UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 96—PART 13

JANUARY 3, 1950, TO FEBRUARY 28, 1950

(PAGES A1 TO A1248)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1950

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

Address of President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by President Truman at a luncheon of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in Washington yesterday, as recorded and transcribed by the New York Times from a radio broadcast:

I congratulate the National Conference of Christians and Jews on another year of widespread and effective work in the cause of human brotherhood at home and abroad. I assure you of my support and enthusiasm for your program for the coming year, and, in particular, for your brotherhood week, which is to be held next February.

I know of no organization that renders greater service to the basic principles on which this country is founded than the National Conference of Christians and Jews. This country is founded upon an ideal—the ideal of the equality of men before God and under the law.

On the basis of this ideal, we have created a nation composed of people from many lands with many faiths and many beliefs. Here in this country men of different traditions and different faiths have worked together for the common good.

I have just come from the National Cemetery at Arlington, where I laid a wreath on the grave of an American hero. No American knows, no real American cares, whether that man was a Catholic, a Jew, or a Protestant, or what his origin or color were. That grave—the Grave of the Unknown Soldier—symbolizes our faith in unity.

We have achieved our unity in this country, not by eliminating our differences in religion and tradition, not by hiding or suppressing our political and economic conflicts, but by holding to a concept, which rises above them all, the concept of the brotherhood of man.

FIRST STEP OF ENEMIES

The first step of every enemy of this country has always been to attempt to separate the different strands of faith and belief out of which this Nation has been woven. Our enemies have tried to set up group against group, faith against faith—to create prejudice and to spread hate and distrust among our people.

The great service of the National Conference of Christians and Jews is to fight against the forces of intolerance, to bring light to the dark byways of prejudice, and to spread the spirit of tolerance and brotherhood which unites our country. This is a great patriotic service, and the country is indebted to the men and women in this organization who have given so much of their effort and substance in performing it.

In looking over your record of performance for the last year, I have been impressed by your comprehensive day-to-day program of education. Your efforts to promote understanding and eliminate prejudice have extended to almost every kind of organization in our society. You have reached not only the schools and colleges, not only the churches and synagogs, but factories and shops, the press, the radio, and the movies, and organizations of veterans, women, and young people.

You will, I am sure, go on to reach more of these groups and bring your message to every agency that helps shape those attitudes of mind which are important to good citizenship.

This fine work by your organization will reach its peak again next February in Brotherhood Week. I am happy to have the opportunity to serve again as honorary chairman of that event. I am sure that it will be a notable success under the leadership of my friend John Sullivan, former Secretary of the Navy, and with the help of those associated with him, who are gathered here today and who are listening in.

STRENGTH IN PRINCIPLES

The greatest strength of this organization lies in its fundamental principles. The National Conference of Christians and Jews has rightly recognized that the true foundation of the brotherhood of man is belief in God. The only sure bedrock of human brotherhood is the knowledge that God is the father of mankind.

In the history of the world, there have been some movements inspired by a desire for brotherhood and greater justice among men which have denied or forgotten the religious foundation of those ideals. Sooner or later these movements have wavered and lost their way.

They have become self-centered; they have set up their own interests as the only standard of right and wrong, and they have degenerated from movements of liberation into movements of tyranny and oppression. We can succeed in achieving brotherhood only if we acknowledge that the ideal of brotherhood is something outside or above us, something by which we in our turn will also be judged.

All the great religions represented in this organization, whatever their differences, acknowledge this belief in God as the father and creator of mankind. For us, therefore, brotherhood is not only a generous impulse but also a divine command. Others may be moved into brotherhood only by sentiment. We acknowledge brotherhood as a religious duty.

All the faiths represented here claim as a common heritage the great thoughts of the Hebrew prophets. The prophets were among the first of men who saw that the concept of the fatherhood of God required men to do justice to one another. They called on the people of their day, just as they call on us today, not only to recognize the humanity of others but also to work unceasingly for the achievement of a greater justice in human relations.

Those of us who believe in God, therefore, can never be content to live for ourselves alone. We must always be working to eliminate injustice, and to create a society which carries out our ideals.

If we look at ourselves in the true spirit of brotherhood, we must acknowledge that in the United States there are instances of discrimination and injustice because of difference in color, religion, or national origin.

But we are working diligently to overcome these violations of the fundamental faith which holds us together. It is encouraging to see that Americans all over the country are growing more and more aware of the importance of this problem.

ASKS LAWS FOR GREATER JUSTICE

I have asked that our Federal Government take an active part in this effort to achieve greater justice. I have called for legislation to protect the rights of all its citizens and to assure their equal participation in national life, and to reduce discrimination based upon prejudice. In view of the fundamental faith of this country and the clear language of our Constitution, I do not see how we can do otherwise than adopt such legislation.

We must strive abroad, as well as at home, to defend human rights and to expand the enjoyment of freedom. We have taken a firm stand in the councils of the United Nations against the violation of human rights. With the help of your organization and others like it, we have been able to play an important part in the United Nations in developing such historical international documents as the Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on Genocide.

Furthermore, we realize that economic progress is essential to the peace and brotherhood that we desire for all mankind. That is why we are striving with other nations to create world economic conditions in which people may achieve freedom and dignity.

That is why we are undertaking our program of economic assistance and putting forward our proposals for helping underdeveloped regions of the world to achieve a better standard of living through their own efforts.

The task of achieving greater justice and freedom will be long and it will be difficult. The beliefs on which we have founded our form of government and our hope of a better world are under attack. In various parts of the world today human rights and freedom are being deliberately violated and

suppressed. Men and women are being systematically persecuted for their religious beliefs. Campaigns are being waged to turn religion into the tool of the state.

These things are not only morally wrong, they threaten to undo the slow and hard-won achievements of civilization. They represent a new barbarism, more terrible than that of ancient times. These are the acts of men who conceive of other men as slaves and not as brothers.

My friends, I am doing everything of which I am capable to organize the moral forces in the world to meet this situation. I am trying to get all those people who look up and who know that there is a greater power than man in the universe to organize themselves to meet those who look down and who are strictly materialistic. That's what we are up against.

The defense of mankind against these attacks lies in the faith we profess—the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. Men and women who have this faith will refuse to bow to force. They will refuse to worship the power of the state.

They will refuse to set their own nation or their own group above criticism. For they understand that above all these works of man there is the eternal standard of God by which we shall all be judged.

It is only the people of religious faith throughout the world who have the power to overcome the force of tyranny. It is in their beliefs that the path can be found to justice and freedom. Their religious concepts are the only sure foundation of the democratic ideal.

To them, therefore, we must extend the hand of brotherhood. This is a task for all men of good will, working together everywhere. There can be no higher challenge than to build a world of freedom and justice, a world in which all men are brothers. That is the goal toward which we must strive with all our strength.

Sustained and strengthened by one another, we can go forward under God to meet and overcome the difficulties which confront us. With His help mankind will come at last to a world where peace, freedom, and justice will be enjoyed by all people everywhere.

A Fitting Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and article from the Buffalo Courier-Express of Sunday, January 1, 1950:

A FITTING MEMORIAL

Two weeks from today—January 15—the $20,000,000 veterans hospital will be dedicated. This new facility will mean a great deal to Buffalo as well as to the veterans it will serve. But to have it known only as the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Buffalo or the Buffalo VA Hospital seems a mighty cold proposition. For this reason we strongly urge that it be given a more significant name.

The search for an individual to be honored, and at the same time one whose name would honor the hospital itself, brings us to one conclusion. Buffalo had just such a man. He served with distinction in World War I, rose from private to major, was wounded in action and won the Distinguished Service Cross for heroism. In World War II he also served with distinction; but this time he did not wear a uniform, though he had much to do with building the great military machines which forced aggressors to their knees at opposite ends of the world. Last year, weakened by overwork in behalf of his country, he died.

We therefore urge the Congress of the United States, which will convene day after tomorrow, to name the new hospital for a former Member of that body—to have it known as Walter Gresham Andrews VA Memorial Hospital.

We have already mentioned that Walter Gresham Andrews won the Distinguished Service Cross for bravery in action as he led an attack of the machine-gun company of the One Hundred and Seventh Infantry on the Hindenburg line on September 29, 1918, but we have not enlarged on the service he gave the armed forces during his 18 years in the House of Representatives. During World War II he was the ranking minority member of the House Military Affairs Committee. In the Eightieth Congress he was the chairman of that committee. Later he became chairman of the Armed Services Committee when that was formed to include Army, Navy, and Air Force affairs under unification. It was the tremendous work involved in this high position that weakened his heart, forced his resignation from Congress, and brought about his death last year. This record, to our way of thinking, makes Walter Gresham Andrews a veteran of veterans.

To stress another point, let us quote from a statement made by the late Defense Secretary James Forrestal:

"Regardless of political affiliation, all those in Government who have known Representative Andrews will learn with regret of his decision to withdraw from public life. Throughout his career, first as a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House and then as chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the same body, he has rendered great public service."

We agree with Secretary Forrestal. Regardless of Representative Andrews' political affiliations, there should be no quibbling in Congress over naming the hospital as his memorial. We do not believe the men he led in battle against the Hindenburg Line asked if he was a Democrat or a Republican. They knew he was a brave soldier—and he was a brave veteran in later years, too.

These are the best of reasons for Congress to pass an act naming the VA hospital in memory of Representative Andrews. It would be fine if it could be done before the dedication 2 weeks hence. But whether it be done before or after dedication, Congress will be honoring itself as well as Mr. Andrews, Buffalo, and the veterans when it is done.

PFEIFFER PLANS BILL TO HONOR REPRESENTATIVE ANDREWS—MEASURE SLATED FOR INTRODUCTION TUESDAY WOULD PUT LEGISLATOR'S NAME ON VA HOSPITAL

(By Lucian C. Warren)

WASHINGTON, January 1.—Representative WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER, of Buffalo, tonight announced he would follow up immediately the Courier-Express proposal to name Buffalo's veterans hospital in memory of the late Representative Walter G. Andrews by offering a bill in Congress. He said a bill to provide the necessary authorization will be introduced Tuesday, the opening day of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

"The naming of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Grover Cleveland Park, Buffalo, in honor of Congressman Andrews," said PFEIFFER, "would be not only a fine but really fitting tribute to a man whose outstanding devotion to his country is hard to match."

The Pfeiffer bill follows the suggestion of a page 1 editorial in Sunday's Courier-Express advocating that the late Mr. Andrews' distinguished service in combat in World War I and as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee in World War II be recognized in the name to be given Buffalo's magnificent new $20,000,000 veterans' hospital.

It is the hope of PFEIFFER, who succeeded to Andrews' post as Representative of the Forty-second Congressional District, that the bill may go through Congress quickly enough to be in time for the dedication of the hospital January 15. He said he would do his utmost to have the bill passed in record time, but that if it is not enacted in time for the dedication he would continue to push for its passage until it becomes law.

The Veterans' Administration today made it clear that an act of Congress is required before the hospital can be named after Andrews.

The VA pointed out that two hospitals have been named for individuals, both through an act of Congress. One is the Royal C. Johnson Memorial Veterans Hospital at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., recently opened. In this case there was a background very similar to the proposed Andrews Memorial Hospital. Johnson was a former Congressman and a hero of World War I. The late Representative Andrews received the Distinguished Service Cross in World War I and also worked for veterans' interests as a long-time member of the House Military Affairs Committee and the first chairman of the House Armed Services Committee in the Eightieth Congress.

PEEKSKILL HOSPITAL CITED

The other hospital named for an individual is the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Veterans Hospital, now under construction at Peekskill. Several hospitals constructed during the war by the Army are known informally by the names given by the Army, though VA officials designate these hospitals by the names of the cities in which they are located rather than the Army name.

In announcing that he would sponsor legislation for the proposed Andrews Hospital, Representative PFEIFFER issued this statement:

"Ham Andrews loved the United States of America. He was my friend for over 20 years and I believe that many people still do not realize the important part he played in establishing and maintaining our national defense.

"He was almost a professional soldier. After he won the Distinguished Service Cross in World War I, Ham Andrews became determined that his services to the country were not ended but instead had only begun.

"As a Member of Congress—a Member whom I have the privilege of succeeding—Ham Andrews was able to understand exactly what was needed to maintain a well balanced national-defense organization. He was a major contributor in the writing of the Unification Act and a firm believer that unification was vitally needed in order to provide the country with the best possible system of national defense. This work sapped his strength and was a contributing factor to his untimely death.

"He was well liked by both officers and enlisted men. His knowledge of military matters was highly respected by the President, Cabinet members, and Members of Congress.

"By naming the new Veterans' Administration hospital in memory of Ham Andrews we will be performing a duty—a duty of giving credit to a person who devoted his life to the preservation of his country and fellowmen."

Resolution of Hospital Industries' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Hospital Industries' Association, which I have been requested to insert in the RECORD:

Whereas the manufacturers and distributors of hospital equipment and supplies, operating under a system of free enterprise, have established the world's highest standard of scientific performance, treatment, and research, thereby helping the United States to become the healthiest major Nation in the world; and

Whereas the benefits of American medicine have been made available to the people of this country through budget-basis voluntary health insurance, the best health insurance which exists in the world; and

Whereas the experience of all countries where government has assumed control of medical services has shown that there has been a gradual erosion of free enterprise and a progressive deterioration of medical standards and medical care to the detriment of the health of the people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Hospital Industries' Association does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative now in the Congress of the United States, and that said Senators and Representatives be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives and to the National Education Campaign of the American Medical Association at 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

THOMAS G. MURDOUGH,
President.
GEORGE J. HOOPER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

State Medicine or the American Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of May 29, 1949:

STATE MEDICINE OR THE AMERICAN WAY?

While it is unlikely that anything in the nature of a national health plan will be adopted by the Congress between now and early summer adjournment, the number of pending bills, plus the administration's continuing, intensive pressure, indicates very clearly that an ultimate decision will probably be made in the next session.

In the meantime, the American people owe it to their well-being to familiarize themselves with the various proposals and to weigh them, so far as is possible, in light of Britain's experiment in state medicine.

The people are going to have to decide whether they want similar, complete medical regimentation for which they will foot the tremendously heavy bill through new taxation, or whether they intend to continue to care for themselves and others in the traditional American manner—voluntarily.

The counterpart of the far-from-successful British plan is the Truman "cradle-to-grave," compulsory scheme to be financed by every American worker and employer, and which would provide state medicine for rich and poor alike.

This is the plan which has inspired greatest opposition, not only from the medical fraternity and thinking Members of the Congress, but from millions of Americans alarmed by the socialistic trend of Washington maneuvering.

There is little, if any, disagreement anywhere on the point of the Nation's need for better medical coverage—for improved public health programs, more medical schools, more doctors, more technicians, and more nurses.

The controversy is on how the needs can be met in the best American manner.

Under the administration's scheme, which, in the final analysis, would be politically controlled, everybody would get everything in the book—from false teeth to bifocals—from "a" to "izzard" in anatomical and mental care. That is what is promised. There is no guarantee of delivery.

The financing of this grandiose scheme would be threefold. The worker would contribute 1½ percent of his wages up to the first $4,800 annually. Another 1½ percent would come from employers. General tax funds in the United States Treasury would provide still another 1 percent. Those who paid nothing into the fund would get the same care as those who did.

Treatment could be general or specialized—in the home or at a hospital, and at the latter would include every type of service the well-equipped hospital could give. Doctors and hospitals could decide whether they wanted to take the patient.

Payment to doctors would be either on a fee or per capita basis. The Government would decide the amount. The number of patients to be served by one doctor would be determined by local committees.

The present grants-in-aid to States would be increased from the present $75,000,000 to $150,000,000 a year as a means of increasing hospital facilities.

To meet the need for more doctors the administration scheme would provide medical school aid of $300 a year for each enrollee up to past average enrollment. Beyond that the aid would be $1,700 for each new student. Other aid formulas are established for public health and sanitary engineering schools, dental and dental hygiene schools.

Construction and equipment needs along the school line would be met by a 50-50 matching fund plan. Funds would be provided for scholarships, too.

Monetary nurse training aid would be supplied at a rate of $200 a year for each student up to the average enrollment point and $1,200 annually above that point.

Research institutes would be established for special fields; grants and loans would be made to provide rural area services; for experimental undertakings financial aid is authorized for farmers' health cooperatives. The administration bill authorizes an expenditure of $70,000,000 for this purpose alone over a 5-year period.

Local health programs in both treatment and training categories would be financially aided.

The boss of all this would be the politically appointed National Security Administrator. The cost, says the Administration, would be $6,000,000,000. The amount would probably be astronomically greater.

Divided Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Daily Globe of November 29, 1949:

DIVIDED IRELAND

One of the embarrassments of being a statesman, and making frequent professions of fealty to principles of government, based upon the expressed will of a majority of the people in any country, is that some of those people may take you at your word. The inspiring thesis you propounded to rally support for your policy in far places comes, as it were, home to roost.

"Your policy," spokesmen for a small state at your doorstep rise to remark, "your policy is admirable. We concur heartily. We agree that every country has a right to its own unity when history, geography, and the will of the majority of its inhabitants fortify claim to that unity. We agree that the more unity in the world today, the better for all concerned.

"We acclaim your insistence that the selection of free government is, and ought to be, the concern of the people who are to be governed; and that it should not be a prerogative exercised by some powerful neighbor, which maneuvers a minority regime into the saddle and then rigs arrangements to insure their continuance in power.

"With all these admirable utterances of yours, we find ourselves in complete agreement. Will you now be good enough to inform us when you propose to apply them to the small nation for which we speak? Surely, principles so well tested, and so devoutly supported by you, are not championed solely on a geographical basis. If sound and desirable in one-quarter of the world, they cannot become a dubious matter in another. It is difficult, we realize, to get them functioning in distant lands, dominated by a monolithic despotism. But we are your neighbors."

This, in substance, is the plea being raised today in Boston by three distinguished visitors from Ireland, one from the south, the other two members of the Parliament in the six counties of the north. The issue created in the partition of their country by act of the British Parliament in 1920 has been sharpened since last May, when the present British Labor Government enacted in Commons its new statute, redefining the relationship between Eire and England consequent to Ireland's affirmation of independence.

The bone of contention tossed into Anglo-Irish relations by that act was defined in clause 1. "The Parliament," runs the statute, "hereby * * * declares that northern Ireland remains part of His Majesty's Dominion and of the United Kingdom, and

affirms that in no event will northern Ireland cease to be a part of His Majesty's Dominion and of the United Kingdom, without the consent of the Parliament of Northern Ireland."

To the harassed labor government at London doubtless this seems a logical and sensible arrangement. It may even appear to be endowed with a savor of democratic principle. The trouble with the proposal, however, is that it rests upon a basis of externally applied force in defiance of the wishes of the majority, not of southern Ireland alone, but in the north as well. Partition in 1920 did not occur by agreement. It was an external act of coercive power. Reaffirmation of partition in 1949, again by the British Parliament without consultation of the people of Ireland, clothes it with no more validity in morals or principle than it had in the first place.

London's action, as the Prime Minister of Ireland has pointed out, purports "to prevent the British Legislature itself from passing legislation dealing with a subordinate Parliament of a small area created artificially by a previous act of Parliament; an artificial area created for the express purpose of enabling a particular majority always to be in power in that Parliament." The gerrymandering of constituencies in northern Ireland's six counties in the interest of perpetuating the present set-up is notorious. Fermanagh's population is 55.3 percent in favor of reunion; but Fermanagh gets but 33.3 percent representation in the northern Parliament. Tyrone has a majority—55.2 percent—for union, but only 44.8 percent representation. Of the entire 4,248,000 population of Ireland, 80 percent want a united Ireland. Of the entire 32 counties, north and south, 30 seek union. Of 199 representatives elected to both Parliaments in the two areas, 159 want union.

The issue here involved will not wisely be ignored, either in London or Washington, if consistency be part of their political doctrine.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Increasing Cost of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from the speech which I made some time ago before the Worcester County Selectmen's Association at Auburn, Mass.:

The war has undoubtedly contributed greatly to the expansion of the Federal Government. The demand for new social services has been another factor. Despite economy efforts there are many items in the Federal budget which cannot be reduced at this time without imperiling the national security or in some serious way affecting the welfare of the Nation.

It is also true that the cost of local and State government has followed suit. At the local level, partly because of the impact of programs initiated by the State or Federal Governments, expenditures and, consequently, tax rates have risen to an all-time high.

Thoughtful persons cannot view these conditions without gravest concern for the future. Most regrettably, the heaviest part of these tax burdens fall upon the ordinary rank and file of our people. Withholding taxes, and other taxes too numerous to mention, taking money out of the pockets of working men and women that otherwise could be used for their own improvement and security, are beginning to undermine our high standards of living which we believed were resting on a solid foundation.

The painful part of this situation is that the end is apparently not yet in sight. Current governmental deficits are steadily rising, expenditures are getting well ahead of income. During the past 18 weeks the Federal Government is reported to have spent about $2,500,000,000 more than its income. If this trend continues, by the end of the fiscal year the Nation will face a deficit of perhaps more than $5,000,000,000. This deficit will have to be made up by taxes, including onerous and shocking taxes upon our poor working people who can ill afford to pay out a larger share of their present meager incomes into the coffers of the Government.

But that is not all. Operating business throughout the State and Nation upon which our working people depend for jobs, high wages and steady work will be immeasurably penalized, hampered and discouraged by increased tax burdens. If this situation continues long enough, it is entirely possible that our institutions of private enterprise and free economic activity will be brought to a state of stagnation.

Every effort must be made in ensuing months by appropriate officials of the Government to implement existing plans for economy and the elimination of waste and extravagance. But this cannot be done without cooperation of our local and State officials who in their respective communities by intelligent, courageous planning can furnish a striking example of the good results that can flow from economy and efficiency in checking and diminishing the heavy burdens of our people.

PHILBIN also dealt with aspects of the current international impasse and urged a united, coordinated front against global communism and its manifestations in the United States.

Military conquest is not the only way by which this Nation can be reduced. Systematic infiltration of Communist ideals, unsound and unwise fiscal and governmental policies, extreme and unbearable taxation can in time accomplish the same end. Your organization which has the confidence of the people where your members reside and serve can wield a direct and powerful influence in molding and mobilizing public opinion in behalf of sound progressive government. That you have achieved so well and so constructively is not only an evidence of your loyalty, energy, and ability but also a very great encouragement to all those of our rank and file who are interested in preserving the essential patterns of American life and the freedoms we have cherished since America was founded.

Christmas Eve Message of President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Sunday Globe of December 25, 1949:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S CHRISTMAS EVE MESSAGE

INDEPENDENCE, MO., December 24.—The text of a talk by President Truman broadcast from here in connection with the lighting of the national community Christmas tree on the White House grounds at Washington:

"My Fellow Countrymen: To each, to all, a Merry Christmas.

"Once more I have come out to Independence to celebrate Christmas with my family. We are back among old friends and neighbors around our own fireside. Christmas is the great epic of home. Our homecoming here on this Christmas eve in familiar surroundings sanctified by family associations through the years—memories of joys and sorrows, of life and death—is typical of similar family gatherings all over the country.

"The memories of most of us go back to childhood when we think of Christmas. After all, the first Christmas had its beginning in the coming of a little child. It remains a child's day, a day of childhood love and of childhood memories. That feeling of love has clung to this day down all the centuries from the first Christmas. There has clustered around Christmas Day the feeling of warmth, of kindness, of innocence, of love—the love of little children—the love for them—the love that was in the heart of the little child whose birthday it is.

"Through that child love, there came to all mankind the love of a Divine Father and a Blessed Mother so that the love of the Holy Family could be shared by the whole human family. These are some of the thoughts that came to mind as I gave the signal to light our national Christmas tree in the south grounds of the White House.

"MUST NOT FORGET HOMELESS

"Sitting here in my own home, so like other homes all over America, I have been thinking about some families in other once happy lands. We must not forget that there are thousands and thousands of families homeless, hopeless, destitute, and torn with despair on this Christmas Eve. For them as for the Holy Family on the first Christmas, there is no room in the inn. Among these families—broken with the tragedy of homelessness—are myriads of little children who have never known what it was to have a home or a country that they or their parents or their brothers and sisters could call their own.

"Let us not on this Christmas, in our enjoyment of the abundance with which providence has endowed us, forget those who, because of the cruelty of war, have no shelter—those multitudes for whom, in the phrase of historic irony, there is no room in the inn.

"In this blessed season, let not blind passion darken our counsels. We shall not solve a moral question by dodging it. We can scarcely hope to have a full Christmas if we turn a deaf ear to the suffering of even the least of Christ's little ones.

"Since returning home, I have been reading again in our family Bible some of the passages which foretold this night. It was that grand old seer Isaiah who prophesied in the Old Testament the sublime event which found fulfillment almost 2,000 years ago. Just as Isaiah foresaw the coming of Christ, so another battler for the Lord, St. Paul, summed up the law and the prophets in a glorification of love which he exults even above both faith and hope.

"We miss the spirit of Christmas if we consider the incarnation as an indistinct and doubtful, far-off event unrelated to our present problems. We miss the purport of Christ's birth if we do not accept it as a living link which joins us together in spirit as children of the ever-living and true God. In love alone—the love of God and the love of man—will be found the solution of all the ills which afflict the world today. Slowly, sometimes painfully, but always with increasing purpose, emerges the great message of Christianity: Only with wisdom comes joy, and with greatness comes love.

"In the spirit of the Christ child—as little children with joy in our hearts and peace in our souls—let us, as a Nation, dedicate ourselves anew to the love of our fellow men. In such a dedication we shall find the message of the Child of Bethlehem, the real meaning of Christmas."

Construction of Jefferson National Expansion Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative in Congress from the Eleventh District of Missouri, it has been my privilege today to introduce in the United States House of Representatives, a bill providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of Old St. Louis, Mo., in accordance with plans approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, and for other purposes.

It is fitting that, as we enter the second half of this century, we turn our attention to the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial.

The one is a landmark of time, the other a landmark of history.

Just 145 years ago, our pioneer Nation sent forth the Lewis and Clark expedition to explore the vast territories of its breathtaking Louisiana Purchase.

Three years and four months later—long after they had been given up for lost—the small, brave group clambered up the river front shore of St. Louis.

They had accomplished their mission. It is there, on that same shore, that the city of St. Louis proposes the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial be built.

When Lewis and Clark returned from their long, silent journey, they brought with them a report of national wealth more staggering than the wildest imaginings of their time.

They had explored and charted thousands of miles of the Nation's newly acquired territory. They had mapped the great Missouri and Columbia Rivers, crossed the rugged western mountains, noted the rich, fertile soil and the fabulous reaches of timberland.

Out of their explorations, out of the daring foresight of one of our Nation's greatest Presidents, Thomas Jefferson, has grown much of our beloved and respected history, many of our great States.

To that, the river-front memorial will be a shrine.

But it also will be a symbol, a symbol of democracy and of faith in our United States.

For a tradition of our history, is our ever-present belief in the future, the belief that our freedom and the good things we enjoy and strive for must be preserved for our posterity.

This memorial, a monument to the pioneering spirit that sought out and conquered great and challenging frontiers, will remind us constantly both of our traditions and of our opportunities.

Our Nation deserves this shrine.

Address of President Truman at Dedication of the Carillon at Arlington National Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of President Truman's address today at the dedication of the carillon at Arlington National Cemetery as carried in the New York Times of December 22, 1949:

Here in Arlington National Cemetery, in the presence of our war dead, we have come to consecrate a carillon.

In their nightly hymn, the bells of the carillon will sing of our faith in the kinship of man and God. Each time they sing that faith, they will proclaim our compact with the veterans of our Nation's wars who gave their lives that our faith might endure.

Our American heritage of human freedom is born of the belief that man is created in the image of God and therefore is capable of governing himself. We have created here a government dedicated to the dignity and the freedom of man. It is a government whose creed is derived from the word of God, and its roots are deep in our spiritual foundations. Our democracy is an expression of faith in the spirit of man, and it is a declaration of faith in man as created by God.

On these spiritual foundations, we have established a creed of self-government more precious to us than life itself. These soldier graves are a testament to this creed, for these men died for it. While freedom prevails, we—the living—shall keep our compact with these dead. And as long as this Government remains rooted in the dignity of man and in his kinship with God, freedom will prevail.

SAYS MANKIND IS WAR WEARY

If man could achieve self-government and kinship with his God throughout the world, peace would not tremble in the constant dread of war. Mankind is exhausted from the ordeal of conflict. All men are sick of blood letting and hunger, and weary of the trouble suffered for so many years. If we could mobilize world opinion among all men who walk the earth, there would never be another war.

This we cannot do alone. For the earth is deeply divided between free and captive peoples. There is no appeal to the brotherhood of men who live in daily fear of the concentration camp. Until the captive peoples of the world emerge from darkness, they cannot see the hand we hold in friendship. While they are made to respond to our handclasp with a mailed fist, we have no choice but to stand ready in self-defense.

Much as we prize peace and friendship, we prize freedom more. And much as we trust in God, while He is rejected by so many in the world, we must trust also in ourselves.

STRESSES NEED FOR COURAGE

In an age where peace must be protected we must resort to our own strength to hold aggression at bay. When good will prevails and peace comes to the earth, it will come because we have had the resolution to hold fast through perilous times, and we have had the courage to share our resources with other nations who believe in freedom.

By generous sharing of our material goods in the past few years, we have restored to many peoples faith in themselves, faith in their freedom, faith in the certain triumph of confidence over fear. Just as long as we continue to face our world responsibilities with the courage and realism we have already shown, we shall deserve the right to hope—and work—for lasting peace.

Meanwhile, our efforts in search of peace and security have not spared us problems at home. Not only do the security needs of our Nation seem at times to be in competition with social progress, but the attention we must give to weapons of defense may obscure the fact that the real basis of our strength is a strong and active faith in freedom.

HOLDS FAITH MUST BE MAINTAINED

As long as freedom remains a force for human welfare, men will cherish it in their hearts and defend it with their lives. In this present-day world where man's personal independence is cramped by the complexities of his economic existence, it is the duty of government to see that each citizen does not lose faith in his ability to provide freely by his efforts for his own welfare.

We have revived the belief of free peoples in themselves in many foreign countries; and we must continue to safeguard at home the belief in ourselves and belief in freedom as the greatest force for human welfare.

This is an age where faith in one's self, faith in freedom, faith in the kinship of man and God, are more important to our survival than all the mighty armaments of war.

As these bells ring out their hymns, they will proclaim that message of faith. As long as they ring, these honored dead may rest.

While faith lives, so does freedom.

While freedom lives, so does hope of a just and lasting peace.

Asleep at the Switch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial, written by J. H. Van Winkle in the Oregon City Banner-Courier, on the subject of the failure of the President to appoint a Chairman of the National Security Resources Board:

ASLEEP AT THE SWITCH

At the request of the President, Congress enacted laws setting up several agencies for national defense. These agencies were made responsible to the President. They were

created at his bidding and turned over to him. They were thought necessary by Congress as a major part of implementing our defense planning.

Three of these independent agencies are the National Security Resources Board, an almost all-powerful manager of just about everything that affects preparation for or against war; the Defense Research and Planning Board, which is charged with stockpiling or finding substitutes for critical war materials we do not produce within the Nation; and Munitions Board, which has wide powers for the procurement and storage of armament and supervision over development and manufacture of modern improvement of munitions.

All three of these vitally necessary agencies have been fumbling around in the dark without a full complement of members and without President-appointed chairmen simply because the President has felt it more expedient to play politics than to implement the national defense.

The President deliberately has refused to fill the chairmanships because his democratically controlled Senate couldn't stomach his nominations. Those characters offered for membership were found repugnant even to the Senate controlled by the President's own party.

Investigation found them wanting in every respect except one—that they were of the right political faith and were cronies of the President. The Senate, wisely enough, protested us from having ne'er-do-wells on these important commissions. It refused to rubber stamp the President's political pay-off.

As a result, the President has turned huffy and pouts, in effect, by saying well, if you won't have the men I want, you'll have no one.

In other words, because the President's poker pals are not believed competent to fill the jobs, the Nation's defense can go to pot before the Chief will bother to consider seeking out responsible and able hands for the vacancies.

World War II Memorial Dedication, Chelsea, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein a statement I made during the World War II Memorial Dedication held in Chelsea, Mass., November 6, 1949. Dr. J. B. Toltz was the chairman of the memorial committee.

The Statement follows:

We who assemble in reverent service at this dedication are separated by time and distance from the men who died for us.

As we grow old and new generations succeed us the meaning of this sacrifice will also be buried in the dry pages of history unless we raise a memorial to them which shall ever remind us of their gallant, generous, and immortal spirit.

From the dawn of history, man has built shrines and has worshipped before altars to those powers greater than himself. Through different stages of his development and by means of various creeds he has lifted his heart to the creative essence of life and has prayed to it for strength and consolation and guidance.

Once he worshipped the elemental forces of nature in fear. The sun and the rain—these were the life-giving elements which he was completely dependent upon for survival. To him a long dry spell during the growing season or the thunder and lightning of a storm were signs that he had incurred the disfavor of the gods. And so he sought to appease them with his primitive rituals.

But as he matured in faith and understanding, the one true God in whose image he is created was revealed to him. Through prayer and good works he seeks to make himself worthy of that eternal love.

And to that Creator he offers the supreme gift of sacrifice.

Not in abject fear or under compulsion, but as the joyful offering of his heart.

In many quiet ways, on this journey through life, average men and women have moments in which they rise above the selfish claims of existence and "do unto others as they would have others to unto them."

It was so with these men whose memory we honor today.

They did not want war.

These fine young men, in the glory of their youth and health, wanted the same chance to live as others who had gone before them.

But when we were attacked there was no other choice. Only the best among us were capable of defending the rest.

And so they went forth, torn by the first wound of separation from happy homes often blessed with wives and children. Others left sweethearts behind them. All put aside their dreams, ambitions, plans to face with the sternest test of their manhood our responsibility.

Shouldering this double burden they went out to meet the fearful unknown, never to return.

When the war that they won at great cost came to an end we rejoiced.

The war was over, but they did not come back.

Today we gather together in a more sober mood, seeking comfort in the company of the living as we reckon our great loss.

Why, why must the cream of a nation's youth be called upon to die for our mistakes? Why didn't we exert every effort beforehand to prevent the tragedy of war? Where were we and what were we doing during those years when the danger was slowly mounting?

For the dead of World War No. 2 it is too late to ask such questions.

They sleep, their lives cut short by our neglect. Even now we reach out through memory to recall their smiles and laughter and the eagerness of their youth which brightened our homes, but memory cannot take the place of life. They are gone, and the world is darker without them.

The door of death has closed on a wealth of character and ability that was denied the opportunity to offer its great gifts to life. We who mourn are the losers in more ways than one.

Time and distance and forgetfulness.

They are merciful to those who have lost a loved one.

But we cannot, we do not want to forget completely.

To do so would betray those who sacrificed that we might learn, and would repeat the careless complacency from which they saved us. Next time, if we should permit the tragedy of war to come again through our blunders, they will not be here to help us, and that may be the margin by which we could lose everything that we cherish.

We cannot fail a second time.

The children of the heroic dead and all children who are so happy on this Sunday afternoon trust in our protective strength and wisdom. They will never forgive us if they at some future date should have to surrender life itself because we would not work for peace.

Standing as we are between the dead and those who are young in life, I believe that we are aware of this responsibility.

We have come to dedicate this memorial so that we shall not forget.

It is made of stone and steel, as imperishable as mortal hands can make it.

But this memorial will not serve its purpose unless we repeat its meaning to ourselves each time that we pass it on our way to work or recreation.

They faced the unknown with fear and with a courage which conquered that fear.

Can we do less and still call ourselves their brothers?

No.

Because ours is an easy job by comparison. We are being asked to solve those problems which will prevent war. Difficult as it may be, this, the greatest of all possible victories, can and will be won.

That is, if we emulate the unselfish devotion of the men from Chelsea who gave their lives in World War No. 2.

This memorial is a shrine to valor.

To young men who once walked the streets of this city even as those we see today, ordinary men who became great under the pressure of crisis. We look up to the high example of courage which they have set before us, proud of them even as we grieve for them. They were members of our human family. They lived in our city and perhaps one or two of them lived on our street. We watched them growing up as children and were shocked when we heard that these youngsters had become men overnight and had died defending us.

And we ask ourselves the question: "How can we be as worthy of life as they have been?"

Perhaps wrapped up in our own problems we have not seen the many small ways in which we could be of help to our city, our Nation, and the world. With the extra years granted to us, we have a greater opportunity to live fully, knowing that we go this way only once and determined to be a good neighbor and a good citizen, for only by this effort can we contribute to understanding and the cause of peace.

A few men with too much power at the head of any nation are responsible for most wars. The hope of the world is in the common people. They get along well together because they have learned the sturdy values of cooperation. This experience must be extended.

It is up to national leaders to learn from them, as we have learned from our young men who made the supreme sacrifice.

By their dying they have opened our eyes to the need for greater courage from the rest of us, the courage to face the larger problems of this life, to think of them, to make ourselves well informed concerning them, and to express them as part of the great voice of public opinion which no leader can ignore.

I know some people who don't want to hear the word "atom" mentioned. It terrifies them. Now, I say that this is fear of the unknown. The power of atomic energy is a fact and a responsibility. We cannot run away from it. Rather, we must work to find some way by which we can be sure that it will be applied to the constructive tasks of peace. That will require effort, patience, and courage. The courage which the heroic dead whom we honor today expect from us.

With this plaque to ever remind us, is it not better for us to become their living memorial, advancing with increasing tolerance and intelligence toward that better world for which they died?

I believe that these young men did not die in vain.

A life lived for others and given for others is the noblest life that any man can live.

It illuminates the way for those who follow by its shining example.

It nourishes us with the immortal spirit which it so clearly revealed.

Four times and more the seasons have come and gone since these gallant men went through the valley of death to that country from which no traveler returns.

Most of their remains have been brought home so that their last resting place may be carefully tended for by their loved ones.

The city of Chelsea goes further. As evidence of a community's reverent regard it is dedicating this memorial on which their names are inscribed in their honor.

So that generations yet to come may pause, and remember, and thank God that the United States had men such as these to save for all her people the blessings of peace, security, and freedom.

Time To Weigh Our Gains—Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial that appeared in the Detroit Free Press of December 28, 1949:

TIME TO WEIGH OUR GAINS—FOREIGN AID

High and hot on the agenda of the Eighty-first Congress' second session, will be European aid expenditures—economic and military.

There will be strong congressional sentiment for sharply cutting this huge outflow of taxpayer dollars. And this opposition will bring dire predictions. Pressure will be turned on to keep Americans in a mood both generous and fearful.

The taxpayers will hear that any appreciable reduction in Marshall plan or related spending will pave the way for Communist imperialism.

Before national opinion formulates, let American taxpayers weigh objectively the things their money being spent abroad has bought, and what a future outlay can buy.

Economically, distressingly little has been purchased. Europe doggedly maintains its old barriers to self-sufficiency. Despite the fine talk about constructive spending and the fallacy of mere stopgap giving, all we have managed is the latter.

Europe's own attitude has frustrated our best intentions.

We have kept things going and by artificial expedient have fended off communism's westward spread. But we can't keep it up forever and survive ourselves. America will be as broke as Europe, with nothing gained and all lost.

Military free spending on behalf of Europe is more a proposition for the future than an existing fact, but the move to make it a fact is far along.

That our money can ever buy a military line of defense east of the English Channel is the remotest of possibilities.

France, which would have to be the continental kingpin of an alliance, can't maintain a government. Under its conception of military teamwork it must be the quarterback, line, backfield, and coach, with only the role of water boy reserved for its friends.

Exemplifying its individualism, jealousy, or whatever you care to term it is "Chairman" Montgomery. Britain's Marshal Montgomery is nominal chief of the feeble military team into which western Europeans have banded themselves.

So faction-ridden, so plagued with national egotism is this alliance that its principal military man cannot be accorded a military title.

In truth, it isn't an alliance at all, but a committee. And a defense run by a committee couldn't hinder the march of the Honduras constabulary.

Britain, within the limits of her size and poverty, doubtless would stand as firmly as she could. So might some of the very small countries, but their potence in a major conflict would be so trivial as to be almost invisible.

So tax money sent overseas to arm Europe can hardly be counted a judicious direct spending for a military hedge against communism on the march—with tanks and cannon.

The best you can say is that perhaps it would contribute to an atmosphere of kinship and comradeship with what America stands for as a democracy. Maybe it would implant a habit of thought, make the western European, no matter what might befall, feel himself a partisan of democracy.

But this is all highly problematical, the more so since investigation indicates that the ordinary European has almost no real knowledge of America's part in his welfare, and that often his appreciation is even less than his information.

To say the least it is a dubious type of insurance for us. If the day ever came to collect on our policy we might find we had been paying our billion-dollar premiums for nothing.

That day for collection would be one on which either by military aggression or political coup the Communists took over lands we have been assisting. If these, even in the hands of communism, remained obdurately loyal to the remaining strongholds of democracy it would help vastly in their rewinning—given time.

But this is decidedly a long-shot chance. There is nothing in the form sheet to support it. And staking billions, year upon year, on a long shot in power politics is no wiser than doing the same thing at a horse track.

The Majority Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following excellent editorial on our majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., on Sunday, January 1, 1950:

A TRIBUTE TO A TRUE MAN

This is New Year's day of 1950. It is the commencement of a new year freighted with opportunity but frightening with possibilities. This is the first day of the month that was named in the Roman calendar after Janus, the god with two heads, one looking forward and the other looking backward.

So on New Year's Day, it is our custom to look ahead to the future as well as look back at the past, in order to make a proper appraisal of events as they pass in review. The importance of government as well as governmental affairs as it pertains to our daily life, cannot be overemphasized in these days.

Accordingly, we must look to our national leaders and their leadership in order to get a proper picture of our direction. Any endeavor to obtain such a perspective will bring into focus the personality and achievements of our own Massachusetts leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader of our National House of Representatives.

The proud record of the Eighty-first Congress established under the direction of Congressman MCCORMACK is one of which all Americans should be proud. Majority Leader MCCORMACK again and again asserted his brilliant leadership for his party, his State, and his country. Years ago, JOHN MCCORMACK was a pioneer in raising his voice in protest against the growing Red terror, south of the border, in our neighboring country of Mexico.

Again and again, he battled against the antireligious drives that would result in chaos and disorder in old Mexico.

His voice was then a voice crying out in the wilderness. Today, all well-informed persons acknowledge the debt of gratitude that is owed to Mr. MCCORMACK for his courage and intelligence in uncovering the dangers that lurked in such a campaign.

When later, world-wide communism commenced to rear its ugly head and to make threats against the American way of life and its peace and serenity, again it was the same leader, MCCORMACK, who sounded the tocsin that Americans must be on guard against the Red peril.

Leader MCCORMACK'S work in the Eighty-first Congress was outstanding. It was truly said to be a "triumph for peace and democracy." Mr. MCCORMACK helped in the shaping of our policies for international recovery and peace, for our national defense and security, for housing, for the programs underlying social security, health, and welfare, as well as those affecting the reorganization of our governmental set-up, our national economy and our agricultural problems. He contributed his political genius to legislation in behalf of labor, the veterans, and did his best to guarantee to all Americans equality of opportunity and civil rights to all, regardless of race, color, or creed.

In his own words, delivered on the floor of Congress on October 19, 1949, Majority Leader MCCORMACK summed up the results of his statesmanship in these words:

"This Congress backed up the impressive foreign policy of President Truman not only with the necessary legislation, but with funds to aid friendly countries to rehabilitate their economic and military strength.

"This foreign-policy program, the prime purpose of which is to bring peace and prosperity to the world, is the greatest undertaking by any government on earth. Our esteemed President, Mr. Harry S. Truman, instituted it and history will record his effort as the greatest ever made to wipe the ravages of war from the face of the earth. Personally, I am proud, and I know my colleagues are proud, to be a Member of the Congress which gave the tools to our leader for the most gigantic enterprise ever undertaken in the history of mankind."

And so, again, the Lynn Telegram-News is glad to publicly acknowledge the debt of gratitude that is owed to Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and on this joyful New Year's Day, may we express our best wishes to the Congressman and his gracious and charming helpmate, Mrs. John W. McCormack. May they both enjoy all the blessings and the good things of life that they have so well earned and so richly deserve.

Preservation of the American Way of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Research Engineer is a monthly publication of the Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.

In its issue for the month of November 1949 there was published on its editorial page a statement by Col. Blake R. Van Leer, the president of the Georgia Institute of Technology, regarding the meaning of the phrase "Preservation of the American way of living," a phrase which has been widely used recently.

Colonel Van Leer's statement regarding the American way of living is one of the finest which I have seen relating to this important subject. In it he presented some great truths in plain and understandable fashion. I was so impressed with Colonel Van Leer's statement, which is short and to the point, that I asked his permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He was kind enough to grant my request, and I insert the article herewith:

"Preservation of the American way of living" is a catch phrase much used today by men with vastly different viewpoints. To the hide-bound isolationist it means the same as the prewar "America First"—nothing for any other country if it would deprive us of an iota of our well being. To the average citizen it means defending our constitutional rights and privileges against the onslaughts of isms, maintaining that atmosphere in which men are individuals instead of units of a state system. To the extreme radical it means free license to advertise his beliefs without fear of the reprisal which the system he advocates would inflict.

To the scientist and engineer—assuming that this group also agrees with Mr. Average Citizen—the phrase "Preservation of the American way of living" is a challenge to increased efforts to find new and better methods and products. To this group, particularly, the "American way" is not a static one; it is progressive. Our method of living has developed, not stood still. It is the outgrowth of the efforts of many men. "Preservation" of this mode of living, therefore, means preservation of a dynamic balance between the best elements of the present and what the future can bring if we strive our hardest.

BLAKE R. VAN LEER,
President, Georgia Institute of Technology.

Government Detectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Clement Norton which appeared in the Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass.:

DETECTIVES

Our Government has done a great job at protecting us. They "planted" reliable intelligence agents right in Communist meetings for years. As a matter of fact, the agents became members of the party and officials of the same. Why not? If the "Commies" are out to destroy our form of government, then we must know these facts. Likewise, if they are not out so to do, then our agents will so report.

Man has more freedom here than any land of the world. I marvel at it. When I go abroad and see how others live. See how little freedom the common man has—why I admire the homeland more and more. This is heaven on earth if you think and read and study and appreciate.

CRIMINAL

It would be criminal negligence for our leaders to stand by and allow Communists or any other group to meet and conspire to destroy this Government, and do nothing about the same. So, of course, we had not only the right, but the duty to "plant" intelligence agents in the meetings of any suspected group. If you woke up some morning and found the gestapo agent at your door, with a gun, then it would be too late.

I'm no hysterical hate-monger. I'm no fanatic against the Commies. I believe that every group has the right to free and open expression of opinion in America, but freedom is not a license to conspire to destroy our Government. If those very same Communists who meet on American soil, and plan to destroy our democracy, were to meet on Russian soil, and plan to destroy Stalin's form of government, they would be taken right out and shot. There would be no trials. No bail. No witnesses. They would just "disappear," the most awful thing that can happen to you in Russia. Disappear as did the 10,000 officers of Poland's army, the "cream of the crop," who were later found buried at Katyn, in Russia, by the Germans, and each officer was shot in the back of the head.

WHY?

So, why should there be any question about the right of our Government to "plant" intelligence agents, in communistic meetings? And yet, when some of our agents testified at the recent Commie trial in New York, I heard a few unthinking citizens remark: "That was a dirty thing to do." No, it was the right thing to do. It was the proper thing to do. It was the patriotic thing to do, for no one must be allowed to plot to destroy our country on American soil without our leaders, and our people knowing about it.

Clyde M. Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, because of his long and distinguished public service, the people of Kansas came to know CLYDE M. REED well in his official capacity. Through the years he had a wide personal acquaintance. However, because he was such a busy man and so diligently devoted to his public duties, there were many who knew him well in his public capacity who had no opportunity to know CLYDE REED as he was known by his family and close personal associates.

Following Senator REED's death his public service was widely acclaimed in the editorial columns of the Kansas press by men who had been long associated with him in the newspaper profession and in public life. These editorials told of the life of CLYDE REED as a great and distinguished public servant. Another and less well-known side of CLYDE REED's life and career is presented in an editorial appearing in the Parsons (Kans.) Sun on November 10, 1949, by Clyde M. Reed, Jr., the present able editor of that paper. I feel sure that his former associates in Congress and in official life in Washington will be interested in reading this beautifully written and poignant picture of CLYDE M. REED as his family knew him:

CLYDE M. REED

My father left this world as he would have chosen, at the peak of his career. Retirement to him was unthinkable because that meant inactivity and he never had known much of that in the busy 78 years which made up his life.

Others knew him as a Senator, a Governor, a newspaper publisher, and an active public man. Our family saw him in that light, but possibly were too close to judge him objectively. We knew him best as a loving father, the head of a large family. He took a deep interest in all of us, despite demands made on his time by other interests. His pride increased with the arrival of each additional grandchild. He was pleased as punch when Clyde M. Reed III, came into the world. He hated to lose at anything, but when the young man, now 7, beat him in checkers twice one evening not so long ago at the hospital, father had a twinkle in his eye that said more than a thousand words ever could tell.

My earliest recollections of my father were as a busy man, constantly on the go. His body rested at times, but his mind never did. In my early years, he was in work that laid the foundation for his wide knowledge of transportation. We had freight rates for breakfast, boxcars for supper. Occasionally I was able to get in a word about football and there would be brief attention given to my sisters' current boy friends, but then we got back to more serious things.

Whether boxcars, freight rates, or later, the State highway system which was inaugurated when he was Governor, or still later, the many national and international questions which came before him as Senator, underneath them all was a deep sympathy for and understanding of people as human beings.

He understood because he had been faced with many problems himself on his way up the ladder. His sympathies were not those of a professional do-gooder or one who got his knowledge of human problems from a textbook. He learned from first-hand experience. His friendships knew no bounds.

One of the daily pleasures he anticipated here at home was a visit to the barbershop of the Grimes brothers. He and Tom and Otis Grimes would discuss a little bit of everything and he got many chuckles and not a few pointers from them. That Tom and Otis are of another race never entered his mind. They were friends, first of all.

He was vitally interested in the work of the Sisters of St. Joseph who operate Mercy Hospital in Parsons. That interest often took precedent over matters of national importance which confronted him, but the sisters were serving humanity, working with people and more than that, were providing an indispensable service in the community he loved and called home, and those things were important in his mind.

In his political life he was known as a fighter, a scrapper. The family knew him in those roles because he brought them home with him and we talked about them. He couldn't leave his work at the office because he was a bundle of energy that functioned 12 hours a day on the minimum and 16 hours on average and the thought that he should slow down some time was mentioned often but never caught on.

Because he was a fighter, he lost battles as well as won them. The defeats hurt. He was pictured by friend and foe alike as a hard-shelled man. On the surface, perhaps. But underneath was a soft heart that reacted to the ups and downs which come with a career like his.

He suffered some low blows. They hurt most of all. He placed unlimited confidence in his friends. It took him a long time to get over the fact that on rare occasion such confidence was misplaced. He was a sentimentalist who tried to hide it and got away with it to all except those of us who saw him at closest range.

That he accumulated his share of worldly goods in a life which began in that regard from scratch never was as important to him as the fact he had stood fast for a set of principles throughout his career and had come to be recognized for them.

Basic in his philosophy that it was better to be right than popular. He was more concerned with the correctness of the thing than whether he would be riding the high tides of public opinion. He believed that when you were right, the rest would come eventually. He lived to see many one-time foes become steadfast friends and supporters. That the lag between rightness and popularity often was a matter of years never concerned him.

Carrying him through in the meantime was courage of a high order. In later years, when declining health and advancing age plagued him, raw nerve pushed him on. Always he was able to arise to the occasion. Advice that he should spare himself was brushed aside. He had come up the hard way, by sheer work and determination. He was determined to finish that way. He did.

Merciful Providence has taken him into another world. Behind he leaves a precious heritage that will live with members of his family always. We are sad, but find unlimited comfort in the fact he was with us so long and that we could do our bit from the side lines to help him make his life what it was.

That was, and is, our father, CLYDE M. REED. We leave him now with his God.

C. M. R., Jr.

Hoover Report on Veterans' Administration Hospitalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following very enlightening statement made by John M. Barry, M. D., of Lawrence, Mass., at a special conference between the Department of Massachusetts, American Legion, and the Massachusetts congressional delegation, held in the Parker House, Boston, on December 19, 1949:

In this report the Commission recommends (No. 1) the establishment of a United Medical Administration, into which would be consolidated most of the large-scale activities of the Government in the fields of medical care, medical research, and public health (including preventive medicine). The responsibility for furnishing medical and hospital care for veterans would be included in the consolidation by transfer of the functions, facilities, and personnel for medical care from the Veterans' Administration (No. 4). Likewise, out-patient service including offices and special services incidental to hospitalization would be transferred, though the Veterans' Administration would continue to certify patients for treatment and would determine disability ratings, etc.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that we in the Legion are considering only that portion of the Hoover Commission report which deals with Veterans' Administration hospitalization. At this time we are not discussing that portion of the report considering a United Medical Administration for the Military Establishment and the Public Health Service. In brief, at this time we are concerned only with the problem of former service men and women who are now civilians requiring Government medical care through the Veterans' Administration.

I would also like to point out at this time that although the American Legion and I personally have been among the severest critics of the Veterans' Administration, we wish to point out that the Veterans' Administration has made truly tremendous strides toward increased efficiency in the past few years. Legion experience, of course, dates back to the period immediately following World War I, whereas my own experience is limited to the period of time since my separation from the Army in 1945. It has been our common experience that the Veterans' Administration has steadily and progressively raised its standards of medical care and increased the scope and speed of its service.

This proposal of the Hoover Commission is in basic conflict with the traditional policy of the Government to accord to veterans, as a class, special consideration through one single agency responsible for administering the various benefit programs. In addition, it would put individuals who are now civilians under the same regime of care and discipline as the armed forces personnel, their dependents and merchant seamen, and it would produce an intermingling for care of strictly service personnel with strictly civilian patients. It would also impede the efficient handling of claims for compensation, pension, insurance and other benefits where a physical examination is necessary. We should also bear in mind that this policy of caring for veterans through a central agency is not a radical departure which sprang up over night like an unwanted weed, but rather it has had a natural, healthy growth based on the bitter and frequently tragic experiences of divided responsibility over a period of years. This has resulted in the evolution of a system which is really working and constantly showing progress. This progress has been the result of the direct interest and concern of the Veterans' Administration, especially its Bureau of Medicine, aided by the cooperation of organized medicine in the formation of the various deans committees to raise professional and teaching standards and further aided by the influence and cooperation of veterans organizations, particularly the American Legion. As a result of this cooperative effort, a truly enviable position has been achieved in medical care by the Veterans' Administration.

You have already heard from Father Bourdon the historical background of the development of the Veterans' Administration program. We should keep in mind that disability compensation and pensions and insurance benefits predicated upon disability require medical examinations, including hospitalization for observation. The monthly payments in cases of veterans without dependents are subject to reduction while receiving hospitalization or domiciliary care. The amounts of monthly payments in many cases are dependent on the veterans' social adaptability requiring field investigations. The feasibility of trial home visits looking to complete discharge from the status of a hospital patient requires investigations of home conditions. Entitlement to new and reinstated insurance is often dependent upon proof of insurability proven by medical examination. Entitlement to vocational rehabilitation under the provisions of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, is dependent upon medical-examination findings. Entitlement to assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing under the provisions of Public Law 702, Eightieth Congress, is dependent upon medical examination and other medical findings. In brief, major benefit programs are so dependent upon and integrated with the medical, hospital, and domiciliary-care programs as to preclude their separation from the Veterans' Administration, of which they are a part, without disastrous effects on the efficient administration of veterans' benefits.

In view of the historical facts which have been outlined and the experiences gained therefrom, it seems clear that the proposed plan would not work without detriment to the efficient operation of the program of medical and hospital care and other benefits provided for veterans. The high standards of care which have been attained by the Veterans' Administration would necessarily be lowered by a merger of our program with other programs.

Under the circumstances, the Committee on Hospitalization for the American Legion of Massachusetts must strongly recommend against the adoption of this plan to incorporate the Veterans' Administration into a United Medical Administration. We believe it more advisable to recommend that the Veterans' Administration be retained for the medical and associated care of veterans, and, secondly, that with the cooperation of Government, organized medicine, veterans' organizations, and the Veterans' Administration itself, a concerted effort be made to aid the Veterans' Administration in accomplishing its mission with the highest degree of efficiency at the least cost.

I would like to add as an addendum that we must also remember that many so-called non-service-connected cases on admission to a Veterans' Administration hospital later become actual service-connected. One other frequently overlooked factor is the problem of the medical indigent. At present cost and in the light of present medical knowledge, practically all patients with a diagnosis of tuberculosis, neuropsychiatric conditions and those requiring hospitalization beyond a period of 90 days, sometimes 60 days, are medically indigent. In addition, due to particular circumstances, a given individual may be medically indigent on a given date, whereas he would not be indigent at another time. Individuals falling in this category who are veterans require assistance from the Veterans' Administration, and the quickest and safest determination of this need is best made at local level under conditions as they now exist in the Veterans' Administration.

Who Won the War?—Visit of Banker Abs to United States Seen as Plan To Restore Nazi Order in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in the Washington Star of December 16, 1949:

WHO WON THE WAR?—VISIT OF BANKER ABS TO UNITED STATES SEEN AS PLAN TO RESTORE NAZI ORDER IN GERMANY

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Every so often the curtain is lifted and we get another glimpse of how the old Nazi order is being restored in Germany with our kind cooperation—as our war aims go glimmering.

We discover now, for example, thanks to Senator GILLETTE, Democrat, of Iowa, that Herman J. Abs, formerly a director of the Deutsche Bank when it was one of Adolf Hitler's chief agents in exploiting occupied Europe, has been in this country for several weeks—since November 17—conferring with New York bankers but also incidentally visiting the State Department.

Herr Abs long ago wormed his way back into the high councils of German finance and those of the victorious allies. He was permitted to go through the British lines 2 days after the fall of Berlin with 7,000,000,000 of marks in cash to reestablish his business in Hamburg in the British zone, and afterward acted as economic and financial adviser to Sir Sholto Douglas, commander of the British zone.

VISIT EXPLAINED

In explanation of this latest episode here, the State Department, on inquiry from Senator GILLETTE, said that the Department was not trying to keep his visit a secret, but did not want to enhance his prestige in Germany by drawing attention to his activities here. He came to this country, it was said, to confer with American bankers who hold about $30,000,000 of German credits and spent a day in Washington during which he called on officials in the German Division of the State Department to discuss technical matters.

He came, it was explained, with Wilhelm Vocke and Hans Treue, officials of the Deutsche Leander Bank, a tri-zonal bank of all the German states set up in April 1946 by the United States, Great Britain, and France, and as a private citizen, though he is not exactly that, being a director of the German Reconstruction Loan Co., an agency of the West German Government. His visa expires December 25.

Who is Herman J. Abs and what was his role in Hitler's conquest?

This was clearly spelled out in a special report in June 1947 by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, then American Military Governor in Germany, based on an exhaustive investigation by AMG experts. It said he was influential in operations of the Deutsche Bank when it, along with the Dresdner Bank, "acted virtually as an economic branch of the Wehrmacht in exploiting the resources of the occupied countries.

The desire to acquire certain institutions or corporations sometimes originated within the banks, sometimes within the Nazi Government, but all acquisitions had one aim in common, namely, the economic and political domination of Europe by Germany. * * * Both banks obtained a share in the spoils."

BANKS PLUNDERED JEWS

Herr Abs was identified as the key figure in the Deutsche Bank's seizure of French-Belgian properties in Czechoslovakia, Luxemburg, Yugoslavia, and Romania. Before the two banks spread out their operations to other countries, they plundered the Jews in Germany, which is told in a section of General Clay's report on Role of the Banks in Aryanization of the German Economy. It says:

"In this way the Dresdner and Deutsche Banks acquired properties for their own account, financed acquisitions of Aryanized property for customers, selected and appraised property for future Aryanization and even searched for prospective customers interested in this type of transaction. This experience gained in Aryanization activity in Germany served the banks in good stead in their subsequent economic spoliation of occupied Europe."

Herr Abs turned up prominently after the war. When the new trizonal bank of the German states was organized its German board of directors elected him president and August Schniewind, a director of the Dresdner Bank in the Nazi regime, as chairman of the board, but on condition that these two jointly would have a veto on the board. This scheme was spiked by General Clay.

Herman Abs turned up also on the list of German trustees on the control board for the Ruhr iron and steel industry, along with other ex-Nazis, who were picked by a German, Dr. Hermann Punder, president of the executive council of the Bizonal Economic Administration, but this was too much for trade union leaders to take and they protested so vigorously that Herr Abs and some of the others were dropped.

Now he turns up in the councils of the mighty in Washington and New York.

Who won the war?

Address of Hon. Joseph K. Carson, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Commissioner Joseph K. Carson of the United States Maritime Commission delivered at a luncheon given by the Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on Thursday, December 8, 1949:

I am honored by being afforded the opportunity of taking part in this occasion, sponsored by Minneapolis-Honeywell. Our chairman, Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, has asked that I express to you his interest in your enterprise and that you will not only cause to be expressed your best effort in the work you are now doing in which the Commission is interested but that you will continue the improvement of your process and product.

It is always worth while for those charged with the performance of public duty to meet with those in industry whose genius and practical ability make it possible for government, and through government, the people, to enjoy the fruits of the inventive minds and productive skill of forward-looking private enterprise.

This meeting, held as it is, under the auspices of Minneapolis-Honeywell, let us say for the purpose of brevity, is an affair which is in its essence a commercial. To use the vernacular, let us call it a little horn tooting. Well, I just love horn tooting.

I remember the time during the war when I was present at a meeting held in Brighton, England. I was seated next to a lady who said, "Colonel, I suppose you Americans think we are terribly antiquated and behind the times." I said, "No, I shouldn't think we feel that way at all, because after all, the British are a literate people and if you want or need all the modern things we enjoy in America, you would contrive some way of having them." I then went on to say, "We shall adopt many of the practices which we are learning from you people while we are here in your country." She replied, "Really, but I should wonder if your pride would let you do that?" I said, "Our pride would not let us do less. We pride ourselves upon having imported and put into use in America all of the good things we have found in every land and clime."

Prosperity in the United States is dependent upon the invention, production, use, and consumption of the things we do not have to have for existence and propagation. Therefore, it is advertising, putting our best foot forward and tooting our own horn that has brought to the people, in this our promised land, the greatest abundance the world has ever known—and with enterprises such as yours being permitted a free hand within the law to progress further, we are in reality only at the beginning of a better way of life for all mankind. For my part, a light under a bushel is no light at all. Good works should be emblazoned across the firmament of the heavens.

Let me state emphatically at the outset that Minneapolis-Honeywell has earned the esteem of the marine industry by its proven ability to make a real contribution to the American Merchant Marine by handling large contracts involving the installation of improvements in ships to make them truly modern and thereby enabling the industry to improve the service offered to travelers and shippers under the American flag.

Our interest today is focused on air conditioning. The Maritime Commission has been interested in air conditioning for a long time. Even before the war the Commission devoted a great deal of attention to air conditioning and better ventilation of ships. As the result of tests made under Commission sponsorship, we have been able to establish certain standards by which more economical designs have been produced than could have been achieved with conventional practices.

During these investigations into the proper use of air conditioning aboard vessels, the Minneapolis-Honeywell organization has been one that stood by and cooperated with the Commission, not alone in the interest of securing contracts, an entirely legitimate aim, but to throw the weight of their experience and technical ability into the effort to produce the best possible results. That is the sort of thing on which a sound business reputation is built.

Now a few words about what air conditioning means to the success of the American merchant marine. It is by no means a far-fetched connection. It costs much more to own and operate ships under the American flag than under any foreign flag. That is why we make subsidy allowances, under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to place our operators on an equal footing with their foreign competitors. In other words, these subsidies make up the disparity between foreign and American building and operating costs.

The reason that American costs are higher, and the reason that such a disparity exists, is a very important and fundamental one. We have in this country a tradition of free enterprise. We strive to have every business organization stand on its own feet and make

its own way in a freely competitive climate. We do not approve of collusion among companies or business organizations. That would restrain trade or attempt monopolistic control of costs of production. In fact, we have laws that prohibit such activities. Compare this with the situation abroad, where for centuries the economies of countries and entire regions have been controlled by cartels, trade associations, or whatever they may be called, for the purpose of regulating production, prices, and wages wholly for private and selfish interests.

In America, on the one hand, we have had free enterprise in the public interest. Abroad, on the other hand, there has been and still is regulation and restriction by private interests for their individual benefit. The result is that today we have in America a land bountiful in blessings, with opportunities for all, while abroad we see some nations struggling bitterly not only to recover from the ravages of war but to rebuild their economies along the lines of the old concepts.

Here in the United States one business can compete with another because all operate in the same atmosphere of free enterprise. When an American business attempts to compete with a foreign business, however, it is quite a different matter. An American steamship operator in competing with a foreign-flag company is forced to do so under many disadvantages. Among those disadvantages are higher wages, costs of fuel and ship's stores, original construction and repair costs, and higher standards of safety and sanitation.

Therefore, we are always alert to find means of meeting and offsetting these disadvantages. One means of accomplishing this is provided by law which authorizes construction and operating subsidies to operators which perform specified regular sailings over trade routes found by the Commission to be essential in the foreign commerce of the United States. Although we offset certain cost differentials by allowing construction and operating differential subsidies, American-flag shipping must go further than receiving financial aid from the Government if it is to compete successfully with foreign flags. In other words, what I am pointing out is that the subsidy merely makes up the cost disparity. From there on out the American subsidized operator is on his own, and whether he makes a profit depends on the kind of a businessman he is.

In competitive fields of passenger and cargo lift a steamship company must offer the public service. By that I mean careful handling, stowage, and preservation of cargoes. By that I also mean well-designed, adequate, comfortable, and attractive accommodations for passengers.

To compete successfully against the international field, therefore, we must offer superior service that will attract both shippers and travelers to American-flag lines. One of the most effective ways in which we are doing that is through the development of air conditioning, both for the protection of cargo and the comfort of passengers.

As I have said, the Maritime Commission has been interested in the development of air conditioning since before the war. Although the war itself side-tracked some progress that was being made along the lines of full air conditioning, it actually accelerated the application of mechanical ventilation because blackout regulations made it impossible to use the conventional methods of natural ventilation. During the past 11 years all passenger ships built in the United States have been provided at least with air-conditioned dining saloons, and most ships built in the last few years have had all passengers' quarters air conditioned and at least half of those have had the crew's quarters so treated. All passenger ships designed in this country within the last 3 years are completely air conditioned, including all passenger and crew accommodations.

Air conditioning is the most important advancement in passenger comfort in passenger liners in the last generation. Yet, few people who take air conditioning in land establishments for granted understand or appreciate the difficulties under which engineers work when designing and installing such systems aboard vessels. We in the Maritime Commission know, for instance, that difficulties experienced in planning of ship construction are far greater than those experienced in planning for structure on land, and that this applies particularly to the inclusion of air-conditioning systems in a large vessel. Fortunately, ship owners are keenly aware that efficient ventilation and air conditioning are not merely a desirable feature, but that sharp competition in the passenger trades makes them an asset to the business which will pay dividends. Consequently, air-conditioning systems are now considered as "musts" in the original designs of all our passenger vessels.

Most of the ships in which air conditioning is a must will be built with Government financial aid and in return for Government aid the purchaser of the new vessel is obliged to accept plans and specifications which meet with the approval of the Commission. Because the presence of air conditioning is an indispensable part of a truly modern passenger vessel, the Commission will not, I am sure, furnish any financial assistance in the construction of any vessel without it. I am certain we would not build an out-of-date ship or one that did not contain the maximum appointments for passenger and troop health and comfort.

First of all, we require air-conditioning systems that are reliable. That means that they must be large enough and rugged enough to do the maximum job required without more than ordinary attention and servicing at sea. We require systems that are reasonable in original cost and in cost of operation. With the exception of refrigeration machinery, cooling coils, controls, and chilled-water piping, a system should certainly not cost more than a first-class marine heating and ventilating job, particularly when provision has been made for it in the original designing of the ship. And we must bear in mind that in passenger ships air-conditioning systems must be such that will not only produce maximum comfort for the people aboard, but will also comply with safety requirements of vessel design and construction, and the specific needs placed upon a vessel as a troop carrier in time of war.

Inertia to change is always with us in every field of endeavor. It is one of the fateful things of life, but progress in America has been made in spite of it. Through the course of our history, practically every invention which has added to the fullness of life has been figuratively thrust upon a skeptical and unreceptive public through the artifices, if you will, of promotional advertising. In earlier times many an inventor went to his grave never knowing that the fruits of his genius, which he could not sell for the price of a little food and shelter, would within a few decades become commonplace in the life of the community. In reverie, I sometimes wonder whether our great men of invention, production, and distribution today are not often amused as they prepare some new blessing of modern science and industry for the sharp battle it must undergo before it is accepted and put to universal use by a still skeptical and unreceptive public. These men must withstand the insults and accusations of windbags, marplots, and ne'er-do-wells who blaspheme and abuse their benefactors with charges that they are interested only in private gain. True, business is run for profit in this capitalistic world of ours, but let me tell you that if it were not for the great forward vision of our large industrial organizations, where extensive research programs are constantly being carried on at private expense to wrest from nature and the universe all that it has to offer for a higher and finer civilization, there would be little hope for the future of the human race. Yes, our industrialists must possess a humor tinctured whimsy as they thrust aside the fulminations of their traducers and turn to produce more of the good things for all of us to enjoy.

The resistance to progress is ever present in shipbuilding. There are several schools of thought, among both technicians and laymen, concerning the value and use of air conditioning. Among engineers and designers themselves, there are those who think that only dining salons and staterooms should be air-conditioned, while lounges and other public rooms should be ventilated only by the outside air. We are coming to the general belief, I think, that it is best to provide air conditioning for the entire vessel with individual room controls so that the ship may be kept comfortable no matter where or under what weather conditions she may be operating. This is particularly important from the troopship standpoint, since a liner which operates regularly in the North Atlantic, let us say, in peacetime, may find herself in the Tropics a good part of the time during war.

Air conditioning on passenger vessels when employed commercially is primarily for the comfort and convenience of the traveler and it is, therefore, the aim of the Commission that this desirable feature be so engineered and installed as will permit the occupant to use, regulate, or dispense with it in his own quarters.

The importance of air conditioning when a vessel is used as a troop transport, cannot be over-emphasized. War lowers the standard of living for everyone, but particularly for those in combat. When we send men overseas we are not able to limit room occupancy as we do with our first-class passenger accommodations. We put 8 or 10 or even more in a room, stacked up in berths from deck to ceiling. Therefore our air-conditioning systems must be able to provide enough air for several times the number of persons who ordinarily occupy the space, in order that our troops may be made as comfortable as possible. This is important both to the health and morale of men traveling in troop ships under wartime conditions when anxiety and general strain are at a high peak.

I am aware that air conditioning is going to cost a tidy sum, approximately half of which the Government must pay if the vessel is built with a construction subsidy. While I am not an engineer, I know that the increase in cost will not only be attributable to the distributing systems required to carry the clean and healthful air to all parts of a great ship, but will entail greater electric generating capacity and added fuel costs. But it will be worth it. Consider for a moment what we mean when we say that American shipping must compete with foreign-flag shipping. We are not thinking in terms of this Nation competing with another. We are thinking in terms of the United States competing with all the rest of the world.

It is with a stark realization of the world condition which confronts us which calls upon us to marshal the efforts of all who can make a useful contribution to the construction of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable vessels for the transportation of passengers and cargo that science and the will to achieve can produce. As a part of such an effort Minneapolis-Honeywell is making a substantial contribution. I am told, and I address this to that organization, that you have the contracts for the installation of air conditioning in all of the six new ships the Maritime Commission has under construction. Had you not been able to demonstrate your capacity to discharge with competence

the undertaking you have embraced you would not have been chosen for the job.

You may not get the next job in which the Maritime Commission is interested. Competitors may challenge your work. Instead of Minneapolis-Honeywell smugly preening itself with satisfaction in its own works, it too will strive for greater perfection. If you attain success it will not be through change—it must come through painstaking work and dogged diligence. If you fail to achieve success, all society loses. If, on the other hand, you are successful in your present undertaking and in all of your works, you'll earn dividends for your stockholders and the people will get their dividend in better service, comfort, and health.

In truth you are playing in a great game—one in which financial winnings for you mean bonuses in better living for everyone.

Letter From Hon. Edwin Arthur Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

DEAR FRIEND: Congress goes back in session this month. As usual, I am at your service in our Nation's Capital.

Every man and woman in our congressional district, regardless of race, religion, or color, has a right to call on me at any time for help with problems.

Don't let the stooges of Stalin scare you from writing to me because I am always glad to hear from you. I value your opinions and often I am in the spot to do you or your loved ones a favor. All you have to do is ask me.

Before I vote on the following questions I want to know how you feel about them.

1. Do you want compulsory health insurance? _____

2. Do you want Federal aid to education? _____

Mark your answers "Yes" or "No" after these questions.

Your interest in your Government will keep America free.

Your Congressman,

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

St. Vincent's Hospital—100 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, all of us know that getting sick is an expensive matter. Few of us are in a financial position to regard with equanimity the cost of medical care for a major illness. Even so, it is difficult for us to comprehend the impact of a serious sickness on the families of the very poor—the empty, helpless feeling that must come with the realization that the breadwinner, or the hard-working mother, will be lost to the family group through hospitalization.

In thinking of such situations, it is heart-warming to recall the friendly, understanding services of the voluntary charitable hospitals.

An outstanding example of such institutions marked its centenary recently. This is St. Vincent's Hospital in New York City.

St. Vincent's was the first Catholic hospital in the city when it was established 100 years ago. It also was the first voluntary hospital established to care particularly for the sick poor. Through a century, its area of usefulness has widened steadily. But St. Vincent's has remained faithful to its primary charge—to provide adequate medical care for those whose means permit them to pay little, or nothing, for it.

It is a Catholic hospital, operated by the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, the oldest order in the Archdiocese of New York. But no consideration of creed ever has controlled its readiness to care for an indigent sick person. It is a voluntary hospital in the purest sense.

New York's growth has changed St. Vincent's drastically in a physical way, but its spirit—that of comfort for the afflicted—has remained unchanged. The devoted nuns who minister there today are one with the sisters of 100 years ago.

It is a privilege to note the centenary of St. Vincent's at this time and to express the hope that God's blessings will continue to favor its works of mercy as it enters on another century of service as an element of the Catholic Medical Center.

Some Miracles To Ponder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, one of my distinguished constituents, Mr. LeRoy G. Davis, of Sleepy Eye, Minn., this past year celebrated his ninetieth birthday and has been engaged in the practice of law for over 67 years. He is the author of a poem, Some Miracles To Ponder, which is a beautiful expression and was contained in his 1949 Christmas greetings. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his poem:

SOME MIRACLES TO PONDER

Who planned the mechanics
That prints without fail
The white on the tips of
The cock robin's tail?
And who do you think fixed
That beautiful thing,
The red on the bend of
The blackbird's wing?
And how?
Who planned for the black on
The meadowlark's throat,
Which comes by a rule that
No man ever wrote?
Who planned the contrivance
From dust of the earth:
That brain for your thinking
You had at your birth?
And why?

—*LeRoy G. Davis.*

1949.

Bishop William T. Manning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, during the recess of the Congress, New York and the Nation have lost a distinguished churchman and most valuable citizen—Bishop William T. Manning.

For 26 years, until his retirement less than 2 years prior to his passing, Bishop Manning was the head and symbol of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York. He died at 83—a revered statesman of his church who retained an active interest in its affairs.

To one not of his faith, the striking characteristic of Bishop Manning was his intellectual integrity. He was forthright, courageous and uncompromising in his advocacy of social principles he considered to have the highest validity. In this, he provoked bitter criticism, as well as firm support.

On occasion, he was impatient with those who were disposed to place a tortured construction on the words of the Holy Bible in an effort to shape it to their conception of modern life. He said:

The Bible teaches religion, not science.

Bishop Manning was born in Northampton, England, and came to the United States with his parents at the age of 16. He was educated at the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., and later returned there as a teacher of theology. He held rectorships in Redlands, Calif., Lansdowne, Pa.; Nashville, Tenn.; and New York City, where he officiated in Trinity Parish.

In 1920 he became Protestant Episcopal Bishop of New York. While he was a stern defender of his Anglican beliefs, he made the pulpit of the huge Cathedral of St. John the Divine available to clergymen of other faiths. As early as 1933 he was attacking Hitler for his persecution of the Jews. And last February he was condemning the trumped-up conviction of the Catholic Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary.

Although essentially a conservative, he supported such social reforms of President Franklin D. Roosevelt as anti-child-labor legislation and unemployment insurance.

If he needs a tangible memorial, his cathedral will serve admirably. Its present magnificence is attributable principally to his unflagging determination to make it a complete temple of God.

All faiths can admire his crusade against spiritual lethargy. Throughout his long career in the clergy, Bishop Manning fought to arouse renewed awareness of the presence of God. He could not countenance passive faith.

We can all admire and salute his noble character—his militant devotion to God.

Toward World Stability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Toward World Stability—An Attack on One Is an Attack on All," which I delivered at the Institute of World Affairs, held under the auspices of the University of Southern California, in the Mission Inn, Riverside, Calif., December 13, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD WORLD STABILITY—AN ATTACK ON ONE IS AN ATTACK ON ALL

Throughout the history of governments the test of the worth of a constitution has always come in wartime. If we overlook the Kellogg-Briand Pact, which in theory outlawed war, we did not have in the history of governments until the promulgation of the present Japanese constitution a constitution based upon anything but force. The Japanese constitution is one within a superior rule. The projected union of Asiatic States is to be based wholly upon morals. The implementation of arms for the North Atlantic Pact finds America once again acting with words used to inspire unity in repelling an aggressive attack. Seldom has it been mentioned, that when Jefferson heard of the use of British troops against the people of Massachusetts before our Declaration of Independence he justified Virginia's interest in what was taking place in Massachusetts by use of words that are now part of one of the greatest positive law treaties that America is a party to, the North Atlantic Pact.

America, in all that she has done in advancing the concepts of liberty and freedom in the world, has always acted bigger than she thought. And never in her action has she failed to back up her words, if need be, with deeds. America has always been stronger than she thought, and her strength has helped in her leadership in the world.

When the people of Philadelphia celebrated the signing of the Constitution they offered two toasts: one, "the United States of America;" the other, "liberty and freedom to all mankind." Thus in America's beginning our people who were near to the spirit of those who wrote the Constitution interpreted that document with a dual meaning; one, an accomplished fact; the other, a hoped-for ideal. America's foreign policy today stands just where it did that night at Philadelphia; first, to keep America strong; second, to maintain our hoped-for ideal.

When our forefathers founded the United States of America they framed a Constitution which assured us our individual rights, liberties, and safety of person and property. They made it an indestructible instrument for the preservation of democratic principles, by which men would be assured that their innate dignity would be respected by government and society. They made it a flexible instrument which guaranteed representative government. In providing for decision by majority vote with full safeguards for minorities they bequeathed us a way of life which has brought us to our present position as the leading power of the free world. By substituting ballots for bullets, peaceful collaboration for decision by violence, they devised a principle of political action which was then, and is now, the highest attainment of man for the ordering of his affairs. Peaceful change deliberately arrived at—an American governmental invention which we have followed for many generations and which the world is now free to adopt—that is America's gift to the world. Direct actionists do not like it. Change by violence is still their way. An election instead of revolution is the democratic way within a nation. Collective action instead of the marching feet of the aggressor is the substitute the world is offered for war. The struggle is not yet won, but the people have seen the point. They believe that aggressors can be curbed, that a substitute for war has been found, and that ultimately mankind can live in a world of peaceful change instead of one of violence.

Throughout the history of this Nation, we have in theory steadfastly applied these democratic principles in the management of our domestic affairs and in the conduct of our foreign affairs. We have expressed in our international relations the same respect for human rights and liberties as we have meticulously sought for ourselves. Traditionally, we have gone to the aid of the oppressed and spent our blood in the defense of the territorial integrity and the political independence of other nations as well as our own. Throughout our history in many parts of the world our actions, our force and our flag have stood for what the world learned to recognize as an American doctrine. We did this in 1898 and in the first World War. We did it again in 1941.

We are sometimes criticized for lack of foreign policy and paradoxically at other times for inconsistencies in our policies. Always admitting that we are human and therefore possessed of human frailties and contradictions, I submit that such accusations arise from an imperfect knowledge of our past. Many of our policies are not as new as some would have us believe. Most of them are deeply rooted in history.

The North Atlantic Treaty as an instrument may be new, but its underlying philosophy is the logical outgrowth of our age-long search for security for this hemisphere as expressed in the League of Nations Covenant, the Charter of the United Nations, in the Rio Pact, and in the Act of Chapultepec. These look back to the Monroe Doctrine, and that in its turn is deeply couched in the past. Indeed 12 years before that memorable message was delivered to the Congress President Madison in an earlier confidential message to that same body, dated January 3, 1811, said: "I recommend to the consideration of Congress, the seasonableness of a declaration that the United States could not see, without serious inquietude, any part of a neighboring territory, in which they have in different respects so deep and so just a concern, pass from the hands of Spain into those of any other foreign power." In response to this message Congress acted with a resolution that laid down the policy of what became a half a generation later the Monroe Doctrine. And troops were used to show we meant it. It was a congress that gave us our Declaration of Independence. It was a congress called convention that gave us our constitution. It was Congress that gave us the resolution that led to the Monroe Doctrine. It was a Senate resolution that paved the way for the United Nations. It was another Senate resolution that directed what became the Atlantic Pact. In each of our great steps towards carrying out the second part of the Philadelphia toast it was the representation of the people that bespoke the policy. American democracy has functioned in the making of our foreign policy.

These things we must never forget. America means popular sovereignty. It accepts the theory that men can act as a result of deliberation and reasoning. America's contest today is as it always has been, a contest against absolutes, the single will, legitimacy, divine right of kings, and dictatorship.

We need not think that article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, which speaks of the natural right of individual and collective self-defense, nor article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which covenants that an attack on one signatory shall be considered as an attack on all the other signatories, are new concepts. It was Thomas Jefferson who said, "An attack on one is an attack on the whole."

Indeed, we might go on the same way with most of our foreign policies, for Thomas Jefferson said, "Make our hemisphere one of freedom," and he struggled for a good-neighbor policy over a hundred years before President Wilson uttered his Mobile address and Franklin Roosevelt embarked upon that same policy under the specific name, "good-neighbor policy." Jefferson also advocated a moral society and a united world which long preceded our participation in the United Nations.

Among the oldest policies we have is that of seeking to establish a stable world in which we and other countries may safely live.

In our present relations with the rest of the world, in problems affecting the United Nations, in the European recovery program, in efforts to end the Greek civil war, in aid to Korea, and in many other current relations, it is therefore consistent with our traditions that we should seek stability.

Thus, too, in our relations with the U. S. S. R., which often dwarf all other problems, it is only normal for us to seek that same stability. And it is in the striving for that stability that we most frequently find ourselves opposed to the deliberate Soviet campaign of threat of force, infiltration, propaganda, and sabotage, to subvert nation after nation, and to reduce the entire world to a collection of puppet states subserviently following without question a single will.

The world knows now that the dictator technique is to exploit instability wherever it exists and to create it where it does not; to incite turmoil, distrust, and violence; to trade on human misery by empty promises of abundance to come through communism; to capitalize on fomenting mass movements toward nationalism in the hope of diverting them into a pattern of puppet governments; and to sabotage any and all efforts by the free nations to establish political, military, and economic stability throughout the world by collective agreement. All this amounts to the creation of social and political chaos for power purposes.

In contrast, to avoid the terrible consequences of falling before the promises of single-will magic and to assist the free peoples of the world to escape totalitarianism,

the United States is pursuing its time-honored and tested course. Wherever possible, we are joining with other nations and peoples in a great endeavor to achieve world stability, for the protection of the freedoms, rights, security, and economic well-being of freedom-loving peoples everywhere. Two world wars in succession have convinced us that the destinies of all peoples are now joined inseparably, and we must either work together to stabilize this closely interdependent world community or allow it to be wrecked. Half the world has apparently not yet learned this lesson, hence enormous energies and resources which might be applied to constructive purposes must instead be marshaled to counter the Soviet threat of destruction. From an American standpoint the fight today is the same as it was against German imperialism, Hitler nazism, Italian fascism, and Japanese Tojoism. The struggle is the same whether it be against the pirates of the Mediterranean, the Holy Alliance, a Napoleon, a czar, a Boxer, or a Spanish king who would enslave our neighbors in the Caribbean.

Today and yesterday, by refusing to respect and comply with their solemn pledge to support and abide by the Charter of the United Nations, the Soviet Union has prevented this great collective means of safeguarding peace from reaching fully effective stature. There is little question that the Soviet has done and is doing this designedly. The United States, enjoying a monopoly of the atomic bomb, offered to share in an international system of atomic inspection and control and to forfeit thereby its great military advantage over other nations. The Soviet Union, counting perhaps on the unwillingness of the United States to exploit its dreadful weapon, has by its veto thwarted the overwhelming will of the UN majority to set up that necessary control. Soviet vetoes have similarly blocked efforts to reduce conventional armaments and to make the Security Council an effective guardian of peace. Let's give our former ally the benefit of the doubt; but lately the inference is inescapable that the Soviet Union does not want international security and an effective outlawing of war, but instead harbors designs and ambitions whose ultimate fulfillment could only be accomplished by crushing democracy.

We see the same pattern for instability in other directions in the disputes and conflicts which have arisen within and between nations to endanger the security of all others. Two spirits are in the world—the persistent veto in the UN or refusal to cooperate in efforts to settle political struggles and armed conflicts in the Balkans, the Middle East, Europe, the Far East, and Southeast Asia. We have only to catalog such names as Greece, Korea, China, Berlin, and Indonesia to expose the mark of noncooperation and note incitement to conflict. Equally, in all these cases, we see the clear record of the democratic spirit wholeheartedly seeking to apply the peaceable, constructive methods set forth in the UN Charter for the establishment of concord within and among all nations and our efforts toward stability through relief, collective action, and military aid.

The great obstacle which stands in the way of world peace is noncooperation. Let us briefly assess its magnitude and far-reaching character. For the moment the issues involved are most clearly set forth in the Far East.

The conclusion of a peace treaty with Japan would unquestionably have a beneficial, stabilizing effect both throughout the Far East and in the rest of the world. It would enable the new, democratic Japan to play a more constructive role in supplying important goods to other nations and would serve as an example of restored political balance which could have a good effect on other countries still beset by political dissension. General MacArthur has declared Japan to be now fully qualified and ready for the treaty and the greater freedom of action which would follow. However, there are forces in the Far East and elsewhere who oppose a treaty now. To me the saddest phase of the peace, following the unconditional surrender, was the dividing up of both the Japanese Empire, a defeated nation, and China, a victor, by the surrender papers. Adjustment is a necessary key to peace in the Far East.

Korea is another example of efforts toward integration and political stability which are being blocked by single-will adherents. The United Nations has put its seal of approval on the democratic government formed in south Korea and has sought to promote the entry of north Korea into that democracy. However, the northern sector is firmly in the grip of a militant Communist minority and is condoning, and perhaps instigating, threats of invading and subjugation of the legal recognized republic of the south.

Turning to China, we see still another situation calculated to disturb the rest of the world. The Chinese Communists have control of China's millions by force of arms. The ominous influence of that part of the world that opposes stability has been publicly displayed by the Chinese themselves in their announcement of their allegiance to the Soviet and in the declaration of Mao Tse-tung. What this means, in the way of world-wide Communist growth, is shown in the special commercial and other privileges which the Chinese Communists have already granted to the Soviet Union. They will most certainly not offer equivalent privileges to other nations, nor would any of the free nations wish to accept them and thereby exploit the Chinese peoples. In this new compact between totalitarian Chinese and power-hungry Russians, there is danger not only to the East but to the entire world.

Almost everywhere else in the Far East, militant Communist groups—some composed of Chinese immigrants outnumbering native populations—are openly striving for political control, creating instability and endangering the uneasy peace of the world. The far eastern peoples themselves are under no illusions as to the Soviet Union's interest in these subversive movements. The heads of some of these states have publicly called for joint action to end the threat to them all of dictator-inspired and directed movements aimed at seizing political control.

But the danger, as we know, is not confined to the Far East. Almost anywhere we look in the world, we see that the policies and actions of advantage-takers within nations as well as those from without are delaying and threatening the efforts being made to find reliable security and political stability throughout the entire community of nations.

The key to our policy lies in the efforts to offset this world-wide organized campaign for chaos. Accordingly, while continuing our efforts with the UN majority to organize world security, we have had no recourse but to supplement that effort. We have done this by joining with other free nations in regional, collective defense arrangements, in harmony with the UN Charter, to assure sufficient strength to deter aggression. Failure to accept the spirit of peaceful change had made the Rio Pact, the Atlantic Pact, and the military assistance program essential. Without them, there could not be sufficient confidence to enable us to proceed with the great task of repairing the damage of war and moving on to new levels of human productivity.

And there again, in the field of economics, we encounter the same grim contest between the seekers after chaos and the architects of stability.

When it became apparent that the economic health of the entire world was endangered by Europe's inability to recover unaided from the devastation inflicted by the war, the United States came forward with the Marshall plan, saving the peoples of Europe from despair and giving them the physical means to rebuild their productive capacity in agriculture and industry, and to reenter world trade on a scale beneficial to themselves and all other peoples. The Soviet response to this great undertaking was to forbid the participation of satellite states of eastern Europe and to endeavor to wreck the recovery program. Happily, the eastern bloc failed in its effort and Europe is now advancing toward recovery.

While the Soviet continues to boycott the constructive programs and activities of the UN specialized agencies, the United States continues to support the manifold efforts to increase food supply, eradicate disease, raise standards, build labor forces, improve education, modernize agriculture, and apply modern technology to the development of human and natural resources throughout the world. The President's point-4 program of technical and capital-investment aid to the underdeveloped areas of the world has been successfully developed in the UN Economic and Social Council, and there are indications that this great enterprise—which has created new hope among many millions of handicapped peoples—will be put into operation in the near future. During the discussions in the Economic and Social Council, Communist-inclined delegates at first attacked point 4 as a scheme of capitalist exploitation. Subsequently, the Soviet Union and its satellites joined with the majority in supporting plans for a greatly expanded UN program of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. Even the obstructors dared not oppose this effort. This is the most hopeful sign we have yet had that a united world may realize at last that the true interests of all peoples will best be served by cooperating instead of opposing every constructive measure undertaken for the benefit of mankind.

When 34 nations met recently at Annecy, France, to draw up new tariff agreements offering multilateral benefits and assuring a greater volume of world trade, the United States was notable by its presence and cooperation, the Communist-controlled nations were notable by their absence. Similarly, when the 1949 World Wheat Agreement was concluded last spring in Washington, the United States was present as a participant and a leading force; the Soviet Union came, observed, and withdrew. The effect of that pact in stabilizing half the world trade in wheat, at prices fair to consumer and producer, will be to put more bread within reach of millions of people and to keep it within their reach.

The list could be continued indefinitely, but there is no need to do so in order to establish the fact of the two spirits in the world—one working for stability, the other working to promote chaos to accomplish political ends.

We know that any solution of the grave issues which confronts us transcends the powers and abilities of any single state. It is a collective job. The instrument we need lies at hand and calls for perfecting and support. We must strengthen and back the United Nations to the fullest. If we do, I am convinced that the single-will dictators of the world will be forced to admit the futility of their ambitions and will have to bow before the enlightened, determined will of aroused free peoples.

There is a powerful new current running through the affairs of all mankind—the current of collective desire to find a universally acceptable and practical method of solving problems now too great to be solved by nations and peoples acting alone.

Almost half of the Senators during the past session of the Congress have joined in the introduction of bills designed to strengthen the United Nations and to create world government. These measures seek stability through some form of international organization which will escape the veto and control the hitherto unbridled acts of a minority. It is my honor to serve as the chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which will consider all of these bills during the next session. We plan to hold hearings on them in January and hope that they may serve as the basis for another resolution of the Senate in foreign relations comparable to the Vandenberg and Connally resolutions. By such steps as these we press forward to eventual peace.

The stability which we seek in company with other free nations grows stronger day by day. The tasks ahead are difficult and enormous, but we have found the method that works, and we will use it. We look forward to the day when all peoples will stand beside us as full partners in the interest of all humankind.

Organization of the Executive Branch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech on the organization of the executive branch, which I made before the Greater New York Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report at the Hotel Astor, New York, on Thursday, December 1, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have very kindly asked me to tell you in a few words why Representative BROWN and I, early in 1947, brought forward the Lodge-Brown bill which gave birth to the Hoover report which your organization is dedicated to advance.

Certainly one thought came from the fact that I had just been in the Army and had seen some of the waste of war. I was also deeply impressed with the way in which the Government had mushroomed, first, during the prewar years of depression, and, secondly, during the war itself. Certainly, so it seemed to me, there had never been a time when reorganization was more needed and when the need for it would be more apparent to everyone.

It was clear that this reorganization would have to be accomplished on a bipartisan basis or it would not be accomplished at all.

It was plain that the concept of economy and efficiency must be linked together. Service in our State legislature and in the Senate before the war had convinced me that economy by itself arouses little enthusiasm.

I also remember reading, shortly before I returned to the Senate, in 1946, a newspaper account of an exchange at a hearing between a Senator and a representative of the Interior Department. The Senator asked the witness: "How many employees could you fire and still run the Department?" The witness replied: "That is a very difficult question to answer. I can only say there are places where reductions can be made." The Senator then had the understandable reaction. He said: "I think that a good way would be to fire about half of these Government people and then see if the public complains of poor service."

This exchange struck me as peculiarly significant. In the first place, the Senator was simply stating an approach to Government economy and efficiency prevalent not only in Congress, but in the country as a whole. There existed then, as there exists today, a widespread, if often inarticulate, protest that our Government is needlessly costly and cumbersome and that the best way to solve the problem is to get out the meat axe and proceed forthwith to chop off large slices of Government, letting the blows fall where they might.

This was a familiar reaction to a familiar situation, but it seemed to me wholly the wrong approach. Organization of the top-heavy governmental structure can never successfully be accomplished by the meat-axe technique. This has been tried again and again by a Congress faced always with the dilemma of either cutting too much or cutting too little—in the wrong places, at that. The situation seemed to me one which required not the brutality of the butcher's axe, but rather the sensitivity of the surgeon's scalpel.

The trouble was that we needed the expert diagnosis of the best surgeon, and here we have always found ourselves up against a stone wall. The representative of the Interior Department, whose testimony I have just quoted, emphasized this universal perplexity when he plaintively remarked that he simply did not know how many employees his department could do without, although he felt certain there were places where economies could safely be effected.

This was indeed the Government that nobody knew. Fiscal responsibility extended off in one direction, while management responsibility went off in the opposite direction. Everyone seemed to be aware of incredible waste, inefficient duplication, and ponderous clumsiness. But there was no one to turn to for the indispensable diagnosis; we had no X-rays of the gigantic patient; there was no surgeon with the training, experience, intelligence, and vision to whom we could look with either confidence or enthusiasm.

These were some of the considerations which led me to the conclusion that talk of Government economy and efficiency was utterly meaningless unless and until we found the surgeon so desperately needed. In this instance, however, we had literally to create our surgeon. It was essential, first, that he be preeminently qualified, the best the country could find. Second, he should be free from any political taint. Further, he should have plenty of time in which to complete his job. He should be given ample funds and all the assistance he needed. It should be clear that he do his work not as a witch hunter or as a headline seeker, but with the purity of the true crusader.

Thus it was that on January 13, 1947, the so-called Lodge-Brown bill was introduced. Its aim was to establish a group of men, to be known officially as the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. This Commission would be our expert surgeon who would at last introduce us to the Government nobody knew, who would go through the baffling governmental maze with a fine-toothed comb, casting light and focus into all the dark and fuzzy places.

Thus the effort began. The legislative history of the Lodge-Brown bill in the Senate, at least, was not without some obstacles. The Budget Bureau, while agreeing to cooperate, pessimistically complained that commissions on Government reorganization were an old story and that such commissions had studied and submitted reports during the Taft administration without any constructive result, so why, it said in effect, go through the futile motions again and simply provide more voluminous reports as material on which the dust would gather? The Comptroller General in a lengthy letter said that an attempt to reorganize the Government, undertaken in 1796, had not worked. Once it was explained that the present situation differed from that which existed in 1796—or during the Taft administration—the doubting Thomases subsided. But we still faced the obstacle of congressional inertia. Here was a manifestly workable solution to a problem of the vastest complexity to which no one seemed to object, but still it was difficult to get anything done. At last, however, both Houses of Congress, by a unanimous, nonpartisan vote, approved the bill in the spring of 1947, the President signed it, and the path was clear for the Commission to commence operations.

Since those days I have had nothing but a series of pleasant surprises. I was first surprised at the extraordinary high caliber of men appointed to the Commission by President Truman, Senate President pro tempore Vandenberg, and Speaker of the House Martin. I was surprised and inspired at the way in which President Hoover subdivided the subject, organized the Commission, and laid out the work. I was delighted at the way in which the activities of the Commission were completely kept out of the Presidential campaign of 1948. To be sure, the bill was drawn so as to keep it out of politics, but the language of a law is never enough, by itself. Another surprise came to me in the quality of the Commission's recommendations which, of course, have aroused the praise of Americans in every part of the country. In fact, the entire Hoover report is now a subject for widespread public confidence and praise and, of course, this praise is music to my ears.

So now we have the report. The expert surgeon has given his diagnosis. It is a report in 19 separate parts which makes more than 300 recommendations. It stresses three things: to fix responsibility clearly, to give ample authority, and to set up a framework of control.

The report found, for example, what one commissioner described as "a complete lack of cost consciousness within the armed services"—something to remember today while Secretary Johnson struggles to carry out the unification law. Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, of the Hoover Commission, reports that Secretary Johnson has already effected economies of $300,000,000 during this fiscal year and will save about $500,000,000 during the next fiscal year. As much as $1,500,000,000 can eventually be saved in the armed services as a whole and without sacrifice of military strength. It is wonderful what can be accomplished by men who are not constantly thinking of new ways of spending money.

But there is still much to do.

The Commission found an absolutely indefensible competition for the taxpayer's dollar between the Reclamation Bureau and the Army engineers in an area where spending amounting to more than $50,000,000,000 is contemplated.

In the field of land management it found a three-way race going on between the Reclamation Bureau, the Forest Service, and the Soil Conservation Service.

Overlapping in Government medicine had created a situation in which there were only 155,000 patients in Government hospitals having a capacity of 255,000.

Recommendations were made to cure all these evils and these recommendations would save from $3,500,000,000 to $4,000,000,000—not millions, but billions.

So we have, thanks to the Hoover report, already accomplished something which no one would have thought possible; indeed,

even if we stopped there, the result would have been worth while in terms of public education. But we have not stopped there. Fully 20 percent of the Commission's recommendations have been adopted, which means a potential saving of $4,500,000,000. Congress has already passed one law which gives the President the right to submit plans which become law unless vetoed by Congress and six out of seven such plans have been already accepted. It has also enacted legislation to simplify and consolidate the bookkeeping functions of government, to unify the armed services and to reorganize the State Department.

If the next session of Congress enacts as much as 60 percent of the remaining recommendations it can bring further economies of at least $2,000,000,000. But if Congress is to do this, it will need the guidance and help of Mr. Hoover and the Commission, who must prepare detailed reorganization plans and precise legislative proposals. The progress of the Hoover report cannot be aggressively advanced unless it is formulated into definite bills on which public opinion can focus. I hereby request Mr. Hoover and those associated with him to get these bills ready so that Congress will be given every facility for action.

This is a good place to pause and to pay a tribute to a man who surely must have had his fill of tributes, for he has received from people of every race, creed, and color, coming from every part of the world and from every walk of life. Yet each one of us who has had some contact with Herbert Hoover can add his own special and personal word of praise. For a period of time I saw him under circumstances which were in their way unique and which I shall always remember. In the full tide of his wisdom he would kindly consult with me as the work of the Hoover Commission progressed. I will not burden you, his friends and admirers, with my comments on his vast knowledge of government, his genius for organizing huge and complex work, his skill at keeping men of differing philosophies of government together, and his realistic sensing of the need for a truly effective follow-through in Congress. The memory that will always stay with me and which I particularly want to stress is of the way in which he never spared himself trouble, work, and fatigue. I think of him in the sweltering summer heat of a hotel room. I remember him—a former President of the United States—making the rounds of offices in the Senate Office Building, calling on Senators to discuss this great work, wearing out shoe leather and expending his energies at a time of life when most men enjoy the well earned ease of retirement. This was love of country indeed and it will always inspire me.

Much has been done but there is still much which remains. The job is still big. A government which has gone from 8 departments with 1,000 employes in President Washington's time to 180 agencies and 2[illegible],000 persons under President McKinley and then has increased to a point where today we find President Truman grappling with 1,812 agencies employing 2,105,000 persons cannot be untangled overnight. The deficit of the Post Office Department this year alone will be almost as much as the whole cost of government in McKinley's time.

And all this translates itself into such items as the $10 purchase order for the 50-cent typewriter ribbon, the penny post card that costs 2½ cents to deliver, and the $8,000,000 item that cost $93,000,000.

All is inexcusable waste. None of it can be condoned on grounds of generosity or liberalism. In fact, the convinced socialist should be leading the cheering for the Hoover report since he wants the Government to do so much. The billions of dollars which enactment of the Hoover report would save are indeed of vital importance. But it was Calvin Coolidge who said: "I favor economy not because I want to save money but because I want to save people." And—to maintain the essential nonpartisan tone of our proceedings—it was Franklin Roosevelt who said: "Liberal governments are often wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policies."

What is at stake, therefore, is nothing less than our liberal Government and the viewpoint about man which this Government represents. For our system of government cannot be expected to endure if, in military parlance, it is no longer operational. It must be an effective instrument for translating into action the aims and aspirations of the people.

The reason for the destruction of democracy in so many countries of the Old World is that it did not or could not give effect to these aims. Let it never be said of us that we lost our democracy because we could not keep our Government lean and vigorous and effective.

Problems Confronting Municipal Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD a very timely address delivered by the Honorable R. Ray Shute, mayor of Monroe, N. C., before the Fortieth Annual Conference of the North Carolina League of Municipalities.

This meeting was held in Winston-Salem in October, and this address contains much food for thought with reference to the municipal governments and to other problems which confront governments at all levels.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the occasion of this year's annual meeting of the North Carolina League of Municipalities, it would be timely to conduct a sort of orientation course for our new municipal officers, due to the fact that the mortality rate has become exceedingly high of late with our official family. It is the sixty-four-dollar question, whether Johnny Q. Public gets more provoked with his city officials than they do with him. At any rate, we are suffering a tremendous turnover in local government, whether we like it or not. I have the greatest admiration for those who are willing to make the personal sacrifice necessary to holding public office on the local level, because it is usually there that the going is toughest. And may I add, parenthetically, those of you who are considering sponsoring the city control of alcoholic beverages in counties that have already voted against control, would do well to converse privately with the speaker. I have just come through such a campaign and I assure you that I was exceedingly lucky to preserve my trousers in the ordeal. The Allied Church League even demanded my impeachment, and had they not won the election probably would have attempted it.

The city is the earliest form of self-government and is the mother of all levels of political enterprise. It is, therefore, not unnatural that citizens expect, and as a rule receive, more services from their city than from any other level of government. In the present complicated system of interrelated government it is perplexing, to say the least, to see the local unit so completely obscured when consideration is given to remedial legislation by either the Federal or State legislative bodies. With this specifically in mind, the American Municipal Association has sponsored legislation to create a Federal commission on intergovernmental relations, which aims at a vertical reintegration of government and we should lend our wholehearted support to this commendable undertaking.

Where once every house had a Chic Sale's nestling peacefully behind a floral design of morning-glories and sunflowers, had a well in the side yard, and an ever-burning trash pile in the back yard, today we have municipal sewer and water systems and garbage disposal. The kerosene lamp has been replaced by the incandescent bulb and the volunteer fire brigade has been replaced by professional firemen and the old vigilante patrols have been replaced by policemen. Dusty and muddy sidewalks and streets are now paved and kept clean by our sanitary and street departments, while the ditches and ponds and puddles are now safely replaced by adequate storm-sewer and drainage systems. Yes; we have come a long way in municipal government and still we are progressing.

Libraries, hospitals, parks, playgrounds, stadiums and other recreational facilities, armories, schools, health centers, airports, courts, prisons, traffic and parking facilities, zoning, planning, retirement, merit systems, public relations, research; yes; even cemeteries are now all a part of municipal government. It is a far-reaching and intricate system of conveniences and services and has so expanded, and so continues to expand, that efficiency experts, business managers, accountants, and a host of specialists and technicians are needed to operate even a modest city.

Today, as never before, we need men in office who are willing to familiarize themselves with the many intricacies of city government and we also need good educational programs to educate our urbanites on the varied problems of municipalities. It is no easy or simple matter to operate city government today, as every single one of you present here today can honestly testify. Ours is a responsibility and a challenge worthy of our mettle. Faced, as we are, with increasing budgets every year, demands for more and better services and, at the same time limited sources of revenue, municipalities face a future whose glowing symbol seems to be a gigantic question mark. In North Carolina the progress which has been made by our cities is all the more phenomenal when consideration of our restricted finances is fully understood. It is, I think, a tribute to our municipal officials.

In the past we have painstakingly discovered new sources of revenue, effected economies all along the line, planned and financed carefully and safeguarded every fiscal and psychological gain. We have hoarded and budgeted our funds and diligently scrutinized and controlled our bond issues and capital expenditures and we have kept our current expenses at a very low level. It is, therefore, to different avenues of relief and assistance that we must now turn to meet the ever-increasing demands being constantly made. We must seek a redefinition of authority and a reinterpretation of certain State fiscal policies as they relate to municipal operations.

While we can expect little increased tax powers, we should at least seek legislation on a positive level which would, for example, permit us to tax wherever we are not specifically denied the right. As it now stands, we are authorized to levy and where specific authority is not granted, we are prohibited—it is a negative method. There are many other ways and means of finding tangible assistance for our cities if we had the support and understanding of both the Legislature and the administration. It is, I think, in these areas that we should seek for answers to many of our problems.

We must not lose hope or feel that ours is a losing fight, regardless of the many disappointments we experience. We are making gains and we are nearer to the people than any other governmental unit. We will eventually win our battle and secure many of the goals that we have heretofore set. We have a cumulative gain and some day a legislative spirit of understanding and cooperation will be manifested. It will not always be as absurdly one-sided as it now stands. More than one-half of our population is now urban and this will increase with the passage of years.

We must continue to exert every effort to operate efficiently and to plan carefully. We must keep our people informed on our problems and solicit their continued cooperation and understanding. The future is not too bright, I'll willingly admit, but it is not entirely without hope. To date, we have exhibited the most efficient operation of any unit of government and we will find newer and better ways of doing things.

There is one thing we must do and that is to guard against the evils into which we can fall—we must never become intolerant, class-conscious, or parties to discriminations and factionalizing. Let others say what they choose, but for us let that old spirit of true democracy continue in the future as it has in the past and we shall be happier and freer. Let us not lose our devotion to our fellowman nor our sense of proportion in these hectic times. Changes will come and men will arise who will have a new vision for the future, wherein democracy will become reactivated and a continuing force for the betterment of all. As in the past, so in the future, democracy must be our optative mood in life. It is our heritage and our only hope in years to come.

I sometimes find myself wondering just where this beautiful and meaningful experiment that we call democracy is destined to lead us in the eventful years that lie ahead. We have observed with no little interest and concern, certain very puzzling trends during the past two decades, which may or may not be indicative of fundamental changes in our way of life. Certainly we all applaud the many economic and social gains which have been made and many of us look with cooperative anticipation to still further gains in the immediate future. However, there are other signs of the times that hardly merit our approbation and if they are straws in the wind, then we should be most apprehensive of the current trend of our times.

In its inception, democracy—certainly the American brand—predicated its right of survival on the thesis of equal rights for all and special privileges to none. The individual, for the first time in recorded history, was given official status in government and the theory of democracy was declared to be a mutual sharing together by individuals in decisions affecting the lives of all. This was a new philosophy of life, refreshingly different, stimulatingly new and typically American. It was a new day in the conception of a way of life, later to be distinguished by the title "The Age of the Common Man"—a term not so well cherished by imperialists in the areas of political, economic, and social, not to mention religious experience. The idea of rugged individualism, private enterprise, and the inherent rights of the freeman became paramount. Under this system America has grown from a seacoast colony of minute proportions to the mightiest Nation on the face of the globe. The challenge of this thrilling new continent furnished the dynamic for Americans to develop a cockiness and confidence that has led us to successes undreamed of in the annals of man. The American way of life became a term associated with strength, courage, vision, and determination. We became a Nation to whom failure was an obsolete term and the impossible merely a challenge to our dogged adventurousness, imagination, and skill. Ours has indeed been a record of achievement unparalleled in all of man's history and the world has learned to live and move according to American methods and democratic thought patterns.

Yankee ingenuity has won out on many occasions and our cooperative potential has twice thus far in this century saved the democratic way of life for the entire world. However, today we observed the greatest paradox in mankind's existence. America has, let us hope momentarily, lost its zest for experiment, its spirit of aggression, its daredevil attitude of leadership, its positive urge and its determined will to progress and surge forward. Something quite serious has apparently happened. We no longer seem able to lead or even willing to strike out on our own. We have adopted an attitude as un-American as the Sphinx. Our every thought, every act, every concern, seems to be on Russia, and we have assumed a negative philosophy of life. We wait to see what the Soviet does—then we do the opposite. This new and unique attitude is most alarming to many of us and we deplore seeing the wealthiest, most powerful, and most prolific Nation on earth surrendering, by default, its position of leadership to an upstart conglomeration of slave states whose basic ideology is as inhuman as it is economically and politically unsafe and degrading. I think most Americans are becoming disturbed about this anomaly and as dislike becomes more intensified, perhaps we may hope for a rebirth of the American affirmation of life and see a resurgency of democracy that will sweep every opposing tenet before it, whether from the right or left, and lead our Nation and world into the challenging future of the atomic age. This, I take it, is the national imperative of this very hour.

While it may not necessarily be associated with this same attitude previously mentioned, at the same time we have developed a new, and to many of us a dangerous, system of government by and for vocal minorities and pressure groups. This departure from the truly democratic process is both un-American in its inception and exceedingly damaging in its operation. More and more we note the passage of important legislation predicated on the voices of pressure groups rather than the apparent needs of all of the people.

And may I pause here, for the moment, and say that I concur with our Governor in many, if not most, of his reforms and I am increasingly thankful that we have a Chief Executive who has the guts to strike out on his own for reforms which are so badly needed and it is my studied opinion that the vast majority of our people will go along on most of these programs. I am sure that every fair-minded citizen of North Carolina wants every segment of our people to go forward together: farmer, merchant, laborer, manager, borrower, lender—with locked arms and hearts and minds and spirits in a mutuality of sharing together in the blessings, the responsibilities, the gains, and the losses of our great Commonwealth. This is the only way that true progress can be effectually made and we of the North Carolina League of Municipalities offer the friendly hand and heart to our brothers of the soil and others in this great State and ask for peace and brotherhood and cooperation from every quarter. It can only be on this basis that we can hope for a future of promise. Let us pioneer and explore and dare to advance; let us do it together and in the true spirit of understanding and democracy.

As Tom Paine wrote on the head of his drum during the trying days of our national revolution: "These are the times that try men's souls." To be sure we live in trying times but only the coward would turn back and seek retreat from the realities of the now—whether they be good or bad. Hence, our course for the day and for the morrow lies ahead: Upward and onward. This is not the first time that we have encountered stormy weather and many times ere this our seamanship and courage have brought us safely through. Our ship is sturdy, our course is clear and behind the clouds the sun is ever shining. We have but to sail on and fear not, for the morning cometh and the lark will yet again sing and skies will be blue and the storm will spend its fury. I say, "Hold the Faith, have courage and be of strong heart." It is always darkest just before the dawn.

The United States Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the keynote address delivered by Col. Melvin J. Maas, president, Marine Corps Reserve Officers' Association, at the national conference held on October 21 and 22, 1949, in Philadelphia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since our last conference in Chicago in January of this year, many things have happened, but the Marine Corps still finds itself faced with the same determined efforts to drastically curtail it as a combat force. The fact that these objectives have not been accomplished is due in no small measure to the efforts of MCROA chapters and individual members who have devoted so much time and intense interest and effort in preserving the Marine Corps.

While our sentimental love of the corps might in itself be a compelling motive to spur us on in the battle to preserve the Marine Corps, that is not our basic motive. We are principally concerned with the necessity of having always available for instant readiness, an effective combat force of shock troops and amphibious teams. While the Marine Corps may not be the only method of accomplishing this, it is certainly the most effective and economical way to do it. The continued existence of the Marine Corps, maintained in a high degree of readiness, is the only assurance that we will have such a force. By the very nature of modern warfare under which hostilities start with stunning suddenness and develop with lightninglike rapidity, a combat-ready force in existence and capable of moving at an instant's notice is absolutely essential. In no other way can we buy the time necessary to even mobilize our defensive military forces, let alone have the opportunity for effective retaliation.

Those who would reduce the Marine Corps to guard-duty status and transfer its amphibious mission to the Army and transfer its air-support mission to the Air Force, are perfectly sincere in their belief that the Marine Corps constitutes a duplication and is therefore unnecessary. They are mistaken. They are mistaken because for while one understands long-range bombing and the other

understands mass troop movement, they do not understand the influence nor the effect upon an enemy of the pressure of sea power. They are under the mistaken delusion that a Navy is designed only to fight enemy ships. What they fail to appreciate, is that sea power is one of the most effective forces in putting pressure on any enemy, to help destroy his capacity and his will to further fight, even in the case of vast land-locked areas. Sea power can deny to the peoples of such areas their essential imports. Any nation's mass imports must ultimately come by sea. Therefore the quickest way to strangle a nation's war potentiality is to deny it those parts of its economy which must come over the broad highways of the ocean.

Because we have never had a collection of our military services in past wars, the soldier understands only fighting other soldiers; the aviator largely thinks in terms of aerial combat with other aviators. Neither knows nor understands the function and the mission of sea power. The seething conflict within our military services that has finally erupted into a congressional investigation, is not merely a conflict of either the self-interest nor the divergent professional points of view of our Navy or our Air Force. While what appears on the surface is an effort on the one hand of the admirals to retain their traditional roles, and on the other hand an effort by the aviators, because they are a new element, to assume unto themselves roles which heretofore were performed by the Navy and Army, this is only a side issue of the real story. It would be made to appear that we are witnessing merely a clash of personalities, a struggle for personal military power. Some people see this as the dying grasp of the straw by the drowning Navy, others see the newborn infant "air power" attempting to segregate to itself all of the functions and missions of the older and more traditional services.

Actually all this is only evidence of a much deeper and far graver situation. What has been happening in the Pentagon and before the committees of Congress is evidence that the United States has not yet realized its dominant position of leadership in the world. We are relatively a young nation, but suddenly we find ourselves thrust into the role of world leader and champion of the democratic forces throughout the world. We and all that we stand for are challenged by a rising and formidable enemy whose ideology and methods are the direct opposite of ours. No; this is not a question as to whether the Navy is right and the Air Force wrong, or vice versa. It is not a question as to whether we can save money by duplicating the Marine Corps in the Army or whether all airplanes should be in one air force. The protests resulting in public statements emanating from the Pentagon by the Army, Navy, and Air Force are evidences that the United States has failed to adopt a world policy and a program which is essential if we are to assume our position as world leader. The reason that the Navy protests the Air Force's limitation, the reason that the Marine Corps protests the Army's efforts to starve out the combat forces of the Marine Corps, the reason that there is a struggle between the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the control of guided missiles is that we have no formula within which to fit the proper assignment of the missions of our military services. We can have no firm, intelligent military program which will be understood and accepted by all within and without the military services until we do have such a formula. Such a formula is dependent first upon our having a national policy of our position in the world. Neither the people nor the Government have as yet stated nor even formulated what our world objectives are. Neither we nor our friends, nor even our potential enemies, know just what the United States stands for nor what its long-range policies will be. We find ourselves pushed around dangerously in various parts of the world because the opposition forces in the world are uncertain as to what our limitations are. They will advance their interests everywhere in the world short of war by pushing us around wherever we will permit ourselves to be pushed. While their objectives may be to accomplish their aims short of war, neither we nor they can be sure that it will stop short of war, since neither of us know just how far we can be pushed before we push back and war becomes the inevitable result. Our friends and potential friends throughout the world are hesitant because they do not know how far we will support them nor how long such support as we do give them will continue. Our military leaders are confused because they do not know just what it is they are to be called upon to do in the support of our national policies. How can they? Those policies have never been stated; in fact, no two people in nor out of Government can clearly define what our objectives are.

The military establishment has as justification for its existence, the implementation of our foreign policy. How can our military or our congressional leaders provide the proper size and type of military organization when they themselves do not know precisely what the mission is to be. The objectives of a nation's military force is not to win a war as such. The objectives of a government including its military forces, is to preserve its integrity, independence, and peace. When war becomes unavoidable in attaining these objectives, the purpose in fighting that war is to destroy forces that are opposing those objectives with the further purpose of resuming those objectives when the hostilities are over, in other words, when the opposition to our policies has been removed.

Therefore, our international concepts and our military strategy and tactics must be such as to further those ultimate aims in war if it be forced upon us, but the war must be so conducted that we do not defeat our own purposes. We must as a Nation, for instance, decide whether we intend to adopt a Genghis Khan concept of totally wiping out our enemy in a war, or adhere to the traditional American idea that we will merely fight an enemy government with the purpose of liberating its peoples from their own tyrannical leaders. Under the latter concept our philosophy has always been that people so liberated would then be receptive to our democratic ideals and would ultimately achieve freedom, liberty, and economic independence. This is the basic issue behind the current flare-up within the Military Establishment. It strikes to the heart of the problem—that of the future of the world.

Our answer to this problem will determine what kind of a world there will be for the next thousand years. A wrong solution will mean another war and a war which will result in the destruction of everything that man has been fighting to achieve during the last thousand years. A right solution will mean not only the preservation of the achievements of mankind but will permit them to progress and advance as much during the next thousand years as they have during the last thousand.

Therefore, you and I are fighting not to preserve the Marine Corps in order to preserve an organization of which we are proud and to which we owe service allegiance. Whether we are conscious of it or not, we are fighting to assure this country a type of military force which will make it possible for us to continue to achieve our worthy objectives in the world. Without a striking force instantly available, retaliation may not become sufficiently evident to a potential enemy to deter him from over-stepping the bounds of our national self-interest. Without such an instantly available striking force as the Marine Corps alone provides, the nature of such a war, if forced upon us, may compel us to wind up with either Genghis Khan warfare, or at least the use of such mass destruction methods as will make it impossible for us to ever again lead the rest of the world in adopting our ideals and philosophy. No, this movement to preserve the Marine Corps is not merely service rivalry, nor evidence of fierce pride in a great and glorious corps. It is the inner conviction of people who have the knowledge that we must have what the Marine Corps can give the Nation in order to survive as a democratic nation, and to continue to be the hope of peoples throughout the world who aspire to ultimate democracy.

MCROA at its last conference, held in Chicago, called upon the leaders of our military services to end the interservice bickering and to accept the decisions of the constituted leaders once the decisions had been made. We called upon all officers, Regular and Reserve, to either accept the final decisions or get out of the service. MCROA, at that time, pledged its leadership in this demand by promising to set an example. We renew that demand and renew our pledge.

However, I wish to call your attention to the fact that our demand and our pledge was predicated upon the assumption that before the constituted leaders made their final decisions, all services would be adequately, fairly, and freely heard, and that they would all be dealt with on a basis of equality in their treatment. This does not necessarily mean equal appropriations, but it does mean that each shall have his problems and his requirements treated on a basis of equality with all the others. When I called upon MCROA in January to demand the end of interservice bickering, I proposed that the bickering be ended by an intelligent and fair elimination of the causes that were leading to this unfortunate controversy. I fear that what has happened in the meantime is that efforts have been made to eliminate the controversy by arbitrary suppression of the bickering and endeavoring to conceal the controversy from the public rather than by getting to the basic causes and removing the sources of conflict. The positive proof that this is what has happened is the fact that the bickering has not ended, the conflict has not been settled and, in fact, has continued to grow until it has finally exploded on Capitol Hill and has resulted in a congressional investigation.

Actually this situation cannot be entirely corrected within the military itself. The Congress and the people themselves must assume the major share of the burden for this situation. A final and lasting solution can come only from the people through the Congress. It is a healthy sign and still a most happy one that this service conflict could get out in the open and could reach the point where all sides could be heard by the legislative representatives of the people, the United States Congress.

Merely to suppress the evidence of the conflict is dangerous. Compare the situation that existed in prewar Germany. There, the military leaders were supreme. All opposition was suppressed so that the public was misled into believing that there was complete unity. This led to the feeling that the leaders had found the correct solution to their military problems. One branch of service dominated the military and, through them, the government of prewar Germany. Unfortunately, those particular leaders, while they understood well the problems of land mass armies, did not understand the potentialities of sea power nor the full implications of the new element—air power. Those who did understand these two elements were only half heard and then suppressed. The dominant military leaders in Germany saw sea power largely as limited

to undersea raiders and air power as merely long-range strategic bombing. Germany lost the war, because she did not bring adequate sea power to bear upon her initial victories, and then failed to follow through on total air power. Germany was doubtless capable of doing both but was prevented from doing so because the informed advocates of adequate sea power, and total air power were suppressed by those who had impatience with these concepts, an impatience due to ignorance of their full implications. Had adequate sea power been made available in Germany, American lend-lease would have been cut off. England would not have survived the furious onslaught of the Germans. The final blow to Germany came when the Luftwaffe lost the Battle of Britain through its failure to provide its strategic bombers with adequate fighter aircraft coverage.

Had the battle of Britain been won by Germany, there is very little doubt but that the United States would have been denied the opportunity to have even challenged Germany in Europe, for England was our only possible base of operations in Europe proper. Adequate sea and total air power on the part of the Germans would likewise have denied to us the opportunity of our African campaign. Even so, our African, Italian, and French landings were made possible only by the use of amphibious tactics and weapons developed by the Marine Corps long before World War II started. Every amphibious landing, whether in the Atlantic or Pacific, succeeded because it followed the pattern developed by the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps being a relatively small, closely integrated organization, employing every weapon, was able to study and develop the tactics, techniques, and the weapons necessary for successful amphibious operations. Neither the Army nor the Navy nor the Air Force each by itself can conduct such studies. It takes an integrated organization with all weapons available at all times, to successfully develop and continue the progress of amphibious operations. Furthermore, amphibious tactics are a complete lifetime military job. It cannot be developed on a part-time basis either by the officers or men engaged in it. The only military organization in the United States that was ready—that is, trained and equipped for the nature of World War II when that war came—was the Marine Corps. Traditionally, armies and navies prepare for the next war by getting ready to fight the last war better. The marines, on the other hand, traditionally forget the methods of one war, the day it is over, and begin to train and prepare for the nature of a future war. Thus, in 1921 the marines realizing that if another war came it would not again be trench warfare but would involve our attacking and landing on hostile shores everywhere in the world, reorganized itself and dedicated the whole Corps, including its air branch, to the development of modern amphibious tactics. So, too, at the end of World War II, the Marine Corps realizing that we would not again be recapturing the same islands in the Pacific we took in World War II, reoriented its entire concept for the nature of a probable future war. No time was lost in reorganizing the field forces of the Marine Corps, its supporting echelons and its tactics, techniques, and its weapons.

To destroy the Marine Corps as a laboratory in time of peace, for the study of future tactics, and as an assault force immediately available if a future war comes may very well spell defeat for the United States in the event of another war. Our national history indicates that if the Marine Corps is destroyed as a combat organization, we are very likely to enter world war III largely with the weapons, tactics, and techniques developed in fighting World War II. However, they simply will not be good enough. The Marine Corps is an essential and integral part of sea power.

So again I call upon MCROA to lead the way. I urge that MCROA insist that the interservice bickering be ended by a full, frank, and intelligent elimination of the causes that have led to this interservice conflict and further, that MCROA urge the people and the Congress to no longer delay in the determination and proclamation to the world of our national and international objectives. When this is done, a formula can be devised whereby military programs will result in providing the United States with security forces that will actually provide security and at a cost that will not wreck the economy of the Nation.

To the chapter presidents and all the members of MCROA, I hand this challenge. It is your greatest assignment. On the outcome, far more depends than any assignment you ever have had in uniform. To assure our objective of the continued existence of a Marine Corps capable of fulfilling its mission, it is essential that Congress provide that the minimum strength of the Marine Corps shall never be less than 6 percent of the total strength of the combined armed forces. Six percent spells security. Hand in hand with this necessity, is its twin—that the law must provide that the Commandant of the Marine Corps sit with the Joint Chiefs of Staff during consideration of amphibious matters, and on all matters affecting the Marine Corps. Not until and unless these two things are done, is this Nation assured of proper military security.

So, the order to MCROA is forward march.

United States Cultural Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of Sunday, December 25, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION IN REVIEW—UNITED STATES CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM NOW COVERS 50,000 PERSONS AND IS GROWING

(By Benjamin Fine)

The United States, as never before in its history, is engaged in a tremendous program of cultural and educational exchange. The State Department, responsible for this project, is convinced that the democratic way of life can be made more secure and the false propaganda of the totalitarian nations more easily negated if the peoples of the world have closer contact with one another.

We exchange with other countries leaders in various fields of industry and professors, teachers, and graduate students. We maintain libraries in all parts of the world. Our experts cooperate with other countries in developing scientific and technical projects in such areas as agriculture, engineering, or medicine. A number of cultural centers in the Latin-American countries, sponsored by the State Department, have helped thousands of adults learn the English language.

At present 26,000 students from foreign countries are enrolled in American colleges and universities. More than 16,000 American students are studying in foreign universities. In addition, another 10,000 semi-academic persons who are specialists in such areas as social welfare, government, technical work or industry will come here or go abroad. As a result, the total flow of academic and nonacademic exchanges will go beyond 50,000. This figure is double the prewar total—and it is still rising.

The exchange program is stimulated to a large degree by the Fulbright Act, which President Truman signed on August 1, 1946. This is the first year that it has been put into effective operation.

The program is financed by the sale of American surplus property abroad. Under the Fulbright Act a country purchasing our surplus war material can pay for it in part by underwriting the education of American students in that country, and by financing the travel expenses of its own exchange scholars who come to the United States.

TOTAL ESTIMATED AT $140,000,000

The act limits the educational exchange in any one country to the equivalent, in their currencies, of $20,000,000. It specifies that the sums allocated for this project can be spent at a rate of not more than $1,000,000 annually. Before the act runs its course, it is expected that a total of $140,000,000 will be made available for the educational exchange program, making this the greatest project of its kind.

Three types of programs are included under the Fulbright Act: (1) Graduate study, (2) teaching, and (3) research. Scholars in each of these three categories will receive maintenance, tuition, incidental expenses, and travel. However, the United States has no funds for foreign scholars coming here under the Fulbright Act, since all available funds are in foreign currencies. The act provides for transportation to and from the United States in those cases where travel can be paid in foreign currencies. Various private agencies cooperate with the State Department in obtaining funds to permit foreign students to come here.

To supervise the operation of the act, Congress has authorized the establishment of a Board of Foreign Scholarships, consisting of 10 members who represent cultural, educational, student, and war veteran groups. The board is responsible for (1) approving policies for the educational programs under the act; (2) approving the types of programs and projects to be undertaken; (3) selecting institutions to be approved for participation; and (4) selecting all candidates, both American and foreign.

FOUNDATIONS TO BE OPENED

The countries which are participating in this program include Belgium, Luxemburg, Burma, China, Egypt, France, Greece, Iran, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, and the United Kingdom. In each of these countries a United States educational foundation is to be established. These foundations will carry on the exchange programs and handle the funds, under supervision of the State Department. The foundations recommend programs to be followed in their particular countries, and suggest the candidates they feel should be sent here.

In the United States the Board of Foreign Scholarships has designated three agencies to assist it in selecting candidates.

These agencies are:

(1) The Institute of International Education, which makes the preliminary selection of applicants for student grants, both foreign and American. Under the chairmanship of the Institute, a national committee representing various other private agencies reviews the applications and submits nominations to the Board.

(2) The United States Office of Education makes the preliminary selection of teachers who want to be placed in elementary schools, secondary schools, and junior colleges abroad. The education office also reviews applications of candidates recommended by the United States educational foundations abroad for travel grants to take up similar positions in this country.

(3) The Conference Board of Associated Research Councils (composed of representatives of the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Council on Education, the National Research Council, and the Social Science Research Council) selects persons who wish to go abroad as professors, specialists in certain fields or advanced research scholars.

MEXIMUM TOTALS

According to present plans, the Fulbright Act will exchange a total of 3,000 persons each year. Of this total 1,500 will be American scholars who would be sent abroad, and an equal number who would come here. It is expected that the United States will divide its three categories this way: 750 graduate students, 500 research specialists or professors, and 250 teachers.

American groups and organizations subsidize the exchange program far more than the Government does—of the 36,000 foreign students here now, probably fewer than 1,000 get any direct funds from the United States Government.

Private groups are in the lead. For example, the Institute of International Education, a Carnegie-supported organization, serves as a clearing house for much of the exchange program. Last year it sponsored more than 1,000 American and citizens of other countries, who received scholarship and travel aid worth more than $3,000,000.

Scores of national, State, or local groups, both large and small, are supporting the exchange idea. For example, the American Scandinavian Foundation brought 515 students to this country last year at a cost of $500,000. The Girl Scouts financed 87 students or youth leaders from 21 countries. The English Speaking Union provided 41 scholarships. The Rotary International last year took care of 38 foreign students. In addition, many local Rotary Clubs had their own scholarships. Several college fraternities have raised scholarships to bring foreign students here.

BASIS OF UNDERSTANDING

Explaining the Government's position in this program, Dr. William C. Johnstone, Jr., director of the State Department's Office of Educational Exchange, declared that understanding based on an appreciation of differences in culture, customs, and history was essential to a world of international cooperation. In a recent interview with this writer, Dr. Johnstone expressed the hope that the exchange program would help build the foundation for a more peaceful world.

"As a Government we are doing everything possible to assist the people of the United States to have more direct contact with the peoples of other nations," he observed. "It is a program of peoples speaking to peoples. It is part of a total American effort to build a secure world. We believe that such security must come to a world in which men's minds are free to accept or reject ideas."

Unfortunately, the money available for this exchange is inadequate. Aside from the funds provided for under the Fulbright Act, the State Department has less than $2,000,000 available for this tremendous job. This is provided under the Smith-Mundt Act, which permits the Department to carry on various kinds of educational, scientific, and cultural exchanges throughout the world. Perhaps as the value of the exchange program becomes more apparent, the necessary funds will become available.

Socialism by Default

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Socialism by Default" delivered by Cecil Palmer, English publisher, author and journalist and one of the signatories of the manifesto on British Liberty at the fifty-fourth annual Congress of American Industry, sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers, New York City, on December 9, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Nationalization undertaken by our present socialistic government is, without the possibility of contradiction, Britain's one-way passage to destruction—destruction of all which the people of my great nation have held dear for generations, yes, centuries—destruction of their right to work where they choose, where their talents best suit them—to a large extent, destruction of their right of ownership and enjoyment of property—destruction of their privacy with their physician or surgeon.

All this because the road on which we of Britain are now speeding—on which there is but a one-way passage (unless a miracle, not now foreseen, halts it)—leads from one state control to another state control until finally the state controls all.

I make no differentiation between socialism—which is the proper appellation for nationalization, though seldom mentioned by our socialistic government—and communism. Socialism and communism are identical twins, make no mistake about that. There may be this difference—whereas socialism merely paralyzes the soul of man, communism utterly destroys it. But where socialism takes hold, in even its mildest form, communism soon follows with all its destructive forces.

Under the past 4 years of socialistic nationalization, Britain has become a nation of frustrated, regimented, undernourished, dispirited people—perhaps nearly the most miserable people on earth. Their respect for law and order has dwindled ominously. In greater or less degree, we in Britain are all criminals now for it is utterly impossible for any man to abide by all the rules and regulations laid down by a socialistic, paternalistic bureaucracy such as is now inflicted upon our people.

How is nationalism accomplished? It is a dastardly story, but here it is.

The first move is to set the governmental propaganda machine in motion and to lay on the poisonous juice progressively until the selected industry itself begins to wonder how it ever came into existence at all. It is coaxed, threatened, cajoled, and insulted with equal hypocrisy at every stage. It is told it is inefficient, costly, greedy, and quite incapable of working harmoniously with its employees. When as much as possible of this mud is firmly plastered over the industry, the next move is introduced.

The industry is set a minimum production target or goal. Even if the industry, left to itself, could attain it, the Government has no intention of allowing it to do so. With their rules, regulations, licenses, and permits, the Government already has the power of life and death over almost every private enterprise undertaking in the country.

The third move merely adds insult to injury. What is called a working party is imposed on the now tottering industry. Superficially, it looks fair enough, but, in substance, it amounts to nothing more than a committee of persons—persons who do not know the business—trying to pass on their ignorance to people who do know it. Usually without waiting for the working party's report, another move is inaugurated. The industry is asked to rob its stockholders by the limitation of dividends on the grounds that normal dividends, if distributed, would have an inflationary influence and give impetus to too much money chasing too few goods. The fact that these assumptions are 95 percent fallacious does not worry the Government one little bit.

By this time the industry, from a private-enterprise point of view, has had it. The stock-exchange prices reflect the situation grimly and graphically. The market quotations go down and down and down, and then, when the Government is advised that the break-up price has been reached, it steps in, freezes the current stock-exchange quotation as the purchase price for nationalization, and compulsorily acquires the industry. It is as simple and wicked as that.

The London Economist, which, more often than not, is a good friend to the present Government, made this comment: "The compensation clauses are as objectionable as ever. Indeed, in the case of steel, they are more so. To rig the market first and then to make compulsory purchases at the market price is more than sharp practice. It is plain dishonesty."

Nationalization has a blighting influence on the British economy as a whole. It relentlessly, ruthlessly, and fatuously reduces an economy of profit, which is the only economy that makes good sense, into an economy of loss, which makes utter nonsense.

At present, the losses of nationalization are being met by the profits of private enterprise—plus the very magnificent generosity of the United States and Canada, without which we would surely meet unthinkable disaster. And I might add, parenthetically, this is borrowed money, running into the billions of dollars, from hated capitalistic systems which the borrowers are so energetically trying to destroy.

Nationalization would seem to operate on the theory that a socialistic government can legislate unsuccessful people into prosperity merely by legislating successful people out of it. The thinking people of Britain are walking about with grim faces, chiefly because the rewards of endeavor, the glittering prizes of achievement are no longer attainable.

Under 4½ years of socialistic nationalization, Britain has become a nation governed by third-raters—not a big man in the whole socialistic governmental set-up—nothing but third-raters dragging down a first-class nation to their own puny level. Theoretically, they know all the answers—but, practically, they know none of the questions.

And this is not all that nationalization, or socialization, is doing to Great Britain. Today our prisons are full, juvenile crime is a national scandal, our state schools' curriculum is strictly secular and, on the material side, we are dissipating more wealth than we are creating. Having substituted state help—which is dear—for self help—which is cheap—we have lost both the desire and the capacity to save. For the first time for over 20 years the British people as a whole are not only not able to save, but are spending past savings. For the first 9 months of the financial year, 1948-49, withdrawals from savings exceeded deposits by $72,000,000. The one institution which continues to spend money as though it were as abundant as water in the Atlantic Ocean, is the state. It has taught the unsophisticated among our people that "the state will pay," and now they do not realize that the status quo state is a pauper with a pauper's mentality when suddenly confronted with an opportunity of spending other people's money.

For instance, the nationalization of the railways, cost the nation as purchase price over $4,000,000,000. It will surely be granted that this is not a bad bit of extravagance for a nation whose government has had to admit that but for American and Canadian aid Britain would be confronted with an alarming unemployment problem and that her present low standard of living would have to be still further reduced. The chairman of the British Transport Commission has hinted, in an interim statement last November, that for the full financial year the deficiency between income and expenditure probably will be $112,000,000. And it will become worse as more and more would-be travelers learn that the trips they would have made in prenationalization days, they cannot make today because of increased cost of such trips.

Under nationalization of the coal-mining industry, the miners seem to be no more disposed to dig it out of the bowels of the earth than they were under private enterprise. In 1938, under private ownership, coal production was 227,000,000 tons. In 1948, the Socialist government urged its coal-mining comrades to achieve a modest goal of only 211,000,000 tons. They could not, or would not, make the grade. The actual production of 206,500,000 tons was 2,500,000 tons short of government expectations, and 19,000,000 tons less than was produced in 1938 under private ownership.

Now, in striking contrast, I would mention steel, still under private enterprise, though threatened with a large dose of socialization. In 1938, steel production was roughly ten and one-third million tons. Unlike the nationalized coal goal, which was lowered, the steel goal was raised by the Socialist government to an almost impossible and certainly improbable figure of fourteen and one-half million tons. The steel industry produced 15,000,000 tons, or 500,000 tons more than the goal—all accomplished by the hated private enterprise system.

And now, as to the individual himself and a free and unfettered democracy, the present Socialist government has almost succeeded in casting these into bondage. By a stroke of the pen, it has imposed industrial conscription, in peacetime, on every citizen of Great Britain between the ages of 18 and 50. All men and women, unless in an exempted category, can be directed to work under the control of engagements order, 1947. Britain today, under socialism, is only a little less than a vast concentration camp.

There has been an immense amount of ballyhoo put over by the governmental propaganda machine about its wonderful handling of the unemployment problem. It typifies the palpable dishonesty of its statistics. It claims to have maintained what it is pleased to call full employment. It has done nothing of the kind. A Truth commentator has pungently pointed this out in the following quotation:

"An ominous feature of the manpower figures to the end of 1948 was that national and local government services were employing 2,230,000 persons, which is 80,000 above the ridiculously high figure to which the government said the bureaucracy was to be reduced by the end of 1948. It is worth pondering what this means. Of the total in employment—20,328,000—2,230,000 are on unproductive, if not obstructive, tasks, leaving only 18,098,000 to do the nation's work. That is, for every eight workers there is one official. The figure in the United States is, I believe, about 1 in 16."

There can be no doubt the Socialists are maintaining this large bureaucracy of 2,230,000 employees to a great extent because it is a powerful factor in bolstering up the fiction of full employment. The correct description, of course, is "concealed unemployment."

And here is another disgraceful example of socialistic planning in Britain—the housing problem. There is an acute shortage of both houses and flats and the cost of them when built is preposterous and the quality deplorable. Home ownership is severely frowned upon. Houses for weekly rental are the order of the day. When the National Savings Committee issued a poster depicting a happy house owner, with the obvious implication that thrift had paid for it, the present Socialist government demanded its immediate withdrawal. Why? Because a Socialist government must not and will not permit its servile subjects to enjoy the feeling of security in home ownership.

Our Socialist government cannot even hold its own in its relationship with its fellow comrades, the Russians, much less make any tangible advance toward mutual understanding. I do not blame them in this instance for their failure. I blame them for their cocky boasting that they could do so much better than the men whose political positions they were destined to occupy.

But here is socialism's greatest racket—social security's cradle-to-the-grave fallacious fantasy. It seduces the people into allowing the state to do for them the very things they should be willing to do for themselves. Something for nothing just does not add up, and when the state exploits this kind of crooked arithmetic it is and can be only for an ulterior motive.

The National Health Service now operating in Britain exposes all the sinister implications of this foreign-conceived conspiracy to capture the bodies and souls of men and women and their children in sickness and in health. The nationalization of medicine is an integral part of the Socialist frame-up. Indeed, it is almost the last link in the chain that is being forged for the eventual communization of Britain. All dictatorships that have outlived their growing pains have found it necessary, sooner or later, to coerce medicine into doing their dirty work.

I am not suggesting for one moment that Britain's health service was conceived in this spirit. Nevertheless, all the necessary machinery is blueprinted for the use and abuse by some future tyrant if one such should emerge. Even today Britain's Socialist cabinet ministers have taken unto themselves powers and prerogatives which grossly and malignantly overstep the centuries-old established boundaries of our constitution.

The formula, issued as a statutory instrument, and in itself neither debated nor challenged in Parliament, reads as follows:

"Confirmation by the minister shall be conclusive evidence that the powers of the act have been applied and that the order lies within the powers of the act."

Our state medical service in its first 9 months' working has exceeded the estimate by nearly $234,000,000, and as the original estimate allowed for an expenditure of approximately $700,000,000 it is not unfair to assume that the aggregate cost per annum will be not less than $1,000,000,000. Such colossal state expenditure on a single item in the social-services program would be fantastic at any time. In Britain's present financial situation, it is stark, raving madness.

The government cannot and has not delivered the goods. There are not enough doctors, or nurses, or hospitals, or clinics. The hospital situation is especially acute and it hits hardest of all the poor patient who, under the voluntary hospital system, could always count upon and always did receive priority treatment. Many of us foresaw the deplorable state of affairs that would follow the introduction of the National Health Service. It was clear to all who observed, that the sudden opening of hospital doors to every citizen, irrespective of his income, would overcrowd these already full institutions. Prior to the effective date of the National Health Service, the man of small means had complete priority of admission to a hospital bed—and rightly so. After that date the hospital beds remained the same in number, but the candidates for admission increased enormously. The Socialist government had come to the rescue of the rich man and abolished the priority of the poor man. This has all been a revelation of thoughtless and careless hospital planning.

The scheme is a political fraud because it has been foisted on the public as a free medical service. It is nothing of the kind. The patients', real and potential, contributions to the Health Service alone is $3,800,000 a week. If that is free medical service, it would be nice to have an estimate for one that isn't. It might be cheaper. It couldn't surely be dearer.

The state medical service has done two things. Firstly, it has revolutionized the status of the doctor. His livelihood, his professional advancement, his loyalties are now at the mercy of the state—the state which pays him with the citizens' compulsory contributions. And, secondly, it has destroyed the relationship between doctor and patient. Privacy and secrecy have gone despite the parliamentary assurances of the Minister of Health. In an official leaflet explaining the new services and issued to all householders in Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a categorical assurance is given in the following terms: "Your dealings with your doctor will remain as they are now, personal and confidential." Only a few weeks later the Minister of Health issued a statutory instrument, No. 506, which flatly contradicted this assurance and created an entirely new position in the Ministry's own relationship with the doctor. Under the heading, "Term of service," every practitioner enrolled in the service is required, and I quote from that instrument, "to keep record of the illnesses of his public patients and of his treatment of them in such form as the Minister may from time to time determine; and to forward such record to the local executive council," which council, I must explain, consist largely of lay persons. Women especially are furious about this barefaced breach of confidence. They point out that Mrs. Smith, the patient, living in block A discovers to her horror that Mrs. Brown, a member of the council, lives in block B with all the possibilities of neighborly gossip about Mrs. Smith's ailments.

From time immemorial, doctors in Britain have voluntarily accepted the Hippocratic oath as binding upon them professionally. Indeed, it was strictly enforced by the British Medical Association and any doctor breaking it made himself liable to be struck off the medical register, a punishment that in effect precluded him from practicing. Thus, a doctor's real dilemma has been created. If he abides by his oath, he must disobey his new master to whom he is now dependent for his salary. If he disregards his oath and places his patients' confidences at the disposal of the Minister, he is clearly guilty of "unprofessional conduct."

Under the scheme, doctors practising in large areas are called upon to accept 4,000 patients. In smaller areas the number is reduced to 2,500. Each doctor receives a per capita fee of approximately $2.25 per patient per annum. It has not taken the doctors long to discover that their net incomes, after deduction of heavy expenses and income tax, are totally inadequate and

they are now, through the British Medical Association, pressing the Minister for a reconsideration of this and other difficulties in the working of socialized medicine.

Furthermore, there is considerable significance in the fact that within a few months of the act coming into operation a new organization, under the leadership of Lord Horder, the eminent physician, and calling itself the Fellowship for Freedom in Medicine, has come into existence and is being strongly supported up and down the country by medical men who have quickly realized that the high standards of British medicine are in jeopardy.

It has been estimated that doctors today can give their public patients only an average of 3 minutes per patient for both diagnosis and treatment. The state, on the other hand, claims under the scheme that "It is the duty of the citizen to keep well," and demands from the doctor a willingness to exercise "harsh certification," which, in plain English means disposing of illness or disability in the shortest possible space of time.

One Cabinet Minister recently told the world that the British were a free people but that "an occasional crack of the whip" paid handsome dividends. It is my very confident guess that the day is not far distant when the doctors will make the discovery that they are expected to "crack the whip."

Perhaps, after all, the late Stephen Leacock was not so greatly wrong when he facetiously observed that socialism will work only in heaven, where they don't want it, or in hell, where they have got it already.

Reason for Dulles Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the November 15, 1949, issue of the Commercial Advertiser, Canton, N. Y. I thought it was one of the best things I have read on the New York election and the state we presently find ourselves in. It was written by Mr. John A. Flanigan, whom I consider one of the best country editors in our State. It follows:

[illegible]

The editorial writer and the columnist become editorial writer, the man on the farm and on the street, in the little shop and the big factory have been given to post mortems on last week's election. But few if any hit the point. As a matter of fact, so long as millions are receiving generous hand-outs from the administration in power, so long will these millions desire that the system be not changed. The average person of maturity doesn't look beyond the point of their nose.

It is easy to say that Lehman, Truman, and others more fully represent the needs of the Nation than John Foster Dulles and Dewey and those who represent the party now outside the Federal feed pen. It must be recognized, pro party aside, that the people who profit by a system of government handout, call it dole or call it something else, don't wish the system changed. The farmer as a rule takes those subsidies and other things that come along. The laborer is getting his, there are millions who believe the Government owes them a living and they are riding the Government pensions or something else that means about the same thing.

There is along here a question that millions have not answered, if they have even thought about it. Where is the money coming from? Is there anywhere along the line that last straw that breaks the camel's back? Is there any such thing as national bankruptcy? Look at England today that started out in this merry ride of spending and is admittedly bankrupt. Where is the money to come from?

Those who are old enough to remember, recall days when old people and young people were thrifty and laid away for the rainy day. There were exceptions to the rule, however, always were and always will be. The writer as a boy knew many elderly people in their little homes not looking for doles; their needs were not large. They had lived lives of thrift, they abhorred waste. Perhaps they had one or two cows and a pig or two and a few acres of land. They were not the objects of charity. In fact they were too proud to accept charity.

Standing in the welfare office in the town hall a few years ago among those present was Prof. Herbert Philbrook Morrell, a member of the faculty of the Theological School of St. Lawrence University. Both the Reverend and Mrs. Morrell were givers to charity and to other things to the extent of their ability. They gave so much of their substance that they were in want, yet they gave.

On the occasion mentioned, Professor Morrell remarked, "The trouble with what we are doing is that if we continue we will become a nation of beggars." He was right and we are largely to blame as people for the system that is creating a nation of beggars. We are telling men and women they are not fit to work after 65. An attempt is being made to lower that age if it is not already lowered. We have a system of employment that invites the worker to quit his job and take a vacation at $25 per or better. Many a good man or woman is out of a job through no blame to them, but there are others, as many more who work just long enough to get that 6 months' vacation with pay.

The system is wrong. The whole thing is a sort of vote-buying excursion of those who run it and those who accept the free handouts of Government. The writer recalls the instance when assistance was being given certain people and they were spending it for booze and local authority objected and cut off the assistance, the persons appealed to higher authority and a representative was sent to Canton to investigate. This representative called on J. Fred Hammond both supervisor and welfare officer at the time. When questioned, Mr. Hammond explained that the money was being thrown away in things not needed and that were not good for those who used it so. The conversation became heated and finally the outside agent put it this way, "It is none of your damned business what they do with the money, drink it up, throw it in the fire, you must give, or we'll take care of you."

There is, the explanation of election results in New York City and in your little country town—they are voting to get all they can, regardless of national or local bankruptcy. The only remedy is to change it. In the old days it used to be charged that the Democrats or Republicans had millions of dollars in campaign funds and would spend to the limit to remain in power or, if out of power, get in power. There you have what has been, but the picture today is reversed. The party in power has the stupendous volume of political patronage, pork-barrel legislation, and every other kind of legislation to subsidize the vote of the country. Instead of voting for the public welfare, millions are voting for their own pocketbooks.

The writer recalls that a little over 10 years ago the village of Canton had a piece of public work performed. The building of Main Street from the corporation line on the Potsdam Road to the corporation line on West Main Street, and Gouverneur Street to the underpass. A man or a boy couldn't get a job on that contract unless he was either a Democrat or would become so when of age. The same thing might have happened had the contract been under Republican administration. That it was and might be so shows the weakness of the whole system.

The country is on a spending spree, a give-away campaign. It wasn't always so and it won't be so long now at the present rate, this country will be in financial ruin. We have the example of England. We have the example of all western Europe on which we have been spending billions.

There is the explanation of why John Foster Dulles didn't win the other day; there is the reason the weak Harry Truman defeated Dewey in 1948—the system—the handouts must go on, rich man, poor man, beggar man, thief, doctor, lawyer, merchant, chief.

Keep Your Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is most interesting to listen to the blatant voices of some proponents of the so-called Fair Deal as they speak of the vaunted prosperity in which the farmers of this country are allegedly wallowing.

They can only be excused on the grounds that they are ignorant of the fact that in the past few weeks egg prices to farmers have dropped to as low as 18 cents a dozen.

In order that Members of Congress, who may be unaware of some of the economic facts of life, become enlightened on the current situation with respect to the farmers, I submit the following lead editorial from the Iowa Falls (Iowa) Citizen:

KEEP YOUR EGGS

It's been a long time since we've seen a sign like this. But it showed up last week—tacked to the back door of an Iowa Falls' grocery store:

"We are paying only 18 cents a dozen for eggs."

We gather that the intent of the sign was to save the farmer's time and breath in bringing his eggs in—if he expected more than 18 cents.

Recent sharp declines have been the result of a 25-percent increase in production over that of a year ago—plus the uncertainty that grew out of the shift from a Government price support of 90 percent of parity to 75 percent of parity.

A good many people think that egg support prices have been too high. And the fact that the Government has spent $90,000,000 in order to carry out the 90 percent of parity support price would seem to bear out that viewpoint.

Nevertheless, the sign tacked on the back of that Iowa Falls' grocery highlights the need there is to stabilize farm prices and give farmers some protection from the vast fluctuations which too frequently occur in their markets when things are left entirely to God and free enterprise.

Of course, we wouldn't be confronted with situations like that if, some morning, we woke up and found signs like this on every farmer's gate:

"Eggs are only 18 cents: Therefore we are paying only $1 a pair for overalls, $650 for a tractor, and $50 a ton for protein supplement."

Privately Supported Hospitals and the Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the December 16, 1949, issue of the Reconstructionist.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATELY SUPPORTED HOSPITALS AND THE PUBLIC HEALTH

Columbia University, at the request of the New York State Joint Hospital Survey Planning Commission, recently completed a study on hospitals in New York State. The study, directed by Dr. Eli Ginzberg, of the Graduate School of Business, has important implications for the problem of health throughout the country.

The hospital study concluded, for example, that the data collected by the research staff did not justify introducing a compulsory system of health insurance for any of the richer States like New York. It was pointed out that coverage could be achieved, with some effort, for about 85 percent of the State population through Blue Cross and commercial health insurance. At the present time some 57 percent of the New York population receives some kind of coverage through the voluntary plans. Dr. Ginzberg suggests that the combination of privately sponsored hospitals, voluntary protective plans, and an expansion of the present State facilities can achieve the ideal of guaranteeing medical care for all the citizens of New York. But he warns, "If one does not look with favor on the expansion of Government into the voluntary hospital field, then one must see to it that it doesn't become necessary. This means that the hospitals must get enough charitable support for their free and partly free work, for medical education and research, and to replace obsolete facilities and get new equipment."

There are many problems raised by the facts revealed in the study and by the suggestions made by its director. Here we should like to discuss just a few of them. In the first place, there appears to be need for widespread publicizing of the facts about medical facilities. At the very luncheon at which the completion of the study was hailed, Governor Dewey declared his concern over "the steady march toward government ownership of hospitals" and "the half bankruptcy of our voluntary hospitals." Yet the study reveals that the voluntary hospitals are approaching "a tolerably decent economic position." Apparently Governor Dewey and other public officials like to set forth their prejudices as objective fact. Citizens must be prepared with the data necessary to evaluate such political utterances.

Secondly, we are somewhat disturbed about the apparent conclusion that government assumption of more and more responsibility for the care of health is something to be avoided. The study asserts that 85 percent of all residents of New York could afford the coverage given in the voluntary plans. Yet the amounts required by such plans do not fall equally among the 85 percent who can afford to pay. A $60 annual payment can conceivably be afforded by a person earning $3,000 per year, as well as by one earning $7,500. But why should not the ability-to-pay fomula apply to contributions for public health as it does to taxation generally? Must we not reckon, moreover, with the reluctance of people in good health but with modest incomes to spend money on insuring their health unless required to do so by law? Also to be considered—and this is revealed in the study—is the fact of the limited extent of coverage in the voluntary plans. Diagnosis and the care of long, serious illnesses are rarely supplied. The poor man must still, under these circumstances, turn to the free wards of charity or State-supported hospitals. It seems, therefore, that much initiative for public health needs must still be taken by government.

The study, as reported in the New York Times, asserts that voluntary hospitals ought to "offer a maximum opportunity for qualified doctors to join the staff." The fact is, however, that in privately sponsored hospitals there is much discrimination against doctors because of their race or creed. Much of the demand for Jewishly sponsored hospitals, for example, stems from difficulty facing Jewish doctors in gaining entry to those that are not under Jewish sponsorship. Here is another instance where the emphasis on private rather than State support for hospitals appears to ignore the evils that inhere in the sectarian responsibility for medical health.

Let it also be emphasized that, as we cited above, Dr. Ginzberg declared a compulsory system to be unnecessary in the richer States. What are the implications of this remark for the backward areas of the United States? Do we need some form of socialization of health services in such places? Or can we rely there, too, on voluntarism and the good heart of the local citizenry?

These are only a few of the issues suggested by the Hospital Survey, which is now available in a volume entitled "A Pattern for Hospital Care." The American people owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Ginzberg and his associates for their careful collection of the data and their forthright recommendations. The report deserves the close attention of those who would like to see medical care extended to all who need it.

One Hundred and Sixty-second Anniversary of Ratification of Federal Constitution by Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and scholarly address delivered by State Senator E. Paul Burkholder, before the Georgetown-Millsboro Rotary Club at the official Delaware Day Observance in Georgetown, Del., on December 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are gathered together to commemorate the one hundred and sixty-second anniversary of the ratification of the Federal Constitution by the State of Delaware.

It was only another link in the great chain of human events that has taken place to enable all mankind to achieve and maintain their freedom. In every generation, men and women have struggled and died that the human spirit may be free. From the creativenes of mankind's liberated mind and spirit has come a host of ideas, discoveries, and inventions with their benefits of comfort and opportunity, and with all of them has come a burden of responsibilities and problems.

Sometimes these responsibilities would be assumed and the problems would be solved by a capable and energetic government in favor of the welfare of the people. In other periods of human history, the freedom of the individual was ignored and tyranny would rule. Then it was, when those men and women who were able would leave their homeland with its oppression and misery and flee to other parts of the world where they hoped to be free.

So it was in the year 1631 when a small ship named *De Walvis*, commanded by Peter Hayes, with about 30 liberty-loving persons aboard set sail from Hoorn, Holland, braved the perils of the Atlantic and finally dropped anchor on the banks of the Delaware. A settlement was made near the site of the present town of Lewes and they named it Zwaanendael. It was known as the De Vries expedition, but De Vries, who organized the party, did not accompany the ship, but appointed Peter Hayes to be the leader. This settlement lasted a short time. In some way, not fully explained, the whole colony was put to death, the presumption being that they were all killed by the Indians. De Vries, afterward in command of two expeditions, came to the Delaware River and explored the same as far north as the present site of Philadelphia.

In 1632, the King of England gave Lord Baltimore a grant of land that was not then cultivated, bounded on the west by the Chesapeake Bay, on the east by the Atlantic Ocean, on the north by the fortieth parallel, now the southern boundary of Pennsylvania, and on the south by the Potomac River.

Even though the colony in Lewes did not last very long, it did prevent Lord Baltimore from acquiring immediate possession of what is now called Delaware. That is why you will find the statement inscribed on the monument erected in Lewes the words: "That Delaware exists as a separate Commonwealth is due to this colony."

In 1638 a group of Swedes, led by Peter Minuet, settled on the Delaware, their location being at Fort Christina, now a part of Wilmington. A park and monument now mark this spot. This colony grew and expanded without interruption. At least 10 shiploads of people arrived during the next decade. Governor Rieder followed Minuet and Governor Printz followed him.

Almost 30 years later, in 1655, the Dutch who were in control of New Amsterdam, now New York, came south and captured all of the settlements on the Delaware, including Christina.

In 1681, the King of England gave a grant of land to William Penn, now the State of Pennsylvania, and in 1682, the Duke of York gave Penn the tract of land now known as the State of Delaware. There is some doubt as to whether the Duke of York had the authority to make this grant.

However, all of the settlements along the Atlantic coast now came under the control of the English. Sir Thomas West, who held the title of Lord De La Warr, became Governor General of the English Colonies and named the territory Delaware. The three

lower counties were named New Castle, Kent, and Sussex. Wherever there were a hundred families, the territory thus inhabited became known as a hundred. Zwaanendael was named Lewes and Christina was renamed Wilmington in honor of Lord Willington, a personal friend of William Penn.

From then on until the Declaration of Independence this territory was under the control of the State of Pennsylvania although most of the time it had a separate general assembly.

During all of these years, a growing unrest developed throughout the Colonies which finally culminated in the drafting of the Declaration of Independence for presentation to the Continental Congress.

The Delaware delegates were Thomas McKean, George Read, and Caesar Rodney. McKean and Rodney were for independence, while Read was opposed to it. Rodney was absent from the session, thus leaving the vote of Delaware divided. On the day before the vote was to be taken McKean sent an urgent note to Rodney asking for his immediate return to the Continental Congress. It was then that Caesar Rodney made his now famous ride from Dover to Philadelphia, arriving in time to cast the deciding vote of the Delaware delegation in favor of the resolution for independence.

Of course, this action brought on the War of the Revolution. Four thousand Delawareans served under George Washington. The battle of Cooch's Bridge was fought on Delaware soil. Two outstanding military figures from this State emerged from the conflict. One of them was Colonel Haslet, who lost his life at the Battle of Princeton. The other was Captain Caldwell, who was born on a farm near Felton. In those days the soldiers amused themselves between engagements by staging cock fights, and it soon developed that some of the roosters brought up from Delaware seemed to be as game as any of the rest, whereupon the Delaware boys would claim that it was a chick from a blue hen. Before long the soldiers from this area were called the Blue Hen's Chicks and Delaware became known as the Blue Hen State.

After 7 years of fighting the war came to a close and the American Colonies at last were free. The Continental Congress now set up a government under the Articles of Confederation.

It was soon discovered that these regulations were entirely inadequate when applied to the actual working of the Government. The Federal Government was bankrupt financially and spiritually. It commanded neither obedience or respect. It owed immense sums of money at home and abroad and had no way of even paying the interest. It had no revenues of its own and no powers of taxation. It could make requisitions on the States, but could not enforce its demands. We had no United money of our own, and with the exception of some copper coins, all the coined money in circulation was that of foreign nations which fluctuated widely in value. The continental paper money was worthless. Some of the States had issued paper money, and this too was of uncertain value.

We were not a nation, but a collection of 13 States, suspicious of and antagonistic to each other. The strong States oppressed the weak. Export and import duties were freely imposed. Navigation of our rivers was either prevented or hindered. Some of the States were anxious to make a separate alliance with England. Other foreign powers were watching for an opportunity to take control of this weakling among the nations.

Many of the States hoped to absorb the others. There was a proposal made that New Jersey become part of New York, that Rhode Island be a part of Connecticut, and that Delaware be ceded to Pennsylvania. Maryland claimed the southern shore of the Potomac River as her boundary, thus giving her control of the river. In an attempt to bring order out of chaos and to save this infant Nation, Virginia called a convention in 1786, to be held in Annapolis, for the purpose of setting up uniform regulations of trade. Five States, including Delaware, sent delegates. On account of the small number of States represented, no business was transacted, and the Continental Congress issued a second call for a convention to be held in Philadelphia in May 1787 to consider such alterations to the Articles of Confederation as were necessary to make the existing system of government adequate. No mention was made of an entire change in the system.

On February 3, 1787, the Delaware General Assembly passed an act appointing John Dickinson, George Read, Gunning Bedford, Richard Bassett, and Jacob Broom deputies to the Convention. Little did these men suspect what important part in world history they were destined to play.

John Dickinson, a native of Maryland, moved to Kent County and lived on a large farm along the St. Jones River. He studied law in Philadelphia and London and practiced successfully. He was known through the Colonies for his political writings. Politically he had been President of Pennsylvania and also of Delaware, as well as a Representative in the Continental Congress.

Gunning Bedford was a native of Philadelphia, graduate of Princeton, where he was valedictorian of his class. He practiced law in Dover and Wilmington. Politically he had served as a member of the general assembly, attorney general, a Member of the Continental Congress, and judge of the Federal court.

Richard Bassett was a lawyer and wealthy man, having three homes, one in Dover, one in Wilmington, and one in Maryland. Politically he was a member of the general assembly, but later became Governor and United States Senator.

Jacob Broom was a native of Wilmington, surveyor by profession, having made maps for George Washington. Politically he had served as burgess of Wilmington, as well as postmaster, and was a member of the general assembly.

George Read was a native of Maryland who moved to Newcastle, where he practiced law and served as attorney general under the English rule. He was a member of the Continental Congress and later became United States Senator and Chief Justice.

The average age of this group of men was [illegible]

The Convention finally met and was organized on May 25, 1787. George Washington was selected as chairman, and James Madison became the floor leader. Seventy-four delegates were present. The New Hampshire delegation was elected but never arrived in Philadelphia. Rhode Island did not send a delegation. This left Delaware as the only small State represented in the Convention.

Even though the Convention was called for the purpose of amending the Articles of Confederation, it soon became evident that a new basic law of the land would be formulated. In the old Continental Congress, each State had equal representation, regardless of population. The great question in this Convention was whether or not each State should have equal voice in the new government. Before many days passed, it was agreed upon that the States should be represented according to their population in one branch of Congress, and the small States fought for an equal voice in the second branch. This proposition was bitterly fought by the larger States. All during the month of June the debate was carried on with the large States winning every argument. On June 11, Sherman from Connecticut moved that each State should have one vote in the upper branch. This was defeated 6 to 5. The tension was great, and after a few more weeks of debate, Gunning Bedford, from Delaware, arose in the Convention on June 30 and attacked the larger States. He accused them of being actuated by their numbers, wealth, and ambition for power. Furthermore, he warned them that if they persisted in their attitude, the small States would find a foreign power that would give them just recognition. This speech threw the Convention into a turmoil. After a few more speeches from delegates of the larger States, the Convention adjourned until the following Monday, July 2.

Immediately after the Convention reconvened, Pinckney, of South Carolina, proposed that a committee be appointed with one member from each State to devise a compromise and report back to the Convention. Benjamin Franklin represented Pennsylvania and Gunning Bedford represented Delaware on this committee.

On July 5, the committee reported that they had agreed on a plan whereby each State was to have an equal voice in the Upper House of Congress and placed it before the Convention for their consideration. Gunning Bedford again arose and defended the smaller States and warned the larger States of the dire consequences if they were ignored. On July 10, Madison the floor leader went home in disgust. He was followed the same day by the New York delegation. Dayton, of New Jersey, and Martin, of Maryland, stated that they would never agree to anything less than equal voice in the Upper House for each State.

The stage was finally set for a vote on Monday, July 16. The fate of the Constitution and perhaps the entire Nation depended on this decision. You can imagine the tenseness of the situation, when you realize that 10 States were left to decide this momentous question, New Hampshire and Rhode Island not represented and New York having gone home. Finally all debate ceased and the roll was called. Massachusetts, not voting; Connecticut, yes; New Jersey, yes; Pennsylvania, no; Delaware, yes; Maryland, yes; Virginia, no; North Carolina, yes; South Carolina, no; Georgia, no—five yeas, four nays.

The great battle was won. Not only a victory for the small States, but also a victory for Gunning Bedford, the delegate from Delaware. Thus because of this victory each State has two Senators in the United States Senate.

During the next 6 weeks, the various provisions and details of the Constitution were agreed upon and on September 17, 1787, it was finally adopted and presented to the States for the ratification.

In November of that same year, the Delaware General Assembly passed an act calling for an election of delegates to a convention for the purpose of considering the Constitution. The act specified that 10 delegates were to be elected from each county to convene in Dover on December 3. The election was held and the Convention convened in Dover on December 3. What they did for 4 days is not known, but it is a matter of record that they ratified the Constitution on December 7, 1787, thus making Delaware the first of the Thirteen Original States to take this action. That is why Delaware is called the first State and why December 7 is an important date in our history.

The struggle for human freedom marches on.

In the War of 1812 we had Commodore MacDonough, who defeated the British in the Battle of Lake Champlain and thus prevented our country from being invaded from the north.

In the Mexican War two Delaware marine lieutenants named Rogers and Chambers were among the first men to storm the fortress of Chapultepec, in Mexico City.

Seven regiments were furnished for the War Between the States, and Commodore Samuel Du Pont was a naval hero.

In World War II we had Major Welch, Admiral Halsey, General Reybold, and General Holcomb, as well as the two Congressional Medal of Honor winners, Sergeants Nelson and Conner.

In every war Delaware has furnished more than her quota in men and money.

Besides military and naval heroes she has given the Nation three Secretaries of State, one Secretary of the Treasury, one Attorney General, five Ambassadors to foreign countries, as well as more than a hundred writers, painters, and inventors.

In the field of education Delaware had her church schools in colonials days and boasted of 22 private academies in the year 1800. She has taken great pride in her educational system ever since.

Delawareans have always been a God-fearing, religious people. Among the early Swedish settlers were two Lutheran clergymen, Old Swedes Lutheran Church was built in 1698. The cradle of Methodism, in the form of Barrett's Chapel, built in the year 1780, still stands in Kent County, north of Frederica. The early shrine of the Presbyterians, built in 1773, is Old Drawyers Church, near Odessa, in New Castle County.

Yes, Delaware has played her part in the march for freedom, and will continue to do so as long as she is true to her heritage.

Statesmen live and pass from the stages of government. Governments arise, thrive, and decay. Principles of freedom and justice live through eternity.

Statement of John Tope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of statement by John Tope, chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, on the state of the Union for young men and women, Washington, D. C., January 3, 1950:

There are some 46,000,000 young men and women in this country in their twenties and thirties seeking to make their own way through life. For them the state of the Union today is one of danger, diminishing opportunity, and frustration. More and more we young people are becoming the ones who are going to have to pay and are paying for the disastrous policies of the Truman administration. Therefore, we, like President Truman, are also obligated to present our views on the state of the Union to the American people.

I. THE ADMINISTRATION'S FLIRTATION WITH SOCIALISM

Ever since the advent of the New Deal, in 1933, the Democratic Party's administration, lacking faith in the American people, has followed a policy of flirtation with socialism. This policy has kept us in an atmosphere of perpetual crisis; it has brought us one trouble after another; and now this policy places us on the very brink of disaster.

The socialistic theme of the administration is that our prosperity as a people depends upon governmental fixing of the prices of goods and commodities and upon fixing of the wages of labor and Government competition with business. This argument began with the NRA in 1933, which proved to be a dismal economic failure and repugnant to the American way of life, even before it was declared unconstitutional. It was continued with the peacetime OPA, which in 1945 left the country in chaos, with empty shop windows, housewives standing in line, and the bootleggers of the black market controlling the necessities of life. Although these disastrous conditions forced President Truman to terminate the OPA in 1946, in 1948 he came back again with a proposal for peacetime OPA. Then in February 1949 this flirtation with socialism reached its peak with the introduction of the Democrat-sponsored Spence bill, H. R. 2756, now pending in Congress. This bill provides for governmental price fixing of all goods, commodities, and wages, and proposes to put the Government into business in direct competition with private enterprise. This bill would nationalize industry into a carbon copy of the Russian system. And as a build-up for these proposals, business all over America has already been hamstrung by hostile Government regulation.

II. THE DEPLORABLE STATE OF THE UNION

These are the burdens placed upon the youth of America by the administration's flirtation with socialism:

A. Living on borrowed money: Each and every day the United States Government now spends $15,000,000 more than it takes in, even at the high tax rates now in force. This reckless spending has resulted in a $5,500,000,000 deficit in this year of high business activity, a year when some of the $250,000,000,000 national debt should have been reduced. Yet the Federal Government ever proposes to keep on spending and going into debt, even in these times of high income, just as if debt were no problem and there need never be a day of reckoning. But a nation that spends more than it takes in in taxes, like a man who spends more than he earns, borrowing year after year, is headed for bankruptcy and its people for the poorhouse. President Truman's administration insists on borrowing more and more money to finance its present policies, and indeed now proposes new and more fantastic hand-outs, leaving to the youth of America the bitter inheritance of inflation, a crushing load of unbearable taxes, and poverty and chaos. The true state of the Union today is that it is rushing toward absolute ruin.

B. The fantastic cost of "Truman prosperity": The cost of direct relief in the United States in the so-called full employment year of 1948 was more than double the payments to individuals for direct relief in 1934, a year of national depression. In 1934 Federal, State, and local governments made payments to individuals for direct relief of $745,000,000. In the so-called prosperous year of 1948 these same payments were more than doubled at $1,727,000,000—and the above figures do not include social security, pensions, unemployment insurance, and the like, which average $9,400,000,000 for each of the last 3 years. Moreover, these expenditures have been increasing at the rate of about 20 percent a year since the end of the war. Hence the relief hand-outs under "Truman prosperity" make the payments under Roosevelt's depression dwindle to insignificance. If all this is the cost of "Truman prosperity," may God help us in the next depression.

C. Punitive taxation: Coupled with extravagant spending and piling up of Government debt, the Truman administration has maintained wartime taxation to the point where it injures the people because it heavily penalizes individual incentive, compels every worker to give a larger and larger part of his earnings to the Government, deprives the country of risk capital, and prevents the establishment of new enterprises and the creation of new industries. This has made it extremely difficult for new business undertakings to grow and expand and to compete with those already established.

D. Paralyzing the country with class warfare: The people of the United States have just suffered many hundreds of millions of dollars of damage due to the coal and steel strikes. Innocent parties have suffered—workers and employers alike—in the railroad, steel fabrication, and automobile industries, as well as the merchants in the strike areas, and others. Yet not a word of disapproval has come from the President or any member of his Cabinet. We demand that President Truman explain on what theory of justice a special group can inflict such terrible damage on the people? It is the policy of the Truman administration to encourage class warfare, to set labor against managements and employes against employer, and then to load the scales in favor of the labor bosses against the worker and his employer. Today the labor union chiefs with their enormous economic power and their millions of dollars paid for political gain and campaign expenses, enjoy a Government-sponsored monopoly of the use of manpower in whole industries. These labor bosses, aided and encouraged by the Government, now misuse their power to regulate production, create scarcities, and increase the cost of living. While labor unions have a legitimate right to organize and bargain collectively, their bosses have no right to misuse their power to tie up a whole industry at the whim of a single person or group, and cause millions of dollars of loss to innocent citizens of the community. The public interest must come first.

E. Political demagoguery: Recently the President has assailed certain "interests" as selfishly seeking to undermine America for their own evil purposes. We call upon the President in his forthcoming state of the Union message to identify the "interests" by name and address so that everyone may know who they are, and so that these sinister activities may be stopped. In the public interest, the President should abandon the coward's role of failing to identify those whom he accuses.

F. The colossal blunder in China: At the same time that it is spending some $22,000,000,000 a year for armaments and aid to fight communism in Europe, the administration has affirmatively aided the Communists in Asia, opening the whole Orient to the Red tide of communism. The administration aided the Communists by dealing the recognized Chinese Government a death blow. After the recognized Chinese Government had the upper hand over the Communists in 1945, the Truman administration forced the Nationalists to cease hostilities, placed an embargo on shipment of arms to China, attempted to force a coalition with the Communists, and enabled the Communists to arm themselves with Japanese arms captured by the Russians. These were horrible mistakes. The Truman administration's diplomatic blunder in the Orient is without parallel in our history. And the administration still lacks a global policy on communism.

III. RANK DISCRIMINATION AGAINST YOUNG MEN AND WOMEN

In conclusion, the state of the Union is not good. This is due to the socialistic program of the Truman administration which has thrown obstacles and stumbling blocks in the way of the American people. And if we young people allow this policy to continue we are bound to endure the poverty and suffer the frustration which has overcome youth in other parts of the world. In short, we want a state of opportunity instead of a state of charity for all. Moreover, we will not tolerate President Truman's rank discrimination against the Nation's young men and

women. We are entitled to the same chance in life that our forefathers enjoyed, and we call upon the American people to rise up and counsel the President to put a stop to the trend which he has inaugurated now—before it is too late.

Conservation of Soil Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the Library of Congress and the files of the Department of Agriculture are no doubt abundant with many fine articles on the subject of soil conservation, but for eloquence and brevity I have never read a finer exposé of the subject than the second prize essay in the Nation-wide essay contest on Conservation of Our Soil Resources, sponsored by the National Grange and the American Plant Food Council, Inc.

The winner of this contest was a young lady from my own State, Miss Natalie Snyder, of Pittstown, N. J.

Since New Jersey is justly proud of this splendid effort, I ask unanimous consent that the essay be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, where I hope it will be read by all Members of the Congress who are interested in soil conservation.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECOND PRIZE ESSAY IN THE NATION-WIDE CONTEST ON CONSERVATION OF OUR SOIL RESOURCES SPONSORED BY THE NATIONAL GRANGE AND AMERICAN PLANT FOOD COUNCIL, INC.

(Winner: Miss Natalie Snyder, age 18, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. William T. Snyder, Pittstown, Hunterdon County, N. J.)

Three centuries ago, when the first settlers journeyed to these shores in search of a new life, they were rewarded by a vast expanse of rich land which stretched out on every side. Because the land yielded bountiful harvests, the people prospered, and because it was free and plenteous, man enjoyed independence and freedom. It was thus that America's soil served as a foundation for the great liberty-loving Nation which grew and became strengthened with the passing of time. Even today, soil is the basis of man's life; everything which man does, every gain he makes, begins with and depends upon its sustained productivity.

However, we were prone to take this great blessing of fertile land for granted, and did not trouble ourselves to become acquainted with the methods to best utilize and preserve it. We grew extravagant and careless, gradually slipping into the shiftless habit of wasting this gift of nature by tragic mistake. Consequently, down through the years, erosion has destroyed 100,000,000 acres, and has severely damaged an equal amount. Each year adds more eroded acreage to the count, and the ultimate end is growing daily.

Erosion not only results in wasted lands, but in ruined lives as well. The farmer's future is blackened, for the yield of his land is greatly lessened, and under such conditions he cannot prosper. Half of all the land in the United States has been affected by erosion. This, of course, reflects upon the welfare of the tiller of the soil, and many are forced into the depths of poverty.

According to statistics, we now have around 450,000,000 acres of good cropland in the United States. In addition, there are about 100,000,000 acres that need various improvements. All in all, we are allowing 500,000 acres to deteriorate each year. This waste is one of our country's chief enemies, for without farm prosperity, our Nation is drastically weakened. Not only our own land, but much of war-torn Europe is greatly affected, for the lives of millions across the sea depend to a large extent upon this country's economic stability. Thus, the importance of the conservation of our soil resources cannot be overemphasized.

What can be done to protect our land and to conserve what we have? The answer lies in the very definition of the term "soil conservation"; we must learn the proper use and management of our land. Most of our soil difficulties stem from ignorance on the part of man concerning measures to keep the land productive. Steps are now being taken to correct this situation by the Soil Conservation Service and other similar units, which are making great strides in education and technically aiding farmers in conservation work. Through extensive and continual research, the Soil Conservation Service has been able to learn much about the science of conservation, and many practices have been found to be highly effective in saving our soil.

Contour cultivation, a prime factor in this attempt, not only makes the work of the farmer less strenuous, but conserves the rainfall and reduces the amount of soil washed away as well, because of the rounded furrows resulting from farming the land horizontally rather than vertically. Strip cropping is another soil saver, and wind stripping, similarly executed, does much to prevent wind erosion.

Terraces and diversion channels are valuable in diverting damaging run-off of water, and hedges serve as a check to water and to forceful winds. Windbreaks, in the form of other trees and shrubs, are useful on the open prairie and plains.

Stubble mulching and the use of cover crops are beneficial in several ways. The former protects the soil from wind erosion, aids in controlling grasshoppers, cuts down soil erosion, evaporation, and baking, helps the soil to retain rainfall, and aids advantageous bacteria growth in the soil. Cover crops prevent erosion of cultivated areas, and may provide a humus for the soil.

Crop rotation, irrigation of arid areas, and drainage of wet and soggy soil are other imperative measures in keeping the land productive.

Of all the essentials of conservation, however, perhaps the paramount factor to be considered is that no bit of land is without value; every piece should be used to its best advantage. Therefore, it is our duty, as the youth of today and the citizens of tomorrow, to become acquainted with these values and to learn to use them wisely, for when ignorance of proper soil-conservation methods is completely overcome, both the farm and the Nation will be better places in which to dwell, and will be the foundation for a finer world for ourselves and our posterity.

Point 4's Human Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of December 5, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POINT 4'S HUMAN GOALS

Two conferences meeting in New York on Friday and Saturday heard discussions of some of the objectives of the point-4 program for aid to the peoples of underdeveloped areas. It was agreed by several speakers that concentration on economic objectives must not lead to an exclusion of consideration of cultural, humanitarian, and social projects. One speaker, Dr. Alva Myrdal of the United Nations, also warned that economic changes must not be too rapidly pushed lest they be detrimental to social values.

This emphasis is sound and we need its balance. But we need to remember likewise that Dr. Myrdal wisely remarked that "social welfare * * * cannot reach very far without economic development." As President Truman set forth the point-4 program and as it was embraced by the United Nations, it rests on the basis of extensive private investment. Unless that investment is forthcoming there will not be much of a program and the investment cannot be expected unless there is the prospect of making a reasonable profit and assurance against unreasonable loss, such as confiscation.

Fortunately investment for profit can be made to have its reflection in raised standards of living, and these can be translated directly into the humanitarian project that are major goals of the program. It goes almost without saying that one of the first items on any program for an underdeveloped people is a sound public health project. Part of the reason for underdevelopment at different points is the presence of endemic or epidemic disease. In Africa it is sleeping sickness, in East Asia cholera, elsewhere it is tuberculosis or malaria or both. Those scourges can be wiped out, but to do so will require money, and a lot of it. Similarly it is agreed that a wise educational program can contribute largely to human well-being and happiness, but this also will demand a very large outlay. That is where the investment for profit must come in, to develop the productive, taxable wealth for channeling into fields such as these.

The two phases of the program are not at all incompatible. In fact, they must be indissolubly wedded if the large goals of the project are to be achieved. What is required here is the combination of a big, warm heart with a good, hard head, and neither can be sacrificed to the other.

Republican Resurgence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Republican Resurgence," written by Mr. Samuel Shaffer, and published in the magazine Newsweek for January 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN RESURGENCE

To Republicans, the Fair Deal's insistence that a welfare state wasn't incompatible with free enterprise seemed a dangerous, if not

a deadly, delusion. Some Republicans suspected that many Fair Dealers didn't really believe it themselves, but were merely attempting to lull the Nation into somnolence while they saddled it with a kind of "creeping socialism." Others, more charitable, thought with less respect for Harry S. Truman's wisdom, said the whole trouble was the President's failure to understand the consequences of his acts.

They agreed that the President was far from a revolutionary and that he was pressing for such measures as compulsory health insurance and the Brannan plan without any thought of destroying the free-enterprise system, but they argued that he was driving the Nation to socialism nevertheless. For a welfare state would make socialism inevitable, they asserted. It was a simple case of cause and effect.

As the Republicans saw it, the only way to prevent socialism, therefore, was to scotch Mr. Truman's plans for a welfare state. Last week, as the Republicans returned to Washington for the wind-up session of the Eighty-first Congress, they came primed for a no-quarter fight on the welfare state in all its aspects.

NEW MOOD

They were quite a different breed from the Republicans who had put up such an ineffective battle against the Fair Deal during the first session of the Eighty-first, a battle characterized by lack of strategy, divided counsels, shattered morale, and bedeviling doubt. At best, they had then fought a delaying action; at worst; they had broken lines to join the Democratic enemy.

Now they were acting like men who had discovered the way to political salvation, for themselves as well as for the country. With the fervor of repentant sinners, they were gathering together under a banner pledging death to spendthrift socialism. Political realists for the most part, they were not promising themselves or their followers a quick, easy victory over the Fair Deal. All they guaranteed was "a helluva fight." As one GOP leader put it, "the shadow boxing is over. Maybe we're in for another licking, but for once we'll have the satisfaction of going down fighting."

At long last the Republicans appeared to have recovered from the state of shock which gripped them on November 3, 1948. Throughout 1949 they had been numbed by a feeling of complete hopelessness and helplessness. Dozens of them had become almost convinced that it would be a waste of effort to run for reelection next fall. Publicly, they blamed Thomas E. Dewey and Earl Warren for their plight, saying that it was their overconfidence which had cost the Republican Party victory in 1948. Deep down, however, they knew they had been just as guilty themselves.

What nagged them most was the fear that perhaps the country really wanted the welfare state, after all. Did they face no alternative except to let the Wave of the future engulf them, or else swim quickly to its crest?

THE PAST

At times, during the opening session of the Eighty-first Congress, party discipline had evaporated entirely while the soul searching went on. Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., dropped the reins for weeks at a stretch. At least twoscore of the Republican legislators voted almost automatically for every welfare-state measure proposed. Another 50, gripped by despair, voted frequently with the Democrats. On some issues, nearly half the House Republicans broke party lines.

There was, moreover, no liaison between House and Senate GOP leaders. Months went by without a phone call or a visit to coordinate strategy. The Senate leaders went off in one direction; the House leaders, in another. In the Senate, ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, fought for public housing. In the House, the Democrats were able to wave TAFT's name in the face of Republicans who opposed it. JOE MARTIN's all-out effort to kill the public-housing measure, therefore, was doomed to failure from the first.

The uncertainty about their future and the divisions in their leadership weren't the only factors that had depressed the Republicans. There was also the bitter fight over the chairmanship of the Republican National Committee between the pro-Dewey and anti-Dewey forces, which ended in the victory of the latter and the election of Guy G. Gabrielson. And finally, there were the insistent letters that kept flooding in from their home districts, demanding: "What does the Republican Party stand for, anyway?" The GOP legislators weren't sure themselves.

What brought about the sudden switch in morale and point of view? The Republican legislators themselves last week offered several explanations:

During the recess between congressional sessions they learned that, from the GOP standpoint, the picture wasn't nearly as black as they had thought. Throughout the country they found resentment over high taxes, the high cost of government, and deficit financing. They found a genuine fear of a Fair Deal drift toward socialism. Where they had previously wondered if they didn't represent a futile minority in their opposition to Mr. Truman's program, they now were convinced they spoke for the majority.

In Washington they had been scared to political paralysis by what they believed was the sure-fire appeal of the Brannan plan. At home they had discovered that it was leaving the farmers cold. Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota, a ranking Republican member of the House Agriculture Committee, last week told his big-city colleagues over lunch in the House restaurant: "Why, the farm organizations back home are beating the brains out of the Brannan plan."

They discovered that even the Democrats, including HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, and PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, were equivocating or beating a downright retreat on compulsory health insurance.

They analyzed the New York State election in 1949 and drew considerable comfort from it. The GOP candidate for the Senate, John Foster Dulles, had been a political unknown, with only 5 weeks to campaign against the best Democratic vote-getter in the State. He had waged an all-out fight against the Fair Deal in what for years had been a Fair Deal stronghold. He had lost by only 2 percent. Although less partisan observers might insist that Dulles' showing was made possible not by his attacks on the welfare state but by Catholic defections—the result of Lehman's siding with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt in her dispute with Francis Cardinal Spellman—the Republican legislators preferred to consider it a great moral victory for the principles of Republicanism. In New Jersey, they said, Republican Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll won despite his me-too campaign; his victory was merely a repudiation of the Hague machine.

Significant of the new attitude of the Republicans was the strategy that Representative RICHARD NIXON, of California, had worked out in his campaign for Democratic Senator SHERMAN DOWNEY's seat. NIXON, a youthful, handsome, curly-haired, and strong-jawed former Navy officer, who is widely considered one of the most capable Republicans in the House, had come out in flat opposition to everything the Fair Deal stands for.

He had announced his candidacy in these words:

"The issue * * * is the choice between freedom and socialist baloney. They can call it planned economy, the Fair Deal, or social welfare. It's still the same old socialist baloney any way you slice it. Believe me, I am well aware of the Communist threat, and I do not discount it. But I am convinced that an even greater threat to our free institutions is presented by that group of hypocritical and cynical men who, under the guise of providing political panaceas for certain social and economic problems in our society, are selling the American birthright for a mess of political pottage. Slowly but surely they are chipping away the freedoms which are essential to the survival of a healthy, strong, and productive Nation."

It had been a difficult decision for NIXON to make—to declare war on the Fair Deal in a State which had always been so overwhelmingly Fair Deal that Republicans like Governor Warren were almost indistinguishable from Democrats. But last week, NIXON assured his colleagues that it was paying dividends. "Things look so good," he confided, "I'm worried."

THE FUTURE

This week, as the Eighty-first opened its wind-up session, the GOP was almost solidly united in the fight on the Truman program. Its ranks included only a handful of mavericks, like JACOB JAVITS, of New York, and JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania, in the House, and WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, and CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire, in the Senate. Even men like Senators HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts, and GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, weren't expected to wander far off the GOP reservation.

In a now-or-never mood, the Republicans were planning to seize the initiative in pushing excise-tax cuts, antilynching, and anti-poll-tax legislation, and slashes in foreign-aid and domestic welfare-state expenditures.

Although they still had differences on foreign policy, the chances were decidedly against a split even over that issue. Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan, had made unity possible by calling for reductions in foreign spending. Even Senator KENNETH WHERRY, of Nebraska, who had consistently fought against the ECA, was prepared to make only a token fight against its extension if the appropriation was slashed by a billion or a billion and a half. And for once, the Republicans had something really to shout about—China and Asia in general, where communism had been making frightening strides, while GOP legislators like Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, charged, the Administration dawdled.

The Republicans expected to raise a real furor over deficit spending, with a challenge to Mr. Truman to balance the budget by reducing expenditures. And they were prepared to make a covert alliance with the Dixiecrats on all issues where it would stymie the Fair Deal.

Only on one Fair Deal issue would they go along: the expansion of social security. Industry generally favored it because it would serve to stifle labor's growing demands for noncontributory pensions. Moreover, the increasing number of aged people in the population made any other position political insanity.

The renewal of confidence and cohesion among the Republicans spelled genuine danger for the administration's program, including renewal of rent control, Federal aid to education, and expansion of public housing. The Brannan plan, compulsory health insurance, Taft-Hartley repeal, and any kind of tax increase calculated to offset probable excise-tax cuts and narrow the inevitable deficit were almost certainly dead.

SIGNIFICANCE

Thus, Democrats and Republicans alike view the 1950 congressional campaign as one of the most vital in the Nation's history. If the Democrats win, the Fair Dealers among them at least will accept the election returns as a mandate for the welfare state, and the chances are that enough conservative Democrats and even Republicans will agree with this appraisal to open the way in Congress for a major part of the welfare-state program.

In the present exuberant state of the Republicans, moreover, a Fair Deal victory will be a stunning psychological blow which

may well have permanent effects. It would be extremely difficult to rally the party again in the 1952 Presidential campaign for an all-out fight on the Fair Deal; 1952 might find the Republicans embracing "me-too" as a permanent policy. The issue of a welfare state would have been resolved. From then on the only question would be: How much welfare in the welfare state?

A Republican victory would not be quite so decisive. The Democrats aren't entering the campaign with the same feeling of desperation as the Republicans; they have been winning too many elections for too many years. They would view a defeat in 1950 as merely a temporary setback, like the one in 1946. And just as they recovered from the 1946 debacle to press their campaign for the Fair Deal with renewed vigor in 1948, so would they be likely to revive the battle for the welfare state in 1952.

On the other hand, a Republican victory would completely block the Truman program on the Eighty-second Congress; it would revitalize the party, and it would increase GOP chances in 1952.

Communist Fronts Attempt To Mislead the Supreme Court of the United States

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of the United States is being invaded by Communist fronts in the most vicious attack on the white people of this country, especially of the Southern States, in the case of Henderson against the United States.

Never in all the history of this country have the relationships between the two races been better than they are between the whites and blacks in the Southern States today. The Negroes are enjoying more prosperity, more peace, more protection, and more security than they have ever known before anywhere in the world.

Yet, we find these Communist fronts going into the Supreme Court of the United States and filing briefs to try to destroy that relationship by wiping out segregation and destroying the present program of equal facilities for both races, knowing full well, if they know anything, that they are merely stirring race trouble and doing both the white people and the Negroes of this country infinite harm.

I am going to put the names of these organizations in the RECORD, and I am going to give you some of the low-down on some of the low-downs involved in this communistic drive.

This is a case where a Negro by the name of Henderson filed suit against the United States of America, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Southern Railway Co., because, while he was afforded equal facilities and was permitted to eat with the other Negroes on the train, he wanted to get away from them and eat with the white people.

The circuit court of appeals dismissed the case and this appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Certain Communist-front organizations, which I shall name here, went into the Court and filed briefs under the pretense of amicus curiae, or friend of the court.

One of the outfits that filed these briefs under the false pretense of amicus curiae was the so-called National Lawyers' Guild, a Communist-front organization that had been so branded and exposed by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the Congress of the United States and also by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the State of California.

In its beginning some very prominent lawyers, including Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, now on the Supreme Court, and Lieutenant Governor Poletti, of New York, joined this organization; but when they found out what it was, they both resigned, as did a number of other leading attorneys throughout the country.

In this case it is represented by Robert J. Silverstein, as its chief counsel, who signed a statement in 1941 defending the Communist Party. That statement was printed in the Communist Daily Worker on March 5, 1941, and is to be found on page 645 of the appendix No. 9 of the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1944.

Another outfit that has filed a brief under the pretense of "amicus curiae" is the Anti-Defamation League, which is the gestapo for the B'nai B'rith, often referred to as a Yiddish Ku Klux Klan.

Members of this Anti-Defamation League are carrying on the most vicious persecution of white gentiles ever known in this country. They are a disgrace to the Jewish people whom they pretend to represent.

This attack on the white people of America, and especially on the white people of the South, is not made through any love of the Negro. They do not give a "tinker's dam" about the Negro. They are simply carrying on a program of persecution of white Americans and using this method of stirring up racial trouble throughout the country.

I call upon the Committee of Un-American Activities to investigate this outfit and put a stop to their communistic defamation and persecution of white Christian Americans.

They have a file on every white gentile in America of any standing, and whenever a man in public life or in business, or a Christian minister, if you please, says or does anything to displease the members of this alien organization, they immediately turn loose a barrage of smear propaganda, for the purpose of destroying such individual.

Another organization that has filed its brief in this case under the pretense of "amicus curiae" is the American Jewish Congress. They are not interested in the Negro. I should like to see the Committee on Un-American Activities investigate this outfit also.

These organizations are attempting to carry out the program of the Communist Party as announced through its vicious pamphlet called The Negro in Soviet America. They are going out of their way to try to wipe out our segregation laws, destroy our separate schools, bring about race riots, bloodshed, and revolution, if possible.

I cannot believe that the Supreme Court of the United States will fall for this kind of propaganda. Every intelligent individual on that august tribunal must know that if the position of these Red fronts is sustained, it will do infinitely more harm than good to both the white people and the Negroes in every section of the country.

Examples for the Western World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times of December 27, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXAMPLES FOR THE WESTERN WORLD

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON.—It is worthy of note that despite the lack of concrete results of a basic nature from the recent meeting of the United Nations General Assembly there did emerge from it in a new role an international figure who demonstrated a positive impulse for peace. Moreover, he symbolizes leadership of the kind that holds hope for the future.

It is significant that Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, of the Philippines, is the first veteran of World War II to be President of the Assembly. In that capacity he represents the men who fought the war and who had, and still hold in spite of everything, the dream of a new sort of world.

He was personally responsible for the one achievement that relates to the dark problem that overhangs the world—the atom bomb. He was the moving influence behind the resolution which revived and put back to work again the UN Atomic Energy Commission, which is trying to find some formula for international control of atomic weapons.

Beyond this, he offered and now has reiterated his own proposal for a temporary halt in production and use of atomic weapons to stop the race between the United States and Russia and thus provide a more favorable atmosphere for devising some permanent plan of international control and inspection.

There is another also in his part of the world, Pandit Nehru, of India, who finally led his people to an independent status.

Reflecting on the activity of these two, both men of spiritual quality as well as courage and intelligence, suggests that leadership in the campaign for world peace may come from that area of the world—the old-east—and from it we may get a new sort of spiritual revival that may, in the end, save us.

All we in this sphere, on either side, have been able to offer is to arm ourselves like rival bandits to protect ourselves from each other. That is the old way, which never has worked. It can only lead to conflict eventually. Meanwhile, it is draining away our resources that might better be used in other ways. And it is eating away at our fundamental liberties of which western civilization has been justly proud.

These are truths demonstrated by history and experience.

They are recognized by the Rosandos and Nehrus. They deserve at least our thanks and our support.

American Policy With Respect to Communist Aggression and Expansion in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on November 28, 1949, a mass meeting was held at Carnegie Hall, New York City, on the question of American policy with respect to Communist aggression and expansion in Asia. The meeting was held under the sponsorship of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding Anti-Communist China, whose national chairman is Mr. Frederick C. McKee, a distinguished citizen of Pittsburgh who has long been a prophetic and courageous leader in the development of a sound American foreign policy, especially during the last critical decade and a half. Speakers at the rally included three distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JAMES FULTON, of Pennsylvania; the Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE, of Connecticut; and the Honorable EARL T. WAGNER, of Ohio; and the Honorable HERBERT R. O'CONOR, United States Senator from Maryland.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following resolution passed by the meeting, outlining a constructive foreign policy for our Government with respect to China, and a letter to the President expressing opposition to any recognition by the United States of the Communist regime in China:

We, citizens of the city of New York, at Carnegie Hall in mass meeting assembled on this 28th day of November 1949, firm in the conviction that the envelopment of the Chinese Republic by the armed forces of Communist aggression gravely threatens the security of the United States of America and world peace, call upon our Government—

First. To declare now a policy of nonrecognition of any government of China imposed by force of arms and intimidation upon the Chinese people.

Second. To declare this Government's moral support of all elements in China opposed to and resisting Communist aggression.

Third. To give significant economic aid and military advice and supplies to those elements in areas of China not under Communist control.

NOVEMBER 30, 1949.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States of America, the White House,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We respectfully call to your attention two resolutions adopted unanimously as to China policy and with two dissenting votes as to Communist arrests of American citizens and officials, at a meeting of more than 2,000 citizens at Carnegie Hall, New York, on November 28.

The speakers on that occasion, Democratic and Republican Members of the Congress, expressed views warmly received by the audience that the present policy of withholding by the United States of America effective support to anti-Communist forces in China is—

1. Inconsistent with the United States policy in Europe and the Middle East, and severely discounts the effectiveness of and warrant for that policy.

2. Inconsistent with our obligations to a faithful ally.

3. Discouraging to anti-Communist leaders in other Asiatic countries and the Malay Archipelago now in the shadow of Communist aggression.

4. A gesture of defeat and submission destructive of American prestige throughout the world, and a great encouragement to intensified Communist expansion.

These results are viewed as a grave danger to American security and world peace.

Respectfully yours,

FREDERICK C. MCKEE,
National Chairman.

Keep Our Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a remarkable sermon preached on November 27, 1949, by Rev. Earle B. Jewell, rector of St. Andrews Episcopal Church, Kansas City, Mo., entitled "Keep Our Freedom."

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP OUR FREEDOM

(By Earle B. Jewell, rector of St. Andrew's Episcopal Church, Kansas City, Mo.)

God send us men whose aim 'twill be,
Not to defend some ancient creed,
But to live out the laws of right
In every thought and word and deed.

God send us men alert and quick,
His lofty precepts to translate,
Until the laws of right become
The laws and habits of the state.

God send us men of steadfast will,
Patient, courageous, strong, and true:
With vision clear and mind equipped,
His will to learn, His Work to do.

God send us men with hearts ablaze,
All truth to love, all wrong to hate:
These are the patriots nations need,
These are the bulwarks of the state.

—*Frederick John Gillman.*

This is Advent Sunday, the New Year's Day of the Christian calendar. Today is the day we begin to get ready for the coming of Christ on Christmas Day. As we think about the coming of Christ and His life on earth, we ask, "What was one of the specific things Christ came to earth to do?"

We have been talking the last few Sundays about how to make God real in our everyday life. We have learned that Christ came to the earth to help us make God real in our lives. This morning I want to go a little further and see if we can get a specific activity where we can make God real.

I believe one of the specific things Christ came to earth to do was to give man a sense of dignity and to help man realize his worthwhileness in the world. He came to earth to help God become so real to us that we as individuals can understand why in God's sight we are important. God came to earth in the form of man, to dignify man, to lift man above the animal, and to make man conscious of his oneness with the Divine.

Man has existed on the earth, if we can believe science, for millions of years. However, only 7,000 years in the recorded period of man's progress. For 5,000 years man was struggling for a meaning to life. Man was struggling against his environment, his awakening consciousness, and his superstitions. He was making a pathetic effort to find a purpose in the world for his life and a reason for his existence. Then something happened in the world of man's aspirations that changed human life with the force of an atomic bomb. Christ was born into the world. Two thousand years ago a man came to the earth and told mankind that the individual was important in God's sight. Man learned that he was a little lower than the angels. Man was taught that God would give His spirit to human beings. Through this gift of God of Himself, man began to walk the earth with confidence and courage and to face life with an inner sense of dignity.

One hundred and seventy-two years ago, or seven generations (one generation equals 25 years) there was founded in the world of nations a new country—a country that was made possible and was brought about because man had received the truth that God intended man to be free. This ideal of freedom opened the door of man's concepts so that he knew that he could have and should have an opportunity to express self-initiativeness, and that he possessed the potentiality of private effort and private enterprise. One hundred and seventy-two years ago man knew that God existed in the world. Our proof is, that men and women seeking to fulfill their inner desire for freedom, came to this America of ours and established the only nation in all history that started on the premise that God intended man to be something in His own sight. America became a reality built and based on a faith in God. God was so real that men and women lifted their heads and their shoulders above the cry of their own defeat and established the only nation in the world built upon the Christian faith, that through God and God's reality, man was important. Man was a free agent in God's world.

Think of it. Man has been going toward civilization for only 7,000 years. Five thousand of those 7,000 years man was searching and seeking. Then just 2,000 years ago God came to this earth as a man and revealed that the individual man was real in the sight of God and God was real to man.

It was only 172 years ago that this great Nation was established on that ideal. Think what has been accomplished in 172 years. Men and women landed on the eastern coast of this continent. They found no buildings. They found no roads. Yet these people marched from the east coast across one of the largest areas in the world. They were propelled by the faith and the courage in the Christian idea that they were free. They conquered a continent and built up the strongest, finest Nation in the world. We call it the United States of America, built upon the Christian faith that God is so real to men that men are free, that men have a sense of dignity, that men know they are worth while in the scheme of God's plan, and that men have the right to express self-initiativeness and private enterprise. And, above all, this Nation was built upon the Christian ideal that God is so real that the individual man has the divine right and the divine gift to keep his self-respect by making his own living in the world without expecting the world to make a living for him.

This morning, after Thanksgiving Day, I am pleading with Christian Americans to awaken. I urge us as Christian Americans to get on our knees and ask God for more courage and more Christian faith to accept back again God's gift of self-reliance, dignity, and the right to express God-given personality. Yes, I am asking Americans to get on their knees and ask Almighty God to give back our lost self-respect. In this regained Christian faith, God again will become real. We will be aware that God intends us to give expression to our liberty. Then and only then will we be able to throw away the dole that is making Americans beggars before the throne of the universe. God will help us to stand again on our feet as men of courage and say, "We are Americans. Freedom. Our self-respect cannot be sold for a mess of pottage. Our freedom as Christian Americans, our freedom as individual personalities, is not for sale on the altar of political expediency. Our independence as freemen cannot be sacrificed on the greedy altar of those organizations which deny God and yet demand a toll from every honest American who wants to express his own personality."

It is later than we think. When we destroy the self-respect of an individual we destroy his moral character. In the absence of moral character man becomes dependent, and he is no longer an upright free American. He is a slave to the dole, and the result is that God cannot be real to such a person.

If we can get enough men to lose their self-respect we will get enough people to lose their moral sensibility, and thus we will create a group of dependents who are no longer free Americans. These people become slaves to the dole. People who willingly deny God's gift of self-respect deny God. If we can get enough people to surrender their freedom for a mess of pottage called the dole, for the expediency of the now, we can destroy America, because we have destroyed the character of American people.

The morning paper informs us that the vote-bribing politicians plan to give $100 a month pension to everybody over 65. Ah, yes, man doesn't have to be independent any more. Man doesn't have to keep his self-respect any more. Man doesn't have to have a moral character any more. All he has to have is a voice that says, "Give me," and a hand that can reach out, and an attitude that says, "Everything in the world is free." We don't know God when we think that way. We don't know the history of America when we accept that kind of foreign propaganda. We do not become aware of the sacrifices of people who have made this Nation possible for us when we expect a dole. We are throwing our freedom overboard in one generation.

Don't ask me if God can be real to this country. He can be as real to us as He was to the people of old. But He can only be real insofar as we accept His gift of dignity that causes us to fight to keep our freedom. Our freedom is based upon the conviction that God made us to be an individual personality. As an individual personality we are aware of the gift of freedom, the gift of self-respect, and the gift of our importance in God's divine economy of His universe. We refuse to have these gifts destroyed by anything in our environment, or any easy promises made to us for our physical well-being.

Men of old did not go back on their faith in God when they started out from the east coast and went across this Nation fighting sickness, loneliness, storm, blizzard, flood, Indians, wild animals, and diverse forms of affliction. They kept going forward because they believed in their individual dignity. They knew that man without freedom is without dignity.

We can sell out if we want to. We can sell our divine gift as individuals to pressure groups, organized minorities or to some form of economic government. But let us remember that the moment we sell our personality for the temporary comfort of a mess of pottage, we cease to be recipients of God's divine gift to us of a free and dignified personality. We cease to become an individual man. We become a mere physical being.

I repeat, if we want to destroy a man's self-respect, make him dependent. The moment we make him dependent we destroy his moral character. After his moral character has been destroyed he becomes a cowardly slave. He is concerned only with his immediate comfort and protection.

It's later than we think. If this country of ours, through Christian people like us, keeps on condoning the dole, we have lost more in one generation than we have created in seven generations. America cannot exist as America without man's faith in God. Such a faith makes God so real that man is aware of his dignity and knows his importance as an individual. This man keeps his self-respect which is so strong that he is able to say, with conviction, "For everything I get I know there is a price tag on it and I am not going to sell out for the immediacy of my own comfort."

I know this is not an accepted doctrine in this country right now. I know that some of you people will say, "I do not go to church to hear economics. I do not go to church to hear politics." This morning I am not talking economics. I am not talking politics. I am talking applied Christianity. I am talking the kind of a message I believe the Christian church should give repeatedly throughout this Nation. Men need to be made aware that there is a danger that they will lose their freedom because their self-respect, their sense of dignity, their moral character is being undermined. When these are surrendered we will lose America and thus separate ourselves from our God because we have chosen enslavement rather than the divine gift of freedom. We become a people enslaved; enslaved to our own appetites and enslaved to the animal instincts of our own protection. We have thrown overboard Christ's crucifixion on the cross. We reject the offering of Himself. He offered Himself for us because He believed that we were so important as individuals that He hung on the cross to redeem us back to our manhood and make us men so that we could stand in His world and struggle with Him to make the individual free.

The moment we tie up our freedom with an economic badge, that moment we have sold out our freedom. We cannot build a moral character on lies or promises that cannot be fulfilled. We cannot build a Christian nation, a nation of strong courageous men and women, without asking people to believe that the God who created them gave them a spirit and a dignity that is beyond purchase price. Yes, we may take our dole now because it sounds so good. But we know the price we are paying for it. We are paying with our lost self-respect as individual free people, and we are taking something from future generations who have no obligations to us.

You ask me what I am going to do with the aged and the poor and the sick and those who can't take care of themselves. I am saying we ought to take care of them. But let's take care of them as a Christian people through the giving and the charity of individuals and of churches and of the charitable organizations that are organized to take care of them. But let's take our needy people off the pay rolls of a political party that stays in power because they promise something for nothing but do not reveal that they are knowingly taking away our freedom and self-respect.

Americans, let us hang on to our personality. Cling to our individual self-respect. Hold to the fact that God wants us to be men and women of strong character. We do this because God is real to us. Let us cling to these truths regardless of the price that may be demanded.

God did not come to this earth to give men a form of government or a form of economics. God, through Christ, came to this earth to give us life, and the blood of Him feeds our blood through the divine sacrament of His own gift of Himself. We can stand-up as men filled with His spirit, fed upon His life, because we have accepted His blood through the sacraments of His love, and we become men again. We need not be afraid of those who destroy the body, but we fight those who destroy the soul.

Americans, awake. Get on your knees. Ask God to baptize us anew with His spirit that restores our manhood and makes us free because through Him we keep our self-respect. We keep our self-respect because we can say, "God gave us the world. He told us to work it, and by His grace and by His help we are men enough to work it."

God has paid the price with His love for us. He has paid the divine price of His own Son to show us how worthy we are in His sight.

Our allegiance is to a God who is so real that He says to us as individuals we are worth while. Our personalities are valuable to Him and to man, and so we keep our self-respect.

Awake, people of America. Let us get on our knees and ask God to help us keep our liberty through refusing to surrender our self-respect. Yes, and then by the grace of God we will be men again.

FOR VICTORY WITH GOD

O Christ, my Captain and my Saviour, help me to bear Thee always in my heart and to follow Thy commandments in my life that, as I meet the onslaughts of evil men and their denials of Thy truth, I may not fight against them in my puny strength alone but may draw on Thine eternal might and power and win all victories with Thee. Amen.

Stronger United States Role Urged To Bar Europe's Collapse at End of ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following forthright article by Blair Moody from the Washington Star of December 25, 1949. He advocates precisely the action by our ECA officials in Europe that some of us tried in vain to get into the original European Recovery Administration legislation in 1948 and again in the act extending it in 1949. Better late than never.

STRONGER UNITED STATES ROLE URGED TO BAR EUROPE'S COLLAPSE AT END OF ECA

(By Blair Moody)

The United States must take a stronger hand in Europe.

In the next 2 years, we must discreetly increase our pressures and require basic, constructive reforms, in return for our Marshall plan dollars, beyond anything we have attempted in the past.

Failure to do this with sufficient perception and vigor may mean the failure of our whole, vast, costly undertaking for world peace and stability. Any other course almost certainly will confront us in 1952 with the choice of continuing to subsidize a dry-rotted system,

or—with Communists engulfing the continent—letting it collapse as it would have had the Marshall plan never been started.

The whole pattern of a future world in which Europe must be an integral part—whether communism or freedom finally wins the cold war—may depend on whether we find the way to insist without seeming to be offensive.

Europe has made a remarkable recovery from the shock and shambles of war, but it is not yet doing the things that must be done to stand on its own feet. Unless we insist, it will not do them.

NOT NOW CAPABLE OF SELF-SUPPORT

In 2 years, of course, Europe cannot possibly turn a feudal structure—shot throughout by antique customs, national boundaries, and special interests—into a model, modern social economy. But it can do much. At least, it can set a new trend of policy and thinking from which, once understood and undertaken, there would not likely be a turning back.

The cold fact is that western Europe, as it is now organized, is not capable of supporting itself without American aid. If it is ever to become capable of self-support, now is the time it had better begin making changes.

The United States must take the lead or wake up one day to find it has spent billions, and the free world is still in a mess, which is precisely what the Communists are counting on.

European statesmen worried by the trend will welcome—privately at least—a stronger use of American influence. Two high French officials told the writer in Paris that the United States must force Britain to form, with France, a dual strong enough to provide constructive leadership within Europe itself. If they don't, say the French, the CONTINENT will.

GERMAN REVIVAL BLOCKED

Another Frenchman said he thought France had saved the United States bacon by blocking the impulse for hell-bent revival of German power, spurred by Wall Street interests, but added: "When it comes to a wise, moderate German program you must at least seem to force us. That will make it possible for us to explain to the French people."

An Italian official in Rome said: "Our country's future depends on other countries adopting the American program. They won't do it unless they are forced. So long as you are feeding them, you can force them. For heaven sakes, in their own interest, do it."

One of the most prominent civilians in Spain, who does not like Franco but supports him because he fears the alternative would be worse, pleaded that the United States make the Caudillo undertake reforms necessary to bring American credit and stave off economic collapse.

Paul G. Hoffman, the Marshall plan manager, is moving as rapidly as he feels he can. But the fight for fundamental change is just starting. The favorable production record of Europe since the war is deceptive because it is grounded in the artificial stimulant of donated American goods and materials. When the stimulants are removed, then what?

STILL CARTEL-MINDED

Europe is still cartel-minded. John J. McCloy, when he took over as American High Commissioner in Germany, found little had been done to break down the centralization of industrial power that paved Hitler's path to war. John Kenney, new Marshall plan chief in London, is trying to crack the British system in which 1,100 trade associations fix prices, control material supply, set production quotas, and discipline competitors. Jean Monnet, No. 1 economist of France, warns that the first results of the customs union between France and Italy have been talks looking toward new cartels.

American influence has to be strong in demanding that European nations balance their budgets and stabilize their currencies. But we have done little to urge continental politicians to improve the relative position of workers so they will have a greater personal stake in modified capitalism and be less susceptible to Communist agitators. This is the most important job of all, and it is proceeding with dangerous lethargy.

In a continent cursed by high prices and lack of mass buying power, wide profit-margins soak narrow, wealthy markets, and nothing much is done about it because the Communists have captured so many workers that the anti-Communist left is politically ineffective.

TAX SYSTEMS FAULTY

In Italy, centuries-overdue land reform seems quite imposing until matched against what there is to be done. Tax systems in most European countries range from reactionary to ridiculous.

France is pleading for closer teamwork with England. The British have such commitments in their sterling area that they cannot link too intimately with the Continent, although they are responding to our suggestion for a northern liaison with Scandinavia. They cannot pool their reserves, for example, in the new Federal Reserve of Europe.

But there is no reason the British should not agree with France on common policies on Germany before that nation builds to dominance of western Europe. And there is no reason the United States should not give British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin a private bumping around if he refuses to do so.

Since we are giving the Continent billions, there is no reason why we should not exercise the same influence as any banker who loans thousands. It must be done carefully, since the Communists, now unable to deny the great good we are doing Europe, charge we are attempting to make it our colony. This gives them the double strategy of tearing down confidence in us and, by making us hesitant to insist on our views, keeping Europe in a state where it some day may tumble into their hands because it failed to reform.

Not a country in Europe can get along without our aid until it makes major reforms. The situation is that bad. The Continent has no leadership worth a continental. But they all know that our only selfish interest is in a stable world and peace, which is also theirs. And if we are reasonable and unofficious but lead strongly enough, they will follow.

Steel Prices and Steel Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Minnesota Labor of December 30, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEEL PRICES AND STEEL PENSIONS

Just when talk about lowering costs and cutting unnecessary expenditures has reached a new high among businessmen, the hatchet swings down hard. Just as government, business, and labor seemingly had halted the trend into a depression valley in spite of many ill omens to the contrary, the dynamiters blew up these efforts.

Even while plunging farm prices and shrinking real wages of factory workers remain a daily millstone around the neck of those who struggle to keep depression out of America, along comes United States Steel and whams out a bell-clanging price boost.

As a result the rest of the steel companies, as has been past practice, fall into line with almost identical price inflations on their products. So costs to all producers and fabricators of products using steel zoom upward again. And prices to retailers will be notched to even dizzier heights as a result.

What does this recurring trend of inflation mean to the average person?

It's too soon to know, but the State CIO research department says that the new steel price raise will increase prices of various products about as follows:

Automobile: $8 (sheet steel is up $6 a ton).

Refrigerator: 40 cents.

Kitchen cabinet: 27 cents.

Farm tractor: $3.

Garbage can: 4 cents.

The research department points out that retailers may not increase these and hundreds of other prices, however. It's getting tougher to move such merchandise. Retailers don't raise prices when sales are harder to make. Maybe they'll try to absorb these cost increases. This will cut their profits again. And in some cases the results will be to force many small-business men out of business.

A hardware store, the appliance retailer, automobile accessory salesmen handle large volumes at small profits. A hike in their unit costs, such as the research department points out, is a distinct possibility—if they can't pass it on in the form of higher retail prices—will push many of them out of business with conditions what they are today.

Why, then, did United States Steel raise prices?

It thinks it can get by with it. Demand for certain types of steel is still strong. Steel can raise prices, get what it asks for and continue to reap huge profits just as long as industry is able to pay the price. It is significant that not all prices were raised. Tin mill products, which are sold on a contract on an annual basis, were lowered in price.

Benjamin Fairless, head of United States Steel—the corporation that turns out one-third of the Nation's supply—said the union welfare and pension plan costs made it necessary to increase prices.

The President's steel fact-finding board last September said the steel industry had used much of its recent big profits for wholesale plant modernization. This action "will substantially lower costs and thereby increase profits considerably, given no decrease in the demand for steel."

These lower costs would permit somewhat lowered prices, the fact-finding board of experts pointed out. Ah, but what about the increased costs caused by the pension plan the board recommended?

Said the board on this point: "The steel companies, under present conditions and under presently foreseeable conditions (which include cost reductions because of plant improvements) appear able to afford this and still put into effect the price reductions mentioned above."

And if the steel companies failed to so reduce prices, the board said, and if business continued to be generally favorable, then "There would appear to be justification for the union to renew its demand for larger participation in this industry's income." In other words, a fourth-round wage increase, which the union called off on the fact finders' advice last fall.

It is highly significant that Senator O'MAHONEY (Democrat, Wyoming), whose work on the prewar TNEC steel investigating

committee makes him one of today's top experts in Congress on monopoly prices in the steel industry, says the price increases are completely unjustified. He says that United States Steel in the first 9 months of 1949 earned $138,000,000 in profits—after taxes. That's about half again as much as it earned during the same period in 1948—$88,000,000.

What Is the Constitution of the United States Worth to American Women?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

of

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "What Is the Constitution of the United States Worth to American Women?" delivered by Helen Elizabeth Brown of the Baltimore bar before the Lawyers' Civic Association of Maryland, on Wednesday, November 9, 1949.

I have an estimate from the Government Printing Office which indicates that the manuscript will take one-fourth of a page more than the two printed pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost, and that the cost will be $184.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES WORTH TO AMERICAN WOMEN?

Although the Constitution of the United States forbids any State to deny to any person the equal protection of the laws, believe it or not—

Men, aliens, and corporations are persons entitled to the equal protection of the laws in this country; American women are not.

It is unconstitutional to try a Negro man with a jury from which Negro men have been excluded; it is not unconstitutional to try a woman, black or white, with a jury from which women have been excluded.

To exclude men from jury service would be to deny them a trial by a jury of their peers and the equal protection of the laws; excluding women from jury service is no such violation of the Constitution.

It is unconstitutional to place restrictions on men's liberty to contract; it is not unconstitutional to restrict women's liberty of contract.

It is constitutional to bar women from any lawful means of earning a living; such laws as to men are unconstitutional and void.

Women may be subjected to labor restrictions; men may not.

Women may be excluded from business and the professions; men may not.

Women in business and the professions may be discriminated against; men may not.

Women may be deprived of their property without due process of law; men may not.

Sex, marriage, and motherhood are the bases of rank injustice and discrimination against American women.

In utter amazement, people ask how such a thing can be in this American Republic. Bishop Hoadly had the answer. When he said that, "Whoever hath an absolute authority to interpret any written or spoken laws, it is he who is truly the lawgiver to all intents and purposes, and not the person who first wrote or spoke them." Justice Holmes condensed it when he remarked that the Constitution is what the courts say it is.

The Supreme Court of the United States has said that a woman is not a person who is entitled to equal protection of the laws under the Constitution and that the Constitution cannot protect her against inequalities and discriminations as long as they are based solely on sex.

INTERPRETATIONS

The famous fourteenth amendment to the Constitution was adopted in 1868, shortly after the Civil War. It states that all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to its jurisdiction are citizens and no State shall make or enforce any law abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. It further commanded that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The Constitution is the supreme law of the land and is said to be a great charter of human liberty, unique in the history of the world. But, oh, what the Supreme Court has done to that great charter of human liberty where women are concerned. The interpreter is indeed the lawgiver. The Constitution has been prevented from protecting women from the rankest kind of discrimination, injustice and inequality by the interpretation—or misinterpretation—placed upon it, that is, by bench-made law.

After the adoption of the fourteenth amendment, many laws were challenged as violating it. The courts say whether or not a law violates the Constitution. If a law does conflict with the Constitution, it is void and cannot be enforced. Cases began to go before the Supreme Court, as the final authority, for decision.

EXCLUSION FROM JURIES

One of the early decisions involved jury service. A Negro man in West Virginia was indicted for murder by a grand jury from which Negro men were excluded and convicted by a petit jury from which Negro men were excluded. The West Virginia law limited jury service to white male persons. The law was unconstitutional, said the United States Supreme Court, insofar as it singled out colored people and expressly denied them all right to participate in the administration of the law as jurors because of their color though they are citizens and may be in other respects fully qualified. "This," said the court, "is practically a brand upon them affixed by the law."

The right of a trial by jury, said the Supreme Court, is guaranteed to every citizen and the constitution of juries is a very essential part of the protection such a mode of trial is intended to secure. "The very idea of a jury is a body of men composed of the peers or equals of the person whose rights it is selected or summoned to determine; that is, of his neighbors, fellows, associates, persons having the same legal status in society as that which he holds." The Court then topped this off by saying that the State could constitutionally place restrictions on jury service which were not based on color, such as confining the selection of jurors to males. (*Strauder* v. *West Virginia* (100 U. S. 303 (1880)).)

Many years later a woman in Massachusetts charged with crime challenged the array of jurors because women were excluded from it. She was not getting her constitutionally guaranteed right to a trial by a jury of her peers and her rights under the fourteenth amendment were being infringed, she contended.

The Massachusetts jury law did not confine jury service to males. It provided that a person qualified to vote shall serve as a juror. The woman's suffrage amendment had been adopted and women were voting in Massachusetts. Women were persons, the accused woman insisted, and they had some rights under the Constitution.

Whether women are persons or not, ruled the highest court in Massachusetts, depends on when and where that word is used. It was admittedly true that the jury law said "person," but when that law was passed women were not persons who could vote and it was not contemplated that they ever would be. The right to a jury trial was limited to a common law jury which was made up of "12 free and lawful men." Women could not serve as jurors at common law. On the theory that the word "person" without further limiting phrase could hardly be construed to include only a part of the male citizens, colored men were declared eligible for jury service, but women of any race were not. As for the nineteenth amendment, that related exclusively to the franchise for women. The fourteenth amendment was intended to take away oppression because of race or color, the Supreme Court had said so in the West Virginia case. The accused had not been denied the equal protection of the laws either, said the Massachusetts court, and pointed out that the Supreme Court of the United States had already decided that it was not a violation of the fourteenth amendment to deny to women the right to practice law in *Bradwell* v. *Illinois* (16 Wall. 130), and *Lockwood, Petitioner* (154 U. S. 116); to deny them the right to vote before the adoption of the nineteenth amendment in *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall. 162); or to deny them the right to contract for their labor in *Muller* v. *Oregon* (208 U. S. 412) and *Riley* v. *Massachusetts* (232 U. S. 671).

"These rights," quipped the Massachusetts court, "appear to us quite as essential to the privileges and immunities of citizens and equal protection of the laws as the duty to serve as jurors." (*Commonwealth of Massachusetts* v. *Welosky* (276 Mass. 398 (1931)).)

The Supreme Court of the United States placed its stamp of approval on this denial to women of a trial by a jury of her peers and the equal protection of the laws by denying a writ of certiorari in *Welosky* v. *Commonwealth of Massachusetts* (284 U. S. 684 (1932)).

Despite the Constitution, some States today exclude women from jury service denying to a woman accused a jury of her peers, those holding the "same legal status," and denying to all women the right to participate in the administration of the law as jurors thus placing "a brand upon them affixed by law." This cannot happen to Negro or white men under the Constitution.

LABOR RESTRICTIONS

Labor restrictions applied to working women while leaving men competitors and their employers free from the restrictions themselves and the attendant bureaucratic bother, report filing, Government inspections, and criminal penalties form one of the most curious chapters in American legal history. In this category, women were out of the Constitution, in again, out again, and this on again, off again, wobbling of the court from one side to the other usually hinged, not on law, but on the notions of one man, and at the most crucial point on the vote of one man who could not make up his mind. Cast on first one side and then the other his lone vote is now responsible for taking away from American women the protection of the Constitution against unequal and discriminatory labor laws.

At the outset the Supreme Court determined that labor restrictions could not be

imposed on men because such legislation violated their constitutional right of liberty of contract. As to men, the Court did not deviate from this ruling. New York State at the turn of the century passed a law limiting the working hours of men. The State courts upheld the law on the grounds of health, morals, and public safety. The State had a right to have healthy, able-bodied men at its command, said the New York court. Oh, no, said the United States Supreme Court, there is scarcely any law but might find shelter under such claims, but they can have no force against the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States which guarantees to the individual the liberty of contract, and the right to sell one's labor is protected by the amendment. Your law is void and you cannot enforce it because it violates the Constitution. (*Lochner* v. *New York* (198 U. S. 45 (1905)).)

When a few years later Oregon passed the very same law and made it applicable to women, but not to men, it was discovered that the "individuals" whose liberty of contract was protected by the fourteenth amendment were men only. Women had no rights and no claims to the equal protection of the laws that the fourteenth amendment guaranteed. Any kind of discriminatory labor restrictions could be imposed upon them, and as long as they were based solely on sex the Constitution did not protect them. (*Muller* v. *Oregon* (208 U. S. 412 (1908)).)

Before this decision, State courts, believing the "individuals" referred to in the Lochner case included women, had condemned such laws as unconstitutional. But when the Supreme Court declared that such legislation violated men's constitutional rights, but did not violate any constitutional rights women had, there was suddenly a great abundance of such laws which handicapped women in obtaining and keeping gainful employment, and they had the additional burden of struggling against them. Cases arising from this struggle kept coming before the Supreme Court.

In California a woman took a job in a hotel and agreed to work 9 hours a day because that was the time required to do her particular job. But California had a law prohibiting any female from working in a hotel for more than 8 hours. Women doing the same work in boarding or lodging houses were not included in the law. The woman's employer was charged with a crime and sent to jail. He obtained a writ of habeas corpus on the ground that his imprisonment was illegal because this law violated the California Constitution and the fourteenth amendment of the Federal Constitution. But the California court said the statute was a police regulation to promote the general health and welfare and sent the woman's employer back to jail. The case went to the United States Supreme Court, which said that this sort of thing could go too far; in fact, it could be pushed to a "wholly indefensible extreme"; but no constitutional rights had been violated here even though like legislation for men could not be sustained. (*Miller* v. *Wilson* (236 U. S. 373 (1915)).)

These statutes were indeed pushed to indefensible extremes. The "health and welfare" sham was used to eliminate women from competition in the labor market. Nobody cared about her health and welfare or how long she worked at any kind of drudgery as long as she did not get paid for it. But the minute she obtained paid employment and came into competition with men her health and welfare became of grave concern, and male labor organizations went to male legislatures to have a law passed against it. The laws themselves belied the health-and-welfare pretense in their coverage and exemptions. For instance, the California law in the Miller case applied to women working in hotels and exempted women doing the same work in boarding houses. There were no restrictions on jobs men did not want or could not get.

One of these laws, a minimum wage law for women and minors in the District of Columbia, which had thrown many women out of work, went to the Supreme Court on the question of its constitutionality. This time the Supreme Court said that it could not accept the doctrine that mature women require or may be subjected to restrictions upon their liberty of contract which could not lawfully be imposed in the case of men under similar circumstances and declared the law unconstitutional. (*Adkins* v. *Children's Hospital* (261 U. S. 525 (1923)).) There was great rejoicing. Women had at last broken into the Constitution. But this application of "equal justice under law" was of short duration.

Soon thereafter the waiters' union in New York was casting about for some means of eliminating the competition of women as waitresses in the late evening when trays were lighter and tips larger. So they went to the New York Legislature and got a law prohibiting women from working as waitresses between the hours of 10 o'clock at night and 6 o'clock in the morning. It was so very bad for women's health and morals to work as waitresses those particular hours. There was no concern as to what might happen to their health and morals if they lost their jobs. Neither were the sponsors of this bill interested in the health or morals of women working during those hours as singers, performers, attendants in ladies' cloak rooms, cleaning up in hotel kitchens, or even waitresses in lunchrooms run by employers for employees where there was not much pay and no tips. These women were not competing with them so they were not interested in their health or morals and they were exempted from the law, as it was easier to pass it that way.

After its enactment the law was challenged on the ground that it violated the fourteenth amendment by depriving the employer and employee of their liberty to contract and denied the equal protection of the laws by an unreasonable and arbitrary classification. The Supreme Court said it was not arbitrary and did not violate any constitutional rights. It pointed out that laws had been sustained by which women working in hotels could be restricted while those doing the same work in boarding houses were not and limiting the hours of women pharmacists and student nurses in hospitals but exempting graduate nurses. The Adkins case was brushed aside with the comment that it involved a wage-fixing law pure and simple and had nothing to do with hours or conditions of labor. (*Radice* v. *New York* (264 U. S. 292 (1924)).) Many waitresses lost their jobs and American women were out of the Constitution again.

A dozen years later they got back in—for just a little while. New York State made an extensive survey of labor conditions which very clearly showed what common sense makes abundantly clear, that if there was to be labor legislation of any kind it ought to apply to all workers and be based on the nature of the work—not the sex of the worker. It was demonstrated that men workers needed protection as much or even more than women. After all, the race does have fathers, and their health and welfare are important, too, not only to themselves but to their families and the community. It does not add to the general welfare if the workman's wife is left with little children to support and laws to hamper her in doing it. The survey further showed that to place restrictions on some workers and not on others was to handicap those restricted and give an unfair advantage to those left free of the restrictions. But the labor lobby wanted the restrictions placed on women only. They did not want any statutory limitations on men. The New York Legislature shifted its responsibility by passing two laws which were identical with the exception that one applied to all workers, men and women alike, and the other subjected women to its burdensome restrictions. Both bills were sent to the then Governor Lehman. The unions pressured him into signing the bill that restricted women but not men. The New York courts held this act unconstitutional, citing the Adkins case.

The United States Supreme Court said the New York court was right and invalidated the law on the authority of the Lochner and Adkins cases. Mr. Justice Butler, writing the opinion of the court, said, "That under circumstances such as those portrayed in the factual background, prescribing minimum wages for women alone would unreasonably restrain them in competition with men and tend arbitrarily to deprive them of employment and a fair chance to find work." (*Morehead* v. *New York* (298 U. S. 587 (1936)).) Women were back in the Constitution, but insecurely.

This was a 5-to-4 decision. Mr. Justice Owen J. Roberts was one of the five justices making up the majority of the Court. One vote alone gave women the protection guaranteed to all "persons" by the Constitution. Less than a year later Mr. Justice Roberts changed his mind and his vote and took that protection away from them. (*West Coast Hotel Co.* v. *Parrish* (300 U. S. 379 (1937)).) This was another 5-to-4 decision. By the vote of one man the Adkins and Morehead cases were destroyed, and women were out of the Constitution again. Justice Sutherland wrote a scathing dissent denouncing the law as an invasion of women's constitutional rights and made some sharp remarks about the exercise of the judicial function, adding some penetrating observations on government. But this did not change the result, and women are still out of the Constitution. The law of this land today is that labor restrictions against women only do not violate any rights women have under the Constitution.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL DISCRIMINATIONS

Women engaged in manual occupations are not the only ones subject to this oppressive injustice. The Constitution does not protect any American woman against the enactment by any State legislature of laws prohibiting the employment of women in any kind of business, in any profession or barring her from any lawful means of earning a living. Many States have done just that and the Supreme Court has ruled that in so doing they do not violate the Constitution. The Supreme Court has made the Constitution powerless to protect women.

Shortly after its adoption, the Supreme Court actually announced that the fourteenth amendment could not be set up to protect women against unequal laws which were a barrier against the right of females to pursue any lawful employment for a livelihood. Mr. Justice Bradley said that in *Bradwell* v. *Illinois* (16 Wall. 130 (1872)) and the court has not changed its mind. Myra Bradwell was denied admission to the practice of law although she met all the requirements and the Illinois statute said that any qualified "person" could practice. But Myra Bradwell was not the kind of "person" who was entitled to the equal protection of the laws. She was a woman, and worse than that, she was a married woman. If the legislature had not excluded women, it must have intended to, said Justice Bradley, besides it belonged to men to make, apply, and execute the laws. At the moment he was demonstrating what a mess some men can make of it.

Contrast this with the case in which the court with great anxiety and solicitude extended the protection of the Constitution to male aliens. It voided a law which contained no discrimination in itself but was being administered so as to be hurtful and an unfair discrimination against subjects of the Emperor of China. It was a law regulating laundries. It applied alike to all laundries and all persons operating laundries. But the law required the consent of a county board of supervisors regarding certain phases of the business. It seems the board was enforcing the law against Chinese laundrymen only. Such discrimination against these Chinese subjects would not do at all, ruled the Supreme Court, the Constitution forbids it. Said the court: "Though the law itself be fair on its face and impartial in appearance, yet, if it is applied and administered by public authority with an evil eye and an unequal hand, so as practically to make unjust and illegal discriminations between persons in similar circumstances, material to their rights, the denial of equal justice is still within the prohibition of the Constitution." (*Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins* (118 U. S. 356 (1886)).)

Aliens are entitled to the equal protection of the laws and equal justice, but American women are not. When it came to corporations, the Supreme Court did not even want to hear any argument about it, but simply announced that the Court was of the opinion that corporations were persons under the amendment (*Santa Clara County* v. *Southern Pacific Railway Co.* (118 U. S. 394 (1886))).

On top of that the Supreme Court said that the State of Virginia was not violating the Constitution by denying to Illva Lockwood the right to practice law in that State on the sole ground that she was a woman. Illva Lockwood had been a member of the bar of the Supreme Court and had practiced law in the District of Columbia for years. The Supreme Court said so and even pointed out that the Virginia statute provided that any person eligible to practice law in any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, could practice in that State, but the Virginia Court of Appeals denied her application. Nevertheless, it was not violating any constitutional rights a woman had because it was for the Virginia court to determine whether the word "person" as used in the Virginia law is confined to males and whether women were entitled to practice in that State. The Bradwell and Minor cases were cited in support of this (*Re Lockwood* (154 U. S. 116 (1894))). The Constitution does not require States to give to women the equal protection of their laws.

Once established in a profession, a woman is not safe from persecution and discrimination. California had a law limiting the work of all pharmacists to 10 hours a day. Then it passed a law that all women in hospitals, except graduate nurses, should work only 8 hours a day. One hospital affected had a pharmacist who was a woman. She and the board of trustees of the hospital took the case all the way to the Supreme Court. The Court said she had not been denied the equal protection of the laws. Of course she was deprived of her means of livelihood when she lost her job to a man who could remain on duty a little longer but her constitutional rights were not violated, according to the Supreme Court (*Bosley* v. *McLaughlin* (236 U. S. 385 (1915))). What was the Constitution worth to her?

The very latest word on the subject by the Supreme Court is that women may be barred from any employment and deprived of the use of their property in spite of the Constitution (*Goesaert* v. *Cleary* (335 U. S. 464 (1948))). One of the last acts of Justice Rutledge was to protest against this in a dissenting opinion. Justice Douglas and Justice Murphy joined him, but their protests did not change the decision. It is now law.

American women have been read out of the Constitution of the United States by the Supreme Court of the United States. They have been compelled to work their way into this great charter of human liberty by amendments. The Constitution itself speaks of the rights of persons and citizens. Masculine courts have said women are not persons and citizens because of sex. With but a single exception, the United States Constitution is now worthless to American women. The one right guaranteed to them is the right to vote. This was accomplished by the nineteenth amendment which specifically forbids the denial or abridgment of the right to vote on account of sex.

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

To make other provisions and guaranties of the Constitution a protection for women of this country, another amendment must be added. The new amendment is necessary to eliminate discriminatory bench-made law and make the fourteenth amendment mean what it says. The new amendment must specifically forbid the denial of due process of law and the denial of the equal protection of the laws on account of sex. Such an amendment, known as the equal rights amendment, has been pending in the Congress for many years. Its passage has been pledged by all political parties and is long overdue.

It is difficult to understand why the Congress has not submitted this amendment to the States for ratification. Lawyers see the need of it in their daily practice. Obviously we cannot do much of a job of selling democracy abroad with this sort of situation at home. Russia, China, Turkey, and many other countries have equal-rights provisions in their constitutions. The United Nations Charter provides for equal rights for men and women. Our own Constitution is prevented from making equal rights for all Americans effective by the crippling and mangling it has suffered at the hands of the Supreme Court.

Some serious thought should be given to these numerous oaths so glibly taken to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. Today's most urgent need is to save the Constitution—remove its shackles, heal it, restore it, put it back on its feet, and see that it does what it was intended to do for every American.

Address by Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois, Announcing His Candidacy for Reelection to the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered at Havana, Ill., on December 27, 1949, by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], announcing his candidacy for reelection in 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My old friends and neighbors, as I stand here before you tonight, I remember the crowded years of my life, the years which have been so exciting and so challenging, the years which have led me into so many battles and so many victories, the years which throw a blazing light upon the path ahead of me.

My life has been a very fortunate one. I was fortunate enough to be born in the Lincoln-Douglas country, in a region filled with the tradition of great men and great deeds. I was fortunate to grow up among the friendly people of the great progressive State of Illinois.

Let me tell you that I have expressed my gratitude to God many times because I had the glorious privilege of being born in the heart of America. Nowhere else upon the whole earth would the way be open for the son of a tenant farmer to become the leader of the United States Senate, the greatest legislative body in the world.

The story of my life is a familiar story here in America. It is the story of freedom and opportunity for the poor as well as the rich, the folks on the farms as well as the citizens in the cities. It is the story which rises from the well-springs of liberty.

All of you here tonight have helped me to make the record upon which I am going to run as a candidate for another term as a servant of Illinois in the Senate of the United States.

You selected me as your State's attorney, when I sought my first public office as a young war veteran. Soon after that, you recall that my comrades of the American Legion honored me by electing me as State department commander and a little later named me national judge advocate for 4 years. You sent me to Congress in 1934 to fill the place of a great man, the late Henry T. Rainey, who had become Speaker of the House of Representatives.

In my two terms in the House, I battled for the rights of Illinois farmers. Those were the stirring days when we passed the Soil Conservation Act and the second Agricultural Adjustment Act—two vital measures which have enabled the farmers of Illinois and the Nation to reach new heights of prosperity. I wrote into the second Agricultural Adjustment Act the first provision for mandatory corn loans which still stands as the basic method of our farm price-support program.

During those terms in the House, I did everything in my power to advance the interests of Illinois labor and Illinois business. To stimulate business, I advocated revision of the tax laws, and I urged special consideration for small-business men. To place labor upon an equal footing with other groups in our economy, I supported the National Labor Relations Act, the Employment Insurance Act, the minimum-wage law, and other measures to improve the living standards of all working people.

In 1938, with the support of the late Gov. Henry Horner and other outstanding leaders of Illinois, I asked for the privilege of serving you in the United States Senate. You gave me another magnificent vote of confidence, and I moved from the House to the Senate with a deep determination to render the devoted and faithful service which would bring honor to my home State.

My 11 years in the Senate have been the years of America's rise to world leadership. In this period from 1939 through 1949, our country has become the most powerful and the most prosperous Nation on earth. I am humbly grateful that I was permitted to take part in shaping the national policy which has brought us victory in war and bounteous plenty in peace.

Yes, my friends, we have shown the world a marvelous achievement here in the land of liberty. By using our Government as an instrument of progress in the hands of the people, we have spread the good things of this life among the vast majority of Americans without the loss of a single freedom.

For 16 years, the moaning men who have captured one of our major political parties have beat their breasts and cried out: "All this must stop. We've got to turn around. We must go back or we'll lose our liberties." These prophets of despair are blood-brothers of the fearful man who didn't believe America could win independence, who didn't believe America could even survive the War of 1812. These gloomy fellows have been predicting disasters and catastrophes for America since 1776.

Yet we have advanced, step by step, year after year, in national strength and national security. We have confounded the critics and astounded the aristocrats of entrenched privilege.

We have approached a new freedom, while we have maintained and cherished our old ones. We can speak freely, write freely, worship in any house of God, go where we please, work where we like, and criticize our Government without any threat of punishment, just as we have always done.

And we have added a new liberty—freedom from the grim specter of want. We have set a goal of full employment, to offer every American a job, and today we have 60,000,000 people gainfully employed at good wages. The profits of American business are reaching new peaks, and our national income is more than $220,000,000,000 a year. Our savings have reached a total of more than $150,000,000,000. Farmers are prosperous and happy.

All these things are reasonable in a country blessed by God with enormous resources. All these things are sound and sensible, and we know it. We are not frightened any more when certain leaders of the Republican Party tell us that we are on our way to the poorhouse.

We remember that the Old Guard men who control that party do not speak for the millions of progressive Republicans who have joined hands with progressive Democrats to overcome unemployment, to wipe out slums, to give pensions to the needy aged, to launch new projects which have raised the United States to the pinnacle of prosperity.

We know that the man who looks around America today, who sees our roads filled with new cars, the smoke of industry rising in our skies, and farm bins filled with bumper crops, cannot agree with the fearful gentlemen who talk about the perils of the poorhouse.

It is a sad thing, my friends, that some of the spokesmen for the Grand Old Party do not realize that the forward-looking Democrats and Republicans of this Nation are not ready to put their heads against a walling wall and ask for crying towels.

Most of us are aware of the truth about America—and the truth is that our country is doing fine.

We have moved through the dangerous years of the postwar period without a disaster, without the depression and collapse which the moaners glimpsed around every corner.

We have met the challenge of aggressive communism by creating a bold program for European recovery known as the Marshall plan. That plan along with other kindred programs has sent a tide of hope and confidence through Europe, and that tide is weakening the walls of the Soviet slave states.

We have launched a giant housing program here in the United States of America. We have taken long strides toward reorganization of the executive branch of our Government to obtain greater economy and efficiency. We have strengthened our national defense to safeguard the rampparts of freedom.

You know my record. You know that I fought for every one of the major measures in our foreign and domestic policy.

In foreign affairs I have always lifted my voice against the deadly doctrine of isolationism. If you give me your support in the coming election, I will continue my determined efforts to keep America working in harmony with the free nations of the earth.

In domestic legislation, I have supported every measure to maintain and extend the economic prosperity which the American people have earned by their energy, their intelligence, and their skill.

As I look ahead, I see the future filled with challenges which will call for the highest statesmanship and the widest knowledge available. Because America holds the key to the destiny of all mankind, I believe that any man who seeks a post in the Senate today must dedicate himself to days and nights of strenuous effort to obtain a secure peace for the world.

We are going to have peace, because another war would hurl the nations of the earth into a blazing furnace of destruction.

To reach our goal of peace means the expenditure of billions upon billions for national defense and our international obligations. But I am willing to pay the price of peace, for in this atomic age, another war would be infinitely more costly in blood and treasure than the cost we must now bear for defense and aid to the free nations. If we do not win the peace and the holocaust of atomic war should fall upon us, all the talk of achieving governmental economy would seem a vain and foolish thing.

We must find the way to peace, because our sons must not be sent forth to die in a colossal conflict which would carry the victor down in the ruins with the vanquished.

With the guidance of Almighty God, we will use the fruits of the earth for the joy of mankind. With the wisdom which led us to the secrets of the atom, we will take the road which leads upward to the hills of happiness.

In the Eighty-first Congress, in which I have the honor of serving as majority leader of the Senate, we have gone far along the road of peace, progress, and prosperity.

Recognizing the inescapable fact that the forces of democracy and the forces of communism are contending today for the future of mankind, this Congress has extended our successful bipartisan foreign policy to maintain our world leadership.

We have placed our reliance upon a comprehensive series of measures to expand trade, to increase the productive power of the free nations, and to continue the scientific advances which have enabled America to lift the standard of living year after year.

While we have suffered a severe set-back in Asia through the collapse of the Nationalist Government in China, we have gained victory after victory in Europe and the Middle East.

The attempt of Soviet guerrillas to seize control of Greece has been defeated.

The aggressive desires of Russia to dominate Turkey have been frustrated with our aid.

The free governments of France and Italy stand with us, and the Communists in those countries have lost their power to disrupt the economic systems of those vital nations.

We have helped the 270,000,000 people of western Europe—very productive and highly skilled people—to take giant strides toward economic and social strength.

Thus far, we have invested more than $7,000,000,000 in the European recovery program. That is a tremendous sum—until you compare it with the cost of the possibility of fighting an atomic war against a vast nation led by tough and utterly ruthless communists. If we heeded the cries of the short-sighted men who have been telling us that we cannot afford to continue the Marshall plan, if we retreated from the world struggle and let western Europe sink beneath the red tide of communism, what would it cost us to arm for a war which we would ultimately have to fight alone?

Here is the view of Paul G. Hoffman, the great Republican businessman, chosen by the President to administer the Marshall plan. Just 2 weeks ago, Mr. Hoffman declared in Cleveland: "If nations now free should become satellite police states, only one course of action would be open to us. We would have to increase sharply our defense expenditures." Paul Hoffman asserted that we would have to spend on arms, "25 billion or 30 billion" dollars a year. I assert that he made a very modest prediction.

We would have to convert our beloved America into a garrison state. We would have to keep huge fleets of planes patrolling the skies above our borders. We would have to keep our Navy and our Army in a perpetual state of readiness to prevent the possibility of a sudden attack which might snuff out the lives of 60,000,000 Americans and destroy dozens of our crowded cities.

I believe our present policy is the only sane and sensible course. Despite what the critics tell you, we are getting excellent results. These carping critics offer you no constructive alternative which gives hope for world peace and the betterment of mankind. Those who oppose our bipartisan foreign policy are deluded isolationists or following a course of political expediency.

Those who urge America to retreat into an iron shell are the faint-hearted men of little faith who call our successful policy a give-away program and a gravy train. Let us analyze these glib phrases for a moment.

The facts prove that the money we are spending for the Marshall plan does not go into gravy or lavish gifts. The money goes into orders for American factories—many of them right here in Illinois—and to buy the products of American farmers.

Here are the figures, my friends, which I have obtained from official sources. The United States is the major source for most types of goods going to the Marshall plan countries. We supply 96 percent of the machinery and vehicles shipped to the countries participating in the program. We sell 92 percent of the miscellaneous products, 88 percent of the raw materials and manufactures, and 62 percent of the food, feed, and fertilizer.

Yes, my friends, we are making a good investment in the Marshall plan. The dollars we appropriate in Congress come home to roost in Illinois and other great States, because our friends abroad must use these dollars to buy the supplies we produce.

Let me give you some examples. The Caterpillar Tractor Co. and other firms in Peoria have received orders under this program which total millions of dollars. During the first 2 months of the ECA, Peoria obtained $6,236,000. Moline received $1,597,000. Chicago got $42,000,000. And many other cities in our State shared in large orders.

Millions were expended under the Marshall plan to buy the products of Illinois farms which were urgently needed by the free nations. Remember these facts. The next time a smooth gentleman tells you we are pouring money down a rat hole, ask him whether he means the money which has gone to Illinois factories and the Illinois farms.

Because we are assisting our allies to create a better life, because we are trying to build a better world rather than retreat into selfish isolationism, because we have demonstrated our leadership in a good cause, we

have won the confidence of many millions of people around the globe.

In the coming fiscal year, we will be able to reduce our expenditures for the military forces by $2,000,000,000. We may be able to cut the size of the Marshall plan appropriation by almost a billion dollars below the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year.

We can do these things because our allies in Europe are growing stronger. The production rate in Western Europe is now 20 percent above the rate attained by European industry before World War II. The free nations will be able to do more and more for themselves and we can reduce our economic aid as their internal strength becomes greater.

But we are not going to slash the Marshall plan to the point where our recovery program may be endangered. I am sure you will agree with me that this Congress should not jeopardize our national defense in the name of meat-ax economy, or cause the Marshall plan to collapse in the name of a balanced budget.

You know that I regard an unbalanced budget as a terrible evil, especially at a time when our national income is very high and the Government is receiving revenues of nearly $40,000,000,000 a year.

You know that I have always met my personal obligations. I have never been a free spender. I do not enjoy the process of appropriating the hard-earned money of American taxpayers, because I am a taxpayer myself. I assure you that I am not one of those individuals who spend for the sake of spending.

But when our Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, and other leaders of our defense establishment, tell me we must spend billions to protect our homes, our families, our freedoms, from a possible aggressor, I find myself constrained to heed such warnings.

You know as well as I do that Secretary Johnson, who bears the responsibility for keeping our military forces ready to defend the Nation, is an excellent administrator who has demonstrated his determination to save hundreds of millions of dollars wherever he can do so.

I have talked with the President of the United States about this budget problem. I wish all of you could see the President going over the Federal budget. He demands a justification for every dollar to be spent. He orders the fiscal experts to examine every estimate, to check every sum, to search for places where economy may be enforced.

In spite of all our efforts, we are now confronted by the disturbing reappearance of deficit financing. We are confronted by the likelihood of another rise in our Federal debt.

I hate deficit financing. I hate to have the Government borrowing more money from the American people.

But if we must make a choice between a period of deficit financing to strengthen our chance for peace or running the chance of engaging in an atomic war, I will declare right now that I prefer the risk of deficit financing.

If we win a secure peace, if we save our sons from the agony of fighting in Siberian snows or dying in the wreckage of devastated cities, I believe our economic sacrifices will be worth while. I do not see how any patriotic American who loves his country and his fellowmen can come to any other conclusion.

We are not going to resign ourselves to an atomic arms race which might lead to a fiery finish for our whole civilization. But that does not mean, that we will not add to our stock pile of bombs. We will continue to send arms to our friends all over the world, and we will try harder than ever to find paths toward peace.

Why did the American people take the announcement of Russia's atomic weapon with such serene confidence?

We were calm and cool, because we knew we had embarked upon the right course, at home and abroad. We were prosperous, progressive, and prepared to win through any crisis which might come. We had proved our own good faith in the ideals of freedom and abundance, and we knew we could count upon liberty-loving men everywhere to meet any challenge which might arise.

Without hysteria and without panic, the Senate of the United States had ratified the Atlantic Pact, linking 12 free nations in a firm alliance to prevent aggression.

The Senate of the United States restored our reciprocal trade program to the liberal policy laid down by Franklin Roosevelt and Cordell Hull.

The Senate of the United States ratified the International Wheat Agreement, to guarantee the export of 168,000,000 bushels of American wheat at fair prices for the hungry nations of the world.

The Senate of the United States voted to send arms to our friends overseas, to enable them to resist any sudden attack and to lift their heads without fear.

We made history this year in the Senate, my friends, and I will thank God as long as I live that my colleagues entrusted the leadership of the Senate to me at such a vital hour.

We proved to the people of the earth that America measured up to the demands of our age.

All the clouds of confusion stirred by the communists cannot conceal the fact that America has made the greatest progress under a liberal government in recent years in spite of a catastrophic depression and the necessity of fighting a global war against the Axis Powers.

Compare 1949 and 1929 for Mr. and Mrs. America. In this year of grace, according to a noted economist, the average American receives 86 percent more dollars in his pay envelope than he did in 1929. Prices have risen by 39 percent. Taxes have increased too. Mr. and Mrs. America are much better off than they were 20 years ago, and these figures prove it.

The American workman can buy a pound of bread with the money he earns in 6 minutes of labor. In Soviet Russia, the workingman must labor more than four times as long.

Our shoe workers can earn the money for a pair of $9 shoes in one-third the time required by European shoe workers. Our dairy workers can earn the price of a pound of butter in one-sixth of the time necessary for Europeans.

Because their incomes have risen, the working people of America can consume greater quantities of meat and eggs, bread and butter, the products of farms, and still have money for manufactured goods and personal savings.

Because our farmers are getting good prices for their crops, farm income has multiplied many times. Farm debts have been reduced, mortgages have been paid off, and the savings of farmers have grown rapidly.

Yes, my friends, the progressive policy of your Government has brought benefits to every group in America. We have all advanced together, during the last 16 years. And we are going to continue our advance under a Democratic administration.

The President and the Congress are committed to a program designed to widen the liberties, to raise the living standards, and to assure more security for all Americans. Under the banner of freedom and progress, we are striving to attain a fair deal for American business, American farmers, American labor.

We are not resting on our achievements of the past—even though our accomplishments in the last 16 years have no parallel in the history of popular government.

We know that we must make it possible for more people with moderate incomes to own and enjoy homes of their own. Good homes in decent neighborhoods produce citizens who believe in democracy.

We know that we must extend and improve our social security system. We must enable millions of Americans to save for their age with the cooperation of far-sighted employers.

The House of Representatives passed a bill in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress to add 11,000,000 Americans to the lists of those who share in social security. As majority leader of the Senate, I promise you that this Congress will complete its action on this bill before we return next year.

We are going to make a mighty effort to obtain a fair-employment law in the coming session of Congress.

We will try to enact a bill for Federal aid to education which will be satisfactory to Americans of all faiths.

Many other important measures will be given final form and enacted into law before the Eighty-first Congress goes down into history.

In the coming session we will devote much thought to our consideration of proposals for greater economy and efficiency in our Government. The President has informed me that he intends to submit additional plans for reorganization along the lines recommended by the Hoover Commission.

Let me remind you that this Congress has already approved more vital measures for streamlining Federal agencies than any other Congress in this century.

On June 20, 1949, we authorized the President to reorganize the executive departments to reach the essential objectives of efficiency and economy.

In addition to this comprehensive reorganization law, we gave our approval to six out of the seven special reorganization plans sent to the Congress by the President.

Through acceptance of these plans, we gave the President a go-ahead signal to streamline the Department of Labor, to reorganize the Post Office Department, to transfer the National Security Council and National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President, to reorganize the Civil Service Commission, to reorganize the Maritime Commission, and to transfer the Public Roads Administration from the Federal Works Agency to the Department of Commerce.

I am strongly in favor of most of the recommendations made by the nonpartisan Commision headed by our former President. But I want you to be well aware of the fact that President Truman and this Democratic Congress have not been asleep at the switch on reorganization of the Government. Many people are apparently not informed on this subject. Many newspapers do not seem to realize that we have already acted in several fields to reorganize our Federal departments and save hundreds of millions for American taxpayers.

Remember that it will take time to obtain the savings we all desire. Remember that efficiency and economy cannot be achieved by swinging an ax wildly over the heads of Federal employees. Remember that savings which may amount to billions of dollars a year can be attained in the future by calm and scientific reforms carried through by able executives.

My friends and neighbors, Republicans and Democrats alike, who have gathered here to do me honor, I lift my voice to pay you a humble and sincere tribute. Your presence here is a recognition that you believe in me. I assure you that when I am reelected to the Senate, I shall devote my days and nights to the service of the people of Illinois and the Nation in the years ahead as I have done in the years gone by.

I enter this campaign with only one obligation—my obligation to the people of my home State and America.

Here in Havana in 1944, when I opened my last campaign, I declared to you: "No individual or group of individuals, no organization, no newspaper, controls my vote in the United States Senate." That is true now, as it was in 1944, and it will always be true.

America has been good to a son of a tenant farmer, who has been given the opportunity to speak for the people of a great State from the highest post in the Senate.

I ask for your continued confidence and faith. I will strive to be worthy of your approval and your support.

This is an hour of great challenge in the affairs of the Nation and the world. We must rise to our responsibilities. There can be no question that we can go forward together to new victories for our beloved America.

Every indication in the Nation, from the Democratic victory in the New York senatorial election to our victories in the county elections recently held here in Illinois, points to another great triumph for our cause in 1950.

We are going to win because the voters in Illinois and the whole country know that the leaders of the Democratic Party are men of unimpeachable integrity and rugged honesty.

We are going to win because we have many splendid leaders in the State, such as our great Governor, Adlai Stevenson, our great mayor of Chicago, Martin Kennelly, and my great colleague in the Senate, PAUL DOUGLAS.

We are going to win because we have drawn to our banner millions of progressive Republicans and independent voters who want to advance with us along the road of peace, progress, and prosperity.

In the coming campaign, we shall elect men who will be faithful to their trust, who will keep Illinois in its rightful place—at the head of the American parade.

Here's to victory in 1950—victory for the principles of democracy—victory for the people.

Federal Power Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a pamphlet entitled "Federal Power Policy," distributed by the American Public Power Association. I found the recommendations of the APPA to be very cogent and certainly worthy of much consideration. The recommendations were adopted by the board of directors of the American Power Association on September 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL POWER POLICY

(Recommendations on the generation, transmission, and sale of Federal electric power by American Public Power Association)

INTRODUCTION

For almost 40 years, the power program of our Federal Government has grown like Topsy. It has been influenced, especially during the last 20 years, by major amendments to existing laws as well as new legislation, such as the TVA Act, designed to apply only to particular regions or to solve special problems, such as electrifying our farm areas. Until 1930 power was an incidental byproduct from dams designed primarily for flood control, navigation, irrigation, and providing water for domestic and municipal purposes. Up to that time the total installed kilowatts in Federal plants was only 226,000. Beginning with Hoover Dam, on the Colorado River, there developed the concept of huge dams, vast reservoirs for water storage, large blocks of low-cost hydro power, and the need for over-all control of a river basin, to attain maximum benefits from the investment. The impact of these large blocks of power on the economy of an area quickly became apparent.

Today, according to the Federal Power Commission, there are in operation, under construction, or authorized almost 17,000,000 kilowatts of federally owned generating capacity, and the Secretary of the Interior has stated that by 1960 some 30,000,000 additional kilowatts can reasonably be anticipated.

Since municipalities, cooperatives, and other public agencies now have preference under the law in the disposition of this power, their stake in the policy followed becomes readily evident.

Accordingly, to protect their present interests and to assure the economic feasibility and soundness of the program, the American Public Power Association has drafted these recommendations for a Federal power policy. Adoption of the statement reproduced below marks one of the most significant actions to be taken by APPA in its 9-year history. It is hoped that this statement will help guide the drafting of legislation in this sphere of governmental activity which is witnessing such a phenomenal growth.

STATEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In the construction of electric power facilities and in the generation, transmission and sale of electric power, the United States should adhere to the following principles, that is:

I. Development of hydroelectric power sites

1. In order to conserve irreplaceable fuel supplies, every site for the generation of hydroelectric power should be developed if and when such development is economically feasible. In the case of projects to be constructed primarily for some other purpose, such as navigation or flood control, maximum power production consistent with such primary purposes should be provided.

2. Hydroelectric power sites are natural resources of the people of the United States and in their development preference should be given to public agencies. Plans for developments should provide for maximum economic utilization of stream systems. Local public agencies should have preference in making developments that fit into such plans.

3. Recapture provisions should not apply in the case of grants and licenses given to any public agency. The only useful purpose of a recapture clause is to reserve a natural resource for the public benefit, and where the people themselves undertake the development the need for the provision disappears.

4. In every case in which the United States has, in effect, preempted a stream and/or precluded local development of hydroelectric power, or assumed the obligation to provide a power supply to an area, then it is the duty of the United States to develop power under an orderly program which will anticipate the potential power demands and meet those demands as they arise.

5. The construction of any Federal dam or power generation plant should be preceded by authorization by act of Congress.

II. Economic feasibility and financing of Federal power projects

1. Determination of feasibility:

(a) The Congress should prescribe standards of economic feasibility for Federal power projects and these standards should be applied to all projects.

(b) With respect to any administrative determination of feasibility pursuant to standards prescribed by Congress, review should be provided by an independent agency.

(c) In determining economic feasibility, each project should stand upon its own merits, but the interrelation of the proposed project with other projects (existing and potential) within the areas should be fully evaluated.

(d) Minimum standards of feasibility should be such that power revenues, after payment of power operation, including depreciation, and maintenance expenses, should be adequate to provide for the payment of interest upon the capital investment of the United States chargeable to power and reasonably to insure the United States against loss of any part of such capital investment.

2. Financing: In those cases in which the United States has precluded local development of a stream, or assumed the obligation to provide a power supply to an area, capital funds must be made available in such an orderly manner as to permit installation of economically justified generating facilities in anticipation of the potential power demands and in time to meet those demands as they arise.

III. Transmission lines and steam plants

1. Regional integration:

(a) The United States should construct and own fuel-burning plants, integrated with its hydroelectric plants whenever necessary for the efficient economical operation of its hydroelectric plants.

(b) The United States should construct and own any transmission lines economically necessary for the proper integration of Federal hydroelectric or fuel-burning plants.

(c) Integration policies should be directed toward benefiting the ultimate consumer and where integration of a Federal hydroelectric plant with the production facilities of a local publicly owned distributing system will better serve the ultimate consumer, such integration should be preferred to integration exclusively with other federally owned generating plants.

2. Transmission to load centers:

(a) The United States should construct and own transmission facilities (within the limits of economic feasibility) in every case where such construction and ownership is necessary to provide service, upon reasonable terms, to public agencies and cooperatives accorded preference by acts of Congress.

(b) Local public agencies and cooperatives should have a preferred right to construct transmission facilities to load centers in all cases where the local agencies are willing to provide transmission upon reasonable terms to customers within the area entitled to preference by acts of Congress.

IV. Power sales

1. Sales to ultimate consumers: The United States should not engage in the distribution of electric energy to ultimate consumers (other than agencies and instrumentalities of the United States) if such consumers can reasonably and adequately be served by any local public agency or cooperative.

2. Preferential rights:

(a) In the sale of power, public agencies and cooperatives should have preference.

(b) In the sale of power, public agencies and cooperatives taking power for direct distribution to ultimate consumers should be preferred to all others.

3. Contracts: Contracts of Federal agencies with privately owned utilities should be

limited in time and should contain provisions for modification upon reasonable terms to the extent necessary to protect the preference of public agencies and cooperatives within the area.

4. Rates: Power from Federal projects should be sold at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles. Rates for power produced at multiple-purpose projects should be sufficient to meet all costs properly chargeable to power, but should not be burdened with any costs properly chargeable to any other purpose, provided, however, that when irrigation is one of the joint purposes, then power revenues may properly be used to pay that portion, if any, of the capital costs properly chargeable to irrigation which is beyond the ability of the irrigators to pay, provided the total capital costs paid from power revenues (those chargeable to power plus those chargeable to irrigation but paid from power revenues) shall never exceed the amount for which a comparable supply of power could have been developed had irrigation not been one of the purposes of the project.

V. Multiple-purpose projects

1. Allocation of capital:

(a) Congress should fix policies and practice with respect to the allocation of capital at Federal multiple-purpose projects and these policies and practices should be uniformly applied upon all projects.

(b) All administrative action with respect to capital allocations should be made subject to review.

VI. Recognition of local interest in Federal projects for the utilization or control of water

1. Investigation and reports respecting proposed water projects: The United States should at all times recognize the rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders and their interests and rights in water utilization. To this end, investigations concerning any proposed project for the utilization and control of water should be conducted in such a manner as to make available currently to every affected State information developed by the investigation and opportunity for maximum consultation and cooperation. Similarly, reports concerning any such project should be submitted to every affected State for comment, criticism, or recommendation prior to the authorization of any construction work upon the proposed project, or, if the report be for submission to the Congress, before such submission.

2. Local participation in operation of Federal projects: The local interest in every Federal project for the utilization and control of water should receive recognition, and local participation should be invited to the greatest extent consistent with the responsibilities of the United States. Such local participation may be achieved through local public hearings, local representation on consulting and administrative boards and councils, and by other means.

VII. Rural electrification

1. It is in the public interest to electrify our rural areas as rapidly as possible. Sufficient funds—both for administrative and loan purposes—should be provided by the Congress as needed.

2. Present powers of REA to finance generating plants and transmission lines, and acquire properties, should be continued.

3. More extensive financing of research in rural utilization of electric power should be undertaken by appropriate agencies.

Adopted by the board of directors, American Public Power Association, September 28, 1949, at Washington, D. C.

One Job for 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the President of the United States submitted to Congress yesterday his message on the state of the Union. Many things were covered in that speech. Many of us feel that we cannot be so optimistic about the outlook for the future of our country if we take an honest, practical look.

An interesting editorial appeared on January 1, 1950, in the Cleveland Plain Dealer entitled "One Job for 1950."

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is something worth thinking about.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE JOB FOR 1950

Hello, 1950. This is a pretty bewildering world for such a young fellow to enter. It isn't like it used to be when your brothers dropped around to spend a year. Then life was simple. Two and two made four. If you worked you ate and if you loafed you didn't. Hardly anybody got paid for doing nothing, and nobody made a career of going on relief. And all the gold was not buried in the ground in Kentucky.

To say, 1950, that we are nuttier than a fruit cake is to understate the case. We haven't made up our minds what we are going to do about China; what we are going to do about a lot of other things. We drift from one expediency to another, yet manage to keep in mind the priceless precept that he who gives away the most to the greatest number remains longest in power.

To saddle all these problems on your poor little back seems brutal, but you might as well learn early that life is a pretty kettle of fish. No one expects you to be able to solve them all. But if you could concentrate on just one thing and get it straightened out, you would be remembered as a jewel among years.

We refer, 1950, to the Government's farm price-support program which prevents prices from going to their natural level.

Uncle Sam, it seems, has a $2,000,000,000 inventory right now, including some 5,000,000 bales of cotton, 400,000,000 bushels of wheat, 600,000,000 bushels of corn, 400,000,000 pounds of linseed oil, 16,000,000 bushels of flaxseed, over 70,000,000 pounds of dried eggs, more than 100,000,000 pounds of butter, $30,000,000 worth of dried milk, to say nothing of large stores of tobacco, tung oil, dried fruit, turpentine, rosin, sheep's and goat's wool, soybeans, turkeys, peanuts, and walnuts.

The Government is running out of storage space. Expense for storage currently runs to $250,000 a day, and at least $80,000,000 is being invested in additional space this fiscal year.

If you could straighten out this one matter, 1950, before it becomes compulsory for every homeowner to offer up his basement, garage, and spare bedroom for storage purposes, you would not have lived in vain.

But don't let us infect you with our somewhat pessimistic outlook. The fact that nothing has been done in recent years that made much sense, does not prove that we shall continue to live an Alice in Wonderland existence all the rest of our days. It is as certain as the noses on our faces that we must return to a solvent condition or go broke.

Perhaps, 1950, you may be able to give us a slight push in the direction of plain, old-fashioned horse sense.

Well, good luck, kid, and happy landings.

Capt. John D. Crommelin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to Capt. John D. Crommelin, by Walter Winchell.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR A GALLANT SAILOR

(By Walter Winchell)

The Japs burned the uniform off Capt. John D. Crommelin, but it didn't stop him from rescuing his wounded men lying below in sick bay. The politicians are trying to keep the admiral's star off Captain Crommelin's shoulder this week, but unlike the Japs, they won't face him in open combat. In the best tradition of Hitler, they have denied him a court martial because he has a complete defense.

There is now an official public reprimand in his record, placed there by Admiral Forrest Sherman. The best constitutional lawyers tell me Admiral Sherman had no more right to do that than the cop on the corner has a right to electrocute you without trial.

This is how it was done: Admiral Sherman, without trial, placed this death sentence of promotion in Captain Crommelin's record: "To the degree that you deliberately ignored your responsibilities to your naval superiors and disregarded the well understood privacy of confidential and privileged communications, you brought into question your fitness to exercise a position of trust and confidence under those superiors or elsewhere in the naval service."

Admiral Sherman must have known when he wrote—as everyone in Washington does—that a large number of Senators, Congressmen, and senior officers of the United States Navy are almost fighting each other for the privilege of testifying for Crommelin. To the extent that he ignored the evidence, Admiral Sherman was stacking the cards. But to the extent that he ignored the law, he was breaking it himself.

Admiral Sherman wrote me a letter explaining his position. Examination of it reveals he used the exact words of naval legal authority but added to them words which suited his purpose, omitted those which restricted his authority and ignored those which questioned the legality of his act. The admiral relies for his authority on the inherent right of a commander-in-chief to express approval or disapproval of the official conduct of subordinate officers under his command.

He omitted to say that the very same book he quotes, the Naval Digest, 1916, specifically states on the very same pages, numbers 500 and 501, that "public reprimand, even as a part of a court martial, is not favored by the Navy."

To railroad Crommelin they had to go far back. That Naval Digest, published in 1916, was quoting naval law as far back as 1869 and 1864. I know Admiral Sherman will have the greatest difficulty trying to produce before the congressional investigation committee which will be formed a single instance where the chief of naval operations has acted in this manner in the last 50 years. The best research lawyers have been unable to produce a single case in the last 30 years, as this goes to press.

Admiral Sherman quoted to me the directive of the Secretary of the Navy, dated January 7, 1949. He neglected to state the directive of Secretary of Defense Johnson, dated June 8, 1949, 6 months after, in which the Navy Department, along with the other armed services, was directed to lift the gag on all officers except for material which was classified "for security reasons." Captain Crommelin was also prepared to prove that the confidential dispatch in answer to which Admiral Bogan's letter was written had been opened to the public by direction of the Secretary of the Navy some 10 days previous to Captain Crommelin's release of Admiral Bogan's letter. In short, Capt. Crommelin has been sentenced, without trial, for making public an answer to a letter which the Secretary of the Navy himself had made public 10 days before.

These are only a few of the legal points in the greatest outrage in the history of military justice since the framing of Captain Dreyfus. As a few more, the Naval Digest, upon which Admiral Sherman relies, isn't even naval law. It is a mere reference book and states so on its very first page. It is the opinion of able counsel that the authorities cited by Admiral Sherman are nullified by United States Code of 1935. Further, in order to bar Captain Crommelin without trial, it was necessary, according to legal experts, to hold that his superiors had sweeping rights over his conscience. Apparently Admiral Sherman has forgotten that we hanged the Nazi generals for blindly obeying Hitler's orders.

Saturday's headlines were misleading. They stated "the Navy was through with the Crommelin case." The Navy may be, but the Crommelin case is not through with Admiral Sherman; nor is the Congress of the United States. Unlike Captain Crommelin, who got no open trial, Admiral Sherman will have full opportunity to explain to the Senate just how the Navy's first airman got the illegal reprimand in his record, which under ordinary circumstances would forever stop his promotion, and he will be asked if, as the AP stated on November 8, he called Crommelin before him, without counsel, and told him if he would avoid "controversial subjects" he would be free to speak in Montgomery, Ala. (Free to speak.)

Crommelin refused. He was hit shortly thereafter with a reprimand. What happened to the Bill of Rights? Doesn't Admiral Sherman know the Constitution of the United States is specifically made a part of naval laws? The trees over Thomas Jefferson's grave at Monticello must be weeping.

As the historic case of Capt. John Crommelin moves to the floor of the United States Senate and the United States Supreme Court issues even greater than freedom of speech are presented. The Congress of the United States has been defied, according to leading Senators and Congressmen, in its efforts to obtain information so that it can perform its constitutional duties. Members of Congress have charged naval officers are being railroaded to naval Siberias for daring to answer the lawful questions of Congress.

To his defense have already come United States Senators of both parties. They are prepared, I am informed, to act not only as his counsel but to take the stand to testify to his public service for the very act for which he has been condemned. High-ranking officers of the Navy will testify that he is, contrary to Admiral Sherman's censure, entitled to hold positions of highest trust and honor. (The enemy Japs—and his two brothers killed in action—are the best testimony on that.) Literally thousands of Americans of very high standing in their community are clamoring to rebut Admiral Sherman's public reprimand.

There will be no admiral's star on CROMMELIN Crommelin's shoulder, according to Washington insiders. But that will mean one star has gone from the American flag.

Address by Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois, at Convention of National Association of Postmasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the majority leader, at the convention of the National Association of Postmasters.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, fellow Democrats [applause]. I want to take this opportunity of expressing to my old friend, Burris Jackson, my deep gratitude for the kind and tolerant remarks that he made about me in that very generous introduction. I found out in my political career that I always go best, as far as applause is concerned, when I speak to postmasters. [Applause.]

That is especially true with Illinois postmasters [applause], and I know there are a large number of them in attendance at this wonderful convention.

Your distinguished chairman has spoken somewhat briefly about the Senator from Illinois being the majority leader in the United States Senate, and I thank him for those kind things that he said about that position. Yet I come before this intelligent group of people to advise you that I doubt if there is another position in public life today that is so difficult as being the majority leader of the United States Senate. We have a majority in the United States Senate of Democrats. Sometimes I think in theory only. [Laughter.] That is, when I see some of my colleagues voting some other way.

You who have followed the history of the Eighty-first Congress well realize that upon a great number of the votes upon highly important and controversial matters, it was a question of touch and go as to whether or not we could win the day.

You who are not familiar with parliamentary procedure must remember that we of the United States Senate in this greatest legislative hall in all of the world have no rule of relevancy. We have no rule of germaneness. An individual Senator who is recognized by the Vice President can stand on his feet and talk as long as there is breath in his body. In fact, not long ago they provided a new device to carry on a filibuster in the United States Senate.

A SEATED FILIBUSTER

My good friend, Senator LANGER, from North Dakota, who is a friend of the postmasters, was carrying on a filibuster just at the close of the session. While the Senator from Illinois and other Senators were away from the Chamber for lunch, and only two or three Senators were on the floor, the Senator from North Dakota asked unanimous consent that he might be seated and read his speech instead of standing. [Laughter.] Nobody objected, and it was granted. Under the rules of the Senate, you can drive a donkey or an elephant down the aisle under unanimous consent and agreement if nobody objects. We do have privileges a lot of other folks do not.

I came in the Senate and learned what had happened, and I saw my friend, LANGER, sitting at the desk pounding it as usual in the great speeches he sometimes makes, and I took exception to what had happened, because, ladies and gentlemen, we must carry on and maintain the integrity and the dignity of the United States Senate. In the Senate of the United States is the last bulwark of free legislative and independent government, and under no circumstances can we as Members of that great body permit the Senate to deteriorate either in integrity or dignity because if that should happen, then government in the United States could well be on its way out.

In these perilous and difficult times through which this great Nation is passing, never was it so important for men and women who serve in that body or in the body on the other side of the Capitol to give the best that is in them to carry on in the great traditions of the founding fathers of the Constitution of the United States in order that America may continue to lead the rest of the world under a form of government which has never been equaled or surpassed in all of the annals of time. It is only because of that type of representative government that we have been able to do the things that are so necessary and so vital in this turbulent and topsy-turvy world today.

Your presence here indicates that you people here have a right to come and hold your convention in a free and open spot. This is one of the few places in the world where you could really do this. Those who oppose our way of life would not permit you to do what you are doing today unless you had permission from some top man in the Kremlin.

We believe, ladies and gentlemen, that what we have accomplished under a democracy has never been equaled, will never be equaled, irrespective of any other type or form of government. When we look about today and see what we have in this Nation, in the way of happiness and prosperity, what we are doing in the Congress of the United States in our efforts to bring about a universal peace for all mankind, every American should cherish from his boot tops up for the fact that he lives as an American under the Stars and Stripes. [Applause.]

INTERESTED IN POSTAL SERVICE

As you know, I have always been deeply interested in the progress of the postal service and the advancement of postmasters and the highly skilled men and women who serve in our post offices.

I presume other speakers have told you about the accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress, but I shall repeat them. A

number of laws have been put into effect which will be of great benefit to postal employees; will improve our entire postal service system.

I take great satisfaction in the fact that the Eighty-first Congress has done more for the American postal service than any other Congress in our recent history, and facts will prove what I say. [Applause.]

We have authorized a research and development program in the Post Office Department which will be devoted to the modernization of equipment, the creation of new methods of handling mail, and the introduction of new devices to give the American people better postal service than they have ever received before. Experts of the Commission on Reorganization of the Government, headed by our former President Hoover, have estimated that this research and scientific development program could result in a savings of $80,000,000 a year.

While the various branches of the Post Office Department have been very progressive in the development of equipment and efficient methods, it became evident that much more could be accomplished by establishing a special office of research which would have the particular duty of making further improvements. The Hoover Commission, in its report on the post office, declared: "If the postal establishment is to be operated as a business enterprise, organized research will become increasingly important in order to remove guesswork from the formulation of service policies."

I know that plans are progressing for the development of mechanical mail sorting, and the use of other devices to expedite the movement of the enormous volume of mail passing through our magnificent postal system.

I might leave my manuscript for a moment to tell you good people that I presume every office in the United States Senate is like mine, and if that is true, there is more mail going through that office today than at any time in the history of the Nation. In other words, more people are writing about their problems and about legislation than at any time in the past. Believe it or not, the office of Senator LUCAS sends out on an average of 25,000 communications to his people in Illinois each month, a regular mail-order house, so to speak. [Laughter.]

We try to answer all of our mail. Sometimes you may get a form letter. If you do, it is only because of the lack of help and we cannot give you a personalized letter.

While the various branches of the Post Office Department have been very progressive in the development of equipment and efficient methods, much work can be accomplished by establishing a special office of research which I talked about a moment ago.

Another action which will improve the postal service available to the American people was the enactment by this Congress of a bill to give postal employees a salary increase of $120 a year. The post office has many thousands of workers who have been in the postal system for many years, and the Congress recognized the fact by placing a special provision in the pay-raise bill to give additional compensation to employees who have long records of service.

Longevity increases are given under the new law in three stages: $100 for those who have served 15 years; another $100 for those with 18 years of duty, and a third increase of $100 for those who have been on the job for a quarter of a century. Those who have served for 25 years or more will receive all three of the $100 longevity increases in addition to the flat pay increase of $120. That means that many postmasters who have made the postal service their life work will obtain a total increase of $420 a year.

BIGGEST IMPROVEMENTS FOUGHT

While this increase is fairly substantial, I do not believe it is enough to bring the scale of compensation for postmasters, assistant postmasters and postal supervisors to the level appropriate for their responsibilities. [Applause.] At this session of the Congress, I introduced a bill to adjust the pay of assistant postmasters and other executives in the postal field service. Hearings were held last May by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and my bill was discussed along with the general postal pay raise bill and other measures affecting the postal system. The committee then prepared its own bill, S. 1978, which includes all the provisions of my bill with a few minor changes and a special section designed to reclassify the pay of postmasters.

I was informed by the Postmaster General, the Bureau of the Budget, and the chairman of the Post Office Committee that there should be further study before a bill for a complete reclassification of the salaries of postmasters could be recommended for final passage by the Congress. I understand that S. 1978 was based upon suggestions made by the National Association of Postmasters, the organization now meeting here today. Let me assure you that the bill to give postmasters the salary scale they should have certainly will receive early consideration at the next session of the Eighty-first Congress. [Applause.]

The laws passed by this Congress to modernize the postal system and to lift the level of postal pay rates are examples of the kind of progressive legislation which we have been able to achieve under the leadership of this administration.

Reorganization of the Post Office Department was one of the seven reorganization plans submitted to Congress by President Truman. It was one of the six plans which went into effect with the tacit approval of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The only plan which was not accepted by the Congress was the President's proposal to establish a Department of Welfare to replace the Federal Security Agency. The six plans now in operation will streamline several important agencies of the Government and will make possible the eventual saving of hundreds of millions of dollars annually for the benefit of American taxpayers.

If I may diverge for a moment, the President of the United States, with whom I have the great honor of meeting every Monday morning when the Senate of the United States is in session, has advised me that when we return in January that a great number of other reorganization plans will be sent to the Congress for their approval, and when these reorganization plans finally get to work, with the elimination of useless employees and the overlapping and duplication of efforts, we believe that we can save billions of dollars, presuming, of course, that the Hoover Commission is correct in their conclusion.

Leaving the postal bills for a moment, briefly discussing some of the other things that happened in the Congress of the United States, and since I received a rather generous applause when I said fellow Democrats a moment ago, I do not hesitate to make just a few political implications as I go along. [Laughter and applause.]

OTHER LEGISLATION DISCUSSED

One of the most important pieces of legislation that we passed during this session, and which is now a public law, signed by the President of the United States, was the housing bill. The result of the housing bill that was passed is that some 810,000 new units will be on their way in a short while, giving to those in the low-income groups a right to have a decent home where they can rear a family. In that same bill we appropriated money to eliminate the slums in some of the great cities of this Nation.

You know, a great number of people fought the housing bill, and have been fighting it for years, on the theory that it will invade the field of free enterprise. Others have the temerity to call it a socialistic movement. Well, a good many Republicans are on that socialistic line, if it is so.

What will happen in the slum areas is this, and what is happening today, you and I know: There is where poverty, diseases, and crime breed, and out of that sort of an environment comes the virus of communism, and that is the very reason, ladies and gentlemen, that I, for one, stood four square behind the housing bill that was passed in the United States Senate some time ago. [Applause.]

We passed a bill known as Federal aid to education, which costs money, but unless the youth of this Nation is properly educated, to meet the test of tomorrow, no one knows what will happen to this great Nation of ours.

We believe that we have passed in the Senate of the United States a bill which takes care of all religious faiths. That was stymied in the House of Representatives, but we have every reason to believe that that bill which has been a part of the Democratic platform for years will be enacted into law before we conclude the second half of the Eighty-first Congress. [Applause.]

Another important bill that you people who live in the rural areas will surely understand came about this time when we introduced a measure to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation charter. You will recall the Eightieth Congress, the Republicans, took from the Secretary of Agriculture the power to acquire and lease additional storage facilities about a year ago this time.

You will recall down through the Corn Belt section of Illinois, where I happen to live, and all through the Corn Belt section of the Midwest, farmers were selling their corn, at least the surplus that they could not sell, at a tremendous sacrifice that did as much, in my opinion, to elect Harry Truman President as any single thing, so far as the farmers are concerned. [Applause.]

So we recognized that evil. Under this Congress, we corrected it. All you have to do is to go into any section of Illinois now and hear the hum of the hammer and saw, building additional storage facilities to take care of the farmer who was denied that right under the previous Eightieth Republican controlled Congress.

We are going to take care of the farmer. We always have and if he is a smart fellow, and I believe he is, he is going to stay with us again when these campaigns come along. [Applause.]

Another thing we did was to increase the minimum wage from 40 to 75 cents an hour, long past due, ladies and gentlemen, to a group of individual white collar people in this country who have no one to represent them in the Congress of the United States, the white-collar crowd who have no leaders as do the other great labor organizations. They are here and they are there and they depend upon me and the others to see that they get their just due. We believe that we have done something worth while to give to that underpaid fellow at least the minimum of 75 cents an hour, so that he, too, can put shoes on the feet of his kids and buy the kind of food that they need in order to make them healthy children in this great land of ours. [Applause.]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS RECORD

In the field of foreign affairs, you know what we have done over the protests of a certain small group of isolationists in this country. They are in the Senate and they are in the House of Representatives. They are out here in the Midwest. We tried isolationism once in 1917. We tried it again just before we got into World War II. It has not worked. It never will work in this atomic age, irrespective of what any one man may say, and under the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States Congress, we have brought forth to this Nation and to

the world a sound, progressive, far-reaching foreign policy which we believe will bring to the peoples of this earth an everlasting and a durable peace. [Applause.]

My friends, I do not tell you that what we are doing is not a calculated risk. I do not know whether we will succeed or not. But what is the alternative if we do not go through with the continuation of aid to Turkey and aid to Greece, continuation of the Marshall plan, continuation of the Atlantic Pact and the implementation thereof with the assistance arms program? The alternative is to come back here in this isolated shell of the United States of America, build an iron wall around this great country of ours, and instead of appropriating $15,000,000,000 for national defense, you will appropriate three times that much, yes, five times that much, in short order, that we may prepare for the oncoming day when the Soviet crowd will challenge us in an aggressive way.

So long, ladies and gentlemen, as we can keep France and England and these other countries, keep their economic position strong, keep them from going to the communistic regime, we are doing just that much to keep communism away from the shores of this great country of ours.

You know, France and Italy had a pretty close call. A year ago this time I was in those countries. I visited Turkey, I visited Greece, Germany, Italy, France, and Spain. I heard the people on the streets talking. I heard them in high places discussing the question and they literally went for the things that America had done for them, regardless of what anyone says to the contrary. They are appreciative people. They are a grateful people and what we have done through the extension of the Marshall plan to those democracies of Europe has stopped the spread of communism from riding herd over all of those great countries. When President Truman not long ago announced to the world that Russia had acquired the atomic bomb, it became even more clear than ever as to the necessity for our carrying on a firm, rigid foreign policy against any aggressor who seeks to challenge the American way of life.

I want to say to you that in the opinion of the experts in Washington, the moment that we entered the Atlantic Pact, that was the beginning of the end of the cold war around Berlin. The blockade was lifted thereafter. They have been getting along pretty well with those fellows since that time.

NOT SEEKING TROUBLE

We are not looking for trouble. We are only looking for peace. We fought two wars. We have asked for nothing. We give and give and give. It is what we do in order to just be left alone, that we might continue on and develop our way of life in this country of ours.

There is no territory that we asked for, no reparations, no aggrandisement of property, nothing except the good will of other nations of the earth.

I have always believed that there was room enough in this world for Russia and the United States to live, notwithstanding the difference in the ideologies that are expressed in the two nations, and Russia may realize that some day. At least we hope that she does.

This great bipartisan foreign policy being carried on at the present time under the leadership of the great Senator from Texas, the distinguished TOM CONNALLY, a Democrat, who is a close friend of Burris Jackson's [applause], and on the Republican side we go to Michigan and find the ranking minority member on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that statesman, one of the greatest statesmen of all times, ARTHUR VANDENBERG, a Republican, ladies and gentlemen. [Applause.]

When you realize that VANDENBERG and CONNALLY and every other member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, whether they are Democrats or Republicans, have reported out on all of these bills this year unanimously, you understand the power that exists in that one committee as far as this country and the world is concerned, and it must continue to be that way. I will take VANDENBERG's ideas on foreign policy rather than some isolationist out here in the Midwest or any other place, ladies and gentlemen. [Applause.]

I think perhaps I have the score.

I do not believe I have. I thought I had the figures on the number of votes, but as I recall, on the Atlantic Pact, there were only 12 United States Senators who voted against the Atlantic Pact. There were only 9 in final analysis who voted against the continuation of the Marshall plan, although they were in there with crippling amendments attempting to defeat indirectly what they could not do directly, ladies and gentlemen.

This has been a Congress that stayed on the job, while the Eightieth Congress ran away, and we have accomplished a tremendous program of good. We have carried out many a point of the Democratic platform and we are only half through. We have another second half of the Eighty-first Congress session to go.

You know, when we go back, we do not have to go through the organization of committees, assignment of bills, hearings, and so forth. Everything that is on the calendar at the present time will be ready for consideration the moment we return. So consequently we will lose no time. We will move right in, a couple of days after the 3d of January, discussing and debating important legislation that affects the general welfare of all of the American people.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have been in the Senate of the United States for the last 13 years, that is, the last 11 years, I served as a Member of the House of Representatives for 4 years before that. All in all I have been in Congress some 15 years. I have seen a good many things happen during that time. But I repeat what I said a moment ago, that I do not believe that in the 15 years that I have been there, that I have seen more controversial, more important legislation that affects the welfare of the people of the world than exists at the present time. It is a difficult job for any Senator, a difficult job for any leader. All that the Senator from Illinois is attempting to do is to do what he believes is right.

I do not say that I am always right, but I pray God that I am right, and then vote accordingly.

TRIBUTE TO HADDEN

You have all been very kind to listen to me. Before I retire, I want to pay just a tribute to my friend, the postmaster of the city of Chicago, who has been your host. He has not been in the post office too long, but he is a wonderful fellow, and I predict for him one of the best careers of any postmaster in any big city in the United States. He has made friends by the thousands already. He is running an efficient office over there. I am glad to pay this tribute to my friend, John Haderlein. [Applause.]

If any of you folks are coming to Washington next year while we are in session, and if the Senator from Illinois can do anything for you, just call me. If you cannot come, write me. That is your privilege under the Constitution, to write your Senator. Present your grievances to him or to your Congressman.

You may not get the answer you want, but you will get an answer of some kind.

Thank you so much.

Essay on Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to direct the attention of the House to certain passages in a book which I think may certainly be considered one of the English classics, but which, like other classics, is not as much read as it should be. I refer to the essay On Liberty written by the great British philosopher John Stuart Mill and published by him in the year 1859. In the closing chapter of the book in which he discusses practical applications of the limits to the authority of society over the individual, the writer gives a statement of objections to Government interference which I think we might all do well to keep in mind. So much am I impressed with the force of what the writer says that I should be glad to see it in the RECORD at the beginning of every session. Even the reference to Russia, although it is a reference to the Russia of the czars, is probably fairly apt when applied to the Russia of the Soviet Union.

The language to which I refer is as follows:

> The objections to government interference, when it is not such as to involve infringement of liberty, may be of three kinds.
>
> The first is, when the thing to be done is likely to be better done by individuals than by the government. Speaking generally, there is no one so fit to conduct any business, or to determine how or by whom it shall be conducted, as those who are personally interested in it. This principle condemns the interference, once so common, of the legislature, or the officers of government, with the ordinary processes of industry. But this part of the subject has been sufficiently enlarged upon by political economists, and is not particularly related to the principles of this essay.
>
> The second objection is more nearly allied to our subject. In many cases, though individuals may not do the particular thing so well, on the average, as the officers of government, it is nevertheless desirable that it should be done by them, rather than by the government, as a means to their own mental education—a mode of strengthening their active faculties, exercising their judgment, and giving them a familiar knowledge of the subjects with which they are thus left to deal. This is a principal, though not the sole, recommendation of jury trial (in cases not political); of free and popular local and municipal institutions; of the conduct of industrial and philanthropic enterprises by voluntary associations. These are not questions of liberty, and are connected with that subject only by remote tendencies; but they are questions of development. It belongs to a different occasion from the present to dwell on these things as parts of national education; as being, in truth, the peculiar training of a citizen, the practical part of the political education of a free people, taking them out of the narrow circle of personal and family selfishness, and accustoming them to the comprehension of joint interests, the management of joint concerns—habituating them to act from public or semi-public motives, and guide their conduct by aims

which unite instead of isolating them from one another. Without these habits and powers, a free constitution can neither be worked nor preserved; as is exemplified by the too-often transitory nature of political freedom in countries where it does not rest upon a sufficient basis of local liberties. The management of purely local business by the localities, and of the great enterprises of industry by the union of those who voluntarily supply the pecuniary means, is further recommended by all the advantages which have been set forth in this essay as belonging to individuality of development, and diversity of modes of action. Government operations tend to be everywhere alike. With individuals and voluntary associations, on the contrary, there are varied experiments, and endless diversity of experiment. What the State can usefully do is to make itself a central depository and active circulator and diffuser, of the experience resulting from many trials. Its business is to enable each experimentalist to benefit by the experiments of others; instead of tolerating no experiments but its own.

The third and most cogent reason for restricting the interference of government is the great evil of adding unnecessarily to its power. Every function superadded to those already exercised by the government causes its influence over hopes and fears to be more widely diffused, and converts, more and more, the active and ambitious part of the public into hangers-on of the government, or of some party which aims at becoming the government. If the roads, the railways, the banks, the insurance offices, the great joint-stock companies, the universities, and the public charities, were all of them branches of the government; if, in addition, the municipal corporations and local boards, with all that now devolves on them, became departments of the central administration; if the employees of all these different enterprises were appointed and paid by the government, and looked to the government for every rise in life; not all the freedom of the press and popular constitution of the legislature would make this or any other country free otherwise than in name. And the evil would be greater, the more efficiently and scientifically the administrative machinery was constructed—the more skillful the arrangements for obtaining the best qualified hands and heads with which to work it. In England it has of late been proposed that all the members of the civil service of government should be selected by competitive examination, to obtain for these employments the most intelligent and instructed persons procurable; and much has been said and written for and against this proposal. One of the arguments most insisted on by its opponents is that the occupation of a permanent official servant of the state does not hold out sufficient prospects of emolument and importance to attract the highest talents, which will always be able to find a more inviting career in the professions, or in the service of companies and other public bodies. One would not have been surprised if this argument had been used by the friends of the proposition, as an answer to its principal difficulty. Coming from the opponents it is strange enough. What is urged as an objection is the safety valve of the proposed system. If indeed all the high talent of the country could be drawn into the service of the government, a proposal tending to bring about that result might well inspire uneasiness. If every part of the business of society which required organised concert, or large and comprehensive views, were in the hands of the government, and if government offices were universally filled by the ablest men, all the enlarged culture and practiced intelligence in the country, except the purely speculative, would be concentrated in a numerous bureaucracy, to whom alone the rest of the community would look for all things: The multitude for direction and dictation in all they had to do; the able and aspiring for personal advancement. To be admitted into the ranks of this bureaucracy, and when admitted, to rise therein, would be the sole objects of ambition. Under this regime, not only is the outside public ill-qualified, for want of practical experience, to criticise or check the mode of operation of the bureaucracy, but even if the accidents of despotic or the natural working of popular institutions occasionally raise to the summit a ruler or rulers of reforming inclinations, no reform can be effected which is contrary to the interest of the bureaucracy. Such is the melancholy condition of the Russian Empire, as shown in the accounts of those who have had sufficient opportunity of observation. The Czar himself is powerless against the bureaucratic body; he can send any one of them to Siberia, but he cannot govern without them, or against their will. On every decree of his they have a tacit veto, by merely refraining from carrying it into effect. In countries of more advanced civilization and of a more insurrectionary spirit, the public, accustomed to expect everything to be done for them by the state, or at least to do nothing for themselves without asking from the state not only leave to do it, but even how it is to be done, naturally hold the state responsible for all evil which befalls them, and when the evil exceeds their amount of patience, they rise against the government, and make what is called a revolution; whereupon somebody else, with or without legitimate authority from the nation, vaults into the seat, issues his orders to the bureaucracy, and everything goes on much as it did before; the bureaucracy being unchanged, and nobody else being capable of taking their place.

The Dogged Retreat of the Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, at this time the country is being flooded with misleading literature put out by an advertising firm with more regard for sensationalism than accuracy, in opposition to Government health insurance. Millions of dollars, levied by a compulsory tax on doctors, are being spent to mislead people on the issue of paying their doctor and hospital bills through a national health-insurance fund raised by pay-roll taxes.

"The Dogged Retreat of the Doctors," an excellent article by Milton Mayer in Harper's Magazine for December, gives the history of the American Medical Association's position on health insurance over several decades and discusses the real facts on the need for improved medical economics in the United States. Everyone who seeks a real understanding of the struggle for a better system of distributing medical care will want to read this article. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DOGGED RETREAT OF THE DOCTORS

(By Milton Mayer)

I

The American Medical Association spent the best years of its life defending things as they were, and things as they were weren't good; too many people were getting too little medical care too late. The defender in chief of things as they were was Morris Fishbein. Fishbein, though his title was only editor of the Journal of the AMA, was the voice of medicine from 1924 to 1949, and there were those who suspected that he was medicine's master as well as its voice. The suspicion was unfounded; no man, not even Morris Fishbein, makes that much history all by himself.

He did the doctors' thinking for them, but that didn't mean they didn't like it. The problem of medical care was no business of the public, still less of the Government. The medical profession was competent to deal with it, and why did it need dealing with anyway? Wasn't American medicine the best in the world, just as Fishbein said? Why socialize it, in Fishbein's words, just because of what Fishbein called local inequalities? And even if it were true that a majority of the American people could not afford the cost of chronic or catastrophic illness, why didn't they, as Fishbein suggested, save their money for a rainy day?

The thinking was fine. What the doctors didn't like was the declining market for it, and they blamed the decline on Fishbein. England had fallen, the thirty-ninth nation to succumb to socialized medicine—that is, government medical insurance. The public demand that something be done was reflected by successive bills in Congress and by President Truman's call for legislation last spring. More and more medical-school professors were on the wrong side. More and more bona fide doctors were on the wrong side. Gosh—even Barney Baruch was on the wrong side. So last June the AMA performed an autolaryngectomy. The voice of medicine was removed.

The inference, perhaps even the implication, is that Fishbein had misrepresented the doctors' position. The fact is that he had represented it—right into the ground—and the fact is confirmed by the further fact that the association's last-ditch struggle against reform has continued, deeper in the ditch than ever. "You have got to understand," said one of the high bodies of medicine, who would rather be found installing goat glands than have his name mentioned, "that Fishbein really represented what the doctors think are their interests. Mind you, I said 'think.'"

The trouble with the AMA is that there are too many doctors in it. A doctor is, by definition, a man who doesn't have time. One of the things the average doctor doesn't have time to do is catch up with the things he didn't learn in school, and one of the things he didn't learn in school is the nature of human society, its purposes, its history, and its needs. There are hundreds—many hundreds—of exceptions among them. But there are thousands—140,000—of doctors in the AMA.

If medicine is necessarily a mystery to the average layman, nearly everything else is necessarily a mystery to the average doctor. Medical education is uniquely narrow, intense, and protracted. The doctor is the specialist par excellence. And his specialization doesn't end with his entrance into practice. The developments in medicine come so fast that the conscientious practitioner has no time to interest himself in the common concerns of citizens.

All these circumstances are common knowledge, but commonly known circumstances have consequences, too. The doctor—the average doctor—is a nice fellow to have around the house or the hospital. His self-sacrifice for his patients is proverbial and proverbially true. But he sometimes breaks down in the larger areas of social intercourse because his training and his calling break down there. And the medical calling, like others that deal with bodies qua bodies,

has a peculiar attraction to the socially circumscribed personality. "Of course I dislike the AMA," said one of Chicago's most distinguished surgeons a few years ago, "but I'm not going to get mixed up in any row. I dislike politics, too. If I had liked politics, I wouldn't have gone into surgery."

Because he dislikes politics, this particular surgeon's office is a precinct headquarters today in the AMA's $2,000,000 campaign to terrify him into terrifying his patients into terrifying their Congressmen to vote against socialized medicine. His office wall is ornamented with a jumbo reproduction of the heartbreaking painting, The Doctor, emblazoned with the heartbreaking appeal, keep politics out of this picture. His reception room is stacked with with red-white-and-blue pamphlets titled, "The Voluntary Way Is the American Way," containing some truth, some distortions, and some outright misinformation. His bills are covered with stickers reading, "As your personal physician * * * please write your United States Senators and Representatives. For more information, ask me." It is all furnished free, in unlimited quantities, by the National Education Campaign of the American Medical Association, Whitaker & Baker, directors. "I wish we had Fishbein back," he says. "I don't like politics. That's why I went into surgery."

II

Back in 1901 the AMA, after a half-century of high-minded obscurity, was told by its committee on reorganization that "if the association would give sanction to its recommendations the profession throughout the country in 5 years would be welded into a compact organization whose power to influence medicine would be almost unlimited and whose requests for desirable legislation would everywhere be met with that respect which the politician has for organized votes." In those days organized medicine, more medical than organizational, was interested in raising the standards of medical education and hospital service and extending medical care. The streamlining was effective; in the next few years the AMA brought about licensure of medical schools and hospitals and obtained the adoption of the first Pure Food and Drug Act. The streamlining also relieved the membership of politics; in 1937 the association was able to report that "attempts were being made"—obviously in vain—"to cause the association to send a questionnaire to every physician in the United States in order to determine his point of view regarding the socialization of medicine."

The streamlining made AMA membership automatic through membership in the county or county-group medical societies, the constituent bodies which send delegates to the State societies, which in turn send delegates to the "legislative policy-making" body of 190, the AMA house of delegates. The delegates meet twice a year to ratify, in practice, the proposals of the board of trustees, which, in principle, is responsible to the house. When the board, which had in the past unanimously supported Fishbein, announced its unanimous recommendation of his dismissal last June, the house unanimously approved.

There are no dues in the AMA, but a subscription to the Journal makes a member, a fellow—the Fishbein touch—entitled to hold office in the association. The various councils test pharmaceuticals, foods, cosmetics, and appliances; they also approve medical schools and hospitals. AMA approval is accepted by State licensing boards for medical-school graduates, and hospitals without AMA certification for intern training are almost impossible to staff. These life-and-death powers bind medical schools and the hospitals to the AMA chariot.

The drug manufacturers also have a natural community of interest with the AMA, but the AMA does not rely on naturopathy. Its seal of approval is the pearl beyond price of drug advertising, and the manufacturers and the retailers are ever ready to set their hand to the preservation of the fundamental American liberties of the men in white.

No government would lightly launch an attack upon such a Wehrmacht or fight the doctors frontally on the issue of insurance. If the doctors maintained a united front, the Government might get medical insurance but no medicine. "You can't mine coal"—or gallstones—"with flags." The adoption of Government insurance has encountered bitter resistance from the profession in most countries; in Germany in 1883 and in England in 1911 organized medicine actually called a strike, which failed in both cases for the same reason, namely, that a majority of the practitioners preferred the future contingency of slavery to the present certainty of starvation. But the AMA has spurned the strike proposal, currently advanced by a group called the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, as "a strike against the sick public." Doctors are professional men.

Or so they think until they run up against the AMA lock-out. Expulsion from the association, invariably preceded or followed by expulsion from the county and State societies, is a doctor's death warrant. Once expulsion meant charlatanism; today it more often means political deviationism. In 1930 Dr. Louis Schmidt, the urologist, courted and won expulsion for advertising his VD clinic to the poor. The Journal addressed itself, not to the great Schmidt, but to the little Smiths: "The individual who violates the rules in a zealous search for an answer to the problem"—of extending medical care—"may overstep the bounds and thereby suffer loss of his relationships to the organized medical profession. When he does so, he is answerable to his own folly, since the organized medical profession has established means whereby an individual may assure himself that the system which he wishes to practice is for the public good and at the same time not a detriment to the practice of medicine." There, beneath the gauze of gobbledygook, was the party line; all who ran might read.

Last spring some 140 doctors who disapproved of Government insurance publicly protested the AMA's $25 assessment for its "national education campaign" against the Truman health program. They suggested that the fund be used to work out a better medical program than Truman's. One of the group, a prominent pediatrician, received a letter from the State health officer of Arkansas a few days after the protest was published: " * * * The Arkansas State Medical Society and the Pulaski County Medical Society have been advised through authoritative sources that you were one of the 136 signers of certain papers and documents severely criticizing the American Medical Association. Through this action on your part, the Arkansas State Medical Society and the Pulaski County Medical Society request that you not appear on the postgraduate pediatric course to be conducted [at the University of Arkansas]. * * * This department sincerely regrets that this most embarrassing situation has arisen and further regrets that it is necessary to cancel your appointment as special consultant for the Arkansas State Board of Health."

The officers and the trustees of the AMA are almost invariably prosperous specialists. And the members of the house of delegates are almost invariably selected by committees appointed by the presidents of the State societies, who are almost invariably prosperous specialists. The association's leadership represents the members, but it may not be impossible that it represents them not as they are, but as they would like to be. It certainly does not represent the ill-fed one-third of the medical profession. In the monthly Medical Economics, we learn that "the delegates [to the December 1946 meeting] met in an atmosphere of high optimism over the national [Eightieth congressional] election results. Dr. Harrison Shoulders, AMA president, put into words: 'For the first time in many years, we're meeting in an atmosphere that approaches freedom.'"

The high optimism of the AMA was not always based on the national election results. Once upon a time its leaders were the leaders of advance in medical education and medical practice. Once upon a time its presidents—Billings, Gorgas, Blue, Bevan, Lambert, Harris—advocated Government medical insurance and its committee on social insurance prepared a model bill providing it. Once upon a time its house of delegates adopted its board of trustees' report that "the time has come when we can no longer resist the social movement, and it is better that we should initiate the social changes than have them forced on us," and its Journal demanded Government insurance and excoriated the British Medical Association for opposing it.

But that was once upon a time. The British Medical Association had opposed the National Health Insurance Act of 1911, which provided government medical insurance of low-income workers. Within a year after its adoption, more than half the doctors in England were voluntarily enrolled, and the BMA was forced to release its members from the association's refusal to work the act. "The important feature of the British Act," said the Journal of the American Medical Association in 1912, "is the recognition that it is the duty of society, as represented by the government, to furnish medical treatment for those who are unable to secure it for themselves. It also means the recognition of the modern physician as a health officer of the State, working for the general good, rather than a private or professional businessman."

In 1915, community sickness surveys by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., the New York State Board of Charities, and other agencies revealed an appalling inadequacy of medical care, and the AMA established its social-insurance committee. In its first report the committee asserted that after 25 years of experience with various forms of voluntary insurance several European countries realized that the "logical conclusion" was compulsory state insurance. This, in the committee's opinion, was the only solution to the problem of the poor and the problem, as well, of "the unfortunate physician facing starvation."

In its second report, a year later, the committee said that wherever compulsory insurance had been introduced, the result had been improvement in the general health and prolonged life to the workers. "The advantages of these systems are so great that the disadvantages, while it is necessary to combat them, cannot be mentioned in comparison * * *. Blind opposition, indignant repudiation, bitter denunciation of these laws is worse than useless; it leads nowhere and it leaves the profession in a position of helplessness if the rising tide of social development sweeps over them." After listening to an attack on the report by a representative of the Prudential Life Insurance Co., the association's section on public health rejected it by a 24-20 vote. It was a narrow repulse.

"It is interesting to think," says the History of the American Medical Association, "what might have happened to social insurance if the war had not intervened." Though innumerable county and State societies had endorsed Government insurance and the model bill had been introduced in 14 legislatures, war prosperity reduced the

pressure for legislation, and postwar normalcy turned the tide. In spite of the plea by its president-elect that the AMA resist the insurance companies, which were lobbying against the bill, the 1919 convention recognized the stupendous character of the problem and buried the committee's report, along with the committee. "It is not a question for the decision of the medical profession," said the committee, "whether or not these laws shall be put in force. * * * It is for the profession to decide whether or not it wishes to carry on its existence under some form of sickness insurance or under some method of state medicine. That choice must inevitably be made."

The 1920 convention declared its opposition to the institution of any plan embodying a system of compulsory contributory insurance against illness. The 1921 convention spent its time defining state medicine and listening to emphatic denunciations of health centers, group medicine, and diagnostic clinics, and the 1922 convention declared its opposition to all forms of state medicine. The discussion was closed. The pages of the Journal were closed, too. In 1924, Assistant Editor Fishbein became Editor Fishbein, and Government insurance became socialized medicine, political medicine, assembly-line medicine, and peasant medicine. Medical service reform of any kind was thereafter damned from hell to breakfast and from week to week.

In darkest 1932, the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care, headed by Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, president of Stanford University and a former president of the AMA, recommended voluntary medical insurance. The Journal called the recommendation socialism and communism. But there were doctors whose shrunken stomachs would no longer tolerate epithets, and group practices with insurance plans sprang up everywhere. The Journal called them medical sacrilege. The hard-hit hospitals accepted the Blue Cross insurance plan. The AMA wouldn't touch it. Medical ethics required the doctor to serve the sick—and forbade him to solicit patients. Thousands of doctors sat in their offices—and waited; millions of sick persons lay in their homes—and waited. Maybe the Wilbur report was socialism and communism, but it revealed that in the peak year of 1929 one-third of the doctors in America had had net incomes under $3,000, and one-half under $3,800.

Though the AMA succeeded in eliminating a medical insurance provision from the Social Security Act of 1935, the California Medical Society had already established an insurance plan. Other States followed. The AMA could not purge whole State societies. It had to backwater. It began forgetting all about the evil of contract medicine and ended by pointing with pride to the State society plans as the alternative to Government insurance. It was the same with hospital insurance. By the end of the 1930's the Blue Cross plans were so well entrenched (over AMA opposition) that the association had to recognize them (on the condition, of course, that the doctor's bill remain uncovered). Three years ago, the Blue Shield plans for limited medical care were started. Last June the AMA declared a "complete separation" from Blue Shield, but an amiable one. The association could no longer afford to condemn the plans; it was using them as its stick to beat Government insurance.

The medical soviets—group practices with insurance plans of their own—which were outside the control of the State societies were given the old cold pogrom treatment. The Lenin Medical Center of Chicago could not even find out why its staff was eliminated by the Chicago Medical Society. Testifying before a Senate committee in 1946, a representative of the Center told of the effects of the blacklist. Because the AMA required local medical society membership for staff members of hospitals accredited for intern training, the center's physicians had access only to two inconveniently located hospitals, and, denied staff membership even in these, found it almost impossible to get beds for patients. The center's staff members were refused membership on the staff of any teaching or research institution. They were excluded from carrying their share of care of the indigent in hospital wards and dispensaries. They were refused accreditation by specialty boards. No insurance company would issue them malpractice policies. The Navy automatically disqualified them as medical officers, and reciprocal licensure in neighboring States was automatically closed to them.

The procedure was the same all over the country, in Dallas, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, New York, and in little Elk City, Okla., where Dr. Michael Shadid's famous cooperative community hospital was supported by the local chamber of commerce. The quality of medical treatment was not questioned; the principle of insurance was decisive, and even this principle had to be abandoned when the State societies started their programs.

What did the AMA want? The conservative Medical Economics quoted a State society executive as saying: "I don't believe the AMA liked voluntary health insurance in the first place. I think the higher-ups would be glad to see them all fail. The AMA has tremendous power. It has some good men. It has lots of brains and lots of money. But it isn't interested. And that's too bad."

It was too bad, and it was getting worse. In 1937 a group of Government employees in Washington organized the Group Health Association for full medical care on an insurance basis, and when the Journal announced that "physicians who sell their services to an organization like the Group Health Association for resale to patients are certain to lose their professional status," Assistant Attorney General Arnold lifted his ears. The Medical Association of the District of Columbia initiated the pogrom—even threatening that members who consulted with group health doctors would be expelled—and when a group doctor was expelled in 1938 the Government brought suit against the AMA and the District of Columbia Medical Society for conspiracy in restraint of trade. The Supreme Court unanimously upheld the decision against the defendants in 1943. The AMA was told to cease and desist from its interference with medical practice and was fined $2,500.

Frustrated by the Federals, the AMA, like so many associations before and since, turned to the States for aid and abetment. In 1939 the New Jersey Legislature enacted a health-insurance-plan law providing that all members of the governing body of any such plan be approved by the State medical society and permitting such a plan to operate only in counties in which not less than 51 percent of the doctors approved it. Some 25 legislatures have since passed remarkably similar laws—most of them in the war-distracted sessions of 1943 and 1945. The State societies not only sponsored the laws, but proudly claimed paternity. The voluntary way, which was once socialism and communism, is now the American way, providing that the AMA has a monopoly on volunteering.

Enlightened conservatives within the profession pressed the AMA to stave off Government insurance with a genuine program of medical service reform. The committee of physicians—including such formidable names as Peters of New Haven, Holt of Baltimore, Cabot of Rochester, Morgan of Nashville, Veeder of St. Louis, Frothingham and Osgood of Boston, and Cooley of Detroit—came before the board to plead for a program. The upshot was still another promise of still another survey. But the surveys all came to nothing, and the committee of physicians abandoned hope in the AMA and accepted the principle of Government insurance. When President Truman proposed legislation in 1945, the association came up with a program which began with improved living conditions and ended with postponement of consideration of revolutionary changes while 60,000 medical men are in the service voluntarily and 12,000,000 men and women are in uniform.

It was not only the unions that demanded Government insurance now, or the radicals, the reformers, and Mrs. Roosevelt; it was also conservatives like A. D. Lasker, David Sarnoff, Gerard Swope, and Lessing Rosenwald. "Too many doctors," Bernard Baruch told some of them, "have been fighting a rear-guard action for too long. Voluntary health insurance is not good enough. A sizable segment of society does not earn enough to pay for it. Nothing has been suggested so far which promises success other than some form of insurance covering those people in by law and financed by the Government, at least in part. * * * A form of compulsory insurance can be devised without the Government's taking over medicine, something I would fiercely oppose."

Those who opposed the status quo in medical care were driven, nolo volo, into the Government insurance camp, while those who favored the status quo in everything else found in organized medicine a new sounding board. In 1938 the Physicians Committee for Free Enterprise in Medicine appeared, under the auspices of Frank Gannett's Committee to Uphold the Constitution. This committee evaporated a year later, and its place was taken by the National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Care. Both physicians' committees, oddly enough, were directed by the same man, who, oddly enough, wasn't a physician but a professional advertising man. But the board members of the national physicians committee were all officers or past officers of the AMA or its State societies, and Morris Fishbein sat in on the committee's organization. The representatives of the big drug houses sat in, too.

The NPC had AMA approval and plenty of money. Twelve thousand newspapers received its canned editorials weekly, and a Nation-wide network of speakers was made available to civic, social, and fraternal organizations. At least 23,000,000 copies of its basic pamphlet were distributed under 2 different covers—1 for the medical profession under the title "$4,000,000,000 of Political Medicine Yearly in the United States," the other for businessmen under the title "Abolishing Private Medical Practice—Prelude to Centralized Control of the Professions and of Industry." The pamphlet depicted doctors under the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill as "political stooges and henchmen" and called upon them to "demand a continuance of medicine under the Christian concept of the sanctity of the human personality—the American way."

The arsenal was down to the dumdum bullet that the AMA had never fired. Morris Fishbein had never been accused of anti-Semitism. A year ago the NPC sent every doctor in the country "one of the few really vital pronouncements of the age," a statement by Dan Gilbert, an old "sidekick" of the notorious Gerald Winrod. The statement began, "Dear Christian American." In the ensuing uproar, the Journal condemned the statement and repudiated "allies of doubtful repute in its campaign for the maintenance of a high quality of medical care and for freedom in medicine in our country."

III

Out of the welter of words there emerge—rather, there can be mined—one grand fancy and a half dozen grand facts on the issue of medical insurance.

The fancy, or hallucination, seems to be almost universal in the medical profession. The doctor thanks God that he is as other men are. He is not. He sees himself as a free agent, with duties, to be sure, but with duties that are private and are due to private persons, in particular those private persons who pay him for his services. He calls himself a private practitioner. He is wrong.

His practice has been public, and a public duty, since the time of Moses, when the law was promulgated "of him in whom is the plague of leprosy, whose hand is not able to get that which pertaineth to his cleansing." "Medicine," said Wendell Berge, with less authority but more recency, "may or may not be state medicine; it cannot escape being social medicine." The doctor has always been "clothed with a public interest"; he has been licensed for centuries. He is not a tradesman, and he does not enjoy a tradesman's prerogatives or immunities; he has never been allowed to refuse his services or plead caveat emptor. The sliding scale of fees, asserted in Leviticus, attests his servitude to public need.

Medicine's ace in the hole, or Sunday punch, is the sacred relationship between doctor and patient. We are told that this sacred relationship would be destroyed by Government intervention. Besides being an ace in the hole and a Sunday punch, the sacred relationship is a bag of bones. Common kindness is sacred, but it isn't medical; as medicine, it is sacred only to the psychosomatist, not to the prostatist or the proctologist. The doctor's only sacred relationship—like the priest's, the teacher's, and, incidentally, the lawyer's—is to his profession. What makes a profession a profession is that it professes something, namely, the obligation of its practice. The doctor's profession obligates him to heal the sick, at any cost, at all costs, or at none; though the heavens fall, the landlord evicts, the shoe store replevins, and the public service corporation shuts off the gas.

"Socialized medicine," says the AMA, "would abolish private practice." How would it abolish private practice? It would abolish private practice by putting an end to the doctor's—and the patient's—"freedom of choice." There is just enough truth in this charge to tangle the falsehood. Under Government insurance, the patient can go to any doctor he wants to and the doctor can take any patient he wants to, but insurance covers care only by those doctors (upward of 90 percent in most insurance countries, including England) who choose to enter the plan. Millions of Americans, geographically or economically isolated, now have access to one doctor or none. The AMA would preserve their present freedom of choice.

Though they have sacred relationships and freedom of choice, doctors are men, not gods, and men must eat. Morris Fishbein let them know that the AMA protected their earnings from the ravages of socialized medicine. This, too, was true—that is, 10 percent true. It was true of the top 10 percent of the profession, who, as in England, could remain outside the medical insurance program and continue anointing the top 10 percent of the populace. For the other 90 percent of the profession, the $12,000 maximum income allowed under the English system probably looks pretty good, and the English practitioner's $8,000 average doesn't look bad, especially since American earnings, like everything else American, would be higher. Raymond T. Rich, hired in 1946 to survey the AMA's public relations, came up with the conclusion that they were bad, and resigned with the statement that its policy had, unfortunately, identified the organization with the economic interest of the doctor.

IV

The half dozen hard facts about medical insurance argue persuasively—but not overwhelmingly—for compulsion.

The most persuasive fact is that, unlike the cost of food, clothing, shelter, recreation, and education, the cost of medical care to this man this year is wholly unpredictable and ought, therefore, like the cost of fire and death, to be spread over a lifetime. Insurance is the American, that is, the sensible way to do this. The second most persuasive fact bears on the question, voluntary or compulsory insurance? Those citizens who need medical insurance the most are, like those motorists who need personal liability insurance the most, precisely those who cannot afford it. And the poor man, like the poor jalopy, is out of order oftener and longer than the rich and, in his jalopic condition, more of a menace to the common weal than his dynaflow brother.

The third most central fact is that most voluntary medical insurance covers only surgery or catastrophic illness, and then only in part. General Manager Lull of the AMA says that, "given enough time, our plan will take care of anybody's catastrophic illness in the United States." There are three jokers in that promise. The incidental joker is our plan, the AMA having fought our plan—voluntary insurance—for 30 years. The minor joker is given enough time, the catastrophically ill being just cantankerous enough to want treatment now. The major joker is catastrophic illness.

There is a clutter kind of illness than the catastrophic: the chronic. No voluntary plan dares to cover the full cost of chronic illness, and few of them cover any part of it. In addition, the greatest need in health is not cure at all, but prevention. While regular medical examination is only one form of prevention and, like all medical attention, only a secondary form, it is established that the two great killers, heart disease and cancer, can, in a substantial proportion of instances, be checked upon early discovery. The Committee on the Costs of Medical Care—the Wilbur report—found that fewer than 7 percent of the American people had even partial medical examination in 1930. The voluntary plans are almost all limited to curative care.

The voluntary plans now cover an inadequate number of people inadequately, and always will. The reason is cost. The National Education Campaign of the American Medical Association, Whitaker & Baxter, directors, asserts, in red, white, and blue, that "an average, fully-approved plan, for full coverage—surgical, medical, and hospital protection—charges $2.50 a month for an individual and $5.50 for a family, irrespective of size." The truth is that the fullest-coverage Blue Shield—nonprofit—plan costs $5.50 a month for a couple and $8.10 for a three-child family, and it does not provide full coverage. It excludes optical care, mental care, industrial accidents, dental fillings, inlays and dentures, prophylaxis for noncommunicable diseases, medicines for nonhospital cases, chronic cases beyond one year, and, among other things, preexisting conditions. Full coverage isn't offered because the rate would price it out of the market.

The high cost of voluntary plans results in cream-skimming, and their history in Europe reveals a tapering-off after a high proportion of the middle classes have been reached. The Blue Shield plans—for limited medical and surgical care—are only 3 years old and are growing fast, with 12,500,000 current subscribers. But some large proportion of these must be included in the 34,500,000 subscribers to the Blue Cross plans for limited hospital care, and the Blue Cross rate of growth is now declining. The total of partial hospitalization coverage—not medical or surgical—is about one-third of the population, if the AMA is to be believed.

Not everybody believes that the AMA is to be believed. President Truman, in his medical insurance message to Congress last spring, said that "only 3,500,000 of our people have insurance which provides anything approaching adequate health protection." The chairman of the board of the AMA replied that 10 or 15 years ago this was true. Today 55,000,000 Americans are protected under the voluntary health insurance systems of this country against the cost of hospital care, and 37,000,000 policyholders are insured against surgical or medical bills."

In view of Morris Fishbein's statement 2 months earlier that more than 1,000,000 were covered by complete medical care programs by the end of 1947, Truman's figure is probably generous. But the new figure of 37,000,000 insured against surgical or medical bills stands in more than remarkable contrast to Truman's 3,500,000. How many of the 37,000,000 are covered for all (not just catastrophic) surgical and (not or) medical care? What does 37,000,000 policyholders mean? Does it mean persons, or does it mean policies? And what kinds of policies are included? Workmen's compensation? Veterans' care? Commercial insurance, at rates prohibitive even to the middle classes? Newspaper accident policies? How many of the 37,000,000 policyholders also have hospital coverage? Were there 61,000,000 persons with prepaid health care in September 1949, as the AMA said there were, when there were only 55,000,000 hospital policyholders in April 1949, and only 15,000,000, according to the AMA, in 1944?

No consideration is more essential in the resolution of the medical insurance issue than the figures on voluntary coverage; if the American people can insure themselves against the cost of sickness, they should resist Government intervention to the death. And the figures on voluntary coverage can be got. The Government could get them with the greatest difficulty. The American Medical Association could get them with the greatest ease. Why haven't they been got?

Either the disparity between 37,000,000 and 3,500,000 is attributable to honest differences in calculation—in which case a count is indicated—or the Government or the American Medical Association is an egregious enemy of public intelligence.

In the pre-inflation year of 1939, the AMA's Bureau of medical economics published a chart showing that only families with incomes over $3,000 were medically self-sustaining. No lower-income group was self-sustaining even for minor illnesses, much less for catastrophic or chronic. Eight years later the Journal was still perspiring over the "misuse of American Medical Association data," but the chart simply cannot be read two ways.

Adjusting the 1939 figure for the 1947 price level, the Journal admitted that the $3,000 would be the equivalent of 1947's $4,800, an income then enjoyed by only 21 percent of the families of the country. (In 1939 only 8 percent had incomes of $3,000 or more.) Thus in 1939 nine-tenths (and in 1947 four-fifths) of all American families were unable, according to the AMA, to afford the cost of chronic or catastrophic illness or even of all minor illnesses.

In the face of this figure, organized medicine's remedy was "a little common sense economy" by "the average man," who is "quite efficient" in planning the cost of radio sets and baseball tickets. The United States Chamber of Commerce liked common sense economy, too, as the solution to a desperate national problem, and suggested, in a pamphlet called You and Socialized Medicine, that a nation which spent $10,000,000,000 a year for liquor could pay its doctor bills. The Chicago Tribune, an even more rapturous advocate of freedom, said that Government medical insurance meant that the "provident" would have to take care of the "improvident," and declared, with unbridled intuition, that "the really poor are already provided medical care by public and private charity." Another AMA ally, the National Economic Council, Inc., found that Government insurance was "explicitly Marxist," since "the basic principle of Marxism is

'from each according to his ability, to each according to his need.'" (This basic principle of Marxism was first asserted, as every national economic counselor knows, in verses 34 and 35 of chapter 4 of the Acts of the Apostles in that popular Marxist handbook, the Holy Bible.)

As the clamor for medical insurance rose ever higher, the AMA yielded ever faster, but always too little and too late. It was willing to have "State aid"—this on the assumption that the State had it to give—dispensed to the "indigent" by the medical profession. It came ultimately to its latest Maginot Line of defense, the profusion of Federal funds for State aid, "where needed," to the "medically indigent." By the AMA's own reckoning, four-fifths of the families of America would be taking means tests to receive medical care.

This formula is embodied in a bill introduced by Senator TAFT in the current Congress. Senator SMITH of New Jersey, another AMA ally, reported a few months ago that every governor, with the exception of one, either is definitely opposed to the compulsory plan or says definitely they want the plan worked out by their States with Federal aid. The State-aid program has been uniformly branded by its opponents—and the history of child-labor and minimum-wage legislation by the States may be instructive on this point—as a device for killing action.

V

There are good arguments against Government medical insurance, but they do not touch the fact of the national need. There is the argument that free, that is, tax-paid, medical care would be abused by hypochondriacs and malingerers. The British Minister of Health, Aneurin Bevan, said soberly, when the plan was established in England a year ago, that this is a very great test of the maturity of the British people, insofar as they have all the resources of the medical profession at their disposal without charge. Government insurance would test the maturity of the American people, too; but so, in some measure, do the voluntary plans. A check in Birmingham, England, after 4 months of the plan, showed that 97 percent of the persons tested for glasses actually needed them. Senator TAFT's unsupported assertion that the English experience has been that millions rush to doctors for every little ache or pain, just because it is free, is contradicted by the testimony of the esteemed London Lancet: "Practitioners, whether in town or country, agree that they are making hardly any more, and sometimes fewer, visits than they usually do at this time of year. Every account agrees that frivolous complaints are no more common than before."

The AMA maintains, though America has more doctors for its population than England, that there are not enough doctors to meet the national need. In the past 40 years, while the population of the United States has increased by more than two-thirds, the annual output of medical-school graduates has remained almost unchanged at 5,000, and the AMA's interest in extending medical training is, like all its new interests, little and late. But this condition, coupled with the national need, would seem to argue for the systematic extension of medical training correlated with the systematic extension of insurance. There is the contention that a physician with 3,000 patients, even though only a small minority of them would be sick at any one time, would have to treat them superficially. On these two deadly serious points, the medical profession, and the medical profession alone, is expert, and one of the major tragedies of the AMA is that its fanaticism has deprived it of expert status.

The question of cost—another consideration which does not nullify the need—is simply unanswerable on the basis of available information. Any estimate would be reckless, and the Government's is more reckless than any other—four to six billion dollars a year. (The Nation's medical bill is at least that high now.) The British underestimated the first year's cost by 100 percent, owing, says Minister of Health Bevan, "to the overwhelming volume of need which the service has revealed. There was a vast amount of silent suffering before." Serious guesses—not the AMA's, which is $18,000,000,000—range up to $8,000,000,000, with a rise for several years at least.

The power to tax is the power to destroy, and the present Senate bill, embodying the Truman program, establishes an open-end account, permitting the use of general funds in the Treasury in addition to the proposed tax of 4 percent (divided evenly between employer and employee) on wages up to $4,800. (The Brookings Institution says the average family spends 4 percent of its income on medical care.) It is clear that a tax subsidy of the "improvident" by the "provident" would be involved; how big it would be no one knows. With the social-security tax rising to 3 percent in 1950, medical insurance, at its cheapest, would mean a fixed 7-percent charge on the economy for social insurance. The choice between guns and butter—or medicine—is a hard one.

Employers are generally unenthusiastic—at least the organizations which speak for them are—about their 2-percent contribution to the medical fund, though individual employers have taken the Government's position that the improved health of their employees would increase productive efficiency that much. The cost of administering the present nonprofit voluntary plans is 12 percent, and bureaucratic profligacy, if it exists, would probably be offset by consolidation. The British sickness-insurance system, operated, like our military conscription system, with volunteer boards, held administrative costs to between 2½ and 3 percent of the first year's expenditures.

The argument against "political medicine" brings the discussion to a lower level more characteristic of the AMA's national education campaign. True, the British doctor complains today of being smothered by forms; true, too, there are nonfilterable, highly reproductive organisms that seem to have red tape in place of red corpuscles, and they turn up in Government service in disproportionate numbers. Doctors, like poets and plumbers, would rather ask silly questions than answer them. But the public business was ever thus, and the more democratic the more thus. "Bureaucracy," however, is not "politics." The AMA never accused the United States Surgeon General of "politics" until he endorsed Government insurance, nor has the Veterans' Administration been accused of dispensing "political medicine." There has not been a breath of "politics" in the English experiment not even according to Morris Fishbein. And in this country Republicans get their mail occasionally, even when Jim Farley was Postmaster General.

The weightiest argument of all against Government insurance is also the most nebulous of all, and it is wholly nonmedical. It involves the interpretation of the already rubberized "general welfare" clause of the Constitution. Medical insurance would certainly extend the economic scope of the Federal power. The Government has for decades been engaged not only in financing but also in performing medical services of particular kinds; and 24,000,000 persons are now so served. But the general power to maintain medical care seems to be, like unemployment compensation or old-age pensions, a categorical enlargement of the welfare function.

The issue is no clearer today than it was when Lincoln set Locke and Mill spinning in their graves by asserting that the function of government was anything its citizens could not do, or could not do as well, for themselves. Historically, there is no demonstrable connection between government medical insurance and despotism; the AMA's howl of "totalitarianism" is of a piece with all its howls. A nation's liberties seem to depend upon heavier and heartier attributes than the liberty to die without medical care. In the end, what the founding fathers called "the peculiar genius" of the people will probably preserve those liberties and its want will lose them, and there is no evidence that it is affronted by compulsory self-insurance for private medical care. It would be better—less risky, let us say—if the voluntary program would work. It would be better yet not to be compelled to do anything, and if (as Hamilton said) men were angels, this might be arranged.

There is a clear and present danger to the democratic process, and that is the unenlightened condition of the public after more than a decade of discussion of a great national issue. But it was the American Medical Association that reduced the issue to the false simplicity of a slugging match.

The character of the discussion has been shockingly low on both sides. What the advocates of Government medical insurance call "national health insurance" is neither health insurance nor insurance, but a tax to insure one, and only one, element of health, namely, medical care. What the AMA calls "socialized medicine," on the other hand, is not socialized medicine at all. But the AMA started it, throwing the whole weight of an honorable profession into a barnyard brawl. The association's first recorded charge of "socialized medicine" against the Government was made in connection with veterans' care. The year was 1926, and the President was Calvin Coolidge. The advocates of Government medical insurance have described it disingenuously as "no different from maintaining the fire department." They have talked about "325,000 preventable deaths every year" and have included 40,000 accidental deaths as, presumably, medically preventable. They cite the rejection—even Bernard Baruch fell for this one—of 5,000,000 draftees for medical causes when some 3,000,000 of these rejects suffered from such medically incurable and unpreventable afflictions as musculoskeletal defects and mental deficiency. They have pinned down cost figures, and pinned them down low, in the absence of adequate information, and even if we had the information the figures could not be pinned down precisely. (Discoveries in cancer or heart disease might cut the Nation's medical bill by 25 percent, and epidemic polio might double it.) They have said that Government insurance would raise the quality of medical care when, for many years at least, it would lower the quality to the total of those served by employing even the incompetent practitioners.

But the advocates are white as snow compared with the men in white. The AMA says that American medicine has made Americans the healthiest, strongest, best-cared-for people on earth, a claim which, even if it could be demonstrated (the Scandinavians, among others, might object), ignores the dominant role of other factors than medicine and the fact that, even medically, American health is traceable in large part to the discoveries of Europeans. It says that in every great nation which has tried government insurance, "the result has been second-rate medical care," when the British Medical Association says that the contrary is true in England—and the AMA itself said 35 years ago that the contrary was true everywhere. It says that a vast bureaucracy of political administrators, clerks, bookkeepers, and lay committees would consume 8 to 10 percent of every pay check, and it says that government insurance would invade your privacy and put both of us under political control. Alfred Emanuel Smith had a word for it.

In a two-way effort to stem the tide, the AMA house of delegates met last December and voted a $3,500,000 war chest for a national education campaign, the money to be raised by a $25 assessment on every member. The session was secret, and the action was not admitted until after the news had leaked out. It was understood that Fishbein, under heavy fire within as well as outside the organization, would not be put in charge, but even so, the reaction was hostile. The assessment—billed by the local societies along with their dues notices—was widely attacked. It was even more widely ignored; it wasn't, apparently, the principle of the thing so much as it was the $25. Six months later the AMA books showed that $2,000,000 had been raised; more than 40 percent of the members had failed to kick in.

The next tack was the adoption of a brand-new 12-point program immediately following the Truman demand for legislation last spring. The program—another AMA declaration of no policy—called for voluntary plans and State aid. While the proponents of government insurance sat back and let the AMA do their work for them, such eminent opponents of government insurance as Minot, Graham, Keefer, Barr, Whipple, O'Leary, Cobb, Sabin, and Goodpasture called the new program a disservice to medicine.

VI

But the sick physicians of the AMA just didn't want to get well. They hired the team of California promoters that had beaten Governor Warren's medical program by the interesting device of buying a minimum of 100 inches of advertising in each of 700 newspapers. Self-advertising, the hoariest of medical heresies, was the order of the day, and the AMA had the word of Whitaker & Baxter that the response from editors in publicity has been far beyond anything we expected." It was good enough for the railroads and the brewers and the utilities, and it was good enough for the holy art of healing. Whitaker & Baxter, loaded with the assessment money, set out to do for America what they had done for California.

Instead of trying to deodorize the AMA, the new promoters took it out and buried it. One hundred forty thousand old family physicians arose in its place, all wearing beards, wing collars, high button shoes, and threadbare frock coats, all keping an all-night vigil at the beside of your curly-headed little child and mine. Keep politics out of this picture. "The Doctor" never was a good painting, even in the Tate Gallery tradition. You may have seen it on your doctor's wall when you were young; it used to be distributed as an advertisement for Petrolagar. It made the doctor feel good. If Whitaker & Baxter are right, it still does.

With Fishbein out of the way, the new campaign is a grass-roots affair reminiscent of the wonderful Willkie boom at the 1940 Republican Convention. The doctor is cautioned against entering too many debates on medical insurance. He is to apply the heat to his patients personally, and the principal physician of every Congressman and every United States Senator is to send his honorable patient a letter telling him of the danger of socialized medicine. The Whitaker & Baxter literature outfishbeins Fishbein; pick it up at your doctor's office and ask him how he likes it.

Whitaker & Baxter are "working with the great newspapers and national magazines to get them to do special jobs," and in one grand spread published in September 1949, Fishbein's dismissal in June 1949 is not even mentioned. But there is some evidence that the great newspapers and the national magazines are not rising to the opportunity of being worked with. M. S. Rukeyser, economic commentator of the great newspapers owned by W. R. Hearst, who hates socialized medicine and the devil, in that order, reported in September that a visiting caravan threw a luncheon party on behalf of the campaign at the Perroquet Room at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York. "They drew modestly," Mr. Rukeyser reported, "on the $2,000,000 which the doctors have made available to the American Medical Association to combat the Truman-sponsored health insurance bill. The representatives of newspapers, magazines, and radio," Mr. Rukeyser went on, "declined to trade their independence in exchange for a little hospitality."

The representatives, while they fished the olives out of their martinis, may have been pondering the reports, lately confirmed by the FBI, of current Department of Justice investigations of the practices of State and local medical societies in Portland, Oreg., New York City, Chicago, Houston, and other cities. The Department's Antitrust Division refuses to discuss the investigations, but its case against the Oregon State Medical Society, the Oregon Physicians' Service, and seven county societies and eight individuals in Oregon was scheduled to go to trial in late October, the Government charging that "the defendants have obstructed medical care organizations other than those sponsored by them * * * hindering competing organizations in their attempts to procure doctors and in obtaining hospital facilities for their members." It was just 10 years ago that the AMA and the District of Columbia Medical Society were convicted of conspiracy to do just that.

Doctors are not as venal as the AMA says they are vestal, but there is no reason for their being perpetual chumps. They should realize by this time—but, then, Louis XVI should have realized before the Champ de Mars—that not even an honorable campaign to hold on to all they have, or all they wish they had, will save them from the clamor of millions of people for a new equity in society, for (quite literally) a new lease on life. The medical-insurance bills made further progress in Congress each time they were buried under AMA pressure, furthest of all in the last session, when no fewer than 17 alternatives to the Truman program went into the hopper.

The members of the medical profession will either accept the fact that the twentieth century—the first half, if not the second—is here or lose their freedom fighting for their freebooting. If socialized medicine—not Government insurance, but socialized medicine—is ever fastened upon this country, the American Medical Association will call Government insurance the American way. But it will be, for the last time, too late.

Labor Must Put Wishes of Members Into Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Akron Beacon Journal:

LABOR MUST PUT WISHES OF MEMBERS INTO ACTION

(By L. S. Buckmaster, general president URWA-CIO)

In complex and changing times it is especially difficult to look into a crystal ball and foresee the future.

Rather than being crystal gazers, we have to take an approach more nearly like that of a pilot of a sailboat in a race.

Knowing that his ultimate objective is to win the race, he must chart his immediate course to round the next buoy, taking into account the trim of his ship, the strength and direction of the wind, the roughness of the water and the positions of other boats.

Similarly, while we in the labor movement recognize that our long-range goal is a free and prosperous society in a peaceful world, we must make our current plans in terms of current problems and the changing social, political and economic environment in which we find ourselves.

The activities we undertake in the coming years and the ways we select to carry them out will be to a great extent determined by the activities of other institutions like business and government and the way and extent to which they play a constructive part in developing a healthy, secure and satisfying life for all people.

American labor has its roots deep in the history of our Nation and we today are justly proud of such accomplishments of our fraternal predecessors as our system of free public schools.

The CIO is one of the newer branches in the long development of American labor and it is a fresh and spirited organization.

For many years our chief purpose was to organize the unorganized and to bring the basic benefits of collective bargaining to our members. We now have become a national institution and in order to serve our members well we have to take careful account of the social, political, and economic winds.

We reflect the needs and wishes of the people we represent through the democratic procedures and principles upon which we are organized.

In a sense, what we have to do is to translate the needs and wishes of our people into coordinated actions on the national scene and in the industries and communities in which we operate.

All factors of modern life are important to us. We in labor are charting our course with the idea that the people in this Nation are our real concern, and that our political and economic institutions must serve the people and not be their masters.

While we cannot tell exactly where we are going and how we shall get there, we do have some clear objectives and we can see the general circumstances which will govern our activities in the coming years.

In economic affairs, the measure to which we as a Nation are able to maintain a high and continuous level of prosperity is certainly one of the major conditions to which we will orient our actions. We are aiming for a reduction in the fluctuations of our economy which engender fear in the hearts of our people.

If American business continues to insist that the best way to adjust our economic affairs is by a return to practices which did not work or which caused suffering and hardship on the part of the American worker, then we in American labor will chart our course for strong regulation of those practices which seem to be responsible for the evils which we are trying to prevent.

On the other hand, should American business take an enlightened approach and endeavor to work out adequate protection for our people with fair and unselfish methods

to sustain high employment and production with just compensation, our approach also will be one of cooperation with fewer controls.

On the economic scene there are other equally important factors which must be integrated into our policies. The decisions of the Government in taxes and foreign trade are among other signs by which we in labor will chart our course. Always our interest will be in how those policies and decisions affect the well-being of the American people and our economy.

There are other national circumstances which will help to influence the future policies and programs of our labor unions. Laws and programs which are developed in the political arena will be of compelling concern to us.

But again we are somewhat less concerned with actual laws than with the development of democracy in this Nation so that the laws which are passed will be a true reflection of the attitudes of the American people.

We in the CIO, for instance, are interested in seeing that more and more people every year participate in local, State, and national elections.

We are interested in seeing that every voter has a full opportunity to hear every viewpoint about the questions on which he votes. Anything resembling monopoly control of the press or radio services in a community or nation is certainly not in the best interests of democracy.

Even though those who operate monopolies of press or radio might try to be impartial, they cannot escape from their personal environments and backgrounds, and their comments are something like the book, An Impartial History of the Civil War From the Northern Point of View.

Even with our deeper concern in the democratic processes of our Nation, specific laws which are passed will also guide our actions as labor unions.

Measures such as the Taft-Hartley law, designed to restrict operations of labor unions, will certainly tend to make the policies of labor unions more militant and directly concerned with political affairs.

Our political programs will, however, not be based on any one law. The whole political climate and the extent to which we are able to feel secure as an institution to express freely and work for the welfare of our members will be our guides.

Problems of a social nature are of increasing concern to American workers and to their unions. All the refrigerators, automobiles, and telephones which we can produce will not make for a strong and stable Nation if the people are plagued with fears of old age, dissatisfaction with their jobs, or inadequate educational opportunities for their children.

The recent drive by many CIO unions for adequate pensions, for example, is but part of developing a meaningful and secure role for older people. As we get deeper and deeper into this question, we see crucial problems arising in such areas as community recreation and adult education.

Health clinics and family counseling agencies will undoubtedly have to be expanded to meet increasing stresses of industrial city life. Labor will be more and more active in these social needs of our members and their communities, for we aim to have a population which is happy as well as prosperous and healthy.

We in labor must have the support and active cooperation of other groups to obtain these economic, political, and social objectives, not only for industrial workers but also for farmers, office workers, and others who are a part of our Nation.

The problem of how we can integrate our activities with those of other groups will be important in the coming years. Our success will be small unless we can achieve some unity of thinking about our basic national needs and objectives.

I believe that it is healthy to have as much of an exchange of information and direct contact among members of various groups as possible. In so doing we will be able better to orient our activities to the problems of all the people of our Nation.

The collective bargaining process is one of the best ways of achieving necessary social and economic improvements for the welfare of the working people. It is through collective bargaining that the needs and wishes of the working people are brought to the direct attention of management.

The bargaining table can be one of the bulwarks of freedom in our Nation, but if management regards collective bargaining as something distasteful and the needs of the workers as something which they would rather not bother with, then the unions will be forced to achieve social and economic objectives through legislation.

But it is not only in labor and management that joint efforts can be constructive. Labor and education, for example, can make important contributions to each other.

Labor unions and the medical profession also have a vast area in which cooperative action will be necessary. How we will integrate these and other aspects of our national activities is problematical, but that we shall do so I believe is certain.

We are living in a divided world with the awesome prospect of raising our children to be consumed by atomic explosions. One part of the world is being drawn closer together because the tentacles of the Kremlin are pulling it together.

Our part of the world is being pushed together by the existence of such external forces as the malignant growth of communism and fascism.

I have a faith, however, that our unity will emerge the stronger because we are free men joining together and integrating our institutions and our individual lives out of a common desire for freedom.

Our unity is becoming one of cooperation rather than compulsion. Compulsion is confinement. Cooperation is creation.

Panama Canal Tolls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress a special subcommittee, of which I am chairman, and Representatives TOM B. FUGATE and E. T. MILLER are members, conducted an investigation into the financial operation of the Panama Canal and Panama Canal tolls, pursuant to House Resolution 44. An interim report of that investigation, submitted on August 23, 1949, is contained in House Report 1304, Eighty-first Congress. A final report will be submitted at an early date.

The studies of this subcommittee have clearly indicated that the Panama Canal presents issues of the gravest national and international importance, in which the toll question and the physical form of the future canal are definitely linked. These subjects are now being extensively discussed in the maritime industry of the United States as matters of vital concern to ship operation.

In this connection, I invite special attention to a selected bibliography in the Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States which I placed in an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1949.

As illustrative of the current Canal discussions in marine periodicals there appeared an instructive editorial in the September 1949 issue of Marine Progress, a magazine that is devoted to the interests of the American merchant marine and the improvement of our waterways.

The text of this editorial follows:

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS

The postponement until April 1, 1950, of the decision to increase the tolls for transiting the Panama Canal from 90 cents to a dollar a ton will give the industry more time to prepare for congressional study a complete presentation of its views concerning the manner of computing charges, of levying tolls, of the proportion which commercial shipping should pay, the portion that should be charged to national defense, and other facets of this question that need futher polishing to bring out their principal characteristics.

The decisions reached in respect to the Canal tolls may have a strong influence on the future physical changes to be made in the Canal—whether it will remain a lock canal, a sea-level canal, or a terminal lake canal. Since commercial shipping is to bear a large part of the cost, and possibly all of it, the final decision is bound to be most important to that group that habitually use the waterway on their normal voyages.

PRINCIPAL USERS

Operators under the American flag who are the greatest users of the Canal are those in the intercoastal trades. In addition to these, there is also a large group engaged in international trade between the east coast of the United States and the west coast of South America and other groups, although smaller, in the west coast of the United States to the east coast of South America trade. To a still lesser degree is the group using the waterway for trans-Pacific voyages and also the tanker companies operating on a number of routes, some of which do not touch at United States continental ports. All these operators have a stake in the toll controversy. While the principal interest in the Congress is for the American operators, any change made will also affect a large number of foreign-flag operators who pay the going toll.

The present toll increase reached the proclamation stage by the easiest of routes. While any such major change would normally call for hearings, the proposed toll increase came about first by a recommendation of the Washington office of the Panama Canal, which, seeing the need for additional revenue under its system of bookkeeping, recommended that the toll be raised by Presidential proclamation, as provided by law and without any action by the Congress, since the enabling legislation was already law. The recommendation that the toll be increased passed through the normal military channels, reaching first the Governor of the Panama Canal, who approved, then the Secretary of the Army, who also approved and thence to the President's desk. He, too, approved and set the date when the increase would become effective. The date was October 1, 1949, subsequently postponed until April 1, 1949 because of the storm of protests that came up over the shipping horrors. Only within the last fortnight has the date again been postponed and it now stands at April 1, 1950.

Meanwhile the shipping industry got working on the problem and strong representations were made to the President and the Congress by the National Federation of American Shipping, the Association of American Ship Owners, the Pacific American Steamship Association and other groups. The result of this protest was the postponement of the effective date but not the cancellation of the move to increase the tolls.

FINANCIAL ASPECTS

The stirring up of the Panama Canal tolls kettle brought to the surface many things that had been buried for as long as the Canal has existed. Some of these things were relatively unimportant but others were vital insofar as American ship operation was concerned. It was learned, for instance, that in the basic law, passed in 1912, the Congress had reserved to the United States the right to discriminate in favor of the United States ships as far as the fixing of tolls were concerned. This power still lies with the Congress, ready to use if need be.

Another uncovering showed that the figuring of the Panama Canal financial officials resulted in commercial shipping bearing the brunt of the cost of Canal operation if not the cost of its construction. The line separating the commercial aspects of the Canal from the national-defense aspects has never been drawn and it is upon the sharp delineation of these two functions that the answer to the tolls question is said to depend.

Since the Canal government has been traditionally in the hands of the United States Army's Corps of Engineers, the emphasis has been on national defense. When the question arises as to the allocation of funds for the operation and maintenance of the Canal there has been a decided tendency to put the accent on the commercial value of the waterway and to minimize the national-defense aspects of it.

PACIFIC COAST REACTION

Naturally, any attempt to switch the burden of support on commercial shipping, particularly in face of an increase in tolls, brought about some realistic talk concerning the Canal and for what and for whom it was built. The Pacific American Steamship Association published a question-and-answer brochure to show the direction its thinking goes in this controversy.

The PASA showed in its brochure that commercial shipping had paid for all the expenses of putting its vessels through the Canal, all, the civil government expenses, and supplied a surplus of $274,000,000.

On the other hand, the Canal government has, each year, added a 3-percent interest charge on all capital improvements plus the actual construction cost of the waterway, money which is not paid by the Canal to the Treasury nor billed to the Canal by the Treasury. It is, PASA reports, merely a bookkeeping figure in use in the Canal Zone for the purpose of calculating the transit rate.

The American ship operators have not asked for free transits nor have they set a figure which they consider adequate as a toll for transiting the Canal. Since the cost of putting a C-3 vessel through the waterway is $14,000 for the round voyage, the interest in toll increase or decrease is vital to the operators.

What the operators want from the Government is a change in calculation methods for computing the toll. Since military or Government-owned vessels transit the Canal free, the commercial operators see no reason why they should have to have the expense of these transits prorated to the commercial users. Neither do they see any justification for adding to the costs of operation such expenses as maintaining hospitals, schools, recreational areas, policing, sanitary work and many other functions not connected to the work of putting a ship through. They feel that these are the duties of the Government and should be paid by the Government.

The operators also feel very strongly about the 3 percent interest charge which is arbitrarily tacked onto the Canal operating costs. Since it is not payable the continued use of the device to extract added revenue is seen as being unfair and unjust.

Since the Pacific coast ports of the United States bear the brunt of the Canal transit costs, since most of the transited cargo is discharged there and transportation costs are normally added to the cost of the merchandise, the interest of the Pacific American Steamship Association is a legitimate one requiring the support of the entire industry.

RECOMMENDATIONS

There has been enough discussion of the problem before the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries for it to make some recommendations before the hearings are completed.

The first recommendation is that the President be requested to cause a study to be made of the organizational aspects of all phases of the Panama Canal, including the Panama Railroad, and that his recommendations of suitable changes be furnished to the Congress. Inasmuch as the problem has recently been considered by the General Accounting Office and the Bureau of the Budget, it is believed that this study may be concluded within the present calendar year, and in any event not later than January 31, 1950.

The second recommendation was that in the meantime the pending proclamation No. 2775, be withheld until a decision is reached as to the final organization of the Panama Canal.

This latter recommendation has already been carried out and the proposed increase has been postponed until next April.

While no formal recommendation was made the subcommittee said that it would like to call attention to a possible improvement in the Canal itself at comparatively low cost. This is the completion of the third locks project, where much of the excavation work has been completed and which has been modified to include the terminal lake plan. This plan will include the elimination of the Pedro Miguel Locks, the concentration of the three western flights in a single structure at Miraflores and the creation of an artificial lake between Miraflores Locks and the entrance to Gaillard Cut. This lake would eliminate lock surges, now present at Pedro Miguel, provide anchorage for locked-through ships in case of fog in the cut, with a subsequent faster transit when the fog lifted, plus other benefits.

Nehru, Asia, and America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. J. J. Singh.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

NEHRU, ASIA, AND AMERICA

(By J. J. Singh)

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, arrived in the Nation's Capital on October 11 and left from New York on November 7. Nehru spent 27 days in the United States (3 were spent in Ottawa and Vancouver). During this period, he visited Washington, D. C., New York, Boston, Chicago, Knoxville, White Sulphur Springs, San Francisco, and Madison, Wis. In every city he visited, he spoke at innumerable public and semipublic gatherings. He also met and talked to scores of Americans who called upon him in every city.

Almost every minute of his time was taken up. Nehru willingly subjected himself to this gruelling schedule, which left him little time to sleep or rest, because he wanted to know and understand America and Americans. His thirst for discovery of America, as President Truman had called it, was overpowering and unquenchable. Title of one of Nehru's books is Discovery of India.

Let it be stated right here that America had a terrific impact upon Nehru. It is true that as a keen student of history, as an author, as a well read, well traveled and well-informed man, he knew America through its history, its literature, its modern skyscraper civilization, and through his personal contacts with scores of Americans in Europe, England and India. But nothing in the past had created such an impact upon him as did his 27-day stay in this country. Nehru felt drawn toward the people of America as the people of America felt drawn toward him. A new bond of "emotional awareness" of each other was created—a bond that did not exist before. Frankly, Nehru had a cynical approach toward America—an approach of a cultured intellectual who, perhaps, said to himself, "So America is the richest country in the world, it is the most powerful country in the world, and it has this and it has that. So what? Is this all that counts in life? Aren't there other values?"

This visit proved to Nehru that there were other values in America. He looked into the eyes of the average common Americans and found kindliness and friendliness. He found that Americans are not all hard-boiled, hard-headed, hard-hearted, and drunk with power. He found that Americans were, just like any other people, basically decent and good. He found that Americans were not robots, that they were human beings who loved their children, affectionately patted their dogs, and tended to flowers.

Nehru was also very much pleased to find that, by and large, Americans had great friendship for the people of India. In one of my talks with him, Nehru told me, "I cannot add anything to your knowledge of this country. (I have lived here for 23 years), but I do want to tell you that there is a great fund of good will here for India."

Anyone who watched Nehru on the day of his departure for England could not have helped but notice that he was almost sad that the time for bidding farewell had come. I was standing close to him when newspapermen asked him for a final word. Nehru said: "My final word is of deep gratitude to the people of America for their kindness and friendship. * * * I hope we shall meet again." When he said that his voice displayed emotion and his ever-expressive eyes seemed to be saying, "Will it be so?"

Such was America's impact upon Nehru. Did Nehru create any impact upon Americans? From what information I have been able to collect from varied sources the general consensus is that Nehru created a most profound effect upon Americans who saw

him, met him, and listened to him. One thing stands out in all the impressions I have heard—Nehru's utter sincerity, straightforwardness, and fearlessness. Many were amazed that the head of a government, a leader of 355,000,000 people, could be so outspoken and truthful. There was nothing "off the record" with Nehru. What he told President Truman, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, or other high officials in private conferences, he repeated in public. It is quite possible that other world leaders may emulate Nehru and take the people into their confidence instead of presenting them with fait accompli.

However, it would be indulging in wishful thinking if we were to assume that all sections of American people and the American press were sold on Nehru. Many have remained critical. But I realize to suggest that his critics are rather impatient and impatient. These critics, who mostly represent a small section of the American press and a much smaller section of the American people, and who are advocates of the theory, "Let's go and drop the atom bomb on the Russians before they drop it on us," had mistakenly expected that Nehru, upon his first contact with America, would hasten to declare that he had joined their ranks.

Anyone who had at all taken the trouble to study Nehru's background, his philosophy and thinking, should have known that he would not join the advocates of another war. Nehru abhors wars and is convinced, like so many other thinking men, that wars do not solve any problems. He, like most human beings, wants peace, even though he is not a "peace at all costs" man. Nehru repeatedly said that peace couldn't be preserved by surrendering to aggression or "by compromising with evil or injustice."

Almost 90 percent of the newspaper and radio stories and the comments before Nehru's arrival, and during his stay, and since Nehru's departure, have mentioned Nehru's "neutrality" in the cold war between Russia and the western democracies. I am sorry to see that, notwithstanding Nehru's forthright statement on the "neutrality" issue, which he made on the third day after his arrival in this country, his position remains misunderstood. Speaking before the United States Congress, Nehru said: "Where freedom is menaced or justice threatened, or where aggression takes place, we cannot and shall not be neutral."

What could be more lucid and to the point? India has not been and is not "neutral" today. India, as Nehru said, is in a "pivotal" position and could not remain "neutral" even if she so desired. India and Nehru could not remain neutral between good and evil, or between democracy and totalitarianism. (Nehru, in his speech in Chicago on October 26, said that under the Soviet system "individual freedom ceases to exist.")

At this stage I am sure the question is likely to be asked that if that is so why doesn't India join America, a democracy, against Russia, a totalitarian state? That would be oversimplification of the problem.

In a most delightful and illuminating talk with Nehru on this subject, I thoroughly understood his position. Nehru said to me, "I am not a dictator * * * India is a democracy—I must carry my people with me." The last sentence, "I must carry my people with me," tells the whole story. It spells out the problem. And that problem is that the vast majority of the people of India are suspicious of America—not that America has done anything, but because of the 200 years of British rule in India. Let us not forget or overlook a simple, a very simple fact: The Americans speak the same language as the British do, the Americans look like the British, eat like the British, and dress like the British—and people of India have had such a bad taste of the British. Memories are still fresh. The same Nehru who is now the Prime Minister of India was rotting in a British jail until May 1945—4½ years ago. I know Nehru has no traces of bitterness left in him for his former jailers, but Nehru is a great man—and India, like all other countries, is full of plain and ordinary people. Thus the memories and suspicions of the foreign ruler still linger on. And thus, new alliances, even with good foreigners, cause raising of the eyebrows and create doubts and suspicions.

I would like to suggest to those Americans who believe in the adage, "If you are not with me, you are against me," to be a little patient. After all, India has been free only 27 months, not 27 years. And at the time of the coming of freedom, our country was torn into two, and for several months, in the very infancy of our independence, we had to go through veritable hell. Therefore, if we are a little preoccupied in putting our house in order, we should not be blamed too much. And if we are desirous to remain clear of alliances with a western nation or nations—then, in fairness, it must be recognized that it is due wholly and solely to a western nation's exploitation and ruthless rule of our country which has left a mark upon us, and which in its turn makes us hesitate and ponder. It will take more than 27 months to remove that mark and that hesitation.

Thinking people in India know that America has no intentions of taking over where European colonial powers have ended. They also know that no western power could ever rule the Asian peoples again, because the Asians are determined to die rather than be the slaves of a foreign power. But even with this new strength and vitality, the memories of foreign rule cannot be obliterated so quickly and so easily. Thus it is that Nehru, a democrat, not a dictator, must wait till he is sure of carrying his people with him in new alliances and alinements.

There is another important angle. I know that India is a large country with 350,000,000 people and thus is exceedingly important in its own right. But I also know that most Americans think of India's importance vis-à-vis the strategic position India holds in Asia. Suppose Nehru, while in America, and as demanded by some ultranationalist Americans had said, "All right, I am in the American corner." What effect such an announcement would have had in Asia. Would such a declaration from Nehru help the cause of freedom and democracy in Asia? No; most certainly not. To start with, Nehru would have received the lambasting of his life from the people of India. They would have accused him of having sold India down the river. They would have accused him of becoming a pawn of Wall Street monopolies. Instead of receiving a hero's welcome, which he did, upon his return from America, the people of India would have thrown shoes at him—a sign of great disfavor and insult. Nehru's influence in India would have begun to dwindle rapidly. His prime ministership might also have been jeopardized. Would that have served the cause of the democracies of the world? I am afraid not.

Another point. What do you think Communist China would have done if Nehru had joined the "American corner?" They would have unleashed a propaganda barrage of unprecedented magnitude to all the Asian peoples, telling them to be wary of Nehru—a man who had sold his soul for American dollars. The prestige of India in Asia would have gone down and the prestige of Communist China would have gone up. Would that have served the cause of democracies? No, such a step would not have served the cause of democracies. On the contrary, it would have played into the hands of Communist China and the Communist parties and the fellow travelers in every country in Asia.

India today is respected by all Asian countries. They look up to India as one looks up to a big brother. India today is the only country, because of its geographical position, population, and resources, that can halt the onward march of Communist China—not by guns or armed conflict, but by ideologies, by preaching and practicing dynamic, active, and alive democracy.

Americans should stop talking about India's "neutrality." India is a democracy and will always line up with democracies.

Does Luce's $12,700,000 Intake From Liquor Render Him Immune to Decency and Conscience?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the need for the enactment of H. R. 2423, I submit herewith an article from the Union Signal of December 10, 1949, and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

DOES LUCE'S $12,700,000 INTAKE FROM LIQUOR RENDER HIM IMMUNE TO DECENCY AND CONSCIENCE?

(By Ernest Gordon)

Mr. Henry R. Luce, through Time, Inc., last year was paid $12,712,000 by the whisky, beer, wine, and associated manufacturers in the liquor field. It is an accepted assertion in financial circles that Mr. Luce controls financially and directly the policy of the three publications of Time, Inc., namely, Time, Life, Fortune.

During two pre-Christmas issues of Life and Time, 1948, Mr. Luce's intake for Time, Inc., was $1,270,000 for liquor advertising.

As is pointed out by R. H. Martin, chairman of the Committee Against Liquor Advertising of the National TPC, these liquor receipts for pre-Christmas issues were 2¾ times the average sum received for these items during other months of the year.

"This possibly suggests," Mr. Martin adds, "Life, Time, Fortune, and their editor in chief's conception of the proper way to celebrate the birth of the Saviour of the World."

The circulation of Life, Time, and Fortune, according to Standard Rate and Data Service, in 1948 was 7,145,158, with an estimated readership of 36,000,000 for 1949.

"Here are three magazines, the unparalleled facilities of which Mr. Luce and his associates turn over to the big distillers and brewers of America, to carry their liquor propaganda to every corner of our land, to one quarter of the entire population of the country, into fifteen to eighteen million American homes."

That "simply means," says Mr. Martin, "this Luce trio" has become "the most powerful ally the liquor industry has in its gigantic advertising program to increase the sale and consumption of intoxicating liquors," by the most sinister and amazing invasion of free speech and a free press ever perpetrated by the vicious cabal of liquor makers and mongers in American annals.

It is for that reason that the following searching analysis and appraisal by Ernest Gordon of the Luce relationship to and policy toward the liquor interests in the United States calls for the most serious consideration of thoughtful men and women everywhere.

It is an appraisal which like everything else that Dr. Gordon has offered the public is

marked by the most thoroughly authenticated factual evidence that could be marshaled on this subject.

"Alcohol is recognized as the third great medical problem in America," declares Dr. Gordon. "It is indeed recognized as a carrier of disease. In its wake follow all kinds of bodily and mental sicknesses, toxic psychoses, cirrhoses, epilepsies, blastophthorias.

"As a carrier of this disease, through their advertising columns, Time and Life, netting their owner $9,400,000 from drink ads in 1947, appeal to the great public to which they minister week after week, to buy alcohol in numberless enticing forms."

ENTICEMENTS TO YOUTH

Budweiser: "Golden, bubbling, sparkling, foaming. It tells you with every sip why it is something more than beer, a tradition in hospitality."

Arrow Creme de Menthe: "The crowning touch to a perfect dinner."

California wines: "The custom is ages old to set a glass of bright, fragrant wine beside each plate on Thanksgiving. Try it and you find why a custom lives on."

Hiram Walker's Cordials: "Blackberry liqueur. You'd never believe the hard-to-catch flavor of luscious fresh blackberries could be captured in a bottle."

Sunnybrook: "Come over to Sunnybrook side. Enjoy the whisky that's cheerful as its name."

Corby's Whisky: "Thanks and the same to you." Father and son giving each other the same whisky Christmas present.

Roma Wine: "The first call to dinner."

Pabst Blue Ribbon: "Mrs. Winston Guest and friend drinking beer in her flame-vined Palm Beach patio, enjoying the tropical sunshine."

Four Roses: "Once again it's time to make a bowl of Merry Christmas."

Hunter's Scotch: "First over the bar." Courvoisier's Napoleon brandy, Johnny Walker, Heublein, Club Cocktails, Kinsey Whisky "that noble, noble flavor," Ballentine, Glenmore, Old Crow—every possible brand of every possible type of alcoholic type drink, spread out like flypaper, and not a suggestion that each and all contain what the greatest physiologist of all time, Claude Bernard, declared "the perfect type of a poison of the nervous system."

EDITORIAL FOCUS FOCUS

But that is not all. The promotion of alcoholic drink and the defense of those who make, sell, and use it, goes on incessantly and more or less obviously in the text, as well as in the advertising columns of Life and Time. The reader lives in a rarefied alcohol atmosphere. He stumbles into little alcohol pools every now and then. Its use is made to appear normal, desirable, harmless, the proper accompaniment of social life, a note of good form. What a priceless thing this secondary advertising, which is not formal advertising, must be to brewer and distiller and distributor of alcoholic wares.

Typical was the great 13-page spread entitled "Liquor. Current studies in Medicine and Psychiatry," in the May 27, 1946, number of Life. Its contents were simply impossible. Thus we were told that "modern research gives alcohol a clean physiological bill of health. The drys (1) have taught that drinking may blast liver, kidneys, and gastro-intestinal tract and make the drinker prone to cancer, heart disease, and tuberculosis. "these claims have no foundation in fact.

"Taken for purposes of relaxation alcohol has never damaged anyone. Even when taken in fairly large amounts over a long period of time, the purely physical effects of alcohol by itself are almost negligible.

"Alcohol does not attack, or corrode, the brain cells. It does not lead to insanity."

A declaration of war, indeed, on all knowledge of the subject.

The greatness textbook on psychiatry, that of Professor Bleuler, of Zurich, devotes an entire chapter of 56 pages to alcohol poisoning, tells us that it is responsible for a quarter of male admissions to insane hospitals and to 10 percent of cases outside, that it complicates, codetermines, and aggravates other psychoses, especially epilepsy, traumatic neuroses, and paresis. Of the physical effects, described by Life, as "negligible," Bleuler says (p. 318), "We cannot determine why in one, drink ruins the liver, in another the heart, in the third the regulation of metabolism, in the fourth the brain, in the fifth all the organs."

It is impossible to quote any even small part of the scientific evidence which annihilates Life's science. One can but name the masters—Strusempell and Weichselbaum in pathology, Kraepelin, and Bleuler in psychiatry Kassovitz, Wiaszak, Nicloux, Delbrueck, Widmark, Le Breton, Graf, and how many more. An outstanding pathologist of today, Dr. Roch of the Geneva Clinic, sums up his studies (L'Alcoolisme et son role en pathologie interne), with this concluding sentence: "In our country and apparently also in most lands of the temperate zone, alcoholism is the most important factor in morbidity and mortality."

For this masterpiece of misrepresentation, Mr. Luce should have the Pulitzer prize, in that he has given the world a perfect example of what a journalist should not do. He has every resource for getting at the truth about alcohol. The literature on the subject is prodigious in amount and brilliant in interest. In every other field he enters he seems to get the truth and to give the truth as far as truth is attainable. Only regarding alcohol does he deviate from truth and that as far as possible.

By thus concealing the results of alcohol study which are so terrifyingly unanimous in their condemnation of drink, as well as by popularizing its use on all occasions and stimulating its sale by every device known to advertising, Life and Time have become not only the typical, but the preeminent, carriers of the disease called alcoholism, and thus premier factors in the spread of morbidity and mortality. Beside alcoholism and its associated diseases of mind and body, typhus is but an occasional plague which we are now easily able to stamp out. But the conflagration for which the Welt narcoticum, the international narcotic, is responsible, endangers our entire European-American civilization.

Perhaps Mr. Luce also believes this, for, speaking at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., some years ago, he said, "The fate of western civilization depends on the individual and collective behavior of the advertisers of the next 10 years." Does he refer to the whisky advertisers and does he imply that these great spreaders of the alcohol plague oblige editors to say things that are not true and suppress things that are true? If so, we can assent to his later Williamstown aphorism. "The true poison of our time is that press that gives the public what they want." So he calls for "facts, the significant facts, the difficult and complicated facts, the unpalatable facts."

What a reorientation, if adopted, that would mean for the alcohol policies of Life and Time.

TEXT AND HEADLINES SCOFF AT ABSTINENCE

The text of Life fairly crawls with these little carriers of alcoholism. I tested, for example, 24 weeks of Life's 1948 issue and found a nearly unvarying three allusions to drink in each number. Were they planted there to give drink prestige, and to gratify their advertisers? I do not know, of course, but it would not be surprising.

At the premiere of the White Sulphur Springs season, those partaking in this social event consumed, we are told, $3,000 worth of champagne but drank little purgative water. Derby Day at Yale makes straw hats and beer cans obligatory equipment. In a later number Cornell's beer picnics are described. "Doug raises his fraternity stein to toast a friend." However, "this year's event was a partial flop since some of the beer was left over in spite of the fact that the price was set low, namely, all the beer a couple could drink for a dollar." On a preceding page, the guests at an Atlanta home "moved inside to listen to a fine collection of records and drank long glasses of bourbon and water." The less aristocratic Packers' Union of the A. F. of L. "indulged in grape juice au rhum and ice cream soaked in cognac."

In the May 31 number, a pleasant gibe is inserted in a life sketch of Shirley Temple. "When the news leaked out that Shirley was to take her first drink, the WCTU was up in arms" at the enormity. Cocktail parties are the common mise en scène for important events. "After meeting her at cocktails on board his yacht, Howard Hughes decided that Miss Doumergue was a movie natural. * * * At a cocktail party given by Mrs. R. Clapper, Cord Meyer answered arguments. * * * Mrs. Henderson threw a night-club crawl to help John Alden Talbot, Jr., celebrate his divorce and offers to drink champagne from her guest's moccasin."

July 18, page 71, there is a full-page picture of young people drinking spiked watermelon. In the August 9 number, the recipe was given: "The Californians pictured added half bottles of champagne, brandy, gin, and rum and whisky to the melon's inside."

We go abroad and discover that in the Crown Colony, Hong Kong, "British, on hot afternoons, sip gimlets." At a Zegreb fair "the fun is largely beer drinking." When an Indian prince is married, whisky, gin, beer are served "not at a butler's whim but as required. Third-class guests had only wine."

In the August 2 number we return to the United States of America where in a quarter page we are treated to the picture of a beer-drinking contest. Men hold nipple bottles for each other. The winner of the prize struggled through his battle in 4½ minutes." The next number, August 9, has a full-page picture of a man up to his shoulders in a pool drinking a bottle of beer, an event of major importance. We were told in the old days that Connie Mack reprobated drink for athletes. Life would correct this scandalous mistake. "Connie gave up his own modest drinking when he was 76. Brother Mike, on the other hand, lived to be 90 by sticking to a glass of whisky."

PHOTOGRAPHS AND ART WORK RIDICULE TEMPERANCE

In its January 24, 1949, number, Life carried a feature article on Williams College and its problems. Williams always brings to mind the able and venerable president, Mark Hopkins, who led it from 1836 to 1872, 36 long years. Life does indeed here print a picture of him, a thumbnail photograph. But the full-page illustration is reserved for Mr. Grimm, a French professor, drinking cocktails in a student dormitory room that is fully equipped with a bar behind which students are mixing drinks.

Mark Hopkins and William E. Dodge were the great figures in the National Temperance Society and made it a power in the land. This picture is a measure of the alcohol barbarism into which the United States has fallen—in no little degree because of the advertisements in Luce publications.

So it goes. I may be mistaken in thinking that these little alcohol lures are purposely allowed to crawl into their pages. If others doubt, let them scrutinize Life's columns from week to week or, better, study Life's files in recent years, here and there, in text soundings.

All this goes along very well with the extensive photographing of near nudity, high

kicking, and strip-teasing with which Life, by stirring up the little underworld in man's hearts, seeks to raise its circulation figure. It recalls the pink pages of the old Police Gazette, which in railway camps in the old days we used to call the great American educator, and adds piquancy to Mr. Luce's religious addresses as, for example, that before the National Conference of Church Women in Milwaukee, 1948. The Face of Janus—Henry Luce * * * Henry Luce.

Time is less risque than Life, yet here, too, one hears little alcoholic obligato played to the main themes. Its favorite entertainment might well be two tipers tangled into one, namely, high finance and the liquor powre. Its editor is a trustee of the American Heritage Foundation which sponsors the Freedom Train. There is no copy of the eighteenth amendment on the Freedom Train, yet it might have been exhibited there as representative of what promised to be one of the greatest emancipations of all times. It was Wall Street in the persons of Mellon, the Du Ponts, bootlegging Perry A. and backsliding John D. Rockefeller, who destroyed that great document. Garrison and Phillips and Abraham Lincoln would have defended it in the teeth of all comers had they been living.

Time insidiously supports the repealers in their continuing efforts to prevent any relief, legal or educational, from the ever-mounting, devastating alcohol flood. It has ever the appropriate gibe, the distorted report. In its October 4, 1948, number it described the WCTU convention in so many words as a collection of septuagenarian hens clucking lamentations over the spread of alcoholism. This is just the impression the drink interests would wish made on the general public.

When Kansas prohibition was repealed last November, their comment was the following moronic simplification, "Kansas boys, raised on lemonade, went away to war, learned there was something more exhilarating, came home demanding more of the same" (Nov. 15, 1948.) It follows the stereotyped Tap and Tavern line, "To Kansas, their bone-dry law has long been a laugh. Good whisky is easier to get in Topeka than in wet Kansas City. * * * Millions of quarts of bootleg stuff from across the border," etc. (September 9, 1946). When a prohibition hearing is held in Washington, boys, pious Joseph R. Bryson and perky Mrs. Ida Wise-Smith are picked for ridicule, the latter representing organized mother-love, and much is made of a tract being circulated, Use Your Bible To Battle the Bottle (January 24, 1944). In another passage, to enforce its antiprohibition clack, it quotes, believe it or not, old St. John Chrysostom, "I hear many cry when deplorable excesses happen 'Would there were no wine.' Oh folly. Oh madness. * * * If you would say, 'Would there were no wine because of drunkards,' then you must say, 'Would there were no steel because of murderers, no women because of adulterers' (January 28, 1945).

When an alcohol-trapped Wisconsin editor made known editorially his despair, Time with enjoyable courtesy ridiculed that an elderly reader had put him on her prayer list, that a minister had read the editorial in his Sunday-school class and that two ladies from the WCTU welcomed him to their aide (January 21, 1946).

TIME REVELS IN PSEUDO SCIENCE

Time revels in cultural alcohol pseudoscience, contrasting the Yale modern school of alcohol studies with the old blue-nose, fiery crusade. Alcohol seldom damages the body permanently. * * * Drinking is the result, not the cause of, the drunkard's neurosis. * * * Alcoholics get that way in childhood, etc. (July 5, 1948).

I can hardly imagine that Mr. Luce believes these paradoxes, any more than any other person of sense. If he does, let me make this suggestion. On November 16, 1937, at the French Embassy at Washington, Mr. Luce, because of his publishing successes, was presented with the Order of Chevalier of the Legion of Honor. In the year 1948, among those who received the same distinction were, grand officer, Dr. Georges Duhamel; commandeurs, Dr. Armand-Delille, Professor Carnot; officers, Dr. Barthelemey, Professor Boulet, Dr. le Couteur, Professor Mouquin, Professor Portes; chevaliers (Mr. Luce's grade), Dr. Bernou, Dr. Trivas.

Why do I quote these names in this connection? Because every one of these savants is also a member of the Groupement Medical d'Etudes Antialcoholiques, the new radical mobilisation of French medicine against alcoholism. My suggestion is this. Let Mr. Luce get in touch with Prof. Dr. Paul Perrin, the secretary of this distinguished group—it has deans of 10 medical schools and 30 professors of medicine on its roster—and let him give an objective report on their program and literature in one of his publications. Then we will believe that he is not what he appears to be.

Time mentioned in its December 6, 1948, number a new drug for the cure of alcohol habit. A letter from the publisher of January 31, 1949, told us that its discoverer was overwhelmed with orders by cable, air mail, telephone, as well as by letters in seven languages. The contents were always the same, cries from the depths, "My husband, my father, my son, my brother, my nephew, my friend * * * is a good man but an habitual alcoholic. Send the drug whatever it costs."

And what did the editorial hard-hearts of Time say of it? They expressed gratification at this impressive evidence of the readership of their medical section, right round the world.

They talk as a vivisector would over a successful experiment, undisturbed, and least of all conscience smitten, at this evidence of the international effectiveness of Time's advertising.

I suppose that Time will be satisfied with whatever happens to our land so long as it is well paid for running its whisky advertisements. In a book review regarding the 3,750,000 excessive drinkers who now burden themselves and American society, it opens with the nonchalant words, "The United States may as well get used to the idea of more and more alcoholics," adding later, "It may as well be admitted that it is a drinking society and make provision for those among us too ill to cope with it."

When Mr. Luce was divorce-sued by his first wife for cruelty, it took the court only 15 minutes to grant her relief. That cruelty was a slight thing, indeed, compared with the vast, mean cruelty of his alcohol promotion.

The Luce fortune from drink advertisement comes indirectly from millions of heads, alcoholic addicts, actual and potential.

AVIDLY APPEALS FOR MORE LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Still he is unsatisfied. Mr. Luce is doing something which no other publisher before or after him ever did, so far as is known. He actually appeals to the distillers' organ, Spirits, for additional advertising. In a great 2-page advertising spread, exhibited by Life in this trade paper, July 1949, one reads: "Five million, two hundred thousand selling messages. That's what liquor advertisers put behind their brands when they're shown in any issue of Life. Life sells 5,200,000 copies every week, read by 26,000,000 people week after week."

In the April 1949 number of Spirits, the Life advertisement has a large picture of the crowded Rose Bowl in Pasadena. We are informed that its subscribers are 200 times as numerous. In no other than liquor publications does Mr. Luce advertise for advertising, as far as observed.

ARDENTLY SEEKS MINISTERS AND EDUCATORS

And while Mr. Luce is making this frenzied appeal for whisky advertising, he is at the same time offering clergymen and educators reduced subscriptions to Life, knocking off $1.75 on a 2-year subscription and $1 on a 3-year one. So does he play both ends against middle.

And it is to this man, to such a man that Protestant officialdom is kowtowing.

Proposed Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have repeatedly called attention to the necessity for the immediate repeal of the wartime excise taxes which we promised to repeal when peace came. I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dozens of letters from Wisconsin, newspaper editorials, and magazine articles, pleading for the Congress to act.

Already there are in the hopper excise tax repeal amendments which my colleagues and I intend to offer, if necessary, to the oleo measure. We firmly believe that repeal of these taxes, rather than contributing to a loss of revenue, would bolster national income and thereby increase tax revenue. At this time I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a straight-shooting editorial on this subject which appeared in the January 7, 1950, issue of Collier's magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLIER'S DEMANDS CONGRESS REPEAL WARTIME EXCISE TAXES AT ONCE

The wartime excise taxes were put on in wartime.

They were put on to reduce employment, penalize consumption, discourage business in lines that were competing with the war effort.

The rates were set very, very high. They were wartime rates. They were made very, very high to reduce employment, penalize consumption, discourage business in lines that were competing with the war effort.

Have you been to the movies lately? Have you bought a lipstick? Or sent a telegram? Or gone on train or plane to visit Aunt Mary? Or to shop, or to sell what you make? Did you have to buy some luggage? Did you buy or not buy a scarfpin? Or a watch? Or baby oil and powder? Did you buy or not buy a fur coat? Or did you buy a cheaper one? These are only some of the ways the consumer and the producer are whipsawed by consumption-reduction taxes. No wonder unemployment is up and national income is down.

Congress promised that when the war was over, the wartime excise tax rates would be repealed.

Nobody wanted peacetime taxes that would reduce employment, penalize consumption, discourage business after the war was over.

The war is over. The wartime excise taxes have not been repealed. They are operating

today in the specific industries affected to reduce employment, penalize consumption, discourage business just as they did in wartime.

We don't want discriminatory taxes in peacetime. We don't want to reduce employment in specific industries; we don't want to penalize consumption of specific products; we don't want to discourage business just because it used scarce materials and labor in wartime.

Let's repeal the wartime excise tax rates on American business, on American employment, on American consumer demand. The war is over. Let's stop wartime discrimination.

Somebody may say we need the wartime excises because of the revenue. No tax that is bad for business and employment was ever any good for revenue.

By reducing consumption we reduce tax receipts on manufacturing profits, on retail profits, on the income of workers; and in addition we increase outpayments for unemployment benefits. And the citizen whose circumstances force him to buy has to pay more than the goods are worth by as much as 20 percent. The Administration policy of keeping the wartime excise taxes on this long is incredible. It's crazy. It's worse than crazy, it's nuts.

Congress knew that the wartime excise tax rates were no good for peacetime. Congress said that when the war was over, the wartime excise taxes would be repealed. Congress would have repealed these wartime taxes last summer if the executive branch had given the slightest signal.

But the executive branch was confused. It couldn't see the difference between gross revenue and net revenue. It couldn't see the difference between a tax to reduce employment and a tax for revenue. It couldn't see that wartime excise tax rates discriminated between one kind of peacetime employment and another. It couldn't see.

Let's get rid of this wartime hang-over. Let's let people go back to work making things people want. Let's stop these penalty prices. Let's use the common sense that Congress is prepared to use.

Mr. President, give Congress a free hand. Congress will meet its wartime pledge, and restore peacetime employment to American citizens and American communities. It will remove the blight of wartime controls from American enterprise. It will permit reasonable prices on peacetime products that are wanted by Mr. and Mrs. American Consumer.

Repeal of the wartime excise taxes is the first order of legislative business for 1950.

THE EDITOR.

To Unite Federalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Freedom and Union for December 1949:

TO UNITE FEDERALISTS

(By Clarence K. Streit)

As the author of a book whose readers have become divided, I find myself in a peculiar position. Many of the readers of Union Now favor the Atlantic Union resolution (Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, House Concurrent Resolutions 107, 111). Others of its readers favor the world federation resolution (Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, House Concurrent Resolution 861). Still others favor both.

I myself support the Atlantic Union resolution, but I have always worked for Atlantic Union as a step toward an eventual free world government. And so—speaking only for myself, though I hope results will show that I am speaking for many of my friends who are now divided—I would suggest that a second paragraph be added to the enacting clause of the Atlantic Union resolution, so that it would read as follows:

"*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*:

"1. That the President is requested to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet this year with delegates of the United States in a federal convention to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union.

"2. That this Atlantic Federal Convention be called as the next step in strengthening the United Nations and in attaining a more distant goal which, in the sense of Congress, should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States—namely, the development of a free world federation open to all nations willing and able to maintain its principles of free, representative government, and capable of effectively safeguarding individual liberty, preventing aggression and preserving peace by its defined and limited powers to enact, interpret, amend and enforce world law."

This amendment would incorporate in the Atlantic Union resolution much of the language and all the major provisions of the world federation resolution,[1] while adding certain necessary safeguards, particularly as regards freedom and the United Nations.

As that resolution now stands, it makes no provision that the world government it seeks shall preserve individual liberty. This omission is no doubt due to oversight on the part of its sponsors, resulting from the present widespread American habit of taking freedom for granted. I trust that on second thought they will agree that it is wiser to return to the habits of our forefathers. They based our government on the principle that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty and devised a remarkable set of checks and balances to secure that vigilance.

The fact that the world federation resolution now contains no reference to individual freedom should make it much more acceptable to Stalin than to us. "A world federation open to all nations, with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law," is quite compatible with dictatorship, slavery, and terror. It fits the kind of world government we would suffer if the present Soviet Communist Federation achieved its dream of bringing all the world under its law. That law has proved more than adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression with its present jurisdiction.

[1] *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the UN and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law.

I know that this kind of world government and law is far from the one the backers of the world federation resolution have in mind, and so I trust they will welcome its being made clear that they aim at a free government. We Americans, and a number of other Atlantic peoples, have long insisted on something more than peace and law—a something called freedom. To secure this freedom we, and these other peoples, have sacrificed peace more than once.

True, our Forefathers sought to insert no safeguards for individual freedom in the alliance they made with the French Bourbon autocracy during the war for independence. But when they turned to the task of constituting a federation—a government, instead of a mere association of governments—they did not attempt the impossible feat of making it with their autocratic French ally, or with their allies among the Indian nations who had little notion of free, representative government. They were careful to limit the enterprise of constituting government to those peoples who were willing and able to build it on a free basis. And they climaxed the Preamble of their, and our, Constitution with a declaration that its aim was to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Experience proves that it can be practicable and wise for free governments to cooperate to some degree with dictatorial governments not only in alliance, but in leagues such as the United Nations. Such associations by their nature must be formed without individual liberty being effectively safeguarded in the treaty establishing them.

To constitute a federation, a government, is—it cannot be emphasized too much—quite a different thing from forming an alliance, league or other association of governments.

Since Americans began constituting government—as early as 1639 in federating the three towns that formed the colony of Connecticut—they have always been careful to make sure that the government was not only of the people, operating directly on them as citizens, but was by and for the people—for their individual freedom. Surely every American would want this precedent maintained now when freedom is so threatened, and would not, on second thought seek the formation of a world government that gave no safeguard for human liberty as the fundamental objective of United States policy. Perhaps I should add that union now, though it popularized the ideal of world government as far back as 1939, insisted that freedom must be the basis and the aim of any such government.

The only other important changes that my amendment makes in the world federation resolution—apart from safeguarding individual freedom—may be thus clarified:

The world federation resolution, as it now stands, permits its objective to be achieved only through the development of the UN and risks having the objective interpreted as an immediate one. My amendment, while calling for the strengthening of the UN and permitting us to make the most of every opportunity to develop it into a world government, does not restrict us to achieving a free world federation only by amendment of the Charter or other action by the UN. It leaves all possibilities open, and there should be no objection to that.

While keeping the strengthening of the UN as an immediate goal, my amendment, moreover, makes clear that world federation is a more distant goal. It thus guards against the resolution, once adopted, being interpreted as authorizing immediate or premature attempts by the United States to change the UN into a world federation. Such attempts could only result, in my judgment, in wrecking the sole world political organization mankind now possesses, and leaving the nations not only sharply divided into two

camps but looking even the meeting place that Lake Success now provides.

The Kremlin would veto any attempt to develop the UN into a free world federation, and the United States would veto any move to convert it into an autocratic world government. Consequently, there would seem to be no possibility of changing it into either so long as dictatorship rules the U. S. S. R., and freedom rules the U. S. A.

Some argue that the United States should, nonetheless, make immediately an attempt to amend the Charter, either to make it a world government or at least to abolish the veto—which is also certain to be vetoed by the Kremlin. They contend this would improve our moral position and fix the responsibility for failure on Soviet Russia. They assume the United Nations would continue thereafter as before, and believe it would then be safe for the United States to form within the United Nations a federation of all the nations that had proved willing to make one when the offer was made to Moscow.

My 10 years of experience covering the League of Nations for the New Times helps convince me that all this, though it seems quite plausible, is very unsound speculation.

Unless one is aiming to go to war, and ready for war, it is wiser not to try to pin down certain responsibilities, or to attempt to maneuver a great power into too openly humiliating a hole. A careful jockeying for moral position is too often the immediate prelude to war. It is very likely to be, if one of the disputants is more concerned with fixing blame on the other than with facing him with power too effective and overwhelming to be challenged.

SUFFERING NO SUCH MORAL POWER

A federation formed by the above process (that is, of combining those nations, excluding Russia, which do accept the offer), would not only tempt present tension to the breaking point but it would invite attack. Those who assume it would be stronger than the proposed Atlantic Union repeat a time-honored error, the one that brought the Persians to grief at Marathon and Salamis. They confuse mere numbers with power. They reckon the loosely organized horde to be stronger than the smaller but closely knit phalanx.

Above all, they overlook the basic fact that the great bulk of non-Communist armed, industrial, and developed raw-material power in the world today is in the hands of the five North Atlantic democracies with which the Atlantic Union resolution would begin the formation of a world federal union. These democracies because of their greater community of interest and stronger natural bonds can be much more closely knit together than they can be federated now with a large number of divergent, disorganized democracies or dictatorships.

To try to federate all the non-Communist world does not change the facts of power; it can result only in shifting away from the experienced Atlantic democracies more or less of the control they now possess over their power. If they should consent to enough shift of control to make the federation a real federation—which is highly unlikely—they would merely be placing their power in less experienced hands. What could encourage the Kremlin more? If they refused thus to shift control of their power, the result would be another loose league instead of a federation. Would another, smaller United Nations overawe the Kremlin?

By taking either course we would not only sacrifice the overwhelmingly powerful federal union we could make with the other Atlantic democracies, but we would sacrifice precious time. The Kremlin could string out the discussion of any Charter amendment as it did his veto proposal for a world atomic authority. While the negotiations for the latter went on, the Kremlin succeeded in learning how to make an atomic explosion. Shall we waste more time now on attempts to strengthen the UN and achieve world federation that require us to begin by asking the Kremlin's consent?

Before we consider further so dangerous a course, let us rid ourselves of the notion that such a proposal to change the Charter would, when it failed, leave the UN still functioning as before. True, if an amendment to the United States Constitution fails of adoption, the Government goes on unchanged, and so it is not surprising that many assume the same would be the case in the UN.

But suppose a powerful group of our 48 States proposed to change our Constitution fundamentally—to make it, for example, a dictatorship, or to change it from a federal union into a league of States from which any State could secede. If they failed to get their way, would the United States still continue as before, or would it be wrecked, and probably plunged into civil war by the bitter controversy this attempt inflamed?

Certainly, if the United States could not survive peacefully such an attempt to change its basic character despite a powerful minority, the much weaker and younger UN would be destroyed, for all practical purposes, by any American move to abolish the veto or change the Charter into a world government—while dictatorship rules the Kremlin and the Atlantic democracies remain unfederated.

Why embark on a policy that so gravely endangers our best remaining bridge to Soviet Russia, while giving the Kremlin time to stock pile atomic bombs before we even attempt to federate with our closest and strongest friends?

The Atlantic Union resolution avoids these perils. There is nothing in the UN Charter preventing any members from going the limit toward achieving its ideals by mutually, peacefully uniting in an organic federal union. Such union requires no action by the UN. The Atlantic Union resolution takes advantage of this fact. We can call the federal convention it proposes without having first to ask the Kremlin's consent. We thus avoid waste of precious time. We also avoid the kind of debate that would ruin the UN.

We preserve it, too, by not attempting to federate all its non-Communist members, but only a few Atlantic democracies at the start. We do not split it into two clear-cut camps; we leave the greatest number of its members where they are today, in between us and the Kremlin, but with us in an emergency, since the Atlantic Union would be no threat to them but a protection—and the only place where they could sell their products and get the manufactured goods they need.

By the Atlantic Union resolution we preserve, too, the charter's bridge to the Russian people, and all the possibilities the charter gives of lining up a coalition of all the non-Communist world behind the Union, in the improbable event the Kremlin should threaten it. Even though the UN is not strong enough to insure peace, and even though it cannot be seriously strengthened by charter amendment, it still can perform so many valuable services to peace that we should seek to preserve it.

The Atlantic Union resolution, in short, would avoid the dangers other policies involve, would preserve the UN and strengthen it in substance, and, by my amendment, would commit us to the goal of ultimate free world federation. And yet it would let us begin at once to explore whether we can now form the nucleus of such a free federal union with the other sponsors of the North Atlantic pact. If we cannot federate with them, how can we hope to federate effectively with the rest of the world now? And if we can join with them in a federal union of the free—as I am confident we can, difficult though even such federation is—we can confront the Kremlin in good time with far more power than we can otherwise put behind freedom and peace, and at far less cost. We can thus block its scheme to win the world through economic disaster and further monetary depreciation in the Atlantic area. We can confront the Kremlin with such immense armed, industrial, financial, raw material and moral power that Soviet Russia dare not challenge it.

Thus we can stabilize the world situation long enough for the slow evolution needed to attain without world war our ultimate objective—a free federation of all the world. By this policy we wed the practical to the ideal. And we do more.

We promptly begin to carry out the pledges in the Atlantic Pact that commit us and our allies "to safeguard the freedom * * * of their peoples, founded on the principles of * * * individual liberty," and "to contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded."

Our American freedom is based on our Federal Constitution, and nothing could contribute more to a better understanding of its principles than to explore in a Federal Constitutional Convention the possibility of our unity through these principles with the other sponsors of the Atlantic Pact. By this policy we keep freedom first. We recognize and act on it for what freedom truly is—the key to peace.

Civic Problems, Civic Bodies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Civic Problems, Civic Bodies," written by Jesse C. Suter, and published in the Washington (D. C.) Star of December 18, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIC PROBLEMS, CIVIC BODIES—SUPERINTENDENT AND BOARD PRESIDENT; WOMEN'S GENERAL FEDERATION CAMPAIGN

(By Jesse C. Suter)

GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS AND NEELY'S CHALLENGE

The national legislative chairman of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. Leslie B. Wright, reports that their Nationwide campaign in support of national representation for the District of Columbia is getting under way. Legislative chairmen of the various State federations are expected to begin intensive work immediately on Senators and Representatives from the respective States to obtain their pledge of support to the Neely joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 132.

The immediate need in this campaign is to provide these State legislative committees and the constituent groups of the State federations with succinct printed statements of

the District's case. It is essential that the question should be well understood by these public-spirited and patriotic women throughout the Nation in order that they may arouse the required interest and enthusiastic activity.

The Neely joint resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would empower the Congress to provide "that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States, in such numbers and with such power as the Congress shall determine, but such representation and powers shall be no greater than those of a State. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal."

Such an amendment to the Constitution is necessary for the reason that the Constitution makes no provision whatever for representation in the Congress other than by States. It is believed that such provision was omitted unintentionally from the Constitution at the time of its being drafted, as matters of far greater importance were at stake.

At a "civic clinic" held by Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY, Democrat, of West Virginia, chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, in September, Mrs. Wright stated that the first thing to get for Washington is representation in Congress and the electoral college. She stated that she was speaking as chairman of the legislative committee of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, for 5,000,000 women, whereupon Senator NEELY said: "If you have 5,000,000 women all agreed on that, you can get it before the end of the next session." He urged her to get active on the subject and get these women busy with their Senators and Representatives.

State chairman visits headquarters

The State legislative chairman for the Federation of Women's Clubs of Michigan, Mrs. Wade Van Valkenburg, called at the headquarters of the Citizens' Joint Committee on National Representation for the District during the past week for the purpose of obtaining required information for use in their campaign. Some literature was supplied, and the lack of fundamental American rights for District residents, the necessity for constitutional amendment, and the required procedure were explained.

Mrs. Van Valkenburg was surprised and shocked to learn, from one of the victims, that these American citizens resident in the District of Columbia and owing allegiance to no particular State are deprived of all participation in the National Government which taxes them and sends them to war, and in the local government which performs the administrative functions usually performed by States, counties, and municipalities. She was much impressed with the opportunity offered in this campaign to render practical service to these voteless and unrepresented fellow Americans of the Nation's Capital.

The late Theodore W. Noyes, long editor of the Star and for many years chairman of the Citizen's Joint Committee on National Representation for the District, always held that there was special appeal in this campaign for national representation to the women of the country. Through the long years of the campaign for woman suffrage, District women occupied a conspicuous place with the women of the States for an amendment to the Constitution which would put women on an equal footing with men at the national ballot box. All the while these District women were engaged in this self-sacrificing service they knew full well that without another amendment to the Constitution they would not acquire through the woman suffrage amendment the privileges of voting in the national elections. Now, it surely is up to the women throughout the United States, particularly in the ranks of the well-informed clubwomen of America, to put their shoulders to the wheel and work earnestly to give these women of the District of Columbia, and likewise the men, the right which they helped acquire for the women of the States.

American Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this morning the Washington Post carries an interesting editorial captioned "American oil." The editorial is inspired by a statement by the attorney general of the State of Alabama, the Honorable A. A. Carmichael, the statement by Mr. Carmichael being on the question of tidelands oil. The editorial deals at some length with Mr. Carmichael's statement, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, together with the full text of the statement by Mr. Carmichael, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of January 6, 1950]

AMERICAN OIL

It is heartening to find a State attorney general who talks about the marginal sea like an American. A. A. Carmichael, attorney general of the State of Alabama, has made a public answer to the National Association of Attorneys General, which has constituted itself a lobby for the purpose of persuading Congress to quitclaim the valuable mineral resources submerged off the coasts of the United States. "If the Congress makes such a gift to the States," says Mr. Carmichael, "it will be tragically derelict in its duty as the highest legislative body in the United States."

In 1947, the Supreme Court held, in *United States v. California*, that California had no title to the submerged lands lying outside its inland waters and beyond the low-tide mark and that the United States Government had paramount rights in and power over these lands. Since that decision, the National Association of Attorneys General has emitted a great deal of expensive propaganda intended (1) to show that the Court was wrong, and (2) to induce Congress to donate to the States what Congress would have power to donate only if the Court was right. Mr. Carmichael said about all there is to say on this subject:

"Title to land, under our system of law, is determined by the courts. A determination of ownership, or nonownership, is binding. It is, therefore, ridiculous for the advocates of State ownership of the marginal lands to declare that the States are being deprived of land, rightfully theirs, by the Federal Government. The highest court in the United States has held that the States do not own, and never have owned, the subsoil beneath the marginal sea. The concept of States' rights is totally irrelevant. A State cannot be stripped of lands in deprivation of its rights, when that State has never had any legal right to the lands. The States' rights concept is again being used, as it has been used so often in the past, to obscure the real issues in the controversy."

Mr. Carmichael has also pointed out what most State attorneys general have apparently ignored, that by quitclaiming the marginal sea Congress would be making an outright gift not to all the States but to a very few—California, Texas, and Louisiana principally, with Alabama itself a possible beneficiary—of incalculably rich mineral resources, the income and use of which should rightfully benefit all citizens of this country. These resources should be conserved and managed in the national interest and as a bulwark of the national security. To give them away would be to give away, fraudulently, an inheritance of the American people.

STATEMENT BY A. A. CARMICHAEL, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ALABAMA

The statement of Walter Johnson, special counsel for the National Association of Attorneys General, that Congress will donate the marginal submerged lands (commonly called tidelands) and the oil reserves therein to the States deserves an answer from one who is himself an attorney general. If the Congress makes such a gift to the States, it will be tragically derelict in its duty as the highest legislative body in the United States.

In 1947 the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of United States against California, held that California, and undoubtedly other States in similar circumstances, had no ownership whatsoever in the submerged marginal lands called tidelands, and that the United States Government had paramount rights in and power over those lands.

After this opinion was rendered by the United States Supreme Court, a weird assortment of State attorneys general and oil magnates have called the opinion wrong. According to these critics, the Supreme Court of the United States (all eight of its members since Mr. Justice Jackson was not sitting at the time) is ignorant as to the meaning of prior decisions of that court.

Title to land, under our system of law, is determined by the courts. A determination of ownership, or nonownership, is binding. It is, therefore, ridiculous for the advocates of State ownership of the marginal lands to declare that the States are being deprived of land, rightfully theirs, by the Federal Government. The highest court in the United States has held that the States do not own, and never have owned, the subsoil beneath the marginal sea. The concept of States' rights is totally irrelevant. A State cannot be stripped of lands in deprivation of its rights, when that State has never had any legal right to the lands. The States' rights concept is again being used, as it has been used so often in the past, to obscure the real issues in the controversy. Since the States severally never possessed or owned the subsoil beneath the marginal sea, such subsoil could not possibly have been taken from the States.

The Congress would be well advised to consider precisely what it would be doing if it should decide to quitclaim the lands beneath the marginal sea to the States. The Congress, in such a case, would be making an outright donation to a few States (Texas, California, and Louisiana, in the main) tremendously wealthy lands whose income and resources should redound to the benefit of all citizens of this country. The Congress would most definitely not be returning to certain States that which is rightfully theirs. For the highest court in this country has decided that the lands in question do not rightfully belong to the States. One need not resort to speculation to determine the magnitude of the oil wealth which Mr. Johnson would have the Congress donate to Texas, California, and Louisiana. The total

area of the continental shelf contiguous to the United States is estimated at 262,500 square miles or about five times the area of the State of Wisconsin.

Geologists have estimated that the continental shelves of the earth contain 1,000,000,000,000 barrels of oil. The shelf contiguous to the United States and Alaska, about one-tenth of the total area of all continental shelves, is estimated to contain approximately 100,000,000,000 barrels of oil. Thus, the potential oil resources in the submerged lands which Mr. Johnson proposes that the Congress donate to three or four States, contains five times as much potential oil as there now is in the whole of the United States.

In terms of dollars—taxpayers' dollars—the figures concerning Mr. Johnson's gift to the States are even more astounding. At the present prices, the estimated 100,000,000,000 barrels contained in the continental shelves contiguous to the United States and Alaska would sell for $268,000,000,000.

There are considerations of conservation, national defense, and public welfare involved in Mr. Johnson's proposal. If the Congress gives the oil-rich submerged lands to the States, Congress will lose irrevocably any chance to control these lands and the oil produced from these lands. The resources will be exploited without consideration of questions involving defense and conservation and welfare.

There must be some reason why oil magnates unanimously desire State ownership. The proponents of State ownership have never explained why they would not be willing to have Congress quitclaim the lands to the States, with the reservation that the United States Government could control the exploitation of oil. Mr. Johnson and his cohorts have argued ardently that their only wish is to protect the States against Federal usurpation. They have stated that oil is not of controlling importance to them. But they do not want the Federal Government to have the power to direct oil leasing, even though the Federal Government might be willing to quitclaim the submerged lands with such a reservation. It is difficult to believe that Mr. Johnson and the oil magnates are not thinking primarily about oil.

The cost of public education, public health, aid to Europe, national defense, social security, and other of the more extensive Government programs does not, in the aggregate, even approach the potential money which Mr. Johnson would so generously give to Texas, Louisiana, and California.

It is apparent that Mr. Johnson's proposal represents an outright donation of immensely wealthy Federal resources to a few coastal States. Mr. Johnson's proposal completely ignores defense, welfare, and conservation considerations. If the Congress of the United States gives these tidelands to the few coastal States involved, the Congress of the United States will be perpetrating a fraud on the people of this country.

Upswing in Rents Is Found Where Controls Are Ended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Lee E. Cooper which appeared in the New York Times of January 2, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

UPSWING IN RENTS IS FOUND WHERE CONTROLS ARE ENDED

(By Lee E. Cooper)

A general upswing in the level of residential rents in decontrolled areas throughout the country was indicated yesterday in a survey made by The New York Times. With Federal controls lifted from more than 2,600,000 family rental units during the past 9 months, it was apparent from reports received from all regions that the prices being paid for shelter had broken out of the narrow range in which they had been held by law for about 6 years.

Although about 12,000,000 families, including those in New York City, and nearly all other major population centers, still are under rent-ceiling protection, many of these families have been affected recently by the growing number of approvals by rent authorities of landlord petitions for increases.

From April 1, 1949, the date the present Federal legislation became effective, to December 9 the Office of the Housing Expediter in Washington reported that 631 decontrol actions had been completed, taking 2,587,000 family rental units from its control. In the past 3 weeks several communities have been added to the list.

STATES WITHOUT CONTROLS

Four States, Nebraska, Texas, Arizona, and Utah, are now without controls and Alabama has voted to end controls in May. Wisconsin is under a State law which replaced the Federal statute and has permitted substantial rises in rents.

Details on the present situation in the housing market as reported by New York Times correspondents in key cities and obtained from other sources were in most instances at variance with the assertions of realty interests that the lifting of the ceilings had caused no appreciable changes in rental conditions. Unprecedented building activity in some centers, however, has helped to ease the problem of transition.

The general level of rents in Houston was found to have risen 11 percent in 3 months and nearly as much in Milwaukee. "Substantial" increases were reported in Omaha and Lincoln in Nebraska. Rises put into effect in Spokane, Wash., were said to average 14.3 percent.

There was evidence of isolated increases of 100 percent or more in some cities now operating under a "free" market. In communities such as Tampa and Miami families occupying the cheaper apartments were found to have been hit hardest, while tenants of some of the more expensive apartments had slightly lower monthly charges.

THE NORTHEAST

In New York State and the New England region all major population centers still are under the Federal ceilings extending to June 30, 1950, and fairly stable conditions are noted despite occasional protests against approval of rent rises based on the "hardship" clause or other sections of the law. No large city has been decontrolled. Actions seeking decontrol have thus far affected only a few sparsely populated communities.

Thus far the Metropolitan Fair Rent Committee, representing property owners here, has failed in its efforts to get a blanket increase of 15 percent. Last week it suggested an increase of 25 percent under the revived rule requiring repainting of apartments every 3 years.

In Boston, although exact figures were not available, a large percentage of rent-increase petitions was being granted under the fair-net-operating-income provision of the law, according to Edgar Driscoll, area rent-control director for New England. This was in line with a general policy reflecting increased costs of operation, Mr. Driscoll said.

In the five-county Philadelphia area containing 420,000 registered units under the jurisdiction of the Housing Expediter, the borough of Swarthmore voted for local option in October, but otherwise there has been no movement for the removal of rent controls.

A spokesman for the Philadelphia Real Estate Board reported that his organization always would be moving in the direction of decontrol and also would like to see some provision allowing for the increasing cost of operation and maintenance.

The Philadelphia area rent office processed 749 petitions from landlords in November and approved 490. The approvals grant rent increases on 1,725 units with an average rise of $10.45 monthly. In the first 11 months of 1949 increases approved on 7,380 rental units increased aggregate monthly payments by the tenants from $348,445 to $421,593.

THE SOUTH

In the South attention has been centered on Florida, where Miami, Tampa, and Jacksonville were freed of ceilings recently after Gov. Fuller Warren had vetoed a bill which would have removed controls on a State-wide basis except for areas around military installations.

In Miami a typical small apartment or house which brought $50 monthly now is renting for about $65, but those which had been leased at $200 can be had for about $150.

With more than 100,000 new family units built in Miami in the past 3 years and many seasonal units offered on an all-year basis following decontrol, the supply now exceeds the demand in some types of housing and there are quite a few vacancies. The net effect is to force down the rent for higher-priced living space.

Higher-priced all-year apartments in Tampa which had been bringing $90 to $120 a month have been reduced by about 10 percent. In the medium-price bracket, from $50 to $90, there have been rent increases of about the same percentage. In the cheaper housing, notably housing for Negroes, there have been instances of rent increases of more than 100 percent, with rents formerly at $4 a week going to as much as $10. Owners of this type of housing assert that they went for years without any return on their investment while rents were frozen.

A high level of house building in Tampa has helped to keep rentals down. Motor court building on the outskirts also has been very active recently, with the result that a price war has developed in some areas. This has forced down the daily cost of a kitchenette unit in some courts to about $1.25 per person from $3.50 to $7.

Not much change in Tampa

Officials of the Tampa Board of Realtors, on the basis of a recent survey, reported "not much change" in the general level of rents.

By action of the Alabama Legislature, rent ceilings will end in the State May 25. Rent-control officials in Montgomery predicted that the result probably would be a number of upward rent adjustments ranging to 50 percent.

An increase in the number of rental units was reported in Knoxville, Chattanooga, and some smaller communities in Tennessee, but spot surveys indicated an over-all rise of 6 to 8 percent in monthly rentals. One leading realtor in Chattanooga estimated the rent rise in that city at 12 to 15 percent. There has been a marked increase in the amount of repair work on rental properties recently. High-priced units have been offered at lower prices.

Landlords and tenants in Atlanta are bracing for a fight over decontrol this month when a new city council takes office. The prospects seem to favor the tenants. Mayor William B. Hartsfield has been opposing all attempts to lift ceilings in the city.

Atlanta has had a continued shortage of low-rent units. There has been no let-up in the demand for housing at $60 a month or less, but the situation has eased for houses and apartments at $80 or more, with slight declines noted last month in the rents on new higher-priced suites. The level of rents in the city rose about 4 percent in the year ended November 15.

Columbus, Ga., moved into the rent-decontrol bracket last week when Gov. Herman Talmadge approved action of that city's rent commission. Savannah has taken similar action to go into effect early this year. Decontrol also has been voted in Charlotte and Asheville, N. C., and Columbia, S. C.

Local action to lift ceilings in Savannah and Charlotte, however, received at least a temporary set-back by an adverse ruling just made by Ed Dupree, Acting House Expediter, because deferred dates were fixed for decontrol in those cities. The resolution adopted by the governing body of Savannah had set February 1 as the decontrol date, and Charlotte had specified May 1.

Mr. Dupree said the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 failed to make any provision for decontrol by local option at a specified future date, but contemplated only immediate actions.

It is expected that amended resolutions omitting the dates will be approved in the two cities.

THE MIDDLE WEST

A considerable number of decontrol actions taken on the initiative of the Office of Housing Expediter and increasing numbers of rent rises granted on petitions of landlords characterized the past year in the nine-State area administered as region VI.

Region VI comprises Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming, and covers about 2,500,000 rental dwelling units. Nebraska and Wisconsin were in region VI, but Nebraska dropped controls by legislative action over the veto of Gov. Val Peterson, and Wisconsin substituted a State law last September.

The decontrol actions in region VI indicated an improvement in the rental situation in smaller communities, but conditions still are tight in the metropolitan districts, particularly with respect to medium rentals available to families with incomes of $50 a week or slightly higher, where the bulk of the demand is concentrated.

Rents were officially increased in the region for various reasons on 25,000 apartments during October, the rises ranging from $5.94 to $8.88 a month. The final figures are expected to show 35,000 or more December increases. The Chicago Fair Rent Committee has an action pending in the Emergency Court of Appeals for a blanket increase.

Farm areas not affected

Conditions were found to be fairly quiet in the agricultural areas of the Midwest, which never felt the full force of the housing shortage. Few instances of use of the local option clause in the Federal statute have come up. In Ohio, ceilings still are in effect in Cleveland, Cincinnati and Dayton.

In Des Moines, the city council recently rejected a decontrol resolution. In St. Louis a movement has been started to put a decontrol resolution before the city council. In Laramie, Wyo., such a petition recently was withdrawn.

Wichita, Kans., and Blytheville, Ark., were freed of ceilings last week, but the full effect has not yet been apparent in either place.

Continued unprecedented apartment building has eased the housing situation in most Indiana communities and there have been no general complaints of rent increases. Some Federal officials, however, insist that the situation demands more Government-sponsored projects.

Bloomington, Ind., took local decontrol action but formal ratification in Washington was held up because the Bloomington petition had set a deferred date, April 1.

Wisconsin law debated

Controversy has arisen over the merits of the Wisconsin law which replaced Federal ceilings. The State statute authorized rent increases of 15 percent for all tenants who had agreed to a 15 percent voluntary rise previously under the Federal regulations and permitted increases of 30 percent for families which had not signed such agreements.

Most landlords requested and received the authorized increases. Some held the line voluntarily, however, and others decided to charge less than the maximum permitted under the law. The State CIO challenged the constitutionality of the State law, but lost the case in the Federal district court.

Conflicting reports were heard in Topeka, Kans., following decontrol. Officials of a property owners' group which sponsored the decontrol movement insisted that increases had been slight, but a labor union representative declared that in some instances rents had doubled. One instance was cited of a monthly rate increased to $75 from $40.

A disturbed situation was noted in Nebraska, where decontrol was completed on November 2 with the lifting of ceilings in Omaha and Lincoln. Mayor Glenn Cunningham, of Omaha, said tenants' complaints recently had declined to a "trickle" and court records there showed a slight drop in evictions.

The fair-rent committee set up by the Omaha Real Estate Board asserted that these factors indicated "a surprisingly easy adjustment" to decontrol, but Mayor Cunningham and spokesmen for labor countered that they merely indicated that "there is nothing the people can do about it."

"I think that maybe in the spring the situation will begin to adjust itself, but certainly November was too early for decontrol," Mayor Cunningham commented.

He guessed that rent increases had averaged 45 percent.

Al Witzling, president of the Omaha Central Labor Union, said that the increases would average 50 percent. He declared that one reason for the dearth of complaints is the fear of eviction.

Dr. Wesley Jones, who represents the Urban League on the Omaha fair-rent committee, stated that the rent situation as a whole was fair, with increases averaging 30 percent. Peter Marchetti, lawyer representing the Small Property Owners Association, reported many large houses made available for rent after having been held off the market while controls existed. Jack Evahn, representing the Omaha Building Owners and Managers Association, estimated the average rent increase at 20 percent.

In Lincoln, Joseph T. Wishart, lawyer and chairman of the Nebraska Small Property Owners Committee, estimated the average rise at 18 percent.

THE WEST COAST

On the west coast conditions generally were reported stabilized, with controls continuing virtually intact.

A considerable number of higher rents was noted in Spokane, Wash., after 5 months of decontrol. James P. Dillard, chairman of the Spokane Rent Advisory Board, which recommended the decontrol, noted in a report last month to Housing Expediter Tighe Woods that the average increase was 14.3 percent, or about $5.28 monthly. He added that a few rental housing operators had taken advantage of the situation to put unreasonable increases into effect.

He stated that there had been a large increase in the number of properties offered for rent recently, and estimated the number of Spokane vacant units at 1,200 to 1,500. One reason is the heavy postwar construction of fairly low-priced houses.

On the other side of the picture, Fred Simmons, who managed the Spokane area rent office before decontrol closed it, announced that he had received complaints from 100 tenants that their rent had been increased 38 to 53 percent.

In the Los Angeles district rents were reported still "extremely tight." Decontrol was authorized on December 7 in Beverly Hills and Ben C. Koepke, area rent director, said that complaints by Beverly Hills tenants of rent increases of as much as 275 percent and averaging nearly 80 percent had reached his office. Bitter controversy preceded decontrol in Beverly Hills, west end neighborhood of Los Angeles.

Complaints also were received from Pasadena, Alhambra, Elmonte, and Pomona. The average increase cited in the complaints, according to Mr. Koepke, was slightly more than $52, indicating that some owners were attempting "rent gouges" and that others were taking this method of trying to get rid of unwanted tenants.

General Los Angeles picture

Many modern apartments are available in the Los Angeles district at $75 or more a month, unfurnished, but hundreds of families are looking in vain for places at $35 to $70 and new arrivals are complicating the situation.

A growing sentiment for decontrol was noted in Long Beach and some other populous communities near Los Angeles, where the housing situation has improved lately.

Controlled rental units in the San Francisco area show an average rate of $44.43 a month, compared with an average of $82.50 for suites in new houses not under control, according to the Federal rent office there. Rent adjustments were granted in the year to landlords of more than 7,000 units, with an average increase of $8.25 a month. The total annual income of landlords was increased by about $695,000. All of the populous centers near San Francisco still are under the rent regulations.

THE SOUTHWEST

In the Southwest interest has been centered on the results of decontrol in the large cities of Texas. The Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that the index of rents in Houston rose 11 percent in the 3 months which ended November 15. There was said to be a comparable situation in Dallas, Fort Worth and San Antonio, all of which have been free of ceiling since September 1.

Rents for some houses in the four cities have been increased 10 to 15 percent, with isolated increases of perhaps as much as 100 percent, according to the Houston Property Owners Association. The association asserted, however, that these increases had been largely offset by lower rents for many apartments.

There have been recurrent warnings lately that Houston may be "overbuilding" so far as multi-family housing is concerned. A renter's market appears to be returning. There also has been a broad expansion in construction of houses. A further competitive factor has been the return of many houses to the rental market following decontrol.

Woodrow Wilson: Man of Half Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been interesting to read the list of names chosen as the most outstanding men of the last half century. Rightly appearing among the great is the name of Woodrow Wilson.

David Lawrence, in the current issue of United States News, presents the name of President Woodrow Wilson as the most outstanding man of the past 50 years.

As a part of my remarks, I beg leave to insert said article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WOODROW WILSON: MAN OF HALF CENTURY
(By David Lawrence)

If decisive influence upon the course of world affairs is the criterion in determining what man during the first half of this century did most for mankind, then the fateful heroism of Woodrow Wilson transcends the claims that may be offered in behalf of anyone else.

For it was Woodrow Wilson who turned America away from more than a century of aloofness and traditional isolation and placed her mighty industrial and military power at the disposal of the free democracies of Europe and thus tipped the scales on the side of victory in World War I. This affected the whole destiny of our modern civilization and kept aloft the torch of democracy which had burned so brightly since our own War for Independence and the French Revolution.

It was Woodrow Wilson who in his war message of April 1917 unhesitatingly recommended to Congress the conscription of our manpower, the extension of unlimited financial aid to our allies, and the prompt dispatch of an American expeditionary force to battlefields more than 3,000 miles away.

It was Woodrow Wilson who in 1918, at the critical moment of the war, insisted on a unified command among the Allied armies and not only recommended Marshal Foch as supreme commander but stood staunchly behind him in the great decisions of World War I.

It was Woodrow Wilson who propagated the doctrine of the "self-determination of peoples from which has since come a recognition of independence movements in Ireland, the Philippines, India, Burma, Israel, Indonesia, to say nothing of the struggles for democracy in central Europe unhappily thwarted now by another autocracy.

BIRTH OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONSCIENCE

It was Woodrow Wilson who gave the world an international conscience. He sought to secure for the world through the League of Nations not only a system of collective security but the maintenance of the territorial integrity and independence of all nations, large and small.

It is no disparagement of his record that America switched back to isolationism in 1920 and forsook the League by refusing to accept its obligations. It is no disparagement, either, that the Charter of the United Nations corrected some of the mistakes experienced with the Covenant of the League. It is no disparagement of Woodrow Wilson's record that a Hitler arose to threaten democracy again and based his aggressive action on the mistaken assumption that the turn to isolationism in America in the twenties was an assurance against our participation in a second world war.

It is natural that the great eloquence and extraordinary pen of Winston Churchill should command attention for him in choosing the Man of the Half Century. But while Churchill saved his own country by his courage in 1940, the die had already been cast for American cooperation in World War II by the decisive steps "short of war" taken by President Franklin D. Roosevelt when Holland and Belgium were invaded in May 1940.

If decisive influence on the course of world history is the yardstick of measurement, then Franklin Roosevelt would appear to stand higher than Winston Churchill, not by reason of any invidious comparisons of ability or personality but solely because of the immense power which Mr. Roosevelt wielded and the decisions he made to use that power in the best interests of mankind.

GOALS OF HUMAN HAPPINESS

Franklin Roosevelt ultimately carried forward what was left undone when Woodrow Wilson's principles were abandoned in 1920 by an isolationism which was to hold fast in both our political parties for nearly two decades afterwards. Even Mr. Roosevelt in the spring of 1932, as he campaigned for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency, wrote that he considered the League of Nations as dead. He displayed no fervor about reviving it until 1945 when he exacted from Stalin at Yalta a pledge to help build the United Nations.

If the course of history is to be influenced in the future by some form of world government or world discipline or by some formula of collective security, the ideals for which Woodrow Wilson gave his life must be viewed as the ideals of the century. They represent still the stirring manifestation of a conscience among the peoples of the world. They are still the aspirations of men and women, whether oppressed behind the iron curtain or elsewhere.

We have not yet come close to those goals of human happiness for which Woodrow Wilson strove so valiantly. But Woodrow Wilson's passion for human freedom in an international sense and his recognition of the ever-increasing need for liberalism in a national sense are today the very essence of such progress as we have made in recent years not only in America but throughout the world.

Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo:

CITY OF BUFFALO,
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
January 4, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to the directions of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, I enclose to you herewith copy of Resolution 160, passed by that body at a meeting held December 27, 1949, in relation to funds for the development of water-front facilities.

Very truly yours,
Dr. J. J. THOMOLOSKE,
City Clerk.

Resolution 160
(By Mr. Rybka)

Funds—Water-front development

Whereas the capital expenditures committee, created by the council, is presently considering the development of the water-front facilities of the city of Buffalo and has appropriated a sum of money for the purpose of initiating such development; and

Whereas such appropriation is but a small fraction of the amount of money needed to defray the expense of the development of our water front; and

Whereas the citizens of Buffalo are entitled to and should have a modern water front complete with park and recreational facilities, bathing beach, boat harbors, etc., without the necessity of traveling great distances to enjoy such facilities outside the city of Buffalo; and

Whereas there is presently, before the common council and the capital expenditures committee, a proposed skyway in addition to water-front development which would facilitate traffic conditions along the water-front area and that such plans represent a large expenditure of money; and

Whereas such development would enhance the value of our city by attracting tourists and new industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the common council go on record memorializing the New York State Legislature, Congress, and Senate of the United States for State and Federal financial aid to the city of Buffalo to be considered at the next session of both bodies beginning January 1950; be it further

Resolved, That the area members of the New York State Senate, Assembly, and United States Senators HERBERT H. LEHMAN and IRVING IVES and area Congressman CHESTER GORSKI, ANTHONY TAURIELLO, and WILLIAM PFENDER be advised of the common council's action and to take the necessary appropriate measures to secure the requested financial assistance for the city of Buffalo.

Passed: Ayes, 15; noes, none.

Taxes Big Issue Faced by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Courier-Times of New Castle, Ind., for December 28, 1949:

TAXES BIG ISSUE FACED BY CONGRESS

The question of taxes promises to be the most important that will face Congress which starts its session next week. No one knows for sure what the President will recommend, but he is certainly facing a public which is more and more becoming tax conscious. Mr. Truman has stated that he prefers higher taxes in order to avoid deficit financing and has been met by demands that deficits be eliminated through the spending of less money.

One of the larger of the tax issues concerns the so-called excise taxes. These are the left-overs from the war and include many items, automobiles, railroad fares, telephone and telegraph tolls, furs, cosmetics and a lot of other things originally classified as luxuries. Many Republicans, headed by JOE MARTIN, GOP leader in the House, believe the time is here to repeal these excise levies and they are being joined by many Democrats.

Of course, if the excise levies are repealed, revenue to make up the deficit must come from other sources. The argument of those favoring repeal is that it would prove a healthy stimulus to business generally and this would make possible a greater normal tax return to the Treasury. If, for instance, the $500 or $600 Federal tax involved in the sale of an automobile be repealed, thus bringing the price down to where sales would boom, the income tax of the manufacturers might be increased to the extent that the return to the Treasury would balance the loss in excises. The same reasoning could be applied to dozens of now taxed articles and the whole thing might be the making of an unprecedented business expansion.

One thing is sure, the whole field is worthy of exploring and Congress is likely to do that very thing.

Mr. Truman on Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times for January 6, 1950:

MR. TRUMAN ON FORMOSA

President Truman's statement on Formosa is a direct reply to the recommendation of former President Hoover and Senator TAFT that United States armed forces be used to aid in the defense of the island. They will not so be used, the President states. We feel that a majority of Americans will agree that this decision is well taken and that the risks of a possibly unsuccessful military commitment outweigh the advantages that might be gained.

Beyond that point, however, the President's declaration compounds the confusion in which the problem of Far East policy is already wrapped. The United States, the President says, has no desire "to establish military bases on Formosa at this time." If not "at this time," then at what time? Why the gratuitous introduction of this qualification?

The United States, says Mr. Truman, will not pursue a course that would lead to "involvement" in a civil conflict in China. But the President has repeatedly pledged the "involvement" of the United States in the cause of the survival of free states against the depredations of aggressive communism. The President's statement means that the United States does not propose to be involved in the support of a Government which, whatever its faults of leadership, we still recognize and presumably expect to continue to recognize against precisely those forces that the President has identified as aggressive.

In addition, the President says that we will not provide "military aid or advice" to Chinese forces on Formosa. That needs explaining. Does it mean an embargo on arms shipments? Apparently not, since the President says that the forces on Formosa have resources adequate to obtain items for defense. Obtain them from where? From the United States! The President says we will not provide "advice" to the Chinese. Is this merely a disavowal of the plan to send some sort of military mission or does it mean that the Americans who are now on Formosa, actually not only advising but training Chinese, will be returned to the United States?

The President says that the present authorized ECA program will be continued. For what purposes and in what amounts? If it is used to strengthen the island's industries, and thus indirectly advance its military potential, will this not constitute military aid? Do the resources of Formosa include any part of the $75,000,000 that the President was authorized by Congress to spend in the China area? If not, why not?

The President has said, in effect, that we wash our hands of Formosa. On the same day, the President's Ambassador Extraordinary, Dr. Jessup, declares in Tokyo that we have no intention of abandoning China. What China? Does Dr. Jessup mean that we have no intention of abandoning Communist China? That seems unlikely. Then he must mean the lawful government of China which President Truman indicates that we are, in effect, abandoning.

It is small wonder that the British, on the eve of their own recognition of the Chinese Communists, regard our policy as vacillating and unpredictable. If it had been otherwise the British might have been considerably less precipitate in recognizing the Mao Tsetung regime, and we would have had one less element of confusion in the picture.

The President's statement has many of the earmarks of a political impromptu designed to meet opposition criticism and to give a line to those Members of Congress who are always ready to support the administration. But it is more than time, now, that the entire matter have a complete airing, with all of the hitherto withheld reports about China brought out into the open. The only place in which that airing can take place is the elected Congress.

New Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding farm journals of the country, the American Agriculturist, whose editor is E. R. Eastman, has inaugurated a movement to arouse its readers and the country to the dangers of current trends in Government. It has published a new Declaration of Independence and is soliciting the support of all citizens who are ready to subscribe to the declaration and actively participate in steps to forestall the continuance of these socialistic trends.

Feeling that this declaration should be of general public interest, I am taking the liberty of including it as an extension of my remarks:

WILL YOU PLEDGE YOURSELF TO THIS NEW DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE?

The following new Declaration of Independence was written by and represents the joint thinking of a group of responsible citizens concerned with the gradual loss of our liberties. They and we are determined to do something about it.

We believe that no American citizen would vote at any one time for the amount of socialism we now have. And we are sure that most people do not realize how fully this country has gone socialistic, or that socialism is the half-brother of communism. Socialism has crept up on us a step at a time. And, because of our indifference, our selfishness in getting our own little handouts from government, or because of our concern for our private affairs, creeping socialism has now reached the walking stage, and unless we can stop it, it will soon be galloping.

The consequence is that the Nation has gone a long way down the road toward centralization of government and the philosophy that the state is more important than the individual. We have more and more government employees, government control, deficit spending, and ever-higher taxes, all of which is resulting and will continue to result in the loss of our most precious possession, individual liberty.

Because of this alarming situation, more and more citizens believe that America is on the downward road and that we must immediately retrace our steps back to the crossroads and start again on the right road to our true destiny of free opportunity for everyone. This can only be done if the people themselves realize what is going on and do something about it. The welfare of every citizen of the United States, and the welfare of the world, depends on what course America follows in the immediate future. It is a grave responsibility.

So, read the statement that follows. If you agree with its principles, pledge yourself to stand by and fight for these principles, and get your friends to do the same.

E. R. EASTMAN.

We, loyal citizens of the United States, determined to maintain and preserve the blessings of liberty and of personal opportunity for ourselves and for our posterity, hold it to be the truth that our American Government and our American system of free enterprise have for generation after generation given our people more opportunity to develop their own natural talents and ability to achieve success and a higher standard of living than has any other government or social system of the past or present. Competition and incentive provided by the free market—in other words, individual enterprise—are absolutely necessary to progress resulting in an ever higher standard of living for everybody.

We emphasize the tremendous sacrifices that have been made since the days of King John and the Magna Carta to the present to achieve our present degree of political, religious, and economic liberty. We submit that one cannot exist without the other.

We are agreed that these liberties are rapidly being lost, and that in many respects there is less liberty in the world today, even in America, than there was before the Declaration of Independence. These losses of our liberties nullify the untold sacrifices of our fathers and sons and are largely due to a false belief on the part of a large number of people that some other social or government ideology, some other "ism" of the Old World, is better than our own American.

We hold it to be self-evident that true liberty of all kind is based upon the welfare and the importance of the individual, that government exists for the individual and never the individual for government. It follows, therefore, that if his importance is to be maintained, more emphasis must be placed on the individual and his organizations, more emphasis on volunteer work for the public good, and less upon force or compulsion by law and government regulations. The powers of government should never be used except to provide the rules that make maximum freedom possible, to protect the citizen from abuses within, to

provide safety from outside aggression. When the powers of government are used they should be based on law, not on bureaucratic regulations.

In view, therefore, of maintaining these basic and vital principles we solemnly pledge ourselves to work with our representatives in the State and Federal Governments, with our associates, with our organizations, with the general public, and with our friends.

I. For less Government in business, agriculture, and labor.

To this end we support the Hoover Report, which calls for fewer Government services and consolidation of departments and bureaus resulting in a lesser number of public employees, lower taxes, and more efficiency.

II. We will regularly and constantly call attention to the growing army of government employees, Federal, State, and local.

As of July 1949, there was a total of approximately 6,500,000 employees on the State and Federal pay rolls, about two-thirds of whom were State and local employees and one-third Federal. These figures compare with the figures for 1940, when the total number was approximately 4,500,000, with almost 1,500,000 of them on the Federal pay rolls. It is plain that America cannot continue to exist on this spendthrift basis.

We are certain that this army of employees, with their total voting power and their natural and normal inclination to keep themselves in office, are a dangerous factor in our Republic. We are convinced that there is confusion and duplication of services, and that many of the jobs done by Government employees can be better done by the individual and his organizations on a voluntary basis.

III. We are determined to emphasize at every opportunity the growing public debt, the constantly increasing current expenses of Government, the ruinous effects of these, and the resulting taxes upon every business and individual in America.

We are convinced that the huge strain of ruinous taxes is increasingly retarding the investment by individuals and industry of capital in constructive enterprises. Such investments are essential to continued expansion of employment and continued growth of the country. Before the war, in 1940, the total State and local tax bill was $8,500,000,000, and that of the Federal Government was $5,500,000,000. Now, in 1949, the State and local tax bill is $14,500,000,000, and the Federal is $43,000,000,000. Even excluding Federal expenses due to war, costs of the Federal Government have doubled. In the last 4 years the Government has spent more money than in all the preceding 169 years since the founding of the country. The power to tax is the power to destroy.

IV. We believe that unrestricted Government subsidies and price-support schemes will destroy liberty and lead to national bankruptcy. Therefore, we will urge the greatest possible use of the free market, competitive system in every segment of our economy.

We submit that an ever increasing standard of living can come only from an ever increasing production of industrial and agricultural products. We believe that free market prices with a stable price level are the best possible guides to production of agricultural and industrial products. Government subsidies and price supports must always lead to controls and restriction of production. Whenever production is restricted, unemployment increases and the national standard of living falls.

The most important factor in maintaining a stable price level is the fiscal policy of government. We believe that government attempts to inflate and debase the currency bring about instability rather than stability of the price level. We believe that thrift in government, a pay-as-you-go fiscal policy, is conducive to a stable price level and we will work to that end.

V. We believe that every American should have the unrestricted right to work and earn.

VI. We pledge ourselves to work for a better understanding of the principles on which this Government was founded, between and among agricultural, industrial and labor groups and individuals in general, with a liberal and tolerant attitude toward all constructive groups and organizations in our political and social economy, realizing that peace among the nations must first start with understanding and friendship among ourselves.

Now, Mr. President, Just Who Pays Our Tax Bill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on this opening of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, we, the elected Representatives of the American people, must, as never before, take into consideration the financial condition of our United States Treasury. We must take a good, square look down the road we are traveling before it is too late to save our people from utter destruction.

All of you, my colleagues in this House of Congress, have just returned from your respective districts, as have I, and I am sure you will admit, if you want to be honest with yourself and the people, that your people, like mine of the Seventh Iowa District, are more deeply worried and nearer to losing heart when looking into the future, seeing what is in store for them and their children, than ever before in peacetime. Surely you must all agree that they have good and sufficient reason to be worried. From the lips and hearts of thinking people, in all walks of life, whether it be the laborer, the farmer, or businessman, all without exception, asked me why, oh why, does Congress spend our money as if it grew on trees? Then, when the news hit that the President contemplated a $5,500,000,000 deficit for the fiscal year 1950, which ends next June 30, without promising a greatly reduced spending program for the fiscal year 1951, their hope for the future looked still darker. And, to add insult to injury, President Truman demanded an increase in taxes. That was the last straw.

Of course, the President said only the tax on corporations will be increased, but what he forgets is that most of the American people have fully awakened to the fact that to impose more taxes on any business, large or small, is just another concealed tax on the consumer, who is the wage earner, the farmer, the retired elderly folks, and all the rest of the consumers. They must pay in tax dollars in the final analysis every penny Congress spends, either with cash, withholding tax, or by the hidden tax on everything they buy. The hidden tax now amounts to about 30 cents on every dollar's worth of goods they buy to eat or use. Surely the President knows that the ultimate consumer has no place; nor any way to shift his taxes; he must pay the bill which the President is trying to hoodwink him into believing is paid by the corporations, or the "big bugs" as the administration likes to call American industry and business. Business must add taxes onto the price of all the goods they manufacture or sell every day to the consumers of America. If they did not do that, they would very soon go bankrupt, and the President knows that too.

Let us see just who the folks really are who are being soaked by the vote-buying and reckless-spending proposals which are demanded by the President, and have been demanded ever since he took over a few months before our fighting Americans, with their brains and brawn ,and blood, defeated the gang across the seas, whose dictators had promised their subjects security and Utopia at the end of the same road down which the President seems determined to lead us.

Who are the folks who must pay this bill? Well, that is an easy one to answer when we get right down to brass tacks. It is the consumer who pays the fiddler, being the laboring people of America, both blue-denim and white-collar workers, plus the retired elderly people, who altogether constitute about 60 percent of the consumers dollarwise; and our farmers who now number about 20 percent of our total population, but who buy and consume one and one-half times more per capita than do the average of the rest of us, making 30 percent total consumption by our farmers dollarwise. Therefore, that leaves only 10 percent for the owners of business and industry of every kind to pay. But mind you, it is this small 10 percent of our consumers dollarwise who our President and his socialistic palace politicians are trying to trick and doubletalk us into thinking they want to soak. Then the truth is, as I have just shown, it is Mr. Farmer, Mr. Wage Earner, and the retired elderly folks, who are getting the real soaking and will get a worse soaking if this vote-buying outfit in power is not stopped.

An editorial in a recent issue of one of our leading farm magazines, stated:

> A rising complaint about taxes is evident over the country. People are beginning to realize that the direct taxes, such as property, income, and school levies, are by no means all they are paying. Back of these is a jungle of hidden taxes. They are a part of the cost of every business and are passed along in the price of everything a person buys. An ordinary good suit of clothes is calculated to carry more than 100 different taxes, an automobile more than 200.
>
> Because the tax collectors' fingers reach into one's pockets at almost every turn, they now take a large part of all income. The Northeast Farm Foundation estimates that they absorb, in visible or invisible ways, over 20 cents of every dollar the farmer earns.
>
> The rate at which the tax bill is growing raises a question of critical importance to everybody. It is simply: How much of the national income can be taken by taxes without leaving too little for the Nation's economy to operate at full capacity? * * *
>
> What should be done is plain. It is to call a halt to unproductive tax spending and to examine every new proposal along that line solely from the standpoint of whether it adds to or takes away from the funds in the common purse. Upon their conservation depends the ability of industry to make and sell goods, of labor to have steady employment, and of agriculture to enjoy a stable market.
>
> The tax question is now a matter of saving a good standard of living in America.

Maybe you personally have not felt the soaking yet, but you will sooner or later regardless of who you are or what you do, unless this Congress makes up its mind to ignore the sweet mouthings of our President and his power-mad, wasteful spenders, and take the bull by the horns and bring all requests and demands for Federal expenditures in line with what the American people can afford to pay for the running of their Government in Washington.

The first session of the Eighty-first Congress spent over $1,200 for each family in America to pay. Does that mean anything to you, Mr. President, or don't you care? Don't forget, Germany's Hitler, Russia's Stalin, and England's Attlee also promised their people security and utopia in exchange for their votes. Their people got neither, but to the contrary they lost their God-given liberties. You know the sad, sad story. Look at England today.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee of this House of Representatives, I plead with you my colleagues for your help in saving our country from committing national suicide through the bankruptcy route as has been the fate of every nation on earth which traveled the full road we are now traveling at breakneck speed.

Regardless of party, I pray that every Member of this Congress will recognize the duty to be performed and rise to that duty. The signposts on the road ahead are now crystal clear.

Martin Gorski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed a great shock for me to learn of the sudden passing of our colleague MARTIN GORSKI. Martin and I were sworn in as new Members of the Congress on the same day.

As my district adjoins the city of Chicago, I soon found that the problems, legislative and otherwise, existing in his district were identical on a great many important matters of legislation to those of mine. On many occasions we consulted and exchanged ideas, and I always found his good judgment and common sense very helpful.

MARTIN GORSKI came to this country from his native Poland with his parents when a mere child. He was in every sense of the word a self-made man. I do not know of any Member of Congress who regarded his congressional duties and responsibilities more seriously than MARTIN GORSKI. Everyone who knew him respected his opinion, and he enjoyed the confidence of many Members of this House. He will be sorrowfully missed by his friends in this body, as well as throughout the Chicago area.

I wish to extend to his family my sincere sympathy in their bereavement.

The Late Sir Willmott Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial from today's issue of the Washington Post and call the attention of the Members to the death of a great friend of America and one of the world's finest and most noted newspaper men.

Bill Lewis' understanding of America, our traditions, our personality, and our history did much during his many years of service in Washington to cement relationships with the British Empire by giving both the United States and his native country a better understanding of one another.

His anecdotes and salty humor will be greatly missed on the Washington scene, but will long live in the memories of his many friends here and throughout the world. The fourth estate has lost one of its most honored and respected members.

SIR WILLMOTT LEWIS

> Few deaths, we suspect, have occasioned such an intimate sadness among so many persons as that of Sir Willmott Lewis, who was for 28 years the Washington correspondent of the Times of London. There is probably no other man in Washington who has enjoyed so much admiration and affection among the members of his own trade. Among them his wit, intelligence, kindliness, and companionability had won him a special status, secure from all jealousy or malice.
>
> It was one of Sir Willmott's peculiarities that with all his long residence here he never shed any of his British mannerisms. But it was also true that he understood the American psychology and the workings of American politics far better than most Americans. Among the many things for which he was famous were his informal lectures in American history to his American colleagues at the bar of the National Press Club. He was an incomparable raconteur, and his fund of anecdotes, accumulated partly from personal experiences in many corners of the world, partly from his omnivorous and incessant reading, was well-nigh exhaustless. He had encountered at one time or another in his career nearly all the great historical figures of the twentieth century, and he had an intimate imaginative acquaintance with most of those who had died before his time.
>
> His dispatches were models of easy prose. It is safe to say that those who followed them in the Times were far better informed about what was happening in Washington than most American newspaper readers. For that matter many eminent American Washington correspondents acquired the habit of reading them for enlightenment.
>
> It was a commonplace observation in Washington that Sir Willmott Lewis had won more good will for his country than a whole succession of British diplomats, and indeed both by his colleagues and by the British Embassy he was recognized as a sort of unofficial ambassador. He was Welsh by origin, and part of the secret of his charm for Americans of all types and trades was a kind of wild Celtic exuberance that broke continually through his affectation of languor.
>
> The legends that have accumulated around Sir Willmott Lewis are innumerable, and will probably be repeated and elaborated as long as all those who knew him survive. Now that he has gone, Washington will seem a sadder and drearier place.

Cotton-Acreage Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert a resolution adopted by the Richmond County, N. C., Board of County Commissioners, and a letter from Mr. N. L. Hendrix, county agent for Richmond County, involving the cotton-acreage allotment.

These representations and many, many others that have come to me clearly indicate that the Congress must with haste make changes in the legislation so as to prevent widespread unemployment and so spell out the law that the acreage allotments will be fair and equitable.

The cotton growers in my district strongly favor control but the severe cuts if carried out in this first year will develop economic tragedy. Even now many honest and faithful tenants are making their way to county welfare offices for actual necessities of life.

The resolution and letter follow:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE RICHMOND COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, ROCKINGHAM, N. C., JANUARY 1, 1950

Whereas pursuant to Public Law 272 the North Carolina cotton growers in the cotton referendum of December 15, 1949, voted for marketing quotas and cotton allotments; and

Whereas there was much dissatisfaction with the formula for establishing acreage allotments under the provisions of the Public Law 272 and, despite this dissatisfaction, the cotton producers voted for the referendum, clearly indicating that a control program was desired in some form; and

Whereas the formula and acreage allotment which have been adopted and will be used under the marketing and allotment program will impose an undue hardship on many people who have depended on cotton production for many years, and in many cases individuals will be left destitute, dependent entirely on welfare agencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Honorable C. B. DEANE, United States Representative, Eighth Congressional District, State of North Carolina,

he and he is hereby requested to use his influence in an effort to support some legislation, by way of amendment, or otherwise, which will more nearly equalize the quotas or allotments for the cotton producers in Richmond County, N. C.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Hollingham, N. C., January 4, 1950.

Hon. CHARLES B. DEANE,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER: The 1950 cotton-acreage allotment in Richmond County is not adequately distributed to the farmers who have been growing cotton in this county. Figures show that 391 farmers have an allotment of less than 5 acres, and 341 farmers have allotments of exactly 5 acres. These 732 farmers have a total allotment of approximately 3,600 acres. Many of this number of farmers grew cotton only 1 year out of the 3-year period of 1946, 1947, 1948.

To illustrate, Farmer No. 1 grew 5 acres of cotton in 1946; Farmer No. 2 grew 5 acres in 1947; and Farmer No. 3 grew 5 acres in 1948. Thus, the average cotton planted by these three farmers would be 5 acres. Under the existing allotment laws, these three farmers have a total allotment of 15 acres. This may be overstressed, but I feel that this type farmer in Richmond County certainly has not averaged more than 50 percent of this allotment in the years discussed. Thus, the farmers who have been growing cotton as the principal crop are being severely penalized for 1950.

There is a total of 1,[illegible] cotton allotments in this county. Therefore, the 400 farmers who have been growing the greater percent of the cotton are only getting a little more than 5,000 acres.

As it is now worked out, the 732 farmers who have an allotment of 5 acres or less are getting more allotment (and a large percent of these farmers do not depend on farming for a living) than the average planted acres of the base period; whereas, the 400 farmers who depend on farming for their main income have an allotment of approximately 51 percent of their normal planted acreage. A few farmers have slightly above this figure, because of their war crops planted and open land factor.

I am not writing this in behalf of the big landowners, but for the tenants on these farms. For instance, one farmer in this county who has been planting approximately 500 acres of cotton each year had his allotment cut almost 80 percent. There are approximately 75 people on the farms operated by this farmer that depend principally upon cotton for a living. Some of these tenants have lived with this farmer for 20 years or more, but this farmer cannot keep these tenants on this small acreage allotment. Now, just what is going to happen to these tenants?

If farmers of this size were allowed 70 percent of their normal acreage, they could probably take care of their tenants.

Eighty-nine farmers in Richmond County who did not plant cotton in 1946, 1947, or 1948 received cotton allotments. This was received by the past farm cotton history and the production of war crops. Most of these farmers were surprised at getting a cotton allotment, and normally would not plant cotton in 1950. However, most of these farmers will be reluctant to give up this allotment, and I don't blame them, for it would be an asset in case the farm should be for sale.

The total cotton allotment in Richmond County is approximately 9,500 acres, and this allotment is close to the acreage that has been planted in the past, but it is just not on the farms that have been growing cotton.

The additional acreage which would be required to give each farmer an allotment equal to 70 percent of the average 1946, 1947, 1948 actual planted acreage is 1,909 acres.

Anything that you can do to help adjust this situation would be greatly appreciated by the farmers of Richmond County.

Very truly yours,
N. L. HENDRIX, *County Agent.*

The Big Job for 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert this editorial from the January 1 edition of the Milwaukee Journal:

THE BIG JOB FOR 1950

The Nation's big job for 1950 is the reorganization of Federal agencies—to bring costs within the ability of taxpayers to pay, and to bring about the efficiency by which we can meet our problems, at home and abroad.

The groundwork has been done. The Hoover Commission took 2 years to find out what happened to our sprawling, improvised Government under the impact of two world wars and a depression. Today we are wasting—actually wasting—not millions but billions. We are setting forth democracy as the most desirable form of government, but the best we can show is only a low percentage of efficiency.

The Hoover Commission laid down the outlines for improvement. It made in all 318 recommendations. The President then took leadership and the first session of the Eighty-first Congress responded by enacting 20 percent of the program. The hard pull will come on the 80 percent remaining, and that points up the job for the second session.

There are two possible road blocks. One is political partisanship and the other is the vested interest of bureaucracy.

The Hoover Commission itself kept partisanship outside the door. Congressman CLARENCE J. BROWN, who wrote the legislation that created the bipartisan set-up, could say before the recent reorganization conference in Washington that never once did the Commission in formulating its recommendations divide on partisan lines. There were differences but they were personal differences. Partisanship can be kept out.

The greater obstacle is bureaucratic obstinacy. People are becoming aroused, however. The Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report is becoming a mighty force. But it is still possible that bureaucracy may stymie reorganization by using vast numbers of people—the citizens themselves—to do it. Here is an example:

One of the most amazing disclosures of inefficiency was that made by the task force which surveyed the Veterans' Administration. This sprawling, overstaffed set-up is of vital importance to 18,000,000 veterans, and of scarcely less importance to all taxpayers because of the billions involved in its budget to meet the Nation's obligations to the men who served America well. Yet the VA uses 10 times the amount of labor to handle an insurance policy that a private company uses. It takes many more days, even weeks, to settle a death claim than private companies take. By actual survey it was shown that the average employee in the VA insurance department does only one-fourth as much work as the equivalent employee in a private company.

One might think that the Veterans' Administration, under such a showing, would leap to reorganization. It has not. The Hoover task force has reported an almost total lack of responsiveness. The chances are that the VA will fight reorganization.

Enough has been said to indicate what line the opponents will take. They will try to make veterans believe that their interests are being assailed. This is not true. The Hoover Commission has not challenged a single benefit to former service men and women. It is asking only that the VA be efficient enough to serve the veterans without wasting the money that the people give. But if the veterans can be aroused to a fancied danger, that will be a formidable attack, indeed.

Another obstacle will come on reorganization that deals with western resources. There the interests of the Army engineers, the Bureau of Land Management of the Interior Department, and the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture will clash. There will be an opportunity to promote a mighty upheaval in the West in which the real interests of the Nation could be sunk.

Nothing is more important than that our natural resources—our forests, our grazing lands, our topsoils, our minerals, and our water supply—be conserved. But they are being wasted, and dollars along with them, in the present chaos of agencies. If reorganization can best be done by shifting and combining bureaus, as the Hoover Commission recommended, fine. Or if it would be better to create a new Department of Natural Resources, as the Commission's own task force recommended, then it can be done that way. This is for Congress to decide. The unforgivable thing would be for Congress to let pressure groups push it off the track.

This whole reorganization job is tremendously important. Every adult American ought to insist that it be done in 1950.

Truman Promises All Things to All Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the first few days of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress indicate conclusively that President Truman and his henchmen are going to attempt to be all things to all men. Since this cynical political strategy has succeeded in the past, President Truman and his followers believe it will continue to succeed politically. They may be right.

In his message to Congress, Truman alined himself with the "I'm-for-economy, but—" group. In other words, he is for economy in speeches to gullible groups of our citizens, but he is not going to do anything about bringing economy to pass in government. He wants to spend you out of all your income.

The President came out in favor of free enterprise. But the kind of "free enterprise" he talked about is the kind the slaves used to enjoy on southern plantations before the Civil War. The slaves were free to come and go as long as they did not leave the plantations. They were free to mix and mingle in the slave quarters as long as they did not come up around the big white house and try to obtain a better deal on the amount of time they worked each day for the "old marster." They were free to accept hand-outs from their benevolent "old marster," but not to kick against the welfare measures he suggested—such as long rows of cabins, ill lighted, broken down, and filled with vermin.

Oh, yes, there was freedom on the old plantations—just as there is freedom in the "poorhouse state" for which Truman is plugging away. The people in the big White House can throw parties, get away with tax-free expense allowances of $50,000 a year, have a private yacht out on the river, and lord it over the foremen, subforemen, and vassals.

Remember, when Truman talks about free enterprise, he is talking about the freedom which he, Harry Vaughan, and all the rest of the freebooters exercise in the big White House while the rest of us are supposed to be out in the backhouses singing hymns. Occasionally, we might be allowed to come around for the lighting of a Christmas tree, to sing folk songs, or to hear the "old marster" expound the virtues of freedom, but by and large, our task is merely to work and sweat and pay.

The "old marster" in the big White House, like those on the southern plantations of long ago, can afford, as long as world conditions allow it, to overlook what is happening outside his "plantation." Thus, Truman overlooked talking about the steady, ever-onward aggressive march of communism. He dodged the issue of whether we shall recognize Spain, whether we shall withdraw recognition from Soviet Russia, whether we shall defend Formosa against the Communist hordes, or whether he is going to clean out the dilettantes, the Hiss-lovers, the knaves, and the fools around him. He can afford to be the "old marster" a little longer.

One of these days, the slaves in the backhouses are going to awaken to what is happening to them and to their beloved "plantation"—this great land of ours. When they do, and when they understand fully what the "old marster" and his crowd are doing to them and to their land and to their chances for survival, there is going to be a whoop and a holler that will make those emitted by slaves freed by Lincoln seem like the tinkling of a cowbell compared to the explosion of an atom bomb.

If the people—and by the people, I mean every Tom, Dick, and Harry, every laboring man and farmer and the rich and the poor—ever wake up to what "Marse" Harry has in store for them, and already is practicing upon them in subtle ways, they will vote so heavily for the Republicans it will be nothing short of a revolution.

The Republicans have a job to do. That job is to expose, expose, and expose; domestically and internationally. If the people see clearly the miasma in which they are wading, they will begin to look for firmer ground. And "old marster" will be gone—where the good darkies go.

A Congressman Views the Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert in the RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks, a speech which the Honorable HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., a Member of Congress, made before the San Francisco Lions' Club on December 6, 1949. Representative SCOTT is a member of the Lions' Club of Germantown, Pa. Before delivering the address he had recently returned from a visit to Great Britain and Europe as a member of the House Subcommittee on Medicine. He is a member of the House minority policy committee. A great many members of the San Francisco Lions' Club requested copies of the address, and I believe it merits being brought to the attention of all Members of Congress. Mr. SCOTT's speech was as follows:

I think it quite possible that I have received during the past 12 months more letters and oral suggestions regarding the development of a truly American program than any other person in this country, since, as chairman for much of that time of the opposition party I was the focal point for such suggestions. Now at last I am free to talk simply as a citizen and as one member of the minority policy committee of the House of Representatives. I welcome such an opportunity and I am going to talk to you about the development of an American program leading away from the deep-freeze state.

What is the deep freeze state (usually called the Socialist state in Britain and the social welfare state here)? They're moving away from it in Britain because they've tried it in its more extreme form; we're moving toward it, because too many people are still deluded by the ballyhoo of the give-away program and the concealed cost hasn't yet pinched the pocketbook nerve of enough of its gullible beneficiaries.

What's it like to live in the deep-freeze state? (Everything's for free—buttered on both sides—with room service at no extra charge.) Well, let's pass by the German experience from Bismarck's social security (through three wars to make good on more abundant life promises) to the ultimate degradation of the national socialistic experiment.

Let's see what happened in Britain when the deep freeze set in. Was it good for the workers? Did they get the welfare? They did not. Their average wage in Great Britain is $29.60 a week. Here it's $55. In Great Britain income tax begins at 40 percent after the first $672, and the cost of living goes higher every month. Bread has just taken another leap away from the worker's mouths and rents are going higher.

The Government in Britain has taken over much of industry. Government is now an employer and anxious to show a profit. So when British workers strike last summer on the docks, the welfare state used troops to break the strike.

Who gets the welfare in the deep-freeze state? Why, the officeholders, of course. There is a story in point. An American auto worker visited a plant in Russia and asked, "Who owns the plant?" "The people own it" said the Russian. "Who owns all of these automobiles?" asked the American worker. "Oh," said the Russian, "they belong to the officials." Later, so the story goes, the Russian visited the American worker at a Detroit plant. "Who owns all of these buildings?" asked the Russian. "Oh, they belong to the company," was the reply. "Well, then who owns all of these automobiles out on the lot?" "Oh," said the American worker, "they belong to us."

In Britain there are far more bureaucrats than were necessary before or even during the war and the workers' wages are frozen and he is frozen in his job, while his real wages go down because the Government steadily takes back more and more in taxes of what it pays out in wages.

What happens to the hope to do better for yourself and the kids next year? That's laid away in the deep freeze, too. Since there is no incentive to the employer or employee from hope of profit, people produce less and costs and prices go higher.

That government which freezes initiative and destroys incentive cannot excuse itself by argument that its motives are good because it would like all of its people to be guaranteed free food, clothing, and medical care by the state. But, of course, at the same time, remember that food and clothing and medical care are produced by work and work only. Therefore in the nature of things they cannot be free, but can only be had by paying for them, either directly by the worker or indirectly through taxes to the government. And it always costs more when government is the middleman because government puts on a lot more nonproducers (government employees) to distribute the product.

The deep-freeze state is a state of ultimate misery because its plan is to strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. It tries to legislate unproductive people into prosperity by legislating productive people out of it. As Mr. Churchill put it: "Capitalism is the unequal distribution of plenty, while Socialism is the equal distribution of misery." Socialism will work only in heaven, where they don't want it, or in hell where they've got it already.

The America we know didn't come out of a deep freeze, but out of a burning desire for new freedoms of the land, of the mind, of the spirit. We didn't come out of a deep freeze and we aren't going into one, be it Wallace's or Truman's—or even General Vaughan's.

In England you can't change jobs without permission of the Government. You can't take your money out of the country, you can't get many of the things we regard as necessities in this country. You can't work your farm except as the Government tells you, you can't build your business in certain areas where you run afoul of the decentralization program, you can't even buy a drink of the country's Scotch, and you'll go broke trying to keep up a moderate little vice like the smoking habit. I'm sure you wouldn't like the deep-freeze state, even though part of your taxes help to make up the billion dollars a year we send over to shore up the weakening timbers of this shaky structure.

So you wouldn't like it. But back in Washington the men in power, from Mr. Truman up, say they have a mandate to bring the welfare state to the United States.

If you agree that here is a European import that we don't want, how do we go about keeping ourselves out of the deep freeze? Well, let's talk plain. Let's fight back. Let's get mad. I firmly believe that freedom is best nourished by a lively sense of outrage. The Boston "Indians" felt it when they showed King George III where he could put his tea. Your ancestors and mine got plenty mad at Ticonderoga, at bitter cold Valley Forge, at Antietam, and up San Juan Hill. And the last two times somebody went after our liberties we were pretty sore, too.

Well, the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. In Washington at Valley Forge, the author has General Washington saying,

"This liberty will not seem so dear when men no longer die to keep it." And Benjamin Franklin's comment bears remembering. "They that would give up a little liberty in turn for temporary safety will soon have neither liberty nor safety."

I said: "Let's talk plain." I'll begin with this statement: "What this country needs is an American program, a program of enlightened conservatism. To conserve means to save, and what's wrong with that? Millions of Americans are trying in spite of the best efforts of High Tax Harry and the wastrels of Washington to save something, to put a little something by for a rainy day."

The Missouri minstrel strums away: "It ain't gonna rain no more." Not all of us believe it. That's what the boys in the back room told Noah. Noah built his ark anyway. And a good thing, too.

HOW TO STOP RUSH OF MODERN FORTY-NINERS TO THE GOLD FIELDS OF FORT KNOX!

Your modern conservative knows that the Greeks had a word for it. Their wise man, Solon, said: "The state can do no more good than the state can bear."

He will ask himself, then, several questions in testing any proposal to further obligate the Government. (1) Is it good? (2) Is it in the public interest? (3) Will it work? (4) Can it be done best by the Federal, State, or local government? (5) Can we afford it? (6) How shall it be paid for?

The modern conservative would do well to avoid the insufferable hypocrisy of the radical left or the selfish greed of the reactionary right. Let him remember that there are dangerous ruts into which one may sink on either side of progress road. Let him profit too from the signposts along the road we have traveled. If some say that he is not mindful of the public good, let him remember that the Eightieth Congress of 1947-48 was led by modern conservatives; that Congress did not heed reactionary clamor to limit existing social services, nor did it heed the radical demands that the Federal Treasury be ravished.

What did those modern conservatives do? They conserved, in the public interest, the existing social services, they heard and heeded the just claims for greater irrigation and reclamation programs, they cared generously for the veterans of the country's wars. But taking note of their obligation to guard the average man's right to better himself and his natural desire to retain more and more of the fruits of his labor, these modern conservatives said to the citizen: "We will help you to keep more of what you earn." This they did by reducing his income taxes and by holding steady the cost of the things he had to buy, by making Uncle Sam live within his income and even pay off some of the mortgage on the United States homestead.

The discouraged guy says: "Them days are gone forever." Uncle Sam is on a spree again. He's borrowing more this year, over and above the forty-odd billions he's taking out of our pockets, than it used to cost to run the Government for a whole year. He will go in the red five or six billion this year. That single red-ink item used to be enough to run the country in the black for 12 months. Uncle Sam's binge makes the selfish interests on the Potomac very happy. More jobs for the selfish interests. "Don't worry," they say, "everything will be all right. We're going to inflate your money until production figures hit $300,000,000,000 a year. Then we will be able to stop borrowing to spend. After that we'll just spend what we take in, because we'll be taking in more."

I don't agree that the days of living within our income are gone forever. I believe there will come a time when the state-bedazzled voter will look at the Truman crazy quilt and demand something better. It will be up to those of us who think that slap-happy government is all wrong to be able to say to such a person not merely "We told you so" but "We've been telling you what to do about it. Now, let's all get together and put our house in order."

What to do about it? What's an American program? Here are some suggestions: Retain social security, unemployment insurance, old-age benefits, care of the needy and disabled veterans and their dependents, and those social-security services which courts and Congress have declared to be within the sphere of the Federal Government, reserving the right to provide for administration through home rule by the States and local communities of such responsibilities as can best be assumed by them for reasons of economy, administrative efficiency, or constitutional function. Provide, preserve, and improve legislative square treatment for employee, public, and employer. Protect the public domain from private exploitation (by presidential favorites, for example), and continue its steady development in the public interest.

Balance the budget by cutting extraordinarily wasteful Government expenditures. Although Congress has passed all but one of the Hoover Commission legislative proposals, the President has not yet put into effect most of the Executive proposals which could save this country as much money as this year's multi-billion-dollar deficit. Reduce unfair wartime excise taxes on transportation and certain other items.

Give us, not doles, not insurance that is only a caricature of real insurance, or other types of economic fakery that pass for business statesmanship. End the adventures of Government into the attempted suspension of natural economic law. Inflation is not prosperity. Take the shackles off business. Make it possible for business to function at its productive and job creative best. Give us a bill that will reduce taxes so that business and industry may distribute profits and have enough left for replacement and venture into new enterprises. Give us, as soon as possible, lower individual taxes so that people can save for old age instead of being dependent upon Government which impoverishes them during their productive years and then gives them a small and inadequate part back as a "benefit." Give us a sound currency, upon which we can rely. Give us a full production plan. Pass it and see what happens.

By offering constructive American alternatives which are not socialistic; for example, to provide for grants-in-aid for the training of doctors, dentists, nurses, and technicians; to set up local health departments, for medical research, for expanded aid in hospital construction, for school health service, for special aids to bring doctors to sparsely settled areas, and for expanded maternal and child welfare services and research; extension of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield services; and the improvement of medical service in local areas such as has been done in Alameda County, Calif., and notably as developed in Kansas by Dean Murphy of Kansas University.

Where States and local communities cannot provide some services unaided, let the Federal assistance be in the form of grants-in-aid, without domination by overseers from Washington and regulations drafted in remote Washington bureaus.

Expose the sham promises of hypocritical demagogues, by battling unceasingly for absolutely fair and equal economic treatment of every American regardless of the color of his skin or the way he worships his God. Unequal treatment is indecent and unworthy. Apply to all legislation the tests of workability in the public interest.

The times cry out for men and women with a sense of what it is right to do, a program for action—with good will toward their neighbors and the courage and the determination to establish certain principles as verities and to fight for them, everlastingly—with tolerance, intelligence and a high spirit.

There is the voice of Lincoln to guide us: "With courage to do the right as God gives us to see the right."

Yes, you can change the world, you can do these things, for there are millions ready, waiting. But remember: "You gotta stay mad."

The Ultimate End of the Truman Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of recorded history that—

The passing of innumerable legislative measures, all of them in a general way of a restrictive order, conduces necessarily to augment the number, the power, and the influence of the functionaries charged with their application. These functionaries tend in this way to become the veritable master of civilized countries. * * *

These are the three pieces of legislation which Mr. Truman will demand in his message. But, say those who framed this strategy and are, curiously enough, proud of it, not one of these measures will be passed. "Nothing," wrote one of the more outspoken of the Fair Deal commentators, "could more upset the White House than for the lawmakers to bow to the President's expressed will in this session."

In brief, the demand will be wholly insincere. The message will be a phony. The presidential recommendations will be frauds. The whole idea is to beat the drums for these three pieces of legislation, to put up a grand show in their favor but in all three cases refrain from putting enough administration weight behind any one of them to permit its passage. Success of this scheme, it is pointed out, will not only preserve all three as live issues for the 1950 campaign but will enable the Truman administration to blame failure of its phony program upon the Republicans and Dixiecrats, whom they will indict as enemies of organized labor, the farmers, and the Negroes.

There are several things to be said about this strategy. One, of course, is that, accepting the printed explanations of those who favor and framed it, it is a brazen piece of political skulduggery. Another is that it is entirely typical of the political advisers by whom Mr. Truman is surrounded. Most of these are decent men in their personal lives but in politics appear to have no sense of right or wrong and are willing to form any combination, make any alliance, to win an election.

The thought of how their political plans will affect the country is so completely secondary as not to be considered at all. Every legislative proposal, every White House recommendation, is rooted in politics. Every move is made with the view of holding organized labor, the farmer, and the Negroes—the three bought groups upon whose support Mr. Roosevelt was three times elected and which the Truman effort is to see stay bought.

The question is, Can they get away with it this time?

The strategy, of course, is based on the belief that the great mass of the people are credulous dupes. It's an insult to the intelligence of every decent citizen and certainly ought to be resented by the three groups with whom they are playing. But

come the party line in the session of Congress about to open.

According to those who reliably reflect the views of the White House insiders, this strategy proves that, though he may not always seem so, Mr. Truman really is an extremely clever man and is just about to tie the "rigidly stupid" Republicans in a knot they will be unable to untie in time to put up even a respectable fight in 1950. In this advisory group there is considerable self-adulation and congratulation over the smartness of the presidential program.

Here is the strategy as they somewhat shamelessly present it.

The purpose of the President at this session is to present himself as the fighting champion of the three great voting groups—organized labor, the farmers, and the Negroes. At the same time the "stupid" Republicans are to be made to seem the enemies of these groups, which then are expected to show their gratitude to the Democrats at the polls. But all this is to be accomplished without the passage of any helpful legislation, whatever for these groups before the election. True, in his soon-to-be-delivered State of the Union message the President will strongly insist again upon repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, the enactment of his so-called civil-rights program, and the passage of the Brannan farm bill, the cost of which even its author has not been able to estimate.

This incessant creation of restriction laws and regulations, surrounding the pettiest action of existence with the worst complicated formalities, inevitably has for its result the confining within narrower and narrower limits of the sphere in which the citizen may move freely. Victims of the delusion that equality and liberty are the better assured by the multiplication of laws, nations daily consent to put up with trammels increasingly burdensome. * * *

Accustomed to put up with every yoke, they soon end by desiring servitude, and lose all spontaneousness and energy. They are then no more than vain shadows, passive, unresisting and powerless automata.

Thus is bureaucracy with its infiltration of communism sapping the vitality of our people.

What does the experience of other bureaucratic Marxist governments demonstrate? Here is the recorded answer:

Arrived at this point, the individual is bound to seek outside himself the force he no longer finds within him. The functions of governments necessarily increase in proportion as the indifference and helplessness of the citizens grow. They it is—

The Fabian socialistic bureaucratic New Deal planners—

who must necessarily exhibit the initiative, enterprising, and guiding spirit in which private persons are lacking. It falls on them to undertake everything, direct everything, and take everything under their protection. The state becomes an all-powerful god.

Under leave to extend I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article of Frank R. Kent which article appeared in the Wall Street Journal, Tuesday, January 3, 1950:

TRUMAN STRATEGY THIS YEAR IS TO PLAY BOTH ENDS AGAINST THE MIDDLE

(By Frank R. Kent)

WASHINGTON.—Sometimes the ardent praise of a President's friends constitutes a more deadly indictment than any his enemies can frame. An interesting instance of this is afforded in the explanation of the legislative strategy, fashioned by his intimate advisers, which Mr. Truman brought back with him from Key West and which is expected to be-

the Fair Deal has immensely superior propaganda agencies. It also has a tremendous bureaucratic political machine. Also it has a great deal of money. And, it is true, the split Republicans help.

Nevertheless, it is a revolting piece of hocus-pocus and not the least offensive phase of it will be the extreme smugness of its advocates.

CVA Foes May Have Overplayed Their Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Joe Miller, Seattle newspaperman, published in the CIO News December 26, 1949, points out why the people of the Northwest demand a Columbia Valley Administration. Titled "CVA Foes May Have Overplayed Their Hand," the story indicates northwesterners' recognition of the propaganda being circulated by Columbia Valley Unauthorities:

(By Joe Miller).

Is it the people versus the special interests?

In the Pacific Northwest, where mighty rivers run with the speed of the fabled Mercury, the people have reason to say with fervor:

"And how it is."

For Harry Truman's favorite phrase aptly describes the bitter struggle that is currently being fought out in America's farthest corner over the President's proposal to create a Columbia Valley Administration.

Fighting the CVA with every weapon it has is the power trust and its big business allies, the great timber barons and companies. With CVA legislation getting closer to final congressional action, these groups have redoubled their relentless campaign of misrepresentation in a desperate attempt to influence public opinion against CVA.

The power trust has set up front organizations to lead the fight against CVA. These outfits are flooding the sprawling Northwest with tons of expensive propaganda.

Carpetbaggers brought in to preach the anti-CVA line are attempting to burrow into every community. The region's newspapers, most of them notoriously reactionary, give the widest currency to all anti-CVA broadsides and play down favorable stories.

Recently, two conservative national magazines—Saturday Evening Post and Reader's Digest—have contributed their bit by printing editorials that damn the CVA.

The Post editorial was written by a former private power propagandist who wrote in the same magazine a few years ago that Grand Coulee Dam would overshadow for the first time in 3,000 years the stupendous folly of the Pharaohs.

(Grand Coulee, world's mightiest power producer, has been responsible for the creation of many thousands of new jobs in the Pacific Northwest; its power produced aluminum for one-third of America's airplanes and helped develop the A-bomb.)

So utterly untruthful has this converted barrage been that a great conservative newspaper, the Portland Oregonian, has coined a new term to describe these spokesmen: "CVU's—Columbia Valley Unauthorities."

Where do the CVU's get the money to circulate their propaganda?

Part of the answer is provided by the first financial statement of 1949 from the Power Trust's chief lobbying outfit, the National Association of Electrical Companies.

In the first 6 months of the year the NAEC spent $324,222 against CVA and other power and resource developments. Only other lobby to spend more than this sum was the American Medical Association.

The rest of the answer will be given when the Northwest's private utilities file statements of their 1949 expenditures, as they are required to do by Oregon and Washington law. In past years, before the CVA fight became hot, these concerns had contributed more than $50,000 to anti-CVA outfits.

When President Truman first announced he was going to seek a CVA, private power's top dog lobbyist, $65,000-a-year Purcell Smith, declared: "We're going to do everything in our power to stop CVA."

By inundating the Northwest and the rest of the Nation with their propaganda, Purcell and his well-paid "wrecking crew" have kept their word. Yet it is beginning to look as if they overplayed their hand.

They persist in the amazing claim that "CVA is being foisted upon the people of the Northwest by the Washington, D. C., bureaucrats."

Yet for 4 years every farm-labor organization in the region but one has been on record for CVA and has been contributing to the grass-roots campaign for its enactment. These 11 organizations include the CIO, AFL, Grange, farmers' unions, and railway brotherhoods—and they represent approximately 1,500,000 of the region's 4,500,000 residents.

In contrast, the few major groups that oppose CVA represent less than 50,000 of the region's inhabitants.

It was this solid base of CVA support in the grass roots and the obvious need for more efficient management of the area's resources that induced President Truman to make CVA the leading plank of his resource development program last year.

And he received large majorities in five of the six CVA States and came awfully close in traditionally Republican Oregon, where Dewey had campaigned steadily for more than a month.

Another reason for the groundswell of support for CVA has been the conspicuous refusal of the opposition to accept the many challenges of the League for CVA to debate the issues, in the tradition of Lincoln and Douglas.

The most conspicuous rebuffs have come from the Governors of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, who have been spearheading the opposition to CVA. These men, who announced opposition to CVA 2 months before the bill was actually drafted, seldom miss an opportunity to attack CVA, but want no part of a debate.

Twice challenged to debate by Representative HUGH B. MITCHELL, Democrat, of Washington, president of the League for CVA and a sponsor of the bill, Gov. Arthur Langlie said he was too busy.

Yet the Governor has found time to make more than 50 anti-CVA speeches and twice travel to Washington, D. C., at State expense to testify against CVA. Langlie's favorite charge is that CVA is fascism.

Mussolini and Hitler had efficient resource programs, therefore an agency which will efficiently develop the Northwest's unmatched natural resources, must be fascistic.

Obviously the arguments of Governor Langlie and his cohorts could easily be disproved in open debate. When he testified at House committee hearings in Washington, D. C., he was asked to name the "dangerous" powers he had said CVA would create. His answer:

"I am not prepared at this moment to give you the details of it."

Under further questioning, Langlie said he could not even remember whether the

Bureau of Reclamation or the Army engineers ran Grand Coulee Dam—the biggest thing in his State, in fact the biggest structure in the world.

Gov. C. A. Robins, of Idaho, was frank. Asked if he understood the CVA legislation, he answered:

"As a matter of fact, I do not."

The position of these men in opposing CVA is made all the more ridiculous by two major facts:

1. The Hoover Commission report which establishes beyond shadow of reasonable doubt that the present system—which the power trust and its allies want to perpetuate—is fouled up beyond recognition.

This impartial report tells of bureaucratic jealousies, hopeless tugs of war, and inefficiencies, which have slowed the West's development to a virtual standstill, and wasted the taxpayers' money.

2. The obvious need for CVA, which is highlighted by four items:

(a) Power shortage: With 42 percent of the Nation's hydroelectric potential, the Northwest is the only region in America with a power shortage.

(b) This lack of power, when it is potentially here to burn, has helped to create an unemployment three times the national average in the region.

(c) Flood control: Every year raging floods destroy lives and property throughout the Northwest. Yet no adequate system of flood control exists, nor has one been proposed by the existing Federal agencies.

(d) Erosion: With 100,000,000 tons of topsoil going down the Columbia every year, the Pacific Northwest is the second most critical area in the Nation for erosion, according to the United States Soil Conservation Service. Yet scarcely anything is being done about it.

These facts point the way to CVA, and the people of the Pacific Northwest—through the educational program of their farm and labor groups—are realizing it.

So, too, may the opponents of CVA, when the people of the Northwest go to the polls next November.

Mr. Hauser's Parallel Makes the Distinction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer-News which I believe should be read by the greedy, vote-hunting Raw Dealers. It might do some good:

MR. HAUSER'S PARALLEL MAKES THE DISTINCTION

The bold admission that 150,000 certain-taking jobs are being used for political patronage is no less shocking because the census chief has been so candid about the whole affair.

In fact, the cynicism which attaches itself to such an admission is a moral measure of an administration which has apparently lost all political perspective.

Even the most hard-shelled political boss usually attempts to cover his operations with a public dressing of gentility. Not so Acting Census Director Phillip M. Hauser. He bluntly admitted that census jobs are used as political hand-outs with the flimsy excuse that it's always been done that way by both parties, "in keeping with the American democratic process."

There have been plenty of shenanigans in American political history. But the democratic process has survived in spite of chicanery and petty politics. It will continue to survive because the American people as a whole draw a distinction between the democratic process and ward-heel politics.

Mr. Hauser may not have realized it, but he is helping the American voter to draw the distinction as regards the national political scene.

The Christmas Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMAN C. CROOK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following forthright article by Michael Joseph, editor, Labor Beacon, Michigan City, Ind. He proclaims that the Yuletide spirit should be practiced throughout the New Year and "peace on earth, good will to men" should be uppermost in our minds. Nothing could be more appropriate to practice in this session of Congress.

CHRISTMAS SPIRIT

(By Michael Joseph)

This Christmas, men of all races, creeds, and nations look to each other for hope and a way toward better living, mutual faith, and peace. They look into the hearts of each other, too, for they have learned that words are treacherous—invisible, malicious things with sound an no meaning. This year, 1949, is drawing to an end—even as this paper reaches you—is the turning point of life of the world.

We either adopt the standards set for us by the man whose birthday we celebrate this week, or we bring destruction upon ourselves. We either learn to rely more upon the spiritual values of living in our homes, our offices, and in our plants or we plunge ourselves into economic and physical slavery and sudden death.

No man has a right to exploit his neighbor—whether he be the man next to him on the job, the man who hires him, or a man of another color or race, or another nation. The man who does, the man who looks upon his fellow beings as only means of satisfying his own ego, who uses them as stepping stones in his ever-striving for material gain, is going against the laws of all that is decent and human. He is treading on the divinity of mankind; for all men, no matter who they are, are sons of God.

There are no such things as differences between one group of people and another. They all spring from the same source. They all have the same functions, the same fears, the same hopes, and the same yearnings for happiness. Those are things of the heart, the things that make men men and not stones. They are not ruled by color or speech. They are the things that connect mankind to that mysterious, ever-present thing from which they sprang.

Today we are in the midst of labor upheavals in this country. At times they make little sense. And there are moments when the upheavals show little of labor and much of the sinister influences at work in this country today—influences that are absolutely opposed to the idea that all men are great and fundamentally good. The men of labor who are keeping their heads, keeping their love of country and self-respect must unite to fight these enemies of the people.

These enemies of the people and of the event and the Man which Christmas memorializes have no respect for the decency of men. They use men as tools for their own greed and selfishness. They play race against race, they break up homes, they foment false concepts of capitalism and labor. They ridicule the idea of Christianity. They scoff at the idea that men can, if they will, live and work in peace with each other. Their warped ideology of communism has become a real and terrible evil which is stalking through our land today.

Surely, people who celebrate Christmas must have some sincerity in their observance of this day? Surely, they must realize that the men who have been dying the last few bloody years for decency, brotherhood, and peace, have some right to their respect? Blood and suffering cannot be wiped out by mugs of beer, flag waving, and radical ranting. You cannot forget the debt of life you owe those youngsters. You cannot sell them out, by passiveness and don't-give-a-whoopness. You will pay for it if you try it. What then can we do this Christmastime to realize the things they were forced to die for?

In the first place we can start making ourselves over. Right there is the answer to the whole business. Everybody thinks the other fellow ought to change, but never considers that he himself is probably in need of extensive overhauling. That's the place to begin—to learn tolerance, understanding, and humbleness.

At this Christmas, the home will be the center of activities—in many for the only time during the year. That, too, is a darned good place to do some fighting for a better world, instead of with the members of the family. To be forced to observe the products of some of America's homes these days is enough to bring on the shudders. The home has broken down. Parents, either by necessity or greed, took advantage of the war boom to make money and turned their kids loose all too often to shift for themselves. In consequence we have a lost generation right here in this country and the effects of the unfortunate thoughtlessness and neglect and indifference of the parents will be felt for years to come.

America must have strong homes, homes based on teamwork, trust, and love. Not a single person in this country has a right to shed a tear for the waifs and war wreckage in other countries until he has done something to clean up the wreckage and damage of war in this country. The place to begin on that job is in his own home, if it needs it, and then try to let others see the course to take. Parents are directly responsible for their children and if the parents fall down, then they are indeed criminals and should be treated as enemies of the people. A parent who buys his youngster a lot of toys and gifts at Christmastime and lets him run wild during the rest of the year makes a mockery of Christmas and parenthood. Parenthood is an all-year job, as the heads of all good homes realize. Homes, no more than life itself, can be successful if they are based on selfishness, cowardice, and desire only for worldly gain.

Most American homes need more of a fear of God and less of a fear of what the Joneses are doing.

At Christmastime we see and hear the age-old quotation of "Peace on earth, good will to men." It doesn't mean a thing, unless we have it in our hearts. It doesn't mean a thing, even if we dressed ourselves in white robes and proclaimed it from the roof tops, if we do not remember it the rest of the year. Alas! How quickly we do forget it. As soon as Christmas is gone and the wrappings

burned up we go right out and wallow in intolerance and bigotry, and worry and scrap and grouch and gripe.

Well, someone says, that's human nature. It may be human nature, but it's only human nature on the wrong track. Human beings are naturally happy, lovely people. They have gotten off the right track and hit too many tunnels and switches and dead ends.

What we all need, and want, is the nerve to practice the Christmas spirit in our daily lives and occupations. If we all did that, then we would find a world full of smiles, and people who were startlingly likeable. We would find a world where even the Communists cut out their hell raising and snarling and slithering. We would have a world full of happy homes. We would find labor and management working together instead of being at loggerheads. And we ourselves would find a greatness and a power in us that would make us soar to new heights.

It can be done. We can have a world of peace if we want it. We can have happy homes if we work for them. We can raise decent children if we remember our duty. We can have industrial peace if we demand it and work for it. We can have all those things if we make up our minds to.

Tito and Spain: A Study in Contrasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the controversy as to whether the United States should recognize Spain, few people realize that the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt not only went out of his way, not merely to recognize the Spanish Government, but also to court and win favor of the head of the Spanish state.

This revelation is contained in an address delivered by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs, at the Belvedere-Sheraton Hotel, Baltimore, Md., October 12, 1949.

Dr. Thorning's address is, in my opinion, an historical document which should be available to everyone interested in this important subject. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I include this address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

TITO AND SPAIN: A STUDY IN CONTRASTS

(By Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs)

Mr. Dean Acheson calls his flirtation with Tito a Marxist totalitarian, a calculated risk. It is a risk, as everybody can see, to loan $20,000,000 to a military dicator who owes his power to the Soviet hierarchy as well as to the criminal folly of those Western leaders who betrayed their one-time ally, Dramha Mihailovitch. For the details of this treachery one has only to study a book entitled "The War We Lost," by Dr. Constantin Fotich, former Ambassador of Yugoslavia to the United States. Totalitarian Tito is a creature of Soviet intrigue and Anglo-Saxon dishonor. Consequently, anything that is attempted in the current crisis to support Josip Bros, who fought on the leftist side in the Spanish civil war, can be characterized as a deliberate gamble. Mr. Acheson's maneuver in power politics is undertaken with open eyes because Tito's record of Red fascism has been writ large on the pages of history. Mr. James F. Byrnes, himself a dupe of Soviet diplomacy, in his amazing bit of self-revelation, Speaking Frankly (pp. 144–145) relates his distress at Tito's murderous actions with respect to American airmen. The whole passage, which may be recommended reading for Mr. Acheson at this time, reads as follows:

"During this * * * period a crisis in our relations with Yugoslavia * * * occurred. There, Marshal Tito, who had fought in the Russian Revolution and was a thoroughly trained Communist leader, had worked his way into control. * * * The Army's Air Transport Service operating between Rome and Vienna passed through Udine in northern Italy to Klagenfurt in Austria. It was impossible for our planes to travel the 65 miles between these two points in a straight line because the northwest tip of Yugoslavia jutted out between them and, because of Yugoslav protests, our planes had been ordered to stay away from that territory. The order was often difficult to obey as the territory is rugged and many navigational hazards exist. Pilots must fly through a pass where mountains are 9,000 feet high and surrounding peaks reach as high as 18,000 feet. * * *

"On August 9, an army transport, carrying 7 Americans, a Turk, and a Swiss, lost its way, strayed over Yugoslav territory, was attacked by two Yugoslav fighter planes, and forced to make a hazardous landing in a wheat field. * * * On August 19, another transport en route to Rome radioed Udine that it was over Klagenfurt. It was never heard from again, but Klagenfurt reported it had been attacked and sent down in flames by Yugoslav fighters. The bodies of the five Americans were found 6 days later. * * *

"The State Department asked for information and Marshal Tito made a belligerent speech. * * *

"'Yugoslav claims to be a friendly government and your planes can fly over our territory at any time,' I told him. 'But even if you were not friendly and one of your planes, flying over Canada, got lost and happened to fly over the United States and was grounded, the officials of the United States would feel it their duty to do everything in their power for the safety and comfort of the Yugoslav crew and its passengers. Any official who failed to do so would be reprimanded by our Government. The idea of a United States Army plane, under such circumstances, firing upon a plane of Yugoslavia, killing its crew and passengers, is something the American Government would never be guilty of and is something for which the American people will not forgive Yugoslavia.'"

In contrast to this Marxist savagery, Spain, motivated by Christian charity, saved 1,200 American aviators from the rigors of internment during World War II. Although these flyers made forced landings in the Iberian Peninsula, they were received hospitably and returned to their homes and families, not in rude, wooden coffins as happened to the innocent boys who, because of bad weather, took a short cut over the territory of a despot they helped to preserve. Tito had far greater reason to show us gratitude than the present head of the Spanish State. And yet the latter, despite pin-pricks and provocations, has never retaliated in kind. Indeed, he has returned good for evil, authorizing the members of his embassy in Madrid to sign the first international air agreement between the United States and any European country.

With sincerity and truth, the head of the Spanish Government can declare to the people of the United States:

"Spain claims to be a friendly government and your planes can fly over our territory at any time. But even if you were not friendly and one of your planes, flying over the Iberian Peninsula, got lost and happened to fly over Spain and was grounded, the officials of Spain would feel it their duty to do everything in their power for the safety and comfort of the American crew and its passengers."

Furthermore, in the air agreement, which Spain concluded with us, we were enabled to obtain landing rights for military as well as civilian planes. This is a valuable concession when you recall, as Senator WILLIAM E. TYDINGS, chairman of the Senate Armed Forces has pointed out, "that some 14 or 15 of the most important air fields in the world, from the standpoint of United States defense, are located in or around Madrid, the capital of Spain."

The United States Navy knows the strategic importance of the Iberian Peninsula. Consequently, Admiral Richard E. Connolly led his warships into the harbor of El Ferrol del Caudillo. Moreover, this gallant naval officer had a most cordial visit with the head of the Spanish state. Like the Hon. James A. Farley, formerly chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the admiral found that the head of the Spanish state could give pertinent, intelligent and interesting answers to all questions under discussion. This is the same report we receive from all Senators and Representatives who visit Madrid. The Navy remembers the loyal attitude of Spain at the time of the North African invasion. And even before that critical hour, the Spanish Government displayed its deepest sympathies, not in words which were utilized to distract Hitler, but in deeds of humanity, as Rear Admiral F. P. Powell has testified. The latter, in the New York Times, September 16, 1949, wrote as follows:

"In 1940, just after the Battle of Dunkerque, I was associated in the evacuation of neutral refugees from Europe through the port of Lisbon. The Spaniards, in many instances, facilitated the escape of British, French, and Polish troops, as well as citizens, and allowed the establishment of three underground routes through Spain to France, over which many of our secret agents were passed without any betrayal so far as known." The admiral, concluding his eloquent, truthful testimony, suggests that "it well behooves the Washington Government to take some intelligent steps to try to improve our relations with that country rather than, through neglect, to allow such a diplomatic catastrophe as has occurred in China to be duplicated in Europe."

It is interesting to compare this advice of Admiral Powell with the text of a question and answer given by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt in the October 1949 number of McCall's.

The question reads as follows:

"How in the name of intellectual honesty and fair play can you explain your stand on the Spanish question? To be consistent you should apply the same yardstick to Russia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, etc."

The reply of Mrs. Roosevelt has this phraseology:

"I cannot see that not wanting to bring, at the present time, more recognition and power to Franco is inconsistent at all with my stand on any other country. Franco is the only living dictator who was an ally of Hitler and Mussolini, against whom we fought the war. It is true that for a short time Russia was an ally of Germany under Hitler, but she afterward fought Hitler. It is true also that today Russia and her satellites are dictatorships, and one has to speak out against dictatorships. Certainly no one has been more outspoken than I have.

"But Russia is a member of the United Nations already and is also one of the powerful nations of the world. While we can be quite honest about what we disapprove of in communism, we must recognize the fact that by becoming our ally the U. S. S. R. helped us to win the war, and we can only

hope, because of her power and strength, that the U. S. S. R. will eventually learn to live side by side with the democracies without trying to change them. To go out of our way at the present time to recognize a dictator who upheld Mussolini and Hitler would seem to me to make little sense."

Analyzing these words, what points may be considered worthy of attention?

In the first place, it is good to see that our relationships with Spain are to be set in a framework of intellectual honesty and fair play. These are precisely the virtues that are at stake in this discussion. And they are qualities highly prized in American life throughout the Western Hemisphere.

"It is true," Mrs. Roosevelt admits, that the Soviet Union, under the dictatorship of Generalissimo Josef Stalin, as well as the Soviet satellites, are "dictatorships." Why does not the wife of the former President add that Josef Stalin and his Soviet gauleiters are at the head of slave states which, in word and deed, are waging war upon the United States of America and upon every free man, woman, and child in the world. To be sure, it is a limited war. But it is a war which is bringing torture, imprisonment, civil and religious persecution, and sudden death to thousands of Christians and Jews in Sovietized Czechoslovakia, Soviet Hungary, where Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty is unjustly kept in durance vile, Soviet Bulgaria, Soviet Rumania, Soviet Albania, and the Far East now in process of Sovietization, while Mrs. Roosevelt contents herself with describing both Spain and the Soviet Union as "dictatorships."

Can Mrs. Roosevelt allege that Spain is destroying one country after another? Does Mrs. Roosevelt claim that a combination of Soviet dictatorships, backed by bombing planes, atomic weapons, tommy guns and torture chambers, is on the same level as authoritarian Spain, where tourists are free to come and go, where minority groups, such as monarchists and republicans live side by side with Government supporters, and where there is not a single Protestant or Jewish clergyman under trial, much less in prison or in cemeteries? Why does not the writer for McCall's magazine point out that there is some difference between a dictatorship which is waging war upon every continent and a Spanish Government which has given and continues to give unmistakable signs of friendship and good will?

During the current year, Mr. Dean Acheson recommended the appointment of Ambassadors to the Soviet Union and to Soviet satellite states. Furthermore, Mr. Acheson freely gave "recognition and power" to the butcher, Josip Broz-Tito, without any guaranties from the latter as to the establishment of civil and religious liberties. Why did not Mrs. Roosevelt protest this grant of "recognition and power" and, we may add, money from American taxpayers to a totalitarian Marxist tyrant who is every whit as evil as Hitler or Mussolini? Tito is a Red Fascist dictator. He is very much alive. He was elevated to his position of dictatorship in Marxist Yugoslavia by Generalissimo Josef Stalin and some deluded allied leaders, who failed to take into account the realities of international life.

In order to justify full diplomatic relations with the butcher, Stalin, Mrs. Roosevelt points to the fact that "Russia (she means the Soviet Union, White Russia, and the Soviet Ukraine) is a member of the United Nations already and is also one of the powerful nations of the world."

Why does not Mrs. Roosevelt explain that the Soviet Union, White Russia, and the Soviet Ukraine were admitted to the UN as peace-loving nations. Does she believe that this status, the Soviets' sole title-deed to membership, is clean? Does Eleanor Roosevelt think she can gloss over the essential, criminal role of the Soviet generalissimo, Josef Stalin, in unleashing World War II, by his share in the partition of Poland, 1939, with the easy, disarming description of "Russia (she does not say 'Stalin') as an ally of Germany under Hitler * * * for a short time." Was not this short time crucial? Was not this alliance the partnership, however temporary, that led to the slaughter of millions?

The second part of Mrs. Roosevelt's apology for Stalin's career of murder merits similar analysis. The Soviet Union, she asserts, "is also one of the powerful nations of the world." Does the lady wish to imply that might makes right. This sounds like Napoleon's dictum that "God is on the side of the big battalions." Or like Bismarck's appeal to iron and blood. Indeed, this type of apology on the part of Mrs. Roosevelt seems to be an echo of the war cry of the late Paul Joseph Goebbels: "What matters is not who is right, but who wins." Or are we to decide questions of right and wrong, issues of international law and practice, by putting the infamous question Generalissimo Stalin proposed with reference to His Holiness, Pius XII: "How many divisions has the Pope?"

The real question is one of right and wrong, of good and evil, of fairness or hypocrisy. The issue is not whether the Soviet Army, because it boasts 5,000,000 men under arms, is more important than the 28,000,000 people of Spain. In 1946, the year of Potsdam, the Soviets began to spread the propaganda story that the Spanish Government should be boycotted, economically, and, if possible, eliminated altogether, because experiments with nuclear energy were being carried on behind the Pyrenees. In fact, this was the specious argument of a renegade American citizen, Mr. Oscar Lange, when he, under the whip of his Soviet dictators, attempted to exploit the machinery of the United Nations in order to starve and subdue the Spanish Government and the Spanish people. Mr. Lange, double-dyed turncoat, failed in 1947. And in 1949 a majority vote in the General Assembly favored an end to the diplomatic boycott of Spain, while a vote of 40 to 9 repudiated the principal accusation brought against that administration.

Try as she will, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt cannot establish a parity between the iron-curtain countries and the countries of the Iberian Peninsula, Portugal and Spain. Within a few hours, any respectable United States citizen can secure a visa to visit Spain. He can talk with the people, hear their criticism of the administration, as he would hear complaints voiced in the United States, in cafes, hotels, private homes, or public buildings. Without a police permit, this same United States citizen could travel from Barcelona to Madrid, from Madrid to Sevilla, and from Sevilla to Valencia. Nowhere would he find the apparatus of a police state, as he would find it in the Soviet states and in Tito's Yugoslavia: (1) A work card; (2) a ration card; (3) a travel document; (4) a lodgings permit.

These are the badges of slavery; they do not exist in the Iberian Peninsula, although there are limitations on freedom of the press, public assembly, and political organization. It is one thing to restrict political liberties, as is the case in Spain; it is something quite different to suppress both political and personal freedoms, as is the iron rule in all Marxist totalitarian states, whether they work in collaboration as do Sovietized Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Albania, and Bulgaria, or one of them is reduced to isolation, as is Tito's Yugoslavia.

In Spain there is progress toward representative government and greater political as well as personal liberty; with regard to the iron-curtain countries, the supreme tragedy prevails in that not even hope of change remains without outside help. Nevertheless, Mrs. Roosevelt, who does not want to accredit an ambassador of the United States in a Madrid that, in the light of this comparison of facts, is relatively free, acquiesces gladly in the appointment of United States ambassadors to European capitals where Soviet gauleiters, à la Hitler, lord it over the people we promised to liberate.

Mrs. Roosevelt can agree to accord prestige, recognition, and power to Red Nazis who make a mockery of the Atlantic Pact and God-given rights. All that the former First Lady asks is that "the U. S. S. R. will eventually learn to live side by side with the democracies without trying to change them." How agonizing such words must be to the noble Polish people, to the Czechs, the Slovaks, Ruthenians, Hungarians, Chinese, Serbs, Croats, and Slovenians. What a message of grief and sadness this must bring to the Russian people themselves, to say nothing of Germans and Austrians in the Soviet zones of Europe. Mrs. Roosevelt's final comment in McCall's may now be subjected to analysis. This conclusion reads:

"To go out of our way at the present time to recognize a dictator who upheld Mussolini and Hitler would seem to me to make little sense."

Is this a correct statement of the issue? In the first place, it should be recorded that, of the some 2,000,000 men who took part in the Spanish civil war, 95 percent were Spaniards. Then, when Mrs. Roosevelt speaks of a dictator "who upheld Mussolini and Hitler," she distorts the picture. It was rather Italy and Germany that accorded help to Nationalist Spain at a time when Soviet international brigades were organized by Stalin to do the job in the whole Iberian Peninsula that they subsequently did in eastern and central Europe, including Czechoslovakia. Paradoxical as it may seem, it was a good thing for free peoples everywhere that Stalin failed in Spain when he took sides against Mussolini and Hitler. If anybody in the course of history upheld Hitler and Mussolini, it was Stalin when he joined his fellow dictators to start the war.

Perhaps Mrs. Roosevelt should be reminded about the identity of the United States President who, subsequent to the abovementioned help from Germany and Italy to Spain, recognized the government, headed by the same Spaniard who has guided the destinies of his country since 1939. It was the Honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt who, on March 31, 1939, "went out of his way" to recognize the present Government of Spain as the "de facto" and "de jure" government of that country. It made good sense then to President Roosevelt, because the establishment of full diplomatic relations simply means that we regard a given administration as firmly installed in authority and ready to respect its international obligations.

On another occasion our late President F. D. Roosevelt "went out of his way" not merely to "recognize" the Spanish Government, but also to court and win the favor of the head of the Spanish state. At a time when we needed every friend we could muster, and that hour will strike again, President Roosevelt chose as his wartime Ambassador to Spain a gentleman who had special titles to command the respect and sympathy of the Spanish people. He knew well what it was when he sent his signed promises to the Spanish chief of state in November 1942, "I hope you will accept my full assurance," he wrote, "that these moves in our north African operation are in no shape, manner, or form directed against the Government or people of Spain. * * * Spain has nothing to fear from the United Nations. I am, my dear general, your sincere friend, Franklin D. Roosevelt."

"In the intercourse of honorable men," comments an intellectually honest, fair-minded scholar, Father Edgar R. Smothers, S. J., of West Baden College, West Baden, Ind., "such words are not to be tendered as a booby trap. They are tendered to be kept, unless the other party rejects them or breaks faith with their author, who was in this case the President of the United States."

"So long as an immediate advantage accrued," Father Smothers continues, "we kept our promises to Spain. Once the main hazards of war were over, and President Roosevelt had come back from Yalta, he wrote his letter (March 10, 1943), unpublished at the time, to the Honorable Norman Armour, his Ambassador to Spain, cutting the ground from under his assurances to the head of the Spanish state. He specified no breach of faith committed by the Government of Spain against the Government of the United States. Our authorities have never done that."

That was after Yalta. At Potsdam, the new President, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, made the public announcement that none of us likes Franco. The following September, Mr. Dean Acheson, then Acting Secretary of State, published President Roosevelt's letter to Ambassador Armour. Our policy of unfriendliness toward the Government of Spain was now an official fact of public record. To that policy we have been faithful; but every step of the way is stained with the moral stain of an international breach of faith.

The recognition accorded by the Honorable F. D. Roosevelt to Spain has never been withdrawn. The act of recognition and the flattering gesture of friendship at the time of the north African invasion were both the decisions of the departed husband of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. By her inadequate, misleading answer in McCall's, Mrs. Roosevelt must share the responsibility with Mr. Dean Acheson for what Father Smothers rightly describes as "an international breach of faith."

Our State Department has admitted that the iniquitous, Soviet-inspired move of the so-called Polish delegation in the General Assembly of the UN has strengthened, rather than weakened, the present Government of Spain. Consequently, Mr. Acheson must be the first to acknowledge that his policy, from the standpoint of international law, or attempted domestic interference in Spain, or in the sphere of the good-neighbor policy, where the other American Republics are taking the lead in sending ambassadors and other chiefs of diplomatic mission to Madrid, has been a failure. And by Mr. Acheson's policy of economic discrimination against the country that sent Christoper Columbus to discover America, we are successful only in this: We compel the Spanish people to suffer for Mr. Acheson's default of statesmanship and of honor.

Cotton-Acreage Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks many statements have been made regarding cotton acreage allotments for 1950. Members of Congress from all cotton-growing States have been in meetings with their farmers, discussing the problems that arise out of the restrictive acreage provisions of Public Law 272 of this Congress and Public Law 12 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Not only have Congressmen made statements, but the press has been abundantly supplied with statements by elements of the Department of Agriculture, statements attempting to dodge responsibility of bad administration by placing the blame on the law. That may be the easy way out, but it certainly is not the honorable answer in the present crisis.

It is my judgment, after much investigation, that the difficulty that most of the farmers are experiencing with the present acreage allotments resulted from the deliberate and arbitrary misinterpretation by the Department of Agriculture of both the intent of Congress and the express language of Public Law 272. The Department may not like the law, but assuredly it has no right to deliberately disregard the wishes of Congress and the obvious meaning of the law in order to suit its own purposes.

All of the people of the United States have a stake in the economic security of the farmer. As the farm income goes, so goes the national income, and the prosperity of the American people is in direct proportion to the income of the American farmer. The farm problem is not a sentimental one, nor a political one, but it is one of cold economic facts. This Nation cannot prosper without a prosperous farm income. For every $3,000,000,000 the farm income drops; a million nonfarm workers go on relief rolls.

The Congress of the United States is conscious of this, and has made a sincere effort to devise laws that will benefit the Nation while benefiting the farmers. The arbitrary action of the Department of Agriculture in misinterpreting Public Law 272 imperils the stability of a large segment of our agricultural population and, consequently, the Nation.

It is difficult enough for the farmer and his prosperity to be subject to the will of a legislative body without having the peril of administrative decree and interpretation hanging over his head.

In addressing this body in February of last year, I called your attention to the difficulties we were to encounter in writing legislation of this character. I did not then question, nor do I now question, the necessity of a national plan for the influencing of, if not the control of, a product such as cotton. At that time I was concerned with the legislation, but I did not anticipate the difficulty of having to write legislation, and then having to fight the Department for a fair interpretation.

The 19 counties in south Texas, which I have the honor to represent, are historically large producers of cotton. They have the know-how, the soil and the equipment suitable for cotton farming. During the past few years, at the suggestion of the United States Government, and in their own interest, cotton farmers have attempted to diversify their activities and, particularly during the war, they gave heed to the requirements of their country and went strong for war crops. Whatever may have been their purpose, they had the right to depend upon the integrity of an agency which said, and I quote the regulations promulgated in 1945 pursuant to enactment of Public Law 12:

> War crop determination for the protection of cotton allotments: That in establishing cotton-acreage allotments under title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for any farm for which a cotton-acreage allotment was established for the 1942 crop, if the total acreage of war crops grown on the farm during 1945 or any subsequent year during the present emergency is in excess of the total acreage of war crops grown on the farm in 1941, the cotton-production history for the farm for any such year will not be considered as representative of the normal history of the farm and the farm will be considered as one on which cotton was planted in such year. For the purpose of this determination, the following are designated as war crops: Soybeans for beans, peanuts picked and threshed, flax for seed, Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, dry edible beans, grain sorghums, sugar beets, sugar cane, rice, tomatoes for processing, oats, barley, sweet sorghums, Sudan grass, biennial and perennial legumes, and mixtures containing biennial and perennial legumes.

And Public Law 272, which said:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary, in administering the provisions of Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, as it relates to war crops, shall carry out the provisions of such act in the following manner:
>
> "The total of the war-crop credits due the individual farms in each county shall be credited to the county and the total of the war-crop credits due all of the counties in a State shall be credited to the State.
>
> "The acreage credited to States, counties, and farms for the years 1945, 1946, or 1947, because of war crops, shall be taken into full account in the determination and distribution of cotton-acreage allotments on a National, State, county, and farm basis."

However, the Department of Agriculture, in interpreting Public Law 272, disregarded the intent of Congress and what I believe to be the plain and express language of the act.

Let me give you, as an example, the effect of the law as interpreted upon Texas:

The national acreage allotment base, as you know, is 22,500,000 acres, and the national acreage allotment is 21,000,000 acres. Texas' share under provisions of section 344 (C) (1), which includes war crops plus the estimated additional acreage for each State required for small-farm allotments under subsection (F) (1) is 8,302,194 acres. The Department found that under provisions of section 344 (C) (2), the actual acreage planted to cotton in Texas, including small farms and adjustments under (B), amounted to 8,182,540. It will be noted that the war crops figure is the larger by 119,654 acres, and to all intents and purposes it would appear that Texas should be considered a State which would come under the war crops formula in the law.

This, however, was not the case. The Department held as follows:

Since, they said, the national acreage total is 22,775,480, which includes an acreage base of 22,306,486 plus 289,994 for small farm adjustments, plus adjustments under section 344 (B) amounting to 177,000 acres, it was necessary, under the law, to reduce that figure to the 22,500,000 acreage allotment base.

It was never contemplated, apparently, that the national acreage total should exceed the allotment base, and the law was written on the premise that the acreage

total would fall below the allotment base. Consequently, under section 344 (c) (1) (C), which reads:

The additional acreage required to determine a national allotment base of 22,500,000 acres, which additional acreage shall be distributed among States receiving no adjustment under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

Texas, which fell under section (C) (1) would not have received adjustment under paragraph (C) (2), and therefore would have received the additional acreage had it been necessary to add acreage to "determine a total national allotment base of 22,500,000 acres." Their reasoning was that since it was necessary, instead, to reduce acreage to accomplish this purpose, the reduction was applied to only those States which would have received the additional acreage had the situation been as was contemplated at the time the law was written.

By this converse reasoning by the Department of Agriculture, Texas lost approximately half of the total national reduction of 275,480, the difference between the actual national acreage and the national acreage allotment base. There is no provision in the law for making this reduction apply to those States which receive no adjustment under paragraph 2. There is provision only to give additional acreage to those States if the national acreage should be less than the national acreage allotment, and it is a matter of interpretation only to apply the converse when the acreage proved greater than the allotment. It appears to me that what the Department has done is to fill in a gap in the law by an administrative ruling, since there was no provision for making the reduction, in the event the national acreage be greater than the national allotment.

We were told by the Department representatives that having applied this reduction, it was found that the Texas acreage, figured on the basis of the war-crop formula, was less than the total figured on the basis of 95 percent of the 1947–48 acreage actually planted to cotton, by a difference of 93 acres. Since the law states that the State allotment base shall not be less than 95 percent of the 1947–48 acreage actually planted to cotton, the Department contended that it was compelled to place Texas in the category of those States whose allotment was figured on the basis of 95 percent of the actual 1947–48 cotton acreage.

I note, however, that in the Federal Register of Tuesday, December 13, 1949, the Department has this to say in that connection:

On first trial, it was determined that a straight pro rata deduction based on the initial State acreage allotment bases would cause the State acreage allotment base for Texas to be less than 95 percent of the 1947–48 average acreage actually planted to cotton. Consequently, the deduction was limited to 119,654 acres for that State, thereby causing the State acreage allotment base to equal 95 percent of such 1947–48 average acreage.

Apparently it was the trial run that did us in.

The Department's decision which cost Texas 119,654 acres, was, in my judgment, an unwarranted and arbitrary one.

Of course, the Department did issue orders to the State committee to give the individual farmer credit for his war crops, but they should have known, and did know, that giving the farm credit for war crops, without giving war-crop credit to the counties, would do far more harm than it would do good.

Perhaps some of you who do not think in terms of farming, and cotton farming in particular, would like to know the practical effect of Public Law 272 as interpreted by the Department. Atascosa County, one of the fine farming counties in my district, in 1942 had a cotton-acreage allotment of 31,583 acres. The 1950 allotment is 5,677. Bee County in 1942 had 33,951 acres but for 1950 the allotment is 8,887. Nueces County, my home county, the county whose rich soil a few years ago enabled it to lead the State, if not the Nation, in cotton production received an allotment of only 92,081 acres in 1950. Comal County in 1942 had 6,054 acres, but in 1950 its allotment is only 670 acres.

Since the emergency ended, war crops, without strong support of the Government, are no longer practical farming crops in large degree. Great economic suffering will inevitably result unless this Congress, during the next few weeks, enacts legislation so plain and so strong that it is not subject to misinterpretation by the Department of Agriculture, and legislation which will equalize and fairly distribute the acreage to be planted under allotments.

Here is an individual case, so that you may understand the problem right down to the soil. A young man of my district, a veteran of World War II, a young man of 29 years of age, purchased 300 acres of fine farm land. He has been farming the land to cotton for the past 3 years. It was excellently adapted to cotton and the equipment which he purchased is that designed for cotton farming. Under the 1950 allotment he may plant 67 acres of cotton. He still owes $100 an acre on the land and is very much concerned as to how he shall meet the payments with so small an allotment.

A war widow called me last week. She was left 600 acres of brush land which at an expense of $600 an acre, she put into cultivation in cotton in 1949. She got no allotment at all under Public Law 272.

These are but typical examples of thousands of farmers. We have not been treated fairly by the Department of Agriculture in its interpretation. It seems to us that with the acreage allotment for the Nation reduced by so small a percentage, any fair interpretation of the law would not leave us with such a critical economic problem and such a disastrous situation as confronts our farmers.

We have been to the Department of Agriculture and have received no relief. We have but one place to go, and that is the Congress of the United States. We believe in legislative government and not administrative decree, and we have every confidence that you will come to our aid and assist us in a fair share of what we believe we are entitled to receive, historically and legally.

Several bills have been introduced. I introduced one this week, which calls for full credit to the counties for war crops. I also favor the proposal agreed upon during the first part of December by several of us, meeting with members of the House Committee on Agriculture, and which is being introduced by Mr. COOLEY.

For those of us living in the southern part of Texas, early action is imperative, for planting will begin within the next few weeks.

Chairman Gaston, of the Export-Import Bank, in Illuminating Broadcast Discusses Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, because of the large public interest in point 4 of President Truman's plan, and the work being accomplished in the development of that plan by the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank, I am sure my distinguished colleagues will be interested in the memorable and illuminating presentment of that subject by Mr. Herbert E. Gaston, Chairman of the Board of the Export-Import Bank, in a recent radio broadcast over Station WCFL in Chicago. Therefore, under the unanimous consent granted I am extending my remarks to include the full text of this broadcast, which follows:

Sound of quorum call: R-r-r-r. R-r-r-r. R-r-r-r.

ANNOUNCER. Quorum call—the three bells that send the Members of the House of Representatives hurrying from their offices to the floor of the House.

Sound of quorum call: R-r-r-r. R-r-r-r. R-r-r-r.

ANNOUNCER. Quorum call—these three bells are again calling the Illinois Members of the House to report to the people of Illinois. This station presents, as a public service, another in a series of programs transcribed on Capitol Hill in the radio studios of Congress. These programs bring to you a personal report from your delegation in the House of Representatives. Your moderator is Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, of the second district. Now here is Speaker RAYBURN calling the House to order.

Speaker RAYBURN. The Clerk will call the roll.

CLERK. Buckley of Illinois, present; Chesney, present; Dawson, present; Gordon, present; Gorski of Illinois, present; Linehan, present; Mack of Illinois, present; O'Brien of Illinois, present; O'Hara of Illinois, present; Price, present; Sabath, present; Yates, present.

Representative O'HARA. My friends, the 12 Democratic Congressmen from Illinois today salute the Chicago Press Veterans' Association which this week is holding its eleventh annual dinner.

It's the most famous and exclusive dinner event in the Chicago calendar. You can't

get in even as a guest unless a couple of decades ago you were a real honest-to-goodness reporter, copyreader, or editor on a big Chicago daily newspaper or are presently so employed. The newspaper greats and the celebrities of the Fourth Estate past and present, will be flying from all parts of the world to attend. They always do. These annual dinners have become the great national event—the one big must date—among veteran newspapermen and are looked forward to by newspapermen in Illinois and all other Middle West States regardless of where they live.

Richard J. Finnegan will be there, and Charley Wheeler, and John Delaney, and Jim Doherty, and Oscar Hewitt, and Bill Stuart, and Warren Brown, and Jim Cleary—that's just the beginning—not forgetting the peer of the best, our own James Spike Kennedy, statesman and journalist, to whom the 12 Democratic Congressmen from Illinois doff their hats in a special salute in recognition of his outstanding service in the campaign of 1948 and in the cause of government of, for, and by the common people of our country.

Some of those grayheads at the dinner of the Chicago Press Veterans' Association will be getting up to introduce themselves ex-"I.-O."—meaning they did their stuff on the old Inter-Ocean on Monroe Street.

Won't you tell them, Mr. Gaston—I am speaking, my friends, to the distinguished guest of the 12 Democratic Congressmen from Illinois, the Honorable Herbert E. Gaston, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank—tell them, Mr. Gaston, how come you qualify as an ex-"I.-O."

Mr. GASTON. I should say first, Mr. O'HARA, that I feel honored and am happy to be a guest, even though at a long distance, of the press veterans' association. I have been for some years a member of what is possibly a more ancient—although I won't say more honored—organization called the Silurians, which consists of old-timers in the newspaper fraternity in New York.

But answering your question, Mr. O'HARA. Truly, I am afraid I cannot qualify as an ex-"I.-O." It wasn't the Inter-Ocean but the Record-Herald for which I worked in 1904–6, and I achieved no dignity there as a journalist. I worked as a night ad compositor 2 or 3 nights a week in a back corner of the composing room overlooking Daily News Alley. I understand that Frank B. Noyes, who achieved some newspaper fame, was the publisher of the paper then, but I didn't meet any such eminent persons. I worked, however, under a fine old gentleman named Eddie English, the ad foreman, whose kindness I shall always remember.

At the same time I attended an institution out on the Midway and Jackson Park, since made famous by Mr. Hutchins. But when I arrived on the scene it was marked by the presence of such men as William Rainey Harper, Amos Alonzo Stagg, Walter Eckersall, and some others whose names you may remember. This, Mr. O'HARA, is how I qualify—if not as an ex-"I.-O.," at least as something or other in connection with the newspaper business in Chicago.

May I add—if I can without tears—that when I came to Chicago the English-language morning papers included the Tribune, Record-Herald, the Chronicle, the Examiner, and the morning Inter-Ocean. Among the evening papers were the Daily News, the Post, the Journal, the American, and the Evening Inter-Ocean.

As an echo of my printing days, let me say that I'm glad to see the Chicago papers again printing today's news today.

Representative O'HARA. I am sure, Mr. Gaston, that the veteran newspapermen of Chicago and the Middle West are well acquainted with your brilliant record on the editorial side after those early years in Chicago, but it probably will be news, and most heartening news, to the members of the Chicago Typographical Union, that the head of what is probably the most powerful bank in the world once worked in the composing room of a Chicago newspaper and carried a card in the Chicago Typographical Union.

Mr. Gaston, would you mind telling us briefly just how the Export-Import Bank fits into the picture of what we are trying to do in rehabilitating a world pretty well wrecked by war?

Mr. GASTON. Briefly and simply, Mr. O'HARA, the Export-Import Bank lends dollars to promote the prosperity of the United States through helping to develop the productive resources of foreign countries. This is exactly what President Truman's famous point 4 is designed to do. It is to add force and new direction to something the Export-Import Bank has been doing for some years—fifteen, to be precise. We do this, not with tax money, but with money borrowed by the United States Treasury and lent to the bank. We have a total lending power of three and a half billions, and it is revolving—that is, the money paid back we can lend again. Our directions are to lend in such a way as to promote the export and import trade of the United States. It is plain that to do this in any effective and lasting way we must consider both the ability of the borrower to pay and the adequacy of the dollar income of the country where the loan is made. That means we must make loans which will earn money and which will earn or save dollars, for we are directed to lend with reasonable assurance of repayment. Of course, this means loans that in the long run really do most for the building up of any country. Loans for useless and unproductive things would mean a future burden or a future default. But we had a special postwar role to play. Before the creation of ECA (the Marshall plan) we made emergency loans to most of the western European countries so that they could go on buying from the United States. The amount of these reconstruction and pipe-line loans (as some of them were called) was close to $[illegible],000,000.

Representative O'HARA. I think our friends in the radio audience may have read recently of the loan by your bank of $16,000,000 to Bolivia for a highway that will open up some 300 miles of rich territory, heretofore neglected, unsurveyed and unreachable. Where does this money come from and what security do you demand? In other words, is this like Marshall plan money or will it come back to us?

Mr. GASTON. We make loans, as I remarked a moment ago, Mr. O'HARA, with reasonable assurance of repayment—and we are confident we have that reassurance in this case. We think the dollars will come back to us and that we will be further rewarded by increased trade and increased stability—political and economic—in the heart of South America. The security we have demanded is nothing but the public credit of the people of Bolivia, our faith that they have accepted this loan with the intention of paying it back and that they will pay it back. Contrary to some popular impressions about Latin-American credits our experience is that good loans—productive loans well made—will be repaid. The road is from many standpoints a fascinating project. It takes off at Cochabamba in the heart of the Andes and makes its way across mountain ranges and through fertile valleys for 300 miles to Santa Cruz, on the low-lying eastern plain of Bolivia. It is part of a plan proposed by a United States mission in 1942 to promote food and forest production. But it is to do more than that. It is to tie disunited parts of a country together for political and social as well as economic benefits, just as the railroads and the highways and now the airplane have knit together the United States into the economic and political unit that it is today. The engineering problems faced by the United States Public Roads Administration in designing the road have been great and it will not be a simple construction project—but the object to be attained is great, too—in effect, building a new country by a sound economic engineering method.

Representative O'HARA. Then, Mr. Gaston, as I understand it, taking the case of the Bolivian loan, in the first place the loan was made as a sound investment, after passing the test of conservative banking judgment, and there is every reasonable assurance that the money with interest will return. Then, in the second place, the road to be built will open up 300 miles of new territory with tremendous possibility for developments which will furnish a new world of profitable employment for thousands of Bolivians, and while improving their economic condition and raising their standard of living will put them in financial position to buy the products of our factories. And meanwhile when the highway is being constructed much of the money loaned by your bank to Bolivia will be spent in the United States for machinery to do the work and in payment of salaries and wages to American engineers and skilled workmen employed on the project. Thus all we are doing is increasing the wealth of the world and thus benefiting everyone, including ourselves. It seems to me just as simple as that. How many such loans have we made already, Mr. Gaston? Won't you give us a bird's-eye picture of the accomplishments to date of the Export-Import Bank?

Mr. GASTON. Well, that's a pretty fast-flying bird you are ordering, Mr. O'HARA. What the Bank has done is to put out or obligate something over two and a half billion dollars of the funds of the United States. These are borrowed funds and not tax funds. The Bank earns money. After paying its expenses and interest to the Treasury, it earned almost an even $60,000,000 last year. Its losses have been extremely light, but it is reserving on the books all its profits—around $150,000,000—as a safeguard against any future losses. Its loans or commitments is some 40 countries in practically all parts of the world. We announced this week a commitment of $21,000,000 to build irrigation projects and associated works to develop the agricultural potentialities of Afghanistan, which are great. We have made irrigation and water conservation loans also in Colombia and Haiti. We have helped with mine, harbor, railroad, and industrial projects in Turkey. Our commitments to develop and rehabilitate specific industries in Italy amount to $100,000,000. We have financed great integrated iron and steel plants in Brazil and Chile. We are helping to build a chemical fertilizer plant in Mexico and another in Egypt. Our engineers are working with Mexican engineers and railroad officials in modernizing the trackage, rolling stock, motive power, and management of the Mexican railways and we are helping a privately owned American-owned railroad, the Southern Pacific of Mexico, to modernize its system. We are undertaking to assist American public utilities in Latin America to expand their systems to meet the rapidly growing industrial and domestic demands for electric current. We have lent money for roads and water supply in Ecuador and are now considering what we can do to help them in repairing their recent earthquake damage. We have furnished capital for textile mills and packing plants and we are in course of acting on a cement plant financing deal in Saudi Arabia. We lent money to promote the chemical industry of China, which we expect will ride through the present storm and convulsion. And we are right now studying the situation in Indonesia, where a new nation is to arise on January 1, with the expectation that we can be safely helpful there in what has been done and, we are sure, will be again, one of

the great productive regions of the world. Maybe these high spots will give you an idea, Mr. O'HARA.

Representative O'HARA. I recall you said to our committee, Mr. Gaston, that there was a duplication of the work being done by the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank in this so-big and so-promising field. Would you mind explaining that to our radio audience?

Mr. GASTON. It is quite true, Mr. O'HARA, that many of the loans made by one of the two banks could be made by the other. But we try not to compete or to duplicate. We met today, for instance, with officers of the International Bank and we meet regularly with them to lay our cards on the table and to discuss what is proper for one bank to do and what the other. The main differences between the two are that our Bank is an agency of the United States, while the other, as its name reveals, is an international institution; that the International Bank can make loans only to its members, while we are not so limited; and that the International Bank must have the guaranty of the government in whose country it makes the loan on any loan it makes. We often do obtain Government guaranties, but not if there are other adequate endorsements available. Thus, besides making loans to forward definitely the interests of the United States, we have greater freedom to help private industry and American business in preference to competitors.

Representative O'HARA. Mr. Gaston, am I correct in summarizing it this way? American money is being loaned in foreign countries to develop neglected areas, thus increasing the wealth of the world and making potential purchasers for our products. This American money comes from: (1) Our contribution with other participating nations to the World Bank; (2) proceeds of the sale to American investors of bonds issued by the world bank; and (3) the loans of your Export-Import Bank to an amount authorized by the Congress. All of this is investment capital, loaned on good security, and expected to be paid back with interest. The Marshall plan, of course, was never intended to be anything more than a stopgap. Do you think, Mr. Gaston, that by the time the Marshall plan gift-money has run out the countries we are helping will be on their own feet, economically through the investment capital, technical knowledge and American know-how we are pouring into them on sound, conservative business reckoning through your Export-Import Bank and the World Bank? What is the prospect as you see it from the driver's seat?

Mr. GASTON. I'll have to manage, Mr. O'HARA, on the driver's seat. There's too much good competition. But you are correct in general summary, and here are my ideas for what evaluation you and our audience choose to put on them. This country has for many years looked happily on what is called a favorable balance of trade, which means simply that we are used to selling more than we buy. We have made this possible by individual gifts—by foreign travel, by foreign investments that didn't always pay out, and in a variety of other ways. But in the last few years because of war diversion and—more importantly—because of political and economic disorganization which have made the United States the only market in which to buy so much of what the world wants and needs, the trade discrepancy has become tremendous. Bellaire me, it's our problem as well as a foreign-dollar problem, because we've got a business set-up galled, first by the war and then by postwar lending and giving, to shipping out a huge production surplus. If we were to stop doing it suddenly, unpleasant things would happen here. I can't claim to know the answer, but these things I fully believe: We need to continue and to accelerate investments and to do that we need to make the way safe for them. This would otherwise be menacing. It is advisable to do this because we have, I am sure, a great deal to contribute in meeting challenging opportunities for development and new productiveness. It is advisable also because commerce in the broad sense of trade, building and exchange of ideas will be the greatest civilizer and offers the best hope of leading the world away from the idiocy of periodical wars, which can only lead back to barbarism. As a part of encouraging commerce we shall have to invite more imports, even though this means keener competition for some. Finally, I think we shall have to find new ways to make surplus labor and surplus production available for increasing the well-being of our own people. But I don't think anybody in the world can give a definite answer to your question of what will happen when the Marshall plan money runs out. There will certainly be readjustments that may be painful and even menacing. It is well to plan, but the world's problems cannot all be met by planning.

Representative O'HARA. As a banker then, Mr. Gaston, you think point 4 of President Truman's inaugural plan is thoroughly sound? There is so much interest in point 4 among our people that I know our listeners would appreciate knowing just what you think of it.

Mr. GASTON. I may already have indicated what I think. Of course, I believe it is thoroughly and unquestionably sound and the most important item on the agenda of the world. It is the first order of business if we want to survive. Either we do our best to spread civilization or somebody else spreads chaos. Point 4 or perish is a slogan for you that is packed with truth. We have an interest in substituting knowledge for ignorance, abundance for starvation, comforts for misery. Even to those to whom doing good has a namby-pamby connotation, self-preservation may not have. That is my opinion in a nutshell of point 4, the essence of which is the application of modern science and knowledge to developing the resources of lands that are not being fully or properly utilized. Somebody in your committee, Mr. O'HARA—or maybe it was the Senate committee—asked how about a point 4 for the United States. Well, I believe in that, too.

Representative O'HARA. Mr. Gaston, would you care to say anything about H. R. 5594, known as the Export-Import Bank loan guaranty bill, which our Banking and Currency Committee reported out and which will be one of the very important measures to be considered by the Congress when we reconvene in January?

Mr. GASTON. I'm glad of the opportunity. The bill as it stands would enable the Export-Import Bank to guarantee investments in foreign countries against loss through inability to convert promptly a foreign currency received as profits or return of capital into dollars; and to guarantee against governmental seizure of property representing a dollar investment without prompt compensation. Note that I say it would enable the Export-Import Bank to do these things. This is a discretionary bill and not, as some people have thought, an automatic guaranty bill to give all investors this limited degree of protection as a matter of right. It would be merely one more of a formidable catalog of powers given to the Export-Import Bank to enable it to discharge its function of promoting the foreign trade of the United States. It would be exercised just as we exercise our other powers, on a case by case basis, and we wouldn't think of giving any sort of investment guaranty to any investment unless we were convinced it was sound from the business point of view and would help to develop the economy of the foreign country concerned. There is absolutely nothing to the fears of those who think we might swamp the foreign-exchange authorities and central banks with obligations far beyond their ability to pay or prevent the conversion into dollars of earnings on money now invested in foreign countries. What would prevent us from doing these things is simply the exercise of ordinary business judgment. We could today guarantee a bond issue of any foreign country or foreign business—with an unqualified guaranty against any risk whatever—within the limits of our lending authority. What prevents us from doing it is simply a grain or two of horse sense. The proposed new guaranties differ from our present powers only in that they could be issued to cover equity investments or proprietorships in addition to the power to guarantee fixed obligations which we now have; but they would not cover any ordinary business risks at all, but only the two contingencies specified in the bill. We think it would be a useful power, because it might enable us to induce private capital to take the place of public loans.

Representative O'HARA. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. Gaston, I was greatly impressed by your testimony and that of Mr. Snyder, the Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Webb, the Undersecretary of State, but, as you will remember, I was afraid unless we made the contrary clear our proposed guaranty would be construed in some quarter as a guaranty of the stability of existing governments and thus provocative of meddling on our part in the domestic affairs of foreign nations. I think the statement which Under Secretary Webb, on my suggestion, and I believe after conference with you and Secretary Snyder, put in the record thoroughly cleared up that phase so that there would be no possible misunderstanding.

Mr. GASTON. I hope sincerely that it did, Mr. O'HARA. We believe in promoting both political and economic stability and in doing everything we can to encourage democratic government, but we don't believe in meddling nor in attempting to establish a protectorate over any country or political regime. I think the limited guaranties we propose will not invoke that danger, any more than do our present loans. I think, in that connection, you will be greatly interested in the fact that obligations to the Export-Import Bank have continued to be respected in spite of political coups d'états and other governmental changes. I hope I have said enough to indicate that our aim has been and will be to promote orderly development, both economic and political; to be as helpful as we can but not to give the slightest ground for the charge that America or Americans have any aggressive or imperialistic aims.

Representative O'HARA. Thank you, Chairman Herbert Gaston, of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank. We have been honored having you with us, and I know the folks back home in the invisible circle of homes in the Middle West to which we are speaking deeply appreciate your fine contribution to making clear and simple just how we in the United States are proceeding in our plan to make this a better world for ourselves by making it a better and a richer world for all men and women everywhere than any we or they have known.

And now, my friends, we have reached the end of another Quorum Call. For the 12 Democratic Congressmen from Illinois, and to all of you everywhere, until next week good-by and happy hours.

Sound of quorum bell: R-r-r-r. R-r-r-r-r. R-r-r-r-r-r.

ANNOUNCER. You have been listening to Quorum Call, another in a series of weekly reports to the people of Illinois by the Members of the Illinois delegation in the House of Representatives. Won't you join our listening audience next week for another factual report from your Representatives in Congress in the National's Capital. This program is presented as a public service. This is Washington; I return you to your announcer.

Iowa Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay written by Stanley Wenck, of Glidden, Iowa, in the sixth district. This essay won first place in a State-wide contest sponsored by the Iowa Development Commission. I heartily concur in its sentiments:

IOWA SPEAKS

IOWA, U. S. A., *April 1846–1949.*

DEAR UNCLE SAM: This is Iowa speaking, 103 years after my admission to the Union. Would you be interested in hearing from your leading agricultural State? I am a land of rolling hills, golden grains, and majestic industrial sights; efficient self-sustaining, and justly proud of my varied activities. Where else are greater advantages to be found than within my borders? Why should anyone seek his fortune elsewhere when my boundaries overflow with opportunities? Rainbow's end is here at home.

The finest of cattle graze contentedly on my pastures, where great quantities of fine quality hogs are found, second to none in your United States. Livestock, whose total value ranks first in the Nation, consumes generous amounts of my famous corn crop. My corn is king over one-third of my land area, ranking first among your States in production. Its sister crop, popcorn, and oats, add more firsts to my honors.

I wouldn't trade places with any other State as our geographic position provides a healthful climate for my inhabitants and an adequate growing season for my abundant crops.

A hawk's-eye view of my graceful countryside would reveal the splendor of my endless rows of stately corn swaying in the gentle breeze and glistening in the morning sun. Seas of gold, in reality acres of ripening oats, thrive upon lush prairies and limitless valleys. How could we maintain such a healthy population without the fruits and vegetables, the poultry and eggs we produce?

No wonder I am called the garden spot of the Mississippi Valley; America's breadbasket. My soil is called black gold since it is estimated to be worth more than all the silver and gold mines in the world. It yields to my native sons and daughters their wealth and health. Just listen to their joyful song: "We're from Iowa, that's where the tall corn grows."

The happy laughter of vacationists at my lake resorts and park areas is music to my ears. I provide recreation for every season of the year.

Nothing exceeds the joyous expectancy of springtime. Now you may see the robins return and hear the goldfinch, our State bird, trill his merry song. Among other events, let me picture for you the Easter egg hunt for tiny tots, the elementary schools' spelling bee, and high school music festivals. How entrancing is the gorgeous tulip festival at Pella.

During the brilliant sunshine of midsummer, my busy people find relaxation in golf and tennis tournaments, the rodeo at Sidney, the State fair at Des Moines. Swimming, fishing, and boating on the rippling blue waters of Lake Okoboji and many other lakes provide delightful pastimes. You should see the crowds at our numerous baseball games.

Autumn arrives with its mild haze and soft fleecy clouds, then, when my forests are aglow with brightly colored foliage; my people may attend such events as intercollegiate football games or the Dairy Cattle Congress at Waterloo.

Winter comes. Snow covers the landscape with a sparkling white blanket. How which do you choose: Hockey games at Dubuque, the Corn Festival in Des Moines, or hiking and skiing in our "Little Switzerland"? This is the season when thousands of basketball fans crowd into gymnasiums to watch this spectacular sport. Have you heard of our annual winter carnival, where colored lights play upon a palatial ice palace at Black Hawk Lake and ice skaters give wonderful entertainments?

High overhead transcontinental airplanes roar on their way, above the network of sweeping, smoothly-curved highways; broad ribbons which lace every county in Iowa and comprise the crossroads of your Nation. Did you know that no part of my State is over 12 miles from a railroad? Motorists travel over 6,000 miles of superior pavements, on the side of which my State flower, the wild rose, grows abundantly.

The Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, to my right and left, respectively, keep on rolling along, carrying heavy freight barges. These assist in the distribution of surplus raw materials.

Most of my farm crops are processed in huge factories. Here busy workmen turn out plastics, corn products, canned goods, etc. The world's largest cereal plant is at Cedar Rapids.

How would you like a fountain pen from one of the largest pen factories in the world, Fort Madison? Could I interest you in some of our millwork; or in the wool products from Amana? My tractor and farm equipment factories buzz with activity. The famous Maytag Co., largest washing machine factory in existence, is said to wash the clothes of the world.

There are creameries in abundance. Fresh butter and other dairy products delight our growing children. Surely, you have noticed, Uncle Sam, how hungrily the Nation views our meat-packing industry? Look. How many miners are busy supplying the humming industrial factories with fuel. Coal underlies about one-third of our area. Iowa ranks second among the States in the production of gypsum, limestone, and clay. Do you wonder at all our brick and plaster concerns?

Not everyone realizes that my State's industrial income is approximately equal to its agricultural income. Immense fortunes are invested in manufacturing establishments in Iowa, land of industrial opportunity. We paid you a half-billion dollars in taxes last year, Uncle Sam.

Do you hear school bells ringing? One-fourth of my 2,600,000 inhabitants eagerly attend elementary, secondary, or college courses. Observe the State university, where culture and art are developed under excellent facilities. Notice the aspiring faces of the students at Drake University. What a mighty cheer goes up from the crowds at the annual Drake relays. Capable, thoroughly trained graduates of Iowa State College at Ames develop modern ideas for the advancement of agriculture, industry, and soil conservation.

What other State boasts a higher educational standard? Iowans are keenly interested in learning. Could you show me a more excellent school system, or better equipped buildings? I point with pride to our 97.7 percent of literacy. The Hawkeye State ranks first in intelligence.

The cultural achievements of my talented sons and daughters are indeed noteworthy. My gallery of greats include: Grant Wood, inspired painter of Iowa's beauty; Phil Stong, whose book and movie, State Fair, make one decide, "That's for me"; MacKinlay Kantor, author, who depicts the joys of our Happy Land. How can thrills to the musical strains of Largo, composed at Spillville. Perhaps the most famous of my sons is Herbert Hoover, thirty-first President of the United States.

Songs, which endure wherever voices are raised, found their origin in Iowa. How quaintly is Pale Moon, by F. E. Logan, how equally entrancing his Missouri Waltz.

Newspapers, magazines, and radio stations also add cultural advantages. Libraries, State hospitals, and welfare institutions attest to the abiding interest in our mutual happiness and well-being.

Finally, Uncle Sam, I conclude this proud panorama. The vast resources of this State have scarcely been tapped. We have almost limitless possibilities for the future. How can we evaluate my potentialities?

The green and gold of my fertile fields nestling among sparkling streams, give promise of continuing productiveness for many generations to come. The future is bright as our agricultural prospects continue to unfold.

Our outstanding educational system attracts students the world over who wish to study the Iowa way.

We cannot sing loud enough praises for our expanding industries. We glory in our superb manufacturing sites, which are surpassed by few other States. This is proved by our progressive factories and million-dollar institutions. Success begins with an interest, and where there's interest there's Iowa.

Occupation never grows monotonous here with the four seasons providing opportunity for many varieties of recreation.

Now it is twilight—the sun sinks in the west and its sparkling rays set the golden dome of the capitol aglow. See? It is reflecting the enormous pride and gratitude we Iowans feel because of the many privileges and freedoms guaranteed to us by our systematic and efficient form of government.

Night falls. Stars twinkle above a peaceful and tranquil landscape. May they ever portray the Christian atmosphere of Iowa which continues to be known as the Bible State. Church spires beckon all to worship the Good Shepherd. Who has guided our destiny in the past, guards our welfare in the present, and who, we pray, will continue to grant success to our efforts in the future.

The stars and stripes above me, and the flag of Iowa beside me, I affix herewith the great seal of my State, and sign myself,

Your favorite nephew,

IOWA.

What Health Insurance Would Mean to You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, a great many people in this country are seriously concerned about the need for some better method of meeting medical costs. They know, from all-too-bitter experience, that one serious illness, or a number of minor ones in a short period, can bankrupt the average family. They know that it is quite beyond the possibility of the average family to provide adequately for the cost of the medical care they need.

The American Medical Association is trying to make people believe, first, that there is no serious need of any change

at all in the present hit-or-miss system of medical economics, and second, that voluntary plans are completely adequate to meet the need which they [illegible] exists.

A speech by Hon. Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, What Health Insurance Would Mean to You discusses these points very thoroughly. It shows the need for health insurance, and the impossibility of meeting that need by voluntary plans. I include this speech in the RECORD:

WHAT HEALTH INSURANCE WOULD MEAN TO YOU

(By Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator)

Good evening. I want to talk to you tonight, not about the Nation's health, but about your own health. Suppose that tomorrow morning, you should become suddenly ill—seriously ill. Suppose you found that you needed an operation, with special medical care, and all kinds of X-rays and drugs. Suppose you had to stop working for some months while you went through your operation and your convalescence. Suppose the doctor's bill, the hospital bill, the bills for special laboratory services and medicines, added up to hundreds of dollars—maybe even thousands. Would you be able to afford it?

If you are like most other people in this country, I can tell you the answer just as quickly as you would tell it to me if I were sitting there in the room beside you. The answer, for most of us, is one word: "No."

Most of us are neither very rich nor very poor. People who are very rich don't need to worry about their medical bills, any more than they need to worry about whatever other bills they run up. On the other hand, people who are very poor do generally get medical treatment in the United States, because we have charity care which does MAKE doctors and hospitals available to the real needy. But, if you are like the majority of Americans, you are somewhere between those two extremes. You've got a job. You've got your self-respect. And you like to stand on your own two feet. But you're not made of money; and when sickness strikes, when you wake up one morning with acute appendicitis, or when your old folks get sick, or when your child comes home from school restless and feverish, you have two worries—your first worry is that they should get the best treatment in town; and your second worry is how you're going to pay for it.

If you have ever been lying in a hospital bed after an operation, worrying about where the money to pay the bills would come from, you know what I mean. If you have had to go to a loan company and borrow money to pay a hospital bill, you know what I mean. If you have ever received a note from your child's school, telling you that your little boy or your little girl needs adenoids or tonsils out, and wondered how you'd pay for it, you know what I mean. If your wife has noticed a lump in her breast, but puts off going to the doctor because of the cost, you'll know—and she'll know—what I mean.

We have a problem in this country, and we're grown-up enough to face it squarely. Here we have some of the finest doctors and hospitals in the world, and we have the benefit of the magnificent research laboratories of America. True, we should be spending more money on medical research, but just with what we've done, we have already made such huge progress in medical research that we could call our times the age of giant advances in medicine. Yet, right now, thousands of sick people are not receiving the benefit of these giant advances because they cannot afford it. Every physician knows the torment he must go through when a patient comes in with a disease that could be cured if only that patient had the money to pay for X-ray treatments, or expensive specialists, or costly new drugs or equipment, that would make him healthy again.

In America today there is a barrier between the doctor and the patient. That barrier is the dollar bill.

This is our problem—to remove the barrier of dollars, to bring the patient and the doctor together, and in this way to make medical care available to all our people, not just the very rich and the very poor, but all our people.

Now, we could simply say, "Oh, we've gotten along O. K. so far, why change things? If people worry, why, they've always worried, haven't they? If people have died for lack of medical care, why, they've always died, haven't they? So what?" Or we might take another line and say: "Anyway, there are systems of voluntary health insurance to take care of those who want to provide for themselves." Yes, we could say these things—if we had the heart to do so. But we aren't the kind of people who can say, "So what?" when we hear that one out of every two mothers who died in childbirth in this country this very day, November 14, died unnecessarily, and that her life could have been saved if known medical measures had been fully applied. It might have been your wife. We can't say "So what?" when we know that one out of every three babies who died in this country today, November 14, could have been saved if known medical measures had been fully applied. It might have been your baby.

The voluntary plans for health insurance are fine as far as they go. But how far do they go? In the first place, most of them stop short of giving the amount of medical care you need. For example, most of them won't pay the bill if you have to call the doctor to your home or even if you go to his office. And if you have a serious chronic ailment at the time you enroll, then they will make a particular point of not giving you protection for that ailment. There are varous other limitations in voluntary insurance policies which I won't take time to recite because these two examples illustrate what I mean.

Another reason why the voluntary health insurance may be impracticable for you is that the premiums for this type of insurance are not adjusted to your income. Whether you earn $50 a week or $200 a week, you pay the same amount.

But most important, in voluntary health insurance you generally get a poor return for your money because overhead and profits of the insurance company eat up huge chunks of the premiums you pay. Many commercial companies are in the hospital, surgical, and medical insurance business sell only group policies. Generally speaking, this means that there must be a group of 25 or more employees of a concern who want the insurance. By dealing with a group, the cost of selling the insurance is reduced and bookkeeping costs are largely eliminated, since the employer keeps all the wage records. However, companies selling group insurance pay out on the average 30 percent of their group insurance premium receipts for overhead and profits, leaving only 70 percent for payment of benefits. But you can't get group insurance if you are a clerk in a small store or if you are a farmer or if you are a small-business man. Unless you work for some large business, you must probably buy insurance from a company which sells individual policies. Now, here's the catch. On individual policies these companies spend for overhead and profits an average of about 60 percent of what you pay them and only about 40 cents of your premium dollar goes for benefits to policyholders. Obviously, such insurance is a mighty poor buy.

Under voluntary non-profit insurance plans, Blue Cross hospitalization plan paid back 85 cents of the premium dollar in hospital benefits last year, and Blue Shield surgical-medical plans paid back in benefits 77 cents on the premium dollar paid.

We ought to be able to do better than that. We can do better than that. That is why we are proposing a plan for national health insurance. There has been a lot of loose talk about this proposal. I think you will want to have the straight facts on how this plan would work for you personally.

Under national health insurance, if you get sick, or anyone in your family gets sick, you would call your family doctor, just as you do now. He would examine you in order to decide the treatment he should prescribe. Your doctor would know that he can freely use X-ray and any kind of laboratory tests he thinks desirable. He may decide you should see a specialist or go to the hospital. Possibly you need eye glasses or a hearing aid or maybe you need an expensive medicine like streptomycin. Under national health insurance, your doctor is free to give you the best that medical science has to offer without giving a thought to what it will cost because this cost is met, not by you personally, but by the insurance fund.

But, you naturally wonder, Where does this insurance fund come from? Well, if you are employed, your employer will pay into the fund an amount equal to 1½ percent of your salary, and another 1½ percent will be deducted from your pay check. This deduction is only taken from what you earn up to $4,800 a year. If you earn $50 a week, you would pay a premium of 75 cents. The maximum premium for any employee, no matter how high his salary, would be $1.40 a week. If you are self-employed, your premium would similarly be worked out on the basis of how much your income was. These payments cover home and office calls by the doctor, treatment by specialists, hospital and nursing care for at least 60 days, eyeglasses, hearing aids, cost of expensive medicines, X-ray, laboratory tests, and dental services to the extent available—for yourself and your family.

You can see from this that national health insurance would affect you and your family in three ways: First, all the bills for medical services will be paid by the insurance fund and not by you; second, you will get more and better medical care; and, third, your contributions to the insurance fund would be in the form of small regular deductions from income when you are well and working, and best able to pay. No longer would you have to pay large doctor and hospital bills when you are sick or convalescing and least able to pay. And you would be getting the most for your money. Remember the figures I gave you before—group policies that pay out in benefits about 70 cents on the dollar, individual policies that pay out only about 40 cents on the dollar, nonprofit hospital plans that pay out about 85 cents on the dollar, nonprofit surgical- and medical-care plans that pay out about 77 cents on the dollar. Overhead under national health insurance would cost no more than 5 to 7½ percent—which means that from 92½ to 95 cents of every dollar in premiums would go to pay for the medical care you need.

The reason estimated overhead costs for national health insurance are so much lower than those of the voluntary companies is that under national health insurance (a) there would be no selling costs; (b) the Federal Security Agency is already keeping the wage records of some 90,000,000 workers and health insurance records would add comparatively little to this cost; and (c) the Treasury Department already is collecting social security pay-roll deductions, and deductions for health insurance could be collected with comparatively little added cost.

Now, what about the doctor under national health insurance? You hear a lot of talk about regimenting doctors, about doctors

spending long hours making out reports, socialization of medicine, etc., etc. You can put all that talk down as just plain "baloney." The proof of this is very simple. Today, the doctors are almost all plugging for voluntary health insurance. But under voluntary health insurance, doctors have the same problems regarding the making of reports, arrangements for payment of their services, handling of hypochondriacs, etc., as they would have under national health insurance. The only difference between national health insurance and voluntary health insurance, so far as the doctor is concerned, is that his bill would be paid by a check from a national insurance fund instead of from a private insurance fund.

Maybe you're worrying about red tape. Maybe you are asking yourself, "Who's going to run this thing?" Well, here's the answer: It would be run right in your own home town, right in your own State, by your local doctors, and by local people representing you as partners in national health insurance. There would be no more red tape than you find today in the voluntary plans for health insurance, and probably less. The day-to-day administration of the program would be in the hands of local doctors and laymen—not here in Washington.

You may have heard some criticism of health insurance. Most of it comes from people who may mean well but who just haven't taken the trouble to find out what the plan involves. Many doctors, I'm sorry to say, have been misled by people who tell them all kinds of horrible stories about what it would do to their profession. When someone tells you one of these wild stories, ask him just to find out what we are really proposing. The plain fact is that this program, when it comes into force, will be the greatest boon to the medical profession since the discovery of anesthesia: for it will help the doctors to practice better medicine for more people. It is just an honest-to-goodness attempt to remove the dollar barrier that separates you from your doctor and prevents you and your family from having the best medical care that money can buy. It is pretty much like social security and not much different, in theory, from life insurance, or fire insurance, or accident insurance.

What would national health insurance mean to you? It would mean that, when someone asks you, as I ask you, "Can you get all the medical care you and your family really need?" you could answer with confidence and relief, "Yes, under national health insurance I can."

WHERE THE HEALTH INSURANCE DOLLAR GOES

Commercial health insurance plans:[1] Under group insurance policies, on the average about 30 percent of premium receipts goes for overhead and profits, leaving only about 70 percent for payment of cash indemnity benefits.

Under individual insurance policies, on the average about 60 percent of premium receipts goes for overhead and profits, leaving only about 40 percent for payment of cash indemnity benefits.

Non-profit health insurance plans:[2] The Blue Cross hospitalization plans showed about 85 percent of premium receipts paid as benefits in 1948, and in the same year the Blue Shield surgical-medical plans paid about 77 percent of the premium dollar as benefits.

National health insurance (proposed):[3] Administrative costs under national health insurance would amount to no more than 5 to 7½ percent, leaving 92½ to 95 cents of every dollar paid by employers, employees, and Government to pay physicians, dentists, hospitals, and others for medical services.

British national health service:[4] Mr. Aneurin Bevan on October 6, 1949, at a press conference in London, placed their actual cost of administration at 2½ to 3 percent of the total expenditures, leaving approximately 97 cents of each dollar to pay for medical, hospital, dental, and other services. He pointed out that it had been possible to achieve the low administrative cost because of the nonpaid volunteers who were entrusted with important parts of its administration.

[1] Spectator Pocket Register of Accident Insurance, 1949, p. 49, "Adjustment expenses" for claims administration (estimated at 2.2 to 5.5 percent), included in "losses paid" in this reference, were reassigned to overhead and profits.

[2] Hearings on a National Health Program, 1949, subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on S. 1106, 1456, 1581, and 1679, pp. 387, 404.

[3] Medical Care Insurance: A Social Insurance Program for Personal Health Services. Report from the Bureau of Research and Statistics, Social Security Board, to the Committee on Education and Labor, U. S. Senate, Senate Committee Print No. 5, July 8, 1946, p. 146.

[4] New York Times, October 7, 1949; London Daily Telegraph, October 7, 1949.

Patriotism an Eternal Virtue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, during the interim between the first and second session of the Eighty-first Congress, it was my privilege on behalf of Rapid City Lodge, No. 1187, of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, to invite a colleague, the Honorable JAMES I. DOLLIVER, of Iowa, to deliver the address at the annual Elks memorial services on the first Sunday in December. Our colleague's address was so universal in its appeal and so well pointed in its tribute to the virtues of patriotism, courage, and fidelity that, with the permission of the House, I am placing it in the RECORD at this point:

More than usual, I am grateful to you of Rapid City for this invitation. This city is the gateway to an area very close to my heart. Not only because this is the richest 100 square miles on earth; not only because it has become the playground of the west for all the people of America; not only because here are the customs, the atmosphere, and the traditions of the old West with all its adventure and excitement. But the Black Hills is dear to me because of my own father was one of its pioneers. He came to these hills when Deadwood was the heart of the roaring gold rush of the last century. He was a pioneer preacher in the days when life was cheap and sin was unabashed and flourishing.

He must have loved this land in western Dakota, because he came back here to spend the last years of his life among the pine trees and the people of this truly golden west. He lies buried on a hillside in the Black Hills not too far from here, beside my mother, who followed him here in life and death, too.

So you see, there is a poignancy and meaning to this occasion far beyond the ordinary. I deeply appreciate your courtesy and kind hospitality in making me your guest today.

As in the days gone by, and in years to come, on the first Sunday in December, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks observe Memorial Day.

The occasion here has been so significant and so long observed that it has become an important day in the calendar of this organization and the entire community. On this Memorial Day, first of all, we invoke the memory of those who have passed on during the last year. We remember them fondly. We recall the smile of their faces, the touch of their hands and the warmth of their friendship. In our mind's eye, today we can see them again, in the fellowship of the lodge, radiating that cheer which is one of the characteristics of an Elk. As we think of them, we give them a sort of immortality, the immortality of memory. They live on with us in our mind's eye.

It is as if they had gone on a journey, a long journey, to be sure, which we, too, some day must take in order to rejoin them.

"Strange is it not, that the myriads who
Before us passed the door of darkness through,
Not one returns to tell us of the road
Which to discover, we must travel, too."

On an occasion like this, the age-old question always presents itself, the question asked by the prophet. "If a man die shall he live again?" On the first Sunday in December every year, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks gives a resounding affirmative to that question. If a man die he shall live again, we assure ourselves, again and again.

Whence comes this assurance and what is the rational basis for our belief? Is it merely a superstitution handed down to us from age-old ignorance or does this faith have some semblance of rationality? Is this confidence, as said by the Communists, an opiate of the people, or is it the inspiration to better living and finer ideals?

I suggest to you that our belief in immortality stems from our inescapable belief in God. Most rational human beings have a belief in the Supreme Being. Indeed, that concept of the Deity has been taught by philosophers and thinkers of all generations as the highest expression of human intellect. And indeed how could anybody doubt the existence of God, looking out upon the Black Hills of South Dakota? Clothed in the verdure of summer or covered with the white mantel of winter, whose soul has not been stirred by the infinite beauty of these mountains? And what man is there who has not responded to such grandeur, with the humble affirmation that this is the handiwork of an architect whose power is without limit and whose concepts of beauty far transcend those of any human artist?

The very fact that the human brain can appreciate such a stupendous work as these Black Hills or, indeed, any of the manifestations of nature, gives that human being a kinship with the Almighty. It suffices to make him a part of the plan of the Deity and thus gives him a spark of immortality, one of the attributes of God.

Several years ago, I had the opportunity to look through the eyepiece of the great telescope at Mount Wilson in southern California. Up to the time of the erection of the 200-inch glass at Mount Palomar, the Mount Wilson telescope was the largest in the world. A huge instrument of optical glass and metal, it brought within range of the human eye the satellites, the planets, the stars and the galaxies far beyond the reach of naked vision. In that eyepiece we saw the craters of the moon, the rings of Saturn, the nearest fixed star, and the vistas of the Milky Way.

For centuries, of course, the astronomers have been studying the heavens. For centuries they have sought to find an outer limit to the infinity of space. And yet, with the 100-inch telescope on Mount Wilson and now with the 200-inch reflector on Mount Palomar, no outer limits have yet been found or even approached. The astronomers tell us that space is limitless, endless, without dimension.

Some doubter may ask why a power which created such infinity would give any time or thought to so finite a creature as man. Or as the Psalmist says, "What is man that thou art mindful of him?" And the answer is as clear as the question itself. A human being whose brain can project itself to the planets, the Pleiades and beyond the galaxies, has some of the attributes of infinity. The human brain that can encompass the precession of the equinoxes, whose study of the sciences has led him from the infinity of space to the infinitesimal concept of the atom, whose power over nature has been gained by constant research and study—such a being has the attribute of infinity and has at least a scintilla of immortality.

The great and merciful God who endowed his creatures on earth with ability to peer into the vast open spaces of the heavens and to refine the smallest particles of matter to serve the ends of man, such a God does not deny the boon of eternal life to his human creation.

But perhaps these men whom we memorialize today were not astronomers or bacteriologists or atomic scientists. Perhaps it can be fairly said that most of them were ordinary men such as you and I. They had no specially outstanding attributes of intellect. Perchance, however, there was another field in which they excelled.

Some of them were men of courage. I can think, for example, that they showed a fortitude and bravery, perhaps in war, perhaps in peace, perhaps in their daily lives, which transcended that ordinary courage with which most of us face our daily tasks.

Or perhaps among them was a man who under great stress and difficulties displayed the virtue of kindness; when he might have been harsh and vindictive he was loving and forgiving. Where he might have shown his anger he showed mercy.

Or doubtless there were among these who sometime during their earthly life displayed that monumental virtue of loyalty: faithfulness to a cause, faithfulness to some other person, faithfulness in the face of superabundant difficulties, loyalty transcending the usual or ordinary call.

Another human virtue which all Elks exemplify is love of freedom and loyalty to our country. No organization has more fully carried out the precepts of patriotism than has our organization through the manifold activities of its members, both in peace and in war. This is a free organization of free men, devoted to constitutional liberty, foe of every form of tyranny. No doubt in this gathering today there are those who served in the armed forces of this country during the recent war with totalitarianism.

During those years from 1941-45 we all entertained the hope that when the fighting was over the war for liberty would be won. Not so. We discover that selfish attempts are still being made both at home and abroad to destroy our republic. Insidious plotters here from within, and abroad our motives are misrepresented and maligned.

Some well-meaning people in this country by espousing doubtful causes or crackpot theories would make Americans the victims of an all-powerful state. They forget that maxim of a free government—that the state is not the master of the people, but its servant. By unsound and destructive financial policies, by promising "everything to everybody," they will drag this beloved land of ours to something closely resembling pseudo-security—freedom gone.

It behooves all Americans to scrutinize closely this trend, and by use of our representative self-government direct our political leaders to follow the trail of freedom and opportunity.

Of course, abroad, even more than at home, we have to face the scourge of communism. A godless, atheistic doctrine and philosophy, it has become a dominant enemy of freedom everywhere. Without the slightest regard for honesty and integrity, this modern devilish concept has damaged and nearly destroyed any semblance of honor in its international relationships. To millions of people communism has meant loss of human freedom and national independence. The number of freedom-loving people behind the iron curtain who are actual slaves is estimated by some authorities as high as 15,000,000.

Without any hesitation, we are told that this foul thing is to sweep the world, and engulf us in free America. I tell you, western civilization has not been confronted with so great a threat since the Moslems knocked at the gates of Vienna half a millennium ago.

Thus on this Memorial Day our bounden duty becomes the more clear. To honor those whom we remember today, we ought to take unswerving and undying allegiance to the land they loved.

These virtues, all virtues, partake of the nature of immortality. They are everlasting. They are as permanent as the granite of these hills. In them we recognize the eternal value of the moral law; the everlastingness of a human spirit embodying courage or kindness or patriotism or loyalty. These virtues have the attribute of eternity in the moral world, just as outer space has the attribute of infinity in the physical world.

Need I remind you that these men whom we remember today, possessing as they did, these virtues of constancy, courage and kindness, portrayed in their own earthly existence virtues as eternal as God himself? Thus the beings who portrayed these virtues and exemplified them in life, can no more pass on and into oblivion, than the everlasting stars of heaven. It is hard to define a moral virtue in abstract terms. But it is not hard to recognize a man whose life embodied in his daily living morality.

May I give you an illustration of patriotism, courage, and fidelity? During the recent war, a young man from my home town, Capt. Darrel Lindsay, was piloting a bomber with its crew over Paris. Their objective was a bridge across the Seine. The Germans were in occupation of the French capital. His was the lead plane in the formation. They ran into serious antiaircraft fire, so serious that one of the engines was ablaze. The captain ordered the crew to parachute to safety, which they did. He stayed at his post. He accomplished his mission. He saved his crew. He died in the flames of the doomed ship. He was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for his constancy, courage, and self-sacrifice.

Can such a human spirit die? I tell you—

"There is no death. The stars go down
To rise upon some other shore,
And bright in heaven's jeweled crown
They shine forevermore.

"There is no death. The dust we tread
Shall change beneath the summer showers
To golden grain or mellow fruit
Or rainbow-tinted flowers."

What is the lesson of this Memorial Day to us, the living? Of course, the answer is obvious. It is that we continue striving to live according to our own best conscience; that we be aware of our own dignity as human beings with an eternal destiny.

The FEPC Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by my friend, Walter Johnson, of Heathsville, Va., who writes a weekly column, Country Lawyer, regularly appearing in the Orange Review and some 20 other live Virginia weeklies.

As Commonwealth's attorney of Northumberland County Mr. Johnson has the unique distinction of being the only elected Republican officeholder in eastern Virginia. Last year he was nominated for Governor in the first Republican primary ever held in Virginia and polled a most encouraging vote in the general election.

In his column Mr. Johnson presents a question that deserves the most careful consideration of all thoughtful citizens who believe in the freedom and dignity of human beings.

The article follows:

COUNTRY LAWYER

(By Walter Johnson)

The chosen representatives of the people are again assembled in Congress in Washington. They will be urged to take further substantial steps along the reactionary road backward in accord with the Fabian plan to lessen the freedom and dignity of the people of this fair land we so proudly call the United States of America.

This Fabian plan derives its name from a Roman general named Quintus Fabius, who argued that the only way to defeat Hannibal was to avoid a general engagement and instead to lure him into a series of small battles and destroy him little by little. It is the plan that worked in England to eat into freedom and to establish socialism and it is the plan that is working here to the same end.

Several large bites into our freedom are on the agenda of Congress. These include the Brannan plan to enslave the farmers and the Taft-Hartley repeal and the FEPC measure to further lessen the freedom of the workers.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act the workers as well as all the people have a measure of protection against arrogant and dictatoral labor bosses. Its repeal would work sharp injury to all.

The FEPC proposal is one of the most far-reaching so far advanced under the Fabian movement. It would destroy a larger chunk of freedom than any previous bite. This monstrosity is advanced under the usual high-sounding name.

It would create the Fair Employment Practices Commission with power to stand between job applicants and the employer and determine who may, in fairness, be given the job in question. Everybody believes in fairness though there is seldom agreement on what constitutes fairness. A Federal agent would decide.

This is proposed as something that would help colored people and force them in jobs not now normally open to them. Most colored people accept that argument and support the FEPC. Actually the FEPC would be a blow of magnitude to all workers and employers both white and colored.

It would mean loosening of another great host of Federal agents to roam the highways and byways to interpose themselves and their ideas between workers and employers. These agents would have power to decide who shall be employed.

Having the power to decide which job applicant shall be hired Government would also have to the power to determine where a man or woman must work. Instead of helping the colored people it would set them back toward a new condition of servitude, and whites as well.

There can be no substitute for the proposition of every man standing on his own individual worth and merit. It is true that many jobs are now closed to colored but it is also true that for some time these jobs have been steadily opening to them as they, in turn, develop and command greater and greater respect from their white friends by merit and individual worth.

On the national scene the Democrat Party has become captive of this Fabian plan. A bewildered Republican Party goes along though it does drag its feet a little. In the national picture the Republican Party seems lacking in the courage necessary for it to stand as an effective minority party.

The Republican Party needs a complete and thorough renovation. It should reconsider and embrace the only formula ever devised by which men can be free and enjoy self-government. That formula was written for us right here in Virginia in 1776 by such truly great men as Patrick Henry, George Mason, Thomas Jefferson, and others.

If the Republican Party is unable or unwilling to embrace and take the affirmative for the freedom and dignity of mankind then we need a new party for that purpose. There must be some way by which the people can rally around the cause of freedom.

Excise Tax on Admission Tickets to Amusements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo:

CITY OF BUFFALO,
January 4, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to directions of the common council, I enclose to you herewith copy of a resolution adopted by that body relative to excise tax on admission tickets to amusements.

Very truly yours,
JOSEPH J. THOMPSON,
City Clerk.

Excise tax on admission tickets to amusements

Whereas the Federal excise tax on amusements is commonly referred to as a luxury tax; and

Whereas movies rank with newspapers and radio as a means of news, entertainment, and education; and

Whereas the movies are the greatest form of entertainment serving approximately 90,000,000 persons weekly, the greatest number of whom are in the low- and middle-income brackets; and

Whereas the 20-percent tax on admissions was patriotically paid during the war and the boom period later, but now is severely felt by the moviegoers and is one of the causes of the serious drop in attendance; and

Whereas the slowing down of the movie business in all its branches jeopardizes the jobs and wage scales of tens of thousands of workers in studios, distribution exchanges, and theaters; and

Whereas other forms of entertainment and sports are similarly affected by this tax; and

Whereas elimination or reduction of this discriminatory tax would undoubtedly cause an upturn in attendance thereby resulting in a lesser actual loss of revenue to the United States Government by reason of increased attendance and thereby increased profit taxes, income taxes, etc.; and

Whereas the welfare and well being of the residents of the city as well as all the industries located therein is a matter of vital concern to the members of the common council: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Buffalo memorialize the Congress of the United States to immediately repeal or substantially reduce the 20-percent excise tax on admission tickets to amusements; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the city clerk to the President of the United States, the Clerks of the Senate and House of Representatives, Senators IRVING M. IVES and HERBERT H. LEHMAN and Congressmen CHESTER C. GORSKI, ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO, WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER, and DANIEL A. REED.

The Privileged Few

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gazette and Bulletin, Williamsport, Pa., for November 3, 1949:

THE PRIVILEGED FEW

The DeMille Foundation, of Los Angeles, has issued a bulletin that puts in a clear style one of the major problems facing the United States today. Rather than try to rewrite or summarize the bulletin, we give it to you complete.

"Denouncing the selfish interests is one of the oldest tricks in every politician's bag.

"Everyone will agree that selfishness is wicked.

"Everyone will agree that, as President Truman has said, the strength of our Nation must continue to be used in the interest of all our people rather than a privileged few.

"But let's bring it down to cases.

"Who are these few?

"And what are their privileges?

"The very rich—with their privilege of paying upward of 90 percent of their income to the Government?

"The capitalists? They can't qualify because they are not few. There are more stockholders in the country than there are union members. If Joe Smith owns a corner grocery, that makes him a capitalist. And there are lots of Joe Smiths in the United States.

"Who are the real twentieth-century barons of privilege?

"Well, it's quite a privilege to be able to shut down the coal mines of the country. One man can do that.

"Then there is the privilege of being able to reach across the Pacific and throw a blockade around the Hawaiian Islands. One man did that.

"Not many feudal lords in the Middle Ages had as many serfs as there are, say, teamsters or musicians in the United States today—and we do not hear of any successful efforts to separate Mr. Tobin or Mr. Petrillo from their privileged positions.

"In the Middle Ages a runaway serf could stay in a city for a year and a day and become a freeman.

"In the United States, in this enlightened age, a union can say to a man: 'You may get a job if you go to another State and change your name, but there's no work for you in this State.'

"How does that line up with another of President Truman's admirable generalities: 'No * * * artificial distinction should bar any American * * * from a job that he is capable of performing?'

"The most potent privilege any man can hold is power over another man's right to work.

"If we mean business about not running the country for the benefit of a privileged few, let's strike privilege where it is strongest."

Coal Crisis Demands Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I received a telegram this morning from the Mount Vernon (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce which reads as follows:

Only 50 tons of stoker coal and 800 tons of other types available at Mount Vernon. Not more than 1 day's supply is left. The weather is near zero. We urge immediate and drastic action be taken by the Government to make coal available to homes and industry.

I received another telegram from the coal distributors of Mount Vernon, Ill., which reads as follows:

Coal situation in Mount Vernon is extremely critical. Only low-grade stoker coal is available, and by rationing will only last one more day. It is urgent that mines resume full production.

Signed by all Mount Vernon retail coal dealers as follows: Anchor Coal Co.; Browning Coal Co.; Bigham Coal Co.; Jax Coal Co.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the public health and safety of these citizens are seriously threatened. This city of 20,000 people with its hospitals, schools, churches, manufacturing industries and homes, is almost solely dependent upon coal for heat. The weather is around zero there at the present time.

It is to be hoped that the highest power of this Government will be immediately invoked to settle the coal dispute to bring about full production in the mines of the Nation. The situation is extremely critical, and it is time for quick and bold action.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this editorial sums up briefly President Truman's message to the Congress on January 4. After all, it was pretty much of a dream, and Mr. Truman failed to provide the ways and means of reaching this utopia—50 years hence.

The editorial follows:

FROM POEM

The more things are the same, as the French aphorist did not say, the more they change. The President's message on the state of the Union is in its fundamentals what it was last year and the year before. The major recommendations, from completion of the Marshall plan to the repeal of Taft-Hartley, follow a familiar pattern, and the well-meaning, if somewhat elusive, philosophy behind them appears to be what it always was. But this year there is a difference.

No longer is there an effort to grapple with the mechanics of inflation or deflation. No longer is there an attempt to deal precisely (as in last year's proposal of Government investment in steel capacity) with the controversial problems of productivity. No longer are any exact figures provided on budget and taxation policy; the President's proposals on taxation, coming late in a long message—"some changes in our tax system which will reduce present inequities, stimulate business activity, and yield a moderate amount of additional revenue"—are indeed a masterpiece of understatement, if not of self-contradiction.

All such hard and practical problems the President has preferred to leave to his budget message and succeeding recommendations. Here he has chosen to present, instead, what might almost be called a prose poem—a vision of America, advancing down the sunlit dairy field of the future, in peace and automatically multiplying prosperity, to quadruple the national product and triple the average family income by the end of the present century. Only one serpent—communism—lingers in the grass, and this is already being scotched by the Marshall plan and the bipartisan policy in Europe (the one surprise of the message is its omission of any references to foreign policy in the Far East); and but a single spook—monopoly—can be observed on the domestic scene.

All that is necessary is to recognize the principle that "the Government has a special responsibility to help create and maintain the conditions which will permit the growth we know is possible." This dictum would certainly have astonished Grover Cleveland and would have surprised most of those who actually did create the extraordinary growth over the past 50 years on which Mr. Truman bases his optimistic prognosis. But it simplifies the policy. It requires only that one offer, as the President here does, something to everybody—a competitive system for large business, a protected system for small business, a guaranteed income for farmers, a repeal of Taft-Hartley for the labor magnates, bigger Federal old-age pensions for those whose unions cannot extract the pensions from industry, wider social security, more Government housing, Government medical care beyond the large amounts already provided, Government education, together of course with undiminished provision for those responsibilities of national defense and foreign policy which are historically the major reason for existence of the Federal Government. The cost-accounting for all this is a minor question which will be taken up later.

California Veteran Hospital Situation Critical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, California veterans are unable to obtain the medical and hospital care to which they are entitled because of inadequate facilities for veteran care in our State.

New veteran hospitals and increased bed capacity has not solved the problem especially in the case of tubercular and mentally ill veterans and overcrowding has continued.

It is therefore necessary that every available hospital facility be utilized at this time in California to provide efficient effective medical care for our veterans. The Naval Hospital at Corona, Calif., which was built by the Navy at a cost of $19,000,000 has been abandoned by the Navy and is now idle. This hospital could be converted for use as a veterans' hospital.

The California State Legislature has adopted the following resolution requesting that the Corona Naval Hospital be transferred to the Veterans' Administration for the benefit of California veterans who are in critical need of hospitalization, and I am in full accord with this resolution:

Senate Joint Resolution 5

Joint resolution relative to hospital facilities for veterans in California

Whereas there are insufficient beds in Government hospitals for veterans in California as evidenced by waiting lists and by the large number of tubercular and mentally ill veterans now adding to the overcrowded conditions of California State and county hospitals; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has announced plans for a future building program for hospitals to meet this need; and

Whereas the United States naval hospital at Corona, built by the Navy since 1941 at an expenditure of $19,000,000, has been abandoned by the Navy and is now idle but in every way suitable and desirable for the care of veterans by the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and other ex-service organizations have recommended the Corona Naval Hospital for transfer to the Veterans' Administration; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Veterans' Administration be, and hereby is, requested to take over at once the Corona Naval Hospital as a major veterans' facility for the care of sick and disabled veterans in California; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to bring about the transfer of the Corona Naval Hospital to the Veterans' Administration and to enact any legislation which may be needed for this purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall immediately be dispatched by the secretary of the senate to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from the State of California, and to the Veterans' Administrator.

Frankness Preferred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post edition of January 4, 1950, on the subject Frankness Preferred which I feel should be of particular interest to Members of the Congress:

FRANKNESS PREFERRED

As the new Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, Edward W. Barrett will have a job as broad in scope and as significant as any in the State Department. He will be an adviser on public opinion to the Secretary of State; he will be responsible for the foreign information and education programs; he will be in charge of keeping the American public informed on foreign policy; and he will direct American participation in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. These are all fields in which frankness and a minimum of pretense will pay dividends.

In all respects but one the Barrett appointment is admirable. It is fallacious to think that the only good men come from outside the Government, and the President could have helped boost the morale of the career service by making his choice within the State Department. This, however, is no reflection on Mr. Barrett. As editorial director of Newsweek, as a participant in UNESCO and with previous service in War Information and psychological warfare, he has an amazingly good background for his job. He is known as an extremely competent administrator. More important, he is devoid of any razzle-dazzle or big-shot complex.

Among Mr. Barrett's many responsibilities, foreign broadcasts are perhaps the most spectacular, though by no means the most important. Here he has an opportunity to place more emphasis on quality and less on physical facilities and technique. What is needed most in the Voice of America is a consistent philosophy, and this entails recognizing the Voice for what it is: an instrument of warfare dealing with men's minds. If the purpose of psychological warfare is to cause other peoples to reject communism, then the Voice ought to be aggressively exploiting every chance to place the Communists on the defensive. This would not mean any departure from truthfulness, but it would mean using the truth as a weapon of propaganda. As Ladislas

Farago pointed out in a recent issue of The Reporter, the Voice ought to be the most authoritative source of information on the Tito-Stalin rift. For it to exploit the full potential of this split, the cooperation of American intelligence agencies will be necessary.

But it is easy to overstress the importance of the Voice of America as compared with other media and contacts. What the people of India think of the United States, for example, is of infinitely greater immediate significance than the at-best-hopeful efforts to win friends behind the iron curtain. Ties with Latin America have never received the serious attention they deserve. There is room for a good deal of fence-mending in the State Department's relations with the American people. Mr. Barrett could seek no better goal than to end the atmosphere of double-talk that too often surrounds State Department proclamations and insist on the rugged honesty that ought to characterize our foreign policy.

Dodging Facts Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune for January 5, 1950:

DODGING FACTS AGAIN

Perhaps some day we shall have a President who will not regard the American people as a bunch of temperamental children or nincompoops.

Mr. Truman's message Wednesday on the State of the Union was in every sense, a political speech. It dealt not so much with realities, and with common-sense problems before us, as a Nation, as it did with fantasies.

It was on the order of a fairy story, told to hold the attention of children.

There was nothing new in his message. It was the same Fair Deal, all over again. Washington observers say Mr. Truman is impatient these days with anyone who mentions New Deal to him. He is convinced that his Fair Deal is far superior to anything Mr. Roosevelt and Harry Hopkins ever cooked up.

His thinking, of course, is along political lines. He obviously judges a Presidential program solely by its vote-getting power.

His far-fetched thinking is demonstrated by his statement that by the year 2000 the Nation's production will total a trillion dollars a year—nearly four times what it is now.

If we are to deal in facts, however, it is inescapable that we ask Mr. Truman whether his trillion-dollar-production figures are based upon his own vastly inflated dollar, or upon the steadier dollar value of the prewar days.

That makes a lot of difference.

The average salary these days is put at $3,600 a year. Ten years ago, it was half that. Ten years ago, you could buy a car or a home for half what you must pay now. The same is true of almost every other commodity.

Thus, it is plain enough that the standard of living has not risen perceptibly in the last decade, even though the amount of dollars earned has risen steadily.

If Mr. Truman's tax program goes into effect, if local and State taxes keep their present pace, if Government regulation and discouragement of investment capital continues, a trillion-dollar production in the year 2000 may not be sufficient to give this country the poverty-stricken standard of today's Soviet Russia.

The President asks for another increase in taxes. It requires a certain quality of effrontery to ask the American people for more taxes, and then to go on spending billions to help support much of the world in which socialistic doctrines of lassitude and general decay are growing.

Almost every time the President speaks to the American people, it is to demand more of them * * * until even their way of life will be demanded.

Senator MARTIN said, "It is difficult to reconcile his program for vastly increased spending and greater centralization of power in Washington with his references to the need for a balanced budget and economy in government, which his administration consistently has opposed."

Said Representative SIMPSON, of Huntingdon, "He finds satisfaction in results to date of our spending $33,000,000,000 in the cold war. He overlooks the fact that more human beings are dominated today by the Communists in Europe and Asia than ever before."

Mr. Truman's record will not bear close inspection by the American people.

Mr. Truman's spending of the public tax money from the 1946 fiscal year to the end of September 1949, adds up to over $191,000,000,000 * * * nearly $12,000,000,000 more than all his 32 predecessors spent * * * except for the 1941–45 war period * * * and Mr. Roosevelt was no slouch at tapping the Treasury.

This kind of spending is without precedent in the world. The American people are financing it. We shall be held accountable for it.

It is our Nation * * * not alone Mr. Truman's. There are more custodians of America than those found in the White House, and environs.

But, these other custodians have fallen down on the job when we let a President spend us along the road to ruin as Mr. Truman is doing, and as he proposes blithely to keep on doing * * * unless the American people by their protests, tell him plainly that he has been given no mandate to destroy our Nation. Protests to Congressmen, to Senators, and to the White House are the only methods the people have * * * until election time, of registering their opinions.

More Needless Bloodshed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the House membership to the article included herewith and which appeared in the December 31 issue of Labor, official weekly newspaper of 15 recognized standard railroad labor organizations. I do so because I am hopeful that early in this present session of the Eighty-first Congress we will have the opportunity to vote on adoption of railway safety legislation that will help to bring an end to such tragic accidents. This accident could have been avoided. Through the years hundreds of lives have been lost in other accidents which could have been avoided.

Will it take another major accident on our American railroads to awaken Congress to the urgency of improving our national rail safety laws? I hope not.

The article follows:

MORE WEEKEND BLOODSHED—THREE TRACK WORKERS KILLED IN MOTORCAR CRASH; ICC MAKES USUAL RECOMMENDATION

Three more track workers have been slaughtered in a smashup of a rail motorcar and a train.

The tragedy occurred on the St. Johnsbury & Lamoille County Railroad near Cambridge, Vt., October 10.

The Interstate Commerce Commission made the usual investigation and found the carrier could have prevented the crash by providing an adequate block system or train order protection for the motorcar.

The ICC recommended the carrier provide "adequate protection" for motorcars. Nothing was done to compel the railroad to do this.

The Commission has contended that it lacks the authority to order such safety measures and for several years has suggested legislation to remedy this unfortunate situation.

However, not many months ago when congressional committees held hearings on safety bills, which had the backing of the standard railroad labor organizations, the Commission's legislative committee did a startling about-face and lined up against the proposal and on the side of the railroad lobby.

Meanwhile, the blood of rail employees continues to be spilled unnecessarily. At least 51 workers have been killed and 86 injured in track car smash-ups alone during the last 6 years.

Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the House has been favored since this new session was called to order with reports from all parts of the country brought to us by the men who represent those parts in this Congress. The people of my district, the ninth of Indiana, have something to say to you, too. My people would like to know when Harry Truman and the Democrats who go along with the Truman Fair Deal are going to learn the economic facts of life that you cannot spend more than you earn and put off bankruptcy forever. I heard the Vice President when he called us "tree-sitters" and "hitching post" thinkers because we were wondering how long this state of unreality could last. The Veep, beaming bridegroom of the year and story-teller to the court of Sir Harry, may have been bred in Old Kentucky but that kind of talk indicates "crumby" thinking in my part of Indiana.

The political flight of fancy in which Harry Truman indulged in this Chamber last Wednesday proves again that he cannot keep his feet on the ground or his

hand out of our pockets when he thinks he hears any loose change jingling. If you will recall, there was almost no mention made of how much it would cost us to bring to life all these political dreams of which Mr. Truman's ambitions are made.

He plays a perpetual game of "let's pretend" with himself, and his advisers help his delusions by keeping from him the rumbling resentment of the common people who are beginning to ask "how much did this Government hand-out cost me?" and "when will things be back to normal in Washington?" Some day the realization will overcome them that normalcy in Washington is that one shade short of insanity that keeps the whole blooming town out of a mental institution. I am ready to join my friend, Mr. RICH, of Pennsylvania, whose new slogan, "Be thrifty in '50" may guarantee him a place in history when the history of this period is honestly written.

End of Tragicomedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial that appeared in the Washington Post of January 6, 1950:

END OF TRAGICOMEDY

Those who have been pleading with the administration for a decisive statement on Formosa will be gratified by the President's declaration yesterday. The statement is pithy, full of point, and compact with common sense; and it should clear the air all over the world about American intentions. Mr. Truman is to be complimented upon meeting head-on the challenge from a lunatic coterie of the Republican Party. The members of it are less significant in numbers than in noise and intimidation. Their policy is simple: they would commit the puissant United States to the role of playing second fiddle to the bankrupt Chiang Kai-shek.

Think of what such a policy, if that is the word, would entail. It has been obvious from the comment of recent days that the interventionist policy would undermine American influence everywhere in non-Communist Asia. Our only allies would be boiled politicians. The whole Atlantic community, now joined together in an alliance, would be riven asunder. For none of the other allies intends to scramble aboard the sinking ship of Nationalist China before it collapses out of sight. In the United Nations, with the United States the lone friend of Chiang, there would be so much chaos that the institution would become a laughingstock. All this would be the evil fruit of the policy of military action that the interventionists want to impose upon the United States. Like Lot's wife, the United States would become a pillar of salt, though the categorical imperative of our situation as leader of the free world compels us to move forward with what William James would have called the blunt and stubborn facts.

Clandestine intervention in behalf of Chiang has already been declared to be beyond the stomaching of many Republicans. Senator LODGE boggled at it, and would doubtless echo Secretary Acheson's "once is enough." On the House side, Representative JOHN KEE, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, saw the situation as clearly as his opposite number in the Senate, Senator CONNALLY, saw it through a glass darkly. Mr. KEE said the choice was simple: either cut the painter or take Formosa away from Chiang, and hold it. The President has decided on the former course—at least he has taken the first step in a thoroughgoing disembarrassment in our relations with Chiang.

The main thing is that involvement in civil conflict in China is disavowed unequivocally. To be sure, there is one hedge in the declaration. That is that "at this time" there is no desire on the part of the United States "to obtain special rights or privileges or to establish military bases on Formosa." This, in the light of Mr. Acheson's statement, should, more properly, have read, "In present circumstances." For the qualification, he says, was inserted as self-protection in case the Russians take leave of their senses and attack American forces in the Far East. A casus belli of any such description would thrust upon this country the obligation of developing and even extending its defenses.

Assuredly Formosa in Communist hands would break the chain in America's offshore military posture in the Far East. So, for that matter, does Formosa in Chinese Nationalist hands. But neither Communist China nor Nationalist China is an air power or a sea power with any potential likely to affect the defense equation. Eighteen months ago, while civil war was going on, there was some reason to take temporary possession of Formosa. Now that the civil war is over, with Chiang Kai-shek holed up in Formosa, there is no sense in it. De facto, Formosa is Chinese, and the need of the moment is to reaffirm the territorial integrity of China.

This Secretary Acheson has done with an unmistakable accent which will be heard all over Asia. He is to be congratulated on the boldness with which he has seconded the President's initiative. Plain speaking was called for equally with a reassertion of Presidential leadership because of the activity of GOP diehards in holding up the United States to universal derision. The air for the last week has been cluttered with the dead cats of amateur Secretaries of State on the Hill whose purpose seemed to be only to second Chiang's aim of getting America into conflict with Russia.

Now the Executive has disengaged itself decisively from this interventionist maneuver. It is on the way to an orderly and correct American in place of a Chinese policy in the Far East. It would make its position absolutely clear in this respect if it now wound up the muddle about the blockade and started to protect the American flag in China seas.

Stating Republican Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I want to insert the following editorial comment from the Wisconsin State Journal of Madison, Wis., one of the largest and most influential newspapers in our State:

DISCARDING "ME-TOOISM"

Republicans, within the next few weeks, will put a committee to work drafting a definite statement of party policy. That is all to the good, and we recall supporting, many months ago, a proposal for a national grass-roots GOP convention where party members could air their views and furnish such a committee with a sample of rank-and-file sentiment.

A good deal of publicity has been given to the statement by National Republican Chairman Gabrielson that the party would discard "me-tooism."

Various interpretations have been placed upon this, and in some quarters—both Republican and Democratic—there has been a tendency to suggest that the Republican party is ready to go on record as flatly opposed to all welfare legislation enacted since 1932.

An eastern newspaper of high repute made this comment recently on this rather dubious strategy:

"Obviously the Republicans cannot be against whatever the Democrats have done or plan to do. It would be a complete abandonment of reason and principle if the party were to let the fear of 'me-tooism' lead it to a denunciation of everything the last decade has brought about. Gov. Driscoll of New Jersey has spoken wisely in this regard, saying that the Republicans are not going to advocate repeal of the Ten Commandments and the Constitution merely because the Democrats have affirmed their support of these things.

"The problem, in a word, is to decide what is good and what is bad, what is desirable and what is dangerous. And the standard of judgment is to be derived less from what the Democrats happen to have done or said than from large considerations of the public need."

With that view we agree completely.

It has been a mistake for the GOP to accept many New and Fair Deal plans with the promise that "we can do it better." It would be an even greater mistake for the GOP to discard all Democratic programs as utterly worthless. Neither political party, made up of good and sincere Americans, has a monopoly on wisdom.

DECLINE OF PARTY PLATFORMS

We believe there are several issues on which the Republican and Democratic parties have similar objectives in mind; the great difference lies only in method.

Both parties are in favor of civil-rights legislation, although there is disagreement on the extent that Federal police authority should be allowed to overshadow State and local government powers.

Both parties are on record in favor of using a certain amount of Federal money to support education. Republicans insist there is a limit to the money available; they also insist that the right of local communities to run their own schools remain undisputed.

Both parties are in favor of expansion of the national social security program. Again, the Republicans insist on a certain amount of home rule, and insist on realistic financing.

Both parties are on record in favor of protection for the Nation's farmers. The Democrats further are committed to the Brannan plan, with costs that appear astronomical and controls that are unquestionable. The record shows that the GOP favors flexible price supports.

There is nothing the matter with the two major political parties having similar objectives or even, when necessary, favoring the same methods. But these differences in method must be spelled out.

If both parties wrote honest and definite political platforms, they would be taken more seriously than they have the past few elections.

In the last couple of decades, there has been a tendency by both Republicans and Democrats to attempt to outpromise the other.

That has led to a ridiculous situation where voters are thoroughly confused and where platforms have come to mean but little.

THERE ARE REAL DIFFERENCES

There are many instances where the Republican Party must and will disagree with its Fair Deal opponents.

There is the question of Government reorganization. It is becoming more apparent each day that the Democratic Party is willing to sidetrack and forget the Hoover Commission's reforms. We believe that the Republican Party should accept the Hoover Commission recommendations 100 percent, and give them a fair trial.

There is a difference of opinion between the two parties on what constitutes a fair labor law. Democrats want to repeal Taft-Hartley and replace it with something resembling the Wagner Act. Republicans favor retention of Taft-Hartley, with addition of the amendments rejected by the Fair Deal during the last session of Congress.

The greatest difference between the two political parties lies in the field of taxation and Government spending. The coming Republican policy declaration should be explicit on this point, and reveal bluntly and honestly where economies can be made. The GOP statement also should call for tax reduction but with enough leeway to provide for some national debt retirement. If the Democrats wish to campaign in 1950 on a program of high taxes and high Government spending, that should be their privilege.

Republicans and Democrats are miles apart on the matter of improving the Nation's health. Democrats, led by Oscar Ewing, seem willing to go whole-hog for socialized medicine. Republicans should make it plain that they are not. There are some in the GOP, led by Senator TAFT, who believe the party should support extended Federal aid for health programs and individual health insurance. The GOP policy statement must state clearly how far the party is willing to go in this direction.

We believe that the parties do, and should, differ on public housing. Democrats have indicated they favor Government housing not only for low-income families, but for middle income groups as well. We believe Republicans must and will define the extent to which they believe Uncle Sam should become a landlord.

There is a difference between the two parties on the matter of socialized electric power. The Democratic Party under Mr. Truman is committed to the extension of the authority plan. Republicans have and probably should continue to support publicly owned power and irrigation projects in some sections of the country. But Republicans should make it clear that they do not favor the pouring of public money into Government-owned and operated projects in areas where private business firms already own and operate satisfactory utility plants.

WHY NOT THE TRUTH?

The basic difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties today involves money—how much should be spent by the taxpayer and how much should be taken from him to be spent by government.

It is here that the Republican Party must draw a line, because it is painfully obvious that the opposition will not do so.

There are a good many things it would be pleasant to have government do for us.

It would be nice to have government pay us all a pension of $500 a month, and let us retire at age 45. We could play a lot of golf, and do some fishing.

It would be pleasant to have Uncle Sam provide us with maids and motor cars. Wonder what it would be like to saunter down to the grocery store and order what we want, without bothering to pay for it? Send the bill to Washington!

But there are limits—financial limits—to which we can go under our present form of government. Those limits should be defined, precisely.

We believe that the Republican Party could be perfectly honest, and could strike a blow for freedom by taking the position that, except in times of crisis, the Federal Government cannot and should not take more than a given share of a wage earner's salary. Its policy statement should make it clear that government cannot afford to do those things for Americans that they can best do for themselves.

Americans are not quite so stupid as many politicians seem to believe.

All of us—regardless of our political affiliation or economic status—know that there is a limit to government spending and thus a limit to the things that we can expect from government.

Let the Democrats do the promising—with a billion here for this little group and a billion there for that little faction.

If the Republican policy statement is honest, it must be realistic.

Americans have a high regard for the truth.

Intervention in Formosa Would Mean Grave Risks for United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Russell Barnes that appeared in the Detroit News of January 4, 1950:

INTERVENTION IN FORMOSA WOULD MEAN GRAVE RISKS FOR UNITED STATES

(By Russell Barnes)

The question whether the United States should in effect take over Formosa and fight Chiang Kai-shek's battle to recover China from the Communists has been appealed over the heads of the administration to the American people.

The attempt to overrule the White House and the State Department, by employing American forces to save Formosa and aid Chiang, as part of our world stop-communism campaign, has been launched by a group of Senators, mostly Republican, led by HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, and WILLIAM M. KNOWLAND, of California.

The proposal to use American armed forces to protect the island of Formosa, and to prevent complete destruction of Chinese Nationalists, has now received the powerful support of former President Hoover.

The demand, of course, is not new—it has been hammered long by Americans who hate communism and love China, and who have been dismayed by the spectacle of powerful Communist armies crumpling Nationalist forces and driving them to a last refuge on Formosa.

A DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

The effort to reverse the administration's Asiatic policy of staying clear of the Chinese civil war is obviously a democratic process. All power basically rests with the people.

But it is just as obvious that if the American people decide to force the administration to switch its Chinese and Asiatic policies, they should act with a clear knowledge of the fundamental facts, and with a realization of what American intervention to save Formosa might mean.

To clear his mind before arriving at a decision, it might be well for the American to seek answers to these questions:

Should the United States risk war in Asia?

Should the United States put itself in the position of occupying Chinese territory?

WHO WOULD COMMAND?

Would American intervention at Formosa strengthen or weaken far-eastern communism?

Should American generals assume command of Chinese Nationalist forces?

If we should decide to intervene to save Chiang, are we prepared as a Nation to spend the lives and money that would be required to reconquer China for the Nationalists?

Do the Chinese people favor return of Chiang and his Nationalist regime?

What would 7,000,000 Formosans and 400,000,000 Chinese think about American intervention?

What would be the attitude of our Asiatic and European allies in the world conflict with Russian communism?

Would Moscow welcome our involvement in the Chinese civil war, because it might further sap American economic strength, and thus speed the day when world revolution might be possible?

WHAT IF THE OF WAR?

Those are all questions which must be answered cold-bloodedly before the American people decide to try to help Chiang hold Formosa.

As for whether we should risk war to stop expansion of communism in Asia, that is easily answered—we have all along been risking war by trying to stop communism in Europe.

The real question is whether we would stand to win or lose a Chinese war, without enormous expenditure of life and capital.

Factors to bear in mind are that in Europe we have had the support of the governments and peoples involved. It is at least questionable whether the mass of Chinese people favor a return of Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist regime.

The record shows that they deserted wholesale to the Communists, because of the failure of Chiang and his government to do a job for the people, and to stamp out governmental corruption and inefficiencies.

Formosa is essentially a Chinese island, whose inhabitants dislike both the mainland Chinese and former Japanese occupiers.

American intervention could certainly be achieved without formal seizure of Chinese territory—the obvious example would be Greece—but our action would certainly be plugged by the Reds as another example of American imperialism.

Most far-eastern authorities seem to think that Asiatic peoples at present are in an anti-imperialistic, antiforeign, nationalistic temper. They argue, rightly or wrongly, that if the United States starts throwing its weight around in Asia, the reaction might be to strengthen the Reds.

American military experts sent to aid the Nationalists have reported that Chinese generalship is so inept and irresponsible that the only hope for success would be to put Americans in command.

If we went that far, obviously we would have to fight the Chinese war through to a

successful conclusion, possibly against an enormous hostile population, or take an awful blow to the national prestige.

We would also be running counter to the convictions of our European and Asiatic Allies that Chinese Communists have established a government which probably should be recognized, because it conforms to the yardsticks of international law.

If it is true that the Russians hope we will break ourselves economically, by spreading ourselves too thin internationally, Moscow might welcome American intervention in China, where American prospects of winning would be, to say the least, less than in Europe.

China poses big problems for the American people. The problems are too big to be solved by snap judgments.

The Kind of Democrat I Am

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an address which I delivered at the New York Herald Tribune Forum on October 24, at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City, as a participant in a panel discussion of the subject The Kind of Democrat I Am:

I am what may be termed a conservative Democrat. It is one whose normal habitat is south of the Mason and Dixon's line. I represent that congressional district of Virginia that was the home of George Washington, who conceived the idea of a Constitution; of George Mason, the great exponent of Democratic government who wrote the Bill of Rights; Thomas Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration of Independence and founded the Democratic Party; James Madison, the Father of the Constitution; James Monroe, author of the Monroe Doctrine; and John Marshall, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court who, by his decisions, breathed life and vitality into the Constitution.

We conservative Democrats adhere to the underlying and fundamental principles of government that guided the thinking of these and other statesmen who wrote our Constitution.

We conservative Democrats believe in certain fundamental principles embedded in the Bill of Rights.

We are unwilling to surrender our convictions to meet every real or fancied emergency that may arise in a modern world, distressed and torn by the swarms of strange ideologies sweeping over the earth.

These conservative Democrats refuse to either marry, betroth, court, or flirt with any of these foreign innovations in government.

Our convictions can be tersely stated by quoting the language of the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution. "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

We therefore hold with the long-accepted theory that Congress has no power to enact legislation or expend the people's money on any subject that it is not given authority to deal with under the Constitution. These limitations of the constitutional powers are not mere academic theories. In practice, they are vital to the welfare, the personal liberties, the rights of private property, and even to the social freedom to select one's associates and business affiliates.

I shall cite with necessary brevity some instances and some consequences of the failure of Congress to confine its functions to the power granted it under the Constitution.

In the field of social welfare, we have enacted the minimum wage law, forbidding the private citizen from working for a lesser wage or for longer hours than the Congress, in its wisdom, deems appropriate to his welfare; ignoring the obvious sequel that if Congress can fix a minimum wage, it can with equal power fix the maximum compensation that our supposedly free citizens may be permitted to earn.

The House of Representatives has repeatedly passed the antilynching bill, under which the Federal Government proposes to inject itself into the enforcement of the criminal laws and the police powers of the sovereign States.

The House of Representatives has, in each recent Congress, passed an anti-poll-tax bill, which undertakes to fix the qualifications of voters in the States in the face of the Constitutional provision reserving to the respective States exclusive authority to fix the qualifications of their voters.

For several terms past, we have had pending in both houses of Congress, and enthusiastically endorsed by the platforms of both major parties, the so-called Fair Employment Practices Act, under which the Federal Government proposes, through the establishment of a horde of national investigators and enforcement officers, to dictate to the free American citizen whom he shall employ and to compel him to engage as his business associates persons with whom he prefers not to associate.

Time does not permit a detailed discussion of all the altruistic activities of the Federal Government that account in a large measure for the nearly bankrupt condition of the Federal Treasury.

Constantly rising over the past two decades, the Government debt has reached the appalling figure of $250,000,000,000—more money than any country has ever owed in all history.

The bulk of this debt comes from the necessary large expenditures of the recent war. While sound policy requires large expenditures and mounting debt during wartime, equally sound policy requires in peacetime rigid economy and reduction of the debt.

Today, in time of peace and unprecedented prosperity, our national budget is unbalanced, our debt is increasing.

In the first years following the war, our revenues were increasing and our expenditures decreasing so that in the fiscal year 1947 there was a surplus of approximately $2,000,000,000, and in the year of 1948, a surplus of $8,000,000,000.

But the year 1949 showed an alarming trend. There was a reduction in receipts and an increase in expenditures over the previous year, resulting in a deficit of around $2,000,000,000, and in the present fiscal year, the most optimistic predictions forecast a deficit of $5,000,000,000.

This presents a picture that should alarm even the most unwary.

Our revenues are on the decrease, while our expenditures increase. No private business could long survive the fiscal policies of the Federal Government.

I do not believe we can continue these policies of irresponsible and reckless expenditures without ultimate disastrous results.

A few examples must suffice to indicate the trend of Congressional thinking. The Congress recently passed a Federal housing bill, which authorized appropriations to the extent of $18,000,000,000, the bulk of which is to help pay house rent for one element of the people so that they may live in the kind of houses to which they would like to become accustomed. Thus, Congress takes the money of one tax-paying citizen to pay the house rent of another.

The Senate has passed, and the House almost passed, a bill to pay subsidies to those miners of certain minerals whose cost of production does not permit the profits to which they would like to be accustomed.

Last year we paid $225,000,000 to subsidize the potato growers who, with a tempting subsidy in sight, raised more potatoes than the market could consume.

Housing subsidies, agricultural subsidies, shipping subsidies, mining subsidies, mail subsidies, and a score of other subsidies that drain the substance of our taxpayers to meet the demands of minority groups of all types.

We rob taxpayer Peter to pay supplicant Paul, if he can marshal a sufficiently potent amount of political pressure.

These briefly present some of the tendencies in Federal Government that go far beyond the functions delegated to Congress.

This Nation has been hewed out of the initiative, the ambition, sweat, and toil of our citizens, seeking by their own efforts to better their social and economic status. When we whittle away, bit by bit, the initiative and the fundamental freedoms of the people; when we teach them more and more, day by day, to depend upon hand-outs from the Federal Treasury to meet every actual or artificial emergency, we take away that initiative, that ambition, and the self-reliance that has made our country great.

This is the insidious way of the welfare state.

The hand that passes out the grants from the taxpayers' money becomes, in the natural course of events, the mailed fist of dictatorship. As more and more largess is distributed, so more and more restrictions and limitations are being imposed upon the liberties of the people.

Such has been the history of the growth of dictatorship.

I deeply resent these tendencies and policies, by whatever political party they are advocated. They are undermining too rapidly the freedom, the initiative, and the independence of our citizens.

Unless there is a swing back to the normal American way of life, I have grave fears for the future of our country.

I have been in Congress nearly 20 years, and watched with increasing alarm the growth of demands from pressure groups of all kinds that Congress enact legislation so foreign to the constitutional concepts of our legitimate functions that there seems no limit to the encroachment on personal liberties or the rights of the sovereign States.

What is the remedy?

There is only one.

Congress reflects the will of the people. The will of the people is transmitted to Congress by those who make the loudest noise and the most convincing threats of political reprisal.

Until and unless the great mass and majority of our thinking people awaken to their responsibility and assert their demands for sound business in Government and a return to the constitutional limits upon the functions of Congress, we shall continue the present policy until some time, some sad day, we find that we have gone too far to retrace our steps.

In a democracy a people get the kind of government that they deserve.

If they think little, they deserve little. If they do little about it, they get little results.

If the present trend of Government is wrong, as I believe it is, it will continue wrong as long as a slothful and indifferent people remain impervious to, and neglectful of, the danger signals flying all about them.

Fair, With Scattered Clouds—Down the Middle of the Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Erwin D. Canham, that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of January 4, 1950:

FAIR, WITH SCATTERED CLOUDS—DOWN THE MIDDLE OF THE ROAD

(By Erwin D. Canham)

The tone of the economic experts as they look into 1950 is essentially cheerful. Most of them think 1950 will be more normal than any year since 1940. While they recognize the dangers of communism in Asia, and the still uncertain economy of western Europe, they see a better year ahead.

In France, the cost of living has gone down a little, for the first time since the end of the war. In England, the drain on gold and dollar reserves has been reversed. The reserve fund is slowly increasing. In Italy, Premier de Gasperi says his nation has made a complete return in every field of world activity. And when Speaker RAYBURN left the White House after going over the President's message on the state of the Union, he said: "It looks like the country is in pretty good shape—I never saw it in better shape."

The big problem of the new year is immediately Formosa, and on a longer view, all Asia. There is a sharp division of opinion on Formosa.

Former President Hoover, Senator TAFT, and many other critics of administration policies say we should take military and naval action if necessary to enable Chiang Kai-shek to cling to Formosa and Hainan, another island off Indo-China. They want us to withhold recognition of the Communist regime indefinitely, and to keep on supporting the Nationalists even in exile. They say this will build a wall against communism in Asia, that to lose Formosa would drive a breach into our line of defense, that to hold it would mean a foothold and a symbol for eventual return of a free government to China. They point to the dangers of having Chinese Communist missions in the United States and the United Nations. Behind these and other influential Republicans, stands General MacArthur.

On the other hand are those who think that United States military intervention to save Formosa might provoke a third world war. That is the view of Chairman KEE of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Senator LODGE, although a Republican, said he had grave doubts of taking any military action toward Formosa. Others said that the Communist regime's conquest of China was already an established fact, and recognition of the government was inevitable sooner or later. They said that to continue hostility toward the Communist regime would be to drive it further into the arms of Moscow.

The main thing, they said, was not the regime but the people of China. New American contacts with the people must be opened, and they thought that indefinite failure to recognize an established government would widen the breach between us and the Chinese people.

If we fought the regime with arms and navies, they said, we might indeed induce Russian intervention. Moreover, our friends and allies in Asia have decided to recognize the Communist government, and we cannot indefinitely widen the gulf between ourselves and them. Already it is with American arms that the Nationalists are bombing open Chinese cities. Indeed, it was with American arms that the Communists made themselves the best equipped army in Chinese history—with arms they took from the largely unresisting Nationalists. So American prestige in China is at its lowest ebb. Unless we begin to work ourselves back, by achieving some contacts with the Chinese people, we are in a hopeless position.

Those who hold this view say that private individuals—missionaries, teachers, doctors, engineers, and other technicians—will offer the best way of proving ourselves to the Chinese. President Truman's point-4 program ultimately offers the best hope of reestablishing a right concept of America in China. But none of this can ensue unless sooner rather than too much later we have regular relationships. And if there is any hope at all of inducing Titoism in China, say these people, we certainly cannot do it by aloofness.

There are the two arguments. It is unlikely that either of them will win President Truman and the Congress outright. The President is likely to be timorous of the political consequences of either extreme. We are likely to try sitting on two stools again, and that is a very difficult feat indeed.

Meantime, it is dubious that the Communists will be able to assault Formosa directly against the effective Nationalist air forces. If the Nationalists are brought down by civil defection within Formosa, their extreme weakness and ineptitude will be evidenced again. We can hardly be expected to intervene to suppress civil strife.

We are therefore likely to do something, at least, for the Nationalists—military and civilian advice, perhaps, which would be a gesture of support and perhaps of some practical value. Such a step, however, would prolong the problem of opening up new channels to the mainland. It would be a concession to a powerful faction of opinion in the United States. It might be the price of continuation of the bipartisan foreign policy. And it might delay a real solution in Asia.

The Late Honorable George J. Bates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of GEORGE J. BATES was a great shock to all his colleagues but especially to those of us who were privileged to be associated with him more intimately.

I first came to know him well 30 years ago when he was chairman of the Committee on Municipal Finance of the Massachusetts House of Representatives and I was mayor of my home city of Melrose. I then had occasion to confer with him frequently at the statehouse on Beacon Hill in Boston for he was well known as an authority on fiscal matters relative to municipalities. All Massachusetts cities were then operating under the provisions of a new Municipal Finance Act and Representative BATES was most constant in urging sound financial policies and most helpful in demonstrating their value to city officials who, while eager to keep in step with changing rules of administration, were inclined to consider the new law revolutionary and restrictive.

Five years later he became mayor of Salem, and during the 14 years he held that office I was in the legislature and continued to see him frequently in connection with pending legislation affecting municipal government.

When I came to Congress in 1943, he had been here for 6 years, and so it was only natural that I should follow the habit of seeking his counsel, and I constantly profited thereby.

So long as I shall live I shall never cease to be grateful for the inspiration and genuine helpfulness which has come to me in public life over these 30 years by reason of constant consultations and conferences with GEORGE J. BATES. Many besides myself have learned how fully was he always willing to share with others the knowledge he had acquired by experience and industrious attention to the problems of government.

The Nation has lost one of its ablest and most devoted officials.

I join my colleagues in extending warmest sympathy to his splendid wife and family in their great loss.

Making Democracy Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the greatest encouragement we have as to the future of our democracy is the reaction and attitude of our young high-school students. Though in their teen-ages now, it will only be a short time when we will look to them to assume the responsibility of our democracy.

Recently when I was back in the district and visited the Lions Club at Stephens, Ark., I, together with the others present, was inspired by two of the most interesting discussions on the subject of Making Democracy Work. These talks were given by two fine high-school students from the local Stephens public school—Miss Sally Jo Wade and Miss Nona Dalton.

They had been studying how our democracy works in their social science classes. Out of this study these two fine young ladies participated in a radio broadcast originating in Camden, Ark., which received a tremendous response. The Stephens High School, the teachers and all interested in the studies and programs, are to be highly congratulated in teaching the young people of that community the basic understanding of our democratic form of government.

I was so much impressed with these interesting discussions that I wanted to share them with others, that they too might be inspired with this living example from our young people. I therefore ask unanimous consent that under

this subject I might include the statement of Sally Jo Wade on Democracy in Social Science, followed by the statement of Nona Dalton on the subject of democracy in the student council. I am sure not only the Members of Congress but people throughout the country who have an opportunity to read these fine statements will be tremendously impressed:

DEMOCRACY IN SOCIAL SCIENCE

In keeping with our theme, Making Democracy Work, I am to tell you how democracy is taught in the social science department at Stephens High School. This department consists of two courses in American history, one in world history, and a civics course. All are prerequisites for graduation.

Democracy must be lived rather than learned. Yet without learning the truths which inspired the founders of our Nation, the facts about our Government, and our relationship to it, living becomes a thing of chance. We may act rightly by accident, but we are far more likely to do so if we are equipped with the information that will help us to make the right choices. Each of us has a place in the life of his community. Our community will reach its possibilities only as each member of it reaches up to his own opportunities for service and achievement.

Social science teaches that no citizen has the right to shift the responsibility for his own thinking and conduct from himself to any organization. We must form our own opinions. It is our duty to get all the information that we can, then stand on our own feet in dealing with those questions that come before us. The fundamental information that the citizen gets comes from the schoolroom.

Upon us, as citizens of our community, State, and Nation, rest certain obligations; social science stresses these: We must have a clear understanding of our rights, and a real appreciation of the duties that go along with those rights. We should learn as much as we possibly can about the world we live in. We should make right use of all the talents and powers we have. We should be loyal to those who have rightful authority over us. We should actively support those causes which we believe to be right. We must believe in the American's creed, which I quote:

"I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic, a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies."

DEMOCRACY IN THE STUDENT COUNCIL

I realize that in a democracy I have a much greater chance of happiness than under any other form of government. Sometimes when I read about conditions in other parts of the world I become afraid. What would happen if we lost our democracy? I become more frightened when I read how some foreigners are working against our form of government. Still more alarming is the indifference of our citizens. Too many stand back and criticize rather than work to improve conditions. We need leaders. There are 4,500,000 boys and girls of school age who are not attending school. These are enough to swing any election. Whose responsibility are they?

I want to do my part and I think working on the student council is one way here and also excellent training for future years. Our student council has 14 members. We have charge of a number of school activities. We spent one day in Sheridan learning how their live student council works. We have undertaken to raise $100 to repair our gym floor. Already we have earned $186 of this money by sponsoring school programs. The other students cooperated with us. We have become better acquainted and more cooperative as we worked together. We are realizing that friendliness is a greater asset sometimes than higher grades. We are using our influence for better school work, a courteous, friendly student body, good deportment, and a good record in attendance and punctuality. We have a well behaved student body. The pupils are busy and happy in the classroom, the study hall, and on the playground. We want each student to realize that this is his school and it will be what he and other students make it. If we practice these things in school life, and help in student government, I think that when we have finished school we will want to take part in the affairs of our community and Nation.

We should all—both young and old—devote ourselves to keeping alive the freedom we have won at so great a price. Let us all strive to make democracy work.

The War Claims Commission and Alien Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. Peter Campbill Brown, Acting Assistant to the Attorney General, and other letters pertaining to war claims.

The letters follow:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, November 29, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your note of November 7, 1949, to Mr. David L. Bazelon, requesting an estimate of the future status of the fund which will be covered into the Treasury of the United States under section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

The net value of the Attorney General's interest in all vested property as of October 1, 1949, is approximately $336,000,000. It is estimated that debt and title claims in the amount of $50,000,000 may be allowed out of this amount. In addition, approximately $125,000,000 of this property is subject to suits for return under section 9 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended. After deducting debt and title claims and property subject to section 9 (a) suits, a balance of $161,000,000 remains which may ultimately be available for transfer for the payment of claims in accordance with the War Claims Act of 1948.

However, while it is presently estimated that this amount will eventually be made available, the amounts actually available for transfer at present or in the near future cannot be determined until it is possible to process the individual vesting accounts in which the former German and Japanese property is held in order to ascertain which items of property are no longer subject to claim or suit. This processing cannot be undertaken until the time has expired for filing new claims or suits with respect to the property. The time fixed by statute (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 33) for filing claims and suits has expired with respect only to a portion of the property held, and two bills are pending in the Congress (S. 803 and S. 729), either of which would extend the filing period even in those cases. Since both bills passed the Senate in the last session and were pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, this office withheld processing the accounts involved because of the difficult problem raised if the filing period should be extended after a portion of these accounts had already been cleared.

The recent payment of $25,000,000 was made in advance of this processing on the basis of estimates that this amount was the maximum safe amount which could presently be advanced against those accounts which, on the basis of present information, probably will not be claimed. While this office will proceed to clear out unclaimable accounts as rapidly as possible when it is feasible to do so, in view of the uncertainty as to the limitation date on claims and suits, it is not possible at the present time to estimate what funds will be available in the near future.

The above information was transmitted on November 3, 1949, to Mr. Daniel F. Cleary, chairman, War Claims Commission, in response to his request of October 19, 1949.

I regret that it is impossible to give you more definite information at this time. As requested in your note, we are returning a copy of Mr. Cleary's letter of November 2, 1949, to you which was forwarded to the Office of Alien Property.

Sincerely,

PETER CAMPBELL BROWN,
Acting Assistant to the Attorney General.

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION,
Washington, November 10, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In response to your inquiry of October 24 with reference to the study that is being made by the War Claims Commission, we are not able to say at this point exactly the amount of time necessary to complete our work. You recall perhaps that we requested an extension of time through Senator CHAVEZ. I feel that it will take all of that to adequately make the survey necessary.

I am indeed concerned over the handling of alien property. I trust that sufficient investigation is being made before any property is restored to its original owner, but I am not at all sure that enough care has been taken in such investigations. I have talked the matter over with the Senators of the Appropriation Committee and trust they will ask for reports at least, if not further investigation, when Congress convenes.

We are told by the custodian that approximately $35,000,000 more is under contemplation now for the return to original owners. It has been stated by this authority that this will be the extent of action to be taken along this line. There will be left approximately $350,000,000 after this last deduction. I hope that we will be able to maintain the $350,000,000 balance for our use. If so, we will be able to do a fairly creditable job in settling war claims but the other members of the Commission and certain of the legal staff feel as I do that the matter should be carefully watched.

As soon as Congress convenes, it is my plan to ask your committee to look into the matter further. I believe you have the authority to ask for reports, or to investigate further if you care to take the time. Knowing your interest in the matter, I feel that you will concede to our wishes.

May I add this statement. We are making noticeable headway in our work, organization, and preparation for the handling of claims. Considering that we have been in office only 6 weeks, I believe we can claim some approval of our effort.

I am looking forward to seeing you again in Washington for further discussion of these problems.

Very sincerely,

GEORGIA L. LUSK,
Commissioner.

DECEMBER 27, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Gladewater, Tex.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your notes of November 28 and December 6, 1949, addressed to the Attorney General requesting information regarding certain specific aspects of the fund which will be covered into the Treasury of the United States under section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

Your note of November 28, 1949, transmitted a copy of Commissioner Georgia L. Lusk's letter to you of November 10 in which it is stated that the Office of Alien Property has under contemplation the return of $35,000,000 of vested properties to their former owners. Commissioner Lusk states further that after these returns have been made, there will remain approximately $350,000,000 of vested properties which may be used by the War Claims Commissioners pursuant to Public Law 896, Eightieth Congress, second session (62 Stat. 1240). You ask verification of these data. In reply reference is made to the Department's letter to you of November 29, 1949, in which it was stated that as of October 1, 1949, the net value of the Attorney General's interest in vested properties was $336,000,000. Further, it was pointed out that this sum was subject to deductions which might reach $175,000,000. Hence, it was estimated that approximately $161,000,000 remain which may ultimately be used by the War Claims Commissioners.

In your note of December 6, 1949, written on a copy of the Department's letter of November 29 referred to above, you request information as to the value of the Attorney General's interest in vested properties if no returns had been made. From March 1943 to October 1949 approximately $19,500,000 of vested properties have been returned. Since the Attorney General's interest in vested properties as of October 1, 1949, was $336,000,000 and since approximately $19,500,000 of vested properties had been returned as of the same date, it would appear that if no returns had been made the total would have been $355,500,000.

As requested, there are returned herewith your notes of November 28 and December 6, 1949.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

Is This the Time To Spend Billions More?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Williamsport (Pa.) Sun:

IS THIS THE TIME TO SPEND BILLIONS MORE?

Here are two columns of figures. One gives the amount spent by each of our 32 Presidents from George Washington to the end of Franklin D. Roosevelt's second administration. The other gives the amount spent by President Truman since his inauguration up to September 30, 1949.

The figures have been compiled by John T. Flynn, from Historical Statistics of the United States (Census Bureau) and United States Treasury Reports, as published in the Reader's Digest.

Spent by 32 Presidents from Washington to Roosevelt (through second term)

Washington	$34,083,486
Adams	34,262,688
Jefferson	72,424,259
Madison	176,473,564
Monroe	147,237,899
Adams	65,427,017
Jackson	152,969,988
Van Buren	122,325,242
Harrison and Tyler	108,904,678
Polk	173,477,220
Taylor and Fillmore	179,631,529
Pierce	255,154,244
Buchanan	272,933,490
Lincoln	3,252,380,410
Johnson	1,578,557,645
Grant	2,253,386,743
Hayes	1,032,268,037
Garfield and Arthur	1,027,742,757
Cleveland	1,077,629,089
Harrison	1,412,315,899
Cleveland	1,441,674,174
McKinley	2,098,918,514
T. Roosevelt	4,655,450,505
Taft	2,790,211,854
Wilson	46,938,280,143
Harding	6,667,[illegible],429
Coolidge	18,585,[illegible],119
Hoover	15,490,[illegible]636
Roosevelt (8 years)	67,518,[illegible]01
Total	179,630,113,[illegible]45

Spent by President Truman from fiscal year 1946 to Sept. 30, 1949

Truman	$191,081,394,191

Think this over:

Thirty-two Presidents in 158 years spent $179,630,113,545.

One President in less than 5 years has spent $191,081,394,191.

(The extraordinary expenditures of the war years from 1941 to 1945 have been excluded.)

Hon. Martin Gorski, a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL J. LINEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. LINEHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday in St. Matthew's Cathedral here in the Nation's Capital, memorial mass will be sung for Hon. MARTIN GORSKI, our beloved colleague from Illinois who passed to the Great Beyond only a few weeks after our adjournment in October.

It seemed fitting to the members of his own party and from his city of Chicago that on the first Sunday following our convening for the second session that we should meet, with his many friends from the delegations from the other States of the Union, in the sanctified atmosphere of religion to pay honor to the memory of a stout friend and a great public servant.

In every meaning of the phrase, MARTIN GORSKI was a great American. He never forgot when large opportunity came to him in the broadening of his influence that the greatest use which can be made of influence is to employ it in behalf of those who are most in need of the services of friendship. He was the champion of the oppressed and his hand was always extended to help to their feet those whom unfortunate circumstances had buffeted about.

As a lawyer of the highest standing in Chicago, as a learned and universally respected master-in-chancery, and as an influential Member of the Congress of the United States, he made a reputation for industry, integrity, and brilliant achievement which for generations will be an inspiration to the youth of Chicago. He was brought to this land, a lad of 3, an immigrant boy. Behind him was no influence. To help him were not available the means of wealthy parents. Yet when he passed to his eternal reward the flags at half mast over the Capitol and over the House Office Buildings reflected the grief of the Nation to the service of which, and its ideals, he had given the fruitful years of his life.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost a great American. To me, with all the other Members from Illinois, has come the loss of a close and beloved friend.

The Problem of Unification of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered to the American Veterans' Committee, at Newport, R. I., on November 17, 1949, by Admiral H. E. Yarnell, United States Navy, retired, on the problem of unification of the armed forces:

Three years ago, there were in existence two armed forces: the Army and the Navy. The Air Force was a part of the Army, and the Navy was composed of a powerful, highly integrated organization of ships, marines, and aviation.

Today, there are three organizations as a result of the National Security Act of 1947. There is also a degree of bitterness and unrest on the part of the Navy, justified or otherwise, which will take much time to eradicate.

It is my opinion that the passage of the National Security Act was a serious blunder. It has imposed on the Government a great monolithic structure in an attempt to solve problems which required evolution, not revolution, to arrive at a proper solution. Like the prohibition amendment, it was a

"noble experiment," and of the same [illegible] value.

No reasonable person denies the necessity of coordination in the organization and operation of the armed forces. Their development and training in time of peace must be to the end of united effort under a common plan in time of war.

This was realized to a very considerable extent in the past war. There were the Joint Chiefs of Staff who decided the general plan of campaign. There was unified command in the European area and, with the exception of the southwestern Pacific, in the campaign against Japan.

For many years before the war joint maneuvers were an annual event, and the service colleges were composed of officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. There was every reason to believe that as a result of the lessons of the war and the realization among the officers of all services for the necessity of united action coordination would have proceeded at a more rapid pace than before the war. The procedure could have been covered by Executive orders instead of by an elaborate act of Congress, and the uproar and bitterness that exists today would have been avoided.

Let us discuss briefly some of the factors that enter into the coordination of the armed forces:

First is that of education. Officers, especially those destined for high command, must have an understanding of the capabilities and limitations of the other services besides their own if they are to be placed in charge of combined operations in time of war. This process of education is being carried out in the staff and war colleges today. This is a matter of time. Since war is a continuation of policy by other than peaceful means, officers of the Foreign Service of the State Department should be included in the student body of the higher colleges.

It is interesting to note that in the Security Act there is no mention of education—one of the most important factors in intelligent and effective coordination of the services.

Another important factor is that of appropriations for the several services and involves the question whether the authority to allot funds and to decide how much each service should receive should rest in the hands of the Secretary of Defense. This is great power to place in the hands of one man, and experience to date shows that it has not been overly successful. There have been accusations that limitation of funds to one service have been with the idea of reducing the effectiveness of that service and increasing that of others.

Since the establishment of the armed forces, the allotment of funds for the Army and Navy has been the prerogative of Congress and its committees. There is where it belongs under the Constitution and there is where it should remain.

There is now one Armed Forces Appropriations Committee, many of whose members have a thorough knowledge of the services through years of committee hearings. They constitute a jury who hear the requests for funds and the arguments for their necessity. Their decision is final; there can be no appeal. There is where the question of the amount and allotment of funds should remain. No service can question the decision of Congress as to their needs or requests.

The Security Act provides for a number of councils, agencies, and boards, some new, and one which was in existence under another name for many years—the Munitions Board. These boards have a certain value but there is an apparent overlapping of functions which may be confusing. There are in addition to the military departments a National Security Council, an Armed Forces Policy Council, a Central Agency, a National Security Resources Board, a War Council, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Staff, Munitions Board, a Research and Development Board, and advisory committees when deemed necessary.

Surely there will not be any lack of information or advice. The problem will be to coordinate it, and I think that is a feature for which the act makes no provision.

The results of all their labors should be centralized in the strategic plans for war, yet the responsibility for such plans rests with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a purely military body.

The whole object of the Security Act was to increase the efficiency and economy of the armed forces in peace and war, and the heart of the whole complex organization was the "preparation of strategic plans and provision for the strategic direction of the military forces."

This strategic plan must consider many factors:

1. Is it to be a total war, or a limited war, or a preventive war?

2. How does the war plan comply with our present and future national policies?

3. Has the Nation adequate raw materials to conduct the type of warfare decided upon?

4. Can the Nation stand the expense of total war if the military decide such is necessary?

5. What will be the consequence on the national economy of a total war, or a limited war?

6. Are we going to use atomic bombs, and gas, and bacteriological weapons? All are equally effective, and equally barbarous.

These and others that might be asked, are momentous questions, and the answers to them may decide our national security or destruction.

When war takes place, the task assumed by the military forces is the defeat or destruction of the enemy. Cost or subsequent consequences are not considered. Those are matters for civilians. Yet there is not a civilian on the Joint Staff which prepare the plans on which the fate of the Nation depends.

This seems to me to be the fatal defect in the present law. It is fairly certain that, if left to the military with no regard to the object of war, its cost, or its postwar results, we will be embarked on a campaign that will require the drafting of many millions of men, the practical exhaustion of our natural resources, and a debt of trillions, not billions, of dollars.

Nowhere is the presence of our ablest civilians more necessary than on the Joint Staff. The chairman of the Staff should be a civilian, and the chairman of the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Resources Board, and the Munitions Board should be members as well as personnel from the State Department. The chairmen of the Senate and House Foreign Relations and Armed Forces Appropriation Committees should be members ex-officio, and to be kept in closest touch with the work of the Staff.

The object of war is to secure a more perfect peace. It is not to destroy the enemy nation. It should be directed against the enemy military forces and not against the enemy people. It should be conducted as humanely as possible, with full observance of the rules of war that were in effect before 1914. It should stop when the enemy is willing to treat for a negotiated peace. The peace terms should be generous. Our enemies of today may be our allies of tomorrow.

After the war between Prussia and Austria in 1866, Bismarck, the German chancelor, insisted on liberal terms of peace with the result that some years later Austria was a member of the Triple Alliance. Had Bismarck shown equal forbearance to France after the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, it might have changed the subsequent history of Europe.

In 1917, Lord Lansdowne in England proposed a negotiated peace with Germany, the latter country then being willing to consider the offer. Lansdowne was denounced as a pacifist, a defeatist, and even as a traitor. The Premier, Lloyd George, declared that the war must go on until the power of the German royal regime was destroyed. Hitler and World War II was the eventual result.

In this war we had "unconditional surrender" decided upon at Casablanca. The taxpayers of America are now footing the bill.

There is no doubt but that the Security Act provided enough boards, staffs, and agencies to collect the information necessary on which to base an adequate war plan. It is another matter to see that this data is evaluated and utilized. In 1941, the War and Navy Departments had information from intercepted Japanese dispatches of the imminence of war and also that an attack on Pearl Harbor was likely. The failure to evaluate this information and to pass it on to the commanders in Pearl Harbor resulted in tragedy.

The act provides for a Munitions Board which has very important duties. Yet much of the information and the plans for which this Board is charged was carried out by the War and Navy Departments between 1919 and 1939 and embodied in an Industrial Mobilization Plan which, had it been placed in effect in December 1941, would have saved months of confusion and wasted effort before a fairly satisfactory scheme of operation was devised. Why that plan was never utilized remains a secret.

All in all, I believe the National Security Act as amended provides for a set-up which is ponderous, over-organized, with too much power in the hands of one individual, yet which misses what should be the heart of the whole problem: civilian control and adequate civilian as well as military staffs on the War Plans Division—a staff that will ensure that if we are so unfortunate as to be involved in another war, it will be one that insures a more perfect peace.

Now a few words on the effect of the act on the Navy. Before and during the war, the Navy developed the most efficient, and united, force of naval vessels, marines, and aviation, that ever carried out military operations.

The plan of campaign was to move direct across the Pacific to the heart of Japan. Bases were seized at Kwajalein and Eniwetok in the Marshall Islands, then the long hop to Saipan and Guam and finally Okinawa. Working together like a Notre Dame football team, the submarines, surface vessels, and aircraft sank the enemy merchant marine, destroyed its surface navy, and practically all of its air force. Japan was helpless with no fuel oil for the few warships still left, no gasoline for planes, and no imports of food for her population. Her official surrender was only a matter of weeks. No invasion of her home-land was necessary, nor were the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It was the most brilliant naval campaign in history. Also it was a magnificent example of a coordinated force—surface ships, submarines, the military represented by the marines, and the air force working together under a single command to a common end—the destruction of the naval and air power of Japan.

All of the many thousands of lives lost through disease and battle in the swamps of New Guinea and in the Philippines were sacrificed to no purpose since the enemy forces in those islands would have been forced to surrender when the homeland collapsed, as did those in China, Malaya, and Indonesia.

The success of the Navy in the Pacific was due to years of training and maneuvers following the First World War. The submarine force was a corps d'elite whose remarkable work was responsible for the destruction of the bulk of the enemy merchant marine.

Naval aviators were trained as naval officers first and aviators second. Their work was with the fleet in combined operations. They knew ships and how to operate with them in scouting and combat duties. During the years of peace they developed dive bombing, scouting tactics, and carrier operations to a high degree of perfection. It takes a skilled flyer to find his way back to his ship in thick weather at sea and land safely on a field 150 feet long, which in rough weather may be rising and falling 15 or 20 feet. Here are a few aviation statistics of the Pacific naval campaign:

1. Naval and Marine Corps planes destroyed 15,400 enemy planes.

2. Of the Navy's total score, 80 percent were destroyed by carrier-based planes.

3. Fourteen Japanese planes were shot down for one carrier-based plane lost.

4. United States carrier planes destroyed 5,649 Japanese aircraft on the ground.

The United States Marine Corps probably represents more fighting value per dollar expended than any other military force in the world. Their battles in the Pacific—the Solomons, Tarawa, Kwajalein, Saipan, Guam, Iwo, and Okinawa—prove that statement. The Corps has been in existence for 174 years. Prior to 1941 the Corps developed the landing craft and tactics for amphibious operations which were a major feature in the Pacific campaign.

The corps has an Air Force of highly trained aviators whose specialty is tactical operation during landings and afterward. They are also trained in carrier landings and fly from these vessels to the support of the marines when landing.

The Navy during the war and today have the most efficient body of officers and men manning its surface vessels of any time in its long and honorable history. Officers at an early age are placed in charge of intricate machinery and in command of submarines and destroyers costing millions of dollars. The greater part of the present officer corps has had war service to their credit, and this fact plus their acceptance of the responsibilities of command at an early age insures the Navy of an exceptionally able officer personnel for years to come.

A few months ago strange rumors came out of Washington. The Navy and its air arm were to be given as their function the protection of convoys and warfare against submarines. It had no need of large carriers. The Marine Corps was to be deprived of its aviation and restricted to guard duty at naval stations. Coming as they did, after the brilliant campaign in the Pacific, they caused consternation in the Navy, especially since there was considerable basis for the rumor.

It is common knowledge that the Army would like to see the Marine Corps reduced to corporals' guards at naval stations, or disbanded entirely. This feeling has existed since the First World War.

In September 1918 I returned to Washington from duty in London on Admiral Sims' staff. One of the tasks assigned me before leaving London was to see the Army Chief of Staff and request the shipment of the Sixth Brigade of Marines in France of a number of 7-inch tractor mounted guns that were available at Quantico. I explained the object of my visit and the need of the guns by the marines.

"These guns are for the marines?" he asked.

"Yes, sir."

"I will never have another marine in France."

The marines did not get their guns.

It is also common knowledge that the Air Force would like to absorb naval aviation, or, failing that, to see it reduced to the lowest possible limit.

In 1941, there were eight bills in Congress providing for a separate Air Force. Six of these bills provided for the inclusion in the Air Force of all naval aviation.

The cancellation of the contract for the construction of the large carrier last spring was mainly due, without doubt, to the objections of the Air Force who feared that such a vessel might encroach on their function of strategic bombing.

At any rate this crescendo of rumors, baseless or otherwise, resulted in the congressional investigation and the disclosure of reports of naval officers which would have gathered dust in the secret archives had they not been brought to light by means not included in the regulation book.

There is no doubt but that the disclosure of these reports and the testimony before the committee have brought into the open a situation that should be in the open. Wars are fought by the youth of the Nation and paid for by every taxpayer. Surely they should be entitled to information regarding the state of efficiency of the armed forces. And it is the youth of the Nation that will give their lives, if another war comes.

Furthermore, the charge of disloyalty directed against the naval officers who testified before the recent congressional committee has no basis. It is the duty of any conscientious officer to report situations which in his opinion are contrary to the national interest. His oath of allegiance is to the Constitution; not to personalities. When the Pentagon is manned with "yes-men," it will be a sad day for the Nation.

What will be the final result of the Security Act remains a question. There is no doubt but that it requires many changes to make it an effective instrument. There is also no doubt but that an organization which provides a square deal for each service without fear of discrimination will receive the wholehearted support of the Navy.

Furthermore, the organization of the armed forces must provide for the control of the war plan itself by the civilian authorities, if we are to avoid another total war which will result in the destruction of our civilization.

High Panama Canal Tolls Hurt Pacific Coast Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the present toll rates charged vessels passing through the Panama Canal are greatly in excess of the actual cost of operating and maintaining the Panama Canal and should be reduced.

Excessive toll rates are oppressive to our California intercoastal shipping and have brought a reduction in the volume of cargo handled at Los Angeles Harbor, as well as at all other Pacific coast ports, with the attendant loss of business and pay rolls.

The intercoastal shipping industry of California and the other Pacific Coast States is a vital factor in our national economy, as well as in our national defense. But high toll charges have caused a steady decline in our intercoastal merchant shipping.

I have received resolutions from many substantial organizations protesting the present rates and requesting that serious consideration be given to a reduction in Panama Canal toll rates based on the belief that the present tolls are a deterrent to intercoastal shipping, which is a valuable asset to the Pacific coast economy. The following are copies of the resolutions I have received from the California State Legislature, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, the board of directors of Marine Exchange, Inc., the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, the Board of Port Commissioners of the City of Oakland, the Export Managers Association of San Francisco, and the Motor Truck Association of South California:

Senate Joint Resolution 1

Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Maritime Commission of the United States, to reduce the tolls of the Panama Canal

Whereas vessels passing through the Panama Canal are now required to pay tolls which are greatly in excess of the cost of operating and maintaining the Panama Canal and are oppressive and destructive to the intercoastal shipping industry; and

Whereas such tolls have been a most important factor in reducing the number of privately owned vessels in the intercoastal shipping service from 170 before World War II to 18 at the present time; and

Whereas this decline in intercoastal merchant shipping has resulted in a corresponding reduction in the volume of cargo handled by all ports on the west coast of the United States with a consequent loss of business and pay rolls by the ports of California, Oregon, and Washington; and

Whereas a number of chambers of commerce and civic organizations have emphatically urged a reduction of Canal toll rates; and

Whereas an active and prosperous intercoastal shipping service is vital to national defense and the welfare of the Pacific coast: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Maritime Commission of the United States, are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to take such steps as may be necessary to reduce Panama Canal tolls to fair and equitable rates which will encourage and stimulate intercoastal shipping; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, the Maritime Commission of the United States, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Congress of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

RESOLUTION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE RELATIVE TO PANAMA CANAL TOLLS ON COMMERCIAL SHIPPING

Whereas water-borne commerce is essential to the economic welfare of the San Francisco Bay area; and

Whereas 64 percent of all intercoastal and foreign-trade cargoes in all Pacific coast ports are subjected to tolls at the Panama Canal; and

Whereas only 20 percent of Gulf cargoes and 14 percent of Atlantic coast cargoes are subjected to such tolls; and

Whereas by means of the accounting practices at the Panama Canal, tolls on commercial shipping are based not only on the cost of providing Canal transit to commercial vessels, but also the cost of providing toll-free transit to Government ships; the cost of certain expense items at the Canal not related to the transit of commercial shipping; and a 3-percent annual interest charge on building funds; and

Whereas no such interest charges are made at the 12 other major, federally built canals in the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress is urged to develop a definite formula for computing tolls at the Panama Canal, based on these principles:

1. That tolls should reflect only the cost of providing transit to commercial ships—

(a) the cost of providing toll-free transits to Government ships should be eliminated as toll factors on commercial ships.

(b) the cost of certain dual-purpose items should be eliminated as toll factors, on an equitable division of such costs should be made in the case of those adjudged to be of service to both the national defense and commercial aspects of the Canal.

2. That as a minimum recognition of the national defense value of the Canal, no interest should be charged on building funds used.

That the president of the chamber of commerce is requested to furnish copies of this resolution to the President, the California delegation in the United States Congress, and to members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Approved by the board of directors, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

M. A. HOGAN, *Secretary*.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, MARINE EXCHANGE, INC., SAN FRANCISCO, AT THEIR REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING ON NOVEMBER 8, 1949

Whereas bay area employment is largely dependent upon shipping operations in the various ports in the San Francisco Harbor; and

Whereas like other Pacific coast ports, nearly two-thirds of all cargoes moving across bay area docks pass through the Panama Canal and thus are in effect subjected to its tolls; and

Whereas the tolls are not based solely on the true cost of providing transit for commercial vessels through the Canal; and

Whereas free transits to Government ships, numerous quasi-Government activities, and a permanent, non-amortizing interest charge are all cost factors in establishing Canal tolls; and

Whereas no such interest charges and in fact no tolls are charged at 12 other Government-built canals in the United States; Therefore be it

Resolved, That tolls on commercial vessels at the Panama Canal should be based solely on the true cost of providing transit to commercial ships and that all building and operating expenses at the Canal properly allocable to the national defense should be so charged and should not be included in Canal tolls computation.

RESOLUTION OF SACRAMENTO (CALIF.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Resolution on Panama Canal tolls

Whereas the second economic development of ocean transportation is vital to the welfare of Sacramento and the northern California area; and

Whereas the Panama Canal is recognized to be vital as a national defense utility and to commercial shipping; and

Whereas it appears that the cost of certain governmental functions cannot rightly be considered to be part of those directly related to the transits of commercial vessels: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, Sacramento, Calif., recommends the establishment of a definite policy for assessing tolls on commercial shipping through the Panama Canal; such formula should be based solely on the cost of providing transit to commercial vessels; all expenses properly chargeable to the national defense should be so allocated and not be considered as factors in the tolls formula; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to each member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and our Senators and Congressmen.

A. S. DUDLEY,
Secretary-Manager.

LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
December 12, 1949.

Hon. GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCDONOUGH: The board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce has adopted the following resolution:

"*Be it resolved*, That the board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, fully cognisant of the value of the Panama Canal to the national defense and the importance of the Panama Canal to the economic welfare of the ports of Los Angeles-Long Beach and the maritime industry, hereby goes on record:

"1. In favor of a reexamination of the costs and expenses arising out of the maintenance of the numerous civic, Government, and military activities in the Canal Zone which costs and expenses are presently viewed as reimbursable through toll charges; and

"2. In favor of a formula for the assessing of toll charges on all ships of every character on such basis as to equalize all proper operating expenses of the facility, including depreciation and interest on investment."

In the discussion resulting in the adoption of this resolution, the board considered many important facts; some of these are as follows:

1. Approximately 64 percent of all west coast cargoes in foreign- and intercoastal trade are subject to Panama Canal tolls.

2. Such tolls are reflected in the general costs of shipping and therefore should be regarded as important to the economic welfare and growth of the maritime shipping industry.

3. The volume of cargo moving through the ports of Los Angeles-Long Beach is vital to the prosperity and economy of the general public and business of this area.

4. The burden of inequitable costs and charges will have an adverse effect on the welfare of the community as well as that of the maritime industry.

5. It appears that the present financial operation of the Panama Canal places the cost burden for certain Government operations on commercial shipping.

There are several very important factors which should be considered in the operation of the Panama Canal. These factors are as follows:

1. Commercial shipping be charged only those costs directly assessable to the transits of commercial vessels.

2. The national-defense value of the Canal be recognized by the Congress.

3. A fair and equitable fomula be established for setting toll rates based on those considerations as well as—

(a) Elimination of the costs of toll-free Government transits as a factor in determining tolls on commercial ships.

(b) Unrelated Government functions should be eliminated as factors in arriving at tolls on commercial shipping.

The Board of Directors, by its resolution, does not propose the cancellation of these tolls and has no intention of creating an unfair competitive situation. Because of the importance of the Panama Canal to the Nation as a whole, and to the Pacific coast specifically, the Board has merely indicated that a policy should be followed which is fair and equitable to all concerned.

In the interest of the ports of Los Angeles-Long Beach, the maritime industry and the community generally, your serious consideration and careful attention to the matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

EARLE V. GROVER,
President, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

BOARD OF PORT COMMISSIONERS, CITY OF OAKLAND

Resolution B678

Resolution with respect to Panama Canal tolls

Whereas the Board of Port Commissioners of the City of Oakland is engaged in the operation of the municipal marine terminal facilities of that city, and the success of its operations is directly dependent upon the extent of ocean freight it can serve; and

Whereas the cost to commercial vessels in transiting the Panama Canal is a large factor in the movement of that freight; and

Whereas the tolls for the use of the Canal assessed against commercial vessels are inequitable and unduly burdensome; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board hereby urges Congress to enact legislation providing the basis for fixing tolls against commercial vessels using the Panama Canal do not include (1) the share of the cost of operation attributable to the transit of Government vessels, calculated on the basis of proportionate use; (2) interest charges on the cost of the construction of the Canal; and (3) not more than half the costs of carrying on governmental functions in the Canal Zone.

RESOLUTION OF THE EXPORT MANAGERS ASSOCIATION OF SAN FRANCISCO, DECEMBER 13, 1949

Whereas this association is vitally interested in the promotion and welfare of intercoastal and foreign water-borne commerce through the ports of San Francisco Bay; and

Whereas it appears that free transit to Government ships, numerous quasi-Government activities and a permanent, nonamortizing interest charge are considered as cost factors in establishing Panama Canal tolls against commercial vessels: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we believe that in the establishment of Panama Canal tolls for commercial shipping, consideration should be given to the exclusion from computation of such tolls, the expenses and costs of operations rightly chargeable to governmental functions and military defense, to the end that tolls may be established which are just and equitable charges on commercial water carriers.

A. E. OTTEN,
President.

RESOLUTION OF THE MOTOR TRUCK ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Whereas the construction of the Panama Canal opened the transit of water-borne freight and passengers between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and facilitated the prompt and efficient movement of military vessels in the national defense; and

Whereas investigations have been made by the Congress from time to time to determine proper methods for administering the operation of the Canal and the apportionment cost thereof; and

Whereas it has been developed that since 1931 the national defense share of the capital cost has been so readjusted as to place the entire financial burden of the canal on commercial users; and

Whereas 64.2 percent of all tonnage paying canal tolls has been charged to Pacific tonnage, thus adding to the already heavy burden of costs imposed upon such water-borne traffic, necessitating increases in rates to meet the mounting costs, which the public is required to pay in the purchase of such tonnage; and

Whereas it is believed that a more equitable formula for the distribution of Canal costs should be arrived at under the following suggested policy:

1. Commercial shipping should pay only its own way, with tolls reflecting the true cost of providing transit for commercial vessels.

2. Interest should not be charged on funds used to build the canal. No interest or tolls are charged on the 12 other Federal-built canals. Panama Canal interest charges should be eliminated as a minimum acknowledgement of its national defense value.

3. All vessels of all types should pay tolls at the Canal. Government vessels now transit the Canal toll free.

4. Commercial shipping should pay through tolls no more than half the cost of dual-purpose expenses at the Canal. Military and civil-government activities should bear at least half: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Motor Truck Association of Southern California, representing the major portion of the trucking industry handling water-borne commerce through the ports of southern California, That the Congress of the United States in considering the report of the Bureau of the Budget covering the within subject, take into consideration the matters submitted herein and act favorably upon the suggested policy hereinabove stated; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of the Congress from the State of California.

Coal Situation in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I have sent the following telegram to President Truman:

The coal situation in New England has reached a stage of emergency in the opinion of all in position to know the facts. Three days of operation each week is inadequate to care for normal winter demands and a serious cold spell due any time at this season of the year would bring on much unnecessary suffering. Dealers report to me that their supplies are shrinking rapidly. Many are now having difficulties supplying day to day needs, and unless action is taken immediately to assure adequate supplies from the mines, widespread suffering could develop almost overnight. I urgently request that you recognize the existence of this emergency and take immediate action under present law with proper authorities to avert what might develop into a serious situation.

I took this action following the receipt of various communications from constituents and others of which the following are typical:

NEW ENGLAND FUEL DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., December 30, 1949.

Hon. ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
United States Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is apparent to everyone in the coal business that 3 days per week operation at the mines does not furnish enough coal to take care of normal winter demands.

In the last few weeks, inventories in the hands of dealers have been shrinking very rapidly. With the advent of cold weather, many dealers will be entirely without coal. Unless action is taken immediately to assure adequate supplies from the mines, widespread suffering is apt to result.

I enclose copy of a letter sent to the President of the United States, which bears on this subject.

I hope that you will use your influence to secure action.

Very truly yours,

J. L. JOHNSON,
President.

NEW ENGLAND FUEL DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., December 29, 1949.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States of America,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In the newspapers and on the radio last week, you were quoted as saying, in effect, that you would take the necessary action if the coal situation reached the emergency stage. I heartily approve of your determination to act, but I am afraid that we may differ as to what constitutes the emergency stage.

I am reminded of the story which we used to read when we were children about the little Dutch boy who discovered a hole in the dike through which the water was seeping from the ocean on the outside of the dike. He put his thumb in the hole and kept it there, effectively stopping the flow of water until others could come and repair the damaged dike. The little Dutch boy, while probably knowing that the amount of water flowing through the little hole of itself would do no great damage, realized that without immediate action on his part the hole would gradually grow until the water came through in torrents and the countryside would be flooded. The emergency existed although the immediate consequences were not great. If immediate action had not been taken, it is probable that the dike would have been demolished and irremedial damage caused.

The present emergency stage of the coal situation, of course, is much more advanced than that discovered by the little Dutch boy. Irremedial damage will soon be with us unless effective steps are taken immediately to prevent it.

An emergency exists, in my opinion, when current economic forces will bring widespread hardship and suffering unless curbed. It is not dependent upon the actual present existence of hardship and suffering.

Unless the present forces at play in the coal business are checked, it is inevitable that people will suffer from lack of heat, that factories will close from lack of fuel, and their employees thrown out of employment.

On behalf of the fuel dealers of New England and the people who are dependent, directly or indirectly, upon coal for their livelihood and comfort, I urge you to recognize immediately the existence of an emergency and to take such steps as will assure the people of an adequate supply of their vitally necessary fuel.

Respectfully yours,

J. L. JOHNSON,
President.

THE CARBON COAL & COKE CO.,
Boston, January 4, 1950.

Hon. ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ANGIER: As a good lawyer, I thought you would be interested to see the list of "unfair practices" of John Lewis and the United Mine Workers, as listed in the petition which the Northern and Southern Coal Producers Associations have presented to General Counsel Denham of the NLRB. They are listed on page 2 of the enclosed bulletin.

Also is a column clipped from the Commercial Bulletin, of Boston, current issue, listing some of the results of Mr. Lewis' bad union leadership during the past year.

If there is anything that can be done to bring such monopoly unions under the Sherman antitrust law, it seems to many of us coal men that it should be taken up by Congress as promptly as possible. The present restrictions of the union seem very much like a conspiracy in restraint of trade.

With my best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

L. P. LEIGHTON, *President*.

[From Bulletin No. 242 of the American Coal Sales Association, Washington, D. C., December 30, 1949]

NORTHERN AND MIDDLE WESTERN OPERATORS FILE CHARGES WITH NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD AGAINST UMWA

Late this afternoon eight operator associations filed charges of unfair labor practices against the United Mine Workers of America; namely, Indiana Coal Producers Association, Indiana Coal Operators Association, Ohio Coal Association, Northern West Virginia Coal Association, Western Pennsylvania Coal Operators Association, Virginia Coal Operators Association, Winding Gulf Operators Association, and Somerset County (Pa.) Coal Operators Association. The operator members of these eight associations mined, in 1948, in excess of 111,000,000 tons of bituminous coal.

The petition charges that the union is attempting, coercing, and forcing members of the association to enter into the "illegal" contract by strikes and partial strikes. The petition concludes by averring that the union has committed the following unfair practices:

1. It has insisted upon a collective-bargaining agreement containing the illegal clause requiring all miners to be or become members of the UMWA. The union has not petitioned the National Labor Relations Board nor has the Board conducted any election or have the majority of the employees voted in such an election to authorize the union to make an agreement embodying such a requirement. The union has forced this provision upon members of the association in the past despite its illegality.

2. The union has insisted on a contract provision with respect to the welfare and retirement fund which would limit the benefits of the fund to members of the union and require administration of the fund solely through local offices of the union in violation of the National Labor Relations Act.

3. The union insisted upon provisions which would extend benefits of a welfare fund to persons who have never been employees, and who are not members of the family or dependent upon persons who had been employees, of any of the employers who contributed to the fund. Such terms are illegal under the National Labor Relations Act.

4. The union's insistence upon the "able and willing" clause is a refusal to make a contract for a definite term and withholds the mutuality which is essential to the existence of a contract and denies to employers the benefits of collective bargaining in good faith.

5. The insistence by the union of the unrestricted memorial periods also withholds the mutuality which is essential to a contract and denies to the operators the benefit of good-faith collective bargaining.

6. The union has refused to make a new contract giving employers representation in the administration of the welfare and pension fund, but has insisted upon the right to designate all three trustees of such fund, and has thereby refused to bargain except on terms made criminal by the laws of the United States.

7. It has refused to bargain in good faith with authorized representatives of employers and has made offers of contracts to individual employers which it has not offered to the operators' committee.

8. The various meetings held by the union with the operators' committee were not serious efforts in good faith to bargain and reach an agreement.

9. Finally, the union has, through coercion, caused and attempted to cause the operators in the hiring of employees to discriminate against those not members of the union, despite the fact that no lawful agreement requiring membership in the union has ever been in effect.

[From the Commercial Bulletin, Boston, December 31, 1949]

A RECORD NOT TO BE PROUD OF

In 1949 the leadership for which coal miners pay high salaries was responsible for a $1,430,000 fine for lawbreaking. The miners paid.

The same leadership in March cost the miners 2 weeks' pay for a strike ordered to protest the appointment of James Boyd as Director of the United States Bureau of Mines.

It has failed to negotiate a new contract to replace the old one, expired June 30.

It put the miners on a 3-day week in midsummer with heavy loss in pay.

It called a second strike for 82 days which ended November 10.

It has dissipated the welfare fund—no coal mined, no 20-cents-a-ton royalty.

It insulted the head of the United States mediation service.

The current report of one of the leading coal companies for the 9 months ended September 30, 1949, shows that on a 5-day week basis from January 1 to November 9, the mines lost 83 days due to strikes. The loss in wages to the miners in this particular company for the period in question was $1,250 per union employee.

Labor leadership in the coal mines has kept them closed for long intervals for many years, and the miners' loss in wages has been enormous. Wages in other lines of business and industry have increased without disastrous strikes each year.

The United Mine Workers' long continued policy of insolence shows the lengths to which an uncontrolled monopoly will go to gain its ends.

It has forced hours, working conditions and wages on the coal industry, regardless of the laws of economics, that make it impossible for that industry under normal conditions to pay those wages and operate at a profit. That is part of the reason the coal industry is only employing 400,000 men and that is why it is losing a large percentage of the American fuel business that it used to have.

Labor rates, like other commodities, are supposed to be competitive. But coal mine labor rates under the United Mine Workers' monopoly are not. The product of the mines, however, must be sold in a highly competitive field. Thus UMW leadership is rapidly turning the coal business over to competitive fuels and destroying jobs of miners.

Dean Roscoe Pound Explains What the Bill of Rights Means to Us Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess of Congress, I had the privilege of attending a meeting of the Bill of Rights Commemorative Committee which was originated by Mr. Joe Crail, a nephew of the former Member of the House of Representatives from California, the late Honorable Joe Crail.

This meeting was known as the Freedom of Press and Speech luncheon, and was attended by prominent members of the press, radio, television, public officials, and civic leaders. The principal address was delivered by the illustrious Roscoe Pound, dean emeritus of Harvard Law School and visiting professor and dean of the law school at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Dean Pound's address is the most illuminating, intelligent, and logical I have ever heard on the origin and the present-day application of the Bill of Rights. I was unable to obtain a full transcript of his speech, but submit herewith a few of the pertinent highlights of the excellent speech made on this occasion by Dean Roscoe Pound. I am confident that all Members of the Congress will be better informed after reading the following excerpts from Dean Pound's address:

A bill of rights is a characteristic Anglo-American institution. Indeed, although it had its origin in Magna Carta and royal charters in mediaeval England, it has had its highest development as an effective guaranty of fundamental individual rights in the United States where it has behind it a Constitution as the supreme law of the land enforced by independent courts bound to deny effect to all infringements by it and to treat all infringements as actionable wrongs at suit of person injured thereby.

As far back as the thirteenth century it was pronounced that the King ruled under God and the law. In the fourteenth century when Edward III wrote a letter to a sheriff directing him not to execute a writ for seizing a person outlawed by the judgment by a court, the Court of King's Bench fined the sheriff for not executing the writ, issued a new writ, and said in effect that Edward, King of England, could pardon an offender by pardon under the great seal, but Edward Plantagenet could not interfere with the course of justice in the courts by a private letter to the sheriff.

In the seventeenth century contests between the courts and the Crown the common-law rights of Englishmen were firmly established as beyond royal power and in 1774 the American colonists, in the Declaration of Rights of the Continental Congress, claimed them as the birthright of Americans. They were guaranteed in the Virginia Bill of Rights in 1776 and have been guaranteed in bills of rights in the Federal and all State constitutions since.

It is instructive to compare these bills of rights with the continental European declarations of rights following the French Declaration of the Rights of Man of 1791. These latter have no independent judiciary behind them and give no power to injured individuals to invoke them against unconstitutional official action. They are only preachments; only exhortations to the executive or the legislative organs of government as to what they should do or not do. The constitution of the second French Republic committed enforcement of its provisions to the senate. At his coup d'etat Napoleon III, then President of the Republic, sent a body of soldiers to put out the Assembly which would not ratify the coup. The president of the senate read the constitution to them. But they were responsible to the executive which was the judge of its own powers, and the reading had no effect. The incident speaks for itself.

So long as the Constitution is upheld by independent courts as the supreme law of the land and the guaranties of the Bill of Rights are not frittered away or lose their hold on the people by spurious interpretation, freedom of the press and freedom of speech are secure. The danger to them today is twofold: (1) Growing disrespect for courts and a cult of force throughout the world; (2) weakening of the Bill of Rights by extending State guaranties to impossible undertakings to secure claims not enforceable by a legal order under a constitution. The staple argument by which dictators overthrow constitutions and come to power is that a constitution cannot and they can guarantee complete satisfaction of all human wants.

Thirteenth Annual Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been invited to an event of great interest to conservationists—particularly sportsmen.

It is the thirteenth annual Wildlife Restoration Week, and it is described in the following announcement from the National Wildlife Federation to which I invite the attention of Members of Congress and others interested in wildlife conservation:

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION ANNOUNCES THIRTEENTH ANNUAL WILDLIFE WEEK PLANS

America's thirteenth annual National Wildlife Restoration Week, originally established by Presidential proclamation in 1938, will be observed this year during the week of March 18–25, under the sponsorship of the National Wildlife Federation.

Wildlife Week aims to focus the attention of 150,000,000 Americans upon the importance of wildlife conservation to their everyday life and the debt which they owe coming generations to help perpetuate our natural resources for future welfare and prosperity.

State, county, and local group meetings throughout the Nation will direct public discussions of wildlife conservation through prudent management of America's natural resources, including water, soil, trees, and all other plant as well as animal life. Conservation-minded and public-spirited organizations participating will include sportsmen's associations, garden and nature clubs, and other adult and school groups.

Calling all lovers of the outdoors to take part in a Nation-wide conservation program, the National Wildlife Federation urges cooperation with State conservation officials, as emergencies may arise, in winter feeding of snowbound birds and animals to prevent suffering and losses through starvation.

Ever since Wildlife Week was inaugurated by the federation and recognized by proclamation of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1938, the federation has carried on a year-round conservation education program. The federation business office issues annually a series of wildlife conservation stamps, with descriptive albums for preserving them.

The distribution of these stamps during Wildlife Week and other times is a part of the education program of the federation. Proceeds from their sale are the organization's main source of income to carry on its wildlife programs. The 1950 series in natural colors includes 36 animal, bird, and plant subjects from the brush of Walter Weber of Vienna, Va., famed wildlife artist and former art consultant to the federation.

A nonprofit and nonpartisan organization, the National Wildlife Federation is composed of an estimated 5,000,000 members of affiliated community and county clubs and State wildlife federations.

Conservation studies initiated in 1936 resulted in concentration in the grade schools on teaching conservation. A series of four books, entitled "My Land and Your Land" is in wide use in grades 3 to 8. It is the federation's aim that these books will become an integral part of the Nation's school curricula. Series for junior high and high-school grades are in preparation.

During 1940 Man on the Landscape, by Vernon Gill Carter, was published by the federation's committee of conservation education. The author is head of the conservation department of the Zanesville, Ohio, schools. The book tells the story of a human being in relation to his land environment, and is designed primarily as a teacher's guide and textbook.

"Much responsibility for the control of erosion, floods, forest butchery, pollution, and declining living standards," says Mr. Carter, "rests on the parents and teachers of American youth." This statement has special emphasis during Wildlife Week.

As a clearinghouse for public as well as members' information on congressional legislation and administrative actions relating to conservation of wildlife and other natural resources, the federation issues Conservation News and Conservation Report. During the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, 53 reports were issued, totaling 480 pages and digesting 1,164 Senate and House bills, as well as reporting any actions taken on them. These bills also have been tabulated in a 34-page index.

During its existence, the federation has sponsored and supported legislation which is today basic in the administration of wildlife, such as the Pittman-Robertson Act, providing Federal aid to State wildlife restoration. The federation believes the time has come for legislation that will do for State fisheries restoration what the Pittman-Robertson Act has done in saving our game.

The average citizen can take part in Wildlife Week by attending community conservation meetings, reading wildlife literature, and purchasing wildlife stamps. These activities will inspire him to practice conservation every day of the year in such simple ways as, for example, extinguishing matches to prevent forest fires.

A musical feature of 1950 Wildlife Week will be the singing of favorite songs of the outdoors at conservation gatherings, aided by the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., and its 30,000 members.

The Navy of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a copy of an address entitled "The Navy of the Future" made by Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, before members of the first class of the brigade of midshipmen, United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., on Friday, December 2, 1949. In my opinion, Admiral Sherman's remarks display a penetrating and high-minded understanding of the functions of the modern Navy in this troubled world. Such remarks as his should do much for Navy morale and should dispel the doubts which some appear to have regarding the Navy's future.

The address follows:

THE NAVY OF THE FUTURE

The uppermost thought in the mind of every man here, at one time or another, has been: "What are my chances for a successful career in the Navy?"

I make no exceptions, when I say "every man here." Some of us wrestled with that question 30 years ago. So must it have been with the officers and midshipmen of 1899, of 1866, and even of 1815.

I must say to you at the outset, that the young men in the Navy today face a greater challenge, and are confronted by greater opportunities than any of their predecessors in the indispensable service whose uniform we wear.

Times have changed since the days of the frigate, but the necessity for a Navy is as vital to the Nation as it was in the time of Stephen Decatur. That necessity will endure as long as humanity survives on continents separated by oceans. And as long as the necessity exists, just so long will the Navy offer its officers an honorable career, a career of opportunity limited only by the ability and determination of the young man who enters it. I need not tell you that it is not an easy life; that the material rewards are often not adequate to the sacrifices, toil, and devotion to duty required. You took that all into consideration when you accepted your midshipman's warrant.

It seems to me that midshipmen at the Naval Academy are in many ways better fitted to view the future of the United States Navy with complete objectivity than are older officers in mid-career, or nearing the end of their service. There are reasons why, at this time, I should be seeking your guidance, instead of offering advice to you. Midshipmen are, in many ways, closer to the glorious history of our service, to its traditions, and to its ideals, than we who have grown gray wearing the Navy's blue and gold. You are certainly less marked by events of recent years which tend to obscure the broad view of the future—and also of the past from which the future must be appraised.

The physical Navy is ever changing and always evolutionary. Its officers have maintained throughout its existence, ideals and standards which have changed but little. Our high traditions of loyalty, service, and devotion to duty will always be upheld. However, the ships in which we serve and the weapons with which we fight have changed continuously. We can be certain that they will continue to change. Technological developments during any long peace will change the art of war at sea and the character of the fleets we need.

The conclusion of nearly every war in our history has produced not only the same contraction in naval strength necessary to peacetime economy which some of us tend to overemphasize and misinterpret today, but also recurring gloomy prophecies that the Navy itself will become obsolete. Thus it was when we scrapped the 1816 program of sailing ships of the line. Thus it was when ironclads and torpedoes made our great Civil War fleet obsolete. When after the First World War we scrapped not only our older battleships, but also seven new battleships and four battle cruisers. It was claimed that the airplane had sounded the death knell of surface warships. Earlier the same had been claimed for the submarine. Yet, during the Second World War, we had to build, man, and take into battle greater fleets of surface ships and greater numbers of naval aircraft than the world had ever envisioned. Today—and tomorrow—and as far ahead as we can see, the airplane and the submarine, and for that matter guided missiles and atomic energy, which have been claimed to mark the end of great navies, will in fact increase naval requirements and result not only in survival but also further development of fighting ships.

Our Navy finished the war with a great fleet in which the aircraft carrier had become the ship of the line, and the battleship a supporting ship for the carrier task group or for shore bombardment. We had more of every useful type of ship and aircraft than could possibly be kept active. We have carefully moth-balled most of this victorious Navy. This has given us a reserve fleet so large that there is some question as to our ability to maintain it without expenditures which will prevent maintaining an adequate active fleet. We have a shore establishment so large that it absorbs funds needed to maintain combat forces in being.

Furthermore, although our ships are new and powerful, they steam through an age of change. We can be very proud of our active ships spreading America's influence around the world. Ship for ship, they far excel the ships of other nations and are the envy of other navies.

But without progress they will not long remain superior. We live in an age of tremendous change. The atom has been split, airplanes roar through the sonic barrier, metals have been transmuted. Like all else in life, our Navy must move forward, must keep up to date or slowly die.

We must shape our future Navy in the light of the lessons of the past and the indications as to future needs. We must take into account the lessons of Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Bikini, and Eniwetok. We must consider the implications of the revelation of Soviet developments in the field of atomic explosions. We must consider the significance of guided missiles and of the feasibility of conducting very long-range bombing in connection with the results of bombing in the last war.

We must remember that in two wars we and our allies have suffered heavy losses from enemy submarines and that much development has taken place in submarines and

more is to be expected. We must make certain that every practicable means is exploited to make the Navy fully ready to defeat a third attempt to deny us the use of the sea by undersea warfare. At the same time, we must be prepared to prevent aircraft from denying us the use of the sea. Our naval counter measures against both the submarine and the aircraft must include striking them at their bases as well as local defense against them.

While we should not adhere blindly to the weapons of the past, it is well to remember that although men thought that Jutland would be the last great sea battle we had nearly 20 years later to fight the great battles of Midway, the Philippine Sea, and Leyte Gulf. Men thought that the advent of aircraft, of coast defenses, machine guns, and automatic weapons had made great amphibious operations impracticable; yet this same generation lived to see the greatest amphibious operations in history. Despite every opposition, we moved great armies over long distances, landed them on hostile shores, and supported them as long as support was needed. We must always move forward, but we must move sanely, grasping the strength of the future, holding the useful from the past.

Within a sound national economy there must be provided airborne and amphibious troops, soldiers and mariners; there must be an Air Force capable of defending our vital centers against attack, capable of striking our enemies at great distances, and capable of effectively supporting the Army and the Navy. There must be a Navy strong enough to control the seas which separate us from our potential enemies.

Our country is fortunate in being in effect an island power. As long as we control the sea we cannot be attacked except by airborne weapons, and we can attack any target within reach of the aircraft and other weapons which we carry in our ships. We can establish and maintain our troops and land-based air power in positions from which they can operate effectively.

The seas are cushions of distance which protect us against our enemies. They are also avenues through which we can project and support our joint military power. The seas enable us to apply relatively small forces and yet achieve superiority in critical areas of our own choosing, and to give visible and substantial support to our national interests and national policies.

Ability to control the seas and the airways which cross the seas is essential to our security, and to our struggle to prevent any hostile power from so dominating all of Europe, Asia, and Africa as to menace our survival. Our national security, I repeat, requires that we maintain a balanced team of fighting services and you may be sure that the Navy is and will be a vital element in the fighting team—a vital necessity in our national life.

My belief in the future of the Navy is shared by everyone who objectively ponders the security of the United States. In his very recent but already IMPORTANT book, Modern Arms and Free Men, Dr. VANNEVAR Bush has this to say:

"The mission of the Navy will be as important, and as difficult, as it ever has been in history. It will need to employ modern techniques to the utmost, and in ample quantity." And, again, "The days of the Navy are not over, nor are its missions less essential. We are a power in this world and we intend to exert that power if need be, far from our shores to support our friends and strike an enemy where he is the most vulnerable. * * * We shall still need to sweep enemy forces from the seas, whether they are under its surface or above it."

In those quotations you have the opinion of probably the best-informed civilian on military matters today. I can assure you that similar beliefs are deeply rooted in the American people and are held also by the responsible heads of our Government. Do not be misled by the moaning of the perennial pessimists nor the partisan propaganda of proponents of other programs.

That leads me to a topic which is made more important by the realization that a number of you are destined to serve in the United States Air Force.

It would be less than realistic not to take cognizance of the conflicting views of the services with respect to their responsibilities for national security which have been aired since the end of the war, and particularly in recent months. Differences in professional opinion are to be expected, and with the strong characters required in military leaders, sharp conflicts are apt to occur. Adequate presentation of such opinions is healthy if kept within proper bounds, but never forget that we are all striving for a common goal—the preservation of our country, our freedom, and our national way of life. When our beliefs and professional advice have been adequately presented—on any level of command or responsibility—it is then our duty to carry out the decisions of our superiors without equivocation or evasion. This is particularly necessary in the case of decisions by the civil authorities in whom the ultimate responsibility rests.

We in the Navy must aid and support our sister services, and we have a right to expect them to aid and support us in maintaining the essential naval elements of the national defense.

We often hear the question, "Why do we need a powerful Navy in peacetime?" The answer, of course, is that if we need a Navy in wartime, we have to have one in peacetime. A navy can't be conjured into being by a Jason sowing dragon's teeth. The question is sometimes elaborated in these terms: The Japanese and German fleets are destroyed; the British will always be our allies; the Russian fleet is relatively small; why then spend three or four billion dollars a year on the maintenance of a powerful United States Navy?

You young gentlemen know as well as I how specious that question is. All we have to do is go back to General Marshall's statement in his final report, as follows:

"Oceans are formidable barriers, but to the nation enjoying naval superiority, they become highways of invasion."

It is essentially the Navy's job in wartime to keep the conflict remote from our own shores, and to deliver the Nation's fighting strength overseas. These are still our principal functions, although not an enemy surface vessel be on the high seas.

But that question ignores a very patent fact, which is that our principal potential enemy does in truth possess a very powerful Navy designed for its own unique geographical situation. A self-contained military power, already in possession of the bulk of two continents and with the potential possibility to envelop and occupy the territory adjacent, has no need for extended lines of sea communications. Its naval problem differs radically from our own. Our business, in a war with such a power, would be to get at the enemy with speed and in strength, while at the same time keeping open the sealanes upon which we depend. Our possible opponent, on the other hand, would seek to prevent us from transporting our military strength across the ocean, and to cripple that strength by denying to the United States essential overseas trade.

For the foreseeable future, the fast carrier task force will be the principal offensive striking element in our fleets—the core of their offensive power, available to strike far from our own bases and to cover and support the operations of other services. This force gives us the power to move wherever we choose against enemy shores, while denying the enemy that same freedom of operation against us. This force is essential to all naval operations. The composition of our fast carrier force must, however, be so adjusted as to bring into balance the expenditures for procurement, maintenance, and operations in the fields of personnel, ships, and aircraft. This is a complex problem on which we are working.

Amphibious operations will continue to play an important part in the Navy of the future. Tactics and techniques will change and equipment will be improved. The availability of weapons of mass destruction, such as an atomic bomb, will exert a profound influence, but they will not change the fundamental necessity in war for moving men and material into overseas positions. They will not reduce the benefits that control of the sea brings in permitting selection of time and place of attack while forcing on the enemy overwhelming defensive commitments. We may expect a highly coordinated and highly flexible use of both airborne and amphibious elements. We must develop speed in preparation, speed in the movement to the objective, and speed in getting troops and supplies ashore and dispersed. Heavy concentrations on the shore line will have to be avoided by speed and dispersal, by the use of separated attack points and by greater use of preliminary infiltrations.

The development of atomic bombs will actually increase the requirement for overseas operations and overseas bases, and will therefore increase the need to maintain in the fleet an amphibious task force and to develop greater skill in its employment.

Besides the fast carrier and amphibious task forces, you may expect to find in the fleets a third type of task force—the antisubmarine task force in recognition of the seriousness of the submarine threat and our major responsibility for insuring the safe movement of men and supplies by sea.

There actually exist in the world today two very powerful navies with opposite and therefore intensely conflicting missions. That we have aircraft carriers and the other naval power has none, that we have a large amphibious force and the other naval power has only a collection of small landing craft, are unacceptable arguments for diminution of American fleet strength. That the other power has a submarine force larger than ours is a potent argument for the United States to possess, not an equal number of submarines, but antisubmarine naval elements of great effectiveness.

These must be so constituted as to permit attacking the submarine by every possible means, not only in our coastal waters and the high seas, but in the enemy coastal waters and bases themselves. Our antisubmarine task force may thus include fast carriers in conjunction with surface and submarine guided missile ships for attacking bases. It might include special raider amphibious units for demolition of bases. It will require hunter-killer teams of submarines, surface ships, and many types of airplanes and blimps. It will require powerful convoy escorts and coastal defense forces especially against submarines firing guided missiles into our cities.

We do not today need to match an enemy naval force type for type, because our probable function is not to resist invasion, but to support military operations overseas. Tomorrow it may be different, and always we must clearly understand the great necessity for a powerful peacetime Navy is the need to have it ready for war. It also has a continuing and a salutary function in the retardation—if not the prevention—of war. A strong navy, by virtue of its mobility, is a potent factor in upholding United States foreign policy. Naval forces have been truly defined as the precision tools of diplomacy. Unlike armies or airplanes, the Navy can traverse the globe without trespassing upon the sovereignty of any nation. As a decisive deterrent to piecemeal aggression, the United States Navy has amply justified its existence in the last 2 years alone.

At that, however, the Navy has been but the visible projection of a tremendous strength in military power and manpower—the latter both militarily and industrially. It could not do the job alone. I sometimes regret that the entire American public is not as aware of the power for peace that our Navy exerts as are the people of Europe. The aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and marines which have operated in the Mediterranean during the past 3 years have been essential factors in the maintenance of peace and stability in the area. The Mediterranean people know and appreciate our naval strength. Many of our own people do not. If the American Navy is allowed to languish and deteriorate, it will largely be the fault of us, the articulate Navy, for not presenting these facts and our needs more convincingly. Incidentally, one of the best ways to insure the continuance of our vital part in the national defense structure is to demonstrate not only our individual importance but also our ability to work with the sister services as an integrated team.

The three fighting services must become a single versatile team with the single purpose of the security of our country. It is our business, in that team, to shape the country's naval forces so they contribute their maximum to the total fighting strength of the Nation. It is our sacred duty to translate into a maximum of useful fighting power the appropriations given us for that purpose, to take full advantage of every available scientific and technological development to do our specific job as perfectly as human ability permits, and to help our sister services to conclude their tasks as we expect them to help us. It is our duty, too, to prune from the Naval Establishment every component that does not contribute in dollar value to our actual or potential combat strength in those definitive terms.

The Navy is a big business. As such it must be prudently operated, and must have competent administrators in its officer corps. There is no one commercial concern whose business affairs approach the Navy in scope, diversity, or complexity. During the fiscal year, 1949, the Navy had over 524,000 contracts with industry, of a total value of $2,000,000,000. Over 2,000 persons in the Navy were wholly employed in that time with purchasing alone.

The money spent by the taxpayers for their Navy is not just an insurance premium, paying off manyfold in war, but returns to swell the national wealth and augment the national income. Navy personnel work intimately with leaders of all fields of activity and endeavor, from agriculture to the pure sciences, from medicine to machine shops.

The identical developments which superficial thinkers argue spell the Navy's obsolescence are the essential ingredients of the greater Navy of the future. Whether they be guided missiles, supersonic aviation of hitherto incredible ranges vertically and horizontally, noiseless high-speed submarines which never need to surface except for replenishment, or atomic missiles—they are all implements which the Navy now and in the future must be prepared to employ, and also combat.

What does this mean to you, individually and collectively? It may appear that you are being pushed, willy-nilly, into specialization; that no individual can hope to gain proficiency in a profession which has so many facets. Not so. You are required first to be naval officers. There is never an excess of the all-round, highly competent combat officer. But for the individual with special interests or special talents, each technological advance offers a new route for advancement in the naval profession. I could give you innumerable examples of officers whose promotion has been accelerated by specialization; I could also give innumerable examples of officers whose promotion has been accelerated by maintaining a thorough grasp of the broader aspects of the naval profession.

All of you are aware of, and some of you may have been unduly impressed by, the headlines which announce drastic reductions in the Navy in the fleet and in personnel. Remember this, however: We are still in the process of contracting a wartime Navy to one consistent with the national economy, and the Nation's peacetime requirements. But when completed, the contraction will give us a Navy very much larger and more diversified in its functions than this country has ever before possessed in peacetime. It will still be small enough, of course, for the duties and responsibilities placed on its ships. In our generation we have witnessed profound changes in world powers. Swiftly the United States has moved to world leadership with all the great obligations inherent therein. Not the least of these is control of the seas; nor is the least part of this problem the incorporation into the Navy both for offense and defense the incredible technical advances that have made modern navies tridimensional.

Consider this also. So insistent are the requirements of the transitional Navy of today and the Navy of the immediate future, that the United States Naval Academy is not able of itself to meet all the officer needs of the Naval Establishment.

The challenge, then, is to you. It is not so much a question of "What does the Navy offer me today?" as "What have I to offer the Navy?"

What have you to offer the Navy in, say, the primary field of endeavor of the seagoing line officer, or in such specialties as logistics, law, aviation, submarines? Numbers of you will elect the Marine Corps for your career, where specialization and integration, paradoxically, are both of the essence. You will find that the outstanding characteristic of the Marine Corps will always be, as it is today and always has been—readiness. Readiness to go anywhere, at any time, to do any job. In the Marines, the Nation truly has a force in constant readiness.

Recently there has been added to the Navy's responsibilities, the function of sea transport for all the armed services. The Military Sea Transport Service may seem like humdrum duty in peacetime, but it will give many officers valuable sea experience, acquaintance with foreign ports, and a more thorough knowledge of shipping problems than we have had heretofore. Should war come, it will be responsible for the delivery overseas of troops and supplies for all our fighting forces and will become a combat element of great importance.

Whether it be in fighting on the sea, under the sea, or over the sea with the fleet, fighting on land with the marines, transporting the fighting men, or laboring behind desks to keep the combat forces equipped with all they need—our Nation in the crisis of war will need every one of you, and 10 more as near like each of you as can be obtained. None of us looks forward to the catastrophe of war with eager anticipation, but there is no more noble a profession than that of the man who dedicates his life to be ready—amply ready—when his Nation's existence depends upon his skill to meet that catastrophe, to confine it and to resolve it in victory.

If you are to be ready you must perfect yourself in every duty assigned. You must learn the art of command by seeking opportunities to lead, and by observing carefully the methods of successful leaders. You must cultivate a philosophy of loyalty and objectivity, must develop tolerance and understanding of human attributes, and never forget that you are learning to command men—not material. You must cultivate the ability to work with others within your ship, within the fleet, within the service, and as between the services. You must be guided by faith in our country and its free institutions.

The Navy has a glorious future. Those who serve in it have glorious opportunities to contribute to the national welfare both in peace and in war. The Navy may be a stern taskmaster, make many demands on us, and be less than tolerant of serious shortcomings, but in it may be found a life of satisfaction—a life so attractive that those who leave it carry with them, more often than not, a never-ending nostalgia for the service and its ways.

In peace and in war, the officers of the Navy must serve their country unselfishly and faithfully. By our industry, our loyalty, our self-discipline, we must set an example to those who serve under us. We must also set an example to every American in the responsibilities of citizenship.

I envy those of you who will carry on and shape the Navy of the future. You will have a life of fascinating interest, of self-respect, and of achievement. To you, I present the Navy of the future in terms of opportunity unlimited.

Why a Worthless Income Under Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are many countries under inflation that have paid wages far in excess of $12,000 incomes to its individual workers. The money, however, had no purchasing power so that the people who received it were on a starvation basis. It is not what the people receive in money—it is what the money will buy. Under the wasteful, extravagant, boondoggling program of the Truman administration our dollar will depreciate so that even the President's $50,000 exemption would not buy a ticket to the beaches in Florida.

Under leave to extend my remarks heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in one of the outstanding newspapers in my district, the Olean (N. Y.) Times-Herald of January 7, 1950:

THAT $12,000 INCOME

Vern Croop, the head of the Gannett News Service Bureau in Washington, has a most illuminating dispatch from the National Capital on this page today.

His theme is just what President Truman did not say in his state of the Union message; and it is a most intriguing theme, too.

But one thing the President did say probably has been engaging the attention of a great many of our citizens to an unusual degree.

Most of us—human nature being what it is—like money. The more we can put our paws on, the more we are pleased. Money is the root of all evil; but it also comes in very handily in buying groceries, clothing the children, buying furniture and gasoline and a thousand and one other things. Even the churches would close without money.

So that when the President solemnly holds out the lure—and we think we have used the right word there—that in another 50 years' time the "real income" of the average American family (that takes in the vast majority of us) would be $12,000 a year or better, it is

only to be expected that a lot of people would ejaculate: "Suffering ducks! Is it possible?" or something to that effect.

And they have a perfect right to be startled.

For most of us have never experienced a "real income" of $12,000 a year; and never expect it.

It's a lot of money; and it is an interesting procedure to speculate on what the average family would do if it had $12,000 a year coming in.

Sounds wonderful, doesn't it?

But we're always a little suspicious of such things; and we have that peaky habit of trying to figure just how they would work out if put into actual practice. For if they don't work out in actual practice—well, that's the end of them.

Well, let's try and think this thing through.

Suppose the working force of any business you can name were in receipt of a wage around $12,000 a year, what would the cost of its product have to be in order to keep going and make a profit—for if there isn't a profit there won't be any keeping going.

Suppose, for instance, that the packing houses of the country paid their vast working forces $12,000 a year—or better—what would a pound of sausage or a can of corned beef hash cost?

If the automobile industry were to pay such wages, what do you think the price of new cars would be?

What do you think a newspaper would have to charge for its advertising and for its subscription rates?

Oh, well, some enthusiast might respond, if we all had that amount of money coming in we would not care what things cost!

No?

Do you think we would sell anything to any other country with manufacturing costs at such a level?

Would we not have to put up abnormal tariff walls around our country in order to keep cheaper foreign-made goods out and prevent them from putting our own industry out of business?

And if we kept all foreign goods out, and did not sell any of our own abroad, where would we land within a very short space of time?

You're right, brother; we would land back on solid earth with such a thud that it would take us a long, long time to get the jar out of our systems and be able to function normally again.

And that process might be very, very painful.

But apparently, we still have people in this country who are convinced that there will be always more where that came from, that the sky's the limit, that there's no need to save and be thrifty, that a benevolent government will provide this and that, and that everything in the national garden will be perfectly lovely—even to the extent of the average family receiving a real income of $12,000 a year or better."

Isn't it about time we snapped out of it?

The Problem of Federal Grants-in-Aid and Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, time and again I have referred on the floor of the Senate to the crucial problem of increasing Federal intervention in State and local affairs. Tied up with that problem of Federal centralization is the interrelated problem of Federal grants-in-aid and Federal taxes. I have suggested that the only way to end the duplication of power and taxes and the increasing centralization of functions in Washington, is to pass legislation, of which I am a cosponsor, to set up a little Hoover Commission to analyze the status of Federal-State-local relations.

Throughout my own State of Wisconsin, as I have previously reported, there is an increasing discussion on this issue of Federal grants, taxes, and powers. Some of the ablest newspaper columnists in Wisconsin have devoted many columns to this subject and have enabled our State to be among the leaders in seeking a solution to this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of two of the ablest write-ups, in my opinion, on this subject. One is a copy of a write-up by Mr. John Wyngaard, of Madison, as published in the Janesville Daily Gazette of Friday, January 6; and the other is a column published some time earlier in the Wisconsin State Journal by Mr. Sanford Goltz.

There being no objection, the articles referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette of January 6, 1950]

UNDER THE CAPITOL DOME—INDEPENDENCE OF STATE AGENCIES IS SHRINKING UNDER FEDERAL AUTHORITY

(By John Wyngaard)

MADISON.—There is an adage in folklore, about the rule that he who hires the fiddler calls the tune. The State government has become aware of that ancient saying. Federal financial intervention in State services has grown steadily, and with the Federal cash windfalls has come increasing Federal control. In some State agencies independence of action and State sovereignty are almost theoretical today.

After years of silence on the subject, there is today an increasing study of Federal subsidies and their effect in local government. The Wisconsin Taxpayers' Alliance recently analyzed the Federal aids that accounted for 16 percent of all State expenditures during the last fiscal year. The flow of Federal dollars also was given prominent display in the annual report of State Budget Chief E. C. Gimmell.

THE EFFECT

The Alliance report always is judicious and careful. In the current issue the Alliance observes that "Federal aid funds must be spent according to the pattern and rules laid down by the Federal Government," and that when State funds are used to match the Federal hand-outs, the Federal rules also determine how the State tax dollar is spent.

Thus is the budgeting authority of the State legislature, and its responsibility, gradually being chipped away. The Federal funds are not budgeted by the State's own elected lawmakers. They are sent into particular departments for designated purposes. The effect, moreover, is to reduce legislative authority over the disposition of funds matched out of the State treasury.

The Washington rules also apply to the actual administrative details of the subsidized programs. There are many irritants in these "directives" from the remote Potomac for State officers, but they rarely complain because they want the flow of Federal dollars to continue. They suspect, and some of them have learned, that it is infinitely easier to apply for money to Washington than to persuade locally elected lawmakers to provide it. In the designing of roads, the hiring of personnel, the promulgations of standards, hours of work and many other details, the decisions and the rules are made by Washington, in an ostensibly sovereign State government.

The proportion of State and Federal money that is contained in some State department budgets suggests how limited State authority must be. About four-fifths of all the money spent by the industrial commission comes from Washington. About half of all the dollars spent by the board of health are Federal aids. About two-thirds of the budget of the State board of vocational education comes from the National Government, although the agency is peculiarly a Wisconsin development.

ALTERNATIVE

Wisconsin citizens are paying out millions in Federal taxes that are being returned to Wisconsin to pay for local governmental services.

Governor Dewey, of New York, who has made frequent representations about the threat to the integrity of the States, proposes that the National Government abandon the numerous excise taxes it now levies and allow the States to use such sources of revenue to pay for public expenditures that now receive Federal aids.

It is likely that if Wisconsin were to get its per capita share of Federal excise taxes now being sent to the Federal tax collectors, it could comfortably finance all of the Federal aid programs now operative according to its own rules and wishes, and according to local needs. Then would the Wisconsin State government be independent and sovereign according to the original meaning of the Constitution. At the present rate, the Federal tax dollar will become a gradually increasing factor and State responsibility finally will be stultified.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal]

UNDER THE DOME

FEDERAL HAND-OUTS TANGLE TAX PICTURE

(By Sanford Goltz)

A rising tide of Federal grants-in-aids to State governments—practically doubled in 2 years and still on the increase—is being pointed to by the council of State governments with something resembling alarm.

Resisting money from Washington is a rather uncommon occurrence, and probably will continue to be. But the State governments group has a reason for its concern.

"If the upward trend of Federal aid continues," a special council committee that has been studying the subject commented this week, "there is little likelihood that any considerable tax reduction will occur in fields suitable for State and local taxation.

"If the States and localities are to regain some of the tax sources preempted by the Federal Government, it is essential that Federal tax reduction be accomplished, and this is dependent upon a substantial reduction in Federal expenditures."

In 1948 the Federal Treasury put out just about a billion and a half dollars to the States, either for use by them or for distribution to their political subdivisions. Two years earlier the amount was $770,700,000, roughly half as much.

For Wisconsin, Federal aids for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, added up to $23,600,000. For the year ended last June 30, the figure was $38,811,000.

Next year, the total is expected to be $44,600,000, and for the 1950-51 fiscal year, $46,300,000.

The council's study showed that for fiscal year 1947, Federal grants-in-aid averaged just over $6 per person. They ranged from a low of $4.22 in New Jersey to $34.85 in Nevada.

In Wisconsin the Federal money was the equivalent of $6.72 per person, putting it thirty-eighth in rank in amount of aid received although the State ranks twentieth in per capita income and twentieth in amount of Federal taxes paid.

The variation in Federal aid from State to State is largely explained by differences in their welfare programs, which account for more than half the aid payments.

Public-assistance aids, including payments and administration of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind, are paid federally in proportion to what the State and local units of government will contribute. Higher contributions there mean more Federal money.

Federal aids for highways, the second most important aid in size, goes to the States on the basis of total area. Figured that way, Nevada got $24.40 per capita, while Wisconsin got less than a dollar, and little Rhode Island wound up with 12 cents.

The council may be overhopeful in looking to Washington for lower spending so that the State and local taxing units can be given a little more leeway in its tax choices.

If it could be done, for instance, there's no doubt that most States would be glad to have the Federal gasoline tax of a cent and a half wiped out, leaving that field entirely to the State.

Those States that wanted to raise the equivalent of Federal highway aids could boost their State gas taxes to do it, and have complete say-so on where the money was used.

There are not many fields, however, where the idea of cutting Federal taxes at the price of lost Federal grants would be popular. Many Wisconsin legislators undoubtedly would balk at boosting the State budget by the $15,000,000 or more a year that Federal old-age assistance grants alone run to—although there, too, Wisconsin would be the gainer if the Federal tax bite here were reduced thereby.

It still remains to be seen if the States mean it when they say now and then, that they don't want all that Federal money.

Address by the President at the Samuel Gompers Centennial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief extemporaneous address delivered by the President of the United States, at Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., on January 5, 1950, before the assembled guests who were celebrating the birthday of Samuel Gompers.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, members of this big organization, I have been at my House all evening working on two more messages on the state of the Union. [Applause.] One of them, the economic message is ready, it is going down tomorrow. [Laughter.] Then I have one that is creating a great deal of conversation, known as the Budget Message. [Laughter.] Everybody thinks they know all about it but me, and I am the only one who knows all the figures in it. [Laughter.] But I was sitting there thinking about this celebration in honor of one of labor's greatest statesmen, and I could not stay away. [Applause.] I knew that anything I would say would be a surface remark after the Vice President and Matthew Woll and William Green had paid a tribute to the great Samuel Gompers, but I wanted you to understand that I remember him distinctly as an originator of the great movement that set labor free. [Applause.] And I wanted to come here and pay tribute to him. I remember when he passed away. It was back in 1924, the year in which I was defeated for reelection. They have never succeeded in doing that to me since. [Applause.]

I was one of Samuel Gompers' great admirers when I was a very young man on the farm. Everybody in that day and age considered him a labor statesman. He was not only a labor statesman in a bipartisan sense, but he was just as good a Democrat as I ever was. [Applause.] I remember very distinctly he supported Woodrow Wilson when Woodrow Wilson needed support worse than anything he ever needed in his life. That was when California decided the election for Woodrow Wilson in 1916. [Applause.]

Samuel Gompers made a great contribution to the welfare of this great Nation of ours, and I consider it a very high honor that Mr. Green and the men who are conducting this meeting tonight should ask me to come here and pay this very slight tribute to one of the greatest labor leaders who ever lived. I thank you for the privilege. [Applause.]

Recognition of Communists in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Needn't Follow Britain," from the Greenville (S. C.) News of January 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE NEEDN'T FOLLOW BRITAIN

As had been widely forecast the British Government is moving to accord full diplomatic recognition to the Communist regime in China and to cease to recognize Chiang's Nationalists.

The action follows similar moves by other British Commonwealth countries; and it must be acknowledged that it marks a rift, or at least a pronounced divergence, between America and Britain over this phase of policy in the Orient.

Britain, of course, is no less opposed than before to communism, but the British statesmen take what they regard as the practical attitude that nothing would be gained by "boycotting indefinitely a Government ruling over a vast territory and population."

But we dare say Britain's desire to safeguard the huge British investments in China and to maintain and expand trade with China is really at the bottom of the apparent British haste to get on good diplomatic terms with the Red regime.

But if Britain is moved by these economic considerations to be so prompt to extend the diplomatic hand to the Chinese Reds there is no corresponding reason why this country should be in any haste to follow suit.

On the other hand there is very good reason why this country should hold itself aloof from this Red Chinese regime for an indefinite time. We have nothing to gain by rushing to extend the "hand of diplomatic fellowship" to it. The Chinese—any Chinese governmental regime—wants a lot more from the United States than we could possibly want from them, or it. We can very well wait to let them make the approaches and we have no reason to be eager to shake hands.

Maybe we shall eventually feel that this regime is sufficiently well established to merit our diplomatic recognition, on the same basis that we recognize well-established governments in Russia and other Communist countries.

But we might as well make it clear in our current policy that we are not currying any favors from this Red regime in China and that on the other hand we still stand ready to give assistance to any actually based movement in China to achieve a really democratic government that will seek sincerely to serve the people's welfare.

Let Britain, if she will, act with eagerness for "trade advantages." We have no such motive, and we can very well let the Chinese Red regime stew for an indefinite time, and leave to it the burden of demonstrating its worthiness for our recognition.

How Falsehoods Spread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Falsehoods Spread," which was published in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Leader, January 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW FALSEHOODS SPREAD

A recent Saturday Evening Post article dealing with the city of Minot has brought a blizzard of letters to the editor of the Post's letters column.

Some of the letters agree with the Post's story on the Magic City; some don't.

But that isn't the important thing. Disagreement is good and healthy in any free country. When the day comes that all persons think alike, it will mean the end of progress.

What we'd like to point out is a certain letter about farm co-ops which was written to the Post by a member of the Nebraska State Grange. The Grange and the Farmers Union don't always think alike; they are rival farm groups. But when H. C. Filley, of the Nebraska Grange, saw a false statement about co-ops in the Post's Minot article, Mr. Filley sat down and wrote an answer to it. Here it is, as published in the Post's letters column:

"The author made a misstatement concerning cooperative companies * * * The

Farmers Union * * * operates oil companies, general stores, feed stores, and farmers' supply and implement stores, all on a cooperative, nontaxpaying basis. * * *

"Business enterprises (such as those mentioned) organized under cooperative statutes pay real-estate taxes, personal-property taxes, sales taxes, social-security taxes, communication taxes, excise taxes, and franchise taxes, where applicable, the same as any other corporation."

This newspaper wants to compliment the Post for retracting the error of its reporter.

The reporter probably met some Minot businessman who has been misinformed by the false propaganda of the North Dakota tax-equality lobby—and as a result a huge falsehood was spread among the CEP's many millions of readers.

Great publications can reach millions—and it is not easy to retract an error in a small letter to the editor—when the original article may have been seen by many more persons than will see the letter. And the impression they may have got from the article will, by retraction time, have been scattered widespread by word of mouth.

The Leader wants to compliment again the Saturday Evening Post for its retraction, but it wants to compliment even more the member of a farm organization who had the goodness to defend another farm organization against an unjust attack.

Lobbying Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Lobbying Money," written by Joseph Harsch, and published in the Christian Science Monitor. It was republished in the Leader, of Bismarck, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOBBYING MONEY

The news that the American Medical Association is going to collect and spend $3,000,000 next year to oppose socialized medicine shows that the AMA is going to be doing a lot of opposing of socialized medicine next year. (It has spent most of $1,000,000 doing the same thing this past year.)

It also shows something else about our political system which, for the most part, has passed us by without our attention.

Two million dollars is a lot more money than the Republican Party has in its treasury today. And it is money that the Republican National Committee would give its eye teeth to get its hand on.

Two million dollars would also look big to the Democratic National Committee, although the Democrats are currently a bit better off than the Republicans, thanks to all the Democrats who experienced a reawakening of party loyalty in the early hours of the morning after last November's election day.

The Republicans, after spending approximately $3,000,000 in the last Presidential election, started 1949 with $800,000 in the till. When the balance was drawn down below $100,000 their national treasurer resigned. It is supposed to be a bit above that figure today, but not by much. The Democrats, who spent $1,800,000 in the 1948 campaign, probably have about $250,000 on tap. But neither Republicans nor Democrats have anything like the wealth of the AMA at their immediate disposal, although, of course, this is an off year.

Behind these figures is the fact that much big money which used to go to the big party organizations for direct political action is now moving instead into the treasuries of organizations with special political causes to plead.

Partly this is because their causes are not identical with those of one or the other of the two big parties; partly because they think they can get more for their money if they spend it themselves than if they donate it to a political party, and partly because of new laws which make party contributions reportable. The reason undoubtedly varies with different organizations.

The AMA is operating the single biggest lobbying operation in the United States today. But it is not the only organization spending large sums of money for political action by itself, rather than contributing it to the coffers of one of the regular parties. The CIO and AFL, in particular, are in the big league.

Here is a list of organizations which reported to Congress that they spent over $100,000 during the first 9 months of this year on lobbying or political action and the amount spent by each:

American Medical Association, $1,225,028.

Committee for Constitutional Government, $443,756.

National Association of Electric Companies, $305,751.

Townsend Plan, Inc., $285,371.

United World Federalists, $220,509.

Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, $186,371.

National Small Businessmen's Association, $161,283.

Association of American Railroads, $135,671.

National Cooperative Milk Producers Association, $131,781.

General Electric Corporation, $128,563.

National Association of Real Estate Boards, $111,172.

This is only a small part of the picture of the money being spent on political action outside the channels of political practices. No one could estimate the cost to the taxpayer of political action involved in Government operations, such as the campaign to win support for a nationalized health service. No one could discover what moneys labor unions spend indirectly on political action. The amounts which they report to Congress as direct lobbying expense are far smaller than their total budgets for political action.

No one has ever compiled the total of the cost of institutional advertising which has a political purpose although it goes on the advertising budget of corporations and thereby cuts their taxes. No one could estimate the cost of political pleading on some of our radio programs because it is mixed in with news and product promotion.

When Republicans or Democrats take an ad, or buy radio time, or put up bill posters we know who is advocating what. And the time was when most political pleading was in such forthright and overt form. But those days are long gone by. Today politics shuns the overt form and the direct appeal. Today you are like as not to find it disguised with your breakfast cereal, your comics, your music.

And the treasuries of the two big parties languish.—Joseph Harsch in the Christian Science Monitor.

Government Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the December 1949 issue of the Reader's Digest entitled "Is This the Time To Spend Billions More?"

The amount of money spent by President Truman up to September 30, 1949, is shown in this article to be in excess of $191,000,000,000 as compared to less than $180,000,000,000 for all Presidents from George Washington through the second term of Franklin D. Roosevelt. To this amount spent by Mr. Truman should be added the expenditures of the Government from September 30, 1949, to June 30, 1950, the end of the present fiscal year. The Congress has already appropriated funds to cover the cost of Government to that time.

Today the President submitted his budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1950, and ending June 30, 1951. He proposes expenditures in excess of $42,000,000,000 for that period. This brings the total amount spent or requested by President Truman to over $250,000,000,000.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THIS THE TIME TO SPEND BILLIONS MORE?

(Compiled by John T. Flynn, from historical statistics of the U. S. Census Bureau and U. S. Treasury reports)

Here are two columns of figures. One gives the amount spent by each of our 32 Presidents from George Washington to the end of Franklin Roosevelt's second administration. The other gives the amount spent by President Truman since his inauguration up to September 30, 1949.

Spent by 32 Presidents from Washington to Roosevelt (through second term)

Washington	$34,088,486
Adams	34,262,068
Jefferson	72,434,269
Madison	176,473,964
Monroe	187,237,899
Adams	65,427,017
Jackson	152,989,998
Van Buren	122,325,241
Harrison and Tyler	108,904,678
Polk	173,477,230
Taylor and Fillmore	179,631,539
Pierce	255,154,244
Buchanan	272,933,490
Lincoln	3,232,580,433
Johnson	1,578,587,648
Grant	2,252,285,743
Hayes	1,032,268,037
Garfield and Arthur	1,027,742,757
Cleveland	1,077,819,089
Harrison	1,412,115,080
Cleveland	1,441,074,174
McKinley	3,095,818,514
T. Roosevelt	4,655,450,505
Taft	2,799,211,854
Wilson	45,038,280,143
Harding	8,667,215,459
Coolidge	810,595,540,115
Hoover	15,480,476,626
Roosevelt (8 years)	67,510,746,001
Total	179,626,113,645

Spent by President Truman from fiscal year 1946 to Sept. 30, 1949

Truman	$191,081,394,191
	191,081,394,191

Experts predict a large Federal deficit during the current fiscal year, ending next June. Yet the administration is demanding expenditure of many additional billions of dollars on vast new and untried projects.

All those who are critical of the program, whether Democrat or Republican, are castigated by the President as being just about 100 years behind the times.

Think this over:

Thirty-two Presidents in 156 years spent $179,626,113,645.

One President in less than 8 years has spent $191,081,394,191.

(The extraordinary expenditures of the war years from 1941 to 1945 have been excluded.)

Basing-Point System Not Needed in Our Economy—Propaganda Predictions of the Calamitous Effects of Cement Decision Fail To Materialize—Building of New Steel and Cement Plants and Increasing Capacity of Old Plants a Good Omen—S. 1008 Must Be Defeated To Allow Present Trend of Normal Plant Dispersal To Continue—Small-Business Stake in S. 1008 Is Destruction of Robinson-Patman Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the calamity howlers who have insistently, through their billion-dollar lobby, pounded on the doors of the Congress for legislation upsetting the cement decision should, if they have the least bit of modesty, run for cover. The predictions which flew thick and fast after the cement decision, to the effect that the steel, cement, and other industries would pine away and die because they could not use the basing-point system of pricing, has turned out to be, like most propaganda, pure bunk.

The plain truth is that the dispersal of factories, which the prophets of doom predicted would be pulled up by their roots and moved, has occurred to some extent but not in the way these predictors expected. There have been completed many new plants throughout the country, and many plants heretofore restricted to small production now have increased capacity. Because of the high level of business, the population increase, and many other factors in our economy, the building up of sections of the country which need production has been taking place. The continued abandonment of artificial price controls will make available to all sections of the country production and distribution of basic materials at fair prices and lower transportation costs.

NEW ENGLAND PLANS NEW STEEL PLANT

New England, where the steel and iron industry had its birth in this country, but which for over 100 years has been paying high transportation costs, whether incurred or not, now contemplates building a steel plant. This plant will not take care of all of New England's needs, but it is a start in the right direction. Many small plants in many sections of the country, relieved of the restraint and threat inherent in artificial pricing such as the basing-point system, are encouraged to increase production without the threat of their big competitors "dumping" in their own back yard. It is a fallacious argument to speak of local monopoly in the steel, cement, brick, and lumber, and many other industries in our industrial structure. The day has passed when it is possible for local monopolies to exist unless artificial restrictions in the form of pricing and transportation are invoked. Free use of all forms of transportation in a competitive manner lowers the cost to the consumer. The railroads are making a tremendous mistake in constantly and insistently pressing for higher and yet higher freight rates. The railroads can live as a necessary part of our economy only to the extent that they render service in competition with other forms of transportation. We need the railroads. They did a tremendous job during World War II, but they did not do it for nothing. The railroads did this job for profit, and it shows even today in their balance sheets and in the retirement of obligations which appeared to be insurmountable before the war came on. If any industry in this country profited because of the war, it is the railroad industry. However, the railroads cannot expect to live in the lap of luxury at the expense of other forms of transportation and at the expense of the consumer. But with determined greed, the railroads not only press for increased freight rates but lend their influence to industries which desire to use artificial pricing systems. It is a short-range view and one if successful, will eventually be detrimental both to the railroads and to our entire economy.

LOBBYISTS SHUT DOWN SMALL—TRY TO MURDER SMALL BUSINESS

The Supreme Court decisions in cement, in certain steel products, in oil, and in other industries added day by day to the array of industrial giants determined to secure legislation upsetting the court decisions. The greed and determination to secure legislation adverse to the public interest is astonishing. All during the recess of the Congress the lobbyists have been busy. These lobbyists have tried to infiltrate into the defense of small-business organizations, honest organizations which are rendering a real service to their members, not the phony ones, for these they already have under their wing. These lobbyists have lost no opportunity to address bodies of small-business men and to feed such groups words upsetting to their business digestive system. Fortunately, it is a rare occasion when these prophets of doom make much impression. Nevertheless, with bottomless pocketbooks and cynic minds, they continue to hammer on the antitrust laws and particularly laws which were designed to protect, and are protecting, small business. The focal point of the attack is the act amending the Clayton Act, which since 1936 has afforded small business its greatest protection.

DESTRUCTION OF ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT AND CHAINSTORE FOR SMALL TOWNS SMALL AREA OF CONSUMERS

With hands folded in upright supplication and a look innocent of all guile, these billion-dollar lobbyists say they do not want to harm small business; they want small business to live and prosper. Yes, they want small business to live and prosper like a cat wanting a mouse to live and prosper or like a wolfhound wanting a rabbit to be free to attend to its own enterprise. There is only one appellation which could properly describe these lobbyists—a word which I leave to your own imagination. The truth leaks out occasionally, as it did before the American Bar Association meeting in St. Louis, at the convention of the National Association of Retail Druggists in New York, and at a more recent meeting of the American Petroleum Institute. The truth that leaks out is the desire of the lobbyists for the artificial-pricing-system crowd to destroy the Robinson-Patman Act. Nothing less—nothing more.

THE CHAINS AND OTHER BIGGEST PROFITS

The passage of S. 1008 will destroy the Robinson-Patman Act and allow the giant chains to move in on the hometown merchant. The predatory interests in any industry can move in on the hometown manufacturer. In other words, we revert to the situation that existed in the depths of the depression before there was any Robinson-Patman Act. The same interests which now seek to destroy the antitrust laws are the same interests that originally fought the Robinson-Patman Act. They are the same interests which believe in the divine rights of the seller to fix prices. They are the same interests which want little or no Government control of any kind and, if permitted, would sweep all antitrust laws off the books, set up cartels and trusts which would draw the life-blood of our economic stream into their own coffers and eventually—and this has been said before—become more powerful than government itself. It is the truth, however, and it is up to the Congress to see to it that such a situation does not exist.

PROPOSED BILL, BASING-POINT CRIMES

More lately, having failed temporarily in securing passage of S. 1008—the basing-point bill, the Robinson-Patman-Act-destroying bill, the antitrust-law-destroying bill—the steel crowd made another approach, with wonderful unanimity of thought. They have attempted, through the administrative

procedures of the Federal Trade Commission, to secure what they have not thus far secured by way of legislation from the Congress. This neat little package which is proposed to the Federal Trade Commission permits some fancy variations of the basing-point system. Surely the representatives of FTC were guiltless of any knowledge that such a thing would happen, but nevertheless it is there to be read by all with an inquiring mind. Astute commentators for big-business mouthpieces so admit, and impartial commentators in a somewhat freer press so analyze the situation with respect to the proposed steel order.

STEEL INDUSTRY BOOSTS PRICES IN FOND ANTICIPATION OF PHONY FREIGHT ABSORPTION

In preparation for all of this—that is, in preparation for the basing-point system—Big Steel and its satellites have boosted the price of its products. In addition to boosting the base price of steel, the extras and differentials have been so juggled that men long familiar with steel-industry prices are unable to estimate exactly what the cost to the American consumer will be. Interestingly enough, in a leading article in the impartial New York Times of Sunday, December 18, Thomas E. Mullaney, commenting on the recent steel price rise, attributes this increase to the prospective reestablishment of artificial selling controls. Mr. Mullaney stated his analysis of the situation in part as follows:

ACCOMMODATION PRICING IN VIEW

Another reason for the suddenness of the steel price rise may be the expectation of the industry that its long quest for permission to absorb freight charges in shipments of steel to customers will be granted early next year. It has been reported that the Federal Trade Commission is on the verge of agreeing to a settlement of the 1947 price-fixing case against the steel companies to give them the privilege of limited freight absorption.

Even if the FTC does not extend that privilege it has been taken as assured that Congress will pass an enabling measure early next year. The steel industry has refrained from absorbing freight charges since it abandoned the basing-point system last year, following FTC and United States Supreme Court decisions interpreted as placing a question of legality on the steel industry's freight-absorption practices.

With steel prices higher now in advance of either FTC or congressional rulings allowing freight absorption, the industry will be better prepared to bear the cut in revenues that such a system of forgiving part of the shipment cost to customers entails.

PLENARY BASING-POINT SYSTEM ALLOWED BY PROPOSED STEEL ORDER

The fact that the steel companies agree to quote f. o. b. mill means nothing, for most quotations mean little without an obligation to ship if an order is placed. The meat in the proposed FTC steel order is permitting a basing point at every mill. This looks, on the face of it, as if all prices would be based on the mill from which the purchase is made. This is not the case at all, for it is the controlling mill that sets the destination price. A consumer might have a steel mill across the street which was a basing-point mill, but steel from this neighboring mill into his yard might cost as much as steel from a mill many miles away. Thus, the local mill under a plenary basing-point system is enabled to charge some other mill's base price plus the freight from that mill to the customer's destination, which, as pointed out above, may be only across the street.

Under a free competitive system in the steel industry, the tendency would be for the local mill to protect its customers and protect itself from the inroads of its competitors.

EXAMPLES OF NEW PIPE AND TUBE FACILITIES IN STEEL INDUSTRY

It is all quite elemental and should not cause Members of Congress a moment's doubt in arriving at a decision. The fact is that any scheme, such as the proposed FTC steel order, or any law which the Congress may pass, permitting any deviation from the present rules of the game is injurious to the public interest and destructive of free competition. I am confident that if the Congress upholds the Supreme Court decisions the trend which has already started in a quiet and orderly way will eventually lead to a dispersal of our basic industries, which will not only be beneficial to our economy but will be vital to our total national defense. For the information of the Members, I include a list of completed and contemplated pipe and tube mills in the United States, most of them in sections of the country where they are most needed.

Company and location	Type and size	Capacity (in net tons annually)	Date of completion
Formed Tubes, Inc., Sturgis, Mich	2 Yoder mills	10,000	August 1949.
Basalt Rock Co., Kaiser, Napa, Calif	14- to 36-inch welded	Unknown	In operation.
Kaiser Steel Corp., Fontana, Calif	5⅝- to 14-inch welded	Unknown	Early 1950.
Sharon Steel Co., Farrell, Pa	2 electric weld mills	Unknown	Mills installed March 1949.
National Tube Co.:			
Lorain, Ohio	2- to 4½-inch seamless	218,000	Began November 1949.
McKeesport, Pa	Welded pipe 26 inches and larger	100,000	March 1950.
Youngstown Sheet & Tube, Indiana Harbor, Ind	1- to 4-inch butt weld	Unknown	Expected May 1950.
Lone Star Steel Corp., Daingerfield, Tex	Up to 16 inches welded	350,000	Expected 1950 or 1951.
A. O. Smith Corp., Houston, Tex. (jointly with Sheffield Steel)	8⅝- to 30-inch welded	360,000–420,000	Expected mid-1950.
Consolidated Western Steel Corp., Orange, Tex	24 inches and larger welded	100,000	Company purchased Government plant November 1949. Will install equipment.
Portsmouth Steel Co., Portsmouth, Ohio	4- to 16-inch welded	Unknown	Planned for 1950 under company's expansion program.

1 eastern company is planning the construction of a new mill to make 5- to 20-inch seamless pipe.

To show the Members what has happened in the cement industry since the Cement decision by the Supreme Court on April 26, 1948, I include a list of new plants and improvements to existing installations in the cement industry, as follows:

Item No.	State	Company	Data on new plants and improvements on existing installations, 1949
1	Alabama	The Ideal Cement Co.	To increase capacity of Mobile plant.
2	Alaska	Alaska Portland Cement Co.	New $2,500,000 plant proposed—1,500 barrels daily.
3	Arizona	Arizona Portland Cement Co.	New $3,976,000 plant at Rillito—2,000 barrels daily.
4	Arkansas	Ideal Cement Co.	Plans to double capacity at Okay plant.
5	California	Calaveras Portland Cement Co.	Plans to increase capacity 80 percent.
6	do	Riverside Portland Cement Co.	Plans to increase capacity at Oro Grande plant to 3,500,000 barrels.
7	do	Permanente Portland Cement Co. (Samuel Guiberson)	Plans new $15,000,000 plant near Palm Springs.
8	do	California Portland Cement Co.	Improvements and general rehabilitation of the Colton plant.
9	Colorado	The Ideal Cement Co.	Improvements, increased production of Portland plant by 1,000 barrels per day.
10	Florida	Florida Portland Cement Co.	Plans to increase capacity at Tampa plant.
11	do	Lehigh Portland Cement Co.	9,500 acres cement-bearing materials near Flagler Beach.
12	Idaho	Lewiston Area Development Association, Inc.	Announced that a $4,000,000 cement plant will be constructed in that area—capacity 3,000 barrels daily.
13	Illinois	General Portland Cement Co.	$4,000,000 expansion program at Chicago.
14	do	Medusa Portland Cement Co.	Improvement program for Dixon plant.
15	Iowa	Dewey Portland Cement Co.	Improvements at Davenport plant to increase production 40 percent.
16	do	Northwestern States Portland Cement Co.	Carrying on $1,000,000 improvements at Mason City plant.
17	Kansas	Monarch Cement Co.	Plans to increase capacity to 700,000 barrels annually at Humboldt plant.
18	do	Universal Atlas Cement Co.	Plans modernization of Independence plant.
19	Louisiana	Lone Star Cement Corp.	Completed $1,000,000 improvements which boosted capacity 30 percent to 6,400 barrels per day.
20	Missouri	Missouri Portland Cement Co.	New 6,000-barrel plant at Prospect Hill—to be completed in 1950.

Item No.	State	Company	Data on new plants and improvements on existing installations, 1949
21	Montana	Ideal Cement Co.	Improvements completed doubling plant capacity at Trident.
22	do	Permanente Cement Co.	650 acres cement-bearing materials—Helena.
23	North Carolina		1949 assembly proposes a new State-owned plant. Plans an $8,000,000 cement plant in Raleigh area.
24	North Dakota		State legislature grants $25,000 for survey to establish cement plant.
25	Ohio	Diamond Portland Cement Co.	Completed improvements increased capacity Middle Branch plant 30 percent.
26	do	Universal-Atlas Cement Co.	Plans modernization of Osborn plant.
27	Oklahoma	Dewey Cement Co.	Begun $8,445,000 expansion program at Sorbeville plant.
28	do	Ideal Cement Co.	To increase capacity at Ada plant.
29	Pennsylvania	Penn-Dixie Cement Corp.	Plans improvements at West Wanderer plant.
30	do	Medusa Portland Cement Co.	Improvements at York and Wampum plants—part of multimillion-dollar program.
31	Puerto Rico	Prince Cement Corp.	Plans to increase capacity to 10,000,000 sacks annually (2,000,000 barrels).
32	do	Puerto Rico Cement Corp.	Plans to increase capacity.
33	South Dakota	South Dakota State cement plant	Plans to double capacity to 4,000 barrels daily.
34	Tennessee	Signal Mountain Portland Cement Co.	Plans to increase capacity at Chattanooga plant.
35	Texas	Tex-Mex Cement Co.	New $6,000,000 plant at Corpus Christi.
36	do	Lone Star Cement Co.	Plans to increase capacity 20 to 25 percent at New Orleans.
37	do	Trinity Portland Cement Co.	Plans to increase capacity at Eagle Ford, Fort Worth, and Waco plants.
38	do	Ideal Cement Co.	Plans to double capacity at Houston plant.
39	do	Lone Star Cement Corp.	New plant near Sweetwater.
40	Virginia	(a) Lone Star Cement Co. (b) Universal-Atlas Cement Corp.	1,700 barrels daily—plans to build new plant near Roanoke. Capacity unknown.
41	Washington	Lehigh Portland Cement Co.	Plans to increase capacity.

DEFEAT OF S. 1008 WILL RELIEVE PRESSURE ON DESTRUCTION OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

The defeat of S. 1008 will continue the beneficial trends now under way in our basic industries and will protect and invigorate our small-business institutions throughout the country because the threat to the Robinson-Patman Act, now so imminent, will have been dissipated. I cannot believe that the Federal Trade Commission will so depart from the fundamental concept of its original sponsors as to approve a document such as the proposed steel order.

RESTRICTED PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY PREVAILED PRIOR TO THE SUPREME COURT DECISION IN THE CEMENT CASE

The foregoing list of cement production facilities, which covers a period of less than 2 years, in sum total is greatly in excess of new facilities built in the previous 25 years. Restricted production of cement and other commodities in our basic industries is the legitimate offspring of the basing-point system. Many instances of powerful forces at play in the cement industry during the basing-point era were brought to light by the proceedings in the cement case before the Federal Trade Commission.

California had a thorough investigation, by a committee of its State Senate during the twenties, which revealed the devastating effects of the basing-point system on dealers in cement in the State of California. Also revealed was the lack of cement production to supply that rapidly growing area. Many stories of intimidation and threats have come to light, which makes it common knowledge that under the basing-point system it was virtually impossible for an outsider to get into the cement business. Henry Kaiser, by the dint of sheer pluck and keen business acumen, bucked the cement trust and built a new plant in the West to supply the Mount Shasta Dam. However, many times in the 25 years prior to the war, even existing plants were forced out of business. Many of these plants were owned by local people who had invested their savings in the cement business.

It is astounding, indeed, how rapidly cement plants and additional facilities in old plants have been built and planned since the Supreme Court decision outlawing the basing-point system. The record shows that fewer plants were built between the years 1920 and 1945 than are presently contemplated. The real reason for cement plants being built over the distant reaches of the United States is recognition of a fact so often stressed; namely, that without artificial pricing controls our heavy basic industries will build their plants at locations where the demand can be supplied at its source. The continued outlawry of the basing-point system, to reiterate, will see cement, steel, and many other plants manufacturing basic commodities erected in every corner of the United States. This is as it should be. The buyer must have more of a choice than the choice of paying the same price, regardless of who furnishes the material. The basing-point system, that handy instrument for the elimination of all price competition, must itself be eliminated permanently if small business and free competition are to have their innings in a postwar world.

DEFEAT OF S. 1008 WILL RELIEVE PRESSURE ON DESTRUCTION OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

The defeat of S. 1008 will continue the beneficial trends now under way in our basic industries and will protect and invigorate our small-business institutions throughout the country because the threat to the Robinson-Patman Act, now so imminent, will have been dissipated. I cannot believe that the Federal Trade Commission will so depart from the fundamental concept of its original sponsors as to approve a document such as the proposed steel order.

THERE IS NO TIME FOR RETREAT—PRESSURE ON SMALL BUSINESS MUST STAND FIRM

This is no time to open the doors to cutthroat competition, to fixed prices, to the destruction of small business; and this is no time to open the doors to a situation which further restricts the choice of consumer by the elimination of competition. This is a time for the resurgence of the spirit of free enterprise and a time to consolidate our gains on the antitrust front. Any weakening of our position now is an invitation for the destruction of small business in the United States.

Address by the Vice President at the Samuel Gompers Centennial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the distinguished Vice President, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, at the Samuel Gompers centennial dinner on January 5, 1950, in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I greatly appreciate the honor involved in the invitation extended by President Green and his associates to me to participate in this memorial program on the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Samuel Gompers.

I did not realize when I accepted the invitation that I would run into so much competition. [Laughter.] I have seen more vice presidents assembled under this roof than I have since the twentieth of January, when I was inaugurated. [Laughter.] But I welcome them into the fraternity of vice presidents with the same spirit with which they welcome me into their fraternity. [Applause.]

It is a great pleasure always to memorialize the lives of great men. It is a great thing to receive inspiration from the lives of men who have consecrated themselves to some great cause, whether religious, educational, economical, or political—and it is a greater thing to have been permitted to enjoy an intimate acquaintance with any of these great men whose lives we celebrate, or whose hundredth anniversary we celebrate and memorialize.

It was my happy privilege to know Samuel Gompers in person. I came here as a young, inexperienced Member of the House of Representatives on the 4th of March 1913—longer ago than I sometimes like to admit. [Laughter.] I have not been here, however, as long as Samuel Gompers was president of the American Federation of Labor. [Laughter.] I came into the House of Representatives with the Woodrow Wilson administration, and I learned, very shortly

thereafter to respect and honor two great Americans. One of them had dedicated his life to education and to politics—not politics in the sense of politics as a game in which men maneuver for position, for high office or preferment—in which men maneuver for the success of a political party merely for its own sake—but one to whom politics was the science of government, as it really is in its truest sense. The other man had dedicated his life to the welfare of the American working man and woman, those who draw the water and hew the wood, those whose names rarely ever find a place on the front pages of our newspapers or periodicals, but who live the lowly walks, in the shadows that infest the valleys between the mountain peaks of achievement, of honor, and of notoriety. This leader dedicated himself to such an extent that I doubt if there has ever been a leader of the American working man or woman—or whether there can ever be one—who so indelibly impressed his personality and his character upon the American people as did he. [Applause.]

These two men whom I learned early in my own congressional career to respect, to revere, and honor were Woodrow Wilson and Samuel Gompers. [Applause.] Strange as it may seem, they were men of the same stripe of humanity—men of keen intellect, discriminating taste, eloquent tongue. And strange as it may seem also to those who do not recall it, in the great crisis that faced our country in World War I there was no man in America upon whom Woodrow Wilson leaned more heavily or confidently than upon Samuel Gompers. [Applause.]

Gompers was not only a labor leader, he was a labor statesman. He was broad-minded in his sympathies and understanding, and he recognized that American labor had its fight to make—had its way to make—and had to establish its right to organize and to act in solidarity for the welfare of the American workingman. I recall his appearance before committees of the House of Representatives. I recall his deep emotion as he pleaded the cause of the American workingman. I recall his cryptic sentences, his eloquence, his deep convictions. I recall the profound impression made not only upon me as a young member of the House, but upon the whole committee and the whole Congress and the whole American people.

I recall that when the Clayton antitrust law was before the House of Representatives and its Committee on the Judiciary, it was largely due to the eloquence and the conviction and the persuasion of Samuel Gompers that we wrote into that law a provision that the labor of a human being is not a commodity to be peddled in the market place [shouts—applause], giving legality and sanction to the membership of men and women in labor unions, for their own mutual advantage and protection, and for the guaranty of their rights. Samuel Gompers was this sort of a statesman.

I recall on one occasion when the Kentucky delegation went out to see President Wilson to recommend a great Kentucky lawyer and jurist for appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States. One by one we made our little speeches in our candidate's behalf, including two Senators from the State and all the Members of the House. When we had concluded, President Wilson, with that keen insight for which he was noted, said to us: "Gentlemen, does your candidate believe that the law grows, or does he take the legalistic view that it is finished?" By that interrogatory he drew a picture of the sort of man he wanted to put on the Supreme Court. But far beyond the appointment of a single man to the highest Court in our land, he drew his picture of the sort of Government in which he believed and the sort of Government that Samuel Gompers believed in and fought for—not only for labor, but for all American people. [Applause.]

We know that the law is not finished; we know that it does grow. It can never be finished nor cease to grow so long as humanity grows. We know that just as science and education and medicine and religion and agriculture and industry are constantly in search of new avenues for expansion and for development and the betterment of their own positions Government likewise must grow and remain modern [applause] in order that it may meet the requirements of a dynamic age where men and women are no longer satisfied that their Government shall sit merely in Washington and in any other capital complacently and with self-satisfaction and draw its pay and do nothing. I recall—and I beg your pardon for these personal references—but I'm sure you'll understand the reverence with which I recite them—I recall one day as I sat in my office in the House Office Building rather unexpectedly a delegation came to see me. It was headed by Samuel Gompers. There were many members of organized labor on that committee, including the railway brotherhoods, and I recall that Davey Robertson and Bert Jewell—George Harrison, of course, will know the significance of those names—came into my office. And Mr. Gompers was the spokesman of that committee, and he, on their behalf and on his own and on behalf of the great American Federation of Labor, asked me if I would introduce and fight for the passage of a law repealing what was then the Railway Labor Act and enacting a new railway labor act which would give fairness to railway employees and not make it one-sided, as the Taft-Hartley law is now [drowning applause]. You may understand that I felt greatly complimented by this honor being done to me. We worked for days and weeks and months in preparation of that legislation. I introduced it in the House of Representatives and Senator Howell, of Nebraska, in the Senate, and it became known as the Howell-Barkley bill. That was in 1924. We were unable to secure passage at the session, but in the next session we did enact it into law and, with such modifications as have been found necessary by experience and administration, it is still the law of this land, and the fairest and the best and the most workable labor law that has ever been enacted in the history of the United States. [Applause.]

These personal experiences of mine with this great labor leader endeared him to me as a young man devoted to the ideals of fairness, just principles in the administration of our growing economic system in which labor and industry must work together in peace and harmony insofar as it can be done in fairness and justice to those who are engaged in it. The century which has been marked by the hundred years since the birth of Samuel Gompers has been sometimes referred to as the "wonderful century." In many respects it has been one of the most wonderful centuries in all the history of man. In many respects mankind has advanced further in all fields of his activity and his endeavors than all the previous history of the world. I need not now recite these advances for lack of time.

Samuel Gompers came to this country when he was about 10 years of age, and through the force of his character, through the clarity of his intellect, through the foresight of his vision, he became the great leader, not only of American labor but, as a symbol, he became the leader of labor throughout the world. [Applause.] During his 48 years as president of the American Federation of Labor, he saw that great organization of human effort, human blood and bone and sinew—sometimes symbolized by tears and heartaches—grow into a body of 3,000,000 men. And when he died, the American Federation of Labor numbered its members at the 3,000,000 mark. Twenty-five years have passed since then, and as his successor William Green [applause] and as his associates and inheritors Dan Tobin and Matthew Woll have epitomized and characterized and emphasized the good principles of Samuel Gompers, until today the American Federation of Labor numbers 8,000,000 men and women. [Applause.] They are, as has been said, a great bulwark against un-American influences seeking now to penetrate our country. And so long as American labor, organized and unorganized, hold the fortresses and the buttresses and the ramparts of democracy and liberty and freedom—fight for freedom of religion and of speech and of the press and assembly—there will not be enough crackpots in America to break down the stability of our great country. [Applause.]

Samuel Gompers came here to find a land of promise: He helped to make it a land of fulfillment. The American way of life which we cherish and enjoy has been humanized and infinitely enriched by his life and by his labors. With all of his heart he believed in the words of Abraham Lincoln, who said, "Whatever helps labor helps the Nation." He fought against industrial serfdom and oppression. Out of the vision of his life, out of his great heart and of his great brain, he helped to create American labor democracy—equality and justice. He added to the Lincoln philosophy one of his own when he said, "Any good union member must first be a good citizen." [Applause.] He believed that in a free country like ours free men and women working freely together could advance their standard of living, elevate their lives, and appreciate more and more their Government and their political and social institutions because under a real democracy they were permitted to help fashion them. History now records how right he was. [Applause.]

A Word About Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the internationalists have betrayed the taxpayers of this country by pouring billions of their money into England to keep the Socialists in power. Now this Socialist regime at the first opportunity has shown its true colors by joining its Communist brethren in Moscow and surrendering China, our traditional friend, to the tender mercies of Stalin and his raiders. This whole move has been aided and abetted and planned by the Communists who have infiltrated into the inner circles of our Government.

It will not be long now before the nations that the internationalists have been supplying with our taxpayers' money will line up against their United States benefactor; then this Nation's young men will have to face the Communist armies of the organized nations to the east of us and to the west of us. UNRRA and ECA and the internationalists have done their deadly work and sooner or later the people will pay for this with their material treasures and the blood of their boys.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of Monday, January 9, 1950:

FORMOSA

Mr. Truman's announcement that the United States would do nothing to keep the Chinese Communists out of Formosa preceded by a few hours Britain's recognition of Communist China's Peiping government. Britain no longer recognizes the Chiang Kai-shek government.

Mr. Truman's Anglophile administration and State Department had unquestionably been notified of Britain's intentions, and the President faithfully brought American policy into conformity with them. The fact that he and Secretary Acheson have not yet extended formal recognition and the possibility that they may not do so later do not alter this judgment.

Britain's principal interest is to preserve her billion-dollar investment in China, her long-established China trade, and her title to the crown colony of Hong Kong. It is incumbent upon her to cosy up to the Chinese Communists, even at a considerable sacrifice in self-respect, in order to hold what she has. An Associated Press report is that she has exceeded the minimum requirements to curry favor by selling 30 British tank landing ships and a number of motor-boats to the Communists at Hong Kong for use in their coming invasion of Formosa.

Mr. Truman and Secretary Acheson can serve British interests quite effectively by denying further support to Nationalist resistance without going the whole way and recognizing the Communist regime. In this way they separate themselves from the British only in the sense that we are left to carry on a technical opposition to the Chinese Communists, while the British carry on the trade with them.

By thus placing us at a disadvantage their policy works out for the benefit of England—which is the usual goal of American foreign policy.

ADMINISTRATION GOES ISOLATIONIST

The Truman administration, in abandoning all of China to the Communists, with Formosa to follow, has gone isolationist with a vengeance. This decision means that Soviet Russia's Chinese satellite will now be installed in the same threatening position on the flank of America's outposts and communications as Japan was in 1941, when Formosa was under Japanese rule.

The parallel is heightened by the fact that the Communists are preparing an invasion of Hainan Island, in the south China Sea, which Japan seized from China in 1939. From Formosa the bombing run to the American base at Okinawa is 300 miles, and to the American bases in the Philippines 250 miles. It will be recalled that Jap planes from Formosa wiped out the American Air Force in the Philippines at the very outset of the Pacific war in December 1941.

In 1941 Mr. Roosevelt brought the United States to war with Japan on the theory that a China under partial domination by Japan was a threat to American survival, and that Japanese occupation of such other positions as Hainan and Formosa was contrary to the interests of America and her imperialist friends. Now Mr. Truman would have us believe that, although he regards communism as a threat to the survival of free government everywhere, and although the Communists of Mao Tse-tung are allied with Stalin, a China wholly controlled by the Communists is to be regarded as a matter of indifference to the United States, and Communist control of the strategic bases of Formosa and Hainan need not disturb us.

If Mr. Truman's view is correct, Mr. Roosevelt's certainly could not have been correct. Mr. Truman is, in effect, conceding that his predecessor plunged the United States into a wholly unnecessary and terribly costly war, to no purpose at all. For all of the objects that Mr. Roosevelt regarded as essential to be attained through his war policy have now been sacrificed by Mr. Truman's policy of neutrality. Russia and its Chinese agents are conceded everything which, when held by Japan, was supposed to make war by America imperative.

MORRISON POLICY IS UNCERTAIN

This confusion of foreign policy is rendered still more ludicrous by the fact that, while Mr. Truman, in pursuit of his policy of containing Russia's aggressive expansion, corks up the European end of the bottle, he leaves the Asiatic end open. While he deems Chiang to be a person unworthy of American support, he and his Ambassador in Belgrade, George V. Allen, vow that they will oppose any Russian aggression against Yugoslavia. Thus they make a distinction in favor of the shabby Communist Nationalist dictator, Tito, who not so long ago was killing American aviators.

The whole development of present official administration attitudes toward China and Formosa demonstrates the folly of Mr. Roosevelt's war and the fatuity of Mr. Roosevelt's and Mr. Truman's personal war diplomacy. It demonstrates, also, the subservience of American foreign policy to British interests and the irrationality of spending twenty-three billion annually on a cold war to stop communism in the west while it is permitted to run wild in the east. Mr. Truman's decision that China is none of our business is a decision which Mr. Roosevelt should have reached 8 years ago.

Freedom and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the remarks made by me on Thursday, January 5, 1950, at the ceremonies attending the visit of the New York State Freedom Train to Bay Shore, Long Island, in my home township of Islip, N. Y.:

Save for such parts of the past as have enriched us by experience and may be resummoned by recollection, history for us is a scroll of object lessons seldom learned. However, when we individuals wrest so little profit from mistakes that have resulted in personal disappointment or anguish, it is small wonder that the collective experience of the ages has proven so poor a palliative against tragedy.

Our recorded approach to history sometimes seems to me ranting and vainglorious and, unconsciously or otherwise, designed to magnify our globe-dwelling ego as though we traveled into the future's space with a comet's blazing beauty in our wake, instead of crawling as we do through the centuries, dragging history behind us like a long chain of mortal and venial sins. Saga and song have aggrandized our slow progression, highlighting all epic events, recounting the splendors and importance of men and principalities. Even as the kings of old had their sweet singers—David to praise Saul in Israel, the bards to harp Ireland's greatness at Tara—modern nations and public men have press agents to herald and interpret their events and actions. Distortion is inevitable, confusion is to be expected.

Much that historians should have recorded has been left to the novelists. Stephen Crane in his Red Badge of Courage, Remarque in All Quiet on the Western Front, and more latterly, Mailler in The Naked and the Dead, show the fumbling admixture of sordid and splendid that compose outcomes known as history, and how pathetically the individual man is bewildered by his puppet-like compulsions. For him the present itself is unrelated.

Historians have yet to give us an integrated picture of the past wherein so much ancient and new now appears foolish beyond belief until we realize that reflective review requires only evaluation and not the exercise of judgment, and that history is as much a matter of judgment as it is continual struggle against nature and the nature of man.

Unquestionably of all studies, history is the most fascinating, unrolling for us as it does—in picture after picture of passion and sublimity, sweat, and vanity—the leavening, making and crumbling of gens and tribes and nations. Even though we may view it with the irony the Welsh put in their proverb—"Human history is similar to the heroic tales pigs relate of swine"—we cannot but be deeply moved by the rare moments in time when man has manifested his spiritual nature through action for freedom and human dignity.

In such high moments America's patrimony is great and rich and of this happy benefice, the Freedom Train carries much precious documented proof, evidence that arouses and inspires. In incentive to freedom we are a Nation singularly endowed, and this incentive, this latent desire which mounts up like fire when the winds reach it, is our true wealth, our treasure.

Without it America would coarsen and turn its will in crassness to building a silk-lined corncrib for security. There is nothing wrong with security. Unlike sin, no one "is agin it," and come the millennium, I might hasten to add, we shall have it.

In the meantime, though every child knows actuality's fingers prick bubbles, the delectable delusion that security can be rolled off the White House lawn like a wonderful and imperishable egg, seems to be making the rounds in so-called adult circles.

Many serious thinkers are disturbed by the problem this puff-and-promise game is propounding. Included among them is my honored and long-time friend, Bernard M. Baruch, who discussed the subject at length with me when I visited with him recently in his New York home. He does not know the answer, he says, nor do I.

How can we best serve the common welfare, now and ultimately? Can we buy future security with today's dollars in the light of possible dollar-value fluctuations? Should we lay away funds for security payments at a stated retirement age in terms of units cashable at a movable rate to be computed annually during those years payment is made? Should the basic substistance need of the individual be determined and fixed like a parity price, with the government or the social security funds coming through with the differentials?

These are merely questions concerning the social security system that I throw out to you. Actually my concern is comprehensive, as I pointed out some 3 years ago when I addressed the Sons of the American Revolution in Manhattan and said:

"America, meshed in economic complexity, can only retain its place untrammeled in the forefront of free men if it improves its social structure with emphasis on economic independence and not on social security.

"When I talk of social security I do not refer to the old-age pension system, a thing for which I fought in the New York State Legislature when it was exceedingly unpopular with the leaders of my own party. Then, as now, I considered it a sad

commentary on the involved financial structure controlling our great wealth that men need cry out to the State for aid in sickness or old age. I believed then, as I do now, that through education, scholastic and civic, and without sacrifice of the primary concept of freedom, the time could eventually come when there would be no underprivileged.

"Our freedom today is threatened by the mounting economic pyramid of developing industrial civilization. Built on the broad base of American free enterprise, this pyramid is ever narrowing. As it grows it is limited, tier by tier, by monopoly and specialization. When its apex is reached free enterprise will be done for and freedom will be gone. * * * The mechanized civilization we have built will circumscribe us with constraints unless we are watchful. Freedom shall be a small thing dwarfed by security.

"Unless we concern ourselves passionately with freedom, how shall we place it comparatively? Unless we are enamored of it, how shall we say it is not to be superseded? What was a conviction with Washington and the creators of America, will be a mere historical footnote of an era's aspiration if our desire for easy living distorts our sense of proportion and we erroneously diminish the great."

What I said 3 years ago still seems true to me and so I repeat it, though perhaps today when honored to address you who have come to view the Freedom Train, my time should have been devoted to listing documents aboard these richly freighted cars and expounding upon their significance as it resumes through to me. I must confess, however, to not getting much beyond the name of the train itself, for there is something about the very words "Freedom Train" that sets one to thinking in wide measure.

Everything to be seen will interest you I know, for it was my pleasure, as one of the Regents of the University of the State of New York, to have a part in preparing the train and sending it on its way.

It carries the original draft by Abraham Lincoln of the emancipation proclamation with corrections in the handwriting of Seward; the "Duke's Laws," enacted in Hempstead in 1665 to protect labor; and the Flushing Remonstrance, sometimes called "the First Declaration of Independence," that firm protest of the Quakers to Peter Stuyvesant against restriction of worship. These and many other of the exhibits will have great meaning for you, including the petition of the coopers of Southampton and East Hampton against unfair competition in one of our early Long Island industries. All these documents, manuscripts, and imprints collected and collated by the New York State Freedom Train Commission, represent tangible evidence that when jeopardy of inherent rights and allowable privileges arouses men, men make such history as that which shapes an America—a country, that will, with God's help, continue to keep clear the rails upon which a freedom train may forever run.

Our Retreat From Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York World-Telegram and the Sun dated Friday, January 6, 1950:

OUR RETREAT FROM ASIA

President Truman's refusal to give either military supplies or advice to the Chinese Nationalists in their fight to save Formosa from the Communists may prove the most fateful decision of his administration.

China held the key to the situation on the Asiatic mainland. When it was lost western civilization was left with no dependable ally there.

That pushed us back out to sea, behind a defense line based on the islands of Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines. Formosa, in Red hands, will endanger that whole line.

In September 1947 Lt. Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer recommended that Manchuria be placed under a United Nations trusteeship, and submitted a program to the President which he believed would save China from communism. His memorandum contained this warning:

"Continued deterioration of the situation may result in the early establishment of a Soviet satellite government in Manchuria, and ultimately in the evolution of a Communist-dominated China."

General Wedemeyer's plan for positive action was suppressed in favor of then Secretary of State Marshall's do-nothing policy, which in turn was succeeded by Secretary Acheson's wait-and-see policy.

So, while our Government sat on its hands, both of General Wedemeyer's dire predictions have come to pass.

In March 1948 General MacArthur joined General Wedemeyer in urging a positive policy in the Pacific. He said, in part:

"The Chinese problem is a part of a global situation which should be considered in its entirety * * * for if we embark upon a general policy to bulwark the frontiers of freedom against the assaults of political despotism, one major front is no less important than another, and a decisive breach of any will inevitably threaten to engulf all."

Loss of China broke the Asiatic frontier, and loss of Formosa will breach our defenses in the Pacific.

However, though the President's attitude toward the Formosan issue has been clarified, the issue has not been settled, as Senator VANDENBERG has warned. Debate on that issue has just begun.

Britain and France did not secure "peace in our time" at Munich, and Britain and the United States cannot buy peace in Asia by compromising with totalitarianism there. Meanwhile, if the Chinese Nationalists, left to their own meager resources, can withstand an armed attack on Formosa, President Truman and the British Foreign Office may find to their chagrin that they have been backing the wrong horse.

Deliberately Placing a Communistic Enemy Across From Our Western Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to note that the press is taking notice, through some of the articles of the outstanding columnists, that this administration has been betrayed by the British Fabian Socialist government. The propaganda of the communists in this country has been so effective that the citizens have ignored the warnings that some of us have given them and they have swallowed the propaganda of the administration hook, line, and sinker.

I am inserting the article entitled "These Days" by George Sokolsky to give it wider circulation among the people who will suffer most as a result of the bertrayal of their interests by the department of the government which is supposed to protect the people of this country in their foreign relations.

The article which I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD, under consent heretofore given, appeared in the Times-Herald of January 9, 1950:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Having given China to Soviet Russia, the Yalta traditionalists in the State Department are faced by the sharp fact that their British mentors are fast at work preparing for arrangements with Soviet Russia that would, if successful, isolate the United States more effectively than any "America Firster" ever dreamed possible.

The British have to be understood, if we are to see this picture clearly. They realize that there are to be no additional gifts to Great Britain beyond our current commitments under the Marshall plan.

They would like an additional $2,000,000,000, but they can read the signs of the times and it is obvious that the next Congress will reduce rather than increase the burden of foreign assistance. Therefore, they would, on the continent of Europe, like to increase east-west trade; that is, the trade between England and such countries as Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Soviet Russia.

It should be recalled that this idea was included in the Marshall plan, but did not develop because the iron-curtain countries refused to join the Marshall plan.

The British had to be cautioned not to sell goods sent to them from the United States to such countries and there was at one time a bit of a scandal concerning that.

At any rate, the British have been very busy fixing up the east-west trade and their economic relations may force them to become a neutral as between the United States and Soviet Russia. Such neutrality, in the political field, could tie us in a knot in the United Nations.

As regards China, the British concern themselves only with trade relations and whatever arrangements they can make with the Chinese Communists concerning Hong Kong, which cannot be adequately defended by the British.

Before the China war (1931), the British had a commercial and industrial capital investment in China of about $1,500,000,000. Such firms as the British-American Tobacco Co., Jardine's, Butterfield & Swire, the Hong Kong and Shanghai bank, and many others are tremendously important in Britain's world economic picture.

If the Chinese Communists follow the universal Marxian pattern, they will, in time, seize and nationalize all property.

The British would like to salvage what they can and to hold it for as long as possible. All that they can offer the Chinese Communists as a quid pro quo is recognition and such trade as would aid Mao Tse-tung's regime, which is at this time particularly short of foodstuffs and construction materials.

It could be a profitable barter trade, the Chinese providing hides, skins, silk, tea, or other exports. It is a trade to which the British are accustomed.

Hong Kong is an island, rising to a deep peak. At the base of the hill is a mass of Chinese. Opposite is an area called Kowloon which is also inhabited by Chinese.

Hong Kong itself produces practically nothing but is dependent upon a hinterland, the center of which is Canton, now in Communist hands. It would be easy to starve Hong Kong. A general strike would leave the city without essential services.

Therefore, if the Communists decide to take Hong Kong, they can do it by starvation and attrition. No military force which the British could muster in China would be sufficient to save the city.

The problem for the British then is whether they are prepared to abandon Hong Kong or make a deal with the Chinese Communists, whose bargaining power is enormous.

On the other hand, Chiang Kai-shek is not altogether without strength. The next few months will show whether his guerrilla forces can be effective. His base on Formosa could be made good for some time for guerrilla operations in southern and western China.

Furthermore, Formosa lies on the Philippines-Japan defenses of the United States. With Formosa in Russian hands, General MacArthur's situation in Japan would finally become untenable.

He admits that the effort of the State Department to minimize the strategic position of Formosa is deceitful propaganda in support of the British and may, with safety, be discounted.

The soundest proposition would be to relieve the State Department of its responsibility for our China policy, which it has messed up beyond belief, and to turn the Formosan problem over to the Department of Defense so that it may come under the aegis of General MacArthur.

New England Hopes To Have Its Own Steel Plant—Freedom From Steel Monopoly Sought by the Six New England States—Small Business Will Be Greatly Helped by New England Steel Plant—Many Regions West of Mississippi Still on Steel Starvation Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, plans of New Englanders for a steel mill to turn out 1,250,000 tons of steel ingots annually seem close to maturity. This will be an integrated mill which will have a finished steel capacity of over a million tons of hot- and cold-rolled sheets, bars, and light plates. More than 2,000 acres of land will be required for this plant, which will employ approximately 5,000 persons. This mill, when completed, will be a magnificent contribution to New England's economy. Since the beginning of the steel industry in this country, New England has paid a heavy toll, through the price-fixing mechanics of the basing-point system, for raw and semifinished steel to keep its thousands of metalworking and fabricating plants in operation.

New Englanders have long operated small, medium, and large plants manufacturing fine tools and hundreds of mechanical appliances which have been distributed throughout the country. New England is noted for its quality products in this field.

NEW ENGLAND AT A DISADVANTAGE WITHOUT STEEL-PRODUCING CAPACITY

Over the years, New England has hauled its steel in from distant points, manufactured it into various products which were shipped back over the same lines from whence came the raw materials for the manufacture of these products. Thus, competitively, New England was at a disadvantage against products produced by factories in the Ohio Valley and Midwest which were close to steel plants. The outlawing of the basing-point system has undoubtedly spurred New Englanders on with the hope of finally having, partially at least, its own steel supply. It is understood that the ore is expected to be hauled in by water from the newly explored deposits in Labrador and that coal for coking and other purposes, produced in the southern Appalachian fields, will flow in, also by water, from Hampton Roads, Va. Limestone is plentiful in nearby locations.

NEW ENGLANDERS PRAISED FOR COURAGE AND FORESIGHT

New Englanders have a big raw-materiel supply problem in undertaking to build this mill. Their foresight and courage to overcome all of these obstacles is to be highly commended. In comparison, the flow of raw materials into the Lone Star plant at Daingerfield is relatively simple. Lone Star mines in Oklahoma have as fine a coking coal as is produced in the Appalachian fields. Its large body of ore nearby and limestone and other materials are accessible and convenient. New England is to be congratulated for conceiving and carrying out plans to take care of a portion of its steel needs in the face of such tremendous obstacles.

MANY AREAS ON STEEL-STARVATION BASIS

Many great areas of our country, particularly west of the Mississippi, have been on a starvation basis, as far as the supply of steel is concerned, for the last 50 years or more. The time has come for these regions to throw off the shackles which have bound them to the steel trust and to build their own steel plants. There are many bodies of low-grade ore in this country where a plentiful supply of fuel is available, as well as limestone and other ingredients suitable for the manufacture of steel.

We have come to accept, no matter how thoroughly we dislike, a huddle of steel plants in a few spots east of the Mississippi River. This is all right as far as it goes, but this country needs, from the standpoint of both utility and national defense, more steel-producing capacity closer to the point of consumption. Again I commend the enterprise of the New Englanders and hope that other great sections of our country will profit by their example.

New York Times and Labor Note Progress of Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the annual TVA report elicited commendatory comments from newspapers with widely differing editorial attitudes. Labor scoffed at those who in speaking of TVA "make a lot of noise about socialism, and the Welfare State" and added that the actual TVA accomplishments "makes the woeful prophets look silly and should make every American proud."

The New York Times, in a different tone, praises TVA accomplishments and says it "continues to be a success." I ask that the two editorials be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From Labor for January 7, 1950]

NORRIS AND ROOSEVELT ALSO WERE CALLED SOCIALISTS—BUT SEE WHAT THEIR GREAT TVA HAS DONE—SAME CRY NOW RAISED AGAINST TRUMAN

Politicians and propagandists who are on the pay roll of the predatory interests continue to make a lot of noise about socialism, the welfare state, and how they are ruining our country. This is not the first nor loudest noise made by these gentlemen.

Back in the 1930's, power-trust propagandists led a furious shouting against socialism. They were positive the country was headed for the rocks of ruin, because the late Senator George W. Norris and President Roosevelt were teaming up to create the TVA.

For 16 years the Tennessee Valley Authority has been carrying on the Norris-Roosevelt program. Have the dire predictions about it come true? Far from it. On the contrary the TVA this week published an annual report which makes the woeful prophets look silly and should make every American proud.

"The seven-State valley served by the TVA," the report points out, "is becoming more and more productive, both agriculturally and industrially. Its resources, being more efficiently conserved and used, have strengthened both the region and the country as a whole.

"Average income per person in the Valley increased from $148 in 1933 to $797 in 1947," the last year for which figures are available. That is a rise of 440 percent, compared with only 260 percent for the entire United States."

By its system of 27 dams and reservoirs, TVA has reduced floods in the Tennessee and lower Ohio and Mississippi River Basins, saving the people of those vast regions tens of millions of dollars annually.

By soil conservation, improvement of navigation, wiping out malarial mosquitoes, improving farming methods and fertilizers, and providing new facilities for the people's recreation, Uncle Sam's great public enterprise has brought untold benefits to the citizens of the region and Nation.

All that, and more, on top of achieving the purpose of which most people think when they read or hear the famous initials TVA—production of plentiful and cheap electric power. Here, too, great success is reported.

In 1949, TVA power cost the average residential consumer only 1.4 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with the national average of 2.98 cents. That's a saving of more than 50 percent.

Incidentally, consumers all over the United States would be paying much more for electricity if Uncle Sam's TVA yardstick had not educated the people and forced private utility companies to bring their rates down.

Yet, while providing power at less than half the average price, TVA in 1949 made a profit of $21,000,000, or 5 percent on the money Uncle Sam invested in his power yardstick.

No private corporation could or would dream of undertaking such a huge all-around development of an immense region and its resources, for the benefit of its people and the entire country.

Yet politicians and propagandists—of the same kind now shouting "welfare state" at President Truman—screamed "socialism" at Norris and Roosevelt when they asked Congress to create the TVA.

[From the New York Times]

PROGRESS ON THE TENNESSEE

By every measurable test the Tennessee Valley Authority continues to be a success. Its sixteenth annual report shows an annual production of nearly 16,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or about 10 times as much electricity as was available in its area in 1933. In 1933, 3 percent of the farms in the area were electrified; now the proportion is 94 percent and growing. The improved Tennessee last year carried 427,000,000 tons of freight, or 13 times the load it did in 1933. TVA has taken the lead in conservation measures to protect soil, forests and wild life; it has had a large share in the nearly complete elimination of malaria. Private business has flourished. The per capita income in TVA territory has gone up from $148 in 1933 to $777 this year—still below the national average but increasing much more rapidly than the national average.

TVA's great building period is nearly over. It has constructed 17 dams and operates a system of 27 major dams and reservoirs. To the installations on the Tennessee and its tributaries will be added dams being built by the Army on the Cumberland, power from which will be distributed by TVA. By 1952 TVA expects to be turning out 22,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, for which a ready market will be found. All this has been done with much less mandatory legal power than most people outside of the Tennessee Valley suppose.

The argument as to whether TVA is in unfair competition with the privately owned electrical industry may long continue. On the face of this report and other official documents it seems likely that TVA is paying sums in lieu of taxes and sums to the Federal Government out of its net profits that come close to being equivalent to the taxes it would have to pay if it were a private enterprise. In addition to these payments, municipalities which operate their own distribution plants are earning net incomes which, in effect, are a species of tax on the ultimate consumer. The real argument for the TVA principle remains substantially what it has always been: that the multiple-purpose development of a great river is too huge an enterprise to be entrusted to a private monopoly. What we can hope to get out of such enterprises, publicly owned and managed, is decentralized and democratic management and the least possible amount of interference with local communities and private businesses. We think that in these objectives TVA has set an admirable example.

The ECA Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the observations of a noted columnist, George Rockwell Brown, who has been an ardent and able supporter of sound government throughout the years, and who has been so recognized by all thoughtful people, are pertinent with reference to our foreign situation, and I am placing them in part in the Appendix of the RECORD, under consent heretofore granted. These remarks appeared in the Times-Herald of January 9, 1950:

Congress has repeatedly voted Marshall-plan money to keep the Socialist-Labor Government at London in power.

It has permitted the financing with ECA funds of organized British effort to steal the American domestic market with the ultimate object of flooding this country with British goods, and sending American working men and women to the unemployment-relief agency.

It has poured billions into Europe, ostensibly to stop the march of communism, whilst the Truman government was steadily and stealthily permitting the march of communism in Asia. Another ECA appropriation bill is in the making.

Congress can deny further aid to Britain on two grounds, one that it is financing the extension of state socialism with American tax money; secondly, that British recognition of the Communist government of China defeats the whole purpose of the Marshall plan.

Against such a program of courageous Americanism the administration will bring to bear all its power and strength.

If socialism fails in Britain, this spring or summer, as it has in New Zealand and Australia, the Truman welfare state will be on its way out in November.

And well does it know it.

Socialism Suffers New Set-Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Star and Herald of Panama City, Panama, of December 11, 1949:

SOCIALISM SUFFERS NEW SET-BACK

After 8 years of experimenting with socialism, the Australians yesterday voted the Laborites out of office and placed a Liberal-Country Party coalition in office.

Socialism received the same set-back almost a fortnight ago in New Zealand, where a Socialist regime had been in office for 14 years.

As Lord Woolton, chairman of the Conservative Organization of Great Britain, said last night, both Australia and New Zealand have tried out socialism and found it lacking and they now know from experience that it just does not bring contentment and a higher standard of living.

It would be interesting to see what the captive peoples who live on the fringe of Red Russia would do to their Communist regimes if they were afforded such an opportunity as the free people of Australia and New Zealand to express their will without fear of repressive reprisals by the armed minority which holds the rights of people in absolute contempt.

Unfortunately, those people live in a so-called new democracy, wholly bereft of the freedoms which we of the old democracy enjoy. To these freedoms we owe the progress of civilization to its present stage; to their regimentation they owe the iron curtain that blacks out the rest of the world from their eyes and keeps them under the yoke of the tyrants who usurped their human rights.

It is possible that the next people to cut themselves free of the Socialist experiment in government will be those of the United Kingdom. Their lot has been a tragic one. They are still just as badly off, if not worse than during those trying days when the Nazi blitz and submarine blockade forced short rations as an unavoidable necessity.

Many billions of dollars have rolled into Britain's treasury from the United States and apparently rolled out just as easily, without doing any apparent good under the present Socialist regime. Many industries have been nationalized but the benefits, if any, of this drastic action do not seem to have advanced the welfare of the people to any appreciable extent. Of what good then, has been the Socialist experiment? If it failed in Britain, it surely must fail anywhere else.

Only when shielded behind an iron curtain can socialism be made to appear as a success by the distortions and half-truths of the propagandists.

The New Zealanders and the Australians no doubt have sounded the death knell of socialism as a governing system in the Western World.

What the A & P Ads Don't Reveal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have before me the November 5, 1949, issue of America, also known as the Catholic Review of the Week. The feature article, prominently listed on the cover page, is entitled "What the A. & P. Ads Don't Reveal—the Law Catches Up With the Nation's Big Grocer."

AMERICA—CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

This review of the A. & P. matter by one of the country's most respected weeklies is worthy of attention by all of us, particularly doubting Thomases who may still think that A. & P. is being abused by the Government's present suit to compel it to end its monopolistic practices.

A. & P. ALREADY CONVICTED IN CRIMINAL TRIAL

The article brings out clearly what the A. & P. advertisements studiously omit—that A. & P. has already been criminally

convicted on the charges in the present suit, the purpose of which is merely to enjoin and prevent A. & P. from continuing activities already found to be unlawful.

PRESENT ACTION IS CIVIL

The present suit is a civil action, and is being tried for the Government by J. Francis Hayden, former chief of the New York office of the Antitrust Division.

With the leave of the Speaker and the Members of this House, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article in America, as follows:

WHAT THE A. & P. ADS DON'T REVEAL

(By Robert F. Drinan)

The announcement by the Department of Justice on September 15, 1949, of a civil suit to break up the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. for repeated violations of the Federal antimonopoly laws came as a surprise to most consumers who, taken in by A. & P.'s adroit public relations, felt that this mammoth chain was one of the unmixed blessings of the American housewife. The A. & P. also pretended to be surprised. In a series of four Nation-wide, full-page newspaper advertisements, it claimed that the Justice Department was operating on a false interpretation of the antitrust laws and that the company was guilty of nothing except selflessly building up its giant grocery business with the sole purpose of providing the American consumer with better food more cheaply. The advertisements could deceive only the more naive. They were promptly and publicly repudiated by the United States Attorney General.

The truth of the matter is that the A. & P. has behind it a 25-year record of violations of the antitrust laws, a record built up in its attempt to dominate and control the retail grocery business in the United States. The pyramiding of manufacturing, distributing and holding companies which make up the gargantuan A. & P. is one of the most incredible stories in American industrial history.

It all started innocently enough with the opening of the first A. & P. some 90 years ago by the Hartford family. By 1925, however, the company owned 14,220 of the 46,800 chain grocery stores in America. In that year a complete reorganization of the A. & P. into 14 distinct corporations took place. No managerial revolution overtook them, because George and John Hartford, heirs of the company's founder, remained as A. & P.'s top executives. Keeping a very close control over the entire organization, they perpetuated their ancestor's drive for domination of the grocery field.

After the 1925 buying policy of A. & P. became more and more one of using its strong and ever-growing power to get a lower price on merchandise purchased than that obtained by its competitors. The company sent its own agents into the field disguised as independent brokers. The suppliers would pay the ordinary brokerage fees, which would, of course, immediately be transferred into the coffers of A. & P. In 1935 gross revenues from this source alone approached $3,000,000. This system of sham brokerages continued to operate until it was made illegal by the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936. The small-business men of America engineered this legislation through Congress. It provided, also, among other things, that any price-discrimination in favor of purchasers of large quantities of goods would be illegal, unless the discount was based on actual savings to the supplier.

In an effort to evade this new legislation, A. & P. then instructed its buyers to induce A. & P.'s suppliers to reduce their price by the amount of the brokerage fee now outlawed. If the suppliers protested or refused, the company threatened to refuse to buy from them or to set up its own manufacturing plant for the item in question. Most suppliers succumbed. Once again A. & P. had the edge over its competitors, at least until the Federal Trade Commission issued a cease-and-desist order against evasion of the Robinson-Patman Act. The Third Circuit Court of Appeals sustained FTC, and in 1940 the Supreme Court refused to review the case.

Indomitable A. & P. now resorted to "direct buying"—again a disguise, because the great grocery chain insisted that its suppliers pay A. & P. for advertising of their products, for sales promotion, and other such services, found to be largely fictional by the courts. Since the funds from these "advertising allowances" took the place of the forbidden brokerage fees, A. & P. continued to undersell the market and overcome its competitors.

At this juncture A. & P. became ever more subtle in its attempts to obtain discriminatory allowances. It required certain suppliers to file with the corporation letters, framed by A. & P., certifying that no concessions were tendered A. & P. in violation of the Robinson-Patman Act. At the same time, however, the grocery chain insisted on its rebates camouflaged as "advertising allowances." During this period, too, the company consolidated its far-flung chain into supermarkets and accepted deliveries to the retail outlets at a discounted price, while it protested against direct deliveries from its suppliers to the stores of its rivals. Another less lucrative but valuable way of securing secret rebates was A. & P.'s custom of furnishing bags and labels to its own manufacturers at a substantial mark-up from the cost of these items.

THE GOVERNMENT BRINGS ACTION

These practices were continued until February 1944 when the Antitrust Bureau of the Department of Justice brought action against A. & P., alleging a conspiracy to restrain interstate commerce and to monopolize a substantial part of the retail food market. The suit was criminal, an action reserved for willful or repeated offenders against the antitrust laws. After a trial lasting several months, A. & P. was found guilty of violating the Sherman Act, and in February 1949 the trial court's verdict was affirmed by the circuit court of appeals in a decision written by Judge Sherman Minton, recently appointed to the United States Supreme Court.

The trial court's decision made it clear that there is no law to prevent the normal expansion of a business, that there is no objection to the mere size of a corporation even if the resources and strength of the corporation give it a dominating place in the industry. Neither horizontal integration nor vertical integration is in itself illegal under the Sherman Act. The use of this concentrated power becomes illegal, however, when, by reason of intent or the inherent nature of contemplated acts, the public interest is prejudiced by the restriction of competition.

The A. & P. trial has brought out into the open the hidden role of the corporation's alter ego, the Atlantic Commission Co., commonly called ACCO. This vast wholesale purchasing company, incorporated by A. & P. in 1928, purchased in huge quantities, sold to A. & P. at preferential rates and to its competitors at tidy profits. In 1940, ACCO handled about 12 percent of the total national movement of fresh fruits and produce. ACCO's size and power have frequently permitted it to reserve to itself the right to set prices unilaterally.

A. & P.'s greatest profits have been derived from the hidden mark-up on all merchandise transferred from ACCO to A. & P.'s 8,000 retail outlets. In fact, the annual earnings from ACCO alone have very nearly approached the total retail earnings of all the stores. Because of this hidden income, A. & P. has been able to undersell, even at a loss, where necessary, all competitors in a certain substantial territory and thus, by this lethal weapon, force all other grocers out of business. When State minimum mark-up laws made such practices illegal, A. & P. would neatly evade the laws by underbilling the products from their own manufacturing plants and from ACCO to the retail outlets. When competition was dead, the A. & P. would then raise its prices above normal, recoup its losses and settle down to enjoy the fruits of relative monopoly in the territory in question.

ACCO—A. & P.'S PAC

With the help of ACCO, the A. & P. has organized the Better Business Association, Inc., to protect A. & P.'s interests, but never has A. & P. let it appear to the public that this association was financed and dominated by the grocery chain itself. Likewise, A. & P. has operated behind the front of the Emergency Tax Council of New Jersey, which, supposedly in the name of and for the sake of the public, conducted a State-wide campaign against special taxes on supermarkets. A. & P. also organized the National Consumers' Tax Commission of Illinois, for the ostensible purpose of studying taxes but actually to express A. & P.'s views on the chain-store-tax question.

Closely connected with this phase of A. & P.'s activities were ACCO's attempts to organize various producers' cooperatives, some of which ACCO sought to dominate, others of which it sought to direct, all with the intent, of course, of securing reduced wholesale prices for A. & P. ACCO's most ambitious effort along these lines was the organization of the Super-Co-op, an association dominated by the grocery chain and designated to give ACCO greater control over its suppliers, but camouflaged to make it appear that the shippers themselves were the moving force in the organization. Super-Co-op was to be used as a propaganda agency to fight A. & P.'s enemies and to induce the movement of all fruits and vegetables through ACCO. Super-Co-op was abandoned, however, because of the admitted fear that it was too apparent an attempt to monopolize the entire produce industry.

Restraint of competition must inevitably follow, the trial court held, from the multiple, irreconcilable, inconsistent functions of ACCO, including its obligation as an agent for sellers to sell high and its obligation as a buying agent for A. & P. to purchase as cheaply as possible. ACCO, said the Court, is the "rotten thread" that runs through the entire corporate structure of A. & P.

THE GOVERNMENT'S SOLUTION

To effectuate last February's verdict of guilty against A. & P., the Justice Department has recently filed a civil action to enforce the Government's recommended reorganization of the company. The suit demands the complete separation of A. & P. from its vast wholesale affiliate, ACCO. The manufacturing and processing of food conducted by A. & P. must be made entirely distinct from its business of buying and selling food. The national network of A. & P. must be divided into seven separate parts, each part to be under independent ownership, control, and management. Its national headquarters purchasing departments must be abolished, and all shadow of collusion and conspiracy between the autonomous sections of the new organization is forbidden.

The Government's remedy seems drastic. Yet it only enforces the strong language of the Sherman Act passed by a Republican

Congress in 1890. The mere attempt to monopolize any part of the commerce between the various States is there made illegal. Likewise, the strong language of the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936, outlawing any discrimination in prices not based on real saving, allows but one interpretation.

The A. & P. fought back at the Government enforcement agency in a second series of full-page advertisements on September 30. The grocery chain asserted that its patrons have deluged the company with messages to the effect that the dissolution of the A. & P. will be a great loss to American businessmen. This is, of course, beside the point, since the preservation of free competition is the real good for the consumer. The stifling of competition, even if it brings present reduction in prices, will inevitably lead to partial or total monopoly, and monopoly always makes the many the victim of the few. At least, that is the underlying premise of the Sherman Antitrust Act. In the ads, A. & P. also assured the public that it is not a monopoly because some years ago it controlled 11 percent of the retail grocery business and today it controls only 6 percent. This is merely in line, however, with the Government's position that bigness is not necessarily badness unless the power inherent in bigness is abused.

Other arguments put forth by A. & P. in this second series of advertisements are not worth answering. We can be grateful at least that the newspaper editorial writers have not echoed A. & P.'s misrepresentations of the issue, although it is probably a foregone conclusion that the public will hear nothing of the truth of the matter, even during the long negotiations between the company and the Antitrust Bureau which will now begin.

A. & P.'s suppressed major premise is its belief in limitless free competition, a system which results, as Pius XI put it so well in Quadragesimo Anno, in the "survival of those who are the strongest, which means those who fight most relentlessly, who pay least heed to the dictates of conscience." Even the inadequate existing antimonopoly legislation in the United States will prevent such a result if this legislation is properly enforced. The A. & P. has done its bit to obscure the value of such legislation in the public eye.

The corporation skilled legal staff will spend the next several months in defending the practices of its employer. Victory for the Government, however, is all but certain, even though it will cost the taxpayer several hundred thousand dollars to prove that A. & P. is wrong. I hope that the money will not be entirely wasted, insofar as it will further the preservation of the system of free, but not entirely unrestricted, competition which is an essential and valuable part of the American way.

Betrayal Completed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial that appeared in one of the Nation's leading newspapers, the Omaha World-Herald, on January 6, 1950. The editorial is as follows:

BETRAYAL COMPLETED

Now the betrayal of Nationalist China by its allies in World War II is complete. President Truman has announced that the United States will not aid in the defense of Chiang's last fortress, Formosa.

In the opinion of many responsible Americans—among them, ex-President Hoover, Senator Taft and, reputedly, Douglas MacArthur—the interests of the United States also have been betrayed.

Whether the President was chiefly influenced by the State Department, or by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or by the Government of Great Britain, was not stated.

But this much is known:

The Joint Chiefs had proposed sending a mission to Tokyo and Formosa in February, to consult with General MacArthur and to study western defense plans. The President's decision short-circuits that proposal, and gives a direct slap to America's greatest authority on Pacific warfare.

Some days before the Presidential decision was announced, word leaked out that Secretary Acheson had sent a secret memorandum to his men in striped pants, advising them that the capture of Formosa by the Communists was widely anticipated, and that the American public should be prepared in advance for the loss of the militarily unimportant island.

In other words, the abandonment of Formosa was an Acheson policy before it was announced as a Truman policy.

Whatever its origin, abandonment of Formosa is a logical extension of the appeasement policies begun at Yalta. There the late President Roosevelt pledged to Stalin that Russia could have Manchuria, the Kuriles, Sakhalin Island, Port Arthur, almost anything else she wanted, if only she would join, sometime, in the war against Japan.

Chiang, one of the allied Big Five, didn't hear about the Yalta deal until 4 months afterward. When he learned of it, he was helpless.

Russia did enter the war against Japan—for 1 week. Then she seized the promised territory, including huge stores of war matériel which were used by the Reds against the beleaguered Chiang.

Now, with the official abandonment of Formosa by the Government in Washington, the Communist world has harvested the full fruits of Yalta.

The State Department's advocacy of the Formosa decision is especially interesting because it is primarily the work of two men.

One is Secretary Acheson, who was Assistant Secretary and Under Secretary during the war, and who is the continuity man between the Roosevelt and Truman Administrations. The China white paper issued last year under his sponsorship was an amazing exposition of the view that Chiang, not communism, was the enemy of America in the Orient.

The other architect of Asiatic policy is Philip C. Jessup, the Department's far eastern investigator. Some years ago Mr. Jessup was associated with the Institute of Pacific Relations, a propaganda organization which campaigned against Chiang and in favor of the Communist rebels. He was a supporter of Red Spain. More recently, he appeared as a character witness for Alger Hiss, the man accused of giving State Department documents to Soviet Russia.

On those two men, apparently, President Truman relied.

To General MacArthur he did not even listen.

Admittedly, a decision to defend Formosa or to strengthen Chiang's forces there would have involved the grave risk of war.

But as against that risk, the chosen policy creates prospects which are no less grave.

One is that Formosa will fall. Military men say there is little if any doubt of it. In that case it will be a Red dagger point at the Philippines, Japan, and all American outposts in the West.

Another is that the Red Government will then become the undisputed ruler of China, and as such entitled to general recognition—and to China's permanent seat on the Security Council of the United Nations. That body will then be divided 3-2 between Communists and non-Communists—with either Britain, the friend of Red China, or France, which sometimes wavers toward communism holding the balance of power.

Not a pleasant prospect for Americans to contemplate. Conceivably the consequences may be more dreadful than those which followed Munich. But it is the course which President Truman and his trusted advisers irrevocably have chosen.

We Have Forsaken Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the January 7, 1950, issue of the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post:

WE HAVE FORSAKEN FORMOSA

Why we have abandoned Formosa to the Communists, for that is what we have done, is not yet clear. President Truman has barred any United States military intervention, aid, or advice, asserting that the program conforms to the traditions of our foreign policy in China, the Cairo and Potsdam agreements, and to a United Nations resolution against any nation's seeking influence or imperial aggrandizement in China.

Did he prevent a war, a real shooting war, by leaving the island open to Communist invasion? Or has he brought us closer to a shooting war by allowing the Communists to take over an island which endangers our Pacific defense line from Japan to Okinawa and the Philippines?

The military leaders of the country were stunned by the abandonment of this Pacific bastion. They disagree fully with Secretary Acheson, who, like his predecessors in the Cabinet post have been sitting on their hands while Moscow has spread its armies and its political control all over Asia.

Intervention to save the island, and the remnants of Chiang Kai-shek's government and troops, might have gotten us into an early war with Russia, is Secretary Acheson's view. We would like some more light on that view. The administration is committed, after all, to stopping communism, yet by its decision on Formosa, it provides Russian communism with an opportunity to advance and menace our Pacific outposts.

The loss of China was bad enough, as it broke the Asiatic frontier, and as soon as the Communists step into Formosa, as they will eventually, our defenses will suffer another break. It all looks very much like a compromise with totalitarianism.

Now that Britain has given full diplomatic recognition to China's bed government, the first major break in Anglo-American accord on foreign policy in 23 years, perhaps an explanation of our policy in Asia will be forthcoming from Mr. Truman. Such an explanation is more important now than anything he said in his state of the Union address. We hope he gives it.

Abject Surrender to Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the credulity of many of our citizens under the persuasive power of propaganda seems to know no limits. Millions of our citizens know that Poland was betrayed at Yalta and they know that the existing administration has coddled the Communists and given them a key to the front door of many of the departments of our Government. The internationalists representing credulous constituencies without regard to party have voted billions of the taxpayers' money to promote and to perpetuate a Fabian socialistic government in England. Now, when the ECA notorious racket bids fair to collapse and the stream of our taxpayers' money is now to be curtailed, the Fabian socialistic government, which I repeat has been supported by internationalists, has double-crossed our people and have recognized the Communist Government set-up in China. I am wondering just how long the people are going to be bamboozled and fooled by the men who have squandered these billions and who now shout for economy and refuse to support tax reduction. I admit that they are playing a clever game of deception, but it ought to be obvious now to thoughtful people that they have been sold and are about to be again sold down the river. The administration plan now is to pass a few crumbs in the way of the elimination of excise taxes to quiet down the public urge for real tax reduction and thus preserve the larger portions of the revenues collected for further domestic and international boondoggling.

It is the people who should demand forthrightness on the part of their representatives and not be lulled into false security by the shouts for economy on the part of the most notorious spenders of the taxpayers' billions.

The economic principles which have given this country a sound economy and a safe foreign policy have been scrapped.

Under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Dorothy Thompson which appeared in a recent edition of the Washington Evening Star:

PRINCIPLES OF UNITED STATES SEEM THROWN TO WIND AT YALTA CONFERENCE—RESULTS IN CHINA DECLARED INEVITABLE; MEANING OF PARLEY STILL UNDIGESTED

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The case against the Chinese National Government and Chiang Kai-shek was presented to the State Department as early as 1934 and again in 1941 by the Japanese, who argued that Chiang was corrupt and reactionary and that this justified Japanese intervention. Then the State Department, under Mr. Hull, stood on the basis of legitimacy and international law, arguing that the incapacities of the government of a country furnished no excuse for fishing in its troubled waters. It was the maintenance of that standpoint against appeasing Japan that precipitated the war with Japan.

The viewpoint had the merit of embodying a traditional and understandable principle. It was entirely abandoned at Yalta, in February 1945.

Although the Chinese Government was an ally, our Government, in a secret agreement with Stalin, of which the Chinese Government was informed only 4 months later, effectively assured that Manchuria should fall to Russia and—if our previous attitude made any sense at all—that this would secure Russian hegemony over all China. We thereby threw previous principles of legitimacy and law to the winds, and also abandoned the only consistent China policy the United States had ever had—that of the open door and no special interests in China.

BURRAGE OF PROPAGANDA

This was preceded and followed by a barrage of American propaganda against Chiang Kai-shek and for the Chinese Communists. Leading in this propaganda were the publications of the Institute for Pacific Relations—on whose board Prof. Philip C. Jessup, now of the State Department, sat in various high capacities—which, as early as 1943, had opened a blast against the national government, presenting the issue as between feudal and democratic China.

The campaign was taken up by most American writers on China; by Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell and finally—in a veiled way—by the official white paper, whose thesis is we could have done nothing anyhow. This thesis is flatly denied by our Ambassador to China. The paper is an appalling record of the disintegration of an originally clear policy, even to the extent of justifying the Yalta deal by historical precedent—the precedent being Russian intervention in China under the Tsars.

The meaning of Yalta has still not been digested. Administration apologists (including the late Edward R. Stettinius, in his book Roosevelt and Yalta) take the line that Yalta was all right but the Russians did not respect their agreements. This is tantamount to saying Munich was all right but Hitler did not respect his agreements. Like Munich, Yalta established spheres of influence among three great powers, and contemplated a Big Three peace in a Big Three United Nations. Russia was granted special interests in east Europe and China, in no case were the Allied Governments consulted.

RESULTS WERE INEVITABLE

The fundamental thesis of Yalta was incompatible with every principle of freedom, equality, and international law. It was, therefore, incompatible with democracy. It denied every paragraph of the Atlantic Charter, and it had inevitable results.

Because the Atlantic Charter was abandoned, we have the Atlantic Pact.

Because we agreed to the division of Europe and the partition of Germany we have our frantic efforts to integrate and unite a rump Europe which is a political and economic monstrosity.

Because we recognized special Russian interests in China, overthrowing the whole concept of the open door, we have a Russian puppet government over the whole China mainland.

You cannot destroy the authority of a government in one place and restore it in another. The case against the Chinese Nationalists has been written by American officials, journalists, and policy. The Communists don't need to write a word of their own propaganda. They can quote Americans.

There is no principle of any kind we can invoke, not even the principle of nonintervention, because at Yalta we did intervene, and made a deal, which we enforced on the China Generalissimo.

We are now in the preposterous situation of standing out alone against recognizing the Communist Government which we, more than any country except Russia, helped create. It cannot be done, and certainly not by this administration. We shall have to lie in the bed made for us, though we shall not sleep. The last laugh may well be Chiang's.

Technique of Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Ira E. Bennett entitled "Technique of Point 4" which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of December 31, 1949:

TECHNIQUE OF POINT 4—PROPOSED PROGRAM LINKED CLOSELY TO NATIONAL SECURITY AND WORLD DEVELOPMENT

(By Ira E. Bennett)

The preliminary study thus far given by Congress to the so-called point-4 program reveals that the proposal is closely linked with problems of national defense and security and also that certain basic features of the program are already in successful operation in Latin America. There, through cooperation, American technique in the fields of education, sanitation, and agriculture has accomplished gratifying results at insignificant cost, and with increased assurance that enormous supplies of materials needful for hemispheric defense will be available.

It is assumed by critics of point 4 that it is a fantastic semisocialistic scheme for feeding hungry people all over the world at the expense of American taxpayers. It is described as a program for delivering a bottle of pasteurized milk daily to every Hottentot, with the compliments of the United States, in the hope that the Hottentotters will join hands in fomenting world affection, fraternity, and eternal peace.

Some of the critics insist that the scheme will not work successfully because bureaucrats will botch it in the administration itself. Others hold fast to the central idea that it is not the business of the United States to uplift lazy, swarming hordes of foreigners, and that the spending of billions of tax money for this purpose would be a crime. Hence, without examining point 4, they condemn it in toto.

A few minutes' study of point 4 reveals that the really fantastic part of the picture is the criticism of the program and not the program itself. The United States stands to gain vastly greater benefits through the program than it could gain by the expenditure of billions otherwise. While the cost to the United States—the cost in public money—will be very small, however rich the resulting benefits to the peoples of undeveloped countries by the application of American "know-how" and industrial methods to potentially great natural resources.

In the American Republics there have been exchanges of skilled advisers with good results at small cost. One expert from the American Geological Survey assisted Brazilian colleagues to map a reserve of 17,000,000 tons of manganese ore, and two other American geologists from the Survey mapped a manganese reserve of 7,500,000 tons in the Amazon area. The Bureau of Mines, according to Julius A. Krug, formerly Secretary of the Interior, has done fruitful cooperative work with Brazil, Bolivia, Mexico, and Peru.

A small technical mission to Mexico contributed substantially to an enormous expansion in fish production.

About 600 projects, large and small, are comprised within the cooperative work now going on in 19 American Republics, under the general jurisdiction of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. American experts are aiding in the task of bettering education, sanitation, and agriculture in the countries concerned.

The cost to the United States is insignificant, but the ultimate benefits are expected to be very important as the level of living standards rises and the productive capacity of the workers increases with improved health and better education.

Congress was so favorably impressed by the operations of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs that it unanimously, in the recent session, extended the life of the institute for 5 years and gave it a modest appropriation with which to finance the American share of the program.

Far-reaching political considerations are involved in the work now going on. All the American Republics are bound by the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro to act as one in case of aggression, and at the conference at Bogotá they agreed to cooperate against Communist propaganda and intrigue. In case of war it could be assumed that the resources of Central and South America, as well as those of the United States and Canada, would be made available for the defense of this hemisphere. Thus the manganese of Brazil and the uranium of Canada would help the United States to replenish its stock of strategic materials.

It is not solely in a quixotic mood, therefore, that the United States desires the increase of production in underdeveloped democratic countries. The Soviet embargo upon manganese exports to the United States means little in any event, as manganese is obtainable elsewhere; but it is a comfort to know that South America contains immense stores of this necessary component of steel.

Treaty negotiations are under way, it is said, with 16 countries for the purpose of safeguarding American capital and assuring its fair treatment while engaged in developing foreign resources.

The proposed treaties are to be the basis of policy under point 4 so far as American investments abroad are concerned. The objective is to encourage American capital to take hold of enterprises which American technical experts have found to be capable of development on a large scale with profit to the investors, and with great benefit to the producing country in the way of good wages to workers. This procedure has already brought rich returns in the development of the copper and nitrate industries of Chile by American capital. Venezuela's oil production is largely financed by Americans. Central American countries are benefited by American enterprise in developing banana production.

Altogether, it is estimated that American capital invested in foreign countries aggregates $17,000,000,000. Only $2,000,000,000 of this, however, has been invested since World War II, as capital has been wary of taking risks in politically restive countries.

The solidarity of the American republics in the matter of common defense has helped to reassure American capital that it can feel fairly safe hereafter when the republics make treaties intended to insure fair treatment and immunity from expropriation. The profit motive in such conditions could be expected to induce American capital to consummate mass production developments which would be too heavy for native capital to tackle.

Point 4 involves no expenditure of public money in any foreign enterprise; but it does contemplate the use of public funds in sharing with other countries the modest cost of pilot work by technical experts in finding the places and means whereby great natural resources can be developed. The lion's share of benefit would go to the producing country. The byproduct of such development would benefit the United States in several ways—by the lessening of tensions and war dangers; by the increase of trade with countries making headway toward a higher standard of living; and by better assurance that vitally necessary strategic materials would be available when needed.

Among these strategic materials are copper, tin, nickel, manganese, uranium, high-grade iron ore, oil, certain chemical products, etc., all of which are obtainable within the Western Hemisphere.

Venezuelan and Mexican oil production is to be joined now by Canadian production from several new fields. In Ecuador vigorous exploration is going on by several strong companies. An outstanding geologist not long ago stated that all signs pointed to large oil pools under Florida.

Just as the American Republics are combined in a defensive pact against aggression, so all self-governing nations are in process of combining to resist the Communist world revolution. The Atlantic Treaty embraces some of these free governments. Other alliances probably will be made if Soviet pressure increases. The point-4 program contemplates cooperation with our governments only when those governments are opposed to communism. It would be economically impossible to cooperate with the Soviet Union or its satellite governments, because all of them prohibit private enterprise and monopolize all commerce and shipping.

To the extent that development of natural resources under point 4 would raise living standards and increase the strength of free peoples, the program commends itself to Americans as useful in combating the Communist world revolution. But, of course, they would be opposed to giving public money to develop the resources of other countries, rich or poor.

Since private capital cannot be compelled to go abroad, there need be no apprehension that American investors would suffer losses in foreign enterprises voluntarily undertaken by big American corporations. Those corporations have suffered sometimes, and they are now only too cautious in entering foreign fields. They know, however, that the foreign field can yield enormously rich returns to capital when conditions are favorable. It is for the purpose of bringing about favorable conditions that point 4 has been devised.

It would be possible to abuse the discretion to be lodged in the State Department with respect to lending technical experts to assist foreign governments in developing their economy. However, if enthusiasm for the program should lead to rainbow-chasing by overgenerous bureaucrats, Congress could quickly bring the dreamers to earth by cutting off the appropriation.

In any event, it seems probable that the point-4 program will be approved by Congress after perfecting the legislation that is now pending, and that administration of the program will be directed by the State Department. International political considerations require that execution of the program shall be in harmony with the Nation's foreign policy. Naturally, all agencies of the Government would furnish technicians for foreign exploratory work as directed by the President under the proposed legislation.

A point sometimes overlooked is this: The United States is itself one of the "undeveloped countries of the world." It can profit by exchanging technicians with other countries whose experts could be sent to this country to assist in developing American resources to better advantage.

Still another point of cooperative advantage is the fact that foreign students trained here in American technical and scientific institutions, including Federal agencies, become the forerunners of important constructive enterprises in their home countries. One of these men who studied the methods of the Reclamation Service was placed in charge of two projects in his own country requiring an outlay of $40,000,000.

Whether American or foreign technicians familiar with American equipment are the pilots of new undertakings, their natural inclination is to recommend the use of American machinery and equipment. Thus foreign enterprises, even if not financed by American capital, will enlarge the demand for American materials, machinery, equipment, and skilled personnel.

Old Man of the Mountain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the National Tribune of January 5, 1950:

OLD MAN OF THE MOUNTAIN

With years a richer life begins,
The spirit mellows;
Ripe age gives tone to violins,
Wine, and good fellows.

—*Trowbridge.*

The announcement on Christmas Day by Commander George Craig, of the American Legion, that Miles Kennedy, of New York, is to replace Gen. Thomas Taylor as legislative director will doubtless cause a pang in the hearts of many a legionnaire. And, for that matter, the news will be received with regret by numerous of Taylor's friends who are not of the Legion and by some who are not unfriendly but who have often locked horns with him in his official capacity. Certainly we of the Tribune, even though it has been an open secret for months that the general must retire, felt a bit uncomfortable when it seemed necessary to name a successor, and we could not permit the news to travel far without attempting to voice briefly our reactions.

In Washington Jack Taylor is something of an institution and one with which people have had to reckon for many years. Beloved by most with whom he has dealt, feared by some because he was once ruthless when opposed in the performance of his Legion duties, but respected by all for his fearlessness in carrying out the dictates of convention resolutions, he is perhaps best known around the Nation's Capital as a lobbyist without a peer. A familiar figure in the Halls of Congress, his mind has clicked for years as precisely as have his heels on the marble of the corridors on Capitol Hill. He was, and is, a familiar figure, carrying always his ash walking stick and wearing spats of gray that are as much a part of him as his tousled mane of gray hair, his flying coat tails, his warm smile, and his static speech.

This commentator has known him at his best—and at his worst—for 25 of the more than 30 years Taylor has devoted to the Legion. It gives us license to treat a little familiarly with the history of a man whom nature endowed with a force of character possessed by few and with whom time has dealt gently. We say he is beloved by most men for the reason that there is gentleness and a warmth of understanding in him; he

likes well those who are attracted to him and those he can call his friends. We say he is feared because we have heard him blasphemed by Congressmen, legislators who had to be whipped into line by an artful and fluid tongue, sometimes by the banging on a solon's desk with that ash cane; aye, we have seen recalcitrants persuaded by a man and his machine until they have voted right, even though that day and that sort of inducement is no longer in vogue. And that he and those he represents are respected is a living thing that can be found in accomplishment. When Taylor finally passes into history, his works will ever shine as a splendid example of love to fellow man. If the American Legion has given to him, he has given to the Legion.

Because, perchance, some may look upon this as an obituary, we hasten to make two assurances. Taylor has his faults like any other human, and he has erred, but it is proper to be kind when a person of his mein approaches retirement, so we avoid listing his shortcomings. Also, he is not yet through. The governing group of the Legion has recognized that the "old rock" has not yet disintegrated, and, by special dispensation, it has wisely decided to continue Taylor in a consultant capacity and as a tutor and guide to his successor. At a proper time we shall warn Kennedy against the good general's failings, while we meantime commend to him his virtues. We treat here mostly with good deeds and with a struggle with Father Time. Under Legion rules it is as inevitable that retirement must come with the months ahead as it is impossible that time will not take its toll. Yet time travels in divers paces with divers persons.

Nobody who looks upon the Taylor countenance would judge him to have seen 65 summers. Nevertheles, he was 24 when he came out of World War I as a high-ranking shavetail with 17 months of overseas service. It would have been doubted that he was 57 years young when he again went abroad for action in World War II in which he participated for 2½ years, and that he was edging on to retirement when he earned that star on his shoulder. A few people rush to get a pencil and paper when they begin to count the many ribbons on Taylor's broad chest, and, if it will suit any sourpuss to know it, one marks him as a first-class private in the French Foreign Legion, but there are some there that denote distinguished service, and we consider him to have a medal of gold for a great performance of duty to the Legion, with a diamond added for his long years of helpfulness to the sick and the disabled of our wars and to the dependents of our departed dead. Thirty-one years of application to work in the veterans' cause and to the Nation, from the birth of the American Legion to its present peak of usefulness, is a mark of distinction given to a very small number of the people's servants.

Back in the 1500's, a poet wrote these lines which we feel fit a landmark in Legion history and one of its foremost participants:

His golden locks time hath to silver turned;
O time too swift! O swiftness never ceasing.
His youth 'gainst time and age hath ever spurned,
But spurned in vain; youth waneth by encreasing.

Jack Taylor has not squandered time nor effort. In the past he has mastered both, because they demand no waste. Time can be counted by heartthrobs or by creeping hours, and too many have elaborately thrown it away, but Taylor has had the strong mind to combat it. Withal, it gallops by relentlessly and they are to be envied who have left strong and graceless footprints in its sands. It has not been ungenerous to Jack, even though it has tamed a little his hand and tempered his judgment, but there must be a follower, a next of kin, if the good of his work to go on. We know that the new legislative director has the required energy and the native ability to fill a pair of shoes, difficult though the transition may be, and that he will have the companionable assistance that only one with Taylor's qualifications can give him in carrying on the assignment and in performing the service that the position demands. We look forward confidently even as we are forced to witness the early passing of the Old Man of the Mountain. We cannot have all we desire for all time, or, as Browning put it:

Never the time and the place
And the loved one all together.

Cotton Acreage Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, much is being said concerning the cotton acreage allotments. I have been interested in reading a telegram forwarded by Mr. Allan B. Kline, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, to the Secretary of Agriculture and the reply of Secretary Brannan to Mr. Kline.

In view of the apparent confusion concerning this important legislation, the Congress and the public, I feel, are entitled to have the benefit of views expressed in the following telegram from Mr. Kline and the response from Secretary Brannan, and under permission to extend my remarks, I include these statements and likewise express the hope that the Committee on Agriculture will rapidly develop corrective legislation to avoid exceedingly serious economic disorders throughout the cotton-producing area of this country.

The statements follow:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
December 16, 1949.

Mr. ALLAN B. KLINE, *President,*
AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
CHICAGO, ILL.

DEAR ALLAN: I have briefly delayed answering your wire of December 10 concerning the 1949 cotton marketing quota legislation because I did not want to appear to be influencing the referendum under this new law held yesterday. Now that the referendum has been concluded, I want to set the record straight on this vital subject.

The American Farm Bureau Federation authored and aggressively supported the legislation by many hours of testimony, by the activities of many of its national and State officers in the Halls of the Congress, and by other means. The bill was adopted in almost the precise form which the American Farm Bureau Federation prescribed, notwithstanding the fact that representatives of the Department of Agriculture and others pointed out that the already discredited method for allotting acres among farms within the county by a cropland formula would create many difficulties and inequities and invite litigation.

I agree with you that the law does create inequities. But I do not agree with you that its defects can be corrected by administrative determinations.

With respect to the three provisions of the law which are the primary contributing factors to the inequities complained of; namely, the cropland formula, the large war crop credits, and minimum small farm provisions, the American Farm Bureau Federation vigorously opposed the vesting of any latitude or discretionary authority in the Department of Agriculture.

Your statement that I have authority to make farm allotments more equitable by reallocating to hardship cases the acreage which will not be planted by the farmers to whom it has been allotted is not borne out by the language of the legislation or the legislative history. Such authority was contained in the act of 1938, but was consciously deleted from the present law. In short, you ask me to take administrative steps which the Congress specifically refused to authorize.

The Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture and all of our staff working on cotton legislation have devoted many hours to the task of making this legislation as workable as possible. But we have been frustrated at every turn by the strict, mandatory provisions of the law. Nevertheless, we are still trying to find means for alleviating the inequities and we heartily welcome your suggestions to that end. If any step now being taken is not consistent with the law, or if another step which you wish to suggest is reasonably authorized by law, please supply us with your recommendations.

I am presenting a chronology of how this legislation came into existence because the cotton producers of this country should be allowed to judge for themselves.

It is clear from this record that the troublesome provisions as to county and farm acreage allotments had their origin in Farm Bureau action even before the Memphis conference or the subsequent activities of its steering committee which itself was dominated by Farm Bureau officials.

Walter Randolph, president of the Alabama Farm Bureau and official cotton spokesman for the American Farm Bureau Federation, during hearings on the cotton allotment law, assured Congress that your members would be "delighted" if Congress adopted his proposal.

This legislation came about as a result of the following events and activities:

1. A special subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, headed by Congressman STUDENS PACE, began hearings on January 7, 1949, on cotton-marketing quota and acreage-allotment legislation. On January 26, the Secretary appeared before the full House Agriculture Committee and urged that the marketing-quota provisions of the 1938 act be modernized. In the course of his remarks he declared that:

"In establishing a basis for apportioning State, county, and farm allotments, a recent period of years should be used."

It was also explained to the committee:

"The recommendations which will be given to you in detail by other department witnesses are in the main the cumulative results of many months of work by the field staff of the Production and Marketing Administration through democratically elected farmer committeemen. State committeemen have obtained, analyzed, and passed on to me the farmers' thinking as to what their program should include, and how it may best be administered."

2. On January 26 and 28, the Production and Marketing Administration made specific recommendations to the special subcommittee regarding cotton legislation, emphasizing that they originated with the farmers out of nearly 3 years of discussions in the Cotton Belt. They recommended (a) that the national acreage allotment for 1950 and 1951 be

apportioned to the States on the basis of cotton plantings for the years 1945–49, inclusive, and for each year thereafter on the basis of the 5 years preceding the year in which the national allotment is established, excluding 1949 in all cases, (b) that the State acreage allotment be apportioned to the counties on the basis of the cotton plantings during the same period of years used in apportioning the national allotment to the States, with 10 percent State reserve for adjustments, and (c) that the county allotment for 1950 be apportioned to farms on the basis of cotton plantings on the farm in 1947 and 1948 and for each year thereafter on the basis of such plantings in the preceding 3 years, excluding 1949 in all cases, with a county reserve for adjustments of 25 percent for 1950 and 15 percent for each year thereafter.

3. On January 31, Walter L. Randolph, president of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation and a member of the board of directors and executive committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation, appeared before the committee, announcing he was testifying in behalf of the national organization. His testimony on the point at issue opposed the Department. For example:

"We recommend that the county allotment be apportioned to farms primarily on the basis of the cropland on the farms in the county that are adapted to the growing of cotton. Experience has demonstrated that this is the most satisfactory method of apportioning county allotments to individual farms."

4. The hearings of the special subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture ended February 11, but the only cotton bill which resulted directly from these hearings was the one later enacted as Public Law 28, which excluded 1949 plantings in the calculation of cotton allotments for future years.

5. A nongovernmental belt-wide cotton conference was held in Memphis, Tenn., on April 24 and 25, in which farm bureau leaders from the Southern States took a very active role. Recommendations were made for establishing national and State acreage allotments, along with other recommendations for cotton marketing quota legislation. There were no recommendations regarding acreage allotment distribution from States to counties, or from counties to farms—the present trouble area. But the conference provided at its conclusion that each cotton-producing State should appoint one man to serve on a general committee "to implement measures adopted at this meeting."

As a result, an eight-man steering committee was created, headed by H. L. Wingate, president of the Georgia Farm Bureau Federation, as chairman; and J. A. Sweet, chairman of the New Mexico Farm Bureau's cotton committee, as vice chairman; and including Hugh Agnew, president of the South Carolina Farm Bureau, and J. H. West, of the Texas Farm Bureau. Thus half the committee was comprised of farm bureau leaders. The recommendations worked out by this committee were incorporated into Senate bill 1962 introduced by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON on May 27.

6. On May 27, the Department submitted a bill to the Congress which was introduced as S. 1971 by Senator ELMER THOMAS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on May 31. This bill contained, among other things, a complete revision of the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. The cotton provisions conformed substantially to the recommendations made to the House by the PMA in January.

7. A special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, headed by Senator ANDERSON, began hearings on S. 1962 on June 14. On that day the Deputy Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration appeared before this committee with the adverse recommendations of the Department and to explain the Department's views on S. 1962. Those views had been set forth in a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture to Chairman THOMAS dated June 13. This report on S. 1962 included the following:

"The Department recognizes the desirability of legislation which will accomplish the general objectives of section 344 (c), which establishes a formula for apportioning the national acreage allotments to States for 1950 and 1951. However, the formula proposed appears to be unduly complicated and to involve factors difficult to justify. In lieu of the establishment of fixed and temporary minimum State allotment bases, we suggest that as a means of providing equitable allotments for 1950 and 1951 factors or guides should be established for the use of the Secretary in making adjustments for trends or abnormal conditions."

The letter then goes on to say that the Department opposed the use of cropland as a basis for apportioning the county allotments to farms, citing five specific reasons, including:

"Under a uniform cropland factor approach, farms do not share in the county allotment according to their contribution to the county allotment, and some producers would bear a greater share of the acreage reduction than others. State and county allotments are based on the total cotton acreage of individual farms located within their boundaries, since the apportionment of the national allotment to the State and of the State to the county is based primarily on cotton-acreage history. Under the cropland-factor approach, however, two farms with the same cropland acreage may obtain the same size farm allotment, even though one of the farms historically may have contributed considerably more acreage to the county and State totals."

The Department emphasized its stand that the historical basis was the traditional way of establishing allotments—it had been tested in the courts, it worked effectively with other crops, and it was accepted and understood by the farmers. By contrast, the Department report said the cropland factor method had not worked satisfactorily when tried in the past until the historical factor was added, commenting:

"The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as originally enacted, contained a similar provision (to that in S. 1962) and it was found necessary to supplement this provision for determining farm-acreage allotments * * * with other provisions so as to correct inequities. These supplementary provisions * * * were based mostly on historical plantings."

The report added:

"In connection with the use of a uniform cropland factor for determining cotton farm allotments, it also should be noted that farm allotments for other commodities, such as wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts, have been established largely upon acreage history and that this method apparently has been satisfactory to producers of these commodities. Since it is probable that allotments for these other commodities may be established on a cotton farm, it will be confusing to producers as to why different methods are used for farm allotments for cotton as compared with other crops."

The Department's report concluded that S. 1962 should not be passed.

8. In explaining to the Senate subcommittee why the Department opposed S. 1962 and made other recommendations, a Department spokesman told of efforts ever since 1945 to obtain, compile, and analyze views of cotton growers generally and county and State PMA committeemen in cotton-producing areas in regard to preferences on all phases of farm, county, State, and national cotton-acreage allotments, adding:

"Then, in January of 1949, another meeting was held in Washington of the PMA State committmen, who went into this question very, very thoroughly, considered every conceivable angle, and took a vote by States on the most pertinent points that were in issue. On the basis of all that background and study, we drafted language for a bill that would modify the Agricultural Act of 1938 (S. 1971).

"I relate all of this background to emphasize the fact that we have, to the best of our ability, tapped the sources of information out in the country and have tried to find out the thinking of the farmers themselves and of those people who are very close to farmers."

The Department's testimony then pointed out the necessity of having some reserve set up in the national allotments to provide for adjustments in new areas, new farms, and small farms:

"The reason we make that suggestion is we think there will always be cases coming up which none of us can foresee, where new areas will be entering into the picture for which some sort of adjustment will have to be made. * * *

"We would suggest that it be deducted on a national basis * * * it makes it much more flexible and more workable."

9. The chairman of the Senate subcommittee stated that it seemed unlikely that all of S. 1971 would be enacted at the first session of the Eighty-first Congress and requested that the Department submit its recommendations in a separate bill dealing only with cotton. Such a bill was presented to the subcommittee later that same day, June 14. Its provisions were the same as those pertaining to cotton in S. 1971

10. H. L. Wingate, president of the Georgia Farm Bureau and chairman of the Memphis conference steering committee, testified before the Senate subcommittee to urge passage of S. 1962, saying it carried out the general objectives of the Memphis meeting and the manner in which such points had been implemented by the steering committee. Dr. C. R. Sayre also appeared as a spokesman for the steering committee, explaining the "added work done by the steering committee to make more feasible in a legislative sense the actual basic principles worked out at Memphis."

J. A. Sweet, chairman of the New Mexico Farm Bureau cotton committee and vice chairman of the steering committee, said it was their specific aim to permit as little latitude as possible for the Secretary of Agriculture in assigning or adjusting allotments:

"May I comment, too, upon the recommendations made by the Secretary of Agriculture. * * * The chief difference lies in the fact that in Senate bill 1962 adjustments for trends and shifts in acreages as between the States are spelled out. The members of this committee have studied carefully the Secretary's recommendations and we can assure you that there is unanimous support behind our proposal that the allotments to the States during the next three years be fully and explicitly spelled out in legislation. You will find other differences between the two sets of recommendations and nearly in every case it is a matter of defining in detail the administration of allotments in Senate bill 1962 and broad authority in the Secretary's suggested legislation."

11. Other Farm Bureau officers testifying in support of S. 1962 as official spokesmen for their natural organization included R. E. Short, of Arkansas, vice president of the American Farm Bureau Federation; Walter Randolph, president of the Alabama Farm Bureau, executive committee member of the American Farm Bureau Federation; Delmar Roberts, president of the New Mexico Farm Bureau; John Taylor, president of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau; and R. Flake Shaw, executive vice president of the North Carolina Farm Bureau.

Both Mr. Randolph and Mr. Short specifically supported the cropland ratio factor of distributing allotments to farms. Mr. Short testified:

"I take the opportunity here to emphasize that we are very strong for allocating cotton acreage to farms primarily on the basis of tilled acres * * *

"We strongly approve the suggestion in this bill, and do not agree with the suggestion of the Department of Agriculture."

Both Mr. Short and Mr. Randolph opposed the Department's recommendations for a national reserve for adjustment purposes.

Mr. Short testified:

"The bill has sufficient provisions to take care of the reserves for small farmers. We believe those requirements can be met much more equitably on a local and State basis than on a national basis. Administration of the program in the past has indicated that ample provision is made for it, and therefore no need for national reserves on that basis. We therefore strongly oppose it."

Mr. Randolph testified:

"I think this bill better than any bill ever before Congress, takes care of the purposes for which this national reserve is recommended, and this bill leaves the major portion of the decision to the local committees and the State committees.

"So we would say we are very much opposed to a national acreage reserve. We are very strongly in favor of the provisions of this bill * * *."

Mr. Randolph told the committee the farm bureau had approved the principles of the bill long before the Memphis meeting, saying:

"At our national meeting in Atlantic City in December we had a committee of which Mr. Short was chairman, and nearly every State was represented * * * we reached agreement there which was substantially in line with this bill, and at our board meetings that has been refined from time to time, and we feel and believe that we represent our membership, which is 1,325,826. In the State of Alabama, I can say with all confidence that the producers, by their repeated votes, the members of the farm bureau, by repeated unanimous votes, have authorized me to represent them, and many of them do know about provisions of this bill and I am certain they will be delighted with the bill if it is enacted."

Mr. Short further testified:

"I think it is rather significant that the Memphis recommendations are in substantial agreement with our original recommendations."

12. A warning contrary to the farm-bureau viewpoint was voiced at that same hearing by Congressman CECIL WHITE, a member of the House Committee on Agriculture:

"It is my observation, gentlemen, that very few of the cotton producers in the United States, particularly in California, know anything about the provisions of the Memphis agreement."

13. On June 29, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported favorably on S. 1962 with minor amendments. The report makes clear the origin of the provisions now being protested by the farm bureau. Of the Memphis conference, it stated:

"At that conference, the proposed system of cotton-marketing quotas and acreage allotments contained in S. 1962 was agreed upon."

The Senate passed S. 1962 on July 6 in substantially the same form in which it was reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

14. On June 29, the special subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture began hearings on H. R. 5392, differing in some respects from S. 1962 but incorporating substantially all of the provisions of the so-called Memphis plan. Although no formal report from the Department was requested on H. R. 5392, representatives of the Department were asked questions regarding provisions of the bill during the hearing.

15. H. L. Wingate, as chairman of the Memphis steering committee, and other members of that committee appeared before the subcommittee to urge passage of the Memphis plan, the major provisions of which were set forth in H. R. 5392.

16. The only national farm organization which appeared before the special committee of the House at hearings on this bill was the American Farm Bureau Federation, represented by Walter Randolph. After proposing a number of minor revisions in the bill, Mr. Randolph stated:

"We strongly support the essential features of H. R. 5392 relating to the computation and apportionment of National, State, county, and farm cotton allotments. * * *

"We want to emphasize our support for the provisions of H. R. 5392, which provide that county allotments shall be distributed to individual farms primarily on the basis of the cropland on the farms in the county that are adapted to the growing of cotton. Experience has demonstrated that this is the most satisfactory method of apportioning allotments to individual farms."

17. Following the conclusion of the hearings by the special subcommittee of the House, Congressman PACE introduced a new cotton bill (H. R. 5738) which differed in some respects from both his earlier bill and S. 1962. However, the revised bill contained substantially all of the provisions of the Memphis plan, except one important provision relating to the problem which has since developed.

18. On August 1 the House committee reported favorably on H. R. 5738 with certain amendments which did not alter materially the general plan of cotton allotments set forth in the original House bill. The House sent the bill to conference after a parliamentary move (substituting the provisions of H. R. 5738 for the provisions of S. 1962, as passed by the Senate).

19. The Senate and House conferees agreed for the most part on the provisions of the House bill, except for the provisions relating to the manner in which the State acreage allotments should be apportioned to the counties. In this respect the present legislation contains the provisions of the Senate bill which had been insisted on by Mr. Randolph for the Farm Bureau.

20. The legislation which was finally enacted as Public Law 272 contained the Memphis plan, as expanded by the steering committee, almost in its entirety. Thus, the two provisions of the legislation which are giving trouble at the moment—namely, the provisions relating to the establishment of county and individual farm allotments, were worked out entirely by the Memphis steering committee along the lines of Farm Bureau recommendations. The Department of Agriculture recommended against both proposals and suggested instead that the county and farm allotments be established primarily on the basis of county and farm cotton history, with provisions for considering other appropriate factors.

That is the record.

It is unfortunate for the cotton growers of this country that such a situation has developed, but I hope it may be turned to a constructive end by serving as an example.

Meanwhile, we will administer the law as best we can. Interpretations of the law to date have been made, of course, under the direction of our Solicitor. We have tried to alleviate the ill effects of which your organization complains by the most liberal interpretation of the terms of the act.

We will welcome an opportunity to work with the Congress and the farmer representatives during the next session of Congress to obtain workable amendments. Until we have this opportunity, however, I invite you to give the Department the benefit of any recommendations which might show us how we could steer a different course than that which we have announced and followed.

Farm leadership is no better than the direction in which it leads. If the direction proves to be wrong, then the leadership was wrong. The only way to correct it is to have a candid examination of the reasons for the error. It will do neither the organization leaders nor the farmers any good to blame the leaders' error on a Government official or agency. My duty as Secretary of Agriculture requires me to make it clear to the farmers where the responsibility rests for mistakes in representing the farmers' interest. For this reason, and because your telegram was made public, I am releasing this letter.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

CHICAGO, ILL., *December 16, 1949.*

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

The board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation today issued the following statement:

"Cotton producers will vote December 15 on the question of marketing quotas for the 1950 cotton crop under a new law passed by the last session of Congress. Many farmers are reported to be dissatisfied with the acreage allotments which have been issued under this law. Marketing quotas have not been in force since they were suspended in 1942. It is only natural that some difficulties should arise the first year that a new program is put into effect, or an old program reinstated after several years of disuse. Actually, the 1949 Cotton Allotments Act is not a new law, but a modernization of the cotton provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

"While everyone recognizes that it is impossible to write an acreage-allotment law that will cover all cases equitably, the major difficulties this fall encountered with cotton allotments are in the main a result of administrative failure to make full use of the authority provided in the law for the establishment of administrative areas within countries and the setting up of State and county acreage reserves to meet the very type of situations which are now arising. This is not solely the responsibility of the State and county committees. The ultimate responsibility rests squarely with the United States Department of Agriculture.

"The Secretary of Agriculture has full authority to make the allotments much more equitable than they are by reallocating to hardship cases the acreage which will not be planted by the farmers to whom it has been allotted. We call upon the Secretary to issue an administrative ruling providing for such reallocations wherever county committees find that the acreage allotted to a farmer exceeds his intention to plant.

"We believe that a vast majority of the inequitable allotments can still be corrected by administrative action without amending the law, but if amendments are found necessary, we shall seek prompt action when Congress reconvenes in January.

"The question of correcting inequities in acreage allotments, however, should not be confused with the main issue farmers must decide in the December 15 referendum on marketing quotas. That issue is whether the 1950 cotton crop is to receive price support at 50 percent or 90 percent of parity. If quotas are approved, the support price for 1950 will be about 28 cents per pound. If quotas are defeated, the support price will drop to 15 cents per pound. The economy of the Cotton Belt cannot stand such a drastic cut in income as would probably result. We therefore urge that cotton farmers

overwhelmingly approve marketing quotas. We can then concentrate our efforts on ironing out inequities in the acreage allotments."

ALLEN B. KLINE,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

The Spanish Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL T. WAGNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would wish to include an editorial from the Washington Star of January 2, 1950. This important declaration should be considered in connection with the fact that, in the last General Assembly of the United Nations, the membership voted 40 to 6 against the Soviet-ised Polish delegation's motion to censure Spain as Fascist and as having been "imposed by the Axis." As Dr. Joseph P. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, pointed out last May, this destroyed the whole basis of the case against Spain as it was originally formulated by the agents of the Soviet Union. After the unbelievable blindness of leftist propagandists about China, it would be a tragic blunder to continue to try to appease the Kremlin with reference to Spain. It is time for the resumption of full diplomatic relations with Madrid as well as for other measures of friendship and help for the Spanish people.

The editorial follows:

THE SPANISH FRAUD

Senator CONNALLY's statement that he believes this country could properly exchange ambassadors with Spain if it wanted to do so is interesting as a subject for speculation.

In 1946 the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution requesting member nations to withdraw their ambassadors from Madrid. This was a phony show of morality that was rooted in deceit and tainted with fraud. The pretense was that the Spanish Government had aided the Axis, that it was a dictatorship, and that it suppressed civil rights and religious freedom. And, of all things, the leader of this crusade for decency was that inverted model of democracy—the Communist-dominated government of Poland.

Evidently Senator CONNALLY is not in sympathy with this shabby performance by the General Assembly. And since he says that he does not regard the 1946 resolution as legally binding on this country, the inference is that he may use his influence as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in an effort to persuade this Government to resume full diplomatic relations with Spain.

If so, he will be working in a good cause. And this is true, not because of any especially compelling reason of self-interest, but because this country, if it aspires to a position of moral leadership in the world, ought to purge itself of the intellectual dishonesty inherent in its position on the Spanish issue.

There is reason to believe that the State Department, or many of the top men in the State Department, would like to see an American Ambassador at Madrid. But they wring their hands and say that this cannot be done while the UN resolution remains in force. Perhaps there is some merit to that contention. Even if one believes that we were mouse trapped by the iron curtain delegations when the resolution was passed, there is still some force to the argument that the United States ought not to act in defiance of the Assembly.

But when these arguments are appraised in the light of the position taken last spring, they are found wanting in simple honesty. There was an effort last May to rescind the 1946 resolution. The vote was 26 to 18 in favor of repeal, but since a two-thirds majority was needed, the effort failed by a margin of 4 votes.

And what was our delegate doing in this attempt to cure the injustice of snubbing Spain while maintaining relations with the iron-curtain dictators? He was doing nothing. Under instructions from the State Department, he sat on his hands and abstained from voting.

It is this aspect of the matter which is most offensive to any concept of integrity. The United States should support the UN. But there is no valid reason why it should refuse to go on record as between right and wrong. If our Government believes the original action was a fraud, it should have voted to rescind it. If it does not believe this, its vote should have been cast against the repealer. In one breath we proclaim our greatness and our moral principles. And then we stultify ourselves by refusing to stand up and be counted on a clear-cut issue which bears not only on our own integrity, but on the integrity of the UN as well.

The Investigation of Lobbying Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am impressed and pleased by the widespread interest being shown throughout the country in the assignment given by the House to the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities to investigate all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation. As chairman of that committee, I am also encouraged greatly by this interest and by the many suggestions we have received so far for avenues of investigation.

In the next few weeks it is my hope that the committee will determine a program of investigation and of hearings which will lead to a full report to the Congress and to the American people on the extent and nature of lobbying activity both by private and public groups on the problems of keeping this lobbying activity out in the open where it can be observed and properly assessed, and on the need for any changes in our present statute requiring the registration and filing of financial data by individuals and organizations engaging in the practice of seeking to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation.

The other members of this select committee, Representatives HENDERSON LANHAM, of Georgia; CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma; CLYDE DOYLE, of California; CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana; CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio; and JOSEPH P. O'HARA of Minnesota are, I know, sincerely committed with me to an intention to make of this committee's investigation a constructive task in the national interest and not a smear campaign or a political witch hunt.

A few weeks ago I issued a statement in the nature of a progress report on the work of the committee and its staff up to that time. At the end of that statement appears a sample of a questionnaire which was distributed among all Members of Congress, seeking their advice and suggestions on policies we should follow or investigations we should make. I hope that those Members who have not yet had an opportunity to respond to that questionnaire will do so shortly. We are finding the suggestions which have come to us so far as a result of this questionnaire to be most helpful, and I am sure every Member of the Congress has similar worth-while information of value to us.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the statement issued by me on December 19 as chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANK BUCHANAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES, DECEMBER 19, 1949

The Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, created by House Resolution 298, was authorized and directed by the House of Representatives earlier this year to investigate all lobbying activities, including activities of agencies of the Federal Government, "intended to influence, encourage, promote or retard legislation."

We were provided with full subpena powers, and an initial appropriation of $40,000, and were ordered to report our findings and recommendations to the House before the end of the Eighty-first Congress.

The seven-member committee appointed by the Speaker, and which includes Representatives HENDERSON LANHAM, of Georgia; CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma; CLYDE DOYLE, of California, CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana; CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio; and JOSEPH P. O'HARA, of Minnesota, organized October 11. On October 19 it authorized the chairman to proceed during the congressional recess with the employment of a staff and the conduct of preliminary investigations and research designed to provide a general over-all picture of lobbying activities and the operation of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946.

No decisions were made by the full committee as to what specific lobbying groups, organizations or individuals, or Federal agencies or officials engaging in lobbying activities might be made the subjects of intensive inquiry and public hearings.

The scope of the inquiry the House has directed us to make into the subject of lobbying is not limited in the resolution in any particular except as to time. Obviously, however, we cannot possibly investigate every individual lobbyist and every individual lobbying practice.

At the same time, it is my hope that before this committee completes its work and makes its report and recommendations to the House, we will be able to answer definitely whether the lobbying law now in operation is being violated and, if so, to what extent and in what manner; also, whether the present act is adequate or requires amendment in order to make it conform to the purposes Congress had in mind in 1946 when it included this unprecedented Federal law on lobby regulation as title III of Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the historic

La Follette-Monroney Legislative Reorganization Act.

I believe that, as a corollary aim, this committee will try to show the Congress and the American people a clear picture of the extent to which lobbies of all sorts seek to influence legislative action by Congress even when such action may be contrary to the public good and to economy and efficiency in Government.

These are our long-range goals. For the immediate present, however, and until the full membership of the committee has decided upon an agenda of full-scale investigations and hearings, the staff of the committee is engaged primarily and exclusively in the accumulation of essential information of a generally noncontroversial nature, in the compilation of what might be termed a catalog of basic fact on the theory and practice of lobbying.

In recent weeks, in addition to engaging staff members, I have, under the committee's authorization, directed the following staff activities:

1. Assignment of investigators to review the books and records of a number of prominent, acknowledged lobbying organizations for the purpose of obtaining factual information on how some typical lobbies actually operate in their efforts to influence legislative action by Congress. Since there is no particular significance attachable to the selection of these preliminary sources of such information, the committee is not presently making public the names of the groups or individuals being contacted. I might say that, with certain exceptions, cooperation on the part of the lobbyist involved so far in this preliminary study has, on the whole, been satisfactory.

2. Two sets of questionnaires, each containing the same 10 questions, have been directed to all Members of the House and Senate, in one instance, and, in the other, to several hundred scholars and journalists who have made special studies in the past of pressure tactics or of lobbying regulation. These questions (a sample copy of which is attached at the end of this statement as exhibit A) are intended to elicit leads on possible violations of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act or, in the case of lobbying by Federal officials or agencies, of the Criminal Code. They also invite information on lobbying practices generally and on abuses, and ask for suggestions of specific lobbies or Federal agencies or officials whose lobbying activities warrant detailed study and investigation.

3. An additional questionnaire is being prepared for eventual circulation among all of the approximately 2,000 lobbyists and lobbying organizations registered with the Clerk of the House under the lobbying law. These groups and individuals, all directly involved in this entire investigation, will be asked to make recommendations for clarification and improvement of the Lobbying Act as a result of their own experiences under it, and will also be invited to suggest specific avenues of intensive investigation.

The advice and suggestions contained in the answers we receive from these questionnaires, plus the information daily coming to the committee from a variety of other sources, including our staff investigations and research, will be compiled and analyzed for the information of the full committee as possible guides to future policies and hearings.

If I have not already made it sufficiently clear, I want to say as emphatically as I can that in any and all cases where investigators of this committee may be disclosed to have examined the files of any lobbyist or lobbying organization, there is no inference warranted that the lobbyist or organization involved is suspected of violating the lobbying law or that the actions of such lobbyists are thought to have been improper in any way. And there would be no basis for a conclusion that the particular lobbyist or organization is to be a subject for all-out investigation or any committee hearings. Our investigators are examining the records of only a limited number out of the many registered lobbyists, and in preliminary fashion only. They are studying these records as examples of typical lobbying practices. The committee itself will decide which groups will be scheduled for thorough study.

EXHIBIT A

Pursuant to House Resolution 298 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session, the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities is undertaking "a study and investigation of (1) all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation; and (2) all activities of agencies of the Federal Government intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation."

In light of your past work and interest in this field, the select committee would appreciate receiving from you suggestions and information, based on your experience and study, on the following matters:

1. Lobbying activities by unregistered persons or organizations;
2. Undisclosed receipts or expenditures by lobbyists and lobby organizations;
3. Undisclosed interests behind lobbyists and lobby organizations;
4. Methods of soliciting or obtaining funds for lobby activities;
5. Methods of expending funds for lobby activities;
6. Practices and abuses of lobbyists and lobby organizations;
7. Specific lobbyists and lobby organizations whose activities in your opinion, warrant detailed study and investigation;
8. Violations of 18 U. S. C. 1913 restricting lobbying activities by Government officers and employees;
9. Practices and abuses of Government officers or employees in regard to lobbying;
10. Specific Government departments, agencies, officers, or employees whose lobbying activities, in your opinion, warrant detailed study and investigation.

The more specific your suggestions and information are, the more useful they will be to the committee. If it is convenient to supplement your response by personal interview, please let me know, so that an informal meeting can be arranged with the members of the committee or its staff.

Yours very truly,

———,
Chairman, Select Committee on Lobbying Activities.

Welfare State Ruining British Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article written by one of my constituents, Louis Bromfield, of Lucas, Ohio. I am certain that friend Louie, as he is known to all of us, needs no introduction to the membership of this body. In his article he clearly sets forth what has taken place in Britain under their present regime.

THIS IS YOUR COUNTRY—WELFARE STATE RUINING BRITISH FARMING

(By Louis Bromfield)

I have a large and lively correspondence with a considerable number of Britishers engaged in farming, livestock breeding and truck gardening. Out of that correspondence there has emerged, over a considerable period, a fairly horrible picture of the fashion in which the Socialist welfare state operates in relation to all those citizens who have to do with providing food and fibre for the British Isles. Indeed, I doubt that any American farmer, even after the experience of the OPA and other regimenting agencies during the war, could imagine the hardships of agriculture under the British welfare state. I quote below paragraphs from two or three letters. They are not from individual "screeheads" because the tone of them is universal.

Apparently the same tone colors the comments of almost any farmer one encounters on his own land in the British Isles.

Writes one, "I am just about to give up, not because I'm doing less well than before. The government subsidies take care of that and the taxpayers pay the difference between what I get for my produce and what the consumer pays for it. The money is taken out of the taxpayer in the form of taxes paid by the city chap. These fellows are perhaps less well off because they're not only paying the difference in prices but at least a couple of million pounds to support the bureaucracy, which has been set up to carry out and administer the regulations and subsidies.

"It's my own opinion that it's more fun to spend your own money for something that costs you just as much than to have the government take it and then pay a lot of incompetent fellows who probably couldn't hold a decent job elsewhere to spend it for you. No, it isn't the price factor. It's the misery of spending hour upon hour filling out forms, telling what you have raised and how much it cost you and whether you followed the recommendations of the learned bureaucrat who probably knows less than nothing about farming.

"There comes a point when no amount of profit is worth the misery that goes with it, and believe me, Mr. B., it is misery. My sister and I sit up for hours at night after we have done a hard day's work doing bookkeeping and filling out forms.

"If you don't do it, you don't get the subsidy and without the subsidy we couldn't make ends meet on our production."

SCREEGHEADS DELAY

Another writes: "It is the perpetual hamstringing that gets you. I may need a new machine or even a part of a machine but I can't get it unless I fill out a series of forms in triplicate. They aren't just simple forms. They practically want to know who your ancestor was under Queen Anne and how many hours and minutes you will use that particular machine during the year.

"Then the form goes off and from 6 to 9 months later you are told whether you can have that machine or part of a machine, and meanwhile the crop and your profits have gone down the drain. I'm persuaded that these forms lie about in bureaucrats' offices for weeks at a time without ever being looked at. Some of our reports I'm sure are never looked at but simply stowed away to gather dust.

"The Government is now engaged in using valuable building materials to build structures simply to house the mountains of forms and paper work. Canute trying to keep back the sea was nothing compared to trying to keep your head above the paper work. If you don't fill out everything, you're out of the picture. You don't get subsidies and you can't make a profit, and they practically have a gestapo in operation looking out for black

marketeers, and the taxpayers pay for the gestapo as well."

Still another writes: "What in Heaven's name does a Government clerk know about what a farmer ought to raise? We're supposed to have farmers' boards to set up programs of the crops which are needed most, but the whole thing is decided in the end by some Socialist bureaucrat with his feet on the desk for whom both farmer and taxpayer are paying.

"The whole thing is a case of everybody kidding everybody else and himself included. The satisfaction of growing good crops, of doing a job of good farming is practically gone, and as any farmer knows, so is the satisfaction in living.

"There isn't any flavor in life any more. We're no longer individuals. We're just cogs in a machine, told what to do from the time we get up in the morning till we go to bed at night. You can have the whole 'womb to tomb' program. I'd rather run my own life and go without a meal or a new jacket now and then."

IT COULD HAPPEN HERE

And so on they run, the letters. We had a taste of it during OPA days. Yet a lot of farmers are asking for it when they say, carelessly and without thought, that "there may be something in the Brannan plan."

And don't forget that if you don't farm in England as the bureaucrats decide is the right way to farm, the government will put you off your own place and give it to some other fellow who will do what the bureaucrats tell him to do.

They'll even sell your farm from under you and dispossess you altogether. None of this is very far from the Soviet state. Only the worst white trash among American farmers would want such a program. The next step, which may come at any time under the welfare state in England is to censor mail. My correspondence with my former friends in England may end at any time the Labor Government sees fit to pull down the iron curtain.

You can't be a little bit Socialist-Communist any more than you can be a little bit pregnant. The welfare state is simply the former symptoms.

Governmental Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, before the Congress reconvened for the second session of the Eighty-first Congress I spent considerable time in my district and observed the very obvious fact that the people of the Fourth District of Iowa are fully conscious that Federal expenditures have gone beyond bounds and will burden the generations to come with taxes. Folks are emphatic in their insistence that we start practicing economy now, and one very timely letter on this subject was written by Mrs. G. W. Norris, of Grinnell, Iowa. It was published in the Grinnell Herald-Register and the Seymour (Iowa) Herald. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article, as follows:

WHAT CAN WE DO?

Persons interested in governmental economy will rejoice in the stand taken by a former Seymour woman, Mrs. G. W. Norris, of Grinnell, the former Verne Hart, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Pearl Hart, of Seymour.

Mrs. Norris is legislative chairman for this district of the Federated Women's Clubs in Iowa, and wrote the following remarks in a letter to the Grinnell Herald-Register recently.

Her letter follows:

"What good does it do to say this?—from your editorial tonight. That certainly is the 64 question, for all of us feel helpless when we actually realize the immensity of our Federal expenditures. Here are more interesting—and amazing—facts.

"Our Federal Government, this year, is spending about $276 for every man, woman, and child in this country. How many of us can afford it?

"It costs the Government 2½ cents to deliver a 1-cent post card and 85 percent of the post cards are sent by business firms. Would you pay 1½ cents for that advertisement you received today?

"Although the Veterans' Administration stated that they are unable to hire personnel for 5,600 of the beds they now have, Congress, in August, appropriated $237,000,000 to add another 16,000 beds, which will also, no doubt, remain unstaffed.

"What can we do? We can keep informed and inform others, and perhaps an aroused citizenry will insist on economy. The Hoover Commission, a nonpartisan group of able and public-spirited people, have presented its recommendations, but does Congress hire a good doctor and then follow his advice? Not without a big fight.

"Already legislation completed makes possible a saving of at least 1.25 billions, but such savings are resisted, almost without exception, by the bureaus and people involved. It means loss of some jobs, prestige, and power. Congress itself is allowing two bills to die which would authorize further study—one to study the overseas administration, and another to study Federal-State relations, a field in which nothing has been done in over 150 years. Congress is not eager to take any more chances on commissions which tell them more than they want to know.

"I have my information from the Citizens' Committee on the Hoover report, whose slogans are 'Waste not and want not' and 'Better government at a better price.'

"Yours sincerely,

"FERNE NORRIS

"(Mrs. G. W. Norris)."

Only Lip Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter which I have received from a very good friend of mine. I think the points taken in this letter merits the consideration of all of us as we start the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. I respectfully ask that the membership read the following letter:

DECEMBER 28, 1949.

DEAR FRIEND: When one becomes confused or lost in a big city, it is wise to ask a policeman what to do next in order to get where one wants to go. Asking a college professor might not bring desirable results. Policemen are experienced in giving directions. They seldom lose sight of the human factor.

Being somewhat confused over domestic and foreign and philosophical problems, I recently sought the advice of three wise men—folks whose experience and wisdom might get me on the track of where I wanted to go.

The first wise man—a domestic expert—told me that mankind would be more prosperous if it were more thrifty; that the weak could not be strengthened by weakening the strong; that character and courage could not be built by destroying initiative and independence; that sound security could not be established on borrowed money; that we could not keep out of trouble by spending more than we earned; that mankind could not permanently be helped by doing for it what it should do for itself; etc.

The second wise man—a foreign expert—told me that we should not take on the quarrels and hatreds of Eurasia; that we should not expect what had failed in other countries to succeed in America; that we would eventually be better off if we tended to our own business and refrained from foreign comments; etc.

The third wise man—a philosopher—told me that kindness and love would solve all of our problems; that manners, unaccompanied by kindness, could not exist; that wars, accompanied by love, were impossible; that greed and hate had to disappear when kindness and love appeared; etc.

I passed all of this wisdom along to many of my acquaintances. Most of them privately agreed it was sound. Many of these most did not pass it along to others because it was not popular. Several of them called me an isolationist or a fundamentalist or a stand patter or a reactionary. One of them suggested I was a Communist. When I told them who the wise men were, many of them became angry—said I was platitudinous. They all gave lip service to Abraham Lincoln and George Washington and Jesus Christ, but many of them were too cowardly or too selfish to preach their gospel.

If, during this coming year, you do what you should to get mankind back on the track, I wish you a perfect 1950.

As ever,

POP.

The Political Platform of Harry S. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

THE POLITICAL PLATFORM OF HARRY S. TRUMAN

The plain truth that President Truman is using the domestic problems of the Nation to further his political aims is now definitely established.

He damned the Republican Eightieth Congress for blocking his legislation. Now he is trying to blame that Congress for the lack of satisfactory (to him) action from the Democratic Eighty-first Congress. Truman is a smart politician and he can see the trend even in his own party is away from his welfare-state program. To combat the will of the people from sending him another Republican or nonsocialistic Congress in 1950 he is carrying out the following program:

1. He is deliberately turning his back on duly enacted laws which do not fit his political conniving. Witness his refusal to use the Taft-Hartley Act to settle the Hawaiian stevedore strike.

At the same time his avowed intention to repeal this law has been allowed to lag. The bill remains to bait for labor votes in next year's congressional elections.

2. His sudden decision to put aside his civil-rights program until later is recognizable as part of the pattern to cull favor with southern Democrats while holding out hopes for future enactment of this legislation to his party supporters in the East and North.

3. He deliberately went on a spending spree he knows we can't afford, counting on raising taxes to pay for his give-away program in an off-election year.

4. Out to get the farmer and the housewife vote, he sent his Secretary of Agriculture into the breach with a farm-support program touted to guarantee farmers high prices and housewives low food prices. The fact that the money difference in such a cockeyed arrangement would have to be paid out of taxes collected from the farmers and housewives were soft-pedaled. The question of how much this deal would cost was never answered.

5. His determination to pay off his handpicked party hacks regardless of their fitness is exemplified in the cases of Mon Wallgren and Leland Olds. Apparently that is the only way he can keep supporters.

Mr. Big first attempted to force Wallgren in as chairman of the national resources board. Failing this, he then put his pal on the Federal Power Commission.

In the Olds case he put the heat on the Senate for confirmation through the Democratic national committee. He wanted Olds kept in his post on the Federal Power Commission, regardless of the nominee's record of sniping at our form of government. But such tactics were too bald for even his own party to accept.

6. In a move to win support from small business overburdened by government regulation he let fly against special interests. Thereupon the Department of Justice filed an antitrust suit against the A. & P. groceries, adopting the time-worn "soak the rich" policy.

7. In his move to expand social security as a sure vote getter he also demonstrated still further indifference to the American housewives. The new social-security amendments propose to cover domestic servants into old age retirement benefits. As a result the majority of housewives in the country will have to become tax collectors.

To Truman it's a matter of simple arithmetic. He believes more votes will come in from the domestics covered by the bill than will be withheld by the housewives.

8. Mr. Big's record on socialized medicine, the heart of his welfare program, falls into the same old rut. After sending forth his Federal Security Administrator, Oscar Ewing, to beat the bushes, he failed to hold Congress in session long enough to take action on the proposal. Such a golden lure for ballots was too good to be rushed. It makes much better campaign stuff in 1950 and 1952.

After the American Medical Association began a fight for life against this proposal the Department of Justice jumped on the American Medical Association. More arithmetic—there are more patients than doctors.

9. His sneering references to "red herrings" mark his attempts to hold onto the left-wing and one-world elements in the political machine bequeathed him by Roosevelt. His efforts to belittle the menace of communism have persisted despite the reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the trial of the 11 Communists in New York, and the Alger Hiss case.

10. The neatest dodge practiced by Truman during the past congressional session was his announcement of an atomic explosion in Russia. Although the explosion is reported to have occurred 2 weeks before, nothing was said about it until the late afternoon of September 23.

In the meantime the administration's $1,314,000,000 European armament plan was being pushed in the Senate against strong opposition based on the obvious fact that normal military weapons in the hands of European mercenaries would be useless if Russia should unleash an atomic attack on this country.

The administration answer to that was that Russia did not yet have the atom bomb and we should set up strong armies in western Europe to fend off a Soviet invasion.

So the bill was passed. A few short hours afterward it was revealed from the White House that Russia had cracked the atom. Angry Senators exclaimed that the vote on the bill would have been different had they known beforehand that the immediate threat from Russia was an air-borne atomic attack, not a ground operation on foreign soil.

Truman will tamper with national security and endanger our whole economy if it will further his own political career.

Political Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star:

POLITICAL DILEMMA

The urgent appeal from Senate Majority Leader LUCAS for action by the administration to ease the coal crisis puts the Democrats in a serious political dilemma and exposes the unworthiness of the President's campaign for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Senator LUCAS' statement came 3 days after the President, in his state of the Union message, renewed his demand for repeal of the labor statute, which he described as being punitive in purpose, one-sided in operation and inconsistent with the practice of true and effective collective bargaining.

As majority leader, Mr. LUCAS will be expected to lead the hopeless fight in the Senate for repeal of the law at this session. But as Senator from Illinois, faced with a stiff battle for reelection next November, he finds it necessary to seek for his constituents the protection which can be found only in the Taft-Hartley Act. And the need for this protection is so urgent, in his opinion, that the majority leader has announced that unless the mine operators and John L. Lewis reach some agreement under which the miners return to work on a 5-day basis he will "be constrained to take the floor of the United States Senate and protest as vigorously as I know how against the continuation of these conditions."

It is possible to sympathize with Senator LUCAS. For he is a trapped man. On the one side he is beset by the fiction, cultivated by the the Democrats for partisan political reasons, that the Taft-Hartley Act is an oppressive, union-busting law which must be wiped from the statute books. And on the other side he is hemmed in by the facts of life. His constituents, he believes, are suffering, and in an election year at that. This being so, he is forced to turn to the berated Taft-Hartley Act, which provides the sole statutory authority for cracking down in the public interest on Mr. Lewis and the operators. It is not an enviable position for such an estimable gentleman as Mr. LUCAS to be in. One hopes that he will not be driven by events to the unhappy length of appealing as vigorously as he knows how, in one breath, for action under the Taft-Hartley law in behalf of the people of Illinois, and then, in the next breath, demanding repeal of the Taft-Hartley law in behalf of the President and the party's political fortunes.

Mr. Truman has taken the position that he will invoke the national emergency provisions of the law if and when a national emergency arises. In his opinion, that stage has not been reached, and here, obviously, he differs from Senator LUCAS. It should be remembered, however, that Mr. Truman has a large responsibility. If he invokes the law, he must be prepared to satisfy the courts that a real national emergency exists, and, this being so, he is entitled to wait until satisfied as to the fact.

But if the President's reluctance to act hastily is understandable, his continued attack on the law itself is not. The Taft-Hartley Act is designed, not to punish unions, but to protect the people from excessive punishment at the hands of irresponsible labor leaders and employers. If Mr. Truman really disbelieves this, he ought to have a little talk with Senator LUCAS. And all of the Democrats who have joined in this disingenuous attack on a law, the essentials of which are needed for the protection of the public, should remember that some day they, too, may be in the unhappy position of Senator LUCAS. What will they say to their constituents then if they should succeed in scrapping the Taft-Hartley Act?

Restoring Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the elections held in Italy in April 1948 were among the most important in all world history. The issue was whether Italy would remain free or succumb to Communist enslavement. It was of vital concern to free peoples everywhere that the democratic forces should prevail and the Communists be overthrown.

For weeks, prior to these elections, the air waves were filled with messages from this country urging all Italians to get out to vote. American citizens with friends and relatives in Italy were urged to communicate with them and impress upon them the imperative necessity for casting their ballots. Thousands upon thousands of letters and cables resulted.

A number of American citizens, estimated at about 4,000, who were then in Italy on business or travel, or visiting relatives, fired with enthusiasm to join in the Italian fight for freedom, went to the polls and cast their votes. Little did they realize in so doing they would lose their American citizenship. But when they sought to return to their native land, they found they had been expatriated.

I have introduced a bill, identical to one authorized by our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, to remove this disability and permit these unfortunate expatriates

to rejoin their loved ones in this country, provided they have had clean records during all of the time they were out of the country. It will heal a lot of broken hearts and restore to one roof American families disrupted by this innocent, but mistaken effort to uphold the cause of freedom in the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I quote an editorial from the Washington Post commending this legislation:

RESTORING CITIZENSHIP

Several thousand native-born and naturalized Americans lost their citizenship by voting in the Italian elections of 1946 and 1948. Most of them want to come back to this country but can do so now only as immigrants and under a quota oversubscribed for the next 8 years. It seems that in general, these people were not aware that loss of citizenship would be entailed in voting abroad. Moreover, they were subjected to a considerable amount of pressure to participate in the Italian elections. Church officials and even the British and American military authorities in Italy urged them to vote in order to overcome the Communist Party threat of the period.

These facts give persuasive support to a bill introduced by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER and unanimously endorsed by a House Judiciary Subcommittee to amend the Nationality Act so as to enable such persons to regain their status as Americans by taking an oath of allegiance to the United States within the next 3 years. Many if not most of them are undoubtedly victims of a misapprehension about the law. They should not be penalized for so innocent an error. Careful screening of the expatriates would appear to be in order to avoid the return of the few who may not be genuinely American. But the bulk undoubtedly deserve a warm welcome home.

Mrs. Norton's Record Boost for Women in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I herewith include in my extension of remarks a splendid but deserving editorial relating to our distinguished colleague Mrs. NORTON, of New Jersey, appearing in the Jersey Journal of December 14, 1949, entitled "Mrs. NORTON'S Record Boost for Women in Politics":

MRS. NORTON'S RECORD BOOST FOR WOMEN IN POLITICS

There will be regrets, not only among her many admirers, but also among voters who have differed sharply with some of her views, if Congresswoman MARY T. NORTON's long-standing decision to retire from Congress a year hence is carried out. The Thirteenth Congressional District, made up of the southern half of Jersey City and Bayonne, will lose one of the Nation's notable legislators when this lady completes a long congressional record covering 20 years, marked by outstanding events of national and international importance.

Mrs. NORTON's record and activities are a devastating answer to those old-fashioned souls who insist that "woman's place is in the home," and who would limit a woman's sphere on account of sex.

Here is a woman who has not only legislated superbly in the interest of the home, but as freeholder, as political leader, and as Member of Congress has shown marked ability in grappling with hospitalization, labor problems, war and peace topics, veterans' problems, and economic subjects of the greatest importance.

Mrs. NORTON has been one of those rare human beings in politics who was not afraid to call a spade a spade, who declined to be a trimmer, who refused to smother convictions to win fleeting praise, who refused to sell what she considered the truth to serve the passing hour.

Frank Hague, who as political leader, has sometimes picked lemons, proved himself a shrewd picker when in 1920, upon the adoption of woman suffrage by national amendment, he chose MARY T. NORTON against her will to begin a public career.

Among Mrs. NORTON's remarkable political performances was her work in pushing through the House of Representatives the Wagner Labor Relations Act, which endeared her to union labor and brought upon her head the criticism of some who feared Mrs. NORTON was going too far for the benefit of the toiler. In any event, Mrs. NORTON's record in general provides support for the well-founded claim that in New Jersey one of the outstanding sins of both parties has been the failure to accord to women the rightful place that it has been shown they can fill.

Austere Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune of November 17, 1950:

AUSTERE SECURITY

American businessmen were told Tuesday by the European Economic Cooperation Administration—Marshall program—that they must be ready to accept greater competition from European-made merchandise in the American market.

The report, sent by Mr. Truman to Congress, states that so far as can be seen, such European competition with our own business would have a minor impact on American producers.

The catch in this latter statement lies in the fact that the Government has been consistently underestimating the European economic situation.

Once a regularly established flow of foreign-made goods is directed into American trade channels, it is inevitable, and proved by the records, that our industries suffer. American watch factories, clay-products plants, glassware producers, leather and sporting goods manufacturers have felt the impact of European imports.

In our own State, the hand-blown glass industry has been cut 50 percent in the last year. Our glassworkers earn about $1.42 an hour. But glassware imported from Belgium, France, and Czechoslovakia is made by workers who earn from 20 cents an hour to 33 cents an hour. And such imports have reduced production in our own plants.

From New England come reports that watch factories are being hard hit by European imports of watches. British leather goods is displacing American-made products in many of our markets.

The economic administration and Mr. Truman contend that this is world trade, that we must build up European markets and foster foreign trade in order to keep the wheels going around.

But, there's a catch in this, too. It throws all true economic calculations out of line. That catch is that European production is based upon American tax dollars.

How far must American taxpayers go to make Europeans self-supporting?

That becomes a question our administration dodges.

For 5 years, we have been sending money, materials, and credit to Europe in tremendous amounts.

The results have not been good. Mr. Truman, Secretary Acheson, and Administrator Hoffman tell us that the Marshall plan is working. But, they belie their words the next day by hinting that we shall have to provide some kind of continuing aid for western Europe beyond the 1952 Marshall program deadline, and that unless we admit more foreign-made goods to compete with us, unless we withhold our own goods from the world market and let Britain and France sell their goods instead, the Marshall program may fail.

This all adds up to a doubtful proposition. If American taxpayers take a real appraisal of it, more will be required to soothe them than the hearty assurances of Mr. Truman and his spokesmen.

The President and Mr. Acheson are concerned about the future of Europe.

What about the future of America?

That is the question the American people should ask.

It is worth noting that the President and his spokesmen do not mention costs.

Is Mr. Truman leading this country directly toward an austerity program such as Britain has suffered for years?

Senator TAFT says he is. All political interests aside, it is worth looking at the figures, which no one denies.

America faces a deficit of five and a half billion dollars. When a man or a nation is in debt, it is necessary to ease up on spending, and to try to get more money.

Mr. Truman evades the issue on easing up on spending, but he says we'll have to have more taxes.

Senator TAFT says it will take 50 percent more taxes to finance the Truman welfare-state program, and such an increase is more than American business and American working people can stand without destroying our present high standard of living.

To increase our own taxes, increase our spending for security programs and for foreign aid will mean inevitably the destruction of many industrial plants, increasing unemployment, increasing Government work projects, and fewer of the things which Americans have grown accustomed to have—autos and homes, radios and good clothes, electric kitchens and the good food prepared in them.

Are we in America headed for austerity instead of security?

Samuel Gompers Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday evening President Truman, Vice President Barkley, President William Green, of the American Federation

of Labor, and others addressed a mammoth banquet at the Hotel Statler opening the centennial celebration of the birth of Samuel Gompers, the founder of the American Federation of Labor.

The following is the address delivered by Mr. Green, commemorating the work and accomplishments of the man who pioneered the labor movement in America:

The number of labor executives who new Samuel Gompers grows smaller each year. We are glad that this celebration of the hundredth anniversay of his birth in London, honoring the name and work of the founder of the American Federation of Labor, also permits those of us who knew and worked with him to share our experiences with newer members of our organization.

Though not a large man, Samuel Gompers had a magnetic personality and a commanding presence that forged him to the front as a leader. With a rich and powerful voice and a rare ability to plumb the mind and feelings of his listeners, his was a high crusading spirit that voiced the struggle of his fellow workers, urging them to join unions and to agitate, educate and organize and enlist others in the battle for human freedom. There was a radiance in his gift for living and enjoying homely details and this gift drew men to him in sincere comradeship.

The first 10 years of his life spanned the bridge between East Side London and East Side New York. Even at that early age he was thrilled with the opportunity of the West, the struggle to free slaves, and the hope of a better life. He explored New York, its theaters, operas, and Cooper Union, while he worked at the cigarmakers' trade. Even before maturity he found what he called the great fact of his life—the trade-union. It fascinated him and consumed his time. He tried to escape to have more time for his family but the union needed and sought him and he needed the union. East Side New York in the 1860's and 1870's was a cosmopolitan jungle where the revolutionaries of Europe sought refuge in the midst of the thousands of new immigrants coming each year. Many cigarmakers came from Germany, Scandinavian countries, from Austria as well as from England and France. Of such were the cigarmakers with whom Samuel Gompers worked. Many had known unions in Europe and they sought to adapt experiences gained in their countries to conditions in the New World. Wages were low, hours long, work uncertain and threatened by tenement production. Collective bargaining as we know it was unknown. Gompers learned much from the older workers who seemed to recognize his unusual qualities. With his inquisitive eagerness to know, he accumulated wisdom from their experiences which helped him to avoid mistakes. He learned from his first union teacher, Karl Laurrell: "Always keep your union card before you. If anything doesn't square with that card, it isn't good for you." Together these workers struggled to build up and develop their union, to better conditions for the cigarmakers of New York. To secure permanence of union membership, they developed union benefits and an employment service. They secured a State law abolishing tenement-house manufacture of cigars to rid themselves of sweatshop competition. They instituted collective bargaining and made their union a business agency, serving members as well as a fraternal agency through which they could help each other in time of need. When they succeeded in developing the New York local, they carried this union plan to their national union convention and elected one of their group president. He extended the practices to all unions.

For many years Samuel Gompers was president of this union of which he was so proud. While he worked and talked, he dreamed dreams of how unions might grow and what they might accomplish. When cigarmakers' unions were under way, Gompers and other union leaders began talking of a national federation of all trade unions. Out of such talks and letters to more distant unions came a national conference in Pittsburgh in 1881 and the Federation of Trades and Labor Unions of the United States and Canada. Without full-time officers, this organization languished. When the Knights of Labor began invading the functions of trade unions, so that the very existence of trade unions was endangered, a great national conference was called which formed a new federation to promote and conserve the trade unions—the American Federation of Labor. The old federation was merged with the new one and Samuel Gompers became its full-time president. In 1887, with an office which was contributed, with makeshift furniture, but with sturdy volunteers, he began to mold the strongest and most aggressive labor movement in the world. He had to do business with pioneers of American business. These captains of industry were strong and often ruthless. Unions also had to fight to survive and make gains. From 50,000 in 1881, the federation had increased threefold by 1886. The nucleus expanded slowly until at the turn of the century more rapid growth came. It reached 4,000,000 in the First World War but declined following the postwar drive against unions. The membership was approximately 3,000,000 at the end of Mr. Gompers' career.

The organizational job alone was stupendous. It began with awakening workers to a realization of what organization could do for them—locally, regionally, and nationally. It rested upon educating individual workers to a consciousness of the personal responsibility of each for promoting his own welfare in cooperation with other workers. He had to develop the tools of operation along with working out plans to achieve its goals. Every institution has its procedures, its rules and records. If these enable it to perform its functions, the organization develops as intended. So in accord with the constitution of the American Federation of Labor, Samuel Gompers developed working rules and forms whereby representatives were authorized to work and report on problems and results. This included devising and issuing credentials to organizers and charters to unions—local, national, city and State federated bodies. Each step of progress was voluntary because the workers concerned saw it promoted their welfare. They said to each and all, "Join with us and it will do you good." Unions were educated to realize that failure to affiliate with central bodies, State federations and national organizations, weakens the whole movement and limits progress. The American Federation of Labor followed the practice—agitate, organize, educate. Force and compulsion were to be resorted to as a disciplinary measure only after all other methods had failed.

Nor was trade-unionism limited to craft workers, he said, in reflecting on unions of workers on streetcars—the horse-drawn variety: "It is not necessarily skill in work on which the union rests, but skill in organization." Sharing of each other's problems in promoting their welfare facilitated organization which was rooted in brotherhood. There is a deep significance in the American union practice of addressing fellow members as brother and sister. Unionism has a spiritual reach that makes it an indomitable force. Gompers felt that any worker taking the obligations of union membership became a person obligated to put human freedom and personal responsibility foremost in his philosophy and to live so as to give reality to that way of life. Since freedom was the goal, voluntarism was the principle he advocated. Democracy to him meant responsible individuals living in a responsible society. Individual rights were the practical results of that way of life. As president of the American Federation of Labor, Gompers could not compel any person or union to act contrary to his or their judgment. He depended, therefore, on persuasion and education to build up a federation held together by conviction and moral standards.

Voluntarism partly explains his emphasis on economic action in preference to legislative action. As workers gained in organization, they achieved economic power which in turn gave them political influence. Bettering conditions and raising standards came directly and rapidly through union demand and collective bargaining. In good times wage rates through union demand and collective bargaining. In good times wage rates could be raised by action of those concerned. To do these things by legislation took more time, for more people had to be convinced. Legislation enforces minimum standards and well-tried practices. Legislation deals with matters affecting all citizens and with rules of action conforming to the ideals of the majority of citizens. It does not provide the flexibility needed for pioneering for new standards. So in economic relations—where men and women determine their work lives—he conceived of the development of economic order by mutual contracts guided by basic principles of human welfare and scientific law. He sought to establish economic government in which all concerned in production should have representation and voice. He was preoccupied with the problems of daily progress. He declared, "We want more, we demand more, and when we get that more we shall insist upon again more and more and even more until we get the full fruition of our labor."

As opposed to the straightforward union plans to reduce hours and increase pay, there were European socialists who wanted to abolish private employers; Henry George, who argued for single tax on land; the Populists, who wanted cheap money, political reform movements, exiles from the Paris Commune, and many others led by intellectuals who wanted to use workers for their own ends rather than to improve work conditions. Watching such leaders beguile workers from the main problem of eliminating poverty, Samuel Gompers urged one organization devoted purely and simply to the welfare of workers—trade unions.

Shorter hours and more pay, he said, are the most revolutionary forces in lives of workers.

Pure and simple trade unionism meant to him unions of workers directed by workers, to promote the welfare of workers. Only workers employed in the union's jurisdiction were eligible to membership and only members were eligible to election to union office. All other organizations, however worthy, were secondary to the union. Some like the Socialists, the Knights of Labor, the American Railroad Union, and the IWW, tried to build up dual unions but without real success. These experiences led the American Federation of Labor to another cardinal principle in union government—one union for one jurisdiction. Other union principles and practices were evolved out of experience in dealing with problems. Our unions took on aggressiveness, born of the New World, where all struggled to benefit by opportunities freely available to all. Samuel Gompers realized that if the union harnessed all the energy and resourcefulness of wage earners in furtherance of economic purposes, the union would lift real standards of living for

all workers and would make workers a power in their community.

This Rope of Sand as he once called the American Federation of Labor, was to him the strongest force on earth because held together by mutual interests and moral compulsion. The principle of voluntarism he extended to political action when in 1906 and 1908 he rallied all the unions to nonpartisan trade-union action to secure relief from injunction abuses that threatened freedom and from application of antitrust legislation to trade-unions. "Laborers have no product for sale," he cried. "They possess only their labor power—their power to produce." To save trade-unions from being crushed by legislation and court decrees, he submitted a bill of grievances to Congress and petitioned the political parties to include labor's declarations in their platforms, and then called upon workers to reward their friends and punish their foes. Their guide was loyalty to the principles of unionism. His faith was later to be justified by the labor provisions of the Clayton Antitrust Act regulating and limiting the use of the injunction and declaring that the labor power of a human being is not a commodity nor article of commerce; and by the enactment of the law establishing the United States Department of Labor, and the Seamen's Act.

In his later years, still crusading for human freedom, he gave distinguished service in the First World War and helped to create the Pan-American Federation of Labor to bring economic freedom to the wage earners of the Western Hemisphere.

As Samuel Gompers journeyed across the country to what he knew was his last labor convention in El Paso, he wrote a personal and final message to labor. In it he embodied his creed. I felt it a great honor that he sent for me and asked me to read it for him as he explained that his eyes no longer served him. That message stated:

"As I review the events of my 60 years of contact with the labor movement and as I survey the problems of today and study the opportunities of the future, I want to say to you men and women of the American labor movement, do not reject the cornerstone upon which labor's structure has been builded—but base your all upon voluntary principles and illumine your every problem by consecrated devotion to that highest of all purposes—human well-being in the fullest, widest, deepest sense."

Such was the kind of labor movement Samuel Gompers helped to mold—an organization typically American and devoted to the ideals that gave our Nation purpose. It is the kind of labor movement in which any free nation may take pride. It is part of the life stream of American democracy.

The organization which Gompers built has withstood the grueling tests of business prosperity and depression. Because of its services it has gained and held members. Bound by spiritual and fraternal bonds, it has inspired its members to work on for ever higher standards. The organization he built stands today unchanged in basic principles. As new problems have developed we have applied the old guiding precept and have added a bit here and there to procedures. There has been growth without change of purpose or goals. Our foundations rooted in understanding of human dignity with inalienable right to freedom, will remain unchanged.

We pledge our founder loyalty to the principles he upheld. We know that the freedom we enjoy was gained by the sacrifices of men who understood and accepted responsibility. If we are to continue to enjoy this freedom we must also share responsibility for exercising rights and maintaining freedom.

Bible Versus Commie War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY CAVALCANTE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Bible Versus Commie War," which appeared in the Uniontown Morning Herald on Saturday, December 24, 1949. I hope all the Members will read this very fine sermon by Rev. William S. Hill, of St. Peter's Episcopal Church, of Uniontown, Pa.

BIBLE VERSUS COMMIE WAR VIEWED BY LOCAL RECTOR

Parishioners of St. Peter's Episcopal Church were greatly impressed by a sermon delivered recently by the rector, William S. Hill, on the subject, Communism Confronts Christianity.

"It was one of the finest sermons I ever heard delivered anywhere," said one member of the congregation.

Enthusiastic over the masterpiece, Attorney Lynn V. Phillips, secretary of the vestry, added:

"Everyone should know what Communism is and how it works in contradiction to Christianity. The sermon by Rev. Hill is one of the best explanations I have heard or read. It is stated so simply and is so complete in thought that a youngster is able to understand the distinction and difference."

TWO ANTAGONISTS

The Morning Herald presents the sermon in its entirety:

"Over and above as well as under and behind any war of weapons, is an even more fundamental war of ideas. Whether or not there is a 'shooting war' of major proportions during the second half of the twentieth century, there is going to be a fierce continuation of the 'cold war' of ideas and the two antagonists in this war of ideas, as everyone knows, are Christianity and Communism.

"Today supplies us with a good opportunity to consider this ideological conflict for this is Bible Sunday—the day on which Christians recall with gratitude the gift of the Holy Scriptures and of course in the present controversy the arsenal of Christianity is the Bible, whereas the arsenal of Communism is the Communist Manifesto along with the writings of Karl Marx.

"The basic similarities as well as the fundamental differences between Christianity and communism can be said to arise from the conception each has of man himself. Christianity prays, 'give us this day our daily bread.' Christianity realizes that as a physical being man must eat. But Christianity also maintains that 'man does not live by bread alone.' Christianity asserts that as a spiritual being man has a hunger which mere bread will not satisfy."

MARX BOAST

"On the other hand, communism does not merely affirm that man needs bread; it goes on to assert that this is all he does need. Karl Marx himself boasted of having got rid of 'the lumber of soul and spirit' and at his death standing beside the grave, Marx's friend, Friedrich Engels said, 'Marx's discovered the simple fact that human beings must have food and drink, clothing and shelter, before they can interest themselves in politics, science, art, religion and such like' and the implication was that these things should be forgotten until all economic problems were settled.

"But now look into your own heart and ask yourself which of the two points of view describes you. Of course, you have to eat. But would you be willing to live by bread alone? Does eating alone satisfy you? Are there not great areas of the spirit which you overlook only at the cost of your own happiness? You are familiar with the lines by James Terry White:

"'If thou of fortune be bereft
And in thy store there be but left
Two loaves, sell one and with the dole
Buy hyacinths to feed thy soul.'

"You recognize this as an adaptation of a Persian theme but doesn't it describe our own attitudes? Sure, we need the one loaf but we need the hyacinths, too. The hunger for beauty, for companionship, for affection, for inspiration, for inner security is not satisfied by bread alone.

"Now, let us consider for a moment the implications in the phrase, Give us this day our daily bread. Here there is the recognition, first of all, that men and women are physical, material beings. They have to eat. And then there is the recognition that any social order or economic system which deprives people of the opportunity to eat, that is, to make a decent living, is unjust and should be changed. Moreover, there is the further recognition that all things on earth—its fruits, its raw materials, its resources—have been put here not for the benefit of the privileged few but for the general good of all. All these points are implicit in the Lord's Prayer and all of them are made very explicit in numerous passages in the Bible."

GOAL OF COMMUNISM

"On all these points communism walks hand in hand with Christianity. In fact, Arnold Toynebee, the eminent historian, says that communism is a leaf taken from the book of Christianity. And indeed it is. The Marxist ideal of social justice comes straight from the Hebrew prophets; the belief that the strong should have power to exploit the weak comes almost word for word from Saint Paul; and the notion that the interests of humanity should be served regardless of racial or national boundary lines represents the thought of innumerable passages in scripture.

"To state it succinctly, the goal of communism is to create an international, interracial society to which each contributes according to his ability and from which each receives according to his need. The plumber, the professor, the parent; the policeman, the politician, each contributes to society according to his ability, and to each of these is given according to what he requires. Could anything be more just than that? Could anything be more Christian than that? Truly, as Toynebee says, communism is a leaf taken out of the book of Christianity.

"Now some may ask, Why did that leaf have to be taken out? Why did communism arise in the first place? Let us be honest about this. It was because Christianity did such a poor job of living up to its principles. Day after day Christians prayed for their daily bread with but little concern for whether or not their neighbors were receiving any bread at all. For too long after the social upheaval of the industrial revolution the Christians were insensitive to the needs of the downtrodden masses, unaware of the claims of simple social justice. You have heard the phrase, 'Religion is the opium of the people.' It did not originate with Karl Marx, as many think. It originated with Charles Kingsby, an English clergyman, who early in the nineteenth century despaired at the lack of social vision on the part of religious people in his own country."

SOURCE OF POWER

"'The best reason for becoming a Communist,' it has been said, 'is an empty stomach.' And in so-called Christian countries from the beginning of the industrial revolution to the present, there have been plenty of empty stomachs. Consider the sketches made of the English laborers 100 years ago by the artist Gavarni—'the men devitalized and clad in rags, the women pining and wasted, the children pallid, rachitic and tearful'—do you wonder that Communist notions of justice got a foothold? Consider the conditions (up until very recently) of our own American workers in mills, mines, and trades. Do you wonder that there are Communists seeking to get power in some of our labor unions? Consider the economic discrimination against the Negro race. Do you wonder that many Negroes are sympathetic to communism?

"If Christianity fails to create a just social order, satisfying the elementary need for bread,' we can be sure that people will incline to the false panaceas and false religions which promise them relief. If Christianity fails, communism will succeed for within every one there is the cry, 'Give us this day our daily bread.'

"But for all that Christianity and communism have elements in common they nevertheless part company. As Arnold Toynbee has said: Communism is 'a leaf taken from the book of Christianity' but he goes on to add, 'This leaf has been torn out and misread.' And it has been torn out and misread precisely because communism deliberately ignores the fact that man does not live by bread alone. He needs the leaf but he needs the hyacinths and all they stand for, as well.'"

CITES COMPARISON

"One thing man wants almost as much as he wants bread is freedom and to live in a Communist regime is to live in a prison. St. Peter, St. Paul and other biblical characters have shown us how to live constructively and creatively even in a prison; but it is significant that they did their greatest work not when they were in prison, where they were fed regularly but when they were out and had to take their chance on subsistence. Interestingly enough, back in 1878, Otto von Bismarck prophesied that should a Communist state be established it would become a vast prison with all but the tyrants at the top at the mercy of the jailers. And on top of the Christian belief that life can flourish best in an atmosphere of freedom, add also the Christian belief that no one is so high and mighty that he has the right to tyrannize over another, just as no one is so lacking in personal worth that he can be expected to become another's slave.

"This brings us to another point, namely Christianity's concern with the preciousness of the individual Jesus, as you know, spoke of how terrible it is to offend one of the 'little ones' and He held up the duty to 'the least of these, my brethren.' From the Marxist point of view, however, the individual counts for little. When some of Lenin's associates were complaining about the terrible sacrifice of blood resulting from the civil war in Russia, he rejoined, 'It doesn't matter a jot if three-fourths of mankind perish. The only thing that matters is that in the end the remaining fourth should remain Communist.' Where he set out still more intransigeantly 'to reconstruct humanity to fit the machine.'"

LENIN STATEMENT

"Related to the disregard for the preciousness of individual is the doctrine wholeheartedly taken over the Marxists but always seriously questioned by the Christians that the end justifies the means. By fomenting class war, by stirring up hatred, by using all kinds of violence, by sowing confusion, by employing every form of intimidation, and by resorting to trickery, deceit, and chicanery, the Marxists hope to build a society of abundance, harmony, and general welfare. Listen to what Lenin said to Gorky in 1920 during a symphony concert. 'I do not like often to listen to music for it might make me chatter amiable stupidities and stroke these people's heads. Today is not the time for stroking heads—today we must use our hands to split skulls, to split them remorselessly.' So the perfect society is going to be built by cracking heads, by compulsory work battalions, by Siberian prisons, by the secret police. That is the kind of absurdities of reasoning you commit when you let yourself believe the end justifies the means. For more likely that all these enormities will produce further enormities. As Bertrand Russell once remarked, 'There is so much of hate in Marx and communism that Communists can hardly be expected when victorious, to establish a regime offering no outlet for malevolence. The Christian principle is that what you build out of hatred and violence will only generate more hate and violence. As the apostle put it, 'Be not overcome of evil but overcome evil with good.'

"But the great quarrel which Christianity has with communism is, of course, on the question of materialism. The Marxists believe that materialistic and economic considerations are the only ones which have any reality and any power. Karl Marx himself wrote in the Communist Manifesto: 'The charge made against communism from a religious, a philosophical, and generally, from an ideological standpoint, are not deserving of serious attention.' Why? Because from his point of view such things as religion, philosophy, and the like are simply the product of economic systems and are used by the ruling classes to keep the common people in subjection. What you think you want and what you believe, in other words, has been forced on you by the economic system under which you live. In contrast to this, Christianity affirms that life is not determined by material forces exclusively. Man does not hunger only for bread. He hungers also for beauty, for art, for understanding, for fellowship, for love, and by no means least, for God."

PERTINENT CONFLICT

"Man does not live by bread alone," says Christianity, and on this affirmation Christianity decisively and permanently parts company with communism.

"But what faces the world today is more than a 'parting of company' between communism and Christianity. It is a war—a war of ideas, a conflict between the Bible and the Communist manifesto. The lines are clearly drawn. In the Marxist view, religion impedes the evolution of this world toward a classless society, and thus religion must be eradicated. In the Christian view, on the other hand, communism for all its insistence on justice bids fair to debase human relations, to distort human personality, to defeat all striving after the beautiful and true, to destroy mankind's hard-won liberties and to desecrate the human soul; therefore communism must be eradicated. So the cold war is on.

"What part is the individual Christian to play in this conflict of ideas? I would say that our fundamental duties in this conflict are two. First, to demonstrate in our lives that our religion kindles a passion for justice more intense and more universal than any which the Marxist shows, in this passion for justice attacking the evils out of which communism frequently arises—misery, poverty, economic insecurity, and war. And then our second duty is to confront Marxist atheism with a vital theism, a living belief in and dedication to God that gives to every area of life a new quality and character making it clear to all that man does not live by bread alone but by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God."

Conferences in the Pacific Coast States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include therein the report made by the Secretary of Commerce to the White House, of conditions as he found them in the Pacific Coast States during his recent tour of inspection:

CONFERENCES IN THE PACIFIC COAST STATES

The conferences which I held in cities along the Pacific coast during September reminded me once again of the differences which characterize the various broad regions of the country and of the variety of their problems and opportunities. The economy of this general area is typified by extremely dramatic and continuing growth. My meetings were held at San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, and Seattle—a coverage which presented a representative picture of the current situation and a wide range of problems.

The fact which stands out above all others in California, Oregon, and Washington is that of tremendous population growth. Nearly a third of the entire national growth in population since 1940 has occurred here. California's gain of more than 3,500,000 accounts for most of it, but Washington's increase was exceeded by only five other States, and in Oregon the rate of growth was faster than that of any other State. Two aspects of this exceptional phenomenon are of particular significance, especially for California. One is that by far the larger proportion of the population increase has come not from new births but from migration into the area of people from other parts of the country, most of whom come not to retire, as in former years, but to settle and make a living. The other is that, though wartime expansion created much of the growth, it has continued steadily through the present year. Some of the current difficulties of the area are rooted in these population changes. By the same token, much of its rich economic opportunity is based on that factor—for here are hundreds of thousands of new workers to process the products of the forests, and farms, and mines, together with the resources of water and power with which to do it. And here, too, is a vast new market for their output. Indeed, the dramatic growth in employment, and business, and industry throughout this area from 1942 to 1948 demonstrates the actual workings of that process.

California, with over 10,000,000 of the area's 15,000,000 people, has felt the full force of all of this. Here, since prewar days, employment has grown rapidly—factory jobs alone have nearly doubled. Nonetheless, and though conditions have improved since the time of my visit, California unemployment has been running above national levels. In important part, this stems from the

continued influx of workers. In Los Angeles, for example, it was pointed out to me that actual employment was higher this summer than in the summer of 1948. But so was unemployment. It was estimated that as many as 10,000 people were still coming into the State monthly; estimates for the Los Angeles area alone ranged above 30,000. Unemployment conditions in Washington and Oregon more closely resembled the national picture, and there was much less difficulty reported there from influx of new workers. However, though unemployment nationally did not reach substantial proportions until the spring and summer of this year, it is important to note that both in Washington and California the number of jobless was already considerable in the summer of 1948—a situation reflecting in large part the conversion from wartime to peacetime production and employment.

Reports made to me on business conditions along the coast from San Diego to Seattle presented many contrasts. Businessmen repeatedly pointed out that levels of activity are far higher than anything known before the war, and said that most of the declines experienced this year represent normal price and inventory readjustments which were desirable and necessary. It did not appear that the general volume of sales in wholesale and retail trade had fallen much below that for last year in physical terms, though the dollar volume was indicated as being at lower than national levels. Representatives of many firms reported a noticeable improvement in sales volume during the summer. However, in those localities adversely affected by GM strikes and curtailment of shipbuilding and other military activity the picture was distinctly less favorable. It was the consensus among those in retail and wholesale trade that because of price reductions and increased operating costs their 1949 profits would be substantially under those for last year. None of the bankers attending my conferences indicated any substantial falling off of business for the year. Real-estate activity was reported to be extremely good, and in some instances, ahead of 1948. On the other hand, a number of construction firms and contractors' organizations mentioned a substantial falling off in commercial and industrial construction and some decline in residential construction as compared with last year; however, home building appeared to have turned upward during the summer, and construction of schools and public and institutional buildings had been vigorous. After experiencing an unprecedented wartime and postwar market, the lumber industry, a major economic factor in Washington, Oregon, and northern California, was said to have experienced some decline earlier in the year, with a resurgence of demand during the summer. However, there appeared to be little question that the decline was felt more severely among the small mills and logging firms which multiplied greatly during the war and find difficulty in a more competitive market. Very large numbers of these were reported to have ceased operations, a major factor contributing to unemployment. The pulp-paper industry was also reported operating at lower production levels than for last year, though activity became stronger in the summer. Production and employment in commercial fishing appeared to have been distributed very well through the year in the Northwest, though at lower prices. The tuna packing industry of southern California, however, was reported to be facing extreme difficulty in competition with tuna imports. Producers of woolens and other garments reported generally satisfactory business. Operations in the basic of basic steel products, machinery, and other heavy goods were reported below 1948 peaks but in line with national trends.

Some of the less favorable business and employment situations along the Pacific Coast, particularly in California, are clearly the aftermath of the amazing record of war production through that area. Notable among these are shipbuilding and ship repair work. San Diego, Long Beach, Richmond, and other communities grew suddenly to enormous size around the great shipyards, or within commuting distance of them. With the necessarily drastic cutback in ship construction, many of the war workers have still to find steady employment. Moreover, ship repair work had greatly fallen off due to the transfer of naval vessels to the mothball fleet, assignment of others to operations elsewhere, the postwar decline in foreign commerce, and such work stoppages as those in docks at San Francisco and Hawaii. Public officials and business and labor spokesmen from the affected communities appeared at my meetings and strongly urged that the Federal Government make a special effort to direct a larger measure of maintenance and repair work on naval and private ships to these centers. All of them, of course, were anxious to see shipbuilding activity resumed. Further, they were particularly distressed at the necessary reductions in civilian employment at military establishments. Some of them urged that the reductions be held in abeyance until displaced war workers were more fully absorbed into other employment. Others urged that the reductions be effected through normal attrition rather than through layoffs.

Still another postwar adjustment problem was posed by numerous small manufacturers doing subcontract work for the aircraft industry. They reported that, because of the postwar decline in prime contracts for military aircraft and because producers of commercial aircraft were pulling production work back into their own plants, a drastic curtailment of orders had resulted. Among this group of businessmen there was a keen interest in the Government procurement program as a source of new business. It was repeatedly urged that procurement procedures be simplified, that contracts be broken down into smaller units, and that small firms be given greater opportunity to bid on prime contracts. With reference to the aircraft industry, there were grave fears in the Seattle area and in southern California arising from discussion of the shifting of production to inland centers. These fears were related not only to the loss of employment and trade, but to the effect such a shift would have on general industrial growth.

Still other problems affecting many businesses in the Pacific Coast States related to our foreign-trade situation. Historically, foreign trade has played a major role in the economy of this whole area. Its harbors have been outlets for a great deal of its own production and that of States to the east, and they have served as ports of entry for a major portion of the Nation's imports. An important part of that trade was with the Orient; dollar shortages and unsettled postwar conditions have been such that it has failed to flourish again. Further, a number of reports made to me from the citrus industry in California and from the lumber and fruit industries of the Northwest stated that our foreign-aid programs had failed to restore to them the European markets they once enjoyed. Other exporters cited the dollar shortage for the failure of their Latin American trade to thrive. Again, both business and labor spokesmen from the movie industry described a truly serious falling off of production and employment stemming from the loss of export business, not only because of dollar shortages but because of market restrictions established by importing nations. Exporters were hopeful that the foreign-aid program would eventually ameliorate these conditions; citrus growers in particular urged that the ECA undertake to support their European markets. Flour millers operating far below capacity complained that a disproportionate amount of wheat, as against flour, was going to Japan in light of the inadequate know-how there for its conversion into superior flour and bread as a dietary supplement. It was complained, too, that because of arrangements under the international wheat agreement which permit Canada to sell in Philippine and other free markets at a price below that set for countries inside the agreement, the United States' share in wheat exports to free markets has been reduced unfairly. Finally, there were complaints that the aluminum industry was not getting an adequate share of ECA purchases, and that ECA funds were being used to purchase aluminum produced in Canada in plants which the United States helped finance during the war; it was stated that domestic producers could not match Canadian prices because of lower production costs there.

The foreign-trade problems called to my attention involved imports as well as exports. This was especially the case in Washington and Oregon. Thus, for example, representatives of the lumber, building materials, pulp-paper, fruit growing, wool, and meat-packing industries were extremely fearful that, following devaluation, imports would seriously affect their sales volume and prices. Because of high labor and other operating costs, they reported great difficulty in meeting the price competition involved. Labor officials as well as businessmen in the Northwest expressed considerable concern over the effects of devaluation because of the great similarity between agricultural and industrial production there and in nearby Canada. In southern California, as previously indicated, tuna fishermen and packers and labor representatives reported that that industry was experiencing vigorous price competition in national markets because of sizable tuna imports. As a result, inventories were said to be moving slowly and accumulating rapidly. There were indications, however, that resolution of problems within the industry domestically might soon improve that situation, and that more effective distribution methods would improve the industry's competitive position.

Along the Pacific coast, as elsewhere in the West, there were many complaints regarding freight rates. Businessmen repeatedly claimed that postwar rate increases on eastward shipments had been disproportionately higher than increases elsewhere in the country, and that the application of the wartime excise tax on top of present rates has the effect of further magnifying the distortion. Both in the Northwest and in California fruit growers and packers stated that for these reasons they were having great difficulty competing in eastern markets. They attributed a generally lower farm income partly to this situation. Among manufacturers selling in the national market there were many expressions of concern as to confusion over the legality of freight absorption in connection with basing-point pricing.

Some of the most effective activity in the field of small business credit to come to my attention I found along the west coast. Some of the banks there, along with service on commercial loans, are extending service of a technical nature on marketing and management problems, thus helping to assure profitable operations both for the bank and the borrower. However, most of the suggestions made regarding capital needs, whether in large or small firms, had to do with revision of the Federal tax structure to permit

retention of a larger share of business earnings for capital purposes and to make equity investments more attractive.

The strike among dock workers in Hawaii and San Francisco appeared to have been felt all along the west coast. A large amount of shipping was said to have been diverted from that area to the Gulf coast. Firms processing Hawaiian fruit imports were deprived of their normal receipts. Retailers importantly dependent upon dock and shipping workers as customers experienced severe losses in sales. Other firms which normally use waterborne shipping for the movement of freight were put to extra expense in using more costly forms of transportation.

The work stoppages above provoked a great deal of interest and discussion among businessmen concerning labor relations. I have already referred to the suggestion made to me in my business conference in San Francisco that both management and labor would do well to spend the money they now put into conflict on learning how to get along with each other. I was impressed, too, with the continued use and achievements of the labor-management committee which has been carried over from the war period in Portland. One of the most thoughtful and sympathetic analyses I heard of current business problems in the movie industry was given me by a labor spokesman at Los Angeles.

Labor representatives outlined a number of situations which can make for difficulties in the field of labor relations. One was the shortage of low-cost housing. It was evident, particularly in California, that population growth had considerably out-paced new residential construction and that a large market demand remains, particularly in the lower-priced field. Labor groups in the lumber industry were most anxious for more vigorous activity in the housing field as a remedy for unemployment there. Labor representatives in California were particularly distressed over what they reported to be the illegal residence of workers imported from Mexico for seasonal agricultural work; remaining in California following their seasonal work. It was claimed that these workers enter into competition with native labor and tend to depress wage patterns. Workers in California were also distressed by the continued influx of workers from other States, especially since many permanent residents have still to find regular peacetime employment.

The rapid population and economic changes through the Pacific coast area have created a host of problems for State and local government. One of the most serious of these is that of water supply in California. Another is the shortage of electric power in the Pacific Northwest, where marked increases in industrial, commercial, and residential power consumption have outdistanced the growth in basic generating capacity; as a result, that area was reported to have been unable to supply power for a number of new industries which would have provided much needed employment for displaced war workers and others moving in from other States. In California, municipalities and private utilities had greatly expanded production capacity to keep up with constantly rising demand. Yet it was reported that an important part of the power supply, coming from the Boulder Canyon project on the Colorado River, will revert to States to the east as they exercise their rights to it; it was strongly urged by local officials that the Federal Government accelerate its power-development program and provide municipal systems with larger amounts of available power. Public officials in California also urged that the Federal Government assist in resolving the conflict between the States over water rights in the lower Colorado Basin in order to assure more adequate water and power supplies. It appeared that San Diego, at the extreme southern tip of the State, had completely exhausted its reserve supplies of water and can sustain further growth only by development of additional facilities to carry water from mountain sources. Several alternative proposals were said to be under study by State and local officials and agencies of the Federal Government.

Population growth in the west-coast area has been largely a matter of urban expansion. Particularly in California this has created extremely serious deficiencies in community facilities and services—schools, sewer and water systems, streets, etc., as well as in those provided by State government. I heard numerous reports there on the very large outlays made since the war both by the State and the communities for all kinds of public works. It was stated that in some localities the financing of such outlays is made difficult by virtue of the large property holdings of Federal agencies and the loss of local tax revenues on such holdings. State and local public works needs were acute also in Washington and Oregon communities on which reports were made, though the situation appears less critical than among California communities. In none of my meetings, despite the urgency of these needs, was there any significant sentiment for lavish Federal spending on State and local public works as an unemployment remedy. Indeed, labor spokesmen in California expressed the fear that such a program might greatly aggravate the unemployment situation by attracting an even larger influx of workers from outside the State. They urged, instead, that public-works expenditures be carefully programmed to fit actual needs and used to provide employment for permanent residents and older workers out of jobs and for the training of unskilled workers. Considerable interest was expressed in Federal aid for the advance planning of public works, and all communities were interested in financial aid for actual construction should it become actually necessary to initiate such programs.

In all of my west-coast meetings there was a very keen consciousness of the need for constant enlargement of the economic base of the area to provide employment and business opportunities for a rapidly growing population. Accordingly, on every hand I heard pleas for development of the power and water resources of the Central Valley of California and the Columbia and Colorado River basins, though there was no unanimity as to the type of administrative arrangement which would best achieve that objective. I heard earnest pleas that the services of this and other departments be made fully available to public and private groups in connection with their efforts to attract new industries and to develop others indigenously.

It was a rich experience to talk with those who have participated so intimately in the recent economic development of our Pacific Coast States. That development has been phenomenal. Business and labor and government there have many vexing problems. But they are largely problems of growth, not of decline. And that growth has added and is adding greatly to our national wealth and strength. The potentials for further growth are very large. Throughout the whole area I found high confidence in the future and a driving enthusiasm to get on with the task of achieving it.

These lengthy accounts of business, employment, and general economic conditions in the regions which I visited necessarily compress a vast amount of factual information and numerous detailed observations and suggestions made to me. They may serve, however, to underscore the obvious fact that this is an extremely diverse country. Trends in employment and production and sales do not take place on some abstract national basis, but within the distinctive and varying settings found in the economies of the several great regions of the Nation. Programs of the Government can gain much in effectiveness when formulated and executed with due regard to these differing needs and aspirations.

The President's Budget Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the President says his budget estimate calls for expenditures in the fiscal year 1951 of $42,400,000,000. That is what he says.

But on page A-6 of the budget appears the real story of what is being requested.

The President is asking for appropriations for 1951 of $40,244,000,000. Of this, $4,312,000,000 is said to be for liquidating previous contract authorizations. In addition to that, he is asking in his budget estimates for $1,444,000,000 of deficiency items for 1950, the current fiscal year. He is asking for new contract authorizations of $143,000,000 and for new funds for 1950, which requires legislation, of $4,275,000,000 and new funds for 1951, which requires legislation, of $1,300,000,000 and new contract authorizations for 1951 of $3,362,000,000.

If you add the new appropriations that he is asking for, including the contract authorizations, the deficiency which this Congress is asked to provide, the new authorizations which this Congress is asked to provide, the items provided for in new legislation carrying an over-all picture of what the President is asking the Congress to give him in this session, you get a total of $50,833,000,000.

Of this amount $3,511,000,000 is new contract authorizations, so that the cash requests total $47,322,000,000. This is an increase of almost $2,000,000,000 over the $38,500,000,000 of cash provided by the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

It is easy enough to see that if the President's budget goes through there are only two choices for the Government: To default on its obligations or to impose additional taxes on a tax paying public that is already groaning from the load.

There can be no question but that this request for cash totalling over $47,000,000,000 means vast spending programs not included in the $42,400,000,000 which the President states he plans to spend in 1951.

The whole situation is critical for the American people. It means so many new taxes and such a drain upon the economy of the country that if we are to have a solvent Government the Congress must wake up to its responsibilities, even though the President himself has no sense of responsibility.

We cannot maintain our liberties if we turn this money over to the President

and the socialistic schemers who surround him.

I intend to fight for a balanced budget. The revenues in sight are $38,000,000,000 and we must keep our expenditures down below that.

More Papa Knows Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of Thursday, January 5, 1950:

MORE PAPA KNOWS BEST

There will be little fault to find with President Truman's state of the Union message insofar as his external objective of peace is concerned, but on the domestic side it is a hodgepodge of glaring contradictions which are all too familiar. We suspect that this phonograph record has by now been played so often that not many will be fooled by it.

The President paid tribute in his state of the Union message to fundamental American principles. These principles—of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—to these he dedicates himself and his administration. Yet, he steps on the accelerator of domestic social reform, going whole hog for European socialistic measures when he hasn't even tried the most obvious American solutions to such problems as public health. He is for "the incentives necessary for investment and for the development of new lines of enterprise," but he makes no more than a gesture toward reducing the taxes which are strangling enterprise. He deplores monopoly as the great hindrance to small business on the very day that a great New York newspaper, the Sun, is forced to give up its existence because of the high costs of production brought about by Truman policies.

The President is for freedom and a chance for the entrepreneur, but he wants to keep on rent controls. He talks about our freedom-loving farmers and yet espouses the Brannan farm plan which is so unfreedom looking to the farmers that some of their largest organizations have opposed it. Implicit throughout the message is the President's faith, not in the people, but in a government under his direction to give the people benefits. Despite persuasive showings that there are little promising hydroelectric development prospects in New England, he would have the Government look into that, too. In short, if anything can be done by Government that might please a lot of voters, regardless of cost, Mr. Truman's for that.

This doesn't sound like statesmanship to us. It doesn't sound like even well-visioned leadership. There is little evidence in this message of national stewardship, of any serious attempt having been made to evaluate the relative importance of national and domestic programs, of putting first things first, or of any awareness of a calendar which leaves room for doing worthwhile things when they can be better afforded by those who have to pay the bills.

Once again, papa knows best, but it isn't papa who pays.

The Young Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and editorial which are self-explanatory:

THE MARION SENTINEL,
Cedar Rapids, Iowa, January 2, 1950.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Last summer I worked out the Young plan for TVA. We published it October 13, and you probably read it.

On November 20, the Knoxville Journal published the Holt plan. Holt, a former TVA employee and evidently a competent man, has presented his plan, originally proposed by me, to seven southern governors.

I wish him all the power in the world, but in justice to the Sentinel, I would appreciate having the original proposition and date printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

ROSS N. YOUNG.

[From the Marion (Iowa) Sentinel of October 13, 1949]

FACING THE FACTS

(By Ross Young)

It is time to call the bluff of the public power lobby and its captive columnist. The weird bookkeeping and other sly actions of TVA may seem smart to a Lilienthal, but they are offensive to many informed and honorable citizens.

It will not be too difficult to discover if TVA bureaucrats, the public-power lobby, and the liberal columnists are really sincere. Simply offer to sell TVA to the people of the Tennessee Valley. The selling price could be the actual cost plus interest. The people in the Tennessee Valley should jump at such a bargain, for most of the construction was carried on at half the present costs. The State of Tennessee and other affected areas could form a corporation. All or part of the stock could be sold to individuals, companies, cooperatives, and municipalities.

In giving the locally owned TVA such a bargain, the Government would insist, of course, on certain safeguards. The new corporation would pay the regular local and Federal taxes. It would be required by law to set aside depreciation and other reserves in accordance with the best business practices.

A first lien on income would be obligations owed the Government. While the sale of stock and local appropriations could take care of much of the necessary financing, the new corporation might wish to take from 10 to 20 years to complete payments. These payments and all future borrowings from the Government would be amortised by standard procedures.

The new corporation could charge any rates it saw fit. Rates could be high enough for solvency, replacement, and expansion. They could be low enough to improve living standards and to stimulate business in the valley.

The experience would be valuable in guiding the American people in making decisions on other projects. There would be a genuine yardstick. TVA would no longer have its hands in the people's pockets, and Federal taxes could be reduced. Does the public-power lobby dare to accept such a challenge to honesty and sanity?

Rice Acreage Allotments and Marketing Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit copy of a letter addressed to Hon. Charles F. Brannan, the Secretary of Agriculture, of date November 22, 1949, from Mr. Homer Brinkley, general manager of the American Rice Growers Cooperative Association on the subject of rice acreage allotments and quotas.

Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Mr. Brinkley, is recognized as one of the outstanding leaders in the rice industry, and his opinion is generally accepted as reflecting the ideas and wishes of the producers of rice in the Southern States.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Department of Agriculture is contemplating the imposition of acreage allotments and marketing quotas for rice in the United States, I am submitting this statement for the information of interested parties, and I hope that those concerned with the administration of the program under contemplation will give favorable consideration to the recommendations and facts which are included in the following letter:

AMERICAN RICE GROWERS
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Lake Charles, La., November 22, 1949.

Re rice acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In response to your invitation to interested parties to submit their views with respect to the establishment of rice-marketing quotas for 1950, the following statement represents the attitude of the American Rice Growers Cooperative Association.

This association is an organization of rice growers in Louisiana and Texas which this year will handle for its members approximately 40 percent of the rice marketed for commercial purposes in these two States. In addition to 20 division organizations operating sales offices in both States for the sale of rough rice, members of this organization own three rice mills which this year will mill over 1,500,000 barrels of rice; 20 rice driers with a drying capacity of 2,500,000 barrels of rice; 17 rough-rice warehouses, an irrigation system, a wholesale producer supply organization, and miscellaneous other enterprises.

At a meeting of the directors of the association in Beaumont, Tex., on November 19, 1949, the following resolution was unanimously passed, and a committee was appointed to implement the resolution with a more detailed statement with respect to our position:

"*Be it resolved*, That this association is not opposed to the principle of acreage allotments but is gravely concerned over the prospect of the establishment of marketing quotas affecting the 1950 rice crop. In addition to many other factors influencing our opposition to the establishment of marketing

quotas for the 1950 crop, we stress the fact that the active demand and extremely rapid movement of the rice crop for the past several years, occasioned by the need for supplying the deficit areas no longer supplied by the traditional surplus areas, gives us reason to believe that as long as the world-wide rice deficit continues no reduction under the present rice production in this country is either necessary or desirable, and therefore that the imposition of marketing quotas should not be resorted to for the 1950 rice crop."

In order to elaborate our views on the subject, a committee of the board of directors, appointed for the purpose, submits the following points in support thereof:

1. The average production of rice in Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas for the past 5 years amounted to 17,658,000 barrels. An allowance of 10 percent as carry-over, and an additional 10 percent as a point at which marketing quotas might be imposed, results in an amount of 19,465,000 barrels, which is 1,285,000 more than this year's estimated production in the South.

2. When the total supply of rice does not exceed the total available market, and when the carry-over at the end of each season is only sufficient to last until the new crop comes on the market, then that total supply is, by any measure of practical market philosophy, a normal supply.

Based on that hypothesis, the present statistical position of rice is such as not to justify the establishment of marketing quotas, or of establishing an acreage allotment at less-than-current acreage. The possible exception to this is in the California situation, but we insist that special means to meet special situations such as this are indicated rather than drastic blanket measures affecting tens of thousands of rice growers in other areas who are in no degree whatever responsible for the problems arising therefrom.

3. California has increased its production 2,000,000 barrels over last year, which is at least 2,000,000 barrels in excess of any commercial market they have ever had. It is this sudden increase in production in California which is responsible for the estimated record supply of rice this year, and we regard as unjust to the South to permit this situation to tip the scale as to whether quotas should be imposed on the entire United States industry, including the South.

In contrast with the California position, the South this year is estimated to produce more than a million barrels less than the actual production last season. It is our view that we in the South have about reached the maximum capacity of land and water requirements.

4. The southern crop has moved into channels of direct consumption and has not been a burden on Commodity Credit Corporation. At the present time harvesting in Louisiana and Texas is practically complete, and at this time the stock of unsold rough rice in first hands is below that of last season.

5. It is our view that since the world-wide shortage of rice still exists and is critical in many areas of the world, we have both an opportunity and an obligation to help supply the deficit. For example, FAO this week issued a statement indicating its alarm at the general world-wide increase in price levels for rice. This increase reflects the deficit situation referred to. Trade opportunities over the world exist, and we cite the case of the Philippine purchase last year, which absorbed the last of our remaining stocks of low-grade rice in the South, and of Indonesia this year which has recently come into the southern market for a quantity of rice estimated at 1,000,000 pockets.

6. While the world market for rice of the type produced in California is far more restricted than for the southern types, we point to the fact that there is ample need for this rice in Japan; and in view of the fact that the United States is responsible for the economic welfare of Japan, such surplus rice as is produced in California can readily be disposed of in that country.

7. The armed forces of the United States have recently purchased $1,600,000 of rice in Egypt. Purchases were also made last year in that country. Such rice might well be purchased in this country, thereby still further obviating the possibility of unsalable surpluses here.

8. Recent events have convinced us we can be and are competitive in world markets, quality considered. For example, on November 18 the following bids were submitted in Jamaica: Italy, $8; Ecuador, $8.50; Indochina, $11.40; Siam, $9; Egypt, $9.35; and ourselves, $7: all c. and f. Kingston. Such foreign markets will absorb large quantities of our lower-grade rice at competitive prices, and there is the additional opportunity of moving even larger quantities of our broken rice into industrial channels in this country. Furthermore our domestic markets are being expanded under the stimulus of the most comprehensive advertising program in the history of the industry.

9. The growers of Louisiana and Texas particularly have regarded the Commodity Credit Corporation program as a device for supporting prices and not a dumping ground for surplus supplies. We have moved out the current crop at prices below, at, and above support levels, and the average for the season will be above. We do not think it likely that in Louisiana and Texas at any rate, any material quantity of rice will be acquired by CCC this year. We definitely do not view CCC as a market, but rather as a means by which prices may be stabilized at reasonable levels and bankruptcy conditions prevented.

10. We submit that growers should know what their acreage allotments are before being called upon to vote on marketing quotas. We point to the grave inequities and instances of uncorrected injustices that existed when we previously had acreage allotments. From that sad memory comes the conviction that at least a year's experience with acreage allotments should be sought before marketing quotas are imposed.

Individual grower production programs are generally geared to a certain narrow range of acreage—the most economic individual operation as determined by ability, need, and experience. Allotments and quotas become a vested property right and tend to make very difficult those normal adjustments between, for example, landlords and tenants; provision for new producers; the needs of more efficient producers; desirable changes of production areas, etc. All this clearly indicates the need for far more experience with acreage allotments before the vastly more drastic quotas may become effective.

11. It is our view that acreage allotments are desirable and will be a deterring factor in further increases in acreage, particularly in such areas as California where growers are apparently producing for a CCC market. Under such circumstances they cannot afford to lose the support which may be gained only by compliance with acreage allotments. If growers in any area are obviously planning their production and marketing program very largely on the basis of CCC operations instead of for the commercial market, it appears to us quite logical that if such a program is not available to them, they will seriously re-examine the inherent danger of their position. The same is true of the high-cost individual producers.

12. The world trend of rice prices is up because of continued abnormally low production and of population increases in the heavy rice-consuming areas of the world. If this situation continues rice producers may become priced out of markets by competitive foods or by lack of sufficient purchasing power. United States rice growers may find themselves in identically the same position if our supply is artificially reduced below the total demand. High support prices coupled with sharp reduction of production constitute strong incentives for continued production by inefficient producers and in marginal areas.

The proposed cut of 20 percent in acreage allotments is far too severe a reduction. It should be clearly understood that while we are not opposed to acreage allotments, we are unalterably opposed to a reduction which establishes acreage at so far below current levels.

13. A sharply curtailed production coupled with the increase of parity of 15 to 18 percent which will become effective next year will run grave risk of resulting in a price structure materially higher than substitute or competitive foods in both foreign and domestic markets; therefore even a smaller production may actually result in a greater surplus at the end of the season than would otherwise be the case. This identical situation existed when the rice industry operated under a marketing agreement program in the early thirties. This surplus would in that case then become the problem of the Commodity Credit Corporation and of the industry as well, since it would seriously affect the marketing situation of succeeding crops so long as it remained unsold. A surplus is always a surplus regardless of ownership.

14. A penalty of 52 percent of the parity price on the marketing excess does not constitute a serious hazard to those highly efficient producers raising rice on good land with the most modern and efficient machinery known to agriculture. If marketing quotas are established on the basis of what we understand to be a proposed reduction of 20 percent under the 5-year average, such growers as referred to above, with their acreage so sharply curtailed, will unquestionably have an incentive and an opportunity under the stimulus of the increased support levels resulting from the new parity, constituting as it will an important stimulus to generally higher price levels, to ignore the quotas and produce outside the program. Ironically enough, the smaller producers, those least able to afford reduced acreage, will be much more seriously affected in their operations than the large producers and the corporate farms.

15. An acreage reduction of 20 percent under the average acreage of the past 5 years will result in acreage allotments of 1,126,000 in the South and 199,000 for California, or a total United States allotment of 1,325,000 acres. This compares with a 1949 acreage of 1,794,000 for the United States, therefore a reduction of 20 percent under the 5-year average will be an actual reduction of 26 percent under the 1949 acreage.

Such a reduction can be justified only by an aggravated situation of surplus supplies and depressed prices, neither of which exists in the industry today. At the present time, for example, there is expected to be an actual scarcity of rice in Louisiana and Texas. We have seen the fastest moving market we have ever had, even during wartime, with a steady increase in price levels. Bad weather conditions during the harvesting period over the entire south will, we believe, be reflected in a considerable reduction in estimated production before the end of the season. Such situations are the very opposite to those which might justify drastic measures to reduce production next year.

Yours very truly,

HOMER L. BRINKLEY,
General Manager.

Something for Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Wheeler McMillen, editor-in-chief, Pathfinder News Magazine:

SOMETHING FOR NOTHING

(By Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief, Pathfinder News magazine)

Looking toward next year's elections, politicians in both parties are hunting for sure-fire vote bait. Each party wants to gain as much as possible in order to build greater strength for the 1952 Presidential struggle. Many governorships, many local offices, and control of Congress are at stake.

Also at stake in the future of America.

Politicians are almost overwhelmingly tempted by the lure that so frequently in history has rolled up majorities, kept parties in power, and ruined nations. That is to "promise 'em something for nothing."

How long has it been since a political campaign was waged on the principles of patriotism? Two wars in this century have shown that most Americans are willing to make some sacrifices in favor of patriotism and freedom. Has it become impossible for a political leader to rise who can appeal to that spirit, instead of to the spirit of larceny?

If so, and if no administration can govern other than by following the give-away system, the bright future of America is fading fast. Leave the people be free and the American standard of living can be doubled in another generation. But the give-aways mean controls, controls reduce production incentives, work will go down and prices go up, then more controls will come and the United States of America will drift on down to the end of the era of freedom.

What would happen if the whole United States Government, all the laws and all the governmental bodies were by some improbable miracle suddenly blanked out? What would America do if they now had to start from scratch, as their forefathers did in 1787, to create an entirely new Government?

My guess is that the people would very quickly set up a new government to maintain order and to provide national defense. Those are the only absolutely essential jobs for which a country needs government.

Then, if wisdom prevailed, people would wait awhile to see what they missed most. They might find no reason for recreating more than about half the functions which they now support.

How much of the present Government do you think you would miss if it no longer existed?

The space that we of the press devote to Government seems to me to be out of proportion to its real importance. Of course, we do have to discharge the duty of a free press to place information before the people. We have to criticize and oppose what appears to be wrong. At its best, the press should never wholly support any administration because always some weaknesses need to be brought to public attention.

The advances of the country rise out of the efforts of men in industry, agriculture, commerce, education, and science. One Thomas A. Edison or one Henry Ford has done far more to raise the national standard of living than almost any half-dozen Presidents. One business genius, by developing some better method for distributing goods, will accomplish more than two or three Congresses.

I have remarked before that as long as Government every week takes one-fourth or more of every worker's income, perhaps every citizen should devote one-fourth or more of his time toward trying to reduce and improve Government. Certainly few do anything like that. Our preoccupations are with our jobs and our duties. And that's natural, since our own personal standards of living and satisfactions come mainly from the discharge of our personal responsibilities. But we do need to be alert to prevent Government from interfering with our doing our work successfully.

We Are Losing Patience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. WHITAKER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "We Are Losing Patience," written by W. C. Lassetter, vice president and editor of the Progressive Farmer, which appeared in the January issue of this magazine:

American Government is big business. Able men of unquestioned honesty and integrity are required in its administration for the public. Yet, no sooner does an able, courageous man accept an important post in public service than he becomes a target for the sharpshooters. No matter how honest he may be, no matter how capable in carrying out the duties of his post, the villainous crew starts tearing him apart.

There's always room for difference of opinion. Difference of opinion invites argument. But an argument, even though it be heated, does not justify vilification.

We are losing patience with those who differ with others just for the sake of being different. We have long since lost patience with those who, in their effort to win an argument, stoop to vilification of the person with whom they differ.

We hold no brief for those few who seek public post with selfish intent. These few are soon unmasked and made to pay the penalty. Such persons should be exposed and we honor those who bring their shame to light. But in seeking out these few, why crucify the far greater number who are working diligently, earnestly and ably in behalf of the public good?

How can any man in position of public trust render best service when he is forced to spend much of his time in parrying personal slander? How can any man, feeling the dejection that comes from unjust attacks, be expected to render top service? How can any able businessman, one who enjoyed the accomplishment of building up and directing a successful business, one who has enjoyed the prestige that comes from such accomplishment, have the courage to accept a high position in Government where he will be the target for all types and classes of vicious snipers? The ablest among us sometimes are the most sensitive.

We have many, many able men who have been in public service over a long period of years. These men continue to flinch when hit by the barbs cast their way. These men still have feelings. But their appreciation of importance of the work they are doing, their feeling of responsibility for the proper performance of this work goads them on, dulls the pain from the uncalled-for attacks. We feel for these men who have the courage to remain in public service. We are losing patience with those who can see no good, those who can think nothing but evil.

Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Bert Andrews appearing in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, there surely is something decidedly wrong with the foreign policy of the administration, or rather the lack of foreign policy. I had the privilege of visiting the Far East this fall and the crossfire bickering among those representing us in this part of the world is disgraceful. Now we have the English recognizing the Soviet Republic of China for what they consider their own benefit and which will also be for the benefit of the Soviet Union of Russia. For one not on the inside of our diplomatic affairs, it does seem rather idiotic to continue helping a country that is helping communism, while we are spending billions to fight communism.

The article follows:

FORMOSA: WHAT HAPPENED—FULL STORY OF WASHINGTON INTRIGUE ON POLICY SETS A RECORD IN SCHEMING AND BACKBITING

(By Bert Andrews)

WASHINGTON.—A strange and fascinating story of backbiting, infighting, news suppression and news leaking lies behind President Truman's final decision to have the United States maintain a hands-off policy toward Formosa.

It is a tale that has flabbergasted even veteran observers of the Washington scene, who thought they'd seen just about everything in the way of official intrigue, only to learn in this case that new and fancy touches can be added at will by inventive minds.

It is a chapter in the book of history which involves President Truman, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, and Senator H. Alexander Smith, Republican, of New Jersey, to say nothing of a host of minor characters.

The basic issue of what to do about Formosa and what is left of the Nationalist government of China is a problem of long standing, of course, and this account will deal only with the weird happenings of the 36 days from December 1, 1949, to January 5, 1950, when the matter came to a head with the President's decision.

Senator SMITH, 65 years old, one of the mildest-mannered and best-intentioned men in the Congress, was, to his own astonishment, the man who set off the chain of events leading up to the show-down.

Senator SMITH did it by holding a press conference in his office on December 1.

He had just returned from a trip to the Orient. In Tokyo he talked with General MacArthur. To be precise, he probably listened to General MacArthur, for it has been the experience of most individuals who have visited General MacArthur since the tide turned in World War II in the Pacific that the general does most of the talking.

Senator SMITH, being a gentleman who abides by promises not to quote people when he has been asked not to, didn't quote General MacArthur. But it was clear that the Senator wasn't merely giving his own views when he contended:

That it was unthinkable that Formosa should be lost to the Chinese Communists.

That Communist possession of Formosa, 100 miles off the coast of China, would endanger the Philippines, American-held Okinawa, and perhaps even Japan.

That Communist drives made possible by a Formosa base might eventually push America's defense back to the Marianas, the Hawaiian Islands—and the Pacific coast.

The Senator got some headlines in the afternoon papers. But by the time the morning papers came out, his views were pretty well down in the stories, for the leaking had begun and the stories were topped by contrary word from authoritative sources.

The authoritative sources in this instance were men in the State Department.

(Secretary Acheson was to say subsequently: "We have had leak and counter-leak, gossip and countergossip." He ought to know.)

The sources solemnly told reporters that the as yet unannounced view of the Department was that Formosa was of no strategic value to the United States and that the Department consequently was prepared to see the island fall to the Chinese Communists.

Over in the Pentagon, where Secretary Johnson holds sway and sometimes gets himself into difficulties by talking too much to the wrong people at the wrong time, there had been some advance notice that that was the way Secretary Acheson felt.

It was also known that the Joint Chiefs of Staff weren't, as of that day, inclined to dispute Secretary Acheson on Formosa.

But—on that same December 1—two men were sent on a flying trip to Tokyo and it seems reasonable to think they went with the blessing of Secretary Johnson and with instructions to "get me something to fight with."

Mr. Johnson, it should be explained, had been saying privately that he thought China policy had been mismanaged and that he was going to keep on asking what our present policy was until he found out.

The messengers to MacArthur were Tracy S. Voorhees, Under Secretary of the Army, and Lt. Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations.

They talked with General MacArthur. Or listened to him. Evidently they got an earful, for they came back to Washington in mid-December and reported to Secretary Johnson and things began to happen. Like this:

December 22: An all-day meeting of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was held. The members drafted a recommendation that the National Security Council attempt to deny Formosa to the Communists to the extent of sending a United States military mission there. The argument, straight from General MacArthur, was that it wasn't necessary to send troops. The argument was further that Gen. Sun Li-jen's forces on Formosa were strong enough to stop any Communist invasion if properly trained and equipped, and if their Chinese commanders had the advice of experienced American officers.

December 23: Presumably the new decision on the joint chiefs was communicated to Secretary Acheson. It didn't seem to make much difference, for a couple of other things happened on this day:

1. The State Department notified its attaches in a memo dated December 23 that Formosa wasn't considered important strategically and that the attachés ought to begin to publicize that view so the United States wouldn't lose prestige if the island fell. (What price a decision by the joint chiefs?)

2. Chinese Ambassador V. K. Wellington Koo called at the State Department and talked to W. Walton Butterworth, Assistant Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The Ambassador made a formal request for military, political, and economic advisers for Formosa.

This was at 4:30 p. m. on the day before Christmas, and all through the State Department house things were pretty quiet. Thus no reporters saw the Ambassador enter the Department. No announcement was made, and Mr. Butterworth left for a Christmas holiday without telling Michael J. McDermott, the Department's top public-relations man, anything about the visit.

There matters stood until December 28, when this reporter learned from a good friend and trustworthy source (reporter's note: sorry G. P. and T. S. that you won't take credit though credit is due and that your G. P.'s and T. S.'s won't either) that the criticism by Senator SMITH and others was about to bear strange fruit.

President Truman and his top advisers began to get worried lest Senator SMITH and other critics accuse them in the Congress that was then about to reconvene of having no policy for Asia. So the orders were to have the National Security Council get together on Thursday, December 29, so that a positive policy could be prepared for presentation to Congress.

The statutory members of the N. S. C. are the President, Vice President, Defense Secretary, Secretary of State, and chairman of the National Security Resources Board. The law gives the President the right to invite any other Government officials to the council meetings in an advisory capacity.

It seemed that the showdown was at hand: that the long-held differences of opinion between Secretary Acheson and Secretary Johnson would be aired in a face-to-face meeting.

Secretary Acheson was there.

Where was Secretary Johnson? In Florida getting some sun.

Why wasn't he there? Well, the best information this reporter has been able to get is that Secretary Johnson had heard that Secretary Acheson had already sold President Truman on his arguments, and that there wasn't any use of him being there.

Unkind critics suggested, of course, as unkind critics are prone to do in such cases in Washington, that Secretary Johnson had run out on the fight. The other view is that if a decision had already been made, there wouldn't be any fight, and hence there was no need for him to listen in while the President gave the nod to the other side.

The best information is that Secretary Johnson asked the President if it was O. K. for him to go away for a while and that the President kindly assured him it wasn't necessary for him to attend the NSC meeting.

At any rate, Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stated the MacArthur-backed arguments for keeping Formosa out of the hands of the Chinese Communists.

About all General Bradley did was to read the document prepared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Reporters couldn't learn whether he backed it up with emphatic arguments of his own, thus taking personal as well as official issue with Secretary Acheson.

Secretary Acheson was prepared with official and personal arguments. He insisted that the United States should not go a little way toward aiding Formosa unless it was prepared to go all the way, including war to protect it from aggression. One report was that he got General Bradley to concede that Formosa did not warrant the commitment of American troops now or even if the Chinese Communists attacked it.

So—with Secretary Acheson in the driver's seat and Secretary Johnson in the Florida sun—President Truman decided for Secretary Acheson's views.

Friends say that Secretary Johnson hasn't given up the fight.

They point to the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are scheduled to visit General MacArthur in February to talk with him. Or listen to him. They might come back so strongly reinforced with arguments as to compel reopening of the case. But that's doubtful.

There is some more chronology:

December 30: Mr. McDermott denied that Nationalist China had formally requested aid for Formosa.

January 2: Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican, of California, just returned from a visit to General MacArthur, said Mr. McDermott had erred; that the Senator knew a formal request had been made.

January 2: Herbert Hoover, America's only living ex-President, and Senators Knowland and Robert A. Taft, Republican, of Ohio, agreed that the United States should use its Navy if necessary to protect Formosa and raise "a wall against communism in the Pacific."

January 3: Mr. McDermott, who never deceives reporters when he knows or can get the answers to queries, sadly admitted he had erred in his December 30 statement. Seems Mr. Butterworth hadn't told him anything about the Ambassador's call.

(Mr. Butterworth, incidentally, had been upset on December 28 when this reporter got wind of the fact that a meeting of the NSC had been called to frame a China policy. Seems he had just got back from his holiday and that he decided on December 23, "If that's coming up, I'm going right away from the office again." He did.)

Then came January 5, with President Truman's announcement of the hands-off policy and Mr. Acheson's statement giving details.

It has made the Republicans so angry—both what was done and the manner in which it was done—that attempts to keep foreign policy going on a bipartisan basis are in danger.

"It has been kicked out the window by the President and the Secretary of State," said Senator HOUSE PRESCOTT, Republican, of Michigan. "I mean in all fields. The President and the Secretary can't divide the world into two parts and say we'll have bipartisanship in one part and to hell with Congress in the other part."

Secretary Acheson summed it all up when he told why the President and he issued their statements:

"We have had leak and counterleak gossip and countergossip. We have gotten a great deal of confusion in the minds of foreign people. We have stirred up a good deal of speculation, all of which, if allowed to continue, would be highly prejudicial to the interests of the United States of America. And, therefore, it was the President's desire to clarify the situation."

Is everybody clarified?

History of the Labor Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following address made by me to the Massachusetts CIO Convention in Boston on November 27, 1949:

President Belanger, distinguished and invited guests, officers of the Massachusetts State CIO, and delegates to the convention,

show the development of trade-union organization is one of the principal themes of this convention, it is altogether fitting and proper that we pause and reflect upon the tremendous strides which the past 60 years have witnessed in the labor movement.

Significantly, labor relations concepts in this country were developed largely by means of judicial decisions. Near the end of the last century, prevailing opinion recognized the legal right of workingmen to combine and to strike in order to secure for themselves higher wages, shorter hours, and improved working conditions.

A great diversity of opinion developed, however, relative to the means by which, the persons through whom, and the persons upon whom, pressure might permissibly be exerted in order to enforce the demands of the workers.

In the absence of legislation, the courts were thus called upon to determine what the public welfare demanded in answer to these problems.

The first judicial opinion on boycotting was rendered in 1886; that on peaceful picketing in 1888. Our courts, then, became the arbiters of social policy in the field of labor relations, and being thus called upon to exercise a quasi legislative function, they naturally differed in their conclusions.

The injunction first came into prominence as a weapon in labor conflicts in 1888. A few years later, when its use became widespread and conspicuous, the controversy surrounding it outweighed the question of the substantive rights of the parties themselves.

This equitable remedy, even though it was applied in conformity with established judicial practice, had unintended effects which impinged upon the personal rights and liberty of the wage earners.

Allegations of violating the terms of injunctions were often heard upon affidavits alone, without any opportunity for confrontation of witnesses or the right of cross-examination. Findings of guilt for contempt and commitment in the judge's discretion had the effect of successful prosecution for crime; but in the course of such proceedings, the wage earner was denied all of the rights normally assured by the constitution to one charged with crime.

Judges, therefore, were accused of usurping the functions of a jury in finding facts on affidavit, of usurping legislative functions in prescribing conditions under which strikes were permissible; and incidentally, of seriously limiting the constitutional rights of a free press, free speech, and to peaceable assembly.

In urging restrictions of the use of the injunctive device, the most powerful argument was that its uninhibited use endowed property with a force which would make it dominant over human beings and the rights of man. In other words, under the guise of safeguarding property rights, the employer was allegedly seeking sovereign power.

At this juncture, right-thinking citizens, zealous only for the public welfare, advanced the commendable theory that the law of property was not an appropriate channel for dealing with problems of social progress or of social unrest, and that the power of State should not be exercised through the courts in favor of one side in the social struggle.

It was believed that the problem of control and conduct of labor relations demanded a solution of its own apart from traditional judicial techniques—and until such time as the proper principles for the governance of industrial relations were formulated, it was wiser not to determine industrial issues by means of injunction.

Opposition to the practice of "government by injunction" led to the seeking of aid from Congress and the State legislatures.

From 1896 to 1914, legislative proposals relating to labor disputes, boycotting, picketing, restraints on injunctions, and the right of workers to combine occupied every session of the Congress; and only within our own memory did these efforts result in enactment of such broad and progressive legislation as the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Wagner Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Wages and Hours Act.

Out of this history of American experiences grew the plan of federation and combination which gave labor its place in the sun. It started with the organization, in 1869, of the Knights of Labor. Then came the American Federation of Labor, and more recently, your own progressive and forward-looking organization—the CIO.

The legal right of employees, through their unions, to negotiate as a partner in industry—the right of collective bargaining—was fought for fiercely for many years—and with the passage of the last 17 years, under the leadership of the immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt until his untimely death, and now President Harry S. Truman, it has been my happy privilege, as a participant in enlightened national administrations, to see it recognized and vindicated.

During the Eightieth Congress a marked step backward was taken in the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. This will be only temporary. Progress of man's associations with man may be delayed by powerful forces, or a step backward taken at times, but the onward journey of progress cannot be stopped.

In the Congress a combination of forces having different intents and interests have blocked temporarily the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and have prevented the substitution for it of sound labor law conducive to the best interests of capital and labor and of the country as a whole. This combination can only delay, not stop, the ultimate repeal of this unsound, unhealthy, unfair piece of legislation.

It is my opinion, which I express in all frankness to you, that we will not be able to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act in this Congress. But while this may be so, we can get satisfaction out of the fact that further antilabor legislation, which was intended before the last election by certain forces, cannot and will not pass this Congress.

The repeal of this law is not alone for the best interests of labor. It is for the best interests of capital and management. It is for the best interests of the country.

If my opinion that the Taft-Hartley Act is not repealed in the next session of Congress is later proven to be correct, I make the prediction that if a minimum of 20 more progressive-minded Members are elected to the National House of Representative, and a minimum of 5 in the Senate, that this punitive and discriminatory bill will be repealed in the Eighty-second Congress.

In that masterful encyclical on the conditions of the working classes, Pope Leo XIII stated, in part:

"That workingmen's associations should be organized and governed as to furnish the best and most suitable means for attaining what is aimed at; that is to say, for helping each individual member to better his condition to the utmost in body, soul, and property."

You have for decades been a leader in achieving this aim, not only for the organized worker but for the unorganized worker.

Labor has not confined itself in its leadership of progress to its own immediate field. It has consistently led the fight for all workers against exploitation; against low wages and inhumanly long hours. It has been a leader in the field of social-security legislation; of legislation to develop the national resources of our country; of legislation to strengthen the position of agriculture and the farmer; of legislation to remove and prevent discriminations against our fellow Americans; all along the line of legislation that will strengthen our country by making the family life of our Nation strong and virile.

The strength or weakness of a nation is dependent upon the strength or weakness of its basic unit—the family.

Labor has been the leader in the constant fight for economic security or, to put it conversely, a leader in the fight against economic insecurity.

In times of peace American labor has been a great force in sound progressive action. In times of war it has always responded to the maximum extent possible. It has repeatedly shown its patriotism and the love of its members for our country.

And in the many contributions to our progress, in peace, and our safety in war, your organization, the CIO, has played a most important part.

I predict that with the completion of the elimination of the dissident elements that your organization will play a far greater and more important part in the future life of our great Nation.

The aim of workingmen's associations in the words of Pope Leo XIII: "Helping each individual member to better his condition to the utmost in body, soul, and property" can further be achieved by balancing right with duty, privilege with obligation, and immunity with license.

As a great American organization, imbued with and actuated as you are by high American ideals and objectives, in the years ahead of us the CIO will continue to grow and expand in influence as a free, American, and democratic movement.

Your President and Mine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Millard D. Gibbs, D. D. S., of Hot Springs National Park, Ark.:

YOUR PRESIDENT AND MINE

(By Millard D. Gibbs, D. D. S., Hot Springs National Park, Ark.)

In discussing "Your President and Mine" I am doing so in a plural sense and what I wish to present is nonpolitical and nonpartisan. The man in the White House is our recognized first citizen and Chief Executive. The freedoms we have in America are the envy of most people in foreign lands. We must preserve them at all costs, and one way to accomplish this is not to abuse them.

Some individuals speak most disrespectfully of the President of our country and, in my opinion, they are sowing seeds of discontent when such abusive tactics are indulged in. In the interest of unity in our Nation, there should be instilled in the hearts of all Americans a more profound respect for whoever may occupy the White House as President of the United States. The application of the golden rule would accomplish this.

Any movement that may serve to strengthen our Nation should be definitely encouraged. Communism, socialism, and other "isms" are continually in our midst, and each has leaders who have strong desires to destroy the democracy our forebears fought for and died to preserve. The Star-Spangled Banner and America, My Country 'Tis of Thee, we proudly sing, but to build a stronger and a lasting America should be our goal for not only this generation but for those of the future.

To be respected as a nation we need to exemplify the same high regard in our daily lives that we exact of other nations for America. If, as an American citizen, one feels justified in criticizing our Chief Executive, why not let such nonapproval be registered in an honorable and respectful manner? Let us stop pretending Americanism and be real supporters of America and the true democracy she stands for and un-American activities will fade out of the picture.

One may have the right as an American to speak disrespectfully of the President, but such practice is an indication of a shrinking patriotism. As Americans we proudly proclaim our freedoms, but seldom alert ourselves regarding the abuse of these cherished possessions and the resulting damage to America and all it represents.

The enemies of America and the wonderful democracy she represents are the ones who profit most when we, as American citizens, violate our moral or loyalty obligations to our Nation. Yesterday the atomic age was merely scientific speculation. Today it is a stern and dangerous reality. Will atomic energy prove an agent for the betterment of mankind or the agent for the annihilation of the human race? With this discovery now in the hands of potential enemies, it behooves all freedom-loving people to strive in every way to outlaw this horrible weapon of death and destruction.

Our President and those who may succeed him, regardless of party, will be faced with these and other grave problems that must be solved.

In a former article, Mr. President U. S. A., not only was the idea of greater respect for the office of President suggested but it was suggested that a national holiday honoring all Presidents be set aside. All civic clubs, the American Legion, Amvets, and other groups of Hot Springs approved the proposal, as did some governors, Congressmen, Senators, and Vice President BARKLEY. Some opposition to a national holiday developed because so many holidays are already in existence and this phase of the proposal has been removed.

Since the suggestion to create in America a greater respect for the high office of President and the one who occupies the office met with such unanimous endorsement, I feel it incumbent upon me to further attempt to bring to a successful termination this patriotic proposal—that America may become a stronger Nation.

The flag of our country we love, honor, and respect and this is as it should be—yet our flag is only symbolic. The President of the United States is the elected Chief Executive of our Nation and represents our country at home and abroad. He is no ordinary person, yet because of our great democracy he may have risen from a most humble environment. This man whom we call Mr. President is the chief defender of our flag as he is the Commander in Chief of both the Army and Navy. He holds the highest position in the gift of our people.

There is a radio program each Sunday afternoon at 1:30 known as Mr. President. It is well dramatized and features that well-known and popular actor, Edward Arnold. This program brings out very vividly the many problems with which our Presidents are confronted. The stories on the broadcast are based upon actual happenings during the administration of the President portrayed in each episode.

Some of our Presidents have died martyrs of assassins' bullets. Others have died in office, victims of mental and physical strain occasioned by the great responsibilities placed upon them. This exalted position most certainly cannot be termed "a bed of roses." No matter which political party succeeds in putting its candidate in the White House, the Chief Executive is not in all respects going to please even his own constituency. He will be praised and condemned, no matter which direction the pendulum may swing.

The business of such nations as ours is definitely not a one-man job, so it becomes necessary to surround the President with a law-making body and a Cabinet, representative of the different departments of government, education, banking, labor, agriculture, industry, and all phases of economics must be included. Many debatable and controversial questions come up before these bodies, and while we have a Secretary of State, Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and other secretaries of less importance, the President is Chief over all.

Many outstanding men and some lesser lights have been candidates for the high office of President. Candidates, in most instances, are approved because they have filled either State or National positions and often because they hail from some section of the Nation where they might be a factor in influencing votes. Upon a political platform a candidate is nominated and he immediately becomes the recognized leader of his party. If elected, he becomes the leader and representative of approximately 150,000,000 people. To please all voters and millions of potential youthful voters is a target hard to shoot at with precision. If Congress is not friendly the aim cannot be relied upon.

To hold the office of President, one must believe in God but has the privilege of worshipping according to the dictates of his own conscience. This liberty is embodied in the Constitution of our Government.

The nominee of each party may have liberal tendencies or he may be of the conservative group, while some are extreme in either of these. The President can be sincere in his views that may have influenced his election, yet later realize his mistake. Should he stand by his campaign pledges or support the measures he is now convinced are best for his country?

Our two major-party systems are unquestionably democratic, yet political antagonism is so prevalent that no matter how well the party in favor succeeds it is rather generally and severely criticized by political opponents. The President, as it were, becomes a veritable target. Some Presidents can thrive on it while with others it acts as a most troublesome stumbling block. The criticisms are often abusive and destructive, yet the President of our Nation is our No. 1 citizen. Freedom of speech and freedom of the press in our democracy are granted to us but in speaking disparagingly of the President, our first citizen, I am wondering if we are not abusing our much-enjoyed freedoms.

Under normal conditions the President is endowed with the power to act, and in case of war or other vital emergencies, he is accorded increased power. He makes many proclamations regarding the observance of days set aside to do honor to some worthy cause or individual. Why not honor him? The Congress, Senate, churches, schools, colleges, universities, the radio and press, and other organizations could arrange appropriate programs. Such a plan would no doubt develop in the hearts and minds of our people a far greater respect for our chief executive. George Washington is known as the Father of his Country and we honor him still. History records the main events occuring during the administration of a President. We should not wait to pay tribute until he has gone from us, but rather let him know during his life that Americans hold him in high esteem.

Differences of opinion exist among men, even when they are members of the same religious or political organizations. This is true in every walk of life. These facts make it impossible for any one individual to decide momentous questions that will be satisfactory to all in a single or collective group. The President, to be such, must have attained a certain degree of success in former undertakings. Otherwise he would never have been selected as the leader of a great political party. He holds an honorable position and at heart is interested in the welfare of the Nation he has been selected to serve. Let the Nation, in turn, honor him by instilling in the hearts of all our people and the nations of the world that the President of the United States is worthy of the honor we have bestowed and that he is entitled to the most profound respect at home and abroad, regardless of political affiliations.

To pay homage or proper respect to the President of our Nation should be a pleasure to all good Americans. Constructive criticism is right and proper but to denegrate the highest office in our land is failing definitely in our patriotic duty as citizens of what we consider the greatest Nation of all. In attempting to keep "our Government house in order" the President needs the help of God and a sympathetic, understanding public. As true American citizens we designate ourselves 100 percent. If we slander and speak disrespectfully of the President of the United States, I am wondering if we are not lowering the patriotic standards we claim to uphold. The high office he holds deserves the respect of every American. In our evaluation of any President of the United States, let us think first before becoming harsh and abusive because someone unfriendly to America may be among those present.

Remember, he is "your President and mine." God bless America!

Record of the First Session of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following radio address made by me over the National Broadcasting Co. network, out of Station WBZ of Boston, the evening of November 18, 1949:

Ladies and gentlemen, tonight I would like to review quickly my impressions of what people—the voters—think of the record of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress and what it means for 1950.

When the first session of the Eighty-first Congress concluded after a near-record session that lasted nearly 10 months, I addressed the House of Representatives as majority leader and summed up the record of accomplishments.

It was an excellent record. But I would like to give you an idea of what the people in my own district in Massachusetts think of that record and what that means as regards the future. And my district is a representative American district.

Immediately following the close of Congress I came home.

I sought out my friends at home and asked them to tell me candidly what they thought. There were many others who sought me out and told me, candidly, what they thought.

During the same time I have had occasion to talk to many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate and I have compared notes with them.

The results of our joint findings are very similar.

The people—and I mean the vast voting public which elects Congressmen to office—feel that the Eighty-first Congress is the best Congress since the emergencies of war took the accent off domestic legislation.

They feel that their Democratic Eighty-first Congress has gone far toward redeeming its 1948 campaign promises. Furthermore, in the instances where the promises have not been fulfilled, a good fight was put up, or a good start made toward fulfillment.

In the field of international relations there was a solid record of achievement. The foreign policy of the Democratic administration was enacted into law. The economic recovery program—the Marshall plan—was extended for another year.

Most voters think this is the single greatest step ever taken by this country in the field of international relations. Almost all the people I talked to—and my colleagues report the same—feel that the democracies of western Europe depend on ECA and unless we continue to help them, Russia will be able to extend her regime of godless communism further toward our shores.

Now I think it is important to realize that people do understand that the ECA alone is not the solution. For that reason they know that the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act was essential, if the full benefit of our ECA program is to be realized.

I was not surprised to learn, although some of my friends seemed to doubt it, that the voter understood the implications of this important law. The people understand that trade does not work on a one-way street, but has to go both ways. They understand that the only way in which such a balance can be reached is to lower tariff barriers everywhere in the world.

With our production capacity and technical know-how we are bound to be the eventual gainer on the returns in trade that will result.

To implement our policy, the Eighty-first Congress also approved the North Atlantic Pact and Arms Aid to Europe, which strengthens the defensive position of the western democracies. Thus we have moved to rebuild the European democracies economically and to safeguard them politically and militarily.

My constituents understood these things and approved.

They asked shrewd questions—questions that went to the heart of each subject. They knew what I was talking about and they knew how it affected New England and the Nation.

My people are not a provincial-minded group who fail to see the forest for the trees. On the contrary they understand very well the implications and the necessities and they, if anything, are ahead of the thinking in the Congress.

This is particularly true in the field of domestic legislation.

In Boston we knew by personal experience the terrible problems of the housing shortage. We knew the problems of high rents and inadequate homes.

It was a major issue and the people of my district regard the passage of the long range housing bill and of the extension of the rent-control law as major steps forward in meeting their needs.

They know in my district that slums breed more crime, more disease, and require more State and municipal services paid for out of the tax bill of every citizen than do any other areas.

My constituents and the voters in other Congressmen's districts with whom I have talked knew all about the efforts of the real-estate lobby to step up action in this vital field. If the real-estate lobby had succeeded—well, there's a song title that answers what would happen—There'll Be Some Changes Made.

One of the most important pieces of legislation passed by the Eighty-first Congress was the new Fair Labor Standards Act, which raised the minimum wage of labor from 40 cents an hour to 75 cents an hour. Now it is true that in New England where I come from this affected relatively few workingmen because labor is well organized.

But it is important from a national sense, in that it betters working conditions for labor in general and tends to equalize labor costs in the various sections of the country. Low-wage areas cannot compete with low sweatshop labor costs with the high living standard areas and get away with it.

Now, as I said, the voting public knows why this law is important. They also know that while the minimum wage was raised, its coverage was not expanded as broadly as the President asked. They know why. That'll be important politically in some areas next year.

In New England, too, where the problem of cheap power has become a paramount issue because industry needs great quantities of cheap power to survive, the people were interested in the action taken by the Congress on public power questions.

Unfortunately the matters considered by the Congress did not include power projects for New England. But the principle of public power transmitted over publicly owned transmission lines to the user at the lowest possible price was enunciated by the Eighty-first Congress. In New England this move was applauded by the people—while the power interests gritted their teeth.

But the people wanted to know:

"If cheap public power is good for the Northwest and for the Tennessee Valley why isn't it good for New England?"

They are going to continue to ask that question until something is done. It may be that the voting public will do something itself—in 1950.

Here in New England there are few large farms. But the workingman and the businessman in New England realize full well that the economic fate of the farmer is bound inextricably with his own.

They wanted to know about the new Farm Support legislation and they asked penetrating questions concerning the Brannan Plan. The people wanted to know why it wasn't good to allow farm surpluses to be eaten rather than allowed to rot in storage. They will continue to ask such questions.

As for the actions of the Congress in rectifying the ripper legislation passed by the Republican Eightieth Congress, the people overwhelmingly approve. They know that if a farmer, for instance, is to get his government loan under the law, he must have storage space for his grain. And they approve the legislation which the Democrats passed to give that storage back to the farmer after it had been taken away by the Republicans.

The people heartily favor the bill passed by the Congress which allows the Rural Electrification Administration to loan money for cooperative telephone service in areas where there is no service now. This was a great step forward and the people so regard it.

So far I have discussed the manner in which the people regard the accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress. They approve of those bills and approve highly. But they are also conscious of the failures.

They want the Taft-Hartley Act repealed. They don't want labor shackled with an unfair law. They want labor allowed to sit at the collective bargaining table as the equal of industry. They don't want government interference to give management an unfair advantage in the collective bargaining act.

They want civil rights legislation passed.

The people know that the Republicans in the Senate, through their cynical repudiation of their own civil-rights plank in the Republican national platform, allowed a southern minority to establish a new rule governing debate in the Senate which places the problem of limiting debate back beyond the 1917 reform.

The Republicans egged the southern Democrats into the filibuster and when the vote finally came to uphold Vice President BARKLEY's key ruling, 23 Republicans—a majority of the Republican membership of the Senate—repudiated their own national stand on the issue to join with the southern Democrats to kill the civil-rights program.

Since fewer than half of the Republicans in the Senate had stood by the platform pledge of their party something had to be done to fix up the record. Under its terms, a minority of only 33 Senators representing perhaps 8 to 10 percent of the Nation's voters can kill any bill it wants to kill. The resolution was passed and the southerners won their victory.

But the Republicans, while they have tried to make a lawyer's record, have not fooled the people. There will be questions asked, and changes made.

Now there are some other phases of the Eighty-first Congress' work in the first session which have been watched with great interest at home. The displaced persons bill for one.

This has passed the House of Representatives. It will be brought up in the Senate early in the next session. I am sure action will be taken promptly to liberalize an unjust law.

And believe me, the people who know who wrote the present unfair law. And they know why it was delayed.

The passage of legislation extending the coverage of the Social Security Act and increasing the benefits paid under the act was also passed by the House and is now up before the Senate. I am sure this will pass with speed as soon as the Congress convenes in January.

This bill is one of the very important parts of the Fair Deal program advanced by President Truman and will bring some 11,000,000 additional persons under the coverage of the social-security law. It will increase benefits in line with advancing costs of living.

Now I have summed up many of the major items passed, defeated, and pending. That is the basic record which the voting people at home in the States are talking about when they see their Congressman or their Senator.

Now let me project this record into the future.

Actually this was a good session of the Congress. But its record was marred by the actions of some of its Members.

Those Members, mostly Republicans, will feel the wrath of their constituents come next year unless they watch their steps.

The recent elections were a good demonstration of the truth of what I say.

The people at home are for the Fair Deal. They know the Fair Deal means the people's deal.

They do not care if the Republicans try to scare them away by screaming "welfare state," "statism," "collectivism."

The people at home only know that for 17 years under Democratic administration, with the exception of 2 years of a Republican-controlled Congress, they received constructive and courageous leadership. They know they have improved their lot immeasureably. They know that labor and the farmer have been able to advance, to take their rightful place as full partners in the economy. They know they got these things as the result of Democratic leadership.

They will not be scared off.

They showed it on November 8, 1948.

And in 1950 they will underscore it once again.

The first session of the Eighty-first Congress has made an outstanding record.

The Eighty-first Congress will make a fine record of accomplishment.

But in 1950 there will be an even stronger Democratic majority for the Eighty-second Congress, and even more will be done.

My people, and the people strongly throughout the Nation, realize that the Democratic Party under the leadership of the immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt, and now under the leadership of our sincere and courageous President, Hon. Harry S. Truman, is dedicated to fighting economic insecurity, and to strengthening the family life of America.

Santa Claus and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, this year I received a lot of form Christmas cards which said:

A very merry Christmas to you, my Congressman, and you can make it a happy new year for me if you'll help put these packages under my 1950 Christmas tree: Government economy, tax the untaxed, excise tax relief.

I answered all of them with this letter:

I acknowledge receipt of the generous sentiments expressed in your Christmas card. I'm sure you will excuse the delay in responding in view of the impropriety of mixing politics with the spirit of Christmas.

Responding to the political page of your greeting, I will vote to equalize taxes on every commercial enterprise. But I doubt the wisdom of taxing churches, lodges, charitable institutions, labor unions, and chambers of commerce. If you feel differently about the latter be assured I'll give your views my prompt and careful consideration when communicated to me. It will not be necessary to wait until next Christmas and couple your views with the affectionate sentiments with which your heart seems to be filled for me. I will consider a letter written for that purpose without any sentimental overtone.

Further answering your political expressions (which I am sure were merely incidental to your burning desire to wish me a merry Christmas), I am in favor of every economy consistent with our safety, and I also favor repeal of most excise taxes—liquor and tobacco being notable among my exceptions.

However, this repeal may necessitate an increase in income-tax rates during unsettled international affairs. For example, the five economy-minded Republican members of the Foreign Affairs Committee condemned the Secretary of State for first appealing to the conscience of the world, rather than immediately appealing to arms, in his successful efforts to procure the release of Angus Ward from the Chinese Reds. These same folks are demanding a drastically reduced budget. But you don't fight wars with popguns. An appeal to arms could well await failure of peaceful efforts. These folks remind me of a fellow who once stood with his hands in his pockets and told another fellow he'd knock his nose in, then turned his head to spit. When he got up he advised his friends to be ready when offering to fight.

Some of these folks also derisively accuse this administration of playing false Santa Claus. Yet they have induced you to ask me to do just that. I know of no way we can provide free protection for you, your loved ones, and your possessions. I suggest you examine the exhortations of those who demand we first resort to arms in each international incident and, at the same time, demand less taxes.

Many of these folks foster the belief that most of your taxes go for welfare legislation. Hence it might not be amiss to remind you of the figures: Health and welfare services, 6 percent; interest on debt, 12 percent; veterans' affairs, 13 percent; military, 34 percent; and international affairs (bipartisan), 16 percent; and general government, 18 percent; the last being swelled by many incidental relationships to present and past defense.

Those are the facts. But they are never related by those who sneer Santa Claus at this administration, while inducing you to demand that I play Santa Claus by providing for your protection for less than it costs.

I lay no claim to occult powers. Nor do I propose to play the role of a charlatan by pretending I have a magic formula. I conceive it to be my duty to tell you the truth, and the truth is that this is a dangerous world—we are on it and we can't move off of it. The atomic bomb is real, not a fairy tale, and Russia has the bomb. The Indianapolis News said (January 13, 1949): "Whether we like it or not a foreign dictator, Joseph Stalin, is writing the ticket for our national expenditures and taxation for the fiscal year 1950."

I shall effect every economy possible while a Representative; but I refuse to turn my back on the facts and when the people want to be kidded by their Representative, they can get another to do the job.

For example, the Indiana Congressman who talks most about economy voted for the military pay raise bill; arms to Europe and to pay the same pension to a 90-day veteran as to a 4-year veteran. I voted against these measures, but I voted for expenditures I deem necessary and honest. Furthermore, I tell the people how I voted and why. Which type of Representative do you prefer?

Would you write me as your Representative in Congress your own views on:

1. Where would you cut expenditures and how much in each instance? (NOTE.—This question is not facetious. I will carefully consider your views.)

2. The Republican State committee recently asserted that expenditures should be cut 20 percent each year. Do you believe this can be done, and if so where, in detail?

3. Would you approve of this administration advocating strengthening of the United Nations to empower it to decide international disputes (even to the point of bindingly deciding against the United States) and to furnish the United Nations the military power to enforce such decisions (even against the United States)?

4. Would you condemn or approve this administration if it took a softer approach toward Russia in its efforts to find a solution to the cold war?

5. Before settlement of the cold war would you approve withdrawal of our armed forces from any, and if so, what parts of the world?

6. Do you disapprove of the bipartisan aid to western Europe program and are you acquainted with the end objectives of that program?

7. Would you agree with me that the Federal Government should adopt Indiana's plan of pay as you go even when expenditures are enormous due to war or threats thereof?

8. Finally, you must realize that the industrial age has thrust a tremendous problem upon us; i. e., business must be big (how big is a question) to produce what we need. Hence corporations (combined financing by many) are necessary. Any one of 50 corporations own assets in double the amount of the assessed valuation of all property found in any one of 13 States. Seven corporations each own assets exceeding the assessed valuation of all property found in Indiana. This wealth creates power, and many of these corporations employ more workers than the population of some States. Therefore, we permit labor to organize to create counter power to protect workers. These combinations present a new problem to society; that is, how to control these enormous concentrations of power without breaking down the very entities necessary to produce. I will read and study any proposal made to solve this problem. Name-calling will not do it, neither will blind criticism. It requires thinking and some give and take. Your help in thinking out this problem will be deeply appreciated.

Senator CAPEHART lambasted the New Deal for years. Then when the issue was put squarely to him in debate he admitted he wouldn't repeal any of it. So he isn't a Santa Claus either—he has no magic free solution to the enormous problems of the day. Neither do I, but neither do I pretend that I do. If you have, I would be pleased to have your suggestions.

In the meantime, I have played Santa Claus by putting one package under your Christmas tree. In that package is this pledge: "I will tell you the truth and not practice demagoguery by pretending there is a Santa Claus who can give you what you want for nothing."

I wish you and yours a happy and prosperous year and many more to come and I thank you for the kind sentiments you expressed.

Resolution of North Dakota American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, in my extension I shall include a resolution passed by the American Legion, Department of North Dakota, at Fargo, N. Dak. In reading this resolution we realize that it is the same old story told over and over again in a different way and on a different occasion.

When the war drums begin to beat then nothing is too good for the boys. They are lauded and assured that their patriotism will be appreciated. We assure them that if disabled they will be taken care of. We assure them that their dependents will be taken care of. We assure them that when they return they will be put as near as possible in the same position they would have been in if they had not been called to serve their country.

But when the war drums cease to beat we gradually lose interest in the veterans. We become more niggardly. We appropriate billions to foreign sponging governments. Governments that started the wars that our boys finished. We give these governments blank checks to do as they please. Yet we should never forget that we owe our

first obligation to the veterans who won the wars that these nations started.

Here is the resolution:

Whereas certain uninformed individuals and organizations have recently seen fit to again flood this country, as they did following World War I, with erroneous propaganda concerning the cost of the veterans' rehabilitation program established by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas such activity is designed to bluff the American people into believing that this Nation's veterans, particularly the wounded and disabled who are still fighting their war from hospital and sick beds, are receiving benefits to which they are not justly entitled; [illegible]

Whereas the cost of rehabilitating this Nation's veterans, who served their country in time of need, must be considered as part of the actual expense of war as was the cost of bombs, planes, and ships during armed hostilities; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission Report, which suggests the elimination of the Veterans' Administration as the agency responsible for the administration of veterans laws, was written without seeking the advice and counsel of those who have made the care of disabled veterans their life work; and

Whereas the adoption of the Hoover Commission Report would place the care of disabled veterans under several Government agencies wholly incapable of and absolutely unwilling to appreciate the many problems of the veterans of all our wars and their dependents; and

Whereas the Hoover suggested procedure was tested after World War I and was found wanting because of the red tape and confusion it caused and the unnecessary expense it placed upon the taxpayers of our country due to the many Government agencies which attempted the handling of veterans' affairs; [illegible]

Whereas Congress eliminated such confusion by establishing the Veterans Bureau, now known as the Veterans' Administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the annual midwinter conference of the American Legion, Department of North Dakota, meeting at Fargo, N. Dak., December 12 and 13, 1949, That the American Legion vigorously oppose that portion of the Hoover Commission Report pertaining to veterans which advocates the elimination of the Veterans' Administration hospital program and the turning over of that program to social welfare agencies, and that the American Legion take immediate steps necessary to present the true picture of veterans' activities in correction of the insidious misinformation now being circulated by antiveteran individuals and organizations.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following splendid address recently made over the radio by Hon. Paul A. Dever, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, I consider it a genuine privilege to be invited to address you under the sponsorship of the Polish-American Congress on the subject Justice for Poland.

It is especially appropriate that the Governor of Massachusetts should appear on this program. For here in the commonwealth we have a great many citizens of whom we are justly proud and who trace their ancestry to that long-suffering nation against which crimes of unspeakable enormity have been perpetrated in our own time.

This valiant country which lies eastward of Germany and westward of Russia has undoubtedly been the victim of the most savage and sanguinary warfare; the most hypocritical and deceitful diplomacy; the most harsh and despotic tyrannies; in short—the most outrageous injustice known to the people of our generation.

Suffering is not novel in the experience of Poland. Long prior to our time it has suffered aggression, oppression and cruelty at the hands of the tyrannical regimes which governed its neighbors. More than once in history its fair and fertile lands and its architecturally imposing cities have been ravished by conquering hordes who came in overwhelming numbers and irresistible combinations. Not for the first time has Poland had her birthright stolen by the fraudulent transactions of enemies who, behind her back and without her consent, cynically disposed of her possessions at the tables of diplomacy.

Yes, many are the injustices which have been worked upon this ancient nation to whom European civilization owes its very existence; whose history reaches back as far, if not further, than any other country in the world; who has made to the culture of mankind contributions as great as those made by any people on the face of the earth. Yet it remained for our time and a few months over 10 years ago for the most barbarous series of injustices of all to have been visited upon Poland.

It has been said, "Happy is the nation that has no history." Poland can boast of a magnificent history. Yet, just as there is no mountain without valley, so from time to time Poland has suffered occasional reverses as it marched triumphantly forward to its destiny of greatness and glory. Conquests, partitions and enemy occupations have from time to time marred her long and illustrious record.

Today, as a result of the infamy which commenced in August 1939, this great nation appears for the moment to have gone into eclipse. She has been violated and outraged in a manner that transcends the darkest days of all her past. Today she stands before the nations of the earth, a mute but eloquent accuser. She has been wronged, ravished and betrayed as she has never been wronged, ravished or betrayed before. In this her moment of sorrow and travail, her condition cries out for the compassion of the world. It should be a burden on the conscience of civilization.

Following World War I, Poland enjoyed a new and joyous rebirth after a protracted period during which she had lain dormant under the control of the despotic regimes which had partitioned her at the infamous Congress of Vienna.

During the War of 1914–18, Russia had undergone humiliating defeat at the hands of Germany and was embroiled in the throes of internal revolution when Poland reemerged in history. The Austrian-Hungarian empire had been dismembered and its former regime was deposed and banished as Poland rose once again. The German Empire which had imposed upon czarist Russia an overwhelming defeat and a brutal peace had in turn succumbed to the victorious allies, and was crushed as Poland was reborn. Once again, Poland had taken up her birthright. Once again she had recovered her liberty and independence. At that happy moment, Poland was proving to the world that what had seemed to have died had only been sleeping. With remarkable energy she reorganized her government and her economy.

Under the wise and prudent direction of the brilliant Paderewski and the formidable Pilsudski she rapidly became a power in the councils of Europe. In this period of her reviving strength she might easily have crushed the then puny tyranny which had seized the reins of power in Russia, but Poland chose to remain in peace, in dignity, and on terms of tolerance with her erstwhile enemies who then lay helpless in defeat, in revolution, in anarchy, and in chaos. Poland continued to pursue the paths of peace while her gigantic enemies gradually restored themselves so that within a generation they once again became threats to the peace of the world. In 1932, Poland in all good faith executed a nonaggression pact with Russia. Later she executed one with Germany. But in 1939, Nazi Germany without a shadow of provocation or a scintilla of justification, violated its solemn treaty obligations and with all the resources at its command invaded Poland.

Within a month, as the Poles fought gallantly, desperately, and brilliantly against the Nazi onslaught facing them from the west, the archscoundrels of Soviet Russia struck them from the rear and inflicted the death blow on the Polish nation. The Polish armies scattered. Some were enslaved in the concentration camps of Nazi Germany, some were enthralled in the equally atrocious internment hells of Communist Russia, but many escaped to fight valiantly by the sides of their allies who had brought help too little and too late. A peace-loving nation and an honorable people had stood up against overwhelming odds and against invasions hurled against them unexpectedly and in violation of solemn covenants to make no aggressions against Poland's territory or sovereignty. As she faced our faithless enemy she was stabbed in the back by an equally unfaithful neighbor.

Yet perhaps the worst was to come. At the very moment when exiled Poles were fighting with their allies on every battlefront of the world, their country was betrayed by those who had professed to be her friends.

As is ever the fashion of thieves, the Nazis and Communists fell out and Hitler's armies invaded Russia. After many dark days of war, after much treasure had been drained and millions of lives had been sacrificed, the tide of battle changed and the Nazi monster was being brought to heel in the west. Even the Red army, which had been repeatedly pushed back by the German forces, was beginning to enjoy some measure of success, and the Germans, under increased pressure from the allies, gradually fell back until ultimately they were defending the city of Warsaw. At that moment a Russian army under command of the notorious Marshal Rokosovsky was standing at the gates. Word was given to the courageous Polish people within to take up arms and they would shortly receive assistance from the Russians who were besieging from without. Bravely they arose to the occasion, but the Red army cynically betrayed them and stood unmoving beyond the gates while the Nazi overlords of the city slaughtered the people who, without adequate arms, had attempted to shake off the alien yoke.

Today a Red regime rules in Warsaw. How false, how foreign, and how anti-Polish is this regime. We need no further proof than the fact that the command of the Polish Army has been entrusted to the brutal Rokosovsky who connived at the slaughter of the people of the city of Warsaw.

For ten long years Poland has suffered the greatest infamy, the greatest outrages, and the greatest betrayals of all her history. The Polish people today are under the domination of alien tyranny. The entire history of the world records few despotisms as bad and none worse. But Poland has shaken off tyranny before and Poland will do it again. The gallant nation which has fought so many successive wars in times past under the ringing battle cry, "For your freedom and ours," will, I trust, soon again achieve the independence, the liberty, and the peace to which she is entitled. May the nations of the earth soon recognize their guilt, their complicity, or at least their unjustifiable indifference, and may they see to it that Poland receives the justice to which she is entitled.

General Pick, Chief of Corps of Engineers, Says "United States Takes Water for Granted While It Runs"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army has a long and honorable and successful record in protecting this country against floods, have made our rivers and streams navigable, have made possible the establishment of great ports, have builded great dams and reservoirs to control and store water to prevent devastating floods and for irrigation and to supply our cities with pure water for drinking and other commercial purposes; they keep the lanes of commerce open by maintaining the channels of our rivers and ports, protect our great recreation centers against beach erosion, build harbors and places where boats take refuge, and in disasters are the first on the ground to give relief and protection with their equipment and skill. All of this in peacetime.

In war, the Corps of Engineers are the first to be called upon to build camps, airfields, roads, bridges, ports of embarkation for men and for the transport of matériels. They prepare the landing beaches for landings, and are always necessary in the operations of our Army.

Mr. Speaker, over a long period of years the Corps of Engineers has had distinguished men at the head of its organization as the Chief of Engineers, and all of them have left their imprint upon the country by their great works.

At this time we are indeed fortunate to have as the Chief of Engineers one of the most distinguished and learned and experienced engineers that the Corps of Engineers has ever had, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick.

I do not have to tell you of his record and his accomplishments as his activities are too well known to the people of the United States.

During World War II General Pick was assigned the most difficult tasks that any engineer had ever undertaken, and all of his missions were accomplished.

Last year when the Midwest was in the throes of a blizzard, one of the worst in the history of this country, the President sent General Pick to take personal charge of the operations to save the lives of the people and save thousands of head of livestock from destruction. This he did without much acclaim.

Looking back on the disasters in our country, our people in Louisiana and the entire Mississippi River Valley were reassured and glad to have General Pick in charge of the fight in the greatest of all floods in the Mississippi River Valley, the flood of 1927, when General Pick was a colonel in charge of the New Orleans, La., district engineer's office where he made a brilliant fight with the odds against him.

It has been my pleasure within the last few months to listen to several magnificent speeches given by General Pick before a number of waterway organizations, and if we will follow his advice and recommendations, there is no question in my mind that the country will be more securely protected from floods; that our resources will be conserved, and that most of our water and waterway problems will be solved.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I feel that, in view of the problem which we recently had in many sections of the United States in regard to water shortages caused by drought that it would be of interest to publish a statement including the opinion of General Pick on this subject given in an interview with Mr. Francis P. Douglas, in the Washington Star of December 8, 1949, as follows:

UNITED STATES TAKES WATER FOR GRANTED WHILE IT RUNS—NATION CAN'T AFFORD TO LET SURPLUSES DRAIN AWAY—ENGINEER CHIEF SAYS NEW YORK CRISIS WILL BE REPEATED

(By Francis P. Douglas)

Our future as a Nation depends on our water supply.

This is the opinion of Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Army Engineers and one of the Nation's foremost experts on water conservation on a grand scale.

He regards water as "the biggest story in the United States." To him the current shortage of water in New York City is an example of crises that will be repeated elsewhere in the future.

According to General Pick, if the United States is going to retain its world leadership it must learn to solve its water problems—husbanding the supply, using it intelligently and effectively. It cannot let surpluses drain off into the oceans in spring floods when it is needed later in the year for parched lands and to fill the streams.

He tells this "biggest story" briefly this way:

"Because we are a great industrial Nation and a great agricultural Nation we find ourselves the leading Nation of the world. If we are to continue to be the leading Nation we must continue to build as an industrial Nation and as an agricultural Nation."

WATER PROBLEM NOT NEW

"We now have 150,000,000 people. It is expected that in another century, we will have twice this number, 300,000,000.

"We have to conserve the land and water to feed this population. We have to have water for industry, which uses tremendous amounts, and for our rivers over which we carry supplies to industry. We have the best harbors in the world and 28,000 miles of inland waterways.

"From the industrial standpoint we are using up some of our basic materials. One is iron ore. A search is being made around the world for sources of iron. With cheap transportation we can afford to go abroad for our industrial raw materials and bring them here to be processed.

"We can afford to do that if we can provide meat and bread to feed our people. But we cannot afford it if we have to bring both raw materials and food from abroad.

"The only thing that will stop our development is that we fail to make proper use of our water."

General Pick declined to make comparisons with other nations. But in the light of what he said, the experience of the British Isles obviously comes to mind. Britain imports both raw materials and food, she has been outstripped in competition and there is discussion whether part of her population should move to other British lands. On the other hand, there is Russia, with great supplies of raw materials, with the possibility of producing abundant food, but so far with a deficiency in industrial experience and skills.

LOS ANGELES SITUATION

The water problem has attracted attention by the experience of New York, where the city's shortage has been dramatized by the whiskers on the faces of those observing no-shaving Fridays to conserve water. General Pick lays the New York shortage to last summer's dry weather plus the steadily increasing use of the supply.

Elsewhere, the water problems is older and more acute. The growth of Los Angeles, for example, is held to be definitely limited unless the city can obtain more water. It now brings water 350 miles from the Colorado River. So acute is the problem that the California Legislature was asked to appropriate $1,000,000 for ideas how to obtain drinkable water from the sea at reasonable cost.

There is also a supply of water underground. But in places along the California coast so much was pumped out that sea water took the place of the fresh water under ground and the wells were salted. This has occurred in Florida, too, and even in Brooklyn and adjacent areas of Long Island.

FARMS ASK IT TOO

Higher farm prices led to more acres in cultivation and to the need for more water. In Arizona so much water was pumped from underground that the water tables subsided and in some places the supply of water has failed to meet the demand. Texas has similar problems, both for agriculture and for its growing cities. Parts of Illinois and Ohio have encountered shortages in their underground supply.

"Washington has an ample water supply," said General Pick, giving reassurance to this area. "But," he warned, "it would be used up quickly if we would place large industries along our streams."

General Pick asserted that we have had enough experience now to know that we cannot take from underground amounts of water comparable to the surface water that is used. Tapping the underground supply is only a temporary expedient, he said.

INDUSTRY'S USES

He gave the daily average use of water per capita in this country as 200 gallons. Since it is estimated that the domestic use runs at 100 gallons a day or less, it is apparent that industry and irrigation takes a half or even more of the supply.

To indicate the tremendous quantities of water industry uses General Pick gave these figures: It takes 10 gallons of water to produce 1 gallon of gasoline; 35 gallons of water for 1 pound of steel (steel is usually figured in tons, which means 66,000 gallons of water per ton of steel); 100 gallons of water for 1 pound of synthetic rubber.

"If we are to continue to expand our industry," he said, "we will have to decentralize our industrial areas. Defense is not necessarily a consideration in this. The main reason is water.

"Heavy industry should be along the larger streams not only where it can get water

transportation but—and more important—where it can get fresh water. That is a must."

A new drain on the water resources, the general pointed out, is the comparatively new air-conditioning industry. He said we must look forward to the time when most stores, restaurants, public buildings, and theaters will be cooled during hot weather. And it takes a tremendous amount of water.

Much of the water used by industry for cooling can be used again. But some water so used is contaminated and must be treated before re-use. General Pick said that steel plants of the Youngstown area along the Mahoning River all use the river water and that the temperature of the stream below the city gets as high as 140°.

He cited an excellent example of industrial location the Standard Oil refinery on the Mississippi at Baton Rouge, La. The plant uses an enormous amount of fresh water, but there is plenty in the river for use when the mud is taken out. Deep-draft vessels can come directly to the refinery docks. Both rail and highway transportation are excellent.

BRACKISH WATER

Some of the Gulf refineries are using brackish water for cooling, General Pick said. The resulting corrosion is a major problem.

How is the water problem to be met?

General Pick said we have to conserve the soil, not only to produce food and lumber but to save water as well. And we have to control the run-off.

Terracing and contour plowing prevent the erosion of the top soil. This saves fertility for food production, helps prevent the silting of reservoirs and allows more water to sink into the ground.

Reforestation not only will provide a future supply of lumber but it also will save the soil of the cut-over areas and slows the run-off of water.

There remains the major engineering problem of saving the water in the river basins and not permitting it to tear its way through the rich bottom lands in devastating spring floods and to pour itself unused into the sea.

CONTROL COOPERATION

"We are pouring millions of gallons of water into the sea, uncontrolled and uncontrollable until we impound it," the general said.

He believes that this problem is not generally appreciated. It means saving water in every stream where it can be stored up. When that is done there will be water behind the dams for the use of an expanding industry, for electric power for industry, for irrigating the farms which must produce the food supply for a growing population and to maintain the levels in the river channels during the dry months so that the heavy freight of industry may be carried.

Congress has recognized the need of this water-conservation program. For the current fiscal year it has appropriated $633,000,000 for the Army engineers' rivers and harbors and flood-control work.

The engineers have water-conservation programs in the basins of practically all the major streams. The huge job on the upper Missouri River and its feeders, for example, will mean the construction of 110 dams.

SILTING PROBLEM

The water to be impounded is measured in acre-feet—that is, the amount of water covering an acre to a depth of 1 foot. The Garrison Dam in North Dakota will impound 29,000,000 acre-feet; the Oahe Dam at Pierre, S. Dak., 21,800,000, and the dam at Fort Randall, S. Dak., 8,000,000.

General Pick faces the problem of silting with confidence. He said the reservoirs are designed to take care of silt during the period the projects pay for themselves. Meanwhile, methods and machinery for moving earth have improved enormously. He is convinced that when the silt encroaches on the use of the reservoirs, resourceful engineers will develop a method of solving the problem and measures to prevent soil erosion will steadily reduce the silt content.

General Pick is perhaps the most widely known officer in the Army engineers. He is 59, a native of Brooknesl, Va., and a graduate of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in 1914. He entered the Army as a Reserve lieutenant in World War I and went into the Regular Army in 1920.

BUILT "PICK'S PIKE"

In World War II he directed the building of the Ledo Road section of the Burma Road to connect Burma and China. In 15 months 45,000 Americans and 42,000 natives constructed 483 miles of road through jungles and over mountains, built 155 bridges and laid 1,800 miles of pipe line. The workers referred to it facetiously and fondly as "Pick's Pike" and the Nation considered it to be one of the greatest engineering feats in Army history.

Befor that and in the 18 months after Pearl Harbor, General Pick directed 93,000 construction workers and the spending of $1,500,000,000 in building airfields, cantonments, hospitals, airplane, and munitions plants and relocation centers for the Japanese moved from the Pacific coast.

In that same period he found time to direct the fight against the Missouri River flood of the spring of 1943 and to draw up the Pick plan, a comprehensive program for over-all control and utilization of the full water resources of the Missouri.

The Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau failed to agree on the Missouri River plan, but when General Pick was in the China-Burma-India war theater they reached a compromise with the Pick-Sloan plan. It became law in December 1944 and General Pick returned in the following November to direct its executive execution.

Last January President Truman named General Pick as Chief of the Engineer Corps to succeed Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler. It happened that at that time General Pick was tied up with another job, operation snowbound, directing the Army's relief of the areas of the West which were suffering their worst winter of 60 years.

He is concerned with no little plans.

Congressmen's Voting Records and Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide that the Legislative Reference Service shall compile and make available the voting record of Members of Congress, and make available information relative to the income of Members of the House.

I feel that the wide dissemination of a Congressman's voting record should be made so that the people will know where he stands on each and every issue that is brought before the Congress for its consideration and disposal. Mr. Speaker, I feel that to provide more democracy in the operations of the United States House of Representatives, and to more effectively discharge its obligations, Members should file with the Clerk of the House a report containing full and complete statements as to, one, the amount and sources of all income received by such Member during the preceding year, including all fees, salaries, income from trusts or estates and dividends received or credited to his account, and, if such income is derived from a law firm or partnership, the names of the clients of such firm or partnership from whom fees were received; and, two, all dealings in securities or commodities by such Member, or by any person acting on behalf of, or pursuant to the direction of, such Member during the preceding year.

Under my measure the Clerk of the House will be directed to compile and to publish within 3 weeks after the close of the present session of Congress a tabulation of the voting record of its Members on all roll-call votes, together with brief descriptions of the issues voted upon. For the purpose of easy readability and quick reference, each Member's votes shall be gathered in one place. The Superintendent of Documents shall sell copies at cost, and shall print sufficient copies so that a supply is on hand at all times. It is impossible today for any voter to get such information from the Congress without authorization of the Member whose voting record is sought.

It is my hope that the Congress will see fit to consider this legislation and report it favorable at the earliest opportunity.

Socialism, Defined and Subversive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am submitting the following remarks I made to my friends of the Associated Industries of Vermont, last fall, at Woodstock, Vt.:

Mr. Toastmaster, shortly before Congress adjourned I told some of my friends that in my judgment Aaron Burr was indicted for treason for doing less in an attempt to set up an empire within this democratic republic than some of those of today were contemplating in an effort to establish little TVA monarchies all over the United States. I am still of that opinion. Their efforts are purely socialistic as socialism is defined by economists and lexicographers. Their attempts follow directly and specifically the theory of civil polity which aims at the public collective ownership, management, and control of land, water, and capital, and sets the pattern for the public collective management of all industries. They are an opening wedge which might and, if experience of other states and countries is a guide, surely would result in the establishment of a socialistic state, called welfare.

Inherent in the proposition to establish these empires within the state is the philosophy which holds that the modern social and economic conditions make for a Socialist order and which favors the principle of such an order as against the prevailing social system. It is a threat to free enterprise as well as destructive of individualism. I am opposed to it as a matter of principle.

I am opposed to their philosophy because of what its adoption similarly as a policy has done world-wide to those who have sold their birthright for a mess of pottage.

Not so long ago Norman Thomas, perennial socialistic candidate for President, said, and it was in 1944. I quote: "The TVA has exemplified what Socialists may and can do and the technique used in the process."

And Carl D. Thompson, guiding spirit of the Public Ownership League of America, founded in 1914, a Socialist national committeeman in 1905; candidate for the nomination for President on the Socialist ticket in 1908; official campaign manager for the National Socialist ticket in 1916, manager of the information bureau of that party, issued a leaflet which contained this:

"The Socialists * * * will control State legislatures and finally the United States Congress and the Supreme Court * * * and finally the Nation will take over one after the other of the public utilities, mines, railroads, interurban electric lines, power plants, telegraph and telephone systems, waterways and forests."

In 1923, Thompson published a map showing his proposed superpower system. This was 10 years before the passage of the TVA Act by Congress, with its misleading preamble which never once mentioned power. In 1937—after the passage of the TVA bill—Thompson again published this same map in the Socialist Public Ownership magazine, with the following headlines:

"Our Dreams Come True."

"Our Plan for a Public Superpower System for the United States Outlined and Published in 1923 Is Slowly but Surely Being Realized."

The article itself, said this:

"Step by step this plan * * * is being * * * realized * * *. The Tennessee Valley has become an outstanding reality * * * Boulder Dam has been finished * * *. The Bonneville power system * * * is nearing completion * * * Grand Coulee is well on the way * * *. In the map * * * one can see the extent to which our dream of 1922–25 has already taken form."

However, those who are really carrying the torch for authorities are not those who developed the TVA. They are simply using the TVA as a smoke screen for their real intentions, which are:

The bringing of some type of national scialism to the United States. They are the Socialists who have been working behind the scenes in America for many years, and have seized upon authorities for river basins as the great step in their plans for national socialism.

My opposition to the TVA is of very long standing, at least 17 years. The reasons for it have been so often stated over the years I see nothing to be gained by repetition, so far as justification is involved. However, I will briefly state a few of the many reasons why I am opposed to the TVA, to the establishment of any similar authority in New England, as well as to the creation of a Vermont power authority. All three ideologies stem from the same school of economics and politics (meaning science of government). Each and all involve the destruction, ultimately, of our form of government. Vermonters should understand that a very determined effort is being made openly and sub rosa and has been made for some time by an easily definable group to socialize Vermont. This group follows the teachings of Norman Thomas and both privately and publicly endorse the socialistic program which has ruined England, and for that matter every country which has followed the fallacies of the have-everything-for-nothing theories on which socialism rests. Vermonters should not be misled by the very competent methods of approach of this group who support the vagaries of the welfare state, in ultimatum, which proposes to lay the foundation of a government program which will enable them to live off the workers from the womb to the tomb.

Upon returning from a recent trip to the TVA area some who were mesmerized by the magnitude of the project came back to sing its glories. They did not tell you, did they, that of all the cities of the world Chattanooga has the highest tax rate of all and every one of the cities on this continent. They did not tell you that the inhabitants of Chattanooga live under the cloud of possible destruction by the flood waters of the Tennessee, did they? They did not tell you that nowhere on the continent are such slums to be found as presently exist in the TVA area.

Poverty in the TVA region is caused by the high tax rates and low wages concerning which the pro-TVA visitors failed to speak. They do not tell you that the TVA area is the land of displaced persons, nobody knows how many; but 14,000 families were moved and over 30,000 different tracts of land were preempted.

Half a million acres of fertile land which once produced $37,000,000 worth of crops annually, at prewar prices were taken, flooded, and are under water today.

Did these opponents of progress and the development of more power at the Wilder Dam tell you about this? They did not. They did not tell you that at least 75,000 people were actually forced to leave their homes, farms, and businesses to make way for the taming of the Tennessee.

There was hell to pay on Tennessee when all this happened. There would be worse than that to pay in Vermont where we sing the slogan of "Not 1 acre of fertile land shall be flooded to produce power," when and after hundreds of acres are already to be flooded by agreement of parties and by the beavers.

The truth is the beavers have flooded more fertile land than all the land owned by the objectors and opponents of progress in Orange County, Vt.

It nevertheless is true that, when good soil and farm homes are destroyed the loss should be compensated for in dollars so far as possible.

Where are the taxes coming from formerly paid by landowners in the flooded areas? They just don't come, that's all, and are passed on to the taxpayers living elsewhere.

They did not tell you that despite all they can say TVA is primarily a power show, though the development of power was hardly an item in the original plan as presented to Congress. I know because I was on the Military Affairs Committee as far back as 1934.

Did they visit the slums in Knoxville? You should see them, the worst in the world, next to ———. Do they tell you that the soil conservation program is frozen out by TVA? So Secretary Brannan told Congress or he said that the soil conservation program was operative as to only 5 percent of the farm lands in the TVA area.

Did these TVA zealots tell you that the rural electrification in Tennessee is the fourth worst in the country because the TVA rates are so low and the taxes too high? Did they tell you that the bonded debt of Knoxville is over $18,000,000 and its tax rate over 45 mills?

Did they tell you that from 60 to 70 percent of the farmers are unable to get any of the TVA products and are in fact denied the fertilizers they need? It is so. The TVA area has suffered from lack of solid nitrates perhaps more than any other section in the United States.

If state socialism is what you want that's what you get under TVA. It will be what you will get under a New England Valley Authority, and then some. No man in the Tennessee Valley from constable to United States Senator dares run unless he is first and foremost and always for TVA.

The socialistic implications of a New England Authority are appalling. The proposal is a definite threat to local self-government.

And by the way did these hypnotized visitors at the shrine of Lilienthal tell you that TVA's "personnel policy gives no protection to workers. Its fertilizer program is not well balanced, is susceptible to favoritism. Its power policy, without checks of any kind, is wide open to criticism. Its bookkeeping system, its arbitrary allocation of costs do not follow standard practice and discriminate against other public power agencies. Its treatment of land owners, competitive private enterprise and other Federal Agencies has been high-handed and capricious. TVA has too much power over human beings, their lives and fortunes and independence."

The truth is and it is acknowledged to be true, the TVA has cost too much, almost a billion dollars in tax funds, none of which has been or will ever be returned to the United States Treasury.

It has cost too much in terms of power capacity, for the benefits so far returned or possible to provide. It has cost too much in terms of rich agricultural land permanently flooded, some 500,000 acres, half of it good bottom land.

It has cost too much in the priceless coin of regional and local autonomy. It is an empire, a dictatorship, set up within a democracy. It is completely socialistic. You cannot afford to give an agency of government so much power over water and land and hydroelectric plants, and impose that authority upon a region. The people pay for it no matter how benevolent the purpose to establish a welfare state. It is time to stop the crowd which follows the flag on which is emblazoned the slogan "This is a good country to live in—so long as we can live off it."

Any such set-up would be simply obnoxious to the independent people of Vermont.

It is passing strange as I see it that hard-headed, thrifty Vermonters should for an instant fall for such an appeal to their selfishness and possible desire to get something for nothing. I doubt that there are very many who will, yet these socialistic-inclined TVAers, country-wide "do gooders," have an insatiable lust for power (not electric). They want the power to fix prices, to fix wages, to develop and to control electric energy, the authority to distribute and to ration it, and the authority to put Government into all kinds of business everywhere. Senator Taft recently said that a farm plan involving complete power to impose production controls on farmers who make it possible for the Government to tell the farmers how many acres of wheat, corn, and soybeans they may raise; how many hogs they can sell; how many beef cattle they can feed, and dairy cattle they can handle, and how many chickens they can keep.

These welfare-state advocates want the Government to guarantee every man a job, but it can only do that if given power to tell every man what job he shall take, and at what wages. These proposals, if carried through, would give complete control of industry, commerce, and labor, including the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, the socialization of medicine, the other usurpations of the privileges of the individual, the other free service to those who are not entitled to them, and "we shall have," said Senator Taft, "almost a duplicate of the labor-socialist regime in England today."

I am against such a socialistic program and the time to kill it is now. I agree with John T. Flynn that among other aspects of the TVA, which is to be used as a pattern

for all authorities, the one which should interest us most and startle us to a recognition of where we stand, is found in the fact that TVA has operated and still operates as a provisional Government agency of a regional province.

It has operated as a Federal corporation under a charter which has enabled it to do an incredible number of things and to escape Government scrutiny. The Federal charter is a comparatively new device to enable the Federal Government to expand its powers immensely. Mr. Lilienthal, in his book "TVA—Democracy on the March," calls attention to the vast growth of Federal power. It has become so great that, he says, it cannot be wisely administered from Washington. But the power must not go back to the governors, mayors, legislatures and councils elected by the people. It must go to great regional areas administered by directors appointed by the President, to a corporation cunningly devised to accumulate power and to elude congressional authority. We will see the country split into a few great regional provinces run by corporate provincial governors. This is what Mr. Lilienthal calls "democracy on the march." I think it is democracy in retreat, a return to the European system of centrally controlled provincial governors. With TVA as a beginning the advocates of regionalism are planning under the guise of flood, navigation and forestry control and other excuses to blanket America with this new type of government which represents a complete revolution in our political system.

This attempt to establish such provinces as the TVA all over this land is not just a local issue. The basic issue involved is as important from the standpoint of what's going to happen to people as if the question were on a vote to socialize physician's services (the same group which is back of a valley authority and public power leans largely to socialized medicine); to nationalize the steel industry, the coal mines (to follow England into the ruin which confronts her), the oil wells, the railroads, telegraph and telephone lines, and radio and television and what have you. The issue confronts and merits the careful consideration of every citizen. Let's look at the record and talk figures for a minute or two.

TVA is the outstanding example of Federal power in the country today. It is urged by some as the pattern for all future Federal power developments. In 1947 the TVA and municipals and cooperatives paid approximately 5.4 percent of the total revenues in taxes and tax equivalents. This compares with 19.8 percent of total revenues paid in taxes by all electric companies in the United States. This 5.4 percent of TVA revenues paid in taxes or tax equivalents, including taxes paid by municipals and cooperatives reselling TVA power, compares with 16.1 percent in Arizona, 17.1 percent in Georgia, 19.5 percent in Oklahoma, 19.4 percent in South Carolina, 27.5 percent in Louisiana, 17.2 percent in Arkansas, 15.2 percent in Virginia, 12.3 percent in Michigan, 17.1 percent in Oregon, and 17.7 percent in Kansas (based on figures of a representative company in the State).

Taxes paid by an electric company are a cost of production, and in the final analysis they are paid by consumers of electricity. Consequently it is people who are being unfairly treated; it is business and farms and families who are being discriminated against, and this discrimination will continue either until the power industry is nationalized or until public power is made to pay full costs, including its rightful contribution to the cost of government.

Then there is in addition the question of interest. Interest-free money for public-power projects is a tremendous force leading to nationalization, for a basic economic fact of the electric utility industry is the proportionately large amounts of capital required, and therefore interest and dividend payments required per dollar of revenue. There are many, however, who do not regard interest as a cost that should be paid by Federal power projects, even though the United States taxpayer is paying in excess of $5,000,000,000 a year to the collectors of internal revenue so that the interest on the public debt can be promptly met.

TVA pays virtually no interest. TVA's annual 1948 report shows that it paid $558,637 interest in 1948 or an investment in power in excess of $400,000,000. At 2 percent—the approximate cost of money to the Federal Government—this item to cover its costs should have been about $8,000,000. With regard to interest the TVA annual report points out that "Funds for construction and operation have been obtained from congressional appropriations, requiring no return of interest. * * * No interest during construction is included in the costs of fixed assets, except for a relatively minor amount pertaining to contested condemnation awards."

If TVA paid full taxes and interest, its expenses would far exceed revenues and its accounting statements would reveal a staggering deficit. No degree of operating efficiency on the part of the full tax-paying electric companies can overcome such lavish subsidies.

We should not forget that free private enterprise as a basic principle of the American way of life is not something that belongs to the businessman, the industrialist, and the shopkeeper, or any special interest. Freedom of the press, for example, is not a concept that is the property of the newspaper publisher or the owner of the radio station. Freedom of the press, like free private enterprise, belongs to the people. Frequently we lose sight of this fact. Business has been known to lose sight of it, but when it has, the people have been quick to reestablish their claim and to make certain that it was made to operate to their advantage and not against them. Government, too, has been known to lose sight of the fact, but when it has, seldom has the ground lost ever been regained.

Free private enterprise is a way of producing wealth, goods, and services to satisfy human wants, and it is a plan just like socialism or communism is a plan. The major way in which a free economic system differs from socialism or communism is that the former is conducted by free individuals for free individuals, not by the state for those who might be the recipient of the state's favor.

I cannot agree with any plan for a New England River Authority based on the TVA plan, under which the New England States involved surrender their autonomy and our natural resources pass out of our hands and into the control of a government within our Government, made of bureaus owing allegiance only to their creator, the Federal Government.

Vermonters are strong believers in a maximum of local self-government. As you are already advised I am unalterably opposed to the establishment of powerful river valley empires to take the place of our 48 free and sovereign States.

I feel about and concerning the proposed valley authority for New England patterned after TVA, as does Representative JENSEN, of Iowa, with regard to the Missouri Valley Authority, as indicated by his reply to a letter requesting him to state his position in reference thereto. Here is a portion of his letter:

"My criticism of the TVA set-up is that a board of three men, appointed by the President, and not elected by the people, have, in effect, full and complete control over the very existence of the people living in the Tennessee Valley. We must bear in mind that he who has authority to control the electric power and water resources of America, or any given area in America in this electric age, can completely control America or that area under such control.

"Congress appropriates each session a lump sum for TVA to build power dams, transmission lines, flood control, forestry, navigation, and, in fact, for most everything to carry on the Federal functions in the valley. Then this Board of three men spend that money at will to run their empire, so you see in reality the TVA is a separate and distinct empire within our American Republic. Not only the people's elected Government officials have lost much of their authority, but this Board of three men have taken over too much of the States' authority, which was specifically delegated to the sovereign States by the Constitution.

Now, if this kind of autocratic regional control is carried on to its ultimate conclusion in the 11 river valleys of America, the Missouri being one of them, 33 men could completely control America. The 48 States could very well be expected to lose their sovereign rights and identity, and we would have in their place 11 separate, powerful regions or valley empires. I am quite certain you do not know that program is the recommendations and hope of the Communist Party of America. They know that so long as our Nation is composed of 48 States that are free and sovereign, whereby the people of the respective States elect their public servants, communism can never completely take over here.

The fact is the American people have deceived themselves far too long in thinking that our variety of socialism is different from the slave state of the Marxist. The trend in this country today is identical in principal to that in operation in other central governments which manage their people and their people's property. We are just about half way toward total socialism, the adoption of which, or the acceptance of which may have been caused by ignorance; which does not change the awful fact.

Most Americans have never stopped to define "socialism." They do not know what socialism is although right here in Vermont there are those who are nothing else but Socialists. They favor Government ownership and Government management of the Nation's economy. They would establish little empires governmentally controlled and operate within the State as they deny the right and capacity of individuals to manage their own business and their property. That's what socialism is. And Socialists and fellow travelers and Communists always move toward compulsion and violence and away from freedom.

Socialism is directly opposed to American constitutional freedom. Socialism and democracy are inherently inimical, yet socialism and absolutism and communism are natural partners. It is my well-considered judgment and long-entertained opinion that no government-controlled regime can equal a competitive system in furnishing to men and women producers the incentives to lead them to do their best along all lines. Only where everyone is free and rewarded adequately for services rendered are human energies released to the limit. Only under such conditions could the United States of America have become the world power that it is, and only under such conditions can all classes really prosper and enjoy life. Soft socialism, the idea of the welfare state, the steady increase in the Federal Government's power over the lives and purses of our citizens, are the greatest menaces confronting us today, not excluding Russia.

Former Secretary of State Byrnes well said: "We are going down the road to statism. Where we will wind up no one can tell. But if some of the new programs seriously proposed should be adopted, there is danger that the individual—whether farmer, workers, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor—will soon be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state."

An alluring, deceptive new term has been creeping into our political language. The kind of government which promises to give everybody health, houses, security, and the comforts of life is being called the welfare state.

Nobody opposes welfare. By hard work and ingenuity we have been able, under American freedom, to produce a great deal of welfare and to distribute it widely among the people. The American record in this respect far exceeds any of any other nation in any time. We can carry it much further.

Promises of abundant welfare have been made by many governments from ancient Rome to Hitler and Cripps. And now Truman. Those governments have always eventually gone bankrupt, or to war, or both. The people have been left with less welfare than before.

The only governments that have achieved truly remarkable records for the welfare of their people are the very few that, like ours, have left the people fairly free from restrictions, and fairly free from the overwhelming taxes that welfare measures cost.

The people have then produced their own welfare by working for it. They have had to pay little percentage to bureaucrats for its enjoyment. They earned it and it was theirs. Having no Brannan plans, they were able to buy their own groceries.

An honest name for the "welfare state" would be the "farewell state," for once we go far enough toward Government guaranties of welfare we can say farewell to American freedom as Americans long knew that blessed condition, and to American standards of welfare.

No nation under any other system has come even close to our success. To be a party to any proposed change of our form of government would be folly, yet the America of tomorrow is threatened from within by ideologies foreign to our living. We must meet and overcome ideologies which use our freedom in an effort to destroy it.

I have just read John T. Flynn's The Road Ahead. It has been appearing in serial form in the Free Press. I commend it to your very serious consideration. One of the leading editorial writers of the country in reviewing the book had this to say:

"The Road Ahead is concerned with two subjects: The first of these is the misery and poverty to which the Labor (Socialist) Government has brought the once proud and powerful British people; the second is what Mr. Flynn sees as a far-flung conspiracy to bring the American people to those same levels of misery, poverty, and weakness.

Engaged in this conspiracy, according to the Flynn report, are a multitude of Socialists who are afraid to call themselves by that name, as the honest and forthright Norman Thomas is not. These people masquerade as economic planners, do-gooders, great lovers of the common people, and fervent believers in the "welfare state."

They are moving in on the Democratic Party, as Britain's Fabian Socialists once moved in on and then virtually killed off the old Liberal Party. "Indeed," says Mr. Flynn, and makes a good case for his assertion, "our masked Socialists already have made a prisoner of President Truman, and he can't break jail."

These conspirators also have infiltrated heavily in newspaper, magazine, radio, movie, church, and educational fields. Hence, they can spread their poison around in great quantity and with considerable effect. The essence of the poison is communism, but our masked Socialists are more subtle and clever about distributing it than are the United States Reds.

The over-all plan is to change your life in every detail that counts, and in the same ways as the Laborites are changing British lives. If the plan succeeds, you will become a slave to a Government which hammers your living standards downward all the time while it tells you you're happier every day in every way. Out-and-out Russian-style communism would come somewhat later, but inevitably.

Mr. Flynn in this book names names, rips off disguises, exposes many a fake lover of the people, and cites chapter and verse. If you like the life you lead in the United States as of now, better read this book. They are after you. They are playing for keeps. They may get you if you don't look alive.

Let us determine that we shall not allow the state to be our master, but that we shall be the masters of the state. The long road to history is lined with the ruins of those states which bought the souls and wills of their peoples by the lure of a granted security, and then led them to ruin by the same mirage. The world does not need even one more such ruin.

Freedom exists only where the people take care of the government. There is no freedom where the Government takes care of the people.

Address of Matthew Woll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave unanimously granted, I am inserting in the Appendix the following text of the memorable address of Mr. Matthew Woll, a vice president of the American Federation of Labor, at the Gompers centennial dinner at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D. C., on January 5, 1950:

Why are we meeting here tonight?

Why are men and women throughout the land and of most every calling and station of life gathering here this evening as a prelude to like gatherings to follow in most of our industrial cities during the year?

What is the purpose of this festive event?

What are the objectives of this eventful occasion—this remarkable demonstration?

The answer is quite simple:

We are here as free citizens—as sons and daughters of a great democracy—a great Republic—to pay honor to a man whose lifelong energies and remarkable talents and abilities have been singly devoted to the perpetuity and enhancement of the ennobling thoughts of freedom and the furtherance of the inspiring principles that have made our Nation a truly great nation and have bestowed on our people blessings never heretofore enjoyed by humankind.

We come as wage earners to pay tribute to one lowly born, yet, who through sheer force of intellect, foresight, understanding and persistency, has contributed immeasurably to the greater fullness of life enjoyed by all and who brought to fruition to a greater, a fairer, and more equitable degree, the division of the rewards of an ever growing and expanding economic order.

We gather here, and as we will elsewhere, to pay homage to one for his unswerving devotion to the cause that binds us in fraternity—for the structure he has founded and built to help men and women rise to higher levels of life and thought and to aid those economically and socially disadvantaged.

We are meeting tonight in deep reverence to the memory of one whose genius and abilities would have carried him far in the realm of earthly possessions, but who chose rather the path of the lowly—the unpossessed—and whose brilliant mind and eloquent voice were dedicated solely to conquer material things in order to uplift humankind and free the spirit of man.

Yes; we are assembled tonight to honor the memory of Samuel Gompers, born 100 years ago this coming January 27—a great patriot, a great emancipator of labor, leader and founder of the American Federation of Labor—a great humanitarian and a crusader in the cause of freedom, justice, and democracy the world over.

The life and labors of Gompers effectually and impressively dramatize and symbolize the growth and greatness of the American democracy and of its people. Here was an immigrant boy who came to the American shores and rose to the greatest achievements in our land and who has merited the overwhelming applause of its people. What a mighty tribute to the vitality and spirit of democracy of our Nation—a vitality and spirit deeply rooted in the diversity of our national and racial origin and in the opportunities presented to all of good will by our social order.

Yes; we are met here to praise and appraise one who has passed on, but whose spirit dwells in our midst and whose teachings will live on and on so long as freedom and free trade-unions endure.

We come not only to praise Sam Gompers, but to rededicate ourselves to the task to which he applied his great qualities of heart and mind, his untiring and unsparing efforts and energies. The spiritual motives that governed his leadership stand out conspicuously in our present-day world affairs.

Gompers was indeed a great leader—a great man—and we do well to honor him.

But what made for his greatness? What are the particular qualities and characteristics that have distinguished him from others?

Friend and foe alike will acknowledge his great breadth of mind. But other men before and since have had great minds. Yet little if anything is heard of them.

True, Gompers was gifted with an eloquent tongue and with exceptional analytical powers, capable of achieving eminent success in the professional world. Yet others have been born with equal endowments but they, too, are numbered among the unremembered.

Gompers was possessed of very rare executive abilities and could have achieved a great business career—entered the realm of wealth and of affluence as others have done. Yet, their names are engraved merely on marble or stone in the silent cities of the world.

And so, too, might Gompers have chosen a political career. No one doubts or questions his preeminence in the qualities that make for high statesmanship. Yet he chose the higher concept of duty which man owes to those with whom he works and for whom he works—an enriched understanding of human justice, an understanding of the finer effects of democracy in daily life, the realization that human brotherhood is, after all, a thoroughly practical ideal and the only lasting basis for human relations.

He cared nothing for what the world calls success; ignoring public office, wealth and preferment, he reached only for that higher thing shown to be of eternal value when the final curtain ends life's play.

As trade-unionists we are here to manifest our feelings of gratitude for his unswerving devotion to the cause of trade-unionism, for his tireless efforts and energies in founding and building up our great trade-union organization and in creating the cornerstone and directing the policies of the American Federation of Labor, which for the past 60 years have withstood successfully every attack from without and every assault from within, and, more than all else, has firmly implanted into hearts and minds of

American trade-unionists the great principles that have made the American Federation of Labor the strongest, most powerful and influential, the most enduring structure of labor ever experienced in history.

What are these great principles?

It is axiomatic today for any public figure—whether identified with labor, with government, or with industry—to make laudatory statements about the value and the necessity of collective bargaining and cooperative labor-management relations.

Some 50 years ago, however, the United States was faced with such phenomena as "robber barons," a "Wall Street" entrenched in finance and Government, and a political set-up in which every city of any size was controlled by unscrupulous bosses, whose judges and police force served the employers.

In those days collective bargaining met with great obstacles, such as the Sherman antitrust laws, injunction writs, yellow-dog contracts, and the like.

In those days, to suggest that collective bargaining, the striving together of labor and industry for amicable relations would be for the advancement and benefit of both, was an open invitation to ridicule and abuse. Yet Gompers seized every opportunity to advance the doctrine of mutual cooperation of industry and labor and to further collective bargaining despite bitter abuse by both radicals and ultraconservatives.

Today the entire political and social outlook of the United States has been one of increasing acceptance of the principles of collective bargaining and of labor-management cooperation.

Gompers was not only the architect who made the blueprints for the creation of the American Federation of Labor; he was also the builder who carried out the details of those plans, and the caretaker who zealously guarded the main principles upon which the organization was built. It was his conception that in the world of labor the chain could not be any stronger than its weakest link, and that the federation would be strong or weak, progressive or retrogressive in proportion to the strength and growth and temperament of its affiliates—its national and international unions.

Conversely, in an address he delivered in 1902, Gompers said prophetically:

"As the federation is constituted, it cannot be overwhelmed by its growth. The national and international unions of the various crafts and callings relieve the central body of this danger and leave it free to do what can be done with safety and advantage for the common welfare."

And this central organization, built on the principle of autonomy for the national and international unions, has in times past, been ridiculed by opponents as a "rope of sand."

An intensely interesting episode in this connection occurred shortly after Lenin had issued his famous "Open Letter to American Workers," which was published and distributed far and wide by the Communists in the United States. In this letter Lenin criticized the form of organization of the American Federation of Labor, and in connection with it used the epithet "a rope of sand."

It was at this time that a Bolshevik commissar, visiting the United States as a representative of Lenin, begged for an interview with Gompers. However, before the conversation began, Gompers, holding a copy of the letter of Lenin in his hand, turned to the commissar and said: "Before we go any further, I want you to tell Lenin that our 'rope of sand' will prove stronger than his iron chains."

This happened about 30 years ago, and last month, in London, the representatives of the free American trade unions, in association with those of 53 other countries, laid the foundation which will bring to reality the prophecy of Gompers of 30 years past.

This reference to a "rope of sand" and the principle upon which the American Federation of Labor has been set up, brings us to another point—the position of the AFL on political action.

The American Federation of Labor has never opposed free expression of political ideologies. Its point of view is best covered in a statement by Gompers, published in the February 1896 issue of the American Federationist—the year that Gompers was reelected as president of the federation after his only defeat the year before. In that statement he wrote as follows:

"I believe in the fullest opportunity for thorough discussion and proper presentation of all schools of thought in the labor movement. My only insistence has been, and is today, that a man shall be true to his trade-union in season and out of season, in spite of friend or foe, and that, apart from that, it is his province to believe in and advocate any reform which, in his judgment, is calculated to best advance the whole line of the trade-union movement."

But Gompers fought bitterly any clique or political party, for he foresaw the dangers of zealots, who, after gaining power in a union with the help of a political party, would then sacrifice the interest of that union in the interest of party considerations.

While Gompers was strongly in favor of political actions on the part of trade-unions, summarized in the well-known phrase, "Reward your friends and punish your enemies," he was as strongly opposed to the theory supported by radicals, that of independent trade-union party political action. Today the entire labor movement holds Gompers' point of view. Only the Communist Party is in disagreement with it.

It is because of Gompers' foresight, courage and watchfulness that the Communists have at no time had any hope of infiltrating into the house of labor. As a result, the Communists looked for other fields to conquer. Due to the precepts laid down by Gompers, the American Federation of Labor has never had to face the painful and distasteful necessity of expelling from its ranks, for ideological reasons, a number of its component unions.

Gompers never made a fetish of any dogmas. He was a man of an open mind. He allowed no clique to mar his thinking or to serve as a substitute for his thinking.

He never worshiped the status quo, nor was he fearful of change. In his testimony before the Industrial Relations Commission headed by the late Frank P. Walsh, he showed clearly the difference between dynamic progression and the dogmas of the sterile Socialist movement in the United States.

Gompers had vision but was not a visionary. He had dynamic vitality and never confused noise with militancy of rowdyism with effective action and struggle against the open-shoppers and other enemies of labor.

He saw clearly and distinctly the urgency and full implication of genuine international labor solidarity. He fathered the idea of and was the driving force for the organization of the International Federation of Trade Unions.

Gompers realized that the labor movement of no single country could remain free and stay prosperous long if the working people of other lands were not free and were subjected to low standards of life and labor. That is why he pioneered in the organization of the ILO and laid special stress on raising the standards and improving the conditions of the toiling folks in the underdeveloped countries.

The labor internationalism of Gompers takes on special living significance today in view of the recent developments in the organization of over 50,000,000 free-trade unionists under the banner of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. It is in this spirit and aspirations of Gompers that the activities of this new world confederation of free-trade unions will have to be activated if this new world labor body is to fulfill its intended mission.

More and more, freedom-loving people everywhere are coming to realize the grave menace of concentrating power in the hands of Government bureaucrats. The rise of various types of totalitarian despotism has focused attention on this growing menace to human rights and liberties won by peoples through centuries of struggle.

As a stanch advocate and stubborn defender and champion of democracy, he never for a moment was misled as to the true nature of communism. To Gompers, communism was nothing else but twentieth century slavery. From the very moment that Bolsheviks seized power in Russia, Gompers fought its dogmas and deeds. As a consequence, the Federation has served as the most persistent and effective opponent to communism in our country and on a worldwide scale.

Finally, Gompers was a great believer in the principle of voluntarism—in action through free, voluntary, nongovernmental bodies. In his conception, the fundamentals of human liberty rested squarely on the principles of voluntarism. It was his conviction that no lasting gain has ever come from compulsion.

When at the El Paso convention of the American Federation of Labor he realized he was too feeble to address that convention in person, and conscious that life was drawing near a close, he called upon then Vice President Green, now entering his twenty-fifth year of service as president of the American Federation of Labor, to present to the convention his last message, and in which he said among other things:

"Events of recent months have made me keenly aware that the time is not far distant when I must lay down my trust for others to carry forward. When one comes to close grips with the eternal things there comes a new sense of relative values, and the less worthy things lose significance.

"As I review the events of my 60 years of contact with the labor movement, and as I survey the problems of today and study the opportunites of the future, I want to say to you, men and women of the American labor movement, do not reject the cornerstone upon which labor's structure has been builded, but base your all upon voluntary principles and illumine your every problem by consecrated devotion to that highest of all purposes, human well-being in the fullest, widest, deepest sense.

"We have tried and proved these principles in economic, political, social, and international relations. They have been tried and not found wanting. Where we have tried other ways we have failed."

And then he concluded his final message in this ennobling appeal to you and all who are to follow:

"As we move upward to higher levels, a wider vision of service and responsibility will unfold itself. Let us keep the faith. There is no other way."

And so, in drawing to a close, may I suggest that our meeting here and elsewhere should not come to an end without a permanent objective. Twenty-five years ago the people of this country and of many foreign lands, industry, and commerce, all stopped in silent homage to him whose name was known and honored the world over because he gave his life in service for others. The United States turned from other matters to consider his life and work; the Mexican Parliament and that of the Philippines did likewise. Flags were ordered at half mast in many lands.

A great man, a great patriot, a great labor leader, and champion of free people and of their rights and prerogatives—had passed on.

But the soul of Samuel Gompers has continued to live on in its potent influence on our national life and customs. It lives today in the daily lives of millions of Americans.

May I, therefore, venture to propose that we give rise to a new conception of our evaluation of the services rendered by Samuel Gompers expressed in the setting aside of January 27 of each succeeding year as Samuel Gompers' Birthday and that this day be solemnized as a holiday to be observed throughout the Nation so that his rightful place among the great of America may no longer remain void and so that to labor of America be accorded, too, the honor of having contributed to the building up of a truly great democracy such as the world has never known before.

As a final and concluding word, may I join with the expression of Daniel J. Tobin, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, where in his closing chapters of an article published in the Teamsters' magazine of January 1950, he said of President Gompers:

"Those who knew Sam will agree with me when I say that it is my personal judgment that there never was any greater leader in the labor movement in this country, in Germany, in England, or any other country than the man who was born 100 years ago in the slums of London and whose anniversary will be celebrated by the American Federation of Labor, opening with a banquet on January 5 at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C."

And then, too, I join with him in saying that "The only missing link to the chain which binds the men of labor together is that good old Sam will not be there instilling fire and courage and determination into those present." But some of us at least believe that he still lives on and that his spirit will be moving from table to table at the banquet whispering words of hope into the ears and into the hearts of the men who have come after him who are now endeavoring to carry the banner which he so successfully held aloft for more than 50 years, the banner of clean militant trade unionism as exemplified and practiced by the 8,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor.

Statement by Hon. Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, on the President's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the subject of the budget submitted by the President on January 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Although the President's budget indicates a deficit of $5,000,000,000 he has clearly made an honest effort to effect economies. Thus he has cut military expenditures by one and five-tenths billions below congressional appropriations for the current year, has reduced foreign aid by a billion and a quarter, and has had the courage to propose removing the $400,000,000 subsidy on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail. The President deserves a great deal of credit for these economies.

But still further savings can and should be made, and we in Congress should carry on in this same spirit and help the President to save another three billions of dollars. This can be done in the following ways:

(1) Reducing military expenditures by a further five hundred millions. (2) Reducing the lending powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association by eight hundred millions below the President's estimate. (3) Cutting the swollen staffs of Government civilian employees by from 8 to 10 percent and thus saving five hundred and fifty millions. (4) Cutting the present excessive vacation leave of 5½ weeks to a month, thus saving $100,000,000. (5) Cutting rivers and harbors or the modern pork-barrel bill by three hundred millions. (6) Slowing up the rate of construction of roads and dams by one hundred and fifty millions. (7) Eliminating the subsidies on silver, flax, etc., to save one hundred millions. (8) Saving 6200,000,000 by consolidating all the Government agencies dealing with transportation and similarly those with engineering.

These further savings would amount to two and seven-tenths billions and if effected would reduce appropriations from the forty-two and four-tenths billions requested by the President to thirty-nine and seven-tenths billions. Furthermore, of the total of around a billion set aside for new legislation, there is probably about three hundred million which, as realists, we should recognize will not be authorized. This would bring expenditures down to thirty-nine and four-tenths billions.

While the Bureau of the Budget is apparently expecting revenues to reach thirty-seven and three-tenths billions for 1950-51, this would seem to be an understatement provided we have prosperity. For revenues in 1948-49 amounted to thirty-eight and three-tenths billions. Indeed allowing for the normal growth in the American economy, with the same average rate of taxation, receipts for 1950-51 should be over thirty-nine billions. By tightening the revenue laws in such matters as the abuse of charitable trusts and by stricter enforcement, we should be able to raise total revenues by from five hundred million to a billion dollars more.

In short, we can balance the budget if Congress and the country have the self-discipline needed to back up the President in the economies which he has already made and go further along the same path.

Proposals Affecting the Dairy Industry and Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk some material on the subject of grass-roots reactions of the dairymen of Wisconsin and in particular the reactions of one of their great cooperatives, the Pure Milk Products Co-op, of Fond du Lac, to proposals affecting the dairy industry and agriculture generally. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from time to time, I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD grass-roots reports from my home State, resolutions adopted by leading organizations, editorials from newspapers, etc. I have felt that although these items obviously took up space in the RECORD, it was essential that each of us bring to the attention of our colleagues pertinent expressions from the rural crossroads and the cities of America, rather than just giving our own views and interpretations.

LARGEST MILK MARKETING CO-OP IN UNITED STATES

At this time, I have in my hand a very fine expression of opinion, consisting of resolutions adopted by one of the outstanding dairy organizations in the United States. I refer to the Pure Milk Products Cooperative of Fond du Lac, Wis. This, Mr. President, is the largest milk marketing cooperative in our country. Wisconsin has many famous cooperatives and is proud of them. In singling out this particular cooperative, at this time, I do so not with any underestimation of the importance of other fine groups, but with a recognition that here is a splendid and truly representative agricultural organization.

The Pure Milk Products Cooperative has some 26,000 members all over Wisconsin. It is owned and controlled exclusively by Badger milk producers.

Last year these producers sent to market 1,237,650,000 pounds of milk with sales valued at around $40,000,000.

I ask you to contemplate, Mr. President, the staggering amount of sweat and labor represented in that huge outpouring of milk. I ask you to contemplate the tremendous investment by small farmers in that output, and the investment by their cooperative in marketing. This is little business at its best; this is small family-type agriculture at its best; this is cooperative organization at its best.

For over two decades, the Pure Milk Products Cooperative has fought the Wisconsin milk producers' fight and has represented the dairy producer in all his legitimate needs.

CONFERENCE ON OLEO MENACE

During the last several days it has been my pleasure to confer at first hand on the crucial butter-oleomargarine subject with several of the outstanding leaders of this cooperative, including its distinguished president, Mr. William F. Groves, of Lodi, Wis., one of the most respected agricultural leaders of my State; and Mr. William O. Perdue, general manager at Fond du Lac, Wis., also one of the finest qualified individuals I know to speak for the dairyman's cause. Naturally, these leaders, like other dairy leaders who have assembled in Washington during the past week, are tremendously disturbed about the threat of the Oleo Trust against United States dairying.

DAIRY CO-OP REPRESENTS CONSUMERS AS WELL

These men, Mr. Groves, Mr. Perdue, and others in this organization have fought not only for the dairyman's view, however, but have always considered the larger interests of American agriculture and of the 150,000,000 American consumers who need nutritious dairy products.

Well, Mr. President, what do the 26,000 members of the cooperative think about the present agricultural situation? At the recent convention held in Fond du Lac, Wis., in October, 307 delegates representing 69 locals were on hand. I should like to present at this point some of their resolutions and comments. In so doing, I ask my colleagues

to bear in mind the fact that these men met at a time when dairy prices were continuing their 1949 decline throughout Wisconsin. Wisconsin farm income last year was 20 percent below that of 1948. The farmers' milk checks are sinking, and as they sink, the general economic health of the whole Badger State, indeed of the entire Midwest, is declining.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE REGARDING ALTERNATIVE PLANS FOR PRICE SUPPORTS

Probably the most controversial, complex, and vital problem facing the farmer today is the problem of governmental price supports for agriculture. For this reason, your manager, president, State board, and this resolutions committee have devoted a great deal of time in analyzing and studying this important question. In this study we have not hesitated in asking the assistance and advice of the most prominent agricultural economists and leaders in America. We submit to you the following conclusions:

A. The principle of Government supports for vital industries is not new. This policy was inaugurated by Alexander Hamilton in Washington's first administration. The policy has been accepted and employed by every succeeding administration. Almost every branch of American industry has, at one time or another, received Government help through guaranties, tariffs, subsidies, direct grants, supports, or privileged legislation. To ask for a farm-income-support program is, therefore, in line with past and present Government policy.

B. The need for a price-support program for dairy products is obvious. During the past year dairy prices have declined over 33 percent. Wage rates have increased and the prices of industrial goods have declined very little during the same period. Thus the dairy farmer is forced to sell his product on a comparatively low market, over which he has insufficient control; and buy his needed supplies (including labor) on a high market over which labor and industry exercise considerable control. Further, organized labor and many branches of industry are subsidized or granted special protection by the Government. Even the necessary grains which the dairy farmer feeds to his cows are supported by the Government at prices which are high in comparison with the price of milk. It is evident that a continuation of this situation for any length of time will bankrupt the dairy farmer.

C. The question of whether farm-support prices should be high or low is irrelevant. The sole purpose of a farm-support program should be to provide the farmer his just minimum share of the national income. If we are to maintain a healthy national economy, the relationship of farm income, labor's wages, and industrial profits must be kept in balance. When the economy of a nation becomes unbalanced a depression inevitably follows. Farm supports are not only of interest to farmers, but are vital to the welfare and prosperity of every man, woman, and child in America. About one-fifth of our population is engaged in farming. This large segment of the population produces its just share of the Nation's wealth and is entitled to a proportionate part of the national income. The major justification for a support program is to give the farmer this just share.

D. The long-term price-support program should provide for—

1. Flexibility: By flexible we mean that the support program must be revised and administered so that the farmer will be induced to shift from one product to another to meet existing market conditions.

2. It should be inclusive: At present, primary support prices are accorded to only a few so-called basic commodities. Most dairy farmers buy large quantities of these basic commodities for feed. Dairy products and livestock are not classed as basic commodities. Feed prices, therefore, are comparatively higher than the price of milk. Any fair support program should include all important farm products, livestock, poultry, and poultry products.

3. A new or revised formula for computing farm support prices should be devised. The present formula for arriving at a parity price is outmoded. It harks back to the horse-and-buggy days. We recommend that a more recent period for determining the relationship of farm prices be used instead of the years 1910–14. We also believe that the costs of farm wages and farm labor should be included if we are to attain a real parity of farm income.

4. We realize that the present Anderson bill recently passed by Congress has taken steps at least partially to bring about the recommendations embodied in this section. We commend this action.

E. Three major methods for supporting farm prices have been recommended:

1. By Government loans and purchases. This is the method employed at the present time. Through loans and purchases the Government attempts to maintain a comparatively high and stable price on certain basic commodities. The Government is thereby assured an ever-normal granary. This policy, however, has a tendency to stimulate overproduction and often large surpluses pile up causing the Government great financial loss. This policy also has the very fatal tendency of pricing the lower income consumers out of the market.

2. The proportionate income support plan: This plan, devised by our own Dean Froker of the University of Wisconsin, would support farm income and allow farm prices to seek the natural levels dictated by the law of supply and demand. "Agriculture as a whole would be guaranteed a minimum share of the national income as a floor below which total farm income would not be permitted to fall. If total net farm income from normal operations is below the prescribed minimum, then it should be supplemented with parity income payments direct to individual farmers in proportion to the market value of the product which they produce and sell." This plan is flexible, it is inclusive, it guarantees a balance between agricultural economy and the national economy. Control of the farmer would be negligible. "Payments would be made on the basis of production and sales rather than on the basis of curtailment of production and restrictions." Pure Milk Products recommends that Congress give this plan careful consideration.

3. Direct commodity payments to farmers: Under this method the Government fixes a parity on individual farm commodities but allows a reasonable free market. Farm prices, therefore, fluctuate with demand. Surpluses are absorbed by the consumer at low prices and the Government pays the difference to the farmer in direct payments.

We urge the Congress to consider all the above plans carefully. Each plan has some merit. We sincerely hope that partisan prejudice and bias will play no part in the evolution of a long-term-farm-support program.

F. It is a regrettable but unavoidable fact that Government aid and regulation go hand in hand. The membership of Pure Milk Products realizes that any price support program inevitably calls for some Government control of farm operations. We urge the Congress to keep such controls at a minimum and absolutely free of party bias. We also urge that the application of the program be placed in the hands of the farmer.

EXCERPTS FROM COMMENTS BY WILLIAM O. PERDUE AT PURE MILK PRODUCTS CONVENTION DESCRIBING WHY FEDERAL PRICE SUPPORTS ARE ESSENTIAL

It is generally conceded that support prices are needed to prevent below-cost-of-production farm prices due to a surplus of food products. However, complaints are still heard from some businessmen who are in a controllable type of business. They ask, "Why shouldn't we be guaranteed a profit on all the goods we manufacture, regardless of the amount we manufacture?" Their argument would be good if they were producing a product as necessary as food, and if their production unit, like the dairy farmer's cow, took about 3 years to make. Then if after the producing unit was acquired, it would be hooked up for continuous production and couldn't be stopped when started without ruining it for future operation. Even that production genius, Henry Ford, would have had a whale of a time balancing supply and demand if he had machine tools that couldn't be stopped from pouring out Fords, unless he wrecked the machine for future production. He would also be in difficulties if he depended upon the weather conditions for raw material. I believe he would have had more trouble operating unde. the conditions of the farmer than he did with the unions.

The milk producer is not asking for a guaranteed profit on his farm, but he does not admit that in the postwar adjustment that his prices should be the first to break, that his prices should decline more rapidly and that his prices should be cut more deeply than prices for goods that are less essential to the Nation. If prices of goods in controllable industry should decline at the same rate of speed, there would be no harm done. We have always found that industrial goods and services do not respond to supply and demand at the same speed as does the producer's price. Take our own product, for instance. The retail price for milk has not declined as fast or as far as the farmer's price. Gross margins for manufacturers and retailers, in many cases, are higher now than they were before our prices declined. Our reductions have not been passed on, and the result has been increased storage supplies, the need for Government purchases, and a threat of low prices for the producer.

It seems that people have to be a little hungry to appreciate food. A little scarcity is profitable for the producer, but in our country we have always provided abundantly. That's the way we want it. It seems logical that some method can be worked out to provide abundance and not wreck the whole economy.

Your cooperative has worked on this problem and supported and presented ideas to the Department of Agriculture and other branches of the Government that are in a position to help solve this matter. We continue to use the cooperative's influence in the milk producer's interest this year.

It may be that some farm plan can be worked out in the future that will be run by the farmer, but, at this time, we must depend upon the Government even though any plan they work out at this time will be a political compromise and not the best plan in the public interest.

Addresses by Hon. Lowell B. Mason and Hon. James M. Mead at Swearing-in Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, during the congressional recess, I had the occasion to be present at the swearing-in ceremonies of former United States Senator James M. Mead as a member of the Federal Trade Commission, on November 16, 1949.

I felt that the address of welcome by Acting Chairman Lowell B. Mason, of the Commission, was such a fine tribute to the new Commissioner that many of his former colleagues here in the Senate would be interested in reading it, together with Senator Mead's speech of acceptance.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that these addresses be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY LOWELL B. MASON, ACTING CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

My colleagues, Mr. Ayres, Mr. Carson, and the members of the Federal Trade Commission staff join me in welcoming you to the Commission. We know your many personal friends who had to be discouraged from coming to Washington to see your induction will realize that the desire to have the oath administered in the Commission's own home made it possible for only a small part of your friends and well-wishers to attend.

We are proud of this building, and with your help, we hope to make this building proud of us. The eyes of the business world are turned toward you for the law of the land makes the Commission the arbiter of what is fair play in our country's commerce. This means that much of the future conduct of business will come under your personal scrutiny.

The competitive 1950's will present problems which cannot be met by the technique of the 1914's. One may know all the precedents of past law from a legal staff, all the facts in a given case from a field force, and all the statistics and trends from economic advisers, but the alchemy of applying these separate wisdoms to maintain a free economy still rests on you and your colleagues' shoulders.

Nothing could augur better for the effective and beneficial relationship between business and Government than to have added to our membership a man who has slowly but steadily worked his way up from the lowest rung in the ladder of business to the highest legislative office in the world. People speak of fast, spectacular rises as though they were something to be especially proud of. I admire those who can win the summit in one easy jump. But none of your colleagues on this Commission was ever favored with such fortunes. I think it a happy circumstance which brings to our membership another who has struggled slowly but surely up the steps of man's development—for such a person brings to the Commission an experience rich in all phases of life.

Born on December 27, 1885, at Mount Morris, N. Y., of parents who were reared in the school of hard manual labor, Jim Mead rose from water boy on a railroad to tender of switch lamps, and maintenance-of-way man. His youth was not spent in idleness.

Seeking knowledge in the law, like many other young Americans who followed his example, Jim Mead took employment on the Capitol Police Force, so he could study law at night. This was followed by his election to the basic foundation of all local government—his home town county board of supervisors.

Along with his obligation to his Government, he did not neglect his loyalties to his fellow workers. In 1914 he became president of his local railroad union. Four terms as a member of the State legislature was but another seminar in the school of life for Jim Mead.

He did his job faithfully. His friends and constituents recognized his ability. They sent him to Congress in 1918. What a testing ground of a man's soul and character that great legislative body is. Many are called but few return. Reelection for three or four terms is something to be proud of, but it is the exception and not the rule. In this case however, the people kept him in Congress for 20 years, a tenure of office which would have been, in my opinion, still unbroken if he had not resigned to step into the United States Senate.

Again the people of New York showed their confidence and respect by sending him back to the Senate for another term. One need not dwell on the manner in which he handled his legislative duties. Suffice to say that as a member of the TNEC before the war, and as a member of Mr. Truman's committee during the war, his collateral legislative work was just as outstanding as his other senatorial accomplishments.

He was a Senator at a time which tried men's souls. In that august body where only strong characters and vital personalities exist, it must have been difficult to always obtain the cooperative teamwork so necessary to the political health of a nation. Yet with all this, it is interesting to note during Senator Mead's service as chairman of the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee, every piece of legislation reported out came to the floor with unanimous support.

I have given this factual sketch of James Mead, not to praise him but so that those in the Commission who do not know him may see what manner of man this is.

It is interesting to note his hobbies, for sometimes a man can be gaged not only by the company that he keeps, the books he reads, but by his hobbies. Former first baseman Mead is vice president of the Buffalo baseball team, and plain dirt farmer Mead tills the soil at Angola, N. Y. No one can say that he is one-sided in his activities or that he has a restricted view of the realities of life. Those of us who have read his speeches know that when he said, "There must be a more sympathetic administration of our social and legislative code," he was speaking as a man who had seen too much of the inequities and cynical lip service in the management of Government.

When he said that "industries must be encouraged by the enactment of legislation based on the theory that what is good for people is good for business," he may not have realized that one day he would sit on the quasi-judicial body whose main concern is that very ideal.

Ten years ago he said that he liked democracy because all men were a part of it and shared in its responsibilities. If those who come within the portals of the Federal Trade Commission could practice this homely ideal, we would never have any need for the prosecutions, the complaints, and the cease-and-desist orders that we must issue.

Your entrance on this bench, Mr. Mead, is the next step in a fruitful life and, in our opinion, will be even more valuable to your countrymen. Excepting that of President and Justice of the Supreme Court, this office is the most important in the Government. Even those who disagree with this statement will admit it is good for each of us to hold his own responsibilities in such high respect.

Commissioner Mead, we wish you good health, good fortune, and, above all, great usefulness to our country.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF COMMISSIONER JAMES M. MEAD

"Very naturally in the performance of my new duties as a member of the Federal Trade Commission, I shall endeavor to carry out the intent of Congress as contained in the Federal Trade Commission Act, as well as the other laws which confer jurisdiction upon the Commission.

"I am eager to perform my responsibilities in a way which will enhance the standing of the Commission, do justice to those who come before it, and, above all, serve the common good."

RECALLS WORDS OF PRESIDENT WILSON

"In our consideration of the problems of business that come before us, I am reminded of a passage in the message to Congress of President Woodrow Wilson which echoes my attitude in such matters: 'What we are purposing to do, therefore, is, happily, not to hamper or interfere with business as enlightened businessmen prefer to do it, or in any sense to put it under the bar.'

"Speaking further on the subject of our relations with business, President Wilson stated: 'The Government and businessmen are ready to meet each other halfway in a common effort to square business methods with both public opinion and the law. The best-informed men of the business world condemn the methods and processes and consequences of monopoly as we condemn them.'

"These opinions expressed by President Wilson are my sentiments and I am sure they are the sentiments of the vast majority of the business community of the country."

Senator Mead pays the highest respect to the other members of the Commission and to the staff and concludes his comments with the following statement, which should be inspiring to all:

"It shall be my ambition to do my job well and—as I said on the occasion of my being sworn in as a member of the Commission—to do justice, show mercy, and to walk humbly with the Lord."

An attitude of fairness could not be better expressed.

Booze Has No Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Booze Has No Conscience," published in the Grand Rapids (Minn.) Herald-Review, of January 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOOZE HAS NO CONSCIENCE

THIS newspaper does not publish hard-liquor advertising.

This policy is based upon a confidence that advertising does sell goods and the conviction that the use of strong drink ought to be diminished instead of increased.

Some would say that this decision is an example of prejudice. That may be, but it is also an indication that conviction is being backed with money, for hard-liquor advertising would bring a substantial amount of cash into the tills of this institution.

Down in Washington, Congress is wrestling with a proposed law which would ban liquor advertising in newspapers of interstate circulation.

The American Association of Advertising Agencies is opposing the bill. One reason for opposition is that it means less money for them and for publishers. Another reason, which has semblance of merit, is that

the Government should not regulate such matters.

A recent issue of the Advertising Age, that of December 26, 1949, tells of the opposition of the liquor interests to such a ban.

In other columns the publication reports the increased interest of large industries in the market of the American Negro and the increased use of the advertising columns of Negro newspapers. The largest advertiser in these newspapers is now the Schenley Co., the great distillers of strong drink.

Here is an interesting paragraph showing a trend in liquor advertising and selling:

"One of the major merchandising stories of the year in the Negro market is that of Distiales, a new research organization, which has been hired by Seagram distributors to help them do a better job of selling the Negro buyer.

"Last spring Distiales made a liquor survey in Baltimore—a favorite test city for the Negro market since its approximate 1,000,000 population is 20.98 percent Negro, and since it is considered to have both Eastern and southern characteristics. This study showed that the Negro population of Baltimore accounted for 44 percent of the total distilled spirits sales in the city."

In other words, while the Nation hopes to bring the money and morals of the Negro to higher levels by many humane actions, the liquor business helps, through advertising and kindred activities, to bring him down.

The Passing of a Great Man—Walter B. Wooden, 1882–1949—A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the course of our allotted time here on earth it is occasionally our good fortune to know men and women who seem by their very nature to be clothed with heavenly grace. Such a soul was the late Walter Banfill Wooden. In all the years that Walter was my friend, so gracious was his personality and his spiritual outlook that the occasion never arose which would have injected into our relationship a moment of doubt as to his loyalty and devotion to his family, his friends, or his country.

WALTER WOODEN, A DISTINGUISHED ADVOCATE OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST

During the course of World War II, the public service rendered by Mr. Wooden was such that the Federal Trade Commission gave it recognition and cited it as specially meritorious service. That action was taken in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress which provided for the recognition of especially meritorious services. The citation was based upon Mr. Wooden's expenditure of tireless effort, outstanding skill, and original thought in showing the way to more effective protection of the public interest. It was, in fact, based upon superior accomplishments. Specifically, he pointed out to the Federal Trade Commission and to the courts ways in which the antimonopoly laws could be applied to prohibit continued use of collusive and price-fixing devices, including the use of basing-point systems. It had long been recognized that basing-point systems had been used to frustrate and suppress price competition. The Temporary National Economic Committee, in its final report before the outbreak of World War II, recognized the use of basing-point systems as a force destructive of price competition in our basic industries. However, it failed to see how the antitrust laws as presently written could be utilized in challenging that evil. It recommended such new legislation as would be necessary to effectively and successfully challenge the evil. Those recommendations failed to bring congressional action. Thereupon, Mr. Wooden acted. He urged that the evils be challenged to the utmost with such tools as were at hand. He believed that the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Antitrust Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, could be used to further the public interest in challenging the evils of the basing-point and other artificial pricing systems. He recognized their weaknesses, but nevertheless urged that they be used to the extent of their limitations. That was done, but only after he alone showed the way in which it could be done.

WALTER WOODEN, A SPIRITUAL LEADER

Mr. Wooden was not only a leader in the public service; he was also a spiritual leader in his community. For approximately two decades he was a leader in the First Presbyterian Church of Riverdale, Md. Occasionally he led from the pulpit. On those occasions he delivered sermons which had been prepared with the utmost care. Frequently his theme was the goodness that could come from each of us in helping our fellow man who is unable to help himself. He was forever fighting for the cause of the oppressed. He despised bigotry, bias, and prejudice. He disliked and fought against discriminations in human relationships with no less ardor than he fought against price discriminations in business relationships which were found to be violative of our antitrust laws.

WALTER WOODEN, A CIVIC LEADER

His unselfishness added luster to his noble character. He never refrained from lending a helping hand to anyone whose cause he believed to be righteous. It mattered not to him whether the one he was helping stood alone or had the support of all in the community. That trait of unselfishness included his giving of effort, time, and financial aid. It was limited only by the limitations of his resources. His associates in public service received advice and help from him at any hour of day or night, workday or holiday, as they informed him they desired it. His associates noted how he extended help to the penniless on the streets in the different cities of the country where he was traveling on official business. The members of his church know not only of his contribution of effort and time but the substantial contributions of financial aid. At the time of his death, he was spearheading the work of a building committee to rebuild his church.

WALTER WOODEN, A FAITHFUL AND COURAGEOUS MAN ALWAYS

I do not believe that Walter Wooden would have his friends grieve that he had departed on that long journey to the eternal city beyond distant horizons. Rather, I am convinced that he would have his close friends among his fellow workers and in the orbit of his community life continue to wage battle in the public interest for those things which he thought were right and for those things in which he believed. At the time of his passing, Mr. Wooden had been designated by the Federal Trade Commission to present argument before the Supreme Court of the United States on the celebrated price-discrimination case of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana. Despite a grave illness which had come upon him a few days previously, Mr. Wooden carried on the preparation of the briefs and arguments to be presented to the Supreme Court in this case. Almost at the very moment of his passing, his eager and scholarly mind looked forward to this last courageous effort in the public interest. It had been Mr. Wooden's plan to retire as of June 1950. His preparation of the argument in the Standard Oil case would have been the crowning effort of his public service.

It is appropriate to repeat in full the resolution adopted by the Federal Trade Commission the very day of his death:

Whereas Walter Banfill Wooden, born in Columbus, Ind., July 30, 1882, was graduated in law from Indiana University in 1905, and served in the Civil Service Commission August 2, 1906, to January 6, 1907, with the Bureau of Corporations until March 15, 1915, and with the Federal Trade Commission from March 16, 1915, the date of its organization, passed away suddenly on Monday, December 5, 1949, upon motion duly made and seconded, it is, by the Federal Trade Commission, unanimously—

Resolved, That the members of the Federal Trade Commission and its staff hereby express their deep sorrow and great sense of loss over the death of Walter Banfill Wooden, associate general counsel of the Commission, who has served with the Commission since its organization on March 16, 1915, as attorney-examiner, attorney in charge of the Chicago office, trial attorney, assistant chief counsel, and associate general counsel, covering the past 34 years, and who, throughout this period, by his devotion to the public interest and his faithful and distinguished service, has won the deep respect, admiration, and affection of his associates and of the members of the Commission.

With those who had the privilege of association with Walter Wooden in his work there will be always the rememorance of his fidelity to duty, his unwavering courage, his tireless energy, his capacity for friendship, and his constant devotion to the public interest, which was exceeded only by his devotion to the Christian principles by which he lived; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be entered upon the records of the Federal Trade Commission and a copy thereof be sent to the family of Walter Banfill Wooden.

By the Commission.

LOWELL B. MASON,
Acting Chairman.

Adopted this 5th day of December A. D. 1949.

I shall miss Walter Wooden, his friendship and his counsel. Long ago he won my admiration and my respect, not only for his great knowledge in his field of endeavor but because of his steadfast adherence to the fundamental principles in which he believed. Words and phrases, when one loses a friend and neighbor, often seem inadequate to convey one's real thoughts. Nevertheless, while deeply conscious of these limitations, the words "a great man, a great soul, a great patriot" come to mind. Walter Wooden was all of these—and more.

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek's Farewell Address to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article on the farewell address of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek to the United States of January 8, 1950:

[From the New York Times of January 9, 1950]

MME. CHIANG VOWS LONG WAR ON REDS IN GOOD-BY TO UNITED STATES—SAYS SHE WILL JOIN HUSBAND ON FORMOSA IN FEW DAYS IN A BROADCAST HERE—AVOWS APPEAL FOR HELP—ONLY CONSCIENCE OF AMERICANS CAN AID, SHE SAYS—CRIES "FOR SHAME" AT BRITAIN

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek bade farewell to the United States yesterday, announcing that "within a few days" she would leave for Formosa to be by her husband's side. She pledged unending guerrilla and propaganda warfare against the Communists on the Chinese mainland.

Speaking at noon over the full network of the National Broadcasting Co., Mme. Chiang sat alone, except for an engineer and an announcer, in the drawing room of the Riverdale home of her brother-in-law, Dr. H. H. Kung. A group of Chinese friends, reporters, and photographers listened to the speech over a radio in a adjoining dining room.

The climax of her talk came when she said:

"Should it be that some of us are killed in this battle for freedom, others will rise to take our places. There will not be a day of peace for the invader. No great powers can arrange treaties, no statesmen can write contracts that will stifle the Chinese yearning for liberty."

REMEMBER ME ALONE

She made no direct appeal for United States aid. "At such a time," she said, "no pleading can be with dignity." But she declared that China, "abandoned and alone, now shoulders the only rifle in the defense of liberty." Only America's own conscience, she added, can bring her again to China's side.

Mme. Chiang denounced Great Britain's recognition of the Communist regime.

"Already the moral weaklings are forsaking us," she said. "It is with heavy heart that I note that a former ally, Britain, which sacrificed millions of lives on the altar of freedom, has now been taken by its leaders into the wilderness of political intrigue.

"Britain has bartered the soul of a nation for a few pieces of silver. I say 'for shame' to Britain. One day these pieces of silver will bear interest in British blood, sweat, and tears on the battleground of freedom. For that which is morally wrong can never be politically right."

She described her husband, the generalissimo, as the first statesman who recognized the treachery of communism and said he had fought against it for 20 years.

CALLS HUSBAND RESOLUTE

"Times have changed, but the man has not changed," she went on. "My husband remains, resolute, to lead his people against the alien invaders and their alien ideas."

Then she declared:

"Our people will continue to fight for our country from some place from such an island as Formosa, or from the fastness of some mountain, as long as we live or as long as there is an alien enemy on China's soil.

"We shall fight fire with fire. Unremittingly and with tenacity of life, we shall fight and bleed the enemy. Everywhere in China's mainland our guerrillas will keep kindled the torch of liberty. The enemy's lies and deceit, their treachery and propaganda will be defeated not only with bullets but also with truth.

"The oppressed people on the mainland will be prepared so that at a given signal they will rise up simultaneously and overthrow the yoke of Communist domination with our returning armies. To this we are dedicated with our lives."

ROLE HELD INITIAL PHASE

Mme. Chiang stressed again and again the theme that although China is now fighting alone, the battle between freedom and communism is world-wide and must be brought to a conclusion. She described China's role as the initial phase of a gigantic conflict between good and evil, between liberty and communism.

Mme. Chiang came to Washington 12 months ago, flying from San Francisco in President Truman's plane, the Independence. She was received by the President only once, at tea, although she had two long conferences with the then Secretary of State, George C. Marshall, while he was in the Naval Hospital at Bethesda, Md.

Her Washington mission in search of large and immediate aid to the Nationalist forces was generally described as a failure. Shortly after the first of last year she came to New York, spent many weeks in a hospital for observation and later retired to Dr. Kung's home.

Constitutional Aspects of the Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Illinois Law Review, entitled "The Constitutional Aspects of the Truman Civil Rights Program." I am advised that to print the manuscript will require more than the two printed pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost; and the Government Printing Office estimates the cost of printing at $218.68.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS OF THE TRUMAN CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

(By Charles Wallace Collins*)

When on February 2, 1948,[1] President Truman asserted Federal jurisdiction over the civil rights of individual persons throughout the United States he precipitated a conflict which involves the fundamental question of the nature and form of our system of government. It involves considerations of origin and destiny.

What are these civil rights? These words do not occur in the Constitution but the concept was fashioned in the Constitution Convention of 1787 and before the public at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. The question has also been adjudicated.

Elsworth, of Connecticut, when asked whether if his State entered into a national government he would not participate equally in national security, replied that he would but that he wanted domestic happiness as well as general security and that the general government could not know his wants or relieve his distress. He said his happiness depended as much on the existence of his State government as a new-born infant depends on its mother's milk. (He was talking about his civil rights.)[2]

Madison, in the Federalist, said that the powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government were few and defined but that those which were to remain in the State government were numerous and indefinite; that the Federal powers would be exercised principally on external objects such as war, peace, negotiation, and commerce, while the powers reserved to the several States would extend to all the objects which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the people, and the internal order, improvement and prosperity of the State.[3] This is the area of civil rights.

In the Slaughter-House cases[4] the Supreme Court held that the privileges and immunities of a citizen of a State embrace nearly every civil right for the establishment and protection of which organized government is instituted.

We see, therefore, that the term civil rights embraces those intimate relationships and contacts in the daily life of the individual person in his struggle for existence, in the pursuit of happiness, in sickness and in health, under the protection and restraint of his government.

HISTORY OF CIVIL RIGHTS

The civil liberties which we enjoy today are our English heritage. They are rooted in the great charters and traditions of the English people who fought for and won them from their rulers—Magna Carta, the common

*Member of the Alabama, Federal, and New York City bars. Law librarian of Congress, 1916–17; librarian of the Supreme Court, 1918–20; general counsel, Bureau of the Budget, 1921–23; Deputy Comptroller of the Currency and general counsel, 1924–27. Author, The Fourteenth Amendment and the States (Little, Brown & Co., 1912); The National Budget System and American Finance (Macmillan, 1917); The Branch Banking Question (Macmillan, 1926); Rural Banking Reform (Macmillan, 1931); Whither Solid South? (Pelican Press, 1948).

[1] 94 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 2, 1948, at 960.

[2] Documents on Formation of Union, H. Doc. 398, 69th Cong., 1st sess.

[3] The Federalist, No. 45 (Mitchell Ed., 1944), 303.

[4] 83 U. S. 36 (1873). (Field, Swayne, Chase, and Bradley, JJ., dissenting).

law, the Petition of Right, and the confirmation of all of these in the Bill of Rights of 1689. When the English colonist arrived on the American shores he moved into the wilderness in full possession of these precious rights. Our Declaration of Independence is a complaint against the abuse of our civil rights by the Crown and an assertion of the determination of the Colonies to protect those rights themselves. Each Colony, upon becoming an independent State under its written constitution, preserved and protected the civil rights of its citizens.

It is at this point in our constitutional history that a new contribution was made to the freedom of man. The newly organized States were established upon the republican principle. This meant government founded upon the will of the people under a system of representation and agency, without distinction of class, with checks and balances in the separation of governmental powers and with the exercise of the sovereign power diffused at all levels of local self-government from the lowly precincts to the highest State authority. In other words, they each established the republican form of government.

When these States met in the Convention of 1787 they established also upon the republican principle, a Union of States in the form of a federated republic. Throughout the debates the chief concern of the States was the preservation of control of their own internal affairs and to delegate to the Central Government only those powers which were deemed necessary to enable it to perform the functions of a central government which were beyond the powers of a single State, such as military operations, public finance, postal service, commerce, and foreign affairs. Even after the Constitution had been submitted for ratification many feared that the Federal Government might invade their internal affairs notwithstanding the consideration that the Federal Government was charged with the duty to guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government.[5] Madison found it necessary to give assurances. He said it must be remembered that the General Government is not to be charged with the whole power of law-making and administration; that its jurisdiction would be limited to certain enumerated objects which concern the whole Republic but which cannot be reached by any one of the States; that the States would retain their due authority over their own affairs. "Were it," he said, "proposed by the plan of the Convention to abolish the governments of the particular States, its adversaries would have some ground for their objection; though it would not be difficult to show that if they were abolished the General Government would be compelled, by the principle of self-preservation, to reinstate them in their proper jurisdiction."[6] Nevertheless these fears continued after the Constitution was ratified and the First Congress, under the leadership of Madison, drafted and submitted to the States the first 10 amendments known as the Bill of Rights, which were forthwith ratified, the tenth article of which confirmed to the States that the power not delegated to the United States by the Constitution or prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

In *Barron* v. *Baltimore*[7] the question was for the first time presented to the Supreme Court whether the first eight articles of amendment to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights, operated as limitations upon the powers of the several States. Marshall ruled flatly that they did not but acted as restraints upon the Federal Government alone.

[5] U. S. Const., art IV, sec. 4.

[6] The Federalist, supra, note 3, No. 14, at 82.

[7] 32 U. S. (1833) (taking property without compensation).

This question did not arise again until 1866 when Congress enacted the Civil Rights Act,[8] over the President's veto, to implement the thirteenth amendment which abolished slavery. There were doubts in Congress as to its constitutionality and it was put aside. Its provisions were, however, incorporated in the subsequent reconstruction legislation after the fourteenth amendment and the fifteenth amendment had been ratified in 1868 and 1870, respectively. These were the Enforcement Act of May 31, 1870, as amended by the act of February 28, 1871 the Ku Klux Act of April 20, 1871,[9] and the Civil Rights Act of 1875.[10]

CIVIL RIGHTS SINCE THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

During the debates on the adoption of the fourteenth amendment and at the time it was adopted there were among its sponsors and supporters those who held two separate but related opinions as to the effect of that article on civil rights. One was that it, in effect, reversed *Barron* v. *Baltimore*[11] and conferred jurisdiction upon the Federal Government to enforce the first eight articles of the Bill of Rights against the States and the other that, henceforth, the Federal Government had jurisdiction over the civil rights of individual persons. There are two separate lines of decisions on these points.

In the outstanding and leading case of *Twining* v. *New Jersey*,[12] in which the whole question was reviewed at length, counsel contended that by virtue of section 1 of the fourteenth amendment the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States embraced all of the safeguards and personal rights which are enumerated in the first eight articles of the amendment to the Constitution. The Court held that this question was no longer open; that where the Court had ruled against a State for the violation of a right which is also protected from Federal interference by the Bill of Rights it was not because the fourteenth amendment gave jurisdiction to the Federal Government to enforce the Bill of Rights against the State, but because the State in that particular case had violated the fundamental concept of due process of law; that the test therefore is whether the State has violated the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment.

In *Palko* v. *Connecticut*[13] this question was again before the Court, counsel for appellant contending that whatever would be a violation of the original Bill of Rights (amendments 1 to 8) if done by the Federal Government is now equally unlawful by force of the fourteenth amendment if done by a State. The Court said: "There is no such general rule," and went on to cite a number of cases where the Court had held that there had been a denial of due process of law by the State for the deprivation of a person of some right secured against the Federal Government by the Bill of Rights.[14] *Twining* was affirmed.

In 1947, *Adamson* v. *California*[15] brought to the Court the almost identical issue as that of *Twining*,[12] decided 40 years before. It was the contention that the fifth amendment of the Bill of Rights was carried over into the fourteenth amendment as a privilege and immunity of national citizenship which a State could not lawfully violate. Here again is an able review of the whole question—going back to *Barron* v. *Baltimore*,[11] covering a period of 115 years. The majority of the Court reaffirmed the Twining and Palko cases and held that a State was free, "within the limits of the due process clause," to abridge the privileges and immunities flowing from State citizenship; that this was in accord with the constitutional doctrine of federalism by leaving to the States the responsibility of dealing with the privileges and immunities of their citizens except those inherent in national citizenship. The Court said: "This construction has become embedded in our Federal system as a functioning element in preserving the balance between national and State power."

These three cases, Twining, Palko, and Adamson, settle the question as to the relationship of civil rights to the Bill of Rights and the fourteenth amendment insofar as this can be done by the Court. Should the Court ever decide that the Federal Bill of Rights is covered in terms by the amendment, the question would then arise as to what extent civil rights had been nationalized and what, if any, powers Congress had acquired by way of implementation of the nationalization by legislation.

The discussion immediately preceding has dealt with the first and least important phase of the civil-rights question, namely, the restrictions upon the Federal and State governments. We come now to the larger and more vital question of the jurisdiction over the violation of the civil rights of one individual by another and whether the Federal jurisdiction had been extended in this respect by the fourteenth amendment.

Nearly 2 years before the Civil Rights Act of 1875 became law the Slaughter House case[16] were decided by the Supreme Court. The question involved was whether certain persons had not been deprived of the privileges and immunities, as citizens of the United States, by State legislation. The Court held that while certain privileges and immunities of citizenship are derived from the Federal Constitution and these a State may not abridge, it was not the purpose of the fourteenth amendment to transfer the security and protection of all civil rights from the States to the Federal Government nor was it intended to bring within the power of Congress the entire domain of civil rights heretofore belonging exclusively to the States.

The next to reach the Court was *United States* v. *Cruikshank*.[17] This was a prosecution under the Enforcement Act of 1870, defendants being charged with depriving certain other persons of their civil rights. The Court held that the restraints of section 1 of the fourteenth amendment ran against the States only and not against individuals. The Court said: "The very highest duty of the States, when they entered into the Union under the Constitution, was to protect all persons within their boundaries in the enjoyment of these 'unalienable rights with which they were endowed by their Creator.' Sovereignty for this purpose rests alone with the States."

On October 15, 1883, all of that part of the Civil Rights Act of 1875 which assumed direct jurisdiction over the civil rights of individuals was declared to be unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in the Civil Rights case.[18] Sections 1 and 2 of the act purported to abolish segregation of races in hotels, on public conveyances, in theaters, and other places of amusement. Five cases, respectively, from California, New York, Kansas, Missouri, and Tennessee, were consolidated

[8] To give the freedmen the right to own property, travel, and to make contracts. See Rhodes, History of the United States (1920), VII.

[9] Id. at 405, 424.

[10] 18 Stat. 335 (1875).

[11] Supra, note 4.

[12] 211 U. S. 78 (1908) (opinion by Moody, J., Harlan, J., dissenting. Self-incrimination).

[13] 302 U. S. 319 (1937) (opinion by Cardozo, J., Butler, J., dissenting but no opinion).

[14] Id. at 323.

[15] 332 U. S. 46 (1947) (Frankfurter, J., concurring. Black, Douglas, Murphy, and Rutledge, JJ., dissenting).

[16] Supra, note 4.

[17] Supra, note 7.

[18] Supra, note 14.

[19] 92 U. S. 542 (1876).

[20] 109 U. S. 3 (1883) (Harlan, J., dissenting).

by the Court and treated as one. The Court held squarely that the prohibitions of the fourteenth amendment have no application to the wrongful acts of an individual, unsupported by the exercise of State authority; that such an act is only a private wrong or crime of that individual; that it may be an invasion of the rights of the injured party, but unless the State participates, the rights of the injured party remain in full force and effect and may be vindicated in the State courts. The Court held that Congress had "no countenance of authority" for the enactment of this legislation.

So far as the Constitution is concerned, the Supreme Court, and the legal profession generally, consider it settled law that the Bill of Rights is a limitation upon the Federal Government only and not upon the States; that the fourteenth amendment did not alter the rule in the Barron case; that Congress has not the power or jurisdiction over the question of the violation of the civil rights of an individual person by another individual person, in which violation the State has no part; that the power of restraint of the fourteenth amendment is in its "due process clause" which operates as a protection to all persons against violation by the States of fundamental rights; and that Congress has no power to legislate in respect to these rights but they must be asserted and vindicated in the courts of law by the person aggrieved. With this background let us now examine the so-called Truman program.

THE TRUMAN PROGRAM

The civil-rights program of legislation can only be attributed to President Truman in the sense that he has caused it to be formalized and has adopted it as his own. The component elements, however, reach back into the plans of the National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People and many lines of political support have been developed in support of some such legislation within recent years. When the CIO-PAC began to develop the idea of "full employment" for the United States, the Negro program for equality and nonsegregation became an integral part of that movement.[21] Anti-poll-tax and antilynching bills have been pending in Congress for several years and on June 25, 1941, President Roosevelt, by Executive order,[22] created the FEPC under his war powers. A bill to establish the FEPC in time of peace has been pending since January 17, 1944.[23] On January 11, 1944, Roosevelt in his annual message on the state of the Union laid before Congress his CIO-supported "economic bill of rights"[24] and the following year in support of the CIO plan for "full employment" in his last message to Congress on the state of the Union, he laid before it what he called "a second bill of rights."[25]

Now all of the foregoing measures and proposals made bold to assert Federal jurisdiction over the civil rights of individuals and all were to become effective without regard for religion, race, or "station." Mr. Truman, as a Senator, was familiar with them and gave them his consistent support. In his first message to Congress, after becoming President, he recommended the CIO program which embraced recommendations for Federal enforcement of the civil rights of individuals including an anti-poll-tax law, an antilynching law and the FEPC.[26] These failed of passage in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The discussion upon which we are here engaged is not therefore ephemeral as though it came in with Truman. On the contrary it presents a great and developing constitutional issue which has now become interwoven in the fabric of our national politics. It is not easy to resolve and we shall have it with us, with perhaps increased intensity, in the years immediately ahead.

On December 5, 1946, the President appointed his Committee on Civil Rights. In the Executive order creating the committee,[27] he assigns three reasons for this action: (1) The necessity to preserve the civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution; (2) to prevent individuals from the injury of other individuals; and (3) to take all possible steps "to safeguard our civil rights."

As to (1), the constitutional guarantee of civil rights runs to the States to protect them in their republican form of government. It is a restraint upon the Federal Government and not a grant of power. As to (2), the Federal Government has no authority to concern itself with private conduct of individuals with respect to other individuals, no action by the State being involved. As to (3), it cannot concern itself with the question of safeguarding the civil rights generally of persons within such States. This has been abundantly shown in the cases cited above. The President therefore, in my opinion, had no authority to appoint the committee to consider those questions of civil rights, which, under the Constitution, rest solely under the jurisdiction of the States.

The report of the committee came out in 1947[28] and formed the basis for President Truman's special message, on February 2, 1948,[29] to Congress on civil rights. The report contains 178 pages while the message is nothing more than a skeletonization of the report. The report therefore is the document which presents the constitutional question and will be so treated when we consider the nature of the measures proposed.

Neither President Truman, nor the report, submitted the proposed text of bills or resolutions to make effective their recommendations, consequently no concrete criticism or evaluation can be made as to their specific relationship to the Constitution in terms. For that we need words and phrases to give life and substance to the proposals. It is true, however, that there were pending before the Eightieth Congress complete drafts of bills on the subject of some of the recommendations of the President, but these were sponsored in committees controlled by the Republicans and the President did not publicly give his support to any of them. To consider them here therefore would be beyond the scope of this article.

Nevertheless, the grounds assigned as a basis for the proposed legislation present fundamental constitutional questions and are subject to critical analysis. President Truman in his message of February 2, 1948, says that the Federal Government has a clear duty to see that constitutional guaranties of individual liberties and of equal protection under the laws are not denied or abridged anywhere in our Union and that that duty is shared by all three branches of the Federal Government, but can be fulfilled only if Congress enacts comprehensive civil rights laws. As far as this statement appertains to individuals alone we have seen that there is no jurisdiction in the Federal Government and that in case a State is alleged to have deprived an individual of these rights no department of the Federal Government can take the initiative, but the person aggrieved may assert his rights in court.

The report of the committee is in part propaganda and in part a desperate speculation to find a way to overthrow or evade existing decisions of the Supreme Court. The argument runs through the report that although the American Government is dedicated to the democratic way of life where all are equal and should have equality of treatment by government and by individuals, this principle is being violated, particularly in the South, and it is time now to reconsider the whole question of civil rights with a view to understanding the causes of prejudices and to stamp them out. To this undertaking it says only the National Government is competent to come forward.

Having reached this conclusion, the task to which the committee assigned itself was to find ways and means. The present state of constitutional law on the subject is admitted. Members of the committee appear to have been familiar with most of the cases cited in this paper, which deny jurisdiction to the central government. Nevertheless, they worked out a modus operandi, the first step in which was that the President and Congress, at the high policy level, and upon the advice of counsel as to the test of constitutionality, determine the wisdom of a broader civil-rights program. Consider next the marks developments in the Supreme Court within the last 10 years toward the protection of civil rights. Let Congress, upon recommendation of the President, therefore enact a series of laws which would put into effect this broader program and let it be fought through the Supreme Court.[30] In this connection the report conceives the possibility that the Supreme Court, in a new climate of opinion might reverse the opinion in the Civil Rights cases and substitute the dissenting opinion of Justice Harlan, in that case, as the basis for a proper ruling.[31]

The basis assigned by the committee for its recommendations for action are:

1. Moral. Burdens on the common conscience must be removed.

2. Economic. Heavy drain on human wealth cannot be afforded.

3. International. What foreigners think of our domestic record in democracy cannot be ignored.[32]

The committee then proceeded to recommend the enactment of 34 separate pieces of Federal legislation, ranging over the whole field of civil rights, including, an antilynching law, an antipoll tax law, FEPC, an enlarged FBI, a permanent Federal Civil Rights Commission, restoration of provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1875 which were annulled, and acts to enforce the thirteenth, the fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments.[33]

The committee states to the President that it believes a program of positive action by the National Government "falls well within the limits of governmental power established by our Constitution."[34] The following are cited as possible sources of legal support: Authority of Congress under the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments; a further enlargement of the application of *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*[35] to protect civil rights; the war powers; the Interstate Commerce clause; the power to tax and expend; the postal power; "power derived from the Constitution as a whole to protect the rights essential to national citizens in a democratic nation";[36] the power derived from the United Nations Charter and finally the claim of the Constitution which—God save

[21] CIO-PAC, The Negro in 1944. Reprinted in Gaer. The First Round (1944), 449.

[22] Executive Order No. 8802, 6 Federal Register 3109 (1941).

[23] H. R. 3986, 78th Cong.; H. R. 2232, 79th Cong.; S. 2048, 78th Cong.; S. 101, 79th Cong.; S. 984, 80th Cong.

[24] 90 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 87 (1944).

[25] 91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 70 (1945).

[26] 91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 8381 (1945).

[27] Executive Order No. 9808, 11 Federal Register 14153 (1946).

[28] Report, President's Committee on Civil Rights (Government Printing Office, 1947).

[29] 94 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 2, 1948, at 805.

[30] Op. cit., supra, note 28, at 107.

[31] Id. at 105.

[32] Id. at 139.

[33] Id. at 151–168.

[34] Id. at 105.

[35] 17 U. S. 316 (1819).

[36] Op. cit., supra, note 28, at 169.

the mark—guarantees to every State a republican form of government.

The report of the committee closes with the following statement, set up in a paragraph in italics in the center of page 178:

"As the committee concludes this report we would remind ourselves that the future of our Nation rests upon the character, the vision, the high principle of our people. Democracy, brotherhood, human rights—these are practical expressions of the eternal worth of every child of God. With His guidance and help we can move forward toward a nobler social order in which there will be equal opportunity for all."

Throughout the so-called Truman program there runs the fallacious assumption that certain groups of persons in the United States are not in possession of fundamental civil rights and that these rights should be bestowed as a boon from the Federal Government. The duality of our citizenship is ignored. The citizens of a State all have equality in civil rights and these rights are protected by the due process and equal protection clauses of the Constitution. In national citizenship each has the same privileges and immunities.

Each is the nature of President Truman's program of legislation for the protection of civil rights.

ARE WE NOW GIVING CONSIDERATION TO AN AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION?

Our American ancestors fought and won freedom. They built on virgin soil a new form of government to make men free. In the short space of our national life—only 150 years—our republican form of government has shown how freedom can be achieved under the rule of law. Nevertheless the framers of the Constitution must now face the fact that a considerable body of public opinion now supports radical changes in our theory of government with the emphasis on personal security rather than freedom.

The last 10 or 15 years have brought to bear upon the minds of the American people cataclysmic concepts of human relations and we have learned a new vocabulary. We became acquainted with national statism in Russia, Italy, and Germany. And in the war with the first we an ally, and with the other two as enemies, we also, under the centralizing forces of national defense and war, followed their example by going far into national statism ourselves. And the influence of this centralization and national planning of everything for everybody has been carried over into the post-war period. Thus many are now coming to look to the Federal Government for the satisfaction of all of their needs and desires. They look to the centralized state for succor and protection from the cradle to the grave. Rugged individualism—the symbol of freedom and adventure—has become to them a term of reproach.

Within this new school of thought which in trying to bend the Constitution to its will without seeking formal amendments, religious values are also playing a part and they are frankly stated in the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. They are supported as legitimate Federal aims by a number of influential religious organizations. The Federal Government is urged to make effective the brotherhood of man because all men are the children of God. The democratic way of life becomes of national concern. This also is a religious or moral concept because it denotes a rule of conduct of the individual. It is different from the concept of democracy as a form of government.

Under this civil rights plan the Federal legislation recommended would carry heavy civil and criminal penalties for violations by individual persons and by State officials. The strong arm of the Federal Government with its enlarged and specially trained secret police would go out to detect and punish those who failed to observe these new laws.

Although to an old line student of the Constitution this situation may present a constitutional nightmare, he cannot afford to ignore it. We have already come a long way in this movement to change the fundamental nature of our form of government by evasion, subterfuge, indirection, and emotionalism. In the near future it bids fair to become one of the chief political issues before the country. New party alinements may arise because of it. It has already been the occasion for the States' rights Democratic revolt in the South. But it is not a local or regional question. It is a question of the survival of the Constitution.

Multiple-Purpose Dams Fit in Development of Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by me which was published in the January issue of the Farm and Ranch magazine with the Southern Agriculturist.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By ESTES KEFAUVER, United States Senator)

It has long been recognized that the water in the streams of our country represents a vast natural resource which should be developed on a comprehensive scale. Rivers have played a big part in the life of man since earliest times, when they provided food, in the form of fish and mussels, and a simple means of travel and transportation.

As man has increased his mastery over nature through engineering and technology, the possibilities of obtaining maximum benefits from flowing water have increased. Once developments were planned and carried out for a single purpose, such as navigation, or at most for two. Today engineering advances have made it possible to develop streams for many purposes. Such multiple development is, practically speaking, a product of the past decade and a half. But the advantages of such developments were realized long before. In 1909, during the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt, a National Conservation Commission headed by Gifford Pinchot made a comprehensive report on natural resources in the United States, in which it said:

"The broad plan already framed by statesmen and experts and approved by the Executive should be put in effect. It provides for a system of waterway improvement extending to all the uses of the waters and benefits to be derived from their control, including the abatement of floods for the benefit of navigation, the extension of irrigation, the development and application of power, the prevention of soil wash, the purification of streams for water supply, and the drainage and utilization of the waters from swamp and overflow lands.

It is clear that the men who framed this statement were sound in their conception of the possibilities for development of water resources. They were also, without doubt, somewhat ahead of their time. Actual realization of their ideas was still some years off.

Even in those days, however, plans were being made to accomplish more than one objective of water control by construction of single structures. Several projects in the West envisaged the damming of streams for storage of irrigation water and at the same time the production of electric power. Such dams might be called dual-purpose dams. The damming of rivers for navigation, as on the Ohio River and other streams, had been carried on for years. These were single-purpose dams.

By the middle of 1920, and particularly after the 1927 flood of the Mississippi, it became apparent that flood control was an objective to which dams and reservoirs must be devoted. Previously, chief reliance had been placed in levees and similar works which averted damage at localized spots. At the same time, such works constricted the natural river channel in floodtime and often caused higher stages at other points along the river. Moreover, levees had been built higher and higher until they were reaching their maximum development, both from the standpoint of economic feasibility and safety. Each foot added to a levee not only added to the cost, but also increased the risk and damage in case the levee failed. Moreover, it was apparent that floods were often caused not by local rainfall and run-off, but were the result of waters falling on slopes hundreds of miles away.

Such considerations led inevitably, as public understanding grew, to the establishment of multiple-purpose projects which would carry out the objectives voiced in 1909 by the National Conservation Commission. The TVA project was the first in which the new concept was placed in effect on a major scale, and today the Tennessee and its tributaries still form the first and only entire large river system which has been brought under multiple-purpose control.

As such, this system of multiple-purpose dams is worthy of intensive study. On this river system, consisting of the Tennessee and its major tributaries, TVA has constructed 17 dams. In addition, it took over Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals, built previously by the Government; it purchased four dams on the Tennessee system from a private company, and it worked out an agreement with the Aluminum Co. of America whereby its five major dams and reservoirs are operated as a part of a unified system. Thus the Tennessee River is controlled by a system of 27 major dams.

These dams, operated as a single system, control the run-off from an area of 41,000 square miles. They reduce flood heights during the rainy season, and they store water which is used during drier periods for maintaining the navigation channel and for producing power. Such a system is, of course, complex. It has to deal not only with a general weather cycle in the Valley, but with specific situations in limited localities.

The multiple-purpose system on the Tennessee achieves several purposes, and at bargain rates. Essentially it consists of two kinds of dams. On the main river, a series of dams creates a continuous chain of lakes from Paducah, Ky., to Knoxville, Tenn. On the tributary streams, high storage dams control the flow by storage and release of water at appropriate periods and seasons.

The system provides 11,000,000 acre-feet of storage for flood control which protects danger points in the Tennessee Valley and in the rich areas along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers below the mouth of the Tennessee. The Tennessee River has been made navigable for modern towboats and barges of 9-foot draft for its entire 650-mile length. And at the same time, the system of dams produces a tremendous quantity of electric power—some 15,000,000,000 kilowatts during the last year, or 10 times as much as was produced in the same region in 1933.

These are the major purposes as defined in the TVA Act of 1933. Today, the flood-control benefits of the system are estimated at $11,000,000 a year. Savings in transportation charges on automobiles, steel and iron products, wheat, corn, fertilizer, and many other items were estimated in 1948 at about four million, with nine million of such savings to be expected annually when traffic reaches mature development. The power produced by the system last year was sold for $100,000,000. In addition there are subsidiary benefits, such as the development of a recreation industry which has attracted so far—in its infancy—an investment by States, counties, cities, and private individuals of nearly sixteen million. The lakes have attracted an increasing number of wildfowl to the preserves which are spotted along their shores. Fishing has vastly increased. It has been found possible to so operate the reservoirs as to virtually eliminate the malaria hazard in areas where it once was a serious problem. States, cities, and industries are taking an increasing interest in stream sanitation in order to realize the greatest advantages from river development.

In operation, the system follows the annual cycle of rainfall and run-off. In the beginning of the flood season the reservoirs are drawn low so that they have space to store possible flood waters. As the danger of floods recedes in the spring, the reservoirs can be filled. Then, as the annual dry season makes itself felt in dwindling rainfall and run-off, the water stored in the reservoirs is released to maintain the level of the navigation channel and to produce power.

Thus the multiple-purpose system makes the most of one of the greatest of the natural resources in the Tennessee Valley, something which could never be done by piecemeal, single-purpose development of the stream flow. In the Tennessee Valley multiple-purpose developments provide a pioneering model showing the way to efficient development of water resources in other parts of the country where the streams are susceptible to similar treatment.

Agricultural Price Supports and the Brannan Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials dealing with the agricultural price-support program and Secretary of Agriculture Brannan's views. The first, entitled "United States Price Props for Farm Crops Dip, Survey Reveals," appeared in the St. Paul Dispatch of December 12, 1949. The second, entitled "Brannan's Warning," appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of December 14, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch of December 12, 1949]

UNITED STATES PRICE PROPS FOR FARM CROPS DIP, SURVEY REVEALS

WASHINGTON.—Government price supports for farm products are going down.

A United Press survey indicated today that support prices for most farm products will be lower next year for the second straight year.

The decline in 1950—as compared to the peak price-support year of 1948—probably will range from more than 50 percent in the case of flaxseed to about 8 to 5 percent more in the case of wheat and corn.

Prospects are that price props for the 1950 cotton crop will be down at least 7 percent from the 1948 support level. Furthermore, cotton plantings will be curtailed by Government production controls.

Egg supports also will be cut in 1950, perhaps as much as 20 percent from this year's level.

Even a small drop in supports will be felt in farmers' pocketbooks next year. Two years ago most farm commodities sold far above the support prices. But most farm commodities now are hugging the support level. Only Government price guaranties are holding them up.

There are three reasons why price props are being lowered:

1. The parity prices for farm products have declined. That is, the farmer's dollar now will buy more—about 4 percent more—than it did 24 months ago. Price supports are set as a percentage of parity to maintain the farmers' purchasing power. When parity declines from one year to the next, the dollars-and-cents figures at which farm prices are pegged automatically drops.

2. In the case of some products the Government has deliberately slashed supports to hold down surplus production or to stimulate consumption through lower prices. This was down this year in the case of potatoes, flaxseed, beans, peas, and naval stores (gum turpentine and rosin).

3. New farm legislation in 1950 for the first time in 8 years strips mandatory high supports from hogs, chickens, and eggs. The Government plans to reduce egg props in hopes of curtailing production and getting people to eat more. It has had to buy more than 2,000,000,000 eggs to support prices this year. Prospects are that chicken and turkey supports also will be cut. There has been no indication as to where supports will be set for hogs or dairy products.

However, bucking the downward trend in supports are tobacco, rice, and wool. Prospects are that supports will be higher for these products next year. New farm legislation boosts the parity price for these products in 1950 and requires that supports be fixed at about the same percentage of parity as in the past.

The following table shows how farm supports are dropping. The support prices shown for 1950 are only preliminary and unofficial estimates.

One of the assumptions on which the estimates are based is that farm production and living costs will not drop in 1950. Actually, the Agriculture Department predicts these costs will drop slightly. If so, actual 1950 support prices would be lower than indicated in this price support table:

	1948	1949	1950
Commodity:			
Corn ..... bushel	$1.44	$1.40	$1.30
Wheat ..... do	2.00	1.95	1.91
Cotton ..... bale	.2970	.2725	.2675
Rice ..... do	1.64	1.75	2.00
Peanuts ..... pound	.105	.102	.1025
Wool ..... do	.423	.423	.449
Milk [1] ..... 100 pounds	3.50	3.11	------
Butter [1] ..... pound	.434	.420	------
Potatoes ..... bushel	1.67	1.09	.95
Eggs [1] ..... dozen	.468	.470	------
Hogs (during 6 months ending March 31) ..... 100 pounds	14.97	16.30	15.90
Chickens [1] ..... pound	.236	.230	------
Turkeys ..... do	.223	.210	------
Sweetpotatoes [1] ..... bushel	1.60	1.72	------
Dry beans [1] ..... 100 pounds	7.41	6.15	------
Soybeans [1] ..... bushel	2.10	2.00	------
Dry peas [1] ..... 100 pounds	4.40	3.12	------
Cottonseed [1] ..... ton	0	66.80	------
Turpentine and rosin ..... unit	121.85	114.05	82.27
Flaxseed [1] (at Minneapolis) ..... bushel	4.40	2.90	2.02
Barley [1] ..... do	1.15	1.09	------
Grain sorghums [1] ..... 100 pounds	2.31	2.09	------
Oats [1] ..... bushel	1.20	1.27	------
Honey [1] ..... pound	0	0	------
Mohair [1] ..... do	0	0	------
Tung nuts [1] ..... ton	0	0	------
Tobacco:			
Fire-cured ..... pound	.639	.625	.642
Burley ..... do	.424	.402	.444
Fire-cured ..... do	.319	.302	.333
Dark air-cured ..... do	.293	.289	.296
Maryland ..... do	.439	.416	.426

[1] Supports can be raised or lowered in 1950 within a range of 75 to 90 percent of parity. If estimated parity prices remain unchanged, 1950 supports will be set somewhere between $2.20 to $2.34 for milk and 69.8 to 72.6 cents for butter.

[2] Supports can be eliminated in 1950 or set as high as current 90 percent of parity. If estimated parity prices remain unchanged, highest possible 1950 support level would be about 41 cents for eggs, an average of $36.92 for hogs, 21.6 cents for chickens, 23.4 cents for turkeys, $2.27 for soybeans, and $35.76 for cottonseed.

[3] Supports can be eliminated in 1950 or set as high as 90 percent of parity. If supports are fixed at the same percentage of parity as they were this year and estimated parity prices doesn't change, 1950 supports would be barley $1.42 (77 percent), grain sorghums, $1.91 (76 percent), oats, 65.7 cents (76 percent), rye, $1.40 (72 percent), sweetpotatoes $1.62 (88 percent), dry beans, $6.74 (88 percent) and dry peas, $3.24 (88 percent).

[4] Must be supported in 1950. If present estimated parity prices remain unchanged, the maximum and minimum levels at which supports can be fixed are 10 to 11 cents a pound for extracted honey, 90 to 95 a ton for tung nuts and 39.4 to 39.4 cents a pound for mohair.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of December 14, 1949]

BRANNAN'S WARNING

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, in his address here last night, has put the position of agriculture before the Nation in a manner that should clear up much misunderstanding and will help to define the problem. In doing so he has performed a public service.

What Secretary Brannan has pointed out is that the classic and historical pattern of agricultural deflation is now repeating itself, although fortunately in much less violent and injurious fashion than in similar economic situations of the past. American experience is that agriculture takes a price decline before other segments of the economy and is the first to feel the effects of a postwar, post-inflationary readjustment.

A great deal of political ill-will has been aroused against agriculture in the populous sections of the country because of the price support policy, with its heavy burden of public costs, during a period of high consumer prices.

What Secretary Brannan shows is that despite these price supports, the net income of the farmers is already down 20 percent from 1947. It may decline another 15 percent next year. What reduction there has

been in the cost of food to the consumer has been principally at the farmer's expense. This is true, and is usually true, because farm prices are the least artificial, and the most sensitive to the law of supply and demand, of any major group of prices in the economy. While the other costs of labor, hauling and manufacture and distribution that go into the final price of food have remained high, farm prices have been declining quite sharply. But the final price of food does not reflect this decline in full because the cost of the crop as it leaves the farm is, in most cases, a small part of the total cost.

Had it not been for the price supports, the misfortune of agriculture would have been severe. And it must be remembered that misfortune, when it hits one great branch of economy, does not stand still but spreads throughout the Nation. As Secretary Brannan observed, "Haven't we seen before what the loss of agricultural purchasing power can mean in terms of declining sales, unemployment, and unless it is checked, in full-scale national depression?"

Hence it is of general national interest to see that the agricultural industry not again become the weak link in prosperity. There is no unanimity of opinion as to the mechanics of a permanent farm program. Secretary Brannan has his own plan. It is highly controversial. The new farm act of 1949, while perhaps an improvement over the Aiken Act, can hardly be scored as more than a hastily improvised stopgap.

Apart from the problem of method, Secretary Brannan has done well in pointing out to the Nation as a whole that it has a stake in farm prosperity, that there is a cloud over the farm scene, and that what is done to stop the slump in farm income is done not just for the farmer but for everyone.

Removal of Restrictions on Margarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address which I delivered last night on America's Town Meeting of the Air entitled "Should the Senate Remove Restrictions on Margarine Now?"

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD THE SENATE REMOVE RESTRICTIONS ON MARGARINE NOW?

The only crime that margarine is guilty of is that it is cheap. The only reason that it is taxed and its sale restricted by law is that it is cheaper than butter. Margarine is made from the products of American farms, soybean oil, cottonseed oil, and milk. It is colored just as butter is colored—by a harmless artificial ingredient.

All that we are asking is that both of these perfectly legitimate, pure, nutritious food products be treated alike. If butter has the right to be colored freely—then so should margarine have that right.

Margarine sells on the average for one-half the price of butter. It is the poor man's spread. To tax and restrict its sale is to levy a further heavy burden on the backs of those who can least afford it, for the enrichment of a relatively few butter producers.

The fight between butter manufacturers and margarine manufacturers is only incidental. The 150,000,000 consumers of this country are the ones vitally interested in freeing margarine from its shackles.

Every time the people have a chance to speak on this issue, they vote for freedom of margarine. Only last November the people of Ohio—incidentally one of the greatest dairy States—the people of Ohio in a direct election spoke up for free margarine by a half-million majority. The House of Representatives twice has voted overwhelmingly by 3 to 1 to free margarine. If the butter interests will permit the Senate to vote—without confusing the issue with irrelevant amendments—the Senate, too, will express the will of the people.

The restrictions and red tape imposed upon the distributors of margarine are more burdensome than the 10-cent-a-pound tax. Most retailers refuse to handle colored margarine because the bookkeeping is similar to that of OPA days.

Butter is the only product I know of which insists that it owns a color and that its competitor can't use it.

What would you think if cotton manufacturers said rayon or nylon shirts or dresses could not be white, unless they paid a 30-percent tax? Would it be reasonable for leather manufacturers to prohibit artificial leather colored brown?

Imitation in color, in shape, in use is the essence of competition. Every new product of science to some degree imitates and supplants some existing product. Competition and change are characteristic of, and inherent in, a dynamic, progressive society.

Do any of you really believe that we should try to freeze the status quo upon our Nation by arbitrary legislation? I don't think so.

The butter people will tell you that there is great danger of fraud—that if the margarine restrictions are removed, consumers will not be able to distinguish margarine from butter. In 1886, when the antimargarine laws started, this argument carried some weight. In those days we did not have the pure food and drug laws. We do today, and it is those laws which require proper labeling. Those laws protect the consumer against impure or fraudulent products, rather than the taxes and regulations which single out margarine for punishment.

The butter people will tell you that repeal of these laws will ruin the dairy industry. But there is plenty of room in our economy for both margarine and butter. In fact, there is a serious shortage of table fats in the diets of many poor people, which the antimargarine laws accentuate by increasing its cost and by restricting its sale.

In Senator WILEY's own great dairy State of Wisconsin, butter represents a very small portion of the dairy farmer's income. In 1948, for instance, Wisconsin dairy farmers received only 1.77 percent of their income from the sale of butter. The reason for this is that butter is the least profitable outlet for milk.

There is no good argument for punitive, discriminatory legislation against a good food.

Gompers Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gompers Centennial," published in the Washington Star of January 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOMPERS CENTENNIAL

The actual one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Samuel Gompers will not occur until January 27, but the centennial celebration already is well under way. This interests organized workers especially, yet it by no means is limited to them. The great American Federation of Labor president was a national figure in the full sense of the phrase and even now, though he has been dead more than a quarter century, his influence still is felt throughout the Nation.

Mr. Gompers himself appreciated his place in the history of his times. Washingtonians remember him not simply as the head of the A. F. of L., but also as a publicist, a social philosopher, with ideas and opinions on everything under the sun. The little Dutch Jewish immigrant boy of 1863 grew to maturity in a world rapidly developing new issues, new conflicts, which claimed his attention and which he rarely, if ever, attempted to avoid. Throughout his career, he kept his mind and his heart open to what was going on about him. He was exceptionally sensitive to economic, social, and political developments, but he likewise was receptive to happenings in such distant fields as music and literature, drama and painting. The major enthusiasm of his life, however, was the cause of solidarity among working people. A cobbler and then a cigar maker, he realized that the individual laborer or craftsman was handicapped by his individuality. In order to bargain successfully at all it was necessary to bargain collectively. So Mr. Gompers applied himself to the task of discovering competent union leadership wherever it could be found, and he set a personal example for the young lieutenants he discovered. Thus the American Federation of Labor became a reflection of his conceptions, his methods, his objectives.

Perhaps the most important test of his whole life was that which emerged with America's participation in the First World War. Thousands of American working men and working women hated the Kaiser but were opposed to the United States being involved in the struggle to defeat him. Mr. Gompers at a tensely psychological moment chose the patriotic course. With all the ardor of his soul he threw himself into a campaign for national unity in the face of popular pacifism. He toured the country speaking at meetings, talking privately with local officers, arguing with stubborn critics. The effort was strenuous, but it was continued as long as there was need for it. His part in achieving victory in 1918 is one reason why the Government is bringing out a commemorative postage stamp for Mr. Gompers on his hundredth birthday anniversary.

The National Budget of Scientific Work for 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted

in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. John R. Steelman, assistant to the President, before the third National Men of Science and Industry dinner in Washington, D. C., December 2, 1949, on the subject "The National Budget of Scientific Work for 1950."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am greatly honored to be with you tonight and to have this opportunity of speaking to so distinguished a group in the field of science.

I had the privilege of meeting with you once before. Since that time I have given considerable thought to some aspects of our science programs and their relation to the public policy.

Within our lifetime science has provided the key to greater material progress than had been made within any period of hundreds of years before. Science will certainly alter the lives of mankind even more in the years ahead.

The importance of science to our national life has been dramatized for all Americans by the atom bomb and the tremendous potentialities of atomic power, but on a thousand less publicized fronts the researcher and the technician are working together in the search for truth. Each new discovery, each new germ of knowledge acquired makes it easier to push further into the deep recesses of the unknown in our search for scientific truths.

As the President said before a distinguished group last year, the knowledge that we now have is but a fraction of the knowledge that we must get, whether for peaceful purposes or national defense. He has expressed the faith that when more of the people of the world have learned the ways of thought of the scientist, we shall have better reason to expect lasting peace and a fuller life for all.

It is fitting, therefore, that we now consider the direction we are taking in utilizing the great reservoir of scientific knowledge already at our disposal and the paths we must follow to acquire the further knowledge that we must have.

Just as the work of the scientist is better understood today than ever before, so is it becoming more evident—and more important—that the pursuit and application of scientific knowledge must be a joint enterprise in which the institutions of higher learning, the private foundations, industry and government cooperate, each undertaking its proper role. We gave the world an example of such teamwork during the war—and without this teamwork, as we all know, the development of the weapons that brought us victory could not have been accomplished.

There may be differences of opinion as to how far in peacetime the Federal Government should go in directly supporting research, both basic and applied, but there is a general realization, growing out of the war, that scientific research is a vital element of public policy and must be supported and encouraged by the Government.

The responsibility of the Government in this connection is threefold. First, we must respect and guard freedom of research for all our scientists, whether they are directly employed by the Government or whether they work in the universities or industry. Second, the Government should continue to encourage private research, and where necessary to support promising research. Third, as the chief supporter of scientific research today, the Government must be prepared at all times to justify its program on the basis of soundness of content, balance of emphasis, and economy of manpower and money. This can be done only by judging the Government's efforts against something which is missing today, and which we must together supply—namely, a genuine national policy and a program for scientific research. There is a close and vital relationship between these factors which must be fully recognized if science is to serve our needs.

The safeguarding of principles of freedom of research means more than making a scientist safe from political harassment, important as that is. We all know that good men of science have come in for more than their share of such harassment since the war, and they, as well as all Americans, deserve to be protected from unwarranted attack. At the same time, we must recognize that today, more than ever before, our Nation's security depends in large measure on the security of our scientific effort.

There should be no grave incompatibility between the enforcement of necessary security measures and the safeguarding of the rights of scientists to engage in free and independent research. I do not think our policy in this regard can be better stated than it was stated, first in the Bush report, "Science, the Endless Frontier," and again in the reports which I made to the President as chairman of the President's Scientific Research Board. We said, "Scientific progress on a broad front results from the free play of intellects, working on subjects of their own choice, in the manner dictated by their curiosity for exploration of the universe. Freedom of inquiry must be preserved under any plan for government support of science."

The question of providing funds and adequate facilities for research involves more than determining how much money shall be spent. Already the Federal Government is spending at the rate of more than a billion dollars annually on science projects. The estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1950 which ends next June 30 are for $1,300,000,000, including money for the construction of facilities for scientific work. I might point out that excluding the expenditures of the Atomic Energy Commission, our expenditures for science this year, are still close to $1,000,000,000, and that excluding the science expenditures of the Military Establishment, we are spending as much for other purposes as we are spending on atomic energy.

In this connection I wish to point out a fact that all of you know but many others perhaps do not stop to realize—that medical and biological studies, to use an example, which are made by the armed services benefit civilians as well, just as many wartime discoveries, utilized at first by the military, now are adding to the comforts of life for all.

The impact of the billion dollars spent by the Federal Government on research and development projects is felt beyond the executive departments, for about 30 percent of the funds are spent off-site. In the 1950 budget off-site obligations run to a total of $425,000,000. This is money allocated both to institutions of higher education and to industry for a variety of purposes. In previous years, also, a sizable portion of the research budget was spent in non-Government laboratories. In 1948, to use a single example, when our Federal research and development budget totaled a little under $1,000,000,000, we allocated nearly $73,000,000, or about $1 out of every 12, to the institutions of higher learning. And in 1949, it is estimated, expenditures for Federal research at colleges and universities were approximately $100,000,000, and this year the amount is larger still.

Federal research funds constitute a substantial portion of the research budget in many institutions, often averaging well over 50 percent of their entire research budget. Since federally sponsored research is largely in the natural sciences, the funds allocated to the schools have had the effect of greatly increasing the research in these fields.

The impact of Federal programs has further affected the work done in the institutions of higher learning by broadening the base of research. In prewar years, when college research grants came largely from private sources, the program pattern was greatly influenced by the direction of industrial research. Many schools feel today that while Federal research funds available to them are not actually the cause of a trend toward a broader research effort, these grants have been of assistance in developing a trend that had already started.

Industry, of course, has benefited dollar-wise even more than the colleges from the Federal research and development budget. This year alone between a quarter of a billion and three hundred million Federal research dollars will be spent in industrial laboratories. Today the operating burden of the development of atomic energy rests primarily on industry. In fact, the entire program, except for top policy direction, is carried on through industry and institutions of higher education.

Likewise, the development and advancement of aviation in this country have been made by an industry strongly supported and encouraged by the Government, both in war and peace.

It seems to me that the record of joint interest which these examples afford provides us with the answer to the oft-asked question of who shall promote science—government, industry, or the universities. The answer cannot be "either, or," but "all together" in the pursuit of our common objectives.

But our problem is not only who, but how much. The expenditures being made out of tax funds for research and development today are at a high level not only because scientific advances of the past generation, and particularly during the war, have given us a keener realization of the importance of science to our national survival and happiness as individuals, but because of current defense requirements.

The Bush report pointed out effectively that there must be more—and more adequate—military research in peacetime. But at the time this report was made, there was no public knowledge of our atomic-energy program, and even considerably later no one foresaw that this program would be of the magnitude we hold essential today, nor that the programs of the Office of Naval Research would remain at such a high level, nor that other military research would require the expenditures that we now consider to be necessary.

Prior to the war, most of the research done in this country was concentrated in a few large laboratories. The work in some of the larger universities and colleges was financed almost entirely from endowment gifts and foundation grants. In industry, a relatively small number of large companies employed a high percentage of all industrial research workers. While to some extent this situation remains true today, both in the schools and in industry, the increase in the government's scientific budget has brought about a great increase in research together with a mounting national expenditure.

Few would question the desirability of research expenditures of the magnitude now carried in the Federal budget. But it is a matter of concern to all of us that as our Federal budget for science increases—and it has increased each year since the war—we must get full value for the money spent.

Only 20 years ago the total private and Governmental expenditures for research were about 166 million dollars. By 1940 the amount so spent was $345,000,000, and today the Federal expenditures alone are nearly $1,400,000,000.

Prior to the war industry paid a high percentage of the cost of all research. In 1930, for instance, the Federal Government provided 14 cents of the research dollar, the

universities 12 cents, and industry 70 cents. During the war, understandably, this situation was reversed, with the Federal Government contributing 88 cents of the science research dollar.

This is the century of science. Never before in history has science so influenced human conduct. Never before have so many millions of people held science in such respect—and fear, as today. Our research budget of a billion dollars plus is itself dramatic emphasis of the vital role of scientific research in the shaping and conduct of public policy. For these reasons, we must assume that the Federal contribution to research and development will continue to be large.

The report of the President's Scientific Research Board gave estimates of the growth that will be necessary. It stated that by 1957 as a Nation—and that means not only the Federal Government, but the colleges and industry, all together—should be spending:

At least four times as much as in 1947 on basic research; at least three times as much on health and medical research, and at least twice as much as in 1947 on nonmilitary development.

These targets are high. There is a real question as to how much further the Government can go, under the existing critical budget pressures, in extending its support. There is a growing belief that the Government should not greatly step up its participation in the Nation's research effort until the total budget for research, private as well as public, can be appraised and redefined as to objectives and resources. But I believe strongly that the attainment of our goals of maximum employment and maximum productivity, based upon expanded business investment, will require a vigorous research and development program supported by private capital. New industries, new products, and new jobs must be created to maintain our prosperity. The Government's research program is heavily burdened by national defense needs, and in consequence the balance of its research funds are very largely limited to filling critical gaps in the nondefense areas. This situation is not conducive to the achievement of the balanced research program which the Nation requires for its human and economic well-being, and for the conservation and development of its natural resources. Government alone cannot do the whole job. I question whether, in the absence of an extraordinarily high peacetime national-defense program, there would exist sufficient public support for a Federal research program on a level comparable to what we now have. We must think ahead to the decisions which will confront us when more stable conditions prevail. I regard this problem as one of the really important issues of public policy facing us for the future.

Steps toward the development and integration of a national defense policy were made through the studies of the President's Scientific Research Board. The report made to the President considered the interrelation of Federal and non-Federal research and development, and contained recommendations for coordinating the Federal program for greater efficiency, and for more effective use of national scientific resources.

The report reemphasized the need for establishment of a National Science Foundation, which the President has repeatedly urged the Congress to authorize.

It is hoped that when the Congress returns in January prompt attention will be directed to this long-overdue legislation. Next year should mark the creation of this important Foundation. I firmly believe that this would constitute the most far-reaching and important step we have taken in the field of science in the postwar world.

In the foundation we should have a focal point for appraising and evaluating our national research needs, and through its operations we could expect the evolution of a national policy and the shaping of a truly national research budget which would make it possible to relate the activities of Government, industry, and higher education on a more balanced basis than has been the case up to now.

Pending the establishment of the foundation, the Federal Government is improving the administration of its own research activities through the work of the Interdepartmental Science Committee, which is composed of representatives of the Executive agencies engaged in research. This committee is concerned in an advisory capacity with a variety of common problems facing Government research organizations, and only recently has transmitted to me a report outlining a suggested course of action to improve Federal practices in the field of research contracts and grants.

The committee is also concerned with problems of budgeting for the Federal research program, dissemination of information about the Federal research program, and scientific personnel in the Federal program.

We must as a Nation take steps to increase the support of basic research. The creation of the National Science Foundation would be an important step in this direction. The Foundation would be empowered to make grants to universities and to offer scholarships and other incentives to scientific activity.

Thus, many top-flight scientists would be encouraged to remain in the schools where they could engage in research in which they are interested and continue their role as teachers. In this way, we would provide for an increasing number of scientists for the future. Under present conditions, lack of trained manpower is one of the limiting factors in research.

This gap in our science program is one that is of increasing concern to all of us, for in the final analysis, the value of any science program is determined by the caliber of the scientists who are doing the job. Since the war there has been no index, anywhere, of the special skills of scientists in this country. Nor is there any accurate information as to the extent and character of the science manpower deficit.

The National Security Resources Board, of which I am acting chairman, strongly feels that appropriate steps should be taken to formulate a national policy on scientific manpower, and it may be that this action should not wait on the establishment of the National Science Foundation, which if it existed would be the logical agency to deal with this urgent problem.

There is some reason to believe that in many important fields the national supply of fully trained scientists is insufficient to meet our needs—particularly as they apply to national security under emergency conditions. It is unquestionably true that nearly every research organization in the country today has unfilled positions—and this situation prevails in universities and in industry as well as in government.

This country, to maintain a place of leadership in science, must be constantly alert to the problems of manpower shortages, must encourage the development of new scientists—involving years of training—and must encourage the sound distribution of scientists.

The most important way in which the Federal Government can promote industrial research, in which you are primarily interested, is to make possible a continuing stream of new scientific knowledge. Basic research such as the Foundation would foster provides the means. But this requires skilled manpower, even more than dollars. It is important, also, in any expansion or redirection of the Federal research program, that Government activity be limited to fields of paramount public importance, which cannot adequately be carried on by private enterprise.

The intelligent and patriotic efforts of the men of science in industry, so well represented by this group tonight, have in large measure made possible our progress in science up to now.

Civilization owes an incalculable debt to the men who manage—and man—the large research programs. Many of them have names that are known around the world, but many more work in comparative anonymity that in nowise lessens their service to humanity.

As the President has said, it is to the scientists themselves that we owe the existence of our atomic-energy enterprise. And it is to the scientists, in industry and elsewhere, that we owe a wealth of knowledge that has made possible our war against disease, that has given us new products, new industries, more jobs—and the hope of still better things to come.

The common objective before us all—in industry, in the college, and in government—is the increase of human knowledge in order to promote the security and welfare of the Nation, and thus to help bring peace and happiness to people everywhere.

Last Year's Lynchings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Last Year's Lynchings," published in the Washington Star of January 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAST YEAR'S LYNCHINGS

The report of the Tuskegee Institute lists three lynchings in 1949. This seems to suggest a loss of ground in the fight against this racial crime, since there were but two lynchings reported in 1948 and only one in 1947. There are other factors, however, which bolster the hope that enlightened forces in the South are making progress in their determined efforts to extend to the Negro the same legal protection that is enjoyed by the white man.

For one thing, the 1949 Tuskegee report is open to some question. One of the offenses reported was unquestionably a lynching. An Irwinton, Ga., Negro was arrested on a charge of disturbing the peace. While in the custody of the arresting authorities, he was taken from jail by a mob and beaten to death. This clearly was a lynching within the commonly accepted meaning of the term.

There is room for doubt as to the classification of the two other offenses. In one case a Negro tenant farmer in Georgia was driving along a road in his wagon. Several white men in an automobile were unable to pass the wagon and, it is reported, accused the Negro of hogging the road. They dragged the farmer from his wagon and killed him. The other killing also occurred in Georgia. A Negro farmer objected to white men fishing in his pond without first obtaining permission. Later, he was found dead with a number of bullet wounds in his body.

In both of these cases, a wanton crime was committed. But their classification as lynching is open to question. Had they occurred anywhere except in the South they would have been listed as murders, not as lynchings. These victims were not taken from jail or from the custody of police officials. There is no conclusive evidence in either case of the premeditated and organized mob action usually associated with lynchings. Had the victims been white men, they might have been beaten but probably would not have been killed. This, however, is not a certain basis for listing the crimes as lynchings rather than murders.

More important is the fact that in fourteen instances during the year attempted lynchings were frustrated. In one case the intended victim escaped by his own efforts. But in 13 others the would-be lynchers were turned back by the police officials.

This certainly is evidence of progress in the South. A few decades ago the police more often than not were apt to be indifferent to lynchings, if not active members of the lynch mob. But in 1949, in 13 out of 15 instances, they protected their prisoners from the lynchers. This is a fact that will be minimized by the politically minded advocates of a Federal antilynching law. But nevertheless it indicates that education and respect for the rights of Negroes are gaining in the Southern States, and that the vast majority of Southern white people are just as anxious as anyone else to wipe out the crime of lynching, once and for all.

Support for Margarine Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter written by Mr. Harold A. Young, president of the National Cotton Council, urging support for the margarine legislation now pending, published in the Progress Bulletin of Memphis, Tenn., of January 1, 1950, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARGARINE SUPPORT URGED AS FIGHT IN FINAL ROUND

Congress is reconvening in Washington today. And that immediately brings up a mighty important issue insofar as cotton is concerned. The issue I'm talking about is the margarine tax-repeal bill.

Probably all of us need some refreshing as to just where we stand on the matter of margarine legislation. Well, here is the picture as I get it:

Right now we are closer than ever before to getting something done about the unfair and un-American laws that are strangling and restricting the sales of the product which was the second biggest outlet for our cottonseed oil in 1949.

In 1949, the House, by an overwhelming 3 to 1 vote, passed H. R. 2362 which would repeal all the Federal taxes and license fees on both yellow and white margarine. The Senate Finance Committee reported the House bill with one very minor amendment.

WILL BE FIRST

Now, Senator SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, the Democratic majority leader in the Senate, has definitely promised that margarine legislation will be the first order of business in the new session.

In other words, we have reached the final round of the fight. And I don't have to tell anyone in the cotton industry that it is tremendously important that we win and win now.

For 63 years now we have seen margarine, which has become an increasingly great market for cottonseed and other vegetable oils, unjustly penalized by Federal laws which serve only to benefit one group of farmers at the expense of another. Frankly, I am getting pretty sick of being on the side that is being penalized. I think that in this respect, anyway, I can speak for every other cotton farmer as well as our friends who grow soy beans.

AREN'T ASKING PENALTY

We aren't asking that the dairy farmer be penalized through legislation. We don't believe in that. All we want is the privilege of selling our margarine—white and yellow—on a market where the consumer can make his choice without being swayed one way or the other by prices artificially elevated by taxes or by added labor requirements in coloring margarine.

All of us in the Cotton Belt know where our Senators stand on this issue. Most of them have gone on record as favoring margarine tax repeal. Now is the time for us to encourage them in their stand by telling them that we appreciate what they are trying to do for us and that we are backing them 100 percent.

This is our great opportunity to get a free and competitive market for our margarine. We must make the most of it.

HAROLD A. YOUNG.

Benefits Paid Minnesota War Vets Pass $105,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Benefits Paid Minnesota War Vets Pass $105,000,000," published in the St. Paul Dispatch of January 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENEFITS PAID MINNESOTA WAR VETS PASS $105,000,000

Minnesota war veterans and their dependents received more than $105,000,000 in benefit payments through the Veterans' Administration in 1949.

This does not include more than ten million additional dollars spent to treat patients in veterans' hospitals and to administer the broad VA program.

Moreover, it does not include the $51,500,000 World War II bonus now being paid by the State.

In a year-end report, E. R. Benke, manager of the Fort Snelling VA center, said today that 1949 found most of Minnesota's World War II veterans back at full-time jobs.

Because of the continued return to normalcy, the VA during the year consolidated its offices and eliminated 679 employees from its work force.

The Fort Snelling center serves an estimated population of 346,000 veterans in 72 counties. Fifteen counties in western Minnesota are served by the VA office at Fargo. In all 87 counties in Minnesota there are an estimated 384,000 veterans—292,000 from World War II.

Benke said the major office changes during the year involved the abolition of branch-office functions at Fort Snelling last January and consolidation there last spring of VA offices formerly located in St. Paul and Minneapolis. The branch office was headquarters for VA divisions in five States.

Field offices throughout the State also were closed. The number of VA employees in Minnesota dropped from 3,318 as of December 31, 1948, to 2,239 as of December 31, 1949.

In the field of veterans activities, Benke's report showed that 20,898 former servicemen and women made initial application for education and training under the GI bill and public law 16 (the latter is for disabled veterans). In training at the end of the year were 43,919 veterans—36,621 in school studies, 6,451 taking on-the-job training, and 7,647 engaged in on-the-farm training.

Veterans made loans totaling $39,817,190 under the GI bill during the year. Of the total, the VA guaranteed or insured $18,816,027. Home loans were predominant with 5,503 veterans receiving $37,918,008 from the lenders; 285 veterans made business loans for $851,435, and another 256 veterans received farm loans totaling $1,047,749.

Readjustment allowances, which for most veterans expired last July, were paid to 18,904 veterans to the tune of $10,336,702.

Applications for disability compensation and pension were filed for the first time by 3,205 veterans. At the end of the year, 47,156 veterans were receiving disability payments and more than 10,100 dependents were drawing death compensation and pension payments.

Private doctors and dentists, reimbursed by the VA on a fee basis, handled nearly 94,000 out-patient medical and dental examination and treatment cases for veterans with service-connected disorders.

These included 54,000 medical treatments, 6,924 medical examinations, 14,000 dental treatments, and 8,994 dental examinations.

The VA clinic at Fort Snelling gave more than 102,000 medical and dental examinations and treatments during the year. Included were 17,000 medical treatments, 75,000 medical examinations, 2,000 dental treatments, and 7,215 dental examinations.

More than 12,000 patients were treated and discharged from VA hospitals at Fort Snelling, and St. Cloud in 1949. At present there are about 2,200 patients in these hospitals. A 7-story, 358-bed addition to the Fort Snelling Hospital is to be built this year, with construction to get under way in the spring.

The Fort Snelling insurance office, serving veterans in Minnesota, Iowa, the Dakotas, and Nebraska, reports that more than 20,000 veterans in the area reinstated GI insurance during the year. This brings to about $1,750,000,000 the amount of protection afforded by the more than 204,000 policies now in force. Of the total, Minnesota veterans hold about 105,000 policies valued at an estimated $700,000,000.

The VA expended about $3,500,000 in salaries and other operating expenses to administer the $105,000,000 direct-benefit program. This does not include expenses of the five-State insurance office or the hospital program.

Senator Scott W. Lucas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article regarding the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], written by Mr. Sidney Shalett, and published in the January 14, 1950, issue of Collier's magazine.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the article is estimated to make 2½ pages of the RECORD, at an estimated cost of $218.62.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATOR ALMOST GOT AN ULCER

(By Sidney Shalett)

MAJORITY LEADER SCOTT LUCAS WORKED HIMSELF INTO A FIXER AND WOUND UP IN THE HOSPITAL, BUT CONCLUSIONS HE REACHED THERE GAVE HIM A FRESH START

Up until January 20, 1949, the chief claim to fame of SCOTT W. LUCAS, Democrat, Illinois, was the fact that he was a Member of the United States Senate. Some people outside of his own State had heard of him, for, during his 15 years in Congress, he had been far from a dummy; he even told off the late Franklin D. Roosevelt memorably on a couple of occasions, such as the effort (unsuccessful) to pack the Supreme Court and the effort (successful) to make Henry Wallace Vice President. But on the whole LUCAS was pretty much of a national unknown.

On the above-mentioned date, LUCAS, by unanimous choice of his party, became majority leader in the Senate of the Eighty-first Congress, which last year plunged its way through the longest and perhaps the bitterest peacetime congressional session in 27 years. From then on, SCOTT LUCAS was—and is—a national figure. Already he has graced radio and television programs with uncommon frequency; newsmen from national journals beseech his opinions on everything from politics to potato parity payments; a political columnist has likened him to Lincoln (a LUCAS hero); a society chronicler has written of "his handsome face rendered pleasantly haggard by grave responsibility," and the august New York Times, in its Sunday crossword puzzle written exclusively for intellectual giants, even has asked (No. 49, down) what President Truman's nickname is for the Senate majority leader. (Answer: "Scotty.") It now seems certain history is going to remember his name, though what history is going to say about him is still a matter for partisan debate.

One thing, however, is certain: If the final verdict on Majority Leader LUCAS' performance is favorable and he goes on, as his friends are predicting, to bigger things, he will be one of the few politicians, if not the only one, whose career was saved by a stomach ulcer. Even his best friends move that, with the help of a GOP-Dixiecrat coalition, his own temper and some bum advice from quarterback Harry Truman, LUCAS was showing up as an ineffective if hard-fighting leader at the outset of his majority leadership. Early in the term, his ordinarily robust health temporarily deserted him and he worried himself into the hospital with the beginning of what promised to develop into a nasty ulcer.

"While I was in that hospital bed, practically starving to death and pining to be back in the Senate, on the golf course, in a duck blind, or anywhere but where I was, I did some thinking and reading," Senator LUCAS relates. "I discovered, largely from perusing Bancroft's History of the United States, that the Senate had been running along for 160 years before I got to be majority leader. I was forced to face the conclusion, though it was somewhat of a shock, that it probably would run along a bit longer without me. Call it a new philosophy or what you will, but since getting out of that hospital I haven't quarreled with any of my colleagues, my office staff, or my wife. I also think that the legislative program has moved along much better."

LUCAS' candor and his lack of stuffiness in commenting thus on his sickbed "conversion" are highly revealing of the man. He is a hard but nonhypocritical fighter, and he says what he thinks, even if it offends friends as well as foes. This frankness, while morally admirable in a man who has been a professional politician for nearly 30 of his 57 years, is not always suited to the job of leading a group of United States Senators, the most rugged individuals in the world, through the maze of disputed legislation. But more and more, particularly since he has learned occasionally to operate with scapel instead of meat ax, LUCAS has won the respect of his colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle and even a few kind words from some Republicans.

He also has won the liking of his hard-boiled audience in the senatorial press gallery. Veteran reporters on Capitol Hill will tell you that LUCAS grew up tremendously in his job between last January and October adjournment. They admire his brutal honesty and his apparent disdain for "soft soap," and they also like the way he answers their questions with direct facts instead of oratory. "He doesn't try to sell you anything when you ask him a question," one reporter comments.

Many Republicans, including LUCAS' implacable and harsh-tongued foe, minority leader KENNETH S. WHERRY, have taken the position that the Eighty-first was the "Eighty-worst" Congress, and that its failures were the fault of the Democratic leadership—i. e., on the Senate side, SCOTT LUCAS. To counter these charges, the White House released a review of the Eighty-first's accomplishments, calling it "a remarkable record of achievement." The truth, of course, lies somewhere in between.

While the administration leadership failed spectacularly on such spotlighted issues as civil rights, Taft-Hartley repeal, a liberalized displaced persons bill, and so forth, it put through some notable victories in the foreign policy field by approving the North Atlantic Pact, extending the Marshall plan, and enacting kindred legislation. It also did some solid work in revising the reciprocal trade program, increasing storage space for grain crops, extending a modified form of rent control, setting up slum clearance and low-cost housing programs ad infinitum. As the New York Times' authoritative Arthur Krock wrote, there is no justification for trying to tag the Eighty-first Congress as a do-nothing body.

For all of this, the big, heavy-handed, stubborn majority leader from Illinois deserves much credit. This is true even though the Eighty-first was a highly mixed-up Congress and many of its praiseworthy accomplishments were the result of coalitions between Republicans and administration Democrats, just as some of its worst defeats were the result of line-ups between the GOP, Dixiecrats, and plain anti-Trumanites.

Solons find him a hard taskmaster

LUCAS is a man who, as one long-time associate remarked, "drives himself, drives those who work with him and cannot understand why the Senate of the United States should not be willing to work equally hard." Even though LUCAS lightly claims that after leaving the hospital with his appeased ulcer he hadn't "quarreled with any of my colleagues," he never ceased riding herd on intransigents on either side of the aisle; his strategy of deliberately holding the Senate in session for 9½ months, until out of sheer desire to go home it was willing to transact business, was an effective stroke of leadership.

Among other things, LUCAS unquestionably was the busiest man in the United States Senate during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. The Democratic Senators organize things differently than the Republicans. Not only does he serve as majority leader (against the GOP's WHERRY) but he also is chairman of the Democratic Policy Committee (against the GOP's TAFT), chairman of the Democratic caucus (against the GOP's MILLIKIN) and chairman of the Democratic Steering Committee (against the GOP's BUTLER). As a man who wears these four hats, in addition to representing the 8,000,000 citizens of Illinois and serving as a key member of the important Agriculture and Forestry and Finance Committees to boot, LUCAS finds himself perpetually scuttling between at least half a dozen offices and conference rooms. He also is a member of the Democratic "big four"—Vice President BARKLEY, Speaker RAYBURN, House Majority Leader MCCORMACK, and himself—which meets every Monday morning with President Truman at the White House.

The majority leader, incidentally, receives no extra compensation for his job; the only thing in the nature of material reward is a chauffeur and a shiny black limousine which are made available to him.

When he can manage it, his mornings are spent in his senatorial suite in the Senate Office Building, where he makes an effort to catch up with correspondence (his mail mounted from 10,000 pieces in March 1948 to 25,000 pieces in March 1949) and keep appointments with constituents. His walls there are covered with scores of autographed pictures, original cartoons, and framed letters. A post-1948 election thank-you note from Truman carries a handwritten postscript: "Yours was a prophetic message. I'm a long time answering it but I received 60,000. You'd better whet your knife. I'm after you in a 'penny' anti (sic) game."

Most of his time, however, is spent in the majority leader's suite in the Capitol, which conveniently adjoins the famous old Supreme Court chamber where the Senate has been meeting while its own chamber was undergoing repairs. This particular suite was the controversial retreat fixed up for himself by LUCAS' Illinois ex-colleague, the isolationist "Curly" Brooks, who was boss of the all-powerful Rules Committee before his 1948 defeat; it has such Hollywood touches as lush drapes, green sofas, and an electric icebox concealed in what appears to be a filing cabinet. LUCAS thinks it is ironic justice that he should have inherited such a fancy lay-out from his old enemy. It made a fine GHQ for Democratic strategy during the last session but, as it also contained the washroom nearest to the Senate's emergency quarters, LUCAS, as a humanitarian gesture, was careful to keep the doors open to Senators of all political creeds.

SCOTT LUCAS, sometimes called, because of his classic Roman profile, the John Barrymore of the Senate, is an easy man to misunderstand. A farm boy in his youth, he still remains the countryman's go-slow instincts about shining up to strangers, until he knows they're not out to do him; even his later success as a big-city politician has not made him an out-and-out glad-hander. His size—he stands 6 feet 2½ inches and weighs close to 200 pounds—gives him a rather formidable appearance, and his face seems cold and brooding, particularly when he is mediating or when the heat of debate has accentuated the naturally downward lines of his face; he seems to scowl more than smile.

Actually, however, the LUCAS scowl is a matter of facial lines rather than inner meanness, and, when he has made up his mind that someone is a fit and reliable companion, he is the best of fellows to be around. There's nothing of the Fancy Dan about him: he likes plain solid food, good bourbon, and male talk. Out in Illinois, he's said to be almost a legendary shot in the duck blinds; recently he brought down three mallards with one shot. He is highly respected as a golfer at the exclusively male Burning Tree Club in Washington. He has been a member of a Friday-night congressional poker game, of which Harry Truman is an alumnus, for some 14 years. It is typical of him that he plays hard and doesn't coddle his companions in either duck shooting, golf, or poker. On the golf course, you'll never hear him murmur sympathetically, "Nice try, old man," when a partner or opponent has muffed a shot, and his reaction to his own poor shots is to rip his weather-beaten plaid cap off his head, hurl it to the ground and stamp on it.

Golf, incidentally, is almost a fetish with LUCAS—so much so, in fact, that his good friend and golfing companion, Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, in praising LUCAS' leadership at the Senate's closing session, commented: "I have only one regret, that as his leadership in the Senate is developing, the quality of his golf game is rapidly deteriorating." LUCAS, who had shot a poor 85 the previous Sunday while worrying about the outcome of the farm bill, went out with a clear mind the morning after the Senate finally adjourned and shot a 76.

Colleagues need not be brilliant

LUCAS is a great believer in regularity and loyalty. He believes a party man should be regular, up to the limit of his conscience. He won his own start in Illinois State politics by going out and campaigning for William H. Dieterich who had beaten him in his first primary race for the Senate.

He was furious with Vice President BARKLEY last session for using his prerogative as chairman of the Senate to cast the deciding ballot (the vote had been tied) against a farm measure that LUCAS considered had been promised by the 1948 Democratic platform, and he was even angrier with President Truman for following the BARKLEY line on the same issue. As a regular he simply cannot understand how Truman, as head of the Democratic Party and an old member of the Senate club, and BARKLEY, his own predecessor as Democratic majority leader, could thus knife their floor general. In a cold speech from the Senate floor, he told the Vice President, in effect, that BARKLEY was breaking the party's pledge to the voters; his off-the-floor comments were reported to be far more explosive. Yet, again as a regular, he agreed later with BARKLEY to edit the bickering out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Being a regular does not mean that LUCAS is a stereotyped politician. Last session he practically broke all precedent by going into a session of the Republican Policy Committee, on invitation of his good friend Senator IVES, of New York, to appeal for bipartisan support in prying loose from the Judiciary Committee the bill to liberalize the Displaced Persons Act. It was being blocked in that committee largely by the stubbornness of Chairman PAT MCCARRAN, a member of LUCAS' own party. Before entering the lion's den, LUCAS told his press secretary, Frank Kelly, that if he wasn't back in an hour you'll know where to look for the body. LUCAS still chuckles when he recalls the shocked expression on Minority Leader WHERRY's face when he walked in. LUCAS did succeed in bringing the DP measure to the floor, but it was lost in the dying days of the session because too many of its supporters, tiring of work, had drifted away from Washington. LUCAS felt this defeat keenly and is expected to press for the bill again this month.

Nor does being a regular mean, as both Truman and Roosevelt before him learned, that LUCAS is a rubber stamp for the administration. LUCAS has always been rated as a New Dealer, though considerably right-of-center in relation to the extremists of the clan. Yet, in 1937, as a Member of the House, he rose to make an 8-minute denunciation of Roosevelt's Supreme Court packing plan that LUCAS himself regards as "perhaps the greatest speech of my career." In it he declared: "It is full of destruction. * * * Unless those in power call a halt to this useless, selfish, and futile gesture I here and now predict that the evil path of this so-called progressive action may ultimately shatter the very foundations of American liberty and life."

Friends who have followed every step of LUCAS' career feel that this memorable speech probably "put him in the United States Senate but kept him out of the White House." They estimate this speech won him the support of 100,000 to 125,000 of Illinois' independent voters, but they also believe that President Roosevelt, though he used LUCAS, never quite forgave him and for this reason would not consider him as a Vice Presidential candidate.

A test of his party loyalty

In 1940, when Henry Wallace was nominated in Chicago, LUCAS arose to withdraw his own name from the Vice Presidential nomination with these stinging words: "Had this been a free and open convention, I would not have hesitated." The same year, however, F. D. R. telephoned LUCAS personally to request that he manage the Roosevelt-Wallace campaign in the 13-State belt area of the Midwest, a summons to which Party Man LUCAS could not say no. In 1944 LUCAS was a serious contender for the Vice Presidency, but apparently F. D. R.'s old grudge still rankled and the White House blessing was given to Harry Truman.

SCOTT WIKE LUCAS grew up with politics in his blood. He was born in the Lincoln country—in Cass County, Ill., only 12 miles from New Salem, where Abraham Lincoln studied law. An avid student of Lincolniana, LUCAS loves to take a visitor from the East to the restored village and reverently point out the replica of the cabin where young Lincoln studied by light from the fireplace.

LUCAS' people originally were from Virginia and Tennessee, and his great-grandfather LUCAS, one of the first white settlers in Cass County, came north by ox-drawn covered wagon in 1829. LUCAS' own father was an erstwhile tenant farmer, justice of the peace, and county tax assessor who never quite earned enough to support his brood of four boys and two girls, of whom SCOTT was the youngest. His mother used to help out by setting a boarding table for itinerant peddlers and traveling salesmen. Chris Kreiling, now a leading civil engineer in Havana, Ill., still recalls the fine dinners of beef and gravy, potatoes, vegetables, and pie—"help yourself to all you want"—that Mother LUCAS used to serve for 30 cents.

Though things were somewhat better by the time SCOTT was growing up, he knew the taste of poverty. Frank Shawgo, now a tavern keeper in Havana, who grew up with SCOTT after the LUCAS family had moved to the little town of Bath, recalls that SCOTT—known then as "Wax," a nickname whose origin is long since forgotten—used to work in the cornfields on Grand Island in the Illinois River for 25 cents a day. At various times, SCOTT also earned money for his education by carrying newspapers, fishing the river for catfish and sheepshead, tending furnaces, playing professional baseball (for Bloomington in the Three-I League) and teaching in a one-room country schoolhouse.

The one heritage "Squire" LUCAS did give SCOTT was a taste for politics. He even named the boy SCOTT WIKE, not after any member of the family but after a Congressman of the day who had boarded with the LUCASES while campaigning.

While preparing for law at Illinois Wesleyan, athletics was the great thing in LUCAS' life, and he regrets none of it, not even the bad knee from his football days which still gives him trouble. Athletics, he says, gives a man a taste for a good scrap. He was a three-letter man, an all-conference player in both football and baseball, and he was aspiring for the same honor in basketball when the school authorities discovered he had played professional baseball the previous summer under the assumed name of "Weaver" and barred him from all athletics.

"I protested like hell," LUCAS recalls. "I couldn't see, and still can't see, why playing professional baseball should keep a man from playing college football or basketball. But the dean said no, so I turned in my suit though I shed tears about it."

Today, he takes great pleasure in the career of 19-year-old SCOTT LUCAS, Jr., the only child in the LUCAS family, as a football player at the Stuyvesant School at Warrenton, Va., near Washington. Whenever Stuyvesant plays, Senator LUCAS tacks one of the posters on the wall of the majority leader's office, right along with the pictures of Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson and the bronze plaque attesting that the first meeting of the United States Supreme Court was held in the same room in 1801.

Another high light in LUCAS' formative years was his career for two seasons as a teacher at Blackjack School, which served a little community called Snicarte. "I had 56 pupils—grades, first through eighth, all in one room," he recalls. "I lived with a family 3 miles away, and I used to walk to school, often through snow and slush.

"The year before, the big kids had chased the teacher out of school. I guaranteed the supervisors that if they ran me out I'd quit and give them back their money, so I got the job at $60 a month. I fibbed a little on my age—I was supposed to be 18 and really was only 17. There were three boys older than I, including one who was 20. I made out all right because I was bigger than any of them."

After he was admitted to the bar in 1916, LUCAS picked Havana, Ill., as the site of his first law office. In the early days, Havana was a rough, tough river town," says its most distinguished citizen. "It was settled by a guy with a red handkerchief around his neck, a keg of whisky on his back, and $10 in his pocket." For the record, Havana still is a free-and-easy town.

His first office was up a flight of stairs over a store building opposite the courthouse. To purchase a law library, he borrowed $1,000 from a bank in Chandlerville. His oldest brother, Thurman, a brilliant country lawyer, now deceased, had to sign the note. "The afternoon soon after I had gone into practice a friend came to sell me a dollar chance on a car that some organization was raffling off," the Senator relates. "I told him if the tickets were a dime instead of a dollar I might afford one. 'Take one anyway—I'll lend you the dollar,' he said, so I did. Blessed if I didn't win the car.

"I didn't have enough money to keep it in gas, so I sold it for $525, paid my friend back his dollar, and went over to Chandlerville to put $500 on my note. The banker asked me how come I was paying back so much so soon, and I told him just how I'd come into the money. 'This is the damnedest thing I've ever heard of in 40 years,' said

the banker. 'From now on, your credit's good for $5,000 on your own signature.'"

Lucas quickly built up a reputation in the law business. He moved so fast that he attracted a certain amount of small-town envy, and some of the town's leading legal lights, looking out at him sourly as he walked across the village square, used to sneer, "There goes young Abe Lincoln." Lucas, incidentally, still has prosperous law offices in Springfield and Chicago, in partnership with Charles A. Thomas, a Legion friend, and he also maintains his old office in Havana, largely for sentimental reasons.

In a little more than 10 years after hanging out his shingle, Lucas had built up a nice practice; had been elected State's attorney for his country; gone into the Army as a private and come out a lieutenant, and served as State commander of the American Legion. He went on to storm national Legion politics with the aid of a jug band from Havana and, while he didn't make the grade as national commander, he did serve four terms as national judge advocate. In 1923 he was married to Edith Biggs, daughter of a well-to-do Havana businessman. Mrs. Lucas is a woman with a good sense of humor, who didn't want her husband to go into politics in the first place and who firmly believes wives of public figures should stay in the background.

In 1932, Lucas, who professes to a schoolboy ambition to serve in the United States Senate, decided it was time to fulfill that ambition. He was defeated in the primary by the candidate being backed by the late Henry Horner, who was nominated for governor. Lucas was a good sport about it and campaigned vigorously for both Horner and the man who had defeated him in the primary. Horner, when elected governor, rewarded Lucas by appointing him chairman of the Illinois State Tax Commission and giving him a post on the Democratic patronage committee.

From then on, Lucas' political star was on the rise. In 1934 he was elected to the congressional seat left vacant by the death of Speaker Rainey, of Illinois, and subsequently he was reelected once to the House and was elected twice to the Senate. In his 1938 primary Senate race, he even won against the opposition of the Kelly-Nash Democratic machine in Chicago, which had fallen out with Lucas' political mentor, Governor Horner.

The considered verdict on Scott Lucas in the national limelight today would seem to be this: In the domestic field, he is a practical politician—skilled, hard-working, and with an eye out for the interests of his constituents, though not without regard for the over-all welfare of the country. In the international field, he has risen to the stature of leader and statesman.

In this latter field, his record is clear. He is and always has been anti-isolationist, and he believes that the only way to achieve and preserve peace is for the United States to use its great influence and resources to work with other democratic powers against reconstituted fascism and nazism, when they were active perils in the world. Persons who disagree with his beliefs can and do attack his judgment, but, from the record of what he has said and done, it would be hard to challenge his consistency, or to claim that Lucas has straddled any issues.

In 1940, for instance, when the Roosevelt administration was trying desperately to enact its lend-lease program, Lucas took an unequivocal stand in favor of lend-lease, although sentiment in his own State, whipped up by the archisolationist Chicago Tribune, was strongly against it. He received 100,000 letters from his constituents on lend-lease; 85,000 of them opposed it, still he voted with the administration.

Winner Switches Bridge Firm

The battle of the motionics against American preparedness gave Lucas what he admits was his worst personal moment. One day Elizabeth Dilling, who was achieving notoriety through her violent attacks on Roosevelt policies, invaded Lucas' office with a group of women. It seemed to the Senator's embattled office staff that there were at least 80 in the contingent, and that all of them were screaming. Phrases like "Blood money!" and "Don't kill our sons for England!" kept rising above the tumult. When Lucas came out, as a still-awed witness puts it, "absolute hell broke loose." One woman flopped to the floor, grabbed his knees and howled, "Don't send us to war." Lucas extended his hand to Mrs. Dilling, whereupon she said, "I wouldn't shake your hand—I'd rather spit in it."

He looked her in the eye, left his hand extended and said coldly, "Have a spit, lady."

There is no doubt that Scott Lucas has mellowed with experience since his early, angry days as majority leader. Not for some time has anyone felt the full lash of his naturally sarcastic tongue—at least, not in public. Still, the new Lucas has not gone flat. "You can be pushed so far—you gotta be an S. O. B. sometime," he says. He still can stick the knife and twist it into such antagonists as his No. 1 adversary, Minority Leader Wherry, who, in a louder, more table-thumping way, is no mean knife sticker himself. The difference is that now he usually bows to Wherry while doing it, and refers to him as "my delightful, genial, and efficacious friend."

As a means of keeping calm, Lucas more and more has been falling back on a hobby of his that not many persons know about. He is an amateur poet, under the nom de plume of "Senator Sorghum." Once while keeping his temper in check he wrote this couplet on the back of an envelope:

"Senators who preside,
Shouldn't rhyme, shouldn't chide."

Few things make Lucas angrier than Senators who habitually play hooky. Once last year he discovered there was not one Republican Senator on the floor. He got up and solemnly remarked that "now would be a good time to introduce a motion to abolish the Republican Party—we could get unanimous consent." Someone sent an S O S to GOP Generalissimo Wherry and in a matter of minutes Republican Senators were panting into the Chamber.

Lucas' own analysis of the record of the Democratic Eighty-first Congress is that, on the whole, the box score so far is good. He admits the humiliating defeats—civil rights, Taft-Hartley, and the others—of the early days, but points to the bulk of solid legislation that was enacted. What Lucas does not point out—though many of his friends do—is the general consensus that President Truman wished an impossible job on his leaders when he sent such a staggering legislative load to the Hill for passage in one session; also, that Lucas, if given his own way, never would have started the session by leading off with the civil-rights issue and embittering the southern Senators for the rest of the session. In fact, he so advised the President—but Truman wasn't listening. Lucas, however, predicts:

"By the time the Eighty-first Congress completes its 1950 session, I believe we will have enacted 80 to 85 percent of the bills in President Truman's program."

Right now, Lucas is facing what some Illinois observers regard as a serious fight for his political future. While Lucas was tied up with his job of leading the Senate, former Representative Everett Dirksen, a Republican and a spellbinder on the hustings, announced that he was going to oppose Lucas in the November 1950 election. Already, Dirksen has been stumping the State. Lucas thinks he can take Dirksen's measure. In fact, he already has mapped out his strategy—the battle, if it materializes, will be waged on the issue of Dirksen versus Dirksen. In Congress, Representative Dirksen made many fervent speeches in favor of internationalism; now, perhaps with an eye toward support from Colonel McCormick's Chicago Tribune, he is declaring that his vote for the Marshall plan in 1948 was a mistake, and he seems all out for isolationism. Lucas avers it will be a pleasure to fight a man on such an issue.

But Scott Lucas, himself a formidable campaigner, does not take the threat lightly. "In this game of politics," he declares, "you've got to run scared.

"I learned that a long time ago when I made my second race for State's attorney in Mason County. Everybody said they were for me, and I was overconfident. It was raining that day and I didn't even bother to send cars to get out the votes. My opponent was not overconfident. He got out the votes, and he beat me by a handful."

Ever since then, Lucas' friends say, he has followed a policy of running scared—whether it is in a political campaign or a battle to put over a piece of legislation. The Senator himself says that "it's always a good idea to expect the worst and come out a little better."

Samuel Gompers—His Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Samuel Gompers—His Story," published in the Minneapolis Labor Review of January 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAMUEL GOMPERS—HIS STORY

To Samuel Gompers, as to few men, fell the opportunity at a historic time to lead an army of men with a bright torch down a broad highway.

The torch he raised is now held high by 8,000,000 workers and blazes its light around the world.

In brief, this is his story:

Samuel Gompers was born in East Side, London, January 27, 1850. He was the son of Solomon and Sarah (Rood) Gompers, both born in Holland. His parents and forebears were wage earners.

After but 4 years of schooling, it was necessary for Samuel, then 10 years old, to help bear the burdens of his family. He was apprenticed to learn the shoemakers' trade but found that distasteful and turned to the trade of his father—cigar making. When he was but 13 years of age the Gompers family moved to America.

After learning the cigarmakers' trade under his father's tutelage, the youth became a journeyman worker and joined the English-speaking cigarmakers union in New York City, old local union No. 15.

At first strongly attracted by the humanitarian work of fraternal organizations young Gompers gave his spare time to lodge work, but as he came to realize the constructive possibilities of the union, he concentrated all of his attention and ability on the promotion of the trade-union movement. He first became leader in his local union and then became prominent in labor affairs of New York City.

Rising to prominence in his international trade organization, the Cigarmakers International Union, he earned a standing and recognition that enabled him to take part in the effort to form a national federation of trade-unions in 1881. He was active in the old federation, serving 3 years as president and 2 years as a member of its legislative committee, and after the merging of the older federation with new unions under the name, American Federation of Labor, served continuously with the exception of 1895, as president.

Samuel Gompers continued to work as a cigarmaker until 37 years of age, giving all his spare time to organization work, sacrificing even the little home life that was accorded to the workers of those days. He held card No. 1 in his international union for many years. Although given numerous opportunities to hold political positions and participate in undertakings that would have made him a rich man, Samuel Gompers held fast to his ideal to make better the lives of the workers.

He became the only full-time representative of the American Federation of Labor in 1886. From then on he gave his full time to the work of developing the economic movement of wage earners for the establishing of higher standards of work and life. Under his purposeful, constructive leadership, gains were made.

It was a cardinal principle of his leadership that the economic organization could serve all the needs of the trade-union and hence he advocated the mobilization of the economic power of wage earners along nonpartisan political lines. Heading an aggressive, nonpartisan, political movement by labor in 1906, on behalf of labor he submitted a bill of grievances to responsible political representatives. This policy was followed with increasing success and substantial labor legislation enacted by Congress.

To Samuel Gompers chiefly is due the enactment into law of that fundamental economic principle: the labor of a human being is not a commodity.

By sympathy and training Samuel Gompers was a pacifist. But when this country was confronted with the possibility of war in 1916, he was among the first to pledge wholehearted support to his country for both himself and the organization he headed.

It was largely due to his influence and determination that the forces of labor were held intact despite subtle and alluring propaganda that might have caused disaster for the cause of the Allies. Labor stood behind the Government of the United States and gave its all to the cause of democracy under the leadership of Samuel Gompers. At a possible sacrifice of even life itself, he made several trips across the water during wartime to help cement the loyalty of the workers of allied countries at a critical hour.

He was appointed by President Wilson as a member of the Commission on International Labor Legislation of the Peace Conference at Versailles. At the first meeting of the commission he was unanimously elected president. The commission drafted the labor charter of the peace treaty guaranteeing to workers of all countries an equal opportunity for better conditions of life and work.

In the year after World War I, he was a dominant figure in helping to tide over a period of unemployment and restlessness which, without his help, might have become influenced by the germs of revolt prevalent the world over.

He was successful in maintaining the morale of his organization and resisting the efforts made toward the disintegration of the forces of labor during the period of readjustment. He was keenly interested in all attempts made to stabilize production and thus guarantee a higher standard of life for wage earners the world over.

The last weeks of his life witnessed a most extraordinary rounding out of plans and activity extending over years, in the thrilling international demonstrations at El Paso, Juarez and Mexico City. He helped to make possible a Mexican federation of labor and participated in the celebration of the first constitutional succession to office of a president, and that president was elected by the laborers of Mexico.

He had just been unanimously reelected president of the American Federation of Labor and of the Pan-American Federation of Labor, of which he was founder, and was engaged in most important service when the end came December 13, 1924. His last words were for the republic he loved so dearly:

"God bless our American institutions. May they grow better day by day."

We Are for Taft's Reelection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial on our friend and colleague, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, which appears in the current number of Collier's magazine, which I have read with interest. It is marked by a very careful and thorough analysis and a high degree of prophecy, in my judgment. I commend it to Members of the Senate and to the country at large.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE ARE FOR TAFT'S REELECTION

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT's campaign for reelection this year is a national issue. The leaders of organized labor who oppose him have made it so. They have promised to send men into Ohio, backed by proceeds of a country-wide fund-raising drive, to work for his defeat, which the A. F. of L. League for Political Education has called "the chief target for 1950."

It is not Collier's custom to take sides in State politics. But in these circumstances we do not hesitate to say that we're for Senator TAFT. We think that his defeat would be costly to Congress and to the Nation. Congress needs men of his caliber if it is to function as a coequal branch of government under the two-party system. It needs men of his caliber if its legislation is not to become mere approval of the popular "mandate" of a President who got a minority of the popular vote in 1948.

Senator TAFT's defeat would also vindicate the frustrated labor bosses' bitter propaganda attack on him as the author of a "slave labor law." The Taft-Hartley law, written by a bipartisan committee and supported by more than half the Democrats in Congress, has been in effect more than 2 years. It has enslaved no one. In those 2 years union membership has grown and better contracts have been signed with fewer days' pay lost through work stoppages. It is not a perfect law, as Mr. TAFT readily admits. In the first session of the Eighty-first Congress he introduced and obtained Senate passage of 28 amendments to it, most of which were suggested by union representatives.

The persistent repetition of the slave-labor tommyrot is more insulting to union members' intelligence than it is to Mr. TAFT. Proof that many rank-and-filers realize this is found in the scores of supporting letters which they have sent the Senator, and which this writer has seen. A verbatim quote from one of them, written by a Milwaukean, will give an idea of their general content: "I am a member of Union A. F. of L. I understand Mr. Green wants $16,000,000 to defeat you when you come up for reelection and wants a contribution from every union member for this purpose. Well, he doesn't get mine. * * * Instead you will accept my contribution for your reelection. You are a friend of labor—not its enemy."

Collier's has disagreed with Senator TAFT on several issues, among them his vote against the North Atlantic Pact and his proposal of recognition and aid for Franco Spain. We considered his legalistic quibbling over the Nuremberg trials ill-timed, to say the least. But even when we have thought him most wrong we have never doubted his motives or his honesty.

Mr. TAFT has been called a reactionary. (He has also been accused of socialism by conservative Republicans for leading the fight for a Federal housing program and Federal aid to education.) But it was the reactionary Mr. TAFT who, singlehanded, halted the administration steam roller which was pushing through Mr. Truman's bill to draft striking workers into the Armed Forces in 1946—probably the most reactionary, fascistic measure ever proposed by an American President.

These were some of the Senator's comments on the measure: "I think it offends not only the Constitution, but every basic principle for which the American Republic was established. * * * In this labor-problem situation we should give considered and unbiased consideration to the whole problem. I do not believe we should be moved by emotion, or by crisis, or by political views, or by resentment against unreasonable labor action, or unreasonable threats from labor leaders, or unreasonable demands for immediate action from thousands of persons who do not really, fundamentally, understand the facts and difficulties involved in any labor situation."

In the past session of Congress it was a bitter opponent, Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, who called the "reactionary" Mr. TAFT the "savior" of the 75-cent minimum-wage bill, according to the labor publication, Trade Union Courier.

Senator TAFT is an easy target for name callers. He won't get down in the mud and slug it out with detractors. He won't debase his intelligence to answer smear with smear. He is no glamor boy, no spellbinder, no backslapper. He will admit to doubts and confess that he may be wrong. He has little sense of public relations or of political timing. Forthrightness may prompt him to come out with a new idea at an inappropriate time, and to phrase it bluntly and awkwardly. But as a friend and admirer put it, "If he didn't make those blunders, he wouldn't be TAFT."

Our search of his legislative record shows no instance where he supported a measure simply because it was a popular vote-catcher. He votes for what he thinks is right, and then only after a thorough study which few Members of this or any Congress can match.

He has risen to Republican leadership in the Senate through character and superior ability and nothing else. Efforts to dislodge him have failed because there was no one who could match him in knowledge, industry, experience, integrity, and absolute trustworthiness.

Perhaps the gentleman from Ohio can best be called an old-fashioned liberal, but he is hard to label. He is an individualist who believes in freedom for the individual,

though not at the price of unequal justice or opportunity. He is more interested in his conscience than in his popularity. He would rather be Bob Taft than be President. And since there are too few like him, the voters of Ohio will do their country an important service by returning him to the Senate.

Turn of the Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Turn of the Century," published in the Minneapolis Tribune of January 1, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURN OF THE CENTURY

This New Year's Day is widely celebrated as the beginning of a new half-century, the midpoint of mankind's journey through the twentieth millennium of the Christian era.

Those people are right, of course, who say it is nothing of the sort, and that the second half of the twentieth century won't begin until January 1, 1951. They have logic on their side; but they lose the argument. The world insists on celebrating the turning point of the twentieth century right now. And there is sense in that, if not logic, for it reflects the unquenchable human instinct to make a new start and to invest that new start with a special significance and hope.

So this is a Super-New Year's Day—one on which to study the entrails of the last half century in search of an omen for the next.

Where do we stand, we humans, at this turn of the century? What, in history's long view, has been the thing, in the last 50 years, which more than any other suggests the shape or the problem of the 50 years ahead?

It may well be that the first half of the twentieth century saw the end of imperialism as a sound basis for peace and world order.

If that is true, it is the most important happening of this century.

For almost four centuries the British Empire had been the stabilizing force in the world—establishment of liberal institutions, source and stimulator of economic development, world policeman through its navy. Like Rome and Spain before it, Britain had widened human horizons and fostered human progress; and no listing of its mistakes or tyrannies (and they were many) can outweigh the record of what it did to set men's energies and spirits free.

In this last half century, the world has outgrown the British political and economic framework. Two great world wars, a grievous economic depression, and now a "cold war" between two powers grown greater than Britain—these are symptoms of man's groping for a new basis of world order, something not only to take the place of the British system but to be the framework for a better way of life for all mankind.

That new framework of peace and order and progress cannot be imposed by any one nation. We in the Western World are determined that Soviet Russia shall not be the new Rome, the new Spain, the new Britain. The American people have no ambition to make Washington the capital of a new world imperialism. Even if there were less resistance to a Sovietized world than there is, even if there were a hot desire to set up American imperialism in the world, the chances are that neither would happen nor could be brought about.

For it is not likely that any nation ever again can or will rule the world as Rome or Spain or Britain did.

Mankind has grown up to a point where every segment of it insists increasingly on a voice in determining its own destinies and conditions of life.

That, of course, is all to the good; it is progress toward government by the consent of the governed.

But it means international anarchy until nations join together in an effective international government with the powers that any government must have to be effective.

To create an effective international government is, therefore, the foremost problem of the next half century. We shall never again know peace, or military or economic security, or an end to "cold war," until we achieve it.

The arguments over what and how will be long and hard and hot. United Nations? North Atlantic Union? World federalism? Or something else? The Tribune has expressed its views on all of these, and will again—as have and will millions of other voices. But we need have no doubt of mankind's ability to work out the best answer in such a great debate if we keep our eye on one central fact.

That fact is that we must want and work toward international government, not just because we think idealistically that it would be nice to have, but because we are convinced that it is the only answer to the problem of peace and security and progress in today's and tomorrow's world.

If we will carry that conviction, that lesson of the first half of the twentieth century, into the second half of the twentieth century, the travail of the last 50 years will not have been in vain.

Address Delivered by Mary Donlon Before New York State Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the recommendation presented by Mary Donlon, the national federation's program coordination chairman and chairman of the New York State Workmen's Compensation Board, at the meeting of the board of the New York State Federation, published in the Independent Woman of November 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET INTO POLITICS UP TO YOUR EARS

It was my good fortune this summer to visit six European countries. There I had the opportunity of discussing social, economic, and political problems with many people, both the great and the not-so-great, including cabinet ministers, leaders of management, and officials of labor unions, Parliament members in the various countries, political leaders of different parties, teachers, clergymen, and especially with young people. This sampling of opinion offered a wide range of views.

Through their own efforts and the essential aid provided by the American reconstruction program for Europe, European countries have made real progress. What is difficult for us to realize, after this lapse of time since the cease-fire in 1945, is not so much the terrible and widespread destruction of physical facilities resulting from bombings and enemy occupation; what we really fail to grasp is the cumulative effect on the spirit of a people of doing without much that is essential to a standard of living, even of a poor sort, over a long period of years. I often wonder whether we would have been able to do as well as they have done.

Keep three important factors in mind, if you want to understand the political situation in the countries of western Europe at the present time.

First, as you would surmise, there is the fear of Russia. This is really the single unifying influence in Europe today. But it is not chiefly there, as it is here, based on ideology. Rather, fear of Russia in Europe today is essentially Europe's old distrust of Russian imperialism, now aroused and deepened by the close approach of Russia, through satellite countries, to western European boundaries. Again and again, as you talk with Russia's neighbors, you get the impression that their fear is less of communism, as such, than it is an uneasy distrust of the old Russian bear, once more erect and on the prowl.

Second of the facts that bear importantly on the political situation in Europe is the cruel burden, economic and social, of repairing physical plants and of satisfying even the most urgent consumer needs. There is something akin to battle fatigue affecting millions of persons in western Europe today. There was moral shock, as well as physical destruction, from the bombings and the enemy occupation. It is small wonder that in some of these countries the suicide rate is reaching new highs, and that tuberculosis, venereal disease, and alcoholism are on the increase. Concerned as we are, and properly, with the physical rebuilding of western Europe, we must also be concerned, and even more deeply, with improving living conditions for the people in order to cushion social shock for those brave folks who stood and are still standing as the farthest outpost in defense of western civilization. We could ill afford to let China succumb to communism. We can even less afford to allow that to happen to western Europe.

Third, and closely related to these other two factors we need to keep in mind in reading the political news of Europe, is the trade vacuum that has followed the virtual collapse of the sterling area. This is, by far, the most urgent problem of western Europe today. I find that many Americans have very little comprehension of it, yet it is something we can do much about.

The sterling area was no myth. It was a real and powerful force, creating for tens of millions of people in many countries the trading opportunities that enabled them to prosper. World trade pivoted on the sterling area for over a hundred years, with England as the international merchant and banker making it possible for small countries to buy and sell.

Forces that we all know, but need not here recount, have deprived England of her position as world leader in international trade. The other countries of the sterling area are in desperate need of attaching themselves as quickly as possible to some other trade center. They cannot prosper by barter, although as a last resort they are now trying

to find markets through barter for their goods. They must have a firm currency in which to trade and a world market through which to buy and sell. They see no alternative, with sterling no longer firm, but to join up either with the ruble or with the dollar. The ruble seeks their trade; the dollar is curiously indifferent or, perhaps, unwilling. Only Americans, in today's world, are rich enough to afford the senseless luxury of economic isolationism.

The terms "right" and "left" have different connotations in Europe from the meanings we associate with them in the United States. There is no significant political movement in England or anywhere else in western Europe today that has the slightest resemblance to the conservative thinking of southern Democrats and some Republicans. All countries and all parties are committed to broad social-welfare programs.

The Conservative and Liberal Parties in England, as well as the Labor Party, have fully endorsed the new health and national insurance programs which have been the subject of far more controversy here than there. Actually the Conservative Party, in its party platform issued for the forthcoming election, claims for the Conservatives full credit for the provision of medical care on a national scale and for the expanded social-insurance program. In assessing election probabilities in England, don't count on differences with regard to Government-provided social welfare as affecting the result. The Labor Party will profit because they put the program into effect, while the Conservatives and Liberals blueprinted it and drafted the bills.

Monopolies and cartels were permitted to flourish in Europe under Conservative governments, and were not broken up as they were in the United States. This is important. The cartels created a distrust of capitalism among working people and are probably the real reason why in Europe the labor unions are the dominant political power pressing for socialization of industry. Socialism has not gained here the political strength it has in Europe because more than 50 years ago we broke the back of industrial monopoly. We are one up on Europe, politically, in that respect. But that tremendous advantage does not justify our confusing socialism with social welfare, as the Conservative Party did for far too long, with disastrous political results.

The recent German election cannot be credited as a great victory for the right, as some newspaper headlines would have you believe. Western Germany has become a new battleground, with the present British Government determined that private capitalism in production shall not be restored. Because they do not understand the political mechanisms of regulation as we do, the leaders of the British Government honestly fear returning to German industrialists the power that, so they believe, has twice led the world into war. Our political contribution should be to teach the techniques of regulating what needs regulation in the public interest, without destroying private enterprise. These techniques are not understood or practiced in Europe.

The Central Democrats in Germany, top party in the recent election, are an uneasy aggregation of divergent viewpoints. Probably the left wing of the Christian Democrats, rather than their right, contributed the necessary margin to the party's narrow victory in the west German election.

All over free Europe there is the confident exception that the Communists will lose much of their present political strength in the next elections. This was borne out by the German election. Of real significance in Germany, however, is the fact that the neo-Nazi parties mustered only approximately the same vote as did the Communists. When it is remembered that Germany since 1932 has known no political party save the National Socialists, it seems truly remarkable that the attempted renaissance of nazism could summon no more strength than did the Communists.

The great need of Europe today is to eliminate currency and exchange restrictions and to stimulate trade. Americans must become world-trade conscious. Unless we step into the international vacuum that has resulted from the default of British leadership in international trade, the small nations that must sell their goods in order to buy their needs will either have to starve or accept the alluring trade proposals of Russia. They are too close to starvation now to make starvation seem their likely choice. It is all very well to discuss important subjects like civil rights, human needs, and political elections, but people who are hungry because they cannot sell fish to buy wheat, or lumber to buy fertilizer, are bound to be more concerned with achieving the modest economic security essential to the protection of independence, freedom, and civil rights.

The challenge today is for us to accept responsibility for the elimination of trade barriers and to take leadership in the restoration of world trade, as England did a hundred years ago. Whether we like it or not, and like it we should, destiny has given us the obligations of leadership in a time of crisis. We cannot adequately fulfill these obligations by debates and discussions, covenants and conventions. Action is required, and that action must be in the market places of the world as missionaries of orderly and prosperous world trade. Unless we create opportunities for the small countries to sell what they have and buy what they have not, the trade isolationism now paralyzing the world behind national barriers will surely bring on a third world war.

This challenge, if America takes it up, can bring undreamed prosperity both to ourselves and to other countries, and at last that peace in our time we so earnestly seek. It is a challenge to political leadership, and that is where we women come in.

Women in other countries are making a larger contribution to political policy making than women are making here at home. Recently Mrs. India Edwards, chairman of the women's division of the Democratic National Committee, was quoted in the press as stating that if there were proportionately as many women in Congress as there are in the Indian Parliament, we would have 85 women in Congress. Instead, we have only nine.

Extending Mrs. Edwards' example, it should be noted that if American women were as prominent in Congress as Indian women are in their Parliament, there would be 15 women in the Senate—where there is only 1—and 70 women in the House—where there are now 8.

In New York—if we did as well proportionately as they do in India—there would be 7 women from our State in Congress instead of 1 woman; there would be 9 women in the State senate, where there is no woman now; and there would be 24 women in the State assembly, instead of 7 as now.

Women are not sufficiently represented in politics or government. If politics is the art of government—and it is—and if government is public housekeeping—and it is—then women's place, quite logically, is in politics.

If you honestly mean it when you say you're for freedom and peace, you have to get into politics up to your ears.

It's not good enough, in these troubled times, to be a good lawyer or physician, teacher, housewife; or merely to do well any career job you can name. History is pulling a fast trick, and you've got to lead a double life of career plus politics.

In your home town, in your State, for that matter in Washington, women's political power is not being used effectively. Yet here are eight important areas of policy determination that are being shaped by politics, and for the most part women are now excluded from the political councils where the decisions are being made:

1. World trade must be resumed. Neither people nor nations can live much above the subsistence level if their trade is wholly by barter.

2. A realistic and consistent foreign policy must be laid down and announced. Week-to-week hit-or-miss planning prevents other nations from adjusting themselves to reasonably predictable American attitudes.

3. Russia has to be contained within her present sphere of rule and ruin. Remember that the war started 10 years ago when Hitler spilled his legions over into still another country. Dictators can't stop. They have to be stopped.

4. Our own sound national economy is the single best assurance of world peace. It must be assured.

5. Government integrity at every level is essential, if for no other reason than to get good value for our hard-earned tax dollars.

6. Government must have, and must be known to have, both a head and a heart. The welfare of each of us concerns all of us.

7. Labor has a just claim to recognition as a partner in our free-production economy; but all the partners—capital, management, labor, and consumers—must be adult and responsible.

8. None can be assured of a good living, but all should have the chance to develop their fullest capacity for useful service without limitation because of race, creed, color, or sex.

Aren't these eight good reasons why women must insist that women shall be consulted and their voices heard and listened to in politics—in your city hall, the State capitol, and in the Halls of Congress and high administrative offices!

Today there is a ninth reason. Now it has been told: Russia, too, knows how to split an atom. Can women any longer hide their heads like ostriches to avoid looking at the facts of modern life?

There are matters that are the concern of all of us as people. If the brotherhood of man remains an unrealized ideal, with men alone shaping the policies that could achieve it, perhaps through a sisterhood of women and a share in policy making we can bring recognition that "above all nations is humanity."

Were the little Japanese women in Hiroshima and Nagasaki any less interested than we American women are in child bearing and child rearing in happy, contented homes? Do the women of the Italian villages and among the mountains of Greece, on Polish farms, and in busy cities of Czechoslovakia, care less than we do that their men and boys shall not again be marched off to kill and to be killed in some cruel war that nobody wins?

What are the women thinking today in Great Britain and in Germany, where no atomic bombs have yet fallen, but where death and destruction so recently came tearing out of the sky night after awful night?

Ours is almost the only remaining land of freedom, of opportunity. Our country is the haven of the harassed, the comforter of the afflicted, the friend of those whose serious needs threaten world peace. The challenge today is not for ourselves alone. With eyes toward Europe, Liberty looks out over New York Harbor, saying now, as of old:

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

Europe this year, seen through American eyes, hopes for a renewal of that noble invitation from us. Western Europe is eager for both the material and spiritual assistance we alone have to offer and which she so desperately needs if she is to stay free. That is why, now more than ever, the hard-headed soft-hearted businesswomen of America must get into politics.

Policy for Asia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Policy for Asia?" written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, and published in the Washington Post of January 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY FOR ASIA?

The period of American paralysis in Asia seems to be drawing to a close, judging by advance reports of the policy that Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson is to expound to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Whether this is really so, is the practical test of the administration's decision to leave Formosa to its fate.

Formosa is, of course, immensely valuable, more because its surplus product can help to feed Japan, than because it has great strategic importance. By every possible test, however, whether economic or strategic or political, Formosa is infinitely less valuable than the populous, incalculably wealthy southeast Asiatic peninsula. The practical objection to the MacArthur-Louis Johnson policy for Formosa has been, simply, that it would impede and perhaps hamstring any attempt to hold southeast Asia against the Communist advance from China.

This is so, for three reasons. First, a Formosan adventure would arouse suspicions of American imperialism all over Asia. But the first principle of the new American policy in Asia must be, and is, to ally ourselves with and support the new nationalism which is the strongest Asiatic force today.

Second, a Formosan adventure would also hopelessly divide our Asiatic policy from the policies of the other western powers with Asiatic interests, and particularly from the policy of the British. Yet the second principle of our new Asiatic policy must be, and is, to secure the friendly cooperation of these former colonial powers, and particularly of the British, in the great task of putting the emerging new nations of Asia firmly on their feet.

Third, a Formosan adventure would surely alienate the leaders of the Asiatic nations, which are already independent, such as Pandit Nehru in India and President Sukarno and Premier Mohammed Hatta in Indonesia. Yet the third principle of our new Asiatic policy must be, and is, to induce Nehru and the others like him to take the lead in the effort to save Asia which we, as westerners, can only aid and back up.

Simply by stating the objections to a Formosan adventure, the main themes of the new Asiatic policy have also been stated. There are, of course, various trimmings, of greater or lesser importance. Opening up active trade between southeast Asia, with its great surpluses of agricultural products, and underfed, highly industrialized Japan, is one piece of trimming of the utmost importance to this country. Other, quite obvious trimmings are ECA aid and some military aid for the new Asiatic nations. The whole adds up to the outline of an intelligent policy to halt communism's Asiatic advance.

Although it is still vitally important to know why we went wrong in China, there could be no greater error than to judge the new Asiatic policy by our old China policy. There is really only one danger from the past.

The mark of our postwar China policy was an extreme reluctance to engage the United States, in the way that we engaged ourselves in Greece, for example. Yet the new Asiatic policy will be doomed to rapid failure unless this country now engages itself very boldly, politically and strategically as well as economically.

This is so far the simplest possible reason. Burma and Indochina are the keys to southeast Asia. If Burma and Indochina go the way of China, a chain reaction will have started, which will first consume Siam, Malaya, and Indonesia, and then attack India, the Philippines, and Japan. Yet, Burma and Indochina are both in imminent peril from strong, well-armed Communist movements. Talking about trade between Japan and southeast Asia before Burma and Indochina have been made safe is like planning the garden while the house is burning down.

Since the situation is so critical, no serious effort to save Asia, coordinating as it must economic and military aid, political influence, and secret-service activity, can possibly be carried on from Washington on a committee system. Yet the Far Eastern Division of the State Department has steadfastly opposed all projects for a flexible special organization to save Asia.

Equally, saving Asia will require taking considerable political risks, and spending a good deal more money than the dribs and drabs now available. Yet the first requirement is contrary to all the present inclinations of the State Department, and the second cuts across the Truman line of holding down all foreign-policy outlays. In short, the Asiatic policy that looks so good in outline may prove to be inadequate in practice. We must be ready to put up the cash, get into the mess, and even get our hands dirty. If the Senators cannot satisfy themselves on this point, they will then be justified in reopening the Formosa issue.

Why Is Generation a Perennial Issue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the January 1950 issue of the Rural Electrification magazine entitled "Why Is Generation a Perennial Issue?"

In this very timely and informative article Mr. Malcolm W. Wehrung ably presents one of the most important issues confronting the whole REA program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY IS GENERATION A PERENNIAL ISSUE?

(By Malcolm W. Wehrung)

As the second session of the Eighty-first Congress gets under way, the towlines in the struggle of private power versus low-cost rural power are again being pulled taut and new footholds are eagerly being sought on both sides. This is as it should be. America from its earliest days permitted a path to be beaten to the door of the man inventing the better mousetrap, rendering the greater service, or selling the cheaper automobile.

Both sides have their feet firmly imbedded in deep-rooted American traditions, private power in the big-business traditions of free enterprise and profit making, and low-cost rural power in the pioneering traditions of free enterprise, mutual aid, and self-help. Low-cost rural power has developed to a large extent outside the profit-motive area and private power has developed without the elements of mutual aid and self-help.

Never before, however, have the paths of each run so nearly parallel nor created such an atmosphere of competition in the power field. In essence, there should be no conflict between private power and low-cost rural power and there is none except that which is promoted and staged by the private power interests. The low-cost-rural-power people naturally are resisting unprovoked attacks on their efforts to solve their own problems.

Perhaps nowhere in the entire field of utility operation does the Geiger counter of the private-utility proponent vibrate more actively than when directed toward generation and transmission projects of the rural electric cooperatives. It is here that the most excited overstatements are whispered (or sometimes shouted) and the most odious comparisons are made. Frequently, selected statistics are expertly manipulated to arrive at intentionally distorted conclusions.

For example, let us take a look at the lead article in the Edison Electric Institute Bulletin for November. It is a statement by Elmer L. Lindseth, president of the institute, as well as of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co. of Ohio. The statement is redolent with self-congratulatory pats-on-the-back for the electric utility industry generally, but the writer goes out of his way to attack what he calls extensive encroachment on the electric utility field by the Government, as though the profit-making companies for whom he speaks have preemptive rights to serve all people, even those whom these companies failed to serve for so many years prior to 1935. He classes all efforts of the people to serve themselves as encroachments by Government on private enterprise.

In one paragraph of Mr. Lindseth's statements he says: "Companies generally do not object to Federal subsidy of rural distribution lines—if this is the national policy—to service rural areas not already served. But they do object to (1) duplicating existing facilities, and (2) erecting competing plants."

NO EVIDENCE OF SUBSIDY

To answer the broad unsubstantiated intimation of the first part of this paragraph, one need merely say that nowhere either in congressional hearings or legislative enactments can it be found that Congress ever stated it to be the national policy that rural electric distribution lines were to be subsidized. The records simply do not bear out the time-worn charge of subsidization. The lines are not subsidized and no substantial block of public opinion seems to advocate that they should be.

Perhaps, if enough obstables are thrown in the paths of those striving for the principle of "area coverage" in serving the last 20 percent of the Nation's rural population, subsidies may eventually become necessary—to reach the most thinly populated areas. That is a question, however, for Congress to decide when the last miles of line on a self-liquidating basis have been built.

Incidentally, members of rural electric systems and their friends bitterly resent the implication that the lines which they have built for their own use, and are paying for in full with interest, are the result of subsidies.

NOT DUPLICATING OR COMPETING

As for the remainder of the paragraph quoted above, in which Mr. Lindseth states that power companies object to duplicating existing facilities and erecting competing plants, it may be said that no unnecessary duplication of facilities has occurred in the REA program. Certainly, none are "unnecessary" from the point of view of those being served.

"Competition" is a word frequently used by private power spokesmen when a group of distribution co-ops band together to build generating and transmission facilities to serve their own needs. This is a misnomer. When an industrial user who has been buying energy from a private utility installs his own generating plant to serve his own needs he is not looked upon as a "competitor," even though the cost of operating his generating plant is materially less than the cost of energy would have been if purchased. Competition is actually present only when two or more producers of energy are vying for the same customers. When consumers, either actual or potential, decide to serve themselves they are no longer in the market as customers and therefore there can be no competition.

Power companies have no legitimate complaint when this occurs, since the loads which these cooperatives have built up are products of their own industry—not of the utilities. The utilities should be happy that the majority of cooperatives still buy their energy from them. Since 1940 well over 12,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours have been purchased from privately owned utilities at a cost of over $110,000,000. This is good business in anybody's league.

Gratitude should be the proper sentiment of the utilities since this business was not developed by any efforts on their part, but in spite of the opposition which most of them interposed. It should be remembered further that a large portion of this energy is a form of "dump" power which the utilities, at little or no added cost to their normal operations, produce from generating capacity which otherwise would be considered reserve or surplus.

In 1948 REA borrowers purchased 57 percent of their energy from the private profit-making companies and in the last 6 years the amount of this business has more than tripled. The proportion of rural electrics' wholesale power purchased from the power companies has also risen. It was only 51.4 percent in 1946.

COMPARING PEANUTS AND POTATOES

Probably nowhere does Mr. Lindseth disclose the propaganda purposes of his statement more than when he compares the noncomparable average cost of purchased energy with the average cost of generated energy by REA-financed systems. The comparison is bad and the conclusion unsound when he says the average price the companies charged cooperatives is 9.5 mills per kilowatt-hour, while the average price the REA generating stations charged the cooperatives they served is 13.6 mills—that is, 43 percent more than the companies charged. No one questions the accuracy of these 1947 statistics. Their juxtaposition, however, is like placing a 5-cent bag of peanuts next to a bushel of potatoes for comparison purposes.

No consideration, for instance, is given to the fact that most present rural electric power plants are in the high-cost fuel areas, where power supply is most critically short. The broad national figure alone is simply not representative.

REA-financed co-ops have never generated for their own use more than 5 percent of their energy, except in 1946, when it was 6 percent. Even if they generated as much energy as they purchased from the private profit-making companies the elemental answer to Mr. Lindseth's comparison is that (1) the administrative policy of REA (not by way of legislative enactment) has been to make loans for generating plants in areas generally where the wholesale costs of energy are considered unnecessarily high, (2) during the first years of operation of any generating plant while its load is developing—the average kilowatt-hour costs are relatively high (the average cost per kilowatt-hour estimated for the life of the plant is the usual and proper accounting figure to use for comparison with the cost of purchased energy), and (3) such comparison does not reflect the fact that the average cost per kilowatt-hour of purchased power is as low as it is only because of the REA generating loan program, and finally (4) such comparison does not reflect the intangible advantages of any type of distribution systems owning and controlling their own source of energy supply. One can only speculate as to the reasons why Mr. Lindseth would permit himself to be caught using such noncomparable statistics.

The first opposition to an REA generating plant loan usually takes the form of showing what appears to be reserve generating capacity in the area. This is generally done by the power company or companies using statistics which make no allowance for station usage, no allowance for repairs or breakdowns, by including name-plate kilowatt rating of obsolete and inefficient equipment and by not revealing existing unserved loads. In one instance at least where voluntary curtailment of energy usage was in effect and where no new unserved loads were being connected, the private power company serving the area reported no power shortage.

INTERCONNECTIONS HIDE SHORTAGES

If one company serving an area where a group of cooperatives propose to locate a generating plant cannot show reserve capacity even by using the ruses mentioned, it will join with as many other interconnected companies as is necessary to show the desired reserve. Some of these groups may even be subsidiaries of different holding companies. They are all blood brothers when it comes to opposing the erection of a cooperative generating plant. Immediately after the co-op plant was built, the nearest company asked for an interconnection and began buying power in huge blocks, in one case.

To visualize most clearly what happens when cooperatives are not banded together to supply their own power, take a look briefly into the New England area. A Maine cooperative now has a contract with a power company which provides for the lowest block of power at 9 mills. The contract has a fuel escalation clause. Now the power company is invoking that clause asking for an increase which would make the lowest block cost 12.5 mills, nearly a 40-percent increase. The company's data supplied to the Federal Power Commission show that only a fraction of 1 percent, namely 0.26 percent, of the company's power is generated by steam. Over 99 percent of it is hydro.

EXAMPLES OF DEALINGS CITED

An example of unfair, unbusinesslike dealing occurred just recently when a co-op attempted to renew its expired contract with a power company. The contract had a 20-mill rate and a provision that such rate shall be doubled unless the contract is renewed. The company demands a 10-year renewal or the rate shall be 40 mills. The company also refuses to relocate its substation closer to the cooperative's load center, thereby making the cooperative furnish a substation or continue to absorb line-loss of transmission at low voltage—an uneconomical practice regardless of who bears the loss.

Again, another New England cooperative has a contract with a power company which has 7 years to run. It is reported that the power company is asking for an increase in rates above those specified in the contract which would increase the cooperative's annual wholesale power bill by approximately $50,000. If the new rate is not paid, the power company threatens to go before the State public service commission to ask for a still higher rate. Another instance—several cooperatives have contracts with a company specifying voltage regulation within allowable commercial limits—10 percent. The voltage variation is now well in excess of 15 percent with some of them. Upon a request for better regulation the cooperatives were told that if they do not like the present service they should correct it themselves or go elsewhere for their energy needs.

POWER COST RATIO LENDING

The importance to the cooperatives financed by REA of the Administrator having lending power for financing generating plants can be better understood when the statistics on the cost of power are compared with the cooperatives' operating ratios. In the early days of the program when power costs were much higher than today these items in the budgets were relatively small. Percentagewise they have been growing larger from year to year as loads continue to build up and operating ratios decline. The leveling off of kilowatt-hour usage in rural areas is not yet apparent in spite of the dilution of the average-use figures by continually adding newly connected member loads.

Only when area coverage has been reached will averages for consumer usage in rural areas become accurate and fully meaningful. In a few years the cost of power will be one-half of the entire operating budget. That is one important reason why rural electrics feel that they must continue to press for ever-lower power costs.

CONGRESS STUDY PROVES SAVINGS

The wisdom of Congress in giving the Administrator in the original REA Act of 1936 specific authority to make loans for financing the construction of generating plants is conclusively demonstrated by the known savings which have been achieved in power costs. In 1945 when the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was considering H. R. 1742, the REA postwar planning bill, a comparison was made of the average rates charged by the power companies before certain REA loans for generating plants were considered in 13 States with (a) the average cost of power actually supplied by REA-financed generating plants and (b) the average rates charged by the power companies in those same States after the generating plant loans had been made.

This showed that an annual saving in power costs of $2,250,000 was effected by reason of these loans. More recent studies, using the same comparisons for the same States, show that almost $5,000,000 is now being saved annually as a result of these generating plant loans. It should be noted that this $5,000,000 annual saving is not all by any means. There are numerous instances where the mere announcement by a group of cooperatives that a study is being made to determine the feasibility of a cooperative generating plant has effected material lowering of wholesale rates in those areas.

The REA program could never have achieved such overwhelming success as it has had not Congress given the Administrator authority to make these generating loans. The right of rural electrics to generate their own power is their only protection against excessive power costs. The future of the program hinges on a continuation of this authority, and power company tacticians are probably well aware of this.

Formosa Stand Said To Put All Pacific in Jeopardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, there appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Wednesday, January 10, in the column entitled "The Air World" by Gill Robb Wilson, an article, the title of which is "Formosa Stand Said To Put All Pacific in Jeopardy." As I feel that this is a very important contribution to the pending debate on Formosa by one of the leading authorities in the United States on air power, I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AIR WORLD

(By Gill Robb Wilson)

FORMOSA STAND SAID TO PUT ALL PACIFIC IN JEOPARDY

Foreign policy in the air age can never afford to be militarily unrealistic.

Prior to the rise of air power, national defense could be compromised occasionally with impunity. The past radius of military action was short and the tempo of movement slower. The time lag between mobilization and combat gave opportunity for strategic recovery of untenable situations. This is no longer the case.

The island of Formosa is an air staging ground easily maintained and supplied from the ports of the China coast. Formosa-based air power outflanks air power on Okinawa, Japan, and Luzon, which forces must be supplied from the United States mainland, approximately 6,000 miles distant. This being the case, it follows that air power based on Guam is also strategically vulnerable.

An inviolate tenet of air doctrine holds that strategic air power must be based where it is not vulnerable to medium or short-range counterattack. Communist air power on Formosa would bring the most effective weapon of the United States into a vulnerable position. With the Philippines and Japan untenable by virtue of Formosa-based air power the American position in the Pacific would be as tenuous as in the days when Bataan fell.

It is difficult to reconcile American realism as exemplified in the Greek war, the Berlin air lift, and in the rearmament of Europe through the North Atlantic Pact with the appeasement represented by the State Department stand in regard to Formosa.

Was there something in the Yalta Pact or some other give-away program which brought the American withdrawal from China and which is continuing to exert its influence in respect to Formosa? Why does American policy seek to contain the aggressor in eastern Europe and pursue a diametrically opposite position in Asia? What baleful influence has the State Department inherited which makes our foreign policy a contradictory mystery? Are we sincere in Europe and insincere in Asia or vice versa?

The viewpoint is advanced that positive American action in Formosa will throw the United States into focus as an aggressor. How can such a ridiculous proposal be advanced by presumably intelligent leaders when the whole world knows that the problem is one of stopping the global aggression of the police concept of government?

Granted that Chiang Kai-shek may be little better than any other war lord; granted that Formosans do not want Chinese overlords—either Nationalist or Communist. Is there anything wrong with the concept of a free Formosa whose integrity is guaranteed by the United States as is that of the Philippines?

Somewhere in the Pacific the United States must become militarily realistic. Is that point to be in the defense of Formosa or in the defense of Honolulu and ultimately San Francisco?

If the problem is one of war or peace, let it come now while military realism still has some chance in the Pacific. If the problem is one of preventing war, why follow one policy in Europe and another in Asia? If the problem is smoking out commitments that have been made in the past and unknown to the American people, let us also find that out.

Formosa is not only a place to stop aggression but also a place to ascertain the consistency of a foreign policy that the American people can know and trust. No less is safe or satisfactory in the air age.

A Political Program for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on October 24, 1949, before the New York Herald Tribune Forum on A Political Program for Democracy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciate your invitation to participate in this stimulating forum, to speak on the very important subject of the political program for our democracy. Tonight I use the term political as a descriptive term for the mechanics of decision making by government.

Professor Rogers has given us a good, succinct statement of the conditions that confront us in America as we attempt political reform. He lists federalism, localism, and seniority as formidable facts of our polity to be reckoned with. I agree. These conditions are obstacles to effective political leadership in this country.

The conduct of public affairs in these crucial days calls for positive direction and responsibility if we are to achieve the promises of the American life at home, and safeguard democracy in the world at large. What we seek, within the framework of our inherited form of government, is a series of arrangements which will at once promote better teamwork between the Congress and the President, avoid dangerous deadlocks, inculcate national rather than provincial loyalties, and give the spirit of youth a larger place in legislative halls.

Ours is a Federal system in constitutional theory, but it is increasingly becoming a national system in actual practice. While we have 48 State legislatures, we have one national economic and industrial system. The trend from State government to National Government has been fortified and accelerated by the Civil War, by the onward sweep of science and technology, by the unifying forces of transportation and communication, and by a long series of Supreme Court decisions. The same evolutionary influences are operating in our political system. There are still lags here and there, particularly in the South, but State bosses and local-party machines are slipping, as in Jersey City, Kansas City, and Virginia while national party organizations gain force and strength. The American people recognize the interdependence of our economy. They sense the necessity for broad national policy. Adequate testimony to this trend of American politics is found in the wide-scale activity of a host of educational, social, and political organizations. This is a healthy trend, and one that is helping to dissolve the traditional sectional divisions and political alignments of the American people.

One of the articles of our political faith has been our belief in the biparty system. We believe that political parties are the principal instruments of democratic government and that the party which wins a majority of the popular vote should have the responsibility and the power to govern the country.

The major party is the only political organization in American life which is in a position to claim that it can measure up to the requirements of modern public policy. It has sought and won a general control of the Government. It alone possesses the kind of political organization required to make government work. It alone may reasonably be held responsible for the general state of public policy. Of all the varieties of political organization, it alone gets a mandate from the people to govern the country. Party government is therefore as right as democracy itself. The American people have long accepted the principle of party responsibility for the conduct of our National Government. We must translate that principle into practice.

But why has the American party system not yet produced that fullness of authority which is necessary to make the Government work without recurring deadlocks and without lag, leak, and friction?

OBSTACLES TO PARTY RESPONSIBILITY

There are several explanations. The Federal structure, our inherited system of separated powers, and the piecemeal practices of American Government create formidable obstacles to effective government. Part of the explanation is to be found in the deep internal divisions within the majority party. Like the Republican Party, the Democratic Party has both conservative and liberal members who wear the same party emblem, but lack a common political philosophy.

Another contributing cause is the influence of special and sectional interests which receive a loyalty that transcends a sense of responsibility to the national interest, as in the tidelands oil controversy. The part is often valued above the whole; the district above the State; the State above the Nation.

Furthermore, legislative procedure, especially in the United States Senate, is such as to give every advantage to the tactics of obstruction by individual Members and minority blocs. The choice of committee chairmen by seniority rather than party regularity, and the unrepresentative character of the congressional committees are also part of the explanation. The fact that Senators and Representatives are responsible to State and local electorates, while the President is responsible to a national electorate, presents a basic difficulty of our system.

I have been a Member of the United States Senate for 10 months—not long enough to become indoctrinated and reconciled to the ancient ways of that body—but long enough to have observed a fundamental obstacle to effective party government in Congress. I refer to the diffusion of party responsibility for legislative action in both houses among a variety of political mechanisms.

I had not long been a Member of the Senate before I made two discoveries: (1) that there are 28 stages in the enactment of a law and at each stage on the legislative highway a few legislators can lurk, like the pirates of Tripoli, and take toll of the passing traffic; and (2) that the power structure of Congress has been so constructed over the passing years that the control of legislative action in both Chambers is scattered and splintered so that effective party leadership is almost impossible to achieve.

Before the so-called congressional "revolution of 1910," control of the House of Representatives was in the party caucus, practically the only organ in Congress for formulating the party will. The Speaker was the only agency for carrying out the party will. The caucus selected the party's candidates for office in the Chamber and formulated and enforced the party's will with respect to legislative action. Decisions reached in caucus were binding upon the entire membership of the party. Caucus decisions of the majority party determined the action of the Congress itself. Thus, the line of party responsibility ran straight from the electorate through the majority caucus to the party leadership in Congress.

This type of party government existed in Congress during the first administration of President Wilson. The success he had during his administration, in having Congress adopt the greater part of his legislative program, has always been considered one of his great achievements. Undoubtedly he deserved credit for the masterly way in which he held together and led the Democratic Party. But the real credit for this achievement is due to the effective way in which the Democratic Party made use of its caucuses in both Houses of Congress. To an extent never equalled before or since, that administration adopted the policy of having all major legislative proposals first considered in caucus, and of binding its members to abide by the action of the caucus. As a result, differences were resolved and a majority vote was assured when they were taken up for consideration.

Contrast that situation with the conditions of today. The caucus has become a conference. Little attempt is made to unite the party membership and hold them responsible to vote for measures designed to carry out platform pledges. The powers formerly concentrated in responsible party leadership are now split up in both chambers and both parties among the committees on committees, the steering or policy committees, the floor leaders, and the party whips.

The function of leadership has been transferred from the Chair to the floor. The power of direction was broken up and diffused among a number of agencies; the appointing power was given to the committee on committees, the strategy function to the steering or policy committee, and the tactical function to the floor leader.

Moreover, the standing committees of Congress exercise large powers over legislation. They have the very important power of determining the whole agenda of the two Houses, by the rule which provides that all bills and resolutions, immediately upon their introduction, shall be referred to the appropriate standing committees for consideration and report. By this rule the House and Senate have declared that they will refrain from the consideration of any bill or resolution until it has been examined by its proper committee and has been reported back to the House or Senate with recommendations for action.

This rule gives great power to the committees because (1) it does not require them to consider or report back bills referred to them; and (2) in practice, only those bills are reported back which the committees favor. Thus, the DP bill and the District of Columbia home-rule bill were pigeonholed in committee for several months, despite party promises to pass them. In short, each committee, acting within its own jurisdiction, is almost sovereign with respect to the determination of the bills that shall come before the two Chambers for action. And their chairmen are immune to party discipline.

The standing committees also play a dominant part in controlling and directing proceedings on the floor when their bills are under consideration. This dominance is partly the result of formal rules and partly that of conventions which have acquired the force of written rules.

The long-standing custom of unlimited and irrelevant debate in the Senate is an additional heavy handicap to effective party leadership and political performance in the upper Chamber.

Thus, the dispersion of political responsibility in Congress, together with its archaic rules and customs, go far in my opinion to explain its repeated difficulties, regardless of which party is in control, in translating the will of the people into public policy. The party leadership is not to blame. Who can lead where others will not follow?

A DEMOCRATIC SOLUTION

There is a growing recognition among political leaders of the need of a more responsible and effective party system in the United States. Various proposals to this end are being advanced. In a forthcoming report a committee of the American Political Science Association crystallizes informed opinion on the means of strengthening party government. Their recommendations impress me as constructive, and worthy of wide consideration.

I have time here only to outline the steps which might well be taken toward the new party system. They are threefold:

First, I believe that we must try to integrate party membership and keep that membership at all levels informed through the discussions of party policy and the development of explicit party programs. Each party should be encouraged to reformulate its platform every 2 years—it might be that national conventions should be held every 2 years—and the platform should be regarded as commitments by all candidates for office and officeholders of the party. This would go far to make our congressional elections, as well as our presidential elections, more meaningful to the American people by providing them with an opportunity effectively to choose on basic issues rather than personalities. American politics should not be a beauty contest or a popularity contest. Policy and issues must be the standards for decisions. Party elections must increasingly become issue elections, otherwise more and more people may lose faith in representative government and become impatient with democratic processes. Despite platform pledges, for three decades now civil-rights bills have been repeatedly defeated in the Senate by various parliamentary strategies.

Second, our political parties must become more responsible to the American people and to their own membership. I believe we must reinvigorate party leadership at the national level by making that leadership more representative of the people. This can be accomplished only as the local and State political organizations more truly represent a broad cross-section of the electorate. This means politics becomes the business of the people, not the special privilege of the professionals. Then, too, party research and education are the political vitamins that insure strength and continuity to a political program. With an educated and informed party membership, party platforms on a national level will increasingly come to represent policy decisions made on the local level. It should be the function of the local party membership to express itself on national issues not only by choosing delegates to national conventions, but by making on a local level decisions on national issues which their representatives are to carry forward to the national convention. Party membership would come to feel that its views and decisions on policy matters have an effect on national party policy decision, and would be an alert and active and responsible membership.

Third, I believe that we must reorganize and modernize the machinery of party responsibility in Congress. This step calls for a number of subsidiary steps, none of which seems to me to be beyond the realm of practical politics, and seem worthy of further consideration and discussion.

1. We should revive and make more extensive use of the caucus as an instrument for the formation and promotion of party policy.

2. A joint congressional policy committee for both Houses of Congress should be created. It should be the function of this joint congressional policy committee to plan legislative strategy and programs, and to be held responsible for the legislative implementation of party policy.

3. The party policy committees should be allocated the function of making standing committee assignments. The party policy committees, or the membership of each committee, might well be allocated the function of selecting the standing committee chairman. Seniority is the most sacred cow in the legislative zoo, but it is not imbedded in the body of the Constitution nor the statutes. It is a custom that can be changed in party caucus.

Twentieth century America is a dynamic society facing complex problems. Our task is to evolve a political mechanism which will utilize the democratic process, place responsibility for action, and maintain an unobstructed connection between the electorate and the elected representatives in Government.

History of Laying of Cornerstone of the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair asks unanimous consent of the Senate to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a history of the laying of the cornerstone of the White House on October 13, 1792, by Lodge No. 9 of Maryland, now known as Potomac Lodge No. 5 of the District of Columbia. This history includes a very interesting article from the Charleston (S. C.) City Gazette, as published in that newspaper on November 15, 1792.

The entire article is exceedingly interesting, and I call the attention of all Senators to it, and hope they will read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAYING OF THE CORNERSTONE OF THE WHITE HOUSE, OCTOBER 13, 1792, BY LODGE NO. 9 OF MARYLAND, NOW KNOWN AS POTOMAC LODGE NO. 5 OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(A report prepared for the lodge by R. Baker Harris, past master)

The Eighty-first Congress created a special Commission, at the recommendation of President Truman, to determine plans for the general renovation and partial reconstruction of the White House. Prior to turning work over to the contractor, the Commission has been making an extensive study of the historic old mansion.

Recently the Commission revealed it is believed the cornerstone has been located at the southwest corner of the original building. Using a new mine detector supplied by Army engineers, and with information that a brass plate was mounted under the cornerstone, the detector was used all around the building. The most distinct response was obtained at the southwest corner, about chest high from the present outside ground level. It was possible to obtain a cross-check on it, the location being at a corner.

Although no definite decision has yet been made, Maj. Gen. Glen H. Edgerton, executive secretary of the Commission, has stated it is entirely possible the cornerstone may be removed, examined, and replaced. Since 1950 is the National Capital's sesquicentennial, such an examination of the stone and its contents, and its relaying, might well take an appropriate place in the year's observances. An examination of the contents of the cornerstone would, of course, reveal additional historical information.

While the Commission feels reasonably certain the White House cornerstone has been located, because of its brass plate, by the mine detector, nevertheless the fact has yet to be confirmed by removing surrounding stonework and by actual examination of the brass plate and cornerstone.

CHARLESTON CITY GAZETTE, NOVEMBER 15, 1792

However, of equal if not greater interest, and certainly of particular importance to Potomac Lodge No. 5, is the Commission's discovery of a newspaper account of the cornerstone laying, published contemporary to the actual occasion. This account appeared in the City Gazette, a newspaper published at Charleston, S. C., in its issue of November 15, 1792.

It is believed that only one copy of this particular issue has survived, and this is located in the Charleston Library Society.

The fact that the only known contemporary newspaper account of the ceremony should have appeared in a newspaper at Charleston is not surprising. James Hoban, who designed both the Capitol and the White House [then referred to as the President's House, and later as the Executive Mansion] was a resident of Charleston at the time he submitted his designs. He was thereafter engaged as the supervising architect during construction.

The full text of the account as it appeared in the City Gazette's issue of November 15, 1792, taken from the original copy, is as follows:

[Extract of a letter from a gentleman in Philadelphia, to his friend in Charleston, dated October 20, 1792]

"On Saturday the 13th instant the first stone was laid in the southwest corner of the President's House, in the city of Washington, by the Free Masons of Georgetown and its vicinity, who assembled on the occasion. The procession was formed at the Fountain Inn, Georgetown, in the following order, viz:

"1. The Free Masons, in masonic order.

"2. The commissioners of the Federal buildings.

"3. Gentlemen of the town and neighborhood.

"4. The different artificers, et cetera.

"They proceeded in procession to the President's Square.' The ceremony was performed by Brother Casenave, master of the lodge, who delivered an oration well adapted to the occasion. Under the stone was laid a plate of polished brass, with the following inscription:

"'This first stone of the President's House was laid the 13th day of October 1792, and in the seventeenth year of the independence of the United States of America.

"'GEORGE WASHINGTON, *President*.
"'THOMAS JOHNSON,
"'DOCTOR STEWART,
"'DANIEL CARROLL,
"'Commissioners.
"'JAMES HOBAN, *Architect.*
"'COLLEN WILLIAMSON,
"'Master Mason.
"'Vivat Republica.'

"After the ceremony was performed they returned in regular order, to Mr. Sutter's Fountain Inn, where an elegant dinner was provided, and the following toasts given in honor of the day:

"1. The 15 United States.

"2. The President of the United States.

"3. Our worthy brothers.

"4. District of Columbia: May it flourish as the center of the political and commercial interests of America.

"5. The city of Washington: May time render it worthy of the name it bears.

"7. The French Nation: A happy issue to their struggles for liberty and justice.

"8. Marquis de la Fayette.

"9. The Masonic brethren throughout the universe.

"10. The Rights of Man and the author of Common Sense.

"11. The fair daughters of America.

"12. The memory of those who have bled in the cause of liberty.

"13. General Wayne and the western army: May their efforts be crowned by a speedy and honorable peace.

"14. The Governor of the State of Maryland.

"15. The Governor of the State of Virginia.

"16. May peace, liberty, and order extend from pole to pole.

"The whole concluded with the greatest harmony and order."

THE MASONS OF GEORGETOWN

In the year 1792 there was only one regularly chartered lodge in the area now comprising the District of Columbia. This was Lodge No. 9 in Georgetown, then a separate and distinct community older than the newly established city of Washington. Lodge No. 9 had been chartered by the Grand Lodge of Maryland, meeting at Easton, Talbot County, Md., on April 21, 1789. On that date there was no President of the United States, no city of Washington, no District of Columbia, and the Congress of the United States had met for its first session, in New York, only the month before. But General George Washington was even then on his way to New York to be inaugurated first President of the United States. Lodge No. 9 had its birth in an historic month and time.

The earliest minute-books of the Georgetown lodge which have survived (now in possession of its lineal descendant, Potomac Lodge No. 5 of the District of Columbia) are those for the year 1795.

BROTHER CASENEVE, MASTER OF THE LODGE

It has long been known, from early Grand Lodge of Maryland records, that Peter Casanave was master of Lodge No. 9 in the year 1792. There has also survived an original document, issued by Lodge No. 9, a dispensation (for brethren to meet at Port Tobacco), dated June 25, 1792, which bears the signature P. Casanave, master.

He was a young man, probably in his middle twenties, in 1792. A copy of his will, signed Peter Casanave, dated April 14, 1856, and probated March 31, 1860, is in the archives of Potomac lodge.

In passing, it is interesting to note that the first master of Lodge No. 9, Charles Fierer, was not yet 30 when he presided over the lodge. He was a young Hessian officer, taken prisoner the night General Washington crossed the Delaware at Trenton. On parole at Dumfries, Va., he became attached to the American cause and served notably as an officer in the American forces throughout the remainder of the war. He edited the first newspaper in Georgetown, the Times, and Patowmack Packet.

MR. SUTER'S FOUNTAIN INN

John Suter was keeper of the famous inn (also known as Suter's Tavern) in Georgetown, where George Washington stayed on March 29, 1791, and the next day met Commissioners Charles L'Enfant and Andrew Elliott to sign agreements for acquiring the territory comprising the Federal District. (See A Manual on the Origin and Development of Washington, by H. Paul Caemmerer, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1939, pp. 19–20.)

From Charles Fierer's newspaper it is known meetings were sometimes held by Lodge No. 9 at Suter's Tavern, and that the brethren also met there to celebrate St. Johns' days.

Lodge No. 9 ceased to work in 1794. A number of its members had gone to the new lodge at Port Tobacco. It must be remembered that the total membership of the lodge in the seventeen nineties was never more than 15 Master Masons, so that the loss of even a few members could be a crippling handicap in those days.

John Suter was one of those who petitioned for the lodge to be reconstituted in 1795. The lodge was reconstituted as Lodge No. 19 of Maryland, and the minute-books for 1795 and 1796 show Brother Suter to have been present at nearly every meeting, holding office, and taking an active part in lodge labors.

JAMES HOBAN, ARCHITECT

James Hoban, a native of Ireland, and, like Peter Casanave, a devout Romanist and Freemason, was engaged to supervise the construction of the Capitol building and the President's house both of which he had designed.

In the year following the laying of the White House corner stone, 1793, James Hoban became first worshipful master of the first regularly chartered lodge in the new city of Washington, Lodge No. 15 of Maryland now Federal Lodge No. 1 of the District of Columbia. As of December 20, 1794, he was recorded as treasurer of the lodge, and he was closely identified with the first activities of Royal Arch Masonry in the city of Washington.

"THE CEREMONY WAS PERFORMED * * *"

Old guide books to the city of Washington had stated, without citing the source, that the White House cornerstone was laid October 13, 1792. The date is now confirmed by the Charleston newspaper account.

Kenton S. Harper in his History of the Grand Lodge and of Freemasonry in the District of Columbia, 1911, page 16 said:

"In the absence, however, of any evidence to the contrary, and taking into consideration the known fact that the leading men in the government and in the corps of architects and builders at that time were Master Masons, it is a reasonably fair assumption that the ceremony (laying the White House cornerstone) was Masonic, and while this is not historic it is given as an historic probability."

In 1792 there were only two lodges in the entire nearby area which might have conducted such a ceremony: Lodge No. 9 in Georgetown, which was the nearest, or Alexandria Lodge No. 22 (now Alexandria Washington Lodge No. 22) across the river in Virginia. The Alexandria lodge minutes for that time showed no mention of the lodge participating in such a ceremony. The Lodge No. 9 minutes for 1792 were missing. The Charleston newspaper account now establishes that it was Lodge No. 9 which conducted this ceremony.

From the newspaper account it is apparent that this was not merely an informal occasion at which Masons were present. Any Mason will recognize immediately the significance of these phrases: "The first stone was laid * * * by the Free Masons of Georgetown. * * * The procession was formed. * * * The Free Masons in Masonic order * * * The ceremony was performed by brother Casaneva, master of the lodge. * * * After the ceremony was performed they returned, in regular order." The cornerstone was laid according to Masonic ceremony, in the tradition of the craft.

POTOMAC LODGE NO. 5

The foregoing is a notable new chapter to the history of Potomac Lodge, the lineal descendant of Lodge No. 9 of Maryland.

The valiant efforts of John Suter and others to continue an active lodge in Georgetown, when Lodge No. 9 was reconstituted as Lodge No. 19 in 1795, succeeded only through 1796. Early in 1797 the lodge again ceased to work. Lodge No. 19, beginning with 12 charter members, had held 22 meetings, received 7 petitions, raised 4, and lost 1 by death.

Remember again: That Georgetown in 1797 was a small community, entirely separate from the city of Washington; that the lodge's highest membership at any time was 15 members; that the loss of even several of these, or their temporary absence on business or travel, could make it impossible for the lodge to work.

Georgetown, for the next 9 years, remained in Masonic darkness. No other lodge was chartered in Georgetown during that time. No other lodge conferred degrees, assumed charge, or did any Masonic work in Georgetown.

During these intervening 9 years, the newly established capital city drew thousands of people to the area. Many settled in Georgetown, and by 1806 its population had grown phenomenally to more than 4,000 persons.

Early in 1806, Valentine Reintzel, who in 1793 had been worshipful master of Lodge No. 9, together with nine other brethren, most of whom had been members either of Lodge No. 9 or of Lodge No. 19, or both, petitioned to reestablish their lodge in Georgetown. These were not new Masons attempting to form a new lodge, but former members of the earlier Georgetown lodges who were petitioning to reestablish their lodge. The grand lodge of Maryland granted the petition on November 11, 1806, and designated the lodge as Potomac Lodge No. 43 of Maryland. This lodge has had continuous life, without interruption even during the anti-Masonic period, to the present time.

In 1811, the Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia was established. Potomac Lodge No. 43 was one of the lodges participating in the formation of the new Grand Lodge. As is customary, the lodges acquired new numbers based on the dates of the Maryland charters under which each was then working. By its Maryland charter of November 11, 1806, Potomac Lodge No. 43 became Potomac Lodge No. 5 of the District of Columbia.

Valentine Reintzel was elected the first grand master of Masons of the District of Columbia. Past masters of Potomac Lodge who have held the office of grand master are: Valentine Reintzel, 1811; Daniel Kurtz, 1819; John Mason, Jr., 1842; Thomas F. Chiffelle, 1866; Malcolm Sexton, 1902; Lemuel Towers, Jr., 1918.

THE CHARTER OF LODGE NO. 9

On the evening of April 21, 1989, Grand Master John H. Hesse, of Maryland, accompanied by officers of that grand lodge, visited Potomac Lodge No. 5 to participate in the sesquicentennial program. On this occasion, the grand master of Maryland, declaring that Potomac Lodge No. 5 had originally been chartered as Lodge No. 9 of Maryland, permanently returned to the lodge the original charter dated April 21, 1789. (See Proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Maryland, 1939, p. 31.)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To President Harry S. Truman, past grand master of Missouri, for his kind personal letter giving assurance that all information possible concerning the White House cornerstone would be furnished to Potomac Lodge for its archives.

To Miss Virginia Rugheimer, librarian, Charleston Library Society, Charleston, S. C., for giving permission to have a photostat reproduction made for us of the November 15, 1792, issue of the Charleston City Gazette.

To the Washington Post which, so far as we know, was the first newspaper to publish the complete story on the Commission's findings regarding the White House cornerstone, in a carefully written and authentic article by Post reporter, Chalmers M. Roberts.

At a stated communication of Potomac Lodge No. 5, November 21, 1949, on motion, ordered to be prepared and printed.

ANDREW D. PRICE, *Master.*

Attest:

RICHARD F. WADDEY, *Secretary.*

WASHINGTON HATCH

First used by President George Washington September 18, 1793, to lay the cornerstone of the United States Capitol. Valentine Reintzel, then worshipful master of lodge No. 9, of Maryland, participated with the lodge in that historic ceremony.

The famous gavel has since been loaned by Potomac Lodge for use by each of the following Presidents of the United States: James K. Polk, in 1847; Millard Fillmore, in 1851; James Buchanan, in 1860; William McKinley, in 1899; Theodore Roosevelt, in 1902, 1906, 1907; William H. Taft, in 1913; Warren G. Harding, in 1921; Herbert Hoover, in 1929; Harry S. Truman, in 1948.

Program for Strengthening Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which I recently received signed by Robert Heller, chairman of the National Committee for Strengthening Congress. I am happy to bring this letter to the attention of the Members of the Senate because of the very important contribution it makes to the whole problem of legislative reorganization. The Heller Committee made a significant contribution in its 1945 report, and I believe its present activities follow in that tradition. I am particularly interested in its report because, as Mr. Heller's letter indicates, it coincides with much of my own thinking on this subject. I plan, in fact, to introduce a joint resolution in the Senate very shortly to create a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR STRENGTHENING CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., December 27, 1949.

MY DEAR SIR: With the opening of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, we are writing, as we did last year, to present our observations and recommendations, for whatever they may be worth, to you who have on your shoulders the greatest legislative responsibility in the world.

The strengths and weaknesses of the internal organization and operation of our Congress were revealed with striking clarity in the session which adjourned on October 19.

Strength and improvement were seen as follows:

1. The maintenance and effective functioning of the committee structure as reorganized in 1946–47, including the marked decline in the use of special committees and subcommittees in the lower House.

2. The growing use of joint committees and joint action in the performance by Congress of its supervisory functions. Joint hearings between House and Senate committees and between committees of each House were helpful.

3. The expansion of the legislative reference and bill drafting services, the gradual transition to a professional status of committee staffs, and the increases in compensation for the legislative staffs.

4. The growing emphasis upon the congressional function of overseeing the operations of the Government, especially by the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

5. The gradual increase of registrations under the lobby law and the creation of a select House committee to modernize and improve operation of that law.

6. Adoption by the House of Representatives of the new 21-day rule to provide a procedure whereby blockades in its Rules Committee can be broken.

7. Passage by the House of all the general appropriation bills in record time by April 14.

8. Agreement in both Houses to include all general appropriation bills in one consolidated bill, beginning in 1950.

9. The submission by the Comptroller General of the report called for by section 205 of the Legislative Reorganization Act dealing with antiquated and obsolete restrictions on the expenditure of appropriated funds.

On the other hand, weakness and continued procedural defects were seen, as follows:

1. The failure of Congress to adopt a legislative budget on the ground that the procedure was unworkable.

2. The unprecedented delay in the passage by the Senate of some of the general supply bills, causing the worst log jam in congressional history and requiring the passage of six continuing appropriation resolutions to keep the Government going.

3. The continuance of a heavy work load of private claims and immigration bills, although this burden was somewhat reduced by the partial ban on the introduction of private bills imposed in 1946.

4. Certain defects in committee procedure, including the failure of the House Committee on Appropriations to hold open hearings.

5. The turn-over of one-third of the professional committee staffs in both Houses

with the change in party control at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress. Some of those released, however, were not fully qualified and some were patronage appointees of the Eightieth Congress.

6. The prolongation of the session for 11 weeks beyond the July 31 termination date set by the Reorganization Act, due largely to a 3-week filibuster in the Senate last March, large-scale time-consuming irrelevancy in Senate debate, extensive absenteeism in the upper Chamber, and deliberate slow-down of the legislative process in that body.

7. Amendment of the Senate cloture rule on March 17 which plugged some of the loopholes in the old rule, but also made it more difficult to limit debate hereafter by increasing the voting requirements, and which perpetuated the possibility of filibusters on future changes in the rules.

8. The marked increase of absenteeism in the Senate, affecting the pace of the legislative process, the fate of legislation, and public opinion of the upper Chamber.

9. The partial break-down of party government in the Senate, owing to a variety of political factors and social forces.

10. The continuation of antiquated, obsolescent, and duplicating organization and methods to administer the underlying housekeeping services of the Congress.

NEXT STEPS TOWARD STRENGTHENING CONGRESS

The first session of the Eighty-first Congress pointed up five main improvements upon which attention might well be focused. These are:

1. Creation of machinery for continuing improvement.
2. Better control of expenditures.
3. Modernized procedure in the Senate.
4. Increased party responsibility.
5. Reduction of work load.

PROVISION FOR CONTINUING IMPROVEMENT BY CREATION OF A JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

We recommend the establishment of a joint standing committee on the organization of Congress. The work of the La Follette-Monroney committee, and the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which it fathered, went far to strengthen internal organization and operation. But the experience of the last 3 years, and especially of the past session, indicates that strengthening this Congress should be a continuous process and that much remains to be done to increase its efficiency. In controlling public expenditures, in performing the overseer function, in the staffing of Congress, in committee and floor procedures, in the regulation of lobbying, and in the lightening of the work load, there is much room for improvement.

In these as well as other respects, the reorganization of Congress to keep it abreast of the requirements of the time in an atomic age is a continuing problem which demands continuous attention. The executive branch of the Government is in process of reorganization after the disruptive influences of the late war. As a coordinate branch of the Government, Congress should also be organized and equipped to perform its vital functions effectively.

The joint committee should not be barred, we believe, from studying and making recommendations with regard to the rules and parliamentary procedures of either House. Such a prohibition was imposed upon the La Follette-Monroney committee, which was thus not at liberty to suggest any changes in floor procedure.

The appalling delays of the past session and the unprecedented log jam of appropriation bills have convinced us that the time has come for a reconsideration of the standing rules of the Senate, which have not been revised since 1934.

Preoccupied with a thousand tasks, Congress is not likely to make much headway in improving its internal organization and operation unless the continuing duty of making studies and reporting appropriate legislation is definitely assigned to one of its own committees. Everybody's business is nobody's business. We strongly recommend, therefore, that a joint committee with legislative authority be set up for this purpose early in the Eighty-second Congress.

Congress has within its own membership the wisdom and capacity, and should provide the organizational means, for continuously strengthening itself to meet its overwhelming present-day responsibilities.

BETTER CONTROL OF EXPENDITURES

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 provided, in section 138, that a Joint Budget Committee, or subcommittee thereof, should report to Congress by February 15 each year a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. The act also provided that the report should be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year.

The first attempt to apply the legislative budget provisions of the act failed in 1947. Although the Joint Budget Committee brought in its budget resolution, which was adopted by the House, and by the Senate with amendments, it became deadlocked in conference and died there. The conferees were unable to agree upon the division of an expected surplus between tax reduction and debt retirement.

In 1948 the Joint Budget Committee submitted its report on February 9, and the concurrent resolution passed both Houses. Thus, Congress complied with the law on its second application, but it was merely a formal gesture, for total appropriations that year exceeded the budget ceiling by more than $6,000,000,000.

This year—1949—both Houses agreed to postpone the date for reporting the legislative budget from February 15 to May 1. But the May 1 deadline came and went without further action.

While congressional fiscal policy leaders regard the legislative budget idea as laudable, in practice they say it has proved unworkable because: (1) the time allowed for preparation of the legislative budget—3 weeks—is too short; (2) the Joint Budget Committee is not adequately staffed to do the job; (3) unpredictable expenditure demands in the form of supplementary and deficiency bills render it impossible to keep total appropriations below the ceiling agreed upon early in the session; and (4) the piecemeal nature of the appropriation process. Thus, during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, 17 separate appropriation bills were passed and became law.

The failure to give the legislative budget a reasonable trial is most unfortunate. It can be made to work in either of two ways:

1. Establish a Joint Budget Committee, reduced in size to about 20 members, to meet early in the session; examine the Treasury's revenue estimates and the President's expenditure estimates; and upon the basis of such a comparative view of over-all fiscal prospects, without undertaking a detailed scrutiny of individual items, to report to Congress by February 15 a concurrent resolution recommending such an increase or decrease in total appropriations or revenues for the next fiscal year as will produce either (1) a balanced budget of a Treasury surplus or (2) require an increase in the public debt, as the joint committee's total over-all view of the Federal fiscal picture seems to justify.

Congress would thus have before it a coordinated view of estimated income and outgo for the coming fiscal year, together with the recommendations of its Joint Budget Committee. A high-level debate would then ensue in both Houses on the general fiscal policy of the Government, and Congress would decide early in the session the basic question: (1) Whether to balance the budget by reducing expenditures or raising revenues, or to have a surplus for debt reduction, or (2) whether to incur further indebtedness.

Such action would be subject to a roll call vote in both Houses. This general decision would thereafter guide the revenue and spendings committees in their detailed deliberations, operating under predetermined ceilings on expenditures and revenues.

Under this conception of the legislative budget, the difficulties of the past 3 years would be obviated. It contemplates arriving at broad decisions, expressed in aggregate figures, rather than framing a detailed itemized budget comparable to the Executive budget. So conceived, the time allowed would be ample, if a proper staff of experts had given careful study to all details; an amount could be reserved for deficiencies based upon past experience; and the consolidated bill procedure would facilitate compliance with the general fiscal prescription.

The Appropriations Committee would retain control of the distribution of the grants as between and within the several supply bills. But they would have to keep the grand total of proposed expenditures, combined in one bill, within the budget ceiling set by Congress in the legislative budget.

2. Provide for a consolidated general appropriation bill and for its submission, on or about April 15, by the House Committee on Appropriations to the Joint Budget Committee which would review it in the light of the latest revenue estimates. On or about May 1 the Joint Budget Committee would report the consolidated appropriation bill to the Congress accompanied by a concurrent resolution recommending such increases or decreases in total appropriations or revenues for the next fiscal year, and/or such an increase or decrease in the public debt, as it thought wise.

Congress would then have before it the recommendations of the Appropriations and Budget Committees. After a major debate on over-all fiscal policy, the Congress would decide whether or not to accept the consolidated appropriation bill, as introduced, or to recommit it for appropriate pruning or enlargement.

If the task of preparing the legislative budget were assigned to the majority policy committee of the two Houses, acting jointly, and if these policy committees were composed of the chairmen of the standing committees, as recommended in Strengthening the Congress—the Heller report of December 1944, Congress would then have gone all the way in establishing a center of responsibility for the determination of legislative policy in all fields, fiscal and otherwise. The majority party leadership would thus be formally responsible to the people for the formulation and adoption of the legislative budget. In this case, a joint budget committee would not be necessary. This plan would presuppose the selection of standing committee chairmen on some basis other than seniority.

In addition to the enforcement of the legislative budget, we also recommend that Congress strengthen its control of fiscal policy by:

1. Expanding the staffs of its Committees on Appropriations by the appointment of expert accountants, statisticians, et cetera, on a full-time basis. Though highly competent, the existing staffs of these committees are too small to make a really intensive scrutiny of the departmental estimates. The staff of the House Appropriations Committee numbers only 12. This is a work load of more than 3,500,000,000 per staff member.

What was gained in time by the speedy reporting and passage of the supply bills in the lower House during the past session was lost in the lack of thorough review of the requests for funds. Economy can be gained only by extensive knowledge of every request for funds and the actual need for them.

2. Amending its rules to provide that a point of order can be made against the omnibus appropriation bill if the Joint Budget Committee has not yet reported its concurrent resolution recommending a ceiling on expenditures.

3. Careful inspection of the reports of unnecessary expenditures of Government agencies and corporations which the Comptroller General submits from time to time to the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

4. Requiring the House Committee on Appropriations to comply with section 133 (f) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, which provides that "all hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public."

MODERNIZED PROCEDURE IN THE SENATE

The past session dramatized in unmistakable fashion certain long-standing defects in the legislative methods of the Senate. Senator ESTES KEFAUVER described these procedural defects in a cogent article What's To Be Done About Congress? which appeared in the New York Times Magazine on September 11. We refer to the continued tolerance by the Senate of unlimited and irrelevant debate, and the marked decline in the attendance of Senators in the Chamber. These practices, as the RECORD shows, exasperate the Members themselves.

As regards the limitation of Senate debate, we agree with Senator MYERS that the change in the cloture rule adopted last March, after a bitter 3-week filibuster, was a retrogressive step.

Certainly the old 1917 cloture rule had proved ineffectual in practice, having been successfully applied only four times in 32 years. The new rule makes it possible to stop a filibuster on the approval of the Senate Journal and on motions to take up bills. But by requiring the approval of 64 Senators to close debate, compared with two-thirds of those present under the old rule (which might be as few as 33), the new procedure so stiffens the voting requirements that we anticipate that it will be harder hereafter—rather than easier—to limit debate when it is designed not to instruct or persuade, but to prevent action.

Under these circumstances, we urge the Senate to reconsider its decision of last March and to liberalize its rules to enable a majority of its Members, or of those present, to limit debate on any motion, measure, or other pending matter after there has been an adequate opportunity to debate it fully.

The protracted delays of the past session were also due, in large part, to irrelevancy in debate, which we feel is a luxury that a busy Senate can no longer afford. We believe that there is growing sentiment in the Senate in favor of amending its rules to require debate to be germane to the pending business. The House of Representatives has had a rule of relevancy since 1789. We urge the Senate to adopt such a rule at its next session.

In regard to absenteeism, Vice President BARKLEY has said that it is growing worse each year. Hardly a day passes when the Senate is in session that several Senators do not ask for and obtain leaves of absence for periods of time ranging from a few hours to several weeks. More than 250 leaves of absence were granted Senators during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Such large-scale absenteeism is bound to affect the fate of legislation and to slow down the legislative process. We urge the Senate to be less lenient in permitting absences, to consider seriously Senator TAFT's suggestion for staggering Senate sessions and committee meetings on alternate days, and to enforce the law which provides that a Member's pay shall be docked every day he is absent without leave except on account of illness.

Underlying the procedural defects which handicap the Senate in the efficient performance of its constitutional functions is a code of rules which has not been revised since 1934. There has been no general revision of the 1884 rules and only two important modifications have been made: First in 1917 when the cloture rule was adopted, and second in 1949 when this rule was retrogressively amended.

These rules may have been adequate for the parliamentary needs of the Senate in the leisurely days of the nineteenth century. But the need of a new, up-to-date codification to bring order and clarity into the patchwork of 65 years has long been evident and often expressed by twentieth-century Senators.

INCREASED PARTY RESPONSIBILITY

In our 1945 report, Strengthening the Congress, I said that "the attainment of a high degree of party responsibility and accountability * * * will aid strongly in a renewed effort to accomplish in fact as well as in form a government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

In the same report I went on to say that "there should be a focal point within Congress where the people could fix responsibility for Congress' action and inactions. * * * Expansion of party accountability is the most practical method of bringing responsibility to a focus."

I recommended in my report that "each House should establish a majority policy committee, composed of the chairman of each major standing committee and chairmaned by the majority leader, and a minority policy committee composed of ranking minority members."

This recommendation was endorsed in principle by the La Follette-Monroney committee in 1946, and majority and minority policy committees, partially constituted (the majority policy committee did not and does not include the chairmen of all standing committees), were created in the Senate in 1947. The House of Representatives did not follow suit. Experience with these senatorial policy committees in the Eightieth Congress was reasonably successful.

The partial break-down of party government, which occurred in the Senate during the last session, was primarily due not to procedural defects but to deep cleavages within the majority party on certain fundamental issues. So long as this condition exists, it will be difficult to achieve effective party government in Congress. But some progress in this desirable direction can be made, we believe, by further strengthening the machinery for it. Similar recommendations were made by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, in an address before the New York Herald Tribune Forum on October 24. We suggest the following steps:

1. Revival and more extensive use of the caucus as an instrument for the formation and promotion of party policy. Both parties have used this device effectively in both Houses in times past. It is the only known means by which the parties may formulate their legislative policies and by which the majority party can bind its members and enforce its decisions.

Objection may be made that, if recalcitrant party members and chairmen are disciplined for not following the party line on a particular important issue, they cannot be relied upon to support the party program in other respects. The answer to this is:

(a) Their support is probably lost anyway on the fundamental matters, and

(b) Chairmen who cannot meet the test of party regularity should be deprived of their chairmanships.

2. Election of party policy committees every 2 years by party caucus without regard to seniority and collaboration between the majority policy committees in both Chambers in planning legislative strategy and program and implementing party policy.

3. Allocation of the function of making standing committee assignments and of selecting committee chairmen to these party policy committees, the chairmen to be chosen not on seniority but upon the basis of ability and willingness to cooperate in carrying out the party program as an arm of the majority administration.

4. Reconsideration of the committee assignments at certain intervals, say every 2 years, to allow the shifting of uncooperative members.

REDUCTION OF WORK LOAD

We call attention again to the need of reducing the work load on our national legislature. In the Heller report 5 years ago, I pointed out that "the congressional work load should be reduced or reallocated. * * * In large part, the burdensomeness of the congressional work load can be alleviated by Congress itself. * * * Unless some action is taken by Congress," I said, "it will remain overburdened and hence unnecessarily handicapped in its more important functions. * * * Members of Congress should not spend one working minute on anything that somebody else can do just as well."

To this end, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 imposed a partial ban upon the introduction of four categories of private bills. As a result, private bills introduced fell from 32 to 21 percent of the total from the Seventy-ninth to the Eightieth Congresses, and private bills passed dropped from 55 to 34 percent of the total in the same period.

So many loopholes were left in the ban on private bills, however, that Congress is still bedevilled by floods of private claims, immigration, and deportation bills which it cannot possibly handle on their merits. Forty-four percent of all the bills passed by the first session of the Eighty-first Congress were private bills.

The Reorganization Act also proposed home rule for the District of Columbia. But Congress still sits once every 2 weeks as the city council of Washington, a burden it ought not to bear.

With the present pressure upon Congress to decide momentous international issues and to act as a board of directors for our vast Federal machine, we believe that it should divest itself of its petty private and local business. We urge, therefore, that Congress complete the evolution so well begun in 1946 and eliminate all private and local legislation from its congested calendars.

We respectfully urge the second session of the Eighty-first Congress to consider the above recommendations seriously and to act upon them promptly. By creating a joint committee to study further improvement in its internal organization, by strengthening its power over the purse, by modernizing Senate procedure, by implementing party responsibility, and by reducing its work load, our National Legislature will go far to improve its efficiency and to justify popular confidence in representative government.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT HELLER, *Chairman.*

Address by Paul G. Hoffman Before Association of American Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and illuminating address delivered by Paul G. Hoffman, Economic Cooperation Administrator, before the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges, in Cincinnati, Ohio, on January 10, 1950. I commend the article to every Senator who is interested in the Marshall plan.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I feel sure that I have at least one thing in common with most college presidents. To me, and I think to you, a billion dollars looks like a lot of money. In my opinion, that is the way a billion dollars ought to look. It is a lot of money. It is so much money that some people are inclined to doubt whether anything which costs that much can possibly be worth it.

As you can imagine, I meet up with that kind of doubt about the Economic Cooperation Administration. Through the ECA, the United States is already committed for the expenditure of not one but ten billion dollars. To finish the job may cost us five billion more. It is no wonder that thoughtful taxpaying Americans want to know whether, at such a cost, the job is worth finishing. That's the question I want to try to answer tonight. I want to answer it first of all, because it is our money—yours and mine—that is being spent. I want to answer it also because of my conviction, a conviction that is rooted in the facts about the world we live in, that it is our future and nothing less than that that is involved in spending it.

Everyone of us has a vital stake in knowing just what the Economic Cooperation Administration is, just what it is up against, and exactly what in America's behalf it is achieving. We have a dollars-and-cents stake in knowing that. And we also have a stake which cannot be reckoned in dollars, even in billions of dollars.

The basis for the answers to those questions can be found in the fact that the ECA today is not only what it started out to be, it is much more than that. It is true that through ECA America's dollars are being used for foreign aid; but it is not true—in fact, it is dangerously untrue—to describe ECA any longer merely as foreign aid or to regard it any longer as merely a foreign-aid program. The truth is that ECA has become a first line of defense for western civilization. It is a first line of defense not only for America's freedoms, for America's free institutions, but for freedoms and free institutions everywhere. It is a first line of defense against those who ceaselessly aim and plot and threaten to destroy democracy. To regard ECA as any less than that is to reveal a perilous lack of knowledge about the menacing facts of our world. It is to reveal a perilous lack of understanding of what is required of us if we are to defend our freedom so that children of free men can live in that world in peace.

Now, it is neither by chance nor by design that ECA has become a first line of democracy's defense. It has become that under the pressure of dire events. We did not bring those events to pass, but America can no more escape their consequences than America could escape the consequences of Pearl Harbor.

The first broad principles which led to ECA were laid down by General Marshall, then Secretary of State, in his historic speech at Harvard University on June 5, 1947. In that speech General Marshall called upon the nations of Europe to join in a vast, cooperative effort to repair their shattered economic health as the only means whereby political stability could be restored, progress resumed, and freedom once more set firmly on its feet. For our part in that undertaking General Marshall declared that the Government of the United States stood ready to "do whatever it is able to do to assist." There were no ideological strings attached to that offer. It was an offer made in good faith. It was backed by good will. Its sole objective was a more prosperous world in which peace and freedom would be more secure. And when that offer was made we believe—or at least we hoped—that that was an objective which every government shared and that that was a task in which every government would be not merely willing but eager to join.

The nations of Europe quickly accepted our challenge. In Paris, hardly a week after General Marshall's speech, the representatives of most European nations—east and west—met to accept our offer and begin to turn that challenge into practical fact. That meeting was attended by the representative of the Soviet Union in the person of Mr. Molotov, its Foreign Minister. It looked for the moment as though, on this technical and desperately urgent level of economic recovery, something close to joint cooperative action for the common good was about to be achieved. For 3 days Molotov attended that Paris meeting, and for those 3 days the hopes of freedom-loving, peace-seeking nations ran high. Then on the third day Molotov, with his entourage of satellites in tow, walked out of the meeting and enplaned for MOSCOW.

That departure, as we now know, was not merely another uncouth Communist gesture. We know now, as Walter Lippmann so trenchantly said, that it was a declaration of a "cold war." It was a declaration of war by world communism against recovery in the free world. And the issues brought into conflict by that declaration were no less momentous for us because the tactics employed were those of a cold war rather than a hot war.

Make no mistake about it. When the leaders of the Soviet Union and of world communism declared war on recovery in western Europe they knew coldly and precisely what they were doing. Their aim to make the whole world Communist is no secret aim; it is written down for anyone to read; it has never been denied; it is continually being reaffirmed. And these men, being realists, know the conditions which are essential to that Communist success. They know that free and prosperous peoples do not choose voluntarily to pass under the Communist yoke; no free and prosperous people ever have. The conditions essential to Communist conquest are hunger, and misery, and hopelessness. The more hunger and misery and hopelessness, the more likelihood of Communist success. Mr. Molotov, when he enplaned for Moscow, and all of Mr. Molotov's colleagues, know perfectly well that if the Marshall plan were to succeed then the Communist program of world conquest would be placed in great jeopardy. At the time of that Paris conference in mid-1947 Mr. Molotov had good reason to believe that recovery could be halted.

Europe's productive machine, shattered in the war, was no more than patched up and pieced together. Industrial production was lagging, and owing partly to bad weather, a crop failure was in prospect. Too many people were hungry and there was far too much unrest and despair. Throughout much of western Europe, a powerful, highly trained, highly disciplined Communist Party was already mobilized and prepared at a signal from Moscow to use every weapon in the Communist arsenal to intensify Europe's hunger and unrest and despair in order that those evils could be turned to more evil account.

On his return to Moscow, Mr. Molotov gave the signal and the cold war was on. Ever since and unceasingly the Communists have used sabotage. They have used riots. They have used Moscow-directed strikes. They have flooded Europe with vicious, lying, poisonous propaganda. And back of all this they have spread terror with the dark threat of a march by the Red Army.

That is the world in which the Economic Cooperation Administration was called on to operate. That is the breach in which America was called to stand. That is what the ECA has been up against. That is the cold war in which the ECA has been a first line of defense. Now we need to know in what manner and with what success that defense has been conducted and that line held.

The weapons we have used in the cold war have been very different from the weapons of the Communists. As vastly different as our faith and our objectives are different from theirs.

Our faith is in man as an individual. Our objective is that kind of society in which men as individuals can live in decency and dignity, a society in which free inquiry and free institutions, such as our colleges and universities can flourish. Only weapons suitable to such objectives could be used by ECA.

We knew, of course, that only the people of Europe could save Europe. We could help, but our role was that of helping them to help themselves. We have fought hunger with food; we have helped increase production in both plants and on farms by providing materials and tools; we have fought against lying propaganda with the truth and nothing but the truth. Such have been the weapons we have used to restore confidence, to revive hope, and to help the people of Europe lift themselves by their own efforts and their growing strength beyond the reach of either the lure or the threats of communism.

And with what success has this unique campaign met? Perhaps my best answer is a quote from Anne O'Hare McCormick:

"Anyone who compares the picture today with that of 1947 can hardly believe that such progress could be made in 2 years. A miracle of recovery has been performed. To look back and see where Europe was when the war ended and where it would be now without American support, is to understand what the European recovery program has done for its beneficiaries—and for the United States."

To Mrs. McCormick's appraisal, may I add my own? Due to—and I repeat myself deliberately—the very great efforts of the Europeans themselves, the Communists are losing their battle to perpetuate hunger and misery and hopelessness in country after country, Communist-engineered riots have flopped; Communist-engineered strikes have miserably failed; and Communist propaganda and hate and lying have begun to backfire. Europe is recovering. Today, on an average, agricultural and industrial production is again up to the level of 1938. In fact, during 1949, levels of European industrial production reached an all-time peak. Today there are jobs and the people of these countries are working at them. There are tools of production and the people are using them productively. There are more things to buy and more of the means to buy them with. And as a result, the most powerful forces at work today are courage and self-confidence and hope.

This should be remembered: Every step that Europe takes toward recovery is, as the Communists knew it would be, a step away from communism and toward the strengthening of freedom and the establishment of a just and lasting peace. Events are proving that the Communists' fears as to the effects of recovery on their plans were well founded. Indeed, in these 2 years there have been many elections in these western European nations. The Communists, just when they thought they were on the threshold of their greatest gains have lost every one of those elections. More than that, in every one of them the

Communist vote has been dramatically reduced".

But we must not exaggerate the extent of our gains. The Communists who are realists know full well the significance of this fight for recovery that is going on in Europe. They know that as of the present that fight is being won by the free nations. But they know also, and you and I as Americans must face this fact, that the cold war, even in Europe, is not yet won. Freedom is being strengthened, but freedom is not yet secure. There is a better chance for peace, but we cannot yet be sure of it.

The Communists know that Europe is still faced with the stupendous problem of earning more dollars than she is now earning if she is to have the dollars she needs to buy the goods and services she can obtain only in the Western Hemisphere. They know that as long as the western European economy remains compartmentalized recovery will be uncertain and the prospects dim for building in western Europe that more dynamic expanding economy which alone can bring a steady improvement in the conditions of life for all its people. They know that Europe's economy grew to greatness when its trade was free and competitive. They know that if it is ever to achieve that greatness again compartmentalization must give way to integration and that the chokeweeds of high tariffs, cartels, and import, and exchange controls must be swept aside.

The men of the Kremlin know that if the Marshall plan should be stopped midway, or that if appropriations were reduced too drastically, progress both toward building up dollar earnings and toward the more enduring task of economic integration in Europe would be disastrously slowed down. They know also that in some countries a sharp reduction in Marshall plan aid would bring a return to short rations and a stoppage of the tooling programs now under way. Above all, they know that if as a result of our quitting they can bring a division among the free peoples once again a situation will have been created where a dictator can divide and conquer. Is it any wonder that they are eagerly awaiting word that the dollars needed to carry on the Marshall plan will not be forthcoming? This is their great hope.

Of course, even if the needed dollars are forthcoming, no one can guarantee that western Europe will take advantage of that aid sharply to step up her dollar earnings or boldly to reduce trade barriers and thus start to integrate her economies. But this is the historic moment when those goals must be won if they are to be won. Later the heads of governments in Europe may have neither aid from the West nor threats from the East to help them overcome the natural aversion to change. Later it may be too late to start building that new continent in western Europe which will be so strong and whose free people will be so prosperous that no dictator would dare march against them.

It is my hope that before Marshall aid ends that Europe will be well on the road toward achieving the goals which I have set forth. It is also my hope that the Russians will wait in vain for word that America is either pulling out or pulling down its aid to too low a level. I hold these hopes for Europe because Europe has already produced one miracle and can produce another. I hold these hopes for America because I am an American. It is not in the American tradition to fail to finish a job. Faced with a crisis it is not in the American tradition to give up and go on. It is our American tradition to stand by our guns, to carry on, and to see it through. And if we do—if we stand steadfast—there is a sound basis for the great hope that the free world will regain the initiative and in the second half of this twentieth century resume its forward march.

Local Public Works Planning and Hospital Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, while the Federal aid to local public works planning and hospital construction has not received the great publicity that other more controversial issues have gleaned from our press, this aid is, nevertheless, vitally important to all members of every community in the Nation, large or small. In a recent issue of my Washington News Letter to the people of Pennsylvania, I explained how the loans are made by the Federal Government and how each community may participate and obtain the expert help and funds necessary to better public works and hospitals in the community. I ask unanimous consent that this news letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Two of the administration-supported measures passed by the Eighty-first Congress almost without fanfare will be vitally important to almost every Pennsylvanian, and I want you to know about them. They involve local public works planning and hospital construction.

How big is the planning backlog in your community? Before any community can build a new school, enlarge its sewerage or water system, put up a bridge, or undertake any local public works, plans must be drawn up.

Making plans sounds easy, but it's frequently difficult, because local budgets provide small planning funds. But Congress has provided $100,000,000 in loans for local community planning during the next 2 years, and Pennsylvania communities can borrow $1,343,328 this coming year, and three times as much next year in Federal loans.

As I pointed out during the Senate debate on the bill, "these are loans—not grants—for engineering planning work—not for construction work, not for a new WPA or PWA, but for drafting plans and specifications only. There is absolutely no commitment that the Federal Government now—or in the future—intends to pay any part of the construction costs of these projects." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 23, 1949, p. 13215.)

Loans are repaid to the Government when the community floats a bond issue to cover construction costs. Because planning is about 3 percent of total construction costs, local communities should be able to plan about $40,000,000 worth of needed projects this year.

This is a tested program. It was first passed in 1944, but the Eightieth Congress let it die. Hundreds of Pennsylvania communities planned $265,000,000 in local projects with less than $4,000,000 worth of loans under the earlier program.

Application blanks and details will be ready in a few days. Get your community off to an early start by writing for particulars. Address Mr. William J. Finley, Bureau of Community Facilities, U. S. General Services Administration, Box 880, Harrisburg, Pa.

Are your local hospital facilities sufficient? If not, there may be something you can do about it soon. The Eighty-first Congress liberalized the highly praised and very successful Federal hospital assistance program initiated by the Seventy-ninth Congress in 1946. The 1946 act was enthusiastically received in Pennsylvania, and under it more than 20 hospitals have been approved for Federal grants amounting to more than $9,000,000 in the past 2 years.

Hospital construction can be greatly accelerated under this year's enlarged law.

Areas with the greatest need will still be helped first, and up to now most of the funds have gone to smaller communities because they needed help most. But many more communities, including some of the largest, will be able to participate in the enlarged program.

How does the program work? It's a three-way affair—local, State, and Federal. Federal grants used to meet one-third of the total cost of each project, but the new law will increase Federal contributions to about 40 percent for each Pennsylvania hospital. The local communities make their own plans and arrange for financing their share. Funds are available for public, or nonprofit, hospitals, and projects may cover entirely new hospitals or enlargement of existing ones. To obtain Federal grants the local projects must be approved by the Pennsylvania Department of Welfare and the United States Public Health Service. Approval by these agencies is based on a showing of local need.

Federal grants formerly amounted to $75,000,000 a year, with Pennsylvania getting $4,547,000 annually. The new law doubles this to $150,000,000 a year. So Pennsylvania will be eligible for $9,241,056 for each of the next 6 years.

Twenty-two Pennsylvania hospitals have been, or are about to be, authorized for grants—Altoona Hospital, Memorial Hospital of Bedford County, J. C. Blair Memorial Hospital at Huntingdon, Bradford Hospital, Brookville Hospital, Centre County Hospital at Bellefonte, Chambersburg Hospital, Citizens' General Hospital at New Kensington, Clearfield Hospital, Curry Memorial Hospital, George F. Geisinger Hospital at Danville, Delaware County Hospital at Upper Darby, Harrisburg Hospital, Harrisburg Polyclinic Hospital, Gnaden Huetten Memorial Hospital at Lehighton, Lancaster General Hospital, Lewistown Hospital, General Hospital of Monroe County at East Stroudsburg, Ohio Valley General Hospital at McKees Rocks, Sunbury Community Hospital, Wayne County Memorial Hospital at Honesdale, and Williamsport Hospital.

Where do you get the details? If your community needs additional hospitals, and you're interested in helping out, write either to the Pennsylvania Department of Welfare, Harrisburg, or to Federal Security Agency, 42 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y.

Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, in my News Letter of December 1, 1949, to the people of Pennsylvania, I discussed just what the Hoover Report means to the

American people, and also the extent of Government reorganization already achieved during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

DECEMBER 1, 1949.

You're getting your money's worth out of the Hoover report. A billion and a quarter tax dollars will be saved yearly by Government reorganization achieved in 1949.

The Hoover report is the first comprehensive survey of our Government in 160 years. It found a multitude of agencies, bureaus, boards, commissions, and administrations piled, one on top of another, by all the Congresses and Presidents since the start of our Republic. Obviously, in examining this complex pyramid of Government, which like Topsy, had "just grow'd," the Commission uncovered tremendous duplication of function, contradiction of effort, conflict of jurisdiction, and cumbersome accounting systems. The report is a blueprint for order out of this chaos.

Reorganization aims at getting the most out of every tax dollar and has the full support of President Truman, who said last summer: "I am taking steps to insure that there shall be a continuous and systematic effort throughout the executive branch to evaluate and improve the effectiveness and economy of Government operations."

Government reorganization is a tremendous task. It means revamping the biggest, most complex business in the world—a business for which the Congress has already authorized a $43,500,000,000 Federal budget for the present fiscal year.

To get an idea of how big a job reorganization really is, keep these facts in mind: The Hoover Commission devoted almost 2 years to its job; 300 experts participated in its comprehensive investigations; the Hoover report is a 2,000,000-word treatise on efficient government; its 300 recommendations are broad blueprints, not detailed specifications; 60 percent of the recommendations require legislative action by Congress.

The Eighty-first Congress and the President were determined from the start to translate these 2,000,000 words into action * * * and everyone is enthusiastic about the results to date. In October, noting what had been accomplished during the Eighty-first Congress, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report said, "During 21 months, more reorganization has been accomplished than in any previous time in the Nation's history."

The Commission estimated its proposals would save $3,000,000,000 or $4,000,000,000 yearly. So far, we have already carried out 20 percent of their recommendations * * * reforms so far reaching that they will account for one-third of the total savings visualized by the entire report—a remarkable achievement in 1 year.

Where do we stand on reorganization to date? Here's a partial list of the solid accomplishments made in recent months by President Truman and the Eighty-first Congress:

The Military Unification Act of 1949 will probably save a billion a year.

The newly created General Services Administration should save $250,000,000 yearly by consolidating all Government "housekeeping" functions.

Secretary Acheson, former Vice Chairman of the Commission, is speeding into effect the State Department reorganization approved by the Eighty-first Congress.

Six reorganization plans submitted by President Truman were approved by Congress this year, renovating parts of the Labor Department and the Post Office Department; the Maritime and Civil Service Commissions; the Public Roads Administration; and the Executive Office of the President.

Long overdue salary increases went through to attract and hold skilled executive personnel in Government service.

Where do we go from here? Everyone recognized that the job was far too big to complete in a single session of Congress. The executive branch is making numerous recommended internal changes requiring no new laws. At the same time, committees of Congress are drafting technical language to accomplish additional reforms. I feel that we can take real pride in the progress we have made to date, and I am confident the job will be tackled with renewed vigor and determination when we reconvene in January.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Early Senate Legislative Calendar, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, during the interim between the two sessions of the Eighty-first Congress speculations began to run high as to what the second session would bring forth on its Legislative Calendar early in the year. In my news letter of December 15, 1949, I pointed out to the people of Pennsylvania some of the more important pieces of legislation that were due for action by the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

DECEMBER 15, 1949.

Count on a lot of talk in the Senate early next session. We will return in January to face a calendar that's a tinder box of filibuster issues. Here are some of them:

Civil-rights legislation, a hardy filibuster perennial, awaits us. A Federal fair employment practices bill is on the Senate Calendar, and the House of Representatives passed an anti-poll-tax bill last summer that is now pending before the Rules Committee of the Senate. Can't predict the outcome on either of these. My own moral convictions give them strong support, and I have fought, and shall continue to fight, for their enactment. I'm proud to note the progress made in enlarging the civil rights of our people in recent years, and I honestly believe a growing national maturity is responsible for this.

Oleomargarine (southerners aren't the only filibusters): Senators from dairy States have promised to talk down efforts to repeal the Federal tax on colored oleo.

Repealing the Federal oleo tax won't make any difference in Pennsylvania, because until the legislature at Harrisburg repeals the State law, it's illegal to sell colored oleo in Pennsylvania. So whatever happens in the United States Senate this winter, Pennsylvania housewives will stay busy adding color by hand; but in the 32 States where the sale of colored oleo is now legal, there will be new relief when the Federal tax is removed.

The displaced persons bill is due back on the Senate Calendar January 25, and as usual, faces a filibuster, but I believe we'll win this fight. The 1948 DP law is a vicious and discriminatory piece of legislation that is now blocking thousands of victims of fascism and communism from a haven in America, victims who can't return home because they have fought, and lost the battle for liberty and democracy in their own countries.

Displaced persons are proving to be fine Americans, and we should be proud that Pennsylvania has taken so many. Only New York has a larger DP population than we.

The basing-point issue is still in the air, and when the bill returns to the Senate January 20, it may set off a filibuster. Basing-point pricing has played an important role in the growth of Pennsylvania industry but ever since a decision of the Supreme Court a year and a half ago, there has been uncertainty in the business community as to whether delivered-pricing practices are legal.

I proposed a 2-year basing-point moratorium bill last winter to give those who used delivered pricing systems in good faith a breather while Congress studied and overhauled our conflicting maze of antitrust laws, but my proposal was set aside during the Senate debate, and Congress has sought ever since to work out language which will safeguard small business and at the same time permit good-faith use of basing-point pricing.

So we're probably due for a lot of useless, time-consuming and expensive talk, as small, resolute bands of Senators seek to block legislation, and it will be more difficult than ever this year to apply cloture, as we call it, when the Senate seeks to limit the time for debate. The assent of 64 Senators is now required to invoke cloture, as a result of the new Senate rule adopted after our filibuster over filibustering of last winter. The new rule is a real victory for willful minorities who are long-winded enough to force a majority to abandon its fight in order to undertake other pressing, dead-line legislation.

If you're interested in more details on filibusters, and the problems they pose to expression of the majority will in a democracy, write me at the Senate Office Building, Washington, for a copy of an article I wrote recently for the Temple Law Quarterly.

Nineteen hundred and forty-nine draws to a close with America in good shape, and I sincerely hope that for all of you, the coming holiday season will prove the happiest, most peaceful and most prosperous you've ever had. My best wishes to you all for a

Very merry Christmas.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Improvement of General Welfare in 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my Washington News Letter of December 29, 1949, in which I discussed some of the striking achievements of the American free enterprise system during 1949.

There being no objection, the news letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

DECEMBER 29, 1949.

The American free-enterprise system gave the general welfare a big boost in 1949. Our standard of living moved up a few more notches as industry after industry turned in all-time high production records for commodities that vitally influence the way we live.

Almost a million new, non-farm homes were begun in 1949, a new record. It may come as a surprise to you, but the previous record for home building was set in 1925, almost a quarter of a century ago.

Home construction should be larger still in 1950, for two big reasons:

Private construction has increased steadily since the end of the war, and new building continued at high levels through August, September, October, and November, instead of dropping off in fall as it usually does. If this trend continues, as it should in view of the huge demand for housing, we should see private home building pass the million mark in 1950.

Construction under the low-rent Public Housing Act of 1949 will get under way shortly, and that program should start on new housing for 100,000 or more American families in 1950, thus swelling the total still further.

The automobile industry broke a 20-year-old production record this year by turning out some 6,200,000 cars and trucks. This is about 800,000 more vehicles than were made in 1929 when 5,358,420 set the record that has stood unbroken until this year.

And we traveled more than twice as far by motor this year than in 1929.

More people used more electricity in 1949 than ever before. Electric power production is up almost 28 percent this year over the 1944 wartime peak. This increase alone in the past 5 years is greater than our total use in 1925.

Television production reached 2,700,000 sets this year, as compared to about a million sets in 1948. The industry planned to make only 2,000,000 sets in 1949, but finding it could sell everything it made, stepped up its sights another 75 percent. And for 1950 a production of 3,500,000 is now planned.

This year about two out of every three American families have telephone service. This has risen in 10 years from about 2 families in 5—or from about 40 percent to almost 70 percent. Long-distance calls, as a result of improved service and wider usage, have increased from 750,000,000 in 1939 to about 2,000,000,000 in 1949.

These are some of the striking achievements of private American enterprise in 1949. They are signs of an expanding economy, and reflect the essential soundness of the give-and-take adaptability and resourcefulness of our system in which security and freedom of the individual are correspondent.

Not all the signs on the economic front are good. There are, of course, rough spots which, if left uncorrected, threaten the whole health of our national life. With our employment this year close to peak levels, unemployment is up somewhat from last year. In some areas—such as our anthracite region—there are severe local dislocations. We're aware of them, and are determined as a Nation to do something about correcting them.

Promoting the general welfare means getting rid of the rough spots. Our Constitution charges the Government with this duty in the name of our people. Judging from our success over the 161 years our Republic has existed, we have done, I believe, a good job at our task of buttressing the free-enterprise system without shackling it, in promoting the general welfare of our people without regimenting them. I am proud of our achievements, and confident of our future.

A happy new year to you all.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Senator Green's Advocacy of Fisheries Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD L. LEAHY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Pawtucket Times. The editorial is a tribute to my colleague the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and is entitled "GREEN for Conservation." The editorial was occasioned by the fact that my colleague has introduced a measure which would make effective an international treaty for conservation of fisheries off the New England coast.

I cannot let pass this opportunity to comment on the aptness of the title. The distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island long has favored liberal legislation and his advocacy of progressive and humane government antedates by many years, in many instances, the time when measures for its accomplishment have been adopted. Throughout his long public life, however, he has been in the best sense a conservative and those of us who have known him and served with him over the years appreciate the very agreeable significance of GREEN for conservation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREEN FOR CONSERVATION

Probably nothing which Senator GREEN of of our State will do at this current session of Congress will be more constructive than his proposal the Senate make effective an international treaty for conservation of fisheries off the New England coast.

The treaty which, we are reminded, is one of three signed by the United States in 1949, is designed to halt depletion of the 300-year-old fisheries of the Grand Banks and other banks from this State to Greenland. The Senator, we are told, suggests the means to carry out our obligations under the treaty in a bill he has drafted. The bill calls for appointment of three United States members to an international commission created under the treaty. These, with others, would name an advisory commission, who would advise the commissioners on all regulations affecting this country. Other signatories to the treaty are Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Norway, Portugal, Spain, and the United Kingdom.

There can be no lack of knowledge of the need of such conservation on the part of newspaper readers, even casual readers. For, in many articles by press associations and others, they have been told how modern methods of fishing at the Banks have taken fish too fast, have caught fish too young and have taken fish of too small a size. The result has been such a depletion of fish in the Atlantic grounds, that some steps must be taken if fish are to survive in numbers sufficient to make them valuable as a food.

It is being brought home to the human family on several fronts that conservation of resources is destined to be a factor for serious consideration by our Nation and others in the second half of this twentieth century. The old days of laissez-faire, of taking more than one needs are about at an end. This country needs to conserve oil, iron, fish, game, lead, and one hardly knows how many other natural resources. Other nations are confronted with a need of saving other precious and dwindling resources. So conserve, we all must. For when what we have is gone, nature is not going to quickly provide us with more. Even water is now a national problem, where once it was as cheap and plentiful as the air we breathe.

Senator Morse's Advice to the Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in a recent issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, with reference to our friend and colleague the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MAVERICK'S ADVICE TO THE GOP

WHAT SENATOR WAYNE MORSE said about the Republicans sounded like good advice to his party—if this Oregon maverick is really a member of the GOP in good standing.

In St. Louis for a speech before the Liberal Forum, he said that the party needs a program—a real, meaningful program. The American voters cannot be snared with words like "statism." They cannot be dragooned into a crusade against the welfare state. It's their welfare which they have in mind when they mark their ballots.

Such tactics will make of the GOP, to the Senator's mind, a party exclusively of rich men. It will end up with far too many campaign contributions and not nearly enough votes. Senator MORSE does not want to see that happen. And he is right. The United States should not be politically divided according to the pocketbooks of its people. That way lies trouble.

It would be the undoing of even the more liberal of our two parties because that party would no longer have the discipline of genuine opposition. Sure of victory, it could go lax, forget principles and purposes.

Such a division of haves and have-nots of course, is not a novelty in the politics of a considerable number of modern nations. But elsewhere the impulse toward it comes from the Marxists. They work hard to create this cleavage and to deepen it. How odd that here in the United States those who have most to lose should be exposing us to this risk.

Yet how many men are saying—perhaps with the hope of nominations and campaign contributions in mind—that the Republican Party needs a rebirth of that kind. Apparently they know little of its birth and of its first successful candidate, Abraham Lincoln.

Senator BRIDGES does know. He knows what made Republicanism valid in the past. He knows what can make it valid in the future—in a nation ruled by the many rather than the few. Will he be heard? Or is his a voice in the wilderness?

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Nebraska State Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered on October 21, 1949, at the fiftieth anniversary meeting of the Nebraska State Bar Association at Omaha, Nebr.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am sincerely grateful for the high honor of your invitation to address this important meeting, celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the Nebraska State Bar Association.

I share with all Americans a profound sense of pride in the progress of the Cornhusker State and the brilliant achievements of its sons and daughters.

Here the spirit of American freedom, enterprise, and self-reliance is firmly rooted. It lives in the tradition of the courageous pioneers who broke the prairie sod and transformed what had been called the Great American Desert into one of the leading agricultural States of America.

I have been greatly impressed by an inscription above the north doorway of your State capitol, which states:

"The salvation of the State is watchfulness in the citizen."

Nebraska citizens have followed that injunction. They are watchful over their government. They demonstrate their determination to have good government by electing to public office men of outstanding ability and strong patriotic conviction.

Such men represent Nebraska in the United States Senate. They have won the confidence, respect, and admiration of all their colleagues in the highest degree.

It is a sincere pleasure to express my personal high esteem and regard for HUGH BUTLER and KENT WHERRY. Their distinguished service to Nebraska and to the Nation is deserving of the highest praise.

I have had the honor of close association with Senator BUTLER in the work of the Senate Finance Committee, and I can assure you that his whole thinking is directed toward preserving the solvency of America through economy and efficiency in government.

When Senator WHERRY was selected as minority leader of the Senate it was in recognition of his courage, conviction, and ability. He has made a remarkably consistent record in the battle to restore sound fiscal policies in the Federal Government.

He has been a strong advocate of a clear-cut line between the two great political parties in order to give the American people a definite choice as to the principles they prefer to support.

Perhaps as a member of the Pennsylvania Bar, I should discuss with you some phase of the law in which you are all interested. Perhaps we could talk about the rule against perpetuities, or the rule in Shelley's case, or perhaps the two recent decisions of the Supreme Court, the Church and Spiegel estates, and what Congress has done to correct these two decisions.

But, this afternoon, instead of discussing some phase of the law, I want to discuss a matter which is of far greater importance—a development which means so much to every man, woman and child, and to the future of our great Nation.

I want to talk to you about an atomic bomb. We have heard a great deal about the atomic bomb since the first one was dropped on Japan. Recently, we have become even more bomb conscious and more apprehensive of the future because of the knowledge that Soviet Russia has made substantial advances in this field.

Only a short time ago, Bernard M. Baruch, elder statesman and adviser of Presidents, called for a stand-by mobilization plan to be ready in case we are attacked with atomic bombs some time in the future.

Today we are spending billions of dollars in preparation of such a plan; in stock piling critical war matériel; in the hope that we will be prepared to withstand such an enemy attack.

As a strong advocate of preparedness, I think that is the proper course.

But this atomic bomb, which gives us so much concern, is not the atomic bomb which I desire to discuss with you this afternoon. Another type of atomic bomb threatens America. One of these days that bomb will explode right here in America. It will cause as much suffering and destruction as the bomb produced by the atomic scientists.

The atomic bomb I have in mind is the bomb of national bankruptcy.

The danger of the bomb of national bankruptcy is not remote at all. It is something close at hand. Unless quick and drastic steps are taken it will shatter the framework of our Constitution and our way of life.

I am thoroughly convinced that national bankruptcy is more imminent and more dangerous to the freedom of the American people than atomic attack by Soviet Russia. Let me tell you why.

I am convinced that Russia cannot afford to go to war, nor does it need a shooting war so long as Russia can make progress in a cold war by bleeding us economically. Thus the Soviets are doing both on the international and on the domestic fronts. In world affairs, they are forcing us to spend billions upon billions of dollars each year for a defense program and to arm the nations of western Europe.

On our home front Soviet agents have infiltrated every sort of organization and pressure group. These people, their fellow travelers and their innocent dupes, wage a never ending war on Congress for greater and greater spending by the Government. Here again the Nation is being bled and weakened and forced deeper and deeper into debt, month by month.

Those who follow the Russian broadcasts to their own people and to the rest of the world, and the Russian propaganda newspapers, know that what I am saying is the absolute truth and absolute basic Soviet policy.

The Communist line that capitalism is a doomed way of life which must be forced to spend itself into destruction, was preached and laid down as basic doctrine by Karl Marx and Lenin. It has been followed and repeated by Stalin and others in the Kremlin. It is used constantly in the propaganda broadcasts and in the articles of which I speak.

The people of the Soviet Union are told repeatedly that America's economy is crumbling; that unemployment is growing worse here; that another great crash is in the making. They don't have to drop bombs on us. They are convinced that we will be the victims of economic self-destruction.

Soviet agents, working on this plan, are using every trick and every weapon at their command. They are seeking to speed up what they believe is the inevitable political and financial destruction of this country. They are being aided by pinks and pressure groups. They are also aided by thousands upon thousands of misguided do-gooders, by a spendthrift administration in Washington, and the spendthrift attitude of the people.

In this gasoline age we seem to have lost all of our horsesense.

Let us face the facts and figures and see what has happened to our Nation in the past 20 years. In 1929, only 20 years ago, the Federal Government spent less than $4,000,000,000. In this fiscal year our Government will spend more than 11 times as much, or approximately $46,000,000,000. It is impossible for the average man to comprehend just how much that is.

Let me make some comparisons that give a better idea of the amount the Federal Government will spend this year. If every life insurance policyholder in the United States cashed in all of his life insurance the total would amount to $44,000,000,000. This would not be enough money to run the Federal Government for 1 year at the present rate of spending.

If every city home owner in this country disposed of his home the total would amount to $30,000,000,000. That would run the Federal Government for about 8 months.

If every farmer sold his farm, all the equipment on it, and all the livestock, the total return would be $25,000,000,000. The Government could not run 7 months on that amount of money.

If every industry converted its net working capital into cash a total of $39,000,000,000 would be realized. That would not be enough to run the Government for 11 months. That is the pace at which the free spenders at Washington are burning up the Nation's wealth.

That is what I mean when I warn of the atomic bomb of national bankruptcy. Remember that when the Government takes on new services and new functions they are never withdrawn. Once established, they grow by leaps and bounds from year to year.

In view of this terrible spending spree, how can we face the future with any degree of confidence? Do you wonder why the masters of the Kremlin are in no hurry to engage in a shooting, atomic-bomb-dropping war?

Do you wonder why they believe all they have to do is to keep us spending at the present rate in order to bankrupt us and finally conquer us from within?

Amazingly prophetic are these words spoken by Abraham Lincoln, and I quote:

"'At what point then is the danger to be expected?' I answer: If it ever reaches us it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of free men, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

How significant are his words today.

The tax collections for this year will be far short of expenditures. We will undoubtedly end this peacetime fiscal year with a deficit of at least six to eight billion dollars. This will be the greatest peacetime deficit in the history of America.

It will also be the year of the greatest peacetime spending since the birth of our Nation.

Down in Washington, when Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, Senator BYRD, of Virginia, your own two great Senators, and many other economy-minded Senators fought to reduce by 10 percent the over-all spending for this fiscal year every legislative trick was resorted to by the administration to block economy and retrenchment.

Now let us continue our comparisons. In 1929 the national debt was $16,500,000,000. Today, just 20 years later, it is 15½ times as big, or approximately $256,000,000,000.

Since July 1, the beginning of this fiscal year, the Federal Government is already in the red approximately two and one-third billion dollars.

Do you wonder why radio Moscow blares out today and every day that America is headed for financial and economic disaster?

In 1929, the Federal Government had less than 600,000 employees on its pay rolls. Today the number of persons working for Uncle Sam is more than 2,200,000.

They are increasing daily and they will continue to increase if the present trend is not stopped.

Today approximately 30 percent of the total income of our people is being taken away from them to support local, State and Federal Government. In other words, we are working about 3½ months out of every year just to pay the cost of government. This is an alarming situation. It should arouse every patriotic citizen.

This deadly infection has not been confined to the Federal Government alone. It has spread from Washington to local governments and State governments all over the Nation.

Let me pause here to praise the courageous stand for efficiency and economy taken by your distinguished Governor, Val Peterson. He has won national recognition for his fight to maintain a sound economy in Nebraska in line with the State's historic pay-as-you-go tradition, based on conservatism and sound common sense. He has refused to follow the example of those who would spend State governments into the same dangerous condition as the Federal Government. I want to commend him. I wish there were more governors like him throughout the United States.

Seventeen years ago Franklin D. Roosevelt, then a candidate for President, made this statement:

"Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse." True words were never spoken.

Since then the Federal Government has spent beyond its income every single year with the exception of 1946 and 1947.

Yes, the poorhouse is the end for the family that follows that policy. But in the family of governments the disastrous end is national bankruptcy and all of the tragedy that goes along with it.

What happens to a nation on the march toward national bankruptcy? Taxes become more excessive and burdensome. Inflation destroys the purchasing power of the worker. Wages decline. The standard of living is lowered. Unemployment is increased. Venture capital is dried up. The expansion of industry and business creating new jobs is stopped.

With this comes rationing of food, clothing, and all the necessities of life.

Confusion and unrest spreads among the people.

Then the bomb of bankruptcy explodes with all the horror and suffering of atomic warfare. Not a single citizen escapes its destructive force.

Savings are wiped out. Life-insurance policies become worthless. Values established by generations of toil, thrift, and sacrifice disappear.

Out of the rubble of a smashed and ruined economy, a socialistic form of dictatorship rises to take control. Government becomes the all-powerful and absolute master of the citizens.

The people are controlled and regulated in their daily lives by the iron hand of a planned and regimented police state.

The free-enterprise system is destroyed. All industry is taken over by the Government and free labor unions are outlawed.

Human rights, human dignity, and freedom of the individual are lost.

As so well stated by that outstanding statesman, James F. Byrnes: "Every individual, whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor—will be an economic slave, pulling an oar in the galley of the state."

I regret that I have to paint such a tragic picture. But the record of history from ancient times to our own day proves that this picture is not exaggerated or overdrawn.

It depicts the downfall of ancient Greece and Rome. It tells a tragic chapter in the history of France. It is an accurate portrayal of the events which destroyed Germany under Hitler and Italy under Mussolini.

England, once the most powerful nation in the world, is today struggling for its very existence. The atomic bomb of bankruptcy threatens the British, largely because they have given up a part of their freedom in return for the promise of security, offered by their socialistic government.

Can we fail to take warning from these examples?

Can we sit idly by and permit the cost of government to consume the substance of the people through reckless spending without any thought of the day of reckoning?

Can we ignore the false and dangerous promises of the demagogue who offers the people security and an easy way of life at the expense of the Government?

Time is rapidly running out, but it is not too late to arouse the American people to the explosive power of national bankruptcy.

Only the people themselves can save our Republic from disaster.

As members of the bar you are leaders in your communities and in your State. Some of you are Democrats, some are Republicans, but in the fight to save American liberty we are all Americans.

That sacred cause transcends political partisanship. It must be a holy crusade to save our homes, our churches, our God given rights to liberty, opportunity and individual freedom.

I appeal to you to enlist in this crusade. I ask you to give it a part of your time and effort as a patriotic duty.

There is so much at stake for our country and the world.

It is imperative and most urgent that we awaken the people of America to the dangers of the atomic bomb of national bankruptcy.

The voice of the American people must be heard in the halls of Congress. It must come from the farms, the hamlets, villages, towns, and cities. It must come from the farmer, the worker, the manufacturer, the lawyer, the doctor, the housewife. It must be the voice of every man and woman who cherishes freedom and our American ideals and institutions.

If that voice is strong enough and loud enough it will not only be heard but it will be heeded.

The people of America get just the kind of Government they vote for.

As lawyers, and as Nebraskans, you are perhaps better qualified than any other group to take leadership in a great protest against spendthrift Government.

You can convince others that the American people are capable of governing themselves without an army of 2,200,000 bureaucrats supervising their lives.

You can discuss the problem of excessive Federal taxation with your associates, with business men and with your friends.

And above all, you can spread the gospel of Americanism and our great duty to keep the doors of opportunity open to the youth of our land so that they, too, may share in the blessings of American freedom.

Talk with the young people, the boys and girls in the high schools and in the colleges, just starting out in life. Tell them of the fundamental values that are embraced in freedom and the rewards that come from initiative, hard work and thrift.

Impress upon them the lessons of our Nation's greatness—that this country was built by sturdy God-fearing men and women who depended upon their own efforts. They did not look to the Government for a handout even when the going was rough.

They were willing to support the Government. They did not ask the Government to support them.

Humbly we pray for divine protection that the atomic bomb may never drop on our fair land. But let me say to you that the atomic bomb of national bankruptcy is one which we alone have the power and the ability to prevent.

Let us reread and reexamine the blueprint of American greatness. Hard work, thrift, courage, humbleness, self-reliance, and love of God directed the efforts of the founding fathers. They should direct us today.

Address by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, Before the Pennsylvania Society of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on December 10, 1949, it was my unusual privilege and pleasure to address the Pennsylvania Society of New York at the annual dinner of that society at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It's customary for most speakers, and particularly those in political life, to start just about every speech to just about any group with the tested formula of how glad we are, how delighted and pleased we are, to have this wonderful opportunity to speak to such a group of fine, intelligent, patriotic men of such outstanding vision and leadership and so on; you've all familiar with the technique, and I'm sure many of you use it yourselves.

And yet I am pleased to be here and to have this opportunity to speak to the Pennsylvania Society.

I remember when I attended this dinner several years ago—one I enjoyed immensely—I was seated next to a friendly Pennsylvanian who made a very pleasant dinner companion. My partner was Thomas J. Watson, the think man, from International Business Machines. Mr. Watson, casting a practiced, thinking eye over the seating arrangements, confided to me why he thought we happened to be seated together.

"Together with Mayor Lawrence, we're probably the only Democrats here," he explained.

That may have been a slight exaggeration; there might have been a few others around, easily identifiable by the lean and hungry look ascribed by Shakespeare to dangerous

men, like Democrats, and so distinctive about Mr. Watson, Mayor Lawrence, and myself.

Obviously, this is not a branch of the New Deal Marching and Chowder Club. Since we Democrats are so badly outnumbered here, and since no speech by me or anyone else could logically be expected to change the political ratio here very significantly, I don't believe I shall attempt to tilt at any windmills.

I've tilted at lots of windmills in my time and there's always a challenge to one's eloquence or adroitness in a situation like this, but at the same time, all of us in public life eventually learn that in any fight, it always helps to have the votes.

I'm not going to try to convert the guests of the Pennsylvania Society here tonight to the Democratic Party. If any of you would like to come over, though—well, we always enjoy company.

I am reminded of what Congressman CHARLIE HALLECK, of Indiana, who was your speaker 2 years ago, had to say when asked what kind of a speech he was going to make in Philadelphia one evening. Charlie said it was going to be a nonpolitical Republican speech.

I don't think I'll even try a nonpolitical Democratic speech. Instead, I'd like for tonight to step out of the role of majority whip, and sometime acting majority leader of the United States Senate, out of the uniform of a spokesman for the Democratic administration and worker in the vineyard of the New Deal or Fair Deal, and instead, talk to you as one Pennsylvanian to another on some matters of politics in the highest sense, in the definition of politics as the science and art of government.

In nearly all of the big problems which face us conscientious citizens in a complex society, we have Republican solutions and Democratic solutions put forward to meet them, but in the rough and tumble of political controversy, it frequently happens that neither is a satisfactory American solution, that both may be special interest solutions of one sort or another. In the last analysis, it may be that neither is any kind of solution at all, but just a lot of political hot air designed to trick the voter into giving his support for what turns out to be an empty promise.

Our national structure and our political institutions are, and have been sound enough generally, to withstand the quadrennial verbal fratricide of our national political campaigns, in which each side sacrifices to itself all the virtues and to the opposition, only vices, but I think that often those of us who participate in these orgies of partnership have been wasting a lot of time and campaign money because few of the electorate take it very seriously.

The growth of maturity in the American electorate has been a slow but consistent, day-to-day thing, like a child's growth, and, like a child's, has been almost imperceptible while it has been happening.

But when your son starts to tower over you, you suddenly realize he's grown up. And when we find the electorate consistently fails to fall for campaign double talk and hobgoblins, we might stop for a moment and consider that politics has got to grow up, too, if it is to be effective.

Those of us who engage in the science of politics, either as a career or as a hobby, either out of motives of the deepest sincerity in behalf of the public weal and the national safety (as, naturally, all of us here tonight do) or out of pure selfish interest of one sort or another (obviously, at this point, I'm talking about some other fellows and certainly no one here), in any event, those of us who participate in the political battles know that there is a good deal of sham and of illusion, of fakery and nonsense in them. While we on either side try to convince the public that our side is the more altruistic, more noble, more sincere, they may go out and vote on the practical reasoning, not that one side is better than the other, but that it is perhaps not so bad as the other.

So, recognizing that the people recognize what we in politics recognize, we might do well once in a while—particularly now, between election campaigns, when it isn't as difficult to do so—to come down off these pedestals of virtue each party erects for its chosen and admit that, fundamentally, the differences between us as Republican Americans and Democratic Americans, although important, are relatively few.

On the other hand, the areas of agreement among us as Americans are simply incredibly huge.

I don't know how many of you are particular students of congressional operation or machinery, but many of you know, I am sure, that a simply tremendous amount of the work of Congress in passing legislation is done by unanimous consent. A bill may be controversial when it is introduced—highly controversial—but after it has been worked over by the experts in this field in the House or Senate committee to which it is referred, it frequently comes out adroitly amended in such a way as to achieve the same goal in a manner which is not controversial at all.

In the Senate committees generally are established on a 7-to-6 or, in some cases, 8-to-5 ratio of majority to minority Members, depending upon the ratio of Democrats to Republicans in the Senate. The number of times in which all 13 agree, and they are usually regarded as the experts for the rest of the Senate on that particular issue, is tremendously high, and when it happens, as it frequently does, such a bill is almost certain to go through on the Consent Calendar, or perhaps, after short debate, to be passed without even a division.

In the realm of foreign policy particularly, admittedly our most important single concern these days, unanimity on the part of all 13 Senators of the Foreign Relations Committee has been the rule in recent years rather than the exception. The bills may be hard fought on the floor, but the results are seldom in doubt. If all of these Democrats and Republicans who specialize in the foreign-policy field can agree as they have in this Congress, and the results were much the same in the Eightieth Congress, most Senators are willing to take the advice of these experts.

That situation is frequently overlooked by those whose reading of congressional happenings is directed largely at the fights and disagreements—the fights are always a better show and get a better press and make more interesting reading. But the results are what counts, and results are what we generally get in the Congress despite the partisan political differences which arise continually.

As a good party man myself, and recognizing that many or most of you also are good party men, I want to make clear that I believe wholeheartedly in the political-party system, and I applaud any concrete definition of goals made by the respective parties demonstrating to the public their essential differences.

At the same time, however, as a Member of Congress for the past 11 years, as one who has been the target of all the pressures and propaganda from all sides on every major issue in that period, I am disappointed and sometimes distressed by the lack of common ordinary honesty in the presentation of facts on controversial issues to the public. This lack of honesty is evident on all sides, and is not restricted to any party or any lobby or any pressure group or any economic interest. I don't think it's so much a malicious and deliberate attempt to mislead the public—and the Congress—so much as it is a reflection of an unspoken and perhaps unconscious fear that unless the presentation of facts on political issues and problems is sketched in the jet blacks of deep villainy as against the gleaming whites of pure virtue, the average American, and particularly his representative in the National Legislature, could not be sophisticated enough to understand them or moved enough to do anything about them.

This whole practice seems to be based on the theory that Americans are fools and the people they send to Congress are particularly foolish.

Now I would be the last person to insist that the Congress, this Congress or any other, has never done anything foolish. And the rules of the Senate and House as to courtesy among Members and as to comity between the Houses—I once saw that referred to in print as "comedy between the Houses"—are not so strict that I cannot concede that fools have sometimes been elected to Congress.

But by and large, the men and women of the American electorate have been acutely aware in the last 20 years—since government began to affect them individually in so many ways—of the importance of national issues of war and peace, of taxes, full employment, public works, and general stability and prosperity. The mail received by every Member of Congress reflects this widespread interest, and shows it is highly informed interest.

And by and large, the men and women whom these Americans send to Congress are also not naive innocents; they are most often individuals who have made successes in a host of specialized fields before coming to Congress. And once there, regardless of party, most of them try conscientiously and hard to do a good job.

The Congress has suffered terribly in the past from lack of expert technical assistance and advice. We've been correcting that situation somewhat since the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act, but even today, with our staff experts and our expanded Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress and with the experts of the administrative agencies downtown to draw from, we still find that the information we seek and need can come only from those directly engaged in the fields in which our studies must be made.

And that's where we get a good deal of our dishonest testimony, not perjured testimony, not untruths, but slanted testimony.

It is understandable enough and human enough that such should happen, for on the decisions of Congress rest, sometimes, profit or loss for a particular business, better or lower wages for some workers, better or smaller returns for some investors. Each economic interest so involved tries its best to color its presentation in the most convincing form. We have advocates before us, then, instead of advisers.

This is particularly true before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, the committee set up under the Employment Act of 1946 to keep the Congress informed on all economic trends which threaten or advance the cause of a stable, high level of economic activity and to advise the legislative committees of Congress on appropriate steps for keeping the economy healthy.

In previous years, when the President's Economic Report came down, and the joint committee went into action to investigate the report and its recommendations and thus make our own recommendations to the Congress, we invited numerous businessmen, economists, and experts of various sorts to come and testify. It was interesting, but not very informative. Each gave us his own prejudices, partisan or otherwise, with a lot of material to back it up. We ended up arguing instead of investigating, and our results inevitably led to separate majority and minority reports, along strict party lines.

This year, we tried something new, and we are all intensely pleased with it.

Instead of having one businessman after another, one economist after another, and one bureaucrat after another, come and make a formal presentation of his own views, we tried the round-table technique. The personal views were still expressed and ably so, but the intent was to find areas of agreement, rather than disagreement. We found substantial areas of agreement. We received, I believe, a much more rounded view of the whole.

When a CIO economist and an NAM economist can agree, and find their agreement also echoed by experts from Standard Oil and the Department of Labor, we are making some real progress and getting some real help. Of course, our round-table panel couldn't agree on everything—we would be in an awfully static economy and society if that ever happened—but we got what we were looking for, and that was informed, and generally frank and open, advice and help.

Whether we can solve the mysteries of the exact forces which cause collapse and depression, whether we can gage with any accuracy when Government should, or must, step in with affirmative action to head off collapse, whether we can draft any rule of thumb of investment in relation to employment which would serve as a weather-vane, whether we can collectively help to maintain an ever-expanding economy without using collectivist methods—these are questions our joint committee seeks to explore.

Similarly, we are seeking the answers in the facts and in the informed knowledge of those who deal with the facts to the questions of Government debt, Government credit, Government fiscal problems.

We are assailed on every hand each year with demands that we cut the astronomical Federal budget. We get few specific suggestions on where these cuts are to be made. We are told to cut taxes, and also cut the national debt. These inconsistent but twin demands always go back to the first demand—that we must cut Federal spending. Federal spending can be cut, and must be cut, and in particulars is being cut every day by the Congress, but blanket demands to cut spending—backed up by no specific suggestions from most witnesses or in the mail we receive on this subject—are as helpful at this particular period in our international relations as a similar demand would have been at the height of the war. Indeed, blanket, across-the-board reductions in Federal expenditures could be as disastrous as blank-check appropriations.

The burden of this whole long discourse, if I have not already made it clear, is that our political responsibilities to our country and to its form of government go a whole lot further than merely voting or expressing our opinions on controversial issues, a whole lot further than campaigning for some candidates, and against others, a whole lot further than concentrating on political actions helpful to us individually or to our businesses or professions.

Each of our citizens who is in the possession of expert knowledge in any field in which the Congress must deal owes it to himself and to his country to give the Congress the facts which he has and to present them straightforwardly and honestly and completely.

The administration of this great country is not a game; it is a grim and earnest thing. In a football game, the idea is to overpower the opposition if you can, otherwise, outsmart him. With our complex economic interests and economic tensions, there is always the challenge to every party of interest to take home the bacon for his own gang. We in the Congress are the targets of these maneuvers.

We can be fooled—we have frequently been fooled. And one economic interest or another—it could be almost any economic interest—has made a fast play and scored a big victory. Over whom? Not just over the innocents in Congress who didn't know any better. No. Over the whole country, over the stability of the economy itself, perhaps; over their own best interests, when they stop to consider.

We can't go on with a high-level economy and real stability in this country if we play our national political and economic issues like a football game. For when this economy topples, as it did 20 years ago, it doesn't make much difference which side made the most brilliant plays or which interest outdid itself in performance—we all get hurt, and we all go down together.

As this country pulled together in war for a common goal of freedom at home, and for the opportunity for freedom to exist elsewhere where it was and still is in many cases denied, so we must soft pedal partisanship, the win-at-any-price theory of politics, and cooperate together on those ideals we hold in common, and they cover just about everything important in American life, and show a still unconvinced world that American democracy is going to continue to work effectively and efficiently for the stability of our own system and the achievement of a decent world of free people at peace.

The Genocide Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Union of Saturday, December 24, 1949, entitled "The Genocide Convention."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

The Genocide Convention should be ratified, despite opposition of the American Bar Association, which it disapproves because the convention involves vital constitutional questions, including "international tribunals, which might supersede American courts and endanger the self-governing power of American States."

Proponents of the convention argue that the association's objections are not substantiated by an objective and analytical study of the documents involved.

It is true that article VI of the Genocide Convention contains a reference to an international penal tribunal which might supersede American courts if established and set in operation. However, the convention neither creates such a court nor establishes its unequivocal jurisdiction at any time in the future.

Article VI merely states that "persons charged with genocide * * * shall be tried by a competent tribunal of the state in the territory of which the act was committed, or by such international penal tribunal as may have jurisdiction with respect to those contracting parties which shall have accepted its jurisdiction."

The text of the convention is thus quite clear; the parties to the convention, by signing the treaty, do not assume any obligation to assist in the creation of such a tribunal, nor to accept its jurisdiction once the court has been established. They have reserved full freedom to decide upon such acceptance whenever a plan for the setting up of such a tribunal has been elaborated and its composition and general jurisdiction stipulated.

Corroborating evidence is to be found in the fact that article VI does not even set forth the instances in which the international tribunal is to be called upon to exercise jurisdiction, the legal basis on which its decisions are to rest, or the manner in which its sentences are to be executed.

The fact is that the reference to an international tribunal was included in article VI mainly because a proposal to study the possibility of international jurisdiction was made by the sixth committee, which discussed the Genocide Convention.

It was felt by those who drafted the convention that since such a tribunal might become a reality in the future, it would be advisable to insert a reference to such a tribunal in the document in order to avoid the necessity of amending the convention at some future date.

Senate ratification of the Genocide Convention would not constitute an agreement to have American courts superseded by international tribunals. If and when the statutes of an international penal court are set forth, the United States will decide whether it will be bound by such statutes.

It will then be time enough to discuss the advisability of taking such a step from the point of view of safeguarding the self-governing power of the American States. Meanwhile, the United States Senate would set a favorable precedent by ratifying the Convention on Genocide which outlaws mass killings of innocent peoples.

New York Times Educational Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a regional break-down of a study undertaken by the New York Times through its education editor, Dr. Benjamin Fine, which appeared in the Times of January 9, 1950, and supporting statistics.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONDITIONS IN THE NATION'S SCHOOLS, WITH PLANS FOR YEAR, AS FOUND IN TIMES SURVEY

(The status of public school education in the United States at present, in contrast with its status a year ago, as shown regionally in a survey by the New York Times, follows:)

NEW YORK, MIDDLE ATLANTIC

Despite the improved conditions generally evident in the New York-Middle Atlantic area, the elementary teacher shortage is still acute. Reports reaching the New York Times indicate that many substandard teachers are employed by the States in this region.

To meet the present needs, these States would need an additional 10,000 teachers to replace the emergency instructors, and another 7,500 teachers to fill vacancies or reduce class size.

Current public school enrollments in New York State are considerably above those of last year, and the trend is steadily upward. The estimated enrollment for all public schools is 1,917,500, an increase of 27,410 over

that of last year. The gain is distributed over all types of districts—cities, villages, union free, central rural, and common school districts.

New York State has a total of 76,250 teachers—just about what it had in 1948–49. In all, 45,500 children will suffer in their education because of inadequate buildings, and another 40,101 because of double sessions or part-time instruction.

Thirty-seven hundred hold emergency permits

The number of teachers holding emergency permits has increased slightly, going from 3,633 to 3,700. The State is unable to get enough adequately trained teachers for the elementary schools, but with the exception of agriculture, home-making, industrial and practical arts teachers, it can get enough on the high-school level. In addition to 3,700 additional qualified teachers to replace those on emergency certificates, the State could use 400 for special subjects on the secondary level.

New Jersey lists similar problems. According to Dr. John H. Boshart, New Jersey commissioner of education, nearly 70,000 of the State's children will suffer an impairment in their schooling because of inadequate buildings, lack of teachers, poorly prepared teachers and double sessions or part-time instruction.

Pennsylvania also is unable to get all the adequately trained teachers it needs for the elementary grades. There is also a serious shortage of secondary teachers in certain departments, but this shortage is neutralized by an excess in the fields of English, social studies, and languages. There is an insufficient supply in home economics, science, health, and physical education and special education.

Conditions generally better

In general, however, conditions in Pennsylvania are better this year, as they are in many other States, for these reasons, cited by the school officials:

1. The teacher supply is better.
2. The number of teachers on emergency certificates has been reduced.
3. The State-mandated salary schedule is higher.
4. Many new school buildings have been erected and additions constructed.
5. The supply of materials of instruction, including textbooks, supplementary books, general supplies, equipment, and audio-visual aids has increased.

Both Delaware and Maryland report that on the whole, school conditions are better this year than they were a year ago. In Maryland 13,400 children will suffer from double sessions or part-time instruction. The number of emergency teachers increased slightly in this State, going from 1,274 to 1,365. The State suffers from an inadequate supply of elementary teachers. Delaware reports that it needs teachers for both elementary and secondary schools. The salary average in both States has increased—it is now $3,440 in Maryland and $3,335 in Delaware.

Conditions in the District of Columbia are reported as being about the same as they were a year ago. There are still 400 teachers on emergency or substandard permits, compared with 477 last year. In the elementary field, the enrollment in the teachers college has been low for a number of years, and many graduates do not go into teaching. As a result, a rather serious shortage of adequately trained elementary teachers confronts the District. The average teacher salary is $3,793, a slight increase over last year's $3,733.

NEW ENGLAND

The New England States are not badly off, compared with other sections of the country. However, a serious teacher shortage still exists in most of the States, while emergency teachers are being employed to some extent. Operating expenses for the schools have gone up somewhat, although not any more proportionately than in the rest of the country.

Massachusetts indicates that it does not have a sufficient number of trained elementary teachers, although the danger of a teacher shortage on the high school level has vanished. Approximately 400 teachers have no more than a high school education, while 700 have had less than 2 years of college training. The State could use 200 additional qualified teachers.

Rhode Island, likewise, employs a number of teachers with less than college training. According to Dr. Michael F. Walsh, director of education, the state has 150 teachers with only a high-school education.

Seven hundred and fifty others have had 2 years of college or less. On the other hand, 2,150 hold college degrees, while 400 have more than 4 years of college. However, Dr. Walsh reports that an insufficient number of adequately trained teachers are available for the elementary fields.

Connecticut notes that 22,200 students will suffer an educational impairment because of inadequate buildings, 12,000 through poorly prepared teachers and 6,600 because of double sessions or part-time instruction. Four hundred and seventy-five teachers are employed on emergency or substandard permits, compared with 511 a year ago.

An adequate supply of well-trained teachers is not available in the State although in most subjects enough high-school teachers can be obtained. Four hundred and thirty additional qualified elementary teachers and 80 more high-school instructors could be used immediately. The average teacher's salary this year is $3,405 as compared with $3,328 a year ago. Connecticut needs $60,000,000 by September 1, 1951, for new buildings and $181,000,000 by 1960.

Both Maine and New Hampshire face serious educational problems during the coming year. Maine, in particular, is concerned at the difficulty in getting elementary teachers, although New Hampshire is hard hit too.

Officials in Maine estimate that 50,000 children will suffer because of inadequate buildings, 800 because of lack of teachers, 15,000 because of poorly prepared teachers and 5,400 because of double sessions or part-time instruction. At present 207 teachers are employed on an emergency basis compared with 500 a year ago. Because the rural communities neither pay adequately nor offer satisfactory living conditions, the schools are unable to get a sufficient supply of elementary teachers. Salaries in Maine range from $1,000 to $4,900 annually.

SOUTH

Nine of the twelve Southern States report that school conditions this year are better than they were in 1948–49. Only Alabama finds the situation is worse, while Mississippi and Kentucky say conditions are about the same.

Nevertheless, the educational picture for the South is gloomy. According to the Times survey, 1,125,000 pupils will receive an inferior education this year because of inadequate buildings, the lack of teachers, poorly prepared teachers, and doubled or part-time sessions.

The shortage of qualified teachers is a serious problem. Elementary teachers are in widespread demand; only three States—Arkansas, North Carolina, and South Carolina—say they can obtain all the secondary teachers they need.

Teachers of poor grade

The educational level of the South's teachers is not high. More than 39,000 teachers have only a high school or a year of college education at most. In fact, 887 teachers in Mississippi and 300 in North Carolina have never completed secondary school. Another 56,287 teachers have 2 or 3 years of college preparation, while the remainder, 135,170 teachers, have 4 or more years of higher education.

Salaries have risen, in some cases as much as $300 or $400, but as a whole teachers in the South are the most poorly paid in the Nation. Mississippi pays some teachers $500 a year and its average salary is only $1,293, the Nation's lowest. Kentucky has a low of $524, South Carolina $696, and Arkansas $700.

The present average salaries are far below the national average. Kentucky's $1,900, South Carolina's $1,795, and Arkansas' $1,675 are among the lowest salaries in the Nation.

Aware of the need for expanded school facilities, most Southern States have mapped building programs. By and large, they fall short of meeting needs. For example, six States, which say they need $594,000,000 to provide adequate facilities, report that they intend to spend only $283,379,014.

As in the case of teachers' salaries, the lack of sufficient funds is handicapping efforts to build new schools. Some officials concede that Federal aid is needed to help save the South's schools.

SOUTHWEST

More than 790,000 children in the Southwest—Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona—are receiving a second-rate education this year, the Times survey discloses. Except for the South, conditions in the Southwest are probably the worst in the country.

More than half of those receiving impaired education are suffering because of inadequate school facilities. In addition, 138,030 pupils in Oklahoma are receiving inferior schooling because they have substandard teachers.

Despite this, conditions in the Southwest have improved—although much remains to be done. Although good elementary teachers are still in demand, the teacher situation is far less critical than it was a year ago. Oklahoma, however, which has nearly 18,000 teachers, added only 500 teachers this fall and could use 2,594 elementary and 608 high-school teachers.

All four States, in addition to hiring new teachers, have succeeded in cutting down the number of emergency teachers this year, though in varying degrees. Oklahoma reports a drop from 3,489 in 1948–49 to 2,412 for 1949–50; Texas, from 2,250 to 2,000; New Mexico, from 209 to 157, and Arizona, from 351 to 111.

Teachers' salaries in Oklahoma and Texas have risen. Oklahoma now pays an average annual wage of $2,726; last year it paid $2,327. Texas increased average salaries from $2,470 to $2,900. Municipal teachers in New Mexico now earn $3,091, while rural teachers receive $200 less. Salaries in Arizona average $3,575, about the same as last year, and are among the highest in the country. This State says it has no difficulty in obtaining all the teachers it wants. Moreover, the educational level of Arizona's teachers is exceptionally high. Five hundred teachers there have 4 years of college preparation; all the rest, 3,740, have more.

MIDWEST

Compared with other sections of the country, conditions in the 12 Midwest States show a slight improvement. Half of the States indicated that school conditions were better, while only one State—South Dakota—reported that they were worse than a year ago. The Midwest plans a total expenditure of $117,177,395 for buildings for the 1949–50 period, compared with $57,803,818 last year. During the next 5 years this region expects to spend $600,000,000.

More teachers are employed in the Midwest this year than last, while the number of emergency or substandard teachers has dropped substantially. Teachers' salaries are higher, although in some States the average is considerably below that found elsewhere. Operating expenditures for elementary and secondary schools have gone up considerably in the last 12 months.

All of the Midwest States reported that they faced a serious teacher shortage on the elementary level. Frequently, as in the case of Nebraska, the high school teachers receive higher salaries than elementary teachers. For this reason, more students in teacher training institutions prepare for high school teaching. The result is that the State could use 2,000 additional qualified elementary teachers, while only 200 high school teachers.

Dakotas face problems

Both North and South Dakota face fairly similar problems: the need for more buildings, better elementary teachers, and a plan to reorganize the school districts. About 600 teachers in North Dakota have not gone beyond high school, while most of the others have anywhere from 1 to 3 years of college. Ten percent of the children suffer because of inadequate buildings, 15 percent because of poorly prepared teachers, and 10 percent because of double sessions or part-time instruction. Similar conditions exist in South Dakota. Both States have a large number of teachers who lack regular teaching permits.

The school budget in Iowa is now up to $101,500,000, an increase of $7,000,000 in 1 year. A capital outlay of $15,000,000 is planned. Conditions, in general, are listed as better, although these needs are noted: Adequate salaries for elementary teachers, increased standards for beginning teachers, and school district reorganization.

One thousand teachers needed

Minnesota and Michigan report that the teacher shortage still exists in the elementary field. Minnesota can use 1,000 additional elementary teachers, while Michigan can use 6,500. Michigan at present has 7,008 teachers working on emergency certificates, about the same as last year's figure. As school improvements within the State, Michigan cites these: Improved teacher supply, additional buildings, enlargement of school districts, and extension of the school program to include thirteenth and fourteenth grades (junior college).

Indiana is in a much better position this year than it was in the past. The average annual salary for classroom teachers is $3,280, as compared with $3,096 a year ago. The salary ranges from a low of $1,600 to a high of $6,440. Although there are not enough elementary teachers, Dr. Deane R. Walker, State superintendent of public instruction, reports that enrollments are rapidly increasing in the training institutions of the State. One hundred million dollars will be needed for buildings in the next 5 years.

Wisconsin and Ohio report that their school conditions this year are about the same as they were a year ago. Wisconsin notes that 50,000 children will suffer an impairment in their education because of inadequate buildings and poorly trained teachers. Wisconsin employs 3,100 teachers on emergency licenses, while Ohio employs 3,767.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN

Educational conditions in the Rocky Mountain region continued to show a slight gain this year, but officials conceded they were far from good. With the exception of Nevada, which has only seven substandard teachers, the percentage of emergency teachers is still high; classes are overcrowded, facilities inadequate, and the salaries of teachers in two States are comparatively low.

Utah, which this year added 430 teachers to its schools, now has 877 emergency teachers in a total force of 5,400. This, however, is a decrease of 380 emergency teachers from last year. Wyoming reported a decrease of 12 substandard teachers to a present total of 170. Colorado, which has 9,000 teachers, now has 1,475, or 25 fewer, emergency teachers.

Teachers' salaries represent a contrast. Two States are above the national average and two are below. Wyoming gave teachers a $200 raise and now pays an average of $2,740. Colorado increased the salaries of its teachers from $2,480 to $2,650. On the other side of the national average are Utah, which increased salaries from $2,900 to $3,100, and Nevada, $3,004 to $3,058.

An extensive school-building program is underway in Wyoming, Ray E. Roberteson, commissioner of education, said:

"School bond issues for approximately $12,000,000 have been floated since 1945 for the purpose of school-building construction. Seventy-seven new school buildings or additions are in the process of construction—a number which is significant when one considers the State has a total of only 88 4-year accredited high schools."

However, the picture is different for Nevada. Although the State needs $20,000,000 during the next 5 years for school construction, at most, it will spend $5,000,000.

NORTHWEST

Conditions in Idaho and Montana are reported slightly better this year, but the picture for the Northwest as a whole is still grim. The States are finding it difficult to obtain competent teachers, particularly on the elementary level, although in one respect they are fortunate: there is no heavy increase in school population and Montana reports a slight drop in the school enrollment.

The number of teachers on emergency certificates in Montana has decreased from 950 in 1948–49 to 700, while in Idaho there is a total of 840, or 180 less substandard teachers. Montana this year has 160 fewer teachers, which may be partly explained by the drop in school attendance.

Of Montana's 4,620 teachers, only 2,220 have four or more years of college education. Four hundred and fifty teachers have 1 year of college training, 470 have 2 years, and 1,550 have 3 years. There are 50 openings for teachers in the State. An estimated 10,000 pupils will receive an inferior education because of poorly prepared teachers; an additional 10,000 will suffer because of inadequate facilities.

Salaries in the Northwest have risen only slightly. Montana pays its teachers an average annual wage of $2,850—$150 more than last year—and Idaho has increased salaries by only a few dollars. Idaho now pays $2,663 a year, which is far below the national average of $2,886. Some teachers in Montana and Idaho receive as low as $1,700 and $1,800, respectively.

FAR WEST

Although conditions in the far West have improved slightly in recent years, the number of children who will receive impaired instruction this year has doubled over 1948–49. Even without complete returns from Oregon, the number of pupils receiving second-rate education totals 449,700; last year it was 250,000.

A break-down indicates that 140,000 pupils in Washington and 60,000 in California are attending classes held in out-moded, overcrowded, and otherwise inadequate buildings; 80,000 pupils in Oregon have poorly prepared teachers; 150,000 in California are enrolled in double sessions or are receiving part-time instruction.

Contrasting pictures of education can be obtained by examining the reports from the three States. Oregon says conditions are better now than they were a year ago; California says it is about the same and Washington says conditions are worse.

Although salaries of teachers have improved to a point above the national average, the States are finding it difficult to obtain elementary teachers and in many cases there is a lack of qualified secondary teachers.

California raised teachers' salaries almost $200 to an average of $3,940—the highest in the Nation. Oregon initiated a $300 increase and Washington effected a $100 raise; both States now pay about $3,300—more than $600 above the national average.

Nevertheless, the teacher shortage there is critical. An official of the California State Education Department declares tersely: "The teachers simply are not available. Many have left the profession since 1942. Teacher-training institutions have graduated too few teacher candidates."

Likewise, Mrs. Pearl A. Wanamaker, superintendent of public instruction for Washington, comments: "The number of teachers graduating from teacher-training institutions are not adequate to make up the shortage of teachers suffered during the war years and to meet needs for additional teachers to take care of expanding school enrollments."

California, however, did succeed in improving its teacher problem. It added 9,000 new teachers during the year and now has the Nation's second largest staff—62,700 teachers. It also decreased the number of emergency teachers from 13,000 to 12,500.

UNITED STATES SCHOOLS STILL IMPAIRED DESPITE GAINS IN TEACHERS—MILLIONS OF CHILDREN ALSO HANDICAPPED BY LACK OF FACILITIES, SURVEY SHOWS—SOME STATES REPORT IMPROVEMENTS

(By Benjamin Fine)

More than 3,000,000 children attending public schools in the United States will receive an impaired education this year because of inadequate classroom facilities, overcrowded buildings and poorly trained teachers. Although conditions in the Nation's schools have improved somewhat in the last 12 months, a serious teacher shortage still exists, particularly on the elementary level.

With the exception of Arizona, every State in the Union reports that it is unable to get all the adequately trained teachers needed for elementary school teaching. Sixteen States lack a sufficient number of high-school teachers, although the situation on the secondary level is not as serious as it was in past years. The public schools now employ 86,000 teachers on emergency or substandard certificates, a drop of 19,000 since 1948–49. This amounts to approximately 1 emergency teacher in every 10 teachers employed, as compared with 1 in every 400 before the war.

These conclusions are reached in a Nationwide survey conducted by the New York Times, which analyzed public school data for each of the States and the District of Columbia. Many grave problems are faced by the Nation's schools, the survey showed. An unprecedented school population increase, coupled with inflationary building costs, have combined to check the upward advances that the school systems started to make in the last year, it also was found.

In the current school year the public elementary and high schools will reach an enrollment of 25,000,000, an increase of 750,000 over the figure for a year ago. From all indications available to the writer it appears that public school enrollment will continue to increase during the next 10 years at the rate of about 750,000 a year. This will add from seven to eight million children to the schools by the end of the next decade. As a result, the present inadequate school facilities and teaching staff will cause even greater grief to school administrators everywhere.

Twenty-four of the States reported that school conditions are better this year as compared with last. Interestingly enough, the greatest improvements, the Times study indicates, are found in the Southern States. Conditions are worse in the District of Columbia, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Alabama, South Dakota, and Washington.

Twelve States said that conditions are about the same as they were a year ago.

State commissioners of education and superintendents of instruction were asked to cite the most pressing needs for the improvement of education in their States. They listed many "needs" that plague their their school systems. Those most frequently mentioned by the educators were the following:

1. More elementary school teachers.
2. Better prepared teachers on both elementary and secondary levels.
3. More school buildings, equipment, and supplies.
4. Reorganization of school districts to eliminate the small, inefficient school unit.
5. A better, improved curriculum for the Nation's high schools.

By far the greatest needs, the country's top school administrators agree, are the necessity for more teachers and the urgent need to construct more school buildings. They estimate that they will need a minimum of $5,500,000,000 to provide adequate school facilities. However, they indicate that less than half of that amount will be available in the next 5 years. A number of State commissioners say that without some form of Federal aid, the necessary buildings will not be constructed.

THEY SCHEDULE PLANNING

However, even without aid from Washington, the States are planning a huge building program this year. Twenty States report they will spend $500,000,000 during the current school year—about double the amount spent last year. Probably never before has so much been allocated for school buildings. Every section of the country plans to construct schools, ranging from near y $200,000,000 worth of buildings in the Middle Atlantic States to $35,000,000 in the Southwest. New York State, with an estimated expenditure of $85,000,000, leads the country.

Of equal importance with the serious building shortage is the teacher crisis. Educators are worried over the lack of a sufficient corps of elementary teachers. Although the number of emergency teachers has decreased, many are still employed 5 years after the end of the war. Many teachers on substandard certificates do not meet even the minimum educational requirements of their States, and are frequently lacking in teaching experience.

As shown in the study, 86,000 elementary and high school teachers are hired by the Nation's schools; the States indicate they could use 75,858 more elementary teachers and 10,147 additional high-school instructors. The greatest need was found to exist in the South and Midwest, where virtually every State reports that it could use more teachers.

As serious as the teacher shortage itself is the poor training and education many classroom teachers possess. The study shows that many teachers do not have a high-school education, while about half have not completed their college program. Actually, some States report that they employ teachers who have less than a high-school education. For example, Mississippi notes that 887 of its teachers have not finished high school, while North Carolina has 346 such teachers, and Texas has 60. All told, 70,000 teachers have 1 year of college training or less.

Probably as serious as any other factor is the large number of boys and girls receiving an inadequate or an impaired education because of incompetent teachers or the shortage of school facilities. A total of slightly more than 3,000,000 children will get a second-rate education this year because of poor teaching conditions. A break-down of the data reveals this picture: 1,896,143 will suffer because of inadequate buildings; 892,726 will be penalized as a result of poorly prepared teachers; another 202,740 will suffer because of a lack of teachers, and 333,590 will have their schooling impaired because of double sessions or part-time instruction.

SOUTH TO SUFFER MOST

The greatest number of children will be affected in the South, where more than 1,000,000 boys and girls are scheduled to get an impaired education. Georgia, for example, reports that 400,000 of its youth will suffer because of inadequate buildings and 125,000 because of poorly prepared teachers.

In Alabama the reports indicate that 200,000 children will get an impaired schooling because of poorly prepared teachers, and 150,000 will suffer as a result of inadequate buildings. Oklahoma presents the worst picture of all in this respect. It reports that 442,834 children will suffer because of inadequate buildings.

The Middle Atlantic States present the best picture. New York reports that 45,500 children will get an impaired education because of inadequate buildings, and 38,401 because of double sessions or part-time instruction. New Jersey lists 11,981 children as suffering through poor buildings, 374 because of the lack of teachers, 49,140 because of poorly prepared teachers, and 6,388 as the result of double sessions. The other States, with the exception of Pennsylvania, report few if any children suffering from a lack of adequate facilities or competent teachers.

For the fourth year in a row the average teacher salary has increased. This year the teachers will average $2,886, as compared with $2,676 in 1948–49—an increase of $210 a teacher. Almost every State reports that its salary schedule has increased this year, although in a few instances the averages reported are slightly below those of last year.

NEW YORK RANKS SECOND

For the first time, New York does not lead in the average salary paid to its teachers. California is now on top, with an average of $3,940. New York is second, with an average of $3,875, while the District of Columbia is third with $3,793. Other States, with averages above $3,000, include: Massachusetts, $3,625; Arizona, $3,576; Michigan, $3,550; New Jersey, $3,460; Maryland, $3,449; Delaware, $3,325; Oregon, $3,305; Washington, $3,300; Indiana, $3,280; Rhode Island, $3,100; Utah, $3,100 and Nevada, $3,058. More States have passed the $3,000 mark than ever before.

The highest average salaries are paid to teachers in the Far West and Middle Atlantic States. The lowest salaries are found in the South and Midwest. Mississippi remains on the bottom, with an average of $1,393, or $27.78 a week, compared with a national average of $55.37 a week. Arkansas is next to the bottom, with $1,675, followed by South Carolina, with $1,795. Kentucky, with $1,990, is the only other State that has an average of less than $2,000.

Although the salaries have been greatly increased in recent years, many educators note that the economic position of the average teacher today is not substantially better than it was just prior to the war. While the national average salary has doubled since 1939–40—it was $1,441 that year—it has gained only about $300 in purchasing power, the National Education Association says. Part of this gain has been offset by the Federal income tax, which did not apply to public school teachers before 1939.

Despite the high average, many teachers receive incredibly low salaries. The Times' study shows. In some States teachers are employed for less than $10 a week. For example, Nebraska reports a salary range going from $450 a year to $4,000. Mississippi has a range from $500 to $3,200. South Carolina from $696 to $3,048 and Kentucky from $524 to $4,300. Thirty States pay some of their teachers less than $2,000 a year.

"How can you expect to get a competent teacher for $500 a year?" one of the State commissioners asked incredulously. "Why, you can't even get a decent janitor at that price."

Every State reports a booming school population. In some instances the increased elementary enrollment is offset by a declining high school student body. However, the States report that the influx of the "war babies" is being felt. Some communities have jumped from 25 to 50 percent in their first two or three elementary grades. The situation, educators agree, will be much worse a year from now, and far more serious 5 years hence. By that time, they say, the high school enrollment will begin to rise, too, thus adding to the needs of the school system on both levels.

TEACHER PERSONNEL RISES

On the hopeful side is the increased number of teachers that are now found in the Nation's public schools. This year the schools report a total teacher staff of 942,530, an increase of 42,000 in a year. A number of States report substantial increases in the teaching staffs. California has employed 62,700 teachers this year, as compared with 53,824 a year ago. Washington has 10,500 teachers, 1,000 more than a year ago. Other States have made smaller gains.

Although the number of emergency or substandard teaching certificates has dropped, many educators are disturbed at the fact that 86,000 teachers are retained on an emergency basis. According to the Times' study, for the most part the emergency teachers lack the qualifications that the regular teachers possess. Many of the substandard teachers do not have much more than a high-school education; they have been "drafted" for classroom use because no competent teacher is available in the community.

OPERATING COSTS SET RECORD

The operating expenditures for the public elementary and secondary schools of the Nation is at a record high this year. The States report that the 1949–50 school budgets will amount to more than $4,600,000,000, as compared with $4,190,000,000 a year ago, roughly a 10-percent increase. Nearly every State points with pride to increased school operating expenditures. New York leads with an operating budget of $525,000,000, a $25,000,000 increase in the last 12 months (this represents the total for all local and State support).

Pennsylvania notes a substantial gain, going from $253,846,551 to $294,994,452. North Carolina has jumped from $87,000,000 to $103,600,000, while Texas has shot up from $217,000,000 to $275,000,000. The greatest gain made by any single State was recorded by Indiana, where the school budget increased from $78,256,696 to the present $155,000,000. California, with a budget of $380,000,000, shows an increase of $24,000,000 during the past year. By contrast, the smallest school budget is found in Nevada, where $6,629,640 has been allocated this year public elementary and high-school support.

Almost without exception, the States report that many serious problems remain to be solved. They are optimistic, however, that the necessary funds will come from the public. Even though money is at the bottom of many of the problems, money alone is not the answer. One of the major issues that a number of States face—particularly in the South and the Midwest—is that of reorganizing or modernizing their school districts. Several States still maintain the school districts that came down from the horse-and-buggy days, when it was impossible for the children to get to a school that was not within walking distance of their farm. With good roads and modern transportation facilities, however, the large number of inefficient, small units can be eliminated.

IMPROVED CONDITIONS SEEN

Although these problems remain to be solved, by and large the school leaders are convinced that conditions are slightly better this year than they were a year ago. The National Education Association believes that the deterioration of the war period in our school system has stopped. It observes that even though strenuous efforts by State legislatures, local school boards, the organized profession, and the public are producing results, much remains to be done.

It is evident that the downward trend has been stopped. More money is being allocated for the operating expenses of the schools, and a huge capital outlay budget has been set aside for the current year. Teachers' salaries have gone to record heights, and in general, the attitude of the public toward the free public schools has improved considerably within the last few years.

On the other hand, much remains to be done before the public can sit back complacently. The unprecedented birth rate, with the record school enrollments that are just around the corner, cannot be easily discounted. With an expected increase of at least 750,000 children a year during the next 10 years, the Nation's schools will be taxed as they never were before. It will require the combined energy, effort, and good will of all citizens, nonprofessional as well as professional, to meet the urgent school problems ahead.

Educators and responsible citizens everywhere are confident that the Nation will meet the coming school crisis, as it has the grave postwar problems that for a time threatened to destroy America's valuable free public-school system. It has long been recognized by all segments of the Nation that the public schools are essential for the continuance of a strong, democratic form of government.

STATEMENT OF STATES ON SCHOOL TEACHING AND OPERATING

The present status of total teaching staff, emergency teachers, teachers' salaries, range of salaries, and operating expenditures for elementary and secondary schools, as reported throughout the Nation is as follows:

	Number of teachers		Number of substandard or emergency teachers		Average salaries		Range of salaries (1949–50)		Operating expenditures for elementary and secondary schools	
	1949–50	1948–49	1949–50	1948–49	1949–50	1948–49	Lowest	Highest	1949–50	1948–49
Middle Atlantic:										
New York	76,250	76,450	3,700	3,625	$3,875	$3,632	$2,000	$6,200	$525,000,000	$500,000,000
New Jersey	27,096	26,121	2,100	1,970	3,460	3,262	2,200	5,600	155,000,000	150,000,094
Pennsylvania	59,560	60,137	2,500	2,645	2,896	2,770	2,000	4,000	294,994,452	253,846,551
Delaware	1,850	1,765	52	105	3,325	2,934	2,400	4,000	9,300,000	8,112,110
District of Columbia	3,307	3,333	405	477	3,793	3,733	2,820	4,520	22,501,935	21,188,157
Maryland	11,504	10,749	1,265	1,274	3,449	3,342	1,100	5,000	85,625,169	84,046,638
New England:										
Maine	6,200	6,198	297	494	2,130	2,080	1,000	4,900	21,300,000	21,086,000
New Hampshire	3,665	2,949	379	414	2,750	2,325	1,700	4,200	15,900,000	13,728,223
Vermont	2,602	2,615	536	434	2,323	2,205	1,500	3,600	10,200,000	9,872,178
Massachusetts	24,250	22,223	(1)		3,625	2,700	1,600	5,100	115,500,879	113,280,902
Connecticut	10,487	10,712	475	521	3,405	3,328	2,000	6,000	60,000,000	58,040,535
Rhode Island	3,980	3,816	35	35	3,100	3,086	1,600	6,300		10,486,455
South:										
Virginia	22,470	18,632	2,840	2,150	[2] 2,300	2,275	[2] 1,185	[2] 4,300	[2] 70,000,000	60,606,078
West Virginia	16,007	15,700	1,826	3,486	2,330	2,400	1,865	3,600	64,363,418	54,113,339
North Carolina	28,800	26,240	300	600	2,550	2,100	1,900	3,900	103,600,000	87,000,000
South Carolina	17,000	16,169	600	621	1,795	1,721	696	3,048	45,000,000	43,377,047
Tennessee	22,198	20,750	2,504	4,025	2,140	1,760	1,170	2,925	69,400,000	58,000,000
Georgia	24,806	23,595	3,600	4,321	1,900	1,800	1,128	2,600	69,000,000	61,251,962
Alabama	22,400	20,800	2,446	4,915	2,040	1,900	900	4,250	59,771,732	52,898,600
Mississippi	15,950	14,700	800	1,067	1,393	1,287	500	3,200	34,082,575	31,596,426
Arkansas	13,300	12,650	2,500	3,069	1,675	1,600	700	3,900	32,500,000	30,081,086
Louisiana	16,225	14,500	1,497	2,389	2,700	2,600	2,400	3,600		
Kentucky	19,000	18,929	3,500	4,600	1,900	1,800	524	4,300	55,000,000	54,286,000
Florida	17,700	15,366	2,000	2,453	2,832	2,752	2,100	3,600	69,577,816	68,716,175
Southwest:										
Oklahoma	17,900	17,303	2,412	3,490	2,798	2,327	1,500	4,200	70,000,000	69,000,000
Texas	50,250	46,000	2,000	2,250	2,900	2,679	1,634	3,600	275,000,000	217,000,000
New Mexico	[1] 5,100	4,350	157	200		2,679				
Arizona	6,200	4,303	111	331	3,575	3,500	2,100	4,800	31,912,612	28,294,296
Midwest:										
Ohio	45,200	41,921	3,767	4,400	2,893	2,930	1,300	4,600	296,700,000	286,288,194
Indiana	25,124	24,400	1,103	1,237	3,280	3,064	1,600	6,440	155,000,000	78,256,696
Illinois	45,400	46,447	1,500	2,495	[2] 2,700	2,675			252,300,165	240,226,267
Michigan	35,000	33,300	7,000	7,400	3,550	3,300	2,550	3,550	240,000,000	230,000,000
Wisconsin	20,000	22,000	3,900	3,350	2,625	2,430	1,800	4,650	98,000,000	88,300,000
Minnesota	20,225	20,300	622	892	2,730	2,700	1,000	4,000	105,000,000	98,097,978
Iowa	22,775	22,578	205	500		2,625	1,100	3,900	101,500,000	94,349,244
Missouri	25,000	24,300	2,000	2,240	2,299	2,100	1,150	4,750	105,000,000	107,000,000
North Dakota	6,388	6,481	670	1,375	2,100	1,573	1,150	4,100	22,500,000	19,038,671
South Dakota	7,014	7,400	1,336	1,577	2,100	1,600	1,125	4,500	25,000,000	23,832,762
Nebraska	12,000	12,000	1,400	2,057	2,113	2,064	450	4,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
Kansas	16,800	15,000	230	592	2,275	2,143	2,097	4,300	64,000,000	
Rocky Mountain:										
Wyoming	2,600	2,600	179	182	2,740	2,552			13,000,000	12,200,000
Colorado	9,400	9,130	1,475	1,500	[2] 2,600	2,400	1,200	4,500	60,000,000	50,618,000
Utah	5,400	4,957	870	1,153	3,100	2,900	2,300	3,900	25,500,000	25,163,000
Nevada	1,341	1,195	7	11	3,058	3,004	2,400	4,740	6,629,640	5,600,679
Northwest:										
Montana	4,620	4,700	700	900	2,930	2,779	1,700	4,000	24,000,000	21,598,095
Idaho	4,700	4,500	540	1,000	2,663	2,430	1,800	3,900	21,230,326	20,215,364
Far West:										
Washington	10,300	15,400	3,600	4,524	3,300	3,300	2,400	4,000	93,000,000	84,986,541
Oregon	10,500	9,500	1,400	1,467	3,305	3,000	2,400	3,900	64,000,000	56,000,000
California	62,700	53,824	12,500	13,000	3,940	3,740	2,400	6,000	380,000,000	356,000,000
Total, United States	942,530	901,006	86,202	105,218	2,886	2,676			[3] 4,594,771,369	[3] 4,022,925,737
Grand total									[4] 4,661,603,374	[4] 4,194,338,051

[1] No certification in Massachusetts.
[2] Estimate.
[3] Total for 45 States and District of Columbia.
[4] Projection for total United States.

TEACHER NEEDS BY STATES

The number of elementary and high-school teachers needed, as shown in the Times survey, is as follows:

	Elementary	Secondary
Middle Atlantic:		
New York	2,700	450
New Jersey	700	146
Middle Atlantic—Continued		
Pennsylvania	1,700	200
Delaware	75	7
District of Columbia	225	[1] 100
Maryland	[1] 35	None
New England:		
Maine	50	None
New Hampshire	300	50
New England—Continued		
Vermont	526	60
Massachusetts	200	None
Connecticut	450	50
Rhode Island	200	None
South:		
Virginia	5,132	
West Virginia	1,656	146
North Carolina	3,700	100
South Carolina	400	150

[1] Estimate.

	Elementary	Secondary
South—Continued		
Tennessee	2,000	300
Georgia	50	295
Alabama	2,000	445
Mississippi	1,000	200
Arkansas	1,000	600
Louisiana	2,000	1,500
Kentucky	3,000	300
Florida	1,000	125
Southwest		
Oklahoma	2,294	600
Texas	None	None
New Mexico	None	None
Arizona	None	None
Midwest:		
Ohio	2,500	250
Indiana	700	None
Illinois	2,500	500
Iowa		
Michigan	4,000	500
Wisconsin	3,000	200
Minnesota	1,000	100
Missouri	2,000	1,500
North Dakota	1,000	65
South Dakota	1,000	200
Nebraska	2,000	200
Kansas	500	50
Rocky Mountain:		
Wyoming	200	None
Colorado	200	100
Utah	734	135
Nevada	None	None
Northwest:		
Montana	1,000	150
Idaho	75	25
Far West:		
Washington	1,000	300
Oregon	1,019	100
California	5,000	None
Total	75,856	10,147

Recognition of Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the interest which many of our Maryland people feel with regard to United States relations with Spain is reflected, I am sure, in a similar interest elsewhere throughout the country. For this reason I believe the attached column from the Washington Star of November 15, 1949, from Madrid, by Constantine Brown, concerning the results of the United States boycott of Spain offers information which our people and the Congress should have.

I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHANGING WORLD—UNITED STATES BOYCOTT OF SPAIN HAS RALLIED PEOPLE BEHIND THE FRANCO BANNER

(By Constantine Brown)

MADRID.—The American boycott of Spain has accomplished something which the Communists and their associates have not been able to accomplish in 9 years of trying.

The Spaniards are wondering whether our Government, which has spent or is spending $30,000,000,000 to save western civilization, is really aware of what the situation in Europe would become if the Spanish economy collapsed.

Spanish politicians and economists maintain that the Communist threat to western Europe has not been removed yet. The Communists in Italy and France now are merely on the defensive. So long as the peoples in the Marshall-plan countries receive American gratuities to the tune of several billion dollars a year, so long as communism from the east is being contained, everything appears all right on the surface.

HEAVY SACRIFICE MADE

Spain has been able to carry on without any outside assistance for a number of years. It has been able to heal some of the more obvious wounds caused by the civil war. This has required hard work and heavy sacrifice, particularly on the part of her industrial and farm workers.

Since the end of 1948, when it became apparent that the present regime would not be overthrown by any internal move against General Franco, the western nations have resumed economic relations with this country.

Spain's trade agreements with all the Marshall-plan countries amount to nearly $750,000,000. But most of the goods thus obtained—by virtual barter—are not of real value to the economy of this country. None of the western European countries can provide Spain with oil refineries. Nor can they send her the tools needed for heavy industry or for the vital improvement of the Spanish transportation system, although British busses are one exception. They cannot provide Spain with motors for planes or the machinery for road building, electric power, and irrigation.

Because of our economic boycott and Spain's shortage of dollars trade with the United States has reached a new low. The Government as well as economic leaders in this country feel that Spain cannot recover without the active support of the United States. All their efforts to correct this condition have so far been useless. To their approaches they got the answer: "Change your regime, get rid of Franco, and we shall help you."

SPANISH PRIDE OFFENDED

The campaign against Franco, which was led originally by atheist Russia and her Communist mouthpieces, throughout the world, has set these fanatically religious peoples at the side of their dictator. At one time there were definite movements, particularly among the high-ranking military, to dispose of General Franco to enable Spain to enter the concert of western European nations. But when the United Nations voted in 1946 to punish Spain by withdrawing ambassadors from Madrid, Spanish pride was offended and the Spaniards have been supporting Franco ever since.

Europe has realized its mistake and has started doing business with Spain again. The American Government is continuing its synthetic diplomacy and has refused to follow Europe's example. Our Government seems to believe that by continuing its policy of attrition now, when the Spaniards need our assistance desperately, we may still bring about General Franco's downfall.

A revolution in Spain might be fatal to recovery of the Continent, according to all realistic observers with whom this reporter has talked. It might spread across Spain's borders. The fall of Franco under such conditions might be a catastrophe since it would upset the shaky balance which we are striving to create in Europe.

Value of Inspection Trips by Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Chicago Daily News of January 6, written by Mr. Fred Sparks, foreign correspondent for the Daily News.

I think it is a valuable article as it may serve to put in better perspective the inspection trips of Congressmen which are so easily passed off as junketing.

Mr. Sparks' observations also emphasize a point of great concern to me, that our great need in foreign lands today is a band of evangelists, rather than apologists, for the American system of life and government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSMAN UPHELD—SPARKS DEFENDS JUNKETEERS' RIGHT TO CRITICIZE ALLIES—UNITED STATES OPINION OF OTHER NATIONS IS WHAT COUNTS, WRITER SAYS

(NOTE.—Recently there's been much excitement about Congressmen traveling in Europe and criticizing foreign affairs. Fred Sparks, Daily News correspondent, here offers his own opinion on this matter.)

(By Fred Sparks)

BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA.—I rise in defense of junketing Congressmen and their right to say what they please.

I don't necessarily go along with Senator THOMAS, who withered Sweden (that profitable nook of neutrality).

But rather than worry Congressmen into silence I'll put up with occasional speeches made in Rome, Italy, to impress voters in Rome, N. Y.

Congressmen—unlike the expanding army of bureaucrats abroad—are responsible directly to you and me.

If they don't have the diplomatic polish preferred by the State Department's tea-cup tipplers, well—neither have you and I.

I'm burning at the bureaucrat who applies finger to lip and stage whispers: "Shhhhh. Hush. Don't say that. Don't print that. It might offend the Dutch or the Norwegians or the Yugoslavs or the Ubangis."

Rubbish. Action, not chatter dominates history.

Who is picking up the world's dinner check today, anyhow?

It is not as important what they think of us—as what we think of them.

In my extensive travels I've met too many United States officials who automatically side with European governments against American critics.

Why? The average bureaucrat abroad doesn't care a bean about the natives. But he shivers in his payroll envelope, terrified that congressional criticism might shrink the next appropriation, and wash out his job.

Here are several disgusting incidents:

A diplomat in a central European country told me. "Six Senators arrive tomorrow. I'll exhaust them with sightseeing and cocktail parties. I'll tell them nothing. What I know goes directly to the State Department."

(Woodrow Wilson warned against the cancerizing danger of secret diplomacy.)

The directing general of a United States military mission invariably takes the advice of natives and overrules his own officers. His alibi, "Oh! They're very sensitive. We can't dare offend them."

An ECA mission chief said, "I often explode at the way this country wastes our grants. But Hoffman (ECA chief) would be furious if I spoke out—might offend the locals."

When a report showed the French press ignoring Marshall-plan activities, an ECA spokesman said, "We can't push them. We can't offend them."

On an air liner I met Congressmen leaving a land kept breathing by our dollars. When I told them some ECA scandals (moneys misappropriated; contracts bought and sold), they gasped, "The Embassy never told us that."

To offset the possibly critical impact of junketing Congressmen's statements, bureaucrats conduct a "smear" campaign.

Congressmen are jokingly depicted as village idiots, uncouth provincials, Rotarian bores, party hacks, "tools of the 'interests'," and just plain stumblebums.

A British diplomat once told me: "Before I met a visiting congressional committee, I was amazed by what your Embassy chaps said about them. They described them as the very worst type of American. Just what kind of people go into politics in your country?"

Unfortunately, too many editorial writers, groping for a daily space filler, join the howling pack to "smear" junketing Congressmen.

The whole thing discourages investigation into foreign expenditures. By abusing junketing Congressmen, who speak freely this year, bureaucrats hope to shut off next year's trippers.

Bureaucrats abroad spit hate for an American Congressman who sports a 10-gallon Texas hat. They are vicious about a southern Congressman who likes a few bourbons and the rebel yell.

Yet these "expatriates" sigh with artistic admiration in the atmosphere of a creepy left-bank bistro—a jernt where the waiter shoves his black fingernail in the coffee cup and the bartender hasn't washed below the neck since the liberation.

A good American said after a continental tour: "Too many of our officials feel that Marshall-plan funds should be mailed directly to foreign governments—and we should hide in a gopher hole.

"I wish everybody was as well fed as Americans. But I see no reason to be ashamed of our God-given prosperity, or our freedom to criticize our Government or our allies."

The Formosa Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Formosa Crusade" by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the Washington Post of January 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FORMOSA CRUSADE

A United Press dispatch from Tokyo, written after the President's clear and honorable statement on Formosa, says "that one veteran member of General MacArthur's staff, who talks to the Commander in Chief daily, said it was obvious that the State Department's views were not drawn up by anyone with military experience."

Perhaps it is about time to remind the veteran member of General MacArthur's staff who talks daily to the commander-in-chief that in this Republic the President of the United States is General MacArthur's commander-in-chief. And so, soldiers who respect the traditions of the Republic have a duty and a right to submit their views through official channels to their superior. But while they wear the uniform of the United States, and especially when they are in a foreign country, they have no right whatsoever to conduct a public agitation, using the press and politicians as their mouthpiece, to challenge and discredit the policies of their Government. If they disagree with those policies and feel it their duty to make a public issue, they should ask to be relieved, should come home, should take off their uniforms, and then as civilians should exercise their rights as citizens to express their views.

If they came out into the open and explained their views and had to debate them, it might just possibly become clearer than it is from the speeches of the interventionist Senators just what the Formosa business is about. It cannot be that these men of military experience really think that the island of Formosa, 100 miles from the coast of China, some 15 minutes by air, within easy range of long-range missiles, would be a desirable place to lock up American troops and American equipment. They cannot wish to tie down American forces in the defense of such an exposed fixed position, and to make of Formosa another and far more indefensible Bataan. Nor can they believe that the Red forces—Chinese or Russian—can do anything by sea, by air, or by invasion from Formosa that they cannot do far more conveniently from Shanghai, Foochow, Amoy, Canton and all the other ports and airfields along the 2,000 miles of coast from Kamchatka to the Gulf of Tonking.

It is difficult to believe that the veteran member of General MacArthur's staff, or any other military man, will care to argue that Formosa, in American hands, would be a necessary asset to our strategic security, and not a dangerous liability.

As a matter of fact, the case for military intervention in Formosa really rests on the argument that we should wage an undeclared war against Red China. The argument for the undeclared war is that if we commit ourselves in Formosa, which has been solemnly declared to be Chinese territory, we cannot be at peace with the Peking government. We cannot recognize it. We cannot have de facto relations with it. We shall be openly at war with it if it attempts to take over Formosa.

The idea behind this is that if we can keep Red China nominally at war with Chiang, but really with us, Red China will not be able to demobilize and, therefore, will be unable to consolidate its victory and to carry out the economic reconstruction. If I had not heard this idea expounded by Senator KNOWLAND himself, I would not have believed that anyone could think that the way to save Asia from communism was to make sure that the Communists had the biggest army in Asia.

The sheer lunacy of the idea comes from Senator KNOWLAND's failure to ask himself what Mao Tse-tung would do with his army if he had to keep it mobilized and if he could not feed the Chinese people. Mao would have the most powerful army in eastern Asia, sitting around eating its head off while his people were starving. Can anyone think of a greater inducement and a greater provocation to make him use his undemobilized army to raid the rich and almost undefended countries to the south of him—to burst into Burma, Siam, and Indochina?

And if that happens, because Senator KNOWLAND has contrived to keep Red China mobilized, will he and Mr. Hoover and Senator SMITH of New Jersey and Senator TAFT send the navy, or will they send General MacArthur, or will they merely send some military advisers, to defend human freedom in the jungles of Burma and in the ambuscades of Indochina?

All they can accomplish by this agitation is to prevent this country from playing any useful part in Asia. Their effort to keep us embroiled with Red China in order to prevent recognition will mean, if they succeed, that we cannot collaborate with anyone in Asia. For every other nation with interests in Asia will soon have recognized Red China. Those nations cannot be at peace with Mao and at the same time allied with a government that is in effect at war with Mao.

Surely as the night follows the day the absurdity and the practical confusion of such a posture on our part will soon be so self-evident that, in order to have any policy at all in Asia, we shall have to aline ourselves with our friends and we shall have to recognize Mao's government. But then recognition will not be, as it is in the case of Britain and the other members of the Commonwealth, a recognition that the facts are what they are. Our recognition, if it is long delayed, if it is preceded by fierce debate, will be a recognition of our own defeat.

To Peking and to Moscow it will bring the immense prestige of having the strongest of the western powers reverse itself and bow to the inevitable. The longer we wait the more we emphasize the importance of the issue; the more we quarrel over the fallacy that recognition means approval, the more we shall lose face before the world and among the peoples of Asia.

Problems of the Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an admirable and very penetrating statement recently made by Rev. Jeremiah M. Reardon, celebrated spiritual leader of South Barre, Mass., before a meeting of Massachusetts Members of Congress.

Father Reardon has for years given unselfishly of his great ability, energy, and talent to help the veteran, particularly the disabled, the hospitalized, and the distressed. His cogent views will be of great interest and valuable assistance to our membership.

STATEMENT OF PATRICK JEREMIAH H. KENNEDY

Ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, I do not need notes to discuss this subject with you but I wish to be as brief as possible and to confine myself to the pertinent points. There are those of you who have given long and honorable services in the Congress of the United States and you know this subject as well as any of us. Others of you may not be so well acquainted with the beginnings of and the reasons for the Veterans' Administration. Briefly let us review the situations.

After the First World War there were two major problems facing the disabled veteran. His first was medical care for his wounds and disease. His second, some form of financial aid to compensate him for his inability to compete on equal terms with his fellow men in earning his living, because of the handicap of his war disabilities. Both had been promised to him. For the first he was to look to the Public Health Service. For the second to the Treasury Department. Some of you know of the tragedies this system caused. We speak of our own here in Massachusetts. You know the tragic influx of veterans into the Rutland area, spurred on by the hope of help there, either suffering from tuberculosis or the effects of poison gas. Nobody knew which. You know of the almost shacks that passed for administrations in that area. You know of the sums of money the veterans paid for medical service they could not get. You know of the tragic deaths that daily took place there from tuberculosis or gas; nobody knew. Because nobody knew the exact effect of poison gas upon the human system; and apparently nobody cared. You know the tragic helplessness of disabled veterans trying to obtain the financial assistance guaranteed to them by the Congress of the United States and unable to do so—for seemingly nobody knew how and apparently nobody cared. For the system then in operation was one of divided authority, and so, one of divided responsibility, and nobody was responsible and nobody cared.

But the infant American Legion cared and a sympathetic Congress cared and out of the mutual labors of both there was created the Veterans Bureau, with a single task, a single authority, and a single responsibility; to care for the veteran in whatever might be his needs. The House established its Committee on Veterans' Affairs to consider those needs and provide for them justly and adequately. Working together we built the Veterans Bureau into a responsible unit. Working together we had a hospital in Rutland in 1922. In Northampton in 1925. We replaced the disgraceful old West Roxbury with Bedford in 1928. We aided in securing Newington as a medical hospital in 1931, and only through your magnificent work were able to secure our diagnostic center in the new West Roxbury in 1940. We had our contact units and our adjudication units, our training units, our medical section, and our finance section. In short we had a working unit. It was not without its headaches and its heartaches. We dislike to look back over the days of charges and countercharges; of investigators and hearings; of transfers and dismissals. Of human inefficiency and human dishonesty. But they were there and we weathered them and out of our trials and labors; out of headaches and heartaches we built a single efficient agency for the care of the veteran and his dependents. We dread to think of the chaos and the suffering; of the anguish and despair that would have resulted, did we not have that single unit for the Second World War. We dare not think of it.

And now, through the report of the Hoover Commission, you are asked to break up and disrupt that unit. You are being told that division is efficiency; and confusion is economy. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Congress—we submit that not one member of that commission knows anything about the disabled veteran and his problems. We submit to you the incontrovertible fact, that not one of us sitting here with you stands to gain or lose by the adoption or rejection of the Hoover report. It will not effect us personally. But we know that it will disrupt and destroy the work that we have carried on for more than a quarter of a century, and you cannot expect us to do other than protest. The medical section of the Veterans' Administration is the primary, essential section of our unit. We must have it, not alone for the care and treatment of the disabled veteran but for diagnosis, and for medical reports to the adjudication section. This work is so essential that we as an organization are compelled to employ one service officer and one contact representative in these hospitals. Can we render efficient service if you compel us to do business with a multiplicity of agencies in this work? We know from experience the confusion that is caused by division. We have it here in Boston. Because we are unable to locate the various sections of the Veterans' Administration in one building we must go from Tremont Street to Court Street to Causeway Street. We know that this means delay and confusion even within the Veterans' Administration. What then will be the delay and confusion in a multiplicity of agencies? We submit that a multiplicity of agencies means multiplied forms, multiplied letters, multiplied telephone service and consequently multiplied personnel. Division is confusion and confusion is waste. The day that you vote to transfer the medical section of the Veterans' Administration to any other agency is the day you vote to destroy the Veterans' Administration.

One brief word in regard to a constant bugbear. I like to recall my days in theology. Among others, we had a brilliant and kindly old professor. One day with a knowing twinkle in his eye, he called one of the students and said: "Compare the word 'lies'." We looked at each other, trying to guess what he wanted. Then he began: "Positive, lies; comparative, damn lies; superlative, statistics." He was about to demonstrate the age-old adage that statistics can be made to prove anything and are often the superlative lie; and he did not want us ever to forget it. Statistics are the bugbear in considering the cases of disabled veterans. You have been given the statistics of non-service-connected cases in veteran hospitals. But it is necessary to look beyond the statistics and consider the veteran. Often we are called upon to make a choice. We are given the case of a disabled veteran in need of hospitalization. The story of his disability convinces us that the case should be service connected. We must make the choice of delay while we connect the case; or else hospitalize the case as nonservice, and immediate hospitalization wins out. Then nothing can be done until hospitalization is complete and the veteran is discharged from the hospital; so that his medical record is complete for the rating board. But the case remains nonservice in the statistics. Veterans are hospitalized with nonservice long term disabilities, such as N. P. or T. B. Some of these cases are service connected after the veteran has been in the hospital for a year or even longer. But since the admission was listed as nonservice connected; it remains so in the statistics. The vast majority of the nonservice cases in veteran hospitals today are men of World War II; and yet it is but four short years since their discharge from service. Then, one of two things is certain. Either the statistics with regard to nonservice cases are grossly in error, or else the laws and regulations governing the granting of service connection are not broad enough to cover the majority of cases.

And so for the proponents of the Hoover report. They are dealing with statistics; we are dealing with disabled veterans. They offer you a promise, we give you performance. They offer you division; we give you unity. Their way is chaos; ours is order. They ask for divided authority. It is the experience of the human race that divided authority is divided responsibility. And it is axiomatic that divided responsibility is nobody's responsibility. These are lessons to be learned from Pearl Harbor other than those in the military field.

Laying Away the Colors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from an address delivered by me at the ceremony of laying away the colors in the hall of trophies, Pennsylvania State Museum, Harrisburg, Pa., on October 19, 1949.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pennsylvania was founded to perpetuate the ideals of peace.

Yet it has tasted the horrors and the tragedies of war more bitterly than any of our sister States.

On the soil of Pennsylvania great and decisive battles have been fought.

Within the borders of our Commonwealth are many scenes of struggle, heroism, and sacrifice.

They stand as shrines of patriotic inspiration, dedicated to the honored and everlasting memory of brave men who suffered and died for the ideals of freedom.

We have Fort Necessity, where George Washington, military genius of American liberty, first commanded troops under fire, and Bushy Run, where Pontiac's Indian warriors were routed to give the settlers of the western part of the colony an opportunity to live in peace.

In the war for independence, Germantown, Brandywine, Whitemarsh, the Wyoming Massacre, the Battle of Thompson Island, and the terrible winter at Valley Forge, all recall the valor of a people struggling to maintain their God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The battlefield of Gettysburg is sacred soil, consecrated by the blood of the North and the South. Here Pennsylvanians rallied in tragic and decisive conflict to preserve the Union, and for 3 days, led by Gen. George G. Meade, worthy son of the Keystone State, fought to glorious victory one of the greatest battles of all time.

Pennsylvania boasts of many distinguished names in industry, in craftsmanship, in the professions, in economics, in culture, and in religion. But none surpass the great figures of Pennsylvania's military history.

Wayne of the Army and Barry of the Navy were Pennsylvanian leaders in the Revolution.

In the War Between the States, Meade, Hancock, and Reynolds were among the many intrepid Pennsylvania leaders who covered themselves with fame and glory.

In World War I, March, Bliss, and Price led a galaxy of brilliant sons of Pennsylvania.

In World War II, Marshall, Arnold, Spaatz, Devers, Craig, Embick, Grunert, Patch, Brereton, McNarney, Gronenger, were only a few of the 1,300,000 gallant Pennsylvanians who wore the uniform in defense of human rights, freedom, and justice.

In every war we have waged that men might be free, Pennsylvania has contributed outstanding and historic military organizations. They were made up of legions of trained men whose devotion to duty and bravery under fire has never been excelled.

Pennsylvania was settled by men of diverse religious, political, and industrial ideals, but deep in the heart of each one of them was the ideal of freedom.

We meet tonight to place in this hall of trophies the honored flags of the Pennsylvania units of World War I and World War II.

The names of the Pennsylvania military units are indelibly written upon the records of the various communities from which they come. They fought in Mexico, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, in Europe, and the Far East.

All have proud histories.

The historical commission of our Commonwealth is to be congratulated upon creating this beautiful and permanent place for these priceless colors.

May they be an inspiration for future generations.

Our constant prayer should be that it may never again be necessary for our men to engage in war to preserve our freedoms.

But as Americans let us never forget that great armament alone will not defend us. We must retain the American way of life. Only total individual freedom will make our position secure. That freedom is our secret weapon in war and our security in peace.

Three things are necessary in the preservation of our country:

Economic stability, an adequate armed force based upon equal service, and a spiritual awakening as to the glories of our country.

We must be strong economically. Our fiscal policies must be sound. Centralized and costly government can destroy us.

We must have an organized defense. We must have the finest small Army, Navy, and Air Force in the world. It should be backed up by well-trained civilian components, directed by the best of our Regular Establishment.

We should step up industrial mobilization by stock-piling critical war materials, by organizing for scientific laboratory work, and by preparing plants for the production of the urgently needed materials of war.

Again our prayer is for peace. We cannot have peace unless there is a spiritual awakening in our country. We must have great mobilization of all the moral forces.

We must understand the greatness of America; we must understand our obligations as well as our rights; we must obey the law.

Tolerant religion, uniting all faith in obedience to the will of God, is the greatest of our spiritual resources.

Our greatest enemy is the ideology which teaches that man can better plan than God.

Should that enemy plunge us into armed conflict, we will fight a holy war.

Jews, Catholics, and Protestants, believing in an omnipotent God, will be massed together a wage a war against a godless people.

Let us put our house in order so we may be properly prepared.

The Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, at the annual meeting of the Wapello County, Iowa, Farm Bureau held on October 24, 1949, a comprehensive set of resolutions were adopted by this fine organization. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include these resolutions in order that all Members of Congress may have an opportunity to read and know the position that the Farm Bureau of Wapello County, Iowa, has taken with respect to the problems and proposals confronting our country at the present time.

The resolutions are as follows:

We believe that it is important to have the farm program developed through a bipartisan approach.

We believe that guaranties of 100 percent of parity as compared with lower supports would result in more drastic controls. It is important to keep controls at a minimum and still get desired results.

We believe there is danger of losing farm programs if the cost is too high.

We are in favor of flexible supports to average 90 percent of parity.

We believe flexible supports tied to the amount the commodity is in surplus with a minimum floor established by the law and the Secretary of Agriculture having the authority to set support prices from this minimum up.

We do not believe that if production payments are used the prices of commodities to the consumer would drop enough to have a marked influence on consumption, however, a cheap food philosophy established in the minds of the consumer would be dangerous to the long-time interests of farmers.

We believe that it is dangerous to have the income of farmers dependent to a large extent upon direct appropriations from Congress, however, we favor the use of production payments in support of perishables (nonstorable commodities).

We favor using surpluses for school-lunch, blue-stamp, and relief programs.

Satisfactory compliance with soil-conservation practices should be a requisite to eligibility for price supports.

We are not in favor of abandoning the parity concept for the income support standard plan.

We are in favor of the human approach of mediator for settling labor disputes inasmuch as they are somewhat social, ethical, and economic in nature.

We favor the organization of a worker extension service similar to the Agricultural Extension Service which would work with labor groups for the purpose of helping them solve problems relative to family living.

We favor the changing of mail routes so that the principle of free mail delivery becomes an actuality to all rural families.

We are in favor of establishment of a Federal agency for the purpose of setting up telephone cooperatives.

We favor a farm program set up on the following bases:

Give Secretary of Agriculture power to set support prices on commodities in excess production as low as 75 or 80 percent of parity provided the support prices of commodities in which increase of production is desired be set high enough that if desired shifts of production are obtained total support prices plus soil-conservation payments equal at least 95 percent of parity—or modernized parity, if preferred?

Use European relief, school lunch, aid to disabled, underprivileged and aged groups (blue stamp) to increase consumption of farm products.

Use acreage controls and soil-conservation payments to prevent costly surpluses and keep down cost of program.

Announce support prices of livestock not later than November 1 of preceding year. Announce support prices on crops not later than March 1 of current year, or earlier if possible, especially in southern States.

We believe an all-weather road should be built to every farmstead in the State as soon as possible even if this should delay the construction of cross country superhighway indefinitely.

We believe rural children should have educational opportunities equal to those of urban children.

We favor increasing Federal aid to encourage more doctors to enter the medical profession.

We favor a voluntary prepayment health insurance plan.

We favor increasing Federal aid for the construction of more hospitals.

We favor more Federal aid to aid for medical research.

We do believe we should revise our health program and adopt a county health unit program for Iowa.

National Phases of the Universal Water Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

INDIANAPOLIS, *December 19, 1949.*

Hon. RALPH HARVEY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR RALPH: Remembering that you sponsored our Indiana law for conservation of ground or well water, and that you also took a leading part in the enactment of our statute setting up a flood control and water resources commission, I am taking the liberty of writing you on some national phases of the universal water problem. I wish to invite your attention to gross inequities that have crowded into the so-called regional-improvement program as it relates to flood control, irrigation, navigation, and hydroelectric power—all water problems.

Since then I've been examining the idea of regional development as a Federal function—not as a man in the electric-power business, nor as a member of the flood control commission, nor as a member of the Indiana Economic Council, but as a private, taxpaying citizen. With everybody wondering how we can put on the brakes, get back within our budget, and begin to reduce taxes, I've come to the conclusion that regional development is one obstacle we can either remove or whittle down substantially. And I'm go-

ing to ask you to read a personal [illegible] of the subject.

We may say regional development was born in the depression days, when, to assist in providing employment, WPA was set up to make jobs, and PWA was established to create public works of lasting value. Now, job making is not as vital as it was then, and we can, further, pose the point whether job making is a proper Federal function.

PWA started out soundly enough, offering to lend 70 percent and grant 30 percent of the cost of local public works jobs. There was relatively little criticism and much good was done. Then, half way along, PWA liberalized, lending 55 percent and granting 45 percent; and more good was done, with some increase, of course, in the griping from those who cannot see Uncle Sam as everybody's Santa Claus.

Now we have made two jumps—a broad jump from local to regional projects; and a high jump, from granting 45 percent to granting 100 percent. Planners assume blithely that we can afford it, and it is our duty. Nationally, our property is worth $1,043 per capita—assessed value—and we can afford (?) to pay Federal income taxes of $286 per capita. Whom, then, shall we help? How much? Look—

Per capita	1948 individual income	Property value	Income taxes
United States	$1,[illegible]	$1,043.[illegible]	$286.00
Indiana	1,[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Kentucky	9[illegible]	7[illegible].20	[illegible]
Tennessee	955	8[illegible].50	111.[illegible]
Oregon	1,[illegible]	7[illegible].70	[illegible]
Washington	1,[illegible]	8[illegible].05	[illegible]

All figures, official sources.

Three fair indices of wealth. Obviously, Tennessee is the one we should help; Oregon and Washington don't need us—but wait, we have just finished giving Tennessee roughly $1,000,000,000. And we're better than half way to the billion-dollar mark for Oregon and Washington.

Where is a clue? Let's look back 10 years, to 1939, when the Federal income tax bill (including all kinds) was only $8.[illegible] per capita. At that time, Indiana's total payments figured $5.29 per capita; Kentucky's, $3.71; Tennessee, $2.66; Oregon, $3; and Washington, $4.35. The billion we dumped in Tennessee increased her income-tax average by 4,073 percent, which indicates a phenomenal improvement in the economy of that area—or does it? Indiana's increase, without benefit of a billion not to be repaid, was 4,833 percent. And Kentucky, Oregon, and Washington, all three, jumped higher, in proportion, than Tennessee did.

Looking at the property valuation figures of Oregon, Kentucky, and Washington, you are bound to wonder whether we, in Indiana, should be contributing to their upkeep. (Kentucky is able to pay more income tax than we do, but that is probably excise on whisky.)

Indiana people are probably about as liberal as the men folks who earned what he got. Too, we are doing fairly well on our own, without Federal largess. We might examine that angle:

	1947 farm income per capita (excluding Federal payments)	Manufactured goods per capita[1]
United States	$[illegible].50	$[illegible]
Indiana	[illegible].50	[illegible]
Kentucky	2[illegible].10	[illegible]
Tennessee	[illegible].[illegible]	[illegible]
Oregon	225.40	[illegible]
Washington	3[illegible].40	[illegible]

[1] Value added by manufacture, Census Bureau says.

This table makes us wonder again whether the billion we gave Tennessee has accomplished anything. Tennessee farm production is down because, perhaps, the TVA has flooded much of the best bottom land—more than was ever flooded temporarily; and her manufactures are not especially impressive. Federal bounty might help Oregon and Washington industrially, but both States are a long way from the center of population, and industry likes to be handy to the middle, for raw materials and sales-distribution reasons. Kentucky could do with some more farm income, but here again we are busy, as we were in Tennessee, drowning her more fertile river bottom lands.

As for navigation benefits in river improvements, if the railroads and trucks can handle our heavier loads of farm products and manufactured goods, it would seem the lighter loads of those other States could get to market without using up a lot of money for slow river barges.

Indiana, in the light of these two tables, would need a lot of crust to ask much in the way of Federal aid. And Indiana is not asking much, except for flood control in legitimate projects that are part of the Mississippi Valley program, started 21 years ago under President Hoover. (Strictly flood control, too, with no hydro, irrigation, or waterway transportation or other phonies as benefits in the picture.) One of these days we may need to add water supply to flood control, but I wonder whether the present beggar States will agree to let us insert it in the program.

More, doing well herself, maybe Indiana can afford to help the national effort at regional aid, if it is sound and not too expensive. Another table:

1950 PUBLIC-WORKS APPROPRIATION, FLOOD CONTROL AND RIVER WORK

United States (to spend) $5.04 per capita, total, $664,178,190.

Indiana (to receive) $1.96 per capita, total, $1,580,000.

Kentucky (to receive) $8.71 per capita, total, $24,905,000.

Tennessee (to receive) $3.10[2] per capita, total $9,030,000.

Oregon-Washington (to receive) $16.26 per capita, total $67,475,000.

This, of course, is the table that gives you a headache, following the two already studied. We have nothing at all against the people in those other States. We hope they do well. But—

Our property is as valuable to us as theirs is to them; there are more of us and we produce more and pay a better share of the taxes than most of them pay. We pay approximately as much Federal income tax as Tennessee, Oregon, and Washington combined, and we receive about 10 percent of what they get for flood control and river work.

Maybe something should be done to help Kentucky bring up farm production and industrial production, despite her high property valuation of property and high income-tax ranking. But should Indiana pay 50 percent more in total Federal income-tax dollars and then receive less than one-third the total dollars that Kentucky receives?

Moreover, if we are rich enough to carry more than our share of the load, and generous enough, too, how can we justify the sacrifice or discrimination in the face of the pitiful showing Tennessee makes after we've dumped a billion-odd dollars into her valleys? Actually, if the people of Kentucky, Oregon, and Washington really knew what we've done to Tennessee, wouldn't they lock the doors when we heave in sight with grants, appropriations, regional improvements, and what-not?

[2] Excluding fifty-seven millions for steam-power plant to firm the four to five hundred millions spent on hydro.

Again, which one honestly needs help most? Much of this regional development is tied up with electric power development, or public ownership. About half of Tennessee's billion-dollar grant is clearly and indisputably in electric power—and only half of Tennessee's farms have electric service. But Indiana farms, about 50–50 supplied by companies, and REMC's with borrowed-and-being-repaid Federal loans, are past 95 percent supplied. And Oregon and Washington farms, like Indiana's, are right at the saturation point on electric supply.

If industrial power supply is what is needed via hydro at dams demanded first and loudest for flood control and irrigation, in the Northwest, look again at the horrible example of Tennessee. Oak Ridge had to have dependable power for atomic development, so built its own steam-generating station, instead of relying on TVA. And now TVA is building steam plants itself—with taxpayers' money, of course. How long would it be, do you suppose, before Oregon and Washington, their billion exhausted for hydro, etc., will be back showing how necessary it is for them to have more funds for steam plants, to firm their hydro?

If we strain ourselves and pay more than our share for the Northwest, will it repeat the sad story of Tennessee? I didn't mean to bring electric power into this matter, but it has a definite bearing. Will you look at one more table, please?

	Per capita power supply	Power used per year	Industrial use
	Horsepower	*Kilowatt-hours*	*Kilowatt-hours*
United States	0.82	1,044	1,130
Indiana	.57	1,005	1,247
Kentucky	.33	----------	----------
Tennessee [1]	----------	----------	----------
Oregon	[2] .78	----------	----------
Washington	[2] 1.12	----------	----------

[1] Not 365 days calculable, because "infirm."
[2] Including some "infirm" hydro.
[3] Much of it "infirm"—witness 2 aluminum plants down recently due to hydro shortage.

Figures based on Edison Electric Institute survey, January 1949.

Indiana's power supply, as noted above, is about 10 percent above the national average for capacity, general usage, and industrial usage. That position directly reflects our strong positions in both industrial and agricultural production. (All three positions, we earned—nobody gave them to us.)

Washington has almost double our power supply on a per capita basis, but seems to accomplish about half what we do with it in Indiana. But like Tennessee, Washington is handicapped because its power supply is crippled periodically by river fluctuations—too high, or too low, water.

Should we spend more to help them? If they need help, can't they pay a little on the cost themselves? Are we sure, in the light of Tennessee, that dollars will really help them? If we can afford or spare them? We might balk and say, "Look, you guys, Indiana was a swamp woods once, but our folks licked it, can't you come through on your own?"

If you've come this far with me, Ralph, I'm much obliged. I should not have bothered you with this letter, except that I am convinced that economy is going to be dogoned good politics, beginning in a day or so from right now. I'm convinced that throwing money around is a long way from being an automatic, infallible answer to everything, regional improvements, or anything else.

Besides, didn't you stumble over that "vulgar" fraction—4,833-percent increase in Indiana's per capita income-tax payments?

Best regards, and merry Christmas.

JOHN C. MILLETT.

Contempt of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS

President Truman has created a temporary Water Resources Commission and named Leland Olds chairman. Olds is the radical, tyrannical, mischievous, egotistical chameleon whose predominant color is pink, as Senator JOHNSON of Colorado called him last year when the Senate refused, by a vote of more than 3 to 1, to confirm his reappointment to the Federal Power Commission. He has a long record of association with Communists.

This time Olds won't have to run the Senate gantlet. He and the other members of the Commission are being paid out of the President's emergency fund. Associated with him are old Morris L. Cooke, the original head of the Rural Electrification Administration, who at 78 is still ardent to bring private enterprise to the bureaucratic heel, and five college presidents and professors.

Appointment of a Water Resources Commission was recommended by the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Federal Government. The pork-barrel competition between two Federal agencies, the Bureau of Reclamation in the Interior Department and the Army engineers, has already cost the taxpayers billions of wasted dollars.

No commission headed by Olds is going to save anyone anything. He is part of the socialist apparatus by which Mr. Truman and his totalitarian advisers are trying to concentrate the rule of every phase of American life in Washington.

There are, as there always have been and always will be, conflicting claims to the Nation's water resources. They are not so important in the Middle West, although we have a ground water deletion problem in Illinois and neighboring States, or in the East, except as municipal bureaucrats fall down on the job, as they did in engineering New York's shortage. But in the arid West water is of first importance and the rights to what there is of it for power and irrigation are the subject of bitter fueds between individuals and States.

Such a situation gives a Socialist the chance, in the guise of allocating the supply of water fairly, to make every individual, corporation, and municipality bow the knee to Washington authority. Beyond that, it offers the opportunity to spend billions of dollars in various fantastic schemes to develop water resources.

In these schemes the Socialists have little interest in irrigation, except as a means of bribery. Irrigation is for farmers, who are hard to push around politically. When the Socialists talk about conserving water resources their eye is on public power. The Tennessee Valley Authority, it may be remembered, was introduced as a great experiment in conservation. Except for a little social worker folderol, conservation is out the window in TVA, which is now building steam-engineering plants at points designed to serve areas far beyond the Tennessee Valley.

The Socialists want to control electric power because, with labor, it is the tool of production that all industry uses. By controlling it they expect to control industry. When they control industry they will also control its workmen and their jobs.

The Olds appointment demonstrates again Mr. Truman's contempt of Congress. A man held unfit for one job is placed in another of possibly greater importance.

Report From India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles by Mr. and Mrs. Harris Wofford; one in the November 1949 issue of the magazine, Common Cause, with one which appeared in the St. Paul Dispatch of November 25, 1949. Mrs. Wofford is a former student of the University of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From Common Cause of November 1949]

REPORT FROM INDIA

(By Harris and Clare Wofford)

The Chicago Committee's Draft World Constitution raised the sights of many federalists, including the two of us, from the goal of an atomic emergency government to that of a positive world republic. In 1947 in Europe we sensed the existence of a "middle world" of perhaps a billion and a half human beings who desired neither America nor Russia as world master. If even the people of American-aided western Europe properly belonged in this category, then we guessed that most of the Asians, Africans, and South Americans belonged there more surely. Since the economic problems of these people seemed paramount, any world government seeking to win their allegiance would need wide economic powers. In this light, the Chicago constitution's maximalism looked like irreducible minimal political sense.

Because of this, some of us campaigned ardently though ineffectively to persuade our fellow federalists to move onto a new road leading to a full-fledged world republic, proceeding by means of a genuine world people's movement able to mobilize the middle world, and beginning with an unofficial world people's constituent assembly as the first step. We failed to convince them, and decided that rather than continue the repetitious debate or try somehow to commence separately we should first reassess our own position. We recognized that our arguments, although deeply felt, had only tender roots in real evidence.

A fellowship from the Foundation for World Government made it possible for us to come to study in India. We resigned our connections with the foundation and with United World Federalists, and for 6 months now, in this heartland of the middle world, we have been focusing on the history of Gandhi's Indian national congress and on the current economic situation—seeking light on the problem of world government. It is fitting that our first public report go to Common Cause.

India is a vast school offering lessons in all of life. We, in the first grades, have learned simple facts of world life which any students from the white, industrialized western one-fifth of mankind should be expected to learn from the Indian continent's one-fifth—or from any country among the colored, underdeveloped majority of mankind.

India made us acutely aware that two-thirds of the world's citizens are ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed. They are suffering and dying from diseases man knows how to cure, illiterate, without useful work much or all of the time, still using wooden tools and techniques which the industrial revolution antiquated. They are struggling for survival on overworked, unfertilized, tiny, and often rented plots of land; they are facing discrimination because of race, religion, class, or sex; unable to think, speak, or act politically as free men because of lack of facilities or because of direct governmental repression; and they are lacking democratic self-government because of national dictatorship, colonialism, or, in another sense, world anarchy.

From India, it seems certain that these once silent, sleeping masses are waking. One idea is arousing them: equality. The majority of poor or landless peasants in the villages—85 percent of India—are already questioning the right of one man to own a thousand acres and most men to have 1 acre or none. The majority of underemployed city workers, living 10 to a suffocating tenement room, are already questioning the right of a few thousands to live in their midst in luxurious western mansions. The majority of underfed Indians are questioning a world society in which their country is without food while the white countries of the west have plenty. The questioning is simple but goes deep. Likewise, equality is a simple but penetrating idea. The voiceless millions are finding their tongues. The questions have led to universal grumbling, the thunder of revolution.

Every step of reform taken to satisfy the demands for equality—abolishing feudal landlords, reducing land rent—only whets the appetite for fuller equality and further arouses the consciousness of the masses. The dam of complacency, lethargy, and ignorance has been pierced by the explosive idea of equality and an irresistible tide is pouring through.

In China the revolution has taken one form. It may take another in India and the rest of Asia.

This revolution fast overtaking us, which is destined to cut through the history of modern civilization, appears to be double-edged.

One side is toward world unification, as we federalists early realized. The other side—sharper for more of the world, and doing most of the initial cutting in the middle world—is toward equality.

The separate national state system is going to end in our time, whether the revolutionary change to a world state comes peacefully before war, or by conquest through war. But federalists will be blind and hopelessly lost if they fail to recognize and cope with the other side, the revolution against privilege.

This economic and social revolution is understood in most of the world in Marxian terms because none others have been suggested. In these terms, there is today a class struggle inside each country and between countries. Inside each country, particularly in Asia, four-fifths of the people, who were born to no choice but misery, are rising to end the hated status quo—by whatever means necessary—and to establish some kind of just social order. Equality of sacrifice and of opportunity, abolition of landlordism, land redistribution, establishment of cooperatives, public control of industry, planning for over-all economic development—all add up to the product labeled "socialism," which is almost universally approved and

desired. Some kind of socialism seems inevitable as well as desirable for these underdeveloped countries who in one generation aim to achieve the industrialization and modernization which took the West a hundred years.

Moreover, an even greater class struggle exists between the whole of the West and the rest of mankind.

Every poverty-stricken Indian peasant seems to know one thing about America—it is rich. (One out of four we questioned had heard that Negroes were badly treated.) In many forms we have been asked by villagers, "Why is it that Americans are all rich and happy, and we Indians are sad and poor?"

The Asian mind seems grimly determined to end this giant inequality. Hostility to the west, generated by centuries of imperialism and racialism, and now continued by gnawing contrast between American abundance and wealth and Asian misery, is growing. This is dynamite lodged in a hundred million minds.

Either the west takes rapid steps to eliminate the dynamite by eliminating the misery, or it will explode in war. One western businessman here prophesied: "Four hundred million Indians are going to industrialize, whether it takes 20 years or three times that, whether it takes a few thousand or a few million lives. If the west helps them enough and in time, we may end up pals. If not, then God help us."

Potentially, in any war today, the masses of India are on the side of the Soviet Union. The same peasants who know that America is rich and racially prejudiced, believe that the Soviet Union is a workers' land, run for the good of the poor, with full economic and racial equality. One in four we talked to knew and approved of the Red revolution in China, where, they had heard, "the tiller of the soil was getting the land." Any world war now could easily develop into a war between the Western one-fifth of mankind and all the rest, led militantly by the billion bitter people of Asia, who could be fired with hatred for the pale-pink prejudiced people with the colonies, depressions, and wars. This would be one resolution of the world "class struggle."

Federalists are fools if they think that world government can be formed without coping with the problem of equality in each country, and between the West and the world. Such a world government, protecting the status quo, would soon be overturned. It would explode from inside disunion, or be submerged by the tidal wave coming across Asia.

Nor can world-wide equality be established without world government. International anarchy means a fearful, frenzied climate of war preparation in which any steps toward social and economic reform become difficult. The economic development and planning required to solve such problems as food shortage can be successfully carried out only by world planning and mobilization of all human resources. Both sides of the world revolution make one problem which must be solved, for good or ill in our time.

In Asia, the Communists are the only forces, with positive proposals to solve both dilemmas rapidly. With courage, intelligence, and dedication the Communists propose proletarian armed revolution to end the status quo, Communist party dictatorship to establish equality, and a World Soviet Union with respect for national cultures to prevent war and to organize world economy rationally.

Among the billion Asian people, civil liberties are unknown. Misery, with its slow daily violence and starvation of body and mind, is their heritage. The Communists claim to offer a swift, violent way to end this. Communism is increasingly winning the allegiance of the young, educated, politically conscious citizens of India. Communist revolution seems like a clean knife to be used in an operation on a cancer that has resisted all other treatment.

World federalists may oppose the Communist solution—refusing to believe that equality, fraternity, and democracy can come through violence, dictatorship, and blood purges—but we must propose a better solution. We cannot and we as Democrats ought not oppose the revolution against injustice. The tide may be forced into terrible destructive channels but it cannot be stopped.

Sadly, from India, it seems abundantly evident that the American Government's policy has no positive proposals either for world equality or world unification. United States policy in Asia seems to consist of half-hearted, vacillating efforts, or gestures, to support the status quo. Chiang Kai-shek's collapse ought to suggest to us that the whole of the American Army plus the atom bomb might be insufficient to maintain the old order. Asia is villages, and the peasants there fear rain and sun, not unknown nuclear fission. The revolution in Asia takes place in each of these villages. To stop the coming changes in India alone would require 700,000 atomic bombs—1 for each village.

Democrats ought to rejoice at this awakening in Asia. Instead of opposing the tide, they should join in, and seek to ride and guide the wave to a successful conclusion through peaceful and democratic channels.

The only forces in India presenting any real alternative to communism are the Democratic Socialists, lead by Jayaprakash Narayan and a half dozen other outstanding young men of integrity and courage, such as Rammanohar Lohia, Achyt Patwardan, and Ashok Mehta. These men of the Gandhi Age, who spent their youth in jail (where they became the best-read politicians in the world), have hammered out in their own lives a union of socialism with Gandhism. Social democracy they conceive as a revolution, which should be achieved nonviolently, which begins by a Socialist living socialism in his own life. By their example of complete dedication and their ideology of full-fledged democratic socialism, these men have inspired confidence and their faith has won considerable allegiance. The Socialist Party is the most hopeful political fact in India.

However, Indian socialism seems insufficient compared with communism. The Socialists have no such direct international answer as have the Communists, and therefore their program goes only halfway at a time when either the whole revolution is achieved or none: halfway across the chasm means destruction. Socialism is so far half-baked because it has no program for world unification.

Indian people and Socialists particularly lean toward an Asian bloc, organized around the negative goal of opposing both the Russian and American blocs. We have suggested instead that India should lead in forging a bloc of world citizens, based on the "middle world" but extending into both power blocs, organized around the positive goal of a world federal republic.

A representative world federation, designed to establish justice, with its first aim the equalization and raising of living standards everywhere, copes with the revolutionary needs of our time.

Through such a world government, the "class struggle" between the west and the rest can be peacfully and voluntarily resolved, with beneficial results for every country. For example, a world development administration could mobilize all the world's resources, including the industrial machine of the west, for a full-production, full-employment, one-generation program to wipe out famine, illiteracy, mass disease, and to develop the vast economic resources of Asia, Africa, and South America for the welfare of all mankind.

Such a program has potential appeal for most people. The problem is how to bring this idea forward as a real alternative to American-Russian power politics. The existence of the "middle world," which we believe could include a majority of the American people, is the first cause for hope. Indians could lead in mobilizing this camp of world citizens. At least the history of India's own struggle for independence through nonviolent popular action throws light on this problem.

The national Indian aim was swa-raj—self-government. This required the development of a responsible consciousness of Indian national citizenship and the organization of a citizens' party, or, as Gandhi called it, army, which would force the British and the 500 state princes and rulers to turn over power to 1 common democratic Indian government.

Gandhi shaped the Indian National Congress into nonviolent revolutionary lines. At times it won such mass support that it acted as a de facto, unofficial parallel government to the British Raj. The Indian Congress met annually as the unofficial legislative body of the millions of Indians who had registered through it as free Indians. Gandhi geared the Congress to a constructive program of concrete, immediate, individual projects which put all politically conscious Indians to work in service of the people—which meant work in the villages. It aimed to end untouchability, establish village industries and cooperatives, promote Hindu-Muslim friendship. Do these things now, pleaded Gandhi, and you will not only convince the people that Swa-raj is worth fighting for but you will prepare yourselves and the country for good self-government. From the popular energy generated in this program the Congress was able to conduct a successful political program of action on immediate issues and later of actual contests for election to office. From this base Gandhi was able to lead the people in mass campaigns of satyagraha ("firmness on truth")—nonviolent direct action which threw the people's weight onto the scales against great armies and prison gates.

Our aim is world Swa-raj. We seek a peaceful world revolution establishing a world republic. This requires the development of world citizenship and the organization of a world-wide people's movement capable of persuading the national governments to transfer their world powers to a government of the people of the whole earth.

Why not a world citizens' congress? The world congress would consist of registered world citizens and affiliated public organizations fighting on some front for a united world community. These forces are powerful, although scattered and without common strategy. They include the forces for world government, UN strengthening, internationalism and one world, the democratic Socialists and other groups struggling for justice inside each country, and the national independence and liberation movements in the colonial areas. Under the banner of a world republic and a common assembly of the world congress sessions, they could develop a dynamic world program based on world constructive service. World citizens need to be put to work on immediate problems like food, health, and education, especially in seeing that refugees and children get a chance for the satisfaction of these needs. A world congress could initiate practical projects which would support the UN agencies already doing good but unsupported work and excellent but neglected planning. A constructive program should include local action for fuller establishment of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights—which means that American world citizens must work to end racial inequalities at home.

A world congress could become a powerful people's lobby in the UN and in national

governments, applying to immediate political issues its principles of opposition to colonialism and war measures, and support of UN strengthening, development of backward areas, and economic steps to prevent depression.

Is mass world satyagraha inconceivable? The time may come when people everywhere could act concertedly and peacefully in effective demonstrations against war. Or, more constructively, the idea of an unofficial people's world constituent assembly might provide the issue around which nonviolent direct action could revolve. This can come only after a world congress has taken root and has real strength and vitality.

The real problem, as so often with Democrats, is to begin. So far, world government is nowhere to our knowledge a living, bread and butter political issue among the people. It has not yet become politics. We suggest that this is because it has not yet been linked to the social and economic issues in the world which are bread and butter, rice and chopati issues. Therefore, we federalists have talked nobly in a world of our own, while the real political forces have been out fighting on the social and economic frontiers. These forces need the unifying and inspiring common aim of a world republic just as much as federalists need their aid. Until the alliance between federalists and these forces is forged, neither will make real progress. Once forged, there would be a political program loose in the world which might accomplish strange and wonderful things.

If this course makes sense it can begin anywhere—with the world movement for world federal government, among Indian socialists, by American federalists in any city or State in the United States of America. We believe that the people of the world are waiting for something like this to be offered. Once started, there might result a chain reaction of hope and constructive work.

A peasant in a Kashmir paddy field stopped planting his rice to ask us just what world government would be like. We described the kind of government envisioned in the Chicago constitution and the sort of things it could do. He told us solemnly: "That world government would help the poor people. All the world is praying to God for such a government."

But as Gandhi insisted about Indian Swa-raj, world government will not descend from heaven; it must be earned and deserved.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch of November 25, 1947]

NEWS WHEAT TO INDIA

(By Clare and Harris Wofford)

SIR: Indians are starving while America's wheat surplus overflows storage space and America's merchant marine lies underemployed in port. This fantastic contradiction faces us on our return home this Thanksgiving time after 6 months in India.

For lack of enough food, the hungry Indian people, especially the thin, undernourished children, lack the strength for long, useful lives. (An Indian's life-expectancy is about 26 years—an American's is over 65.) In their misery the Indians will one day turn, as the Chinese before them, to the Communists who promise a rapid, if ruthless, program to provide food, land and longer lives.

Yet for lack of enough people with dollars to buy America's vast surplus of wheat, our Government, which purchases the wheat to prevent a farm depression, is now spending more money to build great new storage depots. We hear that Victory ships are being tugged down the Hudson River to be reconditioned at great expense as warehouses for untused wheat. But we cannot stockpile wheat like atom bombs: wheat rots.

Is this a Christian—or businesslike—answer to a wheat surplus in a starving world? Cannot we work out some sensible way to send the wheat before it rots on our unused ships to the ill-fed children of India and other lands?

We spend billions of dollars arming ourselves and other governments; but the battle for democracy and peace will be won, not by atom bombs, not on the battlefields, but by bread in the rice fields.

India and the economically underdeveloped countries are unable to purchase our surplus food because they have no surplus dollars. They are trying to raise themselves by their own poor bootstraps out of poverty, away from violent revolution. Their race against starvation can be understood by two facts: If all Indians attempted to eat the amount of food that the United Nations considers the minimum for human beings, 115,000,000 Indians would have no food at all; yet 5,000,000 more Indians are born every year than die.

Let us remember that the Indian continent represents about one-fifth of the human race. The Chinese fifth of mankind has already gone Communist. What happens to India—whether it grows democratic or totalitarian—may decide the future of us all. Yet American policy sticks to western Europe, and India has seen none of our generosity—no vast lend-lease, no dollar loans, no UNRRA, no Marshall plan.

Why not apply Christian principles to common sense and put our wheat to work for peace in a better investment than a dozen battleships? Let Congress vote that our food surplus, above a safe reserve level, is available free to groups outside the regular market, such as the children or the 10,000,000 refugees in India.

Why not have this act of peace do double-duty and help to strengthen world organization as well as the democracy of India? Let the food be a direct contribution from America to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization for distribution in the name of mankind as a whole.

This is an issue for the people and their organizations—particularly the churches, women's and other civic groups. This is something our statesmen might like to do if they thought the people were behind them. We believe the people will be ahead of them.

Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a story of great courage by a fine young American, Matt Vucurovich, of Butte, Mont.

I want to extend my congratulations to Matt and Florence Vucurovich for the tremendous fight they have made and are making against great odds; to their family for the fine assistance they have rendered to them; and to their numerous friends—many of them personal friends of mine—for all they have done to help Matt and Florence.

It is an honor for me to have the opportunity to bring Matt's own story to the attention of Congress because it typifies the courage of an American boy and his sister, the devotion of his family, and the true meaning of friends.

To Matt and Florence, I extend my wishes and my prayers that their recovery will be complete and their courage and fighting spirit rewarded.

[From the Montana Standard, Butte-Anaconda, Mont., of October 16, 1949]

MATT VUCUROVICH TELLS HIS STORY OF SLOWLY REGAINING EYESIGHT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Matt Vucurovich, one of the finest all-round athletes ever produced at Butte High School, and his sister, Florence, became blind at almost the same time in 1944. Now, after many months of treatment, Matt's sight is slowly returning and Florence is showing some improvement. At the invitation of the Montana Standard, in the belief that their game fight points up a lesson to encourage others, Matt Vucurovich tells their story of a return from darkness.)

(By Matt Vucurovich)

After nearly six long years, the shadows are lifting at last, and there is sunlight again.

What manner of miracle this must be is hard to understand and much harder yet to describe. Perhaps "miracle" is not quite the right word for it, because I never weakened during these years of blindness in my conviction that some day I would see again. And now that day is here.

My sister Florence, who is 3 years younger, and I both lost our sight early in 1944. Florence, then in Butte High School, had complained of severe headaches, but nothing unusual happened since the school nurse was treating her for them.

Then one evening in February, while sitting here at home (101 South Oklahoma Street) doing her homework, she suddenly discovered that she couldn't see out of her right eye. There seemed to be a film-like cloud, she said. The eye was badly bloodshot.

When she went to a doctor, he told her she had "pinkeye" and sent her home.

The "pinkeye" turned out to be iritis, which is an inflammation of the iris. Her condition grew increasingly worse, and she went to a doctor in Billings.

"How bad is it?" she asked.

"About as bad as it could be," he told her. The doctor sought to send her to a doctor in St. Paul, but the man he knew there had developed a case of blood poisoning and couldn't take her then. So she came home. Meanwhile her left eye had been failing, and soon she couldn't see at all, except to distinguish shadow from light.

I had entered Compton, Calif., Junior College in September 1943 as a freshman student. When my sister Angie was married to Mike Samardich the next February, I came home for the wedding, and didn't go back.

Then, in April, it happened to me. My eyes suddenly became bloodshot, like Florence's had been. I went to a doctor, but I couldn't learn what was the matter. Both Florence and I had our tonsils out, but that didn't help.

We turned to Rochester and in May that year made the first of our seven trips back there. We stayed until November and then came home for Christmas.

That was when we began to learn how many loyal friends we had in Butte. A committee which included Midge Griffiths, Emett Sullivan, Wreck Donnelly, Mike Popovich, Ed Sullivan, and others sponsored a huge dance program at the American Legion and miners' union halls and the Serbian Orthodox church. Nearly $6,000 was raised, as I recall. It was a wonderful thing, an unforgettable demonstration of help from our's friends and neighbors. Babe Elliott of the Northern Pacific was a great friend in need.

Back to Rochester we went in January and remained until July. We were given gold shots to settle the infection, and the doctors

took their daily looks at us. Florence had three shots a week and the best I could do was two.

Our sister Angie stayed with us in an apartment. She took us around, occasionally to shows or the ice follies—things like that. The time went surprisingly fast. On our first trip, mother had stayed with us. She and Mrs. Clare Jones, one of the best landladies in the world, and Denny Higgins, who ran the other apartment house, got along famously.

My first operation came in November 1948. They worked on the left eye. They got the pupil open quite a bit, and they told me my light perception was very good. But then, somehow, the pupil closed again. I had been able to distinguish colors and differences in fabrics, but now I couldn't any more. Cars which went past were reduced to mere streaky looking shadows. I was pretty discouraged.

There were more trips to Rochester. There was a big ice show staged here as a benefit, and again our friends were wonderful to us. But it was getting to be rather rough going financially, nevertheless.

I had a grocery store at 800 East Park, with Angie coming from Anaconda every day to help out. But it was too much, and I had to give it up after 8 months.

Through the efforts of Midge Griffiths, of the high school, the brothers in Butte Central, the school board, and the chamber of commerce, I was able to retain the concessions at the Butte High School football stadium. The concession part had been abandoned during the war, you know.

Mayor Barry O'Leary and several councilmen, among them Walter Rinared, John Lindquist, Pete Sodja, Art Mehrens, and John McCartan, helped me retain the concessions during the baseball season at Clark Park. The concession work took a lot of pressure off the nerves, and my contact with the ballplayers and fans aided tremendously.

I had lots of help. Besides those in my family, there were Johnny Kovesich, Leonard Stevens, Joe Roberts, Bronko Stanisich, Bronko Bennett, Bob and Maggie Mirich, and Arleen Markovich. They worked without pay, and the business practically ran itself.

It was toward the end of the baseball season this year that I started making improvement. I had gone back to Rochester for a quick 2-minute operation, and was back in Butte 24 hours later.

The people at the ball park were becoming just a bit more distinct, and again I could distinguish colors of clothing. I didn't say anything about it, though.

It was a thrilling experience, and I didn't dare to hope for too much. The first real thing I saw, I think, was Florence's blouse. She was excited, and so was I.

"Isn't that a housecoat you're wearing?" I asked her. And it was.

"How do you know?" she asked.

"I think I can see it."

Then, riding in a car from the ball park, I could make out the white guard posts and rails on the Texas avenue overpass. After that, people weren't just voices any more. They were figures I could see—not very well, you know, but I could see them dimly just like same.

And so I'm on my way back, I'm sure. I bowled three games last week, with Pete, my brother, at Marty's alleys, letting to guide me. I shot 126, 113, and 80, which aren't bad scores for a guy who couldn't even see the floor 3 months ago.

I can read, too—only large type, of course—but that's real progress, too. But it's like learning to read all over again. I have to take it pretty slow.

There's still much to be done, especially in Florence's case. I'm hoping to land the concessions at the new civic center when it's ready, and that would be a big help. Florence hasn't had an operation yet, but probably will sometime this next year.

I had a fine letter from Dr. W. L. Benedict at Rochester a couple of weeks ago. He wrote that he is "very happy to know that you have regained some of your lost vision" and adds that "I know of no reason why your improvement should not continue. Let nature take its course."

It's a wonderful letter, probably the best letter I ever got from anybody in my whole life. And one of these days I'll be able to read it myself—right there in the small typewriter print where it says the 6 years of darkness are about over.

Why Congressmen Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Sunday Sun-Telegraph of December 4, 1949:

WHY CONGRESSMEN TRAVEL

(By E. F. Tompkins)

Some displeasure is being expressed because Members of Congress have been going abroad in considerable numbers and at public expense.

It is not unlikely that part of the criticism is inspired by the bureaucracy which carries on our multifarious projects across the oceans—including the disbursements of very large sums of money.

For Senators and Representatives who visit the foreign scenes are expected to discuss what they observe, and their reports are not always complimentary to the agents and agencies involved.

Discouraging or discrediting congressional tours may thus be a protective political device.

In another phase, the criticism of Congress comes from sincere advocates of Federal economy.

For example, the New York Sun disclosed alliteratively that:

"From Belgium to Bermuda, from Sweden to Siam, more than 100 globe-hopping Congressmen have roamed this year on junkets or missions * * * which will cost the harassed American taxpayer nearly $750,000."

That may seem like a good deal of money. But is it?

Actually, $750,000—three-fourths of one million—is approximately 0.0002 percent of the $40,000,000,000-budget for the current fiscal year which was submitted by the administration and which the Congress was asked to approve—almost an infinitesimal proportion.

Including the expenses of the Marshall plan and of the American occupation forces in Germany, Austria, Trieste, and Japan, plus numerous grants or loans, literally billions of dollars of our appropriated funds are being spent in foreign places.

Why should anybody—even a bureaucrat—object if Members of Congress deem it their duty to do a little overseas auditing?

If the demand is put upon them to provide vast sums, and to levy the onerous taxes implied, why should not the National Legislature ascertain for itself how the funds are being dispensed—and to what good purposes, if any?

In fact, how could Congress legislate capably when recurrent appropriations are proposed unless Congress has more direct information than the interested bureaucracies may choose to submit?

What appears to be overlooked is that the United States is no longer a stay-at-home nation attending to its own business.

We have troops and fleets and squadrons of airplanes in virtually every foreign sea and alien continent.

We have assumed, whether wisely or not, the responsibility of rehabilitating the rest of the world and of supporting much of it.

We are in the United Nations, paying the major share of its bills; we are in the North Atlantic alliance, presumably in anticipation of another European war; we are implicated in diplomatic imbroglios in the Far East, the Middle East, and the Near East; and we are lending money in important amounts to remote countries like Afghanistan.

These far-flung adventures require appropriations of money which only the Congress can make.

Consequently, as the elected Representatives of the people, Members of Congress have an obligation in international affairs that belongs to them alone.

Since the foregoing are the facts—and the facts they are—why should any Member of Congress, or all Members of Congress, be criticized or aspersed because they go abroad to discover for themselves what we are financing?

What they would spend on a few information junkets may be saved for us a thousandfold in carefully edited future appropriations; and no foreign-expenditure lobbyists should be permitted to restrict this prerogative of Congress.

Civil-Rights Compromise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under the auspices of the Atlanta Christian Council, the Honorable BROOKS HAYS, of the Fifth District of Arkansas, appeared in Atlanta on Monday and Tuesday, December 5 and 6, and discussed before various groups the civil-rights problem with especial reference to his own moderate and practical suggested method of settling this problem without resorting to punitive laws.

In connection with Mr. HAYS' appearance in Atlanta, the Atlanta Journal on December 3, commented upon Mr. HAYS' prospective appearance. With my own remarks I am including this editorial which seems to me to be a very fair and able résumé of the approach which Congressman HAYS and other southern liberals are proposing toward improving race relations.

It is truly tragic that many so-called leaders of both parties and both races are using this grave problem for political purposes and are seeking to make political capital out of the perplexing situation.

It is my fervent hope that the voice of understanding liberals like BROOKS HAYS will be heeded and that the problem

will be settled by moderate and reasonable means instead of by the drastic punitive proposals offered by the politicians. I am convinced that if these drastic proposals should be approved by the Congress, the position of the Negroes would not be improved but that progress toward the real solution would be set back a quarter of a century. This is a problem that cannot be settled by punitive laws but which must be settled by the raising of the economic and educational level of the minority races in our midst.

The editorial above referred to is as follows:

HAYS WILL SPEAK HERE ON CIVIL-RIGHTS COMPROMISE

Arkansas' able and intelligent Representative in Congress, BROOKS HAYS, of Little Rock, is a southern liberal who has made a real contribution toward improving race relations. He is the author of a civil-rights compromise which he believes will be acceptable to moderate, clear-thinking people of North and South alike. His proposal has attracted much attention since he first brought it to the floor of the House last February.

Monday and Tuesday, Atlantans will have an opportunity to hear Mr. HAYS discuss the civil-liberties issue in person. He is being brought here by the Atlanta Christian Council to fill a tight 2-day speaking schedule that will include addresses to the Ministers' Conference, to the Christian Council itself, and other interested groups.

As we understand it, Mr. HAYS thinks that if an agreement could be reached that no legislation will be passed on the subject of segregation, southerners would prove themselves quite open-minded on the other issues. He feels that southerners would not then fight for the anti-poll-tax bill, and that a modus vivendi could be reached on anti-lynch and FEPC proposals. With regard to the former, his thinking is that a Federal antilynch bill would be acceptable provided such a law operates only in States having no antilynch laws of their own, and he would handle the fair-employment question by setting up a division in the Labor Department to "counsel with management and labor for the elimination of discrimination and work toward wider employment opportunities for all groups." The FEPC machinery he suggests would carry no "legal sanctions." It would employ reason rather than a big stick.

Most southerners would agree, we think, that in selecting segregation as a point of no compromise, Mr. HAYS has put his finger on the issue where Federal interference with custom and tradition here would be least practicable, and most dangerous. And it is perfectly clear that segregation is an issue upon which Dixie congressmen will not and cannot yield an inch. Thus the Arkansan's proviso on the subject, whatever northern critics may think of it, is only common sense so far as practical politics are concerned.

The Atlanta Christian Council deserves high praise for inviting Mr. HAYS to this community. In our opinion it is through the churches—and the honest, thoughtful, God-fearing people of both races who belong to them—that the most encouraging progress in the field of race relations is being made. And here is a southerner, born in Arkansas and a Baptist by faith, who answers the civil rights zealots with a constructive counter-proposal of his own.

Mr. HAYS' plan will not be satisfactory to Dixie demagogues who get themselves elected to office by peddling race hatred; nor will it please the cynical politicians who cater to minority groups in the North. But it is worth thinking over, and we are glad Atlantans are getting an opportunity to hear all about it.

The REA Program in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration is an agency of the United States Department of Agriculture. It was established on May 11, 1935, by Executive order of the President under authority of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935. The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 gave REA permanent status and authorized a 10-year lending program. In 1944 this lending program was extended by Congress indefinitely. Congress annually makes available the amount of funds REA may lend.

REA is headed by an Administrator who is appointed by the President for a 10-year term. His appointment is confirmed by the Senate, and in his official actions he is responsible to the Secretary of Agriculture. The present Administrator, Claude R. Wickard, of Indiana, took office in July 1945.

REA is empowered to make loans to qualified borrowers, with preference to nonprofit and cooperative organizations and to public bodies. Loans are made to cover the full cost of constructing power lines and other electric facilities to serve persons in rural areas who are without central station electric service. The loans bear 2 percent interest and are repaid over a maximum period of 35 years.

REA itself operates no rural-electric facilities, and no grants or subsidies are involved in its program. Its loans are repaid from the operating revenues of the locally owned, locally managed systems. A part of each individual consumer's monthly electric bill goes to pay off the Government loans. REA serves principally as a banker to the local systems. Its main functions are to lend money and give technical advice and counsel where needed in the construction and operation of the borrower's facilities.

Farm electrification had advanced very slowly in the United States during the 53-year period from 1882, when the first central generating system went into service, to 1935, when REA was created. A few farmers were connected to central-station power prior to World War I. The early twenties saw a short-lived spurt in which the progress made in electrical engineering was reflected by a small increase in the number of farms served. However, only 10.9 percent of all farms in the United States were receiving central-station electric service by 1935. Few power lines had been built beyond the immediate vicinities of cities and towns.

Farmers and farm organizations, chafing at the slow rate of progress, increased their demands for Government action in the field of rural electrification. The result was the establishment of REA, with an action program designed primarily to make electric service available to those farm people who were without electricity.

Since the establishment, REA has greatly stimulated the extension of service into rural areas. By July 1, 1949, a total of 3,838,062 additional farms had been connected to central power lines by all agencies, public and private. More than half of the farms connected to central station lines since 1935—about 57 percent—received electric service from REA-financed systems. The remainder were on lines of other suppliers, many of which were stimulated to greater activity in the rural field by the REA program.

REA estimated as of June 30, 1949, that 4,582,016 farms, or 78.2 percent of the Nation's total, were electrified. About 1,275,000 of the Nation's farms, more than 21 percent, still were unelectrified. In addition, there were hundreds of thousands of unelectrified rural nonfarm dwellings, crossroads businesses, schools, churches, and other rural establishments.

Many of these unelectrified farms are situated in isolated areas, or in areas of relatively low farm income. Consequently, the most difficult part of the rural electrification job remains to be completed. However, the REA program has succeeded in establishing a pattern which eventually can provide virtually every unserved farm in the country with electric service.

As of August 31, 1949, REA had approved $1,867,949,858 in loans to 1,054 borrowers. They include 968 cooperatives, 41 public power districts, 23 other public bodies, and 25 commercial power companies. At that time, REA had on file or in process in the field, additional loan applications totaling $424,111,000 for new system construction and various line improvements. Most of these applications are for expansion of existing systems financed by REA.

Some 968 of these REA borrowers had rural electric facilities in operation. Their facilities included 870,951 miles of line serving more than 2,871,701 farms and other rural consumers in about 2,500 counties of 46 States, Alaska, and the Virgin Islands. Additional lines are being built more rapidly now than ever before.

Of all the loans thus far approved by REA, over 85 percent have been for electric distribution facilities, to borrowers who buy their power at wholesale rather than generate it themselves. REA makes generation and transmission loans only when borrowers are unable to purchase an adequate supply of power or cannot buy it at reasonable wholesale rates. Only about 13 percent of the REA loans have been for construction of generating plants and transmission lines. About 1 percent of the loans have been made to power system operators for relending to their cussumers to finance installation of wiring, plumbing, and electrical equipment and appliances.

Membership in rural electric cooperatives is not confined to farmers. It is open to all people in a rural area who can be reached and who want electric service. More than three-fourths of all consumers on REA-financed coopera-

tive lines are farms. But also included are many thousands of rural nonfarm dwellings, schools, churches, stores, community buildings, and similar facilities. REA borrowers also serve thousands of rural industries and other commercial enterprises. Many of these rural industries themselves are operating on a cooperative plan.

As of August 31, 1949, REA had advanced $1,327,045,633 in loans to its borrowers. Under REA loan contracts, advances are made as the borrowers need funds with which to pay for construction that is under way or completed.

The difference between the amount of loans approved and the amount of funds advanced represents loan funds that are obligated to borrowers. Most of it has been further obligated by the borrowers to pay for materials ordered for the earliest possible delivery and will be advanced as construction proceeds.

As of September 30, 1949, the borrowers had returned to the Government $213,033,387 in principal and interest payments on their REA loans. This included $19,782,981 in payments on principal ahead of schedule. Only $965,241 was reported more than 30 days overdue. Only one REA loan foreclosure has been necessary to date on an operating power system; it was on a loan that had been made to a commercial power company.

REA has made more than 95 percent of its loans to cooperatives organized under State laws by rural people seeking electric service. These groups which make up about 92 percent of all REA borrowers are local independent private business enterprises. They are controlled by their consumer-members through boards of directors elected annually by and from the membership.

Rural electric cooperatives have proved the most effective instrument for carrying out the REA program because of their advantages as a method of making reasonable cost electric service available to farmers in rural areas. These advantages include:

First. REA-financed cooperatives operate on a nonprofit basis. This enables them to provide electric service at cost to their members.

Second. Directors of REA-financed cooperatives are elected because of their known interest in making electric service available to rural people at reasonable rates. They serve without compensation and keep operating expense at the lowest possible level consistent with good service.

Third. Members of REA-financed cooperatives also are interested in electric service at reasonable cost. For example, they help reduce operating expense by voluntarily reporting potential causes of service interruptions such as tree limbs touching the lines. Most of them read their own meters, and many make out their own bills.

Fourth. Previous experience of farmers with other types of cooperatives helps them to organize and operate rural electric cooperatives on a sound basis with a minimum of effort and expense.

Lines constructed by REA borrowers are built to serve entire areas, including less densely settled sections as well as those of greater population. This is known as area coverage. The test is no longer whether an individual line or section will be self-supporting, but whether the entire system as a whole is feasible. This policy has become increasingly important as the rural electrification job has progressed. Only through area coverage can electric service be extended to many of the more isolated farms, and to others which are remotely situated in pocketed areas far removed from any established source of power.

In every region in the United States rural electric cooperatives have demonstrated that farm electrification, far from constituting an additional cash drain on low-farm incomes, actually brings about a higher real-farm income and better farm living. It brings more business into rural communities. It encourages new local enterprises which come about when low-cost power is available. It stimulates private business, both locally and nationally. Surveys indicate that for every dollar invested in rural power facilities the farmer invests an additional $4.50 in wiring, plumbing, and electrical appliances.

The use of electric power in farm production and processing is constantly expanding. To date about 400 farm uses for electricity have been reported. Electric power on the farm is an economic necessity which can pay its way with handsome profits for the farmer. Guidance is given consumers on REA-financed lines as to which uses are the most efficient and the most profitable in these times of power shortages.

In the State of Montana, at the time REA was established in 1935, only 3,768 farms, or 5.5 percent, were receiving central station electric service. REA estimated as of June 30, 1949, that 23,462 farms, or 62.2 percent of all farms in the State, were served. An estimated 14,285 farms in the State still were without service.

The first REA loan in Montana was approved in May 1936, and the first REA-financed line placed in operation on December 5, 1937, by the Lower Yellowstone Rural Electric Association of Sidney, Mont.

As of September 30, 1949, REA had approved $27,051,598 in loans in the State to 24 borrowers, all of them cooperatives. The loans will enable these borrowers to finance the construction of 16,236 miles of line and other rural electric facilities to serve 31,284 rural consumers. Some of these facilities already are in operation and additional lines are being built as rapidly as possible.

As of September 30, 1949, REA had advanced $20,370,126 as loans in Montana, and the State's borrowers were operating 12,556 miles of line serving 24,066 farms and other rural consumers.

The average monthly farm consumption on REA-financed lines in Montana increased from 76 kilowatt-hours in December 1941, to 211 kilowatt-hours in December 1948.

This increase reflects greater use of electrical equipment to save time and labor in performing farm and household tasks to help bring about a more comfortable rural living.

REA's latest debt-service summary, covering all transactions to September 30, 1949, shows that the Montana borrowers have paid $2,013,340 in principal and interest on their Government loans. This includes $242,158 paid on principal in advance of the date due. Nine borrowers were ahead on their payments and none were behind. None were overdue on loans in the State.

This is a great record for a great program in a great State. It is my hope that the day is not too far distant when every farm in Montana is electrified. I will do everything in my power to achieve that goal.

Resolution of Abington (Mass.) Republican Town Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD W. NICHOLSON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Republican Town Committee of Abington, Mass.:

ABINGTON, MASS.

The Honorable GUY G. GABRIELSON,
Chairman, Republican National Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GABRIELSON: We, the members of the Abington Republican Town Committee, realize that once again, as in 1776, Americans are confronted with "a design to reduce them under absolute despotism." The enemies of constitutional government aim to gain complete control of the national income, and they have nearly attained their goal.

Our money has been debauched. Our Government has a public debt over $50,000,000,000 greater than all our country's gold money, and bank deposits, and has concluded this year with a sizable deficit. Unless present expenses are cut, there is the same outlook for the years that lie ahead. Yet, despite this bankrupt condition, those in power have planned ever increasing ways to spend the national income, and sums far beyond it, in their despotic design to enslave our people by extorting the fruits of their labors.

We cannot stand idly by in the face of such threats to our liberty and the liberty of our children. We know that our only defense is to insist that those we send to Washington strive constantly to cut present expenses while blocking all efforts to spend additional money, no matter what the pretense. In that way, and that way only, lies our salvation, and we believe it is the sacred duty of every elected Republican to oppose this traitorous plot at each and every turn.

But this is still not being done. Today Republicans side with the New Dealers on issue after issue, in both foreign and domestic policy, so that we who work to elect Republicans are deprived of representation and are "taxed without our consent."

The situation has become unbearable, and unless we get representation immediately we will no longer support these Republicans. Indeed, we will actively oppose these appeasers at the polls, because we intend to oppose the enemy wherever he exists; and if the Republican Party cannot offer us a fighting leadership, we will continue the fight alone. We will no longer tolerate bipartisanism by Republicans.

We believe every elected Republican should strive constantly to try to attain the following objectives:

1. To restore a sound monetary system which would stabilize American money and restore to the American people the right of redemption of paper money.
2. To adopt a systematic plan for payment of the national debt.
3. To balance the national budget. We will not condone deficit spending or tax increases.
4. To reduce Federal expenses and eliminate all unessential employees. Taxes must come down.
5. To withdraw the Federal Government from competition with private business.
6. To stop politicians from buying votes by promising Federal aid (resulting eventually in Federal control) for education, public housing, socialized medicine, and socialized agriculture.
7. To eliminate Federal subsidies.
8. To establish a sound tax system that will restore and protect the incentive to produce. We believe the power to tax should be limited by constitutional amendment.
9. To return to States' rights and the restoration of local self-government.
10. To return to the constitutional government of our founding fathers which guaranties to individuals "the right to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects," without fear of confiscation, and the right to work without fear of domination or control from any source.

We join with Abraham Lincoln to say:

"Let every man remember that to violate the Constitution is to trample on the blood of his father, and to tear the charter of his own and his children's liberty. As the patriots of seventy-six did to the support of the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the Constitution and its laws, let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor."

As adopted by the members of the Abington Republican Town Committee.

WINSLOW A. EDMUNDS,
CHAIRMAN.

United States Tariffs and Europe's Import Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, with the rapid recovery strides that have been made in Europe through American assistance, it becomes increasingly important that we recognize the necessity of some realistic thinking on the subject of tariffs and trade quotas. After all our ballyhoo about reciprocal trade, it now appears that the greatest hindrance to resumption of normal trade is not American tariffs but the import quotas imposed by European governments on many of the same commodities whose tariffs have been reduced.

The second most important point is that nearly all of the American concessions on tariffs have been against the interests of our own farmers and small manufacturers. In spite of all the Democrat administration's bleating about the plight of the small-business man, we find small businesses most sorely hurt by dumping of cheap foreign goods. In contrast, many of the items most highly protected by tariffs are made by American monopolies or near-monopolies. Of the 262 items which the ECA commerce mission reported European nations wanted to export to the United States and which were protected by tariffs of 25 percent or more, only 2 were farm products—wool grease and shelled almonds.

In the light of these facts, I have asked the United States Tariff Commission to prepare a statement showing the tariff situation on major commodities at the present time. Under permission to extend my remarks, I ask to include this statement at this point in the RECORD:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., December 29, 1949.

The Honorable WALT HORAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HORAN: This is in reply to your letter of November 28 in which you requested a table showing the tariff duties charged by this and other countries on 25 or 50 representative commodities. We have prepared the enclosed table giving information on the treatment of imports of 17 commodities by the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, France, and Belgium-Luxemburg-Netherlands (Benelux). The data in the table are much less extensive than you requested but we believe any feasible extension of the material would leave it less significant for your purposes than you may have expected. The footnotes to the table and the discussion below will indicate that numerous complexities are involved. We shall be glad if you will inform us if we can assist you further in any analysis of the tariffs of this and other countries that you may wish to make.

We understand that your interest in the data requested arises from your desire to compare the degree of restrictiveness or protection in the import policies of this and other countries. One limitation on any conclusion in this matter that might be arrived at solely from the consideration of the tariff rates of different countries arises from the widespread use of import quotas and other nontariff controls referred to in your letter. Such controls have now superseded the tariff in importance for the bulk of the import trade of many foreign countries. Though these controls are in many cases regarded as temporary, to be moderated and withdrawn as balance-of-payments problems are overcome, it is uncertain when if ever the tariff may assume in many countries its former predominance. (We have not attempted in the enclosed table to indicate the bearing of such supposedly temporary restrictions on the imports of the commodities listed by the foreign countries covered. To do so would require more detailed information on the day-to-day administration of the controls than we are able to maintain.)

Even in the United States, which has not made such extensive use of nontariff trade controls as have many foreign countries, such controls have become of substantial importance or potential importance, particularly with respect to imports competitive with domestic agriculture. The sugar trade of the United States is conspicuously a case in point and United States imports of wheat and cotton and some other commodities are subject to quotas or import licenses. Moreover, section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act makes possible (to the extent not in conflict with international obligations) the application of such controls where imports would seriously interfere or threaten so to interfere with production, marketing, or price support programs brought into operation by the Department of Agriculture. You may wish to refer to our letter to you of October 17 for information regarding the more important aspects of our international obligations in this matter.

Another difficulty arises from the fact that the restrictiveness of the import policies of different countries is probably not properly to be judged by comparing the rates of duty applied by different countries to the same commodities. It would probably be better to use different lists of commodities for each country, each list to be made up in consideration of the character of the industries and resources of the respective countries. Some examples will be useful in explaining this point.

Wool growing is not of much importance to the economies of the United Kingdom, France, and the Benelux countries. These countries are more interested in encouraging their wool manufacturing industries than their production of raw wool. The fact, therefore, that imports of raw wool into these countries are free is probably not of itself to be regarded as an element of liberalism or of moderation in their protectionism. The United States has a wool-growing industry that is of substantial importance to certain areas of the country. In a comparison of the foreign-trade policies of the several countries, free entry of wool into the foreign countries named does not have the same significance as would similar treatment of imports of raw wool by the United States.

Different considerations from those suggested by the wool example give the tariff treatment of certain imports by different countries little significance for a comparison of the restrictiveness of their import policies. For example, the United States is on a large export basis with respect to automobiles and the probability is that imported automobiles would not offer important competition to at least the major part of the United States automobile industry (namely, that producing the standard size American cars) even if automobiles were imported into this country free of duty. For this reason the rate of duty applicable to automobiles imported into the United States is probably of much less importance to the United States automobile industry than are the rates of duty on imports of the automobiles into Canada, the United Kingdom, or France to the automobile industries of those countries. For similar reasons the tariff treatment of imports of newsprint paper into Canada, wool fabrics into the United Kingdom, and wines into France are of less importance than the tariff rates applied by other important trading countries to imports of these commodities.

Another consideration which limits the significance of the data you request arises from the fact that in some countries substantial duties are levied on the imports of some commodities for revenue purposes and with little or no protective intent or effect. For example, a very high duty is levied on imports of tobacco into the United Kingdom but the United Kingdom does not have any significant production of tobacco and the duties on imports are not levied with a view to promoting such production. These duties are primarily designed to secure governmental revenue and, at least in recent years, to some extent for the purpose of discouraging consumption of an imported commodity the bulk of which must be paid for in dol-

lar exchange. Somewhat similar considerations apply in respect of the duties which the United Kingdom, France and other western European countries levy on imports of petroleum and petroleum products. The United States does not use import duties to any considerable extent for revenue purposes.

A full discussion of the problems raised by your request would involve many wide and varied considerations. We trust, however, the foregoing may be sufficient for your purpose.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR B. RYDER,
Chairman.

Duties on imports of selected commodities in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, France, and Benelux, 1949 [1]

[Percentages are ad valorem rates]

Commodity [2]	United States	Canada [3]	United Kingdom [4] [5]	France [6] [7]	Benelux [8] [9]
Caustic soda	½ cent per pound	0.3 cent per pound	10 percent	20 percent	8 percent.
Coconut oil [10]	3 cents per pound [11]	10 percent	15 percent	12 percent	5 percent.
Window glass	20 percent [12]	do	do	20 percent	6 percent.
Automobiles	10 percent	17½ percent	33⅓ percent	35 percent	24 percent.
Tin ingots	67 cents per short ton [13]	$2.37 per short ton	25 percent [14]	5 percent	Free.
Lumber, rough softwood	$1 per thousand board feet [15]	Free	4s. thousand board feet (65 cents). [16]	14 percent	3 to 10 percent.
Sugar, refined	0.53 cent per pound [17]	1.7 cents per pound	11s. 8d. per hundredweight (1⅔ cents per pound). [18]	130 percent	(2 to 5 cents per pound) [17]
Tobacco, cigarette	15 or 30 cents per pound	1.8 cents per pound	£2 19s. 2d. per pound ($8.14) [19]	Free [20]	(2 to 4 cents per pound). [20]
Apples, raw	½ cent per pound	0.7 cent per pound	Free [21]	8 to 12 percent [22]	6 to 12 percent.
Cotton, short-staple	Free [23]	Free	do	Free	Free.
Whisky (per proof gallon)	$1.50	$8.72 [24]	£4 5s. 5d. ($11.95) [25]	30 percent	(60 to 76 cents.) [26]
Cotton cloth, bleached	17½ percent [27]	17½ percent, + 3 cents per pound.	20 percent	20 percent	18 percent.
Wool, raw	25½ cents per pound [28]	10 cents per pound	Free	Free	Free.
Wool fabrics, woven	37½ cents per pound + 25 percent. [29]	30 cents per pound + 27½ percent.	17½ percent	15 percent	10 percent.
Wool knit gloves	do [30]	25 percent	30 percent	30 percent	24 percent.
Newsprint paper	Free	12½ percent	Free	25 percent	6 percent.
Gasoline (per United States gallon)	1½ cents [31]	0.8 cent	9d. (9 cents) [32]	18 percent	Free or (9 to 11 cents). [33]

[1] Latest possible information has been employed. Duties are mostly those which were in effect during November 1949. The tariff treatment may have been different in a few cases because of some temporary special measure. Rates of exchange employed in converting foreign specific rates of duty into United States currency are as of Nov. 1, 1949.

[2] The tariffs of countries covered provide for different rates on subclassifications of some of the commodities listed. In such cases the rate shown opposite the commodity for the particular country may be that for a subclassification believed to be important in the trade.

[3] Specific rates shown are expressed in terms of United States currency only. Commodities which are dutiable when imported into Canada from countries other than those of the British Commonwealth are for the most part dutiable at lower rates when imported from countries of the British Commonwealth. The rates shown are those applicable to imports from the United States.

[4] Of the commodities listed, imports into the United Kingdom from the countries of the British Commonwealth are, except for tobacco, whisky, and sugar, free of duty. The rates shown are those for imports from non-British-Commonwealth countries. Figures in parentheses are the equivalents in terms of United States currency of the British currency converted at the rate of $2.80 to £1.

[5] Quantitative controls for purpose of conserving foreign exchange are of great importance in restricting imports into the United Kingdom, France, and the Netherlands (but not in Belgium-Luxembourg).

[6] Imperial preferences in the French tariff system are relatively unimportant for most commodities.

[7] Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg have a common schedule of customs duties, as such; but the Netherlands has additional charges on many products, in choice the "monopoly fees" which are added from time to time by quasigovernmental economic control boards. Belgium-Luxembourg and the Netherlands have made considerable progress toward a complete customs union, but tariff (and excise) treatment still differs on some products. Where a spread is given in the rates in this column, this is because the duty schedules have not been completely unified (lumber, sugar, tobacco, apples, whisky).

[8] Coconut oil is competitive in considerable degree with much fats and oils used in food and in soap, like lard, cottonseed oil, and tallow.

[9] This is the processing tax collected on the first domestic processing of Philippine coconut oil or on the oil made in the United States from imported Philippine copra. At the present time coconut oil derived from copra imported from sources other than the Philippines is subject to a processing tax of 5 cents a pound and imports of coconut oil as such to a duty of 1 cent a pound and in addition, to the processing tax of 5 cents a pound. The non-Philippine products are imported in very small volume. See U. S. Tariff Commission, Summaries of Tariff Information, vol. 1, pt. 4, pp. 89–92 for complicating details.

[10] The actual rate is in specific terms; 20 percent is the computed ad valorem equivalent: The average rate of duty of the first 3 import classes of common window glass in 1949 divided by average foreign value in 1948 (1.1 cent per pound divided by 5.5 cents per pound), both averages weighted according to 1948 volume of imports.

[11] Expressed as 75 cents per long ton in tariff act.

[12] Volume of imports is greatly affected by concerted action of the British iron and steel industry in conjunction with European cartel and under Government sponsorship.

[13] M board feet signifies "per thousand board feet." The United States rate of $1 per M board feet is made up of 25 cents duty and 75 cents import excise tax.

[14] Primarily for benefit of Canadian and other Commonwealth-country producers. This rate is for the classification in which the competition for the British market is quite active. It does not apply to all imports of coniferous lumber into the United Kingdom.

[15] Rate on Cuban sugar: Import quotas are of greatest importance in restricting the importation of refined sugar (as well as raw). A comprehensive system of Government intervention is in effect, including internal-market regulation and direct subsidies to domestic producers (not refiners of raw cane sugar).

[16] The British duty on imports of sugar originated as a revenue measure. When in the twenties the United Kingdom undertook to encourage and support the local production of beet sugar, a direct subsidy to the growers was quickly followed by a considerable expansion of output. A comprehensive system of marketing controls with considerable governmental participation developed later. The rate of duty shown is the one applicable on imports of sugar from non-Commonwealth sources. Imports from the Dominions enter at a somewhat lower rate and those from the colonies at an even lower rate. The excise tax on sugar closely parallels the customs duty.

[17] The duties as such are, for 100 kilos: 300 francs or 18.16 florins; to the former should be added the Belgian excise tax of 60 francs, a turn-over tax of 2 percent and a stamp tax of 0.45 francs; to the latter, the Dutch excise tax of 27 florins, crisis tax of 2¼ florins, sales tax of 3 percent, and others totaling about 1 percent.

[18] Largely for revenue: Preference for Commonwealth tobacco amounts to about 21 cents per pound. Tobacco is not grown in the United Kingdom imports from Rhodesia and Canada have increased greatly.

[19] Imports of tobacco are adjusted by a Government monopoly in accordance with regulation of the internal market; operations are conducted so as to contribute substantially to the national treasury.

[20] The duties as such are, per 100 kilos: 413 francs and 25 florins (Belgian and Dutch, respectively). The various internal taxes are additional.

[21] Free during the main marketing season for American (and other Northern Hemisphere) apples. Otherwise dutiable.

[22] These are the rates which are in effect during the principal marketing season for American (and other Northern Hemisphere) apples. During other months of the year, higher rates of duty are in effect.

[23] Protection to cotton growers of the United States is afforded through quotas on the importation of cotton. The internal-market price is supported through Government loans on stored cotton belonging to growers.

[24] Largely for revenue: Excise tax collected on the Canadian product is equivalent to 86 per United States proof gallon.

[25] Duty is largely for revenue and roughly corresponds with excise tax on production in the United Kingdom.

[26] The duties as such are, per hectoliter: 1,000 francs and 60.53 florins (Belgian and Dutch, respectively). Various internal taxes are also collected. The internal taxes differ as between the imported products and those of Belgium and the Netherlands, presenting a definite possibility of further discrimination against the imported product. These are the rates for bottled goods; the alcohol content is not specified in the tariff schedule.

[27] Rate of duty varies with value of the cloth and fineness of the yarn, measured by yarn count. The rate shown applies to bleached cloth valued over 80 cents per pound and of 31 yarn count, one of the important categories of commerce.

[28] This is the rate per pound of clean content applicable to wools of apparel type, i. e., of grades finer than 44's; in the grease. This is the most important category of imports. Carpet wools are free of duty.

[29] The specific part of this compound rate of duty serves as an offset to the cost of the duty on the raw wool used by the domestic manufacturer, leaving the ad valorem part of the rate as that intended to be protective of domestic production of the fabrics. The rate shown for woven fabrics is for those over 4 ounces per square yard and valued at more than $2 per pound; for gloves, those valued at more than $4 per dozen pairs.

[30] Import-excise tax. No duty as such.

[31] Free for industrial use only.

Cotton-Acreage-Allotment Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely, sensible resolution adopted by the directors of the Henderson County, Tenn., Farm Bureau, on December 17, 1949, and a letter from Mr. John H. Pitts, of Cerro Gordo, Tenn., who is one of the most prominent farmers in my congressional district with reference to the cotton-acreage-allotment program under Public Law 12 of the Eighty-first Congress. Both the resolution and the letter present recommendations for the elimination of inequities and injustices under this program.

RESOLUTION

We, the directors of Henderson County Farm Bureau, in regular meeting in Lexington, Tenn., on December 17, 1949, unanimously recommended that the Congress, as early as possible upon reconvening in January, amend Public Law 12—special legislation on cotton acreage allotment for 1950—to remove inequities in distribution of acreage to growers.

We object to present law for following reasons: (1) does not give some growers just share of county allotment which their farms help obtain; (2) ignores special adaptation of soil, capital investment, and farmer

experience on certain farms to favor those growers in more diversified areas of county who have less interest and are less dependent upon cotton growing; (3) discriminates against the small farmer who has been growing 15 to 50 acres of cotton and favors the larger diversified farmer; (4) sets a dangerous precedent—should history of corn growing, hog production, etc., be ignored on the individual farm in any future control program as in case of cotton, diversified farmers and areas would be ruined just as under present law; (5) while the high percentage of cropland devoted to cotton in the past on some farms cannot be strongly defended, we do challenge the wisdom of applying the cropland factor which forces a sudden and unsound change in farming. Many farmers are not prepared for this change and many tenants will lose their homes.

We recommend that the cotton acreage control law be amended to include the following: (1) that no farm be alloted less in 1950 than 75 percent of average acreage planted to cotton during years 1946, 1947, 1948; (2) that law be amended to put cotton allotments permanently on history of individual farm production beginning crop year 1951.

LETTER OF JOHN H. PITTS

HARBOUR-PITTS CO., INC.,
Cerro Gordo, Tenn., December 27, 1949.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR AND CONGRESSMAN: I have seen no darker future, since the days immediately following 1929, than that now facing us under the application of our present farm-cotton program.

My friends, it is not so much the cut-back or reduction of acreage, which is to put our tenants and sharecroppers off the farms and on the roads looking for other jobs and finally on relief, but the new process of allotments of acreage—allotting to farms on the basis of acreage and regardless of whether or not the farm is suitable to cotton or whether or not the same has been planted to cotton in former and recent years; in fact, it seems, whether or not the farm wants or has any use for cotton acreage.

Apparently, as I reason, this program is attempted as a permanent program, though untried; in my judgment it will largely bankrupt our cotton States in less than 12 months, as a temporary program, provided the injustices or inequities cannot be corrected in its application.

Let me cite you a few cases, of which there are no reasonable estimate of the thousands:

First. Myself and three brothers are the owners of a farm near the mouth of Indian Creek, about 900 to 1,000 acres, largely uplands suitable to cotton but little acreage suitable to other than cotton. In former years we have had as much as 200 acres in cotton. On this there are nine tenant families, a number of them heavily in debt for machinery and other necessities, and all equipped for raising cotton. This farm has an allotment for 1950 of 53 acres for cotton, a little over 5 acres to the family, and will produce under favorable conditions about one-half bale to the acre. How are these tenants or families to avoid bankruptcy?

The adjoining river bottom farm of about 400 acres, on which there is not a tenant house and which, as informed by the man who has it in charge, has had no cotton planted on it since 1941. Yet this farm has an allotment for 1950 of 26 acres and probably not an acre of it rented or wanted for cotton. As I understand it, this condition is common all through this Tennessee River section, if not all over the Cotton Belt.

Secondly, a man, tenant from the eighth district of this county (know him but can't recall the name) came to me yesterday, said: "Mr. Hardy, I'm here to see if you and your brothers can furnish me a crop for 1950, will take any kind of a crop of sufficient size to make a living for myself and my family—wife and four children, all except our baby raised in the cotton patch and know nothing else." When I advised him that we were wholly unable to supply him, that our allotment was no way near what our present tenants needed, he said, "I had my same lands rented for 1950, but now my landlord is so badly cut back in his allotment as to have no land for me and I have to move, and I've nowhere to go." Gentlemen, this poor man's voice was trembling and I thought I could see tears in his eyes. It was a heart-rending scene.

Thirdly, the above man was accompanied by a young man by the name of Bridges and said Bridges advised that his father had a good tenant and no acreage for him and that his father had offered to give his tenant $100, if he could find a location. Surely, my friends, we should find a better route than this.

Fourthly, a Mr. Samp Boroughs, just across Indian Creek from our aforesaid Indian Creek farm, bought in late 1948 some 88 acres of upland off a 400-acre tract, largely in Indian Creek bottom. The above purchase of 88 acres of upland from the tract composed more than half the entire suitable cotton lands of the whole and on which the said Boroughs had 6 acres of cotton in 1949. His allotment for 1950 is, as shown by his papers, one-half acre, and, as I further understand, Boroughs owes mainly the purchase price of the 88 acres. What's to happen to him?

My friends, we need a more equitable distribution of this cotton acreage. We need this acreage distributed to cotton lands and cotton farmers, not to lands not suitable and not wanted to be planted to cotton. Our cotton farmers are equipped to raise cotton and those who handle heavy lands, not suitable to cotton, are equipped to raise other crops and, as is common reason, have no use for cotton lands. In other words, use the old method of distributing according to former acreage, at least temporarily until our people can become adjusted to such radical changes and by which we would hope that all could manage to get by, at least to the extent to keep them in their little homes and off the relief rolls.

Senator and Tom, as a permanent plan for agriculture, which must be found if we are to maintain our present high standard of living and ever pay our Government debts, am fully convinced that our only chance for success in this great undertaking is to be found in some properly administered domestic allotment plan, giving the American producer the American market—that is, full parity on that portion of his production domestically consumed or used, freeing him to further produce as he sees fit for the world's market at the world prices, and as to cotton, it would seem to me that such should be based on baleage or pounds of lint cotton, rather than on acreage, in an effort to place all sections with lands rich or poor on an equal basis. Of course, in such plan our producers would have to be protected by tariff against pauper or less paid labor. I have no faith in any plan which restricts production—such plan as advocates doing nothing to create something.

Now in conclusion, back to our present farm program: It is my opinion that, if we cannot get these inequities out of this program, then we will need no further boosts to our next depression; think this will complete the job in the next 6 to 10 months and, although I am in my seventy-second year and have seen a number of depressions, in my further judgment, this will, or would, be the first depression to be forced upon our people and by a wrong application of a well-intended program.

Sincerely your friend,

JOHN H. PITTS.

Freight Forwarders and Federal Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure in including the splendid address delivered by United States Maritime Commissioner David J. Coddaire at the thirty-third annual dinner of the New York Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association, Inc. The subject of Commissioner Coddaire's address was most timely especially since it is recognized that he has become an outstanding expert on the subject. It would do well for all interested parties carefully to read Commissioner Coddaire's address in the light of the forthcoming proposed regulations of the freight-forwarding industry.

The address follows:

It would be difficult, indeed, to say anything about freight forwarders that you have not said about yourselves in the public record covering the recent cases before the Maritime Commission involving your industry. You have undoubtedly heard the old saying that the best way to teach a child to swim is to throw him in deep water. Shortly after I took office with the Maritime Commission, the Chairman referred to me the job of preparing the findings and recommendations in the then pending dockets concerning the freight-forwarding industry. There I was, a complete neophyte, thrown into the monstrous pool over 6,000 pages deep into which I had to dive and then work my way to the surface. Whether you feel I have learned to swim or merely to do a fast dog paddle depends upon your individual reactions to our decisions.

During the past two decades there has been a steady trend toward Federal regulation of all industry having an interstate or foreign-commerce aspect. Today, almost all such industry is subject, in some form or another, to Government-imposed restrictions. The freight-forwarding industry, as represented by your association, is no exception. Its sole distinction is that this regulation has been delayed longer than in most industries similarly situated. Whether one agrees with the concept of Government regulation in the public interest or not, the fact remains, it is here.

That the business of freight forwarding in the foreign commerce of the United States is subject to the jurisdiction of the Maritime Commission has been decided by the United States Supreme Court. Since then, the Commission has issued its reports in two cases involving freight forwarders and has taken action concerning the regulation of the forwarding of foreign relief and rehabilitation cargoes financed by our Government. While the various dockets are dissimilar, I feel it important to tell you of the principles upon which the Commission has made its decisions.

The public has an interest in every person's carrying on his trade freely; so has the individual. With respect to freight forwarders, among others, so has the Maritime Commission. There is justification for Federal regulation of individual business conduct only if such restriction is reasonable—reasonable, that is, in reference to the interests of the parties concerned and reasonable in reference to the interests of the public, so framed and so guarded as to afford adequate

protection to those in whose favor it is imposed, while at the same time not unnecessarily injurious to the regulated group. That, I think, is the fair result of the rules recently promulgated by the Maritime Commission in your interest.

I consider the Maritime Commission essentially as a public agency for the preservation of free enterprise and reasonably free competition in the carrying on of the foreign commerce of the United States. We have stated formally and to the world that freight forwarders play an important part in that commerce. We have prescribed measures of conduct for the forwarding industry based upon a common idea of reasonableness or fairness. Many of the complaints put forth in the investigation of freight forwarders contain a large moral element, so that the application of our rules calls for common sense and cooperation; not bureaucratic dictatorship or Government control.

If you have understood these comments, I must say you are possessed of astounding faculties of mental absorption and have been extremely attentive. I have read over the statements quite a few times since preparing them and must confess that they are somewhat involved. Boiled down, I merely have attempted to state my feeling that reasonable rules of conduct coupled with a voluntary code of ethics on the part of your association should result in the removal of most of the criticism that heretofore may have been directed toward some of those engaged in the business of freight forwarding. The ordinary shipper may be likened to the average purchaser, who is probably less informed than we think he is; he is generally inattentive, sometimes indifferent, and quite often careless. The shipper depends upon you gentlemen for the technical service and professional handling of his export products. He is entitled to fair treatment, reasonable charges for the services performed, and freedom from discrimination.

Coming now to the brokerage case, I assume that you have heard about the recent decision in that proceeding. There again the freight forwarders offered page after page of testimony about themselves, and how indispensable they are. If nothing else, I must say you have not been bashful nor modest in the presentation of your facts. The Commission's decision in that case, concerning steamship conference prohibitions against brokerage, again recognizes the principle of free enterprise by holding that a carrier should, within stated limits, be free to pay brokerage or not as his individual managerial discretion dictates. Outright conference prohibitions against brokerage were condemned. Thus far no conference has amended its agreement or taken other necessary steps to accomplish the removal of the prohibition. As in any other case, my full support will be given to the enforcement of our decision. The Commission will, and must, on its own motion if necessary, enforce compliance with its official decisions.

May I point out to you that the Commission's authorities in connection with freight forwarding follow two patterns. On the one hand we have regulatory authority to protect the public against unfair and unreasonable actions by forwarders. Our second type of authority involves the protection and preservation of private freight forwarding facilities. We must always be astute to maintain a proper balance between the two purposes to be served.

The so-called Bland Freight Forwarding Act, section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, is illustrative of the Commission's authority to mediate for the benefit of the forwarding industry. While on that subject, I might mention that a major problem facing the freight forwarding industry during the coming year will revolve around the Bland Act. Enacted during wartime and under highly volatile conditions, that act is broad in its terms and lacks clear definition of what the Commission's policy and authority should be. In order to fulfill its duty under the act, the Commission must have a more concrete expression of what the orders from Congress are. Accordingly, the Commission is considering going to Congress on the future of the Bland Act. Some people have advocated complete repeal on the grounds that it is unenforceable in its present terms and unnecessary. Others have proposed modification and clarification by the Congress. What the ultimate action of the Congress will be, I cannot tell. It will be incumbent upon the individuals interested to make their views known to the Commission and the proper congressional committees.

The Maritime Commission has jurisdiction only over those types of unfair trade practices that violate the shipping laws, and, as I have indicated, appropriate proceedings will be taken by the Commission to prevent the continuance of such practices. Other trade practices exist in the forwarding industry, as well as other industries, which are not in themselves violations of law yet are considered either to be unethical, uneconomical, or otherwise objectionable. Here is a field in which voluntary associations such as yours can do much for your own benefit as well as the benefit of the commerce of the United States and the American merchant marine.

Within the last 18 months or so, I have noticed there has developed a measure of cooperation between the Maritime Commission and the freight forwarding industry. Your association has been a leader in developing these closer ties. I am sure the Chairman, other Commissioners, and the staff of the Commission stand ready to continue this cooperation and to work with you in building a voluntary code for the forwarding industry over and above the matters of pure regulatory authority of the Commission. Cooperation along these and other lines should develop during the coming year a practice which will assure the maintenance and growth of a privately owned American freight forwarding industry capable of handling what I hope will be an ever increasing volume of exports from this country to the other nations of the world.

Whither Are We Drifting?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, which was published in the Fairmont Daily Sentinel, Fairmont, Minn., on January 2:

WHITHER ARE WE DRIFTING?

On this first day of the new year it is well to take stock of the prospects ahead, and with that in mind it will not be amiss to ponder the ultimate result of increasing governmental encroachment on individual initiative.

At the outset, let us say that what follows is not an attempt to decry, to view with alarm, or to point with horror. It is merely an attempt to encourage the individual, each for himself to take stock of what is transpiring.

Have we arrived at an age where we must be told how much we can produce, when our hens are permitted to lay, and at what price? Must we have such controls to protect ourselves against overproduction, glutting the markets, and destroying demand?

If such controls must be placed on corn, eggs, cotton, soybeans, poultry, livestock, peas, sweetpotatoes, dry beans, oats, barley, cottonseed, wool, turkeys, and grain sorghums and the number of hours we are permitted to work who shall say we shall not one day have controls that will determine what we may eat and when; what we may wear?

This Nation became great under a system that stressed individual initiative and incentive. It did not become great through governmental regulation that would stifle initiative and individual effort. The sky was the limit, and the men of that era took care of the Government instead of demanding the Government take care of them.

Congress will soon be in session, and now as never before, it behooves the public to keep a keen eye on what the visionaries have in their minds to further regiment and enslave under a crushing, mounting tax burden, the people of this Nation.

Christmas is over and we've played Santa Claus long enough.

Deficit Spending and Hidden Taxes Are Wrecking Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1950, it was my privilege to address the Pennsylvania Poultrymen's Association banquet at the Penn-Harris Hotel, Harrisburg, Pa. This banquet is held each year during Pennsylvania's great farm show.

My remarks follow:

It is a genuine pleasure for me to be here tonight. I am always glad to get away from Washington and mingle with my fellow Pennsylvanians. You men and women are producers of food, income, and wealth. What a contrast there is between your group and the bureaucrats in Washington who spend a lot of time and energy devising ways and means of spending the income which you produce.

I find it gratifying and encouraging to be invited to speak to a group of your character. You are independent and self-reliant, able and wanting to stand on your own feet rather than waiting in line for Government handouts and subsidies. In this day and age after 17 years of New Deal-Fair Deal philosophy it is rather rare to find a producing group like you poultry growers who are not clamoring for more Government aid of one sort or another. Some of our people talk strongly for free enterprise but are first in line for the hand-outs. I consider it an honor to be invited to speak to you.

I come to you from Washington where, during the past week, we have had the second—perhaps it is even the seventh—veil dropped from the Fair Deal body. If there was ever any doubt what the veils covered before, that is no longer the case. Although the surface curves and lines may look superficially attractive and tempting, the bones and muscles are those of state socialism, the poorhouse state or what you may choose to call it, and they are nurtured by Government spending, and it is deficit spending at that.

On January 4 we heard the President deliver his annual message on the state of the

Union in which he spelled out once again his so-called Fair Deal programs. You may have judged from the newspaper and radio accounts that most everybody thought that it was just ducky. It is true that the President was in good speaking form and that his tone was conciliatory. He did not ridicule the Republicans and call his opponents vicious and reactionary. But just read his message and you will see that he is still calling for the same socialistic and spending programs as when he was openly declaring war on those who oppose their enactment. So I warn you not to believe that the leopard has changed his spots. No amount of camouflage can hide the socialistic spots.

On January 6 we heard the President's economic report which merely provides academic dressing for the Fair Deal program. On January 9 we got the full impact of the cost of Mr. Truman's plans with the submission of his budget for the fiscal year 1951, which is in excess of 42 billion dollars. Make no mistake, our pocketbooks are to be raided again and again unless we stand up and fight this trend toward more and more Government hand-outs and spending.

A colleague of mine in the House has summarized the issue well when he said:

"The issue * * * is the choice between freedom and Socialist baloney. They may call it planned economy, the Fair Deal, or social welfare. It's still the same old Socialist baloney any way you slice it. Believe me, I am well aware of the Communist threat, and I do not discount it. But I am convinced that an even greater threat to our free institutions is presented by that group of hypocritical and cynical men, who, under the guise of providing political cures for certain social and economic problems in our society, are selling the American birthright for a mess of political pottage. Slowly they are chipping away the freedoms which are essential to the survival of a healthy, strong, and productive nation."

Former Senator, Supreme Court Justice, and Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, gave us a vigorous warning last June when he said:

"We are going down the road to statism. Where we will end up, no one can state. But if some of these new programs, seriously proposed, should be adopted, there is danger that the individual, whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor, will soon be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state."

Now some of you may think and say to yourselves that what I have just said is nothing but Republican political oratory. You may say we are going along pretty well and haven't been hurt—at least hurt much—by these so-called socialistic and spending programs. I want to be doubly frank with you when I say—it is later than you think—and let me just give you a couple of examples.

Let's take this Government spending—and let me remind you that we are back to deficit spending again—spending more than we take in to the tune of $5,500,000,000 this fiscal year. Some of you—I hope most of you—may have seen the figures in the Reader's Digest for December which show that during the administrations of our first 32 Presidents (Washington through F. D. Roosevelt's second term, 1941, excluding the war years of 1941-45) our Federal Government spent nearly $180,000,000,000 while under President Harry S. Truman in less than 5 years (July 1, 1945-September 30, 1949) the Government has spent the stupendous sum of over $191,000,000,000. In other words Mr. Truman has spent more in 5 years than all other Presidents spent in 156 years.

And I also wish to add that the Fair Deal total is mounting daily so that by next June Government spending will amount to more than $225,000,000,000, which the mathematicians call one-quarter of a trillion dollars. Furthermore, you should know that during the first half of the current fiscal year, June-December 1949, the Truman administration spent $20,974,000,000 which was $3,300,000,000 more than the Government took in. The deficit piled up at the rate of $18,000,000 a day. It certainly takes a lot of poultry and eggs to make up that deficit. Our national debt is now $257,000,000,000 which is about $1,700 for each and every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Now let us look at it in a little different way. Government—Federal, State, and local—is costing us $55,000,000,000 to $60,000,000,000 a year and of course the Federal Government accounts for about three-quarters of the total. Do you know that since 1932 the cost of our Government has increased 100 percent and our population 20 percent? In 1931 the per capita cost of our Government was $33 and now it is $333.

About 25 percent of all the national income produced in this country goes to government. Look at it this way: One chicken out every four and three eggs out of every dozen which you produce is taken by government. You poultrymen work nearly 2 days a week for the Government.

Do you know that there are at least 100 taxes on a dozen eggs, 151 taxes on a loaf of bread, 116 taxes on a man's suit, and 150 on a woman's hat?

There are about 11½ cents of taxes in the cost of a pack of cigarettes, and $300 to $500 on a $2,000 car.

This year the average family pays about $700 in hidden taxes, beyond income taxes. The average family pays in a year, $45 on tobacco, and $49 in the cost of gasoline. Sales taxes take another $48 and corporation income taxes—which the consumer also pays in the form of higher prices—take a healthy $317 out of the average family's purse. (Newsweek, December 12, 1949.)

I am confident that you will agree with me that this condition of high taxes and high spending is cause for serious concern and united action to correct it. You know that we now have a big deficit in Washington but do you know that Mr. Truman is soon going to ask for higher taxes. He may do it in a way which appears to be painless but a tax is a tax and the Nation has to pay for it. We must reduce this Government spending by cutting appropriations to the bone. But that is not enough. We must stand together in opposing and resisting proposals for new programs which once established will require many billions in addition to our current spending. Moreover, once the foot is in the door programs such as socialized medicine cost more and more year by year.

For a moment let us consider the deficit of $5,500,000,000 for this fiscal year. If Congress were to be called upon to increase taxes to meet this deficit it would mean that corporate taxes and personal income taxes each would have to be increased 15 percent. Already we are paying 20 percent of our income to the Federal Government in personal income taxes, and an additional 15 percent would make a total of 35 percent of our personal income paid to our Government in personal income taxes.

It is interesting to observe that those nations who have suffered economic collapse did so when their citizens were taxed 35 percent of every dollar they earned. Here in the United States the average citizen is now paying better than 30 cents in taxes out of every dollar he earns. Because of available resources and the ingenuity of the American people, some believe we can safely pay 35 cents or possibly 40 cents in taxes out of every dollar earned. We are warned, however, that once you reach the danger zone of 35 cents, our Nation is flirting with national bankruptcy.

The stark truth of the matter is that if we at the time of high prosperity deliberately embark on a program of deficit spending it is doubtful—very doubtful—that the budget of the United States will ever be balanced, unless our fiscal system is destroyed and we undergo the terrific hardships of the reestablishment of a solvent currency.

Next, let us take a second example of how the Truman socialistic program affects or can affect you. I want to refer to the agricultural program, particularly the Brannan plan, which the President and his cohorts are trying to sell to the farmers and the Nation.

During the past few years you have had considerable experience with the parity price support, production goals, and other agricultural subsidy and control programs, of the Federal Government. You have also had plenty of experience with price controls, rationing, and poultryless Thursdays under the "Kluckman plan" back in 1947. You know also about the price-support provisions of the wartime acts, the Agricultural Act of 1948 and that of 1949, which is now in effect.

Now we come to the Brannan plan, which would enslave the American farmer and poultry producer in return for a promised security which would cost billions of dollars. You no doubt know more about the details of the Brannan plan and how it would work out than I do. I am sure that you will not be lured into supporting such a program by the bait of direct-production payments to provide you the promised 100 percent of parity income. You know that in order to carry out such promises your whole production and distribution will be controlled from Washington, and we will go completely bankrupt meeting the costs. Using football terminology, the Brannan plan is a real mousetrap play—they open a hole and invite you in—and then you get smacked plenty from both sides.

Much as we would all like to get out of this business of price supports, subsidies, controls, etc., we know we cannot do it all at once. You did not ask for the supports but as long as the other segments of agriculture get Government assistance which increase your feed and other prices, you should be protected from disaster by some guarantees. That I understand is your position and I certainly concur. That is what we did in the Agricultural Act of 1948 and it has been continued in the 1949 act.

In conclusion let me say that it is a privilege to come here and speak to you. I have been very frank and forthright in attacking the socialistic trend that dominates the administration in Washington. I oppose it and want to do everything in my power to stop it. Government spending, yes, deficit spending, is its lifeblood. We must cut down that spending which is sapping the lifeblood of our economy. But we must also be hard-headed and reject the many proposals for more spending or we will have failed in our task.

I hope you agree with me that the danger is real and that it is later than you think. You people have demonstrated that you want to stand on your own feet and not live on Government subsidies. As farmers and poultry producers you see the threat to your liberties in the Brannan plan. As consumers and taxpayers you should know what this socialistic program is costing you. And remember that much of the cost is hidden in indirect taxes. But the cost is there just the same, and you and I and all the country are paying dearly for it.

The Late Bernard W. Doyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement which I recently made on the occasion of the passing of the late Bernard W. Doyle, of Leominster, Mass., one of the outstanding businessmen and philanthropists of our State.

He was such an amiable man, such a beautiful modest character, such an outstanding citizen and business genius, such a wholehearted supporter of worthy causes, such a generous unselfish giver that I could not possibly in such short space give adequate expression to the superb qualities which so endeared him to his friends and community.

Surely his good works, charity, benevolence, and unselfish character will long be a source of inspiration and example to his fellow citizens. His virtue and selflessness will long be remembered. We will miss him. But his memory will remain with us always.

I include herein several newspaper excerpts concerning his untimely passing:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of December 27, 1949]

CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN LAUDS LIFE OF BERNARD W. DOYLE

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, last night issued the following statement in connection with Mr. Doyle's death:

"In the untimely passing of Bernard W. Doyle the State and Nation have lost a great and most distinguished citizen, his home community a loyal, ever-thoughtful son, and his family a devoted husband and father.

"His career which started from humble beginnings and carried him to a foremost rank in the industrial and business life of the Nation vividly illustrates what the individual can achieve under our system of free opportunity when he is possessed of ability and imagination, is inspired by zeal and determination, and is motivated by ideals of service and love of humanity.

GAVE FREELY OF HIS TIME

"Great as his business achievements were, they were overshadowed by his sincere devotion and tireless work for the betterment of his fellowman.

"Bernard Doyle gave of himself unstintingly and unselfishly in all his many endeavors. He was a man of extraordinary and versatile talents, but the thing which distinguished him most was his profound sympathy for and eagerness to help the people of the rank and file.

"A very large part of his active and fruitful life was spent in quietly and modestly assisting the sick, the infirm, and the unfortunate. He was benefactor literally to thousands of fellow citizens. Many poor boys striving for an education know of his generosity."

SOME MANY BENEFACTS

"A philanthropist in the best sense, often anonymously, he not only gave of himself, his energy, his great administrative powers, but also lavished his fortune in order to sustain and expand numerous charitable, religious, and educational works which benefited many individuals and many worthy causes in his own city of Leominster, which he loved so dearly, and elsewhere.

"He was a man of noblest impulses, innately good, humane and kindly. By his unselfish and constructive life, he contributed immeasurably to the fulfillment of the age-old precept—'Love Thy Neighbor as Thyself.'

"No success story could excel his phenomenal rise from humble station to high place in industry, finance and charity. Yet he always was modest and unassuming. About him at times there was almost an air of self-effacement. He believed in sharing his success with others.

"Bernard Doyle was my friend for many years and I greatly esteemed and admired him. I am very deeply moved by his death and join with his family and friends in mourning the irreparable loss. He was a faithful and warm-hearted friend—a friend not alone of individuals but of great causes—causes of mercy, charity, justice and kindness—a friend of the common people.

"Of course, his place in the community can never be precisely filled because in this generation no man could succeed as he did through ability and effort in accumulating substantial wealth and then using it so wisely and so generously for the public good and for the good of so many not so fortunately situated.

"He will be widely mourned. His life's work will long remain as a monument to the great civic and spiritual virtues which he possessed in such abundance—his goodness of heart, his loyalty, his humility, his benevolence, his devotion to his fellow men and women.

"I extend deepest sympathy to his bereaved family for their irreparable loss.

"May he find rest and peace from worldly toil in his eternal reward."

[From the Leominster (Mass.) Daily Enterprise of December 27, 1949]

B. W. DOYLE DIES HERE AT HIS HOME ON LINDELL AVENUE—SERVICES TO BE CONDUCTED ON THURSDAY—ALL CITY DEPARTMENTS WILL CLOSE DURING FUNERAL OF FORMER MAYOR, WIDELY KNOWN BENEFACTOR AND CIVIC LEADER

Bernard Wendell Doyle, 78 years old, one of Leominster's most distinguished citizens, a pioneer in the city's industrial life, widely known for his philanthropies, his business and executive ability and public service, and a former mayor of Leominster, died yesterday at his home, 245 Lindell Avenue.

SERVICES

The funeral will be held Thursday morning from his late home at 9:15 o'clock followed by a solemn high requiem mass in St. Leo's Church at 10 o'clock. Burial will be in the mausoleum in Evergreen Cemetery.

Calling hours at the late home are 8 to 10 tonight and 3 to 5 and 8 to 10 p. m. tomorrow.

In a statement today Mayor Ralph W. Crossman said: "A truly great leader, who symbolizes what man should be. His memory will long live in the hearts of our Leominster people. How fortunate we have been here to have had the support and backing of the unselfish contributions of money, time, and energy of such a man as Mr. Doyle. He is ours, gone, but never to be forgotten."

DEPARTMENTS

All city departments will close during the funeral and all its employees are requested to attend the services. City Hall will be closed during the forenoon.

The Thomas F. Wright Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements.

Trustees of Leominster Hospital, the medical staff of the hospital and Leominster Hospital employees will attend the services in a body. They will meet in front of St. Leo's rectory at 9:45 o'clock Thursday morning.

Mayor Crossman ordered flags on all public buildings and on the common placed at half-mast out of respect for Mr. Doyle.

Born in Leominster, Mr. Doyle was the son of the late Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Doyle. He was educated in the public schools of Leominster, graduating from Leominster High School and entered the Eastman Business College in Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

EMPLOY

On completion of his studies there, Mr. Doyle entered the employ of the Horn Supply Co. here, and in 1897 became secretary and general manager of the company.

In 1901, in association with Alexander S. Patton and Ludwig Strauss, he established the Viscoloid Co., Inc., of which he was secretary and treasurer. The concern ranked as one of the largest of its kind in New England at that time.

In 1925 he became associated with the du Pont interests and the Viscoloid Co. was then reorganized as the du Point Viscoloid Co., serving as vice president and director.

KNOWLEDGE

Mr. Doyle's comprehensive knowledge of every phase of the business and his marked ability was considered one of the important factors for its continued success.

In 1925 he became mayor of Leominster and served the city for two terms as the chief executive during which time many improvements were undertaken.

In 1930 the Leominster plant was renamed the Doyle Works plant of the E. I. du Pont Co. in honor of Mr. Doyle and in appreciation for his contributions to the industrial life of Leominster and to the plastics industry as a whole. He retained an active interest in the company and served as vice president and a director until his retirement in 1938 at the age of 65.

ACTIVITIES

Mr. Doyle not only confined his interest to business activities of his company, but he was vitally interested in banking and financial affairs of Leominster and Fitchburg. He was director and one of the founders and organizers of the Merchants National Bank of Leominster and a director of the Safety Fund National Bank of Fitchburg. He was a trustee of the Leominster Savings Bank and was financially interested in other industrial concerns.

A stanch Republican in political affairs, Mr. Doyle in 1920 and 1924 was one of the delegates to the Republican National Convention from Massachusetts.

On taking over as the city's chief executive, the second in the city's history, Mr. Doyle sponsored projects for municipal improvements and was responsible, in part, for the erection of the junior high-school building and the start of development of the No-Town reservoir as a part of the city's water supply.

HOSPITAL

The city boasts several monuments which will perpetuate his memory. One of these is the Leominster Hospital, the site for which he presented to the city and through his zeal, generosity, and enthusiasm, and interest the hospital is rated as one of the best in Massachusetts.

Mr. Doyle served as president of the hospital association and as head of the trustees of the hospital and gave unstintingly of his time, finances, and energy toward its expansion.

On October 30, 1929, he established a $200,000 trust fund.

Still another monument to his memory is the beautiful 20-acre Doyle field stadium which bears his name. This was constructed at a cost in excess of $200,000 and given to the city by Mr. Doyle and dedicated to the youth of Leominster.

In keeping with his interest in youth and wholesome recreation and athletics, Mr. Doyle also established, about the time Doyle field was opened in 1931, a scholarship fund to aid students to attend college and many have taken advantage of this scholarship fund since that time.

Many of his philanthropies will probably never be made known since he was always ready to lend a helping hand when the need was apparent.

In 1909 Mr. Doyle married the late Elizabeth H. P. Haley and they had two children, Marjorie Elizabeth, a graduate of the Bennett School at Millbrook, N. Y., and the Garland School of Boston, who is married to Richard C. Rockwell, and residing in New York; and Louise Doyle, a graduate of Mount Vernon Seminary in Washington, D. C., and Smith College.

He also has a sister, Mrs. Alice Sullivan, and a brother, Frank Doyle, both of Leominster, and two grandchildren.

On February 27, 1945, Mr. Doyle was elected a director of the Boston & Maine Railroad and at that time was a director of the Merchants National Bank of Boston, the Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Springfield, the Boston Edison Co., and the United States Rubber Co. He also served as a member of the finance committee of the board.

Mr. Doyle held memberships in the Boston A. A., the Oak Hill Country Club of Fitchburg, the Monoosnock Country Club, the Eastern and Corinthian Yacht Club of Marblehead, the Algonquin Club of Boston, the Fay Club of Fitchburg, the Homer Market Club of Boston, the State Republican Club, and was identified with the Boston Chamber of Commerce and Associated Industries of Massachusetts.

He was also a charter member of the Fitchburg Lodge of Elks, life member of the Leominster Sportsmen's Association, a member of the corporation of Northeastern University, trustee of Cushing Academy in Ashburnham, a member of Fitchburg Council, Knights of Columbus, and the Leominster Aerie of Eagles, the Links Club of New York, the United States Navy Club, and the Walsh Memorial Committee.

INTEREST

Mr. Doyle was interested in hunting, fishing, and cruising, and owned a yacht on which he made several cruises.

A stanch supporter of New England, he was ever optimistic over its future. Born in a typical New England manufacturing community he was a keen student of its history and a highly successful businessman who had risen to the highest position in an industry in which he was a pioneer.

On August 30 this year, Mr. Doyle married the former Rachel Butler Holbrook, of Palmer.

[From the Leominster (Mass.) Daily Enterprise of December 27, 1949]

BERNARD W. DOYLE

The passing of Mr. Doyle brings to the community a keen sense of great loss. For the city, both as a private citizen, as an industrial leader and as a public benefactor, and as a public official Mr. Doyle gave richly of time, of ability, and of help.

To him there will long stand many monuments. Those monuments will rise in the enduring esteem and affection in which a community held him. They will stand forth brightly in his many public benefactions, in those many things which he did in such generous measure for the good of the individual, for the advancement of the community.

Many of Mr. Doyle's benefactions are known. But there are those which are not, those kindnesses which he bestowed upon the many, that help which he gave to the many. In all things that were to aid others, to make their path easier, their life brighter, Mr. Doyle gave in the fullest and finest measure.

Doyle Field, one of the most magnificent football fields in the Nation, the Leominster Hospital, in its beginning and in its growth, are, to mention but a few things, evidences of his interest in the public good and in the welfare of that community which was so long his home and to which he gave his efforts in such full measure of devotion.

As mayor of Leominster, Mr. Doyle served with distinction. To the official task to which the people of the city called him, he devoted a fine and discerning touch, performed a work that was marked by that keen business judgment which had characterized his career as an industrialist of wide repute and marked distinction.

For Mr. Doyle to discern a need, one that was broad in its effect and one which when met would result in the greater good of the greater number, was for Mr. Doyle to appraise it, to study it, to apply to it that touch of judgment which was so richly his and, with generous act, to translate plans into the realities.

Fortunate beyond the power of reckoning is that community which has had a man such as Mr. Doyle for a citizen, and deep beyond reckoning is the loss of that community when such a man passes.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of December 28, 1949]

BERNARD W. DOYLE

The passing of former Mayor Bernard W. Doyle is regretted in many circles, particularly in Leominster, where he had his home and lived all his life.

His career was a business romance. Starting as a bookkeeper, he became a great industrialist and a wealthy man. He was a director in many corporations in Leominster and elsewhere; his versatility matched his energy and enthusiasm; and he won all of his success by his own efforts.

He was a benefactor of his city, Leominster Hospital and Doyle Field being only two examples of his widespreading philanthropy. He was a generous contributor to his church and to many charities, and he helped many individuals who were sick and in need. He was especially interested in poor boys seeking an education.

He lived a useful life, freely sharing with others the riches which he gained. Yet with all his wealth he made no ostentation, and he never forgot his modest beginnings. He was a good man to know.

Vote Right—Or Else

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Haven (Conn.) Register of December 29, 1949:

VOTE RIGHT—OR ELSE

Taking a page from the CIO book, the American Federation of Labor has produced what amounts to a purge list of its own. In publishing a list of 107 Members of Congress whom it describes as having opposed the best interests of workers, the AFL gives notice of just how far this vote right—or else—spirit has come to dominate union thinking and to measure its arrogance and its disregard of not only national welfare but public welfare. Here, if anywhere, the average citizen finds the perfect example of the selfish interests President Truman is so fond of chastising when it suits his political purposes of the moment.

Publication of this list, particularly at this time, lets it be known that under administration coddling these unions have become so drunk with the wine of their own power that they can dictate as well as demand.

If they are not properly and soundly rebuked by a wrathful and aroused public for this cheeky piece of effrontery, we may soon reach a point where it can well be asked—why hold elections at all?

Why not allow the unions to select the candidates, conduct the elections, and pass upon the results? If the rank and file union membership is to be instructed in advance on not only how to vote but for whom to vote, why bother to send them to the polls at all? A single ballot cast by the national union secretary would then suffice.

It should be noted that the union makes passing bid for the approval of the farmers and small-business men. This is very "white" of them. However, the farmer and the businessman might like to retain the privilege of speaking for themselves, as the candidates and the issues might appeal to them as individuals, rather than as an organized and voiceless mass.

Because of long years of labor-slanted New Deal and Fair Deal legislation, the big union monopolists reached a height of power through which they could dictate what men could work and what men could not. As a country we came to a point where the economy was disrupted, slowed down, or brought to a halt at the whim of one man, or a small group of men. The tide of public anger brought a halt to such monopolistic advances, but was not of sufficient force to turn it back entirely.

Such antics as these should suffice to arouse the public to a point where a job but begun can be completed.

We Are Losing Patience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the January 1950 issue of the Progressive Farmer:

WE ARE LOSING PATIENCE

American Government is big business. Able men of unquestioned honesty and integrity are required in its administration for the public. Yet, no sooner does an able, courageous man accept an important post in public service than he becomes a target for the sharpshooters. No matter how honest he may be, no matter how capable in carrying out the duties of his post, the villainous crew starts tearing him apart.

There's always room for difference of opinion. Difference of opinion invites argument. But an argument, even though it be heated, does not justify vilification.

We are losing patience with those who differ with others just for the sake of being different. We have long since lost patience with those who, in their effort to win an argument, stoop to vilification of the person with whom they differ.

We hold no brief for those few who seek public post with selfish intent. These few are soon unmasked and made to pay the

penalty. Such persons should be exposed and we honor those who bring their shame to light. But in seeking out these few, why crucify the far greater number who are working ably in behalf of the public good?

How can any man in position of public trust render best service when he is forced to spend much of his time in parrying personal slander? How can any man, feeling the dejection that comes from unjust attacks, be expected to render top service? How can any able businessman, one who enjoyed the accomplishment of building up and directing a successful business, one who has enjoyed the prestige that comes from such accomplishment, have the courage to accept a high position in Government where he will be the target for all types and classes of vicious attacks?

We have many, many able men who have been in public service over a long period of years. These men continue to flinch when hit by the barbs cast their way. These men still have feelings. But their appreciation of the importance of the work they are doing, their feeling of responsibility for the proper performance of this work gives them on, dulls the pain from the uncalled-for attacks.

We are losing patience with those who can see no good, those who can think nothing but evil of those who disagree with them.

A Message on Tolerance From Our Colonial History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago, on a Sunday afternoon—October 23, 1949, to be exact—about 35,000 people gathered on a hillside at Aaronsburg, Pa., to celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of this village of 400 population. But more than the celebration of an anniversary—it was the celebration of an American ideal and a reaffirmation of the American way of life.

Aaronsburg, Pa., was founded by Aaron Levy, a Jewish immigrant from Europe, back in 1799. In the same year, the Salem Lutheran Church of Aaronsburg was founded on land donated by Aaron Levy. In recognition of this double anniversary and this act of early religious understanding, the people of Pennsylvania celebrated the occasion and the Governor of that State proclaimed Sunday, October 23, 1949, as "a day set apart for tolerance and understanding."

High dignitaries from all walks of public life joined in the special observances. All races and creeds which make up our country were represented. A great and inspiring patriotic community service was addressed by such eminent Americans as Gen. William "Wild Bill" Donovan, Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, the noted Christian minister, Dr. Daniel Poling, and Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, former mediator for the United Nations Commission on Palestine and now the director of the United Nations Trusteeship Division.

School children of the area presented a colorful pageant rededicating the lesson of brotherhood as it was understood and interpreted in the colonial period in American history. The events were broadcast by radio to the entire Nation. It was truly a memorable religious experience which touched many people throughout the country and brought to them a new appreciation of tolerance and democracy.

The message delivered that day by Dr. Bunche, it seems to me, is of significance to all Americans and should be read throughout the length and breadth of the country. He has succeeded so well in capturing the spirit of the occasion and in so thoroughly relating the full meaning of the message of Aaronsburg to present-day circumstances, that I am impelled to bring his words to the attention of all Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the address by Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, entitled "The Aaronsburg Message," as reprinted in the Jewish Layman, of December 1949 is as follows:

THE AARONSBURG MESSAGE

(By Dr. Ralph J. Bunche)

One hundred and fifty years ago, the little village of Aaronsburg in Pennsylvania was founded by and named after Aaron Levy, a Dutch Jew. Aaron Levy, the Jew, was a citizen of the world. History attests that to him all men, irrespective of race or creed, were brothers. He was a man of tolerance and vision.

It is fitting that on the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the village which he founded we should gather to muster new strength for the ideals and human values which Aaron Levy personified.

Were Aaron Levy here with us today, he would find himself in a strange new world. His village is no more remote. Man's progress in science, in the harnessing of nature, in transportation and communications, would confront him with an amazing and incomprehensible world.

Yet, in another and unfortunate sense, he would find himself not in unfamiliar surroundings. For despite the spectacular progress which man has made in this past century and a half, in things material, no parallel progress has been made in the spiritual realm, in the art of human relations. Aaron Levy would find in the world of today, and in abundance, the same racial and religious intolerances and prejudices, the same bigotries, the same hostility toward that which is strange, as characterized in the life of his day and age. But why? Why is it that man, with all his genius, has never been able to master the art of living with himself?

Who can doubt that there is anything so sorely and urgently needed in the dangerous world of today as a universal recognition of a fraternal bond of kinship among peoples, the realization of a sense of brotherhood among all men, of human understanding, of a broad spirit of tolerance toward those whose races, creeds, cultures and ideologies may differ from one's own?

There can be but one secure foundation for peace and justice in the world. That foundation must be in the hearts and minds of men. Without an all-pervading spirit of human understanding and brotherhood, the most perfect international machinery for peace will be of little avail. It is not the atomic bomb we must fear. It is in man's perversity, suspicion, and intolerance that our real danger is to be found.

No mechanical devices, no charters or pacts, can serve to save mankind from self-destruction if man in his spirit remains mean and brutish. There is but one road to peace and that is the road of human understanding.

Throughout man's recorded history his inter-group relations have been cursed by intolerances and bigotries. Yet there have always been individual Aaron Levys, men and women whose souls have transcended the narrow pettiness of their fellow-beings. In the meanest circumstances, in situations of sharpest conflict, there can always be found instances of man's ability to let his essential goodness shine through.

BROTHERHOOD UNDER STRESS

In the past 2 years I have spent much time in the troubled Near East. In that region, the Palestine issue had stirred emotions and animosities mightily. People, Arabs and Jews, had been speaking grimly of bitter hatreds, of enemies, of fighting animal-like to the death. Arabs and Jews were shooting each other down like cattle. Yet, even in that frightening atmosphere I have witnessed many evidences of man's innate ability to love his fellow man. I have seen Jewish doctors and nurses of the Hadassah Hospital in Jerusalem attend Arab patients in that hospital with kindest solicitude. I have seen, in the midst of the war, Arab legion troops lining the road between Tel-Aviv and Jerusalem, daily watch unarmed convoys of indispensable food and medical supplies for the beleaguered civilian Jews of Jerusalem pass through their lines, unmolested. I have seen in the Hotel des Roses at Rhodes the head of the Israeli delegation in the room of a member of the Transjordan delegation, sharing, in deep compassion, the sorrow of the Arab delegate at the word he had just received of the loss of his entire family in a tragic accident at his home. As I walked into the Arab's room to express my own sorrow, I saw there in silent mourning, not an Arab and a Jew, but only two sorrowful men, who though enemies yesterday were bound together today in a warm bond of human brotherhood by the stark tragedy which had befallen one of them. I have seen, last Christmas, Arab and Israeli military commanders open their tense military lines in order that civilians might pass through to worship at Bethlehem.

DIGNITY OF MAN

It is of very great significance that the 58 members of the United Nations have solemnly pledged themselves in the preamble of the Charter:

"To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women * * *"; and

"To practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors."

It is peoples with which the United Nations is concerned, for it is recognized that in the attitudes of peoples must depend the success or failure of this tremendous effort to achieve a peaceful and a just world. It is in the day-to-day relations of man with man that the future of all mankind is being determined.

In the modern world, the really challenging problem is the imperfect relations among its peoples. The costs to societies, domestic, and international, of bad human relations have been beyond calculation. In an atomic age, the future costs would appear prohibitive. Suspicions among peoples, group exclusiveness and chauvinistic pride, holier-than-thou attitudes, racial and religious bigotries, master race theories, nationalist egotisms—these are all cancerous growths which attack the very foundations of peace in the world. Indeed, the combination of bad human relations on the one hand and the development of the weapons of modern warfare on the other can only mean that all of us are living on borrowed time.

There is nothing in the nature of mankind which renders it impossible for men to master the art of tolerant and peaceful living.

The future before us would be bleak and hopeless indeed were it to be doubted for an instant that man has it in his power to purge himself of those iniquitous attitudes and practices which are leading him along

the road to doom. I do not doubt it. For I believe in man. I believe firmly in his reason and essential goodness. Bigotry, race-hate, intolerance, prejudice are not innate human traits. They are the products not of nature but of man's social experience. What society does it can undo. It is the will that we have lacked, not the means. We need desperately an intensive mobilization for world brotherhood. It is in our schools, our churches, our homes that the determined effort must be made, that the transformation in people's attitudes must take place. The obligation rests solemnly upon every individual who believes in democracy, who cherishes the American way of life, who loves peace.

It is to men of good will that the world today owes tribute. May their tribe increase.

Rent Decontrol Has Helped Spokane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the RECORD, on pages A58 and A59, there appears a reprint of an article from the New York Times entitled "Upswing in Rents Is Found Where Controls Are Ended." While I cannot quarrel with any of the factual information quoted in the article, it appears obvious to me that the flavor of several statements therein is such as to indicate that excessive increases in rents were experienced in decontrolled areas.

Of the many cities discussed in the report, I am familiar with only one. Yet if the quotations on the city of Spokane, Wash., are a true sample of the fairness of the entire article, the writer of the story has badly distorted the national picture by omitting many important facts. Since the story of decontrol in Spokane has been fully and fairly told in the report of the Spokane rent advisory board to Housing Expediter Tighe Woods, dated December 14, 1949, I think readers of the Times report are entitled to view the full picture. For that reason I intend to insert the entire Spokane report at the end of my remarks.

The Times, for instance, quoted the Spokane report to the effect that rent increases since decontrol averaged 14.3 percent. That sounds like quite a bit but the reporter failed to mention that Spokane rents, prewar, were frozen at an abnormally low average. Even dozens of tenants in Spokane admitted that and asked for increases while controls were still on.

The Times' report further quoted the Advisory Board's report to the effect that "a few rental housing operators had taken advantage of the situation to put unreasonable increases into effect." What he failed to mention was that, after a week-long campaign urging tenants who thought they were being gouged to report to the Board, only 151 tenants out of a total of 21,000 home renters in the city filed complaints. That is just seven-tenths of 1 percent. Of these, most were tenants who had been beneficiaries of abnormally low rents—giving examples of two- and three-bedroom apartments at rents previously frozen at $35 per month.

Neither did the Times' reporter mention the reference to a number of landlords who actually reduced rents since decontrol.

Here, briefly, are a few other important facts on decontrol which the Times' reporter blandly overlooked:

First. New home construction has been accelerated in Spokane since decontrol.

Second. Rental units withheld from the market under control have now been rented.

Third. New construction for rentals has increased and homes previously built for sale are now being offered for rent.

Fourth. Landlords have been forced to clean up their premises, modernize facilities and reinstitute services abandoned under control, all to the benefit of tenants and prospective tenants.

Fifth. Distortions and inequities in rent values which controllers consistently refused to adjust have been leveled.

Finally, I should mention that the Spokane Rent Advisory Board, which made this survey, is a bipartisan body whose chairman, a Democratic State legislator, has made a record for fairness and impartiality in his work. Its report deserves to be interpreted by the press in the same spirit in which it was written and presented to the Housing Expediter.

SPOKANE, WASH., December 14, 1949.

Mr. TIGHE WOODS,
National Housing Expediter,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOODS: Four and one-half months have elapsed since Federal rent controls were lifted from Spokane by your order. This report, showing the results of decontrol in Spokane, has been compiled by the rental advisory board for your information.

In summary, the records indicate the following developments:

1. Rents in Spokane are leveling off at rates about 14.3 percent above the controlled schedules. At the time of decontrol, the rent average in Spokane was $38.50 a month. The average monthly increase is $5.26.

2. Rents are being held at this level by the pressure of an expanding supply of rental accommodations and a progressively mounting ratio of vacancies.

3. New home construction has increased 84 percent over the same period in 1948 when controls were in force.

4. The Washington State Department of Health in its allocation of State funds credits Spokane with an increase in 12 months of 19,000 people, which is substantially higher than any other city in the State. Neither local pride nor local wishes enter into this calculation—it is a coolly analytical estimate for the disbursement of State funds. The population estimate of Spokane City, as of July 1, 1949, is 170,000.

Data supporting these and other important conclusions follow an explanation of the board's activities.

During this period of a free rental economy in Spokane, the rental advisory board has been compiling data on rent trends, availability of rental housing, new construction, and other related statistics. To implement its purpose the board established an office through which data could be channeled for proper recording. The press and radio have given substantial publicity to the request that rent changes be reported to the board in person, in writing, or by telephone, with particular accent on rent increases which tenants felt were unreasonable. This has been a continuous program since the date of decontrol, July 25, 1949. A digest of the board's records follows:

A. THE EFFECT OF DECONTROL ON RENTS

1. Tenant complaints: 151 tenants, out of a total of 21,000 tenant-occupied units, have registered complaints of unreasonable rent increases. The average OPA ceiling of the cases reported by the complainants was $35.40 a month. The average of their increase is $12.02 a month, being a percentage increase of 37.1.

2. Report of property rental agencies surveyed by the board: 8 leading rental agencies reported an average increase of 21.8 percent on the 699 units under their management. The average OPA ceiling of this group was estimated to be about $40 a month, and their average increase about $8 a month.

3. Owner-operated units: 95 percent of all rental units in Spokane are privately managed by owners, or lessors. Individually their operations are small, averaging less than three units each. Their sum total, however, comprises about 20,000 units. The surveys in this group covered 1,000 units. The average of the OPA ceilings reported was $35.70. Their increases average $4.18 a month, or 11.7 percent.

From these surveys, which were minimally comprehensive, the Board feels justified in concluding that the over-all average of rent increases since decontrol is approximately $5.25 over the controlled rates, or 14.3 percent.

B. AVAILABILITY OF RENTAL HOUSING

1. A tabulation of classified rental ads taken from newspapers shows a progressive increase since decontrol, with listings now exceeding those of March 1939, which was the last normal rent year in Spokane prior to rent controls. Counts were made from the last Sunday edition of each month shown:

	For rent	
	Apartments	Houses
July 31, 1949	37	33
July 31, 1949 (Decontrol)	45	10
Aug. 28, 1949	55	25
Sept. 25, 1949	53	22
Oct. 30, 1949	70	35
Nov. 30, 1949	65	30
Dec. 4, 1949	61	41
Dec. 18, 1949	91	41

A count of the classified ads in the for rent columns of a Sunday edition gives you approximately 10 percent of the total units available. This is proved by comparing the annual vacancy surveys with a count of the Sunday edition ads for any number of years. They run fairly true to this pattern. There are probably 1,200 to 1,500 vacant units in Spokane at this time.

2. Sources of this expanding supply of rental units.

(a) Return to the market of hundreds of locked-up units following the removal of rent controls. (The existence of 1,200 of these was established by a survey conducted by the board when it made its recommendation to you that the area be decontrolled.)

(b) Return to the rental market of homes previously held for sale only, by owners who refused to rent them while rent controls were in force. (Some had been rented and vacated and were thus still under control. Others feared the inclusion of their property by legislative action.)

(c) Release of rental units by tenants who have purchased new homes.

6. EFFECT OF DECONTROL ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW RESIDENCES

1. New residence building permits:

Under rent control in 1948:	
August	156
September	[illegible]
October	87
November	100
Total	432
After decontrol (July 26, 1949):	
August	156
September	220
October	163
November	247
Total	787

This tabulation shows that building permits issued during the 4 months following decontrol of this year jumped 84.4 percent over those of the corresponding period of 1948. The Spokane Home Builders Association reports that the stimulus to new construction followed immediately the announcement of decontrol and came at a time when building activity was lagging severely. Tenants in numbers who would normally have purchased their own homes elected to remain in frozen rental quarters as long as possible. When decontrol was announced, they placed their orders. This activity is undiminished.

2. The sale of existing homes. Realtors report an increase in the sale of homes which parallels the record of new construction. They report a scarcity of listings. This record is confirmed by—

	1948	1949
Mortgages filed:		
August	458	621
September	[illegible]	570
October	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total	1,[illegible]	1,879

This is an increase of 48.2 percent, which reflects the improved position of the home sales market following decontrol.

3. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

1. The removal of Government rent controls has set in motion all of those factors which tend naturally to keep rents under automatic control.

2. Better and cleaner accommodations are being offered. Owners are beginning to find it necessary to clean up and dress up their units in order to hold and attract tenants. This has opened up a long neglected business field to the finishing tradesmen and to those who supply them with materials.

3. There is a better relationship between tenants and landlords. The return of competitive conditions in the rental market is compelling owners to make their premises attractive to tenants, and tenants now realize that if they become undesirable residents they cannot retain possession of properties against their owners' wishes. Consequently, each is anxious to retain the good will of the other.

4. Decontrol is ending the distortions and inequalities in rent values which resulted from years of changing regulations. According to the realtors and home builders, the natural leveling of these maladjustments is putting the whole housing industry back on a sounder foundation.

4. PERTINENT COMMENTARIES

Board members James P. Dillard and Wayne Durham personally investigated more than a score of the facilities where tenants had complained of unreasonable increases. In some instances they were able to effect a moderation of the proposed new rates. They found that most of the complaints came from tenants who had been the beneficiaries of abnormally low rents—such as two- and three-bedroom apartments having floor footages running up to 1,200 square feet or more, at rents frozen at $35 to $50 a month. Many were even less. The highest ratio of increases came from this type of accommodation.

The unusually low rent schedules which prevail in this community are the result of rents being frozen at a time when thousands of its citizens had moved to the coastal regions, where prewar preparedness activities were centered.

With the competitive factor already holding rents to a level only slightly above the OPA average, owners appear to be facing a permanent loss in income position in the national economy, as compared with that of the prewar years.

Word has just been received that Western Builders, Inc., the largest home construction and rental company in Spokane, announced that effective today there will be a $10 decrease in all vacant units under their control.

This report is sent to you in compliance with your request that boards continue to function and operate even in areas that are decontrolled. We would appreciate your comments. Any correspondence should be addressed to the board in Mr. Dillard's office, 202 Hyde Building, Spokane, Washington.

Very truly yours,

JAMES P. DILLARD,
Chairman, Rental Advisory Board.

The Forgotten Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item from a recent edition of the Minneapolis Star-Journal of that city entitled "The Forgotten Soldiers":

FORGOTTEN SOLDIERS—PHILIPPINE WAR VETERAN PUSHES FIGHT FOR PENSIONS

(By Ben Kern)

In May 1948, a car honked at James M. Hamilton, 66, 3546 Forty-first Avenue South, and he jumped so hard he strained his hip.

A sympathetic streetcar conductor took Hamilton aboard and let him off at Fort Snelling, where Hamilton confidently limped into the veterans' hospital.

Having been an American soldier in charge of an artillery range finder in several engagements with Moros in the Philippine uprising following the Spanish-American War and having previously been a patient at veterans' hospital, Hamilton thought his hip was as good as fixed when he walked in.

FOT CLASSED AS WAR

He was wrong. A Veterans' Administration employee looked at his file and noticed that his service was limited to the Philippine uprisings subsequent to July 4, 1902.

"They told me in a nice way to scram," Hamilton says.

Hamilton's previous hospitalization in the veterans' hospital had been a "mistake." The hitch was that the Philippine insurrection from July 5, 1902, to December 31, 1913, has never been designated by Congress as a "war" and that body has never voted its veterans any benefits.

In Hamilton's words: "No bonus—no pension—no hospitalization—no nothing. I guess there aren't enough of us around. We don't make enough noise."

Since the day when he strained his hip, Hamilton has been trying to make some "noise" by writing to Congressmen and Senators, but it hasn't done much good.

Four proposals to grant the Philippine Insurrection veterans pensions have failed in Congress since 1939, the latest last January.

Yesterday Hamilton walked into the Tribune and plunked down some Mankato newspaper clippings describing Philippine Insurrection battles, one Philippine Insurrection Medal, one first-class gunner's medal, two Veterans of Foreign Wars Medals, and a copy of his honorable discharge with character of "excellent" and a listing of seven battles, engagements, skirmishes, and expeditions in which he took part from January 27, 1905, to March 15, 1907.

TELLS OF BATTLE

Headlines on two of the clippings were: "Fight hard battle" and "Battle with Moros." The third quoted a letter he wrote to his mother in Mankato: "There were about 1,000 Moros killed. I saw the whole thing, as I was there all the time. Most of them were killed by our shell and shrapnel, and by the rapid-fire guns (the barrels were set in a circle and the hammer went around like the hand on a clock from a long distance)."

About 20 American soldiers were killed in this battle, Hamilton said, "and there were more men killed and wounded in the so-called peacetime battle of Bud-Dajo in March 1906 than in the wartime bombardment and capture of Manila."

(This last fact was cited in a speech by the chairman of the Philippine-Pacific War Veterans national legislative committee, an excerpt of which was among Hamilton's documents.)

"Some war veterans who never got out of the United States are getting pensions, but we get nothing," said Hamilton, "and if Congress doesn't get going, we'll all be dead."

Hamilton is a yardmaster for the Great Northern Railway Co. He has been a railroad man for 31 years and could get some railroad retirement pension, but not enough to suit him. "If I could get a veteran's pension, I'd walk off the job tomorrow," he said.

Economy and Competence in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Herbert Hoover before the National Reorganization Conference of the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., December 12, 1949:

REMOVING OBSTACLES TO ECONOMY AND TO COMPETENCE IN GOVERNMENT

Six months have passed since our Commission finished its reports to the Congress on economics and improvements in the executive branch.

In the meantime, these recommendations have had a magnificent support by the press and the public. Added to this is the astonishing growth of your committee of citizens under the admirable leadership of President Johnson, of Temple University.

This has become a crusade for the intelligent reduction of the expense of government. It is a crusade to clear the track for competency. It is a nonpartisan crusade.

It is a job for citizenship rather than partisanship. The Commission itself represented both political parties. Its work is supported by President Truman and by the leaders from both sides in Congress. Your citizens committee embraces our two living and wise former Vice Presidents and five former Cabinet officers from both the Democratic and Republican side. You include educators, writers, editors, publishers, labor, and farm leaders. You come from every State and congressional district. You are a mighty host and you are in dead earnest.

It was not the field of our Commission to discuss the merit or demerit of governmental policies. Whatever those functions may be, our purpose is to make them work more economically, more efficiently, and with better service in their contacts with the people.

PROGRESS MADE

You can have confidence that you are succeeding.

The last session of Congress adopted several important recommendations of the Commission and of the President. These measures have already secured large savings. In the Defense Department alone they will soon be at the rate of about $1,000,000,000 a year, and Secretary Johnson believes they will amount to fully $2,000,000,000 without impairing national defense. And other measures have been enacted into law. We are already clearing the tracks for competence in Government.

I am going to make some suggestions as to what we should undertake next. But first, I want to tell you four reasons why this crusade of ours has wider implications than specific reforms.

1. Fiscal and economic survival

The first implication relates to our fiscal and economic survival.

During these last 6 months, the financial situation of our Government has become still more difficult. Federal expenditure of over $43,000,000,000 and a deficit of over $5,000,000,000 are announced for the present fiscal year. I believe it may be much greater for the next fiscal year. We may be turning two Frankensteins loose in the land. Their terrifying names are Higher Taxes and Inflation. We are interested here in combating them.

When you listen to "billions" over the radio, you no doubt try to size them up in terms of your church contributions. I might remark that the decimal point leads a restless and uneasy life in the Federal Government. Those groups of three ciphers which are separated by commas are moving steadily to the left.

Government spending and taxes must be related to increased per capita production. Therein lies the key of increasing new enterprise, increasing real wages to our workers, increasing real income to our farmers, and an increasing ability to give security to our youth and our aged. Government is a powerful element in this progress. The method and amount of taxes can seriously affect productivity.

Our economists seem to agree that taxation beyond 25 percent of our national income will bring disaster. Possibly your life has been brightened by some economists who dismiss the Federal expenditures as amounting to only 20 percent of the national income, anyway. On that subject, if you add up the actual and prospective annual expenditures of the Federal Government and the local governments, and if you truly compute the national income, you will find this warning red light no longer shines with an intensity of only 20 percent but with considerably over 30 percent. This means far more than 30 percent of the national income. It is a combustion of your savings and your possible standards of living.

Some one remarked that about the time we think we can make ends meet, somebody moves the ends. Despite this, you should not be discouraged in the work we have undertaken. Whatever we can accomplish helps emasculate the two Frankensteins. And we can ask our people to think it over.

2. Education in good government

Second, another of the wider implications of this crusade is its byproduct in public understanding. Millions of American people are receiving a lesson in the fundamentals and methods of good government. We are making some of the people economy-minded.

One of our results has been the setting up of Reorganization Commissions in 20 States and 10 municipalities for a treatment similar to that of our Commission. We are thus clearing other tracks of obstacles to competence in Government.

3. Preservation of the American experiment

Third, in a larger sense, this is a crusade to make democracy work. There is today much apprehension lest the American experiment will fail. We have need to reestablish faith that the whole of the preamble to the Declaration of Independence and the Gettysburg Address are still related to Government. If the Republic is not to be overwhelmed, the people must have such methods and systems as will enable good officials to give them good government.

Success in our crusade will help bring faith instead of cynicism and disillusionment.

4. Helping in the cold war

Fourth, success in our crusade to reduce cost of government is a necessary condition to winning the cold war. We are fighting this war at frightful cost. The way to win that war is to reduce our wastes, give competence a chance, and defer some Government ventures. By these reforms and these self-denials, we can help disappoint Mr. Stalin.

A PROGRAM FOR ACTION

The question before us now is how to further these reforms. Somebody said that wisdom consists not so much in knowing what to do with the ultimate as in knowing what to do next.

Obviously many of these reforms require legislation. Our congressional leaders requested the Commission staff to draft this legislation. The Budget Bureau is cooperating. Congress is a busy institution, and we cannot expect it to do everything all at once. It has the responsibility to inquire into these proposals, and it has the intricate job of putting them into law as far as they meet with its approval.

Having regard for the burdens of our Congress, it would be well to concentrate on some of the most urgent of these reforms. Some may differ on what this list should be. My own belief is that the following are in the most urgent category:

1. Reorganization of Civil Service—the personnel problem.
2. Reorganization of Budgeting and Accounting.
3. Reorganization of the Post Office.
4. Unification of the Federal hospital services.
5. Unification of water conservation services.
6. Unification of agricultural land services.
7. Unification of transportation services.
8. Relief for the President of the United States.

This is not the whole program, but it would do to go on with.

I believe that $2,000,000,000 of savings and more efficient service to the public is to be had in these areas alone.

The reports of the Commission are filled with facts in support of these eight reforms. I shall only mention them briefly here.

THE CIVIL SERVICE

Above all things, if we are to have economy and service to the people, the country must have a skilled, nonpolitical civil service, and one which will attract and hold the best in the land.

At present "Red Tape" himself dwells in the civil service of 2,200,000 employees. The result is an accumulation of waste and deadwood—and discouragement of good officials. The sword to cut this Gordian knot is to decentralize the engagement and control of these employees (except for certain general services) into the departments and agencies. This must be done under rules to be established by the Civil Service Commission and enforced by it.

BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING

Next on our list of priorities comes budgeting and accounting. I am sure you will agree with me that this is one of the dullest subjects on earth, but it is potent nevertheless. The ghost of Alexander Hamilton still wanders in our fiscal machinery. I doubt whether more than 15 men in the world can make head or tail of the 15,000,000 words and sums in the present Federal budget—certainly not all at one time.

We urge that the budget be rebuilt on a functional or performance basis, by which the costs of a given function can be compared year by year. That is both before and after taking. This system has been written into the law as to the armed services. It should be made universal. Hitherto no one could know what it costs to operate a hospital or the forests. You would need a sort of Geiger counter to discover it in two dozen different appropriations.

The accounts, except for Government corporations, are kept by the Congress, not by the executive agencies. Any executive needs to sit on top of his accounts.

There has been no adequate personal or real-property accounting at all. We estimate that the Government has $27,000,000,000 of personal property. When officials know more about what all this property is composed of, and where it is, the departments might live off this fat for quite a while.

THE POST OFFICE

The Post Office is a big business. Our criticism is not directed to its 500,000 employees. They are courteous, helpful, hard-working, and the friends of everybody—the nearest agent of Santa Claus most of us meet. What we object to is the form of organization that is a relic of Ben Franklin plus 160 years of oft-conflicting laws. They cover more than 800 finely printed pages.

We want the Post Office set up as a modern business. We want it taken out of politics.

UNIFICATION OF GOVERNMENT HOSPITALS, PUBLIC HEALTH, AND MEDICAL RESEARCH

Next we propose a unification of the Government hospitals, health service, medical research and guidance to governmental grants-in-aid to civilian hospitals. As an indication of waste, there already existed in Federal hospitals at the time of our investigation beds for 226,000 patients, and only 155,000 were occupied. Yet Congress had made appropriations for, or authorized, hospitals with 80,000 additional beds, despite the fact that 70,000 are empty—at a cost of $1,200,000,000. President Truman canceled out $300,000,000 of this program, and Congress restored the authority.

But beyond savings, we are striving for something even greater. That is better medical service to our armed forces, our veterans, and our seamen. We also want this service set up better to stimulate preventive medicine. We want it not to deprive our civilian population of its doctors.

UNIFICATION OF OUR WATER-CONSERVATION SERVICES

Fifth on our list of priorities is the Federal conservation of water resources. At present this function is scattered over many agencies. They employ over 5,000 engineers and about 70,000 other people. They overlap

they have duplicate offices; they compete in procurement of both supplies and skills and jobs to do. A pork barrel exists in these areas.

We not alone want to save great sums of money but we want to save water.

CONSOLIDATION OF FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT

The sixth on this preferential list is Federal land management. In continental United States, the Federal Government has about 189,000,000 acres of grazing and forest lands administered by the Department of the Interior. We have about 55,000,000 acres of forests and grazing lands administered by the Department of Agriculture. In the Western States they compete with each other and, cheek by jowl, each maintains a staff in almost every county. Millions are being wasted "in them thar hills."

SIMPLIFICATION OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

Seventh in these urgencies is solution of a major problem in Government services to transportation. Aside from the agencies regulating transportation rates and services, there are about a dozen agencies scattered over a dozen different parts of the Government to deal with these matters. We must eliminate their overlap and waste. We should give the people one central agency to go to when they seek Government service in these matters.

There is something even more vital. The Federal Government directly or indirectly subsidizes or provides facilities for aviation, highways, waterways, and overseas shipping. We loan money to the railroads. They are all an essential part of our national defense. We must have coordination of our national policies, aiming at the development of a balanced national transport system. The troubles of the railroads are a daily exhibit.

RELIEF FOR THE PRESIDENT

Finally, there are some 65 different agencies in the executive branch which report directly to the President. If he gave to each of them an hour a week for administration, he would have no time to formulate leadership in the major policies of the Government, or attend an occasional game. By our proposals we can ultimately reduce these 65 agencies by more than one-half.

Beyond this there is a big sandbank of authorities between bureaus and between the Executive and the Congress. They form great barnacles on the ship of state. Under our Constitution, in logic and common sense, there can be only one Chief Executive officer in our Government, delegating authority ultimately down the line to the office boy. In executive matters Congress should be content to be the board of directors, with agencies of inspection and audit to see that their decisions are properly executed.

OTHER REFORMS

There are many reforms, other than the eight goals I have mentioned. We can furnish them on demand.

OPPOSITION

We have opposition of course. There are still people who hold to the theory of reduced Government expenses but not to its practice. Your job is to minister to these mental disorders. The best treatment is to persuade them to join in this historic movement toward progress and enduring national security.

IN CONCLUSION

These are not merely statistical assertions nor idealistic theories. These forces reach into every cottage in the land. They carry with them the future of our youth and of our country.

We must conserve our strength and stop wasting our heritage if we are to survive as a free people.

"Our Terrible Blunder Regarding Formosa Invites Disaster," Says the Editor of the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a terrible blunder has been committed by the administration in its handling of Formosa.

This blunder is best illustrated by the following editorial dated January 6, 1950, from the pen of Mr. Robert W. Boyer, editor of the Altoona Tribune, Altoona, Pa.

(The editorial follows:)

A TERRIBLE BLUNDER

It is entirely possible that history a decade or so from the present will call President Truman's refusal to try to save Formosa from the Communists America's major policy error in the Far East, topping the whole China debacle.

It is, too, entirely possible that this Formosa declaration will be revealed as one of the most costly errors in American history, perhaps surpassing the tragic blunder committed by the American Government on Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Truman said Thursday that this country will not intervene to save Formosa from the Chinese Communists.

It seems almost beyond belief. In the light of events, it seems downright stupid. An invitation to disaster.

We do not want war, nor do we want anything that will cause war. No sane person does. Yet Formosa represents the crux of everything the administration says it has been fighting the Reds to obtain, except for this vital difference:

The administration, Mr. Truman and his cronies, have centered their attention on western Europe, persuaded thus by the world's ablest diplomats, the British.

In western Europe, we have provoked the Russians to the point of desperation, even while they have been provoking us likewise. We have risked war by sending military advisers to Greece, by sending arms to Greece and Turkey, by organizing the whole of western Europe against the Russians.

It is a strange thing, but true, that Greece and Turkey were far more vital to Britain than to us. Britain did not want Russia to gain domination of the Mediterranean—British life line to the east.

And so, we stuck our necks out for Britain.

But, what do we do for ourselves in the Far East? Formosa is vital to ultimate defense of the United States, so Mr. Truman turns it down.

In the Far East, Mr. Truman refuses to move to save this country's defense arch in the western Pacific, Formosa.

General MacArthur is regarded, not only in America but in London and other world capitals, as the foremost military authority on the Far East. Even the British have not hesitated to acknowledge his leadership in this respect, as demonstrated when he was given top command over Australians during World War II.

General MacArthur advocates that we endeavor to save Formosa. This island lies athwart a perimeter of potential United States defense bases in the western Pacific.

Formosa in the hands of the Communists places us in exactly the same position we were in when Japan struck at Pearl Harbor. Even worse, for then we had free access to China. Now we haven't.

As we have said time and again, we need a President and Secretary of State who will not be overawed by European diplomats and who will assume real leadership in world affairs.

Observe how Britain follows its own course. It has decided to recognize the Chinese Communists.

Britain is playing the game of another Chamberlain Munich—by appeasing the Reds—who cannot be appeased.

Mr. Acheson says this country will not alter its position against Red China—but, he infers—"yet."

Senator CONNALLY says Formosa is not important enough to risk war over.

Was Greece? Was Turkey? Is western Europe?

Is it important that we let the Reds take China? Is it important that we give them leave to take all of Asia? Is it important that we give them Formosa, and thus give them, too, a terrible base for Russian naval and air strength to dominate the Philippines, to harass Hawaii, to menace Guam and Wake and even Alaska and our west coast?

If communism is a threat in western Europe, why is it not at least an equal threat in China, in Formosa, in Indochina, in Burma and Malaya?

The inconsistency—the utter weakness—of Mr. Truman's foreign policy is appalling.

He drives us down a road upon which we squander our strength in all quarters of the world, the while he rants about the dangers of Red Russia; then he proceeds to hand over to Russia the domination of all we fought to retain in World War II in the Pacific.

How Cheap Is Cheap Power?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle of January 7, 1950:

BOOKKEEPING AND CHEAP POWER

In one point particularly President Truman's statement Thursday on his water and power program was incomplete. He said that where private interests can transmit power as cheaply as the Government he will be glad to see them take on the job.

What did he mean by "as cheaply as the Government"?

Did he have in mind the cost figures as shown by the bookkeeping of Government enterprises as compared to the cost figures shown by the bookkeeping of private enterprises of the same nature?

The accounting of Government enterprises never presents a true picture. The Government pays no taxes to States and municipalities on the physical properties it installs and uses; it does not, at the end of the year, have to give up a large share of its income from them to the Internal Revenue Bureau.

The Government uses interest-free funds in its enterprises. It is true that some of these enterprises are supposed to return interest in time from their operations. But

this is a deferred return; the interest is not compounded as it would be in the case of private enterprise deferring its interest payments.

The Government puts into its enterprises all sorts of subsidies which do not appear in their cost accounting.

With the utilities it operates the Government sets up for itself a selected market through maintained priorities. In other words, it takes the cream, whereas the privately owned utility has to take the skim milk along with the cream in the areas it serves. If this gives the Government an advantage it also makes it tougher for consumers outside its priorities by making it tougher for the private enterprises that serve them.

Do these factors make Government enterprises cheaper to the people? Not by one penny. The people have to make up every one of them by taxes. The subsidies all come out of the Treasury, which gets its money from the people's pockets. The people have to dig up taxes to pay the interest on the funds the Treasury raises to put into the construction and operation of Government enterprises. The people go down into their jeans to make up the taxes which Government does not pay on its enterprises but which would be paid by private capital if it built and operated them.

Government bookkeeping brings the appearance of its cost figures down by omitting such factors, but it is only an appearance. The hidden cost to the people remains for them to pay.

Add the costs of bureaucratic red tape, which the Hoover Commission has shown to be excessive, and the human nature factor—the spenders of Government money have no critical stockholders on their necks—and it is altogether unlikely that Government can construct and operate any enterprise as cheaply as can private interests. This would be clearly shown if Government enterprises were compelled to keep their books in the manner State commissions compel privately owned utilities.

The President's statement needed clarification.

Remember Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered recently by Miss Grace Humphrey, a graduate of Wellesley College and the author of several books. The address was broadcast under the sponsorship of the Western Massachusetts Congress. Miss Humphrey emphasizes the immortal moments in the history of Poland with which every free man and woman should be familiar. Our responsibility for the plight of this gallant nation is one of the black spots in our history. We should remind ourselves constantly of the words Miss Humphrey quotes from the Polish national hymn, "Poland is not yet dead, while our lives remain." When the day comes of Poland's liberation, may this Nation have done all within its power to that end and so, in some measure, have removed the guilt we now bear for the stupid, cowardly, disgraceful thing we joined in doing at Yalta.

The address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, remember Pearl Harbor. Remember Dunkerque. Remember Stalingrad. I would ask you to remember Poland.

Twice Poland, the knight among nations, has saved western Europe from invaders from the east. In 1683 the Turks marched as far west as Vienna and only the timely arrival of the Polish king, Jan Sobieski, with his army saved the Austrian empire, saved western civilization. In 1920 Polish soldiers defeated the Bolshevists in the battle of Warsaw, which Poles call "the miracle of the Vistula," so hopeless resistance seemed at the outset—a 2-percent chance of winning, said their leader Pilsudski, but hour by hour that hot August day revised his figure upward until the Russians fled in utter rout. Have you forgotten those two victories and their results for Europe?

Poland, first to fight against Hitler's aggressions when, with no declaration of war his Brown Shirts invaded the so-called corridor in September of 1939, and entered Danzig, a so-called free city under the League of Nations, and World War II began. Have you forgotten listening to the broadcasts of Mayor Starzynski, telling the day-by-day events in Warsaw and reminding England of her promise to help?

People remember Mussolini's stabbing France in the back, dramatized by Churchill over the radio. Poland, too, had a stab in the back from Soviet Russia, despite the treaty of nonaggression, a bully's threat of attack with planes and tanks and artillery at the very time the Poles were doing their best to meet Hitler's blitzkrieg, until Warsaw burning, with no water to fight the fires breaking out everywhere, had to surrender. Polish military resistance on Polish soil was ended, but they fought on; 12,000 of their men in England's RAF made brilliant records during the bombing of London; their troops at the Cassino monastery added a new glory to the long list of Polish successes. Have you forgotten?

Then came a German army of occupation in Poland. The faculty of the university in Krakow summoned to a conference with the German governor and were carried off to concentration camp. That university is the oldest in Poland; its library endowed by the beautiful girl-queen Jadwiga, had the largest book collection in the country, with many rare volumes, some the only copy in the world. Soldiers sorted out the books printed in German, to be shipped to Berlin. All the rest they carried into the courtyard of that beautiful Gothic building where I have walked so often, piled them around the statue of Copernicus, once a student there, and set fire to them. Have you forgotten?

Poles are skillful plotters, thanks to the 120 years of the partitions. Scarcely had Warsaw surrendered than they organized the underground—some men and women with the same tasks as in 1915 and 1916 and 1918 when they lived through another occupation. They planned and waited till the fortunes of war brought a Soviet army westward in July of 1944. Approaching the Polish capital, they signaled the Poles to rise. Led by General Bor, the uprising broke out at an agreed-upon hour in one quarter of the city after another, timed like a radio program. The Russians were just across the bridge in the suburb called Praga.

"Can you hold out 5 days?" they had asked.

"Yes."

"We ought to make it in 2, but we'll say 5 days just in case—"

Some RAF planes flew over Warsaw, dropping medicines and ammunition at a certain minute at a certain street intersection—a perilous mission that, but many pilots volunteered. And just across the bridge were the Russians waiting. It's not a long bridge, shorter than our Brooklyn Bridge. I've often strolled across it. Meanwhile from this section held by the Poles to that one, from Pilsudski Square to Mokotow, from the suburb Zoliborz to the beautiful Stare Miasto, Polish women and high-school students carried messages and grenades and morphine, crawling through the sewers as Jean Valjean crawled through the sewers of Paris—but that was in a book; this was reality; I've talked with women who did it.

Not in 2 days nor in 5 did the Soviets cross the Vistula to Warsaw, nor in 10, nor yet 20 days. Sixty-three days the underground held out as General Bor surrendered then only because there was no more morphine for the wounded, no more bandages, no more ammunition, no more of anything. How proud I was to be invited to the city hall when the mayor of New York presented to that Polish general the freedom of the city.

To an American journalist who told the story to me, the Russians tried to explain the delay: "We had to rest our men. We had to regroup our divisions. And—anyway—the uprising wasn't well organized."

A refugee friend of mine who was in the underground all those weeks of bombardment exclaimed, "Not well organized. Why, I was 1 of 300,000 Warsaw women organized in 3-hour shifts for duty day and night. My turn was always midnight till 2 a. m.; but it made no difference—no one could sleep, ever; the German artillery never stopped firing. All the men, civilians and soldiers, were organized with the same meticulous care." Have you forgotten the uprising?

The Yalta Conference between Churchill and Roosevelt and Stalin dealt the more partition for Poland. As once with Czechoslovakia, the Allies sold Poland down the river, giving Russia her eastern provinces and taking territory on the west from Germany to compensate her. No one consulted the Polish government in exile, no one asked the hundreds of thousands of people affected by this sudden change of frontiers. Poland sold down the river became, forsooth, Roosevelt and Churchill thought it necessary to give Stalin whatever he suggested. Have you forgotten Yalta?

Not one quisling could the Germans find in Warsaw. Have you forgotten that? And the much publicized parliamentary elections which the Allies promised would be honest, under their supervision. Honest? with opposition parties not allowed to hold meetings or publish their newspapers, even to put up candidates? The American Ambassador, Arthur Bliss Lane, watching affairs in Poland during those anxious months, wrote a book, I Saw Poland Betrayed, giving the story of the puppet government installed in Poland by Moscow. Have you forgotten that?

How long will America forget the Poles? Their stirring national hymn begins, "Poland is not yet dead while our lives remain." Justice will come, the enemy be expelled, freedom restored. Take courage, Americans and Poles alike.

"Their cause is just and their victory certain,
For God is always the upholder of justice."

"Slave Labor" or "Semiservitude"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on the floor of the House last

Monday, January 9, my distinguished colleague Hon. CARL D. PERKINS, of Kentucky, made inquiry about the provisions of the Sugar Act, at which time I quoted from a letter from the Department of Agriculture. Under unanimous consent, I am placing this letter in the Appendix of the RECORD together with a newspaper article from the Washington Times-Herald of May 4, 1947:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND
MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1949.

Hon. REED F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in response to your telephone request to the Sugar Branch for information concerning features of the Sugar Act and its administration.

One of the basic features of the Sugar Act is the provision for making conditional payments to growers who comply with certain conditions. Appropriation requirements for these payments are more than offset by excise tax collections authorized by a provision in the Internal Revenue Code with respect to sugar processed or imported for direct consumption in the United States. This tax is equivalent to five-tenths cent per pound, raw value, or 0.535 cent per pound, refined value. Revenues from this tax amounted to approximately $71,247,000 in fiscal year 1948, and it is anticipated that they will approximate $75,000,000 in 1949.

The rates of payment under the Sugar Act are established in section 304 of the act and vary from 60 cents per 100 pounds of raw sugar produced for the smallest growers, to 30 cents per 100 pounds for the largest growers. Payments have averaged around $60,000,000 per year in recent years and are expected to be around $65,000,000 annually when production is equivalent to the quota in each of the domestic areas.

One of the conditions growers must comply with in order to obtain Sugar Act payments is the payment of wages not less than those determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be fair and reasonable. The Secretary is required to consider differences in conditions among the various producing areas, and the standards established by him under the Agricultural Adjustment Act in making these determinations. Among the conditions considered in the establishment of minimum wage rates are the price of sugar and net returns to growers, as well as the cost of living. The degree of mechanization and the productivity per man-hour varies greatly for the different areas. To illustrate, Hawaii, with an annual production of close to 1,000,000 tons of sugar, employs only 35,000 workers to operate its plantations and raw-sugar mills, whereas Puerto Rico, with only a slightly larger production, employs 135,000 workers. A part of this difference can be explained by the fact that the Hawaiian harvesting and grinding season runs throughout most of the year, whereas the Puerto Rican harvesting and grinding season is much shorter. Nevertheless, the difference in degree of mechanization is primarily responsible for the difference in the labor requirement per ton of sugar between the two areas.

The small sugar-growing enterprise in the Virgin Islands should be considered more in the nature of a work-relief project than a commercial undertaking. Prior to the establishment of the Virgin Islands Company, private mills in that area had all closed and the population on the island of St. Croix was left without a major means of livelihood. Although both the yield per acre of cane and the sugar content per ton of cane are very low, the reestablishment of the sugar industry has afforded employment to a large number of workers on the island. Efforts are also being made to develop more remunerative enterprises.

In Louisiana and Puerto Rico the wage determinations provide escalator clauses requiring that wages paid farm labor in the production of sugar be increased with increases in the price of sugar. In the case of Hawaii, the wage rates are actually determined by the terms of the contracts between the various plantations and the labor union. Since such wage rates are high enough to meet the standards provided under the Sugar Act, the determination amounts to little more than the requirement that persons employed on the farms be paid in full for all such work as required in section 301 (c) (1) of the act.

The 1949 basic hourly rates for the several areas are as follows:

	Nonharvest	Harvest
	Cents	Cents
Sugar beets	60	65
Louisiana	32	39
Florida	45	45
Hawaii	76.4	76.4
Puerto Rico	39	29
Virgin Islands	25	25

It should be pointed out that the basic hourly rates shown above are for the lowest rate worker. Higher rates are provided for skilled or semiskilled workers in all areas except for the Virgin Islands.

In addition to the above cash payments, farmers in all of the domestic areas, except Hawaii, are required to provide laborers without charge the customary perquisites. These usually consist of housing, garden plots, and in some cases vegetables, meat, milk, and medical services. In Hawaii, the labor unions demanded and received in wages the cash equivalent of perquisites. In most of the areas piecework rates are used to a large extent. Payments to laborers per hour under piecework average about 50 percent higher than minimum rates established for work on a time basis.

You also asked for information on the restriction of imports of refined sugar and the way that such restrictions tie into the Sugar Act as a whole.

As a means of providing a supply of sugar that will be consumed at prices which will not be excessive to consumers and which will fairly and equitably maintain and protect the welfare of the domestic sugar industry, Congress provided in section 201 of the act that the Secretary of Agriculture determine for each year the amount of sugar needed to meet the requirements of consumers in the continental United States. In section 202 of the act Congress then established the maximum quantities of sugar that may be supplied by each of the domestic areas and the Republic of the Philippines. The remaining quantities required must, accordingly, come from Cuba and other foreign countries.

Although the Sugar Act is designed largely to maintain and protect the domestic sugar growing industry, it also provides for the maintenance of our mainland refining industry. Accordingly, Congress established quotas on the importation or shipment into the mainland of direct-consumption sugar (primarily refined sugar) as follows:

	Short tons
Puerto Rico	126,033
Hawaii	29,616
Philippines	56,000
Cuba	375,000

For a similar reason, quotas were established for the importation of liquid sugar in terms of wine gallons of 72 percent total sugar content as follows:

	Gallons
Cuba	7,970,858
Dominican Republic	630,594
Other foreign countries	0

Essentially the quotas on importation and shipments to the mainland of direct-consumption sugar were established at the levels such imports or shipments had attained prior to the enactment of the Jones-Costigan Sugar Act. Major attention was given to this feature of the legislation in the enactment of the Sugar Act of 1937. Without undertaking to review the matter in detail, it appears that Congress concluded that such imports and shipments reflected conditions prior to the enactment of special sugar legislation and that, since the major objective of the Sugar Act was to protect and maintain a limited domestic producing industry, it would be inconsistent to permit the market improvement anticipated from such legislation to result in an expansion of foreign and offshore refining industries at the expense of the established mainland refining industry.

You also ask for our comments on the degree of industry cooperation we have received in the administration of the Sugar Act. The Sugar Act is recognized to be of vital importance to the domestic sugar industry and we have received a very high degree of industry cooperation in its administration.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. TRUE,
Administrator.

NEW ORLEANS, May 3.—A deeply shocked priest charged today that 150 displaced persons resettled on Louisiana sugarcane plantations are so ill-paid that their babies "are crying for food and milk."

But the priest, the Reverend Carl Schutten, said the DP's are no worse off than native-born Americans who plant, cultivate, and harvest sugarcane in Louisiana. A total of 25,000 to 30,000 persons is officially estimated to be working in the cane fields now.

PAID $2.90 A DAY

Men—American and foreign—are paid $2.90 each for a 9-hour day. Women are paid $2.80 each for an 8-hour day. Father Schutten said that when they can't work because of rain, they aren't paid. He estimated that cane-field workers average about four full days a week—a wage of less than $12.

Father Schutten and the Reverend J. Stanley Ormsby, of the national Catholic bishops' resettlement program, inspected the homes of DP's on four plantations last Saturday. Father Ormsby has returned to New York.

"Officials of the national Catholic bishops' resettlement program will probably take some action after receiving his report," Father Schutten said.

"I'm interested in the plight of them all—American or DP, white or black," he said. "My going to see the DP's merely opened my eyes to what exists."

Father Schutten said homes furnished for the DP's and other sugarcane workers are "not bad." But they have to furnish their homes, pay their electric and gas bills, and buy their food and clothes, he said.

CALLS IT SEMISERVITUDE

"The plantation commissary is the only place where the DP can cash his check. As a result, he has to do all his dealings there, where prices are considerably higher than they are in New Orleans," he said.

"When he gets into debt for $100 or $200 he finds that he can never leave the plantation because he will never have enough money to pay his debts."

Father Schutten said it amounted to semiservitude.

He said most sugarcane workers can't afford to wear shoes during the week; if they had shoes they have to save them for Sunday. He said he suspected that during rainy spells some women went without food so their children could eat.

"I was shocked beyond words," he said.

Mr. Speaker, while we hear much about slave labor, you will note that the newspaper article quotes Father Schutten as having used a more elegant term, "semiservitude."

Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace, Who Towers Above All Others Who Ever Lived on This Earth—the Christian Religion, Whose Transforming Power Is the Miracle of History and the Spirit of Christmas

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I made over radio station WROL in Knoxville, Tenn., on Christmas Eve, December 24, 1949:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this is Congressman JOHN JENNINGS, Jr., speaking to you from radio station WROL in Knoxville, on this Christmas Eve.

For the past 3 years it has been my privilege and pleasure to discuss with my hearers current news items of local and national interest and also world-shaking events which have affected this country, Europe, Asia, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, the Hawaiian Islands, the Philippines, and other island peoples.

Let us now turn to the distant past. The three nations of ancient times that most profoundly influenced the course of human history are Rome and Greece in Europe and Israel in Asia. Rome was a colonizing power and the ancient Romans were preeminent as lawmakers and law administrators. It was justly said of ancient Rome that the arts, civilization, law and order followed where Rome's eagle flew. As a result, the law books of this country are filled with maxims and principles that are the product of Roman thought and the lofty Roman conceptions of law, equity, and the administration of justice.

The Greeks were primarily a nation of thinkers. They evolved and gave to the world the laws of the human mind—logic, philosophy, literature, architecture, the drama, poetry, and the eloquence of Demosthenes. Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, are immortal in the realm of thought and lofty living.

Hence we speak of the grandeur that was Rome and the glory that was Greece. The Greeks loved human liberty and more than once saved Europe from Asiatic despotism.

It is the peculiar glory of the Jewish race that through them, the people of the earth have the revealed religion of one God, the author and maker of mankind.

In 1860, the French Government sent to the Middle East a great French scholar, Ernest Renan, on an archeological mission. When Renan entered upon his study, he did not believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ and took but little stock in the word of God. As a result of his studies and what he saw and learned of the history of the Jewish race and of the life of the Saviour, he became a devout believer in the Christian religion.

As a result of his investigations of the facts surrounding the birth, the life, the ministry, the death, the resurrection of Jesus, Renan wrote one of the world's most informative, entrancing lives of the Saviour. In his opening chapter of this book, he states that the great event of the history of the world is the revolution by which the noblest portions of humanity have passed from the pagan religions of ancient times to the religion founded on the conception of one God and the incarnation of the Son of God.

It has taken almost 2,000 years to accomplish this conversion.

The greatest life in human history is the life of Jesus. By His superior personality, His bold originality, by the love which He was able to inspire, around His life is built the faith of humanity in God and a future life. The Saviour was well versed in the Mosaic law and He emphasized that He did not come to destroy the law but to fulfill it.

He revealed God not as a tyrannical master who kills us, damns us or saves us according to his pleasure. The God of Jesus is our father. The God of Jesus is not the partial despot who chose Israel alone for His people; He is the God of humanity. Jesus boldly raised Himself above the prejudices of His nation and established the universal fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

The true kingdom of heaven, which He came into the world to establish, is in the hearts of men.

In all literature there is no more touching, captivating account of the birth of a little child than the story of the birth of the Saviour by St. Luke. Referring to the mother of the Saviour and His birth, Luke wrote:

"7. And she brought forth her first-born son, and wrapped Him in swaddling clothes, and laid Him in a manger because there was no room for Him in the inn.

"8. And there were in the same country shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flocks by night.

"9. And lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone around them, and they were sore afraid.

"10. And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people.

"11. For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.

"12. And this shall be a sign unto you: Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger.

"13. And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God and saying,

"14. Glory to God in the highest, and on earth, peace, good will toward men.

"15. And it came to pass, as the angels were gone away from them into heaven, the shepherds said one to another, Let us now go even unto Bethlehem and see this thing which is come to pass, which the Lord has made known unto us.

"16. And they came with haste, and found Mary, and Joseph, and the babe lying in a manger.

"17. And when they had seen it, they made known abroad the saying which was told them concerning the child.

"18. And all they that heard it wondered at those things which were told them by the shepherds.

"19. But Mary kept all these things and pondered them in her heart."

But little is known of the childhood of the Saviour except that "He increased in stature and wisdom and in favor with God and man." At the age of twelve, He confounded the wise and the aged with His knowledge and His wisdom. At the carpenter's bench, in the synagogue, in the study of the Scriptures, in the mastery of human nature, for 30 years. He prepared for His ministry, and in the 3 years of that ministry in His daily, intimate life with His apostles spent in the open air, He laid the enduring foundations of a kingdom that shall never pass away. He performed miracles. He healed the sick, restored the sight of the blind, cleansed the leper, raised the dead, burst asunder the confines of the tomb, triumphed over death; the miracle of history is the transforming power of the Christian religion. It has been said that immortality is the glorious discovery of Christianity, that it is the twin sister of eternity. The Christ transcends all others who ever lived on earth, because He most profoundly influenced the thoughts and lives of mankind.

From the Old Testament, its history, its laws which underlie many of the enlightened institutions of civilized men, its prophecies; the poetry of the psalms, the wisdom of the proverbs, in natural sequence arises the New Testament. With the history of a great race as His background, at a time when the world was bankrupt morally, intellectually and spiritually, when there was not a hospital, a children's home, Jesus began His ministry. At thirty, He entered into His life's work, without social standing, with no influential friends, no property.

He spake as never man spake; He taught as never man taught, weeping with those who mourned, rejoicing with those who rejoiced, going up and down the dusty highways of Palestine, in His life and in His words, erecting an ideal so lofty that men must always look up to Him, so far ahead of mankind that we can never overtake or attain it.

In his great essay on John Milton, Lord Macaulay said that Judaism never made a convert. He pointed out that the abstract concept of God could not be grasped by men, but that when mankind saw God in the form of His son, when they came within the radiance of His divine personality, when they saw Him walking up and down the highways of Palestine, learned of His cruel trial and judicial murder by the sanction of Pontius Pilate, when they saw Him ascend the rugged steeps of Calvary, suffer and die upon the cross, they had a demonstration of the great truth of Christianity—that God is love and that all men are brothers. Only a thorn-crowned, bleeding Christ could win the love and consecrated belief of mankind. Macaulay pointed out that before the crucified, risen Christ, the doubts of the academy, the prejudices of the synagogue, the pride of the portico and the swords of the 30 legions were humbled in the dust.

Jean Paul Richter says of Him, "He was the mightiest among the lowly, the lowliest among the mighty. With His pierced hands He lifted the gates of empire from their hinges and turned the stream of the centuries into new channels."

He is God's farthest reach toward man and man's farthest reach toward God.

He set an angel beside each cradle, rendered the human body forever sacred and opened a pathway to the stars.

He made of Calvary the loftiest mountain in history and glorified the sacrificial cross as a conquering symbol, and in the triumph of the resurrection demonstrated the life immortal.

When the end came, as Jesus hung upon the cross, His disciples fled, with the exception of John. The devoted women of Galilee who had followed Jesus to Jerusalem did not abandon Him. They were with Him to the end. They were the last at the foot of the cross and the first at the tomb of the risen Saviour.

After the resurrection, the disciples who had deserted Him in death were imbued with faith in Him and surcharged with His courage and from then on they bore witness to His ministry and spread the new religion even at the cost of their lives.

"As the end approached He endured an agony of despair a thousand times more acute than all His torture and exclaimed, 'My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken

Me!' But His divine instinct still prevailed. As the life of His body became extinguished, His soul became clear and returned to its celestial origin. He regained the idea of His mission; He saw in His death the salvation of the world; He lost sight of the lugubrious spectacle spread at His feet and united to His father He began upon the cross the divine life which He was to live in the heart of humanity through infinite ages."

Renan in his great Life of the Saviour concluded his account of the death of Jesus with these words:

"Rest now in Thy glory, noble initiator. Thy work is completed; Thy divinity is established. Fear no more to see the edifice of Thy efforts crumble through a flaw. Henceforth, beyond the reach of frailty, Thou shalt be present, from the height of Thy divine peace, in the infinite consequences of Thy acts. At the price of a few hours of suffering, which have not even touched Thy great soul, Thou hast purchased the most complete immortality. For thousands of years the world will extol Thee. Banner of our contradictions, Thou wilt be the sign around which will be fought the fiercest battles. A thousand times more living, a thousand times more loved since Thy death than during the days of Thy pilgrimage here below, Thou wilt become to such a degree the cornerstone of humanity, that to tear Thy name from this world would be to shake it to its foundations. Between Thee and God, men will no longer distinguish. Complete conqueror of death, take possession of Thy kingdom, whither, by the royal road Thou has traced, ages of adorers will follow Thee."

The spirit of Christmas is exemplified in the words, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Governor Vardaman, of Mississippi, put this truth in deathless words when he said, "In the great bank of eternity, the greatest credit is given to Him who has contributed most to the sum of human joy, who has planted a flower in the fainting heart of despair and kissed it with the sunshine of hope and who has painted the pallid cheeks of care with the roses of health and happiness."

Labor Paper Defends Kaiser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the December 15, 1949, issue of the Machinist, official weekly newspaper of the International Association of Machinists, which is published in Washington, D. C. The article was written by the paper's editor, Gordon H. Cole, who contributes this weekly column under the pen name of Joe Henry. It follows:

KAISER—SUCH MAKING WHEN HE'S GO BACK TO BOOTSTRAPPER

(By Joe Henry)

Lots of families, our kind of families, are thinking kindly of Henry Kaiser these days. Henry is going to bring out a new, low-priced automobile. He says he's going to undersell Ford and Chevrolet by $200 or more. On a standard-size car, too. And one that will give approximately twice the gas mileage you get out of your Ford or Chevrolet—if Kaiser's performance lives up to his claims.

Somebody else may know more than anyone else whether the small Kaiser car will even ride well, much less whether we will ever want to own one. We do know that if Henry Kaiser succeeds, the price of automobiles will come down. It isn't that Kaiser by some miracle is going to give us twice as much automobile for our money. But, he is going to separate the price of gadgets—the ash trays, the clocks that never run, the cigarette lighters, the arm rests, and all the other frills from the price of the car. If we want frills we can buy them extra. If your family can't afford frills, you won't have to pay for them to get a new car.

You'd think that everybody would agree that this is a step in the right direction. You'd think that everybody ought to be encouraging Kaiser. You'd think * * * well, stop thinking and read the newspaper columnists. Some of them are saying that Henry Kaiser is corrupting the Government. When he got into real financial difficulty, Kaiser went to Uncle in Washington for some help. Like 51,000 other businessmen before him, Kaiser got a loan from Uncle's Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The RFC has lent out a lot of money to business and so far it has actually turned a profit for the Government—and the taxpayers—of $575,000,000 after paying all expenses.

Of course, there is a group of big-business men and their Congressmen who just don't like Henry Kaiser. They say he's not a healthy influence on the free-enterprise system. He thinks it's good business to get along with unions. And, he actually is trying to undersell the market. So they're going to throw as much mud as they know how at Henry Kaiser's new venture. They'd like to put him out of the automobile business.

Maybe they'll succeed. If they don't, Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler are going to have to bring out a new line of low-priced cars to compete with Kaiser. Somehow, we think most families feel that would be a good thing for the country.

The Engineers and Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1950, the Shreveport Times, published at Shreveport, La., ran an editorial entitled "The Engineers and Waterways." This editorial presents strong views on a very controversial matter, and I, therefore, include the editorial as follows:

THE ENGINEERS AND WATERWAYS

The National Junior Chamber of Commerce has launched a campaign for full endorsement of the Hoover reports, seeking to arouse public support that will in turn arouse Congress to action toward bringing about the billions in savings of tax money which the reports are aimed at accomplishing.

The local junior chamber has launched a local campaign as its part of the national effort. The local chamber urges Shreveporters to give 100-percent endorsement of all of the recommendations of all of the various task forces whose recommendations make up what generally are called the Hoover reports, although Herbert Hoover personally simply was the guiding general in the investigations.

As we see it, the local junior chamber thus puts itself in a position of seeking support for action contrary to established local interests in relation to waterway development. The Red River Valley Association has devoted much effort and spent much money of citizenry up and down the Red River Valley for objectives which certainly would be endangered, in our opinion, if the Hoover report recommendations for placing the United States Army engineers under the Department of the Interior in their waterway development activities. Many business firms are strong financial supporters of both the junior chamber and the Red River Valley Association.

The Times itself has endorsed the general objectives of the Hoover reports—the infusion of efficiency into operation of Federal Government in a streamlining manner to eliminate billions of dollars of waste through extravagance, overlapping and duplication of operations, and general incompetency. But, that does not mean that we endorse any such plan as placing the age-old Army engineers, strictly nonpolitical and noted for their independence and efficiency through the decades, under a purely political—partisanly political—Government agency. We have stated that we oppose this phase of the Hoover reports and we repeat it now.

The recommendation to place the Army engineers under the Interior Department came from one of the Hoover Commission task forces and as such had the general approval of the Commission itself. The objectives sought in the recommendation are thoroughly worthy—unquestionably there is great duplication of expenditures in waterway surveys by the Interior Department and by the engineers.

But the answer is, as we see it—if there is to be consolidation—to put the Interior Department's waterway work under the engineers and thus get it out of a political setting and put it in a nonpolitical and strictly independent setting, rather than vice versa.

The engineers have a reputation through more than a century of recommending waterway development only on a basis of absolute impartiality, of absolute national need, and absolute economic soundness. No Government political agency possibly could have or build such a reputation or operate in such a manner continuously.

As a matter of fact, while Mr. Hoover—as member of his own Commission—has endorsed the reports of his task forces as a whole, it was noticeable that in a recent speech at a banquet in his honor he did not specifically recommend putting the engineers under Interior Department, as did his task force. He simply stated that there should be consolidation of operations of waterway operations of the Engineers and Interior to eliminate duplication and avoid waste. On that we agree. But the answer is not to put the independent engineers under a partisan political agency where they are subject to the whims of political appointees.

It is our belief that a vast number of junior chamber of commerce members locally hold pretty much the same view that we do on this point. But there should be—and we hope there will be—clarification from the organization's leadership. Otherwise it will lose much support it might otherwise gain in its campaign on the Hoover reports and arouse opposition it otherwise would not have.

It Need Not Have Happened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I join with other Members in the introduction of a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should immediately invoke the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in an effort to end the paralyzing coal strike.

In this connection, I include as part of my remarks a letter I addressed to the President on October 19 requesting that he recognize the seriousness of the situation at that time and that he appoint a board of inquiry immediately as called for by the Taft-Hartley Act:

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I respectfully call your attention to a situation which requires immediate action by you if innocent people are not to suffer.

The vast Great Lakes region of Wisconsin, Minnesota, and upper Michigan is almost entirely dependent on coal that moves from Lake Erie ports during the shipping season. This season will end on November 15.

Because of the coal strike practically no coal is moving to the dock companies at the present time. If the strike continues, if no more coal moves into this area in the remaining days of the shipping season, the inevitable result will be closed-down industrial plants, unemployment, and heavy suffering among the populace during the bitter northern winter.

The Wisconsin Coal Bureau has already apprised you of these facts. I urge you to verify them by contacting any coal dealer in Wisconsin, Minnesota, or upper Michigan.

In my opinion, this threat to the health and safety of this great area, together with the many other serious effects of a prolonged coal strike upon our national economy, constitutes a clear and present peril of our national health and safety.

I therefore urge you to appoint immediately a board of inquiry into the coal strike as called for under sections 206-207 of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and to request them to report to you forthwith. I further urge, if the report of the board justifies this course, that you proceed under sections 208-210 of this act in an effort to end this calamitous stoppage.

Any further delay, I assure you, Mr. President, is an invitation to a disaster which need not happen.

Yours very truly,

JOHN W. BYRNES,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, to this day I have received neither acknowledgment nor reply to this letter.

Mrs. Edna F. Kelly, First Woman Representative From New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the New York City delegation to Congress has been enhanced by the addition of a new House Member, Mrs. EDNA F. KELLY, who was elected last November to represent the Tenth Congressional District of Brooklyn. Mrs. KELLY is the first woman Representative ever to be elected from New York City.

I feel quite certain she will be an excellent addition to our delegation. She comes to us after serving for 7 years in the legislative halls of Albany, where she gained considerable experience as research director for the Democratic delegation. Mrs. KELLY, who is a graduate of Hunter College in New York, where she majored in history and economics, is the widow of the late city court justice, Edward L. Kelly.

A devoted mother to her two children, a fully informed and intelligent citizen, and a loyal worker for the Democratic Party, Mrs. KELLY will prove to be a hard-working able legislator. We extend to her our hearty congratulations and sincerest wishes for a long, happy, and successful career.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article about Mrs. EDNA KELLY, entitled "One of the 'Flannery Girls' Blazes Borough Political Trail," written by Violet Brown and published in the Brooklyn Eagle, November 13, 1949, as follows:

BROOKLYN'S WOMAN OF THE WEEK: ONE OF THE FLANNERY GIRLS BLAZES BOROUGH POLITICAL TRAIL

(By Violet Brown)

Disillusion was EDNA KELLY'S lot the first time she went to Washington.

Fresh from a class in high school civics, she went with her schoolmates to hear the bonus march debate—and found one droning speaker attended by a few men reading newspapers.

This time she knows what to expect. Flushed with victory as the first woman Representative elected from New York City, Mrs. KELLY has had 7 years' experience in the legislative halls of Albany as research director for the Democratic delegation.

She knows lawmakers can do their jobs without getting their ears bent—and she doesn't expect to do much speaking anyhow. She may not bow to any mid-Victorian dictum about woman's place being wholly in the home, but she knows a freshman's role in the House of Representatives.

Such good sense and balance is typical of the first lady of Brooklyn's Tenth Congressional District. With it she has been able to walk the delicate tightrope of being an inspired political worker and a devoted mother at one and the same time.

EDNA KELLY came into politics by marriage and remained to make it her lifework through necessity.

Her own family was stanchly Democratic, but more concerned with the doings of the seven girls (five of them their own and the other two adopted) that Patrick Flannery and his wife had to bring up.

One of the sisters married Charles R. Durgan, for 17 years Republican mayor of Amityville, and Edna, the youngest of the Flannerys, married Edward L. Kelly, son of William E. Kelly, postmaster of Brooklyn from 1916 to 1929, and right-hand man of County Leader John H. McCooey.

Politics was in Ed Kelly's blood and his bride adopted it. He became a city court justice and had a county court nomination when he was tragically killed in an automobile accident 7 years ago.

Mrs. KELLY, slim, dark-haired and attractive, left at 35 with 12-year-old Billy and 8-year-old Maura Patricia, stepped into the breach.

Now her son is a self-reliant undergraduate at Columbia University, eager to become a lawyer like his father, and Maura Patricia is a cute teen-ager at Marymount Academy, a pitcher on the softball team like her mother before her and a Dodger rooter second only to Branch Rickey.

The Kelly household runs like clockwork under the careful eye of Mrs. KELLY'S sister, Elizabeth, known as Lid to all and sundry, and Mrs. KELLY feels she can be spared "to carry the ball for women" on Capitol Hill.

She is completely informed on the concerns of women, both as citizens and as homemakers. She puts peace first on her legislative agenda and in swift order thereafter repeal of luxury taxes, broadening of social welfare, civil rights, the United Nations—in short, all the concomitants of a liberal Democratic platform.

But when she talks about "luxury taxes," she has a specifically feminine list of examples. She paid a $3 tax on $10 worth of drugstore necessities when she shopped for this summer's stays at her $2-year-old mother's home in East Hampton. She just had to buy Maura Patricia a school bag—with tax—but she hasn't bought a purse for herself since the extra 5c was slapped on that wardrobe item.

And that represents a real moral sacrifice for a woman as beautifully turned-out as the five-foot-nine, 127-pound Mrs. KELLY. (Even her chic is home-based, incidentally. She has a dressmaker "living in the first assembly district," gets her hats made on Bostrand Avenue and looks like something cut of Dior and Dalton.)

Similarly, when she comes out in favor of housing for all, she mentions her gratitude for her own home at 1247 Carroll Street, bought "in the eighteenth assembly district and close to my church in the seventeenth." She knows the advantages of having your own roof over your head at first hand.

When she speaks of education, she has her own theories worked out with her own children. And she has already lived through a phase of social welfare in the very progressively orientated MacNeon Club, of which she is coleader—there have been many Red Cross drives, civil rights talks, cancer collections, bond rallies and blood donor collections at the club.

But it isn't all work with the Kellys, either. Mrs. KELLY, Edna to her kids, loves football as much as her son, who was on the Columbia team until a knee injury benched him. The family goes to football and baseball games together, goes skiing, ice skating, and golfing.

They dote on music—hot and sweet—and they have a real feeling for good food, as befit the child and grandchildren of a Flannery mother who made each one of her girls cook the meals for 1 day a week so she would learn that most important of arts.

Mrs. KELLY cooks all her own meals, is noted for her fried chicken, cakes, and pies, and herself likes best of all her own peach plum jam, made from fruit gathered on the dunes at East Hampton.

She regularly helps can the produce from the garden first planted by her late father, who was a horticulturist and a graduate of Black Rock College in Ireland. She can even sew, although the quality of her product does not quite come up to her own high standards for everything.

A graduate of Hunter College, where she majored in history and economics, Mrs. KELLY, unlike many legislators, is no lawyer. She did take a few law courses after her marriage—she was married the summer she got her B. A.—but "they were just so I could understand what Ed was talking about when he discussed cases with me."

She always had had a hankering to take more law courses, but now, thanks to the voice of the voters last Tuesday, it will hardly be necessary.

Mrs. KELLY isn't going to be learning law any more. She'll be making it.

S. 1008, the Basing-Point Bill, Vicious in Its Entirety—Its Real Backers Desire the Destruction of Robinson-Patman Act—Even the Saving Kefauver and Carroll Amendments Have Been Eliminated—No Compromise Can Now Be Trusted—Text of Statement Before National Association of Retail Druggists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last fall the National Association of Retail Druggists held its annual convention in New York City. Among other matters of vital interest to the thousands of home-town druggists has been the juggernaut bill—S. 1008—a bill designed to crush the amendment to the Clayton Act which has done more to protect our small-business economy than any other antitrust law. This amendment, the Robinson-Patman Act, was conceived and sponsored by the small-business interests of our country. It bears my name because I introduced the original bill and fought for it to final passage. I am proud of that fact, but even more proud of the fact that the Robinson-Patman Act has stood test after test in our courts. It has protected small business in every line of endeavor. I shall fight to preserve its integrity until my labors here are concluded.

S. 1008 A VICIOUS BILL IN ITS ENTIRETY—CARROLL AMENDMENT A PREJOKE

When I addressed the National Association of Retail Druggists, the so-called Carroll amendment, introduced by the gentleman from Colorado, was still in the bill. This amendment was an improvement on the so-called Kefauver amendment introduced in the Senate, and was a further attempt to mitigate the utterly destructive effects of the bill on the Robinson-Patman Act. Naturally, I was in favor of the Carroll amendment as far as it went. However, as I made abundantly clear in my supplementary statement to the druggists, I was against the bill with or without the Carroll amendment. I showed, by exact citation, that S. 1008 was loaded with provision after provision diametrically opposed to the Robinson-Patman Act, and that by their own statements the real supporters of the bill wanted nothing less than the complete emasculation of the Robinson-Patman Act. I also warned against compromise proposals, by the proponents of the bill, inasmuch as they would necessarily be made in bad faith since they would be entirely inconsistent with the basic objectives of destroying the Robinson-Patman Act and slashing the antitrust laws generally.

CONFEREES ELIMINATED EVEN THE CARROLL AMENDMENT (AS WELL AS THE KEFAUVER AMENDMENT)

Apparently I did not exaggerate in my statement to the National Association of Retail Druggists. The real backers and beneficiaries of the bill must have gone to work with ruthless zeal. What they could not, by reason of the Kefauver amendment, fully accomplish in the Senate, and what they could not, by reason of the even stronger Carroll amendment, fully accomplish in the House, they accomplished with almost absolute finality in conference. Most people thought that the conference committee could, and would, simply choose between the Kefauver amendment of the Senate and the Carroll amendment of the House, settling for nothing less than the Kefauver amendment. And it was also believed that the House conferees were virtually instructed not even to yield on the Carroll amendment in favor of the Kefauver amendment.

However, what did the conferees actually do? They reported the bill with neither one amendment nor the other, with neither the Kefauver nor with the Carroll amendment, nor with any variation of either. In other words, they reported this bill minus even these minimum safeguards to the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act. Under the conference wording the Commission, in addition to all other proof, must prove that the effect on competition of the alleged illegal acts will be so-and-so and not merely that it may be. By the time the Commission would be in position to prove this specific effect, the victims, presumably, would have to be wiped out of business, even though the Commission's function is injunctive cease-and-desist relief, designed to prevent offenses in their incipiency, and no fines or criminal sentences are imposed. One Member did the signing for the House Members or managers, once for himself and twice as proxy for absent Members. To his credit, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee refused to sign or vote for the conference report.

CONFEREES ALSO ELIMINATED SECTION 4 AMENDMENT

The conferees went even further and added insult to injury by changing section 4 of the bill. Section 4 also had been modified in the House, and by the House Judiciary Committee itself, in at least token deference to the Robinson-Patman Act. The conferees, not satisfied by requiring proof of what the effect will be, rather than may be, inserted a specific requirement, in proving such effect, for reliable, probative, and substantial evidence, instead of a showing of reasonable probability as voted by the House. Their definition was even stiffer than the Senate version, which did not use the word "reliable." The definition, incidentally, was a complete reversal of high court decisions construing existing law, after years of litigation.

SENATE "LOCKS THE CONFEREES"—EVEN SPONSOR OF BILL VOICES OPPOSITION

Although the House accepted the report, by the time it reached the Senate the full import of its radical changes had become so completely understood that the Senate voted to hold back its approval. Even the distinguished Senator who introduced the bill attacked its proponents for what he regarded as their greediness in insisting upon amendments which were not necessary to their immediate objectives, as avowed by them, but which put in peril the very foundations of the antitrust laws. The matter was put over by the Senate until January 20, which is now approaching rapidly and is a day small business and all believers in the Robinson-Patman Act and the antitrust laws generally should carefully mark on their calendars.

ANOTHER PROPOSED COMPROMISE WILL BE ANOTHER TROJAN HORSE

It is my opinion that the real proponents of this bill themselves now feel that they went too far when they amended section 4 to define so strictly the degree of proof required in showing the necessary statutory effect on competition. It is my opinion that they themselves probably feel that this was adding insult to injury, and that it would have been altogether sufficient if the conferees had merely knocked out the Carroll amendment by requiring, as they did, proof of what effect "will" be, instead of "may" be. For they must now realize that by going to such extremes, they have finally completely shown their hand. They have shown that their desire is not merely for a statutory declaration of the right of charging delivered prices and absorbing freight, a right which I say already exists. They have shown that their wish is to destroy the Robinson-Patman Act and to subvert all of the antitrust laws, not only in favor of the basing point and similar systems operated by means of identical delivered prices, practiced for so many years in the steel and cement industries in particular, but in favor of all monopolistic practices, whereby small-business men, including independent retailers, can be kept in line. However, inasmuch as they have inadvertently shown their hand by reason of their own greediness, to use the expression of the bill's own sponsor, I should not be surprised if they are now again going to try out the tune of alleged compromise, in favor of at least some of the opponents to the bill. Just as I said in my statement to the National Association of Retail Druggists, I think they will try—at least if it proves absolutely necessary—to rid themselves of the opposition of the retail associations of the country by specious concessions and specious reasoning designed to show that the retailers—the grocers, the druggists, and others—will not be hurt, at least not directly hurt, if they permit Big Steel, Big Cement, and all the Bigs to continue to sell for identical delivered prices charged by all competitors, as contemplated by the bill. The proponents of the bill may suddenly become generous and say they will not insist upon the amendment to section 4, to which the original sponsor of the bill has objected so strenuously. They may also suddenly agree to drop entirely section 3 of the bill which is an across-the-board amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act, and not confined to freight rates at all. Who knows but that the proponents will even agree to the restoration of the Carroll amendment, or of the Kefauver amendment? In desperation

they might even say they would be satisfied with section 1 alone of the bill which is the section which simply declares that delivered prices and freight absorption are legal. They may try to say that they have no designs on the Robinson-Patman Act at all and they will withdraw objectionable proposed amendments to that act. In this way they will hope to conquer by dividing, and to strengthen their own noncompetitive practices by claiming that these practices do not weaken competition in other fields.

What I said before in my statement to the National Association of Retail Druggists is therefore doubly pertinent now, and I therefore respectfully ask for permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of this statement, delivered last fall.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BEFORE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETAIL DRUGGISTS—WHY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETAIL DRUGGISTS SHOULD DEMAND THE DEFEAT OF S. 1008—WITH OR WITHOUT THE CARROLL AMENDMENT

The Robinson-Patman Act, passed by the Congress in 1936, has been—I hope it is no exaggeration to say—a Rock of Gibraltar to the small-business men of this country.

The National Association of Retail Druggists was one of the earliest and strongest supporters of the Robinson-Patman Act. The NARD is looked upon as one of the most powerful friends today of the Robinson-Patman Act and as a sincere believer in the basic philosophy of the Robinson-Patman Act, namely, a fair deal for the little fellow in business.

The Robinson-Patman Act is under heavy fire. Big business does not like the Robinson-Patman Act and is engaged in a gigantic attempt to dynamite your Rock of Gibraltar, together with the many judicial decisions now fortifying the act, to the very bottom of the sea.

We all know of the Cement decision, rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States on April 26, 1948, with only one Justice dissenting. The decision held, after years of litigation, that the use of the basing-point system, as proved in that case, was a violation of the Robinson-Patman and of other antitrust provisions.

This decision, instead of being accepted with grace, was the signal for a barrage on the Robinson-Patman Act and on the antitrust laws in general, the like of which has seldom been seen in legislative history.

BASING-POINT LOBBYISTS SMELL NO OVERSALE COVERS

In 1948, from June until December, we had the Capehart hearings in the Senate, directly arising out of the Cement decision. Committee counsel of the Senate, Mr. William Simon, was selected from a Chicago law firm, and it is significant that, now that his committee duties are finished, he is a registered lobbyist—and regarded as the chief lobbyist—for amending our antitrust laws, and the Robinson-Patman Act, in the interest of the basing-point system, euphemistically called the freight-absorption or delivered-price systems.

The big boys, having finally lost the Cement case after years of litigation, during which they kept right on with their illegal practices, decided on a new slogan, a new line. This new line was their alleged need for clarification of the law. They said that all they wanted was clarification of the Court's decision and of the antitrust laws as written on the books. They did not understand the words. No "speaker" English, if you please. They did not dare to admit that they were really seeking to amend the antitrust laws; so they said they were trying to clarify them.

S. 1008, as originally introduced, was a mockery on the antitrust laws in connection with the Cement decision. However, on May 31, 1949, a substitute bill was offered in the Senate, making outright amendments to the antitrust laws, or so-called clarifications. When we refer to S. 1008 today, it is this substitute bill, with or without subsequent amendments.

All that this new S. 1008 was doing, according to its backers, was legalizing delivered pricing and so-called freight absorption. But there is nothing in the antitrust laws forbidding delivered pricing or forbidding freight absorption, provided buyers are treated equally and are not subjected to price discrimination.

S. 1008 GETS THIS FAR TO FLOOR OF THE HOUSE

Actually, S. 1008 goes much further than to declare, by way of clarification, that delivered prices and freight absorption are legal. Having made this declaration, it goes on in subsequent sections to strike body blows to the Robinson-Patman Act, not only as to freight matters but as to all pricing matters. The real backers are interested not only in the basing-point boys, but in all big business. S. 1008 was to be a Roman holiday against the Robinson-Patman Act and the small-business men protected by it.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, always a champion of small business, promptly offered amendments which were accepted by the Senate and by the sponsor of the substitute and which had the effect somewhat of preserving our present law; whereupon on June 1 the bill was passed and sent to the House, where it was referred to the Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee of the House reported the bill in a few days minus the Kefauver amendment. No public hearings were held by the House Judiciary Committee, and only three witnesses were heard in executive session, of whom I was one. When it became apparent that public hearings would not be held, small-business organizations, including the NARD, promptly requested the House Small Business Committee to afford them an opportunity to be heard. On June 28, the House Small Business Committee did start hearings, which were entitled "Small Business Objections on Basing Point Legislation, Particularly S. 1008." Before the hearings had fairly started—in fact, the very next day—the Rules Committee of the House granted a rule on the bill, and thereupon it was rushed to the floor for consideration. The House began consideration of the bill on July 7, and since prior knowledge of this date was available, the hearings before the House Small Business Committee were recessed on July 5, 1949. Actually, we had witnesses representing small-business organizations and many other organizations, as well as many distinguished lawyers and economists familiar with our antitrust laws and able to speak on them with authority, who were willing and anxious to testify against S. 1008.

S. 1008 SHOVED TO HOUSE EVEN WITH SAVING CARROLL' AMENDMENTS

It was my thought at that time that the bill should be beaten and I am still of the same opinion. However, amendments were offered which had a beneficial effect by several of my colleagues, among them Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL, of Colorado. Mr. CARROLL aptly described his amendments as so simple that even a lawyer could understand them. When the House saw the danger of Senator O'MAHONEY's substitute bill to the small-business institutions of this country, they promptly voted overwhelmingly for the Carroll amendments. Senator KEFAUVER later said that the Carroll amendments were an improvement upon his own, which had been struck by the House Judiciary Committee, and that he was glad to accept them.

Later, by a parliamentary maneuver, the Senate sent S. 1008 to conference, but not before the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] moved to reconsider. The fight on reconsideration was stubbornly and ably fought, and it was one in which many distinguished Members of the Senate joined in the fight for small business. However, the vote to reconsider, as you all know, was lost, and the bill was sent to conference by the Senate. Later, upon public assurance on the floor of the House by those who would represent the House in the conference that the Carroll amendments would be preserved, the House permitted the bill to go to conference. Several meetings of the conferees took place, but no agreement could, at least up to the present date, be reached, since the House conferees stood firm and would not recede from the Carroll amendment.

I repeat: This bill—S. 1008—should be killed. The Carroll amendment, good as it is, strikes down only one assault on the Robinson-Patman Act. S. 1008 is replete with assaults on the Robinson-Patman Act. Indeed I go further and state that S. 1008 is counted on by its real backers to crush and annihilate the Robinson-Patman Act.

BASING-POINT LOBBYIST FINALLY LETS CAT OUT OF THE BAG

These are not idle words when I say that S. 1008 is counted on to crush and to annihilate the Robinson-Patman Act. Now that the cat is out of the bag—as the result of Congress' quick reaction since it realized how fully the Robinson-Patman Act was truly involved in this so-called freight-absorption bill—Mr. William Simon, a lobbyist for clarification, calmly admits all and, instead of further indulging in denial or apology, not only confesses all but loudly proclaims that it was all for a most laudable purpose.

In a speech delivered before the American Bar Association on September 8, he blandly admitted that the bill is directed against the Robinson-Patman Act. But, said he in effect, the Robinson-Patman Act is no good. Why? Because it fosters so-it competition among the buyers—that's you—instead of hard competition among the sellers; and because it keeps inefficient small concerns—that's you, the buyers—in business. And he spoke in contempt of the battle against S. 1008 and for the Carroll amendment—I now quote—"spearheaded by the associations of retail druggists and retail gasoline dealers." I note that he left the grocers out, and I hope if there are any here their feelings won't be hurt.

But we don't have to take this somewhat belated confession to find out that S. 1008 is designed to wreck the Robinson-Patman Act. The attacks on the Robinson-Patman Act are written all over S. 1008—although ignored and forgotten in the hot discussion on the Carroll amendment which was directed to only one of these attacks.

HOW S. 1008 EMASCULATES ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT REVEALED

I will now direct your attention to other attacks on the Robinson-Patman Act contained in S. 1008, and you will agree with me, I am sure, that they are equally vicious.

Let us take section 2 of S. 1008. This section creates two exceptions, A and B to section 2 (a) of the Robinson-Patman Act part of the Clayton Act. Exception A does not have the Carroll amendment, as does exception B, and I therefore shall discuss exception A first.

Exception A in the bill provides that it shall not be an unlawful discrimination in price for a seller, acting independently—I now quote—"to quote or sell at delivered prices if such prices are identical at different

See footnote at end of speech.

See footnote at end of speech.

delivery points." This is the zoning system, and its proponents admit that it is the zoning system. The zoning system, as the courts have stated, is a variation of the basing-point system. It has all the vices of the basing-point system—particularly, of course, for heavy products involving substantial freight rates. The zoning system, like the basing-point system, permits supposed competitors—engaging in hard competition, if you please—to employ identical pricing, branded by the Supreme Court in the Cement case—I quote—the "handy instrument" of monopoly and of phony competition. The zoning system, like the basing-point system, of which it is a variation, brings about atrocious price discrimination, compelling nearby purchasers to pay long-haul freight charges and giving giant producers and sellers the political power to build up one region of the country at the expense of another. Such a system, need I tell you, is a flat contradiction of the Robinson-Patman Act and of the fundamental philosophy which not only gave birth to this country but has made it great.

And, please remember, and please do not forget: This exception A in section 2 of S. 1008 is not limited by the Carroll amendment. The Carroll amendment, although it should logically be here, too, appears only in exception B of the section. No doubt it was omitted in A by inadvertence, and in an attempt to do what seemed to be first things first.

S. 1008 GRANTS CLEAR SHELTER TO CHAIN-STORE MONOPOLIES

I have read this so-called zoning-system provision and have reread it, both alone and in connection with the other provisions of the bill. I can tell you that I see no restriction whatever on this proposed exception A—except the equivocal one that the seller is acting independently. But I take it that a giant corporate seller, with any number of outlets, as long as it is acting by itself, can claim to be acting independently; it thus could do practically anything it wanted to within the framework of a zoning system authorized by this provision. And if such a giant were really not acting by itself, but simply following, as it might claim, the same zoning pattern as other giant producers, who is there who is going to prove, without actual and independent evidence of collusion, that it is not acting independently? Apart from this ambiguous wording of "acting independently," there would be an absolute legalization of delivered price—I quote again—"if such prices are identical at different delivery points." The wording has a finality that is almost terrifying to any believer in the antitrust laws.

Actually this wording goes even much further than a zoning system, which at least pretends to be an equality of treatment, even though it may be the same that spurious equality of equal delivered prices to all buyers in the zone. Under this wording for the proposed exception "A", a seller could select two or more favorite customers in entirely different parts of the country, give them identical delivered prices no matter how great the difference in freight, but much lower prices than for any other customers, and thus, by the device of identical pricing to favorite customers, be legally able to discriminate pricewise against all other customers. Who could say with any reference that such a practice did not fit into the bill's wording authorizing the seller to "sell at delivered prices if such prices are identical at different delivery points"? The language of the bill does not use the words "zoning system." The words used, as quoted by me, are broad enough to include everything, including the kitchen sink, to pile on the prostrate body of the Robinson-Patman Act already laid low by the other sections of S. 1008.

See footnote at end of speech.

S. 1008 PERPETUATES AND LEGALIZES PRICE DISCRIMINATION NOW FORBIDDEN UNDER ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Now, let us look at the other exception to the Robinson-Patman Act as provided for in section 2 of the bill; namely, exception "B", which does, at least up to this date,[1] have the protection of the Carroll amendment. And let us assume, which I am not prepared to admit, that the Carroll amendment is fully sufficient to protect against freight-absorption abuses "to meet the equally low price of a competitor in good faith." But, mark this well, the provision goes on to say—I quote—"this may include the maintenance, above or below the price of such competitor, of a differential in price which such seller customarily maintains." In other words—if one of the giant suppliers now "customarily maintains" a price differential, by one device or another, it might continue to maintain this differential. This might be so even if the differential is unlawful under the present antitrust laws or the Robinson-Patman Act. The bill uses the word "customarily"; it does not also use the word "legally."

I am not splitting hairs when I read into the bill a sharp distinction between the words "customarily" and "legally." One of our great Senators, who is intimately connected with this bill, made a speech, after it had left the Senate, trying to reconcile his championship of small business with his sponsorship of this bill. He stated that, if business customs become firmly enough entrenched, it is the function of the law to bow to those customs. That is exactly what this language would do.

The provision contained in exception B of section 2 of the bill is absolution by past indulgence. It is a "grandfather's clause" in favor of antitrust law and Robinson-Patman Act violators. It is a "grandfather's clause" in favor of existing customary price differentials, even those now illegal. At least it would give this argument to the monopoly boys before the courts. It is not only a monstrous mutilation and desecration of the antitrust laws; it is a negation of the underlying American philosophy of free enterprise as we normally expect free enterprise to operate. I am confident that, if it were not for the heat engendered by the Carroll amendment and the failure to hold regular committee hearings, which would have brought out all the issues in advance, this language would have been stricken.

S. 1008 DEPRIVES BUYERS OF STRONGEST EVIDENTIAL WEAPON AGAINST PRICE DISCRIMINATION

Finally, we come to section 3 of S. 1008. This section knocks out the Robinson-Patman Act all across the board—not only as to delivered-price and freight-absorption situations. This is an outright amendment to the entire Robinson-Patman Act. It directly affects all of you people here and association members in all the cases which may be brought before the Federal Trade Commission involving discrimination as to price, discounts, services, etc.

Section 3 of the bill amends section 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act part of the Clayton Act. The present section provides that, upon proof of price discrimination, a prima facie case is made out before the Federal Trade Commission. Nothing more need be proved to make out a prima facie case against the seller by the buyer. The respondent must then step forward, and "unless justification shall be affirmatively shown," a cease and desist order may be issued terminating the discrimination. This rule, putting the burden of proof largely upon the seller, is in the law because of the difficulty of proving this type of case where the facts are too often within the offender's peculiar knowledge. The proceeding is a civil, not a criminal, one; no fines or jail sentences are imposed. The rule is therefore in accord with principles of fairness and due process. Moreover, the Federal Trade Commission, so often maligned by big offenders for being oppressive, has not insisted on its strict enforcement. However, it is an altogether salutary provision to have on the books.

What does section 3 of S. 1008 do with this salutary provision of the Robinson-Patman Act? It just throws it out the window. Section 3 makes it necessary and mandatory for the complainant to show not only price discrimination but also unlawful effect on competition. Even this enlarged showing is not called a prima facie case by section 3, although the section does state that the burden of justification then passes to the respondent.

Finally, believe it or not, section 3 also adopts the "grandfather's clause." It provides that justification may include not only meeting a competitor's price, by selling below or above it, but a differential which the seller "customarily" maintains.

Beautiful, beautiful, wonderful—for the monopolists. But I guess you can see why I oppose S. 1008, even with the Carroll amendment.

S. 1008 LOBBY DESPERATELY ATTEMPTS TROJAN-HORSE MANEUVER

I have been told that Bill Simon, leading lobbyist for clarification, has one more card up his sleeve. His hope has been, of course, that S. 1008, with all its attacks on the Robinson-Patman Act, would pass even without the partial protection to the Robinson-Patman Act afforded by the Carroll amendment. However, the bill is in the hands of the conferees and, by reason of the strong position taken by foes of monopoly, including the druggists, grocers, and other associations, there is considerable doubt as to whether the bill could be reported out without the Carroll amendment. I have been told that, under these circumstances, the ace which this resourceful gentleman is going to produce is an attempt to buy off the opposition of the druggists, grocers, and similar associations by a compromise on the Carroll amendment.[1]

How does he propose to do this? Well, first, he will forget that the whole bill is conceived in destroying the Robinson-Patman Act and that he openly stated only a week or so ago that he does not believe in the Robinson-Patman Act. He will have you forget that section 2 of the bill authorizes the zoning price system, a variation of the basing-point system, and authorizes it without any protection of the Carroll amendment. He will also have you forget that the same section contains the "grandfather's clause" authorizing the perpetuation of price differentials which sellers customarily maintain, even though they may have maintained them contrary to the Robinson-Patman Act. He will try to make you forget section 3 of the bill, the across-the-board attack on the Robinson-Patman Act, applying in all price-discrimination cases, not only freight-absorption cases, and also containing a "grandfather's clause."

BEWARE OF LOBBYISTS BEARING GIFTS

What will he propose? I am told that he will propose that the Carroll amendment[1] may still apply to protect competition among the buyers, but that there should be a change in the amendment so that it should no longer apply to protect competition among the sellers. Under this proposal, the sellers will be permitted to go their own sweet way, eliminating, as far as possible, bothersome competition among themselves. This will be the sellers' end of the bargain.

However, the sellers would still continue to be prohibited, as provided for under the present Robinson-Patman Act and under the Carroll amendment, from conduct which would affect competition among the buyers.

See footnote at end of speech.

This will be your end of the bargain. How it would be worked out in words I would like to see.

The sellers would be saying, in effect, to you buyers: Since you are so insistent upon the Carroll amendment, we are now ready to tell you that we would not think of doing anything adversely affecting competition among our various customers, such as discriminating in favor of one buyer, even in good faith, as against others; and you may have your Carroll amendment[1] for that purpose and your associations may go back to you and say that they won this victory for you. All that we ask is that, if we let you alone, you let us alone, and that in return for our concession to you you leave us to our own pricing and zoning devices. I am even told that they might be willing to give up section 3 of the bill, as a final inducement—inasmuch as nothing is mentioned therein, one way or another, about freight absorption. But they will not be willing to give up the zoning-price section, you can be pretty sure, and I doubt that they will give up the "grandfather's clause." They would want to keep these handy instruments of monopoly. They would want to keep all the essentials in the bill which will keep them in the price saddle.

They will be saying to you, "Just let the wolf get big and fat and you, Red Riding Hood, will have nothing to worry about, not a thing, either in the meantime or later."

SMALL BUSINESS WILL NOT BE DECEIVED BY HIGH-PRESSURE LOBBYING TACTICS

Well, this proposed compromise, of which I have been told, sounds a little different than the attacks on the Robinson-Patman Act made by the gentleman in question at the American Bar Association. But it is not too different. It is just reverse English. I am sure you will know how to handle that ball.

No matter what the compromise offered, if any, you will know that, if they decide that half a loaf is better than none. It is because they would be getting the bigger half—in fact, practically the whole loaf.

I think that the conferees on S. 1008 will know that, too; I think that small business will be the winner after all; and I think—and I certainly hope—that S. 1008 will not become a law in any form.

Small-business men are alert to the situation. Your organization is alert to the danger. The danger of any change of this nature in these parts of the Robinson-Patman Act—even a comma, as I so often say—is enough for the Robinson-Patman Act opponents, with their smart and well-paid lawyers, to defy the law again in the course of endless court litigation in construing the meaning of such changes. Years can go by in that process in the future—just like years have gone by in the past—and then when the Supreme Court hands down a clarifying decision they ask for a new law from Congress to clarify the decision by reversing it.

Finally, I am more than confident that small business will settle the S. 1008 controversy for nothing less than the Carroll amendment. Small business will not be misled or deceived by this last desperate drive to sabotage our antitrust laws—the only real protection of small business and free enterprise.

[1] On October 13, 1949, subsequent to the presentation of the above statements, the conference committee reported out the bill with a "compromise" omitting the saving language of both the Carroll amendment and the Kefauver amendment, and inserting absolutely reverse language in section 4 of the bill. Thus, the objectives of the real backers of the bill to destroy the Robinson-Patman Act, referred to in the above, were made quite explicit. Although the House approved the report, the Senate balked, and the matter is scheduled to come up again before the Senate on January 20.

We Must Not Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD, two fine, well-thought-out and well-expressed editorials from the Montana Kaimin, the official newspaper of Montana State University.

It is my hope that the Members of Congress will read these editorials because to me they represent thoughts which should always be in our minds in these troublous times.

To F. G. L. I want to express my thanks for putting into words the truths we must never forget.

HOPE—A 1949 THANKSGIVING THEME

This is Thanksgiving, 1949. It is the fifth since the end of World War II. In the span of five short years, the human mind has shown a resilience that has enabled us to all but forget the Dachaus, Belsens, and San Paulos.

Five short years have supplanted our revulsion of war's brutality with hope that maybe this time, someday, somehow, we will achieve our true destiny as human beings and act like human beings.

In the past 5 years of fumbling, stumbling, anger, fear, and selfishness; many times we have lost sight of our goals while looking for the mileposts. We have made many mistakes for which we cannot be thankful; but the role America has chosen for itself in the brave new world is not an easy one. Often we have stooped to tactics and practices that were once repulsive to us when used by others, but we have never lost hope—that abstract, undefinable something that enables mankind to rise from the muck and mire of its shortcomings and reaffirm pledges of peace for all generations to come.

Yes; there are many things for which we can feel only shame, but there are many other things for which we can truly be thankful.

We can be thankful for American justice. Judge Medina with his patient, impartial handling of the trial of would-be betrayers of our country, earned new greatness and added new dignity to the American concept of justice.

We can be thankful for the United Nations. The past year has seen this organization settle the disputes in Palestine and Indonesia in the sane, human way of using the conference table rather than the battlefield.

We can be thankful that American labor has the right and exercises the right to strike. What better answer can our democracy give to those critics who call the American capitalist system a slave system. There are no strikes behind the iron curtain.

We can be thankful for the American people's assumption of responsibility as well as world leadership in the fight for a better world. With the Marshall plan we can, and are, restoring the war-torn democracies and with the Atlantic Pact we are underwriting the hope that all these nations cherish for freedom.

We can be thankful for that softness in the American character that Hitler called decadence. This softness has enabled us to think of a world built on justice and freedom rather than revenge and hatred.

Above all we can be thankful for the laughter of children who live in a world that is the paradise man seeks to regain.—F. G. L.

THE BATTLE FOR PEACE MUST BE WON

It has been 8 years since Pearl Harbor. It has been 4 years since Hiroshima. It has been 3 years since men began dying that man might live.

The thousands of crosses that point heavenward in silent, symmetrical rows are the mute testimonials of faith to what men believed and died for.

In their faith, the dead have left us a sacred trust. A simple but vital trust that unless achieved, will mean more sacrifice of human lives, more degradation, more privation, and more shame.

These men died to win a battle—a battle that links vitally in the chain of struggle that eventually means peace. They have won their battle—the war. Now, lest what they have won be lost, we, the living, must win our battle for peace.

We must never lose sight of freedom from fear, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom of expression. We must achieve these for them and for the dignity of mankind now living and yet to be born.

We must work hard for fulfillment of the dream reborn in the United Nations Charter at San Francisco. We must fight the battle of intolerance to achieve a more perfect democracy.

Hunger and ignorance must be defeated if our trust is to be fulfilled. Freedom of religion must be extended unless we want the moral basis of our society to decay and disappear.

Ours is a battle that does not end in armistices or treaties; but one that never ends because our enemies—intolerance, hunger, ignorance, and prejudice—are ever present waiting for us to relax or drop our guard.

They can destroy our dignity as men and destroy the trust left us by the dead, with appeals to our self-interests, our greeds, our vanities, and our human weaknesses.

To the men under those thousands of crosses, we owe this opportunity to seek truth, establish justice, and regain our human dignity. We owe it to them and to those that will follow our footsteps to wage a total war for peace and a better world for all men.

Anything short of total efforts on our part will make a mockery and a farce out of Pearl Harbor, D-day, Iwo Jima, Bastogne, and Anzio—and slaves of ourselves.—F. G. L.

Practical Internationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein a very thoughtful address by Mr. Walter Cenerazzo, national president of the American Watchworkers Union, before the International Student's Center at Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass. Mr. Cenerazzo, who is a brilliant and progressive young labor leader, is not only a keen student of Government but also a penetrating analyst of foreign and domestic economic trends.

His viewpoint is refreshingly American and he is a stanch believer in our free

competitive system as well as our basic political and parliamentary institutions.

The address follows:

PRACTICAL INTERNATIONALISM

To address a group of students who come from many foreign lands to obtain an education in American colleges and universities is indeed a rare privilege for a labor leader whose avocation has been to study the economic conditions existing in foreign lands.

Today in this world there exists a sharp cleavage as to the systems of government. One trend of thought is predicated upon the outgrowth of the idea established in the Magna Carta of King John in the thirteenth century, which is that human dignity shall prevail; that men are not the chattel property of anyone, be it feudal lords, kings, or the politburo; that men shall have the right to choose their own religion, their own field of endeavor in employment, and live within their own family unit as dignified human beings.

The other trend of thought is that produced by totalitarian government, which claims as the first obligation from its citizens allegiance to the government. Their theory is that men should work, eat, live where they are told, take their recreation as the government plans it, and that men have never the right to criticize their rulers. There is no difference between this modern-day totalitarianism and the slaves of Egypt. Both represent tyranny and lack of respect for human dignity.

The free nations of this earth have come a long way since the signing of the English Magna Carta by King John, and as each century has gone by men have gained more and more freedom in an economic way which has given to them freedom in other ways.

To me, one of the unsung heroes in the battle for the freedom of men was a great American—Benjamin Franklin. This man Franklin had an opportunity to observe conditions in England as a workman and later as a statesman. He visited France and lived there during the French Revolution. He was a student of governments, and it is my opinion that the citizens of the United States owe to this man a deep debt of gratitude for our immortal Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States. The thinking that went into that Constitution, which separated the executive, the legislative, and judicial branches of government, was long-range thinking to forever bar any man or men from treating human beings as serfs within the boundaries of the United States of America.

In the century and a half that followed the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, men and women have lived with human dignity and in the industrial revolution have been the people of the only Nation in the world who are a great middle class. Nowhere else in this world will you find a lack of class struggle, nowhere else in this world will you find possible a way of life by which men and women can set their goals within the family unit and achieve them for that family.

In the past several years, I have visited the South American Continent and the European Continent. In South America I had the opportunity to visit Peru, Chile, Uruguay, Argentina, and Brazil. In Europe this summer I visited England, Scotland, Belgium, Holland, France, Italy, Switzerland, and western Germany.

In each of these countries I visited industrial plants to witness the engineering and research skills and to see how productive labor was. I asked many questions concerning living conditions, wages, governmental controls, and where the ideas in existence in the government of the country came from.

One basic element was missing from every single one of these countries—and that was a virile labor movement dedicated to collective labor bargaining with employers to obtain a fair share of the fruits of productivity for the employees of industry.

Oh, yes, there was a labor movement in each and every one of these countries, but those that led it were either Socialists, Communists, Christian Union Democrats, Falangists, Apristas, or some other type of ism which was dedicated to curing economic ills by government fiat. In each case the labor leader of these countries was wrapped up in a political movement to take over the administration of the government. To me this is not the way that a great middle class of people is created within a nation. In these countries there are only the very rich and the very poor, and the purchasing power of the very poor is indeed very small. You cannot have prosperity for a nation unless the rank and file of the people have purchasing power in their hands and can purchase what they produce.

We in the United States, unfortunately, in my opinion, have at the helm of our State Department a group of men who have no understanding of business economics, and who have been in a daydream for many years on the problems of foreign trade. These men believe that you can purchase goods from a foreign country and give to that foreign country prosperity when the persons that made the goods obtained wages that would not enable them to feed themselves properly let alone clothe themselves properly. There can be no prosperity for any country unless the workers of that country obtain a fair share of the fruits of productivity that will enable them to purchase the goods of other workers to consume themselves.

That's the key of the prosperity of the citizens of the United States. Purchasing power—consumer income—with which to purchase consumer goods.

The United States program for reciprocal trade does not and will not help either the American worker or foreign workers. All it does is make the importer richer at the expense of both the American worker and the foreign worker.

For this reason I have advocated for some time a twofold program in the field of foreign trade, which, in my opinion, if carried out would create a middle class of people with purchasing power in every country in this world.

I believe the United States should lead the way by creating a Board of Foreign Trade, composed of 15 persons. The fifteen to be appointed—five by the President of the United States, five by the United States Senate, and five by the United States House of Representatives. Three of each group should be appointed from the majority party in control, and two from the minority party.

This Board of Foreign Trade should have complete control and jurisdiction over all economics that have to do with foreign trade, and every other department of Government should be stripped of authority in this field.

This Board of Trade, with its 15 members, would negotiate agreements with a foreign country on a bilateral basis only, and every agreement with each country would have to stand on its own merit and what considerations that were granted to one country, would not necessarily have to be given to another country.

The type of men I would like to see appointed to this Board would be the best talent available in the field of business, finance, economics, agriculture, and labor. They should receive at least $25,000 per year for serving on the Board.

This Board of Trade should have established within it a statistical department with competent men to establish the production costs on every article produced in the United States, and these records should be kept up to date so that every time unit costs go up or down it is reflected in the records.

In negotiating an agreement with a foreign country this Board of Trade would ascertain the unit costs of production in the foreign country they are negotiating with, and they would establish tariffs equal only to the difference in the unit costs between the cost of production in the United States and the costs of production in the foreign country with consideration given for transportation and insurance costs to bring the article to the United States.

As wages were increased, or unit costs increased in the foreign country, the tariffs would be reduced accordingly. Thus, as more wages were paid to foreign workers, more purchasing power would be in their hands to buy consumer goods and more prosperity would be available for that nation.

This Board of Foreign Trade would have authority to put a limitation on amount of goods to come into the United States of any type; they would have the authority to impose quotas, raise tariffs, lower tariffs, and to negotiate in any manner they deemed essential.

All tariffs which they collected would be put into a fund which I would call the point 4 fund to be spent for the development of underdeveloped areas throughout the world. The Board would be given authority to refund all of the tariffs to a nation for its development if it deemed it wise.

Thus, a twofold purpose would be accomplished. No goods could compete in the United States except at equality at the border and importers' excess profits would be eliminated. The foreign worker would find his employer paying him more wages, for there would be no point in paying him low wages and then paying the difference in tariff to the United States.

In the distribution of point 4 money the second part of my program would come into play, for I would allow no nation to participate in obtaining any of this money unless they first adopt in the constitution of their country a bill of rights comparable to ours and establish a separation of the powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches so that dictators could no longer function or gain a foothold in the future.

With the adoption of this bill of rights would come a new day for the working men and women of foreign countries, for they would be guaranteed the right of free association and forming unions of their own choosing. And thus a virile labor movement would gather momentum and bring about a standard of living that creates a great middle class.

The reciprocal trade program of the United States establishes the same tariff regardless of the wage conditions between nations. Goods produced in a country paying 10 cents an hour wages come into the United States at the same tariff as goods produced in a country paying 50 cents an hour wages. Where do you think investment capital is going to open factories under such a tariff program?

This Board of Foreign Trade that I suggest should have industrial engineers in its employ to visit factories in the United States to make sure they are efficient and productive and have adopted modern technological improvements, and if they have not a leveling factor should be placed on their unit cost of production in the records to penalize them for their inefficiency.

There is no room in this world for inefficiency, obsolete methods, and failure to introduce modern production methods. Only in a world where there is efficiency and modern efficient production can the rank and file of people participate in the enjoyment of the goods they produce.

If every country established such a Board of Foreign Trade it would not be long before all the low wages in this world would gradually disappear and we would have fair living standards for all the workers in the freedom

loving nations of this world. And when misery, terrible housing, improper diet, and squalid living conditions disappear from a nation and an honest democratic labor movement does its job well in obtaining more and more each year in collective bargaining within the framework of prosperous corporate enterprise, those that represent totalitarianism will find the seeds of communism which they spread falling upon sterile ground, which refuses to accept their ideology.

To me there is no substitute for cooperative capitalism to achieve human dignity. Cooperative capitalism to me means adequate dividends to the investor for the risk that he takes in furnishing capital to purchase the tools and equipment, adequate payment to management for furnishing the brains of direction to the enterprise; fair wages to labor for fair work with the accompanying security that prosperous enterprise can give to its employees. And last, but not least, the lowest possible consumer prices for all that effective cooperation between investor, management, and labor can produce.

This is what has made America what it is. It is what has given more people opportunity for a better lot in life than any other economic system yet devised in this world. There is only one way we can preserve it—and that is for every other nation in this world that respects human dignity to achieve the same program and for our Nation to establish a flexible tariff system to protect American workingmen while point 4 does its work in building the production facilities of other nations.

Taxes Can Kill America's Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include this editorial by Ray Hansen, editor of the Daily Jefferson County Union of Fort Atkinson, Wis.:

TAXES CAN KILL AMERICA'S GROWTH

The gravest and most far-reaching internal issue this country faces is the cost of its government. And of all issues, it is probably the least understood.

At a time when the Federal Government's income is at a near-record peak, and when the burden of taxation borne by the people is without precedent in days of peace, the Nation is unable to make both ends meet. It is running a heavy deficit which will be added to the towering national debt—a debt which is a direct obligation upon every man with an income, a piece of property, or material resources of any kind.

There is, of course, a glib answer to all of this. It is: "Tax the rich man and the rich business; let them carry the load for the rest of us." But the fact is that we could tax the rich into financial extinction and the proceeds wouldn't even come close to paying the bill. It is the tens of millions with moderate means—not the few with large means—who are hurt by extravagant government.

But that is not the end of the story. Something infinitely ominous is quietly happening in this country. Taxes are killing our economic growth.

A recent article in Newsweek describes this. Sales of common stock in industry largely determine whether we shall have good times or bad, an expanding economy or a static economy, more employment or less in the future. Yet, Newsweek says, last year trading in stocks accounted for only 4 percent of the national income where, in the 35 years prior to 1930, it averaged more than 40 percent. This means, the magazine goes on, that "If most of our corporations were not already in existence, it would be impossible today to create them." The money that once went into the enterprises upon which our living standards and world leadership are built is being taxed out of existence.

This is but one illustration out of many that could be cited. Every individual whose income is above the subsistence level knows how onerous taxes are. Practically everyone talks at one time or another about the cost of government and how something must be done. But talk is generally the beginning and the end of it.

This brings us to a fundamental fact. Wasteful, excessively costly government is simply a symptom of a condition of overwhelming significance. That condition cannot be described in cold figures. It exists in the minds and hearts of the people.

In the last 20 years there has been an insidious change in our concept of government. We have turned to it to perform tasks which always before were the duty of the individual and the local community. More and more of us look to Government to protect us in every way. We are losing our independence. We ask Government to protect our health, build our homes, care for us if we are unemployed, and see us through all the way from the cradle to the grave. We ask it to provide more and more goods and services. The polite term for this "gimme" habit is "the welfare state," a softer name for socialism. The welfare state always leads to one of two conclusions: It impoverishes and enslaves the people and subjects them to ruthless dictatorship, as in eastern Europe, or, finally, the people rid themselves of its worst manifestations, as the voters of New Zealand and Australia recently did. But even in the latter case the wealth of nations has been dissipated, and the tentacles of government have been woven so tight that it may take generations to recover.

Therefore, taxation directly affects all our liberties. Excessively expensive government is always supergovernment. It is paternalistic government; it is, in its more advanced stages, government by fiat and decree; it is, in its final stages, government by terror. The Russian Revolution was fought in the name of the common man, and now, in that huge "people's state," tens of millions of common men and women live miserably in medieval darkness and real liberty is unknown.

The basic troubles of the world, from war to human want, can in one way or another be charged to too much government. All-powerful government is simply a reflection of the loss of individual self-reliance, initiative, pride, independence of spirit, the will to work—the qualities which made possible the founding and the growth of this Republic. We, as a people, are fortunate that we have not yet gone so far on the welfare-state road that we cannot turn back. We can still have ourselves from the final disaster that has overcome so much of the world. But we, as a people, must do it ourselves. Big government will not do it for us. We must ask ourselves this question: "Are we willing, in return for a mirage of material security, for which we pay through exorbitant taxation, to sacrifice those liberties for which men have fought and struggled for 3,000 years?"

Immediate Vote on Statehood for Hawaii Recommended by Public Lands Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a report submitted to the chairman of the House Committee on Public Lands, under date of January 10, by a subcommittee which recently toured the islands of the Central Pacific and the Far East, urging that H. R. 49 be brought to an immediate vote.

I wish especially to invite the attention of the Members of the House to the considerations which prompt this recommendation.

The report follows:

JANUARY 10, 1950.

HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Public Lands,
House of Representatives.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your Special Committee on Pacific Territories and Island Possessions strongly urges that steps be taken to bring to a vote immediately H. R. 49, the bill to admit Hawaii to the Union as a State. This measure has been pending on the House Calendar since last March, when it was reported by the Committee on Public Lands with only one dissenting vote.

En route to Samoa, the Trust Territory, Guam, and the Far East the committee stopped for 2 days at Honolulu. The headquarters of the Pacific Fleet Command and the government of the Trust Territory is stationed there. The officials charged with the government of Samoa, the Trust Territory, and Guam have drawn heavily upon the experience and the personnel of Hawaii in meeting many of their most important problems in the field of education, science, and agriculture. In traveling through these islands the committee found in many places the results of the very important influence being exerted by Hawaii. People of the Pacific look to Hawaii in many respects much as the French do to Paris, the British to London, and Americans to Washington and New York. It is unquestionably one of the principal cultural centers of the Pacific and recognized as such by those who have been charged with the responsibility for the administration of our Pacific possessions.

On its return from Tokyo the committee spent 4 days in Hawaii. Its members met with the principal public officials of the Territory and leaders in every field of civic activities. The committee was a guest at a community luncheon organized by the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce and conferred at length with members of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, an official agency of the Territorial government charged with the responsibility of promoting statehood for Hawaii.

The committee found Hawaii more aggressively determined to achieve statehood than at any time in the past. The overwhelming majority of people with whom its members talked expressed themselves emphatically in favor of the admission of Hawaii to the Union, believing this would serve not only

the best interest of the Territory but of the United States.

This point of view has been strengthened rather than weakened by the serious economic situation that has resulted first from the sharp reductions of the Military and Naval Establishment in Hawaii and second from a strike of longshoremen that lasted for a period of almost 6 months. The Territory is preparing to deal vigorously with the serious problem of unemployment that was brought about by the former development and takes pride in the action of its legislature which brought about a resumption of stevedoring operations and at least a limited amount of shipping during the period of the longshoremen's strike. The emphasis given to local responsibility by the Federal administration and the Congress in meeting these problems has caused people in Hawaii to feel more strongly than ever that the additional local authority and greater representation in Washington that would come with statehood should be granted at once.

Prompt enactment of H. R. 49 will strengthen the position of this country among people of the Pacific Islands and the Far East. Many of these people regard the future with great apprehension. The advances of communism and the uncertainties as to what course this country might pursue to meet these advances in the Pacific has filled them with grave doubts. That they look to the United States for leadership in meeting this problem and all of the threat that it holds for the freedoms inherent in the democratic way of life is unmistakable. The committee found evidences of this both in the principal centers of population in the islands of the South and Central Pacific and in the Orient. These people are anxious to be reassured that the influence of this country will be exerted to the fullest in support of their efforts to achieve and sustain the freedom inherent in democracy.

The prompt admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State will be notice to the people of the Pacific and to the world that this country intends in no sense to retreat from its position of leadership in the Pacific, won at a great cost in World War II, and on the contrary proposes that every legitimate step be taken to preserve and strengthen the objectives achieved in that struggle.

It will be reassuring to the friends of democracy. The United States will give them a practical demonstration of its belief in the democratic system of government by admitting Hawaii to the Union as a State and its people, thereby, to the full privileges of American citizenship. This example will be of far-reaching influence in Japan, the Philippines, Korea, and China, from whence many of Hawaii's people, now American citizens of long residence in the islands, originally migrated.

It will provide an effective answer to Communist propaganda that is undertaking to persuade the people of the Pacific, and particularly the Far East, that there are racial barriers in the American system of government that militate against people of oriental origin.

It will serve to bring the people of Hawaii into closer relationship to the people of the rest of the country and the latter to a full appreciation of our responsibilities in the Pacific.

Hawaii has long been a proving ground of the American way of life. It has been a lighthouse of democracy in the Pacific. Its relationship to the Pacific and the Far East has been and is today important to the future of our country in this great area. It is both a gateway to the Pacific and the Far East and a common meeting ground of the divergent cultures of Occident and the Orient.

Your committee, therefore, recommends that the promise of statehood long held out to the people of Hawaii be promptly fulfilled. It believes that action at this time is in the national interest.

JOHN E. MILES,
Chairman.
FRED L. CRAWFORD.
WILLIAM LEMKE.
JAY LEFEVRE.
GEORGE P. MILLER.
EDWARD H. JENISON.
JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
Delegate from Hawaii.

Defenseless America—The Isolationists' Paradise Penny-Wise but Pound-Foolish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I would like to say that an old-time philosopher, one Will Rogers, used to preface his remarks by saying, facetiously, that all he knew about it was what he had read in the papers. He neglected to supply the unnecessary information that he read what he had told the papers.

So I am confronted with some newspaper items relating to what I told the newspapers' representatives. Here they are:

I see a headline in the Rutland Herald of the 10th ultimo, "PLUMLEY warns of United States Pacific defense needs" in big letters across the column. And then here comes another, "More than one big carrier is needed," declares PLUMLEY, who goes on to say as follows:

"The Communists have pushed us into Pacific and Asiatic waters up to our necks and we will need more than one big carrier as a life preserver," Congressman CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, Republican, of Vermont, told the press today as he emerged from a hearing of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Armed Services.

Today's was the first of daily hearings scheduled up to March 12 by the five-man subcommittee of which the Vermont Congressman is a member.

The subcommittee is considering a total appropriation of $13,500,000,000.

"Recent action of the State Department relative to Formosa," the Congressman said, "seems to make it necessary to protect ourselves at sea rather than on, off, or from land bases. Eventually, we'll fight either here or on the sea. And do not fool yourself," he warned, "we had better be prepared."

The Vermont Congressman was among Members of Congress who vigorously protested Secretary of Defense Johnson's order to abandon construction of a huge naval carrier last spring.

Now both of these things remind me of the fact that way back last March there appears an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD entitled "Our Place in the Far East," which, by reason of permission heretofore granted, I quote:

OUR PLACE IN THE FAR EAST

(Extension of remarks of Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, of Vermont, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, March 3, 1949)

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, by virtue of permission granted, I am including a letter I wrote the State Department and the answer thereto.

I am putting this correspondence into the RECORD as a matter of protection.

Some years ago while a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I protested the shipment of iron scrap to Japan. I insisted upon the building of stock piles of necessary material. While I made my position perfectly clear with regard to those two matters, I did not at that time make any statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This time, however, I wish my position to be a matter of public record.

For some time I have disagreed with the State, Army, and Navy Departments relative to the policy we have pursued with respect to China.

While chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy, I sent around the world one very well qualified to make a report to me relative to our situation in the East, for the use of the subcommittee.

I have repeatedly announced my layman's opinion with regard to what should be done by us to maintain a world position we did not seek but which we must either sustain or quit.

Here are the letters which briefly outline my position concerning the present situation in the Far East. I am still compelled to think we are making the greatest mistake possible unless and until we assume the burden of our responsibility.

JANUARY 24, 1949.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Some time ago I informed the Secretary of Defense as to my intense interest in the matter of our lack of proper consideration of what our situation in China soon will be.

Last fall, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy, I sent a qualified representative to China to make an inspection and to report to me the result of his investigation. I have transmitted the substance of the report to the Secretary of the Navy.

I desire to be informed what has been done by the State Department looking toward the acquisition, under some kind of lease arrangement, of Tsingtao.

Tsingtao, German planned and built, "has almost everything to recommend it as a base for military and naval operations. As you know, it is situated on the coast of the strategic Shantung Peninsula and possesses one of the world's most excellent harbors. Here the Germans builded well and their handiwork remains in use even today. The topography of the area with rugged mountains surrounding it ideally recommends itself to military defenses. This fact was patently shown by the first German defense of Tsingtao during the First World War.

"The plain facts are that we are spending limited amounts of money here in the maintenance of our garrison on invitation of the present Chinese Government. Expenditures are made, however, only to that extent which is necessary to maintain it as a temporary makeshift base of operations with no real control over the area. This place has great

possibilities for development but as previously indicated we are here merely on invitation and common sense would dictate that it would be foolhardy to expend large sums to install those permanent installations so necessary for the creation of a modern naval establishment unless there were assurances forthcoming that we alone would be the recipients of the benefits of our own handiwork. In my judgment the acquisition of Tsingtao under lease arrangement should be attempted. It would require hard work and delicate diplomacy but it is well worth that try. Such an accomplishment would be of tremendous benefit to the United States of America.

"Tsingtao definitely lies across the Russian path southward down the coast of China. Developed, it would stand as a powerful checkmate to Russian communism at Dairen, Manchuria, and Vladivostok. Most important of all is the fact that it would be a toehold for America on the China coast in the event that all of China falls into the hands of the Chinese Communists. I am not one who believes that Russia will absorb China if this should take place. I do believe, however, that the Chinese Reds will, if they obtain the ascendancy, need economic aid and that should we be so located we would still be in a position to approach them—and they approach us—in the channels of trade. I am also not so sure but that this Chinese brand of communism in due time if properly handled could be changed to something less than Red. It is well worth noting that past events indicated that millions of Chinese are susceptible to the persuasion of economic conditions. At least the chances of modification or conversion of Chinese communism would be far greater than if we were nonexistent on the China coast.

"Most diabolical would be the withdrawal of American forces from China and the subsequent establishment of leased Russian bases along the Chinese coast provided by a Chinese Government friendly to and in obligation to Red Russia. To face such a situation, the United States as I see it would be forced to expend untold billions in Japan, Okinawa, Guam, and the Philippines or else be reconciled to a withdrawal from the Western Pacific. The latter would be a most dangerous step."

We should, if it now be possible, negotiate a lease of the old German base at Tsingtao, rebuild and modernize it, and that at the earliest possible moment.

We should not continue to be so inconsiderate of our own welfare as we were when, against the protests of many, we continued to ship scrap iron to Japan, neglected to afford ourselves a second waterway route from the Atlantic to the Pacific transisthmus, anchored our fleet in the harbor of Oahu as a target and an invitation to the massacre which occurred.

I feel very deeply about the matter of the lease of the fortifications at Tsingtao, as I have felt concerning the other matters to which I refer and I am writing this letter as and for a matter of record in that respect.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 4, 1949.

The Honorable CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. PLUMLEY: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of January 24, 1949, indicating your interest in the acquisition by the United States of the city of Tsingtao under a lease arrangement with the Chinese Government and asking that you be informed regarding the steps which the Department of State has taken to that end.

The Department of State had not previously been aware of your deep concern in this problem and your views have been received with interest. They have been made available to the immediately concerned officers in the Office of Far Eastern Affairs who are available for consultation with you at any time about the problems involved in your suggestion that this Government acquire Tsingtao under a lease arrangement. This Department has not been informed by the National Military Establishment that such action is desirable for military purposes and has taken no steps looking toward the negotiation of such a lease. Thank you for making your views available and be assured of this Department's interest in receiving them.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Counselor
(For the Secretary of State).

Mr. Speaker, it is a sorry story but, in the face and eyes of such a group as was confronting our civilization, we did nothing, as usual, under our alleged foreign policy of appeasement and on have come the Communists till they have reached Formosa as was to be anticipated. So, some months ago, I raised my feeble voice to suggest that we enter into a long-term lease with Chiang Kai-shek in order to try to cover us, that is to say, to protect us, and by us I mean the world, against the further advance of communism in Formosa, and I offered the suggestion that if such action in the premises were impossible of accomplishment or of performance, diplomatically, that in order to preserve the peace of the world, quietly, we might submit the possibility of the negotiation of some kind of leasehold right for us to a plebiscite for the consideration of the people of Formosa. So far as I know, no action was ever taken along the line which I, a nondiplomatic statesman and just a common Congressman, had suggested. Nothing was done, as usual, by us, but the Communists continued to advance.

DIPLOMACY RESPECTED

Now, I respect the necessity of diplomacy in world affairs and defer to diplomatic action, so long as it conserves our safety as a body politic. Nevertheless, I like 24 hours' notice in advance as to who is going to massacre me, even with words. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that the people think we have a competent State Department to protect us, to protect you against Communist advances, which will hear nothing to suggestions made so practical, as everybody acknowledges, they would have resisted their advances?

PRO-RUSSIAN SYMPATHIZERS?

I regret I am compelled to believe, by reason of the reception accorded my suggestions, that the State Department of the United States is so saturated with pro-Russian sympathizers that we are vitally embarrassed. I think it is high time that we found out whether or not my suspicions are or are not well founded. Certainly no action taken by the State Department recently is in denial of my suspicions. Naturally, I would prefer that Russia be our friend but friendship is not to be bought by the sale of all that we hold dear nor by permitting her, I mean Russia, to tell us why and what to do and when to do it. It is time we stopped dead and started the clock which ticks appeasement.

SWITCH TO ALARM

It is time we switched it co to the alarm. Today we are not as capable as we would have the world think as to be thought transcendent militantly. That place can only be bought again at the cost of unnecessary blood and tears and treasure because of our unpreparedness which is the reason why we should properly prepare to so defend ourselves and so organize aggressively as to be able to make defense successfully and now.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that since the State Department has declared we are to have no bases on, off, or land from which to fight to defend ourselves and our rights, the only answer is that we will have to fight from the sea. To do that with the contemplated inadequate Navy and Marine Corps provided by proposed appropriations is nothing more or less than a challenge to a catastrophe.

We should be the rulers and the masters of the sea. That we can be, but it will cost money so to be. That we will not be as is proposed.

Unless we are willing to pay the price, we might as well, in the language of the State Department, "fade out of the picture" as some of those who are undertaking to dictate our alleged foreign policies and our programs obviously would have us to do, I know not why except I know their background.

THE PLACE OF THE CARRIER

One who reads dispassionately, fairly, impartially, as between the armed services, the history of the last war as written by representatives of all the services, must be struck by the repetition of the statement, "and the battle would have been lost if not then had come the carriers." The truth is, seaborne planes won the war initially, and it is so admitted by all the services undeniably. It is the truth that without the carriers the war could not have been won and would not have been won and would have been lost.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am for the big carrier and for a rescinding of the order blocking the building of the big carrier and for ordering it to be constructed at once. That was an act involving malice prepense.

As of today, more perhaps than at any other time in the history of this country, we need it, and others, for the protection and the safety it will afford us and insure. We need it, and more and others like it, and, in truth, a lot of small carriers.

The history of the last war proves my point, any civilian Secretary of Defense to the contrary notwithstanding.

I recognize the importance and the place of the airplane in the wars of the days that have to be as is evidenced by the position which I have taken. I am still more firmly convinced than ever, by reason of the position in which we find ourselves today, since Congress last met, and will find ourselves tomorrow that we need the big carrier, and more of them, and more now than ever.

Mr. Speaker, I have spent hours, days, weeks, months, and long years listening to and studying the advice of men who came up from Annapolis to be lieutenant commanders to captains to admirals, to membership on the Board of the Chiefs of Staff, and of graduates of West Point who have similarly become captains and major generals and members of those

boards to which I referred, as they tried to tell me the story of how a world war should be won, and as they demonstrated it should be won. Out of it all, I feel I have learned the lesson of the necessity for us this day to be able and capable and prepared to dominate and to control the sea primarily; and so it will ever be.

Sea power, Mr. Speaker, true sea power, is unique in military operations because it demands exclusiveness of possession. It becomes all or nothing at all. The security of the United States, and indeed the security of the western civilization, is dependent upon our maintenance of our present position in naval affairs. Maintenance of this position can only be continued as long as the Navy is provided the tools with which to carry out its responsibilities. Naval power requires air power in the fleet. World War II demonstrated that the airplane was the primary weapon of destruction and defense. The aircraft carriers of World War II paid for themselves over and over again by the efficiency and dispatch by which they destroyed both the German and Japanese sea power and brought the war to an early, successful conclusion. The carriers of World War II were mainly built in dire necessity for a specific period of operation. The submarine threat required a large number of small, easily built carriers known as the CVE's. These were built and performed their duty admirably but their continued use in the future is somewhat limited, except for special operations. The *Essex*-type carriers were mainly built for certain types or sizes of aircraft current in World War II. These too will pass into obsolescence in the next decade and are now limited to operation of present-day aircraft.

Since World War II the naval problem has been complicated. The problem of maintenance of naval superiority has been further threatened by the advent of faster and higher performance aircraft, the development of guided missiles, and the increased difficulties in handling the snorkel submarine.

The modern aircraft are mostly high-performance jet type. In order to get high rate of climb, high altitude performance, longer range, and greater striking power, these new aircraft have had to be built larger and stronger and hence are more dense. This density factor requires that the carrier decks be stronger than heretofore. The jet aircraft requires longer decks for take-off and for parking or handling a large number of bigger aircraft. The size of the new aircraft requires that the hangar deck space be larger than previously required. The heavier aircraft require heavier arresting gear and catapults. Jet aircraft are notoriously high fuel consumers and hence the new carriers must have a larger fuel capacity for aircraft. Efficient and continuous aircraft operations with high performance aircraft indicate the desirability for a flush deck carrier, such as was proposed for the U. S. S. *United States*. The increasing threat of the atomic bomb, guided missiles, and submarines to our shipping and naval forces requires greater protection by naval forces to reduce the losses to within acceptable limits. The lessons of Bikini must be applied to minimize damage from the A bomb. The lessons of World War II operations must find expression in new construction. These are the problems in a nutshell as I hope I have learned them.

I submit that the dynamics of air power and naval power requires new weapons to maintain the offensive capabilities, without which a navy is not capable of maintaining true sea power. It may be asked, "Why couldn't World War II carriers be modified to take care of these changes?" To some extent they can. I speak only as one who has listened trying to learn.

Two carriers of the *Essex* type are undergoing modernization at this time, and these modernizations are valuable. But to expect a World War II carrier to be suitable for extensive modernization is, in many ways, akin to recommending modernization of the B-17 and the B-29 aircraft of the Air Force for modern combat use. Major changes in structures and clearances and stowage space would make such attempts to modernize prohibitively costly and militarily and economically unsound. So I see it as a layman.

Time is a factor that is often overlooked in military affairs. The time required to design and construct a new carrier to incorporate the required improvements as were part of the U. S. S. *United States* was approximately 6 years. Preliminary talks and requirements were set up in 1945. The design took approximately 2 years, from 1946 to 1948. Construction was estimated between 36 and 48 months, giving the earlier date of completion somewhat in or after 1952. This carrier design was the result of studies of requirements to operate first-line aircraft developing today and operational in the next few years. This problem of a suitable carrier for the modern planes of the next decade is at present unsolved. It is still and will be a problem for years to come.

If this carrier is not built, two problems will face the Navy. The first is the gradual withdrawal from certain areas now under our control, such as the coastal waters of Europe, Mediterranean, and Middle East, due to the threat of modern and superior land-based aircraft. The second is the rapid obsolescence of United States naval power which no compensating gain by any other arm can overcome. This withering of naval power will result in the United States fleet becoming mainly a supply or logistic service which is liable to heavy losses and uncertain in performance due to its lack of combatant strength for exclusive control of the seas. Until the advent of guided missiles for primary missions of long-range attacks, the carrier task force capable of projecting high-speed, long-range, high-performance aircraft against the enemy, wherever he may be, is a necessity. Failure to build the new carrier automatically denies the Navy the tools required to discharge its responsibilities and to maintain its present superiority over all other navies. This fact has been amply supported before the congressional committees.

Who can say, that in the dynamics of weapons and aircraft changes, that the arresting of the carrier and naval aircraft development may not prevent our early and successful termination of world war III, if, and when it occurs. No competent naval man would take that responsibility for such stoppage in view of the high stakes involved.

We are primarily a maritime power and shipbuilding is vital to United States security. It must provide a base for ready expansion in time of war. It must be kept alive with new construction during times of peace to keep the art current and the skills retained. The supply activities for such shipbuilding must be maintained in some degree in order that the know-how procured in World War II will be ready for war mobilization. National readiness demands that these conditions be met.

In my opinion, the Navy is entirely correct in its demands to build the U. S. S. *United States*. It was a logical development in carriers and represented a new prototype with which the evaluations and operations techniques could be continued. It was a prototype, authorized by Congress, and within the right and duty of the Navy to develop.

Obsolete carriers require the operation of obsolete aircraft. Such operations can cause unnecessary losses of men and forces, in any emergencies in the face of first-class air opposition. The loss of any American boy, through lack of required modern fighting equipment, is a tragedy that we can ill afford to generate. We owe it to ourselves and the country to provide those who might fight to protect her the best available weapons for their mission.

I emphasize the fact that any new carriers built will be used to the fullest extent in supporting naval missions in conformity with the Key West and Newport agreements. The new fast snorkelling type submarine creates a threat against control of the seas many times greater than existed from the submarine of World Wars I and II which almost defeated us in these two wars. To combat this threat every means possible must be used. The Navy has two general methods that can be used; one is offensive and the other defensive. The former is composed of the carrier task force which seeks out the submarine at its source by mining of harbors and bombing the submarine and submarine facilities in enemy ports. The other seeks the submarine at sea by protecting convoys, by hunter-killer operations, which are teams of light carriers and destroyers, and various other means, such as blimps, patrol planes, and defensive mining of own harbors. The importance of containing the submarine threat can be realized only if one understands that unless the submarine is defeated no army, air force, or foreign ally can be supported overseas.

If first things come first, as normally they should, then an adequate carrier task force is one of the first requisites for the defense of this vast insular Nation of ours.

As a valedictory, I wish it to be distinctly understood I am unalterably opposed to the usurpation by the Executive of the legislative prerogatives. When Congress, representing the people, undertakes specifically and definitively to say where dollars shall be spent, it is beyond the law and in derogation of the Constitution for any Secretary of Defense or any President to undertake to divert otherwise the expenditure of funds appropriated for a specific purpose by the representatives of the people. Any attempt to usurp the rights and the prerogatives of the Congress, the legislative branch of the Government, by the Executive, is dictatorship, pure, simple, and undefiled, which Congress—that is, the people—should resent to the extent, if necessary, of impeaching those responsible for such acts in the premises. It is time to take notice.

Award for Distinguished Public Service to Gen. George C. Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the United States conference of mayors is a well established and useful organization. It is unnecessary to remind my colleagues that the mayors of our cities directly represent the general thinking of the people of this great country. On January 19, 1949, formal action was taken by the trustees of the conference of mayors to make a national award for distinguished public service. That public service was specifically defined to include service to any level of government, whether it be Federal, State, or local.

In a ceremony at the White House on November 25, 1949, the President of the United States presented the first award authorized by this resolution to Gen. George C. Marshall.

In order that the House may know the basis for the award, the members of the award committee, and the language of the citation which was read by President Truman in presenting this recognition to General Marshall, I have asked for permission to include that information as a part of these remarks. They follow:

THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS AWARD FOR DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE

HISTORY

On January 19, 1949, by formal action of the trustees of the United States Conference of Mayors, a national award for distinguished public service was authorized. Public service was specifically defined to include service to any level of government—either Federal, State or local.

Initiation of the United States Conference of Mayors Award for Distinguished Public Service was based upon the fact that in the United States outstanding and meritorious public service has not been nationally honored to the extent that individual achievements and major contributions in various professional fields of endeavor have been recognized.

THE AWARD

The award itself is in the form of a mounted bronze plaque, the model for which was designed by an eminent American sculptor. The plaque carries the words "Public service is a public trust."

The award will be granted from time to time as determined by the trustees of the conference of mayors. The trustees function as the award committee.

It is planned that, when circumstances permit, the award be presented to the recipient by the President of the United States on behalf of the United States Conference of Mayors.

By unanimous vote of the award committee the first award for distinguished public service was bestowed upon Gen. George C. Marshall by the President of the United States at the White House on November 25.

* * * * *

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL CITATION READ BY PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

Holder of the Nation's highest military office and honors, a truly great soldier and organizer, this award is given for distinguished and outstanding public service. At a time when retirement was justly earned, you accepted major public responsibilities in the field of our country's foreign affairs. You have again heeded another call to humanitarian duties. As Chief of Staff, Secretary of State, and now President of the American Red Cross, this award is richly deserved and is presented to you by the United States Conference of Mayors in grateful recognition of your distinguished public service.

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS AWARD PRESENTATION COMMITTEE

Mayor W. Cooper Green, of Birmingham, president, the United States Conference of Mayors.

Mayor David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, vice president, the United States Conference of Mayors.

Mayor Thomas A. Burke, of Cleveland, member of the executive committee, the United States Conference of Mayors.

Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., of Baltimore, chairman, standing committee on legislation, the United States Conference of Mayors.

Mayor Michael V. DiSalle, of Toledo, chairman of the advisory board, the United States Conference of Mayors.

Paul V. Betters, Washington, D. C., executive director, the United States Conference of Mayors.

One Person We Know Gives Us a Greater Appreciation of Honor, Integrity, and of Truth; Another Gives Us a Fuller Appreciation of Patience, Earnestness, Courage, Steadfastness, While Others Give Us a Richer and Deeper Appreciation of Humility, Charity, Tolerance, or, Perchance, Understanding and Tact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, sometime, somewhere, someone once said:

I would not grieve in the least if a friend of mine gave a great feast and did not invite me to share with him at his festive board; but, if I had a friend who was sorely tried, and had a great sorrow which he did not invite me to share, then, indeed, I would feel bereft, knowing that I was not permitted to participate in that which to me is the highest privilege of a true friend.

I think it is unnecessary, Mr. Speaker, to tell you that nothing in life could have caused my absence at the testimonial paid you by our mutual friends on the occasion of your sixty-eighth anniversary on Friday last except that which I regarded as my bounded privilege and duty to serve a friend and in that instance it was one not as fortunately situated, and surrounded by a multitude of his friends at that particular hour as was your own good self.

But I was with you in spirit SAM, throughout every waking hour of that happy, happy day. My good wife and I thrilled at the knowledge that you again had passed another milestone in the long years of service to your country and your fellow men.

I remember many, many years ago when in a discussion evaluating the elements and essence of friendship that a great savant made the statement that we only have friends for the things which they could give us, and that thought shocked every fiber of my being. Passionately I asked him what he meant when he said that we only have friends for what they can give us, and from the lips of that great man came words of wisdom that burned themselves into my very soul and which I shall remember until the day I die:

We meet, nurture, and cultivate friendship for someone whom we learn to know—

He explained—

because they personally in some undefined method give us something that feeds either or both our mind and our soul.

One person whom we know—

He continued—

gives us a fuller appreciation of patience, earnestness, courage, steadfastness, while others give us a richer and deeper appreciation of humility, charity, tolerance, or, perchance, understanding and tact.

From one we learn more fully the teachings of the Master himself—that we should clothe the naked, feed the hungry, minister to the sick—while another gives wisdom and knowledge as to the fruits of tolerance, patience, and a clear recognition of the dignity of man regardless of how humble his station in life.

Mr. Speaker, it is thus that we come to the realization that we nurture the friendship of any man who in some manner contributes something worth while to our lives. The more of the spiritual and the less material benefits which they contribute—the greater I have found is the bond of friendship that ensues.

SAM RAYBURN, I have been knowing you for a long, long time. You have not given me a greater understanding of any single one of the aforementioned attributes, you have contributed to me and to all of your legion of friends as well as to the friendships that you have bestowed upon human beings everywhere a greater understanding of all of the elements and virtues that go to make up the greatest of all friendships among men.

It is because of these facts that today you enjoy the fullest confidence and are

beloved by every person who knows you—from our great President sitting in the White House down to the humblest citizen of our land.

Mr. Speaker, this House has had other great Speakers, but it has never had a greater Speaker than Speaker SAM RAYBURN; and I know that in praying that your shadow never grows less I bespeak the sentiments of every man who sits on both sides of the aisle.

Of a certainty this body was never chaired by one who had at one and the same time a more complete understanding of the problems of his colleagues as well as the problems of his country.

In the administration of our proceedings it is, of course, impossible for the Speaker to please every individual, and where all are of equal rank as in such a body as constitutes the House of Representatives. But he can be fair; he can be impartial, unbiased, unprejudiced and rise above party or private preferment; and you, Sam, alway do so rise above them, and at the same time, as a true leader, spend your every talent in bringing harmony out of chaos and good out of everything you do.

Mr. Speaker, acknowledging that you have a heart as big as a Texas steer, we, your colleagues, hail you on this your sixty-eighth calendar year.

I pray that you will live another hundred in order that you will continue to spread the beneficence of your own soul to the benefit of your fellows everywhere throughout the world.

Federal Extension of Rent Controls Necessary To Maintain High Employment Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, it is not premature for us to be thinking about one of the most crucial decisions which we will have to face later in this session of Congress, namely, the extension of the Federal rent control law after June 30, 1950.

In an effort to develop some unemotional thinking about rent control, there is reprinted below an excellent article on the subject by Mr. Leo Lerner, the editor of the Lincoln-Belmont Booster in Chicago, Ill.

The article follows:

THE QUESTION MARK OF 1950

In predicting that 1950 will be a good year, with purchasing power increasing, economists have soft-pedaled the big question mark of the coming year.

The big question mark is rent control.

Federal rent control expires next June. I have heard Members of the present House and Senate predict that there is little if any chance of squeezing through an effective rent-control measure in the next Congress. One reliable Senator has said flatly that there will be no rent control after June, period.

It is believed that Congress will fail to protect renters mainly because most rural areas are now decontrolled or not affected, and that there aren't enough city votes to swing the legislation alone. The seeds of the coming rent and housing crisis were sowed by the last rent bill, which did not provide adequate funds for enforcement and which opened the way for national as well as regional pressure by powerful lobbies.

The big cities, where housing is still very tight and only the rent law keeps many people in their present facilities, are going to suffer most if Congress fails to act. A suggestion has been made that the city or State could step into the breach if Federal control ends, but it must be admitted that Uncle Sam, even though he makes mistakes at times, is best fitted by authority and experience to save renters from the possibility of fantastic and sudden increases in rent. The city of Chicago does not have the funds for control, and there is the strong possibility that if we had a city rent control law, political considerations, which have certainly been at a minimum under Federal enforcement, would prevail. The State of Illinois would be a better medium for holding the line on the cost of having a roof over your head, but there is a real doubt as to whether the State legislature could pass an effective law considering that the farm districts dominate the legislature.

I admit that landlords have a good argument when they say that since everything else has been decontrolled, rents should be put back on a free enterprise basis. It is also true that some landlords have not had justice in their quest for fair compensation considering that all their costs have risen. Further, it must be said that many landlords have not cheated or profiteered, and don't intend to if rent controls go off. I know some landlords who say they are satisfied with present rents and wouldn't put through any further increases.

But the total economic picture would be vastly affected by a sudden lifting of controls in cities like Chicago. I look back with a shudder to the twenties, when rent ate up a disproportionate share of the family income. I wonder what would happen to family purchasing power if some rents jumped to much higher figures. Who would buy the automobiles and television sets and clothing and other products we are now producing in great quantities if housing, still the rarest commodity, were decontrolled? Maybe you will say you don't care who buys an automobile or a television set, but you will care eventually if the high employment figures we are now enjoying, because production is in full swing, take a sharp drop because rents skyrocket.

I heard a war veteran say the other day that although he had sympathy for the landlord, he looked upon housing as he did upon the gun and ammunition business. You have to control that business because it deals in dangerous weapons. The housing shortage, he said, makes shelter a weapon which is held against the head of the entire renting population and which needs to be strictly controlled until the power to provide housing or take it away is not a danger.

In the meantime, those concerned with this major problem of 1950 will have to continue to look to the Great White Father in Washington for a solution until all hope from that source must be abandoned. The people will have to do their best to persuade Congressmen that their votes on this issue in 1950 will be the deciding factor in the 1950 elections. Also, the economic effect of decontrol will have to be made crystal clear to all of those interested in having prosperity in the next several years.

That Filibuster Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. It has been clear from the beginning of the civil-rights controversy in the Eighty-first Congress that the Republicans have consciously chosen to take an effective, if indirect, position against major civil-rights legislation.

Any doubts about Republican action and motivation on civil rights were removed by the revised Senate cloture rule which ended last year's Republican-assisted filibuster. Devised by Senator WHERRY and his colleagues and publicly supported by a majority of Senate Republicans, the rule was advertised as smoothing the way to end filibusters and make easier the passage of civil-rights bills.

Administration Democrats rightly rejected the phony advertising at the time. To their support at this somewhat later date have come the National Committee for Strengthening Congress and the Milwaukee Journal, an outstanding independent newspaper, in an editorial statement of January 7. They now point out, as administration supporters did at the onset, that the new cloture rule is a backward step—that it actually makes passage of civil-rights legislation almost impossible because of its demand that 64 Senators must approve closing of debate.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following editorial:

THAT FILIBUSTER BUSINESS

There was a hot controversy last spring over Senate adoption of a revised cloture rule backed by southern Democrats and most of the Republicans. The action ended a southern filibuster on civil-rights legislation.

Republicans, led by WHERRY of Nebraska, one of the authors, said the new rule would make it easier to invoke cloture and pass civil-rights legislation. The Democrats vowed that it wouldn't and said that WHERRY and his followers had fallen into a southern Democratic trap. So noisy were the orators that it was difficult for the average citizen to figure out who was right.

A voice of authority has now been heard on the subject. It is that of the National Committee for Strengthening Congress, a group of outstanding citizens concerned with making congressional procedures workable and efficient. It says, in a letter to Congressmen, that adoption of the new cloture rule was a retrogressive step and recommends its repeal.

"The new rule," writes the committee, "makes it possible to stop a filibuster on the approval of the Senate Journal and on motions to take up bills. But by requiring approval of 64 Senators to close debate, compared with two-thirds of those present under the old rule (which might be as few as 33), the new procedure so stiffens the voting requirements that we anticipate that it will be harder hereafter—rather than easier—to limit debate * * *"

The committee urges, as did the northern Democrats last spring, that Senate rules be

liberalized to enable a majority of those present to limit debate on any motion, measure, or other pending matter after there has been an adequate opportunity to debate it fully. This is the sensible and thoroughly democratic solution.

The coming session of Congress is to consider civil-rights legislation. That will undoubtedly bring another Dixie filibuster. If it does, the opportunity is perfect to make the rules change proposed by the National Committee for Strengthening Congress, thus ending filibusters for good. This time northern Republicans should be smart enough to vote on the right side—and let WHERRY play with the southerners, if he thinks that's politically wise.

Joseph Scott Denounces Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Joseph Scott, of Los Angeles, recently made a speech in Pasadena, Calif., concerning the college and university professors who refused to denounce communism. A report of his speech was published in the Gaelic American, issue of January 7, which I am submitting herewith.

Mr. Scott is a stalwart American and has dedicated his life to advocating the high principles of good sound American government. He is a former president of the Los Angeles Board of Education and has been prominent in civic and political activities for the past 55 years. I am certain that the Members of Congress will be edified by his sound judgment as expressed in the following:

JOSEPH SCOTT FLAYS COLLEGE PROFESSORS ON RED TEACHINGS

LOS ANGELES, December.—At the dedication recently by His Excellency Archbishop McIntyre of the new St. Andrew's High School in Pasadena, Joseph Scott, the veteran warrior of many battles for truth and justice was the principal speaker.

Mr. Scott, who is national president of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, said:

"Some time ago, our venerable apostolic sovereign pontiff offered these words of warning: 'He only is at peace with God, who is at war with the forces of evil.'

"In the spirit of that admonition from our Holy Father, I am appealing to the officers and members of our various councils to renew their faith and zeal against the gigantic attack that confronts us, in the battle against atheistic communism.

"Recently, Dr. Robert G. Sproul, the distinguished president of the University of California and a native son of this State, felt compelled to arrest the attention of the delegates to the American Bankers' convention meeting in San Francisco, to the grave crisis that confronts himself and the regents of the university through the amazing attitude of many of the professors, some 700 in number, who declined to subscribe to the pledge of allegiance, as required by the regents. These professors demurred to this action on the ground of "academic freedom," because the oath required them to state that they were not Communists or in sympathy with the philosophy of the communistic ideology.

"The San Francisco Argonaut, referring to these professors, say: 'The teachers believe in a substitution known as academic freedom. What this means in reality is a license issued to every professor to say what he pleases in classrooms and laboratories, and be paid for doing it.'

"The late Thomas Woodrock described this substitution as a license for irresponsibility, contempt for authority and insubordination of the gravest kind.

"By contrast with that attitude we have the comforting demonstration of the reaction of the school teachers of the Los Angeles city schools, some 10,000 strong, all of whom, with only three exceptions, took this obligation without objection or protest.

"Dr. Alexander J. Stoddard, the superintendent of schools for Los Angeles, in a public address recently, deplored this attitude of the professors and applauded the wholesome example set by the teachers under his jurisdiction, saying, 'We should make it impossible for those who do not agree with the American viewpoint and way of life to be in a position to teach our prospective teachers.'

"Years ago, when the question of a branch of the University of California was under consideration, some of us old pioneers enlisted the regents of the California University to meet on a proposed site for the university, which is now known as Westwood. Little did we think as we urged the regents to give the young men and women at this end of the State the same opportunity that they had in the north, by opening a branch here, that we would live to see the day when a host of scholars and scientists would set such an unwarranted and diabolical example of lack of patriotism as the behavior of these professors.

"Some of these professors draw down salaries of $8,400 a year for 10 months' work, which could be equivalent to more than $10,000 for the normal 12 months' salary.

"We taxpayers, and that means all of us, are grinding our faces to supply that kind of people to mold the minds and hearts of young Californians.

"I quote this example to emphasize the necessity for continued and unceasing alertness and concern to our bounden American duty, to set our faces like flint against all kinds of subversive influence; they are all around and about us—in Hollywood movieland, in labor unions, among lawyers, the journalists, the authors—everywhere.

"We face this evil, diabolical philosophy of life, godless and unprecedented. We must face it without flinching and hearts full of trust in the omnipotence of God and the righteousness of our cause.

"Of old, the lonely Nazarene said: 'He that is not with Me is against Me.' Let that be our slogan, and individually or collectively, let us emulate the words of the immortal Lincoln, 'With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in'."

Food Surpluses Should Be Sent to the Needy in Other Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, those of us who come from agricultural States are deeply interested in the problems of farm production and farm surpluses. And we are also much concerned in creating American good will in the world by demonstrating that we want to help those who are less fortunate than we are. Since the end of the war, we have given generously of our wealth through governmental and international relief agencies and through the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Our citizens also have contributed to meet the needs of the world through the various private relief agencies such as the Protestant Church committees, the war-relief services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the American Friends Service Committee, Church World Service, CARE, the American Jewish joint distribution committee, and many others. And I believe that we must continue to help the world to the place where they have sufficient to eat and enough clothing to protect them and keep them warm. To do less is not only un-Christian, but leads to the kind of social and economic insecurity in which communism thrives.

The surplus agriculture products that we now hold could be, and should be, given to the peoples of the nations needing food and clothing. We have made the original investment and it would require only a small additional fund to ship them overseas where they would attest to our good will.

There are several ways of handling such a program, but I would prefer to see it handled by a nongovernmental agency, like CARE, which has done such a magnificent job in the past 4 years in distributing more than 9,000,000 packages worth nearly $90,000,000 in Europe and Asia. I know that on the basis of their experience they could see that our farm surplus goes to those in need as a friendly token of our desire to help them. I trust that the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture will give serious consideration to this suggestion and invite the CARE organization to distribute such surpluses as are now in their possession.

It's Up to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune:

IT'S UP TO THE PEOPLE

The answer to continued American freedom lies directly with the people. Our country now is deeply involved in the process of socialization, which brings with it constantly increasing regulation of the lives and efforts of the American people.

We are being placed under such a terrific tax and Government spending burden that as a people, we are in dire danger of being forced to ask Government for ordinary living subsidies.

The lowering value of the dollar, the taxes taken from us, the controls thrust upon us,

are all drawing more tightly the noose of regimentation, and the elimination of a free people under a free government.

Mr. Truman and his official family appear to be engaged mainly in playing politics. The President said from Key West a week ago that he favored streamlining Government according to the recommendations of the Hoover committee, which has been approved by most of the Nation's able businessmen and industrial leaders.

Yet, while stating his belief in the Hoover report, the President, nevertheless, does not give up his fantastic program of spending which he outlined nearly a year ago.

Thus, he plays a politically expedient game, one day praising free enterprise, speaking highly of economy in Government, and a few days later, speaking up again for national health insurance pensions for all, and the rest of his costly and impractical proposals.

He has his official family doing the same thing. Secretary Maurice J. Tobin, who he counted upon to hold labor on the Truman bandwagon, one day speaks up for economy, and the American system. The next, he makes a speech advocating $100 a month pensions, socialized medicine and higher farm payments.

If the American people will take time to look closely at the utterances of their leaders, they will find many an inconsistency in them.

Their praise of economy and the Hoover report scarcely fits in with plans to pension everybody with free medical and hospital service.

The administration in this country has found a rather crowing audience in the soak-the-rich program. Yet, not long ago, Mr. Truman said he was in favor of more taxes on the $6,000 a year people.

In Britain, the wealthy class has been nearly all eliminated. Few really rich families are left in England. Great estates are being rented, or closed, or sold. Yet, the British working people are no better off than ever—in fact, much worse than they have been for 100 years.

Planned programs, of a vague and intangible kind little understood by the people, are weakening the fiber of America, and leading us directly into Government control.

The Government, through its huge propaganda machine, consisting of a costly publicity bureau in every main department, carefully nurtures the idea that profits are an evil thing, and thus, whereas it never before was considered a sin in this country to make money, or to be thrifty, and to save, or to invest savings, now, that philosophy has changed so that the amount of profit of an individual or corporation can make is carefully scrutinized by Government, and the amount of income that may be kept has been established and controlled by Government, which is thus seeking to do everything for everybody, even to the running of his private life.

Soon, such things as the Brannan plan, and other proposals indicate, every farmer may be told what he may plant, and how much he may market, besides how much profit he may make, and much income he may keep.

Government is fumbling from one thing to another, cracking down on great American industries under the antitrust act, yet allowing labor dictators like John L. Lewis to control industry's output, and to challenge the American workingman's right to stay on his job.

It is giving away billions in subsidies to some businesses, such as airlines, and taxing and regulating others like the railroads to death.

Obviously, only the public can do anything about this. It is up to the public, as Congress convenes, to tell its representatives that it is sick and tired of big Government, of Government spending, and taxing and controls, and that it wants the country given back into the hands of the people, and taken away from Government and labor dictators.

Congress is under pressure constantly by well-organized minority pressure groups. Only the vast bulk of the free public, men and women thinking like free Americans, can counteract these little but powerful pressure groups, and give Congress the real mandate of the people.

States' Rights and Lefts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time the most articulate and effective editor in New Orleans on the side of consitutional government is William H. Fitzpatrick, editor of the New Orleans States.

Billy Fitzpatrick has consistently stood up and declared himself against any form of socialistic government and has consistently denounced the tragic trends of the present administration in the direction of regimentation of the American people and centralized control of the daily existence of the people.

In a recent column Mr. Fitzpatrick hits right at the core of the proposed socialized medicine scheme.

For those who are inclined to think that there can be obtained something for nothing there is to be found reason for an examination of the facts. If the good of the country instead of political expediency for the purpose of vote catching is the sincere purpose of those who advocate this program of socialized medicine, then I suggest they reexamine the facts and then let the people of the Nation know whether it is votes or the welfare of all the people that is uppermost in their minds.

Here is Mr. Fitzpatrick's column as it appeared in the New Orleans States recently:

STATES' RIGHTS AND LEFTS

(By W. H. Fitzpatrick, editor, New Orleans States)

Well, you can always give up your New Year's resolutions for Lent, if they last that long.

The advocates of statism are going to try to put over their socialized medicine scheme again in the Congress which meets day after tomorrow.

The Federal Security Agency has made a study of the costs of the plan. That agency estimates the first year toll to be about $4,700,000,000. Doctors who have also studied this scheme say it will cost much more than that. It is not unusual for Federal agencies to underestimate costs and expenditures.

There are about 138,000 physicians in private practice in this country, most of whom would be driven to Government work if the panacea is adopted. It is being held out as a cure-all for many of our ills, but the treatment may very easily prove to be more painful than the disease.

We have seen what happened in England where socialized medicine was adopted. They gave wigs away and false teeth, and everyone who had an itch or an ailment, fanciful or real, hopped to the doctor's office for free treatment. The corridors were so crowded people who were really sick couldn't get in. The hypochondriacs were already there telling about the operation they were going to have.

Now the Commerce Department in Washington estimates the per capita income for 1948—the last year reported—at $1,410. And during 1948, the 41,578,000 Americans who paid income taxes paid a total of $18,079,000,000. Figure that up, and it amounts to roughly $535 each person paid.

And that is only Federal income tax.

Herbert Hoover, in his talk at Stanford University, showed that the average citizen works 61 days a year for the Government. What he earns in those 61 days goes to pay taxes. Mr. Hoover listed them as follows:

	Days
Obligations from former wars	11
Defense and cold war	24
Other Federal expenditures	12
State and local expenditures	14
Total	61

How many more days will we all be working for Uncle Sam if all the panaceas such as socialized medicine and the Brannan farm plan are adopted? Add the $4,700,000,000 the Federal Security Agency figures socialized medicine will cost to all your taxes and see how broke you're going to be.

Now if the Government is really interested in better health for the Nation and not just in starting up another agency to eat out our substance, we have a proposal we wish to make. And not in jest.

Why doesn't the Congress allow taxpayers to deduct from their income taxes all medical bills, and pharmacists' bills and all hospital and doctors' bills?

It wouldn't do the whole job of bettering Nation-wide health, but it would help a mighty lot. And it would save the people from paying more taxes, and it would keep our medical practice free of Government constraint. It would also end the very dangerous threat to medical advancement and learning which must follow any lessening of personal ambition.

Nobody can convince me that medical research will not decline in direct proportion to the amount of Government interference. Socialized medicine places the practice on a production-line basis, with doctors being paid so much per head per visit. It gives them the least possible time to attend individual patients or to devote to research and development.

The doctors are worried about it, and they ought to be. The reader of this column ought to be worried about it, too. Because a lot of the doctors feel like one young sawbones friend I have. He said:

"Listen, if they pass that socialized medicine proposition, anybody who calls me at 2 a. m. is going to get told to call up his congressman."

Hanley: Good Legionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I wish to request the inclusion of a newspaper article regarding Joseph William Hanley, a Louisianian in the employ of the United States Government.

Mr. Hanley is one of the most active members of the American Legion in Washington, D. C., and has won many awards for obtaining membership for the American Legion posts in Washington.

In addition, Mr. Hanley takes active part in the affairs of the Louisiana State Society.

Mr. Speaker, the article to which I refer was published in the Natchitoches Enterprise, of Natchitoches, La., of date November 24, 1949, and is as follows:

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE ON ANNUAL VISIT TO NATCHITOCHES

An annual visitor to Natchitoches, both city and parish, is Joseph William Hanley, who comes here from Washington, D. C., where he is a duly appointed employee of the United States Senate.

Mr. Hanley is a former resident of Chopin, which by the way is still his legal residence. He is at home to visit his hundreds of relatives in different parts of Louisiana and will return to his duties in Washington after the Christmas holidays.

He came via a most enjoyable trip down the eastern coast line, visiting cities in Florida before going to New Orleans. While in that city he paid tribute to the late Mrs. Allen Ellender, taking flowers to her grave.

Mr. Hanley is a veteran of World War I, having served overseas, and is a most active member of Vincent B. Costello Post No. 15, American Legion, Washington, D. C. He has won many awards for securing members for this organization.

The Potentialities of Local and State Government in Forestalling Further Centralization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful and scholarly speeches which it has been my privilege to hear in a long time was delivered by Prof. Edwin A. Cottrell, consultant on local government of the Haynes Foundation of Los Angeles, Calif., to the Institute of Public Affairs at Pomona College, December 3, 1949. The theme of the institute was, Can Voluntary Effort Do the Job?

I recommend Professor Cottrell's speech to everybody who is interested in the problems created by the growth of big government, with especial reference to the overlapping functions of State and Federal authority.

THE POTENTIALITIES OF LOCAL AND STATE GOVERNMENT IN FORESTALLING FURTHER CENTRALIZATION

(By Edwin A. Cottrell, consultant on local governments, Haynes Foundation, Los Angeles, Calif.; professor of political science, emeritus, Stanford University)

"Do not basely relinquish what the forefathers have with great difficulty maintained," is the Latin inscription on the gravestone of Governor Bradford in Plymouth, Mass.

Let me begin our consideration of centralization by quoting from a writer known to many of you:

"In the eleventh century of our era, the Chinese nation, under the dynasty of Sung, presented a spectacle nearly analogous to that seen in Europe, and France, especially, of late years. The great and knotty problems, questions of social and political economy filled all minds, and split into parties every class of society. Those people who at other times have seemed so indifferent to proceedings of their government, then flung themselves passionately into the discussion of systems which aimed at an immense social revolution. Matters had come to such a point, that the ordinary business of life was neglected; commerce, handicrafts, and even agriculture, were abandoned for polemical agitation. The nation was divided into two furious parties; pamphlets, libels, inflammatory writings of all kinds were daily flung profusely to the multitude, who devoured them with avidity.

"The reformer, or chief of the Socialist Party, was the famous Wang-ngan-che, a man of remarkable talent, who kept all classes of the empire in excitement during the reign of several emperors. * * *

"According to Wang-ngan-che, the carrying out of his scheme was to procure infallible happiness to the people in the development of the greatest possible material enjoyment for every one. * * *

"The first and most essential duty of the Government is to love the people and to procure them the real advantages of life, which are plenty and pleasure. To accomplish this object it would suffice to inspire everyone with the unvarying principles of rectitude; but as all might not observe them, the state should explain the manner of following these precepts, and enforce obedience by wise and inflexible laws. In order to prevent the oppression of man by man, the state should take possession of all the resources of the Empire, and become the sole master and employer. The state should take the entire management of commerce, industry, and agriculture into its own hands, with a view of succoring the working classes and preventing their being ground to the dust by the rich."

Wang-ngan-che maintained his ascendency throughout the reign of several Emperors. He overturned the country at his ease and put all his plans into execution. According to historians his plan lasted for over 100 years but, in the end, his social revolution was not successful, the nation being plunged more deeply into misery than ever.

These quotations of an early socialistic experiment, beginning in the year 1069, after the Emperor had been accused of being responsible for several epidemic maladies, earthquakes, and a severe drought, were taken from the story of the two Paulist fathers, M. Hue, who made the trip through Tartary, Tibet, and China in the years 1840 to 1857. (A Journey Through the Chinese Empire, Harper & Bros., New York, 1859, 2 vols.)

Confuctius asked, "Is there a single sentence that can ruin a country? If men's words be good, is it not also good that no one oppose them? But if they are not good, and no one opposes them, may there not be expected from this one sentence the ruin of his country?" "Tax and tax; spend and spend; elect and elect" has become that single sentence in our middle twentieth century. Our own Lincoln, in 1854, gave us one of the best statements of the province of government. "The purpose of government," said Lincoln, "is to do for the people what they cannot do for themselves, or cannot do as well for themselves." Our historical past is well marked by the proposals of its statesmen to enlarge or diminish the sphere of governmental activities, mostly at the Federal level. The proposal of Henry Clay for internal improvements, public works, public schools, management and disposal of the public domain, the building of roads, canals, railroads, and harbors, were all in the interest of that familiar portion of the preamble of the Federal Constitution, and copied into many a State constitution, "promote the general welfare." The Hamiltonian theory of the duties of the Federal Government, now very generally followed by the leaders of the conservative wing of the Republican party, and recently characterized by Senator HUMPHREY as the "trickle down theory," was the establishment of all forms of tariffs and subsidies to aid manufacturers, agriculture, transportation, and other enterprises, and exemplified recently in the creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under President Hoover; the increasing quantity of subsidies to the users and carriers of the mail; the safeguarding of waterways, and more recently of the airways; the subsidies to maritime and air service companies to assist in competition with foreign countries employing labor at a lower standard of pay than our own. All these, and others were based upon the proposition that they were, in large part at least, sustaining the national income of the people. We have accepted protectionism as a natural part of our American economy. Only the recent program of reciprocal agreements has focused attention on the abuses of the high tariff exclusion policy.

Lately the New Deal or Fair Deal theories have been uppermost in the attention of the American public mind. Security, productivity, and the basic prosperity of the people have been the justification for much of the legislation enacted during these past 16 years. We must keep up the levels of employment, provide a universal standard of common education, guaranty social security, and adequate low-cost public housing for all citizens unable to secure these benefits. We must improve conditions that encourage the maximum private and individual enterprise by placing minimum flooring under all economic undertakings—minimum wages, adequate farm-product prices; fair price laws to prevent cut-throat competition; guaranties on bank deposits; adequate retiring or old-age pensions; unemployment compensation; school lunches, school medical service, and transportation to and from home and school; development of public health facilities—clinics, hospitals, diagnostic centers, sanitoria, possibly an extension into low-cost voluntary or compulsory medical service; further development of rivers and harbors; seizure of tideland oil resources; flood control; irrigation and power works, some as individual operations, other under regional authorities, as the Tennessee Valley Authority, the California Central Valley project, or the proposed Missouri and Columbia River developments; sound soil conservation, coupled with adequate instruction to the farmer and ranger on the proper use of land and its products; rural electrification to those areas where the price of construction and distribution would be prohibitive otherwise; and assistance in slum clearance in our congested municipalities.

Subsidies or grants-in-aid have a long history. They were first introduced as land grants for schools and railroad development, a relic of the ancient globe system of the colonies, later as monetary payments for the partial support of land-grant colleges, and more recently as 50–50 matching funds for a dozen or more programs of public works, health institutions, redevelopment of blighted areas, and sanitation projects. All of these grants stifle initiative and encourage dependency. They distort the spending program of the local units as they are obtained not for what is most needed, but for what will bring the maximum aid under a Federal or State grant. There is also considerable evidence that in handling someone else's money, or "manna from heaven," carelessness in spending and accounting has been common.

Federal-State-local relations in the field of taxation, grants-in-aid, regional development, transportation arteries, farming, resources, fuel and energy, rural electrification, RFC loans, low-rental housing, Federal ownership of nontaxable land in cities and rural areas, all pose a problem of segregation of authority. Intergovernmental fiscal competition to create and maintain activities demanded by the people has become a bankruptcy-developing race. There are, however, no sources of revenue that belong exclusively to any one Government level.

We are developing in our States a type of centralization that in some cases is wholly acceptable to all citizens and in others repugnant to the last degree. It is well established that the administration of institutions for criminals incarcerated under State laws, mental and physical defectives; the construction and maintenance of the most important portions of the highway system, including freeways through the principal cities, and toll bridges are operations generally accepted. Under the recently repealed article XXV of the State constitution, all aid to the aged and blind was administered through central State administration rather than the counties. Many still maintain that this is better than county administration. The school system of the State is largely centralized in its administration through the standardization of curricula, textbooks, schoolhouse construction, safety, teachers' credentials, and other matters. School lunches, nursing and medical service, textbooks, bus transportation, building and facility construction are all supported, in part at least, by the State and Federal Governments. The State has administered systems of unemployment insurance, employees' compensation, pensions for public employees under direct grant of State authority or by contract with the local jurisdictions.

We like and support our public-school systems, socialistic or welfare, as many club them. We encourage tuition-free colleges and universities, adequate teaching training, higher salaries for teachers, better school buildings and facilities, and for all the supplementary features of free lunches, transportation, textbooks, medical service, and even for an extension of these into other fields to take proper care of the younger generation. We are demanding and obtaining more and more junior colleges and extension of our State universities in order that more of our young may be able to obtain every sort of education which is advisable to aid their future careers. We don't even argue about these matters any more. We do believe, however, that there are too many small school districts with inadequate financial resources to give proper support to the necessary school operations. Distressed school districts, too proud or jealous to consolidate with larger and more prosperous districts, are a decided detriment to the education of the children within their restricted borders.

Federal aid to the secondary highway system of the country requires a coordinated or joint engineering study by all levels of government concerned in the selection of standards and programing. This makes a most complicated arrangement in our metropolitan communities where the various levels of government are all authorized to build and maintain highways and bridges. Planning, construction, and maintenance varies so widely that the traveling public suffers in its movement from one area to another. The question of freeway planning and construction has caused considerable dispute between the local areas and the Federal and State engineering departments. The maintenance of standards to meet the requirements for the payment of subsidies or grants-in-aid from the higher to the lower governments always creates extensive discussion. Fluctuation in policy is due to the change of administrations, change of plans of policies of the superior government officials, and the pressure of influential groups favoring one plan or another, or advocating strong local autonomy or strong centralization in highway matters. Financial assistance from superior governments inevitably means the introduction of governmental direction of business policy, and that, in this day, is the forerunner of State control, domination, management, and ownership.

Local governments are seriously affected by national and international policies in the economic spheres. The removal or altering of a tariff schedule or rate, the assistance or lack of authorization in the development of rivers and harbors, the financing of the cold war and the European recovery program, and other policies have their direct influence in the improvement or harming of local economic conditions. Farm policies with their pegging of prices, storage of surpluses, control of acreage production, subsidies to maintain parity prices, the establishment of fair price or fair trade laws, protection of restrictive patents, all constitute a form of legal monopoly. We must all realize, however, that Government takes the responsibility to keep output at full production through long-range planning, which can be done only by some central authority.

I do not oppose Government assistance to farmers. Anyone who has to face the hazards of unpredictable weather, the rapid changes of consumption patterns, and the constantly changing price levels for things he has to purchase, is as much entitled to the artificial maintenance of high level of stable prosperity as other production groups. The whole country, in fact now, the whole world, more or less depends on the quantity of their production and level of prices to which they are entitled. The farmer must not be left to the mercy of the so-called free market. But, on the other hand, the farmer has no right to a guaranteed revenue income whether there is a demand for what he produces or not. The purchasing power must be effectively maintained at a level corresponding to the national productive capacity.

It must never be forgotten that to support the farmer, the manufacturer, and the importer, the consumer pays twice over for all his purchases, once at the store or office, and once again to the tax collector. Tariffs, subsidies for transportation, parity support, no matter what it is called, is Government placing a floor under production and distribution for the benefit of the producer at the expense of the consumer and taxpayer.

Fred G. Gurley, president of the A. T. & S. F. Railroad, speaking recently for the railroads, maintains that our entire governmental system is in danger from two groups. First, those who are opposed on ideological grounds to our system of private ownership and management of property, and, secondly, those who, while professing belief in the system, seemingly fail to see danger in accepting financial assistance from Government.

Government aid to maritime and internal waterways transportation, commercial air lines, trucking companies, and other modes of transportation through the construction and maintenance of lighthouses, harbors, wharves, warehouses, Coast Guard protection, marine hospitals, pilot service, air beacons, radio beams, special weather service, mail subsidies, airports, superhighways, and other assistance generally paid through taxation, is naturally resented by the various competitors who have been established over past years. What do people think of the subsidizing of airmail, transportation of newspapers and magazines, fishing and hunting grounds, child and prenatal clinics, recreational centers like beaches and parks, water and power supplies, forest and wild life protection, parcel post system, postal savings system, bank deposit insurance, and other operations?

States and local governments have universally furnished relief to the indigent in the form of food, clothing, and shelter; free medical and hospital services to those unable to pay the rates of the general practitioner or private hospital; free education to all; unemployment opportunities or insurance; and other services. The question now is only of wider or more adequate coverage, and by whom. We have current questions in the local economic, and unfortunately, in the political field, in the Central Valley project and Colorado River water distribution. We have depended on national and State agreements for sufficient flow of water to meet the needs of our southern California population and industry. Pressures now at work on a national scale are attempting to establish legislation which would seriously affect these agreements. Water, or the lack of it, is an ever-present threat to the economic stability of California. In the Central Valley project there is all the more reason why the people of this State should take a serious interest in this vast undertaking. This project was planned and started by the State of California and during the depression years 1933-37 was taken over by the Federal Government in order that the necessary work should be done to preserve and develop the agriculture of the State. The Bureau of Reclamation is spending something in the vicinity of $440,000,000 for irrigation and power development and the Corps of Engineers of the Army is spending many millions more in the guise of flood control of the rivers. Constant bickering between these two divisions of the Government, the local irrigation districts, and the State authorities, has brought this huge project under serious danger of failure. The important question is whether the people of California should surrender control of its agricultural development and irrigation districts in return for financial assistance from the Federal Government in the construction of the necessary works to impound and distribute the water and power.

The State might recover this necessary project and construct the remaining multiple-purpose dams and other facilities for the best interest of the farmers and people of the State. Expenditures of somewhere near the cost of construction are legally possible, either through a bond issue, borrowing from the RFC, or purchasing each segment of the plant from current income. The State has authority and the fiscal ability to acquire the entire undertaking. The needs of the local county and municipalities of the Central Valley, in fact those of the entire State would be benefited by such an acquisition. National political policy formation and control would thus be eliminated, in large part at least.

Recent court decisions regarding the tideland oil reserves which have upset the historical understanding concerning marginal and land-recovered waters, is another indication of the constant encroachment of the Federal Government over local jurisdictions. We have always known that the control of navigable rivers and harbors, no matter how shallow, was in the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. No bridge, pier, or other type of encroachment on a waterway is possible without Federal permission.

Enough of this partial listing of the operations of the central government or those of the State government which may or may not encroach on local governments. Which of these activities are subject to local control, operation, and financial support? Are we leaning on the Federal Government for too many functions, or for everything? Does the legislation which creates this condition destroy individual initiative? Where shall we draw the line of demarcation between what the individual should do for himself, what the Government should do for him, and which government is best fitted to perform

the services which he demands? What is the alternative road? We can't say take this road—follow us, without having a real program to present. The taxpayer is groaning under his burden, bound like a mummy in layer upon layer of government units. Disentangling him is not a pleasant but a thankless task.

We have introduced into our local political vocabulary lately the word "statism." In looking up this word in the dictionary, I was surprised to find, as I know others would be also, that statism is a belief in a State government, as in a republic, in contrast with belief in communism or a soviet government. The answer of those who are supporting this centralization of functions is that it offers more employment, more profits to the farmer and industrialist, more construction and expansion of plant and living facilities, more education, more service of all governmental operations to more people, and that the citizens are becoming initiative-conscious. If this is the welfare state, is the legislation which creates it demanded by the people whom it is designed to serve? Or is it improving the economic well-being of special groups in our society at the expense of others? Many people prefer to deal with a big national government and international problems rather than those of our local counties and cities. We often need a scandal in the local treasurer's office, a police shake-up, an epidemic of some controllable disease, a conflagration, a school lock-out of eligible pupils, inadequate playgrounds emphasized by street accidents to children, a failure of the water or power supply, or other function whose continuous and inconspicuous operation we take for granted, to arouse citizen interest in local affairs.

Duplication and overlapping services of several levels of government fail to disturb our people. That the milk, meat, vegetable, and other supplies that come to our tables are examined and certified by several sets of officers, all of whose salaries are charged in the cost of the articles, means little as long as someone is doing it. James F. Byrnes has stated recently: "Too many people are asking the Federal Government to perform the functions of State governments; too many people are asking the State government to perform the services needed by local governments; too many people are thinking of security instead of opportunity. They seem more afraid of life than death. * * * We are threatened with the concentration in Washington of the powers of the local governments, including the police powers, and with the imposition of creeping, but ever-advancing socialistic programs. Failure of State governments to provide more efficient government is generally due to the fact that the Federal Government has stepped in and monopolized most sources of taxation. Big government is more dangerous than big business."

Obviously the logical solution is a compromise, representing sufficient State authority to insure orderliness and uniform local improvement, with adequate retention of State investment of funds, while preserving local initiative and autonomy. Is there dictation to local units from superior Government officers? Yes, and found in practically every activity in which the superior government aids or subsidizes the inferior one. Education, welfare, health, highways, are all examples in which there is a real tendency for the Federal Government to set up rules and regulations and the local-Federal administrators to see that the local units set up the same rules and regulations with only the change of name at the top of the first page and the signature of the administrative officer at the end of the listing.

Localities differ greatly in their ability to pay for the necessary services needed by their populations. The demands made upon the governments to satisfy the social and economic needs of their populations vary widely, even within a relatively small metropolitan area. The size, density, and character of the population differ enough to make peculiar demands for particular kinds of service. City, county, and State governments must furnish more services which are absolutely needed and which, in many cases, are demanded by a vote of the people.

Functions and responsibilities of local governments expand, and we have to consider ways and means of improving the quality and efficiency of municipal government. Various arguments are used as means to kill off many progressive proposals, such as social-security measures or enlargement of the benefits of those already in operation, public housing, extension of medical facilities, and others, at the State as well as at the Federal level. Is this objection to centralization or is it to the liberal legislation wherever it is proposed?

If all governments did what they should do, including paying off their debts, furnishing sufficient and adequate public buildings, paying adequate salaries to their personnel at all levels, and operating all public services to meet popular demands, the total of all budgets would be in the vicinity of $75,000,000,000 as compared with some fifty billion at the present time. Seventy-five billion dollars is only one-third of the national income, less than one-half of all salaries and wages paid in the country last year.

The 1950 Federal budget now in operation contains 80 percent authorizations for meeting the expenses of past wars and the estimated requirements of the armed services. Twenty percent, or only eight billion out of forty-two billion, goes for natural resources, health, welfare, education, transportation, communication, postal service, and miscellaneous services.

A comparison of the budgets of 1939 and 1949 gives us some pause in understanding the road we are traveling:

Dollars per capita

1939:	
National defense	8
International affairs	13
Veterans	4
Debt payment	7
All others	69
1949:	
National defense	98
International affairs	48
Veterans	37
Debt payment	38
All others	69

"All others" in purchasing power is spending less in amount than in 1939.

A more startling presentation of the change which has taken place in our pattern of taxing and spending is illustrated in this table:

Cents on the dollar

1932:	
Federal	34.0
State	22.0
County	20.7
City	24.7
Total	100.0
1947:	
Federal	74.7
State	13.0
County	6.0
City	5.7
Total	100.0

In a total of $51,000,000,000, a peace-time high, the Federal Government has increased at the expense of local governments. In 1932 each level of government was receiving approximately one-quarter of the total tax revenue. In 1947 the proportion was three-quarters to the Federal Government and one-quarter to all the three lower levels combined.

The necessary increase in costs of government has brought with it the necessity for increasing the base of revenues. The ad valorem tax on real estate has been strained beyond the limit for many years. The introduction or adoption of taxes or fees on sales, personal or business income, trades and professions, amusements, luxuries, utilities, refuse collection, sewage disposal, automobile parking, and hotel transients, is becoming almost universal. More and more there is a demand on the State for a larger share in the centrally collected taxes such as those on automobiles, gasoline, sales, liquor, and others. The erection of an equitable and properly coordinated tax structure, with proper relationships between the Federal, State, and local governments has been long discussed, studied, reported upon, and adequately shelved for future reference. Financial self-help is the backbone of any successful democracy. Home rule and practical local autonomy must be based on ability to carry one's own fiscal load and cease mooching on superior governments—Federal and State—for financial assistance to local projects and activities.

How do we get the money to operate our local governments to the capacity demand for services? Taxes collected in California in 1945-49 amounted to $4,500,000,000, an increase from one billion in 1940-41. Of this amount the Federal Government took three billion, the State eight hundred and eighty-six million, and the local governments six hundred and eighty-seven million. The 397 largest cities in the country collected $4,000,000,000 in 1948, an increase of 16 percent over 1947. The Federal and State governments have practically monopolized all the major supplementary fields of taxation, leaving the dried-up property tax as the main source of local revenue.

Too many officials talk glibly of State and Federal aid. Aid is a false term, as all taxes, whether levied directly or indirectly, or by whatever government, come from the earnings of the people. State and Federal aid represents an avoidance of responsibility by our local officials. "He's a hero. He got us some money from Washington. He didn't tax us." Thus local public officials have not been backward in advancing on Washington, hat in hand, where temporary local enthusiasms have prompted the people of the community to go after something that Uncle Sam will give, or assist in building, primarily because the city or district next door has already received its grant. Cities have even opened headquarters in Washington for this purpose. "Living up to the Joneses," "Gimme mine," "It costs nothing; let's get ours," have all been magic words of local areas seeking relief from higher taxes assessed at home. And the sad part of the story is, that these same people never realize that they are paying the taxes which make these "free" grants possible and that those same taxes are higher than they would be if the same undertaking were done by local governments and paid for out of strictly local funds. If the local areas are in dire need, as many school districts are at the present time, then it is conceivable that some effective solution might be reached with the higher level government whereby the acute problem will be met and the local area allowed to reimburse the higher government. This is the solution, good or bad as it is, that was voted on proposition No. 1 at this last State election. There are distressed school districts where facilities for the increased pupil population are not adequate and where the taxing ability of that district has reached its legal limit, or in many cases the absolute economic limit of its residents to stand the cost of education required by our laws. Rather than depend on these superior governments, it would have been far better, and much safer for local autonomy to lay aside petty neighborhood dif-

ferences and act together to perform the necessary services on a major scale. Local governments must be given powers commensurate with the responsibilities which the State or people has placed upon them.

There is not one single major function of government in which governmental units on all four levels are not actively concerned. Fortunately, we are ignoring the old political jurisdictional boundaries in dealing with flood control, irrigation projects, soil conservation, air pollution, metropolitan development, sanitation, water supply, and other services. Why should not the large overlapping metropolitan areas, some of them more populous and wealthier than half of our States, inaugurates more regional functional activities like our Metropolitan Water District, or the East Bay Municipal Utility District, and extend these same principles of organization and operation to transportation, street and freeway construction, recreation, schools and other cultural facilities, light and power services, collection and disposal of wastes, police protection, planning and zoning, and other operations?

We have in this State the Uniform Election of Powers Act of 1921" authorizing legislative or governing bodies of two or more public agencies to enter into agreements to exercise any common power jointly. Larger cities or counties may render technical assistance and professional services to smaller cities, or two or more counties or smaller cities may render a service jointly. Such joint undertakings have been programed and operated in the fields of law, planning, personnel, engineering, health, police, fire, recreation, library, water supply, power and light, sanitation, and similar functions. All levels of government have developed programs within the same functional fields, and usually without any over-all planning or central coordinating agency. This procedure has brought about much overlapping, duplication, and waste. The Hoover Commission has been a prototype for many others in States and cities which are demonstrating this duplication of functional operation.

Most of our local governments are going through a period of great financial strain. Communal housekeeping suffers the same economic struggles and pains as the individual pocketbook. There is always a demand for more and better service, modernization of housekeeping gadgets, conveniences and luxuries to keep up to the Joneses next door. The postponement of needed public works during the war caught the governments with a decreased purchasing power, necessary construction and equipment costs soaring beyond reasonable estimates, real estate values inflated and unreasonable, and personnel problems complicated by unionization of public employees demanding collective bargaining, cost of living bonuses or increased wages and salaries, specialized job assignments and featherbedding, shorter work day, longer vacations, more adequate insurance and pension allotments, and other types of industrial labor demands. Many of these may be justified and necessary in our present-day economy, but all press upon the citizen in both his personal and public capacity.

Local government officials or civic bodies must take the first step in improving the quality and amount of service rendered per tax dollar collected. Higher prices, deferred building programs, wage and salary increases, general reluctance of the voters to support bond issues or create new sources of revenue, all contribute to the dilemma of the legislator. Many liberals will agree that the present necessity of looking to Washington for the support or solution of our governmental problems can, over a period of time, result in a dangerous over-centralization of governmental power. In fact this is the very condition that will destroy utterly all semblance of local autonomy. I do not believe that this run on Washington for fiscal or security assistance is the fault of the President, of Congress, of the Republicans or Democrats, or of the local State, county, or municipal officials. This rush to the gold fields of Fort Knox is due to two conditions: First, the impatience of the people to obtain, as quickly as possible, solutions to pending troublesome conditions; and, secondly, the result of the fever of depression spending when necessity taught some of us that we could spend ourselves into prosperity and future security.

Now that we know the dangers of centralization, what are we going to do about it? What can the local governmental agencies do to prevent further centralization and avoid the evils of the present condition? What kind of government do we want in these United States? Is it to be a completely centralized one with the tax collecting, fund-appropriating, policy determination at national headquarters, or shall we preserve the historical prestige of the local control over all the problems which can be handled efficiently and economically by the smaller units of government? Are we to continue to ask the Federal Government to dole out money and to enlarge the size of its centralized control? The vanguard of our democracy has always been and must continue to be in the local community.

What shall we preserve? Where shall the line of demarcation be drawn? Have we a choice between annihilation and agreement? I sincerely believe that we have. There are three strong convictions in my mind. First, this country is going through a series of violent and rapid changes, some due to the depression of the thirties, the World War, the cold war, and others due to readjustments new to our economy. Second, the local governments are just becoming conscious of the dangers of extreme centralization of governmental activities in Washington. And third, the local governments have it within their power to bring about a new self-interest in local problems and to accomplish for themselves those services which the citizens want and for which they are able to pay. In other words, local autonomy and pay as you go, and not being dependent on second-hand money from the great Father in Washington.

The problem really is where the line should be drawn between central government expenditures for welfare of the people and opportunity of the people to develop programs for their own welfare. "You can't have a democracy until you have a certain standard of living. A people must have a certain amount of leisure in which to pay attention to the affairs of a democracy." (James T. Watkins IV.) Governor Warren, of California, has said recently, "Just as long as government is on a sound basis in our local communities, we can be sure that it will be sound nationally. If our own government is sound we will solve our national and international problems." Dr. Vannevar Bush in his newest book, "Modern Arms and Free Men," finds that the immediate danger in our country is a creeping socialism. He says that "the central problem is summarized in the idea of the welfare state. The dangers of rushing headlong into a full welfare state are very practical and very immediate," he warns. "A horde of bureaucrats takes $2 from Jones to furnish $1 to Smith and makes Smith stand in line to get it." "The next thing the United States knows," he says, "it will have taken care of everyone at the expense of everyone else, and failed to take care of the primary national interest. We cannot afford today to interfere unduly, even in the name of humanitarianism, with the diversified, vigorous, private initiative that has made us great." If the people ignore their responsibilities in their local governments, we will get the welfare state by default. For, as Bush points out, "A passion for personal security is an opiate which tends to destroy the virile characteristics which have made us great."

Suppose we were to review the operations of the Federal Government which, in many respects, parallel or overlap those of our local jurisdictions. Which of the following operations would we abolish; which would we leave in the Central Government; which would we embrace into the activities of our local governments? Taken at random we find the Federal Government carrying out the following activities of the so-called welfare state: regulation of production and distribution of food; control of exports; handling of admiralty and bankruptcy matters; supervising advertising to prevent fraud; control of the building of airports and operation of civil aeronautics; conservation of natural resources; control of farm production and prices; crop production loans; farm credit; farm mortgages; research and publications in farm operations; home loans; rural electrification; Federal Reserve supervision of commercial operations; insurance of bank deposits; control of rents; aid to the blind, aged, and crippled and dependent children; old-age and survivors' insurance; supervision of communications, power, trade, radio, interstate commerce, commodity exchanges, grain stabilization; loaning through the RFC; aids to marine and air navigation; movement of goods and crops by internal waterways; or the granting of aid to education, health institutions and hospitals, maternal and child clinics, public works, especially for irrigation and flood control, power projects like Hoover Dam, highways and bridges, tuberculosis control; unemployment insurance; workmen's compensation for injuries and industrial illness; venereal-disease control; vocational education; vocational rehabilitation; wildlife restoration; and many others. I repeat, which are you going to continue as Federal, which would you abolish, and which would you absorb for operation by the local governments?

The challenge to reestablish true democratic home rule is almost overpowering. Yes; we have the potentialities. Combined and enlightened intelligence of our citizens behind programs for recovering local autonomy can stop the trend toward centralization. We need agreement and leadership at home. We must elect and appoint men and women of real ability. We must pursue this program free from political party complexion or assistance. We have the authority. We have the fiscal ability. Local governments succeed in proportion to the efforts that citizens give attention to their communal needs, problems, and activities. They must promote a businesslike, honest, and efficient government. The quality of that government depends entirely on the quality and reasoned demands of its people. They must be alert to their situation, informed of the facts, and united in their action. It is the apathetic official and citizen with his rights on the Federal Treasury that is the greatest danger to our local institutions. Local communities are usually divided geographically and politically into clashing areas, districts, racial, religious, labor, industrial groups, school supporters versus welfare adherents, and others. Voters are seldom given an opportunity to vote intelligently on area-wide or regional problems. They are limited to expressing themselves on a small segment of a very important matter that concerns ultimately the whole region in which they live. Policies to improve regional problems of transportation, water supply, sanitation, educational facilities, police and fire services, and other matters of primary importance are not placed within their direct control. Thus it becomes an easy matter to pass these questions up to the State or Federal Government for solution. We must integrate our separate local political entities and fiscal economies to meet these larger regional problems.

Coordination or federation of local governments would simplify our fiscal problems, prevent duplication of functions, provide the necessary services more effectively and economically, destroy sectional or provincial jealousies and pride, recover an interest of the suburbanite who has left the crowded city for the freer living conditions of the country, but those vital interests are still within the more populous area, and more important of all, establish the local region as a control agency for the satisfaction of the necessities of communal living.

"The dog in the kennel barks at his fleas, but the dog who is hunting does not feel them."—Chinese maxim.

Cancer Research Should Be a Function of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the scourge of cancer kills off many thousands of people each year in the prime of their life. I have long urged that cancer research should not be left entirely in the hands of private scientific research with limited means, but that a concerted drive supported and financed by our Government should be undertaken at the earliest possible date. The aid of all scientists and specialists in this field should be enlisted in the hope of finding the causes of this dread disease and to conquer it as we have successfully conquered other diseases with which mankind was afflicted in the past.

A suggestion along these lines is contained in a recent article in the Brooklyn Eagle. I am sure many Members of this House will find the suggestion, made by Mr. Julius Miller, of Brooklyn, both interesting and stimulating. I am proud to number him among my friends. The article entitled "He'd Mass United States Scientists for All-Out Cancer Battle," written by Richard J. Roth, was published on December 4, 1949. It reads:

BROOKLYN'S MAN OF THE WEEK—HE'D MASS UNITED STATES SCIENTISTS FOR ALL-OUT CANCER BATTLE

(By Richard J. Roth)

Eagerness—about his work and family, about life itself, in fact—could well be considered the prime characteristic of Julius Miller. He radiates that quality and he continually encourages his associates to do the same.

"The word for personality is eagerness" is the way the energetic president of the Rand Stores, Brooklyn's giant cleaning chain, sums up what might be called his philosophy of life.

This enthusiasm has paid dividends for the 45-year-old executive, and it has paid dividends for Brooklyn. To it he attributes the rapid growth of the Rand chain, which began less than 20 years ago with a tiny Kings Highway store and now boasts 72 borough establishments.

HE AIMS AT CANCER

Mr. Miller has carried his spirit with him into other fields of endeavor with equally successful results. His greatest hope today is that his success will continue, that he'll be able to pass on this quality to his fellow Americans in his latest and most important activity—the marshaling of the American assembly line genius into the fight against cancer.

Not long ago, after cancer killed a close friend, Mr. Miller determined to do something about the scourge. Recalling the miracle that had been wrought at Oak Ridge during the war he posed a question for himself:

"Why shouldn't cancer research be a function of the Government, like the atomic project, with the greatest figures in science working together, perhaps under one roof, concentrating their efforts and collecting and collating the results of their experiments?"

WANTS CONCENTRATED ACTION

Mr. Miller is determined to have his question answered. Although acknowledging the value of public collections to help care for those stricken he feels that without the concentrated effort of the Nation's researchers only the surface of the real problem can be scratched.

"Are we going to have a project like finding the cure for cancer depend on the collection of dimes?" he asked. "This idea of getting people together to cooperate on something like this is not far-fetched. We shouldn't need a war to show us what can be done. We should be more farsighted."

The Miller campaign already is under way. A letter to President Truman brought a sympathetic reply, and Mr. Miller has contacted several members of Congress and other influential persons to rally their support. There are bills before Congress which would incorporate many of his ideas, and he is hopeful that the coming session will see some of them enacted.

Mr. Miller was born in lower Manhattan in 1904 and lived for a few years in the Bronx before he came to Brooklyn about 26 years ago. Following his graduation from Evander Childs High School he entered New York University, where he earned a law degree.

SEES BIG OPPORTUNITY

After successfully practicing law for a short time he decided to join his father, Philip Miller, and his brother, Leon, in the cleaning store they had started at 161 Kings Highway. From an investigation of chain-store cleaning methods he had made for a law client, Julius, who always has been interested in science, saw a great opportunity for a low-cost, big-volume cleaning business in Brooklyn.

As two decades slipped by new Rand Stores were added every year until today there are 72 scattered all over Brooklyn with a modern, 65,000 square-foot headquarters and plant at 4201 Avenue H. More than 650 men and women are employed and Mr. Miller prides himself on the fact that he knows the majority of his Rand workers—"they're a wonderful group with a wonderful spirit of eagerness"—by name.

HAS APPEARED ON TV

As expert at cleaning as any one in the industry, in which he is highly regarded, Mr. Miller has appeared on television programs to demonstrate effective methods of stain removal, a science which he finds fascinating. Generally, however, he can be seen at the receiving end of television, which he enjoys very much in his East Twenty-seventh Street home.

Chess captain in high school, Mr. Miller still finds time for a game now and then with his sons, Danny, 13, and Jimmy 8, both students in Public School 193. His wife, Belle, is active in many community affairs, particularly as vice president of the school's Parents Association and of Midwood chapter, B'nai B'rith. She's also a stanch supporter of the Mary Richter League of the National Children's Cardiac Home at Miami, a favorite charity of her husband.

Besides the 150 charities aided by Rand, the untiring executive holds office in both the United Jewish Appeal and the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies drives. He's also a member of the advisory board of the East Midwood Jewish Center.

In the professional field Mr. Miller is chairman of the board of the Empire State Chain Cleaning Stores Association and a director of the New York State Cleaners and Dyers Association. He is a vice chairman of the Brooklyn Orchestral Society.

Not long ago the Bear Club was organized at Rand to recognize employees who typify the initial letters of "Be Eager About Rand." The members, now numbering 83, are eligible for theater parties and other treats.

The club members are outstanding examples of the influence of Mr. Miller, but it's a cinch that none exemplifies eagerness more than their employer. He's eager about life and his contagious enthusiasm is making itself felt in Brooklyn.

The Unemployment Compensation Program Should Be Extended and Improved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the bill I am introducing today which provides for the extension and improvement of our unemployment compensation program. I also include a brief summary explaining the principal provisions of the bill. These follow:

A bill to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Employment Security Amendments of 1950."

SEC. 2. Effective January 1, 1951, sections 301 and 302 of the Social Security Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT ACCOUNT

"SEC. 301. (a) There is hereby appropriated to the Federal unemployment account in the unemployment trust fund for the period beginning January 1, 1951, and ending June 30, 1951, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for each fiscal year thereafter, amounts equivalent to 100 percent of the taxes (including interest, penalties, and additions to the taxes) received after December 31, 1950, under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and covered into the Treasury. There is also authorized to be appropriated to the Federal unemployment account such additional sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this title.

"(b) For the purpose of assisting the States in the administration of their unemployment compensation laws, and in the establishment and maintenance of a system of public employment offices in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be expended, for payments to the States, from the Federal unemployment account in the unemployment trust fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for each fiscal year thereafter, sums not to exceed the amounts, including amounts to be expended only in the event of unforeseen changes in conditions, specified by Congress in the appropriation act or acts for the Department of Labor for each such fiscal year.

"(c) There is authorized to be expended from the Federal unemployment account,

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for such fiscal year thereafter, a sum not to exceed the amounts specified by Congress in the appropriation act or acts for the Department of Labor to be necessary for the administration by the Department of Labor of its functions under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and this title and titles IX and XII of the Social Security Act and the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"Sec. 302. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State which (a) has an unemployment compensation law approved by the Secretary under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, and (b) which is in compliance with the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of such law during the fiscal year for which such payment is made. The Secretary's determination shall be based on (1) the population of the State; (2) an estimate of the number of persons covered by the State law and of the cost of proper and efficient administration of such law; and (3) such other factors as the Secretary finds relevant. The Secretary shall not certify for payment under this subsection in any fiscal year a total amount in excess of the amount specified for such purpose in the appropriation act or acts for the Department of Labor for such fiscal year.

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon receiving a certification under subsection (a), pay from the Federal unemployment account in the unemployment trust fund, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, in accordance with such certification."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 303 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after the words "when due" the following: "and such methods for the prevention, detection, and administrative adjudication of cases involving willful misrepresentation or nondisclosure of material facts as are found by the Secretary to be reasonably calculated to insure the payment of compensation only to individuals entitled thereto."

(b) Section 303 (a) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"(10) Participation in plans and methods for the combining of wage credits earned under the State law and wage credits earned under the unemployment compensation law of other States or the Federal Government, and for the payment of interstate claims, as are found by the Secretary to be reasonably calculated to assure the prompt and full payment of benefits in such situations."

Sec. 4. Title III of the Social Security Act is amended by adding the following section:

"Sec. 304. The term 'State' when used in this title includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia."

Sec. 5. Effective January 1, 1952, title XII of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE XII—GRANTS TO STATES UNEMPLOYMENT FUNDS

"Sec. 1201. (a) A State shall be entitled to a reinsurance grant if on March 31, 1950, or on the last day of any succeeding calendar quarter, (1) the balance in a State unemployment fund does not exceed a sum equal to the amount of compensation paid under the unemployment compensation law of the State from the State fund during such quarter and the immediately preceding quarter, and (2) the minimum rate of contribution required to be paid into the State fund was not less than 1.5 percent during each of the taxable years after 1952, or after 1957, during each of the five most recently completed taxable years if, on the computation date for such taxable year, the balance in the State's fund did not exceed a sum equal to 6 percent of the most recent taxable pay roll or the amount of compensation paid under the State unemployment compensation law from the State fund during the 3 years immediately preceding such date whichever is the higher. A reinsurance grant shall be an amount estimated by the Secretary of Labor to be equal to three-fourths of the excess of the compensation which will be payable under the provisions of the State law during the next calendar quarter over 2 percent of the remuneration paid during such quarter and subject to the State unemployment compensation law.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized and directed, on application of a State agency, to make findings as to whether the conditions entitling a State to a reinsurance grant provided for in subsection (a) hereof have been met; and if such conditions exist, the Secretary is directed to certify, to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, the amount of such grant, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that the amounts granted for any prior quarter were greater or less than the amounts to which the State was entitled for such quarter. The application of a State agency shall be made on such forms, and contain such information and data, fiscal and otherwise concerning the operation and administration of the State law, as the Secretary deems necessary or relevant to the performance of his duties hereunder.

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon receiving a certification under subsection (b), pay from the Federal unemployment account in the unemployment trust fund, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, in accordance with such certification.

"(d) All money paid to a State under this title shall be used solely for unemployment compensation benefits; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned to the Treasury to the credit of the Federal Unemployment Account when such State is no longer eligible for a reinsurance grant."

Sec. 6. Section 904(h) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "1949," occurring in the second sentence after the words "December 31," and before the words "over the" and inserting in lieu thereof "1950;" and by striking out the third sentence thereof.

Sec. 7. Effective January 1, 1952, section 1600 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1600. Rate of tax.

"Every employer (as defined in sec. 1606 (a)) shall pay for the calendar year 1950 and for each calendar year thereafter an excise tax with respect to having individuals in his employ equal to 1.5 percent of the total wages (as defined in sec. 1606 (b)) paid by him during the calendar year with respect to employment (as defined in sec. 1606 (c)) after December 31, 1949."

Sec. 8. Effective January 1, 1952, section 1601 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1601. Credits against tax.

"(a) Contributions to State unemployment funds.

"(1) The taxpayer may, to the extent provided in this subsection and subsection (b), credit against the tax imposed by section 1600 the amount of contributions paid by him into an unemployment fund maintained during the taxable year under the unemployment compensation law of a State which is certified for the taxable year as provided in section 1602.

"(2) The credit shall be permitted against the tax for the taxable year only for the amount of contributions paid with respect to such taxable year.

"(3) The credit against the tax for any taxable year shall be permitted only for contributions paid on or before the last day upon which the taxpayer is required under section 1603 to file a return for such year; except that credit shall be permitted for contributions paid after such last day, but such credit shall not exceed 90 percent of the amount which would have been allowable as credit on account of such contributions had they been paid on or before such last day.

"(4) Upon the payment of contributions into the unemployment fund of a State which are required under the unemployment-compensation law of that State with respect to remuneration on the basis of which, prior to such payment into the proper fund, the taxpayer erroneously paid an amount as contributions under another unemployment compensation law, the payment into the proper fund shall, for purposes of credit against the tax, be deemed to have been made at the time of the erroneous payment. If, by reason of such other law, the taxpayer was entitled to cease paying contributions with respect to services subject to such other law, the payment into the proper fund, shall for purposes of credit against the tax, be deemed to have been made on the date the return for the taxable year was filed under section 1603.

"(b) Limit on credit: The credit allowed to a taxpayer under this subchapter shall not exceed 80 percent of the tax against which such credit is allowable.

"(c) Refund or credit: Refund or credit of the tax (including penalty and interest collected with respect thereto, if any), based on any credit allowable under this section, may be made in accordance with the provisions of law applicable in the case of erroneous or illegal collection of the tax (including statutes of limitations). No interest shall be allowed or paid on the amount of any such credit or refund."

Sec. 9. Effective January 1, 1952, section 1602 of the Internal Revenue Code is repealed.

Sec. 10. Effective January 1, 1952, section 1603 of the Internal Revenue Code is renumbered as section 1602 and amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1602. Approval of State laws.

"(a) Requirements: The Secretary shall approve any State law submitted to him, within 30 days of such submission, which he finds provides that—

"(1) All compensation is to be paid through public employment offices or such other agencies as the Secretary may approve;

"(2) No compensation shall be payable with respect to any day of unemployment occurring within 2 years after the first day of the first period with respect to which contributions are required;

"(3) All money received in the unemployment fund shall (except for refunds of sums erroneously paid into such fund and except for refunds paid in accordance with the provisions of sec. 1608 (b)) immediately upon such receipt be paid over to the Secretary of the Treasury to the credit of the unemployment trust fund established by section 904 of the Social Security Act;

"(4) All money withdrawn from the unemployment fund of the State shall be used solely in the payment of unemployment compensation, exclusive of expenses of administration, and for refunds of sums erroneously paid into such fund and refunds paid in accordance with the provisions of section 1608 (b): *Provided*, That an amount equal to the amount of employee payments into the unemployment fund of a State may be used in the payment of cash benefits to individuals with respect to their disability, exclusive of expenses of administration;

"(5) All the rights, privileges, or immunities conferred by such law or by acts done pursuant thereto shall exist subject to the power of the legislature to amend or repeal such law at any time.

"(6) Effective July 1, 1953, compensation is payable to insured individuals for a week of total unemployment in amounts (up to a maximum of at least $30) generally equal to at least 50 percent of the weekly wages of such individuals if they have no dependents, 60 percent (up to a maximum of at least $36) for individuals with one dependent, 65 percent (up to a maximum of at least $39) for individuals with two dependents, and 70 percent (up to maximum of at least $42) for individuals with three or more dependents:

"(7) Effective July 1, 1952, compensation will not be denied to an insured individual (except in the case of willful misrepresentation or nondisclosure of material fact) by reason of exhaustion or reduction of his benefit rights or cancellation of his wage credits until he has been paid within his benefit year an amount equal to 26 times the weekly amount of compensation which he is entitled to receive for total unemployment;

"(8) Effective July 1, 1952, an individual shall be insured for compensation if he has been paid in his base period as much as 18 times his 'weekly wages' as defined herein.

"(9) Effective July 1, 1952, compensation will not be denied, except by reason of exhaustion of benefit rights, to any insured individual who is able to work and is available for suitable work: *Provided*, That such approval shall not be withheld because of provisions denying compensation under any of the following conditions: (A) For the first week of unemployment occurring within the benefit year; (B) for a period not in excess of the 4 weeks immediately following the week in which (i) the individual left suitable work without good cause (including compelling personal cause); or (ii) the individual was discharged or suspended for misconduct connected with his work; or (iii) the individual refused suitable work without good cause (including compelling personal cause); (C) for any week in which individual left or lost his employment due to a stoppage of work which exists because of a strike at the immediate factory, establishment, or other premises at which the individual is or was last employed and for any subsequent weeks not in excess of 5 weeks in which an individual, having so left or lost his employment, continues to be unemployed due to such stoppage of work and the individual is participating in or directly interested in the strike or is a member of a grade or class of workers any of whom were participating in or directly interested in the strike; (D) with respect to any individual who makes a false statement or representation with respect to a material fact knowing it to be false, or who knowingly fails to disclose a material fact with the intent to obtain or increase any payment of compensation.

"(10) Effective July 1, 1952, work under any of the following conditions shall not be deemed suitable for any individual:

"(A) If the position is vacant due directly to a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute;

"(B) If, as a condition or consequence of being employed, the individual would be required to join a company union or to resign from, or refrain from joining, any bona fide labor organization;

"(C) If the wage rate, weekly earnings, hours, or other conditions of the work are substantially less favorable to the individual than those prevailing for similar work in the locality."

"(b) Notification: The Secretary shall, upon approving such law, notify the Governor of the State of his approval.

"(c) Certification: On December 31 of each taxable year the Secretary shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury each State whose law he had previously approved, except that he shall not certify any State which, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, the Secretary finds has changed its law so that it no longer contains the provisions specified in subsection (a) or has with respect to such taxable year failed to comply substantially with any such provision.

"(d) Notice of noncertification: If, at any time during the taxable year, the Secretary has reason to believe that a State whose law he has previously approved, may not be certified under subsection (c), he shall promptly so notify the Governor of such State."

Sec. 11. The Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by renumbering sections 1604, 1605, 1606, 1607, 1608, and 1609 as sections 1603, 1604, 1605, 1606, 1607, and 1608, respectively.

Sec. 12. Effective January 1, 1952, section 1606 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code as renumbered herein is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Employer: The term 'employer' means any person who, at at any time during the taxable year, has one or more individuals in employment."

Sec. 13. (a) Section 1606 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code as renumbered herein is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Wages: The term 'wages' means all remuneration for employment, including the cash value of all remuneration paid in any medium other than cash; except that such term shall not include—

"(1) That part of the remuneration which, after remuneration (other than remuneration referred to in the succeeding paragraphs of this subsection) equal to $4,800 with respect to employment has been paid to an individual by an employer during any calendar year, is paid to such individual by such employer during such calendar year. If an employer during any calendar year acquires substantially all the property used in a trade or business of another person (hereinafter referred to as a predecessor), or used in a separate unit of a trade or business of a predecessor, and immediately after the acquisition employs in his trade or business an individual who immediately prior to the acquisition was employed in the trade or business of such predecessor, then, for the purpose of determining whether such employer has paid remuneration (other than remuneration referred to in the succeeding paragraphs of this subsection) with respect to employment equal to $4,800 to such individual during such calendar year, any remuneration with respect to employment paid (or considered under this paragraph as having been paid) to such individual by such predecessor during such calendar year and prior to such acquisition shall be considered as having been paid by such employer;

"(2) The amount of any payment made to, or on behalf of, an employee under a plan or system established by an employer which makes provision for his employees generally or for a class or classes of his employees (including any amount paid by an employer for insurance or annuities, or into a fund, to provide for any such payment), on account of (A) retirement, or (B) sickness or accident disability, or (C) medical or hospitalization expenses in connection with sickness or accident disability, or (D) death;

"(3) Any payment made to an employee (including any amount paid by an employer for insurance or annuities, or into a fund, to provide for any such payment) on account of retirement;

"(4) Any payment on account of sickness or accident disability, or medical or hospitalization expenses in connection with sickness or accident disability, made by an employer to, or on behalf of, an employee after the expiration of six calendar months following the last calendar month in which the employee worked for such employer;

"(5) Any payment made to, or on behalf of, an employee (A) from or to a trust exempt from tax under section 165 (a) at the time of such payment unless such payment is made to an employee of the trust as remuneration for services rendered as such employee and not as a beneficiary of the trust, or (B) under or to an annuity plan which, at the time of such payment, meets the requirements of section 165 (a) (3), (4), and (5);

"(6) The payment by an employer (without deduction from the remuneration of the employee) (a) of the tax imposed upon an employee under section 1400, or (B) of any payment required from an employee under a State unemployment compensation law;

"(7) Remuneration paid in any medium other than cash to an employee for service not in the course of the employer's trade or business; or

"(8) Any payment (other than vacation or sick pay) made to an employee after the month in which he attains the age of 65, if he did not work for the employer in the period for which such payment is made.

"Tips and other cash remuneration customarily received by an employee in the course of his employment from persons other than the person employing him shall, for the purposes of this title, be considered as remuneration paid to him by his employer; except that, in the case of tips, only so much of the amount thereof received during any calendar quarter as the employee, before the expiration of 10 days after the close of such quarter, reports in writing to his employer as having been received by him in such quarter shall be considered as remuneration paid by his employer, and the amount so reported shall be considered as having been paid to him by his employer on the date on which such report is made to the employer."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to remuneration paid after 1951. In the case of remuneration paid prior to 1952, the determination under section 1607 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (prior to its amendment by this act) of whether or not such remuneration constituted wages shall be made as if subsection (a) had not been enacted and without inference drawn from the fact that the amendment made by subsection (a) is not made applicable to periods prior to 1952.

Sec. 14. (a) Section 1606 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code as renumbered herein is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Employment: The term 'employment' means any service performed prior to July 1, 1948, which was employment as defined in this section as in effect at the time the service was performed, and any service performed after July 1, 1948, and prior to January 1, 1952, which was employment as defined in this section as in effect at the time the service was performed, and any service of whatever nature performed after December 31, 1951, either (A) by an employee for the person employing him irrespective of the citizenship or residence or either, (i) within the United States, or (ii) on or in connection with an American vessel or American aircraft under a contract of service which is entered into within the United States or during the performance of which the vessel or aircraft touches a point in the United States, if the employee is employed on and in connection with such vessel or aircraft when outside the United States, or (B) outside the United States by a citizen or resident of the United States as an employee for an American employer under a contract of service which is entered into within the United States; except that in the case of service performed after December 31, 1951, such term shall not include:

"(1) Agricultural labor (as defined in subsection (e));

"(2) Domestic service in a private home;

"(3) Service not in the course of the employer's trade or business performed in any

calendar quarter by an employee, unless the cash remuneration paid for such service is $25 or more and such service is performed by an individual who is regularly employed by such employer to perform such service. For the purposes of this paragraph, an individual shall be deemed to be regularly employed by an employer during a calendar quarter only if (A) such individual performs for such employer service not in the course of the employer's trade or business during some portion of at least 26 days during such quarter, or (B) if such individual was regularly employed (as determined under clause (A)), by such employer in the performance of such service during the preceding calendar quarter;

"(4) Service performed by an individual in the employ of his son, daughter, or spouse, and service performed by a child under the age of 21 in the employ of his father or mother;

"(5) Service performed by an individual on or in connection with a vessel not an American vessel or on or in connection with an aircraft not an American aircraft, if the individual is employed on and in connection with such vessel or aircraft when outside the United States;

"(6) Service performed in the employ of the United States Government or of an instrumentality of the United States which is (A) wholly owned by the United States, or (B) exempt from the tax imposed by section 1600 by virtue of any other provision of law;

"(7) Service which is performed in the employ of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, or any instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing which is wholly owned by one or more States or political subdivisions; or which is performed in the employ of any instrumentality of one or more States or political subdivisions to the extent that the instrumentality is, with respect to such service, immune under the Constitution of the United States from the tax imposed by section 1600;

"(8) Service performed by a duly ordained, commissioned, or licensed minister of a church in the regular exercise of his ministry or service performed by a regular member of a religious order in the exercise of duties required by such order;

"(9) Service performed by an individual as an employee or employee representative as defined in section 1532;

"(10) (A) Service performed in any calendar quarter in the employ of any organization exempt from income tax under section 101, if the remuneration for such service is less than $125;

"(B) Service performed in any calendar quarter in the employ of a school, college, or university, not exempt from income tax under section 101, if such service is performed by a student who is enrolled and is regularly attending classes at such school, college, or university and the remuneration for such service does not exceed $100, exclusive of room, board, and tuition.

"(11) Service performed in the employ of a foreign government (including service as a consular or other officer or employee or a nondiplomatic representative);

"(12) Service performed in the employ of an instrumentality wholly owned by a foreign government—

"(A) If the service is of a character similar to that performed in foreign countries by employees of the United States Government or of an instrumentality thereof; and

"(B) If the Secretary of State shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury that the foreign government, with respect to whose instrumentality exemption is claimed, grants an equivalent exemption with respect to similar service performed in the foreign country by employees of the United States Government and of instrumentalities thereof;

"(13) Service performed as a student nurse in the employ of a hospital or a nurses' training school by an individual who is enrolled and is regularly attending classes in a nurses' training school chartered or approved pursuant to State law; and service performed as an interne in the employ of a hospital by an individual who has completed a 4 years' course in a medical school chartered or approved pursuant to State law;

"(14) (A) Service performed by an individual under the age of 18 in the delivery or distribution of newspapers or shopping news, not including delivery or distribution to any point for subsequent delivery or distribution;

"(B) Service performed by an individual in, and at the time of, the sale of newspapers or magazines to ultimate consumers, under an arrangement under which the newspapers or magazines are to be sold by him at a fixed price, his compensation being based on the retention of the excess of such price over the amount at which the newspapers or magazines are charged to him, whether or not he is guaranteed a minimum amount of compensation for such service, or is entitled to be credited with the unsold newspapers or magazines turned back.

"(15) Service performed in the employ of an international organization;

"(16) Service performed by an individual in (or as an officer or member of the crew of a vessel while it is engaged in) the catching, taking, harvesting, cultivating, or farming of any kind of fish, shellfish, crustacea, sponges, seaweeds, or other aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life (including service performed by any such individual as an ordinary incident to any such activity), except (A) service performed in connection with the catching or taking of salmon or halibut, for commercial purposes, and (B) service performed on or in connection with a vessel of more than 10 net tons (determined in the manner provided for determining the register tonnage of merchant vessels under the laws of the United States)."

(b) Section 1606 (i) of the Internal Revenue Code as renumbered herein is amended to read as follows:

"(i) Employee: the term 'employee' means——

"(1) any officer of a corporation; or

"(2) any individual who, under the usual common law rules applicable in determining the employer-employee relationship, has the status of an employee. For purposes of this paragraph, if an individual (either alone or as a member of a group) performs service for any other person under a written contract expressly reciting that such person shall have complete control over the performance of such service and that such individual is an employee, such individual with respect to such service shall, regardless of any modification not in writing, be deemed an employee of such person (or, if such person is an agent or employee with respect to the execution of such contract, the employee of the principal or employer of such person); or

"(3) any individual (other than an individual who is an employee under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection) who performs services for remuneration for any person——

"(A) as an outside salesman in the manufacturing or wholesale trade;

"(B) as a full-time life-insurance salesman;

"(C) as a driver-lessee of a taxicab;

"(D) as a home worker on materials or goods which are furnished by the person for whom the services are performed and which are required to be returned to such person or to a person designated by him;

"(E) as a contract logger;

"(F) as a lessee or licensee of space within a mine when substantially all of the product of such services is required to be sold or turned over to the lessor or licensor; or

"(G) as a house-to-house salesman if under the contract of service or in fact such individual (i) is required to meet a minimum sales quota, or (ii) is expressly or impliedly required to furnish the services with respect to designated or regular customers or customers along a prescribed route, or (iii) is prohibited from furnishing the same or similar services for any other person—

if the contract of service contemplates that substantially all of such services (other than the services described in subparagraph (F)) are to be performed personally by such individual; except that an individual shall not be included in the term 'employee' under the provisions of this paragraph if such individual has a substantial investment (other than the investment by a salesman in facilities for transportation) in the facilities of the trade, occupation, business, or profession with respect to which the services are performed, or if the services are in the nature of a single transaction not part of a continuing relationship with the person for whom the services are performed; or

"(4) any individual who is not an employee under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection but who, in the performance of service for any person for remuneration, has with respect to such service, the status of an employee, as determined by the combined effect of (A) control over the individual, (B) permanency of the relationship, (C) regularity and frequency of performance of the service, (D) integration of the individual's work in the business to which he renders service, (E) lack of skill required of the individual in facilities for work, and (G) lack of investment by the individual in facilities for work, and (G) lack of opportunities of the individual for profit or loss."

(c) Section 1606 (j) of the Internal Revenue Code as renumbered herein is amended by inserting "Puerto Rico," after "Hawaii," and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The term 'United States' when used in the geographical sense includes Puerto Rico."

(d) Section 1606 (l) of the Internal Revenue Code as renumbered herein is amended to read as follows:

"(l) Agricultural labor: The term 'agricultural labor' includes all services performed—

"(1) On a farm, in the employ of any person, in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife.

"(2) In the employ of the owner or tenant or other operator of a farm, in connection with the operation, management, conservation, improvement, or maintenance of such farm and its tools and equipment, or in salvaging timber or clearing land of brush and other debris left by a hurricane, if the major part of such service is performed on a farm.

"(3) In connection with the production or harvesting of any commodity defined as an agricultural commodity in section 15 (g) of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, or in connection with the ginning of cotton.

"(4) (A) In the employ of the operator of a farm in handling, planting, drying, packing, packaging, processing, freezing, grading, storing, or delivering to storage or to market or to a carrier for transportation to market, in its unmanufactured state, any agricultural or horticultural commodity; but only if such operator produced more than one-half of the commodity with respect to which such service is performed.

"(B) In the employ of a group of operators of farms (other than a cooperative organization) in the performance of services described in subparagraph (a), but only if such operators produced all of the commodity with respect to which such service is performed. For the purposes of this subparagraph, any unincorporated group of operators shall be deemed a cooperative organization if the number of operators comprising such group is more than twenty at any time during the calendar quarter in which such service is performed.

"(C) The provisions of subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall not be deemed to be applicable with respect to service performed in connection with commercial canning or commercial freezing or in connection with any agricultural or horticultural commodity after its delivery to a terminal market for distribution for consumption. As used in this section, the term 'farm' includes stock, dairy, poultry, fruit, fur-bearing animal, and truck farms, plantations, ranches, nurseries, ranges, greenhouses or other similar structures used primarily for the raising of agricultural or horticultural commodities, and orchards."

(e) Section 1606 of the Internal Revenue Code as renumbered herein is amended by striking out subsection (m) and (n) and adding the following new subsections:

"(m) American vessel and American aircraft: The term 'American vessel' means any vessel documented or numbered under the laws of the United States; and includes any vessel which is neither documented or numbered under the laws of the United States nor documented under the laws of any foreign country, if its crew is employed solely by one or more citizens or residents of the United States or corporations organized under the laws of the United States or of any State, and the term 'American aircraft' means an aircraft registered under the laws of the United States.

"(n) American employer: The term 'American employer' means (1) an individual who is a resident of the United States, (2) a partnership, if two-thirds or more of the partners are residents of the United States, (3) a trust if all of the trustees are residents of the United States, (4) a corporation organized under the laws of the United States or of any State.

"(o) Benefit year: The term 'benefit year' means the benefit period, not in excess of fifty-two consecutive weeks, prescribed in the State unemployment compensation law.

"(p) Base period: The term 'base period' means such period, not in excess of fifty-two consecutive weeks as may be defined in the State unemployment compensation law for the determination of the qualifying requirement.

"(q) Dependent: The term 'dependent' means, with respect to an individual as of the initiation of a benefit year, an unmarried child (including a stepchild or adopted child (who is under the age of 18 and who is living with such individual or receiving regular payments toward his support from such individual; and a wife (or a husband unable to work) who is living with or receiving regular support from such individual and who is not regularly engaged in rendering services for remuneration or in any occupation for profit, and who is not in receipt of unemployment compensation.

"(r) High quarter wages: The term 'high quarter wages' means with respect to an individual, the amount of wages (as defined in the State unemployment compensation law) paid to such individual in that calendar quarter of the base period in which the total of such wages was highest.

"(s) Weekly wages: The term 'weekly wages' means, with respect to an individual, the amount of wages (as defined in the State unemployment compensation law) paid to such individual during the period used for determining his compensation for a week of total unemployment (1) divided by 13 if it is the calendar quarter in which such individual was paid his high quarter wages; or (2) divided by the number of weeks, in the period used, in which he performed services in employment (as defined in the State unemployment compensation law).

"(t) Week of unemployment: The term 'week of unemployment' as used in paragraph 9 of section 1602 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by section 11 of this act, means, with respect to an individual, a week during which such individual performs less than full-time services if the remuneration payable to him for such week is less than the compensation payable to him for a week of total unemployment."

(f) The amendments made by this section shall be effective January 1, 1952.

Sec. 15. Section 1608 of the Internal Revenue Code as renumbered herein is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Secretary of Labor shall utilize appropriate means for consulting with the States on matters of policy with respect to any rules or regulations affecting the States which he may make under this section for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subchapter or for insuring effective compliance by the States with any of such provisions."

Sec. 16. The effective date of sections 4 and 11 (c) of this act shall be January 1 of the first calendar year which begins more than 90 days after the date on which the Governor of Puerto Rico certifies to the President of the United States that the legislature of Puerto Rico has by concurrent resolution resolved that it desires the extension to Puerto Rico of the provisions of titles III, IX, and XII of the Social Security Act, as amended, and of subchapter C of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

Sec. 17. The Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by inserting the following new section:

"Sec. 1609. Provisions relating to Puerto Rico: (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law respecting taxation in Puerto Rico, all taxes imposed by this subchapter shall be collected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue under the direction of the Secretary and shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as internal-revenue collections.

"(b) The provisions of section 1603 (a) (3) of subchapter C of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, shall not be applicable with respect to Puerto Rico, and paragraphs (6), (7), and (8) of section 1602 (a) of such law, as hereby amended, shall not be applicable with respect to Puerto Rico until 4 years after the effective date of sections 4 and 11 (c) of this act.

Sec. 18. The Social Security Act is amended by adding the following new title at the end thereof:

"TITLE XIV. UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL WORKERS

"Sec. 1401. Definitions: When used in this title—

"(a) The term 'Federal services' means services including services performed outside the United States by a resident of the United States performed after 1948 for the United States, or any instrumentality thereof which are not included as employment under section 1607 of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act solely by reason of section 1607 (c) (6) except that the term shall not include services performed by an elective officer in the executive or legislative branches of the Government of the United States, or services performed in the military or naval forces of the United States.

"(b) The term 'Federal wages' means the remuneration paid for Federal services after 1948 including cash allowances and remuneration in any medium other than cash.

"(c) The term 'Federal employee' means an individual who has performed Federal services.

"(d) The term 'benefits' means cash benefits payable to individuals with respect to their unemployment (including any portion thereof payable with respect to dependents).

"Sec. 1402. Information concerning Federal services and wages: All Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States are directed to make available to State agencies who have entered into agreements under this title or to the Secretary of Labor, as the case may be, such information with respect to the Federal services and Federal wages of any individual as the Secretary of Labor may find practicable and necessary for the determination of the individual's entitlement to benefits under this title.

"Sec. 1403. Benefits for Federal employees:

"(a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with any State, or with the unemployment compensation agency of such State, under which such State agency (1) will make, as agent of the United States, payments of benefits, on the basis provided in subsection (b) to Federal employees and (2) will otherwise cooperate with the Secretary and with other State agencies in making payments of benefits authorized by this title.

"(b) Any such agreement shall provide that benefits will be paid to Federal employees, with respect to unemployment occurring after January 1, 1951, in the same amount, on the same terms and subject to the same conditions as the benefits which would be payable to such individuals under the unemployment compensation law of the State in which he last performed Federal services if such individual's Federal services and Federal wages had (subject to regulations of the Secretary concerning the allocation of such services and wages among the several States) been included as employment and wages under such law provided, that in the case of an individual who last performed Federal services outside of any State, his benefits shall be determined under the unemployment compensation law of the State of his residence.

"(c) If in the case of any State an agreement is not entered into under this section or the State agency of such State fails to make payments in accordance with such an agreement, the Secretary, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, shall make payments of benefits to individuals who file a claim for benefits which is payable under such agreement, or would be payable if such agreement were entered into, on a basis which will provide that they will be paid benefits in the same amounts, on substantially the same terms, and subject to substantially the same conditions as though such agreements had been entered into and such agency made such payments. Final determination by the Secretary of entitlement to such payments shall be subject to review by the courts in the same manner and to the same extent as is provided in title II with respect to decisions by the Federal Security Administrator under such title.

"Sec. 1404. Adjustment of duplicate benefits: Where benefits are payable to an individual under this title and where for the same period an allowance is received under title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the amount of such allowance shall be deducted from the benefits payable under this title under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

"Sec. 1405. Operation:

"(a) Determination of entitlement to payments of benefits by a State agency under an agreement under this title shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment-compensation law, and only in such manner and to such extent.

"(b) For the purpose of payments made to a State under title III, administration by the State agency of such State pursuant to an agreement under this title shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the State unemployment-compensation law.

"(c) The State agency of such State shall furnish to the Secretary such information as the Secretary may find necessary in carrying

out the provisions of this title, and such information shall be deemed reports required by the Secretary for the purposes of section 303 (a) (6).

"Sec. 1406. Payments to States:

"(a) Each State shall be entitled to be paid by the United States an amount equal to the additional cost to the State of payments of benefits made under and in accordance with an agreement under this title, which would not have been incurred by the State but for the agreement.

"(b) In making payments pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, there shall be paid to the State, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, such sum as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this title for each calendar quarter, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar quarter were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. The amount of such payments may be determined by such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency.

"(c) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to such State under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment at the time or times fixed by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with certifications, from the funds for carrying out the purposes of this title.

"(d) All money paid a State under this title shall be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned to the Treasury upon termination of the agreement.

"(e) An agreement under this title may require any officer or employee of the State certifying payments or disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement, or otherwise participating in its performance, to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Secretary may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from funds for carrying out the purposes of this title.

"(f) No person designated by the Secretary, or designated pursuant to an agreement under this title, as a certifying officer, shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any benefits certified by him under this title.

"(g) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this title if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided in subsection (f).

"(h) Whoever, for the purpose of causing any benefits to be paid under this title or under an agreement thereunder where none is authorized to be so paid, shall make or cause to be made any false statement or representation as to any wages paid or received, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement of a material fact in any claim for any compensation authorized to be paid under this title or under an agreement thereunder, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement, representation, affidavit, or document in connection with such claim, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(i) Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, or benefit under this title or an agreement thereunder, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud the United States, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"Sec. 1407. Appropriations: There is hereby authorized to be expended out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this title."

Sec. 19. The Social Security Act is amended by adding the following new title at the end thereof:

"TITLE XV. EXTENDED DURATION OF BENEFITS

"Sec. 1501. When used in this title—

"(a) The term 'weekly benefit amount' means the amount of compensation to which an individual is entitled with respect to a week of total unemployment, under the provisions of a State unemployment compensation law.

"(b) The term 'benefit year' means the benefit year prescribed in the applicable State unemployment compensation law; except that, if such State law does not prescribe any benefit year, such term means any period of 52 consecutive weeks specified in an applicable agreement made under this section, or, if there is no such applicable agreement, then any period of 52 consecutive weeks prescribed by the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this section referred to as the Secretary).

"(c) 'Insured unemployment' means a week of unemployment as defined in section 1606 (t) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to which an individual who has met the qualifying wage requirements of a State law and who has not exhausted his right to benefits under such law files a claim for benefits or waiting week credit.

"(d) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"Sec. 1502. (a) Upon the written request of the Governor of any State (or, in the case of the District of Columbia, upon the written request of the commissioners of said District), the Secretary is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with any State, or with the unemployment compensation agency of such State, under which such State agency (1) certifies that the insured unemployment of individuals covered under the State law during each of the three immediately preceding calendar months is in excess of 10 percent of the average monthly covered employment during the preceding calendar year, (2) will make, as agent of the United States, payments of compensation as authorized in this section and pursuant to such agreement with respect to unemployment, and (3) will otherwise cooperate with the Secretary and with other State unemployment compensation agencies in making payments of compensation authorized by this section. (b) Any such agreement shall provide for supplementing the amount of compensation payable to any individual during his benefit year in such amount that compensation will not be denied to any individual by reason of exhaustion of his benefit rights, until he has been paid an amount equal to 52 times his weekly benefit amount (or such lesser amount as may be specified in the agreement) and that such agreement shall be effective with the first day of any month in which the State agency makes the certification required by section 1502 (a) (1) and shall continue in effect until the Secretary determines that the insured unemployment of individuals covered by the State law during each of the three immediately preceding calendar months is less than 10 percent of the average monthly covered employment during the preceding calendar year.

"SEC. 1503. Sections 1302 (b), 1304, 1305, and 1306 of the Social Security Act, as amended, shall apply in the administration of this section."

BILL TO EXTEND AND IMPROVE THE UNEMPLOYMENT-COMPENSATION PROGRAM

Brief summary of the principal provisions of the bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend and improve the unemployment-insurance program.

I. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

A. Changes with respect to financing States' costs of administering the State unemployment-compensation laws and public employment offices: Section 2 of the bill amends section 301 of the Social Security Act so as to—

1. Provide a permanent appropriation of the proceeds of the Federal unemployment tax, received after December 31, 1950, to the Federal unemployment account. It also authorizes the appropriation of such additional sums to this account as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this bill (sec. 301 (a), p. 1).

2. Authorize appropriation from the Federal unemployment account to the Department of Labor such sums as are necessary to provide payments to States to finance the administrative costs of their unemployment-compensation laws as well as their public employment offices under the Wagner-Peyser Act (sec. 301 (b), p. 1).

3. Authorize contingency appropriations to be available to States only when unforeseen emergencies arise (sec. 301 (b), pp. 1, 2).

4. Authorize appropriations from the Federal unemployment account the amounts necessary for the Department of Labor to carry out its functions under the Wagner-Peyser Act, and under the unemployment-insurance program as extended to provide reinsurance grants to States (sec. 301 (c), p. 2).

B. Payments to States (no substantial change): Section 302 is amended in technical respects to conform to changes made in section 301 (pp. 2, 3).

C. Additional provisions required to be incorporated into State laws in order for States to qualify for grants for administrative expenses: The bill amends section 303 (a) of the Social Security Act so as to require States to incorporate into their laws two additional provisions in order to qualify for grants under section 302, namely:

1. Additional methods of administration (section 303 (a) (1)) which the Secretary finds are reasonably calculated to prevent the misuse of the unemployment compensation program by fraudulent claimants and to assure the payment of compensation only to individuals entitled thereto (sec. 3 (a), p. 3).

2. Participation in plans and method of combining wage credits and handling interstate claims which the Secretary finds are reasonably calculated to assure the prompt and full payment of benefits to interstate claimants (sec. 3 (b), p. 3).

D. Extension of title III to Puerto Rico: The bill redefines the term "State" to include "Puerto Rico," making Puerto Rico, upon the concurrence of its legislature, eligible for participation in the Federal-State unemployment insurance program (sec. 4, p. 3; sec. 17 and 18, p. 27).

II. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE XII—REINSURANCE GRANTS TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT FUND

Title XII of the Social Security Act presently authorizes the Secretary to make advance of funds to States if the State's unemployment trust fund falls below a certain minimum. Such advances carry no interest charges but the States are required to refund the advances so made. Such advances may be made only until January 1, 1950.

Section 5 of the bill rewrites title XII so as to authorize the Secretary to make outright grants of funds, from the Federal unemployment account, to States when the balance in the State's unemployment trust fund falls below a certain amount. The bill contains the formulae to be applied in determining when a State becomes entitled to a reinsurance grant, as well as the amount of such grant. The bill requires the repayment of any unexpended balance of a grant when

the State is no longer eligible for a reinsurance grant (sec. 5, pp. 3–5).

Section 6 continues indefinitely the present authorization to appropriate the excess of Federal unemployment tax collections over administrative grants for the years prior to 1950 (sec. 6, p. 5).

III. AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 9, SUBCHAPTER E, INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Sections 7 and 8 of the bill amend the Internal Revenue Code in the following principal respects:

A. Reduces the Federal unemployment tax from 3.0 to 1.5 percent of taxable wages and changes the offset for contributions to approved State laws from 90 to 80 percent. Repeals the "additional credit" conditions under which an employer can get credit for what he would have contributed except for a lower experience rate. The effect would be to establish a minimum State contribution rate of 1.2 percent (80 percent of 1.5 percent). The States would be free to experience rate above 1.2 percent in any form they see fit (sec 7, p. 6).

B. Added standards required to be incorporated into State laws in order for taxpayers to qualify for credit allowance of 80 percent of the 3-percent pay-roll tax:

1. Payment of unemployment benefits of at least 50 percent of the claimant's weekly wages up to at least $30 a week for individuals with no dependents; at least 60 percent of claimant's weekly wages up to at least $36 a week for individuals with one dependent; at least 65 percent of claimant's weekly wages up to at least $39 a week for individuals with two dependents; and at least 70 percent of the claimant's weekly wages up to at least $42 a week for individuals with three or more dependents (par. (6), p. 9).

2. Payment of benefits for 26 weeks in a benefit year if the claimant remains unemployed long enough to draw that many weeks of benefits. Cancellation of wage credits or the reduction in the number of weeks which a claimant may draw benefits is prohibited under all circumstances except in case of fraud (par. (7), p. 9).

3. Qualifications for benefits of all claimants who have acquired the minimum amount of wage credits set forth in paragraph (6) (par. (8), p. 9).

4. Payment of benefits to all claimants able and willing to work except that a State may require a 1-week waiting period; it may postpone (but not reduce the benefits potentially payable) up to 4 weeks if the claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause, was discharged for misconduct connected with his work, or refused suitable work without good cause; a State may deny benefits while an employee is participating in a strike up to a maximum of 8 weeks; and a State may deny benefits to any person who has made a false claim for benefits (par. (9), p. 9).

5. Amends clause (B) of section 1603 (a) (5) by substituting the words "wage rate, weekly earnings" for the word "wages" (sec. 10, par. (10) (C), p. 10).

C. Increase in taxable wages: The term "wages" is redefined to exclude remuneration paid in excess of $4,800 (instead of $3,000, as at present). The $4,800 limit is applicable to wages paid either by the employer or by a predecessor employer (new provision). The bill provides that "tips" are to be counted as wages, and spells out in greater detail the payments which need not be counted as wages (see redefinition of term "wages," sec. 13, pp. 11–14).

D. Extension of coverage:

1. Extension of Federal Unemployment Tax Act to employers of one or more: Coverage is extended to every employer who has one or more individuals in his "employment" during a taxable year (sec. 14, pp. 14 ff.).

2. Extension of coverage by redefinition of term "employment": The bill redefines the term "employment" so as to bring within the coverage of the unemployment-insurance program many services which are presently excluded (see definition of "employment," pp. 14–19). Some of the more significant types of services which would be brought within the term "employment" are:

(1) Services performed abroad on American aircraft under a contract of services entered into with the United States or during the performance of which the aircraft touches a point in the United States (sec. 14 (a), p. 15).

(2) Services performed abroad for American employers by United States citizens or residents under contract of service entered into within the United States (sec. 14 (a), p. 15).

(3) Services performed for nonprofit institutions and organizations exempt from income tax under section 101, except in the case of clergymen and members of religious orders and part-time workers earning less than $100 a quarter (sec. 14 (a) (6), p. 17).

(4) The term "agricultural labor" is redefined as in H. R. 6000. The effect of the redefinition of this term would bring within the coverage of the unemployment insurance program many industrial operations performed on or off the farm on farm commodities which are presently excluded, and workers engaged in the handling, packing, packaging, and processing of agricultural commodities for other than the farmer (compare present definition of "agricultural labor" (Tl. 26, U. S. C., 1426 (h)) with proposed redefinition (pp. 22–24, incl.)).

3. Extension of coverage by redefinition of term "employee": The bill redefines the term "employee." Public Law 642, Eightieth Congress, excluded from the Federal Unemployment Tax Act all individuals who, under the common law rules, have the status of independent contractors. While the bill preserves this test, it specifically includes within the term "employee" many classes of individuals who are economically dependent upon the employer, such as outside salesmen, full-time insurance salesmen, driver-lessees of taxicabs, homeworkers, contract loggers, and certain classes of lessees or licensees of space within mines. The bill also includes within the term "employee" all individuals who meet certain tests which were used by the Supreme Court in determining whether an individual was an "employee" or an "independent contractor" within the meaning of the Social Security Act of 1935 prior to the enactment of Public Law 642, Eightieth Congress. (For definition of term "employee," see pp. 20–22, incl.)

IV. AMENDMENT OF TITLE XIV TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Section 19 of the bill adds a new title to the Social Security Act providing for unemployment benefits for Federal employees. The amounts of the benefits would be determined by State law where the employee last performed Federal services. The benefits would be administered through State employment security agencies under agreements entered into between the States and the Secretary. Costs of the program would be met from a permanent indefinite appropriation. (For details of the plan, see section 18, pp. 28–34.)

Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr. Clen I. Myers, of Denton, Tex., has asked me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a quotation from Dr. Vannevar Bush's speech of December 8, 1949. This quotation is so sound and timely that I agree with Mr. Myers it should be as widely disseminated as possible.

Speaking of dictatorship, Dr. Bush says:

* * * but we cannot meet the threat of dictatorship if we turn this country into a wishy-washy imitation of totalitarianism, where every man's hand is out for pabulum, and virile creativeness has given place to the patronizing favor of swollen bureaucracy.

Dictatorship can compete with dictatorships, and a free virile democracy can outpace any such in the long pull. But a people bent on a soft security, surrendering their birthright of individual self-reliance for favors, voting themselves into Eden from a supposedly inexhaustible public purse, supporting everyone by soaking a fast disappearing rich, scrambling for subsidy, learning the arts of political logrolling and forgetting the rugged virtues of the pioneer, will not measure up to competition with a tough dictatorship.

A Positive Foreign Policy for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, in September the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives appointed the Honorable THURSTON CHATHAM, of North Carolina, and myself as a special subcommittee to make a survey of western Europe in regard to the foreign policy of the United States.

On my return to the United States I made a speech in West Hartford, Conn., on November 28, 1949, and wrote a series of articles which were distributed to various newspapers by the North American Newspaper Alliance.

Pending the writing of a formal report by the subcommittee it has occurred to me that a reprint of these observations may be of interest to the other Members of the House. I, therefore, extend my remarks in the RECORD by including them together with editorial comment:

A POSITIVE FOREIGN POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES

(Speech by Congressman A. A. RIBICOFF, November 28, 1949, at the Alfred Plant School, West Hartford, Conn., under the sponsorship of the West Hartford League of Women Voters and the Hartford Foreign Policy Association.)

This evening I propose to discuss with you not the personalities of Europe, but the problems which the United States faces in Europe. These problems are not easy to describe, let alone to solve. They are harder and tougher today than they have ever been before; and in some ways the American people are less prepared now for the truth of their relations with Europe than they were some years ago. But it is incumbent upon me as a Congressman of the United States and as a Representative of this district, to state as clearly as I can, and as completely as I can, the essential difficulties with Europe. I can only hope that you will bear with me if at times the description becomes

excessively technical. This is a technical and complicated world in which we live; and we are certainly charged with the responsibility of understanding it. More than this, our very lives depend upon our understanding it.

As everyone in this room knows, Europe today stands between the colossus of Russian power on the east, and the gigantic power of the United States on the west. Europe, this middle ground, which is the traditional soil of our civilization, is no longer the leader of western thought and action. The force and direction of the future is coming not from the time-honored sources of Britain, France, Italy, and the rest of Europe; rather it is coming from the far steppes of Russia, and the very close Washington, D. C. The fact that Russia and the United States are unable to solve their mutual problems is the fact that creates the major problems in the middle ground. In Europe, between the two poles of power, dwell millions of people who have a right to life, and in our terms, the pursuit of happiness, just as you and I have that right; yet they are not in command of their own destiny, and they do not have the power to control the future.

Europe will never again have the political and economic balance which was hers during the nineteenth century. The past few years have seen the disappearance, as equals, of two military and naval powers—Germany and Japan—and the eclipse of a third—Italy. It has witnessed the serious economic and military depletion of two western powers—England and France. The recovery of their former strength is by no means assured. It has seen the thrusting of Soviet power into central Europe, and, for a year, to the Rhine. Further, the Politburo has extended its will into vast portions of eastern Asia.

Our traditional feeling of security has been blasted. An ocean doesn't mean very much any more in terms of defense. Airplanes can cross it in 10 hours, and a guided missile with an atomic warhead could probably cross it in 3. There isn't any security in water any longer—oceans are now highways instead of barriers.

While Europe declined, the United States has involuntarily emerged into the preeminent position of power among western nations. This pre-eminence is inherent and cannot be abdicated. It is doubtful that history gives us a precise parallel of such a shift in the power situation in so short a period. Such shifts in power do not lend themselves to fast balance. The adjustment is necessarily prolonged over many decades. The economic and security problems of Europe—and this Nation—will not be over in a year or in 25 years. They will continue to challenge our wisest thoughts and best efforts for many years to come. But our thinking will not be wise nor our striving adequate if we cling to the illusion that the situation is a transient one or that we can turn our backs upon it any time we wish and, at most, in just a few years.

The European knows this as well as we know it. He knows that we must depend upon him to go west rather than east. He knows we must depend upon him to keep from the panaceas of fascism and communism. He knows that the life of the United States, powerful as she is, is inescapably linked to the life of Europe.

Perhaps more important is the fact that the United States is no longer able to afford either economic or political isolationism. We could afford it once, in the years before the atomic bomb. If we look at it realistically, we should include only the years before 1914. It was only in these years that the American people could afford the luxury of separation from the rest of the world. We had a fairly well-balanced economy, we were pushing our own frontiers farther and farther West, we were developing a vast system of productive enterprise, and we were in general living well with ourselves and the rest of the world.

What we fail to realize, however, is that we were living this way because Europe was in a kind of balance. During the nineteenth century France became wealthy, Germany became highly industrialized and wealthy, Italy was able to live with a degree of security and a minimal fulfillment of her basic requirements. And so one could go through the list. The nineteenth century was a stabilized period in the history of western civilization. Ideas of freedom, justice and equality were important, and held to by large numbers of people. The dignity of man was not an idle phrase mouthed by politicians and stated with conviction only by a few; it was an actual living force in the lives of European people, low and high. There was a certain freedom of economic relationships which allowed men to change their jobs when they wanted to, rise to a higher standard of living if they had sufficient courage, and pass on productive wealth to future generations. It was not all rosy, for there were certainly situations which outraged decency and cried out for reform. Nevertheless, the Europe of the nineteenth century was a Europe that produced leadership for the world and a fairly adequate standard of living.

The changes have been wrought through a number of factors. For one thing, the population of Europe became too heavy for its semifeudal land system, and the strife between farmers and city dwellers came into the open. The productive plant of Europe became obsolete, especially since it was having to compete with a new and well integrated industry in the United States. The age of empire ended without the European mind or economy being prepared for the change. War was taken as the only way out, and all the wars did was to create new and more dangerous difficulties. Over and over again, vested privilege in Europe sought to preserve its traditional power through violence and intrigue. Instead of fairly facing the issues of the changing world, European statesmen allowed their moral resources to dry up, and were left simply with hollow phrases and finally with concentration camps.

The fortunate position of the United States, which was made possible by the balance and humanism of nineteenth century Europe, was consequently destroyed. The frontier of the United States ceased to be the Statue of Liberty, and suddenly became the Rhine. American statesmen, most especially those of the Woodrow Wilson variety, saw that we must have a positive government capable of making positive decisions and capable of planning for a positive future. But the old idea of isolation and insulation was hard to kill. Over and over again, Wilson warned that unless we made the League of Nations work, the future would be filled with bloody and terrible wars; and over and over again, those who could not see the change resented the idea of a positive government and retreated into the past. After all, they argued, we have gotten where we are by rigidly adhering to George Washington's dictum—no foreign entanglements. What they forgot was that George Washington lived some years earlier, and that change is as inevitable as life itself.

When Franklin Delano Roosevelt took over the Presidency in 1933, we had no positive government with regard to foreign policy, and we had no positive government regarding our domestic policy. Roosevelt was faced with the necessity of creating a positive government almost overnight. He had to throw together countless numbers of bureaus and agencies to solve pressing domestic problems. He of course made a large number of errors. But had he acted in the tradition of the past, the United States would have seen horrible, bloody strife. The bread lines were bad enough. The marches on Washington seemed almost impossible. The itinerant beggars who wanted to work, who had skills, but who could not find work, presented a picture that this country found revolting and rather incomprehensible. Out of the stuff that usually breeds revolution, Roosevelt was able, through a lot of luck and a real social vision, to fashion a positive state.

But this was the domestic side of our problem. He did little or nothing at that time with foreign affairs. As far as the rest of the world was concerned, we were still isolationists. Admittedly we were waking up to the fact that we could not live forever on an unconscious, unplanned road of happy prosperity. But we were not recognizing that the peace of the world was ultimately going to depend upon whether or not the United States could recognize its responsibilities and formulate a positive policy of leadership.

One thing, at least, should be pointed out. All during the period which stretched between the two world wars, the American people were giving money to Europe. It was not organized, and the fact that it wasn't was a very substantial cause of the 1929 crash. In those dim days European governments floated countless securities in the United States. Our banks, insurance companies, and individual investors bought these securities and soon found them worthless. Untold millions of dollars poured into European reconstruction, and untold numbers of investors lost their savings.

Because the United States Government had no positive idea of our relations to Europe, we individually and collectively through our banks and investors, helped to rearm Europe. We rebuilt German cities, and then the cities defaulted on their debt; we rebuilt French industry and got no return on our investment; and we did the same for other countries.

There is nothing to be gained by reviewing the years between 1933 and 1941 when the scrap metal from the Third Avenue El in New York City fell in Pearl Harbor. Perhaps it would be a good idea to review it simply to show how wrong we were, and how incapable we were of recognizing facts right before our noses. But the task is embarrassing, and I am sure that we all know the facts.

Now we are faced with the necessity of seeing into the future once again. We cannot afford an atomic war, and every American citizen knows it. We cannot afford to be guided by the clichés of the past which cry, "Peace, peace," when there is no peace. We cannot afford to be taken in by panaceas dreamed up in libraries or conference rooms throughout the world. We can actually afford only one thing, and that is to face the facts as squarely as we can and plan our future in the light of them.

What are the facts of Europe? Even if you leave aside Russia's threat, Europe is today a land of desperate people. Europe does not understand now, and it never has understood, the spiritual foundations of American democracy. The German people, for example, knew nothing about democracy, and consequently our attempt to impose the Weimar constitution upon them was little short of ridiculous. We must recognize that we cannot export American democracy and impress it upon Europe. Democracy grows out of a people; it cannot be imposed upon a people.

Another fact one learns when in Europe is that the idea of American free enterprise, as well as its practice, has long disappeared from the countries of its birth. Free enterprise as we know it is not a live option for present-day Europeans. We are going to have to live with a socialized Europe, and we might as well face it now. The surplus which makes our economy possible for us is not present in Europe, and it may never be revived. There are too many people and too few goods. Much of European land is worn out, and much of the possibility for

world trade has been taken away. England has been losing her surplus since the close of the First World War. She must pattern her life according to the greatest good for the greatest number. England and the rest of Europe have their backs against the wall. In many areas they cannot afford the type of freedom and liberty which the American people enjoy. In essence England's problem is no different from that of the rest of Europe.

If we look at England carefully we can see some of the reasons for Europe's present plight. About 30 years ago, when the world was coming out of its First Global War, England was burdened with a heavy internal debt for the first time since Henry VIII. She had always been dependent upon her export markets, and now she found them sadly shrunken. Many of her most important customers had become self-sufficient. And rapid strides in industrialization had raised up new competitors. The whole period between the two wars was a period of increasing difficulty for England's exporters.

Now, it must be remembered that England is an island economy. It is the least self-sufficient of all nations. It is a heavily populated, small section of the world. It must import some 50 percent of its food supply and over 80 percent of its raw materials. If there is no export of finished goods, there is no way of paying for the imports. With a shrinking of export markets, England had to find some other method for paying for her imports, or starve herself out of business.

England's salvation between the wars came in the form of interest on overseas investments and from shipping and insurance earnings. Interest on investment alone gave her a net income of about $500,000,000 each year. Through these earnings England paid for approximately one-third of her total imports.

England was living off her fat. Instead of reorganizing industry and setting off on an aggressive campaign to recapture world markets, the English took an almost wholly negative approach to their problem. Industrial management, unfettered by antitrust laws, got together and set prices and divided what markets they had. They set the prices high, high enough to keep the least efficient producer in business. They consequently aided the downward plunge of British business.

The labor unions did the same thing in their area. Instead of trying to achieve high production at low cost, the workers increased featherbedding and promoted the growth of restrictive practices. They wanted to make the work go as far as possible by dividing it up rather than by satisfying new demand.

When England went into the Second World War she went in with an inadequate productive capacity, and was consequently thrown on her overseas resources. Throughout the war she liquidated her investments to buy arms and food. Private holdings by individual Britons were confiscated, and the Government used the money. By the end of the war Britain had debts where she used to have investments. And her productive plant was even more obsolete. England came out of World War II with a heroic record for fighting totalitarianism, a terrific debt, and one of the lowest standards of living in Europe.

In varying degrees, England's history and problem illustrate the situation all over Europe. The two great World Wars have knocked out traditional wealth, and the people of Europe are looking for a new way to make a living and be free. They have been forced by their own short-sightedness and by the march of progress in non-European countries to dismantle many of their ancient patterns of thought and action. Not since the upheaval of the thirteenth century has Europe been forced to such a radical reexamination of her aims and purposes in life. In country after country that I visited, the people expressed the same confusion and the same sense of being violently uprooted from a traditional past.

The serious life and death question for Europe is whether or not it can discover a specific mission in the world. The European peoples are going to live, and what we want to know is how they are going to live. People can cooperate with each other to solve mutual problems in a number of ways. After all, Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin, all three, got people working together and the trains running on time. The trouble is that we can't live in a world where Europe solves its problems in the fashions proposed by these men, and it is my conviction that confused as they may be, the peoples of Europe don't want this kind of solution. They would like to be able to live in peace, they would like to be able to live harmoniously with others, they would like to be able to count innumerable friends all over the world. But they will forego that desire if it means death through starvation, or a very, very low subsistence living.

What the United States wants for Europe is not that it be a colonial possession of ours but rather that it be an independent association of nations living in peace and harmony with each other, and with us. What Russia wants is that Europe become a colony of the Kremlin. By so doing, Europe would be able to produce for the Russian people and Europeans would live in a slave-labor camp. It would further provide Russia with the opportunity for jumping to the Western Hemisphere and ultimately bringing to fruition the Communist dream of world revolution and domination. Without Europe, Russia is contained. With Europe, Russia will be able to gain absolute control over the peoples of this planet. The European peoples themselves have a vague recognition that this is the case. They don't want to go to Russia, but they are not quite sure that the United States has the plan or the understanding necessary for their salvation.

In the past years we have not offered a constructive alternative to fascism, nazism, and communism. In fact, if you take our public opinion as something measured by the editorials in the isolationist press and the speeches of unaware politicians, all we have done is to resent the fact that Europe has a problem. And this resentment is certainly no alternative to the totalitarian dictatorships.

The constant debate we conduct with ourselves—whether or not to participate in the affairs of Europe—is only a dilemma of the mind. In the real situation, there is no choice, no place else to go. We are not willing to submit to failure as a power and to abdicate the leadership which has been thrust upon us. The difficulty is that in keeping alive the illusion that we might do so we reduce the effectiveness of our efforts in world leadership.

We are today, whether we like it or not, the leader of western civilization. Whether we like it or not, we have to supply the saving grace for western Europe. There is no longer the buttress of British diplomacy, the British Navy, and a fairly stabilized economy of Europe. We have no way of escaping the role history has given us to play. When President Monroe issued the Monroe Doctrine, he issued it without a navy to back it up. He was confident, however, that the British Navy would defend the integrity of that doctrine. Over and over again in American history, we have counted on these buffers between us and a responsible role in Europe. Now the buffers are all gone. We will lead Europe, and we will either lead Europe into the death-trap of Communist dictatorship, or we will lead her into a tolerably well-ordered and tolerably free society. But willingly, we are the leaders. This means that those of us who thought that at least by 1952 we would be able to pull out of Europe and that we would stop the ECA and get back to hunting, fishing, baseball and business as usual, have been all wrong. We will never be able to get out of Europe, because if we ever do leave, the vacuum created by our departure will be filled at once by an imperialistic Russia; and it is a simple step from a Russia-dominated Europe to a Russia-dominated United States. To remain alone as a sitting-duck with Russia dominating the productive capacity of Europe and their people and the people of Asia, would cost such a definite burden on the United States that our expenditures today would be insignificant and in the process free enterprise and democracy would vanish.

The running debate we conduct with ourselves—whether we will or will not participate in the affairs of Europe—is a gigantic illusion. It is carried on in our minds, not in our actions. Actually, of course, we have participated in European affairs in a large way since 1914. We were involved in two World Wars. It has been estimated that the American people have sent in cash to Europe, between 1914 and 1948, before the Marshall plan, some $20,000,000,000 for nonmilitary expenditures such as loans, private charities, immigrant remittances, UNRRA, buying of gold, etc. Now, at least, we should be thoroughly aware of the part we are to play. The real situation is now, as it has been for some time; we have no choice. We cannot abdicate, but we can play our part so badly that only disaster can result. The difficulty with keeping this illusory debate alive is that we reduce our effectiveness in world leadership. We were not good leaders in the twenties and thirties—but our very lives depend upon our being excellent leaders in this day.

World leadership has always been, and will always be, expensive. Leadership of any kind is expensive. It costs time to be a political leader, and, of course, it costs a lot of money. The men who are the leaders in our community are men who say that they are willing to devote time and effort and money to the good of the community. You don't elect as president of your local club a person who tells you at the outset that he will be glad to consult with you twice throughout the year, but not to expect time from him in actual leadership. Well, this is what the world expects of us—time. Time in the form of military aid and military personnel. Time in the form of conference time. But most important of all, time in that crystallized form known as money. After all, the thing which makes an object valuable is the time that went into its production. If it takes a great deal of time, it costs more in our money exchange than if it takes a small amount of time. So money is in a sense solidified time—the time that the American people as a Nation are willing to give to the leadership of the world. The expense of leadership must therefore be measured in terms of time. How much time are you and I willing to give for world peace? How much of our day's working time are we willing to give so that Europeans may find the proper answer to their life and death questions? When the Congress appropriates a fund for European relief, they are appropriating a portion of your time. If you are not willing to give it, then you are unwittingly aiding the imperialistic ambitions of one of the most vicious tyrannies civilization has seen. Don't forget that Britain paid heavily for her leadership of the world. Don't forget that the United States must pay heavily for its leadership of the world. We have a heavy burden or a heavy opportunity.

The only cement that holds Europe together is its confidence in the United States. American initiative is a must. Most of us who think about integration use it as a form of escapism, thinking that if Europe organ-

lose we can give up the burden of leadership and go back to fishing and the old ball game.

The fact of the matter is, I suppose, that we don't want leadership. Of course, we would rather go hunting, fishing, see ball games, live quietly on tree-lined streets, have our children grow up in comfort and security—live in general the kind of independent life that we Americans mean by well-being. Unfortunately for us, we haven't the decision to make. We will lead. We have to lead. We are compelled to lead. And the question is only where we will lead.

The question, Where will we lead? is being asked all over Europe, and it should be asked all over the United States. What will we do about Germany? What we do about Germany may be the decisive force that will make the future one of war or peace. What should we do about President Truman's justly famous fourth point? Should we actually set to work to rebuild depressed areas, raise standards of living, create customers and prosperity? These and a host of other questions force themselves upon us when we ask the question, Where will we lead?

We still like to woo constancy with philandering words. In enacting the European recovery program we reserve our position not only with respect to the sequel, but also during the term of the program itself. Thus we make the leadership effective for only a year at a time, and each spring Congress renews the debate not only as to the amount to be spent in the ensuing year, but also upon the question of whether the program is to be continued or to be summarily dropped. Moreover, the relevant legislation reserves the right of the Congress to back out and call off the program by concurrent resolution at any moment it may choose to do so. Likewise with the mutual defense assistance program. This is supposed to supply the sinew of a solemn, permanent alliance, and yet the legislation is enacted for only a year at a time. Our Nation thus seeks the benefits of a permanent alliance while preserving the freedom of a companionate marriage. Again the legislation includes the statement of the right of the Congress to call the whole thing off by concurrent resolution.

My trip to Europe and the study I have undertaken in connection with my work on the Foreign Affairs Committee leads me to think that there are a number of steps which we must take at once. These steps point in the direction we should go, and give an indication at least of the kind of positive foreign policy we require.

1. Tactically we must think in short terms and be ready for quick shifts of position and changes of technique, but we must not let these characteristics, appropriate to the tactics of the situation, affect our thinking in relation to general strategy. America must insure that any permanent preponderance of power, when realized, shall be on the side with which America is aligned. To this end America must be willing to pledge the same steadfastness of policy and action that it expects from its friends. These considerations are basic to any success we may achieve in general strategy. We cannot fully realize that if we continue the shallow pretense of facing the world a year at a time. The national mind must be made up. We must recognize that there are a number of cherished ideas which must be branded as illusions. We must recognize that the most dangerous illusion of our present situation is the one that tells us that short-term and short-run investments pay higher dividends than long term securities.

2. The Marshall plan and the military assistance program must be formulated and enacted on a long range basis. It is impractical and wasteful to think we can organize the economic and military life of many nations on a year to year basis. If after our careful and considered judgment the actions taken by the recipient are against ours, and their long term interest, we should impose conditions. These conditions should not be based on folklore but on a tough appraisal of the facts and required results.

3. Western Germany must be brought into a strong council of Europe and must not be permitted to make independent unilateral decisions. The Ruhr Valley should not be returned to the cartelists who so successfully stifled trade before the war and so successfully aided Hitler's rise to power. Western Germany must sit among democratic nations and must have her decisions checked and double checked by those who have been her victims in two wars. But it must be recognized that England cannot continue her policy of commonwealth isolation. She must be a part of the Council of Europe. Without England a strong council would be unworkable, and unnecessarily expensive to the United States. It would also give an unregenerated Germany independent power.

4. President Truman's proposal to aid in the reconstruction of depressed areas throughout the world should be implemented by Congress. If we allow vast numbers of people to starve, we are not only immoral, we are also inviting Russia to go in as their saviors. In addition, we are keeping alive by our own inaction situations which can only breed revolution and unrest. With atomic bombs in Russia and the possibility of atomic war hanging over our heads, such a course is suicidal. Also, we are, by inaction, restricting our markets and refusing to build a firm foundation for internal and world prosperity.

5. We should give governmental guarantees to businessmen who will enter the world with their risk capital. When I introduced the Ribicoff amendment to the ECA Act of 1949, I did so because I felt that no American businessman should be asked to take the nonbusiness political risks which investments abroad now entail. I still believe it, and I am happy to see that ECA officials and most all foreign experts are now in accord. We need investment in Europe, and we can get it only if there is some provision for converting earnings into dollars and guaranties against extraordinary political risks. Insofar as our Government insures this portion of the burden it eliminates to such an extent taxpayers' dollars. Private enterprise is needed—needed very badly as a cooperating part of our foreign program.

6. We should reexamine the immigration policies in the contemporary world. You will never solve the Italian and German problem until you solve the problem of their excess populations. Somehow a way must be found to resettle millions of people in other parts of the world. There are huge territories potentially rich in resources and presently unpopulated. Colonizing these areas could be dovetailed with President Truman's point 4. We cannot intelligently consider this problem without also a thorough study of our own capacity to absorb new immigrants and give them a chance for a decent life.

7. We must encourage multilateral and reciprocal trade. Our tariff structure must be reexamined over a period of time. We must recognize that Europe, which desperately needs dollars, can't earn them if they are not allowed into our market places. Trade is a two-way street. We either buy from them or continue to give them the large sum of free dollars to buy from us.

8. A Marshall plan for the Far East should be formulated with the non-Communist Asiatic peoples. We should encourage the welfare, economic strengthening and nationalistic strivings of the vast millions who heretofore have been mere pawns in an exploiting imperialism now dead.

9. The United Nations should be aided and encouraged by us as a very real instrument for preserving the peace. It should be strengthened. We are surely on the road to disaster if we allow the UN to perish. In spite of its ineffectiveness in the present East-West controversy, it is the only public forum for debate on world issues. As a mediating agency it did wonders in the dispute between Israel and the Arabs. In countless ways it is now breaking down the barriers which separate men and cause nations to resort to war. Its decisive activity in world affairs is, I am sure the fervent hope of all of us. The UN cannot be strong unless you and I seize each opportunity to aid it and understand it.

10. The American people should be directly and consistently in favor of world federalism. Today world federation is a dream, but like all good dreams it helps us see the direction we should take when specific issues present themselves. We want to move toward an association of peoples, federally united in the common cause of decent living for all. By being in favor of world federation, by understanding it, by seeing its vision, we set our minds and hearts on an ultimate goal that will furnish some pattern for our work for peace. We should not be deluded into thinking that we can gain the goal easily or in a short time. But hard or long as the road may be, it is certainly the one we should travel.

11. Finally, I suggest that we do all in our power to strengthen our atomic production and defenses. All of us abhor the economic wastefulness of an arms race. Paradoxical as it may seem to many, a strong American Military Establishment is today our best safeguard against war. A democratic nation does not, and our history proves it, engage in imperialistic warfare. We don't want colonies, we don't want subjected people, we don't want to control the world. We want other peoples to be independent, prosperous, and peaceful. If we can attain that, we will be satisfied with our leadership. Consequently, a strong Military Establishment serves only two purposes in peacetime: (1) It deters other nations from starting a shooting war, since they know that the United States is well prepared to defend itself; and (2) it provides us with the means for staying in existence if another nation should attack.

I am convinced that these steps will lead us in the direction of a positive foreign policy which will result in peace rather than war. They are all expensive. They will all take your time and mine. The preservation of western civilization is worth it. I am sure that my children and the children they will someday have are worth it. And I am further sure that you and I live in a Nation that will forthrightly accept the responsibility that history has thrust upon us.

[From the Hartford Courant of November 29, 1949]

MR. RIBICOFF REPORTS

Representative A. A. RIBICOFF has taken his courage in his hands. Fresh from a trip to Europe, in which he is interested because of his post on the House Foreign Affairs Committe, he spoke in West Hartford last night before the Foreign Policy Association and the League of Women Voters. What he said will hardly be popular. Many persons have become irked at and skeptical about the Marshall plan and other forms of aid. It is this, apparently, that leads Mr. RIBICOFF to say that the American people are less prepared for the truth about Europe now than in the recent past. In any case he insists that we face the facts, and act accordingly.

One fact Mr. RIBICOFF stresses is that we cannot export American democracy to the Continent. Self-government by the people as individuals thrives only where it takes root spontaneously. Again, Mr. RIBICOFF made a point noted by many another observer able to penetrate beyond the gay spots and the scenery abroad, namely that free enterprise

as we know it simply does not exist in Europe today. Nor is it "a live option." You have either the cartels that helped bring on two world wars, or you try something else. American individual business enterprise also cannot be exported and imposed. So "we are going to have to live with a socialized Europe, and we might as well face it now."

Mr. RIBICOFF points to Britain as an example of the rest of Europe. "England came out of World War II with a heroic record for fighting totalitarianism, a terrific war debt, and one of the lowest standards of living in Europe." Wars have sucked much of the old vitality out of Europe, and that is the chief source of the trouble. This leads Mr. RIBICOFF to his real argument, which is that we are involved in Europe up to our necks with no hope of escape. To think we can debate whether or not to help Europe is an illusion. Even if we do nothing we shall lead Europe. Hence we shall lead it either "into the death trap of Communist dictatorship, or * * * into a tolerantly well-ordered and tolerantly free society." And this is going to cost us time, effort, and money.

On this foundation Mr. RIBICOFF proposes several concrete steps. Instead of legislating from year to year, he wants us to formulate an enduring, long-term policy that will be as fixed as that of Great Britain when it led the world during the nineteenth century. The Marshall plan and military aid, Mr. RIBICOFF insists, cannot end next year, nor even in the supposed target date of 1952.

All this is controversial. But it will bear some thinking over. It is well to have Mr. RIBICOFF urge us to do so. It is, in fact, a challenge that should come not from an individual Representative, but from the President and his administration. Perhaps Mr. Truman finds Mr. RIBICOFF's conclusions politically unpopular. But they may not turn out to be so in the end. If a political figure speaks in accents that the people recognize as the truth, there is usually a response.

[From the Hartford Times of November 29, 1949]

IT'S A GOOD SYSTEM

Through the cooperation of the West Hartford League of Women Voters and the Hartford Foreign Policy Association, several hundred persons last night were privileged to hear Congressman ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF in a demonstration of representative government at its best.

Mr. RIBICOFF has just returned from a survey of the principal countries of Europe where he went as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. His talk last night was a report to his constituents on his experiences, his interviews with top-rank leaders, his personal observations, and most important of all, his conclusions as to what the United States ought to do to develop a positive and long-term foreign policy. He spoke with engaging frankness, deep sincerity, and such evidences of a practical loyalty to American ideals as to make his address a vital occasion in realistic civics.

It was about a year ago that the voters of the First District decided to send Mr. RIBICOFF to Congress. He was a good choice then, but his talk last night showed that during the past 12 months he has grown to meet his greater responsibilities and opportunities. It is gratifying to know that this district is through him rendering real service in the constructive handling of large affairs in Washington. But it is no less satisfactory to have our Representative return from time to time and pay us the compliment of such a straightforward presentation of personal views and such a challenge to continued service in the advancement of American ideals as Mr. RIBICOFF brought home last night. It is evident that he has not become lost in the petty affairs that are supposed to endear a Congressman to his electorate and assure his reelection. As our Representative he has come to grips with large issues. As a dutiful public servant he had come home to tell us how this situation appears to him. It was an example of how our system works at its best.

Mr. Speaker, the following are a series of articles distributed throughout the United States by the North American Newspaper Alliance:

ENGLAND

England's problem is a world problem, perhaps even more so than they realize. Ever since the United States fought its war against England we have used England as a buffer against European dangers. England has been a kind of financial and political balance wheel which kept the Europe of the nineteenth century in a semblance of order. To be sure, there have been lapses and serious mistakes on her part. However, for a century the British have stabilized Europe through diplomacy. Today this stabilizing force is gone.

Many of Britain's present difficulties can be traced back to the First World War. Britain came out of the First World War with an extremely heavy load of internal debt. Her export markets were sadly shrunken and some of her most important nineteenth century customers had been forced by the war to become increasingly self-sufficient. The industrialization of the rest of the world had proceeded at a rapid pace and the small island economy was no longer as important as it had once been.

It must be remembered that England is the least self-sufficient of all the great nations. Dependent on overseas supplies, she imports approximately 50 percent of her food and about 80 percent of her raw materials. The entire industrial structure of the country is inevitably organized for export trade. When export markets shrink as they did following the First World War, England is faced with the real possibility of economic death.

The menace, however, was not nearly as great between the two wars as it is today. Although England's troubles began in 1914, she went into the Second World War with overseas investments which were valued at about $16,000,000,000 and which provided her with a net income of about $800,000,000. When this interest on investments was added to the earnings made in banking, shipping, and insurance, it left a sizable amount which was just about sufficient to absorb the losses incurred by shrunken industrial markets.

But the Second World War wiped out Britain's overseas assets, raised the shipping tonnage of the United States and other countries, and generally curtailed the number of services England could sell to the outside world. All her dollar-earning assets were taken from her people and used up for war material. As a consequence, England came out of the war a debtor rather than a creditor nation.

England's industrial plant is today more obsolete than it was when she was losing her markets before the war. Her industry has been badly managed since the close of the nineteenth century. Britain has no antitrust laws and, consequently, price fixing was and is a common practice. Business management was lead by stuffed-shirt directorates, with the emphasis being on social standing and cultural background. Nepotism was rife, with a hostility toward research. There was a dread of change and the worship of status quo.

On the worker's side there has been, since the First World War, a steady growth of restrictive practices designed to make a job last as long as possible, to keep in employment as many workers as possible. Any outside observer could have seen and certainly many did see that both management and labor were heading for disaster.

This negative approach on the part of both management and labor assumed that demand throughout the world was limited and that productive capacity should be related to demand. They seem to have lost the idea that demand can be increased by lowering prices. In the end, Britain turned out to be a high-cost producer with a low standard of living.

This is not to say that there is no real fight left in the British. It should be remembered that in the past year alone they have boosted productivity by 4 percent. The total industrial production of Britain is 31 percent higher than it was in 1938. Imports are down 18 percent and exports are up 86 percent. This is a record of national effort and sacrifice which is certainly not equalled by the United States or any other world power.

Those Americans who find it politically advantageous to point to England's troubles and say they all result from the policies of the labor government, engage in a dangerous falsification. The labor government came to power in 1945. England's troubles began many years earlier. Her social services are financed out of taxes raised at home, and Marshall plan dollars are not used for these purposes. It should be remembered that England is long on sterling and short on dollars. The dollars are used for food and raw material.

The serious question is what England must do now. First, she must reestablish her productive capacity and shift even more from a domestic to an export economy. She must reestablish and increase her productive capacity. This will require greater individual effort from each and every person, labor and management alike. Industry which is satisfied to do business in the sterling market only will have to be given incentives to change over to the dollar-earning market. This may well lead to the allocation of both labor and materials to such industries willing to make the change-over.

Currently she must have United States help if we expect England to return as a stabilizing factor in Europe. In so doing we not only help her, but we get an effective ally in the world today. England, however, should show in return a sincere and cooperative spirit, looking toward the economic and political integration of Europe. While this won't happen tomorrow, it will never be accomplished if the will to do so is lacking.

The United States, on the other hand, is not going to be able to keep on exporting and not importing. Trade is a two-way street. We either reexamine our tariff structure, which denies the English manufacturer competitive entry into this country, or we continue to give them the money to buy from us.

Twisting the lion's tail for local political advantage in this country must be replaced by a policy of broad understanding and the realization that England can still be a helpmate in a balanced world rather than a financial burden.

LABOR

There is very little constructive social thinking among the trade unionists of Europe. Some years ago all trade unionists were concerned to map out a plan for the future that would directly relate to the building up of the worker's economic position. Before Russia became a problem in a political sense, the trade-unions of Europe were filled with theoretical Marxists. These Marxists were not tied to any special political party nor were they particularly interested in furthering the imperialistic aims of Russia. Rather they used Marxism as a frame of reference and as a mode of interpretation.

The Communists today are no longer theoretical Marxists. They are totally unconcerned with the bettering of working conditions and their primary aim is to help Russia in whatever they can. World revolution then is more important than full stomachs and safe working conditions.

The non-Communist trade-union people of today are confused and fearful lest they fall into some Communist trap. They spend the greatest portion of their time fighting Communists for control of the unions. They have few economists and social scientists who advise them, and the ones that they do have are certainly not the best available.

As a consequence, the Communist unions in Europe are well-disciplined agents of Russian foreign policy and the non-Communist unions lack discipline and express the general confusion in the minds of European people.

All except the Communist unions are financially weak. Members do not have money enough to pay substantial dues with frozen wage scales (at rates equivalent to about $15 a week in United States dollars) and there is little possibility for a successful strike. Communists unions in both Italy and France are currently getting money from the outside and are using it for propaganda against the west and for fomenting possible internal revolution.

French trade unionists are baffled by the United States labor movement. For years now they have been educated to understand politics in terms of class lines. The two-party system in America where both parties include conservatives and liberals is almost incomprehensible. The lack of definite party responsibility in the United States also leads to their misunderstanding of us. Although the French unionists recognize that American labor is largely in the camp of the Democratic Party, they have no clear idea of how labor's influence is felt in the Democratic Party, nor do they have a very certain impression that labor is an important political force.

The syndicalist tradition in France makes open alinement with political parties impossible for the non-Communist unions. They do little or nothing to help the party select candidates or formulate party platforms. After the platforms and candidates have been designated most of the unions publish a paper indicating which parts of the party platforms and which candidates seem to them the most nearly in accord with their own aims. There is no feverish activity in the labor movement around election time and mostly labor's influence in Government is exerted through conversation and conference.

I asked innumerable labor leaders in all parts of Europe about the possibility of a labor party. In each case I was told that the trade unionists themselves do not want a political party but that they may be forced into organizing one if the established parties continue to disregard their interests.

All in all, the European labor movement presents a contrasting picture to that found in the United States. Here our unions spend a great deal of time thinking through the problems not only of their own unions but the total economy. European unionists, on the other hand, spend most of their time fighting either the Communists or the non-Communists. I got no clear impression from anyone in the labor movement regarding a well thought out plan for the future and a program of economic reconstruction.

It must be clearly understood by Americans that communism works primarily through labor unions and intellectuals. The European unions have a far better record than the European intellectuals. Most of the important unions have, like their brothers in the United States, taken a firm stand that communism, despite the end of the benefits trade unionism tries to achieve. Many European intellectuals are much less sure.

Through the excellent and knowing staff of labor experts from the ECA and the State Department, the non-Communist trade unions are being brought into closer cooperation with western policy makers. Through this cooperation, our efforts to reconstruct the economic life of Europe is made more realistic and more universal.

If it had not been for the Marshall plan, European labor would today be completely hopeless. The unions, without the Marshall plan, would long ago have been forced to the Communist position. Communists can offer nothing but Russian type slavery; the non-Communist union leaders can point to cooperation with ECA and the actual arrival of food and industrial equipment.

A conversation with Luigi Morelli, secretary for Union Activities, Free Italian General Confederation of Workers, had the following questions and answers on the Marshall plan:

"Mr. RISCOFF. What does your union think of the Marshall plan?

"Mr. MORELLI. Our union is grateful to the American people for what they have done and for what the American workers have contributed in the form of taxes to this plan. Italian workers feel closer to the American workers because of this. I can also say this: I took a stand in favor of the Marshall plan before the Italian elections. I took this open stand at the mass meeting in the Piazza del Duomo in Milan when Louis Saillant, French Communist, secretary of the World Federation of Trade Unions, came out against the Marshall plan, together with Di Vittorio.

"Mr. RISCOFF. What do you think would have happened in Italy without the Marshall plan?

"Mr. MORELLI. First, we wouldn't have been able to make the come-back materially that we have made; second, the standard of living of the Italian workers would be about 50 percent of what it is today; and third, politically, we would have more Communists, and possibly a Communist government."

These questions were asked in all of the western countries, and the answers were almost identical in every case.

The American people should not lose the interest and enthusiasm of the European workers. They are, through their unions, one of the most effective checks on Communist expansion.

CATHOLIC CHURCH

The Catholic Church is the most ancient single institution in Europe. It has seen many governments rise and many kings, dictators, presidents and premiers fall. To visit the Vatican is to wander back in time and have the whole range of western history pass in review.

The historic durability of the Roman Catholic Church was even more apparent in the attitudes and ideas expressed by the Pope, Pius XII, as the Popes before, takes a long view of history. He sees this present struggle with communism as the fourteenth century saw their struggle with Islam. Eventually, he is sure, the right side will be the victor. Yet, the present day church, as the church of the past, is charged with a responsibility to help bring about the victory.

One of the more memorable parts of my trip was the private audience with Pope Pius XII. Scheduled to last one-half hour, it extended for 37 minutes. As I entered his private library, he was seated behind his desk. Going to his right we shook hands, American style. Seventy-four years of age, with a frail physical constitution, the Pope has clear twinkling eyes and is unusually alert and keen. His grasp of world affairs is truly remarkable. The Pope speaks English and knows the United States. We discussed many international problems touching on the welfare of mankind, the cause of peace and human solidarity. He showed a sustained interest in peace, justice, freedom and the dignity of the individual.

Since the earliest days of Christianity, the church at Rome has been a potent political force. Rome picked up the pieces of the disintegration of the ancient Roman empire; the church pulled civilization out of the mire of the Dark Ages; and today the Vatican is faced with its most difficult political challenge—the defeat of Russian communism.

The present-day problem is couched in different terms and set in a different world. The world is no longer Europe and the Mediterranean—it is a total globe. Roman catholicism is no longer a highly centralized, closely knit and geographically localized institution. Today it is spread over the world. It has far-flung outposts in the Far East, Africa, South America, and the United States.

The terms of today's fight are different also. In the past, catholicism has fought paganisms and other religions which claim to understand God in a different fashion. Now, catholicism is fighting a gigantic, imperialistic, secular religion which knows no God. In fact, this secular religion claims that all religions which speak of God are "opiates of the people"—man's worst luxury.

Pope Pius XII and the other Vatican officials recognize that communism is a religion. They know that a person cannot declare absolute allegiance to the state, while at the same time serve the Roman Church. It is impossible for the church to admit that the state has absolute control, usurping the authority of God.

The soul of European man is, therefore, the prize for which Russia and the Catholic Church struggle. If Russia should win, the Vatican knows that a whole new generation of Europeans will be raised as Communists, not as Christians. If the Church should win, she will win in concert with the western democracies, and freedom of religion will be a practiced fact.

Roman catholicism works in a number of ways to achieve victory in its struggle. She offers herself as a point of resistance in the iron-curtain countries, even to the extent of having top church officials jailed and tortured; she works through trade unions to teach the lie of communism and the utter falsity of its economic claims; she answers the theoretical charges made by Marxist philosophers and points out in simple language how illogical and false are their claims; finally, the Catholic Church provides a strong bond of union among its 400,000,000 church members spread throughout the world.

But the Catholic Church is more than a powerful political foe of communism. In the parishes throughout Europe and the rest of the world, Catholic worship and moral teaching is helping to heal the wounds left by depression and war. Without fanfare, local priests daily perform their services to man, helping along with other spiritual leaders to build the kind of lives that will some day make possible a decent world.

Europe needs the services of their spiritual leaders—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—in this day more than at any other time in history. As far as I could judge, the leadership of all religious traditions are actively fulfilling their trust.

GERMANY

The American people have never had a thought-out policy with regard to Germany. When we established General Clay as the Military Governor of western Germany, we gave him no policy; we simply allowed him to play by ear. Congress never legislated on Germany. What policy we had that came out of Congress came through the Appropriations Committee. Clay as a consequence had only one real political responsibility, and that was a dollars and cents one.

General Clay, therefore, felt that he was doing his job adequately as long as it was being done as cheaply as possible.

In addition to this negative emphasis is the fact that the Army was running Germany. When an army runs anything, it sits on it. The strength of any soldier is in his ability to guard the state and to make real political decisions possible; but his job is to set the conditions for political decisions, not to make them. From the earliest times both the strength and the weakness of the soldier has been his limited frame of reference. He has never been a diplomat in any over-all sense.

General Clay's administration of Germany was a soldier's administration. As a soldier he did an excellent job; he wasn't expected to exercise political vision.

German recovery has been rapid and, as one would expect, efficient. It must be remembered that Germany is the industrial heart of Europe and the Ruhr Valley is the industrial heart of Germany. Russian actions with regard to the Berlin blockade and the general German problem are only understood as one recognizes that the clue to Europe is Germany.

The clue to Germany is the Ruhr Valley. If this highly industrialized section of Europe is turned over to the western German people, without effective strings attached, England, France, Belgium, Holland, and the rest of the sovereign states of western Europe have a right to be fearful. German industrialists and cartelists have been outstandingly responsible for two of the most horrible wars in history. They could not have had those wars had it not been for the Ruhr Valley.

Russia knows full well that the greatest propaganda weapon they can have is the reestablishment of German industrialism and German control of the Ruhr. What we have done about Germany is to really close our eyes to the problem. We have sent well-meaning people with well-meaning books to Germany and then asked the Germans why they did not want to become like the United States. German conditions and traditions are so different as to make this a foolish vision. We learned after the First World War when we tried to impose the Weimar constitution on Germany that democracy grows out of the spiritual resources of the people and is never imposed from the top. We know this now, but we still go on in a kind of simple way to ask these people if they will not really be good fellows and act like Americans.

The German problem is, therefore, twofold. On the one hand, it is a long, long process of education and realinement of values. On the other hand it is finding some workable way to use this tremendous industrial potential of the Ruhr as a means of peace rather than as a means of war.

I am frank to say that the solution to the total problem of Germany is complicated and not immediately apparent. Just as many other observers, I recognize that our diplomacy has been bad and that we should have substituted civilian control for the military some years ago. This does not mean, of course, that we should have pulled our Army out, but it does mean that we should have established a civilian policy over the Army at an early stage.

Whether we like it or not, Germany is going to be the center of power in Europe. We can lose this center of power if we do not begin today requiring of our Government and the governments of other western democracies hard practical thought. The other problems of Europe fade into insignificance when we realize that if Germany becomes strong again she can retreat to the old Bismarckian policy of pitting the east against the west. We should not be deceived; she will play footsie with Russia while using our resources for her recovery.

Germany must be made a part of a solid group of western democratic nations. She must never again be allowed to rebuild her industry for the purpose of war, and she must never again be permitted a chance to engage in imperialist expansion. The only way to insure the peaceful future of Germany is to make her a part of a strong, peaceful union.

I am particularly distressed to see that Britain is not aware that she must be an active partner in western union. She is still clinging to her traditional policy of commonwealth isolation. As long as she does, there is no hope of solving the German problem. The western European nations, Germany among them, cannot be economically or politically stable without the British. The prosperity of Europe, the health of Germany, and, in a large measure, the peace of the world depends upon an effective council of Europe. Such a council can only be effective with the full cooperation of a strong Britain.

If the British can be persuaded to change their minds, the talk of making Germany a neutral buffer state between east and west will vanish. And it should vanish. In Europe today, it is impossible to be neutral between communism and democracy—between peace and war—between security and insecurity. The British should know this; certainly the Americans are coming to know it.

One thing is absolutely certain. The American people cannot allow the soft sentimentality of the 1920's to guide the German policy in the 1950's. If Britain does not go into a strong western union, then the United States must. We cannot afford to leave a weak council of Europe with Germany in a position to rise again as an independent power capable of starting another war. All important decisions to be made by the Germans should be made in open meeting with strong democratic nations sitting on either side of her.

Germany, in the very nature of the case, cannot be neutral. We must have her positively seated in a strong western democratic bloc, with strong democratic nations determining the course of action.

PROTESTANT CHURCH

The Protestant Church leaders in Europe are trying to rediscover the specific mission for Europe in today's world. They recognize that the old bonds of unity in Europe are dead. The two world wars have destroyed the ancient bonds which bound the peoples of Europe together and now, if Europe is to be regenerated, something new must take the place of the old.

The Reverend W. A. Visser 'T Hooft said: "None of the old forces can do the trick. Roman Catholicism has thought too much in terms of the maintenance of its institutional life and has been too reactionary; Protestantism too divided and too abstractly spiritual; liberalism too superficial and too individualistic; scientific rationalism too bloodless; socialism too opportunistic; nationalism too destructive. And the classes are equally played out—above all the bourgeoisie with its eternal pursuit of false securities but also the labor class with its understandable but nevertheless sterile resentments."

Visser 'T Hooft's observations deal primarily with the institutions of Europe. His hope and the hope of other Protestant leaders in Europe is that there will be some kind of political unity which will emphasize the freedom of individual consciousness. The World Council of Churches in Geneva, of which Visser 'T Hooft is general secretary, is an anti-Fascist and anti-Communist force. In keeping with the Protestant tradition, they are little concerned with the differences of institutions as such and much more concerned with the development of individualism.

What they see as a goal is a kind of classless individualism which will allow very few economic privileges but a great deal of individual freedom in speech and worship.

In talking with various Protestant leaders it became clear that what they wanted the United States to do more than anything was to persuade Europe into union and perhaps make political union a condition for further aid from the United States. In asking for such a union they place very little emphasis upon specifically religious institutions which might be a part of it. By and large, they do not want established churches paid by the state. They would rather see a separation of church and state which will make it possible for them to give denominational expression to Christianity. If religious freedom is not a part of the new political union, Protestant leaders feel that the foundation of real liberty will be missing.

Protestant thought and action in the political real is less spectacular than that of the Catholic Church but is just as real. It is, of course, just as impossible to be a thorough-going Communist and remain a Protestant as it is to remain a Catholic.

I got the distinct impression that Protestant leadership was of a high quality and that if they are given the proper kind of assistance from the United States and from the American churches, their movement toward unity and their political consciousness would play an increasingly important role in the life of Europe.

But the Protestants have certain special problems which make their future difficult. In some iron-curtain countries the memory of the Reformation and the Hapsburg rule is still strong. This memory makes it almost impossible for Protestants and Catholics to unite against their common enemy. Although this fear and distrust is not confined to the Russian countries, the western churches are much less bound by tradition.

Western European Protestantism, as distinguished from eastern Protestantism, is more vital and more active in political affairs. Protestant pastors, like Catholic priests, offer themselves as organizers for anti-Communist resistance. In western Europe, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish leaders continue to show their people what the alternatives are in the present situation. They know that religion in all its traditional manifestations is up against its most impressive challenge.

The German Lutheran Church has, it seems, learned a lesson from the experience under Hitler. For a long period, the German Lutherans said that they could not in all conscience criticize the state, except as the state interfered with worship. Hitler showed them that a state can be demonical and ultimately the cause of man's spiritual death.

Now they recognize the same demoniac character in Russian communism. They know that unless tyranny, in whatever form, is defeated man will never have the chance or the strength to freely worship God.

Throughout western protestantism there is a real concern for a greater unity among the European countries. The nation is, after all, only a means by which man has tried to perfect his life and achieve justice. Many Protestant leaders think that nationalism has served its purpose and should now be discarded.

What should take the place of nationalism is not clearly seen. The Protestant leaders have no blueprint, but they do have a faith that somehow, somewhere, the proper answer will be found.

GENERAL

Europe will never again have the political and economic balance which was hers during the nineteenth century. The past few years have seen the disappearance, as such, of two military and naval powers, Germany and Japan, and the eclipse of a third, Italy. It has witnessed the serious economic and military depletion of two western powers, England and France. The recovery of their former strength is by no means assured. It has seen the thrusting of Soviet power into central Europe, and, for a year, to the Adriatic. Further, the Politburo has extended its orbit into vast portions of eastern Asia.

In the same period, the United States has involuntarily emerged into the preeminent position of power among western nations. This preeminence is inherent and cannot be abdicated. It is doubtful that history gives us a precise parallel of such a shift in the power situation in so short a period. Such shifts in power do not lend themselves to fast balance. The adjustment is necessarily prolonged over many decades. The economic and security problems of Europe—and this Nation—will not be over in a year or in 25 years. They will continue to challenge our wisest thoughts and best efforts for many years to come. But our thinking will not be wise nor our striving adequate if we cling to the illusion that the situation is a transient one or that we can turn our backs upon it any time we wish and, at most, in just a few years.

What the United States wants for Europe is not that it be a colonial possession of ours but rather that it be an independent association of nations living in peace and harmony with each other, and with us. What Russia wants is that Europe become a colony of the Kremlin. By so doing, Europe would be able to produce for the Russian people and Europeans would live in a slave-labor camp. It would further provide Russia with the opportunity for jumping to the Western Hemisphere and ultimately bringing to fruition the Communist dream of world revolution and domination. Without Europe Russia is contained. With Europe, Russia will be able to gain absolute hegemony over the peoples of this planet. The European peoples themselves have a vague recognition that this is the case. They don't want to go to Russia, but they are not quite sure that the United States has the plan or the understanding necessary for their salvation.

The constant debate we conduct with ourselves—whether or not to participate in the affairs of Europe—is only a dilemma of the mind. In the real situation, there is no choice, no place else to go. We are not willing to submit to failure as a power and to abdicate the leadership which has been thrust upon us. The difficulty is that in keeping alive the illusion that we might do so we reduce the effectiveness of our efforts in world leadership.

We still like to woo constancy with philandering words. In enacting the European recovery program we reserve our position not only with respect to the sequel, but also during the term of the program itself. Thus we make the leadership effective for only a year at a time, and each spring Congress renews the debate not only as to the amount to be spent in the ensuing year, but also upon the question of whether the program is to be continued or is to be summarily dropped. Moreover, the relevant legislation reserves the right of the Congress to back out and call off the program by concurrent resolution at any moment it may choose to do so. Likewise with the mutual defense assistance program. This is supposed to supply the sinew of a solemn, permanent alliance, and yet the legislation is enacted for only a year at a time. Our Nation thus seeks the benefits of a permanent alliance while preserving the freedom of a companionate marriage. Again the legislation includes the statement of the right of Congress to call the whole thing off by concurrent resolution.

In a sense, this is the result of our structure of government. In the United States it is necessary for us to elect Congressmen every 2 years, Presidents every 4 years, and Senators every 6 years. It is certainly true that anyone may run for these offices, against any particular point in our previous foreign policy. The Congress, which must be elected every 2 years, must defend its actions before its constituency. If their actions have not met with approval, the voters will send a man with a different viewpoint to Washington. As a consequence, no foreign policy can actually be formulated, at least in terms of appropriations, for an extended period of time.

This situation in American democracy places the major responsibility on the voter. The American voter must be fully aware of what he is voting for when any party presents a program or a candidate. If the voters do not understand America's position in the world today, they will not be adequately prepared to exercise their franchise in an intelligent fashion.

The voter, who for us is the ultimate formulator of foreign policy, must recognize that our stake in Europe is a long-term and an expensive one. Western civilization requires our leadership, and leadership has never been cheap. No person or nation has been a leader without paying heavily in time and money. So I would urge that we not delude ourselves into thinking that we have only an emergency and short-term problem.

Along with the recognition of an expensive and long-term future, the American people must be aware of the necessity for constancy and consistency in foreign policy. We cannot afford to allow isolationist rabble rousers to lull us to sleep and make us think that our frontier is the Missouri River. No voter who is realistically facing the world of fact will be misled, and it is part of our responsibility as citizens of this Nation and the world to make sure that all the facts are known and well understood.

The national mind must be made up. We must recognize that there are a number of cherished ideas which must be branded as illusions. We must recognize that the most dangerous illusion of our present situation is the one that tells us that short-term and short-run investments pay higher dividends than long-term securities. The American people must be willing to pledge the same steadfastness of policy and concern that it expects from its friends. We cannot afford the luxury of constant shifts and changes of mind. I do not think we will change our mind once we realize the new and different character of today's world.

Commodore Everett B. Drew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, not many of us have the time or the opportunity to become fully acquainted with the activities of many valuable groups and organizations which play a vital role in our country, or with the people who devote their time and energy to make these groups function successfully. One of these groups is the Coast Guard Auxiliary, which is the civilian arm of the oldest military service in the United States.

It is my privilege to be a member of the Coast Guard Auxiliary in the Third Coast Guard District in Brooklyn, which is headed by Commodore Everett B. Drew, a friend of mine of long standing. He may be a commodore without a boat of his own, but he heads an organization which boasts a fleet of 1,206 vessels of various sizes and a membership of 3,032 men. The growth and importance of this auxiliary should be an encouragement to similar groups throughout the country and to the Coast Guard in general.

Mr. Speaker, the following article about Commander Drew appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of November 20, 1949, entitled "Yep, He's a Commodore With No Boat of His Own":

BROOKLYN'S MAN-OF-THE-WEEK—YEP, HE'S A COMMODORE WITH NO BOAT OF HIS OWN

(By Paul Blauvelt)

You've probably heard of the admiral who didn't have a navy. Brooklyn now has the nearest thing to him—a commodore who doesn't have a boat of his own.

Brooklyn's commodore does have a fleet, however, for he's head of an organization of 3,032 men who operate 1,206 vessels ranging from 16-foot runabouts and sailboats to 100-foot yachts.

He's Everett B. Drew, of 314 Stratford Road, just elected commodore of the Coast Guard Auxiliary in the third Coast Guard district. The auxiliary is a strictly civilian arm of the oldest military service in the country, made up of boating enthusiasts who occupy a sort of middle ground between the ranks of the Sunday motorboater and the enlisted forces of the Coast Guard.

The commodore, in fact, has never owned a boat, which may seem rather strange for some one selected by power boat enthusiasts to be their boss. But he's not shy on experience on the water, for he comes of a farm-bred but water-adopting family.

His father, Reuben, who lives at the Stratford Road address and, although in his seventies, is still an active harbor pilot, was born on a farm in North Carolina. He tired of the life, however, and came to Brooklyn to start the Red Hook Towing Co., which sold out many years ago to the Dalzell Towing Co. Later he ran a shipyard in New Baltimore, some 100 miles up the Hudson, but he sold that, too, to come back to piloting.

For many years he was skipper of the old *North Star*, popular fishing boat, and then retired for a time. The *North Star* several years ago became the *Traveller* and was put in the round-Manhattan tourist service. And who commands her? Captain Drew, of course.

It was all this water life of the elder Drew that got the new commodore interested in boating. He spent many a day on the old Red Hook towboats—they're never called tugs in marine circles—and later aboard the *North Star*.

"Actually, I never had to buy a boat," he explained. "I got more water experience with my dad than I ever would have in my own boat. And I still think he's the best pilot in the city."

Strangely enough in this strange half-land, half-water existence, the commodore now spends far more time on land then he ever did before. At least 3 nights a week are spent attending meetings and working on the 60-page manual of standards for the auxiliary which he is compiling—the first such attempt to gather into an authoritative publication all the best in training procedures worked out by various flotillas and divisions in the district.

The auxiliary, little known among strict landlubbers, is rapidly becoming widely known among boating men, although it really dates only from 1939, when it was established as the Coast Guard Reserve. It functioned for 2 years and then became known as the auxiliary when a formal military Reserve was set up.

Thus, the Coast Guard now has three units—the Regular Guard, with men serving enlistments at full pay; the Reserve, with enlistees being paid only when on temporary service, and the auxiliary, composed of private boat owners who use their own craft, on their own time, and pay their own expenses to help out the Guard.

The commodore is sort of a liaison man between the wholly civilian auxiliary and the Regular Guard, passing on down to the various units Coast Guard calls for assistance.

What does the auxiliary do, and why do the members without any hope of financial compensation, devote their time, equipment, and personal funds to the various duties they assume?

"Our aim," says the commodore, "is the protection of the last outpost of an unregimented tribe."

More seriously, he explains that the auxiliary works "to avoid the headaches of strict Government supervision over boating in general."

By educating the casual boat owner in safe operating methods and by establishing ever higher standards of operation and maintenance of private power boats, he says, "We're hoping to keep the boating enthusiast free of unnecessary supervision, letting him show he is a responsible individual on his own."

The auxiliary is, in actuality, a collection of small units. The flotilla is the basic one, composed of at least 10 boats, planes or radio outfits in any combination. There are a number of private planes and a score or more of mobile short-wave transmitters listed as available in the district.

A division is the intermediate unit. It consists of two or more flotillas and covers a large area. For instance, Commodore Drew in 1947 became captain of the Rockaway Inlet division, which takes in all of Brooklyn's water front and Jamaica Bay. It had nine flotillas of varying sizes then; he consolidated them into two big ones, with a total membership of 176 men, about half of whom own boats.

The auxiliary, by the way, is not only a refuge for rugged individualists—it's one of the few remaining sanctuaries for males only.

Commodore Drew, for all practical purposes, is a native of Brooklyn. He was born in Bath, N. Y., in 1905, but he arrived there only because his mother went back to the old homestead just for the occasion. He was promptly brought back to Brooklyn—to Red Hook, where his parents lived for many years.

He went to Public Schools 142, 22, and 6, and Stuyvesant High School in Manhattan, then the only technical high school in the city. He also went to Virginia Polytechnic Institute with the intention of becoming a mechanical engineer. He never worked at it, however. Now he's a representative of the Photostat Corp., selling and installing equipment.

At Stuyvesant High he became coxswain of an eight-oared crew that, in 1922, set an all-time record for a mile on the Harlem River—4 minutes 39 seconds. His athletic operations being confined to playing coxswain, he was dubbed "Rowboat" Drew.

The name has stuck with him through the years. Come to think of it, it rather fits a commodore who doesn't have a boat.

British Oil Policy—Day of Reckoning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Amon G. Carter, president and publisher of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, has for many years followed a middle-of-the-road position through his editorial columns on the problems of the petroleum industry and particularly the operations of that industry in the State of Texas.

The Star-Telegram issue of December 30, 1949, has an editorial entitled "Day of Reckoning" which contains some very significant comments on present Government policies of assisting British oil interests to the detriment of American interests doing business in world markets and the resultant effects on the domestic industry. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting this editorial:

DAY OF RECKONING

The United States Government has informed Great Britain of its concern over the announced British intention of drastically curtailing oil imports from dollar areas in 1950. The effect of this cut-back will be to contract sharply the market for American oil in the United Kingdom.

The concern being shown by the American Government is over a condition which it has helped to create and which it should have been able to foresee. Through increases made since the war in British petroleum production and refining capacity, and with continued gasoline rationing, Britain will be faced next year with an oil surplus. The curtailment of purchases of American oil, when Britain has more than enough oil of its own, is a natural decision.

The short-sightedness of the United States Government lies in the fact that it has assisted, through the use of Economic Cooperation Administration funds, in building up British capacity to a state of surplus. Only recently the ECA approved an allocation of $17,298,000 for two refineries which would increase British capacity by 94,100 barrels a day.

Now the expansion of the productive ability in western Europe is a sound aim of the European recovery program to which this country is committed. But it is hardly sound policy to increase productive facilities for any product to the point where they exceed actual or potential market demand.

The inevitable result of this mistaken policy, as reflected in the curb of oil imports into Britain, threatens to have a profound effect upon Texas and upon the domestic petroleum industry of the State and Nation. Most of the American oil sold in Britain comes from the Middle East. Blocking of the British outlet for Middle East production may mean an increase in the already heavy flood of foreign oil coming into the United States. With no other market, such an increase in United States oil imports, in fact, seems certain if the British order stands.

The inflow of oil from abroad already has caused the pinching back of domestic production. In Texas it has brought repeated reductions in the maximum allowable production of oil, which is one of the State's foremost industries and the most important source of State revenues.

The Government's concern over the British development seems to center largely upon its effect upon oil production by American companies in the Middle East and other overseas areas, which some Washington officials view as vital to this country's preparedness for war. These official appear totally unaware that the gradual destruction of the domestic oil industry, which would be accelerated by a further increase in oil imports to supplant native petroleum production, would constitute an even greater impairment of our defensive strength in case of war.

Surface Healthier Than Depths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in the new brands of food for human consumption now flooding the markets, where chemicals take the place of vitamins in flour and by substituting chemicals for milk and lard, I think the hands of the Pure Food and Drug Administration should be sustained by appropriations that will safeguard the people of this country. To give just a glimpse of what is going on I desire to submit herewith an article by J. Richard Feeley published in New Physical Culture in the issue of January 1950:

SURFACE HEALTHIER THAN DEPTHS—BEWARE OF MINERAL OILS AND CHEMICAL FOOD SUBSTITUTES FROM THE BOWELS OF THE EARTH

(By J. Richard Feeley)

The people of the world are using mineral oils, and consuming foods which contain chemicals, derived from minerals, and derivatives of natural gas. Some cancer researchers suspect that some of them may produce cancer. It is possible that they may produce other diseases.

Chemical-oil-gas-fertilizers and insecticides are used on land upon which our cattle feed. They are also used on crops which are later consumed by humans.

It is not known, especially over a long period of years, what effect these mineral oils, chemicals, and gases may have on the human body. I believe that since we live on top of the earth, foods, etc., from the top of the earth, or nearer the top, are best for the human body. I believe that foods and products from down deep in the earth are detrimental to the human body.

With this thought in mind, I have contacted hundreds of people in all walks of life from top personalities of prominence right down to my wonderful neighbors in Amesbury, Mass. As a promoter of health, I have no strings attached. Many researchers have their hands tied by reason of receiving directly or indirectly financial assistance for research from large corporations or organizations which are interested in products for exploitation.

From the many letters I have received it is clear that the matter of chemicals in foods is just being investigated by researchers. But I maintain that common sense tells us first when nutritious items in foods are replaced by chemicals, that the human body over a period of years is bound to be affected. And these chemicals may slowly poison the human race. They were invented by the I. G. Farben trust in Germany during the last war because of food shortages. Some people think that these chemicals caused the sadism and hatred which made Nazis worse than beasts. It long has been a prediction that chemicals can make men into

animals. It was a chemical which was supposed to turn the charming Dr. Jekyll into the brutal Mr. Hyde.

After the war these chemical food substitutes were taken over by the United States Alien Property Custodian with permission given for American manufacture based on Nazi formulas. And American firms are now inventing new food chemicals until there are now about 300 used in foods consumed by Americans. The United States Pure Food and Drug Administration seems to need more money and expanded facilities to cope with the situation adequately.

There should be pure food and drug laws requiring manufacturers to indicate to the consumer just what the product contains. Many scientists say that coal, coal tar, and natural gas derivatives will ultimately supplant the cow. Scientists in Germany are making butter out of petroleum, coal, and natural gas.

Bread is supposed to be the staff of life. The B-1 is taken out of the wheat and sold on the market as a vitamin. Some of the bread made now has a chemical made from natural gas to supplant lard, and another chemical to supplant milk. These chemicals are put into foods because they appeal to the taste, sight, and smell. The matter of taxation or nutrition is not considered at all. Nothing matters to these synthetic food manufacturers other than the god of gold * * * that is my opinion.

Of course, the big argument is that flour cannot be kept from spoiling after 30 days from milling, so in order to make it a nonperishable product they take the life out of it by removing the germ. Then they try to replace that with chemical substitutes and claim the bread has been made richer than before. But man has never yet improved on nature, and never will. Whole grains should be kept in communities for monthly milling and sale within a month. Then people will not be robbed of natural nutriment that bread affords. Bread is no longer the staff of life—much of it is now the stuff of death—that is, devitalized bread of white flour and chemical substitutes.

Panama Sea Level Canal—An Engineer's Day Dream and Giant Bonanza for Machinery Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Congress, I included in an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 26, 1949, an instructive article under the title "Panama Canal—Stop, Look, and Listen!"

Another illuminating paper on that subject was published in the Reader's Forum of the Sandusky Register-Star-News of November 11, 1949, in the form of a letter to the editor by the Honorable William L. Fiesinger, formerly a distinguished Member of Congress from Ohio.

In his statement Judge Fiesinger corrects some of the most obvious fallacies and misconceptions that characterize so much of the public discussions of the Isthmian questions.

The full text of Judge Fiesinger's paper, under leave accorded, is included for the information of Congress:

THE PANAMA CANAL

EDITOR, REGISTER-STAR-NEWS:

For several years I have been intensely interested in the Panama Canal, especially since there has been talk of rebuilding the present canal, or building what is called a sea-level canal. In his article in your paper of October 18, 1949, Columnist Ray Tucker adverts to the subject in connection, he says, with our failure to implement an agreement for rearming of Latin-American nations. In his article Mr. Tucker says:

"In view of Russia's expected progress in making atomic bombs, the major and immediate need is a new sea-level canal across the Isthmus of Panama, probably in Nicaragua.

"The present waterway, which enables our warships to slip from the Atlantic to the Pacific, or vice versa, as circumstances dictated, is too vulnerable to ordinary or atomic bombing. Indeed, our 45,000-ton aircraft carriers cannot negotiate it now."

I think that statement should not go unchallenged for the reason that it affects a vital interest of all our people, and to treat the subject intelligently they should be informed of the following facts:

First. There is a definite proposal to rebuild the present canal conceived by Capt. Miles Duval, United States Navy, retired, called the Terminal Lake Plan, which would permit 45,000-ton aircraft carriers, as well as the largest battleships to conveniently and safely negotiate passage from the Atlantic to the Pacific and vice versa.

Second. The claim that a lock canal is more vulnerable to atomic bombs than a so-called sea-level canal has been definitely exploded by all responsible experts. Either type of canal is subject to be put out of commission by atomic bombs.

Third. The original conception of the Frenchman De Lesseps was a sea-level canal, but as matters at Panama really got under way, the French engineer Godin de Lepinay recognized that the idea of a sea-level waterway was impossible of fulfillment because the Canal must cross mountainous jungle country in one of the world's heaviest rainfall areas featured by turbulent rivers. Of course, that is just as true today, and is supported by every one of the American engineers still living who worked on the Canal.

Fourth. The cost of rebuilding the present Canal to permit ships of any size extant today to freely and safely negotiate would, it has been reliably estimated, cost less than $2,000,000,000, whereas a so-called sea-level canal would cost at least $6,000,000,000 and at that cost would only be an experiment.

It seems to me that a so-called sea-level canal is just another daydream of the spenders in Washington to saddle more taxes and debt on the American people goaded by the makers of machinery and equipment, who would have a bonanza in selling their product.

Finally, Mr. Tucker speaks of a sea-level canal across the Isthmus of Panama probably in Nicaragua. It seems to me that this is highly impractical, if not impossible, for the canal across Nicaragua would require draining of Lake Nicaragua which is 105 feet above sea level and has a water area of approximately 3,000 square miles.

I say let us stick to what we now have, and have had for approximately 40 years, and improve the same. I have several times indicated to Congressman WRIGHT where I stand and the reasons why.

W. L. FIESINGER.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the cost of the canal is as follows for study:

Sea level: $8,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000, or repair present Canal for $130,000,000.

Lake canal: $435,000,000 to $600,000,000 is advocated by all the eminent engineers who participated in building the present Canal and know its problems.

Nicaragua canal is unnecessary, more costly, and less desirable, besides requiring duplicate defense installations.

Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am inserting at this point two editorials, one entitled "Pensions and Inflation" and the other "Who Pays for Pensions." Both are timely, and I commend them to the attention of the Members of the House:

PENSIONS AND INFLATION

Bernard M. Baruch, discussing old-age pensions, does us all a service in stressing how inflation may defeat the best conceived plans for a comfortable old age. The "elder statesman" rightly says:

"Anything that saps the value of savings—and inflation is the worst single threat—is the enemy of the aged and of those who expect to grow old."

He believes that inflation must be licked and our price structure stabilized before there can be any permanent security for any of us.

Mr. Baruch here has in mind, for example, the man who retired, perhaps 10 years ago, at 65. He had created for himself through his savings an annuity paying $100 a month, ample in 1939 to maintain him in simple comfort. Everybody knows that that man has had several times in the last few years to lower his living standards as his $100 became worth less and less in terms of his needs.

Mr. Baruch also has in mind the man who is trying today to build for himself security in the future when he can no longer work. He can save more now, perhaps, than he could a few years ago, because he is saving 60-cent dollars. But what will he do if, when he retires, those dollars he saved have only a 30-cent purchasing power?

There are those who believe that it makes little difference how much a dollar will buy, so long as wages are increased to meet price increases. Mr. Baruch shows how wrong these people are. Part of what we earn today must be put away to take care of us in the future—by our own direct savings or by the accumulations we make for Federal old-age benefits.

WHO PAYS FOR PENSIONS?

Senator TAFT points to the fact that it would cost the people of this country $12,000,000,000 a year to give every worker on retirement the type of pension now set up for the Nation's steelworkers. If such a pension system were set up on an actuarial reserve basis, he points out, the pension funds would have to own nearly all the country's property.

This is something for us all to think about, because the money for pensions will in the final analysis have to come from raised prices for the things we buy and from taxes. For the most part, those who work will have to support those who don't.

There are several factors in the situation which deserve emphasis. In the first place, the percentage of the aged in the population is constantly growing. In the second place, people begin work at a constantly higher age. In the third place, workers are producing fewer and fewer hours a week, as well as fewer days in a year.

The net result is to throw an increasing burden on a decreasing work span. Where a man used to work for nearly 60 years of his life, the average now is closer to 45. In that period he must produce enough to support himself, his children in school, and his elders in retirement. It is only because his productivity per hour has increased so markedly (through the use of power machinery), that he has been able to carry the load so far. It will be only through a further increase in productivity that the Nation can further expand educational opportunities, raise the level of living of the aged and, along with all this, perhaps also decrease still more the hours and years of labor.

Christian Churches Against FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, a letter received by me from the American Council of Christian Churches of California relative to FEPC legislation is so good that I feel it should be made a part of the permanent record.

To my mind it is unthinkable that an intelligent, democratic society would tolerate such unwise, totalitarian interference with their inalienable rights as is proposed by those advocating FEPC legislation.

We should commend the Los Angeles church for its letter of January 1, which follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES OF CALIFORNIA,
CIVIL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 1, 1950.

Hon. ED GOSSETT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Doubtless there will be FEPC legislation brought before the Congress this session.

We have consistently opposed this type of legislation, and we still do.

FEPC legislation would rob the employer of the right to choose whom he would have work for him. This right was upheld by Jesus Christ when He approvingly quoted the employer as saying, "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" (Matthew 20:15). An employer does have the God-given right to choose whom he will to work for him. There is a kind of discrimination that is not wrong.

We realize that there is a kind of discrimination that is wrong. We hold no brief for the one who hates another or for one who discriminates solely because of the color of skin. However, we are convinced that this discrimination is not as prevalent as some of our liberal friends would have us believe. We attended a meeting sponsored by an organization that was pushing FEPC and at which representatives of other allied groups were present. A call was made for any authentic cases of discrimination that could be brought before the California legislative body that was considering their bill. Among all the organizations represented (all of which were left-wing groups), only two individuals were found in the ranks of these groups in all of the Los Angeles area who would go before a legislative hearing and testify that they had been discriminated against. Surely this does not indicate a very serious situation.

FEPC, if adopted, would act as an effective extension of the police state. To set up a Government agency as the arbiter of employment in private business is to add one more control to the already burdensome load which is being borne by the private-enterprise system. This private-enterprise system, which in our modern world is so distinctively American, is the only economic system which is stamped with the approval of the word of God, and that private-enterprise system is the economic system which has made our Nation great.

We cannot correct discrimination against employees by establishing discrimination against employers. FEPC would only tend to increase tensions between classes and groups and could really benefit only those who desire to sow discord and confusion among our people. In this connection it is interesting to note that the Communist Party is always one of the very active proponents of FEPC legislation. They must have some stake in it.

Sincerely,

C. M. LAMB, *Chairman.*

Taxes That Are Paid by the Average Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the demagogue would have the public believe that the big fellow will pay the bills for most of the public-aid programs now being advocated. I am extending my remarks to include an editorial entitled "The Little Fellow's Tax Share."

THE LITTLE FELLOW'S TAX SHARE

If it is the little fellow who gets Government benefits, it is also the little fellow who, more than anybody else, pays the bills.

That was one of the themes of James F. Byrnes in a recent Biloxi (Miss.) speech. Byrnes, who was one of the architects of the New Deal and more recently a member of President Truman's Cabinet, says the United States has become a spendthrift state where "the people have been misled into regarding the Treasury as a Christmas tree, with the President and Members of Congress playing the role of Santa Claus."

The administration, he said, has boasted of what it has done for the little fellow but nobody has been stressing what "big government is doing to the little fellow."

Mr. Byrnes has a point there.

The little fellow today, as always, is paying his full share of taxes. Federal, State, and local governments all rely on him for a considerable part of their revenue. He pays relatively little directly and consciously, but he pays a lot indirectly and unconsciously.

The little man smokes, travels, goes to the theater and has a car. The Federal Government taxes him for all these things. In Wisconsin, the State government also taxes his cigarettes and his gasoline.

The little man's wife uses cosmetics, has furs and jewelry, buys electric-light bulbs and chats over the telephone. The Federal Government makes all these things more expensive through excises.

The little man's family likes a nice house. The local governments and the State tax him for the privilege. He sees this tax and he squawks. The hidden taxes, which are really bigger, he does not see.

But the little man's contribution to government does not stop with direct and more or less hidden taxes. In many cases, his biggest contribution of all comes in taxes levied on the corporations which make the goods he buys.

Government today is getting billions of dollars from the little fellow by the simple device of soaking business. The party leaders know very well that corporations can't of themselves pay no taxes. The money they use for taxes they must get from the people who buy what the corporations have to sell. Business taxes are reflected in the prices we pay for what we need. But business taxes are safe for the politicians, because the little fellow has never yet realized that he pays a disproportionate part of the bill.

The fact is that the little fellow is now paying a larger part of the cost of government than ever. It is a thing he should bear in mind when he applauds some new and perhaps unnecessary benefit. It is a thing he should think of increasingly as government costs rise.

Flying Fryers Wing Way to Alaskan Tables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the poultry industry is one of the leading industries of our section of Arkansas. One of the greatest boosters for that industry is C. Jimmie Carter, president of the Rogers Airport. He never lets an opportunity pass to boost the industry.

Therefore, it was not surprising that when it was necessary to get some fryers to Alaska, he volunteered to take the first lap in the transporting of these chickens. I would like to insert a news item by Dave Miller which appeared in the Tulsa Tribune of November 30, 1949, which indicates the everyday, never-say-die spirit of Jimmie Carter and the poultry boys of northwest Arkansas:

FLYING FRYERS WING WAY TO ALASKAN TABLES

[By Dave Miller]

From Arkansas to Alaska is a long haul to satisfy a craving for fried chicken, but that's the distance several thousand Arkansas fryers will travel before they find their way to some sourdough's table.

Today marked the beginning of a 1-year program in which chickens from the Arkansas Quality poultry farm at Springdale, Ark., will be flown to Anchorage.

The first 1,500-pound load of frozen fowl was flown from Rogers to Tulsa this morning where it was loaded on an airline cargo craft for the flight to the west coast. From there the chicken goes to Seattle, and then on to Anchorage.

Present at the Tulsa municipal airport this morning to witness the loading were E. T. Schmidt, manager of the poultry farm; C. Jimmie Carter, president of the Rogers airport; and Frank Rust, president, and Jay Primo, pilot for Rusty Air Service, which flew the chicken to Tulsa.

The chicken-by-air plan was arranged when a restaurant owner from Anchorage heard of the famous northwest Arkansas chickens. He signed a contract which called for a weekly shipment of about 1,500 birds averaging one and one-half pounds each.

The chickens are quick-frozen at Springdale and shipped to Rogers. Rust takes over from there and flies the shipment to Tulsa in his twin Cessna. In addition to flying frozen birds, Rust and his pilots annually fly more than 4,000,000 1-day-old chicks to Rogers.

The chickens left the Tulsa airport late this morning and will be in Anchorage Thursday noon. There they will be thawed and served to Alaskans at the rate of $4.50 for half a chicken.

"This isn't just a promotion stunt," said Carter. "We're proud of the chickens we raise around Rogers. Restaurants all over the country advertise Arkansas chickens, and now Alaskans will have a chance to see how good they are."

In addition to being president of the Rogers airport and a poultryman himself, Carter is one of the main forces behind an annual breakfast flight in which small plane pilots from all over the country fly to Rogers for a big breakfast of bacon and eggs, laid, of course, by northwest Arkansas hens.

The West Will Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands, I have been greatly interested in the critical water problem that has developed in the humid and populous eastern part of the country.

In the West, where water is ever scant, planning for meeting water needs is as much a part of the growth as the roads over which people immigrate. I agree with William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior and long an expert in western water programs, who recently said, "It is about time for areas of eastern United States to begin longer-range planning for water development."

We of the West are thoroughly sympathetic with those who are now facing water shortages or the prospect of them. There is much experience in the arid region of the country that may be useful, but we also need to break much new ground. I have introduced new legislation toward that end.

I call attention to the report in the January 6 issue of Water Resources Review of the Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, on the New York City water shortage. It is as follows:

Since May 1943 New York City has used water at a greater rate than the total dependable yield of its several sources of supply. The consumption in recent years has been averaging 1,200,000,000 gallons per day, compared to a dependable yield of 1,045,000,000 gallons per day reported by the city of New York. The good fortune of above-normal run-off into its reservoirs prevented a shortage from developing earlier, but that condition and the associated avoidance of an accounting accentuated the difficulty because water demands have continued to increase meanwhile. This year a drought of moderate intensity has led to nearly serious consequences for New York City.

Run-off in the source areas of the New York City water supplies averaged about twice normal in the 3-month period December 1948 to February 1949. As a result, storage in reservoirs was well above normal at the end of February, and was approximately normal at the end of May. The total winter recharge to the reservoirs was about 90,000,000,000 gallons. The draft on storage from June 1 to December 1, 1949, was 150,000,000,000,000 gallons, equivalent to 870,000,000 gallons daily, about three-fourths of the water used by the city. Normally only about one-third of the water used during this period is obtained by draft on storage, the remainder coming from the summer and fall stream flow and from wells in southern Nassau County.

The reason for this abnormal draft was the dry period that began in June 1949, and the high rate of use. Run-off into the reservoirs during the 6-month period June to November averaged about 80 percent of normal, nearly setting a new low record. Lower flows for this period were recorded in 1909 and 1914. However, total run-off for the past water year was not particular low. Much lower flows were experienced without major difficulty as recently as 1941 and 1944, when the use of water was only about 80 percent of the current rate. If the rate of use that existed only as recently as 1944 had prevailed in 1949, the draft on storage probably would have been only about 100,000,000,000 gallons, leaving sufficient reserves to avoid critical shortages despite the drought.

The reservoirs now contain about 90,000,000,000 gallons, about 35 percent of capacity, equivalent to about 70 days' supply at the present rate of use. The normal increment in storage during the winter-spring period of high run-off is 60,000,000,000 gallons. Increments of twice this amount have occurred during past replenishment periods with abundant run-off, as in 1947 when the reservoirs were filled to capacity. However, owing to the depleted condition of the reservoirs, this abnormal recharge would not raise the contents to their normal volume of 242,000,000,000 gallons next spring. The dry period has also resulted in the depletion of soil moisture and ground water. These have first call on any rain and snow melt, ahead of the New York reservoirs.

The outlook, therefore, is that stream flow this winter will be lower than usual unless precipitation is far above the amount needed to satisfy the prior demands of Nature. The prospects are that continued care in the use of water will be necessary in New York until new supplies now being developed in the Delaware Basin can be added to the city's dependable sources. Heavy pumping of ground water in southern Nassau County to supplement the Croton up-State supplies has lowered the water table in the pumped areas to record low levels, and salt-water encroachment may result if pumping is continued.

Despite recurrent statements that our streams are drying up, the accompanying graphs of such long-term stream-flow records as are available in the Catskill Mountain region show no persistent downward trend, except for a slight apparent decline in flow of Schoharie Creek (one of the water sources of New York City). There have been large fluctuations in flow from year to year, characteristic of rivers everywhere, but the flows during the past decade in general have not been greatly different from those during the first decade of the century when records of flow were started. Discharge of Schoharie Creek during the second half of the 42-year period of record, however, averaged 90 percent of that during the first 21 years. None of the streams shown are materially affected by regulation or diversion.

The situation in New York City and in metropolitan New Jersey is largely the consequence of an acceleration in the mounting use of water that began during the war and has continued with undiminished rate since. Critical conditions portend wherever total use exceeds the dependable yield of the available supplies. Overdrafts are reported in a score of important areas throughout the country, mainly with respect to ground water, but some surface-water overdrafts are reported also. In certain communities the demand is exceeding the dependable supply. Although generally the problems are engineering and economic rather than ones of actual deficiency of water, as well as being largely localized in nature, and although there is no cause for undue alarm, the situation must not be ignored and requires prompt steps to obtain a Nation-wide appraisal of our water resources and of the expected future demands.

The Home-Rule Bill Should Be Enacted Into Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have signed discharge petition No. 19. This petition will give this House an opportunity to vote on home-rule legislation for the District of Columbia. As you all know, this legislation passed the Senate last May. It is a measure that has been endorsed and enthusiastically supported by both major parties. It is nonpartisan measure which will relieve the Congress of its city council duties for the District of Columbia and will also bring the rights of citizenship to the disenfranchised residents of this community. I would like to take this opportunity to urge all of my colleagues to sign this discharge petition as soon as possible in order that this legislation may have its hearing before us.

I have a letter from the District League of Women Voters enclosing a copy of the President's letter to Speaker RAYBURN, which I would like to insert in the RECORD. The letter strongly urges that this bill be enacted into law during this session:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1950.

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURDICK: The President has called for home rule for the district of Columbia in his message to Congress. We therefore thought it timely to send you a copy of the President's statement of last July which amplifies his views on this important legislation.

We urge you to sign the discharge petition, No. 19, in order to give the House of Representatives an opportunity to vote on this measure.

Very truly yours,
GRACE H. BEATTY
(Mrs. Donald C. Beatty),
President.

(The following letter was sent by the President to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker, House of Representatives:)

JULY 25, 1949.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On May 31, 1949, the Senate passed, without a dissenting vote, S. 1527, a bill to give home rule to the people of the District of Columbia. A subcommittee of the House Committee on the District of Columbia is now holding hearings on this legislation. I am writing to you to express my hope that the House will complete legislative action on a home rule bill and that it will be sent to me to sign into law before this session of the Eighty-first Congress adjourns.

As passed by the Senate, the bill has three major purposes: (1) to relieve the Congress as much as possible of the burden of District of Columbia affairs, without surrendering its constitutional powers; (2) to create a representative local government for the District of Columbia chosen by the qualified electors; and (3) to provide an efficient and economical government for the District of Columbia.

I am very much in favor of all of these objectives.

It is little short of fantastic that the Congress of the United States should—as it now does—devote a substantial percentage of its time to acting as a city council for the District of Columbia. During the past 2 years, during which it was confronted with many major problems of national and international importance, the Congress has had to find time to deal with such District matters as parking lots, the regulation of barbers, the removal of street obstructions, and the establishment of a Metropolitan Police Force band, to name only a few.

The people of the District of Columbia should not be placed in a different status from that of the people of all other American cities and almost all democratic capitals of the world insofar as local self-government is concerned. In my message to Congress transmitting the budget for the fiscal year 1947, I said:

"The District of Columbia, because of its special relation to the Federal Government, has been treated since 1800 as a dependent area. We should move toward a greater measure of local self-government consistent with the constitutional status of the District. We should take adequate steps to assure that citizens of the United States are not denied their franchise merely because they reside at the Nation's Capital."

It was not the intention of the architects of our Constitution to deprive the District of Columbia of home rule. Writing on this subject in the Federalist, James Madison said that the inhabitants of the District "will have * * * their choice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them" and that "a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them."

The establishment of a well-organized and efficient governmental system in the District of Columbia is a desirable adjunct to the successful operation of the home-rule principle. The present organization of the District government is complicated and administratively cumbersome. I am strongly in favor of better organization and greater efficiency throughout the executive branch. The District of Columbia government should not be an exception carved out from the general rule.

There is nothing partisan about this proposal. The platforms of both major parties urge home rule for the District. The bill which passed the Senate unanimously, received the support of both Republican and Democratic Members of that body. I am sure that the great majority of the people of Washington want home rule. I am equally sure that they ought to have it without further delay. I hope that the House will not adjourn this session without completing action on this important measure.

Very sincerely yours,
HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Good Will Makes Good Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, never before in world history was there greater need for human understanding, good will, and lasting peace than in the present postwar critical period. It is bad enough that mankind is rent asunder by conflicting ideologies and by false prophets interested in creating greater chaos in order to exploit their own selfish interests.

It is worse, however, when these false prophets and hatemongers in our own country spread doctrines of bigotry and hatred which serve only to undermine the unity of our people at a time when such unity is urgently needed for our very survival. There is no need for me to name names; we all know who these preachers of hatred and violence are.

Unfortunately, we sometimes pay undeserved attention to the demagogue while overlooking those who continue to fight for the highest American ideals. They are the true patriots of modern America. One of the finest and most loyal sons of modern America is the present national commander of the American Legion, George N. Craig.

In a recent speech, Commander Craig has shown that he possesses an excellent understanding and grasp of American ideals and some of the problems facing this country today. I believe the address which he made on Sunday, November 13, 1949, before the Joint Defense Appeal Conference in Detroit deserves wider attention. I set it forth in full as follows:

My fellow Americans, in a world which is shuddering under the tragic implications of its first wide open atomic armament race, mankind today faces a critical and an urgent choice.

We of this planet must learn to live together or perish. There is only one way to live together and that is by the Golden Rule. That means doing to others as we would have them do unto us.

The two major religions of the western word, Judaism and Christianity, have for centuries preached the formula for good-will living which is "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Students of history agree that democracy was envisioned in religious terms long before it assumed a political terminology. Actually our American democracy was the first real political expression of the ideals of Judeo-Christianity.

Here in America the century-long teachings of religions have borne their greatest fruit. Our founding fathers built this Nation on the religious concept of the Fatherhood of God. They got that concept out of the Old Testament from the mouth of the prophet who said, "Hath we not one Father? Hath not one God created us?"

On that divine belief they developed the ideals of the brotherhood of mankind and of the intrinsic dignity and value of every human life. They drew on a religious tenet for their first political axiom which became the cornerstone of their Declaration of Independence in these words:

"Man is endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights. Among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To secure these rights governments are instituted among men."

These God-given rights of men were the key to the first promising solution to the problems of minorities. We recognized them politically first here in America. We established a government based upon a written Constitution and Bill of Rights to safeguard those rights.

As a result, America, the melting pot of the world's races, nationalities, and creeds, today represents mankind's greatest progress to date in the art of living together. This progress is our best authority for our leadership in the eleventh-hour effort to build a brave new world in which all nations can live in enduring peace and good will.

We have a solemn responsibility today of trying to teach the world that good will makes good sense.

We must succeed in this or face a world Armageddon. Man has conquered distance and finally pried from nature the secret of the incredible power of atomic fission. Now our social controls must match our mechanical skills. If we fail, then we face the physical destruction of a large portion of mankind and a return to the jungle by the broken and dazed survivors.

Our best propaganda today is the example we furnish to the rest of the world. We must demonstrate in our domestic life that we can live by the tenets of the rights of man. The way in which we meet the problems of our minority groups has a far-reaching influence. Every gain in human insight and in social justice in America today is a world gain, any set-back is a world loss.

We can be proud that in its every heroic moment our Nation has faced danger with complete national unity. We had that unity in the days when we fought to win a war. We need it today in the fight to win the peace.

Our national unity today is the target of well-financed, large-scale, and cunning campaigns to arouse and to aggravate racial, religious, and ethnic bigotry and tensions. The enemies of America are practicing the age-old strategy against us of "divide and conquer."

The foudest aim of communism today is to divide us by pitting class against class,

race against race, and creed against creed. They seek to exploit and magnify every difference, every prejudice, and every real or fancied slight.

Even worse than this Communist scum are those who seek to spread hatred and dissension for personal gain.

These peddlers of mental poisons must be stopped.

The controlling of group prejudices calls for a devoted united effort by all responsible citizens and organizations. It is because the American Legion is deeply concerned in doing its part in fighting intolerance, prejudice, and bigotry that I am happy to be speaking before this meeting of the Joint Defense Appeal. The American Legion wants to cooperate closely with the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith, the American Jewish Committee, and every other loyal organization in promoting American ideals through the teaching of good will, tolerance, justice, and harmony.

Eleven times have national conventions of the American Legion taken vigorous stands against hatemongering in any form in our land. In recent months, I am proud to say, the American Legion has taken a leading role in the South in the moral condemnation and in legislative action designed to smash the Ku Klux Klan for once and for all time.

At its recent Thirty-first National Convention in Philadelphia, the American Legion adopted a number of vigorous Americanism resolutions. They are indicative of our policies in promoting good human relations among all Americans. One was a resolution which branded as a menace to our liberties any individual, group, or organization which fosters racial, religious, or class strife among our people.

In another resolution the American Legion urged the abolishment of racial and religious discrimination in education. It condemns all discrimination in education opportunity and declared that the only democratic basis for selection is scholastic qualification. We of the American Legion believe that every American citizen should enjoy equality of opportunity in education, regardless of color, religious belief or national origin.

The American Legion since 1946 by national convention action has opposed any type of discrimination for jobs because of race, creed, color, national origin, or religion.

At our recent Philadelphia convention, the American Legion endorsed in principle two resolutions on genocide. In this we followed the United Nations approval of the Genocide Convention. I want to advise you that the American Legion has from the beginning been one of the strongest supporters of the United Nations. The American Legion was the first large organization to urge the strengthening of the United Nations Charter. We propose that the veto power be abolished in all matters involving aggression, that there be effective international control of scientific weapons and that an adequate international police force be set up. We are backing the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Pact and we are urging our Government to lend its immediate aid in forming a similar defense pact among the freedom-seeking nations in the Pacific and Far Eastern area.

Your organizations have contributed much to the cause of overcoming religious and racial animosities. One of your distinguished members, Judge Joseph M. Proskauer, is the author of a pledge for Americans unity to which the American Legion can subscribe wholeheartedly. It is only fitting that I should quote it:

"I will spread no rumor and no slander against any sort.

"I will never try to indict a whole people by reason of the delinquency of any member.

"I will daily deal with every man in business, in social, and in political relations, only on the basis of his true individual worth.

"In my daily conduct I will consecrate myself, hour by hour, to the achievement of the highest ideal of the dignity of mankind, human equality, human fellowship, and human brotherhood."

This is a golden blueprint for every-day living in a democracy. It is a basis on which all men of good will can make their personal influence count for tolerance and brotherhood.

There are no short cuts to honest human relations. "Every day in every way" applies here more truly than in any other aspect of human endeavors. Democracy is a way of life to be lived and experienced in hundreds of little routine situations day in and day out. We have a workable pattern. We have gone a long way under it. We must keep going forward. We must keep implementing our positive programs for better human relations.

Here in America our vital job is to teach true democracy by making it work so successfully that all other people will be sold on its advantages.

As the foremost champions of democracy we must put our whole moral weight into the condemnation of the abrogation of human rights anywhere in the world. Several weeks ago President Truman spoke at the dedication of the new United Nations headquarters in New York City. He said, and I quote, "The United Nations has learned that disregard of human rights is the beginning of tyranny and, too often, the beginning of war."

Then he spoke the words which underlie many of the reasons for this meeting here in Detroit today, "We believe strongly that the attainment of basic civil and political rights for men and women everywhere—without regard to race, language, or color—is essential to the peace we are seeking. The minds of men must be free from artificial and arbitrary restraints in order that they may seek the truth and apply their intelligence in the making of a better world."

The American Legion subscribes fully to this philosophy. So, I know, do the organizations represented here by the Joint Defense Appeal. Our methods for organization differ but our motives and purposes in promoting good human relations among all people are the same.

Americans of Jewish faith have filled enviable roles in all American wars. Their record in military service in World War II is outstanding. Although the Jewish people form only 3.33 percent of our population, the percentage of the members of the Hebrew faith in our armed forces was 4.23. More than 550,000 wore the uniform of Uncle Sam and 11,000 of them were killed and 40,000 were wounded. A total of 52,000 Jewish GI's won decorations, citations, and awards for distinguished gallantry and service.

The American Legion is proud to have veterans of Jewish faith in its ranks. They have never found any discrimination against them in the American Legion and never will. Today you will find Jewish Legionnaires, just as you will find those of Catholic and Protestant faiths, in our national offices, on our national staffs, on our national executive committee, on our national commissions, serving as State commanders and adjutants and filling every kind of responsible position on the district, county and post levels. We have had as many as four rabbis in one year serving as our State chaplains. Two rabbis were candidates for national chaplain at our recent national convention.

Veterans perhaps are in a best position to combat bigotry that is based on racial, religious and class prejudices. Men who have faced death together on the field of battle know that in the final showdown it isn't a man's color, place of birth, political belief or church affiliation that counts—it is only his courage to fight to the death, if need be, in defense of God and country.

Our form of government, our way of life and our society are based upon a belief in an Almighty God. Our basic creed is one of good will and love. It was on the basis of love for freedom that the first Americans were able to unite on this continent. Because of that love we have been able, here in America, to overcome the ancient European heritage of feuds and hatreds and build a great new nation. We must never acquire the ability to hate. We must rebuke and check those who would seek to turn one American against another. Every group must muzzle its own fools. Not a single one of us has a right to look down upon another as inferior to what he is himself. We are all brothers and sisters wandering through life to the same end.

That end is that every American today owes his best in creating conditions of life at home which will enable all to develop their noblest and purest instincts, their talents and their gifts. We can do this if we approach this task with a spirit of charity that will recognize there is good in every American and this element of good is the mighty bond of our national unity.

With the atomic bomb suspended today over all mankind, we Americans must be the first to see the truth that man is not doomed to futility and violence if he will but turn to the good sense that lies in good will.

"There is a destiny which makes us brothers
None goes his way alone:
All that we send into the lives of others
Comes back into our own."

United States Leadership in the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "United States Leadership in the Americas," delivered today by Hon. Edward G. Miller, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, before the Rotary Club of Charleston, W. Va.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make two and a third pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $191.34.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I deeply appreciate the privilege of being with you here today. I feel at home in the friendly atmosphere of Charleston, which has been my sister's home since she married and settled here over 21 years ago. I have been well treated here each time that I have come to visit and it is always an exciting experience to see the great industrial activity of the Kanawha Valley.

West Virginia plays an important role in the National Capital today. Your distinguished Senators, KILGORE and NEELY, are well known for their efforts to keep our economy sound and steady, and thus to frustrate the dearest wish of our enemies abroad who so earnestly keep hoping that we will return to a policy of boom and bust. Another great legislator from this State, the Honorable JOHN KEE, of Bluefield, as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, performed great services in guiding through the last session of Congress the heaviest program of legislation in the foreign field that we have ever seen. Our dynamic Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Louis Johnson, of Clarksburg, is attacking with courage and decision problems of exceptional difficulty. Fortunately very effective working relations exist between his organization and the Department of State.

Before speaking of matters within my particular sphere of activity, I might begin with a few words about a general impression that has been made on me since my return to Washington 6 months ago.

The problems with which we deal today in the State Department, in the Department of Defense, in the Treasury Department and, especially in the White House and in the Congress, are so vast and so complex that they tend to surpass the power of human comprehension. It requires humility and patience to deal with these problems—as it does in the case of the people of the country to have to live with them. Above all, it requires the discipline of learning that to some problems there may not be any present solutions whatever—that our aim must be simply to bear them, not only during 1950 but perhaps for our entire lifetimes, until in the slow unfolding of history conditions change and solutions appear. This is a galling concept to Americans, who are accustomed to confronting problems and disposing of them in short order. Our natural tendency when we think of Russian-American relations, for example, is to say that the present state of affairs is intolerable and that we must do something about it. This tendency leads some of us to urge desperate measures upon our Government. Others of us think in broad and copious terms about sitting around a conference table and fixing everything up then and there, so that we can go home and never again have any worries.

All this is wishful thinking and cannot lead to real accomplishment. This Nation was not made great through panaceas but through patience and hard work. Nor is there any reason why war is inevitable in the world today. Let us put no faith in those who say that our system and the Soviet system cannot coexist in this world without war. As Secretary Acheson said to a group of us in Washington recently, good and evil have always coexisted in this world and always will. We have, therefore, had to face up to the necessity of assuming leadership in the free world. We have had to pick up the vast burden of this responsibility, without any assurance that we can lay the burden down again tomorrow.

One aspect of this new responsibility is the tremendous weight of work that is placed upon our Congress. The terrific load that is borne by the individual Members of Congress can hardly be appreciated unless you have been close to it. Senators and Representatives are among the most overworked people in the world today, and I regret that we in the Department of State cannot do more to make things easier for them. Much of the burden they have to bear takes the form of foreign problems that we put before them. For example, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives during the last session considered 50 bills and joint resolutions of which 29 were favorably reported and 24 were passed by the House. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate in addition acted upon some 19 treaties including the North Atlantic Pact. To put the problem in another way, 48 percent of the bills introduced in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress had to do with foreign relations or had an important bearing thereon.

Nor can we blink at the fact that our present programs in the foreign field are enormously expensive. One of the most sensible pieces of legislation ever passed was the law which repealed the exemption of Federal employees from United States income taxes. Let me assure you that we think hard every time we send up to Congress a bill involving new appropriations. As taxpayers ourselves, we know how the impact is felt. It is our objective to keep the cost of our foreign programs to a minimum. Yet we must recognize that the extent of our responsibility in the world is very great, and unwise economies would involve us in risks that could prove far more costly.

Our immediate objective in the world today is to weld together a group of free nations for the common purpose of creating conditions in which, as President Truman said last week, "Men may live in dignity, perform useful work, serve their communities, and worship God as they see fit." That, briefly, is our foreign policy. Our effort to repair the damage which the last war brought to Europe is an important expression of this policy. It has been expensive. It still is expensive. But the problem of European recovery affects every other problem with which we deal—foreign and domestic. While we have already done much in Europe, economic recovery is not facilitated by the continuing threat of evil which looms on the eastern horizon. We have not made the sacrifices of the past few years, however, in order to surrender all their fruits and beat a retreat. Though we still have a long way to go, having once taken up the challenge, we must follow through and persevere in meeting it.

The part of the world with which I am directly concerned is in the Western Hemisphere. The American Republics are sorely beset today by economic and social problems of their own. The great productive possibilities of these countries remain in large degree unrealized. There is, however, in this part of the world as in no other a real opportunity to work forward toward the democratic ideal. We have no iron curtain to divide us. We were spared the direct destruction of two wars. In short we do not have the same kind of road blocks to progress in this hemisphere as we confront elsewhere.

How is it, then, it may be asked, that we read so frequently of revolution and dictatorships in Latin America? Are our friends and allies to the south really making progress? Are they putting to good use the unexampled opportunity for freedom and democracy that the free world now enjoys?

The answer is quite frankly that the record could be better. There have been too many instances in which democracies have been subverted and the popular will thwarted. Such circumstances, where they exist, do not breed confidence. They do not make for enthusiastic collaboration on our part with the countries where they occur—if for no other reason than that our citizens would not favor it. On the other hand, before passing judgment on the situation as a whole, it is necessary to look at the evolution of Latin-American democracy in the long perspective of history.

Some of the American Republics are still relatively new and unpracticed in the ways of democracy. Their political instability and their failures may be in the historic view manifestations of the impact of new ideas upon social structures which had remained static for generations. I believe that on balance they are making progress in the direction of democracy. This becomes evident if we are willing to look at the good as well as the bad—at the positive as well as the negative. The democratic picture in Latin America today is brighter than it was 20 years ago, and a great deal brighter than at the beginning of the century.

One of the paradoxical signs of how democracy is growing in the hemisphere is the sense of shock and dismay that we all feel nowadays when any American republic suffers a set-back through the revolutionary overthrow of a constitutional government. What was accepted as commonplace and hardly worthy of comment a generation ago is conspicuous today. It can no longer be taken idly for granted in the light of the mobilization of sentiment for better government which exists throughout the hemisphere today.

We, the United States, have set the example and taken the lead in this democratic drive, although we are by no means the only good example that the hemisphere has to offer. More than anything else, however, the spectacle of our own thriving democracy has made subservience to dictators more and more intolerable to our neighbors in the south. Likewise, the standard of living that we have achieved in the United States under the regime of liberalism has aroused our neighbors against the grinding poverty that was once regarded as the common man's inescapable lot. In this sense we are, by our very example, responsible for much of the political ferment that marks the Latin-American scene today. If this is true, we may at least reflect that this kind of ferment has often in history marked a transition to better things. That ferment is also a great deal better than the stability of death which has been clamped onto the peoples of eastern Europe. It is certainly better than the compulsory political inactivity and lack of change which characterized many of the more enduring Latin-American dictatorships of the past.

As long as democracy continues to grow and thrive in our country it will grow, however erratically, in the other American countries. It could fall among them eventually only through failure here—and that is part of the international responsibility we bear. I do not believe, however, that there is anything to be any failure here.

Our policy in Latin America, as in other areas, is one of positive cooperation for the realization of our democratic objectives. In terms of brass tacks, we are engaged with the other American countries in a variety of operating projects for economic and social development.

Now let me mention some examples.

It may seem far from this valley of the Kanawha River to the valley of the Sao Francisco River in Brazil, over 4,000 miles away. The difference between the two valleys, in the relative degree of their development, accentuates the effect of distance. Here you people have developed a degree of industrial activity and a utilization of your natural resources as intensive as any in the world. In the Sao Francisco Valley relatively little development of that sort has occurred. Yet, though the stages of development are so different and the distance so great, what happens in the Sao Francisco Valley in the next 10 years will affect in some measure the people of this valley in West Virginia.

There is today new energy and new vision in the leaders of Brazil. They want to put to better use the great natural resources of their country. As in many other Latin-American countries, however, they lack the capital funds and technical resources to achieve their goals expeditiously by their own energy alone. Therefore, and with our own self-interest in view, we are helping Brazil in a variety of ways to achieve these goals.

Last year our Government sent the so-called Abbink Mission to Brazil to help the Brazilians determine the measures which should be taken to promote the development of their country. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, of which, as you know, the United States is the principal stockholder and which is now perhaps a major source of foreign financing for Brazil, has also recently made a survey of the country to see how the bank's resources can best be used to advance Brazil's development. The bank also sent an engineer to Brazil specifically to look into the financial aspects of the Sao Francisco hydroelectric project. The bank's decision on the financing of that project is expected soon.

As we in the State Department see it there are certain types of projects which when soundly conceived may appropriately be financed through loans of public funds. The International Bank has already made one very large loan to a private company in Brazil precisely for the purpose of hydroelectric development.

These public loans, however, have private investment and private enterprise in view. A significant consideration regarding the feasibility of the Sao Francisco project is whether private industries will be attracted to the valley by the availability of power. There are believed to be heavy phosphate deposits in the general area which might be processed to help supply Brazil's great need for fertilizers. These in turn could help restore to fertility some of the worn-out coffee lands in southern Brazil, about which we have been hearing so much since the recent rise in coffee prices. Hydroelectric power might thus bring about the beginning of a chemical industry in the valley, which would in turn give rise to other industries. We have seen just that sort of thing happen in the Rio Doce Valley of Brazil, where important development has occurred just in the last 5 years, largely in consequence of the financing of certain basic projects by the Export-Import Bank, and incidentally because of assistance by our Institute of Inter-American Affairs in the improvement of health conditions. Tremendous impetus to Brazil's economy has also been provided by the construction of the great Volta Redonda steel mill with the help of funds from the Export-Import Bank.

We feel that the complementary industries must, in general, be financed by the investment of private funds. It is only through providing opportunities for private capital that sound economic development can be achieved. We in this country have, ourselves, never hesitated to welcome foreign capital. Even in recent years, since we attained a high degree of industrialization, foreign private capital has made great contributions to our development of new industries, notably in the field of chemicals and synthetic textiles. Our total national wealth and earning power has been substantially increased in consequence. We feel that in the same way much can be done by private capital in Latin America. We also believe, however, that the governments of our sister republics must determine for themselves whether and under what conditions they want private capital to work for them. If they do want it and will create the right conditions, they will find it available.

Our Congress now has before it two specific pieces of legislation that are closely related to our program of cooperation with the other American republics. The first would authorize a large increase in our present technical assistance to all foreign countries, including the Latin American. This technical assistance, in addition to taking the form of such undertakings as the Abbink Mission, is designed to help in the development and application of particular skills to the basic fields of agriculture, industry, education, and health.

Economic and social development cannot be brought about only through large-scale projects such as hydroelectric plants and steel mills. There are a great many smaller and less spectacular projects to be undertaken. You in West Virginia, for example, have had a great deal of experience with the control of silicosis. In Peru, silicosis has ravaged mines for generations. Now our Institute of Inter-American Affairs is working with the Peruvian Government on a modest but highly successful industrial hygiene program—the first of its kind in that country. At the same time, the Institute's agricultural mission is working with Peruvian farmers to help improve the breeds of corn, which are the same today as in the far-off days of the Incas. Other experts of the Institute, working with local experts in the highlands of Bolivia, have been teaching the Indians methods of animal culture by which they can improve their pitifully degenerated herds of sheep. I could cite hundreds of such examples of how our technical assistance is at work throughout Latin America. Although each project is small in itself, the aggregate is of tremendous significance in helping to increase productivity and the general welfare of the continent.

These programs of cooperation go beyond governments. They reach down to the people in the towns and villages, and on the farms. Country people in South America who have never before seen one of our citizens are thus brought into first-hand contact with our democracy in action. Nor do these programs involve a large outlay of money—in fact, the outlay is remarkably small by contrast with the results achieved. We hope, however, that the Congress will now authorize an expansion of these activities so that we may step up our whole policy of cooperation along these lines.

The second legislative proposal before our Congress is that the Export-Import Bank be authorized to use part of the funds it now has available to guarantee investors against certain risks peculiar to private investment abroad. Most important is the risk that dollars may not be available for the conversion of profits earned in foreign currencies. This is a new type of venture, and much experimentation will be called for before it is put into general practice. One of the greatest deterrents to private investment abroad today, however, is the scarcity of dollars to provide for remittances of earnings. The proposed guaranty system is designed to overcome this obstacle. Naturally, care will have to be taken that guaranteed investments will not receive preferential treatment over other American investments. I am confident that the Export-Import Bank, one of the most efficient agencies of our Government, will administer this new authority, if granted, with the same regard for established American businesses that it has always shown.

Now you have undoubtedly recognized that the two legislative proposals I have described to you are parts of the program outlined last year in point 4 of President Truman's inaugural address, which is designed to stimulate the development of underdeveloped parts of the world. This program is not a program of charity. The mood of our country today would not sanction any such thing. Rather the program is designed to serve our national interest by strengthening our friends, restoring stability, and creating a more prosperous world. Through it we and the United Nations are directly attacking the obstacles that stand in the way of democracy's growth.

Related to the point 4 legislation is another proposal, namely, that the Charter of the International Trade Organization be approved by Congress this session. We are already participating in the International Bank, the Monetary Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and a number of other international agencies which are already active in their respective fields. The International Trade Organization will cover the vital field of international trade. In participating in it, we would be paving the road for liberalized foreign-trade practices among all countries—an objective entirely in keeping with point 4.

I have no doubt that the point 4 policy will take its place beside the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the North Atlantic Pact as a historic contribution of President Truman's administration to world order. There are certain fundamental differences, however. Point 4 is not an emergency program or, like the Marshall plan, a temporary device to repair the damage of war. It represents, rather, a permanent measure of reinforcement. It is part of the enduring system of give and take by which our civilization will have to make progress if it makes progress at all. It is in fact a common undertaking in which each country is expected to contribute according to its means. Even the most underdeveloped countries cannot play a passive role. Assistance to any country would be wasted except as it was associated with vigorous steps toward development conducted by that country under its own steam.

This point 4 policy also differs from some of our big emergency programs in that it will not involve any great new outlay of public funds on our part. The International Bank and the Export-Import Bank already have adequate funds to take care of justifiable demands for development loans for some time to come. The lion's share of technical assistance, we expect, will come from private enterprise in connection with private investment.

It has been said that the foreign policy of the United States, as reflected in such programs as the Marshall plan and point 4, is the only foreign policy in the world which is truly revolutionary. We can be proud that, instead of being the slavish followers of old and outworn imperialistic traditions, we are the pioneers and prime builders of a new and positive tradition.

This imposes on us in the State Department the added duty to see to it that we keep our policies vigorous and dynamic. We must never let ourselves be smug and satisfied about our present policies. There will always be room for improvement. This is one reason why next Monday I am going to Habana to meet with our Ambassadors in the Middle American area for a complete review of our methods and procedures. A similar conference will be held in Rio in March with our Ambassadors in South America. We believe that in this way we can keep ourselves alert and looking forward.

I have one final word, which bears on the role of Rotary in making our foreign policy effective. In this country, as is not the case in dictatorships, the people have the final say in the development of foreign policy. Today, far more than ever before, our people are taking this responsibility seriously and making up their own minds about the issues involved. Such organizations as Rotary are prime instruments for giving form and expression to this sense of responsibility. We in the State Department look to you, as well as to our great free press, for democratic guidance.

I will go further and say that Rotary is itself involved in the actual conduct of our foreign relations. For our foreign relations, unlike those of some other countries, are not confined to contacts between arbitrary and all-powerful governments. They embrace direct relations and interchanges among groups of citizens among the peoples themselves. In every capital of the Americas, from here to the southern tip of South America, you will find Rotary organized and playing an important, constructive role in local affairs. This sort of thing is an indispensable part of our good-neighbor policy, which rests upon the support of a myriad of commercial, personal and cultural contacts, between individuals and groups, back and forth across the international borders. I hope you will consider it no presumption on my part to say, therefore, that you in Rotary and we in the State Department are partners in a common enterprise. Let us see to it that our enterprise is successful.

Should Senate Remove Restrictions on Oleomargarine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege on January 10 to debate over America's Town Meeting of the Air, with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the question, Should the Senate remove restrictions on oleomargarine? At that time the Senator and I were privileged to make 4-minute talks before engaging in the answering of questions. I ask that a copy of my 4-minute address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends, remember that, contrary to the impression you may have gotten from my genial Arkansas friend, we are all agreed that Federal taxes on oleo should be repealed.

In fact, we ask the oleo group: If you are so interested in the consumer's problems, why don't you agree (as we have) to simultaneous repeal of hundreds of other nuisance excise taxes on baby lotions, on cosmetics, admissions, phone calls, etc.?

Folks, the Oleo Trust is not interested in the consumer. It poured out millions in false propaganda so as to confuse the issue about taxes. Now, it comes into the open and says it wants to swindle the yellow color of butter and deceive the consumer. I say that if the 26 huge oleo corporations rob the natural trade-mark of butter—its yellow color—they will be violating every American principle—fair prices, fair play, fair business, and good health.

Senator FULBRIGHT says that if oleo robs butter's yellow color—that's just competition. Well, friends, if you tried to imitate the color of cabs of the Yellow Cab Co. on your own cabs, you'd be thrown into jail. If you stole the name of Mr. Denny's great radio program, he'd have the right to stop you.

So, friends, in all fairness, we're urging a substitute dairy amendment which will protect the yellow color of butter in interstate commerce.

This amendment will assure fair prices for the consumer. It will help assure inexpensive prices for vitamin-rich milk, butter, cheese, beef, yes, even oleo. Folks, remember, you won't, unfortunately, get fair prices if the oleo monopoly swindles the yellow color of butter and drives it from the market. Why? Because, then, the oleo trust will skyrocket the oleo price as it pleases.

Here is a second point, friends. We want fair play for the consumer. We don't want the consumer to be tricked into buying something other than what he or she wants. When the housewife orders beef from the butcher, she doesn't want to be cheated by getting horse meat. When she orders butter, she doesn't want to be cheated with oleo which has been concocted to resemble butter. I could cite hundreds of instances in restaurants and markets where you—the public—have been cheated and deceived into getting oleo when you thought you were getting butter.

A third point, my friends. We want fair business treatment for the Nation's great dairy industry—an industry of 2,250,000 honest, hard-working farmers in 48 States of the Union. Remember, folks, your income, your prosperity depends in part on the economic well-being of the vital dairy segment of America.

Fourth and last, we want good health for our population. As you so well know, youngsters and adults need wholesome, nutritious dairy foods. Folks, you won't be able to get those healthful foods if the oleo monopoly stabs the dairy industry in the back. If that happens, milk production will drop by a third. There'll be less milk for your children, for adults, for anyone. And it will be at higher prices because of the cutting down of dairy herds. The farmer won't profit; he'll be getting it in the neck. Only the Oleo Trust will profit.

Remember, folks, under the amendment I'm suggesting, the consumer could buy either uncolored oleo or colored oleo (that is, colored oleo, assuming his own State allows the manufacture of yellow oleo).

On the other hand, suppose the consumer buys uncolored oleo (either through preference or through a requirement of his own State law), then what? Then the consumer can easily color the oleo according to his desire in his or her own kitchen in 120 seconds.

The few seconds required to color oleo yellow in the kitchen may spell the difference between adequate supplies of milk and cheese at fair prices or a terrible shortage of these vital dairy foods in your home.

You, my friends, have a right to free choice between butter and oleo, both tax-free and both without restrictions on grocery men. So let oleo and butter be sold on their own merits, in fair competition, with their own different color. And don't let anyone kid you that cottonseed oil or soybean oil is yellow, it definitely is not.

You don't want to be swindled with horse meat when you order beef. You want to be treated fairly, and that's all I'm seeking tonight. Fair play, not oleo fraud; fair prices, not monopoly prices; fair business and protection of the good health of our youngsters and adults. Thank you.

RFC's New Place in the Midcentury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal, entitled "RFC's New Place in the Midcentury."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RFC'S NEW PLACE IN THE MIDCENTURY

Senator FULBRIGHT's suggestion for a review of activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has merit. Since the RFC was created in 1932 to save weakened banks and railroads in a time of national crisis it has performed an enormous task.

Its activities broadened to such a point that after 8 years the collateral on its loans included fox farms, hotels, whole towns, farmers' mules, and drainage projects. The Treasury paid out $500,000,000 for its capitalization. After operating under Jesse Jones through a period of terrible depression it proved that Government can be competent in business and its financial soundness was established beyond question.

The RFC served impressively during World War II, that other national emergency, to finance industries vital to national security. It is Senator FULBRIGHT's contention, however, that since then the RFC has tended more to make loans to big corporations than to small.

The cases of the Kaiser-Frazer and Lustron loans come immediately to mind, of course. In the case of the former, Senator FULBRIGHT maintains that the RFC's $44,500,000 loan was outside the province of the Corporation's proper activities. In the case of Lustron, the first loans were probably desirable from a standpoint of national interest, being designed to stimulate mass production of a low-cost house at a time when the housing shortage was most acute. Unfortunately it has not been possible to create Lustron houses at what could rightly be called a production-line rate. Neither has it been possible to bring their cost down to justify the tag of low-priced.

Senator FULBRIGHT has specifically mentioned, besides the Kaiser-Frazer loan, RFC financing of the bankrupt Waltham Watch Co. and the Southern Plywood Co. Both loans were granted on grounds of preventing unemployment, which, as Senator FULBRIGHT has remarked, is not now a national problem of critical proportions.

The point is not that the country could do without the RFC. It is generally accepted as one of the most valuable stabilizers of United States economy. However it does seem time for a review of the place of RFC in an economy which has changed radically from the days of the depression, and again from those of World War II.

The Chinese Situation as I Saw It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum of explanation, dated December 28, 1949, written by Roger D. Lapham, former mayor of San Francisco, representative of the ECA in China. It is a memorandum bringing up to date a speech which he made, entitled "The Chinese Situa-

tion as I Saw It," which was placed in the body of the RECORD by the junior Senator from Oregon (Mr. MORSE), on October 19, 1949, at page 15027 of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have the memorandum inserted, particularly because of its concluding paragraph.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., DECEMBER 18, 1949.

MEMORANDUM OF EXPLANATION

On September 8, 1949, I spoke before the Commonwealth Club of Northern California, at San Francisco, on the subject, the Chinese Situation as I Saw It. This talk, prepared for a radio rebroadcast and necessarily limited as to time, described the activities of the ECA mission to China during the year ending June 1949. I pointed out the difficulties faced by the mission, expressed some personal opinions as to the shortcomings of the Nationalist Government, and ended by making certain recommendations. These were:

1. Continue American private business with the Chinese as far as it may be possible, in such a way as not to enhance to any dangerous degree the very limited war potential of the country.

2. Extend all possible help to American endowed enterprises—educational, medical, and missionary—efforts being made to promote the continuation of the private support which these enterprises have received in the past.

3. Keep open our embassy and consulates in China, staffing them with the ablest personnel procurable, in order that we may pit our best capabilities against the serious problems still to be faced.

4. The only practical way to keep the door open, as well as to listen and observe what goes on behind the bamboo curtain, is to accept the fact that we may soon have to recognize in such areas as they control, the Communist Government, as the de facto Government, and be prepared to recognize it whether we like it or not.

Almost 4 months have passed since my talk was made; and today, the question of recognizing the Chinese Communists is becoming more and more debated. I have been asked what reasons prompted my recommendations; and this memorandum is written to explain the reasons why I think it is in the best interests of the United States to prepare, in the near future, to recognize the Chinese Communists, not only as the de facto government but very likely as the de jure one.

While 4 months ago, the Communists had not secured control of as much of the mainland of China as they have today, it was apparent then that, barring unforeseen miracles, what has happened, would happen. The collapse of the Kuomintang government both on the military and the economic fronts has been a continuing and an astonishing one. The strategic islands of Formosa (Taiwan) and Hainan still remain under Nationalist control; but there is good reason to believe—again barring unforeseen miracles, as well as possible but not probable affirmative action by the United States—that these two islands will fall to the Communists in the not too distant future. It seems plain that the Chinese Communist objective is to drive Chiang and the Kuomintang Party off all Chinese soil; and that every effort will be exerted to accomplish that objective as soon as possible. Before I made my definite recommendations last September, I considered certain alternatives:

(A) A vigorous and continued opposition to the Chinese Communist regime by the United States. Such a policy I assumed would require our support of any acceptable Chinese anti-Communist opposition both by military and economic means. At this late date it is plain that economic means would have to be subordinated to military means. This policy then would require active and open military support to what remains of the Nationalist Government; or failing that, support of some other Chinese group as yet unknown, which might be encouraged to resist the Communists. It is plain that any anti-Communist military resistance would not only have to be supported by arms and ammunition supplied by the United States but also would require direct military supervision by the United States along strategic as well as tactical lines. Few competent observers now believe that Chiang and what remains of the Kuomintang Party could accomplish anything even with our military support and supervision. Chiang has lost the confidence of his people, due to his recent failure as a military commander as well as his inability to prevent a collapse on the economic front. Without going into great detail, one thing stands out—the Nationalist military forces, ground troops, Navy, and Air Force, have been defeated by the Chinese Communists who, at the outset had fewer troops, were not as well equipped, and who had no air force or navy. This defeat can be attributed to an obstinate leader, unwilling to delegate authority, and giving preference to favorites rather than seeking the most competent assistance. I am convinced that it would be a down-the-rat-hole policy to even consider backing Chiang's leadership.

Nor can I believe trying now to find some untried or unknown leadership is either practical or feasible. Therefore, I give up the idea of vigorous and tenacious opposition to the Chinese Communist regime by backing Chiang, or anyone else, with military or economic aid.

(B) The next alternative might be classified as abandonment. Pull out of China altogether and close down what remains of our embassy and consular staffs. Then impose an economic blocade and leave those Americans still in China, whether businessmen, teachers, missionaries (medical or otherwise) to shift for themselves as best they can. This policy would be one of pulling down the iron curtain, ourselves; giving notice to the world, as well as to the many Chinese friends of the United States, that we are through. It can be argued that letting the Chinese Communists stew in their own juice might eventually result in their complete collapse; that somehow or other the great mass of the Chinese people would finally turn on their Communist leaders and, through a series of revolutions, throw them out. That may be—but I do not think so. Pulling down the iron curtain, ourselves, would give a free field to Moscow to use, unopposed, all the influence it could bring to bear to keep China in the Russian orbit. I don't like the idea of running away, nor can I believe temporary abandonment would create the situation hoped for. Therefore I discard that policy.

(C) Another alternative advanced is to let things drift as they are. Don't impose an economic or diplomatic blockade. The Chinese Communists will need to trade with the United States and other western powers—so let our businessmen as well as our missionaries and others interested in the welfare of the Chinese people do what they can without any assistance from Washington. It is hard to advocate a drifting, do-nothing policy of this kind—particularly as there is every evidence that Great Britain and other members of her Commonwealth are considering the affirmative action of recognition. It would appear the longer we follow a drifting policy, the harder it will be for the few Americans left in China to keep going.

Instinctively I react against the negative approach. It usually gets one nowhere. I cannot believe a drifting, stalling policy is the right one to follow.

By elimination then, what other policy can we consider?

First, let us pause for an over-all look around. In my opinion, the world today faces an underlying struggle between the type of government offered by the totalitarian Russian Politburo and the democracies of the United States and other western countries. I define democracy as self-government under law—the right of a people to choose its own form of government under free elections, and to change that form of government if the people so desire—whether the trend be toward state socialism or capitalism.

Under Moscow rule, the people are the absolute servants of the state—a state controlled by a dictator or a group of dictators. The people of those countries are allowed no freedom of movement, can read or listen only to what their leaders prescribe and have no opportunity to judge for themselves. It has become increasingly plain, mainly through Russia's actions in the United Nations, that you cannot reach an agreement with that government and count on observance. The teachings of Lenin clearly demonstrate that any means are justified by the end and the end is to impose Russia's will on all of us.

The only threat, military or otherwise, to our national security today is the Moscow Politburo. Our objective is, and must be, to contain the spread of Moscow influence whether it be in western Europe, the Far East, or any other part of the world. We hope, if we play our cards right, to avoid a hot war; but we have pretty well accepted the fact today that, to avoid a hot war, we must fight a cold war.

I believe that cold war can best be waged by ideas—trying to convince other peoples by what we say and do that they would be better off under self-government by law, than by following the Moscow pattern. That policy cannot be effectively carried out by statements from Washington or by Voice of America broadcasts. We must have Americans on the spot, willing and able to counteract the Moscow ideologies.

How best can this be accomplished in China?

If we are anxious to keep in China the few Americans who now remain there, whether businessmen or welfare people, we must not withdraw our diplomatic representatives. But how can our representatives do anything to help those few Americans unless we are ready to recognize and deal with the government in control, whether we like that type of government or not? Some argue that it is useless even to try to deal with the Chinese Communists because we know they won't carry out any understandings reached. That may be—but how are we to prove it unless we try it out?

Are we to assume that what has happened in eastern Europe is certain to be repeated in China? On the surface, I admit that the odds are all against us—the statements of Mao Tse-tung, the treatment of Consul General Ward—all point to impossibilities.

But remember that we have taken part recently in a Chinese civil war. We have supplied military and economic aid to an incompetent Nationalist Government which has lost out on all fronts. The Communists can rightly claim that we only delayed the collapse of this incompetent government.

When you have lost out by trying one means, why not try another? To date Moscow has played its cards well. So far it has not taken part, at least in the front lines, in the Chinese civil war.

But the big $64 question—which won't be answered this year or next year, and perhaps for many years—is whether or not, eventually, the Chinese Communist leadership is going to turn more Nationalist than Moscow-dominated?

If Russia attempts to impose more directly its will and control, perhaps the antiforeign feeling always prevalent in China may well be turned against Russia, rather than against us. So much depends upon how we play our cards as well as how well Russia plays hers.

Considering the various alternatives, I came to a definite conclusion: The best chance of restraining the spread of Moscow influence in China is to recognize the Chinese Communist regime. It appears to me that is the best practical method left today to accomplish our objective.

I cannot go along with those who think it is wrong in principle to even try to deal with the Chinese Communists on the assumption they are 100 percent followers of the Moscow Politburo and will remain followers indefinitely. Time only will prove or disprove that assumption.

In reaching this conclusion I have not overlooked what adverse psychological reactions it may have in such countries as Japan, the Philippines, and other nations in the Asian sphere. Many will take it as an about-face as well as implying approval of a type of government rather than a mere recognition of a government which controls.

The Chinese Communist victory is not a coup d'état. It is the outcome of a long civil war, in the closing years of which the United States backed the incompetent losers.

We have observed in Asia and elsewhere the rising urge of different peoples to run their own show, and in China the resentment of the treatment dealt out in past years by western nations which sought and acquired, by force majeur, concessions and extraterritorial privileges. Recognition now might be considered as an admission on our part that henceforth we will stand aside and not take part in a civil war as we have recently in China.

We can and should insist on the open-door policy in Asia. We should expect that China will accord no special, nor any greater, privileges to any one nation than to another.

I realize that so long as the Nationalist Government controls Formosa it will be difficult to accord recognition to the Chinese Communists on the mainland. The China Aid Act of April 1948 is still on the books, and that act provides aid only for the Nationalist Government.

If, as has been suggested, Washington takes affirmative action to make certain that the government of Formosa remains one friendly to the United States, then we face a very delicate situation. Any decision with respect to such affirmative action on Formosa can be dealt with only at the highest levels in Washington and with every consideration given as to the effect of such action on the over-all conflict between Russia and those nations which oppose the spread of Politburo power, and further consideration must be given to the effect such affirmative action might have on countries such as India, which is not anxious to take sides as between Moscow and the western democracies.

I am strongly opposed to any affirmative action on Formosa that would permit the use of that island as a base for military operations against the Communists on the mainland. The objective should be to make Formosa the Switzerland of the Pacific—a country to be governed for the benefit of the native Formosans and not to be maintained as the last Nationalist stronghold.

HOMER E. CAPEHART.

Blame for Vincennes Flood Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Blame for Vincennes Flood Conditions," by Dan Kidney, published in the Indianapolis Times of January 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Dan Kidney)

WASHINGTON, January 11.—Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, told the Senate today that President Truman is to blame for the Wabash River flood conditions at Vincennes.

"His rule not to make any appropriations for new projects prevented the Vincennes flood wall from being included in the budget," Senator CAPEHART said.

"It is erroneous to say that Army engineers have not approved the project. I was with Col. J. L. Persons of the engineers in Vincennes 2 months ago and he said the $40,000 we appropriated for plans last session resulted in drawings for the project that are complete and ready for construction."

PLANS CAMPAIGN

"I intend to get $400,000 for the Vincennes flood wall this session, or conduct a filibuster against all the flood-control projects which the President has approved.

"It is outrageous that this administration can spend billions helping Europe and we cannot get such a sum to save Vincennes from a flood. It is a small outlay compared with the cost of bringing in a thousand troops there in 1943 and again today."

Community Chatter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Community Chatter," which appeared in the January 10 issue of the Nebraska City News-Press. I call attention to the fact that the editor of the paper is a former Member of the House of Representatives. The editorial itself carries the initials of his son, Mr. Arthur R. Sweet.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY CHATTER

Brother Truman, in one of his congressional election-year messages, spoke about real wages. He said before many years, the average American family will receive $12,000 in real wages.

What are real wages?

Does Mr. Truman believe that within a few years the $3,000-a-year man as of now will have four times his present buying power? If so, the man's real wages will have increased four times.

Probably what Mr. Truman meant was that when and if the average American family receives $12,000 in wages, it will cost $12,000 then for what $3,000 will buy now. Wages will have gone up, but buying power will have remained the same.

This is fine, except for a few little items:

The man with $12,000 in life insurance now will find its value diminished to $6,000 under the Truman no-poverty scheme of things.

And the $25 savings bond purchased during the war will be worth just $6.25 in real purchasing power when it is redeemed in the $12,000-per-year era.

The no-poverty era will be fine—probably—except for people with savings, annuities, pensions, fixed-value investments, and the like.

These people will realize, without studying text books, that inflation has caught up with them.

If what Truman says is true—and no one can foretell the future with certainty—the best investments will be those which fluctuate with the inflationary trend.

Of course this must be remembered, too: All fluctuations aren't upward. Sometimes values come down.

Everything, that is, except the Truman tax schedule.

A. R. S.

Money, Inflation, and Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Money, Inflation, and Socialism," which appeared on January 10 in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONEY, INFLATION, AND SOCIALISM

Gold, in the long experience of the ages, is the best kind of money that can be contrived.

Every other kind of money has genuine value and validity only to the extent that it is related to gold.

In the modern era the usefulness of gold as money was augmented by the auxiliary device of paper money which was redeemable in gold and was therefore the equivalent of gold.

Under this arrangement, a government issuing and guaranteeing the paper money for which the gold was security served as the custodian but not the actual owner of the gold.

The real owners were the holders of the gold-redeemable paper against which the gold had been pledged.

And the gold could lie in safekeeping while the paper passed around in circulation as currency.

Thus, redeemable printed currency was like warehouse certificates denoting title to merchandise.

It was not necessary to move the goods—or the gold—in order to change the ownership.

At the same time, the issuance of certificates—or currency—was necessarily limited by the amount of gold available for redemptive purposes.

This prevented demoralizing monetary inflation.

Likewise, public expenditures and public debt were similarly restricted, which served as a brake on credit inflation in all banking operations.

And, since all transactions had to be liquidated eventually with money, and the money had to be either gold itself or else redeemable in gold, the system was actually known as the gold standard.

Gold, with not very many variations, was the fixed common denominator of all values and of all currencies.

Now, among its other excellences, the gold standard tended to prevent frauds; and frauds can be perpetrated by governments as well as by individuals.

Frauds committed by individuals are punishable by statute.

Government, however, is not only the source of legal currency: it is also the fountain of statutory power.

Consequently, by illicit use of power, government could subvert the gold standard.

Government could substitute deficit financing for balanced budgets.

Government could replace fiat money for redeemable currency—even in the payment of its own obligations.

And the Government of the United States did these immoral things in 1933.

It confiscated all the monetary gold in the country, and devalued the dollar, thereby reducing the worth of pensions and insurance policies by nearly 50 percent.

It took over the Federal Reserve System—that is, the national banks—as a tool and agent of the Treasury.

Thereafter, the Government could "borrow" to institution-dollar installments on the "security" of its own debt and monetize the debts—part of which emerge from the banks in the form of fiat currency but the bulk of which comprises the basis for credit inflation, making itself evident in low interest rates or cheap money, in excessive check-book money and in swollen bank reserves.

These manipulations liberated the Government from dependence on taxes.

They made inflation the Federal fiscal policy.

As a result, the supply of currency in circulation has increased from $6,000,000,000 to $22,000,000,000; the volume of bank credit—about $30,000,000,000 in 1933—now exceeds $100,000,000,000; and the national debt—less than $25,000,000,000 in 1933—had mounted to $42,000,000,000 before the war, and is now more than a quarter of a trillion dollars.

Of course, much of the pyramidal debt and pervading inflation have been due to the war.

And the effect of this has been to obscure the truth.

For the truth is that inflation became the New Deal's policy before the war and has remained the New Deal's policy since the war.

The methods pursued originated in European socialism and in the new economics sponsored by the late Lord Keynes and were imported here to socialize America.

The theory is to be found in the Marxist gospel of Lenin, who taught that the surest way to socialize an industrial society is to debauch its currency.

Without inflation, the New Deal could not undertake the fantastic schemes of its socialist welfare state—and without inflation it could find no excuse for undertaking them.

But inflation—either by means of managed currency or deficit financing—is an illusion for which the people must pay.

They must pay in labor and production without corresponding progress and prosperity, if not in industrial stagnation and degraded standards of living.

And with $24,000,000,000 worth of idle gold in the United States, available for a return to the honest gold standard, there is a remedy at hand.

Our Dangerous Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Wish-Washing United States to War," published in the Indianapolis Star of January 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISH-WASHING UNITED STATES TO WAR

With his eyes glued on the fall elections, President Truman is wish-washing this country into certain war with Russia. By a weak and vacillating foreign policy he is following in the footsteps of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt. He deliberately is building up an argument for the fall elections that will enable him to go to the people with the phony slogan, "I kept you out of war."

By ditching China and refusing to defend our position in the Orient, President Truman is step by step giving the Russians every reason to believe that we are a weak and wish-wash people who are afraid to assert our rights or to prove our strength. That same sort of wish-washing in foreign policy got the United States into World War I. It also was responsible for getting us into World War II. Neither war settled anything, neither accomplished anything for the American people.

Let's look at the record of how bad leadership got us into two world wars, the same sort of bad leadership that right now is leading us into another great conflict:

From 1914 to 1916 Woodrow Wilson wished and washed back and forth until the Germans were convinced we wouldn't fight. Wilson won reelection in 1916 on the sole issue that he "kept us out of war." Within 4 months after that election we were in World War I up to our necks.

From 1935 to 1940 President Franklin D. Roosevelt did nothing to persuade Hitler or the Japs that we would defend ourselves. He deliberately encouraged trade with both the Germans and the Japs. Finally, in 1939, he made the greatest speech of his life at Chicago in which he warned all nations that the United States would tolerate no aggression in the Western Hemisphere. But 2 months later he entirely repudiated his Chicago speech because his New Deal pals convinced him he could win the 1940 election on the slogan of "keeping us out of war." He went to the people with the repeated promise that "not a single American boy will ever be sent abroad to fight a foreign foe." A year later we were at war. But all that time Roosevelt was secretly conspiring with Churchill and had committed the United States to join in the war. He was so determined to save the British Empire and be glorified in the role of a great war President that he deceived the people with ruthlessly false promises in 1940 in order to gain his reelection.

The same thing is happening again. Dean Acheson is writing his pinky-wink protests to Hungary, Poland, Red China, and other Russian satellite countries in the same vein as the infamous "may I not" notes of Woodrow Wilson's prewar diplomacy. President Truman abandons China, deserts Formosa, slaps his Joint Chiefs of Staff in the face, and ignores the advice of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the one man in all the world whose counsel should be followed at this time.

Had Woodrow Wilson taken a firm stand and revealed the strength of the United States to the Kaiser in 1915, we never would have been pulled into World War I. Had Franklin Roosevelt really desired to keep us out of war, he could have made known our strength to Hitler, and the outcome would have been a death struggle between Hitler and Stalin instead of the useless conflict in which we gained nothing and settled nothing. This is not opinion. This is history.

This is no time for soft words, either at home or abroad. The American people will be embroiled in another war just as surely as we were drawn into two previous wars unless we speak up with tremendous vigor now. Russia must be told in the only language she understands—the language of prepared strength—that we will not tolerate another international bully in the world. Russia will never go to war against us if we call her bluff now and call it in measures she understands.

President Truman's policy in the Orient may be good election-year propaganda, but it leads straight to war as the same policy did in 1916 and 1940. The pinky-wink notes and double-talk diplomacy of Truman's foreign policy add only dangerous fuel to certain war.

There is only one sure way to avoid war with Russia, and that is to make her understand now before it is too late that we have no fear of her or any other foe.

The Radio Program Assault and Flattery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is a program being broadcast in Washington under the title of "Assault and Flattery" over radio station WCFM, which may not have come to the attention of Senators but which is fast gaining attention and growing in popularity. It is conducted by the well-known radio commentator B. S. Bercovici. On this program, Assault and Flattery, Mr. Bercovici, instead of reviewing latest news or claiming the dubious distinction of receiving direct wires from the Kremlin or exclusive stories from the White House, it prefers to comment on what other radio personalities or programs discuss with the view to revealing the

other side of important controversies which touch on current issues.

On Sunday, January 1, Mr. Bercovici, in his program, Assault and Flattery, brought to the attention of the public a condition prevailing on the radio which ought to cause some alarm in the ranks of progressive Americans who, in these days of strife between the forces of darkness and the struggles of democracy, face the duty to emphasize the truth not only that men are created equal but that all men must be treated with equality.

I think Mr. Bercovici ought to be commended for his constructive work.

I ask unanimous consent that his broadcast of January 7, 1950, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been said that no work of art worthy of attention can escape being a work of propaganda, the minute you open your mouth to say something, the minute you dip your brush in the paint you become an agent of some propaganda. That is especially evident in the theatrical field, of which radio entertainment is an integral or a component part. Radio programs can be divided into a few categories; such as programs of pure entertainment and programs of information and enlightenment. The programs of information, to which radio comments and forums belong, have a definite and well-defined aim. Those who conduct them or participate in them expound their personal theories and convictions on a variety of subjects from football to the United Nations. Their aims are not concealed. You listen to them if you are so inclined, you agree with them if you think they are propounding ideas to which you are ready to subscribe, or you disagree with them. In short, they do not take you unawares. Then there are programs of supposedly pure entertainment, whose aim is to make you laugh or cry, or excite you with their bloodcurdling situations. You suspect nothing. Jack Benny, for example, is expected to be funny; you anticipate members of his cast are going to rib him for boasting about women; you know his reputation for being stingy is going to be emphasized, and while this gag is by now worn thin, you wonder when the writers are going to dig up some new and untried situations to show that Jack Benny can be funny without being a miser. Or you listen to Edgar Bergen and his Charlie McCarthy, who try desperately to make you laugh also with Bergen's stinginess—the same gimmick. The fun they dispense is innocent. For every radio comedian from Jack Benny to Al Jolson and back has been characterized as being a tightwad. The writers in their boundless wisdom seem to have tapped a source of comedy never exploited quite that way prior to the advent of radio. It has become a bore, but you hope someday another set of radio writers bent on being original will discover a technique to squeeze laughs out of spendthrifts.

But there is a type of comedy on the air which, while it does not specifically aim at distilling opinions out of situations and dialogue, nevertheless, diffuses a set of opinions which must not be ignored. One such outstanding program is Amos and Andy. It is funny most of the time, but not so funny that it fails to alarm. To begin, the spotlight is played on characters—the script is written around characters rather than around incidents, and what characters.

The Kingfish is a slippery, dishonest, conniving, for the most part, unintelligent person, since his schemes never reach fruition; heartless in all dealings, selfish in his dealings even with his best friends, a miserable husband, a social failure in a community where everybody seems to know him, and, generally speaking, a louse of the first magnitude. This is the Kingfish, the chief character in a program intended to amuse. But the program, I am afraid, does more than amuse. Among uninformed and biased elements, the program is apt to leave a lasting impression that the Kingfish is typical. And because the program is apt to do just that, we are faced with the problem of a program the aim of which is to entertain, but which, without knowing it, and perhaps without malice aforethought, becomes an organ of propagating a rather dangerous idea—that men of Kingfish's stripe are typical.

This would not necessarily be so if other characters in the program were given better credentials before they are launched into the world of radio listeners. So, let's look at the other characters in the program Amos and Andy. Andy Brown, a shiftless ne'er-do-well, who hasn't done a lick of work since he was created by his author, a kind of acceptable bum—and very often he is called a bum right in the script—ignorant to the nth degree, a malaprop, just as the Kingfish is a malaprop, stupid enough to be bamboozled even by his best friend who is no mental giant either, untouched by the niceties of civilization into which he has been launched, without pity, good natured, which in his case is not a virtue since it is obvious that he is too dumb to be anything else; gullible and unwashed. One script—the one broadcast last Sunday night—had Andy Brown say that the New York authorities can by no stretch of the imagination blame him for the shortage of water, so that added to his other vices, we were subtly permitted to discover that he has also escaped the civilized habit of bathing. This is the character of secondary importance in the program Amos and Andy, which is supposed to amuse and entertain us. Then there is Shorty, the barber; a stuttering imbecile who is never able to form an intelligent and intelligible sentence; to whom the Kingfish often goes for advice when he is deep in the trouble caused by his own cunning and idiotic dishonesty, but who never is able to produce sound and proper advice. The script presumes him to possess inherent common sense, yet it always robs him of the opportunity to be the sage he is supposed to be.

Then there is the lawyer—a shyster of the first water—whose legal advice is always on the periphery of the law and always on the shady side of professional honesty. Then you have the fifth character of importance, Sapphire, Kingfish's wife, a shrew with whom no man in his right senses could live in marital bliss for more than a week—ugly, demanding, shrill, and, generally speaking, a female monstrosity. There are others, neither of whom to my recollection are worth the powder to blow them up with. Here and there new characters are introduced, stimulating a hope in the minds of fair-minded listeners that he or she would bring into the script a ray of sunshine. But the hope is blasted the minute these new characters are launched. For example, there is the creature who came all the way from Texas to marry in response to a newspaper advertisement. She discovers the man she has set her heart on is the Kingfish himself, who already has a wife. But the Kingfish knows she has a few hundred dollars, so arrangements are cooked up by which the 250-pound monster is to go through a mock marriage, with Andy, the idiot, playing proxy. Nothing is too difficult or fantastic for the Kingfish if he can get his paws on a few hundred dollars. Well, the story says that Andy fell into a trap—the trap, of course, laid by his very best friend. The ceremony is about to reach a legal climax when Andy realizes that he is going to be married for good, so he escapes. The predatory female, knowing her rights, organizes a veritable manhunt, but does the Kingfish feel the pangs of remorse for having betrayed his friend, Andy, or for having attempted to swindle a total stranger? Nothing of the sort. Instead of feeling contrite, the Kingfish proceeds to paint a glowing picture of marital bliss with this monster and almost traps Andy into accepting his fate.

The stories vary, but the theme never does, nor for that matter does the nature or the quality of the moral derelicts. There is, however, one character with whom the average person would shake hands without fear of being contaminated: that is Amos, but the amazing thing about it is that Amos of late has had as little to do or say on the program that he has become a character of little or no effect on the story itself. Whatever Amos is or does is not of recent planning. Whatever he is, we remember from the days when he and Andy were close pals and carried the program alone. We remember him to be a hard-working lad, responsible, law abiding, a good husband, and a loving father—never venturing into shady schemes, never trying to get rich quick by puerile and idiotic schemes, the way Andy and the Kingfish do. But Amos is practically a stranger on his own program. Last Sunday's program gave him no more than a 2-minute opportunity to make his presence known. Amos so far as I have been able to detect, is the only decent human on that program.

Yet, his decency is not highlighted to a sufficient extent to make an impression on the audience. Now the trouble with this program is not so much that it is a theatrical dump heap of mora' and social lepers, but that all its characters are Negroes. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, among uninformed elements, among biased people in centers where whites are eager and ready to believe that Negroes are inferior to whites, this program is just what the doctor ordered. There is the danger that these characters may be accepted as typical Negroes, and don't tell me that's not possible or probable.

True, anybody with a grain of sense knows that the Kingfish is not a typical Negro person, or that Negroes are shifty and lazy and unwilling to work, or that they are imbeciles like Shorty the barber, or shysters like the lawyer in the show. But anybody with a grain of sense also knows that there are among us far too many who are ready to accept the characterization as a typical one. And it is in this that you find the unwitting and unplanned propaganda that is apt to cause a lot of damage among the uninformed and the prejudiced. Because of these factors the program, in my judgment, ceases to be funny. It is in fact tragic. But since no criticism is accepted without some constructive contribution, I would suggest the best and perhaps only way to take the curse off the program is to inject into it a few worthy characters, honest, attractive men and women, hard-working people, God-fearing and church-going, men and women of Amos' type and quality, of whom there are among our Negro citizens an abundance equal in ratio to that of white citizens. Why the writers and the producers of this program never thought of it, or why in their fairness, they did not think this necessary, is difficult to understand. They must know that millions listen to their program and that many among those millions are apt to distill from the program unfair, untrue, and dangerous conclusions. This must be done, especially in these days when all or most of us talk glibly about democracy.

Now to tally the score: I have omitted the program Amos and Andy for the reasons I expounded. No flattery tonight. It's been nice talking with you and until we meet again next Sunday at the same time, let us hope the season will be received in the spirit of good sportsmanship.

Civil Rights Program—The FEPC in New York—Its Failure in Washington—White Americans Betrayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, attempts are being made to ram down the throats of the American people the so-called civil-rights program, including the FEPC—the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation with which this Nation has ever been threatened. It would not be adopted in a single State in this Nation if the people of that State were permitted to vote on it.

CALIFORNIA

They put it on the ballot in California a few years ago, and it was defeated by a clear majority in every single individual county in California.

The same thing would happen again, not only in California but in every State.

Remember, this FEPC program was promulgated by Joe Stalin in 1930, and it is being pushed in this country by practically every Communist-front organization in the country.

PENNSYLVANIA

They have tried to ram it through two different legislatures in Pennsylvania. Somebody sent every member of that body a copy of my speech on the subject, which I am inserting as a part of these remarks, and they killed it as dead as Hector; and if the people of Pennsylvania themselves had been permitted to vote on it, they would have killed it even deader. Because they know that behind it is a communistic design to wreck not only every business in Pennsylvania but to subordinate them to alien control.

It would do the same thing to every other State in the Union.

MICHIGAN

They tried to ram it through the Legislature of Michigan. But the intelligent members of the Michigan Legislature were smart enough to refer it to a vote of the people, and the supreme court of that great Commonwealth declared the referendum illegal or unconstitutional, which ended it so far as Michigan was concerned.

I dare say that if the people of Michigan had been permitted to vote on this monstrosity they would have killed it even deader than they did in California.

ILLINOIS

They tried to force it through the Legislature of Illinois, and failed. If they had referred it to a vote of the people of Illinois, it probably would have been snowed under overwhelmingly in every single county in Illinois.

OHIO

They tried to force it through the Legislature of Ohio twice, and failed both times—one time, I understand, they had a Republican legislature and the other time a Democratic legislature. I dare say that if they had referred it to a vote of the people of Ohio it would not have carried in 1 precinct out of 10.

MINNESOTA

They tried to shove it through the Legislature of Minnesota at the last session, and failed miserably, because the people of Minnesota are beginning to realize what this communistic monstrosity would mean in paralyzing their industries and creating confusion all over the State.

COLORADO

They tried to shove it through the Legislature of Colorado at the last session, and failed, because the members of the legislature of that great State realized the communistic imports of this vicious measure.

Now they come and attempt to shove it through the Congress of the United States without consulting the people whose rights they are attempting to destroy.

NEW YORK

You remember a few years ago when it was forced through the Legislature of New York Mr. Dewey signed it with 23 pens. I said then that "All the perfumes of Arabia would not sweeten his little hand."

It is simply harassing many businessmen in New York out of business.

In other States where it has been adopted, it is hanging like the sword of Damocles over every businessman in the State, with the result that industries are moving out of the area.

Under permission granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting at this point excerpts from two speeches I made in the House on this subject.

In discussing this matter in the House on February 13, 1947, I exposed the vicious regulations which had been adopted under this crazy legislation in the State of New York.

I said:

Here are the regulations, or rulings, issued by the State of New York. They are headed: "State of New York Executive Department. State commission against discrimination. Rulings."

Here are some of the things you cannot do under the law of New York:

UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES BEFORE HIRING ANYBODY

Those words are written in capitals. Here is the first unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the original name of the applicant for employment, whose name has been changed by court proceedings or otherwise."

If you inquire as to his name or what his name used to be you violate the law. You commit an unlawful practice. For instance, take this man who writes for PM, who calls himself I. F. Stone. His name was Isadore Feinstein, as Cordell Hull once pointed out. Suppose he comes to you asking for employment and you ask him that question. Then you will have committed an unlawful act.

Here is the next one:

"It would be unlawful practice to make inquiry into the birthplace of the applicant for employment, the birthplace of his parents, spouse, or other close relative."

How would you like that in Iowa, Illinois, Texas, or Nebraska? In California I know you do not like it, because you have just voted on it.

Here is the next unlawful practice:

"Requirement that the applicant for employment produce a birth certificate or baptismal certificate."

That would be an unlawful practice under this FEPC Act in New York.

I was surprised to see Governor Dewey get his mustache in the vinegar on this proposition. I do not see how he is ever going to get loose from it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. What about this requirement during the war that every person employed in certain industries had to prove that he was born here before he could get a job?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. If we had had this law all over the country then, the Japs would have had a spy at the elbow of every man in a key position; so would the Germans, and so would every other enemy country.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his timely suggestion.

It is an unlawful practice in New York under this law, to make inquiry into the religious denomination of an applicant for employment, his religious affiliations, his church, parish pastor, or religious holidays observed. Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist.

Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist is forbidden, although you may be publishing literature for the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, or any other denomination.

Another thing, an applicant for employment—and I am reading from the rules laid down by this Commission:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that this is a Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish organization."

In other words, if you are in the business of publishing religious literature you cannot even give him that information under this law which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] now proposes for the whole country, including Illinois.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that the following holidays will be observed by the firm and no others, naming the holidays; e. g., Decoration Day and July the Fourth, etc."

You cannot tell them under the laws, rulings, and regulations of the State of New York that they may observe the Fourth of July.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that employees are required to work Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur."

Frankly, I did not know there were any such days until the last few years.

Another thing, it is an unlawful practice under this New York law to make "inquiry into the complexion of an applicant for employment."

Inquire into his complexion and you are likely to get yourself tangled up with the law of the State of New York.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Requirement that an applicant for employment annex a photograph."

That would be an unlawful employment practice. You are not supposed to know how he looks.

Remember, this is not in Russia, but in New York.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. And yet the State Department in order to grant a visa requires a photograph of the person to be presented with his application.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly, and they ought to do so. Much as I respect the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], I certainly would not want to employ him unless I knew how he looked. If I had never seen him, I would certainly want to see his picture.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry whether an applicant for employment is a naturalized or native-born citizen; the date when the applicant acquired citizenship; whether the applicant's parents or spouse are naturalized or native-born citizens of the United States; the date when such parents or spouse acquired citizenship."

You cannot inquire into these questions under this FEPC law in New York.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Requirement that an applicant for employment produce his naturalization papers or first papers."

He may lie to you and tell you that he is a naturalized citizen, but you cannot ask to see his papers.

Another unlawful practice in New York is to "inquire into the lineage of an applicant for employment, his ancestry, or national origin."

You remember a few years ago the Dallas News inserted an advertisement for a colored janitor, and this FEPC outfit down the street, ordered them to take it out, said it was an unlawful practice.

One member of this FEPC outfit here in Washington went into the office of Swift & Co. in Chicago. This FEPC man asked them: "How many Negroes do you have on your board of directors?"

The answer was "None."

Then the FEPC man asked him: "Why haven't you?"

That was the FEPC down here in Washington a few years ago before it died because a few radicals could not browbeat Congress into perpetuating it.

But it is now in force in the State of New York.

Here is another unlawful practice under the New York law:

"Inquiry into the location of places of business of relatives of an applicant for employment."

It is an unlawful practice to make "inquiry into the place of residence of the parents, spouse, or other close relatives of an applicant for employment."

I am reading from the records at Albany.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the maiden name of the wife of a male applicant for employment and/or inquiry into the maiden name of the mother of a male or female applicant for employment."

The other day we had the Eislers down here. One of them has been shown to be representing the Comintern, according to his sister's testimony. He has a brother out in California, who seems to be poisoning the public mind through the moving-picture industry. He tries to defend his brother and refers to this woman as "my former sister." If you wanted to employ any of them and check the name of at least one of them as given here, you could not inquire into those names at all—if you are trying to do business in the State of New York, even though one of them has a half-dozen aliases. You could not even ask where they came from or when they got here or when they changed their names.

Here is another unlawful practice, in New York:

"Inquiry into the general military experience of an applicant for employment."

I wish every ex-serviceman could read that, and the next one.

Here it is. It is an unlawful practice to make "inquiry into the whereabouts of an applicant for employment during the First World War; i. e., during the period from 1914 to 1919."

In other words, inquiry as to his whereabouts in the period from 1914 to 1919 is forbidden as an unlawful practice in the State of New York.

Is that what you want in Colorado? Is that what you want in Massachusetts?

Mr. GIFFORD. We have it.

Mr. RANKIN. Get rid of it, and we will help you.

Is that what you want in Kansas, in Ohio, and in other States?

Let your States vote on it. Michigan is going to vote on it right away. If you will tell the people of Michigan the whole truth, let them know the whole truth about this monstrosity, I will guarantee you they will beat it worse than they did in California.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the organizations of which an applicant for employment is a member, including organizations the name or character of which indicates the religion, race, or national origin of its members."

I presume, if they should ask me if I am a member of the Masonic lodge, I could have them jerked up and brought before this inquisition board or probably prosecuted at various places throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am not criticising the people of New York. I have long since learned in going from one State to another that real Americans are about the same everywhere. I believe if they had a vote on it, the people of New York would beat it, just as they did in California.

They are having a vote on it in Michigan because a little minority group has been attempting to browbeat the Legislature of Michigan into passing it. I dare say when it goes on the ballot in Michigan and the people of Michigan understand what it means they will defeat it more thoroughly than they did in California. The same thing would happen in probably every other State in the Union.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman tell us what the penalties are in New York?

Mr. RANKIN. In addition to being harassed to death with orders and directives to cease, desist, rehire, and so forth, there is a punishment provided of "imprisonment in a penitentiary or county jail for not more than 1 year or by fine of not more than $500, or by both."

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to remind the gentleman that we have that law in Massachusetts.

Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that.

Mr. GIFFORD. I was thoroughly amazed when I looked into it. I had not learned what the rules were. But, perhaps we carried it too far. I am so sorry, and I have been, and I am not in favor of this, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I know the gentleman is not, and I am sure the people of Massachusetts would not favor it if they had a vote on it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Employers always inquire and must know whether you come from a respectable family or not. They are so careful. Perhaps they overdid it. But I think a man ought to be able to find out whether he came from a respectable family.

Mr. RANKIN. There are a great many questions that should be asked which are forbidden under this law.

Mr. Speaker, in order to give the new Members an idea of what a mess this FEPC was here in Washington during its existence under Executive order, I insert a speech I made on this subject in 1945.

It reads as follows:

FEPC A BETRAYAL OF WHITE AMERICANS

"(Speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, July 12, 1945)

"Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of a law at this time legalizing this so-called FEPC would be a betrayal of the white people of the country. If every individual in the United States could understand just what it means, there would be such a roar of protest coming from every State in this Union that it would never see the light of day.

"If every Member of Congress would screw his courage to the sticking place and vote his convictions on this so-called FEPC, it would not get 50 votes out of the entire membership of 435.

"It is a most dangerous and brazen attempt to fasten upon the white people of America the worst system of control by alien or minority racial groups that has been known since the crucifixion.

"When I read the names of the personnel of this outfit you will understand what I mean.

"To sanctify this organization by law would give the lie to everything we have told our American boys they were fighting for. Instead of coming back to liberty, freedom, and democracy, they would find themselves sold into this bondage, herded, humiliated, and regimented by alien influences directed by a foreign comintern representing the deadly doctrine of Karl Marx that is based upon hatred for Christianity and for everything that is based on Christian principles.

"It is a manifestation in legislative form of that infidelity that has closed thousands of Christian churches in Europe and has been responsible for the murder of untold millions of Christian human beings.

"This measure is not directed altogether at the white people of the South. If it were, you folks in the North would not have so much ground for alarm. We in the South know how to combat subversive elements. As Henry Grady once said, we wrested the South from such domination when Federal drum beats rolled nearer and Federal bayonets hedged closer to the ballot box of the South than it ever will again in this Republic.'

"But you people in the North have not had that training, and this FEPC is likely to bring grief, strife, hatred, race riots, and chaos in your northern cities if this vicious agency is perpetuated and sanctioned by your votes.

"Do not forget that the returning servicemen know what this thing means, and they are going to call you to account next year—beginning with the primary. They are not going to wait until the general election.

"Do not forget that every businessman, every farmer, every professional man, and every other independent individual whose blood glows with the instinct of American liberty, is going to join these men, and those other patriotic forces that are fighting to save American institutions for which these

boys have been fighting and dying upon every battlefield in the world.

"If every man and every woman in the United States could just read the list of individuals that compose the personnel of this crazy FEPC, and its subdivisions throughout the country, I dare say there would not be enough of you left who vote for it, even if nominated in the primaries next year, to form a corporal's guard.

"For your information, and for the information of the American people generally I am going to read you the official personnel as it exists today. Remember this list is taken from the official record. This is the group that wants to nose into and control every business in the United States. Remember, they can search the files and records of every business establishment in America where some disgruntled individual is willing to trump up a charge of discrimination. They can drag them all over the country and try them, and in that way destroy any ordinary business concern.

"The next thing they are going to try to do is get control of your schools and force their communistic henchmen into the schools and teach your children their subversive doctrines.

"Read these lists carefully, which, as I said, are taken from the official records here in Washington, and you will see that not 1 out of 10 on these rolls is a white gentile American.

"*Committee on Fair Employment Practice, Washington, D. C., Office of the Chairman*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ross, Malcolm	Chairman	White	[illegible]
Johnson, George M.	Deputy Chairman.	Colored	[illegible]
Hubbard, Mason	Hearings examiner.	do	[illegible]
Bloch, Emanuel	do	White	[illegible]
Copper, Evelyn	do	do	5,600
Berking, Max	Assistant to Chairman	do	[illegible]
Alexander, Dorothy	Secretary to Chairman	Colored	[illegible]
Cohen, J. Jerome	Secretary to Deputy.	do	[illegible]
Brooks, Mary	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Dunting, Myra	do	White	1,800

"You will note that in this office of the chairman, consisting of 10 people, there are 5 Negroes and 5 white people, most of whom have foreign names. One of the whites is a stenographer, who receives the smallest salary of anyone on the list.

"Remember that the members of this group preside over the destiny of every business enterprise in America and are using their assumed powers to intimidate white Americans out of business.

"This is the organization members of Congress are being asked to perpetuate by the passage of this bill.

"FIELD OPERATIONS

"Here is the Division of Field Operations:

"*Field operations*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Mosley, Will	Chief	White	[illegible]
Mitchell, Clarence	Principal fair-practice examiner.	Colored	[illegible]
Davidson, Eugene	do	do	[illegible]
Beall, W. Hayes	Senior fair-practice examiner.	White	4,600
Mercer, Inez	Fair-practice examiner.	do	[illegible]
Rogers, Elmer W	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	[illegible]
Saito, Osamu	do	Japanese-American.	[illegible]
Thompson, Mildred	do	Colored	[illegible]
Cornish, Emma	do	do	[illegible]

"You will note that it consists of nine people—five Negroes, one Japanese, and three others—two of whom have records of affiliations with Communist-front organizations, according to the reports of the Dies committee.

"Imagine this group going about over the country riding herd on the white American businessmen of the Nation, telling them whom they shall employ, whom they shall promote, and with whom they may associate.

"It would be interesting, and probably enlightening, to check up on these people and see how many of them are native-born Americans.

"Members of Congress had better do this now, before they get caught in this trap, because this question of un-American activities is going to be an issue in every congressional district next year, beginning with the primaries.

"The people are not going to wait until the general election for someone who holds a commission as a result of the pernicious activities of Sidney Hillman and his gang to wrap the party cloak about him and shout to the people of his district that 'I am a Republican' or 'I am a Democrat.'

"More than 2,000,000 young men have already been discharged in this war, and they are organizing now to try to save America for Americans. They are going to read your records, and they are likely to ask you some very embarrassing questions when you get home.

"REVIEW AND ANALYSIS DIVISION

"Now look at this list and see who reviews all these records of racial discrimination when they come to Washington, and you will understand how the editor of the Dallas News felt and how other white gentiles feel, including Cecil B. DeMille, the great American movie producer, when they are harassed out of business.

"Here is the list:

"*Review and Analysis Division*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Davis, John A	Chief	Colored	[illegible]
Lawson, Marjorie	Research analyst.	do	3,800
Gelightly, Cerneline.	Compliance analyst.	do	3,200
Hemphill, India	do	do	2,000
Conn, Carol	do	White	2,000
Davis, Joy P	do	Colored	2,000
Hoffman, Celia	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Spaulding, Joan	do	Colored	1,800

"You will note that it consists of six Negroes and two white people, one of whom is named Carol Conn and the other Celia Hoffman, a white stenographer receiving the lowest salary on the list.

"Now, if you sign the petition to bring out this bill or vote for this monstrosity, do not forget that when you get home those white American businessmen who help to sustain this Nation in time of peace and whose sons are fighting its battles in time of war are going to want to ask you some questions that you may not be able to answer.

"LEGAL DIVISION

"But if you want a real laugh, look at this Legal Division:

"*Legal Division*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Reaves, Frank D	Attorney	Colored	[illegible]
Stickgold, Simon	do	White	[illegible]
Gordon, Jernevive	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	[illegible]

"You will note that this so-called 'legal division' consists of two Negroes and a Simon Stickgold.

"INFORMATION DIVISION

"Now we come to the Information Division. If you want information about this outfit, write to this Division:

"*Information Division*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Bourne, St. Clair	Information specialist.	Colored	[illegible]
Whiting, Margaret	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

"You will note that it consists of two Negroes, one registered as an information specialist and the other as a clerk-stenographer.

"BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

"Now we come to the Budget and Administration Division. This Division not only makes up the budget but administers the regulations. Here is the list:

"*Budget and Administration*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Jones, Theodore	Chief	Colored	[illegible]
Jeter, Sinclair	Assistant administrative officer.	do	[illegible]
Baker, Vivian D	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Jackson, Beasles A	Clerk-typist	do	1,620
Paynter, Minnie A	do	do	1,620
Hollomon, Irving	Clerk	do	1,440
Selby, Ralph B	Chief, fiscal	do	3,000
Ross, Sylvia B	Voucher auditor	do	2,000
Nelson, Otelia	Accounting clerk	do	1,620
Carpenter, Elizabeth.	do	do	1,620
Brent, Pearl T	do	do	1,620

"This outfit, which is composed of 11 Negroes and no whites at all, not only makes up the budget for financing this aggregation, but it seems to have the power of administration. I hope you will read this list to your white businessmen, farmers, and ex-servicemen at home when you get back and ask for renomination in the primaries next year.

"MAIL AND FILES DIVISION

"Now here are the ones that have control of the mails and filing system:

"*Mail and Files*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Douglas, Lela	Chief, Mail and Files.	Colored	[illegible]
Welch, Selena	Docket clerk	do	1,800
Gamble, Jessie	File clerk	do	1,620
Phillips, Rose	do	do	1,440
Reed, Charles	Messenger	do	1,260
Mitchell, Regina	File clerk	do	1,440

"You will note that this division is composed entirely of Negroes—six Negroes, and no whites at all. I wonder why they discriminated against the white race in setting up these two powerful branches of this most dangerous agency?

"REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW YORK

"Now, let us turn to the regional offices and see who is going to harass the business people back in the States. Here is the list for the State of New York:

"*Regional office, New York*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Lawson, Edward H.	Regional director.	Colored	[illegible]
Jones, Madison S	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Robert G	do	do	[illegible]
Donovan, Daniel R	do	White	3,800
Irish, Miriam	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	3,000
Asepha, Tillie	do	White	[illegible]
Schwartz, Susie	do	do	[illegible]

"This is the list that is going to help Governor Dewey harass the white American businessman of the Empire State. You will note that it is composed of four Negroes and three white people. Please read the names of the three white people and see if you can figure out their antecedents.

"Businessmen of New York are going to have a hard time after this war without having all this communistic conglomeration to deal with, to say nothing of the one which Governor Dewey and his political henchmen have now heaped upon them.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, PHILADELPHIA

"Now, let us turn to Philadelphia, the birthplace of the Constitution—the City of Brotherly Love. At the risk of causing glorious old Benjamin Franklin to turn over in his grave, I read you the list:

"*Regional office, Philadelphia*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Fleming, G. James	Regional director.	Colored	[illegible]
Greenblatt, Mildred.	Fair-practice examiner.	White	[illegible]
Manly, Milo A	do	Colored	3,800
Risk, Samuel R	do	White	3,800
Grinnage, Willard	do	Colored	3,200
Gorgas, Helen	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Klinger, Karyl	do	White	1,800
Brown, Grayce	do	Colored	1,440

"You will note that it is composed of eight individuals—five Negroes and three whites, Mildred Greenblatt, Samuel R. Risk, and Karyl Klinger.

"Don't you know there will be some brotherly love when that crowd gets going on the businessmen of the Philadelphia area?

"REGIONAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

"Now here is the regional office in Washington, D. C., the National Capital, where there has been so much persecution of white gentiles in the last few years. Here is the list:

"*Regional office, Washington, D. C.*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Evans, Joseph	Regional director.	Colored	[illegible]
Houston, Theophilus.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	[illegible]
Kahn, Alice	do	White	[illegible]
Chisolm, Ruby	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	[illegible]
Urback, Dorothy	do	do	[illegible]

"You will note it consists of four Negroes and Alice Kahn. Just what chance a white gentile will have with this group is entirely problematical, to say the least of it.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, CLEVELAND

"Now, let us move out where the West begins and take a look. Here is the list in the Cleveland regional office:

"*Regional office, Cleveland*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
McKnight, William	Regional director.	Colored	[illegible]
Abbott, Olcott R	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Glore, Lethia	do	Colored	[illegible]
Kelley, Bernice	Clerk-stenographer.	do	[illegible]
Wasem, Edna	do	White	[illegible]

"You will note that this group is composed of three Negroes and two whites, Olcott R. Abbott and Edna Wasem.

"Don't you know the white people of Cleveland will enjoy being dominated by them?

"CINCINNATI REGIONAL OFFICE

"Cincinnati seems to be largely under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland office since it only has two people:

"*Cincinnati*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
James, Harold	Fair-practice examiner.	White	[illegible]
	Clerk-stenographer.		1,800

"DETROIT REGIONAL OFFICE

"Now, let us move on to Detroit, Mich. Here is the regional office for Detroit:

"*Detroit*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Swan, Edward	Examiner in charge.	Colored	[illegible]
Sem, Doris K	Clerk-stenographer.	Japanese-American.	[illegible]

"You will note that it is composed of one Negro and one Japanese. I know the businessmen of Detroit are grateful for this consideration.

"I should like to hear some of the comments they will make to you gentlemen from Detroit when you get home next summer if you support this vicious measure.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, CHICAGO

"Here is a list of the regional office in the Windy City:

"*Regional office, Chicago*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Henderson, Elmer	Regional director.	Colored	[illegible]
Gibson, Harry H. C.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	[illegible]
Schultz, Joy	do	White	[illegible]
Williams, Le Roy	do	Colored	[illegible]
Zeidman, Penny	Clerk-stenographer.	White	[illegible]
Ingram, Marguerite S	do	Colored	[illegible]

"You will note it is composed of four Negroes, Joy Shultz, and Penny Zeidman. I am told that a representative of this group went into the office of Swift & Co. and asked how many Negro members they had on their board of directors. The answer was, "We have no Negro members on our board of directors." Then the question came back, "Why haven't you?" This just shows what this supergovernmental set-up is driving at. They want to communize America and destroy everything which our glorious ancestors have left us and for which our boys are now fighting and dying all over the world.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, ATLANTA

"Here is a list of the Atlanta office:

"*Regional office, Atlanta*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Dodge, Witherspoon.	Regional director.	White	[illegible]
Hope, John	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	[illegible]
McKay, George D	do	White	[illegible]
Chubb, Sally	do	do	[illegible]
Ingram, Thelma	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	[illegible]

"You will note that it consists of two Negroes and three whites; the most important post in this office, that of examiner, is held by a Negro. I wonder how the people of Georgia enjoy the domination of this group. I may have more to say about them later.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, KANSAS CITY

"Here is the list of the Kansas City office:

"*Regional office, Kansas City*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Haglund, Roy A	Regional director	White	[illegible]
Ormsbee, Eugene	Fair-practice examiner.	do	[illegible]
Jones, Mildred	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	[illegible]
Schilen, Helene G	do	White	[illegible]

"You will note that this office force consists of three whites and one Negro. You can read the list of whites yourself and then judge how many of them really represent the people of that area.

"ST. LOUIS REGIONAL OFFICE

"Here is the list of the regional office personnel at St. Louis:

"*St. Louis*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Theodore Brown	Examiner in charge.	Colored	[illegible]
Morris Levine	Examiner	White	[illegible]
Armatha Jackson	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	[illegible]

"You will notice that it consists of two Negroes and Morris Levine. Just how they came to select these particular individuals to preside over the destiny of the white businessmen of the great State of Missouri I cannot understand.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, DALLAS, TEX.

"The members of the regional office at Dallas are as follows:

"*Regional office, Dallas*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Castenada, Carlos	Regional director.	White	[illegible]
(Vacancy)	Fair-practice examiner.		[illegible]
Gutleben, Willetta	Clerk-stenographer.	White	[illegible]

"You will note there is one vacancy. Last year that position was held by a Negro, namely, Roy V. Williams. The other two members, Carlos Castenada, the regional director, and Willetta Gutleben seem to be in charge of the office at the present time. This is the regional office that attacked the Dallas News last year for carrying an advertisement for a Negro janitor. This fellow Castenada, the director, held the same position that he holds now. If this set-up is made permanent, then I presume the rest of the white American businessmen in Texas may expect to be harassed just as the Dallas News was.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW ORLEANS

"The regional office at New Orleans consists of the following members:

"*Regional office, New Orleans*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ellinger, W. Don	Regional director.	White	[illegible]
Morton, James H	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	[illegible]
Reaning, Evelyn	Clerk-stenographer.	White	[illegible]

"You will note that there are two whites and one Negro in this office. As the Negro is the fair-practice examiner, just what the decent people of Louisiana may expect at the hands of this outfit is something to contemplate.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, SAN FRANCISCO

"The San Francisco office consists of the following individuals:

"*Regional office, San Francisco*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Kingman, Harry L.	Regional director.	White	$8,600
Rutledge, Edward	Fair-practice examiner.	do	4,600
Ross, Bernard	do	do	3,200
Seymour, Virginia	Administrative assistant.	do	2,980
Morton, Jewel	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

"This is the only office we have found yet that consists entirely of white (?) people. Just what the background of each one of them is I am unable to say.

"LOS ANGELES REGIONAL OFFICE

"The Los Angeles regional office consists of the following:

"*Los Angeles*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hunt, A. Bruce	Hearings examiner.	White	$5,600
Brown, Robert E.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,600
Lopez, Ignacio	do	White	3,800
Vetter, Vera O.	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Lorna, Marie	do	do	1,620

"You will note that there are four whites and one Negro in this office, the Negro being the fair-practice examiner. I do not know what consideration the white businessmen of the Los Angeles area are receiving at the hands of this group, but from what I can hear there is considerable gnashing of teeth over the situation.

"Mr. Chairman, this FEPC is a supergovernment of commissars, with more power for evil than any other agency that has ever been created in this country. If Congress should ratify it and make it the law of the land, then we will have sacrificed and destroyed that sacred freedom for which our brave men are now fighting and dying on every battle front in the world.

"We have no right to pass such a drastic, reactionary measure that literally changes our way of life, as well as our form of government, while these boys are away from home in uniform, fighting to sustain American institutions.

"As I said before, we are going to carry this battle against such un-American activities into every congressional district in the United States next year, in the primary, so that no one can crawl behind the party block and stalk unmolestedly at the hands of any segment of our people.

"This is a battle for the survival of free constitutional government, for the survival of the American way of life, for the survival of free enterprise, for the survival of American liberty itself.

"It is a battle to save America for Americans."

Pensions and General Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from one of my constituents, Mr. E. B. Clark, of Portland, Oreg.:

PENSIONS AND GENERAL WELFARE

Reference is made to the heading "Old-age pension plan maneuvered to stir excitement," on page 11 of the Oregon Journal, November 28, 1949, from Washington, D. C. This article shows without doubt that the question of pensions has been the subject of much diversified thinking by not only legislators but by all peoples, and is a subject of much concern. A workable and adequate pension plan is much desired and very necessary, that will cover everybody.

It is suggested, therefore, that a national nonpyramidal retail sales-tax plan of 5 percent be established, for minimum cost of living, of $75 per month, with practically no exemptions, for all retired at age 65, or earlier when physically handicapped and health conditions makes retirement necessary, including everybody, both rich and poor. To this should be added funds from all estates left without wills or heirs, plus opportunity for the philanthropic-minded to add large or small amounts thereto, in their wills, also interest on monthly balances at the highest Government rates paid for money. Under such a system, all would pay, and therefore all should participate in the same payments at age 65.

It is understood that over half the States now have adopted retail sales-tax systems of 3 percent and under (mostly under), which are very popular, but inadequate, which could be eliminated if the higher rate were made universal, and pensioners could live in any State desired without question.

The retail sales tax is probably the fairest of all taxation systems and most economical to administer, and by making payments low enough, yet adequate for minimum cost of living, no requirement to expend full amount each month would be necessary.

If such a pension bill were enacted by the Congress, the minimum cost of living would be provided for everyone at 65, to which all would contribute at the same percentage rate, and the same monthly payments would be distributed to all pensioners entitled thereto, which, no doubt, would eliminate depressions and unemployment, as everybody would either have a job or a check each month to cover actual living costs.

Employers and workmen of all classes could then provide, as they might severally determine, such additional private pension systems as desired, through unions, civil service, associations of all kinds, etc., for the basic uniform pension would have already been adopted. It would not necessarily interfere with present private systems and service pensions.

When the constantly accumulating general-welfare fund exceeded the need for pensions, allocations should be made therefrom to the present fast-growing voluntary-contributing Blue Cross group system for hospitalization and medical and dental care and other such State and local groups now sponsored and administered by the medical profession, for the constant and gradual enlargement of that valuable service, making it all-inclusive for pensioners and others whose modest incomes are insufficient to join the groups voluntarily.

Such a universal pension system, operating free from politics, with an immense fund constantly revolving, would have far-reaching and beneficial results in stabilizing our whole economic system, and would free us entirely from fear and want, and change our thinking to peace and plenty, giving the world a practical example of what can be done under free enterprise.

E. B. CLARK.

Statement on Behalf of United States Wine Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Philo Biane, Fruit Industries, Ltd., San Francisco, Calif., on behalf of the United States Wine Industry:

STATEMENT BEFORE THE SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE ON S. 1847, JANUARY 12, 1950

My name is Philo Biane, in charge of wine production at Fruit Industries, Ltd., whose main offices are at 900 Minnesota Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Fruit Industries, Ltd., is a substantial grower cooperative producing wine from the grapes of approximately 1,200 growers in California and is a member of the Wine Institute. Originally Mr. Walter Taylor, manager of our firm, and chairman of the board of the Wine Institute, the trade association for the California wineries, had hoped to be able to appear before you but was unable to make the trip east at this time. I am, therefore, appearing in his place.

I am appearing not only on behalf of the Wine Institute and all the California wineries, but also on behalf of the 18 other wine associations making up the Wine Conference of America which represents practically the entire trade in American and imported wines in the United States.

When hearings on advertising were held before this committee on April 1948 on S. 265, a substantial amount of testimony was introduced on behalf of the United States wine industry which appears at pages 92–119 and 205–208 of the printed transcript. Consequently, in this appearance we do not wish to burden the committee by repeating too much of the data we submitted at that time and would appreciate permission to incorporate the 1948 testimony by reference without reprinting it in this record. We hope, however, the 1948 testimony will receive the committee's full consideration.

Briefly summarized, the 1948 testimony established in detail the following points:

1. Advertising by the wine industry has, with rare exceptions, been dignified and in good taste so that there is no justification

whatsoever for punitive legislation in this field.

2. The majority of families throughout the United States enjoy the use of wine as an accompaniment to food or as a moderate beverage for special occasions, and wine advertising has been primarily directed to this group of consumers to better acquaint them with the proper and moderate uses of our products.

3. The suppression by law of truthful information to the consumer on the proper and moderate uses of wine would not be in the public interest but would, on the contrary, actually foster the abuse rather than the proper use of our products.

4. Restrictive legislation in this field would, without any real justification whatever, ruin thousands of grape growers and wine producers distributed through 13 States, destroy millions of dollars worth of permanent vineyard investments, and adversely affect the employment and livelihood of many people—a body blow to an industry that, since national prohibition, has rapidly reestablished itself as a major factor in our agricultural economy.

We do not intend to burden the committee with any further discussion of the 1948 testimony because it has already been printed and also because no one, to our knowledge, has seriously attempted to controvert the points we established.

We have always felt that our advertising has been in good taste and generally acceptable to the public, and the 1948 hearings tended to confirm us in this view.

Our trade, however, has always recognized its advertising responsibilities, and after the 1948 hearings we voluntarily reviewed our advertising and analyzed it for any criticisms that might be directed at it. We also reviewed much of the proposed advertising that had been suggested but had never actually been printed. We found that in a number of instances proposed, unpublished advertising did not meet the canons of good taste generally accepted in our trade. We believe this was due to the fact that, after the war, many of the advertising agency personnel were new to the business. As a result, it quite frequently happened that advertising themes very common for many commodities distributed in the United States were being copied in the preparation of our wine advertising. There was nothing illegal about these themes or these advertising techniques, but they were quite at variance with what we had been doing and with what the wine industry as a whole felt was desirable.

We, therefore, thought that some statement should be made outlining the objectives of wine advertising which could be used as a guide for merchandisers and their advertising agencies and also by the printing and lithographic trades. Our view was that where advertising might be considered in questionable taste, its final publication was likely to be due largely to the fact that money had been invested in its preparation. We felt practically all difficulties resulting from poor taste could be avoided if some guide to proper preparation were furnished.

The preparation of this guide was done by the 19 associations forming the Wine Conference of America. We first met with Deputy Commissioner Mealey, of the Alcohol Tax Unit, who was of great assistance to us, particularly in furnishing samples of proposed, unpublished advertising and by making available the technical advice of his advertising staff. Further conferences were held within the various trade groups and with advertising experts. Finally, on April 8, 1949, the Wine Conference issued the document entitled "Statement of Principles for Advertising in the Wine Industry." This statement was subscribed to, through these 19 associations, by practically the entire wine trade in the United States.

This advertising code has been furnished to all individual members of these associations for redistribution to their sales personnel and to their advertising agencies. The Better Business Bureau has included it in its "Do's and Don'ts for Advertising." It has been made available to all Federal and State control agencies.

The code has received commendation wherever it has been distributed and, more important, it has accomplished the purposes for which it was designed. Since its adoption was voluntary, this may seem strange. Actually, it is not. Existing basic Federal and State laws dealing with advertising are stringent. Enforcement officials are in constant contact with industry members and their advertising agencies. Through the operation of the Federal and State licensing systems, the industry is highly integrated not only at the producer level, but also down through the wholesaling and retailing levels. Our industry trade associations are active in assisting their members in preparing public relations programs. On the whole, it would be more than surprising if the advertising code did not work.

We feel very strongly that no additional law is necessary or even desirable. The combination of basic law coupled with voluntary group action is becoming more and more common. In medieval times no one questioned the royal right to regulate the personal habits of the subject, and much of this concept passed into statutory law during the Reformation and during the earlier history of this country. But we believe almost everyone nowadays realizes not only the undesirability but also the basic unfairness of trying to use the criminal law to govern human conduct in phases of activity which are not even remotely criminal in the minds of most men.

What constitutes good taste, good manners, and just plain common sense in dealing with your neighbors, is really the only thing that is being discussed before this committee. Habits, customs, and basic thinking differ widely among our large population, both geographically and at various economic levels. Again, we believe it is basically unsound to use criminal law in dealing with activity in any field such as this where there is no question of deception or fraud—matters which are already fully and stringently covered by Federal and State law. This view of ours has been expressed by many eminent jurists, and we think it was aptly put by William Howard Taft before the Pennsylvania Bar Association in 1906 (12 Rep. Pa. Bar Ass'n 239, 240–245), when he gave his view of the function of law in part as follows:

"It is to offer equal opportunities for the improvement of the people rather than to command it by positive law, to be enforced by threatened or actual punishment. It is to furnish the means of maintaining justice, and then to let individualism have its sway in working out character and in adding to the sum of human happiness. The theory that by legislation the State can successfully command people to be righteous in the higher sense is at the bottom of much unsuccessful and obsolete legislation that stands as a monument to the obstacle that hearts overflowing with enthusiastic love for their race but without practical judgment have offered to real progress."

With the permission of the committee, I would like to introduce at this point the wine industry's Statement of Principles already mentioned, and which we think reflects in principle the line of thought just referred to.

On the first page of this advertising code there are three paragraphs explaining its purposes.

Then follow nine basic points covering good labeling and advertising of wine. The first eight points deal with the subject matter of good advertising regardless of media. The ninth point deals with advertising media themselves. This advertising code is attached as an appendix to my statement and I will not read it in full unless the committee desires me to do so.

In considering section 9 of the code dealing with advertising media, serious consideration was given to the use of radio and television. Since radio and television are generally accepted media for the transmission of information, including advertising, we believe their use is perfectly proper for the transmission of information on wine. We realize that certain types of radio and television commercials, based on the technique of the old-time circus barker, are obnoxious to a great many people regardless of the commodity advertised. We, therefore, provide in our code that the same good taste shall apply to these media as to others; namely that the advertiser shall avoid irritating the sensitivities of the normal consuming public and that commercials should be so prepared as to promote the proper and temperate use for which wine is intended, not to suggest that wine should be used for any but temperate purposes and not to bring wine into disrepute with the consuming public.

With the proper type of program we feel that we can contribute to the information and pleasure of the normal consuming public. In the last few months we have been experimenting with the visual system of giving information that television affords. The industry, through the Wine Advisory Board of the State of California, has sponsored cooking demonstrations showing the use of wine in the kitchen and at the table as a proper accompaniment to food. This program has appeared between 8:30 and 9 in the evening in the northeastern area of the United States and it has been highly appreciated by the many householders who really want to know how to cook with wine and enjoy it with their meals.

As to radio advertising by individual companies, I think there is one popular misconception about radio and radio advertising that should be mentioned. When commercial radio first started there were relatively few stations. Receiving sets were bought on their ability to get distance. Today, however, the situation has radically changed. The number of AM stations has more than doubled compared with before the war, and with the addition of FM and television stations, the total number of broadcasting outlets has tripled compared with prewar. Listening has become local and highly selective. Residents of the Washington area, for instance, normally listen only to Washington stations and rarely to stations as close as Baltimore. Programs prepared in Baltimore are prepared for the Baltimore listening area and not for the listeners in Washington who listen to the Washington stations. Furthermore, the increase in number of broadcasting outlets has resulted in a very substantial increase in the variety of programs available even within any given listening area and listeners can and do select the programs which meet their individual tastes. The fact that broadcasting has become local and selective as to audiences means that the advertiser today can and does select the marketing area in which he wishes to make a particular kind of advertising appeal and that he also selects the particular audience in that area whom he wishes to reach. In other words, it is perfectly possible for any member of the wine industry to handle radio and television in such a way as to be in conformity with the customs and habits of the people in any particular marketing area and to give those people who would normally be interested in wine the information they desire. Consequently, we feel that radio and television have a perfectly proper place in

the advertising of our products and should not be discriminated against by legislative action.

We feel very strongly that there is no need for further legislation. We believe we have demonstrated that it is perfectly possible to cover questions of good manners and good taste by voluntary group action. Further, we should like to reiterate our previous statement that the passage of S. 1967, or of any bills of a similar nature, would have the effect of suppressing desirable information concerning the proper and temperate uses of wine with the consequent effect of leading to the abuse of wine rather than to its proper use.

One last thing. This is not stated by way of complaint, because we recognize that some people have a different attitude toward alcoholic beverages than do most of the people in this country, and also that they have a right to their views. Nevertheless, this is the third hearing on this subject that has been held in the past 4 years and the proposals that have been made for legislative action all tend toward the destruction of the grape-growing industry in the United States. This is serious business for us. The retail value of our product is in the neighborhood of $800,000,000, yet the total advertising bill for our industry is only about $5,000,000. Five hundred million dollars implies a lot in the livelihood of about 300,000 retail establishments, 6,000 wholesale establishments, and almost 1,000 wineries located in 13 States.

Grape growing is one of the most important agricultural industries in the country. In California, which produces 85 percent of the wine consumed in the United States, wine provides an outlet for approximately one-half the total crop. This involves over one-half million acres of vineyard furnishing a livelihood for 50,000 families in that State.

The wine industry is a substantial part of the agricultural economy of the United States, and we believe we have just as much right to furnish truthful information about our products to those of the public who want to use them as any other industry in the United States. We believe that our conduct in this respect has standards as high as those of any other industry, perhaps a great deal higher than those for some commodities which are not under discussion here today.

May I here repeat in substance what I have already said—wine remains a natural product and a recognized part of the diet of most civilized men. We have no desire to, nor have we ever sought to force the use of our product on anyone. But the wine industry of this country, on whose behalf I appear today, feels its right to continue the normal and natural pursuit of its business should not be obstructed by the wholly unjustifiable types of legislation that have been proposed to this committee.

We think we have done a good job in an admittedly controversial field. We should like to continue as we have been doing. We hope that the Congress will not take any action that would jeopardize an industry which, despite the fervor created by national prohibition, has rapidly established the United States as one of the finest wine producing countries in the world with products that are a credit to it.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES FOR ADVERTISING IN THE WINE INDUSTRY ISSUED APR. 5, 1949, BY THE WINE CONFERENCE OF AMERICA

The purposes of this statement of principles are:

To maintain a high degree of public respect for wine as a temperate mealtime beverage used primarily in the home; to promote the uses for which wine is most particularly suited; and to present wine as an accompaniment to food, as an appetizer, as an appropriate and moderate beverage for social occasions and as a contribution to gracious American family and social living.

To furnish a guide of traditionally proper practices so as to obviate any usages in labeling and advertising that would injure the public's respect for the industry and its products.

To furnish a positive declaration of the industry's right to advertise and promote wine and its uses along traditional, ethical lines.

1. Good advertising and labeling of wine tend to promote the proper and temperate uses for which wine is intended; do not suggest that wine should be used for any but temperate purposes; and do not bring wine into disrepute with the consuming public.

2. Good advertising and labeling of wine include references in good taste to the generally accepted use of wine at neighborly and friendly gatherings, restaurant dining, weddings and anniversaries, and at festivities and celebrations such as Thanksgiving, Christmas, Easter, the New Year, Father's Day, and Independence Day, but do not associate wine or its use with days set aside to commemorate occasions of deep memorial significance such as Memorial Day and Armistice Day.

3. Good advertising and labeling of wine depict the proper and moderate use of wine on all family occasions including those when children are incidentally present, but do not permit pictorial representation of the consumption of wine by children, or illustrations or representations generally considered as appealing primarily to children, such as Santa Claus as historic fairy tale characters.

4. Good advertising and labeling of wine traditionally include the association of the product with friendly and recreational activities but do not suggest that wine is used by athletes as such nor allow any inference that the use of wine aids athletic prowess.

5. Good advertising and labeling of wine traditionally have included illustrations of the use of wine by the members of both sexes but do not permit any exploitation of the human form in an immodest, vulgar, or sensuous manner.

6. Good advertising and labeling of wine do not associate revered persons of public prominence, living or dead, with the brand or products of any company in such a manner as to imply the use or endorsement thereof. This does not require the abandonment or limitation of any brand names in use on the date of the adoption of this statement of principles.

7. Good advertising of wine brands traditionally utilizes endorsements and testimonials only from persons who have had actual experience in using or serving the product.

8. Good advertising and labeling of wine traditionally have included allusions to the historic development of the wine-growing industry in connection with the establishment of early religious communities, and allow the use of established and recognized illustrations, trademarks, brands, type designations, and names of recognized wine districts which may be associated with religious origins or development, but do not otherwise include, except for sacramental wines and the production for sale of brands of wine by religious orders or organizations, the association of any brand of wine or its use with contemporary religion.

9. Good advertising of wine includes the utilization of all types of advertising media, such as newspapers, magazines, radio, billboards, television, signs, displays, and other media customarily used by other industries. The choice of advertising media, insofar as practicable, should avoid irritating the sensitivities of the normal consuming public, e. g., it avoids advertising in those portions of publications designed primarily for children, and it avoids the use of sound trucks and skywriting.

The Wine Conference of America consists of the following associations of the wine industry: American Wine Association; Associated Vintners of the Middle West; Bottle Fermented Champagne Producers, Inc.; Council Bluffs Grape Growers Association; Finger Lakes Wine Growers Association; Maryland Institute of Wine and Spirits Distributors, Inc.; Michigan Wine Institute; National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc.; National Wine Association; Ohio Grape and Wine Producers Association; Ohio Grape Growers Institute; Ohio Wine Dealers Association; North Carolina Association for Wine Control; Texas Wine Association; Vermouth Institute; Washington Wine Council; Wine Association of Pennsylvania; Wine Distributors of Northern California; Wine Institute.

H. A. CANNON,
Secretary.

Back to the Graveyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of January 16, 1950:

BACK TO THE GRAVEYARD

Almost the last word spoken in the House of Representatives last year was a well-merited eulogy of Congressman EKSERHARTER for having sponsored the notable reform which had enabled the House to function as a legislative body free from dictation. With the aid of a memorandum prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Congressman HOLIFIELD pointed out that the curb Mr. EKSERHARTER had designed for the Rules Committee had saved four bills, possibly five, from the committee's legislative graveyard. In the case of the anti-poll-tax and rivers and harbors bills, the sponsoring committee chairmen had gone to the floor after being denied a rule and induced the House to take the measures from the Rules Committee and pass them. The threat of using the new rule forced the balky Rules Committee into action on the slum-clearance and minimum-wage bills and probably on the vitally important social-security bill.

In spite of this clear-cut demonstration that the new 21-day rule is essential to prevent minority dictation in the House, the Rules Committee has voted 9 to 2 for restoration of its former arbitrary powers. It is not satisfied to serve the House as "traffic director," with limited powers to delay bills approved by the legislative committees. It seeks to regain the power of erecting impassable road blocks against any bill that its members do not like. That is a power which, of course, should not be entrusted to any lesser body than the House itself.

The argument always made for a dictatorial Rules Committee is that it is needed to save the House from passing unwise legislation. Such an argument carries a strong appeal. Many citizens will agree with the Rules Committee, for example, that the rivers and harbors bill taken out of its hands last year was a pork-barrel measure and that the anti-poll-tax bill, which it tried to defeat, is unconstitutional. This newspaper is unalterably opposed to pork-barrel and unconstitutional bills, but we do not believe that it is safe to entrust 12 Congressmen with the power to say what measures approved

by regular legislative committees are too unwise to be submitted to the House for a vote. That is not representative government but oligarchy.

There are other methods of preventing the House from stampeding for unsound vote-getting measures. For many years the House has been urged to set up an effective majority policy committee which, in consultation with the President and a similar committee in the Senate, would shape a legislative program each year and then make every effort to hold members of the majority party to that program. It is unquestionably true that strong leadership is needed in an unwieldy body such as the House. But let it be leadership through the formulation of party programs and use of the caucus to keep members in line with those programs if necessary. The responsibility for what the House does should rest squarely upon the party in control of it, and that party, of course, is answerable to the people. If it indulges in a spending debauch, the voters will know what to do about it.

But for the House to slip back into the undemocratic practice of blocking issues that a little handful of Members deems too hot to handle would be a tragic retrogression. Instead of authorizing the Rules Committee to squat athwart the legislative highway once more, we think the House ought to rebuke its rule makers for not maintaining a smooth and orderly flow of bills to the floor.

Best-Kept Secret—Hidden Federal Tax Load in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John Beckley, from the Des Moines Sunday Register of December 18, 1949:

BEST-KEPT SECRET—HIDDEN FEDERAL TAX LOAD IN UNITED STATES

(By John Beckley)

Not one American in a hundred realizes that total tax collections now exceed the wartime peak. And not one in a thousand knows that hidden taxes—included in the price of everything he buys—will exceed $700 per family this year. In fact, the best-kept secret in the country today is the size of the tax load.

In 1945, when the United States was fighting a global war, with 11,000,000 men under arms, Federal, State, and local governments collected $52,500,000,000 in taxes. This year they are skimming off $56,000,000,000—25 percent of the national income, and more than the entire national income in 1932, 1933, or 1934.

To a modern Rip Van Winkle, rousing from a 20-year snooze, the sight of the Federal Government alone spending $43,500,000,000 a year would be unbelievable. In 1929 the total United States budget was about $3,000,000,000. The Government spent less than two-thirds of the personal income of the residents of California. Last year Federal expenditures were roughly equal to the entire income of all persons west of the Mississippi.

FROM 600,000 TO 2,000,000 EMPLOYEES

Twenty years ago the Federal Government had fewer than 600,000 civilian employees. Today more than 2,000,000 are on the pay roll. And to conduct its affairs the Government occupies 940,000,000 square feet of floor space—equal to 170 Empire State Buildings 102 stories tall.

To bankers and businessmen, Government spending figures conjure up pictures of national bankruptcy and the death of private enterprise. But the average citizen has no such fears.

Today there is a widespread belief that Government spending is essential to continued prosperity. Furthermore, people are in favor of spending money to promote the general welfare. And they are supremely confident that the United States is rich enough and powerful enough to finance any welfare program it sees fit to undertake.

But the most comforting thing is the belief that someone else is footing the bill—probably big business and people with big incomes. The average citizen still has no concept of the size of the hidden taxes he pays every day of his life.

THEY PASSED ON TO THE CONSUMER

It is not surprising that we have little idea of what Government spending is actually costing us. Only half of the Federal Government's revenues and less than 10 percent of State and local receipts come from direct taxes on personal incomes. The rest comes mostly from taxes on business organizations.

And these taxes, in turn, are passed along to the consumer in the form of higher prices. As a result, for most people (those with incomes of $5,000 or less, which includes better than 9 out of every 10 taxpayers—the hidden tax burden is heavier than the income tax.

Tax snowball: Taxes accumulate all along the way from raw material to finished product on the store shelves. And at that point many States and cities add a retail sales tax. The Tax Foundation, a research organization which studies Government spending and taxes, has discovered 150 taxes levied on the manufacture and sale of a woman's hat, 118 taxes on a man's suit of clothes, 151 on a loaf of bread, and at least 100 on a dozen eggs.

There are about 11½ cents of taxes in the cost of a pack of cigarettes, $2.06 taxes on a $3.75 bottle of whisky, and $300 to $600 on a $2,000 car. That is one big reason, say auto makers, why a $1,000 car today is out of the question.

This year the average family will pay $69 in liquor taxes, $45 on tobacco, and $49 in the cost of gasoline. Property taxes—some paid directly, others indirectly in rents and prices—amount to $177 per family. Sales taxes will take another $45.

And corporation income taxes—which the consumer also pays in the form of higher prices—will take a whopping $317 out of the average family's purse.

Some economists do not believe that all business taxes, especially the corporation income tax, come out of the consumer's pocket. But the evidence is impressive. G. Sidney Houston, Minnesota banker, points out that in the 3 prosperous years 1927–29, net income after taxes of corporations which reported a profit amounted to 7.45 percent of gross income.

CORPORATION TAXES INCREASED 2½ TIMES

Since then there has been a three-and-a-half-fold jump in corporation income tax rates; hundreds of other business taxes have also been boosted. Yet in 1946, despite price control, profits after taxes were 6.89 percent of gross income. "It seems rather clear," says Houston, "that corporations did everything in their power to pass on to their customers practically all tax increases."

Last week Newsweek asked leading auto manufacturers a loaded question: "If corporation income taxes were reduced by one-half, would you cut the price of automobiles?" One corporation declined to answer, but from the others came a unanimous yes. Ernest Breech, Ford executive vice president and an old hand at cost accounting, reflected a typical businessman's viewpoint:

"Certainly they would cut prices. In the long run, every corporation must price its products so as to make a reasonable return after taxes in order to survive and grow. In the final analysis, income taxes are just as much a cost of doing business as pay roll."

And if a drop in corporate income taxes would bring a drop in auto prices, who, then, is bearing the cost of present taxes? The finger points directly at the consumer.

TAX FACTS OF LIFE

There is nothing vicious about this passing of taxes to the consumer. It is simply a fact of economic life. It must be recognized that business organizations, by their very nature, are merely tax collectors, not taxpayers. The cardinal rule of every business—the purpose of any profit-making organization—is to earn a fair return on the money invested.

To survive, it must pay its costs and have a fair profit left over. And taxes are just another item of cost. If income taxes take half of a corporation's profits, then it must set its prices high enough to earn twice as much before taxes in order to have the same return.

Death by taxes: If business could not pass taxes along to the consumer, the entire system would be automatically destroyed. In the case of many corporations, the total tax load already exceeds their total profits. Last year the giant American Telephone & Telegraph Co. paid $293,000,000 in taxes. Its profits after taxes amounted to $230,000,000. General Motors paid taxes of $604,000,000, compared with profits of $440,000,000.

If taxes on corporations were completely removed, State public-utility commissions would force A. T. & T. to reduce prices until its profits were probably not much greater than they are today. Public opinion and competition would cause GM to do the same.

If the present tax load were then reimposed—and could not be passed along to the consumer—profits would be completely wiped out.

INFLATION

Besides income taxes and hidden taxes, the average family bears still another cost of big government spending—inflation. During a depression, deficit spending does not necessarily cause higher prices. Some economists maintain it may actually cause more goods to be produced. But when production is running full blast, deficit spending merely increases the demand for a limited supply of goods. The $5,500,000,000 Federal deficit this year has forced everyone to pay higher prices. Inflation is a form of hidden taxation which is almost impossible to measure. Yet it is just as real as many other forms of taxation.

PROSPERITY UNDER A SMALL BUDGET

Is huge Government spending essential to prosperity? The idea that it is springs directly from our experience in the great depression of the thirties. We never did get rid of unemployment until the Government ripped its purse strings wide open to fight the Second World War.

Yet, somehow, in the 150 years preceding the thirties, we managed to prosper with very light taxes and a small Government budget.

And Government spending dropped from a wartime high of $99,000,000,000 in 1945 to $37,000,000,000 in 1948—a cut of nearly two-thirds—and we still enjoyed full employment. There is good reason to believe that we could cut it even farther with equally good results.

Some believe that we must support a certain number of people in the Government because there aren't enough jobs to go around. But the money the Government is now spending could easily be spent by the people from whom it is taken—by lower-income groups for milk, meat, and clothing; by

middle-income groups for homes, furnishings, insurance, and college educations; and by higher-income groups for investment in new tools for industry. Spent by individuals, the money would create productive jobs for those now on Government pay rolls.

MANY SMALL BUSINESSES HUNGRY FOR CAPITAL

Another hang-over from the thirties is the idea that big incomes must be taxed away or they will lie idle. At this time it might have been true, but today thousands of small businesses are hungry for capital. Big corporations which would like to sell stock to expand their operations cannot find enough buyers. And no kind of spending benefits the Nation more than spending which increases its ability to produce.

SUBSIDIES

The objectives of Government spending are admirable, much of it is absolutely essential. But the people who foot the bill have a right to ask, Is the money being spent as efficiently and economically as possible?

We must spend huge sums for rearmament, but questions arise: Is the Army exercising reasonable care when it can locate only 18,000 of 25,000 tanks it supposedly had on hand at the end of the war? Is there any reason why, when the average stay for a tonsillectomy in a private hospital is 1.4 days, Army personnel on active duty should take 16.1 days?

And is it necessary that the Army put a simple order for buying onions through 288 separate steps, as discovered by an investigator for the house appropriations committee? Messengers handled the order 110 times in sending it through 18 subdivisions.

Aid to veterans is important, but should the Veterans Administration Insurance Service have a work load of only 450 policies per employee?

(That of private insurance-company employees is 1,762, 4 times as heavy.)

Ailing veterans need help, but how far should the Government go? Eighty-three out of every 100 veterans admitted to Government hospitals are suffering from ailments having no connection with war service.

The Government must keep records, but should it use 18,500,000 cubic feet of storage space—equivalent to six Pentagon buildings—to store records, especially when 35 percent of them are worthless? Should the State Department take as many as 35 steps to process a letter?

THERE SHOULD BE FEWER AGENCIES TO LOAN ACTIVITIES

Does the Government really need 50 different agencies engaged in making, guaranteeing, or insuring loans?

Does it require 70 different bureaus and agencies with a major interest in transportation problems, at least 15 dealing with public housing and no less than 65 engaged in statistical work?

The Hoover Commission, which studies the functioning of Federal Government, estimates that $4,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 a year could be saved simply through more efficient Government organization without eliminating any present functions.

WHO PAYS THE TAXES?

Can the average citizen shift much of his present and future tax load to someone else? The chances are relatively nil. The rich have already been soaked. And few people realize that less than 4 percent of the national income goes to people who make $25,000 a year or more.

The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation estimates that at a national personal-income level of $200,000,000,000 people with incomes of $10,000 a year or more get only $4,470,000,000. Sixty-two percent of this already goes into Federal income taxes, with States and local governments taking another slice. People with incomes between $25,000 and $50,000 a year get $5,000,000,000, with 38 percent going into Federal income taxes. With United States industry panting for more equity capital, heavier taxes on these groups will merely mean smaller production in the future. And the tax yield will be small.

Next month, when President Truman presents the budget to Congress, the average citizen might well scan it with one important question in mind: Who can spend this money to greater advantage, the Government or me?

Congress May Not Scratch Truman Program's Surface

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gould Lincoln, from the Washington Sunday Star of January 15, 1950:

CONGRESS MAY NOT SCRATCH TRUMAN PROGRAM'S SURFACE—EVEN PRESIDENT'S CAPITOL LIEUTENANTS SEE NO CHANCE OF PUTTING THROUGH LABOR, FARM, OR COMPULSORY HEALTH MEASURES

(By Gould Lincoln)

We have now seen everything. President Truman, in his state of the Union message to Congress, has added the last great group—business—to those whom he promises milk and honey—labor, farmers, and minority racial groups. In effect he told American businessmen that if they would go along with him and his program, their gains would be tremendous.

Mr. Truman pictured American production—and through production American wealth—in the year 2000 as four times as great as it is today. These gains, he told business, "cannot be achieved unless our businessmen maintain their spirit of initiative and enterprise and operate in a competitive economic system." He added that Government has its responsibility to help create the conditions necessary to permit growth. Foremost among these conditions, he said, is the need for a fair distribution of increasing prosperity among all the great groups of our population who help to bring it about. He mentioned business first in the prepared text of his message, but in delivering it, he shifted to labor, with business second and agriculture third.

The President went on: "Businessmen must continue to have the incentives necessary for investment and for the development of new lines of enterprise." Inferentially, he promised businessmen all of that—and incentives mean profits.

But in promising great things to business, Mr. Truman did not forget to renew and increase his pledges to labor, to farmers, to the racial groups—and, indeed, to everyone in the country. Included in his legislative program, as revealed in this message to Congress, are repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law, enactment of the Brannan farm plan with its production payments to keep the prices of all agricultural products at high points, a Federal fair employment practices law, antilynching law, and anti-poll-tax law, and other civil-rights measures, and compulsory health insurance through which free medicine is to be handed out to everyone.

EXTREMELY HEAVY PROGRAM

Mr. Truman's program—as it relates to the domestic picture alone—is extremely heavy, so heavy that it is doubtful the Democratic Eighty-first Congress will even scratch its surface—although in 1948 Mr. Truman complained bitterly because the Republican Eightieth Congress wouldn't put it through in a 2 weeks' special session he called.

In the first place, the President's own leaders on Capitol Hill say they see no prospect of the passage, or even the consideration at this session, of labor legislation, the Brannan farm plan, or compulsory national health insurance. Here are three major measures—the very foundation stones of Mr. Truman's program—which have no chance of enactment. They will, it is now predicted by administration leaders, go into the congressional campaign as major issues in the hope that the Eighty-second Congress will look with more favor upon them than does the present Congress. The Truman Fair Dealers and their allies, the labor union leaders, will do their utmost to put across candidates for the House and Senate pledged to Taft-Hartley Act repeal? A tremendous amount of propaganda work for the Brannan plan is now being done by both proponents and opponents, and that is the case, too, with the Truman proposal for compulsory health insurance—called socialized medicine by its opponents.

What can Mr. Truman expect from the Eighty-first Congress? It is generally agreed that legislative action will be completed on the bill which passed the House during the last session extending the coverage of the Social Security Act and increasing benefits. The Senate Finance Committee is soon going to work on this measure. It may be the most important of the Presidential recommendations enacted into law before the session ends.

The President's huge budget recommendations, covering proposed expenditures for all Government activities during the fiscal year 1951, totaling $42,439,000,000, will be enacted, though probably with modifications. The House Appropriations Committee, under the leadership of Chairman CANNON, of Missouri, is already working to draft a single, omnibus appropriation bill, to take the place of the nine regular annual appropriation bills which have been the practice in the past. Mr. CANNON and Senator BYRD, of Virginia, champion of governmental economy, insist that it will be far easier to approach a balanced budget with a single appropriation bill.

LOGROLLING POSSIBLE

The administration is inclined to look with suspicion on anything approved by Senator BYRD (the President has said "there are too many Byrds in Congress"). Further, Mr. Truman's new budget is a big-spending budget and a big-spending budget can be cared for more readily in a series of appropriation bills, passed independently of each other. So you now find some of the administration leaders on Capitol Hill throwing cold water on the single appropriation bill idea—among them Speaker RAYBURN. They talk of the possibilities of logrolling when the measure reaches the Senate—although why the House should be innocent of such tactics is not explained. By logrolling is meant a practice—reprehensible in itself—whereby one group of Senators favoring certain appropriations will join with another group favoring other appropriations, both groups agreeing to support the other's pet projects. Of course, logrolling is possible, and has been engaged in, when there have been a series of separate appropriation bills. The single appropriation bill still offers much to those who desire economy because when it is drafted and laid before the public, the people as well as Congress itself, can see just what is proposed in the matter

of expenditures as compared to the revenues of the Government.

Appropriations promise to become a major battlefield in this session, particularly as the President has frankly admitted in his budget message that a deficit of more than $5,000,000,000 may be expected at the close of the fiscal year 1951, to be piled on top of another $5,000,000,000 at the close of the present fiscal year next June 30. The Republicans are bent on making this deficit spending a great issue in the coming political campaign.

Only the President's recommendations on tax legislation remain still undisclosed, to prevent a complete picture of the administration's financial program for the next year. Predictions are made, however, that reduction or repeal of many of the wartime excise taxes will be proposed by the President, and as an offset to such revenue reduction he will ask that Congress increase income-tax rates on upper-bracket incomes—from $6,000 upward—an increase in taxes on corporations.

TAX REPEAL REMAINS

Whatever Mr. Truman may do or not do about excise taxes, the demand for repeal of these wartime burdens is strong both among Democrats and Republicans alike in Congress, and a bill will be pushed for action. Certainly if the President asks repeal, Congress will respond affirmatively. However, when it comes to increasing taxes on individual incomes and on business, the opposition in Congress will be material, so material that the odds are the President will not get any increase.

The huge deficits which the President himself says are to be expected this year and next will make chances extremely slim for new, costly projects in the President's program. It will make the voters look askance at proposals, like the Brannan plan and the compulsory health-insurance program. The first might take billions more in tax money, and the second will take billions more from the pay envelopes of everyone—and if that is not enough, still more tax money.

Congress, however, has plenty of time on its hands, and will have, during the next 2 months, while it is waiting for the omnibus appropriation bill. Here is an ideal opportunity for the administration to try to force one or more of the civil-rights bills through the Senate—over the expected southern filibuster. The House may take up soon, Speaker RAYBURN says, the Federal fair employment practices bill.

This is the measure most bitterly opposed by the southerners in Congress. Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, Democratic leader of the upper house, has promised, too, that he will bring an FEPC bill before the Senate and force a show-down on it. The days already are slipping by, however, with a long debate on the bill repealing the tax on oleomargarine. Senator LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, has offered an FEPC amendment to this bill, in an effort to kill the oleo bill.

Admittedly the FEPC bill is probably the most difficult of the civil-rights measures to get through the Senate—but it is the one which Mr. LUCAS and other administration leaders consider most potent as a vote winner in northern cities where there are great concentrations of minority racial groups. Republican senatorial floor leader, Senator WHERRY of Nebraska, has announced he will seek to have the antilynching bill substituted for the FEPC bill when Senator LUCAS moves to take up the latter. More political maneuvering which is not likely to advance civil-rights legislation.

OTHER OBJECTIVES

The President has asked Congress to extend the life of the Selective Service (draft) Act which is due to expire next June. This is a measure of national defense which should receive approval of Congress. The peacetime draft—even though it is not now being used—is not popular and there may be a real fight over it.

Mr. Truman has urged an extension, too, of the Rent Control Act. This will be the signal for another battle. Opponents say that this continued demand for rent control is just another proof the administration wishes to keep control of the people's affairs and the housing situation no longer requires rent control.

Among the other demands made by the President are the following: Federal assistance for housing for lower and middle-income groups, strengthening of the unemployment insurance law, Federal aid to education (a Senate bill has bogged down in the House Committee on Education and Labor), the St. Lawrence Seaway, a Columbia Valley Administration (comparable to the Tennessee Authority), statehood for Alaska and Hawaii and home rule for the District of Columbia.

Faced again by a strong anti-Fair Deal coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats in Congress, the President has a tough 6 months ahead of him. And next November the Truman program must run the gantlet on election day.

Mysteries of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present for your reading and consideration a text of a column written by a very esteemed newspaper representative, Malcolm Epley, of the Long Beach Press-Telegram, January 10, 1950. Mr. Epley writes a column each day, which takes up a very valuable space one column wide and the full length of the page. It is widely read and said paper has a very wide circulation in my home city of Long Beach, Calif.

Mr. Epley's column on this date bears so directly upon what every Member of Congress has to face from time to time that I present it to you for your reading and consideration with a good deal of pleasure and satisfaction, as having come from a very wise and well-informed writer of my own home city. It follows:

BEACHCOMBING

(By Malcolm Epley)

One of the mysteries of politics is that there is nearly always a flock of candidates for every job. There is a deep-seated urge (to rule or to serve, or both) that prompts men and women to turn out for every opening from dog catcher to President, despite certain hazards and discouragements that they all must know about.

Of course, political-office holders have moments of triumph and power. To be sure, there are occasions when they receive cheers and bows and are pointed out as people of distinction if not honor.

But every politician knows that the cheers can turn to boos, that he who fawns over a public official one week may cuss him the next, that it is given to few to retire gracefully from office without the stigma of final rejection to spoil what should be pleasant memories.

He knows that hardly has the flush of an election triumph worn off before he has to start thinking about what can happen to him next time. He knows that overnight some development—possibly something he couldn't prevent—can shoot down his ascending star, yank a comfortable seat from under him, or snatch an unpunched meal ticket out of his hand.

In short, it's a rough business, and, as a citizen who knows we have to have candidates, I would hesitate to put down such a frank description if I thought it would scare anybody. But it won't.

We all know people who have vowed by all that's holy that they would never seek political office, but who, visited by a few delegations, or given an appointment, or otherwise treated to a smell of politics, became starry-eyed believers in their personal political destiny and never got over it.

We just couldn't have democracy if it wasn't that way.

And so, happily, right now people are coming out almost every day for the offices to be filled by the sovereign people at the 1950 elections. It's safe to say not a single job will go begging, and that in virtually all cases there'll be contests to excite interest and create suspense.

This is one of the most interesting periods of the political year. It is marked by considerable jockeying, by trial balloons, by tentative declarations, and conditional withdrawals.

It's all part of the game.

One example of preannouncement technique among hopeful politicians is to put out feelers in the shape of rumors that someone will run, and then feel for the public reaction.

It's easy to start a rumor. Just go down the street, or get a friend to do it, and mention the possibility that you might run for the office. Coming up the street on the other side, you'll probably hear it yourself.

Newsmen will usually oblige with a report that a candidate is considering running. That's fair enough, for it's true—he is considering it.

The prospective candidate can then keep his ear to the ground. If what he hears pleases him, he'll run. And if he really wants to run, the chances are he'll please pretty easily.

Announcements, of course, are virtually always preceded by the urgings of large numbers of citizens. They usually convey the picture of a shy and reluctant candidate virtually pushed into the political swimming hole by delegations of folks who just won't take no for an answer.

Little by little, as the deadline nears, the picture clears, and the public learns who is going to run against whom. Once the date passes when the last declaration can be made, the campaign gets under way.

That makes an equally interesting story, maybe worth some comment here later on. Meantime, consider, as they come out into the open, the courage and willingness for punishment of the good folks who run for office.

National Chaplain of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a copy of my address in honor of the Reverend Edward J. Carney, O. S. A., on his recent election as national chaplain of the American Legion, which I de-

livered at the reception and dinner tendered by the American Legion and the citizens of Greater Lawrence, Mass., at Central Catholic High Auditorium, on Sunday, December 4, 1949, in behalf of Father Carney:

I bring to Father Carney the greetings of the people in the Seventh Massachusetts Congressional District.

This is his day.

And deservedly so.

I know that Father Carney's heart is full of joy at the honor conferred upon him. It is but natural for any man to feel a glow of pride in the recognition accorded him by the free choice of his fellow men. This is followed by an awareness of the responsibility that goes with such an honor.

In keeping with his own friendly personality and the obligations of his sacred profession. I am sure that Father Carney is deeply grateful for this chance to be of service on a national scale to the young men with whom he shared spiritual comradeship during the trying days of the late war.

But as chaplain of our largest veteran organization he knows that its prestige, influence, and policies are not limited to veterans alone.

In these days when so many nations have lost or are losing their freedom, victims of their own carelessness, we in the United States should be proud that we have such a vigilant group as the members of the American Legion.

They understand that the dangers brought on through indifference must be overcome at a fearful cost. That is why the Legion campaigns for preparedness not only in the military sense but through its programs to develop greater opportunities for our young people and to acquaint all of us with the rights, duties, and blessings of our American citizenship.

These are practical and realistic steps to safeguard our precious heritage.

The Legion, however, is not satisfied with defensive measures.

The Maginot line of fortifications did not bring security for France. The iron curtain alone will not protect Communist Russia from its own mistakes. Neither a radar screen nor a veto in the United Nations Security Council will guarantee safety to any nation from fears, real or imagined.

A more positive approach is necessary in this one world.

There is a desperate longing for peace among the peoples of this earth. They watch, with growing apprehension, the increase of military power on the one hand and the efforts to build a world organization to outlaw war on the other hand. And they wonder which will win out.

It seems to me that man with his limitations is putting too much of his trust in material power for the answer to all of his problems.

He is forgetting the strength and wisdom that come from moral rearmament.

In the past the office of chaplain in our fraternal organizations has been largely ornamental, concerned with the impressive, although somewhat exclusive, rituals attending the installation of officers.

I am sure that Father Carney will not be content with such a limited role.

How could he with his youthful vigor, his sincere faith, and his knowledge of the power of the Spirit that has sustained and guided men when all else failed?

Already he has called upon his comrades to mobilize the resources of prayer in a brief period of contemplation at the middle of each busy day for divine guidance on those issues which trouble a world in ferment.

This is an inspiring suggestion which merits the support of all people both in and out of the Legion.

"In God we trust" was the dedication of our founding fathers as they pioneered in the establishment of a new society where all men would have equal opportunity. In too many instances, modern man has forgotten this ideal. It may well be that in an age blessed with material abundance he finds himself beset with so many problems because he has turned his back on God.

If Father Carney has anything to do with it, this dangerous trend will be reversed. The Legion and the Nation will benefit from the refreshing zeal and high purpose which he brings to his new position.

We have known him for many years as the beloved spiritual adviser to thousands of communicants in St. Mary's parish. We remember his eagerness to leave the safety and comfort of his assignment in order to share the dangers and to be of help to his boys in the combat area of the Pacific during the war.

We are happy for his sake at this opportunity for wider service which has come to him. We are proud that he has brought this honor to our city.

He is a credit to his church and to his country.

If there is any way in which the people of Lawrence can be of assistance to him as national chaplain of the Legion, he has only to ask and the response will be unanimous.

Such is our regard for a true man of God and a real buddy to thousands of veterans.

Will Congress Sell Out?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jefferson Democrat, Brookville, Pa., of January 12, 1950:

WILL CONGRESS SELL OUT?

The new session of Congress may do much to decide whether we are to continue down the road that ends in statism and dictatorial government, or whether we are to reaffirm the principles and the ideals that made us a great, free, and prosperous people.

A determined effort is being made to fasten the welfare state idea upon the country. Congress will be asked to appropriate billions for cradle-to-the-grave security measures—all of which, of course, would be compulsory. The only logical reasoning behind proposals of this character is that the American people are no longer capable of taking care of themselves; that independence, thrift, self-reliance and pride are obsolete virtues, and that we must follow the example of near-bankrupt England and dictator-ridden Russia.

An equally determined effort will be made to extend Government ownership and domination of industry and enterprise. This naturally goes hand in hand with the welfare state—the cloth is cut from the same bolt. The principal target of Socialists is and has long been the light and power industry. Inasmuch as electricity enters into almost every industrial, domestic, and agricultural activity, political control of it would create, in effect if not in name, a monopoly over land, water, basic natural resources, and the instruments of production. The completed and proposed valley authorities are perfect examples of this.

It is also possible that an effort will be made to increase the tax rates—despite the fact that they are excessively heavy now, cut deep into the purchasing power of every individual, and make it difficult and in some cases impossible for enterprises to obtain the investment capital they need. That is particularly true of new and smaller companies.

The basic issue was well put by General Eisenhower when he said, "Government ownership or control of property is not to be decried principally because of the historic inefficiency of governmental management. * * * Its real threat rests in the fact that, if carried to the logical extreme, the final concentration of ownership in the hands of government gives to it, in all practical effects, absolute power over our lives." That fine statement should be on every Congressman's desk. We have come nearer than we realize to giving Government such power.

We Don't Quite Get It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial from the State, a weekly magazine having a wide circulation in North Carolina and edited by Carl Goerch. This editorial, We Don't Quite Get It, attracted my attention as containing much food for thought. I agree with the contents of the editorial that some of the press and certain radio commentators are not making their full contribution toward world peace. The big black headlines and exciting words by press and radio convey war hysteria that is disturbing, to say the least.

The editorial follows:

WE DON'T QUITE GET IT

Among the newspapers received at our office are a few which seem determined to foster a stronger feeling of ill will between this country and Russia, Argentina, Spain, and other foreign nations.

Every piece of news which in any way can stir up this feeling is played up prominently and is supplemented by editorial comment.

We don't see any reason why this attitude should be carried out in such persistent fashion.

Is it the desire of some editors, radio commentators, and other individuals to try to bring about another war? Is that why this kind of policy is being pursued? Are they opposed—for some reason unknown to us—to trying to build up a spirit of good will and cooperation among nations?

Perhaps they are trying to warn us of dangers that lie ahead, but isn't our Government in a better position to warn us of those dangers rather than some individual who, after all is said and done, can have very little first-hand information on what is going on?

Why should our country be expected to go around with a chip on its shoulder so far as relationship with other nations is concerned?

Seems to us that it's about time to put a stop to this jingoism and start working on a plan that will really help to promote world peace.

We never can hope for world peace so long as we foster an attitude of distrust and suspicion.

Address of Vice President Alben W. Barkley at Testimonial Dinner for William M. Boyle, Jr., Chairman, Democratic National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a speech by Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY at the testimonial dinner for William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman, Democratic National Committee, at Kansas City, Mo., on September 29, 1949.

The Vice President's speech is not only a testimonial to the Democratic Party; it is also a testimonial to Bill Boyle, who has done such an outstanding job as our national chairman. The tribute to Bill Boyle is highly deserved and it is my hope that his sagacity and wisdom will continue to shine in the years ahead. The difficult times in which we live have placed tremendous responsibilities into his hands but I know that he will do all that he possibly can to uphold the views and the objectives of President Truman and the Democratic Party.

The address by Vice President BARKLEY follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, other distinguished guests, and fellow Missourians. There has always been an inseparable bond—an untreatable bond—that has bound together Kentucky and Missouri. Until about 40 years ago, nearly every Governor of this State was born in Kentucky and now we have a president of the United States who has in his veins, on both sides of his family, Kentucky blood.

I am happy to be here this evening to honor my friend and your friend, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee. I am glad to be here because his career in the political life of his State and city and the country is symbolic of the sort of democracy in which we believe and which we undertake to practice; that democracy which holds out to the humblest boy in every community and in every State the hope that from humble circumstances he may rise to distinction and usefulness, and it is a source of great pleasure to come to Kansas City and to Jackson County, the home of Bill Boyle and Harry S. Truman.

What sort of democracy is it that careers like these two symbolize in this country? Not the democracy of special privilege, not the democracy of exclusive rights, not the democracy of aristocracy—unless it be the aristocracy of character—but the sort of democracy that Thomas Jefferson believed in when he wrote in the first paragraph of the Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal." The same sort of democracy that I might say Abraham Lincoln had in mind when he said at Gettysburg that we should have and preserve a government of and by and for the people. The same sort of democracy that Grover Cleveland visualized when he uttered that immortal sentence, "Public office is a public trust and not a private snap." The same sort of democracy which Woodrow Wilson undertook to bloom on the statutes of this Nation in his New Freedom; that Theodore Roosevelt called the Square Deal; that Franklin D. Roosevelt called the New Deal; and that Harry S. Truman calls a Fair Deal.

It is the sort of democracy that seeks to make the Government of the United States an agent and servant of the people; the sort of democracy that recognizes that as we have become more complex in our social and economic and political life—not only domestically but internationally—the Government of the United States and every political party that seeks to serve the people of the United States must be their agent, always alert, always progressive, always forward-looking—seeking not by whimsical exercise of power, but by the very democratic processes of civilization to make the Government of the United States the guide and friend and agent of the people of the United States to help solve their problems.

The people of this country do not look upon Uncle Sam as an old man off yonder in Washington, sitting astride the dome of the National Capitol, looking around with complacent self-satisfaction, drawing his salary and doing nothing; that is not the sort of democracy we believe in and that is not the sort of democracy the Democratic Party, from the days of Thomas Jefferson, has stood for and now stands for, in spite of all the criticism and all efforts to retard the progress of this great people which it represents.

We are being told now by the tree-sitters and hitching-posters that we are about to enter some chaotic, vague, inchoate existence called statism; that we are now heading toward the welfare state. Well, what of it? In the Preamble of the Constitution of the United States, giving the reasons why it was established, our forefathers said, "We, the people of the United States"—not we, the Senators; not we, the Congressmen; not we, the governors; not we, the mayors; not we, the sheriffs; not we, the county judges; not we, the Supreme Court, but we, the people of the United States "ordain and establish this Constitution in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, and promote the general welfare." That is what they said when the Constitution was adopted.

The Democratic Party, throughout all of its life, by every enactment of its history, has sought to promote the general welfare of the American people. Recently, we were told that we are now on the last mile toward collectivism in the United States. May I, with some propriety, inquire who set us on the first mile toward collectivism in the United States? What is a welfare state? What do they mean by statism? Where does individualism end and statism begin? Did individualism end and statism begin when back in the administration of Woodrow Wilson we passed a law providing for Federal aid to the States and counties in the construction of highways? Would any of those who are now complaining about the trend and course of our history rise in their places and recommend the repeal of Federal aid in the construction of highways? Does individualism end and statism begin when the Democratic Party, under the leadership of one of its greatest leaders in all of its history—Franklin Delano Roosevelt—passed a law providing for the guaranty of bank deposits, so that we no longer fear the closing of banks in this country? Does individualism end and statism begin when Congress under the Democratic administration passed a law declaring that flood control to protect our great cities and our farms and our people in the river valleys of this country is a national obligation, and providing over a long period of years for the effort to control flood waters coming down from a dozen States and damaging property and destroying lives?

We know that no county can do it; we know that no city can do it; we know that no State can do it; we know that only the United States Government can do it. I ask you whether statism begins and individualism ends when we seek to promote the general welfare of our country by protecting them against floods.

A few years ago, we awoke to discover that one-third of our soil had washed away down the rivers and into the oceans. We recognized that if our Nation should not become like China and India with three or four hundred million people and with our soil depleted, we must preserve the fertility of our land and restore that which had been wasted, and so in connection with our flood-control program we inaugurated soil conservation.

Did individualism end and statism begin when the Government of the United States under Democratic auspices provided flood control and soil conservation?

Did individualism end and statism begin when under the Democratic Party we provided for rural electrification all over this country so that today 5,000,000 farm houses and farms enjoy the boon of electric power and electric lights and the drudgery of housework has been lifted from the backs of millions of women?

Did individualism end and statism begin there? We know they could not do it. Only the Federal Government could do it.

Did individualism end and statism begin when under a great Democratic President and with a Democratic Congress we inaugurated social security, old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, and compensation?

Will some of these men who are now declaiming against what they call statism rise in their places and tell the people whether they propose to repeal these laws we enacted?

Did individualism end and statism begin when we passed the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act that saved a million homes in the United States; when we passed the Farm Credit Act that saved a million farms in the United States; did individualism end and statism begin when we passed the Federal Housing Administration Act guaranteeing to banks the loans they made for the construction and reconstruction of homes in this country?

Did statism begin and individualism end when we inaugurated a great housing program in the United States in order that we might make some contribution to a wholesome situation where every child born involuntarily into this great Nation might have a chance for wholesome, healthy educational surroundings free from crime and disease, so that they might themselves help to elevate the standard of life in this country?

Let these men, to whom every tree frog is a roaring lion and every angle worm a spreading adder, tell the people in this country what is "statism" in regard to what we're talking about.

These are only a few of the examples that I have the time to give of what the Democratic Party has done and is doing.

We are not afraid of our record. We are not afraid of our proposals. We are not afraid of epithets, either. Thomas Jefferson was never afraid of an epithet. Samuel J. Tilden was never frightened by an epithet. Grover Cleveland was never frightened by an epithet. William J. Bryan was never frightened by an epithet. Franklin D. Roosevelt was never frightened by an epithet. Harry S. Truman isn't frightened by an epithet, and, if you want to know, I am not either.

The Democratic Party never has been and is not now and never will be frightened by an epithet that somebody applies to a great progressive program that it is seeking to inaugurate and to continue, and whenever those who are undertaking to destroy the confidence of the American people in these great enactments of which I have spoken, and many more that I might mention if I had the time.

I am reminded of a story of a preacher who one night preached a sermon on hellfire and damnation, and at the end of his sermon he said to his congregation, "My friends, if you die outside the church your soul will go to hell lerching. And in that lake of fire and brimstone it'll burn and smoke and spew and fry and boil and sizzle forever and ever," and when he finished some old man with a bosom full of beard came up and he said to the person, "Did I understand you to say that if I die outside the church my soul will go to hell lerching? And in that lake of fire and brimstone it'll burn and smoke and spew and fry and boil and sizzle forever and ever?" "Well," the preacher said, "that is the doctrine." "Well," the old man said, "by the eternal God, the people won't stand for it."

Eighty-first Congress, First Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following radio address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Monday, November 28, 1949:

Once upon a time the story of your Congress, what it did or what it failed to do, was a far-away matter that seemed to have little bearing on your daily life.

Today it is a real, true-life story—your story.

Because your Representatives at Washington vote the way you want them to vote.

Now, the people in any one congressional district are mainly concerned with protecting or advancing their interests.

However, there are hundreds of other districts which must also be considered.

Compromises are necessary to work out a program which tries to be fair to all, a program that will balance conflicting claims and promote the general welfare and security of our Nation.

No one district or group can ever expect to get all that it wants at the expense of others.

Compromise is therefore the workable formula that is responsible for our unity and our progress.

It is the major factor that must be kept in mind when we look at the record.

John Jones, who lives on the third floor of a tenement house with his wife and three small children and who works in the mill, may not understand that the business of the Congress is his business.

The vast programs designed by the Congress and the billions of dollars needed to carry them out may seem to be happening in another world apart from him.

He needs to know that the business of Congress affects him in a very personal way.

His job, his income, the prices he pays for his food, clothing, fuel, and shelter, to mention but a few, are influenced by the various laws which Congress passes.

Multiply the Joneses by the tens of millions of families in the United States and you have a huge program whose meaning is difficult for Jones to grasp.

But this is no excuse for shrugging his shoulders and then ignoring the business of Congress.

He is governed by it, in terms of dollars and cents.

With the growing power of Government it is important for him to keep tabs on it, and to check it when it threatens to go too far.

To neglect it is to neglect himself and his family.

That is why I want to outline the record of Congress from January to October, when it adjourned for the year.

We and one other nation are the leading world powers.

The two represent ways of life which are sharply opposed.

Those smaller countries who believe in freedom as we do were impoverished by the war.

They need help to recover.

That is one of the problems we have inherited as a leader.

We've got to lend a hand, at least temporarily, and that costs money.

Furthermore, until the United Nations can become an effective guarantor of the peace, common sense requires us to be strong in our own defense.

Otherwise, our rival might take it upon himself to attack us.

The temptation to conquer the United States, and thus control the world, would be too great if we became militarily weak.

Unfortunately, preparedness also costs money.

If we did not have to spend billions for this insurance, we would all have more money in our pockets.

But until we can become sure, really sure, that the UN can outlaw war we must spend for defense.

Although it hurts, it is certainly much—so much better—than the fate that would be ours as a conquered nation.

In fact, we would spend everything we had if need be to prevent that.

What has your Congress done this year in the field of international affairs and to promote national defense and internal security?

Happily, members of both parties have supported President Truman's program on these issues.

The Congress has authorized continuance of the Marshall plan that will help free peoples to help themselves and thus save themselves from communism.

We appropriated money to help Greece and Turkey and for the relief of occupied areas.

Through the North Atlantic Pact, we brought the western nations together and served notice that an attack on any one would be considered as an attack on all.

This was done within the rules of the United Nations and is intended to prevent war rather than provoke it.

An arms aid bill to give body to this declaration was also passed.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was restored and extended.

Those who voted for it claimed that it would stimulate the free flow of commerce among nations.

I opposed it because a flood of foreign textiles will depress employment and wages among the thousands of textile workers in my district.

I still believe that it will sell out some American industries in the home market just to help the export market of other industries, and I consider such an approach unfair and dangerous.

The subsequent devaluation of the British pound tends to confirm my fears.

In the area of national defense, this Congress passed an armed services unification bill which was long overdue.

Its purpose was to set up efficiency and reduce costs.

The charges and counter-charges which have since been aired, would seem to indicate that the United States Air Force, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are mortal enemies bent on destroying one another.

This phase is regrettable, because it may give a false impression of weakness in certain foreign circles.

But, in the long run and in the democratic manner, I think that full publicity will be better than smouldering resentment.

The American people are getting the facts.

The pros and cons of the new role to which each service must adjust itself are being discussed in the open.

The inevitable result will be a clearing of the air leading to a genuine unification in which the duties and powers of each service will be spelled out definitely.

The morale of our airmen, soldiers, sailors, and marines, depends on adequate pay as well as other factors.

It was encouraging to them and to their families that this Congress gave them a pay raise.

For some it had been the first since 1908.

In this modern air age, our first line of defense must be in the sky.

Alert to this need, the Congress has authorized a far-flung system of radar warning and control facilities.

The Air Force is empowered to maintain 48 groups of planes.

Research in guided missiles and in every other technical possibility that is needed for defense has been adequately provided for.

We have authorized the construction of permanent military public works in Alaska and Okinawa. We have set up an experimental submarine program and have strengthened our Central Intelligence Agency.

It was on the President's domestic program that die-hard opposition developed.

Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act was stymied and efforts to enact civil-rights legislation were halted by filibusters.

The House of Representatives late in this session did extend the coverage and increase the benefits of the social-security law.

I believe that the Senate will take similar action when Congress resumes its deliberations next January.

Waste and duplication would be fatal to any private business.

They are no less dangerous to the biggest business in the world—that of the Government of the United States.

During the emergency of the early 1930's, agency upon agency was created to deal with new and pressing problems.

That emergency and the emergency of war are past, now is the time for an overhaul.

There is no point in having a multiplicity of agencies stepping on each other's toes, smothering in red tape, and eating up an additional $3,000,000,000 of your money when a streamlined government could do the job better, quicker, and at less cost.

To unravel this situation, the Congress has authorized the President to reorganize the Executive departments in line with the Hoover Commission report.

Some progress has been made, but continued public interest is necessary if these healthy recommendations are to be put into practice completely.

This Congress increased salaries for Government workers from the President down to the letter carrier on your route.

It has liberalized disability compensation benefits for veterans.

In both cases, upward readjustments were necessary to bring them in line with the cost of living.

Support prices for farm products have been continued.

While on some commodities such as potatoes they are too high, I think that basically and with some modifications this policy has merit.

We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that if the farmer's income drops sharply, he cannot buy the products of our mills and factories.

Congress did not back up the members of the New England delegation in their demand that this area be included in public power development plans.

New England does not intend to be left in the wake of national progress.

The rent-control law was extended 15 months from March 31st, 1949, to protect tenants until such time as building catches up with demand.

Perhaps the outstanding achievement of this session was the passage of the Housing Act.

This is a Nation-wide program to eliminate our unsightly and dangerous slums and to provide public housing for our low-income families, many of whom now exist in deplorable accommodations.

It is now recognized that spending billions for national defense and aid to Europe will mean nothing if the morale of our own people suffers.

Every American must have a fair opportunity to earn a living and provide for his family with those decencies and comforts which are elemental in our prosperous Nation.

The dark, unsanitary, and rat-infested slums of our large cities, are no place to bring up children.

They must be replaced by clean, safe, and livable quarters in which the Americans of tomorrow will grow up strong, healthy, and with an invincible faith in the way of life which gives them opportunity.

This Congress was also concerned with the problem of underpaid workers.

To its credit, it passed the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1949, increasing with a few exceptions the minimum wage up to 75 cents an hour, thereby guaranteeing $30 a week pay for 40 hours of work.

The bill to provide Federal aid to education was defeated because it discriminated against private and parochial schools.

It is therefore possible that a bill to help all the school children of the United States, irrespective of their race, creed, or color, will be enacted in the second session.

I believe that the first session of the Eighty-first Congress did a fine job in the fields of international affairs, national defense, and internal security.

On the domestic front, its record was substantial.

During the coming months, before it resumes as the second session, you will have the chance to think over the unfinished business of Federal aid to education, stronger antimonopoly laws, and an expanded Social Security Act.

By doing so and communicating your opinions on these issues you will become part of that public opinion which we depend upon for guidance.

The second session of the Eighty-first Congress waits for you to speak.

Thank you for listening and good evening.

Prevent the Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jefferson Democrat, Brookville, Pa., of January 5, 1950:

PREVENT THE DISEASE

The recent elections in New Zealand and Australia have a world-wide significance. In both cases, long-established Socialist governments were decisively defeated. In both cases, they were replaced by governments which pledged themselves to halt further socialization and encourage private enterprise and industry, to reduce taxes, and to relax some of the onerous restrictions on individual freedom of action which their predecessors had placed in effect.

It is true that the new governments cannot immediately restore free enterprise as we understand it. Socialism has progressed too far in those countries to make it possible to get rid of it easily. But the vote certainly proves that New Zealanders and Australians have grown sick of political control of their lives—and of paying the huge tax bills that make socialism inevitable. Press reports stress the fact that the voters had become disillusioned with supergovernment and with the welfare state.

It remains to be seen how successful Australia and New Zealand will be in breaking loose from the fetters that socialism placed upon them. At best it will be a long and grueling process. In this country, luckily, we can still save ourselves. The advocates of the welfare state are in full cry. So are those whose main ambition in life is to socialize such basic enterprises as the power industry. But they haven't reached their goal and we can still stop them. We can close the door on socialism, and once more affirm our belief that government is the servant of the people, not the master.

The record speaks for itself. It is easy enough to denounce capitalism—but the fact remains that capitalism has given more people more abundance than any other system ever devised, and it has protected and maintained our liberties at the same time. Socialism, on the other hand, has invariably lowered living standards, destroyed initiative and independence, and made everyone a ward of the state. In its most intense form, as in Russia and eastern Europe, it has turned whole nations into slave states.

The people of New Zealand and Australia have rejected socialism—but they will still be paying the price of it for years to come. The people of the United States can prevent the disease, instead of having to try to cure it later on.

American Employment Threatened by Unwise Trade Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today in the House a bill to reestablish the peril-point principle in the making of reciprocal trade treaties.

I fear that unless this peril-point principle, which was repealed last year by the Eighty-first Congress, is restored that American unemployment will increase, our American tax receipts be greatly reduced and our entire domestic economy be greatly weakened.

Under present and proposed reciprocal trade treaties increased quantities of goods from many low-wage, low-living-standard foreign countries are being dumped into the United States. These products from low-wage countries are supplanting goods produced by American workers. As a result many American workers are losing their jobs.

No section of our Nation will suffer more than the Pacific coast from trade treaties entered into without full possession of all the facts about the probable impact of such treaties upon our domestic industries and domestic employment.

During the first 10 months of 1949, Canada shipped 1,058,000,000 feet of lumber into the United States. We probably will import even larger quantities of Canadian lumber in 1950.

Every 1,000 feet of Canadian lumber imported into the United States last year meant the loss of 1 day of work for some United States logger and another day of work for some United States lumber mill worker. With each 1,000 feet of lumber imported costing two United States workers, the loss of 1 day of work each, the importation of more than a billion feet of Canadian lumber meant that more than 2,000 United States lumber area workers lost 250 days or a year's work each last year.

The tragedy of this may not be apparent while lumber production is at a high level, but if lumber output ever declines it will be. Then, because our United States lumber workers cannot compete with the lower wages of Canada, it will be the logging camps and lumber mills of the United States which will be first to close. It will be the mills and camps in Canada that will continue to operate while our plants are down.

This has been illustrated time and time again in the past by the history of the shingle industry.

In the past, when the demand for shingles was heavy, the shingle workers of both the United States and Canada operated full time. However, with the first sign of a slowing down in the demand for shingles, it always was the shingle mills of the United States that were first to close. Often while shingle mills in the United States were closed, those in Canada operated full blast.

The Canadian shingle mills operated while shingle mills in the United States were idle because on any declining market the Canadians, due to their much lower wage rates, could undersell the shingle producers of the United States. By offering lower prices, the Canadian shingle mill operators took away the market from United States mills. The result was that our American shingle industry workers were idle.

The same thing can happen to the lumber industry, and to some extent, is even now occurring.

In British Columbia, the lumber mill worker gets a minimum wage of 95 cents an hour. A lumber industry worker in the United States is paid $1.45 an hour. This is a difference of 50 cents an hour and amounts to a difference of $4 a day in the wage paid lumber workers in Canada and in the Pacific Coast States of the United States.

Since it requires one logger and one millworker about 1 day to produce 1,000 feet of lumber this means a cost of $8 more per 1,000 feet to produce lumber in the United States than in Canada.

Canadian lumber operators also save on freight rates in transporting their

product to market. Canada has no 3-percent excise tax on freight shipments as does the United States. Also her stumpage costs are less.

If the market for lumber becomes highly competitive, as it some day surely will, the Canadians will have a price advantage that will give them a larger and larger share of our American lumber market.

That is something we can protect our lumber workers against if we will restore the peril-point principle to reciprocal-trade treaty making.

The peril-point regulation merely means that the Tariff Commission, which is a nonpartisan, nonpolitical board, shall make studies prior to the reduction of any tariff to determine how far a tariff can be reduced without imperiling an industry.

Surely this is a very small but justified protection for the operators and employees of any industry to ask of their Government. And why should not tariff treaties be so made as to prevent the weakening of any domestic industry? Unless our domestic industries remain strong and their employment is maintained at a high level, there can be no continued national prosperity in this country. Without that continued prosperity this Nation cannot support the many costly programs in which we are now engaged.

THE PERIL-POINT TREATIES

But the lumber industry is not the only one that will be injured by too much free trade, and of treaties entered into with low-wage countries without most careful consideration of what effect these treaties may have on domestic employment and pay rolls.

Last year we imported 473,000,000 pounds of fish from low-wage foreign countries. This was 50 percent more fish by weight than we imported in 1947.

We were buying, last year, enormous quantities of crab from Japan, tuna from Japan and Peru, and bottom fish from Newfoundland. Most of this fish could just as well as not have been bought from American boats operated by United States fishermen. It could have been purchased just as well as not from United States canneries employing United States workers.

If we continue to give away our American fish markets to the operators of canneries and the fishermen of low-wage countries, the end result will be that the hundreds of millions our fishermen have invested in boats and fishing gear and in canneries will become largely worthless. We will receive less taxes from our cannery operators, fish buyers, and fishermen with which to finance our already unbalanced budget.

Prior to 1941 the Japanese supplied 85 percent of all the canned crab that was sold in the United States. Our American crab fishermen supplied only 15 percent of the canned crab sold in American stores and eating places.

When Japanese airmen blew their country out of the American crab market by their sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, Americans immediately began to build boats and to catch crab and to take over the crab business which the Japanese had lost. Many Americans invested their life savings in fishing boats and gear. Many of them went into debt to acquire boats.

If through unwise trade treaties negotiated without possession of all the facts as to how such crab imports may destroy the American crab fishing industry, the millions invested by small American fishermen in crabbing boats will be largely wiped out.

The same fate would befall those who have invested money in canneries to process crab and other sea foods.

FILBERT NUTS

In my district we have about 800 filbert-nut orchardists. It has taken them years to build up a profitable business.

A few years ago a 10-cent tariff on filbert nuts was reduced to 8 cents. Now there is talk of reducing that nut tariff to 4 cents.

If it is reduced, the result will be that our American market will be flooded with nuts from the low-living-standard-ard nations of the Mediterranean countries. Many of the orchardists may be put out of business and the orchards they have devoted years to growing will be made far less valuable than these now are.

All my peril-point bill asks is that the operators and employees of every industry shall have a chance to be heard, a chance to state their case before any tariff treaty is entered into by the State Department.

The Tariff Commission is nonpolitical and nonpartisan. It is the body to conduct such hearings and make such studies as will insure the employees and operators of every industry just consideration before reciprocal trade treaties are entered into by the State Department.

This is to the interest of not only the employers and employees of all industries, but in the best interests of all the people of these United States. We must maintain a high state of employment if national prosperity is to be maintained at a high level. Unless it is maintained at a high level, there is no chance of ever obtaining a balanced budget.

I want the people of other countries to have full employment, but I am not willing to assure it by creating idleness and unemployment in our own country.

The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America and the Separation of Church and State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I received through the mail the other day, from the coordinating committee of lay activities, of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, 674 West Twenty-third Street, Los Angeles, Calif., a small booklet in question-and-answer form, which set forth the view of the Roman Catholic Church with respect to the above-named subject.

I believe that the publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of not only this view but all other related views on this much-debated subject will do much to throw light upon this most controversial matter instead of heat, and help the people generally to form a more proper opinion in this matter.

The booklet is as follows:

THE FIRST AMENDMENT—AN INTERPRETATION OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES WITH REGARD TO FREEDOM OF RELIGION

1. Is the expression "Separation of church and state" a part of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America?

No. The first amendment reads:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

2. What did the amendment mean by the "establishment of religion?"

In some of the countries from which the American colonists came, there was a state religion. This was called the established religion, as in England. An established religion was officially imposed upon the people; membership in it was required as a qualification for civil office, and other civic privileges.

An established religion always meant limitation of civil rights for those not professing the established religion. In 10 of the 13 American Colonies there was such an established religion. In none of these instances was this religion the Catholic religion.

Many of the residents of our colonies had come to America for the very purpose of avoiding the restrictions and burdens of such an imposed religion.

3. Are there any established religions in the world today?

The Lutheran Church is the established religion in the Scandinavian countries.

In England today the Anglican Church is the established religion. This was established by Henry the Eighth.

4. Has any State in the United States of America an established religion today?

No.

5. Does the Catholic Church today in any country possess the status of an established religion?

No. A few countries give it a preferred status, but grant religious freedom to all, and do not require membership in the Catholic Church as a condition for civil rights.

6. Did the founding fathers proclaim their conviction that belief and practice of religion was necessary for the preservation of democratic freedom?

Yes. In the very first paragraph of the Declaration of Independence the founding fathers proclaimed the supremacy of the laws of nature and of nature's god.

And they said: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

In the last sentence of that same memorable document we find these words: "And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Therefore, the founding fathers believed sincerely in God, in the freedom of religion, and in aid to religion. They wished, however, that each be free in his worship of God.

That has been the American system and the reflection of the words of the well-known Northwest Ordinance which reads: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." This was written in 1787, and was the utterance of the then Congress. It would indicate that to the minds of the founding fathers, schools were intended to be a positive means for the promotion of religion and morality as well as knowledge.

8. What is the origin of the phrase "separation of church and state"?

In a letter of Thomas Jefferson to the Baptists of Danbury, January 1, 1802, Jefferson said: "I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should (then quoting from the first amendment) make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, thus building a wall of separation between church and state."

9. Is it to this quotation that reference was made in the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States?

Yes; but without complete reference to the context. Its meaning was illogically extended, for, as Justice Reed aptly stated in his dissenting opinion, in the McCollum case, "a rule of law should not be drawn from a figure of speech."

10. What was the meaning of Jefferson in uttering this statement?

From the writings of Jefferson and Madison and others, and from a careful reading of this quotation, it is obvious that Jefferson meant by "separation of church and state," there should be no established state religion; that each would be free to practice religion as his conscience dictated; that there would be no monopoly by any one group.

Established church meant monopoly and persecution. The writers of the Constitution wished that the practice current in some colonies be not extended to the National Government. In other words they believed in freedom of religion. They also believed in the practice of religion.

According to James Madison, as recorded in I Annals of Congress, 730, the meaning of the words of the first amendment was "that Congress should not establish a religion and enforce the legal observation of it by law, or compel men to worship God in any manner contrary to their conscience."

Thomas Jefferson himself had this to say regarding the purpose of the first amendment: "It was not to be understood that instruction in religious opinion and duties was meant to be precluded by the public authorities, as indifferent to the interests of society. On the contrary, the relations which exist between man and his Maker, and the duties resulting from these relations are the most interesting and important to every human being, and the most incumbent on his study and investigation." (The Writings of Thomas Jefferson; Memorial Edition, 1904, p. 414.)

11. If "separation of church and state" means only opposition to an "established" religion, a state religion, what connection is there between the expression "separation of church and state" and Federal aid to education?

There is no connection. Both the Supreme Court and the opponents of participation in Federal aid to education by non-tax-supported schools have adopted the phrase as a slogan without full comprehension of its true meaning. The slogan "separation of church and state" today is used as a shibboleth. It was used by Jefferson merely as a figure of speech and definitely referred to his opposition to any federally established religion.

12. In the Eighty-first Congress there was presented a so-called Barden bill. What did that provide?

It provided payment of $300,000,000 to be made to the several States for aid to education in tax-supported schools only. Its provisions contained a prohibition against the allocation of any of this aid to benefit children who attended non-tax-supported schools.

13. Did the proponents of this bill favor this prohibition and give as their reason belief in "separation of church and state?"

Yes. Despite the fact that there is no connection between the two ideas.

14. Do they base this use of "separation of church and state" on the contention that such a meaning of that phrase was implied in the first amendment?

Yes, though without foundation as noted above.

15. Is there an organization known as Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State?

Yes. It is more commonly known by its initials POAU.

16. Does this organization explain definitely what it means by "separation of church and state?"

No.

17. Is this organization opposed to the granting of auxiliary education aids, like bus rides, school lunches, and school health examinations to pupils who attend Catholic and other non-tax-supported schools?

Yes.

18. Is the argument of the POAU valid that these helps to non-tax-supported schools would constitute union of church and state?

It is not even a remotely valid deduction from either Jefferson's figure of speech, or from a study of the preliminary discussions of the first amendment or the amendment itself.

The fact that many non-Catholics disagree with the POAU's position is evidenced by statements such as these: "not only must we refuse to play upon our parishioners' fears, but we should set ourselves to help rid society of those pestiferous writers, secretaries, broadcasters, and agitators who make a living rousing the prejudices of people by stirring up their fears of other groups." (Protestantism, issued by the commission of courses of study, Methodist Church.)

19. What would seem to be the objective of the effort to confine aid in education to tax-supported schools?

Since religious instruction of any kind is not permitted in tax-supported schools, the objective of the POAU and its followers would seem to be the elimination of religion from all school education, as well as the elimination of non-tax-supported schools in which religion is taught, leaving only tax-supported schools in which parents could fulfill the obligations of compulsory education.

20. Would such compulsory education be a violation of the rights of parents?

Yes, it would be a violation of their natural and civil rights.

The Supreme Court of the United States in the Oregon School case decision of 1925, ruled as follows: "The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations."

21. Was it the intention of the founding fathers to eliminate religion from education and government?

First. Obviously it was their belief that religion should be a part of education, since all their schools were religious foundations and there were no public schools as they exist today.

Second. It was equally obvious that they did not wish to eliminate religion from the lives of the people or to eliminate basic religious principles from the foundations of government. They were opposed to a state religion that was obligatory.

22. Does the first amendment of the Constitution command that any Federal aid to education exclude from its benefits all children attending non-tax-supported schools?

No.

The present public-schools system did not originate until about the middle of the nineteenth century. Previously the direct aid to education from the Government was confined to the frontier and missionary and Indian schools.

At the time of the framing of the first amendment there was no contemplation of a system of tax-supported schools.

23. Why would any Federal legislation granting aid exclusively to children attending tax-supported schools be considered objectionable?

Because it is discriminatory and contrary to the American principles of equality.

24. Wherein is this discrimination?

Because legislation for public-school children exclusively provides that Federal funds be distributed to the respective States in accordance with the total number of children in each State. Such legislation would further prescribe that the State would then distribute this money only for the benefit of children attending tax-supported schools. By this provision only the children attending tax-supported schools would benefit by the appropriation while the money was distributed to the States on the basis of the total number of children in the State. Thus, the money would be allotted to children in non-tax-supported schools but not paid for them.

25. What was the reason for this distinction?

Largely because of an unwillingness to give any support of pupils attending Catholic parochial public schools and similar schools.

26. Since the Catholic population pays taxes for the support of public schools the same as the rest of the population, is it just that they should be discriminated against when public funds to which Catholics have contributed are expended for aids to education?

No, it is not just.

27. Since Catholic people pay taxes the same as others, and since some elect to send their children to parochial public schools in accordance with their rights under our Constitution, should they be discriminated against?

No.

28. In sending their children to Catholic public parochial schools are they not exercising a right of citizenship and a right under the natural law, as well as the law of the land?

They are. (See Oregon quotation above—No. 19.)

29. What would be a logical sequence to such discrimination and exclusion?

The purpose would seem to be to force all children to the tax-supported schools, and to make them compulsory and do away with schools that teach religion.

30. What is the difference between a tax-supported school and a non-tax-supported school?

The tax-supported school is directed and controlled by the State and local governments and no formal religious instruction is allowed in these schools. In fact, religious instruction of any kind is forbidden. The parochial public school follows the same curriculum in required subjects as laid down by the State or county educational department and meets, and sometimes excels, the scholastic standards of the tax-supported

schools. In addition, however, the parochial schools teach religion and discipline. The regular curriculum suffers in no way by the teaching of religion which has the place of a subject in the schedule.

21. Is this effort to exclude religious instruction in all education in accordance with our Constitution?

No. It would be a direct violation of religious freedom as granted in our Bill of Rights.

22. Why would that be so?

Because education is compulsory by State laws. If that education is demanded by law in schools where religion is forbidden to be taught, the rights of citizens are infringed upon. Religion is at least equal to any other subject of the curriculum.

23. Is Federal aid to education desirable?

In most of the States there is no need for such aid. In a few States there may be need of some aid. But in no case should such aid be given at the cost of discrimination. Discrimination is entirely un-American. The innovation of such an un-American practice would bring greater damage to our country than any lack of education that might come without Federal aid.

The New York Times issue of October 24 quoted Dr. Ernest C. Colwell, president of the University of Chicago, from an address he made on Tolerance and Godlessness. The Times article reads:

"One reason for the noncommittal attitude toward religion, Dr. Colwell continued, is 'the strange twist which has been given to the separation of church and state. What began as a repudiation of one established church supported by the state has become a ban upon religion in the activities of any state-supported institution,' he asserted.

"'If the doctrine of 'tolerance' toward different faiths means the elimination of religion in the education of all citizens, then the state should 'seriously consider whether tolerance can conceivably be as important to the continued existence of the country as religious faith,' Dr. Colwell declared."

United Lodge 889, Order Sons of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following copy of the address I delivered on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of United Lodge 889, Order Sons of Italy, at the Oxford Club, Lynn, Mass., on January 8, 1950:

I am very happy to join with you on this happy occasion.

The thirtieth birthday of lodge 889 is the same number of years that we call a generation.

It was in this period, from 1920 to 1950, that Americans of Italian extraction made their greatest progress. By coincidence these were the years of crisis and change, when the peoples of this world were subjected to tests and trials such as no other generation in history has endured. Old empires disappeared. New nations were born. Some peoples instead of adjusting their lives to meet modern conditions, cut themselves off completely from their faith and culture and are now floundering in the strange, new world of their metamorphosis where man has become just another "thing."

It was not so with the people of Italy, even though they had more difficult problems than other nations. There was art and culture and spirit in them, a rich heritage from past experience, which they would not sacrifice to the demands of economics. A system of land reform accompanied by scientific irrigation and conservation was necessary to make economics sustain human life and encourage human values. The Italian, with his fundamental love of home and family, did not propose to limit these in order to meet his material problems. Under a feudal system that failed to give him these opportunities, he was forced to emigrate.

He came to the United States in large numbers and here found the chance to develop his talents. And all of us are the beneficiaries of the contributions he is making to our way of life.

In the recent war, he gave his sons and daughters generously to the service of his adopted country. From Alaska to Iran and all around the globe they fought as Americans for those larger ideals which offer the best hope for this troubled world. By their loyalty and their heroism they demonstrated to others that we are not only strong in material things, but are creating a faith and confidence in one another without barriers of race or creed.

New American names are appearing in our business life and in the professions, pleasant names that add to the variety of American life. They are showing up among the public officials of our cities, States, and in the Federal Government. And with good reason. For the Italians have had a more extensive experience in the art of government than any other people. From the times of the Roman emperors through the city-states of the Renaissance down to the modern era they have lived under all conceivable forms of government. The most heartening lesson we can draw from this wealth of experience is that they have always thrown off the yoke of tyranny. For independence is a healthy characteristic of your people. You love life, you are neighborly, hospitable, and friendly, but you insist on doing your own thinking. That is good for you and good for the United States.

We live in an age where there is a dangerous trend toward concentration of power. We know that there are certain and necessary functions which only a central government can perform, but there is a limit to these. The problem for us is to determine where we should draw that line and say, "Thus far shall the Federal Government go, and no further." We cannot afford to drift into a situation where all local, State, or regional governments become the poor relatives of a master government at Washington. We want to do some things ourselves and not rely entirely upon others to do them for us.

We hear much these days about the dangers of monopoly and we should regulate it wherever it appears. But that places the responsibility and the initiative upon us to insist upon a proper share of control at the local level.

Now I believe in a social-security program that will cover all people and provide reasonable benefits. And I recognize the fact that only through the Federal Government can we set up such a Nation-wide program. Pensions for all the aged, within our capacity to provide such, is an objective for which I have consistently worked while a member of Congress and I will continue to do so as long as I have the privilege of being your Representative.

This does not mean, however, that I favor an extension of Federal controls without limit. Far from it. During the emergencies of depression and war we look to Washington for leadership in bold measures to meet such crises on a national scale. You and I were born in an age of transition. We have had to experiment in order to find answers to the serious problems we have faced. The Democratic Party has earned the confidence of the people because it has not hesitated to devise new instrumentalities within the Constitution to cope with these problems.

However, we do not expect that our children will live in an age of perpetual crisis. We believe that we are making progress toward the elimination of war and the elimination of economic insecurity. We foresee a future in which we will have helped to win the peace in which men can devote their talents to constructive purposes, free from the fears of our time.

The world of tomorrow will look different from the world of today. In many ways it will be different. But not at the expense of those precious freedoms guaranteed by our Constitution which inspired the remarkable progress we have made in our short history.

The Government did not boss this job. No one class among our people ordered it. If any group in our Nation attempts to set itself up as an arbitrary power, opposition can be found to checkmate it.

We believe in getting both sides of a story and arriving at a common area of understanding before we take action. You will find this at work in the Congress of the United States, where a Democratic majority initiates legislation and a Republican minority serves as a restraining influence. Both functions are necessary in a truly representative government, which stems from the people.

On the job, in business, throughout our educational system, and in every aspect of our lives as human beings no one person has a fixed priority over others. In the day-to-day circumstances of life there is constant opportunity for each person to learn, to better himself, and for us to become full-fledged personalities upon which a free society relies for intelligent and mature cooperation.

Even though such inventions as the airplane, the telephone, and television are bringing the people of this Nation closer together nothing can take the place of personal contacts for creating greater understanding.

Just as the unit of family life is the foundation of civilization the life of the community in which we live is the next area of importance, and we must not neglect it. I myself believe that we should develop our natural resources—like water power—for the benefit of people in the various regions of our country. But although the financial resources of the Federal Government are needed to act as a self-starter for such projects, the control and administration of such developments must be kept in the hands of the people who live in the respective river valleys.

We have come to the point where we must assume responsibility and not delegate it. The communities and the States have work to do, and they cannot shirk it. If the cities and States are permitted to collect some of the revenues now controlled by the Government at Washington they will be able to make improvements under the watchful eye and the immediate control of the people. In this way, the trend toward a massive, centralized government, remote from the average man, can be halted. And the individual will feel that government is still his servant and not in the process of becoming his master.

I congratulate you on calling yourselves the Sons of Italy. You have every right to take pride in that fact, as your fellow-Americans are proud of the contributions you are making to the stimulating variety of our Nation.

In this country we manufacture millions of automobiles every year that look very much alike, because the mass-production system is the only way we can produce them in quantity and at low cost. But we have no intention of standardizing our people. We have learned that each race and creed can learn something from every other race and creed. It is in this interchange of values among its citizens that the United States is becoming the most vital and progressive Nation on earth and a model of human fellowship.

The individuality born of a long and splendid civilization is one of your greatest assets.

Through membership in the Sons of Italy you are preserving and extending that precious heritage.

This is encouraging to all Americans.

For belief in the dignity of the individual is the vigilant faith that will protect us from the encroachment of tyranny in any form.

I will rejoice with you on this thirtieth anniversary of United Lodge 889. And I wish for your organization an even greater future for years without end.

Taxes—The Lady Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, David Cameron, writing in the American Weekly of January 15, has a very revealing article about the extent to which the American people are taxed. He explains in a very interesting manner that from the moment the people wake up, they are surrounded by taxes—taxes in everything they touch, in everything they look at. Some are so-called luxury taxes. Some are just plain nuisances. Mr. Cameron's article follows:

President Truman says he needs more taxes.

"Taxes?"

The lady shrugged her dainty shoulders in distaste. She wrinkled her pretty nose (pancake make-up tax, 20 percent) and repeated:

"Taxes? I don't worry about them. My husband pays them all."

Sister, how wrong can you be?

From the instant you woke up this morning, you were surrounded by taxes. Taxes in everything you touched. Taxes everywhere you looked. Dozens of taxes. Hundreds of them. Thousands.

Some were hidden taxes. Some were not so hidden. Some were "luxury" taxes. Some just plain nuisances. But whatever you call them—sister, you paid them. And you keep on paying—and so does your hubby.

Your day started when your alarm clock went off. (Price 68; tax $1.20.)

You yawned, stretched, and threw off the covers. (Sales taxes on them most places, of course.) You climbed out of bed. (Annual personal property tax, say, 75 cents.)

You looked at your husband (marriage license, $2) who was still gently snoring, and toddled into the kitchen. You flicked on the kitchen radio to get the news (electric current, tax 22 cents on a monthly bill of $10. Radio, cost $30, tax $1.80), and turned on the kitchen light. (Cost of bulb, 20 cents, tax 1 cent.)

Seven taxes—and you haven't even started breakfast.

But breakfast is coming—and so are the taxes. The Tax Foundation—a private research organization whose business is to figure such things out—has them listed for you.

You turn on the electric toaster (cost $16, tax 96 cents) and cut a few slices off a loaf of bread.

Let's stop a moment, and look at that loaf of bread. It doesn't seem big enough for them all—but the truth is that, without half trying, the Tax Foundation found at least 151 taxes hidden in it.

Tax Foundation took a loaf of bread sold by a grocer in Indianapolis. The grocer paid four Federal taxes—individual income tax, 18-percent telephone tax, 3 percent tax on transportation of property, and 30-percent tax on a safety deposit box. Not to mention taxes on light bulbs, refrigerators, and other equipment.

The baker who made the bread paid eight Federal taxes—corporation income tax, stamp tax on transfer of investments securities, telephone tax, telegram tax of 25 percent, transportation tax of 15 percent for salesmen and others on company business, transportation of property tax, safe deposit tax, 1-percent pay roll social security tax.

The baker and the grocer between them paid some 15 State taxes. The mill in Kansas City that made the flour paid seven Federal and eight Missouri State taxes. The railroad that hauled the flour to Indianapolis paid at least five Federal taxes, and State taxes in each State through which it passed—Missouri, Illinois, and Indiana.

The sugar came from a refining concern in New Orleans, which paid—but you get the idea.

So the bread (with the taxes) is in the toaster. The coffee goes on the gas stove (price, $190, tax $8.55) and the fruit juice comes out of the refrigerator (price $300, tax $13.50).

Time to scramble the eggs—and a hundred or so taxes along with them.

The Tax Foundation took an egg sold by a grocer on Pulaski Road in Chicago. The foundation found at least a hundred taxes inside its shell.

It started with the retailer. He accounted for 14 Federal, State, and local taxes. The trucker who delivered the egg to the grocer reckoned he paid 20. The wholesaler added about 17. Then there were the farmer, and the man he bought chicken feed from up in Minnesota, and all of those taxes enter indirectly into the price you paid for the egg.

Getting tired of taxes by now?

Shucks, sister, we've hardly started. Breakfast is barely over. The whole day is before you. You're going to pay, sister—you're going to pay.

Hubby's started for the train (15-percent tax on his ticket to the office). You light a cigarette (cost per pack, 8 cents; Federal tax, 7 cents; State taxes in addition) with a match (tax 5½ cents per thousand) and start to relax when a wail from junior reminds you that baby (birth registration, $1) has to be taken care of.

You talcum him (luxury tax 25 percent) and soothe his tender skin with baby oil (luxury tax again 20 percent). You wonder why such essentials for baby's health and well-being are called luxuries.

There's a shopping trip coming up. You get out the family car (cost $1,600, total taxes, $128, direct or indirect) and stop at the filling station for gas (national average State and Federal taxes, about 5.5 cents a gallon).

And you said you didn't worry about taxes?

This is going to be a special trip. The new fall suit you just have to have. And luxuries, the fur coat hubby at last consented to.

But first there are a few toilet articles you simply must get. Things like new shampoo oil; and shaving cream for hubby. Bath salts and foamy bubble bath. Face creams, lotions, and powders. The lipstick of that perfectly fascinating new shade. Rouge, cologne, a hair rinse, and that home permanent wave solution.

Sure, they're essentials to you. But you pay a luxury tax of 20 percent on all of them just the same.

Don't think that you'll escape those taxes by going to a beauty parlor. The law says that the proprietor of a beauty parlor is considered as buying those goods at retail, and must pay retail taxes on them—taxes, of course, which she considers as part of the cost of doing business, and passes on to you.

Now for that suit. The Tax Foundation found at least 116 taxes woven into hubby's suit—and yours won't be far from that. There's the retailer, and the manufacturer, the transportation of the suit, the railroad, the cotton grower, the wool grower, the weaver. * * *

You get tired of it, after a while. But the tax collector doesn't. Of course—you have to have a new hat to go with the suit. That's another 150 hidden taxes—so the Tax Foundation found out. It took an Easter bonnet sold in a New Canaan, Conn., store, and traced it back through its various processes.

It started with a ribbon maker in New Jersey, who paid a Federal corporation tax, and a Federal telephone tax, among many others.

Next your new fur coat.

No matter what the price, you pay a Federal excise tax of 20 percent. Then, of course, there are the taxes paid by the trapper, and the man who carried the fur to market, and the man who processed the furs, and the man who cut them, and the man who made them into a coat, and the man who carried the coat to a wholesaler, and the wholesaler, and the man who carried it to the retailer, and the retailer, and a few other people along the way.

The only one who doesn't seem to have paid a tax on it was the rabbit himself. But, of course, it was his skin.

Well, with a new suit and a new bonnet and a new coat, you've simply got to have some new jewelry. Dig up 20 percent again, sister.

Taxes on jewelry brought Uncle Sam $310,-[illegible],165 in the year ending June 30, 1949. Taxes on furs brought $61,946,267; taxes on cosmetics and toilet goods, $99,989,341; and taxes on luggage brought $[illegible],017,123.

On the way home you remember to get a bottle of liquor for the party tonight. Uncle Sam gets an excise tax of 60 a gallon on distilled spirits; $2.25 a quart on bonded whiskey. On blended whiskey the gallonage taxes will run about $1.55 a fifth, plus another 5 cents as a tax on rectifiers who blend whiskey with grain neutrals spirits, and a cent for the stamp that tops the bottle.

State taxes will average about 30 cents a bottle—a total of $1.90 in Federal, State, and local taxes.

Regardless of that, hubby's ready for a nip when he comes home at the end of a hard day. This, it seems, is a red-letter day. He's been talking to the architect, about that new house you'd love to build.

Of course, there are a few taxes to think of—a thousand or more, of which the Tax Foundation has counted some 700, without doing much more than skimming the surface.

There's the bank, and the title insurance company, and the fire insurance company, and the builder, and the real-estate agent, and the architect.

All of them pay some, or all, of such Federal taxes as individual or corporate income taxes, stamp on security transfers, telephone and telegraph, taxes for the transportation of salesmen, officials, and such, taxes on the transportation of property, taxes on the rents of safe-deposit boxes, manufacturer's excise taxes, and pay-roll taxes.

They also pay some, or all, of such State taxes as corporation-organization fees, corporation-income tax, bank-income tax, insurance gross premiums tax, real-estate franchise tax, real-estate yearly dividends tax, unincorporated tax, motor-vehicle registration tax, mortgage tax, general property taxes, miscellaneous license taxes and inspection

fee, unemployment-compensation taxes, and such local taxes as property taxes and recording fees.

That's for the purchase, financing, and development of your home.

But that's only the beginning.

Involved in its construction are the subcontractor, dealers and jobbers, railroads that transport materials, and various manufacturers, including plumbing and heating, masonry, insulation, linoleum, roofing wallboard, electrical supplies and electrical fixtures, hardware, paint, steel, flooring, and millwork.

They each pay some, or all, of all the taxes we named above—and in a few cases some others. Then there are other manufacturers who supply the manufacturers who supplied material for your house. And they paid taxes.

True, most of those taxes are not charged directly to you. But they are part of the cost of doing business for the firms that contribute to your house. And, one way or the other, the bulk of them find their way into the total cost of your house.

Let's suppose the lady listened to her husband for a while, enumerating these taxes, her head in an increasing whirl. At last she interrupted:

"Darling," she said, "with all those taxes, we just can't afford a house. Let's just look for a new apartment where we won't have to pay them."

Sister, again, how wrong are you be?

Somebody had to build the apartment house. If it is a small house, up to six apartments, the list of taxes is roughly the same as those above. They became part of the cost of building the place.

And who pays many of them in the end?

The tenant, of course—through his monthly rents. That's true in a big multiapartment building, too. The details may change, but the taxes don't.

They go on forever.

Canadians pay taxes, too. But across the border in Canada the finance minister, D. C. Abbott, believes that taxes should raise as little harm and distortion as possible.

Midcentury Broadcast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a radio broadcast entitled "Midcentury" to which I listened—and I assume millions of others did—that seemed to me to be of great historic importance. This broadcast brought together on the Columbia Broadcasting System, Sunday, January 1, 1950, Columbia's foreign correspondents as well as three others who are presently broadcasting in the United States. It follows:

MIDCENTURY

(Foreign correspondents for the Columbia Broadcasting System, flown to New York from major outposts of the world, participated in a special 45-minute round-table titled "Midcentury," Sunday, January 1, 5–5:45 p. m., eastern standard time. Edward R. Murrow, who broadcasts nightly over CBS, was chairman. The foreign correspondents were: Howard K. Smith, CBS European chief; Bill Downs, CBS correspondent in Germany; David Schoenbrun, CBS correspondent in France; Winston Burdett, CBS correspondent in Italy; Bill Costello, CBS news chief in the Far East, Tokyo. For the domestic portion of the program the participants were Eric Sevareid, chief CBS Washington correspondent, and Larry Lesueur, CBS United Nations correspondent. Mr. Murrow led the correspondents in an informal discussion of the last 50 years and in an evaluation of prospective global trends in the next 50 years.)

Mr. MURROW. I should like some friends of mine to introduce themselves to you.

Mr. SMITH. I am Howard K. Smith, born and reared in New Orleans, La., but in Europe for the past decade, covering all points between Manchester, England, and Moscow, U. S. S. R., from Bergen, Norway, down to Belgrade in Yugoslavia. Present address: 84 Hallam Street, London, England.

Mr. SEVAREID. My name is Eric Sevareid. I grew up in North Dakota and Minnesota, worked in France, England, various war fronts, South America, and the Orient, and now make home and headquarters in Washington on the Potomac.

Mr. DOWNS. Bill Downs, home town, Kansas City, Kans. Assignments: London blitz, Moscow, D-day to Berlin, Japanese surrender, Tokyo and Far East, Bikini, Akron Soap-Box Derby, Detroit, Washington. Present address: 20 Lindenthaler Allee, American sector, Berlin.

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. I'm David Schoenbrun. That's an Austrian name, but I'm a native New Yorker, and I'm stationed in Paris. These past 6 years I've been overseas, reporting from Casablanca to Warsaw. It's good to be back home today.

Mr. BURDETT. I'm Winston Burdett. My home is Brattleboro, Vt. Present assignment and address: Rome, Italy, by way of the Balkans and the Middle East; India, Cairo, the desert campaign, north Africa, Anzio, the Fifth Army, and Washington, D. C.

Mr. COSTELLO. I'm Bill Costello. St. Paul is what Asiatics call my native place, but it's hard now to say just where my home town is. I started newspapering in Minneapolis, while still at the University of Minnesota. And since then my stops in newspaper and radio reporting have included Honolulu, Omaha, Chicago, Washington, and Los Angeles. While I'm roving through Asia, my mailing address is APO 500, Tokyo, Japan.

Mr. LESUEUR. I'm Larry Lesueur, the CBS United Nations correspondent. Born in New York, reared in the Midwest, the son and grandson of newspapermen. My first assignment was the Lindbergh case; reported the war from Dunkerque to Stalingrad; landed with the American troops on D-day. Since then it's been my duty and pleasure to cover the United Nations.

Mr. MURROW. It is our purpose to examine briefly this afternoon, without benefit of statistics, without nominating any men of the year or men of the half century, to examine briefly where we've been, in an effort to see where we're going. No man around this table was alive when the century began. All are reporters, historians of the moment. Let's first examine briefly a few of the great pivots on which history has turned in the past 50 years. What are the big footprints in our own history, Sevareid?

Mr. SEVAREID. Well, Ed, for Americans 1900 ended the age of the great barbecue, and 1950 begins the great age of anxiety. We conquered our continent, we saw our absolute physical security and, therefore, our political isolation disappear. We flirted with imperialism, gave it up because we really didn't care for it. We fought two World Wars, took the initiative for world government with the League, gave it up, took the initiative a second time, and now find ourselves, rather unwillingly, one of only two great powers in a bisected world. And upon our shoulders is the terrible responsibility of preserving the free civilization that western man has developed through laborious centuries. We may not succeed at that, but no one else can. In these 50 years we avowed the policy toward the Orient, restored a reasonable relationship with Latin America, and, finally, understood Europe as our indispensable bastion and partner, instead of a coming competitor.

We saw our broken South start to mend; we began to conserve our wasted natural resources; we saw the rise and decline of organized crime, the rise of organized labor; we saw government teach that preeminent rugged individualist, the farmer, to expect guaranties against failure. We built mammoth corporations protected by property laws that the founding fathers had intended for individuals and then tried, rather vainly, to break them up. We learned to produce goods magnificently, to share them out rather badly and thus failed to quiet our fears of unemployment. We saw the businessman decline as the idol of society and the power in politics and the partial decline, at least, of riches as our personal Holy Grail. Our art forms and literary language became American and not pseudo-European. We felt what the American way of life is, but found ourselves unable to really express it to others.

We believed in the eternity of our social ideals, but at the first warm breath of an alien philosophy many of us panicked, accused people without proof, hunted witches, and became political peeping Toms, until our native good sense rallied again.

All in all, Ed, I think we have used our new world power with uncertainty but with a gentleness which is without precedent in history.

Mr. MURROW. Howard Smith, could you sketch the big turnings in the road for Europe in the first half of the century?

Mr. SMITH. Well, the story of Europe these 50 years can be quickly told. Europe declined. After ruling the world with no competition for about 400 years and giving us our still-prevalent world culture, inventing modern industrialism and spreading it through the world, Europe's situation began to change radically around the year 1900. What caused the change, I believe, was two things: First, the social problems of industrial economy, like maldistribution of wealth, unemployment, and so on, caused the nations to divide within themselves. Second, the advance of science made Europe too small a space for thirty-odd-nation states to exist side by side, with no international order above them. In 1914 the frictions exploded in the first modern total war. The war, World War I, decided very little. It left the people disillusioned and defeatist in attitude, and it created the first Communist state, in Russia. Adolf Hitler was able to exploit both of those factors—the people's defeatism and their fear of communism—and he won his positions to launch World War II. By the skin of our teeth, we of the democracies won both world wars, but the cost was terrific to Europe. Once the seat of all the world powers, there is not a single big power left in western Europe. Communism has advanced to the verge of the west, fascism lies not very far at all below the surface.

The explosive problems that started it all are still there—the internal social problems, the international problem of some kind of world government. At mid-century, this is Europe's third, and probably last, chance to solve them.

Mr. MURROW. Well, most of us have ignored Asia in the past and most of us know that we can't do so in the future. Bill Costello knows more about that part of the world than any of the rest of us.

Mr. COSTELLO. Well, Ed, in these last 50 years Asia has roused itself like a sleeping giant and rubbed from its eyes the crusted

traditions of centuries. In the long view of history, the transformation has been so swift as to be magical. The first major turning point came in 1905, when Japan emerged as victor in the Russo-Japanese War. That victory had three vital consequences: First, it challenged the nineteenth-century myth of white supremacy and paved the way for the decline and fall of western imperialism, for it demonstrated that Asiatic guns were as good as or better than western guns; second, it planted the dream of Japanese imperialism as a bargain-counter substitute for European domination; third, it set fire to the tinderbox of native nationalism, to the struggle for self-respect, political independence, and freedom from economic exploitation.

In the years that followed we have seen the progressive evolution of these three trends. The Manchu dynasty of China collapsed in 1911 because it was too enfeebled, too morally bankrupt to fight for anything. The First World War weakened the economic power of the west and gave impetus to Japan's imperialist ambitions. In one long, difficult step, Asia then began the transition from the iron age to the machine age. In the midst of this struggle for power and wealth, imperialism suffered a mortal blow when in 1936 the United States Congress approved an act promising freedom to the Philippine Islands in 1946. That action raised the Nationalist hopes of millions in Asia. It focused the issue, and the Japanese answer was, first, the invasion of China, and, finally, the attack on Pearl Harbor. In the war that followed the imperialist cycle came to an end, both for Japan and for the European nations. There were quick grants of independence to the Philippines, India, Burma, and Indonesia. The unequal treaties were abolished in China. By coincidence, communism won acceptance in China as the only visible means of achieving order and stability. The immediate accent now is on freedom and self-government, and the ultimate target of every starving peasant is a better standard of living.

At the end of the half-century, Asia has come of age politically, has made a powerful assertion of national feeling. Now it embarks on the vastly more difficult task of preserving its personal liberties while the causes of economy security are being advanced.

Mr. MURROW. Perhaps one of the best ways of measuring our good fortune at this half-century is to examine what people in foreign lands regard as luxuries.

Mr. SMITH. Well, in Britain, darn near everything British-made is a luxury. Hats, textiles and, alas, Scotch whiskey are all for export only.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, in Germany, it's doorknobs with houses on the other end.

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. And in France, hot tap water or a cake of fat soap.

Mr. BURDETT. In Italy, an orange or a clean, unfrayed shirt. In the countryside, a luxury is an electric light, a telephone, a paved road.

Mr. COSTELLO. Don't think this is exaggeration, but for 1,000,000,000 people in Asia—that's half the world's population—anything more than a pound of rice a day borders on luxury.

Mr. LESUEUR. At the United Nations, I guess, the only luxury is just one kind word.

Mr. MURROW. Now there's a list of luxuries, which we in this country regard and accept as ordinary essentials. In a world with such vast economic and social inequalities, debate, decision and joint action is difficult, if not impossible. The major instrument through which nation speaks to nation was born with high hope and much publicity in San Francisco. The future of the United Nations is uncertain, but we may perhaps measure what it can do, by what it has done. Larry Lesueur has reported its doings from the beginning.

Mr. LESUEUR. Well, Ed, like the United Nations headquarters going up on New York's East River, peace can't be built in a day. Some of the sensational political squabbles at the United Nations have obscured its real achievements. We've heard a lot about the atomic energy control deadlock, the misuse of the veto, the disarmament impasse. It's too easy to remember the failures of the United Nations and to forget its successes. But remember, that when the Big Four couldn't decide what to do about the Italian colonies, they tossed it to the United Nations and that when the big powers were up a tree over Iran 3 years ago, the moral force of the United Nations, focused by the Security Council, culminated in a Russian withdrawal from Persia. It's true that the men of Israel forged their own state, but it was the United Nations that originally created it, and the war in the Middle East was kept from spreading.

The mediation of the UN helped contain the conflicts in the Balkans and Indonesia. The war is now over in Greece, and 75,000,000 people in Indonesia got their freedom this very week. I think it was the debates at the United Nations that unmasked the true nature of Russian propaganda. Those debates certainly helped to consolidate world public opinion. And while these discussions go on before the people of the world, in the background are the continuing efforts of the UN's specialized agencies. They're trying to get after the roots of war by making this a better world to live in. The World Health Organization is attacking scourges more deadly than even war: Malaria, tuberculosis, VD. The International Refugee Organization has already settled a million displaced persons. And the International Trade Organization is reducing trade barriers between nations. I think there's a common desire among the UN delegates not to disappoint the hopes of the ordinary men and women of the world. Of course, the UN can't settle problems like the division of Germany. That, the big powers have reserved for themselves.

Mr. MURROW. Or, Larry, it may be that the Germans themselves will decide which way they're going. How does it look from your post in Berlin, Downs?

Mr. DOWNS. Well, Murrow, I feel there's a distinct here-we-go-again atmosphere on this first day of the second half of the twentieth century. Many new things have been added politically and economically, but the problem that made Europe a battlefield shortly after the beginning of the century still exists. It is Germany and the 67,000,000 people who populate the heart of Europe. The German power potential that turned the continent into a battlefield the year I was born still exists. The revival of German power today once again is under consideration—not so much by the Germans this time, as by the super-nation groups now engaged in a cold war. The reason that no democratic internationalism, such as the United Nations, can solve the problem of their late unlamented enemy is that each of the two most powerful nation-states in the world is wooing Germany like a lovesick swain. Both Russia and the United States want to assure themselves that if Germany does not become an outright ally, at least the German economic and military power will not become a future enemy. This is the essence of the cold war in Germany. As you know, there are two Germanys, the West German Republic, based on Bonn and sponsored by the United States, Britain, and France; the East German State consists of the Soviet zone and is a Soviet satellite.

The Bonn government was chosen in free elections. The East German Government is the product of a Communist coup. But Germans are Germans before they're anything else. They are not Communists because the Kremlin says so; neither are they democrats—with a small "d"—just because we direct them to be democratic. The question of what happens in the world during the next 50 years will, to a large extent, fringe on what the German people will do when they eventually are united—as united they will be. Their spiritual home, their culture, and tradition are connected with the west, but their markets and their economy and their military opportunity will best serve them by joining with the east. Basically, the problem is: Will Germany finally follow the Red Star of the Kremlin or the freedom and promise of democracy? There are no answers apparent in Germany to these questions right now.

Mr. MURROW. Well, of course, it's not only in Germany where two philosophies, two ways of life are in conflict. In all nations, it seems to me, the fear of war, of the inevitability of conflict between these two great powers darkens men's minds. Do you think our policy of containment will work? Or, to put it another way, do you think war is inevitable? Smith?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I can't believe that war is inevitable. The cold war is a peculiar kind of conflict. Material interests are not directly involved. The Russians haven't got anything we want, and we haven't got anything the Russians can't do without. The conflict seems to me to be psychological, a matter of suspicions and ideologies. It seems to me that if there could be a period of mutual sufferance, on however vile terms, and the world could recover somewhat, ideologies might be confounded and suspicions could be dissolved. We can have a very long period of peace—for nothing breeds peace like peace.

Mr. MURROW. Sevareid?

Mr. SEVAREID. Well, nothing is inevitable, Ed. But I think war is likely as long as Russia remains a tight dictatorship. Russia's been a tyranny of sorts for centuries, but not always an aggressively expanding one and never before a mechanized one. I just don't see how you can teach people, teach generations of very tough people that destiny has called them to remake the world in their image, and then not expect them to try to act according to their religion.

Mr. MURROW. Do you think war is inevitable, Downs?

Mr. DOWNS. Nations don't make 12-inch guns to shoot quail. They don't drop bombs in mid-Pacific lagoons to kill fish. War is inevitable until the time comes when nations give up their sovereign right to make war and learn to settle their problems peacefully.

Mr. MURROW. What do you say, Schoenbrun?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. I'd say that the only inevitability is hatred for the nation that starts the war or drops the first atom bomb. As for the war itself, the Communists say they'll never fight against the Soviet Union. The anti-Communists in Europe say they will fight, if war comes, but only if Americans are in the battle lines with them from the start. As for the French, they say, "no more liberations, thank you, or you'll be rescuing a corpse."

Mr. MURROW. What do you say about the inevitability of war, Burdett?

Mr. BURDETT. Ed, you asked if containment will work. I certainly don't think that war is inevitable, but I don't think either that containment alone is going to prevent it. A straight military policy, designed to contain Russia, seems to me a negative thing. It can produce two armed camps, two civilizations arrayed against each other. It can never produce two worlds capable of living confidently and peacefully together. Europeans know this. I think they will be made to feel much more secure and confident by a solid recovery of their economies than by

any military alliance we can possibly give them.

Mr. MURROW. How does it look from Asia, Costello?

Mr. COSTELLO. In Asia the cold war is on every tongue, but nowhere except perhaps Japan, did I find any eagerness to fight aggressively against the expansion of communism. For that reason, few Asiatics think war would be inevitable. On the other hand, Stalinism is not much better off than we are. In China and India especially, the Russians are regarded as uncouth upstarts. In the ethical and moral sphere, these people feel better qualified to be leaders than followers. If there is to be Titoism in Asia, it will be a moral rather than a military defiance of Moscow.

Mr. MURROW. Well, this is a matter on which you might have something to say, Lewizur.

Mr. LESUEUR. That word "inevitable" has me stumped. If we cut it down to the foreseeable future I think that a final conflict between the United States and Russia doesn't have to take place. I think that Russia prefers political expansion and that the interests of the United States are certainly based on peace. But limited clashes between small allies are not only inevitable, they've already occurred. I think it's a question of hoping for the best, while we keep our powder dry.

Mr. MURROW. Well, this is an area where there is obvious disagreement as you've heard. But we can at least agree that even if it isn't an enduring peace it has endured a great deal already and there is still room for reasonable men to hope. We are agreed that no one can predict with certainty what the Russians are going to do. So, let's examine for a minute the direction in which the non-Communist world is moving, right, left, or down the middle; what do you say, Schoenbrun?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. I think to the right. The swing to socialism in Europe was sharply reversed in the last year. Socialists have been kicked out, sold out, bought out, or they've bowed out of governments throughout the west. In Belgium they're out of the government for the first time since the liberation. In Italy the Socialist Party divided itself like an amoeba—sterile cells warring on each other. In Germany a still strong Nazi undercurrent and an anti-Socialist majority.

And, in my own territory, France, I've watched the so-called third force—the democratic center—whittled away on both sides. The first half of this century looked for a moment like the golden age of socialism. Now it looks like the age of conflict—swirling tides running in all directions, and chances are that the currents of the next 50 years will depend on how the tides run in America and Asia, not Europe.

Mr. MURROW. Which way is the political tide running in Italy, Burdett?

Mr. BURDETT. In Italy there's a special phenomenon worth noting. At no time in this past half century has the Roman Catholic Church enjoyed such a long period of prosperity and influence. This is not a religious phenomenon. It is not a spiritual revival. It is rather a sign of the remarkable political resurgence of catholicism. I think it's mainly due to the fact that after the wreck of fascism and the upheaval of war, the church emerged as the one intact and uncompromised symbol of stability and order. Conservatives rallied around it. Anxious people throughout western Europe turned toward Catholic leadership in their search for security. Right now in Italy the sharp political undercurrents are rightward. The left-running tide has ebbed. The floating mass of voters, the middle class, is again looking for security and right-wing leadership.

I think this is a deep trend, a long-term trend, and not a passing reaction.

Mr. MURROW. Costello, what would you say the general trend in politics is in Asia?

Mr. COSTELLO. Burdett's point raises an interesting contrast in Asia. People in the Orient are not drifting inexorably in any direction—either right or left. There's generally a sense of bewilderment and confusion. On the other hand Asia does have an asset which is conspicuously absent in Europe. There has been a kind of spiritual revival in this century. It's not in any sense a religious movement. It might be accurately compared with the humanist movement, which grew up in Europe during the latter Middle Ages. It consists mainly of a feeling of individual pride and self-respect. People no longer allow themselves to feel humiliated and degraded as the slavish property of some landlord or warlord or foreign overlord. The great symbol of their emancipation was Mahatma Gandhi, who emerged as the voice of Asia's conscience. Gandhi denounced the old moral law of fatalism and subservience, and, using nationalist feeling as a foundation, he created a new sense of personal worth and dignity, which today infuses the whole of Asia.

Mr. MURROW. Well, you fellows from overseas must remember that we have politics in this country too. Sevareid, what would you say the informed opinion is in Washington as to the direction in which we're going?

Mr. SEVAREID. My opinion, Ed—and I'm in Washington today—is that there are some basic differences. Europe, of course, had an old encrusted class society and we did not. We are now trying to level out our inequities, not by the Socialist means of state proprietorship, as in Europe, but developing a so-called welfare state and distributing benefits is not really socialism. It's hardly left-ism or rightism. But we certainly have changed the function of our Government and our society. First, our Government was to stay aloof from the economic forces and preserve only civil freedoms, then it was to be a balance wheel preventing any economic forces from overwhelming others, now it's to provide benefits, not for classes, but for groups: farmers, labor, veterans, the aged, and so on. America's original motto was "Equality for all—special privilege for none." And now to try to preserve a rough kind of equality it is special privilege for all.

Mr. MURROW. I suppose it is true that the only people who complain about special privileges are those who haven't got them: and viewed from the outside, it seems to me that we in this country have more of them than anyone else.

How does this country look from the outside, anyway? All of you fellows have spent years abroad. Tell us how we are, as others see us, Mr. Smith?

Mr. SMITH. Well, the British have been the world's money lender long enough to know that nobody loves a money lender, and they should be sympathetic with us. But even the British can't suppress a natural resentment of accepting charity. It has been said, and, I think, truthfully, that if either of the British political parties campaigned in the British elections on a policy of twisting Uncle Sam's coattails that party would probably win the elections. It's just human nature, I fear, and the resentment won't end until Europe recovers and can play the role of equal trade partner with us, rather than that of a poor relation with his hand outstretched.

Mr. MURROW. How do we appear to the Germans, Mr. Downs?

Mr. DOWNS. How we look to the Germans depends on which side of the dividing line your particular German lives. In the west we have the position of a stern and wealthy grandfather, meting out punishment and rewards at the same time. Some western Germans say behind our backs that we're a little foolish for being so good to them; while in Communist Germany the flood of antiwestern propaganda is beginning to have its effect. With little to counter the party line, we're coming more and more to be the capitalistic, monopolistic, war-mongering villains.

Mr. MURROW. How do we appear to the French, Mr. Schoenbrun?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. Depends on which Frenchman is doing the looking. A French automobile manufacturer sees us as giants. But a Paris fashion magazine editor thinks we're a little flashy. Tens of thousands of French war orphans think that an American is Santa Claus. But to many a nervous French mother you're a trigger-tempered kid brother who may get the family into a brawl. We're stern uncles to French Government officials; we pay their debts but try to run their lives. We're loved and hated in France; feared and admired, sneered at, flattered, envied, but we're not ignored.

Mr. MURROW. And the Italians, Mr. Burdett, what do they think of us?

Mr. BURDETT. Italy and Europe, looking at America, not Americans, mind you, but America, is like a proud man who has suddenly developed an inferiority complex late in life. Psychologically, it is not easy at Europe's age to have to be grateful for charity, to see your position at the center of the world suddenly eclipsed and taken over by a newcomer. Europeans are painfully conscious that they cannot get along without us and that there's very little they can really do to help us, even though we call them our allies. So they are irritated by this unpleasant sense of dependence. I think there's only one solution to the dilemma. There'll be a healthy mental balance again when Europe feels she's once more carrying her own weight in the world, even though she cannot hope again to lead it.

Mr. MURROW. And what sort of view do the Asiatics take of us, Costello?

Mr. COSTELLO. Well, Murrow, it's my impression that Asiatics treat Americans sometimes with exaggerated courtesy because we have both money and military power. That doesn't mean they like us as a nation or that they respect our leadership and our morality. Many of them are frankly suspicious even when they ask our help. They think of us as being potentially the authors of a new twentieth-century imperialism. They resent our ignorance about far-eastern history and culture and civilization. They don't like our brusque and sometimes patronizing attitude. We need to send Asia a lot of students as well as money if we want to build a permanent reservoir of good will.

Mr. MURROW. Of course, there's a number of foreigners in this country who are getting a rather closer look at us: those who are stationed at the United Nations. What do they think of us Lesueur?

Mr. LESUEUR. Well, as you say, the United Nations has 59 members. Some of them look upon us as imperialists, others as their protectors. None of them likes to be pushed around. But all of them regard us with respect. And no one will deny that the United States is the strongest influence in the UN, and that influence is constantly increasing.

No discussions can take place in a vacuum. The very physical presence of the United Nations in New York has made a tremendous impact on these representatives from all the corners of the earth. The one time everyone listens is when the delegate of the United States speaks. He reflects the power, the prestige, and the money of the strongest nation on earth. I won't say that every decision goes in the direction that we want it to. Far from it. But when the chips are down there are mighty few things that the United States can't get done at the UN if it really wants them.

Mr. MURROW. Let's pursue this matter of the United Nations for a moment. Of course, it wasn't set up to make the peace, but rather to keep it. How's it doing, Smith?

Mr. SMITH. Contrary to most people, I have been greatly encouraged by the UN this last year and mainly by one incident. When it became a question of Yugoslavia getting a seat on the Security Council all the skepticism and cynicism about the uselessness of the UN suddenly dissolved and the powers fought tooth and nail over that seat. I believe that the UN can develop into something like the world's conscience, if not the world's government.

Mr. MURROW. What do you say, Sevareid?

Mr. SEVAREID. Ed, as you said, the United Nations was not designed to make the peace after this war; it was designed to keep it once it was made.

So perhaps the UN hasn't really yet had its chance and won't until the powers do make the peace. But, anyway, I have doubts about the UN, unless by some magic it gets real enforcement powers. It's caught between two great eras, the rise of the era of passionate nationalism in the east and the decline of that era in the west. This is one world all right, but only in space; it's two worlds in time.

Mr. MURROW. What do the Germans think of the UN, Downs?

Mr. DOWNS. One might say, Murrow, that the Germans have a kind of cynical respect for the United Nations organization. They're interested in joining. But they remember Versailles and they see the east-west struggle outside the UN as the real fight and one that the UN seems powerless to settle. I stick to my original contention that the UN or any other international organization will have little real effectiveness until the nations' states are willing to give up those parts of their sovereignty to settle their problems by war.

Mr. MURROW. How do the French feel about the UN, Schoenbrun?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. Two out of three Frenchmen always say "no" to anything. It's essentially a negative country. But on the UN France is positive; support is strong. There's also a big following for world government movements there and lots of friends of world citizen Gary Davis. Frenchmen are often cynical and pessimistic. But the United Nations still looks like an ideal that even a cynic can buy.

Mr. MURROW. Burdett, how does it look to the Italians?

Mr. BURDETT. The Italians have centuries of power politics behind them. They take what I'd call a dispassionate and utterly disenchanted European view of the UN, namely, that the UN is a collection of sovereign nations that can do no more than mirror the world pattern of power politics. It can do the job if the nations which have the power are able, ready, and willing to make it work. And Italians are only too acutely aware that the nations in question are just two.

Mr. MURROW. What's the view of the UN in Asia, Costello?

Mr. COSTELLO. Well, Murrow, it's a little ironic that the United Nations achieved one of its outstanding successes in settling the Indonesian problems as Larry Lesueur pointed out a moment ago. It's ironic because most Asiatics appear to give the UN very little thought. Each country, each locality is too preoccupied with its own renaissance to concern itself with distant international maneuverings. There's a tendency to oversimplify all their foreign problems by looking primarily to the United States for help and guidance. One prominent Indian statesman admitted to me frankly that it is the United States which is preparing the world for eventual world government.

Mr. MURROW. Larry Lesueur, you spend most of your time out at the United Nations. Do you want to add anything to what you said earlier on the subject?

Mr. LESUEUR. Well, I think your original question was "Can the UN do the job?" Ed, and I wish I could answer that one with a simple "yes," but I can't. The United Nations cannot accomplish more than the member states put into it. It can't provide military security for the world, but it can and it does provide moral authority. Its great strength lies in its ability to focus world public opinion. I can say this, that if the UN fails and the world goes up in flames, the first thing the survivors will do is form another United Nations. Men just can't live without hope.

Mr. MURROW. Certainly no one can deny to the UN its record of achievement in settling disputes of a minor nature, or its usefulness as a meeting ground for conversations between the major powers. But it's also true that the major powers are attempting to use it as they did the League of Nations for the promotion of their own national interests. The fact is that in a power world the United Nations itself is sadly lacking in power. But it remains the most massive achievement in international organization in the first half of this century.

Well, fellows, let's stop talking about nations and organizations and juggling hemispheres. I'd like to put a very simple question to all of you. You've flown here from a half a dozen different capitals a total distance of about 22,000 miles, just for this program. Tomorrow you'll all be flying back. We have enough time left for each of you to take just half a minute to say just anything you feel like saying. Smith?

Mr. SMITH. One thing has struck me in my reporting in Europe since the war. Almost every time I start tracing some individual European problem to the possible source of remedy, the road leads almost every time not to some place in Europe but to the U. S. A.

It's clear to me that the fate of the world in the next half century will be decided nowhere but here and with the American people and their wisdom or—God save us—their lack of it.

Mr. MURROW. What do you want to say in 30 seconds, Sevareid?

Mr. SEVAREID. I agree with Howard Smith. It's up to America to demonstrate that men can remain free and secure in a mechanized society. But, we can't prove it to others till we prove it first to ourselves. We tend to forget our own ideals. But the tough thing is that there is a basic conflict within these ideals, the conflict between our drive for equality and personal freedom on the one side, our drive for personal aggrandizement on the other. And I think, Ed, that half the world is waiting to see if we can fit them together.

Mr. MURROW. Now, Bill Downs.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, during the past 10 years that I've been a foreign correspondent, the events that stick in my mind are those that make me ashamed. I was ashamed for being fat when a hungry woman in Amsterdam was so overcome by a can of beans that I'd given her that she cried. In Moscow, I was ashamed at being powerless when one of my friends was shipped to Siberia by the secret police just because he was my friend. In America, I've been ashamed of the color of my white skin when encountering racial prejudice.

On D-day when I saw the crumpled body of a young kid that could have been your brother, I was ashamed in a way to be still alive. During the next half century, the part that I'll live through, I'd like to see this kind of shame abolished from the earth.

Mr. MURROW. Schoenbrun?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. It struck me that we Americans have one characteristic that distinguishes us from all other nations. We want to be loved. We're not content just to have allies, they've also got to be pals, buddies, with a Presidential system just like ours and perhaps a dash of ketchup on their hamburgers. We seem to wear our hearts on our sleeves and we're easily hurt. Maybe the trouble is that our pocketbooks are as open as our hearts and we're secretly afraid that we're loved only for our money. I wish we'd grow a thicker skin in the next 50 years.

Mr. MURROW. Now 30 seconds for you, Burdett.

Mr. BURDETT. Well, I think, Murrow, that this problem of western Europe, which is now ours, is the problem of an insecure civilization. It seems to me that one main reason why Russian pressure seems so formidable and threatening is that the old society of the west is so unsure of itself. If that is so, then our task is enormous.

We can never accomplish it by a purely negative policy dedicated to the idea that everything anti-Russian is good. We can only do it by helping to build a new society, by giving the west a new sense of independent strength, of help, of permanence. By helping Europe to create conditions, the moral and social conditions, for a stable democracy and so for an abiding faith in democracy.

Mr. MURROW. Now, a half minute for you, Bill Costello.

Mr. COSTELLO. I'd say this, gentlemen: Asia today is a keg of dynamite with a lighted fuse and most Americans just don't realize it. We've got to revise our thinking. The old legend of the white man's burden in Asia has been tossed into the limbo of history. The people of Asia today want partnership not patronage. They're willing to buy and sell. But they won't be bought and sold. They don't even want to be dominated by their own governments. They feel just as the Americans do—that people are more important than institutions. In this next half century we've got to extend something more than just material aid. They'd like our money, yes, but they insist on having our respect.

Mr. MURROW. Now, a half-minute for Larry Lesueur.

Mr. LESUEUR. I guess, Ed Murrow, that my chief concern is that the question of war and peace must dominate the rest of our lives. There'll be some very dangerous periods ahead, especially after Stalin dies. A new and insecure Russian leader could plunge that country into war in an effort to preserve his power. On the other hand, the whole Communist movement may break up within the next 50 years. Look at Tito. I think our best hope lies in patience and the cultivation of allies and that one of our great problems will be to erase feelings of racial superiority between ourselves and those allies of another color.

Mr. MURROW. Gentlemen, it occurs to me to suggest that a great deal of sense was talked in those 30-second efforts you just made. And it seems to me, listening to this conversation, that there's been a theme running through this whole discussion—and it is that the last 50 years is a record of increasing conflict between the individual and the state. When dictators have risen to power, it has happened because the individual has abdicated his political and economic rights and assigned his responsibility as a citizen and as a human being to an individual or to a political party. When dictators have been overthrown, it has been the result of the determination of people to retain or to regain that freedom.

We seem to be agreed that the struggle will continue in all of its various forms. The search for security, both national security and individual security, will continue and it'll be intensified. It seems to me that this discussion has demonstrated beyond doubt that what we in this county do—that is, what our Government does—will determine as never before the fate of civilization. The time when we could separate domestic and foreign issues has passed. Whether we like it or not, the awesome responsibility of the leadership of the free world has been thrust

upon us; we didn't seek it. We have come into our full inheritance at an early age, but youth has never been acceptable as an excuse for failure. We in this country are the fortunate few who live in a generous, bountiful and capacious land. We are, as you have heard, viewed abroad with a mixture of fear and admiration. But it seems to me that, having regard to our history, our heritage, and our strength, we can afford to greet the unknown with a cheer. And fortunately, there is 10 seconds left, which gives me the opportunity of wishing all of you fellows much luck, good journey, and good news.

It Is Now or Never If We Are To Stop Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, only in 3 years out of the last twenty has the budget of the United States been in balance. Heavy deficits have occurred in all eighteen of the remaining years.

Our national debt as a result of this deficit spending has climbed from sixteen billions in 1930 to a total of two hundred and fifty-seven billions today.

In his most recent message the President proposed to continue this deficit spending during the next few years. It is my conviction that if we cannot balance the Federal budget now when employment and national income are at a high level we never will balance it.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Aberdeen Daily World, one of the leading newspapers of the State of Washington, because it expresses ideas that completely agree with my own:

DEBT COST HEAVY

President Truman's idea that we can go $10,000,000,000 deeper into debt this year and next as a temporary matter and then straighten things out in the following few years so that the budget will be balanced and there will be no need for further debt is puzzling. It is just as puzzling that he figures the interest on the national debt, increased under his program by $10,000,000,000 will be less in 1951 than it is this year. And it takes 13 cents of each tax dollar to pay the interest now. That is only 1 cent less than goes to the veterans. It is 2 cents more than goes to international aid, and more than twice as much as the 6 cents going to age pensions, health, and social welfare. Now in the name of common sense and arithmetic you are going to add $10,000,000,000 to the national debt and at the same time reduce the interest, only an Einstein, operating under a relativity-gravitational theory, which no one understands, can explain.

Nor are additions to the national debt temporary. Only twice in the last 20 years—in 1947 and 1948—has the Government lived within its means, and in all that time the debt has mounted from sixteen billion in 1930 to a wartime peak of two hundred and seventy-eight billion. It dropped to about two hundred and fifty billion after the war but it is climbing again and will reach two hundred and fifty-eight billion by the end of next June. There is nothing temporary about that. Nor will there be anything temporary about an additional five billion, five hundred million in the fiscal year ending in June 1951.

The people ought not to allow themselves to be deceived in this matter. The huge public debt is a burden. It took five billion, four hundred million to pay the interest on the debt last year. If the country had been out of debt, that sum could have been devoted to other public services or the budget could have been brought into balance, including all the things the President proposes, without incurring more debt.

A nation, like an individual is better off without debt. And certainly there is no sense in going deeper into debt in a period of the highest national income in history. That is the time to pay the country's bills, not add to them. Not even politics can justify the President's deficit spending.

California Community Plans Disaster Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in the great Eighteenth Congressional District of my native State of California is situated the important community of Lynwood. I have now received from the town's newspaper, the Lynwood Tribune, a copy of paper dated September 22, 1949, the headlines of which say, "First disaster demonstration in Nation."

With a great deal of pride, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I call to your attention that this demonstration is the first reported mutual-aid demonstration of the United States by a community with all agencies coordinated, with every organized unit in the city mobilized as it would have to be in case of some disaster. The outline, as reported by this splendid newspaper, is herewith printed. I know it will prove very valuable to other communities in the Nation. I congratulate this thriving, prosperous, and important community on taking the initiative in doing this.

The article referred to follows:

FIRST DISASTER DEMONSTRATION IN NATION—DISASTER GROUP READY FOR DEMONSTRATION ON D-DAY, SEPTEMBER 29, AT 6 P. M.—COMMANDER BRUNER ANNOUNCES CHIEFS IN ALL DEPARTMENTS, FUNCTIONS; MANPOWER, EQUIPMENT PREPARED FOR EXHIBITION

The first mutual-aid demonstration in the United States for relief of a community, with all agencies coordinated, will be conducted in Lynwood at the city park, zero hour 6 p. m. on Thursday, September 29. Personnel of all divisions will be called at a prearranged signal. Practically every organized unit in Lynwood will be mobilized for the demonstration which will combine the highest degree of communications, technical and professional aid with that of heavy duty. Lynwood, foremost in this movement in California has already enacted its ordinance governing this unusual, emergency organization and appointments were confirmed by appointment of the city council Tuesday night.

Vice commander is Art J. Smith, Lynwood veteran, active in the former servicemen's affairs through the American Legion. Other personnel chiefs are named in the following, which includes functions of all divisions, including that of executive officer which is vested in Police Chief Paul W. Kerr, whose facilities in this office have been made available to the disaster council:

LAW AND ORDER

Paul W. Kerr, chief.

Lieut. Claire Dedrick, first assistant.

Lieut. R. Y. O'Shaughnessy, second assistant.

Lieut. W. W. Fuller, third assistant.

Functions: Secure compliance with law and ordinances of the State, county, and city; guarding all facilities within said city; prevent all types of looting; generally assist all law enforcement agencies.

Duties: It shall be the duty of this division to enforce all laws of the State, county, and city for preservation of life and property, and to maintain peace and order.

Contributing organizations: Regular police officers; police reserves; police air squadron. L. A. Co. sheriff's office, humane society; mutual aid. Service clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Exchange, Optimist, Knights of Columbus, etc.). Reserve units (California National Guard, U. S. Naval Reserve, U. S. Army Recruitment Service, Sea Scouts), American Legion; VFW.

FIRE DIVISION

Earl Gallaher, chief.

Functions: To maintain fire-fighting equipment and forces to meet any emergencies.

Duties: To fight fires, rescue persons, administer first aid, save property. Instruct residents regarding fire prevention and defense methods for individual citizen. To instruct in the methods of detecting fires and precautions to be observed in reducing fire hazards.

Contributing organizations: Regular firemen; reserve firemen; first-aid units; rescue squads. Service clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Exchange, Optimist, Knights of Columbus, etc.).

MEDICAL DIVISION

A. J. Frishman, M. D., chief.

Function: To mobilize, organize, and direct the medical, dental, hospital, and first-aid activities.

Duties: Maintain up-to-date lists of names, addresses, and telephone numbers of physicians, dentists, nurses, in key positions, for immediate assignments.

Survey anticipated needs, outline duties, and planning for assignment of medical, nursing, and auxiliary personnel to shelters, emergency medical stations, hospitals, ambulances, morgues, immunization clinics, and public health nursing home visitation.

Contributing organizations and equipment: Red Cross, ambulances, Humane Society, first-aid units, canteens, emergency-aid centers.

Personnel: Medical, dental, and hospital groups; private health agencies and institutions; nursing groups; local druggists, and druggist associations; sanitary engineers from city and county health departments.

Service clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Exchange, Optimist, KC, etc.).

PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

A. J. Bateman, chief.

Functions: To maintain public utilities, to keep all routes in disaster planning open for use, and assist in phases of utilities services.

Duties: To repair and maintain public utilities, repair roads, to restore normal flow of traffic as rapidly as possible, coordinate health

activities and medical services where needed in this division.

Contributing organizations: All publicly owned equipment. All privately owned equipment.

Personnel: City employees, American Legion, VFW, private contractors.

UTILITIES DIVISION

Charles Burke, chief.

Functions: To maintain the operations of all utilities throughout the city, and coordinate disaster planning of each utility services.

Duties: Duties will follow that which is described in the disaster manual of each utility company.

Contributing organizations: Privately owned utilities companies.

TRANSPORTATION DIVISION

Charles Sheaffer, chief.

Functions: To provide and maintain all necessary transportation and vehicle communication services.

Duties: Plan in advances for coordination and mobilization of available facilities so that it will be prepared to function promptly and efficiently in time of disaster.

Survey all transportation resources and obtain pledges of voluntary cooperation from organizations and individuals whose facilities would be essential in the event of disaster.

Contributing organizations: Equipment; auto dealers; taxicabs; busses; auto club, Southern California; truck companies.

Personnel: American Legion, American Legion Auxiliary; VFW and Auxiliary; service clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Exchange, KC, etc.).

COMMUNICATIONS DIVISION

C. L. Blodsoe, chief.

Functions: To provide and maintain all voluntary communications services. To coordinate this service with existing governmental services.

Duties: Perform messenger service for all units of disaster council, operating various systems of communication including wire and radio communication facilities.

Plan in advance for coordinator and mobilization of available facilities so that it will be prepared to function promptly, and efficiently in time of disaster, obtaining pledges of voluntary cooperation from organizations, and individuals whose facilities or services would be essential in time of disaster.

Contributing organizations: Equipment, privately owned.

Personnel: Sons of Legion, VFW, women's club, junior women's club, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, coordinating council, 4-H Club.

PERSONNEL AND RECRUITMENT

Executive officer, chief.

Functions: Assist in volunteer planning by establishing a personnel list for all units of disaster council.

Duties: Assist in volunteer office, record keeping, clerical assistance, interviewing and campaigning for recruitment of volunteers.

Contributing organizations: American Legion and auxiliary; VFW and auxiliary; Sons of Legion, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, 4-H Club; service clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Exchange, Optimist, KC, etc.); coordinating council; PTA's.

AMERICAN RED CROSS

Mrs. Frances Killingsworth, chief.

See Red Cross Plan.

FOOD DIVISION

Phil Harris, chief.

Functions: To obtain, prepare, and serve food. To receive and dispense donated food.

Duties: Work in close cooperation with survey, medical, housing, and registration and information divisions. Arrange with housing divisions for buildings to be used as mass feeding centers and food depots. Work out arrangements to obtain food supplies at any time during day or night.

Make inventory of local and nearby sources of food supplies and information as to approximate quantities usually carried in stock. Inventory and arrange for immediate availability of equipment and facilities necessary for operations of canteens and feeding stations.

Contact restaurant owners and arrange for their places to be used for feeding should need arise.

Develop system of meal tickets and pattern menus.

Contributing organizations, equipment: Large markets, small markets, food warehouses.

Personnel: American Legion and Auxiliary, VFW and Auxiliary, Sons of Legion, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, 4-H Club, service clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Exchange, Optimist, KC, etc.).

HOUSING DIVISION

Herman Yaffe, chief.

Functions: To obtain and provide housing facilities for disaster sufferers, unable to provide shelter through their own resources.

To set up and operate refugee centers.

To set up and operate child-care centers.

To provide necessary tents, cots, blankets, and other equipment where needed.

To arrange to obtain necessary space for disaster headquarters, warehouse, food and clothing depots, canteens, and emergency hospitals.

Duties: Make survey and arrange for available housing facilities including city auditoriums, schools, churches, motels, vacant houses, lodge halls, armories, hotels, rooming houses. The sanitary, cooking, and fire hazard of each shall be considered and lighting and safe drinking water.

Contributing organizations: High school, elementary school, lodge halls, churches.

Personnel: PTA's, American Legion and Auxiliary, VFW and Auxiliary, chamber of commerce, post office employees, building contractors association, churches, real estate association, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, women's club, junior and senior, Sons of Legion, 4-H Club, service clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Exchange, Optimist, KC, etc.).

CLOTHING DIVISION

Louis Murray, chief.

Functions: To obtain through channels new clothing for disaster sufferers during emergency period. To receive and care for donated clothing.

Duties: To determine, prior to emergencies, what clothing supplies are available through local sources.

Make plans with local merchants.

Contributing organizations and equipment: Retail stores, wholesale warehouses, charitable institutions.

Personnel: PTA's, American Legion and Auxiliary, VFW and Auxiliary, chamber of commerce, post office employees, building contractors association, churches, real estate association, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, women's club, junior and senior, Sons of Legion, 4-H club, service clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Exchange, Optimist, KC, etc.).

REGISTRATION AND PUBLIC INFORMATION

Larry Hall, chief.

See personnel and recruitment plans.

CHURCHES AND CHAPLAINS

Rev. Ed. B. Wykoff, chief.

Chaplains, administering to the religious and spiritual needs of persons suffering from the effects of disaster.

YOUTH SERVICE UNIT

Arnold J. Robles, chief.

Assist in programs of youth organizations which are organized and directed toward the promotion of disaster preparedness programs including training thereof.

Mr. Speaker, and then, on Friday, September 30, 1949, the same Lynwood Tribune in big headlines stated, "Disaster relief preparations complete," and therein followed the itemized list of preparation. Without a doubt, this list will prove very valuable to other communities in the Nation.

The matter follows:

DISASTER RELIEF PREPARATIONS COMPLETE—SIRENS WILL ANNOUNCE ZERO HOUR, ALL GROUPS CALLED TO PARK AREAS—COMMANDER FATHER AND CREWS READY. PUBLIC INVITED. CITY PARK WILL BE SCENE OF EXHIBITION THURSDAY NIGHT

Sirens will announce the zero hour, 6 p. m. Go to Lynwood City Park in an orderly manner.

Assignments to groups on the ball diamond will be made and groups directed by officers of the Lynwood Police Department and of the reserves, who are participating.

Heavy equipment has been assigned to places on the outer perimeter of the park.

Lighter equipment will be placed inside the park.

Field kitchens will be set up in the regular manner.

Specially designated places are reserved for medical groups who will be directed by chiefs and police.

The field is reserved for participants in the disaster demonstration. The stands are open to spectators.

Several unusual features will be exhibited as surprise numbers in the plan for relief of disaster victims and evacuation.

Orders will come through the commander, executive officer, and division chiefs.

While facilities of the police and fire department of the city will be represented and available at the disaster demonstration, protection for homes is assured with officers and firemen on duty, according to Chiefs Kerr and Gallaher.

Public-utilities stand-bys are available on call for emergencies, Chief Carley Burke announced.

Commander F. L. Bruner, Jr., will send a radio message to Gov. Earl Warren. The message and answer will be broadcast at the park where public address facilities will be available.

All Lynwood is invited to the city park Thursday night for the disaster demonstration.

Problem No. 1, Dr. A. J. Frishman said at the Monday discussion, is "hysteria," and care of those who may be suffering from shock. There victims are cared for much in the same manner as neighbors who take over when somebody is in distress, at time of an accident. Their reassurance and a medical sedative takes care of numerous in this condition and leaves medics free to attend more seriously injured persons who must be brought to some central point for attention, leaving maximum of the medic's time for attention to the greatest number. Sixty percent treated in this manner may go on their way. In this, the Red Cross and auxiliaries assist and of course the nearest hospital is available for this function, the doctor said.

Lynwood folks who called the police station on the night of the recent quake shock were excited and pointed in their questioning but not hysterical, according to desk dispatcher, Russ Bell, who was on the desk. Bell said he was fully occupied for 20 minutes answering calls but that once folks were satisfied there was no great damage and no probable imminent danger, the calls ceased. He gave them what information was available at the time.

According to Police Chief Paul W. Kerr the reaction indicates that great numbers of people are schooled in these matters

through past experiences and may be expected to respond in a cooperative manner in event of disaster emergency call.

The Aero Squadron, southern California's first unit of this kind outside the sheriff's flyers, with flight surgeon and planes available, according to Chief Bill Dalton will be divided into groups of three and four. I will keep contact with the ground forces by short wave radio.

Trained technicians and nurses will be available through the Red Cross group. Station wagons will be available for the Red Cross, also nursing chairmen and staff assistants.

Police direction will be through the Reserves and the regular force, with assistance from the veteran groups, the Legion, VFW, etc.

Acheson Acts as Expert on United States Defense

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, what could be more touching than the surprise, as reported in yesterday's papers, of Mr. W. Walton Butterworth, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, over the bad manners exhibited by the Communists in seizing our consulate in Peiping? Is he going to be surprised every time a consulate is seized by the Communists or a consul imprisoned? Perhaps sometime the State Department will learn that Communists do not respect rights or diplomatic immunities, unless it happens to serve their purpose, and that in this respect an Asiatic Communist is no better than a European Communist. At the present time, the State Department is quite incapable of facing any of the consequences of its own conduct.

Mr. Speaker, in this morning's paper, the Philadelphia Inquirer, there is an article by Ivan H. Peterman, Acheson Acts as Expert on United States Defense, and I ask unanimous consent to incorporate this article in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

ACHESON ACTS AS EXPERT ON UNITED STATES DEFENSE

(By Ivan H. Peterman)

It is rare for one man, however clever and accomplished in worldly affairs, to assume in one office the philosophic robes of a Confucius, and the strategic pose of a Napoleon, but such today is the simultaneous effort of Dean Dissertation Acheson, United States Secretary of State.

After several depressing days in Washington, D. C., your correspondent has discovered that not only has the Acheson view that we can do nothing whatever about China, or even more vital portions of Asia, been imposed upon the Truman administration, but the Creator of America's worst diplomatic bumglers in the history of this Republic seems also to be the authority for our security and defense.

Where are the military experts? What has happened to Louis Johnson, and his generals, his airmen, and admirals?

Apparently the row in the President's Cabinet drove the Nation's defenders to the hills, so that as we sat listening to Acheson's stream of defeatism in the National Press Club last week, the few recognized authorities on strategy and defense were such as retired Gen. Toohey Spaatz. The active brass from Army, Navy, and Air seem still in a unification haze, too dumfstruck to carry their cries to Congress. Acheson dismisses Formosa as unimportant, is seconded by Truman—and except for General MacArthur's far-off protest, there isn't a significant resistal in all the Nation.

Additionally disturbing is the fact that Acheson's glib words seem to have charmed all but a few Republicans, who are now dismissed from the debate not because they are unqualified but because they lost the election in 1948.

Any pretense at bipartisan foreign policy is, of course, gone. Although experienced Washington observers claim 90 percent of the row over Formosa is politics, Mr. Acheson's own revelations that Russia is hogging up China—Mongolia gone, Manchuria almost, Sinkiang going, and Tibet on deck—would suggest that a certain aspect must be international and real. But you'd never guess it in Washington. Nobody seems disturbed. Not even the newspapermen.

In one of the most contradictory utterances a Secretary of State ever uttered, Mr. Acheson pleaded with press and public not to expect too much logic or consistency. He pointed out that Asiatics were a mixed bag, must be treated in different ways—therefore Uncle Sam will proceed not to treat with them at all, but await their separate pleasures. Meanwhile, wringing his hands at the aggressive, well-designed, and entirely rapacious and plundering success of Soviet Russia.

I came away convinced of these things:

1. The United States declines to take any responsibility, however manifold and atrocious our mistakes that helped Chiang Kai-shek's government down the toboggan.

2. The Truman administration refuses to make any positive policy or declarations for the Far East, and intends to let everything drift.

3. Under the Acheson pro-Communist spell, the regime of Mao-Tse-tung will be recognized in the not-distant future, and Formosa will be tossed in as a bonus.

4. We are following the disasterous British line in China, which is appeasement in its greasiest form—predicated not on honor, or good faith with past allies (Chiang and the Nationalists), but is strictly trying to save investments, prolong trade, and salvage unsalvageable Hong Kong.

5. Our so-called Far East policy is now being molded by the same little group that advised the Nationalists into the ashcan, and blue printed the Stilwell fiasco and all our mistakes since then.

6. The State Department's justification for its calculated risk on China is the hope that Mao-Tse-tung will become another Tito. That, of course, will depend on whether he ever gets home from Moscow. He is now well overdue as the Kremlin plots and pressures for the usual one-way deal.

7. The recent shipments of tanks, vehicles, and munitions from Philadelphia mean nothing at all. Acheson said so. "Part of previous commitments, a private matter, pay no heed," was his summation. But all will fall to the Reds, who, once Chiang's last stand is liquidated, will have that much more United States equipment to threaten Burma, Malaya, Indochina, and India.

Opposition of the American Council of Christian Churches of California to the FEPC Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a letter from Mr. G. M. Lane, chairman of the American Council of Christian Churches of California. This letter is very significant in that it does not come from some southerner.

The council places the emphasis where it should be—the danger of regimentation of our people and the tendency toward a police State.

Mr. Speaker, as one who believes in the Jeffersonian principle—that that people is best governed who is least governed—I would be opposed to this vicious proposal or regimentation on our people if there were not a Negro in my State, and I should like to call the attention of the other Members of Congress and the people of the country generally to the fact that this proposal would mean, if enacted into law, the regimentation of businessmen, both large and small, in California and in New York and all other States, as well as in Mississippi. The letter from Mr. Lane is as follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF
CHRISTIAN CHURCHES OF CALIFORNIA,
CIVIL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 1, 1950.

The Honorable WILLIAM MEYERS COLMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Doubtless there will be FEPC legislation brought before the Congress this session.

We have consistently opposed this type of legislation and we still do.

FEPC legislation would rob the employer of the right to choose whom he would to work for him. This right was upheld by Jesus Christ when He approvingly quoted the employer as saying, "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" (Matthew 20: 15). An employer does have the God-given right to choose whom he will to work for him. There is a kind of discrimination that is not wrong.

We realize that there is a kind of discrimination that is wrong. We had no brief for the one who hates another or for one who discriminates solely because of the color of skin. However, we are convinced that this discrimination is not as prevalent as some of our liberal friends would have us believe. We attended a meeting sponsored by an organization that was pushing FEPC and at which representatives of other allied groups were present. A call was made for any authentic cases of discrimination that could be brought before the California legislative body that was considering their bill. Among all the organizations represented (all of which were left-wing groups) only two individuals were found in the ranks of these groups in all of the Los Angeles area who would go before a legislative hearing and testify that they had been discriminated against. Surely this does not indicate a very serious situation.

FEPC, if adopted, would act as an effective extension of the police state. To set up a Government agency as the arbiter of employment in private business is to add one more control to the already burdensome load which is being borne by the private enterprise system. This private enterprise system, which is our modern world is so distinctively American, is the only economic system which is stamped with the approval of the word of God. And that private enterprise system is the economic system which has made our Nation great.

We cannot correct discrimination against employees by establishing discrimination employers. FEPC would only tend to increase tensions between classes and groups and could really benefit only those who desire to sow discord and confusion among our people. In this connection it is interesting to note that the Communist Party is always one of the very active proponents of FEPC legislation. They must have some stake in it.

Sincerely,

G. M. LANE, *Chairman.*

Less Regimentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newport News in Oregon entitled "Less Regimentation" which merits the attention of those interested in farm price-support legislation:

LESS REGIMENTATION

Our farm price-support program needs overhauling and the Brannan plan is not the solution.

The Brannan plan is an improvement over our present policy in that it provides for disposal of surpluses to the advantage of the consumer instead of storage for ultimate dumping or spoilage. But it fails in the element of control of surplus production in that it must resort to a quota system, regimentation, the process of a police state.

Here is how the problem can be solved.

Consider a farm product; for example, wheat. Determine the average market price of wheat for the past 5 years. Promise the farmer a minimum of 80 percent of this 5-year average. If the price drops below this promised minimum, pay the farmer a subsidy equal to the difference between this minimum and the market price received for the wheat.

This plan could be used on any commodity, a few or all. Five years as the period for which the average should be taken may not be right. Maybe it should be 10, maybe 3. The 80 percent could be 90; maybe 70. These are details that would be determined after more detailed investigation.

This plan is economically sound. It provides for the disposal of surpluses to the benefit of the consumer. In times of rising stable prices it costs the taxpayer nothing. When prices drop, tax money will have to be used to pay the farmer's subsidy, but this will not be burdensome to the consumer, for he will also buy his commodities at lower prices.

Supply and demand, not regimentation, will control production.

Each year's minimum price would be announced before planting time, so the farmer could adjust acreage accordingly. If prices continue to drop, the promised minimum would also gradually come down. The marginal producer would then shift to some other product. If there were no other product for him to shift to, his land should probably be taken out of production as submarginal.

The plan allows the economic law of supply and demand to operate with a minimum of artificial interference. But farmers would be protected against the hardships of sudden price drops.

Keep the System That Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, "Keep the System That Works" is the title of a most interesting editorial in the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of January 11, 1950. The editorial is in large measure a result of the comments on the President's message made by my friend and colleague the gentleman from the Fourth District of Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] and an endorsement of his views in contrast to the recommendations of the President in these particulars.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the editorial follows:

KEEP THE SYSTEM THAT WORKS

Congressman JOHN DAVIS LODGE, of this district, in a statement commenting on President Truman's message to Congress, points out that many of the acts of Congress (or failures to act, such as failure to repeal the Taft-Hartley law) for which the President strongly condemned the Republicans by inference, were supported by an overwhelming majority of the members of his own party in Congress. In other words, the Democratic President and the Democratic Members of Congress seem to be headed in opposite directions.

But we would particularly call attention to Congressman LODGE's criticism of the Oscar Ewing free medical-service plan because we believe this a matter which will come up for increasing attention in the near future and the public certainly needs to be informed about it. Said Congressman LODGE:

"He (the President) apparently favors the Oscar Ewing health plan which would deprive the American people of their choice of a doctor, lower the standards of the medical profession and generally encourage malingering."

If the experience of England is going to be any guide to us in the matter, that is exactly what would happen. There is probably no greater misuse of the English language than the attempt to call such plans free medical service. Every wage earner will pay for his medical services through pay-roll taxes, the difference being that while he still pays the bill, he no longer has his choice of the doctor. This Nation now has the most expensive medical service and the widest hospitalization and the most free clinics of all kinds of any nation on earth, or historically, any nation past or present. Allowing for the sake of argument that one-eighth of the people do not get all the medical service which they might well use or that some of them do not get any at all (and we think that even this figure is exaggerated) the immediate effect of the Oscar Ewing plan would be to reduce the medical service now enjoyed by the other seven-eighths of the population.

How much smarter it would be to improve our present system by extending it to the remote corners, the sparsely settled districts, or the mountain wastelands where medical service is now scanty because of the sheer physical difficulty of rendering it. Why scrap the system which has produced the highest health standards in favor of something which we know, from the experience of other nations, will only give us something markedly inferior?

Why we should turn to those nations whose standards are already inferior to our own, and import their ideas to replace our more successful ones, is a mystery which can be explained in only one way, and that is, that a politician will resort to anything in order to create a glossy-looking issue.

What Does a Credit Man Think About Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by M. S. Szymczak, member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, before the Midwest conference of the Robert Morris Associates, Chicago, Ill., December 9, 1949:

WHAT DOES A CREDIT MAN THINK ABOUT TODAY?

One thing I'm not going to do is try to tell you how to run your business. Capable credit men need no such advice—and the others wouldn't take it anyway. A good credit man knows the many elements to be considered in granting a loan and he knows that he cannot afford to overlook any one of them in reaching his decision. Something of little importance today may, because of rapid economic and other changes, be of first importance tomorrow.

You members of the Robert Morris Associates are well aware of the need for evidence of the borrower's integrity, for assurance that the money he borrows will be employed for provident and productive purposes, and for reasonable certainty that the loan can and will be repaid upon the terms and conditions granted. You know that your advice and counsel must accompany many loans if the credit is to be used to best advantage. You are aware of the dangers of relying too heavily on the continued success of any one industry or enterprise, and of the need for diversification in your lending activities. In short, you know the many angles to this business of lending other peoples' money to other people, and you are endeavoring to consider all of them in an effort to protect your depositors, to provide a fair return on the investment of your stockholders, and to assure the maximum sound productive use of credit in your community.

It is not my purpose this evening to review the many detailed considerations that enter into the granting of a loan. Rather, as a native of this city and former associate of yours, I should like to discuss some of the broader problems of national and international credit policy with which I have been conversant for the past 16 years. In today's world, the conduct of economic affairs at home and abroad is greatly influenced by considerations of social responsibility. In the interest of the greatest good for the greatest number we as a Nation have cut

ourselves the task of maintaining high employment, stable values, and a rising standard of living.

The attainment of these national economic objectives, in view of the growing complexity of our economy, gives rise to many perplexing problems. Considering the essential role of credit in our highly specialized system of producing and distributing goods and services, it is not surprising that these problems are a matter of concern to each and every credit man in our country.

The Robert Morris Associates deserve high praise for publicizing the essentials of constructive credit policies and for encouraging and facilitating the exchange of information and ideas among credit men. The associates' financial statement studies, which are continually being enlarged and refined, have provided members with standards of comparison that are extremely useful in analyzing and evaluating particular loan applications, and in detecting changes in business financial structure. Through its monthly bulletin and meetings such as this, the Robert Morris Associates are encouraging that sort of thoughtful analysis essential to a sound solution of our many problems and to the realization of our economic goals.

THE ROLE OF CREDIT AND CREDIT INSTITUTIONS

We all know that an adequate supply of credit at the right place, the right time, the right cost, and the right repayment terms is essential to the smooth functioning of our economy. There is hardly an individual, a businessman, a municipal or State government, or a national government that doesn't need credit from time to time. In order to meet these varied needs for credit, different types of lending and investment institutions have been developed. Some, like the commercial bank, evolved in response to a need for short-term business credit; others, such as the savings and loan association, were created for the purpose of supplying special types of longer-term credit. Still others, such as mutual savings banks and insurance companies, have, in recent years, turned to lending and investing funds normally supplied by commercial banks. The commercial bank, however, is still preeminent in the field of shorter-term credit. It must, because of the high proportion of its demand to its total liabilities, concentrate on shorter-term credit. In contrast, life insurance companies, the majority of whose obligations represent lifetime contracts with policyholders, and mutual savings banks, which hold peoples' savings, are able to extend credit for longer periods through the purchase of long-term bonds, obligations secured by real estate, and other investments of a long-term nature.

While the demand character of much of their deposit liability largely restricts commercial banks to short-term lending, member banks can, if confronted with unforeseen deposit withdrawals, obtain funds from their reserve banks. In its capacity of lender of last resort, the Federal Reserve System has introduced a much greater degree of flexibility into commercial bank lending than previously existed. In this respect, the powers of the System were broadly extended in 1933. Banks can now grant loans without fear that tomorrow or the day after they may be forced to liquidate them on short notice in order to meet depositors' demands. On the other hand, we recognize that certain types of credit extension are not for commercial banks—among them, purchase and lease of business properties and investment in equity shares. In other words, the role of the commercial bank should continue to be largely that of provider of short- and medium-term credit to business corporations, unincorporated enterprises, farmers, consumers, home owners, and all levels of government.

In this connection, I should like to say a word about public lending institutions that provide emergency financial assistance to banks and business. I think most credit men would agree that Government competition in the field of direct lending is undesirable if private lending institutions can provide the amounts and types of credit needed. On the other hand, I think we should have some public credit agency or agencies available on a stand-by basis to render assistance in periods of financial stress—at least until such time as the commercial lending institutions are able to cope with any conceivable situation. In addition, there may be some remaining gaps in our present structure of financing agencies—for example, agencies that would provide long-term debt capital to small enterprises. Such gaps may have to be filled by new types of private or public financial institutions.

Whether the potential expansion of Government lending agencies poses any serious competitive threat for private credit institutions will depend, in my opinion, on our success in minimizing or eliminating cyclical expansion and contraction of business activity and credit and in filling any gaps with appropriate private lending institutions wherever possible.

The dual responsibility of the commercial banker on the one hand to protect the interests of his depositors and stockholders, and on the other hand to expedite the production of essential goods and services by granting credit, is a difficult one. The desire to protect depositors may cause individual bankers to change their credit policies at the first signs of financial stress. The over-all effect of such action, by sharply curtailing or even liquidating credit lines, might seriously impede economic activity and hurt all bank depositors. Individual bankers might find it difficult to continue granting credit freely when competitors are calling in their weaker loans and tightening up their credit terms.

The only real solution to this problem lies in the prevention, by means of over-all credit and monetary action, and other public and private means too numerous to mention on this occasion, of any economic development that might lead to sharp retrenchment and liquidation of credit.

ROLE OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The Federal Reserve System, as the central monetary and credit authority, is charged with responsibility for regulating the over-all supply, availability, and cost of money with a view to contributing to the maintenance of high levels of employment, stable values, and a rising standard of living.

In an effort to meet its responsibilities the System takes positive action to curb or to encourage credit expansion, as circumstances require. It operates by using either quantitative or selective instruments, or both. Quantitative instruments, such as changing the required reserves of member banks or open market purchases or sales of Government securities, increase or decrease the reserve base for credit extension but leave to the individual bank the decision as to the type or types of credit that should be expanded or contracted. Selective credit instruments, such as margin requirements for the purchase or carrying of listed stocks or emergency regulation of consumer installment credit, apply to a particular type of credit, but impose no direct limit on the total amount of credit outstanding.

Generally speaking, action taken by the Federal Reserve System to influence the expansion or contraction of credit has the primary effect of suggesting rather than requiring certain responses on the part of individual lenders. This is particularly true in time of economic recession when the Federal Reserve can enlarge the basis for credit expansion, but is powerless to force additional credit into business and trade channels. The latter can be done only by aggressive response on the part of individual banks in extending credit and by willingness on the part of businessmen and others to utilize credit in expanding their operations. To make this possible both public and private policies should inspire confidence on the part of businessmen, bankers, and the general public.

In influencing credit policies in an effort to contribute to monetary and economic stability the Federal Reserve System must act in the public interest. Oftentimes such actions are unpopular, especially among the banking fraternity. Sometimes central banking officials resign, voluntarily or otherwise, because of the unpopularity of their actions. This is particularly true in periods of inflation, when most people do not want to see business activity curtailed. However, as recently demonstrated in a number of western European countries, the need for drastic action to insure monetary stability does arise and the results of such action are beneficial. In the end most groups recognize the wisdom of action which they at first opposed.

In the final analysis, the major contribution of the System to the smooth functioning of our economy lies in its early detection of undesirable economic trends and prompt action to guide commercial credit policy away from paths that may lead to serious inflation or deflation. Without the understanding and cooperation of the entire banking system and the public much of the effectiveness of Federal Reserve action is lost.

The organization of the Federal Reserve System, with its 12 regional banks and their 24 branches, provides grass-roots information on what our leaders in the fields of agriculture, industry, commerce, and banking are doing and planning. In a similar manner, the System obtains first-hand information about economic developments in foreign countries and in the field of international trade and finance through its membership in the National Advisory Council and from various Federal Reserve and other Government missions and representatives abroad. Much of this information is relayed to credit men through the publications of the System so that individual lending policies may be reviewed in relation to national and worldwide economic developments.

THE CURRENT BUSINESS SITUATION AND OUTLOOK

In the first place, as you know, determination of appropriate credit policies depends in part on our longer-range economic objectives. But it depends also on the present and probable future course of business activity. Between November 1948 and July 1949 industrial production, as measured by the Federal Reserve index, declined roughly 17 percent; during the same period, wholesale prices, as measured by the all-commodity index, dropped 6 percent and business inventory holdings declined 8 percent. These declines in industrial activity and prices, together with smaller business credit demands on banks and other lending institutions, prompted several monetary and credit actions by the Federal Reserve System during the spring and summer of 1949. Down payment and repayment requirements on consumer installment loans were gradually moderated prior to the termination of Regulation W. Margin requirements on stock-exchange loans were decreased substantially, successive reductions in reserve requirements of member banks were instituted, and a policy of flexibility in open-market operations to permit freer play of general credit forces in the determination of market rates and yields was adopted.

The moderate recession in business activity that we experienced during the first half of this year probably reflected inventory and price readjustments, rather than any basic difficulties. Whether the recovery that began this summer may lead to further inflationary pressure or will be replaced by a resumption of the earlier downward readjustment is now a subject of considerable discussion.

Among the various aspects of the present situation that suggest continued high levels of business activity, one of the most significant is the record level of construction activity. In a recent joint report, the Department of Commerce and Department of Labor estimated that the total value of new construction put in place during 1949 would exceed $19,000,000,000, or slightly more than the 1948 total of $18,800,000,000. Moreover, these same sources predicted that the total of new construction expenditures in 1950 will equal that of 1949.

Consumer expenditures on goods and services of all types were still running at an annual rate of $179,000,000,000 a year in the third quarter of 1949—less than 2 percent under the peak annual rate reached in the fourth quarter of 1948. Moreover, recent Federal Reserve Board surveys have revealed the existence of continued large-scale demands on the part of individuals for automobiles, houses, and other durable goods. Not only is the demand great, but individuals have cash or other liquid assets, or are able to borrow, to finance purchases of these goods. National service life insurance premium refunds during the winter and spring of 1950 are counted upon to bolster consumer demand, while continued large-scale Government expenditures will sustain a demand for many types of goods and services. The over-all financial position of business is sound, despite a substantial increase in business indebtedness during the past few years. In general, the supply of credit is large and elastic and the cost, both of short- and long-term credit, relatively low. Furthermore there is a marked absence of speculative excess, such as we had in the late twenties, while the great strength of the banking system enables it to deal effectively with any sort of economic development one might reasonably expect at this time.

At the same time, we should not overlook the fact that we have gone a long way toward satisfying the immediate postwar demands for industrial plant and equipment, business inventories, and consumers' goods. Business expenditures on new plant and equipment, which reached a peak of $5,400,000,000 in the fourth quarter of 1948, are estimated at $4,300,000,000 for the fourth quarter of 1949—a decline of about 20 percent. Business inventories, which expanded by $28,000,000,000 between December 1945 and December 1948, have since declined by roughly $4,000,000,000. Wholesale prices have continued to fall and at the end of October were about 8 percent below their level of a year ago. While industrial production has picked up since July, and is admittedly being held back by recent work stoppages in the coal and steel industries, the current level is still some 12 percent below the level reached in the same month last year.

Moreover, there is some possibility that business expenditures on new plant and equipment will continue to decline, and that further increases in business inventory holdings will be relatively small. Bumper crops in many lines of agricultural production foreshadow continued downward pressure on farm prices and incomes. It is evident to you, I am sure, that we are still confronted with marked price disparities, such as aluminum versus copper, synthetic fabric versus cotton and wool cloth, and lumber versus other buildings materials. For example, the price of lumber is still over three times its 1939 average, as compared with a current average price of building materials (excluding lumber) that is somewhat less than twice the 1939 level. More liberal pension-fund provisions, of the type recently negotiated in the steel industry, together with postwar wage increases in most lines of industry and trade, and the high cost of postwar additions to plant and equipment, have saddled many business concerns with relatively large and inflexible cost structures which may seriously impede price reductions that might be needed if demand should start to fall off.

All things considered, the credit man is faced with the rather formidable fact that the present balance between further inflation and deflation is a delicate one, which could easily be upset by expansion in Government expenditures and deficit financing on the one hand, or by any pronounced curtailment of consumer or business demand on the other. Such a situation calls for lending policies that will permit utilization of credit for continued production of goods and services, and at the same time will not encourage premature exhaustion of consumer demand. Later in my talk I shall mention several types of lending activity which credit men are watching closely in view of recent economic developments.

RECENT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS ABROAD

If I learned anything in my several assignments abroad, it is the fact that time has long since passed when we could isolate our domestic economy from that of the rest of the world, particularly from the effects of economic developments in the western European countries. Immediate postwar European demand for food and manufactured products of various types provided a large export market for whatever could be spared in meeting our domestic requirements. At the same time, and especially as ECA aid became available, European countries began to rebuild their factories, reestablish their raw material supply lines, and resume production of manufactured goods. In order to attract private capital to their industries and place their own economies on a sound footing, most of the western European countries introduced drastic currency reforms for the purpose of stabilizing prices and money values.

Once the European countries succeeded in establishing some measure of internal stability, their next step on the road to economic recovery was to rebuild their export trade, particularly to this hemisphere. Devaluation of their currencies in relation to the dollar has had the effect of lowering the price of European goods in the American market and enabling European countries to sell more in this country. At the same time, it has raised the prices of our goods in foreign markets and curtailed their consumption to some extent. All these changes are no doubt reflected in your thinking and planning.

It is most important to us that the progress toward general economic stability, in which most countries of the world have participated, should continue. While United States aid has been essential to the progress that many foreign countries have made since the end of the war, I am confident that the contemplated gradual reduction in the amount of such aid will not interrupt nor delay such progress. However, this does mean that if foreign countries are to continue buying goods which they need from the United States, they must be able to expand sales of such of their goods as have a market in this country. To spend dollars here they must first earn dollars, directly or indirectly, and with much of their international transport, financial, and other dollar producing services destroyed or disrupted by the war, more emphasis must be placed on the sale of goods in the world market.

In this connection, the credit man today asks questions about the value of the dollar, not only from our own domestic viewpoint, but in relation to the currencies of other countries. Recently you have been hearing many rumors about devaluing the dollar in terms of the price of gold. Devaluation of foreign currencies was a necessary step toward trade expansion and recovery; undoing its effects by devaluing the dollar would have just the opposite consequences. Nor would dollar devaluation aid our domestic situation one iota. On the contrary, it would add to any inflationary tendencies that exist. There is no shortage of credit or gold reserves in this country, and an increase in the dollar price of gold, even if the legal obstacles to such action could be overcome, would merely mean an indiscriminate subsidy to domestic and foreign gold producers.

FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF CURRENT SIGNIFICANCE

Thus far, we have been talking about some of the broader aspects of the domestic and international economic scene that have a bearing on credit policies. Now, let's take a look at a few of the more specific problems in the field of credit and commercial banking that are of interest to the credit man today.

Installment credit: Since June of this year, the amount of consumer installment credit outstanding has increased by nearly $1,000,000,000. Some thought is being given by the lending officer to the implication of too rapid an expansion of such credit at this time. Many people buy certain large items of furniture and major household appliances only once in their lifetime. To a certain extent, the same is true in the case of automobiles. Once immediate demands are fulfilled, they may recur only after the lapse of considerable time. Moreover, the use of installment credit enables people to buy now and pay for purchases out of future income. If we encourage too widespread a use of installment credit at a time when cash demands of consumers are high, we may exhaust not only the present market but a good part of the potential market of the future. The results of doing so should be perfectly obvious—sales of automobiles and other consumer goods may suddenly fall off and unemployment may ensue, while a larger proportion of the reduced income available would go to pay for goods purchased last year or the year before.

No credit man is in a position to say who shall or shall not buy with installment credit, provided the borrower can establish his credit worthiness. On the other hand, he can influence the use of installment credit by maintaining prudent down payment and amortization requirements.

Real estate credit: My comments with respect to installment credit are equally true of real estate credit. During the 4 years 1946–49 home mortgage debt alone has increased by an estimated net amount of roughly $17,000,000,000. In part, your concern is that the volume of debt incurred may be so large as to threaten a serious credit liquidation. In part, it is that the ability of individuals to purchase housing with the aid of mortgage credit is being exhausted so rapidly that the remaining demand will not be adequate to insure continued high levels of employment in the building and building-materials industries. Again, the banker cannot deny credit to credit-worthy borrowers. He can, however, require conservative owner equities and repayment provisions in times of abnormally high demand, and relax his requirements somewhat when the demand begins to slacken. These are powerful measures of influence, and I am certain that bankers want, in their own as well as in the general interest, to make them as effective as possible.

Term loans: Term loans are often employed by the borrower in the purchase of machinery, equipment, and other more or less fixed capital items, and are repaid out of future earnings. In recent years the well-informed credit man is making term loans with caution, for three reasons: First, construction and machinery and equipment costs are well above prewar levels and there is a good chance that such fixed assets may prove to be overvalued in the long run.

Second, there is always some uncertainty about the profitability of future business operations. Third, the situation with respect to business expenditures on machinery and equipment is somewhat analogous to purchasing of automobiles and housing by individuals—some restraint in the use of credit during boom times should be encouraged.

From time to time questions arise as to the feasibility of developing a formula, or of devising definitions and limits for the guidance of banks in determining what proportion of their assets may properly be invested in term loans. Such an undertaking would have little chance of success. In the first place, the diversity of type, purpose, and conditions of such loans makes satisfactory definition practically impossible. In the second place, the appropriate position for an individual lending institution can only be determined after careful analysis and consideration of the character and solidity of its liabilities, its relative capital position, and the probable credit demands to which it may be subject. The determination of an optimum amount of term loans involves problems similar to those in selecting an investment portfolio, and no rule of thumb applicable to all banks would appear to be practicable.

CONCLUSION

It is evident, therefore, that the time-honored distinction between the trees and the forest is equally true of credit. The individual credit man is primarily and rightfully concerned with the welfare of the individual trees; the central credit authority is charged with responsibility for promoting the welfare of the forest. While the interests of the two may appear to conflict in specific situations, the thoughtful credit man realizes that there are no fundamental differences in their ultimate objectives.

It is further evident that certain types of credit, notably consumer instalment and home mortgage, have increased substantially in recent years. In the interest of minimizing their inflationary pressure, spending demand for automobiles, housing, and other consumer goods over a longer period of time and protecting bank portfolios against subsequent deterioration in value, credit men are examining down-payment and repayment provisions with particular care.

As we know, change has always been characteristic of human behavior, whether it be social, political, or economic. The principal difference in the economic changes that occur now and those of a hundred years ago is that present changes occur more rapidly and affect a much greater number of economic activities. No able credit man can isolate himself from change nor prevent it by ignoring it. On the contrary, he deems it his responsibility to maintain that prudent flexibility of thought and action that welcomes the opportunities for constructive service afforded by change. His is not a dull and routine duty. It is full of constant interest, not only in loans and lending policies but also in broader economic developments.

Indefeasible Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ludwell Denny:

INDEFENSIBLE RETREAT

(By Ludwell Denny)

Secretary of State Acheson's tardy triple effort to stop growing criticism of the administration's far eastern policy—or lack of policy—has failed. His rapid-succession appearances before the two congressional foreign committees, and the National Press Club have raised more questions than he answered.

His failure is due both to faulty tactics and to the essential weakness of his position.

He seems to assume he is confronted merely by a partisan Republican maneuver, which he can counter with a combination of lofty sentiment and ridicule. This would not be effective if only GOP politicians were involved. It is even less effective when the administration is disregarding responsible military advice and challenging nonpartisan public opinion of considerable size, as is now the case.

But the best possible defense of the administration position could not make it a strong one. That is because it is negative. It represents retreat. The Secretary's reasons why China could not be saved, and why Formosa should not be aided, might be somewhat more plausible if the administration offered a vigorous, positive policy against Red advances elsewhere in Asia. There is no such policy.

That is what worries so many generals and admirals. That is what troubles many newspapers and citizens who have no partisan Republican ax to grind. Formosa is only a symbol of the much wider issue. But it is an exceedingly important one since Manchuria and China proper, which were the tests 2 years ago and last year, are gone.

Where is the stand to be made? We have retreated from Korea, where we had a direct United Nations responsibility. There is no policy to give effective aid to threatened Indochina and Burma, if indeed our help would be acceptable there. Where then?

The administration is right when it says the United States should not precipitate war, should not make imperialist claims, and should not send American troops to put down independence movements. But American military occupation is not proposed—only a naval patrol or military advisers. That would entail much less risks than we are taking in many other places.

As for the rights of colonial peoples and the functions of the UN, with which the Administration is properly concerned, its argument boomerangs in the case of Formosa. Legally the Formosans are wards of the victorious powers which liberated them from Japan, until their fate is decided by a Jap peace treaty.

Although President Roosevelt promised them to China, neither they nor Congress nor the UN were consulted. The Administration would be more convincing if it were proposing temporary UN protection of Formosa, rather than inviting Red conquest by its do-nothing policy.

Altoona Chamber of Commerce Has Done Much for the City of Altoona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Altoona, Pa., is the proud possessor of the largest railroad shops in the world which are owned and operated by the Pennsylvania Railroad.

Regardless of the many thousands employed in the Pennsylvania Railroad shops unemployment from time to time presents a disturbing problem and menaces the economy of the community.

Altoona has a wide-awake group of businessmen who through the Altoona Chamber of Commerce have given their effort and money to strengthen the economy of the community by expanding its industries and attracting new ones.

The Altoona Chamber of Commerce, speaking for the businessmen of Altoona, enjoyed a successful year in 1949 due to the untiring efforts of Mr. George C. Keichner, Jr., president, and Mr. G. Stanley Ruth as secretary.

The following report contained in the Altoona Chamber of Commerce News Bulletin gives a detailed story of the Chamber's activities during 1949.

The report is as follows:

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AT WORK IN 1949

The year 1949 has recorded many worthwhile accomplishments sponsored by the chamber of commerce for the city of Altoona. Many hours and days of time and money were expended to promote the general welfare of those projects which make for a better community.

Foremost in line of time expended and results achieved has been the subject of industrial expansion. Since the need for increased and diversified pay rolls is Altoona's first problem, the chamber of commerce has been devoting most of its time in this direction. Although results appear to be small, the fact is that the one new plant built by the chamber's financing vehicle, Altoona Enterprises, Inc., has increased the city's pay roll income by about $650,000 annually.

In order to establish greater continuity in this work, the industrial committee of the chamber under the direction of M. A. Miller, announced an ambitious plan known as the "Altoona industrial pay-roll insurance plan." Organization of the various committees is now in progress and it will consume much time and effort over the next 90 days.

Of course many of the other phases of chamber of commerce work have also gone ahead. Retailing has taken up the second largest phase of time and effort with a well-rounded program of its own.

Other subjects which will be explained in a bit more detail include agriculture, tax-study work, better-business-bureau work, airport development, fire prevention, publicity, and varied phases of daily office assistance.

We wish to take this opportunity to thank all those officers, directors, committee chairmen, and members for their time and contribution given to the various projects under consideration.

We owe a deep vote of thanks to the Altoona Mirror, the Altoona Tribune, and the radio stations, WFBG, WJSW, WRTA, and WVAM for their valuable assistance in publicizing the chamber activities consistently. Without their splendid assistance and cooperation, the work of the chamber would be extremely difficult.

We sincerely trust that the chamber of commerce through its program of work can continue to serve the civic, industrial, commercial, and general welfare of the city of Altoona. We hope that 1950 will afford an opportunity for many, many more people to work through this community channel for the building of a bigger and better city. With proper assistance and support, the chamber of commerce has the resources and access to any and all problems affecting every phase of community life. Its more than 100 years

of experiences in 3,000 communities in America are available to us. You have our promise of continued support for those community subjects which must be worked out to the mutual advantage of everyone in Altoona.

INDUSTRIAL

Early in January 1949 the total financing cost of the Butterick Co. project was squared away with the Prudential Insurance Co. by Altoona Enterprises. The total cost was $458,879.95. Local participation in this project amounted to $95,327.97.

In the meantime monthly installments have been paid on this total amount covering principal and interest at the rate of 4 percent. Principal payments started as of August 1948.

Early in 1949 negotiations were started with the Mylish, Mann & Drucker Shirt people for the construction of their 50,000-square-foot building. Ground breaking ceremonies took place for this building April 27, 1949, and the building was sufficiently completed to permit the company to start operation September 1.

In the meantime other industrial projects were under negotiation but were unable to reach a conclusion as yet.

The accomplishments of the local industrial program were high-lighted in Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Commerce page ads which appeared in United States News, Business Week, Chicago Journal of Commerce, Wall Street Journal, Herald Tribune. Copies of this publicity, together with an industrial prospectus prepared by the committee, were placed in the hands of more than 1,000 industrial firms during the forepart of 1949.

The industrial committee held several meetings to discuss ways and means of offsetting the Pennsylvania Railroad lay-offs in 1949. It was during these meetings that the germ was created for the present pay-roll insurance program.

It might be mentioned here that the increased postal receipts at the Altoona post office from the two industries established here in the last 2 years added more than $100,000 annually to their receipts, placing the office in a higher salary bracket and caused the office to employ a number of additional men.

The $1,000,000 industrial insurance plan was formulated by the industrial committee to provide more continuity and effectiveness for industrial expansion. The plan was announced to the public December 23, 1949. The program provides for the raising of $1,000,000 over a 5-year period and to be used as a revolving fund handled by a board of trustees.

It provides for the employment of a full-time industrial engineer who will work as an Altoona ambassador and will work toward the enlargement and promotion of local industries as well as prospective industries, in addition to the acquisition of new industries and the development of Altoona as a distribution center.

Although the direct effort will be made to all business groups in the city for raising of this fund, the door will always be open to everyone for participation through financial assistance or working assistance. The plan calls for the organization of each of 100 business and professional groups who in turn will be charged with the responsibility of raising their own quota. The work of organizing these groups alone will take much time and effort, but it is believed that the experience will prove valuable in clarifying many of the frequently discussed criticisms that seem to linger in the minds of so many.

In any event, this project will consume the largest portion of the chamber's time and effort in 1950.

RETAILING

The retail division is operating in its second year under the new annual budget financing program. This program has met with success and satisfaction among its members. The program carried out the usual sales promotional events such as dollar days, Altoona day, Pennsylvania week and the large-scale Christmas program.

The division set up a better business committee to call attention to undesirable methods of merchandising and advertising.

The solicitation control inaugurated 2 years ago is evidently working with increased success. Literally scores of unnecessary solicitation efforts have been discarded during 1949. Several of the stores claim that this procedure has saved them many times the annual budget allocation for the retail division. It is hoped that everyone will continue to refer all solicitation subjects to the chamber office for approval of the committee.

The division appointed a parking committee to study the problem of our parking-lot situation. This committee, chaired by J. E. Holtzinger, will be coming forth with an effective report in the near future.

The Christmas program started November 25 with a huge Santa Claus parade made up of many local objects which were to be stimulated in toys. The parade drew the largest crowd that was ever witnessed at this annual event. One of the reasons for this was the fact that it was held in the morning.

The street decorations were erected as usual and although they are now 3 years old, they still are considered to be outstanding in cities of this size.

AGRICULTURE

The agricultural committee, chaired by W. S. Truby, staged a farm products show at the Jaffa Mosque in conjunction with the Altoona centennial celebration. Although this event met with a fair degree of success, it was considered inadvisable to stage a show of this kind in August.

The most successful agricultural event was the eleventh annual 4-H baby beef club show and sale held at the Frankstown Armory, October 19, 1949, where 49 animals were exhibited at the show. There were 14 meat buyers, which was twice the number to participate in the purchasing of these animals in former years.

The steers brought a good average price and the event was extremely well attended. Thanks for the impetus this year must go to Ted Holtzinger who brought about increased publicity efforts.

INTEREST IN MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

The chamber has been active in keeping in touch with the new tax program in Altoona, both prior to the establishment of the business privilege taxes and their operation since enactment.

On January 10, 1949, the chamber called a membership meeting on the subject of local taxes at which time the local ordinances were explained and discussed by Leslie Reese and Dr. Kurtzman of the Pennsylvania Economy League. The Blair County branch of the Pennsylvania Economic League was introduced to the business people of Altoona by a special tax committee of the retail division in the fall of 1948.

AVIATION

The inauguration of regular commercial airline service at the Blair County airport, March 28, 1949, marked an epoc in local transportation history. Since its inauguration, the All American Aviation Co., has been doing a favorable business. In fact their volume thus far is on a par with several of the other top cities on the route.

The chamber of commerce has maintained a constant interest in this subject for the past 18 years and it is of interest that they participate in the program through a membership on the Blair County Airport Commission.

OFFICE ROUTINE

The daily business done by telephone and personal calls at the office by members and others seeking every kind of community information actually absorbs a very large portion of time.

Increased activity has been noted in this direction during the past year when the office was designated last June by the United States Department of Commerce as a cooperating regional office. This means that all of the varied types of foreign and domestic information pamphlets, booklets, and magazines are supplied for the general information of business firms in the area.

In November 1949, the Altoona Chamber of Commerce Office was designated to receive invitations to bid as Government orders from the various procurement offices. This is in line with the fact that Altoona has been designated as a critical area having more than 12 percent of its total industrial employment unemployed.

A number of local firms have been applying for this work and on several instances, contracts were awarded to local people.

The chamber has increased its information service through the acquisition of several other business directories such as the Rand McNally Service, Thomas' Register in addition to the many out-of-town telephone and city directories.

FIRE PREVENTION

Fire prevention work in 1949 was carried out by a special committee under the chairmanship of Robert McDowell. This committee worked in cooperation with the city fire department and carried out a complete promotional program in all of the usual phases with the schools, service clubs, churches, and throughout the retail district.

This is a project carried out for the ultimate purpose of reducing fire losses and eventually reducing insurance premiums.

"INTERNAL ALTOONA"

Shortly after the chamber of commerce moved its offices to the Penelec Building, July 15, 1949, a Penelec window was assigned to it for the purpose of displaying our local industries one at a time, twice each month.

This has been carried through regularly since that time. Each time the pertinent facts about the company are given on separate information cards such as the average annual pay roll, the number of employees, where the products are sold, together with a display of the products manufactured.

During Pennsylvania Week radio station WRTA offered to implement the program by high lighting an industry each week on a 15-minute radio broadcast. These broadcasts are tape-recorded Friday afternoon in the plant. Bill Clear MC's the program with a running description of what he sees as he travels with his roving mike through the plant. The program is then rebroadcast each Sunday at 12:15 p. m.

On November 14, the Altoona Mirror volunteered to cooperate with this community industrial education program by sending a reporter and a photographer into the plant to interview the management and employees and to run the human interest story each Saturday.

This public relations project has been developing a great deal of community interest as well as building employee morale in the industries. Thousands of people are learning for the first time what is being made in Altoona and that job opportunities here are not as scarce as they are sometimes led to believe.

It is not intended that this subject be confined strictly to basic industries, but to include all of those business and service establishments that contribute to the community basic income.

Civilian Control or Militarism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in an issue of the United States News, an editorial introducing a complete reproduction of a report by the Committee for Economic Development entitled "Civilian Control or Militarism?" Because of the outstanding reputation and achievements of the members of the Research and Policy Committee of the CED and because of the timeliness of the matter which is discussed, I feel it is of widespread national interest and should be available to every citizen for calm consideration. Therefore, I am asking that it be included as an extension of my remarks.

The editorial and report are as follows:

WHERE IS THE COMMITTEE IN CHIEF?

[By David Lawrence]

America's defenses are in a sorry state.

Billions are being spent in the name of defense but the American people are being deceived by an official propaganda of canned speeches and statements into believing that national security is being attained.

When a committee of America's most enlightened businessmen, speaking through a staff of educators and qualified observers of governmental functions, issues a comprehensive report calling attention to neglect and failure, it is time for the American people to become concerned.

As a service to the public, the text of the report of this group, known as the Committee for Economic Development, is printed in full on the pages immediately following this editorial.

The CED already has played a vital part in the formation of American opinion on questions of national and international importance. It has always taken a progressive view. It is liberal in its outlook. It is concerned with human rights as well as property rights. Until he came to the Government recently, Paul Hoffman was the head of this organization.

What the new report says should be read by every Member of Congress, because it is that body which has the final responsibility for our defenses. America has not yet succumbed to the general staff concept of militarism originated by the Germans and now the underover objective of the military schemers at the Pentagon.

The CED particularly stresses the tendency today to build up a military dictatorship. It doesn't call names or become a party to the tragic differences that have arisen at the top levels in Washington between the armed services. But it does pointedly call attention to palpable weaknesses in the structure and the threat to individual freedoms.

Long of freedoms: Unlike many reports of critics, the CED proposes solutions. It strikes at the heart of the issue—the lack of civilian control and the manner in which military bureaucracy has taken over in Washington. It emphasizes the loss of freedoms—the censorship, the suppression, the interference with individual liberties. It might well have added that the recent purges and the vindictiveness with which some personnel policies are administered in the armed services smack more of the methods of the Nazis and the Stalinites than it does of free America.

The report doesn't, of course, cover all the ground. Members of Congress who have ventured to go contrary to some of the demands of the military bureaucrats have actually been threatened with opposition at the polls by veterans' groups controlled in the Pentagon. The pressure to sway the Armed Services Committees of Congress is extraordinary.

One-man control: But with keen insight, the CED points at the root of the trouble—the tendency to let one bureaucrat control everything. In the passion for unification one man—the Secretary of Defense—has been given dictatorial powers, with virtually no checks and balances. If he falls under the influence of the military bureaucrats, there is no effective way to overcome his mistakes or for the public even to know about them.

So the CED suggests that there be added to the National Security Council three full-time civilian members without other governmental responsibilities. It further recommends that one of these members be made responsible for a more effective flow to the public of information relating to national security, and that one be made responsible for reviewing the effect of security measures on individual liberties and advising the President thereon.

It was also recommended that the role of the National Security Resources Board be clarified and developed and that a full-time Chairman of the Board be promptly appointed.

Other recommendations of the CED are that within the Department of Defense there be a strong civilian staff independent of control by the military services to aid in developing and evaluating defense policy and that a Committee on National Security be established in each House of Congress, representing all committees of each House whose jurisdiction covers a significant part of the field.

Most of all, the CED stresses the importance of constant attention by the Nation to the security program in its relation to individual liberties and our free economy.

But as one reads the report, these vital questions come to mind: What has the Commander in Chief been doing? Who has been pulling the wool over his eyes? Does he know what is really going on in the defense set-up? Why has the situation been allowed to reach the state of inefficiency and scandalous confusion that now exists? Where is the Commander in Chief?

CIVILIAN CONTROL OR MILITARISM?—A STATEMENT ON NATIONAL POLICY BY THE RESEARCH AND POLICY COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

I. THE THREATS TO OUR NATIONAL SECURITY AND INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

1. We live in a world of insecurity, in a critical period which may last a generation

Since the surrender of Germany and Japan 4 years ago, there has been no peace. Peace conferences end in deadlock; peace treaties remain unsigned. The institutions of world government are unproved and indecisive. New weapons of destruction dominate the headlines.

The coalition that won the war has broken up; former allies have divided into hostile camps. The former enemy presents an uncertain problem. Arms expenditures do not fall to expected levels and the atom bomb seems to be no longer an American secret. A disturbing sense of insecurity is everywhere. This is cold war.

The fear of war may dominate our lives for a generation. The imminent threat of war will rise and fall; we may face alternating periods of optimism and pessimism, but the threat may last for decades. We must assume that war is not inevitable but we must also assume that there is little prospect of genuine peace in the near future. Large-scale measures for national security seem necessary for years to come.

2. We are now faced with entirely new problems

Changes in the world distribution of power, added to revolutionary developments in military weapons, have fundamentally changed the character of our security problem.

Historically, we have been slow to fight and quick to disarm. We have opposed large standing armies. We have opposed economic controls for military purposes except in a shooting war. We have opposed peacetime censorship.

Our past defense policy has been successful in large part because of our distance from potential aggressors. Our allies have had the strength to hold off the enemy while we rearmed. But, in today's era of atomic bombs, of planes faster than sound, of electronics, and of germ warfare, distance loses much of its value as a defensive barrier. Potential allies are no longer in a position to insure us time for rearmament. Possible aggressors can act swiftly, secretly, and with the cooperation of individuals within our borders. In such aggression, the great manufacturing, supply, and operating bases in America seem the natural targets of first attack.

For the first time in our history, we, in effect, share a common border with powerful potential enemies.

3. Today's conditions necessitate a major security program

In this new situation we Americans are painfully learning that our security program cannot be kept to a minor budget or to an incidental effect on our peacetime lives. While we continuously exert every effort to prevent war, at the same time we must be prepared to fight at a moment's notice.

On military defense alone we are now spending over $14,000,000,000 a year, fifteen times as much as before the last war. In addition, billions of dollars are to be spent on the rearming of other nations.

But our security program is only partly a matter of rearmament. The European recovery program on which we spent over $4,000,000,000 in fiscal 1949 is in large part a security measure. So also are such projects as atomic energy, our foreign broadcasts, and the conduct of much of our diplomacy in incoming intelligence.

Estimates of the cost for rearmament and other forms of security expenditure at home and abroad during the next few years amount to $20,000,000,000 or more as an annual minimum. This is nearly a tenth of our national production. It is truly a tremendous expenditure of national resources.

The security program affects our lives in still other ways. It is reflected in peacetime Selective Service. It is reflected in the loyalty investigations. It is reflected in high and still higher taxes and their effect on our behavior. It is reflected in censorship over scientific and technical information. It is reflected in the confusion of citizens unable to evaluate national policy because of limited knowledge and information.

The security program is a necessary and, at the same time, a dangerous force in our society.

4. Our security program threatens our individual freedoms

Though adequate security is essential to protect our freedoms, the program aimed at security raises new threats to our freedoms and to our way of life. Under it there has been a great increase in the role of the military in our Government, a great increase in bureaucracy, and expanding dominance of Government over industry and in increasing interference with individual freedoms.

Much of this is inevitable. When we increase our military defenses we necessarily increase the role of the military in our Government. When we increase the share of our resources devoted to armament, we unavoidably enlarge the scope of Government in industry, in politics, in science and education, and in every sphere of life.

We have already given up important freedoms without adequate challenge. Freedoms unrestricted may be freedoms forfeited.

This trend, particularly if coupled with fear and hysteria or with complacency and ignorance, may produce policies which, in the name of security, endanger essential liberties. Security measures, uncurbed by the requirements of freedom, can undermine our free institutions. Public apathy and the pressure for security can lead us along a dangerous road—a road that ends in what has aptly been called a garrison-police state.

In a garrison-police state, the soldier and political policeman rise to power while the institutions of civilian society and of freedom shrink. In the name of security, channels of public information dry up; the press becomes a mere purveyor of official hand-outs. Cut off from significant information, editors, commentators, and group leaders become less accurate in their judgments. The process of public discussion atrophies. Political parties decline. The power of Congress dwindles. Administration by civilians shrinks, relative to administration in uniform. The courts weaken. Cut off from information, the power of the citizen fades. Local plans are subordinated to central purposes. The free market is constricted. Labor is hedged in by special regulations. Consumers find their range of choice reduced. Decisions come to be made by an all-powerful Government. All freedoms suffer.

5. We must seek both national security and individual freedom

National security means national freedom—freedom to determine our own national policies without external coercion. This is a basic national goal. Our system of individual freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of opportunity, freedom of worship, and other freedoms—is an equally basic objective of national policy.

Yet neither national security nor individual freedom can be absolute. Both can be increased by improved efficiency and balance within the security program. But measures to increase one can operate to decrease the other. Where there is such conflict, the problem is to work out an acceptable balance. Just how much we allow security measures to impair freedom must depend on circumstances, and the relative risks to security on the one hand and to the survival of free institutions on the other.

In time of war, security takes temporary precedence over individual freedoms. Restrictions of freedom are freely accepted when they seem necessary for national survival. The need for unity, swift action, and secrecy overrides normal resistance.

At the present time the balance must be weighted in the direction of freedom. Freedom itself contributes to security. Freedom of scientific inquiry contributes to the production of improved weapons. The maintenance of a free economy encourages the development of economic strength and the growth of a strong, self-reliant people. The maintenance of individual freedoms creates the greatest bulwark of our security—the energy and intelligence of freemen working together to build and to save their own and their country's freedom.

Even more important, freedom and the dignity of the individual are the very foundation of our society, and the ends for which we are striving. Without them security loses its purpose.

II. ON WHAT DOES OUR FREEDOM DEPEND?

Freedom depends on adequate security measures. But the security program threatens two major institutions on which our freedom depends: The traditional supremacy of the civilian over the military and our system of individual liberties. Herein lies the dilemma.

1. Civilian supremacy is essential to freedom

The men who drafted our Constitution provided that a civilian—the President—should be Commander in Chief of the armed forces. They insisted also on the civilian control represented by the authority of Congress and, beyond this, by the power of citizens to elect the Congress and the President. This civilian principle has been advanced in many other ways: by appointment of civilian Secretaries of the War and Navy (and now Defense) Departments, by civilian control of the War Production Board in World War II, by civilian control of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The purpose of this civilian control of the military is clear: (1) To protect free institutions; (2) to insure that military measures fit into the larger program of national security and national policy of which the military is only a part, and (3) to promote efficiency in the Military Establishment itself.

There is today no direct challenge to the principle of civilian supremacy nor to the legal chain through which it can be exercised. But the magnitude and character of our security program make the effective exercise of civilian supremacy increasingly difficult and all the more necessary.

The Difficulties the President Faces in Exercising Civilian Supremacy

As Chief Executive and as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, the President is the constitutional manager of our security system. In the discharge of his responsibilities he must work through many agencies. The Department of Defense is responsible for the military aspects of security. The Department of State is responsible for developing and carrying out a foreign policy geared to our security. Many other agencies play important roles, among them the Atomic Energy Commission and the Economic Cooperation Administration.

To assist in coordinating the work of these many agencies, the President relies upon his Cabinet, upon a few immediate advisers, and upon such staff agencies as the Bureau of the Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, the National Security Council, and the National Security Resources Board.

The complexity of our security organization suggests the magnitude of the burdens placed upon the President. He urgently needs an effective staff to provide him with a comprehensive and balanced review of the security program. For such review the President requires the efficient operation of the two top-level Cabinet committees, the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board.

These two agencies, though not well known to the public, are potentially two of the most powerful and valuable agencies designed to assist the President on security matters. They were established by the National Security Act of 1947 (amended in 1949). The National Security Council was created to advise the President on the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policy. It now consists of:

The President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

The President may add additional members.

So far, the National Security Council has not fully lived up to its high potential though it has made important progress. It has been effective in dealing with certain emergency matters, has developed increased coordination between the State and Defense Departments (including the Central Intelligence Agency and the Joint Chiefs of Staff) and has made progress in developing defense policies. But it does not appear that it has yet formulated a comprehensive set of current and long-range security policies covering both foreign and domestic aspects of the problem. As a result, the President is seriously handicapped in carrying out his responsibility to recommend a balanced and comprehensive security program to the Congress and the people.

The National Security Resources Board, which also reports directly to the President, was created to advise the President on the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization. Under a civilian chairman, the Board consists of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Labor.

The National Security Resources Board has not lived up to its potential. It was established to prepare a sound mobilization plan, to formulate stock-pile policy, to relate the demands of our security policies to national capacities and resources, and in general to survey the impact of security programs upon the economy in times of peace or war. It has been characterized by lack of clarity of purpose and by inability to establish satisfactory working relationships with other security agencies. Its failure to fulfill its purposes not only handicaps the National Security Council in its policy deliberations but further weakens the hand of the President.

The National Security Act also set up a new executive department of the Government, the Defense Department, under a Secretary of Defense, who is designated as the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the Department of Defense. The act also provided for the Joint Chiefs of Staff as principal military advisers to the President, to the Secretary of Defense, and to the National Security Council. The act further established a War Council to advise the Secretary of Defense on broad policy matters affecting the armed forces. It established a Munitions Board to deal with such matters as procurement and the military phases of industrial mobilization plans. It established a Research and Development Board to deal with scientific research. Finally it reconstituted the three military departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The Difficulties the Congress Faces in Exercising Civilian Supremacy

The Congress also has encountered great difficulties in exercising its responsibilities for national security policy.

At least two-thirds of the committees of both Houses are concerned in one way or another with security policy. The Committees on Foreign Relations, Armed Services, and Appropriations are obviously concerned. But other standing committees such as Agriculture, Labor, and Finance also deal with aspects of security policy. And such joint committees as those on Atomic Energy, the Economic Report, and the Economic Recovery Program are likewise involved.

Problems come before Congress in piecemeal fashion. Present procedure exposes and irons out some inconsistencies. It eliminates some superfluous items and assures a certain degree of economy and efficiency. But no congressional agency is responsible for looking at all aspects of security policy with a view to inconsistencies, duplications, and oversights. Neither house has a committee structure designed to secure a balanced, comprehensive view of security policy as a whole.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 went far toward improving the organization of Congress. The number of committees was reduced. The burden upon the individual legislator was to some extent lightened. The standing committee structure of both House was made more nearly parallel with the structure of the executive branch. But there is as yet no agency in the Congress to parallel the National Security Council. Congress is not yet organized to deal with security problems on a broad and balanced basis.

The Difficulties the Citizen Faces in Exercising Civilian Supremacy

Under our form of government the final review of security measures—and in many cases their initiation—lies with the public. To carry out this responsibility, the citizens should have the advantage of an efficient organization of the legislative and executive branches of government. The present faulty organization produces needless public confusion as to security policy.

The citizen also needs much basic information he now lacks. The Government must withhold certain specific information in order to keep it from potential enemies. The problem is where to draw the line.

Recently the line has been drawn heavily on the side of secrecy. Our Government is following a much more comprehensive program of secrecy than in any previous period when we were not at war. Moreover, our people have been cut off from important information through censorship, both formal and informal, by foreign governments. To an unprecedented degree, the public is depending for its foreign intelligence upon what our own Government agencies decide to disclose.

Great danger is believed in a poorly informed public. Even more important is the public apathy toward security policies due to lack of adequate and reliable information necessary for responsible discussion and judgment. An alert and well-informed citizenry is essential to the effective working of civilian supremacy on which our democratic processes depend.

Each of the links in the chain of civilian control, marrying through the President and Congress to the citizen, can and must be strengthened. Without effective civilian control there is danger that security policy will be made more and more by the military alone and in terms of the institutional problems of military defense for which they are responsible rather than in the larger terms of security and freedom.

2. Maintenance of our system of individual liberties is essential to freedom

The requirements of security and the fear and hysteria generated by the threats to our security require constant vigilance to preserve our individual liberties.

We must deal vigorously and effectively with subversive activities. But we must also maintain the safeguards to individual liberty. A threat to our liberty arises when the loyalty of individual American citizens is called into question. First, the loyalty of Government employees is examined. Then investigations extend to the managers and employees of industries working on defense contracts. Suspicion readily spreads to scientists, educators, and students engaged in research. An atmosphere of suspicion favors the growth of political police. Agencies with power to investigate sometimes degenerate into organs of oppression and intimidation. Necessary investigations into loyalty can deteriorate into witch hunts which threaten the whole structure of individual freedom.

A more indirect threat to individual liberties comes when the security program endangers the free economy which underlies so much of our individual freedom. Under conditions characteristic of a free economy—free markets, individual initiative, and a minimum of direct Government control—our great power as a Nation has developed. Our society looks to individuals to make the multitude of decisions about production, consumption, and other elements of economic activity. We depend on the action and interaction of individuals and enterprises to produce a sound and expanding economy.

While this free economy is not perfect, it is the most flexible instrument yet devised to provide the individual citizen with maximum opportunity for the development of his capacities. This is a statement often made, but perhaps it cannot be repeated too often.

A security program of the present size threatens our free economy in three major ways: (1) By the burden of taxes on economic incentives; (2) by the control of business activity through Government contracts; and (3) by the likelihood of recurrent proposals to impose direct controls over economic activity, in the name of security.

1. The new billions in taxes weaken the incentive imperative to the successful working of our free economy. Heavy taxes can weaken the incentive to produce. They can stifle new enterprise and reduce our long-range ability to produce both guns and butter. Their burden will depend both on their amount and how they are collected.

2. The more that Government purchases dominate the market, the more businessmen become, in effect, hired administrators of Government contracts. The free market is thus narrowed. As Government purchases rise, the power of Government to use uneconomic means to control production is increased. Carried far enough, the expansion in Government purchasing can destroy a free economy.

3. The pressure for direct controls to strengthen the military program is great. In wartime this pressure is overwhelming. The drafting of manpower and industry, the allocation of strategic materials, price and wage controls, and a host of other direct controls have become a necessary part of modern warfare. In war, the survival of the society takes precedence over immediate maintenance of a free economy. But, now, the question of direct controls is quite a different matter. The preservation of the free economy becomes an essential objective. The use of such powers for security or other reasons would reduce the area in which free market forces were able to operate and, carried far enough, will undermine the free economy.

Security bought at the cost of destroying our system of individual liberties or our free economy would be self-defeating.

3. An adequate and balanced security program is essential to freedom

Though our freedom is threatened by our security program it would be threatened even more gravely without it. Freedom cannot survive in today's world without reasonably adequate security.

An adequate security program obviously requires a large military establishment. But it must also include such nonmilitary weapons as diplomacy, world information, economic aid, and an effective intelligence service.

Diplomacy is, in a sense, our first line of security. Effective diplomacy can help in preventing war and can strengthen our position in case of war. It can help build up a network of understanding among all nations willing to act together for peaceful purposes. It can hinder the building up of hostile combinations of nations. It can enhance the authority of international organizations.

The program for supplying information to other peoples through the Voice of America and kindred activities is also a major instrument of national security. News about America is a corrective to the one-sided reports that distort the image of our country in the minds of the leaders as well as the peoples of so many areas of the world. It is a realistic influence for peace. It keeps hope alive among the oppressed.

Nondemocracies are likely to underestimate the strength of democracy. They seldom understand that the seeming disorder of democracy is not chaos but only a type of order that differs from a chain of command. The Kaiser and Hitler both erred by greatly underrating the strength and determination of the United States. We do not want such errors again.

Less formalized means of communication are equally important. The representatives of American business going abroad exercise a vital influence on the thinking of key individuals in foreign countries. American scholars abroad can do much to correct the distorted picture of America that some foreign leaders and peoples have formed. Foreign scholars and students who come here speak with an even more powerful voice when they return home as experts on the United States. The treatment of news by the American press services, radio commentators, and news films can have a profound impact upon our security position abroad.

The European recovery program also contributes to security. It speeds recovery and economic development abroad by increasing production, and reducing impediments to trade and so strengthens our allies. It can strengthen the will among our friends abroad to cooperate for peace and security. This will would be weakened if America existed as an island of prosperity in a poverty-ridden world.

An integrated and effective incoming intelligence service is a basic part of an adequate security program. An accurate appraisal of how our friends and potential enemies think and feel toward Americans and what they are doing about it is essential if we are to time our policies and production programs to the needs of every situation. We need to know of specific weapon developments in other nations and of the strategic disposition of military forces. Knowledge of impending attack may mean the difference between victory and defeat. An intelligence service, properly organized and staffed, can be equal in value to many ships, tanks, and planes.

In the working out of an adequate security program, the chain of civilian control has a dominant role to play. The military, whether Army, Navy, or Air, are specialists. They are trained to be responsible for military matters but not for the broad questions of security policy and other elements of national policy. Such broad questions are necessarily a civilian responsibility.

Even in military matters, civilian leadership can be important. In 1940, public opinion was ahead of the official military and administrative opinion as to the country's capacity to produce and use planes. Similarly, civilian pressure has been a primary force toward unification of the armed forces. An effective civilian control can offset any tendency for the military to prepare to fight a possible war III with the weapons and strategy of War II.

A satisfactory balance and timing must be maintained between the different parts of the security program and between this program and other national programs if it is to be effective and not a greater threat to freedom than is necessary. At the present time, there is reason to believe that our security program is neither efficient nor in balance. There are evidences of low efficiency and, despite the Unification Act of 1947 and the changes effected in the summer of 1949, the Nation's defense forces are characterized by deep-seated service rivalries, by widespread conflict over basic strategic concepts and weapons, and by an alleged low state of morale in one of the services.

Furthermore, a balance must be kept between the security program and programs serving other objectives of national policy. In particular, welfare programs compete with the security program for funds. Yet welfare programs can contribute to security by reducing inequities in our system that provide effective ammunition for hostile propaganda.

In the development of the security program, a fine quality of judgment is required at all levels. Recommendations need to be made by the executive branch after balanced consideration of all aspects of national policy. Our lawmakers must keep America solvent as to both ideals and resources. An informed public needs to remain alert to the dangers to both security and freedom.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS TOWARD IMPROVING OUR NATIONAL SECURITY AND PRESERVING OUR INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

There can be no simple solution to the problems of security and freedom. We must look to time and the wisdom of public discussion to find the answers. But public wisdom cannot be brought to bear if the chain of civilian control is ineffective, if the basis for informed discussion is lacking, or if policy is approached in a piecemeal fashion.

The recommendations which follow offer only one step toward bringing public discussion to bear on these continuing problems. They are concerned almost entirely with organization and procedure. Their aim is to strengthen the machinery by which adequate and balanced discussion of security policy and its relation to freedom can be carried out at all levels. It is our belief that these recommendations, if put into effect, will lead to a powerful strengthening of both freedom and security. At the same time we realize that there may be alternative methods of organization and procedure which would be equally effective toward this end. Our basic concern is that there be effective control and that this lead to a balanced over-all review of security policies in order to provide adequate national security while preserving our individual freedom.

Toward more effective exercise of civilian supremacy

The strengthening of civilian control requires action at each level to aid the President, the Congress, and the individual citizen in the exercise of their respective responsibilities.

At the Executive Level

To aid the President in developing a balanced policy with respect to security and freedom, we recommend:

(1) That the National Security Council be developed as the principal executive agency on which the President relies for formulating and reviewing comprehensive and balanced security policies.

(2) That there be added to the Council three full-time civilian members without other governmental responsibilities.

The suggestion has been made that a new civilian commission on security policy and freedom be set up as a means for strengthening civilian control. We do not recommend this more drastic step at the present time. Rather than experiment with an entirely new agency, we favor assigning a broader role to the National Security Council in the hope that this more moderate proposal will serve the end of adequate civilian control. The Council is already established. Since about the time of the Greek crisis in 1947 it has met regularly, perhaps averaging a meeting a week. The statute under which it operates is phrased broadly enough to allow the Council to advise on all phases of national security, including its impact on individual freedom.

The Security Council (in cooperation with the National Security Resources Board, the Bureau of the Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, and other appropriate agencies) should continuously take the long view of all of America's goals and commitments, our human and material resources, our rapidly changing technology, and the vital problem of timing. It should, on an objective basis, consider our security program with respect, for instance, to such basic and diverse questions as the utilization of island bases, new approaches to the stock piling of critical materials, the integration of foreign aid, lend-lease, and our own military program, the peacetime and wartime uses of atomic energy and other scientific developments, the impact of specific military programs upon our natural resources, the character of direct controls required, if any, and the general trends of our diplomacy. In addition to these examples of more obvious problems, the Council should concern itself with the psychological aspects of security, such as the reorientation of Germany and Japan with relation to democracy and the use of propaganda as a weapon. Finally, it should concern itself with the relation of all these security policies to the problem of freedom.

To help achieve a balanced and well-rounded security program, the three new full-time civilian members of the Council should be chosen for breadth of experience and outstanding judgment. They should be appointed by the President with the approval of the Senate and serve at the will of the President. They should have the standing of Cabinet officers and should attend Cabinet meetings at the discretion of the President. They should be kept free from all duties not directly related to the work of the Council. At present, the regular statutory members of the Council are already overburdened with great administrative responsibilities. The three additional members would be available for continuous top-level work on security problems.

One new member should become a general assistant to the Chairman. The other two members should be given special responsibility with respect to public information and individual liberties in addition to their regular duties. These responsibilities are indicated later in specific recommendations.

We further recommend:

3. That the role of the National Security Resources Board be clarified and developed.

4. That a full-time Chairman of the Board be promptly appointed.

The work of the National Security Resources Board is closely related to the overall responsibility of the National Security Council. The Chairman of the Board is a member of the Council and should bring to bear in the Council's deliberations the views of a Board and staff concerned with the relationship of security needs to the Nation's economy. Only a full-time Chairman can perform this vital function. It is imperative that the President clarify the role of the Board and appoint a full-time Chairman who can concentrate his energies on the economic phases of our security problems.

Clarification of the role of the Board will involve consideration of its relations with other agencies such as the Department of Defense, and of its planning duties with respect to industrial mobilization, economic warfare, and stock piling.

We further recommend:

5. That within the Department of Defense there be a strong civilian staff independent of control by the military services to aid in developing and evaluating defense policy.

As far as the military aspects of the security program are concerned, the chain of civilian supremacy has to start in the Department of Defense. In order for civilian control to be effective and to make its contribution, civilians have to be in touch with the work where it is being done. For the Secretary of Defense to perform his civilian role he needs a strong civilian staff in close touch with the various aspects of defense policy as they are worked out.

We believe that with these five changes the President could exercise much more effectively his responsibilities in the chain of civilian direction.

At the Congressional Level

To strengthen the hand of Congress in achieving a proper balance of security and freedom, the Congress should take positive steps to coordinate the various aspects of security policy. To this end we recommend:

1. That a Committee on National Security be established in each House of Congress, representing all committees of each House whose jurisdiction covers a significant part of the field.

2. That as far as possible these Committees on National Security act together in the manner of a joint committee.

There are two clearly appropriate ways by which the Congress could provide itself with the means for viewing the security program as a whole. One is to create a Joint Committee on National Security. The other is to create a separate committee in each House. Both methods have advantages and disadvantages. We believe that on the whole the advantage lies in having two separate committees, particularly if some of the advantages of a joint committee can be obtained through joint meetings of the two committees and close collaboration by their staffs.

Each House would, of course, decide on the proper membership of its Committee on National Security. Presumably each committee would include members representing the standing committees chiefly responsible for security, including those for Armed Services, Foreign Relations, and Appropriations. Standing committees having to do with other significant parts of the total security program, such as Agriculture, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Labor, and Banking and Currency should also be represented. This would assure direct acquaintance on the part of all the committees responsible for legislation on a significant part of the security program with the state of specific legislative proposals and the problems involved.

Adequate staffs would be essential for the successful operation of the Security Committees. They are needed to assemble and organize the material on the basis of which balanced policy can be made.

These securities committees would parallel at the Congressional level the activities of the National Security Council. They would be reviewing rather than hearing bodies. With the help of competent staffs, they should maintain a comprehensive and balanced picture of the security policies of the nation and their relation to freedom, enabling them to report to the other Members of Congress and to the public on the picture as a whole or on particular aspects as occasion arose. There should be close cooperation between the security committees of the two chambers, and with the National Security Council.

At the Public Level

To encourage and assist the citizens in exercising his responsibility for security policy, we recommend:

1. That one full-time civilian member of the National Security Council be made responsible for a more effective flow to the public of information relating to national security.

2. That the President devote a part of his annual message to the Congress and the public on the state of the Union to a discussion of the problems involved in the national security program and their relation to freedom.

3. That vigorous effort be made to stimulate discussion throughout the Nation on the problems of national security and their relation to freedom.

The assignment of one of the proposed full-time members of the National Security Council to be responsible for a more effective flow of information to the public would tend to counteract the present trend toward undue secrecy. This official should study all security regulations and recommend to the President changes designed to provide all possible access to information without sacrifice of basic security. He should examine the practical administration of security regulations with a view to creating an atmosphere favorable to legitimate disclosure. And he should constantly press for the release of information.

There is no more essential job to be done in America than to keep the sources of public opinion as free as possible from blind and obstacles. The naming of a full-time member of the National Security Council to devote himself to this task would be a fitting recognition of its importance.

It will be necessary to keep security regulations under continual study to make sure that the certain of secrecy is not drawn tighter than necessary. Some information must be withheld. But we believe that the regulations could be so drawn as to provide the citizen with much more information than he now receives.

More important than the letter of a regulation is the spirit in which it is administered. At present, there is one-sided emphasis upon the importance of secrecy in the indoctrination of officers, both military and nonmilitary. A Government official is rarely commended for disclosure. He may, however, be reprimanded or otherwise disciplined for "underclassification," that is, for failure to make material confidential or secret. Accumulations of overclassified material can be found in many offices. A better balance between secrecy and disclosure will give the citizen a sounder basis for checking responsibility, without impairing the administration of security. Among the administrative practices to which attention needs to be paid is the custom of leaving classification in the hands of subordinates, especially clerks or secretaries. The resulting resistance to disclosure can be overcome only if there is positive pressure to release information.

The annual state of the Union message of the President has been throughout our history a vital means of providing Congress and the public with an over-all view of national policies and problems. Since it seems probable that the security-freedom problem will be a paramount issue for many years, it would be desirable that the President devote an important section of this message to the status of our security policies and their relation to freedom. This section could be based upon reports from the National Security Council and should be a comprehensive review of our security position and policies.

There is constant need for more intensive public discussion of the problems of security and freedom. Public opinion is not as effective as it should be so long as it depends largely on random exposure to news and comment. Unless there is a comprehensive framework of discussion, the public will be confused.

Various means are available for stimulating public discussion of security issues. Congressional hearings can act as a stimulus. The President's message on national security would provide a basis for discussion. News editors should invite discussion and radio time should be allocated to this purpose. Special forums throughout the Nation should be sponsored by universities, civic associations, and other groups of citizens. These activities should aim to clarify the gain of national security policy and their relation to freedom, to review current trends affecting security and freedom, and to evaluate pending alternatives of policy.

Toward preserving our system of individual liberties

To strengthen the forces which operate to preserve our individual liberties, we recommend:

1. That one full-time civilian member of the National Security Council be made responsible for reviewing the effect of security measures on individual liberties and advising the President thereon.

2. That the section of the President's annual state of the union message devoted to the national security program (recommended above) include a review of the relation of the security program to individual liberties.

3. That the National Security Council, in reviewing the security program, give particular attention to the danger of undermining the free economy.

The preservation of individual liberties must rest primarily on an alert public opinion. By having a full-time civilian member of the National Security Council responsible for analyzing the effects of security policies and measures on our liberties the danger of unnecessary limitations on liberty can be reduced. These analyses can also provide the basis for the presidential review of the subject. Such periodic reports on the effects of the security program on liberties could greatly aid the public in exercising its responsibility for preserving liberty.

In appraising the threats of the security programs to the free economy, the National Security Council should give particular attention to the magnitude of the program both because of the resources it absorbs and the harmful effect on incentives which results from the heavy taxation necessary to support it. The Council should also give attention to the existing procurement machinery with the object of reducing to a minimum the danger of Government coercion of private business through contract controls and the danger of coercion of individuals through job assignments and similar restrictions. Finally, the Council should maintain a strong presumption against the use of direct controls to carry out a security program in a situation short of war, since direct controls tend to limit production, hold down the standard of living, and undermine the free economy on which so many of our freedoms depend.

Toward a more balanced and efficient security program

The recommendations made for preserving our freedom will also help to produce better balance and reduce waste in the security program. In particular, strengthening the Executive through broadening the role of the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board, strengthening the Congress through the establishment of committees on national security, and strengthening the citizen in exercising his responsibilities will all help the development of effective security. Measures for preserving our individual liberties and for preserving incentives and maintaining freedom of markets can also contribute to security.

In addition, we recommend that both the executive and legislative branches of the Government conduct a continuing review of the security program to see—

1. That waste and inefficiency in security expenditure is kept at a minimum;

2. That the security program itself is kept in internal balance, both as among the various types of military expenditure, and as between military and other forms of security expenditure;

3. That measures to further the security objectives and measures to further other important objectives of national policy are kept in balance. An over-all review of all national policies, their timing and their economic cost is needed to appraise their effects on both security and freedom.

The committee believes that such a review is especially needed because, in its opinion, the present security program tends to be unbalanced, it tends to overemphasize the military at the expense of nonmilitary measures. An informed diplomatic service, a strengthened Voice of America and a more effective intelligence system would cost relatively little compared to military arms. Their contribution to security could be many times that of an equal expenditure. We believe that the desirability of expanding each of these activities should be given careful attention.

We also urge an effective foreign economic-assistance program. Economic assistance is not a cure-all or save-all; it can only be a means of helping other nations to help themselves. A failure of the economies of our potential allies would weaken our security.

Further, it is our opinion that the present security program has been developed with too little attention to its consequences upon other national objectives. We believe this to be true not only with regard to the objective of preserving and strengthening our free society, but also the objectives of increasing productivity and living standards and providing greater opportunities for all our people.

Better coordination of the separate aspects of security policy is needed. In particular, there needs to be a close integration between military policy and foreign policy.

The question of timing becomes tremendously important. We must not crystallize our weapons program lest we waste resources in weapons that become obsolete. The cold war is a matter of continually recurring crises. Scares will be frequent. It will take a fine judgment to use and retain the powerful assets and resources of America. Timing is a part of the balance.

The attainment of a balanced and efficient security program requires thoughtful, continuing attention by the President, by the Congress, and by all citizens. Given such attention, we believe that an adequate security program can be developed which will be consistent with a strengthened chain of civilian control, with the maintenance of our system of individual liberties and with the preservation of our free economy.

Vigilance is the price of freedom

In the last analysis, the economic strength and the freedom and security of this country rest on the moral and spiritual vigor of its people. The prestige and friendship we enjoy in many parts of the world arise not merely because of our power but because we have offered the world a unique brand of idealism—the determination to base our political organization on the capacity of individuals for self-government.

By holding to the principle of self-government, we give dignity to the individual and, at the same time, we place on him great responsibility. We are dedicated to the idea that individuals should have maximum opportunity to realize their individual capacities—spiritually, intellectually, and materially. But equally we rely on individuals to exercise the powers of self-government in a responsible fashion. A free society can be preserved only by responsible citizenship.

Under this system, we have fared well as a people. More of our people have enjoyed more freedom and greater material benefits than have the people of any other land. We have developed a nation of self-reliant individuals.

Now the new requirements of national security threaten our freedom. A major security program requires big Government and means greater interference in the lives of us all. The danger is likely to be with us a long time. We must, therefore, have a security program that is continuously in balance, both internally and with other Government programs. It must be efficiently administered and must avoid waste in the use of limited national resources. We must maintain our dynamic free economy and we must insure the flow of information to the public necessary to the operation of democratic government. We regard the recommendations we have made above as likely to contribute to these ends. But improvements in governmental organization and procedure are not, of themselves, sufficient. Only an alert and responsible citizenry can insure that adequate security is obtained without the loss of essential freedoms. We are confident that the American people can and will solve this problem.

RESEARCH AND POLICY COMMITTEE OF THE CED

Marion B. Folsom, chairman; treasurer, Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y.

Beardsley Ruml, vice chairman, New York, N. Y.

William Benton, chairman of the board, Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., and Muzak Corp., New York, N. Y.

John D. Biggers, president, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., Toledo, Ohio.

James F. Brownlee, Fairfield, Conn.

W. L. Clayton, chairman of the board, Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston, Tex.

S. Sloan Colt, president, Bankers Trust Co., New York, N. Y.

Gardner Cowles, president and publisher, Des Moines Register and Tribune, Des Moines, Iowa.

Chester C. Davis, president, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo.

Clarence Francis, chairman of the board, General Foods Corp., New York, N. Y.

Philip L. Graham, president and publisher, Washington Post, Washington, D. C.

John M. Hancock, partner, Lehman Bros., New York, N. Y.

George L. Harrison, chairman of the board, New York Life Insurance Co., New York, N. Y.

Robert Heller, president, Robert Heller & Associates, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

Jay C. Hormel, chairman of the board, Geo. A. Hormel & Co., Austin, Minn.

Amory Houghton, chairman of the board, Corning Glass Works, Corning, N. Y.

Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., Washington, D. C.

Ernest Kanzler, chairman of the board, Universal C. I. T. Credit Corp., Detroit, Mich.

Meyer Kestnbaum, president, Hart, Schaffner & Marx, Chicago, Ill.

Fred Lazarus, Jr., president, Federated Department Stores, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio.

Fowler McCormick, chairman of the board, International Harvester Co., Chicago, Ill.

W. A. Patterson, president, United Air Lines, Chicago, Ill.

Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board, General Electric Co., New York, N. Y.

Harry Scherman, president, Book-of-the-Month Club, New York, N. Y.

H. Christian Sonne, president, Amsinck, Sonne & Co., New York, N. Y.

J. Cameron Thomson, president, Northwest Bank Corporation, Minneapolis, Minn.

W. Walter Williams, president, Continental, Inc., Seattle, Wash.

Theodore O. Yntema, vice president in charge of finance, Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

Where Your Money Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the Christmas season is supposedly over, but an editorial that appeared in the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of December 26, 1949, points up some thoughts about Santa Claus, especially how he, dressed in the garment of a beneficent government, is able to make presents to other sections of our great country from the contributions of my constituents in the Constitution State.

The editorial is as follows:

WHERE YOUR MONEY GOES

The Public Administration Clearing House is currently making a study of Federal grants. Some of these findings are worth putting in your hat for future reference, particularly if you are one of those who believe that Uncle Sam is Santa Claus. Connecticut is contributing about $40 for every dollar it gets back from the Federal Government. Although it stands forty-fourth on the list for the total amount of Federal money returned, it stands fourth in the amount of money being siphoned from your pockets and the treasuries of Connecticut industries.

In 1947, for example, Connecticut paid $216,000,000 in Federal taxes. It got back a scant $5,023,000, far less even than the national average of $6,004,000. To add insult to injury, many of the States that are benefiting by this policy of robbing Peter to pay Paul, are offering all kinds of inducements to get Connecticut industries to move to a friendlier tax climate. Nor is the money being used in so-called poor States. Texas is an example, and a good one, because several thousand Connecticut jobs recently were transferred to that State. Although Texas paid a scant $96,000,000 in taxes, the twenty-eighth in order, it received in Federal benefits more than twice the amount Connecticut received. Oklahoma is another example. It placed second in grants received, four times that given Connecticut, but stood thirty-fifth in taxes paid.

North and South Carolina have been active in promoting the exodus of New England industries and both profited by this share-the-wealth program. For example, although South Carolina stood forty-sixth in taxes paid to the Federal Government, grants received were $8,067,000, or $3,000,000 more than Connecticut received.

As the Public Administration authorities point out quietly, "New York and Connecticut rank very low in per capita grants. This would indicate that grants are distributed so as to give the greatest benefit to the low-income States."

That may be a good idea. But for any politician in Connecticut to suggest that the Federal Government is helping Connecticut by these grants is sheer idiocy. The Federal Government is taking $40 away from Connecticut for every $1 it returns.

The demagog may weep crocodile tears over the plight of the unemployed and may seek to put on a poultice of liberalized unemployment benefits. Real statesmanship would look toward the causes which create a special emergency of unemployment during a time of great national prosperity. If such emergencies occur during prosperous times what have Connecticut citizens to look forward to in bad times? Certainly nothing very cheerful when State and Federal policies cause the atrophy of jobs and the exodus of industry to friendlier climates that are being subsidized by Connecticut taxes. Do you still believe in Santa Claus?

Income-Tax Allowance Plan for National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement by Mr. Sol M. Linowitz urging the passage of legislation to provide an income-tax allowance for the cost of health insurance as an alternative to the administration's program of political medicine. Its stress is upon inducement rather than compulsion, similar to that envisioned in H. R. 6727, which I introduced last week.

Mr. Linowitz, a prominent and able attorney of Rochester, N. Y., has done a great amount of pioneer work in this field. His research, his soundness, and his ability commend his views to careful study and favorable consideration.

A portion of his statement follows:

INCOME-TAX-ALLOWANCE PLAN FOR NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

The compulsory health-insurance program was formulated on the assumption that such a program would make available to most of the people necessary medical and hospital care as required. Its proponents maintain that voluntary plans have failed to do the job and give little promise of achieving the desired broad coverage in the future. The opponents of the program object primarily to its compulsory feature, claiming that the introduction of a Government-controlled medical system will drastically and detrimentally affect medical care and the doctor-patient relationship. They contend also that the cost of establishing and maintaining such a program will be exceedingly great and that only through some voluntary method can the problem be handled properly and in the best interests of all concerned.

Both factions appear to agree on the following:

1. The state of health of the country needs improvement, and Nation-wide prepaid medical and hospital insurance can go far to remedy this situation.

2. The primary aim of any health-insurance program adopted should be to assure adequate medical and hospital care for as many as possible.

3. The problem of the shortage of doctors, nurses, dentists, and hospitals involves a separate program of legislation and must be handled in such manner as will make available to the Nation medical facilities and services where and when required.

4. Medical care for a sizable number of people—the unemployed, the indigent, and the medically indigent—will, under any plan, have to be provided for by public funds, such as Federal grants-in-aid to the States.

The issues, therefore, can apparently be resolved in a manner acceptable to all if a program is adopted which will be voluntary in character yet lead to substantially Nation-wide insurance coverage against costs of medical and hospital care. My suggestion early this year regarding an income-tax allowance was designed to accomplish this objective. The following questions and answers may be helpful in evaluating the proposal:

1. WHAT IS THE PLAN?

The Government would provide that every person who insures himself and his dependents against the cost of medical (including hospital) care under an approved plan with a commercial or noncommercial group may claim a special and separate tax allowance (or credit) for the cost of such insurance. In other words, all taxpayers would be entitled to a tax benefit upon obtaining an approved plan of insurance affording requisite protection against medical costs. Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and other existing commercial or noncommercial groups would make such insurance available through the country. In addition, each community or group would be free to institute programs best designed to meet its own requirements. In some areas, the State itself might seek to offer such insurance to its citizens.

The object of the proposal is to induce rather than compel health insurance. Its essential value is that, by building upon established groups and practices, it offers a voluntary plan, adaptable to particular needs and free of Federal control, which would lead the average taxpayer to obtain health insurance. Furthermore, the millions of State and local employees and railroad workers not covered by the compulsory program would be eligible for coverage under this plan.

II. SHOULD THE INCOME TAX YIELD BE USED FOR THIS PURPOSE?

The Federal Government has long recognized the propriety and desirability of using the income-tax field to foster a governmental social purpose. The special tax exemptions for the blind and the aged and the deductions for charitable contributions and extraordinary medical expenses are illustrative. In New York State the allowable tax deduction up to $150 for life-insurance premiums reflects the same philosophy. With reference to the instant proposal, the present income-tax regulations have already taken the first step in this direction by permitting the inclusion of health insurance cost in computing the right to an allowance for extraordinary medical expenses.

III. HOW WOULD THE PLAN BE IMPLEMENTED?

The most effective method for implementing such a proposal would be to allow a special tax credit to all taxpayers for a designated portion of the cost of an approved type of health insurance. Such a credit or allowance could properly vary in the different tax brackets, making the greatest allowance—and therefore offering the greatest inducement—to those in the lowest income classes. The precise nature and size of the tax allowance and the particular method of implementation will necessarily be determined by those charged with framing the required legislation.

IV. HOW MUCH WILL SUCH A PROGRAM COST?

The exact cost to the Government in lost taxes will depend on a number of factors, many of them under the control of the Government itself in setting up the program. For example, the type and size of the tax allowance offered will have tremendous bearing on this question. In addition, much will depend upon the effectiveness of the program in leading taxpayers to obtain health insurance since premiums will be directly affected by the number of people covered.

In this regard, it is important to recognize that the cost to wage earners of the compulsory insurance plan will be at least $5,000,000,000 per year. Moreover, the Government itself will admittedly be required to pay additional billions in order to make the plan effective and to administer it on a Nation-wide scale. The income-tax-allowance plan would make unnecessary any such costly Federal regulatory or administrative body.

Under any circumstances, therefore, implementation of the income-tax-allowance plan here proposed could be accomplished at substantially less cost than that involved in implementing and administering the compulsory-insurance program.

Letter on Behalf of International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL, RADIO AND MACHINE WORKERS,
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1950.

Hon. WILLIAM J. GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GREEN: I am addressing this letter to you on behalf of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, CIO, a labor organization which was chartered by the CIO last November 2, following expulsion of the Communist-dominated United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers.

We wish to bring to your attention an exceedingly ominous situation in our industry which we believe not only menaces democratic American trade unionism, but also involves grave questions of national security and welfare.

The IUE-CIO is now engaged in a crucial Nation-wide contest with the UE over the right to represent more than a half-million men and women in our industry. Sometime in the near future that contest will culminate in a series of representation elections conducted by the National Labor Relations Board.

We of the IUE-CIO have bent every effort toward the earliest possible settlement of this representation question through NLRB elections, because: (1) We are confident that we represent the overwhelming majority of workers in the electrical, radio, and machine industry; and (2) we are anxious that industrial stability be restored in this important field of production through the establishment of sound collective bargaining relations.

There have, however, been numerous obstacles placed in the way of a swift and amicable settlement of the representation issue. Most of these obstacles have been erected by UE in a deliberate and vicious campaign to postpone—and even prevent, if possible—the holding of elections. And in this campaign, as we shall show, certain sections of management, particularly the General Electric Co., have given active assistance to the discredited Communist-led minority represented by UE.

It would require a small volume to describe to you the insidious legal maneuverings and harassments employed by UE to block resolution of the representation question. In almost every city in the country where the electrical, radio, and machine industry is organized, UE has filed law suits, petitions for injunction and other court actions to prevent the membership from making their own democratic determination of their collective-bargaining agent. Suits to tie up union funds, suits to prevent use of our union's name, suits to prohibit union meetings, suits to force solvent local unions into bankruptcy—all have been commonplace. The deluge of disruptive judicial jockeying has spared no one; even the NLRB itself was sued for $100,000 by UE. Here again we claim that the position taken by management in this dispute has abetted and encouraged the UE in its prolonged legal wrangling.

We would like to emphasize as strongly as we can that this is definitely not a common jurisdictional squabble between two labor groups. This is a fundamental fight—which has long since passed from the cold-war to the hot-war stage—between two diametrically opposed concepts that affect the entire United States labor movement and, through it, our entire economy. It is a fight to the finish between democratic American trade unionism and the attempts of the Kremlin to preserve the UE as a mass base for the expression of Soviet foreign policy in this country. It is a fight, in one of the Nation's most critical industries, between loyalty to traditional American ideals and the menace to national security represented in a type of union leadership whose only loyalty is to a totalitarian foreign power. It is for these reasons that we have become increasingly apprehensive over the role that management is playing in offering aid and comfort to these implacable enemies of American liberties.

That the UE is Communist-led and Communist-dominated and that under this leadership it represents a direct threat to our national security has been recognized time and again by congressional committees and the Atomic Energy Commission among others. The accumulative evidence is overwhelming that in this "sensitive" industry, UE's leadership is more than 90 percent Communist or pro-Communist. The irrefutable truth of this was attested by the Atomic Energy Commission when it completely outlawed the UE as collective-bargaining representative for any workers employed on classified or secret atomic energy projects.

A subcommittee of the House Labor Committee, headed by Representative Charles J. Kersten, made a report on December 14, 1948, following an intensive investigation into UE. The report, which recommended contempt citations against 15 UE leaders including Leo Jandreau, the top Communist leader of UE in Schenectady and upstate New York, proposed several measures for tightening security regulations, all of which were clearly aimed at the threat to national safety represented by UE. The subcommittee declared that Communists have seized control of the UE's "national office, the executive board, the paid staff, the union newspaper and a number of its districts and locals."

Further, the subcommittee concluded: "The hold of the Communists on America's electrical industry is the hold of Communist Russia. It is communism in action—now. It is not a historical danger; it is a present danger."

This evidence of UE's flagrant subservience to Communist Party dictates and Kremlin control has, as I say, been documented repeatedly by other congressional and noncongressional groups. Consequently this information has been fully available to the employers in our industry such as General Electric.

Therefore, at no time could General Electric plead ignorance of the subversive character of the organization with which it was bargaining.

In my testimony before the Kersten subcommittee on September 2, 1948, I charged under oath that management in the electrical, radio, and machine industry has been guilty of aiding the Communist forces and discriminating against the anti-Communist elements among rank-and-file employees. I emphasized that "It has been my whole experience that the employers find it easy to get along with Communists because the Communists cannot be aggressive in adjustment of a grievance." In addition, I pointed out—giving the names of individuals—that in some instances management has even discharged known anti-Communists from their jobs at the behest of UE.

In the face of such evidence presented to the subcommittee, Congressman Kersten, not once, but twice, declared that the collusive arrangements between management and the Communist-controlled UE should be investigated.

At one point Congressman Kersten asserted, "Certainly if it is true that any management is so stupid as to cooperate with Communists, the light of day should be thrown on that situation as well as on any other situation where people are cooperating with the Communists. If there is cooperation on the management side, that should be brought out, too. I can see where it is probably even more dangerous where there is cooperation between management and the Communists."

On the same theme, Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS, who is still a member of the House Labor Committee, remarked, "I think the industry should be called upon to explain that type of action within their own industry, regardless of what it may be, if they are following procedures of that kind." Other members of the committee expressed similar sentiments.

I cite these facts for the reason that although these hearings were held in September and October 1948, there has been no move of any kind to investigate charges of

collusion between management and the totalitarian left. We in IUE-CIO believe it is a fine thing, and important, for Congress to be concerned about the Communist occupation of China and Formosa, about the containment of Soviet expansion in Europe, and the necessity of spending billions of dollars in Marshall plan funds to repel the threat of spreading bolshevism. But we also believe that Congress could wisely turn its eyes homeward toward the even greater danger constituted by opportunistic management collaborating with the Communists. It is the clear and immediate duty of Congress to investigate these charges; to ascertain, for example, whether management's patronage of Communist-controlled unions is dictated in any way by advantageous contracts the companies may hold with Amtorg, the Soviet trade agency. National security demands that the whole field of this question be publicly explored and exposed.

In this period of cold war with the world threatened by a new totalitarian wave, there can be no such thing as neutrality, particularly on the part of giant corporations whose functioning determines both the peacetime health and wartime strength of our economy. Yet management, General Electric conspicuously, pretends to a position of impartiality in this struggle which is concretely reflected in the current dispute in its plants between IUE and UE.

There is ample evidence that GE's impartiality is not only a pose and a pretense but that it also disguises a definite pattern of collusion with the Communist UE. Let me offer just one example, a very recent one.

Last week, while IUE was preparing its campaign for the forthcoming NLRB elections in General Electric, more than 10,000 dues check-off cards were circulated through the vast GE plant in Schenectady, N. Y. The circulation and signing of several thousands of these cards was accomplished by UE within the space of a single day. We know that such an enormous undertaking as this could never have been accomplished without flagrant, illegal collusion between GE and UE, between foremen and other management representatives and leaders of the Communist minority of UE. We know that men were threatened with loss of their jobs, told that they would lose precious seniority, and deceived with the argument that by signing the cards the workers would only be speeding up the date of the NLRB elections. Foremen and other management representatives facilitated the distribution of these cards and actively promoted the threats and lies circulated by the UE representatives.

Such seemingly eccentric behavior by management becomes much more understandable when it is viewed against the background of the company's policies in the past. L. M. Boulware, GE's vice president in charge of labor relations, has for example, inserted full-page ads in daily newspapers titled "A Plague On Both Your Houses." This truly amazing statement by a major American corporation professed to find no difference between democratic American unionism and the revolutionary arm of the Kremlin in the United States which is dedicated to the overthrow of our form of government.

These advertisements, read by millions of Americans, expressed as GE's opinion:

"While frequently the leader and his associates on one side are termed left-wingers, and the leader and his associates are—wrongfully in our opinion, regarded as right wingers, we believe they have in the end the same objectives. We believe that what each side advocates would result in the long run in substantially the same thing for our employees, our company, and our country. In our opinion, whether they realize it or not, both are collectivists—believers in government being big and in people being little."

GE's attitude toward communistic control of its employees in wartime was disclosed when GE President Charles E. Wilson remarked during a session of the War Labor Board, "Matles and Emspak may be Communists but they are very easy to work with. It's just like having a company union and having the workers pay for it."

Time and again it has been indicated that GE would like to see the left and the right destroy each other or else bleed each other to such a point of weakness that collective bargaining would be reduced to the level of company unionism.

When we learned last week of GE's complicity with the Communist-led UE in the circulation of the 10,000 check-off cards through the Schenectady plant, we promptly sent the following telegram to GE President Wilson:

"The International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, CIO, has learned that General Electric Company has entered into a collusive deal with Leo Jandreau of Local 301, UE, at Schenectady, N. Y., under which that local would be paid over check-off monies in return for turning in new signed check-off cards.

"This was done right in the plants, with UE working with the aid and abettance of management.

"This came at a time when an application for an election was pending with the National Labor Relations Board and at a time when GE has a suit pending in the Federal court of New York covering the Schenectady plant seeking a determination as to whether the dues should go to IUE-CIO or to the UE, and when GE has been proclaiming that it is impartial.

"This action by GE is a clear act of favoritism and a flagrant violation of the law. Such violation can be cleared only if GE extends the same privilege to IUE.

"Will GE agree to provide IUE-CIO with the same consideration in similar situations as with UE in Schenectady regarding the check-off or is this agreement confined to financing the Communist-controlled UE 301?

"We demand an explanation and an answer."

As of this date we have received no reply. If and when we do receive a reply we will be glad to forward a copy to you for your information. Possibly, however, you may wish to obtain a direct answer from General Electric to our charges of favoritism and violation of the law on behalf of UE-CP.

No objective observer of the labor scene in America today can escape the compelling fact that it is to management's temporary advantage to deal with Communist-led unions. Because they are the objects of public antipathy, because they have lost irretrievable ground numerically and financially, Communist "union leaders" today are willing to make any sort of deal, any sort of concessions to maintain their dwindling power over sections of American labor. We are prepared to show the extent to which management has found this situation immensely to its liking because the contracts it has been able to impose are frequently spineless and regressive. In some instances Communist "union leaders," to the intense satisfaction of management, have agreed to accept wage cuts for their members. But in nearly every case pay raises, pension plans, and other contract improvements have been measurably weaker where the union has had Communist leadership. An instance in point is UE's negotiations with General Electric over the entire year of 1949. UE's absurdly vague proposal of a "$500 package" increase, unprecedented in the history of American labor's contract demands, was borne out of the weakness, confusion, and disunity that has corrupted UE's strength in recent years. Management, of course, has simply laughed at the "$500 package" idea, and as a result workers in the electrical, radio, and machine industry have gone without any wage increase, pension plan, or other benefits while hundreds of thousands of auto and steel-workers have won new and precedent-setting contract improvements.

When these facts are considered coolly and calmly, it can surprise none that GE publicly proclaims a policy of "plague on both your houses." It is to GE's very substantial advantage to give surreptitious aid to the Communist-led minority, to facilitate the circulation of dues check-off cards, and to compound the confusion of representation as much as possible.

But we in IUE-CIO hold the conviction that the masters of great corporate wealth and power in this country have a sacred responsibility to the American people and to American democratic principles. They must not be permitted, for purposes of financial expediency, to assume a fake pose of "impartiality" to cloak a policy which nourishes a fifth column in America.

The Nation has been exceedingly generous to the managers of this industry. Their profits have been enormous, their return on investments huge. They have benefited greatly by large tax rebates and through cost-plus contracts during the war. In numerous instances where companies, such as General Electric, have been found guilty of international cartel conspiracies or violation of the Sherman anti-trust law, they have escaped with astonishingly light penalties.

General Electric, for example, increased its net profits from $40,900,000 in 1939 to $131,600,000 in 1948, an increase of 222 percent. Profits after taxes rose from 8.5 percent in 1943 to 8.7 percent in 1946, to 7.8 percent in 1947, and 8.1 percent in 1948. GE's annual dividend rate of $1.40 per share in 1945 jumped to $2 in the third quarter of 1948 and to $2.50 in the fourth quarter of 1949. All other financial statistics involving this company provide proof of GE's growing power and profitability.

These facts offer additional reasons why GE's employees and the American public have a right to expect a degree of responsibility and devotion to democratic ideals that is not reflected in the company's policy of cooperation with a totalitarian "labor" organization.

It has long been established that UE's leaders are interested only in the proposition of proving that democracy cannot work. If in that undertaking they are given haven and sustenance by General Electric and other companies, the crime is an outrageous offense against American principles and national security.

For our part, we in IUE-CIO are wholly convinced that the employees of General Electric and the rest of the industry do not want to remain in a Communist-led union. Within the short space of 2½ months, more than 240,000 workers in the electrical, radio, and machine industry have given their blunt answer to the Communist control of UE by taking membership in 150 chartered local unions of the IUE-CIO. The UE will not win the right to represent the GE workers in Schenectady or in any other plant through default by the IUE. To retain control over the economic lives of thousands of workers in this industry, the Communists need the support of inaction or reaction on the part of management.

For these and other reasons we strongly urge you to propose an immediate investigation by the proper committee of Congress into the activities and policies of some sections of industrial management in providing collusive support and encouragement to totalitarian and anti-democratic elements that have infiltrated into American trade unionism.

We cannot, of course, speak for GE or other corporations. We ask for your assistance in requiring them to speak for themselves on this grave question.

Please accept our assurance that the IUE-CIO, its leaders and representatives will give the utmost cooperation to any congressional inquiry into this question, and will gladly

make available the experience accumulated over many years of painful experience with this problem.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. CHEEK,
Chairman, Administrative Committee.

Who's Isolationist Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Santa Monica (Calif.) Evening Outlook:

WHO'S ISOLATIONIST NOW?

Former President Herbert Hoover has joined Senator ROBERT TAFT in proposing that the United States do everything possible, including sending naval aid if necessary, to keep the Chinese Communists from seizing Formosa and other strategic islands off the China coast. "It is my strong belief," he wrote Senator KNOWLAND, "that we should not recognize the Communist government of China; that we must continue to recognize and support the Nationalist Government; that we should, if necessary, give it naval protection to the possession of Formosa, the Pescadores and possibly Hainan Islands."

Listing seven reasons why the United States must strengthen its China policy and help Chiang, Mr. Hoover said it is necessary to build a Pacific wall against communism, defend Japan and the Philippines, prevent Communist China from gaining a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council and from participating in drafting a Japanese peace treaty, and that the United States would have a better chance of saving the southeastern area of Asia from communism if it maintains at least a symbol of resistance.

Every one of these points has irrefutable logic behind it, and together they make what seems to us an overwhelming argument for a strong American policy in the Far East. The arguments of the other side are chiefly two: (1) That it is too late for us to aid the Chinese leader who has already lost China; and (2) that such a policy might embroil us in a shooting war with the Chinese Reds, which is sure sight because world war III.

Has anyone noticed how remarkably similar these do-nothing arguments are to those which were made by American isolationists of 1940 and 1941? Then it was a question of our giving aid to Britain after Hitler had gained control of the European continent; many believed that Britain was doomed to defeat, that American aid would be useless, and would only involve us in war with Hitler. As it turned out, we went to war, not because of our aid to Britain, but because the Japanese war lords made the stupid blunder of blasting us in. There is no exact parallel, because in 1940 most of the world was at war, while today both Russia and the western world want to keep the peace. But it is at least suggestive to note that the same defeatist arguments that were used against mere aid to Britain are now being made against our doing anything to save Formosa, and by people who formerly denounced isolationism.

We were against isolationism and defeatism in 1940, and we are against them today. If it had listened to such counsels in 1940, the United States would have lost World War II and would have been left to the mercy of Hitler and the Japanese war lords. Had it listened to such counsels in 1948, there would have been no Marshall plan and no Berlin air lift, and Russia today would be master of Europe. We do not believe that it is too late today, if the United States stops being weak and defeatist about China, to stop communism from taking over Formosa and southeastern Asia. And we emphatically do not believe that such action would lead to world war III.

United States Deserts China, as France and Britain Abandoned Czechs in 1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer, published January 6, 1950:

UNITED STATES DESERTS CHINA, AS FRANCE AND BRITAIN ABANDONED CZECHS IN 1938

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The American administration's apparent refusal to save Formosa from the Chinese Communists and Moscow resembles nothing so much as Britain and France's abandonment of Czechoslovakia in 1938. Five years after victory over the Axis, the United States has adopted the policy of appeasement.

Defenders of the do-nothing policy that is giving Asia to Stalin use the same arguments that Neville Chamberlain and Edouard Daladier used as excuses for bowing the neck to Hitler. At that time, British, French, and American pacifists took their policy from the Nazis.

The Americans, unfortunately, paced by the British, are taking their policy from the Communists. This policy—for 1949—as sent out by the American Communist Party—consisted of three points:

1. End aid to Nationalist China.
2. Prepare for the recognition of Communist China by the United States Government.
3. Reestablish trade with Communist China.

All three are likely to be accepted by the United States within the near future.

HISTORY REPEATS

In 1938 British and French appeasers argued that the Slavic Czechs mistreated the German Sudetens—and proceeded to hand the latter over to a regime that mistreated everybody.

Now it is the Chinese Nationalist Government that, by mistreating the Chinese people, justified Moscow in taking them over.

Then the appeasers argued that Britain and France lacked the military power to defend Czechoslovakia. Now the same sort of people insist that the "Asiatic mainland is outside the limits of effective military power." (But 1 year later, Britain and France went to war under more adverse circumstances when they finally understood that they had to fight to save themselves.) As matters are now going it will not be many years before the United States may be fighting a terrible rear guard action without any of the Asiatic peoples that we shall have meanwhile abandoned.

In 1938 Chamberlain and Bonnet said that the Sudetens were not worth fighting for. (And a year later, these people were at war for something much smaller, the city of Danzig.)

PACIFIST BED FELLOWS

Now the pacifists and pro-Communists are repeating that Formosa (or Indochina, or Tibet, or Burma, or even India, I suppose) is not worth fighting about.

They are trying to convince us that it is too late to save China, too late to save Formosa, too late to save Asia.

I say it is not. Ex-President Hoover is quite right in urging us to erect a wall against communism.

Again the appeasers protest. The neighbors of China do not want to resist, they say. These states want to negotiate, not to fight. In Asia the United States should defer to Thailand and Burma and come to terms with Communist Mao Tse-tung. If we try to defend Asia with our forces, then Prime Minister Nehru, of India, who has already recognized Communist China, will not like it. Pandit Nehru, another source informs us, is convinced that if we are nice to Mao, he will perhaps consent to play with us and not waste all his cookies on the Russians.

Moreover—the appeasers continue—our European friends do not want to resist in Asia. For us to attempt to use the aid we are giving them to induce them to accept our policy would be most wicked. Etc., etc.

OUR POTENTIAL GREAT

The facts are different. The United States has the means to provide a military force incomparably larger than the one we keep in being now. We can fight, if we have to, anywhere in the world. Some of the countries of southeastern Asia, beginning with the Philippines, want nothing better than to be protected by the United States. If the Government of India has another policy, then the United States should bid that country follow its own line with our blessing. But without us and without our money.

France, our second biggest ally in Europe, has, for the last 3 years, been asking for a common Franco-Britanno-American policy to prevent the further spread of communism.

In other words, a policy that will stop Russia in Asia just as it has been stopped in Europe is possible. We shall have the allies once we start to show both the means and the will.

But before we can get very far with any such salvage, two things are necessary: we shall have to begin to think primarily in terms of the vital interests of the United States; we shall have to exclude from policy making all those Americans, misguided or worse, whose pro-Communist sympathies or errors got us into the present plight.

Foreign Trade Agreements Being Made by the New Deal Are Proving Disastrous to Many American Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of some of our administration leaders to persuade the public to "buy abroad" is forcing labor and management in many industries in the United States to join together in the common cause of keeping alive.

Imports are increasing and exports decreasing. Employment keeps dropping

off as a result of the old New Deal doctrine that some industries should be sacrificed for the benefit of others.

Tomorrow there will be a big meeting here in Washington, participated in by labor and management on an equal basis, to discuss methods of meeting this challenge. The industries to be represented are important—they are especially important to the communities in which they operate. More than 50 top-ranking representatives of both labor and management in each of the industries participating will meet together to discuss this serious problem.

The industries to be represented produce pottery and glassware, matches, cedar shingles, fish and sea-food products, scientific instruments, leather and wool gloves, hats and millinery, hothouse vegetables, aluminum products, and kaolin. A number of other industries have expressed great interest, and other similar meetings will probably follow.

The public notices of this meeting contain some very pertinent information. Two of these are as follows:

[Press release for publication Thursday morning, December 15]

Alarmed at the prospect of increasingly heavy competition from European and other sources as a result of the ECA import program and the State Department's recent announcement of a third round of tariff cuts in 1950, a joint group of representatives of both labor and management in some 10 industries will meet in Washington, D. C., the 17th of January to map plans of defense.

The meeting was initiated by a group of AFL unions that are members of America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, of which Matthew Woll, who is also second vice president of the AFL, is president. Among the industries that will participate are pottery and glassware, fisheries, hats and millinery, scientific instruments, jewelry, matches, and wallpaper.

Pointing out that these groups are representative of the miscellaneous industries in this country that will bear the brunt of any increased competition from abroad, O. E. Strackbein, executive secretary of the labor group, stated today that the economic life of many long-established small and medium-sized industries in this country, devoted principally to the manufacture of consumers' goods, is at stake.

"Few people realize," Mr. Strackbein said, "that in order to hold our export markets at their present abnormally high level, our avowed national policy of opening ever wider our gates to imports, to make it possible for other countries to pay for our exports, is designed consciously or unconsciously to fatten our large mass-production industries which are our heaviest exporters, at the expense of the smaller industries scattered throughout the United States. The big exporters are the industrial giants that manufacture automobiles, iron and steel, electrical equipment and machinery, petroleum, agricultural implements, etc."

Expressing complete sympathy with the objective of European recovery, he said that the meeting scheduled for next January would explore alternative means of correcting the trade balance without bringing unemployment and depression to numerous industrial areas in this country. "There would be little point in gaining recovery for Europe which would be merely temporary," he said, "if this can be accomplished only by visiting a blight upon our own producers in competing lines. This should not be necessary."

In calling the meeting, Mr. Strackbein said, full cognizance was taken of the gravity of the dollar-gap problem. "We want to know whether we (the miscellaneous group of industries) are being peddled off by our diplomats to satisfy an untested theory or to satisfy the export interests, and whether there is some other way of meeting the problem. If further tariff reduction is no solution, considering its boomerang aspects, we want to know why we should be offered up as the sacrificial goats, simply as a disastrous experiment or a grand but empty gesture to impress Western Europe.

"Mr. Paul Hoffman, ECA Administrator, who comes from the automobile industry, has so far offered no suggestion to show how the vast domestic automobile market might best be shared with European producers. His eagerness for imports falters at this point," Mr. Strackbein commented.

"As long as our exports continue at the post-war pace," he continued, "there is no hope of striking an import balance without bringing many of our industries to the brink of destruction. The statement that proposed increased imports of $2,000,000,000 a year from Europe would amount to less than 1 percent of the gross national product is true but must be known to be wholly meaningless by those who give it currency. This is like saying that a disastrous flood would represent only a small amount of rainfall if it were spread over the whole United States. Actually, a $2,000,000,000 increase in imports would not nearly bridge the present gap between exports and imports. To do that we would have to increase our imports by another two or three billion dollars, presumably from Asiatic countries.

"If we continue our foolish worship of exports and attribute special virtue to them, our problem will continue to be perplexing and will bedevil us and the rest of the world for years to come."

The meeting will consider beside the tariff and import program, the Charter of the International Trade Organization, and the escape clause in the trade agreements. "It will be the first joint meeting of its magnitude between management and labor where both will be talking the same language and seeing eye to eye, that I know of," Mr. Strackbein remarked. "Perhaps the idea will catch on in other directions."

AMERICA'S WAGE EARNERS' PROTECTIVE CONFERENCE,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

[For release Thursday morning, January 12, 1950]

Over 50 representatives of labor and management in 15 industries will meet in Washington on January 17 to attend the conference sponsored by America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference. The meeting will consider what action can be taken to safeguard American industry and labor against the impact of the increasing foreign competition resulting from the import-promotional work of the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Department of Commerce, supported by the tariff-cutting activities of the State Department.

The campaign to open wide the doors of the American market to billions of dollars of additional imports, as proposed by the ECA, was first challenged a month ago in a statement made by O. E. Strackbein, executive secretary of the Wage Earners' Conference. In calling the meeting which will assemble here next week, Mr. Strackbein outlined the program as including beside the ECA-State Department import proposals, consideration of the Habana charter of the International Trade Organization which is before Congress for ratification.

Among the industries that will be present will be fishing, fish-canning, and sea-food-processing industries. Imports of fresh and frozen fillets have risen to levels far above prewar imports, principally from Canada and Iceland. Imports of canned tuna have alarmed the tuna fisheries and canneries of the west coast.

The pottery industry is confronted with rising imports of chinaware from Japan, Germany, and other European countries. Approximately $30,000,000 of pottery was imported in 1949 and the trend last year was still upward.

A sharp rise in the importation of women's fur felt hats took place in 1949, bringing the import level well above prewar years in terms of both quantity and value. Leather and woolen gloves and mittens have felt the keenness of competition from Japan and Europe, and it is feared that even without further duty reductions the domestic industry is faced with a substantial loss of market and shrinking employment.

Other industries among those that will be present are the makers of wallpaper and of matches. Imports of printed wallpaper have made extensive inroads into the market, with Canada the chief source. Matches, on which the duty was reduced in the recent Annecy agreements, face stiff competition from Scandinavian countries.

Pressed and blown glass tableware imports, coming principally from Czechoslovakia, have slackened employment in domestic plants making glassware for the American household. Japan last year joined Czechoslovakia as a shipper and began to loom as an important source of low-priced competition.

Makers of scientific apparatus, kaolin producers, and wool hat manufacturers have likewise felt the rising tide of imports at prices that are alarming to those who are interested in either jobs, wages, or profit.

The foregoing industries, represented by top executives of both management and of the labor organizations concerned, will be on hand for the meeting.

"Other industries asked to be represented," Strackbein said, "but we were unable because of the principle of parallel representation of both labor and management, to arrive at a satisfactory basis for invitation, for the present."

Top labor representative to attend the meeting will be Matthew Woll, president of America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference and also vice president of the American Federation of Labor.

AMERICA'S WAGE EARNERS' PROTECTIVE CONFERENCE,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Veterans' Benefits—A Matter of National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, no nation can long survive which fails to reserve for the service of its war veterans a respect and recognition above and beyond that which is proper for simply living so many years or for meeting the responsibilities of civilized society. At the same time, the Veterans' Administration is neither sacred nor perfect and I shall continue to explore and expose waste or inefficiency if found there as I would in any other Government agency. That was my reply to the South Dakota American Legion which recently wired me asking my posi-

tion on certain proposals relative to veterans' benefits.

The text of the American Legion telegram to me and my reply follow:

VERMILLION, S. DAK., January 9, 1950.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Representative,
Washington, D. C.:

The American Legion of South Dakota is definitely against that part of the Hoover Commission report dealing with veteran affairs. Separating the Veterans' Administration into other and more Federal bureaus and commissions will not mean economy but rather complete chaos and confusion eventually ending in nonservice to the disabled veteran and family. Keeping all veteran affairs under one administration is our want, and watching economy in that administration is our aim. Will you wire me your exact position regarding veterans' affairs as contained in the Hoover report so that the American Legion of South Dakota will know where you stand on this vital issue.

C. G. CHRISTENSENSEN,
Department Commander.

My reply:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 11, 1950.

Mr. C. G. CHRISTENSENSEN,
Department Commander,
American Legion,
VERMILLION, S. DAK.:

Re tel. Am opposed to any proposal that would destroy identity of Veterans' Administration hospitals or attempt to convert compensation for service disabilities or hazards as reflected in established veterans' pension system into any general social-security benefits.

This is not any new position for me. In fact in many talks I have cited such proposals why I thought recommendations of Hoover Commission should be acted upon selectively rather than in block. Similarly object to undertones in President Truman's budget message where he cited eligibility of veterans to benefits "under the general social-security program of the Government" and expressed concern over "special benefits for veterans."

Put me down as believing that no nation can long survive which fails to reserve for the service of its war veterans a respect and recognition above and beyond that which is proper for simply living an honest years or for meeting the responsibilities of civilized society.

At the same time the Veterans' Administration is neither perfect nor sacred and I shall continue to explore and expose waste or inefficiency if found there as I would in any other Government agency.

FRANCIS CASE,
Representative in Congress,
Second District, South Dakota.

California and the River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Fortnight magazine for December 23, 1949:

CALIFORNIA AND THE RIVER—SOME FACTS AND CURIOUS FIGURES ON THE THREE COLORADO CONTROVERSY WITH ARIZONA

A California fisherman stood a gigantic playground the east shore of Lake Havasu back of Parker Dam on the Colorado River. Almost immediately the little, barbed, mouse-like lure was seized by a 3-pound bass. The fisherman landed his prize, one of several, and was proud and happy, but only for a moment. During the excitement he had overlooked the drift of his skiff and the approach of a small power craft.

The Arizona game warden noted that he was fishing in Arizona water and demanded his Arizona fishing license. Not having one, the California-licensed fisherman was arrested, his gear confiscated, and he was ordered to appear before the justice of peace in Parker, Ariz., the following day.

As a retaliation measure, California wardens frequently arrest Arizona fishermen for taking their catch in California waters behind the dam and along the main stream of the river dividing the two States.

Such petty skirmishing marks the great California-Arizona-Colorado River controversy on the lower level. The issue extends from here on up and up, however, and involves every single consumer of water, user of power, and resident of southern California. The Governors and congressional delegations of both States are likewise deeply involved and both sides seek by every means at their command to enlist sympathy for their sides. The President, his Cabinet, fellow Members of Congress, and all manner of officialdom are buttonholed and belabored in the name of God and/or the devil to come to the aid of the contesting States.

The year 1950 will see an intensification of this controversy and it may see a decision in favor of one State or the other.

SHOW-DOWN

If California should be successful in establishing her rights to Colorado River water, the investment of billions and the hopes of millions will be secured. If California is unsuccessful in maintaining rights to water she has contracted for, the millions of people in urban areas of southern California can expect to share the desperate plight of residents of New York City with their water level down.

The full implication of such a circumstance is difficult to calculate and measure, but Dean Franklin Thomas of Cal Tech, one of the wisest and ablest citizens of the southland makes some of the meaning clear.

VIEWS

Although Dean Thomas is fully a California partisan, he is first of all a man of science, president of the American Society of Civil Engineers, and as such, he takes an objective view that is not always shared by his fellows on the board of the Southern California Metropolitan Water District. He is chairman of the board and oldest member in point of service and most adept at slide rule savvy. He says that if Arizona succeeds in its bid for a greatly expanded use of Colorado River water, there will be little, if any, left for the metropolitan areas of southern California.

Perhaps not so exactly, but certainly more colorfully, Congressman CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, from the cow counties and squirrel gun country, states the issue this way: "The Central Arizona project proposes to use water which it doesn't own, lift it nearly twice as high as the Washington Monument, convey it farther than from Washington to New York, at a cost to the Federal Treasury of a billion dollars, to irrigate 200,000 acres of war-boom desert land, one-half of which is owned by 420 landowners, who would not be required to repay any of the construction costs, and would raise only crops which are surplus in this country."

BOILED DOWN

The explosive force behind Congressman ENGLE's multi-barreled blast is distilled and refined from the mountain of evidence accumulated over more than a quarter of a century in the bitter water issue between California and Arizona. His statement hints of the land speculation and the war profiteering, the national politicking and the savage contest for influence between powerful men and bureaus and special interests. Events are shaping up for a show-down between the two States at the forthcoming session of Congress and a delineation of the shadows and highlights of Arizona's program appears to dwarf other land speculation schemes and pork-barrel programs that have marked American westward expansion.

It is important for every Californian to understand that Colorado River development in the lower basin has been all California's doing. That the great conquest of the river has been financed by California although the benefits of these installations have extended to all States and to the Republic of Mexico.

The millions of newcomers to southern California would not be here but for the vision and courage of such men as Dean Thomas and many, many others, in staking out the water needs of southern California for years to come. And they won't stay here unless Arizona is checked in her designs upon California water.

NATURE'S CHOICE

Also, Californians should understand that the water of the Colorado is a variable amount, subject to the influence of drought, evaporation, and flood. Within man's ken to calculate such things, this short supply of water has been distributed between the upper-basin and lower-basin States under the Colorado River compact. These assignments were arrived at upon the basis of need and use and are subject to strict priority, based upon the length of use and international treaty.

The inescapable fact is that should Arizona succeed in her multimillion-dollar bid for water for the central Arizona project, more water would be assigned than flows in the Colorado and under the priority rights arrangement, urban areas of southern California would be among the first to dry up.

MINUS

Stated in acre-feet (sufficient water to cover 1 acre of land 1 foot deep) the river, according to Bureau of Reclamation estimates, is 300,000 acre-feet short of the water required to operate present projects contracted for with the Federal Government. The Arizona project would require an additional 1,200,000 acre-feet annually. This water could be supplied only at the expense of California.

So much for the threat to the present welfare and future of southern California contained in the Arizona program. But what of the project itself? An examination of the record of this scheme is another story and while Arizona likes to play up and portray itself in the sympathetic pattern of a "David and Goliath" role, the facts disclose a set-up for a swindle, a gigantic land-speculation deal that would pay off in millions to a few large Arizona landholders at the expense of taxpayers from all States and this with none of the risk and obligation with which California saddled itself in pioneering Colorado River development.

The California-Arizona controversy is highly technical, but generally involves three issues.

First. A disputed interpretation of the meaning of the terms "unapportioned" and "excess or surplus" as used in the original Colorado River compact. At least 500,000 acre-feet are at stake in this difference between the States.

Second. A difference of 600,000 acre-feet in favor of Arizona in determining beneficial consumptive use involving the Gila River, a Colorado tributary, whose waters are totally used within Arizona.

Third. Arizona's insistence that evaporation losses at Lake Mead behind Hoover Dam, calculated at 850,000 acre-feet yearly, be subtracted from California's apportioned total share of Colorado River water.

IF

The stakes are indeed high, more than a million and a half acre-feet. In fact this is the water committed to supply the cities of southern California. The conflicting claims to the water are shrouded in more than a quarter of a century of bitter debate and controversy, but despite charges of water imperialism against California by Arizona and Author Carey McWilliams in his current book, California, the Great Exception, the record will show that California through the years has tried to resolve the differences with Arizona by arbitration and negotiation. Governor WARREN's most recent words on the subject, spoken in Los Angeles before the Colorado River Association, only last fortnight, reflected the good-neighbor attitude to the disappointment, it might be pointed out, of many present who advocate a sterner, tougher dealing with Arizona.

California's congressional delegation, Republican and Democrat, has been in total harmony in this issue, seeking a Supreme Court hearing and settlement of the serious differences.

NO LAW

Arizona, on the other hand, has avoided and fought at every point against a judicial determination of the issues, relying upon a political resolution of the differences. Her strength and power in this sector is impressive for the chairman of the powerful Senate Appropriation Committee is Arizona's senior Senator, CARL HAYDEN. His horse-trading might win for Arizona. Too, Arizona apparently fearing the impartial judgment of the Court, has enlisted the politicians of the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation to her cause.

Her tactic is to oppose with all the considerable political force she has in Congress those California bills soliciting Supreme Court determination of the points in dispute and, at the same time, seeking a congressional approval of the construction of a billion dollar reclamation and power project, the central Arizona project. Clearly, the only water available for this project is the disputed 1,500,000 acre-feet, that California already has and seeks to assure title to through Supreme Court determination.

DATA

Congressman DONALD L. JACKSON (Republican), of Santa Monica, a city 100 percent dependent upon Colorado River water, last July took dead aim on the "Arizona bubble" in a speech in the House of Representatives. His disclosure of the speculative nature of the land scheme has not been denied. His evidence was taken largely from the Bureau of Reclamation reports on the project and from the files available to Congress dealing with the matter.

"In every financial transaction there is a beneficiary," he said. "It might be well to approach the central Arizona project with this premise as a reference point. There is every indication and there is evidence to prove that the beneficiaries of the project, if approved and constructed would be a limited number of large landowners in the State of Arizona. At this time the landowners, together with others, have contributed thousands of dollars in an effort to promote the central Arizona project here in Congress.

"The proposed undertaking is a most complicated and involved one, but stripped of all extraneous issues, the entire proposition, boiled down to its essential factors, means simply that the United States Government is being asked to spend approximately a billion and a half dollars upon the construction of an irrigation project designed to transport Colorado River water several hundred miles into central Arizona. All other factors aside, the cost of the program is so great as to merit the preoccupation of every Member concerned with Federal expenditures and Federal income. There is nothing to indicate that the United States Treasury would reap any material return on the huge investment, but there is considerable evidence to support the belief that some Arizona sponsors would harvest a bumper financial crop for years to come at the expense of the American taxpayers in general."

HAYDEN

JACKSON pointed out that those who are beating the drums for the project would not pay 1 cent of the cost of the gigantic irrigation program, aside from the money, about $200,000 they have raised for promotion and publicity and he listed for the record the contributors and the amounts subscribed.

"Let us deal for a moment with the cost of the project," JACKSON said. "There is every reason to believe that the cost on completion would approximate $1,500,000,000. Those speaking on behalf of the project state that the cost would be about half this figure, but it must be said that those who so contend are either extremely naive or blind to current construction costs."

The speaker then let fly with an eight-point indictment of the project that has not yet been discounted by Arizona:

"First. All of the land in the proposed project area is privately owned. Farm land within the project area with water on it today is worth a maximum of $300 an acre. The land without water on it today, but actually within the proposed project area, is worth probably $50 an acre.

"Second. It is anticipated that 73,500 acres of land within the project area, now without water, would receive water under the project. Certainly, the irrigation of that much additional land for the benefit of homesteaders and others who sorely need land and water, would be a beneficial project. But the 73,500 acres is somehow mysteriously missing. No one to this time, including the Arizona advocates or the Bureau of Reclamation, has identified this land, nor have the names of those who own these acres been made public.

"Third. There are some 400 large landholders in the project area who would be likely to receive indivdual benefits averaging more than $500,000 apiece.

"Fourth. About 80,000 men, women, and children in the project area would stand to receive benefits of $50,000 each, all as a gift from the people of other States.

"Fifth. Up to April 1 of this year a sum of more than $178,000 has been contributed from private persons in Arizona to promote the central Arizona project. Of this amount, more than $97,000 was contributed by anonymous, or unidentified persons. The money so contributed went to the Central Arizona Project Association in Phoenix.

"Sixth. The proposed project would cost more than twice as much as the Panama Canal, and more than the combined cost of TVA and Hoover Dam.

"Seventh. To obtain an assured water supply for the project, water that now belongs to other States would, of necessity, have to be taken from the Colorado River. The other States now own this water under contracts with the United States Government. Advocates of the Arizona project are asking Congress to break these contracts, and to give the water to a few private landowners in central Arizona.

"Eighth. The project scheme would take two-thirds of the power revenues from the project to help pay for it. The other third of the power available would be used to operate a 2,000-foot pump lift on the project. All additional costs of the project would be an outright gift from the people of the United States."

DETAILS

Congressman JACKSON then detailed his eight points and quoted the Bureau of Reclamation report on the project regarding the matter of private ownership as follows:

"Six hundred and twenty-eight thousand seven hundred and sixty acres (in the project area) are practically all privately owned. It is estimated that 10 percent of the privately owned land is held by corporations. The total amount owned by the State and the counties is not significant."

Not one acre of the new land would be available to veterans or other worthy Americans who wished to find farm homes, JACKSON said, and continued with discussion of important 160-acre reclamation law as it applied to the project.

"In the Salt River area alone, which area contains more than two-thirds of the proposed Arizona project land, there are 900 ownerships in excess of reclamation law. About 22 percent of the irrigable land in this one area is held in excess ownership.

True, the Bureau of Reclamation says that the 160-acre law will be enforced if the Arizona project is built. But we know that this law has never been enforced there. There is no reason to believe it will be enforced in the future.

"But enforcement of the 160-acre limitation, or failure to enforce that law, will make little difference to the large landowners involved. They will not be injured in either case, for the idle land now held by the big landowners will immediately increase in value 6 to 10 times. If, on the other hand, the large landowners should be forced to sell all but 160 acres, they would, of course, sell at tremendous profit."

SUBSIDY SCHEME

The speaker then went into the curious subsidy pattern of the program, pointing out that 86 percent of the crops grown in the area are those common, competitive field crops already subsidized by the Government. Under the scheme, the Government is asked to pile the king-sized irrigation water subsidies on top of the crop subsidies.

Of the 73,500 waterless acres in the project area, JACKSON has this to say:

"This acreage has a value today of approximately $3,675,000. With water on these acres this privately owned land would have a minimum value in excess of $22,000,000."

Hidden, but nevertheless in evidence in the Bureau of Reclamation report, is the full dope on farm ownership. The report states that the proposed project area contains an estimated 6,000 farms and that 7 percent of these farms are of 500 acres or larger. The 7 percent contain 55 percent of the irrigated land.

Seven percent of 6,000 farms is 420 farms. In other words, the 420 farms containing 55 percent of the irrigated land would get 55 percent of the irrigation benefits.

Fifty-five percent of the estimated cost of the irrigation feature of the project, $420,000,000, amounts to $231,010,460, or an average of about $500,000 for each of the 420 farms.

It must be pointed out that the President and many high Government officials have not been taken in by this scheme and have expressed their opposition to the engineering and economic aspects of the program. Look what happened to Secretary of Interior "Cap" Julius Krug. But Californians got little comfort in viewing the new Secretary, Oscar Chapman, a career Bureau of Reclamation man and, as Congressman JACKSON points out, the Bureau favors Arizona, apparently motivated by an interest in another gigantic project under its jurisdiction.

As JACKSON put it, "The Bureau obviously does not care whether the project is financially feasible. All the Bureau desires is more control over the economy of the West. Bad projects as well as good ones give the Bureau that control."

tion on certain proposals relative to veterans' benefits.

The text of the American Legion telegram to me and my reply follow:

YANKTON, S. DAK., January 9, 1950.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Representative,
Washington, D. C.:

The American Legion of South Dakota is definitely against that part of the Hoover Commission report dealing with veterans affairs. Separating the Veterans' Administration into other and more Federal bureaus and commissions will not mean economy but rather complete chaos and confusion eventually ending in nonservice to the disabled veteran and family. Keeping all veterans affairs under one administration is our wish, and watching economy in that administration is our aim. Will you wire me your exact position regarding veterans' affairs as contained in the Hoover report so that the American Legion of South Dakota will know where you stand on this vital issue.

C. O. CHRISTOPHERSON,
Department Commander.

My reply:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 11, 1950.

Mr. C. O. CHRISTOPHERSON,
Department Commander,
American Legion,
Yankton, S. Dak.:

Re tel. Am opposed to any proposal that would destroy identity of Veterans' Administration hospitals or attempt to convert compensation for service disabilities or hazards as reflected in established veterans' pension system into any general social-security benefits.

This is not any new position for me. In fact in many talks I have cited such proposals why I thought recommendations of Hoover Commission should be acted upon selectively rather than in block. Similarly object to undertones in President Truman's budget message where he cited eligibility of veterans to benefits "under the general social-security program of the Government" and expressed concern over "special benefits for veterans."

Put me down as believing that no nation can long survive which fails to reserve for the service of its war veterans a prospect and recognition above and beyond that which is proper for simply living so many years or for meeting the responsibilities of civilized society.

At the same time the Veterans' Administration is neither perfect nor sacred and I shall continue to explore and expose waste or inefficiency if found there as I would in any other Government agency.

FRANCIS CASE,
Representative in Congress,
Second District, South Dakota.

California and the River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Fortnight magazine for December 23, 1949:

CALIFORNIA AND THE RIVER—SOME FACTS AND CURRENT PROBLEMS ON THE GREAT COLORADO CONTROVERSY WITH ARIZONA.

A California fisherman aimed a plastic plug toward the east shore of Lake Havasu back of Parker Dam on the Colorado River. Almost immediately the little, barbed, mouse-like lure was seized by a 3-pound bass. The fisherman landed his prize, one of several, and was proud and happy, but only for a moment. During the excitement he had overlooked the drift of his skiff and the approach of a small power craft.

The Arizona game warden noted that he was fishing in Arizona water and demanded his Arizona fishing license. Not having one, the California-licensed fisherman was arrested, his gear confiscated, and he was ordered to appear before the justice of peace in Parker, Ariz., the following day.

As a retaliation measure, California wardens frequently arrest Arizona fishermen for taking their catch in California waters behind the dam and along the main stream of the river dividing the two States.

Such petty skirmishing marks the great California-Arizona-Colorado River controversy on the lower level. The issue extends from here on up and up, however, and involves every single consumer of water, user of power, and resident of southern California. The Governors and congressional delegations of both States are likewise deeply involved and both sides seek by every means at their command to enlist sympathy for their sides. The President, his Cabinet, fellow Members of Congress, and all manner of officialdom are buttonholed and belabored in the name of God and/or the devil to come to the aid of the contesting States.

The year 1950 will see an intensification of this controversy and it may see a decision in favor of one State or the other.

SHOW-DOWN

If California should be successful in establishing her rights to Colorado River water, the investment of billions and the hopes of millions will be secured. If California is unsuccessful in maintaining rights to water she has contracted for, the millions of people in urban areas of southern California can expect to share the desperate plight of residents of New York City with their water level down.

The full implication of such a circumstance is difficult to calculate and measure, but Dean Franklin Thomas of Cal Tech, one of the wisest and ablest citizens of the southland makes some of the meaning clear.

VIEWS

Although Dean Thomas is fully a California partizan, he is first of all a man of science, president of the American Society of Civil Engineers, and as such, he takes an objective view that is not always shared by his fellows on the board of the Southern California Metropolitan Water District. He is chairman of the board and oldest member in point of service and most adept at slide rule savvy. He says that if Arizona succeeds in its bid for a greatly expanded use of Colorado River water, there will be little, if any, left for the metropolitan areas of southern California.

Perhaps not so exactly, but certainly more colorfully, Congressman CLARE ENGLE, Democrat, from the cow counties and squirrel gun country, states the issue this way: "The Central Arizona project proposes to use water which it doesn't own, lift it nearly twice as high as the Washington Monument, convey it farther than from Washington to New York, at a cost to the Federal Treasury of a billion dollars, to irrigate 200,000 acres of war-boom desert land, one-half of which is owned by only 420 landowners, who would not be required to repay any of the construction costs, and would raise only crops which are surplus in this country."

BOILED DOWN

The explosive force behind Congressman ENGLE's multi-barrelled blast is distilled and refined from the mountain of evidence accumulated over more than a quarter of a century in the bitter water issue between California and Arizona. His statement hints of the land speculation and the war profiteering, the national politicking and the savage contest for influence between powerful men and bureaus and special interests. Events are shaping up for a show-down between the two States at the forthcoming session of Congress and a delineation of the shadows and highlights of Arizona's program appears to dwarf other land speculation schemes and pork-barrel programs that have marked American westward expansion.

It is important for every Californian to understand that Colorado River development in the lower basin has been all California's doing. That the great conquest of the river has been financed by California although the benefits of these installations have extended to all States and to the Republic of Mexico.

The millions of newcomers to southern California would not be here but for the vision and courage of such men as Dean Thomas and many, many others, in staking out the water needs of southern California for years to come. And they won't stay here unless Arizona is checked in her designs upon California water.

NATURE'S CHOKE

Also, Californians should understand that the water of the Colorado is a variable amount, subject to the influence of drought, evaporation, and flood. Within man's ken to calculate such things, this short supply of water has been distributed between the upper-basin and lower-basin States under the Colorado River compact. These assignments were arrived at upon the basis of need and use and are subject to strict priority, based upon the length of use and international treaty.

The inescapable fact is that should Arizona succeed in her multimillion-dollar bid for water for the central Arizona project, more water would be assigned than flows in the Colorado and under the priority rights arrangement, urban areas of southern California would be among the first to dry up.

MINUS

Stated in acre-feet (sufficient water to cover 1 acre of land 1 foot deep) the river, according to Bureau of Reclamation estimates, is 300,000 acre-feet short of the water required to operate present projects contracted for with the Federal Government. The Arizona project would require an additional 1,200,000 acre-feet annually. This water could be supplied only at the expense of California.

So much for the threat to the present welfare and future of southern California contained in the Arizona program. But what of the project itself? An examination of the record of this scheme is another story and while Arizona likes to play up and portray itself in the sympathetic pattern of a "David and Goliath" role, the facts disclose a set-up for a swindle, a gigantic land-speculation deal that would pay off in millions to a few large Arizona landholders at the expense of taxpayers from all States and this with none of the risk and obligation with which California saddled itself in pioneering Colorado River development.

The California-Arizona controversy is highly technical, but generally involves three issues.

First. A disputed interpretation of the meaning of the terms "unapportioned" and "excess or surplus" as used in the original Colorado River compact. At least 500,000 acre-feet are at stake in this difference between the States.

Second. A difference of 600,000 acre-feet in favor of Arizona in determining beneficial consumptive use involving the Gila River, a Colorado tributary, whose waters are totally used within Arizona.

Third. Arizona's insistence that evaporation losses at Lake Mead behind Hoover Dam, calculated at 800,000 acre-feet yearly,

be subtracted from California's apportioned total share of Colorado River water.

IF

The stakes are indeed high, more than a million and a half acre-feet. In fact this is the water committed to supply the cities of southern California. The conflicting claims to the water are shrouded in more than a quarter of a century of bitter debate and controversy, but despite charges of water imperialism against California by Arizona and Author Carey McWilliams in his current book, California, the Great Exception, the record will show that California through the years has tried to resolve the differences with Arizona by arbitration and negotiation. Governor Warren's most recent words on the subject, spoken in Los Angeles before the Colorado River Association, only last fortnight, reflected the good-neighbor attitude to the disappointment, it might be pointed out, of many present who advocate a sterner, tougher dealing with Arizona.

California's congressional delegation, Republican and Democrat, has been in total harmony in this issue, seeking a Supreme Court hearing and settlement of the serious differences.

NO LAW

Arizona, on the other hand, has swoded and fought at every point against a judicial determination of the issues, relying upon a political resolution of the differences. Her strength and power in this sector is impressive for the chairman of the powerful Senate Appropriation Committee is Arizona's senior Senator, CARL HAYDEN. His horsetrading might win for Arizona. Too, Arizona apparently fearing the impartial judgment of the Court, has enlisted the politicians of the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation to her cause.

Her tactic is to oppose with all the considerable political force she has in Congress those California bills soliciting Supreme Court determination of the points in dispute and, at the same time, seeking a congressional approval of the construction of a billion dollar reclamation and power project, the central Arizona project. Clearly, the only water available for this project is the disputed 1,500,000 acre-feet, that California already has and seeks to assure title to through Supreme Court determination.

BITE

Congressman DONALD L. JACKSON (Republican), of Santa Monica, a city 100 percent dependent upon Colorado River water, last July took dead aim on the "Arizona bubble" in a speech in the House of Representatives. His disclosure of the speculative nature of the land scheme has not been denied. His evidence was taken largely from the Bureau of Reclamation reports on the project and from the files available to Congress dealing with the matter.

"In every financial transaction there is a beneficiary," he said. "It might be well to approach the central Arizona project with this premise as a reference point. There is every indication and there is evidence to prove that the beneficiaries of the project, if approved and constructed would be a limited number of large landowners in the State of Arizona. At this time the landowners, together with others, have contributed thousands of dollars in an effort to promote the central Arizona project here in Congress.

"The proposed undertaking is a most complicated and involved one, but stripped of all extraneous issues, the entire proposition, boiled down to its essential factors, means simply that the United States Government is being asked to spend approximately a billion and a half dollars upon the construction of an irrigation project designed to transport Colorado River water several hundred miles into central Arizona. All other factors aside, the cost of the program is so great as to merit the preoccupation of every taxpayer concerned with Federal expenditure and Federal income. There is nothing to indicate that the United States Treasury would reap any material return on the huge investment, but there is considerable evidence to support the belief that some Arizona sponsors would harvest a bumper financial crop for years to come at the expense of the American taxpayers in general."

BITING

JACKSON pointed out that those who are beating the drums for the project would not pay 1 cent of the cost of the gigantic irrigation program, aside from the money, about $200,000 they have raised for promotion and publicity and he listed for the record the contributors and the amounts subscribed.

"Let us deal for a moment with the cost of the project," JACKSON said. "There is every reason to believe that the cost on completion would approximate $1,500,000,000. Those speaking on behalf of the project state that the cost would be about half this figure, but it must be said that those who so contend are either extremely naive or blind to current construction costs."

The speaker then let fly with an eight-point indictment of the project that has not yet been discounted by Arizona:

"First. All of the land in the proposed project area is privately owned. Farm land within the project area with water on it today is worth a maximum of $300 an acre. The land without water on it today, but actually within the proposed project area, is worth probably $50 an acre.

"Second. It is anticipated that 73,500 acres of land within the project area, now without water, would receive water under the project. Certainly, the irrigation of that much additional land for the benefit of homesteaders and others who sorely need land and water, would be a beneficial project. But the 73,500 acres is somehow mysteriously missing. No one to this time, including the Arizona advocates or the Bureau of Reclamation, has identified this land, nor have the names of those who own these acres been made public.

"Third. There are some 400 large landholders in the project area who would be likely to receive individual benefits averaging more than $500,000 apiece.

"Fourth. About 30,000 men, women, and children in the project area would stand to receive benefits of $50,000 each, all as a gift from the people of other States.

"Fifth. Up to April 1 of this year a sum of more than $178,000 has been contributed from private persons in Arizona to promote the central Arizona project. Of this amount, more than $67,000 was contributed by anonymous, or unidentified persons. The money so contributed went to the Central Arizona Project Association in Phoenix.

"Sixth. The proposed project would cost more than twice as much as the Panama Canal, and more than the combined cost of TVA and Hoover Dam.

"Seventh. To obtain an assured water supply for the project, water that now belongs to other States would, of necessity, have to be taken from the Colorado River. The other States now own this water under contracts with the United States Government. Advocates of the Arizona project are asking Congress to break these contracts, and to give the water to a few private landowners in central Arizona.

"Eighth. The project scheme would take two-thirds of the power revenues from the project to help pay for it. The other third of the power available would be used to operate a 2,000-foot pump lift on the project. All additional costs of the project would be an outright gift from the people of the United States."

DETAILS

Congressman JACKSON then detailed his eight points and quoted the Bureau of Reclamation report on the project regarding the matter of private ownership as follows:

"Six hundred and twenty-eight thousand seven hundred and sixty acres (in the project area) are practically all privately owned. It is estimated that 10 percent of the privately owned land is held by corporations. The total amount owned by the State and the counties is not significant."

Not one acre of the new land would be available to veterans or other worthy Americans who wished to find farm homes, JACKSON said, and continued with discussion of important 160-acre reclamation law as it applied to the project.

"In the Salt River area alone, which area contains more than two-thirds of the proposed Arizona project land, there are 986 ownerships in excess of reclamation law. About 22 percent of the irrigable land in this one area is held in excess ownership.

True, the Bureau of Reclamation says that the 160-acre law will be enforced if the Arizona project is built. But we know that this law has never been enforced there. There is no reason to believe it will be enforced in the future.

"But enforcement of the 160-acre limitation, or failure to enforce that law, will make little difference to the large landowners involved. They will not be injured in either case, for the idle land now held by the big landowners will immediately increase in value 4 to 10 times. If, on the other hand, the large landowners should be forced to sell all but 160 acres, they would, of course, sell at tremendous profit."

SUBSIDY SCHEME

The speaker then went into the curious subsidy pattern of the program, pointing out that 86 percent of the crops grown in the area are those common, competitive field crops already subsidized by the Government. Under the scheme, the Government is asked to pile the king-sized irrigation water subsidies on top of the crop subsidies.

Of the 73,500 waterless acres in the project area, JACKSON has this to say:

"This acreage has a value today of approximately $3,675,000. With water on these acres this privately owned land would have a minimum value in excess of $92,000,000."

Hidden, but nevertheless in evidence in the Bureau of Reclamation report, is the full dope on farm ownership. The report states that the proposed project area contains an estimated 4,000 farms and that 7 percent of these farms are of 500 acres or larger. The 7 percent contain 55 percent of the irrigated land.

Seven percent of 4,000 farms is 420 farms.

In other words, the 420 farms containing 55 percent of the irrigated land would get 55 percent of the irrigation benefits.

Fifty-five percent of the estimated cost of the irrigation feature of the project, $420,019,000, amounts to $231,010,450, or an average of about $500,000 for each of the 420 farms.

It must be pointed out that the President and many high Government officials have not been taken in by this scheme and have expressed their opposition to the engineering and economic aspects of the program. Look what happened to Secretary of Interior "Cap" Julius Krug. But Californians got little comfort in viewing the new Secretary, Oscar Chapman, a career Bureau of Reclamation man and, as Congressman JACKSON points out, the Bureau favors Arizona, apparently motivated by an interest in another gigantic project under its jurisdiction.

As JACKSON put it, "The Bureau obviously does not care whether the project is financially feasible. All the Bureau desires is more control over the economy of the West. Bad projects as well as good ones give the Bureau that control."

"War Outmoded," General Wedemeyer Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a speech by Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer before a chamber of commerce luncheon in Los Angeles on November 10. This outstanding military man calls attention to the dangers that lurk in the building of a gigantic military machine.

PLEADS FOR IDEAS TO REPLACE BULLETS AT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE LUNCHEON MEETING HERE

A military man, high in office and a professional soldier, yesterday pleaded for use of ideas in place of bullets, decrying war as an outmoded method of settling disputes.

"No satisfactory decision was ever reached by punching someone on the nose," Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer declared. "The puncher may have been satisfied, but the gentleman on the receiving end was more strongly entrenched in his original belief than before the punch was thrown."

That colloquialism was interjected in a scholarly address on world affairs before a luncheon meeting sponsored by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce's military affairs committee headed by Marla B. Pendleton.

WHAT THEY HEAR

It was General Wedemeyer's first visit to Los Angeles since he took command of the Sixth Army Headquarters at the Presidio, San Francisco. In the war, he was commander of United States troops in China. He is a West Pointer.

The unusually tall, slender soldier in his trim uniform spoke with the deepest conviction. He was addressing an audience in the Biltmore Bowl which included high Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force officers in this area.

"I consider most important of all psychological or cultural resources," General Wedemeyer said. "Guns, tanks, planes, A-bombs—none of these can cope adequately with the tremendous force of ideas."

BLUNDERING IMPLICATIONS

"The destructive power of weapons made available by science indicates clearly the dangerous implications of employing military force in the future. From a strictly military standpoint, World War II was a conclusive victory for the Allies. But, paradoxically, today we are sacrificing lives and treasure to build up the political and economic structure of our former enemies.

"It seems inconceivable that any nation would start a war at the present time, especially with so much rebuilding necessary as the result of the last war. However, totalitarian governments are unpredictable. We should not destroy our military resources."

NO PEACE GUARANTEE

"Both western democracy and communism claim the same ultimate objective—a good life for all, regardless of race, creed, or color. Methods for reaching this goal are so different that many think the final settlement can only be made by force of arms."

"A third world war would settle nothing. Even if one nation and its allies should conquer the world, a permanent peace would not be guaranteed. Our problem is to find a method whereby governments with vastly different political, economic, and social structures can live harmoniously in the world. This has been done. After all, the American people represent every shade of political, social, and religious thinking and work successfully together."

The speaker said the solution lies in finding a common denominator, a unanimity of purpose similar to that found in this country.

AFTER SAME THING

"Is it not that we are all seeking the good life, religious, social, and economic freedom to do what one wants to do, plus permanent security," he asked. "Certainly, the world's peoples are after the same thing.

"Marxian communism's ultimate objective was a sort of Utopian anarchy with everyone doing what he wants and getting what he wants. Present-day Communists are a long way from this step. Many will agree that the last step is merely impossible, wishful thinking. However, it does lend strength to the idea that the world's peoples already have a common denominator ready for exploitation in the name of permanent peace."

PLAN NEEDED

"Except for glittering generalities of the Atlantic Charter and occasional vague pronouncements by leaders of the allied nations, neither we nor our Allies during World War II enunciated realistic, common objectives for rebuilding a sound world order. Much of the world's suffering today stems from this failure. We must abandon, once and for all, the old habit of offering pious platitudes in the field of diplomacy. We must explain clearly the principles for which we are prepared to make any sacrifice.

"This must be done through a well-conditioned plan—in military terminology, a strategic plan. Strategy is the art and science of applying resources to accomplish national objectives. The resources that concern us now include the political, economic, psychological, and military. I place military last because it is my conviction that if we employ these other resources in a timely and intelligent manner we can avoid war with all of its dire consequences."

The Way To Balance Is To Begin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of January 10, 1950:

THE WAY TO BALANCE IS TO BEGIN

The most notable thing about the budget is that it does not begin to balance. President Truman estimates that under present tax laws intake would fall short of outgo by more than $5,000,000,000. He hopes to reduce that by new taxes—an exceedingly precarious hope considering the drive for tax cuts—but he does not pretend there will not be a whopping deficit. This he accepts.

Here is the basic policy decision which the American people and their Government have to make: Is an unbalanced budget necessary—or wise under the circumstances?

It certainly is not inescapable. It is true that 70 percent of the budget goes for interest, veterans' benefits, defense costs, and foreign aid, and it is widely assumed that these are virtually irreducible. Actually, every one can be cut, is being cut. Defense costs and foreign aid are being reduced more than $2,000,000,000 under current expenditures. Veterans' readjustment costs should decline. The President also expects a reduction in the cost of farm-price supports. Yet the budget he offers for 1951 is, at $42,500,000,000, less than a billion below this year's.

This figure is not, in fact, irreducible. The Committee for Economic Development has just proposed a budget more than $6,000,000,000 below this year's. The National Association of Manufacturers says the Government could be run on less than $34,000,000,000. The CED saving includes $2,800,000,000 for veterans' insurance dividends—which, although paid out in 1950, was not a charge on taxes collected in 1950. Indeed, we believe both organizations would find it almost impossible to achieve all these savings. But allow for a billion or two and they still indicate the possibility of balancing the budget.

Big savings are possible without destroying the foreign aid program, without dangerously reducing military requirements, and without demobilizing any essential service of the Government. The President is resisting some pressures, like those for excessive veterans' payments, and is putting some of the Hoover reforms into operation to obtain efficiency and economy. He has refrained also from embarking on new public works, except those for atomic defense and development. But he insists that new Federal projects like medical assistance programs, housing for middle-income families, and aid for education should be undertaken.

As we see it, some of these projects might be useful under normal conditions, but should not be undertaken while the Nation is still burdened with such heavy military and foreign aid costs. We do not believe a second housing program is so urgent as Mr. Truman says. On aid to education, why not limit it to the States which show the greatest need? And some of the existing public works projects could be slowed down.

The President implies that the Government must continue to spend at nearly the present level to prevent the national economy going into a tailspin. We can imagine circumstances in which a large program of public works should be launched to help head off a depression. But the Government through its vast military expenditures, crop supports, veterans' benefits, social security, and foreign aid program—the money buys mainly American goods—is already pouring out over $25,000,000,000 that helps to sustain the economy. A national economy bolstered by that amount of subsidy in boom times should begin to try its weight on its own legs. And the way to balance the budget is to begin.

Friendship With Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the following confirmation of the judgment of my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs. The latter, writing in the New York Times, June 21, 1948, pointed out that the 1946 resolution of the United Nations General Assembly about Spain had been rendered invalid by the 1947 failure to pass the identical resolution. This is the view now proposed in some detail and with unanswerable logic by a

Washington attorney, Mr. William J. Byrne. As both Dr. Thorning and Mr. Byrne have emphasized, the attempt by Soviet Poland to censure the present Spanish Government as Fascist and as having been imposed by the Axis was overwhelmingly defeated by a General Assembly United Nations vote of 1949. As a distinguished Senator recently said, all nations are now free to accredit ambassadors to Madrid. The United States can and should act, without delay.

ASSERTS THAT UN ANTI-FRANCO RESOLUTION NO LONGER IS VALID

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Your editorial, The Spanish Fraud, approaches the question of our duties with regard to Spain in their true light and confirms the statement of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CONNALLY, to the effect that no resolution of the United Nations binds us to curtail our diplomatic relations with Spain.

With your leave I would like to develop this. In 1946 a recommendation was passed under Soviet pressure restricting diplomatic relations with Spain and recalling all chiefs of mission from Madrid. But in 1947 the same resolution was submitted again to the UN General Assembly. It was not approved because it did not get the necessary two-thirds majority. It is apparent that from that moment the original resolution is not valid; but the representative from Soviet Poland, disregarding this fact, immediately stated that the 1947 resolution was not valid. Why? Nobody knows. If the 1946 resolution was to be permanent, there was no need for its being considered again, but, if considered, as did happen, the result had to be binding. Or was it to be a privileged resolution according to which, no matter what the final result, it was to continue in force? Why vote in that case?

VOTE SEEN AS VALID

Some assert that it was only a negative vote. But is not a negative vote valid? If in our courts a jury is asked if the accused is guilty and it answers that he is not, the accused is a freeman even if the jury did not pass an affirmative vote as to the accused's innocence. The words of acquittal are "not guilty"; the man is released on a negative vote of the jury. It is a universally used form of parliamentary and legal procedure.

With a view to clearing up any doubts that might have existed in the minds of the respective governments, a new resolution favorable to Spain was presented to the Assembly—and this you mention in your editorial—by Brazil in 1948. This resolution did not get the required two-thirds majority. In his speech to the General Assembly Dr. Arce stated that he would vote for the resolution, although he thought it unnecessary as the Argentine considered that the 1946 resolution had been rescinded. All those nations which voted in favor of the resolution believed the same and considered it a mere symbolic act which, as you state, obtained a 26-to-15 majority. It is not illogical to suppose that some countries, such as Chile, China, and Haiti, might have cast their votes in favor of the resolution if the United States had done likewise. Moreover, of the 16 votes against, two—those of Australia and New Zealand—today would be either abstentions or favorable as a result of the recent elections in those countries. Without those two votes opposed the resolution would have been successful.

MARGIN WAS NARROW

As a point of fact the Brazilian effort failed, not by a margin of four votes as you say in your editorial, for as the number of votes cast, according to the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly Nos. 76 and 78, was 41 (26 in favor, 15 against) and since two-thirds of 41 is 27.33 the margin really was only 1.33.

But the Assembly dealt again with Spain after the defeat of the Brazilian proposal. A Soviet-inspired Polish proposal was considered and can be taken as the UN's final word in the matter. As various nations considered the 1946 resolution annulled by that of 1947 and had appointed Ambassadors to Madrid, Poland attempted to have a vote of censure passed against them for it considered that their action constituted a flagrant violation of the high principles and purposes of the United Nations, undermined international confidence, and will convince the Spanish people that it has been abandoned by the United Nations.

The Polish proposal was defeated 36 to 6, with 11 abstentions. Thus it clearly was established that the May 16, 1946, recommendation no longer was in force and that the member nations were free to resume full diplomatic relations with Spain without transgressing any limits set up by the UN. There can be no legal quibbling in this respect and Senator CONNALLY was following a strict interpretation of the case when he stated that he did not regard the 1946 resolution as binding on this country.

WILLIAM J. BYRNE.

Red Conquest of Hainan and Formosa Will Increase United States Expenses in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown in the Washington Star:

RED CONQUEST OF HAINAN AND FORMOSA WILL INCREASE UNITED STATES EXPENSES IN JAPAN

(By Constantine Brown)

The conquest of Hainan and Formosa Islands by the Chinese Reds would result in a heavy additional American expenditure in Japan—that is to say, another burden on the American taxpayer—according to reports from economists in Tokyo.

Hainan is considered the richest island in the world in iron ore. A mountain in the middle of the island yields a 70-percent ore. This is shipped to Japan, where it is used in the new Japanese factories.

As for Formosa, which is one of the richest islands in the Pacific, its loss to the Communists would create a serious food shortage in Japan. There are three rice crops a year. The large surplus is exported to the islands in the north.

The same thing applies to Formosa's tea and many other products, which are exported to Japan primarily on a barter basis. Raw materials are shipped to Japan and the ships return with cargoes of manufactured products for the island's 7,000,000 inhabitants.

CONDITIONS DEPICTED

According to most recent reports from American observers, it seems that conditions have improved since K. C. Wu, the progressive and scrupulously honest former mayor of Shanghai, was placed at the head of civil authorities in the island.

Realizing the mistakes and corrupt practices of his predecessors, he has organized the island on a Western economic basis and placed educated Formosan natives at the head of important departments. The local currency is pegged to the dollar. There is, of course, the inevitable black market, but the spread between the official rate of exchange and the black market rate has been reduced from 40 percent to about 10 percent.

The Nationalists' treasury is not completely empty yet, although the cost of government amounts to about $1,000,000 a week. Chiang Kai-shek transferred from Hankiu about $250,000,000 in gold when he realized that his capital would be conquered by the Reds.

Although Chiang's action in removing the gold was denounced at the time by Chairman CONNALLY of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as another indication of Chinese corruption—he accused Chiang of absconding with the Republic's funds—the money is coming in very handily now, when the Nationalist government has been almost entirely cut off from any further bonanza from the United States.

A Nationalist force of about 300,000 is being maintained now on Formosa. The morale of this army—mostly young recruits—is not bad. They might be able to offer a real show if Formosa is invaded. The main difficulty confronting the army commander has been that he has not been able to obtain necessary war material for his troops. The loading of 90 carloads of tanks and armored vehicles for the Nationalists on a ship at Philadelphia may alleviate this situation somewhat.

BARRIER FOR REDS LIKELIER

Conditions are not much different from those which existed in northern China in 1948 when Gen. Fu Tso-yi had six armies at his disposal but had equipment for only three. He asked them, when he was still winning against the Communists, for only 4,000 machine guns and some 45,000 rifles with the necessary ammunition. His request was supported by the American military observers on the spot and those, like Vice Admiral Oscar Badger, United States Seventh Task Fleet commander, who visited his forces. After a long and fatal delay in Washington some 400 machine guns and 5,000 rifles reached the Chinese commander.

The Nationalists' armies were defeated and large-scale desertions followed. Officers and men became disheartened because they were being let down by their American friends. This is a matter of record available to those who might wish to investigate the truth of the defeat and desertions of the Nationalists' last combat forces on the Chinese mainland.

A similar situation may arise in Formosa. According to unbiased American observers the non-Communist ground, air, and naval forces might give a good accounting of themselves if they had the means to fight.

Amphibious operations which must be undertaken by the Reds are not easy when the opposing force is full of fight. Neither the Chinese nor the Russian armies have ever undertaken such actions in the past. It is true that the Russians now are training three Chinese paratroop divisions in central China. But even at this late hour a more liberal policy toward the non-Communists—such as providing them with arms, planes, and gasoline—might still be effective.

The Road To Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as an extension of my remarks, I

would like to include the following article written by George E. Stringfellow, past president of the Kiwanis Club of New York City, and which first appeared in the January issue of the Kiwanis magazine:

THE ROAD TO RUIN

Lenin, the chief architect of communism, said, "Some day we will force the United States to spend itself to destruction." The way we have squandered our wealth and pyramided our debt during the last 18 years must have gladdened the hearts of Communists everywhere.

Yet while a candidate for the Presidency in 1932, Franklin D. Roosevelt emphasized the importance of economy in government. He said, "Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose financial policy. We must avoid this danger."

The Federal debt in 1932, which Mr. Roosevelt had asserted was dangerously high, was less than $20,000,000,000, and the annual cost of government, which he promised to reduce by 25 percent, was a little over $5,000,000,000—less than the cost to service the national debt today.

Five years later the debt had risen to $33,800,000,000 or 82.5 percent and the annual cost of government had increased more than 50 percent.

How can President Roosevelt's about-face on cost of government and debt be reconciled with his announced policy of economy and debt reduction during the first 4 months of his first administration? Here I think is the answer to that question. Roosevelt embraced the philosophy of the late Lord John Maynard Keynes, British economist, who visited the United States in 1933, and, according to the British press, Keynes' ideas "captivated President Roosevelt." Those who are in a position to know say that Roosevelt's change in matters of debt and economy stemmed from this captivation. Since that time Keynes' philosophy of "compensatory" spending—the essence of which seems to be that the more you spend the more you have—has been practiced by our Federal Government, and it has infiltrated the States and municipalities.

Keynes' philosophy of "compensatory" spending has about bankrupted Britain. A similar philosophy destroyed the Roman Empire. Keynes' philosophy is advocated by the Communists for our destruction.

Those Americans who are today clamoring for more aid to Britain and other nations at the expense of the sorely pressed American taxpayer might well give thought to the fact that since World War I our Government gave Britain approximately $44,000,000,000. Since World War II we gave Britain and other nations $23,500,000,000. American money has kept socialism alive in Britain; it would have died on the vine without it.

And in some instances our grants have helped the Communists. For example, since World War II we have given Communist Russia more than $441,000,000 through lend-lease and other grants. To her satellite Poland we have given over $480,000,000 and are today buying rye from her, a grain of which America has a great surplus.

This gift of more than $900,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money to Communist Russia and Communist Poland since World War II is hard to believe, but the United States Department of Commerce and Senator HENRY F. BYRD are authorities for this statement. We are, therefore, using our money and our substance to fight communism in Italy, Greece, France, and other parts of the world while feeding it at the core.

If we continue our extravagance at county, State, and National levels, if we continue to live beyond our income, and if we continue our "loose fiscal policy" against which Franklin Roosevelt warned us, our living standard will drop to that of Britain and other socialist countries which may force us to adopt communism through the back door.

Rome was ruined by extravagance, Britain is being ruined by extravagance, and if we continue to follow her lead, we will certainly meet the same fate. Rome fell because her rulers gained and retained power through false promises and the use of taxpayers' money with which to corrupt the electorate, a procedure not different from that of our British cousins and our American politicians.

In speaking of Britain's Socialist government, Winston Churchill said: "Our Socialist spendthrifts and muddlers extracted from the British people a higher rate of taxation than was required in the very height of the war. Never before in the history of human government," concluded Britain's great wartime Premier, "has such a great havoc been wrought by such small men."

During President Roosevelt's three terms, the average yearly spending of the Federal Government was $31,000,000,000, including most of the military cost of World War II—and F. D. R. was no miser in spending public funds. In the four postwar years, the average yearly spending jumped from $14,000,000,000 to $45,000,000,000—an increase of almost 150 percent.

Eighteen years ago a Roman holiday was declared by and for our "spendthrift and muddling" politicians. Since then governmental extravagance at county, State, and Federal levels has been the order of the day. The national debt has increased from $20,000,000,000 to $255,000,000,000—an increase of 1,175 percent. The cost of government has increased from $5,000,000,000 to $45,000,000,000, or 800 percent.

In pursuing the welfare state we are following the precepts of the British Socialist leaders. We are following Keynes' philosophy of "compensatory" spending. We are following the philosophy advocated by the Communists for our destruction. We are on the Roman road to ruin.

Governor Dewey Says: Latham-Halpern-Preller, a Splendid Legislative Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have always tried to work in close harmony with the State legislators of my district for the benefit of the people of my home county of Queens. One could not ask for finer or more cooperative legislative teammates than State Senator Seymour Halpern and Assemblyman Fred W. Preller.

The first citizen of our great State of New York, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, has seen fit to recognize this teamwork in the following letter to Assemblyman Preller, and I take pride in setting it forth in the RECORD:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, January 11, 1950.

Hon. FRED W. PRELLER,
Member of Assembly,
Queens Village, N. Y.

DEAR FRED: I wish to take the opportunity to compliment you and your legislative colleagues from Queens, Congressman HENRY J. LATHAM and State Senator Seymour Halpern, on your vision and energy in the field of State-Federal fiscal relations.

For several years now this legislative team, working in close harmony, has sponsored bills looking toward the eventual elimination of tax competition and duplication between the Federal Government and the States, especially as concerns the taxes on gasoline and amusements.

As you know, I have made this subject one of my major proposals to the New York State Legislature this year. I believe strongly, as I said in my message to the legislature, that the rights and responsibilities of the people of our State are being nullified by the voracious appetite of the Federal budget which is now taking $8,000,000,000 in taxes from New York State citizens as against $1,500,000,000 in 1941. The effect of this policy is to impair the sovereignty of our State and reduce its spirit of self-determination.

Keep up the good work. Legislative teams like Latham, Halpern, and Preller are hard to find.

Sincerely,

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

Economy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, never in peacetime since the United States Government was founded have the Members of Congress faced greater responsibilities to the American people than at this session. To fully meet them we must put the interest of our country first.

To properly meet and solve them, it will require clear thinking and courageous action, a determination to do our full duty in approaching legislation without the thought of how it may affect us politically, but how well the position we take on legislation will serve the people of our Nation.

We are faced with world chaos, and with a more dangerous situation on the home front. Certainly it is a time to approach every question with the highest standard of statesmanship we can bring into play in dealing with the momentous questions which are pressing for solution.

BIGGEST BUDGET EVER

In peacetime we are faced with the President's budget request of $42,400,000,000, the greatest ever asked in taxes of the American people, and at the same time the President predicts that this enormous amount will lack by over $5,000,000,000 paying the cost of the Government for the coming year. At the close of this fiscal year, June 30, we will also have this year's budget deficit of something like $5,000,000,000 in addition. In other words, at the end of the next fiscal year our deficit for the 2 years will be over $10,000,000,000.

This means that with the highest income in the history of the Nation during these 2 years, against which we have levied the highest rate of taxes in the history of the Nation, we will still lack

over $10,000,000,000 of paying the running expenses of the Government. Nothing like this has ever happened in peacetime before in our country.

Mr. Speaker, something must be done about it, and the time to start is now with the first appropriation bill that comes before this Congress. We must then continue to cut all appropriations to the very bone in an effort to reduce the cost of government as many billions of dollars as is possible in this session.

With the cooperation of the President, and with the cooperation of the Republicans and Democrats working harmoniously together, we should be able to effect savings that would wipe out the last year's deficit of $5,000,000,000.

We talk about the danger of another war in the future. The best strategy to prevent another war is to keep this Nation so prosperous and so sound financially that no other nation would dare attack us.

Our first line of national defense is the financial solvency of this Nation. Unless we protect this first line and keep this country in a sound financial condition we cannot defend ourselves against a foreign foe, nor can we preserve freedom and maintain our representative Government for our own people.

Mr. Speaker, with a national debt hanging over us of $256,000,000,000, if a serious depression would overtake us we would at once be in serious trouble financially. We must cut the cost of Government, balance the budget, and begin to reduce the national debt. We cannot increase our income and balance the budget by raising taxes. Taxes are as high now as we dare let them go. Higher taxes will slow down business, throw millions of people out of work and bring in less revenue. We have gone down the road of extravagance, waste, high taxes, and greater spending until we have reached the danger point that we must not pass.

Not a single piece of new legislation that is not absolutely necessary which will add to the cost of government should be enacted into law in this session. This is no time to give serious consideration to such legislation as the Brannan plan and socialized medicine, the two of which, it is estimated, will cost the Government an additional $10,000,000,000 a year.

We should approve the Hoover reports as quickly as possible in the hope that by so doing we can reduce the cost of government by $2,000,000,000.

We must vote against further waste and extravagance on every front.

We must drastically reduce the billions of dollars we have been giving to foreign nations for the past number of years. By adopting the Hoover report, refusing to pass new legislation that will add to the cost of government, and by reducing every appropriation bill as much as possible that comes before us, we ought to be able to cut the over-all cost of government by over $5,000,000,000 and balance the coming year's budget without any additional taxes. I hope and believe that the Members of Congress will cooperate to this end. We must not continue deficit spending.

Congress Must Save the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it serves no good purpose for Members of this body to complain about governmental spending when we appropriate the money. The responsibility is ours. In this connection I am including as part of my remarks an editorial that appeared in the Janesville Gazette, Janesville, Wis., on January 10. This editorial is to the point and fixes our responsibility:

ONLY CONGRESS CAN SAVE US FROM SPENDING SPREE

President Truman has cast the die. He intends not only to continue his wild spending orgy but to expand it with another $5,000,000,000 deficit, taking the Nation further down the road to socialism. Only our Representatives and Senators in Congress can block his way.

While avoiding the subject entirely, President Truman in his budget message left the citizen the conclusion that the President and his advisers do not trust the individual American to handle his own affairs. Hereafter, he will be more and more dependent upon Washington hand-outs, if the Truman Fair Deal succeeds.

There is no alternative for the citizen. If he yields these powers to the Washington hierarchy, the powers to regiment his job, his income, his working conditions, his security, his employer, and the prices he pays for his daily needs—if he yields all this he yields the personal freedom of action which earlier Americans gave their lives to secure, which Americans of World Wars I and II fought to preserve.

Mr. Truman's message reflects fears that the American system will not stand up. He shows a lack of courage to face facts, fearing that our competitive-enterprise system is doomed to fail to provide jobs and income and production sufficient to sustain the needs of our people.

He as much as tells Americans, "You cannot provide your own security or jobs or welfare or housing or adequate education or manage your farms adequately, so we shall have to take over in Washington. To do this you will pay more and more, but Washington bureaucrats will relieve you of all your worries."

In Rock County we wonder why Washington does not cut wasteful spending to balance that budget. Why does Mr. Truman assume that Federal expenses of billions cannot be cut?

The truth is that President Truman does not intend that Government spending be cut. Why? Because he wants his regime to be one of bloated income and a bloated welfare state wherein the citizen, unconscious that he is giving up his freedom, must look to Truman and his cohorts for everything from necessities to luxuries.

Do we want industry looking to bureaucrats for loans, home builders for mortgages, the employed for security, the farmer for Brannan price supports, labor looking for Truman aid for pensions—with everyone reaching his hand out for Federal pap of some kind? How can Americans keep their individual freedom of action if they give up the precious right to remain independent?

How does the citizen, Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public on Main Street, come out? At first it all looks grand. The Fair Deal looks like a Fort Knox with the doors swung open. It looks as though Washington, with the appearance of a rich Uncle, could go on endlessly passing out doles to Mr. and Mrs. and all the children.

Who is going to pay? There is no rich uncle. There is no Santa Claus. There is no bottomless gold stock in Fort Knox or Washington or elsewhere. The billions which President Truman plans to spend he must first take from the worker, the farmer, the businessman.

Before the spending there comes the tax collector. This will be made as painless as possible, but his hand will be in Mr. Public's pocket every day, month in and month out. He must pay more and more and more and more—endlessly—and when he wakes up he asks himself, "Why work 3 hours a day for these bureaucrats?"

Right then he will realize that his initiative has been stolen and so have his personal freedoms. He sold his soul for a mess of hand-outs.

Performance Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the membership to the improved form and procedure used in drawing up the President's budget for the coming fiscal year.

In my opinion, this new performance budget will be an invaluable tool in achieving economical and efficient Government operation. It will assist us as Members of Congress to properly review and make appropriations for Federal Government activities, and it will assist those serving in the executive branch to more accurately plan their programs and their expenditures.

The performance budget is another important step forward in the reorganization of the executive branch of Government. Its use brings into practice modern budgeting procedures recommended by President Truman and the Hoover Commission.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in RECORD, I include a memorandum describing the performance budget prepared by Mr. Robert L. L. McCormick, Director of Research of the Citizens Committee for the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of Government:

BACKGROUND MEMORANDUM ON THE PRESIDENT'S PERFORMANCE BUDGET

WASHINGTON, January 7.—Within a few days Federal fiscal history will be made. The President will present the customary annual Executive budget to the Congress, but the form and quality of that instrument will be changed. For the first time, the budget estimates have been prepared according to a pattern based on logic instead of one based on antiquated customs.

WHAT HAPPENED ABOUT THE NEED FOR THIS CHANGE?

The dynamic circumstances of the twentieth century have made the Federal Government the largest business organization in the world. With the growth of Government services, the Federal budget—our financial plan—has grown in size and complexity, so

that it defies public comprehension. Members of Congress, Federal officials, and citizens have increasingly felt the need for an understandable and workable financial plan for Federal expenditures.

Early in 1949 the Hoover Commission recommended basic changes in the Federal budget process to replace a system instituted and largely unchanged since the Nation's earliest days. The Commission made performance budgeting its No. 1 recommendation on budget reform. Both Presidential and congressional endorsements of performance (sometimes called program) budgeting have followed the Hoover Report.

President Truman announced, in a message to Congress on June 20, that he had instructed the Director of the Budget to work out a system for preparing budget estimates on a performance basis. Both the House and Senate have passed bills requiring a performance budget in the case of the National Military Establishment, and the Senate Appropriations Committee, in its report on the 1950 military appropriations, endorsed this requirement.

HOW DOES THIS NEW PERSPECTIVE PLAN WORK?

Generally, the new plan places emphasis on achieving objectives rather than on how those goals are achieved. This means that attention is focused upon the general character and relative importance of the work to be done, or upon the service to be rendered. In the past, emphasis was upon the things to be acquired, such as personal services, supplies, and equipment. The all-important thing in budgeting is the work or the service to be accomplished, and what that work or service will cost.

In the 1951 budget, to be transmitted to Congress in a few days, will be incorporated factual statements on program and performance, on what work is to be done and for how much. Past budgets have presented a tabulation of the financial plan for the year, consisting primarily of the language of appropriation bills proposed for enactment by Congress and lists of expenditures. The new budget will present two plans: The financial plan, in tables of figures, and the "program" plan, in narrative style, with the two related through performance data.

RELATING WORK DONE TO DOLLARS

Another change which may be less noticeable in form but equally significant is the improvement of "activities schedules." Where more than half of the appropriations in the past have not been accompanied by any break-down showing how the dollars would be related to programs, the new budget will break down over 90 percent of the appropriations to show the programs, projects, or activities to be carried on and the dollars to be devoted to each.

The work output under many programs will be shown. It is hoped that in future years the work output under every program will be shown. Under each program will be indicated such things as how many checks were written, how many cases were handled, how many operations of such and such a type took place. By relating the workload under the program to the dollars spent, it will be possible to measure the unit costs. It will be possible to relate one operation to another. It will be possible to point out weaknesses and places where restrictive legislation runs up costs. It will be possible to relate like operations and to weed out the inefficient.

This work is not yet complete and will not be for several years, but remarkable strides have been made.

OTHER REFORMS

Four additional recommendations of the Commission on Organization also will be involved in performance budgeting, although it will take some time to put them into effect fully.

One of these recommendations is for improvement of the archaic appropriation structure. For example, the 1951 budget proposes that the number of appropriations for the Bureau of Mines be reduced from 19 to 4.

Another proposal of the Hoover Commission reflected in this budget is the separation of budget estimates between current expenses and capital outlay, as has been done in every major private enterprise for years. In addition, the activities schedules will show separately the money the Government spends in the form of grants, subsidies, and contributions. Thus current expense covers the current operations of the Government. Major capital outlay relates primarily to public works and improvements, loans, and other payments in which the Government exchanges cash for some other kind of an asset.

A third Hoover Commission recommendation involved in performance budgeting provides for extension of business-type budgets to 35 Federal organizations, including the Bonneville Power Administration and the Panama Canal. For the first time, we will be able to see profit and loss statements for these agencies.

Another important recommendation in this financial planning area provides for presentation of accounting information on an accrual basis. This will mean that we can see our expenditures for a year in terms of actual costs for services rendered and materials used.

COMPARISON WITH A HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

Specifically, compare this new Federal budgeting plan with planning expenditures in your own home. For example, under the earlier system, the Veterans' Administration could not tell how much it cost to run the veterans' life insurance program nor could the Navy say what it cost to operate the Brooklyn Navy Yard. Likewise, the Civil Aeronautics Authority could not reflect total operation and maintenance costs for civilian airway facilities. But they knew the costs for all "Personal services" or for "Supplies."

If, under this older Government system, in your household budget you would lump together under "Personal services" such items as plumbing repair jobs, baby sitting service, and haircuts, there would be no way in which you could tell how much you expected to spend for baby sitting or plumbing repairs. Likewise, in your home budget under "Supplies," you would not know the expected costs for food, or gasoline, or writing paper, because they all would be lumped under "Supplies."

On the other hand, the Federal Government and the taxpayer, with a performance (or program) budget have their attention centered on the function and activity—the accomplishment of the purpose. Thus, the new type of Government budget will eventually tell how much it costs on the average to service a single veteran's life insurance policy or to operate and maintain, in the aggregate, such civilian airway facilities as visual and electronic devices, traffic control towers, intermediate landing fields, and radio stations. Likewise, you can tell under a program type of household budget, how much food, or rent, or operating an automobile costs. Although the problem is a more complex one in the Government, the principle is the same for household and Federal budgets.

HOW WILL THE NEW-TYPE BUDGET AFFECT US?

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch cited advantages of performance budgeting as follows: (1) "Performance budgeting gives more comprehensive and reliable information to the President, the Congress, and the general public"; (2) it "helps the individual Congressman to understand what the Government is doing, how much it is doing, and what the costs are"; (3) it will "improve congressional examination of budgetary requirements," and "enable the Appropriations Committees more easily to decide the basic expenditure issue each year"; (4) it will "make it possible for the budget document to be submitted and acted upon in a shorter length of time"; (5) it will "enable administrators to place responsibility upon subordinate officials for the clear execution of the provisions made by the Congress."

In other words, individually, we are to be given a type of financial plan for the Federal Government which is much simplified and more meaningful. We have a better chance of seeing what we expect to buy in Government work and services, and how we expect to buy them. We will see with greater clarity more complete expenditure estimates and more accurate revenue figures for the next budget period.

For the President and the Congress, this new method of budgeting includes the same important implications as were outlined above for all American citizens. However, it has special uses for our National Government. In reality, this method concentrates congressional action and Executive direction on the scope and magnitude of the different Federal activities. It places both accomplishment and cost in a clear light before the Congress and the people. As for the executive branch, the budget and appropriation process is the heart of management and control.

In conclusion, it is important to remember that the 1951 budget will represent a distinct break with the past, and, from now on, efforts will be marshalled toward a program budget along the lines suggested by the Hoover Commission and others. The 1951 budget will look considerably different from the past documents.

The 1952 and 1953 documents will offer further improvements, as a result of additional experience, improvements in program reporting and accounting, and additional effort put on the budget. While this 1951 instrument is the first performance budget, it will be far from perfect, but it is a most significant step in national financial planning for every American.

ROBERT L. L. MCCORMICK,
Director of Research, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

One Hundredth Anniversary of New York Typographical Union, No. 6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a story of the development of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, which this year will celebrate its one hundredth anniversary. This history has been submitted to me by Mr. Louis Rubin, chairman, centennial publicity committee, New York Typographical Union, No. 6:

NEW YORK TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION, No. 6,
New York N. Y., October 25, 1949.

Congressman L. GARY CLEMENTE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLEMENTE: All correspondence requesting issuance of a special stamp to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of Typographical Union No. 6 has been turned over to me with the request that I supply you with at least a brief story of the long trek traveled by this union in its march down the corridor of American history.

Its official life began several decades before 1850, although its present official name, still in use, has been carried 100 continuous years. Horace Greeley, famous editor and founder of the New York Tribune was its first president. He was also a distinguished statesman, whose manifold services to the Nation constitute a major phase of American history.

From its very beginning, Big 6, as it came to be called, set up rules for governing its several functions. These were based on American principles, and they are given even greater emphasis today when the democratic ideals of the Nation are being challenged by ideologies which are so inimical to our way of life.

Love of country has been a preeminent phase of its membership. Shortly after it assumed its present name, it gave public expression to its patriotism when on July 20, 1850, it passed resolutions honoring the memory of General Zachary Taylor, president of the United States, who passed away on July 9 of that year. Well represented in the funeral pageant, Big 6 declared, in part:

"Our country has sustained the loss of a gallant soldier, a capable, humane, and victorious commander, a devoted patriot, and a truly honest man."

Within a fortnight after the attack upon Fort Sumter, on April 12, 1861, 13 of its members answered the call to arms. One year after hostilities, 83 of its members were at the front. At the close of the Civil War, 170 members of this New York union were in the Army, many of them having enlisted more than once. During those four perilous years, the union had a membership of 507, including those who went to war. Thus, the proportion of men who served their country reached the astounding figure of 33⅓ percent.

The Spanish-American War tells an identical story of patriotic devotion. Big Six went beyond its normal strength in standing behind the Nation. On October 20, 1895, it petitioned the Congress to grant belligerent rights to Cuba, and on January 3, 1897, it appealed to the National Legislature in gallant candidness:

"The citizens of Cuba are engaged in a struggle similar to that by which our forefathers gained our liberties—shook off the monarchial yoke and established the greatest Republic on earth—the United States of America.

"We hereby extend to the Cubans our sympathy in their notable fight, and we favor immediate legislation by Congress recognizing the independence of the new Republic of Cuba."

We have records in abundance which reveal the vigor with which Big Six pursued its responsibility in World Wars I and II. In the latter, 896 of its members were in the service, while those who were not privileged to serve in the military did all that was humanly possible to help the Nation in its supreme effort.

The story of No. 6's participation in the Nation's wars is only one phase of its services to the Nation. Its peacetime participations are equally notable, for it stood in the forefront of many of the country's most notable advances. For example, it took an active part in the celebration of the electro-magnetic telegraph invented by Samuel F. B. Morse on May 27, 1844. It played an active role in the celebration of the laying and completion of the Atlantic cable in 1866 which united Europe and America for the first time. Documents revealing its enthusiasm over these first-time performances manifestly show the station with which Big 6 greeted these achievements which, like printing, were also means of communication.

As early as 1867, it was a principal factor in espousing peace among nations. On February 26, of that year, the National Arbitration and Peace Congress requested Big 6 President James J. Murphy to act as vice president at a gathering held for this purpose at Cooper Union, April 16, 1867. Efforts of this type are recorded in legion.

Its predecessor organization, the New York Typographical Society, also had illustrious names in councils. Samuel Woodworth, poet and author of The Old Oaken Bucket, was prominent in its affairs. He was the youngest son of a Revolutionary War patriot. The author of Woodman Spare That Tree, General George P. Morris, also became a member. On October 8, 1816, Thurlow Weed, union printer, journalist, and political figure, was admitted. Ellis Lewis, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, compositor on the old New York Courier, joined March 1, 1817. The list is incredibly long.

Even in our own day many illustrious sons of America were, and still are, members of Big 6. It would seem that the incomparable record of this organization induces one to the conviction that we have, here, something more than just another labor union to consider. Here, before our eyes, we have a living, vital, breathing entity which has seen and participated in the entire history of the Nation. That is rare. It is with pride, and not with egotistical affectation, that we, of Big 6, see our union as a brilliant and conspicuous thread in the inimitable American fabric, for in commemorating its one-hundredth anniversary, it also celebrates 100 years of American history, thus demonstrating, incontestably, to the world at large, that the freedoms of this country are not so many abstract phrases, but a reality concretised by the centennial itself.

In brief, the survival of this organization proves the continued and insuppressible duration of the American way of life from the very beginning of our country, and what better way can be point to the proof of America's magnanimity than by the fact that it can point to an American group of workingmen as typical of the freedom which has been extended to it for 100 years of its official existence.

It would seem, sir, that any organization so molded by a century of American history is the true offspring of that history, and that, accordingly, the creation of a Government stamp to commemorate so majestic a triumph would be granted in joyous recognition of pride in its millions of patriotic workers. What a glorious opportunity lies here for an adequate symbol to convey to the nations of the world America's infallible faith in the loyalty and devotion of those who comprise her ranks of labor.

Respectfully yours,
LOUIS RUBIN,
Chairman, Publicity, Centennial Committee.

William Scudder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, though the recent world war is behind us—and it is to be hoped that we do not face another in the lifetime of any of us here today—certainly any time is the right time to polish the medals of our military heroes and to give public recognition to unique deeds of valor committed in the defense of the Nation.

It is in this spirit that I submit to the Congress the name of William Scudder, who now lives in San Jacinto, Calif., in my congressional district. Mr. Scudder claims the unusual distinction of being the only man alive who participated in both the conquest and the liberation of the Philippines.

As a beardless youth, he signed on the U. S. S. *Boston*, which was part of the fleet which met the Spaniards in Manila Bay on May 1, 1898. Our flotilla was under the command of the immortal Dewey, as you well remember.

There was a catchy little tune born of that conquest. It went:

Dewey was the morning upon the first of May;
And "dewey" were the Admiral's eyes down on Manila Bay.

No doubt that strain, or the distilled sentiment of it ran through the mind's eye of William Scudder when 46 years, 2 months and 3 days later, during World War II, he sailed into Guam. This time he was aboard the motor vessel *Pennant*, part of a Coast Guard unit bent on liberating the Philippines from the Japanese.

The quartermaster general of the Spanish War Veterans organization recognizes the yeoman service of Mr. Scudder in these words: "We salute you for your tenacity and we also applaud you as a Navy man."

As spokesman in the House of Representatives for the people of the Twenty-second District of California, I too commend Mr. Scudder and thank him for his patriotic service when the country was in danger.

It is a sorry indictment of our methods in international affairs that two world-encompassing wars and the incident of arms in 1898 should occur in the lifetime of one generation. However, such opportunities for patriotic service have only enhanced the usefulness and courage of such men as William Scudder.

Same Old Tune, Same Old Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Henry Baker Reiley, editor and publisher of the Somerset Daily American, Somerset, Pa.—you can see the county courthouse from the turnpike—in the issue of January 10, gives us a couple of editorials which cannot only be read but acted upon with profit.

They follow:

THERE IS

There is a startling resemblance between the talk of President Truman and that of his immediate predecessor. Their performances also exhibit their kinship.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, seeking the Presidency in 1932, went up and down the Republic promising to cut the Federal Government's expenses "at least one-fourth."

At that time it cost about four billions a year to operate the Federal establishment.

At that time the Federal debt was less than $50,000,000,000.

President Truman has asked Congress to appropriate more than ten times as much as the amount Mr. Roosevelt proposed to reduce "at least one-fourth," for the operation of the Federal establishment next year, and the national debt is more than $250,000,000,000.

Speaking of appropriations while he was yet merely a Senator from Missouri, after the fashion of Mr. Roosevelt while he was a candidate for the Presidency, Mr. Truman said:

"It is easy to appropriate billions of dollars, but it is not so easy to obtain those billions of dollars.

"There is a limit to the amount by which we can safely increase our national debt. The American people are not willing and must not be asked to suffer unnecessary burden of waste, carelessness, and confusion."

Former President Herbert Hoover agrees with the President's warning. But Mr. Hoover has gone further. He has said that we have already reached the saturation point in taxation. By that he means that though we may levy higher taxes, or increase the levies already made, the proceeds of the levies will not produce according to calculations.

We Americans are suffering from unnecessary burdens of waste, carelessness, and confusion.

Congress would do well to agree upon a simple course:

1. There must be no unnecessary appropriation made.
2. There must be no new tax levies.
3. Waste, carelessness, and confusion must be eliminated.

BEWARE THE LION

The Associated Press carried a story several days ago about a trainer who monkeyed too much with a lioness.

His act was to stick his head in the animal's mouth. She evidently didn't think much of it, for one day she snapped as he was withdrawing it and took a bank out of one arm. When his injury had healed sufficiently for him to go back to work, at the very first performance she nipped off the end of his nose and the end of his chin. Obviously, the lioness was trying to tell the trainer:

"Beware the lion."

Now the Government in Washington shied at the British lion during the Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations, after having rescued the bruin from the Kaiser's armed horses in the First World War.

The Russian bear had shown the white feather during the First World War and had made peace with Germany. That is when the United States saw the necessity for entering that conflict. Except for the series of incidents that impelled the action of Washington, Britain might have been subjugated by Germany.

But the lesson was of little value to Britain, for at the first opportunity, the lion struck his head into the mouth of the bear by resuming diplomatic and commercial relations.

The agreement between Russia and Germany which enabled Hitler to open the Second World War was a sort of slipping of the arm of Britain.

The eagle had watched the performance of the lion and the bear and had become eager to follow the lion's example. So, diplomatic and commercial relations between the United States and Russia were resumed.

The eagle was grieved to see what had happened to the lion when Hitler turned on the bear, but when Hitler turned on Stalin, its admiration for the bear was revived.

The Chinese Communists were mere imitators of the Russian, but the lion was brave, so when they had conquered China, in he rushed to make the Chinese partners of the bear.

The eagle lost a good many feathers as a result of following the tail of the lion after the First World War. Indeed, the Second World War was a logical sequence to the eagle's gleeful pursuit.

Both got nipped by the bear at Tehran, at Yalta, and at Potsdam. The bear has been ruminating ever since the end of the fighting in the Second World War. It has made a fuss in Manchuria, in Korea, and in China, to say nothing in a group of less important European nations.

But the lion is brave, and the eagle has a marvelous admiration for the lion's tail.

Economic Forces Operate Against Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that the economic forces operating against small business or enterprise in the United States are now running stronger than at any previous time since the inception of this Government. Furthermore, I am of the opinion that insofar as the Congress of the United States is concerned, there has been too much lip service and too little real service extended to those who, in the first place, live simply, exercise thrift, and who, in the second place, take their savings and invest them as equity capital in enterprise for the purpose of expanding the general foundation of so-called small business.

Anyone who strikes at the foundation roots of small business strikes at the very private enterprise which has made this country industrially what it is today. Those who are now attacking business simply because it is big and who, in the same breath, advocate big government for the purpose of taking over big business are not friends of the enterprise system upon which our people depend.

If reasonable management, with due regard for the worker, the investor, and the consuming public is to be had, management must be found outside the realms of politics. Government ownership and management simply means political ownership and management. If Government ownership and management is to prevail, this means that the quantity and quality of goods and services to the consumer will decline.

Anyone who moves in the direction of removing from the enterprise system the forces of competition, likewise overlooks the interests of the consumer. Under the free enterprise system the only economic protection the consumer has comes to him through the free play of the forces of competition.

In this connection, I wish to insert a statement made by Mr. DeWitt Emery, president of the National Small Business Men's Association:

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., December 2, 1949.

Mr. RAY TUCKER,
National Press Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TUCKER: My attention has just been called to your column published on November 21 in the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, N. C., which column is devoted entirely to a smear attack on the association and the Small Business Economic Foundation.

According to this column, your information is based on disclosures made during an investigation conducted by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN (Democrat, Texas), chairman of the Small Business Committee of the House.

If Mr. PATMAN told you, as you say he did, that the Small Business Economic Foundation is a lobbying organization or that it has ever done any lobbying of any kind or character, he's lied to you and I'll be glad to have you tell him I said so.

The foundation has never had anything whatsoever to do directly or indirectly with any Federal or any other kind of legislation or any kind or type of lobbying activity.

Mr. PATMAN knows this, and telling you otherwise can only mean that he deliberately deceived you so as to use you as a tool in his smear campaign against the foundation and our association.

Actually and as a matter of positive and absolute fact, the activities of the Small Business Economic Foundation are entirely—100 percent that is—educational. Its one and only purpose is to develop and promote a better understanding of the American way of life.

Also if Mr. PATMAN told you, as you claim he did, that the members of the National Small Business Men's Association are not fully informed concerning the objectives and activities of the Small Business Economic Foundation, he told you something which he knows is not true. He has on file in the office of the Small Business Committee of the House, copies of Pulling Together, the association's monthly bulletin to members—these bulletins, together with financial statements and a lot of other material, were filed with the committee at Mr. PATMAN's request—in which the foundation and its activities are discussed at considerable length.

The National Small Business Men's Association was started in 1937; its stated purpose being to give small-business men a voice in national affairs and to help preserve freedom of enterprise in the United States.

Obviously giving small-business men a voice in national affairs meant that the association would be active in connection with Federal legislation. Just as obviously, helping to preserve freedom of enterprise meant that the association would carry on an educational program, a program designed to make the largest possible contribution toward getting the man in the street to understand what freedom of enterprise is, how it operates, and what it means to him.

The association went along from 1937 until the latter part of 1946 carrying on its twofold legislative and educational program. In August 1946 Public Law No. 601 became effective. Title III of 601 is known as Federal regulation of lobbying. Under title III anyone, meaning any organization or any individual, who, as one of his principal activities, endeavors to influence the passage or defeat of Federal legislation must register with the Clerk of the House and file quarterly sworn financial statements.

One of the principal activities of the National Small-Business Men's Association very definitely was and is to influence the passage or defeat of Federal legislation. Therefore, it was necessary for the association to register as provided in title III, which it did and each quarter since has filed the required financial statement.

Shortly after the association registered, the trustees decided that a more extensive and more effective job could be done if our educational program was carried on by a separate organization which would devote itself exclusively to educational work. In accordance with this decision, the Small Business Economic Foundation was incorporated under the nonprofit statutes of Illinois in November 1945.

The association is a nonprofit membership organization incorporated under the laws of the State of Ohio and has its national headquarters office in Akron, Ohio. The association is financed 100 percent by dues paid by its members, all of whom are bona fide small-business men. The dues are $10 the first year and $15 each year thereafter.

The foundation has its office in Chicago. It does not have any members and is financed entirely by contributions made by anyone and everyone interested in its educational program who wants to help it carry through that program.

There may be something wrong with small business, medium-sized business, and big business jointly financing an educational program to develop and promote a better understanding of the American way of life, but if there is I frankly do not know what it is. I don't mean the things a publicity seeking, two-bit politician may rant and rave about, but rather something basically or fundamentally wrong with all businessmen working together to preserve constitutional government and freedom of enterprise in the United States.

Which has the biggest stake in preserving our American way of doing business, small business or big business? The answer is small business 10 times over. If you don't believe this, check with the Census Bureau of the Department of Commerce and you'll find that more than 90 percent of the 3,900,000 business establishments in this country have less than 100 employees.

How long could any big business organization in the country stay in business if it did not have the cooperation of thousands of small businesses as suppliers and dealers or sales agents? Take the big automobile manufacturers as an example. Not one of them could keep its assembly lines running without the bits and pieces furnished by several thousand small business suppliers, nor could any of these giant corporations keep their factories going for even a few months without each having more than 20,000 dealers—all of whom are small-business men—to sell and service their cars and trucks.

This interdependence between large and small business, which applies to our whole business structure up and down and across the board, gives small business a mighty important stake in big business and big business an equally important stake in small business. This being true, I'm sure neither Mr. PATMAN or you will deny that it is, why then shouldn't businessmen at both ends of the scale, top and bottom as well as those in the middle, unite in supporting an educational effort to give more people a better understanding of our American way of working and living together?

Your column is as full of untruths, half truths, and misstatements of fact as a cur dog is of fleas. You say, "Both lobbies are anti Taft-Hartley." The Small Business Economic Foundation is not a lobby so that's one misstatement of fact in these five words. The National Small Business Men's Association is very, very strong for the Taft-Hartley Act, which is the second misstatement of fact in the same five words.

Our association and its members run the attached ad addressed to Mr. Green and Mr. Murray as a full page or a half page in 214 daily newspapers scattered all over the country and the tremendous public sentiment favorable to the Taft-Hartley Act which this ad generated is one of the principal reasons this act is still on the books. Also, if the truth were known, our effective opposition to the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act is the principal reason Mr. PATMAN and some of his cohorts are doing their utmost to destroy or discredit the National Small Business Men's Association.

The foundation's educational program includes the distribution of hundreds of thousands of pamphlets to wage earners, to high school and college students, to high-school and college teachers, to professional people, to businessmen and others all over the country.

The foundation also sponsors a talking moving picture, Letter to a Rebel, which each week is being shown to more than one hundred 16-millimeter audiences of all kinds all over the country. This picture was recently given an honor award as an outstanding and distinguished educational effort by Freedoms Foundation, Inc.

Currently most of the foundation's effort is being concentrated on its series of full-page newspaper educational feature ads which in a short time will be running once a week for 52 weeks in more than 100 daily papers and eventually will run in more than 300 papers scattered over the 48 States. Last week the foundation was awarded a gold medal by Freedoms Foundation, Inc., for the first 13 ads in this series, which to date is all of the series that has appeared in one or more daily papers.

I could continue this discussion indefinitely but believe what I have said will serve to show that you haven't the slightest idea what you are talking about. Either that or you are the sort of person who will deliberately twist, distort, or misrepresent anything in order to turn out what he thinks is a good story.

Sincerely,

DEWITT EMERY,
President.

The World's Free Workingmen Unite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the free and freedom-loving workingmen of the world are organizing to resist communism in labor unions and to combat totalitarianism. The great American labor organizations are joining in this world movement. It is one of the most significant and reassuring signs of these times to see workingmen everywhere repudiating the claims of Communist impostors that their movement befriends, protects and delivers labor from the shackles of non-Communist governments.

I find an excellent review of this free labor movement in Business Action, a publication of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, a copy of which I append herewith under leave to extend my remarks:

WORLD UNIONS GIRD TO FIGHT TOTALITARIANISM

(By Anthony P. Alfino, employer-employee relations)

A new world-wide labor organization has been established by trade unions to help workers everywhere resist totalitarian infiltration.

Meeting in London late in 1949, labor delegates from many parts of the world set up the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) as opposed to Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU).

It all started about a year ago when representatives of CIO, British Trade Union Congress, and Dutch Union Center walked out of WFTU because of its Communist predominance.

FREEDOM AND SECURITY

The new group, ICFTU, proclaims the right of all workers to social justice, to job security, and to association in trade unions which shall be free bargaining instruments and which derive their authority from their members.

Although primary impetus came from those who pulled away from WFTU, many additional trade union groups were represented at London. The second report of the credentials committee, accepted by the conference, listed 261 labor officials from 53 countries in attendance, representing more than 48,000,000 members. Overtures to other trade unions to join, if successful, would raise this claimed total to 65,000,000 members.

Only CIO had been associated with WFTU. However, both AFL and CIO are participating in the new ICFTU, keeping apart their domestic rivalry in order to work together both in the initial preparations for the new world labor body and in the conference itself.

COMPROMISE ON PERSONNEL

Among important compromises was the question of geographic distribution of membership on the powerful executive board. As finally constituted, the board will consist of 19 members.

British delegates, aided by a group of European Socialist members, had proposed London as the permanent site for the organization while American delegates sought a continental city. Finally chosen, by unanimous vote, was Brussels, Belgium.

The conference decided to admit Christian trade-unions which promise to give up membership in the International Christian Federation within 2 years. The French Confederation of Christian Workers obtained from approval of the ICFTU constitution in order not to imply willingness to affiliate on the basis proposed. The Belgian Christian Unionists announced their affiliation, however, and the Italian group is believed definitely within the organization.

WORK WITH SECRETARIATS

ICFTU is considering provisions in its structure for close cooperation with the International trade-union secretariats, worldwide organizations devoted to workers' problems in specific trades and industries.

Figuring in ICFTU's present planning are these trades and industries: Transport, metal trades, building and woodwork, mines, communication, general factory, textile, boot and shoe, public service, clerical and technical work, farm laborers, chemical workers, printing trades, hotel and restaurant, tobacco, garment, food and drink, trade-unions in exile.

The ICFTU organizational set-up provides that it will be governed by a congress of delegates from all unions meeting once every 2 years. In the intervening years, a smaller group known as the general council will meet. Actual execution of decisions of the congress and council, as well as direction of ICFTU activities, will be handled by the executive board, to meet every 6 months.

The board has a seven-man subcommittee, to be on call between board meetings. Area representation on the subcommittee is distributed among Asia, Britain, Europe, Latin America, and North America, with Europe and North America each having two places.

BELGIAN ELECTED PRESIDENT

The conference elected Paul Finet, of Belgium, as its first president, and J. H. Oldenbroek, of the Netherlands, its first secretary general. Oldenbroek for many years has been head of the International Transport Workers Federation.

United States labor unions have two places on both the executive board and on the subcommittee, filled by AFL President William Green, and CIO President Philip Murray. Green's alternates on the executive board are George Meany, AFL secretary-treasurer, and Irving Brown, AFL international representative for Europe; Murray's alternates are James B. Carey, CIO secretary-treasurer, and Elmer Cope, CIO international representative for Europe.

The other two members of the executive board from North America are Percy Bengough and Pat Conroy, both Canadian labor leaders.

Marine Corps Striking Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the announcement during recent days that the Marine Corps striking force is to be reduced to six battalion landing teams has caused a great deal of concern to those of us who are interested in a balanced national defense. There is no question of the determination of some of defense officials, both in and out of the service, that the Army shall take over the functions of the Marine Corps. Apparently the battle is shortly to be joined and the decision should be made in the Congress. The editorial from the Christian Science Monitor which follows sheds light which is of interest to those of us who will be called upon to make the ultimate decision:

THE IF TO THE PENTAGON

(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—So the marines think they're tough, do they.

Montezuma, Tripoli, Chateau-Thierry, Guadalcanal, Iwo Jima? Huh.

Never mind the howitzers, men. Belay those ready assault waves. Call off your close air support. Those marines aren't that tough. We've found a way to lick 'em.

Scuttle 'em in one sentence. Let 'em have it—smack in the budget.

Like this, see: "Six marine corps battalion landing teams will be maintained."

Six battalions of marines, a bare half a division, is all the new 1951 budget leaves the Nation's "first team"—instead of the two skeletonized divisions—of the fleet marine force Congress and the country have been counting on as the hard, steel spearhead of a force-in-readiness poised and ready to move by land or sea or air on less than 24 hours' notice.

This solar plexus punch by the Pentagon planners did not take the marines by surprise. The fact is they saw it coming.

They have been warning Congress about the fancy footwork of top defense officials, the familiar tactic of stroking the Marine Corps with one hand and yanking its funds out from under it with the other.

Gen. Clifton Cates, Marine Corps commandant, reminded the Vinson committee last October of the fears within the corps that the functions assigned it by law are being usurped by others, namely the Army General Staff.

The prevailing opinion around the Army section of the Pentagon seems to be that the Marine Corps is a luxury the country can do without. Generals Bradley and Collins have given the impression that there's nothing in the Marines' manual the Army can't do as well.

They admit that the marines pioneered and perfected the techniques of amphibious warfare. But look at the Army's record in Sicily, Southern France and Normandy, the generals say. They are especially proud of their webfooted exploits in Normandy where General Eisenhower's infantrymen swarmed out of the surf and over the German west wall.

General Cates told the Vinson committee last October that the corps was pared down to the limit of its bone and muscle. Any further reductions in combat strength, he intimated, would be fatal to the concept of the force-in-readiness, which Congress mapped out for the marines.

Now, the thing General Cates greatly feared has come upon the marines in the new 1951 defense budget, which cuts the present nucleus of two divisions in half. Marine Corps leaders say this reduces them to the role of policemen as effectively as though the issue had never been debated in Congress and decided in the Marine Corps' favor.

In writing the 1947 National Security Act, Congress plainly intended to safeguard the Marine Corps, especially its amphibious functions, and provide for its integrated mobilization in time of war.

But the trouble is that Congress didn't go far enough. It put a ceiling on the Marine Corps. It said the marines should not exceed 20 percent of the personnel of the Navy. But it failed to put a floor under the Marine Corps.

General Cates told the Vinson committee bluntly that the underlying effort on the part of the Army to contravene the act of Congress has never subsided. The Marine Commandant said furthermore that the Army was not seeking to have Congress redefine the roles and functions of the armed services but was proposing that the Joint Chiefs of Staff put to a vote the Army-sponsored proposal to transfer and reassign the traditional Marine Corps functions.

Each of those two budget-riddled fleet marine forces—one on each coast—has been regarded as the Nation's No. 1 force in readiness: Air-ground teams, developed during World War II when the Marines perfected the method of coordinating the striking power of air and ground forces in a new form of attack.

Under the roles and missions drawn up at Key West at a conference of Army, Navy, and Air Force leaders, the Marine Corps was designated as the amphibious force in readiness to move within the first 24 hours after the outbreak of war.

It was assumed at Key West the Nation was confronted with the possibility of a war in which an opponent would hold the initiative. Circumstances alone, it was agreed, would restrict the United States to a series of damage-control operations—the marine's job—against the time when the Nation could grapple with the enemy somewhere on the flaming outer fringes.

The marines may be in for their hardest fight—their last one or their best one—when that sentence in the budget reducing the fleet marine forces to six battalion landing teams comes up for consideration. There are signs that they will have considerable close support in Congress by the time the decisive battle begins.

A Voluntary Approach to a National Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, since my introduction of H. R. 6727, my attention has been called to the publication, entitled "A Voluntary Approach to a National Health Program," issued last year by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, in which that important organization advocates a plan quite similar to that envisioned in my bill.

I quote from pages 16 and 17 of this publication:

At the present time there are more than 33,000,000 people in the United States covered by hospital insurance in the Blue Cross and a rapidly growing number in the Blue Shield for medical or surgical benefits. There are approximately 52,000,000 if we include all types of hospital insurance. Another large group of Federal employees could also be included if prohibitions were removed. In order to stimulate enrollment in these voluntary insurance systems and to increase the benefits under Blue Shield so as to include full-scale medical and surgical care given in approved hospitals, we suggest that the Congress amend the income-tax law so as to permit a deduction of premiums up to $75 for health insurance from the net income tax of all individuals in the lower-income brackets, i. e., up to $5,000.

Although the above suggestion differs in detail from the income-tax credit provided in H. R. 6727, the same general principles apply. They are so well stated in the foreword to this brochure prepared by Most Rev. Karl J. Alter, bishop of Toledo, chairman of the bureau of health and hospitals, social action department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, that I have obtained permission to extend my remarks to include this foreword. The high motivation behind the recommendations of the National Catholic Welfare Conference is best expressed by the final paragraph in which it is stated:

It is our fervent hope and purpose by means of the system proposed in this statement to assure each citizen and the members of his family that they will enjoy under God's providence the best possible medical care.

The foreword prepared by Bishop Alter follows:

FOREWORD

The immediate problem under consideration in the following pages is that of developing an adequate national-health program. Interest in the subject has become quite intense and widespread. There has been much discussion and much controversy; but unfortunately there has been also much confusion. The confusion arises in large part from the tendency to oversimplify the problems involved and to assume that the cost of medical care is the only obstacle in the way of a great improvement. The lack of institutional facilities and professional personnel has

been greatly underestimated by reason of the emphasis placed on the former. In itself the latter is a primary obstacle and equally in need of remedy if the quality of medical care is not to deteriorate into a mere increase in the quantity of patients. A sound national program should provide for the elimination of both obstacles.

The controversy revolves in large part around the issue of an exclusive and compulsory Government health-insurance system versus private and voluntary effort supported by Government assistance instead of control. Many competent authorities fear that an exclusive state system under a compulsory tax will necessarily involve a loss of freedom for the voluntary health agencies and put an end to private initiative to the ultimate detriment of the health of the Nation. There is no controversy or disagreement concerning the advisability or advantage of a prepayment plan to meet the cost of medical care. Acceptance of such plans is practically unanimous. The division of opinion concerns the question whether there should be an exclusive state monopoly or whether there should be a cooperating partnership between the Government and voluntary health agencies. A right approach to the problem depends not only on a correct analysis of the concrete situation, but also on a correct social philosophy. The rights and duties of society, the state, and the individual must be considered in relationship to one another.

Society is a much broader and more comprehensive concept than that of the state. Government is indeed a necessary agency of society, but it is not the only one. There are many others. Because man is a social being he enters into association with others in order to achieve the benefits which are comprehended in the category of social welfare. These associations of a voluntary nature have as legitimate a right to exist as the state itself, provided they serve the common good. The state has a definite responsibility to help protect and promote the health of the Nation inasmuch as the Government is charged under the fundamental law with the duty of promoting the general welfare and inasmuch as the Government alone has adequate resources to implement a comprehensive program. Voluntary agencies, however, have a definite right and responsibility to exercise an important function in planning as well as in executing such a program. It is socially undesirable to neglect the contribution of either the one or the other.

Individualism as a philosophy of life has been discredited, not only because it has failed in practice, but because it stems from a false concept of human nature. Man has a twofold nature, both individual and social. His personal dignity and sacred rights originate in the fact that he is created as a distinct, intelligent, and responsible person, with a destiny of his own. His full development as a human being can be achieved only in as far as he is a member of society and only in as far as the obligations of social justice and social charity are fully activated. Ethical and religious ideals which furnish the highest motivation in the care of the sick as in all social service can function more effectively in voluntary associations than through the medium of the modern secularist state.

The bureau of health and hospitals of the social action department, NCWC, the administrative board of the Catholic Hospital Association, and the directors of Catholic charities have given careful consideration to the varied phases of a national health program, and in formulating their conclusions they approach the problem not from a negative but from a positive viewpoint. They recognize the existence of social responsibility, but at the same time they reject the concept of an exclusive state responsibility for the health and well-being of the American people. They reaffirm their conviction that a partnership between the state and voluntary associations provides the better solution and is more consistent with our democratic processes. Monopoly means control; partnership means freedom. They entertain the hope that the following statement will throw new light on the subject and that a genuine cooperation of all parties at interest will produce a constructive program adapted to the needs of the Nation and effective in promoting the highest standards of health and well-being.

KARL J. ALTER,
Bishop of Toledo, Episcopal Chairman, Bureau of Health and Hospitals, Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, and Chairman, Administrative Board of the Catholic Hospital Association of the United States and Canada.

Amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a three-sentence bill which I think merits your support. Its purpose is to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to alleviate the undue hardship which would otherwise befall two groups of veterans.

The first group is composed of veterans who, owning farms on January 1, 1950, have an old-growers allotment for 1950 less than the county percentage factor. It is my feeling that these veterans who returned late from the war and got started on their cotton slowly should not be held down by the greatest acreage limitation. Consistent with the policy of the over-all act, limiting total production, they should be allowed to produce up to the country average. My bill provides for this, but stays within the policy of the act by specifying that only acreage previously allotted to other farms and voluntarily released to the county committee be reapportioned to these veterans.

The second group is composed of veterans who, owning farms on January 1, 1950, are not eligible for a 1950 old growers allotment. Here I am principally concerned with veterans who planted to cotton in 1949, but not in a prior year, for which reason their farms were not considered when acreage allotments were computed. My bill would accord to these veterans an adjustment in their new growers allotments, and to an extent equal to the county percentage factor for old growers, but only so far as released acreage will permit.

I spoke of both these groups in a speech I delivered on the House floor February 2, 1949. My remarks were directed at H. R. 128, which subsequently became Public Law 38. While I agreed with the majority of the House that the purpose of the bill was most commendable, I pointed out that serious inequities would result unless in the final agricultural bill some allowances were made for these veterans off to a late start following their return from service.

It was at the encouragement and recommendation of the United States Government that many returning war veterans of south Texas took lands of very low economic value and at high cost to themselves cleared the brush and put the land into cultivation to grow cotton and feed crops. This arduous process of clearing mesquite and ebony trees to make the land suitable for cotton took a great deal of time, and when it is considered that many of these veterans were late in 1946 discarding their uniforms, and late, perhaps, in 1947, getting readjusted to civilian life and establishing themselves again, it is easy to understand how 1949 may have been the year of their first cotton crop. Or, if not the first, then easy to understand how very small the acreage actually put to cotton in 1948 may have been.

These veterans by their improvements to the land have taken property that was on the tax rolls at values of $2 and $3 and increased the valuations tremendously, with resultant benefit to the counties and State of Texas.

But while the counties and the State have profited, the veterans by their efforts have incurred heavy mortgages and debts in purchasing and developing the land. They bought and cleared their acreage with an eye to the future, and now must face that future uncertainly, as their dry land with its limited uses is further restricted by a law seriously curtailing any cotton quota they might obtain.

In my speech of last February I said:

If 1949 is not allowed in future cotton quotas, and the cotton-quota law, as yet to be drafted, does not provide a means of giving them quotas substantially up to the county average, it will bankrupt a number of men, including many World War II veterans who are planting new lands to cotton this year for the first time, since they would have their cotton allotment appreciably decreased in 1950.

I then went on to point out that much of this new land cannot be profitably farmed unless a large percentage of it is planted to cotton.

My bill, as I have said, is limited to three sentences. The heart of the amendment is contained in the first sentence. This is the provision which reallocates released acreage to veterans of either of the two groups that I have discussed. It reads as follows:

Any part of the acreage allotted to individual farms in any county under the provisions of this section which the owner or operator releases to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotments for such farms and apportioned to farms in the county which are owned by veterans who acquired such farms prior to January 1, 1950, and for which allotments for the 1950 crop are established under subsection (f) of this section, so as to provide, to the extent that the released acreage will permit, an allotment for

any such farm equal to the acreage determined for the farm by applying the percentage factor computed under subsection (f) (2) of this section.

The second sentence was put in the bill to provide for the disposition of released land not required by the veterans. The wording of this provision is:

Any released acreage not required for such veterans' farms shall be used by the county committee for making adjustments of other farm acreage allotments established under subsection (f) of this section so as to establish allotments which are fair and reasonable in relation to the factors set forth in paragraph (3) of that subsection.

The third and last sentence is intended to safeguard an annual supply of released acreage. Without this provision I believe most farmers would be extremely reluctant to give up any part of their quota. The provision reads:

For purposes of establishing farm acreage allotments for any subsequent year, any acreage transferred pursuant to this subsection shall be considered as acreage planted to cotton on the farm from which such acreage was transferred and shall not be considered as acreage planted to cotton on the farm to which such acreage was transferred.

I sincerely believe that the amendment I have introduced is a necessary and proper one. It is not a veterans' handout bill. Rather, it seeks to take into account certain factors now serving to penalize some veterans for their years in uniform, and to make an adjustment for them by putting their lands on a more workable, productive basis. I earnestly solicit your support for the passage of this important legislation.

The Lambs Go Traveling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include this revealing editorial from the Wisconsin State Journal of Madison, Wis.:

THE LAMBS GO TRAVELING

With all the genius Democrats can demonstrate when it comes to raising party slush funds, it's a wonder they can't balance the national budget, which, by Truman's own figuring, is $5,500,000,000 out of joint.

Take, for instance, the case of Charlie Oashin and his fellow United States attorneys across the country.

Charlie and his colleagues have been summoned to Washington for a conference with the United States Attorney General, Mr. Truman's former campaign manager.

The taxpayers will pay their traveling expenses. Nice trip for all the boys. But—

Once there, they're all expected—that's the official word, expected—to plunk down $100 apiece for the Democrats' Jefferson-Jackson day fund-raising feed. The shakedown dinner just happens to fall on the day of the conference's opening.

Neat. Quite neat.

The party-in-power, and power is the word, taps the public till to haul its unofficial lambs into position for blood-letting. And everybody loses but the boys in power.

Yes, just as neat as the pattern in Wisconsin, where worried mail carriers, postal clerks, and other civil servants are getting those letters signed by Jerry Fox and Carl Thompson * * * "Our records do not show you listed as a contributor to the Democratic party * * *." Get going. Cough up. Bam! Slug! Squeeze! * * * "so that party activities and the 1950 campaign fund can be assured."

Neat as the way you get a census-taking job in Wisconsin.

"Come on up and join the Democratic Party!"

Neat, indeed. Very neat. And maybe just a little bit too gaudy.

Vote-Getting Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal under date of January 13, 1950, as follows:

VOTE-GETTING FRAUD

Harry S. Truman is President of the United States and in that position he deliberately is planning political fraud on the American people by promising them things he must know he cannot deliver. It is all part of a design for election victories. He promises, as someone has said, all things to all people, yet is bound to realize that he cannot make good on such extravagant assurances, the while he craftily calculates the vote-getting power of the attitude he thus announces.

When compared to his predecessor, Mr. Truman may not suffer as much, as a politician, as the average observer may think. Franklin D. Roosevelt for years was regarded as possibly the most astute politician in United States history. He was credited with knowing far in advance of the developments what the people would want and demand, with knowing before they had made up their minds what they were going to think later, with anticipating situations affecting the social and economic life of the country, and with making his plans accordingly. Harry S. Truman is not far behind him in political craftiness if, indeed, he is in that position at all. Both were opportunists, and it may be said of the Chief Executive of today that he works just as hard at it as did his predecessor.

It is common gossip in Washington among Members of Congress of both major parties, among newspaper correspondents of years of training and experience, that Mr. Truman, who is to make various demands on the House and the Senate for legislation, does not expect such measures as he champions to be put through. It also is whispered about that with reference to some of the things he will emphasize he actually does not want them to succeed. But—and this is the important thing—having advocated the reforms, which his own party members in Congress confidently are expected to reject, he can remind the electorate that he tried to put them over, that his heart was in the right place, that he was thinking of them, and was trying to do something for them, wherefore they ought to support him when election time came.

Members of Congress considered closest to the White House admit that in this session of Congress Mr. Truman already is as good as whipped on three things he will emphasize: Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, compulsory health insurance, seen by many as socialized medicine, and substitution of the Brannan farm plan for the present price-control law. They also think he has little chance to put through his civil-rights program. Mr. Truman knows this as well as do others. But that does not worry him for he feels that various groups to which he makes his promises will vote as he wishes even if he isn't able to make good his pledges.

If Our Nation Would Remain Prosperous, Like the American Family It Must Balance Its Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, so accustomed have the American people become to thinking in terms of billions of dollars when speaking of our Federal budget, that we have lost sight of the simple economics involved in the matter of remaining solvent, whether as an individual, a family, an institution, or the Government itself.

The following editorial published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 11, 1950, entitled "This Is Not Fiction," translates into terms we all can understand the meaning of our Government's unbalanced budget. I ask unanimous consent to have the article from the Plain Dealer reprinted as follows:

THIS IS NOT FICTION

Will the reader pretend that he has an obscure neighbor by the name of Harry Truman? And will he pretend that Neighbor Truman has decided he must borrow money, a decision which many of us ordinary folks have reached at times in the tempestuous course of life?

Neighbor Truman, we're going to pretend, steps into the bank to apply for the loan, and we're going to have the privilege of observing the transaction.

"I want to borrow $500," says our neighbor. (Now most will anticipate the next few questions, having been through it.)

"Do you have any debts at the present time?" the banker inquires.

"Yes," says our neighbor. "I owe the bank at this moment about $25,800."

"What is your annual income, Mr. Truman?"

"I have take-home pay amounting to $3,750 a year," says he.

"Hmmmmm," the banker hmms. He at once is suspicious of the client's ability to pay the old debt without $500 more added. And aren't his eavesdropping neighbors suspicious, too?

But the banker gives allowance for unforeseen circumstance. So he asks Mr. Truman: "Do you think you will be able to save a large portion of your income this year and each succeeding year to reduce your indebtedness?"

"Oh, no," Neighbor Truman replies to the surprise of the banker, and the neighbors listening in. "My necessary living expenses

this year will be $4,200. I'll be forced to spend more than I earn."

"Pardon me," the startled banker interjects. "Do you mean that, owing already an amount that constitutes seven times what you'll take in during a year, you're going to spend more than you earn?"

"That's right," says Neighbor Truman. "You see I must provide tuition at private schools for my children. I must help a poor relative set up a new business in which he's going to lose money for a long time to come."

"Just what kind of business is that relative going to sink your money in?" the incredulous banker asks.

"Why," says Mr. Truman, "he's got a wonderful humanitarian idea. He's going to sell milk to the Hottentots at a price they can afford to pay."

"But just those things won't eat up your whole income this year; will they?"

"No; but that isn't all," says Mr. Truman. "I am building security for my children by putting price supports under them. My boys sell newspapers to the neighbors at a nickel apiece, but I give them an extra nickel. My daughters make lamp shades which they sell for $5, but I don't think that's a fair price, so I give an extra $3 for each one they sell. Besides, my wife wants a television set."

The banker now steps aside to get his breath. Here's a fellow who owes more than he can ever repay if he lives frugally below his income seeking to borrow still more, and at the same time boldly proclaiming his intention of carrying out fantastic money-spending schemes.

What will the banker do?

Will he lend the new money? It's silly even to ask the question.

This scene is not fiction. It constitutes a faithful reproduction of the program set forth in regal solemnity by President of the United States Harry S. Truman. Multiply all figures by 10,000,000 and you have the Truman budget, his plan of Government, the Government's income, and the Government's debt.

In this case Congress is the banker. If it makes the loan, Borrower Truman's note will have to be signed by the taxpayers, which is to say by all the people. Who, in his right mind, would voluntarily sign the note of such a profligate spender?

A Free Hand in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I note an editorial in the Christian Science Monitor of January 6, 1950, which I regard as a clear and comprehensive view of the problems that confront us in dealing with the Far East. The conclusions reached by the Monitor I believe to be sound, when we take into consideration all the factors of the complex situation. It is not China alone that we are dealing with, but rather a world problem that calls for circumspection on our part as we endeavor to shape a far-reaching policy. Under leave to extend my remarks, I attach the editorial, as follows:

A FREE HAND IN THE FAR EAST

The choice for United States foreign policy on Formosa has been a choice of methods. Americans are agreed on stanch resistance to the spread of communism in the Far East. The differences arise over the most effective ways and means. In adopting a hands-off-Formosa position President Truman—with the advice of the National Security Council—has chosen, we believe, the wiser way.

Any other decision would have left American policy weighed down by the incubus of the émigré regime of Chiang Kai-shek. Armed intervention was the most dangerous venture into which that incubus would have forced the United States. In behalf of a regime plainly repudiated by the Chinese people, intervention would have risked war with the government which—little as we like it—now speaks for the Chinese people.

But as Mr. Truman indicated and Secretary Acheson has more fully explained, American policy now goes farther than mere rejection of armed intervention. It continues technically to recognize the Nationalist government, but practically cuts loose from the discredited Chiang. It refuses to send him military advisers. It confines aid for Formosa to ECA resources already authorized.

The United States refuses to quibble over the legal status of Formosa under the Cairo and Potsdam agreements—which, in the absence of a peace treaty, might have been used as an excuse for American occupation. Mr. Truman specifically renounces any American desire to obtain special rights or to set up military bases in Formosa.

These moves draw the poison fangs from Moscow's charge of imperialism. Americans know that charge is untrue. But the Chinese people, moved as much by anti-foreignism as by communism, have been influenced by it to regard the United States as an enemy. So, too, have millions of other Asiatic peoples.

It is not easy to cut loose from the only organized Chinese resistance to communism. If Chiang could reasonably claim to speak for China, aid for him even in exile might be justified. But when he has been so plainly rejected by the people and is particularly unwelcome in Formosa, continued active support of him was clearly a millstone about the neck of American policy.

Released now from this burden, the United States can begin, in cooperation with other anti-Communist governments—particularly those in the Far East—to regain the friendship of the Chinese people. Now, with hands freed, American policy should seek with renewed vigor to dissociate itself from the imperialism, racial discrimination, and feudalistic exploitation which give Moscow its main chance in the Far East.

The Time for Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, many of us, in considering the way our gigantic national debt is being increased by deficit financing, wonder if it ever will be possible to balance the budget, since the present administration thinks it cannot be done in these relatively prosperous times. And the editor of the largest newspaper in my State wonders if the administration ever will see any need for economy. Under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the Record an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal:

TRUMAN'S UNBALANCED BUDGET

President Truman in his windy budget message says that the Federal budget must be balanced one of these days, but not in 1950, which, of course, is a political year.

Though his 1951 budget contains a $1,700,000,000 cut in foreign commitments and aids to veterans and a $1,500,000,000 increase in social security and postal revenues, it ends with a deficit only $400,000,000 less than in 1950.

Despite the $5,100,000,000 deficit in 1949, the President argues that he has taken the only possible realistic position—that every cent he asks for is minimum for our national safety and our domestic well being. He hints that, were it not for his realization of our fiscal difficulties, he would have set budget goals far higher. After all, the Fair Deal is being expanded by only a billion or so in 1951.

But why, if realism is a factor, must we increase a deficit by spending the $800,000,000 for Federal highways in 1951? Why must we expand relief grants to the States by $260,000,000? Why must we start a $200,000,000 program of educational aids? Why must we in 1951 do a dozen other things the President feels cannot be postponed?

The answer is, of course, that we do not have to extend our social experimentation, unless we choose to. The President's budget, made on the eve of (and with an eye on) the fall elections, can be cut materially without the slightest damage to worthwhile existing programs. The question is whether Congress, also with an eye to the elections, will do the job.

Congress always finds it difficult to cut expenses. Yet it is toying with the idea of reducing the war excises. If it does so, the deficit contemplated by the President may rise from $6,100,000,000 to around seven billion. Congress has never looked with favor on increasing postal revenues by raising second-class mail rates, as the President asks. If it turns down that suggestion, the deficit may approach seven and one-half billion, which is two billion more than this year.

Against this, we shall have the President's proposals for a revision of our taxes, to come later. The revision, he says, will be primarily to remove injustices and only secondarily to increase revenues.

The whole thing adds up to a new Truman policy of gradually decreasing deficits. He would expand expenditures almost to keep pace with future increases in revenue and would reach a balance sometime within the next decade or two.

The time for economy, says the President, is not now. We wonder whether, in his mind, there ever need be such a time.

After all, he has already asked for numerous programs that would boost expenditures far above those even envisaged in this budget message.

Forty-eight Sovereign States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of Friday, January 6, 1950:

POINT-SHOT SOVIETISM STATES

The distinguishing mark of the Fair Deal is a sprawling array of social services imposed extravagantly on the entire country at the Federal level. In the first place the National Government does it and not the States. In the second the Government usually makes its reforms compulsory, and in the third it neglects the capacity of the economy to support the reforms.

This centralization is neatly exemplified by Governor Dewey's message to the New York Legislature. Mr. Dewey reports on an impressive list of social services offered or proposed by the State government. But the services are sustained by governmental paternalism, and they are not expanding beyond the power of the State to support them.

It is particularly significant that while President Truman feels the need to ask for a moderate increase in Federal taxation, Governor Dewey prefers to cut State spending to remain within the present tax structure. In the nice adjustment of social welfare to the ability of the tax base to support it, Mr. Dewey wishes to remain on the black-ink side of the ledger.

Mr. Dewey declares that no person in New York State need go without medical care any more because he cannot afford it. This has been accomplished not by any compulsory insurance plan or by any alternate system of general free services entailing heavy taxes on everyone. It has not interfered in any way with the traditional physician-patient relationship. There is no over-prescribing scandal such as hangs over the British system. It is done by carefully restricting the operation of the government to the area in which the system of individual initiative cannot effectively function.

There are other examples of this State solution instead of welfare. The point we would make here is that the Federal Government is crowding in on the States in setting up its own social services, and it does so partly by laying such a heavy Federal tax burden that the States cannot pursue their own programs.

There is no justification for saying that the Federal Government can do these things better. No national program can be tailored for the individual State, and what Mississippi might need in the way of social services won't do in New York or Massachusetts. Mr. Dewey brings home that the States can do it, and can do it within the bounds of free enterprise without Federal direction.

For Whom, the Rocks?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following interesting editorial from the Daily Belle Fourche (S. Dak.) Post of January 5, 1950:

FOR WHOM, THE ROCKS?

Unless something happens to change the atmosphere, the months between now and next November are going to be an accelerated repetition of the months between November a year ago and now. It's going to be a political campaign whirl during which facts generally are warped into campaign issues for public consumption. The citizen, meanwhile, poses as a lout who will swallow anything if it is poked at him often enough.

It will be a time for digging out campaign issues. And digging out campaign issues has come to mean unearthing petty issues that can be blown up so that they will be mistaken for vital issues.

The fact of the political picture today is that there is no between-election period when all officials buckle down to work for the good of the Nation. Campaign overlaps campaign, the only variety that of intensity.

In the meantime, the citizen looks at government as something apart from himself. He pokes fun at Congress, not once admitting that Congress is the people's branch of the Government, and that whatever it is or is not, he has made it. He pokes fun at Congress never realizing that he is poking fun at himself, at his failure in performing the duties of self-government.

Every Representative or Senator in Washington was elected by the people. He was chosen first by his party mates in a primary election. He was approved by the people of his State or district in a general election. But in spite of these common facts, people make jibes at Congress, not realizing that they are discrediting their own voice in the Government.

There is plenty of fodder to use in poking fun at Congress. The executive branch of the Government sees to that. It is only natural that the administration should try to weaken the force that provides its greatest check—the branch that limits its power.

Consequently, if there is one fact that needs to be hammered into the minds of the people it is this: To discredit Congress is to discredit themselves. To discredit Congress is to prove that men are not bright enough to rule themselves.

The Congress has just opened a new session. But reporters and commentators, before the first day was over, were poking at Congress as they might poke at a congress in Timbuktu—a congress in which they had no part. We belong to this commenting group. And we hang our heads in shame that any group can be so blind to what they are doing. It is all the more to their discredit that these writers, these commentators are among those who have profited most from our free government and its free system of education. Yet they are leading the pack in tearing it—and themselves—to pieces.

Whatever this Nation is, we the people, have made it. If Congress is weak, we, the people have made it so. There is not one among us who has the right to stand off and pitch rocks, as uninterested persons, at the Congress we, ourselves, elected.

Before it's too late, let's realize what we're doing. Before it's too late let us realize that now is the time to choose our best minds and our greatest hearts to represent us and manage the affairs of our Government. Our best in Congress, our best in the Senate, our best in the statehouses—this is the first demand in a democracy. And if it is otherwise, we have nobody to blame but ourselves.

The Need of Limiting by Congressional Amendment the Spending and Taxing Powers of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Robert B. Dresser, Providence, R. I., on the Need of Limiting by Constitutional Amendment the Spending and Taxing Powers of Congress:

JANUARY 3, 1950.

In a speech on the floor of the United States Senate on July 14, 1949, Senator Byrd, of Virginia, speaking of President Truman's speech the night before on the Economic Report, said:

"I say that the fiscal program announced last night by the President is the certain road to ruin. Unless the Congress and the people can defeat this program, we will go over the precipice of financial disaster.

* * * * *

"Such a program can only hold in prospect for business increased taxes or national insolvency. Increased taxes applied to a declining business probably would reach a point of confiscation, and insolvency would mean default on the public debt, in which is now invested a great part of the security of the American public. Confiscation would mean socialism, and default would mean national bankruptcy."

This speech was delivered in the current fiscal year, in which the estimated expenditures of the Federal Government, $43,500,000,000, are the largest in any peacetime fiscal year, and the estimated deficit, $5,500,000,000, the second largest, being exceeded only by the year ended June 30, 1941, when outlays on the defense program led to a deficit of $3,159,000,000. Moreover, in less than five peacetime years under President Truman, the Federal Government has spent $191,081,000,000, an amount greater than the total amount spent from 1789 to July 1, 1941. In 1931 the cost of the Federal Government was $30 for each man, woman, and child. In the current fiscal year it will be over $300.

According to ex-President Hoover, "Twenty years ago persons directly or indirectly receiving moneys from the Government * * * represented about one person in every 40 of the population. Today about one person out of seven in the population is a regular recipient of Government moneys. If all of those of age are married, they comprise about one-half of the voting strength of the last presidential election."

But this is not all. The present administration has proposed legislation that according to some estimates would eventually add over $20,000,000,000 to the present budget.

This alarming state of affairs has been brought about during the past 16 years by the policy on the part of our Federal managers of tax, spend, and elect, the formula for socialism proposed by the late Harry Hopkins.

If we are to retain our freedom, we must drastically reduce our spending and our taxes, and to prevent recurring abuses of the spending and taxing powers they should be limited by amendments to the Federal Constitution.

One amendment should eliminate the general-welfare clause and limit the spending power of Congress to the specific purposes enumerated in the Constitution. This would merely be an adoption of Mr. Madison's view, as opposed to that of Mr. Hamilton, that the general-welfare clause adds nothing to the purposes specified in the Constitution. The amendment should also give to any State the right to question in the courts the validity of an appropriation—a right which generally speaking no one possesses at the present time.

The other amendment should (1) deprive Congress of the power to impose death and gift taxes, and (2) limit the power of Congress to impose taxes on incomes in peacetime to a reasonable maximum rate. The adoption of this amendment would do the following things:

1. It would provide needed assurance, which statutory law cannot provide, against recurring abuse of the Federal taxing power, and aid greatly in the formation of much needed venture capital.

2. It would increase the national wealth, and over the years, the Federal revenue.

3. It would aid greatly in saving our free-enterprise system.

4. It would free the States from Federal domination and aid in preserving our present form of constitutional government.

5. It would terminate the duplication of death and gift taxes by the Federal Government and the States, and leave that field of taxation exclusively to the States, the laws of which, and not the Federal law, determine the right to dispose of property by gift and on death and the rights of inheritance. The death taxes, running to a high of 77 percent, are extremely destructive of capital and will in the long run destroy the accumulations of capital so necessary for industrial activity and expansion and for the full employment of labor and the payment of high wages. The revenue from these taxes is trivial, constituting less than 2 percent of the present Federal budget. The gift tax is auxiliary to the death tax, and both should be dealt with alike.

As to the income tax, both reason and our own Government's experience demonstrate that in peacetime a moderate rate of tax will in the long run produce more revenue than a high rate.

In the United States 90 percent of the work today is done by machinery. It is this machinery that has made the high wages and high standard of living possible. The capital required to provide this machinery comes from the savings of corporations and individuals. Only a small percentage of the people, probably not over 10 percent, save money for investment in such machinery. If these savings are taken in taxes, the capital is not available to provide the machinery needed to maintain and expand our industrial plants.

It is the heavy progressive income tax that does the damage by appropriating the savings of those taxpayers who supply the bulk of the capital needed by industry.

It is clear that unless Federal spending and taxes are drastically reduced, our venture in individual freedom will end and the socialistic state will take over, and it may be sooner than many realize.

In the words of the English historian, Thomas Hodgkin, in his book, Italy and Her Invaders, written in 1880:

"Whatever occasional ebbings there may be in the current, there can be little doubt that the tide of affairs in England and in all the countries of western Europe, as well as in the United States of America, sets permanently toward democracy. Will the great democracies of the twentieth century resist the temptation to use political power as a means of material self-enrichment? With a higher ideal of public duty than has been shown by some of the governing classes which preceded them, will they refrain from jobbing the Commonwealth? Warned by the experience of Rome, will they shrink from reproducing directly or indirectly the political heresy of Caius Gracchus, that he who votes in the forum must be fed by the state? If they do, perhaps the world may see democracies as long lived as the dynasties of Egypt or of China. If they do not, assuredly now as in the days of our Saxon forefathers, it will be found that he who is 'giver of bread' is also lord. The old weary round will recommence, democracy leading to anarchy, and anarchy to despotism, and the national workshops of some future Gracchus will build the palaces in which British or American despots, as incapable to rule as Arcadius or Honorius, will guide mighty empires to ruin amidst the acclamations of flatterers as eloquent and as hollow as the courtly Claudian."

ROBERT B. DRESSER.

Acheson's Red Herring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Washington News of January 14:

MR. ACHESON'S RED HERRING

When a defense attorney can't make out a good case for a client, it's a common expedient to divert attention from the real issue by dragging out a red herring.

Secretary of State Acheson has done this in defending the State Department's blunders in China. Russia is the red herring—and no pun intended.

The Soviets, he points out, are annexing four northern areas of China—Outer Mongolia, Manchuria, Inner Mongolia, and Sinkiang. He predicts that this will provoke the hatred and righteous anger of the Chinese people, and explains that American policy in the Far East is based on that expectation.

Mr. Acheson seems to have forgotten that President Roosevelt agreed to the separation of Outer Mongolia and China in the Yalta deal of 1944, which China confirmed under American pressure in the Russian-Chinese treaty of 1945. We may be sure, however, that the Chinese people have not forgotten it.

Given uncontested control of Outer Mongolia it was easy for the Russians to penetrate Inner Mongolia and Sinkiang.

What actually happened in Manchuria, after Russia invaded that area at our urgent request, is of even more recent memory. But, as far back as 1947, Lt. Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer saw that Russia planned to annex that vast area and advised our Government to put it under a United Nations trusteeship to save it from the Communist invasion. Mr. Acheson's predecessor in the State Department, General Marshall, vetoed that proposal.

In brief, the United States conceded Outer Mongolia to the Russians, and opened the doors of Manchuria to them. This much is recorded in the State Department's own white paper.

Possibly, as Mr. Acheson professes to hope, the Chinese people in time will rise in their wrath and drive the Russians out. Something remotely like that has happened in Yugoslavia. But it has not happened in Poland, despite the country's long tradition of hatred for all things Russian. It hasn't happened in any of the other satellite states.

It is no easy matter for unarmed peasants to overthrow a police-state dictatorship, however unpopular it may be.

Mr. Acheson also is a better defense attorney than historian in his explanation of Nationalist China's collapse.

A much different version is running currently in the Saturday Evening Post.

Chiang Kai-shek, according to Mr. Acheson, emerged from the war the undisputed leader of his people, opposed only by a few ragged Communists hiding in the hills. If that had been the case, by what right or reason did the United States intervene in China in 1946 and demand that Chiang take this unimportant minority into his government? We did that, through the Marshall mission.

Our intervention halted Chiang's armies in their tracks when they were at the point of knocking the Communists out of the war. His support melted away, as Mr. Acheson says it did, but that was because Chiang's war-weary country was unequal to the burden of maintaining his idle armies in the field during the long American-imposed truce, which Mr. Acheson does not mention.

Finally, when Chiang was at the end of his resources, American support was withdrawn from his government because it had failed to satisfy the Communists' demands.

The Coal Situation

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months the slow-down of work in the coal industry brought about by the dictatorial demands of John L. Lewis has served to increase in intensity the present coal situation. Although the weather in certain sections of the country continues to be favorable and thus averts a most critical situation, in other sections of the country where intense and severe cold weather prevails, with a resultant great use of coal, a most acute condition prevails.

To add to this, there continues to be a coal shortage in industry and many of the miners themselves are highly displeased and dissatisfied with the 2-day week and the slow-down in production ordered by Lewis. These miners are most anxious to go back to work.

Mr. Speaker, it is a deplorable situation in this country when one man can dictate to the laboring man when he shall work and for how long. John L. Lewis should be effectively dealt with and promptly. The provisions of the Taft-Hartley law should be invoked and the slow-down and crippling strike ended and coal production resumed, in the interest of the workingman, industry, and the people of America.

DICTATOR JOHN L. LEWIS SHOULD BE DEALT WITH PROMPTLY AND EFFECTIVELY

I have, heretofore, called upon the President to take action in this connection. I deem it of importance in the interest of the people of America.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following two editorials:

[From the Nashville Banner of January 12, 1950]

NOW NOW, CONGRESS!

A resolution has been proposed in Congress which, if adopted, would urge President Truman to exercise the authority vested in him to get full production of coal resumed.

Here is Congress' opportunity to demonstrate clearly, for all to see, how it feels about the situation brought about by John L. Lewis' whims and bites.

It is clearly shown that President Truman is not disposed to take the action the law provides he can take to protect the public. Congress should show the President, and the people, what it thinks—one way or the other.

In no uncertain terms, the gravity of the situation has been presented at the White

House and on Capitol Hill by the people best acquainted with the Nation's fuel necessities.

From the White House has come nothing. From Capitol Hill will come—what?

[From the Nashville Tennessean of January 18, 1950]

ANY MONOPOLY SHOULD BE CURBED

Mr. John L. Lewis, who is probably more responsible than any other man for the Taft-Hartley Act, has now forced upon Congress the possible need of applying antitrust laws to labor unions in order to outlaw the sort of monopolistic restraint of trade that exists in coal production.

The antitrust laws were designed to prevent just such a condition as now exists. For the good of the country, it has been decreed, no man or group should have power enough to dictate the operations of any trade or industry, to fix prices to the detriment of the public, to manipulate production for private gain, and to eliminate competition.

Where coal mining is concerned, of course, there is little or no competition. But here again the question of tyranny arises, since all efforts to challenge the power of a dictator are promptly put down—by force, if necessary.

As an hypothesis let it be assumed that instead of a threat to the economic system by one man in control of the Nation's miners, this state of affairs had been brought about by a person or persons dominating one of the basic private or semiprivate industries. The rich and powerful steel industry may be taken as an example.

Big steel is not without its faults. Its leaders are smart; they take care of profits and, for themselves, handsome salaries and pensions. But no czar of steel has the power to manipulate the industry as coal production is manipulated, with utter disregard of the national public.

How long would a steel dictator last who systematically shut down operations to create shortages and unemployment, thereby starting a chain reaction affecting unfavorably the whole economy? Would the country thus permit its railroads to be partially paralyzed and operations to be curtailed or ended in a vast number of factories, power plants, and private homes? Would the people, to say nothing of the Government, be tolerant if result were to bring actual physical suffering to millions, as is the case when coal supplies are limited by one man's decree?

The result would be a quick declaration that no man or organization is greater than the Government and that ruthless restraint of trade through monopolistic power must stop.

Laws exist for dealing with an imaginary condition of the kind outlined. If they did not exist they would soon be enacted. The important thing, however, is that the American people would not tolerate such an outrage under any conditions.

In the present crisis, President Truman may be forced to application of the Taft-Hartley law. But that would mean only impermanent alleviation. In due time, the tyrant of the coal fields could return to his harassing tactics, as he has always done.

Temporary relief will be welcome, but the time is at hand when it should be made lasting. The right to strike is inherent, but the right to dominate a country is inimical to American principles.

Antitrust laws have been on the books a long time and have served a good purpose. They should be the Nation's safeguard against dangerous monopoly of any kind, and labor has Mr. Lewis to thank for the growing sentiment that its scope should be extended so that the habitual offender who heads the United Mine Workers can be cut down to size.

Rural Electrification

REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, as an ardent supporter of rural electrification, and being a bit skeptical of the ultimate intentions of the Southwestern Power Administration, I am alarmed at the report of a contract between the Southwestern Power Administration and the rural electric cooperatives within my area, awaiting approval of the Rural Electrification Administration of Washington, having as its principal purpose the socialization of the rural people and the abolition of the fine intentions of the rural electrification program.

JUSTIFICATION FOR RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

Rural electrification is a justifiable program within a free democracy operating under our free enterprise system—justifiable for the simple reason that existing private utilities could not in many instances economically reach the sparsely settled rural areas. These rural people have joined together in a true American spirit for the purpose of bringing into their respective communities a necessity and convenience to which they are entitled. These democratic groups who own and operate their own systems are just as free as the stockholders in any other corporation dealing in private enterprise under our system of government. Merely because banking institutions could not economically justify long-term loans at a sufficiently low rate of interest with which electricity could be brought to the sparsely settled rural sections accounts for the need of loans from the Federal Government, to which these people are as much entitled as any business that might borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any other loan agency of our Government. I have no hesitancy in further stating that the rural electrification program is economically sound, and there is no reason why every penny of the money will not be repaid to the Government.

INTENTIONS OF THE SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

The expressed intentions of the Southwestern Power Administration are legitimate, but I have always been a bit doubtful as to whether this organization actually intends to limit its activities to the borders of its expressed intentions. This organization has publicly contended that its existence was necessary for the pooling and proper distribution of power generated by the Federal Government at various multiple-purpose dams within the Southwest. There has been some doubt in my mind whether the Southwestern Power Administration does not in some ulterior manner intend to eventually generate and produce power from sources other than that provided by the Government Flood Control Act. However, along with many other Members of Congress, I have often been assured by officials of the Southwestern Power Administration that they never anticipate the operation of steam-power units for the generation of electricity, or to in anywise attempt the regimentation of our splendid rural electrification system which means so much to the rural people of this country.

However, we now find the Southwestern Power Administration entering into a contract with the rural electric cooperatives which will, in effect, through the back-door method and contrary to the intent of Congress, according to my interpretation of the contract, allow the Southwestern Power Administration to receive all benefits from steam-power electric generating units provided with rural electrification moneys within the Southwest; to operate and eventually own electric transmission lines built with rural electrification moneys that could well be used to extend distribution lines to unserved rural people within my area—which authority has been specifically denied by Congress; and to stranglehold the free operations now being enjoyed by the rural electric cooperatives by allowing the Government through the Southwestern Power Administration to dictate all policies of, and completely regulate the involved rural electric cooperatives.

My accusation that the Rural Electrification Administration is using moneys for purposes inferior to the need for distribution lines to unserved eligible people as provided in the law is advisedly made. For example, I have several times brought to the Administration's attention my personal knowledge of approximately 375 eligible rural people within Scott County, Ark., who have not as much as received consideration at the hands of the Rural Electrification Administration on a loan application filed in December 1947, while during this same time millions of dollars in loans have been approved for the construction of steam-power generating units which will, under the terms of the proposed Southwestern Power Administration-rural electric cooperatives contract, be used for the ulterior motives of the Southwestern Power Administration rather than for the benefit of rural electrification, which action and procedure, I maintain, is contrary to the intent of Congress.

AUTHORITY OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The Rural Electrification Act of 1936, signed by the President on May 20, 1936, is still the controlling law for loans to Rural Electric Cooperatives for rural electrification purposes by the Rural Electrification Administration in Washington. It provides for the loan of funds to rural electric cooperatives and others for the purpose of serving electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service. It provides that loans in the opinion of the Administrator, must be liquidating over a period of originally 25 years, now 35 years. It defines rural areas as areas within the limits of towns of less than 1,500 inhabitants, and in strictly rural areas. The clear intent of this act is

that the moneys loaned by the Government from the Treasury of the United States is to be used under this act for the sole purpose of serving persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service.

AUTHORITY OF THE SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

On December 22, 1944, the Flood Control Act of 1944, was passed, which provides for the construction by the Army engineers at the expense of the Federal Government of a number of multiple-purpose projects, especially on the rivers of the Southwest, in the States of Missouri, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Louisiana. Section 5 of this act provides that power and energy produced at multiple-purpose projects, constructed by the War Department, should be delivered at the dam to the Department of the Interior, who should transmit and dispose of such power so as to give the most widespread use thereof at rates to be set by the Federal Power Commission as low as reasonably possible consistent with good business principles. Preference is to be given in the quantities of power and energy available from such projects to public bodies and cooperatives.

In transmitting and disposing of power and energy from such multiple-purpose projects, the Department of the Interior was authorized from funds to be provided by the Congress to construct only such transmission lines and related facilities as are necessary to deliver power and energy at wholesale quantities to facilities owned and operated by Federal Government, public bodies, rural cooperatives, and privately owned companies. It will be readily seen from reading of section 5 of the Flood Control Act that the Southwestern Power Administration is not authorized to own, construct, lease, or otherwise acquire steam generating plants, nor is Southwestern Power Administration authorized to build any transmission lines that are not directly necessary for the delivery of power and energy to the facilities owned by others as described by section 5 of the Flood Control Act. Mr. Douglas Wright, Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration, has repeatedly testified before Congress and publicly stated that Congress has not authorized the Southwestern Power Administration to construct, own, or operate steam-power electric generating plants.

It will be further noted that section 5 of the Flood Control Act has no limitation as to what parties Southwestern Power Administration may sell and deliver the power and energy from such multiple-purpose dams. Preference as to quantities of power and energy is granted to public bodies and cooperatives, but even in the case of these agencies, if power and energy can be delivered over lines already in existence, Southwestern Power Administration is stopped from constructing duplicating lines to open up fields of competition with the existing industry in the area.

Thus we have two agencies, the Rural Electrification Administration, with practically a blank check to be loaned for service to unserved farmers, which authorizes the construction of steam plants and building of transmission lines from such steam plants to reach persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service. Cooperative steam-power electric generating plants are justifiable provided the involved cooperatives are not otherwise receiving ample service at reasonable rates; but there can be no justification for the Rural Electrification Administration to provide facilities for the Southwestern Power Administration contrary to a direct denial of such facilities by Congress. There is a greater need for immediate service of available electricity to the rural people in my area than for generating plants where we have ample generating capacity. Congress now has no control over the moneys granted in a blank amount to the Rural Electrification Administration for loaning. This sum now amounts to more than $3,000,000,000.

PROPOSED SPA-REA CONTRACT

A plan has developed within my area of the Southwest in the form of a proposed contract between the rural electric cooperatives and the Southwestern Power Administration whereby the rural electric cooperatives, which have been highly successful under their present set-up as free agents, controlled and governed by their own board of directors, would be regimented under the dictatorship of the Southwestern Power Administration. The promoters of this super-cooperative propose to borrow money from the rural electrification program in Washington for the purpose of building steam-power units and transmission lines in the name of rural electrification but for the primary benefit of the Southwestern Power Administration, thereby authorizing the Southwestern Power Administration to in effect receive all benefits from steam-power electric generating units that Congress has heretofore denied them and to allow the SPA to lease transmission lines duplicating existing lines, contrary to the specific denial of Congress.

The contract provides that the super-cooperative—consisting of three or more distribution cooperatives—would borrow $9,565,000 from the Rural Electrification Administration in Washington, $4,825,000 of such sum to be used for the construction of a steam generating plant of 30,000 kilowatts capacity, and the remaining $4,740,000 to be used for the building of transmission lines from this steam plant over a wide area covered by a number of member cooperatives. The contract further provides for the Southwestern Power Administration to lease all of these transmission lines built by the super-cooperative with funds obtained from the Rural Electrification Administration for a period of 40 years, with a payment from the Southwestern Power Administration to the super cooperative in an amount large enough to retire the investment in the lines over a period of 40 years including interest on all outstanding balances. Southwestern Power Administration agrees to operate and maintain these lines, and at the expiration of 40 years these transmission lines are to become the property of Southwestern Power Administration without any additional payment.

In other words, the lines are right from the beginning constructed for the Southwestern Power Administration although section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 would actually prevent construction of these lines by the Department of the Interior.

The contract further provides that Southwestern Power Administration will buy the complete output of the steam plant constructed by the super cooperative on the basis of 85-percent full-load operation. This, in the case of a 30,000 kilowatts plant described herein, would amount to 225,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year, which would mean, at a minimum price, approximately $900,000 to $950,000 per year. Thus Southwestern Power Administration has, in effect, gone deliberately contrary to the expressed will of the Congress in attempting to construct unnecessary transmission lines and a steam generating plant for the purpose of accomplishing its ulterior motive of federalizing the electric utility business.

In this contract the Administrator proposes to apply rate schedule A, which has been approved by the Federal Power Commission for cooperatives, which rate is higher than the rate now being paid by the same cooperatives for electric energy in the involved area. The demand of super cooperative is limited to 30,000 kilowatts over the 40-year period, and the contract is cancelable on the part of the Southwestern Power Administration for power and energy to these cooperatives in the event they exceed this amount of energy at any time, and the contract does not provide arrangements for additional power and energy required over and above 30,000 kilowatts.

Cancellation of the service contract from Southwestern Power Administration to the cooperatives, however, does not cancel either the sale of all the power from the steam plant to Southwestern Power Administration or the lease by Southwestern Power Administration of the transmission lines constructed by the cooperatives. Thus, cooperatives can well find themselves without any power source whatsoever while it would have to continue the sale of all the output of its generating plant and the lease of all of its transmission lines to the Southwestern Power Administration. This could readily result in the liquidation of member cooperatives and their being taken over under the terms of the mortgage with Rural Electrification Administration by that agency.

Cooperatives are required to contract to purchase from the Southwestern Power Administration immediately upon the completion of the steam plant, 18,000 kilowatts for the first year. Whereas the present load of the member cooperatives, in a strictly rural area, largely occupied by national forests, or extremely mountainous territory, is less than 9,000 kilowatts. This provision might result in cost to the member cooperative or to the Federal Government, through inability of the cooperatives to meet their obligation to Southwestern Power Ad-

ministration, thousands of dollars. It is highly improvident and if enforceable could easily bankrupt the member cooperatives.

In addition to this vicious feature, the contract further provides that the super-cooperative will make contracts with its member cooperatives that will provide that their books of record, bank account, and all transactions carried on by the member cooperatives, shall be open to the Southwestern Power Administration, and virtually provides that Southwestern Power Administration will have regulation of retail rates charged by member cooperatives to the farmers and rural establishments served by the member cooperatives.

I cannot believe that the affected cooperatives within the Southwest have been properly advised and fully realize the import of this proposed contract between the Southwestern Power Administration and the Rural Electric Cooperatives within my area, which can amount to nothing less than to allow the Southwestern Power Administration to eventually gobble up the independent electric cooperatives in the southwest for the promotion of SPA's selfish aims, ambitions, and ulterior aspirations.

THE GRANDIOSE SCHEME TO PRIVATIZE ELECTRIC POWER

The entire agreement serves but one purpose and that is—to make use of funds from Rural Electrification Administration for the purpose of circumventing the clear and expressed will of the Congress in regard to operations of the Southwestern Power Administration as provided in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, and to circumvent the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 by permitting these Federal funds which are to be loaned for the purpose of serving persons in rural areas not receiving central station service to be used for the purpose of allowing Southwestern Power Administration to raid territories now adequately served.

This analysis covers only the contract for the one generating plant and its transmission lines in northwest Arkansas. The same pattern is followed by the supercooperatives and Southwestern Power Administration for similar purposes for the Western Electric Cooperative, at Anadarko, Okla., the Central Missouri Cooperative, Northwest Missouri Cooperative, the M & A in Missouri, and for two super cooperatives to be located in southern and northwestern Louisiana, and for a super cooperative to be constructed in southern Mississippi and northeastern Louisiana.

The pattern thus set for the southwest area—Missouri, Oklahoma, Arkansas, east Texas, part of Mississippi, and all of Louisiana—will immediately provide a stepping stone for the same kind of subterfuge in the area covered by the Pick-Sloan plan in the Missouri Valley; for the area covered by the CVA bill now in the Congress; for the New England States; and for the southeastern United States now being investigated along similar lines to those covered by the Southwestern Power Administration. If approved by the Rural Electrification Administration in Washington, with the acquiescence of the Congress, it will inevitably result in the expenditure of several billions of dollars in absolutely unnecessary generating plants and transmission lines.

The Southwestern Power Administration is using the good name of Mr. Claude Wickard and his fine rural electrification program to foster their grandiose scheme at any cost. This contract is just another step toward complete Government regimentation of the farmers. It will not be long until the Government will be telling the farmers how many cows they can milk and how many chickens they can feed, just as the beet and the cotton growers are now being forced to farm under Government regulations. The whole thing is wrong. My conception of government is to legislate and regulate and not to dictate and operate our American way of life.

CONCLUSION

The rural electrification program stands today in the mind of Congress as one of the most successful and meritorious activities for which Federal funds are used. Its support comes from both sides of the aisle. For example, even the Republican Eightieth Congress, a Congress noted for the deep slashes in Federal spending, raised the amount of money made available to the Rural Electrification Administration to the $400,000,000 level. This is the same amount being requested by the President for use in the fiscal year 1951. There can be no doubt Congress wholeheartedly backs the REA program.

There is another Federal agency, however, that has injected itself into the REA program. This other agency lacks solid congressional support and it has always kept itself in political hot water. I refer to the Department of the Interior, which is represented in my area by the Southwestern Power Administration. The Department of the Interior is a Federal agency that has always borne watching. Throughout its entire political history this Department has itched for an increase in its bureaucratic power. Under the banner of serving the public interest and the common good of mankind, it has instead served only its special interest—bureaucratic power and growth.

The most notable administrative scandals in the history of the Federal Government have involved the Department of the Interior. Who will ever forget the famed Teapot Dome affair? It is obvious that the political ambitions of this department know no bounds.

It has been tireless in its effort to take over the forestry service from the Department of Agriculture. It would also like to take over many of the constructive programs for soil conservation now administered by the Department of Agriculture. In addition, it wants to take over the activities of the Corps of Engineers for flood control and rivers and harbors development. It even backed and pushed through Congress section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 under which it markets all power developed by the Corps of Engineers, even on rivers within the TVA service area. Under a sound national power policy this power would be marketed by TVA itself without the interference of the Interior Department as a no-good middle man.

This Department, the Department of the Interior, has always coveted the good reputation enjoyed by the Rural Electrification Administration in Congress and seeks to bring it under its domination just as it is now attempting to subjugate the Federal Power Commission, a regulatory agency of the Federal Government. Interior looks upon itself as the Federal agency that must have complete control over Federal activities and regulations relating to the generating, transmission, and distribution of power. Right now the Department of the Interior is quietly laying the groundwork for an eventual attempt to take over regulatory jurisdiction of the petroleum and natural gas industries, and it may be expected that the Department's pattern of operation may well follow a similar backdoor method for these great resources as has been followed in the case of their ruthless effort to socialize another great natural resource—electric power.

What it cannot do directly, it does by stealth and indirection. When the Congress said "No" and thereby thwarted the Department's ambitious scheme to build needless and wasteful duplicating electric facilities in my section of the country, it went underground and is now using the good name of the Rural Electrification Administration as its front organization.

Since the Department of the Interior cannot lay its hands directly on the $400,000,000 made available by Congress to the Rural Electrification Administration for making electric service available to farmers and other persons in rural areas, it is through leasing agreements getting the Rural Electrification Administration to divert funds from farm electrification to the carrying out of its ambitious program for socializing the southwestern area of the United States.

This is not, however, an issue that involves my section of the country alone. The Southeast and the Northeast as well as other sections of the country are deeply involved with the present attempt of the Department to shape policies that will be applicable all over the Nation. To realize the extent to which the Department has already moved into the East one needs only to familiarize himself with the contents of the 1951 budget document.

The Rural Electrification Administration is off base playing around with the Department of the Interior, and if it does not watch out it will find itself playing the role of Little Red Riding Hood to the wolf.

Until every farm in this country has the benefit of electric service, Rural Electrification Administration's major responsibility is to get adequate service to unserved rural persons. According to a recent REA statement, that agency still has 1,000,000 farms to electrify before the first phase of its work can be considered completed. This means that it still faces the job of getting electricity to

more than one out of every five farms in this country. Thus, it is altogether too soon for this agency to rest on its laurels and to take on the job of playing stooge for the socialistic plotters on the pay roll of the Interior Department.

The NRECA in the January 1950 issue of its magazine Rural Electrification notes that—

> Some (REA) borrowers are disturbed by delays in obtaining REA approval of loan applications during recent months—comparative figures indicate that they may have reason for impatience—less loans funds have been approved by REA during the last 6 months than during the comparable period of a year before.

According to this data, only $143,000,000 in REA loans were approved during the 6 months' period July to December 1949, compared with $193,000,000 during the 6 months July to December 1948.

I know first hand about the situation faced by REA borrowers in my district. I have hereinbefore mentioned the 375 eligible applicants of Scott County, Ark., who have a loan application pending since December 1947. This loan, if ever granted, will be used to serve 375 farmers who in this second half of the great twentieth century are living under conditions that were outmoded by the end of the nineteenth century.

There is a reason why the above loan to the cooperative in my district has not been made. There is a reason why we are not completing this job of electrifying rural America faster. That reason is not the fault of Congress which is making ample funds available for this purpose. It is not because REA lacks sufficient administrative personnel or sufficient funds.

The reason traces back to pressures exerted by the Department of the Interior forcing REA to make its money available for generating and transmission loans. An examination of REA loans during the last 6 months of 1949 reveals that out of the $143,000,000 of all funds loaned more than 50 percent went for the construction of generating and transmission facilities and not for distribution lines. Loans, as a consequence, are being made to further the objective of the Department of the Interior rather than the achievement of REA objectives. REA should follow its program—not the program of the Department of the Interior.

These maneuvers by the Department of the Interior are the work of underlings and little bureaucrats working in cahoots with outsiders. The outsiders, just as back in the days of Teapot Dome, are being motivated by the purposes of private gain. They are not even the true zealots of public power.

These outsiders are only interested in making a quick buck at the expense of American farmers and taxpayers generally. They include engineering firms, lawyers, lobbyists, and those who are willing to sell the traditions of 150 years of American freedom for the jingle of coins in their pockets today.

These are matters with which the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture should become familiar. I feel certain they are unaware of what is going on. Certainly, this is a situation which Secretary of the Interior Chapman should examine at the earliest possible moment. He is involved, for the good name of his Department will suffer as it promotes such shabby tricks. Meanwhile, REA Administrator Wickard in dealing with the pressure exerted upon him for making questionable loans should proceed upon the assumption that his support for an REA program honestly administered comes from the Congress; it does not come from the Department of the Interior.

I am immediately introducing a bill which has for its purpose the prohibiting of loans by the Rural Electrification Administration for the building of electric generating plants or transmission lines to be owned, leased, used, or operated by any other than Rural Electrification Cooperatives, without the consent of Congress. I sincerely trust that any such loans now pending for approval of the Rural Electrification Administration will be held in abeyance until Congress is given an opportunity to act upon this bill.

The Small Farmer and the Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the small farmer is the backbone of our economy. He should not be sacrificed to carry out a program of corporate farm production supported by huge Government subsidies.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by J. H. Carmical which appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, January 15, 1950:

BREAK-DOWN SEEN IN FARM PROGRAM—HUGE SURPLUSES UNDER SUPPORT HELP WEAKENING WHOLE UNITED STATES AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—LITTLE MAN EXPENDABLE—ACREAGE RESTRICTIONS BELIEVED AID TO LARGE OPERATORS WITH ASSURED PROFITS

(By J. H. Carmical)

With huge surpluses of farm products being accumulated by the United States Government as a result of price-support activities, there is fear in some quarters that the present agricultural program is breaking down.

Last week a bill was introduced in Congress to give the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Government agency that carries out price-support activities, an additional $2,000,000,000 to provide support for 1950 farm crops, since its previous authorization of $4,750,000,000 soon would be exhausted.

Under the present program, which provides for maintaining prices at an artificially high level through nonrecourse loans to farmers by the Government agency, the tendency of many farmers is to produce for the loan rather than for the disposal of their products in the regular commercial manner, it was said. Despite efforts to restrict acreage, surpluses may be expected to increase, barring some very unfavorable weather conditions. The program thus is held costly to the taxpayer, who must furnish funds for price-support activities, and also to the consumer, who must pay higher prices for both food and clothing.

In addition, the program is not proving beneficial to a large group of farmers, particularly the small producer, who has had to cut his acreage in order to qualify for benefits. While the large producer also has had to curtail, he has had a much higher base from which to cut his production, and still is able to operate on a large scale. With an assured price for his products, his profits usually have continued at a satisfactory level. In fact, it is that group which is producing mostly for the loan.

SMALL FARMER HELD HURT

The present agricultural policy is believed also to be gradually eliminating the small farmer. Because of acreage restrictions, he in many instances is unable to produce enough to operate profitably. Consequently, thousands of small farmers are quitting each year and letting the big farmer, with his highly mechanized operation, take over.

In the past half century, the amount of labor required to produce a crop has declined sharply. To produce wheat, the amount of man labor has been reduced by about four-fifths, and corn by seven-tenths. On especially favorable terrain, where the largest tractors and combines may be used, the reduction is even greater.

Although the production of cotton is not so highly mechanized as that of grain, it is estimated that for the belt as a whole only about one-half as much man labor is required now as at the turn of the century. In Mississippi, an experiment was made that showed that by using mechanical methods an acre of cotton yielding nearly a bale could be produced and harvested with 21½ man-hours of labor in contrast to 160 man-hours required under standard, nonmechanized methods.

Present price-support activities do not take into consideration the change that has taken place in agriculture in recent years, many believe. That parity price of agricultural products is said to be based on most items, except tobacco, on conditions existing in the period 1909–14. Despite the higher prices that now must be paid by the farmer for everything that he buys, a bushel of grain or a pound of cotton may be produced cheaper under mechanization than in 1909–14. However, under the present price-support program, the Government assures the cooperating grower of roughly two and one-quarter times more for his products than in the base period.

Despite the fact that the high prices for agricultural products, especially cotton, are said to have tended to restrict consumption, it is unlikely that there will be any revision of the program that would eliminate price-support activities entirely. If for no other reason, the political power of the farm vote will insure that the farmer continue to receive benefit payments in one form or other and keep his income at a relatively high level.

President Truman, in his recent message to the Congress, pointed out that farm legislation still was not adequate and that price supports should be provided for commodities that at present are not included in the program. He mentioned direct subsidy payments to farmers to keep their incomes high while permitting the market price of agricultural products to seek their own level.

Many farmers and also the trade generally believe that the Brannan plan is unworkable, in that it would involve too much administrative apparatus and also that it would prove too costly. Under it, the prices of farm

products would sink their level and the Federal Government would pay the difference between that and the "normal price" to the growers. In that it would insure a high income to the farmers and also lower prices to consumers, the proposal is calculated to appeal to those two groups.

A Proposed Solution to the European Economic Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication from Mr. T. K. Fuller 3d, 124 East Pharr Road, Decatur, Ga., giving his thoughts and suggestions for a solution to the European economic problem.

I am submitting herewith Mr. Fuller's suggestions for the information of the House:

A PROPOSED SOLUTION TO THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC PROBLEM

In view of the fact that the cost of the European aid program continues to be a heavy burden on the American taxpayer, I wish to propose a new kind entirely different method of financial settlement for trading between nations.

It is an obvious fact that without Marshall plan dollars, the affected nations would not have survived, but now that the nations have made some recovery, they need to stop depending on the dollar, especially for international trade, and strengthen their internal currency systems.

I propose that a clearing-house system be established in which every nation on earth would be invited to participate. This system would make use of a clearing house similar to the one now in use in the Marshall plan, plus an import-export bank in each participating nation, although neither the clearing house nor the import-export banks would operate as they do in their present capacities. The import-export bank in each participating nation would represent the importers and exporters of that nation with the clearing house. The import-export bank in each participating nation would collect that nation's currency from that nation's importers for their imports, and pay out the currency received to its exporters for their exports.

In turn, each import-export bank would accept a debit on the books of the clearing house in the like amount that was received from its importer. This debit on the books of the clearing house pays for the import insofar as the clearing house is concerned. When the same import-export bank pays out the cash received to exporters, it accepts a credit on the books of the clearing house in the same amount that it paid out to its exporter. Thus we see that the clearing house balances its account with each nation's bank through simple debits and credits on paper, and each nation's bank balances its cash account through collecting cash from its nation's importers and paying out that cash received to its nation's exporters.

The following transaction procedure shows how an English importer and an American exporter would settle their account in a transaction, yet each would deal only in the currency of his own nation:

1. The American exporter sells $100,000 worth of American machinery and tools to English importer.

2. A American exporter files application with American Import-Export Bank for investigation of his contract.

B. English importer goes to English Import-Export Bank and files application to import $100,000 worth of machinery and tools from the United States.

3. A. American bank approves contract and files authority with clearing house to grant credit to English bank.

B. English bank approves contract and files approval with clearing house.

4. Clearing house approves transaction and notifies respective bank of each nation. The American bank automatically authorizes American exporter to make shipment.

5. Upon arrival of merchandise in English port each bank is notified. The English importer pays his bank in pounds, and the American bank pays its exporter in dollars.

6. The International Trading Clearing House credits the American bank $100,000 and debits the English bank in pounds in the equivalent of $100,000.

Several points to be noted in this type of clearing house are:

1. Each nation uses only its own currency. No currency ever passes between bank and bank, or between clearing house and bank.

2. Because each nation's bank would depend on the cash received from importers to pay out to exporters, its exports through these channels could never exceed its imports through these channels. This should be an inducement to each participating nation to import more in order to take more cash into its import-export bank with which to pay its exporters.

3. Because the clearing house settles accounts between nations on paper, there would be no question of whether a nation's currency was convertible or not. Each import-export bank would establish enough credit with the clearing house to cover any anticipated indebtedness.

The exchange rate between nations would be decided by the governing board of the clearing house for only those goods passing through the clearing house channels. By deciding a fixed exchange rate for a definite period, quarterly, semiannually or annually, there would be a tendency to stabilize international exchange.

4. Because this type of clearing house system would place all participating nations on an equal trading basis, it would permit them to trade freely with one another.

The clearing-house system would solve the problem of trading between nations, but each nation would still have its own individual internal problems, which I believe can be solved by application of the principles of free enterprise as we know them in America.

T. K. FULLER.

The Coal Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of thousands of persons—the old, the ill, new-born babies, mothers, in our northern climate are shivering and chilled to the bone for want of fuel. Thousands from these groups are now afflicted with pneumonia, colds, and kindred ailments because of lack of coal to keep them warm. The traveling public, especially commuters to and from their jobs find their security threatened by a lack of train service caused by a shortage of coal. Is there no remedy? Congress has furnished President Truman with a law to meet the emergency but to him politics far outweighs the duty to enforce the law to alleviate the distress and suffering of the aged, new-born babies, TB cases and other persons, who are the helpless victims of the New Deal political cold-coal war.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks an article by Arthur Krock, which appeared in the New York Times, Friday, January 13, 1950:

IN THE NATION—THE WORD "THREATENED" SEEMS TO BE FORGOTTEN

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 12.—Though the skies over the Capital were dark today, and little frozen pellets fell for a while before they melted into rain, the weather remained mild as the President for the umpteenth time told a press conference there is as yet no national emergency in the coal supply. In other parts of the country winter continued to withhold blizzards and other violent seasonal disturbances. Hence the President was able to repeat his estimate of the situation brought on by John L. Lewis' current tactics in an atmosphere of comparative public quiet which normal weather over a considerable area would quickly shatter.

FREEDOM OF CONCLUSION

He was buttressed also in his stubborn refusal to invoke the only specific legal corrective at his command (the Taft-Hartley Act, secs. 206–210, inclusive) by the finding of his labor assistant, John R. Steelman, that any emergency is still only spotty. Even Representative JACOBS, of Indianapolis, the pro-union Democrat who urges Mr. Truman to use the law they both condemn, certifies merely to a regional emergency. Thus the President can say if he wants to that its scope is not yet national, the law having been written to leave such conclusions to the President's opinion.

Substituting the practical for the technical side of the matter, it may be true that the empty bins of many retailers mean that most individual consumers of coal have stocked up fairly well for an ordinary winter. Since Mr. Lewis began last May the complicated series of maneuvers to produce the new contract he wants for his miners, consumers have had plenty of warning to imitate the ant and not the grasshopper in the fable.

THE LETTER OF THE LAW

But there is other language in section 202 that covers the present situation precisely, and the President and his advisers would have a difficult time to disprove this before any impartial jury. This language is quoted in the following extract:

"Whenever in the opinion of the President of the United States, a 'threatened' or actual strike or lock-out 'affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof,' * * * will, if permitted to occur or continue, 'imperil the national health or safety,' he may appoint a board of inquiry, etc."

Thereafter the text of the law enumerates prompt successive steps open to the President before soon applying to the courts for an injunction against the continuation of the strike or lock-out.

BUY THE DAY

On the test of plain facts there is an actual 2-day-a-week strike in the coal industry; and probably no one in the administration, though playing the trickiest kind of politics with the Taft-Hartley Act, would have the face to assert that this is not compliance by the union miners with the plans of Mr. Lewis. On a further factual test this condition definitely affects an entire industry and plainly threatens to imperil the national health or safety. So that Mr. Truman would be within the letter as well as the intent of the only legal instrument he has, or can get at this session, if he invoked it.

Nobody asked him today about that authority to meet the plainly existing threat. There is to be a big reception for Members of Congress tonight by the Democratic National Committee, and the conference was conducted in a manner to get it over quickly so the President could keep his early engagement. Social obligations may not seem a sufficient explanation for cursory treatment of the coal emergency, especially to persons and industries—including the coal-burning railroads whose service has been sharply reduced by the Interstate Commerce Commission—whose bins are nearing the point of total depletion. But Mr. Truman was giving short and uninforming replies to questions, and it was clear he would give short shrift to any effort to go into the coal crisis more deeply.

RESERVES AT VANISHING POINT

Meanwhile, for 3 days a week the miners are digging about 9,000,000 tons, which go fully into consumption, and the customary 30-day reserves of the season are going below 15 because of the 2-day strike. Beyond this exhibition of law being flouted by Mr. Lewis, and its flouting tolerated by the Chief Executive of the Nation, there is the great social and economic risk which is assumed by the union and by the Government.

Yet those advisers of the President who persuaded him to adopt his general and specific policies of favoritism toward union labor at the expense of other population groups are as deeply convinced as they ever were that this course will keep the administration indefinitely in office, and that the White House attitude toward the coal emergency is an integral part of it. The other day when the headlines announced that Republican Senators were demanding use of the Taft-Hartley Act a principal among these advisers remarked: "Stupid as ever. Can't they see they are playing right in our hands?"

Winter may be in a mood to make the game safe for a while longer. Or possibly Robert N. Denham, head of the independent law enforcement office of the National Labor Relations Board, may use his power to seek the injunction the President declines thus far to seek. Or Mr. Lewis may conclude to put his miners back on steady work. The President is leaving it at that.

Water Conservation Program for West Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on November 22, 1949, several hundred forward-looking west Texans met in Fort Worth to launch a most important long-range water conservation program. The occasion was the annual directors' assembly of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce.

The keynote of the meeting was set by the official slogan, "Dam west Texas or west Texas is damned." Over and over again, prominent west Texans made clear their determination to solve the water shortage which has for too long been a millstone on the progress of a potentially rich region.

High light of the meeting was the visit and address by Hon. William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who outlined what the Department of the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation is doing and can help the people of Texas do to solve this perplexing problem.

Secretary Warne's remarks are of great interest, I believe, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his speech be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to be in Fort Worth to discuss the conservation and use of water, a subject of vital concern not only here but throughout the entire Nation. Over all of the United States increasing water demands are outstripping developed supplies. In Texas, however, shortages are growing particularly acute. It is not a new problem, but it is one that is becoming increasingly important. This is recognized by your representatives in the Congress with whom I have discussed the Texas water situation many times in recent months.

Because of grave concern about the problem, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON early this year requested a study of the situation and the views of the Department of the Interior on the proper development of this valuable resource in Texas. An appraisal of the type and magnitude of the problem in different areas of the State was presented together with a suggested program in which the Department's services might be used to aid in finding satisfactory solutions.

Senator JOHNSON believes that the interests of your State could best be served by developing water resources through comprehensive programs for each river basin or for related groups of basins. In view of Interior's experience with western water problems and in the development of projects to solve those problems, we consider this view both realistic and farsighted. As conservationists, engineers, and builders, we in Interior endorse the conclusion without reservation. We advocate strongly the making for Texas of integrated economic and engineering plans with river basins as the basic unit.

I understand that the informal report of the Interior Department to Senator JOHNSON received wide circulation among those most concerned with development of the State's water resources. I am informed, too, that the views have been widely approved among those genuinely seeking such development in the best interests of all the people.

The essence of the statement was that the situation in Texas is by no means hopeless and that the Department of the Interior desires to work with you to achieve maximum benefits through integrated, multiple-purpose river basin developments.

The laws under which Interior operates in the prosecution of these programs for resource conservation and development were designed to meet western conditions. In this, the first year of the second century of service of Interior to the Nation, these programs are moving forward as never before and they are accomplishing miracles along the Missouri, Columbia, Sacramento, Colorado, Rio Grande, and other western streams. That such water development work is today at a maximum in other western States and is at a minimum in Texas forms another phase of our problem. Unless Texas is to fall behind and to permit her needs to outrun her water development, this imbalance should be corrected soon. There are several reasons for the lack of balance to have been developed. Among them is the hard physical fact that the high plains have traditionally been the most difficult of our areas of water deficiencies in which to find answers to the complex problems that are posed. But in Colorado, through a trans-mountain diversion project, a solution in a high plains area was found. And in North Dakota and South Dakota, through the Missouri basin project, a solution is being provided. In Nebraska and in Kansas, as a part of the basin-wide plan for the Missouri River, small streams are being dammed and their waters used by towns and farming areas to yield maximum benefits. Power is being generated at many multiple-purpose dams to help build a sound economy for the Missouri basin area and at the same time to strengthen the economic feasibility of the project. All of this activity elsewhere in the high plains demonstrates that it is possible when local, State, and Federal experts put their heads together to find solutions even for difficult water problem areas like west Texas. So far it has never been possible for solutions to be provided for the major problems by local leaders working alone, by State officials working alone, or by the Federal departments working alone. The cooperation between the various levels of government that has been achieved in the Missouri River basin is needed here.

Although the primary interest of this meeting is centered about the problems of west Texas, difficult water problems are not limited to the western part of your great State. There is desperate need for flood control along the lower streams on the Coastal Plain. The great opportunity for power generation that has been seized by the Lower Colorado River Authority and that is being capitalized by the Southwestern Power Administration exists elsewhere as well. Many other phases of the general water problem are presented in other parts of the State. Texas is not poor in water. The outflow of Texas streams to the Gulf of Mexico approximates 43,000,000 acre-feet of which at least 35,000,000 acre-feet originate in Texas. This amount of water, if it all could be controlled and used, would provide the municipal water needs of all the people of North America and leave enough to fill 336 reservoirs like Lake Waco. Of course most of Texas water falls in the humid parts of the State and is not available for use to meet the problems of west Texas. But let us narrow the focus to west Texas.

Unlike some other sections of the State, much of west Texas has meager ground water, to supply from that source only a small fraction of its water needs. Moreover, in west Texas areas where underground supplies were believed to be adequate, the water table is going down at a dangerous rate. As your population and industry expand, as agricultural production grows, more demands are made on the water supply to meet the requirements for human and industrial consumption, and for irrigation. As a consequence, you must look to your streams to obtain the additional water that is needed. Unfortunately, the run-off of the rivers in west Texas varies widely from year to year. The excess flows of wet years must be stored in reservoirs and held for use in times of drought. This situation is not unique in west Texas. We meet it throughout the High Plains, and generally throughout the West.

More than enough water rises in west Texas to provide the needs of your cities and industries. On the average, in excess of 2,000,000 acre-feet of water leave west Texas

each year through the Red, Brazos, and Colorado Rivers and their tributaries. This water is wasted. Not only would it be useful in west Texas but when it leaves you it sometimes is a danger to lower reaches of the Texas valleys. It adds to flood hazards downstream.

Available water analyses indicate that much of this water is of poor quality for human consumption and industrial use because of gypsum and salt content. However, it is thought that through appropriate means much of this water can be used for irrigation. In any event, according to my preliminary information, about 1,000,000 acre-feet of water could be made available for your towns and cities and for industries if the wasted waters were captured and kept in west Texas. This is a very large quantity of water and will meet your needs and provide for growth for many years to come. So the immediate problem in west Texas comes down to lack of storage and distribution facilities for this water that is available and that is not now used.

That reduces your problem to one of finances and engineering. How to solve it is the question that brought all of us here tonight.

I know how similar problems have been solved in other sections of the West. Not just in isolated instances but over and over again along one river and another, through decade after decade, similar water problems in the West have been solved by this method of local, State, and Federal cooperation that is provided in the reclamation law, which is administered by the Department of the Interior through its Bureau of Reclamation.

In some parts of Texas some individuals call this "reclamationism". Or I should say that I guess that they mean "reclamationism" when they beat the tables and yell, "We don't want any program with an 'ism' attached to it." They surely do not mean "patriotism," which has the unfortunate ending. So I must conclude that they mean to say they favor no program with "reclamationism" incorporated in it. By such generalized attacks, usually intended to cover up opposition to public transmission of hydroelectric power or family-sized irrigated farms, these people have become ardent advocates of the continued disuse of your water. In that, certainly they operate against the best interests of the people who need the water to insure the growth and development of farms, homes, counties, and the great State of which you all are a part.

As the branch of the Federal Government historically charged by the Congress with the responsibility for assisting in developing and utilizing western water resources, the Department of the Interior is prepared to assist you.

You know that investigations are now in progress and that next March the Bureau of Reclamation will give you an analysis of the problems of control and use of the water in west Texas. This analysis will provide sufficient information for you to determine the extent and character of such additional assistance as you wish from Interior and the Federal Government.

We have already partially discharged our responsibility to the Panhandle Plains area by investigation of the Canadian River project. The report on this project, which would furnish a dependable water supply for 11 cities in that section of the State, will soon be sent to the State of Texas for formal review after which it will be transmitted to the President and to the Congress. Here is being developed a new type of project to meet a set of circumstances that is peculiar to the area. It may hold suggestions for other parts of west Texas.

Acting on the request of the people of these 11 cities, we will, if given congressional authority, assume the further responsibility of building this important project on a sound amortization plan which in the end will see the Federal loan repaid by the municipalities as they use the water which will be impounded for them. In my opinion, this is sound economics, both for the local area in your State and for the Federal Government. The people will use Federal funds for a few years, then they will have a wonderful, continuously useful project of their own. The United States will get its money back through appropriate repayment and many times in addition through the new strength and prosperity of the Panhandle cities.

The investigation recently initiated by the Reclamation Bureau in Texas involves a considerably larger area, with many more complex problems than those of the Canadian River project area. This investigation covers that part of west Texas in the upper basins of the Brazos and Colorado Rivers, extending from Odessa on the west to Cisco, Ranger, and Eastland on the east; and from San Angelo on the south to the boundary between the Brazos and Red River watersheds on the north.

The basic problem in west Texas is one of conserving water and making that water available to the people who sharply feel the shortages now and, unless something constructive is done, must suffer them more acutely in the years to come.

Our investigation and report will be directed toward solving the most pressing problem which is to provide water supplies for your cities and industries. It will also include provisions for the development of irrigation, where feasible, by using surplus water not required or not suitable for municipal and industrial uses. Flood-control features will be incorporated in the plan where justified, as will any other appropriate consideration, including fish and wildlife conservation, and recreation.

It is our duty, and it is in your interest, as well as in the interest of Texas and the Nation, to provide for the fullest economic use of west Texas water. In this regard we recognize that municipal and industrial requirements have the highest priority, both under State laws and as a matter of national concern. In our planning we therefore must and will provide for other water uses only to the extent possible without lessening supplies to meet your primary requirements.

There is lots of experience behind those who undertook this task.

The reclamation program is 47 years old. It has made major contributions to the wealth and growth of the Western States. Federal projects have developed areas that have built and that now support such cities as Boise, Idaho; Yakima, Wash.; and Phoenix, Ariz. Scores of projects have been completed and these now provide irrigation water for nearly 5,000,000 acres of land. They also provide power for such growing cities as Los Angeles, Portland, Seattle, and Spokane. Some of them include provisions for municipal and industrial water which they supply directly to such cities as Salt Lake City, Utah, and indirectly to cities in southern California from San Diego to Pasadena.

The Bureau of Reclamation can point to a time-tested example of its policies and work here in Texas. I refer to the 155,000-acre reclamation project on the Rio Grande in Texas and New Mexico near El Paso. This project was constructed nearly 35 years ago. It cost more than $28,000,000. The value of the crops produced under irrigation on the project lands from 1914 through 1948 has totaled more than $400,000,000, and in 1948 alone $43,000,000. Only last month the Department of the Interior and the city of El Paso executed a contract that will permit that municipality to use spare river flow in the project area to meet its growing municipal needs. Thus we have cooperatively expanded again, as we have many times, the usefulness of a fine project and made it meet a new and growing need that could not have been anticipated by anyone a generation ago. These projects live and grow and serve with increasing effectiveness through the years.

No one knows what the life span of a well conceived and executed water project may be. A project that one of our engineers investigated in China was 1,500 years old, and a project near Damascus in Syria is still served by a dam that was built by Caesar's legions.

Some land in the Rio Grande project area was first irrigated 300 years ago when the Spanish conquistadores and padres first used El Paso del Norte.

There is every reason to believe that the projects that have been built under the reclamation law will serve well for generations to come. We do know that in the time since the first of them was built no insurmountable problems have been developed between the Department of the Interior and the people of the project areas. I am certain that none will.

I personally have worked in this field for nearly 15 years. I have visited all of the operating projects and most of those now being constructed. I have met with scores, even hundreds, of groups representing the people of these project areas. I have met with them in schoolhouses and grange halls, where they held their local meetings, and I have met with them in my office in Washington. We have discussed many problems and have exchanged experiences. I never held nor attended such a meeting at which there was a hostile atmosphere. The reason for this is that there has consistently been an attitude of cooperation on all sides.

In all of these meetings I have never had anyone who was living on one of these projects tell me that the Federal Government had tried to deprive him of his water right. In truth, the Bureau of Reclamation has not tried to deprive any of the people being helped through or affected by the reclamation program of any right, water or otherwise.

I make this personal reference because a cult has grown up in the West, vociferous much beyond its size, which would have people believe that there was a mysterious threat in the reclamation law to the rights of the individual to use the project water. It seems peculiarly left-handed and disingenious to me that the people of the West should be asked to believe such rot. Paid propagandists apparently will distort anything to attempt to gain an end. Actually the reclamation law is the only Federal water-control enactment which directs that its program must be carried out under the State laws by which water rights are perfected.

One more explanation. It is the policy of the Department of the Interior and of its Bureau of Reclamation to turn over for local operation water projects that are built under the reclamation law. Of 65 irrigation projects now in operation, 45 have been turned over to the water users to manage. These include such large and important projects as the North Platte project in Nebraska, the Boise project in Idaho, and the Salt River project in Arizona. These major examples of Reclamation's operations are conducted entirely by water users' organizations. The control is local and is as responsive and responsible to the people of the project as a city government is to its electorate. I point these facts out because as you consider great plans for meeting this complex and widefling problem in west Texas you will want to know whether your projects will be locally controlled.

In addition, the Department of the Interior long has recognized the importance of conducting its operations near the affected people. This Department has been a leader in decentralization and is actively moving toward even greater shifting of planning and operating functions to the field. About a

year ago the Department established a Southwest field committee with headquarters at Albuquerque. This committee is composed of the top regional officials of each of the Interior agencies that operate in the region, and the chairman, with a small staff, reports to the Secretary in Washington. The Southwest region includes Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and parts of Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, and New Mexico.

The Bureau of Reclamation, as you know, maintains close relations with local people. In the current west Texas investigation the Department of the Interior is represented locally by Reclamation's regional director, Mr. Howard Robbins, who has offices in Amarillo. He has conferred constantly with your leaders in the course of the present work and he will continue to do so until the assignment has been completed. He and all members of his staff and the staffs of all of the other Interior agencies in Texas are pledged to give you all the engineering and technical assistance that you need and desire.

After Interior's report on the west Texas projects has been prepared, all other interested agencies of the Federal Government, as well as those of the State of Texas through your Governor, will have full opportunity to review the report and comment on its findings.

I would emphasize, as well, that the reclamation program is conducted in accordance with well conceived fiscal requirements. The Federal Government finances the construction and requires repayment over a period of years by those who are the beneficiaries. Power that may be generated is sold with two objectives in mind in setting the rates; one, to carry with interest the cost of producing power and to repay a fair share of the total project cost, and the other to enable the energy to be sold at the lowest practicable rates so that maximum benefits may be extended to the people. Irrigation costs, for their repayment, bear no interest charges, and irrigation repayment contracts run for a maximum of 50 years. The costs of providing municipal water are repaid with an interest charge, where it is appropriate, that does not exceed 3½ percent. The cost of providing for control of floods in these projects is without requirement for repayment. In any particular case, the Congress may provide for special terms to meet peculiar conditions.

The first requirement is for an engineering plan of projects to meet the needs. The next is an economic appraisal of the proposed undertakings. Then follow consideration of the plans by the local people, the State, the Federal agencies of interest, the President, and the Congress. When the projects are authorized, appropriate contracts are negotiated between Interior and the water users, and the conditions of repayment are then fixed. Appropriations next are sought for construction, and the job is as good as done. I would not fool you into thinking that all of this requires only a few weeks or months. It takes time. I have seen a good many projects carried through this mill in my 15 years of service, so I know projects can be completed once the engineering surveys have been started.

Through the years the repayment record of reclamation projects have been good. Delinquencies in payments are almost negligible. At the same time, there has been no harsh treatment of project water users. In times of real emergency, special provisions have been authorized by the Congress, but these have rarely been required excepting during a part of the period of the depression.

The demand and necessity for conserving waste water in Texas is here, and the value of impounded supplies is known, not only by the rank and file, but by the big industries that have heavy investments in this section. With the great ground water reservoir in the high plains of Texas being depleted at a rate many times the natural annual rate of recharge, a problem has been created that it would be folly to ignore. If present trends continue, I am informed, some localities will be seriously affected within 10 years. The unused surface waters must be used to put out the fuse that has been lit on this time bomb, and to bring into safe balance the use of the ground water resource. You are fully aware of the fact that the economic loss being sustained in this area due to a lack of water can be overcome only by dynamic action.

I have been advised that only recently an opinion was given that Texas water problems are so acute that time does not permit perfection of a total, well-conceived plan of development. It is ironical that in the face of serious water shortages, coupled with ever-expanding demands for increased supplies, it is implied that the services of experienced engineers and careful investigations and multiple-purpose planning should be ignored. This is the time when west Texas can least afford to make a careless, piecemeal approach to its water problem. This is just exactly the time when comprehensive planning, expeditiously done, will bring the greatest returns.

Texas only now is entering its second stage of development. Until recently your greatest sources of wealth have been raw materials. Your cotton, wool, and mohair have brought relatively little manufacturing. Only a small part of your cotton production and even less of wool and mohair are consumed by Texas mills. You are justifiably proud of your cattle, but leather and shoe manufacture is another industry that has seen only small expansion within the State.

With continued development there should come a multitude of new industries. Water and power will bring them. As more water is impounded, Texas will reap great rewards in the field of chemurgy. In west Texas, once you have stored water now wasting, once you have your distribution systems to serve the cities and the irrigation projects, once such power as may be generated is made available, you will have overcome the obstacles standing between you and an even greater era of prosperity than the one you are now enjoying. There will then be a clear track into the future.

With characteristic courage and vigor you have gone about the job of seeing what can be accomplished in the full development of the water resources of this area. Through your Senators and representatives in Congress and through your community leaders, we in the Department of the Interior know that your goal is to sponsor projects that will be wealth-creating and that will contribute to permanent growth. We believe that the west Texas projects will provide a sound investment for our energies and for Federal funds; that will strengthen the economic security of this region and of the entire Nation. Speaker RAYBURN, Governor Shivers, and members of the Texas congressional delegation have shown a keen interest in this water problem. I am sure that their cooperation will continue. The Department of the Interior can bring to the solution of this problem the necessary technical know-how.

At times like this, I recall a wise and revealing comment made many years ago by one of the great water planners of southern California, my home. A hot debate was raging over whether the fledgling city of Los Angeles should build its first huge aqueduct. Mr. William Mulholland was the engineer-adviser. Finally the question was put to him. Would such a stupendous project be needed? He said, "If you don't build the aqueduct, Los Angeles will never need it." Everyone saw at once that this was true. The aqueduct was built. The water that it brought created the growth that required the capacity of that aqueduct. Since then two additional and more ambitious aqueducts have been built, and Los Angeles is now grown into a metropolis.

I am sure that we of the Department of the Interior and you west Texans will go forward together in understanding and good will through the difficult process of planning and constructing the projects that you similarly need so badly. You have recognized the need for comprehensive studies, leading to integrated design and construction of projects in the long reaches of your river basins and in behalf of all the people.

Speaking for myself and for the personnel in the various agencies in the Department of the Interior who are now engaged with your problems: We are proud to have been asked to assist in this program. I am certain that a solution acceptable to all can and will be found.

The Upset Down Under

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Morley Cassidy from the Washington Star of January 16, 1950:

THE UPSET DOWN UNDER—AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND REVOLT AGAINST PROGRESSIVE SOCIALISM—PEOPLE WANT CHANGE AWAY FROM REGULATIONS AND ARE PREPARED TO PAY HIGH PRICE FOR IT

(First of a series)

(By Morley Cassidy)

SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA, January 10.—Revolution is all around you, these bright blue summer days in the Antipodes.

It is one of the strangest revolutions in history. It defies every rule in the book.

"Stick around," says the newsstand man at King's Cross, the Times Square of Sydney. "You're going to see some change around here. And quick."

Changes? Who would want to change things in Australia?

Australia can look around itself these days, from the great cities of Sydney and Melbourne to the sheep stations of its own far west, 2,000 miles away, and see abundant evidence that it is one of the world's luckiest lands.

It is in the middle of a boom, perhaps the biggest it has ever known. Since the war's end it has been riding a crest of flooding prosperity.

Half of Australia, right now, is on its way to the beaches, or just coming back from 4 weeks' holidays. The other half is at Randwick or some other race track, trying to outguess the horses.

There is money in every pocket. Sheep ranchers, counting their holdings in thousands of square miles, are getting 90 cents a pound for average wool; 3 years ago they were getting 10 or 11. Beef growers are doing as well. Dairymen have the world bidding for their butter and cheese.

Everybody has a job. There are 28 columns of "positions vacant" want ads in the Sydney Herald. Three people are advertising for work.

Wages are the best Australia has ever known. The basic wage of 6 pounds 4 shillings (about $12.50), which used to be high, is now a joke. Bright lads now are offered that to start and promised a bicycle as a year-end bonus. The Australian pound is valued at about $2.24. Before the recent devaluation, its exchange rate was about $4.03.

Over in New Zealand, 1,200 miles away across the Tasman Sea, the story is the same. There, as here, prosperity is bolstered with the most advanced social services in the world.

PEOPLE ARE IN REVOLT

If there is any country in the world—outside the United States—where, one would think, people should be happy and contented, it is in these two dominions.

But the peoples of both countries, today, are in revolt. They want changes, and are prepared to pay a stiff price to get them.

Within the past 6 weeks, both New Zealand and Australia have fired the governments under which all this prosperity has come about.

In New Zealand, the placid and tranquil little England of the South Seas, the voters marched quietly to the polls and threw out the socialistic Labor government of Prime Minister Peter Fraser, which had been planning and creating a Socialist utopia for 14 years.

In Australia, they voted more resolutionately, and with more grim bitterness on both sides.

The result was the same. The Labor government of Prime Minister Joseph B. Chifley, committed to a full program of socialization on the British model, which had carried Australia through 6 years of war and peace, was thrown out of office with an ultimatum which leaves it, even today, stunned and mystified.

OUTWARD EXPRESSION OF REVOLT

These elections, startling as they were, are only the outward expression of a revolution—or, as the Marxists would say, a counter-revolution.

In Australia, particularly, every man in the street knows that last month's elections were only the first step on a hard, new path.

Its new government, headed by Prime Minister Robert G. Menzies, today is mapping the step-by-step program that it will pursue in the new direction Australia has chosen; and it knows even better than the man in the street that it faces a hard task, and bitter fights.

Already, in its first 2 weeks in office, it is faced with a waterside strike of dock workers whose union is Communist-controlled. As this is written, 20 vessels are standing idle over a seemingly frivolous complaint involving the first-aid man for the stevedore crews.

There will be more such strikes, many more. There will be industrial disorders, in all probability, on a scale and of a bitterness which even Australia has not seen before.

SOCIALISM UNDERRATED

The prospect does not dismay Australians. They weighed this chance when they cast their votes. They voted to run this risk, with their eyes open.

Seldom has any party, anywhere, stated its purposes more clearly, and with less mumbo-jumbo and bait to emotionalize voters, than the combined Liberal and Country Parties in the elections just past.

Every voter was told, in the clearest possible language, that a vote for the Liberal-Country Party ticket would be a vote for free enterprise against the Socialist state.

He would be voting for the outlawing of the Communist Party, and the purging of Communist trade-union officials.

He would be voting for a firmer hand in dealing with unjustified strikes which have crippled Australian industry. He would be voting for a program aimed at more production through wider use of such devices as incentive payments, anathema in the Socialist state.

He would be voting against a program of full employment based on public works; he would take his chances on the full employment growing out of healthy, productive industries.

VOTING TO DESOCIALIZE

He would be voting, finally, to desocialize much that has been done in the past 8 years—to fight side by side with the banks (imagine!) in repealing the legislation aimed at creating a state banking monopoly; to restore competition between national and private air lines and shipping companies, to wipe out the Government monopoly in FM broadcasting and television.

And in exchange, he got only these few promises of concrete benefits.

The social services (many of them first introduced by the Liberal Party) would be retained, and the benefits would not be reduced.

Their cash value would not be raised, but their real value—and the value of all wages—would be increased by putting value back into the pound.

The child endowment for families would be extended to give 5 shillings (about 60 cents) a week for the first child. (All others are already receiving 10 shillings.)

In industrial relations, the emphasis would be on ending class warfare through firm insistence on arbitration, promotion of consultations between employers and employees, and restoration of union democracy by the legal requirement of secret ballots for union elections and strike calls.

VOTED TO RETURN TO OLD PATH

Australians, in these days of full employment and mass prosperity, had every reason, it would seem, to vote for more of the same.

They didn't. They voted, instead, for a return to the old path of free enterprise and competition, a firmer hand with strikes, an end to Government monopolies.

And their vote left no room for argument. The united Liberal and Country Parties here, with an agreed joint program, polled 2,127,268 votes (at the latest count, about 99 percent complete). The Labor Party polled 1,893,988. These figures almost exactly reversed those in 1946.

In 6 years, the Labor Party had declined from 50.2 percent of the popular vote in 1943 to 47.9 in 1946, and now to 40.9 percent in 1949.

And in New Zealand, where the issues were almost identical, and the Labor Party even more firmly entrenched, the results were the same.

Why?

I have been asking that question of hundreds of people, in the course of nearly 5,000 miles of traveling across Australia, from Darwin in the steaming north to Sydney, Melbourne, and Canberra, in the southeast, and across the Tasman Sea to Auckland and Wellington in New Zealand.

TWO ANSWERS HOLD CLUE

Two typical answers seem to hold the clue.

Here's a truck driver in the outskirts of Newcastle, the Pittsburgh of Australia, where the great Broken Hill Proprietary processes most of Australia's steel:

"Why," he says, "it's this socialization. This Chifley bunch was out to take over everything, starting with the banks.

"Next would come steel. And then road transport—they've already hinted at it.

"I've got my own truck, and my eye on another. I could find work for a fleet of them. You think I'm going to nationalize myself into a bleeding government driver at 1-pound-10 (about $3.36) a day?"

And here's a young dairy farmer, with 23 head of Ayrshire cattle, on a farm near Camden, New South Wales—a modern little town with soda fountains in the heart of the eastern plains.

"I was beginning to think I'd been all wrong about things," he says, keeping one eye on the modern milk-cooling machine.

"I had 5 years in the war, and I was under the impression we were fighting dictatorship. At least, that's what I was fighting, myself."

FOUND DICTATORSHIP AT HOME

"And then I came back here to find that's what we were getting here at home. The State trying to run everything—telling you what to plant, and who could get machinery, and all that.

"Maybe I'm misinformed, but I don't see any difference between dictatorships. Some are left, some are right, but I was fighting against dictatorship, period.

"Now we're rid of it here, and you'll see Australia bounding ahead like a kangaroo."

These views, in a hundred variations, seem to me to reveal the full significance of the elections in New Zealand and Australia which have surprised the world.

The first conclusion, so widely and vigorously expressed by the voters that it cannot be escaped, is simply this:

In both Australia and New Zealand, the one great issue was the Socialist state and its program of a planned economy.

Out of this grew a host of secondary issues on which feelings ran high—in Australia, communism's part in the planned economy and how to wreck it, continued butter, tea and gasoline rationing, attributed to Socialist misplanning, and dawdling in last year's coal strike; in New Zealand, high taxes, high living costs, mismanagement of government-run business enterprises, the fumbling efforts to turn an agricultural country into a land of industry.

LABOR PARTY STOOD ON RECORD

In both countries the Labor Party, pledged to a full program of socialization, stood on its record of achievements. In New Zealand this was a 14-year record in which the "welfare state" was firmly established, and state management of industry tested in many fields.

In Australia, there was an 8-year record, including a fine war-time accomplishment, sound handling of finances, and a beginning—hardly more—of the socialization of industry.

In both countries, the vote was so conclusive as to show a genuine revolution in popular thought.

Whether the Socialist state had had time to prove its possibilities, as in New Zealand, or had given voters only a taste of what was to come as here, the voters wanted a return to free enterprise and the fuller production of all the necessities of life which, they seem convinced, free enterprise will bring.

The second conclusion, noted by most politicians and confirmed by scores of conversations, is less obvious but perhaps more significant. It is this:

REVOLUTION OF YOUTH

This return to free enterprise, has been primarily a revolution of youth.

The young Camden dairyman, back from the war, speaks what apparently is in the minds of hundreds of thousands of others in their twenties and thirties. It is a fact over which labor's leaders, too late, are grumbling.

"These young fellows," says a Melbourne railroad man, "have had it too easy. People begging them to go to work for £10 (about $22.40) a week, and all that.

"They take the money, and then complain because they can't get all the petrol they want for their motorbikes. They don't realize how their daddies had to fight to get things as they are."

Be that as it may, labor and socialism—the two here are identical—have become, in Australia and New Zealand, touched with age and a flavor of stodginess.

Their leaders, almost all, are oldsters whose doctrinaire political philosophies have lost all elasticity. The stern party hierarchy represses younger, more flexible men.

SEVENTY PERCENT EX-SERVICEMEN

By contrast, the opposition in the recent election—the men who will hold 74 of the 123 seats in the new Australian House of Representatives, and 46 of the 60 in the New Zealand—are, on the average, 15 to 20 years younger.

Of the Liberal candidates for the Australian House, 70 percent were ex-servicemen. The youngest was 22. More than 50 percent were between 30 and 40.

Australia is a young country, far younger than the United States. It feels its strength in these postwar days in much the same way that America in the burgeoning nineties began to see a vision of what it would become.

Its young muscles, inevitably, chafe at the restrictions of the planned, regimented, noncompetitive state. So now it has thrown them off. How it did it, and what lies ahead, is another story.

Minority or Majority Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, minority pressure groups are attempting and in some instances are dictating governmental policy.

Many of these groups apparently have no concern as to the ultimate results which the enactment of their pet legislation will have on the economy or welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Seventy-four new Congressmen came in with President Truman at the beginning of this Eighty-first Congress. Many of them honestly believe that they received a mandate from the people to enact the entire Fair Deal program.

Maybe they are correct in this assumption—but in my opinion 49 percent of the eligible voters does not express a mandate of all the people. If those eligible to vote continue to stay away from the polls—these minority pressure groups will completely dictate Government policy.

A survey of the last election was made in one typical Ohio county and it shows the percentage of various groups that did not even take the trouble to vote:

	Percent
School teachers	11.5
Auto dealers	37.5
Independent grocers	37.0
Clergymen	23.65
Independent druggists	26.67
Members, chambers of commerce	24.57
Physicians	19.58
Rotary Club members	14.01

If this class of citizens refuse to express an opinion, we will lose our freedom by default.

I would outlaw legislative activities of all paid lobbyists except such testimony as they might care to make on the record—before committees, hearing proposed bills, or letters sent over their signature.

I would disfranchise all eligible voters for a period of 4 years who failed to register and vote in 2 successive national elections wherein Members of Congress were up for election, unless they furnished a reasonable excuse, properly sworn to, as to why they failed to vote. If they then failed to vote at the next national election following this 4-year period, they would be disfranchised for another 4 years.

If we had a clear-cut issue before the people and a majority of all those eligible to vote made a choice, diagnosis would be easy. If a majority of my people then voted for this new socialistic order, I would know that I had been born 30 years too soon and would certainly step out of Congress. However, when less than one-half of those eligible to vote in a county, give a majority to President Truman and also a majority to the Republican Congressman who represents that county, diagnosis of the majority's views is difficult.

I want a majority opinion of all those I represent. What I now have is a majority opinion of minority groups. I have not always agreed with them. Still if they are the ones who go to the polls and express an opinion—I must eventually reflect their opinion in my voting. I certainly cannot reflect an opinion as that of the majority—especially if the majority do not vote.

Address by Hon. Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado, Before Federal Communications Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on January 12 before the annual meeting of the Federal Communications Bar Association, at the Mayflower Hotel, in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARRYING COALS TO NEWCASTLE

It is with some trepidation that I come here to speak to this gathering of communications notables, for no one realizes more than I that here we have the collective brains of the communications world. Present we have the Commissioners—and their staff; we must not overlook their staff. Out there sit the lawyers, calm and collected with their legalistic harpoons well concealed, who not only convince their clients that a Commission decision is illegal, incorrect, or stupid and should be fought through the highest court in the land in the interest of equity and justice, but get paid for it. So tonight, I have the dubious honor of telling the folks who make the wheels spin just how the spinning is done.

To discuss the problems in communications—common carrier and broadcasting—before so distinguished a group is, I know, foolhardy. But as you also know, Senators are inclined that way, and for a Senator to evince deep interest in radio matters requires an even greater degree of foolhardiness. Anyway, here I am.

First off, let me say I expect to be misunderstood. Everytime I say anything about radio, and particularly about color television, I read at least a half-dozen versions of my statement. I ascribe that merely to the fact that each person likes to read into what is said what he wants to hear. Maybe it's because Congressmen use too many weasel words when they bare their souls but it is beyond me how one can be positive in the radio world today with its constantly expanding technical horizons. Particularly does that apply in the field of communications. As a result of developments or discoveries in the laboratory, what one says today may well be fallacious tomorrow. Tonight, I intend to stick closely to broad policy matters which ought not be affected by the progress of the art.

Our Senate committee is interested—vitally interested—in communications policies. Since we have many other duties and many other problems, I ask you to be patient with us. I repeat, we are interested enough to give the matter a lot of our time and our energy; we are interested in the application of the laws which we have written; in the policies formulated by the regulatory agency; in its day by day administration; in its attitude and reactions; and in the efforts the industry makes to keep the Commission, and the Congress, on what it regards as the straight and narrow path. The trouble is, of course, that while everybody agrees that the proper yardstick for the operation of utilities and broadcasting is "the public interest" it seems to make a whole lot of difference in which corner one sits as to what constitutes the public interest.

In an address at Amherst College last month the Chairman of the Commission hit this nail squarely on the head when he quoted the late Justice Harlan Fisk Stone to the effect that "the issue * * * in between the conflicting interests of the individual and of society as a whole, * * * There comes a point in the organization of a complex society where individualism must yield to traffic regulations, where the right to do so as one will with his own must bow to zoning ordinances, or even on occasion to price-fixing regulations. Just where the line is to be drawn which marks the boundary between the appropriate field of individual liberty and right and that of Government action for the larger good * * * is the perpetual question of constitutional law."

Justice Stone's eloquent language states the problem which Congress and the Commission must deal with constantly, frequently against the violent opposition of the legal fraternity.

We in Congress regard the Commission as an extension of ourselves; we regard it as the arm of Congress created to administer the details and weigh the arguments which Congress has neither the time nor the facilities to do. To evaluate the work of the Commission, however, does not require a profound legal background; in fact, the act does not require that one be learned in the law to be a commissioner. So to the extent that the Commission performs legislative acts, we in Congress feel that not only are we competent to evaluate its actions, but that we have the constitutional duty of exercising a close supervisory interest in them.

And like a fond parent who desires his children to grow up to amount to something, we occasionally exercise strong and purposeful parental guidance when we feel that things are not going along as they should. There are two schools of thought nowadays with respect to bringing up children: the so-called progressive education system which follows the Freudian precept of not interfering with the child and allowing it to express its inner urges whatever they may be and never, never restricting or curbing its excesses, and then there is the old-fashioned school which still adheres to the philosophy that to spare the rod is to spoil the child. With respect to the Commission, most of us in Congress, being practical, find ourselves half-way between these extremes.

Seriously, this is a vital problem. The last two decades have witnessed a virulent totalitarian trend which insists that the quasi-judicial, quasi-legislative arms of Congress are administrative agencies under the Executive. The results have led to a prostitution of the original purpose of Congress in the creation of such agencies as the Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Power Commission, the Communications Commission, and similar commissions. Under strong Presidents and complacent Congresses these agencies have not only come hopefully to regard themselves as arms of the executive, but they actually perform their functions as if they were part and parcel of the executive. Unfortunately too, the citizens who come under the regulation of these agencies have accepted this new theory—to their sorrow and ultimately to the eventual loss of their fundamental democratic rights.

Frankly, we in Congress believe these dangerous trends must be reversed and the constitutional powers of Congress restored. However, we cannot make much headway unless we have the cooperation of such groups as yours who should be vitally concerned with the totalitarian aspects of the present trend.

It must be obvious that there is great possibility of mischief if the arms of Congress finally become so wedded to the executive as to become inseparable from it. The agencies, under such a system, are bound to carry out the programs and policies of the particular administration in power rather than adhere to a strict and literal interpretation of the statute under which they operate. The viewpoint of an important party leader then becomes more compelling than reliance on the protection of the law. The rights of citizens to bring about changes through their legislative institutions are abrogated; to get something done frequently requires only influence in the proper places with the party in power. In such a political climate it is who you know and not what is equitable which counts. Not only is such a system intrinsically dangerous and a subversion of the original idea of the founding fathers, but it is bound to lead to the creation of a powerful and all-controlling centralized government. It must be realized, even by those who gain temporary advantage from it for themselves and their clients because in the end it will swallow up even those who profit from it.

I am frank to admit that we in Congress are partly to blame for this unfortunate trend. We have been complacent when we should have been deeply concerned. We can do something about it and we should nip the issue head-on.

For myself, I believe that the existing system of giving the Executive the appointive power to the commissions which are arms of Congress is basically unsound. It is only natural that those who owe their jobs to the Executive would be reluctant to oppose Executive policy and suggestion. Perhaps, if the appointive power were vested in the Speaker of the House, with the Senate confirmation requirement remaining as at present, these important quasi-judicial, quasi-legislative agencies really would attain the independence so vital to democratic government. Moreover, there should be unified standards of tenure, salaries, compensation of office, selection of chairmen, and powers and duties of commissioners in all the independent agencies instead of the present hodgepodge. There should be a more formal and searching annual accounting of commission operations to the people, through the Congress. I am wedded to these principles because I believe in democracy and fear totalitarianism, and I offer them as suggestions which should concern you lawyers in the administrative field.

It is important to emphasize that recent studies and proposals for streamlining the Government, such as the Hoover Commission report, valuable and informative as it is, have a basic weakness. In the interest of unification and streamlining, the emphasis has been to bring about a tightly knit structure of Federal Government functioning under the Executive. Such recommendations stem from the managerial concept followed in big business of having, above all, an efficient administration. But it overlooks and actually denies the fundamental basis of our democracy because it sacrifices and impairs the rights of citizens to participate directly in their Government. Without disparaging loyal, able, and devoted civil-service employees, all of you know that bureaucrats, good and not so good, earnestly believe they know what is good for you; and if you don't like it, that's your misfortune. No Congressman or Senator dare tell his constituents that he knows their problems better than they. Democracy does not work that way.

The history of communications comprises a fascinating panorama of the progress of mankind. From the dawn of civilization, each improvement and advance in the means of communicating more effectively with one's fellows has added to man's spiritual and economic progress. Despite this century's progress in communications, all of us here know that in some respects we are only on the threshold of developments which will mark a new advance in man's climb toward his ultimate destiny.

And since our country and our people are in the forefront of each new development, it is important that we cling tenaciously to high standards and religiously follow those vital precepts which insure continued progress and full freedom of communications from both political and selfish private domination. The modern dictators have taught us that the primary essential step toward seizing control of a country is to take over communications.

Even in this country which is genuinely devoted to democracy we have gone far in some fields by putting Government into many activities that might be better done by private initiative. If this country would hold its position of world leadership, the private-enterprise system not only must survive, but it must be made to flourish and expand since it has proved to the world that it holds the best record for bringing the greatest good to the greatest number. Without the shining example of the free-enterprise system of this democracy, a dismal prospect indeed would face the world. Free enterprise and democracy are inseparable; one cannot function at its best without the other.

Therefore, my criticisms and suggestions are not those of one who regards further Government controls as beneficial, or socialization of enterprise as the dawn of a great new era for mankind. On the contrary, I fear such steps and no one regrets more than I do whenever industry adopts policies which inevitably compels more stringent controls.

Communications is peculiarly vulnerable to the creeping paralysis of bureaucratic control. In the first place, it is a licensed industry. Some think it ought not be licensed, but common sense and the nature of the art make it difficult for me to agree with them. Frequencies are limited, and even if they were not, the economics of the situation limits the number of licenses, and public utilities and broadcasting must be a regulated monopoly to render good service. Incidentally, we ought to be happy about this on both counts. I have recently visited areas where the economy won't support two stations but where two dozen or more stations are operating, simply because every politician thinks he must own a radio station to air his particular political views. If each Member of Congress and each member of the President's Cabinet plus the horde of political leaders in each State owned a radio station, what a racket there would be—in both meanings of that ugly word. And all of you know that such a situation in another neighboring country lies behind the difficulties experienced at the recent NARBA conference.

Licensing implies, and in fact requires, adherence to very definite standards based upon the public interest. To those who argue for standards which should be limited to electrical interference I say "bunk." Such advocates live in a dream world of fancy, not fact. That is their idea of free radio, but it isn't mine. In my judgment, radio wouldn't be free very long if their interpretation were followed. Reasonable men differentiate between private privilege and the public good. Under such criteria, it is plain that the licensing agency has a duty to see that the license is used always in the public interest. Otherwise it becomes not a license but a special prerogative and the so-called licensee the possessor of a facility which belongs to all the people but over which the people have lost control.

That isn't freedom; it isn't even competition. It is special privilege of the worst kind with all of the faults and errors inherent in absolute monopoly. Under such a system, the public would get what the licensee deemed fit; under such a system radio would deteriorate to just what it is in some other countries where the only standard is the political pull necessary to acquire a license.

Of course, regulations can be made arbitrary, capricious, onerous, and burdensome, or even static in the interest of those who profit by the status quo. But they are more likely to become that way only when the licensee is doing a minimum job. When the licensee persists upon skating on thin ice, always seeing how little he can get by with, he strengthens the hand of a bureaucratically inclined agency. It is faulty and sloppy operation that brings on a blue book; it is clever deals that brings on an AVCO rule; it is monopoly practices that bring on network regulations. Licensees and their lawyers constantly cry about the Commission and its greed for more power but the most effective way to pull the Commission's fangs—if fangs it has—is to do such a good job of broadcasting that there is little for the Commission to do except formulate technical regulation.

I am viewing with alarm quibbling against imaginary restrictions and I am not criticizing radio, for American radio has done a magnificent job. There are 10 to 1 more fine radio stations performing a great public service in this country than in all of the rest of the world combined. There are licensees—and a lot of them—whose sole aim is to render a great public service and they have profited handsomely by adhering to that policy. The tragedy is that this is not better known and better understood and appreciated. We only hear about the few chiselers who either aim to get a license so that they can peddle it at a profit, or who regard a license as a potential bonanza to be exploited for all it is worth. They give radio a bad name, and as long as they exist the regulatory agency will have the backing of public-spirited citizens to pursue arbitrary and distasteful policies if they deem such a course necessary.

We will always need a strong, alert FCC whose sole passion should be to regulate the industry in the public interest. I have not hesitated to criticize the Commission and its policies when I thought criticism was justified and to praise it when its work has been noteworthy. It is my particular congressional responsibility to maintain constant watchfulness of its operations.

The Commission should continue its wise policy of constantly raising its sights and stature. It is required to sit in a judicial

capacity on many matters and its best friends in Congress would like to have it attain in its proceedings the dignity and stature of the judiciary. We do not believe that the Commission as a body or individually should discuss or receive ex parte testimony in contested cases, either from its own lawyers or from counsel for one of the litigants. A proper observance of courtroom ethics and procedure would make false the back biting, the petty innuendos, and the snide remarks of its critics.

Our biggest complaint on Capitol Hill is the long delay in processing cases. I do not need to tell you lawyers that delay in many instances is more deadly to an applicant than a flat but prompt rejection. I dealt at some length with that problem in my report on communications to the Senate last April and I hope that I will have a brighter picture to present next April. Late last year, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce requested and received a complete report on the status of the Commission's unfinished work. When we check again we are going to know definitely and clearly just how rapidly and how competently it performs at least one of its most important functions—the handling of broadcast cases.

Some of us think that the time has come for the Commission to overhaul its rules and regulations; to discard some procedures and revise others. We think that perhaps the network regulations require further scrutiny in the light of changing conditions. We think that the Commission might be able to do more in the purely scientific and technical field and that it could do more if some antiquated and unnecessary functions were dispensed with. Even though the majority of the Commission's engineering staff is engaged in monitoring and field engineering, there is some question as to how necessary this work really is now. We ought to know a good deal more about accounting practices in the telegraph and telephone field. Too, a revision of the tariffs in the common carrier field might well result in tremendous savings to millions of users throughout this country.

My views on the question of super power for standard radio broadcast stations are too well known to require elaboration here. I mention the subject only because I hope that the Commission will shortly provide for duplication of clears since the people of this country need more frequencies desperately. Certainly, it has the authority to do so. The maintenance of clear channels is an anachronism in modern radio practice. Unfortunately the clears cannot render the local service that many areas deserve hence they do not serve well. It is archaic to contend any longer that clear channels serve a useful purpose in the United States and the best proof is that the networks now frankly admit that their own seaboard clears might be duplicated without harm to them.

The question of power, of course, is a policy matter for the Congress to decide, since the vital issue of domestic monopoly and international comity are involved in it. We might have been in a much stronger position at Montreal in our efforts to reach a conference agreement had we first eliminated the problem of the clears. Most certainly then we could have dealt with cleaner hands with our Latin-American neighbors. I do not condone for one moment any attempt by any Nation to hold a pistol to our heads, and least of all by one whose entire economy depends on our friendly cooperation.

The United States ought to give serious consideration to the sensible proposal to assist Cuba and the whole Caribbean area in converting their local radio from AM to FM. FM renders better service than AM in areas where static interference is serious and where the area to be covered is not continental. Moreover, its use would eliminate pressing frequency problems and AM interference for us since there are ample FM frequencies. Rather than destroy or impair through a veritable babel of competing programs on the same frequency many of our splendid standard radio stations, which have been operating long and faithfully, it might pay us to make a loan or grant for the installation of FM stations, plus the replacement of all existing AM receivers with FM sets. This is a problem which should be studied seriously on behalf of all the smaller Central American countries where radio communication facilities are sparse or nonexistent. FM is an ideal instrumentality for the Tropics.

I am sorry there has been unavoidable delay in reaching a final decision on the color-television question. But I believe that the Commission's present hearing has been justified by the new interest it has aroused in this art. It is taking more time than anticipated, but a sound decision is more important than a speedy one. I have every confidence that the decision of the Commission will be a correct one, because I know that every member is aware of the vital importance of the question with which they are dealing. They must make sure that what they do is sound and permanent. The essential thing is a decision for the long pull; not something that will please a few powerful economic interests for today's profits. With respect to this matter the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have the advantage of a technical report by a committee of five impartial scientists, headed by Dr. Edward U. Condon, on the engineering practicality of color-television development. I am confident that report will fortify and bolster the Commission's decision that we are ready for color television now.

Television is a magnificent art which promises to bring finer entertainment and more information to the people of the United States. Its impact upon our culture and life socially and politically can hardly be evaluated. When the American people purchase 2,500,000 sets in 1 year they deserve and have every right to expect the best science can offer.

It is in the public interest, therefore, to promulgate quickly broad and sufficiently general standards for color so that this delightful improvement may be developed naturally in the traditional American, free enterprise, nonmonopolistic manner. Since it is generally agreed that color is practical, most emphatically the public interest would not be served by waiting until 30,000,000 families have invested upward of $6,000,000,000 in black and white sets before switching to color.

I hope, too, that the Commission will approve at the same time standards for the immediate commercial utilization of a large number of channels in the ultra-high-frequency band so that a realistic Nation-wide competitive system of television may be developed.

Certainly the public interest requires such an allocation. Easily identified selfish interests are laboring day and night to lift the freeze now and do nothing more. When the proposed 42 UHF channels are allocated on a city-by-city basis throughout the Nation and standards for their use promulgated there will remain no reason for continuing the present freeze on VHF licensing and, of course, it should then be lifted and not before.

All in all, the year ahead in communications promises to be fruitful, exciting, and eventful. Our Senate committee will pursue its studies on the operation of Federal communications systems in an effort to determine their necessity and desirability; we shall explore the entire question of frequency use with the purpose of making a more effective utilization and a more equitable distribution; we shall continue our studies of the serious and pressing problem of domestic and international record communications carriers with the hope that steps can be taken to combine their facilities with the purpose of bringing about lower costs and better service and at the same time improve this country's military and official position in common carrier communications; we shall continue to give attention to legislation which passed the Senate last session designed primarily to improve the administrative and quasi-judicial functioning of the Commission; and above all, we shall try diligently to meet our full congressional responsibilities by maintaining a policy of cooperation and watchfulness.

Commentary and Recommendations Upon the McKinsey & Co. Survey and Report Covering the Port Patrol Division of the Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following commentary and recommendations upon the McKinsey & Co. survey and report covering the Port Patrol Division of the Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, respectfully submitted by Lodge No. 981, American Federation of Government Employees, to better serve the public welfare and security:

A FACTUAL SERVICE

The Port Patrol Division is one of the most important units within the customs service.

It is an armed police force, strategically stationed 24 hours each day at piers, airfields, and in radio cars on mobile patrol as a bulwark protecting the welfare and security of the American people.

In times of war it is as important as is our merchant fleet itself. It stands guard against the sabotage of bombs and incendiary devices, or other forms of sabotage, and against the operations of espionage rings.

In times of peace its services are legion and range from the detection of counterfeit money to the apprehension of narcotic smugglers. It protects the Government revenue. It safeguards the public health from various diseases which could be brought into the country with parrots, monkeys, or other animal life. It stops illegal entry of plant life which could bear destructive insects with it.

The narcotic control work performed by the port patrol is exceedingly important. The illegal narcotic business is detestably vile. It wrecks homes and families through addiction, produces murderous criminals who ruthlessly take other lives through gangsterism, spawns vice dens of degenerates and prostitutes and causes financial losses that are appalling.

Standing at the many doors of entry into our country, the port patrol seizes in single operations the large shipments of narcotics that are intended to supply thousands of individual peddlers.

The personnel of the port patrol is rightfully proud of its 40-year record of achievement and believes that a study of this record will always be illuminating and possess many surprises.

Any reorganization of such an important unit as the port patrol is attended with grave responsibility to the American people.

The National Customs Service Association is an employee organization that includes very few port patrol officers within its membership. The vast majority of the membership performs duties in the various service that have no resemblance to the duties performed by the port patrol officers. This organization has, however, filed with the Congress a commentary and a set of recommendations upon the McKinsey report.

Lodge No. 981, the port patrol officers' representative organization, believes that a commentary compiled by the officers who rub elbows with the most lawless, yet the shrewdest, criminals and who have actual contact with the problems of this work, will be a definite contribution to the public welfare and security.

Concern is felt about many of the McKinsey recommendations which require only administrative acceptance to become effective. A lack of understanding of the deterrent effect of our work seems to prevail. The value of our work cannot be measured in the number of seizures alone. Three pertinent questions must be considered. What would happen if all port patrol officers were removed? What will happen if too few port patrol officers are there? What will happen if demoralizing working conditions destroy morale and efficiency?

In the interests of the public welfare and security, Lodge No. 981 respectfully requests your consideration of the following commentary, covering chapter VIII of the McKinsey report:

PORT THE MCKINSEY REPORT—PROTECTION, INVESTIGATION, AND ENFORCEMENT

"(a) Reduce the amount of merchandise guarding where study indicates other agencies should do more of the work."

We believe that a very important fact is being overlooked here.

During the time that a vessel is berthed at a pier, illegal merchandise or narcotics may easily be secreted on the pier, hidden with the cargo. We believe that the port patrol officer should remain at the pier as long as any cargo rests on the pier. If he is removed, when the vessel sails, the door is opened for the entry of any illegally secreted merchandise or narcotics. There is no other agency sufficiently trained or authorized to perform this enforcement work. The agencies employed to reduce pilferage cannot be held responsible for the law-enforcement work of the port patrol.

"(b) Increase the mobile patrols where practical, thereby reducing costs."

Our contribution to the public welfare and security is the justification for our existence. Any worth-while contribution demands fixed posts of duty with very little shifting of personnel. The need of flexibility should only occasionally arise. The mobile patrol can spot check locations where there is no port patrol officer on a fixed post. As an adjunct to an officer on a fixed post, the mobile patrol is valuable, rendering assistance during the paying off of an entire crew or when large numbers of longshoremen are leaving the pier at one time. The mobile patrol is also valuable in spot checking areas of a large port where a fixed post is not practical. This spot checking cannot be otherwise than haphazard, however. They must be present at an unguarded location at the exact time that an illegal landing of merchandise or narcotics is being attempted. The persons who engage in the illegal narcotic traffic are smart enough to quickly learn to wait until the mobile patrol has spot checked their location, and depart for a check at another unguarded location, realizing that they should then encounter no obstacle to their illegal landing.

We believe that the mobile patrol should never be employed as a substitute for the fixed post of duty. The amount saved would be so relatively small when measured against the great damage that may result, as to make it hardly worth while.

"(c) Expand the use of modern equipment and training to make patrols more flexible and effective."

We endorse the proposal that has been made to send the port patrol officers to the school operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation if possible. We believe that such instruction would enable the port patrol officers to take better care of themselves in emergencies and enable them to render more efficient and better enforcement work.

"(d) Change New York roll-call practices. Test out operations with no roll call. Until results of test are known, decentralize roll call and require supervisors to prepare themselves to drive cars in order to facilitate speedier coverage and inspection of personnel."

The National Customs Service Association suggested a half hour lunch period in their commentary. This is impractical. The time allowance is too short. It would be very difficult to relieve all the port patrol officers who are assigned singly to many miles of New York and New Jersey dock areas. To permit a fixed post to be uncovered during any period of time would eradicate the benefit gained in the 8 hours that the port patrol officer was on duty.

"(e) Standardize vessel searching practices to achieve more uniform coverage and practices."

We believe the results obtained in the Port of New York indicate a superlative efficiency. We believe that more efficient enforcement can be obtained, however, through an interchange of information between ports relative to suspected vessels or persons. Some such information is presently supplied to the officers engaged in searching vessels, and to the customs inspectors by the investigative agency of the customs service. Such information is rarely known, however, to the port patrol officer on a fixed post or on mobile patrol. We believe that this information should be supplied to all port patrol officers by the investigative agency of the customs service and should be expanded if possible.

"(f) Deployment of personnel according to the work load to obtain greater uniformity and lower costs."

Such deployment of personnel other than the port patrol may be found advantageous and practical. Relative to the port patrol, however, we reiterate our previously expressed belief, that all locations where a vessel is berthed or where any cargo remains should be covered with a fixed post 24 hours each day, and the deployment of port patrol personnel should be avoided.

The fixed post is a door of entry into our country. The deployment of a port patrol officer from a fixed post opens this door of entry to anyone who may be waiting for such an opportunity.

ORGANIZATION

"(a) Establish two assistants to the deputy commissioner to allow for closer supervision and better coordination of customs enforcement work."

We wholeheartedly agree with this recommendation of the McKinsey Co. Lack of coordination between the various ports has greatly decreased efficiency. Seafaring men repeatedly express their belief that the port of New York is a more difficult customs port than other ports.

OUR CONCLUSIONS

If it is earnestly desired to maintain a strong and valuable wartime security link, if the public health is to be efficiently protected from foreign disease, if agriculture is to be screened from destructive insects, if Government revenue is to be adequately protected, if narcotic addiction and gangsterism is to be suppressed in any degree, if vice dens of degeneracy are to be eliminated in any measure, and if the general welfare of the American people is to be safeguarded the port patrol should be strengthened and not weakened.

The port patrol officer holds a position of trust and responsibility. He is exposed to various hazards, personal dangers, and occasionally to death while enforcing the laws enacted by Congress. His personal contacts while on duty include seamen of all nationalities as well as American citizens of all social standings. He is the representative of the United States Government and must avoid incidents that would lead to international correspondence, he must employ tact, and be able to transact his business with highly educated persons in such a manner as to reflect credit to his Government. In contrast, he must reflect firmness and strength to the loathsome narcotic smuggler. This calls for the exercise of a wide latitude of independent action.

It must be apparent that a very high type of person is required to fulfill the duties creditably and efficiently. A more appropriate civil service classification, a greater recognition of the hazards and individual integrity and a more equitable procedure of promotion and disciplinary action will aid greatly to attract the type of personnel required for this important work.

There are approximately 1,000 port patrol officers in the entire United States. They constitute a very small group that is rendering very valuable service to the American welfare and security. All the savings that can possibly be effected within the port patrol is relatively small to the national or Customs Bureau's annual budget and should be seriously studied against the type and many services rendered by the port patrol.

Local Level Selective Service Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, during the late war, Iowa was fortunate in having many patriotic and able citizens who gave unstintingly of their time and effort as members of local selective service boards. Among these was Mr. Vernon Denman, of Des Moines, Iowa, who served 6 years as member and chairman of a local board. Mr. Denman recently wrote a letter to the adjutant general of Iowa, Gen. Charles H. Grahl, outlining in detail the problems with which his local board was confronted, and how they were solved. Believing the letter would be helpful to all local board members in event that it becomes necessary to expand our armed services through Selective Service, and under permission granted me, I include in my remarks in the RECORD the letter of Mr. Denman to General Grahl:

OCTOBER 10, 1949.

To: Gen. Charles H. Grahl, State director of selective service, Des Moines, Iowa.

From: Vernon Denman, chairman, local board, No. 13-77, Des Moines, Iowa.

As promised some few weeks ago, I have prepared a brief symposium of public relations experienced during about 6 years as a member and chairman of a local selective service board from the beginning to the end of the act of 1940. Should of necessity the personal pronoun I appear too frequently, please overlook and charge the apparent blunder to the inadequacy of the writer.

Very early in the fall of 1940, it was realized by myself that home front morale was and would continue to be an important factor in the successful conduct of the war. Complaints registered with the Commander in Chief, and other top men charged with heavy responsibilities, be they real or imaginary, could only confuse issues and waste valuable time of such important people, thus, to avoid as much waste as possible and to promote and to improve local morale of both employers, parents, and selectees, a special service was added to the task set aside for the chairman of the board.

As we have discussed this subject before, we have agreed that the following program could very well work both on a State and National basis, just as well as it did in the narrow limits of a local board. It is, therefore, with this thought in mind, that a more extensive use of the plan might be made should the Nation again become involved in a shooting war, that this paper is written.

No form of government survives long without the confidence of the people, in the strict honesty of purpose, in those who are engaged in the administration of that government, providing of course, the people are not by force compelled to admit confidence. Therefore, confidence must be won by actions and deeds and methods. Further, the better informed interested persons are, the less danger of complaints and misunderstandings and the easier to reach an amicable solution to all problems.

How can the Government teach the public as much as possible the mechanics of selective service? First, by intelligent and reliable releases to both the press and the radio, but far more important and satisfactory is for individual board members to take the time to explain the applicable rule or rules to the dissatisfied patron. Most people resent being called before a local board to air their positions. When inescapable that a person must appear, the board should go out of its way to make a hearing pleasant and to avoid embarrassment to that patron, almost at any cost. Harsh words should never be used and the show of authority should likewise be intolerable. When situations arise that are beyond the control of the local board or the State director, prompt solutions must be sought. If a local board member is out of line, then he should be removed and the press should be informed. When the State director or any member of his staff or the National director or any member of his staff become unreasonable or politically inclined, the local board should immediately inform the people via the press and cause removal of such person or persons.

The local boards build and acquire confidence by giving information, that is, all unrestricted information to reporters for the press and by talks to clubs, meetings, and individuals.

People generally have given the word "induction" an abhorrent meaning. They have associated the words of force, compulsion, and unwillingness to the term "induction." They are not very far wrong. Men should be conducted into service. Understandable leadership was never more important or imperative than when men are for the first time entering the armed services of the country.

How best, then, may the above be achieved? The suggestions following are based on several years of actual experience. Here, again, the local board must be well informed and willing to devote considerable time to their assignment.

Invitational meetings should be held to relate to new soldiers the complete story about their new life, especially the trials to be met for the first 3 or 4 days in service.

The invitation should include the parents, the wives, if any, and all friends they care to bring with them. The time of the meeting should be 8 p. m. the day before departure, providing the departure date is not on Monday, Saturday, or Sunday—those afternoon meetings are never successful. Invitations to others, as well as to the men themselves, increase the attendance of the men. An attempt to compel attendance should never be tried.

The meetings should never exceed 45 minutes in length. No speaker should talk more than 10 minutes. The chairman of the local board should conduct the meeting whenever possible. A variety of persons appearing before the audience creates interest. A jovial attitude and presentation of information is desired.

Other organizations should not attempt such meetings. They are doomed to failure. They cannot and never have followed through. An incomplete job is worse than no job at all.

The local board should obtain from the processing Army or Navy post an exact procedure, hour by hour, for the several days required to process a new recruit. This should be prepared under the direction of the commanding officer at the post or base with the cooperation of the chaplain. This permits the parents and wives to live the routine of their loved ones and eases the ties that have been broken. This paper should require not more than 10 minutes to read and should be read by some well-known citizen of the community.

An interesting speaker should then be given 10 minutes to present his subject.

The chairman of the board should then discuss more personal problems, such as, what to take with them, train time and conduct en route to post or base, and the need for officers and enlisted men. Minimize all fear of the needles and fantasies of processing. Warnings against the evils of mingling with women of the red-light districts. Explaining the purpose of USO and all other general information possible. This should not exceed 10 minutes. The final 15 minutes should be devoted to a question-and-answer period. If at all possible, a short social time should be had at the close with some group serving coffee and doughnuts.

It is highly important that the chairman of the board should be at the depot at least 1 hour before train time. Many questions are asked and should be answered. No depot employee should be permitted to march the boys to the train. Last-minute farewells are nobody's business except those who are being separated. A 10-minute warning should be made of departing time, men should not be required to board trains more than 3 or 4 minutes prior to departure. The chairman should board the cars to see that every man has a seat. He should see to it that the trains are clean and that drinking water and ventilation are available. Freedom of movement on the part of the departing boys should not be restricted prior to boarding time.

If the chairman resides within a short distance of the processing station, he should visit each class on the evening of the second day in camp. The board should obtain rules governing the visiting at camps by relatives of the soldiers and should keep their clerks fully informed so they can be of immediate help to all such people.

The chairman should, if at all possible, make himself available for visiting time with men home on furlough and should compliment the men if they have been elevated in rank. A local board that is willing to encourage new soldiers seem becomes well known and appreciated by the parents of the boys.

It is unnecessary to mollycoddle the boys. Far more to be desired is a sincere interest in their welfare and a genuine sympathetic and rational understanding of their emotions and an attempt to lead them toward a more cheerful future than they anticipate.

More detail can be provided if wanted. It is a further suggestion that the Office of the National Director of Selective Service could, during this quiet time, explore the possibilities of adopting the plan on a national scale and be prepared to instruct local boards in its operation, should the need arise. My limited services in the furtherance of the idea are at your command.

It has been my observation during the years I've been a member of a board that those men who have had service in some branch of our armed forces have been the most understanding, the most willing to devote time and energy to the duties of a board and the best all-around members from any standpoint.

Therefore, in selecting a membership for all local boards it would be advantageous to the Government if at least one former serviceman was chosen as a member. There may be a few exceptions to this suggestion but very few.

Respectfully,

VERNON DENMAN.

George Washington Carver: Pioneer in Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, a few days ago the city of Pittsburgh concluded a week set aside in the memory of the great American, George Washington Carver. At the end of that week one of our colleagues, the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], was the principal speaker at a memorial service conducted at Trinity Cathedral in Pittsburgh. Senator GILLETTE's address was a stirring tribute to the splendid contributions Dr. Carver made to our national life, both in the field of scientific investigation and in the living example he set for all to see by the conduct of his own life. I feel strongly that the Congress will be interested in what Senator GILLETTE had to say, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have his speech, "George Washington Carver: Pioneer in Human Rights," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is truly a great honor to have been asked by the Sentinel Achievement Clubs to address this congregation of citizens gathered to celebrate a service in memory of Dr. George Washington Carver. Your president—Dr. Alma Illery—your national officers, your board of directors and all the members of the National Achievement Clubs deserve high praise for your sponsorship of these memorial services for one of our great departed. I consider it a privilege to share

with all of you present today in this beautiful cathedral this brief moment of tribute to a man whose life and accomplishments have made so profound an impression upon our century.

For me it is also a personal gratification to participate in this occasion, since for many years I have followed with deep interest both the career and the scientific achievements of Dr. Carver.

In Iowa, you know, we are rightfully proud that one of our great universities, the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts at Ames, served as the springboard from which George Washington Carver leaped forward into his long and fruitful life as an agricultural scientist, as a discoverer of manifold secrets formerly hidden in nature, and as a pioneer in the art of human relations.

Of course, we make no undue claim for having been responsible in Iowa for the magnificent contributions to human welfare which Dr. Carver made in the course of his life. When George first came into Iowa on his search for knowledge, the seeds that were to make him one of our country's outstanding men had already produced a sturdy young tree.

Ames only gave direction to his natural talents as a "plant doctor," as people called him when he was still a child. Iowa gave him staunch friends like James C. Wilson, his professor at Ames, who later became Secretary of Agriculture, and like the many others who, once they came to know George Carver, remained his steadfast admirers.

Anyone who has read the story of the life of George Washington Carver knows that within Carver himself was the will power, the strength of purpose, and faith in himself and in his God, that were the real reasons why he was able to attain his goal and to serve his people. Sufficient obstacles were thrust in his way almost at birth to have stopped most any child before he even started life. An orphaned son of slaves, a puny, weak child, with an early speech impediment, a member of a downtrodden race, he could count on little but the qualities in his own heart and brain to overcome the obstacles before him.

His attitude toward life has been summed up as follows: He wanted to be exactly what he was and to develop along the road which his nature called him. What he did not want was to be told that he could go only so far but no farther. So he simply set out to go where he was going as if there were no possibility of his being stopped. This inner certainty was his greatest strength—yet it was not his only strength.

Even as an orphan wandering from town to town doing odd jobs as cook and laundress, at an age when most boys are living at home and going to grammar school, he showed an astonishing sense of independence—to such a degree that he always refused charity, feeling that people were kind, but unreasonable, to give something for nothing.

The driving force in his life was his unquenchable desire to know and his unalterable certainty that he could do whatever he set out to do.

His twin love of nature and of art formed a unity in his mind and permitted him to become both a fine painter and a scientific experimentalist. Nor was there ever any conflict in his mind between the presumably opposing doctrines of science and religion. Dr. Carver was deeply religious from childhood. His intimate association with nature, as well as his own personal misfortunes as a child, led him to prayer. And, according to his own testimony, his greatest discoveries in science were revelations from God. Of course, he did not merely sit down and wait for the Divine Power to place new ideas in his head. He went ahead to accomplish all that a man could—then resorted to simple faith. His faith and his natural genius, therefore, formed a single whole.

In the language of psychology, we may say that George Washington Carver had an integrated personality. He was not plagued by inner doubts or subconscious confusions. Life, he saw, was only meaningful as a whole, composed of God, nature, and man.

With this conception, how could he fail to regard human rights as ordained by God? His natural religious ardor would have led him to champion the rights of man, even if he had not been born a member of a race to whom the basic rights of man were being denied.

George Carver was a quiet man of simple dignity. He expected others to respect his dignity as he respected theirs—and was deeply hurt when, as was far too often the case, he was rebuffed or scorned. Yet he always hid his hurt and went quietly ahead spreading knowledge among the people as he believed it his mission to do.

His own character and manner were a moral influence as good for the soul of humanity as his scientific accomplishments were for its material existence. He lived what he preached to others. He never was highly paid. He refused many lucrative positions that would have forced him to leave his work in the South. He did not patent his discoveries, but allowed others freely to realize whatever commercial gain they could from his experiments.

Dr. Carver has been called the greatest single force since the turn of the century in creating racial understanding in this country. I regard him as a pioneer in the field of human rights.

Sixty years ago when he accepted Booker T. Washington's invitation to go South and teach agriculture at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, Dr. Carver knew to a certain extent what he would be confronted with. But I imagine he was enormously shocked by the reality of the South in the 1890's. The economic, social, and racial conditions he found were far different from what they are today. I think a strong case could be made to show that a very large portion of the credit for the immense improvements in the South during the past 50 years should be given to George Washington Carver.

Applying his integrated and unified view of life to the problems of the South, Dr. Carver took one look at the eroded land, the worn-out soil, the low state of the economy, the one-crop system, the tenant farmers bound to the landowner, the cotton growing up to the cabin door, the poor whites and the poor Negroes alike in debt all their lives to the landlord, Jim Crow-ism reigning supreme—and he declared that the fertility of the land and the abundance of unskilled labor had been a curse, not a blessing. At the root of the problem was the complete dependence on cotton, the one-crop system. The solution, for the economy and for the relationships of the whites and the Negroes, was to free the South from its absolute subservience to King Cotton, and thereby free the people from the vicious circle of poverty, serfdom, illiteracy, and prejudice.

In other words, Dr. Carver pioneered in the field of human rights from all sides at once—religious, moral, economic, social, educational, racial, cultural, and economic. He sought to create the material and moral climate in which man's dignity would be respected by other men.

He persuaded farmers to grow vegetables and other foods in their own gardens, so as to liberate themselves from perpetual debt to the landowner's commissary. He taught housewives new recipes to make these foods palatable. He gave lectures with demonstrations throughout the South in order to teach agricultural science to people who could not read. He invited people to bring their problems to his laboratory if they could not write him letters. He corresponded with thousands of people by mail—his average receipt of mail was 150 letters a day.

As an artist—a painter of flowers and plants—he knew the importance of beauty in men's lives. So he taught his people to decorate their homes, and developed new stains and dyes from the earth and the plants of Alabama cheap enough for poor farmers to buy and use in beautifying their homes.

His accomplishments in experimental agriculture are too well known to need recounting. The development of the peanut alone nearly revolutionized southern agriculture. His research into new crops led him naturally to a search for new markets for these crops—and it is interesting to note there is at this time a subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee which is engaged in precisely the same kind of work as Dr. Carver began years ago; seeking new ways to utilize farm products.

On the social plane, Dr. Carver's pioneering work in agriculture was to lead to the growth of a middle class in the South, a broad stratum of society which is secure in its position and which is automatically maintaining a balance between the social extremes inherited from the past. Without this development of an independent and substantial middle class, Dr. Carver knew, the system in the South would remain feudalistic, divided between masters and serfs.

In the sphere of race relations as such, Dr. Carver's contribution though more intangible, were no less real. In his work at Tuskegee and in his travels around the country, he helped white men as well as Negroes. He had a rare knowledge of human nature that told him that a person who does not answer another's plea kills him in his heart. His discoveries and his assistance were freely given to every man.

George Washington Carver was one of the first men to understand that the Negro problem was not the only southern problem. He knew that men of both races lacked the same things, and that this lack made their relations with each other even more complex and difficult.

Of all the many things that have been written and said about George Carver, I think one statement by Dr. Moton, who followed Booker T. Washington as head of Tuskegee Institute, sums up most succinctly the role of Dr. Carver as a pioneer in human rights: Dr. Moton said: "He has been an inspiration as a teacher and exemplification in his own person of the possibilities of the race. Thousands will be his debtor in race understanding who will never know his name."

We have come a long way from the days of the post-Civil War South. The present trend in this country, and in the world at large, is toward guaranteeing full human rights for all men. No one who remembers even part of what has been accomplished in the past 50 years in the United States in creating the physical and moral conditions for better human relations can remain pessimistic. Where 50 years ago there was perhaps only one Negro scientist working in the laboratory and the lecture hall for the benefit of his people and of the whole country, today there are thousands. It would be exaggerating to say that among them are more George Washington Carvers—there has been and will be only one like him. But the pioneering stage is past, and where Dr. Carver led, thousands can now follow.

Before closing, I should like to offer a thought that has been in my mind since I spoke Thursday of this week in my office with a fine, intelligent and highly educated African leader from Nigeria, who received his education in our American universities and who is today striving to lead his people to freedom and economic progress.

Just as Dr. Carver devoted his life to service to his people in the South, bringing them

knowledge by which to liberate themselves and the whole South from a one-group economy and a feudal-type master-serf relationship, so the future of many young Negro scientists and qualified experts in the 50 years lying ahead in this century may be to bring the knowledge they have obtained in America to the aid of the people of Africa.

A new field, such as under the point 4 development program, may soon be opening for a new type of missionary in Africa—for missionaries of civilization bringing not only religious teachings but medical, technical, agricultural and other knowledge, training people in cultivation of the land and in manufacture of products.

Who can better bring the light of knowledge and the incentive to progress to the peoples of Africa than the Negroes of America who have surmounted all obstacles, human and otherwise, set before them since their ancestors were brought to America as slaves? Many American Negroes may find a great and significant future in carrying the word to Africa.

The renascence of the African Continent, under the guiding hand of qualified Negro specialists, doctors, scientists, and technicians from America would, I believe, have an important byproduct in this country—it would simultaneously mean a quickening of the progress of the Negro people in the United States itself. As Africa develops and liberates itself from the outworn colonial system, there will be even less excuse than now for the type of willfully ignorant attitude of some Americans toward their fellow Negro Americans. When Africans are free and progressing, American Negroes—Afro-Americans—will be that much freer and that much farther along the road of their own progress.

What Dr. George Washington Carver saw as his mission in the 1890's—to aid his people in the southern United States—may appear to some young Negro Americans today as the model for their mission in the second half of the twentieth century.

It is now abundantly evident that the pioneering of George Washington Carver has accomplished already far more than the modest aims he set before himself. Everywhere in America today the trend is toward the elimination of those barriers that have prevented the Negro people from fully exercising their rights as human beings. I can imagine only one greater reward for Dr. Carver's pioneering efforts—and that would be if not only the Negro people in this country but also those in Africa were to achieve the full measure of their God-given dignity as men born to be free and equal.

The Modern Challenge to Business Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege, on January 10, to be permitted to talk to the Boston Board of Fire Underwriters at their annual meeting in the city of Boston, Mass. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is really a talk about the cooperation of business and government. It is a talk about the preservation of a democratic capitalistic system, about the establishment of an expanding domestic economy designed to promote the fullest utilization of all our human and natural resources. It is a talk about the preservation of the system of private property and the winning of world peace.

Not since the business leaders of the Thirteen Original Colonies voluntarily assumed the task of promoting the ratification of the Constitution of the United States has a greater challenge been presented to business leadership than that which is now offered. The commercial classes in 1788 knew that a stable national government was needed to prevent the economic and political ruin of the newly liberated American States. They financed the campaigns for ratification up and down the colonies, and, so great was their desire for a national government which would provide a rule of order under which the economic system could work, that they did not hesitate to throw their support behind the pledge that the first Congress would draft a Bill of Rights. It is not too much to say, therefore, that the commercial classes in the closing years of the eighteenth century were a most important factor in the establishment of the new Federal Government which, in our time, has twice saved the world from the reestablishment of central political tyranny.

It is altogether appropriate that we should discuss the modern challenge to business leadership in the city of Boston, because it was here on January 9, 1788, that the Massachusetts Convention assembled under the presidency of John Hancock to ratify the Federal Constitution in a resolution, which also supported a Bill of Rights. Because of what was done here in Boston with the cooperation and support of business leaders and in the other States which ratified the Constitution, 10 amendments were submitted to the States in the first session of Congress, protecting the individual rights of the people as individuals, and asserting their superiority over government.

The business classes of our time face a new challenge, which arises from the fact that excessive economic authority has accumulated in private hands in such a manner as to weaken the economic authority of the States and cause the expansion of the powers of the National Government. This generation has seen the erection of the totalitarian state, because, as in Italy and Germany, the concentration of economic power had become so great that the people, unable to provide employment for themselves, yielded to the false persuasions of Fascists, Nazis, and Communists that the all-powerful state would supply the answer to their problem.

We know that it does not supply that answer. We know that the totalitarian state exists only by the use of force, that it utterly destroys the liberty of the individual, and makes him economically as well as politically the slave of the state.

INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM IS AMERICAN GOAL

The people of America do not believe in the all-powerful state, but they do believe in individual freedom. They are as devoted today to the principles of the Bill of Rights as were the colleagues of John Hancock in the Massachusetts Convention of 1788. They believe that the authority of both political organizations and economic organizations proceeds from the people and they have not hesitated to contribute in unprecedented measure of their blood and treasure to the preservation of this ideal of human liberty. It is the desire of an overwhelming majority of them to do what lies in their power to win permanent world peace and to maintain a stable economic system in which the individual shall continue to have opportunity, not only to support himself, but to improve himself also.

The people know that these two great objectives are inseperable. There are no class divisions in America, so far as this great national purpose is concerned. Those who are engaged in agriculture or in industry, those who serve in the professions or in business, all believe in the traditional American ideals of popular sovereignty. Leaders in business and in government who desire to preserve this ideal, if they are to be successful in that effort, must first of all analyze the cause of the great crisis in which the world now finds itself. First of all, therefore, we must banish from our minds the false notion that World War II is over. Only the shooting has stopped. The peace treaties have not been written. Armed forces are still marching throughout the world. Our own troops are still in Europe and in Asia. A terrible armament race, the atom-bomb race, more appalling than any competition in armament that ever took place, is demanding a larger and larger proportion of the productive capacity of men. There are some who feel that a third world war is inevitable, although they must know that such a conflict would threaten the total destruction of civilization. It was Einstein who, when asked what the weapons in a third world war would be, replied that he could not answer, that he could only predict that the weapons of the fourth world war would be stones and bludgeons.

If the American aspiration for permanent world peace is to be realized we must not fail to maintain here among our own people a stable and expanding economy. For my own part, I believe that the maintenance of such an economy is incomparably the greatest task that our people were ever called upon to perform. We can make no contribution to world history that will exceed in value the certain establishment here of an expanding economy of opportunity for all the people.

If we do this, there is no iron curtain anywhere that will prevent the knowledge of our success from reaching the minds and hearts of people everywhere.

Surely, we know now that war has no victors. We destroyed our enemies in World War II; we crushed Hitler and Mussolini and the Japanese ruling class, but we have not yet begun to pay for that triumph. The national debt is still on a pinnacle of $250,000,000,000. We are paying $5,500,000,000 this year to meet the interest on this debt. The care of the veterans who fought in two world wars is costing $6,000,000,000 annually. Even though the President is refusing to expend the sums appropriated by the Congress for a 70-group air force, national defense this year will cost almost $13,000,000,000, and other billions have been made available for the economic rehabilitation and the arming of western Europe, thus accounting for almost 80 percent of the total cost of this Government. So the people here and throughout the world, hoping and praying for peace, with no personal desire except for liberty and opportunity, are condemned to pay for old wars and prepare for new ones.

WHY TRY THE WAYS OF PEACE

Is there no alternative for this futility? I think so. I think we should deliberately try the ways of peace. Surely the people of America, who have already demonstrated how freedom and opportunity can raise the standard of living of all the people to higher levels than have even been approximated in any other land, or at any other time, can find the answer in their own history. The only trouble is that we have not learned

how to prevent depression. The Kremlin is not planning aggressive war, because it is convinced that the capitalistic system is bound to go down in another economic crash which will create the vacuum into which communism can march unopposed. That is the challenge the modern world presents to business leadership—the achievement of an economic system constantly expanding and always affording opportunity for each oncoming generation.

It is an end which can be attained only by the united action of all our people. The whole is greater than any of its parts. None of the parts must imagine that it alone can prosper at the expense of any of the others. We all stand together or we shall fall together in this great struggle for freedom. We cannot here afford class conflict, for under the American ideal there are no classes. Farm and factory are interdependent. The worker and the manager alike are equal citizens of the United States. There are no classes in the armed forces which we sent to war. There can be no classes in the civilian army that must produce for peace. Production won the fighting war. Production will win the cold war. Production and only production can win permanent peace. Just as during the actual conflict all classes of Americans united without regard to their special interests, so now we must unite if we hope to hand on a peaceful world to the next generation.

We shall, however, find it difficult to perform the economic service which we and all mankind need, if utter disorder in a new scientific war is to be avoided, unless we understand the forces which created totalitarian communism. It calls itself the dictatorship of the proletariat. If there were no proletariate there would be no dictatorship. What, then, is the proletariat? It is the portion of society which is unable by its own capital and its own labor to produce the things that are necessary to maintain life. Though he may be politically free, if he is not also economically free the individual is a member of the proletariat and we must never forget that the proletariat is the raw material out of which communism is made. When the masses are unable to support themselves they turn to arbitrary government. The proletariat is the product of industrial collectivism.

THE DANGER OF A PROLETARIAT

The most important lesson that American leadership can learn, whether in business or in government, is that modern technology has created industrial collectivism through the ownership by a small segment of society of the means of production upon which all society depends. To save capitalism and the free-enterprise system it is necessary to make certain that we shall not permit the creation of a dominant proletariat in the United States. That means we must foster and expand the ability of the masses of the people to own property, including property in their jobs. The workers must have a stake in modern industrial organization. Those business leaders who have adopted the annual wage system or a profit-sharing plan have adopted an admirable means to promote industrial unity in which capital, labor, and management are all partners. Thus can organized enterprise keep itself free of Government control. Government regulation must not be confused with Government control. Regulation merely provides the rule under which free enterprise operates. Government control, on the other hand, is the assumption by public authority of the power to direct enterprise. The former is in complete harmony with the American tradition. The latter is the road that leads to national socialism and communism.

Let no one forget that the Constitution, which was ratified here in Massachusetts 162 years ago, in its first article gives to Congress the plenary power to regulate commerce. One of the primary reasons why the commercial classes of the Thirteen Colonies supported the Federal Constitution was because they recognized the indispensable necessity of establishing a general government to provide a rule of order for the conduct of commercial relations among the States and the people thereof.

KEEP OPPORTUNITY FREE

It is worthy of note that among the recommendations made by the Massachusetts convention for the amendment of the Constitution was that a provision should be adopted to prohibit Congress from creating any commercial monopoly. The Massachusetts founding fathers wanted no national monopolies to restrain trade and commerce in the States. They wanted freedom. Monopoly is the foe of free enterprise now as it was then and no amount of rationalization can make it otherwise. If opportunity is to remain free, then obviously restraint of trade and commerce must continue to be prohibited. It is because the United States had had an antitrust law while, on the other hand, the nations of Europe have permitted and encouraged monopolies, that we in America have outstripped all the nations of the world in productive enterprise. If we are to preserve free enterprise we must keep opportunity free. No group can contribute more to commercial freedom than can the leaders of business, and by their own choice they can avoid the practices which suppress competition.

A large enterprise is not necessarily a monopolistic enterprise. A large country needs big business, but no business, large or small, should be permitted to restrain the operations of any other business or to close the door of opportunity to any new business. If we desire to maintain competition, it is essential to recognize the difference between the business which is managed by its owners and the business which is owned by one group and managed by another. The latter, because it uses the collective capital of hundreds of thousands and the collective labor of other hundreds of thousands is a collectivist enterprise, altogether different from the small enterprises which are managed by their owners. Collectivist enterprise under private managers is but slightly different from collectivist enterprise under public managers. If we are not careful to see that the small owner-operated business is not pushed off the lot by private collectivism, it will be difficult indeed to avoid public collectivism.

Another fact which must be clearly understood if an expanding economy of opportunity is to be maintained, is the difference between agriculture, upon the one hand, and industry and commerce upon the other. Agriculture is still carried on by individuals in their individual capacity. Commerce and industry, which in the days of Hancock was also individual enterprise, is now carried on primarily by organizations. Agricultural prices are made in a free market. Industrial prices, on the other hand, are frequently fixed by combinations and understandings. The farmer sells his produce in a free market, but buys the things he needs in a controlled market.

The preservation of the free-enterprise system does not require that Government should not undertake any operation that might be carried on by private groups. There are some operations which serve the public interest best by being carried on by Government. Water systems, for example, once were privately owned and operated. That is a thing of the past like the operation of toll bridges. It is now generally recognized that the construction of public highways, airports, the control of floods, the operation of harbor facilities, the elimination of water pollution, etc., are all proper functions of Government. And, incidentally, public expenditures for these purposes create business.

PRODUCTIVE EXPENDITURES GOOD FOR BUSINESS

Economy in Government is highly desirable. Waste of public funds is indefensible, but it must never be overlooked that the indiscriminate slashing of Government expenditures can do more harm than good. Productive government expenditures are good for business. For example, rural electrification has created new markets for business and new opportunities for labor. Like public highways and modern airports, electricity on the farm contributes to what we most need, an expanding economy of private owners. The same is true of reclamation in the West, creating as it does new communities that add to the national income, increase purchasing power and provide revenue for local, State, and Federal Governments.

It is impossible to understand the Federal budget unless we compare it with the budgets that preceded the war. In 1939, the last year before the Government began to prepare for war, the total national budget was only a little more than $10,000,000,000, as compared with the estimate of forty-two billion four hundred million submitted by the President yesterday. But in 1939 only 29 percent of Federal expenditures had any relation to war. The rest of the ten billion budget of 1939, that is to say, 71 percent, went for the normal functions of Government and objectives which were designed to foster and stimulate business and improve the standard of living. Today, however, the situation is exactly reversed. Seventy-one percent of the forty-two billion four hundred million projected for fiscal year 1951 will go for war-connected expenditures, and only 29 percent for the normal functions of Government.

If anyone believes that expenditures to support the so-called welfare state are causing the much-discussed deficit, let him remember that only 6 cents out of the 1951 budget dollar will go for social welfare, health, and security, whereas 13 cents will go to pay the interest on the national debt. A balanced budget is, of course, highly desirable. Waste of public funds should be completely eliminated, but the task of Congress, when it examines the budget, is to be certain that it shall not unnecessarily cut the productive outlays that foster and encourage business and that it shall not weaken the capacity of the Government to preserve the national defense and to carry on the struggle for peace.

TO SAVE SYSTEM OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

Government as well as business has a function to perform to preserve the system of private property. It must, for example, reform the tax laws so as to provide incentives for the investment of private savings. War taxes which were designed primarily to obtain revenue with which to conduct the fighting war no matter what the cost must now be revised so that we may have a peace- and prosperity-promoting tax system. The Government at Washington is working to that end now.

The challenge to business is likewise a challenge to promote the investment of private capital by consciously doing away with impediments to private investment in competitive enterprise which too often are erected by business itself. No one knows better than the business leader how valuable competition is. No one knows better than the business leader the temptation to exploit the consumer by fixing prices, dividing territory, restraining production. Combinations and agreements to restrain trade and hamper competition have always been known to the business fraternity. That's why we enacted the antitrust laws with the support of all political parties. Business leadership, I am persuaded, can do more than Government to preserve competition.

It can do more than Government to promote the sense of partnership with labor. It can do more than Government to bring about fair dealing with the consumer. To sum it up, business leadership can do more than Government to preserve the system of private property. That is the challenge which modern times presents to the business leaders of America.

Read the story of the Massachusetts Ratification Convention of 1788. Learn there the manner in which the colonists united in the face of a great crisis to create a political system based upon individual freedom. If we read that story and respect it, we shall not fail in creating a stable economic system here in America based likewise on freedom and one which, like our political system, will be copied throughout the world without war because a free capitalistic system can do more for mankind than any other system.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials, one which appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press for January 3, 1950, and one which appeared in the St. Paul Dispatch for January 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of January 3, 1950]

UNPRIGHTEOUS STALLING

There is no legislation in the Nation's history on which there has been more of high-sounding verbal agreement than is the case with civil-rights legislation. Despite that, however, there is no legislation which has been as stubbornly stalled, postponed, and talked to death. Political parties have agreed and their platforms have pledged laws to stamp out racial discrimination, but that is as far as it has gone. There has been no action.

Democratic and Republican Party platform pledges have for years included Federal anti-poll-tax and antilynch laws. Last year the platforms of both parties even came out flatly for the most controversial of all civil-rights legislation—FEPC, designed to abolish discrimination in employment through legal decree.

The Democratic Party's southern wing is reported to be even more bitterly opposed to FEPC legislation than to their old-time filibuster targets, antilynch and anti-poll-tax measures. And revision of the Senate's cloture rule made last March will actually have the effect of making a filibuster harder to break than before.

Anti-poll-tax bills have passed the House 5 times in the past 8 years, each time by a two-thirds margin. Each time, however, all it took was a threatened or an actual filibuster in the Senate to kill the bill. Antilynch measures have had a harder time. There is broader feeling that they set what might be more dangerous precedents in cluttering local law enforcement situations. Yet, on at least three occasions, antilynch measures have been passed in the House, and they have gotten out of committee oftener than that. The Senate was always the final, immovable obstacle.

FEPC legislation, now spreading to a steadily growing number of States, actually had its biggest boost at the national level, when an Executive order of June 1941 banned discrimination on hirings to fill war contracts, as well as in Government employment itself. The Commission and its enforcement of rules went out of existence in 1945. Yet FEPC bills came out of committee in both House and Senate last session. They had done so, however, on three earlier occasions, and refinements of the congressional stalling technique disposed of them each time.

It is going to be increasingly difficult to continue repeating pledges that appear made only to be broken. That has been the history of solemn promises as to civil legislation from both parties. Sooner or later, a campaign pledge so often repeated will have to be fulfilled. President Truman and his party followers should know that; so should Republicans, at State and National levels.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch of January 5, 1950]

BANDS FOR TOLERANCE

The number of States adopting fair employment practices legislation increased from 6 to 10 during 1949, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People notes. It is a healthful sign for racial tolerance in America, but it goes far beyond that. It strikes at the very root of economic discrimination which has kept racial groups from working, voting, and providing for the future.

One of the outstanding gains for practical democracy is the opening of the National Guard in Minnesota to Negroes. Similar action has been taken by California, Connecticut, Illinois, Washington, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. And because of the backing of the Federal courts, many Negro citizens throughout the South have continued to exercise their franchise rights. Wisconsin and Illinois have passed laws to end discrimination in the public schools.

But the failure of Congress to enact Federal civil-rights legislation and the failure of such legislation in several States, were condemned by the group. In spite of New York's FEPC law—to cite one example—one out of every five members of minority groups have reported that they have experienced some sort of discrimination. While the FEPC laws work out admirably as a rule, there can be a measure of prejudice they cannot touch. That prejudice is a matter of the individual conscience.

Lynchings already have been dealt with by the Tuskegee Institute, which reports one less authenticated lynching than the NAACP—or three to the NAACP's four. Whatever the outcome of this disagreement, the score during 1949 was heavily in favor of the elimination of the bars in society, industry, and the professions, on the basis of color. The year has made measurable gains for tolerance, regardless of the dilatory tactics of Congress.

City of Hope Award Dinner Honoring Ellis A. Gimbel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks at the City of Hope award dinner, held in the Bellevue Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, on Wednesday evening, December 7.

At that time, a Torch of Hope award was made to Mr. Ellis A. Gimbel for the magnificent work he has done in supporting the City of Hope Sanatorium and Research Center. The whole Gimbel family is symbolic of the achievements of our system of free private enterprise and of the sense of responsibility our leaders have for the bettering of the American way of life. It was indeed fitting that Mr. Gimbel be awarded the Torch of Hope award, for his aid to the City of Hope has been significant in helping to make the City of Hope a really great institution—one that has been formed to give medical aid wherever it is needed, without any restriction whatsoever as to color, creed, or religion—an institution that is working for the benefit of all in the true American spirit.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I can imagine no greater tribute to the man we are gathered here to honor than is implied in the award he is being given tonight as noted on the front page of your invitation to this dinner.

In the invitation we are informed that a Torch of Hope award is being presented to Mr. Gimbel—a most distinguished Philadelphian who has just received the congratulations and good wishes of his fellow citizens on having successfully attained his eighty-fourth birthday.

America was still mourning the assassination of Abraham Lincoln, the Civil War had just ended, and Johnson was President of the United States when Ellis Gimbel was born.

Mr. Gimbel has lived through the most turbulent and critical days this country and the world ever have known. He has seen this Nation twice plunged into the horror and destruction of world wars on the successful outcome of which the survival of our civilization depended. He has seen a great depression which left its scars and its bitter memories with us. He has seen us rejoice over military victory in World War II won at a frightful cost in blood and resources only to be confronted with the sobering realization that peace has its price, too—and the price is not cheap—the realization that we must work as hard and as long, and we must be as united and as vigilant to win the peace as we were to win the war. He has observed the death of the League of Nations and the first groping steps of the new United Nations.

He has witnessed man's discovery and use of the deadliest weapon ever known—the atom bomb.

He has lived under 17 Presidents of the United States and behind, knows how many United States Senators, and still his outlook on life and his achievements are such that, at an age 14 years beyond the biblical threescore and ten, he is selected from among millions of his fellow citizens as the first winner in this eastern half of the United States of the Torch of Hope national award.

All I can say is, There is a man.

Of course, to those who know Ellis Gimbel the award will not come as any surprise but as one richly deserved. Hope is akin to faith, and the great Gimbel enterprises, both commercial and private, have been built on a foundation of unshakable faith in America and its future.

And all in all the years of Mr. Gimbel's lifetime, despite their occasional black days, have not been bad years as Mr. Gimbel would be the first to tell you. We have made great material advances in America during his life.

The lot of the average American is far better than it was. We have raised the living standards of our people far beyond what anyone would have believed possible when Mr. Gimbel was a boy. We have made great progress in the fields of tolerance and understanding and cooperation among racial and religious groups. We have attained a new awareness and appreciation of the dignity of man and the importance of individual liberty.

But our most important advance of the last half century or so, in my opinion, has been the widespread recognition of our responsibility to others who are less fortunate.

This is strikingly true in the field of government.

During Mr. Gimbel's lifetime, he has seen a change in America's attitude toward its responsibilities in world affairs, from a policy of extreme isolationism to one under which, through various Government programs, we are aiding freedom-loving people everywhere and our best interests as well. He has seen the enunciation and beginnings of a program that contemplates utilizing private capital, aided by government, in helping to develop the presently inaccessible or commercially unprofitable and still undeveloped natural resources of other nations throughout the world.

At home, he has seen the establishment of workmen's compensation, of unemployment compensation, of old-age and survivors' insurance, commonly called social security, of aid to dependent mothers and children, to the blind and handicapped and disabled. He has seen government and private medicine working together for the eradication of many diseases and he has seen us winning that fight on many fronts. Today these programs and this concept of responsibility to others less fortunate is deeply imbedded in the American people—and it all has happened during Mr. Gimbel's lifetime.

But there are things which government cannot and ought not to do. We, as private citizens, also have an obligation to those who are less fortunate.

Mr. Gimbel is a businessman—a merchant—and an eminently successful one. If we try to analyze why he and members of his family have been so successful in the merchandising field, we discover that their success has been due in large measure to their faithful adherence to a concept that was laid down by Mr. Gimbel's father, Adam Gimbel, when he started the Gimbel store.

That concept was one of service—service to the community. The old concept of a department store was that it was merely a merchandising mart. The Gimbel family were pioneers in changing that concept. They conceived of their stores as quasi-civic institutions. They accepted the responsibility of community leadership for worth-while projects. They gave a part of their facilities to provide accommodation for deserving groups that had no place to meet. They established a woman's center, where women's clubs and organizations could carry on their activities for the benefit of others less fortunate.

The many projects they have sponsored and aided would require several pages merely to list. I can think offhand of their wartime activities on behalf of our servicemen, of their assistance to projects for feeding the hungry abroad, of their sponsorship of the greater Philadelphia exhibition, of their work on behalf of the blind. Virtually every charitable, welfare, and educational group in the city has sought—and received—their aid at one time or another. And by following this policy they have prospered, as they should.

But Mr. Gimbel has not aided others who are less fortunate merely through the activities of his store. In his long career he has helped many in his capacity as a private citizen. He was first to establish International Week for the Blind, Hard-of-Hearing Week, and Orphans Day at the circus.

His latest project—one in which we all are interested—and the reason for our being here this evening is the City of Hope. Others will tell you in detail about this magnificent institution, how it was founded, the good it accomplishes, and how it operates.

It is sufficient for me to mention here only that it is an institution of which great things may be expected. Run along completely modern lines, it gives promise of becoming one of the outstanding sanatoriums and research centers of this country—and it will become that if we give it our support. It is an institution which recognizes no barriers of creed or religion, which recognizes only illness and need, which offers the best of medical care free.

It is performing a great work in the care and cure of persons suffering from chest diseases. But it, and other institutions of its kind, are still inadequate when compared with the need. The city of Hope must expand its facilities to care for more people—and even more important, it must have the funds for research—the kind of research that will enable man to cut down the death rate from killers like tuberculosis as we have conquered other premature killers of mankind.

I can think of no more fitting person to receive this award of the Torch of Hope than Mr. Gimbel. By his own example and unselfish help of those in need he has given hope to many of his fellow citizens. I would like to say a few words also about Mr. Eddie Cantor, one of America's top ranking comedians, who is representing the Hollywood film colony at this dinner in Mr. Gimbel's honor. Mr. Cantor deserves to be honored also for the numerous unselfish contributions of his incomparable talents in the furtherance of many charitable efforts extending over a period of 30 years.

Both men exemplify the spirit of brotherhood—of concern for the less fortunate—a spirit that, despite the destructive wars and violence and oppression we see in the world is still the distinguishing characteristic of this great age—at least in this great country.

To you, Mr. Gimbel, I hope you will carry the Torch of Hope for many, many years, and I know you will continue to derive your greatest satisfaction in life from helping your fellow man.

As long as men like you are active in the kind of projects to which you are contributing your time and efforts and money, despite the many grim and difficult problems facing us, I am confident we shall find much to be hopeful about.

Thank you, and thank all of you for your presence here tonight.

History and Its Meaning to a Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "History and Its Meaning to a Community," by Dr. Lewis E. Theiss, for many years head of the Department of Journalism at Bucknell University, which appeared in the Lewisburg Journal, of Lewisburg, Pa., on January 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY AND ITS MEANANG TO A COMMUNITY

(By Dr. Lewis E. Theiss)

In a letter to a friend of mine, Hervey Allen, the novelist, recently remarked: "A nation that forgets its history may have to relive that history." That is a truth worth considering. In recent weeks the William Maclay chapter, Sons of the American Revolution, has been calling attention through its weekly broadcasts to the history of this region. Scalpings, murders, massacres, burnings marked that history. How would you like to go back to pioneer days and be forced to go through such horrors? If you forget them, you may have to go through worse.

Impossible, you say? Not at all. The Revolutionary War was as nothing compared to World War II. Bernard Baruch, in his recent list of significant happenings of the last 50 years, mentioned what he called the "unnecessary war," by which he meant the Second World War. "Preventable," he said, "if proper steps had been taken. No lessons learned from it or the First World War." If that is true, we sacrificed some hundreds of thousands of fine American youths on the altar of ignorance—ignorance of history, of the true meaning of history.

The reason why we should study history is mainly so that we may be guided by it, so that in future we may avoid the mistakes of the past. Therefore, it is something more than a desire for information that should induce us to study our history. Such study is a patriotic duty we owe to our Nation.

How are we going to bring history home to folks? How make them conscious of the inner meaning of history?

First, by improved teaching of history in our schools; by localizing history; by applying it to the lives of those who study it. The high prices of today, the housing shortage, the terrific taxes, the increasingly lower standard of living—all have a new meaning when coupled with history. Folks should be made to learn the lesson of cause and effect. History teaches that.

In every way possible we should encourage the study and understanding of history, the acute consciousness that certain causes inevitably lead to given effects. We can erect lasting memorials to refresh our memories. We can create and foster patriotic societies that help us to remember the past and learn its lessons. We can use newspapers, magazines, the radio, the lecture platform. In every manner possible we can and should emphasize the lessons of history. The big thing is not to let folks forget.

No one wants another war, another depression, another disaster of any sort. But unless we remember our history and the lessons it teaches, we shall surely blunder into the very thing we dread. The thing to do is to remember our history now, before we go any further along the road that leads to disaster. If we use our heads it won't be necessary to repeat the Revolutionary War or World Wars I and II. It won't be necessary to go through another depression. So let's keep the past, with its lessons, vividly in mind. Let us apply history to our lives as we have never done before.

Opposition of Prince Hall Masonry to Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD copy of a statement relative to Prince Hall masonry and the opposition of such organization to communism as issued by the Grand Masters Conference of Prince Hall Masons.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINCE HALL MASONRY REEMPHASIZES ITS OPPOSITION TO COMMUNISM

(A statement issued by the Grand Masters Conference of Prince Hall Masons)

Prince Hall masonry enjoys and protects one of the noblest heritages that has come down to any group of Americans in the history of our beloved land. Generated and nurtured as it was by a free Negro who in pre- and post-revolutionary days was a courageous champion of human rights for all mankind and an indefatigable prosecutor of the brotherhood of man and of truth and justice, Prince Hall masonry has for 155 years adhered strictly to the lofty concepts held by America's first Negro Mason. Prince Hall, a man of learning, a businessman, a preacher, a soldier in the Revolutionary Army of George Washington, builded so well and enduringly that generation upon generation of Negro Americans have willingly and proudly followed in his footsteps, guided and directed by those great principles, spiritual and masonic, that guided and directed him.

Prince Hall, in harmony with his contemporaries, envisioned an America destined to be great because of its advocacy of such ideals as freedom to worship, think, act, and speak; freedom from tyranny and oppression; freedom of the people to have and maintain a government of, by, and for the people. To these ideals, Prince Hall devoted his life and since human bondage was as yet an item in the economic system of the young Nation, his added task was his labor for an America free of discrimination and differences based upon ethnic considerations. His followers labor on in his footsteps, quietly but persistently, without fanfare but with determination—with unchallenged faith that the same God that brought answers to the prayers of the devout Prince Hall will, as ever, right all wrongs.

As an institution, Prince Hall masonry now represented in 37 States and the District of Columbia, by 38 Prince Hall grand lodges, has consistently stood for the best things in American society. It has been and is stanchly opposed to any and every attempt of foreign or alien ideologists to invade our way of thinking, acting, or living. Especially is it and its votaries categorically opposed to totalitarianism, communism, fascism or any like ism having for its purpose a change in the true American concept of government. Although we recognize the fact that American democracy has not as yet attained the high ideals of our founding fathers, that imperfections still exist, Prince Hall masonry is happy to reaffirm its traditional position and to continue to labor assiduously for the attainment of those high ideals and for the elimination of imperfections, such labor to be done within the framework of our present Government.

The contribution Prince Hall masonry is making in the current fight against communism and its nefarious doctrine is considerable and is being increased daily. Prince Hall masonry calls upon all its followers wheresoever dispersed around the globe, to be on the alert against the infiltration of communism into Negro groups. There can be no divided allegiance. There is room but for one ideology in the minds, hearts, and souls of all the people of this Christian Nation, and that is Americanism—the great light that illumines the paths of all of us, black and white, Jew and gentile, rich and poor.

Prince Hall masonry pledges itself anew to live and die for the ideals and principles that have made our Nation the greatest on the face of the globe.

CONFERENCE OF GRAND MASTERS OF PRINCE HALL MASONS,
By AMOS T. HALL, *President*.

Pearl Harbor Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the lesson Pearl Harbor taught us 8 years ago—the lesson that the United States must take responsibility in world affairs, that it can no longer be isolationist in any respect—was a lesson we learned the hard way, but one which we cannot ever forget. The preservation of world peace depends to a very great extent on the willingness of the American people to bear their full share of responsibility.

On December 7, 1949, I had the honor of addressing the Pearl Harbor anniversary memorial meeting, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars Women's Council, City of Hope, at Convention Hall in Philadelphia. I ask unanimous consent to have the remarks I made at that time printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Eight years have passed since the tragedy of Pearl Harbor taught this Nation its bitterest lesson.

Tonight we are gathered to pay reverence to the memory of the men and women who lost their lives in that sudden and despicable attack by a supposedly peaceful nation—an attack that plunged us into the bloody maelstrom of World War II.

We, in Philadelphia, are not alone in honoring tonight these gallant dead. Elsewhere in the Nation, in scores of cities and towns and villages, exercises similar to these are being conducted.

As of this night there has not been erected some great national physical memorial to those who lost their lives at Pearl Harbor. Probably it is more fitting that their memorial should be in the minds and hearts of their countrymen. Let them be remembered not so much in bronze or marble, but in the more imperishable and durable shrine of the spirit.

Let what happened at Pearl Harbor on the morning of December 7, 1941, live forever in the memory of the American people—a constant reminder and warning against complacency, against unpreparedness, against turning our backs on the rest of the world, and closing our eyes to the dangers that beset us.

If this can be their memorial—passed on from generation to generation of the American people—then, while many here died needlessly they did not die in vain.

Pearl Harbor was the end of an era in America. I believe historians will mark it as a turning point, a milestone from which there can be no turning back. Before Pearl Harbor there were many in this country who refused to recognize that we were part of one world, that war and tyranny in any part of the globe were our concern. Before Pearl Harbor there were many in this country who believed we could draw back into an armored shell and let the war out until all of our potential allies having been conquered and subjugated, the forces of tyranny and oppression could, at their leisure and at a time suitable to them, turn their destructive weapons against us.

Today, the great majority of the American people are facing the difficult, discouraging and costly job of preserving the peace. The great majority of the American people are accepting the burden and responsibility of world leadership for peace. It is a responsibility we did not seek, but it was a responsibility we could not avoid if we wished to preserve our freedom.

There are in some quarters voices raised against the cost to us of preserving world peace—voices which say: "Let's get out of Europe; it's no concern of ours," "We must reduce taxes by cutting out foreign aid to freedom-loving people"; "Build up our own defenses and nobody will dare attack us."

These, fortunately, are not the voices of the overwhelming majority of Americans.

The struggle for peace is a continuing one. Peace must be worked for unceasingly. There can be no let-up. Peace must be preserved and won, like liberty, by each generation.

As we make progress in the struggle—as our potential allies grow stronger, more able to stand on their own feet, capable of supporting their own economies, the financial cost to us of preserving the peace will become less. But the need for constant effort, patience, tolerance, understanding, and a genuine willingness to cooperate on our part and on the part of our allies will be as great as ever.

I think it is apparent to everyone, that we are winning the fight for peace; that, with the help of the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine, the North Atlantic Pact, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the Greek and Turkish programs, we are making genuine progress.

Our potential allies daily are growing stronger. Totalitarian expansion has been stopped, at least for the moment, in its tracks.

But we must not relax or ever again grow complacent. Those who gave their lives at Pearl Harbor should be a constant reminder and warning to us of the dangers of complacency.

And so tonight, as we pay reverence to the gallant Americans who died at Pearl Harbor, let us dedicate ourselves to the difficult task of winning the peace, whatever its material cost, so that young Americans may never again have to shed their blood in far away places.

If we will really remember Pearl Harbor, it can never happen again.

"O Liberals!"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "O Liberals!" written by Bruce Barton and published in various newspapers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"O LIBERALS!"

(By Bruce Barton)

As a general rule I want the bureaucracies in Washington to do less than they are now doing, not more. But there is one slight assignment that I now suggest to the Federal Trade Commission.

This commission, as you may know, has, among its other duties, authority to police the use of words and claims in advertising.

If, for example, you are advertising that your product will cure cancer, the Commission will order you to "cease and desist." You are not allowed to say that your margarine is butter, or that you have made your produce something new and wonderful when all you have really done is to change the wrapper.

My suggestion is that the FTC broaden its activities to the point of examining some political labels. And particularly the word "liberal."

This used to be a noble title, with an exalted but definite meaning. It described a man who loved his fellow men enough to sacrifice something valuable for them—his money, his safety, or his life.

Socrates was a liberal and his reward was the poisoned hemlock. Christ was a liberal and His liberalism meant the cross.

Joan of Arc was a liberal. Abraham Lincoln was a liberal. Eugene Debs was a liberal. They knew that true liberalism is a costly and dangerous business and they were not afraid to pay the price.

But the glorious word has fallen upon evil times. Vicious, cynical men have seized upon it as a cloak to hide their infamy. Mussolini started as a liberal; so did Hitler. Stalin is the heir to Lenin, who loved the proletariat so much that he did not hesitate to liquidate millions of the middle class.

Here at home liberalism is the cheap and easy path. Proclaim yourself a liberal and you are not crucified. Instead, you become a Governor, a Senator, a columnist, a radio commentator—at high pay. You do not even have to abide by such old-fashioned bourgeois obligations as contributing to hospitals, colleges, community chests. You can retain your title without sacrificing anything at all.

When I was first married I lived in the same apartment house with an idealist. He dreamed large dreams, gave lectures, and wrote books—and looked down on me because I was earning a living in trade.

I felt a little abashed in his presence until summer came, and he and his wife went to the country. They left their cat behind to starve. My wife and I, despised reactionaries, had to feed the cat.

I say to liberals: Before you look down on me, I want to know, have you sacrificed anything for your liberalism?

Or are you merely a money liberal—advertising yourself for revenue, or running for office so that you can be liberal with other people's dough?

"O Liberty," Madam Roland exclaimed, "how many crimes are committed in thy name."

She might have said, "O liberals."

Tributes to Florida by Vice President Barkley and J. Myer Schine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, while Florida is accustomed to playing host to the dignitaries of the world, my State had the unique honor of being visited twice in December by the distinguished Vice President of the United States. On the occasion of his visit to the Boca Raton Club, one of the premier resort hotels of the world, Vice President BARKLEY took occasion to say that—

> Florida is becoming a living symbol of the achievements possible under the American way of life, and as we advance further toward our national goal the State will become of increasing importance in our economy.

Another distinguished American who has evidenced his faith in Florida is J. Myer Schine, owner of the Boca Raton Club, the Roney Plaza, McAllister Hotel and other Florida properties, and also the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles and the Ritz Carlton in Atlantic City. Mr. Schine preserves the highest traditions of hospitality in his hotels and has on many occasions confirmed his confidence in the future growth and soundness of Florida. He feels that "Florida in the Fifties" will be a noteworthy period in the growth of my State.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement made by Vice President BARKLEY on the occasion of his visit to Boca Raton, and also a statement made by J. Myer Schine high lighting his views on Florida's future.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOCA RATON, FLA., December 7.—Florida is becoming a living symbol of the achievements possible under the American way of life and as we advance further toward our national goals the State will become of increasing importance in our economy, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Vice President of the United States declared here today.

"Too much emphasis has been placed on the strictly pleasure aspects of Florida," said the Vice President, "that not enough has been given to the steady population increase of the State, its high rank as an international airport serving Latin and South America, its status as one of the Nation's great fruit and vegetable baskets and the tremendous opportunities ahead.

"Florida may yet surpass even the dreams of the early pioneers, the Flaglers, the Carl Fishers, the Merricks and the others who had great visions of beauty and the highest in economic life combined here in this sunnyland."

On his first visit to Boca Raton, the Vice President said the simplicity and magnificence of this great resort challenges the imagination." He said that while he had visited Florida many times he had not realized the achievements made at Boca Raton in combining the natural beauty of Florida, with a classic of architecture and comfort.

Mr. BARKLEY said that only recently he had talked with J. Myer Schine, owner of Boca Raton and other Florida properties and was greatly interested in his plans for expansion, and his confidence in Florida. "Those who question the future of our great United States," said the Vice President, "should have the opportunity to see Boca Raton and other great Florida properties standing as living evidence that our country has just started."

NEW YORK, N. Y., December 31.—While foreign objectives will offer keen competition for American travel expenditures in 1950, the outlook for domestic resorts is exceedingly good and those which place new emphasis on comfort, service, and courtesy will enjoy banner seasons in all sections of the country.

This statement was made today by J. Myer Schine, owner of large resort properties in Florida, Atlantic City, and California, on the basis of bookings for the current 1949–50 winter season in Florida and interest evidenced in summer vacation plans. Mr. Schine owns and operates the Roney Plaza and Gulf Stream, Miami Beach, Fla.; McAllister, Miami; Boca Raton Club, Boca Raton, Fla.; Ritz Carlton, Atlantic City; Ambassador, Los Angeles; and other hotels.

Predicting that higher standards in accommodations and service in hotels and on transportation lines serving resorts and travel objectives can be expected in 1950 and the years ahead, Mr. Schine said that vacationists are showing a tendency to select their play places with more than usual care.

"The trends of the times—the uncertainties and the confusion of national and international affairs—are reflected in vacation demands," Mr. Schine declared, "as people more and more seek travel objectives away from the beaten paths." He cited the emphasis placed on beach facilities, room locations for quietness, and sports opportunities in inquiries coming from prospective patrons.

Mr. Schine believes that the trend of the times point to a period of sound growth in Florida more advantageous than the boom periods of the past. He feels that Florida in the fifties will be noteworthy from the standpoint of new economic growth, new play areas, and new attention from many parts of the world.

"While Florida has been much in the limelight for its winter sports," said Mr. Schine, "comparatively few people realize the tremendous progress made by the State. From a rank of thirty-third in State population in 1900, Florida now ranks as the twenty-first State in population, and growth continues. From a seaside village of 1,600 in 1900, Miami has grown to 172,000 permanent population and the tide of winter visitors swells that number many times."

Pointing out that the new emphasis on leisure time and retirement funds will prove most advantageous in drawing both visitors and permanent residents to Florida, Mr. Schine continued:

"While many sections of Florida hold advantages for those in search of playplaces, vacation objectives or homes after retirement, the 75-mile area along the ocean front on the east coast, which includes Miami Beach and Boca Raton, is one of the only areas in the world, outside of Egypt, offering all-year bathing. It is already one of the outstanding of all recreational objectives. As the nearest Florida point to the Gulf Stream the Boca Raton area has less rain than surrounding areas and a steadier climate.

"Florida has undergone two important eras in its modern development since 1900 and the year 1950 will mark the beginning of the third and most important. The first era was marked by the advent of the railroads and the building of hotels, notably at Palm Beach. The second era was marked by the coming of the motor age, winding up with Miami as one of the leading ports of foreign trade by air. My own confidence in Florida is increasing year to year as evidenced by many investments in the Sunshine State."

Ninety-nine and Six-Tenths Percent Loyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of January 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINETY-NINE AND SIX-TENTHS PERCENT LOYALTY

Figures from the FBI continue to attest to the loyalty of virtually all Federal employees. Latest statistics show that of the more than 2,700,000 Government workers investigated, 99.6 percent have been cleared. In 10,350 cases which the Loyalty Review Board turned over to the FBI for full field investigation, discharges were recommended in only 139 instances, though undoubtedly some other persons resigned voluntarily. These figures are eloquent contradiction of the Communists in Government charges that emanate from irresponsible sources. Not only that, but they speak well for the general moderation which, with a few flagrant exceptions, has characterized the conduct of the loyalty program.

All of this is reason why, if the screening of new employees is continued, as Chairman Richardson of the Loyalty Review Board recommends, it now should be possible to provide the safeguards the program lacks. The conspiratorial designs of the Communists give justification for some sort of checks in sensitive jobs. But this check has merit only as it is restricted to jobs of real importance to security and as it gives the greatest possible protection against rumor-mongering, malice, and circumstantial evidence.

Particularly is this definition necessary if the discretionary powers of heads of sensitive agencies to fire irresponsible employees are to be increased as the administration proposes. No one has a vested right to a Government job, least of all in a sensitive agency. But there is a world of difference between irresponsibility and disloyalty. Unless precise standards of procedure are drawn up, there is grave danger that security risks will be stigmatized as disloyal.

Such standards ought, in our opinion, to provide for the transfer of security risks to nonsensitive jobs wherever possible. If discharge of irresponsible employees is necessary, it should be on grounds of inefficiency or incompetence so that there is no possible stigma of disloyalty. Beyond this, it ought to be basic for all necessary loyalty investigations to include a full statement of the evidence, including a chance for the defendant to challenge his accusers. If the evidence is not of the sort that will stand up in court, then it is highly questionable whether it ought to be the basis for branding anyone as disloyal.

Every Man With an Income of $12,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Phillips County (Mont.) News:

EVERY MAN WITH AN INCOME OF $12,000

We do not presume to class President Truman with a ruthless buffoon like the late Huey Long but it must be admitted that Truman's latest pipe dream offering a minimum income of $12,000 for everybody may be likened to the late Louisiana rabble rouser's proposal to make every man a king. Like a good many other things, the king business isn't what it used to be but it still involves the right to order common folks around—at least in countries where royal working conditions are still considered reasonably closed shop and healthful. What Huey conveniently ignored was the fact that if he debased the king racket and crowned everybody, there'd be no common folks left to boss and the job wouldn't be worth a mouthful of ashes. So it is with Truman's $12,000 minimum wage; it can be achieved by further debasement of our money, but if the $12,000 buys no more than $1,200 now we might as well have the $1,200 in more valuable currency.

We are currently having a dose of this kind of economics. Average wages have doubled, roughly, in 10 years and so has the cost of living, very roughly. So, who's any better off in actual cash? Corporation profits have doubled on paper but in dollars that doesn't buy any more than the workman's wages. Some of us often overlook that.

When pre-Nazi Germany ran her financial system with a printing press, beer got up to a million marks a stein. That is about $235,000 a glass in prewar money and a thin dime in pre-Nazi money. For a billion-mark note you got your change in a bushel basket and nobody counted it because it wasn't worth anything. With that kind of money we can create a $25,000 minimum income if we wish, but if at the same time the family car and grocery bill go up in proportion, does that make the posy smell any sweeter? There's an odor, all right, but it isn't a rose.

In addition to the famous good nickel cigar, what this Nation needs as much as anything right now is a few courageous statesmen willing to tell the public in simple words where this dizzy type of economic thinking is leading us. What it holds in store, for instance, for the savings of the thrifty; what it means to the old person living on a fixed pension. We need to ponder a little on the fact that what a dollar will buy means more than how many we get; that it's not what you pay, but what you get for what you pay, that counts.

According to our notion, any political or economic philosophy which promises to double everybody's income while at the same time doubling his outgo is as phony as a brass dollar. It's time, possibly, that we paid some attention to what is being done to us as well as for us.—J. R. L.

Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolutions on education adopted at the eleventh constitutional convention of the CIO on October 31 to November 4, 1949.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 18

Federal aid to education

Equality of educational opportunity and the continuing improvement of education are imperative if democracy is to survive in the United States. Our Nation must spend enough funds so that this equality is available, as guaranteed, to every child regardless of race, color, creed, or geographical location. Education in the United States today falls short of this standard in a number of respects.

American children are suffering a tragic injustice because of the inequality in educational services provided by the various States, and this is most glaringly demonstrated in the contrast between the facilities in the low income Southern States and those in wealthier industrial States; while within the Southern States, segregated schools for Negroes receive a fraction of the amounts, small to begin with, that are appropriated for white children. Schools for children in rural areas are receiving little more than half the expenditure per child that is being received by children in schools in urban areas.

In spite of an all-out campaign to raise teachers' salaries, teachers today are receiving in real wages only a little more than they were being paid in 1939.

And at least 3,000,000 American children of school age are not attending any school.

All competent studies show that the Nation will need school buildings for at least seven and a half million additional children during the next 6 years and that local and State schools groups cannot possibly finance a school-building program of such magnitude.

In both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, the United States Senate passed a Federal aid to education bill which would provide approximately $300,000,000 in Federal funds for aid to the Nations' schools. Twice, reactionary forces in the House of Representatives and lack of aggressive leadership to support the Senate bill have killed this legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, We urge the enactment by the Eighty-first Congress of legislation—

(1) To provide adequate Federal aid for education so that, together with appropriations by the various States, improved facilities on every level of the educational system, from nursery to university, shall be assured, so that every child shall have a good

education, every class a good teacher, and every teacher a good salary;

(2) To provide, in accordance with the principle of Senate bill 246, that the individual States shall make the decisions as to whether nonpublic schools shall be eligible for Federal aid and as to the kinds of services that shall be covered by Federal grants;

(3) To provide that at least 75 percent of funds appropriated go directly for teachers' salaries; and

(4) To provide at least $3,000,000,000 in Federal funds over a period of 5 years for a comprehensive, Nation-wide school-building program;

(5) To apply the full benefits of this program and the legislation above recommended to Puerto Rico as an integral part of the American economic unit.

Resolution 19

Labor extension service program

In a democracy education must be a continuing process which extends throughout adult life. American farmers have long enjoyed millions of dollars worth of educational benefits through the Federal Agricultural Extension Service, while management representatives can avail themselves of services provided by publicly supported universities and other institutions. But in the United States, public educational services for the nation's wage earners, other than the purely vocational, are almost entirely lacking.

Bills to establish a Labor Extension Service in the United States Department of Labor have been introduced in the Seventy-ninth, Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, in an effort to provide the Nation's wage earners with a federally supported labor extension service operating through the cooperation of unions and universities within the States.

Early in the first session of the present Congress the labor extension service bill was approved by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but it has remained on the Senate Calendar without action for 8 months. Hearings on the bill have been held by the Subcommittee on Labor without action following from the full House Committee on Labor and Education. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, We demand the immediate enactment by the Eighty-first Congress of the labor extension service bill (S. 119 and H. R. 1201); and

All affiliated International unions, councils, and local industrial unions are urged to support a campaign to enact a labor extension service bill by resolution, publicity, and communications with Members of Congress, and cooperation with the financial assistance to the National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, which is coordinating the drive for its enactment.

The full benefits of this program and the legislation above recommended shall be applied to Puerto Rico as an integral part of the American economic unit.

Resolution 20

Children

We reiterate our belief, expressed in Resolution No. 34 at the tenth constitutional convention of the CIO in 1948, that the first right of citizenship in a democracy is to grow throughout childhood to good physical, emotional, and social health and security.

We affirm our pledge to help achieve this right through policies and measures that will insure our next generation of citizens a better start in life than we or any earlier generation has had. This objective motivates our entire program. Higher wages, social security, better housing, and our other goals all are directed to providing a better life for our families. In addition, special measures for children are required: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the CIO, through its national, State, and local organizations, continue to lend its full support to—

The expansion of maternal- and child-health services until they are within reach of all mothers and children who wish to make use of such services, with special emphasis immediately on the expansion of health services for children of school age.

The expansion of public child-welfare services throughout the country which will give skilled help to orphaned, neglected, and delinquent children; to children of working mothers; and to communities in planning and directing wholesome recreational programs for their youngsters.

The expansion of research in child life which will help parents to a better understanding of what makes for healthy, happy childhood.

Federal aid to education and school construction, and State and local measures to assure opportunities for a good education to all our children.

Elimination of harmful child labor through improved Federal and State laws, strong labor law administration supported by adequate funds, and more fact-finding on child labor and youth employment problems.

Strengthening of public employment office systems so as to improve and extend counseling, placement, and follow-up services for young people.

The Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, called by the President for the first week of December, 1950, when all citizens and organizations "to whom a child is important in himself and as the hope of a better tomorrow" will have an opportunity to forge new and better plans for assuring to all children that first right of citizenship in a democracy—the right to grow in good physical, emotional, and social health and security—to which we subscribe.

The work of the United Nations to bring better food, medical care and protective services to children in war-stricken and underdeveloped countries.

Shortage of Hospital Facilities for Veterans in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, California veterans have encountered constantly increasing difficulty in getting the services to which they are entitled from the Veterans' Administration due to an insufficient number of VA offices in California to handle the veteran claims, and an acute shortage of adequate hospital facilities to provide medical treatment.

The veteran population of California today is estimated by veteran service organizations at 1,750,000, and even the accepted estimate used by the Veterans' Administration places their number at 1,355,000. But only 20 Veterans' Administration offices are available to serve California veterans as compared to 55 VA offices which are provided for 1,310,000 veterans in the 6 New England States, and the 41 offices which have been established to serve 902,000 veterans in Texas.

The need for immediate establishment of additional Veterans' Administration offices in California to render proper service to California veterans is evident from these figures. The following letter from Mr. Lawrence C. Stevens, director of the State of California's Department of Veterans Affairs, and the article from the January issue of the department's news bulletin graphically illustrates this critical shortage of veterans' facilities in California and emphasizes the urgent need for relief.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,
Sacramento, January 12, 1950.

Hon. GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McDONOUGH: In order to call specially to your attention some figures illustrative of the Veterans' Administration central office attitude in discrimination against California and her veterans, I am sending you herewith an extra copy of the January issue of the department of veterans' affairs news bulletin. On page 2 of this issue, you will find what we consider some eye-opening figures, taken from the Veterans' Administration's own reports.

I know you are familiar with our acute shortage of VA hospital beds in this State in particular. It is hoped that the information contained in this news bulletin will provide some effective ammunition in your future battles in behalf of this State's growing veteran population.

Very truly yours,
LAWRENCE C. STEVENS, *Director.*

CALIFORNIA IS VA STEPCHILD, FIGURES DISCLOSE

On what basis does the Veterans' Administration make its services available to veterans, geographically speaking?

This question, repeatedly asked by veterans in California, is prompted anew, but not answered, by a study of the latest address list of VA field stations across the Nation.

California is the second largest State, geographically, and the second largest in population, having just passed Pennsylvania in the official estimate by the Bureau of the Census. It is also the second largest in veteran population, although the VA central office in Washington ranks it third, behind Pennsylvania as well as New York.

But in the number of VA offices, California ranks sixth.

CALIFORNIA BARELY TOPS MISSISSIPPI

Here is how the States stack up in number of field stations (excluding hospitals) of the Veterans' Administration:

State	Veteran population (VA estimate)	Number of VA offices
Texas	902,000	41
New York	2,090,000	33
Pennsylvania	1,437,000	30
Ohio	[illegible]	28
Massachusetts	[illegible]	23
California	[1] 1,355,000	20
Mississippi	226,000	18
Florida	[illegible]	17

[1] Veterans' organizations and the State department of veterans' affairs estimate California veteran population at 1,750,000.

In the number of VA offices per veteran, California ranks almost at the bottom of the list.

California has a total of 20 VA offices, including the three regional offices in its three principal metropolitan areas. By the VA's official estimate, there are 1,355,000 veterans in the State, as of August 31, 1949.

This averages out to one VA office for every 67,750 veterans. Using the Department of Veterans' Affairs figure of 1,750,000 veterans in California, this State has one VA office for every 87,500 veterans.

The only State definitely worse off in this respect is Illinois, with 92,306 veterans per VA office. Nebraska is also in the stepchild class with one VA office for each 79,500 ex-servicemen.

The average for all States and Territories is one VA office for every 33,466 veterans.

On that basis, California should have 48 VA offices instead of its present 20 if the VA population distribution estimates were correct. On the higher estimate of 1,750,000 veterans, California would theoretically be entitled to 52 VA offices.

VARIOUS FACTORS

Obviously, VA offices cannot be allotted by slide-rule. Distances play a part, concentration of population must be taken into account, and perhaps other factors.

For example, no State except Delaware has fewer than two VA offices, even those with such small veteran populations as Nevada (21,000) and Wyoming (40,000). On the other hand, Nebraska has only two VA offices although the VA estimates that the State has 159,000 ex-servicemen.

And Texas, vastest of the States, has 41 VA offices, for an average of one per 22,000 veterans.

EXAMPLES POSE QUESTIONS

On the other hand, the study poses these questions:

Why does little Vermont, with about the same veteran population as Wyoming, have twice as many VA offices?

Why do Michigan and North Carolina (750,000 and 410,000 veterans' respectively) have the same number of VA offices (16)?

Why, in view of the relative sparseness of VA offices in Minnesota, Nebraska, Illinois, and California (64,000 or more veterans per office), are there so many in Florida, Kentucky, and Mississippi (25,000 or fewer veterans per office), and in New England?

Another interesting aspect of these tabulations has to do with the closing by the VA of 42 small offices throughout the Nation last June. California lost two offices in that retrenchment; Massachusetts, among the best served of all the States, lost only one.

New England Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, an unusual commentary because of its glaring foresight, faith in continuous scientific progress which has been so tremendously accelerated by World War II, is the editorial of January 11, 1950, appearing in the Sunday Republican published at Waterbury, Conn. Of course, it concerns the suggestion made by the President in his message on the State of the Union wherein he adds New England as a region "Where the benefits of large-scale public power development have not yet been experienced."

The editorial follows:

NEW ENGLAND POWER

When New England undertakes the needed expansion of electric power facilities there should be care to make certain that money and resources aren't being wasted on uneconomic hydroelectric developments which might, by that time, be made obsolescent by the advent of methods for using atomic fuel to drive electric generators.

The question of whether it is possible and economic to get appreciably large new quantities of hydroelectric power by more dams on New England rivers has been raised by President Truman. This is a matter of real importance to New England. New England needs more electric power. It needs cheaper electric power.

A Federal Power Commission survey that was made several years ago purported to show that an additional 3,000,000 kilowatts of electric power could be generated by harnessing New England rivers. That wasn't to say, however, that it would be feasible for private industry to undertake the necessary developments. This estimate contemplated Government-built installations.

The New England Council made its own survey of the situation and reported that as far as private industry is concerned any program that contemplated the production of more than 500,000 additional kilowatts would not pay off.

A third canvass of the possibilities was made by the Providence Journal last year. This disputed the claims of the FPC. The Journal claimed that 1,000,000 kilowatts rather than 3,000,000 was all that could be developed by any kind of engineering, no matter how many practical considerations were disregarded. The same study indicated that unless the projects were federally subsidized it wouldn't be practical to try for more than the 500,000 kilowatts the New England Council visualized.

From the conflicting estimates reached in the studies made so far, it is evident that there would have to be a very careful and definitive assessment by the Government before any Federal program can be undertaken. Thus it might be some years before any start will be made.

Also, from the facts already gathered it is evident that Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts would derive most of the benefits from any large-scale Federal power projects in New England and Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine would make most of the sacrifices. It seems likely that more years would be required to settle the questions raised by this situation.

The possibility of electric power generating plants using atomic fuel shouldn't be overlooked either. In the New England Council's report in 1948 it was stated that it would probably be "at least a decade" before atomic energy became commercially usable in this connection. But once atomic fuel has arrived on the scene it seems almost certain that the development of anything but the most efficient and economic hydroelectric installations will be out of the question.

New England, surely, has nothing to lose by going ahead with as much hydroelectric development as now appears economic from a private-industry standpoint. David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has stated that "atomic power will almost certainly follow the course of supplementing rather than supplanting existing economical sources of energy supply."

But this much is certain. New England will want to be the first section of the country to turn to the use of atomic energy for electric power rather than the last section of the country to try the TVA formula. When the time comes for putting up atomic-powered steam turbines, we don't want to be in the course of condemning vast areas of fertile farm land and flooding our river valleys behind huge dams and paying the bills for obsolete methods and poor planning.

A Reporter Looks at Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the penetrating research and high quality of reporting which characterizes a series of recent articles on the Federal Government commend them to the careful study of the Members. The author, Mr. Paul Martin, of the Gannett News Service, deserves our gratitude for his forthright presentation of the facts relating to bigness in government.

Under leave to extend my remarks, three in this series are included today, and two will follow tomorrow.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of December 12, 1949]

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S SIZE: NO. 1 UNITED STATES PROBLEM

(How big is our Federal Government? How much does it cost you? What are you getting for your money? What are the possible future trends? The Times-Union presents today the first of five articles designed as a comprehensive analysis of how the Federal Government has mushroomed in the last 20 years to become the dominant factor in American economic and political life.)

(By Paul Martin)

The Federal Government has become the Nation's biggest employer, biggest merchant, biggest banker, biggest consumer, and biggest spender.

All this has developed in the course of the last 20 years.

The Budget Bureau estimates Congress will be called upon to appropriate or authorize $47,900,000,000 in the current fiscal year—a new peacetime peak.

The national debt is going upward again as the administration engages in deficit financing in a period of exceptional prosperity.

Within the last 6 or 7 months the debt has gained from around $252,000,000,000 to nearly $257,000,000,000. It will go higher still.

Approximately 36,000,000 Americans are drawing regular, direct payments from Federal, State, and local governments.

One out of every eight persons employed in the United States is working directly for the Government—around 7,600,000,000 Federal, State, and local employees.

Vast segments of our national economy are being supported by Government subsidies, paid out of the general taxes contributed by the people.

The Federal tax structure now reaches down to collect from individuals earning $1,000 a year or less.

Subsidized industries include the Nation's two largest—agriculture and construction.

There are many others—aviation, merchant marine, finance, minerals and metals, utilities, small business, new business.

Many are hidden subsidies, or protective legislation, or can't-lose guaranties.

Some are aimed at special-interest blocs of voters, such as veterans, farmers, teachers, organized labor, ranchers, miners, low-income groups, civil-liberties groups, the aged, needy, and blind.

Many State and local governments now look to Washington for support, after finding the Federal Government is usurping tax fields upon which they formerly depended for local revenues.

There have been at least 60 State-aid programs started by the Federal Government since 1933. Each has a different formula, different matching basis, and different administrative requirements.

They account for an expenditure of around $3,000,000,000 a year. There are forms galore and a host of Federal employees in each State to administer the programs.

Some come out of specific tax accounts, but the great majority drain out of the Treasury general fund.

The Government Reorganization Commission, headed by former President Herbert Hoover, found that the Federal Government, far from being an impartial arbiter of affairs of state, owns or operates or has a controlling financial interest in at least 100 important business enterprises—many in competition with private industry.

The Government's direct investment in these enterprises is in excess of $20,000,000,000, with authorized commitments to supply another $14,000,000,000, if necessary.

Said the Hoover Commission:

"The Government guarantees, directly or indirectly, about $60,000,000,000 of deposits or mortgages, and its instrumentalities written by Government agencies approaches $40,000,000,000."

These agencies have at least 850 offices and branches scattered around the country.

In the power field alone the Government up to June 30, 1947, had built 56 hydroelectric or steam plants and had another 37 generating plants under construction. Congress had authorized for construction an additional 79 plants. And the Government owned 14,000 miles of power-transmission lines.

The Hoover Commission estimated it would cost $50,000,000,000 to build the new plants authorized for construction, not counting the ones already built or in program.

No one, apparently, has ever been able to define clearly and comprehensively the full extent of Government subsidies, open or hidden.

The Hoover Commission, for all its task-force reports and expert research consultants, couldn't tote up the score.

The Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures, headed by Senator Harry F. Byrd, Democrat, of Virginia, asked the Budget Bureau to report or estimate all Federal subsidies to business and farmers from 1934 to the current fiscal year.

The Bureau came up with these estimates:

Agriculture	$11,[illegible],000,000,000
Business, through RFC	[illegible],000,000,000
Maritime	450,000,000

But the Bureau excluded from its subsidy definition: (1) Federal grants to State or local governments; (2) pensions, retirement benefits, and public assistance; (3) payments to foreign governments or individuals; (4) subscriptions to international organizations; (5) loans and loan guaranties.

Obviously the report was far from complete.

Yet it gives a partial picture of how the Federal Government has mushroomed in the last 20 years to become the dominant factor in American economic life.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of December 13, 1949]

NORTH, EAST ARE PAYING FOR BENEFICIES OF WEALTH

(Why are tax dollars of the North and East flowing south and west and overseas? Are the industrial States losing out in Federal-State-aid programs to the agricultural regions? Here is the second in a series of articles designed to give a comprehensive picture of the power and influence of government today, and how it redistributes the wealth of the land.)

(By Paul Martin)

The Federal Government today is carrying out what amounts to a gigantic redistribution of the wealth of the land.

This is being accomplished not only on a personal basis, by leveling off incomes and inheritances of individuals through stepped-up tax rates.

It is taking place on a State and regional pattern, through Federal-State-aid programs; and grants, loans, and subsidies to industry and agriculture.

The greatest percentage of Federal grants-in-aid goes to States which pay the lowest pro rata share of Federal taxes.

During the 1948 fiscal year, 34 States plus the District of Columbia, the Territories, and possessions, received back more in Federal grants than the pro rata share of taxes they paid to support these State-aid programs.

These States and Territories paid in proportionately around $650,000,000 for allocation to State-aid programs; got back around a billion dollars.

All States west of the Mississippi River and south of the Mason and Dixon's line received back more than the pro rata share of what they contributed except one—Virginia.

New York got back the same amount as Texas, and paid in four times as much tax money to support these programs. Connecticut put in twice as much as the State got back. Illinois invested $40,000,000 more than was received in return.

Here's how these States stood in the 1948 Federal-aid programs:

New York was on the bottom of the list for all States—a 43-percent return on tax money which New Yorkers paid to the Federal Government.

Connecticut was third from the bottom. New Jersey and Illinois were in fifth and sixth places respectively.

Over the long haul; from 1933 to date, New York has got back only around 6 percent of her total Federal taxes in the form of State-aid grants.

Connecticut received 7 cents on the dollar. Illinois and New Jersey got back about 10 percent each.

Tax moneys of the industrial North and East are flowing south and west and overseas.

Each new social-welfare program that is proposed will tend to accelerate this redistribution of the wealth.

These include Federal aid to education, compulsory health insurance, expanded social security, hospital construction, insurance against temporary or permanent disability, public power, and home relief.

The economy of the South and West are expanding into diversified agriculture and industry, through Government grants and loans, tax incentives, wage differentials, defense planning, and political influence in the administration and Congress.

During 1947 the South obtained 17.3 percent of its total income from Government sources, compared to 13.8 percent in the non-South.

Per capita payments rose 250 percent in the South between 1929 and 1947, compared to 184 percent for the non-South.

Manufacturing in the TVA region alone between 1933 and 1946 jumped by 140 percent, compared to 98 percent for the Nation as a whole.

Between 1940 and 1946 bank assets in the South rose 231 percent compared to a gain of 131 percent in the North.

The Golden West also is sharing in this Government-directed boom through loans, grants, wool support, silver and gold purchase, stock piling of minerals and metals, reclamation, irrigation, public power, reforestation, public parks and lands, and a natural gravitation of population.

Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, Republican, of Vermont, member of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, once declared that every State west of the Mississippi is living on a Government dole.

Meanwhile, what has happened in the North?

During the last 10 years the Nation as a whole gained 204 percent in income and productivity.

But New York State gained proportionately 191 percent—13 percent below national average.

Connecticut gained 174 percent—30 percent below average. New Jersey hit 175 percent—29 percent below average.

Illinois barely topped the national average with 205 percent.

In 1939 the average income of New York State citizens was 50 percent above national average. By 1948 it was only 34 percent higher than the national average.

A study of the Middle Atlantic region, including New York and New Jersey, by United States News and World Report, shows that between 1940 and 1946 these States lost proportionately 3 percent of all United States population, 5 percent of factory workers, 6 percent in value added by manufacturing, 24 percent of all bank deposits, and 42 percent in value of home building.

A similar study of New England States over the same period shows they lost proportionately 2 percent of population, 6 percent of home-building value, 8 percent of value added by manufacturing, 13 percent of factory workers, and 23 percent of bank deposits.

There were 37,000 production workers employed by textiles alone in Connecticut in 1939 compared to 35,000 in 1947.

New Jersey is losing out gradually in two important industries—chemicals and electrical machinery.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of December 14, 1949]

TAXES FEED 36,000,000 ON GOVERNMENT PAY ROLLS

(Where do your tax dollars go? Who are you helping to support? How much is the Federal Government spending today? Here is the third in a series of articles designed to give a comprehensive picture for the first time of how the colossus of government reaches out into every State and every walk of life.)

(By Paul Martin)

How big is government today, and what is the extent of its power?

Here are some indications:

Approximately 36,000,000 Americans are drawing regular, direct payments from Federal, State, and local governments.

One out of every eight employed persons in the United States is working directly for the Government—or 7,000,000 Federal, State, and local employees.

Total Federal, State, and local spending will run close to $70,000,000,000 in the current 1950 fiscal year. This means around $30,000,000,000 in farm or business channels, around $40,000,000,000 to individuals.

The total Federal spending in prewar 1940 was $10,000,000,000, and even then the Nation was girding for an emergency. In the 1930's the first $4,000,000,000-a-year budget was considered a back-breaker.

The total 1950 budget has been estimated at $47,900,000,000 in total appropriations and authorizations.

The Federal Government has become the most dynamic factor in the entire American economy. It dominates business, agriculture, and foreign commerce. It exercises a powerful influence over what State and municipal governments are able to do.

If Federal loans, guaranties, and subsidies were withdrawn immediately, the national economy would suffer extreme shock.

Around 23 percent of what the average citizen earns today goes into a combination of Federal, State, and local taxes—many of them hidden taxes.

To keep the Federal Government going, we are spending annually around six billion for new material, supplies, and equipment.

The administration since VJ-day has or will export around thirty-two billions to keep communism out of Europe and restore the economic balance of the western world.

The Federal Government has accumulated an inventory of more than thirty billions in military or civilian supplies. This includes more than two billions invested in rolling stock alone, trucks, automobiles, staff cars, etc.

Uncle Sam pays more than $1,000,000,000 every year for transporting public property, mostly over the railroads.

There is a shelf of planned public works in excess of one hundred billions, which might be put under construction in event of a depression.

For all contemplated multiple-use water projects, an expenditure of thirty billions would be required. These activities keep 100,000 on the Federal pay roll alone, plus additional thousands under private contractors

Agricultural activities of the Government has mushroomed from 22,000 to around 100,000 employees in the last 20 years. There are nine separate agencies providing Government credit to farmers on different terms and for different purposes.

Veterans' Administration will spend around six billions this year to aid directly more than 5,000,000 individual veterans, exclusive of the GI insurance dividend.

The Hoover Commission found VA was publishing 68 different technical manuals, 665 different technical bulletins, and over 400 circulars of various kinds.

Where does the money go?

The Budget Bureau says 61 cents out of your tax dollar this year will go to support four big areas of Federal interest—defense, international affairs, veterans, and debt service.

In 1938 the Federal Government spent $85 for every man, woman, and child in America. This year the Government will spend upwards of $367 for every single individual and there are around 17,000,000 more of us.

Here's where the money goes:

For 1939:	
Defense	$8.00
International	.15
Veterans	1.00
Debt service	7.00
All other	43.06
For 1950:	
Defense	95.00
International	46.00
Veterans	36.00
Debt service	57.00
All other	68.00

Total funds to be spent or obligated by the Federal Government in the 1950 fiscal period will be distributed in approximately this fashion:

Salaries: Ten and two-tenths billions for three and seven-tenths million Federal employees, including the military.

Services: Two and four-tenths billions for communications, transportation, rents, etc.

Goods: Ten billions including two and five-tenths billions for construction, one and seven-tenths billions for aircraft.

Benefits: Seventeen and three-tenths billions for subsidies, pensions, and grants, including more than two billions for welfare and old-age pensions, one and six-tenths billions for the unemployed.

Farmers: Direct payments in excess of a half billion, plus crop loans and purchases which may exhaust the near-five-billion borrowing capacity of commodity credit corporation.

Foreign governments: Five and six-tenths billions to be spent mostly in United States markets.

Debt: Five and five-tenths billions for interest alone, nothing for debt retirement.

Loans: Two billions to farmers, real-estate operators, businessmen, veterans.

Where are the Federal employees located?

The greatest number, of course, are in the District of Columbia, or around 220,000. But the State of California alone has 200,000 Federal workers, runs the district a close second.

There are three States with more than 100,000 Federal employees each—California, New York, and Pennsylvania. Illinois, with 99,000, is close to the mark.

Control of Alcoholic Beverage Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DIVISION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL,
STATE LIQUOR AUTHORITY,
New York City, January 11, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TAURIELLO: The New York State Liquor Authority today adopted a resolution (copy attached) which summarizes our position on an issue that we consider timely and important. Although this resolution is self-explanatory, it seems worth while to mention here certain facts and principles that are germane and probative.

We approach this subject from the standpoint of public servants entrusted by the government of this State with the difficult task of administering the restrictions, regulations, and provisions of the ABC law which, by the terms of that statute, were enacted in the name of the protection, health, welfare, and safety of the people of the State.

We refrain advisedly from recommendations of specific legislation by the Congress because we have no peculiar qualifications by virtue of our office or official experience to determine what taxes should be imposed or the amount thereof.

We recognize clearly that the American citizen who consumes alcoholic beverages and who ultimately pays whatever taxes are collected on these commodities, has merit in his position when he insists on fair, equitable, and just treatment. We feel that he has been paying the heavy excise taxes on these commodities originally as a contribution to the winning of the war, and, subsequent to that accomplishment, with a feeling of resignation engendered by his observations that, while such discriminatory taxes as those on baby oil and ladies' purses are being collected, he should not object too strenuously to his lot. But we have no commission, privilege, or intention to represent the taxpayer or to plead his cause, however just, since such action is not within the scope of our official duties.

Nor do we undertake to advocate the cause of the industry whose members pay to the Government and then pass along to the consumer the taxes imposed by law on their businesses. We agree, of course, with their belief that any tax which destroys a lawful business or fosters its illegitimate competitor is unwarranted, unjust, and unrealistic. Again, we have no commission, right, or intention to present the case of the alcoholic beverage industry or to state its position, however meritorious, since to do so would take us beyond the prerogatives of our office.

Yet, sensible to our official obligations, we are deeply concerned with the social evils that are privy to the illicit manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages. We find cause for concern in the figures of the Alcohol Tax Unit of the United States Treasury Department reflecting the seizure by that agency alone during the fiscal year 1949 of 9,008 stills and 3,681,432 gallons of mash. Compared with figures reported by the ATU for the fiscal year 1948 in those two categories (6,797 stills and 1,710,883 gallons of mash) it will be seen that increases of 15.5 percent in still seizures and 114 percent in mash seizures have occurred. These figures give expression to the fact that the consumer demands alcoholic beverages and that, although he is willing to buy them at high prices when he can afford to do so, he will buy the illicitly produced, non-tax-paid produce when he is confronted with the alternatives of abstinence or excessive price. Of interest on this point is a comment by Mr. Virgil W. Peterson, the distinguished operating director of the Chicago Crime Commission and an expert on law observance and law enforcement. Writing in the July-August 1949 issue of Northwestern University's Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, Mr. Peterson asserted:

"In America the tendency is present in large segments of the population to consider it a constitutional right to disregard any law or legal restrictions which may not meet with an individual's approval. Consequently, a tightening of the closing hours in some cities has resulted in open and notorious violation of the closing hours with attending political and police corruption. High taxes have frequently resulted in bootlegging."

Prohibition by price excesses is potentially as destructive a force as prohibition by decree. Both cause irreparable injury to legitimate business and good government. The havoc wrought by national prohibition can be correctly appraised only with the passage of years and through the verdict of history. To those who have devoted themselves over the years to the cause of good government, its combating the kidnaping wave of the early thirties, and to smashing the industrial, vice, and other rackets in later years, it is clear beyond doubt that prohibition spawned the greatest conglomeration of vicious criminals and aggravated crime that our country ever experienced. All of us, regardless of experience, know that prohibition not only failed to accomplish its stated objective but in addition so tarnished the luster of government itself and so corroded its framework that the after-effects will long remain to be seen. Public servants, students of government, and lawmakers in particular should never lose sight of these facts, nor should they underestimate the lessons they teach. Public opinion must be kept on the side of law observance and behind law enforcement.

During the 18 years of its existence the New York State Liquor Authority has sought to attain the objectives of our ABC law by insisting on strict compliance with rigid standards in the hope that this policy and procedure would induce honest, honorable, and respected business people to participate in the business of supplying legitimately produced, potable, tax-paid alcoholic beverages for the moderate and temperate use of the consuming public. We feel that this effort has been rewarded and that a high percentage of the large number of carefully screened persons who have been licensed to engage in this business in this State have exercised the privileges conferred thereby in a responsible and meritorious manner. We believe that any effort to brand these licensees otherwise than as legitimate business people serving a public need and demand would appear to be highly inconsistent with the objectives of liquor control and would be prejudicial to the efforts of the States to attain those objectives through insuring high standards of compliance with the letter and spirit of the law by licensees who are themselves law-abiding, self-respecting, and capable business people.

We trust that this statement of our position is constructive and that it will be of value to you and your colleagues in resolving the direct and related issues that are involved. Should you feel that we can be otherwise helpful, please feel free to command us.

Very truly yours,

STATE LIQUOR AUTHORITY,
JOHN F. O'CONNELL,
CHAIRMAN.

RESOLUTION

Whereas under the powers reflended to them by the twenty-first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, 46 of the individual States have enacted laws to control the alcoholic beverage business; and

Whereas although variously expressed, the purpose of these laws is to protect the health, welfare, safety, and morals of the people of these States by fostering and promoting temperance and moderation and respect for obedience to law; and

Whereas this objective depends for accomplishment upon a sound law effectively administered; and

Whereas to be sound in concept and susceptible of effective administration, particularly as to acts that are not intrinsically wrong, penal statutes, including those relating to liquor control, must be in substantial conformity with public thinking; and

Whereas taxes on alcoholic beverages which are so excessive as to cause public resentment create a condition tolerant of the bootlegger and the bootlegging business and thereby compromise temperance and moderation and undermine respect for and obedience to law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York State Liquor Authority respectfully urge all members of the delegation of this State in the Congress of the United States to consider these facts carefully and to weigh them judiciously in their deliberations on proposals to reduce the high excise taxes which were imposed as wartime measures.

(Resolution adopted by the New York State Liquor Authority in New York City, January 11, 1950.)

Multiple Sclerosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, in recent months I have had numerous letters from individuals suffering with the dreaded and little-known disease, multiple sclerosis. Naturally, they have written to urge me to support several bills now pending in Congress to grant funds for research in multiple sclerosis, and I have in each case assured the writer than I am indeed in favor of funds for such purposes. However, the mail brought me a few days ago another such letter, this time from a fine young woman who has been a good friend of the Murdock family for years. She has written to tell us that her doctor has now diagnosed her trouble as multiple sclerosis.

After reading her letter, I felt that I should redouble my efforts for this legislation, and I think that perhaps other Members of Congress will have similar reaction. Her letter is as follows:

DENVER COLO., *January 11, 1950.*

Hon. and Mrs. JOHN R. MURDOCK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. MURDOCK: It was so good to see you both last summer when I stopped in Washington with Bert and his family. At the time I could have told you my tale of woe but I didn't see any point in bothering you with it since I did not realize you might become involved in the matter.

My Christmas letter sent as I left Twin Falls for Denver told of my peculiar disease being diagnosed as multiple sclerosis. How much do you know about it?

Do you know that it is the disease of which Lou Gehrig died? But of course you know of it because of Arizona's late Governor. They are the exceptions; few of the victims are fortunate enough to die. Instead we face years and years ahead of paralysis. Though the paralysis has not yet set in for me it may come gradually or I may not be able to move a single muscle by tomorrow. A year ago right now I was completely numb from the tips of my toes to my diaphragm. Much of the numbness has disappeared but I can put my whole right leg in scalding water and not feel it. Since February 23 I have been in constant pain though the intensity varies. There are other ways in which I have been affected but this is enough for you to know how important a matter it is to me and to millions of others.

Yes, I say millions. New York City alone has over 10,000 cases. A rare disease? Not in the number of victims (it hits chiefly the healthiest between 20 and 40), but in what is known of it. The disease has been known for nearly 100 years but nothing has been done about finding out the cause or possible cure until 3 years ago next month when patients themselves, together with their families and friends, organized the National Multiple Sclerosis Society (270 Park Avenue, New York). Still the cause and cure are unknown. There is no medicine I can take—nothing to keep my health in the state it is in now or improving it, nothing to stop the disease from progressing.

Government-sponsored research in multiple sclerosis received a boost with the passage by the Senate on September 27 of S. 2591. This bill provides for the establishment of a national institute on neurological diseases, specifically citing research in MS as a purpose of the act. Will you vote in favor of this bill when it comes before the House?

As you know I have left my work as a director of Christian education. I started this week in a strictly 9 to 5 office job with the Denver Council of Churches. I have been fortunate in finding a place to live and mother and dad will join me the first of next week to make their home with me and take care of me when and if I can no longer do so myself.

Do not worry about my mental state; I have not become morbid. I seldom say as much as I have just written you. Perhaps your vote will be the difference between discovery of a cure before I become incapacitated and the present lack of knowledge on the subject.

Perhaps my next will be on a more cheerful note.

Sincerely,

FLORENCE LUDY.

Federal Fair Employment Practice Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing the resolution that I have received from the board of aldermen, legislative department, city of Chelsea, Mass.:

Whereas there is now pending in the United States Congress the Federal Fair Employment Practice Act; and

Whereas the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has already adopted such an act; and

Whereas it is the sense of this board of aldermen that it is vital to the best interests of this country that such an act be adopted in line with the report of the President's Commission on Civil Rights: Now therefore it is

Resolved, That this board of aldermen go on record that it officially endorses the FEPC and urges its Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their good offices in order to successfully enact this legislation;

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Congressman LANE, and Senators SALTONSTALL and LODGE.

Harry Coltun, Joseph B. Greenfield, Joseph E. Thornton, Joseph Margolis, James A. Hanlon, George J. Gallant, Daniel E. Carroll, Andrew F. Murphy, Alexander Dzengielewski.

In board of aldermen, January 9, 1950, adopted.

Approved January 11, 1950.

JOSEPH A. MILLEY, *Mayor.*

A true copy. Attest:

JOSEPH A. TURRELL, *City Clerk.*

We Must Not Be Afraid of Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Raymond B. Fosdick, which appeared in the New York Times magazine of April 3, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WE MUST NOT BE AFRAID OF CHANGE

(By Raymond B. Fosdick, former president of the Rockefeller Foundation)

When the last glacier retreated northward from what is now Connecticut, it left behind, as mementos of its visit, great boulders of rock strewn lavishly across the State. Several of them, larger than corncribs and many tons in weight, were deposited on my farm, and for 15 years I have watched one of them fight a losing battle with an ash tree. The tree evidently started in a seed lodged in a tiny pocket in the top of the rock. When I first saw it, it was a sturdy sapling that had made itself a comfortable crevice for its roots. Today its irresistible growth has torn the massive rock into fragments.

This is the law of life. The future belongs not to rigid absolutes, whether they are primal rock or unyielding social arrangements, but to the thing that can grow, whether it is a tree or a democracy.

It is strange that a principle as familiar as this should today need underscoring, but we are living in years of uncertainty and fear, and fear induces a kind of spiritual astigmatism. To be sure, in our generation, we have reason for our fears and every justification to resist the threat that creates them. But I am thinking of fear as an evil in itself and what it does to human emotions and reactions.

For one thing, fear breeds an instinctive hostility to growth, because growth means change, and in anxious hours men tend to cling to the shelter of the present or to put their faith in nostalgia for the past. But history's current is sweeping us into the future, and we cannot stand still, nor is there now any place left to go back to. The illusion that security can be found in immobility, or that safety is dependent upon the absence of change, is perhaps the most dangerous form of imbalance which plagues the minds of men.

Nothing is static in this world, least of all our ideas. Values change from age to age and the interpretation of one generation is seldom the interpretation of the next. Social conceptions must constantly be retranslated and reexpressed in contemporary idiom to accord with contemporary conditions. Even our conceptions of freedom and democracy are not static principles. The Declaration of Independence was a broader definition of freedom than that which came out of the Revolution of 1688, just as 1688 widened the freedom of Magna Carta.

Today the conception of freedom is once again taking on a larger meaning. Our generation is thinking of the threat to freedom which comes from poverty and insecurity, from sickness and the slum, from social and economic conditions in which human beings cannot be free. In many countries, including our own, this new conception of freedom is struggling to make itself articulate, and irrestible change in older points of view is taking place before our eyes.

Democracy is another conception which must also be reinterpreted from generation to generation. It is government by the people and for the people, but its limits were not finally determined by the political concepts of the eighteenth century. Rather it is a growing, dynamic faith, a perpetually evolving adjustment between freedom and justice, between individual rights and the demands of society. This adjustment, however, is never perfectly and finally attained; it remains a problem which mankind must solve again and again. "It is provided in the very essence of things," said Walt Whitman, "that from any fruition of success, no matter what, shall come forth something to make a greater struggle necessary."

Here again we have a familiar concept to which most of us would doubtless subscribe. But it needs to be underscored today because our current fear of communism is driving some of us to believe that change is somehow subversive, and that anyone who advocates new ideas is probably a fellow-traveler who should be watched. Not only the House Un-American Activities Committee but similar State committees and various self-appointed groups are creating a climate of opinion definitely hostile to those who fail to conform to predetermined standards, and suspicion is thrown on individuals and organizations who dare to think in unorthodox and nonconformist terms.

With the possible exception of John Adams' administration, there is a risk today in being a liberal that has never existed before in the history of this Republic. If you sign a petition to admit colored people to public housing developments, if you favor fair employment practices or are concerned about civil liberties, if you fight for the protection of the rights of the foreign born, if you oppose religious prejudice and Jim Crowism, if you sanction cultural exchange with foreign countries, if you aline yourself with those who are working for more effective labor unions or more adequate medical care, if you take any point of view which involves the implementation of the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal, you are apt to be suspected in some circles as a knowing participant in the Communist front, or, at the very least, as a witless dupe of Moscow's hypnotic influences.

There is hardly a progressive organization or undertaking in the country to which the adjective "communistic" has not been applied in the last few years—from the Tennessee Valley Authority and water-power developments generally, all the way to farmers' and consumers' cooperatives and plans for rural electrification. Fingers are even pointed at organizations like the YMCA, the YWCA, and the distinct Epworth League. In many States, teachers and college professors have been frightened into sterile silence, and even the pulpit has not been free from fear.

The tragedy of this business is that it plays into the hands of the Communists. It identifies Russia with the process of social change at the same time that it limits us to a bleak and hopeless status quo. It concedes the Soviet claim of concern for the underprivileged while it stigmatizes the achievement and promise of democracy toward this same goal. A prominent doctor, head of a State medical society, recently condemned the idea of the broader distribution of medical care on the grounds that it was being pushed "by Soviet agents in this country."

That is the kind of reckless statement which creates an atmosphere favorable to communism. If the idea of making available to all the people of our country the curative techniques of modern medicine is communism, if communism has a patent on the idea, then communism has something for us which we very much want. But it isn't communism. It is democracy. Its roots go back to the Declaration of Independence, long before Karl Marx was born. It is a translation in social terms of a concept that was first conceived as a political idea. It is part of our developing spiritual testament. It is in line with all that is best in our tradition and hope. It is democracy facing the responsibilities of its maturity.

Those frightened people who use the word communism so easily had better reflect with its implications. There are plenty of arguments against communism. It is a facade for a ruthless tyranny. It is a brutal hoax by which millions of confused and hungry people are persuaded or coerced to sign away their freedom in exchange for utopian promises. But to paste a label of communism on the yearnings of men everywhere for a better life, to classify as subversive those goals of equality and human service toward which our democracy is moving, is to contede to the Communists all the best arguments and make a mockery of the faith that sustains us.

It is undoubtedly part of the Communist strategy to frighten us into a position which seems to identify our democracy, not with forward-looking movements related to the hopes of men, but with outmoded patterns of social thinking. If in the eyes of the nations, America could appear as a victim of spiritual paralysis, frozen to the present, deaf to the impact of new ideas of human equality which are sweeping the world, it would be an overriding victory for Soviet policy. That is the picture the Communists are trying to paint of us, and that, unfortunately, is the picture that some thoughtless and panicky people in this country are trying, unwittingly, to help them paint.

I do not underestimate the necessity which we face in times like these of keeping the Communists clear of our Government and rooting out treachery wherever it may be found. Split loyalties or loyalties that respond to strings pulled in Moscow cannot be tolerated in positions of power. We must know who our enemies are. But this is a task requiring consummate judgment and skill. If, in a clumsy attempt to exorcise evil, we proscribe the good as well, the damage will be irreparable. To act as if the term "communism" covers all the plans and dreams of men for making this world an inviting home to live in instead of a place to freeze and fight and starve in is no more intelligent than using a steam shovel to weed a flower garden.

In our concern over what communism may do to democracy we have overlooked the danger of what we ourselves may do to democracy under the stimulus of fear. Fighting fire with fire is an easy but misleading

slogan which has betrayed more than one cause in the past. Challenged by authoritarianism, men begin to build an authoritarianism of their own; they tend to take on the mood and techniques of their opponents; they answer heresy-hunting with heresy-hunting; they become like the thing they fight. That is what fear does to people. If the tactics of the Soviets succeed in inducing us to try to stamp out dissent and to measure loyalty by conformity, if they scare us into a denial of our historic goals, then they have maneuvered us into retreating from the field before the battle has even begun.

If democracy means anything at all it means the promise of growth. Democracy is not a finished project; we are engaged in building it. There is no blueprint which covers all the contingencies that may arise, or the new ideas and patterns that may be developed in the future. There is no final and absolute form of democracy which has been handed down from some political Sinai. We have no Karl Marx in our past. Democracy is a method of evolution, a maturing way of living, a conception of human relations rooted in the worth and dignity of the individual and inspired by the developing idea of freedom.

This is what our democracy has always meant. We have given it its preeminent place in the world because we have welcomed diversity of opinion, because there has been no fixed creed to which our citizens have had to subscribe, no Siberia for our intellectual and spiritual nonconformists. Our national life has been healthy and vigorous because dissenters have been encouraged to think critically of the political, social, and economic order in which we live.

Indeed, as we look back on our history we realize that the periods when we rose to moral greatness were periods of nonconformity—when Thoreau wrote his essay on civil disobedience; when Seward appealed to the country with his revolutionary thesis, "There is a law higher than the Constitution"; when Theodore Parker from his pulpit in Boston denounced the iniquity of our war on Mexico in words that burned their way into the conscience of the Nation. "If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation," said the Supreme Court in the Barnette flag-salute case in 1943, "it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion, or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

It is this kind of tolerance and adaptability that makes the evolving will of the people effective in reaching new definitions of liberty and equality. It is this philosophy of growth that gives us assurance in the present crisis. The only adequate way to answer the challenge of communism is to continue the building of an economic and social system whose concrete results in terms of the welfare of mankind will far outstrip anything that communism can even promise. Democracy thus interpreted is a positive force can events new hopes and new initiatives in human life and can capture the imagination of the world.

Here is a faith worth fighting for. Stalin boasts of his "new order." We have a new order, too, based on the capacity of each generation to experience what Lincoln called "a new birth of freedom." The Communists extol the youth and virility of totalitarianism. In the evolution of democracy we have a world that is perpetually young.

I started by saying that the future belongs to the thing that can grow; a tree can demolish a rock. In spite of the present impetus of its revolutionary program, communism, by encasing itself in an iron-clad orthodoxy, is sealing its own ultimate doom. Whether the field is science or economics or literature or art or music, the Kremlin has circumscribed it with an adamantine authoritarianism. The conformist reaction which holds the intellectual and humanistic life of Russia in a vise-like grip can end only by strangling the vitality of the system it seeks to preserve.

In such an atmosphere there can be no flowering of the human spirit; it withers and dies from suffocation. The Communists are fighting against the laws of nature. In their fanaticism they have forgotten; if they ever knew, that stagnation and death await ideas as well as social and economic arrangements which have lost their power to grow. They taunt us for being the supporters of a crumbling status quo, but it is they who are looking backward, they who are trying to build a status quo far more rigid and absolute than anything the world has ever seen. It is they who would put blinders on men and establish boundaries beyond which ideas and dreams shall not be allowed to go.

Four hundred years ago, Galileo shook the world with the question: "Who is willing to set limits to the human intellect?" Well, the Communists are not only willing to do it, they are attempting to do it; and in that attempt which flies in the face of history lie the seeds of their own ultimate disintegration.

There is no future for such a system, any more than there is a future for a rock stranded by a glacier. Ultimately the irresistible power of a thing that can grow will shatter it. That is why democracy, rightly interpreted, is the last best hope of earth. It is rooted in the principle of growth; it is adaptable to new concepts of social justice. It is built, not on a fixed creed or on a system of regimented concepts, but on the sure knowledge that frontiers are never stationary, that the thrust of events is steadily forward, that there are no privileged ideas around which magic circles can be drawn to protect them from competition. It is only free men who dare to think, and it is only through free thought, freely expressed, that the soul of a people can be kept alive.

Federal Scholarship Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include, and with pleasure, a splendid and deserving article written by Russell Collins, and appearing in the Boston Globe of January 15, 1950, relating to some of the constructive and effective efforts of our outstanding colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO]:

FURCOLO CALLED TO WHITE HOUSE TO EXPLAIN SCHOLARSHIP PLAN—HOW UNCLE SAM WOULD SEND 5,000 TO COLLEGE

(By Russell Collins)

SPRINGFIELD, January 14.—The Federal scholarship plan of FOSTER FURCOLO, freshman Congressman from the Second District, received the "green light" this week when President Truman in his budget message asked Congress to provide $1,000,000 to help capable youths get a college education.

The President's request was regarded here and in Washington as the first step toward establishment of the Furcolo plan under which the Federal Government would finance the college education of at least 5,000 high-school graduates annually, on a self-sustaining loan plan.

Although the plan appeared certain of having opposition before it is adopted, Congressman FURCOLO says he is confident Congress will act favorably upon this initial phase of his bill as asked by the President.

Congressman FURCOLO attracted national attention last spring when he was invited to the White House to discuss his proposed Federal scholarship plan with the President. Veteran newsmen at Washington said they couldn't remember when a freshman Congressman had been similarly honored.

Discussing his proposal this week, following the President's budget message, Congressman FURCOLO said it is based on two major premises:

First, no qualified high-school or college student should be deprived of a higher education because of financial inability to pay for it.

Second, in its present financial condition, the country is unable to provide that education free of charge.

"The aim of the Federal scholarship plan is to enable at least 5,000 high-school students a year to complete a college education when in the absence of the Federal scholarship plan they would be unable to do so," FURCOLO told a Globe reporter in his first detailed explanation of how his proposal would operate.

"The plan also would serve the same purpose for at least 500 college students a year to continue through postgraduate work," he added.

In its present state the Furcolo bill (now awaiting action by the Labor and Education Committee of the House) refers only to college and postgraduate higher education, he said. Actually it is intended to include students who will continue their education after high school whether it be in a college or some other institution of learning.

NO COST TO GOVERNMENT

"The initial plan is based on a college period of 4 years or a postgraduate period of 4 years," FURCOLO explained. "Since many courses would not take that length of time it is probable that the Federal scholarship plan would benefit 7,000 to 8,000 students a year, rather than the figure of about 5,000 or 5,500 upon which the plan is based.

"The benefits of the Federal scholarship plan are intended to be furnished at no actual cost to the Federal Government. The Government does provide money in the initial period of operation of the plan, but this money is not provided in the form of the usual appropriation. It is with this understanding that I say the benefits are made possible by the Federal Government but still at no actual cost to the Federal Government.

"I hope that eventually the time will come when this country can offer higher education to scholastically qualified students at absolutely no expense to the student. Post-high-school education should be free to those of our students who want and are qualified to continue higher education.

"The country has not yet reached the stage where it feels able to provide higher education free of charge. Until that time comes, I advocate the expedient of what I am terming the Federal scholarship plan."

FURCOLO, himself a graduate of Yale, where he paid for his education by working, said, "We must not lose sight of the fact that the country suffers in losing the potential qualities that have not been brought to fruition simply because thousands of individuals have been deprived of educations to fit their individual abilities. It is a public problem directly affecting the welfare of the community."

TEN-YEAR REPAYMENT PERIOD

In its working details, the plan provides for money to be advanced to students and then repaid at stated intervals over a period of 10 years, beginning after the educational period.

The amount of money to be advanced to those students continuing on from high school to college studies is fixed at a maximum of $1,000 per year. College students who are going on to postgraduate schools will receive a maximum of $1,500 a year.

The maximum time period for either group is 4 years of college studies for high-school graduates, or 4 years of postgraduate work for college students.

Those granted aid for college or post-high-school studies will repay the Government at the rate of $250 a year for the first 4 years and $500 a year for the next 6 years.

Postgraduate students will repay the Government at the rate of $250 a year for the first 2 years, $500 a year for the next 2 years, and $750 a year for the next 6 years.

Repayments do not begin until the first year after the study period is completed.

In the year after such payments have been completed so that the entire loan has been repaid to the Federal Government, the student will make a gratuity payment equal to 10 percent of the total amount advanced to him by the Government.

On the above basis, the Federal Government would appropriate about $167,000,000 over a period of 14 years or a little less than $12,000,000 a year for the plan. Fourteen years after the start of the program it is unnecessary for the Government to make further appropriations because the plan has a self-sustaining revolving fund that finances itself.

STATES WOULD CONTRIBUTE

In addition to the Federal appropriations those States that accept the terms of the plan will contribute at the ratio of $100 for every $1,000 advanced by the Federal Government. After the first 14 years of operation of the plan, the total expense to the States is figured at $1,150,000 a year or $50 for every $1,000 loaned to the student. The amount per State will depend upon the population of the State. The yearly contribution of an average State would be about $48,000 for the first 14 years and about $24,000 thereafter.

The contribution of the States differs from that of the Federal Government in that the Federal Government's contribution is a loan and that of the States is an outright gift.

There is an estimated 10 percent loss on loans not repaid by students because of deaths, poor risks, and similar reasons. By the fourteenth year the yearly repayments of students come to $20,700,000. The total amount of the gratuity payment of 10 percent the student makes is $2,300,000 or again, deducting the estimated 10-percent loss, $2,070,000.

Beginning with the fifteenth year and continuing after that time, the yearly administration expenses are estimated at a maximum of $500,000.

When the plan gets under way a total of $23,000,000 will be given to approximately 20,000 college students and 2,000 postgraduate students. Beginning with the fifteenth year the Government would have a surplus of $420,000 annually to reduce the amount of the States' contributions or cover any error in the estimated costs of administration.

SELECTION UP TO STATES

FURCOLO said the method of selecting students would be determined after the program had been accepted by Congress. The selection would be left, insofar as is possible, to the individual State. The student would be allowed to choose the institution he wanted to attend. The plan would not interfere with any Federal-aid-to-education program.

After FURCOLO had outlined his bill in Congress last spring, he received a telephone call from the White House that an appointment had been made for him to see the President. He was with President Truman for about a half hour, during which the President asked him many questions about the proposals. FURCOLO admitted he was surprised at the knowledge of his proposal that the President apparently had.

President Truman told him a program to provide financial assistance to college students was close to his heart, FURCOLO said, and that the White House was giving it considerable study.

Thus, it was no surprise to the Congressman or to others familiar with the proposal when Mr. Truman this week presented his request for an initial appropriation of money to help provide college training for capable youth.

Seafarers International Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I recently availed myself of an invitation extended to all Members of Congress by the Seafarers International Union to visit their headquarters branch at 51 Beaver Street, New York City. I was pleased to have the opportunity to see the hiring hall in action, and to learn what Paul Hall, secretary-treasurer of the Atlantic and Gulf district, Al Bernstein, their international representative, and others, are trying to accomplish.

I was convinced, that because of problems peculiar to the maritime industry, the union hiring halls have injected stability into the industry and have given to seafaring men a proper dignity and security that was impossible under the previous hiring practices.

Because I was so impressed with what I learned during my visit, I wish to take this opportunity to report to my colleagues on my experiences, and to give them the facts which were made available to me.

World War II proved conclusively that a large, strong, and efficient merchant marine is absolutely essential to our national security. Were it not for the fact that we were able to keep our ships sailing when the vessels of our allies virtually had been destroyed, it is not improbable that years would have been added to the conflict. In fact, victory might not have been ours.

It is important here to remember that the hiring hall was the backbone in keeping the ships crewed and moving in wartime to all theaters of operation.

The merchant marine has properly been called our second line of defense by those who shouldered the responsibility for the successful prosecution of our war effort. Just as we must maintain an Army and Navy strong enough to meet any emergency, so must we take the necessary steps to insure the continued efficient functioning of our merchant fleet. We should take no false comfort in the thought that Allied Nations are rebuilding their maritime industries. Constantly changing political alinements mean that the ally of today might well be the enemy of tomorrow.

There is no question that the highly successful operation of our merchant marine during the war was due to the stability achieved in the maritime industry over the past years. That stability should not be threatened, unless we are foolhardy enough not to have learned anything from the past conflict.

Yet the stability of this vital industry, and the job security of the workers dependent upon it for their livelihoods—and the security of the Nation—is threatened because of a serious shortcoming in the Taft-Hartley law.

Because of the ban on the closed shop, the existence of the maritime unions' hiring halls is in jeopardy. If the view of the lower courts is upheld by the Supreme Court, the ban will not only end the current hiring hall procedure with its democratic rotary system of shipping, it will destroy the maritime unions themselves and all their hard-won gains in behalf of their seafaring members.

It is possible that failure to exempt the union hiring halls from the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law was due to a lack of understanding on the part of many Members of Congress as to the nature of the hiring hall and its manner of operation.

As I saw it, the rotary hiring system is the most equitable method of dispatching men to jobs that has yet been devised, with seamen registering for jobs as they come off the ships and then being dispatched on a first-come, first-served basis.

Under the rotary hiring system, seamen who have been issued certificates by the United States Coast Guard testifying to their qualifications to sail in their particular ratings obtain jobs fairly and squarely. When a man wants employment, he registers at the union hiring hall, where he is issued a shipping card bearing the date of his registration.

As jobs come in, they are posted on the shipping board, listing the vessels, their destinations and other pertinent data. In addition, the dispatcher calls out the available jobs and those men who are qualified and wish to apply throw in their cards. Of those throwing in, the men with the oldest cards, or those who have been on the "beach"—unemployed—the longest, get the jobs. No one is compelled to take any employment. If an eligible seaman does not want a particular job, he simply does not throw in for it. He merely waits for one more to his liking to be called out. The date of his registration and the fact that he is qualified are the only considerations determining his right to the job.

I spoke with Paul Hall, secretary-treasurer of the Atlantic and Gulf district, and with his members of the SIU, and their sentiment in favor of this democratic system of obtaining jobs was overwhelming. The older seafarers were especially vigorous in their approval and in no uncertain terms they denounced

the degrading crimp halls and the shanghaiing methods that prevailed in the industry before the advent of the union hiring hall.

Crimp halls were generally seamen's boarding houses, whose unscrupulous proprietors served as employment agencies for equally unscrupulous shipowners. Crimps fleeced their seamen-guests, sinking them deeper and deeper into debt, until they were forced to accept one of the jobs offered them as a means of getting out of debt. The seamen's wages were then used to pay off the debt and, in addition, the crimp received a commission from the shipowner. It was a vicious cycle with the seamen never getting any more than a sum necessary to dispose of his obligation to the crimp.

Shanghaiing was an even more despicable method of supplying men to ships in those days. Manpower needs of a shipowner were satisfied by coercing or kidnapping seamen by crimps and saloon proprietors who would ply them with drugs and liquor, and then hustle them aboard ship.

The union hiring hall wiped out crimps' halls and shanghaiing, and the maritime industry is better off for it.

The union hiring hall also stepped up the efficiency and stability of the merchant marine by ending the employment of "summer sailors," generally well-to-do college students with connections who were pushed through Coast Guard qualification tests so that they could go to sea for a few months as a lark. As a result of this practice, qualified seamen who made a career of sailing and whose families were dependent upon them for sustenance were deprived of employment opportunities. They were forced to sit on the beach until these part-time sailors went back to school.

The union hiring hall not only provides fair treatment for the seamen, it has resulted in considerable advantage to the shipowners themselves, for with the innovation of union hiring came a stability that the industry never before enjoyed.

The Seafarers International Union maintains—and apparently without contradiction—that the end product of a strong union and the democratically administered system of rotary shipping is a membership that is conscientious and fully cognizant of its responsibilities as an important part of an important industry.

The Seafarers point out further that the destruction of the union hiring hall would wipe out many hard-won gains realized by organized seamen over the past 10 years, and chaos, confusion and all the sordid conditions that are now part of an inglorious history would return. And there is sound basis for this prediction.

The Congress of the United States can act to avert such a calamity. I believe all legislators share with me the desire to see our Nation move forward, not backward. I believe, therefore, that it is incumbent upon us to exempt the maritime unions from the closed shop ban. It is in the seamen's, the industry's, and Nation's interest that we do so.

Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Henry McLemore in the Washington Star of January 16:

SAYS FEDERAL SPENDING WILL COST OUR LIBERTY

(By Henry McLemore)

Up until the time of President Truman's budget talk I was against his national health program.

I had not read more than half of the President's budget speech before I realized that his national health program was completely necessary.

With that sort of budget someone has got to take care of a fellow when he becomes ill—he certainly won't be able to take care of himself. If this budget goes through, as it undoubtedly will, most of us will never have a penny any more.

When we get a cold, or a touch of croup, or a giddy spell in our head, we won't be able to call up doctors the way we used to, because we won't have any money to pay them with. Any money we have will be long gone to such places as the Maritime Commission ($162,230,466), Railroad Retirement Board ($612,881,136), and funds appropriated to the President ($4,133,968,085).

FIGURES OUT SACRIFICE

I hate to see the passing of doctors. In many ways they have been closer to the American family than any other professional men. The family doctor was the one man you could talk to. He was the one man who would get up at all sorts of hours and come to see you. He was the one man who knew you were being alarmed over nothing, but was still nice enough to come and allay your fears.

I wonder if Mr. Truman has ever completely figured out what he is asking this country to give up.

In case he hasn't figured it all out, I'll save him the trouble, because I have.

He and his advisers are asking Americans to give up America. If a halt is not called this country will not be the United States of America. Our heritage is being poured right down the drain. And it is much too fine a heritage to come to such an end. Our heritage is based absolutely on liberty—and that's what is being taken from us every time the clock ticks.

RECORD OF GENEROSITY

Speaking as an American, I would rather have it all taken in one big bite instead of having it nibbled away. I consider it an insult to my intelligence for my Government to think that I don't know what's going on. If all we were going to lose was money, I don't think many of us would complain. This country has proved its willingness to give away money to the world. This country has an unmatched record of generosity and decency. No one ever called for help and went unanswered.

But there has come a time when we are being asked, under the guise of politics, to quit being Americans. Day by day, slowly and surely, we are being asked to give away our pattern of life for the pattern of life of the Old World. Ours was the pattern of life of the New World. This country is known as the New World. It seems to me a shame that this country should be asked to walk in the footsteps of countries which have proved themselves failures.

This country was founded on strength and in my book there comes a time when the strong should be protected as much as the weak lest there come a time when there are no more strong to take care of the weak. Excuse my philosophy, readers, but I just had to get it off my chest.

Committed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Woman's Home Companion for December 1949:

COMMITTED

Where do you expect to be when you're a grandmother? Possibly you haven't a very definite idea but I doubt whether you expect to be in a mental hospital. Yet that's exactly where thousands of aged men and women end up every year—falsely labeled insane. Our mental hospitals are becoming a dumping ground for old people who don't belong there any more than you or I.

Says Dr. George S. Stevenson, president of the American Psychiatric Association and medical director of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene: "It is intolerable for a civilized society to permit the continuance of this situation—especially when solutions are at hand."

I have visited more than 40 public mental hospitals in recent years. I have seen rows on rows of old people waiting in numb despair for death to end their miserable existence. Few mental-hospital superintendents will deny that many should not have been there. Most superintendents are eager to have the public know the appalling facts.

When I visited Manhattan State Hospital in New York, I saw plentiful evidence of railroading. Three out of 5 of Manhattan's 25,000 patients are more than 60 years old. Most of the old people occupy the overcrowded back wards—the wards of the hopeless. They are huddled together during their waking hours in unearthly silence in gloomy dayrooms, arms folded, eyes riveted on bleak walls. At night they are herded into huge barnlike dormitories with beds so tightly packed that they almost touch one another.

They suffer from no mental disease; but they are the victims of a social disease—rejections Dr. John H. Travis, Manhattan State's superintendent, readily admits that his institution is no place for these people but adds that he is powerless to stem the tide of unjust commitments.

In my rounds of mental hospitals from New York to California, north and south, I have seen thousands of such elderly patients. One head of a mental hospital told me: "Our chronic troubles—overcrowding, understaffing, financial malnutrition, antiquated buildings and the like—are grave enough, without thrusting the unwanted aged upon us. It is not merely a medical problem. It is an ethical problem and the fault lies not with us but with the community."

The clinical director of a large New England hospital tugged vigorously at my coat and said with repressed emotion: "Many of these old folks die within a few days or weeks after they arrive here. They don't die of any

mental or physical disease. They die of a broken heart. They feel themselves betrayed. They no longer want to live. They commit psychic suicide."

In a large midwest State hospital for the insane, I found a lovely 68-year-old woman who looked strikingly like Whistler's famous portrait of his mother. She answered my questions sensibly and with dignity. As we left, the superintendent who was escorting me through the wards remarked: "They had no more right to commit that woman than you or me. She's a widow and was living with her son and daughter-in-law. Lately she's been a bit confused and forgetful, as often happens when people get old.

"With her son working all day and his wife busy taking care of their two children and the household, nobody could give her the little attentions she needed. The family finally felt it couldn't put up with her any longer. The good homes for the aged were too expensive. Then somebody told them that the State mental hospital had to take in almost anybody, that this was the place that would take her off her family's hands.

"So they went to their family doctor, greatly exaggerated her eccentricities, got a commitment order and here she is. There are many like her here. It's a disgrace. There ought to be more suitable places for them to live out their last years if they can't do it at home."

A psychiatrist in charge of one hospital's chronic ward showed me a stack of commitment papers recently received. "These are all court orders requiring us to admit elderly persons into our hospital," the doctor explained. "We can't ignore them even if we doubt the validity of the diagnosis."

I was shocked by the casual way many of the orders were drafted. Some merely stated that so-and-so was adjudged insane and should be admitted to the State mental hospital, without further explanation. Many were evidently based on perfunctory court hearings or medical examinations by general practitioners with no special training in psychiatry.

Of course, not all the old people in our mental institutions are victims of railroading. Many are suffering from the two main mental diseases that afflict the aged: psychosis with cerebral arteriosclerosis (hardening of the brain's arteries), and senile psychosis (serious deterioration of the mental capacities resulting from the aging process).

The railroaded ones of our time are the victims of two trends that, ironically, have brought material progress to our country. One is the fact that more of us are living longer because of the great advances in health and medicine. In 1900 there were only 3,000,000 persons over 65 in the United States, or slightly more than 4 percent of the total population. Today there are 11,000,000, or more than 7 percent.

The second trend is the gradual transformation of our society from a farming to an industrial economy. American families have been moving from roomy homes in rural areas, where several generations of a single family were accustomed to live together, to small apartments in crowded cities, where the family breaks up into separate units with every marriage.

Thus as the aged among us grow more numerous, the living space for them dwindles steadily. This aspect not only makes elderly people the displaced persons of the family home but actually precipitates them into real nervous break-downs. Their presence in a cramped apartment creates problems which too many of us are not prepared to solve. We may resent the curbs on freedom of movement. Young children in the family may be hostile and refuse to bring their friends home.

Dr. David A. Boyd, Jr., well-known psychiatrist on the staff of the Mayo Clinic, says: "Many of the acute psychoses of the aged necessitating admission to a psychiatric hospital are the upshot of family quarrels. After a short hospitalization the psychosis often recedes and the family is again faced with the same problem. Too frequently they refuse to accept it and the psychiatric hospital has another permanent resident."

Dr. Boyd also notes that a large portion of our mental hospital personnel and funds is diverted to what amounts to custodial care for the aged, in place of an active curative program for younger patients, thus seriously hampering the latter's chances for recovery.

What can be done? There is no single over-all solution; but a combination of steps can effectively eliminate the evil.

Here are some suggestions drawn up after consultations with leading experts in the field:

1. The old-time respect and tolerance for elderly people must be reawakened. The pernicious notion that they are used up, ready for the scrapheap must be eliminated. This change in attitude would be an important kind of insurance policy for all of us who must in time face the problem of growing old.

2. A great deal of mental and emotional disorder—and unhappiness—among older people could be prevented by giving them a chance for continued active participation in our social and economic life. Dr. Winfred Overholser, superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital in Washington, D. C. has wisely observed: "To force people, formerly active, to give up completely the work they have been doing and sit at home contemplating their difficulties is very likely to hasten their complete demoralization and distintegration."

3. Public opinion and professional resistance should be mobilized against the practice of railroading noninsane elderly folk to mental hospitals. Expanded community provision for housekeeping services and home nursing could keep many enfeebled old folk at home while helping to relieve family tensions.

4. Adequate alternatives to mental-hospital care must be devised for mentally enfeebled old folks. Some States are stepping up their family-care programs, placing more mentally enfeebled patients, including the aged, in selected private homes where they can obtain individualized attention and be more content than they can in mental hospitals.

5. Many experts agree with Dr. Boyd, of the Mayo Clinic, who urges the establishment by all States of a new type of institution for mentally enfeebled old people who cannot be kept at home. These institutions, exclusively for the aged, would be built on the colony or village plan—to minimize physical dangers while permitting maximum freedom of movement.

Such State homes, says Dr. Boyd, should be large enough to be operated economically and yet small enough to provide individualized attention. The staff would include physicians with special interest in geriatrics—the treatment of old age—together with nurses, occupational and recreational therapists, and social workers. The residents would be encouraged to use the skills they still have to the utmost degree compatible with their physical reserves.

This may sound visionary to the uninformed. But such a set-up would actually cost us no more than the wasteful practice of consigning the elderly noninsane to expensive buildings equipped for active hospital treatment. It would help restore public mental hospitals to their primary function of active curative treatment. And it would help erase from our souls the stigma of tolerating such an evil as railroading the sane to "insane" asylums.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolutions on civil rights adopted at the eleventh constitutional convention of the CIO on October 31 to November 4, 1949.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION III

Civil rights and the extension of democracy

We of the Congress of Industrial Organizations are proud of the American quest for liberty and the struggle for equality. We seek to implement this great heritage. We are dedicated to the responsibility for furthering economic opportunity, religious freedom, and political participation. Our ultimate goal is full economic, political, and social equality for all groups and individual American citizens in thought, expression, and action, without discrimination because of race, creed, or national origin.

Our American heritage of freedom and equality has given us prestige among the nations of the world and a strong feeling of national pride at home. There is much reason for that pride. But pride is a poor substitute for steady and honest performance, and the record shows that at varying times in American history the gulf between ideals and practice has been shockingly wide. We have had human slavery. We have religious persecution. We have mob violence. We have erected an elaborate system of legal segregation based on race. We have shown at times a complete disregard for the constitutional rights of minorities with whose ideas the majority disagrees.

Our system of segregation that the dead hand of the past has fastened upon our generation does not only establish a system of segregation enforced by the sanction of law, but it penalizes the citizen who has no prejudices. A citizen who desires his children to be educated with all the children in the community, both black and white, is forbidden this privilege by law. These laws do not only merely carry out the prejudices of some members of the community; they compel everybody else to abide by such prejudices. The effects of segregation are not confined to those who are colored. They extend to everyone; they bear vitally upon the interest of the Nation as a whole.

To be free, man must be subject to discipline by society only for the commission of offenses clearly defined by law and only after trial by due process of law. Preservation of civil liberties is the highest duty of every government, whether it be Federal, State, or local. Wherever the law enforcement measures and the authority of government are unused or inadequate to discharge this primary function of government, this authority must be strengthened.

Recognizing these facts, President Truman created the President's Committee on Civil Rights on December 5, 1946, with the specific responsibility of preparing recommendations for more effective means and procedures for the protection of the civil rights of the people of the United States.

The findings and recommendations of this committee, in the form of the report, To Secure These Rights, will rank in history as a charter for human dignity and freedom. With courage and devotion to these principles the President has steadily moved forward to implementing them. He has requested each succeeding Congress to translate this report into legislative reality. He has implemented the report by Executive orders. Progress is being made in the Armed Forces—slow, but the trend is forward. The Department of Justice petitioned the Supreme Court to outlaw racially restrictive covenants in housing. The Department of Justice petitioned the Supreme Court during the October 1949 term to declare segregation in interstate travel illegal.

The CIO wholeheartedly supports President Truman's civil rights program. We are determined to secure the adoption of these recommendations on the Federal and State level. We feel that the enactment of this program will enable America to actual practice to show the world that we intend to close the gap between our stated ideals and our day-to-day practices. We firmly oppose segregation based upon race, wherever it exists, and pledge our efforts toward the elimination of segregation. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Eleventh Constitutional Convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations hereby pledges itself to continue the struggle to achieve the full, equal enjoyment of all the rights guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin.

We recommend:

That each CIO affiliate create a Civil Rights Committee or Department on Fair Practices within its respective organization; and that each International union seek to have incorporated in their collective bargaining agreements non-discrimination clauses particularly pertaining to hiring.

We demand:

1. The passage of Federal and State Fair Employment Practice Acts.

2. The enactment of a Federal anti-lynching bill.

3. The passage of Federal and State legislation outlawing poll taxes and other restrictions on the right to vote.

4. The abolition of segregation in the armed forces.

5. The passage of measures to ban segregation in interstate travel.

6. The enactment of safeguards against racial discrimination in Federal appropriations for State aid.

7. The enactment of civil rights laws in all States which now do not have such laws eliminating segregation.

8. The abolition of the Wood committee.

9. The enactment of laws protecting aliens long resident in the United States and regularizing their status.

10. The establishment of guarantees to protect the freedom of thought and the freedom of political views of Government workers and the revocation of Executive Order 9835.

Resolution 81

Due process in loyalty and security cases

The constitutional rights of the individual under our democratic American system require that he shall not be put in jeopardy or have his opportunity to earn a livelihood impaired or destroyed or have his reputation and peace of mind destroyed without a full and fair hearing subject to all the constitutional safeguards of our system of law.

It is the duty of our Government to protect the Nation against spies, saboteurs in the service or interest of foreign powers and agents acting to undermine or overthrow our Government. But it is equally the duty of our Government to make sure that the security measures employed to protect our democracy do not destroy the very democratic rights they are designed to protect. The most subtle and deadly advantage that totalitarianism can win is for democracy to destroy itself in its effort to defeat the upside-down morality of totalitarian states in which the individual becomes the creature, tool, and slave of dictatorial rule by terror. Thus would be accomplished the atomization of the masses which Hitler declared desirable and which the late Justice Rutledge denounced in declaring unconstitutional the attempt of the Taft-Hartley Act to prevent political action by workers through their unions.

The irresponsible, witch-hunting, headline-seeking proceedings of the House Un-American Activities Committee over the years have created an atmosphere of hysteria which, heightened by the cold war between democracy and aggressive totalitarianism, seriously endangers every individual's democratic rights. This hysteria does more to defeat than to accomplish the legitimate purpose of national security. We cannot be strong if every man is afraid of his brothers. That is not freedom; it is the paralyzing tyranny of fear.

Loyalty and security investigations of government employees and workers in private employment engaged in classified government contracts lack the safeguards which are essential to a fair hearing and they frequently violate the democratic rights of the individuals accused. The all too frequent use of unevaluated, unverified accusations by the security and investigatory agents in loyalty and security investigations, has brought to light the hazards to which loyal citizens are subjected without their knowledge and without opportunity to protect themselves.

Investigations, charges, hearings and dismissals carried on in this irresponsible manner have marked men and women for life, have impaired their ability to earn a living, and have irreparably damaged the reputations of themselves and their families. They have been punished without fair trial.

When applied to workers in private employment, loyalty and security investigations and dismissals conducted in this manner impair the morale of all workers in the plants, interfere with their union organizing activities and threaten their right to be effectively represented in the processing of grievances and in collective bargaining by shop stewards and union officers of their own choosing. Citizens of democratic nations who are known anti-Communist liberals, including democratically elected delegates to union conventions, have arbitrarily been barred from entry into the United States without stated cause or fair and timely hearing. Thus the rule of fear started by the Un-American Activities Committee spreads out to undermine the rights of individuals as citizens, and now, as the arms program and the atomic energy program expand, threatens to destroy the democratic unions of free workers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, This Convention of the CIO calls upon President Truman to create a national commission of outstanding citizens from all walks of life to make an exhaustive review of all so-called loyalty and security procedures of all agencies of the Government, and to report and recommend measures that will fully protect the democratic rights of every individual while guaranteeing the necessary measure of national security.

The procedure employed to determine loyalty or reliability in a security sense of accused persons, including the procedures employed in deportation proceedings, must be revised to provide all the safeguards of our system of law which forms the basis of protection of civil rights. The accused must be presumed innocent until proven guilty. He must be informed of the charges against him and the evidence upon which such charges are based. He must have the right to be represented by counsel and must be given the opportunity to face and question his accusers. He must not be presumed guilty merely by alleged association with alleged subversive organizations, and the listing by the Attorney General of alleged subversive organizations without full and fair public hearings must be discontinued, and any organization listed as subversive by the Attorney General shall have the right to a full judicial review.

The decision must be made by responsible and informed persons competent to distinguish between rumor and evidence and who understand and respect our democratic ideals of due process, who clearly see and respect the distinction between disloyalty on the one hand and belief in a liberal social and economic philosophy or adherence to unpopular ideas on the other, and who appreciate the value of untarnished democratic ideals and practices in the global contest between the idea of freedom and the idea of totalitarianism.

The accused person must have the right to appeal an adverse decision to the regularly constituted courts.

In every case, employees who are cleared of charges of disloyalty or unreliability in a security sense must be given notice thereof and must be reimbursed for costs and loss of income caused by such loyalty or security procedures, and notice that they have been cleared of such charges must be given to all neighbors, friends, and others who were interviewed in the course of the investigation.

We applaud the courageous defense of academic freedom by those colleges and universities which defied the presumptuous attempt of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to censor textbooks, and who have opposed the loyalty oath, and we renew our demand for the abolition of that committee.

We endorse such measures as H. R. 14 by Congresswoman DOUGLAS, of California, which proposes to define rules for the conduct of investigations by all congressional investigating committees so as to protect the rights of persons appearing before such committees.

Resolution 62

Discrimination by American Bowling Congress

The constitution of the American Bowling Congress restricts membership in its affiliated associations to "individuals of the white male sex."

The American Bowling Congress exercises a monopoly of the sport of bowling and ousts from membership individuals who participate in tournaments which it does not approve.

The American Bowling Congress has consistently refused to change its discriminatory and monopolistic policies.

Proceedings to revoke the Illinois charter of the American Bowling Congress have been urged upon the State of Illinois and upon Cook County, Ill., by President Philip Murray, Secretary-Treasurer James B. Carey, Illinois IUC President Joseph Germano, regional director of the United Auto Workers, Pat Greathouse, and CIO Regional Director Michael Mann, and such proceedings have been instituted by John S. Boyle, States attorney: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, We commend our officers and we commend States Attorney Boyle for bringing about this action to revoke the charter of the American Bowling Congress and we urge them to continue in their efforts to rid the sport of bowling of this monopoly control and of this discrimination against Negroes.

We urge all CIO councils and international unions to discourage participation by their members in ABC leagues and tournaments, and to support bowling establishments, and leagues and tournaments where all people may bowl without discrimination.

Resolution 80

Amnesty for conscientious objectors

It is our firm belief that men who, under the compulsion of conscience, take a stand against military conscription in peacetime do not merit confinement in penitentiaries or the resulting loss of civil rights. Such treatment of a minority violates basic human and democratic principles of individual liberty and freedom of conscience. While we oppose the dangerous trend toward state control of religious and minority belief in other lands, it does not become us to make a crime of conscience in this country.

The legal machinery to stop these prosecutions has already been set up. Provisions exist in our law to get men now imprisoned released and the President has the power to grant an amnesty which would end discrimination against conscientious objectors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The Congress of Industrial Organizations, reaffirming a high tradition of the American labor movement, asks that the prosecution of men solely on account of their conscientious opposition to war cease; and we urge the immediate release of those conscientious objectors currently behind prison bars.

We call upon the President to grant amnesty to all conscientious objectors heretofore convicted for violations of the Selective Service Acts of 1940 and 1948.

(Copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States and to the Attorney General of the United States.)

Formosa: How To Save It From Conquest by Chinese Communists—A Filipino's Suggestions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the island of Formosa is today the most vitally strategic point in the entire Pacific area. In the hands of the Communists it will break the American wall of defense in the western Pacific, exposing the American mid-Pacific and south Pacific region, the Philippines, and Indonesia to Communist strategical and tactical offensive planning.

The question is: What could be done to save Formosa from Chinese Communist conquest? The question is urgent. It must have a definite answer soon.

There is a suggestion that the United States give Gen. Chiang Kai-shek and his remaining Nationalist forces military aid. And yet it is apparent that, despite that aid, it is inevitable that the Communists will capture that island. And then, too, the United States Government is not considering giving that aid for broader reasons of foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared in the Manila Daily Bulletin, published in Manila, Philippines, contains plausible suggestions to save Formosa from Communist conquest. The suggestions are of a legal and political nature whose aim is to remove Formosa from the area of fighting between the Chinese Communist and Nationalists.

Mr. Vicente Villamin, Filipino lawyer, economist and writer, the author of the article, suggests three alternatives: (a) The return of Formosa to Japan and be under General MacArthur's control by the revocation of the Cairo Declaration of 1943 upon the request of Nationalist China; (b) the granting of independence to Formosa by Nationalist China; and (3) the transfer by Nationalist China of Formosa to the United Nations for administration as a trusteeship territory.

Either one of the three alternatives, Mr. Villamin contends, would remove Formosa from the field of belligerency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of Congress to read Mr. Villamin's enlightening and timely article, which follows:

FORMOSA'S HOPE AGAINST CONQUEST

(By Vicente Villamin)

LOS ANGELES, December 8.—The immediate future of Formosa is of vital concern to the security of the Philippines. If it came under the control of the Communists, that security would become exceedingly precarious. It will be recalled that the invasion of the Philippines by the Japanese in the last war came from their military concentrations on Formosa.

What could the Philippines do in the present circumstances to prevent Formosa from falling in the hands of the Chinese Communist government? Practically nothing. And what could the United States do, as obviously the control of Formosa by the Communists would affect disadvantageously her strategic position in the Pacific area and her plans to "contain and counteract" communism in the Far East?

The situation demands a bold and immediate treatment. Formosa could be returned to Japan and thus remove it from the area of belligerency between the Chinese Nationalists and Communists—and its permanent future status left for the forthcoming peace conference to determine. Is this legally feasible?

Formosa was detached from Japanese control after the war and restored to China. This was done in conformity with the Cairo Declaration, issued on December 1, 1943, by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, following their meeting at Cairo, Egypt. By the same declaration, Manchuria and Pescadores Island were similarly restored. This declaration could be rescinded, resulting in Formosa reverting to Japan.

It will be noted that Russia was not represented at the meeting and did not take part in the declaration. Thus if the declaration is to be rescinded as to Formosa and the Pescadores, which were taken over by Japan after the Sino-Japanese War in 1895, it could be done by the three governments of the United States, Great Britain, and Nationalist China. And if it is to be done, it should be effected before Chiang's government totally goes out of existence.

Generalissimo Chiang is reported to be making preparations for stiff resistance to the Communists on Formosa. But military authorities are of the opinion that it would not take long for the Communists to capture that island. If they accomplished that before its political status was changed, then the Communists would have legitimate ground to incorporate the island in the new Chinese Communist Republic.

The rescission of the Cairo declaration with respect to Formosa and the Pescadores, leaving out Manchuria for obvious reasons, would not be politically irregular or diplomatically revolutionary if it were proposed by Generalissimo Chiang himself on behalf of his government. Such a proposal by him would have to be accompanied by his simultaneous stoppage of all war preparations on and the withdrawal of his government from the islands.

Another step Generalissimo Chiang could take to remove Formosa from military and political investment by the Communists would be to grant sovereign independence to that island. There are leading Chinese Formosans who have been working on Formosan independence from Japan and who would welcome now that independence from China. A Formosan Republic would, indeed, be militarily weak and vulnerable to attack by Chinese Communist invaders, but such attack, if unprovoked by Formosan action, would bring the full force of world opinion against it to the point where the Chinese Communists would most likely be convinced that they might lose much more than what they could gain in invading the new island nation.

Of course, once an independent nation, Formosa would have to pursue a policy of strict neutrality, at least until the peace conference was held and her independence firmly established. Later, she might make some arrangements with the United States, like permitting it to have military and naval bases as in the Philippines and placing herself with other far-eastern countries in a position to receive American military assistance.

Still another possibility to segregate Formosa from the area of the present Chinese belligerency would be for the Nationalist government to turn the island over to the United Nations for administration as a trust territory. That would have the effect of placing it, roughly, in a status of a country under a neutralization treaty.

The foregoing suggestions could be taken up on behalf of China after determination of who is the head of the Nationalist government—General Chiang or General Li. The latter is now in the United States, while the former is reported to be in Formosa. The two leaders are both patriotic and anti-Communist, and they would not want to see Formosa fall under Communist domination if they could help it.

Lewis and the Coal Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the President to recognize the current coal crisis, which is not only crippling one of our basic industries, but threatening to slow down or stop completely production in thousands of others, despite the pleadings from every side—is perfidious behavior—and a violation of faith.

When he steadfastly refuses to use the power given him under the special provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, or the Constitution, he places himself in the position of a man whose actions are a direct contradiction of his professed image of longing—the welfare state. This disparity between his actions and his words should not be condoned by the American people.

The President occupies the position of a political magistracy, and while such, is in a position of great trust. It is my opinion that unless the President takes action—and immediate action—he will

be forever ashamed, as a man always is, of the things he has left undone.

The attitude of the Government since 1933—NIRA—has forced both workers and their employers into a state of conciliation which, under the leadership of men like Lewis, of the United Mine Workers, has caused an impasse which threatens to undermine not only the coal industry, but our national economy as well as our national health and safety.

Despite my rigorous efforts to prevent the complete nullification of the Taft-Hartley Act, and I consistently voted for its modification—I have studied the situation which confronts us with the cold impartiality of a neutral judge. And I can only say that I find the present attempt to sabotage the Taft-Hartley Act, one of the most dismaying betrayals of democracy that has ever been perpetrated.

Things have reached an intolerable situation when one man not only can, but does so ruthlessly control the destinies of all the members of his union, and who can, and does—either by suggestion or intimation call them out or send them back to suit his whims of the moment, with utter and complete disregard for either their welfare, or that of their families. This same disregard extends to the industry which employs them, and on to the thousands of other industries which are dependent upon it.

This man is too ambitious and too autocratic. His influence is reaching out, by way of trade-unionism, like the tentacles of an octopus until, if he is permitted to continue unchecked by some device, could create such a havoc as will leave us an easy prey to communism.

I call your specific attention to the catch-all union of John L. Lewis. Through this organization, known as District 50, United Mine Workers, and completely apart from his influence in the coal industry by operation of the UMW proper, he can cripple transportation in New York's suburban area, shut off gas in Boston, halt the production of nylon wearing apparel, disrupt the du Pont chemical works, tie up the port of Philadelphia, halt traffic on a dozen railroads, and cause cessation of labor and thus the stoppage of production in a score or more of other important industries.

What is District 50?

I must first point out what it is not:

(a) It is not a district.

(b) It is not No. 50.

(c) It is not a miner's union.

But it is an organization dedicated to the task of grabbing membership in any field or industry not securely controlled by some other powerful union. Its membership, though secret, is rumored to be less than 300,000, but it has more than 300 skilled organizers, working in 68 industries, and has established 1,200 locals in 644 cities of 45 States in the United States and Canada.

It is also reliably reported that district 50 is organizing everything everywhere; that it had contracts with 15 railroads and covers such diverse occupations as salt plants and taxi drivers, and from du Pont's chemical works to entire southern cities. In this last instance I cite Buena Vista, Va., where almost everyone who works for wages pays dues to District 50.

With Lewis and his UMW occupying such an autonomous position in so many industries, it is difficult to understand why he or they should enjoy immunity from prosecution under the antitrust laws, or why these laws should not be amended as suggested by the Senate Banking Committee, to curb labor monopolies.

We are faced with the fact that too much power is concentrated in the hands of one man and his union. We cannot revoke that power, under existing laws, but we can legislate to prevent the complete demoralization of industries like the fuel field. To allow John L. Lewis, or any other labor boss, to exercise monopolistic powers unchecked will, in my opinion, irreparably damage our system of government.

There is a limit at which forebearance ceases to be a virtue. It is impossible to overlook or disregard facts like the following:

The recent telegraphic survey made in the United States, reports widespread suffering and hardships because of the bituminous coal dispute in the 10 following principal bituminous using States: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and Wisconsin.

The shut-down of school systems was reported imminent. Hospitals and institutions face alarming shortages. In several areas a state of emergency has been declared. Rationing has been and is being employed in others, while the machinery for rationing was being set up in the remainder of the 36 towns, all of which reported less than a week's supply of coal. All report that acute suffering has been offset only by mild weather.

Dealers in all 10 States reported they were unable to supply the needs for homes. A majority of coal dealers reported it will be next to impossible to supply home needs even though the mine work week of 5 days is restored at once. The dealers also pointed out that a delay is inevitable even though the President should decide to exercise his powers to order the restoration of the 5-day workweek, as he did in 1946.

Precedent for Presidential action is set by the fact that since the Taft-Hartley law went into effect the White House has acknowledged seven disputes in the national emergency category. Six court injunctions have been issued as a result of pleas by the Attorney General at the direction of the President. They were:

March 19, 1948: Strike of atomic energy workers at Oak Ridge.

April 21, 1948: Strike of United Mine Workers.

August 25, 1948: Strike of the International Longshoremen.

June 14, 1948: Strike of the Maritime Union workers—west coast.

June 14, 1948: Strike of the National Maritime Union—Great Lakes.

June 23, 1948: Strike of the National Maritime Union.

In the seventh case, involving a packing house strike, the White House appointed a board of inquiry, but no injunction was sought.

Unfortunately the precedents deliberately established by the Chief Executive, regarding the antics and tactics of the United Mine Workers' Mr. Lewis, may make it difficult for him to do an about-face, in his general attitude toward the UMW, especially when it might mean using the law he has tried so hard to outlaw. However, Henry Clay said in his speech on appointments and removals in the United States Senate on February 18, 1835, "Precedents which have never been reexamined can not be conclusive."

But should the President not choose to use the act he has found so distasteful he has no such excuse for the general-welfare clause of the Constitution. Under this clause he could intervene in this national catastrophe, as is his privilege when the best interests of the people of the United States are threatened.

I call these facts on the coal strike briefly to your attention:

June 30, 1949: The contract between the United Mine Workers and the operators expired. John L. Lewis put miners on a 3-day workweek without making his demands known to the public.

September 19: Lewis called a total strike of the Nation's soft-coal miners as a protest against the withholding of welfare royalty payments by some southern operators who claimed they could not meet the payments on a 3-day production schedule.

November 9: Lewis, without explanation suddenly called off this strike and all restrictions on coal production were lifted by him for 3 weeks.

December 1: Lewis, again without explanation, ordered miners back to a 3-day workweek.

He announced new contracts signed with independent coal mines and his union, but did not disclose the high-handed methods he used. In two instances he closed down mines completely, not even permitting them a 3-day workweek, and it was reported by a prominent Washington columnist that he had sworn and signed affidavits by the owners of those mines, namely the Cove Fork Coal Co. and the Elkhorn Coal Co., both in Pike County, Ky., and operated by Jack Picklesimer and Fon M. Johnson, who stated they were expected to sign contracts they were not allowed to see or study.

I quote from the column, the Washington Merry-Go-Round, in the Washington Post, which appeared Saturday, December 31, 1949, in which the statements of Picklesimer and Johnson appeared:

> We were called to a meeting at the United Mine Workers' headquarters of the truck mine operators on December 2, 1949, at 6 o'clock. We attended, and Sam Caddy, president of the United Mine Workers, District 30, proposed that we sign a contract with the mine workers which was to extend to September 1, 1951.
>
> A part of the terms were disclosed to us. Included in the terms about which we were told was a 95-cents-per-day increase in wages, a 15-cents-per-ton increase in the welfare fund payments, and a broadening and alteration of the "able and willing" clause which, we were told was to enable the mine workers to control the production of the various mines in the country to prevent an overproduction of coal.

January 4, 1950: Despite President Truman's insistence that the coal strike had not created a national emergency, the Interstate Commerce Commission held that a national emergency did in fact exist, and ordered all coal-burning passenger service reduced by one-third by January 8. This order is effective for 60 days, and, of course, would be rescinded should the conditions in the coal industry improve.

But I call your attention to the fact that 27 percent of the total passenger service in this country is operated by coal-burning steam locomotives. The other 73 percent are either Diesels or electric, or are, as in the cases of railroads in the Southwest, have converted their equipment to use oil in steam engines.

At the time the cut in operation was ordered few of the railroads in the country had more than a 25-day supply, whereas they normally keep from 30 to 40 days' supply on hand. The railroads as a whole averaged a 19-day supply. Six or seven of the railroads in the country were reported already at the danger stage, having less than 10 days' supply on hand.

In the opinion of the Interstate Commerce Commission a 3-day workweek is not sufficient for this time of year when normally 13,000,000 to 14,000,000 tons are mined in full production. Only about 7,000,000 to 8,000,000 tons can be mined during the curtailed week, leaving a shortage of more than 5,000,000 tons. Should the country be hit by a severe cold wave, such as resulted in the deaths of 30 people over the week end, in less than 2 weeks we would have no coal at all. Our supplies would be completely depleted.

On January 6, 1950, faced by the seriousness of the coal situation of which the President refuses to take cognizance, Democratic Members of both the House and Senate pleaded with him to take action, and as a direct result have been thrown into one of the most grave situations in their history. This serves to emphasize the unworthiness and the why of his reluctance to use, and his campaign against the Taft-Hartley Act, which is gaining support daily from earnest and conscientious men who put the needs of their constituents, and the welfare of the country as a whole, above their party politics.

Their appeal came 3 days after the President, in his state of the Union message renewed his demand for the repeal of the labor statute, which would leave the country facing the same old abuses it suffered under the Wagner Labor Act passed in 1935, in which there were no provisions for checking arrogance and autocratic power, when wielded unjustly, to the detriment of the public interests, like Mr. Lewis is now exercising.

The President's reluctance to act might charitably be construed that he does not want to act in haste—or that he does not honestly believe that the crisis does exist—these reasons might be understandable—but his continued attack on the law itself is not. The law is designed, not to punish unions, but to protect the people from excessive punishment and hardships at the hands of irresponsible labor leaders, such as Mr. Lewis has proven himself to be, and from irresponsible employers and owners as well.

On January 9, 1950, Lewis pulled his miners out of the pits of two of the biggest soft-coal producers—Consolidation Coal Co., and the United States Steel Corp. By midweek this walk-out increased until about 60,000 miners in 7 States were completely idle and more than 400,000 tons of daily production were eliminated from the Nation's shrinking coal supply, and its rapidly dwindling stock pile.

This was possible under the contracts signed July 8, 1947, by 75 percent of the soft-coal operators, in which the "able and willing" clause appeared for the first time, and which was designed to write the United Mine Workers out from under the Taft-Hartley Act. This same contract increased hourly pay 44½ percent—the largest per hour increase granted any union in any industry since the beginning of the war. And it nearly doubled the total average increase granted both the CIO and the AFL unions. In addition the welfare and retirement fund royalties were increased to 10 cents per ton, for the period ending June 30, 1948.

The 3-day order has been denounced by the Senate Banking Committee, who declared in their report made after a survey last summer, that this order by Lewis imposing the short week, was the very antithesis of collective bargaining. They not only admit but agree that Lewis has been pursuing for months the policy of curtailing production in order to force operators to accede to his contract demands.

Neither the President, nor Robert N. Denham, general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, whom 45 mine groups had asked to end the short workweek, made any move to take action on the demands made upon them—that they seek court injunctions to force the miners back to a 5-day week.

On January 11, Lewis ordered these 60,000 to 75,000 striking miners back to a 3-day workweek beginning the 16th. As the coal strike progresses the coal operators are filing unfair labor practice charges against Lewis and his mine union before the National Labor Relations Board. Mr. Lewis' only comment was that the only issue at present in the labor dispute is wages.

The President was again besought by Members of both House and Senate to invoke an antistrike injunction—on a regional basis in Indiana and Michigan, and in any other place where there is an emergency.

Others were busy seeking legislative weapons, and in ascertaining whether or not Mr. Lewis can be prosecuted under the antitrust laws, and whether or not they are applicable to unions such as the United Mine Workers.

Mine owners again declared that all of the off-and-on-again strikes were simply harrassment to needle them into accepting the UMW demands for a 95 cents per day wage increase from the present $14.05, and a 35-cent instead of a 20-cent tonnage royalty for the miner's pension fund, and for a further easing of the able-and-willing clause. They point out that their employees have lost, because of the strikes in 1949, more than $1,000 in wages per union mine worker.

The Southern Coal Producers' Association, in their letter to the President of January 12, asked that he instruct the Attorney General to ascertain whether or not Lewis and the UMW could be prosecuted for an illegal conspiracy in restraint of trade. They also asked that if such action is impossible under existing laws and the decisions of the courts that Congress should amend the antitrust laws so that unions and their leaders can no longer willfully and recklessly use their monopoly powers.

I quote the following from their letter:

> If a combination of employers to restrain trade and curtail production is against the public welfare, why is not the restraint of trade and curtailment of production in a basic industry by a union against the public welfare?

Not only the Southern Coal Producers found it impossible to bargain successfully with the union this year, but all others as well, who did not completely capitulate to Mr. Lewis' demands—especially as far as the "able and willing" clause is concerned in a new contract.

It is through this clause that Lewis not only hopes to evade the restrictions of the Taft-Hartley Act, but to set himself up as the marketing boss of the bituminous-coal industry as well, and through this power measure out coal to the country.

The Southern Coal producers further point out that the country's coal supply was the smallest in a period covering 25 years, and considerably under the levels when the President twice declared national emergencies. According to available statistics, the Nation's stock pile had dipped to 23,000,000 tons, most of which is in the hands of steel companies and large utilities, while most consumers had little more than a ton or two.

In November 1946, before the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, the President first used the weapon of injunction to force the miners to end a strike, by declaring a national emergency. In March of 1948, President Truman again declared an emergency, using the 80-day Taft-Hartley injunction to end a mine strike over pensions.

On both these occasions, according to Joseph E. Moody, president of the Southern Coal Producer's Association, the coal supplies were larger than they are today, and that only once in the last 25 years has the total national supply of coal dipped below the 25,000,000 mark, and that was in June 1933—at the bottom of the depression.

If, in 1946—and again in 1948, the President could recognize a national crisis when he saw one—and hasten to corrrect it by declaring a national emergency—what is wrong with his eyesight today?

Since 1947 in the southern area alone, there have been 414 work stoppages during which 483,552 man-days were lost and

more than 2,812,000 tons of coal were lost because of these wildcat strikes—at a time when there was a demand for every ton of coal produced.

He insists there is no emergency in the face of the foregoing facts, and refuses to act—despite urgent demands from every side—but it is not reasonable to assume he will not allow himself to be aware of the following facts:

Coal producers in Pennsylvania are threatening to stop all research and experiments to produce liquid fuel from coal.

That due to wildcat strikes called by Lewis the export market has been practically lost, due to the fact they could not get the grades or sizes of coal they needed in sufficient quantities to supply their markets, and countries who have borrowed money from us to finance their rehabilitation have been forced to divert coal scheduled for other purposes to make up the deficit, which slows down their recovery program and takes more dollars out of the taxpayers' pockets.

Schools, churches, and other public buildings face the prospect of being closed even if the miners return to a 3-day workweek. Factories, industries, and manufacturing plants face shut-downs so that the coal they normally consume can be channeled into household furnaces, thereby throwing countless thousands out of work.

This year, for the first time since the war, the operators in all sections face problems created by a shrinking demand for coal and increasingly stiff competition from oil and gas.

Prices have dropped and further reductions may be necessary to prevent additional inroads on the coal market. In 1942 coal accounted for 51.4 percent of the country's supply of energy. Last year the figure was cut to 42.4 percent, and will take a further drop as industries tire of the cat-and-mouse game of Mr. Lewis which keeps them on the griddle of suspense.

These drops, coupled with the development of enormously productive new mine machinery, create problems also for the members of Mr. Lewis' union, as well as for the operators. In 1923 there were 704,793 men employed in the soft coal fields. Last year a larger quantity of coal was mined by 435,000 men. In less than 10 years it is forecast that only 250,000 men will be required to keep the country in coal.

The first concern of the public is a stabilized coal supply. There must be no stoppage of work. To prevent such occurrences there must be invoked the legal tenets compatible with the situation at hand.

It was in the public interest that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States made their telegraphic survey of 36 cities—all of which reported critical shortages—most of them having less than a week's supply.

In the face of this report the President issued a statement at a news conference that he had no immediate plans to restore full coal production by using the Taft-Hartley Act's injunction emergency powers against Mr. Lewis and his union.

Following the President's statement a further report by the Senate Banking Committee suggested a bill forbidding labor to monopolize control of industry. Such a measure, the report said, would stop the usurpation and abuse of power as demonstrated by the 3-day-work-week order. Seven Democrats and three Republicans made up the committee membership. Their report has been sent to the Senate Judiciary Committee, which attends to antitrust legislation.

Mr. Ben Moreell, president of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., of Pittsburgh, suggested that the 7-month coal contract dispute between Mr. Lewis and the mine operators could be settled on the lines of the agreement which ended last fall's big steel strike.

He went on record as saying:

> J. & L. wants its miners to receive the same dependable pensions, insurance, and social benefits as all our other employees, and it is willing to extend to the miners the same plan for these benefits as it now has in effect for all of our other wage earners.

You will remember that the steel strike referred to was settled through a fact-finding board, appointed by the President, which recommended that the steel workers receive monthly pensions of $100 per month, plus social insurance.

Announcement has also been made that several Federal agencies have been unable to attract bids for coal supplies, and that the Interior Department was also making a survey. It was reported that Army camps within, and surrounding the District, are virtually without coal.

Following its survey, Herman W. Steinkraus, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, proposed, when the President failed to take action, that the Department of Labor be reorganized to promote peace between the worker and the boss and that this Department should then be called the Department of Labor and Management, to meet the requirements of the times, and added:

> When the Labor Department was established in 1913—to promote the welfare of wage earners, improve their working conditions and advance their employment opportunities, labor needed the assistance of the Government to correct injustices and encourage fair bargaining between labor and management. This has been accomplished.

Robert N. Denham, general counsel for the National Labor Relations Board, issued a statement revealing how an important law has been sabotaged and its principals ignored just because the President of the United States, who appoints the members of the Board, does not like the statute and is urging its repeal.

The Constitution stipulates that a President when he takes the oath of office must swear to execute the laws of the land. Civil officers and members of the boards take the same oath.

Mr. Denham had this to say about the National Labor Relations Board:

> When you have spent 10 years or so, saturated with the statutory and administrative theory that one segment of our economic society must be protected, no matter what, and that the offsetting segment of that society must be saddled with the blame for everything that happens, even though the actual offender may be frequently found in the protected group, that kind of thinking and acting is hard to eradicate.

CIO President Philip Murray urged President Truman to remove Denham from office, saying that he had again demonstrated his antilabor bias, and his unfitness for office.

Joseph A. Bierne, president of the CIO communication workers, accused Denham of stalling labor cases, which would be helpful to unions.

Al Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists, unaffiliated, said he was "shocked" that a responsible public official of the Government "should use his high office to cast doubt on the integrity of that agency and agitate among employers to nullify its work."

Mr. Denham's reply to his unionistic critics was to the effect that he might be expected to seek a writ against the UMW which would in effect accuse them of "unfair" practices and using coercion in contract dealings with operators. He is now studying the mine operator's requests for an injunction against the 3-day workweek, production stoppage, and failure to bargain collectively.

There has been word from the coal fields that many of the men would not respond to the "request" of Mr. Lewis that they return to the mines on a 3-day basis. In many sections they have voted to stay away. They are reported both angry and impatient over the failure of Mr. Lewis to obtain contracts after a 6 months' delay with which to replace the industry-wide agreement which expired last June 30. So far 68,000 remain idle in 7 States.

"It's 5 days or nothing," one miner remarked after his Pennsylvania local had decided to stay on strike. "We're tired of going in, then going out, then going in again."

Another reason for the discontent of the miners is the mismanagement and squandering of their welfare fund. This unforeseen collapse of union benefits, coupled with the erratic work schedule imposed by Lewis, has dumped unbudgeted relief obligations on local authorities.

This fund was established in 1946, and coal was taxed 5 cents per ton to raise money for its operations. In the 1948 contract, the tax had risen to 20 cents per ton, and Mr. Lewis now demands 15 to 20 cents in addition to keep it going. This would amount to $175,000,000 to $200,000,000 per annum, and is added to the cost of producing coal, and without any guaranty to the miners that the trustees of the fund would not dissipate it again because it is still set up to operate on an unsound actuarial basis, as it was when payments were suspended on September 17, 1949.

For the benefit of the miners this fund should be put on a sound actuarial basis with the standards of benefits and the rules of eligibility clearly established, and written into the contracts covering this fund signed by the union and the operators, instead of being squandered as mad money.

Announcement has also been made by prominent members of the Senate Labor Committee that influential Democrats will attempt to see that there is no action taken in the current congressional session to write a new labor-management law or strengthen the teeth of the present Taft-Hartley law.

Apparently this is the decision of the CIO and AFL high command, aided and abetted by President Truman and the politicians in the Democratic Party who think they have a prize issue on which to gain a bigger majority for their party in Congress in 1950.

It means that all efforts to get a two-sided law which would be fair to labor and management alike, are to be abandoned in favor of a drive to obtain at the polls a majority dedicated to the principle of special privilege and monopolistic power by single economic groups over the lives and rights of others.

For 2 years now, since the Taft-Hartley Act was passed, union-labor bosses, who brazenly promise blocks of votes—regimented by economic coercion—in return for special legislative favors, have fought against any course of mutual concessions and have insisted instead on an extreme position of all or none. They have served notice that they want the old Wagner Act, with its provisions loaded in behalf of labor unions, restored.

And this, despite the fact that labor unions have enjoyed the largest membership and their greatest gains under collective-bargaining processes that they have known in all the previous history of the trade-union movement in America.

And although President Truman has called the act punitive and one-sided a national survey of opinion is not shared generally by voters outside of labor union circles. One in six said laws governing unions are too strict. Vote of labor union members interviewed showed that 29 percent felt they were too strict; 35 percent felt they were about right; 23 percent felt they were not strict enough; only 13 percent had no opinion.

Congress then, has no reason to wait for invocation of the Taft-Hartley Act by the President before it takes action on this phenomenon of industrial dictatorship.

What the Nation must deal with is something far more serious than a temporary paralysis of industry and commerce because of a deadlock between employers and a powerful union.

Mr. Lewis has asserted a one-man control over a great industry on which a vast number of factories, plants, power plants, railroads, and private homes are dependent for fuel. He says in effect that the industry must meet his demands or cease to operate.

Even during the war he called four strikes to force his edicts—and since that time has repeatedly interrupted coal production for the same purpose.

His conviction for contempt of court for extending a strike in the face of judicial orders has not restrained him.

The immediate problem before Congress is how to go about ending dictation of the Lewis brand—the President may veto any action we might take on the matter—but we cannot escape our responsibility.

Unless Congress is willing to let both industry and the rank and file of miners go through the wringer at the autonomous dictation of this tyrant, we must take up this problem from a more basic viewpoint than the 80-day injunction clause.

A miners' union is a necessity to keep conditions from reverting to where they were 20 years ago. But the operators must also be protected in certain details and left to exercise their managerial duties based on sound business, and with the welfare of the people, as a whole, firmly in mind.

Lewis has fought a long battle against the Government—putting himself above it. There are still those who strongly believe he should have been tried for treason in both World Wars. His record as a whole is a most unsavory one.

A world to be rebuilt needs coal—and the things it makes possible to manufacture.

We are all being enjoined by the people of the United States to substitute reason for tyrannical action, and to this end, I wish to go on record as recommending not only strong legislative restrictions, but the establishment of a permanent fact-finding board to handle all such disputes as may arise between labor and management; and that this board be nonpolitical, so that it may be free from any arbitrary compulsion, with the full power and the dignity of the Government behind it.

What Price Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by Robert M. Hutchins, chancelor, University of Chicago, before the Chicago University convocation in June 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT PRICE FREEDOM?

We hear on every side that the American way of life is in danger. I think it is. I also think that many of those who talk the loudest about the dangers to the American way of life have no idea what it is and consequently no idea what the dangers are that it is in.

You would suppose, to listen to these people, that the American way of life consisted in unanimous tribal self-adoration. Down with criticism; down with protests; down with unpopular opinions; down with independent thought. Yet the history and tradition of our country make it perfectly plain that the essence of the American way of life is its hospitality to criticism, protest, unpopular opinions, and independent thought. A few dates like 1620, 1776, and 1946 are enough to remind us of the motives and attitudes of our ancestors. The great American virtue was courage.

We ought to be afraid of some things. We ought to be afraid of being stupid and unjust. We are told that we must be afraid of Russia, yet we are busily engaged in adopting the most stupid and unjust of the ideas prevalent in Russia, and are doing so in the name of Americanism. The worst Russian idea: are the police state, the abolition of freedom of speech, thought, and association, and the notion that the individual exists for the state. These ideas are the basis of the cleavage between east and west.

Yet every day in this country men and women are being deprived of their livelihood, or at least their reputation, by unsubstantiated charges. These charges are then treated as facts in further charges against their relatives or associates. We do not throw people into jail because they are alleged to differ with the official dogma. We throw them out of work and do our best to create the impression that they are subversive and hence dangerous, not only to the state, but also to everybody who comes near them.

The result is that every public servant must try to remember every tea party his wife has gone to in the past 10 years and endeavor to recall what representatives of which foreign powers she may have met on these occasions. A professor cannot take a position on any public question without looking into the background of everybody who may be taking the same position on the same question. If he finds that any person who is taking the same position on this question has been charged with taking an unpopular position on another question, the professor had better not take any position on this question, or he may be haled before some committee to explain himself.

Is this the American way of life? The great American word is freedom, and in particular, freedom of thought, speech, and assembly. Asserting the dignity of man, and of every man, America has proclaimed and protected the freedom to differ. Each man is supposed to think for himself. The sum of the thoughts of all is the wisdom of the community. Difference, disagreement, discussion decided by democratic processes are required to bring out the best in the citizens. America has grown strong on criticism. It would be quite as consistent with the American way of life to offer prizes for the most penetrating criticism of our country as it would be to offer prizes to those who have done the best job of advertising it.

The heart of Americanism is independent thought. The cloak-and-stiletto work that is now going on will not merely mean that many persons will suffer for acts that they did not commit, or for acts that were legal when committed, or for no acts at all. Far worse is the end result, which will be that critics, even of the mildest sort, will be frightened into silence. Stupidity and injustice will go unchallenged because no one will dare to speak against them.

To persecute people into conformity by the nonlegal methods popular today is little better than doing it by purges and pogroms. The dreadful unanimity of tribal self-adoration was characteristic of the Nazi state. It is sedulously fostered in Russia. It is to the last degree un-American.

American education has not been constructed on such un-American principles. In general, the practice has been to give the student the facts, to try to help them learn to think, and to urge him to reach his own conclusions. It is not surprising that the heart of American education is the same as that of Americanism: It is independent thought. American education has not tried to produce indoctrinated automatons, but individuals who can think, and who will think always for themselves. The basic principle of American Government, and one that accounts for the importance of education in this country, is that if the citizens

learn to think and if they will think for themselves, the Republic is secure. The basic principle of the Russian dictatorship is that the people cannot think or cannot be trusted to think for themselves.

The American doctrine rests on the proposition that it is the individual himself that counts. It is not who his father was, or how much money he has, or what his color or creed is, or what party he belongs to, or who his friends are, but who and what is he. So the test of a teacher is whether he is competent. The professional competence of a teacher is hardly a question on which lay bodies, or even administrators or trustees, would wish to pass without the advice of persons professionally competent in the teacher's field.

If we apply any other test than competence in determining the qualifications of teachers we shall find that pressures and prejudice will determine them. In 1928 it was said that Al Smith could not be President because he would be subservient to a foreign power; and today in many places, and if not today it may happen tomorrow, anti-Catholic or anti-Jewish campaigns may mean that teachers who belong to these churches will not be able to practice their profession.

Teachers may be expected to obey the law of the land. But it is still permissible, I hope, to ask whether a law is wise. To discriminate against teachers—to act as though they were all disloyal—and to put them under special legal disabilities seems injudicious if we want able, independent men to go into the teaching profession.

The assumption appears to be that American education is full of Reds, an assumption that is the precise reverse of the truth. All the excitement of the last few years, all the hearings, investigations, and publicity releases, have not turned up more than four or five Communist professors, even though membership in the party has been perfectly legal up to now. To require oaths of loyalty from all because of the eccentricity of an infinitesimal minority is an unnecessary and derogatory act. And, of course, it will not effect any useful purpose; for teachers who are disloyal will certainly be disloyal; they will not shrink from a little perjury.

The way to fight ideas is to show that you have better ideas. No idea is any good unless it is good in a crisis. You demonstrate the failure of your ideas if, when the crisis comes, you abandon them or lose faith in them or get confused about them to the point of forgetting what they are. The American idea is freedom. Freedom necessarily implies that the status quo may come under the criticism of those who think it can be improved. The American idea is that the state exists for its citizens and that changes in society must occur to meet their developing needs. The whole theory of our form of government is a theory of peaceful change. Many of the changes that Marx and Engels demand in the Communist Manifesto have taken place in this country, and they have taken place without communism, without dictatorship, and without revolution, thus disproving, incidentally, one of the central theses of Marx and Engels, that such things cannot be accomplished without communism, dictatorship, and revolution.

These reflections on the Communist Manifesto lead me to say that labeling some thing or some man Communist because Communists happen to favor it or agree with him, that easy process by which one disposes of different views by applying a dirty name to them, involves the negation of thought of any kind. If it had been applied consistently in American history it would have deprived us of some ideas and some men that we are proud to think characteristically American. For example, the Communist Manifesto demands free education for all. Are we therefore to recant, and repudiate the American doctrine of free education for all?

And what would the FBI say of Thomas Jefferson, who calmly remarked in his first inaugural, "If there be any among us who wish to dissolve this Union, or change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed, as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

Jefferson was not in favor of revolution; he was serene in the face of talk of it because he had confidence in our people, in our institutions, in democracy, and in the value, power, and results of independent thought.

We are now in the midst of a cold war. We must protect ourselves against external enemies, their representatives in this country, and any citizens who may be conspiring to overthrow or betray the Government. But the statute books are already filled with laws directed to these ends. It has never been shown that there are so many spies or traitors in this country, or that the external danger is so great and imminent that we have to divert the entire attention of our people into one great repressive preoccupation, into one great counter-revolution in which the freedoms of our citizens must be thrown overboard as too burdensome for the floundering ship of state to carry.

It is useful to remember that Jefferson spoke in 1801, when our Constitution was 12 years old, and when the infant republic was in dreadful danger from deep divisions within and from the wars that were raging between the great powers. If he were right in speaking in such a way at such a time, we cannot be far wrong if now, when America is the most powerful nation on earth, we seek to recapture some of his sanity and courage.

How is the educated man to show the fruits of his education in times like these? He must do it by showing that he can and will think for himself. He must keep his head, and use it. He must never push other people around, or acquiesce when he sees it done. He must struggle to retain the perspective and the sense of proportion that his studies have given him and decline to be carried away by waves of hysteria. He must be prepared to pay the penalty of unpopularity. He must hold fast to his faith in freedom. He must insist that freedom is the chief glory of mankind and that to repress it is in effect to repress the human spirit.

Decline of West Leading to Slav Domination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson which appeared in the Washington Star January 3, 1949, just a year ago. In the year that passed since it was first published there have been few, if any, signs of a reversal of the trend she described, which, unless checked, can lead only to destruction of our civilization. If the decline is not checked the Soviets will not need to make war on the west. All they will need to do is wait with oriental patience and take us over as we go down, country by country, during the next few decades. Where is the leadership to call people to higher and nobler thinking and living, instead of appealing just to men's acquisitiveness and desire for selfish gain?

DECLINE OF WEST LEADING TO SLAV DOMINATION?

(By Dorothy Thompson)

When the history of this epoch is seen in historical perspective and treated by objective historians (if such survive or are revived), it will record that western civilization perished (or came close to perishing) by its own hand.

The tremendous Soviet political victories—which bid fair to fulfill Russian nineteenth-century dreams of an age of the Slavs dominating the globe—have been achieved, in every case, by default of the west. It seems as though western civilization had become too tired to think and too skeptical to hold to the values which hitherto have assured its survival.

A great and brilliant culture—whose supremacy a generation ago was recognized throughout the globe; which gave the world the first concepts of liberty under law; which recognized the menace of unchecked power; which created the most humanistic societies; whose policies were submitted to reason and inhibited by Christian ethics; from which came nine-tenths of modern science; which in the last two centuries produced the most fantastic wealth and so distributed it as to make the poverty of its least fortunate citizens richness, compared to the condition of their predecessors—has fallen into a condition of such self-distrust, mental confusion, false alliances, and indecision as to prepare the way for a receiver who has but to wait to take over the wreckage.

CHARACTERISTICS EVIDENT

The characteristics of a decaying society always show themselves long in advance of its collapse. Such characteristics are the contempt into which traditional values sink; the growth and impudence of criminality and public indifference to it or justification of it; the secularizing of ethical conceptions; the decline in decorum among all classes; an ever-increasing demand for rights and an ever-decreasing sense of obligation and responsibility; the flattery of masses by leadership and the struggle of leaders to keep their power by satisfying every public whim, in default of personality, reason, and principle; the passage of authority from the hands of those who create values, economic or cultural, into the hands of those who control them—the bosses of workers, makers of formulas, filers of papers, catalogers, critics, bureaucrats; the mechanization of politics; the disorder of sexual life; the commercialization of art; the timidity of intellect; the substitution of slogans for ideas.

All these are the way breakers for internal anarchy, leading to foreign rule—opening a great state for barbarians to despoil, and always with the aid of the barbarous forces present within every society.

MUST OVERCOME FLAWS

No great civilization ever has fallen without all these phenomena manifesting themselves long in advance. To attempt to fight those barbarians, the Communists, without overcoming these phenomena is futile. Communism never wins on its own strength; like bacteria it flourishes in the corruption created for it. Every person mocking at sanctities, spreading demagogic slogans, breaking down decorums, defending criminals, laughing at patriotism, agitating mobs, clamoring for spoils, debasing language, scoring principles—all these prepare the ground.

In this country today vigorous and precise intellect wins admiring recognition only in the sciences. But know-how will not save us unless it is combined with know-why. Rome, when the barbarians took it over—and ushered in the 400 years of the dark ages—had reached a point in scientific and engineering civilization with attendant creature comforts which was not again achieved in Europe for a thousand years.

Louis XIV did not have the bathing facilities of the Emperor Hadrian. But running hot water did not save Rome, whose history perennially is worth rereading.

Philip O'Donnell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a copy of my address at the banquet in behalf of Councilor Philip O'Donnell, ward 4, Peabody, Mass., on Saturday, January 14, 1950:

During the 1930's, when so many people looked to Government to provide employment for them, the honor of being a town or city official was not an easy one.

It was not uncommon in those days for the representatives of the people to discontinue their phone service and to have a secret exit from their offices. These were purely defensive measures. By avoiding his constituents, the official would be saved the anguish of saying: "No, no, a thousand times no" to the hundreds seeking jobs for whom there were no jobs.

We have learned much from that grim experience.

By establishing an unemployment compensation system, by setting up old-age pensions, insuring bank deposits, regulating investments, controlling credit, and extending loans to business in times of stress, by means of these and many other devices, we can move swiftly to prevent our economy from going into a tailspin.

It is not the prime purpose of Government to provide jobs for the people. In other countries where the private enterprise system failed to distribute the profits of production on a reasonable basis, the government has taken over completely. Jobs of a kind are provided in return for complete enslavement to the will of the State.

We in this country have a different system. In spite of the need for occasional adjustments, it is a successful system that has and is providing the highest standard of living in the world.

It is by no mere coincidence that this is so. A man not only receives pay for his work, but has the right through voluntary association with his fellow-workers, to have some say concerning the conditions under which he works.

He is a member of the first team, which is composed of labor and management.

Government is the all-American substitute, rushed in to hold the line if and when employment is pushed back too far.

But Government is only the substitute, the stand-by strength upon whom we call when an emergency threatens.

Ours is a competitive system which inspires every man to give his best. The greatest amount of freedom for business and the workers consistent with the public interest pays off. In a totalitarian country a worker does only what he is forced to do. He does not give that extra something to the job, springing from his own belief in it and from his own ambition to improve himself. In the United States, on the other hand, he is encouraged to employ his full talents, and will be paid for the extra contributions he gives to his work. This is not a mere Horatio Alger story. In the arts and sciences, in professional life, in government, and in every business there are cases too numerous to mention where a man started at the very bottom without wealth or influence and made his own way to the top. This is because the doors of opportunity will open to any average man who makes a real and continuing effort.

The danger in our mass-production system is that the worker never gets to meet and know his employer. The worker feels that he is an insignificant cog in the machine and that he is up against something which is too big for him to buck. To compensate for this he joins with his fellow workers in a labor union to build up a collective, balancing strength.

But if he should lose his job through a falling off in orders at the factory where he works, it is hard for him to get a job in another industry because he has no seniority there. He cannot support himself off the vegetable plot in his back yard or by doing handiwork for the neighbors. Unless he has saved and acquired a little capital, it becomes increasingly difficult for him to start up in a private enterprise of his own.

You and I look forward to the day when economic emergencies and wars will be a thing of the past, when taxes can be lowered and Government restrictions eased, to provide a greater opportunity for small business.

In the meantime, it is hard for many people to do it alone. Those graduates of our business and technical schools must now seek their opportunities, and there are many such, within the framework of a big organization already established.

But the individual drive and sturdy independence that built up our country do not always find complete fulfillment in this manner. Every man wants a little elbow room in which he can produce something of value from his own ideas and on his personal initiative.

We cannot afford to lose these precious possibilities in our present concentration on group security.

True there are people who are handicapped by disability, age, or other circumstances beyond their control. By collective action, through which the strong are assessed to help the weak, we are striving to eliminate these economic hazards, and I believe that we will succeed in this objective.

But once that we have established this base, we should then provide encouragement for extra initiative.

How to reconcile the claims of the individual and society is the stand-out problem of our age.

We find this adjustment taking place even in the area of Government.

In the beginning, the community was the Government.

It had a peace officer, a rudimentary school system, and a volunteer fire department. Its fiscal problems were simple, and a small levy on farms and buildings was enough to make both ends meet.

But, in place of yesterday's villages, we now have towns and cities. The art of government is no longer a part-time job. The business of public administration is now big league, requiring a high degree of ability and character.

With an ever-expanding educational system, with the paved highways and traffic problems of the automobile age, and with a host of other civic problems, the modern community has been forced to tax real estate to the point of confiscation in order to raise the necessary revenues. This has not been enough. The States now turn back a certain percentage of their revenues to help the communities.

When the depression paralyzed the American economy and millions of able-bodied people could find no jobs, the Federal Government tried to make up for the slack by borrowing far in excess of its revenues and authorizing make-work projects in each community with the emergency funds at its disposal.

Towns and cities were the beneficiaries of new schools, roads, bridges, and other improvements which they could not have financed otherwise.

The war diverted our energies in other directions. Materials were needed for military purposes. All other construction was postponed, and the ability of cities to provide a gradual replacement of worn-out facilities was deferred indefinitely. Furthermore, with the growing complexity of life in the cities, more extensive public services were needed.

After the war, there was such a tremendous backlog of demand, that the price of construction materials went sky high. Cities and towns had to cut back their programs, waiting for a more favorable opportunity, but this could not continue indefinitely without impairing the functions of local government.

Either the communities would have to seek new sources of revenue through some such medium as a sales tax which is always unpopular and often unfair, or seek grants-in-aid from the Federal Government.

They are doing the latter in meeting the critical housing shortage which faces the veteran and the new family he is establishing. Plainly, this is a large-scale need in most cities, and it deservedly merits top priority.

Other than this, the Federal Government does not contemplate a broad program of grants-in-aid to States and cities at this time for public works. Heavy appropriations for national defense and to implement our foreign policy, will have to be cut before we can make room for other projects.

However, under Public Law 353, the Congress is providing loans or advances to the States and their political subdivisions, such as cities, to aid in financing the blueprints for non-Federal public works to be constructed when the economic situation may make such action desirable.

And under Public Law 725, Federal aid is provided for the construction of hospitals by public or nonprofit organizations. Under this program operated by the United States Public Health Service, the Federal Government assumes one-third of the cost, the State one-third, and the applicant one-third.

My point in citing these laws is to assure you that the communities can get help if they will first help themselves, under the developing program of local, State, and Federal participation. Although it is limited at the present time, I believe that it will expand as the international sky brightens and we can devote more of the resources of the United States Government to the solution of our State and municipal problems.

The comparison I drew between the individual human being and the group of which he is a member may be applied to the individual community in relation to the United States of which it is a part.

Only the people of a city and the members of its local government know its needs and its capacity. There are certain things which only they can do for themselves. In other matters, they require some help from outside.

This banquet is being held in honor of Phil O'Donnell who you have elected to the city council of Peabody. Your judgment in selecting him is proof of his popularity and of the faith and confidence you have in him.

But do not expect Phil or any other member of the city government to do the impossible.

Just try to imagine yourself as a public official and honestly answer these questions:

Would you be able to find jobs for all the people you would like to help?

Would you be able to provide your city with every public improvement it might need immediately and without cost?

The realistic answer to both questions is the same said it is "No."

Phil O'Donnell is a warm-hearted and generous human being who hates to say "No." So why not make it easier for him by not asking? Give him and every man in public life the chance to do their job without having to cut the telephone wires to their offices or to duck out the back alleys as some officials did in the days when government was expected to provide employment for all.

Remember that as your city councilor he needs your help to make Peabody functions as a busy, happy city whose public administration is a source of pride for all of its citizens.

Growing Cotton With a Fox Hole History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, in view of the present discussions among the Members, as well as in the House Committee on Agriculture on the subject of limiting cotton acreages, I would like to present the following letter which came to me this week. It expresses in a few words the difficulties one ex-GI will have if the present limitation is continued on his cotton acreage. It also gives a concise example of the inequalities and inconsistencies of Government controls.

THERMAL, CALIF., *January 8, 1950.*

The Honorable JOHN PHILLIPS
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PHILLIPS: The following is presented as evidence of the inequities of the cotton program:

As a returning GI I invested my life's savings in 160 acres of raw land under the Coachella Valley (Bureau of Reclamation) project. With War Assets Administration credit, I equipped the farm with machinery; with a Federal farm loan, I leveled and piped the land for irrigation; with a Production Credit loan, I raised 100 acres of cotton in 1948 and 138 acres in 1949.

Now, after the Government has loaned me the money to equip for raising cotton, I am told I can plant only 21 acres this season (21 percent of 1948's 100 acres). This means I am out of business. The Government can take my equipment and farm, but that does not solve the inequities of a law which says to an ex-soldier "The boys who stayed home and built up a cotton history are the only ones allowed to raise cotton." By enlisting and putting in 4 years in the service (serial No. 0132040) was I making the wrong kind of history or making history in the wrong place?

Why don't I plant something else? The answer is the same. You can't raise a price-supported crop without a crop history and financing is not available for other than parity crops.

Please do not think of this as concerning an individual. Just multiply it by all the ex-GI's who are being told they cannot farm with a "fox hole history."

Respectfully yours,

ELMER D. PETTY.

The Future of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Henry Hazlitt who writes Business Tides for Newsweek, in the January 16 issue of that magazine, calls attention to a very important matter which this House will soon be called upon to consider again, namely, more money for our foreign-aid programs. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article in question:

The Marshall plan was based on a wrong diagnosis of the sickness of Europe and a wrong conception of its cure. Its sponsors now hail it as a great success. They attribute to it every economic and political improvement in Europe since it was put into effect. Every set-back or deterioration, they explain, has been in spite of the Marshall plan.

This one-way post hoc, ergo propter hoc logic does not seem to be shared by the beneficiaries. In a recent poll conducted for the ECA in Europe, for example, only 4 Frenchmen in every 100 questioned thought the Marshall plan had been a factor in French recovery.

On purely economic grounds, it would do no harm to terminate ERP when the present appropriation expires on June 30. Unfortunately, though there was not the slightest good reason for our doing so, we made an implied promise to the European governments that we would continue our Marshall aid for at least 4 years. We would only bring on recriminations and charges of bad faith if we were to terminate it now.

On the other hand, even the ECA now talks of terminating aid in 1952 and of cutting next year's appropriations by 25 percent below that for the current year. But if ERP is to run for only 2 years more, the logical way to taper off would be to cut the appropriation by one-third now and by a second third for the following year. The appropriation for the current fiscal year was $3,775,000,000. This should be cut to, say, $2,520,000,000 for the 1951 fiscal year and to $1,260,000,000 for 1952.

To cut the appropriation by only 25 percent now would either imply at least a 3 years' continuance or require European governments to make a disproportionate adjustment at the end of the second year. It seems more reasonable to reduce Marshall aid by $1,260,000,000 in each of the next 2 years than to cut it by only $944,000,000 in the first (and second?) year and by the remaining $1,890,000,000 in the third.

In tapering off Marshall aid in this simple, proportionate way, Congress should act as soon as possible—long before the end of the current fiscal year. And it should authorize now the appropriation both for 1951 and 1952. This would give European governments plenty of advance notice concerning how much they could expect to receive from us. It would enable them to make their plans accordingly. It would also forestall what would otherwise be constant propaganda for larger and continuing aid.

The truth is that the amount set for ERP aid has always been an entirely arbitrary figure. To recognize this frankly would lead to enormous administrative simplification. Congress could simply direct that the reduced total sums it appropriated should be divided among the individual governments in the same ratio as in the current year. This would take from ECA officials a burden of decision that should never have been placed upon them.

In fact, the whole ECA bureaucracy was unnecessary from the first. The elaborate ritual of counterpart funds and other such special earmarked accounts is meaningless as a real control. It merely befuddles both Europeans and ourselves. All Congress need do is to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay checks at regular intervals to the ambassadors of the recipient European governments. The ineffective but much-resented interferences of the ECA in the economic policies of these governments would halt. These governments would still have as strong an incentive to reform as any ECA pressure provides. It would be the definite knowledge that the aid was coming to an end.

Such a plan would be far superior to the proposed new clearing union for Europe. This union would be merely one more futile effort to do what the existing International Monetary Fund is already supposed to do. It would actually apply incentives in reverse by giving the most to the countries that succeeded in getting themselves the biggest trade deficits.

If we cannot have sound foreign-aid plans we can at least have simple ones.

President Truman Wants Only Fair Deal Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks, I include a newspaper article released by INS from which I quote:

WANTS ONLY FAIR DEAL CONGRESSMEN

President Truman made it clear today that he wants only Fair Deal Democrats in Congress.

The Chief Executive indicated in strong terms at a Democratic Party gathering that a new purge is on to get rid of those who oppose his program.

This article makes it clear the President is going to purge anyone who opposes his program.

I have always opposed any program which, in my opinion, would lead us down the road to socialism and communism, and I definitely oppose the President's program of taking power from the people back home and placing it in the hands of Federal bureaus here in Washington. I am not in accord with the President's socialized-medicine program and I will continue to strenuously oppose unnecessary Federal expenditures and the philosophy of spend and spend—tax and tax. I am not in accord with his demand for increased taxes nor do I believe in deficit spending. The time has arrived to cut down expenditures, reduce taxes, and apply a reasonable amount to our national debt.

Because I believe as above stated, I will be one who will be on the "get rid of" list of the President. The Fair Deal candidate who will receive the support of the President will be one who agrees with the philosophy of statism and is in accord with the views of President Truman and his Fair Deal. This philosophy, in my opinion, is not in accord with the views and beliefs of the people, Democrats as well as Republicans, of the Seventeenth Ohio District.

Mr. Speaker, the President is to be congratulated for his outright statement which makes the issues of the coming election clearly defined, freedom and security against bureaucratic control and socialism, a challenge I shall gladly accept.

Partition of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the attached article which appeared in the Boston Traveler of Wednesday, December 14, 1949:

DEMANDS ENGLAND BE COMPELLED TO TURN BACK SIX COUNTIES

(By Charles J. O'Malley)

One of the most troublesome problems involved in international affairs is that of the partition of Ireland. It is getting worse instead of better, and the only means of stopping this outrageous injustice against Ireland is to compel England to turn back the six counties which she now holds in Ireland.

The situation would be comparable to that of England if when she lost the Thirteen Colonies in America she claims that the New England States belonged to her and that she was entitled to retain them. How would that stupidity appeal to the Americans of the present day?

It is 29 years since this infamous assault on justice by partition was passed by England. She didn't attempt to do this in India, the Malay Peninsula, or other sections which she was compelled to turn back.

APPLIED SYMMETRY

But England has always been an efficient spoils master and she has applied her methods severely in her treatment of Ireland, going back many centuries. Her reservation of the six counties is not a new achievement. It occurred several hundred years ago. Before the introduction of the feudal English system of tenure, the lands of Ireland belonged to the people of Ireland, but through the efforts of Queen Elizabeth, all of this was destroyed and the property of Ireland was seized for the benefit of English adventurers.

A proclamation was issued then confiscating and vesting the Crown six counties in Ulster—Tyrone, Derry, Donegal, Armagh, Fermanagh, and Cavan, comprising in all three and three-quarter millions of acres.

The scheme of settlement was carefully designed to avoid the errors of former plantations. Those in previous reigns had been acknowledged failures, by reason of the enormous size of the grants made to the "undertakers."

The "undertakers," as Sir Walter Raleigh and his countrymen were called, found their grants too large to settle and farm personally. They returned for the most part to England, took no trouble to plant English farmers in the land, suffered the Irish to remain on the land, and drew their rents in peace.

GROUPED FOR PROTECTION

In Ulster, however, the tracts were to be of manageable extent; the natives were to have locations of their own to which they were to be removed; the new settlers, drawn from England and Scotland, were to be massed and grouped together for mutual protection.

The lands were to be divided into lots of from 1,000 to 2,000 acres, at rents of 3 cents to 5 cents per acre, and distributed partly among the new settlers from Scotland, partly among English servitors, and partly among the well-affected natives.

Every "undertaker" bound himself to plant on the soil a certain number of fee-farmers, leaseholders, artisans, and laborers, down to the lowest grade; all grantees and their tenants were to take the oath of supremacy, and none was permitted to employ natives or Catholics in any capacity whatsoever.

Of the 3,750,000 acres which were confiscated, about one-fifth was valuable or fat land, and this was mainly apportioned in this manner: Fifty Englishmen and 59 Scots (the needy countrymen of the King) got among them 162,500 acres.

TYPICAL NAMES

The most noticeable names among the English planters were Powell, Heron, Ridgway, Willoughbie, Parsons, Audley, Davis, Blennerhasset, Wilson, Cornwall, Mansfield, and Archdale, and among the Scots Douglas, Abercorn, Boyd, Stewart, Cunningham, Ralston, and the prolific breed of the Hamiltons, who obtained estates by the 1,000 acres in every one of the six counties, and whose descendants are to be found today in every office of profit and emolument in the country.

To emphasize the attitude of America on the Irish question, it will be well to quote here the opinion of Congressman LANE, who demands that the United States take action and compel England to stop her aggressive attitude against the Irish people.

"This is a moral issue on which we will never compromise. In every dealing with the British Government we shall press for the one, decent, and fair solution to the Irish question because it is inseparable from the truly democratic aspirations of the American people who learned from their own bitter experience that no nation can exist half slave and half free."

If England expects America to back her to prevent her becoming a bankrupt nation, which she is close to being at the present moment, she will have to give justice to Ireland.

Gen. H. H. Arnold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to know Gen. "Hap" Arnold way back in the early days of American aviation. When it was extremely difficult to secure the help and support so necessary in the proper development of a new weapon of war. No one who knew him then could resist his enthusiasm, his zealous devotion to aviation and all of its ramifications.

His was not an easy role, for he served through those trying years of the "Billy" Mitchell controversy. He was a strong and active supporter of General Mitchell's theory of the importance of air power in national defense. He served through those equally difficult days when the Air Corps was called upon to fly the air mail, when so many fine young pilots lost their lives because they were called upon to perform a service for which their equipment was most inadequate.

Through all these years General Arnold grew in stature, and the United States was most fortunate in having a soldier of his ability and experience when the need for such leadership was vital. As Chief of the United States Air Force he justly and deservedly earned the acclaim and praise of civilians and military men alike. To him goes the credit for organizing and operating the Air Force that knocked the German Luftwaffe out of the skies, that brought Japan to its knees through the operations of the Twentieth Air Force and its use of the atomic bomb.

General Arnold was not only a great soldier; he was a great man, a kindly, sympathetic individual who hated war and loved peace. Even in his last days he called upon his reserve strength and fading vitality to prepare newspaper articles calling upon our country to maintain a strong defense, with the Air Force as its keystone.

"Hap" Arnold will be mourned by the enlisted man as well as by the commissioned officer. He was that kind of a soldier. Our country will miss him greatly. His friends were numbered in the thousands; his admirers were legion.

A Weather Vane of Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent editorial discussion of our foreign policy by Mr. Robert Letts Jones, of the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Journal:

A WEATHER VANE OF POLICY

Chaos is the word to describe the situation in the Orient.

Chiang Kai-shek takes last-stand position on Formosa off the Chinese mainland. Chinese Communist attempts to land on two islands off the mainland have been snatched. General strike threatens Hong Kong. India recognizes the Chinese Communist regime.

Into this turmoil, the United States sends an aircraft carrier and two destroyers to bolster Asiatic naval forces. And at the same time, Washington announces that a new vigorous policy to block the spread of communism in the Far East is coming up.

The carrier and destroyers are mere indicators of what is happening and what is likely to be American policy in the Far East. For years the people of the Pacific coast have called for a definite policy on the Orient. A do-nothing policy during the thirties

which led to war is still too fresh in the minds of the people of the far West. And it looked as if that onlooker attitude was to continue despite the obvious lesson of the recent war in the Pacific that what happened in Asia affected this country.

This outward indication of a far eastern policy has all the suggestion of filling one of the gaps in a global policy for the United States. Several weeks ago one of the gaps in the Balkans policy was filled by the rather casual announcement that this country was opposed to aggression against any nation—with that announcement being offered for the sake of Yugoslavia, threatened by Moscow.

Following along this same line of reasoning, how can the United States avoid direct complications in China? How can the United States offer to help Tito repulse aggression and not do the same for Chiang? Aggression against Tito could be made to look as much like a revolution, an inside job, as did General Mao's revolt in China.

The time is far past when President Truman should make a formal statement on what this Nation's commitments are and what he intends they should be for a global policy. Letting casual remarks at a press conference tend to reveal points of foreign policy is not fair to the people themselves.

As for the naval vessels going to the Far East, that is the most trouble part of the whole affair. The administration, which has belittled the position of the Navy, finds that it must call on that Navy to act as weather vane of policy.

Water Power To Revitalize New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a copy of my address in connection with my radio remarks as participant in the Public Power Panel over Station WNAC, Boston, Mass., on Thursday, December 1, 1949:

In a few weeks we will be in the year 1950, which is the half-century mark.

It is time to stop, look, and take stock.

The world has made such progress in the past 50 years that the year 1900 seems to be 500 years back in time.

Some people and some areas have failed to keep up with the remarkable advance.

New England is one of these.

We have been busy, it is true, but on a treadmill.

We are not making progress proportionate with the rest of the country.

Why?

Because in this power age we have failed to develop that abundance of low-cost energy which is the lifeblood of industry.

In 1899 we were leaders.

Today we are also-rans.

As proof of this, take a look at any New England industrial community.

With a few exceptions, of course, the buildings are the same ones that were in use in the period from 1896 to 1916.

They are obsolete, for one reason.

For another, they house the same industries, only there are less of them.

The cotton mills which once dominated the scene have moved south.

Many smaller units have moved in.

New England has receded to a second-place position, content to serve as an auxiliary to big business.

The reason is not hard to find.

New England power rates are the highest in the Nation.

Even in this, the fifth year of the atomic age, we are clinging to old-fashioned and expensive methods of producing energy, dependent on sources of fuel supply that are many hundreds of miles away.

Stubbornly we have refused to develop the God-given water-wealth in our own six States.

Once upon a time we prided ourselves on New England enterprise.

That was in 1900.

Where is it now?

Go down the list of the great industries which have come into being since 1900.

Motorcars, airplanes, radio and television, plastics, we have lost out on all of these.

Or consider the coming industries such as atomic energy, light metal alloys, glass fibers, new packaging specialties, electromatic controls, and new textile fibers.

Will we get our share of these?

Not under our present, rigid, and extravagant power set-up.

Stand-pat New England must wake up and get going or be bypassed by progress.

Once upon a time we prided ourselves upon our independence, but more and more we are becoming dependent on other sections of the country that have the vision and the energy to go forward.

The Tennessee Valley area is one of these.

For many years it was a hopelessly backward region.

But the late Senator George Norris was a man of progressive ideas who saw that if you give the people a chance they will make the most of it.

And as he looked at the depression-ridden Tennessee Valley he wondered why the vast resources of nature could not be harnessed to improve the opportunities of the people.

For years he fought for the establishment of a Tennessee Valley Authority, a huge project which only the Federal Government could set in motion.

At last, in President Franklin D. Roosevelt, he found a man of similar vision.

They foresaw the huge dams, the tremendous network of transmission lines, the millions of acres of reclaimed and rejuvenated farm soil, vast new industries, and a prosperous and happy people.

In 1933, the TVA was created.

One year later, Secretary of State Cordell Hull said, and I quote: "In magnitude and importance this vast undertaking stands alone.

"Its beneficial results will, in my judgment, extend far beyond present calculations."

And they have.

The valley has bloomed.

Private enterprise has been stimulated.

Incomes of the people have increased, enabling them to pay $2,000,000,000 in additional taxes to Uncle Sam, more than twice the cost of all TVA's dams and physical plant.

Average residential use of electricity per consumer in the 1948 fiscal year was 2,520 kilowatt-hours, four times greater than in 1933.

Five months ago the millionth TVA power consumer was added to the rolls, which is three and one-half times the number served by the power companies in the same area in 1933.

Due to the 650-mile navigation channel, river traffic has increased, with freight savings of $3,000,000 annually.

Superphosphate fertilizers introduced by TVA on a mass-production basis have revolutionized the entire fertilizer industry.

Test demonstrations of these fertilizers on 13,000 Valley-State farms have increased farm production three and four times.

Hundreds of industries have moved to this miracle valley.

Many new ones are being born there.

David E. Lilienthal, former TVA board chairman, predicts that the Tennessee Valley and the South will become the Nation's No. 1 region in 30 years with TVA's continued technical aid.

And why not, especially if other regions like New England fail to modernize.

It was at Oak Ridge, Tenn., that the atom bomb was manufactured, shortening the war by many months and saving hundreds of thousands of lives.

Oak Ridge was chosen because only this region could supply power in sufficient quantity—abundant, low-cost hydroelectric power.

And atomic power is the key to the future, with untold possibilities for industrial progress and in the advancement of medical science.

But to benefit from peacetime uses of nuclear energy, you must have the resources of a TVA to put the atom to work.

TVA has conferred benefits too numerous to mention.

At the same time it is also paying its way.

And during the fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1949, it poured $4,800,000 into State and county treasuries as payments in lieu of taxes.

This is approximately $1,460,000 more than former property taxes on all reservoir lands and on all privately owned power properties acquired by the TVA and distributing agencies.

Ask me how TVA is operated.

TVA was established on a nonpartisan, nonpolitical basis and the merit system it employs in selecting personnel has been used as a model for many other organizations, both private and governmental.

There is hardly a nation in the world that has not sent experts to study in the hope of duplicating this marvelous creation of a people's government.

Well, what are we in New England waiting for?

We have the idle waterpower.

We have the skilled labor.

And we have the highest private power rates in the Nation which handcuff our industries, and withhold from thousands of homes the many convenient and labor-saving appliances which would be used if power were plentiful and cheap.

We have the Connecticut, the Merrimack, the Penobscott, the Kennebec, the Androscoggin.

We use these rivers as sewers, sometimes using the water over again, after it has been filtered, for drinking purposes.

These same rivers drain off the topsoil of our farmlands.

Occasionally they visit us with floods.

However, they are of little use for navigation or recreation.

They just flow past our antiquated factories down to the sea after providing us with a minimum of power.

There are a few of our people who, for personal reasons, will not give up this 1900 viewpoint concerning the function of our rivers.

But there are millions of other New Englanders who, when informed of the facts, will demand a public program for the development of our river basins.

The past has no right to hold down the present or to prevent the birth of the future.

The TVA is an accomplished fact which mocks the words of the faltering opposition who stand in the way of progress.

It is a challenge to us to meet this competition by insisting on multiple-purpose water-control systems for our region.

Whenever you meet anyone who might try to becloud the issue, remember what I say.

There is no form of private enterprise which can handle flood control, develop the transportation and recreational facilities of our rivers, conserve the soil, engage in reforestation and provide enough low-cost power for our homes and factories, all in one program.

Neither can the individual States or separate and conflicting agencies of the Federal Government.

An integrated plan to cover a whole river basin is the only answer.

The TVA is proof positive that our flexible form of government can be adapted to meet new situations through new instrumentalities created by the people.

In a historic decision, the Supreme Court of the United States has solemnly decreed that the people own the right to the produce of their rivers.

The Democratic Party will hold a regional conference in Boston early next year and it will go on record as favoring TVA's for New England.

I know of Republican leaders who will also support this enterprising program.

The rest is up to you, the people of New England.

We will not get these projects unless you speak up for them until you organize your citizens committees in every city, town, and village and let every Member of Congress know from Maine to Florida and from New York to California that this region is not asleep.

The right of petition is your opportunity to ask for river-basin developments that will revitalize New England and open up a greater future for our children.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an outstanding editorial written by Mr. C. E. Ingalls in the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette Times:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

There was so little logic and so little regard for fundamentals and so great an appeal to prejudice in the President's message that it would be inclined to make an honest thinker sick at the stomach. It was a plain plea all the way through for Government interference in business and Government general supervision of everything under the sun from house building to socialized medicine. It was enough of demagogery to make a man ashamed that such a creature could be elected to be President of the United States. This country has reached the highest civilization in history and it has done so without the aid of the Federal Government supervising of man's affairs. True, other men have appealed for Government control of nearly everything, but it remained for Mr. Truman to be specific and urge Congress to perform miracles and demand that taxpayers come to the aid of every socialistic experiment that the radicals of this country have suggested. It is hard to believe that they themselves believe in the things they advocate, but that they advocate them purely because they are popular with the great mass of our people who pay no taxes.

Labor Injunction Law Here May Lead to the Conditions They Have in England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the account of present political and labor conditions in England is taken from the book, The Road Ahead, by the economist, John T. Flynn, submitted for the consideration of my colleagues:

By the fall of 1947 the British planners discovered their plans were going awry. Cripps must have felt a sense of desperation.

Adequate supplies of labor and full effort by workmen were not forthcoming in the industries the Government wished to stimulate. Cripps made an appeal to the workers. He begged them to consider if what they were producing were the things the country most needed. He told them they had no right to complain about shortages of coal and underclothing and housing when they refused to work in sufficient numbers in these industries. The appeal fell on deaf ears—not wicked ears, but the ears of ordinary working people who, by the very limitations of nature, cannot escape making the decisions affecting their habits and conduct in time of peace upon highly practical premises based on their personal and family interests. Great numbers of miners refused to work more than 4 days a week. Even high pay failed to tempt workers away from their accustomed crafts or their home towns.

And so in the end Sir Stafford and his colleagues had to yield to the inevitable and enact a law which says that no man between the ages of 18 and 50, or woman between the ages of 18 and 40, could change occupations at will. The Minister of Labor had the power to direct such workers to the employment he considered best for the national interest. This is the notorious Control of Engagements Act. Professor Jewkes observes that the "Government had the choice between freedom of occupation and planning, and they chose planning." And he notes that the Prime Minister in February 1947 had said that 17 ministries had power to enter private homes for inspections without a search warrant and that over 10,000 officials had the power to make such entries.

No end of devious apology has been offered for this dark stain on Britain's shield. Mr. Walter Scott-Elliot, MP, wrote the London Times on June 16, 1949, minimizing the character of this compulsive order. Oddly, he ruled out compulsion as fit only for the totalitarian state, and he insisted the Control of Engagements Order was not compulsion. He points out that the order provides that a worker can obtain work in only one way—by applying to the local office of the Ministry of Labor. This puts him, as to a job, wholly at the mercy of the Minister. The choice would be, in the first instance, between the job offered by the Ministry and starvation. But refusal may be treated as a public offense. The Minister may seek to guide the applicant to work in an industry where he can best serve the national interest. But he admits that in the end, the Minister of Labor has power to issue directions. And he adds that this power is seldom exercised—which means, of course, it is exercised upon occasion. It has been exercised and men have been put in jail for resisting it. Exercising it often is obviously not necessary.

The rudimentary muscle of ruthlessness does not stop at the factory. It has made its way to the farms. Over the head of the farmer hangs a threat perhaps more serious than that applied to the worker. The farmers are paid heavy subsidies to produce more food. But there is a regular inspection of every farm and a record kept of its produce. If the farmer falls short of the kind of job expected of him in following the instructions from London he gets a warning and if he does not mend his ways the Government will walk in, put a price upon his property, pay him for it and put him off the farm, which then passes into the hands of a government manager.

Now the British Socialist, faced with the problem of compelling the Englishman to comply with his plans, has turned his hand to compulsions. The Government has plenty of machinery for this, since it now possesses electric power, transportation, credit, and fuel—without which no man can operate a business. The Government can grant or withhold these. But it has gone much further. It asserts the right to tell a man where he shall work or not work and even to force him to change his habitation from one part of England to another. It still permits him to own or to buy land, though where he will get the money to buy in the future I do not know. And, of course, part of the Socialist program is ultimately to take all the land and transform every Briton into a state tenant. His right to spend his income as he chooses is almost permanently abolished, since the Government takes so much of it in taxes that the vast mass of the people have no more left than will cover the bare necessities of life.

More on Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, much has recently been written and said with reference to the matter of the relationship between the United States and Spain. In order that the record may be complete it is desirable that there should be included the following editorials which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of January 2 and 12 and the Washington Post of January 13, in which the editors of these papers present some factual objective views that will be of help in arriving at a proper and immediate solution. The editorials are as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of January 2, 1950]

THE SPANISH PRESS

Senator CONNALLY's statement that he believes this country could properly exchange ambassadors with Spain if it wanted to do so is interesting as a subject for speculation.

In 1946 the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution requesting member nations to withdraw their ambassadors from Madrid. This was a phony show of morality that was rooted in deceit and tainted with fraud. The pretense was that the Spanish Government had aided the Axis, that it was a dictatorship, and that it suppressed civil rights and religious freedom. And, of all things, the leader of this crusade for decency was that inverted model of democracy—the Communist-dominated Government of Poland.

Evidently Senator CONNALLY is not in sympathy with this shabby performance by the General Assembly. And since he says that he does not regard the 1946 resolution as legally binding on this country, the inference is that he may use his influence as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in an effort to persuade this Government to resume full diplomatic relations with Spain.

If so, he will be working in a good cause. And this is true, not because of any especially compelling reason of self-interest, but because this country, if it aspires to a position of moral leadership in the world, ought to purge itself of the intellectual dishonesty inherent in its position on the Spanish issue.

There is reason to believe that the State Department, or many of the top men in the State Department, would like to see an American Ambassador at Madrid. But they wring their hands and say that this cannot be done while the UN resolution remains in force. Perhaps there is some merit to that contention. Even if one believes that we were mouse-trapped by the iron-curtain delegations when the resolution was passed, there is still some force to the argument that the United States ought not to act in defiance of the Assembly.

But when these arguments are appraised in the light of the position taken last spring, they are found wanting in simple honesty. There was an effort last May to rescind the 1946 resolution. The vote was 26 to 15 in favor of repeal, but since a two-thirds majority was needed, the effort failed by a margin of 4 votes.

And what was our delegate doing in this attempt to cure the injustice of snubbing Spain while maintaining relations with the iron-curtain dictators? He was doing nothing. Under instructions from the State Department, he sat on his hands and abstained from voting.

It is this aspect of the matter which is most offensive to any concept of integrity. The United States should support the UN. But there is no valid reason why it should refuse to go on record as between right and wrong. If our Government believes the original action was a fraud, it should have voted to rescind it. If it does not believe this, its vote should have been cast against the repealer. In one breath we proclaim our greatness and our moral principles. And then we stultify ourselves by refusing to stand up and be counted on a clear-cut issue which bears not only on our own integrity, but on the integrity of the UN as well.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of January 12, 1950]

SOME TRUTH ABOUT SPAIN

Chairman JOHN KEE of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has delivered a carefully prepared address on our relations with Spain, and it deserves attention. It is deserving because it is a sensible and, for these times at least, a singularly candid illustration of a blunder which reflects discreditably on this country.

There have been reports that Mr. KEE's speech was delivered with the blessing of the State Department. This is not confirmed, but if true that is a fact to be welcomed.

In 1946 the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution recommending that the member nations withdraw their Ambassadors from Spain. This move was spearheaded by the Communists. Its intent presumably was to weaken the position of General Franco and pave the way for his downfall.

Of course, it has had the opposite result, as might have been expected. The Spaniards, resenting this attempt at coercion and the atmosphere of intellectual dishonesty in which it was conceived, probably stand more firmly behind Franco today than they did in 1946. That the policy has been a failure, in addition to being a kind of international fraud, has been evident for some time. There have been attempts in the General Assembly to rescind it, the latest effort mustering more than a majority but less than the required two-thirds vote. The Government of the United States, however, with all of its talk of world leadership, with all of its pleas for international morality, has been unable to make up its mind on this issue. It has been unwilling to say whether it believes that the Assembly's recommendation is right or wrong. And when the decisive vote was taken last year, when the nations were asked to stand up and be counted, our representative—the representative of the greatest power in the world—sat on his hands, closed his lips, and looked the other way. Rather than take a stand as between right and wrong, we sought refuge in the timid device of abstaining from the vote.

Now Mr. KEE comes forward and urges a different course of action. He says that the policy of withdrawing our Ambassador has failed as a "moral demonstration." The Star does not agree that there was ever anything moral about the policy, but at least there can be no doubt that it has failed. And this being so, Mr. KEE says he believes that the action of the General Assembly should be rescinded, that we should support such rescission, and that when the recommendation has been repealed we should send the best man who can be found as our Ambassador to Madrid.

It is to be hoped that this reflects the present thinking at the State Department and in the White House. If so, we can look forward to the day when our Spanish blunder will be rectified, and when, with respect to Spain, we will begin to serve our own interests rather than the interests of other nations, including all of those who have lined up against us in the cold war.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 13, 1950]

RECOGNIZING FRANCO

Representative KEE in the House on Monday clarified a good many matters relating to the question of full recognition of Franco's Spain. The first and most important is the fact that the United States already recognizes the Franco government and has done so continuously since shortly after the final collapse of the Loyalist government in the early part of 1939. The question, therefore, is whether we should resume now an exchange of embassies with the Spanish Government. For some years the United States has been represented at Madrid only by a charge d'affaires, who is accredited to the foreign minister rather than to the generalissimo himself. Mr. KEE suggested that one obstacle is the difficulty of finding a man suitably qualified for so delicate and important a mission. An Ambassador to Spain, as Mr. KEE observed, "must be able to deal with Spanish problems * * * as part of our western European policy. * * * A solution of issues with Spain is devoutly to be desired—but not at the price of impairing our objectives among Spain's neighbors. Our next envoy must be broad in his comprehension of those objectives and resolute in his devotion to them. The American public must have complete faith in his disposition to represent them 100 percent of the way. With an envoy of such caliber in Madrid, we should find the restoration of an ambassador there much to our advantage."

Another obstacle to the restoration of an embassy to Spain is the resolution adopted 4 years ago by the General Assembly of the United Nations, specifically debarring Spain from membership in that body "until a new and acceptable government is formed there," and recommending that the member nations "immediately recall from Madrid their Ambassadors and Ministers Plenipotentiary." Thus unless the United States is prepared for unilateral action, contrary to the expressed will of the United Nations, the resolution must first be rescinded. We should not, Mr. KEE believes, act in such a way as to weaken in the slightest degree our unity with the nations with which we have entered into great commitments.

It is plain, however, that the resolution was badly advised. The mistake that led to its adoption lay in assuming the perpetuation of the political conditions existing at the time. It is probably true, as Representative KEE says, that the fundamental character of the Spanish Government has not changed since the resolution, but the character of international politics has altered radically.

The whole difficulty, it seems to us, arises from a confusion about what is implied in recognition. In earlier times this difficulty did not exist, for recognition implied nothing more than the power of the government to govern. Thus, the policy was to recognize all de facto governments as soon as they had demonstrated themselves to be such. Indeed, Mr. KEE admitted that whenever the United States has departed from this tradition, whenever it has awarded its recognition as a moral endorsement of a government or its leaders, "we have usually involved ourselves in more problems than we solved."

This being so, the question of full recognition to Spain should not, in our opinion, be weighed according to the theoretic merits or defects of its form of government, or according to the personal qualities of the ruler, but solely according to its advantages or disadvantages in the present state of international affairs. Now, whether we like Franco or not, the fact remains that Spain is part of western Europe. Thus the sending of an embassy to Madrid must be undertaken sooner or later; and, in our opinion, it would be better sooner than later—for the longer it is delayed the more the full recognition of Spain, when it comes, will seem like a moral endorsement of its leader.

Congress of Industrial Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a copy of my address at the third anniversary banquet, Greater Lawrence joint board, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, in St. Mary's auditorium, Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, December 4, 1949:

Ten years ago the CIO in Lawrence was just learning to walk.

Today it is big and still growing

And it is the new partner in the textile industry, a partnership that will never be dissolved as long as labor and management work together for the improvement of our free-enterprise system.

You have done a remarkable job in organizing the mills and in making collective bargaining work.

Whenever I see the letters TWUA I also thing of TWA, which happens to represent the name of an air line, the most modern means of transportation. I think that the two have much in common. Both are developments of the twentieth century. Both have made swift progress, and they have an even greater future before them.

The CIO has transported the textile workers from the feudalism of yesterday to the higher wages and improved working conditions of today without a hitch. In doing this you have not only helped the workers but have brought great credit to Lawrence by the example you have set in harmonious labor-management relations.

Before the workers were organized we used to have a little trouble now and again, which made Nation-wide headlines and gave the mistaken impression that the people of Lawrence were tough guys and gangsters' molls.

Happily, those days are gone.

Proof of this is in the experience we have gone through during the year 1949. Last spring and early summer there were 24,000 people on the unemployment compensation rolls. Lawrence was harder hit than any other city in this Nation. Reporters from New York papers and national magazines came here to get the story. And what did they find? That the people, with an understanding of the situation, were taking their hardships in stride, knowing that textile management and workers were in the same boat.

We are not out of the woods yet but employment in the mills has and is continuing to pick up.

Recalling a little bit of recent history if I may, even though it happens to be history made by the Democratic Party, I would like to remind you of the great social legislation, including unemployment compensation, that was engineered under President Roosevelt. The people of Lawrence have reason to be grateful to his vision and his memory. The value of such legislation was never more clearly demonstrated than in the experience of this city during the first half of this year. Men out of work were able to make some provision for their families, and merchants were able to pay their bills because of the income which replaced in part the loss of wages.

Labor leaders had much to do with the passage of such foresighted legislation. And the unions, even now, are leading the way in promoting new social and economic gains that will mean greater security for all our people.

I was interested in a suggestion made not so long ago by Walter Reuther, head of the huge automobile workers union which is affiliated with the CIO. The industry whose workers he represents has been building cars at the rate of 5,000,000 a year, which will break all previous records. But Walter Reuther knows that this pace cannot be kept up forever. Supply will pass demand and there is bound to be some unemployment. Reuther is not waiting for this to happen. Ahead of time, he is making plans to take up the slack. He suggests that airplane plants, presently not in production, be made available to displaced auto workers for other types of production.

Only industrial experts from the fields of labor and management can make an evaluation of this idea. The point is that Reuther is ahead in his thinking.

This, in turn, is evidence of the vital and intelligent leadership that has come up from the ranks of labor in a truly democratic fashion, producing men who are qualified to deal with the difficult economic problems of our times.

They say that there is no substitute for experience, and the labor movement bears out this contention. Only a man who has himself worked in a steel factory or at a textile loom can know the real meaning of wages and working conditions and the uncertainties that attend such employment. As he goes up the ladder to union leadership and faces management across the conference table, he speaks from life and not from words.

I do not think it an exaggeration to say that the future of American civilization depends upon a responsible and forward-looking labor movement. The quest for economic justice is finding fulfillment through our unions, in the progressive American tradition, that delivers the goods. Communism will never make any inroads in our country as long as we have a free labor crusade to work for security, social and human.

Today, the initiative is in the hands of labor.

A prime example of this concerns pensions.

When conservative elements in the Congress blocked the increase of benefits and extension of coverage under the social security law, they thought they had progress tied down.

But they had not figured on the dynamic leadership of the CIO, which is also an instrument of the people's will, having won for itself the right to make its own arrangements with management in the workers' interests.

Promptly, the CIO brought the matter of pensions to the foreground and made this the principal issue in collective bargaining negotiations. Strangely enough, management agreed with the big unions on private pensions without too much opposition, leaving the Dixiecrats and some others high and dry.

This accomplished fact puts the reactionaries in Congress on the spot.

They now find themselves definitely behind the thinking of the American people and have been served notice that progress will continue with or without them.

The only recourse they have is to try and catch up.

Therefore I predict that the expanded social security law which we in the House of Representatives passed this year will break through the Senate blockade in 1950. If any of the old guard should try to filibuster against it, the people will laugh them down. The unions are proving that the cause of economic justice cannot be pigeonholed. It is now leading the way.

Most of the road blocks which stood in the way of the worker's right to enjoy a better share of his productive efforts, have been cleared away. As we face the future, we can take heart from the fact that a small group of people by their excesses cannot stall the American economy as they did in 1929.

It is no mere coincidence that the CIO was organized after that collapse. It was a movement that developed from the workers along new lines to meet their present-day problems. It was an extension of democracy from the political to the economic field. It is your insurance against a return of the old days.

We in Lawrence, the whole community, have benefited from the work of your union.

On this your tenth anniversary we offer our thanks and our best wishes for continued success to the Greater Lawrence Joint Board of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO.

Our Hidden Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Truman administration is trying to find some way to win votes by eliminating a few excise taxes to appease the rising wrath of the people against taxes, and then win favor with the radicals by soaking corporations. Instead of being forthright with the taxpayers of the country, and tell them that corporation taxes are passed on to the overburdened taxpayers, they seek to accomplish their deception by making it appear that they are giving relief to the small taxpayers.

There are many proposals for tax reduction, and under consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix, heretofore granted, I am inserting an article by Robert S. Bird which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of January 17, 1950. The purpose of extending this is to show the interest which different groups are taking in this all-important question, not only of taxation but of retrenchment in Government expenditures.

The article follows:

OUR HIDDEN TAXES—EVERYONE AGREES ON OBJECTIVES OF TAX REFORM; PHILOSOPHIES COLLIDE ON HOW TO ATTAIN THEM

(By Robert S. Bird)

TAX reform starts with the question: How can the Nation keep and strengthen its system of American democracy, preserve its national security, and, at the same time, finance the social programs its people are demanding?

Everyone agrees that these are the desired objectives; but political philosophies collide on how they shall be attained.

An answer by the Truman administration is given in the new proposals for an enlarged program of deficit spending which would add this year another $6,500,000,000 to the more than one-quarter of a trillion-dollar debt.

These funds would extend social-welfare benefits and would provide for the national security in both military defense and foreign assistance. The administration says that deficit spending in this prosperous period can be continued a little longer without danger, and the American system can be preserved and strengthened, too.

CRITICS FEAR BANKRUPTCY

Leading critics of the administration assert that Federal policies already have weakened that traditional economic system which has won for the American people a living standard higher than any the world has ever known. They say that some of the President's proposals would impair it further, and that his continued deficit spending would take the Nation down the road to bankruptcy. They would drastically curtail Federal functions and expenditures; and, arguing that social security presupposes national security, they would use the ax first on some of the more costly domestic programs.

On specific tax policy there is just as wide disagreement. Labor, laying down the ability-to-pay principle as its guide, insists that the present tax burden is too heavy for the American working people. It views the administration's welfare proposals as necessities, even at the expense of an unbalanced budget. It would diminish or remove those taxes which seem to bear heaviest on the lower brackets and would "soak the rich"—both individuals and corporations—by increasing the tax cut on large personal and corporate incomes.

HYER SEES DISASTER

Business says this would be killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. It points out that the bulk of the national income lies at the bottom of the pyramid. Personal income-tax rates on incomes above $25,000 a year already are so high as to discourage initiative, it argues, and even total confiscation

of all personal salaries over $5,000 would add scarcely $500,000,000 to revenues. The tax burden on corporations is so heavy now, it asserts; that the risk capital needed for new plants and tools to provide jobs and products for the expanding population is drying up.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, depicts the Nation on the horns of a dilemma where to increase taxes would be to invoke the law of diminishing returns, and to lower them would not compensate in stimulated business activity for the loss in revenues. He sees no way today of assuring sound prosperity for the Nation, not until the spending trend is reversed.

A Republican answer to President Truman on his spending and taxing proposals was offered in the present session of Congress in a bill which would give tax relief all along the line. Introduced by Representative DANIEL A. REED, of New York, ranking member of the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee, it would raise personal income-tax exemptions from $600 to $700, at a 50-percent tax-rate ceiling on all incomes, reduce most excise taxes by 10 to 20 percent, permit deduction from gross income of dividends received up to a maximum of $600 and lower the capital-gains provision from 50 to 40 percent.

In pressing for an extension of the administration's social measures, labor represents 18,000,000 union members and their families, comprising the biggest single entity in the National having common social and economic aims. Its view of the spending policy of the Federal Government, as set forth in a tax study last year by the CIO, is that a balanced budget at times is secondary to considerations of full employment, high national income, and general social welfare.

VIEWPOINT OF THE CIO

"As in all things, choices must be made, and the immediate choice involves balancing the budget in a way that will not prevent tax cuts for low-income individuals, but will, instead, seek additional sources of revenue whose burden does not fall on low-income groups," it said.

"So long as the public debt is an internal debt held by residents of the United States, as ours is," the CIO study continued, "it cannot be said to impoverish us as a nation, since all that is involved is an internal transfer of assets, as compared to an external transfer if the debt were foreign-held."

Getting down to cases, the CIO at its last national convention called for increased income-tax exemptions in the lower brackets, repeal of all wartime excise taxes and nonregulatory excises, enactment of an undistributed-profits and excess-profits tax, repeal of provisions for splitting income so as to prevent its use for reducing income-tax payments, a tightening of estate and gift-tax structure, elimination of exemption for tax-exempt bonds, increasing the capital-gains tax, closing "the many existing loopholes in our present tax structure," and prevention of business organizations' evasion of taxation by the devices of nonprofit and charitable set-ups.

SALES TAXES OPPOSED

Then it declared itself "to be unequivocally opposed to all forms of sales taxes, manufacturing taxes, transaction taxes, and wage pay-roll taxes" in States, cities, and localities, asking instead new State income and corporation taxes.

Business asks, above all, for tax relief to permit it to expand and operate with a safe degree of flexibility. Especially it seeks to have eased the provisions of law which impose penalties on corporations deemed to have accumulated reserves in excess of "reasonable" needs, more liberal depreciation allowances, and removal of double taxation of dividends. These are striving to hamper the flow of capital and business expansion, forcing business to depend on "plow-backs" out of earnings to make what growth it can, it says.

At the present high rate of population growth, business estimates that 700,000 new jobs must be made available each year for new recruits to the labor force, and that $6,000,000,000 in new capital is required annually for the plant expansion and equipment necessary to furnish these jobs. The venture capital for this expansion is lacking; excessive taxation has driven it into other channels.

It complains that personal consumption is increasing faster than private investment in new business enterprise, and while corporation sales are up over predepression boom years, taxes are far higher.

EASTED SOLUTIONS PROPOSED

Whereas labor views all the excises with distaste, and industry finds many of them discriminatory against it, varied solutions are proposed. The National Association of Manufacturers would eliminate all the existing excises and supplant them with a single uniform excise tax on all manufactured goods, which would amount to a Federal sales tax. This association would cut the budget by $13,000,000,000.

Most middle-of-the-road advocates of tax revision see a need for continued high revenue, and their budget shaving would not go much further than the $5,500,000,000 needed to eliminate the deficit. They would accomplish this by strictest economies of the kind outlined by the Hoover Commission and by a paring down largely of those outlays which lie between the rigidly fixed items and those providing for national security—including foreign aid.

They are worried about the debt, which, after all, is owned in large part by the people through insurance company, public bodies, and bank investment. And they are concerned about inflation which, if unchecked, would make repayment in a fraction of the dollars originally paid in good faith.

There is little disagreement on the importance of eliminating the overlapping of taxation as between Federal, State, and local governments. This adds to the tax burden for all groups of taxpayers and is a main factor in the present unbalance of the tax load. Roswell Magill, professor of law at Columbia University and former Under Secretary of the Treasury, who served as chairman of the committee on postwar tax policy, has urged a drastic separation of tax sources.

A PLAN FOR DIVIDING TAXES

He would assign to the Federal Government the income tax, which now accounts for 72 percent of its tax receipts, and customs, liquor, and tobacco taxes; to the States, inheritance, gasoline, retail sales, admissions, and unemployment taxes. In the case of corporation taxes levied by both Federal and State governments, he would permit the States to make their own tax laws for enterprises doing business within the State, but would have a uniform corporation-tax law by all States for those whose transactions extend beyond one State's boundaries. This would conform more closely to the traditional areas of responsibility between the governments.

The present tax structure is a patchwork which everybody agrees needs revision. Everybody also wants tax reduction. Tax reduction hinges in the end on Government expenditures, and Treasury Department figures are as plain as they are conclusive; everybody pays for Government expenditures. What Congress does about taxes in this session, and in future sessions, will depend on how the taxpayers speak up concerning which programs they consider to be vital and which can be dispensed with in this time of unprecedented demands. Tax awareness today is just common sense for everybody who wants a strong and prosperous American democracy.

Money, Inflation, and Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks today, I wish to include an editorial from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer for January 10, 1950, which contains one of the most brief and simple statements of the folly of our present state of fiscal insanity I have yet read. I recommend it to all Members as they pore over the tremendous budget and variety of new governmental experiments which have been presented to us this year.

The editorial follows:

MONEY, INFLATION, AND SOCIALISM

Gold, in the long experience of the ages, is the best kind of money that can be contrived.

Every other kind of money has genuine value and validity only to the extent that it is related to gold.

In the modern era the usefulness of gold as money was augmented by the auxiliary device of paper money which was redeemable in gold and was therefore the equivalent of gold.

Under this arrangement, a government issuing and guaranteeing the paper money for which the gold was security served as the custodian but not the actual owner of the gold.

The real owners were the holders of the gold-redeemable paper against which the gold had been pledged.

And the gold could lie in safekeeping while the paper passed around in circulation as currency.

Thus, redeemable printed currency was like warehouse certificates denoting title to merchandise.

It was not necessary to move the goods—or the gold—in order to change the ownership.

At the same time the issuance of certificates—or currency—was necessarily limited by the amount of gold available for redemptive purposes.

This prevented demoralizing monetary inflation.

Likewise, public expenditures and public debt were similarly restricted, which served as a brake on credit inflation in all banking operations.

And since all transactions had to be liquidated eventually with money, and the money had to be either gold itself or else redeemable in gold, the system was accurately known as the gold standard.

Gold, with not very many variations, was the fixed common denominator of all values and of all currencies.

Now, among its other excellences, the gold standard tended to prevent frauds, and frauds can be perpetrated by governments as well as by individuals.

Frauds committed by individuals are punishable by statute.

Government, however, is not only the source of legal currency: it is also the fountain of statutory power.

Consequently, by illicit use of power, government could subvert the gold standard.

Government could substitute deficit financing for balanced budgets.

Government could replace fiat money for redeemable currency—even in the payment of its own obligations.

And the Government of the United States did these immoral things in 1933.

It confiscated all the monetary gold in the country, and devalued the dollar, thereby reducing the worth of pensions and insurance policies by nearly 50 percent.

It took over the Federal Reserve System—that is, the national banks—as a tool and agent of the Treasury.

Thereafter, the Government could borrow in multi-billion-dollar installments on the security of its own debt and monetize the debts—part of which emerges from the banks in the form of fiat currency but the bulk of which comprises the basis of credit inflation, making itself evident in low interest rates or cheap money, in excessive checkbook money and in swollen bank reserves.

These manipulations liberated the Government from dependence on taxes.

They made inflation the Federal fiscal policy.

As a result, the supply of currency in circulation has increased from $6,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000, the volume of bank credit—about $30,000,000,000 in 1933—now exceeds $100,000,000,000, and the national debt—less than $20,000,000,000 in 1933—has mounted to $40,000,000,000 before the war and is now more than a quarter of a trillion dollars.

Of course, much of the pyramidal debt and pervading inflation have been due to the war.

And the effect of this has been to obscure the truth.

For the truth is that inflation became the New Deal's policy before the war and has remained the New Deal's policy since the war.

The methods pursued originated in Europeans socialism and in the new economics sponsored by the late Lord Keynes, and were imported here to socialize America.

The theory is to be found in the Marxist gospel of Lenin, who taught that the surest way to socialize an industrial society is to debauch its currency.

Without inflation, the New Deal could not undertake the fantastic schemes of its Socialist welfare state—and without inflation it could find no excuse for undertaking them.

But inflation—either by means of managed currency or deficit financing—is an illusion for which the people must pay.

They must pay in labor and production without corresponding progress and prosperity, if not in industrial stagnation and degraded standards of living.

And with $24,000,000,000 worth of idle gold in the United States, available for a return to the honest gold standard, there is a remedy at hand.

Socialism Penalizes the Useful Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an editorial that appeared in the Chicago Tribune and which points out the penalties of state socialism as applied to the ordinary citizen:

PENALIZING THE USEFUL CITIZEN

A British market gardener named George Thomas Fidler was prosecuted by the Socialist government and compelled to pay a fine of $2,000 for spending money in excess of what the Socialists thought ought to be spent to rebuild some wrecked greenhouses. He used the greenhouses to grow 23 tons of tomatoes when food was rationed because of short supply and the government was urging increased food production.

In a somewhat analogous case a builder named Ronald A. Stokes, who built himself a bungalow, was jailed for 6 months and fined the equivalent of $2,700 because he did not obtain a government license to provide himself housing.

The treatment of these men by the Socialist Government, though different in particular, is the same in effect as the New Deal gives American landlords. They provide shelter and a needed service for their fellows, and, as a reward, are penalized for their pains by the form of property confiscation known as rent control.

American landlords who are denied fair rents are forced constantly to pay heavier local, State and Federal taxes out of dwindling income. The tax they pay the Federal Government helps to subsidize the construction of competing Federal housing with artificially low rents which will further debase the return from their properties when and if control is lifted.

In England the local governments must meet deficits on government housing through higher taxes on the owners of nongovernment housing. Each new government house adds to the burden on the private home owner or his tenant. There is a prospect that the load on private houses will eventually become so heavy that the houses will be seized for unpaid taxes and the government will have the monopoly in home ownership that socialists seek.

Under the socialism of England and the developing socialism of the New Deal, the stage has been reached where a citizen who does something useful is regarded as a criminal who deserves punishment.

Men's Class of Riverside Church Endorses World Federation Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, rumors of a dread hydrogen bomb which could obliterate our civilization again underline the necessity for passage of House Concurrent Resolution 64. This resolution, introduced by 102 Representatives and 22 Senators, calls for strengthening of the United Nations and its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation and enforcement of world law. Hearings on this measure have today been made available by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—these hearings emphasize the importance of this legislation in the establishment of a permanent world peace.

Appended hereto is the unanimously passed resolution of the men's class of the Riverside Church of New York City which endorses House Concurrent Resolution 64:

Whereas we the members of the forum of the men's class of the Riverside Church, in a resolution adopted in June 1943, have expressed ourselves in favor of the formation of a world government with powers sufficient to insure the preservation of peace and of the participation of the United States therein; and

Whereas House Concurrent Resolution 64, sponsored by United World Federalists, and advocating the development of the UN into a world federation is now before Congress; and

Whereas this resolution seems to provide the initial step toward the attainment of world peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the forum of the men's class of the Riverside Church, do hereby endorse the principles inherent in House Concurrent Resolution 64, and that we urge our elected Representatives to lend their support to this measure.

Isthmian Canals: The Panama Canal and Diplomatic Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, along with many other Members, I have closely followed the Isthmian Canal subject now before the Congress, especially with reference to the national defense. From time to time I have included in extensions of my remarks informative articles. The special attention of the Congress, particularly those Members on committees having legislative cognizance of Isthmian canals, is invited to a comprehensive bibliographical list on the Isthmian Canal policy of the United States which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1949, by Representative CLARE W. THOMPSON, chairman of the special subcommittee investigating the financial operation of the Panama Canal under House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress. This bibliographical list is a most useful reference when seeking independent information relating to the canal question and is a contribution of national importance.

A new and most instructive article on the Panama Canal by the distinguished author, Arthur Stanley Riggs, was published in the November 1949 issue of Forum, volume CXII, No. 5, page 267. In this article Commander Riggs summarizes four centuries of Isthmian history, clarifies some of the major issues of the present canal question, and emphasizes the diplomatic angles of the all-important treaty subject which was ignored by those who conducted the investigations and made the report under Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress. The failure to consider this intricate question and allow for the huge indemnity and increased annuity—both of which would undoubtedly be required by the Republic of Panama for the granting of a new treaty—is a serious omission that cannot be overlooked by the Congress.

Furthermore, it emphasizes the gross inadequacy of the cost estimates of the Panama sea-level project as presented in the indicated report and tends to discredit the entire document.

The text of Commander Riggs' article follows:

THE SENSE OF PAST

[By Arthur Stanley Riggs]

(Commander Riggs is a retired officer of the United States Naval Reserve and a special student of the Panama Canal. The views expressed in this article are exclusively his own and do not represent those of the Navy Department.)

Now that the capacity of the Panama Canal is being taxed by ocean traffic, which continues to grow steadily with the world's postwar recovery, we, as its operators, are faced with two interrelated problems. How can we best secure the needed extra facilities which by 1960 will be imperative if the Canal is not to cause confusion and serious, costly delay? The second is equally vital. How can we do this without resorting to means similar to those President Theodore Roosevelt used when the United States first undertook to see that the Canal was built? We do not, instinctively, distrust our own motives, but the world may. We should remember the long history of Panama and the tremendous part continuous fear has played in it.

To most of us, fortunately, fear is merely a word. We have nothing actually to fear, and knowing that, we carry ourselves perhaps with a slightly self-righteous attitude toward fear's victims.

It is not altogether an academic question to ask ourselves what we should be and what we should do if for 450 years we had lived constantly in an atmosphere charged heavily not with one fear but with many fears. We might also gage the true greatness of the Spain of the past by remembering De Tocqueville's remark that the "physiognomy of a government can best be judged in its colonies, for there its characteristic traits usually appear larger and more distinct." The false vision, the deep religious fanaticism, the individual cruelty of reckless adventurers, despite clear government orders to the contrary, the wild lust for both gold and power in Tierra Firme, paint for us a picture of the Spanish colonial that goes far to explain the steady retrogression of the realm of Don Quixote.

For centuries a whole people lived in daily fear of being robbed of everything they possessed; of having their homes burned to the ground; of being obliged to flee into swamp or jungle or inhospitable hills with their children, their aged, and their sick; of being hideously tortured or of being killed without provocation. The women and children feared being actually eaten by demons in human form. With four centuries of this horror behind them, came a brief respite and then another set of fears: national collapse under the pressures of a powerful neighbor; the loss of independence and of most of the rights that accompany political and religious freedom.

That unhappy people lives between the Americas. It is the mixed population of the bridge of fear that connects North and South America, the Isthmus of Panama. Secure in our own borders and confident in our natural and intellectual wealth, we have not understood our Panamanian neighbors. The benefits we have thought we conferred upon them are of dubious quality in many instances. We have completely overlooked the fact that our mere shadow weighs more in Panama than all the rest of the Americas and Europe combined. The Panama Canal and Railroad have profoundly affected Panama's economy and brought the little Republic many good things. But they have also vastly increased her domestic problems by indirectly affecting social and educational imbalance, health, crime, and so on. To understand all this it is necessary to glance back over the history of the Isthmus, and to evaluate the evidence largely disregarded hitherto in our imperialistic plans and our slightly noxious do-good talking points.

When on his fourth voyage in 1504 Columbus touched the Atlantic side of the Isthmus, he took the lid from a veritable Pandora's box. The Spanish conquerors promptly turned a country into a road. They had no interest in Panama beyond exploiting such wealth as might easily be appropriated. The Camino Real, or Royal Highway, in reality little more than a villainously bad trail between Panama on the south and Nombre de Dios at the north, the Spaniards made the artery through which flowed a flood of gold, pearls, emeralds, silver, and other precious goods. The results for Spain were tragic enough, and we have a fairly accurate estimate of them. What we have never bothered about is the effect those four black centuries had upon the people of the Isthmus.

The centuries saw Francis Drake and Henry Morgan plundering Spain at will. Pizarro started his conquest of Peru and the pillaging of the wealth of the Incas from the bridge of Panama. Admiral-of-the-Blue Vernon in 1739–40 smashed up the fortifications of the Atlantic side of the bridge with a formidable British fleet and so impressed his young lieutenant, Lawrence Washington, that Mount Vernon was named in his honor. Balboa first saw the great South Sea in 1513 from the summit of the Continental Divide that spines the Isthmus, and Drake, years later, was the first Englishman to sail across it. In every direction and in every way this in-between country is not only of surpassing interest, but as the crossroads of the world, present and future as well as past, its preservation is a matter of concern to civilization.

The Republic of Panama is larger than we usually believe. Its area in square miles is only a trifle less than that of the four States of Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Delaware—29,065 miles compared with 29,541. But the compact industrialization of the New England group comfortably supports a population now running to well beyond 5,000,000. Undeveloped Panama, with its hundreds of miles of infertile and untillable land disposed in mountains, swamps, pestilential jungles, and eroded areas, has a white population of a mere 26,906, and a black, yellow, and half-breed population of 145,073, according to the last Panamanian census. The Government, under whatever name it functions, is necessarily an oligarchy and behaves accordingly. This is something distinctly foreign to our North American way of thinking. As we do not send either military men or Government representatives to the Isthmus who themselves seem to understand this, certainly frictions have developed which could have been avoided.[1]

Two years ago, because I have been the most outspoken figure in the fight over improvements to the Panama Canal, a Panamanian engineer attacked me in the daily papers of the capital city. His arguments and mathematics were open to serious question, but his psychology was sound. He said that whatever the United States does the verdict of the world will be rendered on the basis "that it is precisely by what they do in Panama that the United States must be judged." In other words, if we treat Panama fairly and without pressure, the Americas and, in turn, Europe, Asia, and Africa, will find their suspicions of us slightly less tinctured with apprehension.

If we apply pressures to get everything we think we want and Panama feels affronted or robbed, the whole flimsy fabric of our good-neighbor boast vanishes overnight. Every Central and South American state, with the possible exception of Brazil, will feel insecure, aggressively distrustful of our pronouncements, acutely aware that we are the mightiest Nation in the world in a commercial and financial sense—and morally bankrupt. All these countries know how easily power is abused and to what distress such abuse inevitably leads. We face a danger on the Isthmus quite as real as Panama faces from us. Its effects, if we boggle our opportunities, will have tremendous impact upon the world.

Though our detailed knowledge of the Isthmus begins only with the bold railway project and the finale of the gold rush in 1851, the stormy story goes back centuries. Panamá had its first major shock on April 20, 1550, when the two bandit grandsons of its founder captured the city, looted it thoroughly, abused many of the citizens, and tied the new Bishop, Fray Pablo Torres, to a stake in the main plaza. There they insulted him, mocked him, spat upon him, and threatened even worse. After they had left, the outraged townsfolk released him, organized a pursuit, and drove the bandits into contact with a government armed force. Between the two groups the despoilers had a merry time. Not one escaped.

Fires played a terrifying role in the grim story. A few of the conflagrations that swept the largely wood-and-straw constructions occurred in 1539, 1563, 1644, 1671, 1737, 1756, and 1781. The constant raids of English, French, and Dutch pirates began on a large scale with Drake's foray of 1572. They forced Spain to spend millions to fortify and garrison her American ports, and at intervals became so vicious and alarming that men more than once slept for weeks on their arms. Henry Morgan took and looted Panamá in 1671, and in the bloody argument outside the city—the Spaniards lost 600 men and Morgan 200—no quarter was asked or given. When the Spanish governor saw the city was lost, he blew up the magazines, and in the fire that resulted the city was so thoroughly destroyed that it was abandoned and built anew a year or so later on its present site.

As many of the African slaves as could revolted, joined the native Indians in the bush, and bred a new and savage enemy for the colonists, the Cimarrones. Cimarron in Spanish means wild or unruly, and as used in the colonial records it indicates the savage runaway slaves and their descendants. The English called them "Maroons." Their abiding hatred of everything Spanish frequently led them to make friends with the English adventurers, and to inflict hideous reprisals upon every Spaniard unfortunate enough to come into their power. Mere gold had no meaning for them, but they understood thoroughly the Spaniards' lust for it. They partly evened the score on one occasion by giving the Christians all the gold they could take—melted and poured bubbling into their opened bowels.

Besides these purely material terrors, whites and Indians alike were made to feel the horrible, chill fear inspired and assiduously cultivated by the Inquisition. As Englishmen by this time were all nominally heretics, any awkward or particularly annoying cases the civil authorities could not or did not believe it wise to handle, were turned over to the grim bigots of the holy office. This was a convenient arrangement while it lasted, and no foreign pirate or adventurer questioned survived to tell tales. Civil, religious, and military authorities were also frequently at open enmity, and both the distant king and the local colonists suffered. As we gaze back over the dark record of incompetence, flagrant dishonesty, meanness, intrigue, jealousies, and inertia, the parallel of Spanish colonial administration with Democratic administrations today, both Federal and local, is startingly clear.

[1] This criticism does not apply in any way to our present Ambassador Monett Davis. He has repeatedly displayed his understanding, tact, and initiative, and is giving us excellent representation, besides winning the respect and friendship of the Panamanians.

DISASTER

The answer to our doubts regarding Spain is embodied in the name given the Isthmus early in its tragic story: Castilla del Oro, Golden Castile. Spain echoed from Barcelona to Lisbon with tales of the unimaginable wealth to be picked up there without effort. Some of the stories were partly true. Spaniards had stumbled upon nuggets of pure gold in certain rivers. Placer deposits yielded fabulous sums. The proof lay in the whole shiploads of treasure—silver by untold tons, gold by the hundredweight, pearls, emeralds beyond price—pouring into Spain with the regularity of a ferry service. But the treasure tales that drew men as sugar draws ants failed to enlarge upon the Indians with poisoned arrows, the deadly jungle snakes, the fevers that more than decimated whole companies and towns, and the murderous pirates who raided not only shipping and seaports but penetrated far into the interior. Some of the marauders were so terrible that a great Frenchman called them tigers with reasoning powers.

Sixteenth-century Spaniards were tough, hard to kill. Those who went to the Ultramar were especially lusty and ferocious. They had to be to survive, and their own historians have recorded so black a chronicle of their behavior that the depredations of the pirates seem hardly more than a balancing of the scale. The whole story is one of such complete misconception of opportunity, such mismanagement in administration through fear, treachery, bigotry, cruelty, self-seeking, and outright hate that the Panama of the twentieth century is little short of a miracle in survival. With such a background, it is easy to understand Isthmian suspicion of our slightest move, jealousy of our power and wealth, and bitter resentment at much of the treatment we have accorded a republic we facetiously style "an equal sovereign state."

The worst of it is that an oligarchy of 27,000 whites surrounded by five or six times as many hybrids of color is clearly not the equal of a state of more than a hundred million whites, a democracy with extraordinarily firm foundations. Nobody knows this better than the educated Panamanians, and the knowledge is not pleasant. That is the real reason for the delicate political situation that faces us upon the Isthmus and makes what we do so important in the eyes of all the rest of Latin America, whose backgrounds and experience parallel those of Panama, and whose feeling is identical.

* * * * *

Since 1851 the Panama Railroad has been functioning admirably, and besides performing its planned duties has accomplished much incidental good for Panama. The Canal, which operates the railroad as an adjunct, has served the entire world's commerce and shipping for 35 years. Now it is regarded as likely to prove inadequate by 1960. Various powerful interests have demanded improvement to insure its adequacy, the construction of a sea-level canal partly following the present waterway, or the adoption of an alternate route in another location, with the building of one of any number of fantastic systems for transit from ocean to ocean. These schemes include a railway to drag ships overland, bombproof tunnels through the Continental Divide, sea-level, high-lake-level, and mixed-type canals, all regardless of cost.

Those individuals and groups who have declared for the sea-level plan at Panama have gone far out on a very dubious limb. They are sawing it off behind themselves by approving specifications and plans based upon largely theoretical conclusions that every engineer who had actual experience in building the present Canal regards as fallacious and misleading to the point of disaster. The record is clear and conclusive in innumerable documents published by the Government and in technical papers and discussions in naval, marine, and engineering periodicals, some of them republished as documents of national significance in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There is also in the background the sane and conservative plan for the Pacific terminal lake, balancing and making adequate to foreseeable demands the present Canal without interfering for a moment with its operation. It was slowly worked out by Capt. Miles P. Du Val, United States Navy, retired, as a result of his more than 3 years' experience as port captain at Balboa during the war. This is, moreover, the first and only plan for improving the Canal based upon the experience acquired in putting ships through in all conditions, including stress. Casting all theory aside, the terminal-lake plan is based soundly upon actual operating experience, published official data, common sense, and a cost well within the bounds of reason. Its appeal to an economy-minded Congress is indisputable.

What does not appear on the surface of any of these plans, aside from the terminal lake, is their complete disregard of several major factors. We are blithely informed that costs mounting into the billions are negligible. Comment is superfluous, but the annual interest at 3 percent on $2,460,000,000 comes to $73,000,000 a year. We are emphatically not told that before we could dig one spadeful of earth for a sea-level canal we should have to negotiate an entirely new and distinctly different treaty with Panama at high costs to ourselves. We are assailed by raucous nonsense about atomic bombing, national security and the like, though all canals, regardless of type, are vulnerable to the atom bomb or to any bombing. Last, and perhaps most significant of all from the purely economic standpoint, nothing is said about the profits of the manufacturers of special and heavy machinery, new fangled and unproven dredges; the never-too-modest emoluments of the purveyors of the innumerable goods and supplies required by such an undertaking, from dynamite to diapers. Then there are the appalling pay rolls of labor for years to come; the costs of new construction and, in the case of a canal at an alternate location, the astronomical figures to cover the establishment of complete terminal port facilities, which involve the building of whole cities.

Panama naturally regards most of these schemes with dismay. Our more sober-minded legislators also recognize the seriousness of the problem. Many of them have made personal investigations on the spot so that when the matter comes to public hearings and debate before a congressional committee, they will be able to understand and even perhaps to evaluate the different arguments advanced. If Congress blunders when it decides the question, and foists a large increment upon the already huge national debt; the taxpaying public will suffer. Our already perniciously anemic merchant marine may come perilously close to disappearing. With the experience of what the need for ships drove us to in World War II, with its floating coffins, we know that, should another world struggle involve us, we might easily lose control of the sea.

Of all the points at issue in the canal controversy, the matter of a new treaty with Panama is the most complicated and brings us directly back to the fear with which we began. We, as well as Panama, have reason to be afraid of the consequences of blundering. The results of such stupidity and venality could easily spread over incalculable time, and lead to such a frittering away of our resources as to prove almost fatal in the national sense. The incredibly muddy thinking that led us straight from the hot war of shooting into the cold war that still rages, could easily manifest itself in another shocking folly.

THE TREATY

To return to the treaty, the plans for the sea-level canal show the divergence of its route from that of the present ditch at several points. That alone invalidates the present treaty by encroaching upon Panamanian territory. The width of the Canal Zone is figured as a distance of 5 miles on each side of the axial line of the canal, except for the sprawling out of Lake Gatun. The sea-level plan not only changes that axis in part but, if the scheme could be carried out as planned, it would drain and expose thousands of acres of pestilential muck now deep under water, thereby creating a new hazard to health which might easily entail very serious consequences. In addition to this, the present outlet of the Chagres River would be shifted some 10 miles. Villages and individual farms now occupied would be drowned out.

Anyone who imagines that Panama or any other State would acquiesce to all this and more without demanding adequate reparation is unusually naive, even for a North American. Moreover, the definition of adequacy is barbed and poisoned for both countries. Our idea of it may be the opposite of what Panama and the rest of Latin America feel it is. * * *

There is vastly more to understanding the Panama question than is even suggested here. It is high time, too, that we justify our pretense of the good friend to mankind by seeking a modicum of wisdom. The Bridge of Fear is again a region where angels fear to tread, and the ghosts of half a millenium gibber at us to beware as we venture upon it.

Truman Inflation Is Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks heretofore granted, I am inserting the following article by Mark Sullivan which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of January 18, 1950:

TRUMAN PROGRAM CALLED THREAT TO THOSE HAVING FIXED INCOMES—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS ECONOMIC PLAN FAILS TO CARE FOR SAVERS WHOSE REVENUE CANNOT INCREASE

[By Mark Sullivan]

President Truman, projecting an increase in national income, defined that it is the total of all the income received by all the people in the United States. "All the people" is an appealing phrase. It is repeated by Mr. Truman in effect in his projected economic plan for the next 5 years, in which increase of national income is the cornerstone. "The benefits," Mr. Truman says, must extend to all groups."

But there is one kind of income that cannot increase—it is the kind called "fixed income." Wages of workers can be increased.

Prices received by farmers for crops can be increased. Prices received by manufacturers of goods can be increased. But the group who depend on fixed incomes can have no increase.

This group is very large. It includes beneficiaries of pensions, both government and industrial, which are usually fixed in amount. It includes beneficiaries of social security, the amounts of which are fixed by law. It includes persons receiving life-insurance annuities. In the same situation are persons who put savings into Government bonds, the interest and principal of which are fixed. The group as a whole includes nearly all who save from their earnings and who depend on their savings for income after they have ceased to be earners, 10 or 20 or 30 years from now.

FIXED INCOMES IN DANGER

Hardly any of these can benefit from Mr. Truman's projected increase in national income; on the contrary they are set back by it. For out of their fixed incomes they must pay higher prices for what they buy.

If wages of large numbers of workers are increased from $2,000 a year to $4,000, as Mr. Truman projects for a future period, then the services of these workers will cost more, and the goods they make will cost more. Similarly, when farmers are paid more for their crops, food costs more. What is increase of income for these groups is loss for the receivers of fixed incomes merely increased cost of what they must buy.

Those who depend on fixed income or on fixed amounts of savings—in effect nearly all savers—these are the aggregate "forgotten man" in the country's economy, so far as the economy is shaped by the Administration. They are more than merely neglected, they are discriminated against.

The administration urges people to save, meanwhile campaigns urging them to buy Government bonds. By the social-security law, an immense number of workers are compelled to save by paying taxes based on their earnings. The administration exerts pressure for pension systems in industry, whereby employers add to workers' wages an amount set aside for pensions when the workers come to retirement age, some years in the future.

Simultaneously with urging or compulsion of savings for income at a future time, the administration has practiced policies which cause savings to have a smaller purchasing power when they come back to the saver than when the saving was made.

The administration encourages raises in wages—in some cases the raises are decreed by the Government. This causes higher costs of goods, and of services which savers and others must pay for. In some cases the higher costs are decreed by Government bodies, the Interstate Commerce Commission has decreed several increases in railroad passenger and freight rates. And the Government supports prices of farm crops, causing prices of food to be higher than they would otherwise be. The consequence of all this to savers has been reduction in their purchasing power. The saver gets the number of dollars stipulated in his pension or Government bond or social security, but each dollar buys him less goods.

A PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

This has become a familiar experience. When a person 10 years ago put a thousand dollars into Government bonds or other form of savings, that was the price of a new automobile. When 10 years later he gets his savings back, it is only half the price of the same automobile. A saved dollar 10 years ago was in effect a saved bushel of wheat; it is now only half a bushel. This reduction in purchasing power has gone on as respects practically all lines of goods and services.

It is the savers who actually are, in Mr. Truman's phrase, "all the people," though he does not seem to comprehend this. The aggregate of holders of Government bonds, pensioners, and beneficiaries of social security and life insurance is, with overlapping, more than the total population. The Government policies which work detriment to these is an injustice to the people and a dangerous distortion of the country's economy.

Old Age and Survivors Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place the following article by Eugene Bertram Willard, which appeared in the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., on January 12, 1950:

EDITOR, CHELSEA RECORD:

The number of Chelsea folks who have reached 65 years of age and who will be eligible for and accept social-security benefits when they are upped by the second session of the Eighty-first Congress cannot be stated definitely. But we do know that many of our elderly citizens are still at work even though many of these would like to take things a lot easier in their last years, but certainly cannot make both ends meet on the paltry present benefit payments.

Less than 10 percent of the folks now on the old-age-assistance rolls, a set-up bearing all the stigma of welfare, are eligible for old-age and survivors insurance. Many now on OAA do not want to be there at all but because of their inability to find work or because of physical disabilities to retain employment are compelled to accept the State's hand-out and along with this have to suffer the visitations of the snoopers known as case workers. The Federal old-age and survivors insurance system employs no visitors and after an application is filed that is the end of the matter. No embarrassing questions are asked and the beneficiaries accept the payments as a matter of right. As long as a person has been in covered employment long enough to be eligible for the old-age and survivors insurance benefits that is all that is necessary. In certain hardship cases beneficiaries have had to ask for supplementary help from OAA. However, under the proposed increased benefits by the Congress much of this supplementary aid will not be necessary and beneficiaries will not have to suffer the humiliation of bowing and scraping to the welfare department which will have nothing to do with helping the old folks. This certainly will not hurt the feelings of worthy aged persons many of whom now resent the prying into their affairs by welfare workers chiefly interested in their own pay checks.

If we are to preserve the American way of life in Chelsea and elsewhere in the Nation, old-age assistance as we now know it, must be tossed out the window. Its place must be taken by the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system by providing adequate benefits for eligible folks. The older group of American citizens have earned retirement. Many of these are not covered by the Social Security Act. Something will have to be done for these other than making them members of the OAA group which is distasteful to every red-blooded American. The Congress must act to make possible the payment of a pension to every American who has reached 65 so that he or she can hold up one's head and not have to bear the stigma of welfare.

Between the retirement payments and a modest national old-age pension the whole process of our business activity will be stabilized. Retirement payments will provide continuous buying power, will provide the needed balance in market demand, and will help to provide mass consumption, without which our mass-production economy cannot function successfully. It will lead the way to greater prosperity in America.

In discussing this subject we must not overlook that the Chelsea Bureau of Old-Age Assistance does not make its own laws, and any deficiencies in it are the result of mandates from Beacon Hill. It is a safe conclusion that Director George R. Morse has little sympathy with many of the rules and regulations governing OAA clients, but he and his assistants have to do as they are mandated by the law, or else. We know that many will agree with us that the present system of OAA is all wrong because it is beset with so many humiliating musts; we also know that the present system of sending snoopers into the home of aged is all wrong and not the American way of doing things. Maybe somebody borrowed the idea from Moscow. The rank and file of Chelsea citizens, like the rank and file of good Americans everywhere, want to see the aged get a decent break at long last, and they will never get a break under the old-age assistance set-up where closely scrutinized budgets are the rule. Americans must look for something better than the present hand-out by OAA. The hand-out is bad enough of itself, but the conditions imposed upon the recipient a thousand times worse. It is encouraging to know that the progress of the social-security movement in the Congress may be traced by those who have eyes to see; the works of those interested in the welfare of America's aged speak persuasively to those who have ears to hear; the pulsations of the heart humanitarian may be felt by those who have hearts to feel. In their needs, in their tendencies, and in their weaknesses the Eighty-first Congress, just opened for its second session, will be mindful of Chelsea's aged, of the Commonwealth's aged, of America's aged.

EUGENE BERTRAM WILLARD.

Miners' Welfare Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to a unanimous-consent request, I insert herewith the following copy of an article appearing in the United Mine Workers Journal for January 15, 1950:

WEST VIRGINIA MEDICAL JOURNAL PRAISES WELFARE FUND, DEBUNKS STATE MEDICINE CHARGE

Unfounded charges intended to discredit the medical services offered by the welfare and retirement fund were thoroughly "debunked" in the January issue of the West Virginia Medical Journal, an official publication of the medical profession. Its editorial comment was directed especially at the loose talk that the UMWA program was in some way related to state medicine or that it destroyed the traditional doctor-patient relationship.

Text of the editorial follows:

"We have heard whisperings to the effect that the United Mine Workers welfare fund has been wrecked by the inroads of the medical profession; that it will lead to state medicine, etc.

"While exact figures as to medical costs are not yet available, we have information to the effect that, by and large, the fees charged by individual physicians have been reasonable and satisfactory to the fund management; so satisfactory, indeed, that there is no contemplated fee schedule in the offing.

"The questionable fees submitted have been very occasional and far between, although a few have been exorbitant. These have been so few, however, as to be practically negligible.

"As to the charge that the operation of the welfare fund will lead to state medicine, it will in our judgment have exactly the opposite tendency. As set up, the working of the fund certainly is at least a corollary of free enterprise, so to speak. The plan has been worked out in the various States in conjunction with the organized medical profession, and, in those States which have liaison committees of the State medical associations, controversies have been even fewer than elsewhere.

"The plan actually gives the patient reasonably free choice of physician and hospital, certainly along the lines of normal patient flow from his home community, and there is in actual practice no disturbance of the time-honored doctor-patient relationship. The doctor is not hampered as to examination and treatment; he gives the patient what, in his own judgment, is necessary, and submits his bill for service rendered.

"There is no compulsory legal element or tax in the procedure. Certainly this is the very antithesis of compulsory governmental health insurance.

"As far as our observation of the fund has gone, the profession is satisfied and the patients are likewise satisfied. Certainly it has ameliorated the lot of the miner medically and has pioneered in the field of labor-medical relationships. Experiences have been gathered and guideposts have been erected which might well be considered by other welfare funds now being set up when they come to furnishing actual medical service to their beneficiaries."

Be It Known

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and honored to have in my district the Palm Beach Post-Times, whose editor and publisher, Charles Francis Coe, has received national recognition and an award from Freedoms Foundation, Inc., for the most constructive and outstanding editorial of the year. The award is for recognition for his contribution to the American way of life by speaking up for freedom. The presentation to Editor Coe was made at Valley Forge, Pa., by Gen. Dwight Eisenhower and consisted of a gold medal and $2,000.

The greatest of metropolitan dailies had entries before the jury which made the award. This jury consisted of justices of the supreme courts of various States. The award comes to Charles Francis Coe in competition with the great editorial writers of the Nation.

These are times when liberty and freedom should be fortified by fearless expressions. I hope every Member of the Congress, as well as the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will read this editorial.

The editorial is as follows:

BE IT KNOWN

Be it known by the peoples of the world that there is in the earth a government conceived in simple principles, established by and for the average man, strong through nearly two centuries of consecrated growth.

Be it known that this is the Government of the United States.

Be it known that the name of this Government derives from its nature. It is a federation of separate States, each of which of its own sovereignty. These States originally united in a wise and common effort, each to support and serve the other, in a public policy of common defense, and common freedom for the governed.

Be it known that in these States united, the individual dignity and right of a citizen is the first governmental proviso. One hundred and forty-odd million John Does and Mary Does reside in this Utopia of man's creation, under God's guidance.

Schools abound. Libraries are free. Institutions for the betterment of the individual are as common as the very trees. A network of roads binds these States united in a common ground of play and work for all. There is no barrier of customs at any State line. There is no passport or visa needed by the traveler between States.

There is free and unrestricted intercommunication between States, and between men within those States. If a man wishes to move from one State to another, no governmental restrictions retard him. His is the right of citizenship in the State of his own election; and of common sovereignty in the federation of all the States.

Be it known that in this federation, the God of a man's uncontrolled selection, is the God of his worship. The house of John Doe is his inviolable sanctuary, free from unlawful search and seizure. The right of John Doe and Mary Doe to assemble in public meeting is a guaranteed right. The right of each to seek redress for governmental wrong, is of like nature.

Be it known that this Government has so prospered as to become the mightiest among nations. This Government has vested its final and ultimate authority in John Doe and Mary Doe, its constituent citizens.

It knows no monarchs. It repudiates the "divine right to rule." It asserts and maintains the supreme dignity of the average man. It has done so for nearly two centuries of constant growth. It is the manifest expression on earth of man's capacity to be man.

Be it known that lesser governments, though older and more selfish civilizations, in envy and gross ambition of leadership, have sought, and are now seeking, the overthrow of this Federation.

They would replace it with oppression, and the spurious "divine right of kings."

Be it known that such forces have developed, and are developing, a new technique of subversion by using freedom, to annihilate freedom. They are "boring from within." They are polluting the instrumentalities of this Federation. They would destroy the tools which manufacture common liberty. They mock the idea that a government should be accountable to its people. They insist that a people must be accountable to its government.

Be it known that such forces abhor the philosophy of a written contract between government and governed. Such forces are frustrated by such an equitable and specific contract. They insist that the government must tell the people what to do. They deny that the people must tell the government what to do.

So these destructionists are faced with the first task of invalidating the contract between these States and the federation they joined. The contract is the Constitution of the United States. The States refused to ratify it, until 10 amendments were made to guarantee the rights of the States, and of Mary and John Doe.

This contract does not say what the Federal Government can do. It says what the Federal Government cannot do. That keeps Mary and John in control. That defeats the monarchs and the dictators. It will do these things so long as it remains undestroyed.

That is why it is great. That is why Mary and John Doe, and their children, and children's children, live and laugh and learn and labor and love, in a liberty of God's recognition.

Be it known that the forces opposed to such liberty have fomented endless wars, and are still so fomenting wars. Such wars are costly in worldly goods. These destructive forces have come to realize that there may be cheaper ways to destroy freedom and reestablish the "divine right to rule" than by war.

Be it known, therefore, that these forces are providing vast sums of money to finance subversive efforts among Mary and John Doe, in the hope that weariness, and a desire for international peace, will deceive Mary and John into relinquishment of their contract for freedom.

Be it known that traitors are financed and finagled into positions of high trust and power within the federation. Some are now open candidates. These dress lechery in the habiliments of freedom; garb license in the gowns of liberty; bribe treasonists into terror campaigns, and subvert supine politicians with the blandishments of diplomacy along with the gangrenous gold of dictatorship.

Be it known that Mary and John Doe, cherishing their liberty, treasuring their individual dignity, faithful to their trust as custodians of the world of the average man, conscious of the presence of God in the earth, stalwart in the valor and fortitude of their sacred dead, have roused themselves, at lingering last.

Be it known that Moscow money must not buy American liberty. That communism must not overthrow world freedom. That these States in union will not surrender the prerogatives ordained of God and sanctified by the generations of human devotion and sacrifice.

Be it known, aye, be it known.

Let Mary and John Doe make it known, for the hour is late and, through the ballot, the means are at hand.

CHARLES FRANCIS COE.

Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place the following article by Charles J. O'Malley which

appeared in the Boston Traveler, Boston, Mass., on Tuesday, January 10, 1950:

BOSTON INVESTORS CALLED THEY OWNERS OF FORMOSA

(By Charles J. O'Malley)

Considering the news emanating from China and coming through the newspaper channels and the airways, the situation there seems to be deplorable, but the facts bearing on Formosa, which is a crucial point in the Chinese survey, are so different from what has been expressed that it has induced me to present the facts as they are and not what they might be.

The people of Boston and New England have greater ownership interest in Formosa than the Chinese or Japanese.

The facts are these:

When Japan defeated China, she sold the island of Formosa to the Taiwan Electric Light & Power Co. for a sum equal to about five million American dollars. The Taiwan Electric Light & Power Co. was the most important industrial development in Japan. It owned and controlled the electric light and power all over the Empire and the taxing power of Formosa was one of the securities. When this was accomplished it was decided that America would pay for it, and bonds, equivalent to $22,500,000 were issued. These bonds were sold in Boston, New England, New York, and other parts of the United States. In order to accomplish this, the company secured the services of J. P. Morgan & Co., Kuhn Loeb & Co., the National City Co., the First National Bank of the City of New York, and the Yokohama Specie Bank, Ltd. When this was accomplished, through the Yokohama Specie Bank, which was the interest involved in Japan, practically all the leading brokerage houses in this country were engaged in the sale of these bonds. Hayden Stone & Co. sold a great many of these bonds in Boston.

Before the agreement was completed the Imperial Japanese Government guaranteed as follows:

"The Imperial Japanese Government hereby unconditionally guarantees the due and punctual payment of the principal, interest, and sinking fund of the within bond in accordance with its terms; in faith of which it has expressly authorized Jushii Tsushima to sign these presents in person or by his nominee.

"Dated, July 1, 1931.

"For the Imperial Japanese Government.

"JUSHII TSUSHIMA."

I have visited the island of Taiwan, or Formosa, on two occasions. The island is about the size of Ireland and has a population of 6,000,000. These people consider themselves as a part of the United States possessions. The island had, when I was there, about 34 forts protecting it. This island is very rocky and has very steep cliffs.

I was personally interested in this enterprise and knew that the bonds were of some value, for the interest on the bond was paid regularly from July 1931 until July 1, 1941. Then trouble began.

The island of Formosa in 1945 was called the island of Taiwan after the ownership was conveyed to that company. I have been in Japan several times, and a few months ago I contacted the foreign department of the Industrial Bank of Japan, the representative of the Japanese Government in Tokyo. I saw Mr. Togama Araki, the promanager of the bank. He informed me that the people of the United States owned the island of Formosa and that the bonds which were sold for that purpose were the actual ownership of Formosa. This gentleman stated that our bonds are the first obligation of the Government of Japan. The Japanese agreed to pay for these bonds in full with interest when the peace treaty is signed, and every cent was to be returned to the owners in Boston, New England, New York and other parts of the country. In reference to this matter, the United States administration has taken bold action to stop communism in Europe and is now fighting it in Formosa, or the island of Taiwan which the people of Japan call Formosa.

I was talking with Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers in the Pacific, and he informed me that we should hang on to Formosa, it belongs to us and should be our property.

I was told by Mr. Togama Araki that the bonds are worth every cent that was invested in them. They were purchased at 93½ per bond instead of the $100 which was the reputed value. The island of Formosa was the guarantee of the payment of the bonds, and when I was in Japan, a few months ago, I was fully informed that the Americans owned the island and they should keep it. It is now up to us to decide what to do about it.

England has recognized the Communists in China so it is said and the reason is quite obvious. Hong Kong was taken by England from the Chinese in 1841 with the understanding that Hong Kong would protect China from the advent of opium from India, and it was to be returned to China in 1941. When that time came, the Nationalist Chinese did not insist on the return of Hong Kong to China, but the Communists did. In order to placate the Communists, England is now recognizing them, thus protecting Hong Kong from their assault.

United States Naval Officers in Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the diplomatic history of the United States has many great chapters, some of them formed by the actions of our naval officers when on cruises to distant foreign lands.

Among these, none is more brilliant than the opening of Japan in the middle of the nineteenth century by a naval expedition commanded by Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry. This eminent naval officer, like many others before and since, by personally viewing an historic movement and evaluating its significance, was able to foresee events with remarkable precision and to state his conclusions in words of power.

During his famous Asiatic cruise Commodore Perry not only visited the Japanese Empire and other islands of that region but also the mainland of eastern Asia. He was thus able to interpret realistically the movements he discerned. His conclusions have been recently quoted in a letter of Mr. John Frank Stevens to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune, published in the December 8, 1949, edition of that paper.

Mr. Stevens, by the way, is the son of the world-famed engineer, John F. Stevens, who, as Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission and, later its Chairman, was primarily responsible for the decision in favor of the high-level lake canal at Panama and laid out the great engineering organization under which the Panama Canal was constructed— a work essential to the realization of Commodore Perry's prophecy.

To make Commodore Perry's farvisioned pronouncement available to the Government of the United States and the Nation at large, under leave accorded, I am extending my remarks to include the full text of Mr. Stevens' letter, which follows:

PROPHECY BY PERRY—READER QUOTES WORDS OF THE FAMOUS COMMODORE

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

As I lived in the Orient for 17 years, I am very much interested in the political and economic conditions and developments in that part of the world, and now that Communist China has taken over practically all of the continent of that country my thoughts go back to the contents of a paper written by Commodore M. C. Perry, United States Navy, read before the American Geographical and Statistical Society at a meeting held March 6, 1856, in New York City, and published by D. Appleton & Co., 1856, page 28:

"It requires no sage to predict events as strongly foreshadowed to us all; still westward will the course of empire take its way. But the last act in the drama is yet to be unfolded, and notwithstanding the reasoning of political empires—westward, northward, and southward—to me it seems that the people of America will, in some form or other, extend their dominion and their power until they shall have brought within their mighty embrace multitudes of the islands of the great Pacific, and placed the Saxon race upon the eastern shores of Asia; and I think, too, that eastward and southward will her great rival of future aggrandizement (Russia) stretch forth her power to the coast of China and Siam, and thus the Saxon and the Cossack will meet once more, in strife or in friendship, on another field. Will it be in friendship? I fear not. The antagonistic exponents of freedom and absolutism must thus meet at last, and then will be fought that mighty battle on which the world will look with breathless interest, for on its issue will depend the freedom or the slavery of the world—despotism or rational liberty must be the fate of civilized man. I think I see in the distance the giants that are growing up for that fierce and final encounter; in the progress of events that battle must sooner or later inevitably be fought."

For some time it has been the opinion of some of us who are seasoned students of far eastern affairs that the last struggle between the two largest countries would be probably in north China—perhaps in Shantung or Manchuria—and certainly Commodore Perry's paper points to something of this kind. However, let us hope that it can be settled amicably between these two physically very powerful nations.

JOHN FRANK STEVENS.

NEW YORK, *December 4, 1949.*

Abject Failure in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks an increasing number of thoughtful citizens have spoken or written to me expressing their concern about the manner in which our Department of State has handled, or mishandled, our relations with China.

They realize that China has been one of our finest allies and staunchest friends. They further realize that the eyes of the peoples of the entire world are focused on Americans and that the future security of our Nation, as well as many others, may very well depend on what action our Government takes with respect to China and other far eastern nations.

To all of those who have written and spoken to me about China and to all the others who are puzzled about this matter, I say that their interest and deep concern cannot be any greater than mine. The confusion with respect to the State Department's policy, or lack of it, concerning China is tremendous. So far as I am concerned, no explanation yet given by our State Department, including its 1,054-page white paper report, has eliminated this confusion or justified the Department's inconsistencies and wait-until-the-dust-settles attitude. The dust has settled, and what we now see is the entire mainland of China in the hands of Communists—and Burma, southern Korea, Indochina, Siam, and other far eastern nations, including India, squarely faced with this same Communist threat.

Let us compare this actual situation with what the President said in his state of the Union message on January 4, 1950. Said the Chief Executive:

> In foreign policy * * * we can never be tolerant of oppression or tyranny. * * * We must throw our weight on the side of greater freedom and a better life for all peoples.

The very next day the President announced that we were forsaking Formosa.

Because I have been fortunate in having many American friends who spent long years in China and because I have been able to discuss this matter with several Chinese leaders and plain citizens, I long ago became deeply interested in China's problems as they relate to the United States and to the future peace and security of the world.

Partially with that interest and knowledge in mind, I said in May 1947—almost 3 years ago—in connection with the proposal for assistance to Greece and Turkey:

> What we need as a realistic Nation, before we attempt to rebuild the political and economic structures of other countries, is a clearly defined, forthright, widely accepted policy which will provide us with a fully charted, integrated course of action.

In October 1947—more than 2 years ago—I wrote to the Secretary of State, saying:

> It is a matter of concern to me that almost our entire attention—with respect to foreign assistance and foreign economic recovery—is directed toward the European nations when it appears that China, a former loyal ally, is much more certainly in need of urgent assistance than such western nations as Switzerland, Sweden, and Turkey. This becomes a matter of even greater concern when on the basis of apparently reliable information in the public press, economic stability and recovery in China are not only urgent but could be effected at a very much lower cost to this country.

In reply I received this statement from the Under Secretary of State:

> I can assure you that this Government is thoroughly aware of the critical conditions which exist in China and is giving earnest attention to the question of how the United States can most effectively aid China in overcoming the present difficulties.

At the time of that exchange of correspondence Nationalist China had successfully contained the Chinese Communists in Manchuria, which, incidentally, had been made available to the Communists through the secret agreements made at Yalta. In the slightly more than 2 years which have intervened, the entire vast mainland of China has been lost to the Communists.

In spite of what has taken place in China in the past 2 years our State Department said loftily and without a noticeable twinge of conscience that—

> Nothing this country did or could have done * * * could have changed the result; nothing that was left undone by this country could have contributed to it.

This is a self-satisfying, self-serving statement of the Department of State, with which I emphatically do not agree.

During the past 2 years, in the face of State Department opposition, the Congress has appropriated funds for assistance to China. Even now the President has funds made available by the Congress for use at his discretion for assistance to China which have not been and are not being used. Adding to the general confusion were pictures and stories in last week's newspapers showing tanks and other war matériel destined for China being loaded aboard ship at an eastern port. This equipment was purchased by the Chinese Nationalist Government with American funds authorized in 1948. The matériel itself is surplus and, therefore, presumably was available when these funds were appropriated in 1948. It is no wonder, therefore, that questions are being asked as to why it has taken more than a year for this sorely needed matériel to be made available for shipping.

At this point I would like to direct attention to some of the conditions established by our State Department in 1948, as reported in the white paper, with which the Chinese Nationalist Government was expected to comply in order to receive American aid.

We find that China was asked to establish budgetary control in the hands of a central fiscal authority, with sufficient political strength to resist demands for unnecessary expenditures. Now, compare this for a moment with the operation of our own Government. Concerning Federal budgeting and accounting systems, the Hoover Commission reported that they found such systems in this country to be an antiquated, accretion of practices dating back to Alexander Hamilton. Although it would be possible to understand the existence of deficit financing in war-wracked China, it is difficult, if at all possible, to understand or condone peacetime deficit financing in our own country, which is the most prosperous in the world. Nevertheless, the fact remains that this Nation is today spending in excess of its revenues even though we already have an accumulated debt in excess of one-quarter of a trillion dollars.

In 1948 the Chinese Government was asked to eliminate nonproductive expenditures not essential to civic administration and prosecution of the war. In peacetime United States, however, as Senator BYRD's committee repeatedly pointed out, we have had one civilian employee for every two persons in uniform.

The Chinese were told to make administrative improvements in taxation. In our own country the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation reported in January 1948:

> Unnecessary, cumbersome, outmoded, and wasteful practices have continued unchanged in the Bureau [of Internal Revenue] for decades.

In 1948 our State Department asked the Chinese Government to make a conscientious reduction of civil and military rolls to eliminate unnecessary employees. This and the other State Department recommendations to China are highly commendable. But let us compare again what we recommended for China and what we continue to do at home. We find that in December 1947, Federal civilian employment in the executive branch totaled less than 900,000. Seven years later, in 1939, this number had increased by 50 percent and was slightly more than 900,000. As of June 30, last year, the total number of Federal civilian employees in the executive branch exceeded 2,000,000 and was reported by Senator BYRD to be increasing at the rate of 300 a day.

Let us consider another worthy recommendation made to the Chinese in 1948. They were told at that time that coordination and elimination of duplication in civil and military agencies was essential. What is the situation in our own country, according to the Hoover Commission and the Byrd committee? Those groups reported that there was almost fantastic duplication and overlapping among the 1,816 component parts of the executive branch of our Government. Here are but a few examples. We have 37 Federal agencies engaged in public health activities; 1. in electric and water power; 34 in the acquisition of land; 12 in home and community planning; no less than 16 in wildlife preservation; a total of 65 agencies engaged in gathering statistics; and 21 agencies in the field of transportation. This whole situation was very ably described by Comptroller Gen. Lindsay Warren as "a hodgepodge and crazy-quilt of duplications, overlappings, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies with their attendant extravagance."

In 1948 we made many other excellent recommendations to the Chinese Government, but I shall mention only one more. The Chinese Government was told to "clarify, by action as well as by statement, the fields open to private enterprise without government intrusion." On the other hand, in the opinion of many of us, our own Government's continued intrusion into many fields of private enterprise in direct competition with taxpaying private businesses has

become a matter of serious national concern. We find that our Government now owns, or is actively interested in, approximately 100 important business enterprises. Some of these fields of private endeavor into which our Government has entered extensively include banking, electric power production, life insurance, transportation, housing, and purchase and sale of farm products. In the electric power field alone our Government has already invested over $3,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money in multipurpose power projects. But this is only the beginning. Our Government has, in addition, a planned program for further public power development entailing an ultimate aggregate cost of over $40,000,000,000.

Again, let me emphasize the fact that the recommendations we made to China in 1948 are extremely commendable. However, I am unable to understand why these same conditions or requirements were not established with respect to other nations to which we have made available billions of dollars, and why our own Government should not in effect "practice what it preaches."

I mentioned in the preceding sentence that such preaid conditions as were established for China were not applicable with respect to other nations which we are supporting with loans and gifts in tremendous sums. When it was suggested by many Members of Congress that requirements of this nature be made applicable, for example, to the European nations receiving Marshall-plan aid, the reply was given by our Department of State that this could not be considered because we would be interfering with the internal operations of these other governments. I fail to see any consistency in the policies established on the one hand for China and on the other hand for European nations, and yet I believe that the reconstruction and postwar development of nations in Europe and in Asia were of similar significance and importance to Americans and people throughout the world.

Let me repeat—the future peace and security of the world depend in a great measure upon American policy in the Far East. Bipartisan support for our foreign policy is much to be desired. But bipartisan support cannot be expected and should not be given unless both parties are fully and completely informed and unless both parties formulate, in fact and not in theory, that foreign policy.

In view of the foregoing, I earnestly urge that there be an immediate, intensive, and nonpartisan investigation of the forces within and without the Department of State which have caused our weak and wavering China policy to result in abject failure, the loss of China and its friendly people, and the very real threat to peace and security which the continued spread of communism in the Far East represents.

I hope that the pressure of public opinion will force the administration to take fearless and positive action of this nature. If this is done honestly and at once, I am confident that unity of purpose will thereafter produce "a clearly defined, forthright, widely accepted policy which will provide us with a fully charted, integrated course of action"—and support for a truly bipartisan policy which will be recognized by all the world as eminently just and worthy of freedom-, peace-loving Americans.

Lucien J. Bourgoin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place the following address which I delivered at the dedication of the West Street playground to a Franco-American veteran of World War II, Lucien J. Bourgoin, on December 4, 1949, at Lawrence, Mass.:

This is just a field now set apart as a playground, but it is rich in memories of youth that has gone.

Of Lucien Bourgoin and of so many others, some of whom have come back to West Street this day as mothers, fathers, or grandparents. Others have moved to far off places. There are some who sleep forever on the western hills just beyond the railroad tracks, close to the scene of this, their childhood land.

As far back as most of us can remember this was an open space which the young claimed for the sports and games of their happy, carefree years.

If by some magic we could have all the boys and girls who found their freedom here come back today, as they were then, this field would be filled to overflowing and it would ring with their gay little voices.

But youth does not last forever. Sometimes it is taken by the early frost of death and it is so difficult to believe that journey's end has come so soon.

So it was with Lucien Bourgoin, who gave up the brightest years of his life that we might live.

Those of us who have not been called upon to make his sacrifice move on to middle age and to the quiet, thoughtful, later years when the reaper claims us in due season.

We look back on the young who follow us, identifying ourselves with them, trying to recapture the joy and the wonder that once was ours.

Perhaps Lucien's father told him of the ward 5 football and baseball games that were played here long ago, of the championship boxing bouts that drew people from near and far, of the carnivals that strung pearls of light against the night sky, of all the excitement and mystery when the circus came to West Street.

And maybe the boy's eyes went wide with the adventure of life even more so when his dad told him of the Archibald Wheel Co., which once stood just north of here.

It made wheels for the wagons which delivered food and coal and ice and furniture to the homes and wagon wheels which transported goods from the freight depot to the stores. It was a useful industry that served the needs of peace.

But in 1917 and 1918 it made wheels for a different purpose, and it was a busy place in those days. Every few weeks one saw a freight train pull away south along those very same tracks over there (pointing), its open cars loaded with wheels, each one daubed with different colors of paint, as if done by a child.

They called them camouflaged wheels because, at a distance they blended into the background and they were hard to see.

Those wheels were on their way to France as parts of the mobile guns that were helping the American and French Armies to save those freedoms in which our two countries believed.

Sometime later, after the war had ended, I remember those same wheels were carrying the body of a soldier who died of his wounds after his return home, carrying him along the street which flanks the northern end of this one, up to the Legion lot beyond the bridge.

In the meantime, automobiles were crowding out horse-drawn vehicles and the Archibald Wheel Co., having outlived its usefulness, went out of business.

The war to end all wars was over, and life in Lawrence resumed its normal ways.

The field was still here.

A new generation of children played on it. And the games they played were much the same as those played by children of 1900 to 1910, who had since grown up and gone to war and had come home if they were lucky, older, wiser, and disillusioned.

The new ones paid little attention to them, except on Memorial and Armistice Days, and then only in the passing parade.

The young of 1920 to 1930 had other things to do, such as "playing soldier," for instance, little dreaming that they would be called to follow in their fathers' footsteps, and that the game would become cruel, bloody, and in deadly earnest.

Even we, the older ones, did not think that it would happen.

It did, in a war more frightful than the one of 1917.

And we who were older and thought we were wiser failed to stop it. By our carelessness and our failure to concern ourselves with the problems of the Nation and the world we did this to our children.

We sent them off to fight and suffer and die to pay for our mistakes.

And now we receive back their still and broken bodies. Belatedly we grieve and raise monuments in their honor.

Too late for remorse? It is never too late for us to mend our ways and do something for another generation which is growing up in their likeness, and by something I mean that we exert ourselves to the fullest in building an international organization that will curb aggression and banish war forevermore from the face of this earth.

It will not be easy. It cannot be done in a year or 10. But it must be done, for the sake of the children here at this dedication who look up to us in such trust and confidence as their protectors.

Lucien Bourgoin would wish it so.

And as an everlasting reminder to us of our obligations, he would like his name associated with this playground of his boyhood.

To his gallant memory, symbolic of all the Franco-American young men and women who went from this neighborhood to fight our battles for us, we dedicate this playground.

That the children of today—and all children who follow them—may grow up to be happy, healthy citizens in a peaceful world which Lucien Bourgoin inspired us to win for them.

The Rules Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press for Monday, January 16, 1950:

DON'T GO BACK

A battle impends in Congress over whether the House Rules Committee's former power to bottle up legislation shall be restored.

Last year the House voted, 275 to 142, to deprive the committee of that power.

The system then adopted provides that, if the Rules Committee fails to clear a bill in 21 calendar days, the chairman of the legislative committee which originally approved the measure can demand a vote by the House membership on whether it shall be brought out for debate.

Nine of the Rules Committee's 12 members have now asked the House to abandon the new system. Their request should be denied.

The system they would bring back was undemocratic. Under it the Rules Committee too often functioned, not as a traffic signal to keep the flow of proposed legislation orderly, but as a blockade.

Unless a bill could get approval by a Rules Committee majority it was held up indefinitely. Six committee members could prevent 429 other representatives of the people from debating and voting on measures which a majority of them might favor.

It is argued, on behalf of returning to that system, that danger of crackpot and spendthrift legislation would be lessened.

The Rules Committee, that is, could spare the House the necessity of voting on proposed laws and expenditures which most representatives recognize as unwise but shrink from opposing openly for fear of angering potent pressure groups.

Republicans and southern Democrats on the Rules Committee, for example, could prevent enactment of much of President Truman's program.

We question the wisdom of many things in the Truman program. But in the past the power which the Rules Committee now seeks to regain often was abused for the purpose of blocking legislation we favored.

We said, then, that it was wrong for the committee to have such power. We believe, now, that it would be wrong for the committee to recapture such power. What House Members need is enough backbone to stand up for their own convictions, not a device to shield political cowards.

Wind Power as a Possible Source of Power Is Not in Missouri River Basin Power Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by O. L. Huntsman:

WIND POWER AS A POSSIBLE SOURCE OF POWER IS NOT IN MISSOURI RIVER BASIN POWER PLAN

(By O. L. Huntsman, Washington, D. C.)

In connection with the power plan for the Missouri Basin development B. H. Greene, regional engineer at Chicago of the FPC gave the Inter-Agency Committee a report upon various aspects of the situation confronting it. Among the phases treated by him is the estimated required capacity for the next 30 years in that region and as to it the conclusion was that the required capacity of generating facilities would be far short. "To complete the 1970 generating capacity, and additional 8,922,000 kilowatts or 41 percent of the total, will have to come from new sources," the FPC engineer declared.

The new sources of supply of the required power, as suggested in Mr. Green's report, do not mention wind-generated power, but steam power and atomic energy are the contemplated sources or means to be developed.

The significance of the fact that the use of the aerogenerator, in this Great Plains area where wind movement is the most constant of any comparable part of this country, has not been mentioned by this Federal Power Commission engineer shows that within the Commission where the aerogenerator research work was done that the Bureau of Power there is either unfriendly, unfamiliar, or not interested with the new invention as an auxiliary supplier of power.

Wherever a condition exists in a Government agency such as is illustrated above, it becomes a poor policy to delegate administrative power to it—aimed at the development of a proposition—to a group of men who have undertaken the development of a competitive matter. That is to say, that if electricity can be generated by the wind cheaper than it can by water or steam power, those engaged in the construction of hydroelectric projects could not be expected to promote the development of facilities which may render obsolete the water-power or steam-power projects. For these reasons the cause of progress in the field of producing electrical power by the use of the wind should not be entrusted to the Federal Power Commission and its staff.

There are in existence other reports and studies made by the staff of the Federal Power Commission concerning the power development in other river basins, including one of particular interest to Arkansas. These reports are made by different segments of the staff at different times and plans but they show, with an exception, that no thought has been given to augmentation of electric needs of the area covered by use of the wind. In all of the reports on hydroelectric development plans, the demands are greater than the possible potential capacity of water-power resources.

It may be well to obtain copies of these various engineering reports from the Federal Power Commission and have them spread upon the record for information to the people who may be able to see the trends and thereby be able to understand them.

Labor Unions in Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an article from the International Teamster on labor unions in Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia by Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J.:

LABOR UNIONS IN NAZI GERMANY AND SOVIET RUSSIA

(By the Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, S. J.)

In the early stages of nazism and as preparation for seizing total power, Hitler leveled one of his first attacks against the labor unions of Germany. No organized group of that type could be tolerated, since such associations of freemen are always a thorn in the side of dictators. Hence, labor, the church, education, youth organizations, cultural associations, agricultural societies, industry, finance, the press, literature, art, science, and every other agency which had a voice and a will of its own were systematically surrounded, absorbed, and reduced to silence.

When Germany had lost its freedom by this planned conspiracy, Hitler launched his legions on the series of conquests which nearly wrecked the continent of Europe and plunged mankind into the misery from which we are still suffering.

A similar enslavement of labor is the policy of Soviet Russia. No such thing as an independent labor union is tolerated. What are called unions are merely state-controlled armies of workmen regimented to obedience and subject to the iron discipline of the Communist government. Those who attempt opposition or even speculate out loud quickly disappear into concentration camps or are quietly liquidated by the all-powerful NKVD, which can arrest, try men in secret, and even execute them without recourse to legal forms. It is estimated that the number of victims from all levels of society at present in Soviet labor camps reaches the appalling total of from twelve to fifteen million persons. They are slowly being worked to death behind a second iron curtain.

It is an error to imagine that Hitler invented labor battalions or concentration camps. Both existed in Soviet Russia from the earliest years of the Communist regime. Hitler imitated the iniquity but improved the technique and surpassed the barbarity.

These two historic examples demonstrate how brutal and inhuman men can become when they lose respect for the dignity of human personality and degrade immortal souls to the level of mere machines and handy tools to be used until they are worn out and then cast on the scrap pile. It must never be forgotten that the loud claims of Communists to be the protector and champion of workingmen is only a smooth lie to cover up the new slavery and gain recruits for the Kremlin's world-wide campaign against Christianity and democracy. One has only to examine the condition of workers in Russia and compare the known facts in that police state to appreciate the liberty, the strength, and the progress of free labor in the United States of America.

Floods in the Twenty-sixth District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, so that the Members of the House may have the opportunity to get accurate information about the dangers of the floodwaters in the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, I am inserting the statement made by Mr. Peyton Berbling before the Appropriations Committee today.

I trust that when this comes before the House, we will receive the unanimous support of the Members in the effort to reduce the loss of life and property in the Twenty-sixth Congressional District.

The statement follows:

My name is Peyton Berbling and I am the corporation counsel of the city of Cairo, Ill., and attorney for the Cairo drainage district. The Cairo drainage district is the industrial district of the city of Cairo, and in this statement the area is treated as one unit, and considered as the Cairo area.

Cairo, which is at the head of year-round deep-water navigation on the Mississippi River, is situated at the extreme southern tip of Illinois. We are literally surrounded by rivers. At our front doorstep is the Ohio River. At our back door is the mighty Mississippi River, and the north boundary of the Cairo drainage district is the south bank of Cache River. Our levee system, for protection against floods in these rivers, is approximately 22 miles in length, and while these levees are in the process of being brought to standard grade and section, they are not completed. Being thus surrounded by rivers, we of the Cairo area are probably more flood conscious than any people in the United States. We have more flood problems than any other river dwellers, and any failure to adequately protect the people against floods in the Mississippi Valley threatens the security of Cairo. Because of that fact, I am here, as a representative of the Cairo area, to urge this committee to give serious consideration to the flood protection in the Mississippi Valley, not on a basis of economy, not on the basis of expediency, but on the basis of common sense and necessity.

Flood protection is a never-ending job. It cannot be done in 1 year or 2. It requires constant attention and improvement, from the little creek to the mighty river. Possibly stabilization of flood control will eventually come, but certainly the goal is not yet in sight. It is a project that will require for some years an annual expenditure by the Federal Government of at least $100,000,000 on the lower Mississippi River alone. The river is a shifting, changing, unpredictable foe. To spend less is to invite disaster. To spend less is to waste a great part of what is actually spent. And in these days of $40,000,000,000 budgets, $100,000,000 is a very small amount to spend for the protection of our own American citizens and our own possessions. Adequate flood protection is not money wasted. It is a very good type of insurance, for the benefit of the Nation as a whole, because with adequate flood protection the people behind these levees can farm their fertile fields and raise the foodstuffs this Nation requires. If a flood comes, that breaks or overtops the levee the cost cannot be easily measured, but certainly it will exceed many, many times the cost of adequate protection. A flood protection that doesn't protect is like a broken chain.

Possibly this is an old story to this committee. But if the members of this committee will read the newspaper headlines of the last few days, they can easily grasp the widespread devastation. Floodwaters are at this very minute doing to the hundreds and thousands of people in the Mississippi Valley. Today, the Ohio River floodwaters stand some 14 feet higher than the streets of Cairo—held back only by the levees. We have had over 10 inches of rain in 15 days. The Wabash, the Tennessee, the Cumberland, the St. Francis, the Ouachita, and many other rivers are rampaging out of their banks, forcing hundreds of families out of their homes, drowning livestock, destroying property, and the end is not yet in sight. If the rains continue we may well have another flood like the terrible 1937 flood.

I am sure that if I could take this committee with me, to see the thousands upon thousands of acres of fine farmland covered with swirling, yellow, river waters, if they could see the hundreds of families living in boxcars, and other makeshift shelters, if they could visualize the great loss in livestock and property already suffered, this committee would need no urging on my part to allocate sufficient funds for the protection of the people of the valley against floods. The scenes of desolation and destruction by the angry floodwaters of the rivers would be a far more potent advocate than I.

Therefore I am glad to appear before this committee at this time. I think the time most opportune because the facts are here for all of us to see. We are a generous Nation. Please be just as generous with the people of the Mississippi Valley as we are with others. If economy is necessary, then let us economize some other place, and not at the expense of flood protection, which is so vital and necessary.

As the representative of the Cairo area, but also as a vital part of the Mississippi Valley, I respectfully urge this committee to consider this matter in the light of its urgency, and give to the United States engineers sufficient money to go ahead with this great work.

The Close of a Chapter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Close of a Chapter," written by Felix Morley, and published in the weekly publication Human Events of January 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CLOSE OF A CHAPTER

(By Felix Morley)

The British recognition of Communist China, coming on the heels of President Truman's final abandonment of the Nationalist cause, has brought to a close the most miserable chapter in the whole history of American diplomacy. Even the New York Times, stanch follower of the Roosevelt-Truman line, is forced to admit editorially that: "We have taken a terrible beating in the Far East."

As yet, however, there is little realization of what the results of that beating are likely to be. The Communist conquest of China is in itself an event of historical importance second only to the Bolshevik revolution of 1917. But the loss of China is, to paraphrase Winston Churchill, only "the end of the beginning." With Mr. Truman's unconditional surrender of Formosa, initiative in the cold war everywhere passes to the clever men in the Kremlin. We can be sure they will exploit their advantages to the full.

Among the results to be anticipated is the further deterioration of the United Nations. In spite of Soviet sabotage this Organization has heretofore been able to function in a fumbling manner. Russia has stultified the Council by use of the veto power, but with the Soviet hloc a small minority of the Assembly there has been some prospect that the veto difficulty could be bypassed.

This likelihood is now diminished. It is not merely that before long Vishinsky will have an oriental colleague to give Moscow control of two out of the five permanent Council seats. The Soviet influence in the Assembly will also be strengthened. From now on, as in the recent test on the internationalization of Jerusalem, the Government of the United States can expect to be outvoted in the more democratic organ of UN. Continuing enthusiasm for an international organization in which we are continuously outsmarted by Russia is not to be expected.

The growing reaction toward isolationism was obvious in President Truman's noninterventionist statement on Formosa. This reaction is certain to be stimulated by the British recognition of the Mao Tze-tung regime, not less so because we shall ultimately follow the British lead in this matter.

If our foreign policy since 1945 could point to a single tangible accomplishment, it was the solidification of Anglo-American relations. The substance of even this one achievement has now been largely whittled away. In domestic affairs our British ally has moved a long distance toward a national socialism which is anathema to traditional American thinking. In western Europe the British are openly skeptical about the economic "integration" that Mr. Hoffman has been vainly preaching. Now, in the Far East, Great Britain moves to make friends with a Chinese regime that has humiliation of the United States as its clear objective.

II

There is, of course, a body of American opinion that would gladly follow Britain into national socialism as domestic policy, and into military alliances in the foreign field. But the task of those who would push the American people down these devious paths is becoming increasingly difficult. The inconsistencies are too clear, and, what is more influential, they are too costly to be passively endured.

Senator TAFT has been prompt to point out the contradiction between the early Truman doctrine of intervention in Greece and the present Truman doctrine of nonintervention in China. If it makes sense to pour money and supplies into the Greek civil war, it should make at least equal sense to do the same in the Chinese civil war. Mr. Truman's assertion that we have no predatory designs on Formosa is close to admission that we have predatory designs on Greece.

The appalling tangle into which opportunism has brought us is the more deplorable, because the Department of State could easily have advanced a reasonable explanation for its flounderings. Secretary Acheson could have said frankly that while the principle of containing communism is sound, this country simply cannot afford to apply it on a global basis. Mr. Acheson could have said that our Greek adventure has been too expensive, and too dubious in its accomplishment, to risk repetition on a far larger scale in China. Such an explanation would have been frank and honorable, and the more impressive when backed by the explicit and implicit revelations in the President's budget message.

But this admission would be out of character for the present administration. Taking the cue from his predecessor, Mr. Truman refuses to admit that anything is beyond his power. Then, when the inevitable frustrations arise, they are glossed over with hypocritical and sanctimonious phrases which can only serve to play into Communist hands.

Actually, we should be grateful to the British for their forthright, if painful, decision to recognize Red China. It knocks the props from under the whole jerry-built structure of our postwar diplomacy. With increasing insistence Americans will now ask why we should pour billions into the containment of communism in Europe if our allies there are willing to make terms with Communist regimes in Asia.

This is a reasonable question which the Department of State will find increasingly difficult either to evade or answer. Perhaps the only satisfactory answer now would be the cry of confession: "Oh, what a tangled web we weave when first we practice to deceive."

III

The tragedy of China is the more poignant, and the more dangerous, because our recent policy toward that tragic country has been lacking in elementary honesty. Secretary Acheson asserted at his press conference on January 5 that "when the United States takes a position it sticks to that position and does not change it by reason of transitory expediency or advantage." Unfortunately the record says otherwise.

On November 26, 1941, in the virtual ultimatum to which Japan replied by attacking Pearl Harbor, the State Department demanded that Japan should not support "militarily, politically, economically, any government or regime in China other than the National Government" headed by Chiang Kai-shek. If it were true that when we take a position we stick to it, we should be sending a similar ultimatum to Great Britain today.

The record further shows that at Yalta, on February 11, 1945, Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin agreed that Soviet Russia should receive important territorial and economic concessions in the Far East. These concessions, providing the springboard from which the Communists proceeded to conquer all of China, included the complete surrender of Outer Mongolia to Russia and recognition of "the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union" in Manchuria.

Stalin was not merely given these priceless advantages at Chinese expense, he was given them without any consultation with our Chinese ally. As Secretary Acheson himself has written in the letter transmitting the China white paper to President Truman: "It was not until June 15, 1945, that General Hurley was authorized to inform Chiang Kai-shek of the [Yalta] agreement," concluded behind Chiang's back 4 months earlier. The white paper itself says (p. 115): "It was unfortunate that China was not previously consulted."

Diplomatic chicanery of this sort is bad enough in itself. But when followed by rhetorical asservations of "the fundamental integrity" of our policy toward China, the hypocrisy becomes intolerable.

IV

Since the sell-out at Yalta it has been impossible for those who have studied the record objectively to regard our Chinese policy with anything but contempt.

In his letter transmitting the Chinese white paper to President Truman, an attempt to gloss the ugly facts was made by Secretary Acheson. So that the war might be quickly ended, he said: "We * * * were prepared to and did pay the requisite price." But Mr. Acheson failed to emphasize that the price paid to Stalin, for 1 week of Russian participation in the war against Japan, was paid at Chinese expense, and without informing the Chinese of the secret transaction. Against this black background Mr. Acheson now says that we stand for principle, that we are honorable and that we do not put forward words, as propagandists do in other countries, to win a temporary advantage.

All that we can accomplish, by this sanctimony, is to consolidate the Chinese behind the Mao Tze-tung regime. The Chinese Nationalists realize, if we do not, that the United States has sold them down the river. It will be wholly understandable if all in a position to do so rally behind the Communist government, the more so since the latter shows every disposition to pay us off in our own coin.

The background also explains why the British, reluctantly but firmly, are dissociating their far-eastern policy from our unpredictable and indefensible gyrations. As the friendly Manchester Guardian observed, in its weekly issue of January 5: "It is rare for a government to repeat its mistakes so exactly and so quickly as Mr. Truman's administration has now done." Perhaps we can afford a blundering diplomacy. The British cannot. So they have split with us to recognize the Red China that we have done so much to consolidate.

Of course, this split between Britain and the United States weakens the whole basis of our European policy, simultaneously with the complete collapse of our policy in Asia. It is not surprising that Moscow should choose this moment to open a propaganda offensive in Finland, in Italy, and in Germany. The time to cash in on our mistakes is at hand.

It is a dismal picture; one that presages a swift and sweeping revulsion in popular thinking. Indeed, an outstanding question now is which of the two parties will more quickly see the domestic implications of growing disillusion. In November 1940 both Democratic and Republican leadership were for intervention. In November 1950, as the tide is running, a bipartisan policy of isolationism would not be surprising.

B. H. Greene's Report on Missouri River Basin Plan Omits Mention of Possibilities of Wind Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by O. L. Huntsman:

B. H. GREENE'S REPORT ON MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PLAN OMITS MENTION OF POSSIBILITIES OF WIND POWER

(By O. L. Huntsman, Washington, D. C.)

It may be of interest to note some facts which indicate the nature of varied interests that some people have, who are engaged in various phases of power development work. One of these manifestations came to light recently in an official report submitted by an engineer employed by the Government. B. H. Greene, regional engineer of the Federal Power Commission at Chicago, gave the Inter-Agency Committee a technical report upon various aspects of the situation confronting it and among the phases treated is one in the form of an estimate of required generating capacity for the Missouri River Basin power plant in the next 20 years. The conclusion reached by this engineer was that the required capacity of generating facilities in that region would be far short. Using his words, it was said, "to complete the 1970 generating capacity an additional 3,922,000 kilowatts, or 41 percent of the total will have to come from new sources."

The sources or possible sources of this added needed supply suggested by Mr. Greene are atomic energy and steam power. There is no mention of wind power as a possible source, which omission is of significance from another viewpoint.

This is not to criticize Mr. Greene, but to point out the fact that because the constituency of the Federal Power Commission is composed of engineers whose interests and training gravitate around the two conventional types of electric generation—water power and steam power—it may not be sound policy to entrust to it the task of developing wind-power instrumentalities to meet present needs. The steam locomotive is passing into the limbo, but there are thousands of earnest men who still believe that steam power is best notwithstanding the demonstrated fact regarding Diesel engines which are supplanting them, because of efficiencies and economies.

Since the Eighty-first Congress, second session, has before it through the President's messages the public power program, it may be that now is the proper time to inject into it the subject of the aerogenerators as sources of cheap auxiliary power to complement the vast hydroelectric developments which are being designed.

Mr. Truman did not mention the scientific development of wind power for generating electricity among those things enumerated in his message and I doubt whether it has ever been brought to his attention. He did specify the need for power development in the Southwest region embracing parts of Oklahoma and Arkansas.

Here, as I have stated in my memo on wind velocities, may be found the best locations in the country for the use of an aerogenerator, because of the constancy of the wind.

If aerogenerators can be built and installed in that region in connection with the dams on those small rivers, how well the windmill and the water turbine can work together. When the wind blows the water wheel can be shut down, thus conserving that source of power for days when there is no wind, and thus a constant supply of power can be maintained at a minimum cost.

This feature should be considered in the matter of the Southwest power development. I am calling it to your attention for whatever importance you may see fit to attribute to it.

A Reporter Looks at Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, there follow the final two articles in the series on bigness in Government authored by Mr. Paul Martin, of the Gannett News Service. The first three in this series appeared in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of December 15, 1949]

SPEND-FOR-PROSPERITY POLICY FEARED

(What is there to fear in Government planning? Can the managed economy succeed? Are we on the way to a one-party system of government? This is the fourth in a series of articles on the magnitude and power of the Federal Government, supported by taxes of the people.)

(By Paul Martin)

There are many citizens today who fear the growing concentration of power in the hands of the Federal Government.

This is evidenced by the variety of American leaders who have spoken out against present trends, including former President Herbert Hoover, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, and former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes.

Congressmen who have returned to Washington during the recess say the one thing uppermost in the minds of the folks back home is the high rate of Federal spending without being able to make ends meet.

What is there to be apprehensive about today? Sometimes it is the hidden trend in government, rather than the accomplished fact.

Here are some trends which have not become fully apparent:

First, there is the theory of the boom economy.

President Truman's economic advisers have what might be termed a 10-year plan. The object is to channel Federal spending into such avenues that we may be able to pump up the national economy from an output of goods and services of around $200,000,000,000 a year as at present, to three hundred or three hundred and fifty billion dollars annually.

This inflationary program contemplates such goals as a $4,000-a-year minimum income for every family—35 percent higher earnings for farmers, pensions of at least $100 a month for the aged, business profits of $40,000,000,000 a year, instead of fifteen or twenty billion dollars.

Fiscal planners are veering away from the old-fashioned notion of a balanced budget, in favor of a what-can-the-economy-stand formula.

Federal spending will be kept high, even inflationary, to pump more money into production and employment, and keep the stream of currency moving. This in turn should create a broader base for collection of more Federal taxes.

In this managed economy, the national debt itself becomes an instrument for expanding credit, and boosting business.

There is a rule of thumb that the national debt could go safely to twice the amount of the national income.

Thus with output of goods and services running around $200,000,000,000, the debt could hit a peak of $520,000,000,000 without endangering the national economy. If the economy could be pumped up to the Truman goal of over $300,000,000,000, the debt could go even higher.

Then there, is the roll-it-over theory.

So long as the Treasury can meet interest payments on the debt, why worry about the principal? When one set of securities comes due, buy it in, then issue another series.

After all, the full faith and credit of the United States is behind these notes, and if the Government's credit isn't good, whose is?

Another trend affects the future role of State and local government.

An unpublished report of the Hoover commission recommended that the Federal Government reduce State-aid grants, and leave to the various States all control and responsibility for such activities as:

(1) Education, (2) public health, (3) welfare and public assistance, (4) employment security, (5) housing and slum clearance.

The report also urged the Federal Government to retire from the following tax fields, and leave them to State or municipal governments:

(1) Estate tax fields. (2) Levies on gasoline and oil. (3) Excises and retail sales taxes.

The Treasury collects around $4,000,000,000 a year from these sources, excluding the old-line, prewar excises on alcohol, tobacco, etc.

This report, prepared for publication, was not released because of objections from at least 2 out of the 12 members of the Hoover Commission.

One member was Secretary of State Dean Acheson, the Commission's Vice Chairman. Acheson is said to hold the view that in this new era of internationalism, State governments are archaic and old-fashioned.

The trend of Government planning in Washington today is that there should be no expansion in the direction of more State government, but rather a gathering in and consolidation of power in a strong Federal Government.

Finally, some believe there is under way an irresistible movement of voters into one single majority party, melted out of many minorities.

A whole new generation of voters has grown up during the last 20 years, with no concept of the old ebb and flow of political power between the two great parties.

And the Government is getting credit for redistributing the tax money of the people, often in reverse ratio to what they paid in, or how it was collected from the various States.

Businessmen, who formerly resented Government invasion into the field of private enterprise, are being more and more tempted by the easy credit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Grants, loans, guaranties, price supports, State-aid programs, and benefits to veterans, the aged, the needy, the unemployed, hold a magnetic political attraction.

Some political observers today feel that the United States is in danger of losing its traditional two-party system of government.

[From the Rochester Times-Union of December 16, 1949]

A "SPENDING SPREE" INTO SOCIALISM

(By Paul Martin)

Who is responsible for runaway Federal spending and dangerous trends in government?

There are some hopeful signs. But in the last analysis, it's the individual wage earner-taxpayer citizen who counts.

Your direct link to better government is through your home-town Congressman.

What is being done today to protect the United States from economic or political danger?

There are several hopeful signs. But none, in itself, amounts to a firm guarantee that this country is not following bankrupt Great Britain on a spending spree into socialism.

Here are the encouraging signals:

HOOVER COMMISSION

Work of the Hoover Commission probably holds the most immediate promise for future economy and efficiency in government.

This bipartisan group, headed by former President Herbert Hoover, avoiding any semblance of politics, made 288 separate recommendations for Government reorganization.

Mr. Hoover estimated these could save American taxpayers $3,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 a year.

In its concluding report the Commission said:

"Federal Government has become the largest enterprise on earth. In less than 20 years its civil employment has increased from 570,000 to over 2,000,000. Its bureaus, sections, and units have increased fourfold to over 1,800.

"Annual expenditures have soared from $3,000,000,000 to over $42,000,000,000. It now costs more each year to pay the interest on the national debt than it did to pay the total cost of the Federal Government 16 years ago."

Around 20 percent of the Commission's recommendations have been enacted to date. Many additional reforms remain for the next session of Congress.

ADMINISTRATION

The White House expects to send a performance-type budget to Congress in January, for the first time in history.

This is designed to show more clearly where the money goes, make it easier to determine where to cut Federal spending.

Mr. Truman also has shown some gestures in the direction of economy.

He vetoed a number of private bills of the Eighty-first Congress which would have upped the cash outlay of the Treasury. He also impounded $615,000,000 in Air Force funds which Congress voted over and above the President's recommendations.

CONGRESS

The practical opposition to more costly social-welfare programs in recent years has come from Congress.

This has been due to a loose coalition of conservative, midwest Republicans and southern Democrats, who have held in check runaway spending plans of the administrative agencies.

Congress next year will attempt for the first time an omnibus appropriations bill, in which all funds for the 1951 fiscal year will be shown under a single cover, instead of 15 to 20 separate bills.

This may or may not add to economy, but it should give a clearer picture of the Federal spending.

Yet Congress, itself, is at fault in failing to keep spending within confines of the Federal revenues, and failing to establish a debt-reduction program.

Members who in theory are for economy give in to practical politics when an appropriations bill affects some pet project in their own districts.

And they swap votes for subsidies to farmers, veterans, business, home-building, miners, ranchers, aviation, merchant marine, and the like.

Proposals to direct the President to make a flat 5 or 10 percent cut in appropriations, already voted by Congress, are a tacit admission that the legislators don't want to do an item-by-item job of pruning their own money bills.

Former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes summed it up this way:

"Our real trouble is debt and taxes. We cannot cure it by more debt and taxes. We should devote to cutting expenditures some of the thought we are devoting to taxing and borrowing.

"But cutting expenditures is not seriously considered in the executive departments. And new taxes will not be considered in Congress. So deficit spending will continue."

A seasoned politician once gave this advice to a new Member of Congress:

"To stay in politics, you must vote for every appropriation bill—against every tax bill."

POLITICS

The trend to one-party politics may arise in large part from the fact that present political symbols have become almost meaningless.

Study the composition of Congress, and what do you find?

So-called liberals are distributed more or less on a regional basis, not according to party lines.

There are the well-defined areas—New England, the Middle Atlantic States including New York and New Jersey, the agrarian radicals around Minnesota and North Dakota, the far West, and the Pacific coast.

No one knows exactly what a liberal stands for, but it sounds more attractive to many than conservative.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower recently defined a liberal as a "man in Washington who wants to play the Almighty with our money."

So-called conservatives reflect largely the sentiment of the Midwest in the GOP, that of the South for Democrats.

If there were a new alinement according to basic economic and social beliefs, many Members would shed their traditional Democrat and Republican labels, and a new two-party system would emerge.

THE PUBLIC

In the past, it has been difficult to interest the average wage earner in such things as taxes and deficits and socialism.

That era may be on the way out. For taxes now hit just about everybody. Federal, State, and local taxes take around 23 percent of the pay check of the average worker.

Major complaints in the congressional mail this year were against excessive Government spending and high taxes.

It is still difficult to put across the concept of socialism or statism in contrast to individual freedom, competition, and private property.

But former Gov. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, while campaigning for the Senate on President Truman's Fair Deal program, shied away from socialized medicine.

HOOVER

Then what is the solution to run-away Federal spending and dangerous trends in the body politic?

Obviously, no one has the final answer, or there would be no problems today.

But in the last analysis, the direct link between the individual and his representative form of government is Congress.

That means the home district Congressman, and on a larger scale, the two United States Senators.

Congressmen are remarkably allergic to mail from home. They tend to ignore form letters, telegrams, and mimeographed postcards from lobby blocs and pressure groups.

But they consider carefully all well-reasoned, personal letters from constituents.

Material Aid to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio speech I recently made:

My fellow citizens, already most of the first day of this new year, 1950, has passed into history. It is quite possible that many of my listeners have made resolutions for the new year. Personally, I prefer to use the word "determination."

The time has come in the world and certainly in our own country when we must take a very positive position on all fundamental questions if we are to meet the world-wide responsibilities which are ours whether we want those responsibilities or not. There is no doubt but what the rest of the world is looking to us for many things. I wonder sometimes if we have not encouraged peoples everywhere to look our way for too much material help. It may be that as we seek to divide that which is stored in our plenteous warehouses, we forget that real advice, counsel, precept, and example should accompany the liberal sharing of our physical resources. Would it not be wise for us as a country to ponder a more realistic return to the fundamentals which have brought this country to the height of prosperity, mass production, good health, good schools, good recreation, sanitation, good roads, automobile ownership, and opportunities of all character which we enjoy under the democratic way of life?

It must be remembered that our Southland has prospered greatly since the Civil War. We had no Marshall plan to aid us. In fact we had few of the labor-saving devices which we enjoy today. Houses were built by hand; the gasoline plow was unknown. The mechanical cotton picker was but a dream. Children came into the world in private homes instead of maternity hospitals. Sensitiveness to certain foods held no place in the medical fraternity. Miracle drugs remained in undeveloped scientific fields. The automobile was not about us, not even to suggest the absence of the airplane, the radio, and now television. The development of the atom was suggested but not even the most erudite scholar knew where to start and certainly no one dreamed that it would cost more than $2,000,000,000 to build a plant in the State of Tennessee, wherein science in cooperation with business management, architects, engineers, contractors, and skilled workmen would finally produce an instrument so powerful as to not only shorten the most horrible war in the world's history but to bring it to a conclusion. All of this suggests to me that we could have never done any of these remarkable things without the fundamentals of hard work, thrift, honesty, the development of good character as individuals and as subdivisions of a great Federal Government.

All of these accomplishments resulted from an ambitious people ever looking toward the future and ever recognizing the need for bringing real happiness to the world in the development of the sciences and the professions, labor, and business. With all of these remarkable physical advantages about us, without the dedication of sound education to useful gains, with this general prosperity and physical happiness so common to most of the citizens of this great country and with so many luxuries in other parts of the world, accepted as simple necessities here, I am afraid that we have lost some of the substantial foundation in the training of some of our teachers and leaders who would have a utopia reached in a day without the hard and difficult and rugged steps which brought us to this place now and which must be continued if the fondest dreams of the idealists are to be further realized in the future.

The President of the United States has announced that he will again press for the passage of his civil-rights program in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress which convenes day after tomorrow. I list the 10 points in that program for you in order that you may be refreshed as to its details:

1. Set up a permanent Civil Rights Commission, a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, and a Civil Rights Division in the Justice Department.
2. Strengthen existing civil rights laws.
3. Provide Federal protection against lynching.
4. Give more adequate protection to the right to vote.
5. Set up an FEPC.
6. Prohibit discrimination in interstate transportation facilities.
7. Provide home rule and Presidential election suffrage for the District of Columbia.
8. Authorize statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.
9. Equalize the naturalization opportunities for residents of this country.
10. Settle the evacuation claims of Japanese-Americans.

Immediately you will recognize the highly controversial nature of several of these proposals. Just as quickly, I am sure, you will appreciate that some of these suggestions, though very noble in character, are not such as will become a part of the very nature of the individual citizen by simply enacting a law and writing language, which, if violated, will carry a penalty of imprisonment in a Federal penitentiary or the payment of a fine in dollars and cents, or both.

Years ago when I sat as judge of the city court of Memphis, I found out that a great many people believe in the rigid and strict enforcement of the law just so long as those laws are not being enforced against "me or a member of my household." A great many people believe that laws prohibiting the excessive use of speed in the operation of automobiles should be promptly and severely enforced, but many of the same people are just as quick to believe that an exception should be made in a particular case if a member of his household is found exceeding the speed limit. Should that arise many find it very convenient to suggest mitigating circumstances, sometimes claiming that the youth or age of the person committing the violation was the reason behind the excessive speed so as to minimize the charge or completely excuse the offender.

All of us know that you cannot legislate morals. Education is most important. But if a man have an evil heart and you educate that heart you but make it better possible for him to execute his evil design. On the contrary, if a man have a good heart and you give him that broad and understanding education, you make it possible for that individual to render a genuine, a true, and an unselfish service to his fellowman.

I recognize that I have been making a general statement thus far. God willing, I shall be talking to you each Sunday night all this year. I shall discuss specific legislation which is being considered by the Congress. To the very best of my ability I shall report to you the reasons behind some of the proposed laws. I could not let this night go by, however, without stating the premise that this country was not made great and secure, prosperous, and the leading Nation of the world on any basis of socialism. We are truly a capitalistic Nation and our people are essentially capitalists. Our people are both superior and supreme in this land of opportunity. The individual citizen in this country is superior because he has unlimited opportunities. We own more telephones than all of the other nations of the world put together. The same may be said of automobiles. The great majority of people in the United States accept a bathtub as a simple necessity, while millions and millions of people have never heard of one. The people in this country are supreme as capitalists because they buy on a free market everything they want with money earned at the highest wage scale and salary scale enjoyed in the world. The more diligently a man applies himself, the more money he naturally makes and the more material blessings he enjoys. That is all fundamental. From time to time I expect to have much more to say about this thought which any thinking person must accept as axiomatic.

Thomas Jefferson many years ago said this and I ask you to pay close attention to the quotation:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues and public debt as the greatest of dangers. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labor of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy. The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our money for unexplained projects, forbids it in the disposition of public money."

What Jefferson said then is just as true as can be today. This is no time to add further Federal taxes to the citizens of this country. We must raise the efficiency of public service and that can only be raised by the interest of each individual who is employed by the Government.

We must have a complete reorganization and administration of the civil service, and do not let anyone say that I propose the abolition of the Department recognized to administer those laws which cover the regulation of employment and employees and which gives assurance of job security. What I do mean most positively is that red tape must be abolished and foolish regulations, which in themselves add to the pattern of administration and call for literally thousands of unnecessary employees, must go and should go at once. The head of a department should be graded and recognized for efficiency on the basis of the least number of competent people who can do a public service courteously and well, rather than be judged and many times promoted because he is in charge of an extraordinary number of incompetent, discourteous, and unsatisfactory employees. I have had too many Government

employees to agree with me on this to feel for one moment that I am taking an improper or unfair attitude. If there should be a tightening up of inefficiency within the civil service itself, and if that same degree of competence be required in all Federal departments and agencies, much money would be saved and the employees as well as the country would be much safer, much more secure, and certainly happier.

The time has come to follow the expenditure of American dollars into the countries under the Marshall plan. Too many of my colleagues have come back in recent weeks and have reported that many thinking people in other countries of the world have come to the conclusion that the Marshall plan means far more to us than it does to them. Many have said that in our whole complex problem, they have but increased the burden by spending the dollars we allow them in this country which but adds to inflation, when if they had the will to build and to produce the same food, machinery, and other items in their own countries—they would be far better off.

The women of this country are absolutely correct in asking the question as to why there is a 20-percent excise tax on cosmetics, when the same does not apply to men's shaving cream. These items are just as necessary under our way of living for one as to the other. We must have taxes to run good public services, but the more important at the moment is the problem of reducing unnecessary expenses so that our tax burden shall most certainly not be increased, and we hope decreased, so that all businesses, large and small, may extend themselves, grow and profit.

I have already in recent broadcasts made the statement that it was never intended for the post office to go into the express business. I expect to introduce a bill at the earliest possible time in this session, which, if passed, will return the weight and size limits to the original law and will result in the restoration of thousands of employees to private enterprise, reducing not a single person in the Post Office Department, and make unnecessary the tremendous building program which will otherwise be incumbent upon the Post Office Department if post-office express is continued under the present regulations.

As soon as possible I shall state why I am against social medicine. Our professional medical standards are the highest in the world, and we must keep them there.

I expect to take up the so-called civil-rights program item by item and will develop as studiously and sincerely as I know how problems affecting housing, taxes, the development of our rivers and harbors, the Hoover reorganization plan, and all other public questions which I may be called upon to vote as your accredited Representative in the Congress of the United States. I will continue my efforts to stabilize the employment of the civil employees of the engineer depot in Memphis.

I shall leave for Washington early in the morning. The past 2½ months have made possible the longest stay at home since you sent me to Congress February 15, 1940. My secretary, Carl Lemser, and I opened the Memphis office promptly upon adjournment and have sought to answer every call and to meet every demand which came to us. Many organizations and clubs were kind enough to invite me to talk to them personally. To some it may have appeared a strenuous task, but I received a very great reward in the privilege of seeing many friends and meeting newcomers during that period of time. Our office in Washington has remained opened all the while with a most adequate staff. This has made possible more prompt service on many matters because we were in touch daily with that office.

I express the deep appreciation of all of my family and of all of my staff for the many notes of encouragement received during this holiday period. While we go back to Washington without any respite from our assigned task, we do approach this next session of Congress with enthusiasm and determination, and with the hope that we may give a good accounting of our stewardship.

Since reading the prayer of St. Francis of Assisi on a recent broadcast, a great number of requests have come in—that I repeat it—with the hope that it brings you as much inspiration and challenge as it has me. I shall wish all of you the happiest New Year of your lives with this beautiful prayer in my heart.

"Lord make me an instrument of Thy peace; where there is hatred, let me sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sadness, joy.

"O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; to be understood, as to understand; to be loved, as to love; for it is in giving that we receive, it is in pardoning that we are pardoned, and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life."—St. Francis of Assisi.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD four broadcasts by me on October 24, November 7, November 21, and December 5, 1949, under the headline "Happenings in Washington." These embrace programs Nos. 10, 11, 12, and 13.

There being no objection, the broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 10)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

Well, the first session of the Eighty-first Congress has finally ended. Unless called back into special session, we will not meet again until next January.

Under the Reorganization Act, Congress is required to complete its business on or before July 31 of each year.

When that date arrived Congress was so far behind in its work that a technical ruling was made by the Democratic leadership holding that World War II had not yet ended.

Under that ruling Congress continues in session for 3½ months longer.

In this broadcast I want to give you a brief report on the accomplishments and the failures of this long session of Congress. Usually such reports are routine. This year, however, the situation is different.

Recently, in a most unusual step, the President issued a summary of the legislation considered and praised the accomplishments of this session of the Eighty-first Congress. The White House sought to show that this Congress was much superior to the Republican Eightieth Congress which preceded it.

As I said, that was a most unusual step by a President of the United States. It was especially odd, because, as I shall prove to you, the facts do not justify the claim.

First, let us keep some simple figures in mind. In the Eighty-first Congress there were 54 Democratic Senators and 42 Republicans. That was a solid Democratic majority of 12 votes. In the House of Representatives the Democrats had 263 Members, the Republicans 171, and there was 1 Member of the American Labor Party, who nearly always voted with the Democrats. That gave the Democrats an overwhelming majority of 92 votes.

In view of Mr. Truman's summary, I ask you to keep these figures in mind, because they prove conclusively that in the session just closed the Democrats could pass any bill they wanted to pass, and, by the same token, they could defeat any bill they wanted defeated. They had the votes in both Houses.

Now let us turn to the accomplishments and failures of the recent session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Do you remember the Democratic national convention in Philadelphia in July of 1948? At that time President Truman announced that he was calling the Eightieth Congress back into special session. He read a 29-point program, all of which he described as of a highly emergency nature which could not wait. If it were not passed, he said, the country would go to rack and ruin.

What were these emergency measures which Mr. Truman asserted were needed to prevent national disaster? I have listed some of the 29:

The President wanted stand-by authority for price control, wage control, and rationing of scarce commodities.

He wanted to reestablish an excess-profits tax.

He wanted Federal aid to education; socialized medicine; a 50-percent increase in old-age pensions.

He demanded the repeal of the Taft-Hartley bill.

He wanted to establish universal military training.

He wanted civil-rights legislation, including an anti-poll-tax bill, an antilynching bill, and a FEPC bill.

He wanted approval of the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty and the establishment of a national science foundation.

Do you remember these recommendations? And do you remember that the President said in July 1948 that if Congress wanted to buckle down to work it could roll through his entire program in 15 days. I am sure you remember that statement.

None of these recommendations were enacted into law in that special session of 1948. Then the President went up and down the country asking the people to give him a Democratic Congress. He promised that such a Congress would enact his entire program into law and that it would do it promptly.

Well, the people gave him the kind of a Congress he asked for—a strong Democratic Senate and an overwhelming Democratic House.

Now let's see what happened during the first 15 days of the Eighty-first Congress.

It didn't pass the President's 29 points—not a single one of them. In those 15 days it passed just two bills. One of these gave the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House substantial pay increases.

In addition, the President was given an allowance of $50,000 a year, free of income taxes. This raised his total salary to the equivalent of approximately $300,000 a year if all of it were subject to tax.

The other bill gave Government employees a 4-day holiday for the inauguration.

That is the first thing I want to report to my fellow Pennsylvanians about the Eighty-first Congress and its accomplishments in the first 15 days of the session.

But you may say they couldn't put through that program in 15 days. Of course the Democratic Congress could not do it in 15 days, any more than a Republican Congress could. I agree with you there.

Now, let us survey the record of the entire first session of this Congress—a session lasting 9½ months. This session must be recorded as the slowest in American history.

The fiscal year in the Federal Government begins on July 1 of each year. Appropriation bills should all be passed before that date. During the Eightieth Congress the last appropriation bill was approved on June 19, 1948, but in this session we did not complete action on many important appropriation measures, involving billions of dollars, until a few days ago.

Since July 1, the Government has been operating on a stop-gap legislation which provided funds for the various departments, boards, and agencies. Nothing like this ever happened before.

Now let us consider some phases of the program which the President promised would be enacted if he got a Democratic Congress. He promised civil rights. He promised a FEPC law. He promised anti-lynching and anta-poll-tax laws. Now, let me tell you about that.

It was nearly 4 months after the Eighty-first Congress commenced before the administration bills were even introduced in the Senate. Not one of them has been reported out by the Senate committee handling it.

Remember that at the beginning of the session the Democratic majority was increased in every one of these committees so that they would have absolute control. Each committee has a Democratic chairman and a substantial Democratic majority, so that if every Republican member of those committees were to oppose the bills, the Democrats were still strong enough to send them to the floor and pass them, if they were so minded.

The only bill on civil rights which reached the floor of the Senate was a bill introduced by a Republican, Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan. It was an anti-lynching bill. It has been on the calendar since June 6, and at no time did the majority leader of the Senate make any effort or attempt to have this bill taken up for consideration.

It so happens that the large majority of Republican Members of Congress favor civil-rights legislation. You know, as well as I do, that the opposition is centered in the Democratic Party.

When we tried to push some of this civil-rights program through the Eightieth Congress, it was the Democrats who filibustered and prevented its passage. Mr. Truman failed to explain that to you in his report on Congress the other day.

Another promise was to liberalize the existing law with reference to the admission into this country of displaced persons. That bill was bottled up in committee until a few days before the end of the session when it was finally reported to the Senate without any recommendation. Mr. Truman failed to explain that in his report on the Eighty-first Congress.

Among Mr. Truman's recommendations was a 10-percent increase in taxes. Both parties joined in killing that proposal. I know you are not sorry for that.

Important groups of domestic measures which became law were those reorganizing and merging certain executive departments and agencies. Those were based on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. That Commission was created by the Republican Eightieth Congress and the legislation which was passed, putting its recommendations into effect, had bipartisan support.

The administration admits it was weakest in the fulfillment of its domestic program. It has been concealing these failures by attempting to emphasize the accomplishments in the field of foreign relations.

Let me remind you, my fellow Pennsylvanians, that the accomplishments in the field of foreign relations was a bipartisan affair. Prominent Republicans like Senators ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan, and John Foster Dulles, of New York, actually led and managed the debate on the floor.

Under their patriotic guidance, partisan politics was put aside to strengthen American leadership for peace and security in the world.

They must be given full measure of credit for any claim of accomplishment in this field by the present administration.

I voted for nearly all of these measures. My principal disagreement was over the administration's extension of the reciprocal trade agreements. I voted to amend this law and to write into the bill the peril-point provision which would have given some degree of protection to the American worker and farmer.

The recently disclosed list of products on which tariffs were further reduced, at Annecy, France, is convincing evidence that Congress blundered in rejecting the peril-point amendment.

The recent devaluation of the currency of foreign countries will have the same effect as a further reduction in the tariff rates. Workers in the glass and pottery plants of western Pennsylvania, and many other industries which I have mentioned in previous broadcasts, are learning this the hard way. They are among them any whose jobs are being taken away by the influx of low priced foreign goods.

Mark my words—those conditions will become worse—and more Pennsylvanians will be out of jobs because of the blundering mistake of this session of Congress.

In the summer of 1948, Mr. Truman issued a "box score" of legislation which he claimed was vital to the public welfare.

In denouncing the Eightieth Congress, he wrote after many of these points, "Failed to Act."

Among the points on which Congress had failed to act were such Presidential demands as anti-poll-tax legislation antilynching; FEPC; compulsory health insurance; Federalized medicine; repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act; universal military training; St. Lawrence waterway treaty; stand-by rationing authority; wage and price controls; Federal aid to education; a national science foundation, and many others.

Well, the Eightieth Congress did not act on them in 15 days. The Eighty-first Congress did not act on them in nine and a half months.

Now, I want to make a flat charge about the majority leadership in this Congress. I charge that the administration leaders of the Eighty-first Congress never made an honest effort to push some of these bills through, although they had the votes and could have done so.

It is common talk here in Washington that the administration leaders have put many of these bills in the deep freeze in order to keep them and bring them out as major political issues for 1950. They seem to like it better that way.

This Eighty-first Congress might well be termed a "5-percenter Congress." It has given President Truman about 5 percent of what he recommended.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 11)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

With the close of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, I have almost reached the half-way mark in my 6-year term as your representative in the United States Senate.

This is an appropriate time, therefore, to look back over the 3 years of my service at Washington and to report to you on some basic principles of government which are the foundation of American freedom, opportunity, and progress.

Throughout my public career I have supported the idea of a proper division of powers, functions, and duties among the three levels of government—Federal, State, and local.

I have opposed the increasing trend toward concentration of authority in an all-powerful supergovernment at Washington.

I have fought against the encroachment of Federal control upon functions that rightfully belong to the State.

I have supported the principle of local control of local affairs, because the closer government is brought to the people the more efficiently and the more economically it is administered.

Most of all, I have fought to protect the American plan of individual freedom, individual initiative, and self-reliance from the false and corrupting promise by government that it can provide everything needed by the people for their happiness, prosperity, and security.

Those were the fundamental principles that I brought to Washington when I took my seat in the Senate 3 years ago. My experience in the Senate has confirmed my belief, more strongly than ever, that local government is government by the people and must be preserved.

For 3 years I have been watching at first hand the process by which our local and State levels of government are being stripped of power and authority while the Federal Government assumes absolute control over one function after another.

At every opportunity I have spoken in protest against this unwarranted and dangerous course. My votes in the Senate have been in opposition to its further extension.

But the process goes on. Supported by so-called grants in aid, it has spread year by year until today Federal funds are being used to impose bureaucratic control upon practically every important local and State government service.

Who is to blame?

First, I blame the power-hungry men, who want more and more control over the political and economic life of our Republic and who seek to achieve their objectives by unlimited and reckless spending.

But all the blame does not rest there. A portion of the blame must be placed upon those State and local governments that have been careless of their responsibilities and have failed to do the job which had to be done.

They made no protest when Washington moved in. In fact, they welcomed Federal funds as something for nothing.

Finally, some of the blame must attach to the individual citizens—the taxpayers and the voters—not only in Pennsylvania but in all of the States.

Let me tell you why.

I know from long experience that the average citizen is watchful over local expenditures. He will fight vigorously against an increase in local taxation.

He will oppose proposed new projects, no matter how desirable, if the cost is beyond

what his community can afford. He will frequently upset his local government when he believes it is spending his tax money in waste or extravagance.

But here is the great difference. The same citizen does not object with equal vigor when the more distant Government in Washington wastes his money or spends too freely.

He does not become aroused over high Federal taxes. He does not become indignant when deficit financing adds billions to the national debt. He does not rise up in his wrath against Washington.

At home he demands prudence, efficiency, and economy, because he knows he pays the bills. But when Federal funds are being spent—that's Government money; he feels it doesn't cost him anything.

That is one reason why local and State governments have not done their full job. They have become dependent upon Washington.

Local responsibility has been undermined by a constant flow of power into big Government control at Washington.

There is another thing we must not forget. When the National Government takes over a project that should be done at the local level the price invariably goes up. Overhead costs are greater. Administrative expenses are higher. More people go on the pay roll.

Experts have estimated that it costs the taxpayers $1 for every 10 cents worth of actual construction when they use Federal funds to build roads or improve their schools or airports.

Now what about that citizen who thinks what he gets from the Government doesn't cost him anything?

Let me remind you again—there is no such thing as government money. There are no free gifts from Washington.

The Federal Government has nothing to give that it does not first take from the earnings of the worker and the farmer.

The only way Washington can get funds to turn back to the States and local communities is by taxing all the people in Pennsylvania and all the people in the other 47 States.

The next time someone tells you that Government money is something for nothing, just remember this:

Of every dollar you pay in taxes, 75 cents goes to the State and its local subdivisions. That includes county, township, school district, borough and city taxes.

The other 25 cents is taken by Uncle Sam's tax collectors.

When someone tells you of the benefits which flow from Washington, just remember that you are paying—and paying a high price—for all of them.

Just keep in mind that out of every month you work, it takes one week to pay the various taxes, direct and hidden, which all levels of government collect from you.

And three-fourths of that week is put in to earn the money you pay in Federal taxes.

But that's not all.

In this fiscal year the Federal Government is operating at a deficit which will surely exceed $5,000,000,000 and may go as high as $8,000,000,000—I said billions, not millions.

Let me put it this way. As late as 1934, Federal expenses for all purposes—operating all the departments, boards, commissions and agencies, Congress, national defense, interest on the public debt, pensions—cost the taxpayers less than the deficit alone will be in this fiscal year.

That is how much Washington is going into the red during this 1 year alone.

What did Mr. Truman say about this the other day?

Well, he said it was impossible to cut expenses. He said the only way to close the gap was to raise taxes. In other words, you would have to work more days a month to support the National Government in Washington.

This is why I have been fighting the spread of Federal spending. When your city or town proposes something like that, you crack down hard. You demand economy. Local government costs are lower because people take more interest in their local government than they do at any other level.

But what I have just been telling you is not the whole story of how your money is spent in Washington.

The Federal Government is proposing even greater spending. It wants to get into new projects—Federal aid to education, socialized medicine, low-rent housing at the public expense, higher subsidies for farmers, for the shipping industry, and many other things.

Powerful organizations are lobbying for all these proposals. Many people, misled into thinking that it will be something for nothing, are urging their Representatives in Congress to vote for these things.

They refuse to believe there is no such thing as free "Government money".

But, you and I know better.

You and I know that Washington, despite the present high national income, cannot make ends meet. It is running billions of dollars in the red.

Therefore, if new so-called benefits are to come as handouts from Washington, the price must be paid in higher taxation, or a much greater debt, or both. That debt must be paid by the people.

It cannot be paid within the lifetime of anyone listening to me today. We will hand it down as a mortgage on the future of our children, our grandchildren and generations yet unborn.

I believe that essential new projects, should be taxed and managed at the local and State levels. There they will cost less and they can be designed specifically to meet the needs of Pennsylvania.

I shall keep on fighting and voting in Washington for less expensive Federal Government—for less frills and less waste. Not for higher taxes to support bigger and more expensive Federal Government.

And I should like to see all the people of our State join in this fight.

There is only one way to get results in Washington. That is for the people to demand as much efficiency and as little waste there as they do on local community levels.

One way to help is this: When Washington offers to take over new functions from the States and local subdivisions, you folks must say, "No" in a loud, clear voice.

You must insist that if the job is to be done, it should be down at the State and local levels. You must be willing to provide the tax money to have it performed at those levels.

The State and local governments must be willing to bear the responsibility and to do the job.

Not until then will we get more home rule and better government at lower cost.

Remember always that good government begins at the local level.

We cannot have good government at the higher levels unless it begins in our home communities.

Local elections are most important because upon them we build the foundation for good government in the State and in the Nation.

Next Tuesday the people of Pennsylvania will go to the polls to name public officials who will serve in our city halls, borough, and township buildings, and in many of our courts.

American citizenship has no more important duty than the election of men of upright character and honest principles—men who will accept responsibility and have the courage to carry out those responsibilities with fidelity to the public interest.

Regardless of party affiliation I urge every man and woman voter in Pennsylvania to exercise the right of franchise on election day.

Vote for candidates in whom you have trust and confidence. But do not fail to vote.

It is a patriotic duty that must not be neglected or ignored.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention

---

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 12)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

In my last talk, a few days before the recent election, I appealed to the people of Pennsylvania to turn out and vote. At that time I said, and I quote: "Regardless of party affiliation I urge every man and woman voter in Pennsylvania to exercise the right of franchise on election day. Vote for candidates in whom you have trust and confidence. But do not fail to vote. It is a patriotic duty that must not be neglected or ignored."

Now that the election is over and the smoke of the political battle has cleared away, it is most gratifying to know that so many of the citizens of Pennsylvania fulfilled their obligation as free Americans by casting their ballot on November 8.

It was a record-breaking vote in a year in which Pennsylvanians were not voting for President, or Senator, Congressmen, or Governor.

The only State-wide office voted upon in the last election was for a judge of the superior court. Yet, of the approximately 4,900,000 eligible to vote in Pennsylvania, more than 3,500,000 ballots were cast.

This was a splendid demonstration of self-government at work. There is no more patriotic service that can be rendered in peacetime than the intelligent exercise of the right of franchise. I hope we shall have even larger turn-outs in future elections.

In some counties more than 75 percent of the registered voters went to the polls. In my home county of Washington, with approximately 100,000 registered, more than 78,000 ballots were cast. That was true in many other places.

Since the election I have been asked by many of my constituents whether the results in our State and elsewhere had national significance.

It is only natural that each political party should attempt to place the most favorable interpretation upon the returns.

Earlier this year, a special election was held in the Twenty-sixth Congressional District, comprising Cambria, Armstrong, and Indiana Counties. It resulted in a smashing Republican victory. Naturally, Republicans regarded this as a rejection of the policies of the Truman administration.

Now, with the election of the Democratic candidate, HERBERT LEHMAN, as the United States Senator from New York State, it is natural for the Democrats to claim this was approval of the administration's program.

On the other hand, the Republicans, with equal right, claim that the reelection of Governor Driscoll in New Jersey was a repudiation of those same Truman policies.

Certainly there was nothing in the Pennsylvania returns to indicate a national trend.

In the only State-wide contest, Judge William E. Hirt, the Republican candidate for the Superior Court, was reelected in spite of overwhelming Democratic victories in Philadelphia and Allegheny counties.

Pennsylvania's election was a crazy quilt of strictly local campaigns and local issues from which no general interpretation can be drawn.

For example, while Philadelphia elected four Democrats to county offices, the voters in Erie, at the other end of the State, ousted

a Democratic mayor and city administration, and elected every Republican on the ticket.

Meadville and Shamokin replaced Republican mayors with Democrats.

In three heavily Democratic counties—Berks, Fayette and my own county of Washington—Republican judges were elected. There were numerous similar situations. It is apparent, therefore, that in Pennsylvania the elections were determined by the local issues. There was no over-all pattern.

Unquestionably the heavy vote was, in a large measure, due to the efforts of the veterans who organized in support of the soldier's bonus.

I hope that these veterans will take the same active interest in future elections. They can do so much to help solve the great problems which confront the Nation.

Since the adjournment of Congress last month, I have talked with many Pennsylvanians—not only my own neighbors in Washington county, but with men and women from all sections of our State. This has given me an opportunity to find out what is foremost in the minds of our people.

What seems to be most disturbing to the average man is the fiscal policy of the Truman administration. People consistently ask me how long the Government can continue to spend more money than it takes in and still escape disaster.

The President's recent announcement that we would end this fiscal year with a deficit of five and one-half billion dollars—which, by the way, is a very conservative estimate—shocked many people. I have been pointing out for several months that the deficit would probably reach eight billions, and perhaps more.

The people I have been talking with remind me that they cannot keep out of trouble if they continually spend more than they earn. They ask me if there is any way that a government can spend itself in the red year after year and still avoid national bankruptcy.

The answer is obvious. The Government has no mysterious source of revenue. It receives no money except what it takes from the earnings of the people.

Abraham Lincoln, perhaps the greatest of all our Presidents, answered the question of Government overspending most emphatically when he said, and I quote:

"As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest, and, next, no one left to borrow from, so must it be with a government."

This statement by President Lincoln is a simple truth. It cannot be challenged successfully by name calling directed against those who question the wisdom of going deeper and deeper into debt.

Today we are spending each year in interest on the Federal debt alone more money than we spent to run the entire National Government as recently as the early 1930's.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was another who answered the question of whether a recklessly spending government can avoid disaster. In 1932, when he was a candidate, Mr. Roosevelt declared:

"Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse."

Well, that is what our Federal Government has been doing year after year since that statement was made—living far beyond its means and going deeper into debt.

I find that the people of Pennsylvania are alarmed about this situation. They want the budget balanced. But they make it clear that they do not favor the recent suggestion of Mr. Truman that the only way it can be done is by raising taxes.

They point out that in July of this year the President said a tax increase would be detrimental to our national economy—that it would dry up business and result in unemployment.

Then, in October, only 3 months later, Mr. Truman stated that he knew of only one way to balance the budget—and that was to increase taxes. He said he would recommend such increases when Congress comes back to Washington in January.

Some of the people I have talked with have suffered as the result of the great strikes—coal miners, steelworkers, storekeepers, and housewives. They have had to adjust their budgets and to cut down on their spending. Things haven't been good with them and they can't afford to have their taxes raised.

They suggest that the Government, like themselves, should take a hitch in its belt and reduce spending to fit its income.

But Mr. Truman says it can't be done. He claimed the other day that he just could not see how he could reduce the Federal spending, now running at the rate of more than $43,000,000,000 a year—the highest rate of peacetime Government spending in the history of our Nation.

Each week since July 1, when the Government's fiscal year began, Washington has spent an average of $160,000,000 more than it has taken in.

I know it is hard for people to grasp these sums. Their vast size makes them something beyond our comprehension. But let me try. Let me put it this way.

Pennsylvania is the Nation's greatest factory State, so I'm going to give you some figures about factory wages.

The Federal Department of Commerce recently announced that the average weekly wage of the factory workers in America in September was $55.64—the second highest level on record for factory workers.

There are 12,000,000 factory workers in our Nation and their weekly wages add up to more than $667,500,000 a week.

That is a lot of money, you will agree. Yet, if they were to take every cent of their earnings and give it to the Federal Government, it still would not be enough to pay the bills at the rate Washington is pouring out the cash.

In fact, the $830,000,000 the Government spends each week is nearly $163,000,000 more than all our factory workers earn.

Now, President Truman says that the only way to make up his estimated deficit of $5,500,000,000 is to raise taxes. Well, let's see what that would do.

To close the gap would require an average increase of 18 percent in the income tax paid by every individual and 18 percent in the corporate tax paid by every business.

Are you ready to shoulder an increase of 18 percent in your income tax?

I think such a burden should not be added to the heavy tax load our people are already carrying.

I remember, even if Mr. Truman seems to have forgotten, that Federal taxes are not the only ones we pay in this country. I remember that our people also pay taxes to their States and their counties and their school districts and cities. This is no time to add to the load.

If there is to be any change in Federal tax levels, I favor reducing them. If we are in the red today—and of course we are deeply in the red in Washington—the solution lies not in taxing more, but in spending less.

The solution lies in Government at lower cost. It lies in cutting expenses to the level of what we can afford.

No more serious problem confronts the American people today than preserving their national solvency and preventing this march down the road toward national bankruptcy.

You, and you alone, have the power to stop it. You must demand less spending and make this demand heard in the Halls of Congress.

In a speech out in Minneapolis the other day, President Truman cited Thomas Jefferson in support of the administration's spending policy. Mr. Truman set up the great patron saint of the Democratic Party as a good authority. I accept the authority.

But let me tell you what Thomas Jefferson had to say about spending policies like those being followed in Washington today. He said, and I quote:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

My fellow Pennsylvanians, those are the words of Thomas Jefferson, the great authority referred to by President Truman.

Those are living words still. Today they apply more forcefully than ever, because we are more deeply in debt than ever.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 13)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

In previous talks I have discussed the high cost of Government and the dangerous increase in Government spending.

In this broadcast I want to discuss Government lending, which is just as dangerous as Government spending because it adds to the tax burden of every American citizen, every worker, and every farmer.

Recently I have had many letters from Pennsylvanians asking:

"What about those millions of dollars in Government loans to Henry Kaiser?"

"What about the loans to the Lustron Corp. and others?"

"How can the Government make all these loans to private business and agriculture?"

"Who hands out that money down there in Washington?"

"Why don't they get private loans from banks the way most people have to?"

These are very interesting questions.

Many of us, both in and out of Congress, have been trying to get the answers.

There have been several investigations by congressional committees. The Hoover Commission made an exhaustive study of the Government lending and business enterprises financed by Government funds.

Another investigation is going on right now and I am confident that next year we will get to the bottom of the Federal Government's confused and tangled ventures in competition with private business.

Remember it is your money that is being poured out in loans and business investments. You have a right to know where it is going, how it is being handled, and what protection you are being given.

Since the Federal Government went into the business of lending money, its operations have become involved in a trackless jungle.

Uncle Sam is today the biggest banker in the world. In direct loans to businessmen, farmers, housing projects, and foreign governments we have handed out over $10,000,000,000.

In addition, your Government has guaranteed over $300,000,000,000 in bank deposits, mortgages, loans on farm commodities, and loans to veterans. Your Government has issued life-insurance policies totaling $60,000,000,000.

On top of that, your Government has an investment of more than [illegible] in a wide variety of business enterprises which compete with private business.

Your Government is producing and selling electric power. It is producing and selling fertilizers. It is buying and selling farm products. It is smelting and selling metals. It is operating railways and ships.

In all, there are about [illegible] important business ventures which the Federal Government owns outright, or has a substantial financial interest.

As I said before, this is all your money. All of it is money which was taken from you in taxes or borrowed from you when you bought Government bonds.

I regret to report to you that there is so much confusion that no one seems to know where we stand.

The figures I have just given you are only a partial picture of our Government in the small- and large-loan business and our Government in private business. It is an appalling situation, bordering on chaos.

Let me try to explain it this way. Among the more than 2,000,000 Government employees there are thousands of economists and fiscal experts. I doubt if you could find one of them who could even name the various Federal Government lending agencies or could describe the functions of each.

Let me give you an example. A year or two ago the Senate Judiciary Committee looked into this situation. The committee found that there were 20 Government agencies making loans in the field of agriculture alone. There were many cases of overlapping and duplication.

Some of these agencies were in competition with each other in lending out the taxpayers' money. They worked at cross purposes. Naturally your money was frittered away in waste and duplication.

But agriculture is only one field of operation. There are loan agencies in housing, veterans' affairs, general business, and international relations, all with the same confusion, duplication, and waste.

In addition to the confusion which occurs within each category, there is similar confusion, similar overlapping, and similar waste in the constant tug of war among agencies in different departments.

These lending agencies are forever at war with each other, striving always to become bigger and more powerful. All too often it is utterly impossible to tell where the authority of one agency stops and the next begins.

This may sound very confusing to you. But it is not surprising because of the story of these lending agencies is one of utter confusion.

One of the principal lending agencies of the Government is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It was set up as a temporary organization to make direct loans for the purpose of saving banks and business from bankruptcy during the depression years. It was to operate for 1 year but today, 17 years later, we find it is still operating on a tremendous scale.

Let us now take a look at the Henry Kaiser loans which have been the subject of so much discussion and concerning which some of you have written to me. With the latest loan of $26,400,000 recently authorized, he has received from the Federal Government a loan of $226,795,000 in loans and mortgages. Of that sum he now owes $184,843,000.

The announced purpose of the latest loan was to finance the production of a new car in the low-price field. That new car would be in competition with the Ford, Chevrolet, and Plymouth.

Now, Ford, Chevrolet, and Plymouth financed themselves without Government loans. They are also big taxpayers. Yet, part of the money they pay in taxes is being used to build up competition against them.

The RFC is authorized to make direct loans to private business where bank loans are not available. But it has been brought out that Henry Kaiser is using part of this latest Government loan to pay off his bank debts.

Here is a situation worth considering. If Henry Kaiser may do this then any other businessman should have the same right to borrow Government money to pay off his bank loans.

Believing as I do in free enterprise and in keeping the Government out of business as much as possible, I am strongly opposed to that kind of transaction.

The trouble with some of these Government loans—such as this one—is that the Government soon finds itself committed to protecting its investment by advancing more money.

One example is the Lustron Corp., which was organized to build prefabricated steel and enamel homes on a mass-production basis to relieve the housing shortage.

In 2 years the Government has invested $37,500,000 of the taxpayers' money in this experiment without making a dent in the housing shortage.

Most of the millions advanced by the Government have been spent on pay rolls, material, machinery, and other equipment. The company has been losing money ever since it started in business and is reported to be going in the red at the rate of $1,000,000 a month.

If the company is to continue in business, it must have more working capital and now the Government is asked to put up another $15,000,000.

Now that looks like throwing good money after bad. Nevertheless the RFC must either keep the business going or write off its $37,500,000 investment as a total loss.

Now, whose money figured in this fanciful and unprofitable scheme? Your money of course. The Government borrowed it from you and then loaned it to the RFC at a lower rate of interest than it pays to you.

If it all should be lost, how would you be repaid?

That's easy. The Government would increase your taxes in order to raise enough money to pay off the Government bonds you bought.

Let me give you just a few typical examples of what has been going on.

Not long ago it was decided for the Federal Reserve Board to tighten credit in order to check the rising threat of inflation. In line with that ruling, banks put the brakes on their lending and rejected some loan applications that might otherwise have been granted.

But the Reconstruction Finance Corporation paid no attention to that. Under its regulations it may grant direct loans to businesses which cannot be obtained through normal banking channels.

So we had the RFC operating in direct conflict with the Government's anti-inflation policy.

In other cases Federal business agencies, operating on money advanced by the United States Treasury, invest their surplus funds in Government securities and collect the interest. This means that the Government pays interest on its own investment. Of course, that means you pay the interest.

The Hoover Commission, in its survey of Government administration, figured that elimination of this practice by six agencies would reduce the interest-bearing debt of the Government by $350,000,000.

We all recognize that many of these agencies were created in the depression period. They were temporary, emergency organizations to provide employment and to lift the Nation's economy over the hump.

We've long been over the hump but we still have the agencies, bigger and more powerful than ever.

They are no longer emergency propositions. They are permanent. We shall continue to have them until the people rise up and demand that they be done away with.

You will recall that one of the principal objectives of Government lending was to help small business. How that has worked out is shown by testimony given a few weeks ago before the Congressional Economy Inquiry, headed by Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

It was brought out that the RFC has 127,000 loans of all types now outstanding with a total of $1,682,000,000. Of this total nearly one-half, or $733,000,000, have been advanced in loans of more than a half-million dollars each to 207 concerns.

That looks like big business, not small business.

There are many reasons why the Government should get out of the business of making direct loans to individuals or business organizations.

The Hoover Commission, in its report had this to say, and I quote:

"Direct lending by the Government opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism to individuals or enterprises. It invites political and private pressure, or even corruption.

"Emergencies may arise in depression, war, national defense, or disaster which should be met in this way. But direct lending should be absolutely avoided except for emergencies."

That is bad enough but, in my opinion, the greatest danger lies in the increasing trend toward Government regulation and control of the Nation's economy.

That, my fellow Pennsylvanians, is the road to socialism.

Free enterprise built the great industrial strength of America, not a socialistic system, controlled and directed by an all-powerful government.

Government in business is notoriously inefficient and costly to the taxpayer.

That is why you should call upon your Government and your Congress to get out of this business of private loans and to get out of all enterprises which compete with private initiative.

Aside from the cost, a great principle is involved. We must decide whether we are to continue under a system of free enterprise or whether we are to permit the Government to dominate the economic life and progress of our people.

I hope all Pennsylvanians will make their wishes known on this most important question.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Statement by Former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts on Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts on the subject of Atlantic Union.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts said today that passage of the Atlantic Union resolution by Congress in 1950 would be the first step toward unifying the foreign policies of the democracies, thus strengthening the United Nations and helping to avert the threat of a hydrogen bomb war.

Roberts cited division of opinion between Great Britain and the United States on recognition of the Chinese Communist Government as the most recent example of divided sentiment among the democracies.

"The old American motto—United We Stand, Divided We Fall—is still good," he said. "Division between the remaining democracies encourages the Kremlin which hopes through its current boycott of UN sessions, to force the democracies to give way one after the other in recognition of its puppet government in China.

"On the other hand, a Federal convention of sponsors of the Atlantic Pact, called to consider turning our present defensive military association into a positive political union of free peoples, would present a united front against the advance of dictatorship and would lend hope to advocates of freedom in countries now dominated by Communist minorities. The Atlantic Union resolution authorizes President Truman to call such a convention. Our delegation of Atlantic Union members from 15 states will discuss with the President the world-wide significance of this step when we call on him Friday."

Practical Internationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Practical Internationalism," delivered by Walter Cenerazzo, national president, American Watchworkers Union, before the International Students' Center, Cambridge, Mass., on January 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRACTICAL INTERNATIONALISM

To address a group of students who come from many foreign lands to obtain an education in American colleges and universities, is indeed a rare privilege for a labor leader whose avocation has been to study the economic conditions existing in foreign lands.

Today in this world there exists a sharp cleavage as to the systems of government. One trend of thought is predicated upon the outgrowth of the idea established in the Magna Carta of King John in the thirteenth century which is that human dignity shall prevail, that men are not the chattel property of anyone, be it feudal lords, kings, or the politburo; that men shall have the right to choose their own religion, their own field of endeavor in employment, and live within their own family unit as dignified human beings.

The other trend of thought is that produced by totalitarian government, which claims as the first obligation from its citizens obedience to the government. Their theory is that men should work, eat, live where they are told, take their recreation as the government plans it and that men have never the right to criticize their rulers. There is no difference between this modern day totalitarianism and the slaves of Egypt. Both represent tyranny and lack of respect for human dignity.

The free nations of this earth have come a long way since the signing of the English Magna Carta by King John, and as each century has gone by, men have gained more and more freedom in an economic way which has given to them freedom in other ways.

To me, one of the unsung heroes in his battle for the freedom of men was a great American—Benjamin Franklin. This man Franklin had an opportunity to observe conditions in England as a workman and later as a statesman. He visited France and lived there during the French Revolution. He was a student of governments, and it is my opinion that the citizens of the United States owe to this man a deep debt of gratitude for our today—that inalienable Bill of Rights—the first ten amendments to the Constitution of the United States. The thinking that went into that Constitution which separated the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government was long-range thinking to forever bar any man or men from treating human beings as serfs within the boundaries of the United States of America.

In the century and a half that followed the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, men and women have lived with human dignity and in the industrial revolution have been the peoples of the only nation in the world who are great middle class. Nowhere else in this world will you find a lack of class struggle, nowhere else in this world will you find complete a way of life by which men and women can set their goals within the family unit and achieve them for that family.

In the past several years, I have visited the South American continent and the European continent. In South America I had the opportunity to visit Peru, Chili, Uruguay, Argentina, and Brazil. In Europe this summer, I visited England, Scotland, Belgium, Holland, France, Italy, Switzerland, and western Germany.

In each of these countries I visited industrial plants to witness the engineering and research skills and to see how productive labor was. I asked many questions concerning living conditions, wages, government controls, and where the ideas in existence in the government of the country came from.

One basic element was missing from every single one of these countries—and that was a virile labor movement dedicated to collective labor bargaining with employers to obtain a fair share of the fruits of productivity for the employees of industry.

Oh, yes; there was a labor movement in each and every one of these countries, but those that led it were either Socialists, Communists, Christian Union Democrats, Falangists, Apristas, or some other type of ism which was dedicated to curing economic ills by government fiat. In each case the labor leader of these countries was wrapped up in a political movement to take over the administration of the government. To me this is not the way that a great middle class of people is created within a nation. In these countries there are only the very rich and the very poor, and the purchasing power of the very poor is, indeed, very small. You cannot have prosperity for a nation unless the rank and file of the people have purchasing power in their hands and can purchase what they produce.

We in the United States, unfortunately in my opinion, have at the helm of our State Department a group of men who have no understanding of business economics, and who have been in a daydream for many years on the problems of foreign trade. These men believe that you can purchase goods from a foreign country and give to that foreign country prosperity when the persons that made the goods obtained wages that would not enable them to feed themselves properly, let alone clothe themselves properly. There can be no prosperity for any country unless the workers of that country obtain a fair share of the fruits of productivity that will enable them to purchase the goods of other workers to consume themselves.

That's the key of the prosperity of the citizens of the United States. Purchasing power—consumer income—with which to purchase consumer goods.

The United States program for reciprocal trade does not and will not help either the American worker or foreign worker. All it does is make the importer richer at the expense of both the American worker and the foreign worker.

For this reason I have advocated for some time a twofold program in the field of foreign trade which, in my opinion, if carried out, would create a middle class of people with purchasing power in every country in this world.

I believe the United States should lead the way by creating a Board of Foreign Trade composed of 15 persons, the 15 to be appointed, 5 by the President of the United States, 5 by the United States Senate, and 5 by the United States House of Representatives. Three of each group should be appointed from the majority party in control and two from the minority party.

This Board of Foreign Trade should have complete control and jurisdiction over all economics that have to do with foreign trade, and every other department of Government should be stripped of authority in this field.

This Board of Trade, with its 15 members, would negotiate agreements with a foreign country on a bilateral basis only, and every agreement with each country would have to stand on its own merit, and what considerations that were granted to one country would not necessarily have to be given to another country.

The type of men I would like to see appointed to this board would be the best talent available in the field of business, finance, economics, agriculture, and labor. They should receive at least $25,000 per year for serving on the Board.

This board of trade should have established within it a statistical department with competent men to establish the production costs on every article produced in the United States, and these records should be kept up-to-date so that every time unit costs go up or down it is reflected in the records.

In negotiating an agreement with a foreign country this board of trade would ascertain the unit cost of production in the foreign country they are negotiating with, and they would establish tariffs equal only to the difference in the unit costs between the costs of production in the United States and the costs of production in the foreign country with consideration given for transportation and insurance costs to bring the article to the United States.

As wages were increased, or unit costs increased in the foreign country, the tariff would be reduced accordingly. Thus, as more wages were paid to foreign workers, more purchasing power would be in their hands to buy consumer goods and more prosperity would be available for that nation.

This board of foreign trade would have authority to put a limitation on amount of

goods to come into the United States of any type; they would have the authority to impose quotas, raise tariffs, lower tariffs, and to negotiate in any manner they deemed essential.

All tariffs which they collected would be put in a fund which I would call the point 4 fund to be spent for the development of underdeveloped areas throughout the world. The board would be given authority to refund all of the tariffs to a nation for its development if it deemed it wise.

Thus a two-fold purpose would be accomplished. No goods would compete in the United States except at a tariff at the border and importers' excess profits would be eliminated. The foreign worker would find his employer paying him more wages for there would be no point in paying him low wages, and then paying the difference in tariff to the United States.

In the distribution of point-four money the second part of my program would come into play for I would allow no nation to participate in obtaining any of this money unless they first adopt in the constitution of their country a bill of rights comparable to ours and establish a separation of the powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, so that dictators could no longer function or gain a foothold in the future.

With the adoption of this bill of rights would come a new day for the working men and women of foreign countries, for they would be guaranteed the right of free association and forming unions of their own choosing. And thus a virile labor movement would gather momentum and bring about a standard of living that creates a great middle class.

The reciprocal trade program of the United States establishes the same tariff regardless of the wage conditions between nations. Goods produced in a country paying 10 cents an hour wages come into the United States at the same tariff as goods produced in a country paying 50 cents an hour wages. Where do you think investment capital is going to open factories under such a tariff program?

This board of foreign trade that I suggest should have industrial engineers in its employ to visit factories in the United States to make sure they are efficient and productive, and have adopted modern technological improvements, and if they have not a leveling factor should be placed on their unit cost of production in the records to penalize them for their inefficiency.

There is no room in this world for inefficiency, obsolete methods and failure to introduce modern production methods. Only in a world where there is efficiency and modern efficient production can the rank and file of people participate in the enjoyment of the goods they produce.

If every country established such a board of foreign trade, it would not be long before all the low wages in this world would gradually disappear and we would have fair living standards for all the workers in the freedom loving nations in this world. And when misery, terrible housing, improper diet and squalid living conditions disappear from a nation and an honest democratic labor movement does its job well in obtaining more and more each year in collective bargaining within the framework of prosperous corporate enterprise, those that represent totalitarianism will find the seeds of communism which they spread falling upon sterile ground, which refuses to accept their idiocy.

To me there is no substitute for cooperative capitalism to achieve human dignity. Cooperative capitalism to me means adequate dividends to the investor for the risk that he takes in furnishing capital to purchase the tools and equipment, adequate payment to manage for furnishing the brains of direction to the enterprise; fair wages to labor for fair work with the accompanying security that prosperous enterprise can give to its employees. And last, but not least, the lowest possible consumer prices for all that effective cooperation between investor, management and labor can produce.

That is what has made America what it is. It is what has given more people opportunity for a better lot in life than any other economic system yet devised in this world. There is only one way we can preserve it—and that is for every nation in this world that respects human dignity to achieve the same program and for our Nation to establish a flexible tariff system to protect American working men while point 4 does its work in building the production facilities of other nations.

The Taft-Hartley Act to the Aid of Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the situation in my State with reference to fertilizer is very serious. In this morning's issue of the Washington Times-Herald, an editorial entitled "The Taft-Hartley Act to the Aid of Farmers" was published. The editorial speaks very well of a former Member of this body, and I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT TO THE AID OF FARMERS

Two strikes now threaten to tie the national economy in knots. One is John L. Lewis' 40-percent strike in the coal fields—the 3-day week. The other is a strike of workers in the potash plants at Carlsbad, N. Mex.

Mr. Truman is about the only person in the country who refuses to admit that the coal slowdown constitutes a national emergency. He has taken his stand against the Taft-Hartley Act, and he refuses to use its powers even if the whole country freezes.

The National Labor Relations Board, however, has invoked the Labor Act in an effort to protect several million American farmers from crop failures caused by lack of fertilizers.

Potash is one of the three essential ingredients in all standard fertilizers. The three companies at Carlsbad produce 85 percent of the American supply. This is their busiest season. Before the strike they had been working around the clock and had had no opportunity to accumulate stock piles.

Three-fifths of American crops now depend upon commercial fertilizers and 70 percent of the demand is during the first 4 months of the year, as farmers customarily spread the fertilizer when they seed their crops. Furthermore, it takes 6 weeks to dig potash from the mines, process it, and ship the refined product to fertilizer makers.

The Carlsbad strike thus has cut off virtually the whole of American agriculture's 1950 fertilizer supply at one stroke. This was not accidental.

Investigators for the National Labor Board discovered that the Washington representative of the CIO Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers had made extensive inquiries of the Department of Agriculture about fertilizer sources and peak demand periods shortly before the union called the strike in mid-November.

VIOLATION CHARGED

The Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, although at the moment in good standing in the CIO, face an investigation of Communist control of their union. At Carlsbad the union conducted mass picketing to keep employees who wanted to work out of the plants and conducted a campaign of threats against nonstrikers.

These practices violate the Taft-Hartley Act. The employers filed charges of unfair labor practices against the union. Counsel for the National Labor Relations Board then went before Federal Judge Carl A. Hatch, who enjoined the goons from interfering with the operation of the plants.

On Monday several hundred employees, most of them members of nonstriking AFL unions, were able to enter the plants from which they had been barred previously by picket mobs. The struck companies say that they expect to resume production with this force.

This strike puts to the acid test the CIO's professions of friendship to the farmers. Philip Murray and his followers are urging farmers to unite with them behind the Truman program for a poorhouse state, particularly on the nonsensical Brannan plan to pay for groceries out of our tax bills.

The claim of a community of interest between labor and farmers is shown up by the CIO strike to inflict crop failures on the Nation.

Get the Real Facts Before Judging Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the transcription of my biweekly broadcast for the week end October 14 to 16, inclusive, in which I discussed the achievements of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What has the Eighty-first Congress done in its first session, and how do these things affect you?

Politically speaking, of course, these are the $64 questions of the year. And, just as naturally, the answers you get often depend upon the politics of the expert who gives you his opinion.

Now, I don't intend to answer the $64 questions on this broadcast, although I will comment on some of the achievements and failures of this session, from a factual standpoint, and then let you decide, if you will, whether the Congress has done a good job or a bad job, and whether the actions it took affect you for good or for ill.

In connection with these broadcasts, I'd like to thank this station for providing me with this opportunity every 2 weeks to report to the people of Pennsylvania on the doings of your National Government, particularly as they affect you as a citizen of Pennsylvania; I feel that the station thus makes a real contribution to its public trust. As a United States Senator, my actions take on great importance to you, whether you agree with all of them or not, and it is equally important for you to know why I take these actions. By providing time every 2 weeks for me to report to you, this station and others participating in this series have made possible the full and complete report I feel you should have.

Those of you who are already familiar with what I have covered in my past broadcasts in this biweekly series are aware that most of the matters I have discussed have been right in the midst of some great battle in the Congress over the particular form that the various pieces of vital legislation should take. So in large part, the measures I've discussed haven't been in the final form of a public law.

And, as you know, until both Houses do agree in identical detail on every detail of a bill—and sometimes that takes weeks or even months, as in the case of the flood-control appropriations bill which we finally sent on to the White House for signature last week—all we have is a combination of separate bills, one bill passed by the House, and a separate and different bill, usually, passed by the Senate. So until both Houses iron out their differences, the bills can't become law.

So what I've discussed in most of my previous broadcasts in this series was forced by events, by the inconclusiveness of legislative action, to remain restricted to the possibilities or the probabilities of proposed legislation, rather than the finished public law.

Your newspapers over the months have given you the step-by-step and play-by-play and day-by-day developments in legislation. But I gather from the conversations I've had with numerous Pennsylvanians that what most of you would really like to know is how these laws will actually be administered, how the working of these vital pieces of legislation will actually operate in their effect on you, and on Pennsylvania, and on the Nation.

I haven't had an opportunity yet to make firm plans as to the details of any future broadcasts, but what I have in mind is to bring before the microphone with me some of the top men—and also some of the operating officials who are experts on particular phases of the work—from such departments and agencies as agriculture, labor, public health, social security, public housing, and others, and have them tell you in their own words, in plain and understandable terms—not in "Government-ese" or gobbledegook—just how these new laws will be administered, and, much more important, how the laws will affect you.

As I say, the details aren't worked out, but I feel you'd find such broadcasts informative and interesting. The big question in the minds of all of us when we hear or read about gigantic Government operations is why—and the why of them is what I want to help to bring to you with the assistance of these experts in the departments and agencies who do the actual administering of the laws we pass—laws we often pass in broad-gaged terms, leaving the detail determinations to the so-called bureaucrats.

I have often found it necessary to defend these officials against what I considered extremely unfair criticism voiced in general terms about all Government officials without discrimination and without identification, but on these future broadcasts I will let them speak for themselves. And in order to obtain a full and complete picture, I intend to ask all of them the hot-potato questions, including, in the case of agriculture, the one about the potato itself.

And now, let's take a look at the Eighty-first Congress. In speaking to you on this question, I am acutely conscious of my own position in that Congress as majority whip, as assistant majority leader, in the Senate, a position which carries with it the obligation to lead in pushing through to enactment the administration program. And since that program, in most details conforms to the 1948 Democratic platform, and since I was chairman of the committee at Philadelphia which battled over every detail of that platform before we finally drafted it, I am in close identification with the administration point of view.

Nevertheless, I have always tried in these broadcasts to you to keep them as nonpolitical as possible, as factual and as much above partisanship as possible, on the theory that you are interested primarily in the facts, and not in the politics, and I approach this review of the Eighty-first Congress activities with that idea uppermost.

Now don't get me wrong: I personally am quite proud of the achievements of this Congress thus far. I don't hear very often any more the term "Eighty-worst" Congress used about this Eighty-first, for the achievements in many fields, particularly in the international affairs, but also in some domestic fields, have been solid achievements, and I am proud of them. But, at the same time, recognizing this as a nonpartisan program, I would rather let the facts speak for themselves, and let you decide on our accomplishments.

On the international front, this Congress gave the President and the State Department virtually everything they asked for—not out of loyalty to the administration, or blind acceptance, but out of thoroughgoing, intensive, critical and extended study of the merits.

It is still a source of amazement to me that despite a tremendous outcry in the Congress and in some sections of the public, the Congress has sent onto the President—with simply overwhelming majorities in the votes—measures which renewed the Marshall plan, ratified the Atlantic Pact, together with provision of adequate funds for the arming of the nations participating with us in that Atlantic Pact. The votes were obviously of bipartisan origin, and had almost universal public support. The credit here is not so much to the administration or to the majority leadership in the Congress—but to the people, to the public, who got behind these programs and stayed behind them and refused to be panicked into opposing them by hysteria or by misleading and unsupportable attacks.

One other piece of significant foreign policy legislation passed by this Congress differed from the others in that strong bipartisan support for it was conspicuously lacking. The extremely successful and highly important reciprocal-trade program inaugurated by our great former Secretary of State, Cordell Hull in 1934, almost had the rug pulled out from under it by the amendments put through the Eightieth Congress last year. I am pleased, and very proud, that the reciprocal-trade program has been restored to its full vitality by the Eighty-first Congress, and is now effectively at work. And the bill we put back on the books this year provides ample safeguards to American industries against undercutting by vicious and unfair slave labor competition from foreign producers. The law as it now stands will go forward to produce greater wealth for all free nations through its encouragement of international trade.

But it's on the domestic front, on the legislation that begins and ends at home, that we can really take the measure of the Eighty-first Congress. Here's just a partial list and because my time is short on the remaining part of this broadcast, it is only a list, and it is only partial:

This present Congress, the Eighty-first, has passed a new low-cost public housing bill which, during the next 6 years will permit 810,000 families all over the country to move from slums into decent and adequate American housing. This same legislation had failed to get through in two previous sessions, but this time we got it through. Even though the act is just a few months old, it has already been announced that at least 12 Pennsylvania communities have agreed to go forward with construction during the next 2 years—Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Johnstown, Allentown, Bethlehem, Pottstown, Farrell, Beaver Falls, Aliquippa, Ambridge, Harrisburg, and Williamsport having already been approved for Federal assistance in their separate programs.

We got rent control extended, after dire prophecies that it would die in this Congress. But after a really major fight, we were able to pass, finally, a good bill which I believe is a pretty fair bill for both sides—landlords and tenants.

After years of talking about Government reorganization, the Eighty-first Congress approved six major reorganization plans submitted by President Truman on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. And in addition to the big improvements made possible under those six specific bills, there have been several other reorganization plans approved by the Congress that were passed in connection with other legislation affecting the particular agencies.

On the farm front, the Eighty-first Congress has made it possible for the Commodity Credit Corporation to assist in providing adequate storage facilities for grain, after this problem had haunted farmers in recent years when they saw bumper crops rot away because there were no storage facilities. Efforts had been made to pass this legislation in the Eightieth Congress, but they failed. The Eighty-first Congress, too, has provided for a gradual expansion of crop insurance, a measure of vital importance to farmers which will enable them to help themselves over rough spots when acts of nature unexpectedly wipe out whole crops in a particular neighborhood.

The Eighty-first Congress has renewed for the next 6 years the splendid program which will assist local communities in the construction of needed hospital facilities. Under the new bill, the Government will put up $150,000,000 annually to pay for two-thirds of the cost of building new hospitals, leaving to the communities the job of planning for their needs and raising the balance of the funds.

And I might mention, too, that since I last discussed it on this series of broadcasts, that the House has now approved the bill previously passed by the Senate to provide $100,000,000 in loans to local communities for use in planning schools, sewer and water facilities, and other public needs. These loans will permit cities and towns and counties all over Pennsylvania and the Nation to make plans for local improvements which they expect to put under construction with their own funds.

As I said earlier, this list of accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress—and I might mention the minimum wage bill passed by the Congress—is only a partial one, only a part of what I proudly regard as an impressive total accomplishment. There are many, many more things, and if I am any judge of the present political scene, I believe all of you are due to hear a great deal during the next few weeks over the question of what the Eighty-first Congress has done. You will hear those who will deny with a good bit of fervor that we have accomplished much in our long months here in Washington—and you'll hear others say that we've done a great deal.

I notice that my time on this broadcast is running out, but I'd like to leave this thought with you:

When you hear a debate over the record of the Eighty-first Congress, make every effort you can to sift out the political arguments,

and do your best to glean the real facts. Listen carefully to what we've done—and what we haven't done, on such failures as civil-rights legislation and the promise of this administration to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. Look at the record. Weigh the good against the bad. Weigh the facts, all of them you can get. Ask yourself what the accomplishments mean to you. Then decide for yourself where this Congress stands.

I'm proud of what we've done in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, and I believe, when you look squarely at the record, most of you will be proud, too.

I invite you to be with me in 2 weeks when I hope to get under way my rather ambitious proposal to bring before you the men who will administer the laws we in the Congress have passed.

Low-Rent Housing Program of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on my biweekly broadcast of the week end of October 28-30, inclusive, I chose as my discussion topic the new low-rent housing program authorized by the Eighty-first Congress. I invited Mr. Walter Alessandroni, executive director of the Philadelphia housing authority, and Mr. Charles Levy, director of the Philadelphia field office of the Public Housing Administration, to join me in discussing just how the new housing program would work in a State such as Pennsylvania; how it would help to alleviate the tremendous lack of housing in all of our cities, not only in Pennsylvania but in the other 47 States as well. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my broadcast printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Officially, at least, the Congress is out of business for the rest of 1949, and we aren't due to go back into session until January of next year. This doesn't mean, of course, that our duties and responsibilities in communities are over and done with for the best 2 months or so. Between now and January, all of us in Congress will want to take stock of what we accomplished in the last session by looking into the way the new laws are working out in practice, and then, too, we'll have to look over unfinished business and new business in order to make plans for next session.

Now I can't think of a better way for us to evaluate the achievements of the Eighty-first Congress than to follow up with the people who administer these laws, and have them fill out the details left to their discretion, supervising and administering the broad legislative instructions that we in the Congress have established.

Because housing is a subject of such vital importance to Americans, I intend to devote this broadcast to the new low-rent public housing program authorized by the Eighty-first Congress, and I hope in this way to reduce this vast program down into terms familiar to us as Pennsylvanians. I was a proponent of the housing bill in the Senate, and I am very gratified at the vigorous and enthusiastic fashion in which communities all over Pennsylvania have participated in the program. The public housing law authorizes Federal assistance to communities for the next 6 years, during which period it is expected that 810,000 low-rent nonfarm public housing units will be constructed. The new law, in addition, will provide for direct grants to communities for the purpose of slum clearance, and it also establishes a research program which will be used to develop better and less expensive methods of housing construction.

Now what does all this mean to Pennsylvania? Well, I have invited as my guests on this broadcast two Pennsylvanians who are prominently identified with public housing. I intend to ask each of them a few questions, and I believe their answers will do a great deal to explain just what this does mean to Pennsylvania and Pennsylvanians.

My first guest is Mr. Walter Alessandroni, executive director of the Philadelphia Housing Authority. Mr. Alessandroni, as the State commander of the American Legion, as former chairman of the national housing committee of the American Legion, and as a past national vice commander of the American Legion, you are exceptionally well qualified to discuss public housing on two counts—first, how the local public-housing program is working out in Philadelphia and, secondly, the importance of this program to veterans. I don't think there is any doubt at all but that your efforts have been largely responsible for the Legion's present position in support of public housing. And so why, Walter, have you led the all-out fight, year after year, to get the Legion to adopt its present, enthusiastic support of public housing?

Mr. ALESSANDRONI. Well, first of all, Senator MYERS, this act provides for a priority to veterans, and the American Legion feels that the Congress very wisely gave the veterans a priority because certainly, as a group, they are most sorely in need of housing accommodations. Secondly, the housing legislation which was adopted in the Eighty-first Congress—which was known variously as the W-E-T bill, or "wet bill," and then the T-E-W bill, and now as the National Housing Act of 1949—offered the most comprehensive and forthright solution for providing decent, safe, and sanitary housing for a large segment of our population who never would have been able to provide themselves with adequate shelter otherwise. This legislation also received the full public discussion and debate in the Congress for some 4 years, and no better alternative was ever offered. The act which provided assistance for the present public-housing units has been in operation for over 10 years, and we believe has been found satisfactory.

Senator MYERS. Well, Commander Alessandroni, when the first public housing act of the Federal Government was passed, back in the late thirties, you and I both remember that the municipal government in Philadelphia was dead set against participating in that program at first. Now, of course, the entire municipal government in Philadelphia has swung around completely on public housing, as have most communities and most community officials all over Pennsylvania in the past few years. And when we passed the new housing law this summer, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh were the first two cities in Pennsylvania to be approved for participation in this new program, the Philadelphia Housing Authority having been allocated 10,000 units to be constructed during the next 2 years. Will these 10,000 new low-cost units answer all of Philadelphia's problems, Walter?

Mr. ALESSANDRONI. No, Senator MYERS, they will not answer all Philadelphia's problems, but they certainly will go a long way toward alleviating a situation which has been with Philadelphia and all great cities for many years. I might say that Philadelphia was slow in accepting public housing some 10 years ago, but then in all pioneering efforts, cities as well as people are slow to lead the way. Philadelphia I think at that time was concerned about its local autonomy. I believe, however, that the experience of the past 10 years with public housing has led Philadelphians and public officials to the inescapable conclusion that Philadelphia will retain its autonomy, and that this bill is merely one of Federal money assistance.

Senator MYERS. Well, I think what you have said, Commander Alessandroni, makes it clear why low-rent public housing should be a completely nonpartisan issue, and it makes it equally clear that the national policy which this program reflects is simply one that's above politics, and is squarely a question of getting done with a vital and a necessary job, if we're going to see to it that all Americans are giving a real opportunity to become full-fledged Americans, self-sustaining, and productive.

Thank you very much for joining me, Commander Alessandroni. My next guest is Mr. Charles Levy, who has recently become Director of the Philadelphia Field Office of the Public Housing Administration, which office has jurisdiction over Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia. Mr. Levy, because you have had years of professional experience in the Public Housing Administration, having grown up as it were under this Federal program that was in existence before the war, I think you are exceptionally well qualified to answer several questions I have about the new housing law we passed a few months back. In the Housing Act of 1949, the Congress provided that a total of 810,000 low-rent, nonfarm units could be constructed all over the country with Federal help during the next 6 years. Now I understand that the Public Housing Administration is allocating these housing units on the basis of a program to be undertaken only for the next year, or next 2 years. And since a 2-year program is a third of the total we provided for in the law this year, this means, I believe, that you will parcel out 270,000 units to communities all over the country for the next 2 years. This doesn't mean that all these units will be allocated to the first communities that send in requests for allocations, does it, Mr. Levy?

Mr. LEVY. No, indeed, Senator MYERS, the Public Housing Administration can't allocate 270,000 units in the next 2 years on a first-come, first-served basis. That wouldn't be fair at all. We've taken a lot of things into consideration. There is a far greater need for public housing than can be filled with the 270,000 units, or 810,000, for that matter. To allocate these units fairly, we have to consider the relative needs for slum clearance for new housing in all our communities. We have to consider the amount of bad housing, the number of low-income families living alone, or doubled up, in the various communities and the states. So what it is, is a question of fitting all these things together, not inflexibly, but as best we can, to give every community with housing problems a chance to be helped by the new law.

Senator MYERS. There is another limitation in the law, as I recall it, Mr. Levy, which provides and sets up and limits the allocations to any particular ones of the larger States more than 10 percent of the total of all units. Now Pennsylvania is one of our largest States, and as I understand it that means that we in Pennsylvania couldn't get more than 27,000 units—or 10 percent of the 270,000 units that are allocated for the entire country for the next 2 years. The last figures, as I saw them, indicated that nearly 20,500 units have already been allocated to a total of 18 communities in Pennsylvania. And I think my listeners might be interested in the names and the allocations to those communities. There was an allocation of 10,000 units to Philadelphia, 5,000 to Pittsburgh, 750 to Johnstown, 600 to Allentown, 400 to Bethlehem, 200 to Pottstown, 100 units to Farrell, 100 units to Beaver Falls, 175 to Aliquippa, 150 to Ambridge, 750 to Harrisburg, 300 to Williamsport, 150 units to Uniontown, 100 to Brownsville, 50 to Masontown, 400 to Chester, 628 to Reading, and I believe, 600 units to McKeesport. Now what kind of an opportunity, Mr. Levy, will other communities in Pennsylvania have where allocations have not yet been made?

Mr. LEVY. A very good opportunity, Senator MYERS. You see, the list of cities you mentioned already contains almost all the large communities in Pennsylvania. The largest communities naturally tend to have the greatest need, and as would be expected, they take up a substantial part of the total. The 18 communities have been allocated as you have indicated approximately 20,500 units for the programs in the next 2 years. We have also received applications from the city of York, Darby Township, and Upper Dublin Township. There have been inquiries from a number of other communities, large and small. I feel confident that not only will these communities receive programs, but that communities which do not have active local authorities will have time to examine their needs, organize an authority where required, and make requests to participate in the first 2-year portion of the program. New authorities have recently been formed in Connellsville, Lancaster, York, Lycoming and elsewhere, and any interested community can do the same thing.

Senator MYERS. Well, what if some of the people listening to this broadcast, either municipal officials, or just plain private citizens, are interested in seeing local housing authorities established in their communities if they haven't already got a local authority? What would you suggest to such communities, Mr. Levy, and what would you advise them to do?

Mr. LEVY. Well, Senator, you are familiar with the 30-page pamphlet on the Housing Act of 1949, what it is, and how it works. That was put out by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. I think it is an excellent job, and the Public Housing Administration, Washington, D. C., or the Public Housing Administration, 3701 North Broad St., Philadelphia, will be happy to send it to anyone who writes. It's got the facts, and it's good.

Senator MYERS. That's a fine suggestion, Mr. Levy, and I might also say that if they write to my office, 307 Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., we might also be able to provide them with a copy of this pamphlet. And incidentally, I have a number of these pamphlets already on hand, and as I say, these folks to whom you have just made the suggestion that they procure such a pamphlet can obtain it from my office, or they can obtain it from your office, as you have said, Mr. Levy, or from the Public Housing Administration in Washington.

Now all our discussion on this program has been devoted to the low-rent public housing problems in our cities. The Housing Act initiates a brand new program which we haven't discussed; it will undertake the building of low-rent farm housing, the getting rid of rural slum conditions.

The two gentlemen who have been with me on this program have been best acquainted with the city problem, and so we have stuck to that. The Farm Housing Program is under the Department of Agriculture, and later when I hope to have with me on one of these broadcasts some high officials from the Department of Agriculture, I intend to discuss this program of rural housing. And then I haven't discussed the slum clearance provisions of the new housing law. Most of the communities with local housing authorities are familiar with this important phase of the law, and perhaps in a later broadcast we can go into this in detail.

Well, my time on this broadcast is running out, and so I'd like to close by saying I will be back with you again in 2 weeks.

Farm Bill of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on my regular biweekly broadcast of November 11-13, inclusive, I was indeed fortunate to have our Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles F. Brannan, join me in discussing the services rendered by the Department of Agriculture, the problems faced by the whole agricultural industry of our great country, and the meaning of the farm bill passed by the Eighty-first Congress to both the farmer and the consumer. I request unanimous consent to have the text of that broadcast printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When most Americans think of Pennsylvania, they think of us as having one of the greatest of the industrial States. But I don't think they are aware that Pennsylvania is also one of the great agricultural States.

We in Pennsylvania know this, of course. We know that there is scarcely a spot in the State which is more than a few minutes distant by car from really fine farming country.

Our agriculture is diversified. We aren't a one-crop State—and we haven't got the huge factory farms that you find on the Great Plains of the West. But we do produce a great deal of the food we eat—and in some instances, such as buckwheat, we are among the largest producers in the country.

So that means that I, as a United States Senator from Pennsylvania, must keep up with farm legislation just as carefully as I must with matters like minimum wage, housing, social security, reciprocal trade, and many other important issues.

But farm legislation is important to Pennsylvania not only because we have a great agricultural State. Whether you're a farmer, or a businessman, or a housewife, you are very much interested in what your food costs you. You are interested in seeing that we continue to find markets for the countless products of our industries and our mines—and because the farmer is an important consumer of the products we make, we're interested in the farmer's ability to buy them.

I'm fortunate in having at the microphone with me on this broadcast the Secretary of Agriculture, Charles F. Brannan.

Most of you are, I imagine, aware that Mr. Brannan moved up through the ranks of the Department of Agriculture to become its top boss, bringing with him to that job about 15 years of distinguished accomplishment and a widely varied experience in some of the most important phases of the Department's many activities.

Well, Secretary Brannan, since the Department of Agriculture is one that annually receives hundreds of millions of dollars in appropriations—I think it is only fair to ask you what the American people get for their money. You employ more than 80,000 people to get your job done, and I can't think of a single aspect of our economy that isn't affected in some way or another by what the Department of Agriculture does. So I do think it's fair to ask what the Department's goals are—and what the American people actually got for their money.

Secretary BRANNAN. Well, Senator MYERS, as you know, the Department of Agriculture has various kinds of responsibilities. They have, and maintain, one of the greatest research and educational institutions in the field of agriculture in the world.

Then they do a great deal of regulatory work, keeping the foods that move in the channels of commerce in the best possible condition for the consuming public. They regulate the grain market so that the speculating that is essential to some phases of trading in grain and some of the other commodities is not carried on to the penalty or disadvantage of farmers.

Then there are a wide variety of services to farmers, in addition to research—the crop reporting which gives farmers some indication of what the volumes of crops this year are so they can plan for next year—and an economic analysis of what farmers might expect in the way of prices, etc., for their various crops.

The Department of Agriculture also has a great lending institution, the Farm Credit Administration of the Farmers Home Administration—and collateral to that, lending institutions which make it possible for farmers to build their own cooperative enterprises in the field of rural electrification and now, perhaps, in telephone. There is also going to be an agency now concentrating on improved housing.

Then, basically, they are trying to assure the American farmer, through the price-support mechanism, the opportunity to earn a fair return on the marketplace. And then, when we get too much of one commodity, or another, we take some of those commodities and put them into the school-lunch program.

Senator MYERS. I'd like to interrupt you right there, Charlie, to ask you to explain a bit more about the school-lunch program. Every child in Pennsylvania is eligible for that program—and while it doesn't represent the largest item in the Department of Agriculture's budget, I think it is exceedingly important.

How's the school-lunch program working out, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary BRANNAN. Well, Senator, it's doing a tremendously important job in my opinion. Of course, even now it isn't big enough to serve all our school children, but it represents a big advance over where we were a few years back.

In the Nation last year, it provided over a billion meals—42,500,000 of them in Pennsylvania. That was a 13-percent increase for Pennsylvania over previous years, and shows an appreciation of the program. The amount of good any State gets out of the program depends, of course, on how the people take hold of it. At the peak of the program last year, the Nation had 7,000,000 children in about 48,000 schools participating in the program—and Pennsylvania had 230,000 in about 2,036 schools.

The program will give us an opportunity to help farmers who are producing abundantly, as we want them to, and also in some cases where we have surpluses, to handle the surpluses in a way which is not wasteful and destructive of good food.

Senator MYERS. Of course, Secretary Brannan, putting some of our surplus food to work in the school-lunch program is just one minor phase of our food-surplus problem. But food surpluses do suggest the price-support issue, and I'd like to talk about

that new farm bill we just passed in Congress.

The problem of surpluses is a national question, and both parties agree on that completely. Republicans and Democrats agree, too, that we must strive to produce some reasonable surplus of food every year to avoid shortages, high prices, and the privation that would result from serious droughts or other natural calamities. Both agree we must produce this food at reasonable prices people can afford to pay. And both agree we must at the same time see to it that our farmers incomes stay at a decent level—and avoid the wild ups and downs that have plagued farmers in the past. And that's just about as far as general agreement goes.

We don't agree on how we're going to accomplish all this. Our national agricultural policy at the moment is in a period of transition. Partly this is because we increased our food production so tremendously during the war—and even though we're eating better today, we don't know what to do with surpluses. Some say we should use fixed price supports—and others say they should be flexible. Some say we should use rigid crop controls—and others say crop controls are the worst kind of regimentation. And there are innumerable variations.

So with all these different ideas, it's pretty obvious we in the Congress this year didn't solve all the basic issues that make up our so-called "farm problem." You might say the new bill just postpones these issues until we find a more satisfactory solution. The bill we passed was a compromise of these conflicts—and like any compromise, I doubt that anyone was completely satisfied with it.

But it was an honest compromise, fought out in the traditional American manner of give-and-take, and now we've got to wait and see if the issues we compromised in this bill actually lend themselves to compromise. The ultimate solution may, in a few more years, turn out to be the Brannan plan, or some variation of it, or in some other plan that hasn't even been suggested yet. But I know that the Congress is sincere in wanting to find a practical, long-range, enduring solution, and I honestly believe our compromise bill was a pretty good bill. In view of all the conflicts, I know it was the best bill we could get at this time.

What's your reaction, Mr. Secretary, to the bill we in Congress gave you? Could you compare it briefly with your own suggestions?

Secretary BRANNAN. Well, Frank, I look upon this new act of 1949 very much in the same way as you just analyzed it. Certainly, it is a much better law than the one which it replaces—the one passed by the Eightieth Congress. It does provide better protection against declining farm prices, and helps us maintain farm incomes at a level which the American people, both farmers and others, are entitled to see it returned.

However, it does leave important problems unanswered. It does not encourage shifts in production so as to balance supply with realistic demand. It does not meet the dual objective of assuring farmers the opportunity to earn fair returns from abundant production, and at the same time assuring consumers the opportunity to use the products the farmers have produced.

Those are objectives that I'm sure we all agree upon. The question is just how you do it. The administration has recommended certain ways of meeting these outstanding problems. But if anybody can find better methods of doing the same thing, and if the Congress will agree that they are better methods, the administration will wholeheartedly undertake to make those new methods work. We aren't fighting over a narrow difference of detail. We're interested in seeing the farmers have a decent return, and we're interested in seeing that the consumers of this country have access to the food we can produce abundantly at reasonable prices. In my opinion, the job is partly done, but there is much yet to do, and I am glad to hear you say, and I agree with you, that the Congress has done a fine job so far, and is in a mood to continue to work on it.

Senator MYERS. Well, Secretary Brannan, I think everyone will agree that the consumer has a very real interest in the prices he has to pay for food. In fact, I recall that on an earlier broadcast in this series, I promised I'd ask you the question about the potato—which for the consumer has really been a question of the $64 variety in the last couple of years. I know we had to increase our potato production during the war, then wound up with too many—and the Government had to buy the surplus. But the housewife had to continue paying high prices for potatoes she used at home. How do you answer that one, Charlie?

Secretary BRANNAN. Well, there's no really brief answer, FRANK. The problem is very complicated. Farmers have learned to produce potatoes in ever increasing quantities. I think the yields per acre have jumped perhaps as much as a hundred bushels to the acre in the last few years. And at the same time, the capacity of the American people to consume potatoes has not increased proportionately.

And then, you must remember, you just can't export potatoes. So we've got to consume them domestically—or they become a very serious surplus.

We at the same time tried to assure the potato growers of the country a fair return because they have been in business a long time, and we got them in business during the war. Trying to assure them a fair return, and then at the same time, making the potato acceptable at reasonable prices to American consumers is the job that we have not gotten done legislatively these past 5 or 6 years. And frankly, it's not done yet.

Senator MYERS. Well, Secretary Brannan, your answer certainly tosses the hot potato back into the laps of Congress. But I will say I'm glad our farms were able to produce so much more food than before when we really needed it to feed ourselves and so many other people.

Thank you, Secretary Brannan, for joining me.

I notice now that my time has just about run out, and I'll close by saying that I hope you'll join in listening again in 2 weeks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In earlier broadcasts while the Congress was still in session, I made periodic progress reports on the status of the new wage-hour bill as it made its way through the House and Senate to final enactment along in October.

When President Truman put his signature on the wage-hour—or minimum-wage—bill as it's sometimes called, a fight which had gone on for years ended in victory, a victory for a higher American standard of living.

Because this will mean added purchasing power for a great many Americans, we in Pennsylvania will benefit from the law in a number of ways. For one thing, we know that purchasing power measures the health of our whole productive economy. For us in Pennsylvania, it is exceedingly important that we find markets for the things we produce in our factories and our mines and on our farms—and thus any change which increases the ability of more people to buy the things we make has a very real effect upon our prosperity.

This is one of the many reasons why I want you to know something of the details of the wage-hour law and I hope in the course of this broadcast to develop for you some of the things which will be accomplished by the new act recently passed by the Eighty-first Congress.

Now the wage-hour law isn't a new idea. Congress passed the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938, so we've had the basic law on the books for more than 11 years. The Eighty-first Congress this year changed many of the details of the 1938 act, but we left the fundamental features of the old law pretty much as they were, so I think I should begin by telling briefly about the essential purposes of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

For one thing, the terms of the original act provide a floor under the wages of more than 22,000,000 Americans whose work flows through the channel of interstate commerce. But because we usually think of it as the minimum-wage law, we frequently overlook the fact that the 1938 law also established, for millions of Americans, the 40-hour workweek as the usual standard, and provided that overtime payments should be made for any work above that amount. And lastly, among the really important features, the 1938 act contained certain provisions which marked a real beginning toward a decent child-labor law.

I have invited Mr. William R. McComb, the Federal Wage and Hour Administrator, to join me in this broadcast because he has been the top administrator of the old law, and will, after January 25, 1950, when the new amendments go into effect, be responsible for carrying out the administrative provisions of the new duties we have provided for him as well.

Mr. McComb, you've heard my brief description of the provisions contained in the wage-hour law, and as my first question I'd like to ask you what you consider to be the most important change we made in the Fair Labor Standards Act by the amendments we passed this year.

Mr. McCOMB. Well, Senator MYERS, I don't think there's much doubt as to the most important feature; that is, the increase in the minimum hourly rate from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour. That is the change which has received most of the attention, and it certainly deserved to.

Senator MYERS. I agree with you, Mr. McComb, that the new 75-cent hourly minimum is the really important new feature, but I'd like to say something more about the 40-cent-an-hour minimum in the old law.

Wage-Hour Bill of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my broadcast to the people of Pennsylvania of the week end of November 25–27 printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. At that time I was privileged to have join me Mr. William R. McComb, the Federal Wage and Hour Administrator, and we discussed the background of minimum-wage legislation and the effects of the new minimum-wage law on the American worker.

As I recall, while the 1938 act did provide for a 40-cent hourly minimum, we didn't plan that it would immediately bring every worker covered by the law up to 40 cents an hour. If we'd pushed the minimum up to 40 cents at once, it would have wiped out many businesses, and so the law visualized a gradual, step-by-step increase up to 40 cents.

In fact, as I remember it, the minimum wage that was established for 1938 was only 25 cents an hour, or $10 for a 40-hour week. That still makes me shudder when I think that we could ever have considered $10 a week as a satisfactory minimum wage, even in 1938—but that's where we had to start.

Mr. McCOMB. Ten dollars a week wasn't much money at all, Senator, but it gave us a start, low as it was, and we were able to get some valuable experience in administering the law at a time when many of its features were more or less untried.

Then, as you've said, the law made it possible for the minimum to move up year after year when, after careful study, it appeared that could be done without serious hardship to employers, and it wasn't until 1944 that we finally reached the over-all 40 cents an hour for everyone covered by the law.

Senator MYERS. Well, Mr. McComb, 1944 was right at the peak of our wartime production, and virtually everybody who wanted a job could get one. You shouldn't have had much trouble enforcing a 40-cent minimum wage rate at that point because almost everyone could find a job that paid at least that much money.

Mr. McCOMB. You're perfectly correct, Senator. The 40-cent-an-hour minimum wage under the law became rather meaningless at that time.

Senator MYERS. Yes; but if it was rather meaningless in 1944, it became completely meaningless in the postwar years. Remember that though a lot of us in the Congress fought hard to stave off inflation, the major wartime price controls died in 1946, and, of course, inflation followed.

So in the postwar years, it's obvious that 40 cents an hour—$16 for a full working week—certainly wasn't a realistic minimum wage when the cost of living rose the way it did. You'll recall that the Senate actually did pass a bill in 1946 to increase the hourly rate above 40 cents, but the House refused to go along, and the question was held over for the Eightieth Congress when it convened in 1947. And, as all of us know, the Eightieth Congress didn't budge on minimum wage.

Mr. McCOMB. That's right, Senator MYERS, and I recall that you tried to amend the act from the floor of the Senate in 1947. Didn't you offer an amendment to the Portal to Portal Act of that year which would have increased the hourly minimum under the wage-and-hour law to 60 cents?

Senator MYERS. Yes; I submitted such an amendment, Mr. McComb, but unfortunately the Senate voted it down without debate, because we were then operating under a strict application of Senate rules during a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on various aspects of the portal bill.

But immediately after my amendment was voted down, Senator TAFT, as chairman of what was then the majority policy committee, and also as chairman of the Senate Labor Committee, promised that the Labor Committee would report out a wage and hour bill promptly. I regret to say that didn't happen, although the Eightieth Congress didn't end for almost another year and a half. In fact, there never was a wage-and-hour-bill reported out of a Senate or a House committee during the Eightieth Congress.

That's history now, and the Eighty-first Congress has amended the wage-hour law, adopting, among other changes, a 75-cent minimum wage.

How many wage earners are due for an increase to that figure under the new provision?

Mr. McCOMB. The best estimates, Senator, indicate that about a million and a half people covered by the law are making less than 75 cents an hour, and thus that number will receive direct increases to the 75-cent level.

Senator MYERS. Where do these million and and half work, Mr. McComb?

Mr. McCOMB. The best available information we have, Senator MYERS, shows that these lowest-paid workers who will get direct increases under the new 75-cent provision are employed principally in segments of these manufacturing industries: Lumber, leather, apparel, furniture, and food products. Then there are some others in nonmanufacturing industries such as trade and communications. And they're scattered throughout practically every State in the country where these industries are to be found.

Senator MYERS. We have every one of these industries in Pennsylvania, so I imagine there will be a number of Pennsylvanians who'll get direct increases to the new 75-cent minimum.

But Pennsylvania working people, by and large, earn wages that are well above the 75-cent level. I know, though, that some of the very employers who pay these higher wages in Pennsylvania are threatened by competition from other manufacturers who now pay less than 75 cents an hour. So this will be a big protection to employers who pay more than 75 cents, because low-paying competitors will now be required to raise their wages at least to the 75-cent minimum—in other words, the new amendment will do a lot to end unfair, sweat-shop competition against fairer-minded employers.

Now, Mr. McComb, before our time runs out, I believe we should go over some of the other important changes we made this year. For one, I'm proud that we strengthened the child-labor provisions of the wage-hour law, and eliminated, as I hope we did, one of the worst loopholes in it. How is this going to work out?

Mr. McCOMB. It's a big improvement, Senator. A child under 16 can't work at any industrial job covered by this act—and if it's a hazardous job, the minimum age is 18. Before this new amendment, the act did not directly forbid child labor in these jobs. About the best we could do was to restrict and discourage child labor, but the law could be evaded, and we were powerless to stop it.

Senator MYERS. Another change we made this year was along the lines you suggested to the Congress, Mr. McComb. The 1938 wage-hour law didn't provide a satisfactory means of computing overtime pay—and a lot of trouble resulted. The famous "overtime on overtime" case went to the Supreme Court, and there were a number of others. You pointed out we could get around much of that difficulty by defining the term "regular rate of pay"—and so we incorporated a new definition in the law. Just how will that definition help out?

Mr. McCOMB. What we did this year, Senator MYERS, was to give employers and employees something concrete to work with, whereas before, the law hadn't been clear as to what was intended. By enumerating some of the types of payments which do not have to be considered in determining an employee's regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime computation, much of the confusion and uncertainty we experienced will be eliminated.

Senator MYERS. Thank you very much for joining me, Mr. McComb. I appreciate your visit, and I know our listening audience does, too.

Incidentally, Mr. McComb told me before the broadcast that anyone—whether an employer or an employee—can get more details on the new wage-hour law by writing the Wage and Hour Division at the Widener Building in Philadelphia or the Wage and Hour Division at the Victory Building in Pittsburgh—or I'll be glad to send you the material if you'll write to me, United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Thank you for listening. I hope you've enjoyed this broadcast.

Achievements of ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on the week end of December 9 to 11, inclusive, I had the honor of having Mr. Paul Hoffman, ECA Administrator, join me on my regular biweekly broadcast. Mr. Hoffman's work has been invaluable to the achievements of the Marshall plan, and I felt it a great privilege to have such a public servant with me to discuss just how our programs in Europe have helped the nations of Europe fight communism and rebuild their own economies. I ask unanimous consent that the text of that broadcast be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator MYERS. At this time of year, when the words "peace upon earth and good will among men" are frequently heard, I think we may be grateful that the spirit of peace has more substance this year than it's had for some time.

Too often, recent years have been marked by the tragedy, destruction, and pestilence of war, or threat of war. At the end of 1947, two years and a half after the European war ended, many Americans feared we were losing the peace. World War II veterans cast anxious eyes at their discarded uniforms, and there were rumors of a third world war in a matter of weeks.

Communism, a new threat to Europe's liberty, rolled out of the east Europe's democracies, their economies close to collapse, their people on the verge of starvation, seemed ready for Communist masters to take over. There were rumblings in France, and dire prophecies that the Communists would win at the Italian polls in the spring of 1948.

Today, 2 years later, we face a vastly different picture. The Communist march has been halted. The western democracies have a new strength and vitality. There is real confidence now that we are winning the peace.

We can't explain this change or this new confidence by any one reason, but we do know without doubt that Marshall plan assistance has played a huge role in shaping our success to date.

I've asked Mr. Paul Hoffman, the ECA Administrator, to join me on this broadcast in bringing you a report on the progress the Marshall plan has made during the 19 months it's been in operation.

I recall in the spring of 1948, Mr. Hoffman, when we first debated the ECA bill in Congress, that those of us who were all out in support of the Marshall plan got behind General Marshall's proposal because it was

the only solution we could see for giving the free European democracies a chance to prove that liberty could be retained while a worn-out, hungry and broken Europe got back on its feet, rebuilt its factories, restored its agriculture, and reestablished its trade.

But the ECA blueprint of 1948 was merely a hope—really our only immediate chance—to save the day for democracy. You've been close to this right from the beginning, Mr. Hoffman. How do you feel we've progressed in translating this hope into reality?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Senator MYERS, I believe it can be said in all honesty that the Marshall plan is ahead of schedule. That doesn't mean for a moment, of course, that our task is near completion. It isn't. Much—much more—remains to be done. But we do feel that the first phase of the recovery job has largely been done.

Senator MYERS. And that means?

Mr. HOFFMAN. First, and most importantly, that the Communists in Europe have been stopped cold. They have been turned down in election after election. Norway in its recent election, practically obliterated the Communist Party. As a result, there is a new political vitality flowing through the veins of the European democracies. I think it is accurate to say that Europe is well on the way to becoming freer and more democratic than ever. On the economic front, I can report with some gratification that in all the Marshall plan countries the people now have a sustaining diet. It isn't a luxury diet, but it is enough to grow on and work. That is a warm and human accomplishment that should make all of us very happy. I can also report that the people in Europe are working, and working hard. They have jobs.

That is the human meaning behind the statistics that European production is now 50 percent above what it was when the Marshall plan was conceived, and 20 percent above what it was before the war.

Defeatism has been replaced by hope. The people now have confidence in themselves and in their future. That, as General Marshall saw so clearly, is all important to the success of the program.

Senator MYERS. Of course, Mr. Hoffman, the success of this first phase of recovery—that is, the rebuilding of production to levels that in most instances are well above prewar—has depended a lot on the equipment and food we've furnished Europe during the past year and a half.

But Europe's productive efficiency was low—also that was true long before World War II. How we in America are very proud of our industrial know-how because, with this know-how we've been able to turn out tremendous volumes of goods at low cost, while at the same time paying much higher wages than were received in Europe.

It seems obvious that Europe must step up her efficiency—and the purchasing power of her people—if she is to play an important part in a flourishing world economy in the future. Have European nations shown much interest in our know-how, Mr. Hoffman?

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are familiar, of course, Senator MYERS, with the technical assistance program through which we are translating our know-how into European terms. The Europeans are cooperating enthusiastically. The British have, in fact, set up an Anglo-American Council on Productivity which envisages a permanent exchange of information on techniques and procedures.

All of the Marshall plan countries have sent, or are sending, teams representing both management and labor to visit our factories, farms, and mines. These teams return home to spread the information collected. I am convinced that this program will have both short- and long-range results. It has proven to be, furthermore, a most inspiring adventure in human relations. The foreigners who have visited here have learned to know America and like Americans. Our people who have entertained them have learned to know and like them.

Senator MYERS. I am delighted to hear that, Paul.

Now I suppose we might regard as the second phase of European recovery the economic integration of western Europe. We've heard a lot about that word "integration"—and I think everyone understands it to mean the western European nations will act as an economic unit, more or less in the same sense our 48 United States do.

I can't imagine what America would be like if people in New York and every other State had to pay a tariff on something manufactured in Pennsylvania—yet that is the way tariff walls between the European countries work. Worse still, most European countries also have trade restrictions—restrictions that actually limit the amount of a particular goods that can be brought in from another country.

You made a big point of this in your recent visit to Europe, Mr. Hoffman, and I'd like to know whether you expect many European tariffs and trade restrictions will be lifted in the next year or so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The long-range goal I put before representatives of the participating countries was the effective integration of the economy of western Europe, the building of a single market of 270,000,000 consumers, in which quantitative restrictions on the movement of goods, monetary barriers to the flow of payments, and eventually all tariffs should be permanently swept away. We in ECA are, of course, fully aware of the difficulties in the way of such a program. We realize it cannot be done overnight. Therefore, I pointed out that as a practical approach to their long-range goal, smaller regional groups might make faster progress within their own areas. I suggested that the small groups push ahead with such a plan, keeping, of course, their ultimate objective constantly in view.

The suggestions I offered were accepted, and have been embodied in resolutions which are now before the governments of the member countries. There is no magic, of course, in resolutions. I am confident, however, that we will see quick action on these short-term objectives. I, also, have high hopes for rapid and early progress toward the longer-range goal of European integration. The Europeans themselves, I think, see this as the only answer to their problems.

Senator MYERS. I hope we do see that kind of progress, Mr. Hoffman, but it will be a difficult job.

We've had a hard time lowering American tariffs; yet we know that tariffs cut down on world trade; and we know that our own economy is most prosperous when world trade is greatest. The reciprocal-trade program, initiated by our former great Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, back in 1934, has always faced a tough fight in Congress simply because it aimed at reducing American tariffs. I'm happy, though, that the Eighty-first Congress restored reciprocal trade to its original vitality this year, by repairing the damage done to the program last year by the Eightieth Congress. Now the reciprocal-trade program is back at work, and is assisting the Marshall plan in restoring and encouraging world trade.

In our discussion thus far, Mr. Hoffman, we've confined ourselves to talking about the way Europe is getting back on its economic feet. I think it's extremely important to consider what probably would have happened if there'd never been a Marshall plan, there had never been an ECA. I'm convinced Europe, without the Marshall plan, would have fallen to the Communists, perhaps we'd be at war with Russia today, or if not, we'd be watching the Communists consolidate their hold on the continent of Europe.

We've helped Europe rid itself of the conditions that breed communism. Without the help of the interim-aid program, and especially ECA, Europe simply couldn't have come back fast enough to avoid trouble. But Europe's getting along toward recovery—and when free men can find a way to feed themselves and their families, and can see hope in the future, then the rash promises that communism can provide security through dictatorship are promises that fall on deaf ears.

Of course, we're spending about $15,000,000,000 this year on national defense alone, but even without going to war our national defense would probably cost us two or three times that much if the Communists controlled western Europe and its industries.

We estimate the Marshall plan will cost about $15,000,000,000 to carry it through to its end in 1952, and we'll have spent close to $10,000,000,000 of this when the present law expires in July of 1950.

Do you think, Mr. Hoffman, that we can end ECA in 1950, instead of 1952, as originally planned, and still have any assurance that democracy could survive in western Europe?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If our aid to Europe were halted now, it would not take 6 months to undo all the accomplishments of the past 20 months. We have not yet passed the halfway point in getting our job done. Europe is still highly vulnerable. The Marshall plan will not have accomplished its purpose until Europe has ceased to be vulnerable. Let us not fool ourselves. The frank truth is that while the flames of economic and political catastrophe have been dampened down and are no longer easily visible, the fire has not yet been put out. The free world, and that includes the United States, will not be safe until it is.

You, Senator MYERS, I think, have shown an appreciation of this fact. I have not forgotten how ably, as acting majority leader, you supported our program for European recovery.

Senator MYERS. There will be a fight about this in the next session of Congress, Paul, but I'm confident the American people want to stay with the job until it's done. They know we can't afford the alternative of allowing Europe to fall to the Communists because of economic collapse in the democracies. If a total of $15,000,000,000 will put Europe back on its feet, this is a far better bargain than spending twenty or thirty or forty billion dollars every year for national defense, as we'd have to do if the Communists controlled western Europe and her industries.

Thank you for joining me, Mr. Paul Hoffman, and I congratulate you upon the splendid progress which has been made in the recovery of western Europe. Your magnificent and inspiring leadership has had a great deal to do with the success of the program.

I hope our listeners have enjoyed this broadcast and will join me again in 2 weeks.

Christmas 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, Christmas week end of 1949 was the occasion of one of my regular biweekly broadcasts to the people of Pennsylvania. In that broadcast I reviewed the achievements of the year of the American people—and in the year 1949 they were, in many respects, greater than any preceding year in our history. I pointed out, however, that we cannot be self-satisfied with our progress—we still have a long, hard road to pull to world peace and security. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on this broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a very special time of year for all of us; a time when the Christ Child and the Three Wise Men, when thoughts of home, of our families, and of our closest friends are uppermost in our minds, a time when the words "Peace on earth and good will unto men" have a special significance.

On Christmas Day of 1949, we can pretty much settle down, relax, enjoy the holidays and reminisce. We can talk and laugh about the difficulties we had with our Christmas shopping; about the troubles getting train, or bus, or plane reservations to get us home as soon as possible; and about what a particularly fine Christmas this one really is.

And I honestly believe this is a good Christmas. I believe most of us will look back upon this season in 1949 as a truly memorable one. America is in pretty good shape—very good shape, in fact. We're at peace, and our prospects for the future look good.

The world has quieted down a good bit this year. It's true, of course, that lasting world peace isn't a sure thing yet, but the outlook is better than it's been in a long, long time.

Christmas, the time of peace, has scarcely meant that to the world for many years. But this year, for a change, we can go back to the old Yuletide vocabulary without having it marred by earth-shaking terms like "Blitz," "Pearl Harbor," "Stalingrad," "The Battle of the Bulge," and the "cold war," all of these, and many others that have been the important words in our hearts at Christmas time for a decade or so.

So, this Christmas we can settle back and relax—relax and be pretty well satisfied that 1949 represents, by and large, a job pretty well done. And in its own way, 1949 has been something of a record breaker.

True, in other years we've produced more tanks, more machine guns, more war planes, and all the other things that played their part in making America the arsenal of democracy. I recall in that connection the time some years back when we talked of shifting our production from guns to butter.

Well, this year we turned that phrase around, and to use the same terms, we really went to town on our butter production. We're back in production for peace again, and I'd like to point out several significant instances where we broke some records this year.

Perhaps our most spectacular domestic accomplishment for 1949 was in the field of housing. As all of you know, we have lived with a serious shortage of adequate housing for years, and it may surprise you to know that until this year our record year for new home construction occurred way back in 1925, and it's taken us 24 years to break that record. The final figures for 1949 aren't in yet, but we're already sure that the 1925 record has been shattered.

It is almost certain now that very close to one million new, non-farm dwellings will have been put under construction between the first day of January and the last day of December 1949. The most hopeful note of all, however, is the fact that the trend in home construction is steadily upward, and if the trend continues, as we have every reason to believe it will in view of the great need for housing, I'm confident we will see well over a million new units begun during 1950.

We aren't going to lick our housing problems over night, but we're moving in the right direction. Another factor which will increase construction next year is, of course, the new public housing program authorized by the Congress last summer. That new program came along too late to have any noticeable effect on our building program in 1949, but by 1950, I think we're safe in saying that it will add another hundred thousand or so dwellings over and above the private construction—which is almost certain to increase as well.

All of this adds up to the fact that this time next year, another million or so American families will be living in brand-new, decent homes.

Another important old record has already been broken this year. Just 20 years ago, 1929, America produced the record number of almost 5,500,000 automobiles and trucks. We've come close to breaking that record twice before this year—first in 1941, and again last year, in 1948—but in neither case did we quite make the grade.

But this year, the automotive industry will smash that 20-year-old record to smithereens by turning out almost 6,250,000 cars and trucks—or about three-fourths of a million above the 1929 production level.

There is another factor of real significance behind this tremendous automobile output in that the largest increases in production were made in the less expensive models, the cars that give us a lot for our dollars in the form of sturdy, dependable, and economical transportation.

Too, we've seen the disappearance this year of the endless waiting to get anything with wheels, and what is more, we don't have to buy every gadget under the sun in order to get delivery. For a change, the prospective automobile buyer doesn't have to take the first thing that comes along, he can shop around until he gets just what he's looking for. That kind of condition is healthy, and I think everyone benefits by it.

The radio industry's big achievement this year was in the field of television. After turning out about a million TV sets in 1948, the industry set its sights on the figure of 2,000,000 sets for 1949 * * * then surprised itself and everyone else by stepping up its production goals all year long with the result that some 2,750,000 TV sets will have been manufactured this year. And the plans for next year are even bigger.

Now these big strides in some of our primary producer industries are among the outstanding ones, but they certainly don't represent all the examples we find in looking over the production records for 1949. And, of course on the other hand, there are plenty of instances where production this year is below the high points of other years.

But for the most part our producer industries are rolling along pretty close to peak levels, if not actually exceeding them.

So, as I've already said, we can settle back and be pretty well satisfied at the way 1949 has turned out. Our economy is humming along in good shape for the most part, with plenty of signs that the future looks good.

Perhaps we can be most encouraged by the fact that this free-enterprise system of ours is not only meeting the heavy burden of our domestic needs but is shouldering the load of our staggering and absolutely essential international obligations as well. Not only have we turned out nearly a million new homes, more than 6,000,000 cars and trucks, and all the other domestic requirements, but in addition, our economy is footing the bill on about $6,000,000,000 worth of Marshall plan assistance and arms for the military assistance program.

Six billion dollars a year for foreign commitments is a tremendous investment, but where the stake involved is world peace we simply can't afford to gamble. In less than 2 years we've pretty well dampened down the fears that a cold war might, at a moment's notice, become a shooting war. The concerted efforts during the last 3 years of the western democracies have stopped the advance of communism in Europe, and we can be proud that our American contributions to those efforts have made us a principal architect of world peace.

We can be proud, too, that the American economy this year came sailing through what the gloomy prophets of last spring were heralding as the next depression.

Yes; we can be satisfied—quite satisfied. But there is a big difference between satisfaction and smugness.

We can't be smug. Not everything in this old world of ours has been patched up properly. There are still plenty of trouble spots, plenty of instances where the machinery of our national and international life isn't operating as smoothly as the machinery should. We can be satisfied, I think, that the steps we've taken thus far to oil the machinery or to remodel it are proving out to be steps in the right direction, and most indications show pretty clearly that our progress to date has been basically sound.

Some of our trouble spots are rough to handle, but we're going after them in a realistic fashion. Right here in America, on this very day, there are, I regret to say self-respecting, capable, dignified, and conscientious people who are not at work, and many of them haven't been able to find work for some time. Still worse, there are a great many who haven't been able to provide for themselves and their families the kind of livelihood we like to regard as the American standard of living.

Some of these Americans are Pennsylvanians—our neighbors, living in our communities. It is frequently a vexing problem to find opportunities for these people to work and earn their way in order that they, and their families, may live decently.

There are perhaps three and one-fourth million people unemployed, as compared to about 60,000,000 who are at work. This unemployment is spotty; it's concentrated in particular communities, and in some of those communities it has had an almost paralyzing effect on the life of the entire community.

The important point, of course, is that whatever may be the reason for poverty, insecurity, and unhappiness, the problem of doing away with fear and insecurity is a national problem, and it is being approached as such. As a Nation, we have no intention of sitting idly by. Unemployment is eradicated by continuing to expand our economy through the encouragement of private initiative buttressed by affirmative Government cooperation. We are determined in our efforts to keep our economy expanding, and the results show that we're getting places.

Elsewhere in the world today there are other trouble spots. On this day there are hundreds of millions of people who, fettered by vicious dictatorships, are unable to think freely, act freely, and worship freely. The precious freedoms which we in America regard as so essential in our way of life are denied the victims of totalitarian regimes.

These trouble spots mean not only the oppression of human beings in far away places, but they exist as stark threats to the democracy under which we in the United States live, and in which we believe.

So long as we keep our Nation healthy, so long as we are capable and willing to undertake our responsibilities of world leadership in the cause of liberty and peace, I have no fear of the future.

America is setting for the world the lesson of the good example. With a scant 7 percent of the world's population, we are responsible for about half of the total industrial production, and our margin of productivity is increasing steadily. Without being smug about it at all, we do represent an example which other nations wish to follow. The truth about America is a persuasive truth that is permeating all corners of the world. No iron curtain can keep it out, and the truth

is ultimately capable of corroding away the most impervious of curtains, iron or otherwise. By continuing our example, and by continuing our good works toward world peace, a lasting kind of world peace, we will surely wear away the barriers to full understanding and freedom throughout the world.

It is a slow job, but we're making steady progress. We are dedicated to that task, the task of giving peace its true meaning, the meaning intended by the Prince of Peace in that holy era so long ago, and we will succeed.

And so we Americans do have cause for rejoicing during this blessed season of 1949.

A merry Christmas and the happiest of New Years to you all.

Liquor and Free Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Liquor and Free Speech," published in the Christian Science Monitor of January 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIQUOR AND FREE SPEECH

A determined audience packed the big Senate caucus room to overflowing the other day, in support of a bill to ban interstate transmission of alcoholic beverage advertising. A duplicate of the Capper bill, for which that Senator worked so earnestly while in Congress has just been introduced by Senator WILLIAM LANGER.

Here, perhaps, is the most formidable single weapon for attacking the liquor evil through legislation. For it strikes at the multimillion-dollar efforts of the liquor industry to expand the market for the very product which lies at the root of that evil.

Spokesmen in behalf of that industry have contended before, and doubtless will contend again, that since the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages is lawful, there is an accompanying right to use any means to merchandise it that are open to other businesses. That contention is not valid.

Liquor is a tolerated product, as the universal practice of licensing attests. It is already controlled because it is dangerous. And society has a clear right to control it further in the public interest—as it forbids indiscriminate merchandising of firearms and narcotics.

Friends of the industry have claimed before, and doubtless will claim again, that banning liquor advertising would violate the right of free speech. It would not.

Anyone and everyone, including the liquor industry itself, would continue to have the right to speak freely through any medium he chooses to influence public policy in his behalf.

And that is what free speech means. It does not mean that there is an inalienable right to persuade boys to take up pistol toting, teen agers to try marijuana—or youngsters to begin on beer, or even sober, workaday citizens to acquire "distinction" through the social drinking of branded whisky.

The Pine Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the pine tree is extremely important to the southeastern area of the United States, especially in my section of the country. On Pine Festival Day, at Macclenny, Fla., a very attractive young student in high school gave a very magnificent dissertation on the pine tree and its importance and possibilities to Baker County. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from this young lady, Miss Jackie Douberly, together with the excellent discourse which she delivered on that occasion, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and essay were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACCLENNY, FLA., *January 3, 1950.*

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: Enclosed you will find my essay, which I read on Pine Festival Day, here in Macclenny. I hope I have not waited too late to send it to you.

I cannot tell you how glad I was when you told me that it would probably be put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope I have not waited too long for you to do so.

Please, let me know if it was put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanks, for making me feel so wonderful.

Sincerely yours,

JACKIE DOUBERLY.

THE PINE TREE: ITS IMPORTANCE AND POSSIBILITIES TO BAKER COUNTY

Pine, the name of a family of cone-bearing evergreen trees, distinguished as the oldest living trees that have descended from the forests of geological time. Within this great family, which includes larches, spruces, hemlocks, firs, and others, is the genus Pinus, made up of 80 different species. It is the trees of this genus that we usually have in mind when we speak of the pines.

The pines may be distinguished from the rest of the cone bearing trees by the arrangement of their needles; these are borne singly or in groups of two to five, and have paper-like sheaths around their bases. The pines called soft, because of their soft wood, shed these sheaths when the needles reach full growth, but the resinous pitch pines keep them until the leaves fall. While the trunks are straight and tall, sometimes reaching 250 feet, the shapes of the trees vary from round to pyramidal; the lengths of the cones range from 1 to 18 inches or more. Although the pines thrive in almost any soil and place, they prefer sandy uplands, and can live but a short time in unusually smoky cities, where, it is believed, the gases choke them. To the pine genus belong some of the world's most important timber trees; many species, moreover, are valued for ornamental purposes.

Foremost among all the pines is the white pine. The wood of this pine is soft but compact, straight-grained and easily worked, and takes a fine polish. The bark yields a sap that is used in cough mixtures.

The Georgia, yellow, southern, or long-leaf pine, most important and widely spread of southern timber trees, ranking next to the white pine, may be recognized by its orange-brown branches, large cones, and needles more than a foot long. From the needles is obtained an oil much like turpentine, and a fiber used for making bagging and for stuffing pillows. The long-leaf pine is valuable, not because its wood is easily worked, but because it is hard and strong.

Naval stores, which include the gathering of turpentine and tar, is of great importance to Baker County. Naval stores are produced from slash and long-leaf pines. When these trees are wounded or chipped, they exude a resinous gum to aid in healing the scar and to prevent insect attack. Man has taken advantage of this and systematically chips the trees and collects the gum by means of cups and gutters. Every 2 or 4 weeks, except during the winter months, the gum which has flowed into the cup is collected and taken to a still. At the still, the gum is distilled into turpentine and rosin.

The long-leaf and slash pines are referred to as dual-purpose trees because after being worked out for naval stores they may be cut into sawlogs, poles, pulpwood, and other forest products.

The first naval stores sale on a national forest was made on the Chactawhatchee National Forest in 1910. Since then better practices and more efficient management of lands for naval stores production have been developed on the national forests and elsewhere, especially on the Osceola National Forest. This forest with a gross area of 161,813 acres, is located in northeastern Florida in Columbia and Baker Counties, 12 miles south of the Georgia line. The Suwanee River, made famous by song and story, flows within 2 miles of its western boundary, and the St. Marys River within the same distance of its eastern boundary. The Old Spanish Trail, US 90, and the Seaboard Air Line railroad run along the southern boundary.

The entire forest is extremely flat, and the area is dotted with numerous small ponds and swamps where the soil is covered with water varying in depth from a few inches to several feet. Long-leaf and slash pine grow on the higher areas, and with adequate protection from fire the pine reproduction has become well established. Slash pine and cypress predominate in the shallow swamps, and hardwood and cypress on the muck soil in the deep swamps. In the larger swamps are virgin stands of cypress.

The Osceola National Forest is managed primarily for naval stores and saw timber. After the trees have been worked out for turpentine, the larger trees are taken as saw timber and poles, the small trees and tops are sold as pulpwood and the turpentined butts, as fuel wood. Cypress in the large swamps is being cut as saw timber, and much of the Cypress in the ponds is being taken out as cross ties.

The forest was established primarily as a naval stores demonstration area to show that proper forest management could be practiced economically and effectively in the naval-stores belt. Because the area favors intensive management, research, and demonstration, many permanent improvements have been constructed. The most important of these are located near Olustee, 13 miles east of Lake City. Three miles east of town is Olustee guard station. Here the key fire-lookout tower and a modern equipment depot and machine shop are located, also a complete modern seed extractory which furnishes pine seed for national forest nurseries elsewhere.

At Olustee is located the naval-stores branch of the southern forest experiment station and the naval-stores laboratory of the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils. The southern forest experiment station manages 3,000 acres of the Osceola National Forest as an experimental and demonstrational

area, and conducts large-scale experiments on the management of southern pines for naval stores. The naval-stores station of the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils conducts studies to determine the most efficient methods of harvesting raw gum and distilling and refining turpentine and rosin. Many of the theories that are worked out in an experimental way by these agencies are practiced in a commercial way on the Osceola Forest. Since the establishment of the Osceola forest in 1931, it has produced revenue in excess of a quarter of a million dollars, and has increased its annual cuppage of naval stores and its sale of pulpwood, saw timber, and other forest products.

Several species of pine trees yield turpentine. Cuts are made through the bark into the wood of the tree. The crude turpentine then runs from the tree into little cavities cut for the purpose, when it can be collected as a semisolid substance. About every 10 days the bark is cut at a higher point, and so the flow is kept up right through the summer.

This process goes on for a number of years, but the product is best in the first few years after the tree is tapped. The hardened turpentine is often sold as frankincence, though this product is also the gum of several other kinds of trees.

Seedlings should be planted while in a dormant condition. Trees are usually dormant from the first of December, to the first of February. Best survivals have resulted from planting before the middle of January and effort should be made to plant not later than the end of that month. Moisture conditions at the time of planting are important and, if on a dry site, planting should be done when there is some assurance of rainy weather.

Pines weakened by rot, disease, fire, grazing animals, logging, or storms offer good homes for thousands of kinds of insects, some of which do great damage. But insects can also damage trees that seem to be perfectly healthy, with no weakness noticeable.

Leaf-eating insects are easily seen, of course. Pine sawdust and sometimes sap or gum may come out of the holes that boring or girdling insects make. Bark beetles make regular wavy passages or galleries on the inner side of the bark. Under certain kinds of insect attack the leaves of the hardwoods change to their fall colors, while the softwoods turn brown or red.

Careful forest management, which prevents injuries to trees and removes those already sick or weak, helps to prevent insect attack. Tiny parasites destroy some of the insects.

Each year fires cost Baker County thousands of dollars. Yet the cash value of the wood destroyed is only a part of the damage. Burning kills some of the larger trees and weakens and slows down the growth of others. Bark beetles and diseases enter easily through the burned places. Seedlings and young trees needed to establish another forest are killed. Fire may destroy the fertile, moisture-holding litter on the forest floor, robbing trees of nourishment and perhaps starting erosion. Woods fires sometimes take human life.

It is estimated that 25 percent of forest fires are caused by smokers—persons who go into the woods for camping, hunting, and recreation. A carelessly discarded burning match, cigar butt, or glowing pipe heel may in a few moments be converted into a disastrous forest fire which, before sufficient manpower or equipment can be brought to the scene, results in a desolate, blackened wilderness of smoking ruins. If the forests of Baker County are protected from fire, they can be made to fulfill the highest objectives of forestry.

Among many tributes to the pine, the following, by Robert Service, the Canadian poet, is especially appropriate:

"On the flanks of the storm-gorged ridges our
black battalions massed.
We surge in a host to the sullen coast, and
we sing in the ocean blast;
From empire of sea to empire of snow, we
grip our empire fast.

"To the niggard lands were we driven, 'twixt
desert and foes are we penned;
To us was the Northland given, ours to
stronghold and defend;
Ours till the world be riven in the crash of
the utter end;
Ours from the bleak beginning, through the
aeons of deathlike sleep;
Ours from the shock when the naked rock
was hurled from the hissing deep;
Ours through the twilight ages of weary
glacier creep.

"Wind of the East, Wind of the West, wandering to and fro,
Chant your songs in our topmost boughs,
that the sons of men may know
The peerless pine was the first to come, and
the pine will be last to go!"

Mr. Truman's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Mr. Truman's Budget," published in the Nevada (Mo.) Daily Mail of Tuesday, January 10, 1950. I think this editorial will be of general interest, appearing as it does in an avowedly Democratic newspaper in President Truman's home State. As a Missourian, who sent the editorial to me, remarked, "It is evident that the people are beginning to think for themselves."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. TRUMAN'S BUDGET

President Truman's annual budget message to the Congress, yesterday, set most of us back a peg. His schedule of expenditures indicates that the Nation will operate again next year more than $5,000,000,000 in the red.

This, a commentator explains, is an "anti-deflation budget, as economists view it. The Government would be putting more money into the public's pocket than it takes out in the year starting July 1."

Somehow we had higher hopes for Mr. Truman and the Government than this anti-deflation gobbledygook. His message certainly wasn't antideflating. We definitely feel deflated.

To the ordinary, run-of-the-mill citizen, who sees a fair share of his pay check go to the Government each week, the fact that Uncle Sam proposes to keep on going into debt is a source of uneasiness. Although it may be sound enough theoretically, to most of us it doesn't make common sense.

One of the hardest lessons of life, and one that every person must learn if he is to get along satisfactorily, is that he must not spend more than he earns. Anything else means overdrawn bank accounts, bill collectors at the door, mortgage foreclosures, mechanics' liens and all the other things with which the improvident are daily hounded.

When a government continues to go into debt, year after year, one can't help but wonder if it is sound policy. We are not expert in taking a budget apart to see what's wrong but, from what little of the document has been exposed thus far, it would appear that there were certain expenditures recommended which might well be put off until there is more hay in the barn.

Surely we can wait for fatter days before we begin the costly experiment with a national health plan. Nor does this seem to be the time to expend $50,000,000 to "aid middle-income groups to obtain adequate housing they can afford." Nor can we justify financing out of a deficit a million-dollar program to assist capable youth to get a college education, a $30,000,000 subsidy to medical schools, nor a $290,000,000 grant to grammar and high schools.

The Government needs to share some of the facts of life with which its citizens are faced, and in the doing both will be infinitely better off.

Atomic Energy Commission Report Makes Mandatory Plans for Removal of the Seat of Government—Shocking Implications of Report Should Blast Complacency—Even in Peacetime Washington Not Geared Up To Service Million Citizens and Government Functions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on September 16 of last year I introduced House Resolution 358 which would authorize the Rules Committee to investigate the possibility of removing the seat of Government west of the Mississippi River, preferably in the Colorado area. Public reaction to this proposal, as reflected in letters, telegrams, and newspaper editorials, indicates that it has strong national support. It is obvious that forward-looking citizens concur in the belief that while Washington may be an archeologist's dream spot it is unsuited to the demands of modern government. It is generally agreed that the time has arrived when the removal of the Capitol should at least be brought up to the blueprint stages.

A major undertaking such as the removal of the seat of Government to a more centrally-located area necessarily will require much study and planning before it can be executed. It was primarily to stimulate thought on this project, in the hope that discussion would ultimately lead to action, that I introduced my resolution.

Since I introduced this resolution certain official information has come to light which bears out the urgency of my

proposal and the irresistible logic behind it. The Atomic Energy Commission recently issued a report of its study of the effects of an atom bomb on the city of Washington. The report is enough to cause a national nightmare.

This report, which I am discussing in detail, reveals some of the shocking possibilities in the event of war. The report alone, with its terrifying implications, should be sufficient to shatter our complacency and to force plans now for any future contingency. The report makes such planning mandatory. In times of prosperity and relative security such as we now enjoy in this country, it is difficult almost repugnant, to consider the frightful possibilities contained in this report. While it is difficult for a peace-loving people such as we are to even contemplate the horrors of war, we must overcome this national inertia if we are to survive.

In cold, detached and simple prose, the Atomic Energy Commission raises disaster warnings for all of us to see. One atom bomb dropped on Washington would blow the city sky high, wreck its communications and, since it is the nerve center of the Nation, would cripple the country. That is the gist of the scientific study made by the Atomic Energy Commission. The inescapable conclusion is that the seat of Government should be removed inland or at least should be greatly decentralized.

David E. Lilienthal himself expresses grave concern for immediate action on the subject of decentralizing Government agencies in preparation for an enemy attack. Mr. Lilienthal recognizes the urgency for planning for such an event. No thinking person can brush off this warning contained in Mr. Lilienthal's letter to the National Security Resources Board, which ordered the study:

The recent atomic explosion in Russia brings closer the time when decisions must be made on major issues of civilian defense, including the matter of dispersal out from congested urban areas of facilities such as those of Government in Washington.

Unfortunately, the Atomic Energy Commission's report has not gained the currency to which it is entitled. The implications of the report are a matter of vital national concern to all of us. Since it was given only piece-meal treatment by newspapers, I am including its full text at this point in my remarks:

THE CITY OF WASHINGTON AND AN ATOMIC-BOMB ATTACK

(Report by the staff, Division of Biology and Medicine, to the Atomic Energy Commission)

The effects of the explosion of an atomic bomb in a metropolitan area and the problems of civil defense that must differ in both quality and quantity from those of high-explosive bombing.

The experience of the bombed cities of England and Germany may be utilized for lessons in fighting fires, rescue of trapped personnel, and large-scale care for the wounded and homeless. Knowledge of the problems which are peculiar to an atomic-bomb attack, on the contrary, must come from a study of what occurred at Hiroshima and Nagasaki where the bombs were fused to detonate high in the air. The Japanese estimated that the heights of burst were 550 to 600 meters, that is, approximately 1,800 to 1,970 feet. While there is no assurance that an enemy might not detonate his bomb in water adjacent to a city, on the surface of the ground, or underground—each of which would bring its own unique problems—it is more likely that he would resort to an air burst because the latter would devastate a larger area on the surface of the ground. That is, a bomb equal in power to the Nagasaki bomb, if detonated in air over an American or European city, would crush or otherwise render useless the residences, as an example, over an area of 6 to 8 square miles. It presents not only a radiation hazard, but an explosive hazard beyond any blockbusters, and a fire hazard beyond any incendiaries.

From such a burst there would be four effects near the surface of the ground: (1) Blast, that is, a wave traveling with approximately the velocity of sound would engulf objects in a high pressure; (2) wind of considerable velocity would follow the blast as the highly heated air near the point of detonation expanded; (3) heat traveling with the velocity of light would strike exposed objects and kindle fires; and (4) radiation would penetrate the bodies of exposed personnel. Two additional effects should be mentioned. First, from the detonation of the bomb there would result highly radioactive fission products which would rise with the cloud from the bomb to be scattered harmlessly at great distances by the air. Second, near ground zero—the point on the ground directly beneath the point of burst—the radiation would cause objects to become radioactive but at a level which, to judge by Japanese experience, would be harmless to those who entered the area on rescue missions immediately after the incident.

If an atomic bomb is exploded quite close to the ground, as at Alamagordo, there will be a small area of residual radioactivity. If a bomb is exploded in water, such as Test Baker at Bikini, there will be considerable amounts of residual radioactivity, depending upon wind, currents, tides, and the size of the body of water.

The blast and wind, which may be considered together, would crush or render unusable the ordinary load-bearing brick wall dwellings for a distance of 7,000 or 8,000 feet from ground zero, would severely damage steel mill-type buildings for a distance of 4,000 to 5,000 feet, and would cause substantial structure damage in multistory steel or reinforced concrete buildings up to distances of 2,500 feet.

Accordingly, in an instant the usually dependable telephone, telegraph, electric service, and transportation (both public and private) would cease to exist in the damaged area. Also, because of the numerous broken pipes in houses, water pressure would fall to near nothing.

In addition to the direct fires which would follow the flash heat, there would be many more which would start from broken gas and electric lines and in particular, from combustible material coming into contact with cooking and process fires. Fire-fighting equipment inside the damaged area would probably be crushed by the collapse of the firehouses and with water pressure gone the many fires would speedily merge to destroy the greater part of the crushed area.

While this is happening, what would be the fate of the people? In Japan, the number of casualties was enormous because the attacking planes were not heeded and people were caught in the open or with inadequate cover. Consequently great numbers were badly burned by the flash, many so severely that they died within a short time, or were exposed to such a level of radiation that they died. As radiation passes through the body in any considerable amount a number of tissues which are necessary for normal health are damaged. At Hiroshima and Nagasaki everyone within one-half mile not protected by earth, steel or concrete died and the incidence of radiation injury was very high up to approximately one and a quarter miles from ground zero.

With adequate warning which was heeded and adequate shelters which were occupied the casualties could be greatly reduced. Furthermore, doctors with ample medical supplies, hospital facilities, and blood banks would save many of those who were injured by blast or burns.

No one can do the enemy's thinking for him and decide what he would select as his aiming point in Washington. In addition to some purely military establishments like the Naval Gun Factory, there are three obvious targets: (1) The Pentagon, (2) the area near the Capitol which includes the Senate and House Office Buildings and the Union Station, and (3) assuming 5,000 feet as the diameter of the circle in which there would be severe damage, the area in which is located the White House, Treasury Department, Executive Office, State Department, Interior Department, Navy Department, Pan American Union, Federal Power Commission, Court of Claims, Brookings Institution, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Inter-American Defense Board, American Council on Education, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Red Cross, Federal Works Agency, Veterans' Administration, Federal Reserve, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and Atomic Energy Commission. Aiming accuracy being something less than perfect, it is clear that other sites on the rim of the area would also be endangered.

The 5,000-foot-diameter circle has been assumed somewhat arbitrarily. It is known from the experience in Japan that at distances of 2,500 feet from ground zero substantial modern tall buildings would suffer such damage that 10 to 15 percent of their main columns and beams would require replacement, much of their outer-wall shell would be stripped off, and they would lose their partitions and their windows. As the distances to ground zero became less the damage would become progressively greater.

Because it represents modern construction and because the data are available, the Atomic Energy Commission Building is selected as an object for study. Would it protect its population in an attack? From its plans it is found that the building has the following above its floors:

Cover above:	*Inches of concrete*
Attic floor	2½
Third floor	9½
Second floor	17½
First floor	25½
Basement	33½

The maximum thickness mentioned, that is, 32 to 34 inches, may protect against the radiation hazard from a bomb detonating overhead at a height of 1,800 feet. No one can predict the strength of an enemy's bomb. Furthermore, windows, partitions, and possibly walls would become missiles. There would be approximately 80 percent casualties and added to this an unknown number of radiation deaths. Naturally, less substantial buildings and their inhabitants would suffer much greater damage. The inevitable conclusion is that the building should be abandoned in the event of an impending attack, or well before. The predictions for AEC building are generally applicable to Government buildings in Washington.

Metropolitan business districts, in which there are great concentrations of population during working hours, are additional vulnerable areas. Shelters for these populations may be provided in basements and in the interior of lower stories of large buildings if the work is undertaken in time. However, adequate warnings must be assumed for any

shelter to be effective. Hence, dispersal is far preferable.

It must be regarded as probable that fire will spread from the outside to buildings which have been opened by blast and that, in the absence of firefighting, their contents will be destroyed. In consequence, valuable records or microfilm copies should be removed to storage vaults.

The hard fact is that a shelter system, while saving the lives of the persons who take shelter, does not guarantee the resumption of vital functions. For example, in the event of an attack upon the Atomic Energy Commission building the building would be completely destroyed and following the attack those who emerged from the shelter would be quite helpless to carry on the far-flung operations of the atomic energy program.

The alternative to the shelter system and an alternative which not only saves the lives of key personnel but also permits at the same time a continuance of the vital governmental operating functions is—dispersal. The problems which it presents, physical, financial and psychological, are obviously tremendous and beyond the scope of this paper and the authority of this agency.

Long-range community planning to place projected hospital, fire stations and other essential emergency services in properly dispersed fashion should be encouraged. Routes available for emergency evacuation should be planned. These may well provide effective fire lanes through areas now highly vulnerable.

The attractiveness of the target vanishes with dispersal of some or all of the above-mentioned agencies. Scattered in the outskirts of the Washington area with distances of perhaps 2 miles between targets, the agencies would have a fair measure of security because no single one of them would be likely to warrant the expenditure of a bomb. Also, and equally important, persons who live adjacent to the original area would be less in jeopardy because the enemy would seek his target elsewhere.

From the experience at Hiroshima and Nagasaki it is clear that if an attack comes to an unwarned population the most that can be expected of them will be that the uninjured will rescue those who are trapped or injured before they are reached by fire. Because of the confusion and destruction which will follow a bomb burst, general relief must come from the outside. Washington, if attacked, would look for help—that is, for workers, supplies, and equipment—from its outlying undamaged ring and its suburban areas and from cities as distant as Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Richmond. Relief must be organized with this in view. Supplies, supplementary fire-fighting equipment and new hospitals must be kept outside vulnerable areas.

Safety will in large measure depend upon adequate warning of an attack, warning which it must be assumed will come from the radar system of the National Military Establishment. Such warning when combined with shelters for those who must stay in threatened areas, will minimize, or even eliminate, casualties. Less effective measures may result in panic, suffering, and 80,000 deaths as at Hiroshima.

Mr. Speaker, the conviction of those who have studied this problem that the seat of government should be removed west of the Mississippi River is further confirmed by the recent public statement of Secretary of Defense Johnson. His statement reveals that already plans are under way for the removal or decentralization of the three branches of the armed forces in anticipation of an enemy attack. His statement said:

Recognizing the fact that it is not beyond the bounds of possibility for Washington to be the target of a devastating or damaging attack, and that the seat of government might have to be moved as a result, it follows that plans should be prepared to cover this contingency. Such plans are in the course of preparation.

Specifically, these plans include the movement of the three service elements of the Department of Defense to other locations and the designation of successors to military command.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OVERGROWN WHISTLE STOP CRUSHED IN JAM OF TWENTIETH-CENTURY PROGRESS—ITS HORSE-AND-BUGGY STRUCTURE NOT SUITED FOR SPEED AND EFFICIENCY OF FORWARD MARCH OF ATOMIC ERA

Even in peacetime the seat of government should be removed from Washington. The District of Columbia is an overgrown whistle stop. It is not geared up to serve the ordinary needs of its million residents. It has passed its absorptive capacity for people, homes, office buildings, and apartments.

In 25 years the town has built only one hotel of major importance. The city, supposed to reflect the glory and power and culture of a free people selected by the Creator to receive the richest blessings in all history, does not even have a legitimate theater. The town is a national disgrace to the dignity of a great nation.

In establishing the village in 1800 as the seat of government, officials never dreamed of the march of events that would turn the muggy marshland into a swollen metropolis teeming with automobiles that drag along at a snail's pace during rush hours. Because of this hardening of traffic arteries, which borders on paralysis, it often requires 40 minutes to traverse 7 miles in a straight line.

Washington, the horse-and-buggy town, cannot keep step with the swift pace of the atomic era. It has outlived its usefulness in peacetime and constitutes a threat to our national security in wartime.

The time has arrived for a serious study of the proposal to remove the seat of government to a more centrally located area. I trust that the Rules Committee will see fit to adopt my resolution without further delay.

At this point in my remarks I wish to insert an editorial on the subject from the Nevada (Mo.) Herald:

A NEW CAPITAL

Recently Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, suggested that the Nation's Capital should be moved from Washington to some point West of the Mississippi. Either that or have a second capital established, a sort of substitute capital, as it were. In this atomic age, Washington's location on the eastern seaboard is too exposed and definitely hazardous.

Mr. PATMAN's suggestion isn't original. Roger Babson not only made a similar suggestion several years back but actually did move some of his establishments to Eureka, Kans., within what he calls the "magic circle"—an arc which takes in much of Kansas, western Missouri, Arkansas, and Oklahoma.

Of course everyone out in this part of the country will embrace the Congressman's suggestion with a view toward converting their home town into the new Nation's Capital—or substitute capital. After all, possession of the Congress, several hundred lobbyists, the Supreme Court, and a dozen or so bureaus would be a far better prize for any chamber of commerce than an egg-breaking plant that employed only a few thousand people.

We strongly suspect that Congressman PATMAN in making the suggestion had some spot in Texas already picked out for the new capital. If he didn't support such a move Texas would surely be the first State in the Nation to launch lynching proceedings.

Our neighbor city to the south, Joplin, has put in its bid for the new capital.

Says the Joplin Globe:

"Let them erect a new capital between Joplin and Webb City. While it is true that almost any point in the United States is equidistant from Russia, via the North Pole, our important official records should not be housed in a large city. Then in this district, if cold war developed so much hidden fire it threatened to burst into flame and an atomic attack was feared, the records and official operating personnel could retire to the safe and commodious underground caverns of our worked-out sheet ground mines.

"Maybe you think this is a bizarre suggestion, offered only with facetious intent, and maybe it is, but don't be too sure it won't seem 100-percent practical and desirable some day in the future."

Although we know of no Kansas towns that have made a bid for the new capital, some are sure to do so on the specious grounds that both the geographical and geodetic centers of the United States lie within the borders of Kansas. As we see it, those are about the only bases on which any Kansas town can lay much of a claim. Kansas just don't do. Although it has recently voted itself wet, liquor is still something of a novelty in the State and the cosmopolitan crowd that hovers around our Nation's Capital would find itself uncomfortable in such a new-set environment.

Oklahoma would have to be ruled out of the picture because it is legally a dry State. Arkansas might qualify but it is too hard to get to. The only place left is Missouri.

Big cities, with their factories and war plants, can't qualify. So the choice narrows down to a smaller Missouri city and, of course, there is only one that can meet every sort of test. Needless to say, that's Nevada.

Nevada already is a cosmopolitan city. The High Lama from Tibet or the Minister of the Exchequer from Britain could walk through Nevada streets now and feel perfectly at home. The town's ability to absorb strangers, and make them feel not strange, is practically unlimited.

Nevada has railroads (at least part of the time), highways, and a big air field that could handle any number of traveling dignitaries.

The Government already owns considerable real estate in this vicinity—Camp Clark—with its own water and sewage disposal system which could be converted into the Capitol grounds on short order and a minimum of expense.

True, Nevada has no caves. We presume some could be dug if it seemed expedient. But it appears to us that the virtue of keeping Government aboveboard and on the up-and-up outweigh whatever perils are threatened by the atomic bomb.

And if the Government is really interested in this move, we presume the Nevada Country Club would let Mr. Truman bid on one of the lots out at their auction Sunday afternoon, even though the President isn't a member of the club. After all, they could afford to be generous if it meant having the White House on top of their hill.

What Is Right in the "Left"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, an article by David Lawrence entitled "What is Right in the 'Left'" covers a subject of general interest and merits wide circulation. Under permission of the House, I submit it herewith for printing in the RECORD:

WHAT IS RIGHT IN THE "LEFT"

(By David Lawrence)

"Left wingism" was defeated in Australia and New Zealand, but not by a negative attitude on the part of the conservatives toward those good things which the "left" had brought through social welfare legislation.

To allow emotional prejudice to shape the course of a political party anywhere is to invite defeat. The Republican leaders in our own country are discussing what kind of a program or platform they should write for the coming elections. The Democratic conservatives in their primary campaigns also are discussing how to fight "left wingism." No political group in either party can make progress by assuming that the Nation does not want some of the basic principles retained which have enabled America to deal with social welfare problems during the last several decades.

When Governor Dewey, as a presidential candidate in the autumn of 1944, announced, in a speech at Portland, Oreg., that he favored the principle of Government intervention in the economic life of the country, he was promptly criticized by many conservatives in his party. They began then—and have echoed ever since—an attack on what they call me-too-ism. The argument runs that the Republican candidate, who favors any activity a Democratic administration has sponsored through legislation and merely claims he can do a better job, either by amending the existing law or by better execution of the task, is simply crying "Me, too."

Yet the principle of Federal intervention in the economic life of the country is older than the Republican Party itself. It was first pronounced by Alexander Hamilton when he and the founding fathers declared that infant industries must be protected by a tariff. The Federal Government started social security in the form of pensions and granted land to the soldiers of the Revolution. It made land grants to pioneers who headed west. It later built good roads. It helped the railroads to get land grants. It not only assisted the growth of land and water transportation through the building of bridges and the dredging of rivers and harbors but, in the Republican administration of William Howard Taft 40 years ago, it entered the express business by carrying parcel post.

The Federal Government has helped to do countless things for the farmers, from free seeds to better crop information. It even began, under a Republican Congress in the 1920's, to regulate labor-management relations on the railroads.

Federal intervention in the economic life of business and the individual is no longer vulnerable as a principle. It is rather the scope and degree and quality thereof which is debatable.

Political strategists always court defeat if they attempt to fight a battle on a battlefield favorable to their opponents. Good strategy requires a different battlefield. If the conservatives in the United States would only grant in a few words—as did the conservatives in Australia and New Zealand—that they plan to retain the good things the "left" has brought and to do them even better, it would enable the conservative strategy to be devoted 90 percent or more to the subjects on which "left wingism" is injuring social welfare.

Principal among these is the interference by "left wingism" in the individual liberty of the citizen and his family—his right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness. To dissipate the workers' dues paid to certain unions, to intimidate a worker, to threaten his family, to overturn his car at the factory gates, and inflict violence upon him when he asserts his right to work is not social welfare. It is despotism.

To permit a union boss to regulate the production of coal or any other commodity is to sanction monopoly. This is not social welfare.

To impose on the citizen such tax burdens that in the price of food and clothing and the necessities of life there are hidden imposts which cut down the net purchasing power of the worker's dollar is to bring social ill and not social good.

To allow the Federal budget to remain unbalanced and to add to the national debt at the rate of $5,000,000,000 a year is to threaten the solvency and hence the social welfare of the Nation.

The primary meaning of the word "conservative" is one who wishes to conserve. The problem of conserving America's national and individual resources presents the biggest conservation issue the Nation has ever faced.

Conservation of natural resources as against the exploiters was a big political issue of 1912 and a mark of progressivism.

Conservation of individual resources and of the precious freedoms of the individual as against the exploiters is even more important today.

Failure of Peace on Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Emil Predrich, of Garrison, N. Dak., addressed to the editor of the Garrison (N. Dak.) Independent.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER OF

DEAR EDITOR: Christmas will come and Christmas will go and bells will toll throughout the world, peace on earth, good will toward men. Children are singing in cathedrals in all lands: Glory to God in the highest. Peace on earth, good will toward men, is one of the greatest philosophies put into a few words, which is meant for the benefit of humanity, not for 1 day, but for 365 days a year. These few words and their meaning have failed utterly. Their teaching can be put into reality by parents and educators, educating children from childhood, when the brain is fertile, love toward your neighbor and fellow man, which will bring out the beauties of life, and to abhor the wickedness and the cruelties of war.

The teaching of the great Master has failed up to the present day. Universal is the cry of peace, and in silent meditation, they come from everywhere, to meet in holy assemblage, people of all nations, whether in peace or war. What is the highest order that will bring peace to man? Surely not weapons, to destroy what the Creator of the universe has created alive.

We create pretention calling to our people, saying that we must arm and be a strong Nation, and tell them to take up arms for patriotism's sake. We make it greater than God's commandment, "Thou shalt not kill." We multiplied widows and orphans by the thousands; we have caused poverty to reign in a land of abundance, we have rained death upon helpless old men and women, small children that have harmed no one, little infants in their cradles, the most precious being in the eyes of the Creator. When the helpless looked toward the heavens, and pray to their Heavenly Father for protection, its death out of the blue skies. To the man who says there shall come a time of peace, we mock and say, "Thou fool, we have become more terrible than the beast in the forest."

Why be selfish, greedy, corrupt, and self-centered? It would be more beautiful to be pleasant, amiable, tolerant, honest, and serviceable to each other than to be mean, nasty, and dishonest in our dealings with our fellowman. That holds true to nations; we are now standing at the very threshold of a new day, for recent technological advances have wiped out all cause for selfishness which heretofore has barred the way. A little united effort and the victory is ours.

We must stop prattling the Lords Prayer like a bunch of parrots and work for it, praying fervently in our hearts, "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth," etc. We have been deceived and been told that Mammon must reign his thousand years, as if he not already reigned far overtime, but his power is waning. It is the Creator's aim that all mankind shall be one loving family here on earth, living in peace, harmony, and comfort. Although he has found few loyal helpers, he has gone steadily forward, building to that end by teaching us the great principles upon which all human happiness must rest, altruism.

You were put here to bring this about. Man has clung to individualism and selfishness, but the Creator has continually taught him the opposite. "Love thy neighbor as thy self" fits into an individualist society just like Thou shall not kill, fits any army. Are you helping bring the Creator's kingdom on earth? What has been accomplished the last 2,000 years. Love one another has failed. Are men more tolerant today than yesterday? Do they not hate each other more than ever before? Men against men, nationality against nationality, their efforts wasted. They have spend hundreds of years, and millions of dollars in preaching, converting the heathens, teaching brotherly love. The sad part of it is, they have failed and utterly failed, not only in other countries, but right here in this great country of ours. One of the greatest inscriptions I have seen on the bulkhead of a coal bunker, inscribed by a humble coal passer, in the year of 1918. "You cannot have peace on earth, not until civilization becomes civilised, humanity humanized, christianity christianized, not until then will you have peace on earth, good will towards men." I say "Amen" to that. I do not intend to lecture on this subject, nor do I care to listen to everlasting preachings, but it sure would be a world of beauty and a paradise on earth, if there would be more action and less empty verbiage.

EMIL PREDRICH.

GARRISON, N. DAK.

I Adjure You To Watch Please Where the Illegitimate Propaganda Babies Are Being Laid and by Whom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to advise, and thus I hope alert, my fellow Congressmen to a realization of the fact that the superlatively selfish reactionary political and financial alliance in our Republic has been quite busy for some time, like a rogue in the night, laying illegitimate propaganda babies upon the doorsteps of some of the unsuspecting, sleeping Americans, among said babies being the following:

First. By blaming John L. Lewis and his United Mine Workers and not the coal barons, mine owners, and operators of the Nation for causing or threatening to cause the banking or putting out of the fires in the factories and homes of America by failing, neglecting, and refusing to bargain collectively, honestly, and in good faith with Mr. Lewis and his miners, and jamming the listening posts of America with calamity howlings that the wheels of industry will stop for want of coal and the home fires of America will sputter out, until today the conjured-up cold causes the substitute teeth of some people to chatter and their aging knees to knock in sequence until you cannot distinguish any more the old clippity clop in the mule-train song from the noises these calamity howlers are making, all to the great detriment of hill-, mountain-, and plain-billy music.

Second. Seeking by deeds to retain and by words to polish and gloss over the vicious and idiotic Taft-Hartley slave-labor law, and without cause, force President Truman to invoke its foul provisions so as to make for them campaign talk for the 1950 elections.

Third. By causing certain precocious, child-minded doctors of the medical profession to wax wroth in the contention that national health insurance is socialized medicine, and that it would lead us into England's present plight, sans bombs, sans bombings, sans total war's devastating everything.

Fourth. By stirring up and fomenting religious strife in the Republic and driving a cruel wedge of discrimination into the heretofore tolerant and peaceful educational systems of the Nation by denying to poor nonoffending, impressionable children attending private and all parochial schools the duly-paid-for benefits they are entitled to, such as bus rides, free nonsectarian books, health programs, and so forth.

Fifth. By demanding restrictive alcoholic advertising legislation in an attempt to prop up the ugly, deadhead of the Republican Party's so-called noble experiment and breathe life into the putrid prohibition carcass.

Sixth. By encouraging and promoting legislative road-blocking in sundry ways including a return to the old bottle-'em-up rule of the House of Representatives Rules Committee.

Seventh. By encouraging the use of unpatriotic, gutter language in referring to the high office of the Presidency of the United States and its present incumbent, who is a real friend of the people and not an enemy of any man, woman, child, or institution, big or little, in the Republic.

Eighth. By giving encouragement, aid, and comfort to Joe Stalin and other enemies of the Republic in libeling and slandering the state of the Nation as far as the honor and integrity of its executives is concerned, and its much-desired, worth-while currency, and its financial solvency, stability, and over-all honesty of purpose and efficiency of operation.

Ninth. By encouraging the enemies of the Republic into believing that the Republic is disorganized and wastefully weak and impotent, is practically bankrupt, and thus hastening world war III with vulture No. 1.

Tenth. By attempting to divide the households of America and thus, in Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin fashion, disunite the Nation and thus divide it in order to conquer it for themselves.

Eleventh. By carrying on a campaign of lies and attempting to convince the people that their friends are their enemies.

Twelfth. By wickedly infiltrating, for politically shameful purposes, otherwise good intentioned and respectable organizations.

Thirteenth. By claiming that the present administration, and not the greatest war in the history of the world, is responsible for the present huge public debt and unbalanced budget.

Fourteenth. By pretending that an unbalanced budget and deficit spending is new, novel, and original for the Republic and was authored by the present Democratic administration, when the truth of the matter is that the budget of the Nation has never been balanced, beginning with the administration of Calvin Coolidge, the Republican mummer, who after all had sense enough to keep his tongue from wagging potential treason.

Fifteenth. By working to build up huge monopolies and trusts and causing the free enterprise system of America to become an exclusive enterprise system for them.

Sixteenth. By attempting to pervert with money the great free press of the Nation into an unfair press and a sordid hireling of glorified gangsterism.

Seventeenth. By attempting to ruthlessly scare and frustrate people into a depression.

Eighteenth. By ignobly attempting through the circulation of falsehoods to destroy the high purpose and prestige of our country at the council tables of the other nations of the world.

Nineteenth. By spending propaganda money like drunken sailors in expectation of a return to political power so as to again enslave and debauch the people of the Nation.

Twentieth. By resisting civil-rights legislation and approving of second-class citizenships.

Twenty-first. By the coalition of evil forces to fuse the thoughts, words, and deeds of reaction into one octopus whole.

Twenty-second. By pretending to ride again with Paul Revere in the interests of freedom and the Constitution when in truth and in fact they are striving to attain economic slavery over others in violation of natural and moral law and of the United States Constitution and proper human law.

Twenty-third. By pseudo-endowment of self-created pressure-group organizations to fight public hydroelectric and other power projects of the people behind the masked face of inordinate greed and selfishness.

Twenty-fourth. By funneling money into various and sundry lobbying activities.

Twenty-fifth. By hiring persons and other entities to endeavor to lure people into following the crooked and winding ways of the financial serpent and go basely upon their ignoble bellies and not upon their stalwart feet.

Basing-Point Law Condemned by Farmers Union Herald—Cites Clash of Big Business With Farm, Labor, Co-op, and Small-Business Groups—Many Groups Aroused in Opposition to False Issue of Clarification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Farmers Union Herald of January 9, 1950, in a short but direct leading article on its front page, signals the danger to many groups embodied in the basing-point bill, S. 1008. The Herald says:

A head-on clash of big business versus the major farm, labor, co-op, and small-business groups has shaped up. Big business wants a basing-point clarification bill passed which, in effect, overrules the Supreme Court.

This refers to the Supreme Court decision in the Cement case on April 26, 1948, outlawing the basing-point system.

FARMERS OPPOSED TO ARTIFICIAL PRICES

The Farmers Union Herald article describes the basing-point system as a gentlemanly form of business monopoly. Farmers are opposed to monopoly because in the past they have been victims of monopoly in the purchase of supplies and equipment for use on the farm and in the sale of farm products. Any system of fixed prices by an industry levies its toll from every walk of life, either by direct consumer purchases or by taxes used for materials to build our great public works.

PARMERS UNION POSITION IS SOUND

The position of the Farmers Union on S. 1008, the basing-point bill up for consideration on January 20 by the Senate, is the correct one. The Farmers Union

has consistently opposed S. 1008 and predecessor bills of like nature since the beginning of this fight shortly after the Cement decision. I commend this short article to my colleagues as it concisely describes the situation. The article follows:

BASING-POINT LAW FIRST ORDER IN BUSINESS

The basing-point system—a gentlemanly form of business monopoly—may again be legalized when Congress takes up S. 1008 on January 20. Under a Supreme Court order, the basing-point system is now outlawed.

A head-on clash of big business versus the major farm, labor, co-op, and small business groups has shaped up. Big business wants a basing point clarification bill passed which, in effect, overrules the Supreme Court.

The system is used to make sure all manufacturers give uniform prices and bids on material—such as steel and cement—throughout an area. Any producer who wanted to offer bids could be sure no one else would offer less.

If it turned out that someone put in a lower bid and took the business, he was regarded as a chiseler who ought to be punished. The other companies would teach him a lesson by offering low prices in his territory, even at a loss, until he was faced with bankruptcy and decided to be good.

Thus a basing-point system is a much more civilized and gentlemanly way to set up a monopoly than the old-fashioned system. But it is just as effective.

The great cry on Capitol Hill now is going to be a demand that Congress clarify the law so everyone will know just how far he can go on the basing-point system. "This is like demanding that Congress clarify the law against murder, saying just what weapons you must not kill a man with," said spokesmen of the National Farmers Union last week.

Reception in Honor of William Warrick, of Scranton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an excellent address delivered by Oscar J. Toye, Massachusetts department commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, before a group of veteran representatives and city officials in Lynn, Mass., on the occasion of the reception which was given William Warrick, of Scranton, Pa., when he visited the widow and children of his late buddy, Maurice Goldstein, who was killed in the Battle of the Bulge in 1945:

It is a rare privilege for me to be here tonight and to bring to you the official greetings of the Department of Massachusetts Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America and to join with you in welcoming our guest and his charming wife into this great city, in a great State, of the greatest of all lands, on the eve of a great day. Mr. Warrick has come here on a great and noble mission—to pay, as he himself has described it—a long-delayed visit to the widow and children of his former buddy, and to bring to them a measure of solace. To a large degree, Mr. Warrick's visit with us tonight, as also this entire assemblage by this group, represents combined effort on our part to answer the question to the young lad of a war hero, "Why did my daddy have to die?" and to help in the solution of the Nation's No. 1 problem, internal friction. I hope that you will forgive me if I digress for a moment and inject what may seem a personal note.

To me personally, standing before you tonight breaking bread with my comrades and fellow Americans is of special significance. Tonight marks the twenty-eighth anniversary of my stepping onto American soil for the first time. My first meal in this blessed land of ours was a traditional Thanksgiving dinner, such as the one we are having tonight.

I left Europe 28 years a week ago, and came to this land 28 years ago tonight. I left behind me a country, a continent, which was a malignant sea of hate. I came to a land where love and brotherhood was the order of the day. It was then, as it is now, a haven and refuge for many people. And as I look back and trace the happenings in the world during these past 28 years, and as I draw in my mind a quick comparison between the many countries of Europe, each of them set against one another and the peoples within the borders of each of them divided among themselves, and the unity that exists among our people, I cannot help but see where that sea of hate in Europe has engulfed and drowned millions of its people, and the countries have gone from bad to worse; while our country has been going forward all the time and has since become the hope of the world. If you will accept the benefit of thinking by one who has spent the first part of his life in the Old World, and the major part of his mature years in the New World, then I am sure you will agree with me that the reason for the big gap that exists between the conditions in the two worlds is to be found in the two words "hate" and "love."

Where hate creeps in, no matter in what small doses, division follows. Internal harmony suffers, the structure weakens, and collapse is the inevitable result. We must be alert to learn from the bitter lessons of the Old World, and make the elimination of group hatred and the substitution for it of love and respect as the first order of business on the agenda of every American. We must reject and combat the false teachings of the Old World which have been making inroads into our way of life during the past decade. This gathering represents a milestone in the history of our people. We have reached a point in the life of our Nation where we find that we have all too long delayed our program of house cleaning. We should embark on it now, not only to secure ourselves by preserving harmony in our land, not only to perpetuate and preserve a way of life for which men like Maurice Goldstein gave their lives, and men like William Warrick gave so much, but also to abide by the teachings of Christianity and Judaism which command us to "scorch the bad from our midst."

This program of house cleaning could begin in nearly any city or town in our land. That it began in Lynn, Mass., is no reason for any aspersions on this cosmopolitan city.

On the contrary, I do not share the opinion of some of the people of this city that the Goldstein incident puts our city here in bad light in the eyes of the Nation. Which of the cities and towns here in this State or in any State in the Union can claim immunity from the disease of hatred and bigotry, so that it might lie in the mouths of its people to take issue with us here. I submit to you, my friends, that the people of the city of Lynn are at this moment writing a golden page in the history of our Nation. They will be recorded to the credit side of the history of our people as having had the courage to ask the question which was on the lips and in the hearts of millions of people in our land, but which was not asked, much less was the answer given. The question in our language would probably be, "How long will we continue to tolerate the bigot in our midst; how long will we permit the daily desecration of the principles for which the flower of our people gave their lives; how much longer will we delay housecleaning?" The Goldstein lad, having received an unmerited beating for no other reason than he was the son of an American who chose to abide by the faith of his fathers, a Jew, asked the question in much simpler but deeply rooted question, "Why did my daddy have to die?"

The press of this country has quoted our guest as saying that the incident has impelled him to pay a long-delayed visit to the widow of his buddy. I am very much intrigued by the phrase "long delayed." Is that not characteristic of our people, and of our country. Here is a fine man, who for several years harbored in him a longing, a desire to do something nice, something noble. We are a busy people, we are a hard-working people; a good portion of the time we are busy carrying on our backs the people of Europe, feeding them and pulling their chestnuts out of the fires, and we have not the time to do the things that are most dear to us. Then something comes along and shocks us into action. That is what happened to Mr. Warrick. When he heard of the beating administered to the son of his buddy, whom he saw dying for the American way of life, he could not tolerate his postponement any longer. He is here tonight joining with us in some housecleaning. The same, my friends, is true of our entire country. This incident has shocked the Nation, the American people are doing a bit of extra thinking and self-searching, and that means, we are going to do some long-delayed housecleaning, and that means we are moving forward along the lines of the principles for which our men and women gave their lives.

HOW MUCH OF HATRED AND BIGOTRY?

You are going to tell me perhaps that we are making too much of an issue of an isolated incident that has happened so many times, and perhaps happened to some of you in your young days, and you are going to ask me, "How much of bigotry and hatred between groups in this country is there? How serious is it?" I am afraid that I cannot answer you the first part of your question. But I can attempt to tell you how serious the existence of any of it is to our security, to our reputation, and to the daily well-being of ourselves and our children.

PULLORUM CLEAN

I come from a family where there are a number of individuals engaged in farming. Two of my brothers run one of the largest turkey farms in Middlesex County. My uncle operates one of the big farms in Norfolk County. Now I am not trying to canvass any of your business; it would be late in the day to do it, especially after you have already had your dinner. But I want you to bear with me while I attempt to answer your question, "How serious any measure of bigotry is."

For a number of years I have watched State inspectors coming to the farm of my uncle and my brothers, at their invitation, and take blood tests from each and every one of some 6,000 birds. Finally I heard them rejoice in the fact that their stocks were declared by the State to be "Pullorum clean." I heard so much of that word "pullorum," that I decided to betray my ignorance and to inquire.

I said to my brother, "What is this business 'pullorum,' that you talk so much about it." "Why, that is a disease of the blood stream," came the answer. "It gives you a bad reputation, people refuse to deal with you, and any morning, you might get up and find your entire flock succumbed to the disease. You are never certain." Having become interested, I proceeded to ask him, "Well, do you want to tell me that all these years until now, all of your 6,000 birds were pullorum-affected?" In answer, I received one of those amazed and inquiring looks, and after a moment of silence the answer came, "No, only perhaps about 15 or 20 birds in the entire flock were diseased." "And is that so serious?" I inquired. "Very serious," was the answer. "Permitted to remain, the entire flock would become infected, the blood stream of every bird might become diseased, and I would lose my entire business, my whole life savings." Buyers would shy away from him, he would lose his credit and standing. Because of that, he is going through annually a process of testing and checking at great expense, and painstaking effort. "But," he says, "it pays big dividends." He is in a healthy state; he has a sense of security. He enjoys a good reputation; he is making money, and he is happy. His stock is pullorum clean.

My friends, bigotry, the practice and the teaching of hate on account of race, creed, color, or national origin, is a disease of the blood stream. It is the pullorum of the human race, and if permitted to go unabated, if not checked at its source, we are endangering the well-being of our entire people, our national security, and the future of our children. We shall leave them an inheritance of hate, which they may not survive.

I hope that the mother of this young lad will forgive me for what I am about to say. I know she is an understanding person. At this time, I am not concerned with the beating that her son received at the hands of youngsters, by whatever description we want to call them. Young Larry will soon forget this, if he has not already. I will go a step further; though here I may be going on thin ice, and I will say to you that for the time being, I am not too much concerned by the fact that he was beaten by the youngsters for no apparent reason except that he was called a Jew while being beaten, though that is very serious. I submit to you that he was assaulted and insulted by youngsters. We can retrain these youngsters to our way of thinking and understanding, which is the American way.

But I am gravely concerned, and so should you and so should every American be concerned, about another phase of this matter. I want to know where did these boys learn that you must beat Jews because they are Jews. I want to trace that to its source and give it a thorough cleaning there. I want to find those individuals who are undermining our youth, who are disseminating imported un-American, un-Christian doctrines in our midst, and deal with them as befits a free, democratic people. I want to get at that disease-spreading human pullorum, at its source, and check it before it is too late. We have made a good start.

Last week, following the incident, I called at the home of Mrs. Goldstein and presented young Larry with a volume entitled "Jews in American Wars." I told him that there he would find many stories which will parallel the heroic story of his dad, and there he would "find part of the answer" to his question. I turned over to his mother a letter which I addressed to her son, requesting Mrs. Goldstein to let him read it when she thought her son was mature enough to understand it. But I want to tell one or two of the things that I told Larry, and then I will conclude.

First, I cautioned Larry against the fixation that his father alone died for his country. I informed him that more than 300,000 American men and women died during World War II for the American way of life; that 18,000,000 more Americans were in uniform ready to die; and if 18,000,000 more Americans had been asked to die, they would have gone. It is our America. All of us will defend it and its institutions in every generation, even as his father and Mr. Warrick did.

Secondly, I cautioned him against the belief that he was assaulted by Christian kids. I told him that Christian kids do not beat Jews. That Christianity like Judaism teaches love, respect, and dignity, and I told him that even though these kids may be of Christian parentage, the moment they beat him because of the fact that he is a Jew they took themselves out of the Christian faith, or any religion practiced in our land.

My friends, I would like to go one step further tonight. The word "America" has long since ceased to mean just a land, just another country. To us and to the whole world it has come to mean more than that. It is a philosophy of life synonymous with Christianity and Judaism, and any person who practices the false teachings of hate, bigotry, and the monolithic doctrines of a people browbeaten into unity through uniformity is also un-American. He or she belongs to that small poisonous group of people in our midst who live in America, but are not Americans, because they don't practice America. They are our real enemies.

Let us also remember that the whole world is presently engaged in an ideological war. We must prove to the world that our way of life is the best. Our enemies will not fail to even magnify and exploit the situation to their unholy designs. Let us be ready to tell them that this is a "family situation" of which we are able to acquit ourselves honorably. But as for ourselves, and between ourselves, let us remember that the elimination of hatred and group tensions in our land is a major and serious problem, and the solution of that problem cannot be delayed with impunity. Tonight, and from now on.

Treaty of Friendship With Uruguay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the President has sent to the Senate for its consideration and for ratification, a treaty of friendship, commerce, and economic development with the Republic of Uruguay.

As the Speaker and my colleagues know, I was the chairman of the South American Study Mission of the Committee on Foreign Affairs which toured Latin America last fall. On November 23 we were fortunate to be present when the Uruguayan Foreign Minister, Dr. Charlone, and our Ambassador, Mr. Ravndal, signed the treaty in Montevideo. Accordingly, I wish to express a few thoughts with regard to Uruguay and to the treaty.

I was most favorably impressed with Uruguay and its people. They have a progressive country with one of the highest standards of living in Latin America. As a democratic nation Uruguay unquestionably ranks among the world's first. The Uruguayans are friendly and their make-up and viewpoint, while predominantly Latin, are very much like our own.

The Uruguayan economy is similar to that of our Great Plains area, for the most part. Cattle and sheep raising and the production of wheat and corn predominate. The country does, however, produce considerable fruits, wines, rice, and fresh vegetables. Since the beginning of the last war the United States has been Uruguay's best customer for wool of a high quality. Also since that time, Uruguay has obtained most of its manufactured goods and many of its raw materials from the United States.

A long period of stability, democracy, and social consciousness has allowed a progress which is very commendable. Uruguay has large meat packing plants in which United States capital has a heavy share. Virtually all the country's cement is produced by a United States owned plant. Most of the other industries are owned by Uruguayan capital which has been of sufficient amount to sustain a moderately wealthy economy and one which allows universal and free education of a high standard as well as an enviable public health system including health security benefits to the whole population.

All this has been possible in South America's smallest country. For Uruguay has only about 71,000 square miles inhabited by approximately two and a half million people. But this small country has many firsts to its credit. The friendship, commerce, and economic development treaty to which I refer is the first modern treaty of this type which the United States has signed with a Latin-American nation. It is similar to the treaty with Italy which went into effect in 1949 but is more comprehensive. Additional features are intended for the most part to encourage technical collaboration for the economic development which is heralded in the title of the treaty itself. These features are further evidence, if any is required, that the days of dollar diplomacy are forever gone and that the United States intends diligently to pursue a constructive course in its dealings with other nations, always with careful provision for the maintenance of mutual guaranties to safeguard legitimate private and national interests.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this treaty a highly important foundation stone in the structure we are trying to build of international interchange and reciprocal help. It is for this reason that I wish to invite your attention and that of my colleagues to the President's message to the Senate requesting its approval.

Alaska in the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 12, 1950:

ALASKA IN THE BUDGET

Alaskan appropriations of $185,000,000 which President Truman is asking for in his budget are certainly none too much. These relatively few millions will go to make the United States' most vulnerable outpost more defensible and to create something better than poverty and privation out of its potentially rich resources.

One of the major items in the budget figure is for construction of roads and reconstruction of the Alaska Railroad. If the country should ever be called on to defend Alaska, and to defend itself through the defense of Alaska, roads will be indispensable—roads between the United States and Alaska, roads from one part of Alaska to another. Yet the highway connecting the United States and Alaska is primitive, and there are fewer highways within Alaska than in the tiny State of Delaware.

The railroad is also of critical strategic value, and the heavier rails, the new shops being built at Fairbanks and the terminal improvements there would be worth many times their cost in event of an emergency.

Other major items are for health, education and welfare, including the construction of hospitals, schools, electric and telephone systems, water and sewage systems. Alaska has little more than an elementary school system, and a scattered one at that. Its health problems are acute, its tuberculosis death rate shameful. In peace times these conditions are a national disgrace. In war times they could be a national debacle, for the defense of the territory can be no stronger than the people who live there, on whom defenders would have to rely for many forms of assistance and cooperation.

When the economizers get down to Alaska on the budget, they would do well to realize that the best way to use money economically at this stage of the game in Alaska is to use quite a fair amount of it. There is quite a good deal to be done.

The Coal Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams:

BEAVER FALLS, PA., *January 17, 1950.*

Hon. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
House Office Building:

DEAR MR. GRAHAM: All industry in Beaver County notified today by Duquesne Light Co. that all industrial power will be shut off completely unless coal is received before Friday, January 20. Over 300 industries affected. Means complete shut-down in 90 percent of plants. Have wired an appeal to President Truman. Hope you will lend your efforts in our behalf. Imperative that we have coal.

Sincerely,

MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF BEAVER COUNTY,
C. E. MARTIN, *Secretary.*

BEAVER FALLS, PA., *January 17, 1950.*

Hon. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Beaver County industries face a shut-down of electrical power effective Friday, January 20, midnight, by Duquesne Light Co., unless coal supplies are made available. The economy of Beaver County will be drastically affected by the coal situation, which has progressed beyond the emergency stage. We hereby appeal to you for assistance.

BEAVER FALLS BOARD OF TRADE,
S. E. STEWART, *Secretary.*

NEW CASTLE, PA., *January 17, 1950.*

LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Coal situation in New Castle critical. Government action requested.

NEW CASTLE COAL MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION,
EARL L. MILLER, *Secretary.*

MONACA, PA., *January 17, 1950.*

Hon. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
New House Office Building:

Have been notified by Duquesne Light, our supplier of power, that all production operations must cease Friday, twentieth, account of coal crisis. Major effect upon rubber and other enterprises using our product, zinc oxide, which is now in critically short supply, as well as those consumers of zinc metal. How much longer must the business life-blood and millions of workers and consumers of this country be pushed around by a few big goons and several thousand small goons who practice absolute tyranny and monopoly while our legislators and the Department of Justice debate, sue, and otherwise harass so-called big business, which has an important part in maintaining our great Nation?

ST. JOSEPH LEAD CO. OF PENNSYLVANIA,
GEORGE F. WEATON.

BEAVER FALLS, PA., *January 17, 1950.*

Hon. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
Congressional Representative From Pennsylvania, House Building, Washington, D. C.:

Is coal situation critical? Local power company advised us today they were obliged to suspend service to us midnight Friday, the twentieth, for productive use in our plant until further notice. Understand same restriction issued to other manufacturers served by Duquesne Light Co. This means shutting down our plant and laying off 300 people. We urge your immediate attention to assist in demanding a proper legal approach to stop coal-strike difficulties.

INGRAM RICHARDSON MANUFACTURING CO.,
J. F. INGRAM, *President.*

Economic Deadlock in Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Business Week for January 7, 1950:

STILL OVER LEWIS' BARREL

WASHINGTON DOUBTS THAT AN INJUNCTION WILL BE MUCH HELP TO COAL OPERATORS—REASON: A COURT PROBABLY WOULDN'T ACT ON THE 3-DAY WEEK, WOULD ONLY TELL LEWIS TO RESUME BARGAINING

Can the coal operators' attempt to enjoin John L. Lewis break the economic headlock he has on the industry? That has Washington wondering.

Pinned down

The consensus seems to be that the operators' charge of unfair labor practices brought before the National Labor Relations Board can't get them off the floor.

Here are the reasons:

The charges—that Lewis is refusing to bargain, that he is insisting on forcing the operators to accept an illegal contract—aren't enough. Any NLRB order or court injunction based on these charges can only tell Lewis and the union to go back to the bargaining table—and Lewis can do that without letting up on his headlock. Such an order, even if obeyed by both sides, will not result in anything but an eventual Lewis-dictated contract. Few people believe the courts can enjoin the 3-day week on the basis of unfair labor practices in bargaining proceedings.

Taft-Hartley health-welfare injunctive powers cannot be used against Lewis because the public health and welfare aren't endangered. Coal stocks above ground, coupled with the 9-million-plus tons of coal coming out of the ground each week (Business Week, December 24, 1949, p. 36) are enough to keep industrial and home-heating customers going until April. There may be a few "spot" shortages in home-heating coal, but nothing on a national scale, barring very bad weather which would slow down or stop transportation of coal. And then it would be too late to do anything.

Lewis prevailing

Few people in Washington believe that a court injunction would be issued against the 3-day week. They say that:

1. You can't make a man work—particularly when he has no contract.

2. The charges by the operators that the 3-day week is coercive are not stated in a way that makes the sin a separate issue. It's tied to bargaining.

Thus, Washington opinion (made up of pro-Lewis, pro-operator, and neutral government statisticians) points to a continuation of the deadlock in coal. Most debators won't bet on the outcome, because they can't outguess a court. But they believe that Lewis will win in the long run.

Apportionment

The economic strategy that Lewis is using was planned more than a year ago. As far back as October 1948, Lewis was thinking of spreading the work (Business Week, December 25, 1948, p. 21). Even then the bloom was coming off the coal market, both here and more particularly, abroad. With the UMW's 400,000 members spread between low-cost good-coal mines and marginal low-grade pits, a depression in coal would put the marginal operators out of business. And Lewis didn't want part of his union unemployed.

The answer had to be an apportionment scheme along the lines of the prewar Guffey coal act, which "divvied" up production of coal among the entire industry.

Here was where Lewis was in a dilemma. He couldn't think up an angle to write into a contract—and Congress was cold to another Guffey act.

Backfire

The get tough attitude of the operators—they let it be known that they wanted more work, less pay, and no royalty on tonnage—finally worked to Lewis's benefit. When the 1948 contract expired in June, Lewis was faced with the alternative of striking or knuckling under to the operators. He couldn't do either.

With the "spread-the-work" idea in the back of his mind, Lewis came up with a temporary solution—the three-day week. This spread the work. And it was not a strike, but still put pressure on the operators where it really hurt—in their pocketbooks.

The beautiful thing about the 3-day week—to Lewis—is that the only charge against it, a monopoly in labor, can't be prosecuted because the law exempts labor unions from monopoly restraint.

New twist

Meanwhile, while the country waits for the outcome of this latest version of the slow-down, a new twist on the old saw about carrying coals to Newcastle, has shown up.

This week a ship from England will unload coal at Boston. A year ago we were shipping the stuff to England. Now we are getting it back.

Predatory Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an editorial from the New York Daily Mirror of Tuesday, January 10. This editorial refers to the slogan of my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman RICH, to which slogan the House and the country might well pay attention. Either we give serious consideration to the matter of reducing Federal expenditures or our whole financial house will be in a state of collapse.

PREDATORY GOVERNMENT

The most hopeful bit of news out of Washington yesterday was simply a slogan coined by Representative ROBERT F. RICH, veteran Pennsylvania Republican, who, in the past, has been fond of asking the question most embarrassing to politicians, namely, Where are we going to get the money?

Representative RICH's slogan for this session, he told the House, is "Be nifty and thrifty in '50."

Perhaps that is no great shakes for sloganizing, but the idea is there by which we can throw the spenders out if it is only hammered home again and again.

Because taxation is the hottest issue in this country today; it burns everybody's pocket; it jeopardizes everybody's job and everybody's future.

That brings us to the most vital news from Washington yesterday—President Truman's proposed budget for the next fiscal year, starting July 1, in which he plans to spend $42,439,000,000, or $5,183,000,000 more than the Federal Government will take in.

Prorated among our 150,000,000 population, that means the Federal Government's expenses would cost $283 for every man, woman, and child in the country.

The deficit alone figures out to $34 per person.

The national debt at the end of the next fiscal year—after 2 years in which deficits have totaled more than $5,000,000,000—will stand at $253,000,000,000.

That, if divided among the 150,000,000 of us, figures out to a mortgage of about $1,700 on each of us; and the annual interest costs each of us $35.

Of course, Truman budgets are hard to understand. They are so big. They are like the Einstein theories.

But Samuel B. Pettingill, former Congressman, simplifies it in an article for the Gold Standard League. He says:

"If every one who holds life insurance cashed his policies, the amount would not run the Federal Government 1 year. If every urban home owner sold his home, the total would finance the politicians on the Potomac for 8 months. If every farmer sold his farm, equipment, and livestock, the total would run the Government for only 7 months. If every industry converted its net working capital into cash, it would last the Federal politicians less than a year."

Or, think of Government spending, in the terms used by Herbert Hoover in his famous 75th birthday speech; that—

Twenty years ago, all Government (Federal, State, and local), omitting Federal debt service, cost the average family $200 annually; today the bill is $1,800. And—

Today, the average working citizen must work 61 days for government before he can take care of his own family.

The spenders hurt you also in invisible ways.

President Truman's deficits are covered with printing press money—inflation, which drives down the value of your dollars. Your insurance, savings, Government bonds, pay off in dollars worth less than the dollars you put into them.

A $10,000 insurance policy, paid up in 1940, has lost about $4,000 in terms of what it will buy today.

We have a predatory Government, waring on its people, stealing their substance. The Republicans, this year and in 1952, should fight it out on that overwhelming issue.

NLRB Schism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of today under the heading "NLRB schism."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NLRB SCHISM

Robert N. Denham, general counsel for the National Labor Relations Board, may have legitimate grievances against the Board, but it is difficult to see why he chose to air them before the Building Trades Employers Association in New York. It was inevitable from the very nature of the separate status that Congress gave to the general counsel in the Taft-Hartley Act that differences would arise between him and the Board. But we doubt that Congress ever contemplated the general counsel attacking the Board in public in this fashion. In our opinion, Mr. Denham has raised a serious question as to whether the present system will continue to be workable with this sort of strain upon it.

Mr. Denham's chief complaint is that the Board is misinterpreting the Taft-Hartley Act—presumably twisting it toward the grooves of the old Wagner Act. Whether or not his charge has substance is an extremely complicated question that we do not presume to discuss here. But in no event could the Board be expected to agree with the general counsel all the time. Out of 20 cases in which the courts have granted temporary injunctions while waiting for the Board to hear the testimony and decide the cases on their merits, the Board has sustained the position taken by Mr. Denham 13 times and overruled his contentions 7 times. This seems to be a fair batting average for the general counsel's office. If the Board were to agree with the general counsel in all cases, the purpose of Congress in separating the prosecuting and judging functions would obviously be flouted.

It is a distortion of facts, moreover, for Mr. Denham to say that "the courts have apparently been held by the Board to be in error in issuing injunctions at the behest of the general counsel, in cases which the board has later dismissed." The courts have issued injunctions only to prevent irreparable damage from being inflicted while the case is being disposed of on its merits. Representatives of the general counsel have repeatedly requested injunctions with the understanding that the cases were not presented to the court on their merits. For Mr. Denham to assume that the court is being overruled by the NLRB when the court never considered the merits of the case is distortion of a type that a public servant should not indulge in. Of course, there is no way in which the NLRB can overrule a court after the court has heard a case on its merits.

More serious is the fact that when appeals from the Board's decision are carried to the courts, the Board must be represented by the general counsel. The general counsel has now said in public that he thinks the position taken by the Board in numerous cases about to go to the courts is wrong. In effect he has invited employers dissatisfied with the Board's rulings to appeal to the courts, knowing that he himself will represent the Board when it is challenged. How can he or his subordinates conscientiously present the Board's case before the court in these circumstances? The effect of the speech is thus to bring to light a grave weakness in the present set-up of the NLRB and to accentuate doubts as to the advisability of giving the general counsel as much power as he now has.

What Can Nazi Victims Expect?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, through the aid and insistence of United States authorities a law was recently adopted in western Germany to indemnify Nazi victims for their suffering and losses under the Hitler regime. While the principle is a sound one, the law unfortunately does not go far enough and the rate of compensation is far too small. Nevertheless, I think American officials in Germany who were instrumental in getting the law into effect should be congratulated:

The following is an article entitled "What Can Nazi Victims Expect?" by Murray Frank, was published in the National Jewish Monthly, in the January 1950 issue:

WHAT CAN NAZI VICTIMS EXPECT?

(By Murray Frank)

When United States High Commissioner for Germany John J. McCloy announced last

August that the American Military Government had approved the draft of an indemnification law to compensate Jewish and non-Jewish victims of Nazi Germany, the action was hailed as a just and courageous step.

Mr. McCloy unquestionably deserves the praise and gratitude which greeted his announcement. His action is evidence of the serious and fair manner in which he approached this problem, and indicates how quickly he realized the righteousness of the principle of compensating the victims of Hitlerism for their losses and for the injustices they suffered at the hands of the Nazis.

The indemnification law—its official title is "Law Concerning Redress of National Socialist Wrongs (General Claims Law)," but the designation, "General Claims Law," has been adopted in common usage—has been in the making several years. Some of its basic clauses date back to 1948, when the Restitution law was promulgated in the United States zone in Germany, but that law dealt mainly with the restitution of identifiable property, tangible or intangible.

In 1947, the combined Chiefs of Staff to the Military Government in Germany issued a directive (MGR 23-3002) which listed as one of the occupation aims the payment of compensation for bodily injuries suffered under the Nazi regime. Thus, the general claims law seeks to fill this gap.

It had been reported that important elements in AMG were opposed to the law; opposition was also reported in the State Department, as well as in the British military government, which objected to enactment of the law in the British zone. Despite this opposition, Mr. McCloy advertised the military authorities and on August 10, 1949, he approved the indemnification law.

That, in brief, is the history of the law. It now remains for the German provinces of the United States zone to formally put it into effect. Incidentally, it has since been reported that plans are under way to put the law into effect also in the British zone.

Thousands of DP's and other Nazi victims, now in the United States, Israel, and elsewhere, are presently seeking an answer to such questions as: Who is entitled to indemnity under the general claims law? How much? How does one go about collecting? How and when will it be paid? This writer has given careful study to the matter in recent weeks; he has consulted State Department officials who are working on this problem in Washington or who have been to Germany in connection with it, and he has also obtained a complete copy of the indemnification law, of which only a limited number are presently available in English translation. It is not a simple matter to go through the text of this law. It consists of 27 legal-size mimeographed pages, single spaced, of legal language.

Here it will be possible to deal only with the high lights. Despite its verbosity, the law lacks certain details pertaining to procedure and remuneration, which makes it impossible to answer fully the above questions. These details are in preparation at this time and will be announced at the time the law goes into effect. It should also be emphasized that for the time being the law applies only to the United States zone; nor does it include Berlin. It is believed, however, that it will eventually be adopted by the west German federal government for the area under its jurisdiction.

The five major sections of the indemnification law are:

I. General provisions, in which are established the restitution claim, liability, assertion of the claim, and transfer.

II. Restitution cases, dealing with damages to life and limb, health and liberty, possessions and property, and damages to economic advancement.

III. Priority of restitution payments, indicating the various groups or classes of claimants and the sequence in which payments are to be made.

IV. Procedure, specifying the time limit and the prescribed form for filing claims.

V. Penalties and final provisions, enumerating causes for rejection and cancellation of claims, special decrees, and time when law becomes effective.

The most important of all is article 1, which establishes the right to indemnification. It provides that all those who were persecuted under the Nazi dictatorship, from January 30, 1933, to May 8, 1945, "because of political conviction or for racial, religious, or ideological grounds" and who suffered damage to life, health, liberty, possessions, or economic advancement, are entitled to compensation.

Claimants must show that on January 1, 1947, they had their legitimate domicile in the area now constituting the United States zone as a refugee or resident of a DP camp, or that they emigrated prior to this date, or that the victims on whose behalf they are seeking indemnification died before that date. Claims can pass on to legal heirs, such as the widow, children, or near relatives who were supported by the deceased, but such claims cannot be transferred beyond the second order, such as grandchildren.

The law recognizes as claimants not only individuals, but also institutions or unincorporated associations which previously functioned in Germany and were forced to dissolve because of political or other reasons. This means that Jewish communities are enabled to claim compensation for the destruction of their synagogues or other property. In the case of institutions or associations, however, the claimants must establish that they are the legal successors to the dissolved agency.

Where indemnification is sought in the death of a close relative, the claimant must show that the relative was killed or driven to his death at the instigation or with the approval of an agency or functionary of the Nazi regime. The law stipulates that "existence of these prerequisites is assumed in favor of the claimant, if the persecutee has died during deportation or political imprisonment or immediately thereafter," which means that relatives of those who died in the concentration camps or during deportation will have no difficulty in establishing their claims.

Compensation will be paid in the form of annuities as follows: To a widow, until her remarriage or death; to children, until the end of their sixteenth year; to relatives formerly maintained by the deceased, for the duration of their need. Claims are neither transferable nor inheritable.

Indemnification for damage to body or health will be made where the working capacity of an individual has been reduced by at least 30 percent; if the mental and physical efficiency of the claimant have not been reduced over a longer period of time, such damages will be considered as negligible.

Loss of liberty will be compensated if the claimant has been imprisoned under the Nazi regime for political, racial, or other motives, detained for investigation, kept in a concentration camp or ghetto, or assigned to a penal unit of the Nazi army. The compensation in such cases shall be at the rate of 150 deutsche marks for every month of detention. (The deutsche or west German mark was formerly worth 30 cents, but was devalued in September to 23.8 cents).

In cases of damages to possessions and property, the indemnification in each individual case cannot exceed 75,000 marks. The provincial government will determine the extent of damage and the amount of compensation.

Special taxes imposed upon those who were persecuted, either through legal or arbitrary acts by Nazi agencies or functionaries, shall be refunded in annual installments. The tax imposed on German Jews who wished to emigrate after January 30, 1933, shall be refunded up to a sum of 50,000 marks. Fines paid or exacted under pressure shall also be refunded.

Then follows a series of articles which defines damages to economic advancement as far back as 1933, provided such damage was inflicted by special laws instituted by the Nazis, such as the national citizenship law of 1935, the law excluding the Jews from the German economy in November 1938, the law on utilization of Jewish property of December 1938, etc. Damage is recognized as loss of a person's public or private service career, professional activities, trade, or business. In each case, a method for indemnification is prescribed. One or two examples will explain the point. Professionals, such as physicians, lawyers, engineers, etc., who were removed from their profession as a result of persecution measures, shall be allowed to resume practice of their profession and the necessary licenses and in some cases subsidies will be granted them. Another illustration concerns persons who have been deprived of maintenance benefits which they enjoyed prior to the rise of the Nazis and who subsequently emigrated from Germany or have even become nationals of another country. Their benefits shall be regranted them retroactively from the time of their deprivation, but the total sum is limited to 5,000 marks.

Indemnification claims will be arranged according to a system of priority, with preference given to those in the first group. Class I includes payments for medical treatment, annuities to relatives of victims who were killed, annuities to victims who lost their earning capacity, pensions to civil servants who lost their jobs due to persecution, maintenance benefits, half of the indemnification to those who lost their freedom, etc. Class II includes the balance of indemnification for loss of freedom, compensation for damages to property and possessions, fines and special taxes, payments to former civil servants and to those engaged in the professions. All other claims will come under class III.

The section dealing with procedure does not indicate sufficient details, other than to state that claims must be filed in the prescribed form not later than 1 year after enforcement of the law, except that in certain cases the time limit may be extended. A State Department official told this writer that for the time being, until further and exact procedure is announced, all applications for indemnification should be sent to United States High Commissioner McCloy at Frankfurt, with the request that it be forwarded to the appropriate agency for consideration.

So much for the law itself and its major clauses. It should be remembered that while it has been approved by the United States occupation authorities, the law has not yet become effective and that many important details remain to be worked out by the Germans themselves. The entire indemnification program will be administered by the Germans. They will determine the amount of compensation to which the Nazi victims are entitled; they will determine who is or is not entitled to indemnification, they will decide how and when to make the payments. The American authorities will have supervisory functions limited primarily to the task of seeing to it that the law remains in effect.

Payment will not be made in United States dollars, but in German marks. Although it has not yet been announced, one State Department official who had returned from Germany the day before I discussed the matter with him told me he was certain that the Germans will not permit any of the money paid out under the indemnification law to be taken out of the country, nor will it be convertible. The only possible concession may be that the German authorities may allow the purchase of German goods for this money for shipment out of the country; otherwise the money will be deposited to the account of the claimant, who can come to Germany and spend it there.

It is difficult to say what claimants may expect to receive as compensation. Some general estimates have been mentioned, i. e., that 850,000,000 marks will be distributed, and that the average claimant will receive 70 marks per month. State Department officials were reluctant to discuss such general figures. By way of comparison, it is interesting to note that refugee authorities in Israel estimate that the damage to Jewish property destroyed or confiscated by the Nazis in Germany and the European countries which came under their domination amounted to $9,000,000,000.

The wording of many clauses is so ambiguous that interpretation of the law becomes difficult and may provide loopholes and excuses for rejecting indemnification to many claimants. In fact, it is difficult to see how any claimant can succeed in collecting his due compensation without professional advice. Furthermore, it should be remembered that execution of the law depends largely upon political developments in Germany in the years ahead. Will the law remain in effect after the occupation powers withdraw from Germany?

Weak and ineffective as the law is, its greatest weakness lies in the fact that it is limited to the area comprising the United States zone in Germany. What about the Jews and other peoples who perished in other parts of Germany? What about the millions of Jews who were exterminated by the Nazis in the crematoria and gas chambers established on Polish soil? Or in concentration camps established by the Nazis in other European countries? Indemnification—if the Germans can ever really indemnify the Nazi victims for the magnitude of the crime they committed against them—should be made applicable to all victims in all countries which came under the Nazi regime. Relatively few will benefit from the law.

Another weakness is the meager compensation prescribed under the law. A concentration camp victim will be entitled to 150 marks a month or 5 marks a day, equivalent to $1.19 a day for "enjoying" the benefits of life in the hells of Nazi Germany.

The indemnification law is more of a gesture than anything else. The victims of Nazi Germany will benefit little from it. It is no atonement for the wrongs committed against the Jewish people. Yet it is important that the principle of indemnification be clearly established, and that is what the law primarily amounts to—a law in principle, in theory, but not in practice.

Reduction of Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter reprinted from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick:

EDITOR, DERRICK: Remember during the war emergency the Federal Government called on certain capable individuals in private industry to head up important posts to organize and expedite the production of war matériel. As I see it, an emergency exists today which is equally as serious and just as much a threat to the well-being of our country and the continuance of what we call the American way, as war, viz, the deficit spending and waste in Washington.

The stock reply by anyone in the administration, from the President down, is "Where would you cut?" when they are urged to decrease the budget by eliminating waste, overlapping, duplication, etc., in the Federal administration. This reply is an admission of utter incompetence, in my opinion. They are spending more money than they are taking in, and they don't know how to stop.

I would respectfully suggest a plan to meet this emergency; viz, that the President appoint a special committee of, say, six or more individuals selected from the personnel of the management of the larger corporations in the United States. This committee would be given supreme authority to go to work and put the Nation's house in order. There is no doubt any of the major corporations in the country—the genius of whose management really has made America great—would be willing to allocate one of their executives as a member on such a committee, and I would also recommend that a representative be secured from the administrative department of the greatest circus on earth, whose efficiency is the wonder of the world. If it were possible to put such a scheme into action, it would be only necessary to give these men about a week to organize and then turn them loose on the Washington scene. It is reasonable to expect that results would become evident within a relatively short time and we could be sure that there would be a prompt cancellation of further research, for instance, on the Love Life of the Frog; the Government Printing Office would be reorganized on an economical basis and many of the ridiculous and uneconomical situations that the Hoover Commission report brought to light would be quickly corrected.

This idea may cause many people to smile, but it can be seriously considered and put into effect if there was a nonpolitical desire to do so. Incidentally, after this committee got down to business, the income of all transportation companies out of Washington and other places where there are Federal offices should be greatly increased. In fact, it might prove to be the greatest exodus in history.

CHEERITE.

OIL CITY, PA., *December 21, 1949.*

Prayers-for-Peace Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a proclamation issued by the mayor of the city of Newark, N. J., the Honorable Ralph A. Villani, on December 22, 1949, in connection with the Prayers-for-Peace Movement:

PROCLAMATION—PRAYERS-FOR-PEACE MOVEMENT

Whereas two frightful wars have been witnessed within our life's span, the havoc of which has remained with all its incumbent threats, circumstances, and international maladjustments and influences; and

Whereas in taking cognizance of these destructive and trying conditions, a prayers-for-peace movement came into being by way of a resolution introduced by Mr. Herve Joseph L'Heureux, Chief, Visa Division of the State Department, and adopted by the Last Man's Club, William W. Jutras Post No. 43, American Legion, at Manchester, N. H., on October 28, 1948; and

Whereas subsequently veterans' groups of all religious denominations, Americanization committees of the Army and Navy Union, units of the Gold Star Mothers and the Blue Star Mothers, Rotary Clubs, industrial and other firms, student bodies of schools and universities, religious groups of every sect, newspapers, through editorials and governmental leadership, have adopted the prayers-for-peace movement, calling for a 1-minute noonday prayer; and

Whereas we are now on the threshold of holy season, dedicated to good will and peace among all men.

Now, therefore, I, Ralph A. Villani, mayor of the city of Newark, do hereby proclaim this endeavor as prayers-for-peace movement in our city, and ask that the fullest measure of recognition by our press, radio, churches, synagogues, schools, civic, industrial, and business groups, toward the purpose of this peace movement be given. I further urge that each of us pause for 1 minute each day at noontime and offer fervent prayer for guidance toward the adjustment of ourselves to one another, to eradicate bigotry, to help us build for better understanding and pray for tranquillity to the end that we may become unified of purpose toward our chief desire—peace.

RALPH A. VILLANI,
Mayor.

Dated December 22, 1949.

Article by Congressman Vito Marcantonio, Daily Compass, January 15, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

TRUMAN CAN PASS OR KILL FEPC, SAYS MARCANTONIO

The bill to establish a Fair Employment Practices Committee can be passed by the House of Representatives next Monday.

Or it can be bottled up forever in the Rules Committee.

Whether the FEPC bill is to be passed or is to die is entirely up to President Truman.

The chips are down.

Monday is the crucial day. On that day the country will discover whether the Truman administration's devotion to civil rights is real and honest, or mere demagogy for vote-getting purposes.

The American people will discover on Monday whether the Democratic platform was a statement of the honest principles of honest men, or a hypocritical sham.

If it comes before the House, the FEPC bill will pass, probably with 60 or 60 votes to spare. I say that as one who has canvassed the situation thoroughly, as one who in 1940 introduced the first FEPC bill in history, as one whose anti-poll tax bill was passed by the House in the Seventy-eight and Seventy-ninth Congresses, as one who has lived with the problem of civil-rights legislation every day and every night for 13 years.

But the problem is to get the FEPC bill before the House.

Monday is the last day that can be done.

Whether it is done then depends upon the action of three Congressmen. They are not

Dixiecrats. They are not Republicans. They are not enemies of President Truman.

On the contrary, they are Administration stalwarts. They are the leaders of the Truman Democrats. They are the prophets of the Fair Deal.

The three men are:

SAM RAYBURN, Democrat (Texas), Speaker of the House.

ADOLPH J. SABATH, Democrat (Illinois), chairman of the Rules Committee.

JOHN LESINSKI, Democrat (Michigan), chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

What they do will depend on what President Truman tells them to do.

Here is the parliamentary situation:

The present Congress—the Eighty-first—passed a resolution on the first day it met, in January 1949, which took away from the Rules Committee its power to sit forever on legislation it didn't like.

The new rule provided that when a committee of the House reported out a bill, the Rules Committee had only 21 days in which to set a date for debate on that bill by the full House.

If the Rules Committee sat on a bill for more than 21 calendar days, the chairman of the committee which had originally reported out the bill had the right to bring it before the House for debate and action.

Two days of each month were set aside for this purpose, the second and fourth Mondays.

On those days—and only those days—the chairman of any committee whose bill had been bottled up in the Rules Committee for more than 21 days could rise, obtain recognition from the Speaker, and bring the bill before the House. The Speaker was required to recognize the committee chairman for such purpose.

The Committee on Education and Labor, of which Representative LESINSKI is chairman, reported out the FEPC bill during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, last summer. The Rules Committee failed to bring it before the House in 21 days.

Chairman LESINSKI could have brought the bill out and forced a vote on it by exercising his privilege on the remaining second and fourth Mondays of the session. I urged that this be done, but the administration decision was to let it go until the second session, beginning in January 1950.

Immediately the new session convened I issued a statement to the press demanding that the FEPC bill be brought before the House at the earliest possible date, the second Monday of the month, January 9.

This was not done. Chairman LESINSKI failed to ask the Speaker for recognition.

However, he promised to seek recognition on the fourth Monday of January. That is next Monday, the twenty-third.

If the administration had permitted LESINSKI to act at the first opportunity the present dangerous situation would not exist.

After that opportunity had been allowed to pass caused a new factor entered the situation.

The Rules Committee, by a vote of 9 to 2, approved a resolution which would abolish the 21-day rule and return to the committee its power to bottle up legislation indefinitely.

That resolution, approved by the Rules Committee last Friday, was the fruit of an alliance between Republicans and reactionary southern Democrats to block civil-rights legislation.

When it comes before the House that resolution may be approved.

That will end any chance to bring the FEPC bill before the House for a vote.

The FEPC bill must therefore be brought out for action before the resolution abolishing the 21-day rule is presented to the House.

This can be done. It must be done next Monday, January 23.

It depends on the action of three men, the three administration stalwarts, the three men whom President Truman can tell what to do: Speaker RAYBURN, Representative SABATH, and Representative LESINSKI.

Here is what President Truman must do if he really wants the FEPC bill passed:

1. He must see to it that SABATH, the chairman of the Rules Committee, holds up for the full 10 days allowed by House rules the resolution abolishing the 21-day rule. After 10 legislative days from last Friday, any member of the Rules Committee can bring the resolution out for a vote. But for 10 days, until after next Monday, SABATH is perfectly within his rights in not bringing up the resolution.

2. President Truman must see to it that LESINSKI, chairman of the committee which approved the FEPC bill, jumps up and seeks recognition as soon as Congress convenes Monday.

3. President Truman must see to it that Speaker RAYBURN recognizes LESINSKI, rather than some other committee chairman seeking to bring his own committee's bill to the floor.

It is entirely discretionary with Speaker RAYBURN which committee chairman he recognizes.

As President Truman's general directing the administration's program in the House, he is responsible for carrying out the President's wishes. If the President is sincere in his protestations about civil rights, RAYBURN will recognize LESINSKI.

The President can no longer pass the buck to Congress. He can no longer blame the Republicans or the Dixiecrats for blocking civil-rights legislation. His own men now hold the key to success or failure.

Unless administration Democrat SABATH holds up the 21-day resolution until after Monday, unless administration Democrat LESINSKI seeks recognition on Monday, unless administration Democrat RAYBURN recognizes LESINSKI, the FEPC bill is doomed. And only one man will be to blame.

The country will know who that one man is.

The Upset Down Under—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Morley Cassidy, from the Washington Evening Star for January 18, 1950:

WOMEN OF AUSTRALIA CREDITED WITH BIG PART IN LABOR DEFEAT

(The Upset Down Under—No. 3)

(By Morley Cassidy)

SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA, January 18.—"These women!" The Labor Party organizer in a South Sydney suburb shook his head gloomily as he doodled on his green desk blotter.

"I just can't figure them out," he complained. "Look what we've done for them in the last 8 years:

"We've doubled the child endowment, from 5 shillings to 10 for every child after the first one.

"We've given them a basic wage of six pounds four shillings a week. We've given them child care centers, pharmaceutical benefits, old-age and widow's pensions. We've given their husbands full employment, more leisure, and better wages than they ever got before.

"And are these women grateful? Haw! They see a chance to get an extra five shillings a week, and they go running to the other side like sheep.

"Women," he concluded sadly, "just don't think straight."

Australia's Labor Party, from top to bottom, is pondering the strange and fickle ways of women these days, as it prepares for a party executive meeting at which it will conduct a rueful post mortem into the recent election which threw it out of office.

VOTED CONTRARY TO HUSBANDS

The winners—men of the combined Liberal and Country parties—don't go quite so far in assigning credit for their sweeping victory.

But their best political brains, too, say that Australia's women did more than their share in casting the votes that reversed the tide of socialism in this part of the world.

Tens of thousands of women whose husbands voted Labor, ward workers say, marched to the polls to cast their own votes for the other side—to throw out the party that could point to an excellent war record, 4 postwar years of booming prosperity, full employment, high wages, short hours, a free health plan and an elaborate program of social benefits.

In New Zealand, the story was the same. Women, the politicians agree, outdid the men in overturning a Labor government which, in 14 years, had created the most advanced social services in the world.

Why?

Labor still wonders. In the winners' minds the explanation is simple.

"Women are realists," says Mrs. Thelma Kirkby, a dainty little housewife of Bellata, N. S. W., who did more damage than 50 wildcats to Australia's Socialists.

"The workingman's wife may not know economic terms, but she sees the difference between money wages and real wages when she does her shopping at the green grocers or the drapers."

HAD TASTE OF SOCIALISM

"She knows, as buyer for the household, that the family is worse off, not better, if wages rise 40 percent and meat and clothes and shoes rise 50 or 60 or 80.

"And when she sees her husband and the other men, working a 4-day week, or limiting their day's production, she sees a connection between this crippled production and the fact that she can't get a new stove, or new plumbing, or a home of her own.

"Australian women have had their taste of socialism, and want no more of it."

Labor's leaders don't agree with this interpretation of the women's vote. Most of the women who normally voted for Labor, and switched their vote this year, were lured, they think, by the promise of an extra five shillings a week through "child endowment."

The present law (passed, incidentally, by the Menzies Liberal Government in 1941) gives parents an allowance of 10 shillings (about $1.10) a week for each child after the first, on the theory that the basic wage is computed to provide for a husband, wife, and 1 child.

The non-Labor parties, in this election, promised to give 5 shillings for the first child as well. The Labor Government refused to match this promise, contending that it would require a revision of the basic wage rate.

But Labor may be deluding itself in thinking that this "5-shilling bribe" swung the women's vote.

POLLS SCORES OF HOUSEWIVES

I have talked since the election with scores of housewives in Australia's cities and small towns who formerly voted for Labor, but switched this time to the Liberal or Country Parties. I asked them why.

Five out of six have the same answer, and in ringing, indignant tones.

"Why, on account of this socialization," they say. "Chifley and his bunch were out to nationalize everything. Look what they tried to do with the banks. If the high court hadn't stopped them, we wouldn't have a private bank left."

It seems strange, hearing this concern for banks from a tired-looking woman in a workingman's cottage in Sydney's Haymarket section, where the soot from Central Station begrimes the walls. She'd be one of the last, it seems, to worry about private banks.

"But this was just one step in their plans," she says belligerently. "Look what they did to the air lines.

"My husband's a taxi driver. Supposing they decide next to socialize transport? My husband would be working for the Government, for whatever they chose to pay. Oh, no! Not for me!"

Hundreds of thousands of Australian women, obviously, felt as strongly on this subject. Their bitter objections to socialization or nationalization, frequently coupled with references to communism, are only matched by their expressions of relief that the danger has been scotched.

WOMEN LED CRUSADE

It was Mrs. Kirkby and a half-dozen like-minded housewives who turned dislike into a crusade.

Mrs. Kirkby, slim, blue-eyed, and pretty, still in her 30's, the wife of a sheep rancher in New South Wales, is a bit of an amateur politician.

Australians first heard of her a few years ago when she locked words with a cabinet minister, one Mr. Tulley, in a public meeting, and in a whispery little-girl voice proved that he didn't know as much about his own department as she did.

She was immediately tagged as "Mr. Tulley's problem child."

Eighteen months ago, when the Labor government was still pressing its efforts to nationalize all banks, Mrs. Kirkby became the problem child of the whole Labor government.

She and Mrs. Crawford Vaughan, of Sydney, a leading Liberal, and four or five others decided that it was time to mobilize women's opposition to Socialist doctrines.

Firmly eschewing financial aid from any party, they organized their own Australian Women's Movement Against Socialization.

CAMPAIGNED WITH EDUCATION

"We decided first of all," says Mrs. Kirkby, in a deceptively shy whisper, "that our best weapon was simply a program of education, to show Australian women where socialism was taking them.

"We started out by educating ourselves. Then we gathered a group of about a dozen women—not politicians, but women whom other women would want to listen to.

"One was Marion Doughtery, who won her title in the Royal Red Cross for her work in charge of the sick at Belsen prison camp.

"Another was Helina Kosurowska, whose brother was head of the Polish resistance movement. She rescued two Australian aviators during the war, taught them Polish, and found places for them in the Polish underground. After the war they helped bring her here.

"Another was Jennie Broad, a famous English ferry pilot. Another, Nancy Bird, an Australian flier famous for piloting bush nurses through our far West.

"All of them, like us, started learning about socialism from its beginning. We studied Karl Marx and Engels, the works of the Fabian Socialists, and all the rest.

"At our first public meeting in Sydney, we had 2,400 people. But from then on we concentrated on little meetings in private homes."

NEW BRANCHES ORGANIZED

"We promised to supply a speaker for anyone who would open her home and get together a group of 20 or 30 women. Invariably, each meeting resulted in the organization of a new branch.

"We managed to send a speaker to every meeting.

"Our speakers proved, out of Labor's own words, where it planned to take us. We showed the connection between socialistic planning and the shortage of bricks, and housing crisis.

"Our meetings got bigger, and we had to use public halls. Then the Communists began to take notice. They'd crowd in first, get seats near the microphones, and break up our meetings with their heckling or chants of 'We Want Peace.'

"We learned to deal with them. We kept the doors closed until our own people had all the seats near the microphones.

"We were determined not to get 'tagged' as a political organization, for we had many labor women among our workers—women who could see that their gains had been illusory.

"So we wouldn't take a sixpence from any party. Our branches supported themselves with bazaars and cake sales and what we call 'American teas'—only you probably never heard of them—where everyone brings a gif' and buys a gift."

AMAZED AT SUPPORT

"We were amazed at the support we found. "I remember one instance well. It was a dreadfully poor little house in a workingman's quarter, and I thought it seemed almost useless to stop and try to point out the danger of nationalizing banks.

"The woman who came to the door was middle-aged, weary, with a baby in her arms and another tugging at her skirts. I began explaining my purpose, when she interrupted me.

"She said, 'Too right, luv, I've 'ad this mob.' In American, that would be, 'You bet, dearie, I've had my fill of this bunch.'"

Labor's chieftains, of course, can't believe that so many women could be so indignant over such a heavy subject as bank nationalization. They prefer to think it was that five-shilling bonus.

They may be right, or they may be wrong. But they're out.

Letter Addressed to Son of Veteran Killed in Battle of the Bulge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein copy of letter addressed to Master Laurence Goldstein, of Lynn, Mass., by Oscar J. Toye, Massachusetts Department commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America. Master Goldstein's father made the supreme sacrifice during the Battle of the Bulge in 1945.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS,
JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Boston, Mass., November 17, 1949.

Master LAURENCE GOLDSTEIN,
Lynn, Mass.

MY DEAR SON: You have resulted an undeserved beating at the hands of ill-bred and misinformed youngsters who were brought up in an unwholesome atmosphere, perhaps by un-American parents. This, my boy, has made you think like a man three or four times your age. You have asked a very basic and troublesome question. You asked it like a mature man and you deserve being answered like a grown man.

I know, my son, that you did not complain for your physical injury as much as you did for the injury to your dignity as a child of God, as an American, and as a son of a war hero.

Your question, "Why did my daddy have to die?" cannot be answered in words, but it is being answered every day by good and decent people of this country in every nook and corner; it is being answered by Americans of every color, age, and religious conviction. Your question is being answered every day of the year by organizations such as the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, the American Legion, the VFW, the AMVETS, the Marine Corps League, and others, of whom your father is an honorary member. Your question is being answered, not in words, nor in speeches, but with small and big deeds; deeds that preserve and perpetuate the good things and institutions for which your father, as one of the 300,000 Americans, died.

Last Friday, as you know, people all over the country observed Armistice Day. Thousands of former servicemen and women marched in parades. Millions of Americans watched the parades. These same people and millions more filled the synagogues and churches throughout the country. Jews, Christians, whites, yellows, and blacks all mingled together just like during the wars. We prayed and we paid tribute to your father and to thousands of other American heroes. The President of the United States, on that day, delivered a great historic address, explaining, in part, why your father had to die.

But more important than that, every one of us on that day once more rededicated himself to do something in memory of the war heroes. On that day all of us good Americans resolved to do something good so that we may deserve to enjoy the freedoms which your father defended heroically and for which he died.

It so happened that last Friday, my boy, I was talking to several hundred people who filled a synagogue in Dorchester and just like yourself, I too, a man four times your age, asked that question. I asked it somewhat different. I asked the people who were there, what right one group of human beings in this country has to ask another group to go to war and to die. There is but one answer to it, my boy. The answer is that all of us fought to protect something that was going to be taken away from us and then life would become worthless. It wasn't only your father who was asked to fight but 18,000,000 other Americans went to fight and if 18,000,000 more had been asked, they too would have gone to fight. But all of us, including your dad, went to fight for one thing and one thing only, and that is the American way of life.

Under the American way of life, people make no distinction between Jew, Christian, white, colored, born American or immigrant. Under the American way of life, we have a right to pray to God as we wish and we have a right to express our minds as freely as we want. Under the American way of life, we strive for self-discipline and for greater

freedoms. Had your father not gone to war, had he and the others not died, those freedoms would have been taken away from us as they were taken away from the people of Europe and you and I would surely have been dead today or at best, we would have been slaves.

Your father didn't want that; he wanted his sons and all American sons, regardless of race or creed to live and grow as free men. Your life and the life of future generations of Americans was to your father dearer than his own life. That is why your father died and that is what makes him a hero to all Americans.

You have a right to say to yourself that every time you see an American do a good deed, he is doing it in tribute to and in memory of your father. Every time someone does like what the kids did to you, they are desecrating the memory of American heroes and you have a right to stop them. But in stopping them, you must live up to the tradition and heritage of your father. You must try to do it with persuasion, with love and kindness, with teaching and arguing, but with force only when forced to do so. You are a descendant of the Maccabees. You will never run away from bullies.

Now there is one more thing I should like to say to you. I am very much afraid that because of these boys who beat you and called you "Jew," you might be led to believe that you were assaulted by Christians. I want you to say to yourself that these boys were not Christians. Christians do not hate others or beat them. The Christian religion, like our own religion, teaches love for one another. I do not care of what parentage these boys are or to what church they go. When they did what they did to you, they took themselves out of the Christian faith and out of any other religion, and they have no further right to call themselves Christians. I venture to say to you, my boy, that these fellows are not even of Christian parentage. Had their parents been Christians, they would have attended to their business of bringing up their children in the spirit of love and respect for other human beings, regardless of faith.

Do not, as you might be tempted, pass judgment on these kids or on other Christian kids. Christians do not hate Jews. It isn't Christians, it is nonreligious people that hate. Christianity like Judaism teaches to love, to help, and to share.

Another thing, it is very natural for you, as it would be for me, a man four times your age, to want to see these kids punished. You would want to hear a judge say so. Ask yourself what good would it do and would it be a tribute to your father. You may not know it but your mature sense and courage of conviction has already set in motion the greatest judging machinery in this country. It is even higher than the Supreme Court of the United States. You have aroused the indignation of the people of the United States. Your question has made them think hard and whenever the American people think hard and act much good comes out. A hundred blue laws passed by legislatures and a thousand judgments pronounced by courts will not accomplish as much good for this country as you have through your action. A million dollars could not have built a greater monument for the 400,000 men and women heroes of our country, of which your father is one, than your courageous action.

I am herewith sending you a book entitled "Jews in American Wars"; also one for your younger brother. This book was written in a hurry and does not contain all the stories of all the heroic men and women of our faith in their fight for this country. But somewhere in that book you will find a story which is just like your father's. When you have through reading this book, I am sure that sensible a boy as you are you will gain an added sense of faith in our great country and in the good people that inhabit it.

Your job and mine is to see to it that the few people who don't understand America don't get hold of it and spoil it.

Be humble, brave, and courageous.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR J. TOYE,
Department Commander.

Hunting for a Coal Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Business Week for January 14, 1950:

HUNTING FOR A COAL CRISIS

Need to find a weapon against John L. Lewis, more than any real coal shortage, accounts for Government moves in situation created by 3-day week in the mines.

It's easy to be bewildered over coal this week.

On the one hand you find such signs of serious trouble as these: An Interstate Commerce Commission order directing most of the country's railroad lines to cut service on coal-burning passenger runs by 25 percent; and preparations in Washington for a court injunction against John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers.

PARADOX

All that has the sound of crisis. But against it you can set these facts; Nowhere in the country is anyone actually out of coal. A year ago, in another warm January, most of the mines were working 2- and 3-day weeks for strictly market reasons. And today—on the statistics—coal production matches consumption.

FIGURES

Weekly production on the 3-day week ranges from 8,500,000 tons to a little over 9,000,000 tons as compared with a normal 12,000,000 on a 5-day week. In November, the most recent figures, consumption totaled 34,600,000 tons.

Consumption may have been a little higher in December, but stocks were in good shape. On December 1, industrial stocks averaged 51 days, ranging from 24 days for the railroads to 87 for electric utilities. Retail dealers had 5 days' supply, normal for the season. Over-all, the country had 39 days' supply above ground.

WHY CUT SERVICE?

The railroads had the lowest industrial stocks but plenty of coal. Weeks ago they were empowered to seize coal cars at the mines. The limitation on service was a conservation measure. ICC Chairman Johnson told Business Week, "I am not worried about anything until February. After that, in some of the northern and northwestern areas there may be a shortage."

Elsewhere, the coal situation is a nuisance. Some industrial users, unable to get coal from regular suppliers, are paying 50 cents a ton premium, taking inferior grades. In St. Louis, hit simultaneously by a quickie strike and a cold snap, dealers warned of empty yards. Dealers everywhere see customers turning to other fuels.

And in Washington, NLRB Counsel Denham's lawyers, doubtful that they can make a case for a health-and-welfare emergency, are shaping up their case for a court order enjoining the 3-day week as an unfair labor practice. Whether that will prove to be a weapon to defeat Lewis' subtle strategy—(Business Week, January 7, 1950, p. 61) will be up to the court—probably next week.

The Upset Down Under—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Morley Cassidy, from the Washington Evening Star of January 17, 1950:

THE UPSET DOWN UNDER—No. 2—ATTEMPT TO NATIONALIZE BANKS AROUSED VOTERS IN AUSTRALIA—LABOR REGIME OUSTED WHEN PUBLIC FEARED INDUSTRIES WOULD SUFFER SIMILAR FATE

(By Morley Cassidy)

MELBOURNE, AUSTRALIA, January 17.—Most of America's practical politicians, I feel reasonably sure, would laugh themselves right out of their suspenders if anyone suggested they run for office on a slogan of Vote for Whoozis and Dear Old First National Bank.

Pure suicide, they'd say. But their eyes might pop if they talked to some of the voters who have just thrown Australia's Socialist-minded Labor government out of office.

They'd find Australians still boiling with indignation over what Labor tried to do to our banks.

The tone is almost as though they were speaking of an outrage against our Nell. It makes a stranger blink.

A WAITER EXPLAINS

The brisk little waiter in a Collins Street restaurant, here in Melbourne, a good union man, says he voted Labor in 1943, naturally. This time he switched.

"I couldn't go for this bank nationalization," he says earnestly. "You know, that's just one step from dictatorship."

"Personally," he explains, "I don't have any dealings with banks, outside of my savings account. But suppose I decided to start a restaurant.

"If I needed a loan, there's a half dozen banks I could go to. If one turned me down, I could go to another.

"But under this nationalization scheme, there'd be just one bank—the Commonwealth Bank. If I went to them for a loan and they turned me down, I'd be out of luck. That's dictatorship."

He is no rare specimen. Three out of four people, among the hundreds I have talked to in Australia, have cited the Labor government's attempt to nationalize the banks, and the prospect that it quickly would take over other industries, as a major reason for their vote to oust the Labor government that had held office since 1941.

I know as well as any ward politician that this is incredible. But there you are. And Labor is out.

OUTPROMISING FAILED

It is the more astounding, according to one of the master-minds who mapped out the victorious Liberals' campaign, when compared with what happened 3 years ago.

"In 1946 we tried to outpromise Labor," says this man, too modest to let his name be used.

"We promised to extend child endowment, to raise old-age and invalid pensions, and a list of other benefits. We cut Labor's vote by about 2 percent. But we lost.

"This time we promised nothing in the way of easy vote-catchers, so-called. We did promise, as before, to extend the child endowment to cover the first child, but only because we believe it should be done."

DIDN'T MINCE WORDS

"We didn't renew our promises to eliminate the means test, or raise the pensions. On national insurance we simply said we would examine the possibilities with a view to submitting a plan in 1952.

"We didn't mince words about a lot of things that seemed like dynamite. We said the nation's defense called for selective training—call it conscription. We said we'd be tough with illegal strikes.

"Our whole campaign was simply this:

"Here's the socialist state. Here's what it has done to you so far. Here, from its own statements, is what it plans to do in the future. How do you like it?

"The result was a landslide. How do I account for it?"

MAKING THE ISSUE CLEAR

He doodled for a minute or so on his desk blotter.

"I'd put it this way: There's no use trying to out-promise the socialists.

"They'll always get the people who want promises of easy benefits, no matter what the other side offers. So you can save your breath—and the taxpayers' pocketbook.

"Socialism, fortunately, seems to answer itself with its works. Let people have a good taste of it, with all its mistakes. Then put the issue squarely, as an issue that touches every aspect of people's daily life, the issue of government monopoly, controls and a planned state, or individual freedom and free competition.

"We fought the campaign on that issue."

BANKS ARE A SYMBOL

The socialists' effort to seize the banks was held in the spotlight, as a sort of visible symbol that the Labor party wasn't just mouthing words when it talked of creating a socialist state.

Many Australians, it seemed, had taken it for granted that Labor's socialization plank was an empty political slogan. Now, suddenly, it was brought home to them that the socialist state meant business.

And from that time on, it is clear today, every man's and woman's grievance became, miraculously, the work of "these ruddy socialists."

A sheep rancher in New South Wales' outback country, near Gunnedah, waves his hand at a field full of rabbits, the great pest of Australia.

"That's what a coal strike does," he says bitterly. "No coal, no steel. No steel, no wire netting.

"This country needs 300,000 miles—miles, mind you—of netting to protect its grazing lands. A lot of us have to fence our fields. So it rusts in the grange. How can you fence in a field on two sides?

"There are your socialists and their planning."

FARMER WANTS A TRACTOR

A farmer has been waiting 2 years for an American tractor.

"My dealer got two last year," he says. "At that rate I'll get mine in 1960. Why? Because the dealers can't get permission to pay dollars.

"There's socialist prosperity for you."

Every man with a car or truck has a grievance against the stingy ration of gasoline, or petrol as it's called here.

"Who won this war, anyway?" growls a Newcastle truck driver. "Four years after it's over I'm getting 5 gallons a day for this truck, and I need 10."

STRIKES STIR ANGER

A Sydney businessman speaks grimly of his shipping costs. Much of the increase is due to trouble on the docks.

"Out on Glebe Island," he says, "we've got mechanical loaders. In 1939 we were loading 37.6 tons an hour. Today, with the same equipment, we're loading 21.3—and today the men are on strike again."

The complaints are endless. The most frequent involve the Labor government's refusal to deal firmly with Communists in trades-unions; with its acceptance of "drags," the unions' restrictive practice limiting output, its handling of strikes, most of all its tardy action in dealing with last summer's great coal strike.

And, to top it all, there is the rise in prices. "We've got a 12-shilling pound," say the housewives. It takes 20 shillings now, that is, to buy what 12 shillings bought at the end of the war.

One gathers, in talking to ex-Prime Minister Joseph B. Chifley and men of his staff, that they are still hurt and a little bewildered at the fury of the public's reaction to the assault upon "our banks."

They speak glumly of the fear complex created by their enemies. Actually, they point out, they had taken only the bare first steps toward a truly Socialist state.

This is true. By comparison with Britain, for instance, Australia is a land of riotously free enterprise.

SOCIAL SERVICES MODERATE

Its social services—old age, invalids' and widows' pensions, unemployment and sickness benefits, and the like—are well advanced, but no one calls them excessive, or the mark of a welfare state. They have been created by all parties, all parties promised to maintain them, and they were never an issue.

The railroads have always been state-owned, as have the telephone and telegraph systems. City tramways and transport have been publicly owned for many years.

There has been no seizure of whole industries, as Britain took over its coal mines and railroads. But that, Labor's enemies quickly point out, is not the fault of Labor. It tried.

STARTED AFTER THE WAR

Australians have known, in a vague way, that every Labor candidate since 1921 has signed a party pledge to work for the socialization of the means of production, distribution, and exchange.

Most people, no doubt, had regarded it as a pious expression and little more. But when the Labor government of John Curtin faced a wartime election in 1943, the public had misgivings. To allay them, Mr. Curtin and his cabinet pledged that there would be no effort to nationalize industry during hostilities.

Mr. Chifley, who succeeded Mr. Curtin on the latter's death in 1945, was quickly freed of this pledge. Almost immediately, Australians were jolted by the establishment of Trans-Australian Airlines, under a commission empowered to take over all Australian air lines.

ELECTIONS OF 1946

The high court, Australia's Supreme Court, declared this seizure illegal, but approved the state's operation of its own line. The state-owned line now operates in competition with private lines.

This dispute still was sputtering when the elections of 1946 were held. Nationalization was not an issue; but Labor ministers, soon afterward, were asserting that the party's platform pledge was well known, and that the election, therefore, had approved a program of full socialization.

Fairly soon thereafter, startled Australians found themselves with a state-owned shipping line, a state-owned broadcasting corporation, a government monopoly in television and frequency-modulation broadcasting.

Finally, in 1947, socialization hit full force, with the measure authorizing the commonwealth to take over all trading or commercial banks, making them a part of the government-owned commonwealth bank.

It is doubtful that any Labor Party official guessed what a storm would follow. Protest committees sprang up like magic. The bill was carried to the high court and declared unconstitutional. The Labor Government—in defiance of its own pledges to abolish appeal to the Privy Council in London—carried the case to that council and lost again.

It lost more than it knew. For now Australia was rallied behind "our banks," and opposition brochures were telling people that no one, from now on, could say that "he didn't know it was loaded" if he voted for Labor.

Loan Guaranty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. T. B. King, Director of the Loan Guaranty Service, Veterans' Administration, concerning the work of his department. I believe the Members of the House will be interested in the information concerning the veterans' loans for homes, farms, and business.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1950.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: In accordance with your telephone request I am pleased to advise you with respect to the salient factors in the loan-guaranty program. Attached is a statistical summary of the loan-guaranty operation compiled as of November 25, 1949.

You will note that approximately 41,000 applications were received during the month of November of which over 39,000 were for home loans and the balance were applications for farm or business loans. This figure is double that of the all-time low in applications which occurred in March 1949 during which approximately 20,500 applications were received. The increase in volume is due primarily to (1) the 100-percent secondary market for section 501 loans which has been made available through the facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association and (2) the decrease in the yield on long-term Government bonds and the lack of other sound investments makes the 4 percent guaranteed mortgage attractive.

We are extremely gratified with our default and claim experience to date. There have been 108,000 defaults reported on home loans of which more than 72,000, or 66.9 percent, have been cured. We have paid an aggregate of 5,300 claims which is approximately one-third of 1 percent of the number of home loans closed. Of the 39,000 farm

loans closed, we have had defaults reported in approximately 4,700 cases of which 62.1 percent, or 2,900, have been cured and 661 farm-loan claims have been paid. We have received 19,700 default notices on the 112,000 business loans that were closed. Nine thousand of the defaults, or 45.7 percent, have been cured and we have paid claims in 6,936 cases. There have been 141,286 paid-in-full loans of which 87,157 were home loans, 12,407 farm loans, and 41,702 business loans. It will thus be noted that 8 percent of all loans closed to date have been paid in full and less than 1 percent (0.8) have resulted in claim payments. There have been no marked increases in the number of defaults reported or claims filed during the past year. We have been confronted with certain local situations involving unemployment due to industry shut-downs and strikes. However, the mortgagees have been extremely cooperative during such periods and have extended indulgence to the veterans. It is my sincere hope, as I am sure it is yours, that this fine record of our former GI's will be maintained.

If I can be of any further service, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Very truly yours,

T. B. KING,
Director, Loan Guaranty Service.

Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR REPEAL OF WARTIME EXCISE TAXES,
New York, N. Y., January 16, 1950.

Hon. A. F. TAURIELLO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your bill H. R. 5735, concerning the reduction of the excise to eliminate war increases, indicates your interest in the repeal of the wartime excise taxes.

Mr. Frank M. Mayfield, chairman of the National Committee for Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes, as well as the members of his committee, have requested me to forward to you the attached copy of the resolution adopted unanimously by the committee, at its meeting on January 12, at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York.

Respectfully,

H. LADD WHITELAW,
Secretary.

Whereas the undersigned have associated themselves together as a committee of principals under the name National Committee for Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes for the purpose of undertaking to secure the repeal of the discriminatory wartime excise taxes so as to leave in effect only the pre-1941 status, and have included in their objective all such excises except those on alcohol, tobacco, and gasoline; and

Whereas this committee of principals believes that these unfair and discriminatory taxes should be repealed for the following reasons, among others:

1. The strongest reason for their enactment was that they were admittedly repressive and would put a brake on the businesses affected. They were intentionally diversionary and punitive in order to meet wartime necessities. Since they continue to repress and to divert in peacetime, they are discriminatory and unfair.

2. They are rationing by taxation—the last of the wartime controls.

3. They dictate to the consumer how he shall spend his dollar; a severe limitation on his freedom of choice.

4. Since they strike deeply into whole communities and particular businesses, their unfairness causes bitterness when unemployment results to the individual worker.

5. The Congress has a moral commitment to the American people to end the high wartime excise taxes. This pledge is woven through the laws, their legislative history, and the very logic of their original enactment.

6. Since they increase prices to the consumer, they produce a maximum of mass irritation at a minimum of return, with their greatest impact on the low-income group, least able to pay.

7. Because they are arbitrarily selective by peacetime standards, they have injured particular industries.

8. More people and more businesses are subjected to the repeated bite of these taxes than any other, without exception.

9. Consumer-spending (which we must increase in order to sustain high-level employment) is decreased by these taxes.

10. The term "luxury taxes" is misleading, confusing, and in fact false, since the wartime excise taxes were not imposed on "luxuries." They were imposed on goods and services that interfered with wartime necessities.

11. Only complete repeal (restoration of the pre-1941 status) can be effective; mere reduction in rates would be a serious mistake—the irritant would remain; the moral commitment would be unfulfilled; the discrimination and unfairness would continue.

12. These are bad taxes; they are placed on gross revenues, not on net profits.

13. If it is wrong to keep the discriminatory wartime rates, and right to repeal them, America cannot afford not to do the right.

14. Tax repeal action rather than public works is the only way to reach the skills unemployed by consumer resistance to wartime excise taxes.

15. If these taxes are now repealed, the Government will have exerted itself positively in the direction of continued high-level employment and increasing national income throughout 1950.

16. When taxes enacted for an emergency purpose are permitted to remain after the emergency has passed, the faith of the people in their government is shaken.

17. Because of the general belief that these taxes will be repealed, quick action to this end is necessary, as the public is curtailing its purchases of many products and services in the affected industries.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Committee for the Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes, That the aforesaid unfair and discriminatory excises should be repealed, and the pre-1941 status restored at the earliest possible date.

This 12th day of January 1950.

National Committee for Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes: Frank M. Mayfield, Chairman, President, Scruggs-Vandervoort-Barney; Arde Bulova, Vice Chairman, Chairman, Bulova Watch Co., Eric Johnston, Vice Chairman, President, Motion Picture Producers & Distributors of America; Louis Ruthenburg, Vice Chairman, Chairman, Servel Inc.; James J. Newman, Treasurer, Vice President, B. F. Goodrich Co.; J. Carlton Bagnall, Sr., Executive Vice President, Swank Incorporated; Lester Baker, Treasurer, Dayton Rubber Co.; Robert F. Bensinger, President, Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co.; John M. Biggins, Vice President and Treasurer, Elgin National Watch Co.; Harold Bosell, President, General Telephone Co.; Henry P. Bristol, President, Bristol-Myers Co.; Thomas A. Buckley, President, The Buxton Co.; J. H. Carmichael, President, Capital Airlines, Inc.; John S. Coleman, President, Burroughs Adding Machine Co.; John Collyer, President, B. F. Goodrich Co.; Robert Driscoll, Vice President, Greyhound Corp.; Samuel B. Edison, Vice President, Edison Bros. Stores, Inc; Albert J. Feldman, Secretary and Treasurer, A. Hollander & Son; Marion B. Folsom, Treasurer, Eastman-Kodak Co.; John A. Fry, President, Detroit-Michigan Stove Co.; Leonard H. Goldenson, President, United Paramount Theatres, Inc.; Julius Green, President, Julius Green Fur Co.; C. R. Harding, President, The Pullman Co.; Lyle C. Harvey, President, Affiliated Gas Equipment Corp.; J. V. Heffernan, Vice President, Radio Corporation of America; Oscar Heyman, President, Oscar Heyman & Bros., Inc.; Stanley H. Hobson, President, George D. Roper Corp.; R. J. Irish, Executive Administrator, A. O. Smith Corp.; Stanley Klein, President, Mendel-Drucker, Inc.; R. A. Lumpkin, President, Illinois Consolidated Telephone; John H. Moore, President, John Hudson Moore, Inc.; Daniel J. O'Brien, President, Commodore Perry Hotel, Toledo; Brock Pemberton, President, League of New York Theatres, Inc.; B. Earl Puckett, President, Allied Stores Corp.; Milton R. Rackmil, President, Decca Records, Inc.; Carl P. Ray, Assistant to President, Underwood Corp.; Vincent P. Ring, Treasurer, Knapp-Monarch Co.; Carl Rosenberger, Chairman, Coro, Inc.; Nicholas M. Schenck, President, Loew's, Inc.; Glenwood J. Sherrard, President, Parker House Hotel, Boston; Spyros P. Skouras, President, Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.; C. R. Smith, President, American Airlines, Inc.; E. D. Taylor, Administrative Vice President, Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute; Edward Wallerstein, President, Columbia Records, Inc.; Harry M. Warner, President, Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.; Howard V. Widdoes, Vice President, Remington-Rand, Inc.; Edward T. T. Williams, President, The Lambert Co.

Christmas Festivities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio speech I recently made:

My fellow citizens, I am grateful to radio station WREC for this generous extension of my time. Never in all my life have I enjoyed anything quite as much as this opportunity to visit informally with so many of my friends on each Sabbath Day evening at 10 minutes after 10 o'clock. To all of you who have written me notes and who have spoken to me personally in acknowledgement of these humble efforts, I express my very deep gratitude.

On next Sunday night I plan to outline some of the subjects which must have attention in the early days of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. As you know we return to our duties in Washington on January 3. Because of the many complex domestic issues to be considered, I expect this

session to be rather a difficult one and certainly filled with highly controversial questions. As I go along through life, I recognize that all of us cannot be in entire agreement on all things. But if we have an honest purpose and a studious mind and an open heart, we can find a way to reconcile minor differences and adjust our understandings.

Tonight as time is reckoned in our part of the world, this holy day has just about been concluded. I do hope that you and your families have found happiness during the all too-swift passing moments of this Christmas.

The great event of 1,950 years ago made mankind reckon with B. C. and A. D. Our risen Lord is still the dividing factor but our only hope. There is no argument anywhere about the real disciple of the Master. It is that spirit, that character, and that kind of life which conveys the answer to human problems and echoes the song of Bethlehem and the music of the angels. To all such He becomes the unifying factor above party, race, or creed.

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.

"Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this."

It may interest you to know that the first certain mention of December 25 is in the calendar of Philocalus. This records that Christ the Lord Jesus was born on December 25, a Friday, the fifteenth day of the new moon in year 1. However, December 25 A. D. 1, was a Sunday. So to me the Christmas Day of 1949, falling on the first day of the week bears more than ordinary significance.

Christmas was not among the earliest festivals of the church. Before the fifth century there was no general concensus of opinion as to when it should come in the calendar, whether on January 6, March 25, or December 25. The earliest identification of December 25 with the birthday of Christ is in a passage, otherwise unknown and probably spurious, of Theophilus of Antioch, preserved in Latin by the Magdeburg centuriators, to the effect that the Gauls contended that as they celebrated the birth of the Lord on December 25, so ought they to celebrate the resurrection on March 25. As late as A. D. 245, Origen repudiated the idea of keeping the birthday of Christ, as if he were a king Pharaoh.

Certain Latins as early as 354 set the birthday at December 25, which was then a Mithraic feast day. The Syrians and Armenians clung to January 6. We are certain that the date originated in the West, but spread quickly eastwards. In A. D. 356, it was observed at the Court of Constantius; Basil of Caesarea adopted it in 370. Honorius, emperor in the West, told his mother and brother Arcadius how the feast was kept at Rome. The patriarchs Theophilus of Alexandria, John of Jerusalem, and Flavian of Antioch were won over to the date in A. D. 398. As early as 400, an imperial rescript includes Christmas among the three feasts on which theaters must be closed. Then as late as 1644, Christmas, as a day of observance, was forbidden by an act of Parliament. Charles II revived the feast, but the Scots adhered to the Puritan view. But so much for that part of sacred history.

I have never seen Memphis quite as beautifully decorated as during this holiday season. Perhaps there are some in my audience who have never paid particular attention to the origin of Christmas customs, the singing of carols, the beginning of the big Christmas Day dinner, the use of the term "St. Nicholas," and the giving of gifts.

The Mesopotamian god, Marduk and his court of gods have long disappeared, but their winter festivals survive in our Christmas celebration. In the Balkans and in central Europe, on the 12 days of Christmas, troupes of masqueraders go about, headed by a "fool" or a "wild man"; also troupes of carol singers, not unlike those we know from merrie England. There are still bonfires, and a special log which a young man fells and brings home; and over this log a ritual is performed (with praise, now, to the Christian God); and on Christmas Eve it is burned in the fireplace.

The Roman festival of Saturnalia began around the middle of December and continued until January 1. In its midst was December 25, the day as the Romans calculated, when the sun was at its lowest ebb, ready to increase again and impart its strength to the growing things of the earth. Hard upon this day came the Calendae of January—January 1. The word itself has become the name which the Slavic and Baltic peoples use for the days of the Christmas festivities: Koleda, Kolyada, Koledos, etc. The Roman Saturnalia and the holidays which followed were boisterous indeed. The citizenry masqueraded through the streets, ate big dinners, feasted their friends, wished them good luck at this time of tender fortune, and gave each other good-luck gifts called Strenae. The halls of the Romans were decked with boughs of laurel and green trees, with lighted candles and with lamps—for the hovering spirits of darkness were afraid of light.

To the pagans, the Saturnalia were fun. To the Christians, the Saturnalia were an abomination. As there were more and more immigrants into the ranks of the Christians the church fathers discovered to their alarm that they were facing an invasion of pagan customs. The church leaders tried strenuously to keep Christmas strictly a churchly celebration. But though pagan Rome became Christian, the Saturnalia remained and became adapted to Christian purpose. The church finally took the merriment, the greenery, the lights, and the gifts from Saturn and gave them to the Babe of Bethlehem.

To the old pagan Germanics, December was the time to slaughter the extra animals and preserve the meat, a good time to invite friends in for a bit of feasting. The god who cared for the fertile herd was Frey, after whom Friday is named; his animal symbol was the boar. The boar sacrifice was too enjoyable to be forgotten, so it survives in the feast of merrie old England in which the boar is treated as if it were some royal personage—first the trumpets blow, the door swings open, in marches a platter bearing a steaming boar's head, an apple in its mouth; behind it troops a procession of lusting puddings. This, too, is Christmas.

Woden (Wednesday: Woden's Day), the chief among the Northland gods, came originally from the Near East and became, by amalgamation with the real St. Nicholas, the St. Nicholas or Santa Claus of Christmas. In Europe St. Nicholas wears Woton's broad-brimmed hat and rides his faithful old white horse. In Europe he does not come on Christmas Eve but on the eve of December 6; St. Nicholas, archbishop of Myra, a seaport town in Asia Minor, died on December 6, in the year 326.

St. Nicholas must have been a remarkable person, judging by the varied and numerous legends which have gathered about his life on earth and his life as a saint after his death. From England to Greece and Orthodox Russia, he rides the storm at sea, saving the lives of sailormen for whom he is the last and only help.

St. Nicholas overleaped the frontiers of Christianity itself to become the helper of the pagan Samoyed and Laplanders—the man of the reindeer, the fisherman of the Arctic Ocean. So, in America, we tend to believe that the Arctic is his one and only residence.

By saving ships at sea, St. Nicholas saves the landlubber merchants who are their passengers; surely he protects them on land as well. By this reasoning, he becomes the patron saint of travelers everywhere, protecting their goods, and insuring them safe passage. His three bags of gold became the symbol, as three golden balls, of the pawnbroker: a man's goods, that is, are safe under the sign of St. Nicholas. He is the protector of all humble and small folk and he is special guardian of unmarried girls. He had the habit of slipping gifts into the homes of worthy folk, for he had inherited a fortune which he gave away without letting anyone know from whence it came.

So when the children of the Iowa Zuiderzee island, on both sides of Dutch-German border, set out their clogs for "Santeklas" (there are many versions of the name St. Nicholas) to fill on the eve, not of December twenty-fifth, but of December sixth, they put hay in them for the white horse, and their parents set out a sheaf of grain. Sometimes, instead of clogs, they set out little wooden ships. But, clogs or ships, they always place them by the chimney, for the saint still prefers to deliver his presents secretly in the night.

The exact origin of the Christmas tree is unknown. Limbs of evergreens were used in the Saturnalia and, in northern Europe, box, bay, ivy, holly, yew, larch, juniper, pine, spruce, fir—the plants that remain green when all else turns brown and dead—were the enemies of winter's white death and shields against the witches and demons of the long winter nights. Also the veneration of some particular tree as being the property or dwelling place of a spirit was so widespread and so varied among the pagan Europeans, that the customs which grew up around it have provided a wide range for those who like to make guesses.

Throughout history trees have been set up and decorated in almost every important holiday. The May-pole itself was a tree, and it even bore the same ornaments which were used on the Christmas tree; but garnished trees stood also on Shrovetide, Palm Sunday, Easter, Ascension Day, Harvest Home, St. Martin's, St. Nicholas', New Year's, and others. If the tree of Christianity in particular belongs to this family, then somehow, and unaccountably, it is a lone survivor.

There are many accounts of Christmas festivities going back into the Middle Ages; but they never mention the Christmas tree. A forest ordinance from Ammerschweier in Alsace, dated 1561, says that no burgher "shall have for Christmas more than one bush of more than eight shoes' length. This seems to be the first mention of anything that can be recognized as the tree. In a travel book dated 1605, there is this passage: At Christmastime in Strassburg they set up fir trees in the rooms, and they hang on them roses cut of many colored paper, apples, wafers, gilt, sugar, and so on. So it appears that the Alsatians were the first people to pass from hanging greens to a standing tree.

To the collection of false ideas we may assign the widespread notion that Martin Luther was out walking one night, and the stars suggested to him lights, which he then placed upon a fir tree to brighten the Christmas of his son. Nor can a good case be made for the Yule log as the ancestor of the Christmas tree. One favorite notion has been that it is the symbol of the Tree of

Life which stood in the Garden of Eden. Indeed, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, in northern Germany, that is precisely the way people regarded it; in Hamburg, for instance, you could buy little figurines of Adam and Eve and the serpent, to place under the tree. In the treasure chest of folklore the church keeps the story that on the first Noel, in defiance of the snow and the night's darkness, trees put forth blossoms and fruits; so the Christmas tree bears flowers and fruits. Some southern Germans cut cherry and hawthorn boughs on St. Andrew's Day (November 30) and place them in a pot of water in a warm room. By Christmas they spread and put forth full bloom.

The devotion of the southern colonies in America, with their predominantly English population, to the old customs of the mother country indicate that Christmas there was a day, not simply of religious observances and worship, but of family reunions, social gatherings, feastings, and frolic.

In New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware the observance of Christmas was naturally affected by Continental European Christmas customs derived from Holland, Sweden, and Germany. Practice varied among these peoples. Some of the more radical religious sects minimized the day. Among the Moravian Germans, Christmas appears to have been purely religious. Dutch, Swedes, and Germans of the Reformed or Lutheran churches, however, added new features to the traditional English way of celebration. St. Nicholas, or Santa Claus, was a feature of the Dutch, Swedish, and German Christmas. The Germans in colonial days introduced the Christmas tree, with toys, trinkets, figures of angels, and numerous little lighted tapers, into America.

In Philadelphia, Christmas was not, so we are told, generally observed. The Quakers, whether English or German, did not incline to the commemoration of holidays. Nor was Christmas popular among the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians.

Throughout the colonial period Christmas was frowned upon in New England. The Puritans were opposed to Christmas. From the earliest settlement at Plymouth, constant effort was made to prevent its observance. Massachusetts, in 1659, passed a law which reads as follows: "Whosoever shall be found observing any such day as Christmas or the like, either by forbearing of labor, feasting, or in any other way, as a festival, shall be fined 5 shillings." By 1800, Puritanism had lost much of its force even in New England, but Christmas Day was not made a legal holiday in Massachusetts until late in the first half of the nineteenth century.

The research to review the establishment of December 25, with the customs which followed has been stimulating. We may find ourselves wholly accepting or denying, this historical background but far more stimulating to me is my simple faith that the Christ Child did come last, the world, that he grew to young manhood, died, rose again, and that those of us who believe that he did live and died and rose will have everlasting life.

I am thoroughly convinced that our own country is thinking more about religion today. Men in every walk of life are turning to deep and more spiritual thinking. We are still just as frail as ever—we make just as many mistakes or more, but we do know that real peace will never come to the world until we live by the Golden Rule and we can more faithfully keep the 10 and, yes, the 2 great commandments.

It was He whose birthday we honor today who taught us to pray—

"Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever." Amen.

Judge Albert Conway, Guardian of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn is very proud of its senior jurist, Albert Conway, associate judge of the court of appeals. He is one of the great jurists of our State and country.

On Thursday, January 19, Judge Conway will be guest of honor at the golden jubilee dinner of the Cathedral Club in Brooklyn. It is a deserving tribute to a scholar, a teacher, a lawyer, a judge, but above all to a man—a good man.

The Brooklyn Eagle of January 8, 1950, designated him as Brooklyn's man of the week. The article, written by Wendell Hanmer, reads as follows:

BROOKLYN'S MAN OF THE WEEK—CONWAY'S CREED: A JUDGE IS A GUARDIAN OF LIBERTY

(By Wendell Hanmer)

Brooklyn's senior judge, who also is senior judge of the entire City of New York and third ranking jurist of the State, will be the guest of honor at the Cathedral Club's golden jubilee dinner in the Hotel St. George on January 19. He is Associate Judge Albert Conway of the court of appeals.

A member of the club 38 years, he resisted previous attempts by the club to honor him and again protested this year that the distinction should be accorded a younger man, that he is "getting old—not going anywhere."

If he is not going anywhere, any member of the legal profession will tell you, it is because he has arrived. And Judge Conway's philosophy of life would bear them out.

Judge Conway is well-satisfied with his life to date. Could he start it over, it would be the same. Again he would become a lawyer or, he added a moment later, a doctor.

"Well, eh—doctors serve the people," he said when asked to explain.

"Do lawyers?" he was asked.

"Lawyers and judges," he replied instantly, "stand between the State and the people. They're the guardians of the liberty of the common man."

DEMOCRACY

"Would you be thinking of democracy?" he was asked. "And, if so, what is your interpretation of democracy?"

"I was," he said, "and of democracy as it should be. What it should be to the man in the street."

Judge Conway abruptly leaned back in his chair in his chambers in the Appellate Division Court House on Monroe Place. From an inner pocket he took a billfold, removed a printed card and thrust it forward.

"Here," he said, "is the best definition of democracy I know."

The card bore this:

"On my honor I will do my best to do my duty to God and my country and to obey the Scout Law—to help other people at all times—to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake and morally strong."—The Scout Oath.

"A Scout is trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, reverent."—The Scout Law.

ACTIVE IN SCOUTING

The Scout movement is his chief, almost his sole, nonprofessional interest. He has no hobbies. For relaxation he reads detective stories.

Judge Conway's interest in scouting was born of his admiration for James C. Cropsey, who was active in the movement throughout his lifetime. When Cropsey, then a Supreme Court justice, died in 1936, Judge Conway succeeded him as president of Brooklyn Council, Boy Scouts of America. Thereafter he was chairman of the council's board of directors and is now its vice chairman. He also is a member of the executive committee of region 2, which embraces the scout organizations of New York and New Jersey.

Judge Conway first met Cropsey in 1913, when the latter, a Republican and district attorney of Kings County, gave him a 3-month summer appointment as a deputy assistant district attorney. The temporary appointment was on recommendation of the Republican lawyer Cropsey had just engaged to head the appeals bureau of the district attorney's office. That lawyer had been Conway's employer.

STEPPING STONES

Like his lawyer father, the late Joseph P. Conway, Judge Conway always has been a Democrat. With a promotion to assistant district attorney, his temporary appointment continued until April 1, 1920, when he resigned to enter private practice.

In 1928 Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed him superintendent of insurance. Eighteen months later he was appointed a county judge, and eighteen months after that elected a justice of the Supreme Court on a joint Republican-Democratic nomination.

Designated a member of the appellate division in 1937, he was detached and assigned by Governor Lehman to preside throughout 1939 over an extraordinary term of the supreme court in Buffalo concerned with charges of municipal corruption.

On January 1, 1940, Governor LEHMAN appointed him to the court of appeals in Albany, the State's highest tribunal. He was elected to a full 14-year term on that bench in November of that year.

WHAT HE LIKED BEST

Asked which phase of his long and varied legal career he had enjoyed most, he grinned boyishly and said:

"My 17 months on homicide in the district attorney's office. It was a day and night job, on duty 24 hours of each day, including Sunday. I'd go back tomorrow for my present pay ($28,000 a year), except that at my age I couldn't take it. I have to read detective stories now."

While nothing in his physical appearance indicates that time has treated him other than kindly, Judge Conway concedes at least one major sacrifice to the passing years.

"I used to smoke all the time," he said, "cigarettes, cigars, and pipe. I really enjoyed it. But it began to slow me down. Six years ago I quit."

Born in Brooklyn on April 3, 1889, Judge Conway is a graduate of Boys' High School, where he was a classmate of the school's present principal, Alfred Tausk. He attended St. John's University briefly, then, when 16, obtained a job in a law office and began attending evening classes at Fordham. He graduated cum laude from Fordham with an LL. B. in 1911. Since then he has received honorary degrees of LL. D. from both Fordham and St. John's, and also from Syracuse University.

In 1917 he married Irene M. Hewitt, and they had four children. She died in 1929.

In 1933 he married the former Irene M. O'Neil, with whom he lives at 845 Carroll Street.

"I Speak for Democracy"—Prize Winning Essay by Miss Gloria Chomiak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in a recent contest sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Radio Manufacturers Association, and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, which sought the best radio script among 1,000,000 high school students in the Nation on the subject I Speak for Democracy, Miss Gloria Chomiak, of 510 South Heald Street, Wilmington, Del., a student of the Wilmington High School, was designated as one of the four winners. This Delaware girl is the daughter of a former immigrant from the Ukraine and spent most of her childhood in Fort Vermillion, Canada, and in recent years came to live in Delaware.

In winning this contest on democracy, Miss Chomiak, a senior in Wilmington High School, has brought great honor not only to herself and to the State of Delaware but also to the students of our Nation. This essay should be read not only by every student but more important, it should be read by every adult in this country. Far too often we who have always enjoyed the advantages of a democracy have failed to appreciate the real benefits of self-government.

When we stop to consider that during the recent elections in our country nearly one-half of our citizens failed to exercise their privilege to vote, it is high time that we who claim to be citizens of this great Republic, the last stronghold of democracy, awaken to the warning cited in this essay.

Before asking unanimous consent to have this entire essay incorporated in the RECORD, I want to call the attention of the Senate to the first paragraph, in which Miss Chomiak said, "I speak for democracy, because two generations back my ancestors could not; because if I do not speak of it—if many more do not speak of it, there may come a time when we too, will not have the right to do so. For today more than at any other time governing powers are pitted one against another. It seems a crisis has been reached, and must be broken. We who believe in democracy cannot trust to our living it alone. We must stand up, and speak and be heard in its cause."

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have this entire essay embodied in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I speak for Democracy, because two generations back my ancestors could not; because if I do not speak of it—if many more do not speak of it, there may come a time when we too, will not have the right to do so. For today more than at any other time governing powers are pitted one against another. It seems a crisis has been reached, and must be broken. We who believe in democracy cannot trust to our living it alone. We must stand up, and speak and be heard in its cause.

And what is this thing called democracy? It is a thought discovered in ancient Greece; a thing a Slavic serf dreamed of too much and paid for with his life; an ideal, started in its practice by a model Parliament of England; and bitterly struggled for in Louis' France. It is a leavening of revolutions, a stepchild of utopia; a system, first defined as a government for and by the people in our own country, where it has grown to what we know and love today.

It is a government that has been developing for hundreds of years, and shall develop for hundreds more; a government that has outgrown an initial stage wherein it served the citizens of Greece—citizens who did not include the underprivileged and the captive and who constituted but a fraction of the population. It is a government that has weathered the time when a land-laden Polish baron frowned upon it, thinking of his foreign serfs, tilling their foreign fields for his benefit alone. He worried little for he could dispose of them at his pleasure if he found one who thought in their number.

DEMOCRACY NEVER SLEPT

It is a government that has grown great since that medieval year when England's people first had representatives before their king—the first representatives before authority a people ever had.

It won a place for itself during the bitter civil war of France, when people were hungry and angered with the extravagant caprices of those who ruled through heritage, and it found a home in the New World when honest colonists learned to demand a rule by their own choice.

It has grown from a privilege of the few to a right of the common, risen from a persecuted idea to a mighty ideal upheld in safety by millions. It has developed into a system whose imperfections can be remedied, and whose virtues are a God-given right.

For this democracy is a natural system. Men were created equal in their rights and their responsibilities. And is not intelligent participation in governing among them? Men were given individual minds and desires. Ought not they have a right to voice them?

Democracy is a system with flaws, because through the ages men have erred and do err, and a democracy is only as right as its people. Democracy is able to abolish its principles by its own excess.

A cynic spoke the truth about it when he said that democracy can make each man his own oppressor. Yet, I believe that greater men have said a truer thing about democracy: that the people's government cannot—shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD immediately following the essay itself an editorial which appeared in the Wilmington Morning News under date of January 17, 1950, extending their congratulations and the congratulations of every citizen of Delaware to Gloria Chomiak.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRATULATIONS TO GLORIA

A very recent newcomer to this community has brought honor to Wilmington and the State of Delaware. Gloria Chomiak, 17-year-old Wilmington high school student who came here only 2 years ago from Canada, is one of the four winners of the fourth annual Voice of Democracy contest.

That is, the address she wrote and later delivered over a radio station here has been adjudged one of the four best among approximately a million produced by boys and girls in the 48 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Puerto Rico. So she will go to Washington to receive a $800 college scholarship, meet the President, attend sessions of Congress, and broadcast over the radio networks and the Voice of America.

These are substantial rewards. Gloria, whose parents were born in the Ukraine and who spent most of her childhood in Fort Vermillion, Alberta—so far from the centers of population that she went to school by correspondence under the supervision of an adult—might be in a quandary to say which she likes best. But they will all contribute to her knowledge of the democratic way.

We congratulate her. And we also congratulate the National Association of Broadcasters and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce for sponsoring this worthwhile competition. It is good to know that young Americans, and young immigrants, can speak for democracy with force and conviction.

Ship Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank Reil, director of information for the American Merchant Marine Institute, which appeared in the current issue of Railway Progress:

SHIP OPERATIONS

(By Frank Reil)

"Nobody likes subsidies or likes to admit getting them," said the November Railway Progress in its Behind the Washington Ticker column. And to this perhaps should be added: "Don't talk about my subsidy; pick on the other fellow's."

However, the same November issue did same talking about subsidies for the merchant marine but it didn't tell the whole story. It was chiefly concerned with Federal aid for new ship construction, which in the final analysis is a subsidy for shipbuilders. But another type of assistance for operating the merchant marine was hardly mentioned and it deserves much better notice.

Can you imagine a subsidy in which Uncle Sam gets his money back? Or one that has been so small over the years that it ranks last on the long list of Government aid?

This oddity is the ship operating differential subsidy and is the only one of all the Federal grants that is subject to recapture by the United States Treasury.

The price-support programs for a wide variety of agricultural production, mining, and other industries are strictly a one-way proposition. The air lines have their mail payments—the merchant marine said good riddance to this type of assistance in 1933—but there are no recapture provisions.

Other forms of indirect Government aid, such as protective tariffs, land grants for some railroads, and the second-class mailing privileges for newspapers and periodicals,

are of such a type that recapture or refunds to the Government are not feasible. [Not only feasible but actual when it comes to those land grants. The railroads got land worth $429,000,000 from the Government, and over the years gave the Government preferential rate treatment worth $1,[illegible], Net profit to the Government on that deal: $1,[illegible].—EDITOR.]

REASONABLE SCOPE

Having taken care of the "other fellow's subsidy," let us now examine this unique one for American shipping. At the outset it can be said that its scope and amount has been greatly exaggerated. Actually, it is relatively picayune when compared to others paid, and, as will be seen later, Cheddar cheese has received greater financial assistance than the operation of the American merchant marine.

Operating subsidies are restricted to American ships engaged in the foreign commerce of the United States. Our ships in the coastwise and intercoastal services are not eligible for them. Out of 60 companies only 13 are subsidized—a fact which will surprise many who think that all steamship companies are subsidized. In September 1939, before world shipping became affected by the war, there were 141 American subsidized ships, or 55 percent of our dry-cargo tonnage, in foreign trade. Today, with an expanded merchant marine, there are less than 200 ships receiving subsidy, or 36 percent. Incidentally, no payments were made after Pearl Harbor, and they were not resumed until 1947.

The sole purpose of the operating differential is to place an American company at approximately the same cost level as that of his foreign competitors. The payments do not give an American operator full parity with his foreign competitors, as they cover only the difference in wages, subsistence, stores and supplies, repairs and maintenance, and marine insurance. Students of business accounting will note that much higher fixed charges as management, depreciation, and other items are not considered.

HOW MUCH BASIS

The Maritime Commission carefully determines this differential between United States and foreign costs for the five items mentioned and payments are made to a company on a voyage basis. Roughly, the vessel expenses on these five items are approximately 45 percent lower under a foreign flag.

A company that accepts an operating subsidy must agree to many regulations imposed upon it by the Maritime Commission under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The company must operate a certain number of ships over specified routes on approved schedules and may not operate them on other routes. The size of the crew and wages must not be less than Government requirements. Even the limit of salaries to be paid company executives is set by law. The company is also obliged to set aside reserve funds for new construction. These are only a few of the restrictions placed on a subsidized company and many shipowners find them so confining that they prefer to operate without Government assistance.

Moreover, these payments do not assure a profit or guarantee against a loss. The American company must still solicit cargo and compete for the available cargo. If there is to be a profit, he must operate efficiently. If there are profits of more than 10 percent, they must be held in reserve for a 10-year period. At the end of that time, one-half of this reserve must be returned to the Government, up to the total amount of subsidy paid.

How has this recapture worked out in actual practice? For 10 of the subsidized companies, the first 10-year recapture period has recently expired. Five of the companies have paid back in full every dollar received from Uncle Sam. Another company's earnings were such that the Government recovered 90 percent of its payments. On an over-all basis, 72.5 percent of the subsidy paid the 10 companies has been returned to the Treasury. Of the $40,400,000 paid these companies during the 10 years, some $29,300,000 has been given back. In other words, the subsidy has been at the rate of only $1,100,000 a year.

As to how this compares with other Federal aid let us turn to Senate Document 13, Eightieth Congress, first session, prepared by the Bureau of the Budget, containing a listing of Federal subsidy payment to business and farmers for the fiscal years 1934 through 1946. Topped off by more than $4,000,000,000 in land-conservation payments, it reaches the staggering total of $13,000,000,000.

The figure for ship operating subsidy, covering all companies, is $48,700,000, which places it behind the Commodity Credit Corporation subsidy for cheddar cheese at $67,700,000 and of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation payments for coffee at $51,[illegible].

But the Budget Bureau's figures do not include recapture for ship operation and according to the Maritime Commission, the recapture position for all lines in 1947 indicated this subsidy total could be reduced to $21,200,000.

At this figure ship operation slips to the very bottom of the list, dropping below the subsidies for coffee, sheep and lamb, beef production, milk fluid, and wheat for alcohol.

In view of the importance of the American merchant marine as an instrument of national defense and a servant of our overseas commerce, the American taxpayer should have little reason for concern about the modest Government expenses for operating on the oceans of the world the finest merchant marine in our history.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two broadcasts by me, on December 19, 1949, and January 2, 1950, under the headline "Happenings in Washington." They cover programs Nos. 14 and 15.

There being no objection, the broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 14, December 19, 1949)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and extending sincere and whole-hearted Christmas greetings to my fellow citizens of Pennsylvania.

This is a great season of the year for all mankind—for all men and women of good will, regardless of color or creed, who worship one God.

It is, as all know, the most important religious holiday for Christians the world over—the most solemn and, at the same time, the most joyous. This is a monumental season in history and in religion.

It is also a most important time for American citizens of the Jewish faith, as well as for Jews the world over. In this season, falling each year just before Christmas week, is the ancient Jewish holiday of Chanukah, the feast of the candles. One of the important religious celebrations of the Jewish religion, it tends further to emphasize the importance of the season.

This is a time of brotherhood, of kindness and of homage to the spiritual things of life.

It is a time also to count our blessings. We can rejoice that America has been blessed in greater measure than any other nation in history.

As Pennsylvanians we rejoice doubly because so much has been given to our State. I refer not alone to material blessings, although Pennsylvania's portion is so large—with its 171,000 flourishing farms, its 17,000 diversified industrial plants, its annual pay roll of $5,000,000,000.

I speak rather of spiritual blessings.

William Penn, the founder, was a religious, understanding man. Love of God and faith in his fellow men were his inspiration when he launched his holy experiment in the New World. He was a man of peace. The great State's foundations were of social, political, and religious freedom. The brotherhood of man was engraved on its cornerstone. Work, tolerance, and thrift were the principles which guided and built Pennsylvania.

From its beginnings our State has continued in its tradition of Christian tolerance.

Although it has grown great economically, it has never outgrown the spiritual touch which it received at the beginning.

That is why today, we have more places of worship—cathedrals and churches, meetinghouses, synagogues and temples—than any other State. That is why we have a greater active church membership than other States.

These are good things for Pennsylvanians to keep in mind in the Christmas season.

This fundamentally spiritual side is doubly important.

It has been a priceless end in itself. Americans are better for having it.

But it has also helped our people to build our strong structure of liberty and independence.

In our land the seed of human dignity and freedom was planted in the good soil of love of God, tolerance, work, and thrift. From this seed has grown the tree of America. It is sturdy and strong. Its branches are widespreading enough today to provide shelter, security, and opportunity for 150,000,000 men, women, and children.

So long as we water and cultivate this tree, it will continue to flourish and to serve us as it has served our forefathers.

But we must water it; we must cultivate it. This tree cannot grow in the future as it has in the past if we fail to do our parts.

It is here today because our fathers, our grandfathers, and those who came before them had the will to work, to save, to build, to plan ahead, and to live at peace with the world and with each other. They were courageous. They were self-reliant. They were tolerant.

They did not assume that what had been handed down to them was theirs alone to profit from without effort on their part. They did not assume that no effort on their part was necessary to provide themselves and their families with security.

Today, unfortunately, a substantial number of people in this country accept false assumptions. They think that men no longer have to work for security—that they can simply conjure it up at the ballot box.

They think that a vote for this man or that, for this political party or that, is all that is necessary to assure themselves prosperity, security, peace, and independence.

My fellow Pennsylvanians, the history of the world teaches us that we cannot have these things by substituting legislation for perspiration. We cannot have them by substituting wishful thinking for toil and effort.

The really precious things of life—security, peace, freedom, and human dignity, must be earned the hard way. And, once they are earned in any nation, each succeeding generation must earn them again—or they shall be lost.

History is full of examples that prove this. Ancient Rome built the greatest empire and the finest civilization until comparatively modern times. But, what happened?

The people of Rome, the hard core of this vast empire, grew soft. They refused to work and fight. They said they had done their share of toiling. They said they had reached the pinnacle, and that others should now do the working and fighting for them.

They enlisted legions of mercenaries to fight for them. They brought in slaves to do the work.

The average Roman—the little fellow—what we call "the man in the street"—wound up as the beneficiary, and eventually, as the victim, of bread and circuses.

He demanded hand-outs from his Government—free food and free entertainment. He was a citizen, so his legislators gave him what he wanted.

That was security by legislation substituted for security earned by work.

From that point on the Roman was a goner. The fate of the Roman Empire was sealed.

Hard-muscled barbarians who did not fear work and who did their own fighting closed in. They broke up the greatest empire the world had seen up to that point.

As a footnote, this should be pointed out. These were mostly the same tribes of barbarians whose ancestors had been beaten in war again and again by the fighting, hard-working Romans of the earlier days.

In Great Britain today people are seeking security through legislation. They have turned their country into a socialistic state. The Government is moving in to take over industry after industry. The most recent is steel. In exchange for social services, they are sacrificing freedom. The right to strike has been going out the window. The right to work at a job of one's choice is being restricted. The right of a man to start up a little business of his own is being narrowed sharply.

Taxes are far higher than anything we know in this country. Long after such countries as Belgium, Holland, France, Italy—all very hard hit by the war—have removed nearly all, if not all, of the wartime restrictions—socialistic England continues under rigid ration controls of what a man may buy with his money. He continues to use ration coupons.

Britain, thank heaven, still permits a man to stand up and publicly criticize his Government. It permits him to go to the ballot box to change the party and the system in power.

But how long can these freedoms remain if the spread of socialism—which means leaning on the Government for more and more services and benefits—continues?

My fellow Pennsylvanians, these are matters for us to consider in this holiday season and in all seasons. We must not sacrifice the basic things which gave our Nation such a solid foundation and which fostered its growth until today it has become the world's richest and strongest nation.

We must not assume that because we are in this exalted position today, it is permanent.

We must not assume that toiling and fighting and striving are ended for Americans.

We must not assume that we can permit others to do our work for us and to fight our battles for us.

We must not assume that we no longer need to earn security—that we only have to vote for it.

We must not assume that if we trade individual initiative, individual freedom, the right to do our own thinking and our own acting—for hand-outs from Washington—we can regain these precious rights any time we want to.

Our forefathers in America knew better. They knew the price was eternal vigilance, hard work, and an abiding trust in God.

Earlier, I said this was a time to count our blessings.

Today there is no greater blessing for any man than to be able to say, "I am an American."

To be an American means one may choose his rulers and discard them. It means he may stand in a public place and voice his opinions and views without fear of secret police. It means he may have his day in court if his rights are challenged or threatened, and be protected from arrest at the whim of a dictator.

It means protection by the world's greatest nation.

It means the right to worship openly at the shrine of his choice.

It means greater economic prosperity and greater economic opportunity for all the people, than have ever been offered or enjoyed anywhere else.

Yes, my fellow Pennsylvanians, there is no greater blessing than to be able to say, "I am an American."

In all the rest of the world there is nothing comparable to what we have in our country.

Consider the other nations.

There are dictatorships. There are police states. There are vast areas where religious freedom has been abolished and where such religion as remains is being bent to the will of political dictators.

There are great areas of poverty and hunger. There are large portions of the globe where fear for their lives prevents men from speaking their views of their rulers. There are areas of revolution and turmoil and weakness.

Yes, it is great to be able to say, "I am an American."

You and I can say it today with pride and dignity because our forefathers worked hard, trusted God, and were ever vigilant against encroachments of their freedom.

To keep what we have, I urge that we follow in their footsteps.

Let us work hard.

Let us trust God.

Let us be on guard against encroachments of our rights, no matter what the source.

Then we shall have earned the right to the blessing of being an American.

I think back a few years ago to a wartime Christmas season in 1944. As Governor of Pennsylvania, I spoke at the Christmas tree lighting in the rotunda of the State Capitol Building in Harrisburg.

I spoke of our State's great patriotic service, with approximately 900,000 men in uniform with 4,000,000 other Pennsylvanians producing food and munitions for the United States and our allies.

I reminded that, throughout our history, Pennsylvanians had always responded in the hour of their Nation's need.

Today the shooting war is over. But, today there is still need—as there will always be the need—for men and women to be vigilantly on guard to protect our heritage. We must protect them so that we can hand on to our posterity the kind of free, independent, God-fearing land which was given into our keeping.

And now, I should like to quote the final sentences of that 1944 Christmas message in the rotunda of the State capitol. They are equally true today:

"All our hopes and aspirations are embraced in the spirit of Christmas. We rejoice that the Christmas spirit lives forever to gladden the hearts of men and to lift them above the cares and strife of a darkened world.

"We rejoice that Christmas manifests itself in love and kindness and brings hope to those who live in the shadow of tyranny and oppression.

"We are thankful that Christmas brings assurance of brighter, happier times to come, when justice and brotherhood will rule, under God, in a world of universal freedom and peace."

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. The season's greetings and God bless you all.

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 15, January 2, 1950)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

As we go into a new year, the Eighty-first Congress is about to open its second session. Congress must handle many critical issues in the months ahead.

It will be called upon to determine whether we shall protect our national solvency by returning to sound fiscal policies.

On the international front it must face vital new problems due to the Communist conquest of all China.

In a time like this, you have a right to know where your Senator stands on the big issues ahead. It gives you an opportunity to tell him how you—the people—feel on these matters. As your Senator, and before that, as your Governor, I have sought and welcomed the views and opinions of the people of our State.

In this broadcast I propose to discuss where I stand on the big issues which will reach Congress.

But first I would like to point out some encouraging signs that I have encountered among the people back home. I have found that more and more Pennsylvanians have developed a deeper interest in the kind of government they have been getting from Washington.

They are showing greater concern over socialized proposals, deficit financing, increased taxes, foreign policy, and Government inefficiency.

More and more they are asking these questions:

"How can we continue as a free government if we spend more than we take in?"

"How can we have all of these so-called social-welfare benefits without paying for them in higher taxes?"

And the question that stands out above the others is this:

"How can we have security from the cradle to the grave without surrendering our liberty and freedom to an all-powerful central government?"

I am happy to report that the people have made it clear to me that they prefer liberty and opportunity under the American system of individual freedom rather than the false hope of security under a socialized state. I shall be guided by that fundamental principle.

On the subject of Federal taxing and spending I stand just where I stood when I came to Washington 3 years ago.

I believe government costs too much and reaches too deeply into the pockets of our people. Government has grown too big and too complex. I favor, and shall vote for, lower taxes and less expensive government. That means I shall work for a balanced budget, economy, efficiency, and the elimination of waste and extravagance.

I favor removal of nearly all of the wartime excise taxes. These taxes, in peacetime, are an unfair burden on the individual consumer. They are a drag on business. Elimination of these taxes will stimulate buying. It will increase the number of

productive jobs. It will create new markets for workers. And in the end the increase in income-tax payments will offset any revenue loss caused by the removal of these nuisance taxes.

The matter of civil-rights legislation will be coming up early in this session and may become involved in filibustering tactics.

Never in my life have I tried, by filibuster, to prevent a vote on any issue. I believe that, after reasonable debate, every important bill should come to a vote for an honest decision. Last year I voted for a change in the Senate rules to curb unlimited debate and to give bills a chance. I shall continue my efforts to bring the civil-rights bill to a final vote and shall support a sound civil-rights program.

Let me remind my fellow Pennsylvanians of this—the filibuster has never been used by Republicans to block a vote on civil rights. I regret this fact is sometimes forgotten.

Early in the session legislation to liberalize the Displaced Persons Act will come before the Senate. The present law, for which I voted in the Eightieth Congress, is being carefully studied by the Senate Judiciary Committee. That committee is required to report its findings not later than January 25. I shall give this report careful consideration and will vote for amendments to remove any injustices or inequalities in the existing law.

We Pennsylvanians live in a State which is a true melting pot. Our people are of all creeds and races. Our people come from many different nationality stocks.

Pennsylvania is proof that diverse races and nationality groups can live together and work together in harmony. Pennsylvania's greatness has been built upon this blending.

In the field of labor, I shall continue to support the principles of the Taft-Hartley Act. Like many others, I do not believe that the law today is perfect. I think it can be improved in several respects. A few months ago Republicans and Democrats joined in an effort to improve it. We brought forth a score of amendments to remove inequities. What happened?

Why, the administration pigeonholed our bill. It did not want the Taft-Hartley Act improved. It would accept nothing short of outright repeal.

The Taft-Hartley law was not improved in 1949 solely because the administration leaders in the House blocked the proposed amendments after they had passed the Senate.

They called it a slave-labor law. Well, look around. After 3 years, nobody has been enslaved—not even a little bit. The individual worker is better off than ever. The only thing that has happened in this. His union leaders now have a greater responsibility to him and to the public.

Our State Department is close to recognition of Communist China. I am flatly opposed to such recognition. I believe the President and the State Department are guilty of a terrible blunder in China. In coming years, this might prove to be the worst blunder in our entire international history.

The administration in power and the State Department betrayed China at Yalta and Potsdam. Later they refused to aid the Nationalist Chinese Government—our wartime ally. Instead, they permitted the Nationalist Government to go down to defeat, crushed by Communist forces, armed and advised by Soviet Russia. Thus, our administration surrendered 500,000,000 Chinese to communism. The way was opened for the expansion of communism all over east Asia.

Now the administration proposes to compound its colossal blunder. It would give its recognition and its blessing to the Chinese Communist Government. I have opposed our Chinese policy and I shall continue to oppose it.

If our kind of government is to survive, we must not compromise with communism anywhere.

I have supported the Hoover program for the reorganization and consolidation of the sprawling and conflicting agencies which clutter up Washington. The Hoover Commission recommendations would eliminate waste, overlapping, and duplication. They would save from three to four billion dollars a year for the taxpayers. I shall continue to vote for sound reorganization proposals in the interest of economy and efficiency.

Another bill, slated for Senate action early this year, would legalize the basing point method of freight charges on commodities, except where such basing points are in restraint of trade. This bill is important for the protection of jobs in our Pennsylvania factories. I have had many communications from Pennsylvania businessmen and labor organizations approving it. I shall vote for the passage of this measure.

Shortly before the close of the last session of Congress, the House passed a measure to extend social security. I am in favor of broadening the base of our social-security system to provide protection for more people. For example, I shall vote to permit coverage for the self-employed. At present the self-employed have no protection under the law, although they are taxed for its upkeep.

There are some measures expected to reach the Senate this year which I shall continue to oppose as I have opposed them in the past. I refer particularly to the Brannan plan of farm subsidies, socialized medicine and Federal aid to education.

If you study these three measures you will discover that they share the same objectionable feature—they open the door to strong, centralized Federal control over large segments of American life.

They promise something for nothing. Actually, they must result in extra taxes on our workers to pay the bill.

The Brannan plan was beaten in Congress in 1949. But it is expected to be revived in 1950. Under the Brannan plan, the Federal Government would have the American farmer by the throat. The Government would be able to dictate to the farmer, to an extent far greater than ever before, what he could and could not grow and how he must use his land.

Once that principle is established, there is no telling how far future administrations might carry it. The national farm organizations have been fighting this scheme bitterly. They know it means the end of free enterprise on the farm.

Under socialized medicine, the Government would move in on the Nation's physicians and dentists. They would be controlled just as the farmer would be controlled. The average citizen would suffer under assembly line, mass production treatment. He is being told this would be free. Actually, he would be taxed heavily to pay for inadequate service plus the cost of Government red tape, just as in England.

I voted against Federal aid to education in 1949, when it was before the Senate. The measure is now in the House of Representatives. If the bill should be amended by the House, the Senate would be asked to vote again on the new version.

I shall continue to vote "no." This bill shatters a fundamental cornerstone of the American school system.

It opens the door to very strong central control over education from Washington. It breaks down our traditional State and local controls. It threatens to destroy the free educational system of America.

As Pennsylvanians, there is another thing we must keep in mind on all these proposed new services from Washington—the high price we must pay.

Invariably such new experiments are costly for Pennsylvanians. They involve new spending, with Washington collecting the money and reallocating it among the States.

Under this system Pennsylvania always gets back—as its share—a small percentage of what it contributes. It is always taxed for the benefit of other States.

As a Member of the United States Senate, I must naturally consider legislation from the viewpoint of what is good for the Nation. But as a Senator from Pennsylvania, I must also consider legislation as it affects the interest of our State and all its people.

And when I find—as I find in these cases—that what is best for the State in the long run, and what is best for the Nation in the long run—is exactly the same, then I know that I am right.

I have discussed the outstanding problems that will come before Congress early in the session.

But to my mind the greatest issue, involving the stability of our Republic and the preservation of American freedom, is the threat of national bankruptcy.

We cannot continue deficit financing. We must balance the budget. The administration argues that a balanced budget can be achieved only by increasing taxes.

I challenge that philosophy.

The traditional American way is to cut spending to fit our income.

Let us save America by returning to that sound, time-tested plan as an established policy of government.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and extending to all my fellow Pennsylvanians my sincere wishes for a happy and prosperous new year.

A Suggestion for Reducing Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial written by John A. Kennedy, editor and publisher of the San Diego Journal. The suggestions made deserve full consideration and public discussion.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

As I sat in the press gallery on Capitol Hill this week listening to congressional debate over the budget deficit, it occurred to me one more or less painless way to cut Federal spending would be to put Government services on a cafeteria-style or pay-for-what-you-get basis.

What I propose is simply to fix a charge on some of the many important and special functions Uncle Sam now renders free to his citizens. They are worth hard cash to groups and individuals now receiving them gratuitously.

For example, Joe Doe thinks nothing of paying the county $2 for a marriage license or the State a similar amount for a driver's permit. If the city lays a new road and sidewalk in front of his home, he expects to pay a pro rata share of the cost. His gasoline taxes generally build and maintain highways.

But almost without exception, the Federal Government makes no charge, or a nominal one, for licensing and inspection which directly benefit special interests and individuals.

Why, for example, should Uncle Sam not exact a payment for the valuable export licenses the Department of Commerce issues to businessmen? Or for the certificates of operation, charters and inspection services given gratis to interstate motor and freight carriers by the Interstate Commerce Commission? Why shouldn't the Civil Aeronautics Administration or the Maritime Commission be reimbursed at least for the paper work involved in issuing charters to aviation and shipping companies?

Is there any reason why the Federal Communications Commission should not charge for the valuable franchises it dispenses in the form of licenses every 3 years to the more than 2,000 broadcasting stations on the air? These broadcasters are in business not only as a public service but obviously because radio appeals to them as a pleasant way of earning their bread and butter.

Many hundreds of free services performed by the Agriculture and Interior Departments for farm and other interests are even more to the point.

Take the case of the proposed purchase of American Overseas Airlines by Pan American for $17,500,000. An examiner and Federal staffs have been working on the case for many months. Why shouldn't the buyer and seller reimburse the Government for its costs in handling the sought-after approval.

Drew Pearson, Bob Allen, and a Baltimore group are seeking the frequency of WBAL, Baltimore, after the FCC set the station's license renewal for hearing over alleged rules' infractions. This Pearson et al. request probably has cost the Government more than $50,000 already. The Pearson group probably would be glad to pay their way.

I am also in the radio and television business. Why shouldn't I pay the Government for servicing my various requests which have helped make my radio businesses profitable?

The railroads want about $100,000,000 more a year for handling mail. Let them pay the cost of their hearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

When the telephone company wants a rate increase or something of value from the FCC let it pay for the cost of the hearings.

Power companies seek grants from the Federal Power Commission—corporations want Securities and Exchange Commission approval for issuing stocks and bonds. You can multiply the examples a thousandfold. Let them pay for what they get and not cause a tax boost from the rest of the public.

To take other examples more directly affecting the man in the street rather than the entrepreneur, over 500,000 pilots and technicians hold CAA licenses for which they pay absolutely nothing. Another 80,000 amateur radio "hams" and 60,000 commercial radio operators get their 5-year licenses at no cost from the FCC. Could payment of a token $2 to $5 for the paper work involved in preparation of these valuable pieces of paper be considered discriminating by these licensees?

Then there is the mammoth Government Printing Office, which distributes the bulk of its output without cost. It is true that a nominal charge, reflecting only actual printing, not preparation, costs is placed on these documents prepared at the request of individual Government agencies. But those folk enterprising and knowing enough to ask for the publications at their congressional offices or at the originating Government agency usually get them "for free." Why?

In 1947, the Public Printer sold 36,000,000 pamphlets for $3,238,000. But over twice that number—86,000,000—were distributed free through offices on Capitol Hill and elsewhere.

Despite the hue and cry against pyramiding high taxes, we have long since accepted at least the principle of taxation according to ability to pay. Why should we object, therefore, to paying directly cash-on-the-line for specific services rendered particular groups by Government agencies?

I imagine that some skeptics will look down their noses at this suggestion as providing too little in additional Government moneys to offset the added headaches of bureaucratic bookkeeping.

But this is to ignore the basic fact that multiplied throughout the whole fabric of Government, such fees could be fixed on the cost of services performed and could add up to a lot of money for the Treasury.

We are headed for an estimated $5,000,000,000 deficit this year.

About 80 cents of every budget dollar is earmarked for defense purposes or in payment of past wars, leaving only 20 cents for peacetime expenditures. This 20 cents must be shaved to bring us within sight of a balanced economy.

Proposals of the Hoover Commission for streamlining the clumsy superstructure of Government—most of which have already been endorsed by this paper—will help.

But I respectfully suggest that putting Uncle Sam more on a cash-on-the-line basis in his dealings with John Q. Public—in the best tradition of American business—might help to take some of the red out of our national bookkeeping.

JOHN A. KENNEDY,
Editor and Publisher.

Nonagricultural Employment in North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by William R. Waind, cooperating representative of the North Dakota State Employment Service and North Dakota Unemployment Compensation Division, dated December 19, 1949, and the analysis and table dealing with the nonagricultural-employment situation in North Dakota enclosed with his letter.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[North Dakota State Employment Service and North Dakota Unemployment Compensation Division, Bismarck, N. Dak., in cooperation with U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics]

DECEMBER 19, 1949.

GENTLEMEN: On November 18 we forwarded to you our first estimates on nonagricultural employment for manufacturing industries in North Dakota, based on figures obtained from cooperating employers. At that time, we stated that in the near future we would be able to release estimates on total nonagricultural employment. We are enclosing our estimates on total nonagricultural employment for the years 1947, 1948 and the first 11 months of 1949.

Please note that estimates of employment in the construction industry for 1949 are not available. These estimates have been included for the years of 1947 and 1948, and we hope to be able to provide current estimates for this industry in a short time.

Month-to-month estimates of nonagricultural employment will be forwarded to you on a regular monthly basis.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM R. WAIND,
Cooperating Representative.

[North Dakota State Employment Service and North Dakota Unemployment Compensation Division, Bismarck, N. Dak., in cooperation with U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, November 1949]

An analysis of nonagricultural employment (excluding construction) in North Dakota shows that in 1949 average employment during the first 11 months has come within 0.3 percent of that obtained in the peak year of 1948. Specifically for the first 11 months of the year nonagricultural employment (excluding construction) has averaged 100,047 per month, while averaging 100,380 per month during 1948.

Month to month figures show that we exceeded 1948 employment during the period March through September, but have fallen below 1948 during the months January, February, October, and November. Current estimates put November employment at 102,120, a decline of 1,000 from November of 1948.

The principle contributing factor to the over-all decline in employment in 1949 was the decline in the number employed in the railroad industry. This industry employed an average of 1,433 less per month in 1949 than in 1948 due largely to the completion of the construction program carried on in the State by the railroads in 1948.

Industries reporting major gains over 1948 were Government, with an average monthly increase of 858 (due to such projects as Garrison Dam, Reclamation projects, etc.); communication and other public utilities up 334 per month; and wholesale and retail trade up 313.

Manufacturing employment recorded a decline (average 268 per month) from 1948. This decline was centered entirely in the nondurable group and was largely due a decline in employment in the manufacture of food and kindred products. The durable goods group reported an over-all gain largely as a result of increased employment in the stone, clay, and glass industry.

The 1949 employment averaged 6.1 percent more than the 1947 average monthly employment of 94,310. Here, too, major increases were reported in the Government, wholesale, and retail trade, and communication and other public utilities groups. These gains were offset somewhat by declines in manufacturing and in railroad employment.

In the period under consideration (1947–49) the largest increase in nonagricultural employment (including construction) came between 1947 and 1948. The 1948 employment averaged 6,113 more per month than it did in 1947. Increases in construction (up 2,042 per month), railroads (up 1,298 per month), wholesale and retail trade (up 2,789 per month), and Government (up 1,442 per month) were the principal factors behind the over-all increase. During this period the only industries recording declines were mining, down 29 per month, and manufacturing, down 16.

Estimated nonagricultural employment

JANUARY TO DECEMBER 1947

Industry	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
Total nonagricultural employment [1]	93,330	93,110	94,770	96,430	97,380	99,930	100,480	101,130	102,160	102,400	102,970	103,400
Mining	800	770	770	740	770	770	800	820	790	900	900	930
Construction	3,010	2,950	2,930	3,540	4,840	5,520	6,180	6,470	6,100	5,930	5,220	4,230
Building construction	1,190	1,130	1,100	1,410	1,760	1,920	2,180	2,280	2,250	2,070	1,870	1,640
General construction	550	490	490	660	1,040	1,790	2,130	2,290	2,030	1,830	1,470	1,290
Special trade construction	1,270	1,290	1,340	1,470	1,740	1,810	1,870	1,900	1,910	1,930	1,880	1,950
Manufacturing	5,900	5,700	5,920	6,090	6,160	6,270	6,430	6,530	6,360	6,220	5,350	5,020
Durable goods	700	710	740	770	810	850	860	820	760	640	530	530
Lumber, wood products, furniture and fixtures	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	25
Stone, clay, and glass	130	130	140	160	200	250	260	250	210	170	200	160
Primary and fabricated metals	230	230	260	290	290	290	310	300	290	270	300	290
Machinery and transportation equipment	190	220	220	230	230	230	270	280	280	310	300	300
Other durable goods	90	90	90	100	100	100	90	90	90	100	100	90
Nondurable goods	5,190	5,190	5,180	5,250	5,250	5,420	5,570	5,520	5,500	5,580	5,550	5,360
Food and kindred products	3,850	3,740	3,920	2,950	4,250	4,170	4,300	4,300	4,250	4,150	4,250	4,050
Printing and publishing	1,410	1,400	1,400	1,430	1,430	1,440	1,450	1,410	1,420	1,430	1,440	1,420
Other nondurable goods	240	230	240	230	230	210	220	220	230	240	220	230
Railroads	7,980	7,990	7,940	8,220	8,340	8,300	8,530	8,540	8,440	8,370	8,360	8,110
Transportation	1,900	1,940	1,880	1,780	1,840	1,870	1,940	1,950	1,970	2,050	2,100	2,120
Communication and other public utilities	3,000	2,960	3,060	2,990	3,020	3,220	3,250	3,240	3,260	3,130	3,150	3,100
Trade	30,480	30,360	31,110	31,440	31,670	32,400	32,510	32,990	33,720	34,080	34,800	35,530
Wholesale trade	8,430	8,400	8,790	8,180	8,260	8,610	8,470	8,740	8,900	8,730	8,960	8,930
Retail trade	22,050	21,960	22,320	22,260	22,410	22,790	23,040	23,250	23,820	24,310	24,850	25,700
Finance, insurance, and real estate	2,770	2,750	2,820	2,860	2,840	3,010	3,040	3,040	3,070	3,100	3,100	3,140
Service (excludes domestic)	12,370	12,430	12,710	12,770	12,790	12,660	12,640	12,530	12,690	12,780	12,910	12,920
Government	22,400	23,300	23,800	24,100	25,100	25,700	25,200	25,200	24,800	26,000	26,100	27,400

JANUARY TO DECEMBER 1948

Total nonagricultural employment [1]	101,540	101,240	101,260	103,530	108,330	110,060	109,650	109,940	110,670	111,200	110,950	109,380
Mining	800	770	770	800	770	780	790	810	850	860	820	790
Construction	3,420	3,790	5,430	4,930	6,860	8,740	9,060	9,370	8,980	8,610	7,830	5,630
Building construction	1,340	1,270	1,290	1,940	2,610	3,490	3,250	3,420	3,360	3,180	2,940	2,170
General construction	720	800	890	1,040	2,080	2,080	3,180	3,200	2,960	2,980	2,090	990
Special trade construction	1,360	1,830	1,660	1,950	2,210	2,560	2,690	2,750	2,660	2,770	2,900	2,470
Manufacturing	5,340	5,320	5,620	5,740	6,060	6,370	6,350	6,440	6,460	6,280	5,580	6,060
Durable goods	810	840	860	860	910	920	890	880	850	870	800	870
Lumber, wood products, furniture and fixtures	30	40	40	50	50	50	40	50	50	50	40	40
Stone, clay and glass	190	170	190	210	250	290	310	310	280	240	240	220
Primary and fabricated metals	300	290	300	300	300	270	210	200	190	230	240	280
Machinery and transportation equipment	190	200	200	220	230	230	240	240	250	250	220	290
Other durable goods	100	90	100	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	100
Nondurable goods	5,090	4,770	4,760	4,790	5,180	5,440	5,460	5,550	5,610	5,410	5,520	5,190
Food and kindred products	3,720	3,490	3,440	3,440	3,850	4,110	4,110	4,200	4,260	4,000	4,110	3,810
Printing and publishing	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,100	1,090	1,120	1,130	1,120	1,170	1,170	1,160
Other nondurable goods	210	200	250	280	230	240	230	220	230	240	240	220
Railroads	8,300	8,230	8,240	9,480	9,460	9,710	9,800	9,810	9,710	9,650	9,400	8,840
Transportation	1,990	1,950	1,900	1,840	1,900	2,020	2,000	2,010	2,020	2,180	2,190	2,140
Communication and other public utilities	3,200	3,200	3,270	3,240	3,440	3,380	3,670	3,650	3,620	3,590	3,640	3,600
Trade	32,600	33,740	32,770	34,050	34,510	35,820	35,790	35,650	35,940	36,820	37,300	37,650
Wholesale trade	9,250	9,270	9,170	9,280	9,380	9,800	9,770	9,780	9,950	9,990	9,960	9,790
Retail trade	23,350	24,510	24,600	24,760	25,130	26,020	26,020	25,870	25,990	26,830	27,340	27,860
Finance, insurance, and real estate	3,070	3,040	3,090	3,130	3,110	3,260	3,220	3,230	3,220	3,200	3,200	3,220
Service (excludes domestic)	12,690	12,940	12,450	12,450	12,510	12,810	12,830	12,790	12,760	12,700	12,780	12,750
Government	27,300	27,300	27,600	27,900	27,700	28,900	28,100	28,200	27,100	27,900	27,300	28,900

JANUARY TO NOVEMBER 1949 [2]

Industry	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November
Total nonagricultural employment [1]	97,410	96,100	97,710	99,600	99,820	101,450	100,900	101,040	102,000	102,350	102,120
Mining	790	790	780	650	690	760	770	770	790	820	810
Manufacturing	5,730	5,380	5,620	5,700	5,960	6,010	5,950	5,970	5,920	6,000	6,040
Durable goods	800	750	800	810	860	1,030	1,050	1,050	1,040	1,050	990
Lumber, wood products, furniture and fixtures	50	60	60	50	50	60	60	60	60	60	60
Stone, clay, and glass	190	160	200	200	210	240	360	370	350	300	310
Primary and fabricated metals	290	270	250	280	230	290	250	240	240	250	250
Machinery and transportation equipment	230	220	240	230	250	280	290	300	290	290	290
Other durable goods	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
Nondurable goods	4,880	4,600	4,740	4,790	4,730	4,980	4,900	4,910	4,880	5,000	5,050
Food and kindred products	3,500	3,220	3,370	3,390	3,330	3,590	3,550	3,530	3,480	3,620	3,670
Printing and publishing	1,170	1,140	1,140	1,160	1,150	1,150	1,140	1,170	1,180	1,200	1,190
Other nondurable goods	220	230	230	240	250	250	210	210	210	210	210
Railroads	7,650	7,630	7,530	7,920	8,040	8,330	8,500	8,430	8,170	7,830	7,710
Transportation	1,960	1,970	1,940	1,910	1,890	1,820	1,880	2,010	1,970	1,950	1,940
Communication and other public utilities	3,460	3,550	3,560	3,740	3,840	4,000	4,080	4,130	4,060	3,940	3,970
Trade	34,200	33,510	33,480	33,700	33,900	35,420	36,030	35,960	36,200	36,580	36,920
Wholesale trade	9,420	9,170	9,330	9,700	9,800	10,100	10,170	10,120	10,300	10,240	10,170
Retail trade	24,780	24,140	24,150	23,970	23,900	25,270	25,860	25,820	25,900	26,340	26,750
Finance, insurance, and real estate	3,300	3,320	3,340	3,360	3,380	3,380	3,410	3,450	3,450	3,480	3,500
Service (excludes domestic)	12,420	12,580	12,140	12,820	12,720	12,700	12,780	12,750	12,850	12,900	12,980
Government	27,900	27,700	27,900	27,900	28,500	28,040	27,600	27,400	28,700	28,700	28,400

[1] Figures rounded to nearest 10.
[2] Estimates not available for construction workers.

Definition of employment: Data include all full- and part-time wage and salary workers who were employed during the pay period nearest the 15th of the month. Proprietors, self-employed, and members of the armed forces are excluded. Government employment excludes fourth-class postmasters and substitute rural mail carriers. State and local government data excludes those who receive only nominal amounts of pay. Regular teachers on unpaid as well as paid vacations are included. These estimates are based on employers' reports to the North Dakota unemployment compensation division and the State employment service in cooperation with the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

A World in Which Right Will Be the Master of Might, and Peace Will Reign in the Hearts of Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, last night I had the very great pleasure of listening to the recently elected junior Senator from my own beloved State of New York, the Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN, as he addressed the 600 guests present at the dinner given by the Men's Club of the Adas Israel Congregation of Washington.

It was a remarkable gathering, Mr. Speaker, and it was a remarkable speech, which I am proud and happy to insert in the RECORD, under leave, as part of my remarks.

The Adas Israel Temple is, I believe, the largest congregation of Judaism in Washington, and the largest conservative Jewish congregation in the southeastern part of the United States.

I am sure that many of those present reflected, as I did, on the fact that only in the English-speaking democracies of the Western World would this gathering have been possible; and that, of course, is the reason that those of us who love and honor America for its hospitality to all minorities oppose, with all our strength and courage, any deliberate incitation of bigotry or discrimination, and work equally hard to make sure that where discrimination exists it is destroyed, as a surgeon might cut out and destroy a diseased organ to save the whole.

It seems to me especially significant that it was in the victory of Senator LEHMAN that President Truman's Fair Deal administration—a philosophy of government stemming straight from Jefferson and Jackson by way of Wilson and Roosevelt—was vindicated and confirmed as the choice of the people of the United States.

As you read the words of his address you will understand why the people of New York, who twice chose him governor, chose him last fall as their Senator.

Senator LEHMAN's speech follows, Mr. Speaker; and I am sure that you will agree with me that it is an expression of democratic philosophy worthy of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt's successor as Governor of the great State of New York.

It is not too hopeful, I am sure, to believe that the day will come when we will have built a world in which men will seek to help their neighbors, and not to harm them; a world in which right will be the master of might, and peace will reign in the hearts of men; and a world in which there will be no hatred or prejudice as to race, creed, or nationality.

No, I do not think that this is too visionary. I do not think that it is impossible or impractical to build a world in which the basic principle of the brotherhood of man—the oneness of the human race under God—will be recognized and accepted as the first law and the Gospel of all humankind. Yet, for the construction of this bright but not impossible world, certain rules must be observed, certain conditions must be accepted by those of us who would build and who would lay the stones for this shining future.

If we are to build a world of security and lasting peace, we must fashion the structure on the immortal words of the prophet Micah: "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God." The very hope of lasting peace is destroyed if we permit injustice to any group, or any individual, or any nation. Spiritual freedom, as well as social and economic security, can survive only where there is exact and even-handed justice to all. There can be no security for one unless there is justice for all.

NEED NOT YIELD

In spite of obvious disappointments and discouragements, I still believe with all my heart that a world of security and lasting peace can be built, providing we show enough patience, good will, and understanding. We need not yield any of our fundamental principles to do so. On my many trips to war-ravaged countries both during and since the war I met and talked to peoples as well as to governments. I found that peoples generally wherever they lived, deep in their hearts, want just about the same things that we want—freedom, security, and lasting peace. It is the solemn duty of all of us, regardless of creed or race, to give the utmost of our strength and faith to the secure building of a world society in which peoples and nations will work together for their common welfare and for lasting security. Men must be freed from fear and blind hatreds. Hatred and fear can tear down but cannot create.

In this country, the well-being of the individual is the concern of all. This is our chief advantage, our blessing, in contrast to many other great areas of the earth. This is the most precious heritage we received from the founding fathers. But this heritage, wrung from centuries of inspiration and struggle in the old world, was not lightly preserved here. It took vigilance and courage, pain and suffering, and heroism and sacrifice to protect this heritage, to enhance it and to adapt it to an everchanging nation.

In other parts of the world this ideal of individualism and the national concern for the individual have never taken root. And because of this fact, evil men have been able to seize power in some of those areas and crush the individual under the heavy heel of oppression and tyranny.

Thus we must never take for granted those rights which we call inalienable. We can never afford to be supine or complacent in the enjoyment of these rights. We must win them anew each year, and again each generation. We must extend them and protect them against onslaught from without or decay from within.

THE URGENT QUESTION

Nor is that all. We can never really have these rights, and certainly not retain them, if the opportunity to enjoy them is not shared by all the people, equally, without regard to economic, social, or racial origin. "No one can be perfectly free until all are free", said Herbert Spencer, the philosopher. And those of us who do not wage unremitting war to free all men, and to extend equal rights to all our neighbors, will end by losing our rights too.

The urgent question for us is how we can solve our social and economic problems upon a reasonable basis, and by the application of truly democratic principles. We must prove that democracy is not an insensible machine of Government, but a living thing; that its soul is the soul of its people and that it grows and develops to meet the needs and ideals of its citizens. Only so long as democracy remains alive to the needs and aspirations of its people, will it continue to retain its strength. It is our duty and our responsibility to see that it does so. Any other course leads to stagnation, and ultimate decay.

Perhaps these words sound a trifle unreal, perhaps even empty and hollow in a world convulsed by fear, and overshadowed by the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb, and in an atmosphere heavy with hate and foreboding. Yet we must not, we cannot, lose faith in the truths by which we live, even in the valley of the shadow through which we now walk. We must believe and practice the truths of a living faith, although we are beset on every side by the dangers and temptations of apostasy.

Recently we emerged, or thought we had emerged, from a trial of strength with the forces of evil and darkness. We had vanquished fascism, or so we thought, and now the world could bind up its wounds and return to the ways of peace, to the unsolved problems of everyday living. But almost immediately our dream of peace and quiet was rudely disturbed. A new assault upon our civilization, upon our values, and our truths gathered and struck.

SPIRITUALLY IDEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

We are in the midst of that crisis today. We have, I hope, successfully passed through a major part of it. We have built up the bulwarks of other nations against aggression from without and have helped strengthen their internal fiber against subversion from within. But while we have done much, and must continue to do much in this material way, we are, I fear, inclined to neglect our own defenses and to neglect some of our most important resources for this great struggle.

No; I do not refer to our military defenses or to our physical resources. We are doing as well as can be expected with those. I refer instead to our spiritual defenses and our ideological resources.

Today the battle of ideas precedes the battle of arms. The initial assault is by infiltration of sinister philosophies and concepts. The method of attack is subtle. In many countries it has been effective. Its object is to weaken morale, to sabotage loyalty, to divide the nation into groups which can be played one against the other. Our best defense against such attacks is to rededicate ourselves to the democratic and religious principles by which we live and which our enemies hate and seek to destroy. Attempts to weaken morale must be answered by a crusading faith. Attempts to divide us must be answered by complete unity and by a militant devotion to the principles of religious freedom and civil equality. Injustice to any group or any individual will eventually tear down the structure of democracy itself. Democracy can survive only where there is exact and even-handed justice to all.

A VITAL REQUIREMENT

Should we let down our defenses in our democratic practices, should we permit the rights of some of our people to be denied or withheld, for any reason, should we deny equal justice to any in our midst—even to those who would deny it to us—should we do any of these things, we invite defeat and disaster. The fortress is only as strong as its weakest point. Our Nation is weakest where its democracy is weakest—in the partial denial of rights and privileges to racial minorities, and in the withholding of full

social justice from vast numbers of the underprivileged. Democracy, like religion, is an expression of faith, a call to duty from which no man may draw back. Democracy must be supported by a militant faith, and by a willingness to crusade for that faith, and to abide by it in all ways and in all relationships. Democracy is not a faith to be held only when it is pleasant and convenient. Democracy is not a habit to be worn only on fair days. Sometimes democracy is awkward, and unfortunately, sometimes it involves danger. But if it is good at all, it is good all the time.

But even democracy is more firm without armies, unless it bears at its center an inner faith in the goodness of God. In the sanctity of the human soul, and in the brotherhood of man under God. First we must be loyal to these concepts, or our devotion to democracy is timid and dim. If our spiritual faith is weakened, we will not prevail in the struggles ahead.

So let us proceed, let us go forward, arm in arm and shoulder to shoulder, full in our faith, full in our devotion to each other and to all our countrymen, resolved to combat evil from whatever source, and to shout in chorus, so that all the world will hear, "freedom is for every man." As we would not be slaves, so we do not wish to be masters.

Rise up with us, look up with us. Join us. See how, just over the horizon, lie the green valleys, of peace, and brotherhood and understanding.

Bills Endanger Farm Radios

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bills Endanger Farm Radios," published in the December issue of the National Live Stock Producer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLS ENDANGER FARM RADIOS

When Congress convenes next January renewed efforts will probably be made to pass legislation which well-informed opponents declare would seriously affect radio service to a large part of the Nation's farm population.

Adequate service to rural and sparsely populated parts of the country is a major problem of national broadcasting and Federal regulation. Most radio listeners do not realize that there is any distinction between service in city areas and that available to the farm population. Not only is there a great difference in favor of the city listener, but pending legislation which the average city radio fan knows nothing about would move him in on the already inadequate farm service according to evidence placed before the Federal Communications Commission. This agency has been hearing about the matter for 3 years. Incidentally, national farm organizations have taken note of the situation. While the result so far has been to postpone passage of pending bills, the threat is still present.

Radio listeners in metropolitan areas have a wide choice of programs and strong, clear reception, due to being served by several or as many as 20 stations in their immediate vicinity. Millions of farm listeners, however, must put up with weak signals, much static, and a limited number of stations. The only way they can get anything approaching adequate service is through what are termed "clear channel" stations. Broadly speaking, these are stations which do not share their frequency at night.

These clear-channel stations, it is estimated, furnish the only night-time broadcast service available to people in more than 78 percent of the country's area. In behalf of this bloc of radio listeners, the Federal Commission has been told that they do not now receive adequate night-time broadcast service in terms of signal strength. This is due to the presence of static and other interference. Some areas receive no broadcast service during the day.

Instead of curtailing clear-channel service, it is argued that the only way to properly serve a large part of the Nation's population in rural areas is to not only maintain clear-channel broadcasting but also to increase their power. Where they now have only 50-kilowatt power it is believed that the present signal strength of such stations should be greatly increased.

This is where pending legislation comes in. Two bills, S. 491 and H. R. 4004, it is charged by farm opponents as well as by the clear-channel stations affected, would limit the Federal Commission's authority by forbidding the licensing of clear-channel stations with power in excess of 50 kilowatts. The bills also would require "duplication" on clear channels; in short, the placing of other stations, each operating with power up to 50 kilowatts on each clear channel.

It is considered virtually certain that the effect would be to increase the number of stations serving city listeners, at the expense of cutting in on the reception strength of the rural listener. While some farm organizations have taken a stand opposing these bills, many farm listeners are not sufficiently aware of the situation.

Federal Spending Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a review of the President's budget for fiscal year 1951, under the heading "Federal spending facts," prepared by Mr. Alvin A. Burger, director of research, Council of State Chambers of Commerce.

An estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that the manuscript will make in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one-fourth of a page more than the two printed pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost, and that the cost will be $184.50.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Federal spending facts, Council of State Chambers of Commerce]

A REVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1951

The 1951 budget at a glance—Estimated expenditures

Function:	
International affairs and finance	$4,711,000,000
National defense	13,545,000,000
Veterans' services and benefits	6,080,000,000
Social welfare, health, and security	2,714,000,000
Housing and community development	1,329,000,000
Education and general research	434,000,000
Agriculture and agricultural resources	2,506,000,000
Natural resources	2,218,000,000
Transportation and communication	1,662,000,000
Finance, commerce, and industry	212,000,000
Labor	243,000,000
General government	1,267,000,000
Interest on the public debt	5,625,000,000
Reserve for contingencies	175,000,000
Total expenditures	42,489,000,000
Estimated receipts	[1] 37,356,000,000
Estimated deficit	5,133,000,000

[1] The President will shortly recommend to Congress "certain adjustments" in the tax laws which, if approved, would produce some net additional revenue in 1951.

Here are some of the salient facts which stand out in a review of the President's 1951 budget message as submitted to Congress on January 9:

1. For the fourth successive year since the end of World War II President Truman has presented to Congress a Federal spending budget higher in amount than the one submitted by him the year before. Each successive request has set a new all-time record for Government spending in peacetime.

2. By requesting authority to spend some $5,000,000,000 in excess of anticipated revenues in 1951, the President beckons us to take another long step in the deficit-financing abyss down which this Nation has traveled for 18 out of the last 20 years.

3. According to the President, $12,100,000,000 or 29 percent of the $42,400,000,000 budget total for 1951 will go to meet obligations incurred in 1950 or earlier. This illustrates the costly effect of "foot-in-the-door" commitments made in previous years for the starting of new spending programs and new public works projects financed at the outset by small initial appropriations or by contract authorizations.

4. The proposed budget contains $956,800,000 to initiate 34 new spending programs proposed by the President, many of which are continuing. This would represent the first year's cost only, for we estimate that these continuing programs would eventually add as much as $3,900,000,000 annually to future Federal budgets, to be financed out of general tax revenues.

5. In addition to the above, the President proposes new and expanded social-security programs to be financed by pay-roll taxes. We estimate that these proposals, if adopted, would eventually add between seventeen and twenty-four and one-half billion dollars annually to the pay-roll taxes exacted from workers and from employers. This would mean an increase over present employment taxes of between 12 and 17 percent on wages and salaries up to $4,800.

6. The budget message reflects a commendable determination by the President to carry out numerous recommendations made by the bipartisan Hoover Commission to improve administrative efficiency. This is noted particularly in the improvements made in the form of the budget itself, and in proposals relating to the military establishment, veterans' services, the postal service, and certain other functions.

7. On the other hand, other important findings and recommendations in the Hoover report are ignored or flouted. This pertains particularly to the Commission's recommendations aimed at circumscribing Federal expansion into the fields of banking, electric power and other forms of business enterprise, and at curbing the growth of the Federal grant-in-aid evil.

8. Despite efforts by the President to hold public works spending at a minimum in 1951, the budget provides for a record-breaking expenditure of $3,500,000,000 for public works next year. (This sum includes $419,000,000 of expenditures for rural-electrification programs.) Most of this amount is accounted for by outlays for projects already authorized or under way. While the President appears to have succeeded fairly well in keeping the lid on appropriations for new projects, it remains to be seen whether special interest pressure groups can persuade Congress to blow the lid off again.

RECORD PEACETIME BUDGET SPENDING

In elaborating on some of the above observations, let us begin with the first one.

In January 1946 the President requested authority to spend in fiscal 1947 the sum of $35,900,000,000.

In January 1947 he requested for fiscal 1948, $37,500,000,000.

In January 1948 he requested for fiscal 1949, $39,700,000,000.

In January 1949 he requested for fiscal 1950, $41,900,000,000.

On January 9, 1950, he requested for fiscal 1951, $42,400,000,000.

It should be pointed out that actual expenditures for each of the above fiscal years differed in amount from the President's original budget estimate because of three things which happened subsequent to the submission of his January messages: (1) His original recommendations were followed each year by a steady stream of supplemental and deficiency appropriation requests, the effect of which was to increase the January estimates; (2) congressional action on appropriation and new spending measures further altered the total amount of spending authority, either increasing or reducing it; and (3) some departments spent less than the sums allotted them, while others overspent their original appropriations.

Thus, while the President's budget message of a year ago estimated 1950 expenditures at $41,900,000,000, subsequent supplemental and deficiency requests are expected to bring actual 1950 spending up to an estimated $44,500,000,000.

Whether and to what extent the President's 1951 budget estimate of $42,400,000,000 may be increased by supplemental appropriations and by congressional enactment of new spending measures not listed in the budget message is up to the Congress.

FOOT-IN-THE-DOOR SPENDING

One of the chief reasons why the proposed 1951 budget has swelled to the size it has is the increasing tendency of both Congress and the executive branch to resort to foot-in-the-door financing devices to speed approval of new spending legislation which would otherwise encounter rough sledding on Capitol Hill.

For instance, passage of new spending programs of a continuing nature is often made easy because the legislators are told that a very modest appropriation will suffice to get them under way the first year. The extent to which the annual cost will rise in succeeding years is a matter which is seldom explored or divulged. The 1951 budget is full of large expenditures for items which once began modestly enough but have grown steadily through the years. This should provide a warning to Congress, then, to look carefully at the price tags on the many new spending measures advocated by the President or initiated by congressional committees.

Three examples of projected programs bearing a low down-payment tag but destined ultimately to require huge annual appropriations include: (1) The bill creating a National Science Foundation, which would spend only $400,000 the first year but would eventually entail annual outlays of $100,000,000 and up; (2) the St. Lawrence seaway, which would involve the expenditure of only $4,000,000 the first year but would eventually shoot up to a minimum of $62,000,000 annually for the next 7 years; and (3) Federal aid to education, which contemplates a $290,000,000 expenditure at the start but would reach $2,000,000,000 or more annually as soon as possible, according to the commitments of its sponsors. So on down a long list.

Another foot-in-the-door device to get new projects started is the contract authorization, which is a grant of authority to a Federal agency to contract for construction or other services in a given amount. This is a sound and even necessary procedure when properly used, but in recent years it has been much abused. For instance, Congress has frequently replaced part or all of a requested appropriation with a grant of contract authority in order to show a budget cut. The taxpaying public, we believe, would rather see Congress make bona fide reductions in appropriations and put an end to such subterfuges as this.

The President's 1951 budget message asks Congress to approve $3,363,000,000 in contract authorizations, of which $1,280,000,000 is for programs requiring new legislation. These sums for the most part are not included in the $42,400,000,000 spending total proposed for 1951. They are in addition to this total, and their cost would be reflected in increased expenditures for 1952 and thereafter.

PAY ROLL TAX-SUPPORTED SOCIAL WELFARE PROGRAMS

The budget message also proposes important new legislation for social welfare programs financed by pay-roll taxes. The large expenditures which would be required by these measures are outside of, and in addition to, the $42,400,000,000 of regular 1951 budget expenditures financed out of general tax revenues.

There is now before the Senate Finance Committee a bill already passed by the House (H. R. 6000) which would expand considerably various social security benefits provided under existing legislation. For instance, liberalization of the old-age and survivors insurance program under H. R. 6000 would immediately add some $600,000,000 to present costs. The additional cost of H. R. 6000 would eventually increase to $3,250,000,000 annually for this generation and to about $5,000,000,000 for the next. The President's proposals for liberalizing this program would result in costs far exceeding the cost of H. R. 6000. They would add to the costs of benefits under existing statutes over $6,000,000,000 annually for this generation and about $10,000,000,000 for the next—all to be supported by taxes on pay rolls.

Administration estimates of the cost of the pay roll tax-supported socialized medicine program advocated by the President are about $8,000,000,000 annually. Independent authorities place the cost much higher, from at least $11,000,000,000 to $14,500,000,000 annually.

Taking both these programs together, they would impose an additional tax load upon the present pay rolls of the Nation's wage and salary earners amounting to a minimum of $12,000,000,000 annually. Ultimately this additional tax load would increase to as much as seventeen to twenty-four and five-tenths billion dollars annually, or between 12 and 17 percent on wages and salaries up to $4,800.

THE PORK BARREL, AT A RECORD HIGH

Despite efforts by the President to hold 1951 outlays for public-works construction to a minimum, we find that the total amount requested for such projects would set a new all-time record. Here is the way these expenditures have skyrocketed in the postwar period:

1947 actual expenditures	$1,422,000,000
1948 actual expenditures	1,620,000,000
1949 actual expenditures	1,998,000,000
1950 estimated expenditures	2,907,000,000
1951 requested expenditures	3,530,000,000

(NOTE.—Funds for rural electrification projects are included in all the above figures.)

Although the President has tried to hold the lid down on the starting of new public works programs, it is noted that new projects call for first-year expenditures of $156,160,000 in 1951 and a total of $319,800,000 additional in later years. The largest of these is the St. Lawrence River power and navigation project, which calls for an initial expenditure of only $4,000,000 in 1951, but will require a total of at least $500,000,000 later to complete it. In the light of past experience it is certain that the final costs of all these new projects will be much larger than presently estimated. Some Federal public works programs when completed have been found to cost several times the original estimate.

These pork-barrel expenditures offer Congress one of its best opportunities to do some effective budget-cutting, particularly by rejecting new starts. What usually happens, however, is that spending interests in Washington go to work to generate pressure from allied interests back in the home districts in behalf of larger pork-barrel outlays, often defeating efforts by responsible Members of Congress to whittle down unnecessary spending in the interest of a balanced budget.

FOREIGN AID AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

The largest item in the proposed $4,700,000,000 estimated expenditure for International Affairs, including foreign aid, is the $3,250,000,000 estimated to carry the European recovery program through its third year. This represents a reduction of $913,000,000 below the estimated 1950 expenditure. If the original schedule for this aid program is adhered to, the Federal budget for 1952 should contain the fourth and last annual appropriation for it.

The budget message asks a $848,000,000 appropriation and a $500,000,000 grant of contract authority for the mutual defense assistance program for European nations which was initiated last year. The program's sponsors last year would not admit at congressional hearings that this program would require funds beyond 1 year, but this is now clarified by the budget message, which makes it plain that further appropriations for this purpose will be sought in 1952 and thereafter, and that the amount of these future requests may rise somewhat further.

National defense expenditures for 1951 are estimated at $13,545,000,000 as against $12,148,000,000 to be spent this year. But what counts here is the fact that new defense spending authority sought for 1951 totals $12,800,000,000 as against $14,576,000,000 approved by Congress last year for fiscal 1950, or a reduction of $1,776,000,000. These figures reflect the first results of efforts by Defense

Secretary Louis Johnson to reduce unnecessary civilian personnel in the armed forces and to effect other economies made possible by the recent integration of these services. While there is undoubtedly much more room for economies, at least a good start has been made in squeezing the huge waste out of military expenditures.

THE 1951 BUDGET AND THE HOOVER COMMISSION PROGRAM

As we pointed out earlier, the budget message gives evidence of commendable efforts by the President to carry out some of the administrative reforms proposed last year by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch (known as the Hoover Commission). First steps have been taken to provide a performance budget in line with the Commission's recommendations. Passages in the message relating to veterans' services and benefits also reflect much of the sound thinking expressed in the Commission's reports.

The President gives attention to Hoover Commission proposals in tackling the problem of the $551,000,000 deficit of the postal service. He points out that the Postmaster General "is exploring fully all opportunities for reducing the cost of the postal operation"—an activity which, if diligently pursued, should result in a very substantial reduction in operating costs. The President recommends legislation to increase certain postal rates "so as to bring them into line with postwar costs"—this also being in line with Hoover Commission suggestions.

IMPORTANT HOOVER COMMISSION PROPOSALS IGNORED

The Hoover Commission recommendations on business functions now carried by the Government sought to establish a clearer demarcation between the fields of taxpaying private enterprise and Government enterprise. This was particularly true with respect to commercial banking and lending activities, electric power utilities, and certain other forms of business enterprise. Many of the Hoover recommendations were aimed at restricting Federal expansion in these fields. Of direct Government lending, for instance, the Commission said: "It opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism. * * * It invites political and private pressure or even corruption. * * * Direct lending should be scrupulously avoided except for emergencies."

The President's budget message, however, advocates large Federal expansion in these various fields. It seeks additional lending powers for the RFC, an agency whose operations the Hoover Commission roundly criticized. It calls for further expansion of Federal electric power activities, including the creation of a Columbia Valley Administration in the Northwest, and it suggests similar authorities in other parts of the country. As we have pointed out in previous bulletins, such a program adds up to nothing less than the eventual nationalization of the electric power industry—an objective certainly not entertained by the Hoover Commission.

The message also seeks legislation to enlarge the Government's part in the Nation's home-building industry by launching a program to provide housing for middle-income groups. Other proposals for new ventures into business fields are included in competition with taxpaying private enterprise—all adding up to more bureaucracy, more waste, and more tax demands upon the people's pocketbooks.

FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID SCRUTINIZED

The Hoover task-force committee on Federal-State relations expressed concern about "the trend toward National Government encroachment on the fields traditionally reserved for State and local governments." It called for Federal withdrawal from tax fields properly belonging to State and local governments and for an overhauling of the Federal grant-in-aid structure.

The budget message virtually ignores these proposals. Instead it asks Congress to approve grants-in-aid for 1951 totaling $2,999,-600,000—an increase of $738,000,000 over 1950 outlays and an all-time high figure. This increase would include $280,000,000 to initiate the controversial Federal-aid-to-education measure now before Congress, which is opposed by most Governors and State legislatures and by many leading educators as an unwarranted attempt by the Federal Government to intrude upon a public service which is constitutionally and traditionally a State responsibility.

CONCLUSION

It is significant that this is the first budget submitted by President Truman in which he has failed to offer proposals for balancing expenditures with revenues, at least by increasing the latter through new taxes. His tax proposals for 1951 are admittedly not expected to raise enough new money to come close to meeting the anticipated $5,100,000,-000 deficit.

The President expresses a belief that deficit financing will come to an end a few years hence when foreign aid and national defense outlays are reduced, and when a hoped-for higher national income will yield greater tax revenues for Federal spending.

The budget message takes no account of the fact that State and local government taxation is also on the increase, thus adding to the Nation's over-all tax burdens. Nor does it recognize the fact that future outlays for all the new spending programs advocated by the President, including social-welfare measures financed by pay-roll taxes, would eventually impose new tax burdens of such staggering size as to dwarf any possible reductions in national defense and foreign aid, however substantial these might be.

So we had better face up to the deficit situation now and solve it. To this end Congress should take advantage of a blueprint for a $36,000,000,000 budget for 1951 recently made public by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, an acknowledged expert on Federal fiscal affairs. In this, Senator BYRD throws in the very teeth of the spending pressure groups and their adherents in Congress the answer to the cynical question often shot at economy advocates, Where would you cut the budget? Senator BYRD shows that the Federal establishment can live within its income and provide services essential to the Nation's welfare and economic well-being. The chief difference between the President's budget for 1951 and the budget of progress of Senator BYRD is $6,400,000,000 of wasteful and unnecessary spending.

ALVIN A. BURGER,
Director of Research.

Truman's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truman's Budget," published in the Uniontown (Pa.) Evening Standard of January 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN'S BUDGET

We're afraid the millennium for the American people of which President Truman has spoken with so much optimism will never be reached through plunging the Nation deeper into debt.

The President on the one hand talks of bigger and better prosperity and on the other recommends the very character of unprincipled Federal spending sure to represent a serious block on the road to that prosperity.

His budget for the 1951 fiscal year, handed to Congress yesterday, figures up close to $42,500,000,000. That is $5,000,000,000 more than the anticipated revenue for the year. It means continued deficit spending, deficit financing, and, we're convinced, very apparent danger to the national economy.

We think it's time this country starts living within its income. There would be nothing complicated about the start. Merely a simple matter of keeping the outgo within limits of anticipated tax revenue. A lot of Government hand-outs and synthetic services might have to be suspended, and real economy in the executive branch of the Government might have to be inaugurated, but the result would be more than worth the effort.

If prosperity is to be as far as we can see into the future, then the Government's going to have to represent one of the prime contributing factors. It can command neither confidence nor respect as long as it continues its unlimited spending binge.

Farm Renters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Mrs. Frank Bohn, of Hannah, N. Dak., under date of January 2, 1950, dealing with the situation in which farm renters now find themselves.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANNAH, N. DAK., *January 2, 1950.*

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Perhaps you can bring our problem, and that of many other farm renters, before this session of Congress. We are farm renters; my husband has farmed since 1941 with his own machinery. Before that he worked on farms—he was born and reared on a farm. He is a good worker and knows how to manage a farm. He has a full line of power machinery. Our problem is this: We can't find a place to rent that has decent buildings. Yes, we can find farms with buildings. The houses are livable—but no shops, no granaries, poor barns, and even no wells. How can a family man live on a place like that? The landlords want to rent on a one-third, two-thirds basis, but they are unwilling to spend any money on their buildings. Here in this section of North Dakota, and we believe it is true in the rest of the State as well, there are too many big farmers—men who are farming 10, 12, or more quarters of land. Consequently the man who wants and needs three or four quarters can't find them. If we don't find a farm by spring, we will have to sell out, and my husband will have to learn a completely new method of earning a living. Is it fair? This would be my solution to the problem: Let any man own as much land as he wishes to. But let's limit him to the amount of land he can actually operate. Possibly we could tax him double on each quarter he operates above three or four quarters. Any one man can make a good living on that amount of land.

This would divide the land more evenly—would perhaps draw men back to farming—thus easing the growing unemployment problem. Of course, some will say that my solution is undemocratic—it is taking away their freedom to farm the amount of land they want to. Granted, it is. But the condition as it exists now is taking away our freedom to farm. Whose freedom is more important? The United States has always been known as a country where the little man has an equal chance with the big man. It is a land of opportunity. What is happening to that equality? I know we aren't the only ones facing this problem. There are many others like us. People ask, "Why don't you buy a farm of your own and get away from this moving?" We aren't financially able to buy a farm at current land prices. Someone else suggests a loan. We investigated the FHA loans. Twelve thousand dollars is the maximum amount they will loan, and with this they expect one to buy three quarters—almost an impossibility. Prices around here range from $15,000 to $20,000 for three quarters.

If we had no children, we probably could rent land with no buildings, living in a house trailer. We think too much of our three children to expect them to grow up in such an environment. My sister and her husband, who are vacationing in the South for the winter, have opened their home to us. Had it not been for their generosity, we would have been among the homeless.

We're hoping that you can do something to ease this situation. Perhaps my solution isn't too practical. You can, no doubt, work out a better one.

Thank you for taking time to read my letter. And thank you, too, for any help you may give.

Yours sincerely,

MRS. FRANK BOHN.

Making Democracy Work Is a Basic Ingredient of National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there is a vast difference of meaning between the national unity of idealism which most of us advocate, and the dead level of conformity which is too often enforced by economic and political sanctions.

The glory of democratic living lies in the freedom of the individual—an equality of freedom, in which the limitation on my freedom is the point at which my freedom interferes with yours or another of my neighbors.

The indivisibility of American citizenship is one of the precious heritages which we must preserve and strengthen in spite of that small minority in the screwball fringe who continue to preach religious intolerance and racial discrimination. In consonance with my general policies, I was one of those who were shocked into protest by the attempt to turn Jefferson Military College, an ancient institution with an honorable history and tradition, into a citadel of racism. My protest found its way to the desk of the Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of National Defense; and in reply I received a letter which I shall long treasure because of its succinct statement of the fundamentals of democratic living. Under consent, I am inserting Secretary Johnson's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to extend its influence and give it the immortality of the published word:

MY DEAR MR. KLEIN: The President has requested me to reply to your telegram to him of October 28 concerning early press reports that Jefferson Military College had accepted a $50,000,000 gift on condition that the school exclude persons of African or Asiatic origin, and that it teach the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon and Latin-American races. In your telegram, you urged that the President, "as Commander in Chief, take the only act which appears to be open under existing law to express the deep disapprobation of all true Americans by ordering the removal of Jefferson College from the list of recognized accredited schools of the Naval and Military Academies."

As you know, since your telegram was received at the White House trustees of Jefferson Military College announced that "superiority of one race over another has never been taught in Jefferson College. No such study is anticipated." With this announcement, it was reported in the news that the five- to fifty-million-dollar offer had been withdrawn. I think, therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the matter has come to a satisfactory close—not only to the credit of Jefferson Military College but also to the cause of education in a free society.

For your promptness in denouncing bigotry when it arises, I wish to offer my congratulations, as well as to all like-minded citizens who pay the price of liberty by their eternal vigilance.

Racial and religious prejudice are inimical to freedom and democracy, just as the proponents of the extreme right and left who foment intolerance are saboteurs of our way of life. Making democracy work is a basic ingredient of the national security, and, therefore, of world peace and freedom. It is the No. 1 job of all Americans, as well as all citizens of the democratic countries of the world.

With warm personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

Should Farmers Get Federal Pensions?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Should Farmers Get Federal Pensions?" published in the Des Moines Sunday Register of January 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD FARMERS GET FEDERAL PENSIONS?

Do farmers and farm workers want to be included in the expansion of the Federal Social Security Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System? They are the one big group conspicuously left out of the bill which passed the House and is now up for consideration by the Senate. They were left out because they didn't put up a fuss to be included. Several Congressmen said so plainly for the record in October.

But, since then, some of them are kicking up a fuss. The Idaho State Grange passed a resolution in December favoring inclusion of farm people, and circulated arguments for it to local granges.

The arguments point out that the impact of our two supplementary systems of old-age pensions under the Federal social-security law is very different in agricultural and industrial States.

In industrial States, the contributory system (old-age and survivors insurance—OASI) is bearing a large and increasing part of the load—roughly half now, and more if the benefits are raised. In agricultural States, the relief system of pensions (old-age assistance—OAA) carries an overwhelming part of the load, because agricultural workers are not eligible for the contributory system.

Is this an injustice to farmers? To farm States? The Idaho folks are thinking this over, and Iowans will confront it soon.

On this lofty statistical level, the question is not a simple one. The arguments being circulated in Idaho assume that the contributory system (OASI) pensions are paid out of the stored-up contributions of the contributors, which is good, whereas the relief pensions (OAA) are paid out of taxes, which is bad.

This is an optical illusion. Both are paid for out of taxes: OAA out of general State and Federal taxes, chiefly sales and income; OASI out of a special payroll tax on "covered" individuals and their employers.

Both sorts of taxes are in some degree shifted (through prices of goods and services sold by those taxed to the general consuming public), and no one can be at all certain where the burden ends up ultimately.

The big difference between OASI and OAA is not the source of funds, but the way they are paid out.

OAA pensions are paid out only to the needy, in amounts based on individual needs as determined by local welfare departments, within the limits of State appropriations and State and Federal regulations. OASI pensions are paid out to everybody in covered industries, regardless of need, in amounts based on what the individual has paid in as pay-roll deductions.

So the real question for farmers is: Would they like to be taxed on their current earnings for the sake of survivors insurance or a pension, based on how long they have paid in and how much they were making?

As long as the rates remain away below cost (as they are now, and have been since 1935), this is a tremendous bargain for individuals—at the expense of those who are paying taxes when this generation retires.

Commercial and industrial employees have been getting the benefit of this bargain since 1935, and the Federal House of Representatives has passed a bill to extend it to public employees and to the nonfarm self-employed.

Well-to-do farmers might take it or leave it. Farm laborers, sharecroppers, and the like, however, need it worse than most industrial and commercial employees. But they won't get it unless somebody—preferably among farm organizations—speaks up for them.

A broader question remains for all of us. Should we go ahead and expand the contributory system until it all but replaces the relief system of old-age pensions?

Under the present hybrid system, we have ridiculous duplication. Many who are getting OASI pensions cannot live on them and must get supplementary grants from OAA.

But if we increase benefits under the contributory system to levels which make this unnecessary, and if we extend coverage till nearly everybody comes in on it, that will mean a perfectly terrific cost which will have to be met by much higher pay-roll taxes, general taxes, or both.

Can we afford pensions for everybody, regardless of need, on a level so that everybody could live on them if necessary?

Bonneville Power Is an Investment, Not an Expense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a very fine and most informative editorial from the Longview (Wash.) Daily News, on the fine performance of the Bonneville Administration.

It is my hope that all Members of Congress will read this editorial because the subject is one that will soon be discussed on the House floor. We are properly concerned over the increasing amounts we are asked to appropriate each year. The justification for these requests should be carefully studied.

Congress has and should continue to appropriate the necessary funds for the development of hydroelectric power in the Northwest. The record shows that these projects are actually a sound investment of Government funds. They are not only paying back the entire amount appropriated, with interest, but have already increased national income and production many times their cost.

The editorial follows:

BONNEVILLE POWER PROVE ITS WORTH TO PACIFIC NORTHWEST

One of the troubles with publicly owned enterprises, we often hear, is that they are monopolies and therefore don't have competition keeping them on their toes to provide the best possible service to the public. In the case of one of the biggest public enterprises in the Northwest—the Bonneville Power Administration—there is something of a substitute for competition that keeps that vast business striving for a good record. That something is the necessity for congressional approval of its annual budget and the expenditures it makes for improvements and extensions to the power-distribution system.

As a result Bonneville is not above tooting its own horn when it has something to toot about and we do not blame it in the least. Bonneville points with some pride to the fact that it recently paid a $3,000,000 surplus into the Treasury, thereby advancing repayments on its indebtedness about 10 years ahead of date due.

Bonneville Dam itself cost $87,500,000 and $49,000,000 of that was to be repaid from power revenues. Already power has paid back on that indebtedness $11,[illegible] including interest and operating expenses. The huge network of transmission lines cost $133,000,000. And power revenues have paid back on that indebtedness $27,[illegible].

Keeping ahead of its debt payments has been possible for Bonneville despite the fact that its wholesale rate of $17.50 per kilowatt year—the lowest in the Nation—has not been increased.

Bonneville also has cause to boast about the wealth it has brought to the Northwest in terms of pay rolls and the addition of property to tax rolls of various counties.

It reports that 11 plants built in the Northwest because of Bonneville represents an investment of about $[illegible]. This compares with the Federal investment in power facilities of $[illegible]. Through December 31, 1948, the 11 factories produced more than $780,000,000 worth of aluminum ingots, aluminum sheets, and other rolled products, ferrosilicon, chlorates, calcium carbide, and other chemicals. These firms have paid $35,000,000 in Federal income and excess-profits taxes on their production at these plants and $4,400,000 in local property taxes.

These 11 plants include the two Permanente Metals Co. mills at Spokane; two ferrosilicon plants, one at Spokane and one at Rock Island; aluminum plants at Tacoma, Troutdale, Vancouver, and Longview; two calcium carbide plants in Portland and a chlorate DDT manufacturing establishment in Portland.

The contribution of Reynolds to Cowlitz County, attributable directly to the advent of cheap hydroelectric power in the Northwest, is considerable. Bonneville reports that Reynolds Metals property in the county accounts for 4.6 percent of the total assessed valuation of $14,519,740 in 1949. The taxes it paid came to more that $188,000. In addition the Reynolds plant has provided jobs for nearly 500 workers since 1941.

All these figures, of course, are meaningful to us in the Northwest and we appreciate their significance. The problem each year is to get Congress to appreciate their meaning. For the Bonneville Administration still must go begging to Congress each year for its operating expenses and any money it needs to improve its system. It makes a profit but it is not allowed to keep that profit, having to turn all of its revenues into the Treasury.

It might be further noted that when there is talk about the creation of a CVA in the Northwest to take over various Federal functions, it is never pointed out that the Bonneville operation is such that it requires consolidation with some new Federal agency. About the only criticism about Bonneville we ever heard comes from those who oppose its efforts to extend transmission lines into territory now served exclusively by private power companies. And that is a matter of ideology and not operations. All in all, the region has many reasons to be proud of and well satisfied with this agency, which has proved its worth many times over.

Christmas Is a Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by one of my constituents, Mr. Harry Karp, of 156 Second Avenue, New York, and printed in the December 17 issue of The Flash, a house organ of the Radio-Keith-Orpheum Corp.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will agree that Mr. Karp has presented a challenge of good will to the contemporary world. Another world war will destroy our civilization, our democracy, our material and spiritual heritage of past generations. In organized religion, teaching the kinship of all men, lies one of the great hopes of peace.

CHRISTMAS IS A CHALLENGE

What is Christmas? Perhaps one of the most challenging answers comes from the national commander of the American Legion, who, unwittingly, may have given it to a query from a young boy, mercilessly beaten for his religion. The lad, whose father had perished during the Battle of the Bulge, was on his way home from a Scout meeting when the attack occurred. Embittered and angered at the injustice, he asked just why his father had to die. The commander's response to the question was that as long as evil men seek to destroy the dignity of freemen, the world will engage in wars and tribulations will persist. Until man learns to adopt a code of morals that outlaw injustice, attacks of the sort will continue. Almost two thousand years ago a teacher stood at the gates of Gethsemane preaching the very same doctrine, that all men are in reality brothers; that the greatest blessing the Lord could bestow upon them was that of living in peace together. What wonderful words they were and yet for Him too there was scorn, derision, hatred, utter cruelty, and finally crucifixion. But the words could not be forgotten. They have stood the test of time. They have not been dimmed by the years and at His birthday, people, everywhere, see almost too clearly the need and meaning of the teachings. Christmas is a children's holiday. It is then that we try to instill in them the beauties of laughter and of home. It is also a world holiday if it reminds us that man does not have to destroy himself by hates and envies. The air is free and the earth is large; man can share in its beauties and in its harvest, acting as brothers and respecting the views of each other. On the 25th day of December we celebrate the birth of the child who was destined to bring eternal hope of peace on earth and to all mankind good will. Despite the wars and threats of wars, His theme has stood its ground. If man can sing the glories of peace and God with his tongue may he yet learn to live the glories of peace and God with his heart and mind. Christmas opens the challenge. Can man accept that challenge before it is too late?

HARRY KARP.

A Pioneer Aviator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following article from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., of Tuesday, January 17, 1950:

GEN. "HAP" ARNOLD

Gen. Henry H. "Hap" Arnold, who led the mightiest air armada of all time to victory in World War II, was a soldier's soldier in the strictest sense of the word. Outspoken, courageous, and patriotic enough to put his country's needs above his personal health, Arnold has been ill of a heart condition since 1944, but refused to retire until June 1946. He preferred to take his chances with the rest of the Nation's fighting men and went back to duty.

A pioneer aviator—he was taught to fly by the Wright brothers—General Arnold was a lifelong battler for the development of a strong air arm in the Nation's defenses and his sound judgment was vindicated by our overwhelming success in the air in the recent conflict. Even in retirement he continued to urge the maintenance of an unrivaled air force, declaring that Russia fears neither armies nor nations, but only a far-reaching bomber strength. In his death the country has lost a great patriot and a distinguished soldier.

The Welfare State—What It Means to Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, on December 1 I had the pleasure of addressing the Luncheon Club of the Fraternal Order of Eagles in my home city of Milwaukee. This splendid organization has long served a most useful purpose in bringing discussion of current problems before its members. The club's programs are broadcast, thus greatly widening its audience. I desire to insert my speech, the Welfare State—What It Means to Business, in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WELFARE STATE—WHAT IT MEANS TO BUSINESS

How frightened would you be if someone hissed in your ear, "Beware the Jabberwock." Maybe the panicky tone might scare you, but I think you'd wonder what on earth they were talking about.

And yet that's just about what's been going on for the last few months—a kind of panic campaign, lifted right out of Alice's Adventures Through the Looking Glass. The only difference is that when Lewis Carroll wrote that famous story, he intended it to be nonsense. But in this case, people—a few people—have been moaning "Danger! Here comes statism!" or else, "Look out! look out! It's the welfare state!" Then they expect you to run in all directions.

Now it really can't be the terms themselves that are scaring Mr. Dulles and Mr. Dewey. The dictionary defines welfare as "prosperity" and "exemption from pain and discomfort." And it defines statism as "belief in a state government, as in a republic, in contrast with belief in communism or a Soviet government."

Obviously, it can't be the words that are worrying them. In fact it seems much more likely that these gentlemen's terror is induced by having followed Alice through the looking glass into that land where everything goes backward and no one thinks it necessary to use words that make sense. So, since it's apparently impossible to understand this jabberwocky, we can only go over all the possible reasons that might be causing this hysteria.

WELFARE STATE GOOD AMERICANISM

Do you suppose they think a government concerned with the welfare of its people is un-American? To some of their exponents, Stalin has long dominated the policies of the present administration. Mr. Steinkraus, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, recently claimed the present Government was completely discarding the American system.

Well, let's go back to the days of the inception of our country and see whether Mr. Steinkraus' fears are justified. I suppose we could consider the signing of the Constitution as perhaps the very first official act taken by the Government of the United States. And in it, the new Government is specifically charged with the responsibility of promoting the general welfare.

This clause in our Constitution is well known to the wanderers through the looking glass. A confidential big-business news service goes so far as to advise its members that the only way left to prevent the Government from promoting the welfare of its people is by constitutional amendment. Then, in typical mirror language, they go on to mention casually that the concept of the welfare state is so well liked by the American people that Mr. Dewey himself warned Republicans it would be political suicide to deny it. This leaves me as puzzled as I was at their original outcry. How, I wonder, do these gentlemen then propose to amend the Constitution?

SUBSIDIES OLD AS THE COUNTRY

But the general welfare is not only our constitutional concern. Historically, it has always been considered our primary responsibility—by Federalists, Democrats, and Republicans alike. Jefferson assumed that Federal subsidies for education were the definite and specific responsibility of the Government. Lincoln's Congress passed the Homestead Act, distributing vast areas of land to individual families in family-size units, and thus establishing what was the equivalent to an employment and social-security program. As early as 1887, under Cleveland, Congress provided grants for agriculture—and long before the New Deal the Government was already giving subsidies to the States for 15 major welfare purposes.

So I can hardly think that even the looking-glass boys, on their nostalgic progress backward, can be finding a concern for welfare un-American.

Perhaps they think that statism is a great plot on the part of the Government to undermine business.

Even looking backward, that can hardly be proven. Under that same dreadful clause in the Constitution, Alexander Hamilton established the national bank, which was certainly clearly designed for the business and property interests of the country.

And ever since then the Government has shown a great concern for business. In the first days of our Republic, subsidies were given to shipowners and manufacturers, and land was donated for all sorts of private purposes, including not less than 179,000,000 acres to the railroads. But, strangely enough, it was not until the United States was taken over by this wicked and dangerous Jabberwock—first under the New Deal and then under the Fair Deal—that our Government really went into the business of saving business.

If you will recall, when President Roosevelt closed the banks, it was to save the banks, not abolish them. When the RFC was established, it was to enable business to carry on and expand, not to close down factories. When the FHA was set up, it was to make it possible for private builders to continue, not for Government construction.

GOVERNMENT HELP PREVENTS DEPRESSION

In fact, so conservative a periodical as the U. S. News and World Report recently listed some of the many ways in which the Government is at present supporting business. In their opinion, it is this very support that makes it impossible for the kind of calamity to overcome us that occurred under that looking-glass President, Mr. Hoover.

First, they point out, in 1929 there was wild stock-market speculation. In 1949, this is protected by that very subversive agency, the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Second, 20 years ago, the building boom was over, and there was of course almost no public construction. Today, the private building cycle is in its early stages, and there is a $5,000,000 public building program under this administration that is one of the important reasons that business' position is so secure right now.

Next, under Herbert Hoover, there were widespread bank failures. Now, that tool of the welfare state, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, insures deposits, and keeps banks sound.

Fourth, in the "good old days" when prosperity disappeared around the corner, mortgage loans were unprotected, and there were thousands of foreclosures. Now, again the doing of that wicked welfare state, mortgage loans are insured.

PURCHASING POWER MAINTAINED

But let's go on. The U. S. News comments on the fact that in Hoover days personal incomes and puchasing power were helped by only $1,000,000,000 in Government benefits. When the factories shut down, when businesses had to cut their staffs, the people who were thrown out of work had no way to keep going—or, incidentally, to keep business going. Now, the monster of the welfare state supports personal incomes by $12,000,000,000 in Government insurance schemes, such as social security, unemployment insurance, and old-age benefits.

Another of the reverberations of the great crash was the drop—with a thud—of farm prices. Now, the Government supports farm prices and keeps us from having a large portion of our population completely stranded, with the inevitable repercussions on the business firms with which they deal.

Also, in the aftermath of the roaring twenties, unions were weak, and wages spiraled down. Thanks to the Wagner Act, unionism is strong, and the combination of healthy unions and the minimum-wage law protect wage income—and therefore protect purchasing power. After all, it doesn't matter how much you have to sell, if no one can afford to buy it.

So I simply cannot see how these Lewis Carroll characters see a menace to business in their jabberwock. Let's try another tack.

I've been talking about business. But I haven't been referring to business that is so big it becomes monopoly. One of the firm foundations of our Government and of our way of life is free enterprise. Our forefathers believed in it—and our present administration believes in it.

However, in spite of the looking glass protestations of the moguls and mouthpieces of big business, I'm not at all sure that they really want free enterprise at all. I haven't seen any of the mammoth trusts encouraging competition. But the welfare state does want free enterprise. It cannot be interested in helping to increase the profits of a few arrogant men, who at the end of the nineteenth century practically owned the country. On the other hand, there was not anyone so upsetting to monopolies as President Truman, or so shocking as the Fair Deal that first recognized the dangers of the growth of trusts. By the beginning of the twentieth century the power of the barons of Wall Street was already so well recognized that Bryan answered John Pierpont Morgan's smug comment that "America is good enough for me," with the retort, "Whenever he doesn't like it, he can give it back to us." And it was Theodore, not Franklin, Roosevelt who first prosecuted monopolies.

I think we are getting closer to the real meaning of the Alices walking through the looking glass. They are truly afraid of a government who might want to put some restraints on big business to prevent it from swallowing the rest of the economy. But more than that, there is another thing they are afraid of.

WELFARE FOR ALL THE PEOPLE

The present government is legitimately concerned about business, and has shown this concern through many concrete actions. But it does not limit its concern to business. It recognizes its responsibility to all its citizens. It recognizes the need of all citizens to live free from the fears of poverty and serfdom. In this richest of all countries in the world, the Government has thought it proper to share its wealth with all its people, not in the way of totalitarian states which offer the lure of bread at the price of liberty, but by helping people to help themselves, by protecting them from

dangers beyond their control, by allowing them to grow strong enough to protect their own interests against exploiters.

So the Fair Deal has insisted on public housing, in order that everyone may have a chance to live decently, not only the rich. And we've fought for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act so that labor will not be forced back into the position of accepting whatever scraps are offered by what a utilities company spokesman once called "the Christian men to whom God in His infinite wisdom has given control of the property interests of this country."

And the welfare state is concerned about the economic security of its workers, and with that of its citizens who are out of work. We have increased the minimum-wage law so that it is more in keeping with present-day living costs—and, may I add, present-day business profits. We still consider it imperative to keep up farm prices—and we would like to see it done in such a way that the consumer will also reap the benefits, as Secretary Brannan has proposed. We are pressing for a decent increase in old-age benefits. This is an amendment to the Social Security Act which I am sure all of you will support since, as members of our great lodge, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, you worked so hard to obtain the original act. We are striving to obtain a good education for all American children. We are working for equal rights and opportunities for all Americans. And as members of a state deeply interested in the welfare of its people, we are going to do everything we can to provide adequate health services for everyone.

WHO WANTS TO GO BACKWARD?

Ah! Now I think we have the answer. This is what jabberwock means at last. It means fear of a government which takes its responsibilities seriously. It means horror of a state that cares and does recognize that its obligations are not primarily to a few industrial giants or to a handful of their bookkeepers.

And to that definition, we proudly plead guilty. We gladly agree that the Government's responsibility is to the farmers—not to the cotton kings; to the storekeepers and shopowners—not to the president of the A & P or United States Steel; to the workingmen—not to Wall Street.

And if these travelers in looking-glass land want to go forever backward, do you think what they want reflects the will of the people? Do you think their program of cuts in relief, abolition of social security, withdrawal of farm-price supports, breaking of labor unions, and reincarnation of slums—do you think their program would ever have a chance so long as we are a democracy?

Have the election returns in 1948 and in 1949 suggested that the people of this country want a government by millionaires? Or legislation for private privilege? Do you really believe that anyone wishes to change the word welfare to farewell?

Traffic Director

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following excellent article from the Boston Herald, Boston, Mass., January 18, 1950:

BACKTRACKING ON RULES

There is nothing particularly surprising about the current effort of the House Rules Committee to recapture its former life-and-death power over legislation in the lower House. But it is both surprising and shocking to find this effort abetted by responsible persons outside the committee.

The function of the Rules Committee is to serve as "traffic director" for bills previously reported by other standing committees of the House. The committee is not set up to review bills on their merits, but merely to arrange for their orderly presentation to the House.

When, as frequently happened prior to the last session, the committee refused to grant a rule to a properly reported bill, or made the rule conditional on substantive changes in the bill, it was unsurping a function which never belonged to it. It was making a joke of majority rule in the lower Chamber.

This Congress performed one of its most constructive acts by finally curbing these activities last January. It would be criminal to backtrack now.

But one hears again all the old slippery arguments for Rules Committee control. Before the new discharge arrangement, it is recalled, the committee held up a lot of bad bills as well as good ones. Sometimes the Members of the House didn't want to record themselves on a measure, as was the case with the universal military training bill, and counted on the committee to kill it. Sometimes, as in veterans' legislation, the committee was less vulnerable to minority pressures than the House as a whole.

Currently the leading advocates of restoration are the economizers. The President, it is said, has abandoned hope of a balanced budget and is off on a spending spree. His supporters are in a majority in Congress. Those who would save the country must therefore resort to extreme measures. A restored Rules Committee would now certainly sabotage and obstruct for a worthy purpose.

Alas, democracy is not that simple. Of course, it is desirable to curb spending. Of course, it is desirable that Congress be prevented from swallowing any more political welfarism. But we cannot be saved by hiding behind the skirts of a Rules Committee. We can't have economy until the people want it and their elected Representatives in Congress vote for it. We can't have democracy by avoiding its responsibilities.

The House of Representatives is the popular branch of Congress. It must act according to majority rule and face the consequences. No amount of quibbling can justify a voluntary resubmission to the old Rules Committee shackles.

We hope the Representatives stick by their guns.

Heritage and Destiny in Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walter D. Fuller, president of the Curtis Publishing Co., recently made a very interesting and informative address dedicating the Advertising Hall of Fame of the Advertising Club of New York. He has pointed out the tremendous effect which advertising has had on the people of the United States and upon American business methods. Very important from the point of view of Congress, the speech demonstrates the extent to which our national prosperity parallels a high volume of advertising.

It has been stated recently that a 20-percent drop in business turn-over would reduce Federal revenue by sixteen to eighteen billion dollars a year. Turnover could easily be reduced by that amount if the volume of advertising were substantially reduced by the businessmen in this country.

I feel sure that Mr. Fuller's address will give Members of Congress a greater appreciation of advertising and its importance to national income. I am therefore having the entire speech inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

HERITAGE AND DESTINY IN ADVERTISING

(By Walter D. Fuller)

Some fourscore years ago modern advertising was born. There had been faint stirrings before the War Between the States, but in the flood of energy and ideas released by the ending of that war came the first glimpses of advertising as we know it today.

With and through the coming of modern advertising came a great increase in sales and distribution volume, which ultimately made possible the miracles of American mass-manufacturing production. There also gradually developed very wide dissemination of general information among Americans from coast to coast at little or no cost to them. This was probably the most remarkable development of widespread mass adult education in the history of the world.

Advertising and advertising media—magazines, newspapers, direct mail, outdoor, and, more recently, radio and television—have literally tied America together. Through advertising the women of New York, Hollywood, and Dallas, of the farm, the small town and the large city, know and wear the same styles in clothes, discuss the same subjects in their clubs and equally share in their responsibilities of citizenship. The mass education brought about through advertising has had an even more direct effect upon the men of America and upon American business methods and operation. All these things and much more, advertising has brought to our country.

Modern advertising as we know it, is essentially American and it is no accident that the terrific progress of the United States of America toward world leadership parallels our advances in advertising. Other nations have no form of mass communication which can compare with our advertising.

So much to set the picture.

Now let us look back over these fourscore years and see the names of the men who were the pioneers and leaders in advertising during this time. Someone has said that progress is the lengthening shadow of a man, and this can be plural as well as singular.

THERE WILL BE OTHER PIONEERS

Tonight we have listened to the citations prepared by your committee for 10 of the great men of advertising during this 80-year period. To 4 of the 10, in order of birth dates, Wanamaker, Curtis, Jones, and Johns, your committee has applied the word "pioneer." I mention the point only to make clear that some great men in any field may, by their ability and their opportunity, fill the role of pioneers—all honor to them, yet other great men will follow, in service, in the establishment of integrity, and in vision for the ever-expanding future. I think we will agree that all who lead and whose deeds become keystones of progress should merit the honors which rightfully come to them. Certainly, these 10 men whom your committee has so carefully selected will receive equal niches

in the Hall of Fame. Washington was a great national pioneer, but that fact does not diminish the luster of Lincoln as a great American.

I shall not attempt to review the magnificent history of John Wanamaker or of Cyrus Curtis, both of whom are now almost legendary in the advertising, mercantile, and publishing world. I knew Mr. Wanamaker slightly, but, peculiarly, I always see him in memory from the early prints of John Wanamaker, a very young man, wheeling his handcart full of goods for his pioneer store on lower Market Street in Philadelphia. While there was over 150 years' difference in time, somehow I always class Mr. Wanamaker's pioneer beginning with another pioneer American who strolled up Market Street in Philadelphia one autumn day in 1723, munching buns and hoping that Philadelphia would show him opportunity. Which brings me naturally to Cyrus Curtis, who rebuilt in his lifetime the publication which this last young man originated in 1728.

Of course, I knew Mr. Curtis very well indeed. I saw many examples of his great courage, his ability to reach into every problem for its nucleus, and to brush aside the secondary details. I saw him making brilliant innovations and I also saw him make mistakes, but the mistakes were few and the successes were many. He was, indeed, a pioneer in publishing and in advertising. His life is an epic of free enterprise, of the wise realization of opportunities, of high honesty in all things, no matter how it hurt, and of the development of careers for able and diligent associates.

These two men, Mr. Curtis and Mr. Wanamaker, are of an earlier generation than the other eight men you are honoring.

Mr. Jones of Eastman was instrumental in building a new industry and in spreading Kodaks throughout the world to a point where the name is as familiar in Hindustan or China as it is in the United States of America. Mr. Johns was all the things listed in the citation. In addition, he had a sympathy and a depth of conviction which made his influence in advertising unique and unusual.

These four are the men your committee mentions as "pioneers." If I may insert a personal word, I believe I would support the right of Edwin Meredith to a similar designation, although in a different way and at a later date. The citation tells you why.

Likewise I personally believe that T. F. MacManus also deserves the term for his brave and unusual handling of advertising in the early days of the automobile industry. Certainly if he were not a pioneer, he was indeed close to it.

I knew all these men personally except Messrs. Strong and Ayers. Some I knew much better than others and of course I knew all by the great reputations they acquired during their lifetimes.

MANY HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO ADVERTISING

Messrs. Romer, Erickson, Ayers, and Strong each exerted a great beneficial influence upon the advance of advertising. All were its strong proponents and each in his own way was among the great of our profession.

After careful study and much consideration, these ten were the selections of your committee, but I am sure that your committee would agree that during these fourscore years there have been hundreds of other men of advertising who have given greatly to the growth, accomplishments, and success of advertising. To the memory of all such people, men or women, who have passed on to their eternal reward, I am sure we tonight give our homage, and honor them for what they have done.

Let us now survey the results of those years as they are disclosed by the provable facts. I shall start with the year 1900, when the tempo of advertising progress really began to become national and to hit its stride.

If you will take the record for the years since the beginning of the twentieth century, you will find that from 1900 to 1930, with only one yearly exception, the total annual expenditures for advertising in America have been over 3 percent of national income. During the 1920's this ratio at times almost reached 4 percent. I repeat that for 29 of those growing prosperous years, advertising expenditures reached or exceeded 3 percent of national income. And please note that during this whole period there were only two periods of serious unemployment and both were relatively brief in duration.

The years of preparation up to 1900 and of realization and expansion from 1900 to 1930 were the years in which the men we honor tonight were most active.

I think I can show you that their accomplishments and that of the other men of advertising during those hectic and resultful years up to 1930 are far more than merely a matter of pride for us tonight.

EXAMINE OUR RECENT RECORD

It seems to me that the things they did, the obstacles they overcame and the magnificent results they achieved, when compared with the record of our generation since 1930, is a challenge to us and to those who will follow us.

Because, gentlemen of advertising, our record in recent years is not so good. Listen.

In 1930 the depression came. Both advertising expenditures and national income fell abruptly during the early 1930's. All through the latter 1930's our ratio of advertising expenditures never rose as high as 3 percent of national income and all through this period we had heavy unemployment. During the 1930's, except for 2 years, average unemployment was in excess of 8,000,000 persons until we came to the period of war preparation in the early 1940's. Then during the war we experienced a strong sellers' market and advertising promotion dropped to as low as 1.5 percent of national income.

We are now completing the year 1949. We are almost wholly back in a buyers' market. Many of our businessmen have become accustomed to the standards of, either the sellers' market of the postwar period, or of the depression period. Many younger men have had no experience with the prosperous pre-depression days. It has been almost 20 years since we have been building soundly prosperous times.

For 30 years, from 1900 to 1930, America experienced an almost unbroken buyers' market. During that time the ratio of advertising expenditures to national income was well over 3 percent. In 1948 advertising investments were but 2.2 percent of national income. In 1949 they will probably be slightly lower. This must be a matter of very grave concern for us men of advertising. It should be a matter of grave concern to Congress. It is of grave concern to manufacturers and to merchants. Regardless of actual dollar increases, advertising expenditures when compared to national income are 1 percent less than they were during the first 30 years of this century, and remember 1 percent of current national income, my friends, is over $4,000,000,000.

A PICTURE OF OUR INADEQUACY

We all need to look at these figures of current advertising inadequacy in order to get a clear impression of the situation. Here are the gory details:

Over 3 percent of national income was spent for advertising during every year from 1900 to 1930 except for 1918; a peak of 3.9 percent was spent for advertising during the 1920's.

A steady drop in this percentage during the depression, down to 2.6 percent by 1940.

Never over 1.6 percent during the war; 1.9 percent in 1946; 2.1 percent in 1947; 2.2 percent in 1948; probably not much over 2 percent in 1949.

Here we are 5 years after the war, and only about two-thirds as much advertising as 30 years of successful experience have shown to be needed to move America ahead to real progress and prosperity.

The following figures are even more embarrassing to us men of advertising than the figures I have just quoted.

Through the period from 1900 up to 1930, total national selling expenditure for all kinds of selling, averaged a little over 36 percent of national income. This included advertising, of course. During the depression years, the percentage of total selling expense held up far better than did the percentage of advertising. In 1940, when the ratio of advertising to national income had dropped nearly one-quarter below the 1900 to 1930 average, the ratio of total selling cost showed an almost negligible drop from the 30-year average. Through the war, of course, the selling percentage dropped sharply, but in 1946 this total selling ratio, even in a buyers' market, was back to 35.6 percent and in 1948 it was 37 percent, or higher than the average of the 1900 to 1930 period.

WHAT IS THE MATTER?

Don't ask me what this means, but it certainly is a sorry showing for advertising. We have new and unique advertising methods and media. We can prove the power of the impact of advertising, but volume—by ratio—is way off, about 33⅓ percent off as I see it. What is the matter? Can you be proud of these figures? I certainly cannot.

Let us take a common-sense look at the situation.

Business today is on a see-saw. Will it turn up or down? If it is going to turn upward, it will need power to climb the hill and that power is advertising. You know what happens if it turns downward—there will be unemployment, inventories will mount, and that will mean less sales, still more unemployment, closing factories and stores and all the rest of the dismal downward spiral.

We are here tonight to do honor to great advertising men of the past. They did their job magnificently and left us a great heritage. Through the mists and fogs of their futures, they dreamed great dreams and they saw colossal mirages of progress. They made the dreams and the mirages come true—far more true than they could possibly have imagined.

Are we so dreaming today, have we the vision, the energy, the conviction, and the courage to do our duty to our future as they did to theirs? That is the question we face tonight, my friends, we in this room and thousands of other advertising men throughout America.

Let us dream just a little in our turn. Let me give you a taste of my dreams for advertising's future.

I believe advertising is the surest way to bring prosperity to America and to the world, the most certain road to true security, and the real solution to the problems of almost universal happiness. I think advertising can lower the cost of government, and that is the only way to greatly reduce taxes. I believe it can pay off the national debt. I believe that through advertising lies the best hope of the world for universal peace. I believe all these wonderful results are possible if the men of advertising have the vision, courage, and honesty possessed by the men we are honoring tonight. We shall need help, of course.

A few weeks ago, Mr. David F. Austin, vice president of Big Steel in charge of sales, said that the half million salesmen of America must save the world if it is to be saved. I would only add my conviction that the several thousand influential men of advertising who naturally are a part of Mr. Austin's half million have got pretty much to be the leaders in the job.

PROSPERITY IS INSURANCE

How can this ambitious program be accomplished? First, we certainly must have prosperity in America.

Sumner Slichter, in an article in the November Atlantic, predicts that by 1960 the annual national income will be at least $416,000,000,000, and is more likely to be in excess of $500,000,000,000. Figure 3 percent of that amount you agency and media men. The $550,000,000,000 figure will be easy if the trends of the last 50 years are continued. There will be more people in America by 1960, probably at least an extra 25,000,000. There are already seven or eight million more children than was anticipated 10 years ago. In addition, there is the steadily increasing unit production per man-hour which on the average and for many years has moved ahead at about 2 percent a year. This is the result of invention, of the developments of machinery and power, of the increasing efficiency of management, and of the dexterity and intelligence of American men and women.

In addition, in many directions there has been an increase in the buying power of the dollar. A surprisingly large number of products are today priced far below the prices for which they sold in past years, and when this has happened, it has been principally because of the enormous increases in demand brought about through advertising.

Look also at the record of increasing individual income—in 1914, the year the First World War was started, the average per capita income in this country, adjusted for changes in cost of living, was $472. In 1948 it was $825—these figures are adjusted so that they are comparable. This tendency has followed a continuous pattern in America almost from the beginning. There is no evidence that it will change.

The whole trend of events indicates that we probably will have continuing prosperity in America. At least for the long run, that seems likely.

TWO DANGERS CITED

Now what could prevent such a to-be-desired development? There are two dangers: First, the development of a completely socialist state in the United States of America. Such a development, through its destruction of initiative, incentive and competition, could stop American and probably world progress for centuries. The second danger is war with its terrific destruction of property and human life and with the probability that it would leave us with a military or police state and with an utterly ruinous national debt. Remember, Einstein said recently, "I do not know all the weapons which would be used in a third world war, but I do know that if there is a third world war, then the weapon for the fourth world war will be clubs."

How can advertising keep America away from these desperately dangerous trends?

Continuing prosperity is the sure way to combat socialism and communism.

Americans are strong free enterprisers today. We must keep them so. And by that statement I do not mean that we can safely live in a world that favors either end of the spectrum. Neutral tints have always been the natural colors of nature.

Federal old-age pensions, for example, within reason and on a sufficiency level are not socialistic, they are just plain common sense. This is equally true of other forms of well-managed public operations such as the maintenance of adequate Federal defense, our public schools, police and fire departments, etc. Common sense and local conditions are the judge, not arbitrary rule. In the town in which I grew up, the cemeteries were owned by the city. Was this socialistic? I do not think so. If we could persuade some of our well-intentioned but mentally blind friends to view current events with common sense and not with thicker and utterly fixed convictions, that the future can be built entirely from the past, we businessmen would travel faster and leave less ammunition for our opponents. I think it was Louis XIV of France to whom his prime minister once said, "Sire, if you would but once concede that you could be wrong—" We need some of that sort of realization in certain high places today.

Common sense says that we must have competition, keen competition. Where monopoly is desirable for public reasons as, for example, with public utilities, we need reasonable and intelligent regulation. We want competition because it breeds incentive and invention and adventure. We must have no limits upon size where size is beneficial to the public. These are the things that manufacture prosperity. America has found the way. We must develop and improve it, and you know that advertising and publicity are principal tools by which the desired results can be achieved.

Almost everyone agrees that production of goods and services is essential if people are to have more things and better living. But there seems to be a blind spot with many people about the difference between the actual manufacturing production and the use of the materials produced. It is neither good economics nor profitable to produce any sort of material if it does not move off the shipping platforms. It is only as customers take goods that the goods become of value. The production of customers and of sales is as important as the production of goods, and the process, stimulus, and speed with which the products of the factory or the farm or the mine reach the consumer is of paramount importance to prosperity.

During 1948, American manufacturers and merchants spent over a billion dollars for national advertising in magazines, newspapers, and radio. These were practical businessmen who know the value of an advertising dollar. They did not spend this money because they loved the publishers or the radio stations. Rather they spent it to stimulate the sale and turn-over of their goods in our country's market places. These businessmen backed their choices to the extent of a billion dollars in 1 year because they knew, from experience, that this was the best way to accomplish the results they sought. You will agree, I know, that this expenditure must have provided a great stimulus to the turn-over of goods. In addition hundreds of thousands of dollars were spent in other forms of advertising.

SPEED OF TURN-OVER IMPORTANT

Speed in the turn-over of goods and services is one of the principal forces which is instrumental in creating national income. The best estimates indicate that the inventories of American manufacturers had an average turnover of slightly more than seven times in 1948. Suppose expenditures for national advertising were reduced to a point where the net effect of the reduced advertising volume and the subsequent reduced sale was to slow the manufacturing turnover from seven to six times. This would result in serious unemployment and in a cut in Federal tax revenues of many billions of dollars a year. That is just how important national advertising is to the national turnover rate and to Federal tax revenues. Advertising not only creates a market for a product, but it also adds dollars to Federal income.[1]

[1] The following quotation is from a speech made by Dr. Harold G. Moulton, president of Brookings Institution, in New York on December 8, 1948, before the Congress of American Industry:

"Because of the highly sensitive character of our tax system, even a moderate recession, such as a 20-percent decline, would involve a drop in tax receipts of something like sixteen to eighteen billions of dollars."

A few moments ago I said that advertising can lower the cost of government and thus greatly reduce taxes. The figures indicate strongly that we people of advertising have an economic value to the Nation considerably broader than merely the selling of goods and services.

On the average each time an extra dollar of advertising is expended, it means that more goods are being sold, greater employment is being provided, and the revenue of the Federal Government is being increased by—I think—several dollars for each dollar spent for advertising.

Obviously, if advertising can do these things, it can reduce taxes and in time pay off the national debt. The debt can never be paid by saving—it is too big—our one hope is a greater volume of sales, ever growing and steadily prosperous. The answer is all in the cards, my friends; it is just a question of how well we play them.

ADVERTISING AN AID TO PEACE

I said earlier that advertising can be a major factor in bringing peace to the world. I meant just that. I think our country has been missing a perfectly enormous opportunity. We are spending tens of billions of dollars each year to arm ourselves and we expect to spend a good many more billions to arm our allies. We expect to continue such expenditures indefinitely into the future. I do not quarrel with these expenditures today, but I ask what are we doing to make such mammoth expenditures unnecessary in the future? Is it not true that the major cause of war is lack of understanding between the peoples of different nations? Isn't the danger and the expense of today's defense preparation due to the fact that leaders of a certain country have been propagandizing their people and much of the rest of the world with completely false doctrines and with vicious lies about America?

We certainly know that most of the troubles of the world have their foundations in mass movements. People are lead into things en bloc. The farewell state in England is an example. Have we not drifted a considerable distance down such false lanes in America? Does not the correction of such a drift and the insurance against its reoccurrence lie in the education of the individual to his personal responsibilities as a citizen? The men you honor tonight were individuals with one thing in common and that was a crusader's zeal to promote and sustain the integrity and development of advertising. The same opportunity is open to all of us. We may never occupy the same broad stage, but we can each be effective in our own field of activity no matter how limited it may be. All of us in this room tonight have strong convictions as to the importance and efficiency of advertising. Most of us have assumed I think that Americans are the premier advertisers of the world? But are we? Are we the great salesmen we used to be? Advertising today must be viewed not alone from the economic angle but also from political and social angles. America has been built on a selling foundation since the days of the fur traders and the Yankee clippers, yet we are letting a group of relatively rank amateurs from behind the iron curtain successfully sell their political doctrines throughout the world. Isn't it about time we did a better job in that connection? I have no doubt that our international propaganda has been well done, but obviously we, as a Nation, have been doing a boy's job in this regard rather than a man's—else 5 years after the end of the war we would not be facing the defense expenditures that we do face today. If a commercial advertising campaign was still inadequate at the end of 5 years, what would happen to the advertising manager or to the advertising agent?

Surely more convincing propaganda internationally about our American way of life—and floods of it—could bring long-lasting peace. If we remove the cause for the need for extreme defense, then we save untold billions.

NATIONAL ADVERTISING EXPENDITURES SUP

Anybody or anything that puts an obstacle in the way of advertising today is doing our Nation a great disservice. That is what I have been telling Congressmen this year in Washington because at this time of all times it would be terrible to unnecessarily increase the burdens upon advertising, when we need its unlimited expansion so desperately.

There is today a decrease in the ratios of expenditures for national advertising. All business history in this country points to the fact that as a Nation we have been prosperous and have had full employment when business turnover was high, and we have usually had depression when the reverse was the case. The speed of the turnover of goods in American markets is influenced to a substantial degree by advertising—in fact the stimulation of the speed of turnover is a principal reason for advertising.

The high employment which has existed since the end of the war is the result of wartime shortages and a sellers' market. In 1950 we will be completely in a buyers' market. Conditions will then be different—coming problems of unemployment must be met by hard selling, lead by advertising.

We people in the advertising field have done a remarkable job in stimulating the sale of goods to customers. Equally we have done a very poor job in selling the importance of our own business to the American public. We have hardly scratched the surface in developing or transmitting effective political and social advertising. Isn't it about time that we people of today's generation of advertising men go to work and do a lot better job in this connection? Incidentally, it seems to me that success in this sort of mission would be the best sort of way for us to earn for advertising eternal appreciation of its merit; and for everyone, happiness and security. These problems we have before us are both an opportunity and an obligation. They mean harder work in the days ahead for each one of us.

That is my story tonight, gentlemen. We have honored ten great men of advertising history. Where shall we stand when the advertising men of the future call the roll of our accomplishments? That is the challenge you and I must answer. If we have the sales ability and the energy, we can carry advertising's banners to far greater heights than they have ever reached before. Let me wish you success in our forward march.

Gag Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following article from the Christian Science Monitor, January 17, 1950:

BACK TO GAG RULE

The vote of the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives to try to restore to itself the power to hold back legislation favored by other responsible House committees reflects little credit on that group.

Gag rule is no respectable rule in a democracy. It may appear to make the handling of some situations easier, as Republicans and conservative southern Democrats seem to think with reference to the proposed fair-employment-practices bill in President Truman's civil-rights program.

This newspaper, as it has indicated before, does not believe it is wise to try to change suddenly by Nation-wide legislation the social and industrial customs of large sections of the population. But it does believe the subject is entitled to debate in Congress and should be decided by a vote, not by subterfuge or the dictatorship of a clique.

Frank discussion would throw light on the subject and might make for more political honesty in the writing of party platforms.

A change in the rules such as the committee seeks would affect all legislation and might hinder various proposals of genuine merit. Ordinarily, bills recommended by legislative committees of the House in their respective fields must wait for the Rules Committee to give them a place on the calendar. A year ago the Administration obtained adoption of a rule under which, if the Rules Committee ignores a reported bill for 21 days, the chairman of the committee sponsoring the bill may call it up for consideration.

To repeal this rule would be a backward step. The Rules Committee in the Eightieth Congress usurped its powers by bottling up the selective-service bill, the Taft-Wagner-Ellender housing bill, and other legislation. To retain a right to vote on legislation which properly should come before it, the House should repudiate the present proposal of its Rules Committee.

Communists and American Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the press today it is stated that the State Department has taken action to get back 42 merchant ships sold to China, saying it does not want them falling into Communist hands. Surely we do not want to give aid and encouragement to the communists by leaving our ships where they can be easily taken. However, the same personnel in the State Department since 1945, did little to get back the nearly 100 American merchant ships that the Russian Communists have belonging to the United States Government. The State Department announced that it has instructed American representatives to ask local authorities in Far East ports to prevent the sailing of any of the ships, which may be there. Presuming that they might fall in Communist hands.

Yet these American merchant ships in the possession of Russia have been to our shores on hundreds of occasions since the ending of the war. They have carried free goods to Russia in the way of tractors, trucks, and heavy machinery, all usable in war. Yet the same Department of State did nothing to keep them on the American shores. Surely the State Department is doing a lip service in taking away the ships from Chinese Nationalists while for years past it has been loading American ships belonging to the taxpayers of this country and permitting the Russians to keep the ships. Only a few have been returned and when these American-owned ships in the hands of Russia were loaded with gasoline and fuel oils and tied up on the Pacific coast in 1948 they were ordered released so that the Communists could continue to have these American-owned ships.

In addition to all of this the Russians had in their possession a great number of naval ships some of which have been returned from time to time. If the same State Department would have given even lip service to returning the American ships they would not be of use for the march of communism to the east. Russian communism has thrived and moved to the east with the aid of American trucks, tractors, and heavy machinery taken to Russia by American-owned merchant ships still in possession of Russia of which the State Department did nothing to apprehend when they were tied to the docks on American shores. If the State Department had done something since the ending of the war in 1945 by keeping from Russia the American-owned ships and the billion dollars of heavy goods and materials we would not be fearing the march of communism in the east.

Where a Reserve Fund Becomes Meaningless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal:

WHERE A RESERVE FUND BECOMES MEANINGLESS

On January 1, 1950, social-security taxes for old-age benefits will be increased from the present rate of 1 percent to 1½ percent, and the increase will bring an additional $667,000,000 into the fund which now totals $11,600,000,000. This huge fund is now invested in obligations of the United States Government.

Since there is mounting pressure for increasing the amount of old-age benefits—and this pressure has been greatly heightened by the recent pension settlements made in the steel and automobile industries—it is worth while to try to take an objective view of the whole Federal old-age-benefit scheme.

The first aspect of the situation which is readily apparent is that pensions are and must be paid from current production at the time paid. That which a pensioner wears, eats, or otherwise consumes is not something stored up as Joseph stored grain in ancient Egypt, but is rather the wool, the corn, and the fuel produced at the time of consumption. The source of the funds used to pay for the items consumed does not alter the fact at all just as the source of the funds used in the recent war to pay for war material did not alter the fact that the material which we consumed during the war was in

general the result of production during the war. Consequently, pensions, however paid for, are charges against current production.

The idea of funding pensions, that is, providing sufficient money and investing it so as to produce a total fund of principal and interest sufficient to meet liabilities as they accrue, is essentially a private industry idea. It is the principle upon which all life-insurance companies operate and upon which private pension funds and annuities are set up. There is a certain plausibility in transferring this idea to Federal pensions and creating a fund sufficient to meet all liabilities. That is what has been done and the funds are invested in United States Government bonds, which are admittedly the safest investments available. However, in this assumption that such a fund can be set up is a very basic fallacy. The security of the fund is based upon the taxing power of the Government because it is only that which can make the bonds good. If there were no fund, the taxing power of the Government would still be the basis of security of the pensions.

In any one year any drafts upon the fund can be paid only from (1) interest on the bonds held in the fund which comes from taxation, (2) from bonds paid off, which comes from taxation, (3) from additional social-security taxes collected, which is taxation, or (4) sale of bonds to private investors, which is merely postponed taxation, in that the bond will ultimately have to be paid. If this analysis is correct, it seems to us that the creation of a Federal pension fund serves no purpose that could not be served by direct taxation and appropriation each year.

There are, however, certain undesirable features of the present scheme. The amassing of bonds in the Federal pension fund tends to create a sense of financial security independent of Government which does not exist. It gives a distorted picture of the Federal debt in the absurdity of one branch of Government owning obligations of another branch. It distorts annual budgets in that the true cost of pensions paid in any year is what is paid out in that year, whereas under the funding system these costs may be concealed in interest paid, bonds sold, or other transactions. It is perfectly true that Federal pensions even at present levels, will constitute an ever-increasing cost each year as more and more people arrive at pension age and as life expectancy increases. But to think that in an insurance scheme covering the whole population a financial fund can be set up in anticipation of these requirements is an illusion. Such a fund can be only a claim against future taxation.

Let's get rid of the illusion and face up to the facts. If we are to pay Federal pensions to everyone eligible, we should tax and appropriate the sums required each year. Then we will have some accurate idea of what we are doing. The insurance concept on a national basis is self-contradictory in that by embracing the whole population the distribution of risk becomes meaningless.

Address Before Daughters of the Confederacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Daughters of the Confederacy at Confederate Memorial Hall, Washington, D. C., Wednesday evening, January 18, 1950:

We are highly honored in the privilege to join with you descendants of the brave Confederate soldiers who followed the matchless leaders of the Confederacy, Robert E. Lee, Thomas J. Jackson, and Matthew Fontaine Maury, whose memory we now honor.

On first thought it may seem rather strange and at the same time gratifying that in this Capital City we are permitted to thus unfurl the Confederate flag and observe the birthday anniversaries of these great leaders. But when we look into the lives of those men and calculate their true greatness, then we must conclude that it would be strange indeed if Americans anywhere were reluctant to pay them honor.

It is remarkable indeed that a nation which endured only a few short years should produce military leaders of such matchless ability, integrity, and enduring fame. The events which led to the formation of the Confederacy and its ultimate defeat on the field of battle may be forgotten, or buried within the history of our now united Nation, but the names of Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, and Matthew Fontaine Maury will never be forgotten. Those names will live in the hearts and minds of our people as long as mankind recognizes the merit of true heroism and nobility of thought and deed, which qualities of character were so truly exemplified in the lives of those Confederate leaders.

It is a happy coincidence that the birthdays of Lee, Jackson, and Maury fall so nearly on the same day—Lee's on the 19th, Jackson's on the 21st, and Maury's on the 24th of January—for because of their inseparable ties in the history of the Confederacy we can hardly honor one without at the same time honoring the others. They lived and died for the same cause.

First of all let us have a closer look at General Lee and inquire what makes his life appear so immeasurably grand.

It must be the fact that he went beyond the heights of greatness and on to peaks of nobility.

"His life was gentle, and the elements so mix'd in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world: 'This was a man.' "

We have only to witness the degree of fortitude and courage with which Lee accepted adversity as well as the gracious manner in which he bore pain, suffering, and even defeat to appreciate the true stature of his greatness. Everything about Lee, the loftiness of his ideals, manliness of his actions, and the unselfishness of his deeds, seemed firmly anchored in the bedrock of Christian faith, hope, and charity.

Both by nature and necessity General Lee was a lover of hard work; he cared little for the social or lighter pursuits of life. He liked the soldier's hardships, the soldier's toil, even the soldier's fare, as well as the soldier's glory.

General Lee was born in Virginia January 19, 1807. In 1825 through the generosity of that great South Carolinian, my own predecessor in Congress, then Secretary of War, John C. Calhoun, young Lee was admitted to West Point, graduating therefrom 4 years later without a demerit, second in his class.

Probably the most unusual experience ever coming to an individual came to Lee in March 1861, when at the Blair House here in Washington, where the President now lives, he was confronted with the decision as to whether he should command the Federal forces or the poorly organized, scantily clad troops of Virginia. He assumed command of the Confederate forces in 1861 with the rank of General which he held until his surrender at Appomattox on April 9, 1865.

Someone has said that the presence of Napoleon in battle line was equal to the presence of 100,000 troops. If that be true, how could we estimate the value of the presence of the matchless Lee as he recklessly rode among his troops in his modest uniform of grey, bearing only the stars to indicate his rank?

The late Benjamin H. Hill, of Georgia, has described the character of Lee in these beautiful and striking words: "He was a foe without hate; a friend without treachery; a soldier without cruelty; a victor without oppression, and a victim without murmuring. He was a public officer without vice; a private citizen without wrong; a neighbor without reproach; a Christian without hypocrisy; and a man without guile. He was a Caesar without his ambition; Frederick without his tyranny; Napoleon without his selfishness; and Washington without his reward. He was as obedient to authority as a servant, and royal in authority as a true king. He was gentle as a woman in life, and modest and pure as a virgin in thought; watchful as a Roman vestal in duty; submissive to law as Socrates, and grand in battle as Achilles."

So, like the varicolored threads of a rich tapestry which combine to produce one perfect, balanced design of beauty, the attributes of Lee's greatness, that is, his outstanding ability and talent, his sterling character, his high moral caliber, his Christian faith and devotion, together without the nameless other qualitative attainments and representations of his life were joined, it seemed, to create the world's grandest and most enduring design for noble living.

Theodore Roosevelt once said: "The world has never seen better soldiers than those who followed Lee; and their leader will undoubtedly rank, without any exception, as the very greatest of all the great captains that the English-speaking people have brought forth."

British Field Marshal Wolseley said of Lee: "He was the ablest general, and to me seemed the greatest man I have ever conversed with. * * * General Lee was one of the few men who ever seriously impressed and awed me with their natural and inherent greatness."

Turning now to Gen. Thomas J. (Stonewall) Jackson, we find that he, too, was a military leader of rare genius. It would be entirely pointless to attempt to draw a comparison between Lee and Jackson. Historians and military experts agree that those two southern generals are unexcelled in leadership and strategy as they carried out their respective assignments in the Confederate Army. John Warwick Daniel says of Lee and Jackson: "They were complements of each other, and like David and Jonathan, their souls were knit together."

Jackson has been quoted as saying of his chief: "Lee is a phenomenon. I would follow him blindfold," and Lee, upon learning that his chief lieutenant had been mortally wounded, exclaimed: "Jackson has lost his left arm; I have lost my right arm."

Both Lee and Jackson were Christian gentlemen of the highest order, temperate in all things and total abstainers from intoxicants.

Jackson's strength was in his simplicity of life and an almost childlike humility; his brilliance was in his unwavering devotion to duty and concentration on the task at hand.

A devoutly religious man, Jackson gave thanks to divine providence for every victory in battle. He once told a friend that he prayed constantly.

From his boyhood onward, the life of this fearless warrior was the very model of a Christian gentleman. Fearless and strong, self-dependent and ambitious, he had within him the making of a Napoleon, and yet his name is without spot or blemish.

He was daring and brilliant in leading his troops, but for success in battle he gave God the praise; he was bold, aggressive, and unrelenting in attack, but was the humblest of men, and his own will was always submissive to the will of God.

As would be expected of a man of such unwavering Christian devotion, Stonewall Jackson, although one of the greatest military leaders of all time, prayed and longed constantly for peace. In almost every letter he dispatched to his wife during the Virginia campaign, Jackson expressed his fervent prayer for speedy peace.

Field Marshal Wolseley has described Jackson in the following words:

"Shy as a lad, reserved as a man, speaking little but thinking much, he led his own life, devouring the experiences of great men, as recorded in military history, in order that when his time came he should be capable of handling his troops as they did. A man of very simple tastes and habits, but of strong religious principles, drawing directly from the Bible; a child in purity; a child in faith; the Almighty always in his thoughts, his stay in trouble, his guide in every difficulty, Jackson's individuality was more striking and more complete than that of all others who played leading parts in the great tragedy of secession. * * * With that innate love of virtue and real worth which has always distinguished the American people, there has long been growing up, even among those who were the fiercest foes of the South, a feeling of love and reverence for the memory of this great and true-hearted man of war, who fell in what he firmly believed to be a sacred cause. The fame of Stonewall Jackson is no longer the exclusive property of Virginia and the South; it has become the birthright of every man privileged to call himself an American."

G. F. R. Henderson, the British military historian, concludes his outstanding book, "Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War," with the following words which are particularly appropriate today as we wage a relentless struggle against the enemies of freedom:

"The hero who lies buried at Lexington, in the Valley of Virginia, belongs to a race that is not confined to a single continent; and to those who speak the same tongue, and in whose veins the same blood flows, his words come home like an echo of all that is noblest in their history: 'What is life without honour? Degradation is worse than death. We must think of the living and of those who are to come after us, and see that by God's blessing we transmit to them the freedom we have ourselves inherited.' "

Matthew Fontaine Maury, though not so generally known for his contribution to the southern cause, is nonetheless outstanding. He came from a family of distinction, having been born in Spottsylvania County, Va., January 24, 1806, and died in Lexington, Va., February 1, 1873. Like other great men who were physically handicapped, his accomplishments and services to mankind were without limit. His philosophy of life is expressed in the following sentence: "I don't think that so much depends upon intellect as is generally supposed; but industry and steadiness of purpose, they are the things."

The work of Maury in compiling charts of the seas has never been improved upon. His observations and findings even to this day are held to be the most dependable authorities in the world on naval shipping. Though less conspicuous in his service than Generals Lee and Jackson, his, too, was most outstanding.

To be sure, there is no longer any feeling of sectionalism, no South, no North, no East, no West—all of us are now sons and brothers of our great common country. It is with a feeling of pride, however, that those of us from the South extol the virtues of our heroes and count their contributions to history. At the top of the great roster of our southern heroes will forever be found the names of Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, and Matthew Fontaine Maury.

The Tempted Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I issued a statement pointing to the likelihood that some Republican Members would use back-alley techniques to restore the Rules Committee's powers as a way of killing FEPC, the whole civil-rights program, and all Fair Deal legislation. I wish to bring to the attention of these same Republican Members this editorial from this morning's edition of the country's leading Republican newspaper, the New York Herald Tribune. It properly recalls to the Republican Members their obligations to their party, to the Congress, and to the people of our country. One more Republican finagle on civil rights will prove once and for all the hypocrisy in all Republican protestations in favor of civil rights.

THE TEMPTED REPUBLICANS

Mr. Truman likes to make large statements. Sounding off on the durable issue of civil rights, he promises that a Senate vote will be forced if it takes all summer. Such a bugle blast makes a snappy headline, but we doubt that the President is really quite that much of an optimist. Nothing has appeared to indicate any great change of temper in the Senate. With a congressional election coming up, there is less taste than ever for sitting out the summer in Washington. The filibuster is still the southerners' effective weapon, as Mr. Truman knows. One can only assume that the White House cry was intended for external consumption, with civil rights intended again for the purposes of vote getting in November.

A far more immediate test of civil rights rests in the House, where the Rules Committee is on a rampage to regain its autocratic powers over legislation. Southern Democrats and Republicans are in coalition to put the Rules Committee back in control, able to pigeonhole not only civil rights but every other bill which meets their common opposition. The vote is imminent, and the prospect for the Truman Democrats is scarcely comforting.

What concerns us is the Republican danger. For the sake of putting the majority party in a hole, a considerable number of Republicans appear willing to go along with the ultraconservative southerners who are consecrated to the one purpose of defeating civil rights. This is an alliance that violates principle and purpose. The Republican position on civil rights is historic and forthright, even stronger than that which Mr. Truman so fondly trumpets. But when Representative Cox, of Georgia, suddenly proposes restoring the Rules Committee's life-or-death authority over the legislative stream (and this by neat coincidence in the midst of hearings on fair employment practices), the Republicans on the committee wheel right into line. It is not an inspiring picture.

There has been a lot of pious talk that the Rules Committee is a private conscience, an enlightened combination of old heads, that saves an unruly House from much bad and costly legislation. If such a device is required to balk Mr. RANKIN's pension schemes, it is a sad commentary on congressional intellect and courage. This contradiction of majority will, the ability to sit on bills and keep them from coming to vote, cuts in both directions. The House is directly responsible to all the people, and why should the encrusted Rules Committee, operating by its own set of prejudices, be allowed a superior authority? Legislative traffic controls we need; effective party policy committees are required. But having clipped the Rules Committee's wings only last year, let us hold to the gains of open responsibility. The Senate has its entrenched filibuster; spare the return to the House Rules Committee. That is the challenge to Republicans in the coming House vote, to stick up for party principle and shun the Dixiecrat tempters.

Communist Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Observer, of Kearny, N. J., published under date of January 12, 1950.

Under the title, "Communist Approach," the editor has written a revealing article on the technique employed by agents of the Kremlin—the wolves in sheep's clothing. It is well that we acquaint ourselves so that we be equipped to stand guard.

COMMUNIST APPROACH

Many Americans must still wonder if the Soviet Union actually calls the tune within the satellite states or if these states, as the Kremlin claims, are actually independent "people's democracies." They must wonder, too, just how communism manages to overrun a state—Czechoslovakia, for example—which had always had a high degree of individual freedom.

The October issue of Foreign Affairs carried a revealing answer to these questions. It was written by Josef Reval, whom the magazine terms "the leading theorist of Hungarian communism," and was published in a Hungarian Marxist journal.

The gist of Reval's remarkable article is found in this paragraph: "We were a minority in parliament * * * but at the same time we represented the leading force. We had decisive control over the police forces. Our force * * * was multiplied by the fact that the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Army, were always there to support us with their assistance. * * * When we struggled directly and apparently only for steadfast achievement of bourgeois-democratic tasks, we fought as well for the establishment and assurance of the conditions which made possible the socialistic transformation. The change in the development of our people's democracy into the dictatorship of the proletariat began with the destruction of the right wing of the Smallholders' Party, with the liquidation of the conspiracy and the fall of Ferenc Nagy (Nagy headed a Hungarian coalition government). Then the kulak (the more prosperous class of farmer) became an enemy, then the leading role of our party and the working class was strengthened. * * * This development, our development into a dictatorship of the proletariat, was crowned and definitely assured * * * by the destruction of the right wing of the Socialist Party and the establishment of the united Workers' Party."

That is a frank and accurate description of the standard Communist technique, written from the inside. It applies in principle to every country which has adopted the Marxist religion. The Kremlin actively aids and abets the movement, and the threat of Red Army action always exists. The wolf-in-sheep's-clothing device is always employed to disarm the people. And, once power is seized, all opposition is liquidated—including even the more moderate elements within the Socialist ranks.

Reval's article implies one more fact of the highest importance. The Communists must win an election or any form of political struggle only once—then they are in for good, unless war or revolution unseats them. Those who believe in free, representative government must win every time if they are to survive.

Gerald J. Doyle Wins Speaking Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, Gerald J. Doyle is a modest youngster, 18 years of age, who is a senior at Bishop McDonnell Memorial High School. He resides with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leo J. Doyle, at 196 Clinton Avenue, Brooklyn, which is located in my congressional district.

Gerald's ambition is to become a radio announcer. He works after school hours as a switchboard operator in Kings County Medical Society, but finds time to write on timely subjects, showing a keen grasp of problems which confront our Nation.

On May 22, 1949 he was awarded first prize in a public speaking contest conducted at his high school. I have read some of his writings, and I am happy to have the opportunity to commend to the reading of my colleagues one of his speeches entitled "I Speak for Democracy."

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

I speak for democracy because the democratic way of life gives me the assurance that I will be considered as an individual, a person—instead of a cog in the machinery of an all-embracing state. We, the highschool students of this country, are fortunate in that we are in the United States, where democracy means what it should mean—liberty to one's own life without government interference. We may prepare ourselves for and enter upon any walk of life we may choose, without let or hindrance from any bureaucratic or Government agency. All over this country, young men and women are finishing high school and seeking to enter college, so that they may be prepared to shoulder the burden that will preserve real democracy for themselves and those that come after them. Why? Because only in a true democracy, such as the United States, can a man achieve success and happiness.

Democracy gives me freedom of conscience, my right to worship my Creator as and when I see fit, to live my life according to the moral code sanctioned by my religion and to be educated in the faith of my fathers. I am guaranteed this by the basic law of my country. We have no state religion, but they render unto Caesar the things that belong to Caesar and to God the things that are God's, according to our religious concepts.

I hope to go to college—I want to gain all the knowledge I can, because free enterprise calls for the person with training. My training will help me to succeed in business; it should help me to safeguard that democracy which gives me all these opportunities.

Democracy can only exist and grow when the citizenry of a country is interested in government, and in those who run the government. My representatives, to whom I and my fellows have given the task of running my Government, should be helped by me in every way, so that the ship of state may safely sail the seas and weather the storms that beset her, be these storms national or international.

When things go wrong, I must be capable of voicing my dissatisfaction with those responsible; my criticism, however, should be constructive. Only a trained citizenry can give constructive suggestions to those who have been placed in power. All over this land, my fellows and our elders are taking keen interest in governmental affairs. The radio, newspapers, commentators, by voice or in writing, are enlightening us. Both sides of public questions are presented for our information, so that when our fathers, and later when we exercise our power of franchise, knowledge, and good judgment, will be called in to play when we choose those who will stand in our places in the legislative halls of our Government.

We, who speak for democracy, realize that there will always be a struggle to set on the right track those who lose faith in our system of government. Knowing that it is not perfect, we must be prepared to better it; but, in our attempt to better it, we must not lose the fundamental principle of our freedom. We must keep before us the true democratic ideal, that man, without regard to race, creed, or color, must be given the dignity which belongs to a rational being. I am the voice of youth. I believe in true democracy. I believe in my United States of America—may it always be the land of the free and the haven of the oppressed.

The Rules Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times for Saturday, January 14, 1950:

THE RULES COMMITTEE

A curious item of news originating in Washington yesterday was that the House Rules Committee had voted 9 to 2 to regain its old power of holding up legislation indefinitely. Readers may recall that the House deprived the committee of this regal prerogative a year ago. The vote in that case was 275 to 142. All that the committee can do now is to hold up bills approved by standing committees for 21 calendar days. After that the chairman of any standing committee so involved may call the measure up on the floor of the House on the second or fourth Monday of any month during a session. To the older-fashioned members of the committee this situation apparently seems cruel and unusual. Chairman SABATH, who made the announcement, stated that he himself had voted "no." This was consistent, since Mr. SABATH last year was the author of the motion to curtail the committee powers.

This particular action at this particular time must have some connection with the bill to establish a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission, which was approved by the House Labor Committee last year and is now before the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee has delayed action on this measure until it can hear some more opponents. Practically speaking, we need not expect this or any other civil-rights measure to become law at this session. The FEPC might pass the House but if it did it would be killed by the filibuster in the Senate. Just as the Rules Committee is fighting for the dictatorship of a minority in the House, the opponents of effective cloture in the Senate have always fought for and won—as they did last March—the dictatorship of a minority in the Senate. It is odd that 6 members of the House Rules Committee or 20 Senators should be able to veto measures possibly desired by a majority of the Senate, a majority of the House of Representatives and a majority of the 48,489,217 voters who went to the polls in November, 1948. Such, however, may sometimes be the case. This is a point at which our democracy is still imperfect and needs attention.

Asia Out of Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting an article written by William Henry Chamberlin for the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, January 19, 1950:

ASIA OUT OF CONTROL—MOST OF CONTINENT IS NOW RULED BY NATIONALIST REGIMES OVER WHICH UNITED STATES CAN EXERT VERY LITTLE INFLUENCE

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The gist of Secretary of State Acheson's long speech at the National Press Club on America's Far Eastern policy could be summed up in two short sentences. Asia is out of control. And there is little we can do about it.

In discussing what has happened in China Mr. Acheson argued like a lawyer with a case to prove, not like a dispassionate historian. He very much exaggerated the strength of Chiang Kai-shek and the weakness of the Communists at the end of the war. He passed over in silence two substantial contributions which the Roosevelt administration made to the Chinese debacle.

One was the obsession of the terrible-tempered Gen. Joseph Stilwell, highest American military authority in China until 1944, with the idea of fighting a campaign in the jungles of Burma. This led to the diversion and withholding of supplies which might have made it possible to save large areas of southern China from Japanese conquest in 1944. And wherever the Japanese went the foundations of Chinese administration and social order were destroyed and a vacuum was created which the Communists were quick to fill as soon as the Japanese were eliminated.

SELL-OUT AT YALTA

The other contribution was the discreditable and stupid sell-out of China's economic rights and interests in Manchuria to Stalin at Yalta. Mr. Acheson denounced the Soviet Union for detaching the northern provinces of China, Manchuria, Outer Mongolia, Sinkiang and Inner Mongolia, and attaching these regions to the Soviet Union. He failed to mention the relevant if embarrassing fact that the late President Roosevelt at Yalta gave a considerable impetus to this process of encroachment on China's territorial integrity.

Nor did the Secretary explain how we got into the confused and contradictory position of being so eager to bribe Stalin to take part in a war, which wild horses couldn't have kept him out of, that we offered Russia on a silver platter the things which we had pronounced it utterly inadmissible that Japan should take.

Mr. Acheson derived some consolation from predicting for the Russians the righteous anger and the wrath and the hatred of the Chinese people. But this is largely guesswork. There has been nothing in the record of the Chinese Communists thus far to prove that they will not subordinate the interests of their own country to those of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union inflicted upon Poland about every cruelty and indignity that one nation could inflict upon another. It annexed almost half of Poland's prewar territory. It deported hundreds of thousands of Poles to slave labor concentration camps. It massacred thousands of Polish officers in the Katyn Forest. Yet it has been possible to maintain in Warsaw a Moscow-oriented government and to compensate the Poles to some extent by giving them territory and natural resources which rightfully belong to Germany.

Who can be sure that Stalin will not be able to offer Mao Tse-tung attractive prospects of expansion southward, into Indochina, Siam, Malaya, Burma, to say nothing of Formosa and Hong Kong, and thereby reconcile him to the idea of Russian domination of the northern Chinese provinces? Communists do have a way of making life uncomfortable for those who build great expectations on their good behavior.

THE OLD ORDER IS GONE

Although Mr. Acheson is deficient as a historian of what has happened in China and is indulging in wishful guessing about the possibility of the Chinese Communists turning against Moscow, there is no reason to dispute his main conclusions about other parts of Asia. That continent has broken loose from its old moorings.

Before the war the British, Dutch, and French Empires maintained stability over a wide area of southern and southeastern Asia. Now the old-fashioned colonialism symbolized by Kipling's phrase, "the white man's burden," is dead and nothing very firm has taken its place.

India and Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon are independent states. After years of fighting and negotiation the Dutch have recognized the independence and sovereignty of their former vast imperial possessions in Indonesia. The Philippines had been freed by the United States before the war and have taken up where they left off before the Japanese invasion. The French are fighting a costly, wasting, no-decision war in their big colony, Indochina.

Asiatic nationalism had been gaining strength before the war and gained irresistible impetus during the war, when the Japanese for a time overran almost all southeastern Asia. The Japanese carried on much propaganda against white imperialism. And the speed with which the French, British, and Dutch possessions fell before the first sweep on the Japanese onslaught certainly helped to destroy native belief in the invincibility of their foreign rulers.

It has been American policy to favor the emergence of moderate nationalist regimes as the most hopeful barriers against communism. It was largely under American pressure that the Dutch Government, to the dissatisfaction of a considerable section of Dutch public opinion, came to terms with the Indonesian nationalists.

NEW NATIONALIST REGIMES ARE UNSTEADY

The French experience in Indo-China certainly shows the difficulty, perhaps the impossibility, of trying to restore old-fashioned colonial relations. But we do not have and cannot have any assurance that non-communist national regimes will be able to function smoothly and efficiently. The masses in these Asiatic lands are poor and illiterate; the new governing classes are inexperienced and doctrinaire. Burma has fallen into complete chaos and there are occasional ominous earthquake rumblings in India and Indonesia. The British have been fighting a hit-and-run guerilla war in Malaya, although they have been more successful there than the French have been in Indo-China.

Obviously it is not in America's power to take over and run countries where the old forms of foreign rule have broken down or are breaking down. Nor is our economic power so strong a weapon in Asia as it was in Europe. For, even if the new nationalist governments appreciate the advantages of American trade and investment, their hold on their peoples is precarious and uncertain.

There may be a suggestion of wholesome humility in recognising that Asia is out of control, that we cannot run the whole world. If we had acted on that principle 10 years ago we would probably have saved ourselves many lives, a vast amount of treasure and innumerable frustrations and disillusionments.

Kenosha's Civic Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of my progressive cities—Kenosha, Wis.—has done an outstanding piece of work in civic betterment. On Sunday, December 25, the Hearst newspapers in this country featured Kenosha and pointed out that the Kenosha Manufacturers' Association and other civic organizations had made a significant contribution to civic life by coordinating important elements in that community to the end that industry, labor, and business had a common goal, namely, the good of all its citizens. As part of my remarks, I am enclosing an editorial that appeared in the Kenosha Evening News on December 20, 1949:

KENOSHA'S CIVIC SPIRIT GETS NATIONAL RECOGNITION

"Kenosha, the City Where People All Work Together" is the title of an article by Rev. Paul Mitchell which is being presented Sunday, December 25, in Hearst papers. A number of pictures were taken of Kenosha's institutions and of the individuals connected with them. Because of the extensive distribution of this article, which will appear in 22 city editions and in special editions in 36 States, various combinations of the pictures taken will be used in different localities; thus pictures not used in the Chicago-Milwaukee area will be used in other sections of the country.

This article is the result of attention attracted to Kenosha by the booklet, The Story of an Industrial Association, recently issued by the Kenosha Manufacturers Association. Rev. Mitchell, who is pastor of Kenosha's Peniel Tabernacle Church, became interested in the civic activities of the Kenosha manufacturers through contacts made with the KMA in his capacity as president of the Kenosha Ministerial Association.

Early this year the booklet won a top national award for its description of programs and activities carried on by the manufacturers of the community through the KMA and in cooperation with individuals and groups throughout Kenosha. This award created a widespread demand for the book.

CAN WORK TOGETHER

Many of the letters subsequently received from top management and industrial and public relations men, as well as from labor leaders, clergymen, and educators who had received the book, expressed the belief that Kenosha's accomplishment was evidence that all citizens in a manufacturing city can work together in harmony and understanding to solve industrial and community problems.

Commenting on the article, J. C. Stump, executive director of the manufacturers association, said: "The manufacturers of Kenosha recognize the importance of industry to the community, as well as the tremendous responsibility that industry has to the community. As individuals, as corporations and as a group through their association, they are constantly striving to fulfill and meet that responsibility.

"The association is carrying forward the manufacturer's proven ideal: The final solution to any problem, product, or program must be for the best interests of the public, the stockholders, the employees, management, and the community."

Stump further pointed out that, "The association in its regular daily work and services for industry and the community has had the outstanding cooperation and support of all manufacturers, members of their staffs, industrial employees, and every other individual and segment of the community. Without their cooperation and support the programs could not have been successful. This is fully appreciated and it is the constant goal of the association that it will always prove worthy of that highly regarded confidence, cooperation, and support."

The Coal Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

WATERTOWN, MASS., *January 19, 1950.*

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

House of Representatives:

We have been notified by St. Josephs Lead Co. they will suspend shipments zinc oxide because Duquesne Power Co. will cut off power January 20 on account of coal shortage. Our other supplier New Jersey Zinc Co. has been closed by strikes for 5 months. Zinc oxide being essential ingredient in our process we face shut-down of our plant employing 250 people. Can anything be done?

MASON, INC.,

J. H. MASON HARRIS.

Everyday Miracle at Fishersville, Va.: The Lame Learn To Walk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the pen of Hamilton Crockford, published in the Sunday, January 8, 1950, edition of the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, and also an editorial from the same paper on the subject of rehabilitation.

Within the past 3 months I have, upon two occasions, taken advantage of opportunities to visit the Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center at Fishersville. What I witnessed there was something not only surprising in the methods employed in the rehabilitation of the handicapped, but the evidence on every hand of successful accomplishment was nothing less than astounding. I feel that the story of this rehabilitation center and its achievements in the work of restoring to handicapped persons both the will and ability to take their rightful places in the world of effort, will be of interest to all who may read it. The article and the editorial follow:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of January 8, 1950]

EVERYDAY MIRACLE AT FISHERSVILLE: THE LAME LEARN TO WALK

(By Hamilton Crockford)

Fishersville: The man on crutches moved slowly down the corridor. He slipped and fell.

The physical therapist standing nearby didn't make a move to help him. She simply looked at him and laughed.

"Did you hurt your knees?" she said.

As though he'd never expected anything else from her, the man picked himself and his crutches up unaided. Then he laughed, too. He was a double amputee, and the knees were artificial.

"You'd think we're the most brutal people in the world," said Dr. Josephine Buchanan, supervisor of medical services at the Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center, recalling the incident later. "But it's all calculated."

The man, you learned, had been taught how to fall, and how to get up, too. He wasn't hurt. It was all in his daily curriculum.

"You see, we teach them independence first of all," Dr. Buchanan elaborated, "and they love it. Some of them have been so pampered at home it's pathetic. We have to rehabilitate their families as well as the patients."

An elderly man moved through the room with the aid of a pair of canes, strange noises emanating from his artificial legs, as the doctor was talking. She took time out to observe, "You're squeaking."

"Yes, I need oil," he said, and grinned broadly.

A UNIQUE VENTURE

This kind of banter between staff and students sets the pace for Virginia's unique venture in the rehabilitation of handicapped civilians here.

The treatment combines complete physical therapy with vocational training in a rounded program, with the specific objective of putting ultimately employable men and women back in shape to hold a job.

And a high heart plays a high role in it. When you're a paraplegic, or have lost your legs, had polio, or speech or hearing defects, severe asthma, arrested tuberculosis, or epilepsy, it takes that.

The "ultimately employable" category might not seem to include all those. But with modern techniques, the center has handled each of those types of cases since it started up in September 1947, and many others. In its first 2 years it served 394 men and women whose cases fell under 45 different diagnoses.

And a mental lift was the first thing on the program for them. Countless seemingly casual little factors contribute to create it.

There are no "patients," for instance, at Woodrow Wilson, and indeed the term wouldn't fit. They're students. And nothing is simpler than the short wooden handbars on walls next to beds and showers by which the students can lift themselves. But the devices enable people to dress and bathe themselves who never could before. It's a long first step to independence.

[Economy-minded folk will note it also eliminates the need for a number of attendants the State would have to pay.]

LEARNING TO WALK

The results of all this are as obvious as the thick black beard on William Yancha's face. Yancha, a Pennsylvania miner who lost one leg below the knee and another above in an accident on the job a few months ago, started growing that bushy ornament soon after he reached the center. He won't shave, he declared, until he walks again without canes. The beard, he figures, is coming off early in the New Year.

It's the kind of extra something that crops up here in addition to the treatment.

The initiative for the over-all program here came from within the State, according to Supervisor Frank O. Birdsall, who succeeded W. K. Barnett, the first director, as head of the staff at the center. Plans for such a center were refined and expanded in the summer and fall of 1945 through cooperation from the Baruch Committee on Physical Medicine, he noted.

Then after long negotiations the former Woodrow Wilson Army General Hospital was deeded to the State and Augusta County July 25, 1947, for educational purposes. The 150-building, 400-acre installation was valued at more than $6,000,000. Along with its utilities, and furnishings and equipment worth $350,000, it was transferred at no cost by the Government.

Making the most of the opportunity, the county opened a consolidated high school for some 1,000 students in its part, and the State also established a regional vocational school, the sixth in Virginia.

The rehabilitation center, utilizing 50 of the one-story brick buildings, completed the three-way integrated set-up. With training as well as treatment available on the spot, it thus afforded a complete program such as no other State has yet provided.

Some have medical centers for the handicapped, but none offer the combined facilities. Even Texas, Birdsall noted with a smile, admitted at last fall's national meeting of rehabilitation workers that Virginia was ahead of it.

STATES COOPERATE

Representatives of several States and a half dozen foreign countries have visited the center to take notes. Some 12 States have entered a few of their own handicapped students here, and the experience has led Birdsall to conclude that centers should be planned to serve several States rather than a single one. A pooling of cases and resources, he explained, assures better and more varied services at lower cost.

Under the State rehabilitation program, created following the enactment of State and Federal laws in 1920, the Federal Government matches on a 50-50 basis the case service funds appropriated by the general assembly for such work.

Rehabilitation is not limited to Fishersville. Across the State 22 field supervisors carry the guidance and training program to disabled persons in their home localities—those who qualify as being old enough to work, but not too old to hold a job, and having some ability left which can be used to make a living.

The State board of education, which administers the program, estimates there are 30,000 such persons in Virginia, between the extremes of the helpless and the nonhandicapped, though many are not reported. In fiscal 1947-48, those enrolled in the projects numbered 2,004. The board reported that the 982 who completed their training that year were supporting not only themselves but 1,415 dependents the next. It noted the cost of rehabilitating them averaged $393 each, and the next year they averaged earnings $1,699 each.

The center here now accommodates about 200 students at a time—the severely disabled—for an average 6-month stay. Some 65 of them are from other States.

Those who come here pay all their maintenance and medical fees if able, or whatever portion they or their families can meet, with public funds making up only what is left. Public funds cover tuition costs. The State provides any capital outlay funds for the others.

CHARGES VARY

Virginia students pay $45 per month for maintenance, out-of-State students $60, based on cost analyses worked out by auditors. Some people injured in industry are admitted under the sponsorship of insurance companies, and others financed by such sources as the United Mine Workers or the National Polio Foundation also are accepted in limited numbers.

The total budget of the center for all purposes figures to about $4 per capita per day, and Birdsall, noting that the costs during the first years will be high, expects this to drop when more students are entered.

For that kind of money, 19-year-old Iris Dove, who never walked in her life, is going to walk. She'll need crutches, but life will be far different from what she knew before. And she'll be equipped to become an alteration seamstress.

A spastic paraplegic from birth, the Roanoke girl had had numerous operations in past years. She never attended public school. Home bound instruction provided by the Roanoke school system and other instruction in hospitals gave her the equivalent of an eighth grade education.

Now, while the technical school teaches her a vocation, the physical medicine department of the center is reeducating her unused muscles. First the therapists exercised her legs, a slow, methodical process, and now she exercises them herself, walking alone with the aid of hand rails.

LEARN TO WALK

But Iris Dove's case is no more striking than many another. Paraplegics and double above-knee amputees are, however, the most difficult cases that come to the center, according to Dr. Buchanan. And these individuals, who seldom ever got back on their legs before, are getting back on them here.

It's the first time, the doctor said, that civilians generally have had a chance to get this kind of rebuilding, which heretofore has been pretty much limited to veterans in Government hospitals.

The techniques, she explained, are largely the result of knowledge gained in the Government's program for rehabilitating war casualties. It's a new specialty in medicine which did not exist 2 years ago, she noted, and numbers of doctors just now are entering it.

Hard work by a cheerful group of skilled physical therapists, exercising the student's

leg stumps or paralyzed limbs, starts off the treatment. Then the student takes over, walking, falling, climbing hand rails, climbing steps like those on a bus or in front of buildings. Before he "graduates," Dr. Buchanan explained, he has to walk around the building on crutches, cross a ditch, fall and get up, and do numerous other stunts, all unaided.

There are other courses for other handicaps. A speech therapy department is one of the recent additions. Consultants on all medical services visit the center and advise on treatments.

But students spend only part of their day in physical rehabilitation. They've selected, with the help of Guidance Counselor J. Paul Glick, the kind of vocational training they want. They get it in the adjoining technical school, headed by W. T. Sinclair. The lay-out of the corridors is such that they can travel to class in their wheel chairs or on foot without going outdoors.

EDUCATION, TOO

The school, with an enrollment of 283, including those from the center, offers them choices of business courses, watch repairing, cabinet making, laundering, shoe repair, sewing, and numerous other subjects.

After hours a social center is available for recreation.

Students admitted to the rehabilitation program are those with disabilities remaining after surgical or medical treatment is done. For some 50 percent of these, physical therapy and rehabilitation can reduce and sometimes eliminate the disability, Dr. Buchanan explained.

But the others, for whom no further treatment is feasible, still benefit by getting training in the technical school which they couldn't get elsewhere because of the pace they'd have to keep or the physical surroundings. Here the program is paced to their need and the equipment is adjusted in every conceivable way so that they can work at it.

Thus, an undermanned center staff, conscious of the need for saving taxpayers' dollars, is able to say that there are none who come here whom it is unable to help.

Assistant Supervisor W. G. Chrisman pointed out this fact is pretty well assured beforehand by the screening work done in home localities. No applicant is admitted direct to the center.

Students are accepted only after the field supervisors in their territory, backed by expert medical opinion, certify they can be improved by the program here. The plan, Chrisman noted, saves the State many dollars it might otherwise spend on cases which couldn't be helped.

The center, Dr. Buchanan reiterated, "is not a haven for the chronically disabled or unemployed." Its program, she stressed, "is an active program, and when the students are sufficiently improved, they are sent on their way to make way for others."

"The amount of money you spend rehabilitating a man," she added, "is far less than you spend just to maintain him in helpless condition. Eventually he gets a job and starts paying taxes back to the State."

URGES MORE FUNDS

Meanwhile, it's the kind of program on which the State could afford to spend more money, in the opinion of one interested observer from Hawaii, M. O. Ekern, director of the vocational rehabilitation service in Honolulu's department of public instruction. Mr. Ekern declared he found the project is a 24-hour job for Birdsall and his assistants. They badly need more help, he said, if the job is to be done most efficiently.

A 65-year-old student amputee, who walked out recently with the aid of a pair of canes after being graduated in 6 months, had his own comment. George H. Caperton, a Beckley, W. Va., coal purchasing agent, who lost a foot when gangrene set in because of diabetes, was leaving to get married.

"I'd been off my legs since July 1948," he said, "and doctors told me I wouldn't walk again. I never would have if I hadn't gotten here."

Said Caperton's brother, William, of Washington, who came for him, "It's a darned shame more people don't know about the place."

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of January 8, 1950]

TAX MONEY WELL SPENT

From both a humanitarian and a dollars-and-cents standpoint, expenditures of tax money for vocational rehabilitation seem to be among the most fruitful made by the Federal and State governments.

During the last 5 years, 222,000 disabled civilians have been restored to a self-supporting status at a cost to the Federal Treasury of $76,000,000, according to figures announced by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Federal Security Agency. The FSA says these rehabilitated people already have returned $70,000,000 to the Treasury in Federal income taxes and eventually, it is estimated, will pay $10 in such taxes for each $1 of taxpayers' money spent on them.

The Federal Government pays about 70 percent of the cost of the over-all rehabilitation program, with the States putting up the other 30 percent. Just as they return money to the Federal Treasury, so do the rehabilitated persons pay taxes to the State.

Virginia has been accused of being a backward State in the matter of per capita expenditures for public education and for other purposes considered by some analysts in determining relative progressiveness among the States. In the matter of vocational rehabilitation, however, Virginia is in the forefront. Its Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center near Staunton is the only State-owned facility of its kind. The valuable work done there, with the aid of Federal funds, is described by Hamilton Crockford in an interesting article in this section of today's Times-Dispatch.

About 2,000 disabled Virginians now are actively engaged in some phases of the rehabilitation program, receiving either medical treatment or vocational training. Another 2,000 are in the active file, in that they are being given counselling service and ultimately will go into the medical or vocational phases of the program, which is administered in Virginia through the State department of education. Cases are referred from the State industrial commission, the department of public welfare, the State employment service, schools, hospitals, physicians, and other sources.

The vocational rehabilitation program began nearly 30 years ago, and the system was greatly enlarged 5 years ago. Since its inception, more than 30,000 persons have been aided in Virginia and approximately 430,000 in the Nation as a whole. But the FSA says that only one in five disabled persons is receiving the training needed and that many more are being disabled each year than are being rehabilitated.

Welcome Thrifty Fifty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a poem, Welcome Thrifty Fifty, by James Lewis, one of my constituents from Bradford, Pa.:

WELCOME THRIFTY FIFTY

We managed to muddle through
  The years right up to date,
But now the babe called '50
  Is coming t' rough the gate.

He has a happy Truman smile
  But no ribbon round his axis,
Instead he totes a sign
  Announcing forty-three billion taxes.

"Living costs too much," sez he,
"I'm going to give you, all for free,
Education, insurance, security
From woes and foes, immunity."

"Labor must have much more pay
For working less and shorter day.
The farmer much more for his crop,
We'll tax-support them if they drop."

"Billions overseas we'll send,
Billions more we'll spend and lend
For steel mills, dams, and various plants,
You gave your shirts—here go your pants."

—*James Lewis.*

While His Naval Critics Assail Unification, the Committee for the Hoover Report Presents Secretary Louis Johnson "a Citation of Merit for Encouragingly Applying to His Department the Recommendations of the Report of the Hoover Commission and Thereby Achieving Notable Economies While Maintaining the Effectiveness of Our National Defense"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under the extension of remarks as recited in the Appendix of the RECORD on last Friday I read an address headed "The problem of unification of the armed forces." The article could well have been entitled "Creating Disunity in the Armed Service Forces of the United States."

Certainly, in his approach to the problem of unifying our armed services, Admiral H. E. Yarnell, United States Navy, retired, made no effort whatever to indicate what should be accomplished by those charged with administering the National Security Act nor did he suggest what benefits could be had under that law as it was passed by this Congress.

Admiral Yarnell exhibited personal opposition to the act as it was passed by this Congress in starting out by saying in part, "The passage of the National Security Act was a serious blunder," this he said despite the fact that under the act and through Secretary Louis Johnson, President Truman has already saved the taxpayers of the country not hundreds but, I might say, thousands of millions of dollars.

Stressing all points of difference—the admiral made no mention of the many

points of agreement that have long since been reached between the official heads of various armed services and other bodies charged with the defense of this country.

It seems no happenstance that his speech preceded another outburst by Navy Captain Crommelin and was followed by an article written in the same vein which was headed "If This Be Treason" and published in Collier magazine this week.

Altogether they add up to what I sincerely hope will prove a futile endeavor to continue to spread discord, misunderstanding, and dissension among the armed services, and spread it at a time when our country needs nothing more in the world than to close ranks and address every last talent of its citizenship to the solution of the vexatious problems now at hand and which lie ahead.

What a contrast exists between the words spoken by Admiral Yarnell and the motive that prompted the little heralded or publicized presentation of a simple but eloquent testimonial and citation bestowed upon our great Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, a few short weeks ago.

The idea of making the bestowal of that testimonial did not stem from some prejudiced source nor was it the expression of some opinionated individual. It was, on the other hand, the grateful recognition of a tremendous group of representative citizens from all over these United States. It was, moreover, the expression of men who, without regard to their political affiliations or their pride in our Army, Navy, or Air Force, expressed publicly their acknowledgment of the things already accomplished by the Secretary of Defense in achieving—

First. The declared purpose and the objectives of a Republican Congress which passed the National Security Act of 1947.

Second. The objectives and purposes of a Democratic controlled Congress which amended that act as of August 10 last year in order to insure the attainment of the objectives previously expressed.

Mr. Speaker, the year of 1949, insofar as the administration of government is concerned, saw no greater tribute given to any man in public life than was the recognition given to my good and long-time friend and the friend of every man in Congress, the Hon. Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, by the National Committee on the Hoover Commission.

You will recall that the Commission itself was set up by a Republican Congress. You will recall, moreover, that it was given several million dollars to report back to the Congress the ways and means by which we could achieve greater efficiency, economy, and businesslike administration of the Executive Departments of the Federal Government, with a minimum expenditure of the taxpayers' dollar.

The proposal, although it was sponsored by the Republicans, met the warm-hearted support of the Democratic delegation and President Harry Truman signed the bill that gave birth to the Hoover Commission.

Mr. Speaker, nowhere but in a true democracy can I vision leaders of diametrically opposed political forces, and meeting in an election year at that, and dispensing with partisan politics, paying tribute to a great Democratic public official for the deeds which he has already accomplished in the performance of his duties.

Mr. Speaker, that is in fact what happened on Tuesday, December 13 last. On that occasion a Nation-wide committee representative of American citizens in every State of the Union and made up of men concerned solely with advancing the well-being of these United States expressed their faith in and their recognition of the abilities of the Hon. Louis Johnson to coordinate, perfect, and administer the most sacred trust outside of the Presidency of the United States that could be given to any man—the security and peace of these United States.

The chief spokesman on that occasion was the Hon. Frank Pace, Jr., Director, Bureau of the Budget. Second to him on the program was the Hon. Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president of Temple University, chairman of the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report of the Commission for Reorganization of Government, and who personally presented the committee's award to Louis Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, the words spoken on that occasion need no embellishment of mine. They are of such great interest to the Members of this House that I am inserting them into our proceedings today with the sincere hope that every Member on both sides of the aisle will read and learn of the tribute paid by a great group of fellow Americans to one who is doing his job as his God and conscience dictate that it should be done in behalf of our country.

Centuries ago it was written that "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Despite the critics of unification, in and out of service, who, in this election year, and on the eve of the political "dog days" which lie ahead, are snapping at the heels of our great Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson continues on his way of translating planned economies into actual action programs in behalf of national economy, security, and the American taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, may God preserve Louis Johnson to continue his work knowing that the President and Americans everywhere are behind him to a man.

The presentation of the award was made by Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president of Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., chairman of the Citizens Committee.

Dr. Johnson spoke as follows:

Mr. Secretary, Under Secretary, Mr. Colts, other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, some 9 months ago when we first started to think in terms of establishing a citizens committee that would carry on a program to implement the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Departments of Government, I discussed the same with Mr. Herbert Hoover. It seemed to Mr. Hoover, as it also seemed to me, that one of the first steps taken should be to visit with President Truman—tell him what we had in mind and to receive his blessing and approval for the project. I would have you believe that the President was most generous in giving his approval.

It then occurred to me that it would be a good thing also for me to talk to some top-flight governmental officials and get their viewpoints and support. One of the first men whom I had an opportunity to meet was our great Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Louis Johnson. I met him first in Philadelphia and at the time he was there to christen the *Roanoke*, the ship named after his home town in Virginia.

I shall never forget the observations and the statements which he made that day. There was a something about the quality of his speech, his spirit, his devotion and affection for his mother, for his home town and, above all else, the sensatory thrill he exhibited of being of service to his country and cooperating with all of those working with him in his new job bespoke his great sincerity.

I then, for the first time, realized that we had in Mr. Louis Johnson a truly great public servant and as I got to know him better we discussed intimately the difficulties and hurdles that would have to be taken before he could effectuate the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I found solace and comfort in his remarkable perception and complete understanding of the importance of the findings of the Hoover Commission and I knew that we could count on him for advice, counsel, and forthright action on his part.

So, my friends, it gives me great pleasure today to hand over to one of the finest public officials that I have ever had the pleasure of knowing and whose personal support of our objectives has meant so much to all of us on the Committee, an award for distinguished service in line with the recommendations of the Hoover report.

Now my friends I would like, if I may, to read this memorial:

"The Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report presents this citation of merit to the Honorable Louis Johnson in recognition of distinguished service to the American people in encouragingly applying to the Department of Defense the recommendations of the report of the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of Government and thereby achieving notable economies while maintaining the effectiveness and efficiency of the Defense Establishment."

Now Mr. Secretary Louis Johnson it gives me great pleasure to present you with this citation.

Secretary Johnson's response was as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Johnson, my colleague, Steve Early, Frank Pace, ladies and gentlemen of the Hoover Commission.

Dr. Johnson, I particularly want to thank you for the kind reference you made with respect to both my mother and my home town.

I told Steve Early about an hour ago that I could speak all that I had to tell you in about 2 minutes and, frankly, now I don't remember what it was that I was going to say.

Dr. Johnson, someone once wrote that there are some who collect old pictures, some old china, others old linen and, as I recall it, the writer went on to say that while all were precious and worth while, that all of these things were fragile and that the only imperishables of life are the memories.

Mr. Chairman, when the going was rough, and I would have you know it was rough at the time we first started on unification—there was the memory of the yesteryear in the War Department and my knowledge of the things that then needed to be done that spurred me on to the doing of those things.

Additionally thereto I have enjoyed the wholehearted support of our President, Harry Truman. But the one thing above all others that made it possible, in addition to our President's support of unification, was the understanding memory and sympathetic support and cooperation of the Honorable Herbert Hoover and your committee—and now Mr. Chairman I want publicly to express my appreciation of that support.

But a short time ago I saw on the wall of the home of a friend an original letter written and signed by Gen. Robert E. Lee in 1867. I thought as I read that letter how eloquently it expressed the philosophy of ex-President Herbert Hoover. The thought impinged itself upon my mind that in our generation there was probably none other than Herbert Hoover himself who could have written such a letter as that great American, Robert E. Lee wrote to Col. Charles Marshall in the distant year of 1867.

May I ask the indulgence of you, my friends, to read that letter to you? I do so because it makes me better understand why Herbert Hoover, treasured then by his friends, while he was railed at by those who worked for and under him, is now treasured and respected by good Americans everywhere throughout our land.

That letter of Gen. Robert E. Lee read in part as follows:

"My experience with men has newly disposed me to think worse of them nor indisposed me to serve them, nor in spite of failures, which I lament, of errors I now see and acknowledge, or of the present aspect of affairs do I despair of the future. The truth is this. The march of providence is so slow and our desire so impatient, the work of progress so immense, and our means of aiding it so feeble, the life of humanity is so long and that of the individual so brief that we often see only the ebb of the advancing waves and are thus discouraged. It is history that teaches us to hope."

Therein, Mr. Chairman, is to me the philosophy that makes Herbert Hoover tick, and inspire people like you to work with him.

I accept, sir, this citation of merit with humility and with full appreciation that it comes not to Louis Johnson but that it comes to all of those on a team that is now on fire with the zeal of doing a good job in behalf of our Nation.

Men like Steve Early, Secretary of Army; Gordon Gray, the Secretary of the Navy; Frank Matthews, the Secretary of the Air Force, Stu Symington, General Bradley, and the three grand Chiefs of Staff who serve on the War Council advising me as Secretary of Defense on all matters relating to the armed services. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, as you know, act as the principal military advisers to the President and the Secretary of Defense with specific responsibility for preparing strategic plans and providing for the strategic direction of the military forces.

All of these splendid men, I am happy to say, are of one mind with me in realizing that the defense dollar is a sacred dollar. Moreover, they realize that the taxpayers' dollar that is entrusted to the Secretary of Defense by the Congress is being spent more economically and without waste and extravagance in producing greater results than the same dollars produced before we went to work to cut out waste and extravagance.

The spirit that recognizes that economy is now actually effecting efficiency in operations is strikingly illustrated, as you well know, Steve, by the splendid work being done by the congressionally established War Council.

While the proceedings of the War Council are usually secret, I can tell you this much. A few days ago one of the departments reported that where they had cut civilian strength in that department by about 30 percent they were turning out more and better work than they did before they made the cut in their personnel.

Dr. Johnson, it is to these splendid officials from the highest and operating down to the lowest echelons to whom this citation should be awarded; it is on their behalf that I accept it from the Hoover Commission.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time since I have been Secretary of Defense where I did not have to sing for my supper and make a speech. I am indeed glad that on this first occasion where I was not billed as a speaker I heard one of the most factually sound and inspiring speeches I have ever heard. The speech was delivered by my good friend, Frank Pace, Director, Bureau of the Budget.

May I say that, in my opinion, there is no man in this country that has a more comprehensive view of the fiscal problems of all branches of Government than does your own good self. The speech made here this evening, coming as it did from one charged by Congress to assist the President in the preparation of the budget and the formulation of the fiscal program of the Government, was a speech that should make all of us sit up, take notice, and go forward despite all obstacles or criticism to do an even better job.

Believe me when I say, Frank, that that talk has inspired Steve, myself, and the rest of us all to do a better job.

Moreover, we will do our best to serve America as you, Dr. Johnson, President Hoover, those of the Hoover Commission, and fellow Americans everywhere, would have America served.

High Spots in the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a radio speech which was delivered originally over radio station WHP in Harrisburg and WLBR in Lebanon, Pa., discussing some of the major trends outlined in the President's message on the budget for the fiscal year 1950:

SUMMARY

Nothing whatever was done in the House this week. It convened merely as a formality—to meet the rule that it cannot adjourn for more than 3 days unless the Senate gives permission for a longer recess. The flood of new legislation is just working its way into committee sessions. None of it is ready for floor debate. However, the Senate is more active. A great deal of legislation passed by the House last fall had not been acted upon by the Senate. Included in these bills are those on displaced persons, extension of social security, abolition of the poll tax and repeal of oleomargarine taxes, and a number of others. The order of business in the Senate is the oleomargarine bill. This week only the Korean aid bill is scheduled for House action. It is due to come up on Thursday.

HIGH SPOTS IN THE 1951 BUDGET

The budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, is a 6-pound volume of 1,403 closely printed pages. It contains literally hundreds of tables giving in detail the costs of government, even down to items such as $150 for snow removal in front of the Supreme Court Building. When outlining how the budget was prepared last week, I neglected to mention that prior to September 15, when Mr. Pace, the head of the Budget Bureau, called for formal budget estimates, there had been a long series of preliminary conferences with the various departments and agencies. These had lasted for at least 6 months previous. Obviously, I have not been able to go through this massive book in detail. Already it has been analyzed by many. There are some striking facts which stand out from it clearly. There can be no dispute about them.

First. This is the fourth year in a row in which President Truman has sent to Congress a Federal spending budget higher in amount than the one submitted the year before. Each one has established a new all-time high for Government spending in peacetime. In January 1946, he asked for $35,900,000,000 to spend in fiscal year 1947. Each year since then, he has sought and secured more.

Actually, the final figures for Presidential spending for the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, are now estimated at $43,800,000,000 or more than the $42,400,000,000 he asked last January for fiscal 1951. However, the President's original budget request made for that same period was for slightly under $42,000,000,000. This increase during the year over the preliminary figures is customary and will probably happen again this year. Each year the original recommendations were followed by a steady stream of supplementary and deficiency appropriation requests which had to be added to the original figures so that the final total was always much higher than the first.

Secondly, over $12,000,000,000—or 29 percent of the new $42,400,000,000 budget—goes to pay for debts or obligations incurred in this present fiscal year or earlier. Nearly every one of these prior obligations began in bygone days, with a small—even tiny—initial appropriation or by a contract authorization. Then these programs grew and grew and grew. As I pointed out last week, new programs, such as the low-cost housing subsidy one passed by the Eighty-first Congress in its first session in 1949, have not yet begun to "take"—that is, to require the outlay which we know for a mathematical certainty they must ultimately demand. All this shows the grave danger to the solvency and credit of the Federal Government from these opening wedges, these camel's-nose-under-the-tent, or foot-in-the-door methods. Nearly all of the past and the new spending proposals are of a continuing nature. They will last for years and years. The odds are 10 to 1—or greater—that they will grow more costly each succeeding year.

Thirdly. In view of what I have just said about the foot-in-the-door method, it is startling indeed—and a matter of grave concern—to find that this new budget asks for nearly $1,000,000,000 to start 34 new spending programs. Many of these are continuing ones. But this $1,000,000,000 is only the cost for the first year for these new ideas. It is reliably estimated that in time—and in not so long a time—these continuing projects will require an outlay each year of about $4,000,000,000 (to be financed almost entirely out of general tax revenues).

Fourthly. The next fact to hit us in the face is this: Mr. Truman wants Congress to give him the power and authority to enter into contracts, placing on you and your pocketbook the duty and obligation to pay out at some future time, nearly $3,500,000,000 additional. Of this $3,500,000,000, $1,250,000,000 is for projects on which new legislation is required. In general, these sums are pure contract authorizations. They are not appropriations and, therefore, are not included in the $42,400,000,000 spending total called for by the budget. They are on top and over and above that total. Their costs will not begin to be part of the national budget until 1952 and following years.

As a matter of fact, the average yearly rate of Federal spending during President Truman's 4 years in office in peacetime, is

$14,000,000,000 per year higher already than the annual average during President Roosevelt's three terms in office, although the average for President Roosevelt's 12 years in the Presidency, included the years of World War II. Did you ever stop to realize that?

What I am driving home is a double-edged argument. First, this is the largest peacetime budget in history. And secondly, it definitely plans, and lays the ground work for, far larger budgets in 1952 and succeeding years. Indeed, you can truthfully say that the approval of this budget by Congress, in whole or in major part, will force higher outgo in 1952 and following years.

I should mention here that the budget total does not include the large expenditures needed for social-welfare programs, which either are now covered or might be covered, if and when enacted, by payroll taxes. These would be outside of and in addition to the $42,400,000,000 to be met out of general tax revenues—as distinguished from payroll-tax revenues.

The railroad-retirement taxes, on the other hand, are included in the total budget receipts and are transferred to its accounts as a budget expenditure.

Representative JOHN TABER, of New York, the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, in a statement released shortly after the budget message was issued, said this: "If you add the new appropriations that he is asking for, including the contract authorizations, the deficiency which this Congress is asked to provide, the new authorizations which this Congress is asked to provide, and the items proposed for in new legislation carrying an annual-all picture of what the President is asking the Congress to give him in this session, you get a total of $50,823,000,000."

Let me give you an illustration of how these little acorns grow into large oaks. Last session $3,500,000 was provided to start a steam-generating plant in the Tennessee Valley Authority. This is certainly a tiny fraction of the budget. However, before this project gets through, it is admitted that it will cost at least $90,000,000, and in all probability, it will cost much more than that. Later, other steam plants to generate electricity will be pushed through in like manner and with small beginnings. All this will pyramid this cost further.

The President asks for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway. This would involve the expenditure of only $4,000,000 the first year. But thereafter it would rise up to a minimum expenditure of $22,000,000 annually for 7 years. Even the proponents agree that this project would cost at least $570,000,000 to complete. Past history shows that all similar projects have cost double or more than the original estimates of the proponents. So my guess is that the St. Lawrence seaway would end up by costing close to $1,500,000,000. Of course, I have always been opposed to the St. Lawrence project on principle. I am against it also because of the disastrous effect it would have on our section of the country and on Pennsylvania to institute subsidized transportation down the St. Lawrence to compete with transportation now available in this section and to give lower rates through Government subsidy to Canadian and foreign waters commerce. That gives those areas an unfair competitive advantage against you. That is taking your money in taxes and spending it to put you out of business. The mouth of the St. Lawrence is in Canada and our northern neighbor would reap the major benefit of any good results which might accrue. However, my point in mentioning it here is to show how great oaks from little acorns grow. And to show how the $4,000,000 for the St. Lawrence in this budget, if approved, would force far larger annual appropriations each year thereafter for many years.

This is the first budget submitted by President Truman in which he has failed to pay at least lip service to the theory of balancing expenditures with revenue. In the past, he has demanded new taxes for the purpose of bringing the two into balance, thereby admitting the necessity for budget balancing and the wisdom of so doing. But he has already stated that his tax proposals for 1951 will not raise enough new money to come even close to meeting the anticipated $5,000,000,000 deficit.

Past history proves, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that governments will never restrain their spending without some compulsion. One of the greatest brakes is the inability to impose new taxes, or the promise to reduce existing taxes. If new taxes are granted at this time, then it seems almost inevitable that Government spending will automatically go higher and higher, to be followed in due course by new demands for more and more taxes. The President's economists, in their recent review of economic conditions, stated at one point: "The principle of annual budget balancing is difficult in practice and unsound in principle." President Truman apparently adopts this theory. While he did not say so in so many words, the general tenor of all three of his messages and the figures in the budget, indicate his endorsement of this idea. No one is more ready to admit that budget balancing is difficult in practice. It is tough for the ordinary citizen to do it in respect to his family expense account. It is even tougher for the Government. But I disagree emphatically with the proposition that it is unsound in practice. On the contrary, I believe it is absolutely essential, if we are to retain national solvency and our form of government. It is most important to do it today—when taxation is near its peak, when employment is at its peak, when national income and national production are at or near their all-time highs. If we can't live within our income under these conditions, when can we ever hope or expect to do so?

How About the Alleged Coal Shortage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, for a number of days now, "Old Southern King Coal," the merry old soul, instead of calling for his bowl and calling for his pipe and calling for his fiddlers three, has boldly and brazenly, in a single spaced, seven-paged harangue, via special messenger, if you please, ordered the President of the United States to—

1. Proceed immediately under the national emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in an effort to put an end to the coal crisis and to restore the genuine collective bargaining which must be the cornerstone of any equitable and enduring agreement between employers and their employees.

2. Direct the Attorney General to consider proceedings immediately against the United Mine Workers of America for violation of the antitrust laws, and if he finds there is no basis under existing law for prosecution of the union, that you send a message to the Congress upon its return in January, requesting amendment of the statutes to make labor unions properly subject to the antitrust laws.

This ill-advised, impudent, unauthorized directive reminded me of a great piece of literature because it was so darned different.

All of us, I am sure, are interested in ascertaining just what the true national coal situation is at this time. We hear of complaints from various parts of the country about impending coal shortages, factory shut-downs, black-outs, and discontinuance of railroad-train service and diverse other emergency curtailments of home and business efforts.

When I want to know the truth about some general news matter, I have learned to turn to a great daily newspaper which to my observation has always fairly reported the true facts, uncolored by bias or prejudice. I refer to the Christian Science Monitor. This is what that splendid newspaper said about the alleged coal shortage on January 16 last:

TRUMAN STILL SEES NO COAL SHORTAGE

(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—Is there a critical Nationwide coal shortage or isn't there?

Is there mutiny in the ranks of John L. Lewis' miners or isn't there?

Controversy over these two questions is increasing as Mr. Lewis' "40-percent strike," which his 3-day workweek is called, continues to spread into 100-percent strikes in mines throughout Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

The administration's answer to the first question is "No."

President Truman is sticking by his guns. He has told his congressional leaders again that the coal situation does not warrant declaring a national emergency and using the Taft-Hartley law to restore full production in the coal mines.

Mr. Truman's attitude was reported by Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, of Illinois, Senate Democratic leader, who told the White House for the second time in 10 days that a serious coal shortage exists in Illinois because of the 3-day week being enforced by the United Mine Workers.

WEEKLY CONFERENCE

Senator LUCAS was at the White House with other Democratic congressional leaders for their weekly legislative conference with the President.

The Senate leader told a reporter he had shown Mr. Truman "a brief case full of letters, telegrams, and newspaper clippings" about the coal situation in Illinois.

The President replied that he was aware of the situation and has his top advisers reporting to him daily, Senator Lucas reported.

However, Mr. Truman was said to have described coal stocks above ground as the key factor and that while there were "spotty situations that were bad," he did not believe the facts warranted declaring an emergency under the Taft-Hartley law now.

Senator LUCAS said Mr. Truman noted that the use of the Taft-Hartley emergency weapons would require him to substantiate a finding in court that the coal dispute had created a national emergency.

BUREAU BACKS TRUMAN

The administration is backed up by Dr. James Boyd, director of the United States Bureau of Mines. Dr. Boyd says the Bureau has been trying its best to find out how the Nation's coal stocks stand.

The Bureau reports that there is more coal above ground than at any time in a long time. Dr. Boyd is a Republican, by the way, and Republican leaders in Congress have been insisting there is a critical coal shortage and that the President should invoke the Taft-Hartley Act to restrain Mr. Lewis from holding down production by his arbitrary campaign for stabilizing employment by letting his men dig coal only 3 days a week instead of 5.

While Dr. Boyd might have political reasons for upholding the crisis claims of Republican leaders, nevertheless he asserts he cannot honestly say there is any serious soft-coal shortage.

Unfortunately, this impartial Government report on the real state of the Nation's coal stocks lends weight to charges published by the weekly newspaper, Labor, that big United States and Canadian railroads are using a trumped-up coal crisis to justify drastic curtailment of passenger train service.

The article in the January 14 issue of Labor says in part:

"Protests swept the dominion this week as the big Canadian National Railways, apparently following the lead of carriers in the States, also slashed passenger trains, blaming the move on the coal shortage.

"The Halifax Chronicle-Herald in Nova Scotia ran a front-page editorial blasting the Canadian National. In Nova Scotia, the paper said, the mines had huge stock piles of unsold coal—at the very time the CNR claimed a shortage. It raised the question of whether lack of coal was the real reason for the slash in service, or just an alibi.

"By contrast, the Canadian Pacific Railway did not cut off any trains. It declared it had ample coal on hand.

"What is the issue in the dispute between the United Mine Workers and the coal operators? The question is supremely important, because the newspapers, the mine owners, and reactionary lawmakers are using it to stir up hysteria."

LEWIS STRATEGY

Many observers here believe the situation is in no way near so critical as the industry is trying to make out or as Mr. Lewis wishes it were.

They think the mutiny among the miners, their refusal to work 3 days a week, linking their refusal to a demand for a contract calling for production 5 days or none is not a revolt against their union leader but a Lewis-inspired stratagem—a foxy one at that—to tighten the screws on management in his effort to force a new contract out of the industry.

It should be noticed that the latest 100 percent walk-outs of rebellious miners are aimed at Mr. Lewis' chief protagonists, the big works of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal and the Frick interests in the Pittsburgh seam.

Pittsburgh Consolidation is said to be the largest commercial coal company in the world. Frick is the coal-producing branch of the United States Steel Corp.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a serious question as to whether or not there is a real shortage in the coal supplies of the Nation. I have heard it stated in the House of Representatives, and have read in some newspapers, that in many communities, the reserve coal on hand has dwindled down, in some instances, to a few coalscuttlesful.

Other people and newspapers have contended that President Truman was correct in claiming that no such national emergency exists, as yet, which would warrant the use of the injunctive provisions of the Taft-Hartley law.

In reading the Christian Science Monitor of January 18, 1950, it is stated by its Mr. Joseph C. Harsch, the chief of its Washington News Bureau in a front page article, that although the coal piles of the Nation are shrinking daily, no real national emergency presently exists which would be compelling upon President Truman to apply for an injunction under the Taft-Hartley Act. In discussing the coal supply, he had the following to say:

"They are shrinking now. December production is estimated at 35,000,000 tons. (Final figures for the month are not in yet.) This compares to a November consumption of 43,737,000 tons. That is, the mines produced about 9,000,000 tons less in December than was consumed in November. The December shrinkage in coal piles might run as high as 10,000,000 tons. But on December 1, total stocks on hand amounted to 45,264,000 tons, meaning that there is today about 35,000,000 tons on hand—which is about a 30-day reserve."

In conclusion I wish to say that this whole vocal uproar about acute coal shortages reminds me of the remarks of the man who had just finished shearing the scabby sheep that had kept up a continuous bleat, "'Twas a great cry indeed for such little wool."

The Upset Down Under—No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Morley Cassidy, from the Washington Evening Star:

THE UPSET DOWN UNDER—NO. 4—AUSTRALIAN LABORITES WATCHING TO SEE HOW FOES WIPE OUT REDS

(By Morley Cassidy)

CANBERRA, AUSTRALIA, January 19.—And now comes the big question: How do you unscramble a Socialist omelette?

How do you take a socialized or partly socialized state, dedicate it to free enterprise and make it work?

Australia, which has voted to do exactly that, knows part of the answer. It begins: "First you get rid of your Communists—"

But how?

No one is waiting with more grim anticipation than members of the late labor government who first tried to kill Communists with kindness, finally tried toughness, and failed with both.

One day when Sydney's latest dock strike was getting well under way, and seemed to be shaping up as the Communists' challenge to the new Liberal-Country party government of Prime Minister Robert G. Menzies, I was in the Sydney office of a leading figure in the late labor government.

On his desk was a newspaper with black banner lines reading "56 Ships Now Idle Here—40,000,000 Pounds Cargo Tied Up—Strike Spreading."

PROSPERITY MAKES PROBLEMS

This man, who was tearing his hair 6 months ago trying to end Australia's big Communist-led coal strike, rapped his knuckles on the headlines.

"Menzies thinks it's going to be so simple to stop these strikes," he snorted. "He'll just outlaw Communists, and make it illegal for them to hold union office. That will stop the trouble.

"Well—that's his baby. Now let's see him wash it."

Many of Australia's gravest problems have been masked, temporarily, behind the surface appearance of prosperity created by the post-war boom in wool and wheat prices.

Everybody has a job, and every factory, office, and farm is crying for more help. Wages are the best in Australia's history, and hours the shortest.

But Australia's voters have discovered, their votes seem to show, that full employment and good wages do not necessarily add up to real prosperity.

It's not hard to see why, talking to Australian people.

"What kind of prosperity is this, anyway?" says a young ex-service man, clerk in a Sydney hardware store, who lives with his wife and 2-year-old daughter in a four-room flat with her parents.

"We've all got jobs, and we haven't got houses. We get more money but it doesn't buy the things we want."

UNABLE TO GET BRICKS

"If we try to build a house, we can't get bricks because there isn't enough coal to make them. The farmer can't buy a plow because there's not enough steel. If you get a car, you can't get gasoline because the the labor government thought we shouldn't have it.

"And how long will we have money when the bubble goes out of the wool market?"

His views, apparently shared by a majority of Australia's voters, brought the downfall of the labor government of Prime Minister Joseph B. Chifley. And they point directly at the deep-seated problems which the new free-enterprise regime inherits.

Australia's socialization of industry has not approached the sweeping scale of Britain's nationalizations. Labor's efforts to set up government monopolies of banks, air lines, shipping, and coal mining have been frustrated by the constitution and the high court.

But the new government must unscramble the affairs of the Australian Shipping Board, which had lost £10,188,730 (about $22,000,000) in the last 4 years, trying to run shipping lines.

AIR LINER BITS DUST

It must deal with Trans-Australian Airlines, created to take over all air lines, but now limited to competing with private lines with the advantage of an annual subsidy of £700,000 (about $1,500,000).

It must take over management of the government's huge collective farm in northern Queensland, designed to boost the production of sorghum as a food for pigs. With the help of a fleet of 30 tractors, 30 headers, and 30 combines that private growers cannot buy, it has managed to raise 300,000 bushels of sorghum where 400,000 grew before.

There is also the problem of the government pay roll, which has grown until the government now employs 685,400 people, more than one-fourth of all employed workers in the Commonwealth. There is a maze and restrictions and controls through which the state has sought to effect its planned economy.

There is a sticky problem of state's rights. Australia's six states, as jealous of their right as Georgia ever was, have seen more and more of their powers gather into the central hand of Conberra, the federal capital.

They boil, especially, because the labor government took over the right to levy income taxes, and then bargained with each state over the amount to be remitted for state purposes.

DECENTRALIZATION IS TRUE

Decentralization is a burning issue, and the new government favors it. But because of the social-benefits program it will not be easy to turn back the taxing power.

All these problems are minor, however, compared with the one fundamental task of putting value back into the pound.

This campaign slogan is a short way of saying that the new government intends to turn back inflation and the high prices that hit every household.

It can do it only by making it possible for private enterprise to step up production—a field in which the Labor government failed conspicuously.

Take housing, for instance: Four years ago the Australian Housing Commission found that the nation was short 300,000 homes.

It mapped a plan to wipe this out in 4 years at the rate of 80,000 homes a year, in addition to providing 40,000 new homes yearly to meet the normal growth in population.

Four years have now gone and home building has not even kept up with normal requirements, so the shortage now is greater than ever.

BUILDING WORKERS LACKING

Part of the difficulty is a shortage of building workers. Despite the crying need for more skilled hands, the Building Workers' Industrial Union, Communist controlled, has firmly closed its ranks to new members.

A Labor government program for training ex-servicemen for these trades has been frustrated. At the moment 4,000 veterans are awaiting training as plumbers. The union is permitting the training of 16. No training classes for bricklayers or carpenters have been authorized for a year.

The housing problem and many others run into the problem of coal and steel shortages. So take coal.

Despite the Labor government's desperate efforts to woo the miners' Communist leaders, strikes have blocked every effort to raise production.

Since the war strikes have taken a heavier toll each year of coal production, rising to 2,000,000 tons in both 1948 and 1949. So production from the deep pits is now just about equal to prewar.

For lack of coal the steel production, on which Australia's rosy hopes of great industrial development were built, has dropped steadily since the war.

In 1940 and 1941, with smaller manpower, the mills were producing 1,000,000 tons of ingots yearly. In the last 3 years they have been able to turn out only 75 percent of that. Today the biggest mill, Broken Hill Proprietary, is down to 64 percent of capacity for lack of coking coal.

GREAT HOPES FOR FARMS

Finally, take food and the farms. Australia had great postwar hopes there.

In the 8 years of the Labor Government, with prices high and world demand at its peak, the crop area has dropped from 21,500,000 acres to 22,200,000. The sheep on the ranges have declined from 111,000,000 to 102,000,000. Exports of food of all kinds have dropped from 880,700 tons to 511,953.

So how is production to be achieved? Obviously, the new prime minister thinks, there must be a new spirit of cooperation between employers and organized labor.

He has promised to put an end to the spirit of class warfare, through strengthening the arbitration courts—extensively weakened by the Labor Government as a concession to Communist union leaders—and through restoring trade-union democracy.

The first step toward industrial peace, Menzies is convinced, must be the elimination of Communists from control of Australian labor.

But communism's hold is strong. It was broken temporarily in 1940 and 1941 when Menzies, then in power, outlawed the party. It went underground, but when labor returned and lifted the ban in 1941, to win unity during the war, the party instantly sprang to life.

Labor Party appeasement has helped to strengthen the Communist hold since the war. Militant avowed Communists were appointed to the stevedoring and shipping boards and to other government agencies.

REDS CONTROL MANY UNIONS

Today admitted Communists hold either complete or effective control of the unions of ironworkers, blacksmiths, boilermakers, sheetmetal workers, miners, building workers, dockers, seamen, and clerks, and are influential in the unions of teachers, scientific workers and many others.

How is their grip to be broken? Menzies and all Liberal and Country Party candidates—now the majority in the House of Representatives—promised drastic action in their campaign speeches.

They promised to declare the party subversive and unlawful, and to dissolve it. They promised that the attorney general, subject to appeal, would be given the power to declare other organizations substantially Communist, and to follow the party into whatever new form it may attempt to take.

They promised a law banning Communists from any paid post in government, or any office in a registered industrial organization.

"These are far-reaching proposals," says Menzies, "but half-measures are no good."

Leaders of the late Labor Government are grimly waiting to see if Menzies can do what they could not. They doubt it.

"He may get a surprise," says one of them sourly, echoing many others. The toughest Communists we have are Jim Healy, secretary of the waterside workers, and E. V. Eliott, secretary of the seamen.

They are also among our most efficient union executives. The Communists didn't have to rig their election. They got elected for the same reason your John L. Lewis gets elected—because they get results.

Bureaucrats Die Hard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in yesterday's New York World-Telegram. There is certainly more truth than poetry in this statement and for those of us who can see where centralizing government from Washington is leading us, we would do well to heed this advice.

BUREAUCRATS DIE HARD

Rent Director Tighe E. Woods is asking the public and the Congress to swallow his story that it's necessary to extend Federal rent control for another year. To support his stand, Woods has dug up a set of figures that are supposed to show, but don't, that dire things happen to rents that have gotten out from under the fist of the Great White Father in Washington.

The Rent Director has announced that rents in six big cities increased 16 to 41 percent when Federal controls went off. Now this does make a case for some system of rent control. But it is by no means proof that the Federal plan is the one to do the job.

Woods failed to point out that the various States still do have legislative power that could be used to control rents. If the people of these six States feel that the rent increases granted were excessive and unjustified, let the various legislatures pass their own control laws to handle the separate situations according to their own individual needs.

The Federal rent law has been proven to be unfair, too complicated, and unnecessary. The Rent Director's fight to extend it can only be taken as a bureaucratic attempt to perpetuate centralized governmental control where there is not the slightest need for it. Congress would do well to recognize the Woods extension campaign for what it is and let this measure die.

Is There Poorhouse Space for 149,000,000 People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. H. LICHTENWALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, there is a great concern today throughout America because of vast Government expenditures and that a continuation of the policy of deficit financing and extravagance in Government will lead us to national bankruptcy. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, therefore, I submit the following editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Allentown Evening Chronicle:

IS THERE POORHOUSE SPACE FOR 149,000,000 PEOPLE?

Is there room in the poorhouse for 149,000,000 people?

In 1932, Franklin D. Roosevelt, then a Presidential candidate, had this to say about Government spending:

"Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse."

Those words, important 17 years ago, have even greater significance today. Why? Because in every year since 1932 (with the exception of the two fiscal years immediately following the war) our Federal Government has spent more than it has collected.

Surely the time has come to make our present administration realize that a government which continually spends more than it collects cannot long remain strong and healthy.

In 1932, our Federal Government spent $4,500,000,000. For the fiscal year of 1950, it is estimated that our Federal Government will spend 10 times that amount—$45,000,000,000.

To give you an idea of just how much money this is, consider these facts:

1. If everyone in the United States cashed in all of his life-insurance policies, the total would amount to $44,000,000,000. This would not be enough money to run the Government for 1 year.

2. About 11,000,000 urban families own the homes they occupy, valued at $30,000,000,000. If converted into cash, this amount would run the Government for only 8 months.

3. About 3,900,000 farmers farm their own land, valued at $17,000,000,000. Besides this, they own tools and livestock valued at $8,000,000,000. If converted into cash, the total of $25,000,000,000 would operate our Government for less than 7 months.

4. If every manufacturing corporation converted its net working capital into cash, the total would amount to $39,000,000,000. That's hardly enough to run the Government for 11 months.

These facts put a new light on the staggering size of our Federal Government's planned $45,000,000,000 expenditure for the fiscal year of 1950. And remember, this excessive spending is in the face of a national debt of more than $250,000,000,000.

Isn't it as true today, as it was in 1932, that "a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse?"

Just what are you doing to end excessive spending by our Federal Government? Have you written your Congressman? Have you appealed to your Senators? Have you discussed the problem with your business associates, with other businessmen, with your friends, with your employees?

Let's make sure our Representatives in Government know how we at home feel about the continuance of a habit that "means the poorhouse."

The time for action is now.

Concerning the Reactionary Prophets of Gloom and Doom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, since coming to the House of Representatives as a Member from the Second Nebraska Congressional District 1 year ago, I have sat day in and day out listening to some of the most dire and outlandish predictions of national doom ever heretofore told perhaps outside of the comical house.

I have heard the reactionary Republicans bewail and fairly keen, that we were heading for national bankruptcy, socialism, the welfare state, inflation, recession, national unemployment, regimentation, economic slavery, spendthrift-ism, going busted-ism, and lastly, going-to-freeze-to-death-ism, and every other conceivable awful, terrible thing which could happen to a great Nation, yet not one of these frightful and frightening things have come true, yet the prophets of gloom are still going strong and sometimes even predicting that two diametrically opposite things were going to happen to the Republic at one and the same time.

Methinks, old Gloomy and Doomy Gus was just a piker after all.

The foregoing conduct, however, is not confined to Congress. An old friend of mine was wont to say "some people would kick if you hanged them with a new rope."

I know an old Irish farmer who lived at O'Neill, Nebr., who was reported to have complained about the bumper crops he raised because they were so hard on the ground.

Instead of appealing to my fears, this conduct of some of my reactionary colleagues made great contributions to my sense of humor, and I was reminded often of the poem, Said Hanrahan, written by Father John O'Brien, of Australia, and contained in the book, Witness to the Stars, edited by Paul L. Grano, LL. B. So that you may become also a member of The O'Sullivan Share-the-Laughter Club, I herein set it forth at length:

SAID HANRAHAN

"We'll all be rooned," said Hanrahan,
In accents most forlorn.
Outside the church, ere Mass began,
One frosty Sunday morn.

The congregation stood about,
Coat collars to the ears,
And talked of stock, and crops, and drought,
As it had done for years.

"It's lookin' crook," said Daniel Croke;
"Bedad, it's cruke, me lad,
For never since the banks went broke
Has seasons been so bad."

"It's dry, all right," said young O'Neil,
With which astute remark
He squatted down upon his heel
And chewed a piece of bark.

And so around the chorus ran
"It's keepin' dry, no doubt."
"We'll all be rooned," said Hanrahan,
"Before the year is out.

"The crops are done; ye'll have your work
To save one bag of grain;
From here way out to Back-o'-Bourke
They're singin' out for rain.

"They're singin' out for rain," he said,
"And all the tanks are dry."
The congregation scratched its head,
And gazed around the sky.

"There won't be grass, in any case,
Enough to feed an ass;
There's not a blade on Cassy's place
As I came down to mass."

"If rain don't come this month," said Dan,
And cleared his throat to speak—
"We'll all be rooned," said Hanrahan,
"If rain don't come this week."

A heavy silence seemed to steal
On all at this remark;
And each man squatted on his heel,
And chewed a piece of bark.

"We want an inch of rain, we do,"
O'Neil observed at last;
But Croke 'maintained' we wanted two
To put the danger past.

"If we don't get three inches, man,
Or four to break this drought,
We'll all be rooned," said Hanrahan,
"Before the year is out."

In God's good time down came the rain;
And all the afternoon
On iron roof and windowpane
It drummed a homely tune.

And through the night it pattered still,
And lightsome, gladsome elves
On dripping spout and window-sill
Kept talking to themselves.

It pelted, pelted all day long,
A-singing at its work,
Till every heart took up the song
Way out to Back-o'-Bourke.

And every creek a banker ran,
And dams filled overtop;
"We'll all be rooned," said Hanrahan,
"If this rain doesn't stop."

And stop it did, in God's good time;
And spring came in to fold
A mantle o'er the hill sublime
Of green and pink and gold.

And days went by on dancing feet,
With harvest-hopes immense,
And laughing eyes beheld the wheat
Nid-nodding o'er the fence.

And, oh, the smiles on every face,
As happy lad and lass
Through grass knee-deep on Casey's place
Went riding down to Mass.

While round the church in clothes genteel
Discoursed the men of mark,
And each man squatted on his heel,
And chewed his piece of bark.

"There'll be bush-fires for sure, me man,
There will, without a doubt;
We'll all be rooned," said Hanrahan,
"Before the year is out."

In conclusion, I wish to observe that poor old Hanrahan surely must have quite a few mental kinfolks and blood brothers in our branch of the Congress.

Empire Builder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column, The Federal Diary, edited by Jerry Kluttz in the Washington Post, in which there appeared on January 19, 1950, the poem, Empire Builder:

THE FEDERAL DIARY

(By Jerry Kluttz)

If you'd like to start off today with a chuckle, I recommend the reading of the delightful poem below. The Federal worker author prefers to remain anonymous.

EMPIRE BUILDER

This is the way, I'm telling you
A large percent of our Government grew.
There was once a man, who with good intent,
Gave his friend a job in the Government.
"With nothing to do, he won't stay long,"
He told an assistant, but was he wrong?

They found an office as it was bare,
They moved in a desk and a chair.
And so the friend wouldn't feel alone
In this office they put a telephone.
For several weeks the new man stayed
And in doing nothing, progress made.

For several months our friend sat there
With never a worry and never a care.
With nothing to do, he was on his own,
Till they gave him a girl to answer the phone.
But now our hero was in a stew
To find a task for the girl to do.

After some thinking he solved his plight,
By dictating letters for her to write.
She wrote so much, that after a while,
She had to have help for she couldn't file.
So that is how it came to be
The group in her office grew to three.

Another was added, for number three,
As good a filer as she could be.
Seemed to have something on her mind,
For though she could file, she couldn't find.
Adding this finder made one more,
And they got more space as they numbered four.

After a while three and four fell out,
Though it was comic to see them pout.
While looking for letters they couldn't find,
A rather bright idea came to mind.

So now no one is ever vexed—
Five keeps the letters all indexed.

Everything now was going strong,
When a wave of economy happened along.
When the big boss checked on his worthy friend
To find that the force had grown to 10,
The big boss' big boss said, said he:
"How in the hell has this come to be?"

Economy pruned both left and right,
And everyone grew pale with fright.
As reduction in force now was the rule,
But the clerks of our friend kept calm and cool.

And after all of the stir was through,
Instead of one unit, our friend had two.

And the one who gave his friend a start,
And did his best to take his part;
Yes, you have guessed it without a doubt,
He was the one who was left out.
And the friend was promoted up instead,
Until he became division head.

Still doing the same thing as at first,
He wasn't the best, he wasn't the worst.
What little he did he did with vim,
As all above thought well of him.
Knowing naught of worry or grief,
Our friend was made a bureau chief.

As bureau chief he got a break,
In a good assistant, made no mistake.
Lost at poker to prominent men
Held everyone as his good friend
Was very careful of what he said
Became at last, department head.

The Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times for Wednesday, January 18, 1950:

THE CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

President Truman disclosed yesterday that the administration intends to get a vote in Congress on its civil-rights program even if it takes all summer to do so. The principal items in this program are repeal of the poll tax, an antilynching law, and a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act. The President's continued willingness to do battle for these measures is commendable, but it has long since been made evident that on each of these issues his own party is deeply, and at least for the time being, irreconcilably, divided.

What is puzzling is the failure of the Republican Party to take advantage of this Democratic split, in order to assert more actively Republican initiative and leadership in these matters. The Republican Party itself is pledged (by its 1948 Republican platform) to the enactment of each of these three measures—anti-poll-tax, antilynching, FEPC. Yet Republicans helped last year to make it more difficult to apply closure in the Senate to end a threatened filibuster, and Republicans are now lending support in the House to a proposed revival of the power of the Rules Committee to keep measures of this kind from coming to the floor.

There are, of course, individual Republicans who favor action on these bills. But the party as a whole is letting an opportunity for leadership go by default.

A Young Woman Going Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an article from the Michigan Voter in its issue of December 1949:

A YOUNG WOMAN GOING PLACES

(By Phil Williams, member, Wayne County Republican executive committee)

She's a young woman going places—a Republican who one day will hold high office in her party and her government. Perhaps she will be Michigan's first woman member of the administrative board, for it is high time that we had a woman as secretary of state or as State treasurer.

She is Blanche Parent Wise, mother of five children, successful automobile and truck saleswoman, Detroit's woman of the year for 1946, and recent nominee for common council.

Mrs. Wise's race for the council was one of the most astonishing developments in the city's political history. For membership on that body is a most difficult attainment and can be achieved usually only by one of two types of politicians. Most successful in the past like John C. Lodge, former Gov. William A. Comstock, or former Mayor Edward J. Jeffries, Jr. But the city also has turned at times to name candidates like former Councilman Fred Castator and Councilman-elect William Rogell, whose popularity results from his baseball career.

Nine were elected this November, and Mrs. Wise finished eleventh.

For a woman running for office the first time and having a name that is not known to the voters, that accomplishment is sensational, to say the least. It could be called a miracle, for if she had found another 12,000 votes in this city of 816,000 registered voters, she would have been elected.

Billy Rogell, famed ball player and former councilman, was ninth with 192,000. Mrs. Wise, who staged a brilliant campaign almost alone, had 180,000.

True, the city elected its first woman council member in Miss Mary Beck. But Miss Beck has been active in city politics for many years, has been identified with the probate court, and has run for office unsuccessfully in the past, including the council. Finishing in sixth place, Miss Beck had only 38,000 votes more than Mrs. Wise, and it was a near-record turn-out.

Politics is an inexorable taskmaster, and so mysterious in its values even veteran office holders are frequently confused by the course the voters follow. But the charm of Mrs. Wise is so potent, and captivating, the voters seemed to discover early in the campaign that this woman was no ordinary candidate. It was something they sensed, and they were right.

Mrs. Wise was no glory seeker or publicity seeker. She was running for common council only because she was convinced she could add to the city government a value that it has not had. She knows the intricate and baffling problems of government, and she is equipped by sound background and understanding.

As a saleswoman for John Hertche's Ford agency, Mrs. Wise is near the top of her profession and has sold more cars and trucks than any woman in the world. It was because of her professional career, and her keen interest in government, that she was chosen "Woman of the Year."

But there were other reasons for this honor—five of them to be exact. There is Penny, who is 15; Kay, 14; John, Jr., 12; Mark, 9; and Rick, 7.

How can a woman become successful in business, maintain an interest in government, and yet be equally successful as a mother and homemaker? Mrs. Wise was asked that once by the Detroit Federation of Women's Clubs, and she answered:

"I was trained by my own mother to be a competent housekeeper. I have continued her teachings in my own home.

"The work is organized and each of my five children has a definte job. Remember, that from 8:30 a. m. until 4 p. m., from September until June, my children are under the supervision of school teachers. When they are not in school, I am with them a large part of the time. Our interests—music, reading, play—are parallel. I couldn't have the kind of children I have if they didn't have supervision. But I believe in freedom with responsibility."

Mrs. Wise was born in Detroit. Her ancestors came to Michigan with Cadillac. She will be running for office again, but not because she needs a job.

"It was a wonderful experience," she said. "Like any candidate, I was disappointed when I did not win, but the vote I received was certainly a compliment I will not soon forget.

"I think the community conscience should be represented more effectively in the local, State, and national governments. Men in many ways are better organizers than women, and are probably keener in handling the practical politics of public office. But, left to their own devises, men are inclined to be just a little too practical and too often the community's interests take second place.

"I think a woman, if equipped to serve, can bring to government a tremendous force toward good."

Mrs. Wise, whose husband, John Wise, is an architect, was a school teacher in Detroit early in her life. Her long career of quiet public service includes activities with the Detroit Girl Scout Council; the governing board of the Community Chest and a divisional chairman; legislative and public affairs chairman of the League of Catholic Women, member of the women's committee of the Detroit Round Table of Catholic, Protestants, and Jews; a first vice president of the Inter-Group Council for Woman as Public Policymakers, and a member of the League of Women Voters.

She made the owl famous during her campaign, using a picture of the bird on her advertising and cards.

"Just remember the owl and you'll remember the name when you reach the polling booth," she preached, "the wise old owl—remember it."

A lot more voters will before she is through.

Pennsylvania Counts the Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN F. JAMES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following article which appeared in the Chester Times of Chester, Pa., on January 16, 1950. This article makes particular reference to the administration's proposed budget cost to the people of Delaware County, which county I have the honor to represent.

The sum of $104,453,000, our share of the $4,400,000,000 budget, is almost one-half of the total capital invested in the 305 industrial enterprises in Delaware County—$213,641,000—in the year 1949. It is nearly 70 percent of all salaries and wages, combined, paid to the 50,611 persons employed by those industries in the same year—$152,165,000.

It is nearly 15½ percent of the total value of all products produced by those industries—$677,818,800—and it is over seven times the value of all farms in Delaware County—land and buildings—$14,653,600.

Where is Delaware County, Pa., going to get the money? They still have to pay modest county and local taxes.

TRUMAN BUDGET TO COST PENNSYLVANIANS $3,000,000,000

HARRISBURG.—Pennsylvanians could finance their government for the next six years on the amount they would have to pay in Federal taxes under President Truman's proposed 1951 budget, the State Chamber of Commerce claimed today.

If Congress approves Truman's $42,000,000,000 budget the chamber said, residents of this State will have to pay $3,238,852,000 in direct and hidden taxes for Federal coffers.

Based on the current all-time-high State budget of $1,038,000,000 for the 1949–51 biennium, this sum would be sufficient to finance normal operations of Pennsylvania's State government for the next 6 years, the chamber estimated.

"The $3,238,852,000 cost to Pennsylvanians is more than one-third of the total assessed value of taxable real estate in this State in 1948," the chamber asserted.

"It is equal to 14.4 percent of the $22,381,745,000 market value of taxable real estate in Pennsylvania as determined by the State tax equalization board," it continued.

The State chamber's general secretary, Leonard P. Fox, called upon Congress to slash "a staggering budget under which the Federal Government would continue to live beyond its income and beyond the reasonable ability of the people to pay."

"Congress should thoroughly explore all possibilities for reducing nonessential expenditures just as every farm and business and household has had to do in these days of high taxes and high prices," Fox said.

An estimate of the cost to the people in each of the State's 67 counties also was made. The estimates were based on each county's population, buying income and taxable payrolls under the Federal social security program. Philadelphia's share, under these figures, was put at $813,961,000.

The cost to Delaware County was put at $104,453,000.

Peanut Acreage Changes Sought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hertford County Herald, Ahoskie, N. C.:

PEANUT ACREAGE CHANGES SOUGHT

SCOTLAND NECK.—Growers of what is called the Virginia type of peanut, the producing area of which is confined principally to Virginia, North Carolina, and a small area in South Carolina, decided here Thursday to attempt to secure amendments to national peanut quota legislation which will permit the allocation of peanut acreage quotas on the basis of need and demand for peanuts by types rather than the present method of national consideration of all types together.

The decision was made at a meeting of the peanut commodity committee of the North Carolina Farm Bureau jointly with a representative group of Virginia peanut producers, members of the Virginia peanut and Hog Growers Association.

The conference was presided over by R. V. Knight, Tarboro, chairman of the North Carolina Farm Bureau peanut commodity committee, with Parker Brinkley, executive secretary of the Virginia Peanut and Hog Growers Association, and R. Flake Shaw, executive vice president of the North Carolina Farm Bureau, taking a prominent part in the discussions. J. B. Blalock, president of the Virginia Farm Bureau, was among those present and took part in the discussions also.

The action of the North Carolina and Virginia farmers was prompted by the fact that there is a shortage at present time of the better grades of Virginia-type peanuts, notwithstanding the reported oversupply of other types of peanuts and the announced intention of the Secretary of Agriculture to further reduce peanut-acreage quotas this year.

Under the present quota law and its application, North Carolina and Virginia farmers face a further reduction in peanut quotas while not living sufficient acreage in production under quotas last year to meet the demand for their product, it was pointed out by Brinkley, Mayon Parker, president of the Growers' Peanut Cooperative, Inc., and others who took part in the discussions.

In North Carolina it is proposed to reduce peanut acreage approximately 7 percent from last year's acreages.

A committee of seven North Carolina and seven Virginia farmers was named to press forward the effort to secure passage through Congress of the amendments to the law necessary to make the decision of the group effective. Parker Brinkley and R. Flake Shaw were named joint chairmen of the committee and instructed to proceed immediately with preliminary contacts to secure the support of legislators and other farm groups.

If the proposed change in the law is accepted and passed by Congress, peanut-acreage quotas in the producing area for the Virginia-type peanut will be allocated solely upon the basis of supply and demand for the Virginia type.

The Virginia type is known generally for its larger size, oblong type of kernel, and nutty flavor, with lower oil content than the runner and Spanish types produced in the Southeast and Southwest peanut areas.

For purposes of sale in the shell, for salting, and many other edible uses, the Virginia-type peanut carries a premium in demand and in price, it was pointed out during the conference here.

Because of the demand for and preference of consumers for Virginia-type peanuts for edible purposes, it is believed that acreage allotments in the Virginia-Carolina area can be protected against further decreases and possibly increased, if the change advocated by the group can be brought about.

Acreage quotas for tobacco are allocated under a similar program, with quotas fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture according to the need for and supplies of tobacco according to the various types, such as flue cured, burley, air cured, Maryland, shade-grown, and others.

The group present here also discussed changes in the Government's price-support program that would be desirable to encourage the production of Virginia-type peanuts of the larger and more distinctly Virginia types but took no definite action on them. It was decided that the committee appointed to work for the legislative changes sought by the group should also confer with Department of Agriculture officials as to changes in the price-support schedules as applied to Virginia-type peanuts.

LOCAL PEOPLE

Attending the conference from this area were: Bertie County, W. L. Powell, and C. W. Spruill; Northampton County, J. P. Turner and P. H. Jamieson; Hertford County, Davis Spiers, C. Gordon Maddrey, and Mayon Parker.

Planes to Rome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an editorial from the Washington Post of January 19. I think perhaps it is time the Congress paid a little attention to some of the current maneuverings of the Civil Aeronautics Board and perhaps to some of the apparent connections between certain high officials in the Government and Pan American Air Lines. I shall have more to say about this matter at a later date.

PLANES TO ROME

Pan American Airways has received a nice little windfall from the Civil Aeronautics Board in the form of preliminary sanction to conduct charter flights to Rome during the Catholic Holy Year. The only scheduled United States airline operating to Rome is Trans World. In view of the current recommendation of a CAB examiner that Pan American be permitted to purchase American Overseas Airlines—which would remove the third competitor from the field and place Trans World at a disadvantage—the sanction will look like favoritism. It is no wonder that a TWA protest has led the board to defer final action.

Actually there may be a good deal of point to the board's feeling that the Holy Year traffic will be large enough to support all the flights American lines can provide. Also it may be that Trans World was slow to appreciate the potential, and that Pan American merely showed more initiative in completing an arrangement with Felix Roma, the Catholic travel agency promoting Holy Year tours. Certainly Pan Am has demonstrated initiative in circularizing American Catholics.

Nonetheless, the CAB has played fast and easy with someone else's market. This is especially true in light of the fact that Pan Am's charter flights actually would amount to regular service. Yet, the special excursion rate authorized for Pan American tours is considerably below the fare TWA is compelled to charge on regular flights. Moreover, TWA still has a considerable number of vacant seats on flights to Rome, and it is augmenting its capacity by 30 percent. TWA's grievances have been fanned by Pan Am's undaunted ambition for the chosen instrument—or single American airline abroad in which Pan Am would play a dominant role—and by the curious lack of publicity preceding the CAB's sudden approval.

Now the CAB has remedied the current favoritism by opening charter flights to Europe to all regular and large irregular carriers. This removes some of the discrimination; but the proper time to have announced such a policy would be if and after Trans World found itself unable to accommodate the traffic to Rome. It is of course important to promote American travel to Europe. But it is no less important to maintain the integrity of the certificates of convenience and necessity which are the law of regular air transportation. On the Rome run the certificate is in danger of being reduced to a point where it does not mean very much.

Keep Draft Registration Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, our most able and most conservative chairman of the Armed Services Committee recently stated that one of the all important bills to come before the House at this session of Congress was a bill to provide for the extension of the Selective Service Act's registration machinery.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the original bill which included the draft phase met with quite some opposition when it passed the House 2 years ago—and certainly there is no member who would like to see the reason for its enactment come to an end any more than I would myself.

I am myself satisfied that there is no man in America who would like to see it terminated more than would my good friend, Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, but, yet, it is Louis Johnson who will have to come before the Armed Services Committee to urge that it be again extended even though it is not now made effective with respect to the induction of new men and new manpower in any of our armed services forces.

Mr. Speaker, no living man can foretell what lies ahead. All thoughtful men are convinced that if and when war again comes to us it will come out of the clear blue and without warning. There will be no time to waste in organizing the thousands of draft boards that would have to be implemented in order to get the manpower immediately needed to defend the country against continued enemy attack. The thing to do is to have the registration mechanism kept functioning at all times in order that it can be ready for immediate use when Congress presses the button by enacting a new draft law.

All the machinery of war is costly. To continue to register, give physical examinations, to classify and set the youth of America in readiness for mobilization against that fateful hour will cost money.

It costs money—plenty of money—to build tanks, ships, and planes in order to have them stand by and in readiness for use when needed.

If we appropriate money for weapons why not for manpower? The records clearly disclose that the Selective Service Act, while not made effective with respect to the induction of men into our armed services for some time past, has been of inestimable value in providing men in the various Reserve components of our Army, Navy, and Air Force, to say nothing of what it has done to help recruit new men to maintain the established strength of our Regular forces.

The machinery of selective service, which is an essential insurance policy, necessitates the payment of a premium on a policy which this Congress can ill afford to drop.

We can all take comfort in knowing that selective service, as administered by Secretary Louis Johnson, whatever the cost, will be kept at an irreducible minimum.

Mr. Speaker, may I now ask the indulgence of this House to insert into the RECORD as of this day a very short editorial on this subject clipped from the New York Times, which cites the necessity of keeping the registration machinery in operation, and which reads as follows:

KEEPING THE DRAFT

A bill to maintain the machinery of selective service has been introduced in the Senate by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator TYDINGS. It should be enacted. It is an unpleasant thing to have even the machinery of a draft in peacetime. It is a necessary thing, because many factors in the world situation are themselves unpleasant. This would be a much happier world if we didn't have to think about armies and navies and weapons of destruction. But it wouldn't be the world in which we happen to live at this moment. The draft machinery is essentially an insurance policy and at this time the premiums must be kept up.

Additional weight is given to the argument for the draft machinery on grounds of security by the fact that abandonment of the machinery at this time would be widely interpreted as a sign of indecision if not outright defeatism. We need, at the moment, not only to be strong ourselves but also to inspire the confidence of others. Any step that would weaken that confidence should be avoided.

It's Our Own Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, Minneapolis, Minn., of January 17, 1950:

IT'S OUR OWN CONGRESS

As the new session gets under way, it is well to remember that Congress, for all its frailties and faults, consists largely of conscientious Americans who are trying to do a good job according to their lights. The tendency to hold Congress up to ridicule, and to impugn its sincerity and good faith at every opportunity is not a wholesome one, in our opinion.

There are, to be sure, charlatans and demagogues in every legislative body, but we should be careful not to judge the whole by its least admirable parts. Congress is a product of the American system of representative government, and the chronic scoffers at Congress are in effect belittling and deriding that system.

Selective criticism of Congress is proper and desirable, but steady sniping for the sake of sniping is a bad habit. In the last analysis, the American people are responsible for Congress, and regardless of the party controlling it, it remains a symbol of some of our best American traditions.

Seventeen-Year-Old Delaware Girl Speaks for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago a 17-year-old Wilmington, Del., high-school senior stood up before distinguished State and city officials, her teachers and her fellow students and said, "I thank America; her kindness and hospitality are so wonderful.

The girl who made that statement was Gloria Chomiak. The occasion was a special high school assembly in her honor, because she had just been selected as one of four national winners in a "I Speak for Democracy" contest, in which there were more than 1,000,000 entries. The competition was sponsored by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Broadcasters.

Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member of this distinguished body will read with care Miss Chomiak's statement on democracy. It is as fine an expression of faith in democracy as it has been my pleasure at any time to read. And, Mr. Speaker, an unusual and important feature of this matter is that Miss Chomiak has been in the United States only since September 1948. She came here at that time from an extremely remote section of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, all Delawareans are proud of Gloria Chomiak and the honor which she has brought to the first State. I am confident that all Americans who read her statement will feel the same sense of pride and realize the responsibility which each of us as individuals has to protect the democracy of which Miss Chomiak spoke.

The following is a complete text of Miss Chomiak's statement—I Speak for Democracy:

I speak for democracy, because two generations back my ancestors could not; because if I do not speak of it—if many more do not speak of it, there may come a time when we, too, will not have the right to do so. For today more than at any other time governing powers are pitted one against another. It seems a crisis has been reached, and must be broken. We who believe in democracy cannot trust to our living it alone.

We must stand up and speak and be heard in its cause.

And what is this thing called democracy? It is a thought discovered in ancient Greece; a thing a Slavic serf dreamed of too much and paid for with his life; an ideal, started in its practice by a model Parliament of England; and bitterly struggled for in Louis' France. It is a leavening of revolutions, a stepchild of Utopia; a system, first defined as a government for and by the people in our own country, where it has grown to what we know and love today.

It is a government that has been developing for hundreds of years, and shall develop for hundreds more; a government that has outgrown an initial stage wherein it served the citizens of Greece; citizens who did not include the underprivileged and the captive, and who constituted but a fraction of the population. It is a government that has weathered the time when a land-laden Polish baron frowned upon it, thinking of his foreign serfs, tilling their foreign fields for his benefit alone. He worried little for he could dispose of them at his pleasure if he found one who thought in their number.

It is a government that has grown great since that medieval year when England's people first had representatives before their King—the first representatives before authority a people ever had.

It won a place for itself during the bitter civil war of France, when people were hungry, and angered with the extravagant caprices of those who ruled through heritage and it found a home in the New World when honest colonists learned to demand a rule by their own choice.

It has grown from a privilege of the few to a right of the common, risen from a persecuted idea to a mighty ideal upheld in safety by millions. It has developed into a system whose imperfections can be remedied, and whose virtues are a God-given right.

For this democracy is a natural system. Men were created equal in their rights and their responsibilities. And is not intelligent participation in governing among them? Men were given individual minds and desires. Ought not they have a right to voice them?

Democracy is a system with flaws, because through the ages men have erred and do err, and a democracy is only as right as its people. Democracy is able to abolish its principles by its own excess.

A cynic spoke the truth about it when he said that democracy can make each man his own oppressor. Yet, I believe that greater men have said a truer thing about democracy: That the people's government cannot—shall not perish from the earth.

A Mission of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from El Imparcial, Santiago, Chile, of November 17, 1949.

Such friendly and sincere expressions of mutual concern are appreciated and will add to the many reasons why the friendship between the American Republics should grow stronger as the years go by.

The editorial follows:

A MISSION OF GOOD WILL

In fulfillment of a carefully planned program, three distinguished Members of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress are our guests since yesterday. They are Mr. A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Representative from Missouri, a former teacher and an influential public official; Mr. OMAR BURLESON, Representative from Texas, a lawyer and former head of the housing department of the District of Columbia, and OLIN E. TEAGUE, Representative from Texas. These distinguished Members of Congress were accompanied by Mr. George Millikan, adviser to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; Mr. Donald William Smith, representative of the State Department; Capt. Charles Lutz of the Air Force, and the delegation's secretary, Mr. Charles Schneider.

Their high office and their neighborly determination to further friendly relations between their country and the Spanish-American peoples, endow this visit with a special significance. The press of Mexico City, Panama, and Lima, where they received a warm welcome from the governments and social institutions, agreed on this point.

This cordial reception has been well deserved since the guests have shown keen interest in acquainting themselves with the work carried on by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, which recently received additional funds from the United States Congress to continue its program for another 5-year period.

To accomplish this end, the American Congressmen and members of their delegation will study the work done in this city by the Health Center and Trudeau Hospital; will visit the construction of the sewerage system in North Santiago and other projects of this Institute.

Furthermore, they will hold private conferences with high officials of the government agencies of this country regarding problems which are common to Chile and the United States.

We appreciate the coming of these American Congressmen and in saying so, wish to leave on record our approval of these tours of good will, since the increase in mutual understanding which is already to be seen, indicates practical trends which will result in common benefits, notwithstanding the base intentions of the Muscovite sect, which are directed against the White House accusing it of an arbitrary and selfish imperialism.

Mr. Millikan, as consultant for the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives, will be in a position to inform his colleagues of the friendly attitude prevailing toward the United States on the part of the governments and peoples of Latin America. His own experience in diplomatic work will permit him to discover the basic reasons for the attacks from those who, calling themselves partisans of the democratic regime, conspire against it and attempt to destroy it by weakening the power of the United States.

American Legion Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the splendid statement of Hon. George N. Craig, national commander of the American Legion, made before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am chairman, on Tuesday, January 17.

Commander Craig's statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Rogers, members of the committee. As National Commander of the American Legion, I would feel honored to appear before this committee under any circumstances. I am conscious of a particular honor and pride today, however, for the reason that here in your chamber and through your courtesy, we are marking a memorable event in the history of organized veterans. For the first time, the elected leaders of the major veterans organizations appear before you as a group to present their respective programs for the current legislative year.

I speak for the American Legion. I neither have nor profess the right to represent another organization. But let me assure you, ladies and gentlemen, that the unity expressed by our joint appearance is a unity of fundamentals, not merely of front.

It is because the principle and the entire structure of veterans' services built upon it are in imminent danger of destruction that the American Legion stands side by side with our brother organizations represented here today.

The threat to which I refer is contained in legislation pending or proposed in the report of the Hoover Commission having to do with the Veterans' Administration and the veterans' program. My remarks this morning will be directed solely to that subject.

The American Legion is for real economy in the Government's discharge of the Nation's obligations to its 19,000,000 veterans. The American Legion has always abhorred waste in Government effort. It realizes that improvements can be achieved in the operations of the present Veterans' Administration. But it believes very strongly that such improvements in services and savings in costs can best be made within the existing framework of the Veterans' Administration.

The framework of this agency is sound. It has successfully resisted for years all political pressure and all pork-barrel raids. Today, the VA handling all veteran affairs exclusively, is a one-stop service station for all veterans.

For the stated purpose of promoting greater efficiency and economy in the Veterans' Administration, the Hoover Commission asks that the VA be stripped of the following major functions:

1. Hospital and medical services: Under Hoover Commission plans, these duties would be the part-time concern of a colossal new Federal medical bureau to be called the United Medical Administration.

2. Hospital construction: The Hoover Commission would farm out this job to the Department of the Interior.

3. Veterans' insurance: Another brand new creation, the Veterans' Insurance Corporation, would inherit all matters pertaining to United States Government and National Service Life Insurance.

4. Home loans: The Hoover Commission believes that the loan guaranty program set up under the GI bill of rights should be relocated somewhere in the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Other services would be left to the remnants of the Veterans' Administration.

I say to you that these proposals would bring about the dismemberment of the Veterans' Administration and, eventually, of the veterans' program. They would mass produce red tape of such quantity and quality that the intended beneficiaries of legislation generously provided by this committee and the Congress would be denied their rights. The eventual consequence will be that the

veteran will be trimmed but that costs will not.

Let's look at this proposed amputation, limb by limb.

The Veterans' Administration has been 20 years building and refining what is now universally hailed by civilian medical leaders as an outstanding hospital system. Veterans' Administration hospitals and medical personnel are among the finest in America, and they got that way because experience and devoted individuals in and out of Government, were willing to contribute their time and skills at great personal sacrifice. You are now asked by the Hoover Commission to scrap this system with all of its accumulated advantages and bury it in the new proposed United Medical Administration along with three other adjuncts of Government medicine whose standards are not so high and whose services are not related.

Veterans' Administration hospitals even today cannot accommodate all of the eligible patients. The last Veterans' Administration report shows 20,319 disabled and sick veterans on the waiting list unable to get a hospital bed. This is the situation with only veterans competing for hospitalization. Under the United Medical Administration set-up the veteran would have to compete with the merchant mariner, the civil-service employee, and the personnel of the armed forces and their dependents—and his admission would hinge on the availability of beds not occupied by nonveterans.

The establishment of a new United Medical Administration would involve the creation of thousands of new jobs. It would mean the training of many new officials. It would entail many duplicating functions and, worse still, many specialized functions, with special case files for each of the numerous classes of patients. It would result in more costs, more red tape, and more grief—for the veterans and all other taxpayers.

The Hoover plan would transfer hospital construction from the Veterans' Administration to the Department of the Interior, notwithstanding the fact that the Hoover Commission itself scored that Department for its apparent inability to properly estimate the cost of proposed construction.

On page 6 of its report on the Department of the Interior, it charged that the Department was guilty of inadequate evaluation and underestimation on such vast jobs as the Colorado-Big Thompson project in which its estimate was $44,000,000 and actual cost was $131,800,000. It estimated $6,300,000 as the cost of the Hungry Horse project in Montana which actually cost taxpayers $87,500,000.

I am sure your committee appreciates, as we do, the importance of a close working relationship between the builders and designers of medical structures on the one hand, and those who are responsible for maintenance and additions. With a relationship now exists within the Veterans' Administration. It would be shattered by the Hoover plan. In the American Legion's judgment, transfer of Veterans' Administration hospital construction to any other Federal agency would bring on serious repercussions—and economy and efficiency would not be among them.

By still another Hoover dismemberment plan, the Veterans' Administration would lose the veterans' insurance business. We are told that a new Federal creature, the Government Insurance Corporation, must be introduced to handle the servicing of some eight million national service life and United States Government insurance policies. We challenge this process on two counts. In the first place, the proposal comes up for action at a time when the peak insurance burden on the Government has long since passed; the VA finally has perfected its insurance operation to the point where the job is now getting done in reasonably good time and order. Secondly, in recommending an insurance corporation, the Hoover Commission turned down the advice of its own task force of experts who investigated this matter. The task force, men who were nearest the problem, reported that shortcomings of the agency should and could be corrected administratively within the VA.

Under the loan guaranty provisions of the GI bill of rights, 1,625,329 young veterans have been enabled to purchase their own homes. There has been only 1.3 percent of defaults among all home loans approved by the Veterans' Administration. If any one phase of the veterans' program were to be singled out as a model of efficiency, loan guaranty would merit priority consideration.

In spite of this record, the Hoover Commission proposes to carve up this smoothly functioning activity by turning over the actual lending operation to another Government agency while leaving the certification for home loans with the Veterans' Administration. The Commission fails to specify what will be done with the two corollary features of the program—farm and business loan guarantees. Apparently the idea is to strip away only the best third of the loan-guaranty operation.

The American Legion condemns this move as violating the principle and jeopardizing the administration of the GI bill. The loan-guaranty program was designed to give preferential treatment to veterans. That objective can be best fulfilled through administration by an agency primarily interested in the welfare of veterans. But the Hoover plan would take the job away from that agency—the Veterans' Administration—and give it to another—the Housing and Home Finance Agency—which provides sundry services for the general population and has no specific interest in veterans.

In addition to dismembering the Veterans' Administration, the effect of the Hoover plan would be to do away with the present system of processing veterans' legislation through the Congress. Many of you will recall that in the early 1920's legislation pertaining to veterans was handled in the House by a number of different committees. It was to relieve the resulting confusion and bottlenecks that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was created in 1924. Since that time your group has served—and served superbly—as the monitor and author of all the important bills having to do with the veterans' program.

Whether there is an implied criticism of this committee in proposals of the Hoover Commission that would virtually nullify the need for the committee I leave to your judgment. The American Legion believes you have done and are doing a job that is indispensable to the veteran and Congress alike. We want no turning back of the legislative clock that would see veterans' legislation again miscarry for lack of interested and experienced champions.

President Hoover himself in 1929 told the Nation that efficiency, economy, and more uniform administration required consolidation of the three separate agencies then handling veterans' matters. The Congress responded by replacing the Veterans' Bureau, the Pension Bureau, and the National Home for Volunteer Soldiers with the new Veterans' Administration. Now, 20 years later, we are told that for the same reasons of economy and efficiency the VA must be carved up into not just three agencies but five. Was Mr. Hoover wrong in 1929, or is his commission wrong now?

There is absolutely nothing in the Hoover recommendations on veterans' affairs that cannot be accomplished administratively by the Veterans' Administration. There is no existing defect that cannot and should not be corrected within the four walls of the Veterans' Administration. The American Legion is never satisfied with the VA, just as we are never satisfied with the performance of our own rehabilitation forces. We have criticized the Veterans' Administration whenever we believed criticism was warranted, and we will continue to do so. But we do not intend to see real or imagined weaknesses of the agency used as an excuse for destroying the veterans' program.

The Hoover task force on veterans' affairs completely ignored the American Legion in reaching its findings. For 2 years, these people went about their work in offices four doors removed from our headquarters in Washington. Four times we asked to be heard to present the side of the veteran, and the request went unanswered. It might be pertinent to ask of this committee how many of you were invited to give your views on the agency and the program you deal with so effectively from day to day.

The practice of according deserving preferences and services to veterans is as old as America. There are those who contend that the tradition is fictitious—that it came into being as a concession to sentiment and endured only because responsible authorities dared not challenge it.

The members of this committee have reason to resent that charge, as we do. There is just one reason why the veteran over the years has commanded the special attention of his Government, and that is because the American people have always been convinced in their own minds that he is entitled to it. Only once, and then at a time of great stress, have the people speaking through Congress permitted a violation of this trust. In 1933 there was an Economy Act, and veterans' hospitals were purged, compensations whittled, and claims rejected in wholesale lots. Did that Economy Act bring about savings? Sure it did, at the expense of battle casualties and war widows who saw their means of livelihood wiped out even as they were being assured that the law would not touch them.

There are striking similarities between the antiveteran trends in 1933 and in 1950. Then, as now, the movement marched under the holy banner of economy. Then, as now, it attracted the zealous support of a small but well-organized and financially potent group of individuals who were able to give an exaggerated impression of numerical strength. Then, as now, they relied upon the apathy and forgetfulness of the people to put across their grand design.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Hoover Commissioners have no corner in the economy market. The veteran of this Nation has a very personal interest in economy. He and his family represent approximately one-half of all the taxpayers in the country. To a greater extent than any other group, he feels the high cost of government and wants to bring it down. But he is not going to accept just any road to economy, and he will fight to the finish to forestall an economy move that spells the betrayal of his Government's obligation to his disabled and sick comrades, and the widows and orphans of his fighting friends who did not come back.

As national commander of the American Legion, and as one of the millions who are receiving no benefits, and ask none for themselves, I appeal to you to help the American Legion win this fight by defeating the Hoover Commission legislation that comes up for consideration by your committee. And may I say in conclusion that the American Legion is proud to close ranks with the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and AMVETS, in a united effort to protect, for those who are unable to speak for themselves, the benefits and rights provided by a grateful people.

Basing-Point Bill, S. 1008, Makes for Higher Prices in West and South—Eminent Northwest Educator Urges Defeat of S. 1008—West Subjected to Price Discrimination Through Operation of Basing-Point System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Vernon A. Mund, of the department of economics, University of Washington, has forwarded me a copy of the letter which he wrote to one of his colleagues at Washington State College, Pullman, Wash. Dr. Mund pointed out that S. 1008 was due for consideration on January 20, and, in the interests of the West, should be defeated. He said:

> I am convinced that, if this bill * * * becomes law, it will prove injurious to the economic freedom of the West and South.

NOTED STUDENT OF PRICING SYSTEMS

Dr. Mund is known throughout the country as an authority on artificial pricing systems and has often given testimony to congressional committees on the economics of such systems. Dr. Mund's opinion is worthy of consideration by all Members of Congress from the West and far West who have any lingering doubt as to what should be the fate of S. 1008. Dr. Mund thinks the bill should be killed, and in that thought I am happy to say he is joined by many Members of the Congress. Dr. Mund's letter, in part, follows:

> In my own opinion, basing-point and zone-delivered pricing systems operate not only to eliminate price competition, but also to prevent a decentralization of industry. The use of an eastern base price makes for high-cost prices in the West and South and discourages the development of local fabricating industries. Local fabricators which do develop, moreover, cannot ship eastward to any significant extent in competition with fabricators located near an eastern basing point, for the delivered costs of their basic supplies are higher.
>
> When basic products (such as aluminum) are produced in the West and South and sold "freight allowed," the development of local fabricators is likewise restricted. Local prices are high—as high as elsewhere in the country—and fabricators find no cost advantage in building plants near the sources of supply. The sale of fabricated products (such as copper wire, cable, and tubing) by eastern mills at freight-allowed prices (based upon an average freight item) also serves to discourage the development of distant fabricators, for the established mills, in effect, are able to dump into the distant areas by absorbing some or all of the freight—at the expense of their nearby customers.
>
> Congressional leaders who are actively opposing S. 1008 include Senators PAUL DOUGLAS, ESTES KEFAUVER, WAYNE MORSE, WILLIAM LANGER, RUSSELL B. LONG, and Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN. I am sure that each of these men would appreciate any word of encouragement which you might give them before January 20.

Our Nation's Capital, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, Americans can be justly proud of the beauty and simplicity of Washington, D. C., and my wish is that all of our citizens could visit here.

Holiday magazine has devoted its February issue to pictures and articles on Washington and the following article was written by Walter Winchell which has emphasized the fact that Washington belongs to all Americans and is not just the city of its residents.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Mr. Winchell's statement as it appeared in the Washington Post on January 18, 1950:

WASHINGTON—A TALE OF THREE CITIES

(By Walter Winchell)

All solid objects including cities have three dimensions, except Washington, D. C., which has four. The extra one is in time. Washington, D. C., is a city located in the middle of twentieth-century history at the exact center of its political forces. Nothing in the twentieth-century world can be done without a calculation of its effect on Washington; and very few things are done in Washington without careful appraisal of the effect on the rest of the world. Washington is really three cities: Washington the world capital; Washington the capital of the United States; and Washington the city of nearly a million people solely engaged in the serious business of government and who, ironically, have no vote.

This, in itself, is unusual, but not for Washington. Washington as the queen city of the complex twentieth century is also the king city of all of its paradoxes. Among the first is its politics. In Washington, politics is the fascinating way of life for the lucky unlucky few. They are lucky in that their slightest whim is reflected in the lives of millions of people, and that fame and glory necessarily attach to persons who wield that much power. They are unlucky in that the price of making history is to be broken by it. The higher the pinnacle, the greater the blast and the less the shelter. The ascent is incredibly difficult and the descent impossibly dangerous; but, paradoxically, the lure is irresistible. For every broken man carried down the slope there are a hundred pressing upward under the magnificent illusion that fate deals in names and not in numbers.

Washington, primarily, is the capital of the United States of America—a fact which is more often overlooked than not. Washington's politics is to the United States Government what a steering wheel is to an automobile. It gives direction, but the power and the strength are below in the engine. The engine of government carries on 99 percent of the work through anonymous assistants—the Government people—mostly career people—who know and live with the job below the whirlpool of politics. This is merely saying the obvious: that for every Postmaster General there are tens of thousands of postmen who deliver the mail; for every Surgeon General there are thousands of nurses caring for the sick; and for every conservation commissioner there are hundreds of fire wardens patrolling the forest trails.

Thus, paradoxically again, Washington, the seat of government, is only the headquarters of the work. Washington is present in every county in the United States and in every country abroad through its field men. Washington in the real sense, is everywhere. Indeed, it is a twentieth century miracle that you can summon Washington to your doorstep with a 3-cent stamp. Practically all of the experience of civilized man is at your beck and call upon inquiry to the United States Information Service. It will tell you anything and everything, from how to feed the baby to how to kill a Japanese beetle. Indeed, if their only signature for the ages were the Library of Congress, it alone would establish the timeless greatness of the American people.

But it is the far-flung Washington field men who are the immediate and effective Government of the United States. Washington radiates government authority and the delegation of power starts with the push buttons on the secretary's desk. It is axiomatic to those who know Washington that the Secretary's secretaries run the Department; but it is also axiomatic that it is the man in the field who finds the facts which control the decisions of the secretaries. The capillaries, paradoxically, control the action of the heart.

Washington's work is all-pervasive almost beyond the belief of the average citizen. There is no function of our national existence—from the lonely blinking lights off the Florida Keys to the signal towers of the Alaska Railroad—whose operations are not the responsibility of some unknown but very responsible person in the Nation's Capital. Tens of thousands of faithful, anonymous people give the civil services the same selfless devotion that the flag receives from the armed ones. Their work varies all the way from testing steel to producing antidotes for snake venom. Their heartbreaking role is that their effectiveness is taken for granted. They are noticed only when and if their service fails to function.

Government people, as distinguished from the politicians, also are part of the Washington paradox. Battle fleets are commanded by underpaid admirals who wait in line for the street car; billions are expended by men who return home at night to worry about sending their children to college on a salary of $6,000 a year. Yet few would leave willingly the bleak bridge of the ship of state for the comparatively comfortable quarters—and minor importance—of private business.

American Government is a study in reflex. Washington has a great effect on the Nation, but not nearly the effect that the Nation has on Washington. Washington governs America, but America governs Washington.

Washington as a city is famous for its physical beauty. But the historians, probably more than the architects, will record its broad approaches, great avenues, grand vistas, and magnificent perspectives. Because no less than that describes their mighty Capital at Washington, D. C., it also describes the mind, the spirit, and the heart of the American people.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Dedication of the Mellon Dormitory, Washington and Jefferson College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the dedication of the Mellon Dormitory at Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa., on October 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The beautiful dormitory we dedicate today stands as a memorial to the honorable career and distinguished achievements of a great American, an alumnus of Washington and Jefferson College, James Ross Mellon.

It is a tribute of honor and respect from his son, William Larimer Mellon, who, with his wife, May Taylor Mellon, 10 years ago established a foundation for the advancement of religious, charitable, scientific, and educational purposes.

We are saddened that William Larimer Mellon is not with us today to participate in these ceremonies. His death 3 weeks ago today brought to a close a life of brilliant accomplishment in many fields of endeavor.

William L. Mellon was a kindly man, retiring and soft-spoken. One of his outstanding qualities was modesty. He avoided the limelight. All forms of personal publicity were distasteful to him.

He could have chosen an easy way of life. His tastes were simple and his needs were modest. He did not have to seek and search for riches.

But he was not of that stock. He wanted to create and to build.

He plunged into business and industry. He took great financial risks in his commercial ventures. He created jobs for men and women in many parts of the world. Success rewarded his vision, energy, and enterprise.

His business interests expanded tremendously but his real greatness is revealed by the fact that in the midst of his busy life he found time for active participation in his church and in government. He took part in politics but never sought his own advancement.

He wanted to build a better and more prosperous, stronger America.

W. L. as he was known to his intimate friends, wanted to help his fellow man. His contributions to churches, schools, hospitals, and for charitable purposes were generous and without ostentation.

W. L. Mellon was of the third generation of the Mellon family in America. The Mellon family name is associated with the progress and development of southwestern Pennsylvania. It is symbolic of the industrial and financial strength of our Commonwealth.

The story of the Mellon economic empire is most fascinating. Thomas Mellon, or Judge Mellon, the founder, was a poor immigrant from Ireland. Whatever social or economic background he brought assets of great value to America. He brought courage, the will to work, honesty, integrity, and strength of character. He cherished the principles of America—individual freedom and opportunity.

The same fine American characteristics descended to his four sons.

With the growth of the Mellon industrial and banking interests the gifts, endowments, and foundations of the Mellon family for the public benefit grew correspondingly.

They included such noble benefactions as the Mellon Institute, the site where the Cathedral of Learning now stands, the National Gallery of Art, located in the Nation's Capital, the School of Public Health of the University of Pittsburgh, the Graduate School of Industrial Administration at Carnegie Tech and many others well known to this audience.

Today the honorable traditions and the responsibilities of the Mellon family are carried forward by Gen. Richard K. Mellon, able and public-spirited son of R. B. Mellon.

Like the Mellons, other individuals and families have used accumulated wealth for the benefit of their fellow man. They have established industries, churches, hospitals, and colleges. They have created foundations for scientific and medical research.

This giving accumulated wealth for public service has been a mightly stimulant to American culture and the national welfare.

The roll of public benefactors includes the names of Peter Cooper, Johns Hopkins, United States Senator Leland Stanford, Andrew Carnegie, Julius Rosenwald, Henry C. Frick, Russell Sage, and George Eastman.

The great gifts of John D. Rockefeller have totaled over $500,000,000.

Others on the long and impressive list are Charles Hayden, James B. Duke, Mrs. Edward Bok, Augustus D. Juilliard, United States Senator James Couzens, and Edsel Ford.

Here in Pennsylvania two great schools for the education of orphan boys were established by Stephen Girard and Milton S. Hershey.

Other Pennsylvania foundations bear the names of Falk, Buhl, and Drexel.

There are hundreds of others who have followed the road marked by the creators of these institutions and foundations.

During one 10-year period 100 foundations in the United States spent $500,000,000 for the public benefit in these seven classifications:

Education, two hundred and twenty-three millions.

Health, one hundred and seventy-two millions.

Social welfare, seventy-five millions.

Recreation, nine millions.

Internal relations, eight millions.

Religion, seven million, five hundred thousand.

Law and government, seven millions.

This does not include money spent for missionary and similar work.

No other country in the world has established such a magnificent record.

What made it possible?

As measured by the hourglass of nations, it is only a short time since the Western Hemisphere was discovered.

Its two continents were developed by groups having opposite objectives. To South America came men in search of gold. North America was settled by men seeking God.

That is the reason why material progress in our country has so far outstripped that of the South American countries.

Here God-fearing men established a form of government based on the theory that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights—and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

They established an economic plan based on the theory that men must be free to own property and to have the reward of their own courage, initiative, and resourcefulness.

That freedom of economy, together with the other freedoms enjoyed by them, has built the greatest empire of agriculture, transportation, and industry of all history. It has given the people of the United States the highest living standard of all times. In addition, the people have enjoyed great culture and high spiritual attainments.

Other nations have had greater population and more of the world's natural resources. Although we have only 7 percent of the world's population, and occupy only 6 percent of the world's land area, we produce more than one-third of the world's goods.

What do we possess that the others do not have?

Just one thing—freedom of the individual.

As a result of our God-given freedoms we have more automobiles, more radios, more telephones, more newspapers, more colleges, more foundations, more life-insurance policies, more savings accounts, more homes, and more churches than any country in the history of the world.

In our free economy, many men of humble origin have become leaders in the professions, science, in commerce, and industrial development. The great endowments and foundations I have discussed were established with the accumulated wealth of such men.

These foundations offer a great and lasting argument for the incentive, capitalistic or free enterprise system of our country. That is a system built upon the solid rock, the firm foundation of free men and free women working in freedom.

They demonstrate clearly that free men will carry out the impulses of human brotherhood so much better than it can be done by government.

The gift of this beautiful dormitory to Washington and Jefferson College is representative of such an impulse.

It honors the memory of a private citizen—but also it is a monument to the system of free government and opportunity that made it possible.

The same system created and sustained nearly all the liberal arts colleges.

They have done an outstanding job in developing leadership in this country. They trained the men who founded this Republic. Their sons and daughters have developed the culture, the science, the philosophy, and the religious thinking of this Nation.

Their curricula have been broad. They have tried to teach men to think straight and analytically rather than along the lines of political doctrine or to dream of economic utopias.

They have given us great military, political, industrial, educational, and religious leaders. They have kept the lamps of learning lighted. They have done all this, however, without any agency of Government or any commissar of education, directing the way in which our leadership must be trained.

The small colleges of Pennsylvania have kept their doors open to students of all faiths and creeds, and all races. Upon them largely depends the tolerance of our people and the respect that is due every religion and every form of worship.

These small colleges are the guardians of the religious tradition in education. For generations they have combined mental and moral training.

They must have freedom in their cultural, academic and spiritual policies. The standards of the faculty and the quality of the student body must be judged by the institutions themselves. We must not receive young men and women without the mental and spiritual qualifications needed to make them worthy of the great history of our small colleges. There is no room for any student or faculty member who lacks spiritual interest or concern for the ideals of our country.

I am proud of Washington and Jefferson. It is a free institution. It has never accepted Government help. It teaches freedom, tolerance, and patriotic Americanism. We must keep it that way.

Yes, we must keep all our colleges free, uncontrolled, and unregimented. We must protect the American system of education

from the dangers which have arisen in recent years.

First, there is the trend toward Government control of education to be enforced by so-called Federal aid. That eventually would mean bureaucratic dictatorship of educational policies.

Should our schools and colleges ever come to depend upon the Federal Government for their support, academic freedom would be destroyed.

When Washington dictates what our schools shall teach, the foundations of American freedom will have been shaken.

Just as we hold sacred the principles of religious liberty, so must we be vigilant in the cause of educational freedom.

The second danger grows out of excessive taxation and the vastly increased cost of government.

Twenty years ago the Federal Government was operated at a cost of less than $4,000,000,000 a year.

This year Congress passed appropriation bills totaling almost forty-six and one-half billions—and contract authorizations for four and one-half billion more—making a total spending program of nearly $51,000,000,000.

This is frightening, but if the new and expanded spending proposals now before Congress are enacted, the cost of Federal Government will skyrocket to double that figure.

Today approximately 30 percent of all the earnings of the worker and the farmer is collected in taxes to support all levels of government.

If that drain upon the national income continues it will be impossible for any individual or any family to accumulate the wealth necessary to establish endowments and foundations such as have been created in the past.

Unless the present trend of reckless and unlimited spending by government is checked, we will soon dry up the sources of voluntary contributions needed for the support of our colleges.

It will force many of our colleges to close their doors. The others will become dependent upon financial aid from the Government. When that day comes, the American educational system, as we have known it, will be a thing of the past.

That is why I urge you to follow the example of W. L. Mellon in personal and active interest in the affairs of government.

A great educator and a great President, Woodrow Wilson, summed up his educational philosophy in these words, and I quote:

"No more vital truth was ever uttered than that freedom and free institutions cannot long be maintained by any people who do not understand the nature of their own government."

That is the end of the quotation.

Woodrow Wilson's words are a clear warning that unless we fully understand the nature of our Government we cannot maintain freedom and the free institutions of which our small colleges are such an important part.

Our system of free enterprise laid the foundations of our colleges at a time when the state did not concern itself with education. That system created those other great foundations for the improvement of health, morals, culture, and human welfare that exist in America.

It was that system of free enterprise that made it possible for our missionaries, both spiritual and medical, to go into all parts of the earth and teach the great underlying principles of religion and our American way of life.

The free-enterprise system made it possible to operate the millions of American farms by machinery and probably did more to drive famine from the world than any other thing under the sun.

Without that system the small colleges of the Nation cannot endure.

I am hopeful that the colleges of America will teach young men and women how to think and how to live.

I hope the students will acquire a proud knowledge of our form of government, its traditions, and its freedoms.

I hope they may come to revere the great men and women—church leaders, soldiers, statesmen, industrialists, educators, legislators, and craftsmen—the Americans who have made this country a great Nation.

I hope they may be so trained that they may teach others how to use the instruments created by our scientists and technicians for human progress, and not misuse them against mankind.

Above everything else, religious culture must be emphasized.

In this country our form of government is one of laws and not of men. Government by men is maintained by force and fear. Government by law is by independence and a willingness to live as free men, just as righteous men ought to live.

Here in America the object of education should be to fit our people for good citizenship and God-fearing lives. That objective is the special responsibility of the colleges of America.

We thank God for the small college, for America, and for men like W. L. Mellon, who have helped so much in building our great Republic.

Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial concerning the record of accomplishment of Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, published in the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger of Wednesday, January 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUBSTANCE IS THERE

Governor Driscoll appeared for his first inauguration 3 years ago as a new figure in the affairs of the State—a young man who was neither a machine creature nor a flamboyant crusader, but a thoughtful citizen who had learned the art of government in his home town, in the legislature and in an exacting administrative post as head of the alcoholic beverage department. He aroused high hopes 3 years ago, but there was also apprehension among his friends that he might prove too idealistic and inflexible to cope successfully with the tough and unyielding men and conditions that constitute the political scene in New Jersey.

The same man was inaugurated a second time as governor yesterday. That in itself was an eloquent commentary on the fact that he had met the tough men and the tough conditions and, in his own way, had managed to live with them and influence them for the better.

The fact of his second inauguration in itself reflects the story of a remarkable peaceful revolution in the very climate of government in this State—a revolution that swept away an obsolete, cumbersome form of government and paved the way for the sensational demise of the Hague machine in Hudson County.

In his address to the legislature yesterday the Governor could speak with the conviction and authority of one who had already simplified many a complexity. He took the long and broad view of government, calling attention to its failure to keep abreast of the sweeping industrial and social changes of the age and demanding that the present hodge-podge of confusion and costly overlapping among Federal, State, and local governments be rationalized in order to bring government close to the people.

While his message dealt primarily with the wisdom of providing the State with a clearly defined field in relation to the Federal Government, the Governor's philosophy of a federalism resting upon a maximum of local self-government and effective State government received its most cogent expression.

In an age when the doctrine of "one world" is receiving increasing consideration, the need for rationalizing big government along with bigness in industry, business, and labor becomes imperative and even desperate. Thus, the man who strongly urges that the Federal Government, in order to make itself more effective as a world leader, divest itself of those functions that properly belong to the States, also emphasizes the urgent necessity of municipal reform, in order that our cities may play their full role in making sense and order out of the enormous complexities of modern life.

The Driscoll viewpoint on government, a viewpoint that is definitely his contribution to our political thinking, has yet to be marked by the fighting, or the alluring, or the sensational phrase. Nothing quite so brief and easily remembered as New Deal or Fair Deal or private enterprise or good old days is available as the label of the Driscoll philosophy. But the substance of a new political movement is decidedly present.

Here is a man who is skeptical of all ideologies, firmly devoted to religious value and civil liberties, rooted in experience with local and neighborhood problems and profoundly aware of the flow of history. On the basis of successful performance in State government and his contribution to political thought, he has clearly earned a high place in the national councils of his party.

Since Governor Dewey's rise to the national scene in 1936, Governor Driscoll is the first Republican personality to offer successful experience in government administration as well as political achievement; and he is the only one among newer Republican personalities to offer a solution to our towering national problems of Government that is not rooted in obsolete controversies.

It is not with relation to 1952 that we point to Governor Driscoll's place in the national scene. It is 1950 that must pave the way for 1952, and the thinking for 1952 must be done now.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at 1949 Campaign Dinner of the Republican City Committee of Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the 1949 campaign dinner of the Republican City Committee of Philadelphia, at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, October 28, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Truman thinks you are not paying enough income tax.

In fact he thinks the Federal Government is not spending enough of your money.

He wants to reach deeper and deeper into your pocket. He wants to take another chunk out of the pay envelope of every wage earner in America.

That's what Harry Truman meant last week when he announced that at the next session of Congress he will demand an increase in Federal taxes.

Does that make sense to you?

Can you swallow that without choking?

For the current fiscal year which began July 1 the Democrats in control at Washington appropriated and authorized the spending of nearly $50,000,000,000.

That is $350 for every man, woman, and child in the United States or $1,400 for the average family of four.

Of course the Federal revenue will not reach $50,000,000,000. It will fall short by twelve or thirteen billions.

But that doesn't worry Harry Truman and his spendthrift crew.

Oh, no. They just climb on the merry-go-round of deficit financing and the national debt—now more than a quarter trillion dollars—is pushed up, higher and higher.

Never in the history of our Republic have we traveled at such a dizzy pace around the vicious circle of more spending, more taxes, more debt, more spending, more taxes, and more debt.

Around and around it goes and where it stops nobody knows.

And there's no end in sight while the Democratic squander crowd remains in power.

The only solution they offer for any problem is more and more spending—not in millions but in billions.

If all the schemes now before Congress, and all the proposed experiments in socialism are enacted, the cost of Federal Government will eventually skyrocket up to $100,000,000,000 a year.

President Truman's own economic adviser, Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, couldn't take that. He fought a losing battle for sound common sense and when he resigned the other day he gave blunt warning that the administration's "monetary and fiscal tricks have no power of magic but are a slippery road to misery."

Keep that in mind—a slippery road to misery.

President Truman's demand for higher taxes is further convincing evidence that he has no intention whatever of curtailing the waste and extravagance that have led us into a deficit which may reach seven or eight billion dollars this year.

But he had an alibi ready. He blamed it all on the tax cuts made by the Republican Eightieth Congress. He called it a rich man's tax-reduction bill.

That is a typical example of the reckless and irresponsible statements to which Harry Truman resorts to cover up the real facts.

In Washington we have to fight continuously against such false and misleading statements at the national level.

I notice that in this campaign you have the same kind of fight at the local level.

It seems that the whole philosophy of the Democratic Party, from top to bottom, is based on loose, reckless, and irresponsible statements.

Let me illustrate.

When President Truman called the tax-reduction bill enacted by the Eightieth Congress a rich man's bill it was another move in his campaign to array one class of Americans against another.

He conveniently forgot that 71 percent of the four billion eight hundred million tax reduction went to people with incomes of less than $5,000 a year.

He conveniently overlooked the fact that more than 7,000,000 people in the lowest-income brackets were removed entirely from the Federal income-tax rolls.

Let me give you another illustration of the loose talk down in Washington that is being echoed here in Philadelphia.

The Democratic leadership, and that includes President Truman, have been talking about civil rights. They have promised all kinds of legislation for the protection of minority groups.

Now the Democrats had majorities in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. They packed the committees and had absolute control of the Eighty-first Congress.

But in all the 9½ months that this Democratic Congress was in session not one civil-rights bill was enacted into law.

The only civil-rights bill that was reported on the calendar of the Senate was an anti-lynching bill introduced by a Republican, Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan.

That bill was on the calendar for 4 months, but the Democratic leadership in the Senate refused to bring it up for action.

There was plenty of double talk, but not a single civil-rights promise was fulfilled.

The Republican Party may have its faults but it keeps its promises.

Don't let anyone tell you that your local election has nothing to do with national issues.

If we are to return to sane, sound, economical, constitutional government it must begin back here at home.

It must be built from the ground up, it cannot start at the top.

We hear a lot about getting down to the grass roots. In politics that means getting out in the field and digging for votes.

Here in Philadelphia you have a golden opportunity to make your Republicanism SHINE.

You have nominated the finest candidates ever offered by any party anywhere in the United States.

They are men of outstanding ability, upright character—and unquestioned integrity.

Every public-spirited citizen can support your candidates with pride and complete confidence that they will give the people of Philadelphia distinguished service in their respective offices.

Remember that this election is the forerunner of 1950 and 1952.

Therefore, I say that any Republican who fails to give this splendid ticket his active and wholehearted support is guilty of a disservice, not only to the city of Philadelphia, but also to the State and Nation.

Legislative Program, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week, Commander in Chief Clyde A. Lewis, and other officials of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, appeared before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am chairman, to present that organization's legislative program.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the very fine statement made by Commander Lewis to the committee on that occasion.

Mr. Lewis' statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CLYDE A. LEWIS, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, IN REGARD TO THE VFW LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before your committee and discuss briefly some highlights of the legislative program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I have spent most of my time since my election traveling throughout the East, Middle West, and the South. In a few days I plan to be in California for a series of visits in that State, as well as in Oregon and Washington.

I can think of no congressional committee more important to our veterans and their dependents than your Committee on Veterans Affairs. The congressional reorganization plan, which consolidated jurisdiction of all House veteran bills in this one committee, had the full support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This committee, originally designated as the World War Veterans Committee, has had a long and constructive history. Your distinguished chairman has served with the committee since its inception, and others of you have been on it for many years. We are proud of the fact that one of our past commanders in chief, Gen. PAT KEARNEY, is now an old-timer on your committee, and another past commander, Capt. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, rendered long and valuable service before moving to Armed Services. Notwithstanding the changing make-up over the years, the traditions and policy of the committee have remained steadfast. In good and bad times we have always been able to count on this committee to give every reasonable consideration to the needs of our veterans and their dependents.

I have with me today three of the ablest members of our staff who are outstanding in their field. I refer to Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, director of the national legislative service; Col. George E. Ijams, director of the national rehabilitation service; and Admiral Leland Lovett, director of public relations. I am sure they are well known to you.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars today consists of more than 1,100,000 men who have served on foreign soil or in hostile waters in the United States armed forces during some war, campaign, or expedition in which the United States has been engaged and for which a service or campaign medal or ribbon has been authorized. Of our membership, approximately 1,000,000 are overseas veterans of World War II.

The current legislative program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is a broad and comprehensive one. Although the objectives to which I respectfully invite your attention this morning concern the welfare of our veterans and the widows and orphans of deceased veterans, they are by no means the complete program adopted by our Golden Jubilee Convention held in Miami, Fla., in August 1949. The delegates at that convention, representing 10,000 posts throughout the Nation and beyond the seas—a true cross-section of American life—were also concerned with the problems of national security, housing, foreign affairs, employment, the welfare of our armed services, our national economy, and the fight against the evil of communism.

In keeping with the program for this meeting I shall confine my remarks to a few of the highlights of our legislative program. A detailed outline of all of our objectives which come before this committee will be offered for insertion in the record by our legislative director. Subsequent meetings of your committee will provide an opportunity for full discussion of bills under consideration.

SERVICE PENSION

Before discussing other important points in our legislative program, I would like to commend your committee for its sincere and painstaking consideration of the pension program during the first session of this Congress. While the bill, H. R. 4617, which this committee approved and which passed the House on June 1, 1949, falls short of the VFW objective for a uniform pension for all war veterans—similar to the pensions authorized for veterans of the Spanish-American and previous wars; nevertheless, the bill represents a decided step forward. Despite the President's attempt, in his recent Budget Message, to sound a cataclysmic note at the prospect of future expenditures in behalf of our Nation's veterans, we shall not be deterred in our efforts to achieve a sound and equitable pension program. We believe that our old and crippled veterans are entitled to special consideration—at least equal consideration with our European neighbors.

In our pledge to continue the fight for enactment of the pension bill, H. R. 4617, we voice our opposition to the President's stand, as intimated in his budget message, that the pension bill represents an "overlapping and unwarranted * * * special benefit for veterans. The issue is clear and the battle lines are drawn. We shall not waver from our announced purpose that the traditional pension for our Nation's war veterans must be extended to the veterans of World Wars I and II.

COST-OF-LIVING INCREASE IN DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND PENSION

Our organization strongly favors an increase in disability compensation and pensions payable pursuant to laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. The Congress has been generous in the past in the matter of adjusting these rates, but unfortunately it has not kept pace with the rise in the cost of living.

In 1939 a veteran totally disabled, service-connected, received $100 per month. Today he receives $150 per month. It is more dollars but less purchasing power than in 1939. To provide a purchasing power equal to 1939 dollars, the compensation for total disability should be not less than $160. We are recommending an increase which would bring the rate for a 100-percent disabled veteran, service-connected, to $172. It is our hope that some day the Congress will put the totally disabled veteran on a standard of living comparable to that enjoyed by the citizen making an average wage in industry.

REVISION OF INCOME LIMITATIONS

The Members who served on the committee in the Eightieth Congress recall the extensive hearings devoted to this question.

Existing income limitations governing eligibility for veterans' part III non-service-connected disability pension and the widows' non-service-connected death pension are $1,000 where the veteran of the widow has no dependents, and $2,500 where the widow or veteran has dependents. These income limitations were written into the law in 1934 and the figures applied were those used for personal exemption for income-tax purposes.

Fifteen years have elapsed since the fixing of these limitations and for the past several years they have become arbitrary and lost their meaning. We believe, as this committee did in 1948, that these figures should be increased in order for the law governing eligibility for these pensions to have the same meaning that they had in 1934. We ask this committee to again consider this matter and to increase the limitations to $2,000 for the veteran and widow without dependents and $3,000 for the veteran and widow with dependents.

ADJUSTED SERVICE COMPENSATION

Since the close of World War II the national encampments of the Veterans of Foreign Wars have adopted resolutions calling upon the Congress to enact adjusted service compensation legislation which would tend to alleviate the economic disparity as between the young man who spent the war years in the military services and the young man who remained at home as part of the civilian war effort. Such legislation, in the form of readjustment insurance, was introduced in the Eightieth Congress and again in this Congress by your chairman as H. R. 914, at the request of our organization.

This legislation would place the veteran who, because of age, family commitments, or economic reasons, was unable to participate substantially in any of the benefits of the GI bill of rights, on a par with the veteran who did fully participate in the benefits of that bill. We do not believe, for example, that the veteran who had to go out and make a living for his family should be denied a benefit comparable to those received by veterans drawing readjustment allowances or who were able to go to school for several years. Accordingly, in this legislation we have suggested that the Congress deduct from adjusted compensation the tangible monetary benefits received by any veteran through the operation of the GI bill of rights.

INSURANCE

Twelve resolutions were adopted by our recent national encampment calling for certain amendments to the National Service Life Insurance Act so as to encourage more veterans to retain their policies and to facilitate reinstatement for those who have permitted their policies to lapse. Many of these resolutions are embodied in the bill H. R. 5574, introduced by the chairman at the request of the four major veterans' organizations. We are hopeful that the committee will hold hearings on this important bill in the very near future.

VETERANS' HOSPITAL PROGRAM

More than a year has elapsed since the promulgation of Executive order which reduced the VA hospital-construction program by approximately 16,000 beds. At that time we were shocked that the President, pursuant to recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, acted so summarily without soliciting the advice of the Congress which had authorized this construction program.

We continue to insist that the President was poorly advised; and since then we have been supported in our contentions by action of the Congress in the independent offices appropriation bill for 1950, which continued the authorization of $237,000,000 for the projects which were ordered curtailed.

Your committee, rising to the occasion, reported favorably the bill H. R. 5965, which directs the Administrator for Veterans' Affairs to proceed with the construction of additional facilities to provide 16,000 more hospital beds. We are hopeful the Congress will enact this legislation before adjournment.

Distressing as was the action of the President in reducing the hospital-construction program, there is an even more dangerous threat to deprive thousands of veterans of an entitlement to hospitalization which was granted by the Congress many years ago. One of the proposals of the so-called Hoover report on Government reorganization would, if approved, sound the death knell of the veterans' hospital program.

The particular recommendation to which I refer is that which would transfer all the medical functions and hospital services, including VA hospitals, to a united medical administration operating directly under the President. There is much more than meets the eye in this proposal. Disguised with a veil of economy, the recommendation, if carried out, would mean the end of the veterans' medical and hospital program as we have known it for the past 25 years. And there is no assurance that economy and efficiency would result in such a consolidated medical set-up.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States will fight to the utmost against such a reorganization plan. We remember only too well the almost tragic consequences of a generation ago when treatment and hospitalization for the disabled veteran was identified with an other Federal medical agency. The Congress, after an exhaustive survey by a special commission, then created a distinct and identifiable veterans' hospital program in the Veterans' Administration, and we pray that our friends on this committee and in the Congress will join us to defeat this particular recommendation of the Hoover Commission.

In closing, let me again thank you for your courtesy in permitting me to appear before your committee and I will now yield to Legislative Director Ketchum, who will conclude our presentation.

Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article about the new Secretary of the Interior, Oscar Chapman. The article appeared in the Sunday Denver Post of January 8.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPMAN CAPS NOTABLE CAREER—NEW INTERIOR CHIEF RATED LIBERAL, CONSERVATIONIST

(By Barnet Nover)

WASHINGTON.—Oscar Littleton Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, is a modest man with a ready smile, a serene disposition, and a great capacity for friendship. Temperamentally, he is the exact opposite of the rambunctious Honest Harold Ickes, the self-styled old curmudgeon, under whom he served ably, amicably, and self-effacing, for more than 12 tempestuous years.

Indeed, Chapman is the only top-flight official of the Interior Department who had come in with Ickes in 1933 and was still around when Ickes made his sulfurous exit early in 1946.

That fact is proof of Chapman's capacity to get along with people, his skill in avoiding those fierce jealousies and that intense struggle for power and place which tend to make Washington the graveyard of many of man's ambitions.

A CONSISTENT CAREER

Survival is, of course, no virtue in itself. Otherwise, the galapago turtle, which reckons its life span in centuries, would have to be admired as the noblest of animals.

The fact that, first as Assistant Secretary, later as Undersecretary, and now as Secretary of the Interior, Chapman has broken all

records for continuous service at the little Cabinet and Cabinet level is not in itself of great significance.

What is significant is that Chapman's long tenure in the Government, all of it in the same department, forms an amazingly coherent pattern that is consistent within itself and consistent, as well, with the social-minded philosophy that has dominated his life and thought since his very early years.

The only time I ever saw Chapman display anything resembling a touch of temper—and I have known him for well over a decade—was when I sought his reaction to the charge made in a magazine that, while outwardly a liberal, he is actually only a coldly calculating careerist who has always trimmed his sails to the winds of political expediency and his own high-flying ambitions.

HEIGHT OF LOYALTY

Chapman dismissed that charge with asperity.

"I haven't the slightest interest in politics," he told me. "I have never wanted to run for any office and do not intend to."

To those who have watched Chapman's career in the Government closely this fact is certainly clear: He did not seek the job which, back in 1933, first brought him into the national picture. Nor is there the slightest shred of evidence to suggest that he ever participated in any intrigue to advance himself. The truth is he leaned backward to avoid it.

He was passed over in 1935 when the post of Under Secretary of the Interior was created. It went to Charles West. He was regularly passed over whenever that post became vacant, as it did no fewer than five times in the course of the last 10 years of Ickes' stay in office.

But while under secretaries and first assistant secretaries came and went, Chapman stayed on, loyally cooperating with them all and giving no indication that he was anything but happy to remain just where he was and continue doing the job he was doing.

Chapman's ambition has never been either in the direction of piling up a fortune or of scaling the dizzy political heights that lead to the pinnacles of power.

Had wealth been his goal, he would have retired from the Government long ago; indeed, he would probably never have gone into the Government in the first place.

The offer of an assistant secretaryship of the Interior came to Chapman not through his direct seeking but as a result of fortuitous circumstances and at a time when he was in a position to earn more money in private life than he had ever earned before.

He and the late Edward P. Costigan, whose successful campaign for the United States Senate in 1930 he had managed, went to Albany after the election of 1932 to discuss with President-elect Franklin D. Roosevelt certain problems of legislation that were due to come up when the new Congress met in March 1933.

It was the first time Chapman had ever met Roosevelt.

"Ed," said Roosevelt to Costigan when the conference ended, "I want to keep this young man in Washington. He is the kind of man we want in the Government."

CHAPMAN TAKES A HAND

At that time Chapman had no thought of entering the Government. His plans were to return to Denver and run Costigan's law office while the latter served in the Senate.

Roosevelt's remark put ideas in Costigan's head. He suggested to Chapman, whose attitude toward Costigan was just this side of adoration, that 2 or 3 years in Washington would be helpful experience for a young lawyer. There would then be time enough to go back to Denver and take over the law office.

One day in Costigan's Washington office, Chapman and Costigan's secretary, Marguerite Owens, were having a talk. Chapman happened to mention what the Senator had said about the usefulness of a spell of Government service to a lawyer.

"Here," said Miss Owens, laughing, while pulling the Congressional Directory on her desk toward her, "let's see what kind of job we can find for you."

F. D. R. APPROVED

With Chapman peering over her shoulder, she opened the book at random. On one of the exposed pages there was a description of the duties of the Assistant Secretary of Interior, including supervision of the General Land Office, the Office of Education, Howard University, the Indian Service and the administration of islands and Territories.

"Now that's the job I want," said the grinning Chapman. At that point Costigan entered the room and was made privy to the joke.

"But that's wonderful," Costigan said. "I'll talk to Roosevelt about it."

Roosevelt was agreeable to the idea. So was Bronson Cutting, Senator from New Mexico, who had been offered the secretaryship of the Interior and was then considering whether to take it. When Cutting refused the job, Harold Ickes was named.

STEPS BOW ICKES

Costigan took Chapman over to see Ickes.

"What is your philosophy of conservation?" Ickes asked.

"I am in complete accord with what Gifford Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt have done."

"That's good enough for any man," said Ickes, adding: "Can you get Farley's endorsement?"

Farley was friendly, but revealed that he was committed to a Montanan named Harry B. Mitchell. An hour later, Farley called up Chapman and offered him the job of President of the Civil Service Commission, a job paying substantially more than that of Assistant Secretary.

STARTED WITH LINDSEY

Chapman suggested that Farley offer the Civil Service Commission post to the man from Montana, which, if the latter agreed to take it, would leave open the Interior post. Mitchell agreed to this swap. Chapman was willing to work for a lower salary in order to get a job in which he could be useful.

So it came about that Oscar Chapman began on a new career that was ultimately to lead to a Cabinet post.

Like so many ardent Coloradans, Chapman was born elsewhere and went to the State for reasons of health.

Born in the little Virginia town of Omega, in the tobacco belt, he received his education at Randolph-Macon academy at Bedford. During World War I he served in the Navy as a pharmacist's mate. In the course of his service he crossed the Atlantic 36 times and contracted tuberculosis which resulted in his moving to Colorado.

It is a familiar story in Denver how, enormously attracted by the personality and genius of Judge Ben Lindsey, Chapman determined to work for the latter and by sheer persistence and after countless disappointments finally managed to see him and be given a job.

BACKED THREE PARTIES

In 1922 Chapman became assistant chief probation officer of the juvenile court which, under Lindsey, had attracted world-wide attention. He was named chief probation officer in 1924.

Together with Costigan and Ickes, Lindsey was one of the three men who had the greatest impact on Chapman's life and philosophy.

All three had begun life as Republicans. All three had followed Theodore Roosevelt into the Bull Moose camp in 1912. All three had ultimately sought the carrying out of the programs they favored through the Democratic Party.

The term "welfare state" had not been invented in their day. But Theodore Roosevelt's fair deal and Woodrow Wilson's new freedom were precursors of the movement that led to Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal and Harry Truman's Fair Deal.

Characteristic of all of them was their emphasis on the need of conserving both natural resources and human resources as well.

With this viewpoint Chapman has always been in complete sympathy. And his successive posts in the Interior Department have enabled him to put that program into action.

PROJECTS LEASED

As Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Chapman was largely responsible for the administration of the Taylor Grazing Act regulating grazing on public lands. To acquaint the cattle and sheep people with the law and also to give them a chance to be heard, Chapman held hearings in 11 States.

His was also the responsibility, under Secretary Ickes, for assigning oil leases, a particularly ticklish matter in view of the acute memories of the Teapot Dome scandal. Chapman is proud to recall that Ickes never approved an oil lease over his Assistant Secretary's disapproval.

Chapman also played a dominant part in the efforts to rehabilitate the Virgin Islands which President Hoover had once described as an effective poorhouse. He took a deep interest in the efforts to develop Alaska, improve conditions in Puerto Rico, bring statehood to Hawaii. He was largely responsible, again with the strong support of Ickes, for the program of developing synthetic fuels, including the oil-shale-extraction experiment at Rifle which appears to have succeeded beyond all dreams. He led the fight for creation of the Jackson Hole National Monument and has been vigorous in his efforts to build up the great national parks that have come into being since Franklin D. Roosevelt's first administration.

These represent but a small part of the contributions which, as an official, Chapman has made in the cause of the best use and wisest conservation of our natural resources.

They have not been his only contributions. Having no formal hobbies, he has spent much of his spare time working on behalf of minorities. He master-minded the famous concert given by Marian Anderson on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial after the noted Negro had been refused permission to sing in Constitution Hall. Behind the scenes he did much on behalf of the efforts that led to creation of the Republic of Israel. He regards the political work he has done, first on behalf of Roosevelt and, during the 1948 campaign, on behalf of Truman, as the least of his efforts.

In 1940 he took a leave of absence without pay to help organize the 11 Western States on behalf of Roosevelt's reelection campaign.

BOOMED FOR TRUMAN

In 1948 he was Truman's advance man, helping organize meetings for the President and drumming up support for him where such support was likely to count. Since he believed in what Truman stood for, he was willing to go all out in working for the latter, regardless of how dismal Truman's chances appeared to be.

Seeking no publicity, working quietly and effectively, the genial Chapman was one of the real architects of the surprise Truman victory of November 1948.

At 53, Chapman looks a lot younger than his years. He is happily married to the charming and attractive former Anne Kendrick, who for 3 years was his secretary. They have one child—a son.

A teetotaler and nonsmoker, Chapman is no hermit. He likes people and is liked by them; no Washington official is more popular. But he is no gad-about. Nobody in the Capital spends more time at his desk.

But with all of the vast responsibilities that have now descended on him—the administration of a department that spends more than $600,000,000 a year and has more than 60,000 in its employ—Chapman remains unharassed, unruffled, and unhurried. After 16½ years in public life he knows how to get things done.

Civil-Rights Program for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from an address which I delivered at the National Emergency Civil Rights Mobilization on January 15, 1950, in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Civil rights in America is on the march. This meeting is proof of that fact, because you who represent millions of Americans all over the United States are demonstrating by your presence the wish of the American people to enact into law the principles of brotherhood and human equality which democracy stands for.

All over this land the people of America, in their churches, in their trade-unions, in their fraternal organizations, in their farm co-ops, through their city and State FEPC laws and antidiscrimination laws, are telling the Congress of the United States, "Enact civil-rights legislation." They are telling the nations of the world, "We, the people of America, believe in the democratic principles we profess. We, the people of America, call upon our Congress to carry out the will of the electorate." The responsibility of American Government is to legislate for the people, not to consolidate the entrenched power of the minority by political manipulation of parliamentary rules.

The most vital issue facing the American Congress today is that of civil rights. The preservation of human rights is the paramount issue of our generation. The extension and the guarantee of human rights and civil rights is the core of our struggle with the totalitarian forces. The denial of human liberty, the betrayal of democratic ideals, is the sin and the crime of communism and other totalitarian doctrines. This great Nation of ours has poured out billions of dollars of the people's money in a struggle against the aggression of Communist ideology. We are sapping the economic strength of our economy to maintain a powerful military establishment because of the threat of Communist aggression. We live in a psychosis of fear because of the evil and ruthlessness of the totalitarian power.

How blind can we be? Are we incapable of seeing that neither communism nor fascism can be stopped by the mere demonstration of military power and financial resources? Our secret weapon in this great struggle is the fulfillment of the democratic ideal of human equality. This ideal is embodied in political form in the civil-rights proposals which are now before the Congress of the United States.

The issue of civil rights penetrates our foreign policy and adulterates our domestic policy. It penetrates our foreign policy because by our failure to guarantee basic civil liberties to all peoples, regardless of race, color, or creed, we are denying acceptance of the principles of human equality.

The underprivileged long-exploited peoples of Asia and Africa wish to be accepted as free and equal members of the human society. They will place their faith in the nation and the people who accept them and work with them as free and equal peoples. A foreign policy that does not include the issue of human dignity and human equality is one that is doomed to failure. As it has been stated again and again, the struggle we are now engaged in is one for men's minds. Respect, understanding, and affection cannot be purchased by loans, gifts, or grants. A unity of freedom-loving people cannot be molded by power and military might. The intangibles of human freedom, equality, and individual dignity are the only real forces and weapons on the side of democratic faith.

Our moral standing in the eyes of the world hinges on whether we pass civil rights legislation. The moral and political health of our own economy depends on whether or not we adopt civil rights legislation. We can scarcely call ourselves a democratic nation if we fail to guarantee the right to vote and the right of personal security. We jeopardize our economic strength if we deny people an opportunity for employment because of such factors as race, color, or creed. We weaken our national strength in direct proportion to the number of people that we discriminate against either in the exercise of their political liberties or their economic opportunities. We can no longer afford the luxury and the waste of second-class citizenship.

The facts of international politics, the moral obligation of our own political faith, the economic and political needs of our times, call upon the Congress of the United States to fulfill the pledges on civil rights legislation which have been given to the people.

It would seem to the casual observer that the enactment of civil-rights legislation would be a routine matter. Our entire history is one filled with the ideals of freedom, individual dignity, and brotherhood. The forward movement of our developing democracy has been that of human liberation. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Emancipation Proclamation—all are testimonies to the will of the people of this Nation to liberate ourselves from our sense of guilt and shame. The people of our country have carried a great moral burden for too long a time. We have cried out for democracy in other nations at the same time that we denied democracy at home. This hypocrisy has developed a sense of national moral guilt that calls for an immediate answer. Americans now realize that discrimination is a denial of our creed. We have been a Nation plagued with a guilty conscience.

We made an auspicious step toward absolving ourselves of this sense of guilt with the publication of the precedent-breaking report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, organized labor, business, all religious groups—almost all sections of our public life were represented in this report which called—in ringing words—for an end to discrimination, the right of all citizens to live free of terror and oppression and to participate fully in the responsibility and benefits of their Government. This was a landmark in our march toward the realization of genuine democracy. The next step, and the step we now face, is the implementation of the Committee's recommendations.

In 1948 at the convention of the Democratic Party, the decision was abruptly made. When the delegates were challenged to get out of the shadow of States' rights and to walk forth in the bright sunshine of human rights, they voted to relieve themselves of their guilty consciences. They voted against discrimination and against bigotry. They justified the freedom of freemen.

Again, on last November the third, our faith in the American citizen was tested and affirmed. There can be no doubt now about the American people's passion for liberation. They voted to liberate themselves from their guilt as well as to liberate minority groups from their displacement. The American voter showed to all the world that he had the courage of his convictions.

In spite of that great demonstration in November, a minority in the Senate of the United States withstands the national tide. They will fail, because history is against them, the people are against them, the President of the United States is against them, the times are against them. Our President risked his political career to bring the issue of civil rights to the people. He traveled many miles to proclaim his vigorous views on this issue. He has broken all precedent in the degree of his strength and leadership to the end that man's inviolate dignity shall be accorded to all men equally. President Truman has truly shown that he would rather be right than be President.

As a Democrat I call upon my party to carry out its promises to the people. Those promises were embodied in the platform under four specific proposals: (1) The right of equal treatment in the armed forces; (2) legislation to abolish the poll tax; (3) a meaningful and effective antilynching bill; and (4) fair employment practices legislation.

I do not underestimate the difficulties that lie before us. Already in the Eighty-first Congress the people of the world have been betrayed by the sell-out of human rights known as the Wherry compromise which changed the rules of the United States Senate on the matter of curbing a filibuster. It was the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition just a year ago which passed the Wherry Resolution that requires a two-thirds vote of the entire membership of the United States Senate to stop a filibuster. This was indeed a Machiavellian body blow. It was the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition which made a political issue out of human rights. As a Member of the Congress, as one who has been given the honor to serve my Nation, I am ashamed and am heartsick that this tragic mistake and sell-out has taken place.

This is no time, however, for acrimonious attack or bitter words. This is the time for a call to reason and a plea for justice. Just because the rules were changed thereby making it extremely difficult to curb a filibuster, so now the obligation is all the more upon us to overcome the difficulties that have been placed in the path of human freedom by delivering the votes needed to break a filibuster and to pass civil-rights legislation.

That which has been done by men can be undone. The mistakes of yesterday can and must be corrected by the positive accomplishments of today.

I call upon the Republican Party and upon my own party, the Democratic Party, to come clean on the issue of civil rights. No man has a right to play politics with human lives and human dignity. To exploit the oppressed, to gain power or advantage by political expediency at the expense of human beings is not only a denial of democratic ideals, but is immoral.

The issue of civil rights should be a nonpartisan matter. The passage of civil rights legislation is a bipartisan obligation. Neither the Republicans nor the Democrats can honestly say to the millions of Americans who are suffering under the yoke of discrimination or bigotry that this Congress did not have the votes to pass the civil-rights proposals. The Republican Party is committed by platform and by pronouncement to this program. The Democratic Party is equally committed. It will not make much sense to the American people for the leaders of either political party to try to explain

their failure by the fact that a handful of opponents stopped action. This is but to say that the process of democracy has been stopped dead by a willful obstructionist minority that was vastly outnumbered by the Democratic-Republican majority.

The President of the United States, who stands as the leader not only of this Nation but of his party, has given the call to action. He had every right to expect the support of all Members of Congress who have declared themselves for this legislation. Tonight I share the platform with a distinguished leader of the Republican Party, my friend and colleague, Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon. I appeal to the Republican membership of the Senate to follow the leadership of Senator MORSE and his liberal associates on this vital issue of civil rights. I know of no demonstration on the part of the Congress that would instill more faith in the hearts of our people as to the honesty and the integrity of the democratic processes than a bipartisan effort to pass civil-rights legislation.

Soon we shall come to grips with the issue of fair-employment practices legislation. The FEPC bill listed on the Senate Calendar as S. 1728 will be brought up for debate on the floor of the Senate within a matter of weeks. This bill has the support of the majority of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. This bill represents a reasonable, moderate, and constructive approach to a very serious problem. The principles of fair-employment practices legislation are neither new nor untried. The President's Committee on FEPC during the war years has an enviable record of accomplishment. Already 10 States have FEPC laws on their statute books. Many of the large cities have pioneered in this all-important field of legislation. Roughly speaking, about 50,000,000 people, or more than a third of our country's population, is already covered by State or local FEPC laws. It cannot be too strongly emphasized, however, that the problems of discrimination are Nation-wide. In discussing them, no State, section, nor community should feel that it is being singled out for criticism. To pass FEPC legislation is not to legislate against any section of the country. The problem of discrimination is present in all sections in some form or other. It is therefore the responsibility of the National Government through its Congress to establish a basic standard for human rights and problems of employment.

The passage of FEPC and other civil-rights legislation is, as I have stated before, jeopardized by the Wherry resolution. I do not want to underestimate the difficulties which are placed in our path. However, I am convinced that belief in the Golden Rule can overcome a Senate rule. If we should fail, there is but one alternative, an old, true, tried, and tested alternative, namely, a free election. I am sure that every Member of Congress can understand the meaning of this language. The time for political politeness is over. The clubby atmosphere of the Congress does not carry through to the country. It is not enough just to be a good fellow and to be liked by your colleagues. The American people did not send 531 Members of the Congress of the United States to Washington in order to develop our social life. We are here for the purpose of developing, protecting, and extending the democratic way of life. That way of life is being challenged by bigotry, hypocrisy, intolerance, and discrimination right here in America. It will require much more courage to stand up against the antidemocratic forces within America than it does to vote the people's money to fight the Communist forces outside of America. The eyes of the people of the United States are focused on Washington. They say: "Whether you are Democrat or Republican is not the issue. By your deeds shall ye be known."

Heywood Broun's Gifted Pen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last month occurred the tenth anniversary of the death of Heywood Broun, journalist, humanitarian, and founder of the American Guild, one of the great unions in the American labor movement. At the time of Mr. Broun's death, our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, said:

Heywood Broun lived a full life and leaves a noble heritage. His great gifts of heart and mind and soul were ever directed toward his purposes.

Neither slander nor calumny nor thought of personal consequences ever deterred him once he had entered a fight in the cause of right and justice as he saw it.

He was a hard fighter but always a fair adversary and no matter for whom he worked he wore no man's collar.

He will be missed and mourned particularly by the underprivileged whose staunch champion he always was.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article, Jottings From Broun's Gifted Pen, which appeared in the Guild Reporter for December 9, 1949, a newspaper published by the American Newspaper Guild.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MORE JOTTINGS FROM BROUN'S GIFTED PEN

(Broun wielded a gifted pen. It could cut, it could bring chuckles, and it could state an issue in simple, logical terms. Here are some random samples, culled from his columns in the World, the World-Telegram, the News Republic, and from speeches.)

A newspaper is, among other things, a business. And, even so, it must be more than that. * * *

A newspaper is a rule unto itself. It has a soul for salvation or damnation. * * *

A newspaper can neither rise nor fall beyond or below its staff. * * *

I've always had the feeling that newspapers most of all were fit subjects for some sort of socialization. I've never known even the most obscure reporter who didn't think he knew more about running a paper than the man who owned it. I've always felt that way myself. And once I was right.

There is no force which can stand against a fierce, a free, and stalwart spirit. The voice of such a one is louder than the roll of guns.

Liberals need not be born. They can be trained by care and kindness.

The word "liberal" itself has fallen into disrepute. To a radical it is a label for a man who professes friendship and then rushes away for his 30 pieces of silver as soon as the crisis comes. In the eyes of the conservatives a liberal is a dirty Red who probably bought his dinner coat with Russian gold.

Neither interpretation is correct and it should not be impossible to expose the fallacy of such reasoning.

Nobody has a right to demand that an editor shall never change his mind. New facts on any given situation may require a complete right-about-face.

I am not so much interested in the freedom of the press as in the integrity of the press. Freedom means any man who owns a large paper can print or throw into the wastepaper basket what he likes. A man who poisons news is more dangerous than a man who poisons wells and springs.

There can be no such thing as a free press and no such thing as the integrity of the news if the men and women who write the news live in fear of the security of their jobs.

He had the harassed look of a flapjack cook in a lumber camp.

Free speech is about as good a cause as the world has ever known. But, like the poor, it is always with us and gets shoved aside in favor of things which seem at some given moment more vital.

They never are more vital. Not when you look back at them from a distance. When the necessity of free speech is most important we shut it off. Everybody favors free speech in the slack moments when no axes are being ground.

The weakness of communism has always been in its basic dependence upon leadership which was far away and unfamiliar with American conditions.

Quite inadvertently, I am sure, some of the publishers have allowed the feeling to grow and spread that newspaper men and women who join organizations of their own creation will be subject to penalties.

The penalty may not be dismissal. All newspapermen know of an institution known as the Chinese torture room. A reporter who incurs the displeasure of the boss by organizing activity may find himself writing obits for the rest of his life.

A press that rests upon the fears and apprehensions of reporters who are frightened and who feel that they have good reason to be frightened is not free.

It is a curious tradition of American journalism that no one is supposed to speak well of it until he has left that part of his life behind.

At 51 I have more faith than I ever had before. People are better than I thought they were going to be—myself included.

But at 51 I'm a better fighter than at 21. Things which once were just a sort of sentimental solace are now realities. Brotherhood is not just a Bible word. Out of comradeship can come and will come the happy life for all. The underdog can and will lick his weight in the wildcats of the world.

Broun's description of Al Smith, at the 1931 Democratic National Convention:

"That curious voice, half Caruso and half Tenth Avenue. When Al speaks the nose has it. It cuts like a sharp blade, a fish knife, through the uproar. Al carries his own gavel in his larynx."

No body politic is in a healthy state until it begins to itch.

Anger isn't the same thing as hatred. It is a flash of feeling which goes over the dam upon the instant. No man who has expressed his anger with reasonable fluency need go back to it again.

Revenge is a form of procrastination. The man who eases his soul by paying off a score at the end of 20 years confesses that he didn't have the nerve or the mental alertness to handle the situation when it lay immediately in front of him.

I still think that the lawless employers should be restrained, and if they don't like it here, I see no possible objection to sending them back where they came from.

I've been fired in the spring, the summer, and the early winter. I like it best in the summer. Three times in the 31 years isn't so much to be fired.

The first firing is often worse than the last. It's very discouraging to get canned when you're young. That's the way it was with me.

I was 21 and working on the Morning Telegraph. My stall in the old Eighth Avenue car barn was right next to Bide Dudley. He was getting $35 a week and my salary was $28. I wanted $30 but when I asked for it they fired me.

Public opinion in this country runs like a shower bath. We have no temperatures between hot and cold.

With all deference to tradition, I do not think that news, either in peace or war, is limited to the recital of overt acts. True reporting should be a great deal more than a recital of oddities. It should go deeper into the commonplace and ordinary.

Journalism at its best is current history, and in the long run history is compounded out of things which may seem trivial at the moment. There ought to be an eye for acorns as well as oaks.

All too frequently a daily paper takes on the form of cataloging the folk in a sideshow. The silliest sort of playboy can earn himself headlines by semi-insane antics. Lunatic acts and kindred deeds are overplayed, in my opinion.

There is no poorer rule for the approximation of news than the familiar adage about dogs and men. Unless there is some special setting for the event, I deny the existence of news in the fact that a man bites a dog. An editor's reaction to such an event should be to spike the story, saying, "It's just another nut or one of those press agents."

Wanting things is fun. Getting them ruins your appetite.

Newspaper reporters have the habit of bestowing the title of "sage" somewhat too readily. They speak of sages almost as often as dramatic critics and book reviewers refer to "genius."

I was a child prodigy myself. That is, at the age of 5 I always required 12-year-old pants.

It is not inevitable that today's strip of newsprint should be no more than tattered scraps in tomorrow's dust bin. The man who writes well enough and thinks through the thing before him can win his immortality, even though his piece appears obscurely in a Wall Street edition.

Most of us on papers, for all our swagger, are at least five and a half times too humble. We are apt to say, "Oh, I'm just a newspaperman." When called upon to justify ourselves we smirk and behave as if the thing we did were really of but small importance.

We know better than that. There is no reason why a first-rate man on any newspaper should yield precedence to every novelist and minor poet and and little essayist. In city rooms I've known the whole crowd to gape at some member of the staff in considerable awe and whisper behind his back, "He's written a book."

There's no special magic in getting between boards. Last year's novel is just as dead as last year's paper. Indeed, I know few sights more horrible than second-hand book stalls on which dead volumes are exposed to wind and weather, completely dead and lacking only decent burial.

Independent liberals always get beaten in American elections because they reserve their commitments until a month or so before election. * * * Organization can't be beaten without organization.

We're More Tax Conscious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chico (Calif.) Enterprise-Record of Saturday, January 7, 1950:

THERE'S MUCH TALK ABOUT TAXES

At the moment the people of the United States must be acutely tax conscious. There are several good reasons why they should be.

Every person in the country who draws a pay check this week, from which his tax deductions are made at the source, probably will blink and take a second look at the figures. His tax for social security has taken a bigger bite out of his check. The percentage deducted has gone up from 1 to 1½ percent. Instead of the deduction stopping when he has earned $3,000 this year, if he has a job which pays that kind of money, it'll go right on until he's earned more than $3,600.

Employers, too, may do a little blinking and give certain figures a quick double-take when they note at the end of the month that their contributions to social security for their employees have gone up correspondingly. They may fume a little, too, over the new requirement for monthly reports. Bookkeepers already are tugging at their hair because State and Federal deductions are no longer alike, and each must now be figured separately.

A great many people, the self-employed as well as the employed, must have been made very much tax-conscious by what they've been reading about Washington activities this week. Quite a bit has been said in Washington lately about those wartime emergency excise taxes, which somehow continued to hang on after the war ended to bear heavily and probably unfairly on certain lines of business. It develops now that the excise taxes, once designed to discourage buying of certain goods and wares, haven't really been going to help pay for the war. The Government found other places to spend the excise-tax money. Other things are now dependent upon the excise taxes, and if the excise taxes are taken off we'll have to dig up other tax money to keep these things going.

What has happened in the case of the excise taxes has happened before in other governmental activity. We're the darndest nation to get ourselves into an emergency of some kind, take emergency steps to relieve the emergency and then be unable to step back into normal position when the emergency is over.

A great many people, who were already well aware that the Government is now spending tax money it doesn't have, must have been made considerably more tax-conscious when President Truman talked to Congress this week. Mr. Truman asked Congress for a moderate tax increase, and asked again for some new ways to spend more tax MONEY.

A great deal has been said about taxes down Washington way since the President's message to Congress on Tuesday. As of today, the big umbrella issue which hangs over all others in Washington is the issue of taxation. It's pretty plain to everybody.

The Associated Press felt Congress' pulse day before yesterday, after the President's tax request, and reported that at least a half dozen of his proposals are doomed to die a quick death. And it wasn't just those heel-dragging Republicans who were making that forecast, either. There were some Democratic voices which could be heard even above the Republican pleas for trimming expenses. Men of both parties are convinced that the Federal budget can be deflated to the point of eliminating deficit spending, and perhaps even paying a little on the grandpapoy of all national debts.

If a great many people have been made tax-conscious, it's about time. Taxes are imposed by the Federal Government only by sanction of the people themselves. The people themselves have not only sanctioned, but actually have been responsible for much of the tax burden now weighing heavily upon them. They've done it by demanding more services, more facilities, more benefits from a government that has had to obtain the money from the only source of money the Government has—the same people.

So long as any taxpayer labors under the mistaken idea that anything government gives him will be paid for by someone else we're going to go right on being more and more tax-conscious.

Desk Memo for Congressmen and President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a desk memo for Congressmen and President Truman, which you and other Members of the Texas delegation may wish to read at the Jefferson Democratic dinner. It may be that this quotation has escaped the attention of the Democrats during the great spending orgy that has now brought the Nation to the brink of insolvency.

I am inserting in the RECORD, under leave to extend heretofore granted, the memo from J. Constantin, 508 Continental Building, Dallas, Tex.:

DESK MEMO FOR CONGRESSMEN AND PRESIDENT TRUMAN BY THOMAS JEFFERSON

(Quotation from Reader's Digest, October 1949)

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. * * * To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt.

* * * We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude. * * *

"If we run into such debt, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. * * * If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

Most of you in the past several years have made yourselves heard either over the radio or in the press crying for the stabilization of the country's economy.

I know of no better way to stabilize our economy than by following the concepts of the above statement made by Thomas Jefferson, a great American, nearly 150 years ago.

Army Open Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY OPEN DOOR

If promises about the Army's new racial policy may be taken at face value, a major milestone has been passed. Under a new circular, Negro soldiers will be assigned on the basis of their skills and qualifications without regard to race. This sensible assignment policy is what is needed to implement the previously announced opening of Army schools and military occupational specialties to Negroes. These advances represent achievement of three of the four principal goals of the Fahy Committee on Equality of Opportunity in the Armed Services. The fourth, abandonment of the racial-quota system, remains to be met, but there is reason to hope that the Army will soon adopt the same criteria of intelligence rather than race that obtain in the Air Force and Navy.

It is the principle, rather than the immediate effects of this new policy, that is significant. The Army has at last shown itself of the negative influence of the zooz-daggers who insisted on strict segregation because of the Negro problem. This influence frustrated the recent decision to open schools and occupational specialties by preventing qualified Negroes from using their training except in Negro units or overhead installations.

Caution is still warranted by the well-known ability of individual army commanders to sabotage policies with which they disagree, and it will be necessary for Secretary Gray to do some policing in order to insure that his orders are carried out in good faith. But an excellent start is being made in the unequivocal directive to assign critical specialists to any unit, white or otherwise, and to fill other vacancies with Negroes wherever practicable.

Aside from constitutional of equal treatment, this move is fully warranted on practical grounds. The Army is short of certain skills which qualified Negroes are competent to fill. Efficient use of the best available manpower also obviates the substitution of intelligence tests for racial quotas—a practice which in the Air Force has worked out to maintain approximately the same ratio of Negroes to whites. As the Army moves toward integration, which is the only defensible standard for an American fighting force, we believe that its Negro problem will disappear.

Everybody Gets "Soaked"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner:

The collectivist conspirators of the Fair Deal constantly strive to convince people with small incomes that they get material benefits from socialistic Government policies while others pay for them.

A research just completed by Representative HAROLD LOVRE, of South Dakota, demonstrates how completely untrue that is.

The national income for the fiscal year ended last June 30 was $225,000,000,000, of which Federal, State, and local taxes amounted to $56,000,000,000—about 25 percent.

Figures compiled by Representative LOVRE, with the help of the Federal Bureaus of the Census, Internal Revenue, and Labor Statistics, show that the average family with an income of $3,000 paid—in Federal income taxes, in corporate taxes passed along in the prices of goods, in social-security taxes, and in the various excise impositions—a total of $510.75 Federal taxes.

It paid $196.15 in State and local taxes.

The family's total taxes amounted, therefore, to $706.90, or 23.56 percent of its income.

The average family on a $5,000 income paid out $1,238.45 for taxes, or 24.75 percent of its income; and in the case of the $7,500 family the total taxes amounted to $1,970.70, or 26.27 percent.

The $3,000 family, as these figures clearly show, paid out in taxes only a very slightly lower percentage of its income as did other Americans, one-fourth of whose total earnings were taken by government.

So obviously the rich are not paying the taxes for the man of smaller income.

He is paying them himself, and if he wants to keep more of his income for his own family he can accomplish it only by insisting that the Truman administration stop squandering his money on socialistic schemes designed to buy his vote.

Mr. Speaker, the country and the Congress are indebted to Congressman LOVRE for undertaking the research which gives the facts as to who is paying the taxes which are forced on the people by the present administration. It is time that we realize that even those in the average income groups are not getting something for nothing and that the so-called security offered by the Fair Deal is only the old, well-known scheme of robbing Peter to pay Paul. I personally want to commend Congressman LOVRE for his great job of completing the research he has undertaken. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to present this editorial to the full body of the House of Representatives.

No Submission to Federal Blackmail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arizona Daily Star of January 6, 1950.

The Federal Security Agency informed the State of Arizona that funds for the crippled children's program were being withheld effective January 1, 1950, unless the State of Arizona would make available to the children residing on Indian reservations all facilities afforded under the crippled children's program. This action by the Federal Security Agency has caused a serious situation in the State of Arizona, and has caused the crippled children, now being cared for, and the parents of those children, undue mental anguish.

The Arizona State Board of Social Security and Welfare submitted a compromise plan for the consideration of the Federal Board which was as follows:

1. That we will withdraw from our plan all reference to any class or group.

2. We will accept all applications on the rheumatic-fever program for Indian children who would make application and take them in the order received. (This is a wholly Federal project.)

3. If and when a special session of the legislature is called, we will ask for addition funds for crippled Indian children and discuss with our doctors a process for handling them.

This plan as presented was rejected by the Federal Security Agency and, with the continued withholding of funds, the situation is becoming more serious day by day.

The State department in Arizona does not have available any publicly owned or operated hospitals of any kind. The convalescent home for crippled children has very limited facilities and is used for convalescence purposes only. In contrast to this the Indian Bureau of the Department of the Interior has had, and now has, available hospital and nursing facilities which are for the use of Indian children only. The State, through its crippled children's program, has afforded clinical service to all Indian children whether they resided on or off the reservation. Those needing medical or surgical care were then referred to the Indian Bureau.

The Federal Security Agency has demanded that the State of Arizona give the same treatment and hospitalization to children residing on Indian reservations if they are to have their Federal funds restored. Considering the fact that the appropriations by the State legislature are limited, if the State were to concur in the demands made by the Federal Social Security Administration, it would not extend any great amount of service to reservation children and would curtail the service now being furnished

to other crippled children in the State. Arizona has a situation that is peculiar in that it has approximately 16.5 percent of the total reservation Indian population in the United States; also in excess of 70 percent of the total land in the State is owned by or is under the control of the Federal Government.

The reservation Indian children have, at the present time, available more facilities for medical care than any other group of children in the State of Arizona. The State department of social security and welfare will not accede to the demands being made by the Federal Security Agency. It would appear that the Federal Security Agency in this move is trying to set a precedent whereby the State of Arizona will be forced to assume all Indians that would qualify for aid under the various categories of the social-security program. The State is not financially able to carry this program nor is it responsible for the care of reservatiotn Indians, since that is a duty of the Indian Bureau and their responsibility in every respect.

The editorial follows:

NO SUBMISSION TO FEDERAL BLACKMAIL

We have just had a good lesson in what happens when a State starts accepting doles of Federal money to support new social work sponsored by the Federal Government.

Because Arizona would not make any kind of an agreement to accept responsibility for reservation Indians, the children's bureau of the Federal Security Agency in Washington has arbitrarily shut off funds that have been financing the care of crippled children and some others suffering from rheumatic fever.

After getting Arizona to start this new social work, the Federal agency comes along and says, "Do what we tell you, or we will shut off your funds."

Arizona properly refused. Certainly the Arizona director of the social welfare board would be exceeding his authority to take on the responsibility of caring for crippled children of reservation Indians. Yet that is what the Federal bureaucrats demanded. If that precedent were once established in Arizona, it would in time lead to the spectacle of the State of Arizona assuming the social welfare burden of these Indians, over which it has no authority.

So few people, outside of Arizona in particular, realize what this distinction means. The Federal Government sets aside the Indian reservation for reservation Indians. Over these Indians and their reservations the State of Arizona has no authority. Indeed, it is denied the right to exercise the least bit of authority over Indians living on reservations. For that reason Arizona now refuses to accept any financial responsibility for reservation Indian children, who are crippled.

This position can possibly be appreciated better when it is understood that Arizona discriminates in no way against Indians who do not live on reservations. They enjoy every right that every other citizen does. Their crippled children are entitled to just as much care as other children. But these Indians pay taxes. They are not wards of the Federal Government.

Moreover, Arizona has an additional reason for refusing to get trapped in the present controversy. On every Indian reservation there are hospitals for the exclusive use of Indians. Arizona citizens have no right to receive care in such Federal hospitals.

Behind all of this controversy is the determination in Washington, by certain top bureaucrats in the Indian Bureau and the Federal Security Agency, to browbeat Arizona into setting a precedent of recognizing responsibility for reservation Indians.

Arizona is not going to do it. It will be cheaper to forego Federal appropriations. It would be wrong to assume responsibility over something where authority is specifically denied, as it is in the case of Indians and their reservations.

Employment and the Tax Incentive Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address made by me on January 11, last, at a luncheon meeting of the Bond Club of New York. The meeting was presided over by Mr. C. L. Morse, Jr., president of the club.

The address entitled, "Employment and the Tax Incentive Act of 1950," follows:

I have had two surprises in connection with my appearance here today. The first was when I received the invitation, for I could think of no other organization whose members would care less to meet a Democratic Member of Congress. Coupled with the fact that I am a Bronx Democrat—than whom there is no more of a Democrat—and a member of the tax-symbolic Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, I submit I had real cause for astonishment. My second surprise came today when I saw so many of those in the securities business present. I did not think there were that many of you left in Wall Street. I assume that is due in no small part to my good friend Ed Hanrahan, who, as a member and later as Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, has been a real friend of your business and, at the same time, an able champion of the public interest.

I am sorry not to see here present my good friend Emil Schram. He is one man who, when he appears before our committee, or, in fact, before any committee either of the House or Senate, commands the attention and respect of his listeners. I believe that he has done a wonderful job—not only for the New York Stock Exchange—but for the whole securities business and the entire country. I am glad to know that he is out of the hospital and on his way to Florida for a much-needed rest.

You may get the idea from the topic of my address and the title of my bill and its provisions that I am moving in various directions. At the very outset may I say that pure logic is not the language of statesmanship or democratic policy. These characteristics are to be found in the spirit of moderation and compromise which gets things done without creating irreparable rancor. In the pulls and twists from the various great interests of the public as producers and consumers and investors, successful policy steers clear of letting any group have its way completely. You may say that irreconcilables can be reconciled, and I will not argue the point on grounds of logic. I maintain, however, that seemingly irreconcilable interests often have more in common than the differences that part them.

Particularly in the field of Federal taxation is the acceptance of the second best often imperative, and this acceptance comes with easier grace when one has a full and complete understanding of all the facts and viewpoints. Would that the Ways and Means Committee could bring forth a tax measure, wholly new, unmarred by ambiguities and undistorted by Treasury regulations and court decisions. Would that we could fashion a tax structure that would reach out and collect all the revenue the Treasury sought, and, at the same time, fill the taxpayer with delight at the prospect of filing the annual fright known as the income-tax return. Alas, that is the illusive ideal.

I wish more interest were displayed by the public in the process out of which the final figures on the income-tax form eventually emerge. As you know, the Constitution provides that all revenue bills must originate in the House. The underlying idea is that the lower House of the legislature is closer to the public opinion. However, direct election of Senators, made effective in 1913 by the enactment of the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution, has weakened this theory. In any event, the Senate has an important part in revenue bills because it may amend. The Ways and Means Committee is the tax committee of the House of Representatives and, together with the Senate Committee on Finance, is in charge of the preparation of revenue bills. My membership on the Committee on Ways and Means runs back to 1943. Our respected chairman, Hon ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, a really young and vigorous man of 86 years, has been a member since 1932. Membership on the committee, I say without boast, is a liberal education in economics and politics. The committee is made up of 25 members, with the usual division among the majority and minority parties. Every important group—and, sometimes we are inclined to think, every articulate individual—has bright ideas about taxes and presents them to members of the Ways and Means Committee, whose work often continues between sessions of the Congress. Hearings on a revenue bill are usually opened by the Secretary of the Treasury and members of his staff, preliminary to which private conferences have been held on many phases of proposed measures, including both basic issues and administrative and technical matters.

Hearings of the committee are public. You will readily recall occasions in recent years when Treasury officials have been questioned by committee members searchingly and without favor. While there have been far-reaching changes in the relation between the Chief Executive and the Congress in the past several decades, I am happy to state that the members of the Ways and Means Committee take their constitutional responsibilities very seriously and maintain an admirable degree of independence. Following the administration's presentation of the case for the bill, representatives of various groups appear to testify for or against the proposals in whole or in part. The committee also has the benefit of the comment of publicists, economists, and resolutions of various commercial and other organizations.

At times the Senate Finance Committee's proposed amendments having proved unacceptable to the committee, a conference or series of conferences are held between members of the committees of both Chambers. The agreement reached by the conference usually is approved, particularly as the time may now be short. A European statesman is credited with the thought that whoever wishes to keep his respect for sausages and laws should not see how either is made. I I can't speak for sausages, and there may be a measure of truth in the statement with reference to some bills. As to revenue measures in general, subject to the closest scrutiny of public opinion and picked apart by interested groups with little forbearance and less restraint, I can say only that they mirror

the fiscal needs of the country and reflect the best judgment of the committee as to how these needs are to be met.

To return to home base, and one revenue bill in particular which has still to run the gauntlet of the whole legislative process, H. R. 6393 was introduced by me on October 13, 1949, shortly before the first session of the Eighty-first Congress came to a close. As a little background material, you will remember that the President a year ago insisted on increasing the rates of individual income taxes in the middle and higher brackets and on corporations, except those with very small earnings. You will recall, too, that the President has consistently declared that the Revenue Act of 1948, which was passed over his veto, was responsible for the Federal Government's deficit. The present fiscal situation you are all familiar with from a reading of the President's budget message.

I would be less than frank if I pretended that my bill has the blessings of the administration, and I would be yielding to self-deception if I thought that you, reflecting the views of the world of finance, would greet all of my proposals enthusiastically. When I am through, perhaps it will be said that we disagreed only in opinion; but this is my bill; I have given it my name; and I am willing to make this essay in the art of persuasion, let the chips fall where they may.

H. R. 6393 provides that wartime excises be reduced on toilet preparations, long-distance and local telephone services, telegrams, photographic equipment and supplies, and the transportation of persons. Furthermore, the bill eliminates excises on electric-light bulbs and such preparations used in the care of infants as baby powder and baby oil. The bill provides for the exemption from excise duties of jewelry items selling for less than $50, furs selling for less than $200, and luggage retailing for less than $25. In this way the full rates now in effect are retained on jewelry, furs, and luggage which are in the luxury class, whereas taxes on such things as costume jewelry and on inexpensive fur coats, handbags, wallets, suitcases, and the like, which are, in reality, necessities, and are bought by the average man and woman, are eliminated entirely. I suppose that this part of my bill, standing alone, will not invite much criticism. According to the best estimates obtainable, the revenue loss from these proposed changes in the aptly described "nuisance taxes" is around $250,000,000. But these provisions do not stand alone.

Secondly, H. R. 6393 provides for the following changes in capital-gains taxation: (1) A reduction of the tax rate on long-term gains to 10 percent, (2) an increase to $5,000 in the amount by which capital losses may be offset against ordinary income in any one year, and (3) shortening the holding period to 3 months. At this point, I would merely note that these provisions, designed to make possible increased production—the only source from which an increase in national income such as the President projected can flow—also do not stand alone, but are a part of a four-pronged measure meeting the President's tests of moderate fiscal reform. Capital-gains taxes are not primarily regarded as revenue features of the tax system. It is impossible to gage the effects of the proposed changes, although I believe studies of the consequences of our present set-up lead to the conclusion that the greater mobility of capital assets would more than offset the lower rates and, as a result, the Treasury would gain rather than lose income.

It is my considered judgment that these proposed changes in capital-gains taxation will encourage the flow of investment funds that will provide the machines and tools for well-paid job opportunities in industry. It takes an average investment of $5,000 to provide one job in modern industry. It is a matter of simple arithmetic to multiply this figure by the 700,000 new entrants into the labor market annually to see that billions of dollars of new money are required by private enterprise each year if full employment is to be maintained. It is through full employment that the prosperity of the country can be maintained.

Like everyone else, I am not insensitive to a favorable reception from my listeners, and I have anticipated that this part of my bill would meet your approval. Nevertheless, if I thought the proposals regarding capital gains would lead to unbridled activity in the securities markets, I would not for a moment countenance such changes. So long as the Federal Reserve Board has broad powers over margin requirements and the SEC retains its vigilance under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Securities Act of 1933, the possibility of a recurrence of the late twenties can be dismissed with confidence.

There is a strong and well-founded public opinion that double taxation of dividend income is unjust. Bearing the Treasury's revenue needs in mind, I have provided for only a 10-percent-dividend-income credit on income received from common-stock investments, which, however, will cause a revenue loss to the Government of approximately $575,000,000. This will not completely remedy the inequities of double taxation of dividends but will serve as a token recognition of the evil and, it is hoped, will convince the investing public that the administration is sympathetic with their problems. When I ask for sympathetic consideration of the taxpayer, may I also inject a plea for kindly consideration for an administration that is confronted with a gigantic war debt, a further tremendous financial outlay in a cold war that threatens the security of the world, and the complex domestic problems arising out of the natural desires of our people for a higher standard of living. And, when, on occasions, you hear Congress assailed and, unfortunately, too often made a target of ridicule, give sympathetic consideration to the 25 men, Republicans and Democrats, who are sincerely and earnestly and, I think, intelligently, facing these tremendous financial responsibilities and, when you think of them, remember that they are only typical of the rest of Congress.

Having, I hope, enlisted your sympathetic consideration, I now come to the most difficult part of H. R. 6393, which is the proposal to increase corporate income taxes by 4 percentage points this year and next. The added revenues resulting from this temporary increase would amount to about $1,200,000,000, or just enough to cancel the revenue losses resulting from the excise and dividend proposals.

I like to believe that H. R. 6393—I almost said, the Revenue Act of 1950—as a whole is stronger than the sum of its parts. The overarching consideration have been moderation, realism, and, if you will, a double-barreled philosophy. Let me elaborate.

For the past 15 years or more two broad schools of thought have sought to win over public opinion. On the one hand it has been said that national economic well-being can be promoted solely by direct methods of lifting mass consumer buying power. On the other hand, it is contended that the dynamic quality of our society lies in the use of ever larger amounts of labor-saving devices, which raise productivity. Not being an economist, I may not understand all the refinements of economic theory and I sometimes find myself almost unable to resist the arguments of those whom I have heard last. In H. R. 6393 I have tried to frame a synthesis that will avoid extremes, improve the balance of the tax structure, provide immediately recognizable benefits, and make a beginning in the direction of solving several widely acknowledged faults in the Federal tax structure. Consumption obviously would benefit from the lower burden of excises. That excise taxes bear most heavily on the lower income groups cannot be denied. Not only would the lower income groups be relieved of these excise taxes but the heightened demand for consumer goods would more strongly fortify them in their jobs and give encouragement for the expansion of business and the development of job opportunities.

Changes in capital-gains taxes and the dividend credit are addressed to the need of keeping investment in new business equipment and machinery high. I have been impressed with the fact that the President and his economic advisers seem to agree that undeveloped foreign countries can be helped most effectively by the application of American capital goods and technical know-how. In these countries, consumption is pathetically low by our standards. Supplies of consumer goods, clothing, etc., would certainly be of assistance, assuming their ability to buy, yet it is recognized that the slower way of expanding production, heightening productivity and creating job opportunities is the sounder, more economic, and more lasting way in the long run. If this is true beyond our borders, it must be true in the United States.

I am also impressed by the fact that Government economists look for a run-off in expenditures on plant and equipment in the months ahead. Manufacturing employment is presently somewhat below the level of a year ago and while 3,400,000 unemployed at this time of the year is not a cause of alarm, it is a danger signal that should not be ignored. With November construction at $1,700,000,000 or 6 percent higher than in 1948, with steel production bouncing back to 97 percent, with the automobile industry in Detroit hitting toward its first 6,000,000-car year and with the New York Stock Exchange, during the first 10 days of January, doing twice as much business as in the same period in 1949, I am firmly convinced the evidence points overwhelmingly to greater prosperity for labor and the investor if the Government would moderately loosen the tax chains that presently hinder the normal flow of investment in the capital market. If we are to maintain high employment at high wages, we must not only have jobs for our present employables, but we must have the wherewithal to invest in the production of the machinery and the tools that will give employment to 700,000 who annually enter the labor field.

My innermost concern in a highly populous district is to do everything I can to maintain gainful employment, for I have watched at first hand the frustrations of uncertain and intermittent employment. I believe that the problem can best be solved by simultaneously attacking both underconsumption and underinvestment. I will concede it is simpler to see the relation between economic progress and consumption than to follow through the steps by which investment, by first adding to the production potential, finally leads to more work at higher rates of pay and makes possible a permanent improvement in living standards. I am not wedded to either economic theory. To my mind they are not inconsistent. They are different approaches to the same objective. We will, under H. R. 6393, advance both along the road of increased consumption by means of reduction of excise taxes and the road of increased productivity via capital gains changes and dividend credit, to the goal of fuller and more permanent employment.

To the extent that higher corporate taxes are involved, you may accuse me of a backward step. I am extremely reluctant to recommend even a temporary increase in corporate taxes. Unfortunately, I see no other

way of obtaining the other parts of H. R. 6393. My assumption is that business will be stimulated by the simultaneous advantages to investment and consumption contained in the remainder of the bill. In consequence, the actual addition to business costs would be reduced materially.

However, you may be certain that before there is any increase of corporate taxes, even to the limited degree contained in H. R. 6393, every effort will be made by the Ways and Means Committee to plug up the loopholes of tax evasion. I believe that a step in that direction will be taken this month when I expect that the House will pass a bill which will make life insurance companies pay income taxes. I expect that the burden upon you and me and the other American taxpayers will be reduced by $93,000,000, when we get the life insurance companies to pay 1947, 1948, and 1949 income taxes. And I can assure you that never again will life insurance companies go scot-free on income taxes as they have been doing for the past 3 years.

I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Taxation of Life Insurance Companies. I think we have caught up with them. You wonder not only that they haven't paid any taxes, but you are astounded when you are told that some of them don't think they should pay any taxes. Let me tell you bond men that not only are the life insurance companies invading your field and taking your business away from you, but some of them want you to pay their taxes besides. I think, in fairness to the life insurance industry, it should be said that the overwhelming majority of the industry is willing to accept this legislation. The real leaders of the industry realize the tax-consciousness of the country and the utterly untenable position of the life insurance companies in not paying their fair share of the cost of the government under which they exist and prosper. The two life insurance associations, representing 95 percent of the industry in their membership, have approved the proposed legislation and thanked the subcommittee for the fair and courteous treatment accorded them. Several small companies, and one large company—the Equitable Life Assurance Society of New York—feel that, while you and I and other Americans were breaking our backs under the tax load in 1947, 1948 and 1949, they should pay no tax.

The battle will be fought in the courts and in the district I represent. I expect every one of Parkinson's agents will be briefed on the alleged unconstitutionality of making the Equitable pay income taxes and they will thereupon contact every Equitable policy holder in my district. Using the technique of the modern radio commentator, I predict that "come election day, Lynch will still be in Congress and the Equitable will be paying Federal income taxes."

While talking of plugging loopholes, I might just as well say that those nonprofit institutions, founded for the intellectual and cultural development of our youth, which have gone in for the manufacture of macaroni, ball bearings, and similar scientific research and production, or have gone into the business of operating department stores and the like, all with a 38-percent tax advantage over their business competitors, may face the future somewhat grimly, but nonetheless secure, in the fact that the free ride has ended. Thirty-eight percent is a big tax advantage to give one competitor over another in the manufacture of even so humble a commodity as macaroni. Profits from department stores, whether operated by Macy's, Gimbel's, or the University of Pennsylvania, will be taxed. Profits from the sale of macaroni, whether manufactured by Angelo Baccigalupi or New York University, will be taxed, even if we have to plug up not only the holes in the tax law, but the holes in the macaroni as well.

Timing is all important in tax legislation as well as in decisions involving an investment portfolio. Right now I believe, in all earnestness, that my program will keep the economy on an even keel. It is not at all improbable that in several years, if business outlays for capital equipment lag, more emphasis may have to be placed on stimulating investment, or, in the less likely eventuality, should optimism be so prevalent as to create excessive business spending or profits, be maintained by a failure to pass on to the consumer any savings in operation, then a shift to emphasis on consumption would be in order. At this time the accent is properly on balance. H. R. 6393 is, I submit, a balanced tax bill.

Just a month ago you listened to the able finance minister of Canada, Mr. Abbott, in this very room. He set forth the wholesome effects of well-timed tax reforms centering around a dividend credit. There is entirely too much skepticism about the prospects of sound tax legislation at this session of the Congress. We will do a good job. It may not be all that you would like, but you are sensible businessmen and patriotic Americans. You know that almost 75 percent of the total Federal appropriations are in payment of the cost of the war or to maintain our defense in the event of another war. I doubt if the budget can be trimmed down on the rest of the appropriations to bring it into balance without tax receipts. I cannot, for one, advocate a tax bill that in a year of great prosperity and while the country is at peace would increase the deficit gap between the revenues and expenditures of our Government. Deficit spending in time of prosperity and peace will, if continued, lead to national bankruptcy.

I am convinced, however, that H. R. 6393 will not cause a revenue loss to the Government in 1950, and that in 1951 an expanding economy will result in increased revenues to the Government. I believe that H. R. 6393, or any bill containing its provisions, together with amendments to plug up loopholes in our present tax structure, will increase consumption and production, and, therefore, employment. I have no illusions about H. R. 6393. It is not the greatest tax bill ever introduced into Congress. It would, however, surely help the people of my district hold their jobs and get better jobs. It would develop job opportunities for young folks entering the labor field for the first time, so that they would enter upon their life work with the enthusiasm instead of the despair of the boys and girls of the '30's of even getting the most humble job by which they could maintain themselves. Furthermore, the enactment of H. R. 6393 will spread on the record, for all to see, that ownership capital in the world's greatest capitalistic nation is to be encouraged, that free enterprise and government can work together, and that the American economy, although heavily burdened by the costs of a world-wide war and by a humane, yet protective, program for the rehabilitation of the devastated countries, is still sound.

We have a great country. We have years of prosperity ahead as labor buckles to the job, as investors supply the needed savings for the machines and tools of production and as the Government—as I am confident it will—slackens off tax restraints, as the threat of inflation disappears and as the assurances of fuller employment and greater capital investment become more evident in year 1950. Yes, we have a great country and 1950 is the year.

Mr. Truman's Mystery Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post, issue of December 24, 1949, entitled "Mr. Truman's Mystery Man," by Alfred Steinberg:

MR. TRUMAN'S MYSTERY MAN

(By Alfred Steinberg)

EVEN HIS BEST FRIENDS CAN'T TELL YOU WHAT DAVID NILES DOES FOR TRUMAN—ALL THEY KNOW IS THAT HIS TRIPLE LIFE PROBABLY CONCEALS SOME OF THE FANCIEST POLITICAL FOOTWORK IN WASHINGTON

David K. Niles, a round-faced little man who is one of President Truman's most important official advisers, has spent the last three decades making himself mysterious. In this enterprise he has been a brilliant success. Some of the men who have played cards with him week after week and year after year don't know much more about him than the fact that he is excellent at bridge, fair at gin rummy, and mediocre at poker. Niles' secretiveness has evidently served his own purposes well, for his White House influence unquestionably is enormous. This is not without its penalties, however. Any political figure who operates from the shadows is bound to excite suspicion. Opinions of Niles, necessarily uninformed, range from laudatory cries that he is the one idealist of the Truman administration to gloomy apprehensions that he must be, at the very least, an agent of the Kremlin.

Niles has played a major role in every presidential-election campaign since 1924. Such events are not readily confused with the deliberations of a secret society. Yet Niles, if noticed at all, has never appeared to be anything more than an unidentified political bystander. If some men have made achievement of their own obscurity a talent, Niles has elevated this accomplishment to a level of genius.

Niles spent years at the left elbow of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. With the exception of Stephen T. Early, now the Under Secretary of Defense, he is the last Roosevelt intimate who is still situated importantly in the executive branch of the Government. Niles helped the late Harry Hopkins cook up the third-term draft of Mr. Roosevelt, and Niles gave the President daily comfort and advice during the fourth-term campaign. Almost alone, despite his frequent ritualistic efforts to resign, he has survived the advent of the "Pal Harry" coterie in Mr. Truman's Washington, for he has proved invaluable as a liaison man with organized labor and all of the racial and religious minorities.

In his time, Niles has dispensed Federal patronage, built political machines, and honeycombed the Government with his protégés. Many a Cabinet member or other top official today has an uneasy feeling that he might rise or fall on a casual word from Niles. Currently, if he cared to, Niles could lay claim to master-minding the independence of Israel and President Truman's controversial civil-rights program. On the side, Niles is a minor angel of Broadway plays, a director of several private foundations, and an entrepreneur of the guest-lecturer industry. With all this, Niles has done the neatest

possible job of losing himself in the crowd. "I am a man of no importance," he says.

Niles, officially, is an administrative assistant to the President at $5,000 a year, one of those White House helpers whom President Roosevelt once proclaimed to be equipped with a passion for anonymity. In Niles' case, this definition was a magnificent understatement. "I would say," a Niles acquaintance remarked the other day, "that the passion might be more accurately described as a mania."

Not long ago, a Boston Congressman telephoned Niles' secretary to ask what the K in David K. Niles stands for. "I haven't the slightest idea," she replied.

"I guess," said the Congressman, "that it must be K as in Kingmaker."

For that matter, the same secretary told a recent visitor, with patent sincerity, that I really don't know anything about Mr. Niles. In depression days, when Niles was the Federal relief distributor in Boston, a partition was built around his desk. Niles took one look and ordered pasteboard for the windows in the partition. "I'm rather shy," he explained.

"I am glad that someone is writing about Dave Niles," Roger N. Baldwin, director of the American Civil Liberties Union, informed me a few weeks ago. "I have known him for 30 years and I would like to find out something about him."

Niles is convinced that his telephone is tapped by the *FBI*. If so, the G-men who have to listen in on him must be bored to death. Niles' phone conversations consist largely of such illuminating phrases as "You are misquoting me," or "You don't mean what you're saying," or "This should not be discussed over the phone." Recently, Niles was credited with a major role in mediating the public quarrel between Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and Francis Cardinal Spellman. "You flatter me," Niles told reporters. "I had nothing to do with it." The reporters nodded and looked wise.

As a virtuoso of obscurity, Niles is physically suited for the part he has chosen to play. His eyes are pale blue, peering near-sightedly through horn-rimmed glasses. He is short, plump, and altogether inconspicuous. Niles' hair is thin and graying; he is somewhere in his late fifties—how late Niles won't say and nobody else seems to know for sure, except that he is about 58 or 59. His accent is a cultured Bostonese with overtones of Oxford, although Niles' formal education ended with high school. If he had not been involved in politics, Niles might have been an excellent private detective. No one would have given him a second glance.

Some of his close associates—it would be inaccurate to say that Niles has intimate friends—look upon Niles with something approaching the detachment of a psychiatrist. "I have about decided," says a long-time gin-rummy opponent, "that Dave has worked himself into a state of frustration. He knows so much because he keeps his mouth shut. But he is dying to tell what he knows to prove that nobody else knows more than he does, and he can't because then he wouldn't have a chance to know so much."

Some people, upon meeting Niles for the first time, come away with an impression that he is "a cold fish," others find him warm and affable. Behind whatever facade he may set up, Niles is a complex and emotional man. Companions have seen him weep when he walked through a slum area. He was extremely attached to his mother, and badly broken up by her death a little more than 2 years ago.

Niles has a curious reluctance to affirm or deny anything about himself. I asked Niles about the statement, reprinted for years as a fact, that he was the man who persuaded John L. Lewis to give nearly half a million dollars to the Democratic Presidential campaign of 1936, with the understanding that Lewis would be made Vice President of the United States. Niles responded instantly with a perfect Nilesian clarification. "Oh," he said, "John L. will get so angry again."

One Congressman declared inaccurately, in 1940, that Niles was Harry Hopkins' brother-in-law. Three years later, the assertion having gone unchallenged, the Congressman repeated it. Only then was the record corrected—and not by any statement from Niles, either. People who have known Niles for years assume he has always been a bachelor, but one former Federal official insisted that he saw a Government job questionnaire on which Niles wrote that he had been married and divorced. Niles was asked to comment. "Well," he said, "it's a good story."

Marriage, as a matter of fact, would be impractical for Niles today, for he leads a triple life. From Monday morning through Wednesday afternoon, he does his confidential chores for the President in Washington. From late Wednesday through Friday, he is a New York man about town. The rest of the week he is a Boston man of culture.

Early on Monday morning, Niles arrives back in Washington, fresh from a hectic week end in Boston, and unpacks his bag in his room at the Carlton Hotel. He has occupied this room for years and has thoroughly littered it with books and card tables. Then he hurries over to his drab office on the second floor of the decrepit old State, War, and Navy Building, next door to the White House and across the street from Blair House, where the Trumans are living temporarily.

Niles' job, basically, is that of political trouble shooter and buffer between the President and certain segments of the public. In addition to keeping labor and the minority groups happy, he dabbles in such things as New England patronage, Israeli matters and preparing for the next election. Currently, he is operating on the theory that President Truman will seek reelection in 1952, and that Gov. Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, is the man Truman will have to beat at the next Democratic National Convention—at least, that is the impression of people who have talked politics with him recently.

Niles spends many office hours listening to the requests of an endless line of people who want him to intercede for them, both within and without the Government. "I came to Washington with a little problem and a letter of introduction to Dave Niles," an awe-struck young Boston doctor recalled recently, "and the next thing I knew I was talking to Attorney General Clark." Actually, most seekers of favors receive little more from Niles than the impression that he will use his influence to help them. As an unofficial employment agency, however, Niles has been hailed—and condemned—as a close competitor of his friend, Justice Felix Frankfurter, in placing Frankfurter-Niles type liberals with Government agencies. The Niles clique in the Government has been diminishing in size ever since the death of President Roosevelt, but a few of those who have remained have risen steadily in influence and importance.

Niles is a shrewd political manipulator, but his Washington personality is difficult for either the average politician or idealist to take. His behind-the-scenes operations make him immediately suspect to the politician, and his concern with votes and patronage gives pause to the idealist. As one politician put it the other day, "Anybody who sees the President as much as Dave Niles must be knifing somebody." Washington folklore widely credited Niles with leading a campaign to oust the late James Forrestal as Secretary of Defense in favor of Louis Johnson. "Jim called me up one day and asked me about that," Niles told me recently. "I had lunch with him and assured him there was nothing to it." Then, grabbing me by the arm and looking me straight in the eye, Niles said, "You don't think I'm that kind of a fellow, do you?"

White House circles are agreed that Niles was a key man in the achievement of independence for Israel. When the Palestine issue came up after President Truman had taken office, Mr. Truman pushed the whole problem over to Niles, to be decided in terms of Democratic Party justice.

From Truman's opening shot that the British permit 100,000 Jewish displaced persons to enter Palestine, through the long-drawn-out international hearings that followed in the next year and a half, Niles cagily planned a series of Presidential moves which, despite certain inconsistencies and divisions among the Zionists themselves, forced the reluctant British into a position in which there was nothing for them to do but agree to an independent Jewish state.

After a day of dealing with such heady matters, Niles retires to his hotel room for interminable gin rummy or bridge games with his cronies, many of whom are lawyers, both in and out of the Government. Niles never appears at cocktail parties or State dinners, which are hotbeds of verbal indiscretions.

Wednesday afternoon, Niles bustles back to the Carlton, flings some fresh clothing into his suitcase—he is usually somewhat rumpled in appearance, although he dislikes untidiness in others—and takes a taxi to the airport. A few hours later Niles, the man about town, takes up residence in the Roosevelt Hotel in New York. This is a more easy-going Niles. Enjoyment is the thing, plus a little business. Thursday is theater night. Niles usually has a few investments on Broadway, and currently is supposed to have small pieces of Mister Roberts and South Pacific.

If time permits, Niles looks into the Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, of which he is a trustee, and which at present is considering establishment of exchange scholarships between American and foreign schools. When something special comes up in Washington and Niles cannot be located on Broadway or at the foundation, he usually can be found at a Jewish restaurant on the lower East Side, happily consuming potato pancakes with salami or tongue, and sipping tea from a glass.

By noon on Friday, the glamour of Broadway begins to fade, and Niles heads for Boston, his natural habitat. Early on Saturday morning Niles can be seen at the Touraine Hotel breaking bread with Boston's young liberal set. The discussion begins on a lofty plane, but usually reaches realistic political levels long before the coffee cups are filled again. But even with these intimates, some of them former Washington protégés, Niles speaks guardedly.

In season, Niles attends Harvard's home football games. He dines at a Chinese restaurant on Saturday evening, then moves along with the crowd to the Boston Symphony. Niles the music lover, recently merged with Niles the politician, when he engaged in a bit of genteel lobbying over who should succeed Serge Koussevitsky as conductor of the orchestra. When the orchestra is on the road, Niles heads for a card game at the Preston Hotel in Swampscott or at the Belmont Country Club, in a Boston suburb.

Niles has an office in the Little Building, in the heart of Boston, and on Sunday mornings the door is open to visitors. There for many years before his death, Rabbi Joshua Liebman used to discuss psychology, philosophy, and religion with Niles, and together they hashed over much of the material in Rabbi Liebman's best seller, Peace of Mind. Mayor James Curley, Boston's favorite no-matter-what, is an old political crony, and so are Gov. Paul A. Dever and House Majority Leader John McCormack. Although he professes to regard great personal wealth as a bad thing, Niles makes it a point to be friendly with wealthy people. One of the Boston Filenes, upon Niles' urging, established a cooperative department store and a cooperative grocery in the Washington area, and supported Niles earlier in establishment of the Twentieth Century Fund, a well-heeled private-research and public-education concern. Brandeis University, at Waltham, Mass., is another Niles project, named for the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis, another Niles friend.

By Sunday afternoon Niles is ready for business as one of the most successful practitioners of the traveling-lecturer industry. As director of Ford Hall Forum in Boston, one of the oldest such organizations in the United States, he goes out to greet the guest speaker who will appear that evening, goes over his speech, takes him to dinner, leads him to Ford Hall, shows him the stage entrance, and then disappears into the audience. Ford Hall Forum, which has heard many an avant-garde political thinker in its day, was the springboard Niles used 25 years ago to jump into his extraordinary career. Niles clings to it today as much for sentimental reasons as for the fresh contacts it gives him. After the forum, Niles makes a last-minute check into the Open Forum Speakers' Bureau, which he also directs. The speakers' bureau, a handy tool for molding public opinion, is one of the largest of its kind in America. After this inspection, he packs his bag to return to Washington. This weekly routine is broken only by political-trouble-shooting trips around the country, and by his summer vacation. For the latter, he holes up in a hotel at Poland, Maine, or at Martha's Vineyard, plays cards day and night for a few weeks, then returns, refreshed, to his lives in three cities.

Niles was born in the slum heap of North Boston, the son of Russian immigrants named Ascher and Sophie Neyhus. Somewhere along the line, Niles and two of his brothers changed their name from Neyhus to Niles, although another brother and his parents clung to the family name.

Niles' father was a tailor, and the family was poor. His mother encouraged in young David a burning desire to get somewhere in life, but when he finished high school there was no money for college. Niles went to work in a Boston department store, but he was restless and unhappy. His only fun came on Sunday evenings, when he would go to Ford Hall for the lectures and discussions. Niles soon took to hanging around the hall in his off hours, attracting the attention of George W. Coleman, a goateed Republican who then ran the forum and was the Dale Carnegie of his day. Soon Niles was Coleman's protégé, then a regular assistant. In 1915, Niles took a job with the extension department of the Milwaukee public-school system, where he helped develop an adult-education program. Homesick, he returned to Boston and Ford Hall 2 years later. When World War I broke out and Coleman went to Washington as Assistant Director of the Labor Department's information office, he took Niles along as his assistant.

In Washington, Coleman had a good opportunity to study his young helper at close range, and he liked what he saw. There was depth to Niles' mind. He did not push himself, but was quiet and self-effacing.

Although the Labor Department had little to do, Niles developed an appetite for Government service and politics. The end of the war eliminated his job, but experience he picked up in making movie trailers for the Labor Department landed him a job on Long Island with Paramount Pictures. Some months later, Niles switched to a new movie company organized by a group of Boston businessmen. Whether he wore puttees, a cap turned backward and a wide-mouthed megaphone, as was then the style for movie makers, cannot be determined, but Niles helped make a hit picture called The Miracle Man, starring Lon Chaney, Thomas Meighan, and Betty Compton. The Miracle Man was such a box-office miracle that the company overexpanded and went broke. Niles went on to a third movie outfit, also on Long Island—Hollywood had not yet become the film capital—but by this time he was beginning to doubt that he would make millions in the movies.

When a new job in 1921 tied up so much of Coleman's time that he had little left for Ford Hall Forum, he sent Niles an S O S. Niles turned his back on the movies and returned to Boston. In 1924 Niles was promoted from Coleman's assistant to associate director of the forum, and already he had surrounded himself in mystery. A close associate, in a book about the forum, reported that "the Ford Hall folks and Mr. Coleman have been only too pleased to recognize Mr. Niles' amazing talents, talents which are surpassed only by a modesty which renders impossible any accurate narration of his generous and unselfish devotion."

The same year, 1924, the elder Bob La Follette and Burton K. Wheeler established the Progressive Party and ran, respectively, for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States. The candidates had been acquainted with Ford Hall Forum and they asked Niles to head their speakers' bureau. Niles accepted and in a short time was running the whole campaign. The regular campaign manager was so religious that he spent half of every day studying his Bible. Not so preoccupied himself, Niles dashed about the country, making wild predictions as to the outcome of the election. When voting day passed the Progressives had won only Wisconsin's 13 electoral votes, but Niles had learned a great deal about politics and had attracted virtually no attention to himself.

Two years later Niles found himself involved through Boston friends in the famous Sacco-Vanzetti case. This cause célèbre had already dragged along 6 years, but with the help of Felix Frankfurter, Niles soon brought the save-Sacco-and-Vanzetti forces together and whipped them up to a fever pitch. There were thousands of mass meetings, speeches, pamphlets, and demonstrations. Niles' major job was to coordinate the various defense groups, a most difficult job in view of the many factions primarily interested in using the two men as a symbol for whatever political product they were selling. Niles did some of the most skillful behind-the-scenes wirepulling of his career, but it was all in vain. Sacco and Vanzetti were executed on August 23, 1927.

By now, Niles was an incurable political manipulator. He went to New York in 1928 to direct the National Committee of Independent Voters for Al Smith. His work was of uncertain value to Smith, but of great value to himself, for it brought him into close contact with the Hyde Park Roosevelts and their social-worker friend, Harry Hopkins. In 1932, Niles and the insurgent Republican, George W. Norris, ran the National Progressive League for Roosevelt, another of the fringe political organizations in which Niles was fast becoming an adept. Niles was rewarded with the chairmanship of the Massachusetts NRA Adjustment Board, then made Federal Emergency Relief Administrator for his home State. Oldline Democratic politicians in Massachusetts didn't like this too well—many of them had never heard of Niles—but Niles made friends with them, handled himself shrewdly, avoided scandal and distributed millions where he thought they would do the most good. When WPA was established in 1935, headed by Hopkins, Niles was brought to Washington as Hopkins' general assistant on labor liaison.

Niles' first big Washington job was to obtain the 1936 campaign contribution from John L. Lewis. This success assured Niles' future, although his reputation for effectiveness was somewhat tarnished in 1938, when he was assigned to make Jimmy Roosevelt Governor of Massachusetts, and the effort fizzled badly, when the opposition discovered, among other things, that the President's eldest son was not even a registered Massachusetts voter.

Shortly after President Roosevelt began his second term, Harry Hopkins decided that the Nation needed Hopkins for President in 1940. Niles franked out thousands of copies of a speech in which Hopkins hailed deficit spending and pump priming as the best ways to insure prosperity. Howls of rage rose up in Congress, and increased when WPA scandals in Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Tennessee broke into the headlines in 1936 and 1937. Then Hopkins' wife died and Hopkins underwent an operation. Momentarily, Hopkins lost his taste for the Presidency, dismantled the controversial theater and arts groups of WPA which Niles had established originally, and finally resigned as chief of WPA.

After a rest, however, Hopkins got the Presidential bug again. Mr. Roosevelt expressed no objection and even helped him along by making Hopkins Secretary of Commerce in December 1938. Niles went along to Commerce as Hopkins' assistant. Beyond pushing Hopkins' candidacy, his main job was to distribute 100,000 jobs necessary for taking the 1940 census. This Niles did to the satisfaction of hungry Democratic Congressmen, operating for months from an office with no name plate on the door until some Republican Congressmen inquired as to just who this mysterious figure was with so much patronage in his control. Congressman McCormack made it all very clear: "Mr. Niles is a fine gentleman, a very fine American, and equally a very fine public servant." Niles himself couldn't have done better.

Niles concocted the second Hopkins build-up for the Presidency on a foundation of pure corn. First Hopkins made a speech defending free enterprise, to the considerable astonishment of free enterprisers. Then he held a small-business men's conference in Washington, which proved unfortunate, because the small-business men got out of hand and raucous with their temporary importance. Then Hopkins bought a 340-acre farm in Iowa, announced to the curious press that he loved the soil, and was photographed in farm kitchens unhappily chewing on homemade cookies.

The second Hopkins build-up fell apart in August 1939, when Hopkins became ill again and left political ambition behind for good. In the spring of 1940, Hopkins moved to the White House as companion to F. D. R. Later in the summer, a few days before the Democratic National Convention opened in Chicago, Hopkins and Niles went to the convention city, and established themselves on the third floor of the Blackstone Hotel with a direct telephone line to the White House. Hopkins got on one end of the line, Mr. Roosevelt on the other, and Niles scurried about lining up delegates to make the third-term draft a certainty. The usually astute Jim Farley, who somehow thought he was in line for the top post, suddenly found himself out in the cold, with Roosevelt nominated and Hopkins and Niles advising the key delegates that the chief wanted Henry Wallace as his running mate. This was accomplished to a protesting chorus of boos which rattled the rafters of Chicago Stadium.

After the convention, Hopkins resigned as Secretary of Commerce and Niles went back to fringe-machine politicking. Niles, too, resigned from the Commerce Department, organized the LaGuardia-Norris Independents for Roosevelt, and thus further established his influence with Democratic irregulars throughout the country. This activity also further endeared him to the President, who

had no way of determining the importance of the job Niles had done, and shortly after the election, Mr. Roosevelt found Niles a desk in the White House as a key assistant and trouble shooter.

In those hectic days when William Knudsen and Sidney Hillman jointly headed the Office of Production Management, bickering daily in their respective accounts, Niles was rushed over to help Hillman win some of the arguments. Once this unfortunate experiment was concluded, Niles was brought back to the White House and given the title he bears today—Administrative Assistant to the President. In the fourth-term campaign, Hopkins was overseas, so it was Niles upon whom the President leaned most heavily. Niles had been Harry Hopkins' "Harry Hopkins" for years; now he was playing the role of Hopkins himself. Niles also worked closely with his friend Sidney Hillman and Hillman's newly organized CIO Political Action Committee to bring out the labor vote. In addition, he directed independent groups for Roosevelt and passed out patronage to hard-working independents after the election.

When Mr. Truman came into office, Niles resigned. But so loud were the protests from minority organizations, who feared they would be without a sure entree to the White House if Niles pulled out, that Truman insisted he stay. Since then he has resigned several more times. It requires less of the need for his services, incidentally report, to have the President turn down his resignation as regularly. Niles is as close to Mr. Truman today as we once was to Mr. Roosevelt, or to Harry Hopkins, or to Coleman, and he served cleverly and inconspicuously on the Truman board of campaign strategy last fall.

Since he is so modest, Niles' friends have often wondered what would be inscribed on his tombstone. It is not too difficult to predict, even at this time. There will be no tombstone.

For Equality in the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of January 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR EQUALITY IN THE ARMY

It is gratifying to know that the United States Army has completed, and will shortly carry out, its program for integration of Negro personnel on a basis of skills only, without regard to discriminatory quotas of any sort. This is as it should be, from every point of view. National defense is too big and the Army is too good to have any place for race and color bars. When we get to a sense of basic values we have a chance to further basic human justice.

The basic value here is skill, and it has nothing to do with the amount of pigmentation, one way or another. To impose any sort of quota in such a field is unintelligent as well as inhumane. We have come to understand this variation in many fields, such as sport, for example, and there is no reason why we should not apply it to all.

Beyond that is still another basic value, that of our common humanity; the thing that Jefferson had in mind when he said that we held it to be self-evident that all men were created equal and that they were endowed, obviously equally, with unalienable rights. What the Army is doing is working toward that broader concept of values and every step in that direction is a mark of human progress.

Equal-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith an article by Dr. Alice Hamilton, of Hadlyme Ferry, Conn. Dr. Hamilton is an outstanding authority on industrial medicine and is professor emeritus of Harvard University Medical School.

[From the Ladies' Home Journal]

WHY I AM AGAINST THE EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT

(By Alice Hamilton, M. D., president of the National Consumers League)

We hear a good deal nowadays about the Equal Rights Amendment, which, after more than 20 years of ardent effort on the part of a group of feminists, the Woman's Party, seems to have reached a point where its passage by Congress is possible. Both parties in the last election declared themselves in favor of it, and it has been passed on favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

What is this amendment to the Constitution which may be put up to the State legislatures in the near future? It reads very simply:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Well, that sounds only fair and reasonable. No woman wants to have her rights denied or abridged. The amendment seems to open a closed door, to clear away difficulties that have been in her path. Perhaps she is working in an office where some man, not nearly so efficient and conscientious as she, has a higher place, just because he is a man. Perhaps she is a physician who, because she is a woman, cannot get on the staff of a hospital. Perhaps she is a teacher who knows that when the principal retires she would get his place if she were a man, but no matter how much she deserves it she will be bypassed and a man put in. Or perhaps she is a businesswoman like one who said to me, "Women in business are like the Red Queen in Alice; we have to run as hard as we can to keep in the place."

These women see in the amendment a means of wiping away all such sex discriminations; they see themselves placed on a real equality with men. But are these hopes justified? Will such a law do that? Will it give women more than it will take away from them? I do not think so, and I will tell you why.

No law can compel a man to employ a woman or to promote her; no law can compel a hospital to place women doctors on its staff or to admit them as interns and residents; no law can prevent an employer from passing by a competent woman and appointing a less competent man. These are matters which lie outside the domain of law; they are decided by men who are often swayed by the old prejudices, the instictive inhibitions and compulsions which centuries have implanted in us. I do not mean that these obstacles cannot be overcome; the history of the past century shows how far the emancipation of women has advanced already, but the advance cannot be brought about by law, by compulsion. Only the slow growth of a genuine feeling of sex equality can bring it about; but surely when we see the attitude of the young generation we cannot fail to be heartened by the striking signs of increasing equality between the sexes.

It is true, as the advocates of the equal-rights amendment insist, that there are still in some States inequalities that can be removed by legal action, and have been in the more advanced States. To that I would answer that it is in the power of such States to follow the example of their sister States, that it is not necessary to bring about such relatively simple reforms by so cumbersome a method as an amendment to the Constitution.

But why should we—I speak as president of the National Consumers League and as a member of the National Women's Trade Union League, the League of Women Voters, the Association of University Women—why should we who call ourselves feminists oppose a measure which, even if it does not do all its proponents claim, will still help to remove women's disabilities? It is because we know that women would lose more than they would gain if, at one stroke, all the laws which treat women as women and not only as persons were revoked. Now to the strictly orthodox feminist, women should be treated only as persons. I remember a debate before a women's club in which I took the side opposed to the amendment and the side defending it was taken by an eager, attractive, but very young woman. I argued that the laws, so general in the older countries, which provide vacation with pay for pregnant women in industry were necessary for the good of the race. She opposed it, of course, but finally gave way. "All right," she said impatiently, "if you say 'pregnant persons' we won't object, but not 'women'." I assured her we would be quite content with that.

This is, of course, an extreme instance of what one might call feminist fundamentalism, and I am not suggesting that it is typical of the Woman's Party. But I do think it is typical of that group to ignore the real physical and social differences between men and women, differences which lie at the base of the laws applying only to women and not to men. The fact that these differences have often been exaggerated in the past and that nowadays we ignore many of them does not mean that we can sweep them all away and act as if that settled it. Women still have to bear the babies and still ought to rear the children, and I ask any young mother if that is not a real handicap which deserves consideration.

The proposed amendment would do away with the protection of women as homemakers and mothers; it would either make the wife equally responsible with her husband for the support of the family or it would remove responsibility from both. In such a case, which parent would be more likely to get out from under? Ask any social worker. Surely it is only common sense to hold the husband responsible for the support of his family.

And what about alimony after divorce? So far the laws relating to alimony (passed by male legislators) have been much more favorable to women than to men; in fact, they have shown an absurdly sentimental attitude

and often they have worked great injustice. But to abolish them altogether and to put the woman on an equal footing with the man would work even more injustice. Take the middle-aged woman who has no professional or industrial experience, who knows no skill but amateur housekeeping and child care. When her husband tires of her and seeks a younger mate, is she to be left penniless to find her own support? Alimony laws need strict revision, but not abolition.

The laws of property as they affect married women are too complicated to be covered in this discussion. It is quite true that in backward States such laws are unfair to women, but in most of the States they have changed with the changing times and those disabilities that still remain can be removed if ardent feminists will only carry on the sort of intensive campaign which we of the older generation devoted ourselves to, some 40 to 50 years ago. They would then know exactly what they were trying to achieve, for they would be attacking a definite evil, not a system which is part evil and part good.

It is in connection with labor legislation that my opposition to the equal-rights amendment is strongest, for my field for 35 years has been the protection of working people against the harmful features of industrial work, against dangerous dusts, poisons, excessive heat and heavy exertion, long hours, low wages. Dangerous dusts cause silicosis, followed sometimes by tuberculosis; poisons used in industry include lead, mercury, mineral acids, carbon monoxide, and a host of volatile solvents which act like ether and chloroform, only sometimes more harmfully. Our efforts have always been to protect both men and women against these dangers, but when we could not do that, when legislators were willing to protect only the women, then we took gladly what we could get.

And in some respects protection is needed more by the women. For one thing, they have the handicap of youth; and, as we all know, the younger the worker, the more susceptible to a poison and to fatigue and to the harmful effects of dangerous dusts. Men in industry are divided into the different age groups just as men are in nonindustrial work, but women in industry are massed overwhelmingly in the early age groups. This means that they are more susceptible to all the harmful elements in their work, they are less prudent than older women, they are reckless and they have the silliest ideas about food and about protection against cold and wet. Partly because they are young, partly because they draw the lowest wages, young women workers have a higher tuberculosis rate than men. Young women workers cannot stand for long hours on their feet as well as men can, nor can they lift heavy weights; older women have their special handicap, housework and the care of children added to the hours of factory work.

It is true that the Walsh-Healey wage-and-hour law applies to men as well as women, but it covers only those industries that enter into interstate trade, not those that are strictly within the State—restaurants, hotels, laundries, stores, and the white-collar industries. For these, State laws are necessary, to prescribe a minimum wage and maximum hours. Of course, it would be better to extend such laws to cover men also, but this has never been done. We should be giving up a reality for a vain hope.

We do not need, we older women, to ask what will happen if all the laws protecting workingwomen should be revoked, for we remember only too well what happened before those laws were passed. In Illinois we fought for years for a 10-hour law for women. I knew a young Irish girl in Chicago who had a job as night waitress in an all-night eating place out near the stockyards. She worked 6 nights a week, 12 hours a night, 72 hours a week, and it could have been raised to 84 so far as the law was concerned. There were no minimum-wage laws in 1912 when, out of 5,000,000 workingwomen in the United States, half under 24 years of age, a million earned less than $4 a week.

In those days I hated to shop in Chicago stores, for I knew so well the lot of the girls who worked in them. There was no vacation; not even in the hot summer months could the employers be persuaded to close for 1 weekday? It was a 10-hour day with plenty of overtime—paid for usually by a lunch—especially before Christmas; wages ran from $2.50 to $10 a week and very few ever reached that latter figure, yet a girl could not then support herself in Chicago on less than $8 a week. Even to get seats for these girls meant a long fight. I remember a girl who was a worn-out, middle-aged woman at 24, after 10 years' work in a department store for never more than $7 a week, all of which went to her widowed mother. She had no normal girlhood, no fun ever, for her Sundays must be spent in sleep or in mending and laundering.

The women who are pushing the equal-rights amendment insist that to limit the hours of work for women and to insist on pauses for lunch, on separate toilets, on provision of seats—all these things handicap women in getting jobs and that they want to be free to compete with men on equal terms. I think that is probably true of a small number of women in industry, such as linotypists on morning papers, and ticket sellers on elevated roads and subways, who are not allowed to work on the night shift. But in normal times their number is infinitesimal compared with the number of women who welcome these safeguards. Of course in wartime all restrictions are suspended in most of the States.

I can assure you that when Ohio passed laws for the protection of women workers, Ohio women did not envy the freedom of the women of Kentucky to work as long hours and for as low a wage as they pleased; Massachusetts textile workers did not move to Rhode Island to free themselves from the wages-and-hours laws; the women of the Northern States did not look with longing at the untrammeled freedom of the South. There is no articulate organization of workingwomen that favors the equal-rights amendment.

For more than half a century the struggle to alleviate the lot of women workers has gone on, and we can point with pride to what has been gained. Twenty-six States have minimum-wage laws, and this means that some 4,000,000 women in hotels, restaurants, laundries, and so on, must be paid a decent wage. Forty-three States limit the hours which a woman may be required to work. Less essential, but still important, are the regulations which require seats—and their use—separate toilets, time off for lunch, and so on, and these are in force in practically all States. And such laws have not limited the employment of women, handicapped them in their search for jobs; on the contrary, it is during that past 25 years, when these laws were passed, that the employment of women has increased steadily—not only during the war—and in just those States where labor laws are strict. All this gain would be swept away by the adoption of the equal-rights amendment. Is it any wonder that workingwomen have dubbed it the unequal-rights amendment?

In theory, of course, women should fight for their rights as men do, but in actual fact they seldom do. Even now, in wartime, only about three million of the seventeen and a half million women wage earners belong to unions, and the majority of these are in war industries, aircraft, and automotive production. When the war is over few of them will remain in those industries; they will have to go back to their old jobs, most of them in unorganized industries or with far less strong unions. Surely they will need as much protection as they did before the war.

The equal-rights amendment will not free women from discrimination; no laws can do that. It will not make it easier for professional women to advance nor for workingwomen to get or to hold jobs, but it will sweep away the few measures which now make the lives of the wage-earning women less hard. It will remove from the wife and mother all consideration for her as a woman and will place her on a legal equality with her husband, an equality that is mostly imaginary, has little basis in hard fact. The legal injustices under which women in some States still suffer can be removed one by one with far less effort than was needed in earlier years, and without sacrificing what is good in order to get rid of what is bad. If women in and out of industry understood clearly what the proposed amendment would do, it could never be passed.

Why Does Uncle Sam Pick on Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Carl A. Gray from the Saturday Evening Post:

WHY DOES UNCLE SAM PICK ON US?

(By Carl A. Gray, president, Grenby Manufacturing Co., makers of electronic equipment)

(Condensed from the Saturday Evening Post)

My son Harvey is 10 years old and already a businessman. He has a paper route. I am flattered that he has decided to follow in my footsteps. I have been a businessman ever since I left college some 25 years ago. Harvey is more enthusiastic about being in business than I am. According to his lights, being in business means supplying needed services or articles for a modest profit. He looks forward to a lifetime of following this simple formula.

I don't know whether to tell Harvey the economic facts of life or to let him enjoy his illusion. I cannot decide whether to tell him that the future of the small-business man is in jeopardy; that a generation hence he may be extinct.

Along with thousands of others, as a small employer I am today staggering along in a labyrinthine economy of uncertainty, weakened by the bloodletting of excessive taxation and faced at every turn by inquisitive agents of government. Today the margin of safety is so tenuous that one costly mistake of judgment in buying, selling, or engineering could wipe out not only the year's profit but the business as well. If the squeezing process continues, there won't be any small-business men when Harvey grows up. Then everybody will be working for the Government.

One day I walked into my office, and it was as busy as Grand Central Terminal. There were eight Government agents there, representing a variety of bureaus. They were checking our files, looking for statistical information, studying time cards, examining our books, and conning our personal records. It was just a coincidence that they arrived on the same day, but it started me thinking.

That night I went home and totted up the advantages and disadvantages of operating one's own business.

I was appalled to find that the debits more than outweighed the credits. A lot of things had happened, I discovered, since 1939, when my partner and I started in a tiny plant with three employees. Now we have 175, and the headaches have increased by geometrical progression.

Here are just a few of the Government agents who drop in to see us, sometimes in twos and threes, sometimes like small hordes of locusts: State sales tax, State labor department, factory inspectors, Federal unemployment, State unemployment, revaluation and conversion, Internal Revenue, War Assets, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Government auditors on contracts, renegotiation representatives, and, last but not least, wage-and-hour representatives. Many are pleasant fellows, but they all take time.

When you get a contract with some Government agency—your troubles really begin. We had one that ran for 7 months, back in 1945. Our monthly reports were filed and approved; we received payment, and final releases were signed.

Then out of a clear sky in June 1947 two men walked in and said they were going to audit all transactions on this contract. They stayed 4 weeks.

Three months later we got a letter saying our records were incomplete and we were liable to a penalty of $12,531. We yelped loud enough and the case was reopened. New auditors arrived and started from scratch. After a couple of weeks, one of them got sick and left. A week later his partner left. We put everything back in the files.

In June 1948 a stranger walked in. He explained that he was there to audit the contract. He stayed so long that I began to mistake him for one of the help. Then one fine morning he came up with an answer: The Government owed us $2.09.

But hold. A couple of months later two grim gentlemen from Washington arrived to tell us that they were going to do another once-over-lightly. That was early in 1949, and we were still holding our breath. Then a new 64-page set of regulations arrived, superseding everything else.

Sometimes it is impossible to find out what certain Government rulings mean. Not long ago we called the Collector of Internal Revenue to ask him if contracts secured from the Government prior to May 21, 1948, were renegotiable. He told us to call the office at Hartford. We did. They told us to call the main office in another city 40 miles away. We did. They told us to write to Washington. We did. Several weeks later we got a supposition that the answer was included in certain sections of an enclosed document that covered 145 pages of legal-size paper. A few days later we received a note telling us to "please destroy the copy of part 423 sent to you earlier." Accompanying this note was another fat volume of 64 pages of legal-size paper. Somewhere in it is the answer.

Far worse, however, than these day-by-day pinpricks is the tragic siphoning of money out of business through taxation and dispersal of dividends. If we're lucky enough to make a profit of $100,000 in 1 year, here's what happens: Instantly that shrinks to $47,000 as the Federal Government takes its cut of 38 percent. Then the State government gets a whack at it. I'd like to keep most of what's left in the business for a rainy day. But section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code stipulates a penalty of from 27½ to 38½ percent unless I parcel out a large part of the balance for dividends. That way, of course, the Government gets still another lick at it through personal-income taxes of the stockholders. But it leaves me with less than $20,000, probably nearer $10,000, to go into surplus. You can't win.

At the present time our company has five good new devices gathering dust on the shelves. We just don't have the money to finance their production. And if we did, there's the inevitable feeling, "What's the use? We're only adding to our headaches."

You can't blame private investors for being skeptical. The owner of a business which makes small castings for us told me that he was trying to get more equipment and modernize his plant. It called for venture capital. He talked to a friend who has considerable money. Here is the answer he got: "If I put money into your company, even though it is in excellent shape, I am just risking money. And if I make money, it means that I have to pay more to Uncle Sam. The risks are too great for the sake of paying more income taxes."

Suppose, then, that you try to float a public stock issue to raise money. That's a nightmare I've been through. You've got to file a prospectus with the SEC. Minimum legal advice for this costs about $15,000. Minimum charges for SEC audits run to another $15,000. Bankers also like to have special reports from outside engineers. These cost another $10,000. If the small entrepreneur wants public financing, he's got to put about $40,000 on the line before his application is considered. With that kind of money lying around he probably wouldn't be applying in the first place.

Have I broken your heart yet? Then perhaps you'd like to hear about the sleeper in the wage-hour law. We got rooked by it.

There's a provision in the law that says if a foreman spends as much as 20 percent of his time doing any of the work of his men, he is entitled to time-and-one-half for overtime. Well, we bought out a New York concern and took several of their old employees on our pay roll. One of these newcomers slapped an attachment on our factory. It seems that during the war years this foreman had more on his mind than winning the war. He kept careful tab of the hours worked. He felt he had $20,000 coming to him.

Understand, all this had happened before we even came into the picture. But all our assets were permitted to be frozen by State law. The pay of our employees was in jeopardy until I scurried around and posted a bond. I have a friend who got nicked for nearly $75,000 by several of these sudden suits for overtime. The suits were stimulated by overenthusiastic representatives of government.

There are a lot of things I'd like to be doing if we had a proper margin of safety for operations. I have lots of swell youngsters coming to me wanting to learn a trade. It takes a couple of years to train a good machine operator. Even a graduate engineer needs a year or so under mature guidance before he earns his keep. We've had to pass up some of this good raw material, letting it go to bigger companies or, even worse, to seed.

I'm not being mealymouthed when I say I'm in business for more reasons than just to make a profit. I want profit because I want job security as much as the next fellow. But I also like to feel that I am contributing to the welfare and prosperity of my community. And I like to feel that my small company can do its part in creating a strong industrial fabric for war or peace.

I think my country is more secure with thousands of small plants like ours than with just a few big ones under centralized control. Recently we underbid one of the largest corporations in the country. The purchaser is saving $400,000 on this transaction because we carry no excess baggage on the pay roll.

There's not a small manufacturer I know who wouldn't be satisfied with a decent annual profit and the chance to operate in a friendly and secure atmosphere. By profits I mean not only money to put into stockholders' pockets, but profits to plow back into business; profits to make new products and to create new jobs.

My company is in good financial shape—better than most. Yet for 2 years during conversion from war to peace we made no profit at all. This year we will make a reasonable profit. But it will sift through our hands like sand through a sieve. During the year I have risked all my capital and worked day and night. I will have little to show for it even in this good year.

Why should I take all these risks? There is an easy way out. I can retire and invest my money in tax-exempt securities. I'd see more of my family. I'd stop waking up at night and asking, 'Have we done this right? Are we violating a law or regulation if we do this?"

But I have no use for parasites. To me there is only one real wealth. It is the product of man's mind and skill and sweat. Anybody who tells you that Government produces wealth is kidding. Government consumes it. But you and I, when we take the raw stuff of nature and transform it into something usable, are creating wealth. That's why when we kill off the small entrepreneur we are killing off the real wealth makers of the country.

If we don't believe in a free competitive system, then, for heaven's sake, let's junk it manfully and cleanly. This slow suffocation is a painful sight to those of us who believe that free competition is best for all of us individually and collectively. I believe it is worse than a direct frontal attack from men who do not believe in the dignity of the individual or the worth of private brains, private capital, and private sweat. It is worse because small business is today slowly being throttled by the ignorance, stupidity, and suspicions of the very men who protest their faith in the American system.

And what of my son Harvey? I watch him as he walks down the street whistling and delivering his papers. One of my neighbors told me, "I tried to tip him, but he refused to take the money. He said, 'One price and the same good service to everybody.' "

I am old-fashioned enough to feel proud about that. Harvey finished the summer with a total profit of about $45 and a belief that he had discovered the American system. Do your job, display enterprise, give people the service they're glad to pay for. In return, you get the security of a good business and a steady income. It will pain me to disillusion Harvey. Someday soon, however, he's got to learn that the planned economy of the welfare state is here. In that state men seek pensions, not profits. They eschew adventure in favor of security.

I am not completely despairing. I think men like myself at 50 are probably too old to carry on the fight. I think that the generation that followed right on my heels is too enervated in its search for the illusion of security. They are too pension-bent, too hypnotized by the idea of the state as the all-in-all.

I know in the future, though, that still another generation must cut cleanly through these cobwebs. These are the post-depression babies and I hope they can rediscover America. They must come as a courageous, adventuring troupe, intent on the development of their own potentialities and inner resources. A man who is concerned only with security is only a half man, because he does not live up to the promise as a creative creature made in the image and likeness of God.

And when that clean, creative wind sweeps through this country of ours, I hope fervently that my son Harvey will have the honor of being among those present and doing something about it.

The 19 Hoover Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by Harold Stein appearing in the January 2, 1950, issue of the New Republic entitled "The 19 Hoover Reports":

THE 19 HOOVER REPORTS

(By Harold Stein)

(Harold Stein is staff director of the Committee on Public Administration Cases in Washington, an organization sponsored by the graduate schools of Public Administration of Cornell, Harvard, Princeton, and Syracuse Universities. He is a graduate of Yale who has spent most of the past 15 years in Government service.)

The Hoover report is back in the news again. A Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report has been created on a Nation-wide basis, to build a fire under Congress; it has held a conference in Washington, at which the former President was himself one of the speakers. His remarks caused the resignation of Dewey Anderson, director of the Public Affairs Institute, who said that Hoover's observations made it clear that the committee is "no place for a liberal." Among those pushing the report is the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States. It is sending out 1,300,000 pamphlets to businessmen, repeating the familiar claim that millions of dollars are being wasted every day in the operation of the Government.

There is, of course, no such thing as the Hoover Commission report. The 12 Commissioners issued 19 reports, of varying quality and with a wealth of dissents (many admirable), and about the same number of so-called task-force reports, the latter ranging from excellent studies to documents that read like campaign speeches for John Foster Dulles. But even though there is no "report," the Commission did assemble and publish a set of recommendations for the organization of the Federal Government that provides a solid base for action. Most important, the reports show the wholehearted acceptance (with only occasional lapses) of the doctrine of Presidential accountability and responsibility and make a strong plea that the President be granted adequate authority to carry out that responsibility.

On this basic issue there already has been important progress. In June the Congress passed the Reorganization Act of 1949. As recommended by the Commission, the act exempts no agencies—except the General Accounting Office, considered, with dubious accuracy, an arm of Congress. However, the act does have other shortcomings; it will expire on April 1, 1953, and any Presidential reorganization plan can be defeated either by 49 votes in the Senate or by 216 in the House, within the 60-day period. The Commission had recommended a statute under which reorganization plans could be defeated only by a majority vote of both Houses.

The President's success in achieving major improvements depends on a variety of factors: his own prestige, the ability of the opposition to mobilize for the attack, the effectiveness of party leadership in Congress. A favorable item is the bipartisan support he has been getting from the Citizen's Committee for the Hoover Report, backed up by Hoover's own prestige. The committee's usefulness is limited by the fact that it is automatically committed to all the majority proposals—good, bad, or indifferent—and by its own unfortunate decision to sell the program on the basis of dollar savings. Most of the announced savings are quite mythical, and the public is left with the impression that our Government is staffed by incompetent and greedy bureaucrats. But on the whole its influence lies on the side of virtue.

During the past session of Congress, the arithmetical score on Presidential reorganization plans was good: eight plans sent up, six adopted, one superseded by new legislation; only the proposal for a Department of Welfare, which happened to arouse a curious mixture of congressional antagonisms, was defeated.

By reorganization plan and by legislation a good start has been made on modernizing and giving the President more effective control over the housekeeping functions of the Government. There is a new law clearing part of the statutory jungle of property legislation, and a General Services Administration has been established to combine in one agency a variety of formerly scattered functions. Congress has raised the salaries of key Federal employees and has passed an improved Classification Act. A more intelligible and useful form of budget is being put into effect and Congress seems to be rationalizing the appropriations structure to correspond. Minor improvements in the Government's archaic accounting practices are in prospect. The National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board have been placed squarely in the Executive Office of the President, where they belong.

Most of the President's responsibilities must be carried out through the Cabinet departments; if the President is to have effective authority, the heads must also have authority to organize and direct their own departments. In this field, useful advances have been made in State and elsewhere.

The one great achievement in departmental control is the Unification Act of 1949 for the National Military Establishment. The recent terrifying exhibition on Captiol Hill should not mislead us. Many of the attacks and counter attacks of the generals and the admirals received no effective reply, while the performance of the civilian chiefs gave no convincing assurance of their wise understanding of strategy. But at least it did appear that the President and the Secretary of Defense now have a chance to establish a defense policy that is something more than a military pork barrel.

Part of the problem of making the Government work better is straightening out some of the anomalies in the assignment of functions to the different departments and within departments. This is, of course, a never ending process. New stresses in our society, new concepts of Federal responsibility require adaptations in our governmental structure. This is peculiarly the area covered by the new Reorganization Act. The President has begun to move. Administrative responsibility has been lodged in the chairmen of the Civil Service Commission and the Maritime Commission, giving hope of improvement in those creaking agencies. Public Roads Administration has gone to the Department of Commerce as a first step in making Commerce the center of all nonregulatory transportation activities. The perpetual squabble over the location of the Employment Service and Unemployment Compensation has been settled—again—by transferring both to the Department of Labor.

These are the main points of action consequent upon the Hoover Commission report. For such a short period of time, it is an impressive showing. It carries on wisely from the great reforms proposed by the President's Committee on Administrative Management in 1937, and accomplished in 1939, notably in the establishment of the Executive Office of the President, the transfer of the Budget Bureau from Treasury to that office, and the strengthening of the White House staff. The Hoover Commission has built on that achievement; the total area of its impact, already astonishingly wide, promises to be still wider.

Much, very much, remains to be done. No arithmetical measurement of the Commission's work has any significance, because the recommendations range from the important to those that should be buried. To the latter class belongs the proposal for a united medical administration, of, by and for the doctors, or more probably, the AMA. (Item, a proposal for a permanent commission to "study Federal-State relations" that would inevitably push toward an abdication by the Federal Government of fields of taxation and control that can never be managed within State boundaries. (Item, a proposal to liquidate the Farmers Home Administration.) But there are many valid recommendations that have not been acted on.

The Civil Service Commission remains a hybrid body, ill adapted to carrying out a vigorous and liberal personnel policy. Beyond that, the present personnel laws are archaic, rigid, and utterly confused by veterans' preferences that work badly for the veterans and abominably for everyone else. New legislation has been introduced and more is in preparation. The chances for passage in the next session are good, but veterans and other groups may succeed in reintroducing many of the rigidities and defects that should be discarded. The Government is a good employer in the sense that public service can be deeply rewarding, but modern personnel practices are urgently needed.

The General Accounting Office should be transformed into an effective auditing agency for Congress—which it is not—and accounting responsibility should be restored to the executive branch. The majority of the Hoover Commission recommended an unhappy compromise, but there is no reason to believe that the Eighty-first Congress would touch the subject in any event. The present Comptroller General's great personal popularity reinforces the normal congressional belief that any disliked by the Executive is good for Congress.

One important reform in the President's own family was recommended by the Commission. That is to change the Council of Economic Advisers—now operating in the full glare of publicity and erratically for themselves, for congressional committees, for various interest groups, and for the President—to an economic adviser whose exclusive job will be to help the Chief Executive. The President must have informed assistance on the economic impact of his whole program and all its parts: paradoxically, he needs the assistance because he must do many things (like maintaining a large defense program in times of inflation) that are noneconomic. He can never hope to get unbiased advice if the advice is constantly made public. Most of the opposition to the Commission's recommendation has come from liberal groups in and out of Congress; their policy seems painfully short-sighted.

Another urgent need in Presidential staffing is a Board of Review for natural-resource-development projects. This was recommended in a dissent. Even the majority's somewhat confused proposals for a Board of Impartial Analysis for engineering and architectural projects would fill the gap created by the unseemly abolition of the National Resources Planning Board. Perhaps with the horrid word "planning" omitted, Congress might be willing to go along.

In the area of interdepartmental shifts there are two badly needed consolidations, both in the field of natural resources: the civil functions (rivers and harbors, and flood control) of the Army Corps of Engineers

should be united with the work of the Bureau of Reclamation, and similarly, though the need is not quite so urgent, the Forest Service (Agriculture) and the Bureau of Land Management (Interior), which includes the Grazing Service and the old General Land Office, clearly belong together in one agency.

The question of who should control a combined Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management is not a simple matter; both parent agencies can make out a pretty good claim. Along with the disasters on the Commission, I plunk for Interior. This seems to me a good time to emphasize conservation in the public domain. The on-the-farm conservation job of Agriculture can and should go ahead anyway. Nobody knows what the President will do, and even if he recommends a transfer to Interior, Congress will probably defeat the plan, because the prestige of Agriculture and the Forest Service probably outweigh the political appeal of Interior and BLM.

The other case is clear-cut. River-basin development from the source in the mountains clear down to the sea should be handled by one agency and that agency belongs in the Interior Department, or in a new Department of Natural Resources, which is what Interior should become. Power, flood control, navigation, irrigation—all must be planned simultaneously and by one agency, and the basic function is civilian, not military. If the engineers need this kind of training, let them be given assignments with Interior. As they did in the WPA, they will learn much from working in a civilian agency and they will have something of their own to contribute. The present system gives only partial training to about 215 engineer officers at any one time and bids fair to wreck the effective use of our magnificent water resources.

I know of no one in Washington who thinks that a reorganization plan transferring rivers and harbors and flood control to Interior could get by Congress unless—and this is a big unless—and until enough people in this country wake up to the significance of the problem and tell their Senators and Representatives about it.

The Law of Reverence and the Law of Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the sermon delivered by the Right Reverend John K. Cartwright at the Red Mass, on January 15, 1950, in the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Human society must be ruled by law. As inexorable as the force of gravity or the movement of the tides is the principle that all gatherings of men must establish rules for their order and their peace.

Even today, in the midst of unexampled disturbance and conflict there is by and large over all the earth a regimen of law. Anarchy exists only sporadically and momentarily. In the nature of things mankind must keep coming back to forms of stable understanding that we call law.

However, there is a wide diversity in the character of the laws that rule the world. Broadly speaking, the world is divided into two parts. In one the law is that of reverence. In the other it is the law of fear.

Of course law everywhere makes use of coercion and therefore imposes fear. But in free societies the fear operates only against the minority: the fractious, the unreasonable, the criminal. In a free society the good citizen does not fear the law for he does not intend to break it. But even in a free society the good citizen does pay the law the homage of his reverence. In last analysis the law rests, not upon the coercion which it applies to the few, but upon the reverence of the many which is its chief support, and without which society could not combine order and freedom.

In reading history we find that through vast reaches of human experience law has tended to repose on fear. Even in the classical republics where liberty was born, liberty was for an elite rather than for every man. In the enormous slave states of our own time, whether the nationalistic tyrannies which have been accounted for, or the socialistic tyrannies under which half the world now groans and which the rest of us look upon with dread, in these great areas the law of fear dominates with unexampled power. For fear in our age has acquired techniques and procedures quite unknown to man in any other age. In past time tyranny no less than beneficence suffered from lack of efficiency. In the present all the discoveries of science and the modern genius for organization put themselves at the disposal of terror. One-half mankind lies under the daily imminence, personal to every trembling heart, of espionage, imprisonment, torture, and cruel death.

We used to think that evils like these had fallen into desuetude by the mere fact that time had passed and man had outgrown them. Instead the slave state is among us in a form of effectiveness in which no past century could know it. And, as far as regards the techniques of fear, it is impossible to prophesy their exhaustion. They could be with us for centuries, for millennia, forever. And they could absorb not only the countries now cursed by them, but our own country and all the earth. There is unfortunately nothing about our climate, or our latitude and longitude, or our inherited blood-strains which would forbid the establishment among us of this law of fear. There is nothing to prevent it, except the virtues of our people maintaining the institutions of freedom under the providence of God, and making these institutions valid by the power of the spirit of reverence.

Our history has been one of reverence for the inherited principles of a great tradition, a tradition that began with the beginnings of European civilization and that reached a high point of enlargement and perfecting in the experiences of our own Nation. While other peoples were still living under stagnant tribal custom or under the futile restlessness of barbaric military states, the peoples who formed Christendom set about the august task of building the politics of freedom. The experiments of the Greek cities and the Roman republic with limited freedom, the inculcation of human dignity by the two testaments, the bringing of these teachings into universal popularity by the teaching of the church, the building of the statutes and jurisprudence of the Roman law, the writing of the great charters and documents of the Middle Ages like Magna Carta, the working out of the pacts and treaties that brought peace out of the religious wars, the charter of religious freedom of the Maryland settlers of 1634, the Bill of Rights of England of 1692 and of the United States of 1789, the Declaration of Independence, and the Proclamation of Emancipation—all these are high points of advancement in a progression through many ages of turmoil and battle toward a greater and greater heritage of honor and wisdom.

These problems we did not solve. They were solved for us and the answers belong to us and to mankind forever. These principles are the application to man's difficulties of eternally valid truths embodied in the natural law. They are not to be treated merely as rules of a game to be used pragmatically. They are to be regarded as emanations of truth and as the sacred foundations of all law. If they are so cherished then the body of statutes will be enlightened by them and will serve the uses of man's freedom. If they are so cherished then mankind will reverence the law he lives by and obey it. But if they are not so reverenced then the law of freemen must fail. And since man, free or not free, must have some law, since society cannot exist without it, the law which replaces the law of reverence can only be the law of fear.

The law of freedom and reverence is our heritage. But like all our heritage it is being attacked from without and sapped from within. An irreverent and irresponsible philosophy is growing daily in its influence. Positions of social prestige and intellectual power are being rapidly won by those whom a great English writer describes as vicious and ignorant children picking the mortar out of the foundations of society. There is no part of our inherited legal and jurisprudential wisdom which is sacred to this spirit of irreverence.

When our people built a residence for its highest court it tried very properly to express reverence for one of its greatest institutions by the majesty of the building. Have you noticed in recent years the sarcasm with which in certain circles of thought it is customary to ridicule this action?

When people are to be subjected to the guidance of law and some of them to law's sanctions and coercions, we might properly expect on the part of their judges a responsible and reverential concept of the human person so made subject to him. What can be looked for when a judge can say as one judge did say that for him there is no essential difference between a man, a baboon, and a grain of sand? This was the personal philosophy of one judge. But many a jurist has been to school at the feet of teachers of a similar philosophy. And if such came to be the thought not of a judge but of the judiciary, what reverence for the law beneath the laws would temper justice with mercy, what criterion would restrain the judging mind from any vagary to which politics or personal caprice might incline it? What might the people think of such a system by which they would no longer be law's beneficiaries but its victims?

When people are accused of violating the law, our system gives them the benefit of the doubt, the right to trial by jury, the right of expert counsel, the value of all the delays that can safeguard justice. In compensation the law expects from them the attitude of respect that makes the processes of trial orderly and indeed possible. Such an attitude it can commonly presume even when it deals with the thief and the murderer. But we have seen the scandal of organized and deliberate mockery introduced to our courtrooms by people whose intelligence makes them all the more guilty. They are the pawns and servants of a law that works by fear and they seek by deliberate destruction of the law of reverence to bring in here the law of fear.

The withdrawal of reverence from law is as yet exceptional. But it is frequent and its frequency increases. It increases because it is being diverted at its source.

For law, though it be the object of reverence, does not create reverence. Reverence comes out of the conscience of man. And the conscience of man needs to be both enlightened and animated by religion. Without religion the conscience atrophies. Without a conscience reverence dries up. Without reverence the law of free men cannot function. But society must have law. If it cannot be the law that rests on reverence it must be the law that rests on fear.

It is no accident or mere coincidence that in this divided world the habitat of official atheism is also the habitat of the law of fear. In the lands where the people are held in hourly terror, where the very rulers tremble together in a wretched loyalty of fear, in that land there is no use for reverence. Those rulers must not be inhibited from any savagery that by respect for men would prevent the application of effective fear. They must not be hampered in their mathematical justice by the irregularities and individualities of those who know they have a soul. Law must be supreme over all interests, unexceptionable, undeterred in merciless effectiveness. Away with those who call on constitutions and writs of habeas corpus. Away with those who talk of rights. Away with those who claim for man personality instead of number. Away with those who speak of souls and honor and truth and reverence. There can be no law of nature which is the will of God with reason to understand it and reverence to maintain it. There can be only laws—and torture to enforce them.

On the other hand the habitat of the law of freedom is the habitat of reverence. Here only the evil and the violent need fear the law. The citizen respects it and upholds it. He understands society's need for reasonable arrangement of its basic interests, and perceives that without this basic arrangement of law no other arrangement of any other interest either of business or of education, or of art or of friendship or of pleasure would be possible. Since human law is so basic to all forms of human society it springs out of the natural law which is only another word for the will of God. Therefore it has about it in a free society something that is sacred and that appeals not only to the intelligence but to the conscience. And this appeal to the conscience must be kept alive if a free society is to endure. The law of fear can operate in the mathematical functioning of the state when welfare is maintained by a secret police in its torture chambers. The law of freedom can function only when the masses and multitudes of men reverence the law of freedom as the gift of God.

Our country since its inception has been a country of freemen's law. It originated in the repudiation of the law of fear. It was able to substitute reverence for fear very easily, because its founders, its heroes, its common people had the religious conscience which is the first element in citizenship. They were rebels but not anarchists. Therefore they set up a government with an enlightened Constitution as the basis of its laws. And that Constitution was enshrined in their reverence.

Our traditions, particularly our traditional jurisprudence, have developed in the light of that understanding. Our law has understood how it is rooted in the religious conscience and for that reason among others it has respected the position of religion in society. It did not resuscitate the forms of religious establishment which history had found so lamentably wanting. On the other hand the religion of the citizen never asked or wished that there should be a reversal to these outmoded experiments. The religion of the citizen did not ask this and does not ask it and, please God, shall never ask it. Denominations as such and ministries as such do not ask from American law establishment or union or abusive privilege. But religion as such has at our law its full right to exist, to worship, to teach, to inspire, to console and to form the conscience of the citizen out of which comes reverence for society and law. American law has always respected religion not only for what it is in itself, the deepest-rooted of all human rights, but for its civilizing function of creating in the public mind the climate of reverence which is the only climate in which the law of freedom can exist.

God has blessed America in the beauty of her mountains and prairies. God has blessed her with abundance. God has blessed her in the energies and talents of her people. But God has given her no greater blessing than this of the working together of her free laws and of the religious conscience of her people. It is the law of reverence which makes possible the abolition of the law of fear. May it forever be so. And may the wisdom of our lawmakers and judges always make secure the honor of their own exalted ministry by maintaining the American tradition of the law of freedom enshrined in the reverential conscience of the citizen.

Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs. Dr. Thorning, who is my friend and the friend of many Members of the Congress, gave this interpretation of international law in the New York Times, January 13, 1950. His explanation is not only clear and logical; it is also unanswerable, from the standpoint of sound juridical principles. An immediate exchange of Ambassadors with Spain would satisfy the claims of ethics and, at the same time, enable the peoples of the world to champion the cause of freedom and representative government. Full diplomatic friendship will pave the way to many other constructive acts of statesmanship. I recommend Dr. Thorning's analysis to the attention of my colleagues:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 10, 1950.*

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In the current discussion about friendship with Spain, an important admission was made in the Times' editorial Recognizing Franco, December 22, 1949. This reads as follows:

"It was wrong and short-sighted to withdraw the chiefs of diplomatic missions in the first place."

One could go further and acknowledge that the policy of attempted ostracism, adopted under an impression that the Soviets would be suitably appeased, has proved not only bad in principle but also a failure in practice. It had exactly the opposite effect to that intended: It consolidated overwhelming popular sentiment behind the head of the Spanish state as the symbol of resistance against outside interference. Indeed, according to the Madrid correspondent of the New York Times, the present administration in Spain is stronger than ever. For that result, the constant drum-fire of foreign dictation is largely responsible.

The Times is correct—and so was Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG—in pointing out that the Spanish question should be considered in its "proper framework" and in the light of all pertinent resolutions of the UN General Assembly. But readers of the Times have a right to expect the whole record to be rehearsed and studied.

Although the so-called Franco Fascist regime, without any opportunity for self-defense, was denounced and a resolution was passed in 1946 recommending the withdrawal of chiefs of diplomatic missions from Madrid, it is untrue to assert that such a policy has been "reaffirmed by the Assembly."

When the "identical 1946 resolution" was brought up again in 1947, "according to the rules," by the Soviet-dominated Polish delegation, it failed to receive the necessary two-thirds vote and, in the official minutes of the General Assembly reporter, was recorded as rejected.

This is one reason why many experts on international law, including Dr. Edwin Borchard, of Yale University, and Dr. George Finch, former editor of the American Journal of International Law, judge the 1946 resolution to be invalid. Consequently, a number of nations, including some in the Western Hemisphere, considered themselves free to maintain, or to restore, a full complement of diplomatic officials in Spain.

More recently, in May 1949, a decisive majority (26 to 15, with 16 abstentions) supported the motion proposed by Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, and Peru, to leave all nations free to send, or not to send, Ambassadors and Ministers Plenipotentiary to Madrid.

At the same time, and this is a point of genuine importance, the proposal of soviet-ized Poland to repeat the 1945–46 denunciation of the present Spanish Government as Fascist and as having been imposed by the Axis was soundly beaten by a vote of 12 to 11. A similar fate, by more resounding majorities, was inflicted upon all other resolutions urged upon the UN by the iron-curtain bloc in the General Assembly. With the defeat of these Soviet-inspired motions, the whole case against Spain fell to the ground.

In view of this historical sequence, it would appear to be reasonable to expect our country, democratically, to review its Spanish policy without delay. Since a mistake, admittedly, was made in 1946, the sooner we admit our error and try to repair the damage done, the more secure will be the people of the United States and the more advantageously we can provide for our national interests.

If we do what is right, there is no solid ground for belief that the shock to public opinion in western Europe, and especially in France and Great Britain, would be enormous. Has not the wartime Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Winston Churchill, called, repeatedly, for a revision of bankrupt policy toward Spain? Did not the French Government, despite leftist clamors, reopen its Pyrenees frontier and resume a lucrative trade with the Spanish people? Has it been forgotten that the Times (London) calling for an end to hypocrisy in a powerful leading article (April 26, 1949), described the attempted ostracism of Spain a futile gesture?

"Without offending political honor or popular sentiment," the same editorial advises, "it would be both possible and wise to extend to Spain the normal facilities and courtesies which smooth the relations between sovereign states. * * * There is also a strong case on grounds of humanity and efficiency for admitting Spain to membership of United Nations agencies, if not to the United Nations itself. It is illogical to deprive the Spanish people of all international benefits because of the nature of their Government."

The public, here and abroad, will recognize a policy of good will and fairness toward the people of Spain.

Dr. JOSEPH F. THORNING,
Associate Editor of World Affairs.

The Australian Immigrant Aims at a Sitting Duck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an article that is worth 3 minutes of anybody's time to read. It is entitled "The Australian Immigrant Aims at a Sitting Duck," from the Washington Daily News, by Robert C. Ruark.

THE AUSTRALIAN IMMIGRANT AIMS AT A SITTING DUCK

(By Robert C. Ruark)

SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA, January 19.—It's been my privilege to observe a wonderfully gratifying thing, a sight denied me in America by virtue of my tender years.

This would be the influx of foreigners to a new, raw, nation, much as the Italians and Irish and Poles came aboard America in the last century. It remodel the land to their own specifications.

Australia flung open its postwar doors to the homeless, and the people flocked to a land where there was breathing space and room to flex a muscle. They are people of all countries, save the black and the yellow, for the Aussies still operate on a slogan of white Australia. In an odd sort of way, even this is pardonable, since you folks back home cannot imagine being a small oasis in a desert of alien culture. In the upsurge of nationalism among the Asiatics, Australia figures there are enough Asiatics ringing them without inviting them to come in.

But the gate has gaped wide to the folk who were stripped of their homes and identities by the European war, and they have eagerly seized the opportunity to begin afresh in a country where space is so vast that a million-acre sheep station is not peculiar. Australia's eight million live largely in the principal cities of Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide, Brisbane, Perth, Darwin, and Townsville. The rest of the land is laid out there, panting for development.

These people, who have come down under to dwell, are folk who are accustomed to living in postage-stamp nations. The broadness of this land is new and wondrous in concept to them. They are pioneers in an age when pioneering is obsolescent. They have stare in their eyes, and limitless endurance in their muscles. These are dedicated men and women.

They have already begun to integrate themselves into the nation, even as our immigrants dug into America, by doing chores nobody else wants to do. They take the tough jobs at small pay. They work the extra hours. They serve as mutuals, as rough laborers, and always they save. They save intently, fiercely. They squirrel away their small earnings, paring their expenses to bone, against the day they will be able to start their own business and insure a new dream.

The job, for these new pioneers, is going to be pathetically easy. They are plumped into an economy of state-fostered sloth, where the man in the street has knocked off work a couple of generations before his time. Australia is a beautiful object lesson in state interference with individual endeavor today.

There is no real overtime in Australia. One industrialist was trying to describe to me the difference between the Australian worker and the American worker. He said: "If you pay the Yank enough, he'll work a night shift, or even week ends. But you can't pay an Australian enough to work more than his 40 hours a week."

That is where the non-clock-watching migrant has his opportunity. He is aiming at a sitting duck. Australia will develop and expand, and people with "ski" on the hind end of their names will be a potent force in the development. It's a healthy thing all around for my Aussie friends, because with their tight inheritance of Scotch, English, and Irish, they were getting to look overmuch alike anyhow. This is one continent that can use some new blood—economically as well as physically.

Resolutions of Mahaska County (Iowa) Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, at the annual meeting of the Mahaska County (Iowa) Farm Bureau, a comprehensive set of resolutions were adopted by this fine organization. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include these resolutions in order that all Members of Congress may have an opportunity to read and know the position that the Farm Bureau of Mahaska County, Iowa, has taken with respect to the problems and proposals confronting our country at the present time.

The resolutions are as follows:

MAHASKA COUNTY RESOLUTIONS, 1949–50

I. APPRECIATION

We express our appreciation for the assistance given to the county committee by the various townships. It is from the information submitted by the townships and by individuals that these resolutions have been prepared.

We commend the county, State, and National Farm Bureau officers for their untiring efforts to secure for the farmers of America a fair share of the national income

II. NATIONAL FARM PROGRAM

A. Political implications: We reiterate our belief that farm programs should be developed through bipartisan approach.

B. Controls: We believe that controls should be kept at a minimum since it is apparent that guaranties of 100 percent of parity as compared to lower supports would result in more drastic controls.

C. Cost: We believe there is danger of losing farm programs if the cost is too high. We recognize the fact that guaranteeing farmers 100 percent of parity would cost an untold number of dollars and it would be necessary to make a definite increase in taxes to carry out such a program.

D. Level of supports: We favor minimum guaranties or floors under farm prices. We are convinced that the free-enterprise system cannot exist under full guaranties.

E. Flexibility: We favor flexible price supports tied to the amount commodity is in surplus with a minimum floor established by the law and the Secretary of Agriculture have the authority to set price supports from this minimum up.

F. Production payments: We believe it would be dangerous to establish a cheap-food philosophy in minds of consumers at the expense of the Government and that the use of production payments would not noticeably affect consumption. We are opposed to farmers becoming dependent upon direct appropriation from Congress, however, in support of perishables we do favor the use of production payments.

G. Limits on production: We are opposed to limiting production of a farmer to approximately $26,000 gross if he is to be eligible for provisions of price supports. There is very little correlation between gross and net income and certain types of farms must be operated on a large scale to support one family.

H. Soil-conservation payments: We believe that satisfactory compliance with soil-conservation practices should be required of all farmers in order for them to be eligible for price supports.

I. Parity versus income-support standards: We are opposed to abandoning the parity concept for the income standard plan. We believe in the parity concept since it is a true relationship between the price of the products the farmer sells and those that he must buy.

III. NATIONAL AND STATE HEALTH PROGRAMS

We believe the $2,000,000,000 the Federal Government is spending is sufficient to better the health of our country. Due to limited facilities we do not feel an increased appropriation in Federal aid to encourage more doctors to enter the medical profession would be a wise expenditure at this time. However, we do favor increased Federal aid for construction of more hospitals and medical research.

If we have a Federal prepayment health-insurance program, we favor voluntary participation.

We believe we should revise our State health programs and adopt a county health unit program for Iowa.

IV. LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONSHIP

We believe labor-management disputes should be settled through the human approach of mediation.

We favor the establishment of a worker-extension service for labor groups that would be similar to the agriculture extension service.

V. GENERAL

A. Rural mail delivery: We favor the changing of mail routes so that the principle of free mail delivery becomes an actuality to all rural families.

B. Rural telephones: We believe a Federal agency should be established for the purpose of expanding rural telephone service.

C. Hoover Commission: The rapid growth of our Federal Government has resulted in an establishment of a great many Federal agencies whose duties at the present time have created a considerable amount of overlapping and duplication within each department. To eliminate a great deal of confusion and waste of tax money, we aggressively support the report of the Hoover Commission.

VI. STATE

Speed-limit law: We favor the enactment of the speed-limit law with maximum limit being set at 60 miles per hour during the day and 60 miles per hour at night.

VII. COUNTY

Health: We believe Mahaska County should have a county health nurse; therefore, we urge the board of directors of the Mahaska County Farm Bureau to contact the proper authorities in an effort to encourage the employment of a county health nurse.

Roads: We recommend that a committee be appointed by the board of directors of the Mahaska County Farm Bureau to contact the county board of supervisors and urge them to instruct the county maintenance crews to do a better job of maintaining secondary roads.

VIII. PEACE

Everyone can recognize the present worldwide feeling of unrest, suspicion, and insecurity, and the need for a greater faith in a workable plan for peace. At the moment, it appears that the fate of civilization rests upon the Russian-American relations and the atomic bomb. As immediate action toward a more satisfactory world peace policy, be it resolved that the United States take the lead by cooperation in—

1. Increasing east-west trade in Europe.
2. The world-wide reduction of armaments.
3. Strengthening and supporting the United Nations.

COUNTY RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE,
WALTER H. COLVILLE, *Chairman*,
HARRY HEDGE,
CONNIE VANDER LINDEN,
CLIFFORD BUSBY,
Mrs. FRANK RANDELL,
Mrs. ALVIN WIMER,
Mrs. ROYD MCCURDY.

Federal Fiscal Picture Alarming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, indicative of the alarm which is noticeable throughout my congressional district is the editorial in the Hammonton News of December 15, 1949, entitled "Federal Fiscal Picture Alarming." This is not a partisan matter but is a problem for all of us if we want to preserve our solvency and the solvency of future generations. The editorial follows:

FEDERAL FISCAL PICTURE ALARMING

The Federal Government's current fiscal picture cries out for the earnest consideration of New Jersey's delegates in Congress.

The $43,500,000,000 Federal spending program authorized by Congress for the fiscal year 1950 not only is the largest peacetime spending budget in the Nation's history, but contains many new projects which commit the Government to ever-increasing outlays in the years ahead.

The Bureau of the Budget estimates that 1950 receipts will amount to $38,000,000,000, which is $5,500,000,000 under the $43,500,000,000 spending total. This impending $5,500,000,000 deficit is large than the total taxes collected by the Federal Government in any peacetime year prior to 1938.

The Federal Government's return to deficit spending depreciate the value of every dollar in the hands of American wage earners, housewives, pensioners, and local governing bodies.

The tragic thing about this sad picture is that Congress and the executive branch could have avoided deficit financing by forthrightly eliminating billions of dollars worth of wasteful spending and by exercising restraint in starting costly new spending programs and in dipping deep into the pork barrel.

Prospending Republicans must share the blame with their similarly disposed Democratic brethren in the Eighty-first Congress for the complete capitulation of Congress this year to the spending bureaucracies and pressure groups in Washington. Tens of thousands of letters received by Members of Congress from folks back home pleading for drastic cuts in excessive and wasteful Federal spending went practically unheeded insofar as effective affirmative action was concerned.

It is futile for us to aid and arm the rest of the world in the fight to arrest communism if, at the same time, we allow the financial structure of our Nation to crumble simply to satisfy the avarice and greed of selfish, short-sighted spending pressure groups.

Inexcusable Political Maneuver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when those who believe in civil-rights proposals, to which both major parties are pledged, should be fully informed of the facts as they exist in the House of Representatives.

It has been announced by the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor that he will seek recognition on Monday next to call up the FEPC bill. Whether he is recognized or not depends on the decision of the Democratic leadership of the House.

It so happens that there is also pending a proposal by the House Rules Committee to alter the very rule under which the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor will seek recognition. It is the recommendation of the Rules Committee that this rule be repealed and that the committee's previous authority as traffic policeman of the House be fully restored.

So that the FEPC bill might be considered on Monday, it was the intent of those sponsoring the rules change not to have it brought up until the Thursday after that vote. However, the Democratic leadership, through a parliamentary ruse, has scheduled the rules-change proposal for action in the House today, thus endangering the possibility of any vote on FEPC on Monday. Should the House adopt the proposed rules change, then the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor would no longer be privileged to seek recognition on Monday. This is the peril to civil-rights legislation for which the Democratic leadership is solely responsible. It is as craven a disregard of party pledges as this House has ever witnessed.

From my talks with my Republican colleagues I know that they stanchly believe that the FEPC legislation should be considered on Monday and that no proposals should be taken up by the House in the intervening days that might jeopardize consideration of FEPC. They intend, as I do, to vote for adjournment of the House today so that the rules change cannot be considered until after action on FEPC.

The Democratic Party has turned the civil-rights program into a travesty by endless maneuvers and delays which it mistakenly believes give it a political advantage. When it is realized that the FEPC legislation enjoyed a privileged position and could have been called up at any time after last August by the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and when it is recalled that the Senate Democratic leader announced that FEPC legislation should be considered in the Senate as the first order of business this year, only later to withdraw that promise, then it should be clear to all that the Democratic Party has no intention of ever enacting civil-rights legislation.

The overwhelming majority of House Republicans want the FEPC legislation to be brought to vote. We not only will oppose the efforts to bring up the rules change today but we will oppose all other efforts of the administration to keep the civil-rights program dangling like bait before the American people. The entire program should be brought to a vote at the earliest possible date.

Hon. Gerald R. Ford, Jr., of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I am highly honored to report to this distinguished body today that one of our Members has been chosen as one of the 10 outstanding young men of the country by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce for 1950.

The annual dinner to honor these 10 young men is to be given at Peoria, Ill., in the district which I am honored to represent. Our colleague who has been singularly honored is the distinguished young gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable GERALD R. FORD, JR., and I am sure that we can all agree that the JC's made no mistake in his selection.

Representative FORD is an outstanding practicing attorney from Grand Rapids, Mich., holding degrees from both the University of Michigan and Yale University Law School. He was in the thick of the fight during World War II in the Pacific serving on board the U. S. S. *Monterey* as assistant navigator.

My good friend and colleague has played an active role in politics, both as a delegate to State conventions and as a candidate for the office which he now holds. Since becoming a Member of our body, Mr. FORD has distinguished himself time and time again by his forthright stand on various issues presented before this body.

I am sure my Republican friends will all agree that he has been most able and sincere in representing the principles of the Grand Old Party here in Congress. We likewise feel sure that he will be returned by the electorate of his district to the Eighty-second Congress and as long as he chooses to represent the good State of Michigan.

Much Disconnected Ado About Something

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, we all must agree that it is a bad state of affairs, which medically should be inquired into immediately, if one hears voices and no one is physically present, such as Hamlet did and some present-day left- and right-winged reactionaries do.

We all must agree also that if a person has a copious oral cavity and uses his voice and does not say anything which even the most credulous could believe, like some present-day political left- and right-winged reactionaries do, that too is a very bad state of affairs and is very possibly a pressing personal and community problem and is a matter which medically should be inquired into immediately.

We all must agree likewise that some left- and right-winged reactionaries who have whopping voice boxes and mouths to match them, use their natural noise-making apparatus to spew and roar about horrors and horrible fates which the Republic and its people will endure in an attempt to describe President Hoover's ridiculously conjured up last mile toward his dreamed up governmental chaos, when in truth and in fact the alleged last mile is the goal of true progress in human government, that also is a frightfully bad state of affairs and is a strait-jacket and padded-cell matter suggesting and requiring immediate restraint and long political rest and quiet if the parties are public officeholders.

Of course you do not necessarily need to be crazy to be either an extreme left- or right-winged reactionary, but I must admit that it should help a lot.

There should be, and I am sure that there is, some way of stopping this political flitting and roaring about of some people through the towns and countrysides of America like evil spirits and fairly making "the welkins ring" with their oh, so patent airy nothings. The votes of the people—the common stockholders of the Republic—can put every Mister Effervescent Worry Wart officeholder, however, where he needs to be—in retirement.

The following is a portion of a letter which I received recently from one of my constituents:

I believe that divine providence has put a mark upon people who willingly or unwittingly have determined to pursue with eagerness, by violent expostulation, the causes of evil and selfishness. Their harsh, croaking, rasping, and indistinct voices, betray them. It has been said of old, in substance, that by their works or deeds and not their mouthings, ye shall know them. Basic notions, however, have changed since the days of these utterances. Time was when I could tell a Communist from a reactionary just by looking at them, but now I cannot tell them apart because both of them are today, equally bug-eyed and wild. Of course, sometimes a right-winged reactionary dresses a little better and eats a little better food and is housed a little better and has a little better automobile, and of course, all that helps to differentiate between these political species.

However, I have always been able to tell a reactionary and a Communist by their voices. When you stop to ponder the statement and think about bird and animal life and all of the other creatures whom God privileged to make noises, the truth of the statement that the voice is the key to the heart seems to be indisputable. Carrion birds, such as the vultures, ravens, and crows, have bad voices and look and smell bad also. Also the great pillagers and devourers such as lions, tigers, hyenas, and leopards, have alarming, soul-penetrating, back-shivering, blood-curdling voices. Look at the simeon brood such as the orangutan, chimpanzee, and gorilla and their voice box concoctions are anything but music to the ear, or should I say a discordant harmony not yet understood.

This is the advice which I give to all. If you hear a noneuphonious, or any other inhuman voice over the radio or otherwise, tune it out of your life because it is a dead certainty that a reactionary is offending your auditory nerves.

If, however, you hear a nice, bold, pleasing, manly voice, that's probably President Harry S. Truman or some other liberal, so just turn him on louder and give that voice profound attention because he is talking for the purpose of doing you some good and not to enslave you financially or otherwise, or to pick the gold fillings out of your teeth, if you have any, while he talks to you as many of our reactionary trumpeters and brayers do.

Another constituent writes:

Today, due to the ignoble efforts of right- and left-winged reactionaries, some of the inhabitants of our zoos and circuses and the household pets fare much better than some of the men, women, and children in America.

I know of no present-day opportunity to play wild animal any more. To illustrate, I am reminded of an old story I heard some years ago about an Irishman who was out of work and answered a circus advertisement to secure employment. He was hired and told to put on a lion's skin and get in the cage and play lion. He followed the directions and when he was in the cage a little while he observed another bristling lion at the other end of the cage and a great fear momentarily overcame him, but his terror vanished when the other lion called out, "Fear not Pat, I am an Irishman too," and he recognized the voice and lo and behold it was his long lost brother Mike.

Today, I believe, we have passed from the great era of harmless deception into the age of harmful deception. I believe that there is now a crying need for all Democratic officeholders to determine to be servants of the people and not their masters or their deceivers. We must, as President Cleveland so aptly put it, be ever mindful that "a public office is a public trust." We must move with intelligence and decision toward the goal of our great Democratic Party—the fulfillment of the promises made to the people in the last Democratic platform. We must aid and assist our truly great President, Harry S. Truman, in making this great country safe and comfortable for the people by promoting the general welfare and not let it again be a hunting ground for the greedy and the selfish who it seems have never yet learned that everything in this world was not made for them exclusively, but for mankind generally.

I would like to requisition your attention for a little while longer and present to you the following rhyme which may or may not be pertinent or of any use to you in cultivating your sense of humor and adding to your storehouse of wisdom in these restless, trying times, when it seems to be so difficult to keep political and other heads supplied with common bay-horse sense:

A DREAMING WITH GARGANTUA THE GREAT

(Inspired by the following news item: "The 550-pound carcass of Ringling Bros.' Gargantua the Great, circus gorilla, is to be a permanent exhibit at the Peabody Museum of Yale University," and written in collaboration by Joseph M. Lovely and Eugene D. O'Sullivan of Omaha, Nebr.)

My children list whilst I relate,
The tale of old Gargantua's fate.
An ape was he, yea anthropoid,
And all through life was unemployed.

No love he made, and hence unmarried,
He lived a life unvexed, unharried.
He reached the age of maturity,
Neck deep in caged security.

He had no worries, and never a care
O'er what to do, or eat or wear.
He saw the dawn of the atom age
Safe in his air-conditioned cage.

No servant problems, no income tax,
Nothing to do but just relax.
Safe from fevers, and aches, and chills,
No rent to pay and no doctor bills.

No bugaboos of welfare state
Screeched forth at him from frenzied pate,
To mar his sweet monotony,
As lolled, clad he, in nature's botany.

His precious freedoms, three in all,
He always had at beck and call.
His life was full as was his paunch,
No Gabrielson at him could "faunch."

Dear Harry's talks, he never heard
Nor those of prudish goppy-birds.
The lobby "gelt" and selfish greed,
His life's fat plan did not impede.

At friendly man he bold leered out,
With rightist jungle mien and pout,
As if he knew that apes like him
Ran loose and wild amidst life's din.

Who would not love to emulate,
The life of old Gargantua the Great?
Fine home, fine care and yea, well fed,
Then off to Yale when you are dead.

Query: If an ape can fare so well, why cannot human beings fare better?

Will Fight for Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report recently has committed the absurdity of recommending the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act and suggests that the Government buy no more silver for coinage purposes. As may be expected, Senator GREEN of Rhode Island, front man for the silver fabricators and arch-enemy of monetary silver, has taken the opportunity to introduce a bill to give force to the recommendations of the joint committee. The cheaper the price of raw silver and the higher the price of tableware, the better the dapper Senator from Rhode Island likes it.

In spite of these moves, the New York Times reports that there is a growing interest among western countries in the coinage of silver. This I consider to be a healthy trend. In the case of silver we have a curious and perhaps unparalleled situation where the silver miner is subsidizing the Treasury—hence the average citizen—rather than getting subsidies from the Government. Every ounce the silver miner sells to the Treasury at ninety-odd cents becomes worth $1.29 when coined into dollars, thus making the general public a profit of 30 cents at the expense of the miner.

The late Senator Key Pittman, of Nevada, fought all his life for the Silver Purchase Act, and I intend to continue the fight with all I am worth. I shall oppose the efforts of any eastern Congressman to repeal this act which is so vital to the state of Nevada and western silver producers.

A Brave Little Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the January 2, 1950, issue of the New Republic, entitled "A Brave Little Band":

A BRAVE LITTLE BAND

Edward A. Rumely, accused of acting for Germany in World War I, has extended his activities to a new organization called Fighters for Freedom, an offshoot of the Committee for Constitutional Government.

Rumely's name doesn't appear in any of the advance promotion material his organization is putting out, but transmittal and business letters are signed by him as executive secretary. On the letterhead are the names of Dr. Willford I. King, as chairman, and Sumner Gerard as treasurer, plus a partial list of trustees and advisory board, including ex-Senator Edward H. Moore, Tulsa, Okla.; Frank E. Gannett, Rochester, N. Y.; Lamar Fleming, Jr., of Houston, Tex., and others.

The FFF is commencing an advertising and personal-fund-solicitation campaign among business and professional men who can be scared by the threat of a socialist-labor-union conspiracy to take over the Government. The organization argues: If you don't give us $50 or $100 or $500, then the labor unions, which are organizing politically, will move in to get the Taft-Hartley Act repealed and bring on a welfare state, and the only way to stop that is for businessmen to organize politically.

In Texas, the organizing drive is scheduled to begin soon after the first of the year, with Dallas and Fort Worth as the starting points. The FFF sets 1,460,000 as its Nation-wide minimum membership goal—1 percent of the population in each community. With that minimum membership, the propaganda says, "each radiating his or her influence to five or eight others, this 1 percent can build a block strong enough to tip the scales at the bar of public opinion and reverse the drift into socialism."

As an important part in the campaign, the FFF plans to distribute 2,000,000 copies of John T. Flynn's The Road Ahead, which it describes as the most important book of this decade. It exposes how, in secret, planners at top level in Washington have been working for a stealthy revolution in collaboration with labor monopolists, according to one letter. The legislation they have forced through fits together as the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle, each piece part of a general plan to drive America into collectivism exactly as have the Fabians in collaboration with British trade-unions in England.

The FFF divides its fighters into four classifications: Group A, or grass-roots fighters (goal: 1,250,000), will pay $2 and will get limited amounts of literature. Group B, or associate fighters (goal: 500,000), will pay $5 and will get more literature, including biweekly mailings from Representative RALPH GWINN, Republican, New York, and Dr. King. Group C, or cooperating fighters (goal: 250,000), will pay $10 and will get more literature. Group D, the sustaining fighters (goal: 50,000), will qualify by contributing $25 or more or by buying that much literature.

Telegram of New Orleans Spot Cotton Merchants' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *January 19, 1950.*

Congressman OTTO PASSMAN,
House Office Building:

The New Orleans Spot Cotton Merchants' Association, at a special meeting, adopted in resolution form the following press statement of Mr. Ben J. Williams and respectfully call it to your attention. It will be appreciated if you will insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as the quickest and best means of calling it to the attention of other Members. Your expressions to Mr. Wilson are greatly appreciated.

"The report from unofficial but authoritative sources that the Federal Government is about to engage in the barter of American cotton for critical materials is causing wide concern. Such a program is viewed as threatening to the commodity marketing system as well as the whole structure of private enterprise," Ben J. Williams, prominent New Orleans cotton merchant, said today.

"It is expected that businessmen everywhere will join commodity merchants and traders in taking immediate steps to acquaint the Congress with public disapproval of such a plan. A barter program is both contrary to proven methods of trade and a threat to our own economy and that of other nations," Mr. Williams stated. "Since price is normally arrived at on the basis of supply and demand, the principal danger of exchange of goods for goods is that price becomes unimportant. The sale price of cotton exported against a barter transaction may be fixed at a completely arbitrary level—at whatever price is deemed necessary to offset prices also arbitrarily set for the things imported. Therefore, this deviation from the established system of buying and selling through separate and distinct competitive channels will be ruinous," Mr. Williams continued. "Hardest hit will be small business, because the break-down of our established marketing procedure will result in only large corporations with world-wide organizations participating in what is done. It is hard to understand how our Government can consider the substitution of peremptory methods for free enterprise at home on one hand and condemn the same bureaucratic domination of individual rights by other nations. It is likewise difficult to understand the thinking behind a program which will destroy the very fundamental values we have and are spending billions of dollars to salvage out of a chaotic world situation," Mr. Williams concluded.

J. E. GOULD,
President, New Orleans Spot Cotton Merchants' Association.

Put the Peril Point Back in the Reciprocal Trade Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, there is now on the lawbooks of this land a measure known as the Reciprocal Trade Act, a statute which has as its stated—and very worth-while—aim the breaking down of trade barriers between the United States and other nations. I am very favorable to the aim and favorable to the principle of world trade insofar as it can be carried on without undermining the economic enterprises of the United States. But I do not want to have a treaty which, in effect, disregards protection to American factories, to American working men, and to American farmers.

The bill as it stands today allows the State Department to carry out reciprocal trade agreements with various nations. It allows the State Department to say to those nations, if it desires, that the United States will reciprocate for their favors by allowing our own industries to go into bankruptcy.

In the Eightieth Congress a new clause was written into the Reciprocal Trade Act—a clause which required the establishment of what is called the peril point at which importation of cheap foreign goods or products would be destructive to American industry or agriculture producing a similar item. In extending this act the first session of the Eighty-first Congress eliminated this section.

Restoration of this peril-point clause will not erect the tariff walls of years ago around these United States. It will not prohibit competition, nor will it restrict it unduly. What it does is assure that foreign producers will not be able to take unfair advantage of the wages they pay workers in order to mass-produce cheaply for American consumption. Fair competition will then be maintained—as it should be—on the basis of the quality of goods rather than on how low a wage can be paid to a worker.

If the Truman administration would rather have the United States act as a society for promoting economic uplift among our overseas friends instead of collecting money for our depleted Treasury, let it hint to foreign manufacturers that they might spend some of their money which might otherwise go to tariffs on improving the lot of their workers.

Let me cite an example of how the reciprocal agreements affect industry. Many thousands of Californians depend upon lumbering for their livelihood. The employees receive wages of about $1.45 an hour for their work, while in Canada workers in the lumber mills receive 95 cents an hour. This amounts to $4 a day less pay for a Canadian worker than for an American. It requires one logger and one millworker about 1 day to produce 1,000 board feet of lumber. This means a cost of $8 more per 1,000 feet to produce lumber in the United States than in Canada. Since Canada does not have the 3-percent excise tax on freight shipments—a tax which, incidentally, I am seeking to equalize through passage of H. R. 3374—it costs her lumber producers less to ship to market. Thus they can sell on the American market much more cheaply than American firms can. In boom times, this differential is not easily noticeable since all the output of American mills is bought. But when the demand for building materials is contracting—as, indeed, it is today—the pinch is on. Cheap foreign lumber is bought; American lumber goes begging. Americans, who have worked for many years to achieve and maintain a high standard of living, will be thrown out of work. The poison of unemployment will choke off the arteries of commerce, for without purchasing power by our workers there can be but one result—a slow-down of the nation's economic life.

The fishing industry, too, faces ruinous competition from abroad. An unskilled male worker in the California fishing industry is paid $1.55 an hour. If no protection is afforded to the industry and to this worker, American-caught fish would have to compete on the open market with fish caught by a Japanese fisherman earning the equivalent of 31 cents, American money, for an entire day's work. There is no assurance under the existing law that foreign fish, such as that from Japan, could not be brought into the United States in greater and greater quantities and dumped onto the market to the detriment of the American producer.

Take for another example the producing of olive oil. In 1948, 15,554,968 pounds of edible olive oil was imported from Italy and Greece. Despite the fact that olive oil produced in California was filling the warehouses to capacity, the President saw fit last year to reduce the duty on Italian olive oil packaged in drums of less than 40 pounds from 8 to 4¾ cents per pound; and on Italian and Greek olive oil, packed in drums of more than 40 pounds, from 6½ to 3¼ cents per pound. Such reductions have proven ruinous to the California olive-oil industry.

California also has an extensive almond-growing industry. The Mediterranean nations, with a climate similar to California's, also produce large quantities of almonds. These nuts are shipped to the United States for consumption. The situation in this case is much the same as in the olive-oil industry; there is ruinous competition from abroad. Have not our producers a right to protection by our Government against economic aggression from outsiders?

Just today I have been informed that a cut in the present low tariff rate on brined cherries—the raw material for maraschino cherries—is on the new list for possible cutting this year under the Reciprocal Trade Act. Already there is a surplus of such cherries on the Pacific coast, yet it is proposed that the duties be lowered to allow more Italian cherries into this country for cutthroat competition. More sweet cherries today are brined than are canned; in California, Oregon, and Washington, brined cherries account for 28 percent of the annual crop. A substantial volume of brined cherries come from other States, too—principally from Michigan, New York, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania. A cut in the tariffs at this time would be ruinous to the cherry industry.

The peril-point legislation I propose asks only that the employers and employees of industries have a chance to be heard before the nonpolitical and nonpartisan Tariff Commission prior to the State Department's entrance into reciprocal trade treaties. The Commission has only the power to investigate and recommend. The Commission would determine the peril point below which importation would be damaging to domestic industries. If the President desired to reduce the tariffs lower than this figure, he would then be required to obtain approval by the Congress.

I favor full employment throughout the entire world. But I oppose our creating such full employment through deliberately allowing idleness and unemployment in our own United States.

Lee Evans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL T. WAGNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer:

LEE EVANS

It is all in the day's work for a newspaper reporter to write obituaries or for an editorialist to pen tributes to leading citizens when they pass away. It is a little different when they are doing a piece on a colleague—and particularly on a colleague who held such a warm spot in the hearts of his fellow workers as did Lee Evans.

Lee Evans was a member of the Enquirer staff from January 1914, until January 1950, and that is a long time. During this period he served as a reporter, financial editor, city editor, and more recently, as head of this newspaper's New York bureau.

Mr. Evans was a man of fine understanding and deep feeling. He had real affection for the multitude of persons he genuinely liked and a fine tolerance for the far fewer people for whom he cared little.

Dozens of able newspapermen today can thank Lee Evans for their starts to successful careers. He always was willing to lend a helping hand to boys who wanted to become journalists, and he did help many of them. He was an unusual character, honest to the core, and a first-rate newspaperman.

Lee Evans counted his friends by the hundreds and they were in all walks of life. These men and women will miss him but, most of all, he will be missed by his fellow workers on the Enquirer who knew and loved him best.

The Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of addressing the Milwaukee Junior Bar Association in my home city on December 12 and, permission being granted, wish to insert in the RECORD my speech before that group on the welfare state.

The address follows:

I once read a poem—or a sort of poem—by a very modern writer indeed, Gertrude Stein. She is, in fact, so modern that many think she has become completely unintelligible. She starts this one in a fashion that is certainly at the least unusual. The opening words are printed in a circle and go, if you wish to read them in this sequence: "Rose is a rose is a rose is a." Or if you prefer to start at another point: "Is a rose is a rose is a rose?"

Recently I was reminded of this ring-around-the-rosy by two articles that I read in order to prepare myself for this particular occasion. Since I myself am a legislator, rather than a lawyer, I thought I might be better equipped to discuss the—shall we call them legal—aspects of some of the current political questions if I learned more of the legal point of view, so I glanced through the most recent copies of the periodical which, I gather, is the official organ of the legal profession, the Journal of the American Bar Association.

The two articles which interested me particularly were on the subject with which I, in my capacity as Congressman, am as closely concerned as any lawyer—the welfare state. One was written by a gentleman from Alabama, Mr. William Logan Martin, who, I understand, is not only a member of the Alabama bar, but is a representative to the American Bar Association's house of delegates. The other was written by a man to whom the members of the legal profession gave the recognition of electing president of the American Bar Association, Mr. Frank E. Holman.

These two treatises, although different in style, are extremely similar in content. They are both on the subject of the welfare state—called variously by the two distinguished authors by what they consider equivalent terms of opprobrium—"welfare state," "statism," "socialism," and "social justice." They both start with the premise that since the time of Mr. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, this country has been—not drifting, but catapulting—down the road toward totalitarianism, and that the shocking reason for this shocking fact is the Government's presumably new-found concern with the security of the masses of its people.

ARGUMENTS NOT NEW

These arguments are not exactly novel to me. I have heard them before. In fact, in studying the history of our country, I have come across them many times. But I must admit that I have never read statements so frank and direct in presenting this viewpoint since I marveled at a pronouncement made by John D. Rockefeller in the eighteen seventies—another story about a rose—when he said blandly, "The growth of a large business is merely a survival of the fittest. The American Beauty rose can be produced in the splendor and fragrance which bring cheer to its beholder only by sacrificing the early buds which grow up around it. This is not an evil tendency in business. It is merely the working out of a law of nature and a law of God."

After my reminiscent gasp of amazement, I decided to read the articles more carefully. After all, since I had not had legal training, I thought I might have missed the point. Possibly this was a technique used by lawyers in order to put their own positions into a sharper and more dramatic contrast. So I went on reading.

This is what I found. First, a welfare state, as defined by Mr. Holman, is a state "which provides for the social and economic well-being of the citizenry." That sounded fine to me. But, continues Mr. Holman, by that very fact, it is—and I quote again—"a form of collectivism."

Secondly, a state concerned with the welfare of its people is unconstitutional. Third, such a form of government is beyond the remotest conception of the founders of this country.

Those are the three major general conclusions. But these gentlemen do not limit themselves to generalities. They are quite specific. They itemize, carefully, and in logical sequence, the particular pieces of legislation that support their thesis. And this is an even more fascinating study.

BAR PRESIDENT AGAINST RACIAL EQUALITY

Mr. Holman is primarily concerned with what he considers the dangerous and foreign-inspired theory of racial equality. He argues vehemently against it, asserting that our forefathers, when they declared "all men are created equal" did not at all mean social or economic equality, but merely—and in case you may think I am taking liberties with his presentation, I give you his own words again—"intended to permit any inequalities to rest solely on the basis of actual differences in personality and ability." It is therefore, the president of the American Bar Association deduces, not only a historical fallacy, but basically unconstitutional, for the Government to interest itself in civil liberties, or to do anything to assist in equalizing opportunity.

Mr. Holman carries this argument all the way to the Supreme Court, and questions the constitutionality of the Court's recent decision, which declared that anyone who was able to buy property must be allowed to live on it. This seems to me to place so eminent a lawyer in a curious position. It is my understanding that the Supreme Court is the arm of the Government which has the right to decide on the constitutionality of laws made by nonlegal persons such as myself. Or is it, not the administration, but the very basis of our Government itself that Mr. Holman is questioning?

The defender of the Constitution does not stop with his theory of racial inequality. He also despairs of other things. He considers the idea of Federal aid to education equally vicious and un-American. The fact that Federal assistance to educational institutions was started in 1806, by Thomas Jefferson, would not, I think, convince him. After all, if Mr. Holman had lived in those days—and I wonder, perhaps, whether he still doesn't—he would very probably have been against such Government interference even then. I'm sure he, like many of his Federalist contemporaries, would have considered Mr. Jefferson a dangerous revolutionary. In fact, he would probably have called him a republican—a term then associated with the French Revolution and used with as much abhorrence as the author of this current tirade attaches to the words "social justice."

Mr. Martin agrees entirely with Mr. Holman on all the points I have mentioned. But he goes into more detail. He itemizes all the social legislation which—he seems to think—sprang full-grown from the pagan head of Franklin Roosevelt—social security, labor legislation, farm-price supports, public utilities, and public housing—and blasts all these with the same logic and virulence that his colleague used. These are the things, he announces, that lead to communism—that are unconstitutional—that our forefathers would never have thought of.

But there are more. Under President Truman, Mr. Martin thinks, the Fair Deal makes even the New Deal look old. He uses pages of small print exposing the enormity of the Government's interest in the health of the Nation. And he spends his best prose efforts being horrified in elaborate language at the two new proposals which he, as a member of the bar, is now fighting most actively. According to Mr. Martin, you all, as fellow members, will immediately recognize what these two issues are. Which two recent proposals are the most illegal, the most destructive, to our system of government—the most dangerous to the welfare of cultivated and white and Christian people?

HUMAN-RIGHTS CONVENTION CRITICIZED

I am amazed that you do not seem to identify these proposals automatically. Mr. Martin assures me no member of the legal profession could possibly be blind to the perils of the proposed convention on human rights. Apparently our representatives to the United Nations—not only Mrs. Roosevelt, who, of course, might by some be regarded as contaminated by humanity—but, if I am not mistaken, including, at that time, that great protagonist of social progress, Mr. John Foster Dulles—apparently these two, among many others, were so blinded.

But not so the member of the Alabama bar. It is presumably a shocking thing that a statement should even be proposed—particularly in the company of other nations—which attempts to secure to all persons these basic civil and political rights: The right to life; the right to protection against torture, slavery, forced labor, arbitrary arrest or detention; the right to freedom of movement and residence; the right to a fair and public hearing; the right to freedom of religion, assembly, and association; and the right to the equal protection of the law.

To attempt to secure these rights for all mankind—this is the monstrous hoax Mr. Martin claims would violate and abolish the rights of the individual—and would be the last step toward a totalitarian state.

The second pitfall the lawyer from Alabama is afraid we shall plunge into—and which he points out the President has already sent to the Senate for ratification—is the Genocide Convention. Do you realize the dangers of this subversive document? This is a statement, again worked out with trial and tribulation in the United Nations, and with the participation of revolutionaries such as members of our Department of State—proposing, in essence, to prevent the mass slaughter of any race—no matter how much Mr. Martin doesn't like it.

There have been, recently in the world's history, incidents which suggest why these wicked people at Lake Success thought such a convention relevant. You may have read in the paper only a few weeks ago of the discovery of a new mass grave which answered the question of where some of the millions of Jewish bodies had been hidden—bodies which a man named Hitler had ordered killed because he didn't like their race.

But to propose the outlawing of the crime of genocide, and for nations to agree to punish any individual who commits this crime—this Mr. Martin calls the "destruction of the 'indestructible union of the indestructible states'."

I realize I have gone into considerable detail discussing two articles—or shall I call them philosophies—which I do not, and I am sure you do not, sponsor. But I make no apologies. I have done it partly because I find them quite literally breath taking, and partly because I think it important to discuss with you the opinions—almost the official voice—of your profession. Primarily, however, I have presented these legal anachronisms in such detail because they state my own position so clearly. All you need to do is start at another point in that circle of "rose-is-a-rose-is-a-rose."

Actually these articles show more clearly than I would otherwise have known how to do—exactly why I am for everything their authors are against.

May I review again some of the key statements to show what I mean?

JUSTICE DOUGLAS REMINDERS

Mr. Holman's definition of the welfare state is, in my opinion, excellent—a state "which provides for the social and economic well-being of its citizenry." It is only that he thinks this is a communistic goal, and I think it is the very heart of our democracy. As Mr. Justice William O. Douglas put it—and he, I gather, can be considered as quite as learned in the law as the president of the American Bar Association:

"The human welfare state is the great political invention of the twentieth century. It is the instrument of politics that the Communists fear above all else. * * * The greatest assets of a nation, greater than any material resources, are its men and women. The industrial system was designed to serve mankind. Human welfare is the measure of its service. There is a place for justice in the factories as well as the courts. Human rights transcend property rights."

And later he states: "We place our faith in a society that preserves the greatest possible freedom for the individual yet secures the masses in their basic needs."

I am, of course, not so well equipped as any one of you here to argue the legal aspects of the charge that an interest in human welfare is unconstitutional. However, long before the present era—long enough ago to be nostalgically acceptable to the most unreconstructed southern legal practitioner, in 1831—Justice Barbour, of the Supreme Court of the United States, handed down a decision which said in part:

"It is not only the right but the bounden and solemn duty of a state to advance the safety, happiness, and prosperity of its people and to provide for its general welfare."

A hundred years later this opinion was reaffirmed and extended by another distinguished jurist, also a member of the Supreme Court of our land, when Mr. Justice Cardozo stated for the Court:

"Congress may spend money in aid of the general welfare. * * * The purge of the Nation-wide calamity that began in 1929 has taught us many lessons, not least, of the solidarity of interests that may once have seemed to be divided. * * * The problem is mainly national in area and dimensions. Moreover, laws of the separate States cannot deal with it effectively. Congress, at least, had a basis for that belief. * * * Only a power that is national can serve the interests of all."

WELFARE IS LEGITIMATE CONCERN

In view of these legal opinions, I think I have a sound basis, grounded in law, for my contention that an interest—and an active interest—in the general welfare is a legitimate concern of government. But there is another basic argument—a sort of obbligato that runs through bar journal compositions—a plaintive reproach that "our forefathers would not have done this." Here, again, I am in perfect accord. I am sure that the theory of a state concerned with social security, with public housing, with industrial relationships, with farm-price supports, was, in the words of Mr. Holman, "not conceived by our forefathers."

I can only add that in the eighteenth century, in an almost totally agrarian economy, years before the industrial revolution, before steam and electricity, in the time of small-farm owners, each of whom could produce for himself more than enough food for his own needs—at that time in our and in the world's history it would have seemed rather odd for our forefathers to base their plans on a twentieth-century civilization. Even the imaginative men who form our Union could hardly have been expected to visualize modern factories and skyscrapers, radios, and airplanes. It seems to me that what these gentlemen are saying is much like crying out, "Take a horse," to the driver of a 1950 convertible.

So I am not dismayed by the fact that our ancestors did not conceive of the necessity for certain kinds of social legislation—I would be much more startled if they had. However, there is one point I think our two historians ignore. These same propagandists of our democracy felt strongly and deeply the need for defending it, and took every measure they knew in order to preserve it.

When Thomas Jefferson argued passionately for States' rights, it was at a time when the new Federal Government was dominated by the bankers and a few rich landowners. The democratic participation of the people was in those days only possible in the local communities. Jefferson was defending, not the prerogatives of the states to supersede the Nation, but the prerogatives of the people—of the masses of the people—as opposed to the interests of the small wealthy group who were trying to take control of the Government.

When Andrew Jackson vetoed the Bank Charter, it was because he considered that the bank would make the rich richer and the poor poorer, and he proclaimed it his duty to take a stand against all new grants • • • of exclusive privileges, against any prostitution of our Government to the advancement of the few at the expense of the many.

When Lincoln had the sad obligation to lead the Nation into a civil war, it was because he believed the responsibility of the Nation to all its people came before the economic interest of some of the States in maintaining slavery—that human rights came above States' rights.

And this, I think, is perhaps the most important issue of all. The president of the bar association twists the meaning of our forefathers by a reduction of the statement that all men are created equal. He turns this into all men are not created equal. It is an interesting reinterpretation. He makes it, because, he argues, otherwise the shiftless and the industrious would have to be considered equal. And, of course, therefore there would be no more incentive for private enterprise.

I find these arguments extraordinary. I never knew that equality of opportunity was equivalent to the division of the world's goods into equal portions. But since we did not live in 1789, as Mr. Holman seems to deplore, what kind of government would we have if we did not at least try to equalize the chances for everyone?

THE EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

If Mr. Holman had been black instead of white, if he had been a factory worker instead of a member of the bar, he might well listen differently to words such as those of Woodrow Wilson, who in his first inaugural address, pointed out that:

"There can be no equality of opportunity, if men and women and children be not shielded in their lives, their very vitality, from the consequences of great industrial and social processes which they cannot alter, control, or singly cope with. Society must see to it that it does not itself crush or weaken or damage its own constituent parts. The first duty of law is to keep sound the society it serves. Sanitary laws, pure-food laws, and laws determining conditions of labor which individuals are powerless to determine for themselves are intimate parts of the very business of justice and legal efficiency."

Mr. Martin goes even further than his colleague in his denunciation of the interference of government in defending human rights. He not only considers the protection of human rights an inappropriate function for the Federal Government, or for the nations of the world. He believes that genocide—homicide compounded—should not be considered a crime, or at the most, that no one should be punished for it if the very persons who committed it do not so wish it. Do you by any chance notice any similarity between this point of view and some of the lynching trials that have taken place in Mr. Martin's part of the country?

But again, the definitions made by Messrs. Holman and Martin are excellent. I, too, think the concept of the welfare state is inseparable from an acceptance—more than that, an insistence—on the rights of all people to be treated as human beings, and to have equal opportunities and equal justice.

So, altogether, these two legal writers have helped to state my position succinctly. I believe a welfare state is a state concerned with the welfare of all its people not only with the interests of the few and powerful. I believe such a state in the society of today must make provision for the social and economic security of its members, since society is so constructed that there are many factors beyond the control of the individual. I believe that in an industrial system, where the machine might otherwise dominate the man, and the employer the employee, the Government has an obligation to see that the worker is protected in his right to work. I believe that in a country dedicated to free enterprise, the Government must be responsible for protecting free enterprise against the encroachment of monopolies. And above all, I believe that a country rooted in the concept that all men are created equal should be the leader of the world in carrying that concept to the far corners of the globe.

My two legal references concluded their denunciations with an exhortation to the legal profession, in the important and strategic posts they hold throughout the country—to put aside personal ambition in order to preserve our Nation against destructive forces. I can do no more than echo their sentiments. And I am convinced that as members of a profession which should, above all others, know the meaning and stand for the principles of justice, and as Americans, who should, above all other nationals, know the meaning and stand for the principles of democracy, you will agree with me—not with those two isolated legal secessionists—that we have no other course, except to preserve our system from the dangers of both the right and the left. To accomplish this, we have grave responsibilities, responsibilities of which we were reminded by President Roosevelt in the dark days of 1936, when he warned us:

"Democracy has disappeared in several other great nations, not because the people of those nations disliked democracy, but because they had grown tired of unemployment and insecurity. • • • In desperation they chose to sacrifice liberty in the hope of getting something to eat. We in America know that our democratic institutions can be preserved and made to work. But in order to preserve them we need • • • to prove that the practical operation of democratic government is equal to the task of protecting the security of the people."

One World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from an outstanding American who, because of his experience and training, has a wide and accurate knowledge of foreign affairs, comes a copy of a letter written to a member of another body.

This letter is so timely, so thoroughly American in its sentiment, that it is printed herewith:

JANUARY 19, 1950.

HON. WALTER J. MAHONEY,
Chairman, Finance Committee
of the Senate,
Capitol, Albany, N. Y.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have known you for some time by reputation as one of the ablest members of the senate, and you may be sure that I do not question the sincerity of your belief that by the development of a world government, peace can be assured to the world. While I differ with you in regard to this proposition, I trust you will credit me with equal sincerity in the expression of the belief, that had you lived among the teeming millions in India and Burma, even for a brief period, as I did in my youth—not merely traveling but actually living in the jungles among the people—you would hardly be inclined to sponsor the resolution you now have before the senate.

I say this, not because I think you would have been prejudiced against these people by reason of their color or their race—certainly, I was not, and that this lack of prejudice was reciprocated was proved by the circumstance that one man whose life I saved in upper Burma, and another to whom I had rendered some service in Ceylon, on bended knees and with their hands around my ankles, sought to enter my service for life—but, because I think you would have appreciated that these people, by and large, can only be governed by some form of paternalistic dictatorship. The historic native style was as often kindly as harsh. The British system was unquestionably irritating but benevolent. However, since the evacuation, I venture to believe that it will be the ultimate fate of all India to bear the Russian yoke.

Inasmuch as you may wonder at my basis for advancing this contention, perhaps I should say that for 9 months during World War I, as an officer of the United States Army, I was assigned to collaborate with a representative of the British Government in connection with the revolutionary movement in India insofar as it affected the interests of the United States. For this reason, I believe that I know who had a large part in instigating the revolutionary movement, and who fostered it after the war against Germany was concluded. That, however, is

another story. In any event, all Asia has a population of approximately one billion and a quarter. Popular government to this mass of human beings is a chimera but if ever this great horde could be made to understand its principles, Asia could outvote the world and her ideologies would be supreme.

In a comprehensive study of war initiated by the University of Chicago in 1926, which was carried forward under the direction of Prof. Quincy Wright, you will find a statement to the affect that a list of all revolutions, insurrections, interventions, punitive expeditions, pacifications, and explorations involving the use of armed forces would probably be more than 10 times as long as the 278 wars listed between the years 1500 and 1940. You will also find that although the United States had been involved in only 13 wars in its history, according to Professor Wright, it was in addition engaged in over 170 distinct military campaigns. (Cf. A Study of War, p. 636, et seq.) In other words, the inference is inescapable that the mere creation of a great state like our Federal Union does not preclude the possibility, and, I should be inclined rather to say, the inevitability of war.

The Pax Romana was probably the nearest thing to universal peace the world ever attained. It was a peace imposed upon a mixed and discordant population by a ruthless dictatorship and supported by a magnificent army. When that army became corrupted and was infiltrated by recruits derived from subject people, the Roman Empire collapsed. That result was, of course, as inevitable as it was logical.

Let us be realistic, Senator, so I ask you what kind of an army can we conceive would come into existence to support a world government today, if its recruits were apportioned fairly among all the peoples of the world. Who would command such an army? Our people represent only 6 percent of the world's population, so I venture to say, that on the basis of popular representation we certainly would not be in control, at least not for long after we surrendered the position we now hold.

In a speech entitled "Un-American Internationalism," delivered in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, June 14, 1949, by Congressman ROY O. WOODRUFF, an important point was brought out which should not be lost to sight. "There is," said Congressman WOODRUFF, "actually in existence today a government whose fundamental purpose is known to be the establishment of the supremacy of its system over all peoples of the earth. I refer, of course, to the Soviet Union. The population of that country is composed of 182 different nationalities, speaking 149 different languages or dialects, and the Government of the Soviet Union only maintains itself in power by the exercise of a ruthless dictatorship, which is utterly unthinkable to people who believe in popular self-government.

Let me add to this quotation that it is, I believe, common knowledge that the Soviet Government now has under restraint in terrible concentration camps some ten to fifteen million of its people.

As I, and the people associated with me in the American Coalition, which is an organization of 85 of the leading patriotic societies in our country, believe in a government of the people and by the people, as set forth by Lincoln in his Gettysburg Address, we cannot contemplate, therefore, with equanimity the submergence of our system in a world government composed of people who, by traditions, customs, and habits of life belong, or are subject to the control of, wholly different ideologies, and, above all, of widely divergent interests.

The United States at the present moment, and has, since we granted the loan of $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain, been supporting a Socialist government whose fundamental program is, in substance, like that laid down by Karl Marx. It differs in fact only in a minor degree from the professed ideals now set forth by the rulers of Soviet Russia. Likewise, we are financing regimes on the continent of Europe which are socialistic in character, and differ only in varying degrees from that of Britain and Russia in the ideologies professed by their rulers. In other words, we are paying for the maintenance in power of a number of these governments, who, by reason of their special interests only are not, at this moment, sympathetic with those in control of the Soviet Government in Moscow.

I suggest, my dear Senator, that the only way concord can be maintained between such divergent interests in the ultimate is by force ruthlessly applied. For my part, and that of my associates in the American coalition, it seems that the United States can render a greater service to humanity by upholding the torch of liberty as an example to the world than in burying our sovereignty in a world government. We Americans in the American Coalition loathe fascism, we detest communism, and we abhor all forms of dictatorship.

Now, let me say a few words regarding the economic aspects of this proposal. I have before me a copy of a leaflet entitled "Beliefs, Purposes, and Policies," of the United World Federalists, Inc., and I see on the second page:

"*Resolved*, That a world federal government must initially be based upon the following principles and include the following powers:

"PRINCIPLES

"1. Basic structure: The world federal government should include the following basic organs: (a) a world legislature to enact all laws necessary to carry out the functions delegated to the world federal government; (b) a world executive agency to administer and enforce the laws; (c) world courts to interpret the constitution and laws, and to try and to sentence lawbreakers.

• • • • •

"4. Enforcement of world law: World law should be enforceable directly upon individuals.

• • • • •

"7. Revenue: The world federal government should have authority to raise dependable revenue under a carefully defined and limited but direct taxing power independent of national taxation."

There is the program. If it goes into effect, we would cease to be free. We would be a minority of 6 percent in the face of 94 percent of the world population. What that means I suggest would be well set forth in an analysis of the races of the world and their degrees of civilization. The Dictionary of Races and Peoples, published by the Immigration Commission of the Senate in 1911, is a source authority to which I respectfully refer you. We Americans would be subject to tribunals manned by people foreign to us in a multitude of ways. In this connection I suggest a rereading of our Declaration of Independence.

Finally, consider the power to tax which it is proposed to confer upon the superstate which the world federalists envisage. It is a well-worn, but, nevertheless, true axiom that the power to tax is the power to destroy.

I venture to say, Senator, that it is no answer to assert that the taxing power would be limited under the constitution of the world government because once our country entered the arms of this Frankenstein our power to resist unjust impositions would be gone, and our right to secede is specifically denied in the program.

There is, my dear Senator, in a magazine entitled "American Affairs," volume X, No. 3, dated July 1948, an extremely interesting article entitled "How To Equalize the Wealth of the World." In this article it sets forth, in substance, that, according to the latest estimates (1936-39), the population of the world amounts to 2,145,000,000. A corresponding estimate of the population of the United States at that time was 130,000,000, or around 6 percent of the world's total population.

The article also sets forth that the wealth of the world amounts to $1,100,000,000,000, and that of the United States around $330,000,000,000, or 30 percent of the total.

The income of the world is given as around $210,000,000,000, and the income of the United States, as of 1940, from $72,000,000,000 to $75,000,000,000, or a percentage of the world's total of 34 to 36 percent.

Now let me quote from the article:

"In order to establish equality throughout the world, the United States must retain only her per capita share of the total world income, i. e., she must reduce her income to 6 percent of the total, and must give away the remaining 30 percent of the world income which she now holds, so that 94 percent of the population outside the United States will also receive 94 percent of the world income. This operation would theoretically raise the rest of the world to an average per capita income of one unit—which is a theoretical gain of 50 percent from the present average. But the average citizen of the United States would, in the process, lose five-sixths of his income."

Now, Senator, let me suggest to you as a practical politician, that in the face of the virtual bankruptcy of the world, the inevitable result of our submergence in a world government would be the reapportionment of our wealth and the destruction of our immigration barriers, so that the overpopulation of Europe and Asia could swarm upon us and destroy the magnificent structure, whose foundations were laid by the men who brought about our separation from the British Empire.

This is a long letter, and I trust that you will pardon the scope which it encompasses, but the subject, I believe, is vital to the continuance of our existence, and that is my excuse for burdening you with this communication.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN B. TREVOR.

A Good Tag Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of January 19, 1950:

A GOOD TAG GAME

Republican leaders have come up with two fresh ideas in the new session of Congress. One is a dud and the other a dandy. The first is the notion that next November's election is going to be one on the island of Formosa. The project for military intervention would play Moscow's game by fastening Chinese attention on "American imperialism" while Russia seizes Manchuria. It's a game that holds many pitfalls, few votes.

But the second idea—that of putting price tags on Fair Deal projects—carries a lot of promise. The idea of telling the people how much each slice of Truman pie-in-the-sky is going to cost strikes us as not only good

sport but good politics. It's a fair game, for the administration has either refused or neglected to let the voter know what the bill will be for several of its more glamorous offerings. For instance, the Brannan farm plan and the Ewing medical insurance plan have been well advertised—with the price tag carefully omitted.

A really fair deal would give citizens an honest accounting. And we trust that if the Republicans start this tag game they will be scrupulously careful to give accurate and clear statements of the cost for each project before Congress—including their own pets. Of course, there are some folks to whom prices mean nothing—especially if they think somebody else is paying. For this reason it might be useful to tell voters who think they pay no taxes how much each project will cost in hidden taxes—of which the average family pays $700 a year.

But we believe the great majority of Americans are honestly ready to pay their own way—refusing to buy when they can't. Even those willing to "charge it" want to see the price tag. Let's have the goods on the counter, plainly marked.

Power Grabbers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of December 22, 1948:

POWER GRABBERS

Representative EBERHARTER reports that 25 percent of the House Members have responded to his recent proposal for curbing the dictatorial Rules Committee, and nearly all the replies are favorable. If this reform is adequately presented to Members of the House, it will probably have the support of a large majority. For the average Congressman is interested in getting legislation enacted and is as disgusted as other citizens when the Rules Committee takes upon itself the responsibility of saying that the House shall not vote on measures that a majority may favor.

Legislators of the Seventy-ninth Congress will remember that when the House Labor Committee reported out a labor-relations bill the Rules Committee impertinently discarded it and gave a special rule to the much more drastic Case bill. The latter bill had been introduced only 2 days previously and had never been considered by a legislative committee. In other words, the Rules Committee usurped the function of the Labor Committee and disrupted the orderly process of lawmaking instead of aiding it. This year the Rules Committee forced the emasculation of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill before permitting it to go to the floor. It was responsible in very large measure for the defeat of that bill and thus contributed immeasurably to the Republican debacle in November.

Of course, the House never intended to give any small group of men such arbitrary power. It created the Rules Committee only to facilitate the flow of legislation by granting priority to important bills and prescribing conditions under which they may be debated. The rule makers have come to be dictators only because House leaders and a long-suffering membership have tolerated that breach of trust. Once before the House surrendered its powers of legislation in accord with the wishes of the majority, but those abuses were swept away in the revolt against Uncle Joe Cannon in 1910. Now another uprising must curb the powers of the Rules Committee if the House is to become a reliable instrument of the popular will. The first duty of every progressive, democratic, and liberal-minded Representative in the Eighty-first Congress will be to reduce the power-grabbing Rules Committee to its proper status as a legislative traffic director.

Real Estate Road Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an article appearing in the January 2, 1950, issue of the New Republic entitled "Real Estate Road Show":

REAL ESTATE ROAD SHOW

Unable to defeat the slum-clearance and public-housing sections of the Housing Act in Congress last session, the real-estate lobby is putting pressure on local city councils throughout the country to refuse Federal assistance for construction of low-cost housing. The lobby opened its drive early this month when the National Association of Real Estate Boards passed a resolution opposing the "$15,000,000,000 socialized-housing program," urging State and local home builders to "carry on the fight" by referenda, and recommending that Congress amend the act to limit "occupancy in all socialized housing to the indigent." Since that convention, the lobby has appeared before city councils in St. Petersburg, Norfolk, Dallas, and other sizable cities in its all-out effort to scuttle the low-cost-housing program.

At St. Petersburg, the owners of slum property teamed up with the apartment house owners, and hotel men's association, the local real estate board, and private builders and contractors. Through advertisements in the local papers and personal contact with a friendly city council, they charged that the housing program would jeopardize the income of units normally rented to tourists, that construction of new housing units would absorb all skilled labor in this field, crippling the builders, and, following the lead of NAREB, that public housing would kill private enterprise and initiative. The city council and the mayor openly opposed the Federal program and are referring the matter to the voters in a referendum.

The lobby was not so successful in Norfolk. Last week, the city council adopted an ordinance paving the way for construction of some 3,000 low-rent housing units which will cost an estimated $28,000,000.

The real-estate interests are now concentrating on Texas, where the lobby hopes to force referenda in Dallas, San Antonio, Beaumont, and Corpus Christi. If the request for a referendum is turned down by the city council, the group has threatened to circulate a petition in an effort to force the issue.

Tell It to the Pentagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harlan Trott from the Christian Science Monitor of January 12, 1950:

TELL IT TO THE PENTAGON

(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—So the marines think they're tough, do they.

Montezuma, Tripoli, Chateau-Thierry, Guadalcanal, Iwo Jima? Huh.

Never mind the howitzers, men. Belay those ready assault waves. Call off your close-air support. Those marines aren't that tough. We've found a way to lick 'em.

Scuttle 'em in one sentence. Let 'em have it—smack in the budget.

Like this, see: "Six Marine Corps battalion landing teams will be maintained."

Six battalions of marines, a bare half a division, is all the new 1951 budget leaves the Nation's "first team"—instead of the two skeletonized divisions of the fleet marine force Congress and the country have been counting on as the hard, steel spearhead of a force-in-readiness poised and ready to move by land or sea or air on less than 24 hours' notice.

This solar plexus punch by the Pentagon planners did not take the marines by surprise. The fact is they saw it coming.

They have been warning Congress about the fancy footwork of top defense officials, the familiar tactic of stroking the Marine Corps with one hand and yanking its funds out from under it with the other.

Gen. Clifton Cates, Marine Corps Commandant, reminded the Vinson committee last October of the fears within the corps that the functions assigned it by law are being unsurped by others, namely the Army General Staff.

The prevailing opinion around the Army section of the Pentagon seems to be that the Marine Corps is a luxury the country can do without. Generals Bradley and Collins have given the impression that there's nothing in the Marines' Manual the Army can't do as well.

They admit that the marines pioneered and perfected the techniques of amphibious warfare. But look at the Army's record in Sicily, southern France, and Normandy, the generals say. They are especially proud of their webfooted exploits in Normandy where General Eisenhower's infantrymen swarmed out of the surf and over the German west wall.

General Cates told the Vinson committee last October that the corps was pared down to the limit of its bone and muscle. Any further reductions in combat strength, he intimated, would be fatal to the concept of the force-in-readiness which Congress mapped out for the marines.

Now, the thing General Cates greatly feared has come upon the marines in the new 1951 defense budget, which cuts the present nucleus of two divisions in half. Marine Corps leaders say this reduces them to the role of policemen as effectively as though the issue had never been debated in Congress and decided in the Marine Corp's favor.

In writing the 1947 National Security Act, Congress plainly intended to safeguard the

Marine Corps, especially its amphibious functions, and provide for its integrated mobilization in time of war.

But the trouble is that Congress didn't go far enough. It put a ceiling on the Marine Corps. It said the marines should not exceed 20 percent of the personnel of the Navy. But it failed to put a floor under the Marine Corps.

General Cates told the Vinson committee bluntly that the underlying effort on the part of the Army to contravene the act of Congress has never subsided. The Marine Commandant said furthermore that the Army was not seeking to have Congress redefine the roles and functions of the armed services but was proposing that the Joint Chiefs of Staff put to a vote the Army-sponsored proposal to transfer and reassign the traditional Marine Corps functions.

Each of those two budget-riddled Fleet Marine Forces—one on each coast—has been regarded as the Nation's No. 1 "force-in-readiness": Air-ground teams, developed during World War II when the marines perfected the method of coordinating the striking power of air and ground forces in a new form of attack.

Under the roles and missions drawn up at Key West at a conference of Army, Navy, and Air Force leaders, the Marine Corps was designated as the amphibious force-in-readiness to move within the first 24 hours after the outbreak of war.

It was assumed at Key West the Nation was confronted with the possibility of a war in which an opponent would hold the initiative. Circumstances alone, it was agreed, would restrict the United States to a series of damage-control operations—the marines' job—against the time when the Nation could grapple with the enemy somewhere on the flaming outer fringes.

The marines may be in for their hardest fight—their last one or their best one—when that sentence in the budget reducing the Fleet Marine Force to six battalion landing teams comes up for consideration. There are signs that they will have considerable close support in Congress by the time the decisive battle begins.

Opposition to FEPC Not Confined to South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a letter from Mr. Kern Dodge, engineer, Lewis Tower Building, Philadelphia, Pa., expressing in clear and forceful terms his opposition to the FEPC and his reasons therefor.

I commend his letter particularly to the attention of my colleagues who come from the Northern and Western States. As I have previously pointed out, the FEPC means regimentation of the employer wherever he may be, in Pennsylvania, in Michigan, in California, as well as in Mississippi. Behind the pious label and the lofty objectives of the bill lies the dark threat of the further intrusion of government into the liberties of the individual, of the further vesting of autocratic power in a bureaucratic body, of a further tendency toward a police state.

The letter from Mr. Dodge is as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 16, 1950.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: By all means, vote against any so-called civil-rights measures, especially those having to do with fair-employment practices. Such a bill would—

Deny employer freedom of contract;

Deny the employer the right of selective judgment in procuring his employees;

Deny to fellow employees the right of selecting associates;

Deny the employer the right to hire, promote, or discharge employees upon the basis of their efficiency, merit, or faithfulness.

It would subject the employer to endless investigation, harassment, and possible fines and penalties, determined by a commission.

It would deny the employer the right of trial by jury, and give him no right to a review of the facts found by the commission.

It would compel the employer to give testimony against himself and expose his private letters, books, and papers for the inspection and investigation of a horde of employees of the commission.

It would compel the employer to hire a person whom he did not wish to have in his employ, and deny him the privilege of selecting an employee of his own choice.

Such a commission would have the power to make rules and regulations which have the effect of laws, of which we have more than enough, and which hamstring business.

I am sure you would not vote for a bill which would require a person of a certain race or color to work for another against his will. Therefore, you should not vote for any bill which would require another person to employ someone to work for him against such employers will.

This whole civil-rights program is being pressed by certain minority groups who are not satisfied with life in the finest country in the world, but who wish to remake it for their own special selfish benefit.

Yours very truly,

KERN DODGE.

Confederate Memorial Day—Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address which I delivered to the Daughters of the Confederacy in Statuary Hall this afternoon, the one hundred and forty-third anniversary of the birth of Robert E. Lee.

The address referred to follows:

Madam Chairman, United Daughters of the Confederacy, ladies and gentlemen, first, permit me to thank your distinguished chairman for her flattering introduction.

It is a real pleasure to appear before you today, on this the one hundred and forty-third anniversary of the birth of Robert E. Lee, and to pay my humble tribute, not only to that distinguished leader, but to all the other heroes of the War Between the States.

I first want to pay my tribute to the glorious Daughters of the Confederacy, one of the greatest women's organizations the world has ever known. They, together with the Daughters of the American Revolution, have probably done more to protect our form of government and our American way of life than all the other women's organizations combined.

The Daughters of the Confederacy are due the credit for establishing our Memorial Day. On April 25, 1866, just 1 year after the war closed, the Daughters of the Confederacy at Columbus, Miss., in the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress, while decorating the graves of the Confederate dead, decorated alike the graves of about 40 Federal soldiers who had been buried there.

The news of this incident spread throughout the country and brought from the pen of the Honorable Francis Miles Finch, a distinguished northern writer, a little poem called the Blue and the Gray, that will live as long as this Republic lasts.

This incident occurred on the banks of the Tombigbee River, the inland river to which Judge Finch refers in his beautiful poem, in which he said:

"By the flow of the inland river,
Whence the fleets of iron have fled,
Where the blades of the grave grass quiver,
Asleep are the ranks of the dead;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the one the blue,
Under the other the gray.

"These in the robings of glory,
Those in the gloom of defeat,
All with the battle blood gory,
In the dusk of eternity meet;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the laurel, the blue,
Under the willow, the gray."

He closed with this verse:

"No more shall the war cry sever,
Or the winding rivers be red;
They banish our anger forever
When they laurel the graves of our dead.
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Love and tears for the blue,
Tears and love for the gray."

Standing back of me, or I should say almost beside me here, are the statues of two outstanding figures of the Confederacy, Robert E. Lee, the great commander of the Confederate forces—the War Between the States—and probably the greatest commander of men the world has ever known, and Jefferson Davis, the only President of the Confederacy.

Theodore Roosevelt characterized Lee as the greatest commander of the English-speaking race.

Field Marshal Wolseley, of the British Army, once said Lee was the ablest general and to him the greatest man he had ever conversed with. He said "I was simply awed with his inherent greatness."

As Senator Ben Hill, of Georgia, once said:

"When the future historian shall come to survey the character of Lee, he will find it rising like a huge mountain above the undulating plain of humanity, and he must lift his eyes high toward heaven to catch its summit. He possessed every virtue of other great commanders without their vices.

"He was a foe without hate, a friend without treachery, a soldier without cruelty, a victor without oppression, and a victim without murmuring.

"He was a public officer without vices, a private citizen without wrong, a neighbor without reproach, a Christian without hypocrisy, and a man without guile.

"He was Caesar without his ambition, Frederick without his tyranny, Napoleon without his selfishness, and Washington without his reward.

"He was obedient to authority as a servant, and royal in authority as a true king. He was gentle as a woman in life, modest

and pure as a virgin in thought, watchful as a Roman vestry in duty, submissive to law as Socrates, and grand in battles as Achilles."

In the words of Oliver Goldsmith—

"As some tall cliff that lifts its awful form
Swells from the vale, and midway leaves the storm—
Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread
Eternal sunshine settles on its head."

He stands today the most commanding, the most masterly, the most serenely inspiring figure upon the horizon of human history.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without pausing to pay my respects to Jefferson Davis, the great president of the Confederacy, whom Caleb Cushing once characterized as being "eloquent among the most eloquent in debate, wise among the wisest in counsel, and brave among the bravest on the battlefield."

He was the real victim of the War Between the States; but as time goes on, and the people of the world learn the facts his stature will grow with the passing years.

Bishop Galloway once said of him:

"Marvelous, many-sided, masterful man, his virtues will grow brighter and his name be writ larger with each passing century. Soldier, hero, statesman, gentleman, American—a prince of Christian chivalry, the uncrowned chief of an invisible republic of loving and loyal hearts—when another 100 years have passed no intelligent voice will fail to praise him and no patriotic hand will refuse to place a laurel wreath upon his radiant brow."

If Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, U. S. Grant, Abraham Lincoln, and all those brave men who wore the gray and the ones who wore the blue in the War Between the States, could come back today and see what is going on in this country, they would probably forget their differences and join hands in a supreme effort to save this Republic, this great constitutional Government of ours, as well as our American way of life, from being destroyed by our enemies abroad, who are aided and abetted by the enemies within our gates.

We, the sons, grandsons, and collateral relatives of the men on both sides of that great conflict, are joining hands today, across the walls of party politics, to try to protect this Nation, and to protect American liberty—that proud heritage of patriotism, conceived in the minds of the greatest statesmen the world has ever produced, guarded and protected by the undying loyalty of a noble ancestry—to preserve and defend that liberty in our time and transmit it unimpaired to our posterity, that this grand old Republic, with its free institutions, its guaranties of liberty, and our American way of life, may go on down to the future with strength in her loins, hope in her soul, and the eternal song of triumph on her lips.

New Russian Diversionary Moves Expected by Diplomatic Observers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown concerning future courses of action by Russia which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of January 19, 1950:

NEW RUSSIAN DIVERSIONARY MOVES EXPECTED BY DIPLOMATIC OBSERVERS

(By Constantine Brown)

The time is approaching, according to a number of diplomatic and military observers, when a new Russian blowup should be expected somewhere in Europe or the Near East.

These observers do not claim to have positive information as to when and where it may happen. Their fears are based principally on the Russian strategy of creating diversions in one sector of the world in order to help themselves in another.

The Berlin blockade and airlift are mentioned as particular instances of Russia's deceptive diplomatic strategy.

From the strictly military point of view Berlin was of no consequence either to the Russians or the Western Powers. At the time when the blockade was established Moscow's plans for the conquest of China had ripened.

INCIDENTS COOKED UP

The reorganization of the Chinese Communist armies had been completed and they were facing fairly efficient nationalistic forces, which were weakened by the State Department's undeclared embargo on arms shipments.

The Nationalist forces were supported, however, by the American Congress. The Republican-dominated Eightieth Congress was determined to carry out the commitments of President Roosevelt to the Nationalist Government. Moreover, at that time—the winter of 1948—President Truman himself wished to follow the policies of his predecessor.

It became essential to distract the minds of the American Government and its people from the Far East. The Berlin incidents and blockade then were cooked up.

This was countered by an American-British move in which prestige took precedence over military necessity. We were not going to be pushed out of the shambles of the former German capital by the Russians, it was said, and the spectacular airlift was decided on as an answer to the Soviet blockade.

For more than a year the attentions of the western peoples were focused on Berlin. Whenever it appeared that public attention in American and western Europe was relaxing, as the airlift became routine, inflammatory incidents—such as collisions between airlift planes and Soviet fighters—were concocted by the Russian authorities. This revived western interest and rumbles of an immediate war between East and West began to spread in the West.

But all this time the real Soviet action was taking place on the Chinese mainland. With America chiefly interested in the airlift, little thought could be given to China.

REDS GAINED OBJECTIVE

The Nationalist armies gradually lost heart, while the Chinese Communist forces gained strength. Finally, the Russians gave up their spectacular plan of deception in Berlin and lifted the blockade. By this time, however, they had achieved their objectives.

The Soviet puppets in China defeated the Nationalists. Moscow helped itself to three juicy slices—Mongolia, Sinkiang, and Manchuria, while the rest of that vast country was placed under the leadership of Moscow's Charlie McCarthy—Mao Tse-tung.

By the time we awoke to what had happened to us in the Far East it was too late. We were faced with an accomplished fact in China, alteration of which we are neither willing, prepared, nor capable.

We discovered belatedly—despite statements to the contrary by those who muffed the ball—that our strategic position in the Pacific and Indian Oceans had been dangerously weakened. The arguments advanced by the administration supporters, both in and out of Congress, and the unprecedented official attacks on Chiang Kai-shek, chief of state of one of our allies, are clear indication that American officials feel our policy may have missed fire.

While we were looking across the Atlantic the Soviets stole China. Now we are looking across the Pacific, wondering what happened. It is probable that this interest on the part of politicians and the people in general will continue for some time.

Meanwhile, the Russians are suspected, and not without well-founded reason, of preparing to resume their diversionary tactics somewhere in Europe or the Near East.

The Upset Down Under—No. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Morley Cassidy, from the Washington Evening Star:

THE UPSET DOWN UNDER—V—BRIGHT PLANS THICK AS BLOSSOMS IN NEW ZEALAND'S LITTLE EDEN

(By Morley Cassidy)

WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND, January 20.—Bright new plans are busting out all over this little Garden of Eden, thick as the Pohutukawa blossoms in the midsummer air.

"You won't see me driving a cab much longer," says Frank Choate, 33, a veteran of the New Guinea campaign, as he drives you to your hotel.

"My chum and I, we are going in business for ourselves, making the best fruit drink you ever tasted.

"We've been trying to do it for 3 years but the old government wouldn't give us a license. Said it wasn't economic.

"Now we can go ahead. And you watch—you'll be drinking our product in the States one of these days."

HE'LL RAISE SHEEP

Up in Auckland, Hartley C. Peeres, an insurance salesman, has a gleam in his eye. He's going to raise sheep, a job he was born to.

"I've been trying since 1947 to buy a place down south on the island," he says. "An old chap there has been running 1,000 ewes and I told him I could double that so we made a fair deal. But the old government stopped it. It fixed the price so low the old chap wouldn't sell. Now maybe we can get together."

Plans are blooming everywhere. An elderly gentleman sunning himself on the Parliament House grounds happily tells of his hope that he now can sell his Wellington home for enough to build a cottage near his old home at Dunedin. A bustling grocer on Lambton quay brings out his plans for modernizing his shop by putting in a frozen-food department.

In the Hawkes Bay area a group of businessmen are organizing a new building company to turn out prefabricated houses. Everywhere tens of thousands see a chance at last to buy their own homes.

All New Zealand, in short, is tasting the intoxicating pleasures of an exciting idea.

The idea? Don't laugh. Free enterprise.

It may be a phrase to scoff at in other places. But not here. While other countries have been enjoying free enterprise and sometimes jeering at it in recent years, New Zealand has been getting a man-sized dose of its alternative, socialism.

SOCIALISTS ARE MYSTIFIED

Why? Socialism's leaders, wandering idly through the halls of Parliament House, where they ruled for 14 years, are mystified and saddened.

They thought they had made New Zealand a happy land. Their Labor government had given the people the most advanced social-security system in the world.

Sociologists came from all over the world to study its generous old-age, widow's, and invalid's pensions, its free medical and hospital care, its unemployment payments, sickness benefits, veterans' allowances, and dozens of other safeguards against misfortune.

They could point to such full employment that a waiter in a Lambton quay restaurant boasts, "I could step into a dozen other jobs tomorrow."

They could point to the best wage level and shortest hours in the nation's history, and to more legal paid holidays than any land in the world. But New Zealand has quietly but firmly turned out the men who did all this, and today is preparing to gallop down the reactionary road of free enterprise.

"It was the vote of the young people that turned the scales," says Walter Nash, genial, kindly Minister of Finance, who was New Zealand's wartime envoy to the United States.

He shakes his head sadly. "Young chaps don't remember what times were like in the depression. It's a pity. They talk of restrictions because they never knew what hard times were like."

And that, say New Zealanders of all ages, is exactly the spirit which they have finally cast aside.

GHOSTS OF 1932

"For 14 years," says a 38-year-old Wellington haberdasher, "the Labor Party has kept us living in the midst of a slump that ended in 1936. They've kept ghosts of 1932 dancing before our eyes every minute.

"At every election they have bombarded us with speeches about 'eating the bitter bread of charity,' about the days of the soup kitchens and of cast-off clothing.

"But we have discovered slowly that we were buying security at the cost of freedom."

New Zealand, eagerly setting out on the road of free enterprise under the government of Prime Minister S. G. Holland, is not casting security aside. Its social-security program, much less sweeping than England's, much less generous in many respects than those in many American States, was never an issue in the recent elections.

It is almost universally approved and the new government is pledged to maintain and safeguard it.

"We didn't shoot Santa Claus," says a young Wellington professor. "We voted to keep him alive when he was about to die of arteriosclerosis."

When New Zealanders today tell why they turned against the socialistic theories of the Labor government, and what they hope for from the new regime of free enterprise, one word inevitably pops out: "restrictions."

It is a word that stands for hardening of the bureaucratic arteries, a disease which a majority of New Zealanders find has grown with every year of Socialist planning.

THEY FELT BLOCKED BY PLANNERS

"It had just got so nobody could turn around," says an earnest young policeman. "We just had to turn the people loose to get things rolling." Every second New Zealander today is eager to tell how restrictions have crippled New Zealand's normal progress.

Tens of thousands are like Choate, the taxi driver, who has been wanting to set up his own business. Labor planners have compelled every man to get a license to go into business. Licenses were never granted if the new business threatened to compete with Government-run enterprises or were not economically essential to the community.

So tens of thousands of ideas for earning British pounds or American dollars have been blocked at the outset because planners couldn't see the possibilities.

Peres, the insurance salesman, is an example of another hated restriction—land-sales control.

Four classes have been hit here—farmers and would-be farmers, home owners, and home seekers.

With noble intentions—avoiding land-price inflation—Socialist planners limited farm land prices to 22 times the value of the land's 1942 production. Well and good, but today's production is far higher and the prices of products have doubled. No one has been willing to sell.

Old owners have held the land, often restricting the number of sheep to avoid the risk that any farm with over 1,000 ewes might be divided under another Government rule, and eager ex-servicemen haven't been able to buy farms under any circumstances.

Home owners and home seekers have been hit the same way, with prices frozen at 1942 values. The old gentleman in the Parliament House Grounds is a perfect example of how bureaucratic rigidity has frustrated its own purposes.

WHY SHOULD I SELL?

"Government assessors put my four-room house down at £1,100, about $3,000," he says. "I could find 20 people tomorrow to pay me £2,000, and it would cost me £1,400 to build a three-room cottage at Dunedin. Why should I sell?"

Tens of thousands of home seekers, as a result, are still waiting for homes which owners are only too eager to sell at a price based on replacement costs.

One of the most effective posters for the recent campaign was headed, "Everything under control" and showed the Labor government dangling from a cluster of balloons labeled "coal-mine control, egg control, waterfront control, land-sales control, and rent control."

New Zealanders might have endured the controls willingly if the benefits were clearly visible, but a disastrous series of experiments in Government-run enterprises and the mounting costs of social services have brought steadily soaring taxes.

But the greatest evil seen by the new generation of New Zealanders is in controls which have blocked individual effort and competition which would reduce prices.

It is this that makes free enterprise appeal to New Zealanders as an exciting idea full of promise for the future of the last happy land of earth.

Policy for China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson relative to our China policy which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on January 19:

ON THE RECORD—POLICY ADVANCED BY ACHESON FOR CHINA DECLARED SO EXTREMELY COMPREHENSIBLE

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, speaking at the National Press Club last Thursday, advanced a policy for China (and we presume, for the rest of the world) which has all the charm of extreme novelty.

"The single, most important fact shaping American policy in the Far East," Mr. Acheson said, "was the attaching by the Soviet Union of the four northern areas of China." The United States must not now do anything which might divert Chinese attention from Russia, he continued, for the division of China "must bring upon the Russians the hatred and righteous anger of the Chinese people."

PLANNED IT THAT WAY?

So we planned it that way? The reason for the secret treaty at Yalta, giving Russia special privileges in Manchuria, was just to encourage Russia to overreach herself? The reason for forcing the truce upon Chiang Kai-shek in November 1945, and allowing tens of thousands of Communist troops to escape; and for insisting in 1946 that the Kalgan Pass be opened to permit a million Communists to move into Manchuria and be armed by the Russians with the entire equipment of the Japanese Kwantung Army, was to be sure that by Russian encroachment in China, the Chinese people would recognize their real enemy?

Do we, perhaps, have a secret agent in the Russian Politburo who directed the Soviet Union to annex the four northern provinces of China, since this is going to make the Chinese people awfully sore?

We don't like the Nationalist Government—runs the argument—so it is well for the Communists to defeat it. But communism being synonymous with Russian imperialism is hostile to the real interest of the people of China, and they will revolt. Ergo, the more successful Russian communism is, the less successful it will be.

No wonder George Kennan, author of the containment policy, resigned from the State Department. To contain communism is putting the cart before the horse, said Secretary Acheson. "It is the United States aim to develop within the people a resistance to communism based on the dignity and rights of every people to develop their own way * * * anyone who violates the integrity of China is the enemy of China and is acting contrary to our own interest."

But, apparently, you can't develop a resistance to communism until you first have it, nor rise in righteous anger against the violation of territorial integrity until it is violated.

This is certainly a subtlety outsubtling the Kremlin.

ENEMIES THEY, OURSELVES?

What we want to know, however, is just how the indignation of the Chinese (and other) peoples is going to express itself once the Russian noose is around their necks and all anti-Communist leaders assassinated or exiled?

There are at present some million Nationalist guerrillas on the Chinese mainland. There are 300,000 Chinese Nationalist troops (trained by the United States) in Formosa. There is a leadership, now very reduced, but still a leadership, and all these express the hatred and righteous anger of the Chinese people.

But we mustn't support them. No, we must wait for something more inspiring—obviously another Tito.

Maybe Secretary Acheson has one in mind. We suggest, however, that the Russians have

thought of that possibility, and aren't going to let it happen twice.

At any rate, we have a new foreign policy, surely the most remarkable in our history—and so extremely comfortable. Under it we don't have to do a thing except keep our own purposes perfectly straight, perfectly pure, perfectly aboveboard, and our enemies will do all the rest for us.

Stalin doesn't know it, but he's our ally. The more people's he subjects, the more he will be hated and, conversely, the more we, sitting still in our perfect purity, will be loved.

Obviously, too, we were wrong about Hitler. If we had just let him take the world, people would have been plenty sore, and would have revolted—the Jews, for instance.

It is incredible. But it's true; it's the policy.

Coal Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the continuing stoppage in the soft-coal fields is doing irreparable harm to our Nation. The effects are being felt more every day by both domestic and industrial users. The midwestern home owners are suffering for the arrogant attitude of one man—John L. Lewis. Although bituminous coal is rarely used for domestic heating purposes in New England, its industrial use is almost universal.

Telegrams and letters I have received from the Bristol (Conn.) Brass Corp.; the Naugatuck (Conn.) Chemical Co.; the Chase Brass & Copper Co., Waterbury, Conn.; and the Scovill Manufacturing Co., Waterbury, Conn., outline the difficulties faced by these concerns in maintaining production of essential products. A continuance of this unwarranted work stoppage will result in the unemployment of thousands of workers in Connecticut who can ill afford to be idle.

The President is evidently reluctant to invoke the provisions of a statute duly passed by the Congress to halt this one-man dictation to the whole Nation. Whether the President approves or disapproves of the Taft-Hartley Act is of no consequence. It is his sworn duty to administer the laws of our country, notwithstanding the pressure of certain groups who exert tremendous influence.

The telegrams follow;

JANUARY 17, 1950.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The account of coal shortage St. Joseph Zinc Co. have notified us that they will have to suspend shipments of zinc from their Josephtown Smelter at Josephtown, Pa., because Duquesne Power Co. will cut off power this Friday. Zinc is one of our basic metals and will affect our operations if this condition is not remedied. Please see if you cannot do something which will help this situation.

BRISTOL BRASS CORP.,
A. D. WARNER, CHAIRMAN.

JANUARY 19, 1950.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Coal shortage increasingly affecting supply of essential materials. For example shutdown of Duquesne Power Co. for lack of coal will paralyze production by St. Joseph Lead Co., of zinc oxide, an indispensable material for rubber and chemical industries. Urgently request you use your influence to effect use of existing legal measures to end this intolerable slow-down of vital industrial activities.

NAUGATUCK CHEMICAL CO.,
P. E. RICE, *Factory Manager.*

CHASE BRASS & COPPER CO.,
Waterbury, Conn., January 18, 1950.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: We have just been advised by one of our suppliers of zinc that they will be forced to suspend shipments because of the action of the Duquesne Power Co. in shutting off industrial power due to the coal shortage.

Any interruption in the supply of zinc will be serious for the brass industry, and, if continued, result in curtailment of operations with resulting unemployment throughout the brass industry.

Settlement of the present difficulty in the coal industry is, we feel, of vital importance, and we urge that every possible effort will be made to bring this about promptly.

Very truly yours,
CHASE BRASS & COPPER CO.,
W. E. HUSTED,
Executive Vice President.

SCOVILL MANUFACTURING CO.,
Waterbury, Conn., January 18, 1950.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: I thought you would be interested in knowing that the brass industry faces a very serious situation with reference to high-grade zinc.

We have been notified by one of our important sources that the Duquesne Power Co., which supplies the electric power for their thermic unit at Josephtown, Pa., is shutting off power commencing Friday due to coal shortage; and as you probably know, the New Jersey Zinc Co. has been closed for some time due to labor difficulties. The matter of power at the high-grade zinc plants about the country due to the coal shortage is very serious, and while we read in the papers there is no emergency due to the coal situation, we also hear of possible shut-downs all through the Middle West and the serious effect that this will have on Connecticut manufacturers, and I urge you to do all possible to endeavor to alleviate this situation.

Kind personal regards.

Very truly yours,
SCOVILL MANUFACTURING CO.,
W. M. GOSS,
Executive Vice President.

Medical Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star on Thursday, January 19. This article is by Dr. Walter A. Bloedorn, who is the dean of the George Washington University School of Medicine.

Dr. Bloedorn is a former citizen of Nebraska and a graduate from one of its medical schools. You will find his article, which is in answer to an editorial, "We Need More Doctors," to be factual and well written.

The article follows:

MEDICAL EDUCATION—DR. BLOEDORN DISSENTS FROM STAR EDITORIAL AND VIEWS AIRED AT ACADEMIC DEANS' CONFERENCE

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

I am writing you regarding the editorial We Need More Doctors published in the January 11, 1950, issue of the Evening Star. This editorial is based on statements reportedly made at the American Conference of Academic Deans held in Cincinnati on January 9, 1950.

Although the editorial admits that such a charge may be grossly unfair, it cites a statement which it asserts lends plausibility to the charge that the medical profession and the medical schools are protecting physicians from the competition of outsiders in keeping down the number of new students by extraordinary limitations placed upon admissions to our medical schools—wholesale exclusion of potentially good students—no matter how eligible many of them may be.

The idea is too naive to warrant the characterization of grossly unfair.

The Association of American Medical Colleges' headquarters' office in Chicago reports that for the year 1948–49 there were 6,514 freshmen enrolled in the medical schools. The number enrolled in 1949–50 was 6,887 which represents an increase of 373 over the previous year.

It is true that more students apply for admission to medical schools each year than are or can be admitted. The process, however, is one of selection and not of exclusion. The fact is that anyone, no matter how ill-prepared or ill-suited to undertake the long and difficult study of medicine, can apply. The fact is that thousands of those who do apply are wholly unqualified.

The careful selection of students for the practice and study of medicine is one of the most important functions of the medical school. Students are selected for admission on the basis of demonstration ability to do creditable work in premedical studies, tested medical aptitude, character, and motivation. The sole purpose of this careful selection is to assure, as nearly as possible at the outset, the training of physicians in whose hands patients would be willing to place the health and often the lives of themselves and their families.

FACTORS CONTROLLING ADMISSIONS

The actual number of students admitted to the medical school each year is determined, not by an arbitrary limit set in conspiracy by the medical profession and the medical schools, but by several more fundamental, if less sensational factors:

1. The capacity of the physical plant of the individual medical school: lectures and laboratory work cannot be conducted in the public parks.

2. The number of qualified teachers available to instruct the students; students cannot teach each other.

3. The number of hospital beds available for clinical instruction; students cannot learn medicine from books alone.

The physical plants and the teaching staffs of the medical schools are limited by budgets. Tuition fees cover but a fraction of the cost of medical education. At the present time the Nation's medical schools require additional financial support even to maintain existing facilities and faculties at the present standards.

The Nations' medical schools, at the moment, are training medical students at the limit of their capacity. The accelerated program in effect during World War II, in the opinion of most medical educators, lowers the standard of performance of the medical schools.

The number of students admitted to medical schools could, of course, be doubled overnight if standards regarding selection of students, adequacy of equipment, availability of qualified teachers, and sufficiency of clinical facilities were thrown overboard.

It is unlikely that the critics of the present system of medical education would willingly consult a physician trained under such circumstances.

The editorial also implies criticism of "the long years of costly study, the added years of internship, and the widespread tendency to concentrate on a specialty instead of on general practice." If any adequate substitute for long years of study and internship can be suggested which will provide well-trained physicians, the thousands of men now undergoing the hardships and sacrifices of this discipline undoubtedly will welcome them.

It would, of course, be possible to establish diploma mills to turn out thousands of doctors and additional thousands of specialists with training limited to short periods of instruction.

ONE DOCTOR FOR EVERY 710 PERSONS

The Star's editorial criticizes the medical schools chiefly, because, it states, "there simply are not enough doctors to cope with the health needs of our greatly increased and still growing population." "There exists," the editorial states, "a doctor shortage"—"especially in the nonurban areas." The fact is there are more doctors in the United States in proportion to the population than in any other country in the world—with the sole exception of Palestine, where many refugee physicians have gone from Europe.

There is 1 doctor for every 710 persons in the United States.

As to the needs of our increasing population, the fact is that during the past 20 years the number of physicians has increased at a greater rate than the population as a whole.

Since the beginning of World War II, new medical colleges or expansions of former 2-year schools of basic medical sciences have been developed in Alabama, Washington, California, North Carolina, Texas, Utah, and Illinois. Others are being considered in Mississippi, Florida, West Virginia, North Carolina, and elsewhere.

It is true that there is a relative shortage of physicians in some rural areas. This shortage exists independently of the relative abundance of physicians in the Nation as a whole, however. Merely increasing the number of students admitted to medical schools will not solve that problem.

There are today many small communities without newspapers or colleges, and in these communities there are no editors or college professors. Similarly, there are communities without hospitals, health centers, laboratories, and many of the other facilities necessary for the practice of modern scientific medicine; for this reason, there are communities without physicians. The solution to this problem is not the wholesale turning out of ill-trained physicians. The solution is to be found more likely in furthering local, State, and national programs for the establishment at well-selected points of clinics, health centers, and hospitals to provide facilities which will make it possible and attractive for physicians to practice good medicine in these areas.

Medical education is not perfect. No one knows this better than medical educators. Medical education is the foundation of our national health and welfare. The importance of the medical schools to the Nation is far out of proportion to their number, their size, and their costs of operation. It is important that undergraduate medical education be maintained at a high level of quality.

WALTER A. BLOEDORN, M. D.,
Dean, the George Washington University School of Medicine.

Washington—Disgrace to the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an article appearing in the New York Times of Friday, January 20, 1950, taken from the February issue of the Woman's Home Companion, entitled "Washington—Disgrace to the Nation":

WASHINGTON—DISGRACE TO THE NATION—EVERYBODY KNOWS THAT AMERICA IS THE WORLD'S FINEST DEMOCRACY; BUT BEHIND THE BEAUTIFUL FACADE OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL LIES SQUALOR, BIGOTRY, POLITICAL SLAVERY—LET'S CORRECT THESE CONDITIONS TO IMPROVE OUR POSITION IN WORLD AFFAIRS, URGES HOWARD WHITMAN

Washington, the Nation's Capital, has hidden long enough beneath its glistening white facades as America's show window, democracy's living monument the world over. What is the Capital City really like? Let's take a tour no sightseer ever took.

We'll find slums so vile that Michigan Senator, Homer Ferguson, after he saw them, scrubbed his hands and said, "But you can't scrub out your soul after sights like these." We'll see men with trousers rolled up to avoid the vermin and women carrying sticks to protect them against rats. We'll find a city touted as the heart of democracy—with its 1,000,000 people deprived of the right to vote. Worse, we'll find a dread lest democracy be turned loose in the District of Columbia and drive out special privilege.

We'll find city hospital facilities so bad that doctors and nurses all but weep at what their patients suffer. At Gallinger, Washington's big city hospital, we'll see a man virtually rotting to death because facilities for his proper treatment are lacking. We'll find a Jim Crow town. In the citadel of democracy we'll see Americans barred from restaurants, hotels, movies, hospitals and schools because of the color of their skin. This is the lame-duck District of Columbia, governed by a Congress which is too busy pleasing the folks back home to give two hoots about a million voteless people on the Potomac.

The District of Columbia contains more than a hundred thousand dwellings. Of these, reports the National Capital Housing Authority, 44,000 are substandard. Nearly half of the dwellings in the Capital of the richest nation on earth do not meet civilized standards of safety, health and fitness for human habitation. "In these squalid slums," reports Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, "the tuberculosis death rate is 99 percent higher than for the rest of the population, the pneumonia rate 25 percent higher."

Perhaps you have been to Washington. Perhaps, as I did, you regarded Washington as a city of beauty and inspiration. The illusion smashed abruptly for me. I was touring Washington in a police scout car. Suddenly it turned off one of the large open streets, nosed into an alleyway. "Like going through a rathole, eh?" one officer joked. My eyes darted over rows of filthy tumbledown shacks, with people swarming in and out of them; unpainted gray boards and sagging walls; a litter of garbage and bones, with scavenging dogs and cats and buzzing clouds of flies.

It was the center of a city block, hollowed out to make a slum. You could walk around that block for days and never dream such a rotten inner core existed. "But I had no idea Washington had slums like these," I said. "Nobody does—they're hidden," replied the policeman. I came to know dozens of other rotten hollow cores of city blocks that look respectable on the outside. I found rats so abundant that I learned to flush them by tapping a stick ahead of me as I walked up dark smelly stairways.

Would you expect to find outhouses in Washington, D. C.—within sight of the Capitol? The courts and alleys are full of rows of ramshackle privies, some with slats broken out and doors that don't close, sitting in the garbage-cluttered back yards, emitting a horrible stench. The slum dwellings, occupied by Negroes mostly, have neither steam heat nor running water. Kerosene lamps and candles provide light; coal stoves provide heat—for those who can afford to buy coal. In the yards there are water spigots, one to half a dozen families. Some are cross-connected with toilet plumbing so there is no telling when bacteria from the toilet wastes pour out in the drinking water.

Senator Ferguson, during his tour of the slums, blurted in astonishment, "Aren't there any health laws?" No, Senator, there is no modern plumbing and sanitation code in Washington. The Housing Authority drew one up 10 years ago. It would have ruled these slums off the map. But for 10 years the code has gathered dust in the District Commissioners' desks. Meanwhile the district clinic must continue treating the babies who are brought in with festering red holes on their fingers and foreheads—rat bites.

The main reason for Washington's failure as the world show window of democracy is that Washington is not a democracy. It is a disenfranchised little protectorate where 1,000,000 Americans are denied the right to vote. They are placed in the same category as felons, aliens, and the certified mentally ill. The world champion of democracy has seen fit to turn away democracy on its own doorstep.

Washington's rulers are three Commissioners appointed by the President and they can do nothing without the approval of Congress—Congress acting as a sort of board of aldermen. Congressmen must waste their time over every smidge of local legislation. Recently, with world emergencies breathing down its neck, Congress had to wrangle over a bill for the disposal of weeds.

The District government is a morass of accretions, improvisations, and confusions. It is doubtful if 10 percent of the Members of Congress understand it themselves. There are over a hundred departments, divisions, agencies, subboards, and miscellaneous bureaus—each with a finger in the pie. Its fumbling is grievously seen in the inside story of Gallinger Municipal Hospital. Yet Gallinger looks trim and first-class on the outside.

Gallinger is Washington's only city hospital. It has 1,500 beds—for a city of 1,000,000. It is forced to pack the pneumonia cases so close together they cross-infect one another. "We don't have enough anesthetists to keep our surgical suites going," reports Dr. Joseph Pazekas, chief of staff. "Patients who need elective surgery just don't get it." A doctor described the X-ray department as "the worst equipped I've seen in any hospital." Last August the American Medical Association refused to okay it for residency training.

The hospital is so short of drugs that Dr. Pazekas must beg for hand-outs from the large drug companies. Nurses have impossible loads—up to 60 patients. One nurse said, "We don't even know what's ailing some of the patients. We haven't time to find out." The staff wants to change Gallinger's name to the Nation's Capital Hospital. Why? Because that might shame somebody into doing something. Dr. Pazekas explains.

Self-government for Washington may seem to most Americans a simple question to settle. But is it? Washington's population is 22 percent Negro. The desire of many Congressmen to keep it a segregated city is hidden behind much of the opposition to home rule. Negroes would vote. And if Negroes voted, segregation—by democratic process—might go.

Many Americans would be shocked to realize that when they set foot in the Capital of their country they are in a city where Negroes must eat in Jim Crow restaurants, where Negro children are barred from white schools, where a Negro can't even go to the same movies as his fellow citizens of lighter complexion.

This is doubly shocking to many of us because we feel that the rest of America has gone far in recent years toward ending racial and religious discrimination. Much remains to be done but much has been done, officially and privately—the various State fair-employment laws, the removal of restrictions in our armed forces, for example; the inspiring Springfield plans and good neighbor clubs, the dropping of bars in many college fraternities. And let's not do any finger-pointing at Georgia or Alabama until we have taken a good hard look at Washington, D. C.

Segregation of human beings because of race, color, or creed is tragic enough anywhere in the world. It is doubly tragic in the capital city of a nation dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. I met a judge in Washington—a Negro appointed to the Department of Justice by Theodore Roosevelt and later to the bench by Calvin Coolidge. At noon every day this judge must walk a mile to the Union Station to get his lunch because no restaurant near his office will serve him. I met a taxi driver who served 4 years overseas in the war but is not permitted to drive a veteran's cab. Such cabs are for white veterans only.

Countless incidents—an African foreign minister turned away from a hotel, a Puerto Rican senator forced to sleep on an office couch, a Bolivian educator turned out of a restaurant—reached an ironic climax last spring when the Negro diplomat, Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, refused the post of Assistant Secretary of State. Life in Jim Crow Washington was something he didn't want to inflict upon his three children.

There is a bill in the congressional hopper, written by Congressman ARTHUR G. KLEIN, of New York, to end segregation in the Nation's Capital. It hasn't a ghost of a chance of passing. But there is a sentence in it to remember. The failure to close this gap between the principles of democracy and the prevailing racial practices in Washington, D. C., materially impairs the leadership of the United States in the cause of a democratic world.

How can we sell democracy if we don't dare open our sample case? How can we try to democratize the outside world until we have really democratized Washington, D. C.? Washington belongs to all of us. We want our children to go there with their high school classes and see American ideals brought to shining flower. We know the American way of life. We know it is the finest way of life man has yet found. Let Washington exemplify it through and through. Washington should be a national shrine—not a national disgrace.

Timely Observations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL J. WELCH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following articles from the St. Joseph News-Press, St. Joseph, Mo., of January 16 and January 18, 1950:

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press of January 16, 1950]

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

May we quote Dana? It was Charles A. Dana, journalistic giant of the famed New York Sun. When criticized for printing news happenings of tragedy and disaster, he remarked something in this vein: "What the good Lord in His omnipotent wisdom sees fit to let occur, I in my humble role as editor of a newspaper shall not deem myself too lofty to report." That story on the great Dana comes to mind as we read of that United States Senate committee which is toying with the idea of a Federal law banning advertising hard liquor, beer, or wine in interstate commerce.

Sincerely and frankly we leave out any thought now of income to a newspaper from liquor advertising. (Why ration department stores' advertising if our only concern for liquor is to get their money?) We oppose a prohibition of liquor advertising on sound ground. This newspaper is for temperance. It has repeatedly over many years deplored the abuse of liquor. But this newspaper opposed national prohibition with all the force at its command. It predicted that national prohibition would be a failure. It made only one error in that prediction. It failed miserably to estimate the enormity of that failure.

But the people spoke, or so we thought. The eighteenth amendment became law. It was opposed by two great leaders of that day, Woodrow Wilson, then President, and James Cardinal Gibbons, archbishop of Baltimore and a beloved churchman and friend of many Presidents. Woodrow Wilson so bitterly opposed a constitutional amendment against liquor he vetoed the Volstead Act, the enforcing law for that amendment. The story of national prohibition is a sordid tale of terror, of gangsterism which is still felt in the States. It brought the worst forms of official corruption. Washington hired prohibition agents to spy on fellow agents and then a third set of spies to spy on the spies. No fooling. And all three sets of the spies took graft. Look at the record.

Then, again the people spoke: Prohibition was repealed in one of the most complete and fastest reversals of public opinion this Nation has ever known. When prohibition was repealed liquor became legal and newspapers of the land then again accepted legally advertising of whisky, beer, and wine. That is the situation today.

If the people of St. Joseph and Buchanan County through local option want a ban on liquor, fine, extra fine. If the people of Nodaway County or Gentry or Platte or Andrew—any of them—through local option want a ban on liquor we heartily agree. There are many counties in Missouri that through local option permit no liquor. In Kentucky, the home of bourbon, there are more dry, by local option, counties than there are wet.

But local autonomy must prevail. National prohibition cannot succeed unless the mind of the people, the mass mind, undergoes a tremendous change. Many of us remember Czar Wayne Wheeler and his methods with the old Antisaloon League. A Congressman could be so drunk he could just stumble to his desk to record his vote for prohibition. To Wheeler and the professional drys that was all right. Congressman John Q. Souse, who lived wet but voted dry, got the support of the monumental political machine of the professional drys and was returned to office time and again.

This newspaper deplores the abuse of liquor. It hails such groups as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and Alcoholics Anonymous. And yet legislatively it is against letting other States force their views on moral issues such as this upon the State of Missouri. And as long as sale of liquor is legal, so long must it be legal to advertise it in newspapers and magazines. Let's not return to the witchcraft, crackpot era of regulating our lives by a law that created more grafters and perjurers than any law in the history of America.

Some of our good friends will not like these observations. There will be some who will willfully accuse us of being swayed by the cash register's tinkle. Not at all. No more than we would be influenced by the owner of that store or factory or shop whose son got arrested, and we were threatened, almost politely, but firmly nevertheless, that unless we kept sonny's name out of the paper, papa would withdraw his advertising. Want to know how we react to that? And the "we" there means the whole staff, both papers. Want to know what we do when someone makes a threat or even boasts to a friend that he can "square off" so and so "up at the paper"? It goes page one.

One more thought on the drive against liquor advertising in the United States Senate. This newspaper and this column have deepest reverential respect for that great Protestant church that maintains an official board of temperance and morals. Yet it regrets its radical approach to national prohibition a generation ago. It regrets that today one of its great bishops is spearheading the drive to ban liquor advertising. That man is taking advantage of his profession. He is using the dignity of the cloth in a manner unworthy of his sacred calling.

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press of January 18, 1950]

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

For the first time that can be recalled, Timely Observations has a guest contributor today, that is, one who has no connection with the staff of the News-Press. He is our valued friend, the highly respected pastor of First Baptist Church, Dr. Adiel Moncrief. There are so many things on which the good cleric and this column do agree, it seems unfortunate that there must be any difference at all. But Timely Observations did some observing on advertising liquor, which Dr. Moncrief resents. His letter, intended for the Forum, appears herewith in full:

"EDITOR, THE NEWS-PRESS,
St. Joseph, Mo.:

"DEAR SIR: Your observations on the subject of advertising liquor make one point clear: You favor such advertising and seek to justify it. I was under the impression this was the case. Mr. Editor, what has your lengthy excursion into the evils of the late prohibition era, gangsterism, political corruption, lawlessness, and a kind word for the late Cardinal Gibbons who opposed national prohibition, to do with the subject?

"You reject the obvious reason why a newspaper might favor this kind of advertising. You say it is not the profits, since the paper could substitute department-store advertising for liquor ads and there would be no loss of revenue. Then you assert that the paper is 'for temperance.' You say it has deplored the abuse of liquor while 'opposing national prohibition with all the force at its command. It predicted that national prohibition would be a failure.' Again, what has all this to do with a straight answer to the question, Why is your newspaper advertising liquor and determined to continue doing so?

"I have always believed that there are three reasons why a person favors the manufacture, sale, and use of intoxicants. (1) He likes the liquor and wants to drink it, (2) he likes the profits and wants to sell it, (3) he likes the business and wishes to engage in it.

"I would agree with you that national prohibition is not the way to curb the evils and tragedies of the tremendous liquor business in America. But I do not agree with you that advertising of liquor has any logical justification in political wisdom and social sanity. Why continue through newspapers, magazines, movies (where the drinking scenes are dragged in in the most disgusting manner), and even radio with its beer and wine promotion, to ever increase the consumption of drink and the billions of profits to this harmful beverage industry?

"There is good reason why the liquor trade ought to be curbed and controlled far more than it is today. The bills which constantly appear in the Congress and in State assemblies reveal a growing sentiment among the people to impose by law such restrictions. But I do not have great faith in the law. St. Paul said of man's moral reformation, 'What the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh (God did in the revelation of goodness in His Son) who condemned sin in the flesh.' Our hope lies in moral changes.

"We have got to stop making drinking so attractive and smart to youth. It ought to be treated with a realistic attitude as it is in some countries. A stigma is attached to drinking in excess.

"A young college student, speaking recently to a civic club in our city, made my cheeks burn and my heart sick, as he described the attitude of European peoples to America because of the false presentation of American life they have had through the Hollywood movies with their orgies of drunkenness and crime. We seem to be in the unhappy position of being accepted as a stupid, lustful people who have nothing but money and sex as the end-all and be-all of life. This false picture of America is dangerous in a day like this and it should not be tolerated for a moment.

"I respectfully renew my appeal to the editor of the News-Press to seriously consider the elimination of liquor advertising in the newspaper as one step in the direction of temperance—for which the newspaper stands, according to your own testimony.

"ADIEL J. MONCRIEF."

Timely Observations has no desire to quarrel with the brilliant minister at First Baptist. Long, long ago we learned never to pick a quarrel with a priest, a rabbi, or a minister. It's no good. Furthermore, it's bad luck. Then, too, laymen should have too much veneration for the ministry to permit themselves to appear to say or do anything to hold that ministry in disrespect.

Dr. Moncrief does ask why we mentioned the late Cardinal Gibbons. The Baptist minister seems to think we went out of our way to say a kind word for a Roman Catholic prelate. Dead right, Doctor. But there was a purpose. Cardinal Gibbons at the time the eighteenth amendment was adopted was the chief representative of one of the three great Christian churches that opposed national prohibition.

But let us assure the good minister that there are many radical Catholics on the subject of liquor. Surely he is familiar with the Knights of Father Mathew, a total-abstinence society for Catholics. And all Protestants do not see eye to eye on the advantages of national prohibition. American citizen No. 1 today happens to be Baptist layman No. 1, the President of the United States. We believe his views on liquor are more in accord with ours than Dr. Moncrief's. It sums up to this: Dr. Moncrief is opposed to the use of liquor, we to the abuse of it.

The Common Cold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Paul de Kruif, from the Reader's Digest:

IS THIS, AT LAST, GOOD-BY TO THE COMMON COLD?

(By Paul de Kruif)

November 15, 1949, marked the beginning of a great step ahead in the comfort of mankind. On that date occurred the scientific publication—in the New York State Journal of Medicine—of a powerful and practical preventive and cure for the common cold.

The new cold-killer is no tantalizing laboratory curiosity; it's available to everybody. It is safe, and it is not limited to expensive prescriptions; the Federal Government permits its direct sale to the public in drugstores.

Until 4 years ago just about all that anyone knew about colds was that they were catching and were caused by a virus. Cures? Here was the gloomy advice of Dr. Perrin H. Long, famed therapeutist of Johns Hopkins: "The only rational treatment * * * is to be put to bed at the onset and remain there for 2 or 3 days." But in 1945—with no fanfare whatever—came the hint of a clue for a cure.

Dr. Elizabeth Troescher-Elam and coworkers in San Francisco proved that the sneezes and sniffles of hay fever were scientifically identical to the sniffles and sneezes of acute cold in the head. The culprit in both troubles was a chemical, histamine, released by the human body in all its allergic explosions. As the Journal of the American Medical Association put it in an editorial comment last September 10, "the common cold is an allergic response in susceptible persons."

Physicians in 1945 were getting their hands on a battery of new antidotes for allergies—chemicals called antihistamines. Dr. John M. Brewster of the United States Navy Medical Corps dosed more than 100 victims of the common cold with benadryl. Ninety-five percent of the sick sailors got marked relief and had much shorter colds than usual. Ten percent, treated very early, had their colds quickly cured, aborted, an event truly unique.

But there was a catch. Benadryl made many of the sailors very sleepy. Pyribenzamine (PBZ), a more powerful and less drowsy antihistamine, was launched against the colds of nearly 400 factory workers in Framingham, Mass., by Dr. H. G. Murray. Caught early, the colds of 110 workers were blitzed completely within 24 hours after the patients started swallowing pills of PBZ. Most of the others were markedly benefited; as were also 89 percent of sneezy students in Charlotte, N. C.

But, alas, PBZ and other antihistamine pills, though acting effectively against early head colds, all sang a troublesome chemical lullaby. Too many of those cured grew deeply dopey. No antihistamine could be sold except by prescription.

And how many of us go to our doctor at the first unhappy harbinger of our colds in the head?

Hope for a more practical cold killer came out of Yonkers, N. Y., in the autumn of 1947. Chemists of Nepera Chemical Co., Inc., under the direction of Dr. Edmond T. Tisza, vice president in charge of research, synthesized a new antihistamine they named neohetramine. Powerful against allergies, neohetramine did not make folks sleepy. The Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry of the American Medical Association declared it the least toxic of available antihistamines.

In the autumn of 1948, at Sing Sing prison in Ossining, N. Y., began a comprehensive and truly scientific test. Dr. Charles C. Sweet, medical superintendent of the prison, called in an expert allergist, Dr. J. J. Arminio. From volunteers among the prisoners Dr. Arminio chose 311 who gave no history of hay fever. He divided them into three groups. When colds developed among the men that winter he gave neohetramine tablets to one group, blank tablets looking just like neohetramine to the second group, and the traditional doses of aspirin, nose drops, and lozenges to the third group.

The result made history. The men getting the blanks or the aspirin ran through all three phases of colds in the head—the sneezy and nose-running first phase, the stuffy-headed second phase, and the third phase with its thick discharge caused by the secondarily invading microbes that followed the attack of the cold virus. The colds averaged the 5 to 6 days that all of us suffer.

But the colds of the lucky fellows getting neohetramine within 24 hours of onset were cured in just a bit over 1 day; and those beginning treatment within 48 hours were restored to health in 2.8 days. However, when treatment was begun after 2 days—in the third, purulent phase—it did no good at all.

None of the prisoners got sleepy or showed any other side effects from the neohetramine treatment.

But an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Drs. Arminio and Sweet began testing neohetramine's preventive power upon Sisters at the Maryknoll Convent and students at the Maryknoll Seminary, near Ossining. One hundred took one 50-milligram neohetramine pill once a day; 100 took two pills a day; 100 took three. Again it was an impartial experiment, for all mixed up with these 300 nuns and students were 300 more getting blank pills; and none of the 600 knew which was which.

The results were astounding. All 600, intermingled, had the same chance of exposure to the cold virus. Of the 300 getting the blank pills every day for 6 months, 241 caught one or more colds, some of them five or six. One hundred seventy-nine of them developed real "bingers" going through to the phase of secondary infections; some developed pneumonitis, bronchitis, or misery of their sinuses.

Among the 206 getting neohetramine pills 2 and 3 times a day during that 6 months, 182 (91 percent) had no colds at all. And the others, who developed a bit of a sneeze and stuffiness, were well in 1 to 2 days. No headache. No sinus. No cough. No fever. No work loss. A few of the group getting three pills a day had some throat dryness; the three daily pills were cut down to two. Twelve subjects of the one-pill-a-day group got well-established colds, but even these were mild.

During all those 6 months none of the 200 experienced any sleepiness, dizziness or any other discomfort.

The Federal Food and Drug Administration, recognizing the safety of neohetramine, has now permitted its over-the-counter sale direct to the public. It is the first antihistamine so approved, but there will unquestionably soon be others. Neohetramine will continue to be known by that name to physicians. The public will purchase it under the trade-name Anahist. The tablets are 25 milligrams. They can be given to children as well as to adults. One large electrical company has already introduced Anahist cold prevention among its 20,000 workers.

Use of Anahist at a cold's first warning signal, with regular dosages thereafter, will likely kill a cold within 36 hours. It will also minimize the sneezing and coughing and runny noses that now spread the virus to others. It may break the age-old chain of infection. Thus it seems within the range of possibility at last to wipe out the curse of the cold in the head.

Governmental Costs for Pay Rolls Near Twenty-two-Billion Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent article from the Washington Evening Star:

GOVERNMENTAL COSTS FOR PAY ROLLS NEAR TWENTY-TWO-BILLION MARK

Governmental pay-roll costs are approaching a $22,000,000,000-a-year mark, an Associated Press survey showed yesterday.

These pay and allowance outlays by Federal, State and local Governments amount for nearly $1 of each $6 paid out for wages and salaries in this country. They were surpassed only during the 1943-45 wartime period.

By official records, 7,581,000 persons—about one out of every eight workers in the country—are drawing Government pay.

The total includes members of the armed forces and school system employees.

Commerce Department data showed Government pay rolls hit a peacetime peak of $21,900,000,000 a year in November, and it appeared the climb was continuing.

Officials helping to analyze President Truman's budget for fiscal 1951—the 12 months beginning next July—said total Federal pay-roll outlays in that period will approximate $11,300,000,000.

That means a $600,000,000 increase over this year, split about equally between 1,500,000 members of the armed forces and approximately 2,000,000 civilian workers.

TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-FOUR DOLLARS FOR EACH TAXPAYER

The $11,000,000,000 Federal total averages out to $244 for each of the 45,000,000 Federal income taxpayers. The increase over the current fiscal year is due to boosts in military and civilian pay voted by the last Congress.

Precise figures were not available on the number of employees of the Congress and courts, but pay and allowances in those departments were budgeted at around $50,000,000.

The budget called for 1,960,000 civilians in the executive branch of the Government. The all-time peak, in wartime 1945, was 3,770,000.

The Decisive Decade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the content of an address by Herman Steinkraus, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in Pittsburgh, Pa., on January 10, 1950.

Mr. Steinkraus, a Connecticut citizen and outstanding industrialist, is well qualified to speak out on the issues facing this country, as he has done in this address. I commend its reading to all who may peruse the RECORD.

I am very happy to be here this evening in Pittsburgh. It was just 30 years ago this month that I first came here for a company in Cleveland, on my first job as a traveling salesman. I remember Pittsburgh made quite an impression on me—or rather, what I could see of it—if you get what I mean. I remember my laundry bills were very big. I realize all that is changed now, so I shouldn't bring up those old days.

But at least my enthusiastic impression of this fine city still remains, and it is a pleasure to be here to speak to you, in this place which has always been so much the industrial heart of our country.

At this time I am conscious as you are that we are at the beginning of a new year, a year of great promise, but also of grave significance. Within the last few days we have heard the President's message on the State of the Union, the economic outlook, and his budget message. We have also heard many predictions from economists, bankers, and businessmen as to the outlook for 1950. The prophets are optimistic. They say business will be good.

Far be it for me to throw cold water on such optimism, but I believe that while this short-range view is helpful and interesting, yet when we consider the trend of our times it is much more important for us to have a long-range view, not for the next year alone, but for the next 10 years, which may well be for us the decisive decade.

Great events don't happen full-blown in a single year. They cast their shadows before, and the world lives in their aftermath. Events that will mark our future are shaping all about us today.

Pick up the daily newspaper, and you read of world-wide changes. The quiet course of day-to-day living of the early part of our century is gone forever. Changes come so swiftly it is hard for us to keep up with them, much less develop programs to handle them.

These dynamic, and in some cases catastrophic, changes seem to fall into three general spheres. First, the physical. The whole map of the world is different. Boundary lines, we learned in school, for Europe and for Asia have passed into history.

The great British Empire, whose bonds held tight for centuries, now finds those ties are loosened. New nations are born. We see new names appear in parts of India, China, and the satellite countries. The last new nation—at least unless a new one has happened today—is the United States of Indonesia, comprising an area almost as large as that of our own country.

In fact, map makers are hard pressed to get out maps fast enough to make the correct changes of just the last few months.

Along with these are major population shifts, millions of people moving from one place to another—in Russia, China, and Europe, with its millions of refugees from Poland and Germany and elsewhere. A million people went to Israel alone in the last 12 months; many came to this country.

All this brings some nations closer to the realization of freedom, while others who have struggled for years to win their freedom now have lost it. Still others mark time, like patriotic little Finland, using her wits to save her soul, or Czechoslovakia, living on hope.

So, the physical changes of our world are vast and numerous.

The second sphere of change is in the field of science, with more new inventions and discoveries than at any time in the world's history. We absorb them quickly. It took a century to make full use of the invention of the power engine which brought about the industrial age. Today, with the growth of our technical knowledge, our skilled engineers, and our lightning speed of communications it is a very short time from the scientific discovery to its actual practical use.

Think of the march of science in just the last few years—radar, electronics, atomic energy, not to mention new metals, chemicals, and wonder drugs. Scientists tell us that there are many more discoveries on our doorstep in every one of these fields. In medicine doctors feel they are very near the answer to diseases that have ravaged man since history began. Last week 10,000 scientists met in New York City and announced the latest discoveries in many fields, including Einstein's new formula.

The other evening as I came home on the train a fellow commuter was studying the page before him with the picture of the new Einstein formula on it, with its numbers and letters. As he looked at it intently I said, "Do you understand that formula?" "Are you kidding?" he said, smiling. "It looks to me like a formula is a formula is a formula."

I presume some of you scientists here in Pittsburgh do understand it.

The third sphere of changes is the most important of all. That is the sphere of ideas—new concepts arising to challenge the old. Ideas about people, about governments, about life. The one that affects us the most today is the concept of totalitarianism which has been revived, challenging the principle of freedom which has been with us since the French Revolution. Many astute thinkers believe this challenge between totalitarianism and democracy will come to a head and be resolved in this decisive decade that lies ahead. It threatens the very way of life as we have known it.

As Dr. Vannevar Bush expressed it at MIT recently when he said: "The fundamental question of our times is the strength of the democratic system as compared with the strength of the totalitarianism system and the ability of each system to grow in strength in the years to come. By and large,

all questions of policy, national or international, economic or political, immediate or long-range, take on importance and urgency to the degree and only to the degree that they bear on this basic issue."

The danger for us lies in the fact that totalitarianism extends itself by conquest; it holds its conquest, not by persuasion, but by force and terror. There can be no freedom. We hate such methods. Yet there is no use in our burying our heads in the sand, ostrichlike, and not facing the unpleasant facts, such as the military expansion of Russia, her tremendous standing army, her so-called German police guard in the eastern zone, her Arctic air force, her submarines, her development of missile planes, and now the atom bomb.

In the last few months we have had the benefit of reports from many observers in Russia—journalists, businessmen, and others, including our former Ambassador, Gen. Bedell Smith. Almost without exception they tell the same story. They have no doubt whatever that Russia is bent on world extension of her communistic ideas. Incidentally, with their curious habit of calling things by names which they are not, Russians call it, not communism, but democracy, or socialism.

The reason Russia is so ready to use force to eradicate free forms of government is that she doesn't believe the two systems can exist peaceably in the same world. One or the other must be conquered.

As Stalin once expressed it, "In the future progress of international revolution two world centers will be formed: the Socialist center, attracting to itself all the countries gravitating toward socialism, and the capitalist center, attracting to itself all the countries gravitating toward capitalism; the struggle between these two centers for the conquest of world economy will decide the fate of capitalism and communism throughout the entire world."

But our observers of Russia also say, almost without exception, "This does not necessarily mean war." But they add the proviso—"provided the United States remains strong."

I have dwelt on this world issue because I feel it should be perfectly clear that our economic strength is a subject that is linked very closely to the survival of democracy and to the cause of freedom in the world.

To keep our country strong in every sense is the best protection we can have, and the best thing we can do for world peace. We know Russia expects and waits for our weakness. In the past she has never attacked the strong; instead, she has absorbed the weak.

If we are militarily protected, and keep our economy and industry sound, time and history will work for us. The records show no aggressor nation has been able permanently to hold together different peoples in far places, with different customs, ideals and beliefs. It is not likely that Stalin or the men in the Kremlin can succeed where Alexander the Great, Caesar, Napoleon, and Hitler failed. But the "if"—and it is a big "if"—is, if we remain strong, not merely in means of wartime defense, but strong in our industry, sound in our finances, and strong in purpose.

I do not wish to be an alarmist, but many of our leaders are deeply concerned, and feel the situation is even more serious than I have indicated. Only last Friday Mr. Tom Beck, the publisher of Collier's, said, "The Russians have got China. Next is Formosa, then Indochina, Malaya, and Siam. They'll take Japan when we get out. There's trouble in Kashmir on the border of Russia and India right now. The Russian boast is that they could take India in 60 days. Communist infiltration is taking place in Nigeria and Eritrea in Africa."

He believes that some day the Russians will overstep the bounds of caution, such as with the imprisonment of American nationals, and go too far in their undeclared war on the United States. For when America decides she has had enough, the strength of the two systems will be put to a test, and a severe one.

Are we building our Nation strong enough to meet this emergency or any other that may arise? That is the question. One thing we are sure of, the opposition is working day and night and making great sacrifices to grow militarily stronger than we are. Furthermore, Lenin said just before he died: "We shall force the United States to spend itself to destruction."

Let's look at the question of our financial strength, which is basic to any other kind of national strength. We are now entering upon the third year of major deficit spending. The annual deficits of this fiscal year and the next one, for which the President has just released his budget message, are actually greater than the entire annual costs of our National Government in the years before the war.

Now the President proposes still greater expenditures on more programs. He asks for still higher taxes, and estimates a deficit of $5,100,000,000 for 1951. What would happen to us in the midst of this period of bountiful spending if a serious crisis would occur?

We can all remember those years of $100,000,000,000 budgets during the Second World War. Could our economy stand such a strain today on top of our already huge debt of $259,000,000,000? If such a catastrophe comes, we can't count this time on some other nation holding the aggressor off until we get ready. Other nations are still so weak from the last war that we must help them with our ECA funds to put them back on their feet. We can't expect a year or two of grace, as we had in the previous two World Wars, when our Allies and two oceans kept our enemies from our shores.

I fear we would be in for a lot of trouble if we had to face such a situation tomorrow. I hope it doesn't happen at all, but we can't depend on hopes alone when our eyes and ears tell us what is going on throughout the world. We ought to plan for the worst that might happen, and that in itself is the best guaranty that the worst will not happen.

So I think we should ask ourselves this question right now: With the highest rate of national income in our history, and the highest level of taxes in our history, and the largest Federal debt in our history, and the biggest threat to the future of democracy in its history, is this the time for greater spending, and greater taxes, and greater deficits? Or is it about time to stop that course, reverse the direction in which we are going, and resist the demands for still greater benefits for all—out of the public purse?

I say, the American people should wake up to the danger at their door. They should be aroused to insist on economy in Government, in balancing the budget, and on preserving our industrial strength.

We have a number of men in the Senate and the House who have tried to show how this could be done. Senator BYRD, who for 16 years has had to do intimately with fiscal policies of our Government, has proposed a budget of $36,000,000,000, without curtailing any of our defense program or other essential programs, but cutting down waste and many high-riding items we don't need. Only recently he warned that without solvency and stability our form of government cannot survive.

Yet, in the face of such wise counsel from devoted Americans in high places, the program for the coming year is one of still greater spending, still more deficits, still higher taxes. Few people realize that even a $36,000,000,000 budget is $2,000,000,000 higher than the budget for 1948. This year we are spending $43,300,000,000. For next year the President asks for $42,400,000,000. But there is little if any reference at all in any of the President's three messages about economy.

I have read over the President's economic message several times. It is about 8,000 words long. It uses the word "economy" 34 different times. In each case, however, it is business economy, peacetime economy, expanding economy, and so forth. Apparently the President's economic advisers know only one meaning of the word, and that pertains to business. They never, not even once, mention Government economy, the kind we need worst of all.

Some people have the impression that this increased spending program is due to larger amounts going for defense, and our aid to Europe. This is not exactly true. In fact, the Defense Department has been making savings for a number of months. The deficit of five and one-half billions for fiscal 1949 is due to an increase over $6,000,000,000 in our domestic spending alone, for different programs of our administration, for social welfare, housing, and other items.

Probably in themselves they are all desirable things to have, just as each of us can think of many things we would like to have for our families if we had the money. But in times like these our desires must be tempered with good judgment and foresight. When the course of this Nation for the future hinges on what we do now, our tax and expenditure program should be a sound one.

Our American voters shouldn't be lulled into a feeling that the future is completely rosy for 50 years to come, and everyone should earn a thousand dollars a year more in 5 years, and building air castles about the year 2000. What we need most right now is one simple word of advice: "Economize."

There is another way in which we must be strong in any emergency. That is, in our industrial strength. I don't have to recall to you that basically that is what saved us in the last war. We had the production, miracles of it. The world had never seen anything like it. Even Russia benefited from our industry to the tune of $11,000,000,000 worth of goods—everything from raw materials to machines and tanks and trucks and ships. But Washington has apparently forgotten about that. For in the feverish activity for the redistribution of wealth under the New Deal and Fair Deal programs, our Government has devoted little thought or attention toward helping our industry create more wealth.

For only American industry and agriculture and business and labor can create wealth. The Government can't do it; but it can hinder the rest from creating it. Unfortunately, I fear that is what has been happening. Attacks on business from high Government places have hampered us for many years.

Right now many of our most successful companies are being attacked for the very bigness which made it possible for them to serve our Nation so well. You know who they are. Some of them are represented right here tonight. How Russia would love to see the bigness of these basic industries destroyed.

Industry is being taxed so heavily, investment capital is slowing down. Even the President recognizes that such investments went down an alarming 18 percent in 1949, and are still dropping.

We need all business, big and small, to grow steadily to provide the growing number of jobs we need in every town. Each year an additional six to eight hundred thousand young people come into our labor force. To provide jobs we must attract more people's savings which they are willing to risk in common stocks of business corporations. That means the risk must be made worth while. A basic 52 percent of corporation

tax, which is threatened to be raised still higher, plus a double taxation on dividends, is shown by very simple arithmetic to mean that under the most favorable circumstances the Government takes more than 50 percent of a company's earnings. In the most adverse circumstances the Government takes as much as 82 cents out of every dollar of profits, and the owner is left with less than 18 cents.

Unless we have drastic changes in this tax set-up, middle- and small-sized companies will find it harder and harder to get capital for their business to grow. They will stagnate; some will want to sell out to the very same bigger ones, which the administration wants to trim down.

In the most earnest way I can put it, I urge the present administration to correct this growing discouragement of venture capital. We cannot remain strong or grow any stronger unless our Government leaders understand better, or perhaps I should say, act better toward the problems of business. The Nation must look to American businessmen for the creation of jobs, production, and the creation of wealth. That is the only fountain source from which all the benefits they promise can possibly come, these benefits to be distributed by a generous and loving government.

This change in attitude on the part of the Government should certainly include stopping the damaging attacks on business and having the constructive one of helping business to become stronger. It also should include an end of Government competition with business, an end of threats. For example, such threats that if private enterprise decides against building a certain number of certain priced houses in a certain city, then the Government will. An end to threats that if the steel industry is unwilling to accept Government figures on how much productive capacity is needed, the Government will build it. An end to such plans as dividing the country into nine regions ostensibly for flood control. Practically it would mean complete control of the basic power facilities of the entire Nation under the direction of 27 appointed commissioners with responsibility only to the White House. It is just too much power in one place.

Finally, if we are to be stronger industrially we must by all means have greater unity in relations between management, labor, and the Government. Many of you here tonight could speak eloquently on all the need for better leadership of our Nation's top officials to stop the loss in income for workers and management, the cost to the American people, and the destruction of good will and violence that come in the path of strikes.

I can see we are making some slow progress. But oh, for an end to this class struggle, the false accusations, the play for power and for votes, and the loss and distress to the public, who are the ones who always pay in the long run. Pittsburgh could write a history of sad and bitter experience perhaps not equaled by any one other city in the country.

But every section of the country suffers from labor strife, and every man, woman, and child pays for it.

I have two specific suggestions as to how we might start to build a happier, better relationship between government, management, and labor. It might not work, but I think it would. It is worth a try. It is something we could do right now.

First, I think the Taft-Hartley law should be given a fair chance to operate without the continuous blanket condemnation that it isn't any good, and without schemes to avoid its fair application, as in such instances as the coal situation today. This law was put on the books after one of the most thorough hearings from all sides as to what kind of a law was needed ever experienced in Washington.

Of course, it has restricted some privileges of union leaders, but it has also set up strict rules which management must follow. I believe most workers are for it, because it protects them against abuses which had crept into the labor movement. It also protects the public from some of the abuses it used to take, under the old laws, from management and labor both.

Such statements as that which the President recently made condemning the law impedes its fair trial.

Under this law an avalanche of strikes was curbed; under this law Communists have been driven out of many unions; under this law workers and management both have had the best set of rules for collective bargaining they have ever had; during this period we have had the best conciliation and mediation service we have ever had.

No matter what is said to the contrary, experience all across the country shows it has helped the collective-bargaining process, and it will do still better if given a reasonable chance. It is unfortunate that it has had to operate under continued attacks on the part of labor leaders and holders of public office.

My second proposal is that the Department of Labor be reorganized to become the Department of Labor and Industry, or perhaps it might be called the Department of Labor and Management.

I have given this matter considerable thought for a number of years, and have discussed it with a number of Government officials. Reaction has been so favorable, I would like to suggest it tonight. Here is the reason for this proposal.

When the Department of Labor was first organized back in 1913, labor needed the help of the Government in order to bargain with management on a fair and equal basis. The Department of Labor was given the specific purpose by law to further the interests of labor, and nobody else.

But now labor has grown into great strength, and the situation has changed completely, and a further step is needed. Such a reorganized department would be charged with the responsibility of promoting better understanding between labor and management, and to develop methods of avoiding strife and strikes, which cause such distress and financial loss.

Secondly, the new Department would be charged with safeguarding the interests of the public. As it is now, frequently both sides are partly right and partly wrong, and the public gets caught in the middle.

Such a Department would clarify many of our labor problems, I believe, because there would be some unity in the handling of such matters. Consider the lack of logic in our present situation where the Bureaus of Conciliation and Mediation have nothing whatsoever to do with the Department of Labor, and for a good reason, too. The Department of Labor does have a Bureau which compiles labor statistics, and a very good Bureau it is, too.

But the fact is, the present Department of Labor, as a whole, is completely outmoded. It does not meet our present or future needs. The reorganization I propose would serve all parties, and become an instrument of service to all. For the basic interests of both labor and management are the same. A union can only be successful when connected with a successful company. The sale of the New York Sun last week is an example. When labor and management share the responsibilities more successfully, then, and then only can they also share the rewards of teamwork.

The atmosphere in which business blames labor and labor blames business only injures the industrial health of our Nation. No matter who is right or who is wrong, or whether both are partly right and partly wrong, the fact is that strife between them weakens the whole Nation.

If my analysis of the No. 1 problem of this year and the decade to come is correct—all of us will have to sacrifice some of our pet ideas—all of us will have to give up the idea of benefits which right now we would like to have, but which we cannot afford. All of us will have to rededicate ourselves to the protection of our great heritage.

I sincerely hope that in this session Congress will devote its talents and energies to these urgent matters; that it will face up squarely to the realities of the situation and will not permit an impending election to cause them to play politics with the future of our Nation and the democratic world.

Fortunately for us, we have men of great leadership on both sides, whose devotion to country surmounts all other considerations, and whose advice if followed will lead us to a successful conclusion to the critical years that lie ahead. But businessmen too must rise from their lethargy and let their voices be heard. We should be sure that our representatives in Washington know our views.

The challenge of this decisive decade is not a challenge of material things; it is a challenge to the character of our people, a challenge to their willingness to face realities, and put the things first that ought to come first. Give them courageous leadership, but please don't fool them with honeyed promises of greater benefits, at this time when we face a danger which we can only meet if we are a united, strong people. God grant our leaders the wisdom to lead us right.

Gary, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by editor H. B. Snyder of the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune again reveals that the Calumet region of Indiana is today recognized as the No. 1 steel-manufacturing center in America. We have Carnegie, Illinois, Inland, Youngstown, and other large steel mills in Gary, East Chicago, Hammond, and Whiting, Ind.

The largest oil refineries, cement plants, and almost every branch of heavy industry makes its home in the Calumet region of Indiana.

GARY MEN TAKE OVER

The Gary-Chicago district has been taking over Pittsburgh's place as the Nation's steel capital, so it's quite fitting that Gary steel men should be taking over top executive positions in Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corp.

Selection of S. M. Jenks to be Carnegie's vice president in charge of operations means that three former Gary plant executives now are in key posts with the No. 1 subsidiary of United States Steel.

In addition to Jenks, there is Earl Moore, who preceded him as Gary Works general superintendent, as Carnegie's vice president for industrial relations. And there's James Darbaker, former top man of the Gary Sheet and Tin Mill, as Carnegie's manager of sales.

Gary was a proving ground in their development as top-level executives with Carnegie-Illinois. And so it was with Austin J. Paddock, former manager of the American Bridge plant here who is now operating vice president of the company, and with Laurence S. Dahl, former hot strip mill superintendent of the Gary Sheet and Tin Mill, who now is operations vice president of Columbia Steel, United States Steel's west-coast subsidiary.

The Midwest is continuing to be an expanding-market area for the steel industry. Pittsburgh steel men regretfully admit that the smoky city is definitely losing its preeminence in steel and that it never will be regained.

We aren't so optimistic as to believe operating headquarters therefore will be moved from Pittsburgh to this district, but it is encouraging to know that three of the key executives in the Carnegie-Illinois set-up are former Gary men who know and understand the potentialities of the industry in the Calumet.

Example of Ultra Vires Action by Rules Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 5, 1949:

HOUSING STALL

With Chairman SPENCE of the House Banking Committee moving to bypass the obstructionist Rules Committee, a vote on the housing bill now appears to be a certainty. That is good news, for failure of Congress to pass any comprehensive housing legislation at this session would not only undermine the hopes of a vast number of poorly housed families, it would also be regarded as a repudiation of the pledges made in the last campaign by both major parties and would thus be a blow to confidence in popular government.

The Rules Committee has followed its traditional head-in-the-sand policy. When it received the housing bill from the Banking Committee 3 weeks ago, any well-informed citizen on the street could have told it that this was an important measure which should be sent to the floor promptly with a rule allowing ample consideration. A similar bill had passed the Senate by a vote of 57 to 13. But the committee stalled, held hearings for 3 days, and stalled some more. Its conduct seems especially unenlightened in view of the new rule which permits the Banking Committee to take its appeal directly to the House 3 weeks hence. One can only conclude that the Rules Committee majority has learned nothing from the revolt of last January against its tyranny.

The high-handed nature of the Rules Committee's action is illustrated by its probing into cost figures and the extent of the Government's obligation under the bill. These are problems for the committee reporting the bill, the Appropriations Committee, and the House itself. So far as we can see, they have nothing to do with the Rules Committee's function of routing measures to the floor in an orderly fashion.

As to the merits of the bill, we do not think that economy is the major issue. Of course, the total amount that is to be spent under this measure must be determined by the resources available. Even for the replacement of slums with decent housing for low-income families, expenditures must be kept within the limits of a sound fiscal policy. But that does not minimize the desirability of getting this program started—of getting a sound public housing act on the books. A long-range policy is envisaged under which the Government will help local communities to meet their slum problems. We think that policy is sound and practicable even though it may have to be inaugurated on a small scale compared to the need.

Nor is socialism the issue. Americans have never regarded it as socialistic to aid families who, by reason of misfortune or low income, are forced to live in squalor or unhealthful environment. The current housing bill is merely a means of making such help practicable. It is predicated on the belief that private enterprise should provide housing for all the families that it can possibly serve. Beyond its reach, however, are vast slum areas that must be wiped out by governmental effort to save our cities from an incredible burden of crime, delinquency, disease and social malaise. Our highly integrated society cannot neglect this problem without risking its own health and stability.

Government Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Marinette County Pomona Grange has forwarded to me a resolution recently adopted by that fine organization. The resolution comes like a fresh breeze on a sultry summer day. So that all Members may dwell upon it, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD. The resolution follows:

Whereas it has been intimated that we can make very little progress toward economy and business in Government this year because most of the Members of Congress are up for election;

Whereas if this intimation is valid, it means that America is in grave danger of being governed by fear rather than democratic principles, and that its citizens are voting to protect selfish interests rather than the general welfare—that they have sunk to the depth of selling their vote to the highest bidder; and

Whereas the report of the Hoover Commission, which has been received enthusiastically by the country as a whole, under such reasoning, would be subject to the whims of selfish Government employees rather than put to work for the common good: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Marinette County Pomona Grange go on record with the following convictions:

1. That there are enough loyal citizens, whether employed by the Government or not to elect officials pledged to good government and sane economy.

2. That the intimation that we cannot foster good government during an election year is an insult to the American people, and is not worthy of the consideration and publicity it has been given.

3. That we firmly believe in the ideals of the great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, and call upon every citizen to do his best to insure that we keep the Government of the people, by the people, and for the people: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the press, our Congressmen and Senators, to each subordinate Grange and to the State and National Grange.

House Resolution 133

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, speaking to House Resolution 133, I reported to the people I represent as follows:

Good evening. Within a week democracy will face a severe test here in Washington.

This test will not be directly concerned with any particular legislation.

But the very bedrock foundation of democracy is to be tried. A terrific strain will be brought to bear upon the cardinal principle of democracy.

That principle is the right of the majority to govern this country within its constitutional framework.

The attack upon the democratic principle of majority rule is a subtle one. But it is very simple indeed when all the hocus-pocus is exposed.

Here is the issue in stark simplicity: Shall 7 Congressmen be empowered to veto the right of 428 Congressmen to vote yea or nay upon a bill—a bill, if you please—that has been studied and recommended for passage by another legally constituted congressional committee.

Now, having stated the issue, let's see how it is coming up. A little background will make it perfectly clear.

I hope all of you will follow me carefully. The issue is vital, but, I repeat, it is simple. It is one which every man, woman, and child in America should understand.

We are a nation of some 150,000,000 people. We are committed to the sacred principle of self-government.

This principle is embodied in the historic documents upon which our Republic was, and is, founded.

Our Declaration of Independence declared that all men are created equal and that we are each endowed by our Creator with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That immortal document then asserted that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Thus the fundamental principle of your government is your consent, which means your approval of a proposed new law. One hundred and fifty million people cannot meet, consider, and give their individual decisions on each proposed law. We Americans have, therefore, resorted to representative government.

Each district sends a Representative to Congress. You of the Eleventh Indiana District sent me.

There are 435 of us in Congress. Thus we are a large parliamentary body. We could not operate without rules.

In the absence of parliamentary laws and a code of procedure, we would fall into utter confusion.

The Constitution gives us the power to write our own rules of procedure. This we have done.

Our membership is divided into committees. Each committee—usually consisting

of 18 Congressmen—is charged with the duty of studying legislation in its given field, like Labor or Education or Foreign Affairs, Agriculture, Armed Services, etc.

There are 19 standing committees. One is the Rules Committee. We will discuss it and its function later.

The 18 remaining committees are charged with the responsibility of studying and holding hearings on proposed legislation.

If a majority of such committee approves such legislation, it is voted out with recommendation that it pass.

The public hearings are printed and the committee prepares a report. These are for the information of the public and other Congressmen.

The bill then goes to the House of Representatives for consideration of the Representatives of all the 155,000,000 people in the United States.

Here, however, we must have further rules of procedure. Otherwise, the chairmen of the 18 standing committees would never agree upon the order of business.

Members are entitled to know what bills are on the calendar for debate and vote. They are thus enabled to concentrate their study upon these bills, reports, and hearings.

Therefore, there must be a calendar; and since the 18 chairmen of the standing committees would probably each consider his bill of greatest importance, they would never agree upon a calendar.

It is, therefore, necessary to empower someone to make up the legislative calendar.

Here is where the nineteenth standing committee comes in.

It is the Rules Committee. It has charge of the order of business. In other words, the Rules Committee makes up the calendar for the House. It has no power to write the rules governing the House.

Some bills are long and complex. Some are short and simple.

Thus it requires more debate and consideration for some than for other bills.

Accordingly, it is proper and necessary that more time be assigned some bills than others.

Someone must decide the time allotted for each bill.

The Rules Committee's duty is to decide as to time allotted for debate on a bill—as well as certain control of its place on the House Calendar.

In order to allot time, the Rules Committee must know something about the bill under consideration.

Therefore, it is proper that the Rules Committee hear evidence as to the nature of the bill.

Naturally, as the members of the Rules Committee hear what the bill is about—and what it provides, these members form opinions.

Such is the course of the human mind—a course that is inevitable—and concerning which there can be no objection.

After all, the members of the Rules Committee are also Members of Congress. They will be called upon to vote upon the bill; that is, once it is scheduled for consideration on the floor of the House of Representatives.

But there is the rub. There is where the issue—the crucial test of democracy is coming up. The members of this committee want the power to decide that bills they don't like can't come up on the floor.

Let's keep in mind the real function of the Rules Committee. Its duty and responsibility is to schedule business in the House of Representatives—to act, as it were, as a traffic engineer—to assist the orderly flow of business in the House of Representatives.

It is not the duty of a traffic engineer to stop every person and decide whether he should be allowed to make his particular trip—to pass judgment on whether I should go to a lecture or you should go to your grandmother's for a Thanksgiving dinner. The traffic cop should decide when you cross the intersection, but he hasn't the right to say you shall never cross.

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court may be authorized to make up the court's calendar.

Then, when a case is heard, he can cast his one, out of nine votes, for a decision.

But the Chief Justice has no power to conclude that your case shouldn't be decided and, therefore, refuse to schedule it for hearing; perhaps because he thinks a majority of the Justices will decide your case differently than he would.

When he does that, he is usurping the entire power of the Court; of which he is but one of nine members.

But that is exactly what the Rules Committee has done in the past.

As the years rolled by, its members gradually lost sight of the distinction. They overlooked the great difference between the standards and quantum of their vote as members of the Rules Committee and as Members of Congress.

They began to support their views as Members of Congress, where they were just 1 of 435 men; yes, they backed up their individual views by refusing to schedule bills they opposed.

Congressional committees of 25 have heard from the public on many bills and voted to recommend passage. But the Rules Committee usurped the power to decide that it was a bad bill. So the Rules Committee simply denied the bill a hearing before the House.

In many cases the bill was one that had been an issue in a national election, and the party sponsoring it won.

So these 12 men sit in the Rules Committee and just 7 of them, a majority, decide the people made a mistake; that the other 428 Congressmen can't be trusted; and therefore, the bill goes into the proverbial pigeonhole.

Now that was the situation in the House of Representatives when the Eighty-first Congress met.

Congressman EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, proposed a way to stop this usurpation of power. He proposed that on certain days the chairman of a standing committee could call up any bill his committee had approved; without consent of the Rules Committee.

We adopted this new rule by almost 2 to 1. Some of you may recall my mentioning this in my broadcast of January 22, 1949. At that time I said:

"I recall my first vote in Congress. It was on the question of whether or not we would change congressional rules so that we Congressmen could force the leaders to bring legislation out on the floor of the House so that the Members could have the opportunity to vote or be forced to vote upon it.

"A member of the Rules Committee who spoke against our proposition said, 'For every man who has asked me to bring a bill out on the floor, there have been 10 who asked me not to bring it out because if they were forced to vote upon it, they would be defeated in the next election.' It was my judgment that any man who didn't have the courage to vote on legislation had no business in Congress and, therefore, I voted for the change."

I have not changed my mind.

However, the Rules Committee has voted out a resolution to repeal the Eberharter rule. It will probably come up next Tuesday. In other words, this committee is trying to again arrogate to itself the power that belongs to the House of Representatives.

The Senate has its filibusters—the House had Rules Committee procedure that permitted 7 men to stop dead in its tracks a constitutional body of 435 elected Representatives of 150,000,000 people.

We took that power away from it. Now it hopes to regain that power—places its hopes on the fear of some Congressmen to vote on controversial legislation—in this case, the Fair Employment Practices Commission, known as FEPC.

Strange as it seems, this legislation was, in effect, pledged by both major parties.

However, the well-known coalition between certain Democrats and Republicans is spearheading this movement.

None of these people has the responsibility to represent any except his own district.

Yet they want to decide what I shall be privileged to vote for.

I calculate that you folks in Indianapolis don't expect me to be afraid to vote on any measure. I further calculate that you elected me to represent you; and that you aren't relying upon any of the 12 men on the Rules Committee to do that job.

Naturally, many of you will disagree with me; some on one measure, some on others. And in the end, a majority of you may be dissatisfied with how I have represented you generally.

But, it is not representative government when men from distant parts of the country say that your Representative can't represent you.

Nor do I have a right to hide behind the Rules Committee's skirts. Nor do I want to. Nor should any other Congressman want to.

Congressmen aren't supposed to be weaklings. If they can't stand on their own feet, the sooner that's discovered, the better.

For these reasons I think democracy is now in danger in the House of Representatives.

For the same reasons, I am going to vigorously oppose repeal of the Eberharter rule and the return of this unwarranted and usurped power to the Rules Committee.

Goodnight.

Strengthening Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable James A. Farley at the annual meeting of the Manhattan Council of the Boy Scouts of America, held at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on January 16, 1950:

This introduction makes me feel very humble, for as I face this great audience I realize how much more many of you are contributing to the cause of Scouting and the boys who are growing up among us in New York City that it is within my power to do. Right here I would like to pay tribute to the hundreds of unselfish leaders in the Manhattan council who are giving their time and effort and intelligence to bring the Scout program to the boys of this area. The cubmasters, the scoutmasters, and the explorer advisers, with their assistants, are directly affecting the lives of boys who in the future may make a contribution to the happiness of millions of people. They are dealing with deathless values. Then there are the commissioners, members of committees, and hundreds who serve in other positions, all of you engaged in this great undertaking of building the human foundations of our country's future. The thanks of New York City and of the Nation go to you for the work you are doing. The results will extend further than you and I may ever know.

It must give you great satisfaction that because of your efforts during the past year your council has made the greatest gain in membership in all its history. Your president has told me that the upswing in the number of units, and in the number of boys and leaders in those units, far surpasses anything you have previously achieved. I congratulate all those whose hard work made this record possible.

Yet, I wish to remind you that this record should be interpreted always in human terms, in terms of boys growing up to manhood on the streets of the city of New York, growing up, many thousands of them, into upright, responsible, God-fearing citizens because of the exertion made on their behalf by the men and women in this audience. Only by continuing and extending these efforts can we help to overcome some of the handicaps of the living conditions which we have imposed upon the boys in New York City.

Some of you may know that I am not a city-bred man. I grew up in a small town, and the things which we as boys took for granted as part of our daily lives, would be privileges beyond the purchase of even the well-to-do boys in New York City today. It is true that we had no neighborhood clubs, no movie houses, no radios. But we had the open fields and the hills and the streams and the woods. In the summer we could go fishing or get up a game of baseball on a vacant lot. In the winter we skated or coasted down hill or sometimes got together in someone's big kitchen to pop corn or make candy and play games. We were rich, though by the economic standards of today we would be considered underprivileged. We were rich in a hundred opportunities which the boys growing up around us can never hope to experience, unless we bring them such a program as Scouting; unless we take them out of this walled city of steel and concrete, out to where they can see the blue sky, hear a bird call through the quiet woods, and live through some of the simple primitive experiences that are the natural heritage of every boy.

These boys shouting over their games in the midst of the city traffic are living the most impressionable years of their lives. Right now their lifetime habits are being formed. Right now, they are being permanently influenced for good or for bad, by the sights around them, the people they meet, and the ideals which we present to them.

I believe that under God and the fitness of things, we owe to them the best preparation within our power to give, for the burdens which we are going to lay upon their shoulders. In a few years, these boys are going to take over where we have left off, and upon their integrity and clear thinking and hard work will depend the future not only of our city, but of our entire country which we love so dearly.

For the conditions which confront the young people in New York City are not just a local problem. They are pretty universal throughout the country, and I wish that at least in these few minutes which I spend with you, you would mentally extend your horizons, and think of your Scout work not just in terms of the Manhattan council and the boys that it serves, but in terms of the Nation as a whole, and your contribution to the future of America and, indeed, the entire world.

You are taking part in a Nation-wide crusade which should bring to American boys a vision of their heritage as free-born citizens of the greatest country on the face of the earth, and furthermore help them to realize, in terms of a boy's language and a boy's ideals, that they as citizens of this great country, have definite responsibilities toward themselves and toward other people.

I have been studying what you call the targets of your campaign, and it seems to me that you have been wise in selecting as your first one, good leadership, because the effectiveness of any kind of training for young people depends upon the effectiveness of the leadership. A top-notch leader, a man whom boys admire and want to imitate, can have more influence on his boys even without a program, than the finest system the mind of man could devise, if it is administered by a man they do not respect. Influencing young people is a delicate business. Older people frequently think they know how to do it, and they often succeed without realizing just how. Influence depends upon who the leader is, and how the boy feels about him. I think everyone in this group can probably recall some person who has made a lasting impression upon his thinking and acting.

A man well known in public affairs once told that never since he was 12 years old had he ever pointed anything, even a stick, let alone a gun, at anybody. He had received his first instructions in handling firearms from a man whom he respected greatly. This man was a veteran of the Civil War, and a woodsman, an expert marksman, and when he urged caution, the boy treasured what he had to say, because the boy had faith in his teacher. That boy was taught by the right sort of man under the right conditions. Yes, undoubtedly, the Boy Scouts learn a great many more things from their Scout leaders than technical Scouting.

Now, the second thing that you have set up in your targets comes under the heading "Program," and this is where you catch your boys. Don't fool yourselves on this. You feel that the Scout program offers good training in democracy, that it prepares boys to be cooperative citizens, and helps develop the kind of character you want to see in your son. But the boy first, last, and always joins the Scouts, not because he wants to be done good to, but because he wants to have a good time, and he thinks that the Scouts will give it to him.

Who says the future is menacing and the world is out of joint? Not the boy. He sees the world as a splendid, exhilarating jamboree that meets in a jungle especially designed for his purpose. As long as your program gives him adventure, something to do in the woods and the fields, boys will want to be Scouts.

You have a lot of competition for the boy's interest these days, so you have to be on your toes to keep your program up. All sorts of commercial amusements are available on every street corner, many more now than when this Scout movement was first developed. But the nature of boys has not changed in the past 40 years nor in the past 400 years, psychologists tell us, and most boys still will prefer the adventure the Scout program offers, if you make sure that you give it to them—camping, a chance to sleep out in the open, build a fire and cook dinner over it, to learn first aid, life saving, how to take care of themselves and other people.

It is not altogether easy for you folks in a big city like this to give these outdoor experiences to boys. I realize there are unusual problems. But of course it can be done, and I am glad to learn that you have been doing it, and that you had more boys in camp in 1949 than ever before.

Did you ever drive in the dusk of a late afternoon in autumn through the outskirts of the city? In the open fields and in the vacant lots you will see them, the boys of the neighborhood, gathered together in little groups. And the thing that holds them fascinated in the gathering darkness is a bonfire, their campfire. Maybe it is crudely built of just a few old slats or broken boxes, but to them it means adventure and magic. That is a need deep in the heart of every boy. That is the quality you have to keep in your program if you expect to get across to boys some of the other fine things like citizenship that you want to teach them.

Another feature in your program that attracts the boy—the chance to learn and do things that seem to him worth while. It is an appeal to the man that is beginning to take shape in him, a chance to be recognized, to stand out in his community as someone to be relied upon. Boys have a great deal more idealism than some people give them credit for, and are eager to work hard and make personal sacrifice, if the cause seems to them to justify their effort. For instance, look at what Boy Scouts accomplished during the war. These boys, most of them in their early teens, worked at back-breaking tasks, collecting and salvaging tons of material which the Government requested; they drudged cheerfully for millions of hours at all sorts of unspectacular jobs, because they believed they were helping to win the war. If any of you ever have any doubt of the fiery idealism that burns in American boys, I suggest that you look over the record of Scout war service.

Through his Scout unit, the boy finds a chance to help in many projects for his community and other people. He gets training that he knows will qualify him to be of service to others. Because he wants to help, he works hard.

One thing always impresses me when I read the reports of service that Scouts have rendered, and that is the amount of hard work that boys do almost automatically as a part of their Scout program. Paradoxically, although as individuals I think we are not sufficiently alert to our obligations to youth, we often ask too little actual work from them in this mechanical age. It is true that in rural areas boys are usually obliged to take a definite share in the duties of the farm and home, but in a city like New York, boys are not expected to assume many duties, compared to those required of us when I was a boy.

The ability to work is the foundation of good citizenship, and the opportunity to work is a part of our American heritage. The men who built America were workers. Unfortunately, a good many people today overlook this fact, and believe that if a man is smart enough he can find ways to live without working. Maybe an individual can for a while, but a nation never. The trend of the times seems to be to get as much as we can and to contribute as little as possible. We cannot build our house upon sand, and there are certain principles which have stood the test of time and upon which we must still stand, if our American institutions are to go forward. One of these is loyalty, and the other is work. The time must come when our able-bodied men and women must settle down to work and earn and save. That is our priceless American heritage which we must pass on to our children—the privilege of work.

Another feature in the Scout program which appeals to me strongly is that it is not based upon a mere materialistic foundation, but upon the consciousness that there is a God who is to be honored and served. The Scout is taught in our American scheme of things. Let me recall to you the judgment of George Washington, the father of our country. He said, "Let no one cherish the illusion that without religion and morality the security and well-being of the Nation can long survive."

Religion is the foundation of society, the basis on which our civil government rests. It was religion which braced the founders of this country against the dangers of the ocean and the perils of the wilderness and helped them to build here a true democracy. A few years ago I saw an interchurch world survey of church relations in cities with a population of over 300,000. The picture is not a bright one—52.7 percent of the population, so the survey showed, were nonchurch-going people. In rural areas, the percentage was even higher. Now speaking to you as a father, and as a churchman, I ask you what can we expect of our boys and

young men when more than half our homes are "religious jungles?" How important it is that you men in Scouting should emphasize by every means within your power the importance of the twelfth Scout law: "A Scout is reverent. He is reverent toward God. He is faithful in his religious duties, and respects the convictions of others in matters of custom and religion."

It is not going to be easy in the years ahead to present our democratic way of life. We can help to do so by making religion a living reality in the lives of the boys of America. We must teach our children to respect the convictions of others, and recognize the inspiration of religion and power of Almighty God. The American future cannot be guaranteed by a few slick tricks of economic manipulation. We need to get something akin to a vast religious awakening that will give new dignity and new values to our lives.

I notice you have set up as your third target, an increase in your membership. Speaking as one outside your organization, that would seem to be automatic. If you have the right leaders and the right program, the boys will come knocking at your doors. It is important that you set up the machinery to take care of it. As a businessman, I find your organization plan for taking care of boys good procedure. Anybody can throw a basketball up in the air and collect a gang of boys. But when you build on a church, or a men's club, or some other group, you give a stability and permanence to your units, and that is the way you are building them.

There is only one danger there as I see it, the human tendency which we all have, to relax when we are doing a good job. Sure, your church has a Cub Pack, and maybe your Legion post has a troop. It takes care of ten, twenty, perhaps even more boys. But maybe that church or Legion post ought to be serving a hundred others. Maybe there are that many boys in your neighborhood wanting to come in, only there's no place for them. Soon they may get tired and look for their recreation elsewhere. Soon it may be too late to reach them. So I hope that you will make sure, if you feel that you are doing your share, that you really are. Maybe your church ought to have a group of older fellows, those too old to join your troop. Or the younger one—they can get some mighty valuable experiences if your board of directors votes to get a pack started for them.

What a debt we owe these boys! Don't forget that a few years ago it was our young men who flew our planes, drove our tanks, died in foxholes and won the war for us. We owe our youth a debt we can never pay. We have the finest young people in the world right here on the sidewalks of New York. I am always impressed as I meet with them and talk to them by their sincerity, their frankness, their fine sense of loyalty and capacity for devotion. And yet the majority of our criminals are boys and young men. Eighty percent of them are less than 25 years of age. Our rate of juvenile delinquency is equally depressing. If the good people of the borough of Manhattan ask why so many youths become delinquents and criminals, I can tell them why. Experience shows that the majority of these young people have had bad influence during the impressionable years covered by the span of Scouting, from 8 to 18. During these years every boy needs the influence of the right kind of man. He needs such a man to supply his ideals and become his hero. The reason so many boys become criminals is because they follow the wrong leaders.

This condition is a challenge to the men of our city. Nightly these thousands of boys roam our streets, looking for amusement, longing for adventure, yearning for companionship. Many come from broken homes. Few have had a chance for church influence. Should we shut the doors of Scouting in their faces? Should we not provide a place where they can meet and find wholesome activities under the right kind of leader?

This is a practical thing. It can be done. You have made a beginning, with wonderful results. Why should you not undertake it in a bigger way? Will you not, each one of you, here and now accept the challenge and do your part for the boys who are knocking on the door?

I do not think we should spend too much time looking into the past. The world is not finished. We have just started. As long as we have the desire to go ahead, we shall progress. What we need is to help with all our might the young people who are going to carry it on. We can make the future what we want it to be if we will equip them to carry on what we have begun. When we compare our democracy to the forces that beset us, forces that stand for the suppression of religion, of free speech, free press, and the dignity of the individual, for the perversion of youth by propaganda, we realize how necessary are such movements as the Boy Scouts, devoted to the development of character, integrity, reverence, and the American principle of fair play.

The symbol of America, the Statue of Liberty, represents liberty and justice. It stands for everything we hold good. Americans should be prouder than ever of their country today, and the ideals on which it is founded. You have embarked upon what you term a crusade to strengthen the arm of liberty. I urge that you step in and win it. Make this a crusade of decency, for democracy, for the sanctity of the individual and the cleansing of the moral fabric, through constructive training for youth.

I think this crusade can make a real contribution if it helps boys to realize what real Americanism is, so that they can grow up to live by it. Our forefathers instilled into their children a love for the blessings of freedom and liberty. It is now our turn to teach the next generation that liberty and honor are a precious heritage which must be guarded with all our strength. The continued freedom of this Nation depends upon generation after generation of citizens holding fast to the truths without which no people shall ever achieve national greatness.

Generation after generation of fine boys and girls have grown up to defend these principles. Strong in body, keen in mind, brave in heart, generous in spirit, these young people are the glory of the present, and the hope of the future. God is sending us such young people today as he has sent them to every generation in the past. In them and in God Almighty we put our trust. To them we pledge our best today, and as long as life lasts.

Nationalists Can Hold Off Formosa Foe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a first-hand report on conditions in Formosa. The State Department constantly passes out stories about allegedly worsening conditions in Formosa, threatened revolt against the Chinese Government, or defection to the Communists. It continues its obvious determination to produce all the bad things it has predicted in order to justify its miscalculations about the Chinese Government whose downfall it has been solemnly forecasting "within a few months" since 1944. What are its sources of information? I have talked to many Americans and Chinese who have been in Formosa in the last few months. None of them confirms the picture of hopelessness. Almost all report improving conditions. The following article shows the heroic efforts Chinese and Formosans are making to stay free. Would it be wrong for us, the descendants of Valley Forge, to encourage those efforts and, for a change, reorganize and commend good where it exists as well as condemn bad?

The following article by Walter Simmons appeared in the Washington Times-Herald January 20, 1950:

NATIONALISTS CAN HOLD OFF FORMOSA FOE

(By Walter Simmons)

TAIKAO, FORMOSA, January 19.—With their backs to the wall, the Chinese Nationalists will surprise the world by holding Formosa without American military aid for many months, most qualified American observers agree. This forecast was confirmed by the writer's independent survey of defense installations.

Hainan Island is not being defended seriously and will be lost to the Communists soon. But on Formosa the picture has changed so rapidly in recent weeks that there is a move to get the American Joint Chiefs of Staff, due to visit Japan in February, to see the encouraging new situation for themselves. Here are the high lights:

1. Reforms plus the incorporation of Formosan youths into the army for the first time have roused the islanders to a wild patriotic fervor. Grumbling natives, bitterly antagonistic to their Chinese rulers a month ago, have become their rabid backers.

TROOPS READY TO FIGHT

2. Under the inspiring leadership of a new commander, Lt. Gen. Sun Li-jen, the defense garrison has developed the greatest fighting spirit ever observed in Nationalist troops.

3. Ransacking forgotten Japanese arms depots, the Chinese have found thousands of weapons and large supplies of ammunition. Although the soldiers are pitifully underequipped, they still have enough arms to repel any assault the Coramunists are likely to mount this year.

4. New government leaders have risen to power, replacing most—but not all—the crooks and incompetent who lost the mainland war.

5. The weakest spot is the island's economy which, under the burden of the present military effort, will collapse within an estimated 6 months without substantial outside aid.

This correspondent, who watched General Sun's men in beach defense maneuvers today on the island's southern coast, was impressed by the dash and physical condition of the troops.

Although about only half of the troops had rifles and they lacked shoes, helmets and adequate transport, they repelled a mock landing with fierceness, reflecting General Sun's Americanized training methods. The beaches are guarded with new concrete pillboxes, barbed wire and automatic weapons. Coastal guns up to 150 millimeters and 75 millimeters pack artillery overlook the landing sites. Underwater obstacles are being placed. Land mines are ready for placing. The defenses are being manned 24 hours a day.

The Japanese intended to defend Formosa against American attack with 200,000 infantry and artillery troops. Sun has more than

this, together with aerial and naval superiority which the Japanese lacked.

SEVEN THOUSAND YOUTHS VOLUNTEER

The armies have a strong backbone of determined men. They include 7,000 youths who, ignoring the traditional student immunity from military service in China, slipped through the Communist lines to volunteer. Five hundred officers from the beaten first army in Manchuria escaped to Formosa to rejoin Sun, who had trained them in Burma.

Hundreds of American light tanks will utilize the island's excellent paved road network as mobile defense forces poised to guard the best landing beaches.

Conscripted last week, 4,500 Formosan students already are uniformed and drilling at Fengshan near here. The Nationalists had feared the results of conscripting natives but it was a political masterstroke.

Sun's problem is to defend a 13,900 square mile area included within a 708-mile coast line.

At a south Formosa arsenal, moved bodily from Nanking last year with 1,400 workers and 2,000 machine tools, old Japanese .25 caliber rifles, rusting since VJ-day, were being repaired to fit .30 caliber ammunition. Already 100,000 had been modified and 20,000 more were stacked nearby.

No Answer From Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include therein a copy of a letter written by our Ambassador the Honorable Arthur Bliss Lane to His Excellency Andrei Y. Vishinsky, Foreign Minister of the U. S. S. R., Lake Success, Long Island, N. Y., under date of November 7, 1949, touching on the Katyn incident and asking an authentic report of the massacre of more than 4,000 Polish officers in the Katyn Forest and the disappearance of another 10,000 Polish prisoners elsewhere in the U. S. S. R. during the last war.

I am informed through reliable sources that this letter has never been accorded the courtesy of a reply, in other words, it has been disregarded.

AMBASSADOR ARTHUR BLISS LANE'S LETTER TO MR. ANDREI Y. VISHINSKY

NOVEMBER 17, 1949.

His Excellency ANDREI Y. VISHINSKY,
Foreign Minister of the U. S. S. R.,
Lake Success, Long Island, N. Y.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: As chairman of the American Committee for the Investigation of the Katyn Massacre, Inc., I have the honor to request Your Excellency's assistance to this committee to establish the truth regarding the massacre of more than 4,000 Polish officers in the Katyn Forest and the disappearance of another 10,000 Polish prisoners elsewhere in the U. S. S. R. during the last war.

We appeal to you not only as the present Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union but also as an official who was Soviet Vice Commissar for Foreign Affairs in 1940 and 1941, and who was in charge of Polish affairs during that period when it is alleged this war crime was committed.

As you will recall, you had many highly important conversations with the representatives of the Polish Government on this subject, specifically with the Polish Amabassador, Prof. S. Kot, on the following dates: September 20, October 6, October 14, November 2, and November 12, 1941, and July 6, 1942

More than 4 years have passed since the end of hostilities. During this period a sufficiently large number of new facts concerning the war crime of Katyn have come to light to warrant a new investigation. To conduct such an investigation is the purpose of this committee. It is the aim of the committee to establish the truth beyond any shadow of doubt.

Therefore, this committee will appeal to the whole world for assistance in its endeavor to establish the truth. It will accept testimony from any direct or indirect witness of the crime regardless of nationality, creed, or race. It will carefully listen to all the direct and circumstantial evidence available, and, in evaluating this evidence, it will be guided only by the measure of credibility and veracity of the evidence produced. The committee pledges itself not to abandon its task of establishing the truth about the mass slaughter of the more than 4,000 Polish officers at Katyn and the disappearance of more than 10,000 other Polish prisoners of war in Russia, no matter how long the task will require.

May I express, not only in my own name, but also in the name of every member of this committee, the deep hope that Your Excellency will either be good enough to appear before this committee or will delegate a duly qualified representative to do so, in order to further our work which will be guided by the promise to humanity as expressed in the joint declaration issued on the close of the Moscow Conference in October 1943 over the signatures of President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin, reading as follows:

"Let those who have hitherto not imbued their hands with innocent blood beware lest they join the ranks of the guilty, for most assuredly the three Allied powers will pursue them to the uttermost ends of the earth and will deliver them to their accusers in order that justice may be done."

With the expression of my esteem, believe me, Excellency,

Very sincerely yours,

ARTHUR BLISS LANE,
Chairman.

Gas Rate at Jacksonville, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the following is submitted for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the request of officials of the city government of Jacksonville, Fla.:

Whereas at the request of the City Commission of the City of Jacksonville the Federal Power Commission made available to the city three of its staff experts in proceedings instituted by the city commission to fix a fair and reasonable rate for the sale of manufactured gas to consumers thereof in the city of Jacksonville by the Jacksonville Gas Corp. and on the appeal by said gas corporation from the action of the city commission to the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission; and

Whereas the services rendered by said staff experts Messrs. Edward L. Dunn, Carl T. Kallina, and Robert Simonds have been of invaluable assistance to the city of Jacksonville and to consumers of manufactured gas in this city, and have contributed in a large measure toward the rendition of an order by the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission reducing present rates for the sale of manufactured gas in the city of Jacksonville: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Commission of the City of Jacksonville, That the grateful appreciation of this commission be extended to the Federal Power Commission for the assistance rendered to the city of Jacksonville in the aforesaid proceedings to establish a just and reasonable rate for the sale of manufactured gas to consumers thereof in the city of Jacksonville, Fla.; and be it further

Resolved, That the sincere thanks of this commission are hereby extended individually to Messrs. Edward L. Dunn, Carl T. Kallina, and Robert Simonds for their untiring, efficient, and valuable services rendered to the city of Jacksonville in the aforesaid proceedings; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of this commission to the Federal Power Commission and to Messrs. Edward L. Dunn, Carl T. Kallina, and Robert Simonds.

A true copy.

Attest:

EARLE E. JONES,
Secretary, City Commission.

Newspaper Advises Landlords and Tenants Re Decontrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of all the Members of this House what appears to me to be a very worthy newspaper article, which appeared Friday morning, January 13, 1950, in the Long Beach Independent, at Long Beach, Calif. Long Beach is the largest community in the State of California which has voted decontrol of rents by its duly constituted city council.

There are several other similar communities in California which had previously done so.

I present this for both landlord and tenant, not only in Long Beach, Calif., but for landlords and tenants in every city in America, as they meet this problem of cooperative adjustment, when necessary, as a result of decontrol.

The article follows:

LANDLORDS BEWARE

Rent controls are not off. The Governor has approved decontrol, but until officially decontrolled by the Federal Housing Expediter, it is not official. He must decontrol, but landlords must await that official action, which should be in about 2 weeks. It is hoped the action will make little difference between landlord and tenant. But above all, landlords should recognize their responsibility and danger.

First reaction of both tenant and landlord will be emotional. Many tenants will expect

restriction of rent increases where none is intended. Some landlords may hope to use decontrol to gouge tenants with unreasonable rent increases. This type landlord is the greatest menace now faced by the property owners who seek only the right to operate their own properties.

The President only this week asked Congress to renew rent control for another year after June 1. What happens in Long Beach can mean his request will be granted. If rents soar here it will be used as an example of why Nation-wide controls are necessary. Long Beach is the largest city yet decontrolled. What happens here will be watched by all who seek permanent socialization of housing. It can mean only a few months of decontrol then permanent control.

There are certain to be some adjustments. If they are reasonable, tenants should expect them. Rents have increased an average of 15 percent while all other commodities and services have increased much more. On the other hand, landlords have had a steady income for 10 years which they did not have before and again soon may not have. It is an emergency that calls for decency and sound thinking, free from emotions and selfishness by both tenants and landlords.

There will be evictions. Some will be for good reasons where tenants have deliberately misused property and been obnoxious. No one can criticize landlords in such cases. But even in these cases, landlords would be wise to go slowly, lest they dig their own grave by controls being enacted. It is a good time to stop, look, and listen before jumping.

Surveys have shown hotels are becoming daily more plentiful. It is only a short step to seeing vacancy signs in every block. A year ago, we were begging for newsprint for the paper. Today, we have far more available than we can use. Few publishers expected that condition for at least 3 years. The same thing can happen to housing. It is common sense to keep tenants who pay regularly rather than to be seeking new tenants. It is also common sense to hold down criticism of decontrol by not raising rents or promiscuous evictions.

All owners of rental properties are on a spot. We hope they make of Long Beach an example of why decontrols are justified and not an example that will be used by those who seek control of all private property.—L. A. C.

Canada Succeeds in Cutting Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this country if it is to maintain its pay rolls and create more jobs will have to lift the crushing burden of taxation from those who create venture capital through thrift and savings.

Canada has had the vision and wisdom to approach this problem realistically by reducing its excise taxes and other tax burdens without resorting to deception by increasing the taxes of their corporations, and thus passing the excise-tax load back onto the people.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article which appeared in the New York Journal-American of January 10, 1950:

CANADA SUCCEEDS IN CUTTING TAXES

(By Don Hazell)

What goes on across the border?

That's what tax-conscious United States legislators wanted to know when Canada's Finance Minister Douglas Abbott presented a 1949–50 budget that not only called for heavy tax reductions but provided for further slashes in the national debt.

To Congressmen belabored by constituents demanding tax relief, the whole Canadian program—if it worked—was potent ammunition to be trained against the Fair Deal's announced tax-and-spend policy.

Even Canadian conservatives admit now—with only 3 months of the fiscal year to go—that Abbott's estimate of an $87,000,000 surplus, to be applied toward debt retirement, will hold. In short, Canada has reduced taxes and pared her public debt again: a feat few, if any, nations in the world have achieved since the war.

What is even more significant, however, is the basis for corporate tax relief. As Abbott puts it:

"These reforms were undertaken, not because of any deterioration in the profit position of Canadian corporations, but because in the Government's view, the economic development of Canada depends upon the willingness of our people to risk their money in constructive enterprises."

Taxes have been going down in Canada, in gradual stages, for about 4 years, but the 1949–50 over-all 32-percent slash in personal income-tax revenues is the healthiest cut of them all. Most of this relief took the form of higher exemptions, removing some 750,000 Canadians from the income-tax rolls which formerly totaled 2,000,000. And it meant a revenue drop of $235,000,000.

But other forms of taxation figured in the new budget.

The rate on the first $10,000 of corporate profits was cut to 10 percent to protect the small family type of business. Profits in excess of $10,000, however, were taxed an added 3 percent. Net result: $8,000,000 added revenue.

Individual Canadian shareholders were allowed a credit against their personal income taxes equal to 10 percent of the dividends they received from common shares of Canadian taxpaying corporations. This represented the first step toward removal of double taxation of dividends, and accounted for a revenue cut of $9,000,000.

Numerous wartime excise taxes were repealed. These included, with their corresponding revenue reductions, soft drinks, $24,500,000; candy, $16,600,000; chewing gum, $1,700,000; transportation, $19,200,000; communications, $6,500,000.

Other excise taxes—sales, toilet articles, luggage, matches, smokers supplies, pens and pencils, cigarette lighters—were cut to 10 percent for an over-all revenue slash of $17,300,000.

Americans who reckon the public debt, taxes, and Government expenditures in terms of billions of dollars may at first glance look upon Canada's tax-relief program and its debt retirement as "small potatoes." But when it is pointed out that population across the border is a mere thirteen and one-half million and the total net national debt by March 31 will be only $11,600,000,000 (after a $1,700,000,000 reduction in 4 years), the picture is a little clearer.

For example, if the same debt-retirement program undertaken by Canada in the last 4 years had been put in effect in the United States, our public debt would have been reduced by nearly $30,000,000,000.

While Canadians were enjoying the fruits of a balanced budget, the main cogs in its economic wheel looked like this:

Steel output last year hit 2,200,000 tons against 2,100,000 in 1948, the previous high; oil production soared to 21,000,000 barrels from 12,300,000 in 1948, the previous peak; banks were in the strongest position in their history; telephones in use jumped to a new record of 1,500,000; automobile production hit 280,000, an all-time peak; power output jumped to 46,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours, another record.

Value of shares listed on the Montreal Stock Exchange was estimated at $3,200,000,000 against $3,700,000,000 in 1948 and 1947. Newspaper advertising and circulation was at an all-time peak, but increased costs cut into profits; employment was high and the country was free of strikes in the key industries of the economy; newsprint production was 5,100,000 tons against 4,900,000 in 1948, the previous record.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Northampton County Republican Campaign Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at the Northampton County Republican campaign dinner, at Easton, Pa., on Friday, November 4, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great honor to meet with you tonight in old Northampton County.

When my good friend, your chairman, Ken Kressler, invited me to attend this grand Republican rally, I accepted with pleasure.

I welcomed this opportunity to come to Easton because I have so many friends here with whom I have had such pleasant associations.

I like to come to Northampton County political gatherings because your leadership and your organization preaches and practices the kind of politics that strives for good government. You take part in politics because you want to preserve America as a land of freedom and opportunity. That, my friends, is real peacetime patriotism.

We are in another important political campaign.

All campaigns in America are important no matter whether they are local, State, or National. Under our system of self-government in the United States, every vote cast in every election means something.

Daniel Webster, one of the greatest of American statesmen, expressed a strong and classic political truth when he said:

"The first object of a free people is the preservation of their liberty."

And I say to you that the preservation of our liberty begins at the ballot box in your own community and in your own voting precinct.

All good government has its foundation in municipal or local elections such as we are having next Tuesday. The offices we fill in this election are of so much importance to the people because their duties and responsibilities bring them in direct contact with the people.

Schools, roads, streets, elections, police and fire protection, health services, and your county courts come under their jurisdiction.

Local government is self-government. It is home rule. It is the bulwark of our freedoms.

Local government is the last line of defense against the advance of centralized bureaucracy. It must be maintained in health and vigor or we will be defeated by those who would control and regiment the lives of our people under a socialistic planned economy which destroys freedom of the individual.

There have been great changes in government in the United States in 20 years.

Let us make a few comparisons.

In 1929, only 20 years ago, we spent less than $4,000,000,000 to operate all the functions of the Federal Government.

In this fiscal year our Government will spend more than 11 times as much—approximately $46,500,000,000. In addition, Congress in the session just closed, passed contract authorizations of $4,500,000,000, making a total of almost $51,000,000,000.

Now, you know, it is impossible for any of us to comprehend just how much that is.

Let me make some comparisons that give a better idea of the amount the Federal Government will spend this year.

If every life-insurance policyholder in the United States cashed in all of his life insurance, the total would amount to $44,000,000,000. That would not be enough money to run the Federal Government for 1 year at the present rate of spending.

If every city home owner in the whole country disposed of his home, the total would amount to $30,000,000,000. That would run the Federal Government for about 8 months.

If every farmer sold his farm, all the equipment on it, and all the livestock, the total return would be $25,000,000,000. The Government could not run 7 months on that amount of money.

If every industry converted its net working capital into cash, a total of $39,000,000,000 would be realized. That would not be enough to run the Government for 11 months.

The cost of local government in the whole country is about $10,000,000,000 a year. That would only support the Federal Government 2½ months.

All the 48 State governments collect another 10 billion, which would only keep Uncle Sam going 2½ months.

Let us continue our comparisons. In 1929 the national debt was $16,500,000,000. Today, just 20 years later, it is 15½ times as big, or approximately $256,000,000,000.

Since July 1, the beginning of this fiscal year, the Federal Government is already in the red approximately $2,300,000,000.

In 1929 the Federal Government had less than 600,000 employees on its pay rolls. Today the number of persons working for Uncle Sam is more than 2,200,000.

They are increasing daily and will continue to increase if the present trend is not stopped.

These figures should serve as a warning signal. They reveal the dangerous pace at which the free spenders at Washington are burning up the Nation's wealth and the earnings of its workers.

Today approximately 30 percent of the total income of our people is being taken away from them to support local, State, and Federal government.

We spend more to govern ourselves than we pay for food. Government costs us 13 times as much as we spend for education and 40 times as much as we contribute to our churches.

In other words, we are working about 3½ months out of every year just to pay the cost of government.

Forty years ago, of all the taxes collected, 55 percent went to local government. Now it is only 13 percent. Forty years ago, 10 percent went to the States. Now it is 13 percent. Forty years ago, only 35 percent went to the Federal Government. Now it is 75 percent.

This will be the year of the greatest peacetime spending since the birth of our Nation.

The tax collections for this year will be far short of expenditures. We will undoubtedly end this fiscal year with a deficit of at least six to eight billion dollars. That will be the greatest peacetime deficit in the history of America.

This is an alarming situation. It should cause every American possessed of common sense to stop, look, and listen.

But it doesn't worry the spendthrift crowd that is in charge of the Government at Washington.

Two weeks ago President Truman announced the most brazen plan in the long history of reckless extravagance by Democratic administrations.

With the Federal Government spending about $6,000,000,000 a year beyond its income, Mr. Truman says that's not enough. When Congress comes back into session next January his first demand will be for higher taxes.

President Truman says he knows no way to balance the budget except by increased taxation. He wants to reach deeper into the wages of the worker and the earnings of the farmer.

I would like to suggest to Mr. Truman that he could get some very good advice if he would come up here to Easton and talk with some of the good housewives in your community.

They could tell him how to make expenses balance with income. They could tell him what they do when it becomes necessary to economize. They could tell him how they cut down on the family expenditures and live within their means.

But it seems that Mr. Truman has never learned that simple principle of economics. From his early business experience down to the present time, he still thinks he can get ahead by spending more than he takes in.

That is what we mean by deficit financing. It means living on borrowed money, and going deeper and deeper into debt. Mr. Truman thinks that's good for the country.

Actually, it is like cutting off a dog's tail in order to provide him with meat. You end up by whittling away the dog.

In the same way we are allowing our Government to be destroyed.

Not higher taxes, not more spending, but prudence, efficiency, and economy in government are America's needs today. We need better management, better housekeeping, and a realization of the fact that the course we have taken is the road to national bankruptcy. It is the road which ends in the loss of freedom under tyranny and dictatorship.

When President Truman's own economic adviser, Dr. Henry G. Nourse, resigned 2 weeks ago he gave blunt warning that the administration's monetary and fiscal policies have no power of magic but are a slippery road to misery.

How long can we stay on that road without rushing headlong into disaster?

How far can we travel along our present course and preserve the American system of individual freedom?

How long can we, as a nation, spend billions beyond our means and continue to enjoy the highest living standards in the world?

President Roosevelt, when he was a candidate in 1932, gave the answer when he said:

"Any government, like any family, can for a year, spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse."

That was a sound statement. Unfortunately, it was soon forgotten. It was overwhelmed in a mad rush of bigger and bigger spending.

We cannot, we must not, keep it up much longer.

I predict that if it continues another decade the great blessings we have enjoyed as Americans will be lost.

What has brought all this about?

Are we not as understanding about Government matters as were our fathers?

Are we not attentive enough to our duties as citizens?

I am afraid we are neglecting the obligation we owe to our country.

We are thinking too much about our rights and not enough about our responsibilities.

We are listening too much to the demagogues who buy votes by promising ease, comfort, and security to be paid for with your own money.

We are listening too much to the agents of the Soviet Union. The Communists have predicted that America would spend itself into economic collapse.

They have infiltrated every sort of organization and group. These people, their fellow travelers, and their innocent dupes, wage a never-ending war on Congress for greater and greater spending by the Government.

We are listening too much to thousands upon thousands of misguided "do-gooders."

We are listening too much to the demands of pressure groups for new governmental services. Once established they grow by leaps and bounds from year to year.

All this results in a great centralized bureaucracy at Washington which, slowly but surely, takes away the power, authority, and functions of State and local government.

What can we do about it? How can we prevent the loss of local government and home rule?

There is only one way and that is for every American to take part in government.

To take part in government effectively we must take part in politics.

Only through the ballot box can we rebuild local control and local responsibility in every community.

Good government begins by electing qualified men of upright character and unquestioned integrity to local office.

I hope there will be a full turn-out in all the election districts of Pennsylvania on Tuesday.

If we place good Republicans in our city halls, our township and borough buildings and in our court houses in this election, we will have a solid foundation for Republican victories in 1950 and 1952.

It Is Appeasement of Aggression, Not Resistance, That Leads to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Bridgeport Post of January 18, 1950. Its recognition that it is attempted appeasement of aggression, not firm resistance to it, that leads to war is as irrefutable as the quotation from our colleague the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LODGE), whose words it takes as its text.

The editorial follows:

M'MAHON AS AN APPEASER

It may surprise some Connecticut citizens to find Senator BRIEN MCMAHON depicted as an appeaser on Formosa, or in general, an appeaser of the Communist domination of

China, but in the opinion of Congressman JOHN DAVIS LODGE, who is a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, that is what the Senator's conduct amounts to.

"Unlike McMAHON," says LODGE, "I do not believe in compromising with communism. I believe that the policy of military aid and advice which succeeded in repelling the godless forces of communism in Greece and Turkey can also succeed in Formosa. Doesn't he know that the policy of resistance to communism has been successful in preserving freedom in both Greece and Turkey without precipitating a world conflict?

"For my part I am convinced that peace is a product of strength, that war is the result of weakness, and that the administration's policy in the Far East, actually a do-nothing policy, increases the chances of war. I am convinced that if Asia succumbs to Communist aggression, Europe cannot endure as a free area. If Europe goes under, the very survival of our Nation is at stake. * * * I wonder what the Senator has learned from the tragic events which led to World War II."

Senator McMAHON's expressed opinion is that if we take an aggressive stand to aid the Chinese Government in Formosa or to prevent the further spread of communism, it will lead to war.

But historically Congressman LODGE is right. We got into World War I not by doing something, but by doing nothing. We got into World War II, as most persons can easily remember if they will prod their memories a bit, in exactly the same way. We did nothing, we bowed well the aggressors that we would do nothing and as a result in that conviction, Japan struck at Pearl Harbor, and we were in.

We do not believe that the Communist-dominated nations want war or are prepared to wage war. But they are only too pleased to take advantage of our timidity at no cost to themselves. What they want above all else is time in which to consolidate their gains, perfect their weapons, increase their armies, and become strong enough to defy us or even to conquer us by force.

Chase National Bank Fund To Aid Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of January 20, 1950, indicating a loan fund established by the Chase National Bank to aid small business. I trust that other banks of the country will follow suit.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOAN FUND SET UP BY CHASE NATIONAL—$10,000,000 CREDITS ESTABLISHED TO AID SMALL BUSINESS THROUGH CORRESPONDENTS—LATTER ALL OVER COUNTRY—LOCAL BANKS TO HANDLE MATTERS UP TO $10,000 FOR 5 YEARS AT OWN DISCRETION

The Chase National Bank has established an initial $10,000,000 loan fund to participate with its correspondent banks in extending loans to small business in their communities throughout the Nation, Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman, announced yesterday.

More than 3,700 banks, at least one of which is in virtually every county in the 48 States, have a correspondent relationship with the Chase, it was pointed out, and over a period of years the Chase has participated in many credits with them.

"This plan has been devised to meet, at least in part, the contention that some small businesses are unable to obtain the intermediate term credit they require," Mr. Aldrich said. "Whether or not this is true, we believe the commercial banks of this country can, and will meet the legitimate credit needs of small business for bank credit.

"The Chase National Bank is anxious to help meet whatever need does exist. Our plan is an offer of cooperation to banks in all sections of the country which may, because of local circumstances, need additional lending capacity for intermediate term loans to local business concerns. Our offer of assistance is made on a voluntary and friendly basis for the sole purpose of helping our correspondents in meeting this problem."

Correspondent banks of Chase will soon be supplied with full details of the plan, Mr. Aldrich said. Under the plan all applications for small business loans must be made through local banks, not directly to the Chase, which will offer to take up to 90 percent of the dollar amount of each loan, subject to a 5-day review period, it was explained.

The local banks are to have discretion in arranging the terms of these loans up to a $25,000 maximum amount and for not longer than 5 years. Chase will allow the local bank one-half of 1 percent as a service fee for handling the loan and will request for itself a minimum net interest rate of 4½ percent.

Excerpt From Inaugural Address of Carl B. Rechner Before Real-Estate Board of Kansas City, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from the inaugural address of Mr. Carl B. Rechner as president of the Real-Estate Board, Kansas City, Mo., January 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

And now may I discuss briefly an issue which outweighs all others and is trying to stamp out the pattern for generations. I refer to the drift away from independent, free initiative and enterprise, and the trend toward building the security welfare state with its plan of socializing our lives and business. No political party or special group alone is responsible. But by expecting something for nothing, by fear, laziness, and the attempt to divide by class, too large a number of our people are looking to a paternalistic Central Government to wet nurse us through every contingency of life. Our reward system, the free-enterprise system, under the grace of God, has steadily given the great masses of our people a standard of living far beyond our neighbor nations and is the envy of the world. Our great incentive system, backed by education, research and development, has won two world wars largely through production. Yet this same system has failed to use its great salesmanship and ability in simply furnishing the truth of its results and worth, so that it is more fully understood and appreciated by all our people from school child to housewife and wage earner. This is our system, yours and mine. Our values, efforts, and future are built on this premise. People in alarming numbers are demanding of Government on all levels, additional services and direct security without knowing the cost in taxes.

The cost of government has now risen to the point considered by the best economists to be close to the limit of our ability to support. To illustrate, take your four principal items of expense from each dollar:

	Cents
In 1929:	
Food	23
Shelter	23
Clothing	13
Government	12
In 1949:	
Food, no change	23
Shelter, one-third decrease	18
Clothing, a decrease	11
Government, almost 100 percent increase	23

The source of these statistics is the United States Department of Commerce.

Our job is to be alert to the cost of government, to intelligently formulate and work for a better understanding of this great system of free enterprise, which has given us these unlimited advantages we accept as commonplace. This basic knowledge must be taught in the schools to children, be understood by school teachers, by parents, and be our watchword. The spreading of this truth is real security, our real welfare. The Government will reflect our thinking and desires as long as we stockholders, the American public, speak. Many thinking citizens are aware of this influence. Effective action is being launched now by private and trade organizations.

Enlightenment on this issue will bring the right results. We have always had problems but if we are alert and willing, we can master and solve these new problems with certainty.

Again our objections are not directed at politics or individuals but apply to principles. We demand progress. Business must furnish untiring leadership for the improvement of all men. We can never achieve this noble objective if we are broke, divided and beaten. We must continue to build internal strength. Strong and unified, we then can continue to be the light of the world.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Fifty-first Annual Dinner of Pennsylvania Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered before the fifty-first annual dinner of the Pennsylvania Society at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N. Y., on December 10, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a rare privilege to be a member of this fine assembly.

Over us tonight hovers the spirit of William Penn and Benjamin Franklin and the other illustrious Pennsylvanians whose memory we honor in praise and gratitude.

In no other country of the world could a group like this, with widely divergent views and opinions, meet in friendly relations to discuss the problems confronting our Nation and its people.

I am particularly pleased to express my deep appreciation of the fine association I have enjoyed with my distinguished colleague, Senator MYERS.

As you well know, we are frequently on opposite sides on questions before the Senate, but that has not interfered with our sincere personal friendship and fine understanding.

Tonight I want to talk with you about some of the things that have been happening in Washington.

It would be pleasant to report that the State of the Union is perfect. It is always pleasant to view our country through rose-colored glasses. There are those who would have us wear those rose-colored glasses permanently. But we would only be deceiving ourselves, if we were to accept the rosy picture as natural color.

For the sake of our land, for the preservation of our liberties, for those who will come after us, we must face up to facts, not technicolored fiction.

In recent years we have witnessed radical changes in the philosophy of government and dangerous departures from traditional American course.

We have seen a vast increase in the size and complexity of the Federal Government. We have seen its power encroaching more and more upon the functions and authority of State and local government.

We have seen the cost of Government multiplied eightfold in 20 years. We have seen excessive taxation drain away the earnings of the worker, the farmer, and the resources of industry.

We have witnessed the tragic spectacle of an administration unaware of the danger of national bankruptcy and the threat to American freedom that is inherent in a national debt exceeding a quarter of a trillion dollars.

We have witnessed the wildest spending spree in our Nation's history. This year alone it may add $8,000,000,000 to our present crushing burden of debt.

For the first time in the peacetime history of our Republic, an administration spokesman—the Secretary of the Treasury—has advocated deficit financing as a definite policy of government.

That is a shocking reversal of our historic policy of balanced budgets. It must not go unchallenged.

You will recall that President Truman told the Nation he knew only one way to balance the budget.

Just raise taxes, he said.

Don't try to economize. Don't eliminate waste and extravagance. Don't cut away the thick undergrowth of needless and useless Government functions. Don't do away with duplication and overlapping.

Just raise taxes.

But everyone knows that today the American people are trapped in a great jungle of taxes, both hidden and direct.

Thirty cents out of every dollar of every one of us—worker, farmer, preacher, lawyer, doctor, and businessman—goes for government.

With this big tax bill confronting us there are important and critical questions which must be answered.

How much of the national income can be taken in taxes and still leave enough to continue high employment and operate industry at full capacity?

How large a cut can we take for taxes and still maintain our high living standards?

How far can we go without everyone getting hurt in the tax squeeze?

If we cut down taxes more people will have more money to spend for automobiles, homes, household appliances, and the necessities of life. That is the way real income should be increased, not by inflation through borrowed money.

Deficit financing is like cutting off a dog's tail in order to provide him with meat. You end up by whittling away the dog.

Unfortunately, too many of our people do not recognize the fact that every increase in the national debt is another step toward inflation.

It is the dangerous process by which we water our currency and depreciate the value of the dollar.

Let me give you an example.

President Truman told the country recently that under his policies the income level of $4,000 per family per year could be established.

And he envisioned an increase of $75,000,000,000 in the national income in a short time.

However, we must remember that these figures don't really mean all they appear to mean on the surface. An income of $4,000 per family today is not double an income of $2,000 for the same family 10 years ago.

Let me explain that.

Suppose, 10 years ago, in 1939, you invested $18.75 and purchased a $25 United States savings bond.

This year, 10 years later, your bond has matured. You cash it in and get $25. You have deferred use of your money for 10 long years. It has increased by one-third, or $6.25.

But has it really? The answer, I am compelled to say, is "No."

Under the inflationary policies fostered by this administration, you can buy less goods for $25 today than you could buy for your original $18.75 in 1939.

Thus, you have gone without the use of your money for 10 years to find you have less than when you started. This administration's inflationary policies are largely responsible for that.

The same depreciation in real value, as represented by the reduced purchasing power of the dollar, strikes at savings funds, insurance policies, annuities, pensions, and all other forms of fixed payments.

Labor, agriculture, and business are entitled to a stable dollar.

We are told, however, that if the Government bureaucrats are given greater control of our national economy we can have security against all the contingencies of life.

But I assure you that all the fiscal tricks of the present administration at Washington will not produce a magic formula that can provide security for 150,000,000 people.

Real security must be bought and paid for by work and sweat, individual thrift, and sacrifice. It is the reward of enterprise, initiative, and prudence.

Security cannot be achieved by the simple method of having the earnings of the people spent, not by themselves, but by a spendthrift Government bureaucracy.

The Federal Government has made itself the biggest single distributor of income in the United States. More than 19,000,000 men and women get a check of some kind from the Federal Government at regular intervals.

History teaches us that one of the causes of the fall of the great Roman Empire was the steady trend toward turning citizens into pensioners. When the Roman masses got their minds firmly fixed on free bread and circuses, they soon became indifferent to liberty and freedom.

In modern times we see the abuses of democracy in the constantly increasing pressure and demand upon the Government for support of destructive programs that reach into every activity of our daily lives.

When Government control goes far enough into medicine, education, agriculture, labor, and business, the freedoms which made us such a great nation will be lost.

These are only a few of the trends and dangers.

What are we to do? Is there any way to curb the danger? Or do we want our lives planned, controlled, and regimented by an all-powerful central government? The answer must be given by the people. It can be given only through our political parties.

There are some of us—not divided by party lines—who have been fighting to bring economy and a balanced budget to Washington. We seek to end this reckless spending, these endless deficits. We want to reverse the dangerous trend toward a socialistic economy which robs youth of freedom, opportunity, and incentive.

Because we are making this fight we have been ridiculed as representing selfish interests. We have been told we are 100 years behind the times, that we are reactionaries and do-nothings, that our principles are vicious and against the interests of the people.

Those who attack us call themselves liberals. They claim Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson as their patron saints. But they pay only lip service to the principles of those American statesmen. They do not follow the teachings of Jefferson and Jackson.

Thomas Jefferson was a great prophet of the evils of government debt and government grown to monstrous size.

It was no reactionary, no Republican, it was Thomas Jefferson who stood out in warning:

"We are ruined if we do not overrule the principle that 'the more we owe, the more prosperous we shall be' and that 'a public debt furnishes the means of enterprise.'"

It was Thomas Jefferson again—and I hope they are listening down there in Washington—who said:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues—and public debt as the greatest of dangers. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty * * * or profusion and servitude."

Yes, that was Thomas Jefferson talking.

And what of that other patron saint, Andrew Jackson? This is what he believed:

"From our past experience it cannot be doubted that simplicity in the character of the Federal Government and a rigid economy in its administration should be regarded as fundamental and sacred."

Later he told the Congress:

"No people can hope to perpetuate their liberties who long acquiesce in a policy which taxes them for objects not necessary to the legitimate and real wants of their government."

Let me remind the free spenders at Washington that these quotations express the philosophy of Jefferson and Jackson. Let me ask:

"Will you brand them as reactionaries and tories because they, too, preached economy and limitations upon the growth of the central bureaucracy?"

Let us step forward to the year 1893.

The great Grover Cleveland, first Democratic President after the Civil War, is being inaugurated for his second term. In his inaugural address he said:

"The lessons of paternalism ought to be unlearned and the better lesson taught that while people should patriotically and cheerfully support their government, its functions do not include support of the people."

Will they in Washington sneer at Grover Cleveland and disown his great memory?

Then, in 1913, the next Democratic President occupied the White House—Woodrow Wilson. Let me quote briefly from Mr. Wilson. He said:

"There is a point at which, in peacetime, rates of income and profits taxes discourage

energy, remove the incentive to new enterprise, encourage extravagant expenditures, and other attendant evils."

Again, it was Wilson who declared:

"The duty of economy is just debatable. It is manifest and imperative."

I turn now to the Democratic National Convention of 1932. The platform adopted contains this language:

We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government."

May I point out that in that year the entire cost of operating the Federal Government was less—I repeat, less—than this year's interest on the national debt alone.

Running on that platform was Franklin D. Roosevelt, who declared in a major address:

"Any government—like any family—can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse."

Ladies and gentlemen, these are magnificent words. They should be hung in every office in every department and bureau in Washington—and I include the President's own offices in the White House.

Then in 1941 a Democratic Member rises in the United States Senate. He says:

"It seems that when public funds are to be expended no one has any interest in what happens to them, no matter what his responsibilities may be under his oath of office.

"I dislike to make such a statement, but unless this body and the House of Representatives exercise their prerogatives in connection with the purse strings of the Government, much of the money appropriated will be thrown away for no good purpose whatever."

At that time we were engaged in total war. The Senator who made that statement was the chairman of the Special War Investigating Committee. It was Harry S. Truman, then a Senator from Missouri.

And so, when I hear them call those of us who are economy minded, reactionaries, and horse-and-buggy folks, I remember the strong stand of every great Democratic President in our history, down to the time of the New Deal and the so-called Fair Deal.

Were they all wrong? Were they all reactionaries? Were they all horse-and-buggy men?

Were all these great men fools because they feared deficit financing and growing Federal encroachment upon the liberties of the citizens?

Were Roosevelt, the candidate, and Truman, the Senator, reactionaries, and fools?

We who are called tories and reactionaries because we fight for economy and solvency are struggling to preserve the greatest product given by God to mankind—freedom and opportunity.

The American people have become so accustomed to it that they have forgotten its real worth. They have forgotten that no other country in all the world offers this great product so freely.

They are trading it off, day by day, in exchange for fool's gold, wrapped in the most seductive, vote-getting package of all history.

We must find a way to make all our people understand that what they are sacrificing is infinitely more precious than the gaudy, tinsel-covered package whose glitter must fade away and leave nothing but broken hopes and disillusionment.

Heaven help our Nation if the ideals upon which it was founded and upon which it has grown great, are now to be regarded as false principles.

Heaven help America if, like Esau, we sell out the birthright of future generations—and their heritage for the temporary gain of hand-outs from Washington.

We glory in the greatness of America. We boast of the miracle of American progress in a comparatively brief span of years from a trackless wilderness to the mightiest nation of the world.

We are proud of the vast productive capacity of our giant industrial strength.

We rejoice in our high cultural and spiritual attainments, and in the high living standards of our people.

What has been responsible for all these unparalleled achievements? Why have we surpassed other nations with equal or greater population and richer natural resources?

What does the United States possess that other nations do not have?

It is individual freedom. It is the right to work at the job of our choice; the right to retain the results of our enterprise, courage, and resourcefulness; the right to take part in our Government; the right to worship God as our conscience dictates.

To secure all these blessings the Atlantic seaboard was the stage for the greatest drama of all history. Here was enacted the story of man's fight for individual freedom.

The players in that stirring drama were the greatest men and women of their time. They had been trained for their parts in the most exacting school—that of hard work, courage, and necessity. They came to this country seeking God, truth, and freedom.

The freedom they established has been preserved by the blood and sacrifice of heroes in every generation. It is too precious to be lost through indifference or neglect of our responsibilities.

If we are to help save America we must all interest ourselves in politics, because the kind of government we are to have is decided at the ballot box.

We need a deeper understanding of practical, patriotic politics—the kind of political activity that is based on the highest standards of morality, honesty, sincerity, and love of our country.

With those standards as our guide we can spread the gospel of true Americanism. We can preach what our precious freedom means to us as individuals and as a Nation.

It's great to be an American. Let us have the courage to be real Americans.

Let us have pride in the past and look with confidence to the future.

Let us put our trust in the sovereignty of God rather than the sovereignty of an all-powerful central state.

The Coal Situation in Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram which I received from Mr. Leon Walker, president, Delaware State Coal Club, and also a letter from the same gentleman.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reports received from representative retail coal dealers throughout Delaware show present stock of prepared sizes of anthracite for domestic heating, also for broiler growers use, are extremely low. Many dealers are already out of sizes. A spell of cold weather will quickly exhaust present stock and 3-day operation of mines, resulting in curtailed and delayed shipments, will not then be able to take care of an acute situation. An emergency does now exist and immediate steps should be taken to place operation on a normal basis. Letter follows.

LEON WALKER,
President, Delaware State Coal Club.

DELAWARE STATE COAL CLUB,
Wilmington 1, Del., January 21, 1950.

Hon. J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALLEN: Confirming my telegram of date, copy enclosed, reports received from representative retail coal dealers throughout the State show their present stock of prepared sizes of anthracite for domestic heating purposes is extremely low and should we have normal winter weather a critical emergency will exist within a period of 3 or 4 days, or at least a week. Many dealers are now out of sizes and due to the 3-day operation at the mines, shipments are necessarily confined to those days and if not then made no shipments can be made until the following week, plus a further delay of a week to 10 days for rail movement before any coal can be received. The present 3-day production schedule cannot possibly meet normal winter weather demands and with stocks exhausted and limited shipments, an acute emergency will quickly develop.

Reports from the lower end of the State also indicate that the stocks of nut coal on hand by dealers supplying broiler growers will not exceed 1 week's normal winter requirements. The only solution is for immediate resumption of anthracite production on a normal weekly basis. Should we have a spell of cold weather, further delay in handling the present situation will be disastrous. The President should act before it is too late.

I have taken the liberty of addressing you on the subject because of its importance.

With kindest regards.

LEON WALKER, *President.*

Illusory Women's Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial on the subject of the equal-rights amendment be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of July 19, 1945]

ILLUSORY WOMEN'S RIGHTS

We have always had difficulty in taking seriously the campaign to secure equal rights for women by amending the Constitution. However, with both the Democratic and Republican Parties on record in favor of such an amendment and the present House Judiciary Committee approving the proposal, it is no longer possible to assume that common sense will save us from the folly of incorporating a meaningless and mischievous slogan into our basic law.

The proposed amendment has an attractively egalitarian ring that may commend it to the thoughtless because it proclaims that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." It is only when we undertake to find out just what this amendment would do for women that doubts arise. There is no denying that in some States women are subject to legal discriminations that should be abolished. But in contradistinction to such discriminatory laws, which are being whittled away year by year under the pressure of an increasingly enlightened public opinion, there is a vast body of legislation applicable to women that is primarily protective in character.

Most States limit the number of hours women may work, require minimum wages and provide other forms of protection for their health and efficiency. Married women and widows also receive preferential treatment under State laws. The wife, for example, is entitled to support under State laws. That fact alone justifies differences in laws relating to the property rights of men and women.

Assuming that the proposed amendment might succeed in effecting complete equality of men and women before the law, women would soon find that they had paid a heavy price for limited gains. For the effect would be to eliminate all the special legislation designed to safeguard women in industry and in the home along with the laws that are unfairly discriminatory. In short, the proponents of this equal-rights amendment have set up standards for guidance that are utterly unrealistic, being based on the untenable assumption that women are in a position to make their way and fend for themselves quite as well as men. Nobody knows better than the working women how false that notion is.

The handicaps—physical and social—under which women, especially wage earners, labor are often formidable; many of them are purely physical handicaps that it would be sheer folly to ignore. Others are an outgrowth of prejudice and customs that legislation cannot alter. Only time, education, and slowly changing public opinion can assure women a perfectly fair deal in the competitive rough and tumble of modern life, even in those occupations for which they are by nature and training well fitted. Hence, it is not surprising to find major labor groups and outstanding women leaders, such as former Secretary of Labor Perkins, who are intimately acquainted with labor problems, actively opposing the equal-rights amendment. They realize that equality before the law is worse than an empty formula.

It is an invitation to oppression for the law to disregard differences between the sexes that affect earning capacity and to refuse to make allowance for the different social positions of men and women as members of family groups. As the minority members of the House Judiciary Committee said, "using the Constitution for a broom with which to sweep away indiscriminately the good with the bad is neither sound law nor sane behavior." Where State laws unjust to women exist, efforts should be directed toward their revision or elimination; that is, there should be a separate bill for a separate ill.

The proposed amendment sets up no legislative standards to replace existing laws it would invalidate. It is purely negative and essentially destructive. Nor is it clear what is meant by the second paragraph of the amendment to the effect that Congress and the several States shall have power within their respective jurisdictions to enforce this article by appropriate legislation. Conflicting interpretations and endless litigation would be the result of incorporating any such vague amendment into the fundamental law of the land. However, there appears to be general agreement on one point: the amendment would wipe out all the laws, State and Federal, that give special protection to women and would also make it impossible to provide for their protection in the future, without extending a like degree of protection to men who may not desire nor require it.

Willie Six

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column Next to the News, by Alfred Mynders, which appeared in the Chattanooga Times of Sunday, January 15, 1950. Mr. Mynders tells of the passing of a distinguished American Negro whose life was a tribute to Christian usefulness. What has been related by Mr. Mynders about the late Willie Six amounts to a eulogy to be desired by any man, whatever his color or creed or religion may be.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEXT TO THE NEWS

(By Alfred Mynders)

Today and for the next decade or two, the so-called color line will be a controversial issue to all who are of and who love the South. "Crossing the color line," a phrase which must have been invented by someone not of the South, is in current use. But this column deals with something entirely different. It is the story of a man who transcended the color line. So powerful was the force of his spirit, so convincing was the quality of his devotion, that he took with him in his flight across the mystical barrier many hundreds, certainly, and perhaps thousands.

His name, Willie Six, might seem almost whimsical to someone not knowing Sewanee athletes and their fierce loyalty to this unusual man. But he came by the name honestly. He wore a discarded football jersey with the numeral "6" on it. His name already was Willie Sims, so quite simply the transition was effected. The new name pleased "his young men" and in that it coincided precisely with his life's motive.

He was building a church in 1906 when Coach Harris G. Cope asked him to become trainer for the team the following year. It was about half finished when Willie turned to the gymnasium in 1909, and half finished it remains, under the name of All Saints' Chapel at the University of the South.

It is not given to many to be buried from a church which they helped to build, but that is one of Willie's honors. He was buried last Saturday in the rocky soil of the mountain top which he loved and which loved him. The story of his death had been flashed throughout the land and brought some comments which are notable. A major general telephoned from North Carolina to say, "I feel a personal loss. Having known Willie since 1912, I can say that in that time and in my experience on several continents, I've never seen greater devotion to duty, greater loyalty. I've come to think of him as exemplifying the real spirit of a Sewanee man."

Telegrams from bishops in Florida, Virginia, and New Mexico, from a lieutenant general in Atlanta, from the head of the largest of the world's broadcasting companies * * * these were only a few of the messages which revealed a relationship beyond the power of words to express.

The junior Senator from Washington, Senator HARRY P. CAIN, arose in the United States Senate Friday to eulogize a friend—Willie Six, who had watched over him when he was a well-known Sewanee athlete years ago. He noted the passing of this good Christian gentleman and he said: "The junior Senator from Washington has risen to express his personal feeling of loss and to extend his sympathy to the family of Willie Six."

Many of the virtues which Christ talked about were qualities whose desirability he was reiterating, qualities which had been recommended before by the philosophers of ancient Israel, as well as those of China and India. But some of the meaning which Christ gave to that virtue called humility and to that dynamic outpouring called love had a new quality and gave a novel flavor to His teaching.

If we are to believe the testimony of witnesses who can be called nothing less than reliable, then we have seen an humble colored man whose love was so great that he left a lasting mark on his time.

One of his closest friends, Gordon Clark, for 20 years athletic director at Sewanee, has perhaps said what needs to be said: "Willie Six was a great Christian gentleman. I have never known a greater one. He brought to a relatively lowly station in life a dignity, an integrity, a charity which would do credit to the highest office. He loved more people and thought more continually about their welfare and comfort than anyone I have ever seen. He leaves countless friends to mourn the passing of a rare spirit."

Valete, Willie Six. Your example has not been lost nor your sacrifices made in vain.

A Forecast of Conditions Under Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "All of Us," by Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief of the Farm Journal, appearing in the February 1950 issue of that publication. As I read the article I could not help feeling that it might happen to the people of the United States, as it has already happened to the British people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL OF US

Here all of us are, facing the last February of the first half of the twentieth century. A few days after you receive this issue of Farm Journal I shall be observing another birthday. Since I was born in the nineteenth century, before another 25 years roll by I may be old enough to write reminiscences. So this month let me be old and cantankerous and pessimistic, and imagine that I am already 25 years older. Would I, perhaps, be writing notes like these?

February 1975: I can remember clearly how, back in 1950, nearly every family had an automobile. People were putting television sets in their homes. New houses were being built by individual families. No one used ration coupons for anything, although some had been used during the Second World War, and people knew what they were. All meat and grocery stores were then owned and operated by private individuals and companies, who competed with each other on price and quality.

March 1975: My neighbor was arrested today and they say he will be sent to jail for 2 years. His sow raised a litter of nine pigs, but he reported only eight to the meat administration. He had managed to hide the other one from the farm inspectors, but someone found it out when he butchered the pig. He had hoped to give his four youngsters a little home-grown meat. The meat administration says that not nearly enough meat can be produced or imported, and that the ration must be reduced to a half-pound per week.

April 1975: Our hens, encouraged by spring, laid an extra egg today. It would be nice to have two for breakfast again some morning, but it has become too dangerous to try to dodge the law. Besides, for many years now one egg a week has been the allowance, and we have got used to getting along. We never appreciated our good fortune when it was possible to have two eggs and bacon, too, every morning for breakfast, and even cream for our coffee. I remember how sorry I felt for the English, back in 1940, when they had only one egg a week.

May 1975: I went down to the Lumber Administration today to apply for three two-by-fours to brace up the barn. Had to fill out three sets of application blanks, six copies of each, and to draw a diagram to show just where the pieces would be used.

June 1975: This morning I stood in line until noon before the Health administration offices. Wanted to get the tooth pulled that has kept me awake most of three nights. I couldn't get in to see the clerk. Long ago, before we had this "free" medicine for everybody, one could generally find a doctor or dentist fairly quickly. They took a personal interest in our troubles. Now they just jot our number down in the book and hurry us through, if we get to see them at all.

July 1975: The Fourth of July reminds an old fellow of his younger days, when we celebrated or not, according to how we felt. Today, as in usual now, everybody had to appear in town to listen to the official program, and watch and hear the President make his speech on the municipal television. He talked about freedom, like his father used to do, but what he says and what he does are two different things.

August 1975: The Lumber Administration refused my application for the three two-by-fours. They said it was improperly made out.

September 1975: I have been trying to figure out in my own mind just when these present conditions had their beginning. Some say it was when the Government bought all the railroads. Next they took the coal mines, then the steel mills, then the truck hauling business, then the whole petroleum industry. They said they had to have the mines and the oil business to get fuel for the trains and trucks and the steel mills to get enough steel for everybody. Just try to buy some now. Now the Government runs nearly every kind of business, just as Russia did when I was a young fellow. Then production started going on down, and the country has been getting poorer ever since.

October 1975: I think the beginning was further back. It might have been about 1936, when the politicians discovered they really could buy votes in quantities with borrowed public money, through the WPA and other things. Some of the younger people now can't even remember when we used to have elections.

November 1975: I've got it now. Our freedom began to be lost in 1913. That was the year the income-tax amendment was ratified. The idea would have been all right, probably, if it had contained a provision that no more than one-fourth of any ordinary man's earnings could be taken in taxes, and no more than half of the biggest incomes. Since there were no limits on taxes the politicians eventually discovered that there were no limits on the amounts they could spend. They kept taking more and more from everybody to give more "free" help, until no one could save. Then there had to be still bigger pensions for us old people, and more Government services of every kind. No one could save up for investment, so the Government said it would have to take over business.

December 1975: Kind of hard to be cheerful at holiday time. Can't help remembering the great days when every American out of jail was free and full of hope for the future.

July 1976: Just two centuries ago the Declaration of Independence was adopted. Two hundred years. Years that saw the United States produce the highest standard of living that ever has been. And years that saw us, in my time, fritter away our freedom until all of us once proud Americans are no better off than serfs. Except the Government crowd, of course.

August 1976: They'll shoot me if I print these paragraphs. And suppress Farm Journal. After all, this isn't 1950 any more, when one could still say what he believed. All right, let 'em shoot.

Are my "reminiscences" exaggerated? I hope so. But I have mentioned nothing that doesn't happen today in England or Russia. And the United States of America has been faithfully following the English route. Next month I'll write about the cheerful and wonderful prospects that can be realized if the United States of America is left free to go ahead.

WHEELER MCMILLEN.

Louis Houck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Louis Houck," delivered by Hon. Norwin D. Houser, of Perryville, Mo., judge of the Twenty-seventh Judicial Circuit of Missouri, at the Southeast Missouri State College, Cape Girardeau, Mo., on October 15, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COL. LOUIS HOUCK

(A speech delivered by Judge Norwin D. Houser at Southeast Missouri State College, Cape Girardeau, Mo.)

FOREWORD

Institutions, quite appropriately, honor their founders and those who played leading roles in their early histories. At the homecoming ceremonies held at the Southeast Missouri State College, October 15, 1949, the memory of the late Col. Louis Houck, a man who loomed large in the early history of the college and southeast Missouri, was honored. For 39 years he served as a member of the board of regents and for 36 years as the president of the board.

The speaker chosen for the occasion by the alumni association was Hon. Norwin D. Houser, a former student of the college, now judge of the Twenty-seventh Missouri Circuit. This brochure presents in full the address which he delivered. Those who heard the address adjudged it an eloquent and comprehensive analysis and evaluation of the achievements of Colonel Houck, one of the recognized builders of this region. Undaunted by recurrent obstacles, he was able to realize the objects of his dreams. To quote Judge Houser: "Louis Houck felt the hand of destiny on his shoulders."

The Southeast Missouri State College and its alumni association are under obligation to Judge Houser for his most excellent address and to the Cape Girardeau News for making it available in this form.

W. W. PARKER,
President, Southeast Missouri State College.

The complete text of Judge Houser's speech follows:

"I regard it as a high compliment to have been chosen to do honor to Louis Houck, southeast Missouri's most illustrious citizen, and I want to acknowledge my debt of gratitude to M. Leming, and the other members of the committee.

"Nearly a quarter of a century after his death in 1925, the commanding figure of Louis Houck continues to stand out in bold relief in the Hall of Fame.

"Fifty years from now—a century hence—indeed, as long as men can read of the glories of the past, his achievements will be indelibly stamped and recorded as an integral part of the legal, historical, academic, and commercial development of the land we live in.

"A new generation has sprung up since he departed. Many of you were yet unborn during the time of his great deeds, whereas many others of us congregated here tonight were his contemporaries.

"Too often we forget the men of the past. Soon all memory of their labor vanishes from the common recollection of men * * *. Yet it is the work of the men of the past bequeathed to us that is our priceless heritage. It is because they labored and suffered, dared and did, thought and executed, because they laid deep the foundations of our civic institutions that we today are enjoying a material prosperity, the marvel of the world.' (From a tribute by Louis Houck to Alexander Buckner, delivered September 28, 1897.)

"And so it is fitting and proper that we pause for a few moments to honor this indomitable man, this resolute spirit, this distinguished newspaperman, lawyer, public servant, author, historian, railroad builder, and educator-administrator.

"And it is quite appropriate that these exercises be held here, on the campus of this great college which was so dear to him; on the very steps which he caused to be built as part of a beautiful and symmetrical plan."

MOVED TO CAPE

"Born in St. Clair County, Ill., while William Henry Harrison was still President of the United States, Louis Houck came to Cape Giradeau when he was 28 years of age. Already he had made a name for himself in the fields of journalism and law, and had served as Assistant United States District Attorney at St. Louis.

"When this gifted young man settled here, in 1869, 4 years after the conclusion of the War Between the States, southeast Missouri was a wilderness of isolated villages and malaria-ridden swamps. Cape Girardeau, an unimportant river landing, with a population of 2,500 souls, was going through the dark reconstruction days. There were no railroads. There was no system of drainage districts.

"What a contrast between the meager opportunities open to Louis Houck in 1869, in a comparatively primitive civilization, and the marvelous opportunities for the young man and women of 1949, in this, one of the most highly developed areas of America.

"He practiced law here during the seventies, married Miss Mary Hunter Giboney in

1872, developed into one of the best lawyers who ever practiced at this bar, and during the late seventies developed an interest in railroad building, and a vision of the importance of transportation by rail to the commercial development of southeast Missouri.

"This was a frontier-like country. The principal products, outside of the minerals produced in the area, were timber, furs, wheat, and corn. There was no way to market these products, except by river transportation after long overland hauls by team and wagon, over tortuous dirt roads, trails and through bog and swamp. Remember that there were no highways; no farm-to-market roads, and no railroads closer than than Iron Mountain."

RAILROAD BUILDER

"Houck, with prophetic vision, knew that if the isolated communities of southeast Missouri could be welded together into one unit; if the millions of acres under water could be drained and reclaimed, their rich alluvial soil would yield a harvest sufficient unto the needs of an empire. He believed that a system of railroads linking together the entire area would transform these raw wastelands into a garden spot of production. Louis Houck felt the hand of destiny on his shoulder, and he undertook the prodigious task of making his dream come true.

"He pioneered in the railroad business with little previous knowledge of the engineering, construction and financing problems involved. All he knew was that he wanted to build railroads, and by the eternal, he was going to build them.

"He started out with $5,000 in cash, an iron will, and the determination to succeed.

"During the next 25 years, from 1880 to 1905, he pierced the swamplands and highlands of southeast Missouri with 500 miles of railroads, which feat was accomplished in the face of seemingly insurmountable adversities, which he overcame by virtue of dogged persistence, adroit (and sometimes unconventional) financing, ingenious resourcefulness and rugged individualism.

"Some have said that he failed; that he lost his railroads; that he became entangled in a morass of litigation. But let it ever be remembered by his critics that when this empire-builder passed from the scene of his labors in 1925, trains were operating daily over almost every mile of right-of-way he procured; trains carrying wheat, corn and cotton; lead, cobalt and iron; cement, limestone and brick; shoes and shirts and the myriad other products of modern factories; livestock and lumber and a thousand other products of our area, into the marketplaces of the world.

"And in that 45 years, this section of the country had been transformed from a strictly provincial outpost into a prosperous, diversified, thriving community.

"The 'Open Sesame' was Louis Houck."

CAPE TO DELTA

"Resourceful? Let me tell you that Louis Houck was resourceful.

"The first railroad he built was from Delta to Cape Girardeau. He contracted to put the road through and drive an engine into Cape Girardeau by midnight, December 31, 1880. On this condition he was assured of a subscription list and bonus of $10,000. The distance was 16 miles. The time limit was 6 months. He had no engine, rails, ties. He had no previous experience. Trestles had to be built—everything done from scratch. He contracted with the Iron Mountain Railroad for rails. There was an unbroken forest primeval along the line of the right-of-way, and he chopped his ties from the virgin woods. It was hard to get laborers. There were no quarters with which to provide them housing. The winter of 1880 was one of the worst ever known, snow beginning to fall on the 18th day of October, and zero weather up to January. The Iron Mountain was slow in delivering rails. Many difficulties were encountered. When at last they got to a point 1,000 feet from Cape Girardeau they ran out of rails. The Iron Mountain failed to deliver under their agreement. No rails could be produced elsewhere, and if they could have been found they could not have been brought in, for the river was frozen solid. The time was getting short. So, with characteristic vigor, Louis Houck ordered the engine run to the end of the uncompleted track, then ordered his men to tear up the rails laid behind, fixed them in place on the Cape Girardeau end, laid the rails straight into the city. Time was so short that old residents swore that it was 3 minutes before midnight on the last day of the contract when Houck's decrepit, wood-burning engine, borrowed from the Illinois Central, steamed into Cape Girardeau, in literal compliance with his contract.

"Time does not permit any extensive delineation of the hardships, litigation, and competition thrown in the way of this tenacious, bold, self-reliant, independent, adventurous, and far-seeing man."

DEFEATED JAY GOULD

"The story of his defeat of Jay Gould, the railroad tycoon, of his encounters with the Missouri Pacific and Frisco, of the floods that washed out miles of his tracks, of the methods of construction sometimes resorted to to get the trains rolling, of the experiences of those early days of trains jumping the tracks on soft spots in the roadbeds, all makes one of the most fascinating, romantic, and delightful chapters in the history of railroading, and all testify to the astuteness, the insatiable ambition, and the uncompromising drive of this remarkable man, who, in spite of hell and high water, Gould and the receiverships, creditors, and competitors, was bound to, and did, connect southeast Missouri into one railroad circuit."

PACIFIC WATER

"During this period of creative activity, which would have occupied the full time of a dozen ordinary remarkable men, Louis Houck found the time, and had the intelligence and scholarly attainments necessary, to give to the world a history of Missouri from the earliest recorded times down to the admission of Missouri into the union of the States. Houck's history of Missouri is the foundation upon which all subsequent histories of the Commonwealth have been written.

"Another work, the Spanish Regime in Missouri, published in 1908, is rated by many critics as a highly authoritative account of the Spanish settlements in this country. It earned for him a place in the Encyclopedia Britannica.

"His other literary achievements included the Boundaries of the Louisiana Purchase and Law of Liens.

"Louis Houck not only scattered the seeds of learning and lighted the fires of knowledge with his hand and pen, but, more than any other one man, is responsible for the development of this great educational institution from whose portals have issued an innumerable throng of teachers, educators, and scholars, to bring light to dark corners, to disseminate knowledge, to contribute to the profession, arts, the skills, and the crafts throughout the far reaches of the earth."

CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

"For 39 years he was a member of the board of regents. For 36 of these years he was president of the board, and chairman of the executive committee.

"He was working for this college even before it was located here. When the General Assembly, in 1873, passed the law which authorized the establishment of a college in southeast Missouri Louis Houck became instrumental and influential in inducing the commission to select Cape Girardeau as the location for the college.

"When it came to selecting the ground upon which the institution should be built, Louis Houck offered 10 acres of ground, free of cost, in the South part of the city, near Ford D. as a site for the building.

"Instead the board purchased the ground where Academic Hall stands, some 9 acres at that time, for $1000, actuated by a desire to establish the school upon a high eminence, visible from all parts of the surrounding territory."

NINE TEACHERS

"When he first entered on his duties as a board member, in 1888, there were 9 teachers on the faculty, a total of 278 students enrolled, one building, and 9 acres of campus.

"When he passed on in 1925, still a member of the board, the faculty and administrative staff consisted of 60 persons, the annual enrollment topped the 2,000 mark, and the campus and grounds had been enlarged from 9 to 190 acres; and the educational plant consisted of seven monumental stone buildings.

"In those early days the terrain surrounding the spot where we are gathered tonight consisted of steep hills, deep gullies and ravines. There was a gaping quarry 30 feet deep where Leming Hall now stands. The site of Kent Library was the top of a high hill. The college was built far from town. There were no sidewalks, no paved streets leading to the college—many of the present streets and avenues were fields, forests, and creeks. There were only one or two houses in the vicinity of the college. There were only two or three houses on North Pacific Street. Where these beautiful approaches rise now, there was an ugly ravine 20 feet deep, which ran all the way down to Pacific Street, and in order to make the grounds accessible, a bridge 30 or 40 feet long was constructed.

"There was no system of terraces; there were no trees, no dormitories, and none of the present buildings existed."

BAD VISION

"A man of small vision would have failed to provide for the enormous expansion of this institution; would have allowed the city of Cape Girardeau to grow up and surround the original 9-acre tract; but Louis Houck was a man of far-flung vision, who could and did foresee the time when this city would be a metropolis, and this institution a major center of education and culture, required to meet the needs of a populous and enlightened civilization."

BUY MORE LAND

"To prepare for things to come, he immediately began to insist on enlarging the college grounds. In the eighties, he caused his board to purchase 3½ acres, now known as 'The Home of the Birds,' for the sum of $65 which, although insignificant in these days, was no doubt an item of importance in their meager budget. They purchased 34 acres from the Kaiser estate, paying for it at the rate of $200 a month. Mr. Houck purchased individually and donated to the college two tracts of land, one of which was 10 acres east and north and east of the city water reservoir, land he bought from L. R. Johnson, no doubt the land where the tennis courts and Cheney Hall are now located. The site for Kent Library was purchased, the top of the hill graded off, and for years that part of the campus was known as the Athletic Field. Other tracts were secured, the board, under the direction of Mr. Houck, sometimes making small down payments, paying for the properties on the installment plan out of incidental funds.

"Many of these purchases were made over determined opposition, which did not deter Mr. Houck, for he knew what he was doing.

"Streets were laid out, sidewalks built, trees planted, terraces established, barns and unsightly structures removed, hills graded

down, appropriations fought for, and buildings erected, all under the proud and watchful eye of the man whom we honor tonight."

BUILD DORMITORIES

"Dormitories were needed for the students. Three public-spirited citizens, Mr. Houck, Mr. M. E. Leming, and Mr. Leon Albert, realizing the need, and having the best interests of the college at heart, organized a company, advanced the money, and built Albert Hall, employing the same architect who designed Academic Hall. Thereafter they built Leming Hall, with their own funds, renting the halls to the college for only enough to pay the interest on the money they had borrowed to build them. Thereafter the legislature appropriated $60,000 to buy these buildings, which was $10,000 less than they cost originally.

"Another willingness to sacrifice for the college was demonstrated by Mr. Houck when he offered to donate the stone to be used in the construction of the Education Building in 1922.

"Thus, largely through the vision and foresight of Louis Houck, the physical plant and environs of this delightful college were founded on a scale sufficient for the needs of a growing institution for a century to come, and the basis laid for what is today the most beautiful college campus in the Midwest.

"In 1925 a committee consisting of Dr. Serena, R. S. Douglass, and Judge James A. Finch, in drafting a memorial about Louis Houck, said this, among other things."

CULTURE AND BEAUTY

"His interests, however, were not in the buildings alone, nor even in the rapid increase in the number of students. He believed in culture and beauty. His concern for the library, that it might always possess the world's greatest books, his love of the humanities, especially the classics, and his gift to the college of the fine group of statuary, reproductions of many of the world's masterpieces, are more evidence of his real interests. It was through his efforts that the Herculaneum collections—archeological and historical—were secured, and largely through his efforts that other invaluable collections were added to the institution's possessions.

"He believed that this college is placed in its wonderful setting, a veritable light upon a hill, to hold ever aloft the torch of learning, beckoning to it the youth from the thousand hills and the rolling plains of southeast Missouri that here they might pursue learning.

"In the years of richest life experiences he more and more turned aside from a development of the natural resources of southeast Missouri to the pioneer in developing the intellectual and spiritual power of the youth of this new empire. It is not an exaggeration to say that in his last years this college became the ruling passion of his life, and that in the years to come the Southeast Missouri State Teachers College, for which he wrought so well and did so much, will be his greatest monument."

DEFECTED CHURCH

"Other monuments to this great man are to be found in many of the churches of this section which were the object of his bounty, and at least one of which was wholly built by him, and deeded to the members of the congregation, acts of charity not noised about, and known of but by few. Mr. M. E. Leming once said that Mr. Houck contributed to more churches than any other man in the country, and that no man had greater respect for the church.

"Senator James A. Reed, a close, personal, and political friend of Louis Houck, in speaking of Mr. Houck's political belief, said at a memorial service in 1935:

"'He stood for the Constitution, because he knew that so long as it remains unimpaired, so long as it is revered and loved, the liberties of the American people will be secure. And if our country ever fails, it will not be by attacks from without, but from corruption and indifference within. He knew that corruption and indifference will not come if we continue to cultivate a spirit of individual liberty, and to teach the doctrine that each man stand upon his own feet; fight his own battles; receive the rewards of success and suffer the contumely of failure—asking from the Government no protection, save that which is guaranteed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. He knew that by thus proceeding we would be every day developing the character of our race, putting iron into its blood, steel into its nerves, and courage and exaltation into its soul.'"

STOOD ON OWN FEET

"Yes, my friends, here was a man. Here was the personification of the spirit of individual enterprise. Here was a man who stood upon his own feet, and fought his own battles, and hewed out his own destiny with his own mind and hands; who received the rewards of success; who knew no discouragement, and recognized no defeat; who operated on his own and created his own opportunities.

"Louis Houck despised the despairing creed that the world owed him or any man a living. His pride was in his strength and courage; in his will to serve family, community, and nation.

"His life was gloriously fulfilled, both materially and spiritually, because, in an atmosphere of freedom and opportunity, in a system free of governmental regulation and restriction, he loosed his individual powers and employed his will, his courage, his enterprise, and his faith, to the attainment of his objectives.

"His life and deeds are an object lesson of the accomplishments which are possible in America, under a governmental system which is based upon free, competitive, individual, private enterprise.

"I conclude with the following extract from a tribute to Louis Houck by his lifelong friend, Allan H. Hinchey:

"'The civilization of today has come through the Louis Houcks of the past; the civilization of the future rests upon the Louis Houcks to come, for in all ages there must be such as he.'"

That Mandate Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD a New York Herald Tribune editorial which was reprinted in the February issue of Reader's Digest:

[From the Reader's Digest of February 1950]

THAT MANDATE AGAIN

(Editorial in New York Herald Tribune)

Mr. Truman is determined that the country shall accept his version of the mandate which was conferred upon him in November 1948.

The real question is whether the Government can now insure good wages for labor, a fair opportunity for small business and cooperatives, an insured income for the aged, protection against loss of income for the ill and unemployed, decent housing at prices they can afford for the citizenry, educational opportunities for all our young people, a fair price for farmers, better health and medical care for everyone, and equal participation in our national life, free from fear and discrimination for all Americans.

No one disputes the desirability of the goals, no one doubts that the American system has within itself the power to attain them to a degree known to no other nation. But to achieve them demands more than mere faith, more than a political formula, more than the denunciation of reactionaries. It is not enough to laugh off the question of cost, or the infringement on personal freedom which the injection of Government intervention into these spheres entails, as simply the propaganda of the reactionaries. The program which Mr. Truman puts forth in so debonair a fashion is as complicated, difficult, and costly as anything which could well be imagined. Combined with the vast commitments for defense and foreign aid which the United States has undertaken, it would constitute a crushing burden on the productive energies of America. This is not what the will of the people demanded, nor what Mr. Truman told the voters in the 1948 campaign. He spoke then, and he speaks now, as if a goal has only to be stated in legislation to be won, painlessly and finally. The experience of too many countries with this kind of wishful thinking, however, has proved it to be futile and dangerous.

Moscow Can Thank Tito for Western Recognition of Mao

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Human Events written by the brilliant French observer Bertrand de Jouvenel. His penetrating insight that Tito's removal of Yugoslavia, at least temporarily, from Russia's direct control is likely to be the factor which by its influence on sentimentalist wishful thinkers in the West, brings Asia under Russian control in only a part of his brilliant analysis of the fatal malady—loss of convictions—which afflicts the West, including ourselves:

THANKS TO TITO

(By Bertrand de Jouvenel)

PARIS, January.—The British have recognised Mao Tse-tung as the rightful government of China. When Mao celebrated the new year with Stalin they were aware of this impending move. They must have dedicated a kind thought to Tito. For they owe him his great diplomatic victory. His unpunished secession has encouraged western policy makers to put their hopes in further secessions: Mao is to be another Tito.

Seceding Communist tyrants are to be offered, according to an already established pattern, British advice, British trade agreements, American money and machines, American protection; ultimately they are to be provided with arms and drawn into a wide scheme of collective security, including national Communist with democratic societies.

From the angle of Realpolitik the test of this grand strategy is its success. The bigger the battalions the better the chances. Let us however be clear that we are thereby rejecting moral standards in international affairs, and that the American sword is henceforth to be drawn equally in defense of tyranny and of liberty.

It can be forcibly argued that alliances are a matter of expediency, ruled by the necessity of containing dangerously expanding powers. Did not liberal England uphold in the nineteenth century the rotten Ottoman despotism? And is it not true that Europe paid dearly for the reversal of this policy? This line may be taken, but it is then a palpable inconsistency to exclude from our alliance such non-Communist states, the internal regime of which does not meet with our approval.

If history can provide many arguments in favor of the Realpolitiker outlook, the student of our own times must stress the monstrous danger of this line in our democratic societies. It is very much to the credit of the people that the forces of public opinion cannot be marshalled without an appeal to the moral sense. If our cause is the right one, it is not easy to explain that some of our allies are just as bad as our opponents. Nor do some intellectuals make it any easier by their curious propensity to sugar-coat with moralism the bitter pill of expediency.

It has taken the West all of 5 years to emerge from the moral befuddlement attendant upon the Russian alliance. Of course the condemnation of Germans for crimes against humanity was marred by the presence among the judges of those responsible for many Katyns. Of course, the penance done by Germany for its aggressive imperialism fails to drive home its lesson while Germany's original accomplice wallows in its conquests. In September 1939 Leon Blum branded Stalin as responsible for the war: "Had he signed with England and France, war would have been impossible or highly improbable, his signing with Germany made it almost inevitable." (Le Populaire, September 21, 1939.)

We have lived through years of scandalous would-be moralism, deferentially consulting mass murderers on the right wording of a charter of the rights of man. It was a stifling atmosphere, a nightmare of values. We are at long last emerging from it. Is it to be plunged again into confusion?

Let us beware. We have in the West a mass of morally spineless intellectuals whose impotent desire for boldness, discipline and strength turns to a female craving for Communist company. The present explosion of moral disapproval against Stalinism has frightened them away from the Moscow shrine; they are offered an unhoped-for alternative; they can do their pilgrimage to Belgrade. Who will blame them for praising on their return the institutions of a valued ally? There are not a few signs that Tito may prove the Trojan horse in the western camp.

EUROPEAN PROBLEM

We want Tito and other such to help us defend western Europe which we do not feel strong enough to defend by ourselves. In the same manner the declining Roman Empire called upon barbarian allies. They caused the corruption, breaking apart, and downfall of Rome: so will it be with us. For our lack of strength which makes them desirable associates also makes their influence irresistible. It is a lack of moral strength. There never was in Europe a more numerous population than there is today to withstand the assault of Asia. Nor was the Roman Empire lacking in numbers or equipment: on the eve of its collapse it stood incomparably superior in quantities of men and arms to what Rome was when she ranged the known world under her laws. But one thing had departed: virtue.

Europe is internally eaten away by doubt, distrust, and cynicism. It is perhaps the tragedy of our age that socialism—practically, reliance on others—is offered as a cure for a feeling of insecurity which could only be cured by a restoration of self-reliance. Nor are great physical assets a condition of such self-reliance. Men are not cowards: they have the courage of their convictions; it is the convictions that they need. Nihilism is Europe's malady.

It is not fear of the Cossacks which reduces Europe to a helpless jelly. It is doubt of the justice of our cause, a vague feeling that the Communists may have right and history on their side. Perhaps after all their system is the fulfillment of democracy—and here the follies of western war propaganda comes to roost—and is not their creed the tail end of our prevailing beliefs?

We can be thankful for the crazy Valhalla lyricism which made the Nazi creed unpalatable and ridiculous to the West. The Soviets on the contrary speak the language of utilitarian technocracy which is the common language of the West. In my country the youth who was tempted by nazism was usually a romanticist. In direct contrast it is striking to see juveniles simultaneously buying a magazine about engineering and a pamphlet about Russia. Minds cluttered with factual knowledge avidly absorb the dreary tale of figures uttered by the Moscow radio.

Taught by their masters to doubt all beliefs and by too many surrounding examples to deride them, their gods are machines and the building of socialism is to them as entrancing as a gigantic game of meccano. Stalin is to them a more tangible Einstein, who has also written out the laws of the world on his blackboard.

The watcher who sees them merrily putting in their little rivet is apt to be moved by their boyish enthusiasm. We must be prepared to have again and again the sort of thing American correspondents in China have been giving us: That the Communists entered Shanghai in admirable order and seemed animated by excellent feelings. Whoever thinks that great things, even bad, can be achieved without an appeal to virtue and the play of virtues, knows little of man. All the dangerous seductions of our age have owed their effectiveness to the virtues they enrolled.

So there can be no antipathy in the heart of the watcher who in a small village, in a suburb, sees a youth enthusiastically enrolling his good will in the Communist cause. He tries to argue this recruit away, and finds no effective weapon in the armory of his nineteenth-century ideas. Shall he speak of progress, of evolution, of enlightenment? This is it, answers the youth. Society moves forward, rejects the last of superstitions, the new man emerges, the rebuilder of the world. Yes; but freedom of thought? Why, would you not, the youth retorts, move to the foot of the class those who do not give the right answer in the right figures? But must you crush human beings? Why not, if it is to benefit a greater number?

The watcher moves on, troubled in his nineteenth-century mind. He has no answers. The nineteenth-century biological outlook provides no justification for the absolute value of the individual life. Nineteenth-century relativism in regard to truth must logically emerge into a pragmatism which admits that deviationist beliefs are bad because they are deviations and enervate the collective effort. Thus, the nineteenth-century utilitarian must give up. But as he moves on he sees the priest moving in to the Communist fair. The priest, indeed, is the only one who, in fact, tackles the venture. His is the only non-Communist voice which makes itself heard in Communist circles: a situation which is not without its dangers for religion itself which some nonbelievers would use as a social weapon. But the very existence of this situation testifies to the inherent weakness of current humanism, incapable of making an effective appeal to the people in its own name.

The weakness of Europe lies in the absence of convictions, and consequent lack of power to convince, of its great mass of intellectuals.

Amending the Rules of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this resolution eliminating the power of the 21-day discharge rule.

To me there is something unreal about all of the sound and fury of this debate. It is amazing to have the Democratic Speaker arguing against rules that his party put in force in 1931 and operated under all through the days of the New Deal. This is even more astounding when it has been stated by members of the Rules Committee of both parties that a rule was never denied on a bill when the Speaker, Democrat or Republican, demanded it.

Under the 1931 rule, which was in effect until 1949, any bill could be brought to the floor by a discharge petition or by the committee on Calendar Wednesday. It takes unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday, yet I can remember the call of committees on Calendar Wednesday just once during the past decade. The present rule, giving every chairman the theoretical power to bring a bill to the floor has not meant very much during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. In theory the rule can bring anything to the floor that any committee wants, in practice it depends entirely upon the Speaker. All he has to do is to fail to recognize the chairmen on the days when committee discharges are permitted, and the bill does not get to the floor.

Representative government in Congress is no different in essentials from representative government in lodges, unions, clubs, churches, and other organizations that everybody knows about. Pure democracy will not work, because all of the people cannot get together at one time to talk things over; therefore, they choose representatives. In any organization as big as the House of Representatives, with a membership of 435, the membership cannot work out an intelligent program except through representation of the members on committees, and through leaders acting formally or informally. The rules of the House are not perfect, but they represent the experience of nearly a thousand years of striving toward workable, representative, parliamentary government. As one wise Member has put it, the problem is to strike a balance between the rights of the individual Member and a majority; to permit a majority to work its will after due consideration of the views of the minority, but in all of this to have machinery and rules to get the work done.

Under our rules the party in power has control of the program, of what is to come up. This is as it should be. This power is exercised through a majority on every committee, including the Rules Committee, and through selection of the Speaker, who holds a very powerful office. There has always been considerable

bluffing and stalling and buckpassing under the Rules Committee system, but this applies equally to the 21-day discharge rule, as it has been in effect this year. For instance, FEPC could have been brought to the floor any time on at least a dozen occasions during the past 6 or 7 months by the Speaker and the committee chairman. I voted to adjourn until Monday to make doubly sure that FEPC could be brought up then, but as both sides in this argument today have stated, FEPC is not the real question involved in this rules fight.

This skirmish today arises from the fact that the Democratic Party, which has a paper majority in the House, does not have a responsible working majority capable of developing an intelligent working program for Congress. Tinkering with the rules will not change this situation. I prefer the old system, that centered power and responsibility, but, as has been stated repeatedly today, and not denied, that system was under the control of the Speaker and the majority party leadership in the House. I think that the continuation of the 21-day discharge rule will simply add to the confusion and make it harder to have any orderly program at all. Having a majority of each committee decide what shall come up on the floor means control of the time of all the rest of us by a very small minority in Congress.

We have been reminded today that our financial resources are not limitless, and that some group must have over-all responsibility for coordinating the actions of the various committees into a Federal financial budget. What has been forgotten is that our time resources are not limitless; the time of Congress must be budgeted. We have seen in the past year, after an unusually long and futile 10 months' session, that the new rule budgets neither time nor money. We can run up a deficit in dollars, but inexorable laws over which we have no control make it impossible to pay back time already spent. Whether we change our rules or not, we will be wasting time and money this session because of the composition of the Democratic paper majority in the House.

Federal Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following is a transcript of a broadcast over Columbia Broadcasting System by Housing Expediter Tighe E. Woods, January 16, 1950, at 11 p. m. This is a case-by-case history of why Federal rent control is absolutely essential to American families throughout the country. It shows what has happened where there has been premature decontrol of rents. Through this broadcast individual American families are able to tell their side of the story.

At 528 East Seventh South Street in Salt Lake City, Utah, Nicholas Franks lives with his wife and 9-year-old daughter. Nicholas Franks is a machinist for the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad. In the last few months his take-home pay has dropped about 40 percent. Any cut in family income is serious enough these days. But it is even more serious for the Franks family, because their rent has been increased. They used to pay $32.50 a month. Now they pay $45 a month, and the rent comes due every month.

Salt Lake City is only one of many cities where increases in rent have occurred. These are the cities where rent control has been wiped out, where rent control no longer protects tenants from unreasonable increases in rent.

But what has brought about this situation? How was rent control lifted in these cities?

Under the present rent-control law, Congress provided three ways by which controls can be ended by States and municipalities, by local rent-advisory boards, and by the Housing Expediter. When a State or local government ends rent control, it cannot be restored, no matter how high rents may go. When controls are lifted on the recommendation of local rent board, or when the Expediter ends them, they can be put back into effect if rents go up too high.

Since the present law went into effect, last April, four States have taken action to end controls—Nebraska, Texas, Wisconsin, and Alabama. In the same period, local governments have wiped out rent control in 200 towns and cities. Local rent advisory boards, which are made up of groups of representative citizens in each town where rent control is in effect, have eliminated controls in only five communities. As Housing Expediter, I have lifted rent control in 467 communities.

I have been criticized for lifting rent controls in such a large number of towns and cities. But I am under a mandate from the Congress to decontrol wherever possible. However, the Housing Expediter has the authority to put controls back into effect if rents rise unreasonably, but the action of the States or local government cannot be recalled.

In only three of the communities which I have decontrolled has it been necessary to restore controls. In one city, Spokane, Wash., which was decontrolled, about half of the dwellings covered in a recent survey had increases in rent. The increases averaged 18½ percent. We are now making a further study of housing in this city to determine whether controls should be put back into effect.

During the past few months, statements have been made to the effect that rents have not increased very much in communities where State and local governments have ended rent control. Until now we have not had accurate information on these towns and cities. But tonight I can give you the real facts.

Recently, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, which is an independent, fact-finding agency, made surveys of rents in six of the largest cities now without rent control as a result of State or local action.

They found widespread rent increases.

In Dallas, Tex., and Knoxville, Tenn., two out of every three of the families in the survey have had their rents boosted.

In Jacksonville, Fla., and Salt Lake City, rent increases hit about half of the families.

Forty percent have had their rents raised in Topeka, Kans.; 31 percent in Houston, Tex.; and in every one of those cities more rents are being raised, month-after-month.

These increases are not small. They are substantial increases.

In Dallas, these families are paying 35 percent more rent each month.

In Houston, 41 percent; 30, in Topeka; Knoxville, 27; Salt Lake City, 16; and 26 percent in Jacksonville.

But that is only a part of the story.

The people who are hit the hardest are those who are least able to pay higher rents.

Take Dallas for example.

In Dallas, almost three out of every four families included in this survey who earn less than $40 a week have had their rent increased approximately 50 percent.

The rent comes due every month. If you don't pay, you get tossed out. But you can't run the risk of being out on the street, because you can't find another place to rent. At least not at the price a family making $40 a week can afford.

The same thing is true in Topeka, Kans., where Mrs. Erlene Kistler lives. Mrs. Kistler is a widow. She has a 6-year-old daughter whose name is Rita. They live at 417½ West Seventh Street in Topeka. Mrs. Kistler has had a lot of trouble trying to find a place to live where they don't object to children. The apartment where she lives at present used to rent for $45 a month. Now the rent is $60, an increase of almost 35 percent. This winter Rita needed a new coat to wear. But the family budget is too small. Mrs. Kistler has had to make over an old coat of her own.

I told you that in Salt Lake City, where the Franks family lives, half of the families surveyed have had their rent increased. At the time the survey was made, the increases in rent in Salt Lake City averaged 16 percent. Of course, that is 16 percent on top of the increases they had already received under rent control. But there is another angle to the story of Salt Lake City that is important.

The Salt Lake Tribune of December 23 printed a news item in which Mr. Darrell Welling, executive vice president of the Salt Lake Real Estate Board, denied reports that landlords were contemplating a new rent increase on January 1. The news story said—and I quote: "Landlords, on January 1, will have a free market on their properties to work out problems with their tenants, Mr. Welling noted. Pledges signed by landlords not to increase rents more than 10 percent will expire at that time." That is the end of the quotation. Mr. Welling added that he thinks some landlords in Salt Lake City may decrease rents. We hope he is right.

I make this point about the rumors of more increases in Salt Lake City because similar conditions apparently apply to other cities where rent control has been ended by State or local governments. On the basis of the BLS survey, it appears that the longer a city has been without rent control, the greater the number of families who receive rent increases. Houston, Tex., had been decontrolled 1 month when the survey was made. Thirty-one percent of the tenants were paying increased rents. Dallas had been decontrolled 5 months when the survey was made. Sixty-seven percent of the families were paying higher rents. This clearly contradicts the contention of opponents of rent control that when a city ends rent control prematurely rents will only raise a little at first and then level off at reasonable rates.

The BLS surveys were made in only a few cities where controls have been lifted by local and State governments. But hundreds of families in other cities now without controls have reported similar increases.

In Omaha, Nebr., rent control was lifted by action of the State legislature. "Moon" Mullen who lives at 201 South Thirty-sixth Street in Omaha, is only one of many people there who are now paying increases in rents. "Moon" has three children. One girl is in high school. Their rent used to be $42.50 a month, now it is $60. The children have been needing new shoes for some time. But "Moon" can't afford to buy new shoes for them, now that his rent has been increased about a hundred percent.

Day after day dozens of letters come to me in Washington asking if there is anything I can do to help families whose rent has been raised. Here is just one example of the kind of letter I receive. It is dated December 20, and it is from a housewife in Oklahoma City:

She says:

"DEAR MR. WOODS: Please put rent control on again in Oklahoma City. Our landlord has raised the rent from $45 to $65 a month, and we can't pay it. We have one boy 11 years old and no one will take a child. We looked at a place Sunday which rented under rent control for $20 a month. Now it is $65. I don't know what we and dozens and dozens of families are going to do."

This housewife went on to say that she would have to move from her home on January 9. That was a week ago. I hope she was able to find a new place to live.

I wish I could have done something to help her. But I couldn't. Oklahoma City was decontrolled by action of the local city council.

There is another factor which now faces families in cities where rent control has been lifted prematurely. It is fear of eviction.

A moment ago, I said to you that hundreds of families have reported increases in rent. But for every family who reports an increase, there are thousands more who are afraid to do so for fear of being evicted. Time after time, as we talked to people in the cities I have told you about, we were met with this statement: "I can't let you use my name because I might be evicted if my landlord found out that I reported the increase."

Some people argue that rent control should be abolished right away. Landlords have been particularly vocal about it. And I am the first to admit that they have their side of the story. In a short time I expect to issue a statement on our present liberal policy for granting increases in rent to landlords.

Some people argue that rent control should be abolished right away. No one wants controls any longer than is absolutely necessary. But we still have rent control because the need for housing is so critical in many cities and towns that the premature lifting of controls forces tenants to pay exorbitant increases in rent.

I have already told you what has happened to rents in some cities. Let me repeat the amounts of those increases.

In Dallas, rent increases average 35 percent.

In Houston, 41 percent; 30 percent in Topeka; Knoxville, 27; Salt Lake City, 16; and 26 in Jacksonville.

If you want to know what it would mean to you to pay an increase in rent like families in these cities and others are paying, just take a piece of paper and pencil and figure out how much of a dent it would make in your own budget to pay an increase of 35 percent.

Last year, committees in the Senate and the House of Representatives held hearings on rent control and reported to the Congress that controls should be continued. Both of these reports made statements concerning the effect of lifting rent control which are very significant. The Senate report says: "If rent controls are relaxed, or lifted entirely so that rents continue to go up, we are likely to find that the farm groups, industry, retail trade, the whole economy would suffer a severe blow. * * * Any increase in rents today would be at the expense of diets, medical care, clothing, and other necessities of life of millions of American citizens."

This report to the Senate has proven to be "the handwriting on the wall." The prophecy has come true. You have heard what happens when rent control is lifted too soon. The families who are paying increased rents cannot afford clothing they need, and other necessities of life, such as food and medical care. This cut in their purchasing power has already had its effect upon retail trade and will continue to do so, because the increased rents come due every month.

As I said, we still have rent control because the shortage of housing in many cities is still so critical that the lifting of controls forces tenants to pay increases in rent that result in actual hardship. The removal of rent control is not the solution to our continuing housing shortage. That is like taking away a sick man's medicine to see whether he will get worse. The way to end the housing shortage and get rid of rent control is to build more homes. And when it is possible for the average family with an income of around $50 a week to get a place to rent at a price they can afford, then, and not until then, can we abolish rent control.

Your Taxes Can Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the people are demanding some relief from the overwhelming burden of taxation which they have borne with patience during the spending orgy of the Fabian socialistic administration.

When the average burden of taxes from excises alone amount to about $700 per family in the United States to furnish boondoggling funds for the spendthrift administration it is more than the people will bear.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting an article by David Camelon which appeared in the American Weekly of January 22, 1950:

YOUR TAXES CAN BE CUT

CANADA HAS PROVED THAT IT'S GOOD BUSINESS FOR EVERYONE, INCLUDING THE GOVERNMENT, TO PUT MORE SPENDING MONEY IN THE POCKETS OF ITS PEOPLE

(By David Camelon)

The lady gasped at the list of the thousands of taxes she had to pay.

"Oo-o-o-o-h," she said with a shudder, "no wonder my budget won't stretch."

Wait, sweetheart. You could be wrong again.

We gave you the bad news in the American Weekly last week. It was a tough jolt. We told you all the taxes you pay every day. Hidden taxes—luxury taxes—nuisance taxes—taxes on everything you touch from the moment you wake up.

But maybe something can be done about it.

You want more spending money, sweetheart? There isn't a reason in the world why you shouldn't have it. How? By cutting taxes.

That way, you can have more money—the government can have more money—and everybody can be happy.

Sounds like double talk? It isn't sweetheart. Many of our best-informed men—men like Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, veteran chairman of the Senate Finance Committee—say that it is just plain common sense.

Why? We'll get to that.

First, let's take a look at Canada. Canada believed it made sense, too. But Canada didn't stop there. Canada acted. It cut taxes. It gave your cousins across the border more money to spend. And the idea, Canadians say, is working out fine for everyone—including the Canadian Government.

Suppose you were sitting by your radio in Canada one evening not so long ago. You wouldn't have heard President Truman asking for more taxes. You'd have heard Canada's Minister of Finance, the Honorable D. C. Abbott, announcing a program of tax reduction "such as no parliament has ever made before, here or anywhere else, I believe."

He spoke with pride of Canada:

"During the past year this community of free people has produced a record quantity of consumer goods, and at the same time has produced and installed a huge amount of new and improved capital equipment which promises still greater output in the years immediately ahead."

He said he was going to make sure that the people would have more money, so that they could buy the goods they were making. He said that was good for the people.

"Consumers should have more money to spend this year than last," he said. He added that that would happen partly as a result of the tax reductions which I shall be inviting this House (Parliament) to approve.

He pointed out that there were so many things in the stores for the people to buy that in some cases we can observe the occasional emergence * * * of bargain sales by retailers, something which we had almost forgotten to be a normal part of business.

He wanted you—if you were a Canadian—to have enough money in your purse to take advantage of those bargains.

Mr. Abbott said that taxes should cause as little harm and irritation as possible. He explained that he was cutting taxes because the people wanted him to. He said:

"I have been led to believe in recent months * * * that most of the Canadian people would support, and even welcome, an enlarged measure of tax reduction this year."

Here's what Mr. Abbott did:

He repealed the tax on transportation. (You still pay 15 percent.)

He repealed (a year ago) the tax on amusements. (You still pay 20 percent.)

He repealed the tax on telephone calls. (You still pay it.)

He reduced the tax on jewelry to 10 percent—and he applied it, not to the retail price, but to the manufacturer's price. That's a double reduction—because the manufacturer's price is, frequently, only half of the retail price. (You pay 20 percent of the retail price.)

He reduced the tax on cosmetics to 10 percent on the manufacturer's price. (You pay 20 percent of the retail price.)

He reduced the tax on luggage, bags, purses, fountain pens, cigaret lighters, and similar goods to 10 percent—again on the manufacturer's price. (You pay 20 percent of the retail price.)

He reduced and adjusted the excise taxes on several other things.

And for the third time since the end of the war, he reduced income taxes—by increasing personal exemptions, and lowering the rates.

The personal exemption for a single person was raised from $750 to $1,000. (Here in the United States a single person's exemption is only $600.)

The personal exemption of a married person was increased from $1,500 to $2,000. (If you're married, in the United States, your exemption is $1,200.)

Families with children got an even better break. In the United States, a family with two children would get a total exemption of $2,400. In Canada, in addition to exemptions for children, the Government pays a family $72 a year for each child. On this

basis, a married man with two children who made $3,000 a year in Canada would find the Government owing him a balance of $53.

And a married man with two children, making $5,000 a year, got a tax reduction of $177—or 28 percent.

You can buy a lot of pork chops—and pancake make-up—with $177, sweetheart. Particularly when the cosmetic tax has been cut.

By those changes, Mr. Abbott said, Canada had returned to the prewar level of personal exemptions. He estimated that an additional 725,000 men and women wouldn't have to pay any income taxes at all. In the United States, with a population 12 times as big as Canada's, that would be the same as excusing 9,000,000 more people from paying income taxes.

Sounds good, doesn't it?

And don't let anyone tell you Canada could cut taxes because her debt wasn't as big as ours. In proportion to her income, Canada owes more. Her national income, in 1947, was only 5 percent of ours, but her national debt was 6 percent. The war cost Canada money, too.

What has been the result of Canada's tax cuts? A responsible government official said:

"The tax program has already given the people more money to spend. Business is booming. From every side we get reports of increased business—increased income.

"We have avoided the business slump—and the increase in unemployment—that the United States experienced recently. We're tremendously optimistic. We are sure, now, that the revenue flowing from the increase in business and in our national income will more than offset the immediate loss of revenue from the tax cuts."

Why can't the same thing be done here? It can.

Senator George said:

"Canada is moving in the right direction. We can, and must, follow a similar path."

Among the first to go, Senator George said, must be the wartime excise taxes—those luxury taxes that Canada has already repealed or reduced. He said:

"These taxes were imposed during the war largely to discourage civilian buying. The purpose was to save raw materials and labor for essential war work.

"They were deliberately repressive on business. They tended to produce unemployment in civilian fields."

High income taxes had the same effect.

In time of war, the Senator said, that may be necessary. But high taxes—taxes that act as a brake on business, that tend to produce unemployment—are precisely what we don't need in time of peace.

Follow the Senator through some figures here. They aren't hard to get—and they'll show you why taxes not only can, but must, be cut.

Our total taxes—Federal, State and local, are running close to $[illegible],000,000,000 a year. Senator George didn't believe—apart from wishful thinking—that there was much real hope of making any material reduction in that $40,000,000,000 revenue in the next few years.

Even with that enormous revenue, the Senator said, the Federal Government will face a deficit at the end of its fiscal year next June 30 of from $3,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000.

President Truman has asked for more taxes to cover that deficit. Senator George said:

"I regret to say that I feel the President's theory of covering a deficit by higher taxes is entirely erroneous. I know of no way to meet that deficit except by easing the tax burden and increasing the income of the people who must produce those taxes.

"I know of no way in which you can get more income and production in a sound economy by increasing the burden on the producers."

America's national income, he pointed out, is slightly more than $200,000,000,000 a year. With a total tax of $60,000,000,000, that means that roughly 30 percent of our national income goes to pay taxes.

If we should increase the already repressive taxes, the Senator said, the national income would drop. If it went down to $150,000,000,000, we would have to pay 40 percent of it to meet the tax bill.

"That would be a crushing tax burden on the people," Senator George said. "It in turn would constitute an even greater brake on business. We would see tax collections dropping—and the deficit increasing."

If, however, we did what Canada did—if we cut taxes now, if we took the brake off business and employment, the national income would, in Senator George's opinion, increase immediately. He said:

"The national income is simply what every person in the country gets for the goods and services he produces. If we lift the tax burden from the people who produce that income—from every man and woman—I believe that within 3 to 5 years our national income may rise to $300,000,000,000.

"With a national income that big, we would have to pay only 20 percent of it to meet the tax load. That in itself would be a tremendous spur to our business."

With lower taxes, the Senator said, the people will have an incentive to produce more—and will have more money to buy their increased products.

He endorsed another of Canada's tax-reduction moves—the elimination of double taxation on corporate profits. In announcing that move to Parliament, Mr. Abbott said:

"Today we find governments in this country, as well as in most other countries, taxing away at least a third of corporate profits.

"In addition, the personal income-tax rates apply in full to what is distributed out of the remaining two-thirds. The tax may be as high as 80 percent upon distribution to shareholders.

"It seems to me that under a system of private enterprise which depends for its existence on a steady flow of venture capital we cannot afford to neglect the implication of this defect in our tax system."

Mr. Abbott reduced the tax on corporate profits to 10 percent in the case of small business. And he allowed every individual to take a credit against his personal income tax equal to 10 percent of the dividends received from Canadian corporations.

He announced that this was only a start on the problem of eliminating double taxation on profits.

Such a move, Senator George agreed, will encourage Canadians to use their money to buy the tools and new plants necessary to keep production climbing—in the words of Mr. Abbott, to produce even more of the capital equipment which "promises still greater output in the years immediately ahead."

Senator George said we can do one of two things:

We can raise taxes, with the risk of depressing business and reducing our income; or we can lower taxes, taking a temporary loss in tax revenue, with the certainty that any loss will be more than made up by the stimulation to business, more employment, and greater national income.

Well, there you've got it, sweetheart.

Which would you rather do?

Amending the Rules of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1949, I voted against the rule change, as at that time I believed much undesirable legislation would be proposed to the House unless adequately screened by a responsible Rules Committee.

The Democratic Party's tremendous spending and tax program, designed to bring socialism to this country, in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress has proven that I was right.

The Democratic leadership now, through political maneuvering, has tried to couple the civil-rights program with this proposed rule change. They use the civil-rights issue only as a smoke screen, and I deplore such tactics. The Republican Party is pledged to support FEPC and other component parts of the civil-rights program. I have long been an advocate of this, and shall vote for it when it comes before the House. Failure to change the rules last Friday gave the Speaker of the House today opportunity to recognize the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, in order to bring up the civil-rights bill. He chose, instead, to recognize another chairman and by his action it must be obvious to all that the Democratic leadership of this House has no desire to act on civil rights despite their many empty promises.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the effect of application of the provision of the proposed FEPC law as presented in a letter from Mr. Kern Dodge, a prominent engineer of Philadelphia, is submitted herewith for the consideration of my colleagues:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 16, 1950.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: By all means, vote against any so-called civil-rights measures, especially those having to do with fair-employment practices. Such a bill would deny employer freedom of contract; deny the employer the right of selective judgment in procuring his employees; deny to fellow employees the right of selecting associates; deny the employer the right to hire, promote, or discharge employees upon the basis of their efficiency, merit, or faithfulness.

It would subject the employer to endless investigation, harassment, and possible fines and penalties, determined by a commission.

It would deny the employer the right of

trial by jury, and give him no right to a review of the facts found by the commission.

It would compel the employer to give testimony against himself and expose his private letters, books, and papers for the inspection and investigation of a horde of employees of the commission.

It would compel the employer to hire a person whom he did not wish to have in his employ, and deny him the privilege of selecting an employee of his own choice.

Such a commission would have the power to make rules and regulations which have the effect of laws, of which we have more than enough, and which hamstring business.

I am sure you would not vote for a bill which would require a person of a certain race or color to work for another against his will. Therefore, you should not vote for any bill which would require another person to employ someone to work for him against such employer's will.

This whole civil-rights program is being pressed by certain minority groups who are not satisfied with life in the finest country in the world, but who wish to remake it for their own special selfish benefit.

Yours very truly,

KERN DODGE.

How Congress Makes a Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, we in the Senate of the United States work with the complex machinery of national legislation every day. An idea is born. We know that it must pass over a long and rocky road to become a law. This knowledge has become almost of second nature to us—so much so, perhaps, that in the turmoil of our busy days we are apt to forget how important it is that every American understand, at least in a general way, the "whats," "wheres," and "whys" of our legislative process. And it is helpful too, I believe, that every once in a while we in the Congress, as well as the American public, be reminded of all these complicated steps in our national law-making.

I feel that now, while the Eighty-first Congress is still in the early days of its second session, is a good time for all of us to review once again how we in the United States get a national law, and so here, in broad and easily understood terms, in the text of my regular biweekly broadcast of the week end of January 20–22, inclusive, to the people of Pennsylvania, is a discussion of the steps and pitfalls that lie ahead of any proposed legislation before it can become law. I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Radio address by United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, of Pennsylvania)

I have intended in one of these regular radio reports to the people of Pennsylvania to paint in broad strokes a picture of the way a piece of legislation is born, and the fashion in which it ultimately grows up to become a public law.

Of course, to those of us who are Members of the House of Representatives or the Senate, knowledge of this sort is part of our stock-in-trade, but I have often been surprised, in reading over my mail, or in talking to Pennsylvanians who come to see me, when I realize that relatively little is understood about the way the Congress operates.

RESEARCH NECESSARY TO DRAW UP BILLS

Let us suppose that a matter comes to my attention with the indication that it would be desirable to pass a law relating to it. The first step, naturally, involves quite a bit of research into the existing laws we already have on the books to make absolutely certain that there is no legislative provision which covers the situation. When I am satisfied that no suitable legislation exists, the next step is one of collecting all of the factual background I can possibly get in order that I may be sure the proposal has merit.

In gathering these facts, it is frequently necessary to call upon experts in Pennsylvania who are acquainted with the matter, and who can explain what this will mean to the people of our State. It is also necessary, quite frequently, to call upon representatives of the local, or the State, or the Federal Government, for their comments and recommendations regarding the proposal.

Then, with all the facts before me, I go over the various means which have been suggested for accomplishing the desired result. Then follows the job of drawing up a bill, which, in appropriate legal terms, will carry out the intended purpose of the law. Members of the Senate are assisted in drafting this legal language by an official group known as the Legislative Counsel, a body of skilled lawyers, who are expert in drawing up legislation.

The steps I have enumerated thus far may, in the case of comprehensive legislation, consume weeks, or even months, before I am satisfied that we have come up with a proposal suitable for the purpose at hand. On the other hand, of course, there are occasions where the facts are clear from the start, where the remedy needed is a simple one that may be accomplished with the passage of a short, concise piece of legislation.

INTRODUCING THE BILL

In any event, once the bill is drafted, the rules of the Senate permit any Member to introduce a bill at any time, or at least there are very few occasions in the Senate when we may not interrupt debate long enough to introduce a piece of proposed legislation. This is accomplished by rising from your chair on the Senate floor and being recognized by the Presiding Officer, explaining that you wish to submit a bill.

Only under the most unusual circumstances does the Senate proceed immediately to consider and vote on the proposal at the time it is introduced. Instead, the Presiding Officer of the Senate refers the proposal to one of the standing legislative committees.

WORK OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

Now let me explain to you just what these legislative committees do. We have, in the Senate, a total of 15 such committees, and I will name each of them now in order that you can see the type of legislation which each of these considers. We have a Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a Committee on Appropriations, on Armed Services, on Banking and Currency, a Committee on the District of Columbia, on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on Finance, a Committee on Foreign Relations, and then on Interior and Insular Affairs, a Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and on the Judiciary, a Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and one on Post Office and Civil Service, another on Public Works, and on Rules and Administration.

With the exception of the Appropriations Committee, each of these 15 committees is composed of 13 of the 96 Members of the Senate. As a general practice, every Senator serves on two such legislative committees. I, for example, am a member of the Finance Committee and the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In the Eighty-first Congress, in which, as you know, the Democrats outnumber the Republicans in both Houses, there are usually 8 Democrats and 5 Republicans to make up the 13 members of the committees, since this ratio is approximately proportional to the ratio of Democrats to Republicans in the Senate.

When you stop to think about it, it is obvious why we must have a committee system in the Congress. Let me illustrate this by pointing out that 2,675 separate bills were introduced by the 96 Members of the Senate in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. It's obvious that no Member of the Senate could be familiar with all of the provisions of all of these bills. It's obvious, too, that there may be 3 or 4, or sometimes as many as 15 or 20, bills introduced by different Senators, all of which deal with aspects of the same problem.

So the primary purpose of our legislative committees is to provide the Senate with a relatively small group which becomes expert, say, in matters of the armed services. All of the bills that relate to the armed services are referred to that committee. It is the committee's duty to examine them all. The committee may decide it would be preferable to group a number of bills together, consider them all at once and report out a single piece of legislation which covers all of the situations visualized by those separate measures. On the other hand, the committee may have before it only one bill which relates to a given proposal, and in that event, the measure will be considered separately.

It is surprising how few of the bills referred to any committee are controversial. And under these circumstances, the committee will examine the merits of the proposal and perhaps vote to report the original bill pretty much in the form it was submitted, recommending, at the same time, that the Senate act favorably upon it.

HOW CONTROVERSIAL MEASURES ARE HANDLED

Where a number of bills are considered at the same time, however, where the matters involved are steeped in controversy over the way a situation should be handled, the usual practice of the committee is to appoint a subcommittee and conduct public hearings. To these hearings are invited the representatives of groups interested in the legislation being considered. These witnesses explain to the subcommittee why they favor or oppose the various proposals under discussion. Particularly when the subject matter is comprehensive in its scope and controversial in its nature, subcommittee hearings may go on for months and months in an endeavor to put all of the facts of the case before the subcommittee.

When at last the committee is satisfied that no new facts will be brought to light, the hearings are brought to a close, and the members go into what is known as executive session. Here they debate among themselves all the various proposals, rejecting those that are clearly unsuitable and attempting to work out provisions upon which all the members can agree.

During the course of executive sessions efforts are made to draft a single bill containing the proposals agreed to, and ultimately the 13 members vote to recommend the new bill to the Senate. Such a committee vote may produce any number of results. All 13

members may agree unanimously to the bill as it then stands. This has been especially true in the field of foreign policy, where Republicans and Democrats alike on that committee have agreed down to the last comma on virtually every measure reported from that committee. Unanimous agreement by the 13 members characterizes the vote in most committees on most legislation.

There are, of course, the few occasions—occasions that are always given tremendous publicity—in which a committee divides right down the middle and votes squarely along party lines, the Democrats voting one way, the Republicans the other. As I say, this doesn't happen often among the experts who know most about the legislation before them. When a committee does vote 8 to 5 to report a bill in a particular form, the five minority members almost invariably write a dissenting report, and you can generally count on a fight when such a measure hits the Senate floor.

I will say a brief word about the reports which accompany each bill as it is voted out of committee and sent to the Senate. These reports usually outline the provisions of the bill and summarize the committee's reasons for recommending passage of the measure. A minority report points a finger at the provisions in the bill which the minority does not endorse and gives the reasons for its opposition.

There is a final possibility that may result from a committee vote. The committee may vote to report out no legislation at all, thus bottling a bill up in committee and in effect, killing any chance that the Senate might consider it at all.

When this happens, about the only way in which the Senate may bring the issue to a vote is through the extraordinary tactic of the Senate itself voting to discharge the committee of further consideration of the bill. You may recall that this tactic was proposed late last summer as a means of bringing the displaced-persons bill out to the Senate floor. Before that tactic had been attempted, however, the Judiciary Committee did vote to report out the bill.

THE SENATE CALENDAR

Once a bill has been reported out of committee, it is placed upon the calendar of the Senate. The calendar is simply a list of bills upon which committee work has been completed and that are all ready for action.

It may surprise many of you, but almost all the bills passed by the Senate are passed with the unanimous consent of the entire body. This is accomplished by what we refer to as calling the calendar. When this is done, we read down the list of bills, and if no objection is heard to the bill at the time its number is called, the measure is passed by unanimous consent. However, if only one Senator opposes a bill, he may enter an objection when the number is called, and the bill is held over to be brought up later for debate, and ultimately to be voted upon.

DUTIES OF MAJORITY POLICY COMMITTEE

Once a bill has been objected to and passed over, it remains on the Senate Calendar. Thereafter, it becomes the duty of the Majority Policy Committee of the Senate to determine the time at which the measure will be brought up for debate. In my capacity as the assistant majority leader of the Senate, or the whip, as the job is otherwise known, I am one of the eight Democratic Senators who serve on the Majority Policy Committee. Our job, as I've already indicated, is, first, to determine the sequence in which legislation is brought up for debate. The Policy Committee has the further function of mapping the general strategy which will be used in guiding the legislative program of the administration.

When the Policy Committee met shortly before the first day of this session of the Eighty-first Congress, we decided to bring up the oleo bill as the initial measure the Senate might consider.

Once a measure has been selected for debate, the efforts to obtain passage of the bill are usually assumed by the Senators who serve on the committee which processed the legislation, since they are the real experts on the measure, and the Senate necessarily must rely on their special knowledge of the facts. The committee members are, of course, assisted by the Senate leaders, and for that matter, by any other Senators who wish to participate in the debate.

FINAL STEPS

The bill, as you realize, must be agreed to in every respect by both the House and the Senate before it can be sent to the President for his signature, making it a Public Law. So, if the Senate is the first to pass the bill, it is referred then to the House of Representatives for consideration. If, on the other hand, the House has already passed the measure, but in a slightly different form from the Senate version, a conference committee, composed of a few Representatives and a few Senators, is appointed, and the compromise agreement is ultimately sent back to each House for its approval before sending it to the President.

Thus it is that a law is passed by the Congress.

The Quack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Quack," appearing in the Omaha Evening World-Herald of January 20.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE QUACK

If a faith healer were named medical czar of the United States, it is likely that the past presidents of the American Medical Association would have some salty things to say about the fellow.

A situation similar to that has arisen among economists, now that Leon Keyserling has become the No. 1 economist in the Truman administration. It is widely predicted that he will shortly be named chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, of which he is acting chairman at present.

Mr. Keyserling is an ersatz economist. C. P. Ives, of the Baltimore Sun, in looking into the man's qualifications, discovered that he has practically no preparation or standing in the field in which he is now so prominent. He holds no academic degrees in economics. His sole published work in the field is described by Mr. Ives as "a second-prize essay on postwar economic policy in a promotion contest run by a brewing company."

His experiences amounted to 1 year as an assistant in economics at Columbia University when he was 24 years old. Mr. Keyserling became a member of the American Economic Association, the professional society of working economists, only after he had been appointed an economic adviser to the President in 1947.

Four past presidents of the American Economic Association have paid their respects to Mr. Keyserling in uniformly uncomplimentary fashion.

Dr. Edwin C. Nourse, a former AEA head, made known his sharp differences with Mr. Keyserling when he (Dr. Nourse) resigned as chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, who once headed the AEA, crossed swords with Keyserling over the latter's insistence upon restrictive controls a year ago when practically everyone else knew that inflation had ebbed. A Senate committee headed by Mr. DOUGLAS has noted "how unsafe it is to base fiscal policy" upon economic predictions.

Dr. E. H. Ellis, who headed the economists' group last year, is the sharpest Keyserling critic. He has accused Mr. Keyserling of befuddlement or dissimulation and casuistry. "Honesty," says Dr. Ellis, referring to the policies of Dr. Nourse, "is apt to be better long-run policy than Keyserling's (congressional) testimony."

Another critic is Princeton's Dr. Jacob Viner, outstanding economist who headed the AEA in 1939, and who once worked for the Federal Government. He once told Keyserling at a public meeting that if a Government official speaks to the public, he has to speak his master's voice. When Mr. Keyserling objected to Dr. Viner being the keeper of my conscience, the Princeton professor snapped:

"I am not interested in your conscience, Mr. Keyserling. I have enough trouble with my own. I am interested in institutions—American institutions."

Such is the indictment of Economist Keyserling by some of the country's leading economists.

Whether it will sway the President of the United States in naming a new chairman for the CEA remains to be seen. Mr. Truman ordinarily is more concerned with loyalty than with competence. And Mr. Keyserling has been loyal.

The most effective way to rid the Federal Government of Mr. Keyserling and his odd theories would be for Congress to abolish the Council of Economic Advisers, on the grounds that it has become simply a political tool of the White House.

Formosa and the Truman Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tears of the Crocodile," published in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEARS OF THE CROCODILE

Among the myths that are being sedulously circulated as a result of the Formosa decision is that the administration has killed its own Truman doctrine. The funeral orations have been delivered by one after the other of the China interventionists in Congress. Some of them never favored the Truman doctrine, anyway, but that fact, far from moderating their wailing, has made their lamentations even more shrill. A flock

of commentators has seconded the dirge, and the only person who seems unperturbed by the outcry is the parent who is accused of the foul murder of his child, viz, President Truman.

Mr. Truman is not as hard-hearted as the serenity he maintains in the midst of this Irish wake would seem to indicate. We have consulted the child's birth certificate, dated March 13, 1947, and can vouch for the fact that whatever has been killed, it is not the Truman doctrine. The Truman doctrine, contrary to the burial notices, was not a declaration to "contain" Communist expansion. Indeed, a reading and rereading of the message does not disclose either the word "containment" or the word "communism." The message, inspired by Britain's announcement that it could no longer help Greece, laid down this general policy:

"It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure."

The first thing to notice about the declaration is its positiveness; it was for, not against. It emphasizes aid, to be given in one or more of a variety of forms, depending upon circumstances. However, the doctrine indicated what kind of aid was primarily meant; it was economic:

"Our help should be primarily economic and financial aid which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes."

On the basis of the Truman doctrine, economic and financial aid and then military aid started to flow to Greece and also to Turkey. The reason was that Greece and Turkey were struggling to prevent the Russians from cutting the Mediterranean and encircling the Middle East. Ask any military strategist and you will find that this was all-important to American security. There is only one Mediterranean, only one Greece; and, as Secretary Acheson has said, the American interest differs with locality. In this sense the Truman doctrine has been administered—is still being administered. It is being applied all over the world according to the requirements of situations and geography and the limitations of American resources.

Out of the Truman doctrine, for instance, stemmed the Marshall plan in Europe and the Far East. The Marshall plan followed the wise maxim underlying the Truman doctrine of helping people who helped themselves. It would have been money down the drain to have any other rule. Wherever there was a contrary practice, as in China, the result has been worse than wasteful; it has been a boomerang. The Marshall plan, moreover, was followed by the North Atlantic Pact and the arms program—all tracing back to the Truman doctrine. They all sprang from the original concept of supporting free peoples who were struggling to keep themselves free which was expressed in the Truman doctrine. The conclusion is that the crocodile tears now being shed over the demise of the Truman doctrine are all eyewash.

Wheat for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Mr. J. J. Singh, president of the India League of America. This letter appeared in the columns of the New York Times on December 25, 1949.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIA LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., December 26, 1949.

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

During the visit of Prime Minister Nehru to this country, several newspaper stories appeared indicating that a barter deal was in progress, whereby the United States would sell 1,000,000 tons of wheat to India in exchange for such raw materials as mica, manganese, etc., which the United States needs.

It is very regrettable that, according to information available, this barter deal has met snags and has bogged down. This means that the urgently needed wheat for the hungry in India is not available.

One of the snags is that India will not be able to supply mica, manganese, and other raw materials of a similar nature for several years to come. The reasons being (a) the next 3 or 4 years' supplies are already pledged, and (b) that with the devaluation of the rupee, 40 percent additional quantities have to be produced.

It seems very unfortunate that due to red tape and technicalities, valuable time is being lost and India's food situation is being allowed to deteriorate.

Surely, with the cooperation of the State Department, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, a way could be found to overcome some of the technical difficulties—and if a barter deal is not feasible at this stage, then wheat should be sold to India on a long-range credit basis. The sale has to be on a credit basis for the simple reason that India, like many other countries, does not have the necessary dollars to purchase and pay on the barrel.

Sale of a million tons of wheat to India on a long-range credit basis is a two-way street. It will help India and it will also lessen the burden of the United States taxpayer.

It is authoritatively reported that under the farm price-support program, the United States Government has bought, paid for, and is storing surplus farm commodities valued at millions of dollars. It is costing United States taxpayers $237,000 a day for storage and carrying charges on these farm products. By selling 1,000,000 tons of wheat to India, the American taxpayers' burden will be lessened.

India's economy is in a critical condition. And it is chiefly due to the lack of food. The Indian Government has had to buy, at very high prices, food in different parts of the world, to avert a large-scale famine. Such heavy expenditures for food grains have reduced India's capacity to import other essential capital goods to help India's economy.

A loan of a million tons of wheat would stabilize food grain prices in India and will feed millions of hungry mouths. This in turn will keep the masses satisfied and reduce the possibilities of Communist propaganda amongst the hungry people.

I do not believe in flaunting the danger of communism at every stage and turn. However, this aspect cannot be overlooked.

Strong and surging Communist forces are nearing the borders of India. The defection of the Governor of the Sikang Province to the Communists brings real danger to Tibet.

From all reports available, the Chinese Communists plan to move into Tibet in the very near future. Some reports indicate that infiltration has already taken place. This is to presage a fake internal revolution to depose the young Lama. The irony is that there is very little that India and the western democracies can do in this instance. No military or material aid is possible. Also, Communist China could probably make a good legal case for hoisting their flag at Lhasa. Tibet has been considered part of China since early seventh century A. D. The Chiang Kai-shek regime, too, has consistently maintained that position.

Once Tibet comes under the control of the Communists, serious troubles for India are likely to begin. Because it would be easier then for the Communists to infiltrate into India through the two small Himalayan kingdoms of Nepal and Bhutan whose northern borders join Tibet and southern borders join India.

It is true that the reigning house of Nepal is very friendly toward India (a treaty of friendship and commerce is being negotiated) and the western democracies, and the Government of the United States has a full-fledged mission stationed there. And Bhutan, which receives a large subsidy from India and whose foreign affairs, since August 1949, have been in the hands of the Government of India, is being more or less run by India. Yet, it must not be forgotten that ethnologically, the Nepalese and Bhutanese are Mongoloids like the Tibetans. This will make "infiltration" very easy.

Then, too, there are no democratic institutions in these kingdoms. The Communists are sure to take full advantage of that by appealing to the poor masses against the rule by the few.

Solutions are hard to find under such conditions. However, one of the apparent solutions is to encourage and strengthen the democratic forces in India. And one of the ways to achieve that end is for the United States to help India in putting more food into hungry mouths and in stabilizing food prices.

Such a gesture from this democracy will mean a lot to democratic forces all over Asia. It may even give India a chance to counteract Communist propaganda in Nepal and Bhutan, thus stopping the Communists on the border of Tibet.

J. J. SINGH, *President,*
India League of America.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, a couple of my colleagues have conscientiously protested my opposition to the activities of the Southwestern Power Administration, which is their privilege under our great American heritage. It is noted with interest that these eminent gentlemen purport to justify the activities of the Southwestern Power Administration by emphasizing the success of the rural electrification program. Perhaps these two good friends of mine are unconsciously influenced by the fact that the activities of the SPA deserve no praise and cannot be justified.

REA AND SPA ARE SEPARATE

When a boy on the farm, like my neighboring boyhood friends, I longed for the day when I could live in the small town nearby that I might enjoy some of the comforts and entitlements of life principally afforded by electric service. However, it is now possible to visualize

a near future when the people of the metropolitan areas will be living for that day when it will be possible for them to move to and reside within the wide open rural spaces where they will at the same time be afforded equal comforts of life to those within the metropolitan areas.

Hamstring the rural electrification program? No. I would do absolutely nothing detrimental to this great enterprise and will always use every honorable means at my command to further this most meritorious project. I am a devout advocate of rural electrification, and I am just as anxious as any person in this country to see every farm within the United States electrified at the earliest possible date.

Actions speak louder than words. Therefore, I suggest that some of the proponents of the SPA activities who would accuse me of being unfriendly to the REA program scrutinize my past activities concerning this subject. I have a public record of several years, and the people within my area know of my activities on behalf of the rural electric cooperatives. During my tenure in Congress I have consistently supported the REA program. In every one of my 62 speeches before civic organizations in Arkansas during the 45 days immediately preceding this last Christmas I highly praised the rural electrification program and, at the same time, lost no opportunity to advise the people that in my opinion the Southwestern Power Administration would eventually attempt to do just exactly what it is now doing by means of the SPA-REA contract. I sincerely feel that my efforts to prohibit the SPA from taking over the facilities and privileges of the involved electric cooperatives is my duty as a friend and representative of the farmers and electric cooperative membership within my district.

The REA and the SPA are distinct and separate programs, and the SPA has contributed nothing to advance or promote the high standards of rural electrification. The rural electrification program is a successful, meritorious, free, and independent organization—the respective electric cooperatives being owned, controlled, governed, and operated by and for the membership, with justifiable authority under our American way of life to freely engage in bringing electric service to the rural areas of our country.

The Southwestern Power Administration, on the other hand, is an agency of the Federal Government under the Department of the Interior with limited congressional authority to pool power and energy produced from Government multiple-purpose dams and distribute such power and energy as provided by law at rates to be approved by the Federal Power Commission.

I wholeheartedly concur in the statements of one of my fellow colleagues that rural electrification has been a long and hard struggle; that the remaining unserved 33 percent of rural Arkansas should be electrified under the splendid rural electrification program without delay; and that rural electrification is just now coming into full fruition. However, these facts do not in anywise justify the activities of the SPA. It cannot be contended that the SPA should be credited with having electrified 67 percent of the rural areas within the State of Arkansas, but, to the contrary, these achievements have been realized under the authority granted by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. It is not necessary to allow the Department of the Interior, through the Southwestern Power Administration, to nationalize, federalize, and socialize the rural electric cooperatives in order to bring electricity to the remaining 33 percent of the unserved rural area of our State.

GENERATING PLANTS AND TRANSMISSION LINES

Yes; the rural electric cooperatives should be and are authorized and entitled to construct electric generating units and transmission lines that the cheapest possible electric energy may be made available to the membership in accordance with good business principles under our system of free enterprise. However, I insist that the Southwestern Power Administration is not justifiably entitled to similar authorizations if we are to maintain our principles of democracy, assist our rural electrification program, and uphold our belief in private ownership.

To allow the Federal Government, through its SPA agency, to establish and dictate policies for the rural electric cooperatives, and to use, control, and receive all benefits from electric generating and transmission facilities constructed by the cooperatives is nothing less than an authorization to federalize the rural electric cooperatives, permit the SPA to expand its legal jurisdiction, and place the Government in direct competition with its citizens.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AS A COMPETITOR

As brought to our attention by one of my colleagues, I likewise know of but very few, especially within our section, who do not believe in free, competitive enterprise. Perhaps it should be added that I know of even a lesser number in our area who believe that one of the competitors in free competition should be the Federal Government. I would not hazard the contention that the rural cooperatives or others engaged in the power industry could produce electricity as cheaply as the nontaxpaying Federal Government. No doubt we could buy our food and clothing a lot cheaper at Government-owned grocery and clothing stores.

Those proposing to place the Government, through its SPA agency, into the power field as a competitor in order to assure cheaper energy than the taxpaying electric cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry can produce could just as successfully contend that we should have Government-owned parallel and duplicating railway and streetcar tracks; airplane, boat, bus, and truck routes; telephone and telegraph lines; and radio and television channels. Petroleum, gas, and coal could be produced cheaper by the Government. No doubt all of these businesses are in the plans of those seeking to use the Government as a competitor to free enterprise. The ultimate results of such a plan can only mean Government operation and eventual ownership.

SPA-REA CONTRACT ABOLISHES COMPETITION

Prior to the approval of the SPA-REA contract the rural electric cooperatives within the Southwest have today three sources of electricity:

First. Government flood-control dams over transmission lines owned by the Government, private companies, or those that the cooperatives build, own and operate themselves;

Second. Private power companies;

Third. Electric generating plants that the cooperatives build, own and operate themselves.

Right now the rural cooperatives have the private companies and the Federal Government SPA agency right where they should want them. Both are doing everything possible to do business with the cooperatives. The Southwestern Power Administration and the private companies are competing for the cooperatives' business, and they fully realize the possibility of the cooperatives' building their own steam-power units and transmission lines should the electric rates not be sufficiently low to make justifiable such action on behalf of their membership. As long as this situation prevails it is the rural electric cooperatives within the Southwest that stand to benefit by not becoming involved in a long-term contract. They have their freedom of choice—the American way.

Once, however, these cooperatives lose their advantage by negotiating a long-term contract, permitting themselves to be tied irrevocably to the apron strings of the SPA for a period of 40 years, the opportunity to buy electricity upon a competitive market is gone and the right to produce and transmit electricity by means of their own facilities has vanished.

SPA is not in the power field with the rural cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry with my good graces. TVA was established not only for flood control and navigation but as a "yardstick" of electric costs for regulating private-power companies. The Public Service Commission in my State of Arkansas as well as the Federal Power Commission regulates the involved electric rates. The SPA must sell electricity from the Government flood-control dams at rates approved by the Federal Power Commission. The SPA renders only a power marketing service. The Corps of Engineers build and operate the flood-control dams, and could distribute the electricity from that source to the rural electric cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry over transmission lines built by the engineers, the private companies, or the cooperatives at a great savings to the taxpayers. Were the SPA completely out of the power field the rural electric cooperatives could still obtain electricity from the Government flood-control dams over transmission lines owned by the Government, the private companies, or those that the cooperatives build, own, and operate themselves. Alternative sources would come from private power companies or from electric-generating plants that the cooperatives build, own, operate themselves, and tie in with the Federal power projects.

CONCLUSION

A memorandum as of the 17th day of January from the Washington executive manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association to all managers, State presidents, State papers, and NRECA directors is a fair example of the misinterpretation of my bill by those who hope to see the rural electrification movement in the Southwest completely controlled by the Federal Government SPA agency. This memorandum can only serve to misinform our rural people who have the most to lose if the REA is taken away from them and put under the control of the Federal Government. Could it be that the Washington office of the NRECA is afraid to allow the affected people to know the truth?

The afore-mentioned NRECA memorandum out of Washington incorrectly charges, among other things, that my bill will:

First. Stop all REA loans for transmission and generation where lines would be tied into any other power source except where they are individually authorized by Congress;

Second. Stop advances (of funds) on all such generation and transmission loans already made except as they are hereinafter specifically authorized by Congress.

It is well known by the Washington manager of the NRECA that my bill in no way affects the authority of the REA to make any loans except for the building of electric generating plants or transmission lines to be used, leased, owned, or operated by others than the rural electric cooperatives. I merely want to keep the SPA from federalizing the rural cooperatives until authorized to do so by Congress. I am at a loss to know how anyone could object to Congress being given an opportunity to determine whether the Federal Government, through the SPA, should enter into the power field as a competitor with its citizens by regimenting and federalizing the rural-electric cooperatives.

The proposed legislation does not attempt to curtail the present authority of the REA to loan funds for electric service lines; for generating and transmission systems; for transmission lines to carry hydro power from Federal projects, generating plants, or from any other source; or for any other purpose than the building of generating plants and transmission lines to be used by others than the electric cooperatives.

As a freshman Member of Congress, of course I do not have at my disposal the excellent means of reaching the cooperative members throughout the Nation as does the Washington manager of the NRECA. In my district, however, it will be my pleasure and privilege to take this issue to my own farmers. If the rural-electric cooperative membership throughout this country could in some manner be given the true picture of the situation at hand, it would take no action by Congress to preclude the federalization efforts now being made through the SPA plan. A great majority of the people are aware of the Federal Government gradually encroaching more and more upon the lives, happiness, and freedom of the American people. My people do not want Federal regimentation; they will not stand for it; and so long as I am a Member of Congress I shall do all in my power to keep it from being forced upon them.

I hold no brief for the private electric utilities; recognize them as monopolies requiring strict Federal regulation and supervision; but I feel that all water, telephone, electric, fuel, and like utilities have a definite place in our economic picture, and should not be permitted to be abolished by the competition of the Federal Government. No monopoly could ever exist so dangerous and devastating to democracy as a Federal Government monopoly.

However, you may be assured that I do hold a brief, and a strong one, for the American system of free enterprise upon which this Nation was founded and has become the greatest upon the face of this earth. It alarms me and it should concern all of us tremendously when we see the Federal Government taking steps toward nationalization, which would result eventually in a completely socialized state. The founders of American democracy never intended that we employ such a system. The great strength of America today lies in the fact that our individuals and industries have been encouraged and inspired by the right of free enterprise—the right to earn a legitimate, honest dollar without working in direct competition with the Federal Government, or without being taken over, lock, stock, and barrel, by the Federal Government, as some of our "planners" would like.

The Southwestern Power Administration activities are of far-reaching significance—going beyond the electric-power field—going into the very heart of our right for free enterprise which was guaranteed to each and everyone of us by the pioneers who built our Nation and our Government. I, for one, want to preserve that right, and I shall do everything within my power to preserve it, regardless of politics and regardless of criticism by "do-gooders" who would like to see the Government take over everything, including the future rights of our children to which they are justly entitled by American democracy.

New Mining Bill To Secure Venture Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, having just come back to Washington from Nevada, where among other places the Committee on Public Lands held hearings on western problems, I heard a great deal about the troubles of the domestic mining industry.

High costs and comparatively low prices have caused a serious economic crisis which is surely and rapidly strangling to death the small and marginal mines of Nevada and elsewhere, causing a greater and greater dependence upon foreign sources of minerals—and, I may add, a largely unnecessary dependence. There are a number of contributing factors, among which are high taxes, low tariffs, lack of a Federal system of mine incentive payments such as is contemplated in the Murray-Engle bill, and failure of the Bureau of Federal Supply to apply the buy American clause of the Stock Pile Act of 1946.

Congress provided in the Stock Pile Act of 1946 a mechanism (the "buy American" clause) especially designed to prevent too great a dependence upon foreign sources of minerals and metals and laid down a policy to govern the executive branch of the Government in dealing with this problem. The first section of Public Law 520, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, states clearly that one of the purposes of the act is "to encourage * * * the development of sources of these materials within the United States, and thereby decrease and prevent wherever possible a dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of these materials in time of national emergency." This policy has been almost completely nullified by the executive. As not infrequently happens, Mr. Speaker, the Congress saw more clearly than the advisers of the President who in his message of approval of the Stock Pile Act stated his "reluctance to signing a bill which reaffirms the application to stock-pile purchases" of the buy American clause. This statement by the President ever since has controlled the policy of the executive agencies. I cannot believe the President intended to bring about the results which have stemmed from this unfortunate statement, and I feel he has been ill advised.

However that may be, Mr. Speaker, it is up to the Congress to reaffirm its stand and policy and to implement it.

One of the difficulties in getting private capital to develop and open new mines is the extremely speculative nature of the enterprises and, because of double taxation of any income at the mine and again when it reaches the investor. Only small tax advantages can be taken of losses, and at the same time the net income to an investor from a successful venture is so small as to make it extremely unattractive to risk one's capital in such ventures. Investment in tax-free securities or in safe, low-income industrial issues or in bonds, has become the popular way of safeguarding one's capital, and the idea of making money through speculative ventures in new enterprises has well-nigh had to be abandoned. Mining has been the chief sufferer in this respect. It may be that the SEC regulations have restricted new investments to some extent, but the real trouble is the reluctance of the investor

to take the risk of "heads you win, tails I lose" in playing the tax game with Uncle Sam.

I believe that mining can be made attractive to the investing public by the right sort of tax relief. I now am talking of new ventures which hit the jackpot, not mines which are unable to make both ends meet. No amount of Federal tax relief can help those who have no operating profit. If, however, one stood a chance of keeping the jackpot when he hit it, one might well afford to invest in a number of projects and take the losses from the unsuccessful ventures.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I introduced a new bill, H. R. 6456, which strikes a blow against double taxation of the income from new mining enterprises. The effect of this will be to keep the mine free from Federal taxation for 5 years after its first commercial production, and to make the profits to the investor tax-free for 5 years after the first dividends are declared. This is a radical and drastic departure from other tax-relief plans, but the situation is desperate and requires drastic action.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the Members will give this new plan careful study and consideration. I know of no other way to induce private venture capital into this basic industry so as to extend our ore reserves. If the Government will not help, the stage must be set so that the industry can help itself and improve our basic economy at the same time. This bill should be given hearings and cleared for the consideration of the House at the earliest possible moment. I hope for prompt and favorable action.

A Popular Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under date of January 12, 1950, the editor of The Observer, of the town of Kearny, N. J., wrote a very timely and encouraging editorial entitled "A Popular Start." It suggests that Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public will be pleased with the new administration which will guide the destiny of the town of Kearny under the able hand of Mayor Joseph P. Healey.

The projected program of Mayor Healey, one of my closest friends, has won the admiration and respect of his townspeople. The editor of The Observer is to be commended for his remarks which will do much to spur well-intentioned public servants to give of their best efforts.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the editorial:

A POPULAR START

There was ample evidence this week that Kearny's new Democratic administration means to fulfill promises to provide improved municipal services. The sharp warning given to street department employees by Councilman Bergen, street committee chairman, has been received with complimentary reactions from all parts of the town.

The crack-down orders and subsequent warnings issued by Bergen along with Mayor Healey have been applauded by the public who pay the tax bills and who are deserving of better garbage collection service.

Administration officials promised there would be no political reprisals, but that department employees would be expected to perform the jobs assigned to them with courtesy and efficiency. Complaints that refuse collectors in past years had acquired a habit of arbitrarily leaving certain refuse at the curb have been justified and the new orders that everything is to be picked up and garbage cans completely emptied promises immediate improvement in a service that is close to home.

The mayor told municipal workers that harmony and cooperation with the street department's new policy will be required to improve this vital service. Employees of other departments are due to be told the same things very soon, all of which will continue to please Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public.

Legislative Program of Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 17, 1950, David M. Brown, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, together with other officials of that organization, appeared before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the purpose of presenting their legislative program to the committee.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the very comprehensive statement of Commander Brown to the committee on that occasion.

Mr. Brown's statement follows:

(Statement of David M. Brown, national commander, Disabled American Veterans, before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, January 17, 1950)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee: In accord with annual custom, it is my privilege as national commander of the Disabled American Veterans to appear before you today to present our legislative program. First and foremost, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not take this opportunity to express the deep appreciation of my organization to the chairman and to each member of the committee for the splendid and intelligent record you have established in behalf of the service-connected disabled veteran, his dependents and for his widow and orphans.

As is well known, the DAV is a single-purpose organization. We devote our activities to the wartime service-connected disabled, his dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. We are indeed grateful for the many excellent laws your committee has had placed on the statute books. Your approach to this legislation has been considerate and understanding.

Of course, we are aware that there is a strong economy movement under way and all too often these movements are directed at veterans and veterans' benefits. Those of us who recall the effects of the vicious Economy Act of 1933 are most apprehensive. We of the DAV observe the billions of dollars being sent overseas. While the veterans of this country are as charitable as the next person, we do hope and pray that drastic reductions will not be made at their expense for the benefit of foreign nations and their nationals.

High in priority on our legislative list is the continuation of the 16,000 hospital-bed construction program. Appropriations have been made by a generous Congress for this construction, plans completed, and many sites acquired. Mr. RANKIN, chairman of your committee, introduced H. R. 5965, which would direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to proceed with the necessary construction of additional facilities for the 16,000 hospital beds previously authorized. Your committee favorably reported this measure, but there was objection to it when it came up on the floor of the House in the closing days of the last session. Every member of the DAV and of its Auxiliary will support you in your efforts to have H. R. 5965 enacted into law. I hope this will be very soon.

Our insistence in this program is due to our thorough and complete knowledge of a disgraceful situation which exists even now where seriously ill disabled veterans are being denied hospitalization because of the lack of beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals. The need now and in the immediate future is not questioned by any unbiased medical authority.

Our insistence on this program is due to committee for having given favorable consideration in the Eightieth Congress to the measure which became Public Law 877 and established an allowance for the dependents of service-connected disabled veterans with a disability of 60 percent or more in degree. Again in the last session your committee gave further consideration to this and the degree of disability was reduced so that veterans with a service-connected disability of 50 percent are now eligible to an allowance for their dependents. We of the DAV respectfully recommend that early and further consideration be given to this subject so that the dependents of veterans with lesser degrees of disability than 50 percent may be included within the benefits of the act. Chairman RANKIN has introduced for the DAV the bill H. R. 6738 which would carry this recommendation into effect.

Being a single-purpose organization, the DAV took no position on H. R. 4617, the so-called general pension bill. We were very happy, however, that this measure carries a provision dealing with income limitations. Of course, we have no knowledge as to what the Senate Finance Committee may do with H. R. 4617, but we do hope action will be taken on some measure whereby income limitations with respect to eligibility for part III benefits will be raised. The DAV's mandate urges the Congress to increase the annual income limitation for widows without dependents from $1,000 to $2,000, and for widows with dependents from $2,500 to $3,500. The existing annual income limitation was placed on the statute books at a time when a dollar more nearly equaled 100 cents in purchasing value. Today the dollar is worth far less, so existing income limitation places an inequitable restriction on the eligibility of thousands of widows and children to receive pensions. Also, we of the DAV recommend that the Congress specifically exclude proceeds of commercial insurance policies when computing the annual income of widows for purposes of determining their eligibility for pensions.

While we of the DAV have bills affecting statutory awards pending before the committee, we are making a further study on the subject and hope to submit recommendations at an early date. Our concern is directed to those horribly disabled boys in an

eastern Veterans' Administration hospital with practically all the face, or the nose, or the jaw, or other parts of the face disfigured and destroyed by shot or fire. Also, we are giving consideration to statutory awards for the blind. We believe there exists an inequity under Public Law 182, Seventy-ninth Congress. Presently, a veteran is entitled to a statutory award of $42 monthly for blindness of one eye, having only light perception. However, if in addition to blindness of one eye, the veteran also has suffered the loss or loss of use of one foot or one hand, he is entitled to but one stautory award. The DAV will seek to amend this law so that any veteran having suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot or one hand and blindness of one eye, having only light perception, will be entitled to an award of special monthly compensation of $42 for each such loss.

At a later date we shall submit for your consideration our findings on the foregoing and other statutory awards.

We appreciate your efforts which resulted in enactment of Public Law 339, Eighty-first Congress. During the last session we suggested a straight 25-percent across-the-board increase in awards of compensation and pension. In view of the 8.7-percent increase granted by Public Law 339, we recommend additional consideration of this subject with a view to a further increase of 15 percent in monthly awards of compensation and pensions. Chairman RANKIN has introduced for us H. R. 6737 which would accomplish this result. We ask your favorable consideration.

In the field of insurance the DAV is supporting H. R. 5574 (introduced by Representative RANKIN and pending before your committee). It would amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, in several respects. Because insurance is such a technical subject and it would consume too much time to explain the provisions of H. R. 5574, I shall not take the time of your committee to do so at this time. At a later date, however, if and when hearings are held on insurance matters, the DAV's legislative and insurance representatives will attend such hearings and present appropriate supporting testimony. We of the DAV are hopeful that hearings will be held on insurance matters at an early date.

It is my understanding there is divided committee jurisdiction over housing matters. By national convention mandate, our organization is opposed to any increase in interest rates on GI loans to veterans, a subject which would be referred to your committee if consideration is given to it. You will recall that there were movements afoot in recent sessions of Congress to increase interest rates on GI loans from the existing 4 percent to 4½ percent. We specifically endorse legislation to authorize the Veterans' Administration to make direct loans to veterans for the purchase or construction of a dwelling whenever the veteran can show he is unable to secure a loan at not in excess of 4 percent from private lending sources. This subject has received some consideration from the Committees on Banking and Currency. Also in the field of housing, the DAV has recommended that disability compensation be excluded in computing income for purposes of eligibility for admission to and the rental for public housing units. I believe this subject will also be considered by the Banking and Currency Committee, however.

Closely related to the current economy movement are proposals to change the Veterns' Preference Act of 1944. I realize this subject will be considered by another committee, but I know each of you is interested in all legislative proposals affecting veterans. By several national convention mandates we of the DAV will oppose changes in the Veterans' Preference Act which would tend to lessen job opportunities for disabled veterans and we will continue to endorse proposed legislation providing additional retention credits to all service-connected disabled veterans who have achieved permanent status and who are entitled to and in receipt of disability compensation.

The foregoing specific objectives are but a part of our legislative program. Time does not permit presentation of each one at this time. At the conclusion of my statement I request permission to insert for the record more detailed information regarding our program. Our resolutions and mandates cover a wide range of subjects, but all stem from a desire on the part of the Disabled American Veterans to relieve the suffering of America's wartime disabled and improve his material welfare.

In conclusion, I should like to revert to the current economy movement. Apparently there is an organized and well-financed campaign under way to sell the American people on the adoption of the Hoover reorganization proposal in its entirety. In communities all over this Nation, citizens' committees are urging that the Hoover Commission report on the reorganization of the executive branch of the Federal Government will bring about efficiency and economy in Government. It is safe to say that many of these people have never read the Hoover Commission report and do not have the slightest conception as to what it contains.

We of the DAV are particularly opposed to those sections of the report which would destroy the identity and status of veterans, as veterans. For example, the report recommends that all Federal hospitals be consolidated under a single Government agency. Under such a system there would be no distinction between a public-health hospital patient and a service-connected disabled veteran. Another section would establish a Federal corporation to deal with veterans' insurance. Other recommendations would destroy veterans' preference. Such recommendations do not constitute progress. There are members of this committee who recall the early World War I postwar years when it was necessary for a veteran to apply to one or a dozen different agencies for various benefits. The end result was confusion and chaos. The members of our organization and of our auxiliary will militantly oppose and attempt to deprive disabled veterans and the dependents of battle casualties of their rights and benefits under a guise of economy in Government. We of the DAV are confident that if and when recommendations are presented to you in legislative form, the members of your committee will be in the forefront in the Halls of Congress protecting the rights of veterans.

(Supplemental statement of David M. Brown, national commander, Disabled American Veterans, January 17, 1950)

By permission of the chairman and members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I submit this outline of resolutions adopted at the 1949 national convention of the Disabled American Veterans held at Cleveland, Ohio, for the information of the members of the committee.

1. The DAV urges Congress to enact H. R. 5965, or other similar legislation, and that we vigorously oppose the proposed reduction of the hospital building program as contrary to the expressed desire of Congress and the pressing need of America's war-disabled. Likewise, we militantly oppose any merger of the Veterans' Administration hospitals with hospitals operated by the Army or any other branch of the Government (Hospitals, Hospitalization, and Medical Treatment Res. 9, Legislative Res. 11) (H. R. 5965).

2. That a cost-of-living increase of 15 percent in all compensations and pensions be granted (Legislative Res. 18) (H. R. 6737).

3. That Congress be requested to amend Public Law 877, as amended, to include dependents of veterans rated 10 percent or more disabled (Rehabilitation Res. 17) (H. R. 6738).

4. That the annual income limitation on eligibility to receive pension be increased (Rehabilitation Res. 1).

5. That Public Law 182, subparagraph (k), Seventy-ninth Congress, be amended to provide awards of special monthly compensation for each anatomical loss enumerated therein (Rehabilitation Res. 29) (H. R. 288).

6. That a 10-percent disability rating be granted to all veterans who received gunshot wounds in combat and who are not compensated for these wounds and the residuals thereof by the 1945 rating schedule (Rehabilitation Res. 26) (H. R. 289).

7. That the Veterans' Administration rating schedule be amended to increase the rating for Hansen's disease, or leprosy, to 100 percent for life (Rehabilitation Res. 9).

8. That any veteran having a service-connected malaria condition be compensated 10 percent or more for at least 5 years from the date of the original rating and that if the residuals of such disease can be determined definitely as after effects of malaria, that Veterans' Administration rating boards be directed to consider such fact in fixing the rate of compensation for such veteran (Rehabilitation Res. 24).

9. That the widows and children of veterans of World War II receive pensions equivalent to those of veterans of World War I without regard to service connection (Rehabilitation Res. 2) (H. R. 904).

10. That section 602 (d) of Public Law 801, Seventy-Sixth Congress, as amended, be further amended to remove existing inequities in the law (Rehabilitation Res. 6) (H. R. 5574).

11. That the insurance service of the Veterans' Administration be required to consider service-connected disabilities as having been directly service incurred in considering applications for new insurance or reinstatement of National Service Life Insurance and that the time limit for making these applications be extended (Rehabilitation Res. 5) (H. R. 5574).

12. That Public Law 801, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended, be further amended to require the Veterans' Administration to accept letters, affidavits, or other adequate evidence from friends or relatives of the deceased veteran as presumptive that the veteran had applied for additional insurance (Rehabilitation Res. 3) (H. R. 5574).

13. That Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, be further amended to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans to veterans for the purchase or construction of dwellings in all cases where the veteran is unable to secure a loan at not in excess of 4-percent interest from private lending sources (Legislative Res. 16) (H. R. 2436).

14. That Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, be further amended to authorize rehabilitated veterans who have used less than 4 years of their entitlement to enroll in other courses consonant with their occupation or vocation and that such courses shall not exceed the maximum period of entitlement (Rehabilitation Res. 30) (H. R. 4444).

15. That Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, be further amended to give the unremarried widow or one child of any serviceman who died in service or who died subsequent to discharge from a service-connected disability the same education and loan benefits as the veteran would have been entitled to if he had lived (Legislative Res. 6) (H. R. 3280; H. R. 1433).

16. That Public Law 663, Seventy-ninth Congress, be extended and liberalized (Legislative Res. 1; Rehabilitation Res. 32) (H. R. [illegible]).

17. That subsection 303 (c) of Public Law 846, Seventy-eighth Congress, be amended to provide stenographic assistance to those veterans' organizations chartered by act of Congress (Legislative Res. 1) (H. R. 912).

18. That there be established within the Veterans' Administration a board to review certain decisions of the Board of Appeals (M. E. C. Res. 3) (H. R. 296; H. R. 3660).

Coal Stocks Above Ground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1950.

Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KIRWAN: In accordance with the request of Congressman JENSEN that members of the Interior Department Appropriations Subcommittee be supplied with data pertaining to coal stocks above ground, enclosed are published reports of the Bureau of Mines, and a press release by the Department of the Interior, that, together with the fact that retailer stocks were 1,394,000 tons on January 1, 1950, give the latest information in this matter.

These data show that bituminous coal stocks above ground on December 1, 1949, totaled 43,824,000 tons, representing an average of 59 days' supply, as compared to 69,579,000 tons, representing 47 days' supply on December 1, 1948. Broken down as between industrial and retail dealer stocks of coal the figures are as follows: Industrial stocks—42,430,000 tons (58 days' supply) on December 1, 1949, as compared to 68,500,000 tons (43 days' supply) on December 1, 1948; Retail dealer stocks—1,394,000 tons (5 days' supply) on December 1, 1949, as compared to 3,079,000 tons (15 days' supply) on December 1, 1948.

Because of the concern regarding bituminous coal supplies for retail consumers, we requested retail coal dealers to submit their reports for December 1949 earlier than usual. Accordingly, we now have the retail dealer stock figure for January 1, 1950, which is 1,394,000 tons (4 days' supply at the December 1949 rate of dealer deliveries) as compared to 2,706,000 tons (8 days' supply) on January 1, 1949. Figures on industrial stocks on January 1, 1950, will be available on February 5.

For your further information there also is enclosed our latest report on anthracite stocks, which were as follows:

	Dec. 1, 1948	Dec. 1, 1949
Railroad (class I)	168,847	68,[illegible]
Electric power utilities	2,545,189	4,204,783
Upper lake docks:		
Lake Superior	942,[illegible]	140,[illegible]
Lake Michigan	[illegible],441	193,244
Producers' stocks [1]	[illegible]	1,136,[illegible]

[1] Mostly in small backwood sizes.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD ROSS,
Director.

Social Security and the Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I was happy recently to have the privilege of speaking before the Milwaukee Chapter of the American Association of Social Workers on the subject Social Security and the Welfare State. It was a particular pleasure to address this fine group, who constantly seek to solve in a constructive manner the social problems which beset our country, on a subject of such direct concern to them. This address, delivered in my home city of Milwaukee on December 13, follows:

(Address by ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, Member of Congress, before the American Association of Social Workers, Milwaukee Chapter)

The current controversy being waged about welfare must be particularly interesting to you in this group. How many times most of you must have heard arguments, entered into discussions, and participated in heated emotional debate over that one little word. And how triumphant you must feel, to find that the word "welfare" has, possibly because of all the excitement, finally come back into its own.

Again it means "the welfare of the people," the "general welfare" that our forefathers wrote into the Constitution. It no longer is saddled with the unpleasant connotation of "relief" or "charity" with which all of you are unfortunately only too familiar.

I was one of the severer critics of that sort of "welfare"—of the kind that "did good" to the poor, with the Lord Bountiful approach that really broke people down rather than built them up. But that approach is, I hope, a thing of the past. To any professional person the whole basis of welfare has always been construction, not destruction. Let us leave to the lovers of old-fashioned days, like Senator TAFT and ex-President Hoover, the concept of charity—both private and public—of a Government that doles out baskets to the worthy poor if they thank you prettily. Do you remember, during the first years of the depression, when millions were unemployed, when millions were ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-clothed? Do you remember Hoover's famous statement? "I am opposed," he announced, "to any direct or indirect Government dole." This, he pointed out, was a job for private charity.

TRUE CONCEPT OF WELFARE

If President Roosevelt had followed his advice, I am sure that Mr. Hoover's prosperity would still be around that mythical corner, from which he was always trying to summon it. But in 1934, we began to develop, or rather, regain a true concept of welfare, and of the responsibilities and obligations of a democratic Government for its citizens.

I am proud to regard our Government as a welfare state. And by that I mean a state devoted to the welfare of all its members, concerned with the needs and desires of its total population.

Abraham Lincoln, in the middle of the nineteenth century, once stated that the object of Government "is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot by individual effort do at all, or do so well." In the middle of the twentieth century, Mr. Justice William O. Douglas defined what he called the "human welfare state" as "a society that preserves the greatest possible freedom for the individual, yet secures the masses in their basic needs." It is in the framework of these two definitions that I want to discuss some aspects of current legislation and administration policies.

"To do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot by individual effort do at all, or do so well." Who could quarrel with that concept? What man, believing in democracy, could question that aim?

And, yet, many do. Or at least a few do in such a loud voice that they are sometimes mistaken for many. They argue that, first of all, that is a foreign idea, and, secondly, that it is not only foreign, it is communistic.

Next, it is in any case unconstitutional. Fourth, even if it were not unconstitutional, it was never in the minds of the founders of our country. Fifth, whatever it is, and notwithstanding all the other arguments, the welfare state destroys individual effort and incentive.

I should like to examine these arguments very briefly with you. I think that some of the things we find will be illuminating.

NOTHING NEW ABOUT WELFARE CONCEPT

Is the welfare state really a foreign concept? Well, we can go back to 1789, to the Constitution, where the Government is first charged with the responsibility of promoting the general welfare, and is given taxing powers to fulfill this duty. We can trace recognition of this responsibility in some fields even farther back. In the Northwest Ordinance of 1785 a section of every township to be established in the new territory was set aside for the maintenance of public schools within the township. In 1806 Thomas Jefferson, in his annual message to Congress requested a donation of Federal lands for a national establishment of education, and specified that these lands be income-bearing, not merely to be used for the site of the buildings.

These are not isolated examples. Land, which in that period of our country's development was more valuable than a money subsidy is now, was granted for all sorts of welfare purposes: For public buildings, for public transportation, and for various types of schools. Going on, we come to the Homestead Act of 1862 when hundreds of thousands of acres of land were divided into family-sized portions and allocated to individual citizens to enable them to maintain themselves. This was not only a public-welfare program, but in reality a social-security project, giving economic security and a way of life to tens of thousands of Americans who had not been able to compete successfully in the industrialized East. I shan't go into all the details of the development and extension of the system of Government subsidies for welfare purposes, but I would like to point out that by 1920—not 1934 as some would like to have us think—Federal grants were already being made to the States for 15 major welfare purposes.

So whatever the welfare state is, it can hardly be called un-American.

But perhaps it's an American brand of communism we are advocating. Let's examine that hypothesis—which has certainly had a great deal of publicity, even if very little factual substantiation.

DIRE PROPHECIES

Actually, our opponents do not go so far as to explain what they mean by this scare word. They belong to the horrible-consequence school of prophets. You know, where people mutter dire prophecies about "What will become of us?" and attach to all their warnings, words that have frightening connotations—but they never, never define what they mean. If they did, they might realize their own confusion.

Communism, according to its original protagonist—and to this extent even in its present style in the Russia of today—is based on government ownership and management of the means of production, of capital, of land, and of property. This can hardly be claimed comparable to our method of government. Private enterprise and private property is the very backbone of our system. But, mind you, belief in private ownership does not go so far—in a welfare state—that the means of production, and all capital and land and property, end up in the hands of a few individuals who run them at the expense of the masses. This would merely be substituting a dictatorship of the millionaires for the Russian kind of dictatorship.

So, whatever it is, the welfare state cannot be validly called communistic.

UNCONSTITUTIONAL CHARGE "IGNORANT"

The next cry is that it is unconstitutional. That I find almost the most ignorant of all the arguments. Not only is the very phrase "to promote the general welfare" explicitly in our Constitution, but concern for the welfare of its members has been interpreted to be the basic responsibility of government by the Supreme Court, the arm of government which was set up to determine the constitutionality of laws. An this interpretation dates as far back as 1837, although it has, as you all know, been reaffirmed and fortified by the famous decision of Mr. Justice Cardozo establishing the constitutionality of the first Social Security Act. In fact, although the usual public cry of those opposing the welfare state is that it is unconstitutional, I recently came across a confidential news letter to businessmen, which admitted—sadly—to its members that the only way to circumvent the Government from extending its activities to more and more fields of the public interest, would be by constitutional amendment.

So, whatever it is, it seems somewhat uninformed to call the welfare state unconstitutional.

CROCODILE TEARS

Perhaps we should examine the claim that it was not conceived of by our ancestors. Many crocodile tears have been shed about that. It is apparently not only unfilial, but immoral, for our Government in 1949 to be different from the one established in 1789. This is an argument particularly much used by lawyers and historians of the give-me-the-good-old-days school, who seem to think that by turning back the pages of history we would arrive at the best of all possible worlds.

I think they misjudge the founders of our country. Those were imaginative men who tried to establish a flexible pattern for a democratic way of life—who believed, above all, in human rights and the principles that "all men were created equal." On the basis of those beliefs, they fashioned a Constitution and laws that could best express them in the framework of the world they lived in at that time. But it is hardly likely that they conceived, in the eighteenth century, of a twentieth-century civilization. Remember, this was before the industrial revolution—before the use of steam and electricity—before the growth of modern factories—when our country was a land made up primarily of small farmers, when almost all household articles were made by hand—when the machine did not yet threaten the man. It would have been strange indeed, if our forefathers had attempted to legislate in such an economy for a situation they could not possibly conceive. The statement that our forefathers did not conceive of the type of government we now have is in a sense true—no more than they could have foretold the coming of the airplane or the atomic bomb.

But whatever the welfare state is, it is ludicrous to try to pretend it should be a colonial in modern dress.

The final complaint—and perhaps the most serious charge—is that the concept of a welfare state—of a government that attempts to give security to its people—is dangerous because it destroys individual effort.

EXAMINE FAIR DEAL PROGRAM

Since the term "welfare state" is used as synonymous with the present administration, I think the best way to examine oft-reiterated statement is by a review of the particular legislation which the President of the United States has presented to the Eighty-first Congress. These are the laws, proposed or passed, that are the basis for the complaints. And it is through this specific examination that we may get a glimpse of the features of those who are opposing these laws.

One of the basic planks of the administration's platform is a determination to do everything in its power to ensure civil liberties and to guarantee basic human rights to everyone. I don't think I need to argue the merits of this theory—especially to you. From the time of the Declaration of Independence, through the bloody Civil War this Nation fought to maintain this principle, the equality of every human being has been accepted by all but a few fanatics and bigots. But we all recognize that we have a long way still to go to carry this principle out into practice. And those who fight any attempt to implement this philosophy are the ones who say that Government action, for example, to prevent discrimination in being hired for a job, would destroy individual initative. I wonder how much individual initiative is encouraged by a lynching?

I wonder how much individual effort is required by a Negro to get a job at a factory that has a sign out front saying "whites only." It is also interesting that the gentlemen who oppose any Government action in equalizing opportunity for all its citizens happen to benefit economically by restricting job possibilities for one portion of its population.

Then there's the administration's proposal for farm price supports and for a fair program for farmers which would also benefit the consumer. This is criticized on the same basis that the Government subsidies take all incentive away from the farmers. I ask: When a farmer's crop fails, how much individual effort will he need to manufacture synthetic potatoes? Or when he has a bumper crop and discovers it will cost him more to dig them up than he will be paid, what form of iniative does he have to keep himself and his family alive?

WHO OPPOSES FARM SUPPORTS?

But let's glimpse the other side of the coin. Who is it who is most violent against Government price supports for farmers? It's curious—the opposition seems to consist of those who make their money at the farmer's expense—who make their fortunes out of the crop the farmer has to sell at less than cost.

There seems to be something familiar in this pattern, doesn't there? For example, there's the perennial cry against any legislation helping labor. The general implication is that labor unions are wicked, all-powerful monsters which are killing private enterprise. I wish the proponents of this theory would read some history beyond the days of George Washington, and learn a little about the growth of the labor movement. I wish they would study about the 13-hour days in the factory, the sweatshops, the hired strikebreakers, the starvation wages, instead of limiting their hindsight to the beautiful view from Mount Vernon.

How far do you think an individual worker would have gotten if, before unions and before Government protection of unions, he had gone to Henry Ford, or Andrew Carnegie, and said: "Look, I can't live on what you pay me. And you're making enough profit to pay me more." And who would benefit right now if the back of organized labor were broken? I detect a certain unconcern for "the will of the people" in the groups that oppose legislation to protect labor—possibly even a hope, do you think, that the golden time might return when an employer can say, "Take it or leave it: All I'll pay is 20 cents an hour. There are plenty of hungry men to do the job."

Labor legislation is decried by employers of labor. The housing legislation is even more violently decried—by housing speculators, of course. I don't mean things like the FHA. That is the type of Government legislation very pleasing to private contractors and real-estate owners; what I'm talking about is public housing. That is regarded as a vicious, undemocratic practice—by the people who make their profits selling and renting houses—they argue violently that public housing makes it possible for low-income groups to live as well as others, and that this is clearly destroying all incentive and individual effort. Can anyone here explain how much individual effort would be required by a tenement dweller to tear down the building he's living in, and build instead a decent house, where he can live for a monthly rental he can afford? And is there, do you think, any correlation between the protests of the apartment-house owners' associations and the profits they are making through renting substandard dwellings?

AMA IN ACT, TOO

Let's go on. The AMA, for instance, is spending a million dollars to carry on a campaign against a national health program. Their arguments against health legislation—dismissing for the moment their complete, and intentional, misstatements of facts—are primarily based on the belief that doctors would, under compulsory health insurance, lose their incentive. It is significant they do not talk of the patients. Apparently they think that people do not or, at least, should not, become ill if they can't afford it. I want to quote to you an editorial statement, printed this August in the New York State Journal of Medicine, the State medical society's official publication. This extraordinary confession goes as follows: "We readily admit that under the present system a certain number of cases of early tuberculosis and cancer, for example, may go undetected. Is it not better that a few such should perish than that the majority of the population should be encouraged on every occasion to run sniveling to the doctor?" This statement stands as a masterpiece of explanation. It needs no comment. But it does give an interesting insight into the thinking of the opponents of legislation planned to meet the needs of the people, rather than the pockets of physicians, doesn't it?

Do the features of the opponents get into focus?

Altogether, the pattern is slowly emerging. The faces of the ones opposing the welfare state are becoming clearer, aren't they? And they all have one feature in common, that of self-interest. It is the industrialist who opposes labor, the real-estate speculator who opposes public housing, the profiteer in farm crops who fights price supports, the employer of cheap labor who doesn't want Negroes able to choose their own occupations, the doctor who is afraid his fees will be cut. Very few of them are thinking of government as a society that preserves the greatest possible freedom for the individual, yet secures the masses in their basic needs.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT IN FOCUS

I think, of all the legislation proposed or discussed or passed during this session, the amendments to the Social Security Act, passed by the House before we adjourned, best illustrate the point made by Mr. Justice Douglas, and best clarify the issues of the welfare state.

Sometimes, while this bill was being argued on the floor of the House, I thought I

was back in 1935—the moans and the groans with which the air was filled were so similar to the original arguments against establishing a social-insurance program. In fact, they were so much alike that they often sounded as though the gentlemen protesting might have been found asleep during the intervening period, and just woke up to continue what they thought was an uninterrupted argument.

Manufacturers' associations, or at least their congressional mouthpieces, argued that the proposed amendments would wreck business, would take away incentive from workers who were not now covered—in other words, that people would work harder because they were facing the poorhouse at the end of their lives. They protested the amendments would increase unemployment, because they would decrease purchasing power—that was their interpretation of the effects of slightly increased employer contributions—they weren't interested in the similar increase of the employee's contribution. Finally—inevitably—with much the effect of a broken record—it would stifle individual responsibility.

I want you to answer this charge—not me. This group—above all others—ought to have had sufficient experience with the problems that gave rise to passing the original Social Security Act—and with the problems that make it necessary now to amend it.

OLD-AGE INSURANCE PROVISIONS

Let's look at the provisions for old-age insurance. I imagine many of you have been talking to people who are receiving old-age insurance now. How much are they getting? How many of them are retired from firms that went bankrupt in the process of putting in the employers' contribution? And how many of them are able to live on even a minimum decent level on the insurance benefits they are now receiving? And don't forget, this is insurance to which the worker has contributed as much as his employer, and which he only receives on the basis of work he has already performed. This is the type of retirement pension that every big firm in the United States takes for granted—for their executives. The only difference—and that is a big one—is in the number of zeros after the dollar sign in the monthly amount.

When you get to old-age assistance—when you look at the amounts to which the Federal Government contributes—on a percentage basis—for those who are not covered by the insurance provisions—then the arguments become even more ridiculous. The average monthly payment in Wisconsin to persons receiving old-age assistance is at this moment $41.50. Exactly how luxuriously can one live on that? If I, when I became 65, was dependent upon that princely sum to live on, I think I would get rather annoyed at some millionaire industrialist who pointed at me as an example of shiftlessness.

As you all know full well, the other forms of assistance authorized under the Social Security Act—the aid to dependent children, the aid to the blind, the small amount for child-welfare services—they are all equally meager. They really never intended to cover the needs of all our people or to cover all the needs of any one person. It was a start, that's all. It was really only the basic recognition on the part of the Government that it was responsible for the welfare of its members, and that it would try to find ways of meeting this responsibility.

PRESENT PAYMENTS PITIFUL

That was the original act. Since then we have had experience and have learned of some of the basic needs that have not yet even been touched. We have been able to see that the insurance scheme which was intended to be the primary program—the one that would give workers a sense of security without making them feel like paupers—that if this program is not extended it would not serve its initial purpose. The majority of older people are still being cared for on an assistance basis, submitted to the indignity of a "means test," and granted a pittance, with the dispensing agencies acting in the capacity of lord of the manor. Also, in 1949 the cost of living is very much more than it was in 1935. So that the amounts allowed, even on a minimum subsistence basis, 15 years ago are completely out of relation to present conditions.

These were some of the considerations that led the administration to propose changes in the Social Security Act. The bill, H. R. 6000, as it passed the House before the end of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress incorporated these basic changes.

HOUSE APPROVED CHANGES

First of all, it increased the coverage for old-age insurance from the present 35,000,000 to about 48,000,000. This includes the following:

Persons who are self-employed. This provides the same security for small shopkeepers and people in business for themselves as for persons employed by others.

Secondly, the bill includes domestic servants. I think that the coverage of this group is one of the things that is most important about this bill, because here is a group who have heretofore had the least security, who have been the most dependent on the bounty, on the personal and unpredictable whims of the people for whom they work. And, to me, it is this attitude, this residual of a feudal philosophy, that is the most antipathetic to a democracy, to a state where every citizen is entitled to freedom of opportunity.

Third, salesmen are included—that notoriously neglected group of white-collar workers who seem heretofore to have represented a curious philosophy, suggesting we had a society which made insecurity the badge of office for any man who didn't work with his hands.

Fourth, employees of State governments have an opportunity of being covered in those States where existing retirement systems are not already adequate. And in this group are also included those Federal employees who are not covered by the present Federal retirement schemes.

Fifth, employees of nonprofit institutions are included, although in this instance employers' contributions will be made at the option of the agency. This section takes the first step in rectifying the omission that those most interested in public welfare themselves insisted on at the time of the passage of the original act. It was not, even then, that social workers thought those who worked all their lives for the betterment of others were not entitled to the same economic security as those they served, but because the leaders in the public-welfare field felt, at the time they were fighting to give everyone basic security, that they might jeopardize the good of all by including their own profession. They wanted to be sure, above all, that they would not be open, even in warped minds, to the criticism of pressing for something in their own interest.

Finally, agricultural-processing workers will be included. Some of us had hoped to include all agricultural labor, but in the final version of the bill, all those employed in such jobs as canning, food-processing, and other jobs which are connected with agriculture, but are essentially of a commercial or industrial nature.

OTHER PROVISIONS

Besides this increase in coverage, the bill does several other equally important things. Insurance benefits are increased, not—unfortunately—on the basis of actual increased costs of living, but to an extent to make the word "insurance" a little more realistic. For those currently receiving old-age benefits, the monthly amount will be raised from 50 to 150 percent, with the higher percentage increases for those now receiving the least. And, because the bill also increases the amount contributed to the insurance fund by both employers and employees, it will be possible to increase the monthly benefits of those who become eligible after it goes into effect to an average of almost double the present amounts.

Two other additions to the present old-age-insurance provisions are also noteworthy. Veterans will get a wage credit toward their insurance on the basis of $160 a month for the time they spent in military service, and everyone who is covered by the new bill will be insured against permanent total disability as well as old age: they will receive the same monthly benefit they would have been eligible for when they became 65—on the basis, of course, of their earnings up to the time they became incapacitated—whenever they become totally disabled.

Of course, the insurance provisions of the act are not the only ones affected by the proposed legislation. H. R. 6000 provides for increases in the Federal contributions to the States for all the assistance schemes for which the Government is now providing grants, and, further, makes allowance for additional grants for persons who are permanently disabled, but who do not qualify under the new category of insurance.

These additions indicate in general the main provisions of the amendments proposed by the House of Representatives to the Social Security Act. I have left out a great deal, and I have perforce much oversimplified a complicated piece of legislation. Many of you here have been technically trained to understand this type of legislation, and I am sure you will recognize the impossibility of analyzing such a bill in detail in the course of a discussion such as this.

ESSENCE IMPORTANT

But I would like to return to the essence of these amendments. This type of legislation represents what I consider one of the cornerstones of a welfare state. It represents the concern of a government with the needs of its members, and the needs of human beings for basic securities. It makes provision for these needs on a basis that recognizes human dignity, and gives to all the possibility of participation in securing these benefits.

And that is what I mean when I speak of the welfare state. That is what I think we should all be fighting for—and of all the professions I know of I think yours is the one which should be in the forefront of this fight. We must keep our Government and our country out of the role of being kind—when some of us want to—to what the rich used to call the worthy poor; we must bury any remnants of the system personified by Rockefeller giving dimes to beggars; we must change the connotation of charity back to its original meaning of interest and understanding of other people's problems, instead of a kind of smug largesse; we must not condone a pauper state; we must build up a welfare state.

We Pay the Interest on National Debts at Home and Abroad; How Long Can We Stand It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury reports today that the national debt as of January 20, this year, is $256,899,219,802.03 with an interest charge for the fiscal year of $5,700,000,000.

While we are paying this interest at home, we are contributing the money to buy farm commodities and machinery to give to the governments of the European countries—the so-called Marshall-plan countries. The word "governments" should be underscored, because we do not give the things we buy with the $8,750,000,000 we have appropriated for the ECA to the people of the Marshall-plan countries because our gifts are made to these governments, and the people must bring in their money and pay their governments for the goods we donate, and when the interest-money comes due on the national debts of these governments the money that has been paid in for the goods we have donated is in their treasuries and is ready for the European bondholders.

The following, taken from the book of the economist John Flynn, the Road Ahead, is enlightening:

> In taking over the railroads, the coal industry, and others, they—the British—have bought the properties outright from the corporations and stockholders who owned them. They have paid for them with British bonds paying 3 percent interest. With each new industry taken over, the Government has added another mass of obligations to its already crushing national debt. Now the folly of this lies in the fact that, under the old order, the stockholders had no claim for profit if none were made by the industry. But all these stocks—pure risk investments—have been converted into Government bonds, which are a fixed charged upon the Government whether the industry makes a profit or not. And as all these industries have been operating at a greater or lesser loss, the Government has had to find in taxes the means of paying this debt. Indeed, it has been charged in the United States Senate that the British Government had got permission from the United States Commission to use $82,000,000 of the American funds granted Britain to pay interest on its debt which it was unable to meet because of the additions to it created by these nationalization schemes.

Tendency To Look Down on Political Career Real Weakness of the American System

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this being an election year the air will soon be full of incrimination and recriminations on the political front. In some places a loud clamor will be set up by the holier-than-thou citizens whose only participation in things political is to complain.

The following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of January 22, 1950, written by Robert M. Grannis, is most apropos:

TENDENCY TO LOOK DOWN ON POLITICAL CAREER REAL WEAKNESS OF THE AMERICAN SYSTEM

> At the expense of being considered naive, I am amazed to discover there are a lot of people with ambitions for public office who'd rather forget the whole thing than subject their lily white hides to contact with a system which they consider pernicious. As one man said to me the other day: "I figure you can't step into the gutter without getting dirty."
>
> I don't know how dirty the American political scene is, but I do know there is a suspicion there are things about it less than clean. And I know that ethical standards have reached a point where a man has to toss a coin to decide which is the greatest menace to a decent civilization—the atom bomb or the cavalier attitude that prevails in many official places.
>
> In my travels, I encounter people who insist that a man can't enter politics and make a career of it without the sacrifice of his principles. To me, that is so much rot, and one of the real reasons why any sort of happy-go-lucky standard of procedure is accepted without a quiver. Indifference of this sort paints all officeholders with the same brush and creates a cynical approach to the most important phase of modern existence. A nation, a State, or even a city, cannot prosper long or hold up its head without good government as the major prop beneath it.
>
> We have a nasty habit of looking at people in office as members of a certain party instead of as a duly-elected representative of the people. We are so ready to take it for granted that party considerations must come first that only the stalwarts here and there resist the tide and operate on the courage of their convictions.
>
> I think it is disgraceful that any American should consider that a political career, here, is beneath him, beneath his dignity. In a sense his attitude so often expressed loosely, tossed to the four winds and blown hither and yon, is the real weakness of the American system and, in time, could lead to the utter decay of good government.
>
> Public acceptance of a standard in anything is what actually calls the shots, and nobody can tell me today that most folks don't wear a silly smile when someone dares to suggest that Joe Doakes, who works for the Government, is a thoroughly honest guy. When Joe sees the smile he finds he is no less than human, and his resolve to stick to the straight and narrow and fight for what he knows to be right sinks a little lower. He begins to hear the small voice, hitherto silent, that suggests—why stick my neck out?
>
> An honest man in office shouldn't have to feel that he will be made the goat if he refuses to fall in line with a loose trend of conduct. He shouldn't have to look in vain for the wholehearted support of the people who pulled the lever for him back on election day.
>
> I'd like to see the day return when all of us believed that the finest career a young American can follow is a political career, which is another way of expressing service to the citizens of the Nation, and the highest type of service. But as long as there are a great many people who see only the dirty side of politics and go out of their way to spread the "good word" wherever they go, I'm afraid that day is far off.
>
> I'm convinced that we get exactly what we are willing to accept, and if we are apathetic to what we envision as a downward trend in politics, we have no right to expect anything else. A good start would be to offer every encouragement to the square shooter in office, regardless of party, and make it clear that by his example we intend to set an over-all pattern. The sly smile is the sure road to ruin. Pride in the system is needed and some of the dark spots can be made to disappear.

District Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the membership of the House to the letter written this week to all Members of the House on home rule for the District of Columbia.

This letter, from Robert Heller, chairman of the National Committee for Strengthening Congress, urges the consideration of the Kefauver bill, S. 1527, as one of the most important means of lightening the extraneous work load on the National Congress.

May I call the attention of the membership to the fact that this recommendation of ending the use of the National Congress for the purely local job of being city council for the District of Columbia was made by your former Joint Committee for the Strengthening of the Congress. It was not included in the reorganization bill because of its length and complexity. Now, many months of hearings have been held in the past on the measure, recommended by many leaders of the District of Columbia. I would appreciate the consideration of the membership in this important measure.

The letter follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR STRENGTHENING CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1950.

The Honorable A. S. MONRONEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We urge you to take every possible step, in this session, to enact S. 1527, a bill to provide home rule in the District of Columbia. As a first step we ask that you sign Discharge Petition No. 19 as soon as possible, so that the bill may reach the floor of the House for vote without delay.

Congress must act promptly to get rid of its extraneous work load, if it is to give adequate attention to the tremendously important matters before it. Passage of S. 1527 is an essential step necessary to reduce that work load. The bill would vest power in a city council, composed of residents of the District of Columbia, to pass laws to govern the District. Congress would keep the power to override the city council at any time. Thus the interest of the Nation in its National Capital would always be protected. At the same time Congress would be relieved of having to take positive action in order to pass laws for the District. We enclose a more detailed statement of how the bill will work and why it should be passed.

The bill has already passed the Senate by overwhelming bipartisan vote. We believe that a solid bipartisan majority in the House likewise favors it. After it passed the Senate, however, the House District Committee voted not to report out the bill. If this is not now corrected by action of the whole House, Congress will have failed to relieve itself of a burden which is wholly unnecessary, undesirable, and contrary to sound government.

Passage of S. 1527 is therefore essential. Discharge Petition No. 19 will bring the bill to the floor of the House for vote. We urge

you to go to the Speaker's desk at the first opportunity and sign the petition. If you have already signed it, we urge you to ask other Members to sign also, and to support the bill in the House.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT HELLER.

STATEMENT TO MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE BY ROBERT HELLER, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR SEMI-SELF-GOVERNMENT CONGRESS, IN SUPPORT OF S. 1527, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME-RULE BILL

WHY S. 1527 IS NECESSARY

Our letter of December 27, 1949, to Members of the House and Senate, pointed out the strengths and weaknesses in the operations of the last session of Congress. We emphasized that Congress, to discharge adequately its responsibilities to the Nation and to the world, must act promptly to reduce its extraneous work load. Passage of S. 1527, the home-rule bill, is an essential step in this direction. It will virtually eliminate the necessity for Congress to act as a city council on day-to-day matters which relate solely to the workings of the city of Washington. The bill also assures that Congress retains full authority to intervene in District affairs whenever the situation so demands.

In the last session of Congress alone, several thousand valuable man-hours were spent by busy Congressmen and Senators on purely District matters. These included such local trifles as the elimination of weeds, the regulation of podiatry, and the destruction of starlings. The time for Congress to relieve itself of the necessity to sit once every 2 weeks as the city council for the District of Columbia and consider such purely local matters is long overdue.

HOW S. 1527 WILL HELP THE CONGRESS

The bill would vest power in a city council, composed of District citizens, to pass local laws to govern the District of Columbia. The council would be composed of nine members elected by District residents and two additional members appointed by the President. Except for minor ordinances, any laws passed by the city council would, before becoming effective, lie over for 45 days while Congress is in session. During this period Congress could by concurrent resolution veto the proposed law. As a result, neither the District Committees of the House or Senate, or the House and Senate as a whole, would need to take positive action in order that necessary legislation for the District become law. Congress would always be in a position to modify or revoke the action of the District council. In fact it could abolish the council or modify its powers. In this way the interest of the Nation in the affairs of its National Capital would at all times be protected.

Establishing a local legislature to relieve Congress' work load is not new. It is substantially the same method that Congress has used successfully for years in governing the Territories, such as Hawaii and Puerto Rico, which are under its exclusive jurisdiction. The Territorial legislatures are at all times answerable to Congress, and Congress may step in and take over at any time. Congress is, however, relieved of the burden of passing day-to-day regulations for Territorial government. Enactment of S. 1527 would put this satisfactory method to work in the District of Columbia.

S. 1527 IS THE PRODUCT OF YEARS OF CAREFUL WORK AND HAS STRONG BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

The home-rule bill is the result of exhaustive study and work by congressional committees and by interested local and national groups, both partisan and nonpartisan. In the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Joint Congressional Committee on the Organization of Congress, in its report which led to the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, urged that Congress divest itself of the duty of acting as city council for the District. A joint committee in the Eightieth Congress, headed by Representative ARCHINCLOSS, Republican, of New Jersey, and Senator BALL, Republican, of Minnesota, held exhaustive hearings and drafted the basic home-rule bill, H. R. 6327. This bill was reported out but reached the floor of the House too late to come up for final vote before the end of that Congress. The 1948 platforms of both the major parties urged home rule for the District. A Senate subcommittee, headed by Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, in the present Congress held further hearings and reported out the present bill, S. 1527. This bill is based in large part on the Auchincloss bill of the previous session, but embodies a number of improvements which add strength to the measure. It passed the Senate by overwhelming vote in May 1949, with heavy bipartisan support. Senators KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, and TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, were the proponents of the bill for their respective parties on the floor. We have reason to believe that, when the bill reaches the floor of the House, a solid bipartisan majority will likewise vote for it.

YOUR ACTION IS NEEDED TO ASSURE PASSAGE OF S. 1527

Despite the strong support local and national groups gave S. 1527 in the House District Committee after the bill passed the Senate, the House committee voted not to report out the bill. If this action of the committee is not now corrected by action of the whole House, Congress will have failed to relieve itself of a burden which is wholly unnecessary, undesirable, and contrary to sound government. Congress can no longer afford to carry the burden of acting as a municipal council for the District in the second half of the twentieth century. The present arrangement is wholly incompatible with the kind of organization which Congress must have if it is to meet its national and worldwide responsibilities during the years to come.

Passage of S. 1527 is therefore essential. We ask you to sign Discharge Petition No. 19 and to support the bill on the floor of the House. We ask this in the belief that passage of the home-rule bill will be an important step forward in creating the stronger and more effective Congress the United States must have in order to meet the difficult problems that lie ahead.

The Lawyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the American lawyer has won a distinguished place in the development of our political and economic system. He has played a powerful part in the establishment of the institution of government, the dispensation of justice, and the protection and enforcement of the inherent rights of the people.

I take great pleasure in asking that the impressive eulogy of the American lawyer, written by my friend and former classmate at New York University Law School, Mr. Louis Lande, reprinted from The Lawyer and Law Notes, volume 3, No. 2, 1949, be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAWYER

I am the lawyer.

I displaced brute force with mercy, justice, and equity.

I taught mankind to respect the rights of others to their property, to their personal liberty, to freedom of conscience, to free speech and free assembly.

I am the spokesman of righteous causes.

I plead for the poor, the persecuted, the widow and the orphan.

I maintain honor in the market place.

I am the champion of unpopular causes.

I am the foe of tyranny, oppression, and bureaucracy.

I prepared the way for the Ten Commandments.

I pleaded for the freedom of the slave in Greece and for the captive in Rome.

I fought the Stamp Act.

I wrote the Declaration of Independence and the rights of man.

I defended the slave. I was an abolitionist. I issued the Emanicipation Proclamation.

In every land, in every clime, I punish the wicked, protect the innocent, raise up the lowly, and oppose brutality and injustice.

I fought in every war for liberty.

I stand in the way of public clamor and the tyranny of the majority.

I plead for the rich man lest prejudice prevent him from getting justice, and I insist that the poor man be accorded all his rights and privileges.

I seek the equality of mankind, regardless of race, color, caste, sex, or religion.

I hate fraud, deceit, or trickery.

I am forbidden to serve two masters or to compromise justice.

I am the conservative of the past, the liberal of the present, and the radical of the future.

I believe in convention, but I cut the Gordian knot of formalism and red tape to do justice and equality.

I am the leader of mankind in every crisis.

I am the scapegoat of the world.

I hold the rights of mankind in the hollow of my hand, but am unable to obtain recognition of my own.

I am the pioneer. I am the last to renounce the past and to overturn the present.

I am the just judge and the righteous ruler.

I hear before I condemn. I seek the best in everyone.

I am the lawyer.

LOUIS LANDE.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Zionism in Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1950, the Brooklyn region of the Zionist Organization of America held its annual dinner. More than 1,200 persons attended, including leading Christians and Jews of the community. Hon. Maximilian Moss, president of the board of education of the city of New York, was the chairman of the evening. The meeting was addressed by Philip H. Lassar, president of the Brooklyn Zionist region, the Honorable Arthur Lourie, consul general of Israel, and Louis Lipsky, chairman of the American Zionist Council. The Honorable Albert D. Schanzer, on behalf of the organization, presented an award to the New York Herald Tribune for its outstanding work on behalf of the Zionist cause. Walter Kerr, foreign editor of the Herald Tribune, in the absence of Mrs. Ogden Reid, the owner and publisher of the paper, accepted the award.

The dinner was originally planned as a tribute to William O'Dwyer, mayor of the city of New York, who unfortunately could not attend because of illness.

The highlight of the evening was an address by Benjamin G. Browdy, acting president of the Zionist Organization of America, which is set forth in full as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am glad to be here with you tonight to add my tribute to our guest of honor whose forced absence from this testimonial dinner we all regret, and to say a word or two about the situation in Israel and in the United States which confronts us today.

The Zionist movement has placed its reliance mainly on the Jewish people itself. Herzl kept on reiterating that the creation of the Jewish state is largely in our own hands, if only we will it. He called the Jewish masses to rally to the cause, realizing that it's their strength that can bring about the miracle of all ages—the Jewish state.

Hand in hand with the faith in the Jewish people, has gone the faith in the conscience of mankind. Herzl opened the first Zionist Congress with a fervent appeal to world public opinion in behalf of the Jewish people. Since then, the Zionist movement has never wearied in its attempt to influence and bring to our side the leaders of public opinion, of political power, and of government. In this endeavor we have scored some signal successes, particularly with those great leaders whose vast power has been paralleled by their tender and sensitive conscience. In the United States we have been particularly fortunate in enlisting the sympathy and the support of the Presidents of the United States from President Wilson to President Truman, and a great many other political leaders whose sense of justice and of fairness ranged them on our side.

I daresay, none has excelled in zeal and in devotion to justice and fairness for the Jewish people, our guest of honor, the mayor of the city, William O'Dwyer. No fair-weather friend was he. Rather he has been a friend in need. While some talked and talked, made promises which always lagged behind performance, he acted in our behalf with an energy and determination which I sometimes wished I could discern in many a high-placed Jew in Washington or elsewhere. I could give you many an instance of his unflagging support in time of crisis, but I think it will suffice when I recall the rescue action in the fall of 1947, when he undertook to save the UN resolution for a Jewish state, then practically abandoned by Washington, from complete collapse, and similar rescuing expeditions on which he launched in 1948, when the Bernadotte plan threatened to crush us, depriving the Jewish state of a large part of its territory.

I think the future historian, busy as he will be with the many phenomena of the life of our era, will note that in William O'Dwyer, the Jewish community of New York, the greatest Jewish community on earth, has found a warm friend and great champion. And I believe that the debt of gratitude which we owe Mr. O'Dwyer is yet to be repaid in full, and that he has yet a great role to play in the days that lie ahead.

I would be remiss in my duty as acting president of the Zionist Organization of America were I not to call your attention to the fact that as Zionists and as Jews we are heading for stormy weather. The Jerusalem issue is assuming alarming proportions. Some of our friends on whom we have relied for assistance are beginning to shift their positions, leaving us to wonder as to what we are to expect from them in the near future. The Jews of America have applauded the stand of their Government opposing the Soviet-Australian resolution calling for the internationalization of the ancient capital of Israel. However, only the other day the State Department announced that America will "participate constructively" in the Geneva meeting of the Trusteeship Council for the internationalization of Jerusalem. That the American Government should now lend itself to the implementation of a policy it fought so hard, is indeed a source of deep disappointment to us.

Mr. Acheson, in another statement issued by the State Department in reply to Representative JAVITS, assures us that he sees no danger in Britain's shipment of arms to the Arab states. American Jews, however, cannot share the State Secretary's equanimity on that score. On the contrary, they have reason to fear that the rearmament of the Arab states might serve as a prelude to the reopening of war with Israel, to a second round for which the Arabs have been priming themselves since their defeat on the field of battle.

In the days that lie ahead we shall have need of the strength of the Jewish people. On this, the Zionist movement has always relied and will continue to rely. But we shall also have need, and in an increasing measure, of the powerful help of our friends and allies, of whom Mayor William O'Dwyer is so shining an example.

To all of you I say: Let's rally around the Zionist Organization of America; let's build it into the greatest instrumentality for Jewish action both in Israel and on the American scene. Only after we shall have done that, will we be able to look forward to our future and the future of our children with confidence and hope.

Resolution of Young Republican Club of the University of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and a resolution of the Young Republican Club of the University of Michigan:

JANUARY 18, 1950.

Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JERRY: The following resolution was passed at a club membership meeting on the above date:

"*Be it resolved*, That the University of Michigan Young Republican Club goes on record as wholeheartedly supporting and standing firmly behind the development of the unpartisan foreign policy established and led by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan."

Very sincerely yours,

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB,
LEONARD A. WILCOX, *Secretary*.

Your Dollars at Stake: The War on Trusts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the history of the last century teaches us that unrestrained private enterprise ceases to be free enterprise early in the history of every industry.

The industrial revolution of the early nineteenth century brought in its train a new economy with new ills.

Traditionally, the democratic countries have attempted to remedy those ills, not by turning the clock back to the Middle Ages and not by destroying private enterprise, but by regulating private enterprise in the public interest, to keep it free.

In the February issue of Everybody's Digest I have found an article entitled "Your Dollars at Stake: The War on Trusts" by Ben Atlas, a widely known newspaper and magazine correspondent of Washington.

In this brief essay on the work of the Congress and the Department of Justice Ben Atlas makes a number of trenchant and telling points.

He shows, first, that private enterprise is not necessarily free; second, that bigness in itself is not good or bad—that it is the consequences of bigness which may be good or bad for the country; third, that bureaucracy exists in private industry wherever it has an opportunity to arise; fourth, that in spite of our antitrust laws and in spite of the work of the Department of Justice there is a constantly increasing concentration of economic power and resources which bring us face to face with two equally abhorrent alternatives in the future—some form of nationalization which must inevitably be socialism or communism, or an industrial fascism.

The Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, under the enlightened leadership of our beloved colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], is striving to find the democratic answer to this dilemma.

There is a tendency on the part of Fascist-minded big industry to ridicule the subcommittee efforts as socialistic and on the part of the extreme left to ridicule it as ineffective. The fact is that all of us who believe in genuine free enterprise in an atmosphere of political freedom and democratic processes should support the subcommittee with enthusiasm.

Under leave, I am inserting the text of Mr. Atlas' article in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR DOLLARS AT STAKE—THE GROWING WAR AGAINST TRUSTS

(By Benjamin J. Atlas)

When Tom C. Clark moved from the Justice Department to the Supreme Court bench last summer, most observers were surprised to learn that the mild-mannered Texan had piled up four times more antitrust suits than any previous Attorney General.

If Clark fooled the experts, his genial successor is confounding them again. Attorney General J. Howard McGrath and his lieutenants have been adding feverishly to the record number of cases with the help of the fattest congressional outlay for trust-busting in history.

While Washington experts are diverting themselves with a guessing game about who's next on McGrath's list, the jackpot question for most of us could well be: What's this bigger trust-busting jamboree about and what effect does it have on us?

Look in on any courtroom battle scene in a monopoly case and you'd be justifiably bewildered—but don't let that fool you. Scratch beneath the legal jargon of both sides and you'll find that the battle is right inside your door. The ordinary Joe Citizen is a fellow whose freedom both sides claim to be championing.

The king-sized struggle involves down-to-earth things in our daily lives. It's about such matters as how much we pay for bread, meat, and butter; what are our opportunities to get and hold jobs; who'll do the hiring and firing; what chances we have to start a business and survive.

When Attorney General McGrath slapped an antitrust suit recently against a small Ohio newspaper even a McGrath confederate couldn't refrain from commenting that the obscure publisher had one consolation—"He's in damned high-and-mighty company." The current line-up of defendants reads, as usual, like a blue book of American industry. The list resounds with names like American Telephone & Telegraph, United States Rubber, and Aluminum Co. of America.

As for protagonists on the Government side, rarely has there been a less spectacular crew of antitrusters. McGrath's cohorts are shrinking violets compared with the crusaders of the New Deal heyday. In the entire Government there's no personality like the late President Roosevelt's top trust buster, Thurman Arnold, whose flair for dramatizing issues made monopoly in his day a horrid word.

Today's antitrusters insist they don't need a Thurman Arnold. In the New Deal era the idea was to sell folks on the antitrust laws: our job is to enforce them.

The Antitrust Division under Herbert A. Bergson is a bailiwick of solemn lawyers who eschew public oratory and shy away from the press with more resoluteness than Greta Garbo. Despite ample proof by many a defense lawyer that a well-timed public speech or press conference is sometimes worth more than weeks of argument before a dozing jurist, Bergson's team has doggedly followed a slogan, "If there's anything to say, tell it to the judge."

A fellow New Englander of McGrath's, Bergson has been a Justice Department work horse practically from the time he got his law degree at Harvard in 1933. Ever since he advised McGrath chief in 1946, his team has been made up more and more of Government careerists like himself, most of them about his own age—45—and all of them, like Bergson, as devoted to their task as the seekers of the Holy Grail.

Industry spokesmen charge that the Government is bent on driving big business to the ground and saddling the Nation with a blundering bureaucracy. If little businesses are finding it hard to stay afloat, say some of the corporation lawyers, it's because the dinosaur in Washington is snowing them under with a plethora of taxes, regulations, restrictions.

The Government men checkmate this by pointing out that big business can also be a blundering bureaucracy with time-a-dozen lackeys, executives and grateful suppliers. But Bergson adds that even where some industries grow too big for efficiency he doesn't care, "any more than I object to a man living in a mansion when a three-room apartment is all he needs."

"What is bad both economically and legally," declares the antitrust chief, "is when one reaches the point where he alone, or in conjunction with two or three others, is in a position to so dominate an industry that there is no longer room for competition. Then he, rather than the economic laws of supply and demand, controls prices and production."

To deal with juggernauts like that, the Government has been slugging with its heaviest weapon, the Sherman Antimonopoly Act. Fondly revered by antitrusters as the magna carta of free enterprise, this law has been on the books since 1890. The law's chief target is any industry which alone or in a group fixes prices to knock out competition.

Anybody convicted of violating the Sherman Act in a criminal suit is liable to a $5,000 fine or a year's imprisonment, or both, on each count. In civil suits won by the Government, the law empowers the court to hack the monopoly into smaller businesses, such as the courts tried to do in the famous split-up of Standard Oil.

Besides the Sherman Act, there's some important subsequent legislation, including the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the Robinson-Patman Act, all of which attack monopoly by imposing penalties on businessmen who try to smash rivals by unfair advertising, price discriminations, and other shenanigans.

The antitrusters, according to their critics, are using the laws as a year-'round hunting license to fire away wildly at big business without stopping to find out if monopoly exists. The language of the laws, they say, is so general that the courts, and not Congress, have in effect been doing the legislating.

On the contrary, says Bergson, the strength of the Sherman Act is its broad language making it as useful today as it was 60 years ago. Every antitrust case, he says, is a suit "by the Government on behalf of the public and on behalf of the law-abiding businessman who seeks to compete in a market free from artificial restraints."

If the antitrust suits have been popping with increasing frequency, it's because monopolies have been growing and little businessmen have been complaining about the pinch, says Bergson. Nine out of every ten trust-bust cases originate with a complaint from some hard-pressed businessman, and there's been hardly a day in the last few years when at least five complaints haven't come into the Justice Department.

Bergson's hard-working lads, referred to by private lawyers as "Bergson's beavers," confide that once they get on the scent of a law violator, there's less trouble than one usually suspects in digging up the facts. After all, explained one of Bergson's stalwarts, business, like government, is living in a bureaucratic age of "one yellow, three blue and four salmon carbon copies." So, antitrust agents have found quite legible samples of exchanges of correspondence that have become especially incriminating when the letters were carefully marked, "Please destroy after you read."

An antitruster tells of one particular case in which a businessman, "perhaps wishing to make the game of antitrust enforcement really exciting for us," directed a staff of stenographers and clerks to work overtime one night to destroy his files with a paper shredding machine. One of the stenographers in canceling a date with her boyfriend explained the highly exhilarating nature of the overtime work. The next day the entire staff appeared before the grand jury.

In the last 5 years, the antitrusters have won 151 cases either by court decisions or decrees, against 36 lost. More cases were filed in the last 10 years than in the previous half century, with one in every four suits won without coming to trial.

Although Bergson's boys have been getting results in the courts, they haven't been faring so well with public fancy of late. When the Justice Department filed a civil antitrust suit against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., the grocery titan thundered back with a weekly series of full-page newspaper advertisements in 2,000 newspapers and stuffed reprints of the ad in every bag of groceries. The corporation's angry outcry, "Do you want your A. & P. put out of business?" reached the American kitchen with a clamor that fairly rattled the dishes.

At the A. & P.'s New York City headquarters, five trunklines were kept open to handle phone calls from sympathetic housewives. Checks and cash ranging from a dollar to $20 poured in by the hundreds from customers anxious to help support the defense. Civic groups in several cities voted resolutions endorsing the chain outfit's position.

When the Government planked an antimonopoly suit against du Pont de Nemours & Co., the corporation's executives opened a barrage of speechmaking that reached into hamlets all over the country. Crawford Greenewalt, du Pont president, rushed letters to stockholders and to 80,000 firms from which du Pont buys materials and Greenewalt himself got one of his most prized audiences at a National Press Club luncheon, in Washington where a few hundred of the capital's newsmen and Assistant Attorney General Bergson were present to hear dire warnings about what the Government was doing to private enterprise.

Topping that for ingenuity was a National Press Club fete last summer arranged by a Washington public-relations firm for the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, which has been up to its musical ears in monopoly and cartel suits. For 3 hours the audience of newsmen and Government officials was regaled with hit songs from the Broadway shows of Richard Rodgers and Oscar Hammerstein II, who were there in person to give out with a fast patter of humor that offset a dull speech from ASCAP President Fred E. Ahlert.

As the public hears more and more from antitrust defendants, a lot of people are seriously wondering if the Sherman Act is worth while in a fast-paced twentieth century economy. They're wondering whether trimming giant monopolies down to human size is worth the loss of efficiency, employment, and low prices, as critics of the antitrusters have been telling them.

The answer is in the records of courts, congressional committees and countless surveys. The monopolist selling below his competitor's prices today is likely to be the fellow hiking prices sky-high as soon as his rival gives up the ghost.

As a matter of court evidence, Bergson cites the A. & P. case. The grocery chain, he says, has paid a mere $175,000 in fines for criminal conviction in which the court found that the outfit's bigness "was not due to efficiency and enterprise but to the predatory application of its mass purchasing power and the abuse of that power through boycotts, blacklisting, preferential rebates, price wars, and below-cost retailing in selected areas."

The court found, adds Bergson, that "A. & P. prices were reduced in as many as 30 percent of its 6,0000 stores only long enough to drive out local competition." By selling at higher prices in the rest of the stores, located in noncompetitive communities, "A. & P. was able to accomplish this at the expense of its customers and at no cost to itself," says Bergson.

If antitrust suits are being filed at the fastest rate in history, it's because the Government is worried about an ominous trend of mergers in which control of the Nation's economy has been passing into fewer and fewer hands. Forty years ago the 200 biggest nonbanking firms owned about a third of all corporate assets. In 1928, their control swelled to nearly half of all assets, and today it's approaching two-thirds.

Four out of every five bars of soap bought by housewives are the products of only three companies. If you own a car, in 9 cases out of 10 your tires and tubes could only have come from one of four rubber companies. If you smoke cigarettes, four chances out of five the brand you puff comes from one of the Big Three of the tobacco industry. And so on.

What this means for the consumer, according to the records, is that he pays stiffer prices as the mergers move toward saturation where there can be no competition in pricing. As for business, its style is already badly cramped. Nineteen out of every twenty little businesses that start are doomed to flop as the small fellows come under the sway of the big threes and fours. As for jobs, they're governed by fewer and fewer Gullivers. And money for business? It's getting scarcer. Most of it, according to recent Government reports, is tied up by corporations in the process of swallowing lesser fry and spreading to unrelated businesses.

The story is told with monotonous repetition in the Government's array of antimonopoly charges. In suits against some of the kingpin investment banks of Wall Street, the Government has charged them with gang play in determining who gets loans and who doesn't. A suit against the Big Four meat packers charges a similar kind of action that has practically killed competition in the industry. Elsewhere the antitrusters are trying to open up trade in the shoe-machinery industry, break up combines in the movie industry, establish competition in the aluminum industry, divorce A. T. & T. from a manufacturing subsidy which practically monopolizes the output of telephones, and end integration of the three giant industries of du Pont, General Motors, and United States Rubber.

The antitrust laws are facing the worst assault in recent years. Ever since the Supreme Court handed down a decision forbidding industries from absorbing freight rates to fix prices, Capitol Hill has felt the pressure of what Representative WRIGHT PATMAN has described as the greatest lobbies in the history of our country to force enactment of a law nullifying the Court decision.

Antitrusters are getting some solace, however, both from their winning streak in the courts and from a hope that for every conviction hundreds of would-be violators are scared into conformity.

But trust-busting will have to improve even on that impressive record. Merger, PATMAN warned the House recently, must be stopped now or else the big corporations will become so big that there will be nothing left to do except for the Government to take them over—socialism in the United States, as in Great Britain, where they never had our antimonopoly laws. The other alternative, as the late President Roosevelt once said, is industrial fascism.

The average little citizen can logically ask, "Where do I come in?" Judging from the charges and counter-charges of the protagonists, the little man's question is shaping up as one of the biggest issues of our time.

Service or $ervice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND W. KARST

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. KARST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following excellent article from the January 1950, Postal Record, which is a monthly journal of the National Association of Letter Carriers:

SERVICE OR $ERVICE

SHALL SENSE OR CENTS DETERMINE A SOUND POSTAL POLICY?

In seeking legislation, postal employees are constantly confronted with the objection that their legislation cannot be given favorable consideration because there is a postal deficit. This hue and cry is not new. It has been in existence during practically the entire history of the Post Office Department. It is peculiar that none of the other departments of Government are ever accused of having a deficit. It stems from the oft-repeated statement that the Post Office Department operates one of the world's largest businesses. It is true that the Post Office Department operates a very large business. The revenue of the Post Office Department today amounts to $1,500,000,000. In 1790 the revenue amounted to only $36,000. Today the Post Office Department contracts for tens of millions of dollars yearly for rail, ship, airline, and trucking transportation.

On Monday, December 12, I attended a forum conducted by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. Mr. George H. Mead, a member of the committee, delivered an address on the subject, Streamlining the Post Office. Among other things, he declared:

"We should not, however, measure the problem only in terms of that huge deficit. Four hundred years ago, European rulers thought of their postal monopolies as producers of revenue. Our founding fathers are cited as having felt that the service should pay its own way. Today there apparently is a growing concept that the whole country should share in the cost of the post office and recover only part of this cost by direct charges.

"The Hoover Commission felt, however, that Congress should decide whether the price of ordinary post office services should cover the cost of post office operation. The Commission did not recommend any changes in first-, second-, third-, or fourth-class mail rates. We said that the rates for certain special services—special delivery, special handling, money orders, and the like—should be sufficient to cover their costs. But in general we stuck to our task as we saw it: Streamlining the management of the post office. There were, and are, millions to be saved by adapting the best management practices of modern American business to this huge Government enterprise of carrying the mail."

It might be well to point out that the European rulers referred to by Mr. Mead either sacrificed service or profit. Where service is extended to everyone, there is no profit. The principle of a postal system with service the paramount consideration was first espoused in America by Benjamin Franklin. Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan was true to the Franklin tradition in his report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, when he stated, "During the past 100 years the financial ideal sought by the management of the postal establishment, which has been to make the institution substantially self-sustaining, has rarely been achieved, and then usually during war years. The service ideal as differentiated from the financial has been, as it always should be, held paramount. In the development of our country, in the furtherance of social improvement, and in the fostering of business enterprise, the long-time policy of Congress and the Post Office Department has been to recognize that service must be provided and extensions made even though the costs far exceed the revenues obtained."

Fundamentally, however, the Post Office Department is not a business. It is a service. Postal operations are always managed by government. There isn't a single country in the world where the postal service is owned and operated by private capital. There are obvious reasons why the government must operate the postal system. The transportation of mail is exceedingly important to the daily business life of a country. The result of a break-down in mail transportation for as much as a week would be chaotic. Communication is the cornerstone of unity. Even today in this great country of ours the postal service is the only universal public service. There are millions of people who do not have telephones; there are millions of people who do not have access to telegraphic service; there are millions who do not have running water; there are millions who are not served by public transportation; there are millions who do not have the benefit of electricity.

Indeed, the Government has deemed it necessary to subsidize the extension of electric power lines throughout the rural sections of America. For this purpose they have established the REA, a most commendable program. The Eighty-first Congress found it desirable to subsidize the extension of telephone service throughout the United States of America and they set up a system of subsidies for the extension of telephones. The postal service is the only universal means of communication in America. If a candidate for office, for example, wishes to contact every single one of his constituents he well knows that the only way he can do it is through the postal service. Every citizen in the United States has mail service every working day in the year. To bring this service to people in rural areas the Post Office Department has established rural free delivery. They have established post offices at practically every cross road town in America. According to the 1948 Report of the Postmaster General, there was a total of 41,695 post offices in the United States. Of these, 20,546 were fourth-class post offices; 13,195 were third-class post offices. These 33,800 post offices were operated at a loss. The volume of mail in these offices is not great enough to pay the expenses of operating these offices. They were maintained, however, for the purpose of bringing the mail to the American people.

Elsewhere in the Postal Record you will find a story of carrying the mail in Roaring Hells Canyon on Snake River. There are many other similar instances where mail service is maintained at a considerable loss to the taxpayers. Yet it is important; it is American; it is justified.

There have been a great many investigations relative to the operation of the Post Office Department. Every one of these investigations costs several hundred thousand dollars. Generally speaking, they are conducted by accountants who confine their analyses to figures and reports; they do not take into consideration the many ramifications of the postal service.

During its entire history it has been the traditional policy of Congress to regard the Post Office Department as a service to the American people. Likewise, it has been the traditional policy of Congress to branch into new fields of transportation and communication by experimentation in the postal service. In the early days encouragement was given to the operation of railroad lines by granting subsidies to the lines for transporting mail. That policy continues even to the present day.

The Pony Express, a glamorous story of romance (the details of which have been recited on pages of the Postal Record in previous terms) was established and operated by the Post Office Department without any thought as to whether or not the operation would be profitable. As a matter of fact, the operation of the Pony Express was very expensive, but it did bridge the gap from St. Joseph, Mo., to Sacramento, Calif., and did tie the business, social and cultural life of these early Californians to the other peoples of the United States of America.

The Post Office Department also helped finance the operation of the early stage coach lines. It helped break roads into the wilderness. Moreover, if it were not for the financial help and practical experience in flying airplanes gained through the operation of the mail service, our aviation industry would not have progressed to the point it has reached today. Many romantic and glamorous stories could be told about the operation of the air-mail service. Even today it is only by virtue of subsidies received for transporting the mail that many of the commercial air lines are able to keep their planes in the air.

The entire history of the postal service discloses that the foundation and the method of establishing postal rates definitely placed emphasis on service to the American people. As evidence of this contention, it can be cited that mail within counties is transported free. This service is established to encourage the smaller newspapers. Again, religious, scientific and fraternal magazines are given preferential rates.

The Postmaster General has been endeavoring for the past 3 years to secure an increase in postage rates. Certainly no one can quarrel with him in his general objective of securing some additional revenue. Many of the postage rates today are but slightly increased over the rates charged in the twenties. With the cost of other commodities rising, certainly a comparative increase in postage rates is justified. We believe that to be self-evident. Rates, however, cannot be increased sufficiently to eliminate the so-called deficit. To attempt to do so would drive the most lucrative business out of the Post Office and at the same time saddle the Department with the high cost operations.

The postal service is an unusual organization. It is not always easy to decide what is the proper rate to charge. As we have pointed out previously, the postal service, strictly speaking, is not a business. Service must be maintained in localities where the operation is bound to result in a loss. The telegraph company, the express company, and transportation companies do not maintain service except where such service can and is operated at a profit. No business organization maintains branch offices except where branch offices render a profit. Yet the Post Office Department, in order to fulfill its fundamental purpose of bringing the mail to the American people, is compelled to maintain approximately 20,000 post offices that are operated at a loss. No one in America would suggest for a minute that these post offices be closed, yet some people instantly demand that the so-called postal deficit be eliminated.

In many other respects the Post Office Department is a very peculiar operation. It is peculiar as far as government organizations are concerned. In determining appropriations for the Post Office Department no one can describe or confine the operation of the service to a certain finite limit. The volume of business dictates to a great extent how much money must be used in operating the Post Office Department. Mail volume fluctuates, of course, in tune with the economic rise and fall of business and other circumstances. In deciding upon the rate to be charged, Congress must give careful consideration to public welfare. They must decide on a rate that is socially desirable. At the same time they must confine the rate to an amount that will not bring about a decline in the volume of business reaching the point of diminishing returns. Obviously, if the rate on a certain class of mail were increased to an amount that would compel mailers to distribute their commodity through some other channel, it would result in the loss of all of that business in your larger centers of population where the unit cost of delivery is small, but more important, it would mean that the Post Office Department, being a public service operated by the Government, would have to retain the delivery of that commodity in Hells Canyon and in other scattered rural areas—places where the unit cost of the delivery of that product is extremely high.

The late Clyde Kelly, of sacred memory, a distinguished Congressman from Pennsylvania, probably understood the subject of postal policy better than anyone of recent history. Through his activity, legislation was passed whereby credit was given to the Post Office Department for handling certain types of mail.

In the Postmaster General's report of 1948 the following credits were shown:

Penalty mail	$53,195,697
Free registry	23,412,641
Free for blind	90,929
Free-in-county publications	772,837
Differentials in second-class postage favoring religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, and fraternal organizations	459,129
Franked mail	1,202,982
Estimated excess on cost of aircraft service over postage revenues on air mail	17,088,124
Total	96,222,339

It can well be noted, however, that there are many fields of operation where it is difficult to determine the loss and no attempt has been made to take credit for the loss in these particular directions. Clyde Kelly knew this well and in his many speeches and writings he developed this thesis at length.

There is no attempt to show that the railroads of this country are subsidized by the Post Office Department. The Post Office Department is the only shipper who is required to pay for the hire of railway cars two ways even if the car is empty on the return trip. There is no attempt to assess the cost of operating post offices in the far-flung corners of the United States. There is no attempt to estimate the cost of rural delivery. A complete study would go far beyond the so-called free services and less-than-cost items carried in the Report of the Postmaster General. It is rather absurd to expect the Post Office Department to operate as a business. The Post Office Department has saddled on it by other agencies many services for which they receive little or no reimbursement.

First, they are required to maintain a country-wide information service on civil-service examinations for the Civil Service Commission. Secondly, they sell United States savings bonds for the Treasury Department. Third, they sell documentary stamps for the Treasury. Fourth, they sell migratory-bird stamps for the Department of the Interior. Fifth, they perform custodial services in Federal buildings in which post offices are housed. They are partially reimbursed for the sale of Treasury bonds and bird stamps. They receive no reimbursement whatsoever for the other services.

The Post Office Department has no right to bargain on the rates paid the railroads. This is handled and determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission. They have no right to bargain or determine the amount paid to the air-line companies. This is determined by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Outside of a limited control for the establishment of parcel-post rates, the rates themselves are determined, not by the Post Office Department but by the Congress of the United States. It is rather peculiar, too, in analyzing a Government operation to find that there is so much hue and cry relative to the so-called postal deficit. The postal deficit is merely the amount paid by the Government for operating the Post Office Department. All of the revenues collected by the Post Office Department are turned over to the Treasury of the United States. The Post Office Department then must go before the Congress of the United States and secure an appropriation which has been rigidly confined to 59 separate items. I am happy to report that this has been reduced to five items in the 1951 budget. The difference between the amount that the Department collects and turns in and the amount appropriated by the Congress of the United States represents the so-called deficit. The Commerce Department of the United States spends in excess of a billion dollars, but this expenditure is never referred to as a deficit. The Agricultural Department of the United States spends $2,000,000,000; this is never referred to as a deficit. The Department of the Interior spends over a billion dollars, but this is not referred to as a deficit. The Federal aid to State and local governments in 1949 amounted to almost $2,000,000,000, but this is never referred to as a deficit. After listening to the voluble protests on the postal deficit, one would almost come to the conclusion that the expenditure for the Post Office Department was the major portion of governmental expenditure.

Let us briefly analyze Federal expenditures. Thirty-four percent of the $42,000,000,000 expended by the Federal Government goes to the military; 16 percent is sent to Europe; 13 percent goes to pay interest on the Federal debt; 13 percent goes to provide care for the veterans of previous wars; and 6 percent goes to social security and other welfare expenditures. Only 18 percent of the money spent by the Federal Government goes to provide for the normal operations of Government. The cost of operating the Post Office Department is a small part of this, one-fifteenth of the 18 percent, to be exact. The history of progress and the stability of the Nation rests upon the maintenance of sound, efficient, orderly communication and transportation. Throughout history and to date the Post Office Department has been the backbone of both communication and transportation. Even if the money spent by the Post Office Department were two or three times greater than it is, it is money well spent to maintain this great Nation of ours.

The Post Office Department is operated as a service. It is up to Congress to establish rates that it feels are fair and equitable. It is also the responsibility of Congress and the responsibility of the officials of the Post Office Department to secure sufficient funds to operate the postal service so that the American people are given the service that they are entitled to. The depression and the war have left serious scars upon the standards of service that have been maintained throughout the years. The instructions sent out by the postal officials in Washington generally uphold a high standard of service. Unfortunately, the philosophy of many of the people carrying out those orders does not uphold the philosophy of good service. We have many chronic curtailers, who in reality are assassins of the postal service. The Hoover Commission criticizes the Department on the grounds that many people in it are conscious of expense but not of cost. The expense-conscious administrator curtails today but spends tomorrow. There is only one way to deliver mail efficiently, that is to deliver it immediately. Every time a piece of mail is rehandled it increases the unit cost. Poor mail service costs the American public thousands and thousands of dollars. Certainly, a doctrine that the postal service should be operated fundamentally to give good service to the American people is absolutely necessary. Poor service gives great distress to conscientious postal employees.

The Truman Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the taxpayers of the country can look behind the tax curtain set up by the President to obscure the view of what he is really doing to the economy of the country. If the Congress were to adopt the various proposals which he has outlined it would send business into a tailspin and throw hundreds of thousands of people out of work. I hope that the citizens, who are after all the sovereign power of this Nation, will bring pressure to bear on their representatives sufficient to make sure that the wild and reckless tax proposals of the President are not carried out. The few crumbs in the way of excise taxes promised the public are only bait to set the trap for more taxes for the administration to spend.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, January 24, 1950:

THE TAX PROGRAM

In his message on the state of the union President Truman promised a tax program which, in providing adequately for present fiscal needs, would "reduce present inequities, stimulate business activity, and yield a moderate amount of additional revenue." It seemed a neat trick in the prospectus; now that the mystery has been unveiled it seems rather a neat trick still, though its adroitness is much more apparent in its political than in its economic implications.

Evidently, the real problem was concerned only indirectly with the financial and economic soundness of the American system. The real problem was to win the 1950 elections. This imposed certain conditions: no drastic curtailment of the "welfare state"; no important increase in taxes; a show, however, of economic orthodoxy at least sufficient to forestall criticism; an adequate amount of lip service to the popularly attractive aim of releasing private enterprise to produce where government cannot do so. These seemingly contradictory requirements have not proved too difficult for the administration experts.

Orthodoxy is served by taking another billion out of the corporation income tax (few voters will mind this, since few will be aware of its effects, and it is sweetened anyway by the proposal to reduce somewhat the burden on middle-sized corporations). The administration's interest in private enterprise is demonstrated by a willingness at least to reduce the excise taxes (especially those of which the voter is most aware). But to avoid any suggestion that this is risking the spending state, the reduction has to be made up by tax increases elsewhere. Here a little terminological adjustment (easy for any expert in modern government) proves helpful. What is wanted is to soak increased taxes on all available sources or groups which are so small or so unpopular that nobody will mind. By describing this process as "removing the inequities of under-taxation" it is made much more palatable.

It is wonderful, in this connection, how the only tax inequities which ever interest a Government expert are those of "under-," not over-taxation. Such staggering inequities as those of double taxation on corporate dividends, or the State governments' unpleasant habit of taxing what one pays in Federal taxes, are passed over in silence. But since few love the oil men, the insurance companies, the larger corporations, the rich testators, or the Hollywood glamor merchants, it is just removing the inequities to sock them again. So the skillful structure has been built. Like so many other Truman programs, it is designed to do everything and avoid the political consequences of any of them. But the fact that in reality it does next to none of them is still likely to be rather painfully obvious.

For the principles ostensibly underlying the Truman tax program there is much to be said. The main elements in the present deficit may prove temporary. There is reason for attempting to meet it only in part at present. To revamp the tax structure so as moderately to increase the yield, to remove its real injustices, to make it an effective encouragement for private production and to put it on a sounder permanent basis would, if all this were done with a firm grasp over long-range fiscal and economic policy, be a high act of statesmanship. To pretend to do these things without suffering the pains of any of them is perhaps skillful politics; it is certainly little more.

Truman Doctrine Has Been Effective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Tears of the Crocodile" which appeared in the Washington Post, Tuesday, January 24, 1950:

TEARS OF THE CROCODILE

Among the myths that are being sedulously circulated as a result of the Formosa decision is that the administration has killed its own Truman doctrine. The funeral orations have been delivered by one after the other of the China interventionists in Congress. Some of them never favored the Truman doctrine, anyway; but that fact, far from moderating their wailing, has made their lamentations even more shrill. A flock of commentators has seconded the dirge, and the only person who seems unperturbed by the outcry is the parent who is accused of the foul murder of his child, viz, President Truman.

Mr. Truman is not as hard-hearted as the serenity he maintains in the midst of this Irish wake would seem to indicate. We have consulted the child's birth certificate, dated March 12, 1947, and can vouch for the fact that whatever has been killed, it is not the Truman doctrine. The Truman doctrine, contrary to the burial notices, was not a declaration to contain Communist expansion. Indeed, a reading and rereading of the message does not disclose either the word containment or the word communism. The message, inspired by Britains' announcement that it could no longer help Greece, laid down this general policy:

"It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure."

The first thing to notice about the declaration is its positiveness; it was for, not against. It emphasizes aid, to be given in one or more of a variety of forms, depending upon circumstances. However, the doctrine indicated what kind of aid was primarily meant; it was economic:

"Our help should be primarily economic and financial aid which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes."

On the basis of the Truman doctrine, economic and financial aid and then military aid started to flow to Greece and also to Turkey. The reason was that Greece and Turkey were struggling to prevent the Russians from cutting the Mediterranean and encircling the Middle East. Ask any military strategist and you will find that this was all-important to American security. There is only one Mediterranean, only one Greece; and, as Secretary Acheson has said, the American interest differs with locality. In this sense the Truman doctrine has been administered—is still being administered. It is being applied all over the world according to the requirements of situations and geography and the limitations of American resources.

Out of the Truman doctrine, for instance, stemmed the Marshall plan in Europe and the Far East. The Marshall plan followed the wise maxim underlying the Truman doctrine of helping people who helped themselves. It would have been money down the drain to have any other rule. Wherever there was a contrary practice, as in China, the result has been worse than wasteful; it has been a boomerang. The Marshall plan, moreover, was followed by the North Atlantic Pact and the arms program—all tracing back to the Truman doctrine. They all sprang from the original concept of supporting free peoples who were struggling to keep themselves free which was expressed in the Truman doctrine. The conclusion is that the crocodile tears now being shed over the demise of the Truman doctrine are all eyewash.

Controversies in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the

Pittsburgh Spirit of January 18, 1950:

CONTROVERSIES IN CONGRESS

This session of Congress will consider some of the most controversial legislative proposals in history. Yet no one seems to expect that much definite action will be taken one way or the other.

The fireworks began with Mr. Truman's State of the Union message, which contained nothing new, nothing that had not been anticipated. The President asked, as he has on many occasions in the past, for broadened social security, the compulsory Federal-health-insurance bill, some tax increases and adjustments, his civil-rights program, repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, and the Brannan farm price plan. The response to his speech divided pretty much along party lines. The Democrats, with a number of exceptions—particularly the southern bloc, which is prepared to fight the civil-rights proposals to the bitter end—praised his program as being just what the country needs. The Republicans, almost to a man, denounced it, some vehemently—about 100 GOP Representatives signed a round-robin statement to the effect that Mr. Truman is firmly committed to the eventual socialization of the United States.

A change in the President's mannerisms and attitude was noted. The rather somber humorlessness he first showed on taking office has gone. In its place, he shows utter confidence that he is right and his opponents are dead wrong.

If, as is expected, Congress turns down or deters most of the President's program, will it be a defeat for the administration? That brings up a very curious situation. Some of the canniest commentators have been saying that Mr. Truman does not really want the program to pass at this time—that, indeed, its passage would actually amount to a setback to administration plans and strategy. The reasoning back of this point of view is simple enough. The Democrats, like the Republicans, are looking to 1952. Recent events certainly indicate that Mr. Truman will run again, though he has not said so. Therefore, the argument goes, Mr. Truman wants the stage set so that he can go to the country, point to congressional refusal to give him what he wants, and base his campaign on that. His advisers seem to feel that this would be sound politics, and that it would enable the President to paint his opponents as black reactionaries and tools of special interests.

Practically everything that this Congress does and says will be colored by the race for the Presidency that is to be run almost 3 years hence—as well as by the elections of next fall. As has often been noted, Senator TAFT's campaign for reelection will command principal national interest in 1950. On domestic policy, he is the unquestioned leader of his party. If he wins, he will have the inside track for the 1952 nomination.

The Trial of Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, it was gratifying to follow the recent trial of Alger Hiss and note the unfailing efforts of Federal Judge Henry W. Goddard to render justice in an impartial and unbiased manner. His judicial aptitude deserves the acclaim of the American people. Likewise does the brilliant performance of Assistant Attorney General Thomas F. Murphy deserve mention and praise.

The recent trial brings to mind the gross impropriety and acts bordering on judicial misconduct so apparent in the first trial conducted by Judge Samuel Kaufman. These acts were pointed out by me and other Members here on the floor of the House a little more than 6 months ago. At that time I enumerated six examples of judicial impropriety on the part of Judge Kaufman which were flagrant violations of our principles of American justice. By referral to the record, we must all agree that there was no repetition of these improprieties in the second trial. Some Members suggested at that time that impeachment proceedings could be brought then. But upon the announcement that Kaufman would not act as trial judge in the second trial, most of us thought it would be wise to forego such proceedings for fear of the effect it would have upon retrial of the case. We were all interested in determining the guilt of Alger Hiss in a trial which would exemplify our traditional spirit of justice and fairness to both the people of the United States and the defendant.

The authority and duty of the Congress to survey the conduct of the Federal judiciary was exercised with this spirit in mind. Our chief question now is: Would impeachment proceedings against Judge Kaufman serve now the purpose of further protecting the integrity of our courts? In answering this question we must be reminded that this was the first trial of national significance heard by Judge Kaufman and he had little judicial experience otherwise. In addition to that, the pressure from members and friends in the executive department of government and other nationally known personalities must have been terrific—in fact so terrific that only a seasoned and experienced judge could withstand it as Henry W. Goddard did. So I maintain that since justice has finally been done, impeachment proceedings against Judge Kaufman should not be further considered. The American people have long been noted for their tolerance and understanding of the difficulties of the inexperienced and are steeped in the spirit of forgiveness of the mistakes of their fellow men. Vindictiveness for political purposes does not befit us as representatives of the people. So I urge that we drop consideration of this matter now and turn our attention to other serious threats to our internal security and the peace of the world.

The trial and conviction of Alger Hiss remind us that our security is still being threatened by subversive forces within our country and within the executive department of Government itself. The diabolical plans of the forces of communism are exemplified by several as yet unprosecuted cases of treason, espionage, sedition, and perjury. Last November, the Un-American Activities Committee unanimously recommended that the files in the case of Dr. Joseph W. Weinburg, known also as Scientist X, be turned over to the Department of Justice for further consideration with the view in mind of indictment and prosecution for perjury. So far this case has not been brought to a Federal grand jury nor has any report been made by the Justice Department. While we demand that the Attorney General's office act fairly in the consideration of this case, we also demand that he act promptly.

There are numerous other Russian espionage agents and subversives still running loose in this country busily engaged in activities aimed at overthrowing our Republic with force and violence. The Un-American Activities Committee on several occasions has had before it Steve Nelson, alias Steve Mesarosh, who is alleged to be an active member and organizer of the Communist Party in the United States and a former member of the executive council of the American Communist Party. On these occasions Nelson has openly defied the committee and refused to answer questions directed to him regarding his activities in conjunction with atomic bomb scientists at the University of California in the years 1942 to 1945 and his subsequent activities as a Communist agent in western Pennsylvania. The contempt he has shown for the committee is most certainly a travesty on American justice.

Such performances cannot be tolerated by a free people and will, I hope and pray, be eventually brought to light and vindicated. I personally have no intention of letting these cases become lost in the bewildering jungles of bureaucracy and shall, from time to time, remind the Justice Department, publicly and privately, that the cases are pending, until action is taken.

Korean Economic Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by President Syngman Rhee of the Republic of Korea:

STATEMENT ISSUED AT SEOUL BY PRESIDENT SYNGMAN RHEE ON RECEIPT OF THE NEWS OF THE DEFEAT OF THE KOREAN ECONOMIC AID BILL

I have just learned with the greatest regret that the United States Congress by a close vote failed to pass the enabling act for ECA aid for Korea yesterday. Despite the most unexpected defeat of this bill, I remain confident that the Congress and Government of the United States of America, upon further and more careful reflection will not fail to grant to Korea this aid which is most essential for the development of a sound domestic economy, enabling the Korean Republic to continue its successful resistance to the persistent, militaristic Communist threat. The Republic of Korea is the only country of Asia today which is determinedly, wholeheartedly, and daily fighting off, and successfully fighting against the armed attempts of Communist imperialism to invade and overthrow. Some Asiatic

nations waiver, some recoil in fear, one great nation has gone down in defeat, but the Korean Republic continues to resist and fight with unflagging determination, courage, and success. Past American aid, added to strong Korean hearts, has made this remarkable success possible. But continued ECA aid, to establish a strong basis for our economy, is essential to sustain those strong Korean hearts in this difficult transition period. Let those who say that the risk is too great, that the U. S. S. R. is too powerful, that money for Korea is water down some rat hole, remember Berlin. There was risk, there was a powerful Soviet army itself, potential basis for attack in itself, but with courage, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France took the great risk; Berlin and even all western Germany were saved by courageous risks despite enormous expense. Korea, the only free spot of northeastern Asia continent, can and will be held by courageous Korean men and women for the free world and for an independent Korea if the United States continues to risk a few more millions of its hard-earned wealth. Despite yesterday's vote in the United States Congress, I remain certain that further and wise consideration will be given to the cause of an independent Korea to insure that this Republic and these people will have the chance to remain within the orbit of the free world.

The Dairy Farmer Begins To Worry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement by E. E. Pfeiffer:

BIOCHEMICAL RESEARCH LABORATORY,
Spring Valley, N. Y., January 20, 1950.

Representative KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: I would like, in the enclosed brief material, to call your attention to the situation of the dairy farmer, not only in Orange County, but in many other counties of the northeastern States. I am a dairy farmer myself and also a consultant to other farmers.

In addition to the facts on the milk-price situation, there are two things which I would like to bring to your notice.

So far, I have not met a single farmer who is in favor of the Brannan plan for agriculture.

Nor have I met a single farmer who is in favor of the recent development known under the name of "statism."

Coming from Europe (I was raised in Switzerland and came to this country as a Swiss citizen), I had the opportunity, as an agricultural consultant, to travel widely there before the last war. I have seen a lot of "statism" abroad and I think that if the present development goes in the direction of something only nearly similar to what was then already developing in European countries, it will be contrary to good American traditions, of which I am a great admirer.

It may perhaps be due to this background of experience that I have followed political trends in the United States with keen interest during the more than 10 years I have been here. As a naturalized citizen, having become this about a year ago, I naturally place great value on the maintenance of all that has made our country great.

Faithfully yours,

E. E. PFEIFFER.

THE DAIRY FARMER BEGINS TO WORRY

In the daily press and magazines we read so much about how well the farmer has been doing over the last years. This may be true for those who grow corn and wheat and mine their soils. The dairy farmer has to care for the maintenance of his soil's fertility and works conservatively. Generalized statistics do not reflect the actual situation, at least not that of the Eastern States dairy farmer.

The writer operates a dairy farm in Orange County, N. Y., and is a consultant to farmers in several Eastern States. He knows the figures of these farms. The following is quoted from the balances of a farm where the owner makes a living from dairying, i. e., these are actual figures reflecting facts.

Comparing the average annual milk price which was received by this farmer for his milk, the average feed cost for 18 percent protein feed in dollars per ton, the total labor cost and the total feed cost, the picture is as follows:

	Average milk price per 100 pounds	Average feed price per ton	Total feed cost per year	Total labor cost per year
1946	$5.772	106	$2,[illegible]	$1,7[illegible]
1947	5.123	78	2,[illegible]	2,[illegible]
1948	5.774	105	3,[illegible]	3,987
1949	4.65	80	[1] 5,739	3,371

[1] Unusual increase caused by the drought.

Using 1946 as a basis and setting it as equal to 100 percent, the increase and decrease in prices and costs looks as follows:

	Increase and decrease of milk price	Feed price per ton	Total feed cost	Total labor cost
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1946	100	100	100	100
1947	89	117	81	154
1948	100	107	104	229
1949	79	123	[1] 162	198

[1] Unusual increase caused by the drought.

While in 1943 one could still hire a dairyman for $80 per month, the wages increased to $100 in 1945, to $120 in 1946, to $150 per month in 1948, and stayed at $150 in 1949. Right now it would be difficult or almost impossible to get a good dairyman below that wage in our area. Evidently the dairy farmer is in a squeeze. The milk price declines. Feed and labor costs decline more slowly, or not at all.

The dairy farmer works 11 hours a day, 7 days a week. His pay is among the lowest. With strikes still going on in order to increase or adjust the wage level to the high cost of living, the dairy farmer does not appreciate being the first one to whom the price squeeze is applied. Of course, we all agree that the cost of living should be reduced, and the dairy farmer, more than anyone else, wants the city people to have cheaper milk. But the reductions should be fair, taking into account both the producing and the selling ends. The production cost, feed, and labor costs, should parallel the milk price. The milk price is determined by the law of demand and production, but the basis for this calculation is not a parity basis which meets reality. Then too, the milk-price control is outside the range of the dairy farmer. He gets paid 3 weeks after delivery and actually does not know in advance how much he will receive while producing the milk.

Our Government urges the employment of as many people as possible; 64,000,000 are spoken of as a goal. With the present price squeeze, the only way out the farmer can find is to work more with less help. At 11 hours per day, 7 days a week, this solution does not sound attractive. The authorities who determine the milk price are cordially invited to come to our farms and try to make a living as dairy farmers.

We dairy farmers have already reduced manpower to the minimum in order to make a go of things. The other way out is to increase milk production so as to make up for the decrease in milk prices. Here, however, there is a biological limit even with the most skillful management. The writer has increased the production on his farm over the reported period by 30 percent, with the same number of cows.

There is another gripe we eastern dairy farmers have right now. Last summer we had a prolonged drought. Even the population of New York City is beginning to know something about drought. To the farmers in this area it did not only mean that some wells and springs went dry, it meant that we had to start feeding our winter reserves already in August. The increased cost of feeding is thus reflected in the above-mentioned figures. In the reported case an increase of about $1,500 was due to the drought. The milk price does not reflect this emergency. Some wise man of the USDA published in September that there was no need of support on account of the drought "since the drought was over, inasmuch as it had rained in September." It rained over the New York City watershed, too, didn't it?

The dairy farmer begins to worry.

E. E. PFEIFFER.

Conviction of Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release:

Congressman DONALD L. JACKSON, of the Sixteenth Congressional District, this week applauded the perjury conviction of Alger Hiss, former State Department employee and adviser to President Roosevelt at the Cairo Conference. Hiss was found guilty on two counts of perjury against him in a New York Federal court, after a first trial some months ago had resulted in a hung jury. JACKSON also lauded the effective work of Congressman RICHARD NIXON, of California, candidate for the United States Senate and member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

In his statement, delivered on the floor of the House last Monday, Representative JACKSON said:

"The present administration's keen and unfailing sense of bad judgment has been again sustained with the conviction of Alger Hiss which stamps him publicly as a liar and a spy. The former bright boy of the State Department * * * the confidante and one-time adviser of highly placed administration officials * * * was last Saturday found guilty in a New York Federal court on two counts of perjury. The finding by the jury was made in spite of frantic efforts on the part of many highly placed officials to prevent the case being brought to trial.

"Hiss was a leading exponent of the policies which have led to disaster in China. Together with others of like mind in the Department of State, he advocated abandonment of our Chinese allies. He was part and parcel of the international conspiracy which sought a world-wide vote of no confidence in the Chinese National Government. He was a mental perpetrator who served the cause of world communism with energy and enthusiasm. His conviction will meet with the approval of all good Americans.

"Congratulations and the thanks of all America are due Judge Henry W. Goddard, who presided at the Hiss trial, to the jury which made the finding, to Prosecutor Murphy, and to our own distinguished colleagues, Representatives RICHARD NIXON, of California, and Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, who almost single-handed forced the present administration to bring the Hiss case to trial.

"The American people themselves," JACKSON concluded, "will decide whether or not such trials are worth while or whether the President was being honest or just political in branding investigations of this kind as 'hysteria and a red herring.'"

Tariffs and Monopoly Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Mr. O. R. Strackbein, executive secretary of America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, before the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee on the study of monopoly power:

STATEMENT OF O. R. STRACKBEIN, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF AMERICA'S WAGE EARNERS' PROTECTIVE CONFERENCE, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON THE STUDY OF MONOPOLY POWER, NOVEMBER 9, 1949

This conference is composed exclusively of national and international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Among them are unions that are organized in the glassware and pottery industries, in hat and millinery manufacturing, in fisheries, photoengraving, wallpaper, etc. The aggregate membership is upward of 500,000.

We wish to call to the attention of the Committee on the Study of Monopoly Power certain aspects of our national tariff policy that have a direct bearing on the question to which the committee has addressed itself, namely industrial bigness and monopoly power.

We think it important that we do this because the policies of a government, aimed in one direction and having perhaps admirable objectives, may produce effects in other directions that are of a quite opposite character.

Thus, our Government has certain anti-monopoly policies; and this very hearing is dedicated to learning more about monopoly and bigness so that remedial measures may be recommended. The purpose, we assume, is to prevent further concentration of business into aggregates that will smother small and independent enterprise and lead to other undesirable results, such as the need of excessive public control.

This means, we take it, that the Government is concerned about the future of small- or medium-sized independent enterprise. Presumably, present trends toward concentration of business and, in fact, the great size already attained by some of our corporations, are a source of worry. The Sherman and Clayton Acts, the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the various governmental efforts to aid and protect small business, to the contrary notwithstanding, the fact remains that the trend of business continues in the direction of still greater size in ownership and management. In recent times the growth of parallel labor organizations to great size and power, as a counterpoise in the field of bargaining, has also attracted attention. The fear is that between these two forces, freedom of the individual and freedom of enterprise will be crushed.

Against this background we wish to pose the current policy of our Government as it bears upon international trade. To a very important degree, in our estimation, the effects of this policy will be to discourage, hamper, injure and in some cases to destroy small industries, while, on the other hand, it will encourage, help, and promote the large, mass-production enterprises. In other words, the execution of the policy will give impetus to the very forces about which this committee and other parts of the Government avow growing apprehension. This is not to say or to imply that such effects are contemplated or sought by those who have formulated our international trade policy or by those who are charged with carrying it out.

The relationship between the current policy to reduce tariffs and to encourage imports, on the one hand, and the growth of already gigantic industrial enterprise, on the other, is not apparent at first blush. Quite to the contrary, protective tariffs have long been associated in the minds of economists and others with the growth of trusts. In fact, the tariff has been called the mother of trusts. Could it then possibly be true that the reduction of tariffs will help the so-called trusts or big business and do harm to the smaller industries and the smaller companies in big industries?

We raise this question at this time before this committee because the policy of reducing tariffs in order to increase imports is finding powerful added support from those who are seeking an escape from the condition of dollar-shortages that afflicts many foreign countries. The dilemma is real and the problem is unmercifully difficult. Either we import more, much more, or we continue to make grants of billions of dollars to the dollar-short countries; or else we cut these countries off to shift for themselves. These are the alternatives that are generally held out to us. The least painful of the alternatives, then, seems to lie in a further reduction of our tariff so that imports may flow more freely into this country. Therefore our Government embarks on a vast educational program to condition the minds and hearts of the American people to the kinder reception and more willing purchase of imported products.

The increased imports would put more dollars into the pockets of those who export the goods to us; and this would reduce the dollar-shortage overseas and thus help the rest of the world to balance its trade with us. Incidentally, it would help us to maintain our present volume of exports, a good part of which is now paid for by the American taxpayer. We could, by receiving more imports, so the argument goes, reduce or eventually perhaps eliminate this indirect subsidy that our exporters now enjoy.

The logic of this argument seems inescapable.

Before answering the questions that we have raised, and before addressing ourselves to the alternative of the present policy, we wish to offer a very brief analysis of our exports.

It is perhaps not generally known that some of our large industries, notably those in which capital concentration has reached huge proportions, regularly export a larger volume of products than the total output of some of our other industries. A suitable example is found in the automobile industry. Average annual exports, classified by 5-year periods, of this industry from 1925 to 1940, have been as follows:

United States exports: Automobiles, parts, and accessories

Annual average:	
1926–30	$406,164,000
1931–35	146,503,000
1936–40	417,439,000
Actual:	
1948	929,294,000

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, and Summary of Foreign Commerce of the United States.

Compare these export figures with the gross annual product of other industries, as reported by the Bureau of the Census (Census of Manufactures):

	1939 value of product
Concrete, gypsum and plastic products	$257,598,000
Cement	192,611,000
Glassware, pressed and blown, including glass containers	255,589,000
Flat glass	102,389,000
Books, printed or published, or both	236,752,000
Hats and millinery	206,857,000
Professional, scientific, surgical, medical instruments	180,014,000
Jewelry, costume jewelry and miscellaneous products	178,509,000
Toys and sporting and athletic goods	151,404,000
Liquors, distilled, rectified, or blended	105,224,000
Wines	32,782,000
Pottery and related products	98,884,000
Fish and shellfish, canned or cured	81,071,000
Silverware and plated ware	62,771,000
Cutlery and edge tools, except silver and plated ware	89,924,000
Leather luggage (suitcases, bags, briefcases, etc.)	36,591,000
Wallpaper	24,969,000
Feathers; plumes and artificial flowers	18,504,000
Small leather goods	14,334,000
Umbrellas, parasols and canes	11,520,000

From this table it is clear that the exports of automobiles, parts, and accessories during the 5-year period of 1936–40 averaged higher in value per year than the total output of the entire glass industry, including all glass tableware, scientific and laboratory ware, bottles, and window and plate glass. Again, these exports were as great as the total output of the cement and the hat and millinery industries combined. Once more, they were as great as the combined product of the last nine industries listed in the table, namely, pottery and related products, fish and shellfish, canned or cured, silverware and plated ware, cutlery and edge tools, leather luggage, etc.

Another of the exporting giants is the petroleum industry. We show the exports below:

United States exports: Petroleum and products

Annual average:	
1926–30	$536,364,000
1931–35	331,352,000
1936–40	345,619,000
Actual: 1948	656,881,000

Other heavy exporters of industrial products are the iron and steel industry, manufacturers of electrical machinery and apparatus, and of agricultural machinery and implements. Important but less heavy shippers to other countries are the meat packers and manufacturers of office machinery and appliances. The table immediately below gives the export figures for these various products:

United States exports

Product	Annual average			Actual, 1948
	1926–30	1931–35	1936–40	
Iron and steel products	[illegible]	[illegible]	$319,876,000	[illegible]
Electrical machinery and apparatus	102,711,000	62,435,000	101,405,000	[illegible]
Agricultural machinery and implements	102,051,000	26,750,000	84,027,000	281,025,000
Meat products	77,988,000	28,734,000	29,459,000	50,752,000
Office appliances and equipment	44,[illegible]	21,298,000	23,370,000	86,942,000

Source: Statistical Abstract; Summary of Foreign Commerce.

Examination of the foregoing statistics reveals that the average annual exports from 1936–40 of the four leading export industries listed in the foregoing and preceding tables, namely, producers of automobiles, petroleum, iron and steel, and electrical machinery and apparatus, were as great as the total annual product of the following industries in 1939: glassware, bottles and flat glass; book printing and publishing, hats and millinery, pottery, fish and shellfish canning and curing; liquor and wine, and cutlery and edge tools.

Of course, other comparisons could be made. Other industries could be used as examples. However, the predominant position in our exports of the large mass-production industries, wherein resides much of the bigness and monopoly power which are the subject of complaint and inquiry, is very clear and indisputable. Most of the industries that we have presented for comparison with the giants of export are those which would receive much of the impact of stimulated and increased foreign competition, such as is contemplated.

Very few of these smaller industries are afflicted with monopoly power. They are industries that are devoted predominantly to the production of consumers' goods, and are widely scattered throughout the United States. The individual establishments are generally very small in comparison with the plants of the large iron and steel companies, the large electrical equipment manufacturers, the automotive vehicle producers, etc., which are our heavy exporters of industrial products.

The question is how the proposed program of increased imports, fostered by further reduction of our tariff, would promote bigness and monopoly; or, to say it differently, how could the surrender of protective measures which purportedly nurtured the trusts during their growth, now, after they have matured, advance their entrenchment and add to their power?

The answer should be clear. The economies of mass production have enabled the large industries not only to meet foreign competition in our home market (with some exceptions) but to compete successfully in foreign markets with foreign producers. The further reduction of our tariff would not injure these titans, if at all, in any degree comparable to the injury that would be inflicted on the smaller industries that manufacture the principal classes of goods whereof imports would be stimulated.

Failure to open wider our market for a miscellany of goods manufactured in the countries that suffer from a dollar-shortage, would in time, no doubt, decrease our export trade, assuming a contraction of our foreign aid program. The greatest exporters would undoubtedly suffer most from such an ebb in our overseas trade. In the industrial field the mass-production industries, the prime examples of bigness and wielders of great power, whether monopolistic or not, would absorb most of the impact.

However, the need for export markets as exemplified by the United Kingdom, Germany, Japan and other industrial nations, is not limited to the American outlet. There are other important markets. Should those countries regain the overseas markets outside this country which they enjoyed before World War II, much of the present pressure for exports to the United States would slacken.

The exigencies of war delivered many of these overseas markets to us. Our exporters were virtually the only ones in the world who could undertake to fill the partial vacuum created in those markets by the withdrawal of England, Germany, Japan, and other industrialized countries as suppliers of manufactured products. We did export more extensively than ever before, and while we were unable to meet the great demand and found it necessary to ration our exports, we came into a predominant position as suppliers.

It is perhaps natural and human that our exporters should seek to retain these wargained markets. However, if this retention should impede the postwar adjustment and hinder the restoration of multilateral trade and therefore the basis for correcting trade balances, the price might be too high.

By insisting upon retention we will delay the necessary adjustment and at the same time will aggravate the problems confronting our occupation forces in Germany and Japan in seeking to restore the exports of these countries to their prewar channels.

It is in very considerable degree the failure to restore these overseas markets to their prewar suppliers that creates the demand for a substitute market in the United States. In bowing to this demand as a matter of policy we will contribute to the bigness and monopoly power of our mass producers and sacrifice the smaller producers of a wide miscellany of goods.

All the concern over bigness and monopoly and all the solicitude for small business professed by our Government will ring hollow if our gates are opened yet wider to imports that come into competition with our producers of miscellaneous goods. Our tariff has already been reduced an average of 50 percent. Should our smaller producers be asked to shoulder the whole burden of the necessary adjustment? Should the taxpayer be asked to continue his subsidy of the large exporters?

This committee is concerned with influences that make for monopoly power and result in oppressing the smaller independent enterprises. We strongly urge that it pursue the question raised here and consider the wisdom or unwisdom of the policy now being pressed in the field of foreign trade by other branches of our Government.

The question in the end is: If some of our industries must get hurt, should our policy be so shaped that the injury would fall principally upon the smaller producers?

Oklahoma Pioneers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention of the House to the honors paid to the pioneers of Oklahoma on the national radio hook-up of American Broadcasting Co.'s program recently.

On Friday, January 20, our pioneers who came West from the State of Virginia were recognized for their daring on the Lone Ranger series, in a broadcast called The Banner of Virginia.

The broadcast had to do with a group of Virginia veterans of the Civil War who had settled in the rich lands of the then Oklahoma Territory, and who were reminded by the Lone Ranger of the glorious heritage left them by such men as Gen. Robert E. Lee. The broadcast was coincident with the one hundred and forty-third anniversary of Lee's birth, which was on January 19.

In the broadcast, the Lone Ranger reminded these pioneers of their great traditions and urged them to resist the enemy—whether it be ruthless desperadoes or bad weather. The future—he advised them—was incredibly promising if they would work out a new State from the pioneer life they found. How significant these words to the Oklahoma pioneers.

We in Oklahoma appreciate the recognition given our pioneers and the veterans of Virginia by George V. Trendle, creator of the Lone Ranger show and civic leader of Detroit; also to Mr. Frank Stricker, chief writer of the radio series which, in its nineteenth year, dips into the history of the West for its story themes.

Practical Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greenfield (Ind.) Daily Reporter:

PRACTICAL AID TO EDUCATION

One of the greatly publicized objectives of the present administration in Washington has been to inaugurate greatly enlarged Federal aid to education.

This would mean the expenditure of great sums of Federal moneys and has been quite a debatable issue, chiefly for three objections:

1. Elementary education has been declared a local problem, which should be financed primarily by the local community benefited, and perhaps in a secondary way and where necessary, with lesser amounts of State assistance.

2. The fear has been expressed that strings tied to Federal money would inevitably take school control away from local authorities and place them under Federal domination.

3. Areas which have already made the necessary expenditures and sacrifices, if necessary, to maintain their own schools at an adequate level, would have to pay again into funds for other areas that have been derelict in this regard and refused to pay proper amounts at local levels for the purpose.

However, it was granted that schools in certain areas are in need of improvement.

How idealistic, impractical and fraught with political bait the Federal declaration in this regard is, happens to be demonstrated in incidental fashion by the coal strike emergency.

Schools all over the country are closing because of lack of coal. The Federal Government has the legal machinery to correct the situation. The cost would be nothing. It would be practical and cheap Federal aid to education. Up to now not a finger has been lifted in Washington to get schools a supply of coal. No emergency exists.

Beat and demand added millions in the name of better schools, but no move to get even an extra hod of coal to keep the ones open which now exist.

Ain't that stumpin'?

Take-Home Pay Isn't All We Earn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, David K. Steenbergh, publisher of the Feed Bag, a national trade magazine, has written a timely editorial which was contained in the December issue of that publication. Mr. Steenbergh calls attention to an important matter so far as pay is concerned, and as part of my remarks I am including it at this point:

The eyes of the working world, which includes most all of us, are focused on take-home pay. The rate of pay per hour, gross wage per week or monthly salary no longer means anything. Withholding taxes and social-security assessments are simply classified as "deductions" and the worker no longer sustains any conscious responsibility toward meeting the constantly rising cost of government.

We do not believe this was the intent of Congress. It merely shifted the cost of collecting taxes from Government to industry. In so doing, however, it destroyed individual responsibility to Government and thereby made possible the vast spending spree of the New Deal and the Fair Deal, of FDR and Truman.

Historically, March 15 was established as the date for payment of all taxes due the Government on income received during the previous year. Imagine if you can, then, what would happen if all workers had actually received their gross wage or salary for 1949 and were now forced to scrimp, save, scrape, and borrow to pay their taxes by March 15, 1950. The hue and cry would quickly bring an end to reckless government spending, the New Deal and the Fair Deal notwithstanding.

Industry did not want the job of collecting income and social-security taxes for the Government. To do so has required the employment of thousands of additional bookkeeping and clerical workers with no saving anywhere, as the United States Treasury Department also now has many more employees. Emphasis on take-home pay rather than gross income has accelerated the demand for higher and higher wages and salaries. All this has boosted the cost of doing business and increased the price of all the things we buy.

This effect is bad enough but not nearly as serious as the resulting lack of responsibility to and for the Government. Taxes which do not pinch the individual pocketbook fail to impress the average worker. He sees no connection between his income—of which he considers only his take-home pay—and the rapidly rising cost of reckless and wasteful Government spending.

The really great men of our country have and are warning us that deficit spending is rapidly leading our Nation to bankruptcy. Deficit spending will continue, however, until the majority of our citizens realize the personal stake they have in the rising cost of Government and the staggering national debt.

As now collected, income taxes are hidden taxes. They were never intended to be and Government reform will not come until they are uncovered. If we are employers, let's explain their tax interest and its relation to Government spending and debt when we supply the withholding tax reports to our employees. If we are employees, let's examine our withholding tax report carefully and note what taxes we are paying as related to our actual earned income.

Take-home pay is important to all of us but how long can it be sufficient to meet our needs if the Government continues to take a larger and larger percentage of our earned income for unnecessary and wasteful expenditures at home and abroad.

DAVID K. STEENBERGH.

It's High Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we read and see quoted editorials from the New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Chicago Tribune, Kansas City Star, and other metropolitan newspapers. These editorials express certain opinions and receive a lot of attention. There is a feeling that these opinions are the last word in editorial comment because they came from the big papers. The small-town paper from Main Street is generally overlooked. I hope that my colleagues will read the following editorial coming from the pen of Byron L. Lehmbeck of the Meade Globe News. It is so typical of the way rural America is thinking these days.

IT'S HIGH TIME

All that stuff your mammy and pappy done told you about thrift and enterprise is just so much hooey.

If you don't believe it just review the rules of the great game "robbing Peter to pay Paul" that has been going on for years in this country.

For example, it has been and is the popular thing to berate, belittle, and damn the thrifty and enterprising. If you are a person that is a producer, one with initiative, resource, stamina, ambition, vision, perseverance, or with any of the other qualities that are necessary to get ahead you have been classed as being a conniver of the first order.

If you are a Paul, however, a person who has become indolent, shiftless, and careless you are classed as being the salt of the earth. You are the bright boy who has seen the light. You'll be taken care of from the cradle to the grave, and at Peter's expense.

The Pauls and those advocating that Paul be top man are making life rough for the Peters. The Peters are the ones who must work harder and longer to meet the many taxes and expenses imposed upon them.

But how long are the Peters—the person who trys to lay up something for a new car, a home, or to educate their kids—going to be able and willing to work to pay the Pauls? When, and if the Peters are forced or get tired and quit, it's going to be a sad day for all of us.

At the present time there is too much effort being made to discourage enterprise, thrift, endeavor, and planning by those who are able and willing.

As an old boy out in Utah recently summed the issue up, "The present course is like cutting down the fruit trees, one after the other, to make the fruit easier to pick. Soon there will be no trees—and no fruit."

It's time to make an about face. It's time to reward thrift, industry, and foresight. It's time to penalize shiftlessness, indolence, arrogance, and the desire—yes, demanded by the Pauls—of something for nothing.

It's high time the issue was clearly put: socialism versus freedom.

An Occasion for Great Pride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure in calling to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the Watsonville Register-Pajaronian.

We can all be thankful that the United States of America is still a working democracy.

AN OCCASION FOR GREAT PRIDE

We're about to bust our buttons with pride in our city today.

There was a real Vishinsky-type oration at the high school study hall last night.

Of the twenty-five-thousand-odd people who live in the Pajaro Valley, around 24,968 of them stayed home or went elsewhere.

But what makes us proud is this: this speaker, who hates the capitalist system and thinks Russia is just fine, was permitted to speak to anyone who wanted to hear him—without heckling, without violence, without demonstration.

In contrast to some cities like Peekskill, N. Y., whose citizens have made themselves notorious by senseless rioting against speakers they disagree with, Watsonville is a very bright spot indeed this week.

Not that we're asking for more of the same—but there's a valuable lesson for other communities in what happened, or didn't happen, Thursday night. These Stalin-

loving screwballs thrive on demonstrations, bans, and hecklers; they die for lack of audiences when they're let alone. Gerald L. K. Smith, the Christian Front rabble-rouser, drew big crowds in San Francisco when he was denied the use of public buildings and demonstrated against. When he was ignored, his appearances became a colossal flop.

We think the same thing will work here, just fine. Watsonville has preserved the right of free speech, which extends even to the right to be ridiculous. By so doing, it has tremendously strengthened the cause of democracy.

Our congratulations, therefore, and hearty thanks to the members of veterans' organizations and others who—like ourselves—are vigorously and unalterably opposed to Communist tyranny and dedicated to freedom and democracy. Their restraint and good judgment, in refraining from raising a fuss and making a martyr out of the speaker, have immeasurably weakened his cause and strengthened ours.

The fallacies expounded by Mr. Lohr during his speech are too numerous for rebuttal all at once. In fact, his words were so like those of other Communist apologists that they are entirely familiar to most of us, and carry their own rebuttal.

One familiar phrase made us prick up our ears: "the stench and rottenness of the system under which we are compelled to live." We're not sure just where Mr. Lohr came from. But even were he a native-born American, we're reasonably sure he isn't compelled to live in the United States. There should be little trouble in getting a passport for one of the "people's democracies" like Poland, China, or the Soviet Union, and hardly any compulsion to come back.

Another random thought, that came as we watched Mr. Lohr denounce our decadent democracy. Over his shoulder, hanging on the wall, was the American flag which guaranteed him the right to speak his warped thoughts.

How many citizens of the people's democracy of the Soviet Union, we wondered, went in automobiles last night to little Red schoolhouses, to hear a speaker freely denounce Stalin and praise capitalism?

There, we think, lies the overpowering strength of American democracy and freedom. There lies the answer to any speaker who prattles of the glorious freedom of Communist dictatorship.

The best way to insure ourselves against losing the fight against communism, we're convinced, is to let 'em pop off; reason their arguments out; and come to your own conclusion—would you rather live in a country where free men can speak their minds, even to the point of foolishness, or in one where an improper thought will send you to a Siberian salt mine?

The kind of good sense demonstrated by Watsonville citizens Thursday night is the best insurance that freedom will continue to exist.

Peekskill, N. Y., papers please copy.

Women Speak Out Against Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing concern on the part of the women of this country that Congress should not adopt a socialized-medicine program. A very interesting letter has just been received from Mrs. George D. Richardson, president, the City Federation of Women's Clubs of Brodhead, Wis. It is so pertinent and timely that I am including it as part of my remarks:

BRODHEAD, WIS., *January 16, 1950.*

Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: The City Federation of Women's Clubs of Brodhead, Green County, Wis., a group of 250 legally qualified voters, have delegated me to write you what we are thinking, and this is perhaps the consensus of most voters in the Middle West. Green County, with 26,000 intelligent citizens, is one of the richest and finest dairy and farming areas in the United States of America. We are nationally famous for cheese. We consider that there is a definite coal shortage in our area and we urge you to do something about the coal situation right now.

We also want to go on record as follows:

We definitely do not want socialized medicine.

We do not want Federal supervision of schools.

We do not want the Brannan farm program.

We do not want more taxes.

We would like to keep our liberties and not give up our heritage, our American way of life, by being asked to walk in the footsteps of countries where such methods have failed.

We deplore the tremendous governmental spending.

We do approve the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Some of our ancestors came to Wisconsin as early as 1670 and from that time on, without hand-outs, by their courage, ambition, integrity, perseverance, and pride of achievement managed to earn a living, then came comforts and prosperity, and we believe we can still carry on that program. Description of Green County, I know, was not necessary for you, Mr. SMITH. This is a copy of the letter sent to President Truman. Do you approve? If it meets with your approval perhaps a movement could be started among club women all over the State. Could you offer suggestions?

Now, should I be sent to the guillotine for this, please ship the remains back to Green County; at least, they will erect a monument saying, "She died trying."

Very respectfully yours,

LEONE RICHARDSON.

Flow of Foreign Oils Into United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, we in the oil-producing States are becoming increasingly concerned about the tremendous flow of foreign oils into the United States. The people of Texas—my own State—are being penalized in the sum of $30,000,000 in State revenues because these alien oils have taken so much of the domestic market. It is time that our Government take cognizance of the seriousness of the situation and provide protection to domestic producers, before domestic production is eliminated, because that is exactly what will happen unless action is taken. Then America will be a have-not nation with regard to petroleum. I urge my fellow Members to study the following statement in order to understand the gravity of the situation we are in.

THE PRESENT OIL SITUATION

Since World War II there has been a rapid development of the production of oil in foreign areas at a rate greater than could be absorbed by foreign markets. The resulting surplus has been an important factor in the following changes in the operations of the domestic petroleum industry.

1. Oil production: Domestic production, according to Government statistics, averaged 5,380,000 barrels daily during the last half of 1949. This was a reduction of 10.3 percent as compared with the same period in 1948.

2. Producing capacity: Domestic capacity under sound conservation practices averaged 6,380,000 barrels daily during the last half of 1949, according to authoritative estimates by industry experts. This represents an increase of 6.3 percent over 1948 productive capacity.

3. "Shut-in" production: The difference between capacity and actual production shows that the domestic industry was "shut-in" by an amount averaging 1,000,000 barrels per day or 17 percent during the last 6 months of 1949.

4. Oil imports: Imports of foreign oil during the last half of 1949 averaged 680,000 barrels, according to Government statistics. This was an increase of 23.6 percent over the imports during the same period of 1948.

5. Oil exports: Government statistics show that exports averaged 290,000 barrels daily during the last half of 1949, a decrease of 29.3 percent as compared with the previous year.

6. Oil producers' income: On January 1, 1950, the United States Department of Interior reported that the total income of domestic crude oil producers in 1949 was $507,000,000 less than in 1948.

Decreased oil activity in the United States and reduced income from oil production affect American labor, Federal and State tax revenues, the prosperity of hundreds of communities in oil-producing areas, and the income and general welfare of the Nation. The experience of the industry proves conclusively that a loss in income means decreased drilling activity and a lessened ability to maintain producing capacity to meet national oil requirements. As this takes place, the Nation shifts its dependence for oil supplies from thousands of domestic producers to foreign oil controlled by a few large oil concerns operating on a world-wide basis.

World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, at the request of Alan Cranston, president of the United World Federalists, I am including herewith a petition from various interested citizens in Palo Alto, Calif.

PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA,
January 1, 1950.

Believing that the achievement of a World Federation, with limited and defined powers, is essential to the preservation of the

peace and that the United States should take the lead in working to this end, we, the undersigned, citizens of Palo Alto, Calif., urge the Congress to pass House Concurrent Resolution No. 64, introduced last fall, which reads:

"Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that it shall be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

G. A. Casaday, minister, Congregational Church; Alfred Bunnell, attorney at law; D. J. MacLachlan, major, United States Army retired; Russel V. Lee, M. D.; A. Guerard, Professor Emeritus Stanford; Mrs. David Starr Jordan; Everett C. Thomson, pastor, First Presbyterian Church; Adron Beene, attorney at law; Byrl R. Saleman; Oscar F. Green, rector, All Saints Church; Grace R. Hellwell, librarian; A. Marvin Stuart, minister, First Methodist Church; Don Edwards, executive vice president, San Jose Abstract & Title Insurance Co.; W. Stanley Pearce, insurance agent; Andrew W. Spears, attorney at law; Charles E. Allen, assistant to the chairman, Hoover Institute; John H. Leeding; F. Danford Lion, minister, Unitarian church; Henry L. McIntyre, secretary - treasurer, United Helicopters, Inc.; Eugene Santschi, Jr.; Mary Curry Tresidder.

Information Relating to Federal Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, like many other Members of Congress I have received a great number of letters urging me to work and vote for the repeal of Federal excise taxes. Many persons do not realize the amount of Federal excise taxes and upon what items Federal excise taxes are collected at the wholesale level and at the retail level.

In order to apprise the people of the amount, nature, and extent of such taxes, I wish to quote the following from the December 2, 1949, La Salle Washington Letter, written by Harold K. Howe, manager of the Washington office of the La Salle Steel Co., which figures in the hasty check which I made, appear to be quite authentic. He states that the total excise taxes collected during the fiscal year of 1949 was $7,506,017,641.55. He lists the following items as those upon which Federal excise taxes are paid at the wholesale level:

Beer, wines, and distilled spirits, 75 cents to $9 per quart (plus special occupational taxes for brewers, distillers, wholesalers, and retailers from $25 to $250 per year).

Cigars, $3.50 to $30 per thousand.

Cigarettes, 70 cents to $1.05 per carton.

Oleomargarine, colored, 10 cents per pound; uncolored, one-fourth cent per pound (plus occupational taxes for manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers from $6 to $600 per year).

He then points out that he has ignored the taxes on narcotics, opium, and marihuana.

Playing cards, 13 cents per pack.
Lubricating oils, 6 cents per gallon.
Gasoline (Federal tax only), 1½ cents per gallon.
Tires, 5 cents per pound.
Inner tubes, 9 cents per pound.
Automobile and motorcycle accessories and parts, 5 percent.
Automobile truck chassis and bodies, 5 percent.
Other automobile chassis and bodies and motorcycles, 7 percent.
Electric power and light, 3½ percent.
Mechanical refrigerators, air conditioners, etc., 10 percent.
Radio sets and parts, 10 percent.
Matches, 2 cents to 5½ cents per thousand.
Sporting goods, 10 percent.
Photographic equipment and films, etc., 15 to 25 percent.
Firearms, shells, and cartridges, 11 percent.
Musical instruments, 10 percent.
Luggage, 10 percent.
Electric, gas, and oil appliances, 10 percent.
Phonograph records, 10 percent.
Electric light bulbs, 10 percent.

He also lists the following items as those upon which Federal excise taxes are paid at the retail level:

Jewelry, 20 percent.
Furs, 20 percent.
Luggage, 20 percent.
Toilet goods, 20 percent.
Admissions (movies, etc.) 1 cent on each 5 cents paid.
Ticket brokers, 20 percent.
Roof gardens, cabarets, etc., 20 percent.
Club dues and initiation fees, 20 percent.
Sugar, ½ cent per pound.
Telephone and telegraph service, 15 to 25 percent.
Safe deposit boxes, 20 percent.
Pipe-line transmission, 4½ percent.
Bowling alleys, pool tables, $10 each alley or table.
Coin-operated devices, $10.
Coin-operated gaming devices, $100 per year.
Passenger transportation, 15 percent.
Property transportation, 3 percent of freight paid.
Coal transportation, 4 percent of freight paid.

One may readily see that when people are demanding that they be freed from the paying of all Federal excise taxes they probably are demanding something which they do not really want and could never expect to secure.

One can readily understand that if $7,506,017,641.55 excise-tax revenue was eliminated that the national budget would be just that much more out of balance, and consequently, the reason for President Truman's approach in his annual tax message of a repeal of certain Federal excise taxes is quite proper and should be understood easily by everyone.

I have heretofore pointed out to many of my constituents that a number of the more burdensome Federal excise taxes placed on articles during the war period might have been repealed if the Eightieth Congress had done its plain duty to the people, and had not entered into an unholy alliance to relieve some of the big Federal income-tax payers of their proper share of the tax burdens.

In informing my constituents of this conduct of the Eightieth Congress, I said in part in a letter to them as follows:

I have received recently a number of communications in reference to the prospect of having Congress repeal the present burdensome excise taxes on everything but true luxury items, and I refrained from answering them until it had been definitely established that the first session of the Eighty-first Congress could do nothing about repealing these Federal war tax measures.

None of us would have been further plagued at this time by such taxes if the repudiated, Republican controlled Eightieth Congress had done its plain duty to the people and others who have been worried and burdened far too long by such Federal excise taxes.

Lest you might feel that the facts do not bear out my last statement I want to submit to you that when the Democratic controlled Congress passed the bill providing for wartime Federal excise taxes in the year 1943 there was a proviso in the bill that the collection of such taxes could not be made 6 months after the cessation of World War II hostilities. On December 31, 1946, His Excellency Harry S. Truman, President of the United States declared that hostilities had ceased. Therefore under the law passed by the Democratic administration in 1943, the collection of these Federal wartime excise taxes would have ceased automatically on June 30, 1947.

The Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress decided not to let this happen and rushed a bill through the House of Representatives in January of 1947 which bill was enacted speedily into law in March 1947 making these excise taxes permanent.

President Truman recommended to the Congress that this bill extend the excise taxes for 1 year only, for the purpose of making a study to determine if any of these excise taxes should remain law, but the Eightieth Congress was adamant and made these excise taxes permanent.

The record shows that on January 28, 1947, at page 692 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a vote by yeas and nays was taken on H. R. 1030, a bill to continue war excise taxes permanently, and it passed with the helpful votes of the Republican majority including the votes of all of the then four Republican Representatives from Nebraska.

The record shows further than on February 2, 1948, at page 926 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a vote by yeas and nays was taken on H. R. 4790, a bill to reduce individual income-tax payments and for other purposes, and it also passed with the helpful votes of the Republican majority including the votes of all of the then four Republican Representatives from Nebraska.

President Truman vetoed this bill, H. R. 4790.

The record then shows that on April 2, 1948, at page 4053 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a vote by the yeas and nays was taken to override President Truman's veto of H. R. 4790, and it passed also with the helpful votes of the Republican majority, including the votes of all of the then four Republican Representatives from Nebraska.

This information I hope brings the reader up to date on why he has been plagued and harried with Federal war excise taxes and who is to blame for same at this time.

This Republican strategy was not understood clearly for a time, but later it developed that they decided to make these excise taxes permanent so that they could pass an income-tax reduction bill which would enable many greedy and selfish people to prune some $5,000,000,000 a year from their then income-tax payments to the United States Government. These doings demonstrate how the reactionary Republican legislative mind functions. To give the rich relief they saddle some of their tax share onto the middle and poor classes of people, and then the budget balances; don't you see? I am sorry that you now find that you have been since March 1947, along with myself and other good Democrats and Republicans, a budget balancer for the rich people.

Of course to sugarcoat their financial pill they permitted 7,000,000 poor and ordinary taxpayers to get slight income-tax reductions so that rich taxpayers could get the lion's share of income-tax reductions.

What President Truman wants to do is put the income-tax saddle back where it belongs, so that some of these excise taxes may be repealed, but the reactionary Republicans have shouted No! No! No! for the past months in Congress, and have introduced a bill to repeal all of the excise taxes, but have made no provision for getting this much needed tax money from any other source. They want to heartlessly and heedlessly put the budget further out of balance by fooling the people who have to pay and put up with burdensome excise taxes into thinking that they are their friends and not their slippery thinking enemies.

I feel that President Truman's recent tax message to Congress was an excellent one and should receive the support of every Congressman who is endeavoring to be truly helpful in tax matters. I am sure that it will be interesting to watch the way that some Congressmen will respond to the President's sound and sensible approach to the elimination of some of the war excise taxes and the aid which will be given by them to find other proper tax sources so as to try to balance the budget.

A Permanent FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the fight now being waged for FEPC is best described by the text of a report by Walter L. Kirschenbaum, a delegate of the Greater New York Council for a Permanent FEPC, which is submitted herewith for the consideration of my colleagues:

Fellow fighters for civil rights: I was honored and privileged to represent this council in Washington, D. C. You can feel proud that those of us who represented the New York delegation gave leadership to the mobilization, and at times inspiration. I say this in all due modesty, in view of the great sacrifices that were made by the delegates and by those who arranged the mobilization.

There was a great deal in the press prior to our departure for Washington indicating that certain groups of political bigots were determined to take the mobilization over, and to use it for their own nefarious purposes. I think I can report here that the latter group suffered the worst defeat in the city of Washington since the retreat of the other redcoats in the War of 1812. By and large the vast majority of our fellow delegates from the other cities and States gave a vivid demonstration of faith in democratic ideals. All of us conducted our business, both in work sessions and on the Hill, in a spirit which threw the lie into the faces of the Ku Klux Klan, who said that we were a group of Communists, and we likewise threw the same lie into the faces of the Red Ku Klux Klan who had announced that they would take us over.

There is not a New York Senator nor is there a New York Congressman who does not know that his constituents are wholely in favor of FEPC, and, with few exceptions, we have received the assurances of our senatorial and congressional delegations that they will vote for an FEPC law.

Tomorrow what were merely skirmishes will blossom into full-fledged battle. The New York delegation has already told our Congressman that we expect every one of them to be in Washington tomorrow to vote against any change in the rules, and for them to be in Washington Monday, January 23, to vote for FEPC. We reaffirm that position here tonight. We shall reaffirm that position next election day should any member of the New York delegation fail to vote against the rules change and fail to vote for FEPC. The New York delegation in Washington helped weld together the forces of the fifty-some-odd organizations who sponsored the mobilization and who are dedicated, as we are, to that fundamental principle that civil rights in the United States for the Negroes, the Puerto Ricans, the Jewish, Catholic, Protestant, and other minority peoples must be matched by civil rights for everyone, everywhere in the world. We did not appease and we did not compromise with those who would qualify on the subject of civil rights.

The mobilization did not pass any resolutions because we did not come to Washington to write words—we came to Washington to write history. We did not speak from the floor to one another at the mobilization, but we went up to the Hill to speak to our congressional leaders and to make them fully responsible for the fulfillment of the President's civil-rights program.

Our mobilization spoke to the colonial peoples; spoke to the people behind the iron curtain; spoke to every man who has been turned away from a job because of race or religion or color; spoke to the student who is forbidden to enter a college or a university or a school because of race, color, or religion; we spoke to these people and to others and we told them that those of us who believe in civil rights and who will fight for civil rights have not forsaken them. We do not offer them demagogy; we do not offer them chauvinistic appeals, but we do offer them the handshake of friendship and the resolute determination of free men and women in fighting our battles in a democratic manner without fear and without compromise. It was with that spirit that the New York delegation went up on the Hill. We did not go meekly, but we went with determined spirit to get FEPC and civil rights passed, once and for all, and we will not relax in our determination.

In closing, I want to reiterate that the fight which we waged in but a few brief days was accomplished because it was led, not by those who have made civil rights a crusade for their own political party but because it was led by men and women, both young and old, both Negro and white, who have faith in democratic principles, and will never surrender to the racial bigots on the right or the political bigots on the extreme reactionary left.

Let it be clearly understood that the mobilization was not the property or the monopoly of any political party or any private organization, but was the collective efforts of all the ingredients that go to make democracy. It was a mobilization for human rights, and we in the New York delegation were proud to be part of that fight.

Ninety Percent of Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Farm Bureau is probably the largest organization of farmers in the United States. In Iowa there is a Farm Bureau organization, and an active one, in every county. Recently the Farm Bureau members of Lucas County, Iowa, met at an annual county meeting and on this occasion adopted a set of resolutions setting forth the position of the members of this county with respect to National and State issues.

I ask consent to extend my remarks and include the resolutions so that all Members of Congress may know the attitude of these progressive and leading farmers with respect to national issues and problems. The resolutions are as follows:

LUCAS COUNTY FARM BUREAU RESOLUTIONS

NATIONAL RESOLUTIONS

I. We believe there should be some type of price-support program and we favor 90 percent of parity with parity being adjusted in line with a 10-year moving average.

II. We believe that it is necessary to have the farm program developed through a bipartisan approach.

III. We believe it is important to keep control at a minimum.

IV. We believe a cheap food philosophy established in the minds of the consumer would be dangerous to the long-time interest of farmers.

V. We believe food and wages should be on a comparable ratio.

VI. We do not favor having the income of farmers dependent to a large extent upon the direct appropriations from Congress.

VII. We favor the use of compensatory payments in support of perishables. (Nonstorable commodities.)

VIII. We favor satisfactory compliance with soil-conservation practices to be eligible for price support.

IX. We do not favor abandoning the parity concept for the income-support standard plan.

X. We favor a voluntary prepayment health insurance plan.

XI. We favor increasing Federal aid for the construction of more hospitals.

XII. We favor more Federal aid for medical research.

XIII. We believe we should revise our health programs and adopt a county health unit program in Iowa.

XIV. We favor increasing Federal aid for training facilities for doctors.

XV. We favor the changing of mail routes so that the principles of free delivery become an actuality to all rural families.

XVI. We favor the establishment of a Federal agency for the purpose of setting up telephone cooperatives.

STATE RESOLUTIONS

I. We favor increasing the State aid up to 80 percent of the total cost of operating the schools on the need basis for the continuation of a better educational program for the benefit of the children of Iowa.

II. We recommend for your consideration the replacement of the present wool-purchase program by a "nonrecourse loan" or a "guaranteed advance."

COUNTY RESOLUTION

We believe that there are many miles of Lucas County roads that could be and should be annulled so that the money spent on these roads could be spent on unimproved roads that would accommodate many more families and get them out of the mud.

FARM BUREAU RESOLUTION

We favor the farm bureau continuing the high level of emphasis on the legislative and educational programs and increase emphasis on the service for member program.

Who Is Responsible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article entitled "Who Is Responsible?" from the January issue of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Railway Journal. This article will bring serious reflection to all those interested in railway safety.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?—A SHRIEKING STEAM-LINER, HURLING THROUGH THE NIGHT, LEAVES THE RAILS. THERE IS A CRASH AND DEATH VISITS WORKERS SLEEPING IN DILAPIDATED BOXCARS

On November 1, 1949, the Interstate Commerce Commission released their report on the investigation of the accident on the Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway which occurred near Grayville, Tenn., on September 9, 1949. In determining the cause, the Commission stated: "It is found that the accident was caused by a broken wheel."

Examination of the track structure revealed occasional kinks in the rail head throughout a distance of 11.2 miles. Inspection was made at Oakdale, 88.7 miles north of Grayville, and no indication of defective equipment was found. The train (second No. 58) was traveling approximately 50 miles per hour when the rear truck of the forty-fourth car was derailed. A short time later a general derailment occurred which literally demolished three of the extra-gang outfit cars standing on the spur track south of the station.

KILLED WHILE SLEEPING

A broken wheel on a car in transit in the majority of cases results in a derailment; but when it involves the death of a maintenance-of-way employee, sleeping in his outfit car, more than our curiosity should be aroused.

It was 2:04 a. m. and the extra gang workers were asleep when cars of the southbound train tore into the sides of their outfit cars. One would not have to be an eyewitness to the crash to imagine the wild confusion among those who were shaken by the terrific impact which ripped the ramshackle cars apart. Nerves of steel would hardly withstand the shock. Still in the cause of railroad progress thousands of workers have traveled and slept in such pitiful accommodations, all because the problem of human relations is assumed to be an equation not to be solved.

Management has always argued that the employees must get a good night's rest in order to perform their duties efficiently. We ask how this is possible when the records reveal several instances where outfit cars were reduced to rubble while the employees were sleeping. This occurred on the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway in June 1947 and again on September 9, 1949, at Grayville, Tenn.

Must every chapter of railroad progress be written with the blood of an employee who, through the negligence of others, becomes a martyr? Railroad workers are drilled in the theory "safety is of the first importance in the discharge of duty"; but if the employee is no longer on duty, is his care left in the hands of the Creator? The employee killed in the accident was just an extra gang laborer, but he was also a human being, and his death was unnecessary.

NEGLECT OF DUTY

We are unable to predict the intentions of the Southern Railway to remove all wooden under-frame cars from service in the maintenance of way department but the incident should serve as an inspiration toward that end. What occurred at Grayville cannot be termed an unavoidable accident, or act of God—it must be written in the records as neglect of duty.

It cannot be denied that the railroads have made great strides in their modernization programs and huge sums have been spent for new equipment. The expenditures for such rolling stock was of necessity, but in the end the revenues realized cushioned the initial cost. There is quite a contrast to the picture involving the welfare of the employees. Many roads are still clinging to the practice of permitting the penny to hide the dollar of efficiency in promoting the welfare of the employees. Every request for a wage increase or improved working conditions has been met with "rigorous opposition by the carriers. Human relations is an unproven theory and safety has definite boundary lines.

Volumes could be written of the efforts made by the representatives of the employees to obtain safe and suitable outfit cars. In practically every case management argued the cost first and then bolstered their arguments to prolong the issue of the impractical problem with which they were faced but unable to define.

In February 1947 the War Assets Administration offered for sale 871 special troop-sleeping cars at $2,880 each which were built by the Pullman Standard Car Manufacturing Co. There was also another type steel sleeper offered for sale at $3,780 each, as well as several hundred kitchen cars for $3,240. Every effort was made by our general chairmen to induce their management to purchase some of these cars for maintenance-of-way service, but only a few of the railroad companies saw fit to do so.

COSTLY LESSONS

It is not our intention to criticize the policy of any carrier but the managerial prerogative has in many cases been exercised to the detriment of the employee. Outfit cars with wooden center sills do not harmonize with Diesel locomotives and steel gondolas on roads with a streamline design. At Grayville, one maintenance-of-way employee was killed and two injured. There is one consolidation, three of the boxcar bootoy traps were damaged to the extent that they cannot again be placed in service. Experience is a dear teacher and the railroads evidently wish to learn the hard way.

Veterans Ladies' Auxiliary on Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following letter received from Ladies' Auxiliary, Veterans of Foreign Wars of United States, Sergeant Harold O. Young Post, No. 2394, of Melrose, Mass.:

LADIES' AUXILIARY, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF UNITED STATES,
SERGEANT HAROLD O. YOUNG POST, NO. 2394,
Melrose, Mass., January 20, 1950.

Congressman ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Whereas the American veteran in two world wars has defended the American free-enterprise system which has made possible the development in this country of the highest standards of medical care and the finest medical institutions attained by any major country in the world; and

Whereas, having experienced the shortcomings of impersonal, assembly-line medical care inherent in the form of Government-controlled medicine necessary in time of war, the veteran understands the dangers of imposing such a system permanently on the entire population; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would impose an unjust tax on the veteran's pay check for medical care to which he is now entitled free of charge as a reward for his service to his country; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would force a tax of 3 percent on the income of the employed veteran, rising to a tax of at least 6 percent within a few years, creating new financial burdens which would increase the costs of necessities of life and lower the standard of living for veterans and other citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Ladies' Auxiliary to Sergeant Harold O. Young Post, No. 2394, Veterans of Foreign Wars, does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control.

Respectfully yours,

MARY E. CONLEY, *President.*
EVELYN MACMONAGLE,
Secretary.

Elimination of Expensive Combination Loans to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a memorandum in opposition to the so-called combination loans to veterans. The memorandum

was prepared by Mr. Omar Ketchum, director of national legislative service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

The elimination of combination loans (Sec. 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944) has been recognized by Congress as imperative. The Administrator of FHA should coordinate his administrative procedures with the intent of Congress, as recently set forth in the housing legislation of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

MEMORANDUM BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO FURTHER COMMITMENTS BY FHA AND VA OF GI HOME LOANS UNDER SECTION 505 (a) OF THE GI BILL OF RIGHTS

I. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLE

A great injustice was perpetrated against the veteran on June 22, 1944, when section 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI bill of rights) was enacted into law along with an otherwise highly commendable and monumental piece of legislation. This particular section was inspired by well-meaning legislators who visualized it as a proper vehicle through which the efforts of veterans to purchase homes would be greatly facilitated.

In view of the Congressional intent for elimination of this uneconomical and burdensome section 505 (a) loan, as evidenced by provisions for such elimination in S. 2246 approved by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and H. R. 6070 approved by the House of Representatives; and further in view of the fact that in actual practice the operation of this section has been most unfortunate and costly to the veteran, further commitments by the FHA and VA involving its continued application should and ought to cease for the reasons herein set forth.

II. THE SECTION 505 (a) LOAN

Section 505 (a) of the GI bill of rights authorized the Veterans Administration to approve a second loan (actually a second mortgage) by a veteran to cover the remainder of the purchase price or cost of a home, or a part thereof, where the principal loan (first mortgage) had been approved by the Federal Housing Administration.

III. HOW THE SECTION 505 (a) LOAN PENALIZES THE VETERAN

(a) *It causes him to pay a higher interest rate for his loan*

The FHA-insured first mortgage carried an interest rate of 4½ percent plus an insurance premium of one-half of 1 percent or an effective interest rate of 5 percent. Lenders, logically, sought to insure the greater portion of the loan under FHA leaving the minimum for the VA guaranty, the interest rate for which was fixed by law at 4 percent. The exercise of the section 505 (a) loan therefore resulted in an increased interest rate to the veteran of approximately 6.5 percent over the straight GI loan of 4 percent.

(b) *It causes him to pay more in brokerage fees and other charges*

FHA-insured loans—remember, this is the greater portion of the veteran's loan—permitted certain brokerage and other charges which are not allowable on GI loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration.

(c) *It causes him to pay more in financing costs*

The section 505 (a) FHA-VA combination loan involving two mortgages results in double recording and notarial fees, title policies, and of course double appraisals.

(d) *It causes him to lose part of his $160 gratuity payment from the VA*

On an FHA-VA combination loan for the purchase of an $8,000 home, the VA guaranteed portion cannot exceed 50 percent of the total, or $1,600. Under the GI bill of rights, the VA makes a gratuity payment amounting to 4 percent of this, or $64, which is applied to payment on the loan. However, on a straight VA guaranteed loan for the full $8,000, the guaranteed portion is $4,000, and the gratuity payment is $160. Thus, the veteran loses $96 right at the start on the section 505 (a) FHA-VA combination loan.

IV. HOW HAS THE CONGRESS MET THE CHALLENGE OF THE SECTION 505 (a) LOAN?

On August 23, 1949, the House Committee on Banking and Currency reported favorably the bill, H. R. 6070, providing among other things for the elimination of the section 505 (a) loan. In its report to the House (H. Rept. No. 1296, p. 6), the committee stated:

"This existing authority for an FHA-insured first mortgage at 4½ percent interest plus the insurance premium, in combination with a VA-insured second mortgage at 4 percent results in an increase in the interest a veteran pays in excess of that provided for in the GI bill."

The House passed H. R. 6070 on August 25, 1949, including the provision to eliminate the section 505 (a) loan.

On August 11, 1949, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency reported favorably the bill, S. 2246 (companion bill to H. R. 6070), and in its report to the Senate (S. Rept. No. 582, pp. 52-53), the committee stated:

"Your subcommittee has found that the present second-mortgage type of home-purchase plan raises financing costs to the veteran at least 10 percent above the costs of a 'straight' 4 percent first-mortgage GI loan. This is true because of the higher rate of interest (4½ percent) and insurance premium (one-half of 1 percent) charged for the underlying FHA-insured first mortgage, because of duplication of costs and because of brokerage and other charges permitted on FHA-insured loans which are not allowable on GI loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. All of the veterans groups which gave testimony on the bill concurred in the desirability of eliminating this burdensome form of financing for veterans."

The bill, S. 2246, is on the Senate Calendar scheduled for consideration by the Senate upon the reconvening of the Congress in January 1950.

On October 25, 1949, Public Law 387, Eighty-first Congress, was enacted which extended FHA and FNMA authorization; and in addition provided an unlimited secondary market in FNMA for all GI section 501 loans where the original principal amount does not exceed $10,000 per dwelling unit. This, of course, should enhance the opportunities of veterans seeking a straight GI loan without the onerous aspects of the combination loan.

V. THE FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION AND THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION SHOULD HEED THE INTENT OF THE CONGRESS AND DECLINE TO ACCEPT FURTHER APPLICATIONS FOR SECTION 505 (a) LOANS

There is ample precedent for the Administrators to refuse to process further applications for combination FHA-VA loans.

The basic authority for the section 505 (a) loan (Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended) reposed discretion in both the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and by indirection the Administrator of the Federal Housing Administration as to the approval and processing of such loans. Such discretion is evident from the language used by the Congress in providing the basic authority:

"SEC. 505 (a) In any case wherein a principal loan, for any of the purposes stated in section 501, 503, or 504, is approved by a Federal agency to be made or guaranteed or insured by it pursuant to applicable law and regulations, and the veteran is in need of a second loan to cover the remainder of the purchase price or cost, or a part thereof, the Administrator, subject otherwise to the provisions of this title, may guarantee the full amount of the second loan: *Provided*, That such second loan shall not exceed 20 percent of the purchase price or cost: *And provided further*, That regulations to be promulgated jointly by the Administrator and the head of such agency may provide for servicing of both loans by such agency * * *."

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation recently announced that it would not approve further requests for loans to the Lustron Corp. despite the authority contained in existing law for such loans. The RFC was prompted in its decision by repeated statements made by Members of the Congress on the floor of the House of Representatives and before the House Banking and Currency Committee during the first session, Eighty-first Congress, evidencing an intention to inquire into the need for and the propriety of such loans. The RFC thereupon announced that it would heed the intent of the Congress in this respect, and refrain from exercising its discretion until the Congress noted a change in intent in this regard.

Regardless of this or any other precedent, the authority of an official of the executive branch to refrain from exercising a discretionary authority, even when the exercise itself is discretionary, is fundamental in our legal system. The Supreme Court of the United States has reiterated this doctrine repeatedly in denying petitions for writs of mandamus compelling an official of the executive branch to exercise a discretionary authority (55 Corpus Juris Secundum 220 and cases cited).

As there is no question as to the authority of the administrators to cease processing further applications for section 505 (a) loans, there remains but the decision and will of the administrators to so do. This, we submit, for the reasons set forth above, should and ought to be resolved in favor of the veteran home buyer; and we therefore urge that the Federal Housing Administrator and the Veterans' Administrator deny further applications from lenders for approval of section 505 (a) loans.

Respectfully submitted.

OMAR B. KETCHUM, *Director,*
National Legislative Service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Where Are We Headed and What Is It Costing Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent congressional recess, I had the opportunity to visit with my constituents in each of the 11 counties of the Eighth Congressional District of Iowa. They expressed grave concern over the high cost of government and almost everyone asked the same two questions: "Where are we headed in government?" and "What is it costing us?"

So that my constituents might have the facts regarding their share in the cost of government, I have prepared the following itemized statement showing the share of each individual county in the Eighth Congressional District of Iowa of the $42,439,000,000 spending budget proposed by President Truman for 1951. I also set out the cost of the national debt to each county of my district. The President estimates that the national debt will be $263,800,000,000 at the end of the fiscal year 1951. The cost to the counties of the spending budget is based on 1948 consumer income figures and the cost of the national debt to the counties is based on population estimates as of January 1, 1949, and per capita debt of $1,759. The following figures will give my constituents some idea as to their share in the cost of government under the Truman administration this year. It should also throw some light on their question of "Where are we headed in government?"

County	Share of fiscal 1951 Federal expenditures of $42,439,000,000	Share of Federal debt of $263,800,000,000 at end of fiscal 1951
Buena Vista	$4,736,000	$30,911,000
Clay	4,[illegible]	31,[illegible]
Cherokee	4,[illegible]	30,[illegible]
Dickinson	2,798,000	19,878,000
Ida	2,[illegible]	17,765,000
Lyon	3,[illegible]	20,[illegible]
O'Brien	4,[illegible]	30,[illegible]
Osceola	2,[illegible]	14,[illegible]
Plymouth	4,[illegible]	30,[illegible]
Sac	4,[illegible]	30,[illegible]
Sioux	4,[illegible]	[illegible]
Woodbury	27,[illegible]	184,870,000
Total	[illegible] 100	[illegible]

Substitute for FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] has offered a substitute for the administration's FEPC proposal which should appeal to all those who feel that in these desperate days in world affairs we should do all we can to create good will among our people. My colleague believes that the use of force by the Government between the employer and employee will not work. I agree with him in his fears.

In his approach to this difficult problem, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] has proposed that we rely upon conciliation and mediation as the method for achieving worthy objectives in employment. This proposal has been widely discussed and has attracted much favorable comment. As an example, I wish to call the attention of Members of the House to a syndicated column written by the distinguished newspaperman, Marquis Childs, which appeared in the Washington Post of Saturday, January 21. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpts from Mr. Childs' column:

The all-out adherents of the administration's fair-employment-practices law will, of course, denounce the substitute put forward by Representative BROOKS HAYS of Arkansas as milk and water. HAYS does not provide powers of punishment to be directed by the Federal Government against those who discriminate for reasons of race, color or creed in hiring and firing.

The HAYS substitute would set up a Minorities Employment Bureau in the Department of Labor. This bureau would be authorized to set up local, State and regional advisory councils to aid in carrying out a policy of nondiscrimination.

In other words, the reliance would be on education and persuasion. Any fair-minded person must admit to doubt as to whether prejudice can be legislated away by punitive powers exercised by the long arm of the Federal Government. On the other hand, we have let this matter of prejudice fester for a long time and the process of education is slow. One of the chief arguments for the administration measure is that without a stick behind the door there will be no progress.

Eleven States now have fair-employment-practice laws of one kind or another. As has been aptly said, the States are laboratories for testing legislation. It would seem to me that a wise preliminary move would be to canvass carefully the results that have been achieved. From what I have been able to learn, those States that have the power to punish employers have not used the punitive provisions.

Why is that so? Has any substantial progress been made in breaking down prejudice in employment? The answers to these and a number of related questions should be helpful to Congress.

Representative HAYS also has a substitute antilynching bill. It provides that where both the community and the State fail to take action when a lynching has occurred, Federal officials may go before a Federal judge and argue that the State has failed in its duty. If the judge finds this is true, then the Federal Government would take jurisdiction with authority to apprehend and try the lynchers.

It seems to me that these are both valid compromises that an honest man could vote for without any suspicion of evasion or face-saving. They both recognize that the power of law is limited, a lesson this country should have learned through the tragic experiment of prohibition when alcohol was presumably legislated out of existence.

The Real Issue This Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the battle is on. The issues are drawn. Union bosses are using their power to tax union members in order to collect war chests for the 1950 congressional elections. They state they propose to defeat labor's foes and elect labor's friends. That slogan sounds good, but when analyzed it simply means: Defeat any Congressman—no matter what his record—if he voted for the Taft-Hartley bill, and elect anyone—no matter what his qualifications—if he will promise to vote for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. Speaker, the scarcest thing in Congress today is not brains, it is courage, grit, backbone, intestinal fortitude, guts. And if the powers that be have their way—and by powers that be, I mean the leaders of organized labor—courage in Congress will be more scarce after the 1950 election. Make no mistake about it, that is the issue this fall.

This issue has been so well expressed by Samuel J. Kornhauser, of the Cleveland bar, in connection with the campaign of misrepresentation against Senator TAFT, that I include his article as a part of my remarks:

WHY LABOR LEADERS ASSAIL SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT

(By Samuel J. Kornhauser, of the Cleveland bar)

The struggle to unseat Senator TAFT, already moving toward its climax a year hence is no ordinary election campaign. On its result may hinge the future course of America.

The captains and kings of union labor are amassing resources and mustering their forces, the tumult and the shouting are in full cry. Men whose vision is not blurred by passion and prejudice, nor perverted by inordinate ambition, see in this savage onset a portent of disaster to our country. During more than 2 years much has been said and written for and against the Taft-Hartley Act, yet there is reason to doubt that the general public has an adequate understanding of the inherent implications of the issue raised, and particularly of the underlying motives which give rise to this strenuous opposition to Senator TAFT.

What, then, is it that has evoked the frantic ejaculations of these captains and kings of union labor? What is there in this law to justify the charge that it creates slave labor? What is there about Senator TAFT which should lead anyone to stoop to such slanderous epithets and innuendoes as have been hurled at him from places high and low?

TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

In the 2 years which have elapsed since the Taft-Hartley law became effective, not a single instance can be found of loss by workingmen of any right or privilege, designed for their well-being, which they previously enjoyed. Not only is freedom of organization, and protection against employer coercion, left unimpaired, not only is collective bargaining fully maintained, but they are in fact strengthened by the new legislation.

Even the prohibition of the closed shop did not remove the obnoxious practice which that term signifies, for the union shop may continue to exist under this law; and the difference between a closed shop and a union shop is merely the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee.

Employees, by resort to the union-shop indulgence, may, if they choose, still compel their employer to retain only union members in his service. This subterfuge makes union membership the price which a man must pay in order to hold his job. Further, the check-off, that is, collection of union dues and assessments by the employer through compulsory deductions from wages, which are paid over to the union officials—that invaluable contrivance by which union income is made secure—has remained without substantial alteration, and without lessening the grip of union leaders on the members.

THAT HAWK

Then, take all the sound and fury because of the anti-Communist oath required of union officials. How is the workingman injured because his union leaders are called upon to swear that they are not engaged in treason against the United States? A man elected President must take an oath to protect and defend the Constitution before he can serve in the office. Congressmen, judges, indeed all important public officials take a similar oath. Almost everywhere, directors of corporations qualify by swearing fealty to the Constitution of the United States, and to that of the State in which they perform their duties. An immigrant, to become a naturalized citizen, must forswear allegiance to any foreign government or potentate, and make oath to support our Constitution. Why, then, should any decent citizen complain when asked to manifest by solemn affirmation that he is not allied with Soviet Russia, nor with any persons whatever bent on overthrowing our Government by force or other unconstitutional or unlawful means?

UNTENABLE AGGRESSION

Moreover, during more than 2 years under the Taft-Hartley law union membership has increased, wages have been substantially advanced, and there has been no bar to strikes, which have occurred as usual whenever union leaders willed to call men out. Indeed, no conscientious labor leader has yet asserted that the workingman has in any respect suffered privation because of this law. And the outcry against it does not come from the wage earners themselves who are unable to see any difference in their status and opportunities since its enactment.

Recently Mr. Carey, national CIO secretary, subjected himself on the Meet the Press radio program to the incisive questioning of several well-informed, unhampered journalists. Mr. Carey was too honest to defend his opposition to the Taft-Hartley Act and to Senator TAFT by the usual claptrap about "slave labor" and hostility to wage earners. When cornered by persistent questioners, the only excuse he could give for advocating repeal of the law and defeat of Senator TAFT was that this legislation had "made it more difficult to organize labor in the South"—not generally, mind you, but only in the South. And though he was obliged to acknowledge that during the past 2 years union membership had increased even in the South, all efforts to elicit further comment and explanation brought forth nothing except constant reiteration of his original sterile answer. His inability to present even a vestige of tenable ground for his hostility to the law and the Senator made his performance a significant manifestation of the infirmity of the union position.

TRIBUTE TO TAFT

As to Senator TAFT, himself, it is acknowledged by unbiased men of all parties and interests, who know his facts, and are free to express them, that intellectually he has no superior, perhaps no equal, in the Senate, and that his character, courage, and patriotism rise to exalted heights. When Mr. Carey was asked if he believed that only Congressmen who supported the views and demands of labor unions should be elected, he quickly conceded that all shades of public opinion should be represented in the National Legislature. But when pressed to explain why, under that theory, the widely held opinions which Senator TAFT espouses should be deprived of his able voice in the Senate, Mr. Carey was entirely at a loss for an answer. He remained mute, and his silence was an abject confession that the ostensible objections to the Taft-Hartley law and to the Senator are a mere pretext.

THE REAL REASON

What, then, is the real reason for the frenzied resistance of Green, Murray, Lewis, and their collaborators to this law and its sponsor? They know well that the workingman has not been shorn of any legitimate privilege. The fact is that their envenomed attacks burst forth not because something was taken from union members, but because something of inestimable value to the rank and file was bestowed by the first steps taken to secure genuine self-government in labor unions.

These intrenched labor lords see in this law a serious threat to their continued autocratic domination. Though, in effect, the act does not presently reduce their vast power, they fear, and not without ample reason, that if the Taft-Hartley law remains, further legislation will surely follow which will thoroughly break their grip. There is your underlying reason

DEMOCRATIZING LABOR

The act goes but a short way toward democratizing labor organizations; but it is an entering wedge aimed at arbitrary dominion. It recognizes the principle that workingmen shall not be subjected to restraint and coercion from any source, neither from those who head industry, nor those who head labor. But what has most aroused the fear, and consequent hatred, of the labor lords is that section of the law by which it is sought to bring the internal operation of labor unions into the light. In this they see, as well they may, the greatest threat to their excessive power.

Here again, the law makes only a moderate and insufficient advance. Unions are required to file copies of their constitution and bylaws, to report the names, compensation and allowances of their three principal officers, the manner in which they were elected or appointed, the amount of initiation fees and dues levied, the qualifications and restrictions as to membership, the procedure relating to elections, assessments, imposition of fines, authorization of strikes, audits of financial accounts, and expulsion of members. Finally, they are compelled to file annual accounts of receipts, expenditures, assets and liabilities, and also furnish them to the members.

WHY THE ANGER?

Now, in all this there is nothing which should cause any untainted labor leader to fly into a rage. If their affairs are honestly and properly conceived and conducted, there is nothing to hide. Corporations are required to submit similar data, and more, and their stockholders are provided by law with ample means to make their will effective. But it is not these publicity provisions which in and of themselves disturb the labor leaders so greatly, for they impose relatively little restraint and, such as they are, can be easily evaded. What engenders their animosity is the realization that if this law stands it will be expanded until the hidden practices by which their arbitrary rule is maintained will be completely exposed to the view of the union membership and the public, and they well know that if this occurs they will be ousted.

If union members were supplied with indubitable proof that they were being victimized by their own officers, that they were being beguiled by crafty manipulations, pretense, and chicanery to elect chosen serving men of their leaders as officers and delegates; if they were shown the graft by which the insiders feather their nests, and the collusion between unscrupulous unionists and equally unscrupulous employers by which the loot is divided between them; if they were made safe against violence to themselves, their homes, their wives and children, so that they became free to speak and vote as they pleased, how long would they leave the Greens and Murrays and Lewises in the seats of the mighty? And a man like Carey could speak frankly and be unashamed.

REIGN OF TERROR

We talk glibly about labor being for this and labor being against that, when in point of fact it is the labor leaders, who, having herded the men under their sway, originate policies and make decisions, first and foremost to maintain power and profit for themselves. It is these labor lords, and not the great body of robust, right-minded American workmen, who inspired this crusade against Senator TAFT, and they resort to every available expedient to defeat him. It is their purpose to strike terror into the heart of every public official, to establish that no matter how honest, well-meaning and salutary the views and efforts of a man in office, or seeking office, may be, if he is against labor-union autocracy, he will be marked for inescapable slaughter.

And that is precisely what will happen if Senator TAFT becomes the victim of labor-leader vengeance. There is nothing in the law which bears his name which interferes with the legitimate functions of the honest union official; it strikes only at the guilty who, in turn, have selected him for conspicuous immolation to serve as a horrible example.

THE HOWL

Exploitation and rapacity are no less obnoxious whether they emanate from industrial barons or labor-union chiefs. It became necessary, in due course, to curb the unbridled power of captains of industry; now, it is equally imperative that arbitrary control by labor leaders, which is at once a menace to workingmen, to the public in general, and to American institutions shall be conclusively ended. Those institutions will perish unless we demolish the separate dominion in our midst which we have allowed to grow up and become formidable.

The election of Senator TAFT involves an issue which is not confined to the people of Ohio; it is a vital concern of the whole American people. So far as Senator TAFT, himself, is concerned, 25 years from now, it will matter little whether or not he retained his seat in the 1950 election. But for the babes of today who will then be men and women aspiring to rear families and to gain the satisfactions of a good life, for them it will be of the utmost importance what kind of America they inherit.

He's Fed Up With Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two letters to the editor of the Record-Herald and Indianola Tribune of Indianola, Iowa.

HE'S FED UP WITH DISPLACED PERSONS

FARMER BUILDS SWAN WRITES ABOUT HIS EXPERIENCES

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Several weeks ago the Record-Herald and Indianola Tribune was informed by Mrs. W. B. Schooler, our correspondent at Hartford, about a young married couple from a displaced-persons camp in Europe who had come to make their home with Mr. and Mrs. C. E. Hunt on a farm near Swan.

Before a reporter and photographer could find time to go to Swan to interview Mr. Hunt and his newly acquired farm laborers, it was learned that Mr. Hunt was not too well satisfied with the arrangement. Recently, after the couple had left his farm, Mr. Hunt

wrote a letter telling of his experiences with displaced persons.

The letter follows:

FERNDALE FARM,
C. E. HUNT & SONS,
IOWA, IOWA.

DEAR FRIEND DON: I am sending you my experience with a married couple from a DP camp in Europe. You may publish it.

Last February, I wrote the C. W. S. (Church World Service) at New York City giving my assurance and asking for a farm or country boy of 16 to 18 years of Protestant faith willing to come to an Iowa farm, willing to work and live with us as a member of our family. That it was our wish and intention, as soon as he was capable, for him to rent the farm. Until such a time, we expected to furnish every requirement the same as a son. I guess I wanted and expected a Sam Jober. C. W. S. thanked us for our assurance.

The first of July we received a letter from a young woman of 24 and a newly acquired husband, 26, telling us they had signed our assurance. They were in Bettle DP camp, United States zone, Augsburg, Germany, where they had been for 4 years. Frankly, we thought our prayers had been answered. They arrived here October 2, when the oats and maples were at their best. The weather perfect, and with Iowa's wonderful crop everywhere. We welcomed them with open arms. A fine chicken dinner with everything to ice cream and angel food cake. They had cost me $115. We never got one "thank you" nor heard a single word of gratitude for America in all the 8 weeks they were with us. They spoke Russian when together, yet they could write and read German and she could speak it very well.

WOULD RUIN US

We extended the same proposition to these folks, to live with us 1 year, board free, that I would build a new home for them next summer and I expected them to work out the $115. Beginning January 1, they were to start sharing the income of the farm, one-fourth of calves, we had 25 females, one-fourth of pigs, one-fourth of crops off the farm, less one-fourth of seed and gasoline, I to furnish everything. Also they were to have half the cream after groceries were bought. We expected to work along with them for at least 1 year.

The first week they could do very little since they were not farm folks and had not lived in the country. The second week we got some services, but we had discovered they had no intention whatever of becoming farmers and signed our assurance only to get to America. The third week we got very little work from them. They had become so disagreeable, insulting, even to calling me a liar when I told them I had paid $30 for their baggage and living from New York. They were large, robust and did not look like they had been hungry in their lives nor had seen a hardship. He was 5 feet 2 inches and weighed about 185. They complained of farm work, that it was ruining their health and that they would not do such work—and believe me they did very little. We always had to call them to get up; and several mornings she lay in bed while my wife prepared breakfast. They had good clothes. Her dresses were of velvet and several of them woolen. She had five pairs of good shoes that we saw, a new blue raincoat, sweaters, and so forth. They told me they had no money except $4 of the $20 I sent to C. W. S. for them, yet I am told they cashed an $80 postal money order the day they left, which was just 3 weeks after coming.

REMOVED SEVERAL ARTICLES

America does not want such people and I shall regret to my dying day that I gave an assurance. That was used only as a means to get to America. They had lived some 4 years in this displaced-persons camp provided by the generosity of America, three square meals every day, a bed at night, with no cost and very little work required. They, like many others, were fed up on "Rich America." They expected big wages, short hours with no manual labor.

They told us they wanted $1.50 per hour or $150 per month with board, and that they would buy a fine American car in 90 days, the only thing they seemed to want. The more you give people, the more they want and expect. It destroys their backbone and leaves a wishbone. I am wondering when the United States is going to wake up to this fact.

Sincerely,

C. E. HUNT.

Mr. DON BERRY,
Indianola Tribune.

DEAR SIR: Just finished reading the letter account of the DP couple that the Mr. Hunt was so generous with and can't resist commenting.

We never know just why some folks are so generous to someone with a sad story from across the sea; no doubt they do have every intention of doing a very fine and noble deed.

Being the mother of a son who paid almost all for our right to keep this America a fine place to live with a 70-percent lifetime disability at Pearl Harbor, and a husband who earned a DSC in War I, having myself cared for four motherless boys besides my own family of seven during the war so their daddies could go into uniform, I can't understand why Mr. Hunt or any other Iowa farmer would seek someone needing aid across miles of ocean, when these same men who wore their shoes full of mud for days, went hungry, sick, gave up their families and homes so we here, yes, in Warren County, Iowa, we at home were safe and sound by these fine boys, the same boys, lots of them, have never had the chance offered them to get a start that was given this family from across that did nothing for us.

The past year I have been working in a large company in Des Moines that has taken in many of these DP's. I have never heard one yet say, how wonderful, how grand to live here. They complain how dirty, how hard, little pay, on and on, wish they were in Chicago, or back in New York, one told me he hoped to go back across in 2 years. Can't we find deserving folks in our own State? Yes; I think in our own Warren County.

MRS. ARTHUR CLARK,
Warren County Democratic Vice Chairman.

P. S.—This all brings to my mind a request of wartime for farmers to take Japanese into their farm homes and relieve their own sons to go to the front. We were asked to take such. Please don't ask for the terms of my answer. Soon after, I attended church. There sat an able-bodied Jap, who had come to live in a sonless family, while my son, along with many others just as fine, had gone to make it fine and grand for someone whose grandfathers surely had not been pioneers of this good old United States. A healthy by war free man, in the seat my son, as treasurer of that Sunday school, had given up to go to war.

Let's take care of our own first.

Our Departing Hat Shops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Boston Daily Record of January 23, 1950. Here is a succinct and cogent statement of what threatens New England jobs and New England prosperity and ought to give pause to those who favor reciprocal trade extension at least without the peril-point provision. The editorial follows:

OUR DEPARTING HAT SHOPS

It's no secret that bureaucrats have short memories, particularly when scant recollections are convenient for them, but hardly anybody expected them to forget the wrecking of the New England shoe industry so soon.

Before the war the so-called reciprocal trade treaties, which were reciprocal mainly in former Secretary Cordell Hull's imagination, exported the Lynn and Haverhill shoe business to Japan and Czechoslovakia and caused ruinous unemployment.

Later Japan waged war against us, using the dollars she piled up through our senseless generosity, and Czechoslovakia slipped behind the iron curtain, where she can scarcely be regarded as a boon companion for Uncle Sam.

Ignoring all this now, the bureaucrats in Washington are busily engaged in an even more nonsensical program calculated to set up various European countries in the hat-making business—at American expense, of course.

The United Hat, Cap, and Millinery Workers and other labor organizations are understandably incensed, since they don't relish the possibility of eating in bread lines while the British and other people are tasting the caviar of prosperity.

Maybe this latest exportation of New England jobs will stir our Senators and Congressmen, especially the ones who gave the reciprocal trade idiocy an extended lease on life.

But don't expect too much from them. It's your job that's threatened. Theirs are safe for a year at least.

Brinks Robbery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of January 22, 1950:

ROBBERS AND RICHES—CRIME STORY OF LAST WEEK USED TO POINT MORAL OF WEALTH NO THIEF MAY TAKE AWAY

(By the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Litt. D.)

Audacious and cunning thieves are loose in the land. The entire Nation is aghast at a sensational robbery which, in the huge loot snatched and made away with, involves the greatest amount of currency ever to be thus bagged at one haul. A million and a half dollars is an immense amount to fall into the hands of desperate connivers who defy the laws of God and man. The alerted armed constabulary symbolizes the Nation's grim determination to track down robbers and other criminals and to enforce law and order. That network of detection suggests wealth that always is in danger of being filched from its rightful owners and appropriated by those whose twisted moral sense brands them as public enemies.

But there is another armed representative of We, the People, who ceaselessly paces to and fro at his marble post and who speaks of a national heritage whose opulence no scheming robber can molest. That lonely figure silhouetted against the storied stones of Arlington is not there to prevent thieves from confiscating the mammoth block of flawless marble or disturbing the last rest of a soldier known only to God. It was for visions that the unknown warrior fell, and upon such treasure can be put no mark of the dollar.

An astounding robbery such as has captured the headlines this past week brings to vivid remembrance wealth that is in no danger of being so confiscated. In the immortal Pilgrim's Progress, John Bunyan deals with deathless experience which the passing years never can outmode or outdate. There we come upon Mr. Little Faith, who was held up by highwaymen in Dead Man's Lane. Poor Mr. Little Faith. It seemed, as one looked at him, that the thieves had taken everything that they could get their hands on. As a matter of fact, they had. But the remarkable things about that hold-up was that when the victim recovered his senses and was able to investigate the extent of his loss he found that his assailants had taken only his spending money: "The place where his jewels were they never ransacked. So these he kept still." Highwaymen can do little to disturb the inner peace of a man like that, who finds his jewels still intact even though his spending money has been snatched from him. Not in our marts of trade nor in our guarded vaults are the symbols of our highest wealth.

In this Capital City, set on a high hill of hope in the gaze of the whole world, on Mount St. Alban's is the expanding and rising Cathedral of St. Peter and St. Paul.

St. Peter, who had heard uttered the Master's great word about riches that moths and rust and thieves cannot touch, long afterward in writing to the scattered and persecuted Christians spoke of the inheritance that is incorruptible and that fadeth not away. And St. Paul has a great word regarding that wealth not reachable by robbers' hands. Having suffered the loss of all things, he, too, wrote to an infant church. The letter was penned when he himself was a prisoner in Rome. Judged by all the commercial standards of Corinth, the members of that church were paupers. Their names were not in the Who's Who of the city. Yet it was to them that Paul wrote, "All things are yours." For, he assured them, in substance, you can claim the past with all its great names. They all belong to you. You can claim the world with all its entrancing beauty. You can claim life with all its unfolding and enlarging capacities. You can claim the present and transform even a cup of pain and loss into a chalice of victory. You own the future. You can even claim death, for it is but your servant to usher you into a glory that eyes cannot see or mind conceive.

That indeed is a great passage about riches and robbers.

In lilting verse the story is told of the robbers who came to rob a wealthy man. They picked the locks of his palace gate. They seized his jewels and gold and priceless ornaments. All this was taken by the robbers who came to rob him.

"But loud laughed he in the morning red,
For of what had the robbers robbed him?
They robbed him not of a golden shred.
Of the radiant dreams in his wise old head.
And they're welcome to all things else, he said,
When the robbers came to rob him."

The Late Gen. H. H. Arnold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by Paul A. Johnson, of Denison, Iowa:

"The difficult, we do immediately, the impossible may take longer" was the motto that was above his desk in his Washington office. Those young men that flew to win a war for their country worshiped. Gen. "Hap" Arnold as much or more than they had their athletic coaches they had played under in school.

He remembered these fellows. They were individuals to him, not mere cogs in a war machine. When our son graduated at the Victorville school, General Arnold was there and presented the pilot's wings to the graduating class. Among the prized letters in the memory book we have of Bob is the letter sent us. It may have been one of the difficult things he felt had to be done, sending letters to the parents of those young men that gave their all. Reading this letter again we know why Bob thought he had a commander that could do the impossible.

Part of it was as follows: "It is with regret that I have learned of the untimely death of your son First Lt. Robert Allen Johnson on December 7 in an engagement in the North African theater of war operations. While a cadet in the Victorville Army Flying School he attained a fine record. As an officer he repeatedly demonstrated courage and trustworthy performance of duty winning the praise of his superior officers and the friendly respect of all who knew him well."

Written in the midst of his most busy and trying time, this letter did help some to soften the blow of knowing that our son would not return to us.

We will not forget General Arnold and his kind words.

Our Blunders in War Built Russia's Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edward J. Meeman from the New York World-Telegram of January 21, 1950:

OUR BLUNDERS IN WAR BUILT RUSSIA'S POWER—ERRORS MADE SOVIET STRONG ENOUGH TO SWALLOW BALKANS AND CHINA

(By Edward J. Meeman)

When Hitler attacked his ally, Stalin, in 1941 the Scripps-Howard newspapers said editorially:

"When crooks fall out, justice is the gainer. "It was the 'treaty of friendship' signed by those two bloodthirsty and power lustful dictators in the summer of 1939 which kindled the flames that swept across Poland, Finland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France, and the Balkans, and subjected the British people to inhuman assault.

"It will be poetic and moral justice if Hitler and Stalin are now consumed in the conflagration of their own making.

"They are both enemies of our way of life. They have both maintained in this country fifth columns of agitators, propagandists and saboteurs, seeking to destroy the unity and security of the American people.

"These two dictatorships by force and terror have extended their conscienceless rule over hundreds of innocent people. The fact that they have fallen out over the loot before their conquests were completed is a great break for our friends of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and a great break for us.

"While our enemies, the Nazis and Communists, are fighting each other, let's redouble our efforts to produce guns and tanks and planes and bombs for the British—and redouble our efforts to make our own defenses impregnable."

That was a realistic appraisal of the situation.

But the makers of American foreign policy forgot realism. They forgot that Soviet Russia was our enemy and did not cease to be when Hitler attacked her.

So the result of our tremendous expenditure of men and resources was not victory. The result was simply to destroy one enemy and make the other stronger.

Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times, is writing a history of World War II. In preparation for it he is recounting "Our Worst Blunders in World War II," in articles in the Atlantic Monthly for January and February. He says:

"There is no doubt whatsoever that it would have been to the interest of Britain, the United States, and the world to have allowed—and indeed encouraged—the world's two great dictatorships to fight each other to a frazzle. Such a struggle, with its resultant weakening of both communism and nazism, could only have aided in the establishment of a more stable peace. It would have placed the democracies in supreme power in the world, instead of elevating one totalitarianism at the expense of another and of the democracies."

Out of the great misconception that Soviet Russia had become our friend grew many blunders.

Of these, Mr. Baldwin puts "unconditional surrender" first. He says:

"In the First World War Wilson took care to distinguish between the Kaiser and militaristic Junker class and the German people. The opportunity of driving a wedge between rulers and ruled * * * was muffed by Roosevelt and Churchill. Unconditional surrender was an open invitation to unconditional resistance, it discouraged opposition to Hitler, probably lengthened the war, cost us lives, and led to the present abortive peace."

Another major blunder was in not invading Europe through the Balkans, rather than western Europe. Had our armies been in central Europe we would not have lost those lands to the Reds and found ourselves later pushed around in an isolated Berlin. Says Mr. Baldwin:

"Russia had to have our help; we did not to the same extent, require hers. * * * In retrospect, how stupid we were. A man being strangled to death struggles with all that's in him: Russia could not quit.

"In the same manner and for much the same reasons we reversed the policy we should have followed in the Pacific war. Instead of recognizing that Russia * * * would have to participate in that war if she was to serve her own interests, we 'bribed' her to enter it."

And so we invited Russia to start taking over China. We sacrificed the very thing

that caused us to send an ultimatum to Japan—the freedom and independence of China.

Yet some people still think Roosevelt and Truman led us to victory and peace.

Strikes in Potash Plants Threaten Massachusetts Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following letter from the Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation calling attention to a scarcity of potash available for Massachusetts farmers in fertilizer needed for the spring producing season by reason of pending strikes:

MASSACHUSETTS FARM
BUREAU FEDERATION, INC.,
Waltham, Mass., January 18, 1950.

Representative ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GOODWIN: All users of commercial fertilizer in Massachusetts are gravely threatened by the fact that we have almost no potash available for the spring producing season.

Potash is one of the three major ingredients of every commercial fertilizer. It is necessary for our pasture lands and vital to the growing of all fresh vegetables. The importance of the quality and nutritional values of foods produced with a lack of potash can and will adversely affect public health. We cannot get potash because there are strikes which have been going on since November 10 in the three potash companies in Carlsbad, N. Mex., which produce practically all of the potash used in New England and 85 percent of all the potash consumed in the United States. These three plants operate on a 24-hour-day basis at the full capacity of their facilities. Every day that they have been on strike and every day that they continue to be on strike has lost for us forever that day's production and we need every bit of production that was possible for them to put out. If there is no other way to protect the American public, the Taft-Hartley Act must be invoked.

This is one of the most serious things that has come to my attention in a long time and I ask you to do everything in your power for the time is growing painfully short.

Respectfully yours,

CARLETON I. PICKETT,
Executive Secretary.

China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor which appears in the January 1950 issue of the American Federationist which is the official monthly magazine of the American Federation of Labor.

I think it is most heartening that the leader of this important labor union, of which I am a member, should express himself so forcefully, so eloquently on a matter of such grave importance to our national security and to world peace. He makes it clear beyond the shadow of a doubt that, as a leader of the American Federation of Labor, he understands far better than does Mr. Truman the true nature of the Communist challenge. President Green is well aware of the threatening implications of the conquest of China by Stalin's Communist agents. I hope that my colleagues will ponder the full meaning of his words, bearing in mind that he speaks for many millions of the working men and women of our country. Our Department of State is supposed to provide leadership. It is their function to anticipate trouble rather than simply to act after the trouble has occurred. In this instance the trouble is hard upon us and still they are doing nothing. This editorial constitutes additional evidence that once again the people of America are way ahead of Mr. Truman and the State Department in understanding the great issue which confronts us.

CHINA

Stalin has carried out the plot against China which he initiated at Yalta. The concession which Stalin won at Yalta gave him Manchuria and a foothold in China. He has moved steadily and relentlessly ahead until now Communist troops control China with her 475,000,000 people. With possession of this heartland of Asia, Stalin can expand in any direction. His position is well-nigh impregnable. Formosa is still left—the key to attack on the Philippines, Japan, and our own west coast.

There were those who told us Chinese Communists were different from those of Moscow—that they were "agrarian reformers." But now we see their leader Mao responding to the call to Moscow and received with greatest ceremony. He is being integrated into Moscow control.

With immense territories in eastern Europe and in north and eastern Asia, Stalin has achieved what czars, Napoleon, and Alexander the Great dreamed of, as he moves toward world dominion. Wherever he rules he sets up a regime which is in exact contradiction of what we have called progress for the past 2,000 years. Individuals do not count. There is no freedom and no personal rights. Each must conform to the pattern which Stalin approves or go to concentration camps or a quicker road to death.

The people of China have been friends of the United States for many years. They have come to our schools, lived among us, worked with us to learn our way, but they have never come here as spies to get from us the means to injure and betray us. They are weary of wars that have wasted their land, their substance, and their people. Without modern arms, Chinese Nationalists were unequipped to meet Communist armies in combat. Communist armies, led by Stalin's agents and generals, now are in control of much of China and are poised for southeast Asia, which holds resources invaluable to our economy.

We face the issue of political recognition of this government by conquest or nonrecognition because we do not approve for moral reasons. We have had experience with appeasement and have learned that it eventually costs millions of lives. We have also refused to recognize other governments which failed to conform to our ideas of human justice and welfare.

There are at stake grave moral issues. Nationalist China was one of the five major world powers which underwrote the United Nations Charter. One of the purposes of that organization is "to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples."

Can we honorably recognize a government set up by aggression instituted and led by the agents of a foreign government? Our last convention included in a program for action to help China the following: "Have our Government give all-out support to the Chinese delegation to the United Nations in its effort to have the United Nations investigate and pass judgment on the Russian role in (a) fostering and financing civil war in China against the legitimate government recognized as such until a few days ago by all nations including Russia itself, in (b) flagrantly flouting its solemn treaty obligations in China, and (c) deliberately endangering world peace."

The least that we can do for a great people—the Chinese people—is to refuse to recognize the government set up by Russian aggression and conquest.

The House Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, by 53 votes, the House of Representatives defeated a reactionary proposal which, if passed, would have had the effect of choking the wishes of the majority. The resolution was an autocratic attempt to keep controversial issues from reaching a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives. It is incomprehensible that so many members voted in favor of this curbing resolution.

My vote, naturally, was against this attempt of the House Rules Committee, supported by many Republicans and southern Democrats, to restore its old power to pigeonhole legislation.

For many years, this method of bottling up legislation has been a major impediment of true democratic method. It was repealed in the first session of the Democratic Eighty-first Congress and was hailed as a major step in improvement of parliamentary processes. The attempt to return to the antiquated practice was repulsed by the Democratic Party.

It is to be fervently hoped that the House of Representatives will never return to this system which kept Representatives from performing their legislative duties in an unimpeded and democratic manner.

Oleo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of January 22, 1950:

OLEO'S MAJOR VICTORY

The Senate's overwhelming vote for repeal of Federal taxes on oleomargarine is a victory for the housewives of the country as well as for a long-oppressed industry. There is no way of knowing just how much influence the "housewives' revolt" had on the final vote in the upper House, but it must have been considerable. For the consumers of margarine who resented being forced to work yellow coloring into their oleo because of the punitive 10-cent tax on factory-colored margarine have become increasingly articulate in recent years.

The oleo forces included other resentful and powerful groups, too, not the least of which were the farmers whose cottonseeds and soybeans provided the oils from which the butter substitute is made. The oleo-butter fight long since had ceased to be a war between farmers (of the dairy variety) on the one hand and processors of animal fats on the other—as it was more than half a century ago when oleomargarine was compounded largely by packing-house byproducts. In recent years the fight found farmers ranged against farmers, with the vegetable-oil farmers rebelling against discriminatory taxes imposed on margarine for the protection of dairy farmers from competition.

First the House and now the Senate have recognized the unfairness of the restrictive Federal taxes on margarine and have, in effect, restored free competition to the field of butter and butter substitutes. There are minor differences to be adjusted between the House and Senate bills, but, in the main objective, they are alike. Withdrawal of Federal taxes does not mean that the fight for complete emancipation of oleo is entirely won, however. Sixteen of the States still outlaw the sale of yellow margarine, as compared with 32 States in 1901. Five States abolished yellow-margarine bans in 1948 and four more States lifted restrictions last year. The winning of the margarine fight in Congress no doubt will spur the campaign to remove all State restrictions of an unfair nature. That will be a happy day for all who believe in free competition between dairy and other farm products.

Final Chapter in American Treachery Against Wartime Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sarasota Herald-Tribune of January 12, 1950:

WHERE IS AMERICA'S PRIDE?

Formosa, if Secretary of State Dean Acheson has his way, will go down in infamy as the final chapter in American treachery against our wartime ally, the Republic of China. Despite the death and suffering of thousands of Americans who fought for China during World War II, despite the millions of dollars supplied by our taxpayers, and despite the pledging of American support to the Chinese Government, the leftists in our State Department and other Government departments have succeeded in undermining Chiang Kai-shek and aiding the Communists in their conquest of the vast portion of the world's land and population that is China.

Those Sarasotans and other Americans who fought in China know that the Chiang government was far from perfect. But they also know how close Chiang came to unifying the war-lord-ruled provinces and of the valiant fight for year after year against the Japanese invaders. They know how supplies destined for China's defenders were diverted to the Communists by our State Department and General Stilwell, the American commander in Asia. They know that while our own pilots were dying to fly supplies over the Hump, while our soldiers were suffering disease and hardship to advise Chinese combat troops, the State Department was lauding the Communists as agrarian reformers and Stilwell was saying that he wished he could shoulder a rifle with the Communist troops.

The full story of America in China is a sordid one, despite the glorious chapters written by General Chennault and our other fighting men. It is a story that other governments which we seek to hold as allies are sure to read and study. They will learn that American and British leaders, without even consulting China, bargained away to Russia at the Yalta Conference huge areas of China's territory including Manchuria. They will read that to force Chiang to take Communists into his government, our leaders withheld ammunition for the guns we had furnished China as an ally.

Now, unless the arguments of the Joint Chiefs of Staff win President Truman's favor over those of dapper, appeasement-minded Secretary Acheson, the world will read that we are finally to desert Chiang and abandon the rich island of Formosa, because the Communists "might want to attack it." Perhaps the world will see a parallel to the case of Mihailivitch, of Yugoslavia, who was honored as a hero for a while in our Government propaganda, and then abandoned to execution by the Communist leader, Tito. With the record in view, can we expect the leaders of India, Indonesia, and other nations in the path of Communist world expansion, to align themselves with us? Can we expect them to take refuge from the Red firing squads behind our promises?

We should by now have learned from Munich, from Yalta, from Berlin, that appeasement is simply surrender by installments. We should have learned that our only victories in the cold war with Russia have been won when we stood our ground and displayed our force.

Formosa is a vital link in our defense lines from the Philippines and Okinawa to Japan. It lies a hundred miles off the China coast, readily defensible. It was liberated from the Japanese by American forces, and our legal position in defending it would be clear. The line must somewhere be drawn against the Communists in Asia. Our national honor and our security require that the west boundary of Formosa be on the American side of that line. If we clearly announce to the world that the American Navy and Air Force will prohibit passage of invasion troops across the Straits of Formosa, that warning will be respected.

Rather than casting aside Formosa and our allies of so many years, we should cast out the appeasers and the Communist sympathizers of our Government who are nullifying the victories won by the courage and sacrifices of our armed forces.

Iowa Newspaper Comments on Arizona's Fantastic Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the interest of other States in the water controversy between Arizona and California has been aroused by the discussions over the proposed Central Arizona project. The Mason City Globe-Gazette under date of January 2, 1950, has an editorial entitled "A Fantastic Project," which in my opinion is an appropriate title and designation of that project. The editorial reads as follows:

A FANTASTIC PROJECT

Two bills which will be before the next session of Congress will have slight favor if our Senators and Representatives take the time to examine their nature. One is S. 75, the other H. R. 934.

These companion measures would authorize an irrigation project in Arizona at an outlay out of Federal funds of at least $738,000,000, or a cost per acre of $1,856, 11 times the average of other western irrigation projects.

Nor is that the whole of the story.

The project would give to 420 large land owners benefits averaging $550,000 each. It would not open public land for entry and development by veterans and other worthy Americans.

Plans call for lifting water from the Colorado River a total height of 805 feet. Incidentally, it would deprive Californians of water to which they are entitled under existing Government contracts.

The proposal has every appearance of being a scheme for bringing enormous benefits to a few Arizona land owners at the expense of the Nation's taxpayers. The deal should be nipped in the bud.

State Department Hypocrisy or What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star of January 17, 1950:

HYPOCRISY OR WHAT?

Secretary of State Acheson must have a short memory. Either that or his recent

restatement of United States policy on China is a barefaced piece of self-righteous hypocrisy.

Acheson, who now says, "Anyone who violates the integrity of China is the enemy of China," was Assistant Secretary of State 5 years ago when the United States, Russia, and Britain signed the Yalta agreement. That agreement violated the integrity of China.

Acheson today proclaims that as the second basic rule of United States policy we must "keep our own purposes perfectly straight, perfectly pure, and perfectly above board." But the Yalta agreement secretly violated the rights of China, an ally in the war against Japan, as a bribe to Russia, a nonbelligerent.

Was it pure and aboveboard to make concessions at China's expense, behind the Chinese Government's back, and then promise President Roosevelt would take measures to obtain the concurrence of Chiang Kai-shek so that the claims of the Soviet Union would be unquestionably fulfilled?

And on what were those claims based? On crystal Russia's violation of Chinese territorial integrity in the latter part of the nineteenth century. China was weak, and Russia and Japan growled at each other over the remnants of the collapsing Manchu empire.

The Liaotung Peninsula, which includes Dairen and Port Arthur, was ceded to Japan by China in 1895. Then in 1898 Russia forced Japan to withdraw and took over. Finally in 1904, following what the Yalta document calls the treacherous attack of Japan, the Japanese kicked the Russians out and settled down until the end of World War II.

(In connection with the treacherous attack, it is interesting to note that Russia, too, was preparing for war, but the czarist Czar-led his far-eastern commander: "It is desirable that the Japanese, and not we, be the ones to start military operations. * * *")

It's all a sorry story of cynical big-power imperialism, and little can be accomplished merely by condemning it out of 50 years' hindsight. But no good and much harm is done by our perpetuating such cynical practices in an agreement like the Yalta deal—and then talking about traditional pure and aboveboard purposes.

"You cannot sit around in Washington or London or Paris or The Hague and determine what the policies are going to be in these areas," says the righteous Acheson of today.

Nor Yalta, Mr. Secretary.

Real Democrats Given Wrong Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial, reprinted from the Gazette, of Farmerville, La., of January 5, 1950, as follows:

REAL DEMOCRATS GIVEN WRONG NAME

(Reprint from the Gazette, Farmerville, La., January 5, 1950)

It is noticed in many press articles and comments of columnists that the word "Dixiecrat" is used in referring to the genuine Democrats of the South and elsewhere, who are battling against the present trend toward centralization and domination of everything by the Federal Government. And it is regrettable that some of those enlisted in that fight seem to be content to let it go at that. All should resent it, for it is out of place and smacks of Civil War sentiment of eighty-odd years ago—long settled.

The so-called States' rights element in the Democratic Party are not Dixiecrats nor any other sort of crats except real, old-fashioned Democrats who have become quickened of the spirit of patriotism and love of country to arouse the whole land—North, South, East, and West—against this head-long rush toward the precipice of socialism into which England has fallen. If we, at last, go over that horrible precipice, we shall not return, for it has no bottom.

Why should we be dubbed "Dixiecrats" anyhow? The term sounds provincial and sectional; and we are neither, for we fight for the right of every State to enjoy home rule and to exercise the functions of government reserved to it by the Constitution of the founders. The principle of home rule, community independence, and self-government, and the withholding from Washington of undelegated powers and bureaucratic control of our very lives is a vital one to every State in this Union—North, South, East, and West.

The so-called Dixiecrats are the real, simon-pure Democrats. And the rest of the country is fast finding that out. They are beginning to see that what we contend for is as vital to them as to us; as important for serious reflection to one section as to another.

The Democratic Party of our fathers has always been a national party, seeking equal and exact justice to all, reserving to each and every State and community the right and responsibility of doing all for itself, except certain Federal functions, comparatively few, stipulated in the Federal Constitution. To any power, anywhere, assuming a contrary attitude, seeking to destroy this principle, the democracy, of old, always cried out, "Thou shalt not."

This new-fangled name "Dixiecrat" has been coined by the enemies of real democracy and hurled at real Democrats. To refer to real Democrats in a certain State or a certain section as "Dixiecrats," is out of place, a misnomer, and should be resented. It should be resented by every true Democrat everywhere, no matter where he lives. It should be resented by every true American citizen.

We have a faith that, sooner or later, the element in the party of Jefferson and Jackson, which is now hypocritically trying to tear it from its proper moorings, will scatter as chaff before the winds of an aroused, indignant people, without regard to party label, which no longer means very much. Surely the people of this great country have too much common sense and patriotism to allow a group of vote-seeking "gimmecrats" to drag them down the hill their fathers climbed.

Every Democrat in this country, regardless of where he lives; yes, every American who believes this rush toward socialism should be arrested before it is everlastingly too late, should resent the name and slur of "Dixiecrat." It is all wrong. We are only genuine Democrats, and we shall remain such and fight within the lines of the national democracy to redeem it from the ills of recent years.

An Employer Does Have the God-Given Right To Choose Whom He Will To Work for Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting the following letter from the St. Louis Area Council of Christian Churches, which, in my opinion, sets forth one of the more objectionable features of the proposed FEPC legislation. I concur in the expressions contained in this letter:

THE ST. LOUIS AREA COUNCIL
OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES,
St. Louis, Mo., January 18, 1950.

The Hon. PAUL C. JONES,
United States Representative from Missouri, House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: From time to time I am sure you are interested in the churches' reaction to certain types of legislation. Some church groups, I am sure, have been working hard for the passage of House bill H. R. 4453, known as FEPC legislation. Our group—about twenty churches in the St. Louis area affiliated with the American Council of Christian Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches—are solidly against the passage of such a bill.

FEPC would rob the employer of the right to choose whom he would to work for him. This right was upheld by Jesus Christ when he approvingly quoted the employer as saying, "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" (Matthew 20: 15). An employer does have the God-given right to choose whom he will to work for him. There is a kind of discrimination that is not wrong.

We realize that there is a kind of discrimination that is wrong. We hold no brief for the one who hates another or for one who discriminates solely because of the color of the skin. However, we are convinced that this discrimination is not as prevalent as some of our liberal friends would have us believe.

FEPC, if adopted, would act as an effective extension of the police state. To set up a Government agency as the arbiter of employment in private business is to add one more control to the already burdensome load which is being borne by the private-enterprise system. This private-enterprise system, which in our modern world is so distinctively American, is the only economic system which is stamped with the approval of the word of God. And that private-enterprise system is the economic system which has made our Nation great.

We cannot correct discrimination against employees by establishing discrimination against employers. FEPC would only tend to increase tensions between classes and groups and could really benefit only those who desire to sow discord and confusion among our people. In this connection it is interesting to note that the Communist Party is always one of the very active proponents of FEPC legislation. They must have some stake in it.

It is our hope that you will carefully respect the convictions of our constituency and do what you can to defeat this proposed legislation which strikes at the very heart and life of our glorious democratic way of life.

Sincerely yours,
REV. CALVIN H. HAMAR,
President, the St. Louis Area Council of Christian Churches.

Hordes of Jews Flee Red Terror by Underground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following International News Service report on the underground operation which enabled thousands of persons to escape from Russia and her satellites. This news item appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of January 21, 1950.

HORDES OF JEWS FLEE RED TERROR BY UNDERGROUND

SOMEWHERE IN FRANCE, January 20—An "alias army" of tens of thousands of Jews, some of whom hacked off their fingers to escape slow death in slave camps, have escaped from Russia and her satellite lands in a highly successful underground operation.

Their story can be told today in part for the first time—how they dealt Premier Stalin what they term perhaps his first big internal defeat.

AIDED BY FUNDS FROM UNITED STATES

It has been a well-kept postwar secret, this operation which ended early last year. The Jews, most of them Orthodox, escaped to western Europe from Russia proper through faked papers.

Funds obtained in the United States aided the inexpensive machine.

Tens of thousands escaped from Soviet satellite lands to find religious freedom and relief from persecution.

Men like Samuel Davidson, Isaac Goldin and Nissan Pinson brought with them "case histories" which reveal Soviet slave camps, religious persecution and widespread Soviet official corruption which partly aided their emigration.

The young Jews include former Soviet officers and peasants who fought the Germans.

RELIGION OFFICIALLY FREE

Goldin is a former Russian officer. With money used in the right Soviet spots he was allowed to escape as a repatriate.

Goldin said religion officially is "free" in Russia.

"For instance," he said, "circumcision, a fundamental of Judaism, is officially legal. But the man who performs the operation is arrested.

"Again, a teacher of religious law faces deportation to the Arctic regions."

Goldin said Zionism, which the Communists claim has such a great friend in Russia, still is officially banned. So is the teaching of Hebrew. Despite all Soviet obstacles, Goldin said, thousands of Jewish families are able to bring up their children true to their religion.

Davidson is 45—but looks 60. He spent 8 years near Murmansk in the Arctic region, in a camp where he said thousands of Jews have perished for only one sin: they remained true to their religion.

Davidson said the religious prisoners are fed a diet of bread and colored water called tea. No vegetables, no meat, no fish. The condemned deportees, he said, work from dawn until after dark chopping wood.

Nissan Pinson told how he organized a synagogue service in Moscow in 1945 after getting out of the army. This was still the "honeymoon period" between the Allies and Russia, and Pinson was cheered by the simulated appearance of religious tolerance in Moscow.

"Many Red Army men and women showed up for the service," he said, "but they subsequently began disappearing. The remaining believers long since have ceased speaking to each other for fear of police agents who always are on the watch."

SOME EXPERT, EXECUTED

Finally Pinson, with the aid of false papers, led a group of Jews to another country and subsequently to the transitory camp in the suburbs of a modern French city.

It was a risky trip and the underground route was closed when Soviet border vigilance increased and after some Jewish operators were captured and presumably executed.

Pinson said at many way stations the Jewish group he led bribed train officials and government agents.

Near Lwow, former Polish city seized by Russia, Pinson said one mother became too ill and had to be left behind. He added:

"But she would not keep her child with her.

"She gave her son to her friends, saying 'at least my son will have a chance to live'."

Aid to Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, no more eloquent statement was made in the debate on this bill in the House than that of the President of the Republic of Korea himself, issued under date of January 20, 1950, and which is appended hereto:

I have just learned with the greatest regret that the United States Congress by a close vote failed to pass the enabling act for ECA aid for Korea yesterday. Despite the most unexpected defeat of this bill, I remain confident that the Congress and Government of the United States of America, upon further and more careful reflection will not fail to grant to Korea this aid which is most essential for the development of a sound domestic economy, enabling the Korean Republic to continue its successful resistance to the persistent, militaristic Communist threat. The Republic of Korea is the only country of Asia today which is determinedly, wholeheartedly, and daily fighting off, and successfully fighting against, the armed attempts of Communist imperialism to invade and overthrow. Some Asiatic nations waiver, some recoil in fear, one great nation has gone down in defeat, but the Korean Republic continues to resist and fight with unflagging determination, courage, and success. Past American aid, added to strong Korean hearts, has made this remarkable success possible. But continued ECA aid, to establish a strong basis for our economy, is essential to sustain those strong Korean hearts in this difficult transition period. Let those who say that the risk is too great, that the U. S. S. R. is too powerful, that money for Korea is water down some rat hole, remember Berlin. There was risk; there was a powerful Soviet Army itself, potential basis for attack in itself; but with courage, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France took the great risk; Berlin and even all western Germany were saved by courageous risks despite enormous expense. Korea, the only free spot of northeastern Asia continent, can and will be held by courageous Korean men and women for the free world and for an independent Korea if the United States continues to risk a few more millions of its hard-earned wealth. Despite yesterday's vote in the United States Congress, I remain certain that further and wise consideration will be given to the cause of an independent Korea to insure that this Republic and these people will have the chance to remain within the orbit of the free world.

Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of January 22, 1950:

SPANISH REVERSAL

When experience has shown a governmental policy to be both a failure and morally insupportable, it is time to change the policy. That is what Secretary Acheson has done with respect to our Spanish policy, and he has done it with a degree of forthrightness which merits commendation.

Pursuant to a resolution adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1946, we have not assigned an Ambassador to Madrid. Our position has been that this country, as a firm supporter of the United Nations, could not send an Ambassador to Madrid in contravention of the Assembly's recommendation. That is a contention, however, which does not tell the whole story.

The prime movers in the UN campaign against Spain have been the Communists. They have been supported by non-Communists, but the main drive came from the delegates who were under the Kremlin's thumb. Their motives in trying to overthrow the Franco regime have not been even remotely related to the motives of the non-Communists who played the game with them. This became evident soon after the 1946 resolution had been adopted, and attempts were made to reverse the 1946 decision. Although a majority favored reversal last spring, the effort failed for lack of the required two-thirds vote.

It was in this setting that our Government put forward its worst diplomatic foot. Although it was clear that the policy was wrong, and that it had failed, this Government could not bring itself to join the other countries voting to rescind it. Instead of taking a position on a matter of some importance, it sought refuge in the timid device of not voting at all. That is not an attitude which becomes the most powerful

Nation in the world, a Nation which boasts of its moral leadership and to which smaller countries are bound to look for guidance.

The gist of Secretary Acheson's announcement is that we will no longer seek to dodge the Spanish issue. We will not take the lead. But when the question of rescinding the 1946 resolution again comes before the Assembly we will vote in favor of lifting the ban and permitting the member nations to do as they see fit in the matter of exchanging Ambassadors or Ministers with Spain.

There is still some foot-dragging in the Acheson announcement. He frowns on Spanish participation in the European recovery program, for instance, because the Franco government is unacceptable to many western European nations. Considering our role in ECA, that looks like a case of the tail wagging the dog. And when one recalls the effort made to bring into ECA some of the cutthroat regimes behind the iron curtain, it is a bit hard to swallow any implication that Franco should be debarred on grounds of political morality or immorality.

There may be practical reasons, however, which justify this Government in its unwillingness to attempt to introduce Spain into the western European community. Franco is a dictator and he did come to power with the aid of Hitler and Mussolini. If, because of these facts, he continues to be persona non grata with our allies in western Europe, we should not attempt to force him on them. No argument in behalf of Spain could justify a policy on our part which would disrupt the western European coalition. The attainment of a proper relationship between Spain and its neighbors can be left to the processes of time. Meanwhile, it is good to know that we have abandoned a policy which denoted moral disapproval of Franco at the price of implying moral approval of governments whose conduct makes the Franco regime seem like a model of good democratic practices.

Order of Sons of Italy for FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I enclose the following resolution recently adopted by the grand lodge of Massachusetts, Order of Sons of Italy in America, calling for the enactment of a Federal fair-employment-practices bill:

Whereas there is now pending in the United States Senate S. 1728, and

Whereas this proposed legislation makes provision for Federal fair employment practices and tends to eliminate the evils of racial, religious and national discrimination from our democracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the grand executive council of the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts, Order of Sons of Italy in America, in meeting assembled on January 4, 1950, at Boston, cognisant of the great need for this legislation and representing, as we do, some 22,000 members in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby unanimously endorse S. 1728 and urge its immediate enactment; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Internationalization of Jerusalem Unnecessary and Impractical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following is a news report and editorial from the New York Times of January 20 and 21, respectively, giving a survey of the situation by distinguished churchmen deeply interested in the security of the holy places. These facts are more important than reams of argument:

[From the New York Times of January 20, 1950]

FACT BODY OPPOSES UN ON JERUSALEM—GROUP OF SIX CHRISTIAN LEADERS HOLDS INTERNATIONALIZATION IS DANGEROUS, UNNECESSARY

A fact-finding mission of six Christian leaders, just returned from Jerusalem, announced yesterday its conviction that internationalization of the Holy City was dangerous and unnecessary.

The group recommended, instead, the establishment of a United Nations commission with no territorial sovereignty to assure the free accessibility of the Christian world to the holy places of Jerusalem.

Guaranties should be given to such a commission by both Jordan and Israel, the report said, assuring the freedom and sanctity of the sacred places within their territories. This is all that the Christian world has a right to require of two sovereign states, which we believe will in time compose their differences.

This making of the peace will be accomplished all the more if Israel and Jordan are encouraged in their negotiations by the western powers.

Members of the investigation mission, who traveled under auspices of the American Christian Palestine Committee, 41 East Forty-second Street, included Dr. Samuel Guy Inman, member of the Federal Council of Churches' Commission of International Goodwill; Dr. Charles J. Turck, president of Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn., and president of the National Council of Presbyterian Laymen; Mrs. M. E. Tilly, member of President Truman's Commission on Civil Rights and field representative of the Southern Regional Council.

Also Dr. John W. Bradbury, editor of the Watchman-Examiner, national Baptist magazine; Dr. Ralph W. Riley, president of the American Baptist Theological Seminary, and Prof. Victor Obenhaus of the University of Chicago, national chairman of the Council of Social Action, Congregational Christian Church of America.

The group's findings were made public at a conference in the Commodore Hotel, with Dr. Inman and Dr. Bradbury as spokesmen. They announced that copies of the report had been sent to Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Roger Garreau, president of the United Nations Trusteeship Council, and Francis B. Sayre, United States delegate to the council.

The report said that the overwhelming majority of religious leaders interviewed in Israel had felt that the internationalization plan would not work.

"Many held it was impractical and certain to add confusion and impede peace negotiations now in progress," the report declared, and added:

"Total internationalization is not necessary for the protection of the holy places. Neither the Arabs nor Israel has any other plan or purpose than to protect and preserve them. Moslems have kept these places inviolate for many centuries, and virtually all of them are now in Arab hands. There is not the slightest evidence that Israel will molest or limit the use of any religious institution or shrine."

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM COMPLETE

The group said it found "complete religious freedom" in Israel and that the religious leaders interviewed "all declared they were in no wise interfered with in their functions."

"The prevailing conviction was," the report went on, "that when the bitterness created by the recent war will have diminished, Israel and the Arabs would yet come to an agreement in these controversial matters providing external interference did not complicate the problem."

The mission denounced as "utterly false and without any factual support" reports that the Israelis had desecrated religious institutions, churches or shrines since the fighting ceased. It pointed out that the Government of Israel had established a Department of Religious Affairs to deal "constructively and fairly with the complex religious communities in her territory."

The report referred to the plan advanced by Mr. Garreau, which provides that the international zone should include principally the Walling Wall, sacred to the Jewish faith, and those holy places sacred to Christians, and said the plan, while an improvement over previous proposals, was "still too inclusive."

CRITICIZES PROPOSAL

"It is hardly justifiable to exclude so obvious a holy place as the Mosque of Omar of the Old City from an internationalized zone, and the entire Mount Scopus where absolutely no legally established holy places are to be found," the report observed.

"To advance such a plan on the ground that the territory to be taken from Israel and Jordan must be equalized is to condemn the plan by demonstrating that the major consideration is not concern for the holy places."

The group called on on the United States Government to press for a reconsideration of the United Nations Assembly decision on internationalization. Formulation, instead, of a just and workable plan for guaranteeing the sanctity of the holy places would enhance the United Nations prestige and power, the report asserted.

The group noted that, during its 3-week investigation, it had observed conditions in both Jewish and Arab areas and that it had discussed the internationalization problem with representatives of the Israeli Government, the Coptic Church, the Greek Catholic Church, the Copt Catholic Church, the Roman Catholic Church, and Protestant churches. It talked with Arabs, both Christian and Moslem, as well as with city officials and administrative officers.

[From the New York Times of January 21, 1950]

THE JERUSALEM DILEMMA

The Trusteeship Council of the United Nations has now convened at Geneva with the thankless task of working out an internationalization plan for Jerusalem in conformity with the general assembly's ill-advised resolution of last December. There is always the possibility, however remote, that the Council may come up with a proposal acceptable to Israel and Jordan, the two countries most directly concerned. The latest draft, put forward by Roger Garreau, president of the Council, is certainly a step in the right direction.

Meanwhile six eminent Christian leaders, just back from the Holy Land, have expressed the opinion that the whole concept of internationalization of Jerusalem is dangerous and unnecessary. We agree with them that the only necessity is for guaranteeing * * * assuring the freedom and sanctity of the sacred places within the two countries. There should be no difficulty in obtaining such guaranties once the idea of internationalizing secular territory is ruled out, or at least brought down to the narrowest possible limits. To achieve this end, it is likely that the Assembly will eventually have to modify its uncompromising position in accordance with the justice and the realities of the situation.

Coal Shortage at Pontiac, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, further information has reached me from Mr. J. Byron Judd, secretary-manager of the Pontiac Lumber, Fuel and Builders' Supply Exchange, regarding the coal shortage at Pontiac, Mich., and vicinity.

There are 17 dealers in the area. They have on hand, as of January 19, counting coal and coke in transit, 5,647 tons. The average daily requirements in that city of 80,000 people and many thousands living in the immediate area is approximately 900 tons daily. This indicates only a 5-day supply on hand.

During the calendar year 1949 the coal and coke receipts were 32.5 percent less than the year previous and 30.5 percent less than the previous 5-year average. The total coal and coke inventory for January 1, 1950, was but 18.5 percent of the inventory for January 1, 1949.

In view of this record, this fuel exchange warns that a critical coal shortage is not only imminent but actually exists. The dealers have been rationing consumers with 1-ton and half-ton deliveries.

This condition is a dangerous threat to the health and welfare of the people in that area. The President should act and act immediately with the powers which Congress has given him to relieve this emergency.

Mr. Judd's report follows:

PONTIAC LUMBER, FUEL, AND BUILDERS' SUPPLY EXCHANGE,
Pontiac, Mich., January 19, 1950.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: It is observed you, with some other Members of the Congress, were present at a round-table conference in Washington January 9 on the invitation of the American Retail Coal Merchants Association to listen to the general problem of the retail-coal merchants operating in the bituminous-coal-burning areas of the Nation. On behalf of the retail coal merchants of Oakland County, I desire to express their gratitude and appreciation for your obvious interest in the problems of supply to satisfy consumer coal service demand for the past many months.

Supplementing what was reported at the January 9 conference, I desire to report the coal supply-and-demand picture as presently exists in this local area as revealed by a survey completed this date as follows:

Trade area, Pontiac City, Mich.—Total 17 dealers and 17 reporting

	Tons
Total inventories domestic coal and coke	4,312
In transit 25 cars coal (estimate 62 tons per car)	1,300
In transit 1 car coke (estimate 35 tons per car)	35
Total on hand and in transit January 17, 1950	5,647

In calendar year 1948 Grand Trunk Railway reports these same 17 dealers received 2,903 cars of coal and 174 cars of coke, an estimated total of 141,351 tons. Assuming this was normal annual requirements for this area and that the month of January normal requirements as generally admitted is 10.5 percent of the total annual requirements for spaceheating, we find January normal requirements for this area are 889 tons per day. If these actual stocks of coal and coke on hand and in transit and the estimates of requirements are accepted, this survey reveals, if all coal and coke in transit would arrive within 5 days, we would only have presently a 5-day supply.

It should be further realized coal supplying this market is normally in transit from 7 to 11 days.

That coal and coke rail receipts in this area for calendar year 1949 were 32.5 percent less than year previous, and 30.5 percent less than the previous 5-year average. Also that in the 8-month period, May 1 to October 31, 1949, the coal and coke rail receipts were only 46.7 percent of the same comparable period previous year. It may be further stated this condition is the major factor why these 17 local dealers report coal and coke inventories January 1, 1950, were an average of only 18.5 percent of inventories January 1, 1949.

It may be stated the inventory of one dealer January 1, 1949 was more than the combined inventories of all 17 dealers January 1, 1950. Another dealer January 1, 1949, 75 percent of all dealers January 1, 1950.

Survey completed of inventories, etc. in other Oakland County areas about reconcile with the prevailing conditions in Pontiac area. Four county areas have no coal or coke for delivery while three areas are in somewhat better position than Pontiac area.

You may consider all statements furnished as reliable and according to authentic record.

On behalf of the citizens who are dependent on retail coal services and the retail coal merchants of Oakland County, we venture the opinion, according to the record, that a critical coal shortage is not only imminent but does actually exist in this area. We therefore solicit your influence to not only correct this current condition but also attempt by legislation or otherwise that in the future our experience may not be repeated.

Dealers generally, for many weeks, have been rationing consumers with 1-ton and ½-ton deliveries and definitely dealers and consumers alike know that an emergency does actually exist impairing their health and economy.

Thanking you in advance for your consideration and that your influence and action may be helpful in correcting this intolerable condition.

Very respectfully,

J. BYRON JUDD,
Secretary-Manager.

A Look at the Compass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as Republicans prepare for the 1950 and 1952 campaigns, it might be well to get our bearings and locate the harbor for which we are steering.

Some of us here in Congress, remembering Mr. Truman's flippant remark that our efforts to uncover and expose the Communists in his administration were only a "red herring," are encouraged by the conviction of Mr. Alger Hiss; made more determined in our effort to oust the Communists and communism from positions of power and influence in Mr. Truman's administration.

Five-percenters and adherents to the Pendergast type of machine politics are bad enough, but Communists are, if that be possible, more dangerous.

Of almost equal danger is Mr. Truman's socialistic program, his determination to purchase the political support of first one group, then another, either by appropriations of Federal funds or the enactment and enforcement of discriminatory laws.

In the morning Times-Herald is an editorial by George Rothwell Brown which gives at least one view of the present situation.

The editorial which suggests "me-toolism" is still powerful in the Republican Party is as follows:

POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

President Truman stands as of today the undisputed master of a thoroughly cowed House of Representatives.

Under terrific pressure from the White House and its allied labor bosses, a temporary coalition of radical Democrats and Republicans courting the votes of minority groups who deserted their party leadership by the score, has opened the door of the Rules Committee to the FEPC bill, and probably to more of the welfare state, involving a threatened multi-billion-dollar Treasury raid.

The conviction of Alger Hiss, fair-haired protégé of the Roosevelt New Deal, on charges tantamount to those of treason at a time when he was a State Department official, probably will have the psychological effect of greatly discrediting the whole Communist program in this country, high at the top of which stands FEPC.

If the FEPC bill should be approved by the House—and it was to obtain this action that most of the Republican deserters ran out—the southern filibuster against it in the Senate would be strengthened by the reaction to the Hiss verdict.

Once this controversial question is out of the way it may be possible for the coalition of conservative House Republicans and southern Democrats to unite their forces once more in opposition to the rest of the President's socialistic program.

But this coalition, the sole remaining hope of stopping the welfare state in the House has been seriously torn asunder.

It is upon the continuation of this setup of the conservative allies that the permanence of Mr. Truman's bosses of the House of Representatives depends.

So far as the Republican Party is concerned the failure of the effort to restore a legislative traffic power to the Rules Committee threatens with disaster its entire campaign for control of Congress in this year's elections.

The wide-open split thus revealed in the party has rendered utterly farcical the attempts now being made in Washington by the GOP National Committee and State and congressional leaders to determine a party policy upon which all its candidates could stand united in the approaching campaign.

With such a large percentage of Republican members of the House voting to pave an easy roadway for the enactment of a Federal FEPC law and the whole welfare program, it is extremely improbable that the conservative businessmen and industrialists of the country will be willing to contribute any important money to the Republican campaign fund.

Why should they?

Save for one possible course of action, it will now be difficult for the Republican Party as a party to go into this year's congressional campaign on a platform of opposition to the socialistic welfare state.

It may still be possible to prevent the renomination of those Republicans who voted on this vital issue with the Truman-Rayburn-McCormack axis, by putting up a conservative Republican against them in each of the Congressional districts involved in this mass desertion.

If the British people repudiate Socialism in in their February elections, indicating a world-wide reaction against left-wing radicalism, it may be easier for real Republican candidates to defeat these welfare-staters than perhaps they realize.

If such a large part of the party in the House of Representatives is permitted to embrace "me-toism" unchallenged, the Republican Party can hardly hope to survive the 1952 presidential election.

The processes of democratization will be accelerated. As against 64 members who went over to Trumanism on this crucial vote, only 49 deserted their party leadership on January 3, 1949, when the destruction of the traffic power of the Rules Committee was first accomplished.

The rot within the party thus appears to be spreading.

The way is now open for a motion this week to bring the President's FEPC bill to the floor for a vote, subject to the recognition by Speaker RAYBURN of the chairman in charge of that measure.

American Jewish Committee for FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a resolution recently adopted by Boston chapter, American Jewish Committee, urging enactment of a Federal fair employment practices bill:

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE,
New York, N. Y., January 18, 1950.

It is the unanimous opinion of the membership of the American Jewish Committee, Boston chapter, that fundamental to our American democracy and to our American economy is the right to employment opportunity without reference to race, color, or creed; that this right can be properly protected throughout the Nation only through the establishment of a Federal law, in conformity with the platforms of both major political parties: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress at the present session enact the bill known as the Fair Employment Practices Act (S. 1728).

Which Road for the United States—Right, Left, or the Middle Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following copy of my radio address over WMEX, Boston, Mass., January 23, 1950:

We hear some people splitting hairs over the question: "When does the first half of the first half of the twentieth century end and the second half begin, on January 1, 1950, or January 1, 1951?"

There are others who point to a new method of reckoning which reduces the century-yardstick to the smaller proportions of years, days, or even less. They insist that an entirely new age in the history of man opening the doors to an unknown future began in the fateful month of August in 1945.

It is not the day or the year that is important, but the fact that we face great changes in our way of life. There are some who would avoid responsibility in this matter because it requires serious thought and special effort. There are others who clearly see that we must grapple with these strange problems for which there are no ready-made answers. Within the flexible framework of our democratic institutions we must devise new methods which will provide the greatest security and freedom for all.

It will not be easy to bring these opposites into a workable relationship.

Your Government with a green light from you is trying to do it.

It is watching the experiments going on in other democratic nations and is learning much from their mistakes. Australia and New Zealand have ousted their labor or socialist governments. There is a possibility that the English may do the same, or falling short of that may increase the Conservative minority to the point where it may serve as a restraining influence upon an extreme program.

And yet much that has been put into practice will never be repealed by the Conservatives. The pendulum swings from side to side but we cannot ignore the fact that the housing of the pendulum is moving forward with the times.

In the United States we have accomplished much in the way of readjusting our society to present-day realities. To do this we have had to experiment. In the process we have started some programs which now need expansion. Others which served an emergency purpose have been discarded. We have not been afraid to meet change with change. We have made a few mistakes which can and will be corrected, but they are the mistakes of positive action which clears the way. We can look back for a moment over the past 17 years and honestly say that the comeback from the low point of 1933 has been remarkable.

Our Nation is now a world power. More goods are being produced, more people are employed, and the standard of living has increased. The base of this progress has broadened to include greater numbers of our people and it will continue to do so.

I do not mean to paint a perfect picture of the present situation for that would be false. Even though they may be reduced, the expenditures for our Military Establishment and for economic aid to other countries will continue to be heavy. These are necessary to protect our own security and to promote world recovery and world peace.

We also have problems at home.

This is an election year. The various measures requested by President Truman will be approved or rejected on the basis of public opinion toward them as interpreted by individual Congressmen. These will vary from district to district but the composite will reflect the majority opinion of the people of the United States.

I believe that this year will also be one of pause or digestion before we set our sights toward the second half of the twentieth century.

The Congress as I see it will take the following action during the current session. I will try to make an objective estimate, asking you to bear in mind that it will not coincide with my own position and my own votes on some issues.

Taxes on income will not be increased.

Health insurance and temporary-disability insurance will be debated but that's as far as they will get.

The bill proposing a Fair Employment Practice Act will be hotly contested and defeated.

Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act will be blocked.

No special old-age pensions for veterans will be provided.

Neither the Columbia River Authority nor the St. Lawrence Seaway will muster a majority vote.

Federal aid to education looks dubious.

The Brannan plan for farm aid will not pass.

On the affirmative side of the ledger, Congress will probably appropriate more money for public housing and public works.

Rent control on a limited scale will be retained.

More money for arms but less for economic aid will be voted to aid western Europe.

Some excise taxes such as those on travel tickets and on cosmetics will be cut.

The draft law will be extended but restricted as to its use.

Some postal rates may be revised upward.

The most significant development will concern old-age insurance. More people will be included and benefits will be increased.

Which brings us to the key question of our age which is the quest for security. And it is not a matter of if, but how.

The one worry uppermost in the minds of most people is how to find personal security against the economic hazards of old age, sickness, disability, and unemployment.

Man has had to deal with these problems since the beginning of time. Why is it, then, that so many millions are unable to cope with them in this the greatest wealth-producing age known to man?

Once upon a time most people were self-employed on their own small farms or with the tools of their trade. Those were the days of individual craftsmen. But now we are faced with an entirely new situation. Three-quarters of all who work for a living in the United States today are employees. The ownership and control of the means of production have passed out of the hands of the individual. Today every individual needs and wants a job—a steady job at decent wages. In most cases he cannot create this for himself, but must depend on others to provide it for him. And he does not believe that the right to property shall stand in the way of his right to employment.

Our founding fathers emphasized the "unalienable" rights of man—the individual's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The right to liberty guarantees certain protections and privileges which may be called political, such as free speech. The right of the individual to pursue his happiness, to find fulfillment as he may choose, guarantees his spiritual and cultural freedoms.

But what does the right to life mean? Simply protection from violence? No. In the complex economic society of today, where the average man cannot support himself with his own hands, without help from others, it means something more.

Take my home city of Lawrence, in Massachusetts. It is an area, including adjoining communities, of some 125,000 people. They are largely dependent for their livelihood upon the operations of several large textile mills. Not only the income of the workers, but that of every storekeeper, businessman, and public servant, is affected by the level of activity at the mills. These in turn depend upon sources of raw materials and markets far removed from Lawrence, over which management and workers have little control.

There is not enough food produced in this industrial area to feed the people for 1 day. You cannot feed cattle or grow crops on hard-surfaced city streets. Therefore, when workers are laid off because the mills have no orders, they cannot eat, which means that they cannot live. The rights of liberty and the pursuit of happiness, necessary as they are, cannot make up for the right to life which is threatened by unemployment.

We are recognizing the fact that man has economic rights which must be protected if the right to life is to have real meaning. To implement this expanded concept, we have started a program to provide unemployment compensation and old-age security.

The former was a lifesaver for Lawrence in the spring and early summer of 1949, when 24,000 people were out of work for weeks on end. Without this transfusion to support purchasing power, the life of the whole community would have been threatened.

Fortunately, the mills have picked up considerably since then. Some thousands are still out of work, and many of these are included in the figure of 12,179 claimants who had exhausted their benefit checks at the end of 1949. A lesser number may not have any unemployment compensation accruing to them in 1950.

I hope that the Congress will pass legislation which I will support, to improve our unemployment-compensation program so that it will take care of such local emergencies.

The people of Lawrence, caught in the rip tide of economic forces beyond their control, were given a helping hand through unemployment compensation. They believe in it because it protected their right to live.

It is, in this day and age, "promoting the general welfare," which were the words used by our forefathers in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States.

Now the word "welfare" is open to many interpretations and it is sometimes misused to scare people.

As we Americans see it, "welfare" means basic protections against unemployment, sickness, disability, and old age provided by cooperation between management and labor.

It means the stabilization of employment to the highest possible degree. It means every encouragement to a dynamic American economy. It means insurance paid for by all of the people, and paid out by the Government as an agent of the people, only under clearly specified conditions.

Some people think we have only two choices: capitalism of the right, or socialism of the left. But I believe that the road we are taking is the middle one of voluntary cooperation.

There is a better distribution of income in the United States today than ever before. Power is fairly well balanced throughout our economic structure. Even in Washington, with a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress, a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats gives conservatism some voice in our national affairs. Neither capitalism nor socialism dominates the American scene.

In our scheme of things Government is not a god but just a combination of umpire, first-aid man, and substitute employer.

Our aim is to keep it in that subordinate role.

Most Americans are ambitious and want to advance themselves. It is this vitality which spurs us to accomplishment and sometimes—sometimes leads to excesses. The only thing we have to fear from this is mass unemployment, which will not be tolerated.

However, warned by a previous experience which should be our last one of that kind, the Congress will authorize those temporary and compensatory techniques to fill the void, if and when necessary.

Labor, the farmers, liberal groups all these are organized and are facing the future today. Only the business groups seem to be lagging behind, failing to assume their share of the initiative.

Collective bargaining is the first step toward the humanization of industry, but it is not enough. The worker needs the security of belonging. Experts in such matters tell us that while material efficiency has been increasing for 200 years, the human capacity for working together has, in the same period, continually diminished.

Management has a great opportunity in helping us to keep to the middle road by promoting its own insurance and pension plans, by applying the annual-wage method where feasible, by scheduling maintenance work in slack seasons, and by privately insuring against lay-offs as a supplement to Government unemployment insurance.

By building this genuine and effective good will, it will help to create that loyal friendship between employer and employee which will protect and encourage the full development of all three human rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

What the Truman Program Is Costing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the January 14 issue of the Sturgis Journal, published by Mark P. Haines at Sturgis, Mich., comes an editorial on the subject of what Mr. Truman's program is costing the Nation.

The editorial carries a picture, which cannot, of course, be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, showing three stacks of $1 bills, representing the increase in the per capita cost of running the Federal Government.

From there on the editorial is as follows:

WHAT IT'S COSTING

At left is a stack of bills totaling $101.14. This was what it cost every man, woman and child to run the United States Government in the fiscal year 1941.

The middle pile shows what it will cost each of us in 1951 as proposed by Mr. Truman's budget. The figure is $282.17—almost triple the 1941 amount.

At right is $1,758.86—what each of us can claim as his share of the national debt at the end of fiscal year 1951 (June 30, 1951) if Mr. Truman's budget is adopted.

Mr. Truman's budget calls for an outlay of $42,439,000,000 in the 1951 fiscal year beginning July 7. Mr. Truman has a reputation for underestimating expenses in his budget messages. For fiscal 1950, Congress will be asked to approve $5,863,616,000 in supplemental appropriations.

Estimated Federal income for 1951 is $37,306,000,000, leaving a deficit of $5,100,000,000 for the year. Mr. Truman blames the Republicans for the deficit, saying that the 1951 deficit is equal to the tax cut put through when the Republicans controlled the Eightieth Congress.

Over 70 percent of Mr. Truman's budget is wrapped up in spending for past, present, and future cold and hot wars. These are the items of national defense, veterans' program, foreign affairs, and debt interest. Congress will find it hard to cut these expenses.

But on the domestic side, economy-minded solons of both parties will have better chances of reducing Mr. Truman's budgetary program. For example, his $300,000,000 request for aid to education includes a new system of Federal college scholarships which are desirable but not wise in these days of deficit spending. Another request which the administration will find difficult to enact is that of a housing program for the middle-income class.

Critics of Mr. Truman's policy of deficit spending are not confined to the Republican Party. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat who is a long-time advocate of Government economy, has proposed a $36,000,000,000 budget to Congress. Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Illinois Democrat, thinks $3,000,000,000 can be shaved from the President's budget without any trouble. The Committee on Economic Development says a $6,000,000,000 reduction is possible.

Mr. Truman is not expected to ask for added revenue which would balance the budget. A balanced budget will not be possible for several years, according to the President.

The moderate increase is expected to apply to individual income, corporation, estate and gift taxes while at the same time some of the wartime excise taxes will be lessened or removed.

Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, local union No. 275, Newton, Mass., January 14, 1950:

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

We, the undersigned, members of Local Union No. 275 of the Carpenters and Joiners

of America, citizens of the United States of America, do wish to commend the efforts of the General Welfare Foundation of America for the efforts they are exerting, and the work they are doing, to secure legislation authorizing old-age pensions for all citizens 65 years of age and over.

We commend them for the part they have had in causing the passage of H. R. 6000, passed by the House of Representatives in the Eighty-first Congressional First Session, and now before the United States Senate for their consideration.

In expressing these commendations, we do now, and hereby, request that the said G. W. F. of A., Inc., continue their good work, and that in their efforts that they advocate nothing less than a $100 monthly pension.

We further pledge our cooperation to the extent of our ability.

EMERY C. [illegible], *President.*
ARTHUR MACLEAN, *Treasurer.*
JOHN BARRELLI, *Secretary.*

How We Can Help Prevent Tuberculosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent article written by 15-year-old Nancy Allworth, of Corvallis, Oreg., High School, which won first prize in that school in a contest sponsored by the Oregon Tuberculosis Association:

[From the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette-Times of January 18, 1950]

HOW WE CAN HELP PREVENT TUBERCULOSIS

Tuberculosis, or TB, is a contagious disease that is caused by a germ called tubercle bacillus. It may be spread by direct or indirect contact, or through milk. The germs usually do most of their activity in the lung; however, they can attack any part of the body. This action, while in process, will not be noticed by the victim, who could be any individual on earth. To be more specific, it could be you.

Everyone can, and should, try to help prevent tuberculosis. If you might be at a loss as to how you can help, begin brushing up on your knowledge of it by reading some of the numerous publications put out by health and tuberculosis organizations. It may save you time and money in the long run; they are free.

First, learn all you can about tuberculosis: its cause, its symptoms, its effect, and its prevention and cure. Next, put what you have learned to work. Here are some simple hints to help you out:

Every year a tuberculosis chest X-ray unit passes or should come to your town. If it does not, you be the one to look into it; if it does, don't neglect to have an X-ray and don't let your friends neglect it either. If you should discover that you have tuberculosis, you are lucky that you had the X-ray. Too many people have it and never suspect it until it is almost too late. Sometimes it is. Be careful of how you treat yourself and other people. Consider the happiness and health of others as much as you do your own. You may be endangering your and their lives by neglecting tuberculosis symptoms.

Articles that you, or any other tuberculosis victim, have used are contaminated; so the best thing to do with them is to burn them. If they are not disposable, do the next best, which is baking or boiling them for 10 or 20 minutes.

Let us peek into the hall of a typical city high school and view an everyday occurrence.

Our scene will take place at Jane's locker. Jane is one of our characters, a sophomore girl. The remainder of our cast is made up of Betty, Jane's classmate, Joe, the first germ, and George, the second germ.

Joe and George are sitting uncomfortably on the end of the sticky lipstick in Jane's locker.

"If she only knew," chuckled Joe.

"I almost wish she did," moaned George, who was holding his nose. "The perfume in this stuff is terrible. I'll be asphyxiated if someone doesn't come."

Betty, rushing down the hall, sees Jane near her locker.

"Jeeps! Jane, may I borrow your lipstick? I forgot my compact and purse and everything."

"Sure, Betty. I've got a little cough but I don't think it's anything. Oh, by the way, wasn't that dumb stuff we learned in health about all those old diseases? I don't see why we have to learn it, anyway."

"Bother! You made me smear this all over my face, uh, huh! Isn't it boring though?

Meanwhile Joe and George, the TB germs, have picked up their overnight bags and hopped onto another likely victim.

This instance, excluding the germs, is a familiar one in almost any high school, but there can be germs. How can we stop this?

Begin now. You be the one who refuses to loan your personal belongings even to a friend. If everyone did this, fewer germs would be spread. You be the one who does not borrow other peoples' things.

If you have a cough without apparent reason, don't hesitate to see a doctor; you may be the cause of hundreds of cases of TB without realizing it.

Our standards for preventing TB should be built around a rule similar to the golden one. Your rule may read something like this: Be considerate of others by covering sneezes and coughs, avoid lending or borrowing, and do everything in your power to make our world freer of a dreaded disease. Remember, we are the ones who can cut another chunk out of a diminishing number of mortalities due to tuberculosis.

Little germs so apparently small
Can bring sad death to one and all.
Just keep your habits clean and true,
And they'll refrain from both'ring you.

NANCY ALLWORTH,
Grade 10, Corvallis High School.
CORVALLIS, OREG.

Monopoly Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power will soon resume hearings. They will be two-pronged. One phase will be upon three distinct bills prepared by the staff of the subcommittee. The introduction of these bills is justified by the two sets of general hearings heretofore held.

The other phase will be a third series of hearings on specific industries. While the two previous sets were generally on the subject of monopoly, undue restraint, and concentration in industry and commerce, the subcommittee may, starting in February, address itself to a number of specific industries where such undue concentrations and financial power are alleged to threaten our economy, such as, for example: First, United States Steel; second, newsprint; third, du Pont complex; fourth, Lever Bros., that is, Unilever of Netherlands and Unilever of Great Britain; fifth, monopoly in the legitimate theater; and sixth, distilling industry.

With reference to the legitimate theater monopoly, charges have reached us that a group, headed by Schubert Enterprises in New York, control over 60 percent of the chain of legitimate theaters of the country, and the tribute exacted from producers, authors, directors, actors, composers, and so forth, are unfair, affecting drastically the whole sphere of the theater. It is also claimed that a theater ticket racket stems in part from this combination.

All the foregoing, of course, involves a great deal of research and investigation. The subcommittee may not have time to consider all these charges and complaints in addition to others. During the remainder of the Eighty-first Congress, the subcommittee shall proceed with its work to the fullest possible extent within the limitations of time and, of course, appropriations.

The subcommittee on study of monopoly power has set Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, February 1, 2, and 3, 1950, for hearings on three specific bills:

First. H. R. 6679, introduced by Mr. WALTER, to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts.

Second. A bill to require the Department of Justice to report to Congress on the nature, number, and reasons for consent decrees and pleas of nolo contendere in antitrust cases.

Third. Amendments to the Webb-Pomerene Act, which Mr. CELLER will introduce.

A number of witnesses, scheduled to be heard last autumn, were unavoidably unable to attend. Of these, Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer will be invited to appear; also Charles Luckman, recently resigned president of Lever Bros., and Henry J. Kaiser.

The subcommittee will also study the recent recommendations for changes in the Sherman and Clayton Acts proposed by the Federal Trade Commission.

Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1949

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the New York Times in a leading editorial today recognizes the need of a federally coordinated system of civilian defense of American cities.

The House will recall I wrote President Truman last September, shortly after his report of an atomic explosion in Russia, that further neglect in building up such a defense would be unconscionable. Later, I addressed the House stressing the meager efforts that had just begun and pointing to the New Jersey program inaugurated under the leadership of the far-sighted Governor Driscoll.

I still contend that Dr. John R. Steelman, assistant to the President, is too busy to be acting chairman of the National Security Resources Board, in charge of civilian defense, and all governors and States are not cooperating in the present program.

The Times editorial follows:

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

It is a dismaying fact, more than 4 years after the end of the Second World War, that we still need a civilian defense organization. Many thousands of Americans got some psychological satisfaction and did some real service during the Second World War by enforcing black-outs, practicing first aid and watching for enemy airplanes. The enemy airplanes did not come during that war. If there were to be another war, they would come. Melancholy as the task may be, we have to be ready for them. Civilian preparedness is part of the entire preparedness of the country to defend itself.

This subject comes up with the appointment of Dr. Paul J. Larsen, formerly a director of atomic research at Los Alamos and Albuquerque, to be chairman of the newly reorganized Civilian Mobilization Office of the National Security Resources Board. Health, housing, censorship and the strategic placing of industry and Government facilities will all be parts of Dr. Larsen's job. This phase of preparedness, too, has its role in preventing war, since it is intended to lessen the effectiveness of any enemy attack. At the same time, it need cause no alarm in any other country. A group of American civilians try to minimize dangers to other American civilians in case of an alien invasion will be no menace to anybody.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place the following very interesting editorial from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., on January 21, 1950:

The proposal for Federal aid to education will be before Congress again this year. The House is supposed to get a chance to consider the measure, passed by the Senate, which would appropriate $300,000,000 for the purpose, leaving the use of the money up to the individual States.

There is a growing inequality of educational opportunity among various sections of the Nation. It is due to the plain economic fact that some sections have far more resources of wealth than the national average and other sections have far less than average wealth. The education offered to children in the areas less well off may in the future have a great effect on the areas now more wealthy. The question to be decided is whether the entire Nation would not be benefited if Federal funds, obviously coming from taxes collected in the wealthier areas, were used to improve educational facilities and opportunities in the less wealthy sections. This question, standing by itself and on its own merits, ought to get a thoughtful answer.

Imports Peril New England Hat Firms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1949, this House passed the so-called reciprocal trade agreements without the peril clauses, which would have provided safeguards to American industry and to industry in my district, the State of Connecticut, when such would be jeopardized by the effects of these agreements. At that time the unemployment situation in Connecticut indicated a tendency of increasing from week to week, and, as a matter of fact, the number of unemployed in February 1949, as indicated by the weekly reports of the commissioner of labor, listing the number of unemployment benefits, approximated 50,000 unemployed. By October 1949 the number of claimants for unemployment benefits exceeded 100,000. At the present time the number of claimants, according to the last report by the Employment Security Division, Department of Labor, lists 48,431—a drop of 53,840 for the previous week. Added to this total must be the number of claimants who have exhausted their unemployment benefits in Connecticut, and such total of exhaustions approximate 55,000. In view of these facts, it seems to me that the article that appeared in the Boston Daily Record on January 23, written by Mr. Dan Markel, entitled, "Imports Peril New England Hat Firms," is a matter which, I feel sure, will be of great interest to my colleagues in the House. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article:

IMPORTS PERIL NEW ENGLAND HAT FIRMS

(By Dan Markel)

WASHINGTON.—Hat makers of New England and Pennsylvania and chinaware and pottery workers of the Midwest and California are battling State Department boosts of foreign imports and its direct purchases abroad.

For the 40,000 organized hat makers and 50,000 chinaware producers it's a fight for life.

State Department trade deals with foreign countries, principally Italy and Communist-controlled Czechoslovakia, have jeopardized their industries.

For hats or hat bodies costing $30 to $48 a dozen the duty used to be $13 plus 25 percent of value per dozen.

The generous State Department has fixed a new rate of $8 plus 12½ percent per dozen.

That means for the $48 per dozen hat bodies the old rate was $25; the new rate $14.

OTHER GIFTS CUT

Similar cuts have been made on other grades.

In secret contracts the State Department already has purchased $280,000 worth of dinnerware in Germany for its embassies and consulates around the world.

It did this following tariff cuts amounting to virtually 50 percent on such items as vases, statuettes, steins, cups, lamps, clock cases, plaques, and other earthenware and china articles imported from abroad.

Senator HUGH BUTLER, Republican, of Nebraska, exposed the secret purchase deals, and said the State Department now is negotiating a third.

America's diplomats, he pointed out, will no longer dine off American chinaware.

UNITED STATES PRICE REVOLT

BUTLER emphasized that the secret State Department chinaware deals were engineered without American producers even being granted an opportunity to bid. And at a time when unemployment, cancellation of orders, and a slow-down of American production is occurring.

The vitrified-china industry wrote to the British Embassy here inquiring whether the British would consider using American china in its Embassy services. It got a tart reply:

"As the United Kingdom is itself the manufacturer of some of the finest chinaware in the world, we are not in the market for china manufactured elsewhere."

Grants-in-Aid for Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of public discussion about the effect of Federal grants-in-aid on the initiative and independence of local agencies.

With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article on grants-in-aid for public health, by Dr. C. E. A. Winslow, the distinguished editor of the American Journal of Public Health, in the October issue of that magazine.

The article terms the first 10 years of Federal grants for public health "a record of an outstanding public service and a guide for future policy." It adds that Federal grants have not resulted in a decreased sense of responsibility, but exactly the reverse.

The article follows:

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR PUBLIC HEALTH

A recent bulletin of the United States Public Health Service (Public Health Bulletin, No. 300, USPHS 1949) telling the story of Ten Years of Federal Grants for Public Health, is significant as a record of an outstanding public service and as a guide for future policy.

The first Federal Social Security Act of 1935, among its general provisions, authorized substantial Federal grants to the States for assistance in the development and support of State and local public-health services. Formulation of the basic policies under which this program was carried out we owe largely to Dr. C. E. Waller in charge of the Division of Domestic Quarantine of the United States Public Health Service from 1931 to 1936. Grants for general health services actually began in 1937; for venereal disease control in 1938; for tuberculosis control in 1946; and cancer control, mental hygiene,

and hospital planning and construction are now also specifically included.

Allotments to the Public Health Service for such grants-in-aid have increased from under $2,000,000 in 1937 to under $2,000,000 in 1946 and over $5,000,000 in 1949.

Small as these appropriations are in relation to the total Federal budget, the results accomplished have been nothing less than spectacular. During the period 1935 to 1948, the number of State health departments reporting specific identified projects in various specialized fields, in comparison prior to the designated year, increased as follows: Tuberculosis control, 19 States to 48 States; venereal-disease control, 26 to 48; industrial hygiene, 4 to 38; public health nursing, 30 to 48; public health education, 16 to 43; dental hygiene, 16 to 43; cancer control, 5 to 27; nutrition, 7 to 30. The significance of such broadening of scope is great, and the major stimulus to such development has come from the grants-in-aid. In the same period, and largely under the same stimulus, full-time local health units have increased from 541 to 980.

It is encouraging to note that the Federal program has not, as some had feared, tended in any way to diminish local initiative. Under the system of administration in force (using in most cases a matching requirement), the increase in State and local funds has exceeded the increase in Federal funds. In 1937 a grand total of $22,000,000 was spent for all State and local services, of which 37 percent came from Federal sources (including both the United States Public Health Service and the United States Children's Bureau). In 1946 the grand total was $109,000,000, of which only 28 percent came from Washington. Federal grants have not resulted in a decreased sense of local responsibility, but exactly the reverse. They have primed the pump for more and more fruitful drafts on State and country resources.

The Bulletin under review is a purely factual one, and very properly contains no discussion of the basic philosophy of Federal grants-in-aid. This is a subject, however, on which this Journal, as the organ of the public health profession (which is on the receiving end of the process) may properly express an opinion. Every now and then an address is delivered, or an essay is written, which views with alarm the fearful prospects of Federal domination of State policies supposedly involved in grants from Washington. It happens that the writer of this editorial has for more than 30 years been a member of a State public-health council which has been the recipient of Federal grants, and is in position to testify that such fears are wholly illusory. Experience has shown that Federal fund-granting agencies are normally highly conscious of the fact that each State has two Senators, who are quite readily accessible by a word from the State capitol. It is reasonably certain that if there are faults in the actual operation of the program, they lie in too much, and not too little, deference of Washington agencies to local opinion.

We sometimes meet with statements which contrast the alleged bureaucratic control supposed to be involved in Government grants with the freedom of initiative characteristic of the contributions of voluntary agencies. This contrast again is fallacious. We do not for a moment imply that voluntary agencies have, in practice, exercised undue pressure. Such is not the case. That they could exert such pressure, if unwisely directed, is, however, clear. Their managing boards are, in actual fact, largely self perpetuating and the general public has no control over their conduct. Governmental agencies, on the other hand, are responsible to the citizenship which supports them. They are highly susceptible to pressure from individual citizens or groups of citizens. It may be suggested that those who lie awake at night in fear of Federal domination have at the bottom of their minds a different concept of government, which assumes that domination by someone is essential and that such domination can best be exercised by themselves. In a democracy, as we conceive it, the government is our Government. It cannot tyrannize over us because we control it, and we accept the underlying faith of the founding fathers in the ultimate soundness of the democratic process.

The American Parents Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the New York Times, which describes the legislative objectives of the American Parents Committee. I am familiar with the program of the committee and am cognizant of its work here in Washington and throughout the Nation to improve conditions affecting children. Mr. George J. Hecht, chairman, and the Washington representatives of the American Parents Committee are doing an effective and worth-while job in this worthy cause:

NINE-POINT CHILD AID ASKED OF CONGRESS—PARENTS' COMMITTEE OUTLINES ITS PROGRAM FOR 48,000,000 UNDER CABINET-RANK UNIT

WASHINGTON, January 2.—A nine-point program for the advancement of stated goals in the child-welfare field was announced today by the American Parents Committee. The committee added that the proposals were designed especially for the attention and action of Congress.

In a final analysis, the program is a request for enactment of legislation to improve the health, education, and welfare facilities for the Nation's 48,000,000 children.

Organized 3 years ago to put forward a national program for the benefit of children, the APC is headed by George J. Hecht, publisher of Parents' magazine. As chairman, Mr. Hecht has the assistance of these vice chairmen:

Dr. Henry Noble MacCracken, former president of Vassar College; Dorothy Canfield Fisher, author and educator; Walt Disney, motion-picture producer; and Robert L. Johnson, president of Temple University and chairman of the citizens committee for the Hoover Report.

Legislative goals for which the APC will press include:

1. The national school health services bill, calling for an annual $35,000,000 grants-in-aid program for school health examinations and treatment of all school children. This measure already had been passed by the Senate.

2. The public school construction bill, which asks $5,000,000 to match the States for a Nation-wide survey of needs, and other sums for emergency school construction. This has been voted by the Senate.

CONTROVERSIAL MEASURE BACKED

3. The Federal aid for education bill, which provides $300,000,000 for grants-in-aid to the States under a formula which gives a larger proportion of funds to the needier States. This bill has passed the Senate, but is blocked in the House by a controversy over whether Federal funds could go to the parochial schools for services such as bus transportation.

4. The national child research bill, which proposes a grant of $7,500,000 annually for research in child life and development. Hearings have been conducted in the Senate, but not yet by the House.

5. To the bill on revisions in the social-security system, and already passed by the House, the Senate will be asked to add: Increased benefits for dependent children and needy mothers under the insurance program; increased grants-in-aid for needy children when the father is unemployed; and benefits for dependent children and mothers in the program of total and permanent disability insurance.

6. The local public health units bill, which has for its purpose an increase in the number of public health units until the entire population is served, thus insuring to children safe-drinking water, milk inspection, sanitation inspection, and other health benefits. This bill has been endorsed by the Senate.

MORE FUNDS FOR CHILDREN'S BUREAU

7. To carry out basic purposes for which the Federal Children's Bureau was established by Congress in 1912, an increased appropriation will be urged, above the $600,000 currently appropriated to the Bureau, and aside from its grants-in-aid program, to total $2,250,000.

8. An increased appropriation, also, for the national school-lunch program. An increase from $83,500,000 to $100,000,000 is sought by the APC.

9. Establishment of a Federal Department of Welfare with Cabinet status. This the committee's Federal statement emphasized was long overdue, and represented a movement to help all individuals and particularly to improve the effectiveness of the many child-health and welfare programs administered under the Federal Security Agency.

Are the TV Boys Color-Blind?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ARE THE TV BOYS COLOR-BLIND?

(By Robert F. Jones, FCC Commissioner)

WASHINGTON.—Although the 3,500 pages and 100 exhibits of the color television hearing are significant sometimes for lack of sound scientific data from witnesses and parties from whom more might be expected, the hearing isn't half over and, therefore, it's a little early for the inside story that color's rigor mortis has set in. Some folks may be intoxicated by their own propaganda or they may be tuning an eager ear to their wishful thinking but the record at this stage doesn't justify the reckless conclusions bandied about by some members of the industry who haven't had the courage to enter a formal appearance for their individual companies.

In the hearing, aside from proponents of color and their witnesses, only DuMont, Philco, and American Television, Inc., appeared and testified in behalf of their own firms. Allen B. DuMont complained that the current color hearing was the first hearing of its nature not requested by the industry. When questioned on this point, he buttressed his

contention further by saying, "I don't believe there has been any general discussion, say, between the Commission, the RMA (Radio Manufacturers Assn.) and the TBA (Television Broadcasting Assn.) and other organizations before the hearing was called." David Smith of Philco, testifying for RMA, followed the party line in his direct testimony that the industry wanted color. When it seemed that RMA and the industry were tossing brickbats at color while they sanctimoniously said they were for it, Commissioner Frieda B. Hennock asked Smith the $64 question: "How are we going to get color television, we in the Commission? Where are we going to get it from?" Smith replied for RMA, "I think you are going to get it from industry, Miss Hennock."

I've heard a lot in the last 16 years about a nebulous supergovernment of the vested interests. I've heard victories asserted in the name of the common man in every national election since I entered public life. For several years preceding the current congressional investigation of lobbyists, I heard of the sinister conduct of "the interests" in seeking self-serving legislation; but I never heard of any manufacturer chiding a Senator or Representative in Congress because a hearing was held on a bill affecting his economic interest before it was cleared with the National Association of Manufacturers or the United States Chamber of Commerce.

RMA'S APPROACH OUTDATED

To understand how outdated is RMA's approach, one has only to review some recent American history. When Sam Insull's perverted sense of public service dominated the private utilities industry, he had about the same notions as Smith expressed for RMA. But the utilities have long since learned that they cannot set the low-water mark for public service. And I do not believe that the private television industry will make the same mistake despite the views expressed by Smith for the RMA that the Commission must get new developments of the television art from the television industry exclusively.

The colossal engineering feats of Hoover and Grand Coulee Dams, not to mention the enormous engineering plans for further development of the Columbia River Valley in the northwest, the Central Valley in California, and the Missouri Valley are testimonials that the Government is capable of doing a comprehensive engineering job. One only has to look at the stormy career of the TVA to understand that the Government's development of the Tennessee Valley was accomplished in spite of the bitter opposition of private interests. On a number of fronts in the Southwest, West, and Midwest, private utilities have had the lesson dramatically brought home to them in the last 16 years that Government doesn't have to and hasn't waited for private enterprise to furnish the engineering answers.

Let us get clearly in mind that I'm talking about developmental engineering jobs and I'm not proposing that Government go into the broadcasting business in competition with private broadcasters. Although it was written about the same time that the Bonneville Power Act put the Government in the power business in the Northwest, the Communications Act provided that broadcasting was the business of private enterprise alone. That philosophy I heartily indorse and I'm emphatically not advocating a change.

I am what some would term an old-fashioned conservative. In public and private life I have stood for private enterprise, lock, stock, and barrel and have stuck by my guns when it was easier politically to ride the popular tide of putting Government into business as a recrimination against some faults of business and businessmen. During my 2 years as a bureaucrat, I believe my record bears out this philosophy in dealing with licensees whose problems are properly before the Commission. You'll invariably find me on the side of strict interpretation of the act for the same reasons I tried, as a Member of Congress, to cut appropriations and write into appropriation bills limitations upon the unbounded activities of some Government agencies. The motive is simple—I believe and have believed all along that the least government is the best government.

It does not follow, however, that the Government doesn't have a job to keep private enterprise honest and to make it abide by some fair rules for the game. The antitrust laws, the Fair Trade Act, the Food and Drug Act, and the Securities and Exchange Act are pertinent examples of the Government's proper role as a referee. Who would say that we would have any of these acts fostered by both Democratic and Republican administrations if we had to clear them with Wall Street, the National Association of Manufacturers, or the United States Chamber of Commerce? These statutes dealt with proper subjects for legislative action and no one but the President had the veto power. The color hearings are likewise quasi-legislative proceedings and the act does not give any veto power or signal-calling to the RMA, Joint Television Advisory Committee, Institute of Radio Engineers or any other organization of industry. As Commissioner Walker pointed out to Dr. DuMont in the hearings, the mandate to the FCC is clearly drafted in the Comunications Act that "the Commission shall from time to time as public convenience, interest, and necessity requires study new uses for radio * * * and generally encourage the larger and more effective use of radio in the public interest." The current color television hearings fall squarely within this statutory mandate.

UNSUBTLE ROAD BLOCKS

What is all this noise about then? We have some color proposals and we have the industry practically unanimously throwing up road blocks in front of the Commission's hearing schedule to dispose of them. I say road blocks because they've posed field tests, studies and time limits from 6 months to the wild blue yonder before they can be ready to recommend standards for color.

Their intention to veto the color hearings was pretty well spelled out early in the hearings when no noticeable effort was made by the manufacturers and their alter egoes—the RMA, JTAC, and IRE—to program, plan, or report methods to the Commission by which they would build the receivers for public reaction, and for laboratory tests of color signals and color systems. Once having posed these questions, without turning a hand toward furnishing the wherewithal to answer them, it is not surprising that RMA is having labor pains forming a new National Television Systems Committee. Do they propose answers by February 27 when the hearing resumes? Apparently not. They appear merely to want time to draw up another color system with the FCC to serve as the practical nurse from now until labor is over.

You may ask why does the RMA want Commission blessing of a new NTSC? The answer is simple. The FCC engineering bureau hasn't grown with the phenomenal use of the radio spectrum. The Commission has, therefore, relied upon engineering committees whose personnel is drawn largely from the radio industry to solve its problems.

Compare, however, the Interior Department. Whether I agree with it or not, the Interior Department has a hydraulic engineer hanging from every crag in the West and an electrical engineer in every potential power market because they recognized early that they couldn't rely upon private utility engineers to carry out their conception of the development of the natural resources of power and water of the West and Midwest.

There were obviously going to be conflicts between private and public interests. The radio spectrum is one of the most precious natural resources the American public has today and I believe we are now at the crossroads, deciding whether we should let private interests exploit it for private profit and time each new development of the art for their balance sheets; or whether we should ourselves do the job that the statute imposed upon us for the public interest alone.

What does failure to build color receiving sets to determine public reaction, failure to schedule tests of the proponents' systems mean in the face of the Commission's order of November 21 urging manufacturers to build color receivers and cooperate in the tests to get the answers to the questions they themselves have posed? It means they are giving the Vishinsky veto to the color hearings. They're making the last stand for a supergovernment. What they may not win by direct methods, they apparently hope to win by acting in a semiofficial status as FCC engineers—paid for by the industry.

If Henry Kaiser had to get the approval of his automobile from the automotive industry before he could sell a car, do you think he'd have sold one yet? Or suppose the Government back in the early twenties had thrown its weight against the public's desire to buy and play with crystal sets, against receivers with morning glory loudspeakers and howling signals, on the theory that none should be sold until the superheterodyne and FM were invented. This is precisely what RMA wants to do with color proposals. The tycoons of television would be dwarfs today if Government had done this in the beginning. The radio pioneers are very short-sighted if they try to let reservoirs of knowledge run dry in this color hearing.

Religious Bigotry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when religious feeling is running high it is regrettable that the alleged ill-treatment of Texan Protestant missionaries in Italy is being used to stir up bigotry into action. The following letter has been circularized throughout parts of Texas, and it is in the interest of justice and fair play that its false and malicious character be now exposed:

MARY MOTHER OF GOD
NOCTURNAL ADORATION SOCIETY,
New York, N. Y., January 9, 1950.

Rev. J. WOOD,
Crescent Hill Church,
Brownfield, Tex.

SIR: We have read the protests you made concerning the illegal missionary activity of your workers in Italy, and of the just punishment they have received from the faithful. Worse is in store for you, as you will soon find out.

Let me assure you that you, together with all other false heretics and agents of hell, will surely burn forever in purgatory for your damnable acts. His Holiness, Our Most Holy Father Pope Pius XII, Vicar of Jesus Christ on Earth, has said there is one true church and one only—and not your false, so-called Church of Christ—which is the Devil's own church.

You have absolutely no right to be in Italy. The Italians are members of the true church, and they don't need your Holy Protestant missionaries to confuse and mislead them, so you had better stay out of where you don't belong.

Furthermore, unless you repent and confess your sin and come back to the true Roman Catholic Church the agonies of perpetual torture in purgatory and hell await you—together with Mrs. Roosevelt, Bishop Oxnam, and all others who dare attack the Holy Roman Church and our Holy Father Pope Pius XII.

I am asking the holy sisters and nuns of the Immaculate Heart of Mary Mother of God to pray for you, and maybe you will be converted to the true faith. If the Roman Catholic Church were not true, it would not be the largest, richest, biggest, and best church on earth, which it most surely is. Furthermore, hundreds of thousands of former false Protestants are daily being converted to the church by Monsignor Sheen and others.

Yours in the Bleeding Heart of Mary,
FATHER XAVIER O'TOOLE.

The Official Catholic Directory which lists every recognized Catholic ecclesiastical organization, and which lists as well every Catholic priest in good standing in the United States, has no record of a priest by the name of Francis Xavier O'Toole. Nor is there any such organization as the Society of the Immaculate Heart of Mary Mother of God. A further check with the chancery office of the archdiocese of New York confirms the Official Catholic Directory.

What then can be said of any religious group or any individual connected with a religious group who will make use of a letter which is not only malicious but libelous in character and false in its representation of Catholic teaching, without bothering to investigate its authenticity. Surely there can be little point in appealing to civil rights for Americans overseas, if those who are pleading for those rights contravene the fundamental right that Catholics as well as Protestants have to their good name.

In the publicity which has surrounded the so-called Frascati case, the impression has been conveyed to the American people that Protestants have no rights in Italy. As against this impression, Dr. Guido Comba, secretary-treasurer of the Waldensian Church of Italy, told a news service correspondent last week that Protestants in Italy have the same legal standing as Catholics. "Our church has never been molested in any of its charitable activities," Dr. Comba said. "All the institutions owned and conducted by the Waldensian Church can do their work without interference by anybody." There are over 230 Waldensian pastors in Italy who go about their regular work without interference. There are 17 Waldensian institutions in Italy: 5 orphanages, 4 homes for the aged, 2 hospitals, 2 colleges, 3 hostels for boys, an industrial home, and a home for incurables. Surely it cannot be said that Protestants are not allowed to have their institutions in Italy.

It is not Protestant missionary activity or charitable works which occasion bitterness in predominantly Catholic countries. Rather it is the method or methods used by missionaries. It seems almost naive that Italians whose Catholic culture has produced a Michelangelo, a Dante, a Thomas Aquinas, a Palestrina, and a Francis of Assisi, should sit idly by and show no emotional reaction when Texan missionaries hold that culture up to ridicule and tell the Italian people that they have been living in error all these many years.

There certainly is some point to the comment made by Carl Victor Little, who is a Protestant, and who conducts a column in the Houston Press. He expressed the hope that the State Department would return home the group of American Protestant missionaries, including the 11 Texans, who have complained that they were ill-treated by the people in some Italian villages.

These missionaries—

Mr. Little wrote—

supported by money raised in Texas, have been preaching in communities in the Italian hinterland that have been Catholic since the dawn of Christianity, that their concept of the gospel is the only true one.

We wonder what those Texans who were missionarying in Italy expect the plain, uneducated people to whom they are preaching to do, serve them spaghetti and give them a bouquet? Mr. Little asked.

These innocents abroad, the Texans, go right into the backyard of the papacy and denounce the Vatican and all its works. Then they cry and protest to the State Department, because the peasants greeted them with a shower of stones, but, according to a dispatch there were no injuries except perhaps to their delicate feelings. We wonder what would happen if a group of Italian missionaries from Rome would come to some sections of Texas and tell us Protestants that we have been talking through our theological hat and that ours is not the only true belief after all—

Mr. Little continued.

A shower of stones would more than likely be the minimum that these hypothetical Italian missionaries would receive for their trouble in trying to save the heathen of Texas—

He concluded.

Mr. Little certainly has a good point in what he says. The attempt to make use of a phony letter whose object is to foment bigotry and discord, has little place in the American scheme of things, and it is a matter of profound regret that any use of this letter has been made at all, without an attempt being made to determine whether such a society existed and whether its name was used with permission.

A Transparent Evasion of the FEPC Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, failure of the Democrat leadership to give the green light yesterday to FEPC legislation is capable of two interpretations. At best, it is an admission of division and disunity within the party that demonstrates its unfitness to govern. At worst, it is evidence of a callous repudiation of solemn and oft-repeated pledges.

Let us hear no more anywhere about a GOP-Dixiecrat coalition bottling up the civil-rights problem. The Republicans want to vote and wanted to vote yesterday. The country expected us to do so. The transparent dodge of this issue yesterday by the administration leaders will not fool anybody. They have dangled this civil-rights bait before the voting public long enough. For depriving us of the chance to vote on this issue, the responsibility rests squarely on the Democrat Party.

Tomorrow, on Calendar Wednesday, they will have an opportunity to right the wrong they committed yesterday. The country expects them to live up to their platform pledge. The Republican Party is prepared to demonstrate its sincerity, if given a chance by those who control the scheduling of legislation.

Real Fights Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been invited to an able and understanding editorial in the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer, entitled "Real Fights Ahead."

It presents a clear picture of the Rules Committee problem which confronted the House last week, and which still puzzles some of our Members, and even more of the general public.

I commend it to those of each group as enlightening and informative reading. It follows:

REAL FIGHTS AHEAD

"Who won the election in 1948, anyhow?"

That is the way Speaker SAM RAYBURN stated the issue on yesterday's vote to change the rules of the House of Representatives. So far as the House is concerned, the issue was not overstated.

The effort of a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats to return autocratic powers to bury legislation to the House Rules Committee, which they control, has been defeated.

The real fights lie ahead, however. It is true, as its proponents gleefully admitted, that if the proposed change in rules had been adopted, President Truman's entire program would have been thrown overboard. It does not follow, however, that the President's program has been saved in its entirety. It will have to be saved, so much of it as can be saved, item by item and bill by bill.

Fortunately, yesterday's vote broke party lines on both sides of the aisle which, theoretically at least, separates the two parties.

The administration was supported by 171 Democrats, 64 Republicans, and 1 Laborite and was opposed by 98 Republicans and 85 Democrats.

There will be shifting alinements on individual bills. Many southern Democrats are so much opposed to parts of the President's program that they were willing to vote, in effect, against the whole program in order to make sure of defeating part of it. Some of the 83 who favored changing the rules will vote for individual items on the President's program.

On the other hand, Republican leaders will be able to corral more of their followers against individual items on the President's program than they were able to muster in yesterday's vote.

The Democratic Party and Democratic government stood to lose a great deal in yesterday's vote. About all it has gained is chance to fight again, item by item, bill by bill. It is disheartening that on a vote that might have meant so much, one-third of the Democratic members deserted their party leadership. * * *

Needless to say this vote is not typical of the record of the North Carolina delegation in the Eighty-first Congress when that record is viewed as a whole. It is safe to predict that in the votes to come the North Carolina delegation will make a much better record.

And there are real fights ahead.

Franking Privileges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the 11-year fight against EDWIN ARTHUR HALL as a Representative of the people by the newspapers of Binghamton is still raging.

I have never failed to strike back when attacked and I never will fail whenever the ruthless foes of our types of representation challenge me.

The latest beef these ancient enemies are featuring is their same old gripe about the franking privilege.

To the folks back home who have voted for me year after year in the face of this stirring issue, it must seem slightly threadbare and tiresome to have them keep harping on this question.

They cite a cost to the taxpayers of twenty-six million annually that Government mail runs and then single me out as the greatest abuser of all. Actually my franked mail is slight by comparison.

For their information, I will frank messages telling the true side of the story every time these newspapers smear me with false innuendoes, ridicule, and genuine viciousness.

They know I can reach more people than they can, because most of their readers turn to the sports page and the funnies anyway and cannot be bothered with their editorial tripe. To the contrary, every voter reads my direct letter.

This is why these newssheets in my native city would give their eye teeth to deprive me of the franking privilege. You see they just want to cut me off from all contacts with the people I represent.

It is O. K. for them to distort my position on every subject under the sun and to make fun of the elected representative of the people. But they are determined to give me no quarter to give the public the real truth.

For over a decade they have waged in my direction the greatest character belittling campaign ever directed against a public official, at least in our part of the country. But as long as I can enjoy the privilege of striking back with the only weapon a Member of Congress now has left to defend his reputation, my voice shall not be silenced.

Let them editorialize, write poison-pen letters, set up their stooges to attack me. It will avail them nothing, especially in view of the fact that their sports pages and funny section are much more enlightening.

They deplore the fact that I use the frank. A sure way, then, for me to use the frank less will be for them to lay off. This will save us all a lot of frustrated energy.

So if they are really sincere and not just shedding crocodile tears for public benefit, let them desist.

The Special Services Program of the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, during the recent congressional recess, I had the pleasure of speaking to the meeting of the nineteenth district hospital commission, American Legion, department of California, at my home city, Long Beach, Calif., December 11, 1949. I also had the very great benefit of listening to an address to the large number in attendance by Douglas Dashiell, assistant chief, Veterans' Administration, on the subject The Special Services Program of the Veterans' Administration. It was recognized that the important subject matter he related was so clearly and succinctly stated and was of such valuable import to all Members of Congress, and the general public as well, permission was granted that I should ask to have this splendid address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I respectfully commend the reading of it by all.

Madam Chairman, distinguished guests, Legionnaires and members of the American Legion Auxiliary, during World War II, the motto of a well-known general hospital under Army control was happiness, kindness, and efficiency. In the Veterans' Administration we take pride in the fact that our hospitals provide medical service second to none. But, no hospital can achieve the goal of a medical service second to none, unless it serves its patients with the humanizing element paramount in all of its phases, for medicine used in its broadcast sense is founded in human sympathy. No man can live alone, since we are servants of each other. We are under constant and lasting obligations to one another. The policies of the Veterans' Administration embody this motto; since its goal cannot be achieved without kindness to the patients, happiness for the patient, and efficiency in serving the patient, first, last, and always.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley, now chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and formerly administrator of veterans' affairs gave recognition to this fact when he emphasized that sick and wounded veterans have certain human needs to be cared for, over and above the minimum physical needs.

Medical service second to none is based upon a well-thought-out plan of operation of the medical team. This concept represents the functioning of groups of professional and associated, qualified lay employees working in close coordination to the end that the most complete and efficient care, consistent with rigid standards of governmental economy, be employed in the treatment of hospital patients and in the care of home members. This medical team consists of these groups: (1) Doctors, nurses, and allied professional people; (2) medical rehabilitation; (3) Special Services; and (4) volunteer workers.

Today, I shall briefly discuss one of the programs of the Veterans' Administration which is designed to satisfy the human needs of our hospitalized veterans, namely, the third member of the medical team—Special Services.

The Special Services Division—on coequal staff status with operating agencies such as, Claims, Insurance, Personnel, etc.—includes the following services or fields of activity: Recreation and entertainment, sports, library, chaplaincy, and canteen services. Each section is staffed by specialists in the particular field. All special services activities are coordinated with and integrated into the over-all hospital program, as set forth by the manager and chief medical officer of a hospital.

The primary purpose in the operation of the special services program in the Veterans' Administration is to raise the morale of patients in the hospitals and members in the domiciliaries by furnishing those things which can make their stay more pleasant and thus facilitate their recovery. Special services, as such, is something new in the Veterans' Administration. During World War II, special services was a very important branch of the Army and the Air Force. In the Navy, the same services, known as welfare and recreation, received just as much emphasis and made an equally worthwhile contribution to that branch of the service. With the influx of veterans of World War II into Veterans' Administration hospitals and homes, and the accelerated program of veterans affairs, it was a logical step to incorporate the special services program into the Veterans' Administration. Veterans of World War II were used to a highly geared program of recreation and entertainment. They were used to the finest of sports facilities and equipment. They were used to new books, new motion pictures, church services for all faiths, modern PX's. Above all, they were not used to depending upon the charity of individuals at will as to whether or not they received these things.

The aim of Special Services is twofold: To assist in giving the patient a will to get well, and, at the same time, to keep his interest alive in the normal activities of life so that he may be better prepared to take his place in normal living when he is released from the hospital. That latter point is an important one to remember, for it is fundamental in our thinking and planning that our efforts be constantly aimed at returning the veteran to his community, to assist him in taking his place in that community as a valuable citizen.

Now, let's take a look at the Special Services program in progress in the Veterans' Administration. Naturally, each activity is designed and conducted to meet the needs of the patients and members for whom it is intended. This is a tremendous challenge when you analyze the personnel which our

beneficiaries represent—the presence of Spanish-American War veterans and young men of World War II, the present of sisters of World War I and pursuits ex-servicewomen of World War II, and the varying degrees of physical and mental health.

RECREATION AND ENTERTAINMENT

The recreational program comprises both active and passive recreation. Practically every patient and member is reached by this program. If his condition prohibits freedom of conduct or physical ability to go and come as he pleases, the activities are brought to him. We stress patient participation throughout the program. The Recreation Service plans and supervises programs in the fields of motion pictures, radio, hospital newspaper, music, hobby clubs, games, dramatics, and personal appearances of both professional and amateur groups. Trips into the community are a fine morale booster. The recreational program is planned and supervised by our professional staff, and a great number of volunteers are utilized in its execution.

SPORTS

A second field of activity included in Special Services is sports. The mission of the Sports Service is to provide patients and members the opportunity to participate in an enjoyable and healthful voluntary sports program. Patients and members engage in impromptu sports activities of their choice. They learn to participate better in, and to gain a fuller appreciation of sports in which they are interested. Patients compete with others of their own approximate level of athletic ability. All patients are cleared in writing by the appropriate medical service prior to participation in the sports program, in order to determine activities in which the patient may safely participate, limits of participation, and any other information needed to safeguard the patient. In addition, both patients and members are provided opportunities to attend off-station sports activities with spectator appeal.

LIBRARY SERVICE

Library service is a third responsibility of the Special Services Division. Various phases of hospital library service include:

Book truck service to wards which contacts all patients. These trucks, carrying 75 books and 100 magazines, are accompanied by a trained librarian who exchanges books and magazines, recommends reading, and notes requests for reference material and books not on the truck.

Messenger service from the library to the bed patient in the delivery of material requested on truck schedules or reserve material.

Reserve service by which books requested, which are not immediately available, are flagged in circulation and are forwarded to readers when available.

Reading room service, where readers have opportunity to examine or read books, magazines, and newspapers in comfortable surroundings.

Reference service, which requires the answering by the librarian of all types of reference questions and the forwarding of desired information to the bed patient.

Medical library service to the medical and auxiliary medical staffs.

Entertainment loan service, by which books located in one station library are available to other libraries.

Other library services, such as projected book—the projection on ceiling or wall of complete books filmed on 16 millimeter film—thus bringing considerable enjoyment to the bed patient.

Distribution of cross-word and jig-saw puzzles which many readers request as mental relaxation.

CANTEEN SERVICE

The Veterans Canteen Service is an instrumentality of the United States established by law in the Veterans' Administration. It supplies merchandise and services to specified classes of persons, and is financed by appropriated funds accounted for in the form of a revolving fund.

A hospital station canteen operation consists of:

1. Retail stores.
2. Warehouses.
3. Soda fountains.
4. Restaurant or cafeterias.
5. Barber shops.
6. Beauty shops.
7. Laundry, tailor, dry-cleaning and pressing services.
8. Shoe-repair services.
9. Vending and amusement machines.

Our canteen service provides the patient with those articles of use and convenience which, because of his hospitalization, he is unable to procure otherwise. When the patient is ambulatory, he has the opportunity of going to the store, of going himself to the canteen to make his purchases. When he is bedfast, a portable canteen, or ward cart, is brought to his bedside on a regular schedule. Careful attention is given to the choice of items made available in the canteens, as well as to the display of the merchandise in an attractive manner. The emphasis, as indicated before, is on surrounding the patients with as much normalcy as possible. Because the canteen service is a business organization, it is strictly controlled by adequate audits and inspection. Prices are kept low and any profits that accrue revert to the Federal Treasury.

CHAPLAINCY SERVICE

For administrative purposes, the chaplaincy service is a part of the Special Services Division. In the endeavor to give attention to our patients as individuals, careful thought has been given to their spiritual needs. A chaplaincy service was established in which recognition is given to the three major faiths—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish. A quota is maintained to insure equitable representation for all so that every patient may follow his religious inclination. The chaplaincy service is organized to provide one full-time chaplain for (approximately) every 500 patients, with part-time chaplains as needed. The major emphasis in this highly important service is placed on bedside ministry. In this personalized and individualized service the chaplain has the opportunity to learn intimately the spiritual needs of the patients and to bring them courage and the solace of the church.

May I summarize by saying that these special services are designed and conducted to combat the evils of inactivity and to provide some of the conveniences, stimulations, and comforts of every-day life. When supervised and conducted by adequately trained personnel—both staff personnel and voluntary personnel—Special Services can go far in aiding the veterans to recovery, increasing their vision of opportunities by provision of incentives, and help restore them to their rightful places in the community.

No official of the Veterans' Administration could discuss the hospitalized veteran without paying tribute to the splendid contribution which volunteer workers have made, and are making to the service of veterans.

A source of vast potentiality that has been brought forward by the war, though it is as old as human nature, is volunteers. No more valuable aid to therapy exists than those who come because they want to and are not paid, who bring in the breath of the outside world and keep a hospitalized patient from losing his contact. There comes with such people the visible evidence of the love and affection of America for its veterans—patients see from day to day not only doctors, nurses, orderlies, technicians, professionals in the field allied to medicine previously mentioned, who must perforce, under the best of circumstances remind a man that he is ill, but the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker, lawyer, merchant chief, the champion boxer, local athlete, well-known artists, prominent people, pretty girls, stars of the amusement world. Leaders of organizations have selected good citizens, old and young, to visit and work with the men and women of our hospitals and home. Volunteers from the local community by and large are of more value than casual visitors, for they come often enough to get acquainted and form a lasting influence. Both are valuable.

With regard to the function of volunteers, we are operating on the principle that a volunteer plays an essential part in the total job of aiding in the recovery of a patient, that he has certain specific functions with regard to doing specific jobs with certain patients, and, in addition he has general functions which have to do with the background, environment, and other connections of the patient before and after the treatment, and an important relationship to the community at large.

The compensation which a volunteer receives is not financial, but it behooves everyone concerned with the volunteer in an administrative and promotional capacity to keep in mind the very important consideration of satisfaction, appreciation, and other forms of compensation which the volunteer worker must have if his work will remain steady and show gradual improvement.

Effective utilization of volunteer assistance is a prime essential for a working voluntary service program. The planning and the coordination of the volunteer program, orientation and indoctrination of the volunteer, on-the-job instruction, and proper supervision of the volunteer are essential factors in the establishment of a voluntary service program. These factors are the responsibility of each staff member supervising the activities of volunteer workers in the special services phases of the voluntary service program. The career of the volunteer in the hospital program is in the hands of VA staff members supervising the volunteer. This career will have significance for the volunteer only if the supervisor gives meaning to the assignment, clarifies the responsibility involved, and works closely with the volunteer.

Each VA Special Services staff member is asked to analyze his program with respect to its further development through the use of volunteer assistance, and with respect to the qualifications and requirements necessary for volunteers participating in specific assignments.

By supplementing the work of the VA staff members, you are enriching and expanding the organized accomplishments of the Veterans' Administration. In great number, you have shouldered a heavy burden of hospital visitation and work. You have generously given of your time and of your money. You have built and kept alive the fire of service. Your efforts have not been in vain, because you have done the job courageously, and the veterans have benefited thereby through your devotion. For this, you are the recipients of the gratitude of the Veterans' Administration.

In the realm of rendering service, let us give recognition to the fact that the Veterans' Administration represents our Nation's plan and determination to care for our veterans. This great governmental agency is symbolic of the principle of serving those who served. It is the official assurance, as expressed by the representatives of a great people, that America has not forgotten and will not forget a job well done.

There will always be hospitals. There will always be patients in those hospitals. There will always be members in the homes. There will always be the need for that extra measure of personalized attention that means so much to living human beings.

The job of helping to restore lost opportunities to a whole generation of Americans calls for the active support of all Americans.

It has been a privilege to meet with you today. Thank you.

Senator Byrd's Budget Would Save Taxpayers Six and One-half Billions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on January 9 President Truman recommended to Congress a spending budget for the fiscal year 1951 totaling $42,400,000,000.

On that same afternoon Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, an authority on Federal fiscal affairs, submitted for the record his own budget proposals for 1951 totaling $36,000,000,000, which was $6,400,000,000 less than the amount requested by the President.

Inasmuch as all Federal spending must be met in full by taxation, and all Federal taxes come from the residents of the 48 States, the District of Columbia, and the several Territories, the following tabulation is offered to show (a) what the Truman budget would cost the people of each State; (b) what the Byrd budget would cost the people of each State; and (c) the amount which the people of each State would save in taxes if Congress were to adopt Senator BYRD's proposals instead of the President's:

	Percent of Federal taxes borne by State	Cost of Truman budget	Cost of Byrd budget	Saving under Byrd budget
United States total	100.00	$42,400,000,000	$36,000,000,000	$6,400,000,000
Alabama	1.17	496,598,300	421,200,000	75,398,300
Arizona	.37	157,024,300	133,200,000	23,824,300
Arkansas	.72	305,580,800	259,200,000	46,380,800
California	8.32	3,530,934,400	2,996,200,000	534,734,400
Colorado	.99	420,542,400	356,000,000	64,542,400
Connecticut	1.67	708,731,300	601,200,000	107,531,300
Delaware	.49	169,736,800	144,000,000	25,736,800
Florida	1.29	547,863,100	464,600,000	83,263,100
Georgia	1.40	594,146,600	504,000,000	90,146,600
Idaho	.33	133,804,800	115,200,000	18,604,800
Illinois	7.59	3,221,120,100	2,732,800,000	488,320,100
Indiana	2.29	971,852,100	824,000,000	147,852,100
Iowa	1.38	670,536,200	568,800,000	101,736,200
Kansas	1.15	488,048,500	414,000,000	74,048,500
Kentucky	1.30	550,296,800	472,000,000	77,296,800
Louisiana	1.22	517,755,600	439,200,000	78,555,600
Maine	0.44	186,731,600	158,400,000	28,331,600
Maryland	1.68	712,975,200	604,800,000	108,175,200
Massachusetts	3.40	1,442,928,000	1,224,000,000	218,928,000
Michigan	4.71	1,998,576,000	1,695,600,000	302,976,000
Minnesota	1.96	798,965,600	678,800,000	120,165,600
Mississippi	.71	301,416,800	255,600,000	45,816,800
Missouri	2.53	1,073,706,700	910,800,000	162,906,700
Montana	.35	148,536,500	126,000,000	22,536,500
Nebraska	.96	384,973,400	326,600,000	58,373,400
Nevada	.13	55,176,700	46,800,000	8,376,700
New Hampshire	.29	123,073,100	104,400,000	18,673,100
New Jersey	4.39	1,396,243,100	1,184,800,000	211,443,100
New Mexico	.28	118,828,300	100,800,000	18,028,300
New York	14.67	6,225,601,300	5,281,200,000	944,401,300
North Carolina	1.59	674,780,100	572,400,000	102,380,100
North Dakota	.34	144,292,800	122,400,000	21,892,800
Ohio	8.78	3,452,974,200	2,930,400,000	522,574,200
Oklahoma	1.17	496,526,300	421,200,000	75,326,300
Oregon	1.04	441,363,600	374,400,000	66,963,600
Pennsylvania	7.62	3,233,861,800	2,742,200,000	491,661,800
Rhode Island	.56	237,628,400	201,600,000	36,028,400
South Carolina	.76	322,526,400	273,600,000	48,926,400
South Dakota	.38	152,780,400	129,600,000	23,180,400
Tennessee	1.37	581,414,300	493,200,000	88,214,300
Texas	6.38	2,706,928,200	2,296,800,000	410,128,200
Utah	.34	144,292,800	122,400,000	21,892,800
Vermont	.18	76,390,200	64,800,000	11,590,200
Virginia	1.49	632,341,100	536,400,000	95,941,100
Washington	1.63	700,243,500	594,000,000	106,243,500
West Virginia	.92	390,458,400	331,200,000	59,258,400
Wisconsin	2.09	886,719,000	752,400,000	134,319,000
Wyoming	.18	76,390,200	64,800,000	11,590,200
District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Alaska	1.48	628,097,200	532,800,000	95,297,200

The formula used in estimating each State's share of Federal expenditures consists of three factors: First, the percent of individual income taxes collected from each State; second, the proportion of corporate income taxes borne by each State, measured by the State's percent of the national income; and, third, the proportion of excise and miscellaneous taxes—excluding social-security taxes—borne by each State, measured by the State's percent of total population. Thus we get a picture of Federal taxes borne by rather than collected from, each State, which we believe more nearly reflects the true distribution of the Federal tax burden. Each of the three factors is weighted according to the percent each tax bears of the total Federal tax revenue—1949 figures: Individual income taxes 47.52 percent, corporation taxes 30.42 percent, and excise and miscellaneous taxes 22.06 percent. Total 100 percent.

Brave Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of recent date paying just tribute to the people of brave Finland:

BRAVE FINLAND

Voting in the 13° below zero weather did not give the Finns shivers in Tuesday's election despite a campaign of intimidation conducted by the Soviets.

Once more, and by a greater majority than ever, little Finland has turned a cold shoulder at the polls to Communist candidates, notwithstanding political aid from Russia. Before Tuesday's election for the Finnish Parliament, which chooses the President of the country, Moscow, with much fanfare, charged the Finnish Government with harboring and aiding escape of 300 war criminals. Pravda earlier poured out poison against the rightist trend in Finnish politics.

In Tuesday's election a tough-minded old man, who refused to be a "yes man" when Finland twice lost wars to Russia, was elected President. In addition to carrying 107 electoral votes, the largest party bloc in Finland, Juho Paasikivi, who heads the right-wing party of the Conservative Liberals and the Swedish-speaking Liberals, also was pledged the 67 votes of the Social Democrats, giving him a total of 170 against two opponents with 150.

There was heroism in the Finnish election.

The Hiss Verdict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Hiss Verdict," published in the Indianapolis News of January 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HISS VERDICT

There must be some very red faces in Washington today, as a result of the conviction of Alger Hiss, former State Department official, on two counts of perjury by a New York Federal court jury. The reddest face of all, undoubtedly, should be that of President Truman, who brushed off the charges that Mr. Hiss had betrayed his country by passing important secret documents to Soviet spies; the case was, Mr. Truman said airily, only a "red herring," and he may live to

regret those words—if he has not already done so.

It would be enlightening, also, to know the reaction of Justice Felix Frankfurter who not only was responsible for introducing Mr. Hiss into the Government service, but also was one of the two Supreme Court Justices who broke legal precedents by appearing as character witnesses in the first Hiss trial. Mr. Justice Frankfurter will be in an interesting position if and when this case is carried on appeal to the Supreme Court.

The verdict of the jury in New York removes much of the uncertainty from what has been, from the first, a confusing and complicated case. In the tradition of American justice, Mr. Hiss has been given every opportunity to establish a reasonable doubt of his guilt. In the eyes of the American people, as well as of the jury that listened to the evidence, Alger Hiss stands convicted. And the people of the Nation are asking: "What is to be done about other trusted Government officials against whom similar charges have been directed?"

Two points of significance appear in the wake of the trial. The first is that it took the legislative and judicial branches of the Government to uncover this sordid story of betrayal in the executive branch. The second is a warning to the American people, and a revelation. The Nation's security has been menaced by one whom highest trust should have been to guard it. That must not be allowed to happen again.

Hiss Case Lessons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hiss Case Lessons," published in the Indianapolis Times, of January 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISS CASE LESSONS

The conviction of Alger Hiss should cause some soul-searching in the White House and the State Department.

This man was found guilty of perjury—of trying to lie himself out of charges that he betrayed his country and its government, under which he held positions of responsibility and trust.

Yet it has taken 11 years for justice to triumph over political premiums in this infamous case.

The diligent prosecutor who won the case before a Federal court jury must have wondered sometimes which side the Government was on.

President Truman called the congressional investigation which brought to light the charges against Alger Hiss a "red herring."

Two justices of the United States Supreme Court testified as character witnesses for Hiss at his first trial last year.

Ambassador at Large Philip C. Jessup testified in behalf of Hiss at both trials.

Secretary of State Acheson publicly expressed confidence in Hiss as recently as January 1949, although by that time most of the evidence which has resulted in the conviction was known.

Nor was that Mr. Acheson's first introduction to the Hiss case. When existence of a spy ring in the State Department was reported to the Government in 1939, an investigating official was told that Dean Acheson and Justice Felix Frankfurter would vouch for the Hiss boys. (Donald Hiss, brother of Alger, is a member of the Acheson law firm.)

It is admirable for a man to stand by a friend in trouble. But an official sworn to uphold and defend his Government has a duty that transcends friendship.

It is pertinent to ask where Secretary Acheson now stands on this issue.

For it would be assuming too much to conclude that Alger Hiss was the only person in the State Department or elsewhere in Government service who transmitted official secrets to agents of Soviet Russia.

It would be assuming perilously too much to conclude that the State Department and other Government agencies are now free of traitorous enemies within.

Imprisonment of Alger Hiss will do little to protect this country unless there is drastic change in the attitude of high officials who sought to belittle the charges against him and to help him escape punishment.

Hiss Is Guilty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hiss Is Guilty," published in the January 23 issue of the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram, of Richmond, Ind.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISS IS GUILTY

A Federal court jury Saturday found Alger Hiss guilty of perjury on two counts. He will be sentenced Wednesday.

The finding of the jury labels Hiss as more than untruthful in his testimony, before a New York grand jury. It confirms him as a former Government official who stole State Department secrets.

Whittaker Chambers, self-confessed former Communist courier, said it was Hiss who gave the secret State Department papers to him to be copied for transmission to Communists.

In charging the jury before it retired, the Federal judge said that they need not be convinced that Hiss gave the stolen documents to Chambers. Rather it was up to the jury to decide whether or not Hiss was guilty of the thefts.

But the jury also found that Hiss was guilty of lying when he said he had not seen Chambers after January 1, 1937. Evidence presented by the prosecution convinced the jurors that Hiss had seen Chambers after that date, and knew him well.

The conviction of Hiss is a historic decision.

It is historic because it establishes the connection between the Communist spy system and our own State Department in a crucial period in world history.

Later this same Alger Hiss was an adviser to President Roosevelt in his conferences with Josef Stalin during World War II. It was at these meetings of Roosevelt, Stalin, and Winston Churchill, England's Prime Minister, that the fate of millions of people was decided.

From these decisions came many of the concessions to Communist Russia which led to a policy of appeasement and stalemates between our own country and the power-seeking Red regime of Russia.

The Hiss conviction confirms the successful operation of Red spy rings in the Nation's Capital. It also lends more importance to the dangerous clique of fellow travelers who have leaned and still lean toward bowing before Communist government leaders rather than establishing a strong American policy looking toward the preservation of our own democratic principles.

Many of those friends of Russia still operate and wield their influence in Government circles to the disadvantage of the American people.

Other Accused Subversives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Next?" appearing in the Columbus Evening Dispatch of January 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEXT?

Whittaker Chambers does not regard the conviction of Alger Hiss as a closing of the book on the subject of traitors for communism in the United States Government. Last week-end, on being notified of the Hiss conviction, Chambers stuck his neck out again and reminded reporters that Hiss wasn't the only person in Government whom he had accused of working for the Soviet Union in the same Communist group as Alger Hiss.

Mr. Chambers stoutly recalled that he had accused the following, and that nothing has been done about them as yet:

Lee Pressman, a former Government attorney, later general counsel for the CIO (belatedly fired) and a strong supporter of Henry Wallace.

John Abt, another former Government attorney and Wallacite.

Charles Kramer (born Kravitsky) a former employee of a Senate subcommittee.

Nathan Witt, still another former Government attorney and former executive secretary of the National Labor Relations Board.

Abraham George Silverman and Henry Collins, both former Federal employees.

All right. What about these worthies? Some of them have been on the carpet before, but they took refuge in that familiar refusal to comment lest they degrade or incriminate themselves. Certainly Alger Hiss was no lone wolf. Certainly, in view of the strenuous efforts made to defend him, conceal for him, and dissemble for him by persons too high to be making off-hand statements, there was more than just Hiss in this business. Are other clues to the mess to be found through Pressman, Abt, Kramer, Witt, et al.?

Mr. Chambers is willing to put himself in difficulty if not jeopardy again to cast more light. Is the Government willing, too?

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio program which was broadcast from Station WSPR in Springfield, Mass., on January 8, in which Attorney Joseph A. Nowak and I took part.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY ATTORNEY JOSEPH A. NOWAK

Friends of Poland, the title of this series of weekly programs, "Justice for Poland," is symbolic of the aspirations of a brave people for their freedom and independence. That freedom and independence of which they were despoiled because of the policy of appeasement of Stalin that was adopted by our diplomats. Congressman HARRIE SCOTT of Pennsylvania best expressed the weakness of our diplomatic behavior at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, when he said in the House of Representatives at Washington recently, "The American people saw and deeply felt the suffering of the Polish people. We, in the name of the Atlantic Charter, promised that at the end of the war, both Germany and Russia would leave Polish soil. We solemnly promised that Poland again would be free. But that solemn promise was never kept. On the contrary Poland was betrayed. She was not only the sad victim of the onslaught of her enemies, but she also has been the victim of the cruel deceit of her friends. At Yalta, the fifth partitioning of Poland was sanctioned, at Potsdam it was confirmed by President Truman. Yes, we won the war. But we have yet to win the peace. We have failed to win the peace because our national leadership lacked that courage and devotion to the principle of freedom that characterized the life of Casimir Pulaski. Our national leadership was willing to compromise principle for expediency. And on the altar of expediency the freedom of the people of Poland, indeed, the freedom of the people of half the world was sacrificed."

The plight of the displaced persons of Poland is another result of the weakness our diplomats displayed at those conferences, but as to that I will let you hear from our speaker of today who has seen those displaced persons, been with them and knows of them.

He is the scion of an old and prominent Massachusetts family. After graduating from Harvard University in 1934, he entered the field of journalism and worked as a reporter for the Boston Transcript and in New York for the Herald Tribune. He served in the Massachusetts General Court and in 1936 was elected to the United States Senate from Massachusetts. When our country was attacked during World War II, he left the Senate and joined the Army of the United States. He fought in Libya, Italy, France, and Germany. He was promoted by grades to the rank of lieutenant colonel. In Italy he had the opportunity to observe the heroic attack made upon Monte Cassino by the courageous Polish Army under General Anders, which spearheaded the Allied Armies victory and opened up the road on the march to Rome. There he saw those men exultant in victory. Later, when the news of the betrayal of Poland at Yalta became known he had the sad experience of seeing tragedy in the eyes of those men. There he saw those men despondent in abandonment. There he saw them become displaced persons. Friends of Poland, I feel highly honored to present to you for your consideration the transcribed address of the speaker of today, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR. Mr. LODGE.

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

It is always a great pleasure for me to have the opportunity of being on this Justice for Poland Hour, to discuss the matters of interest to you and to me, and to all citizens who believe in and cherish the idea of justice. It is particularly appropriate to discuss today the subject of displaced persons. It is a timely subject for it is expected that the Senate will shortly have before it a new bill dealing with this important question. But not only is the subject of displaced persons a timely one, it is conspicuously a most fitting one to discuss on a radio program whose fundamental theme is justice.

I believe that Congress should enact a liberalized displaced persons law, seeking to make more workable and more practical the law which Congress passed in 1948. These unfortunate men, women, and children, whom we call displaced persons, have been waiting and praying for many years for an opportunity to start a new and decent life. They have been living under subhuman conditions. Many of them could make a splendid contribution to our common country.

This country of ours has a glorious tradition as a haven for the oppressed, and the land of hope and opportunity for those less fortunate than ourselves who subscribe to our ideals and principles, and who turn to us for a helping hand in their struggle toward a new and better life.

Somehow, many people seem to have obtained the incorrect idea that the United States already has taken a larger share of the displaced persons than is actually true. As a matter of fact this country, according to the best information I can obtain, has accepted only about 15 percent of all the displaced persons who have been resettled in new homelands.

The House of Representatives passed a bill liberalizing our displaced persons law last year, and it is with reference to this bill that the Senate is expected to act at this session. This bill will permit the admission of an additional 134,000 persons, distributed properly throughout all the 48 States, in rural and urban areas, in all walks of life.

Because my time is brief, I would like to dwell on one particular provision of this bill, which I think alone justifies our giving it the stamp of justice.

Through the years there have existed strong cultural and political ties between the people of America and the people of Poland. During World War II, members of the Polish armed forces fought with heroic determination to vanquish the common enemy. They fought with conspicuous valor in the skies over England; they fought at Narvik; they fought on the Maginot Line; they fought with stubborn fortitude at Tobruk; they fought in the terrible hell of Monte Cassino. On the slopes of this Italian town alone 3,600 of these brave men gave their lives, and I was at that cemetery myself last summer.

They gave their lives, and in so doing they saved the lives of many of the Americans in General Clark's Fifth Army; they saved the lives of many Britishers in the Eighth Army; they saved the lives of many Frenchmen in the French Expeditionary Corps. They gave their lives in a common cause, but they have not reaped the fruits of a common victory. In the eloquent and very moving words which form the title of the book written by the former Polish Ambassador to the United States, Jan Ciechanowski, they suffered "Defeat in Victory." Not for them the return to their homes and loved ones; not for them the freedom which their allies are now enjoying; not for them the dignity of independence for which they fought and for which so many of their valiant comrades sacrificed their lives.

Many of these Polish soldiers have refused to return to Poland. This refusal is, of course, due to the sorrowful fact that Poland is enslaved today as totally and brutally as she was enslaved by the Nazis. The men of the Polish Army who fought Hitler's panzer divisions in September 1939, and went on to fight the battles which I have just mentioned, have lost their country. These men, the flower of Polish manhood, have not seen their native land or their loved ones for over 9 years. Many of them will never see their loved ones again. No man is wise enough to say when or at what cost Poland will be liberated. Since the enslavement by Stalin's henchmen, cumulative crises have created a world crisis so vast and so complex that this original sin is all but swallowed up in the gathering clouds of conflict. The fate of Poland must wait upon the fate of the world—it will not be decided until a general settlement has been arrived at.

In the meantime, however, there is something we can do to express our sympathy for the Polish people, our interest in the Polish tragedy, and our desire to bring them some measure of comfort and justice. All citizens who pay more than lip service to the idea of justice have been deeply sympathetic with the plight of the displaced persons, and I have always so felt that it was urgent and just that members of the Polish armed forces should be included in that group. We give preference to our veterans in this country, we should certainly not discriminate against the veterans of a martyred ally, who are in truth displaced. Virtually the only foreign veterans who are displaced are the Poles.

Since Poland is still under the domination of a despotic power it is time to give tangible evidence of our desire to help these people. It is time to give active recognition to the part these men played in achieving the peace which is their just heritage, but the sad truth of the matter is that we have done nothing for the Polish soldiers. England has offered them temporary haven, but they are living under conditions which are not very different from those under which all the other displaced persons are living. Many of them are very unhappy, their living conditions are bleak, their ration is austere, few of them, I am told, have settled down to a normal family life in England. Many of them want to come to the United States, where they feel they can have a future. It seems to me a matter of simple justice that they be permitted to do so.

I was gratified that the House of Representatives included a provision in the displaced-persons bill, which they passed during the first session, permitting a generous quota, 18,000 of these veterans, to enter the United States under the law. Incidentally, if I may be permitted to add a personal word, it was my brother, Representative JOHN LODGE, of Connecticut, who successfully sponsored this amendment in the House and, as soon as he had done so, I addressed an appeal to the Senate Committee to retain that language in the bill, which so far has been done. Let me say also that I am the author of a bill which passed the Senate, which will authorize the enlistment into the United States Army of a few selected young Poles, who will then become officers in our Army.

The displaced-persons bill is now in the Senate committee, and it is expected that this committee will report a new bill to the Senate in January. I shall support the Polish provision of the displaced-persons bill because I think it is just and fair. It is more than a gesture and more than words alone. It is a concrete action which will prove that

we in America have not forgotten the debt we owe these valiant men, and in a very constructive way it represents definite assurance that we have not deserted the idea of justice for Poles.

Doubt as to Soundness of Old-Age System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Casts Doubt on Soundness of Old-Age System," from the Chicago Tribune of January 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTS DOUBT ON SOUNDNESS OF OLD-AGE SYSTEM—BROOKINGS STUDY URGES PLAN BE SCRAPPED

WASHINGTON, January 24.—The Brookings Institution in a study of the cost of financing of social security released tonight, seriously questions the financial soundness of the present social-security system and of the administration's proposals for its expansion. It recommends a pay-as-you-go system in which each generation would take care of its own dependents.

The study says the actuaries in the social-security administration estimate annual benefit payments in the year 2000 at from $13,300,000,000 to $20,000,000,000, and non-Government experts place the figures twice as high.

RECOMMENDS CHANGES IN SYSTEM

The present offers an opportunity to reconsider the fundamentals of the social-insurance system that may not come again, the report says. Mushrooming benefit rolls, expanding annually for the next 50 years, may result in a burden of taxation beyond the capacity of the economy to support without a substantial increase in the price level, the report continues. Increases in prices may impair if not destroy the real utility of the authorized and administratively costly system.

The study recommends fundamental changes in the system, because of the magnitude of future costs and the uncertainties in foreign and domestic conditions confronting the Nation.

SHUNDOON IT ENTIRELY

"The way to avoid the dilemma of the current pattern of old-age and survivors insurance, with its pseudo resemblance to private insurance, is to abandon it entirely," the report says. "In its place should be instituted a system that assumes responsibility for the full current load to the extent that provision seems socially desirable and can be made within our present capacity to pay. Then we can be on a genuine pay-as-you-go basis.

"Each year benefits will be paid to those in need of them and current taxpayers will supply the required funds. There will be no reserves, no level premiums, no taxes being increased according to a schedule contained in an act of Congress attempting to forecast the distant future and to bind children and grandchildren. Our grandchildren would take care of its own and trust future generations to do likewise."

EARLIER SYSTEMS FAILED

Lewis Meriam and Karl T. Schlotterbeck, who conducted the study, recalled that in the early years of the century many private and municipal retirement systems went on the rocks because they had promised old-age benefits which, as the systems matured, proved too costly to finance.

The report said that because the present system started without any benefit load and will not take on its full load for 50 years, the present collection of taxes on all covered workers produces far more revenue than is immediately needed to pay benefits.

The reserves thus created are borrowed and used by the Government for current expenses, and the assets of the reserve fund are simply promises that the Government at some future time will obtain the cash by one means or another and place it in the fund, the report asserts. Such reserves do not give financial security, it adds.

Long continuance of the present international uncertainties and the resulting necessity for heavy expenditures for national defense and aid to friendly foreign nations would seriously jeopardize the utility of the social-security program, the study asserts. It also says that an upward spiraling of wages and prices, resulting from unsound governmental financing would seriously impair the purchasing power of all the fixed money benefits.

The National Defense Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech recently made at Boston by the able and distinguished Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, in which he answered an inquiry submitted by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], received from a department store clerk, and also dealing with other vital phases of the national defense. The inquiry of the clerk submitted by Senator LODGE read as follows:

Mr. Secretary, my job pays me $38.45 per week, less Federal income tax. Why do you need $68 from people like me? What are you doing with the money? Why not get along with less?

I believe it will be very helpful to those interested in the cost of national defense to read the views of Secretary Johnson, and particularly his analysis of the defense budget and efforts being made by his Department to effectuate policies of economy consistent with our military needs and requirements in a world which is seething with turmoil and danger.

In my opinion, Congress is keenly aware of the urgent need of conducting governmental affairs with economy, efficiency, and accountability. Secretary Johnson has ably set forth his own opinions as to how these ends can be secured in his Department without impairing the national security.

His speech is thoughtful and pointed. It evidences his desire, shared by many, to keep expenditures for national defense at the minimum level compatible with our security in a troubled world and is a definite contribution to current discussions on national economy. The distinguished Secretary has ably presented his viewpoint.

ADDRESS BY HON. LOUIS JOHNSON, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Eleven years ago—to the very day, by strange coincidence—it was my privilege, as the Assistant Secretary of War, to address the Annual New England Conference of the New England Council here in Boston. At that time, the facilities afforded by your forum, served as the means of my delivering a message destined to have an impact throughout the whole world. And what I have to say to you today though it may not on the surface seem as explosive, I trust may prove of like significance.

On that November 18 in 1938, we were living in ominous times. The ink had just dried on the Munich agreement. The world was beginning to realize its sordid implications. The Sudetenland of Czechoslovakia had been handed over to Germany as an act of appeasement. A ruthless and intensive program of Nazi suppression and massacre of minorities had quickly followed. President Roosevelt, outraged by this shocking behavior, had declared that he could "scarcely believe that such things could happen in a twentieth century civilization." Secretary of State Hull, foreseeing the road to war that was being thus paved by these Nazi acts of aggression, publicly had warned that the world was at the crucial crossroads of its history, and had urged all to return to the ways of peace before it was too late.

The Axis powers, however, heeded no warnings. Drunk with their triumphs and determined in their mad plan of world conquest, they continued their aggressive ways—augmenting their military forces—mobilizing their industry—and embarking upon a production program which, above all, was intended to give them world supremacy of the air.

Realizing the potential scope of this increasing Nazi menace, and anticipating the role that the United States might have to play in an impending world crisis as the arsenal of democracy, President Roosevelt decided to meet the threat in characteristic American fashion—then and there—on the assembly lines of our factories, by the joint efforts of progressive management and free labor.

It became my duty to advise the country and inform the world that the United States had accepted the production challenge of the Nazis, and that we would start forthwith converting our pruning hooks and plowshares into airplanes, engines and propellers, to preserve our national integrity and the freedoms we cherish. Your invitation to me at that time to address you in Boston, 11 years ago, seemed a most fitting and appropriate occasion to launch the announcement of our grim determination to prepare ourselves to meet world conditions.

Among other things that I said to you then, and I give you my exact words, were: "To meet the tremendous pace that the rest of the world is setting we must double, yes treble, and perhaps even quadruple our present Air Force with the best airplanes that can possibly be purchased."

Up to that time our goal had been an Air Force of 2,500 planes. My remarks were thus interpreted as meaning that we were going to expand toward 10,000 planes, an unheard-of figure in those days. This statement of mine received wide notice. It was featured throughout the free world as a welcome announcement indicating a new and hopeful development in American policy. But in many circles, both here and behind the Siegfried line, I was criticized for what was characterized as "warmongering." In the main, however, what I said to you on that occasion did receive most kind and generous support—especially here in New England—among people everywhere whose opinions I deeply respected.

Outstanding in my memory of that event, a recollection I will forever treasure, was the laconic comment of my Commander in Chief, the late President Roosevelt, which he wrote across the copy of my speech after he read it. He simply noted: "L. J. Grand."

Today, however, I shall discuss another challenge. It may not be as spectacular as the one I discussed in 1938, but it is for us today of equally grave importance. It will not be in the nature of an exhortation to meet any production figures of overseas airplane factories, but will be in the form of an answer to a simple inquiry from a woman clerk in a Washington department store. Her message was relayed to me by your own junior United States Senator, HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.

And, if I may digress for a moment, let me take this opportunity to tell you that we in the Department of Defense look upon Senator LODGE and upon your senior Senator, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL—both of them battle veterans—as men who always place the national security above considerations of party, both of them stalwarts with rare insight into the intricacies of our problems, and always ready to render their utmost support to all efforts to assure the national security in these crucial times.

And, let me add, that likewise in the entire Massachusetts delegation to the House, led by Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority floor leader, the cause of national defense—regardless of party ties—has found many of its strongest adherents in the Congress. And this is true of the congressional delegations of the other New England States. In fact, I would be remiss indeed if I did not take the opportunity of my visit to Boston to express the appreciation of the Department of Defense to all those patriotic political leaders from New England, who are doing so much in Washington to help us in meeting our defense needs.

But let us get back to the challenge of that department-store clerk. In effect, this is what she said:

"I have a job which pays me $38.45 a week. Out of that I have to take a weekly deduction to pay my Federal income tax. I have been told that $68 a year out of my Federal income tax goes toward the support of the Pentagon. Sixty-eight dollars is a lot of money and means an awful lot to me. So I humbly ask you, Mr. Secretary, why do you need $68 from people like me? What are you doing with the money? And why don't you try to get along with a whole lot less?"

Here is a $64 question with a $4 bonus, that goes to the heart of national defense. The department-store clerk is certainly entitled to an answer and so is every American taxpayer. My remarks to you today are directed to such an answer.

We spend $68 contributed by women like the Washington department-store clerk, and proportionate and equitable amounts paid by all of our American taxpayers, first, because we need adequate national defense, and second, because its cost in the United States comes high.

We need national defense because in the world of today, as in the year 1938, there are forces at work against us—forces which tend to capitalize on national, military, and economic weaknesses to achieve their sinister aims. In the long run, aggressive communism as practiced today must lose, because like nazism and fascism and all of its other tyrannical forebears it panders to bestiality and destroys human dignity, because it is economically unsound and spiritually bankrupt. Its fanatical zealots have not yet been convinced of the inherent folly of their blind drives for conquest, and between now and the time it has run its full course to limbo it is capable of spreading misery, suffering, and war in its march. We must, therefore, be always alert to its dangers. We must be unfaltering in our aroused determination not to fall victim to any of its aggressions, now or in the future. We must stand on guard, ready to resist—with force, if need be—any attack that may be leveled against us.

Such a state of readiness in the world today, demands a mobilization of armed forces larger than we ever had before—except in time of war; and the cost comes high. Our defense needs must be realistically related to existing global conditions and to the array of forces most likely to be pitted against us. Our military planners are skilled in the art and science of warfare, and in their assumptions work on the premise that those likely to be on the other side may be just as smart, just as calculating, just as capable of making right decisions as we are. Our probable adversaries undoubtedly recognize that just to plan aggressive war against us is not enough. Before attacking they must give themselves a possibility of victory—with more than an even chance. Otherwise, they know they doom themselves to certain defeat.

We can assume, therefore, that no one will attack us who is logical in his planning, if he knows in advance that the probabilities of victory are too doubtful. We therefore must present to the world the spectacle of an Army, Navy, and Air Force so unified, and so strong, that an attack against us would be exposing an aggressor to certain defeat.

Our planning however, must go beyond this reasoning. We must also take into consideration a possible attack against us which to a prudent aggressor would seem foolhardy. To assure our security, we must calculate the risk of a dictator, who in self-centered frenzy will toss aside the counsel of logical prudent planners and go berserk, Hitlerlike, and depend on his own inspiration as the guide to his military conduct. Of course, the ultimate defeat of that type of self-inspired, military-untutored dictator would be inevitable. No war can be indefinitely maintained by flashes and hunches. Yet, based on little more, such wars have taken place and, in the process of waging that type of losing war, dictators have brought in their wake death and destruction to millions, among them many precious American lives. The American planner therefore has to take into his close consideration the possibility of that kind of poorly calculated war by a potential enemy, also.

We have another factor to consider, and that is the effect of heavy spending on armament on the economic system of our country. What will preparedness or even victory in battle avail us, we must ask ourselves, if our free democratic system is crushed in the process?

So, in the American defense plan, we must figure on armed forces large enough to protect America from all foreseeable danger but yet, at the same time, not costing so much as to jeopardize our national solvency—and that is indeed a very delicate job. It calls for compromise and restraint by all. It means adjustments and readjustments among the services with the full knowledge that no service will get all that it honestly believes that it needs. It means adjustments and readjustments between the defense and the over-all national budget in the complete realization that no taxpayer can get all the relief he needs to keep himself solvent and still risk his capital in new enterprise.

After all these calculations have been made in the consideration of our defense budget, we find that presently it costs somewhere between thirteen to fifteen billion dollars a year to support the kind of military forces we basically need. True, some other country needing the same amount of armament could get it for a lot less, but the pay and the standards of living—both of the men in the services, who must prepare themselves if need be to use our weapons and equipment, and of the men and women in the factories who must produce our armament, come much higher in the United States. That factor pushes up considerably our cost of national defense.

There is another hurdle. The United States has no design on any other nation, and has no intention of attacking first. That principle is basic to our national democratic psychology, and properly so. Our planners must therefore be defense-minded. That does not mean that they must think in terms of Maginot lines on the land, sea, or in the air, or that they should rely exclusively upon the deterrent effects of any single type of weapon of destruction. But it does mean that we must build around a strategy which will parry the first blow and keep it from becoming a Pearl Harbor or a series of Pearl Harbors, while being able to let loose against the enemy almost simultaneously our full might in a crushing counteroffensive. We must plan to have enough reserve resources in men and matériel to exploit, swiftly and finally, the strategic success of that counteroffensive, through a powerful army safely transported to overseas theaters of operations by a powerful navy, and supported in its landings and in its operations by the added might of adequate tactical air forces.

But "Why don't you try to get along with a whole lot less?" asks the department store clerk.

First, let me say categorically that we not only are trying to get along with a whole lot less, we will get along with a whole lot less. Moreover, we will get a lot more for our money. It will be a matter of less money and more defense.

We are already effecting many savings, savings in overhead, savings in operations and installations no longer needed, savings by reducing waste and duplication; and we are doing so without reducing the capabilities of our armed forces to defend America in the kind of war that we are most likely to be called upon to face in this modern world.

We in the Defense Department are appreciative of the need for national economy. To become dollar conscious is not only good economics but good military discipline for our military and naval men. We now have courses in economics at West Point, at Annapolis, at our National War College, at the Industrial College of Armed Forces, and other schools. Our men in uniform in all echelons are being made to appreciate the cost of national defense and the relations of those costs to the financial structure of our whole economy. They are now applying to their budget planning in particular, and to their peacetime administration in general, the doctrine of the economy of force which has been a fundamental principle of war throughout the ages.

Its application to military manpower problems is well understood by our fighting men. It has been hammered continuously into their minds in all their service schools, in maneuvers and map exercises, and in the conduct of battle operations. They know well that whether leading hordes of Genghis Khan, a select band of Gideon's men, French poilus, Russian cossacks, or American doughboys, the successful military leader—first and foremost, always saves his troops, keeps his men healthy, strong and aggressive—and commits no more of his troops to action than are absolutely necessary to achieve his objective.

This principle of economy of force also has its application to logistics. For in all wars supplies have played a vital though too often an unpublicized role in the success of battle. In our military and naval training today we devote a great deal of attention to logistics. Since there cannot be enough tonnage available, for instance, to take care of all possible needs of overseas forces in war, the logisticians must ration it among the respective users, and each user, in turn, must get the

most out of the tonnage space allotted to him. That means calling only for what is most needed, and then using judicially what one gets.

The military and naval minds of our country that have won our wars with the full realization of the meaning of economy of force as applied to manpower and to munitions power, are, I am happy to report, learning today to apply that doctrine also to the use of America's money power. In the past, there often crept into military and naval budgets exaggerated demands for specific appropriations because, it being a foregone conclusion that Congress would cut the amount, there was a feeling such a practice of asking for more was justified to secure at least the minimum required for adequate defense. We hope to correct that situation. From now on we expect to present a scientific budget on behalf of the armed forces which will be more definitely indicative of rock bottom needs and I am confident that disciplined minds of our services, brought up on the doctrine of economy of force, will make a decided contribution toward holding down costs. They will make cuts, but they will make them on the basis of sound military and economic analysis. Arbitrary cuts just to effect savings for savings' sake have not been ordered, and will not be ordered. However, no project will be regarded so sacred that it will not have to submit itself to close scrutiny to justify its allotment of funds. And, on the other hand, none will be so prejudged that it will not have an opportunity to prove its value. We have set our sights for a budget of $15,000,000,000 next year as against the $15,000,000,000 given us by Congress this year. We shall make every effort to achieve such a savings but we shall still remain adequately prepared to face any military crisis.

We are going to get along on this lesser amount because we know our economic system cannot afford to pay much more. In doing so, we hope to win the full confidence not only of the department store clerk who sent this inquiry, but of all of our American taxpayers no matter how large their tax burden. We are determined to give to each of you your full money's worth, and money for defense well spent, no citizen will begrudge.

Even reduced to $13,000,000,000, the cost of defense is still high. But it is necessary at this time. All of us, however, look forward hopefully to that day of lesser armaments when war and the threat of war will no longer occupy as much of our time and thought, and absorb so much of our resources, as they do now. That time, however, has not yet been reached. When and if it comes, I pledge you that our armed Forces will be the first to ask for reductions themselves. They are learning how closely tied together are the national solvency and the national defense of our country. They can be depended upon to do their utmost to help achieve what is best for the national interest.

We have an economic system and a way of life of which the men and women in service—military and civilian—are very proud. Most of those now in uniform have seen service overseas. They have seen other systems at work. They have had intimate opportunity to determine for themselves how superior the American democratic system is in comparison with the others in achieving for all its citizens—security, happiness, freedom, and better standards of living. The men in the services understand the issues we face. Rest assured that the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force will cooperate in every way in meeting the challenge of these trying days. They are prepared to do more with less, and they will be prepared to give more and more—and, if need be, their all—for the defense of our country.

Social Security Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, last fall I was 1 of 14 Members to vote "no" on the social-security bill. Certainly I voted my convictions as I always try to do, regardless of the political implications involved. Certain it is too that we should stop this "Ponzi" operation that bilks Americans by the millions for billions of their treasure and finally must pay them from the wages of the Americans then gainfully employed. A private concern would wind up in jail for such an operation. The Security and Exchange Commission would put them out of business.

Why not an honest pay-as-you-go system without this hocus-pocus that savors of the old shell game at the county fair?

The following editorial is from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of December 8, 1949:

THIS IS FANTASTIC

The Federal Social Security Administration has discovered a neat way of making money. It takes the employer-employee contributions to the social-security fund and invests them in Government bonds. These bonds pay up to 2½ percent in interest annually. With $10,000,000,000 of social-security money so invested, the profit is approximately one quarter of a billion dollars annually.

These are the facts related in an article distributed by the North American Newspaper Alliance. Social Security Commissioner Arthur J. Altmeyer is the authority for them.

At this point, no doubt, the public is supposed to stand up and applaud the faithful public servants who are handling the social-security money so prudently and actually making a profit with it instead of piling up a deficit.

But where does the quarter of a billion dollars in interest, which the social-security funds earn, come from? Why, from the Government, of course. And where does the Government get it? Why, from the taxpayers, the only source of money the Government has.

Consequently, those taxpayers, who happen also to be employers or employees, are making two contributions to social security. One is made directly in the form of a pay-roll deduction which is matched by the employer. The other is made indirectly in the form of a tax to pay the interest on the first contribution.

Thus the intended beneficiary of social security gets soaked twice to pay for it. But that isn't all.

What happens to the social-security money which is invested in Government bonds? Is it stacked up in neat piles in the Treasury, awaiting the day when the people who paid it are ready to retire and to start drawing it out in monthly benefits?

Don't be silly. There isn't any social-security money in the Treasury. The Government has already spent it.

Then where is the Social Security Administration going to get the money to meet the claims of the people who are 65 or over and who want to retire? That's easy. The administration will simply cash in some of the bonds it is holding. Since they are Government bonds, the Government will have to redeem them.

But where is the Government going to get the money with which to redeem the bonds, if it has already spent the money it borrowed on them? Why, from the taxpayers, of course. Where else can the Government get money? Of course, the Government might issue new bonds, and sell them to the banks, but eventually they would have to be paid off, too, and the money would have to come from the taxpayers.

Thus the taxpayers are going to be soaked a third time for social security.

Calling this system social security is probably one of the biggest frauds ever put over on the American people. What it amounts to is simply a device to compel everyone who has a job to contribute to the pensions of those who have retired.

Labor Conflicts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newark (N. J.) Sunday News for January 22, 1950:

LABOR CONFLICTS

Industrial relations experts are agreed that the most promising path to industrial peace is through wholehearted collective bargaining. Its contribution to economic stability was stated by the labor committee of the Twentieth Century Fund some years ago in these words:

"Collective bargaining can be, and should increasingly become, a technique to help insure a larger and more regular output of goods and services, to maintain high levels of purchasing power, to establish clear lines of communication between employer and employee, and to inspire and intensify their joint responsibility."

Early this month Cyrus Ching, chief of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, exhibited an optimistic view of the progress in collective bargaining techniques. The contrast is furnished by David L. Cole of Paterson, a nationally known arbitrator who was a member of the President's inquiry board in the recent steel dispute and currently is serving as chairman of a fact-finding board appointed by Mayor O'Dwyer to study the demands of New York City's transportation workers.

Speaking in this city, Mr. Cole said it was a tragedy that the true possibilities of collective bargaining were being neglected. Although deriving part of his livelihood therefrom, he deprecated the need of having Government boards intervene in labor disputes instead of settling them by direct negotiation. Most of the blame he laid to the "philosophy of irreconcilable conflict" by management and union alike.

Labor conflict has its origin in many and varied causes. Perhaps the most prolific cause of disagreement, leading to intervention by constituted authority, is the innate tendency of management and union to regard collective bargaining as mainly a horse-trading proposition instead of a cooperative undertaking to be pursued in good faith. No simple and effective cure may be immediately available, but Mr. Cole indicates the danger of the present situation as he sees it in these words:

"If Government has to tell employees how long to work and for how much, and employers what conditions they should provide and what welfare funds, the next step will be toward complete totalitarianism."

Thus is presented a crucial issue in the American economy that concerns each of us, whether or not we own a business or whether or not we belong to a union.

Defense Secretary Johnson Says "Unification Means Dollars and Makes Sense—That While It Would Be Disastrous To Wreck Our Economy by Inordinate Military Expenses, It Would Be Equally Disastrous To Be Penny-Pinching—The Watchword Must Be Military Security First, and Economy Second"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I have just come upon a copy of an address delivered by Secretary Johnson to the New York Bar Association. It is a talk such as you would expect from a great direct actionist like Louis Johnson—a talk which lays right on the line, the administration policies he has established in order to achieve the economy, efficiency, and national security which the Congress of these United States declared to be its policy when it passed the act to unify the defense establishments, inclusive of the armed services.

Louis Johnson is no stranger, either to the Members of this Congress or the problems of administering the Nation's defense.

His marvelous work as the Assistant Secretary of War in mobilizing the industrial forces of this country during President Roosevelt's administration was an achievement of which America will always be proud.

A lawyer himself, and a conciliator of no mean ability, he reminded his fellow barristers of the personal differences, the financial, administrative and other difficulties which arise when one endeavors to effect the merger of two or three great corporations.

Congressionally dictated, the decision to unify the three services under a single department of defense was neither the brain-child of a superefficiency expert nor a bureaucratic planner with an uncontrollable itch to bring the independent services within the confines of a flow chart. Unification was a practical decision, dictated by experience and imposed by this Congress to meet the need of security in an insecure world.

Mr. Speaker, it is because I deem Louis Johnson's address to the New York Bar Association a statement of deep and vital interest to every Member of this House that I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include the same in the records of our proceedings. I do this with a recommendation to all my colleagues that they study every word that our great Defense Secretary has uttered.

The talk is as follows:

UNIFICATION MEANS DOLLARS AND MAKES SENSE

I want to talk to you tonight about unification of our armed forces and its vital contribution to the national security.

Let's begin by defining our terms. What is the national security? It is not just the strength of our arms. It is the sum of all our strength—our political, economic, moral and military strength—and the strength of all the other peaceful nations of the world. My job is concerned primarily with our military strength. Our policy to attain this aspect of national security is based on three principles—each dependent on the others.

The first principle is that peace can only be maintained through preparedness. In the light of recent history this needs little argument or justification. Our preparedness has been generally recognized as a major stabilizing factor in these unsettled times. But what kind of military strength do we need? Obviously, to build up our military power to the point where it overburdened our peacetime economy and hurts that prop of our national security, would be disastrous. Such folly would help the cold aims of potential aggressors, would play right into their hands, and would not be preparedness at all.

But, while it would be disastrous to wreck our economy by inordinate military expenses, it would be equally disastrous to be penny pinching. The watchword must be military security first; economy second. And if we are realistic, we must face the fact that our military requirements are not static, but flexible. They are bound to be affected by major shifts in the international situation and new developments in science and warfare.

The second principle on which our military policy is based is that military security must by its very nature be relative. Obviously it is impossible to be absolutely secure. The cost of such security and the risks of obsolescence in a fast moving scientific age tend to negate efforts to achieve absolute security. This means that our military organization must be adequate, efficient and readily adaptable to change; our planning must always look to the future as well as the present. We must have an up-to-date fighting force in being, rapidly enlargeable in wartime, capable, in concert with our natural allies, of defeating any potential enemy. The maintenance of that kind of a fighting force, backed up by a sound economy, and high public morale, will give us relative security.

The third principle underlying our military policy deals with unification of the armed forces—one of the means by which the Department of Defense is developing this up-to-date fighting force designed for relative security. And it is this third principle—that unification is absolutely necessary to the maintenance of our national security—with which I wish to deal tonight.

Your own association, the New York County Lawyers Association, and the other bar associations of this city, have been having some experience with unification recently. The project before you is one of unification of the courts of the State, as proposed by the presiding justice of the appellate division of the first department and by other thoughtful leaders of the bar. You have all seen how difficult it is to carry out in practice what seems so sound and unassailable in theory. Opposition comes quickly—and in great force. Questions of history and tradition, of vested rights and national inertia, arise to plague us wherever we try to merge or consolidate two or more historic agencies. Doubts are expressed about trying the unknown, when the known has proven adequate at least in the recent past. Conflicting claims come up about priorities and superiorities and about respective jurisdictions. I need not tell you lawyers about that. You come across it every time you try to merge two corporations. You have come across it in a public way in your efforts to consolidate courts.

So you, above all others, have some idea of what I am up against.

World War II taught us that unified planning, unified command, unified research, and unified procurement are essential to success in modern war. The day before Pearl Harbor, unification, as we understand it, had not even been conceived. The tragedy of December 7 compelled us to adopt unification as the only sane method of fighting the war. But it took months and years to get unification into effective operation in the overseas theaters. If war should ever come again, the armed services won't have the luxury of years then to get organized for war; we might not have even days or hours to get organized properly. The national security requires that the Military Establishment be unified properly—now.

The problem since the war, then, has not been to determine whether, but how closely, our land, naval, and air forces should be joined together. The seat of most of the difficulty in the past has been the reluctance of some elements in some services to accept the functions assigned to their service.

These functions are determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff under the direction of the President and his assistant, the Secretary of Defense. The sum of the roles and missions of the various services adds up to the whole military problem of being prepared for—and, if necessary, waging and winning—a modern war.

Under unification, the Army, Navy, and Air Force are each responsible for carrying out specific roles and missions. Obviously, we must constantly evaluate the effectiveness of this assignment, and we must make necessary adjustments whenever performance does not measure up to plan or need.

This process of assessment and adjustment of our state of preparedness, made practicable by unification, is essential to the maintenance of relative security. It is constantly being conducted—in whole or in part—by the President, the National Security Council, the Secretary of Defense, the Armed Forces Policy Council, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the services themselves.

The criterion for deciding how closely the services should be joined together is simple: How much integration will most effectively carry out the services' roles and missions? All policies and procedures of the Armed Forces must be examined exhaustively to see that they fit into this pattern of integration for relative security.

Furthermore, because of developments in the international situation, in concepts of war, and in weapons, this yardstick of unification must constantly be applied and reapplied to every operation of the Military Establishment. Unification, therefore, is an evolutionary and never-ending process.

Unification is not to be considered an end in itself; it is the means by which we achieve relative security. Unification is not simply an administrative device for securing economies in military expenditure. Nor is it simply a streamlined system of double-entry bookkeeping.

Neither is it a scheme for reducing the three services, and the several branches of the three services, to a common, colorless, undifferentiated denominator. It is not an administrative device, which, in the interest of a supposed efficiency, would strip the individual services in their history, their traditions, their distinctions, which form so large a part of their morale.

There are those crisp, starched experts who would have men called in the Department of Defense, and be assigned willy-nilly, regardless of their individual wishes, and solely according to the results of scientific intelligence and aptitude tests, to the Army, Navy, or Air Force. I am not one of those experts.

I do not favor a common uniform, which would take away the paratrooper's distinctive insignia, or deprive the Marines of the distinguishing devices that identify the units which have made history in the wars we have fought for freedom and the minds of men.

It is easy to make fun of "the wild blue yonder," "Anchors Aweigh," "The Shores of Tripoli," or "stand up and hook up." But the "wild blue yonder," "Anchors Aweigh," the Shores of Tripoli," and "stand up and hook up," in the world of the imagination—which, after all, is the world in which morale has its life and being—represent to the airman, sailor, marine, and paratrooper certain definite accomplishments of which they are proud and which they will always seek to emulate. They represent the Eighth Air Force over Schweinfurt, the fleet on the move in the Pacific, the landing on Tarawa, and Normandy on D minus 1. We ought not to dim those memories, or to tarnish the visible symbols of them.

If, then, unification is not merely the common procurement of T-shirts, nor the reduction of three services to an agglomerate mass, what is it?

Unification is a state of mind that grew out of the experience of the war—so right, so forceful, so undeniable that those who had experienced that state of mind during the war were convinced that it must control the thinking and planning of the Military Establishment in peace.

To get some notion of that state of mind, and how it arose, take your thoughts back to the invasion of Normandy, to the invasion of the Philippines. What were the essential conditions of combat, without which success in these invasions would have been impossible? They were the same as for every engagement in the war. For this was not simply a land war, not simply a war of aerial bombardment, not simply a war of naval engagements—but a war in which the three arms had to play, and were eager to play, their part in securing a grand objective.

If this unification, if this state of mind, was the prerequisite of victory in modern war, then, all responsible and disinterested military men finally agreed, it had to furnish the guide for the Military Establishment which was to secure the peace so hardly won.

The decision to unify the three services under a single department of defense was not, then, the brain child of a superefficiency expert, a bureaucratic planner with an uncontrollable itch to bring the independent services within the confines of a flow chart. Unification was a practical decision, dictated by experience and imposed by the need of security in an insecure world.

The decision to unify is one thing. The degree of unification, the act of unification—I need not tell you—is something else again. Honest men can, and do, differ as to the extent of unification which security required. It is relatively easy to get agreement on joint medical research, or even on joint research on weapons. These are matters on the periphery of the unification idea, and do not so closely engage the loyalties and jealousies of the three services.

It is far more difficult to get agreement on the roles and missions which are assigned to the services in the event of war. This is not surprising. The Army, Navy, and Air Force are not merely units on paper. They are institutions, living institutions, human institutions. And, like any human institution that has salt and savor in it, each of them has a proud history. It may be true that this history is at times an encumbrance to clear thinking in the present. It may be true that some officers are sometimes self-seeking like other men, and that their self-seeking narrows the range of their vision. Even conceding these things, still we must ask ourselves whether these very defects have not played some part in building up the efficiency of the services. It is true that narrow regard for the interest of the individual service may result in a disregard for the national interest. Yet, we must admit that in the past this narrow self-interest, this fierce independence, this rivalry, this competition have also acted to keep our services at the top of their forms; these elements were active ingredients in service morale; and they have, as a result, played a part in the victories which our arms have won.

Edmund Burke, criticizing the attempt of the French revolutionaries to wipe clean the slate of history, declared that while society was indeed a contract—as the French revolutionary philosophers maintained—it was not a contract in tea and calico and spices. It was, said Burke, a contract in every science, in every art, in every virtue; it was a contract between the living and the dead, between the living and those yet to be born. In the same way our three services are not paper organizations—no mere collection of bodies and weapons. They are proud institutions with every right to be proud. They have a contract with their past—and with their future as well. That contract must, and shall, be honored.

But they also have a contract with their country—as they have always had. And while the object of that contract remains what it has always been—the security and defense of the Nation—the terms of that contract have changed. The terms have changed because science has changed the nature of war, and the roles and missions of the three services. The safety of the Nation no longer reposes in the skill and valor of its individual arms, individually engaged, but in its combined arms jointly engaged. The decision to combine and unify, to subvert the individual role to the common end, is a decision that is taken rather easily when the Nation is fighting for its life. It is a decision that is much harder to take in peacetime—especially when the planning is for an indeterminate future. But that decision is necessary. It has already been made. The decision to unify has been made by the Congress, approved by the President, and endorsed by the American public. And that decision is going to be carried out.

In carrying it out we have found that decisions which affect the autonomy of the services—or what they have regarded as their autonomy—have resulted in prolonged resistance and, at times, acrimonious debate which culminated in public hearings on Capitol Hill. And while the debate has often been wearisome and feelings have been bruised, this process is to some extent a part of our democracy. I cannot help but add that the process might have been expedited by the use of some more imagination and [illegible] sense and less self-interest.

To my mind, however, the wonder is not that the first 2 years of unification have generated differences. The remarkable thing is that unification has progressed as far and as rapidly as it has. Far more progress has been made than is generally realized. The state of mind, which is unification, is becoming more widely accepted, and more widely diffused, both in the services and out. This is especially so since the recent public hearings before the House committee.

One thing which these hearings did bring out, and which I would like to emphasize, is the lack of substance behind the frequently reiterated statement that in the councils of the Joint Chiefs of Staff the Navy has been consistently outvoted 2 to 1.

Now the facts of the matter are these: The concept that decisions are made by a 2-to-1 vote in the Joint Chiefs of Staff is a fallacy, from start to finish. The Joint Chiefs of Staff do not vote; neither do they decide. Instead, the Joint Chiefs recommend; and the Secretary of Defense, as the representative of the Commander in Chief, and where appropriate the President himself, does the deciding—all within the provisions of the Constitution and the unification law enacted by the Congress. The ultimate decision of the Secretary of Defense or the President is not necessarily governed by the fact that two of the Chiefs may recommend substantially identical courses of action, while a third Chief recommends something quite different. All that any difference of opinion means is that the issue is one which must be decided by someone other than the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

This is somewhat comparable to a situation where you have a petition for a writ of certiorari from a circuit court of appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States. The fact that the expression of views in the circuit court of appeals was 2 to 1 for or against your client does not determine what the Supreme Court will do. Many of us here tonight as lawyers have had occasion to find that out from time to time. It is true, of course, that the client who has both a good case and a good lawyer when the issue reaches the Supreme Court can have greater confidence than the client who is less fortunate. I can assure you that in the forums which Congress has provided for the purpose—the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Armed Forces Policy Council—all issues are being argued effectively and persuasively by excellent advocates of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

In conclusion, may I venture to say that we have now reached a point where unification has about weathered the stormy seas of service controversy. It is now emerging into the comparatively calm waters of greater understanding and acceptance. It is sailing toward the safe harbor, where decisions, because they have been jointly arrived at, can command not only obedience but obedience freely and cheerfully given.

Your Dollars for a Delusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Your Dollars for a Delusion," by E. F. Tompkins, from the Chicago Sunday Herald-American for January 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR DOLLARS FOR A DELUSION

(By E. F. Tompkins)

Tomorrow the Finance Committee of the United States Senate will start public hearings on a new social-security bill.

This is a bill which was passed by the House of Representatives at the last session of Congress by a vote of 333 to 14, to increase the payments of old-age pensions by the Federal Government.

The overwhelming favorable majority indicates that virtually everyone believes in security.

Even more, it indicates that politicians are somewhat afraid of the question as a political issue; they are willing to vote security when actually there is no assurance that the security will be provided.

And, because of the nature of the Federal social-security system, and the New Deal's fiscal practices, there is no such assurance.

The Federal social-security system is not a sound insurance system.

It is financed by taxing pay rolls, and the tax money is not saved up to meet the obligation.

Instead, the money goes into the general fund of the Treasury and is spent by the Treasury.

In lieu of the money, the social-security fund receives investment paper from the Treasury, which the Treasury must repurchase when the insurance fund needs the money.

And the Treasury can obtain the money only from taxpayers—including the workers and employers who already have been taxed once—or by borrowing against future taxes.

Until now, the pay-roll taxes have exceeded the annual payments, so that the fund has a mythical surplus.

But the time approaches when the annual payments will exceed the pay-roll taxes, and the Treasury will have to meet the deficiency by more taxes—whether on pay rolls or otherwise.

The only remedy for this defect—one which the Hearst newspapers have advocated—is to provide old-age pensions according to need, and to revise the whole tax system in order to provide for them.

Otherwise, both the Government's obligation and the pay-roll taxes will become excessive and damage or destroy the free-enterprise system.

Furthermore, an insurance system cannot be any better than the monetary system of the Nation.

A worker who pays for a retirement pension with one kind of dollars is entitled to receive the pension in dollars that are just as good.

At present, because of the New Deal's deficit financing and its substitution of fiat dollars for gold dollars, we have inflation, and inflation is the thief of security.

We no longer have a 100-cent dollar.

Our unredeemable paper dollar is worth only about 50 cents in comparative purchasing power.

If the administration continues its financial methods, the dollar is likely to diminish to a dime in actual values of goods.

And a pension of $100 a month, promised now, may be equal merely to $10 when the retired worker gets it.

It is no investment to pay a dollar for a dime's worth of security.

One of the best appraisals of inflation and social security was made recently by Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, a long-time advocate of social legislation.

In a copyrighted interview with the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, he said:

"No plan for old-age security can work unless savings have a sound, stable value."

Taking notice of some of the fancy pension schemes that are being promoted now, Mr. Baruch observed:

"We mustn't let ourselves become victims of the delusion that all we have to do is to vote the older people money."

Calling attention to the fact that the cost of living has increased something like 65 percent since 1939, Mr. Baruch concluded:

"Each pension or old-age insurance or social-security check buys that much less than before the war.

"It means that workers who paid their taxes expecting pensions when they retired are now being shortchanged."

The Senate Finance Committee should have Mr. Baruch in as a witness when it opens its hearings in mid-January on the pending social-security legislation.

Governor Driscoll's Second Inaugural Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 18, 1950:

GOVERNOR DRISCOLL'S ADDRESS

The statement of principles with which Governor Driscoll begins his second term will be read with interest outside New Jersey for its strong affirmation of the desirability of self-reliance at the lower levels of government. This is in the nature of reiteration; the Governor made the same point last December in an address here, when he said, "We want to do more and more for ourselves and ask less and less from others." It is a theme that echoes with frequency of late. It was dominant in Governor Dewey's recent message opening the New York legislative session. It was emphasized, we are especially pleased to note, in the letter published yesterday of the State conference of mayors to Governor Dewey and the legislature.

Our cities and States might well take to heart one warning uttered by Governor Driscoll in his inaugural speech. "One sure way," he remarked, "to destroy our Federal system and home rule is for the States to fail to provide for the general welfare of their citizens." The same lesson applies to the relations between the State and its localities, a fact recognized when Mr. Driscoll urges strengthening of the capacity of cities to govern themselves and to "mold their form of government to fit the needs of their citizens."

Most of the problems of New Jersey are not unique, except in emphasis. Some of these, and the general philosophy for dealing with them, bear a marked similarity with the pattern of Governor Dewey's message. The fiscal situation is troublesome. The demands for services by our citizens far exceed available revenues. After reviewing the several fields in which he hopes to extend progress already made and others in which new ground needs to be broken, Governor Driscoll reminds us that "despite the pessimism of some, we live in a good world." He sees this as a world of opportunity for government, but his fundamental interest is in keeping government close to the people. We wish the Governor well in his second term as he seeks to continue in New Jersey the progress acknowledged by the voters in returning him to office.

Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes

REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, like many other Members of the House, I was gratified to note that President Truman has recommended the repeal of certain wartime excise taxes.

It seems to me, as I have stated many times before, that the continuance of these wartime taxes is untenable on any principle of governmental finance or social policy. I see no possible justification for continuing to impose such heavy and detrimental levies upon so many articles and commodities of ordinary use. These taxes have been well termed a national nuisance. They strike at many classes of our American body politic and some of them are ridiculous.

Is it arguable that we should continue to tax baby oils, women's handbags, telegram and telephone messages, transportation, recreation of the rank and file of our people, cooking appliances and water heaters and other things so indispensable to the American home? The President will have widespread support of his proposal to eliminate many of these onerous levies.

I have again joined with many of our colleagues in urging the House Ways and Means Committee to formulate appropriate legislation to repeal these inequitable, illogical, and repressive wartimes taxes.

I am not unmindful of the fact that when these taxes are repealed the Congress will have to provide other sources of revenue to replenish the Treasury for the losses sustained. In the first instance lifting the taxes on many of these commodities will unquestionably result in larger profits to industries and businesses affected and hence additional income to the Treasury.

Whether this additional income will be sufficient to offset the loss of revenue due to repeal is debatable. There is expert opinion both ways. Measuring the various opinions, I am inclined to the view that the additional income will not equalize the losses.

Assuming this fact, the Congress has two choices. It can provide new taxes to make up the difference, or it can endeavor to effect further savings and economies in expenditures. If it is at all possible, without impairing essential services, I should be disposed to favor the latter course. Otherwise, it will be necessary, and I very reluctantly reach this conclusion, to impose new taxes to make up the difference. Congress should exercise utmost care not to impose further onerous taxes, if avoidable.

The other alternative is continued deficit spending and in my judgment that would be most undesirable and unhealthy for the national economic well-being. Whatever this Congress does regarding revenues and appropriations, we

should work together in a wholehearted effort to avoid an unbalanced budget and further deficit spending.

Industrially and economically the Nation is near the peak of prosperity. Over 60 millions of our citizens are gainfully employed. Business and industrial profits have been unprecedented. The national income has been greater than ever. Great and desirable social gains have been achieved. The Congress must hold and extend these gains by promoting sound financial and fiscal policies which alone can form the enduring, solid basis for full employment, high wages, prosperity, and security for the American people.

We are all aware that this Government creates and produces no wealth on its own account. Our matchless economic system animated by the incentive and energy of our people performs that function. The Government can encourage and direct and guide business by pursuing wise policies and rendering necessary counsel and assistance and by maintaining basic conditions under which finance, industry, business, and agriculture may flourish and prosper. But we must have it constantly in mind that our economic system upon which the Government and our people must depend can be seriously impaired in its efficiency and, in the end, broken and destroyed on the rock of high taxes and regimentation. We have many examples before us in Europe of this fact of which we should take stern cognizance because they clearly point to the dangers and catastrophy involved in over-spending, over-taxing, and over-regulating by the Government.

Such unsound policies will lead us as a nation down the road to totalitarian serfdom. I think and hope that this Congress can and will take effective steps to avoid the sad experiences of other nations which have departed from the fundamentals of the free way of life.

I hope we will not seek to serve special privilege, greed, avarice and over-reaching by any class or group. If we move to secure to the average American citizen the protection of his basic rights and opportunities, his fundamental right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, we can best serve our Nation to build even a stronger citadel for a well-ordered government, a flourishing economy and a progressive and humane democracy.

The Strange Career of Teddy Hayes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a story entitled "The Strange Career of Teddy Hayes," as written by Joe Williams, sports columnist of the New York World-Telegram and the Sun.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRANGE CAREER OF TEDDY HAYES

(By Joe Williams)

NEW YORK, January 20.—There was quite a to-do on the city side yesterday when it became known that one Theodore T. Hayes had been named assistant to Oscar (Ole Oss) Ewing who is head coach of the welfare State varsity, or, as it reads on the door of Washington office, the Federal Security Administrator.

Who was Hayes and how did he come to be an authority on such vital and controversial items as social security and health insurance? I go back a long way with Hayes—back to the days when he was using his square moniker, Teddy Weinstein, and, as a lightweight, was fighting ham and eggers for small change out of Chicago.

TOWEL WELL SWUNG

It is an illuminating commentary on his fighting genius he did not become nationally prominent until he joined up with the two Jacks—Dempsey and Kearns—and was assigned to corner work such as carrying the champion's bucket and swinging a towel between rounds.

I regret I am unable to contribute anything to the search for information as to his qualifications as a social worker except to point out he never was a dumb cluck when it came to looking out after his own security and health.

I do happen to recall Mr. Hayes was connected with a Mexican lottery several years ago as a barker or shill. This may have been when he experienced the first twinges of a social conscience. I used to read his letters with tear-dimmed eyes. All the money was to go to helping the poor, the sick, the illiterate. Mr. Hayes needed publicity. First prize was $100,000. Obviously, Mr. Hayes was hopeful Americans would switch from Irish sweeps to Mex.

A SENSITIVE SOUL

Mr. Hayes' admirable program to bring sunlight, happiness, tequilla and tortillas to the underprivileged, unfortunately, was not a smashing success. Very few of the American winners collected. Some of the more heartless went to court. Such unwholesome descriptives as racket and larceny were applied to the operation. Naturally, Mr. Hayes, a sensitive soul, was distressed. But it is to his credit that, undaunted, he continued to fight the good fight for the oppressed, and when the call came from Oscar (Ole Oss) Ewing to help sell the welfare state to Congress he responded without the slightest hesitation.

I first came across Mr. Hayes as a representative of the Government when he was serving as Ed Flynn's assistant at a world's fair we had around here. Later, I believe, he became the commissioner of the fair. And still later Flynn, ardent New Dealer, sent him on the road hustling up young Republicans for the Dems. Little Teddy Weinstein, who used to carry Dempsey's bucket, had come far.

FOR HIS BROTHERS

I don't know how Mr. Hayes happened to go for the Mex deal unless he feared, as so many other Truman loyalists did at the time, that the joy ride was over and Tom Dewey was going to take over. Still, it couldn't have been too difficult a choice, considering that Mr. Hayes was going where he could do so much good for his less fortunate brothers south of the border.

The last time I saw Mr. Hayes in a prize ring was the night before the 1930 derby—or the Gallant Fox derby, as the pros put it—and on this occasion he was helping Jack Kearns master-mind Mickey Walker, the middleweight champion, against a large slab of suet named Paul Swiderski. This one turned out to be a lulu.

The weather had been bad all day, seat sales worse, and Walker had been told, or was under the impression, the fight had been canceled, but around 7 o'clock the promoters decided to go through with it anyway. Which was fine except in the meantime Walker had gone out and got himself so full of food and beverages he was scarcely the picture of the perfect warrior.

BOTTLE RINGS

But since this was supposed to be one of those pleasantries in which the less impeccable members of the profession sometimes engage, there was nothing to fear. That's what Kearns, Walker, and Mr. Hayes thought. Swiderski, noting Walker's condition and seeing a chance to steal the title, came out swinging. Walker was down five or six times before the bell rang to end the first round.

The end, it developed, came prematurely. Kearns had slipped around the ring and banged the bell with a beer bottle. In an instant there was wild confusion in the ring. Mr. Hayes punched Harry Lenny, Swiderski's manager, right between the eyes. In came the cops. Presently everybody was in the cat. It must have been 15 minutes before the ring was cleared. By then Walker had recovered, which was the main idea, and from there he went on to win like the remarkable fighter he was.

Unlike Mr. Hayes, Lenny never had an official Washington tie-up, but as an expert masseur he treated the late President at Hyde Park several times and has letters to show his ministrations gave Mr. Roosevelt at least a few moments of relief from time to time.

The Coal Situation

REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, which comes first—the national welfare or the selfish demands of a few arrogant labor union monopolists? Whose interests are paramount—those of the general public or those of a highly organized pressure group? Whom do we serve, the inarticulate mass of American people or a noisy dictatorial minority?

Those are questions which I should like to address particularly to the House Committee on Education and Labor. For weeks a number of us have been endeavoring to impress upon the President the great hardship and suffering being experienced by our people in the coal shortage. To this end a number of us have introduced a resolution calling upon the President to invoke the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I wrote the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], urging him to grant us a hearing that we might present persuasive and conclusive evidence of this emergency.

I have in my hand his letter of January 24 in reply.

He refuses to schedule a hearing. He not only thereby refuses to recognize the existence of an emergency, he even refuses to permit us to prove by evidence the existence of one.

In refusing us a hearing he uses as an excuse that his committee has agreed to hold executive sessions on measures previously reported by the subcommittees. He says, and I quote his exact words, "There will be no hearings scheduled before this committee until all pending business is concluded."

In other words, the Chairman of our Committee on Education and Labor tells us that regardless of how cold it becomes, regardless of whether or not industries shut down, regardless of the hardship experienced by innocent people who find themselves without heat, light, and jobs, he does not intend to depart from the routine business of his committee. He will not even let us prove how grave this emergency is.

Incidentally, the committee did not meet today on any business. I asked for a hearing last week, and it could have been scheduled for today.

Am I to believe that the prejudice against the Taft-Hartley Act is so great and certain labor union leaders so politically powerful that we cannot even be allowed to prove a need for use of the act?

At long last, at least one person connected with this administration admits the existing crisis in the current coal shortage. As you have noted from the press accounts, Dr. James Boyd, of the Bureau of Mines, admitted in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Labor yesterday that a national emergency exists.

These are his exact words:

Accordingly, it is believed that unless there is an immediate resumption of substantial increased coal production the national economy, health, and welfare of the Nation is now or soon will be imperiled.

Mr. Speaker, I again call upon President Truman to act immediately. Does this Government belong to all the people, or is it being run solely for the benefit of a politically powerful few?

JANUARY 20, 1950.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: I respectfully call your attention to House Concurrent Resolution 157, which I introduced on January 12 last, and respectfully urge that your Committee on Education and Labor give immediate consideration of this resolution.

It is my understanding that around 24 like resolutions have been introduced and referred to your committee. This in itself indicates the serious situation existing in various sections of the country because of the current strike in the coal industry. We are prepared to present to your committee, at a hearing I hope you will grant, persuasive and compelling evidence that this strike imperils our national health and safety.

The purpose of this proposed resolution is to call the attention of the President to the acute coal shortage resulting from the strike and to urge him to invoke the national emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947. As representatives of the people we are seeking by this resolution to express the views of the people we represent. I hope your committee will grant us such an opportunity by a public hearing and prompt consideration of these resolutions.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

RALPH E. CHURCH.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1950.

Hon. RALPH E. CHURCH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 20, in which you ask for hearings on House Concurrent Resolution 157, a resolution favoring the invoking by the President of the United States of the national emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the pending coal strike.

Please be advised that on January 16, 1950, in executive session, the Committee on Education and Labor adopted a resolution to hold executive sessions daily on bills that have been previously reported to them by the subcommittees.

Therefore, there will be no new hearings scheduled before this committee until all pending business is concluded.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN LESINSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

Capturing Revenue From Income Labeled "Tips"

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, an innocent gesture, originally intended to demonstrate a superlative feeling of satisfaction and gratitude for some special favor rendered, has expanded into an institution which has reached the height of promiscuity and insolence. I am referring to the tipping habit, or perhaps I should say "racket."

The President in his budget report the other day announced that if we are to do away with luxury taxes, additional ways and means must be found to replace this loss in current revenue. I know of no better source from which additional revenue can be obtained than the income from tips.

Time and time again, investigations started by the Internal Revenue Department, seeking to uncover income obtained from tips have been both ineffective and unsatisfactory. Recently our appeals courts have laid down a definite rule as to what constitutes income, and they say tips must be considered as such.

A thorough investigation relating to the receipt of gratuities and tips, together with the resultant loss of revenue is a matter I believe Members of the House should seriously consider at this time.

The tax burden as it now prevails, should be distributed equitably, and that presumes that moneys received and classified as income are not to be omitted from taxation, except when specifically so earmarked by law.

I have filed a resolution asking that a more thorough investigation be made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue into incidental income from tips, which represents additional income for workers in a score or more of classifications.

From the meager reports available it is reasonable to assume that more than three-fourths of the income derived by means of tips are never reported, and the Government thereby loses an inestimable amount of money in revenue; plus an additional source of taxable income, which quite conceivably add enough money to the Treasury to allow for the reduction of taxes which have become a harassing burden to the American people.

The liberal interpretation of the tipping situation as presently applied, has reached a point where it can no longer be ignored. While the costs of all necessities of life have risen sharply during the 10 years—so has the scales of expected tips risen.

From 1939 to 1949 retail food prices have risen from 95.2 percent to 204.8. The cost of wearing apparel has risen from 100.5 percent in 1939 to 190.9 in 1949. Rents have increased from 100 percent to 120.5 in 1949. Railroad passenger rates have increased from 100 percent to 133.8 during the same period.

It has been conservatively estimated that the tipping practice has reached the point where several billions of dollars per annum are extracted from the pockets of wage earners in other fields—and on this, at the present time, the Government has no definite check.

As a point of illustration, I enumerate the number of gratuities which are usually given on an ordinary overnight trip from one city to another. Not less than 11 tips are regarded as necessary from hotel to hotel. These are:

First. Tip to bellboy to carry baggage from room.

Second. Tip to doorman for getting taxi.

Third. Tip to taxi driver.

Fourth. Tip to station redcap.

Fifth. Tip for dinner service on train.

Sixth. Tip for service in club car.

Seventh. Tip for service to pullman porter.

Eighth. Tip for breakfast service.

Ninth. Tip to station redcap.

Tenth. Tip to taxi driver.

Eleventh. Tip to bellboy to convey luggage to room.

The average traveler can hardly manage to escape from some of these voluntary returns for favors or services rendered; but he or she will find still other occasions for tipping, should they require any additional services at all.

As for the hotels themselves, there are no ceilings on rooms occupied by transients, with the result that hotel owners and innkeepers have upped their tariffs to as much as the traffic will bear without

leaving them enough empty rooms to curtail the hotels' income, thus the patron shoulders this burden, and the increases in the amounts required for tipping as well.

Hotelkeepers indicate that they can justify the increases in rates, and the tipping practice. During the Senate hearings, when rent controls were being considered in 1949, Mr. Glenwood J. Sherrard, speaking for the American Hotel Association, stated that since decontrol of hotel rooms there had only been an increase of 25 percent. This amount, he stated was more than consumed by the increase of wages and maintenance.

However, this figure was much different from the increase reported by the Housing Expediter, Mr. Woods, who testified before the same committee that hotel rates had increased since decontrol more than 47 percent.

Other checks have ascertained that a hotel room costing approximately $10 per day, costs its temporary tenant no less than an average of 33⅓ percent additional. Thus, his or her room, because of incidentals reflected in tips, costs $13.34 cents per day, not including food.

All this is in the face of wage increases. For the 10-year period ending in 1949 the average hourly earnings had increased 110 percent. Average weekly wages had increased 115 percent. The average weekly average of all groups, including clerical, salaried, and so forth, had increased 103 percent. The all-over increase for every single group and type of worker has almost doubled—or has increased 99 percent to be exact. It is known that employers encourage and countenance the tipping system, and are parties to it, despite the fact they have increased the cost of their commodities time after time.

Increased wages, instead of decreasing this drain on the public, has given way to unwritten laws setting up a regular scale to be expected in tips, which, if ignored by customers and patrons, makes them the target of derision, sneers and other embarrassing outward evidences of the servitors' disdain and displeasure. This scale, although flexible frequently amounts to 33⅓ percent for personal services over and above the basic charge.

The investigation I request should probe all categories of employment where tips are allowed and a thorough examination be made of wage scales; increases in business incomes, including the increases in costs to the customer and consumer.

Judicial precedent has already been established in this matter: I cite the case of Roberts against Commissioner of Internal Revenue, No. 11999, which was heard in the United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, wherein the court said:

> Generally a payment earned at the same time be a gift and taxable income, but a gift cannot be excluded from gross income unless it is a genuine gift, and the essential characteristics of a gift, including absence of consideration, must be present.

Tipping lacks the essential element of a gift, which is the free bestowing of a gratuity without consideration.

The decision pointed out that tips received by people who render services to the public are an incident to the service, and constitute compensation for personal services so as to require their inclusion in taxable income.

In this decision Roberts was ordered to pay an additional 10 percent prorated on his basic salary.

When the recipient of tips is confronted with a complaint and asked for an accounting he usually resorts to a well-developed and carefully thought-out pattern in justification for his demeanor. He maintains that he, by no outward sign or suggestion, has asked for the tip, and that it is the giver's expression of exhibitionism or showoffishness, a mere manifestation of his personal vanity, and therefore is a gift.

But the court, in the Roberts against Commissioner of Internal Revenue case, did not concur with this line of thinking. It stated that tipping had become so commonly accepted an incidence of certain types of service that "he who fails to give it may incur the haughty stare of the servant when he leaves, or expect a haughtier stare if he appears again," and that "the giving of a tip is tied to the service, without which the occasion would not have arisen."

This decision leaves no doubt as to just how "voluntary" the act of tipping has become. While it is almost automatic, still the court was moved to comment that any patron who failed to tip found it impossible to escape the "grumbling and sour faces" superinduced by a tip considered insufficient or inadequate by the recipient, just as Sir Walter Scott found the situation more than a century ago.

General Hershey Makes Masterful Statement in Support of Continuance of Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted me I am including a statement made by Gen. Lewis B. Hershey as a part of these remarks. During the recent war General Hershey performed a remarkable job as head of our Selective Service System. During practically the whole time between the wars he was studying the selective-service principle. He, more than any other man, is responsible for the system as it was finally enacted into law and for its administration.

His performance in carrying out the mission of providing the manpower for our armed forces was superb. We are now in the postwar world that we all thought would be a peaceful one. But to our surprise and disappointment the world is still unsettled. On the horizon we see many menacing clouds of discord, misunderstanding, distrust, and conduct that menaces the peace of the world. We have seen over a dozen nations lose control of their domestic affairs through the relentless penetration of one large nation that apparently is trying to dominate the internal affairs of these countries. This relentless drive to take away from large populations the right to select and operate their own governments is going on in various parts of the world.

From day to day we do not know what incident might bring war upon a war-weary world. For this reason we should keep ourselves in a strong military posture to indicate to the world that we are prepared to take care of ourselves in any kind of a contest. General Hershey made a statement to the Armed Services Committee of the House of the benefits to us and the world by the continuance of Selective Service by the United States of America. I wish every Member of Congress could find time to read this statement. He points out that this step now is really good peace insurance at a low premium rate. His statement follows:

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. LEWIS B. HERSHEY, DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE, BEFORE THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE

Mr. Chairman and the members of the committee, I recommend the extension of the selective service law. My reasons for this recommendation are: First, the presence of the law is a vital factor in the preservation of the present precarious peace; and second, should all efforts to maintain the peace fail the existence of this law will be a most favorable factor in the expeditious procurement of manpower for the winning of the war and the reestablishment of the lost peace.

I believe that the preservation of the selective-service law is the cheapest insurance the United States can buy for the prevention of war. This is true for three reasons: First, continuation of this law is a pledge of good faith to friendly nations. Those nations, like us, are interested in maintaining and extending democratic principles upon which this Government has been founded and under which it has lived. On the other hand, failure to extend this law cannot but raise questions as to the intentions of the United States to support to the limit of her manpower resources the course upon which the community of nations has embarked.

Second, extension of this act is a notice to all who may not view with friendliness the ideals and the policies of the United States. Extension is evidence of continuing intention of the United States to use all its manpower resources in support of its policies. Had such action been taken, and such an intent been crystal clear to the aggressors prior to World Wars I and II, it is most doubtful that it would have been necessary for the United States to have become involved in either of these wars.

Third, and last, the most important of all, the extension of selective service is not only a pledge to our friends and a notice to others, but it is a dedication of Americans themselves in a forthright manner to indicate an understanding on the part of the Congress and on the part of the people of the United States that the troubled world in

which we live cannot be safely lived in without the cooperative efforts of the whole people. The experiences of World War I and World War II indicate that if war comes all of our citizens will be under the necessity of giving their maximum efforts. There has never been a question of the intentions and willingness of the American people when once the gage is down. It is worth the effort, in an attempt to prevent World War III, for our people to indicate in advance—and to understand in advance—that requirements for service will be upon all who are able to bear it. If that is the inescapable consequence of war, how wise and how honest to understand and to be willing to give a very small portion of the unity and support that is a part of the preparation for service in order to prevent a war which requires so many more times the effort and so much more of the individual's time to win.

The presence of a Selective Service Act not only is one of the many factors which go to preserve the peace, but constitutes an insurance policy which contains many other benefits. In cost it is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the Federal budget for survival. Like insurance, it must be bought before the time when its benefits become due. Once that day arrives the favorable insurability has been lost. It is only in peace that we may buy at minimum rates the protection which may well be the difference between peace and war.

The second reason for recommending the extension of selective service is based upon its value in increasing the potential of the United States should peace be lost. Our experience in the past indicates that should war come it is inevitable that manpower of this Nation would be furnished to the armed forces by some orderly, expeditious, fair, and just method of selection and induction. It is no small task to register and classify the 50,000,000 of our manpower as we did in World War II. It requires a machine which covers the entire United States. It requires organization; it requires training; it requires teamwork; it requires a morale which comes with a feeling of esprit de corps for an organization in which all of its members can take a well-deserved pride. Such an organization is not built overnight. The Selective Service Act of 1940, which was passed in September, did not produce men at the rate of 400,000 a month until October of 1942. Fortunately it was not called upon for this rate of production earlier.

It will remain controversial as to the date that this production level could have been achieved by the Selective Service System organized under the act of 1940. It is my considered judgment, based upon every inquiry that I can make of our historical experience, that when we have said that 4 to 6 months would be required to organize and train a system, imbue it with its objectives and its ideals, while at the same time registering several millions of people and running them through this recently organized system up to this point where it was capable of producing even 300,000 a month, this estimate I believe to be in error on the side of optimism, rather than the contrary. I fear that we should inevitably find ourselves consuming at least a year to reach the production level of 500,000. There is no experience that we have had in this Nation that could lead us to any other conclusion.

In that particular I should like to state I believe that we lead ourselves into error in our thinking and planning when we presume that a critical situation with the country in chaos will permit and force a more rapid organization which is efficient and orderly than under circumstances in which we have more time and less interference. I believe firmly that if we should be attacked it would be much more difficult to perfect this organization than it was in 1940 and again in 1942. The present system, torn into segments, will operate each in its own area much better than an organization which must be brought together under circumstances that are disintegrating in their nature. There is no question, and can be none, of the inevitableness of the use of some selective sort of a system for the procurement of men for the armed forces should we be forced into war. There is likewise no question that the existence of this organization with men registered and classified will save months of time, billions of dollars, and hundreds of thousands of lives.

I have tried to indicate that the extension of the Selective Service System, is a positive and powerful move for peace—by its encouragement to our friends, by its warning to others, and by reminding each and every one of us of the responsibilities that survival in this present world entails. I have tried to indicate what it would mean to have this law and the system which it organizes in being in the event every effort which we have put forth failed to hold the peace.

I should like to discuss just briefly the law as it has operated for the past 2 years. I shall make no defense of the law. I believe that history when written with the distance from its occurrence which insures objectivity will give it a place that is not recognized now. There are on this committee most of the individuals responsible for this legislation in the House of Representatives. Because it has not been used to the extent that it might, because it has functioned to provide men by indirect means, there has at times, certainly on the part of many, been a feeling that it was not necessary. I am sure that the verdict of objective history will be otherwise. Discount the fact if you will that we have not deteriorated toward war since the passage of this law. Precarious as it may be, we still have a peace of a sort. I shall not claim that this act saved this peace, but it helped. This law would have been used a great deal more if we had gone to war, but how much better it is that we can be satisfied its presence was a great factor in preventing its maximum use.

We are prone at times to forget what it did do, especially in its early days. It is often said that the Navy and the Air Force never inducted any men under it, and yet their recruiting in the months immediately subsequent to the passage of this act tripled over what it had been the months before. I am sure that 250,000 men entered into the services, including the National Guard, under the impetus of this law in addition to the rate which had been in existence for the 6 months preceding the passage of this act. It is true that the Army is now permitting men to go to swell our ever ebbing trained reserve after they have served 1 year. Let us not forget that there are undoubtedly over 200,000 men now serving in our armed forces who are there as a direct result of the wisdom of our Congress in the passage of the Selective Service Act.

It is one of the strange experiences of life that we pay the premium on our life insurance when we live, and certainly we would not be wise to criticize our insurance policy at the end of 2 years from its purchase date because we had spent our premiums then and still had not collected because we are still alive. Protection we pay for, and one of the commodities bought is the absence of war. It is the same with the fire department or the police department. Do we ask as we pay each week or each month the individual fireman whether or not he has attended a fire that particular pay period, and then abolish his job, close up the fire house because it has not been used?

We are content with the policemen when there is no crime. How ridiculous it would be to ask each policeman on stated occasions whether or not he had shot a citizen during that period, and if his answer was "No" ask him to turn in his badge and get his pay at the office, because obviously if he was killing no one, there was no need for his services.

Selective service, like the armed forces, performs its duty just as much when it succeeds without its use, as when it is forced to rescue a war that is already in existence, a war generated by circumstances before the selective service could influence those circumstances. I am sure the members of this committee need not apologize to their colleagues, or to the United States, for the fact that they did their full measure of duty in the passage of the Selective Service Act of 1948 and thereby made a major contribution in strengthening America's position, and, by strengthening that position, avoided the loss of peace. Had the Congress passed a Selective Service Act in 1936 as it did in 1948 we might have avoided World War II in 1941 as we avoided world war III in 1948 and 1949.

It is so much easier to see this pertinent need which existed for the selective service law in 1940 than it is to see the same need in 1948. Saving and winning a war are steps that are visible daily, hourly, to our citizens. Preventing war, as well as keeping peace, is a 24-hour-a-day, month-by-month, year-by-year job. It has no glamour, but it has no casualties.

The fireman on his chair in the engine house is not a glamorous figure. He looks like a load on the taxpayer's purse. The same fireman though, up on his ladder in the blaze, is understood; and yet when he by his presence and his timely arrival at the fire puts out with his hand extinguisher a blaze that might be a seven- or eight-alarm affair, he is most useful, if not most glamorous. Preventing war by strength, by declaration of intentions, and by continual dedication of our citizenry needs no apology.

To keep our strength, to be ready, and to keep the peace, I recommend the extension of the Selective Service Act.

Is Hiss Alone?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Is Hiss Alone?" from the Indianapolis Star for January 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS HISS ALONE?

The conviction of Alger Hiss climaxes the most dramatic and important criminal trial in recent history. The jury has unanimously decided that Hiss lied and that his accuser, Whittaker Chambers, told the truth. Hiss denied that he gave secret State Department documents to Chambers for transmittal to the Communist underground. The jury's decision that this denial was a lie brands him as a traitor to his country.

The astounding thing about this decision is the fact that a young, brilliant, and ambitious man who was engaged in a Communist conspiracy against his own country should rise so high in the service of the Government. The frightening thing is the proof here given that a servant of communism did become a

very important member of the inner council of Government, was given a position of great power and influence, and successfully hid the fact that all the time he was supposedly serving the people of the United States he was actually serving the ruthless tyrants of Moscow.

Alger Hiss held one of the top jobs in the State Department. He was an assistant to Francis B. Sayre, Assistant Secretary of State. He was Secretary General of the San Francisco Conference which wrote the United Nations Charter. The imperfections of that Charter are now being used by Soviet Russia to block all hopes of peace and national independence through collective action.

But most significant of all, Alger Hiss was a member of that small group of statesmen who went to Yalta and traded the freedom of half the world for the empty promises of Joseph Stalin. At Yalta the United States turned over half of Europe and all of China to the Communist regime. We abandoned the traditional policy of the United States in China. We violated the high principles to which this country subscribed in the Atlantic Charter. We produced the greatest debacle in foreign relations in the history of the American Republic, the conquest of China by communism.

During a period in which the American State Department was making decisions that might mean life or death to the people of this Nation, this man, this convicted liar who is now branded a traitor to his country, was helping to formulate those decisions. Alger Hiss has been accused and convicted as a plotter against the system of government which he was sworn on oath to protect and defend and preserve.

Of course, Hiss was only one of many people who created the policies that today find this Nation backed against the wall in a terrible struggle for the preservation of all the things America and our form of government mean to the people of this Nation. His influence may not have been decisive. But now we cannot help but ask, was Hiss alone? Were there others who were equally adept at hiding their servitude to Russian totalitarianism, working in the same way for the dissolution of American power and principle. Are there still others like Hiss in important positions in this Government?

President Truman called the investigations that finally led to the convictions of Hiss "a red herring." He can no longer do so with any justification. The part Hiss played was a real part, not the figment of somebody's imagination. The safety of this Nation, the rightness of our future foreign and domestic policies depend on the Government's clear and proved answer to this question: Is Alger Hiss alone?

Resolution by the Atlanta Chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, although in some quarters in Washington there is a disposition to ignore it, the fact is that the people of the United States know that Communists and Communist sympathizers have infiltrated into our Government, and they are tired of it. The people are tired of Communist coddling.

I have on two occasions within the last few days expressed my sentiments regarding this question.

I am inserting herewith resolution regarding this subject, adopted on January 11, 1950, by the Atlanta Chapter, Military Order of the World Wars.

I am in hearty accord with the sentiments expressed in this resolution.

RESOLUTION BY THE ATLANTA CHAPTER OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS AGAINST COMMUNISM

Whereas communism as a political ideology and as a way of life is a danger that threatens to subject the world, including the United States, to tyranny and cruel suffering wherever it can fasten itself upon a people; and

Whereas communism is an aggressive, greedy, proselyting form of political disease that feeds upon the apathy of governments and of people, spreading like a cancer where the body politic is not always awake to its terrors and growth; and

Whereas communism is spotted upon the United States in frequent enough incidence to be a dangerous threat to the freedom and existence of this Nation and its peaceful way of life; and

Whereas communism here is by its publicly avowed and confessed doctrine a part of the pattern of world communism, alien to us in every sense, inimical to our safety and happiness, and working to poison our institutions to our destruction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is urged to take measures to prevent the infiltration of Communists and of known Communist sympathizers into any position with the Government of this country, national, State, county, or city; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is urged to adopt such measures as may be necessary to guarantee that no quiet seizure of this Nation by such enemies shall go forward, whether through its press, its schools, its radio, its public forums of any kind, or through clandestine organizations which work unmolested to destroy us; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress recognize the awful extent to which communism has grown in the United States, and take steps to establish effective security and counter-Communist agencies adequate to the mission of affirmatively stopping communism and Communists here.

Adopted by the Atlanta Chapter, Military Order of the World Wars, at Atlanta, Ga., January 11, 1950, with instructions to transmit a copy to each Member from Georgia in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

Attest:

T. CLINT HOUGLEY,
Commander, Atlanta Chapter, Military Order of the World Wars, Atlanta, Ga.

Britain's Hand in Uncle Sam's Pocket—Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I read with a great deal of interest an editorial appearing in today's Times-Herald, headed "Britain's hand in Uncle Sam's pocket—Again."

Two years ago I pointed out how the Marshall plan was born, having been conceived by a group of Wall Street bankers and war profiteers and those connected with and interested in the I. G. Farben cartels of Germany.

This editorial throws additional light, not only upon some of these men, but it also makes clear Britain's influence and interest in these German cartels. I feel the American people should have this brought to their attention. Consequently, I ask permission to embody this editorial in my remarks in the RECORD for their enlightenment.

The editorial follows:

BRITAIN'S HAND IN UNCLE SAM'S POCKET—AGAIN

A move to give more billions to the British is gathering momentum. Representative WOLCOTT, of Michigan, one of the best-informed Members of Congress on financial matters and a delegate to the Bretton Woods conference in 1944 by appointment of President Roosevelt, said in a statement last week that an attempt soon would be made to have the United States assume the debt of Britain to India, Egypt, and other foreign countries.

NEW SCHEME REVEALED

WOLCOTT was the first to describe the details of the new scheme. He said that the United States would pay these British debts by accepting sterling now frozen in London in payment, first, for agricultural products accumulated by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and then for machinery and other items.

All this ties up with the proposal made in December by a study group of United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce. The scheme released by that group was the first suggestion of using money obtained from the American taxpayers to pay old and stale debts of the British Government.

The study group limited the donation to 15 percent of the British debts. The idea now, according to Representative WOLCOTT, is to have the United States assume the entire debt.

The composition of the group in the International Chamber of Commerce which made the original proposal shows the motivating influence. The interests back of the new eight-billion-dollar donation to Britain are the same ones which put over the Marshall plan and then made huge profits out of it. They are also the same ones which backed every other donation of American funds to Britain.

MARSHALL PLAN BUSINESS

One of the 21 named as authors of the scheme is Lamar Fleming, Jr. Mr. Fleming is president of Anderson, Clayton & Co., the principal business of William L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State.

Mr. Clayton was the principal architect of the Marshall plan, directed negotiations with foreign countries in working out the plan, and directed the drive for the passage of the first ECA act. Mr. Clayton's firm has supplied at least $100,000,000 worth of cotton paid for with ECA funds. ECA transactions with Anderson, Clayton & Co., tabulated by the Tribune, total $79,000,000, with no figures available since September nor between February 1, 1949 and April 30, 1949.

Another member of the International Chamber of Commerce group which suggested unloading British debts on the American taxpayer is S. Sloan Colt, president of the Bankers' Trust Co. of New York.

His bank has, from the first of ECA, had a large percentage of the letter of credit business. Through the end of the year, Mr. Colt's bank has had $281,000,000 worth of business from the Marshall plan. Two directors of the Bankers' Trust Co., Philip

Reed and Ward Melville, were members of the committee for the Marshall plan—the propaganda group which agitated for passage of the act originally. Reed also is president of the International Chamber of Commerce.

The National City Bank of New York, which has had $310,000,000 worth of ECA business, was represented on the committee to put over the Marshall plan by two of its directors, Sosthenes Behn and Gerard Swope. Now we find two officers of the bank, W. Randolph Burgess, chairman of its executive committee, and Leo N. Shaw, a vice president, on the roster of the study group which brought out the new British aid plan.

BANKS GET THEIR SHARE

Two Irving Trust Co. directors, Henry P. Bristol and David L. Luke, worked hard to get the Marshall plan through Congress. The bank has cashed in on their efforts thus far with $220,000,000 worth of letter-of-credit business. A vice president of the bank, August Maffry, took a leading part in preparing the International Chamber of Commerce report.

J. P. Morgan & Co. has had $238,000,000 worth of business out of the ECA. I. C. Raymond Atkin, a Morgan vice president, was one of the study group which brought out the suggestion for a new lot of British aid. The Bank of America also can see the point that foreign aid is good for the country or at least the financiers' end of it, as its share of the ECA banking business so far has been $197,000,000. Russell G. Smith, an executive vice president, is on the international chamber's committee.

Those who had the misfortune to invest in foreign bonds which are not being paid or serviced would like to see their debtors helped; so the membership of the chamber's committee of James Grafton Rogers, president of the Foreign Bondholders Protective Council, is understandable. For like reasons, so is that of William S. Robertson, president of the American & Foreign Power Co.

The new plea for British aid at the expense of the American taxpayer is not being promoted by patriotic people who have only the welfare of all the people of the country in mind. It has been launched by persons who have their own private interests in mind. The influence of these people, when combined with that of the eastern Anglophiles, proved sufficient to put over the $3,750,000,000 loan to Britain in 1946 and the Marshall plan.

Unloading upon the United States old and stale debts of the British Government does seem a little more outrageous than the other schemes, but it will all look sweet and reasonable when the internationalists' propaganda has had a chance to dress it up.

Shaky United States Economy Resulting in New Kind of Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Shaky United States Economy Resulting in New Kind of Isolationism," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer for Sunday, January 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHAKY UNITED STATES ECONOMY RESULTING IN NEW KIND OF ISOLATIONISM

(By Constantine Brown)

A new kind of isolationism is developing rapidly among thinking political men, some voiceless military men, and others who, in the past, have been inveterate foreign interventionists.

One of the reasons for this reaction is the disappointment suffered by so many because of the failure of our leaders to secure a stable peace after we had won an overwhelming victory in World War II.

Another reason is deep concern over the possibility that our economy will become so shaky, as the result of extravagant expenditures abroad, that we shall be incapable of defending ourselves against the Soviet Frankenstein monster we helped to create.

And, finally, there is a growing feeling that the billions we are planning to spend in rearmament of western Europe may be thrown away because of the war-weariness of the peoples of the Atlantic Pact.

The American Government is committed to provide the equipment for about 25 divisions among the nations of the Atlantic Pact. But there is increasing fear, even among the advocates of that plan, that the war material may not be used if the Russians decide to strike at a time when we can scarcely spare the money to build up properly our own national defense against a Soviet attack from Siberia.

This neo-isolationism is different from that advocated before the last war by the America First organization. The America Firsters were opposed to any military preparedness. They maintained that a substantial increase in our Military Establishment would only lead to intervention in the war going on across the Atlantic.

The neo-isolationists believe in the strongest possible military preparedness at home. They believe in a substantial increase of our air arm, our ground forces, and to a lesser extent the naval forces. But looking at our budget—which is in the red—and at the commitments we have made across the seas, they do not think an increase in the cost of our national defense is feasible.

So far we have spent nearly $35,000,000,000 since VJ-day on all kinds of stop-communism-in-Europe schemes. We are the only country in the history of the world which is paying indemnity to the defeated nations. After having crushed Germany, Italy, and Japan we now are spending more than $3,000,000,000 a year to put them back on their feet. If we had not done that, it is argued, all those countries—with a population of nearly 170,000,000—might have gone over to the Communist side.

In Italy alone we spent nearly $2,000,000,000 in cash to defeat the Communist Party at the last election. In order to prevent the Communists from making real gains in a prostrate Germany we have to spend more than $1,000,000,000 a year in helping to put the German economy back on its feet.

It is difficult to guess when we will be able to stop our subsidies to western Germany. The Germans are working hard and would like to be on their own. But many difficulties lie in the way of their full economic recovery.

Neither France nor Britain, our closest allies, like the idea of meeting German economic competition. This explains their determination to dismantle the German factories. Officially we were told that if German industry is permitted to remain intact—even after a large portion has been dismantled—the risk of another German aggression would be great.

This argument, however, concealed the real reason, namely, the fear of the French and British Governments to compete once more with the hard-working Germans in a restricted world market.

Both the British and French can afford to adopt such a policy. It does not cost their taxpayers a nickel. But with us the situation is different. The American taxpayer must foot the bill not only for the armies of occupation in the Reich but also for many of the Bonn government's requirements. If we refuse, we are told, the whole structure of that democratic government will go to pieces and we will be faced with a Communist Germany in that area which is so close to the western union.

Over and above that, we are spending money on the Marshall plan to keep the Communist bear away from the western European countries and we are now to ship war materials of all kinds to the Atlantic Pact nations to permit them to organize their armies as a defensive force on the Rhine. But whether the European nations actually will use that war material if the Russians strike is another question.

Our Government has been assured by the governments of western Europe that they will fight if they have the means to do so. The European generals and admirals have assured their American opposite numbers of the same thing. But nobody has ever attempted to ascertain—even through some kind of poll—how the peoples of those countries, who would have to do the fighting, feel about it.

In private conversations our top military men admit that it is not humanly possible to give a clear-cut answer to such a question. They are compelled, however, to assume that what they are told by responsible officials across the Atlantic is correct. We must assume that by spending between $5,000,000,000 and $6,000,000,000 in the next 3 years we will provide the armies of our allies with sufficient equipment for them to put up actual resistance to possible aggression.

When these American military men are asked how they reconcile their optimism with the historical fact of the Nazi conquest of western Europe in 1940—when 81 French and British divisions melted away under the attack by a much smaller German force—they reply that the situation was different then. We had not committed ourselves to help the western democracies before the defeat occurred and the French felt themselves hopelessly alone.

Now that they know we are committed to fight any aggressor, they say, they will have a greater inducement to fight. Thus it is hoped that the western armies behind the Rhine will be able to fight off a numerically stronger Russian force with less than one-third of the forces they had in 1940.

The neoisolationists take this with a grain of salt. They ask quite frankly what would happen if the Russians, while holding the European front, decided to strike directly at us through Alaska, Greenland, or Iceland. None of these vital strategic points is prepared to withstand a Russian aggression.

At this time we have no ground forces in Alaska. The reason is that there is not enough money to meet all our domestic requirements and our international obligations and at the same time build houses for a minimum of one combat division in that Territory.

There are no military agreements between the United States and the government of Iceland, or with the Danish Government which controls Greenland, to provide for common defense of those strategic areas. All the American troops stationed in Iceland during the war were withdrawn—and properly so—soon after VJ-day. The military installations, to a great extent, have been destroyed.

The neo-isolationists say that in the event that Russia looks to and strikes at the strategic positions which would bring their air forces close to American territory, there

is more than an even chance that our western European allies would protest, sympathize with us, and offer every conceivable moral support. But no western European government would remain in office for half an hour if it attempted to live up to the provisions of the Atlantic Pact and created a diversion by striking at the U. S. S. R. in Europe.

Hence, our neo-isolationists say, we must be prepared to face the music alone and rely only on our own efforts. The fear that Russia might attempt to strike directly at us is due to the fact that America, it now is obvious, is considered enemy No. 1 of the Soviet imperialism. If it had not been for our intervention, western Europe might already be behind the iron curtain. And if it had not been for our unbelievable policy in the Far East the U. S. S. R. would not now be the dominating power on the Asiatic mainland, free to do whatever she likes in that area.

A strong non-Communist China would have been a thorn in the side of the Russians and would have deferred any plans to use Siberia as a jumping-off place if the Kremlin decides to attack America and bypass its western allies.

The possibility that we will have to fight the Soviet forces alone is strong in the minds of many people, who now are called neo-isolationists. Because of that possibility they believe that we must start soon to pay far more attention to the defense of the United States on its own soil than to continue to throw our wealth, which is not inexhaustible, about in the world.

These views are likely to be heard soon when Congress starts to scrutinize the new budget, particularly those sections containing provision for the Marshall plan and military aid to Europe. Secretary of Defense Johnson and the senior officers of the Air Force will be asked pertinent questions as to whether they are able to maintain the defense of the United States with the present 48 groups provided for in the budget. The Army will be asked whether it can assume full responsibility for defense of Alaska with the one combat division it intends to send there during the summer and whether the three divisions available in the United States are sufficient to guarantee the country's security in the event of Russian aggression.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff in all probability will be asked whether they are planning on physical help from our western European allies in the event of a surprise attack.

A substantial improvement in the actual defense of the United States is demanded by many who are afraid that we are dissipating our substance abroad and not providing for our own defense in case an aggressor bypasses western Europe. At this time, they say, we are planning to fight another war exactly as if the German strategy of World War II is to be adopted by the Russians. But what will happen if they decide to alter the strategy and leave the ripe European plum hanging loosely on the tree and turn their full power against America itself?

Oil and Gas Depletion Tax

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, to satisfy the ravenous appetite of this administration to secure more taxes rather than to practice economy and cut the cost of Government, the President in his tax message this week asked for a reduction of the oil and gas depletion tax which has worked successfully and to the benefit of the Nation for many years. This ill-advised recommendation of the President should and, in my judgment, will be soundly defeated by this Congress.

If this tax-depletion recommendation is approved it will drive all independent oil producers in the Nation out of business. The independent producers who risk their capital and open up new oil fields cannot and will not be able to operate without the benefit of this tax depletion.

This move on the part of the administration, if successful, would place them in a position where their only alternative would be to sell out to major companies who would be able to name their own terms. It is a gigantic move which will favor big monopoly.

In addition hundreds of small refineries would be put out of business. Hundreds of thousands of men operating throughout the oil fields would no longer be employed.

This move to destroy the thousands of independent oil producers must be defeated in the interest of national defense because without the independent producers to discover new fields our oil reserves would dwindle, oil production would slump and in the event of another war the Nation would find itself short of oil and gas to supply the motive power for our Air Force, Fleet, and the Army.

Independent producers throughout my district tell me that if the proposed attempt to tamper with the depletion allowance is successful they will have no choice but to get out of the business. In selling they will be at the mercy of a few buyers consisting of the major oil companies and large financial corporations. Such a move which will produce less oil would not only throw a half million out of work but would cause the price of oil to increase to the consuming public. I ask, Which is preferable, to soak the consumer of petroleum products, or to keep back enough from the clutches of a wasteful bureaucracy to carry on a work that is a safeguard to the national security and which provides necessary and useful employment to hundreds of thousands?

These are the exact conditions that will follow unless this Congress defeats the attempt of the tax authorities to grab this power.

This depletion tax allowance has played a major part in extending the search and discovery of new oil and gas reserves throughout the United States. Because of this incentive we have been well supplied with oil products in time of peace, and we had an additional producing capacity which carried us successfully through the recent world war beginning with the critical hour when the Japs struck in December 1941.

The efforts to hamstring the oil producing business have been tried before. Congress has each time refused to let it happen. The weight of the evidence should again bury those who would sacrifice this industry so that their insatiable appetite for new tax can be gratified.

The process of finding new fields is expensive and hazardous. A majority of the wells drilled at great expense are dry with a terrific loss to the producers. This depletion tax is fair and just. It is the same type of a depreciation tax provided for the aging of buildings or the wear and tear on machinery. When an oil well is discovered it may produce well, but within a few years the oil in the ground supporting this well is pumped out. The well becomes worthless—that is the reason the Congress has wisely provided for the 27½ percent income tax depletion on oil well production.

United States Superforts to Great Britain—What Military Assistance to Arabian Countries?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, my attention was attracted to an Associated Press release from London appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times of January 25, calling attention to the fact that Great Britain is to get about 70 of our superfortresses.

Inasmuch as Great Britain is supplying various Arabian countries with weapons of war, I wonder whether these superforts will also be sold to those countries by Great Britain after having received them gratis from us?

In view of this situation I think our country should cease furnishing war material to Great Britain to further their purpose of supplying these countries in their war preparations. Surely they do not intend to war against one another. If there is any intent of war, it would naturally be against the new state of Israel, which is doing everything possible to bring about peace with the Arabs, has taken care of over 60,000 Arabs, and notifying them to return, which they have and are doing in large numbers. Though the new state of Israel has aided them in every conceivable way, there are some who, for political reasons, are creating discord with the assistance of British authorities.

The Associated Press report is as follows:

BRITAIN REPORTED DUE TO GET SUPERFORTS

LONDON, January 25.—The United States will give Britain about 70 Superfortresses and some sorely needed raw materials under an arms aid agreement now nearly complete.

Diplomatic officials who reported this last night said the agreement probably will be signed in Washington this week end.

The Anglo-American pact is one of eight being worked out under the American $1,000,000,000 military aid program for the nations of the North Atlantic alliance.

Britain recently objected to some of the conditions which the United States wanted in the accord. The informants said these difficulties have now been ironed out.

Flow of arms to Europe will begin about a month after the pacts have been signed and President Truman approves the strategic plans already drafted for defending the Atlantic area. The President's approval is expected this week.

A new meeting of the Atlantic Defense Council—made up of the defense ministers of the 12 partners—is due in the spring.

Socialism in Britain Hits Church and Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Socialism in Britain Hits Church and Home," written by Stephen C. Noland and published in the South Bend Tribune for January 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIALISM IN BRITAIN HITS CHURCH AND HOME

(This is the first of a series of articles prepared as a result of a recent personal visit to England and study of conditions under its Socialist Government. The writer, Stephen C. Noland, was for 15 years editor of the Indianapolis News. His recent visit to England was for the specific purpose of learning first hand of the conditions and attitude of the rank-and-file residents of England. Every person who reads the articles, and all should, will learn the truth about socialism in that country and should ask himself whether he desires such conditions in America.—Editor, Tribune.)

(By Stephen C. Noland)

LONDON, ENGLAND.—You may have heard the rumor that British farmer now can be permently "kicked off" his land for not farming it to suit a government committee.

Is that really true under today's British Socialist Government under the Labor Party, which is now in power? As a Midwestern American newspaperman, farm-born and farm-minded, I looked for the answer not in a book or magazine article or merely in a printed British Government regulation but rather on an actual visit to a farmer in Durham County, England.

And the answer is "Yes," British farmers now can be "kicked off" their land.

That's the way the information for this series of articles was dug out. All of it came from the everyday lives and experiences of common people in England, Wales, Scotland, and northern Ireland who are really living under socialism.

WISDOM TOOTH PERMIT

Can a dentist in Britain pull a wisdom tooth without a Government permit? No, he can't. And you'll get the details straight from a British dentist in one of these articles.

What about socialized medicine? These stories won't stem from books or propaganda broadcasts but from doctors' own waiting rooms and inner offices. One will be about my own attempt to get free medical service to which foreigners are entitled. Another will be an interview with a doctor driven to the verge of a break-down by people demanding his signature on "sick cards" so they could stay home on sick pay for 13 weeks.

LARGE STEPS ON LARGE

How are the steelworkers doing and why? How are the coal miners getting along and why? You'll read their own answer given to me at the pit heads and down in a mine 2½ miles under the North Sea and in their own cottages in talks with their wives and children.

What has happened in Britain to the right to strike, the right for which labor has struggled more than a century? To get right down to the point, What happened to that right when workers in an electric power plant near London walked out in protest against a phony wage boost which netted them no more take-home money? Their own leaders, now running the government, denounced them as unpatriotic and sent armed soldiers into the struck plant to run it. The way that was done, leaving labor union members helpless to use their hard-won right to strike and their leaders gagged and out on their feet, will be told in one of these stories direct from the strike scene.

BREAK UP THE CHURCH

How much headway is British socialism making in its admitted effort to break up the church and the home as the "two greatest obstacles" to its complete control of the people through government? How is the church being beaten down until today only 20 percent of the British people claim church membership as compared with 50 percent in the United States? Are mothers permitted to feed their children the milk, orange juice, and cod liver oil prescribed by the government?

What is the Socialist diet, 9 years of it now, doing to the physical strength of the British people? How do men hold up on one meat meal a week, a dab of butter now and then, only one egg a week? Can they keep going on potatoes, bread, and fish?

IT HOLDS NO HOPE

What happens to the normal ambition of men in a country which takes 84 out of every $10 they earn for taxes and holds out no hope for better days? Have these conditions in Socialist Britain been caused by some of the same policies which the United States is pursuing today?

You'll read answers to these any many of your other questions straight from British common people themselves in the articles in this series.

Stop the Chinese Reds Now—Or Else!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from a recent edition of the magazine See. Why has the State Department insisted for 4 years on following the advice regarding China of those who have consistently miscalculated the nature and objectives of the Chinese Communists instead of the advice of men like General Wedemeyer, Admiral Cooke, and many other eminent authorities who have been as consistently correct in their analyses. None has been more profoundly accurate than General Chennault, whose article follows:

STOP THE CHINESE REDS NOW—THE FAMED LEADER OF THE FLYING TIGERS, A WORLD-KNOWN EXPERT ON THE FAR EASTERN MILITARY SITUATION, OFFERS A DYNAMIC PROGRAM TO BLOCK COMMUNIST TIDE IN ASIA—FORESEES DISASTROUS RESULTS IF UNITED STATES FAILS TO ACT DECISIVELY

(By Maj. Gen. Claire Lee Chennault, U. S. Army (retired))

In ancient Peiping today functions an iron-handed People's Government established last October by Communist forces who came down from Manchuria to conquer northern China. Russia formally recognized it a few hours after it was proclaimed. Since then, it has sought recognition from the world.

This fanfare has served to cloud the real and desperate issue which the United States must face in China. Careless thinkers, instead of championing non-Communist forces forlornly holding China's south and west, parrot false hopes that the Chinese will develop a Tito brand of communism or absorb the Communists and evolve a kind of socialism.

That kind of talk reminds me of a conversation I had with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in 1939, in his Chungking office. Madame Chiang, as usual, interpreted for her husband. I mentioned Japanese gains.

"Don't worry about those," the generalissimo said, "we'll defeat the Japanese if it takes a hundred years."

I thought a moment. "Madame," I said, "will you tell the Generalissimo, with all due respect, that neither he nor I will be here for a 100 years?

It is quite possible that Chinese communism will be modified in a century or two, but western hope for a free Far East will disappear in the meantime. If we let all China go under Communist domination, it will be a downhill ride for the Reds over the rest of Asia.

The United States must protect its position in Asia now, or risk maturity of an enemy power so enormous that it may destroy, first, the American system of free enterprise and, finally, American freedom itself.

Imbalances of strategic power, even more than new weapons like the atomic bomb, bring on wars. If the increasing imbalance in the Far East continues, we ultimately will have no choice but to fight a third world war—from a disadvantageous position.

Power-greedy despots start the wheels turning. Once the monster gathers momentum, its creators cannot stop it. To save themselves, they must go on. In China, the Communists put their war machine into low gear 5 years ago, and began chugging slowly southward, gathering force. Today that machine is in second gear. If we let it move into high, it will be all the harder—and it may be impossible for us to stop it.

Once the Reds have mopped up China, they will turn loose a well-organized, tremendously powerful force against smaller targets to the South. Below China in Asia, they can choose and conquer victims, one at a time.

CERTAINLY BUGGED THREE WEEKS

Last year, for 5 months in Washington, I listened to the tugging over United States policy in the Far East. Asked to express my convictions, I examined them carefully. They stem from sympathy for the Chinese people, including my Chinese wife. But, much more, they stem from a judgment I reached during many years in China: the United States must frame and aggressively execute a realistic anti-Communist policy toward the Orient, or jeopardize freedom in this world.

As I see it, there is a realistic solution to the problem. I believe we must take three steps:

1. Create a military and economic supreme authority for rehabilitation of the Far East, with American personnel in charge initially.

2. Have this authority execute a definite United States policy for close economic and military integration of all non-Communist areas in the Far East.

3. Extend financial and military-equipment aid to Chinese military leaders fighting the Reds.

I believe the head of the proposed supreme authority must be an American at the outset. Only an American would be trusted by everybody. And he must have military and economic knowledge of the Far East.

I would like to see Gen. Douglas MacArthur in charge of this supreme authority. He has the respect and admiration, not only of non-Communist China, but of the entire Orient. He is decisive, objective in performance of work. Finally, the American people know him well enough to rely on him.

The supreme authority should be given adequate powers and a moderate sum of money, to be spent at the supreme's commander's discretion. His staff would consist of men from the Department of Defense for military work, and from the State Department for economic and diplomatic work.

Around the supreme authority all non-Communist elements in the Far East would rally. It would participate in military planning for Chinese and all other anti-Communist Asiatic military leaders. Its military experts would apply their talents to tactics, logistics, and strategy in opposing the Reds in China and Asia in general.

This authority would determine just which military leader, at which locale, needed weapons, ammunition, equipment; would supply the needed items, and would see that they were used.

No American troops would be involved. The authority would be a planning, supply, and advisory mechanism, with power and money to act. Unquestionably, the anti-Communist Chinese leaders—all of them, including those in China's constitutional government—would welcome it.

When a vigorous anti-Communist nationalism had been created throughout Asia, leaders of the Far East would themselves take control of the supreme authority.

In offering this plan, I will be accused of submitting too simple and too inexpensive solutions. I plead not guilty.

The American people have grown used to having financial problems discussed in enormous figures and complicated formulas. But in the Far East, it is still an axiom that the best way to do a job is the simplest. And, properly used, money goes a long way in money-poor Asia, where $1 will get as much done as $100 in Europe.

It is therefore unnecessary to write a philosophic analysis of the Orient into a plan for action in the Far East. Besides, we don't have time. The Far East is in critical economic and military condition—a condition on which communism thrives.

IT'S A JOB FOR EXPERTS ON ASIA

One of the most embarrassing questions I am asked in free China is this: "If you Americans won't help us because you don't like our Government, or don't like Chiang, why don't you tell us WHO or whom you want?"

I can hardly answer: "The truth is, we don't tell you because we don't know."

But if, in Europe-minded Washington, we cannot decide what we want in the completely different situation in Asia, then let's deputize the job to our own expert Asiatic experts.

Fundamentally, the long-pull task in the Far East is economic. Only a healthy economy and a happy people can contain the Communist virus permanently. At the present stage, however, the task is to stop the Communist war machine—and stop it in China. The least we can do in China is to buy time for the rest of non-Communist Asia to get organized for what is coming.

Despite Communist victories, there are 400,000,000 Chinese outside Red control. The great majority are violently opposed to communism and given any kind of encouragement and assistance will fight. Their non-Communist territory is largely in the western and southern areas. It is rugged country, easy—and relatively inexpensive—to defend with small forces.

ANTI-RED CHINA CAN BE SUPPLIED

The mountainous character of the terrain precludes the use of expensive and complex military equipment. Financial support—silver—to pay troops, plus small arms and ammunition, some pack howitzers, 75-millimeter mountain guns, and a few mortars would do the job, in my opinion. I have seen these mountain military leaders. In their strongholds they are almost invincible. Supplies of all kinds could be flown in to them, or hauled in by human pack work through the mountain passes, or both. It has been done before.

Here in the high western and southwestern portions of China is the key to the conquest of the remainder of continental Asia. Here we must hold against the Reds, or be faced with the infinitely harder task of trying to restore freedom in Asia at some future time. From the high southwest Province of Yunnan, the downhill approaches to French Indochina, Siam, and Burma, and ultimately Malaya and India, are extremely vulnerable.

It is essential to United States security that Formosa and Hainan Islands, Formosa especially, be denied to unfriendly powers. Both have good harbors suitable for submarines, and many good airfields. Our American lines of communication and transport in the western Pacific—from Japan through Okinawa to the Philippines—and the British line—stretching from Ceylon to Singapore and Malaya and up to Hong Kong—can be dominated by enemy submarines and planes based on Formosa and Hainan.

A FRIENDLY FORMOSA IS VITAL

If we were absolutely forced to it, there would be no legal reason why the United States itself could not move in and occupy Formosa, just as we did in Japan. Formosa was not given to China after it was taken from the Japanese. Chinese Communists, conquering it, would succeed to no Chinese Nationalist title. The Chinese Nationalists have the same status in Formosa we have in Japan. They are conquerors, holding the island until a treaty of peace with Japan finally determines ownership.

Communist plans for Asia's future are plain, were blared boastfully over the radio as the Red soldiers moved south. They involve:

1. Conquest of China.
2. Immediate aid to Communist allies in Indochina, Siam, Malaya, Burma, and India.
3. Rapid extension of this pattern in Indonesia, the Philippines, and Japan.

TROUBLE IN ASIA IS WIDESPREAD

With accomplishment of these steps, free civilization would have lost a strategic asset perhaps more essential to American security than all of Europe. An over-all look at the Far East begins to tell the story:

In addition to a large-scale war in China, there is Communist trouble in French Indochina, Burma, Malaya. The Communist leader in Indochina, Ho Chi-minh, has been fighting the French more than 4 years. There is Communist disturbance in Siam. I have information that the Bengal Province of India is rotten with communism. The Philippines are troubled with Communist-inspired and Communist-armed guerrillas.

Against a Red force in control of China, Formosa, and Hainan, these southward areas, already infected with communism, could offer very little resistance.

The burden of opposing the Reds' southward march could not safely be based on Hindu military operations. India's potential of course is enormous, and Prime Minister Nehru is a brilliant man, but the road to Indian consolidation and cohesion will be long and hard.

WHAT AN ALL-RED ASIA WOULD MEAN

Hindu passive resistance is no weapon with which to fight communism. Wherever this type of opposition prevails, there lies the most vulnerable points for the Communist pattern of conquest—infiltration, indoctrination and, only then, arms.

An all-Communist Asia would be a disaster to the United States. All of Asia's great resources and wealth would be available to Communist Russia. A Russian Far East merchant marine would spring up like magic, bringing new strategic dangers to democracies and gobbling up the rich eastern trade.

With the past 5 years Communist Russia has built at least 20 industrial cities along the Trans-Siberian Railway. Their factories need Asia's rich resources—iron, tin, wolfram, antimony, aluminum, rubber (and slave labor)—to build guns, tanks, airplanes, railroads, ships.

Moreover, if Russia established her Communist pattern in Asia, her industry would be so decentralized that it would offer no critical target to hostile bombers. Her vast industrial set-up would extend, almost unattackable, from Vladivostock to Poland. And the only good airfields for massive operations against the Russian atomic plants, known to lie in Siberia's Lake Baikal area, are in China—airfields built by the United States Army for B-29 operations in the last war.

Another important point: with China consolidated into Russia, it would be impossible to keep Japan in the American orbit. Communists would be free to cross the Bering Straits directly into Alaska, meeting only United States frontal defense. Today the invader also would be exposed to attack from Japan, on the southern flank.

With all Asia conquered, more than half of the population of the world would go behind the iron curtain. All the results of Christianized education, built up in the Far East over more than a century, also would go down the Communist drain. Any Christian or any western-educated Chinese would be considered seeds of infection under a Communist form of government.

The United States, therefore, would lose a tremendous human asset. It consists of thousands, maybe hundreds of thousands, of Chinese educated in the United States or in American mission schools in China: converts of American missions; sons and daughters of earlier-generation Chinese who made their fortunes in the United States and returned to raise their children in western traditions. In no other Asiatic country—not in Japan, not in India, possibly not even in the Philippines—are there so many people of Asiatic blood with an American intellectual inheritance.

We must, therefore, find, and keep, some piece of China free; a place where our Chinese friends can find sanctuary to plan and carry out a program for freedom in the Far East.

NO HOPE IN A CHINESE UNDERGROUND

Talk of supplying underground Chinese opposition to communism makes no sense so long as there is fighting strength overground. Even overground armies are expensive. The leakage through a thousand crevices in an underground would be 10 times more wasteful.

Today millions of Chinese working people stand ready to fight with the west for freedom against Communist domination. When the Chinese are criticized as a people who cannot or will not fight, I sometimes think of the war conference at Cairo to which the late President Roosevelt invited, among many others, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and myself.

Generalissimo Chiang and Madame Chiang had gone out to visit the pyramids. I came

along later. The Generalissimo was standing still, looking up at the Great Pyramid, solemn, obviously impressed.

"Madame," I said, "remind the Generalissimo for me that we put more rock in the big airplane runways at Chengtu than they've got here.

"My Chinese built four B-29 runways and three fighter fields, two taxi ramps and hardstands for 48 planes, simultaneously. Every ounce of the rock had to be hauled and crushed by hand, and pounded into the runway excavations. Those runways were 2,600 meters long, 60 centimeters deep. If you ground up two of those pyramids, you wouldn't have enough rock to make those runways."

The sightseeing Generalissimo suddenly looked less awestricken.

The mountain men of western China, who built our B-29 runways, will toil and fight to be free, as they always have been free. All they need besides arms is advice to match the modern advice Russia is giving to the other side.

It is not too late—nor would it be too costly—to stop the Reds in China now, before they launch a downhill rampage into southern Asia from the Chinese provinces on the southwest slopes. Unless we do, we will have more on our hands than a struggle back uphill. America and the free western world in general may find that they have become an embattled island, fighting desperately for life.

Franco Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days I have read with amazement various reports of the intention to bring about early recognition of Franco Spain.

In this connection I read an editorial appearing in the January 23 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times entitled "Inching Toward Franco," expressing, as I believe, the viewpoint of a vast majority of the American people. It is as follows:

INCHING TOWARD FRANCO

What to do about Spain is an emotionally charged issue in this country. It is worth while to try to decide what is important and what not important in our relations with that nation.

Whether this country is represented in Madrid by an Ambassador or by a Chargé d'Affaires is not of the highest importance. Recognition is not at issue. We recognized Spain in 1939 and have never reneged. During the war we had an ambassador there. After the war we went along with the UN General Assembly's recommendation that Ambassadors be withdrawn.

Now Secretary of State Acheson says this country will support an Assembly resolution permitting any member to restore its Embassy if it wishes.

There is no very strong reason why this should not be done—even though the reasons often given for doing it ring exceedingly hollow. Those who tell us what a fine fellow Franco is, and how badly we need him in our struggle with communism, overlook the one fact that distinguishes Franco from every other ruler in the world.

The fact is that Franco was our enemy during the war. He did what he could, as long as he thought it safe, to support Hitler's cause. He was a Fascist tyrant when he come into power, he rode the wave of fascism as long as he dared, and he remains a Fascist tyrant today.

Franco should have been knocked off at the end of the war, when it would have taken only a slight push to do so. But he wasn't. Today there seems little doubt that the mere withholding of ambassadors is not going to force him out of power. Nor will the mere dispatch of ambassadors to Madrid significantly alter his situation or Spain's.

What is important in our relations with Spain is that we should not act alone in defining them. We should take no steps that are not thoroughly discussed with and approved by our friends in western Europe.

The most ardent promoters of Franco's cause obviously hope that sending an ambassador to Madrid will be the prelude to bringing Spain into the Atlantic Pact and making her eligible for economic aid. These are the really important issues. Before we decide them, we ought to recognize that we cannot squeeze Franco into the Atlantic community without totally destroying the conception of a community based upon a common devotion to freedom and democracy.

Franco's promoters would do well to recognize something else—namely, that the dispatch of an ambassador to Madrid will shatter any ideological grounds for failure to recognize Red China. There may be other reasons for withholding recognition of China—for example, the need for assurance that our diplomats won't be pushed around—but once we have an ambassador in Madrid we can hardly decline to send one to Peking because we don't like Red China's ideology. If you can stand Franco you can stand anything.

Money, Inflation, and Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Money, Inflation, and Socialism," written by Burris Jenkins, Jr., and published in the Seattle Post Intelligencer for Tuesday, January 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONEY, INFLATION, AND SOCIALISM

(By Burris Jenkins, Jr.)

Gold, in the long experience of the ages, is the best kind of money that can be contrived.

Every other kind of money has genuine value and validity only to the extent that it is related to gold.

In the modern era, the usefulness of gold as money was augmented by the auxiliary device of paper money which was redeemable in gold and was therefore the equivalent of gold.

Under this arrangement, a government issuing and guaranteeing the paper money for which the gold was security served as the custodian but not the actual owner of the gold.

The real owners were the holders of the gold-redeemable paper against which the gold had been pledged.

And the gold could lie in safe keeping while the paper passed around in circulation as currency.

Thus redeemable printed currency was like warehouse certificates denoting title to merchandise.

It was not necessary to move the goods—or the gold—in order to change the ownership.

At the same time, the issuance of certificates—or currency—was necessarily limited by the amount of gold available for redemptive purposes.

This prevented demoralizing monetary inflation.

Likewise, public expenditures and public debt were similarly restricted, which served as a brake on credit inflation in all banking operations.

And, since all transactions had to be liquidated eventually with money, and the money had to be either gold itself or else redeemable in gold, the system was accurately known as the gold standard.

Gold, with not very many variations, was the fixed common denominator of all values and of all currencies.

Now, among its other excellences, the gold standard tended to prevent frauds; and frauds can be perpetrated by governments as well as by individuals.

Frauds committed by individuals are punishable by statute.

Government, however, is not only the source of legal currency; it is also the fountain of statutory power.

Consequently, by illicit use of power, government could subvert the gold standard.

Government could substitute deficit financing for balanced budgets.

Government could replace fiat money for redeemable currency—even in the payment of its own obligations.

And the Government of the United States did these immoral things in 1933.

It confiscated all the monetary gold in the country, and devalued the dollar, thereby reducing the worth of pensions and insurance policies by nearly 50 percent.

It took over the Federal Reserve System—that is, the national banks—as a tool and agent of the Treasury.

Thereafter, the Government could borrow in multi-billion-dollar installments on the security of its own debt and monetize the debts—part of which emerges from the banks in the form of fiat currency but the bulk of which comprises the basis for credit inflation, making itself evident in low interest rates or cheap money, in excessive check-book money and in swollen bank reserves.

These manipulations liberated the Government from dependence on taxes.

They made inflation the Federal fiscal policy.

As a result, the "supply" of currency in circulation has increased from $6,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000; the volume of bank credit—about $30,000,000,000 in 1933—now exceeds $100,000,000,000 and the national debt—less than $20,000,000,000 in 1933—had mounted to $40,000,000,000 before the war, and is now more than a quarter of a trillion dollars.

Of course, much of the pyramidal debt and pervading inflation have been due to the war.

And the effect of this has been to obscure the truth.

For the truth is that inflation became the New Deal's policy before the war and has remained the New Deal's policy since the war.

The methods pursued originated in European socialism and in the "new economics"

sponsored by the late Lord Keynes, and were imported here to scare us Americans.

The theory is to be found in the Marxist gospel of Lenin, who taught that the surest way to socialize an industrial society is to debauch its currency.

Without inflation, the New Deal could not undertake the fantastic schemes of its Socialist "welfare state"—and without inflation it could find no excuse for undertaking them.

But inflation—either by means of managed currency or deficit financing—is an illusion for which the people must pay.

They must pay in labor and production without corresponding progress and prosperity, if not in industrial stagnation and degraded standards of living.

And with 424,000,000,000 worth of idle gold in the United States available for a return to the honest gold standard, there is a remedy at hand.

A Dental-Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, at the ninetieth annual session of the American Dental Association held in San Francisco last October, a dental-health program for the community, the State, and the Nation was unanimously approved by our house of delegates.

In order that the public may know the objectives of the 79,000 ethical dentists holding membership in the American Dental Association, I herewith submit our dental-health program:

A DENTAL-HEALTH PROGRAM

The dental profession in this country long has urged a constructive approach to the national dental-health problem. The dental profession's proposals represent a scientific, feasible, economical, and rational approach to the problems of dental diseases in direct contrast with the costly and unrealistic proposals bound up with a system of Federal compulsory-health insurance.

In the past decade or more, there has been increasing recognition by the public of the value of dentistry as an essential health service. New methods of prevention and control have been discovered and these promise to give the profession more effective weapons in its fight against dental diseases. This progress has been accompanied by a general reawakening to the fact that American life traditionally is based on community life, that needs can best be determined and met through individual and community effort.

In the light of these developments, the American Dental Association reiterates the basic principles which have guided the development of dental-health programs and offers additional suggestions and recommendations which experience has demonstrated will be useful in the development of better local community programs for dental health.

THE NATIONAL PROGRAM

The American Dental Association believes that the following elements are essential for the success of a national program for the promotion of dental health.

Federal department of health: A Federal department of health, with Cabinet status, should be established independently of welfare and educational agencies and should be administered by persons trained in the health sciences and qualified to coordinate all Federal health activities except those of the military services.

Dental research: Dental research should be promoted through the National Institute of Dental Research and through grants to public and private agencies and individuals qualified to carry on significant research. New resources for dental research should be sought continuously from private agencies.

Dental-health education: Dental-health education should be carried on through appropriate State and community agencies to provide authentic information on health practices, to motivate people to assume personal responsibility for health and to inform them of the facilities available for dental health care.

Dental care: Dental care should be available to all regardless of income or geographic location as rapidly as resources will permit. Private and community programs should provide for priority treatment, prevention and control of dental disease in children, and for the elimination of pain and infection in adults. The community in all cases shall determine its methods for providing services.

Program planning: In all major conferences that may lead to the formation of a national dental-health program, authorized representatives of the American Dental Association should participate. Similarly, in all major conferences that may lead to the formation of a community or State dental-health program, authorized representatives appointed by constituent or component dental societies should participate that public health and welfare may be best protected.

Councils on dental health: The establishment of councils on dental health at State and local levels should be completed as rapidly as possible in order to provide a mechanism through which the development of dental-health programs can be facilitated. Such councils should have lay and consumer consultants.

General health plans and programs: It should be the consistent policy of all dental groups to cooperate as fully as possible with other health groups in the development of programs designed to promote the total health of the patient.

Public-health dentistry: Each of the States should be urged to establish a division of dental health within the department of health and the administration of the dental program should be in the hands of a qualified dental officer who is directly responsible to the State health officer.

Veterans' dental care: The dental care of veterans should be maintained at a high standard and should be provided under a State program in which the veteran has free choice of practitioners in private practice.

Hospitals and health centers: The construction or addition of adequate dental facilities should be undertaken in all hospital and health centers. Such dental facilities should be operated and maintained in accord with standards established by the American Dental Association and administered by a qualified dentist.

Methods of payment: Voluntary prepayment and postpayment plans consistent with sound experience should be developed as rapidly as possible. A Federal compulsory health-insurance program should be opposed on the ground that it is not in the interest of the public or of the profession.

Dental education and personnel: Facilities for the training of dental personnel should be expanded. Such expansion should be consistent with local and regional needs. Improved support for dental education should be sought provided that such support does not entail a loss of independence on the part of the educational institutions.

Dentistry in military services: Dental programs in the military services should provide high-quality care for the military patient. All policies dealing with dentistry should be developed, administered, and controlled by the dental officer.

THE STATE PROGRAM

The State dental-health program should be developed within the broad framework of policies established by the dental profession through the State dental society and the American Dental Association. The right of determination on all points which vary from State to State should be reserved to the individual States.

General policies: The State dental-health program should be developed specifically after a consideration of the 13 points outlined in the national program of the American Dental Association.

Grants-in-aid: Grants-in-aid should be considered as an acceptable method of supporting State dental-health programs provided that the right of the State to adapt any program to meet its own needs is safeguarded.

Dental-health inventory: In order to formulate the objectives, principles, and policies for a State-wide program based primarily on community dental-health programs, provision should be made for the examination and analysis of dental-health needs, for an appraisal of resources available for meeting those needs and for determination of the methods and means for utilizing and supplementing those resources.

Dental-health conferences: Dental-health conferences, sponsored by the State dental society and the State health department, are tested and successful devices for making a dental-health inventory and for planning a State-wide program based on prevention of dental disease, dental health education and dental care especially for children.

Continuing education for dentists: At the State level, the dental and other professional schools should be encouraged to coordinate their undergraduate teaching programs with the general program of dental-health service in the State. Short postgraduate courses should be made available regularly to practicing dentists, and an extension teaching program may be organized to reach dentists in areas more remote from the dental school. Where there is no dental school, a State-wide program of annual seminars or refresher courses may be developed cooperatively by the dental society and the health department, and conducted in the various districts, drawing qualified teachers from outside the State if necessary. Library service also should be made available to dental practitioners, so far as is practicable.

Courses of study for teachers: Opportunities should be provided for teachers in training to learn dental health facts and methods for integrating dental-health subjects in routine classroom instruction in elementary and secondary grades. Every teachers' college should include in the curriculum a course of study devoted to dental health.

Experiments and demonstrations: Experiments and demonstrations designed to teach or disseminate new facts of value in providing dental-health care should be encouraged by the State provided that there is approval by the State dental society of the type and duration of the experiment or demonstration.

THE COMMUNITY PROGRAM

The community dental health program should be developed with the advice and assistance of the dental profession. In all major conferences that are held for the purpose of planning a community dental health program there should be participation by authorized representatives of the component or constituent dental society. These representatives are to be selected by the dental society either by presidential appointment or by other means. It is vitally essential that all community dental health programs be developed with special consideration for local needs, traditions, and practices.

General policies: The community dental health program should be developed after consideration of the 13 points outlined in the basic program of the American Dental Association and of the elements of the State program outlined by the American Dental Association and after consultation with authorized officials of the constituent and component dental societies involved and with officials of recognized health agencies.

Objectives of a community dental health program: The objectives of a community dental health program should be to:

1. Help every American appreciate the importance of a healthy mouth.
2. Help every American appreciate the relationship of dental health to general health and appearance.
3. Encourage the observance of dental-health practices, including personal care, professional care, proper diet, and oral habits.
4. Enlist the aid of all groups and agencies interested in the promotion of health.
5. Correlate dental health activities with generalized health programs.
6. Stimulate the development of resources for making dental care available to all children and youth.
7. Stimulate all dentists to perform adequate dental health services for children.

Organization of community dental health program: The following initial steps are recommended to communities in the development of dental health programs:

1. A conference of key persons in a community should be called to develop a plan of action.
2. A procedure should be developed for the appraisal of the community's dental health needs and resources.
3. The general public, and community leaders in particular, should be made aware of existing dental health needs through publicity and group meetings.
4. The local dental society should be consulted to obtain advice on technical and professional matters.
5. A plan based on the dental health education, prevention of dental disease, and dental care for children should be adopted after it has been related to the needs of the community.
6. The responsibility for administering the program should be delegated to the individuals and agencies best suited to this task.

Financing the program: Whenever possible, local funds should be utilized for the institution and maintenance of community programs. In communities where funds are inadequate for this purpose, State and, if necessary, Federal funds may be sought. The appropriation of local, State, and Federal funds should be in keeping with the magnitude of the dental health problem. Funds for health care from public and private sources are generally interpreted to be available for dental care. Public health, welfare, and voluntary organizations, therefore, should be asked to budget a portion of their funds to assist in meeting dental health needs.

Local, State, and Federal funds are available under specific conditions for dental health programs. Federal funds include those allocated by the Children's Bureau and by the Public Health Service. Federal funds allocated by these agencies are appropriated to State health departments. Some State governments provide funds for dental treatment programs for specific groups. Some county and local departments of health, local boards of education, and welfare departments provide funds or facilities for the treatment of children whose parents have low incomes. Voluntary groups, such as the Red Cross, parent-teacher associations, and others also are sources of funds for initiating experimental or permanent dental health programs.

Appraisal of community dental health problems: In order to provide a sound basis for planning and executing an effective community dental health program, an appraisal of the community's dental health needs and resources must be made. The appraisal may be sponsored by the local dental society, the local health department, voluntary health agencies, educational authorities, and other interested community groups. The appraisal should include: (1) an analysis of the community's dental service needs and specific dental health hazards; (2) a census of available dental personnel, including dentists, dental hygienists, dental assistants, and dental laboratory technicians; (3) delimitation of those oral health procedures essential for optimal oral health; (4) a list of accessible service facilities, including private dental offices, hospital dental clinics, and other public and private clinics; (5) an estimate of public and private funds expended for dental services in the community; (6) an estimate of the effective demand for dental care in the area; (7) a study of individual variations in income and in the ability to pay for dental care; (8) an estimate of the community's potential or unused resources in providing dental health services.

Dental-health education: The community program should make specific provision for the education of the public in matters relating to dental-health hazards and diseases and to desirable and undesirable health habits and practices. Instructions in dental health for school children should be an integral part of the school curriculum. Dental-health facts and proven methods for imparting them to children should be available to all school teachers. Speakers should be furnished for meetings of special groups which can be interested in dental health. Factual, simple, and attractive dental health pamphlets should be provided and the press, radio, posters, motion pictures, television, newspapers, and magazines should be employed in a continuing program of education for the general public. Whenever possible, dental health education activities should be directed or supervised by a person qualified in the field of health education.

Continuing professional education: Continuing education for the professional personnel involved should be an integral part of the community program. Opportunities should be provided for practicing dentists and dental hygienists to keep abreast of scientific knowledge in their fields, for public health workers to develop and maintain familiarity with basic dental-health principles and practices, and for physicians and nurses to understand and accept their responsibilities in the dental-health program.

As a part of the community program, dental societies should be encouraged and assisted in the development of well-planned discussions on community dental-health problems, as well as on scientific subjects, in connection with their regular meetings. Joint sessions with local physicians and public-health workers can be helpful in consolidating various phases of the community health program. In addition, study groups and clubs may be formed locally to encourage day-to-day individual study and periodic group discussion of special problems and fields of mutual interest.

Efforts should be made to relate the continuing education program for professional personnel in communities with the same program conducted at the State level.

Methods of payment: The need for finding a more satisfactory financing plan to meet dental health service costs, especially for the medium and low income groups, suggests the desirability of establishing experimental voluntary prepayment and postpayment plans. Although the successful application of the prepayment principle in meeting hospital and medical care costs has been well established, present knowledge of the subject is inadequate to determine whether a similar budgeting plan can be applied to dentistry.

Experimental prepayment plans for dental service should be inaugurated by dental societies. With proper management, it is believed that actuarial data can be obtained to analyze the now unknown factors of a prepayment system as they are related to dental care.

Efforts to develop satisfactory postpayment plans should be encouraged and the dental health education program should motivate the public to budget for dental care.

Eligibility for dental health care: The determination of those eligible to receive dental care at the expense of the public should be made under a plan acceptable to the concerned groups of the local community and should be related to ability to pay. Priority should be given to dental care for children and to the relief of pain and infection and the rehabilitation for employment in adults.

Facilities for dental health services: Every effort should be made to use to the maximum extent existing facilities for rendering dental health service. Such facilities should include the offices of private practitioners, hospital dental clinics, mobile dental units, and other private and public facilities.

Dental fees: Payments to dentists participating in the program may be made on a full-time, part-time, hourly or unit-of-service basis. The dental fee schedule should be determined by authorized representatives of the dentists who will render the dental services. In all cases payments should be consistent with the provision of a high grade dental service.

Preventive services: Certain preventive procedures which lend themselves to mass application on a public health basis may serve as effective agents of community dental health education. The community dental health plan should include such preventive measures for the control of dental disease as are approved by recognized dental authorities.

Treatment services: Although priorities in treatment service are usually listed separately for children and adults, certain services, such as the relief of pain and the treatment of acute infection, should be available to all regardless of age classification. The following priority classification of treatment services is recommended:

For children

1. Relief of pain and treatment of acute infections.
2. Elimination of pathosis and extraction of unsavable teeth.
3. Treatment of permanent teeth with exposed vital pulps.
4. Treatment of bone and soft tissue diseases and anomalies.
5. Repair of injured or carious permanent teeth.
6. Repair of injured or carious primary teeth.
7. Prosthodontic and orthodontic services.

For adults

1. Relief of pain and treatment of acute infections.
2. Elimination of pathosis and extraction of unsavable teeth.
3. Removal of irritating conditions which may lead to malignancies.
4. Treatment of bone and soft tissue diseases.
5. Repair of injured or carious teeth.
6. Replacement of lost teeth and restoration of function.

Program evaluation: All persons interested in health and community affairs will be interested in the accomplishments, weaknesses, and cost of the community dental health program. Data for evaluating the program may be obtained through follow-up services

and the maintenance of simple records. Simplified dental health indexes should be applied periodically to provide comparative data for evaluating the effectiveness of the program and improvement in the dental health status of the community. Accountability for the expenditure of funds will require the maintenance of records of costs and of services.

Legislative Program, AMVETS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a very splendid statement made before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on last Tuesday, January 17, by Mr. Harold Russell, national commander of American Veterans of World War II, better known as AMVETS, covering his organization's legislative objectives.

Mr. Russell's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HAROLD RUSSELL, NATIONAL COMMANDER, AMVETS, BEFORE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, JANUARY 17, 1950

AMVETS expresses its appreciation to the committee for this opportunity to appear before it and present its program.

We endorse the statements of our colleagues, Commander Craig, of the American Legion; Commander Lewis, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; and Commander Brown, of the Disabled American Veterans, in censuring the Hoover Commission report as it pertains to the veteran and the Veterans' Administration. We believe that if this Hoover Commission report were implemented the result would be not economy and efficiency, but additional costs and drastic cuts in service to the veterans.

There is no question in our minds but that there is ample room for increasing efficiency and creating economies in the Veterans' Administration; to this end we have watched with pleasure the establishment by Congress of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. But to take these services and place them in other Government agencies to be handled with non-benefit legislation would be chaotic. We claim that the common denominator in the administration and effective utilization of the rights and benefits as enacted by Congress is the veteran himself and not the program, such as medical service; that for the most efficient operation of these programs it is necessary to maintain these services within the Veterans' Administration. Congress has enacted certain so-called benefit legislation in recognition of the fact that the veteran suffered certain handicaps and losses because of his service in time of war. Because of the special nature of this legislation, the Veterans' Administration was created. Now the Hoover Commission report would upset the basic concept and philosophy of veterans' benefits and say in effect that the veteran does not have any special problem, did not suffer certain special handicaps and losses in time of war. We refute this philosophy. If Congress is right in setting up the VA and passing this legislation, then the Hoover Commission is wrong.

Therefore we call upon this committee to guard against such attacks which we recognize as the mouthings of the same philosophy expressed by the economy league of 1933 and the effect of which you gentlemen will remember.

AMVETS urge the enactment of the so-called escalator bill in relation to compensation. Compensation, today, is still out of line with the cost of living in America. The Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates that the cost of living index rests at 168.7 as of November 15, 1949. It is inconceivable that this Nation should desire its disabled veterans to exist on present compensation levels. Recognizing the tremendous legislative work which must go into every change in the structure of compensation, AMVETS urge that this compensation be tied to the cost of living index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and that for each 10 percent increase in the cost of living index, so shall compensation be increased, and likewise decreased so as to at all times honestly reflect the needs of these men in relationship to the purchasing power of their dollar.

Gentlemen, we bring to your attention the non-service-connected pensions for widows and orphans of World War II. We ask for equalization of these benefits with benefits allowed to widows and orphans of World War I. Hunger and want is common to all people. A generation's difference does not change the needs of those who have lost husbands and fathers.

AMVETS support H. R. 5574, a bill to liberalize the provisions of National Service Life Insurance. This is a particularly long and technical bill and AMVETS will appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this committee at a later date on it. This bill would serve to further equalize the insurance opportunities of World War I and World War II veterans.

At our last national convention, AMVETS voted in favor of adjusted service compensation payable in Government bonds maturing in 1960—10 years hence. Fifty-six percent of the delegates at this convention voted in favor of the bonus.

Thus, to put it bluntly, AMVETS favor a World War II soldiers' bonus computed at the rate of $3 per day for domestic service and $4 per day for foreign service to an individual maximum of $4,500.

We recognize that in some quarters this is an unpopular issue—that it has always aroused the wrath of the economy-minded in the press and even in the Congress. But by every standard of equity, the bonus is justifiable. It is inequitable to spend literally billions of dollars helping young, married, nondisabled veterans to make up their lost schooling, to spend other billions in European countries and to ignore completely the problems of older veterans with long-standing family obligations who were forced to give up their jobs, their businesses, and often their homes to go to war.

There are many thousand veterans, particularly in the older age brackets, who cannot collect a dime under the GI bill of rights and whose right to some form of financial reward for their wartime services has been utterly neglected. The bonus would adjust this inequity.

We support S. 2596, the Taft-Teague bill, which will redefine the rights of veterans to education under Public Law 346.

AMVETS also wishes to record a digest of all of our resolutions as enacted by our 1949 national convention, as a part of my remarks.

(The matter referred to follows:)

DIGEST OF AMVETS 1950 RESOLUTIONS

Resolution 1. That national headquarters and the national legislative director support legislation providing stenographic assistance for full-time paid representatives of certain congressionally chartered organizations that have been assigned office space in VA offices.

Resolution 2. That AMVETS urge congressional committees handling veterans' bills to make copies of reports on such bills from Government agencies and departments available to any congressionally chartered organization requesting them; and that if necessary, the rules of Congress be amended to make this possible.

Resolution 3. That AMVETS take steps to gain Federal and State recognition of service time in the WAAC for the purpose of veterans' privileges and benefits, when such service time was followed consecutively and uninterruptedly by service in the WAC.

Resolution 4. That in conjunction with the conscription of any citizens for the armed forces in the event of a future war, a proper and effectual mobilization of all resources, including industry and labor, be effected.

Resolution 5. That AMVETS favor enactment of legislation granting employees in the field service of the Post Office Department the same vacation and sick privileges accorded to other Federal Government employees.

Resolution 6. That AMVETS national legislative director support legislation whereby veterans who are discharged from the VA or other hospitals by reason of confinement or hospitalization for service-connected illnesses and who are not able to follow a substantially gainful occupation for a period of 6 months shall be given convalescent ratings entitling them to disability payments for that period of time; and that further such period of time be extended for periods not greater than 6 months where the physical examination discloses the veteran to be physically unemployable.

Resolution 7. That AMVETS recommend that a request be made of the President in the name of AMVETS that the first vacancy occurring in the membership of the Civil Service Commission be filled by a qualified World War II veteran.

Resolution 8. That we urge the President and the Congress to enact legislation providing that amounts of compensation payable to disabled veterans and dependents of disabled veterans shall be immediately increased to take care of the increase in cost of living, and in the future be automatically increased by 10 percent for each 10-percent increase in the cost of living, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, provided that such payments shall be reduced in the same manner, but that such compensation shall not be reduced automatically below the basic rate in effect on the date of enactment of such legislation.

Resolution 9. That we urge Congress to enact legislation to give holders of national service life insurance the same rates, benefits, and privileges as are enjoyed by holders of insurance of World War I.

Resolution 10. That AMVETS will work for the passage of such laws and amendments as will give credit on social-security benefits for honorable service in the armed services between September 16, 1940, and April 30, 1947, at the rate of compensation of $250 per month.

Resolution 11. That the national legislative director is instructed to prepare and support legislation providing for special rating for veterans of World War II who have suffered loss or loss of use of a creative organ in line of duty.

Resolution 12. That AMVETS support the permanent extension of that portion of Public Law 663 of the Seventy-ninth Congress providing for the supplying of an automobile or other conveyance to veterans who have lost or lost the use of one or both legs above the ankle, cost to the Government on each not to exceed $1,600.

Resolution 13. That AMVETS strongly recommend to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and if necessary to Congress, that the VA accept as evidence for rating purposes, examinations made at any hospital approved by the American Hospital Association.

Resolution 14. That Congress is urgently requested to appropriate adequate funds to the State employment services and the USES to provide for sufficient personnel for effective job placement and employment counseling for veterans.

Resolution 15. That AMVETS recommend legislation to double the dependency allowance of veterans who receive service-connected disability compensation and that such allowance be granted on a prorated basis comparable to the veteran's degree of disability rating.

Resolution 16. That AMVETS recommend a women's ward be included in each VA hospital throughout the country.

Resolution 17. That AMVETS recommend that VA regulations be amended to permit eligible veterans a minimum of two prosthetic appliances per year in addition to those provided by the service hospitals upon discharge and that additional appliances need be furnished only after the veteran has proven need.

Resolution 18. That AMVETS support legislation permitting veterans eligible by reason of loss of one or both legs at or above the ankle as a result of service to purchase a car of their own choice; if the price be greater than $1,600, permit the veteran to pay the difference between purchase price and the $1,600 full liability of the VA as prescribed by law.

Resolution 19. That AMVETS support legislation providing for full benefits of veterans disabled in line of duty be given to WAAC personnel who suffered disabilities in line of duty prior to July 1, 1943, and who were unable to become members of the WAC because of these disabilities.

Resolution 20. That AMVETS support legislation raising income limitations to $1,800 per year for an unremarried widow without children and to $3,000 per year for an unremarried widow with children, and the limitation on permanently and totally disabled veterans without dependents entitled to non-service-connected pensions be raised to $2,000 and to $3,000 for such veterans with dependents.

Resolution 21. That AMVETS support the establishment of a national cemetery in each of the 48 States.

Resolution 22. That AMVETS urge amendments to existing laws providing an increase in burial allowance from $150 to $250.

Resolution 23. That AMVETS urge legislation exempting income from private or commercial insurance for the annual income limitations governing payment of death pensions.

Resolution 24. That AMVETS urge legislation placing widows and children of World War II veterans on a level with widows and children of World War I veterans with reference to non-service-connected death pensions.

Resolution 25. That AMVETS request adequate funds for the Civil Service Commission so that it may adjudicate veterans appeals, process examinations and AMVETS oppose any decentralization or reorganization of the Civil Service Commission.

Resolution 26. That AMVETS believe that veterans in Federal civil service should be separated only under section 12 of the act of 1944; also in the widening areas of competition; also that preference eligibles should be allowed to displace nonveterans if the veterans meet the minimum requirements of the new position.

Resolution 27. AMVETS request the Civil Service Commission and the several Federal agencies to amend leave regulations so that a veteran with service-connected disability who because of that disability needs hospitalization for longer than a year shall be granted such leave without pay so that he shall not lose seniority rights.

Resolution 28. AMVETS support H. R. 87 and S. 669 of the Eighty-first Congress (postal employees military credit bills).

Resolution 29. That AMVETS petition Congress for legislation extending the period of filing for gratuitous insurance to a period of 10 years from the veteran's death; further requests the parent be allowed to prove dependency within a period of 2 years from date of death of the insured.

Resolution 30. That AMVETS consider National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week as a continuing 52-week program.

Resolution 31. That AMVETS petition Congress to amend the national service life insurance laws to provide that the total and permanent disability rider now available on World War I insurance be made available on a like basis for veterans of World War II.

Resolution 32. That AMVETS request the VA to release to all newspapers and service organizations the method whereby the amount of refund on national service life insurance is computed.

Resolution 33. That AMVETS recommend the VA make available to all veterans with a service-connected disability an identification card.

Resolution 34. That AMVETS recommend a substantial raise in pay be given to VA hospital attendants, especially those in mental hospitals.

Resolution 35. That in regard to extension 2A of the 1945 rating schedule, AMVETS recommends to the VA if a veteran is released from a VA hospital in cast or other condition necessitating return to the hospital he be released on pass or furlough and not be discharged, so that his extension 2A benefits will be continuous.

Resolution 36. That national headquarters is mandated to do everything possible to have the Servicemen's Readjustment Act extended for 2 years.

Resolution 37. That AMVETS favor the extension of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act as specified in the Rankin bill with the following exceptions: (1) Closing date be extended from June 30, 1950 to July 25, 1951; (2) the proviso dealing with one or more years of training under the auspices of the VA be removed from the bill; (3) that the benefits of this bill be made retroactive to the date of expiration, July 25, 1949.

Resolution 38. That AMVETS recommend a contingent fund to enable the Veterans Employment Service to expand its facilities similar to the contingent fund now available for the Unemployment Compensation Facilities.

Resolution 39. That AMVETS recommend continuation of veterans' reemployment rights program on its present basis without any reduction in personnel.

Resolution 40. That AMVETS urge the statutory award for all World War II veterans with arrested tuberculosis similar to World War I benefits.

Resolution 41. That AMVETS favor the release of some part of the $33,000,000 now held in the Treasury contributed by the veterans of the National Soldiers' Home in Washington, D. C., to be used for the expansion of that facility.

Resolution 42. That AMVETS recommend the VA amend its regulations to permit eligible veterans a minimum of four pair of shoes per year at the veterans' request.

Resolution 43. That the national executive director and national legislative director publicly post at the next convention all resolutions adopted at this convention, together with notations of all action taken on such resolutions.

Resolution 44. That the position of our national legislative program be carried as a column of the National AMVET.

Resolution 45. That approval of posts affected by any State or national fund raising activities be secured prior to the start of such activities.

Resolution 46. That the national executive committee make a review of all items of expenditure at national headquarters.

Resolution 47. That national headquarters and the national executive committee are urged to take steps to establish a national joint veterans' council.

Resolution 48. That AMVETS strongly oppose section 3 of the Judd bill, concerning immigration of Chinese nationals as it applies to wives and children of ex-service personnel.

Resolution 49. That AMVETS believe the maximum efficiency in achieving agreement among labor and management will result when there is a minimum of outside interference; further this convention recommends that national legislation dealing with labor-management be limited in scope to definition of minimum working conditions, the right of organization and expression of workmen, protection of fundamental property rights and the proper staffing and operation of the United States Conciliation Service.

Resolution 50. That AMVETS exert all means to influence the ending of discrimination in the armed forces and commend Secretary Johnson on the initial action taken toward accomplishing that purpose; that AMVETS urge the American Bowling Congress to drop its racial barriers; and that AMVETS generally support such pieces of legislation in the Congress designed to afford full, free, and unrestricted life to all classes and groups of the population.

Resolution 51. That AMVETS urge prompt action on the admission of Alaska and Hawaii as States.

Resolution 52. That AMVETS urge the privilege of naturalization be accorded to parents of honorably discharged Japanese-American veterans of World War II.

Resolution 53. That AMVETS urge that American Indians be made citizens in the full sense of the word to give them all privileges and rights of American citizenship.

Resolution 54. That AMVETS urge that the citizens legally domiciled in the District of Columbia be allowed the right to vote.

Resolution 55. That AMVETS commend those national and State legislators who have given careful consideration to the great body of veterans' legislation proposed.

Resolution 56. That AMVETS commend post 8, of Wichita, Kans., for its action in giving 15 percent of its profits from its new clubroom to the National Service Foundation.

Resolution 57. That AMVETS instruct its quartermaster department to establish an independent budget; distribute catalogs as widely as possible; arrange for furnishing women members with WAC-type hats; instruct its suppliers to use forest green piping on caps instead of Kelly green; reemphasize cap colors as green with gold lettering for posts, white with green lettering for State, and white with gold lettering for national; contract for, stock, or sell any pins not authorized by a national convention; remind AMVETS that a key has been established as an official reward to past post, State, and national commanders; to inform uniform manufacturers to comply with specifications laid down by a previous national convention; to provide suitable publicity in the National AMVET on quartermaster items; and to arrange for delivery of caps within 2 weeks.

Resolution 58. That AMVETS oppose compulsory health insurance by the Federal Government in any way, shape, or form.

Resolution 59. That AMVETS go on record favoring the Hoover Commission report in principle.

Resolution 60. That the national commander of AMVETS should instruct all State commanders to appoint State agricultural committees and to do all in their power to have post agricultural committees established.

Resolution 61. That AMVETS do all possible to assure that the Government in its spending programs for maintaining the farmers' purchasing power provide funds for the addition of organic matter to the soils of the United States.

Resolution 62. That AMVETS urge close scrutiny of all bills as a result of the work of the Hoover Commission pertaining to the families and benefits for veterans.

Resolution 63. That AMVETS urge the following housing legislation: (1) Establishment of complete secondary market for GI home loans through an agency of the United States Government, retroactive to the time full secondary market lapsed, with a continuation of present 50-percent market for FHA loans; (2) abolition of the section 505 combination FHA-GI loans; (3) Government-guaranteed mortgages on individual homes be limited to the same rate of interest as provided by the GI bill so the GI loan will be as attractive as other loans; (4) extension of amortization period from 25 to 30 years, and income of Government guaranty from 50 percent to 60 percent, with a maximum limit of guaranty increased from $4,000 to $7,500; (5) establishment of a Government agency, when and if necessary, to aid and assist veteran home owners facing loss of homes through economic circumstances beyond control; (6) Congress and/or Department of Justice make a complete investigation as to the amount of favoritism, 5 percentism, malpractice, and other irregularities existing in branches of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration; (7) adequate appropriations be provided for the VA to maintain and enlarge, if necessary, that division which has been so successful in preventing foreclosures on homes owned by veterans through successful counseling and advice to the veteran home owner; (8) secure similar financing arrangements for veteran cooperatives as now provided by the GI bill; (9) give priority to veterans of World War II in the purchase of Lanham Act property; (10) the VA and FHA use only competent and trained appraisers, with an appraisal panel available for final adjudication of appraisals held to be unfair; (11) AMVETS establish a continuous national housing committee; and (12) AMVETS oppose any legislation which eliminates or precludes any existing rights and privileges now held by the veteran under Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

Resolution 64. That AMVETS national executive committee create an AMVET National Youth Foundation.

Resolution 65. That AMVETS adopt peace and preparedness program as follows: (1) United States to support the UN and seek its development into a world federal government, open to all nations; (2) eliminate the veto in matters pertaining to aggression and preparation for aggression within the UN Charter; (3) eliminate present armament race by international control and inspection and treat violating nations as aggressors against members of UN; (4) create an international court with jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to aggression within the UN and to establish and maintain a police force to carry out the court's decisions; (5) national headquarters to implement AMVETS bylaws by appointment of the directors of the AMVETS division of international affairs; (6) continue support of the Marshall plan, Atlantic Pact, and the armed implementation thereof; (7) encourage removal of trade barriers in our commerce with Marshall-plan countries; (8) continue the reciprocal-trade program, but prohibit shipment of all goods from the United States to Russia and her satellites; (9) urge the United States to promote an economic and political union of Europe leading toward a United States of Europe; (10) encourage development of regional pacts for collective self-defense, including a Pacific Pact; (11) reiterate our support of the good-neighbor policy in the Western Hemisphere, the Rio Pact, and support stronger economic and cultural ties among the nations of the Americas; (12) support requests of the armed services for full appropriation, and provide for their organic composition to insure the most effective armed force in the world; (13) continue selective service to keep America prepared and encourage appointment of World War II combat veterans to selective-service boards; (14) improve and unify the administration of justice in the armed services to permit qualified enlisted men to serve on courts martial, to authorize the appointment of a civilian inspector general, and to separate the functions of the inspector general and judge advocate general from the chain of command; (15) enact legislation requiring the registration of all Communists, Communist-front organizations, and all other people or groups advocating the overthrow of the United States by force or by subversion; (16) intensify the Nation's efforts in the fields of military intelligence, scientific research and development, and the world-wide dissemination of the truth about American democracy; (17) establish a program of economic mobilization to include industry and labor in case of war and eliminate excess profits; (18) support the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; (19) support moves for strengthening the four freedoms in all countries of the world; and (20) urge that Americans accept as a duty and responsibility the opportunities for service to our State Department when they are called upon to do so; we urge the Government to recruit more World War II veterans for State Department and foreign service.

Resolution 66. That AMVETS favor equal educational opportunities for all at the highest possible level and thus favor Federal aid to education.

Resolution 67. That AMVETS favor enactment of legislation providing for adjusted compensation with the following features: (1) Adjusted compensation be paid to veterans with honorable service in the armed forces of not less than 60 days unless sooner discharged by reasons of a service-incurred or service-connected disability during the period of time between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945; payment to be computed on the actual time in service from September 16, 1940, to and including December 31, 1946. (2) Totally disabled veterans and unremarried widows and children or dependent parents of veterans who died in service to receive the maximum amount; said adjusted compensation to be computed upon the amounts of $3 for each day of duty in the continental limits of the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, with a maximum of $4,500. (3) Said adjusted compensation shall be payable by issuance of United States Government bonds to mature in 1955, bearing an interest rate of 4 percent per annum; bonds to be nonnegotiable, nonattachable for debt, or for any other reason, and shall not be subject to pledge or security.

A Plan To Cut Your Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Coronet magazine:

A NEW PLAN TO CUT YOUR INCOME TAX

(By Gwilym A. Price, president of the Westinghouse Electric Corp.)

HERE IS A PROGRAM DESIGNED TO HELP THE TAXPAYER AND BOLSTER OUR NATIONAL ECONOMY

At the heart of any conviction that America's future can be greater than her past lies the problem of taxation. Here, perhaps, is the most significant single factor in our national economy today.

More than 1 dollar in every four that we earn is taken directly from us by tax collectors for city, county, State, and Federal Governments, or is consumed by hundreds of hidden taxes on everything from cigarettes to limousines. Hence, how these taxes are levied is of supreme importance in determining what kind of an economy we are to have, and which way our country is to go. It can be either a dead hand or a force for progress.

A tax program which I believe can be a powerful force for progress is the incentive income tax plan, designed by my fellow-Pittsburghers, Frank Wilbur Main and M. C. Conick. Their plan is not designed as a cure-all for the problems of taxation, but it will go far, I feel, toward relieving the American people of the many inequities under our present income-tax laws.

Listed below are the main planks of the plan which I am convinced will benefit and encourage: (a) Labor; (b) business enterprise; (c) savings and investment; and (d) the intelligent spending that leads to better living:

1. All income should be taxed at the same rates, whether it is received by an individual or by a corporation.

2. Exemptions should be raised to $1,000 for a single person, and $2,000 for a married couple, and remain at $600 for each dependent.

3. The new graduated rates should begin at 15 percent on the first $2,500 of taxable income, and rise to a maximum of 50 percent at the $50,000 level and above.

4. Eliminate the double tax on corporation dividends by freeing the stockholder of tax liability.

To these recommendations, I would add this proposal:

5. Allow corporations to retain untaxed more of their earnings, insofar as they are used for modernization of plants and machinery.

Now, how could these tax revisions help our people to a better tomorrow? First, consider the small-income earner, like the average farmer and the person who lives on a modest salary or pension.

To start with, 30,000,000 individuals who now pay income taxes would be released from paying anything at all. This would be accomplished by raising the exemption from the present $600 per person to $2,000 for husband and wife.

Assuming the customary 10 percent in deductions for contributions, interest, local taxes, and the like, a family of four today pays tax on all wages above $51 a week. Under the incentive plan, the family would have to earn $68—or $17 more a week—before the tax collector got anything.

Now, let's see how the plan would work for a family of the same size which earns more. If the husband and father makes $3,500 a year, he now pays about $125 in income taxes. Under the incentive plan, he would pay nothing. The $5,000-a-year man who now pays about $350 would pay only $195. In the $7,000 bracket, where he now turns over about $650, even after taking advantage of the new joint-income provisions, his bill would be cut to $465. If he is at the

$10,000 level, his $1,167 tax would drop to $890.

For the big earners, the incentive tax would rise to a limit of 50 percent on incomes of $50,000 or more, putting into practice the popular belief that any man deserves a 50–50 break from the tax collector.

So much for the individual earner. What about the company for which he works?

Obviously, as head of a corporation, I do not find palatable an increase in the corporate maximum income rate from 38 to 50 percent. I could not possibly support such a provision, except as part of a total plan which I am convinced would be in the best interests of stockholders, employees, management, and customers, and therefore of the corporation itself.

Today, a business with more than $50,000 net earnings pays in income tax a top rate of 38 cents of every $1 it earns. Under the incentive plan, the corporation would pay in graduated amounts up to 34 percent of the first $50,000 earned, but would pay 50 percent on all earnings over $50,000. This would be an unbearable burden, unless it were offset by such benefits as:

1. Elimination of the double tax on dividends.

2. Greater freedom for corporations to retain more of their earnings for growth.

Elimination of dual taxes on dividends, along with the freeing of millions of small earners from income taxes, would be the most important boost our lawmakers could give to America's financial welfare. To appreciate the importance of this step, let us see how the dollars which buy stock—and provide the capital to make jobs—are now doubly penalized for taking that risk.

In the first place, the profits these dollars earn are taxed as corporation income—the tax that now goes up to 38 percent. Then, when the corporation pays part of what it has left to the stockholder in return for the use of his money, the investor in the top bracket is asked to pay as much as 82 percent on that.

For example, before Westinghouse pays a stockholder a dividend of $1.25 a share for using his money, it must first pay Federal and State taxes of about 85 cents a share. But that is only tax No. 1. The investor in turn must pay a second tax, running anywhere up to 82 percent or $1.03 of the $1.25 he gets.

Even if he is only a moderately wealthy man, he will pay enough tax to reduce the return on his investment to a mere 3 percent. Three percent. What incentive is there in such a return to persuade the investor to put his money into corporation stock, to turn over his savings to help make jobs for others, to help produce more and better products at lower prices?

The United States has become the world's greatest Nation only because its founding fathers and the pioneers who followed them were willing to take a chance. But who would have opened the West, built the railroads, prospected for oil, or labored to perfect the automobile if the rule had been: "If you succeed, the Government takes most of your profit. If you fail, the loss is all yours"? Removal of the double tax on dividends is at the very core of the argument that the best financial policy for a democracy is the one which leaves the greatest initiative in the hands of its people.

The incentive tax plan is not perfect. What are the principal drawbacks against it?

Frankly, it won't raise as much money for the Government as our present tax program does. On the basis of the 1948 national income, this new plan would have cut the Government's total take from $29,000,000,000 to an estimated $25,000,000,000.

Even in these days of big Federal spending, $4,000,000,000 is a lot of money. But it needn't be all lost. In the first place, it happens to be just about the amount the Hoover Commission says could be cut from the Government's expenses by reorganizing Federal agencies. Maybe if there were $4,000,000,000 less coming in, the President and Congress would have a little incentive of their own to bear down harder on spending.

There are other incentives, too. By removing 20,000,000 persons from the tax rolls and cutting the bills of others, there will be more money in their hands to buy the things they need. This, in turn, will bring increased business and higher tax yields. And more of the same would be accomplished by removing the double tax on dividends, prompting the creation of new enterprises and new jobs.

The second complaint against the incentive plan charges that freeing millions from paying taxes will make them less insistent that their Government operate economically and efficiently. But if you look at the record of recent years, you will find little support for this argument. With one-third of all Americans on the tax rolls, where is the proof that our Government has become economy-minded?

To me, it seems essential that tax relief be given to those in the lower income brackets so that they can keep their families' living standards as high as possible. Too much of these low incomes is currently going for taxes. Take just one example:

Think of the wage-earner's tax bill and his life-insurance bill. It is the exceptional worker who does not pay far more in taxes than he pays to protect his family's future.

One of the major advantages of the incentive plan is that it is easy for the taxpayer to comprehend and easy for the Government to operate. How different from our present complicated tax laws, which have been described as a code for penalizing success. The incentive plan is a forward-looking program, based on the belief that our greatest days as a Nation are still ahead.

To go forward confidently, our country needs nearly 700,000 new jobs a year. That figure represents the margin by which young men and women looking for jobs outnumber the oldsters who quit.

But today's worker does not depend on his hands alone. He uses the best and most efficient tools in the world, and they cost a lot of money—on the average, perhaps $8,000 per job. This means we have to pour about $5,500,000,000 of new money into business each year just to provide new jobs for all who want them. That money should come only from voluntary investment by individuals.

In recent months, we have seen the increasing tendency of pressure groups to turn to the Government for help in fighting a slow-down of our business machine. That is all part of the idea that government can provide security for all, that government can protect us from loss and guarantee us a profit.

But the idea is a fallacy. Government does not earn any money. It has for spending only what it takes from its citizens in the form of taxes. It cannot create jobs, income, or guaranties of any sort except by taking money from one group and giving it to another.

Far better, it seems to me, is a government that gives its citizens the incentive to make their own way—an incentive to work harder and risk more because both worker and investor will earn and keep their fair share of the wealth thus created. I am convinced that a tax structure based on such confidence in ourselves as a free people will yield increased prosperity and bring higher living standards to every family in the United States.

Tribute to Brig. Gen. Wladimir B. Krzyzanowski

REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, at the time that freedom-loving people of the world mourned the death of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, another great Pole, Gen. Wladimir B. Krzyzanowski, also a champion of liberty, was born on July 9, 1824, in Roznowo, a small town in an already enslaved Poland. Having lived his early years in an atmosphere of servitude, he grew up with the determination to seek freedom for himself and to help win it for others.

As a young man, Wladimir Krzyzanowski organized a strong student underground movement to rid his native land of German domination. Branded a conspirator and hunted by the German police, Wladimir fled to America in 1846. He came here as a humble immigrant. A young man, 22 years old, possessing a powerful physique and a burning desire to succeed, he faced the challenge of a new country—a land of liberty and opportunity.

Krzyzanowski's first undertaking was learning the English language. He spent several years pursuing an education, finally completing a course in engineering. With America's constantly expanding boundaries, he used his knowledge to chart railroad lines in America's westward move.

His career was interrupted by the outbreak of the Civil War. Two reasons prompted Krzyzanowski to join the Union Army at once. First was his strong love of freedom. Remembering his youthful years spent in servitude and oppression in a partitioned Poland, he pledged himself to save the freedom he came to know and embrace in America. Second was his knowledge of engineering which was invaluable to the Union Army. He was willing to forsake a promising career to volunteer his services in strengthening the Union forces.

Wladimir Krzyzanowski enlisted as a private on April 11, 1861, in Washington, D. C. At once he distinguished himself as an organizer. Just as in his early days in Poland, he inspired the student underground movement for throwing off the German yoke, so now in the United States he recruited a company of fighting men to help save the Union.

Because of his military skill and outstanding leadership, Krzyzanowski soon rose to the rank of brigadier general. His great achievement during the Civil War was recruiting a regiment of infantry, named the United States Rifles, which later merged with the Polish Legion to become the Fifty-eighth Regiment of New York. This regiment was composed of Danes, Frenchmen, Germans, Poles, and Russians, all of whom were eager to devote their services to the

cause of justice. Under the leadership of Krzyzanowski, the Fifty-eighth Regiment fought gallantly in the battles of Cross Keys, Sulphur Springs, Waterloo Springs, Fox Ford, and Bull Run. On May 1, 1863, Krzyzanowski's men were the only ones to stop Gen. Stonewall Jackson at Chancellorsville. His regiment also saw heroic action in the Battle of Gettysburg. In each of these battles he contributed to the victory of the Union Army.

The outcome of the war saw the preservation of the Union. In Krzyzanowski's own words, "The ideals and freedom of America" were saved. Thus, through his contributions in the Civil War, Brigadier General Krzyzanowski has gone down in history as a great soldier. Though his deeds are not known as well as those of Kosciuszko and Pulaski, his name has always been inscribed brilliantly in the chapters of the Polish Legion of American Veterans.

After the Civil War, his job as a soldier done, he continued serving the United States Government in a civil capacity. His restless spirit took him on a mission first to Alaska where he started the first United States supervision of the Territory, then to Panama. Later he served as a special agent of the Treasury Department. Krzyzanowski died at the age of 62 on January 31, 1887. He was given a soldier's farewell and his body was laid to rest in the Greenwood Cemetery in Brooklyn, N. Y. Many years later, through the efforts of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, his body was moved to Arlington Cemetery to rest among the heroes, all of whom served the country so well.

This year, the Polish Legion of American Veterans will commemorate the sixty-third anniversary of Brigadier General Krzyzanowski's death by placing a wreath on his grave. It is in behalf of this organization that I am extending an invitation to all Members of Congress and their friends to participate in this memorializing ceremony which will be held at 10 a. m. next Tuesday, January 31, at the Arlington Cemetery.

Multiple Sclerosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that H. R. 3943, which is designed to fight the frightful, insidious condition known as multiple sclerosis, has been favorably reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

It is not necessary to recite the merits of this legislation. Its title is self-explanatory and its objectives so commendable and praiseworthy that I believe there will be little, if any, opposition in this House to its enactment.

The statistics show that a surprising number of persons throughout the United States are suffering from this dread disease. Science has made comparatively little headway in counteracting its ravages. Government research and Government cooperation with scientific bodies already studying this condition will be of inestimable value. Perhaps new treatments can be developed. Perhaps new formulae and new drugs can be developed which will attack this fearful enemy of mankind. Perhaps so-called atomic medicine holds the secret to the solution of the treatment and cure of multiple sclerosis.

The recent advance of science has been phenomenal and in no field nearly so beneficial to the human race as in the field of medicine. Newly discovered drugs are rapidly obliterating physical ailments and diseases which formerly took a cruel toll of lives of the American people. The sulfa drugs and penicillin, and now cortisone and acth, have worked near miracles in combatting infections and diseases heretofore fatal or disabling or crippling to unfortunate individuals. The science of chemistry is advancing so fast in developing new drugs and the science of medicine is proceeding so rapidly with new methods of treatment and techniques that in truth a frontal attack against many dread diseases is steadily expanding average life expectancy and eliminating pain, misery, and disability.

It may well be that in the future, except for cases resulting from trauma, accidents, and other limited types of injury or physical ailments, chemistry will replace surgery as an effective means of fighting disease. The Government should not only encourage medical science and chemistry in striving to develop and perfect these modern drugs but it should assume a definite leadership and guidance in setting up and effecting programs designed to accelerate not only the paths of discovery but the development of these chemical substances which hold out so much hope for the alleviation of human suffering and the restoration to active useful lives of so many Americans.

I urge the House leadership to take early action concerning H. R. 3943 and related measures so that this House will be able to move toward speedy enactment of this vital legislation.

Our Crumbling World Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by my colleague from New York, Hon. RALPH W. GWINN:

OUR CRUMBLING WORLD POWER

My colleagues in Congress are deeply concerned about our policy in China, and with good reason. Our China policy touches the military security of our Pacific coast and the whole continental United States.

At the end of the war the United States was head and center of a military coalition whose power stretched round the world. Its pincers closed in on our enemies and destroyed their military power completely.

Only 5 years later the Communists' military power stretches in a huge semicircle from eastern Germany across Russia and Siberia, through China to the Pacific. It is marching on without resistance to Formosa, Okinawa, and Japan. Our power is crumbling. We are the country being encircled, not Russia.

In the last year of the war, there were 1,800,000,000 people in the countries making up the United Nations. Only one-ninth of this vast population, the old U. S. S. R. was under totalitarian rule, while 1,625,000,000 were antitotalitarian. Today the antitotalitarian group has shrunk to 540,000,000. The group under totalitarian control has grown to four times its former size, while our futile foreign policy has lost 700,000,000. Nations like India and Sweden have fallen away to a neutral group in the struggle between freedom and barbarian power.

This new danger is not like nazism, removed by thousands of miles of impassable ocean. Russia is only a few miles from our frontiers in Alaska. She is threatening our Pacific island defenses, which we are losing by stupidity and cowardice, if not treason.

We fought the last war from the island aircraft carrier of Great Britain, but if Japan falls and Okinawa is untenable, we shall fight the next one from California or Oregon, or perhaps behind the ramparts of the Rockies.

The people of the west coast are seriously alarmed. Husbands and fathers are thinking now of how they can protect their own families in a new Pearl Harbor. The east coast is not on the front line. We are not worried about invaders in our homes. But we certainly ought to understand what the danger is.

Who brought the proud American Nation to this dreadful pass? We let President Truman have $191,000,000,000 of our money in 3 years. The Reader's Digest made a table showing that he had spent more than all the other Presidents of the United States put together, including 12 years of Franklin Roosevelt.

Most of this money has been spent for military affairs or foreign aid. How could any President bring us to such a humiliating political and military defeat with over $300,000,000,000 to implement his foreign policy?

The answer is that the New Deal does not have a foreign policy. It has only one policy, the old familiar cheap political policy of tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect. Every dollar spent on its foreign aid is carefully designed—judging from results—to win votes among farmers, businessmen and the rest.

Meanwhile the Communists insult and imprison our consuls. We ask Siam and Czechoslovakia to intervene on our behalf. We haul down the American flag from Peiping and call our foreign representatives home. The Communists imprison two members of our armed forces and we say, "Please, oh please, won't you let them go?" In every test the Communists have set to trap us we have given way.

The working heads of our armed forces know that we are in danger, but they are silenced by the politicians as Denfeld was silenced. Just so they silenced our admirals before Pearl Harbor.

Husbands and wives, fathers and mothers of this country! Any public official who knowingly exposes our land to the danger of invasion by a foreign foe is a traitor! The brilliant young men like Alger Hiss, American-born and American-educated, who

gave away our secrets to a foreign power were traitors. But the petty politicians in high office who protected, promoted, and sheltered them for years, in order to get the collectivized vote, are just as much traitors as those who dealt directly with the agents of a foreign enemy.

How many other bright young Communists is Mr. Acheson sheltering in the State Department today as he sheltered Hiss? How many members of this Communist cell are still heading up our roving delegations in Asia, in the United Nations, in the Foreign Service, and in the Office of the Secretary?

When is President Truman going to be serious? When will he clean out the Communists who make our foreign policy? Can we sleep safely until we find and remove every one of the traitors?

In a moment of peril in the Continental Army, General Washington issued the order, "Put none but Americans on guard tonight." Our country is again in peril. Our first line of defense is to have in positions of honor and trust only those men who will put their country's welfare ahead of any personal or political gain.

Flood Control, Lower Mississippi River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, January 19, 1950:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am most grateful for the opportunity to appear before this committee in support of the budget item of $72,000,000 for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries.

I realize the very great importance of keeping Government costs down to a minimum and as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I state without any reservation that I expect to be a party to keeping Government costs down wherever possible. I am fully aware of the fact that the House Appropriations Committee has a tremendous responsibility to discharge when considering appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, and may I further state that, in my opinion, with the high degree of prosperity that we are now enjoying, deficit financing is undesirable and unsound. Nevertheless, I am convinced that certain budget recommendations should not be reduced too drastically; specifically I refer to the recommendations for flood-control appropriations because there is proof that for every dollar invested in flood-control improvements, the value of America is enhanced $2.15. If these figures are accurate—and I believe they are—then funds invested in flood-control construction are a good investment.

In appearing before your committee, I am not necessarily asking for special consideration for any flood-control project in my district nor for the State of Louisiana. My interest is in the entire lower Mississippi Valley because Congress appropriates a lump sum for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries. Therefore, if the authorized projects in my district and State are to receive Federal funds, the over-all appropriation for the Mississippi River and its tributaries must be adequate; otherwise certain projects cannot be continued.

The Mississippi River and its tributaries is the oldest Federal authorized flood-control project in America and it is the No. 1 flood-control problem of the entire United States.

No doubt it has been directed to the attention of this committee that 42 percent of all the floodwaters of the United States must necessarily pass through the lower Mississippi Valley to reach the Gulf of Mexico. The $72,000,000 budget item for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries will be used against authorizations totaling $1,038,000,000. A study of the record will disclose that progress on the main stem of the Mississippi River and the off-river projects is progressing too slowly to be completed economically. I am sure this committee will be pleased to learn that out of the $72,000,000 requested, none of the funds will be used to start new projects. All of the funds will be used on projects already under construction.

I have been told, on good authority, that the Corps of Army Engineers asked the Bureau of the Budget to recommend $117,000,000 for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries for the fiscal year 1951. I might state further than the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, of which I am vice president, expressed a fear that if the Bureau of the Budget recommended less than $100,000,000 for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries for the fiscal year 1951, that many of the projects now under construction would have to be curtailed. That is history because the Bureau of the Budget saw fit to recommend only $72,000,000.

It is my hope that this committee in its wisdom can justify the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget which, in my opinion, is a very minimum by which the work on the main Mississippi River and off-river projects can progress economically. I am sure it has been directed to the attention of this committee that when funds are appropriated for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries, the lives and property of a great majority of the people living in the States of Kentucky, Missouri, Illinois, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana are protected. Available information will disclose that it requires a very minimum of $47,000,000 for maintenance and work on the main stem of the Mississippi River. Therefore, any reduction that you make will affect only the off-river projects.

There are projects in my district only 8 percent completed, others only 28 to 43 percent completed. This condition has been brought about by lack of funds and as businessmen I am sure you will agree that when work of this kind is prolonged over a period of many years, it makes the completed job much more expensive, which is nothing less than false economy.

I have appeared before this committee many times to testify in support of sufficient funds for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries and knowing that you have heard many other witnesses on the same project, I should not like to consume any more of the committee's time than is absolutely necessary, but I should like to point out to the committee that floods and soil erosion are costing the American people in excess of $1,000,000,000 annually. I am sure you will agree that if we permit this waste to continue, especially in face of an increasing population, this country may find itself in the same condition as many foreign countries; that is, without sufficient cultivatable land to produce the food to maintain our present standard of living.

I wish there were some way that expenditures in the field of flood control and reclamation could be considered on a capital-investment basis rather than as an expense, because on such a basis we could evaluate the benefits and check the return received on the investment.

Mr. Chairman, flood-control problems in the lower Mississippi Valley are great. I repeat, that we are working against a $1,038,000 authorization and I am thoroughly convinced that the $72,000,000 requested by the Bureau of the Budget is the very minimum by which the projects under construction in the lower Mississippi Valley can be continued economically. If the committee grants the $72,000,000, it will make possible the continuation of a minimum of work on the main stem of the Mississippi River and the off-river projects. I am sure that this committee has in its possession all the technical data and statistics dealing with the Mississippi River and its tributaries. Therefore, I shall not incur additional expense to the Government by filing additional statistics and technical data in the record. In conclusion, I should like to say that it is my sincere hope that this committee will grant the $72,000,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and if you do, then the projects in my own district and the State of Louisiana will benefit along with the other 6 States in the lower Mississippi Valley.

Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa State Dental Society, in convention assembled, has adopted a set of resolutions on the subject of compulsory health insurance and has memorialized Congress of the opposition of this organization toward any legislation containing the principle of compulsory health insurance.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include these resolutions so that all Members of Congress may know the position of this great organization:

Whereas the American dental and medical professions have established the world's highest standard of dental and medical care, thereby helping the United States to become the healthiest major Nation in the world; and

Whereas the great advances which have been made in the profession of dentistry under the stimulus of private practice would be impeded by enactment of a Federal system of compulsory health insurance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the University District Dental Society does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States not to enact any legislation containing the principle of compulsory health insurance,

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative now in the Congress from this State, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the council on legislation, American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

P. M. HERRICK,
President.

FREDERICK B. LEHMAN,
Secretary.

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, JANUARY 17, 1950.

The Democratic Program for a Growing America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Assistant Secretary of the Interior C. Girard Davidson at the Springfield Public Forum, Springfield, Mass., Wednesday, January 18, 1950:

THE DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM FOR A GROWING AMERICA

The Democratic Party has a vigorous, positive program for meeting our many and diverse problems. If I were to cover them all, I could do no more than list the points in that program in the time available to us tonight.

Instead I shall address myself to some of the basic objectives which underlie that program.

For the Democrats, the first objective of our democracy must be to guarantee opportunity, security, and liberty for all our people. This aim is as old as the Constitution itself, which was drawn up to establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense. But that is not all. The Constitution lists this further purpose of our American Government—to promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

To Democrats it is obvious that our Government is directed to carry out this last-named purpose as well as the others. We have undertaken the action needed to promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty.

We believe that all Americans should share in the bounties which this rich land can provide. We believe too that all should share in the responsibility for conserving and utilizing these riches. The workingman must have an opportunity to earn his living and to participate in setting the conditions for his employment. The businessman must have access to materials and markets in a freely competitive economy. The farmer must be secure in the preservation of his land and is entitled to a fair return for his products.

Every one of us has a right to security in old age, to adequate schooling, to a decent home, to medical care, and to protection from discrimination. Thus secure in the essentials of life, a man has an opportunity to make his contribution to a fully-functioning democracy and to an ever-expanding economy. He can face the future unafraid.

Unable or unwilling to accept the implications of a democratic society, the Republicans have attempted to debase these noble objectives of our founding fathers. They have ducked the job ahead and turned instead to the invention of slogans. In years gone by, fearful, sometimes greeting, they have attempted to breathe unfathomless complications into the phrase "the welfare state." Frightened by the revolution of true democracy, they have labeled it a bogeyman to frighten children.

We Democrats are not afraid of the welfare state. We are proud of it. The welfare state is meeting the needs of the people. That is our aim.

To achieve security, opportunity, and liberty, we must have a balanced expanding economy. Even the most old-fashioned of our economists have now admitted that this is possible, that catastrophic depressions are not inevitable. Last year we proved it. Well-conceived measures enacted earlier by the Government enabled us to slip out of a difficult inflationary period without serious economic upheaval.

Never has America been more in need of a stable economy that grows year after year. The entire free world depends for its prosperity, and for its continuing liberties, on a balanced economy in the United States. The masters of that portion of the globe which has lost its freedom lick their chops greedily in anticipation of our relapse into economic chaos.

A balanced economy calls for steadily expanding production to meet the needs of a growing population. Expanding production guarantees jobs for all. Expanding production guarantees goods for all in quantity to assure the American standard of living for everyone.

There must be a steady stream of investment to finance this new productive capacity. There must be a steady stream of wage and salary payments so consumers can purchase the goods turned out by this expanded industrial plant. This calls for a balance in the distribution of our national income: A proper share to create consumer purchasing power.

This is a delicate and dynamic balance, changing month to month and year to year. Industry, labor, and agriculture, freed from fear and firm in their faith in a growing America, could make the shifts to preserve the balance. But our Government must help by reading aloud the signposts as we move forward so we all know the road. And sometimes our Government must put a shoulder to one or another of the wheels which get caught in the mire, lest the balance be disrupted.

The concept of a balanced economy is not too big for the American people, who have foresworn depressions forevermore.

But the leaders of the Republican Party have not yet shown that they understand this fundamental objective of our society. They have whittled down this broad goal which promises a better life for all of us. Republicans prate about balancing the budget.

Twenty years ago, the Republicans balanced the budget. The year was 1930. They balanced it with bread lines.

Because the Republicans balanced the Federal budget, millions of family budgets became unbalanced. People found that the red ink in their books could not be eaten or worn or lived in. People stopped buying, and a lot of business budgets went out of balance. Next down the slide went the budgets of manufacturers, so more men were thrown out of work. Relief payments by localities and States mounted and—since the Federal budget insisted on its ivory-tower equilibrium—these States and local government budgets went out of kilter.

Anybody could balance the Federal budget any time—if it were an important end in itself. The recipe is universally known. All you do is lop off some disbursements or levy some new taxes.

But it is not an end in itself. Balancing the Federal budget today must not be done at the expense of unbalancing other budgets elsewhere in the Nation, and very probably torpedoing entirely budgets overseas in some democratic countries dependent upon us.

Fifteen years ago, the orthodox economists viewed with alarm our unbalanced budget. This can't go on, they said. Government securities will become worthless, they warned. The Republicans echoed their gloomy predictions.

While the Republicans continued to prattle about budget balancing, the rest of us went to work on building the economy. We learned some basic economic facts. We found the Federal budget could be a useful tool. We discovered that what we did with an unbalanced budget was a large factor in promoting a balanced economy. To the Republican leadership, however, the Federal budget is still like the rubber ball to the trained seal, a toy to juggle.

President Truman reiterated these economic truths in his budget message and economic report earlier this month. He acknowledged that we could balance the budget today—but only by means of dangerous and crippling economies. Instead he chose a program which would raise our levels of production and income. This would bring us to the point where additional revenue coming from increased production and income would in time balance a budget providing for all the services necessary in this land of opportunity.

President Truman stated the proposition plainly: Either we can shrink or we can grow. Guided by the forward-looking spirit of the American people, he made his choice: "Let us grow," he said.

The President set out the goals of a hopeful people with faith in themselves and in the future. "Within 5 years," he stated, "we can achieve an annual output in excess of $300,000,000,000—a gain in national income equal to an average of nearly $1,000 for every family in the United States."

Such goals are not fanciful, but merely projections of our rate of progress over the past few years. But their achievement is not automatic. Government fiscal policy can help to assure them.

Public development of our rivers, our soils, our forests, and our minerals will give private industry and agriculture new fields for investment so that they can raise production. Public encouragement of housing and transportation will serve the same ends. Public expenditures for social security, health, education, and housing will maintain and expand consumer purchasing power to provide wider markets for expanded production.

The resultant increase in income will generate additional revenues to strengthen the fiscal position of the Government—and balance the budget.

How do the Republicans reply to this statement of goals for a growing America, for a higher standard of living. "It can't be done," they intone mournfully. They search for reasons why these goals cannot be achieved.

America was not wrested from the wilderness by men and women with an it-can't-be-done attitude. Today, too, our problems call for the same type of positive effort, for daring and bold imagination. Today the Democratic Party has reflected the frontier spirit in its bold proposals for the welfare state.

The people know the difference between construction and obstruction, between proposing and opposing. The people are not misled by Republican double talk about a balanced budget. The people say, let the Republicans leave their negative attitude behind. Let's all join in searching for a way to reach the goals of more jobs, more income, and more good things for all of us.

We forget that the Republicans once were crusaders for democracy. In its first year, the Republican Party freed the slaves, preserved the Federal Union, and set up free farmers on homesteads in the west. These acts were fully consistent with President Lincoln's pronouncement. "The legitimate object of Government," he said, "is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot by individual effort do at all or do so well for themselves."

Thus Lincoln perfectly defined the welfare state. The Democrats today are pleased to accept his leadership. We are striving for the creation of Lincoln's welfare state, even though he is now forsaken his own party.

The present-day critics of the welfare state aren't really opposed to welfare by government—if it's for them.

Businessmen aren't complaining about RFC loans, not even Mr. Guy Gabrielson, Chairman of the Republican Party, whose Carthage Hydrocol Corp. has received more than $13,000,000 in RFC loans. They aren't objecting to 90 percent FHA guaranties to builders. They don't oppose subsidies to air lines and steamships. The railroads never fussed over accepting a gift of the public lands equal to the size of France.

The question here is whose welfare?

Low-cost housing for the welfare of the workers? Oh, no, they caution us; that kills incentive. But let's have some more loans to industry.

Control monopolies to allow the small-business man a chance to compete? Definitely not, they say; that will destroy free enterprise. But let's slap some more injunctions on the unions.

Parity payments to assure the farmer a steady income? Beware, they warn us; that is the road to socialism. But can you get us a shipping subsidy?

We Democrats admit we are confused by this double talk. In our way of thinking, prosperity for one group does not require repression on another. All have to gain together or the laggard becomes a drag on the economy. The Government is dedicated to the welfare of all its citizens, and should assist any of them suffering from inequities or unable to play their part in the economy. That's why the Democrats are for the welfare state.

I always find that I can get a better understanding of a problem if I examine it in my own backyard, in terms of things close to home which are familiar to me. We might do the same thing with the goals of the Democratic Party. Let's take our objectives of opportunity, security, liberty, and a balanced economy and relate them to the problems of New England. Let's see how New England might use the principles of the welfare state.

You are all familiar with the region's economic picture. Production and income are falling off, unemployment is comparatively high. The fact is, New England in recent years is playing a progressively smaller role in the life of the Nation. Since 1929 manufacturing in New England, as measured by value added, has increased only 109 percent as compared to 133 for the whole country.

Now let's see what's happening to the natural resources which might provide a firm base for an expanding economy.

No one knows better than you residents of the Connecticut Valley what great damage floods have done to your communities. Pollution of the river and the destruction of fisheries is also a familiar story here. You have seen once rich cropland leached by erosion and taken out of cultivation. You have felt the lack of an adequate channel for river navigation.

Although New England has about 3,000,000 kilowatts of undeveloped hydroelectric generating capacity in its streams, its electric rates are the highest of any region in the Nation. For the same amount of electricity, the average householder pays twice as much here in Springfield as he does in Tacoma, Wash. Industry also suffers from the same differential, and many of the southbound plants have given high power rate: as one of the main reasons for leaving New England.

Let's see what the welfare state has done about similar problems in other regions. This year, for instance, the Federal budget earmarks about $2,000,000,000 for development of natural resources. This will be spent for flood control, for irrigating new land, for protection of fisheries, for navigation, for soil conservation, for forest management, and for generating low-cost hydropower. A surprisingly small amount of this money will be spent in New England.

We have seen how this kind of Federal investment stimulates industry. TVA operations resulted in cutting retail power rates by two-thirds in the Tennessee Valley. Initiation of Federal power projects in the Southwest brought an immediate cut of one-half in wholesale power rates to preference customers. As a result of the full development of the river by TVA, the Tennessee Valley region is now growing economically much faster than the country as a whole. Federal resource developments in the Pacific Northwest have brought in hundreds of power-hungry new industries.

If conditions in this region warrant it, New England has a right to expect some Federal investment in development of its resources. Although the effect may not be as spectacular as in other regions, it may well help you to reestablish the stable economy New England used to know.

The time has come to get the facts. Your own Congressman, FOSTER FURCOLO, has introduced a bill to survey the prospects of the Merrimac and others providing for a Connecticut Valley Administration. And one of your distinguished New England Senators has already worked out a way to get the facts on the entire region. Senator GREEN has introduced a bill in Congress for setting up a New England River Basin Survey Commission. It would study the whole region, not just pieces of it. It would study all possible uses of rivers, not only water power. It would bring together the proposals of all parties into a unified program for regional growth.

This Commission would be seeking a firm base for a balanced economy in New England. It would try to point the ways to new opportunities for industry, for agriculture, for employment of labor. It would show what steps are necessary to realize these opportunities. These are true functions of a welfare state.

Here is a Democratic proposal for meeting some of the basic problems of New England. It is only one example of how the Democratic Party proposes to meet domestic problems. We intend to see that the Federal Government does its share of the job of expanding America's economy, of providing better security for its citizens, and of seeking a fair distribution of the fruits of the labors of our people.

We propose to do these things because we have unbounded faith in the people of America, in the strength and vitality of our democratic Government and of the dynamic upward drive of our free-enterprise economy. We are firmly convinced that the path America must take is not to the left, not to the right, not to the rear, but forward to a life of ever-increasing abundance and a peaceful world.

Jackie Robinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I know that most of the American public are highly pleased with the signing a day or so ago of that great ball player, Jackie Robinson, at an annual salary which is said to be the highest for a player in Dodger history. The Brooklyn Eagle claims that it took less than 5 minutes for Jackie and President Branch Rickey to agree. This fact is a tribute to both of them. The annual signing of Dodger ball players is not always so easy. My good friend in Brooklyn, Jim Ryan, the father and founder of the famous Anvil Chorus, points this out in the following limerick which he recently wrote:

"SIGN-US" TROUBLE

From Rickey we've wrung the admission
That headaches with him are tradition,
And they grow more severe
In the spring of the year
Which is due to a "sign-us" condition.

Man's Economic Background

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Chester D. Tripp, publisher of Economic Trend Line Studies. He points to the weaknesses of man which have led to the downfall of each of the five major economic systems man has devised, and will lead people to abandon ours unless they are corrected:

MAN'S ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

It might be said that no social economic system devised by man has ever been proved successful. One might come to this conclusion by a process of elimination: No system, as yet devised, has worked well enough to maintain itself over any great period of time.

There are many instances where the world has tried communism, and there are many places today, where it is still the common practice, but, without exception, no lasting high culture has ever been developed under its auspices. The same may be said for the economic systems involving barter, or exchange carried on through currency. These latter systems are as old as the hills; they still exist in large parts of the world, enjoying, if one may use that expression, shockingly low standards of living for the great majority of the practitioners.

As for capitalism, which should be considered exchange through the facilities of central banking, there is no long, uninterrupted records of its use. In Hellenistic times, the Near East was more capitalistic than it is today, and, incidentally, at that time had a much higher standard of living. The late Imperial Roman period was partially capitalistic and partially currency-minded. The Far East, Indian and China have to all appearances been barter- and currency-minded since the beginning of history, and, although we think of the Chinese social structure as being one of the oldest in the world, a detailed study of it shows many upsets and fully as many changes in government as have been experienced in Europe itself.

No one of these economic systems has ever been tried in its pure form, so far as the record shows. In currency-minded parts of the world, the hinterland still leans heavily on barter. Communism, whether practiced in seventeenth-century America or among the natives in Mexico, was and still is heavily tinctured with currency trading and even with rudimentary forms of capitalism.

Capitalism itself did not develop on a grand scale until after the seventeenth century, but, even today, half the capitalism of

the world, if one can judge by bank deposits, is carried on by North America, a third by Europe, and the remaining percentage pretty much limits itself to coastal cities around the world and to capital areas where international trade takes place.

It is a fair question under such circumstances to ask, What is the reason for these 5,000 years of failure or only partial success of any one of these systems? They have all been tried either in relative purity or in combination, and all have clearly left something to be desired.

Currently, we have an articulate minority decrying the evils of capitalism. This is particularly true in western Europe, and, to some extent, in the United States. I have little doubt that in other parts of the world where other systems are used, there are other articulate minorities raising their voices against the standing order of things, strongly suggesting social and economic shifts in one direction or another on the theory that the suggestions they have in mind would cure the trouble and make Utopia universal.

The sad part of the situation is that, historically, these shifts have been going on for centuries in both hemispheres. The economic technique after another has been overthrown, with conditions as likely as not going from bad to worse, the suggested panaceas having been proven time and again to have been inadequate. Why this long series of failures? Why is it that even today, right under our noses, the state-controlled economy hailed as liberalism is proving itself bankrupt.

On the face of it, and in pure theory, any one of the systems could work reasonably well if honestly practiced. Communism, under certain conditions, has developed a social atmosphere that is to say the least, tolerable; barter and currency certainly have much to recommend them; and capitalism, at least on paper, seems to solve a good many of the shortcomings of all of the systems, and seems to present the possibilities of a way of life much more abundant than anything that has been attained to date.

Very important literatures have been built up on the pros and cons of these systems. There are numberless books on why socialism, for instance, would solve our problems, and the political theories, based on the practice of socialism are without end. I wonder if we should not look elsewhere for the real cause of these failures. I would like to present the thesis that in some of these cases it is the fault of the system or of the theory of the system. I have a strong feeling that some systems could produce an abundance far greater than others, but I think it is safe to maintain that any one of them could work toward creating a social environment at least better than the days of the cave man. Criticisms of the different systems point out fundamental weaknesses within the systems themselves: Lack of incentive in socialism and in communism, the ponderance of actual money operations in currency trading; and the inability to easily tap distant markets in the case of barter. These disabilities are only important in degree and they in no way account for the widespread social unrest and dissatisfaction which have continuously driven humanity to further experimentation and to continual revolution.

It is my opinion that the great fundamental weakness in all the systems is the inherent weakness of a substantial majority to operate under any system. If education were really widespread, if honest effort were more universal, and if personal uneasiness were more the rule than the exception, any of the systems could operate. It is, in my opinion, the weakness of us humans that gives the subject matter to the articulate minority for airing their dissatisfaction in the system and in so doing, trying to interest the masses in experimental changes. Endless examples can be brought up to support this theory.

Let us start with capitalism. The accomplishments in the name of capitalism have been exceedingly great. This economic system has done more to raise the standard of living than any system or combination of systems ever tried. Yet capitalism has its back to the wall today in defense of itself. It is my opinion that the dissatisfaction with the system is not based on the workings of the theory involved. As a matter of fact, I find the theory of capitalism rarely discussed, and I believe it is little understood. It is the individual impositions of a small number of ruthless and selfish people that continuously produce irritations which become socially significant.

What is happening today in the countries that are again experimenting with socialism? Why does not England produce more? Why is continental Europe torn with bickerings concerning the division of the tax load and the dominance of one party or another? Again, it is the question of the individual selfishness of a fair part of the population in not cooperating with the theoretical scheme of things.

The individual in Britain lacks incentive. He would like to get something for nothing. In spite of a splendid theory of individual cooperation, his very lack of incentive is causing the standard of living of that large section of the world to be lowered at a much faster pace than he realizes. I have no doubt that this same thing is true in Soviet Russia. Russia's swing in the last few years toward piecework and incentive production strongly indicates that the communism of brotherly love on paper has to be tempered to the facts of human nature, and supported by the prison camp and the iron fist if it is going to work at all.

It has often been said that what the world really needs is a spiritual revival. I probably read into this statement a deeper meaning than the proponents of this theory intend, but I cannot help feeling that there is something to this if by spiritual revival is meant a simple and earnest desire to pull one's own oar, to be fair and friendly with one's fellows, and to be deeply concerned with the welfare of one's community.

If the basic trouble with capitalism is the human factor, the problem of setting up the ultimate perfect social organization may be far in the future. Blueprints and theories will never solve the problem. What our society, or any other, must be concerned with is not the question of individual security, but of a widespread realization that any working system must be based on honesty, fairness and understanding. Every person in this great population wants to see a better day, wants to have more abundance, and to enjoy greater personal freedom from the risks of life, but, if there is ever going to be any fundamental change for the better, of more permanence than history has shown to date, that change will have to originate in the human heart and mind, and not in any temporarily espoused social order.

Let me summarize this great problem with its historical background in mind. To begin, mankind has been particularly unfruitful in originating economic procedures. Broadly speaking, the essential qualities of a workable system can be counted on the fingers of one hand. For clarity, they might be listed in order, the order mainly taking the position in which they appear in history. First, we have the economy of self-sufficiency: The original hunter and fisherman, who, in the course of centuries, supplemented his activities by adding primitive agriculture. The societies practicing this technique were wanderers who of necessity were continuously changing their locale. Obviously, their standard of living was exceedingly low. Often, too, the population was controlled through starvation, mostly due to this low standard of living.

Thousands of years later the self-sufficient nomad began to settle down. Stock raising became characteristic of his economy, agriculture became somewhat advanced and consumed a greater percentage of his activities. The new life involved the creation of settlements, and, as a result, there developed the primitive mechanical arts, such as pottery making and house building. It was at this stage of the development that barter, almost automatically, became the economy of the day, and with barter, labor began to specialize, and the standard of living was raised.

Communism is the next form clearly indicated. All primitive societies have gone through it. As late as medieval times, it was practiced even in advanced England, the English Commons being a survival of the technique. Sixteenth century America practiced communism to a marked degree, and the more advanced states of Central and South America even today carry on communistic activities, little knowing that certain parts of the world are trying to introduce the technique as a new discovery.

Beginning about 500 B. C., or possibly a little earlier, the Mediterranean economy became currency minded. With the minting of coins in the Greek colonies, the whole tempo of exchange suddenly changed: Trade expanded greatly, and with it, individual well-being improved. A very few hundred years later in the Near East, a capitalistic economy was practiced in a crude way, and then for 1,500 years, the known world floundered, using one of these forms or another, or combinations of all three. The high standards of living in the creative periods, however, are closely associated with either the use of sound currency or simple forms of capitalism.

In the seventeenth century, the English and the Dutch established central banking and a capitalistic economy followed on a broad basis. Almost immediately the scope of world trade was enlarged. The dispatch possible in bringing materials from the ends of the earth by self-liquidating credit instead of by barter or the use of hard money was most spectacular. As we would say in modern terms, the velocity of trade increased largely due to the elimination of obstacles. The new trade of the world greatly expanded the importance and position of the middle classes and it was at this time that European civilization began to develop what Gladstone called the social backbone of England, and what the modern Russian refers to as the degenerate bourgeois.

Since the seventeenth century, the institution of capitalism has increased spectacularly in the United States, but it has been much more slowly accepted in other parts of the world than the average American appreciates. At the best, it is a thin veneer that simply facilitates final accumulation of goods for shipment, probably originating in many places under the mechanism of barter or a currency economy. I think it would be safe to say that three-quarters of the population of the world have no idea that great quantities of goods can be handled on bills of exchange, without the use of money in any tangible form.

The record is fairly simple and as I have said, earnestly presents a question as to why history shows so much shifting and so much retrogression when it is so obvious that the capitalistic economy is the greatest trade-creating mechanism that society has ever used. To my mind, the answer lies in the endless series of impositions practiced by ruthless or selfish individuals that on the very face of it demands the greatest exercise of honor and fairness. If I am right in this, the solution does not lie in going back to first principles and primitive forms. What we need is an enlightened and efficient police power and an awakening on the part of everybody through education and understanding that an economic method that is essentially based on honesty and fair dealing can be very easily sabotaged. Capitalism in its pure theoretical form has never been broadly tried nor has there ever been a demonstration, on the record to date, that any large group of humans has yet displayed the qualities in their personal dealings that might make this latest economic discovery a success. If and when that day ever comes, the well-being of the world can be increased beyond measure.

Minimum Wage

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act went into effect. A million and a half workers are getting higher pay because the law now says that everyone who is employed in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce must get not less than 75 cents an hour. No oppressive child labor can now be employed in commerce or the production of goods for commerce, and no children may be employed in agriculture during school hours.

For the 22,000,000 workers who are covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act the 75-cent minimum wage means that they once more have real protection for their own living standard even though they may be getting much more than 75 cents an hour. The business health of the whole country is strengthened, and the children of this country are given greater protection. The entire country benefits from this great advance in the improvement of the Federal law establishing minimum fair labor standards.

I think it is important for all of the citizens of this country to realize how great an achievement this Federal establishment of minimum fair labor standards has been. The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 was made the law of the land by the Democratic Party under President Roosevelt and has been expanded and modernized in line with our changed economic conditions by the Democratic Party under President Truman.

The earnest and untiring efforts of fair-minded and forward-looking people to outlaw substandard labor conditions have had a long history in this country. More than 100 years ago the Commonwealth of Massachusetts moved to limit the workday of children to 10 hours.

Today we are far beyond such meager and pitiful beginnings. But year after year and decade after decade the record was one of frustration and of painfully slow progress.

The great impetus given in 1933 to the idea that the Federal Government itself could protect the people as individuals has brought results that are now plain for all to see. The protection of the worker against hardships that befell him when the country experienced a downturn of economic activity required a basic floor under wages. The attempt to do this under the National Recovery Administration was declared unconstitutional. This was a grave set-back to those of us who wanted to establish decent minimum fair labor standards as the law of the land. But it was not accepted as defeat. Our efforts did not stop. Nor did the need for our efforts disappear. By 1938 much had been done to improve the economic health of the country and to relieve the suffering of its working men and women. But great numbers were still working extremely long hours at desperately low wages. These people bore the crushing burden of weary hours of toil while others looked in vain for jobs.

Too many people were working 60 hours a week or more for 10 or 15 cents an hour. In too many households was industrial work being done by children as well as their parents, with the entire family earning six or seven dollars a week with their combined efforts. These conditions had to be corrected.

A start had already been made in 1936 in establishing fair labor standards for the workers who produced goods bought by the Government in the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act. This law applied to the important but limited field of the Government contracting for goods and supplies.

In 1938 the first Federal statute of broad application was put into effect. It met tests on constitutional grounds because it lies squarely within the framework of our Constitution. It met the tests of actual operation in preventing substandard labor conditions in the channels of interstate commerce and in the production of goods for interstate commerce. It helped the individual worker in these employments to attain more nearly the minimum of material sufficiency that he needs for his self-maintenance as a worker and for his self-respect as a man and as a citizen of our country.

The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 provided for a minimum wage of 40 cents an hour. It required the payment of one and a half times the worker's regular rate of pay if he worked more than 40 hours in a week for each hour in excess of 40. It prohibited the shipment in interstate commerce of goods produced in an establishment in which oppressive child labor had been employed during the 30 days before such shipment.

The purpose of the minimum wage was to correct a condition under which a man might work a full week and still find himself unable to feed himself and his family. There was no reason why a man who contributed a full week of his efforts to the economy should have to go outside the economy to get relief payments for his sustenance. There was no reason why the enterprise that employed him should be permitted to meet part of its necessary pay roll with relief money. The floor under wages was established to correct this condition.

The overtime-pay requirement was set up to spread employment and the child-labor provision was an effort, although an indirect one, to prevent oppressive child labor.

The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 has proved itself an effective instrument for carrying out its humanitarian aims and its beneficial economic purposes. It has been a good law for the worker and a good law for the employer. It went far to correct substandard labor conditions. It went far toward removing from the great majority of employers of this country who are fair-minded and who want to maintain decent labor standards the fear and the pressure of unfair competition from those who would seek to win an order or gain a market at the expense of their own employees.

But conditions have changed greatly since 1938. We have moved to a $250,000,000,000 economy, and the 40-cent minimum wage had become out of date. It was time to reexamine the law. It was time to bring it in line with conditions of today, and to strengthen it. This the Congress has now done under the leadership of a Democratic administration.

The new minimum-wage rate of 75 cents an hour directly benefits a million and a half workers whose pay had lagged behind the times. Indirectly, it affords protection to the 22,000,000 workers who are covered by the law. And it is an additional protection of the Nation's economy.

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act as it stands today there is vastly greater protection for the children of our country. Oppressive child labor is now directly prohibited in the production of goods for commerce. For the first time oppressive child labor is now also prohibited in commerce which brings this protection to such activities as transportation and communication. The act now provides clearly and directly the authority needed to deal with the vicious aspects of industrial homework.

The Fair Labor Standards Act, modernized, strengthened, and improved, is a great achievement and another great step forward in our unceasing efforts of the past 17 years to promote the general welfare of all the people.

Modernization Work on Aircraft Carriers in Brooklyn Navy Yard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial published in the Brooklyn Eagle of Saturday, January 21, 1950, which commends my friend and colleague, Representative LOUIS B. HELLER, for his efforts to secure the assignment of one of the two giant aircraft carriers for modernization work to the Brooklyn Navy Yard. The navy yard is

situated in Representative [illegible]'s congressional district and he has won the admiration and respect of the employees of the yard for his consistent efforts to provide them with additional work and increased employment. In that connection, he has had the wholehearted cooperation and support of the other eight Representatives in Congress from Brooklyn.

The editorial follows:

NAVY SHOULD [illegible] OF CARRIER MODERNIZATION JOBS TO BROOKLYN [illegible]

Representative [illegible] has made a timely appeal to the Navy high command to assign to the Brooklyn Navy Yard one of the two giant aircraft carriers slated for modernization work. As he points out, the Brooklyn yard has pioneered in the work of rebuilding carriers along the lines dictated by postwar scientific developments and atomic research. And, as he adds, the work would provide employment for hundreds of Brooklyn workers who face dismissal on completion of several current jobs.

It should be pointed out here that when the economy cut-back in navy yard personnel was ordered throughout the country last year, Brooklyn suffered heavily but demanded that it receive its fair share of the necessary, continuing work which must be done by the Navy's shipyards unless our fleet is to rust away or fail into complete obsolescence.

Now, just the situation that was foreseen at that time is upon us. Additional workers, beyond those contemplated by the economy slash, have dismissal at the Brooklyn yard. They face that dismissal unless a share of the work which is to be done is awarded to the yard in Brooklyn. In terms of individual workers and their families, this means tragedy. In terms of maintaining the usefulness of the borough navy yard and its trained personnel for possible emergency, it would be another type of tragedy.

Brooklyn does not demand that the work at its navy yard be increased beyond the economy standards set last fall. It does demand that it have its fair share of the work which must be done, that it not be victimized by increasing the work of navy yards elsewhere.

The Eagle is glad to add its voice to that of Congressman [illegible] in demanding assignment of one of the two carrier modernization jobs to the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Ambassador to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning we received the announcement from the State Department of the elevation of our diplomatic mission to Ireland from the rank of legation to that of embassy. I should like at this time to extend my congratulations through the medium of this House and its RECORD, to the State Department for this acknowledgment of the importance of carrying on diplomatic relations with Ireland on the highest level.

When Ireland took its proper place among the free and independent nations of the world, the United States quickly accorded recognition to the Irish Government, and welcomed to this capital the first minister to come from Dublin.

The establishment of the Irish Legation in Washington and the concurrent arrival of our Minister in Dublin signalized a new and happier era in Ireland's long and troubled history. Today's announcement by our Department of State marks a new milestone in American and Irish history.

This week is indeed a joyful one for the people of both Nations. It was only last Friday that our Government announced the signing of a historic treaty which restates and renews the long friendship which has marked the relations of the American and Irish peoples.

Today we can point not only to a treaty of friendship, but, more, to a sealing of that compact with a still further earnest of friendship and high esteem—the elevation of our diplomatic missions to full rank.

What has happened today will, I am sure, lift up the hearts of millions of Americans of Irish descent. I sincerely hope that these two great strides in Ireland's glorious history will be harbingers of a third great advance—to the complete unity of all the provinces and counties of Ireland under the one free and independent Government in Ireland, the Government whose seat is in Dublin.

Hawaii Welcomes Inquiry of Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 18, 1950, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin published the following editorial:

THAT INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICANISM HERE

A visit here by members of the National House Committee on Un-American Activities is expected within the next 60 days.

It's to study the scope and effect of alleged Communist influence here.

The Washington bureau of the Star-Bulletin clearly describes the plans being made now at the Capital.

First, one of the two special investigators sent here a few months ago by the House committee is coming back. He'll be here in a week or 10 days, to set the stage for the private inquiry and for the public hearings, if any.

He will be followed by the subcommittee, which will come at such a time as its members can get away from Washington.

The subcommittee will bring one or two of its own staff members. Other staff workers may be engaged here.

No limit has been set on the length of the committee's stay in Hawaii. That depends on the job they find to do, and the thoroughness with which they do it.

The proposed inquiry should be a salutary thing.

If carried out in a spirit of objective investigation, it can be, for Hawaii, a most helpful thing.

We are confident that any objective, completely unprejudiced inquiry will prove that the great majority, the overwhelming majority, of Hawaii's people are thoroughly loyal.

They are neither Communists and fellow-travelers nor under the influence and domination of such Communists and fellow-travelers as may be skulking in the dark and working in their sinister way to undermine an American community.

We note in some quarters a disposition to sniff at the proposed investigation—to dismiss the projected visit of the Congressmen as merely a junket for their personal pleasure.

One such sneer comes from Willard E. Bassett, the mayor's administrative assistant and often the mayor's mouthpiece.

Another sniff is from Ralph Vossbrink, president of the Oahu CIO council.

And a similar crack comes from Jack Hall, ILWU regional director. Says he: "It is nothing but a political smear committee."

Such an attitude does none of them credit. It is particularly ill-becoming in the assistant to the mayor. For it amounts to a jeer at the processes of democratic government, and he himself has been the long-time beneficiary, through appointment to public jobs, of that kind of government.

We should welcome any investigation which will produce facts on the Communist situation here, whatever it is.

Anyone who has facts or reliable leads on communism here should join heartily in making those facts and leads available.

And because this Territory has now for a long time been under fire from a few quarters as a nation rampant with communism, we should insist, as a matter of common justice, that the climax of the committee's work be the production of established facts.

Its findings, moreover, should clearly set the Hawaii situation in proper relation to the whole national picture.

For nothing is more certain, more clear, than that communism is alien to Hawaii. If it is here, it has been imported, or has entered by stealth, as secretly as the termite, the fruitfly, the leafhopper, the cane borer, or any other pest which has plagued the islands.

Rabbi Abraham Mayer Heller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

BY

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Brooklyn Eagle of January 22, 1950, by Clarence Greenbaum, paying tribute to Rabbi Abraham Mayer Heller:

RABBI HELLER, OF FLATBUSH, A PREACHER AND TEACHER

(By Clarence Greenbaum)

Erudite Rabbi Abraham Mayer Heller's lifelong philosophy is that community educational activities are necessary adjuncts to the conduct of religious rites.

Dr. Heller, to whom many honors came last week as his congregation marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of his affiliation with the Flatbush Jewish Center, has applied this educational theme of preacher and teacher well. In practice, under his guidance, the center has thrived from the point 25 years ago when it attracted but 35 families to its present stage as a magnet for more than 700 families.

When one thinks of the center at 500 Church Avenue, one cannot help but think

of Dr. Heller, who was made life rabbi there 5 years ago. The 51-year-old spiritual leader, who springs from a long line of rabbis, is the only rabbi the center has ever had. It was organized in 1921, but services were conducted by visiting rabbis before Dr. Heller was engaged.

HIS SCHOOLING

By the same token, the center is the only religious institution which Dr. Heller has served. Born in Lithuania, he was brought here by his family when he was 11 years old. He was graduated from Townsend Harris Hall High School, and attended the College of Arts and Sciences of New York University before finishing his undergraduate work at the University of Minnesota. There he received a bachelor of arts degree.

Then he did graduate work at Columbia University, where he received a master of arts degree in social science. He was graduated from the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Manhattan, in June 1924, with the degree of master of Hebrew literature, qualified, in his own words, to serve the community as a preacher and teacher.

In 1930, Dr. Heller received the degree of bachelor of laws from St. John's. He was admitted to the State bar in 1931, although he has never practiced law. It was his thirst for knowledge and his desire to have as much background as possible to serve the needs of his community that prompted him to study law.

WROTE TWO BOOKS

Dr. Heller is the author of two fairly popular books on Jewish religion. One titled "Jewish Survival," is a collection of his selected essays and sermons. It was published in 1939.

The other volume, The Vocabulary of Jewish Life, published in 1942, is a study of Hebrew customs and rituals. It is used extensively as a textbook for adult education classes in various schools. Additionally, he has contributed many articles to various publications.

Besides being one of the best-attended synagogues in the borough as far as services are concerned, the center's education department includes Brooklyn's largest daily afternoon religious school for children between the ages of 6 and 14. This school supplements the youngsters' secular education.

ADULT CLASSES

Under the guidance of Dr. Heller, the educational program also features departments for high-school students and adult classes. There is being erected a seven-story community house and educational institute on the Ocean Parkway side of the center which, when completed by this fall, will house an experimental Jewish progressive day school. All the curriculum requirements of the board of education will be conformed to, plus Hebrew teachings. For this purpose, the Bialik Hebrew Academy at 400 Stone Street, recently chartered by the board of regents, will be moved to the center. There will be an 8-year curriculum, plus a nursery school and kindergarten. The new edifice will also house a gymnasium, library, and other educational and recreational facilities.

HONORS NOT NEW

Dr. Heller is proud of the fact that the center serves as a beehive for community events. Many organizations and clubs, such as the Jewish War Veterans B'nai B'rith, meet there. During the war the center supplied a record number of blood donors for the Brooklyn Red Cross. Now the Flatbush division of the Red Cross is housed in the center for the annual appeal. The center also was among the four leading religious institutions in the sale of war bonds.

Honors, like those heaped upon Dr. Heller this past week, are not exactly new to him. Five years ago, to mark the twentieth anniversary of his affiliation with the center, a grove of 5,000 trees was planted in his honor near Jerusalem.

He is a founder and past president of the Brooklyn Board of Rabbis, and served two consecutive terms, in 1946 and 1947, as president of the New York Board of Rabbis. He has been prominently identified with Zionism and various philanthropic endeavors, and during the war he led movements for the escape of as many Jews as possible from Germany and other Hitler-controlled lands.

As chairman of the New York Board of Rabbis committee on chaplaincy, it is his duty to provide some 50 Jewish chaplains for city institutions like Bellevue Hospital, as well as for private institutions.

TO GET SANCTUARY

Dr. Heller's long and distinguished services to the community are in no small part due to his wife, the former Frances Lesser, of Boston, whom he married in March 1932. At that time, she was national president of Junior Hadassah. They live with their one son, Zachary, 11, at 188 Stratford Road.

So greatly esteemed is Dr. Heller by the members of his congregation that last night they surprised him by announcing that, when the new religious school is completed, he will have a 6-month sabbatical leave, with his family, to Israel with all expenses paid. Besides, they took out a special insurance policy for him, naming his family as beneficiaries, and presented it to Dr. Heller as a token of their warm affection for their "preacher and teacher."

Problems Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 1949, the members of the Farm Bureau of Davis County, Iowa, met in annual meeting at Bloomfield and adopted a set of comprehensive resolutions expressing the position of this great organization with respect to issues and problems that are before this country.

I desire to give to the Members of Congress the opportunity of knowing the position of the Farm Bureau of Davis County, Iowa, at this time, and I include these resolutions in my extension of remarks:

We, the resolutions committee, present the following declarations of principles and suggestions for consideration to the members of the Davis County Farm Bureau:

1. We feel it is imperative for the future success of any farm program to have that program developed through the combined approach of our two major political parties.

2. We believe that guaranties of 100 percent parity as compared with lower supports would result in more drastic governmental controls. It is important, therefore, to keep controls at a minimum and still get satisfactory and desired results.

3. We believe that if the cost of administering and carrying out a farm program becomes too high, in the minds of our consumer public, the agriculture segment of our society will stand in danger of losing its farm program.

4. We are in favor of flexible supports to average 90 percent of parity.

5. We favor flexible supports tied to the amount the commodity is in surplus with a minimum floor established by law and giving the Secretary of Agriculture the discretionary authority to set support prices from this minimum up.

6. We feel that, if production payments are made directly to a farmer, the prices paid by consumers for farm commodities will not drop enough to have a noticeable influence on the amount of farm commodities consumed. We believe that production payments would establish a cheap food philosophy in the minds of consumers. This philosophy might be dangerous to the long-time interests of farmers.

7. We believe that it is dangerous to have the income of farmers dependent to a large extent upon direct appropriations from Congress. We do, however, favor use of production payments in support of perishable nonstorable commodities. We go on record as being opposed to the destroying of any farm commodity that is in physical surplus as this destruction is both wasteful and sinful.

8. It is reported that half the families in the United States are not eating right. Part of this is due to insufficient family income and part to not knowing how to eat right even though the family income is sufficient. We favor promotion and extension of a school-lunch program that will give each and every school child in the United States an equal chance to have at least one square meal a day.

9. We favor the using of farm surpluses for school-lunch programs, blue stamp and relief programs.

10. We favor more research by Government farm agencies in expanding the farm market and finding new and alternate uses for farm commodities.

11. Use European relief, school lunch, aid to disabled, underprivileged, and aged groups (blue stamp) to increase consumption of farm products.

12. Satisfactory compliance with soil-conservation practices should be a requisite to eligibility for price supports.

13. We feel that when acreage allotments are used the base for computing them should depend upon fertility of land and good soil-conservation practices rather than past history of production in that area.

14. We would like to personally commend the Soil Conservation Service for the services they have rendered to farmers in Davis County during the past year. We strongly urge the farmers in Davis County to take advantage of the services available to them through our local soil-conservation unit. We would like to see the farmers make more use of the services of our soil technicians.

15. We strongly favor having the Soil Conservation Service set as their ultimate goal the charting of every farm in Davis County for that farm's capabilities.

16. We are not in favor of abandoning the parity concept for the income-support standard. We believe that parity should be modernized to reflect changes in technology and regions that have taken place in agriculture during the past 35 years.

17. We are in favor of the human approach of mediation in settling labor-management disputes since these disputes are somewhat social, ethical, and economic in nature.

18. We favor the organization of a Worker Extension Service, similar to the Agricultural Extension Service, to work with labor groups for the purpose of helping them solve problems relative to family living.

19. We favor the changing of mail routes so that the principle of free mail delivery becomes an actuality to all rural families.

20. We are in favor of the establishment of a Federal agency, similar to the REA for the purpose of setting up telephone cooperatives.

21. We believe that road funds should be distributed on a need rather than an area basis.

22. We, in the Farm Bureau, recognize that there is duplication and overlapping of services among our governmental farm agencies. For this reason we favor the coordination of the farm agencies to the fullest extent possible in an effort to correct this situation.

22. We favor a farm program set up on the following basis: Give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to set support prices for these commodities in excess production, as low as 75 or 80 percent of parity. At the same time making provision to set support prices of commodities in which an increase of production is desired high enough so that, if desired shifts of production are obtained, total support prices plus soil conservation payments equal at least 90 percent of parity.

23. The United States has become the greatest creditor nation the world has ever known. It is her responsibility, therefore, to promote good will in international trade and do away with artificial barriers to trade. This would be one method of raising the standard of living in other nations. This would also promote more trade thereby giving other countries a chance to pay their debts.

A. We go on record as favoring a gradual reduction of tariffs and the lifting of other free-trade barriers.

B. We favor the establishment of more reciprocal trade agreements between the United States and other nations.

24. We would like to take a few moments in memoriam the loss by death of five of our oldest Farm Bureau members, George Good, William Wagler, Ed Blunt, W. G. Warner, and H. J. Craig. It was they who stood solidly in support of our farm organization from humble beginnings to its present place of power and prestige. We can only hope that community-minded young men will replace them by accepting the responsibility that was theirs.

26. In closing, we feel all of us should pledge ourselves to the procurement of membership in every way possible, so that we will have help in carrying the tremendous load our Farm Bureau organization has assumed for the benefit of all farmers.

The Study of Bigness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the New York State Bar Association on January 25, 1950:

THE STUDY OF BIGNESS

There are many valid reasons which prompted me, as chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, to set up a Subcommittee on the Study of Monopoly Power.[1] One, frankly, was to shake the public lethargy, to prod the people into awareness that the middle nineteen hundreds was as different from the turn of the century as handicraft is from mass production. This commonplace thought is most readily agreed to, generally, but meets with fiercest resistance when an attempt is made to apply it to a realistic definition of monopoly.

There are two main reasons why I am concerned about concentration of economic power in the United States. One is that concentration of business unavoidably leads in some kind of socialism, which is not the desire of the American people. The other is that a concentrated system is inefficient compared with a system of free competition.

We have seen what happened to the other industrial countries of the Western World. They allowed a free growth of monopolies and cartels until these private concentrations grew so strong that either big business would own the government or the government would have to seize control of big business. The most extreme case was in Germany, where the big-business men thought they could take over the Government by using Adolf Hitler as their puppet. Hitler turned tables on them, so Germany passed from private monopoly to dictatorship and disaster.

In a report of experts sent to our Secretary of the Army we find this significant statement:

"Germany built up a great series of industrial monopolies in steel, rubber, coal, and other materials. The monopolies soon got control of Germany, brought Hitler to power, and forced virtually the whole world into war."

We must deplore the weaving in this country of the pattern that gave us in Nazi Germany the Krug, Thyssen, and I. G. Farben industrial empires.

There are clearest indications that unless checked our economy will become more and more controlled by a handful of giant corporations. The Federal Trade Commission just reported[2] that 46 percent of the total capital assets of all manufacturing corporations in the United States as of 1947 were concentrated in the 113 largest manufacturers, which in turn owned over sixteen billions of net capital assets. Three companies already control 100 percent of our aluminum output, three companies make over 95 percent of all tin cans and tinware, three make over 90 percent of all linoleum, three huge oligopolies control cigarettes, three control whisky, three control soap, three control autos. A Department of Commerce study corroborates this dangerous trend: A Big Four controlling at least 50 percent of production dominates 150 of 452 industries recently surveyed by the Department.[3] It is time we stopped, looked, and listened.

The Sherman Act is 60 years old. The Clayton Act, 36. They are horse-and-buggy statutes applied to an automotive and jet-propelled era.[4] These antitrust laws have not been kept current with today's facts of life.

All amendments to them have weakened, not strengthened, the antitrust laws.[5] The end sought, that of a free and open competitive society, has been steadily constricted by such acts as the Shipping Act of 1916,[6] the Civil Aeronautics Act,[7] the Reed-Bulwinkle,[8] the Webb-Pomerene,[9] and the Insurance Moratorium Acts.[10] All these amendments permit restrictive arrangements and agreements to lessen or soften competition. They chip away the underlying principle of the Sherman, Clayton Acts. They are economic crutches for certain groups—mainly pressure groups—at the expense of the general public.

The time has come to reexamine all these enactments that have weakened our antitrust fabric. The loopholes through which those seeking monopolistic advantages easily crawl must be plugged, whether the loopholes were hollowed out by amendments such as I named or by holes in the acts themselves.

Let me examine with you one such obvious hole in the antitrust laws. When the Clayton Act[11] was passed in 1914, Congress clearly intended to prevent prospective concentration achieved through the merger of competing concerns.[12] Section 7 of the act prohibited one corporation from acquiring the stock of another where the effect of such acquisition would be substantially to lessen competition, restrain commerce, or tend to create a monopoly. Absurdly enough, it is not violative of the act to acquire the assets of a corporation for possible monopolistic purposes.[13] I have proposed the cure in the Celler bill, H. R. 2734, which has passed the House and now awaits action in the Senate. Again, it is 1950 and the agents of resistance to change (no matter how logical and necessitous the change) and public apathy leave the issue still in doubt.

Yes, we hear the complaints that the law is not clear, that court decisions cannot be predicted,[14] and that the trend of interpretation is wrong. But you know, as good lawyers (and that you are) in most instances whether or not a particular activity violates the antitrust laws. There is, of course, a borderline area, but how narrow a strip that is. Even one as wise as Solomon could not envisage a law to cover all compounds in a conjuring cup which you able members of the bar can mix. As Mr. Herbert Bergson, of the Department of Justice, puts it, "* * * one who does not wish to run the risk of falling in should not persist in skating out as far as he possibly can on thinning ice; or for that matter skating on no ice at all."[15]

It is safe to say if there were not so many circuitous routes taken to skirt the intent of the antitrust laws—the maintenance of a competitive society—we'd hear less complaints about the obscurities and misinterpretations of our antitrust laws. The burglar wouldn't have to worry about the complexities of a Yale lock if he didn't intend to break through in the first place.

I want to make it clear I would vigorously oppose any antitrust laws that attempted to particularize violations, giving bills of particulars to replace general principles and the basic philosophy of free enterprise. The law must remain fluid allowing for a dynamic society. Otherwise, to put it bluntly, the process would become a rat race between the monopolist seizing upon omissions and the Congress trying to fill them into the law, always 18 steps behind. As I pointed out before, after 36 years Congress hasn't caught up yet to plugging section 7 of the Clayton Act.

True everybody is publicly against monopoly as he is publicly against sin. It reads well in publicity releases. A president of one of our billion-dollar companies, a very able

[1] See H. Res. 137 (H. Res. 156), 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949).

[2] Report of the Federal Trade Commission on the Concentration of Productive Facilities, 1947 (1949).

[3] Report, Secretary of Commerce, December 1, 1949, p. 12.

[4] TNEC Monograph No. 16, Antitrust in Action, 76th Cong., 3d sess. (1940), pp. 5, 12–20, 101–105.

[5] See laws cited in Hearings Before Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, serial 14, pt. 1, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), pp. 728–750.

[6] 39 Stat. 733; 46 U. S. C. 814; Public, No. 260, 64th Cong. (1916).

[7] 52 Stat. 973; 49 U. S. C. 401 ff.; Public, No. 706, 75th Cong. (1938).

[8] 49 Stat. 472; 49 U. S. C. 5b; Public Law 802, 80th Cong. (1948).

[9] 40 Stat. 516; 15 U. S. C. 61–65; Public, No. 126, 65th Cong. (1919).

[10] 59 Stat. 33; 15 U. S. C. 1011 ff.; Public Law 15, 79th Cong. (1945), as amended July 30, 1947, 61 Stat. 448; Public Law 238, 80th Cong.

[11] 38 Stat. 730; 15 U. S. C. 12 ff.; Public, No. 212, 63d Cong. (1914).

[12] H. Rept. No. 1191, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), pp. 3–4.

[13] See *Fed. Trade Commission* v. *Western Meat Co.* (272 U. S. 554 (1926)); *Arrow-Hart & Hegeman Electric Co.* v. *Fed. Trade Commission* (291 U. S. 587 (1934)).

[14] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, serial 14, pt. 1, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), pp. 396, 430, 437, 514.

[15] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, serial 14, pt. 1, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), p. 382.

and estimable gentleman, in testifying, proclaimed his approval of the antitrust principles with no little emphasis,[16] yet his company has 16 antitrust suits filed against it by the Department of Justice and a number of similar complaints filed against it by the Federal Trade Commission. In the last two suits, two district judges within a year, one Judge Knox[17] and the other Judge Forman,[18] excoriated the baneful practices of the company. That kind of support for the antitrust laws as expressed by the president of that company is like the support the rope gives to the hanged.

And what about bigness as such—the power of size aside from what it may or may not do? That seems to me the question which has gone begging, and which only a very few have the courage to face up to. What inhibiting fear blocks even the asking of the question? Business giants are a fact in our economic life. Is then not an examination of their impact on our society a healthy and even a necessary one? Judging from the repercussions there are those in big business who do not think any question of their position is proper.

Recently a new judicial trend appeared, striking at bigness. Judge Learned Hand in the Aluminum case[19] made it abundantly clear that mere size could reach a point in which the power to restrain trade was so great as to make it illegal. The numerical measurement of size in this case was 90 percent of the industry under consideration.[20] Judge Hand's decision was cited with approval by the Supreme Court in the Tobacco case,[21] where the defendants, although conspiracy was charged, together controlled over two-thirds of the domestic field of cigarettes and 80 percent of the field of comparable cigarettes. But the Supreme Court apparently is unwilling to follow to the end of the line, leading to the principle that power is more significant than specific intent. The Court has yet to depart from its established principle that "the law does not make mere size an offense * * *"[22] Whether sound economic theory and industrial history have antiquated this principle is the question we must face.

The facts in the Columbia Steel case[23] revealed that the acquisition of the Geneva plant from the War Assets Administration gave the United States Steel Corp. ownership of over 51 percent of the rolled steel or ingot capacity of the Pacific coast area. With this background of size, the court nevertheless held that the acquisition of Consolidated Steel Corp., coupled with the 180 acquisitions of the United States Steel Corp. prior to 1920 and 8 acquisitions from 1924 to 1943, was not persuasive enough to compel the conclusion that there was present the necessary specific intent to monopolize.

The majority of the court, in this case, failed to strike down the immunity which it has granted to bigness under the Sherman Act. At the present time, therefore, the problem of bigness as such is still far from judicial solution.

Many of our expert witnesses, and witnesses from small business, have stressed the idea that bigness is dangerous to free enterprise and to political freedom.[24] This view was contradicted by witnesses representing big business, who asserted that the antitrust laws and the pressure of competition can be counted upon to prevent abuse of the supposed powers of large size.

The viewpoint that power is dangerous has best been summed up by Justice Douglas in the Columbia Steel case where he stated in his dissenting opinion, "For all power tends to develop into a government in itself. * * * Industrial power should be decentralized. It should be scattered into many hands so that the fortunes of the people will not be dependent on the whim or caprice, the political prejudices, the emotional stability of a few self-appointed men."[25] Those in agreement with Justice Douglas believe that some concentration of power, both private and public, are unavoidable. Technology has to be accepted for the great benefits it offers, and some aspects of technology require large organizations for their efficient use. Many such applications as we all know, take the form of natural monopolies that fall under public regulation as public utilities, or in some cases become public services like the TVA, reclamation, and the Post Office. But all concentrations, public or private, are liable to abuse and require constant public vigilance to keep them devoted to the services of the public.

They believe, too, that private corporations may have to be large in order to do some kinds of work, other kinds of work can be efficiently carried on by small or middle-sized organizations. The relative size actually required for efficiency leave plenty of scope for free enterprise and competition, but only provided the big firms are prevented from using their power to take over the areas in which bigness has no technical justification.

Often we are told, and often it has been stated that not only has the process of concentration become accelerated, but that the units of concentration, the concentrates themselves, have grown to gargantuan size. The du Pont complex is often pointed to as an example of conglomerate concentration. It embraces not only the du Pont operations, vast as they are, but likewise has a significant relationship and control over General Motors, United States Rubber, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass and numerous other huge entities. Each one of these outfits controlled by the du Pont dynasty is, in itself, an empire which has grown from without as well as from within, by natural growth or by merger, consolidation and the elimination of rivals. They have acquired the companies of their suppliers, distributing companies, mines and quarries as well as absorbing their customers and competitors.[26]

The Federal Communications Commission in its report of the investigation of the telephone industry in 1939 points to the relationship between the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and its subsidiary, the Western Electric Co., which resulted in sales at noncompetitive prices and effected as well the rate structures for telephone services, since a large part of the total investment in the Bell System, as well as a part of its operating expenses, represents the purchase price of telephone apparatus, equipment, and material.

It has likewise been pointed out to the subcommittee that a tremendous amount of risk capital is in the hands of large companies in the form of profits that are not distributed to the stockholders.[27] These corporate savings, we are told, are usually available for expanding the plant of the big company or for acquisition of either a substantial or complete control of other companies. We have likewise been asked to note that many great companies, for example, have not offered any issue to the public for years. They don't need to.[28]

In 1936, Fortune magazine, a magazine nobody could remotely associate with the baiting of big business, ran a series of articles on bigness. I want to read two short paragraphs to you:

"In the progress of mankind there are times for everything. There was a time for the dark ages, another for a renaissance, another for an industrial revolution. There was a time for the building of America, for the creation of bigger markets and bigger pay rolls, and, inevitably, bigger industrial units. In our time men have been conditioned to the idea of bigness. They believe that to grow big is almost of necessity to progress. They believe that the expansion of American enterprise necessarily involves the corporate expansion of its units. And they are taught that the corporate expansion of the units should result in bigger profits, individually and to the economy as a whole.

"But it is possible to question this: Not that our time has been wrong, but that it may be time for something else. It may be time to weigh the notion that there is some necessary connection between economic expansion and corporate bigness. It may be time to wonder whether profits and the national income would not be bigger if the corporate units of industry were not so big."[29]

I have dwelt lengthily, I know, on the question of bigness and while the subcommittee is in the process of examining it, I believe it is necessary for a group like the members of this esteemed bar association to examine the premise as well, to give us the benefit of your approach, your understanding, and your studied criticism. You must ultimately concern yourselves with the question: Should Congress legislate on the problem of bigness?

An adequate answer to the questions presented by gianttism and bigness is fraught with innumerable economic, legal, and political pitfalls. Brave, indeed, is he who would tread upon the hallowed grounds preempted by size. Yet several suggestions have been volunteered by those who have considered the broad implications of the problem with care. I do not consider any of these proposals a panacea; nor do I present them to you as possibilities other than tentative in nature. I do feel, however, that they offer fertile soil for stimulated thinking on the part of both members of the bar and the American public.

Prof. Howard J. Trienens, in his recent testimony before the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power,[30] emphasized the strong analogy between the Public Utility Act of 1935[31] and dissolution procedure under the

[16] Wilson, Big Progress and Big Business Go Together (1949), p. 7.

[17] *United States* v. *General Electric Co.* (80 F. Supp. 989 (1948)).

[18] *United States* v. *General Electric Co.* (83 F. Supp. 753 (1949)).

[19] *United States* v. *Aluminum Co. of America* (148 F. 2d 416 (1945)).

[20] Judge Hand declared: "That percentage is enough to constitute a monopoly; it is doubtful whether 60 or 64 percent would be enough; and certainly 33 percent is not." P. 424.

[21] *American Tobacco Company* v. *United States* (328 U. S. 781 (1946)).

[22] *United States* v. *U. S. Steel Corp.* (251 U. S. 417, 451 (1920)).

[23] *United States* v. *Columbia Steel Co.* (334 U. S. 495 (1948)).

[24] See, e. g., Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, serial 14, pt. 1, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), pp. 71, 146, 251–252, 300, 362, 537).

[25] Op. cit. supra, note 24, p. 536.

[26] See Edwards, Maintaining Competition (1949), p. 100, footnote 14.

[27] See Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, serial 14, pt. 1, 81st Cong., 1st sess., pp. 257–259.

[28] See hearings, op. cit. supra, p. 232.

[29] Fortune, March 1936.

[30] Testimony Before Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, December 1, 1949; see, also, Trienens, the Utility Act as a Solution to Sherman Act Problems, 44 Ill. L. Rev. 331 (1949).

[31] 49 Stat. 803; 15 U. S. C. 79a et seq.; Public, No. 333, 74th Cong. (1935).

Sherman Act,[26] the former being closely patterned after the decree of the court in the Tobacco case of 1911.[27] On the theory that public utility holding companies should be legally treated in a manner no different from other holding companies engaged in interstate commerce, a bill was drafted by Dr. Walter Adams of Michigan State College applying the principles of the Holding Company Act of 1935 to all corporations of excessive size.[28] The bill goes little further than to embody in legal language the suggestions outlined in Fortune magazine as early as 1935[29] and merits attentive consideration.

Another line of attack was suggested by one of the prominent "experts" in the field of antitrust law. This solution would amend the Federal Trade Commission Act by adding a new section empowering the Commission to order the dissolution of a company whenever its size and power was so great as to substantially lessen competition or create a monopoly in any line of commerce.[30] It, too, is worthy of thorough study.

A third avenue of approach suggests an amendment to section 2 of the Sherman Act which would give a statutory definition to the concept of monopoly. "Up to the present time the antitrust laws have not been successful in the monopolization field."[31] The legal definition of "monopoly" has failed to square with the economic realities of the current market place despite optimistic predictions to the contrary.[32] Any such action on the part of the Congress would have to be done with great care and studied preparation. But the idea that the hiatus in the antitrust laws which suffers the spawning of unwieldy mammoths to go unchecked may be closed by legislative language defining "monopoly" is certainly worth exploration.

We all seek the same goal: a free and competitive society. The primary question lies before all of us, gentlemen—How shall we maintain and expand it?

---

[26] 26 Stat. 209; 15 U. S. C. 1–7; Public, No. 190, 51st Cong. (1890).

[27] *United States* v. *American Tobacco Co.* (221 U. S. 106 (1911)).

[28] See Testimony Before Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, December 1, 1949; the bill is printed in full in Special Supplement, Bureau of National Affairs, Daily Report for Executives, December 1, 1949.

[29] See Fortune, March 1935; id., April 1935.

[30] The full text of the amendment, as presently drawn, reads: "Any corporation whose size and power are such as substantially to lessen competition or to create a monopoly in any line of commerce in any section of the country shall be dissolved into a number of independent enterprises sufficient to restore competition in such line of commerce, provided that no action under this section shall be taken if the corporation proceeded against can demonstrate that the proposed action would materially lessen efficiency in any line of commerce." See Interview, U. S. News & World Report, September 23, 1949, p. 30.

[31] See Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, serial 14, pt. 1, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), p. 253.

[32] Levi, the Antitrust Laws and Monopoly, 14 U. Chi. L. Rev. 153, 181 (1947).

[33] See Rostow, the new Sherman Act: A Positive Instrument of Progress, 14 U. Chi. L. Rev. 567, 576 (1947), who says: "The Supreme Court is on the threshold of recognizing what the economists call monopolistic competition as the offense of monopoly under sec. 2 of the Sherman Act." Cf. Douglas, J., dissenting in the *United States* v. *Columbia Steel Co.*, 334 U. S. 495, 534 (1948), and Black, J., dissenting in *United States* v. *Yellow Cab Co.*, — U. S. — (Dec. 5, 1949).

A British Warning To Preserve the American Watchmaking Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on repeated occasions, during the past 3 years, I have urged the Members of this House to concentrate their attention upon the gradually increasing disintegration of the American watchmaking industry, and the paramount need for corrective action to preserve it.

I have emphasized that, while I am not personally opposed to the cooperative economic theory at the basis of our trade-agreements program, it has been my understanding, which I am sure is shared by every other Member of the Congress, the negotiation of such a program was not intended or designed to eliminate our own domestic industries.

Especially so when such domestic industry involves the preservation of irreplaceable skilled craftsmanship and a vital contribution to our national security resources. I have already introduced in the RECORD the testimony of high Government officials that the continuation of watch-manufacturing operations is essential to the defense of the United States.

I have asked the State Department, again and again, to take cognizance of this vital fact in their trade-agreement negotiations with Switzerland, which country is subsidizing their own watchmaking industry with clear purpose of controlling the world watch market and eliminating American competition.

Although the State Department has no qualms about asking the American taxpayers, through their elected Representatives, to support almost every country on the globe, they are yet unconcerned about our national security and community employment problems with respect to the watchmaking industry.

It has been said that our State Department follows the lead of, and takes its instructions from, the British school of diplomacy. In this regard, I should like to call the attention of the State Department, and my colleagues, to a pertinent article entitled, "Watch and Clock Making Revives in the United Kingdom," written by Mr. A. H. Stuart, Consumers Merchandise Branch, Commodities Division, OIT, United States Department of Commerce, which appeared in the Foreign Commerce Weekly of January 16, 1950.

This article, without bias or prejudice, but with scholarly, factual detail, traces the history of domestic watchmaking in the British Empire. It decisively proves that the British have learned, from sad experience, that watchmaking is an essential industry, and they are being wise enough to admit past mistakes and take measure to rectify them.

It is my hope that the State Department high command will perhaps see fit to consult with Commerce Department experts to coordinate their primary joint purpose of administering the departments of this Government for the good of the people of the United States.

I earnestly ask each of you, my colleagues, to read this warning message, and join your efforts to prevent the American people and our Armed Forces from being deprived of sufficient precision instruments to conduct a possible atomic war. God forbid!

The article follows:

WATCH AND CLOCK MAKING REVIVES IN THE UNITED KINGDOM—BRITAIN'S BURGEONING CLOCK INDUSTRY SCORES FORTY-FIVE-FOLD GROWTH IN 9-YEAR PERIOD

(By A. H. Stuart, Consumers' Merchandise Branch, Commodities Division, OIT, U. S. Department of Commerce)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—What is happening in timepiece production in the United Kingdom provides an interesting case study of the neglect and rehabilitation of a national asset. The very problems that are now of concern to watch manufacturers in the United States were encountered earlier and more severely by the British. It is well to note how the wartime shortage of watches and clocks has induced a remarkable change in improving British methods of production and in minimizing reliance on imports. If this program is carried forward vigorously, the British industry's output will—after satisfying accumulated demand at home—again be flowing into the channels of international commerce, earning exchange for Great Britain. The impact of this renewed competition is likely to be felt chiefly by the Swiss watch industry and the United States clock industry.)

Considered at one time to be the greatest of its kind in the world, the British watch and clock industry, after a long period of dormancy, was reestablished during the war. It is possible that it will again become a principal source of horological products, as the British Government has decided that a flourishing watch and clock industry must be maintained for security reasons (the Government's general policy of building up domestic manufacturing in order to provide employment and reduce imports was of secondary importance in arriving at this decision).

To encourage increased domestic production of watches and clocks, the Government is giving practical aid to the industry. The success of this program may be measured by the increase in production in 1948, when 580,000 watches and 2,700,000 clocks were manufactured, compared with 1939 output of only 10,000 watches and 60,000 clocks.

DEVELOPMENT AND DECLINE OF THE INDUSTRY

For hundreds of years English craftsmen specialized in making timepieces. The earliest clock worthy of our modern definition was made by Peter Lightfoot, an English monk, about 1335. By 1655 approximately 70,000 persons were employed in making and repairing timepieces, and British exports of horological products in that year were valued at more than £400,000. In 1675, the Greenwich Observatory was founded and was to become the basic reference point for measurement of time throughout the globe.

Englishmen have been responsible for many of the foremost inventions connected with horology. In 1661, Robert Hooke introduced the first balance spring (because he used a pig bristle, it became known as the hair spring). A few years later, Thomas Thompion, the father of English watchmaking, developed the cylinder escapement with horizontal wheels. Other master craftsmen were Thomas Mudge, inventor of the

gravity escapement, and George Graham, designer of balance wheels. In 1759, a self-educated Yorkshire carpenter named John Harrison crowned 50 years of self-denial, unremitting toil, and ceaseless concentration with the development of the first accurate portable timepiece—the marine chronometer. After a 10-week trial of one of his chronometers, it was in error by only 4½ seconds—less than one-tenth of a second in 24 hours. His instruments won for Harrison a prize of £20,000 offered by the British Government for development of a method to determine accurately longitude at sea. With Harrison's chronometer, longitude could be obtained from the difference in time measured from a standard meridian.

By 1800, Britain was the world's leading watch- and clock-making country, and its artisans were supreme masters of their craft. Tradition and individual craftsmanship, however, were insufficient to sustain the industry permanently. By 1850, the craftsmen's apathy toward the American system[1] of making timepieces from interchangeable parts manufactured by machinery was beginning to result in the progressive decline of the English industry, and some of the most skillful artisans were emigrating to other countries. By 1900, the industry could no longer meet domestic requirements and the United Kingdom was importing considerable numbers of watches and clocks from Switzerland, France, and Germany.

During World War I, the United Kingdom met essential requirements for timepieces by supplementing domestic production with Swiss imports. Following the war, the British industry continued to decline, and by 1935 the United Kingdom was importing approximately 5,000,000 clocks annually. At that time efforts were made to revive the industry. Several new clock factories were established by substantial concerns which believed that they had sufficient resources to withstand the foreign competition that was expected to be directed at them. However, the severity of this competition was much greater than anticipated. Prices of German clocks were reduced by more than 50 percent, and within 5 years some of the new firms were obliged to go out of business.

United Kingdom's imports and exports of watches, clocks, and parts, 1938 and 1947–48

[Quantity in thousands of units, value in thousands of U. S. dollars]

Item	Imports						Exports					
	1938[1]		1947		1948		1938[1]		1947		1948	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
Watches	7,548	6,517	1,333	4,672	1,519	5,072	234	584	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Watch movements	584	1,181	266	1,361	352	1,712	19	66	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Clocks	4,156	2,499	853	1,577	1,141	2,197	165	270	532	2,495	849	3,270
Clock movements	837	794	14	(2)	11	112	14	60	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Watch and clock parts	(3)	867	(3)	1,437	(3)	2,257	(3)	370	(3)	2,785	(3)	2,625
Total value		12,058		9,114		11,330		1,230		[4]5,580		[5]5,895

[1] In 1938 reexports of imported watch and clock products amounted to $795,420 and consisted of 196,674 watches valued at $307,910; 18,838 watch movements valued at $63,570; 50,016 clocks valued at $84,360; 6,631 clock movements valued at $11,680; and watch and clock parts valued at $317,600.

[2] Included in watch and clock parts.

[3] Quantity not reported.

[4] Includes reexports of imported merchandise valued at $637,830.

[5] Includes reexports of imported merchandise valued at $550,380.

SOURCE: Accounts Relating to Trade and Navigation of the United Kingdom.

Germany appreciated the importance of a horological industry to the war potential of a nation, and undoubtedly the policy of undercutting pursued in the British market was motivated largely by military considerations.[1] During that period, German manufacturers received Government subsidies on exports to the United Kingdom ranging from 25 to 40 percent of production costs.

The fall of France in World War II and the subsequent cutting off of trade with Switzerland resulted in an acute shortage of precision timing instruments needed by the British military establishment. Some relief was obtained by imports from the United States, but after 1941 the United States own requirements sharply curtailed supplies from this source. The then existing British industry was too small for expansion on a mass-production scale. The United Kingdom was of necessity obliged to start from the primary stages of industrial tooling and labor training and produce as best it could the timing devices essential in modern military and civilian activities.

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE TO THE WATCH AND CLOCK INDUSTRY

At the close of the war, the British Government decided that the necessities of national defense made imperative the continued development of the domestic watch and clock industry. On October 16, 1945, Sir Stafford Cripps, then president of the board of trade, asked the House of Commons for a vote of credit for assistance to the industry. The vote was agreed to, and a government credit of £320,000 (approximately US$1,300,000 at the then existing exchange rate) was established. Provision was also made to increase this amount to £1,000,000, should additional funds be needed.

In commenting on this action, the Manchester Guardian on October 18, 1945, stated that "Britain has now as a result of the successful reproduction of watches and instruments during the war a national capital asset of equipment, skill, and experience which would be wasted unless some encouragement is given to its use for commercial ventures. To maintain a body of trained instrument makers and a basis for research in this field is desired, both for reasons of future defense and for the sake of precision standards in British industry generally."

The Government at once made available £200,000 for the establishment of a National Horological College at London. This college was opened in 1947 and provides facilities for training essential technicians. The remaining £120,000 was used to encourage the establishment of watch and clock fact ries in distressed areas of Scotland and Wales.[2]

Under this phase of the government's aid program, fully equipped plants are leased to selected manufacturers for 5 years at an annual rental of 4 percent of their value—half the usual rate—with an option to purchase at the end of the period at prices then prevailing. As some equipment costs have risen by more than 300 percent over prewar levels, the offer of plants to users 5 years hence at current market prices eliminates the possibility of the industry being burdened with inflated capital charges, should equipment costs decline.

All firms taking advantage of these benefits are required to make full use of plant facilities, to undertake research development, and to take all possible steps to reduce costs in order that their products may become competitive as rapidly as possible. Several factories at Dundee, Glasgow, and Swansea are now operating under this system.

COLLABORATION WITH THE SWISS WATCH INDUSTRY

One of the most urgent problems facing the British was that of obtaining certain highly specialized watchmaking machines that were available only in Switzerland but which the Swiss refused to export, with the idea of protecting their own watch industry. However, when it became apparent that the British Government was determined to expand domestic production of watches, the Swiss realized that the British precision machine-tool industry could eventually supply the required machines. This would be possible because the decision was based on the necessities of national defense and initial capital costs were not, therefore, a controlling factor.

Under the circumstances, the Swiss felt that it would be to their best interest to collaborate with the British, and, as a result negotiations took place between representatives of the watch industries of both countries. An agreement was signed March 12, 1946, under which the Swiss agreed to make available, on a rental basis and under certain conditions, the special machines which the British needed. However, the decision as to whether a particular British manufacturer would receive such machines remained expressly with the Swiss, who also have the right to inspect the British factories to see that the machines are being operated according to Swiss methods. The Swiss also agreed to furnish to the British jewel bearings and certain watch parts. The British established acceptable import quotas for Swiss watches and movements at increased maximum prices.[4] Furthermore, the

---

[1] About 1800, the American inventor Eli Whitney, realizing the limitations of handicraft production, developed the idea of making mechanical devices from accurate interchangeable parts produced by machinery. In 1807, a New England clockmaker, Eli Terry, adopted this revolutionary principle and within a short time had reduced production costs by more than 75 percent. In the late 1840's, at Waltham, Mass., Aaron L. Dennison applied Whitney's idea to the manufacture of watches. British failure to accept the new method of manufacture at this vital transition stage is ironical, as an English clockmaker, Henry Hindley, is credited with making and using the first jig, a fundamental device in machine operations. Also, Eli Terry was an English clockmaker who had emigrated to Connecticut. The Swiss adopted the American system of watchmaking in the 1880's.

[2] Germany's watch and clock industry made important contributions to that country's war effort in World War II. One factory employing 2,800 workers produced more than 5,000,000 88-millimeter AA mechanical time fuzes and 15,000,000 20-millimeter point detonating self-destroying fuzes, in addition to supplying several types of timepieces required by the armed forces.

[3] Subsidies paid by the Exchequer to the watch and clock industry during the period July 1, 1946, through June 30, 1949, were as follows (expressed in United States currency): $310,000 in 1946–47; $730,000 in 1947–48; and $590,000 in 1948–49.

[4] Following devaluation of the pound, the British Board of Trade agreed to sanction the import of Swiss watches on a numerical basis instead of by value so that the same number of Swiss watches could be imported irrespective of their now-greater cost.

British agreed that Swiss principles regarding control of output would be applied to the British use of Swiss machines.

The official Swiss announcement on the agreement stated that the Swiss Federal Council was convinced that the evolution of the British watch industry could not be prevented, and that it would be better for Switzerland to collaborate with the British industry than to permit it to develop independently.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PRESENT INDUSTRY

Approximately 70 firms are now producing watches and clocks in the United Kingdom, of which about 12 can be classed as large. The leading manufacturer employs more than 50 percent of the workers in the similar industry and accounts for nearly 60 percent of total output. To achieve efficient mass production, this company has integrated a number of specialist units into an organization which is as nearly self-contained as possible. The firm operates 13 large factories and several smaller units. Each factory specializes on either a single finished product or a related group of component parts.

This type of organization is designed to reduce costs to a minimum through mass production based on an intensive division of labor and on the use of a large number of specialized machines—a system that has been highly successful in Switzerland. It is understood that several other firms in the British watch and clock industry are being organized along similar lines.

Approximately 21,000 men and 14,000 women are employed in the industry, an increase of more than 31,000 workers over 1938, when total employment was less than 4,000. The average wage (as of August 1949) is 30 cents an hour for a 44-hour week, an increase of about 35 percent over the prewar average. A considerable number of youths are employed at a starting wage of 22 cents an hour. Most firms grant a 2-week vacation with pay each year. Unemployment has been slight and has been due primarily to temporary stoppages resulting from material shortages. The number of home workers in the industry is estimated to be extremely small.

PRODUCTION

Production of watches in 1948 was estimated at 500,000 units, of which [illegible] were entirely of British manufacture, while some imported components were used in the others. Production of clocks was 2,[illegible] units, 2,000,000 of which were alarm clocks. All types of watches and clocks are being produced in a wide variety of styles. Clock cases are made of plastics and glass, as well as of wood and metal. One firm has developed a magnetic escapement for clocks which is said to make clocks silent, more accurate, and cheaper to produce.

It is expected that by 1950 annual production of clocks will exceed 7,000,000 units, and that this rate of output will be sufficient to meet domestic requirements and leave an exportable surplus of some 2,000,000 clocks. It is estimated that annual clock production by types will be as follows: Alarm, 4,500,000; half-hour striking, 400,000; chiming, 150,000; 30-hour, 800,000; and electric, 1,150,000.

Because of labor-training problems and the difficulties entailed in obtaining certain machinery, a corresponding increase in watch production will require a longer time. However, the National Horological College should eventually provide the technical personnel needed to design watches, and the machines leased from the Swiss will assist materially in solving the machinery problem.

At present the shortage of certain raw materials and component parts is a problem. Some special types of brass and steel are allocated to manufacturers in ratio to the amount of their production which they export. Several firms have installed plants to manufacture jewel bearings, mainsprings, hairsprings, and small screws. Ample quantities of these items should soon be available.

PRICES AND DISTRIBUTION

Although prices in the domestic market are subject to strict Government control, the retail prices of timepieces in the United Kingdom are high and are subject to a purchase tax of 33⅓ percent of the wholesale value. Alarm clocks are priced from $6 to $15 and electric clocks from $10 to $50, depending on the type and quality of the case.

Traditional outlets for watches and clocks are some 7,000 retail jewelers. However, chain stores are now selling a considerable number of alarm clocks, and many electrical contractors are selling electric clocks. Most of the leading manufacturers arrange window displays in the stores handling their products. Although advertising is limited by the paper and newsprint shortages, the industry has expressed slight concern over this, as well as other marketing problems, because it can readily sell in the domestic market just about every timepiece that can be produced.

IMPORTS

Prior to World War II, annual imports were approximately 7,000,000 watches and watch movements and 5,000,000 clocks and clock movements. Switzerland was the principal supplier of watches and Germany and France supplied most of the clocks. In 1948, imports of watches and movements declined by 77 percent from 1938 and imports of clocks by 73 percent. Only 24,119 clock movements were imported in 1948, compared with 836,710 in 1938. Switzerland supplied most of the watches and movements and 50 percent of the watch parts. The United States supplied 40 percent of the watch parts. Switzerland and France were principal sources of imports of clocks and parts.

In view of the British Government's program for developing the domestic industry and of its general policy of limiting imports, it is probable that imports of timepieces will continue to decline. As a result of the quota provisions of the agreement of March 17, 1946, with Switzerland, that country will undoubtedly continue to supply most of Britain's imports of horological products.

Imports of alarm clocks valued at not more than 12 shillings[5] each are subject to an import duty of 26 percent ad valorem, or 4 shillings each, whichever is the greater. British Empire countries receive a preferential rate of 16⅔ percent or 2 shillings 8 pence[6] each, whichever is the greater. Imports of all other clocks, watches, and parts are subject to an import duty of 33⅓ percent ad valorem, except imports from Empire countries, which receive a preferential rate of 22⅔ percent ad valorem. Imported watches and clocks are also subject to the purchase tax of 33⅓ percent of the wholesale value.

United Kingdom imports and exports of watch and clock products in 1938 and 1947–48 are given in the table on page 4.

EXPORTS

In 1938 the United Kingdom exported domestically manufactured watch and clock products valued at $506,650; in 1948 such exports amounted to $5,346,640 and consisted of clocks valued at $3,270,300 and watch and clock parts valued at $2,076,540. Most of the 1948 exports were to countries in the sterling area.

The Government is placing great emphasis on increasing exports of timepieces as a means of obtaining foreign exchange. Each manufacturer is assigned an individual export quota and, as previously stated, is allocated scarce materials in ratio to his success in meeting his quotas. To meet foreign competition and achieve export goals, some manufacturers have reduced export prices below cost. With export quotas made and materials assured, it is then possible to make up the loss in the domestic market.

CONCLUSION

It will probably be several years before British domestic demand for watches and clocks is satisfied. During the war, few timepieces were available for civilian purchase and use, and a large replacement demand exists which cannot soon be filled under the current policy of reducing imports and increasing exports.

The continued success of the United Kingdom's export program is dependent primarily upon further increases in production. However, increased foreign competition or the imposition of prohibitive import tariffs and other restrictions by importing countries would tend to limit British exports of watches and clocks.

[5] One shilling is equal to 14 cents, United States currency.

[6] One penny is equal to 1.17 cents United States currency.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives an article by Wilfrid Parsons, S. J., which appeared in America, the weekly review, on December 3, 1949.

Like Father Parsons, many Members may not be aware of the very fine record that has been made by REA in bringing electricity to the American farm. It is a record that Mr. Claude Wickard and his associates in REA and in the Department of Agriculture can well be proud of.

WASHINGTON FRONT

After a recent visit from a former student of mine, now an employee of the Rural Electrification Administration, it occurred to me that we had there a very good example of the "welfare state" in action. Accordingly, I procured a kit of material which that agency has prepared for public information. Since few city people are even aware of the agency, still less of how it works, some of my urban readers may be interested.

When the Rural Electrification Act was passed in 1936, less than 11 percent of the country's farms had electricity wired into them. Farm work was muscle work, or at best gas-engine work; lighting was by oil lamp; housework was done by hand. In 1949, more than 78 percent of the farms have electricity, and I have before me a list of 22 farm-home and 37 field-and-barn appliances run by electricity, which are now most commonly used by "electrified" farmers. Formerly, the utility companies did not find it profitable to join the farms by wire, or, if they did, the price per kilowatt-hour was too exorbitant for all but a few of the most prosperous farm families. Cheaper distribution makes the difference.

Not by any means all the difference, however. Nearly 60 percent of all the farms electrified since 1936 get service from REA-

financed facilities. For REA does not build; it only finances. Generating plants and lines are built by the borrowers themselves, with money loaned by REA at low-interest rates and long terms of payment.

Now the interesting point about all this is that the vast majority of the borrowers and users are farm cooperatives, in most instances formed directly for this purpose. These co-ops follow the classical form: one vote for each member, and distribution of savings back to members each year. Borrowers own a million miles of line, serving 3,000,000 consumers. They either generate their own power, or buy it wholesale.

Since its foundation, REA has loaned an aggregate of $1,105,876,987; it has received $78,000,000 in interest, and $106,000,000 in repaid principal. Less than 1 percent of borrowers are in arrears. One interesting thing is that within 30 years or so, REA will go out of business, since by then the borrowers will have 100 percent equity, and REA will have all its money back—unless, of course, new forms of electrical power are invented meanwhile.

This is, of course, a tremendous economic revolution, which has profited the utilities, the appliance manufacturers and the farmers, not to speak of the United States Treasury, which will earn a handsome profit in interest. It is, also, still private corporate enterprise, of the cooperative type. But it is still more tremendous social revolution. Few city people can realize what a social change has been operated on the farms by that very electricity which they have always taken for granted. That would merit a separate essay by itself.

WILFRID PARSONS.

American Income, Its Sources and Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the first article on American Income, Its Sources and Distribution, by Justus L. Johnson, of Aurora, Ill., former Republican State chairman of Illinois and one of the ablest political economists of our State:

I. AMERICAN INCOME, ITS SOURCES AND DISTRIBUTION

What the future has in store greatly concerns us. Not all people agree, neither do the experts produce the same conclusions.

Up in Wisconsin there is a manufacturing company whose chief line of production supplies the hospitals of the Nation. They have been greatly concerned because the hospital needs have been growing faster than the income of these institutions. They do not want to reduce the number of their workers because hospitals receive insufficient gifts to pay for goods needed.

This concern, the Hamilton Manufacturing Co., issues a bulletin of information designated "Hi-Lites." It is worthy of attention and analysis and is here presented with full credit to E. P. Hamilton, president of said corporation.

HOW IS INCOME DISTRIBUTED

Preachers and teachers are among America's foremost opinion molders. Enjoying this place of influence, as they do, should carry a deep responsibility in presenting true facts. Unfortunately, some facts they present are inaccurate and is resulting today in a great deal of harm to our American way of life.

I don't think these groups are deliberately falsifying actual facts. Some no doubt are, because among preachers and teachers, we have some persons who want to twist facts around, just as this is being done by some persons in any group. Fortunately, the number is small and they account for only a very small part of the damage being done.

The real cause for the damage which results from wrong information is because of the lack of knowing what the true facts are. If preachers and teachers, who are among the best read people in our country, have incorrect facts, is it any wonder that the vast majority of our citizens are misinformed? Dr. Claude Robinson, president of the Opinion Research Corp., conducted a poll in American communities of over 2,500 population, among representatives of the clergy and teaching profession, on the subject of how American income was distributed. The clergymen were from all denominations and the teachers were social science teachers. Three questions were asked on this subject of income distribution—

(a) Wages and salaries.
(b) Dividends and interest.
(c) Rents.

In each case the persons interviewed were asked, "What portion of this form of income goes to persons whose total income is under $5,000 per year, and what portion goes to persons with incomes of over $5,000 per year?"

WAGES AND SALARIES

The average of the answers received showed that 66 percent of wages and salaries paid went to those with income under $5,000 and 34 percent to those with income over $5,000 per year.

This result was in great variance to the true facts. What are the true facts, and what is the source giving out these facts? The source of the facts I have taken from a pamphlet entitled, "The National Income and Its Distribution," published by Father Edward A. Keller, director of economic research of Notre Dame University. Father Keller's source was from figures published by the United States Department of Commerce and the United States Treasury Department. Here are the true facts.

Instead of those with incomes of under $5,000 per year receiving 66 percent of all wages and salaries paid (as Opinion Research showed, preachers and teachers thought to be true), 89.8 percent was the correct figure. Likewise, instead of those with incomes over $5,000 per year receiving 34 percent of the national income, they received only 10.1 percent of the national income from these sources.

An interesting thing to note at this point is that those with incomes of over $5,000 per year who receive 10.1 percent of the national income, have only 5.5 percent left after paying taxes. This means that income taxes take nearly half of this total income. It should be obvious that if all the income in excess of $5,000 was confiscated from those receiving more than $5,000 per year, it could not even make a dent in the taxes paid by those receiving less than $5,000 per year.

DIVIDENDS AND INTEREST

Now, let's take a look at dividends paid by corporations and interest paid on bonds, bank deposits, insurance premiums, building and loan associations, and so forth. Dr. Robinson's preachers and teachers thought that those with incomes of under $5,000 per year received 29 percent of interest and dividend payments, and that those with incomes of over $5,000 per year received 71 percent.

Again, the true facts are far from what these preachers and teachers thought. Father Keller points out that those with incomes of under $5,000 per year actually receive 69.4 percent, not 29 percent and those with incomes of over $5,000 receive only 30.6 percent of all income received from these sources, not 71 percent. Also, of this 30.6 percent after taxes, those with incomes of over $5,000 per year have only 17.3 percent left.

Now, dividends and interest are the foundation of our capitalistic or free-enterprise system. They represent profit or a return on an investment that was made out of savings, savings that were the result of somebody spending less than they received, even possibly denying themselves some pleasure in order to create them. Is a profit disgraceful? Some, today, seem to think it is. Then let it also be understood that the overwhelming bulk of this disgrace, 69.4 percent of it, goes to those with incomes of less than $5,000 per year.

RENTS

Now let us consider that individual whom many consider an obnoxious character, namely, the landlord, who collects the rents.

Dr. Robinson's preachers and teachers think that people with incomes of over $5,000 per year receive 70 percent of all the rents collected in the country, and that those with incomes of under $5,000 per year receive 30 percent of these rentals.

What are the real facts? Again, Father Keller's survey indicates that all of the rentals collected in the country, 83.1 percent is collected by persons with incomes of under $5,000 per year, and only 16.9 percent is collected by those with incomes of over $5,000 per year. Again after taxes the 16.9 percent collected by those having incomes of over $5,000 per year have 9.6 percent remaining.

In most countries being a landlord is the habit of a few, but in these United States it is the habit of millions.

Next Sunday the balance of the article of Mr. Hamilton will appear. It presents an analysis of "What has happened" to the income groups in America.

Californian Wants TVA There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL F. WHITE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, I quote below a letter which reveals the typical attitude of the people of California on Federal development and distribution of electric power. My people feel that since the flow of mountain streams belongs to all the people there is no reason why the electricity created by these streams should be turned over to the private power interests and sold back to the people at a profit.

The letter speaks for itself:

MORRO BAY, CALIF., *January 15, 1950.*

Congressman CECIL F. WHITE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: I read the enclosed clipping in the Fresno Bee regarding your bill to have the Federal Government build dams on the Kings River to generate electricity, and I was wondering what, if anything an ordinary citizen can do to help along this project. I live in Morro Bay, Calif., and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. have control of

this district and the people are at their mercy. They raised the rates in November and they are getting beyond the limit of the person of moderate means.

A friend from Chattanooga, Tenn., has told me of the wonderful things that have been done there since the TVA went in, because of the low rates of electricity. Why can't we have the same advantages as the taxpayers pay for the dams that create these projects?

Respectfully,

Egg and Grain Price Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have spoken of the low price of eggs and the high price of grain. They will be interested in the following letter to me from the Department of Agriculture dated January 25, 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 25, 1950.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: This is in reply to your letter of December 27, 1949, and newspaper clipping from the Lowell Sun regarding the egg price situation.

In recent weeks farm sales of eggs throughout the Nation expanded tremendously as a result of a relatively large pullet flock and exceedingly favorable weather conditions. Market prices declined substantially due to this increased production of eggs. Moreover, the egg driers in the Midwest who were cooperating under the egg price-support program were offered more eggs than they could use in their plants, with the result that in many communities egg prices declined below the certified price of 35 cents which driers were required to pay. The Department seriously considered this problem and came to the conclusion that the only alternative would have been to inaugurate a comprehensive purchase program for both frozen and shell eggs in addition to dried-egg purchases. Since the support program for 1949 terminated on December 31, 1949, it did not appear advisable to broaden the program so late in the year and for such a relatively short period of time. As a result, the egg market during December sought lower levels based upon supply and demand conditions.

Under the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, eggs and poultry products are in a large group of commodities for which price support is nonmandatory. The law requires that if any of these products are supported, the support price may not exceed 90 percent of parity. The law sets forth eight factors which are to be considered in determining whether price-support operations shall be undertaken and in determining the level of such support. After full consideration of these eight factors, it was decided to announce the support of egg prices in 1950 at a national median average producer price of 27 cents per dozen. In order to help achieve this objective, the Department announced on December 30, 1949, that it would buy dried eggs from midwestern processing plants that would agree to pay farmers an average of 28 cents at the farm, or 27 cents at the drying plant. Copies of three press releases and a background statement which explains the price-support program in detail are enclosed.

Laying flocks have not yet reached their peak in production, and in many cases sales of eggs at this time of year probably do not completely offset feed costs. However, it is expected that producers who follow good poultry husbandry practices will begin to show some returns over feed costs as their flocks come into full production during the next month or so. As was indicated in the press release of December 21, poultrymen are urged to give careful consideration to their management practices and adopt those practices that lead to the greatest possible efficiency in production and marketing. Such practices will include careful culling and efficient use of feed.

Although corn and wheat are supported at 90 percent of parity, oats, sorghum, and barley are supported at 70 to 72 percent of parity. It should also be remembered that the market prices of some of these grains are not always at their respective support levels because all farmers do not make use of the price-support programs. During December the average percentage of parity received for the grains used in poultry feed was about 75 percent of parity. This is the same level, in terms of parity, as is the announced price-support level on eggs.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

If This Editor Went to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am herewith including the following newspaper article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat in which Charles L. Blanton, Jr., managing editor of one of the outstanding newspapers in southeast Missouri, gives his views on some of the problems which are confronting this Congress:

IF THIS EDITOR WENT TO CONGRESS

(C. L. Blanton, Jr., managing editor of the Sikeston (Mo.) Daily Standard, views the national scene and outlines what he would do in a legislative way to correct current errors and omissions. He frankly concludes that he would "serve only one term in any legislative body in which we attempted to enact our views into law.")

Today we feel as though we were going to Congress and will set down for our readers' perusal legislation we would enact if we were all-powerful in the halls of the lawmaking bodies.

If we were in Washington today the first thing to fight on our calendar would be any change in the Taft-Hartley labor law. Our discussion with individual laboring men has convinced us that in spite of the leaders' hue and cry, the individual feels that the Taft-Hartley law is his sole protection from labor goons.

We would see that Government costs were cut, with a major reduction in the number of Federal employees, a reduction of funds for aiding foreign countries, a reduction in funds for farm subsidies; in fact, we would be tempted to fight for across-the-board cuts in all Government departments.

We would reduce taxes immediately regardless of whether the budget was balanced or not. We would repeal the so-called luxury or excise tax imposed as a wartime measure. We would increase the taxes on liquors and cigarettes. If the income-tax law should be rewritten, we would continue the exemptions for contributions, medical expenses, dependents, etc., and apply a reduction to the middle income group first. We would expand the social-security program to include everyone.

We would approve an increase for benefits from social security if the recipient made a proportionate contribution.

We would not favor a compulsory health program applicable to individuals but would approve contributions to States to assist cities and counties.

We would not prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages so long as the statements contained in the advertisements were truthful.

We would not support the return of prohibition.

We would favor military training.

We would penalize the Department of Justice for every charge brought against big business or small business that it was unable to substantiate in courts.

We believe that a majority of Government authority and expense should be in the hands of the State of Missouri or the individual State.

We are sincerely afraid of the present trend and power and growth of non-tax-paying consumer cooperatives.

We would not support the proposed Civil Rights or Fair Employment Acts.

If we could transfer all power to the State legislature we would prohibit drunkards and seniles to the State mental hospitals. If it were not the obligation of the children to help the seniles, we would have a separate institution for them exclusively.

We would have a statute enacted covering the case of Dr. Hermann N. Sander, or like cases, on the merciful removal of suffering patients with incurable diseases provided the requests were made and substantiated by the patient and his or her husband, wife, and children.

We would provide for sterilization of all child sex offenders upon the first offense. We do not wait for two murders.

We would make it mandatory that all patrons of all theaters and picture shows receive the return of their price of admission if they were unable to find scenes in the moving picture or on the stage which are shown in the newspaper ads, billboards, and placards.

And, our final pet peeve—we would ask the legislature to reenact the good-roads-and-gas-tax-increase bill ex-Gov. Lloyd Stark and his committee originally submitted, giving to the highway department 2 cents to be spent as they are now spending, 1 cent to be spent on rural roads by the State Highway Department, and 1 cent to be spent on streets in cities, towns, and villages by the highway department.

We are confident we would serve only one term in any legislative body in which we attempted to enact our views into law.

Friendship, Trade, and Navigation Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the past on the partition of Ireland and raising the status of the representation between the United States and Ireland.

Today I would like to congratulate the State Department on its wisdom and prudence in arranging the treaty of friendship between the United States and Ireland which was signed on January 21, 1950. This treaty registers, for the first time, in writing, the strong feeling of amity and, indeed, almost a devotion which exists between our two countries. I trust that from it will spring a great good and that our State Department will show further interest in Ireland by using its influence to end the unhappy state of partition which still exists in the country to which we are now pledged in friendship. This treaty deeply recognizes the close association between the people of the United States and Ireland.

The Coal Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, on three different occasions I have written the President of the United States asking that he take action in connection with the critical coal shortage which is paralyzing the Nation. I have received telegrams and letters from people in Aberdeen, Sioux Falls, and Vermillion, S. Dak., explaining to me that the shortage of coal has reached emergency conditions.

In Aberdeen there was not enough coal last week to operate the schools, and there was a shortage in the hospitals. In Sioux Falls and Vermillion rail service had been seriously impaired.

In the last few days a serious blizzard has swept South Dakota sending the temperatures to lower than 20° below zero in many parts of the State. It is obvious that there is a critical need for coal at this time. There is already serious suffering and there will be more if this coal shortage continues for any length of time.

Perhaps the President, enjoying the June-in-January weather now prevailing in Washington, is unaware of the predicament out in the Middle West where people are cold and where schools are closing and trains are not running because of the failure of the miners to provide a sufficient supply of fuel for them.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you the situation has already passed the emergency stage in South Dakota. It is now in the critical stage. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, why should one man be allowed to tie up the transportation and economy and jeopardize the health and welfare of thousands of people. That is what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I said one man is allowing this. I should say two men. One is the head of the miners and the other, upon whose shoulders there is an even more grave responsibility, is the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Mines yesterday reported that the coal shortage had reached an emergency stage. The Bureau of Mines should be in a position to know the effects of the shortage on a Nation-wide basis.

The Taft-Hartley law clearly gives the President the authority to step in and correct this situation when strikes create a national emergency. I say that that national emergency is now at hand—and has been—for several days. The time has long passed for action.

This is no time for politics. If it is, then the President is playing politics with the health and welfare of a great Nation. The people stranded in chilly homes on the farms and in the towns of South Dakota are in no mood for a game of politics. They are demanding action. I believe they have a right to expect their Chief Executive to take this action.

The reason none has been forthcoming is simple. The President does not want to use this law because a Republican Congress wrote it. But I say the people do not care what kind of a Congress wrote the law. It is on the books—the administration refused to repeal it at the last session of the Congress—and the people want relief from their inconvenience and suffering.

Mr. Speaker, the President has the power to stop this foolish, stubborn obstruction. I suggest once again that he use it. There is no excuse. The President can look at the weather report from South Dakota if he wants a convincing answer to his question if the report from the Bureau of Mines is not enough to convince him to use the injunction provisions of the Taft-Hartley law.

Distribution of Relief in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Communist Government of Poland has taken control of Caritas, the chief charitable organization of the Roman Catholic Church in this country, the Polish Press Agency has announced.

Caritas operates orphanages and other institutions in Poland.

The Communist government says that those in charge of Caritas will be jailed.

The Red determination to halt any display of faith has reached the point where even the abodes of homeless waifs are to be, not supervised, but controlled by the Moscow-trained Communists most of whom are not Polish by nationality but are recognized as the Government of Poland

We have seen the present alien rulers of Poland join hands with Soviet Russia in a vicious campaign of vilification of the United States, its Government, and its democratic institutions.

We have seen the faithful of all creeds kept from church and prevented from any demonstration of faith.

I ask that the Secretary of State protest to the present so-called leaders of Poland against this latest despicable show of authority in taking from its rightful supervisors the organization that has so ably directed the distribution of supplies received from the American relief to Poland and American Catholics and that the care and guidance of the orphanages be given back to those who are trained and faithful to the proper rearing of the youngsters who are parentless and homeless.

Cars for War Amputees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, all of us in the routine of our congressional work receive sincere and sometimes very touching letters. I want to read one I received this morning because the writer, who is an amputee of World War II, so well represents the cheerful attitude and the fine outlook on life I have always found among those men who gave so much for you and me. He writes:

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am an arm amputee so I hope you will forgive my handwriting. I have three and a half fingers left on my left hand, so I know you will pardon me in my efforts to write legibly enough for you to read this letter.

I wrote to you once before, in 1947, in regard to automobiles for men who lost an arm in World War II. I received your most kind reply and I wish to thank you very much for your efforts to grant us wounded veterans a $1,600 car. You certainly don't give up. I believe anyone else would have given up long ago. I've written countless letters to other Congressmen and in their replies they were all for it. As you know, our honorable President vetoed said bill. Needless to say, we arm amputees were disappointed; I've hoped for the past 2 years we would receive the same as the boys who lost legs. One loss is as bad as the other.

I've a car now, 1940 vintage, which is always in need of repair. I keep it nice, because I take my wife and two small children riding every Sunday. I sure thought last October I'd have a new car. When the car bill was vetoed we were a sad lot indeed. However, I think I'm a lucky guy, don't you? I have a swell wife, two small kids, I live in a free country, and I have people like you looking after us ex-servicemen who were wounded.

I've heard your name mentioned so often in veterans' groups and am happy to say they are all for you. They, the veterans, know they aren't forgotten when people like yourself see to it that they aren't.

I received my DAV paper in today's mail, and I saw a bill, H. R. 6565, entered by Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS (Republican, Massachusetts). I smiled to myself, and thought, boy, Mrs. ROGERS will never give up. How can we fail. I think you will win this time Mrs. ROGERS, as you don't take defeat. I think the honorable President will pass it this time.

May I say again, Mrs. ROGERS, thank you and may God bless you and yours.

Sincerely yours,

A Vote Against House Resolution 133 Not a Vote for FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, since many Members through their remarks made on the floor of the House have apparently sought to confuse the issue and have attempted to interpret the recent vote on House Resolution 133 as having placed some Members on record as being opposed to or favoring certain pending legislation, I would like to take this opportunity to state my position.

Herewith is the current release of a weekly newspaper article which I have prepared and which will appear this week in most of the newspapers published in the Tenth Congressional District in Southeast Missouri:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

(By PAUL C. JONES, Representative in Congress, Tenth Missouri District)

Now that one of the most controversial nonlegislative issues is out of the way, perhaps the House can get down to work and begin dealing with some of the real legislative problems that face this Congress. On last Friday an overwhelming majority of the membership (236 to 173) reaffirmed the action taken by the House at the opening of the Eighty-first Congress a little more than a year ago when the powerful Rules Committee was relieved of some of its dictatorial powers.

Since 1931 and up until January 1949, the 12-man Rules Committee, with a membership including 8 members of the majority and 4 of the minority, not only served as a traffic director by determining the order in which bills would be considered on the floor, but in addition had the authority, not infrequently used, to exercise a veto power over the action of the regularly constituted legislative committees.

By the practical operation of the powers given to the Rules Committee, any seven members of that committee could block any bill even though it had the unanimous approval of the committee to which any bill or resolution had been referred and which had given detailed study to the legislation.

Last January this procedure was changed by the adoption of what was known as the "21-day rule" which provided that in the event the Committee on Rules failed to report within 21 calendar days any resolution providing for an order of business for the consideration of any bill or resolution favorably reported by a committee of the House, the chairman of the committee which originally recommended the bill or resolution could call up for consideration by the entire membership of the House the resolution which the Committee on Rules failed to report.

Naturally, there were times and occasions when the operation of the Committee on Rules under the old procedure ruled the convenience of most of the Members. For instance, if a Member was opposed to some highly controversial bill, he might be relieved of the obligation and the necessity of taking a position on this bill if a majority of the Members of the Rules Committee, being of the same mind, would vote in committee to prevent this bill from reaching the floor.

Despite the fact that the leadership of both parties in the House attempted to make a political issue out of the proposed change, and despite the many different arguments which were advanced by individual Members participating in the debate, it seems to me that the question was based on the principle, "Does the end justify the means?" I can understand and appreciate the position of most of the southerners who in their unalterable opposition to any FEPC legislation, and who realizing that if the dictatorial powers could be restored to the Rules Committee that the FEPC bill would not come up for a vote in the House at this session, were willing to take this drastic action. There is no question in my mind but that an overwhelming majority of those who voted for this change were influenced entirely by the FEPC legislation. Voting on the bill did not follow party lines since 85 Democrats, practically all of them from the extreme South, joined 98 Republicans in their unsuccessful attempt to change the rules. Likewise, despite the urgent pleading of their leadership, some 64 Republicans joined with 171 Democrats in defeating this proposed change.

I think Speaker RAYBURN, who relinquished his chair to come down on the floor of the House to discuss this issue, stated the proposition very clearly when he said: "There is a lot of talk here about civil rights being involved in this matter. As far as I am concerned there is no element of the civil-rights program involved in the rules as they exist today and as, in my opinion, they should exist. The rules of a legislative body should be such at all times as to allow the majority of a legislative body to work its will. Under our present set-up, I am sorry to say, that is not the case in many instances.

"When a legislative committee of the House of Representatives has labored long and honestly, and by overwhelming majority brings in a bill and reports it to the House, and it asks for the privilege of being granted the right to try their case before the elected representatives of the people of the United States, there should be something in the rules of the House, regardless of one other committee which is not a legislative committee, allowing the House to work its will on that bill.

"That is the issue here, and I do trust that the membership of the House in their wisdom will leave the rules of the House as they are so that a majority of the House of Representatives on any and all occasions may have the opportunity to register its will."

While I did not join those who voted for the change in the rule, it has been my intention and I have announced that I do not expect to support the proposed FEPC legislation which will now come upon the floor of the House for a vote of the entire membership. In this same connection I think that, generally speaking, southern Members have placed too much emphasis upon the racial question involved in this legislation and have overlooked or minimized many of the other more important principles.

American Income, Its Sources and Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I herewith submit the second of a series of articles entitled "American Income, Its Sources and Distribution" by Justice L. Johnson, of Aurora, Ill., former Republican State chairman of Illinois:

II. AMERICAN INCOME, ITS SOURCES AND DISTRIBUTION

Last Sunday the article reprinted in the Now and Then column concerned itself with the sources of income, it covered wages and salaries, dividends and interest, and rents, and gave us some insight into its distribution.

Today, we present the balance of Mr. Hamilton's bulletin, which analyzes what is happening to the country and who must furnish additional taxes if national programs are extended. The article follows:

WHAT HAS HAPPENED

We constantly hear derogatory references to those in this country who have, or are considered to have, large incomes. Even our highest governmental offices refer to them as economic royalists, princes of privilege, the selfish few, etc. The Government has even published their incomes in the daily press. The figures quoted are, of course, always before taxes. Why don't these figures show the income of these people after income taxes? The reason is that it would not make a good story for those who want to stir up class prejudice in this country.

Father Keller points out that in 1917 persons with incomes of $25,000 or more had, after paying Federal income taxes, received 6.7 percent of the national income distributed to individuals. In 1932, under President Hoover, this same group received 3.4 percent of the national income distributed to individuals. Under President Roosevelt they continued to sink. In 1938 this group received 3 percent; in 1941 they received 2.5 percent; and in 1944 they received 1.3 percent of the national income distributed to individuals. Since 1944 the trend is still downward.

When the national income received by those with incomes of over $25,000 per year shrinks from 6.7 percent in 1917 to 1.3 percent in 1944, which is 80 percent, why do our starry-eyed crystal gazers still keep shouting about the "privileged few"? It apparently is popular to blame all our troubles on a few by making the people of this country think a few persons receive most of our national income. The facts cited above by Father Keller, who got his information from Government sources, makes it clear that the exact opposite is true.

GIFTS DIMINISH

The citizens of this country must realize that up to 10 years ago our colleges, hospitals, research foundations, etc., were built and supported by gifts from persons with incomes of over $25,000 per year. Gifts of this kind contributed in no small way to the advancement of the standard of living we enjoy in this country. Now that this group has been nearly wiped out, those who remain because of high taxes can no longer make these gifts.

The question is, Who is going to make money available in the future for colleges, hospitals, etc., if we are to continue our way of life in America? The answer is that the Government must supply the money.

The next question is, Where will the Government get the money? The answer is, From the people, because that is the Government's only source of revenue.

The next question is, From what group of people will the Government get the money? The answer is, From those people with incomes of less than $5,000 per year. Why is this so? Because persons with incomes of less than $5,000 per year now receive, as shown above, 69.8 percent of all the wages and salaries distributed. This group receives 69.4 percent of all dividends and interest distributed. This group receives 83.1 percent of all rents paid.

BIG BUSINESS

Another popular slogan our crystal gazers like to harp on is big business. Who actually owns big business? The magazine, Trusts and Estates, recently pointed out the result of a survey of 120 of our biggest United States manufacturing companies.

These 120 companies were owned by 6,126,716 stockholders. These same companies had 4,464,000 employees. These companies had 40 percent more stockholders than they had employees.

Sixty-two of these one hundred and twenty companies were able to supply a break-down of their stockholders, with this result:

(a) Twenty-four companies reported that no individual owned more than 1 percent of the stock.

(b) Five out of six holders owned 100 shares or less.

(c) About 9 percent of the stockholders, accounting for 41 percent of the stock, were institutions (schools, hospitals, cemeteries, and insurance companies). These institutions in turn represented millions of individuals.

Eighteen million people (one out of every seven United States citizens) own this country's corporations.

American Telephone & Telegraph Co., one of the largest, if not the largest, United States corporation, is owned by 764,000 persons. These people own an average of 30 shares each. The great majority are working people with small incomes. Are they the privileged few?

General Motors is owned by 433,000 people
* * * 320,000 own 50 shares or less
* * * 140,000 own 10 shares * * *
about $600 in the business. Are these the privileged few?

General electric is owned by 249,000 people. United States Steel is owned by 227,000 people. Pennsylvania Railroad is owned by 207,000 people. Radio Corp. of America is owned by 206,000 people. Standard Oil Co. is owned by 200,000 people. Are these the privileged few?

LIFE INSURANCE

In 1948 there were 78,000,000 people who owned life insurance policies. This represents 90 percent of all families in the United States. If the assets of all insurance companies are divided by these 78,000,000 policy holders, we find that $690 is the average individual stake. Thirty-one percent of this $690 individual stake is invested in American business. Dividends and the payment of benefits to beneficiaries is dependent, of course, to a large extent on business profits. Can you picture what could happen if business failed to earn enough profits to show an adequate return on the investments that are made to guarantee life insurance?

Something must be done in this country to awaken the citizens as to what is taking place. This country has gone far along the road to socialism, more so than most persons realize. The greatest factor in this socialistic trend is government spending.

It is considered good politics to talk as if the privileged few will pay for all these securities that our Government officials are sponsoring. The privileged few is a phantom. They no longer exist. The people of this country must understand that from here on in the cost of government must be paid principally by the group with incomes of less than $5,000 per year. They must realize that the only way that their taxes can possibly be lowered is by the Government spending less money, hence collecting less money by taxation.

Those with incomes of under $5,000 per year are the persons who can and must stop the present trend of Government subsidies, Government securities of all kinds, and various other Government spending activities. On this group hinges the future course of America. Their understanding of what has made their standard of living the highest of all countries will determine whether they will continue to enjoy and improve their way of life, or whether they will enjoy the way of life now not enjoyed by the peoples of Europe.

Next Sunday article III will examine how the American worker is getting hurt by the adoption here of European patterns of control.

Odd Fellows Donate Occupational Therapy Building to Veterans' Home of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, when I was home during the recent recess of Congress Mrs. Hazel Hannan, of Stockton, told me of a most unusual project that the Odd Fellows, and its affiliated organizations, had carried to completion. This order had raised and donated $244,000 for the construction of an occupational therapy building at the Veterans' Home of California. This institution is located in my district in the beautiful Napa Valley. It provides a home for about 1,200 veterans of our various wars. The operation of this home takes a big financial load off the back of the United States. The National Government recognizes this and does make a contribution of $500 per veteran per year toward the operation of this home. The cost to care for these veterans has risen during the past few years and is now about $1,200 per veteran per year. This institution is administered by Nelson W. Holderman, who was one of the great heroes of the First World War, receiving the Congressional Medal of Honor for his heroic service as second in command of the famous Lost Battalion. Colonel Holderman has made a magnificent record in administering this great institution.

When Mrs. Hannan told me about the project of the Odd Fellows, I thought it was so unique and constructive that I asked her to write me about it so I might place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. When a group of people dig down in their pockets and raise a quarter of a million dollars to take care of veterans, which is the obligation of the National Government, that effort should be an example to others who might be similarly inclined. The purpose which the order had in mind when it raised this fund was also a uniquely constructive one. It was to furnish a facility which would help veterans rehabilitate themselves vocationally. What could be more constructive or humane than to provide a means whereby men who have been injured while in the defense of our country should be provided with an opportunity to overcome their disability and again become useful and self-supporting citizens? Just think of the personal happiness this facility will bring to these veterans, to say nothing of the economic benefits.

The following letter, which I make part of my remarks, explains the matter fully:

CALIFORNIA I. O. O. F. OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY FACILITY FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Stockton, Calif., January 18, 1950.

Mr. LEROY JOHNSON,
Congressman, Third District of California, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: At the request of Mrs. Hazel Hannan, of Stockton, Calif., I am writing to you the following information:

At the annual session of the Grand Lodge, I. O. O. F. of California, held in Sacramento, in May 1944, a resolution was adopted, wherein a committee was appointed for the purpose of raising a fund in the amount of $250,000, to be donated to the State Veterans' Home of California, to be used for the construction of an occupational therapy building for use in rehabilitating the veteran members of said home, and to be dedicated to the members of our order who gave their all in World War II.

As chairman of the committee appointed (67 members) we solicited our entire membership of Odd Fellows and Rebekahs throughout the State for free-will contributions. As is the case in all such projects, there was some opposition. But through untiring efforts and constant work of the committee by personal appearance in the lodges and thousands of letters, we finally succeeded in completing the raising of the funds in May of 1948, in the total sum of $244,000, said amount being delivered to the administration in the office of Gov. Earl Warren, on April 20, 1949, at 2:30 p. m., with appropriate ceremonies, pictures, etc. (Governor Warren is a member of the order).

Recently I have been informed that the contract for drawing of the plans and specifications has been awarded to a firm in San Francisco, and as soon as said plans have been completed and accepted, a date will be set for ground breaking, on which occasion many officers and members of both the Odd Fellows and Rebekahs will assemble at the veterans' home to participate in the breaking of ground for said building, then later another occasion will be laying of the cornerstone, and finally will come the great day of dedication. All of which our entire membership are looking forward to with great pleasure.

It will be my pleasure to advise you of the date of each of the above-mentioned occasions, and we shall be very happy to welcome you to be present at any one or all of them.

While it was a very large undertaking for our committee, and all of us worked very hard, we feel gratified that we accomplished our goal.

A large portion of credit for the work done, is due to the untiring and persistent efforts of our sisters, the Rebekahs, for they went into it wholeheartedly and never faltered for a moment. Sister Hazel Hannan, being one of them.

As you may know, our officers of both the Grand Lodge IOOF and the Rebekah Assembly are changed each year. Therefore, due credit goes to each and all of those fine ladies who took up the work, each in turn, and worked untiringly to the final accomplishment.

It will be my pleasure to be present at each of the occasions as stated above, and as chairman of the committee, will be one of the speakers.

If there be any further information you desire, kindly feel free to call upon me for the same.

Sister Hazel Hannan has stated that you desired this information so that you might put it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This will be greatly appreciated, and when so done, I will be very happy to receive a copy of same.

Thanking you for your interest, and looking forward to seeing you at the Veterans' Home, when we all gather there for the above-mentioned occasions, I wish to remain,

Sincerely yours,

WM. V. McCOY,
General Chairman of the Committee.

The Polish Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a radio address recently given by Prof. Eric P. Kelly, of Dartmouth College, over Station WSPR, in Springfield, Mass., on the Justice for Poland program.

The address follows:

THE POLISH HERITAGE

The Polish heritage and its contribution to western civilization is one of the most valuable assets that we possess here in America. For more than a thousand years the Polish people have struggled amidst the most devastating conditions to preserve the rights of a free people, and not only their example but their actions have had a tremendous effect upon us all in preserving our own freedom.

By acting as a buffer state against eastern and despotic civilizations, Poland has in the past saved European civilization from destruction many times. The Polish state repelled more than a dozen Tartar invasions which would have devastated Europe. It turned back the Turks when it seemed at the time that the Ottoman Empire would extend clear to France. It opposed the spread of Nazi Germany by forcing Hitler to fight before he had completed the manufacture of his secret weapons, the atomic bomb among them, and undoubtedly saved England and America thereby from slaughter and destruction.

And yet, although the population of Poland dropped from 35,000,000 to 20,000,000 during the war, the spirit of resistance against despotism is still going on despite the fact that Poland is now ruled by a stooge set-up put in power by Stalin. There is a strong underground in Poland, ready to act at the proper moment—a psychological underground rather than a military underground, for people don't gather in old-fashioned cellars any more to make bombs in any romantic fashion. They are wisely playing the nonresistance game and waiting.

Along with Poland in central Europe are some 200,000,000 other peoples in Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, eastern Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Rumania, and Yugoslavia simply waiting for a chance to attain their freedom. These peoples, whom the western nations allowed to slip to Stalin's control after Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, belong to the nations of western civilization. They will never be content to be stooge states under Communist dictatorship.

How will the break come, as it certainly will come? War? Who but Stalin dares prate of war in this atomic age? Who but Stalin uses the threat of war to spread fear throughout the world? Fear of war never prevented it. One must hate war and not fear it if war is to be prevented. No; I think the redeeming of these people from slavery and concentration camps will come about in some other way. Just what that way is is yet to be determined, but I am sure that we have enough brains in America, England, France, and the other western nations to devise some other method.

Poland is the key to peace in Europe. Mr. Raymond Leslie Buell pointed that out a few years ago. It has always been and will always be the keystone of Continental Europe. A partitioned Poland poisoned Europe for nearly 150 years, causing strife on all sides. Hitler signed his own death warrant when he invaded Poland and broke down the barrier against eastern tyranny.

Poland has been a center of democratic thinking since its earliest days. The freedom of the individual to speak, worship, and carry on his own work as he chooses has ever been a passion. If any fault is more noticeable in Poland than in other nations, it has been on the side of individualistic freedom and lack of cohesion in the whole state. Most of the propaganda hurled at Poland in recent years, stemming first from Hitler and then from Stalin, accusing Poland of landlordism and class society has been wholly false. Poland was one of the earliest states in Europe to elect its rulers by vote of its citizens, it has ever been liberal in its attitude toward religion, it has always possessed high ideals of education and justice, and has been a refuge place for many racial groups persecuted elsewhere.

The world will never be safe until Poland regains its liberty again. The great mistake of England and America in allowing Poland to be partitioned and in allowing Stalin to have control there is something that not only smacks of the greatest ingratitude for Poland's tremendous service in the war, but it endangers the life of every inhabitant of the world, since it sets up a heart of discontent and poison in the very center of Europe which may lead to one of the greatest tragedies of all time unless the wrong is righted.

United States Should Not Recognize Communist Regime in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, recent developments in China and the proposals in some quarters that the United States grant recognition to the Communist regime imposed by internal aggression and forced on the Chinese people, make even more pertinent now than when they were given the remarks on this subject by our distinguished colleague the Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE, of Connecticut, before the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York on December 1, 1949:

[Excerpts from the remarks of the Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Member of Congress, Fairfield County, Conn., in a speech to the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, in New York City, on December 1, 1949.]

There is, at the moment, an attempt to prepare American public opinion for the recognition of Communist China. It has also been suggested that the Department of State may set up three legalistic criteria to decide whether or not to recognize the Communist government of China. Yet the Communists cannot even meet these criteria:

1. They are not yet and—pray God—will never be in full control of the territory of China.

2. They cannot be relied upon to discharge their international commitments. This is illustrated most dramatically in their incarceration of Angus Ward, the American Consul General at Mukden. Indeed, there is virtually no evidence that any Communist government feels bound by its word. Moreover, it is clear, beyond peradventure of doubt and by their own admission that Mao Tse Tung and his followers are not agrarian reformers, but are the disciplined agents of Stalin. And it is well known that the Soviet Union has been guilty of repeated breaches of treaties and agreements.

3. The Communist government in China does not represent the free choice of the Chinese people. It has been reliably reported that not more than 3 percent of the Chinese in the territory overrun by the Communist armies actively support the Chinese Communist government. The many millions of refugees from Communist-dominated China testify to the instinctive fear and revulsion which the Chinese people feel toward the Communist state.

But aside from these somewhat soulless tests there are certain unimpeachable State Department precedents.

For instance, we did not recognize the Hitler puppet government in Norway. Acting on the Stimson doctrine of nonrecognition of territories acquired by force, we refused recognition of Japan's puppet government in Manchuria. Woodrow Wilson declined to recognize the revoluntary government of Mexico which took over following the political murder of President Francisco Madero and his Vice President.

Accordingly, refusal by our Government to grant recognition to the Communist regime in China would be in accord with well-established practice.

Some hold the view that we can do business with the Chinese communists. At one time it was also contended that we could do business with Hitler. While there might be some temporary limited commercial gains, recognition would increase the threat to world peace and to American national security, thereby jeopardizing the entire American community on the preservation of which all Americans depend for their prosperity and for their freedom. Communism is by definition and by design opposed to private property and is dedicated to its destruction.

It is argued that the reestablishment of Japan's trade with China is important to us in our efforts to stabilize the economy of Japan, and that Japan's foreign policy should not conflict with our own. But it is also true that the hard-pressed Chinese Communists need the Japanese market. If we are not willing to help the anti-Communists in China with military aid, we should at least use the economic weapons available to us to help our friends in their struggle against those who seem to be determined to destroy us. After all, we are using the Marshall plan to create elsewhere on the Eurasian Continent, where there is a cold war, a political climate propitious for the preservation of freedom. We can do no less in China where the war is hot. If we cannot achieve victory in economic warfare, we can hardly expect to avoid another war.

Moreover, the recognition of Communist China would enable the Communists to obtain supplies which they badly need, while the American people are spending billions of dollars in their global struggle against this very same communism. These American supplies would help to subvert this gigantic

and costly American effort. The scrap iron and oil which was sent to Japan in the pre-Pearl Harbor days, not only destroyed life and property in China, our lifelong friend and ally, but also destroyed American life and property in the terrible war which followed. Let us not repeat this tragic and shameful mistake. Let us not allow short-term expediencies to overcome long-term principles. Let us realize that these American supplies may some day become blood-soaked and tear-drenched reminders of crass materialism and vacillation at a time when lofty leadership and high resolve were called for.

For it is an incontrovertible fact that the recognition of Communist China by the Government of the United States would give help to the self-styled enemies of America. Any action which assists Soviet imperialism or bolsters the economy of any of the Russian satellites may well capsize the tenuous balance of power in the east-west conflict.

Such recognition would open up every Chinese Embassy, legation, and consulate to espionage, fifth-column activities, and subversive attacks on free peoples. It would give the Soviet bloc an additional vote on the Security Council of the United Nations and would automatically range us on the side of the Soviets in their vicious attacks on the duly accredited Chinese delegation. Let us then abandon the policy of business as usual. Let us awaken to the hard fact that there is no sharp dividing line between war and peace. Let us realize that the cold war in Europe is irrevocably intertwined with the hot war in China, and that if we do not win the cold war we shall have war. Let us at long last make a start on a vigorous, far-sighted far-eastern policy by refusing to recognize the Chinese Communists and by recognizing with limited and directed aid those who are still fighting to prevent the subjugation of more than a billion human beings.

The recognition of Communist China by the United States Government would encourage Communist elements everywhere. It would discourage the valiant, freedom-loving people whom we are pledged to assist and who, although confronted by overwhelming odds and desperately weakened by war and invasion, are still fighting this godless tyranny.

It would compound the tragic results of our cynical, hesitant, and unworthy China policy at a time when our national interest as well as our solemn obligations demand that we look for inspired remedies rather than timid excuses. It would ratify in advance the brutal conquest of Pacific territories for the preservation of which 108,000 Americans gave their lives in freedom's cause.

It would, in the eyes of the world, constitute American approval of Soviet methods and objectives in China which are inseparable from their methods and objectives in Europe. It would consecrate Soviet imperialism. It would brand us as people of little faith in the freedom for which we fought two world wars and which we have publicly sworn to preserve. It would commit us to a course which, while it might be in accord with our postwar China policy, is not in keeping with our declared global policy to oppose rather than to appease the forces of Communist aggression. It would, in all probability, foreclose the possibility which still exists of aiding the anti-Communists in China, thereby at long last forsaking the dreadful doctrine that we can run with the hare in China while we hunt with the hounds in western Europe. It would strike a heavy blow at the security of our own Nation and the peace with freedom which is our sacred objective.

Repeal the Excise Tax on Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, as has frequently happened in the past, great news came out of Albany, N. Y., yesterday. The New York State Senate, by unanimous vote, and the New York State Assembly, with but a single dissenting vote, passed a resolution urging Congress to repeal immediately the Federal sales taxes, euphemistically referred to as excise taxes, imposed during the war and still retained as a burden on the American people.

It is significant that every member of the Democratic Party in the New York State Legislature voted for this resolution. I hope that the members of that party who serve in the Congress of the United States will share the view of their colleagues in New York. Since the Republican pressure has been strong for more than a year to repeal these wartime levies, all we need is to convince the Democrats down here, as has been so successfully done in Albany.

I understand that an opportunity may be presented to us today to state our position on the repeal of these taxes when the distinguished minority leader offers an amendment to House Joint Resolution 371. This amendment, while granting relief on the commodities singled out in the President's recent message, lacks the discriminatory feature which characterized the President's recommendations, since the amendment applies to all commodities subject to the wartime taxes and restores them to their prewar level.

This action of the minority leader, as contrasted with that of the President, will certainly be greeted with enthusiasm in the community which I represent. More people are employed there in the photographic industry than in all the rest of the country. Yet the President's recommendations were silent on the subject of reducing the discriminatory and outrageously high sales tax on photographic equipment and films. Indeed, he expressly limited his recommendations to retail taxes, which excludes any relief to the photographic industry.

The thousands employed in this business, now the victims of the highest Federal tax of any, forgotten by the President, will certainly welcome the fight which the minority leader is making to help them. On their behalf, I tender to him my grateful appreciation.

These are taxes on the right to work. It is estimated that they caused 5,000 people in my congressional district to lose their jobs last year and thousands of others to be forced to work part time. These levies were imposed during wartime to discourage civilian consumption. Yet they are still stubbornly retained, bearing in their wake loss of business, short workweeks, and unemployment with all of their attendant hardships and suffering.

Although the photographic industry is perhaps the most seriously affected by these taxes, there are, of course, many others where much the same situation exists. I hope the Members will solidly get behind our colleague from Massachusetts in the valiant fight he is putting up to convince the administration forces that action to relieve this situation is imperative.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Rochester Times-Union. The editorial follows:

REPEAL EXCISE TAX ON ROCHESTER JOBS

Months after jobs were lost in New York State by the thousands because of continuance of wartime excise taxes, the President has agreed to modify some of them, but he offers no relief for Rochester.

If Congress can raise enough revenue to replace them, the President will accept reductions in certain excises collected at retail—on handbags, luggage, furs, jewelry, and so forth. But he ignores entirely those collected from the manufacturer, including the 25 percent tax on cameras and 15 percent on films.

These taxes cost the jobs of 5,000 persons in Rochester last year and skip-week work schedules for thousands of others, because trade in these lines declined more than four times faster than general trade in the first quarter of last year.

At the same time the Government's receipts from the tax dwindled 41 percent below the year before. The camera tax is no longer an important source of revenue but of fundamental importance to Rochester.

Senator GEORGE recalls that Congress promised when these taxes were imposed to repeal them within 6 months after the end of the war. That promise has been ignored.

These taxes were designed to discourage consumer buying during the war so that manpower could be channeled away from civilian markets and into the war effort. That need disappeared 5 years ago. How far can an emergency be stretched?

Many of the other wartime excise taxes should be repealed outright, rather than reduced. They are hidden taxes on the cost of everything. A tax on freight, for example, defensible in wartime to discourage civilian shipping, is ridiculous in peacetime in a Nation so dependent upon transportation for most of the things we buy.

The same applies to taxes on communications. They are an added cost of doing any sort of business which the consumer pays.

The President's message makes clear again that so long as we have an administration that shuts its eyes to the spending side of the ledger, we shall have no tax relief.

Amending the Rules of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the national legislative body of a nation which was founded on the principles of democracy should proceed in such a manner that free discussion of issues is encouraged.

At the same time, however, it is necessary that rules be in effect which make it possible to sift from the great volume of legislation introduced those measures which are of the greatest importance and urgency to the people as a whole. Without such rules legislative chaos would surely result.

Our problem, then, in considering a change in the rules of the House is how we can establish a rule which will best implement the two requirements stated above. The rule in effect since January 1949 allows a committee chairman to call up for debate a measure cleared by his committee after it has been in the Rules Committee 21 days. It permits consideration of bills which might otherwise be blocked. But this rule also makes it possible for committee chairmen who are understandably zealous about the importance of legislation from their own committees to call up bills recognized by the House leadership or by the rank and file of both parties as not being in the best interests of the country.

It was instructive to note the unchallenged statement by the gentleman from Georgia that "there has never been a time when the present Speaker of this body or his predecessor, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], made request of the Rules Committee for a rule on any bill but what the request was honored." This is another evidence of the undeniable fact that it has always been possible to get up for debate any measure that a majority of the Members really approve and want.

The resolution before us today would eliminate the 21-day rule and return to complete control by the Rules Committee unless 218 signatures to a discharge petition can be obtained or Calendar Wednesday used. The latter device has proved impracticable because dilatory motions can be made to waste a whole afternoon without even getting to the bill involved. I oppose the Cox resolution to repeal the 21-day rule for the same reason I voted for the rule last year—it is the lesser evil of the only two alternatives we are being permitted to choose between.

What we need is something in between the extremes of "gag" rule by the Rules Committee, or a ship almost rudderless as the House is under the 21-day rule. A workable middle ground could be obtained in two ways. One method would be to amend the discharge petition rule so the number of signatures required would be reduced from 218 to 150 (as was the case prior to the Democratic Congress of 1931–33). The other method would be to amend the Calendar Wednesday procedure so that no dilatory motions or quorum calls could be permitted by the Speaker. Either of these methods of amending the rules would serve the purpose of limiting power in the hands of the Rules Committee and yet preventing confusion and waste of time in dilatory quorum calls or debate on bills which are not considered important or advisable by a substantial group of Representatives. Unfortunately we are not being permitted to offer debate and vote on such amendments.

Our Congress is one of the few legislative bodies left in the world which is actually responsible to the people and which has power to initiate, without executive sanction, measures it feels are in the best interest of the people. We must endeavor to keep it this way and to make it a model to be admired and emulated by other people in the world who hope for a truly democratic type of government. The present rule is not the best way to achieve these ends because it does not promote maximum efficiency in the use of our time. It allows a minority of either the ardent proponents or the bitter opponents of a measure to make a spectacle of this body and to weaken public confidence in the legislative process. The 21-day rule will be retained by today's vote, but it is not an adequate answer. We must continue to seek a better solution to the problem.

White House or Transport House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Peter Barry which appeared in the English weekly magazine Truth:

WHITE HOUSE OR TRANSPORT HOUSE

(By Peter Barry)

Benedict Arnold was the great American traitor. He was one of George Washington's officers in the War of Independence, and he decided to betray his own side. He made a bargain with Major Andre, of the British Army. But the bargain went wrong. The Americans caught Andre and hanged him. Arnold escaped—and the Americans have execrated him ever since as the man who propitiated his enemies at the expense of his friends.

I dare say that Mr. Lewis Douglas, the American Ambassador in London, would be startled and outraged to hear himself compared, however remotely, to Benedict Arnold. So would Mr. Averell Harriman. So would Mr. Thomas K. Finletter, the United States Minister now administering Marshall aid in London. But let us see.

It is not suggested, of course, that any of these gentlemen is venal or in any other way personally disreputable. On the contrary. Their intentions are undoubtedly excellent. Unfortunately, it is not their intentions that matter.

Objectively (as the Communists say), Mr. Douglas and his two colleagues are—however unconsciously—betraying the American way of life. They are betraying the free enterprise system on which the United States is based. They are giving aid and comfort to the enemies of that system; and they are doing so not at all from any unworthy motive but because of credulity and ignorance. The difference between them and Benedict Arnold is that Arnold knew what he was doing and they do not know.

Mr. Douglas, Mr. Harriman, and Mr. Finletter have now become three of the principal assets of the British Socialist Pary. To judge from their public utterances they take their inspiration not from the United States but from the Socialist headquarters at Transport House. They are like a ventriloquist's dolls. Mr. Herbert Morrison's Charlie McCarthy's.

In the last 12 months these three innocent gentlemen have provided a whole series of unsolicited testimonials to British socialism. Almost every time they open their mouths they proclaim their belief in the ultimate success of the Socialist experiment. They swallow without a gulp the crudest propaganda balderdash put out by Mr. Morrison's machine. For capacity to be duped and humbugged and bamboozled Mr. Douglas, Mr. Harriman and Mr. Finletter bear away the palm.

Their utterances could not be more useful, from the Socialist point of view, if Mr. Morrison had written them himself. They are featured on the front pages and in the editorial columns of the Socialist press; they are circulated in thousands of leaflets and handbills; they are part of the equipment of every Socialist propagandist; they are quoted incessantly by canvassers and hecklers and saloon-bar oracles. Whenever a Socialist politician finds himself in a debating difficulty he falls back triumphantly on Mr. Douglas, Mr. Harriman, and Mr. Finletter. If there is any gratitude in politics, and the Socialists win the next election, Mr. Attlee should celebrate the victory by offering peerages to Mr. Douglas, Mr. Harriman, and Mr. Finletter. No man will have done more to earn them.

Let us look at the facts. At the present moment the Socialist experiment in Britain is drifting rapidly toward the rocks. It has been kept afloat from the beginning by American dollars and by nothing else. (Without those dollars, as Mr. Arthur Greenwood candidly confessed in a speech during the Hammersmith by-election, there would now be 5,000,000 unemployed in this country.)

But, in spite of the dollars, disaster is near; and the British voter is beginning to realize it. The Socialists have lost his confidence. He sees the muddle, the mismanagement, the jobbery, the incompetence all around him. With that slow-moving sagacity that is his distinguishing characteristic the British voter is coming gradually to the conclusion that socialism will not work.

It is being borne in upon him that the Tories are right; that we cannot keep a population of 50,000,000 alive on this island by passing resolutions; that Britain must choose, literally, between capitalism and starvation. We must produce more or we shall perish. In order to produce more we must go back to profit-making, to competition, to thrift, to investment, to exploitation and inequality and imperialism and all the other Socialist bogies.

A disagreeable conclusion; and it is not surprising that the British voter moves toward it slowly. He has been told so often that socialism can take the place of sweat. But move toward it he does.

This is the moment chosen by Messrs. Douglas and Harriman and Finletter to assure him, loudly and repeatedly, that the Socialists are right after all. Let us begin with Mr. Finletter. Mr. Finletter arrived in this country in June 1948. Within a few hours of his arrival he was holding a press conference at the American Embassy, at which he said: "The United Kingdom has made an extraordinary effort of recovery. Production has increased by 10 percent over the 1938 figure."

If Mr. Finletter calls this extraordinary, he must be, indeed, easy to astonish. He has, in fact, swallowed hook, line, and sinker, the crudest of all Socialist tricks, the trick of ignoring the increase in our population between 1938 and 1948. There are over 2,000,000 more people in this country now than there were then—a fact which makes nonsense of all the Socialist statistics. (Comparisons between our food supplies now and prewar, for instance, are completely nullified by the 2,000,000 additional mouths to feed.)

But this elementary fact is concealed from Mr. Finletter. If he does not know it (and apparently he does not), and if there is nobody in Mr. Douglas' Embassy who knows it (as apparently there is not), he should ring up the Conservative Central Office, who will be glad to tell him about it. The telephone number is Whitehall 8181.

Having begun by talking nonsense, Mr. Finletter went on to talk more nonsense. On January 12 last he journeyed to Manchester to address the chamber of commerce there. He told his audience—who must have been puzzled to know whether they were listening to a spokesman of free-enterprise America or to a member of the Socialist government—that there had been highly satisfactory gains in British production, and that "austerity is a misnomer. It should be called the self-discipline program, because it is not as austere as all that." And so on, and so on.

The Socialists hailed this speech with jubilation. It was printed at length, in the first person, on the front page of the Socialist Daily Herald next day, with a jeering headline inviting Mr. Churchill to read it. Ever since, Mr. Morrison's orators have been using it systematically, on the widest possible scale, in order to persuade their dupes that socialism is doing fine. Here is a spokesman from capitalist America who says so; and here is the Socialist press using this capitalist spokesman as material for mud to throw at the Tory Churchill.

In addition to talking nonsense in London and Manchester, Mr. Finletter has found time to talk similar nonsense in Washington, too. Last February he had the assurance to tell the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate that the proposed nationalization of the British steel industry would not affect general production here. He also handed to the committee a document praising the "responsible attitude of the British trade-union movement in facing the nation's economic difficulties."

Presumably he meant something by those words; it would be interesting to know what. At the present moment the miners' trade-union, led by its Communist secretary, will not permit its members to work as hard as they did before the war. At the present moment the transport union and the engineers' union are forbidding the use of labor-saving machinery by their members. At the present moment the postal workers' union are forbidding under threat of a strike, any restoration of prewar postal services. At the present moment the railwaymen's union is blackmailing the public (to whom the railways now belong) with demands for higher wages that are not being earned. And so on, and so on.

Yet Mr. Finletter talks about "the responsible attitude" of the trade-union movement.

At the same meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Averell Harriman also saluted the Red flag. He said: "I have seen no change for the worse in Britain as the result of socialism. I have seen no indication that the Labor Party does not believe in the free process just as we do."

It may be that Mr. Harriman is compelled to talk like this—or believes he is—because of the requirements of American politics. Marshall aid is the responsibility of the Truman administration, and therefore it must be defended against the opponents of that administration.

Agreed—but is it necessary for Mr. Harriman, in striking at the opposition in America, to strike at the opposition in this country too? Is he really so naive as not to know that the words he utters in Washington will be used—as they have been and are being used—to plaster the cracks in British Socialist propaganda?

Senator WILEY, from Wisconsin, did his best to enlighten Mr. Harriman. "It is an historic fact," said Senator WILEY very properly, "that every attempt at European socialism has degenerated into totalitarianism. Do you see any steps in that direction in Britain?" To this Mr. Harriman replied: "None whatsoever."

If Mr. Harriman believes that, he is capable of believing anything. He will have no difficulty, none whatsoever, in believing that there are fairies at the bottom of his garden.

Next let us look at Mr. Lewis Douglas. To judge from his speeches Mr. Douglas should be accredited not to the Court of St. James's but to Transport House. He seems to have swallowed the Socialist policy at one gulp; he is the complete marionette.

He testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last January; and he made a statement then about the nationalised British mining industry that might have been written for him by Mr. Morrison. Here are three sentences from it: "By 1951 Britain hopes to produce 240,000,000 tons of coal a year. If the problems of the industry are tackled with the vigor of the past three or four months, Britain will attain her target. This is all the more remarkable considering the mines' history of neglect and mismanagement."

An Ambassador who knows no more than this about the principal industry of the country to which he is accredited is a luxury that only the United States can afford. The mixture of ignorance and credulity in those sentences would hardly pass muster on a Socialist soapbox. Every statement in them is demonstrably untrue. It is nothing less than scandalous that the American Ambassador should soil his tongue with the Socialist lie of Tory misrule—the most contemptible lie in British political history.

Since the Americans are so willing to offer advice to this country they will not object, I am sure, if this paper offers some advice in return.

It is the business of the United States to uphold democracy and the American way of life. Democracy and free enterprise are two sides of the same coin. If free enterprise is destroyed then democracy dies with it.

Now a Socialist victory in 1950 will mean the end of free enterprise in Britain. It will put this country so far on the road to totalitarianism that there will be no turning back. Does the United States want that?

The answer, presumably, is "No." Let the United States therefore tell Messrs. Douglas, Harriman, and Finletter to stop acting as the chief unwitting propagandists for British socialism. If the Socialists win the 1950 election a very large part of the responsibility for that disaster will rest on the shoulders of three Americans.

NOTE.—This issue of Truth contains an article which will cause everybody who reads it concern, and may cause some resentment. It is no light thing to criticize the accredited Ambassador of a friendly power, but it is equally no light thing that an Ambassador should, however insdvertently, lay himself open to criticism.

The article White House or Transport House is written in no carping spirit but to demonstrate that three distinguished Americans, presumably devoted to the American way of life, which is founded on free enterprise, are by their utterances helping to destroy that way of life.

It need hardly be said that Truth will most gladly put its space at the disposal of any of these distinguished gentlemen should he feel that its contributor has been guilty of misconstruction or misrepresentation.

EDITOR.

Marine Battle Position 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Maj. William P. McCahill, USMCR, which appeared in the January 1950 edition of the Reserve Officer.

Major McCahill is the executive director of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association—MCROA—and is well qualified to speak on the subject he has discussed in his article.

There are many Members of Congress who are aware of the attempts being made to reduce the duties and functions of the Marine Corps. We have noted with regret the language and budget estimates as they affect the Corps in the 1951 budget, but we have also noted with some satisfaction the statement by Secretary of Defense Johnson at his press conference when he unequivocally said that the Marine Corps would maintain two divisions at reduced strength. This would indicate that more than the six marine battalion landing teams mentioned in the budget message will be considered.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that both the Armed Services Committee, under Chairman CARL VINSON, and the Armed Services Appropriation Subcommittee, under Chairman GEORGE MAHON, will keep in mind the real and practical needs of the Marine Corps and will do what they can to see that it is maintained as it should be and protected in its functions and duties.

MARINE BATTLE POSITION 1950

(By Maj. William P. McCahill, USMCR)

"In spite of sugary words and fair phrases from high places, the Regular marine and his civilian counterpart in the Reserve has a jaundiced eye cocked at recent developments in national defense."—So says a marine and here he tells why.

The marine reserve today finds himself in a peculiar role. He is on the defensive. After almost making a fetish of the offensive spirit since 1775 the marine of today is both baffled and belligerent over the role assigned him in the peace of 1950. The Pacific champ almost has to apologize for being around.

In spite of sugary words and fair phrases from high places, the regular marine and his civilian counterpart in the Reserve has a jaundiced eye cocked at recent developments in national defense. Some of the oratory we take at face value. The rest of it we consider strictly double talk for the record, a double talk we consider dangerous.

After having had a fair share of annoying moments from Guadalcanal through the occupation of Japan and North China the corps might expect that its professional and volunteer marines could take a breather. But such has not been the case and it was General Cates who as Commandant of the Corps described the Marine Corps as occupying "a battle position which must be defended in full force."

At a time when defense spokesmen are assuring the public we will strike back and

retaliate in force in event of another "4 o'clock Sunday morning attack" the Department has recommended to the Congress through the Budget Bureau that the offensive strength of Marine aviation be pared 80 percent. It is also an established but as yet unpublished fact that Marine ground elements of the Fleet Marine Force, the Navy's instant landing force in readiness, will receive a substantial cut.

Such is the magic of the word "economy" today. You can't tell a marine about economy. We are used to it. We have been a shoestring service for so long that it is a known fact that for every fighting marine we put on the field it costs some $3,000 less than for his soldier counterpart.

Marine Reserve officers have much more to do than run down their sister services and their brother reservists. Yet, the professional publicists would have the Nation believe that we are essentially opposed to "unification," unable to give credit anywhere else but within our own ranks, and violently antagonistic to the Army, the Air Force and even the Navy at times.

If a man strikes back after being pushed around, after being ignored, after being studiously insulted by inference if not in actuality, he isn't picking a fight. And yet, there are brother officers in the civilian reserve who resent the treatment the corps has been getting in postwar policies almost as much as marines themselves. Generally, they are people who either served with or alongside marines and are familiar with the way a marine can handle a dirty assignment nobody else wants.

If anyone still thinks we are looking under the bed, if the scoffers actually believe that we are poking lances at windmills or setting up men of straw they should read the record and balance words against deeds. It may be that the budget cuts planned for 1951 and the cuts already instituted for 1950 are not disproportionate. We doubt it. It may be that the country doesn't need a strong Marine Corps capable of instant field operation and air support. We also doubt that. It may be that certain Pentagon planners love the Marine Corps. However, when the commandant breaks a long and studied silence, a silence predicated on trying desperately to do a job for the country without rocking the boat, we prefer to listen to him. When the commandant says that planned budget pruning deliberately strikes at the combat efficiency of the corps we have no alternative but to believe him and discount other sweet sentiment so liberally dished out.

Because they have had the courage to stand up and take their case to the Congress and the people, marines may yet win this greatest of their bloodless battles. And because the American people respect a battler the battle may be resolved in the next meeting of Congress if the issue can be sufficiently clarified in an age which worships at the shrine of economy.

RSA SUPPORT

It won't be easy. But the corps has many friends. The Reserve Officers Association, at its recent national convention, was the first national group to get behind a program aimed at an adequate peacetime for the corps and the country, the present legislation establishing a minimum flooring on corps strength. Midway in the last session of the Congress some 85 Representatives and 4 Senators tossed bills into the hopper in support of Admiral "Bull" Halsey's suggestion that the corps should always be 6 percent of the total armed forces personnel strength. The bills also call for an Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Marine Corps.

ROA was willing to go along with and lend active support to the proposition that the average of the last 20 years, 6 percent, was a legitimate request. But the legislation is almost sure to have unanimous opposition from the Defense Establishment and perhaps all three of the Departments.

Col. Melvin J. Maas, a former national officer of ROA and long time national president of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, has pounded away at the need for a corps that can get up and go anywhere, any time. He has pointed out that 67 percent of Marine aviators are graduates of the amphibious schools and know what the gyrene on the ground is thinking about planning to do and how he's probably going to react under a given situation. He has emphasized that because of their very training and background the Marine is at home on all elements.

Sometimes it's the little things that indicate a man's thinking. In a speech December 7 titled "The Ramparts We Watch," Secretary Johnson made two references to the Marines but consistently referred to the three services. This slight constantly irks Marines. We feel that if the Congress says we are a service then the Secretary of Defense should recognize it and so should the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is true that there are three Departments. But as long as Congress says there are four services we'll insist on at least that minimum recognition.

Recent developments in the Naval Establishment indicate that we may be well on the way toward winning our point. Admiral Forrest Sherman has ordered Col. John Smith, Congressional Medal of Honor Guadalcanal ace, to duty in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations. John Smith is to see to it that Admiral Sherman doesn't forget to let General Cates in on anything that he should know of on any pending plans which concern the corps.

The Civilian Components Policy Board which is carving our future Reserve policy carefully and professionally now refers to the four services and is perhaps better indoctrinated to the capabilities of the corps than either the Joint Chiefs or the Little Joint Chiefs. But it's an uphill battle.

Marines freely admit that they are biased when it comes to the corps. But so is America biased when it recalls Tarawa, Iwo, and Midway, as it too infrequently does today. It seems today that it was the Army that took Guadalcanal. There are a lot of guys who still get hot and cold with malaria that might give you an argument on that one.

However, in spite of our acknowledged bias, many of us are sincerely and seriously concerned about our military security as a nation. If a set line of thinking can set the stage for practical disintegration of the corps as a combat unit, the same thing could happen tomorrow or a year from tomorrow to another arm of our defense team. We are the first to concede the reasonableness of a balanced team for our national security. But, as David Lawrence so ably pointed out, we are puzzled when the Defense Secretary jumbles the context of the amendments of the National Defense Act passed in 1949 and comes up with a quarterback in the garb of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The next speaker within my earshot who piously proclaims that he has no intention of abolishing the Marine Corps is not only going to have to define his term "abolish" but answer a few pointed questions, at least better than did the eminent chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee last summer.

CONGRESSIONAL DISCUSSION

In recent Senate debate Senators KNOWLAND and TYDINGS scoffed at any danger to the corps. However, when Marine Lt. Col. PAUL DOUGLAS, junior Senator from Illinois, asked Senator TYDINGS a direct question, he received an evasive answer. Senator DOUGLAS asked, "Does the Senator from Maryland know of any persons anywhere in the National Military Establishment who would wish to abolish the Marine Corps?"

Senator TYDINGS failed to answer the pointed question simply because there are men in high places who have this intention. Senator TYDINGS, speaking as chairman of the powerful Armed Services Committee, said: 'The Senator from Maryland, so long as he is in the Congress, will resist any attempt to abolish the Marine Corps, because it has been of tremendously valuable assistance to the United States and is worth millions or billions of dollars to our country."

In the language of economy-minded legislators and officers we probably will again hear the specious argument that we do not need "two armies and two air forces" which is another way of saying that marines should be confined to interior guard duty and thrilling the folks at home with snappy parades. During 1947 debates on the so-called Unification Act, both the Army and the Air Force wanted the marines cut down to size. Their statements are available for all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (p. 9306, July 12, 1949) and provide much light on today's controversy where it appears that some people neither mean what they say nor say what they mean with regard to the corps.

General Eisenhower, as Army Chief of Staff, recommended:

1. The Marine Corps is maintained as an adjunct to the fleet and participates only in minor shore combat operations in which the Navy alone is interested.

2. That it be recognized that the land aspect of major amphibious operations in the future will be undertaken by the Army and consequently the marine forces will not be appreciably expanded in time of war.

3. That it be agreed that the Navy will not develop a land army or a so-called amphibious army, marine units to be limited in size to the equivalent of the regiment, and the total size of the Marine Corps, therefore, limited to some 50,000 or 60,000 men.

General Spaatz, as Air Force Chief of Staff, said:

"I recommend therefore that the size of the Marine Corps be limited to small, readily available and lightly armed units, no larger than a regiment, to protect United States interests ashore in foreign countries and to provide interior guard of naval ships and naval shore establishments."

There is no question here of good faith. It is merely a matter of opinion. Marines and others feel that in an atomic age there is still great need for shock troops ready to pack up and go at a moment's notice. There are some other matters which require consideration, such as the evident fact that the Marines serve as a measuring stick against which to measure the effectiveness and economy of other American military units. Maybe some commanders would prefer not to have such a handy measuring stick around. Maybe some people in high places would find it difficult to explain the number of generals per men in the Army as against the Marine ratio. Maybe the Army would be embarrassed if tomorrow we were to be mobilized and the corps could put two streamlined divisions with air support in the field in a few hours or days while the giant Army was able to provide only about an equal number of troops in the same time.

Last year in summer maneuvers the Marine Reserve air arm actually transported 23,000 Reserve ground troops either to or from training at Camp Lejeune or Camp Pendleton. Marine fighter, bomber, and transport planes converged in 24-hour periods under Reserve control at the coastal bases at Cherry Point, N. C., and El Toro, Calif. This past year countless companies and battalions of the Organized Reserve and thousands of volunteer reservists took part in amphibious training designed to keep them ready if the call should come. The Marine Corps Reserve is almost 130,000 strong and represents an elite corps of trained specialists ready to more than double present Marine strength in case of war or serious emergency. Yet, if present budget plans are carried out—and they have not been officially denied—Marines will find themselves with insufficient planes available for reserve training and probably with none in the world.

Never before in its history has the corps needed friends so badly as it needs them today. Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, recently said very frankly to a marine audience that no Congressman or Senator would dare risk political suicide by advocating abolishment of the corps. Most of his colleagues probably would echo his remarks. But this is not the danger. The abolition of the corps is not the immediate goal but rather the stripping of its ability to ever spearhead another war as it did in the Pacific.

So when a person scoffs at any real or presumed danger to the corps, it is well to check not only his motives but also his interpretation of danger. A corps of the size proposed by Pentagon planners would certainly be incapable of carrying out its assigned missions and functions as laid down at the Key West conference and subsequent agreements.

Whether on guard in the Near East or the Pacific, whether aboard capital ships of our shrinking Navy or at domestic and foreign land and air bases, the Marine Corps today stands ready, as in the past. Its future readiness is in the hands of the Congress and the American people. May they be as faithful to the marines as the corps has been to them.

Between the Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks at this time to include a poem by Mr. Tex Reynolds, of the Racine Journal Times, Racine, Wis., which seems to point out a moral which the American people should be thinking about quite seriously:

WITH ABJECT APOLOGIES TO ROBERT W. SERVICE, WHO AUTHORED THE SHOOTING OF DAN MCGREW

A bunch of the boys were whooping it up,
In the new White House saloon,
And Harry that hammers the music box
Was playing a party tune.

When out of the night, which was gosh
awful cold,
And into the political air,
There staggered a mailman, fresh from the
truck,
Bowlegged with all he could bear.

He looked like a man who needed a shot,
With scarce the strength of a louse,
But while Harry hit a gay musical bit
He called for a drink on the house.

There are men who somehow grip your eyes
And hold them hard like a spell,
Such was he, and he looked to me,
Like a man who was madder than hops.

But he had the poise and amid all the noise,
He raised his hand with a sway—
"If you will just please quit pounding those
keys,
"There is something I want to say."

Then Harry stopped with a kind of a laugh,
And his manner was cute and droll,
"I suppose," he said, with a wag of his head,
"Some more cities are out of coal."

"Oh, smile if you wish," the mail carrier cried,
"But let me my story unfold.
"These missives right here, from far and
from near,
"Mean that a lot of good people are cold.

"For weeks and for weeks these letters have
come,
"To tell of the cost and the toll,
"That you could soon end if you'd only
unbend
"And put a stop to the strike in coal."

But Harry replied with a grin that was wide,
And his voice it was calm and cool,
"I'm playing it smart with my head, not my
heart—
"I'm nobody's political fool."

"So the coal piles are shrinking and citizens
freezing?
"Well, tell 'em to put on their wings,
"I know of a clime where it's warm all the
time—
"Why don't they go to Palm Spring?"

Then he whirled right around and started to
pound,
And the number was lilting and light,
And the music it rang while his Margaret
sang,
"Hot Time in the Old Town Tonight."

So those are the simple facts of the case,
And I guess I ought to know,
They say the mailman was dumb like a goose,
And I'm not denying it's so.

If he had been wise like the "fixer" guys,
Just between us two,
He'd slyly have gone to General Vaughan—
The White House "Lady Lou."

Why Can't We Unmask Old King Coal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no real coal shortage emergency at this time, according to the best informed sources, among them being the Christian Science Monitor. The real shortage is one of facts to substantiate the coal operator's false and futile claim. The principal shortage is a shortage of truth in this matter and an abundance of makebelieve. The alleged coal shortage has been self-created by the unholy coal barons and their ilk which is indirectly putting the coal squeeze, at this time upon many unsuspecting small communities, coal users and small-business institutions, who in turn, as was expected, are pleading with certain of their unsuspecting Congressmen to compel President Truman to declare that an emergency exists, when it does not exist in fact, and invoke the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, which its first-named author admits has 27 things wrong with it.

No sensible person blames our great President, even in a proper case, for being hesitant about making use of such an un-American, grotesque legislative monster.

If the supposed authors of this act, had 27 things wrong with their handkerchiefs, socks, shoes, underwear, shirt, tie, pants, vests, coat, overcoat, gloves, or hat, would they want to use them further or throw them on the scrap heap. If they did want to make use of them further everyone would be justified in believing that there were 27 things also wrong with their heads.

There is in this Nation, right now, a large supply of coal piled above ground, on railroad sidings, joyriding in transit from place to place, and stock piled in the coal yards of favorite manufacturers and dealers. Some of the railroads are helping to put the squeeze on those who are now in want of coal by laying off trains and squalling loudly but falsely that they, too, are also hard hit because of a coal shortage. Something should be done immediately to stop this latest reactionary rascality.

No, my dear readers, I am forced to come to the conclusion that the whole thing about a national coal crisis is a flatulent conspiracy of extreme right-winged, bad, big business, spearheaded by reactionaries and the innocent uninformed, and is without basis in fact and dreamed up to crush out the United Mine Workers and John L. Lewis, whom I believe to be in most instances, a fearless and great man truly working in the interests of the United Mine Workers of the Nation, their families, and their communities.

With due apologies to the author of a hopeful present day song hit, I dedicate the following humble filched words to today's reactionary jewels of misrepresentation and deceit, the coal clique.

Oh our ears are full of tears,
Lying on our backs in our beds,
Crying over you.

Adventurous Aroostook Farmers Have Seen Both Prosperity and Adversity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, so much publicity has been accorded to subsidy payments made to the potato growers of Aroostook County, Maine, that I should like to call attention to an article in the Boston Globe of January 1, 1950, which gives a little perspective on Aroostook County history. Aroostook County does not happen to be in my district but I know the county well and I know that the Aroostook farmer does not want to raise unwanted potatoes or to be paid beyond his deserts. He has fully complied with acreage allocations, and current surpluses arise almost wholly from importations from Canada.

The article in question is as follows:

ADVENTUROUS AROOSTOOK FARMERS HAVE SEEN BOTH PROSPERITY AND ADVERSITY

(By Herbert W. Moore, executive secretary, the Potato Industry Council of Maine, Inc.)

You have been reading much about the Maine potato industry in recent months. It has been the favorite subject for various political writers, who with little regard for the

truth, have sought to create an exceedingly distorted and false picture of its way of life.

All of these writings have centered about the wartime price support program which ceased to exist a year ago, and have given absolutely no recognition to the picturesque and romantic development of an industry which within the past century has transformed a bleak impenetrable forest land into the most concentrated, and most heavily mechanized agricultural area in New England.

Aroostook, a county the size of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Rhode Island combined but with only 10 percent of its area cleared of timber, and its gigantic potato industry which each year harvests 15 percent of the total national potato production, is by reason of its unique development perhaps far more removed psychologically than it is geographically from the rest of New England agriculture.

As with the progress and development of our great Nation and its historic expansion from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the progress and development of the Aroostook potato industry has also centered around the railroad. In our case, however, the direction has been northward rather than westward, and for the most part has taken place in the first half of the twentieth century.

AROOSTOOK'S WESTERN STRUGGLES

Since the Civil War, Aroostook has been actively engaged in the production of potatoes, but without adequate transportation facilities its potato production was converted in its entirety to the manufacture of starch for use in the New England textile industry.

With the coming of the railroads in the later part of the nineteenth century, however, the development of the Maine potato as a national delicacy began and it was only a matter of a few years before it assumed a commanding role in the life and diet of the entire population of the eastern seaboard.

Perhaps because of the nature of our growth, more analogous to the development of the West than of New England, a westerner would feel right at home in Aroostook. Instead of grain elevators beside the tracks, however, he would see potato houses. Since the direction of our growth has been northward he probably would find weather conditions more severe, but he would recognize the general atmosphere and feeling which permeates the area as distinctly that of the cattle country, the wheat country, or the irrigated country.

By reason of the nature of this industry which involves such tremendous financial risks as to stagger the imagination, there has developed a people who by virtue of their past experience are hardy, adventurous, keen, and tenacious.

In fact, their willingness to take risks has resulted in the development of a production know-how that is without peer. Nor have they stopped there. With the same energy and aggressiveness, by means of self-imposed taxes, they are financing continual projects aimed at the betterment of storing and merchandising their great crop to insure the consuming public of superior quality at minimum cost.

LOSSES MEMBER WITH PROFITS

Let's take a moment and review the financial history of Aroostook, where until now the potato has been king and where diversification has been very limited in scope. Here are the figures for the profit or loss that the average farmer received per barrel, charging all the costs and all the returns. These figures are exceptionally dependable as cost figures go. They were assembled by an impartial expert. They are based on hundreds of farms. Starting with 1926 the figures run like this: 1926, profit 78 cents a barrel; 1927, loss 9 cents; 1928, loss $1.40; 1929, profit $1.59; 1930, loss 44 cents; 1931, loss $1.06; 1932, loss 65 cents; 1933, profit 58 cents; 1934, loss 69 cents; 1935, profit 39 cents; 1936, profit 89 cents; 1937, loss 55 cents; 1938, loss 16 cents; 1939, profit 14 cents; 1940, loss 67 cents.

No wonder bankruptcy was general, that mortgage companies were desperately trying to get out. No wonder the potato country is inhabited by men more adventurous than the typical New England farmer; men who can take it. They have had to.

Since 1940 there have been the war and price support. The area has had a period of stability and relative prosperity heretofore unknown. The prosperity however has been much more modest than the most lurid stories that have gone out have led the general public to believe. Here are the profit figures for these years every one a profit, but a modest one: 1941, 43 cents; 1942, 70 cents; 1943, 31 cents; 1944, 34 cents; 1945, 95 cents; 1946, 53 cents; 1947, 53 cents. This, remember, is per barrel. A barrel is 3 bushels. To get the profit per bushel divide by 3.

Unfortunately, figures from this authoritative source are not available since 1947.

Nineteen hundred and forty-eight was a year of profits, the last year of operation under wartime legislation and the subject for so much publicity in recent months. The estimate for that year is 90 cents per barrel of merchantable potatoes (less than for the year 1936). In consumer's terms, one-half cent a pound. And that profit includes the Government payments that have been so widely advertised.

MOST OF FARMS SMALL

These 8 years constitute the only period for which there is authentic history of stable prosperity in the potato country.

To get an even more realistic picture of the degree of the prosperity of our area let us look for a moment at a typical farm.

It distinctly is not a big operation that has been pictured so widely. In Aroostook County, where 90 percent of Maine's potato acreage exists, there were 4,338 potato farmers in 1949. Of these only 21 had over 200 acres of potatoes; 90 more had between 100 and 200 acres, 4,227, or 97 percent, had less than 100 acres. Most of them less than 50. Nearly one-half of all the farms were limited to less than 20 acres. These farms are farmer-owned and operated with 95 percent of the growers actually living on the farms. True the ordinary farmer has lived a little better than usual these last few years. More of the houses are painted. The machinery on most of the farms is fairly modern and fairly adequate and much of it is paid for. Mortgages are smaller and in better shape. But the farmer still has to borrow money to buy his fertilizer and seed and pay the potato pickers. He hasn't gotten far enough ahead to finance his next year's operations by himself and there are seasons of the year when the financial shoe pinches pretty tight.

Even in the face of this, however, these farmers of their own initiative sought the abandonment of high level wartime price supports.

They did not want profits to be guaranteed by the Government. This is not the way the industry had been developed up here. Only through Yankee ingenuity and thrift had it survived the economic rigors of the past and it had no desire to radically change this position in the future.

It did recognize, however, that because of its very nature—an industry consisting of thousands of small growers—it did not of itself possess the machinery by which it could effect even a reasonable stability. Therefore, it decided to experiment with a new idea—that of letting Government provide the machinery whereby its economy could be brought more nearly into line with that of industry, labor, and other segments of agriculture in the area.

"FIRE INSURANCE" SUPPORT

They have thus come up with a "fire insurance" price support, the level of which will not even cover the farmer's costs. This experimental plan has just begun to operate in 1949, but it is too early to determine what all the effects will be. We do know this much, however: The 1949 crop will bring in less than two-thirds what the 1948 crop brought in, despite a record yield. In 1949 the average farmer will go behind. He won't go down and out—not yet.

The ordinary farmer will dig into savings, if he has any. He will go further into debt if his credit will stand it. He will stop repairs and replacements and live partly on the depreciation of his buildings and equipment.

In 1950 the potato country faces a further cut in acreage—nearly 15 percent more. The 30-acre farmer therefore will become a 25-acre farmer. And price support will be lower still. It will not and cannot underwrite the stabilized moderate prosperity that Aroostook enjoyed for the first time in its life from 1941 to 1948.

That is the true picture of Arcostook.

EIGHTEEN POUNDS IN 1909, FORTY-ONE NOW

Where will we go from here? The next few years will tell us that. If our present experiments indicate still more controls and continued restrictions in acreage we will not be able to put up with it for long. At least not for what we are getting out of it now.

Then we shall try again.

We hear much talk about the Brannan plan, the features of which have been under study in this area for years, but its practical operation has created many doubts in the mind of the farmer.

In any event, in the firm belief that a reasonably stabilized and a reasonably prosperous agriculture is a primary requisite for a healthy national economy, and with bitter memories of the depressions in the past half century, all of which started on the farm, the residents of Aroostook are earnestly seeking some means of maintaining some of the stability they have enjoyed for the past 8 years.

Many accusations have been made that price supports have caused high potato prices. True, potatoes cost somewhat more than they did several years ago, but so does everything else. It is interesting to note however that in the period 1909 to 1914 1 hour of labor in industry would purchase 18.2 pounds of potatoes at the farm, whereas in 1948, 1 hour of labor in industry would buy 41 pounds. And still we hear that potatoes are high priced.

We continue to hear also that the farmer is responsible for higher potato costs. This is not true. In years gone by, when potatoes were sold in bulk the housewife loaded herself down with potatoes when she went to market. Now storekeepers do not want to sell potatoes that way. They want them in small packages so that the housewife will have room to carry out other merchandise. The housewife also wants them that way for her own convenience in handling. Fancy packaging in small lots costs money. That is why even if we gave the potatoes away here at the farm the housewife would still pay anywhere from 1½ to 4½ cents per pound for them at her local store as a result of the costs of packaging, distribution and merchandising.

RAISING OF BEEF CATTLE

As far as 1950 is concerned, and with or without support, the only hope of fair returns is that by some miracle the national average yield per acre which has been mounting year by year should suddenly turn downward resulting in a relative shortage of potatoes and prices well above support levels. There is a chance of that—a bigger chance than in recent years—but not big enough on which to pin very substantial hopes.

There is one other ground for hope in the potato country on the long-time basis. It doesn't promise much for the immediate future. It can't be done that fast. That is the farmer will be able to expand the production of other farm products to supplement his potato sales.

He won't give up potato raising unless he has to. But potato acreages are down and down permanently. The great increase in yields per acre—nearly doubled nationally—and the spectacular drop in potato consumption make old acreages entirely out of the picture. The Arcostook farmer now has more acres not needed for potatoes. With the lower returns from the potatoes he does grow he must put these idle acres to work if he is to survive.

At the present time the biggest development appears to be the expansion of dairying, although the raising of beef cattle is also assuming considerable proportions.

We are not going to go out of the potato business, but rather will add other farm products to what potato business we have left. The combination seems a very sound one, and brings about a diversification never before experienced in the area.

That is our history and that is our story—certainly unique in modern New England history and certainly less remunerative than others would have you believe.

This past 50 years has seen our complete development and growth. Our troubles have been many, our heartaches great, but they have been overcome.

Our progress will continue to be governed by the adventurous, hard-headed, and progressive thinking of our people and regardless of the obstacles we shall continue to maintain our place in the economic life of New England and the Nation.

Admiral Yarnell Warns United States of Greater Loss in Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal-American of January 15, 1950.

In it Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, noted author and student of Far Eastern affairs and former Commander in Chief of the Asiatic Fleet, warns that our failure to live up to our commitments to our ally, the Government in China, not only will cost us our prestige and influence in the Orient, but will lead to certain loss of Formosa, which he terms a vital link in America's Pacific defense perimeter. He declares that America must abandon her do-nothing policy in the Far East and adopt a dynamic course of positive action against the spread of communism in Asia. It was Admiral Yarnell who foresaw better than any other high official the menace of Japan and the attack on Pearl Harbor. He was ignored then. Are his warnings to be ignored now?

YARNELL WARNS UNITED STATES OF GREATER LOSS IN ORIENT—CALL FOR ACTION ON FORMOSA

(By Admiral H. E. Yarnell, U. S. Navy, retired)

There have been few periods in the diplomatic records of the United States that can compare in ineptitude with that displayed in our relations with China during the past 13 years; this has been especially true since the occupation in recent months of most of that unfortunate country by Communist armies.

We have openly adopted a "wait and see" attitude inspired by lack of any plan for assistance to the Nationalist Government in its resistance to an enemy, whose advance in Europe is being halted by the billions of dollars we are pouring out to that end.

In fact, there are those both in the Government and out who feel that the time has come to recognize the Communists as the de facto government of China. They argue that by such action our trade and the Americans remaining in China will be safeguarded.

WHAT ABUSEMENT

Judging by the treatment of our nationals in other Communist countries, there is scant support for such an argument. Worst of all, results of such recognition would be the effect on Indochina, the Philippines, and Indonesia.

It would mean our abandonment of the Nationalist Government, and would encourage and strengthen the Communist elements in their plans for control of the remainder of eastern Asia.

Furthermore, it would mean the eventual surrender of Formosa to a Communist regime, and a break in our island defense barrier in the western Pacific.

BEED FIRM POLICY

While the State Department has announced a policy that it proposes to follow in regard to Formosa, there are certain factors in the situation that should receive consideration.

There must be, sooner or later, and the sooner the better, a definite policy concerning our attitude toward communism in the Far East.

It seems strange to have one policy entirely opposing communism in Europe, and an entirely passive one in regard to communism in the Far East. For that reason, a policy similar to that proposed in this article should be given urgent attention.

The recognition of a de facto Communist regime would be a betrayal of the Government that fought Japan for more than 4 years before Pearl Harbor and suffered losses of life and property beyond computation.

Many hundreds of thousands of American lives were saved by the 8 years of Chinese resistance to the common enemy. Surely the debt we owe the Chinese leaders and people merits more than a passive attitude and the criticism that is being directed against the Nationalist Government today.

HATRED FOR UNITED STATES

We need have no illusions as to the treatment the United States, its nationals and its trade, will receive at the hands of a Communist regime. Their leaders have openly avowed their allegiance to Moscow and their hatred of the imperialist America.

Furthermore, it does not make sense to contribute billions of dollars from our depleted purse to resist the advance of communism in Europe while leaving the back door open to its spread over the other half of the world.

The time has come for a clearly stated, dynamic course of action against the Chinese Communist regime and a discontinuance of the passive, do-nothing, "wait and see," procedure that prevails at present.

The consequences of a do-nothing policy are obvious. Communism will sweep the entire Far East. Formosa will be lost and our island barrier against Moscow in the western Pacific will be shattered. American prestige and influence in the Far East will disappear. A third world war becomes more probable.

WOULD SAVE BATTLEFIELD

Only a positive stand on our part will influence the Communists who respect nothing but strength. To that end we should aid by political, economic, and military means those people who are resisting its advance in the Far East.

Moral support alone will be of great value, and to that end a statement should be issued that the United States will not recognize any regime in the Far East which is dominated by Moscow and the ideals of communism.

On the other hand, support will be given to democratic national governments, which guarantee the rights and freedom of the people and are willing to work with other nations to establish peace throughout the world.

Since we have established the precedent in Europe we should support a "Pacific pact" of the far-eastern nations opposed to communism.

NEED MILITARY AID

We should also declare that the United States will have no economic dealing with Moscow-dominated Communist regimes, but will make every consistent effort to improve its economic relations with democratic governments in the Far East.

Military aid must be given also, but this need not be on the grand scale of that now being given western Europe.

The Nationalist Government of China has established itself on Formosa, and from that stronghold its navy and air force, with our help, can exert a powerful influence in the eventual defeat of communism. An efficient military force can be built up in Formosa at moderate cost on our part for arms and equipment.

Propaganda and guerrilla warfare can be utilized to great advantage and at small cost on the Chinese mainland. In many ways these are the most useful methods of combating communism. It is the use of weapons which they themselves have found most effective.

THEN EUROPE AID

An early settlement of the Japanese problem with a just treaty of peace, which must provide, however, that she cannot go on the warpath again, will add a note of stability to the far-eastern situation.

A staff of diplomatic, economic, and military personnel under the direction of an outstanding authority on far-eastern affairs would be valuable in coordinating the campaign and the part to be played by the several agencies.

Nothing has been recommended in the foregoing suggestions that has not already been done in Europe on a much grander scale. Whether the Asiatic area is more or less important than the European area is a moot question.

One fact is plain, however, and that is that failure to contain Russia and communism in their drive for control of the Far East will eventually result in the United States being driven back to our Pacific coast with Hawaii as our outpost.

The situation demands positive action—not passivity. The first method may, or may not, succeed. The latter will certainly fail.

WORLD LESS WAR

The announcement of such courses of action and their execution will inform the Far East and the world that the United States is determined to resist the spread of communism in Asia as well as in Europe. It will strengthen greatly the hands of those elements which are opposed to Moscow and its philosophy.

We are a world power, so let us act as one, not only in Europe but in Asia. Such action as proposed, if taken at once, and directed strongly and wisely to a common end may do more for our national security than many billions for armament. The friendship of the people of Asia is a necessary rampart of our defenses. Let it not be lost by indecision and procrastination.

General MacArthur at 70

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include a splendid story on that great general, MacArthur. He will be 70 years old tomorrow and has given 50 years of his life to the service of his country:

MACARTHUR AT 70, DRESSED IN FRAYED KHAKI, WORKS 12 HOURS EVERY DAY

(By Walter Simmons)

TOKYO, JAPAN.—It is somehow symbolic of Douglas MacArthur that America's STRANGEST military uniform has insufficient space for the 47 decorations and 19 campaign ribbons he has won in more than 50 years as a soldier.

On his seventieth birthday next Thursday the great soldier-statesman can look back on the most fantastically successful military career of any American since Washington.

In his own lifetime General MacArthur has become a legend. His likeness has appeared on stamps and coins. No American has ever worn his country's uniform for so long. His public career has spanned three generations of the Nation's life, from service as President Theodore Roosevelt's military aide to the colossal responsibility he now bears in Japan.

At an age when most men have retired his reputation is so high that whenever a global problem arises somebody in Washington is certain to suggest hopefully, "Let's turn it over to MacArthur."

Not in 150 years has any American so combined the skills of the soldier and statesman. Two foreign ministers, who had remained unmoved by the most skillful Washington diplomacy, changed their international policies after talking with General MacArthur in Tokyo.

RUSSIAN INTEGRITY

His extraordinary success has extended even to dealings with the Russians. After pocketing the big diplomatic winnings of Yalta and Potsdam the Soviets have made no headway in Japan or Korea. Relations between General MacArthur and the Russians in Tokyo were courteous but firm from the beginning.

Trying to outguess him has led them into some ludicrous mistakes—they passed up, for instance, an opportunity to send an occupation force to Japan's northerly island of Hokkaido, where opportunities for mischief would have been tremendous.

Once, after listening to a long discourse from Lt. Gen. Kuzma Derevyanko, Moscow's top emissary in Japan, General MacArthur reportedly snorted, "Baloney!" That closed the discussion.

Soviet efforts to propagandize in Japan by hailing American sponsored reforms were answered with such shattering vigor that the Reds have kept quiet since early last summer.

Japanese Communists, too, have failed to make much progress despite the rich opportunities offered by the nation's low living standard and the apparently hopeless prospect of ever bettering it much. Since summer the Communists have suffered one defeat after another.

A carefully timed campaign of civil violence, synchronized with the return of thousands of Communist-indoctrinated war prisoners from Russian areas, backfired with stunning force. Millions of Japanese unionists rebelled against Communist leadership within a few months.

All this vindicated General MacArthur's judgment that the Japanese were capable of taking care of communism themselves without resort to the repressive sort of police action used before the war.

HIS UNIFORMS FADED

Those who knew General MacArthur as the Beau Brummell of the Army during his years as Chief of Staff are surprised at the simplicity of his life in Tokyo.

His summer khakis—some of them dating back to days on Corregidor—are faded and frayed. His winter olive drabs are strictly GI and fit none too well. He wears no insignia or ornaments aside from the five-star token of his rank as general of the Army.

General MacArthur has probably done the hardest work of his life in Tokyo. His schedule is 12 hours a day, 7 days a week. In 4½ years he has missed only a few days at his desk, due to colds.

Working tropical hours—a trick learned during his tours of duty in the Philippines—helps conserve energy and also ties in better with the 14-hour time differential between Tokyo and Washington.

The general rises at 7 and over a leisurely breakfast, enjoys a visit with his son, Arthur, 12. By 8:30 breakfast is over and he goes to his study to read Washington cables that have arrived during the night.

Between 10:30 and 11 he sets out for the office in a big car bearing five-star plates front and rear. Formerly he was followed by jeeploads of honor guard men, but now a few Japanese policemen spaced along the 5-minute route between his American embassy home and GHQ are his only protection.

HIS KNOWLEDGE PROFOUND

The simplicity of his office often astonishes visitors. It contains little besides a telephoneless desk, a leather davenport, several chairs, and an undistinguished marble bust.

Hundreds of prominent Americans have visited him here since the war. They have run the gamut from Ike Eisenhower (MacArthur's one-time aide) to ex-President Hoover, the late Father Flanagan, of Boys' Town fame, and Showman Billy Rose.

General MacArthur has been around so long, seen and experienced so much, read so widely, and known so many different kinds of people that he is quickly on terms of easy intimacy with any visitor.

Congressmen are astonished at his broad grasp of politics. (He was one of the few who foresaw Truman's victory over Dewey.) Labor leaders find him a great deal more liberal than they had supposed.

Educators are confounded by his knowledge of their field, until they recall he had to wrestle with the problem of a university president when he was superintendent of West Point back in the twenties.

But it is when he starts discussing far-eastern matters that he leaves his visitors with their mouths hanging open. His personal knowledge goes back 45 years to the time he observed the Russo-Japanese War with his father, Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur.

Those who have heard him discuss the Orient agree that his grasp of it—military, political, economic, and historical—is more profound than that of any other American.

OPPOSED HUMILIATION

Something of the sort is to be expected, of course, since he has been in the Far East since 1935 without a trip home. After his unprecedented 8 years (1930-38) as Army Chief of Staff, he went to Manila as military adviser to the Philippine Commonwealth government.

Since the war, which resulted in his storied journey to Australia, New Guinea, and back to the Philippines, he has officiated at the birth of two new Governments—the Philippine Republic (July 4, 1946) and the South Korea Republic (August 15, 1948).

The general's industrious study of things Japanese before and during the war equipped him with unique qualifications for the job of supreme commander for the allied powers in Tokyo.

It was not necessary for him to unlearn such favorite American wartime oddments as "the favorite diet of the Japanese is fish heads" or "the average Japanese can live for weeks on a tobacco sackful of rice." (Actually fish heads are used for fertilizer, and the average Japanese is miserable unless he eats approximately a wastebasket full of cooked rice every day.)

The wise decision to keep Emperor Hirohito on the job was made in Washington, of course, but it was General MacArthur's sure handling of a difficult protocol problem that helped make the occupation such a success.

Most Americans in 1945 and 1946 wanted to see the Emperor publicly humiliated. The general would not permit it. He did not even summon the Emperor to his headquarters, as many expected.

After a while the Emperor called on General MacArthur. These courtesy calls have recurred at 6-month intervals ever since. What is discussed is never divulged, but it is probably nothing of major importance.

ARMY A FRIENDLY GARRISON

The supreme commander himself has never claimed Japan is completely democratized, or will be by any such foreseeable date. He made this plain on St. Patrick's Day, 1947, when he gave Tokyo correspondents his only interview of the occupation.

The interview became one of history's landmarks, for at that early date General MacArthur urged an immediate peace treaty, a settlement of the reparations problem and an end to the economic blockade that still stifles Japan.

He also warned that a long occupation would defeat its own purpose. When it became plain last year that the occupation was going into its fifth year without a peace treaty he moved swiftly to sever connections between American troops and Japanese life.

Today the occupation is over to all intents and purposes and the Army has been turned into a friendly, protective garrison force.

Military government is a thing of the past.

INFLATION STOPPED

Increased production of necessities has made it possible to brush aside the vast web of controls that had tangled business for more than 10 years.

This action, which Commander MacArthur earlier had promised as soon as practicable, virtually eliminated the black market. Prices of many commodities dropped and quality has greatly improved.

Other far-reaching changes have taken place within the year. Inflation was stopped by balancing the national budget for the first time in 18 years. Occupation costs to the Japanese were slashed to the bone. Subsidies were drastically pared. Coal production now exceeds demand for the first time.

Industrial output has been shoved close to the 1930-34 level by prodigious effort, but living standards are only about 70 percent of that level because of a 17,000,000 increase in population.

American unilateral action finally broke the reparations impasse, but Japan's foreign-trade picture remains clouded because of the determination of several nations, notably Britain, to keep their war-won markets. General MacArthur has gone ahead, nevertheless, by returning nearly all trade to private hands.

As the complexity of his task has increased General MacArthur, far from attempting to run a one-man show, has not hesitated to ask the services of numerous technical experts from the United States.

The modern techniques they have imported have increased efficiency in government, industry, agriculture, and many other fields. For instance, Blaine Hoover of Chicago, a civil-service expert, threw the feudalistic bureaucratic system out of the window and replaced it with modern personnel methods.

NO REBUKES YET

The Japanese Government's recent accomplishments in budget balancing, tax reduction, elimination of controls and subsidies and the firing of 170,000 surplus government workers are food for thought for Americans here who reflect that General MacArthur was passed over as a Presidential possibility in 1948.

Actually he refused to cooperate with those who sought to get him the nomination. He refused to give interviews or pose for pictures.

This was admittedly his last chance at the Presidency. Perhaps it is just as well, many of his friends agree, that Americans no longer view him through the red haze of political passion.

As his long and lonely job draws to a brilliant close General MacArthur gives no indication of what he might do after leaving Japan. Friends point out that he is the only great war figure who has not written his memoirs. Asked about this long ago, he smiled and said:

"Well, I've got 20-foot lockers full of papers up at the house."

A Story of Bravery and High Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Record-American, Mahanoy City, Pa., under date of January 19, 1950, relative to the mine tragedy that attracted Nation-wide attention.

By the heroism of the anthracite mine workers, who daily risk their lives in the bowels of the earth, and by the wholehearted cooperation of all who aided in the rescue, the life of one World War II veteran was saved, but that of his brother, who also served his country with honor, was lost.

Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to Mr. and Mrs. Michael Burda, of Moreas Colliery, Pa., in the loss of their son Edward, who after returning home from the horrors of war, met such an untimely and tragic death in the region where he had hoped to find peace and contentment. Such is the lot of hundreds of coal miners who in their daily duties to earn a living risk their lives to recover a precious natural resource to keep the wheels of industry moving, the home fires burning, and contribute to the national security.

A STORY OF BRAVERY AND HIGH COURAGE

The Burda brothers have been brought up from the bottom of their independent mine slope at New Boston—Joseph, alive, and Edward, dead. The saga of their rescue from the depths of the earth adds another brilliant chapter to many other such rescue projects that are part of the history of the anthracite region.

Certainly the spirit of unselfish courage that motivates men to brave all dangers and work like galley slaves when called upon to come to the rescue of those in distress was splendidly exemplified by all those directly connected with the operations near New Boston that began when word was flashed around Friday afternoon that two men were trapped inside a bootleg mine. Only those who were privileged to view the work at first hand are in position to appreciate the unselfish devotion those scores of men exhibited once they heard the call of distress.

Outside newspapermen on the scene were indelibly impressed with the nonchalance the force of mine workers displayed as they arrived on the scene volunteering their labors in the great effort that was to be made to free the entombed men. There was no question of pay—you can't offer money for a task which men take up knowing that it may cost them their lives. They were only interested in reaching the mine prisoners and getting them to the surface, dead or alive. They gathered at the mine mouth, smoked, chatted in low tones and when one or more emerged from the opening there were others there to silently take their places without even a question. Thus it went until the limp body of Edward was brought to the surface near noon on Wednesday.

And there were others. The call went out for equipment needed on clearing the way for rescuers to enter the blocked slope. Owners of power shovels, bulldozers, and the crews that manned them heeded all requests made for help and willingly sent valuable machines to the scene all the time knowing it was a humanitarian job with no recompense promised or expected.

And there was the splendid gesture of the coal companies whose managements responded generously to the call for materials, timber, and so forth, so vitally needed in the job ahead. The P. & R. C. & I. Co. magnanimously sent in a force of expert mine workers headed by leaders trained in mine-rescue work and continued them on the job until their task was accomplished. It was a work that surely must have struck a chord of high appreciation in the hearts of men whose fate it possibly may be to face a similar fate as long as they are engaged in a hazardous occupation.

All honor and credit to the State mine inspectors who took charge of the work and who relayed each other until their job was finished and when they could take pride in accomplishment well and faithfully done.

And there were those others who, while not necessarily engaged in the direct work of going into the earth, nevertheless did their part in attending to the wants of those who did. The devoted members of the Salvation Army crew who supplied food and drink to the workers; the Red Cross who were on hand with offers of financial or other assistance; the truck owners who provided transportation of men and materials when needed. The good people of Moreas and New Boston, generally, who stood by at all times ready to do anything in their power to advance the work that lay ahead.

There were leaders from among the mine workers who provided needed guidance to those who volunteered; who brought the plight of the entombed to the attention of those who might help in a big way; to owners of equipment; to mine managers for timber and other supplies. As with all the others they threw themselves wholeheartedly into the job before them and played an important role in the project completed successfully.

Shortage of Doctors Becoming a National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as the years go by the shortage of doctors in this country is growing proportionately larger and is becoming a real national problem. According to reports the number of doctors in relation to population is less now than it was 40 years ago. Unless we take steps to solve this ever-increasing problem in time, we may some day have to pay a terrible price in the event of some unforeseen national emergency.

Various plans are now before Congress aiming to aid medical students and medical schools so that we may attain a larger supply of doctors and a better national health program. I can think of no better investment in the future of our people than in safeguarding its health. The sooner we do it, the more economical it will prove to be in the long run.

I am placing in the RECORD an article, Not Enough Doctors—Subsidy Planned, which appeared in United States News and World Report, January 27, 1950:

NOT ENOUGH DOCTORS—SUBSIDY PLANNED—GOVERNMENT WANTS 20,000 MORE IN 10 YEARS

(Forced growth of the doctor supply is coming closer. It's a $312,000,000 project, as it stands in Congress. Federal aid for medical students is one phase. So is cash help for medical schools. Bigger enrollments—more doctors in training—is the first goal. Idea is to spread the supply of doctors more evenly over the Nation, get enough to man a national-health program.)

A new subsidy is not far from approval by Congress. This subsidy is one of $312,000,000. If it clears final hurdles, it will be used over a 5-year period to finance the training of more physicians, dentists, nurses, osteopaths, public-health officers, and maybe optometrists.

The doctor supply has reached the stage of a national problem. The Senate already has voted to do something about it. A House committee has recommended action. Barring last-minute hitches, Congress will approve a subsidy for medical schools and for students, designed to step up training of physicians and others in the health field.

Physicians in relation to population are fewer at this time than 40 years ago. The supply is not uniform. In some parts of the country there is one physician for every 1,840 persons; in others, one for 556 persons. That situation is leading to political pressures, reflected in Congress, for more physicians in shortage areas.

Congress shows interest too, in the fact that many youths who want to enter the medical profession are unable to get a chance at training. In the 1949 autumn term, about 25,000 sought admittance to medical schools, with 6,965 accepted.

A subsidy plan is offered as a partial solution to the problem.

A subsidy is urged by many medical schools, and a committee of doctors helped to write the present plan. The White House favors it, because a larger doctor supply is essential for a national health-insurance program. The American Medical Association opposes the idea, on the ground that each

doctor can care for more patients now, so that there is no need for a great expansion in numbers of doctors.

Schools are to get several subsidies under the plan as it passed the Senate. One subsidy is to be a United States fee of $800 a year per student, to schools of medicine and osteopathy. If a school enrolls more students than in the past, it will get $1,000 a year for each added student.

Similar payments, on a lower scale, will be offered to other types of schools, such as those teaching dentistry and nursing.

Another subsidy is to come from a fund of $5,000,000 a year, for buildings and equipment. The United States Surgeon General will allocate the money where it is needed most. Some of this money may be used to start new schools. States such as Florida and South Dakota, with no medical schools, are keenly interested in this possibility.

These grants are to help the schools meet their present financial losses. Medical schools figure they lose about $1,600 per year on every student. They say that is one reason why enrollments are held to a low level in many institutions.

A few medical schools are reported to be on the verge of closing down, unless they get more income. For their financial relief, and the aid of other schools in the field of health, the Senate plan calls for a total Federal subsidy of $200,000,000 in the 5 years starting next July 1. Another $25,000,000 is set aside for vocational training of practical nurses.

Students are to get some Federal aid also. Scholarships costing an average of $11,000,000 a year are promised to students in dentistry, nursing, and public-health courses. It is assumed that 1 out of every 10 will get a scholarship to study dentistry, starting in 1951. The sum to be allowed is $2,000 a year per student for tuition, fees, living expenses.

Dental hygienists and nurses are to get scholarships of $1,800 a year. About 30 percent of the nurses are expected to win scholarships. Students preparing for public-health careers will be allowed $1,500 a year. No scholarships are provided for medical students under present plans. This limitation may be removed in future years.

What this plan produces, in the way of additional medical workers, will depend on many factors. Without the plan, medical schools will graduate about 57,000 new physicians between now and 1960. With the plan officials estimate that an additional 15,000 physicians may be trained during the next 10 years. They figure that the plan also will produce 5,000 more dentists than would be trained otherwise.

In other fields these results are hoped for: An 8-percent increase in the number of osteopaths trained each year; a rise in the enrollment of nursing schools, from 43,000 at present to 80,000 by 1961; a 9-percent increase in the number of dental hygienists turned out each year; a 25-percent increase in graduates of public-health training; a 60-percent increase in the number of sanitary engineers.

Actually, the increases might fall below these estimates. There is no assurance that medical schools can find enough physicians to teach many more students, in the next few years at least. The money promised for construction, $25,000,000 in all, is called a drop in the bucket compared with needs by the schools. Medical schools alone count up a need for about $200,000,000 to bring facilities up to date.

Any serious delays in the expansion program will be reported to Congress by the National Council on Education for Health Professions. This new group is to advise the Surgeon General on administration of the training subsidies.

The council also is directed, in the proposed legislation, to draw up a permanent Federal program to encourage medical education. This long-range plan is to be ready by 1953. The subsidy system now being considered is only the emergency first step of aid.

Lack of doctors in rural areas goes a long way to explain why Congress suddenly is getting excited about medical training. The chart above shows one aspect of the doctor-supply situation. It shows that there are 137 physicians per 100,000 people now, where there were 140 in 1909. In other words, there is one physician for 730 persons now, where there used to be one physician for 671 people.

Nobody can prove whether or not this is enough physicians. The American Medical Association says that it is, and cites an estimated one-third increase in each physician's productivity since 1940, due to new drugs, better equipment. The Federal Security Agency has adopted as its goal a supply of not less than one for every 585 persons.

What interests Congress, in any case, is that the proportion of physicians is far below the national average in many rural areas.

There has been a steady increase in the number of physicians in relation to population since 1929 for the country as a whole. But the new ones have flocked into cities, away from rural places. Low pay and professional isolation, in rural communities, are the usual reasons.

Many rural areas point to a record like that of Kansas. That State had 2,732 physicians for 1,545,000 people in 1906. Now there are 1,900 for 1,900,000 people.

The East has gained notably in the number of physicians, while other areas have lagged. In Massachusetts there is one pediatrician for every 5,000 children; in Mississippi, one for every 35,000 children.

The regions line up this way, as to supply of physicians:

New England States, plus New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, have 1 physician for every 575 people now, far more physicians than there were 27 years ago.

South Atlantic States have 1 physician for every 800 people. These States have also gained sharply.

All other regions in the country have fewer physicians now than they had in 1923, in proportion to population. That is true of the Midwestern States as a group, the South, the Mountain and Pacific regions.

These facts and figures, as outlined here on the basis of official surveys, form the background for the plan to expand medical training. This plan has been taking shape, largely unnoticed, in the shadow of political battles over national health insurance. It appears to have widespread support in Congress.

But, even if the plan is approved, an economy-minded Congress may cut down on the subsidy when the time comes to appropriate the cash.

Charity Begins at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, early this month, at the joint session of Congress, President Truman delivered his annual message on the state of the Union. This was not a message of defeatism and dejection. It was a fearless and constructive message. It was a timely message outlining the hopes and ambitions of the American people, not only for the next year, but for the next half century.

The message had depth, breadth, and vibrated with hope for peace and progress for all the people of the world. Truly this was the finest message that President Truman has ever given to the Congress of the United States.

This splendid document tells the whole world that the President intends to carry out the Democratic platform of 1948, and calls upon the Congress to back him up.

This bold and fearless message, which foretold of the fulfillment of our democratic pledges at home and our support for the people of the world in their struggle for freedom and liberty, struck fear into the hearts of the reactionaries. The wheels of sabotage were set in motion. How to stop Truman was the $64 question.

Last week the coalition of reactionary Republicans and reactionary southern Democrats showed their hand. They brought out a resolution to give back to the 12-man Rules Committee autocratic veto power over House legislation. The vote was taken last Friday, and without doubt, it was the most important, the most far-reaching, the most crucial battle of this Congress. Fortunately the Truman forces, with the help of a few progressive Republicans, won this fight. If the opposition had won, it meant that the Democratic platform and all of the Truman Fair Deal program was killed for this session.

In the past, pledges and party platforms were absolutely meaningless, a huge joke and a hoax upon the people. They were meaningless because of the veto mechanisms that were set up in the House and Senate, by which a small minority could block the will of the majority and defy the pledges of political parties made in open conventions and approved by the majority of the voters in the Nation.

In the Senate the mechanism for minority veto is the filibuster. The power of the filibuster was increased when the reactionary Republicans and the reactionary southern Democratic coalition got together and emasculated the cloture rule.

Previously cloture could be applied to choke off debate by a majority of those present, which might be 33. The anti-administration coalition raised the number required to 64, thus virtually throwing cloture out of the window.

In the House the 12-man Rules Committee had exercised veto power over legislation since 1884. The Rules Committee was originally designed to control the order of business. This authority was soon perverted and the committee became autocratic and domineering. They took upon themselves the right to pass judgment on the merits of all legislation.

Of course, membership on the powerful Rules Committee was much sought after. It was a great privilege to be 1 of 12 men in the House who could say "yes" or "no" on vital bills. Of these 12 members 8 are Democrats and 4 are Republicans. Of the eight Democrats, four are from the South and on most issues they see eye to eye with the four Republican Members. They like to call themselves "strongly conservative." So,

whether we call them conservative or reactionary, the fact is that this anti-Truman, anti-Fair Deal coalition, has 8 of the 12 votes on this powerful committee. They do not all have to be present at a meeting because six votes is sufficient to block any positive action. So, Government by majority becomes a farce. American democracy cannot meet the challenge of the times. Legislative machinery could not be speeded up. The will of the majority is made ineffective.

The Rules Committee, originally organized as a traffic light for House legislation, had become a road block for everything that it opposed and could smother any bill that it desired to.

When a bill is introduced in the House it is referred to a standing legislative committee, usually made up of 25 members. Many weeks are spent in hearings and deliberations; after much study and hard work the legislative committee would report out a bill only to have it languish in a pigeon-hole in the Rules Committee. So, last year the House took this power away from the Rules Committee. The new system provided that after a 21-day wait a committee chairman can call to the floor any bill on which the Rules Committee has not acted.

On Friday the Truman opposition tried to abolish the liberalized rule adopted last year. They were beaten by a vote of 236 to 183. It was a great victory for the people. No longer can 6 or 7 men on the Rules Committee thwart the will of 435 elected Representatives of 150,000,000 people.

It is too soon to say that the battle is over, however. This powerful coalition will try again when the proper opportunity presents itself. The second and fourth Mondays of the month are reserved for chairmen of legislative committees to call up bills under the 21-day rule.

Last Monday, by forcing six or seven unnecessary roll calls, thereby stalling the legislative machinery and preventing chairmen of legislative committees from calling up the bills pigeonholed in the Rules Committee, this hard and unrelenting coalition showed that it is still unwilling to accept the verdict of the people in the 1948 elections, and in defiance of the wishes of the American people, this group, with the Republican leadership in the vanguard, has shown that it will resort to every dilatory tactic to bottle up important legislation included in the program submitted to Congress by the President of the United States.

Yes, the people have rejected the Republican Party in five consecutive presidential elections, but still by political chicanery, with the aid of some reactionary southern Democrats, they may yet gain control of the legislative machinery.

In recent months we have heard much moaning and groaning about the welfare state, statism, socialism, and just generally, that Truman and the Democrats are driving the country to the dogs. This propaganda was played up strongly in the last 3 or 4 months of 1949.

But since the annual reports have been published showing corporate and business earnings for last year, those political and professional wailers have slowed down to a mere sniffle here and there.

Here, I hold a Detroit newspaper dated January 17, with the headline "Profit sets record for all firms," and that General Motors Corp. earned more profits last year—over $600,000,000—than any other company ever made in a similar period, Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., chairman of the board, revealed today.

Addressing 500 leaders in industry, finance, and civic affairs at a Forward From Fifty luncheon, preliminary to the company's annual auto show—the Midcentury Motorama—opening Thursday, Sloan termed 1949 a satisfactory year for the industry and for General Motors. Last year's profits, he said, "are likely to move up to over $600,000,000. Such a figure is well over $13 a share on outstanding common stock, on which 1949 dividends totaled $9 a share.

EXCESS 1948 FIGURE

In 1948, net income amounted to $440,447,724, or $9.72 a common share, while common dividends that year aggregated $4.50 a share.

When I presented this to some of our Republican groaners and moaners in Congress, the answer was "Well dogone it anyhow. You Democrats are not supposed to read the financial pages."

But in a couple of weeks when they feel sure that the people have forgotten all about these earnings and huge profits, out will come the big red bandana handkerchiefs and the tears will be profuse and voluminous, the wailing, the moaning, and the groaning will increase in tempo every week—yes, sir, right up to November, because there is an election this year.

One of the problems that I am most deeply interested in is that of old-age pensions, and adequate social security. For years this problem has been bantered about. Finally, last year, the Ways and Means Committee reported out H. R. 6000 which passed the House with only 14 votes against it. This bill is now before the Senate for consideration. I hope that the Senate will liberalize the provisions of this bill because it was brought up under the so-called gag rule in the House and there was no opportunity to amend it on the floor.

Now, since the House passed H. R. 6000 the whole pension issue has broken wide open as a result of labor-management conflicts. The auto workers, steelworkers, and coal miners have fought a strong and determined battle for a $100 monthly pension. The Townsend-plan workers are more active than ever. Big business, headed by Herman Steinkraus, president of the Chamber of Commerce, fearful of the effect on private business of the private pension-plan agreements won by the unions, is now supporting a broader Federal-aid program. Private industry therefore will support bigger Federal benefits in order to shift some of the burden of private pensions.

So, the lesson learned is that when you hit the company pocketbook, they too will join in the parade for adequate Federal aid for the aged.

Under the bill passed by the House, the vast majority of needy aged would not receive pension insurance as their right, but would still have to rely on charity from the assistance programs. I believe that these old people should remain as a group of active consumers. That is the position that the Townsend plan people take. I also believe that annuities should begin at the age of 60 years.

The one thing that this Nation can afford and must provide is a real measure of security for its old people and its disabled citizens.

To keep our internal economy sound and to guard against any sudden emergency, I believe that the Federal-State unemployment insurance system should be strengthened by establishing a minimum standard of $30 a week benefits—with additional amounts for dependents—for all parts of the country and extending coverage up to 26 weeks.

All of those big business and big banking interests who have been so loud and insistent in their support of the Marshall plan and China-aid programs are always quick to point out that a certain portion of these free Treasury dollars will be spent for United States goods and services. That the expenditure of this money means markets for farm products, automobiles, and tools.

Well, how about a little domestic Marshall plan for our own people—those who are sick, aged, unemployed—for those communities that need hospitals, schools, teachers, and nurses?

Is not every one of these dollars going to be spent right in our own country for farm products and manufactured goods?

Why is it that the same people, the same big and powerful interests who are so anxious to raid the United States Treasury to spend money in Europe and Asia are always leading the parade in opposition to domestic programs in the best interest and welfare of our own people? The only obvious answer is that there is money and profits in the European and Asiatic deals, and they cannot snip anything off on the domestic programs. Therefore, our program is called the welfare state and socialism.

I think that it is a simple truth that full employment in our country depends on the ability of consumer purchasing power to keep pace with the steady increase in production of goods and services. To guarantee steady and expanding markets there must be an increased flow of real income to the American people. This also calls for an economic uplifting of our substandard families. I feel that our domestic welfare programs have been slashed too deeply already, and that we are endangering our paramount objective which is permanent full employment. I believe that substantial cuts can be made in appropriations for the Marshall plan and the military. More than one-half of our tax dollar is going to those two sources.

President Roosevelt laid down a postwar program for peace and prosperity. The foundation for this is the United Nations and two of the cornerstones are the International Trade Organization and the World Bank. Roosevelt had told the Congress and the whole world, including Mr. Churchill, right after the second UNRRA appropriation, that there would be no more free dollars available, that the American economy could no longer stand the strain. Mr. Roosevelt had proposed the International Trade

Organization and the World Bank as a means of financing world trade for the postwar period. The ITO was to provide multilateral agreements so as to give to all the nations an equal opportunity to trade in all the markets of the world for raw materials, supplies, and machinery. The bank was to finance this world trade. We have 38 percent of the stock in this bank; the bank was to issue bonds paying 2½ percent interest, and the bank was to charge 4½ percent interest for the loans that it made. This was sound business policy. We were assured of the return of our money; yes, not only the return of it, but 2½ percent interest upon the bonds that we bought. Now, would any Member of Congress oppose the purchase of ten or fifteen billion dollars worth of these interest-bearing bonds? I do not think so. Was this not a better program than the Marshall plan? Yes; but the recovery of the world would have been assured, and there would be no necessity for bilateral trade agreements which are aimed at destroying the trade of the United States of America and putting us out of the world markets. Yes, by doing business through the World Bank we were assured the return of our money or the defaulting nations would lose faith and credit in the whole family of nations.

Well, now of course, this program did not suit Mr. Churchill, who was looking for more free hand-outs for England. This proposal did not suit those Americans who had a $1,000,000,000 prewar investment in Germany and were seeking free United States Treasury dollars to triple or quadruple this kitty. Of course, this program did not suit the international cartelists, monopolists, and the big international banking houses, who worked hand in hand with the international cartelists—but then Franklin D. Roosevelt died. So Mr. Churchill came to Fulton, Mo., made his famous speech that left America shaking and quivering with fear. The hysteria grew and mounted, and the free American dollars started to roll out again. Mr. Churchill won, England got her money, the German barons and the Japanese zaibatsu will be handed back their war plants and industries, newly restored with the latest American equipment and machinery, and the latest American production methods. It is time to stop, look, and listen. Charity begins at home.

You'd Smile, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, as one who last year opposed the tax exempt $50,000 expense allowance increase for President Truman, it is with pleasure that I insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Bremer County Independent, a newspaper published at Waverly, Iowa:

Ever see a picture of President Truman when he wasn't smiling? Well, if we had $56,000 left out of our salary after paying Federal taxes, got an extra $40,000 expense allowance, plus an additional $50,000 expense money in January, all tax-exempt, we wouldn't just smile—we'd laugh out loud!

Haym Salomon, a Hero of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the heroes of the American Revolution was that great patriot Haym Salomon. We remember this month the one hundred sixty-fifth anniversary of the death of this man who carved for himself a place of honor and dignity in the annals of American history by his selfless support of the cause of American democracy.

Haym Salomon, who is described by American historians as "the financier of the American Revolution," was a Jewish immigrant from Poland. He was born at Lissa, Poland, in 1740 and arrived in New York in 1772. He settled in New York and opened a brokerage office on Broad Street. He was among the early supporters of a little group of American patriots who advocated independence for the American Colonies. Because of his ardent activities in this patriotic organization, known as Sons of Liberty, he was arrested by the British on September 26, 1776, and confined at the famous Citadel.

About a year later he was released, continued his activities with the American patriots, and early in 1778 was again arrested by the British, court-martialed for spying for the patriots and sentenced to be hanged. With the aid of the Sons of Liberty, he succeeded in escaping and fled to Philadelphia. There he reestablished his business connections which enabled him to make contributions of vast sums for the patriotic cause during this crucial period in American history.

I am privileged to call your attention to the following article by Harry H. Schlacht, which appeared in the New York Journal-American and other papers throughout the country on January 13, 1950:

HAYM SALOMON: THE FORGOTTEN MAN OF HISTORY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

We open the golden book of memory. We thank God for our heroes of yesteryear who have by their vision and their faith, who have by their courage and their lives, bequeathed to us our priceless heritage.

We remember with gratitude the one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of the death of Haym Salomon. He was the great Jewish revolutionary patriot whose qualities of mind and heart endeared him to our founding fathers.

Let America remember and acclaim this great benefactor and patriot. Here was a man of great character, of noble self-sacrifice, of wholehearted patriotism, of martyr-like devotion to high ideals.

If our Nation is great, it is because such men have made it great.

Haym Salomon came here seeking liberty. He came here to help build a nation which gives to bigotry no sanction, no persecution no assistance. He was a man of humility. He was a man of self-denial. He was a simple man, the badge of a great soul.

The American Revolution was a time that tried men's souls. It was a time that also tried men's purses. When Gen. George Washington called upon him for aid, Haym Salomon placed at his service his wealth and fortitude, his enthusiasm and energy in freedom's holy cause. He was an institution in himself. He became part of our glorious inheritance. It was he who helped raise the money to equip the Continental Army. It was he who contributed his entire personal fortune of $640,000. It was he who gave his all, and all he could borrow to enable General Washington to keep his tattered forces on the march until victory was won.

Haym Salomon died penniless.

From the very birth of our Nation to the present day, the descendants of Haym Salomon have been the dauntless defenders of American liberty. They have written their names in flaming letters upon the treasured pages of American history. They have played a noble role in the Government of our country. They were identified with our colonial growth. They have fought with glory in all the wars of the Republic. They have won the highest commendation from every President of our Nation. They have helped write liberty in the skies all over the world.

Haym Salomon belongs to America. He is part of the very heart of our Nation. He is ours by more than patriotic self-devotion. He is ours by the unshakable gratitude for his services in the crisis of our fate. He belongs to America by that tie of love which is stronger than death, which links his name for the endless ages with the names of Washington and Jefferson, Morris and Madison, and the other great immortals of our glorious history.

Let America remember Haym Salomon. Let Congress set aside a Haym Salomon Day. Let the President sign this resolution. Let his name be revered as long as America shall live. Let his example be a beacon light to all Americans. Let us be strong in the faith of Haym Salomon, whose memory we honor.

Mr. Speaker, as suggested by Mr. Schlacht in his very fine editorial, I have today introduced a joint resolution making January 6 of each year Haym Salomon Day. I hope that it will soon be adopted by the Congress.

An Honorable Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial from the Lock Haven Express, of Lock Haven, Pa. This editorial speaks for itself and expresses exactly my own sentiment and what I believe to be the sentiment of almost every Member of Congress:

AN HONORABLE CAREER

Congress won't be the same without BOB RICH.

His decision not to be a candidate for reelection in this year's campaign is received with sincere regret by his host of friends and admirers, including many who may have opposed him politically but could not fail to recognize his sincere purpose and sturdy convictions on matters of principle.

During his 18 years in Congress, and even including the 2-year term when he surrendered his seat to stay on the sidelines, Mr. RICH has been a consistent and sturdy spokesman for the fundamental principles to which he has been committed throughout his 20 years in public life on the national scale—solvency in government. He has been one Congressman whose record has been steadily consistent in two predictable areas—Federal economy and service to his constituents.

There is a sort of poetic compensation in the fact that, after years of what Williamsport Grit yesterday described as "crying in the wilderness," Mr. RICH now retires from Congress in an atmosphere of an increasing Nation-wide concern for governmental economy.

He may have been a prophet without honor among some of his congressional colleagues during the past 20 years, as he insistently demanded to know where the money was to be found to finance expanding governmental operations, but even the skeptics now can see the day of reckoning approaching. He will leave Congress at a time when the old-fashioned virtue of economy, which he championed through the season of scoffings and scornings, is winning respect and even popularity as Congress and the country see the national deficit growing by billions each year.

The Fifteenth District owes Mr. RICH a real tribute of gratitude for his congressional service, for he has turned in an amazing performance of conscientious and careful service on behalf of his district.

Regardless of party, residents of the Fifteenth District could be sure that any request or query they might make to Mr. RICH's office would be attended to as swiftly and satisfactorily as possible. The Congressman and his efficient office assistants have given this district outstandingly efficient day-to-day service on the multitude of matters in which a Congressman must act as the Washington spokesman for the people of his district.

It is no exaggeration that Mr. RICH has set an extremely high standard of service in this respect—a standard any successor will have a hard time to match, certainly during the first years of his career as a new Congressman.

Tree Farming Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Commercial Appeal of January 20, 1950:

TREE FARMING INCREASES

Reports from American Forest Products, Inc., say that tree-farm acreage passed the 20,000,000 mark in this country last year. At year's end the Nation had 20,000,102 acres of privately owned timberlands dedicated to the perpetual production of wood for commercial use. This acreage represents 2,242 different ownerships in a total of 27 States.

Of special interest is the fact that the reports show the South led the Nation, and for the fifth consecutive year, in increasing its tree-farming acreage. During 1949 the South added 1,151,759 acres to the total number set aside to do nothing but grow wood. Alabama leads the South in the number of tree farms, with 325, but Arkansas, with 251 farms, is ahead in acreage with 3,009,843. Mississippi has 226 tree farms amounting to 738,792 acres and Tennessee has 231 farms totaling 290,193 acres.

It is to be hoped that the South continues to advance rapidly along these lines. That they have profitable possibilities was vividly illustrated just recently when a new $32,000,000 paper plant began operations near Childersburg, Ala., to offer landowners in the area a steady income from tree farming.

Legislative Objectives, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a digest of the legislative objectives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The matter referred to follows:

LEGISLATIVE OBJECTIVES OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JANUARY 17, 1950.

The following legislative objectives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States are subject to the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and are based on resolutions adopted by the 1949 national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States:

1. To increase disability compensation and pensions for World War I and World War II veterans and widows and orphans (Resolution 337). H. R. 909 by Mr. RANKIN.

2. To urge the enactment of the veterans pension bill H. R. 4617, now pending before the Senate Finance Committee (Resolution 211). H. R. 4617 by Mr. RANKIN.

3. To increase the income limitations governing eligibility for widows' and veterans' non-service-connected death pension to $2,000 for those with no children, and $3,000 for those with children (Resolution 343). H. R. 921 by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts.

4. To enact legislation which would provide an equitable adjusted service compensation for veterans of World War II of $3 per day for home service (maximum $3,500), $4 per day for overseas service (maximum $4,500), plus an additional $500 for a wound or wounds received in combat; and that all tangible monetary benefits received by any veteran pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, be deducted from such adjusted service pay (Resolution 335). H. R. 914 by Mr. RANKIN.

5. To urge the President of the United States, (a) to rescind his order for the cutback of the 16,000 beds announced on January 19, 1949, and (b) to issue orders for the prompt construction of these and such other beds as may be required for adequate care of America's disabled veterans (Resolution 432). H. R. 5965 by Mr. RANKIN.

6. To provide a statutory seniority equal to the time spent in the armed forces during World War II for those veterans employed in an industry governed by the seniority system (Resolution 357). H. R. 6600 by Mr. RANKIN.

7. To amend Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, so that any rehabilitated physically handicapped veteran would be allowed to complete a further training course on part-time or night-school basis, provided that such additional training will not exceed the maximum of 4 years, as authorized under existing law (Resolution 226).

8. To provide statutory award for arrested tuberculosis, service-connected, for World War II veterans on same basis as World War I veterans (Resolution 294).

9. To enact legislation providing that all honorably discharged veterans who have served in any and all past armed expeditions on foreign soil and in which the United States took part, be entitled to receive the same medical aid and hospitalization as is extended to veterans of war service (Resolution 57). H. R. 3575 by Mr. KEARNEY.

10. To liberalize existing law relating to the granting of automobiles to disabled veterans so that the Government contribution will be $2,000 instead of $1,600, or in the alternative to support the passage of S. 2115, Eighty-first Congress (Resolution 368). S. 2115 by Mr. PEPPER.

11. To enact legislation providing for chiropractic service in the medical facilities of the Veterans' Administration (Resolution 436). H. R. 1512 by Mr. HOBBS; and S. 2026 by Mr. PEPPER.

12. To urge that all cost of training programs for Veterans' Administration medical and other professional personnel shall be charged to an appropriation separate from the Veterans' Administration appropriation and that any such trainees shall be required to serve for 2 years with the Veterans' Administration upon completing such training (Resolution 450).

13. To amend Public Law 483, Seventy-eighth Congress, to provide death-pension benefits where the serviceman incurred a permanent disability but his death while in the service was not considered in line of duty, although not under dishonorable conditions (Resolution 401). H. R. 5619 by Mr. FUGATE.

14. Endorsing H. R. 1776, which denies apportionment of compensation or pension to the wife of a veteran unless there was continuous cohabitation from the date of marriage or where separation was due to the veteran's misconduct without the fault of the wife (Resolution 451). H. R. 1776 by Mr. RANKIN.

15. To amend part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide that constitutional and developmental abnormalities producing unemployability shall be treated as disability for this purpose (Resolution 395). Covered by H. R. 899 by Mr. RANKIN.

16. To amend Public Law 483, Seventy-eighth Congress, so that widows of World War II veterans would be eligible for pensions on the same basis as now provided widows of World War I veterans (Resolution 234). H. R. 6188 by Mrs. ROGERS.

17. To provide pensions for veterans of the Confederate Army on the same basis as pensions now provided veterans of the Union Army (Resolution 325). H. R. 5621 by Mr. HARE.

18. To enact legislation to exclude commercial insurance payments from consideration as income in determining eligibility for non-service-connected death pensions (Resolution 294). H. R. 3821 by Mr. RANKIN.

19. To enact legislation providing that the interval between technical release from active duty and arrival home within a reasonable period shall be considered active duty for compensation purposes, provided, that disability or death during such period is not attributable to the veteran's own willful misconduct (Resolution 394).

20. To oppose any legislation that would reduce the hospital benefits now available to

veterans suffering from non-service-connected disabilities (Resolution 18).

31. To enact legislation increasing compensation by 20 percent for those having combat-incurred disabilities and diseases (Resolution 251). H. R. 908 by Mr. HIESTER.

32. To urge the enactment of H. R. 6074, which would presume as service-connected the disabilities of veterans of the Spanish-American War for the purpose of obtaining out-patient treatment and hospitalization in facilities of the Veterans' Administration (Resolution 19). H. R. 6074 by Mr. RANKIN.

33. To enact legislation excluding pensions derived from contributory systems in determining income for pension eligibility (Resolution 272).

34. To increase monetary veterans' benefits by 25 percent in the cases of veterans residing in Alaska in order to meet the higher cost of living in that territory (Resolution 1).

35. To amend Veterans Regulation 2676 (B) (4) so as to permit the acceptance of lay testimony in determining service connection for malaria (Resolution 34).

36. To provide a uniform pension program for war veterans, based on attained age or non-service-connected disability, as follows (Resolution 340)—H. R. 2512 by Mr. RANKIN:

Upon being rated 60-percent disability, $60.

Upon being rated permanent and total disability, $72.

Upon reaching the age of 65 years, $80.

Where an aide or attendant is required, $120.

37. To amend Public Law 182, Seventy-eighth Congress, providing for payment of a statutory award for enucleation or loss of use of an eye and loss of use or amputation of an arm, or enucleation or loss of use of one eye and loss of use or amputation of a leg (Resolution 207). H. R. 1260 by Mr. HINSHAW.

38. To extend the time for administrative presumption of service connection for World War II veterans to August 1, 1950, and limit presumption to the diseases now provided for in World War I presumptions (Resolution 208). H. R. 2311 by Mr. MILLER.

39. To enact legislation making permanent the present Federal-aid allotment of $500 per veteran per year established in State and Territorial veterans' homes (Resolution 20).

40. To enact legislation providing out-patient treatment and medication for those veterans who have been hospitalized and are in need of further treatment; or, if hospitalization has been requested, treatment may be authorized when beds are not available, for those suffering from non-service-connected disabilities and who are in receipt of part III benefits (Resolution 321).

41. To extend for 3 years the period during which World War II veterans may receive readjustment allowances under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Resolution 15). H. R. 1376 by Mr. HUNTER.

42. To endorse the bill, H. R. 5479, which provides for reimbursement by the Veterans' Administration of medical expenses incurred by a veteran under certain emergency conditions (Resolution 291). H. R. 5479 by Mr. RANKIN.

43. To enact legislation providing World War I veterans status to those persons serving with the army of occupation between November 12, 1918, and July 2, 1921 (Resolution 68).

44. To enact legislation abolishing or reducing the 5-percent compound interest on insurance liens under World War I insurance (Resolution 47). H. R. 30 by Mr. DAVIS.

45. To enact legislation to entitle veterans rated totally disabled service-connected to reinstate Government insurance (Resolution 114). H. R. 6236 by Mr. RANKIN.

46. To endorse H. R. 5574, providing for certain liberal changes in the NSLI Act of 1940 (Resolutions 407-417). H. R. 5574 by Mr. RANKIN.

47. To oppose the proposal of the Hoover Commission to operate the insurance activity of the Veterans' Administration in a different manner than the other major services of that organization, and to assure that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs retain his present full control over all phases of the Veterans' Administration activities, and operate the Veterans' Administration as one administrative entity (Resolution 430).

48. To endorse the bill H. R. 5331, Eighty-first Congress, which authorizes an equitable adjustment of certain NSLI policies by applying contemplated dividends to unpaid premiums so as to revive lapsed policies (Resolution 433). H. R. 5331 by Mr. RANKIN.

49. To oppose any effort to transfer from the Veterans' Administration its Loan Guaranty Division or any other divisions, departments, or functions (Resolution 255).

40. To oppose any plan which would take from the immediate control and jurisdiction of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, any of the functions of Government which have to do with the care and treatment of veterans (Resolution 431).

Without Issues Voters Fail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the expressions and beliefs of an outstanding American, Justus L. Johnson, clerk of the Appellate Court for the Second District of Illinois since 1920.

His statement is sound and logical. It should be given sincere thought by every taxpayer.

His statement follows:

WITHOUT ISSUES VOTERS FAIL—INCOME, OWNERSHIP AND OPERATION AFFECTED BY REVENUE SYSTEM

Too many people of small incomes have been led to believe that the rich and corporations are carrying the heavy Government expenditures. Many feel the Government actually grants them advantages.

The true facts show that 89.8 of salaries and wages, 69.4 percent of dividends and interest, 88.1 percent of rents go to persons with incomes of less than $5,000 per year. This is the compilation of Father Edward A. Keller, director of economic research of Notre Dame University, in his pamphlet "The National Income and Its Distribution." The figures are from the United States Department of Commerce and the United States Treasury Department.

From whom can more national revenue be obtained? The country's corporations are owned by 18,000,000 stockholders. There are only a very few large corporations having individual stockholders possessing over 1 percent of that company's stock. The exceptions are institutions, schools, hospitals, cemeteries, insurance companies, etc., who account for 41 percent of the ownership of these corporation stocks. But these associations represent millions of people.

The Government already imposes a heavy corporation tax and also taxes the individual stockholder's dividends, which makes a double tax. To increase the corporation taxes will reduce individual stockholder income. The great pool of national income already is in the hands of those receiving $5,000 or less per year. From here on the pinch is more tightly on small incomes if the Government cannot reduce its operating costs.

Every new regulation or tax imposition adds to the cost of production. The business operation or corporation must add the overhead on its output, if it is to continue. There is only one place from which it can get a return—the user and consumer. He is at the end of the line and pays the added cost. He has been made the goat for all added costs. Every time the Government socks the producer or corporation up goes the cost of his article. The hurt is passed on to the ultimate purchaser, who is the fellow with the income less than $5,000 a year. He constitutes more than 90 percent of the purchasing needs.

The producer and the consumer constitutes the neglected groups in the United States. The heavier the added cost of production the higher the price structure. This increases buyer resistance and lessens the volume of production and reduces employment. The fellow who uses the article or goods, pays for everything that has been added to the price. He does not escape because corporation taxes have been upped or the rich have been soaked. These clear by attaching the added costs. As a matter of fact, the consumers, who have nothing to pass on, have been made suckers to supply the income for Government programs he does not understand.

In addition to the millions of employees who work for the Government for pay, other millions are strait-jacketed to become tax collectors, without pay, to build up revenues for Federal spending. Every salesman, every business operator, every assembler and producer, every worker under social security, anyone that sells goods, pays or collects from others to build up accumulations for Federal spending. Services and time that could be used by people, for people, are absorbed in satisfying Government inquiries and reports and overcoming buyer resistance on heavily tax-loaded prices. This is also an overhead on production and distribution and the expense becomes part of the price that the customer must pay. No one speaks up for him in terms he understands. He is the beast of burden who provides for the absorption and carrying of all these weights. Is there not a leader or party who is able enough to become his champion?

We wonder how politicians have so successfully hoodwinked the two largest classes of citizens—the producers and the consumers.

It is time to have new issues in campaigns—freedom—the Constitution—liberty—trade and commerce—your brother's keeper—suffering Europe and starving people—as issues have been worked to death while the producer and consumer in America pays the bill. Strange how this has been camouflaged—how the people receiving less than $5,000 per year are kept from understanding that they are 90 percent of the consuming class and to them is "passed the buck" to provide the payment for making the world "safe for democracy."

Is it not time that someone should arise and speak? Point out the groups that continue to make the little fellow the beast of burden for grandiose schemes and world-wide give-aways?

TAKES ONE-FOURTH OF INCOME

The tax bill in the Nation is above $50,000,000,000 annually, 25 percent of the

whole national income. Forty billion dollars is taken by the Federal Government. Some escape income tax because of exemptions and low earnings. Do they escape paying? Everything carries that indirect burden—that package added to production. In many cases it far exceeds any direct tax load that might have been imposed on the individual. Certainly it is time for the consumers of the Nation, especially those with families to support, to get off the "sucker list" put together by these "Princes of Power and Politics."

Let us get our bearings and understand that the two important groups of people in our country are the producers and the consumers. If a healthy atmosphere exists for these two groups, the remainder fare all right. When materials and goods are produced there is trade and commerce. Without production there will be disaster and it will fall first on business institutions. The American public has been distracted too long. Let's get on the beam—understand our problems. Give adherence to leaders who lead—voices that get their guidance from production centers and from the consumers. Ghost writers and propaganda-inspired solutions do not present basic answers. Change the viewpoint and the American public will take on a crusader spirit. Give the voters something to fight for and there won't be over 43,000,000 voters failing to go to the polls.

FACE THE FACTS

Let's face the facts and give the voter something to support or oppose. Ninety-three million voters were qualified to cast a ballot in 1948. More than 48,000,000 did not vote. Did these nonvoters have positive convictions? People busy with their own affairs want consideration of problems that affect their existence. Meet them on issues in an understanding way and no one will need to drag them to the polls.

Old empires grew to power on control of sea routes and the sea ports controlled the pattern of life. It was trade and commerce. To the Atlantic seaboard in the United States it was normal to think in these same terms. But America is not like Britain, France, Italy, Spain, Rome, Greece, Egypt, etc. More than three-fourths of America is not on the seaboard and from the very beginning of our development it was devoted to production. Attitudes on life, law, politics, what is important, varies where well-being depends on giving something for what you get—it is the code for production. Let the production areas make the slogan for so-called leaders. Let the consumers who pay the bills, say to the politician, "Earn it, not burn it."

The country's problems affect us all. As a practical matter about two-thirds of our voters the country over are traditionally members of the two major parties. They vote the candidates and the party platforms. The party in power has slightly over half of these traditional party men in its ranks. Another one-third of the voters are fence sitters and vote only when aroused to action. For them there must be issues that burn for solution; that calls for judgment and creates a willingness to do something.

In the last national election many Democrats, many Republicans, and very many independents failed to vote. In fact, about 47 percent of the qualified voters did not go to the polls. Now do you think people are not serious? They will follow the candidate with answers. Let the answer come from those who understand the production problem and are a part of it. Let the consumer understand what part of his dollar goes to the producer and what part goes to far away places and programs. We will then get what we are willing to pay for and the "Voice of America" will come from the heart of the people on whom our country's prosperity depends.

No Arab Ghettoes in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe many Members of this House will be interested to know how Israel treats its minorities. Israel's population now numbers about 1,200,000, of whom 175,000 are non-Jewish. Most of this non-Jewish population are Moslem and Christian Arabs.

Here, then, is a state where for the first time in 2,000 years Jews constitute a majority of the inhabitants. What have Jews learned during their long exile when they were always and everywhere a minority, often suffering indescribable persecution and oppression? How are they applying this lesson in their own state today?

The article on this subject, which I am inserting in the RECORD, answers these questions. I trust all Members will take the few moments necessary to read this article and judge for themselves. It was published in the issue of June 10, 1949, of Israel Speaks.

The article follows:

NO GHETTOES FOR ARABS IN MINORITY-MINDED ISRAEL

(By Zvi Shiffrin)

TEL AVIV.—How Israel treats its minorities—especially the Arabs—is a matter of interest for the whole world. Almost every country has had a Jewish minority within its borders for some period during the past 2,000 years, and many people are curious to know just how the Jews have reacted now that the tables have at last been turned.

Right now it's too early for a detailed analysis. Security reasons prevented the complete normalization of the relationship between the Jewish state and her Arab minority. Even its harshest critics, however, have found little to criticize in Israel's treatment of the 70,000 Arabs who elected to remain within its borders.

CULTURAL RIGHTS

Probably the chief reason for Israel's success in this field is that so many of her leaders really understand the Palestine Arabs and their culture. Their policy toward the Arabs rejects the two extremes that hurt the Jews so much in the Diaspora; ghettoization on the one hand, and assimilation on the other. What they want to ensure for the Arab population is equal democratic rights for the individual, and community cultural rights for the Arabs as a group. To carry out a policy like this requires more than tolerance. It demands real understanding.

A minor but highly significant illustration of this occurred at the opening of the Knesset (Israeli Parliament) in Jerusalem. One of the Arab delegates rose to say a few words, in his native tongue, of course. When he was through, an official translator repeated his remarks in Hebrew. Then to the amusement of all, Foreign Minister Moshe Sharett, one of Israel's leading Arabic scholars, asked for the floor and pointed out that the translator had made a slight mistake. Sharett then proceeded to give the correct version while the Arab delegates beamed with satisfaction.

Thus far the Israel Government has undertaken rehabilitation measures for the Arabs extending into every sphere of life—religion, employment, education, health, even marriage and divorce. Whenever possible, Arabs themselves are entrusted with the administration of these activities. Each ministry has a special department to look after the Arabs. Thus the Department of Labor takes care of Arab employment, while the Department of Health is responsible for Arab health. It is felt that the problems are so complicated that this method works better than setting aside one ministry to cope with all Arab needs.

FILL MINISTRIES TWICE

A good example of the work done by the Government is the record of the Ministry of Religion. The mass Arab exodus last summer left Israel's Moslems without religious leadership. (Most leaders of Christian Arab communities remained, however.) From the Mufti down, Moslem priests (imams) and judges (kadis) left their people to wait until the Arab forces would march triumphantly into Tel Aviv. While they waited, the Israel Government proceeded to fill the vacuum. They had to do something, because without the proper Moslem officials, there could be no Arab marriages. And how could a minority be happy without any marriages?

The Israeli authorities charged with dealing with this intricate subject had to start from scratch. With the assistance of special Baison officers appointed by the Army the Government authorities immediately took charge of the deserted mosques and religious courts. The mosques were repaired and, in many cases, again put into use. The destroyed archives of the religious courts were reassembled and the Ministry of Religions appointed a special committee to deal with Moslem holy places. This committee was headed by Prof. I. A. Meir, of the Hebrew University and its function was to advise the ministry on the conservation of Moslem religious sites.

A search was made and a few suitable candidates for the job of kadi were found. Their pay was raised substantially above what it was under mandatory rule and their courts are now operating in Jaffa, Haifa, Majdal, Tiberias, Nazareth, Acre, and other places. They have full authority to perform marriages and divorces. It is hoped that the second stage of Moslem jurisprudence—the appellate division—will soon be reestablished.

MOSLEM PROPERTY

How to hold religious services for the Moslems presented another difficult problem. So far, more than 35 religious dignitaries of various grades have been reinstated, but the number is woefully inadequate. What the Government plans to do is to reopen the Achmadi Seminary in Acre in order to provide enough functionaries to conduct Moslem rites.

The possessions of the Waqf—Moslem religious authority—are very extensive, and taking care of them has proved to be a complicated affair. Previously they were under the control of the now nonexistent Supreme Moslem Council. A detailed plan on how to manage and dispose of these lucrative holdings still has to be worked out by the Government. In the meantime, the limited income derived from the Waqf property is being spent on the maintenance of Moslem religious services and various welfare activities.

Eventually the Government wants to give the Moslem religious community complete responsibility for the direction of its own affairs, with only a liberal and discreet control from Tel Aviv.

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

The Jews hope to cement permanent friendship with the Arabs—not by buying

individual notables—but by instilling local self-government in every village and by giving them a share in the democratic rule of of the state. As one official puts it, "We're not satisfied merely to make the condition of Israel's Arabs better than that of the Arabs in Moslem countries. And of course, we would never force the Arabs to live the way Jews in Arab countries do. What we do contemplate is raising the Arab standard of living to that enjoyed by the Jews in Israel."

There will be no second-class citizens in Israel.

Foes Seen as Aiding Fair Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Paul Pioneer Press of January 8, 1950:

FOES SEEN AS AIDING FAIR DEAL

(By Gustaf A. Nordin)

WASHINGTON.—The conservatives of the American political scene may today be devising the very method for the Fair Dealers to extend the welfare-state program which they so bitterly attack as socialistic.

It may sound impossible that a conservative Republican President—Herbert Hoover—may have built the vehicle in which a Democratic President—Harry S. Truman—will ride to victory. But there is reason to believe it not only might happen—but that it already has.

Herbert Hoover was appointed by President Truman to head a commission which would find means of reducing Government expenditures, some way of getting more for every tax dollar spent.

The conservative Mr. Hoover accepted the task and named a flock of task forces to dig into every governmental closet. President Truman gave his full support. The doors of the agencies opened, the books were laid bare. No one dared object to such a bipartisan effort to save the taxpayers from a top-heavy Government.

Experts in the field of finance, accounting, and research gladly agreed to help a bipartisan legislative body do the job proposed.

They did their work so well and thoroughly over a 2-year period that detailed accounts on how the Government was wasting money quickly were provided. The President again gave his blessings and Congress, eager to appear economy-minded, set in motion the legislative machinery to carry out the Hoover Commission recommendations.

Billions of dollars are to be saved through the recommendations.

All factions of all parties agreed with the philosophy of thrift. But did they really? Did they all want economies for the same reason? It doesn't really appear to be the case.

Mr. Hoover soon will discover that he has been talking all the time about saving taxpayers' dollars. He thought he was recommending a way of cutting down on Government spending. He figured the outlay of dollars would be less if his plan was promptly carried out.

The Fair Dealers, who are supporting President Truman's welfare proposals, don't see it quite that way. Their program is condemned by Mr. Hoover and the Republicans generally, but it is to help finance the welfare program of the Fair Deal which prompts them to suspect wholeheartedly the work of the conservative Mr. Hoover.

The Fair Dealers want to make the Government efficient so that more money can be made available for extending the Fair Deal.

They are not talking about reducing spending, as Mr. Hoover and his followers. They are talking about economy through efficiency, so that the multi-billion-dollar Federal budget need not be increased and yet leave several buildings for the new programs.

If Herbert Hoover's plan could save $5,000,000,000 annually, for instance, this money could be used for the compulsory health insurance plan, extension of social security, Federal aid to education, and any other program which might cost money not now available.

* * * * *

So spending could go up if the people insisted upon the rest of the Fair Deal program.

A few days ago, Dewey Anderson, head of the Public Affairs Institute, a privately financed research group, quit the Hoover citizens' committee. His reason: The former President tried to commit us to a set of principles that is anathema to every New Dealer and Fair Dealer. He objected to a Hoover speech which Anderson said would establish a limited Government, a ceiling on public expenditures.

Perhaps before long the Republican conservatives and anti-Fair Dealers will discover they have helped provide the means by which the welfare state can be more easily financed.

McGregor Opposes Me-Too-ism and Gag Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to discuss House Resolution 133 which was recently defeated by action of the House of Representatives. This resolution, if passed, would have given a majority of the Rules Committee, comprised of 12 members, veto power over every legislative committee in this Congress, and the Rules Committee would dictate to the Congress just what bills would be presented to us for our consideration. It should be remembered that before a bill reaches the Rules Committee it has already been considered by the appropriate legislative committee, after possibly many weeks of hearing, and has already been recommended by the majority of that standing legislative committee for House consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to dictatorship in any form, which certainly includes this legislative body. I do not believe in gag rule of any kind that prevents the membership of the House from expressing by their speeches and votes what they believe to be right. I have been sent to Congress by the people of the Seventeenth Ohio District to express their views, both by voice and vote, and they do not expect me to relinquish my powers or responsibilities to any small group of individuals. I am of the firm conviction that we have some in Congress who are fearful of taking sides or taking a definite stand on some of the issues confronting us. I recognize, had the resolution been passed, that a great many controversial issues would not be presented to us for our consideration. In other words, as stated on the floor of the House, by passing the resolution we would be "taken off the hot seat." But, Mr. Speaker, it is time for the membership of this body to be willing to go on record so that the people that elect us will know how we stand on various issues. Then, after we are recorded either by "yes" or "no" vote, the people will have the opportunity to determine whether or not we express their views, and they will so tell us at the next election. The argument has been put up that only by passing this resolution and giving the power to these 12 men will we be able to stop our enormous expenditures. This statement is in error because of this reason: Legislation covering our expenditures is considered by the Appropriations Committee and they report bills covering appropriations directly to the floor of Congress for our consideration and completely bypass the Rules Committee, in accordance with long-established legislative procedure. We, by our vote on the floor of this Congress, determine whether or not we are in accord with the expenditures, and, I reiterate, the people should know how we stand. We should be honest enough to come out in the open and put ourselves on record in voting on legislation before us for our consideration. It is time for all of us to be willing to stand up and be counted so that the people can decide by our record whether or not they want us to represent them in this legislative body.

Voters Ought To Begin Pinning Down Noncommittal Element in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Mobile Press Register of January 23, 1950:

VOTERS OUGHT TO BEGIN PINNING DOWN NONCOMMITTAL ELEMENT IN CONGRESS

Representative J. HARRY MCGREGOR, of Ohio, is another Member of Congress who has served notice on the Truman administration that he cannot be cutmated on to support deficit spending, tax-raiding, and the concentration of more and more power in a bloated Federal bureaucracy.

He says:

"I definitely oppose the President's program of taking power from the people back home and placing it in the hands of Federal bureaus in Washington:

"I am not in accord with the President's socialized-medicine program and I will continue to strenuously oppose unnecessary Federal expenditures and the philosophy of spend and spend, tax and tax.

"I am not in accord with his demand for increased taxes nor do I believe in deficit spending.

"The time has arrived to cut down expenditures, reduce taxes, and apply a reasonable amount to our national debt."

Every Member of the House and Senate who does not voluntarily make known his position, should be pinned down by his constituents for an explicit statement of position on the raw-deal program devised by the Truman administration.

The people of the United States deserve to know who on Capitol Hill in Washington is and who is not a congressional puppet of the Truman administration where its raw-deal program is concerned.

It's time for the voters to begin calling the roll of those Members of Congress who have been vague or noncommittal as to where they stand.

H. R. 6769, To Amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMAN C. CROOK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, having been born and reared on a farm, and continuously keeping in close contact with the pulse of agriculture, I sincerely want my rural friends to know that I have always considered agriculture to be one of the very basic enterprises of our country. In fact, the prosperity and economy of our Nation, the success of our various industries, and the welfare, health, and happiness of our people are highly dependent upon the tillers of the soil and the products from the farms.

Let us be reminded that approximately all the wealth of our Nation comes from soil and toil, and those that toil in and on the soil are entitled to a fair share of the wealth they help to produce.

In recent years, through legislative enactments, we have been quite successful in providing the farmers of our Nation with conditions conducive to giving them a fair opportunity to dedicate their efforts in a constructive manner, exalt the dignity of their calling, and receive a reasonably fair share of the wealth to which they are entitled. Others just starting in the agriculture arena, and some with years of tenant farming experience, but sadly handicapped for want of capital to adequately equip a farm or rebuild impoverished soil, have now found a vehicle that makes it possible for them to become successful farm operators or owners of a family-size farm.

Since 1935 special aid has been given to low-income farmers by the Resettlement Administration, which was reorganized as the Farm Security Administration in 1937. The Bankhead Farm Tenant Act of 1937 authorized loans for tenant purchase and loans and emergency grants for rural rehabilitation. The Farm Security Administration was replaced in 1946 by the Farmers Home Administration, which gave permanent status to the production and subsistence loan program formerly carried on by FSA.

So we may rightfully say that the FHA program was given inception to assist worthy tenant farmers, potential farmers and GI's that were unable to obtain enough insured loans from banks to adequately establish themselves so they could become operators or subsequent owners of farms.

The FHA program has been a very meritorious one. It has met with success and pays incalculable dividends. In fact, it has been a godsend to those worthy and energetic farmers who avail themselves of the provisions incorporated therein. Checking many of the FHA farms in my congressional district, I was happy to find that the operators or purchasers of said farms had gained a new lease on life, were doing an excellent job of farming and were much in advance of required payments on interest and principal. Many of the farmers will clear their indebtedness within a span of 10 years.

Up to the present time the ownership loan under FHA, in most cases, has been limited to $12,000. Considering the present high cost of land, farm equipment, building materials, fencing, fertilizer, modern utilities, and so forth, so essential for successful and profitable farming, I am thoroughly convinced that the FHA farmer could well use a larger farm-ownership loan to a decided advantage.

So I have introduced H. R. 6769 in this second session of the Eighty-first Congress to amend the farm-ownership loan provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to increase the amount which may be loaned with respect to certain farms.

Said resolution provides that the second sentence of section 3 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Loans may not be made for the acquisition or enlargement of farms which have a value, as acquired, enlarged, or improved, in excess of whichever of the following is higher: (1) $15,000, or (2) the average value of efficient family-type farm-management units, as determined by the Secretary, in the county, parish, or locality where the farm is located.

In conclusion, I wish to say a loan of $15,000 on a farm cannot be considered exorbitant, considering the price one pays for a reasonably good house and lot in the average city.

If Jackson Only Knew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT A. MEYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Oklahoman of January 22, 1950:

IF JACKSON ONLY KNEW

All of these $25-a-plate banquets to be served by the Fair Dealers will be called a celebration of Jefferson and Jackson Day. And we suspect that it is a mighty good thing for the promoters that Old Hickory knows nothing at all about it. If he did, he might erupt from his grave with the pistols he once used so effectively against just anybody who had stirred his Hibernian wrath.

For Andrew Jackson was the sworn foe of the national debt. He was pledged to pay off that debt in the days of his Presidential candidacy. And when he became President he paid the national debt. For the first and only time in our history the National Treasury was debt free in the closing years of the Jackson tenure.

Now the party that has created the largest national debt in human history is on the eve of staging a series of political feasts, and the promoters of those feasts are pleased to call the day of the festivals Jackson Day. Men who have built up the largest national debt known on earth since time began and who are driving desperately to add billions to the sum of the indebtedness have the audacity to name the day of their banqueting after the only President in American history who paid the national debt and left the National Treasury debt-free.

It is a good thing that the shade of Andrew Jackson doesn't know what is going on. A good thing that in for the puny politicians who have swamped the Nation in debt and then boasted that they are Jacksonian Democrats.

Cooperative Banks Favor Tax Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

BY

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution recently adopted by the executive committee of the Massachusetts Cooperative Bank League:

MASSACHUSETTS COOPERATIVE BANK LEAGUE,

Boston, Mass., January 24, 1950.

The Honorable ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GOODWIN: At a recent meeting of the executive committee of this league, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, and I was instructed to so inform you:

"Whereas the cost of government, Federal, State, and local, has continued to increase until today more than 25 percent of the national income is taken in the form of taxes for the operation of government; and

"Whereas the Massachusetts Cooperative Bank League, like similar organizations throughout the United States, represents, through its members, thousands of substantial citizens who are either buying their homes on monthly payments or who by self-denial are endeavoring to accumulate by savings a down payment on a home which they hope someday to own, and yet another group who by small monthly savings are endeavoring to build a modest competence for their old age; and

"Whereas every dollar expended by the government, whether Federal, State, or local,

is a dollar taken from those thirty million and handicaps them in their efforts toward personal security—a situation startling not only in Massachusetts, but in every State in the Union: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the executive committee of the Massachusetts Cooperative Bank League, on this its December meeting, calls upon our representatives and Federal, State, and local government officials to give heed to the excessive cost of government and bend every effort to reduce expenditures and particularly to eliminate unnecessary services."

Respectfully,

W. M. ALLEN, *Executive Secretary.*

The King Cannot Err

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT A. MEYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Oklahoman of January 22, 1950:

THE KING CANNOT ERR

In the ultrapartisan debate in the House of Representatives Friday, Speaker RAYBURN beat back the opposition right handsomely with his rhetorical question, "Who won the election in 1948, anyway?"

Of course, the answer was obvious. No Congressman could doubt and none would dare deny that Mr. Truman won that election. And no one could quarrel with the Speaker for asking such a question.

But the implication of that question is a different matter. In effect it was a categorical assertion by the Speaker that since Mr. Truman was returned the victor in the 1948 plebiscite, all opposition to the President and his policies should cease on every line. Whatever the President asks for should be granted meekly, even if the Congress is convinced that its acquiescence would be ruinous.

The question further implies that since the President won on a certain program in 1948, he has the absolute right to present an entirely different program in 1950 and that it is the duty of Congress to accept the change. Since the people declared that the 1948 program was right, nobody has any right to say that the 1950 program is wrong. In other words, when a President has carried one election, he has the full right forever thereafter to say how Congress shall vote, what the people shall think, and when his opponents shall cease to do any thinking at all.

It happens that the question before the House Friday was a proposed change in the House rules. Of course the House has the right to choose its own rules and to change them at will and no one else has any right to interfere. Certainly it is not the function of the President to write the rules of Congress. Nevertheless, the Speaker chose to imply that since the country went Democratic in 1948 the House is bound to adjust its rules to Mr. Truman's wishes.

The spirit that underlay the RAYBURN interrogatory was at one time dominant in Great Britain. At that time the spirit was expressed in the formula, "the king can do no wrong." And for centuries the people of Great Britain agreed that the king could do no wrong. But finally they began to question it. And the more determinedly they questioned the principle of royal infallibility the faster their bill of liberties grew. Finally the American colonists reached a point where they seriously doubted if the king could do anything right.

Now by implication the Speaker of the House revives in a small way the old discredited formula that the king can do no wrong. The President was elected in 1948, wasn't he? Therefore no man born has any right to oppose him on any issue whatever. When he commands Congress to do something, Congress is guilty of a mild form of treason if it fails to do it. He was elected President, wasn't he?

This policy of blind recognition of executive infallibility may be good politics. It may help a partisan President to have his partisan way. But it is extremely questionable Americanism.

Terminal-Leave Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to state that on January 12, 1950, I appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services urging favorable action on legislation which would extend the date for veterans to file application for terminal-leave credits at which time I filed the following statement with the afore-mentioned committee:

On February 3, 1949, I introduced legislation H. R. 2235, which would extend the date for veterans filing application for terminal-leave credits to June 30, 1950. No action was taken by the Armed Services Committee on this legislation in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

I am happy to know that your subcommittee is now considering H. R. 9205, introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], which in effect is the same as my bill except for the date.

It is my understanding that the committee is being asked to extend the deadline to June or July of 1951. This meets with my complete approval.

It makes little difference to me whose name appears on the bill, since I believe we are concerned only that equity be done here by granting the veterans who have this money due them the right to apply for these credits, if by inadvertence they failed to meet the previous dead line of September 1, 1948.

I have no way of knowing how many veterans have been denied their justly-earned terminal-leave credits, but I would presume that several thousand are involved. I firmly believe that such veterans should be given an opportunity to file for their terminal-leave credits, and, therefore, respectfully urge that the subcommittee favorably act upon this legislation.

Address of Leonard W. Trester

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Leonard W. Trester, chairman of the committee on advertising, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and director of public policy, General Outdoor Advertising Co., Inc., Washington, D. C., delivered before the Lions Club, Madison, Va., on December 13, 1949:

Things seem to change so gradually about us that we are all inclined to forget that we are living in a different world from the one we were born into.

In the lifetime of many of us in this room we have seen the airplane, the radio, the telephone, the automobile, and refrigerator, to mention only a few items, come into existence and be sold into mass consumption.

The accomplishments, the progress, in the period of our lifetimes, has been amazing. If you are 43 years old, you have lived one-fourth of our national history. Yes; think of it, the Declaration of Independence was signed only 173 years ago. How our progress has accelerated from the isolated agrarian economy of that day to the present time, particularly in the period of our own lifetime. The physical changes we have seen stagger the imagination.

But it is more of the subtler changes in our way of life that I want to speak. Sixty years ago 80 percent of our people lived on farms or in rural areas. Today, 90 percent of our people live on 1 percent of the land in the United States. Less than one person in five lives on a farm and this ratio is decreasing every year. One-third of our farms produce four-fifths of all of our agricultural production—all we will need after the world-feeding problem is solved by a few good European harvests.

In the past those living on farms were largely self-contained. Most owned their own property. They ate the fruits of their labors and they spun their own cloth and made their own raiment. The basic necessities of life, however meager, were assured by that kind of existence. In the trading areas business was largely local. Drugs and soap, two generations ago, were brought in from regional manufacturers to some extent. But most of what was sold locally was made in town.

Looking back across the years, consider also the problem of health. In those days we did not live so long. But that was before the day of the specialist. The poor were cared for by private agencies, supported by that out-moded individual whom the income tax has killed, the philanthropist, or by local governments. But the people of modest means had a family doctor who charged on the basis of ability to pay. Expensive specialists, hospital and diagnostic services were unknown. A bad disease was more likely to mean death in those days but not so likely to spell years of working off debt.

Wave upon wave of immigrants were only too glad to take the jobs at the bottom of the ladder, which represented such an improvement over their lot abroad. The immigrant saved and worked for the day when he or his sons might climb the ladder and open a small shop and, as the sociologists like to say, become assimilated to America.

The opportunities of yesterday have not disappeared by any means. The Congress of Industry of the National Association of Manufacturers saw only last week a skit of a displaced person who, coming to these shores 2 years ago, had borrowed $2,000 and set up a business which has already grossed $400,000.

But the fact that freedom of opportunity abounds here as it does nowhere else on earth—the fact that even the poor of our day enjoy luxuries unknown even to our grandfather and envied by the other peoples of the earth—all of this, I say, should not blind us to the climate in which we live.

We live in a time when half of the people of this country do not even own their own homes and one in five do not own their own furniture, even. Thanks to union restrictions, the interdependence of the economy, Government regulations, and all the rest, most are thrown out of work only when it is equally impossible for them to get jobs in the same line somewhere else. In two out of five homes mother goes to work along with dad and brings home at least 25 percent of the family income. In these very homes servants are out of the question because of the cost of human labor, so the children are left to roam the streets. Serious illness can throw the budget out of whack for years to come.

Well over one-third of the people who now populate this country cannot remember the period before the depression of 1929. They remember the long decade when it was not unusual for one out of every four breadwinners to be tramping the streets. They remember the period when NYA or CCC actually represented an opportunity for the youth trying to get a foothold. They have known the insecurity of the war that followed. They, like all the rest of us, know the insecurity of another threat of war, which may well be beyond our control to do anything about, and the fact that we may all be blown to smithereens at any moment, but there are too young to have developed a philosophical attitude toward these contingencies.

Another fact that we must face is that the day in which we live is not necessarily one in which enterprise, initiative, incentive, and perseverance are the royal road to success. Without capital, even the most outstanding, personable, and hard-working folks cannot hope to succeed, except over a very long pull. The hand lathe cannot compete with the electric one. Keeping accounts by hand cannot be done so quickly as with the adding machine. Longhand cannot keep up with a typewriter. Sometimes I wonder whether we do not have too much, rather than too little, rugged individualism in our great country, when I consider that one of every three businesses that opens in a normal year is bankrupt within the next two.

Less than 35 percent of all retail stores in this country have more than two employees. There is one retail store for every 25 families. Three out of five retail stores gross less than $53 a day. Forty percent of all stores are run by proprietors alone or with the unpaid help of their families.

Let us face the facts. There are insecurities in our day unknown in the times of our fathers. Acts of God could cause us in a simpler and earlier day to have to tighten our belts and work harder. But the individual was not at the mercy of man-made systems, union restrictions, and all the rest, over which he as one individual has little control and which can deny him not only a livelihood but also his birthright as a man—pride of accomplishment and the right to spend himself in his work.

If the best our generation can offer is to say that those who long for security can find it in prison, then perhaps it is we who belong there. It is for us, out of our years of business background, to provide some guidance, some constructive and positive leadership—if our philosophy is as sound as we proclaim it to be.

In spite of the longing for security, it should encourage us to know that a Nationwide survey of college graduating classes found these youngsters rate opportunity for advancement as the first prerequisite of a good job, although high-school kids listed it third. But surveys also show that most of those going to work for the first time are not so much interested in risking a connection which gives them a chance of cleaning up financially, early in the game, as they are in a steady job with gradual advancement. This is what they mean by opportunity to advance in business or the profession, not taking a roller-coaster ride.

Is security so bad, when it has raised the home-ownership figures from 35 percent 2 years ago to nearly 50 percent today? And most of the owners earn less than $300 a month and are under 35. Maybe security is to our sons pretty much what our fathers meant when they talked about thrift.

Is security so bad when it impels people to study for self-advancement? One out of every five adults is taking some sort of educational course—extension, night school, and the like. One-third of all loans made by personal finance companies under $500 are for training for self-improvement. That is what most of us have preached to our youngsters and younger employees, but we talk about it under the name of opportunity.

You and I, my friends, must find the answer to this great interest, longing, desire, or what have you, for stability, unless business is to lose not only its profits but its power and prerogatives for leadership.

Our youth are looking to the Government for solutions, because whatever else may be said of its panaceas, the Government's obsession with this problem, for political reasons, I grant you, has been apparent and it cannot be said that their proposed solutions, however much they lacked in practicality, have been short in imagination.

In our youth—yours or mine—nobody expected business, Government, or anyone else to look after people. As I have pointed out, conditions were different—there was no need for it on a widespread scale. The businessman philanthropist plus local governments could more than cope with the problems.

In those days it was the accepted function of business to make a profit. Nobody but crackpots questioned that. And the better profit the company made, provided it came by it ethically, the more respected and successful it was.

Today, however, business has no choice but to assume the responsibilities for increasing all the human satisfaction of the group with which it is associated, as Dean Donald David, of Harvard, puts it.

The reason is that business management as a group is just as much in competition for the loyalties of the public as the individual businessman is in competition with those in his same line.

We live in a day of big labor unions, big Government and big business—all competing for public favor. The Federal Government and the national labor unions are today primarily public relations agencies. In its national health programs, in its housing projects, its electric power developments, they are saying in effect that it can distribute human satisfactions more adequately to more people at less cost than private business. It is advertising its merits through every channel of communications. The national labor organizations recognize the magic of being in favor of the good ends of life and stress their ability to provide, with the aid of a friendly Government, more of the good things of life—a larger share of them—to their members. Labor and agricultural groups, depending on the individual dues of millions of members, have long realized the public relations secret of interpreting themselves, their motives and their objectives in terms of basic human aspirations. Business, on the other hand, has been the only factor so busy in producing the good things of life that it has not had time to win the battles of public opinion and so is gradually losing its right to distribute what it produces. As Government gains ever more control over the distribution of what it does not produce—housing, health benefits, food, electric power—business faces the prospect of becoming the contractor for a Government which will decide what shall be produced, by whom and in what quantities, for what price and how it shall be distributed.

As one industry or profession is taken over after another, the tax burden on the remainder—the shrinking free segment of our economy—becomes ever greater, not only because it is numerically reduced but also because it must pay the subsidies which allow Government to sustain the illusion of greater efficiency, increased distribution and lower costs in the nationalized industries.

We are far down the road to socialism already, so far along that some of my friends who have studied the problem doubt whether the tide can ever be completely turned. I am not that pessimistic, but it is going to take not only herculean efforts but sustained work on the part of us in business to reverse the trend, that I do recognize.

Today 14,000,000 persons, 1 family head in 6 receives Government checks regularly. One out of four aged people in this country are on the public-assistance rolls. The amount spent for Government relief, in payments to individuals in this country last year, was 250 percent of the aggregate amount of dividends paid by all United States corporations. The Government paid out $65,000,000 in Aroostok County, Maine, alone last year to hold up potato prices, as a result pickers' earnings averaged between $20 and $25 a day. Six out of every one hundred breadwinners in the United States work directly for the Federal Government. The Government will operate in the red next year to the tune of $7,500,000,000 assuming the most prosperous sort of conditions.

The Federal Government now costs $100,000,000 a day.

Here is the sort of thing it is doing with that money:

The Government owns 2½ typewriters for each stenographer or typist on its pay rolls.

If you apply to certain Federal agencies for a job, your application is processed through more than 100 different stages.

In Washington alone, the United States Government employs 1,485 press agents, 2,650 botanists, and 5,725 lawyers and legal assistants.

The United States Government has 45 separate Federal offices dealing with housing.

More than 500 Federal offices are located in Chicago alone.

Today the average person must put in 61 working days to pay his taxes. If the administration program carries, he will have to devote the earnings of 81 days' work to this purpose. The bill for taxes will absorb between 75 and 85 percent of all the savings of the people.

Our Federal debt is $250,000,000,000 or more than all the capital assets in the country, and equivalent to $6,297 per family.

The Federal budget itself is a document of 1,670 pages from which it is a practical impossibility to determine the real cost of any activities of Government. These pages are in fine type, almost impossible to read, let alone interpret. For instance, one item in the Veterans' Administration is a single line—salaries and expenses, $848,897,000. On another page in the same budget is a similar short item for carfare and bicycle allowance, $43.

The cost of the application of the so-called Brannan plan to milk alone is estimated at $2,000,000,000 by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

In addition to the 17,000,000 persons receiving payments direct from the Federal Treasury, there are millions benefiting indirectly from approximately $25,000,000,000 flowing annually from the Federal Government to business through subsidies, purchases, construction contracts and other expenditures.

Since the war there have been 23 programs for siphoning off American money, material,

and credit overseas and by last July the total value of our foreign assistance was already $35,000,000,000. To this figure should be added another $7,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000 in usable military equipment left behind in Europe.

Eighteen cents out of every tax dollar you pay goes to foreign aid programs—3½ cents for defense and 18 cents for interest on the debt.

Interest alone is now more than the total cost of the Federal Government in 1939.

Hiring of Government employees is increasing daily. One hundred and fifty thousand will be taken on for the census. Roughly 50,000 full-time permanent new employees were authorized by the last Congress.

Let's take a closer look at this subject of taxes. In 1914, when the income-tax bill was passed with a maximum rate of 1 percent, some cautious Nellies wanted to put a ceiling of 5 percent on by constitutional amendment. They were assured, however, that this was asinine since it was said no one in his right mind could even contemplate the tax rising that high.

Today one-third of the cost of the average item the consumer buys goes to taxes. More than 60 percent of the cost of cigarettes goes to taxes. Corporation taxes have increased 1,000 percent since 1932. Well over 100,000 units—Government-owned corporations, cooperatives and unions—including are escaping much more than $1,000,000,000 in tax liability, 622 hidden taxes take one-third of the cost of a $10,000 home, for which so many of our people are saving and scrimping. There are 116 tax items added to the average store-bought suit of clothing. But we can all take comfort in the thought that there is no Federal tax on coffins, unless the Government leaves us enough to buy one costing more than $100.

Seriously, the hour is late, the situation is alarming. But I, for one, do not expect it to be solved by merely reciting the facts and figures or by a long harangue on taxes. Our people want stability; our youth cannot, for the most part, because of their inexperience, see clearly the road down which we are traveling. Even though they can grasp perhaps the tangible, financial cost, but not the spiritual cost in terms of lost liberties, I believe, from my own observations, backed up by many researches, that there are great numbers of people in this country who would prefer to pay staggering taxes in exchange for a relatively stable existence without too many ups and downs over which they individually have no control. Who, indeed, would not rather bring his children up on a modest salary than in luxury one year and perhaps extreme poverty the next? Nineteen hundred and twenty-nine, when ruined fortunes, suicides, breadlines, and foreclosed mortgages went hand in hand, is an experience deeply etched into the consciousness of even the youngest.

The paradox of our situation is that even under a great tax load, business has demonstrated, with little help from many administration prophets of gloom and catastrophe, that it is the great economic stabilizing factor in our economy.

But business has failed to do a public relations job like its competitors in the arena of public opinion. Business has failed to sell itself. At the very time it has sold its tangible products and wares it has allowed its competition to steal a long march in the ultimate control of distribution of these good things of life.

The problem, oddly enough, is not one of business ability to produce the most human benefits or to produce them most efficiently nor even to stabilize the economy, although sorely hampered by Government and organized labor. That has already been accomplished.

Therefore, it is obviously not enough that we in business do an efficient job of reducing costs, providing jobs, improving quality, or expanding distribution.

Unless these benefits of business are interpreted and understood, it is clear that the public will favor those programs which the politicians promise, even though they as taxpayers must share the burden of paying for them.

National advertising can do a lot to educate the public about the economic benefits of business, just as it has made those benefits possible. But business management, unlike labor, agriculture and a Government administration, suffers from the handicap that it cannot speak with a united voice because the very system which it seeks to preserve is competitive. Nor would it help matters much if business could speak with one voice because people would still judge business in general by the actions and words of the individual businesses which they know. The problem, as we have seen, is not primarily a rational one which can be answered by rational arguments and demonstrated proof, or the problem would not continue to exist. The problem is emotional or psychological.

There just are not enough people in this country either who are enough interested in the viewpoint of business management per se to give it fair hearing or to support that viewpoint, merely because it would preserve power, prerogatives, or profits of business. Therefore, it becomes obvious that business can only win public support by identifying itself with the interest of people in general.

How to do this? The answer is that a lot of little things go to make a good sale. Public relations is looking after the details. The place to make the sale—the people we can influence most—are our employees whom we see every day.

In selling the principle of free enterprise, we should realize that in the past too many of us have been too autocratic and authoritarian in our management of people. We must more and more realize the importance of dealing with people as individuals rather than treating them as a mass. This means giving people an opportunity for advancement, a chance to ask questions about how the company's plans will affect their jobs, and giving them specific information about their work.

Specifically, we should not get into too much detail in trying to run our stores or businesses. We should give each employee broad latitude to use his own common sense and imagination in trying to develop the best techniques of selling, taking inventory, or whatever. Maybe he can teach us something if we don't nap his initiative.

All employees should have a chance to discuss policy with us individually and in a group meeting from time to time. We can then tell them why things are done as they are; and get the benefits of their observations as to how they might be done more efficiently and economically.

We should not go in for general pay raises where they can be avoided. People enjoy knowing they have earned a raise, rather than that it is something forced upon the employer or at any rate, automatically. Periodically, we should review with employees why they are or are not getting raises. And we should be specific about it.

We should try to treat all workers as equals not in proficiency at the job (that would be silly) but in basic privileges, such as vacations, sick leave, and so on.

Consider trying to keep rules down to a minimum. Instead of posting signs such as "Do not run up the stairs—J. C. Scrooge," why not get a cartoon drawn, with a comic figure saying "Don't be a dope, you may slip and fall."

Instead of prohibiting smoking on working hours altogether and having your people constantly slipping out the back door, why not suggest they come up with some practical rules as to how smoking can be handled without offending customers or slowing up the work. You'll probably find you have less smoking in the end that way and the rules will be stricter than your past enforcement of an outright ban.

Have chats with new employees frequently. Not only will this get them to pull on the team and feel the job is worth while but a fresh eye can see a lot of things about any of our businesses which we don't recognize.

Before you start telling your customers or suppliers about some new development in the business, be sure to cover your employees. They can help spread the word, and they will in a negative sort of way if they are confronted with such information by the wife who has heard it somewhere before they are "in the know."

Take them into your confidence, so far as possible, about earnings, the cost of your investment, and how much is needed to maintain your place of business in proper condition. If you don't do this, chances are they think you're taking a lot more out than you really get and that if you weren't such a skinflint you would give them a better Christmas bonus and substantial raise.

These are just a few hints on how to run a business on democratic principles. The reason for doing it is that it is the most satisfactory, ultimately the most profitable, and always the most human way of managing men.

As we learn this, we will be doing the most important job that business must learn to survive. Simple as it seems, difficult as it is, day by day, this is the great challenge facing all of us if we are to pull our oar in the race for understanding ahead. As H. G. Wells once said, "The situation in America is a race between understanding and catastrophe." May you and I do our part to advance understanding. Then and only then, can business move forward with a strong and active faith and devote its entire energies to realizing that higher standard of living for everyone which is nearly within our grasp.

Is the Coal Shortage Critical?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, is the coal shortage critical?

Does the threatened closure of schools and institutions because of the lack of fuel, the suffering which faces families without coal, the curtailing of work in shops and on railroads because of exhausted fuel supplies, constitute an emergency? Or are all of these things daily occurences?

Do these conditions warrant firm steps to get our coal mines in production? Or must we wait until there is a complete collapse, with its hardships, before we take action? I believe the situation is critical. There is a serious coal shortage. I believe that any informed person knows it.

The only reason the Nation has not been seriously hurt by the current coal shortage is because of the blessing of a mild winter. It has alleviated suffering

and made an intolerable situation bearable. That is obvious. Only the kindness and consideration of the weatherman has prevented a disaster.

But the President sees things differently. He seems to be as mired down in his prejudice against using the legislative tools to get coal mined, as the "Mighty Mo'" is stuck in the mud of Chesapeake Bay. He stubbornly refuses to act, regardless of what happens to the country.

If a hard blizzard should strike Colorado and the Nation, I fear the consequences.

I have received telegrams from three schools in my district, plainly pointing out the seriousness of the coal shortage. Their supplies are gone. The officials state they may have to close the schools. They are appealing for immediate relief. Action is necessary. We must get coal on its way. Further delay invites catastrophe.

Under unanimous consent, I include these three telegrams with my remarks:

STERLING, COLO., *January 23, 1950.*

Representative WILLIAM S. HILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Have little over a ton of coal to run junior college. It will only last a few days at most. It will be necessary to have coal at once. Hope you will be able to get action to keep our schools running.

JUNIOR COLLEGE COMMITTEE.
Dr. J. H. JACKSON.

STERLING, COLO., *January 23, 1950.*

Representative WILLIAM S. HILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Only a few days of coal supply left. If the weather gets bad that will be very few days. It is urgent that we have coal. We'll have to close all our schools unless we receive supply of coal at once.

STERLING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.
HAROLD R. WYMAN.

STERLING, COLO., *January 23, 1950.*

Representative WILLIAM S. HILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Here is a shortage of coal. It will be necessary to close our high school unless we can receive some coal within the next few days. Because of State aid we must keep our schools open 172 days. If the schools have to close it would cost the district thousands of dollars. We urge immediate action on your part to get coal for Logan County.

LOGAN COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL COMMITTEE.
A. E. BEEBE, *Chairman.*

The Hiss Conviction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT A. MEYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, much is being said and written in condemnation of the treasonable machinations of Communists and fellow-travelers within our borders which were revealed in connection with the conviction of the traitorous Alger Hiss.

Mr. Frank C. Sands, editor of the Daily Reporter, of Independence, Kans., my home town, in a recent editorial discussing this nauseous Hiss case, concluded by stating:

It is indeed a sad case, far sadder than the deflation of Alger Hiss. The really sad part is what happened to the United States and what probably is continuing to happen through the efforts of persons of similar rathood who remain in positions where they can do great harm.

Because no more important verdict than the Hiss conviction has been reached in our day, and because Mr. Sands in his editorial drives home in telling fashion several factors underlying this case, I am, Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, quoting his editorial in full herewith:

HAS MORALITY CHANGED?

The name of Benedict Arnold still is the blackest one on the pages of history in the minds of average Americans. The Teapot Dome scandal brought to light during the Harding administration created an immense sensation among the American public and the name of Albert Fall, a Cabinet member, was blackened as a result of it.

The conviction of Alger Hiss on a perjury charge, based on the accusation that he lied when he said he had not given American secrets to the Russian Communists, brands Hiss as bad as Arnold and worse than Fall, who only stole money, but the public seems less excited than it was by Arnold or Fall.

Is this because there has been so much Communist treason in recent years that the moral sense of the people is blunted?

A formal charge of treason against Hiss was prevented by the statute of limitations, but he is morally guilty of that crime unless the jury was mistaken in its verdict of perjury.

How probable was it that the jury was wrong?

The former high standing of the accused in governmental circles gave him a presumption of innocence from the start. Compared with his accuser, Whittaker Chambers, he had infinitely greater prestige.

Two justices of the United States Supreme Court volunteered to appear as character witnesses in his first trial. The present Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, said, "Alger Hiss is my friend, and I do not give my friendship lightly."

Hiss was an adviser to President Roosevelt at Yalta and he was secretary general of the San Francisco conference in 1945 which drafted the United Nations Charter. Hiss held top ranking in the State Department under three Secretaries.

When he could be convicted in the face of all that, the evidence must surely have been compelling.

It becomes plain that talk of Communist influence in high places was not a "red herring" as it was described by President Truman in his last campaign.

According to Chambers there were a lot more "red herrings" in the school of fish with which Hiss swam.

Future activities of the administration will show whether the Truman government is more interested in seeing traitors cleaned out or in protecting the reputation of the FDR administration and his own.

A vigorous move to put only Americans on guard cannot be very confidently expected until there is a change in the high command in Washington.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who made the muddled comment that "I feel he [Hiss] may have perjured himself, but I don't feel he ever sold any secret papers," added "It's a very sad case."

It is indeed a sad case, far sadder than the deflation of Alger Hiss. The really sad part is what happened to the United States and what probably is continuing to happen through the efforts of persons of similar rathood who remain in positions where they can do great harm.

Voting on Appropriations

REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to discuss a resolution I introduced which provides as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"5. No bill or joint resolution of a public character making an appropriation shall be finally passed, and no amendment of the Senate to, or report of a committee of conference on, such a bill or resolution shall be agreed to, unless the vote of the House is determined by yeas and nays."

I do this, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of letting us become appropriation-conscious. I have seen in this House not millions but billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money appropriated without even having a majority of the Members of the House present. I think we owe it to the taxpayers of this Nation, our constituents, to let them know how we stand on the appropriation of their money. I hope you will give consideration to this resolution.

Well, a Little More Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it has been a very long time since I last had the pleasure of reading a worth while short story. My attention was directed to a short story published in Collier's for December 24, 1949, and written by Bob Considine, long-time columnist for International News Service. The article is entitled, "Well, a Little More Time."

With the tumult and confusion that is constantly present in our everyday lives, I enjoyed this article all the more, for in it I found a perfect veiled presentation, in a figurative story, of a meaning metaphorically implied but not expressly stated. This allegory should be read by

everyone, and I can assure you that you will enjoy it. Oftentimes, allegories are true to life.

The article follows:

WELL, A LITTLE MORE TIME

[By Bob Considine]

He had grown a bit older through the nearly 2,000 years. And He had been working too hard. The phones had been going night and day, for centuries, and there were millions of newcomers He hadn't been able to meet as yet.

His mother, of course, was the first to notice the few gray hairs around His temples. Quietly, but firmly, she suggested that He get away for a spell, and just before His birthday He decided it might be a pretty good suggestion, at that. He went to the window of His study one clear night and looked things over, trying to pick a vacation spot.

There were more than 20,000,000,000 worlds to tempt Him. All these, of the countless billions more, had passed through the trying years of war and want and had settled down to a point where peace had become an estate much more exciting to their peoples than war. He mulled over which of them He would visit, for He had not been to any of them for a time. But then a distant memory stirred itself and, searching the cavernous oval of the littered sky, He found a tiny, luminous cinder amid an obscure constellation. And after a bit He remembered its name: Earth.

When He announced that He had chosen that forgotten place for His vacation, His mother was a bit vexed.

"The hotel situation is bad there," she reminded Him. "Don't You remember we had some trouble getting reservations?"

He laughed a little, in His kindly way, and assured her that nearly 2,000 years can make a lot of changes in man's hostility to man. She walked away, wondering, and pretty soon Michael, an enormous archangel, with a handsome face and the wingspread of a B-29, came up to Him and sat down.

"I heard You're going on a trip," Michael, the archangel, said. "I'll drive You down. And get you back in a jiffy."

"No, thanks, Michael," He said. "I'll get down all right. And besides, I've been wanting to try some of the transportation down there. Primitive, isn't it?"

And so, on the morning before Christmas, He arrived in New York City, bought some new clothes, took a look around the town, then caught an air liner. He got off at a fashionable winter resort and applied for a room at a nice hotel.

The man behind the desk looked Him over carefully and shook his head. "All booked," the man said. At the next hotel, the desk clerk said the same thing, and at the next and the next. But the doorman at the last place seemed to take a little pity on Him and suggested that He inquire at a place where a lot of young men, bachelors, mainly, seemed to stay.

They were nice to Him there, especially the lady in charge. She said that the town's hostesses and hosts had just about emptied her place looking for extra men to fill in at the numerous holiday parties being held. And would He please tidy up in a hurry? He did, and was happy when the lady in charge said He too had been invited to a party. It would give Him a chance, He felt, to get to know the descendants of those for whom He had undergone certain hardships.

It was a grand party, and He found it stimulating. Nobody caught His name, but He passed that off as one of the inconveniences of this odd little planet. The talk was fine: certain political events had bestirred the men; certain fashion events, the women.

He joined in and found it rather easy to hold His own, for people had talked much like that when He was around the last time. Everybody at the party loved His fairness and easy wit.

Everything would have gone nicely, He supposed later, if the talk had not turned to, "Where are you from?"

They were from an interesting variety of places, He found; places that had sprung up during the split second of the last two or three centuries. He was charmed by the pride they held in their home towns, their schools, their clubs, and the like. Then just before the party was to move on to the exclusive Wampum Club for dinner, He realized that somebody was asking Him the question.

"I was born in Bethlehem," He said. "It's a small place."

"Bethlehem?" His host repeated. "Been there many times, when I was in steel. Fine town!"

"Then we moved on to a town named Nazareth, and finally to Jerusalem."

He didn't notice, for a moment, that a heavy silence had fallen on the room.

The host was the first to recover, boomed for another round of drinks for the other guests, and then took the Stranger by the arm and escorted Him to a quiet corner of the living room.

"Don't mean to be personal, old man," he said, "but You say You were born in Bethlehem * * * moved to Nazareth * * * then Jerusalem?"

"Yes," He said wonderingly.

"What's your profession?"

He thought a bit, then smiled. "I was a carpenter for a time. Then I sort of went on the road, as you say."

"Salesman?"

He thought that over for a time. "Yes, in a way."

"We thought You were a writer, from the beard * * *"

He shook His head. "No, I never got around to that. But I used to talk now and then."

The host thought things over for a long time. "Well," he said, finally, "I hope you won't be offended by this, but we've got to face facts here. Are you Jewish?"

"Yes." He smiled.

The host wheezed again. "Facts," he said, "have to be faced. We were counting on You being an extra man at the dinner at the Wampum. But, I'm sorry, it can't be done. There's a rule, see? Don't blame, me, I didn't make it. It's just a rule. If I bring You, and they find it out, I'll be asked to resign from the club. It's the oldest and best club around here, and we've got to live here, see? I hope You understand."

"Understand? Why, yes; I guess I do. You've already been quite kind to Me."

"Not at all. Not at all. You're interesting. I like your manner. But this is one of those things I can't buck."

The host's wife hovered behind them. "We're late, Horace," she reminded him. "You know how they are about holding tables, especially on Christmas eve."

The guests crowded out on the curb in happy confusion and piled into their convertibles and the chauffeur-driven cars. The sweet sound of racing motors filled the soft night. The host stayed behind, momentarily, and put his arm around the Visitor's shoulders.

"No hard feelings?" the man asked.

"No hard feelings," He answered warmly.

"Well, I got to get along. Nice of you to drop in." The host stepped into his own convertible and roared off.

The Stranger stood for a moment on the curb of the now darkened street. The air was tender in the palms, and it reminded Him vaguely of the palms He had known as a Child, and the palms He had known for one brief Sunday as a Man. He thought for a long time, reflectively. Well, a little more time. Then He chuckled a bit—or was it a laugh?—and clapped on His new hat.

Then He looked up at the star-studded night and cupped His hands around His sensitive mouth.

"Michael!" he shouted at the top of His lungs. "Oh, Michael!"

Will Congress Sell Out?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. Jerry Keohen, one of the publishers of the Montgomery Messenger, of Montgomery, Minn., which appeared in that newspaper on January 13, 1950:

WILL CONGRESS SELL OUT?

The new session of Congress may do much to decide whether we are to continue down the road that ends in statism and dictatorial government, or whether we are to reaffirm the principles and the ideals that made us a great, free, and prosperous people.

A determined effort is being made to fasten the welfare state idea upon the country. Congress will be asked to appropriate billions for cradle-to-the-grave security measures—all of which, of course, would be compulsory. The only logical reasoning behind proposals of this character is that the American people are no longer capable of taking care of themselves, that independence, thrift, self-reliance, and pride are obsolete virtues, and that we must follow the sorry example of near-bankrupt England and dictator-ridden Russia.

An equally determined effort will be made to extend Government ownership and domination of industry and enterprise. This naturally goes hand in hand with the welfare state—the cloth is cut from the same bolt.

It is also possible that an effort will be made to increase the tax rates—despite the fact that they are excessively heavy now, cut deep into the purchasing power of every individual, and make it difficult and in some cases impossible for enterprises to obtain the investment capital they need. That is particularly true of new and smaller companies.

The basic issue was well put by General Eisenhower when he said, "Government ownership or control of property is not to be decried principally because of the historic inefficiency of governmental management * * *. Its real threat rests in the fact that, if carried to the logical extreme, the final concentration of ownership in the hands of government gives to it, in all practical effects, absolute power over our lives." That fine statement should be on every Congressman's desk. We have come nearer than we realize to giving government such power.

Federal Control of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the following address which I delivered before the Rotary Club of Leesburg, Va., on January 26, 1950:

There is no doubt that the paramount difference of opinion today—the one that means most to the future of the United States and the lives of its people—is the controversy swirling around the welfare state idea.

The welfare state means many things. In general, though, it means that the Federal Government takes care of everything—health, education, conditions of employment, income. It's an all-encompassing system that has reached pathetically ludicrous proportions in England with such things as filling out a Government form to get a wig or a set of false teeth.

We have read in recent months of the curtailments the British have been forced to make in this brave scheme. The country has reached the brink of bankruptcy, and the Government, busy taking care of everybody, has been forced to pause and try to figure out how to take care of itself.

But these snags in the great experiment in Britain haven't dampened the enthusiasm of the "welfare staters" in the United States. The technique here is to offer a series of proposals which, from their surface aspect, can be expected to generate substantial public support.

Medical care for all the people, better education, increased interest in elections, adequate opportunity for employment—these, for example, form a group of objectives all of us can endorse. The "welfare staters" assure us they can be achieved painlessly and quickly through Federal legislation. The flaws are not discussed in the sales talk. We have to find them by looking closely at the merchandise now—before we buy it. It's not being sold with a money-back guaranty.

But let us see the effect of these proposals when you add them up and put them all together. The anti-poll-tax bill is a deceiving prelude to Federal control of all now free elections. The FEPC would place control of employment relationship in Washington; repeal of Taft-Hartley would subject the industrial production of the Nation and its workingmen to the caprice of a dozen labor bosses; compulsory public-health insurance would give control of public health to Washington bureaus; passage of the Brannan farm plan, devised by Henry A. Wallace and pledged in the 1948 platform of Wallace's Progressive Party and later adopted by Mr. Brannan without credit to its true author, would vest control of the Nation's food and raw materials in the hands of a Washington bureaucracy; Federal aid to education would place the training of American youth in the hands of an untrustworthy group; housing measures passed and proposed will destroy private business in a large field; continued deficit financing and high taxes will crush the middle classes and small business to extinction. What sort of an America does this add up to in your mind?

Many who are opposed to all other features of this program may protest the inclusion of Federal aid to education in this group.

Although always suspicious of the proposal, I confess that, at first, I was not convinced, as I am now, that the sort of Federal aid to education program pending in the Congress is the worst of all of these plans.

Because so many fine citizens—unfortunately including a number of experienced and respected legislators—have not looked under the veneer of this proposal to discover the stark structure of centralized socialistic control, I should like to tell you why I have come to regard the measure with such disapproval and concern.

The one argument that is advanced in its behalf is that some of the States are too poor to support an adequate public-school system. Did you ever stop to think that there is no State in the Union with a financial structure so unsound and demoralized as that of the Federal Government?

In Virginia, for example, we have relatively low taxes, whereas the tax structure of the Federal Government is inequitable and extremely high. Virginia has a surplus. Uncle Sam will wind up this fiscal year with a $5,000,000,000 deficit. Virginia owes no money, but the Federal Government owes $250,000,000,000.

Let us grant the need for additional money for schools. If that additional amount is to be raised by taxation, Virginia is in a better position than is the Federal Government with respect to increasing taxes. If it is to be financed by borrowing, the credit of Virginia is better than that of Uncle Sam. If more money is to come from surplus, Virginia has the surplus, whereas the United States Government is in real danger of bankruptcy as a result of heedless deficit spending.

Admit, for the sake of argument, that a few States, such as Mississippi, are so poor that they cannot finance adequate schools without outside help. Why should we include the great majority of States, such as Virginia, in such a program, which would take away more from Virginia citizens and give back less to its schools?

I challenge you to suggest a single reason other than a desire to force decisions on State and local school boards as a condition to receiving Federal grants.

Now, the sponsors of the Federal education subsidy program protest that there is no thought of Federal control over the Nation's public school systems. Those who believe that are misinformed. Those who are informed don't believe it.

Without entering into the delicate discussion of racial relations this quotation from a recent open letter to the Washington Post signed by a prominent group of educators, including John Dewey, is cited merely to show that leaders of education intend to exercise control:

"The existence of racially segregated schools is itself a blot upon the American public school system which must in time be eliminated. Any measure which forward-looking forces can support must provide effective means to prevent discriminatory application of Federal funds."

In addition, there is no form of Federal grant in aid that is not accompanied by conditions to be met before the money is paid. This has been true of Federal aid to roads; of aid to hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act; and of all similar proposals.

The power to withhold huge funds until conditions are met, of necessity, carries with it the power to impose the controls. Let the States accept the Federal aid for a few years, become accustomed to it—adjust their State financing to depend on the Federal contribution for school-program maintenance. Then, the educational planners will be ready for the next move—more controls, an approach to standardization of curricula—in short, a Federal system of public education, worked out in Washington and supervised by a corps of bureaucrats headquartered there.

What sort of educational system do they seek to impose upon us?

We can judge that when we have examined the efforts of leaders of the progressive education system and of bureaucrats up to now. Let us also consider the progress they have made up to now under State and local control which forces them to permeate the education departments of 48 States and thousands of localities.

It is my opinion that their intentions are very bad and their success very great.

Most of us have been puzzled, if not seriously concerned, at one time or another by evidence that our children aren't being taught the fundamentals that were drummed into our own heads years ago—an appreciation of the history of this country, for example, and a respect for its institutions of individual initiative and free enterprise.

We have noticed, too, that children who, either as a result of inadequate effort or insufficient ability, fail to master their subjects are nevertheless given a passing grade, but have we considered that when such a system is continued until a youth approaches maturity its effect must be to instill in him the thought that somehow he will get along in life regardless of ability or effort. We have noticed that the precocious or hard-working child is not permitted to enter the schools earlier or advance faster than the dull or indolent child, but have we considered that when such a system is continued until a youth approaches maturity its effect must be to instill in him the thought that there is no competition in life or reward for individual effort. We have noticed that public school curricula rarely includes the 3 R's, that rarely do children have courses in history, or spelling, or geography, but have we noticed that the high school graduate is untrained and uneducated? A survey made a few years ago by the New York Times showed shocking ignorance among the Nation's high school graduates, most of whom could not identify the Declaration of Independence or locate the Mississippi River.

Are we off the track in our thinking? Is this just our imagination? Or has there been a scrapping of the old teaching methods in favor of a new educational mysticism? I think it is the latter. I think, in fact, that we have permitted to grow within our system of public instruction a dangerous cancer. If we permit control of public education to become vested in one Washington bureaucracy that cancer may not be cured by our surgery.

John Dewey, a philosopher and educator, probably has been responsible to a larger extent than has any other individual for the new course set by this ivory-tower coterie in the teaching field. I say "ivory tower" because it is clear the thoughts of the average American parent as to the upbringing of his child is beneath the dignity of their notice. They believe they must educate the young in spite of, instead of in cooperation with, the parent.

Those who have deified Dewey want only to be left alone to teach in the manner in which they interpret the tenets of this new mysticism. And most of all, they resent any effort to insure that the teachers in our schools and colleges believe in our democratic system.

These shadowy schoolhouse rings have moved in our schools, under the noses of conscientious governors and other officials.

They are preaching dissension and outright subversion in subtle paragraphs sprinkled through dozens of textbooks which have been approved by State educational authorities for use in elementary and high schools.

In some of these texts, widely used in the United States, the founding fathers are dismissed as self-serving men; the Constitution is branded an outdated document; so-called social gains of the Soviet Union are discussed at length; there is overemphasis on poverty and distress in the United States. The claims of socialism usually are described in proximity to the description of the seamier side of American life; the idea of a class struggle is harped on, and it is suggested repeatedly that the capitalistic system serves only the moneyed, industrialist class, at the expense of the worker.

Let us look at a few illustrative statements contained in textbooks used in public school systems:

In Elementary Sociology, by Ross L. Finney, it is said:

"We often hear the old slogan that local self-government is the vital organ of democracy. But this slogan was coined before the invention of railroads and automobiles, telephones, telegrams, and radios; and so

longer applies to present conditions, except in part."

And here is another one from a book co-authored by the noted—or notorious—Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell, who is saying that capitalism is a failure continues:

"Just as it was impossible for our Union to exist half slave and half free, so it may become impossible for the world to exist half socialistic and half capitalistic. And there are many who believe that capitalism in the nineteenth century present form would prove a weaker system than the system being developed by the Soviet Union."

Sneering reference is made to what is termed "the unreasoning, almost hysterical, attachment of certain Americans to the Constitution."

In another textbook used in American schools, Man's Worldly Goods, by Leo Huberman, is this choice gem:

"The break-down that came in 1929 is often referred to as a world crisis. * * * The crisis swept like a tidal wave over all countries but one; * * * the Russians were secure behind their dyke of a socialist planned economy."

Teachers' College at Columbia University in New York City is considered in the profession to be one of the outstanding institutions for the development of educators.

Many teachers who have studied there have been exposed to the influence of a Dr. George S. Counts. In addition to teaching at Columbia for a number of years as a professor of education, this Dr. Counts has been a leader in the American Federation of Teachers, a labor union for teachers.

He set forth his teaching philosophy very frankly back in the 1930's, when he wrote a number of papers on the general theme, "Does the School Dare Build a New Social Order?" These papers were delivered before audiences of educators.

Among many things, he said:

"That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and make the most of their energies is my firm conviction. To the extent that they are permitted to fashion the curriculum and the procedures of the school, they will definitely and positively influence the social attitudes, ideals, and behavior of the coming generation."

Among the ideas that Dr. Counts offered teachers was this one, straight from Karl Marx:

"If property rights are to be defined in industrial society, natural resources and all forms of capital will have to be collectively owned."

In preaching the class conflict, Dr. Counts said something must be done to overturn American capitalism in its existing form. "And according to the historical record," he commented ominously, "this process has commonly been attended by a bitter struggle and even bloodshed."

Such men, highly placed in the profession of education, are preaching conflict to our young teachers. And they are making substantial headway in many large cities in unionizing the teachers and promoting bitter strife.

Dr. Harold O. Rugg is another educator who wants the teachers to emphasize struggle between classes in their teaching—to give the pupils to understand that a bitter fight must go on continually between classes.

In one of his Teachers' Guides, intended to tell teachers how to use a textbook series he prepared, Dr. Rugg points out how they should develop one central idea, the beginnings of the march toward Democracy as a struggle between the so-called common people and the so-called upper classes.

"Thus we present political history as a conflict between groups desiring to control the Government," Dr. Rugg states. And he comments:

"For 300 years, this struggle has been revealed in America."

He goes on:

"This material raises the question of the distribution of the social incomes, the enormous inequality in the wealth of our people, and the share of each class in the national income."

In other words, the idea of class warfare is to be impressed on our children.

Similar advice to the teacher is found in a 1946 report by the National Council for Social Studies, an affiliate of the National Education Association, wherein the teacher is urged to point out, and I quote, "that Russia's suspicion of the world parallels the attitude of the young and insecure American Nation of the nineteenth century."

Admirers of Soviet Russia are legion among the educators. In 1935, a number of them went to Russia to attend a summer school at the University of Moscow. John Dewey was among the sponsors of the session. And, in 1937, the United States Office of Education, the Federal agency which will administer Federal controlled education, saw fit to issue a bulletin for public schools describing a series of public affairs pamphlets which included a number dealing with conditions in Russia. One of them was written by the Communist, Earl Browder. This was financed by taxes paid by you.

In a study of textbook trends made by the Sons of the American Revolution, a prime exhibit is a series of publications known as Building America, inaugurated in the 1930's with the financial assistance of the Rockefeller Foundation and widely used in public school systems. An analysis of this series revealed that more than 100 Communist front organizations were represented in the affiliations of persons whose writings were cited in the series as reference material.

Extensive support of socialistic housing and medical schemes, as well as inflammatory civil-rights agitation, could be found throughout the Building America material.

To what extent has this disturbing tide touched Virginia?

Until this year, the approved list of textbooks for our schools carried a book entitled, "The Story of Civilization." One of the authors of this book has permitted his name to be associated publicly with organizations officially adjudged subversive and Communist-controlled. This book referred to Karl Marx and Lenin in glowing terms; upheld the Spanish loyalists for their heroism; defended socialism and vilified capitalism.

It taught that Stalin had abandoned the principle of world revolution and was seeking only to win the good will of other nations and maintain friendly relations with them. This book stated:

"Many ministers and priests felt that the capitalistic system was un-Christian, since it imposed poverty on the masses of workers while the rich employers and capitalists lived in palaces."

Although the State board of education let this book slip by, it is to be commended for striking it from the approved list. But what would be the situation if books of this character were bought for use in our Virginia schools—not as the result of a slip, but through the deliberate policy of Federal bureaucrats exercising authority which local school authorities were powerless to oppose?

In his inaugural address last week, the Governor expressed his dissatisfaction with the lack of emphasis on fundamentals to be found in Virginia schools. Although the situation in this respect is much less serious here than in many other States, as a citizen of Virginia, I am in full agreement with the Governor's position.

So long as we retain control in the people of Virginia, you and I can back our Governor in his announced purpose to bring our Virginia schools to the forefront in training our youth to become informed and patriotic citizens. But once we surrender the management of our schools to the Federal bureaucracy and the parlor pinks of the progressive movement in education, neither you nor I, nor State and local school boards, nor even the Governor and the legislature will have any power over who teaches or what is taught to our children.

Instead of Federal control of education, what we need most at this time, it seems to me, is a firm resolve that the people shall recapture our schools from schoolhouse rings—to take back into the people's hands a careful supervision of the education of our children.

The school is the public institution closest to the family. It belongs to the people. It was contrived to serve the desires of the people as to the education of the young.

School authorities must be made to understand that it is the people's wishes which are paramount.

We may be stupid and uncouth in the eyes of the disciples of Dewey, who insist on their way of education and demand to be insulated from parents. But the children belong to the people and so does the money that pays the school bills.

If we want our youngsters trained as God-fearing, patriotic, industrious citizens rather than as soulless instruments of class struggle and social upheaval, that is our business.

And it looks as if we had better start doing a better job of minding our business.

More About the Katyn Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been interested in unearthing the ghastly details of one of the greatest crimes of the century—one that should take its place in the halls of shame together with the Nazi gas chambers and concentration camps. I refer to the cold-blooded murder of 10,000 Polish officers at Katyn.

Charges have been made by responsible authorities that this horrible deed was perpetrated by the Soviet Red Army. Recently a committee of inquiry has been formed to find the true facts and this body is headed by the distinguished Arthur Bliss Lane, former United States Ambassador to Poland. To aid this inquiry I have several times sought to gain access to information in the hands of the Office of National Defense on the basis of investigations made by American Army officers. Each time my request has been refused on the ground that the information is classified. I am taking the liberty of appending herewith the full correspondence on this matter for the information of the American people.

It seems to me the American people should know why information as to this heinous crime against humanity is kept secret. What justification is there for classifying this information and smothering it in the files? I should like to know who is primarily responsible for the decision to withhold this information from the world and what is the motive behind it. At a time when the Soviet Government is conducting a ceaseless barrage of slander against the United

States, why should we not tell the truth about the Katyn affair, more than 4 years after the end of the war?

Is it possible that the fact that Donald Hiss, brother of Alger Hiss and a member of the law firm of Acheson, Burling, Rublee, and Shurb, who has been representing the government of the Soviet satellite state of Poland, for some time, has something to do with the suppression of this information? Is this one more example of Soviet appeasement?

The correspondence follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 6, 1949.

The DIRECTOR, MILITARY INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Some time ago I inserted an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding the murder of several thousand Polish officers, probably by the Russians.

It has recently come to my attention that certain British and American officers were taken to the scene of the execution of these men while such officers were prisoners of the Germans.

It has been rumored that at least two of the American officers were Lt. Col. John Van Vliet, Jr., now stationed at Fort Lewis, Wash., and a Captain Stewart, otherwise unidentified.

It is quite possible that a committee will be formed to investigate this matter officially, and the purpose of this letter is to inquire whether or not the above-named officers have made a report on this matter and, if so, whether such report is available. If so, I would be very much pleased to receive a copy of the same.

Thanking you in advance, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
GENERAL STAFF,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
Washington, D. C., October 19, 1949.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DONDERO: Reference is made to your letter of October 6, 1949, in which you request information on a report of the Katyn massacre. The Intelligence Division has recently acquired a report on this subject, which was partially based on Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's observations of the German exhumation of the Polish graves at Katyn in 1943. The report is classified, and therefore cannot be released at this time.

In the event this report is declassified, it will be a pleasure to furnish you a copy.

Sincerely yours,

S. LEROY IRWIN,
Major General, GSC, Director of Intelligence.

ROYAL OAK, MICH., *October 31, 1949.*

Maj. Gen. S. LEROY IRWIN,
Director of Intelligence, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL IRWIN: For the life of me I cannot conceive why Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's report on the Katyn affair should be classified.

Would you please explain what reasons impelled the Department to classify this document and why such classification is maintained at the present time, 6 years after the event?

Was the action taken as a result of instruction from the State Department? If so, I should like to know what the instructions were and who issued them.

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
GENERAL STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY,
Washington, D. C., November 8, 1949.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DONDERO: Your letter of October 31, 1949, concerning release of the Van Vliet report has been received and your interest in this matter is appreciated.

I should point out, however, that since the perpetrators of this crime have not been determined with finality and, since the report contains certain highly sensitive information the premature disclosure of which would be extremely unwise in view of the current international situation, the Department of the Army believes it inadvisable to release the report.

Sincerely yours,

S. LEROY IRWIN,
Major General, General Staff Corps,
Director of Intelligence.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 9, 1950.

Hon. LOUIS JOHNSON,
The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For some time I have been interested in securing reports of the Katyn massacre.

I write to inquire if the report of Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet is now available and whether a copy may be provided for my study.

I am also advised that Mr. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk stated in his book, The Rape of Poland, that the official Russian records of the Katyn prisoners (together, I believe, with German translations) were carried into Germany when the German Army retreated from the Smolensk area, and that these documents were captured by American forces and brought to this country. The importance of such documents can hardly be exaggerated, and I should appreciate your advice as to their availability.

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, January 18, 1950.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DONDERO: I have received your letter of January 9 in which you express interest in obtaining documents concerning the Katyn massacre.

Of the two documents you mention, the only one which we have in the Department of Defense, is a report prepared in the Army General Staff. This report is an accumulation of information from various sources and, although its preparation has been commonly attributed to Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet, he collaborated in its preparation only to the extent of reviewing its contents.

It is my understanding that you have previously requested the Army to release this report to you and you were informed that, since it contained highly sensitive information, its release by the Army was considered unwise. However, shortly before I received your letter, Secretary of the Army Gray raised with me the question of its release. No decision has been reached as yet concerning this matter but I hope to be able to give a definite answer to your request at an early date.

* * * * * *

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

Communists on the Federal Pay Roll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial appearing in the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News. In my opinion, this editorial calls to the attention of all of us the lack of protection we have in our various departments of Government against Communists. I join with the writer of this editorial and insist we clean house of the Communists on our Federal pay roll and make a sincere endeavor to better protect our people in the future.

Elections will soon be here and the left-wingers and those who are friendly toward communism will support many candidates. The people should carefully analyze and scrutinize the various candidates to make certain they have not pledged themselves to those who would attempt to destroy our form of government.

During the last campaign, Mr. Speaker, the President as well as some candidates for Congress attempted to tell the people that communism was but a "red herring." Events since that time certainly prove that communism is still a menace to our freedoms and should be considered as such. Let us remember those who attempted to belittle this threat.

The editorial follows:

MAKING IT OFFICIAL

For years there have been rumors that the State Department—as well as some other Government departments—was pretty well sprinkled with Communists and Communist sympathizers.

And there have been rumors that these Communists and fellow-travelers have been active in feeding American secrets to agents for the Russian Government.

Just how much truth there is to these rumors has never been proven.

But it is now known that there is some basis for them.

This proof was contained in the verdict of the jury which convicted Alger Hiss on a charge of perjury for denying to a Senate committee that he had supplied State Department secrets to a Communist spy ring.

The outcome of this second Hiss trial—the jury in the first was unable to reach a verdict—makes one wonder about the present and the future.

Have all the Communists and sympathizers been cleared out of the departments and agencies in our Federal Government?

Or are there still some left in positions that enable them to inform Moscow on what is going on in the innermost circles of our Government?

And will the proper steps be taken to eliminate any Communist influence that still may remain in our Government?

For Alger Hiss was a trusted official. He was one of the brightest of the bright young men of the New Deal era. He held several important posts in the State Department. He was one of the late President Roosevelt's top advisers at the Yalta conference. He was secretary-general of the conference which drafted the outline for the United Nations Charter.

He had the utmost confidence of numerous persons high in public life during the time he was helping shape the policies of Government.

President Truman branded the Communist spy ring investigation by a Senate subcommittee a "red herring."

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt expressed the opinion, in her newspaper column, while the first Hiss trial was in progress, that Hiss was innocent.

And Supreme Court Justices Frankfurter and Reed were character witnesses for Hiss at his first trial.

Doesn't the Hiss case show the importance of exerting the utmost care in the selection of men and women to safeguard our national secrets and in taking every precaution to assure that those who now have access to secrets are to be trusted?

It is evident such precautions were not taken in the past. The American people should have the assurance of better protection in the future.

American Income, Its Sources, Distribution, and Continuation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an article by Justus Johnson, of Aurora, Ill., a political economist of distinction:

III. AMERICAN INCOME, ITS SOURCES, DISTRIBUTION, AND CONTINUATION

Sources of income and their distribution as reported by Dr. Claude Robinson, president of the Opinion Research Corp., and Father Edward A. Keller, director of economic research of Notre Dame University, have been presented the two previous Sundays.

These facts were pointed out neither to amuse nor to create prejudice. They helped understand what makes the wheels go around to produce a better living for all.

Let us give it further consideration. Why do we live better in America? Because there has been provided out of savings enough capital to better equip every worker. In Mongolia, lumber is sawed by hand. Here we have circular saws and electric or steam power. On the farms there are tractors—in the shops there are machines—everywhere the individual's effort is multiplied by implements and power energy. Back of each worker there is more than 100 horsepower of energy and over $6,000 of production equipment. Countries that do not make savings provide no capital. The production there is low and living is at a subsistence level.

European and Asiatic countries are much older than America. Many centuries of living together in groups provided manners ahead of us. The older civilization should have developed efficiency and know-how greater than ours. Their land area and undeveloped raw materials exceed ours.

DEVICES TO EXCELLENCE

About the only things in which they surpass Americans is in devices that are now being promoted here on the patterns that made poverty there. Europeans especially have attained great experience in passing the buck and getting the other fellow to provide. These designs have been acquired in the extension of trading corporations and empire building. Their purpose is to get the fruits of the other fellow's toil. People long experienced in using their energy and ingenuity in this kind of effort, fail in providing better and more production among themselves. This type of operation has come down from the higher levels and now reaches into the worker groups. It is shouted from radio and press in America by the nonproducer class—those interested in making profits from handling the other fellow's goods. The eastern seaboard cities and the National Capital make 90 percent of the noise. Their faces are eastward across the ocean—not westward to production centers that supply 90 percent of the articles that give them an opportunity. The pattern of "get the money" stands out like a sore thumb.

America owes little of its success to this kind of leadership. The two most important groups in America are the consumers and the producers. A successful national policy must answer to their problems. A proper solution will get plenty of response at elections.

ADDED COSTS

Adding costs on the producer reduces the volume that could be utilized and lessens the amount of employment.

Production is absorbed by consumers and users. All added costs fall on these classes. The producer must add his overhead to the article and the consumer must pay the additional cost. Some may escape direct income taxes, but they will pay the load of added cost on everything purchased—food, clothes, housing, fuel, amusement, luxuries—everything carries the added production costs. One example which illustrates how it works: Politicians say "tax the corporations," so General Motors, which makes automobiles, is "socked." You buy their product. Their salesman without receiving Government pay collects from you, the buyer, $400 in taxes on every $1,500 of car price.

The consumer in America pays the bill. Strange how this has been camouflaged, how the people receiving less than $5,000 per year are kept from understanding that they are 90 percent of the consuming class and to them is passed the buck to provide the payment for making the world safe for democracy, according to the pattern of these good folks "who toil not, neither do they spin."

Is it not time that someone should arise and speak? Point out the groups that continue to make the little fellow the beast of burden for grandiose schemes and worldwide give-aways? These princes of power and politics stake the average man into camp and make him the goat to pay the freight. It is done by resorting to prejudicial namecalling as princes of privilege, selfish few, and similar cognomens.

LOCAL AND FEDERAL COSTS

Let's give thought to what we get from our Government revenues. From our local taxes we get the city service, police and fire protection, garbage collection, street cleaning and maintenance, public nursing, city health department, city hospital services, sanitary district, park system, township road and bridge expenditures, district organization, city, county, and circuit courts, county government, and State government. State government covers penal institutions, normal schools and State universities, State police department, many regulatory bodies, State aid, road systems, and many other services. Most of these can be visualized.

Now, recite what personal benefits you can visualize that comes because of the expenditures of the Federal Government. You name them and compare. Yes, sir, the Federal Government's take from the Nation's earnings is many times the cost paid for all these services enumerated as local.

America spends more per capita on education than any other country. Nearly every family can have provided for their children 8 years of grade school, 4 years of high school, some State university training, and special schools for those suffering from infirmities, and all this is provided at a fractional cost of what the Federal Government takes from the consumers.

TAKES ONE-FOURTH OF INCOME

The tax bill in the Nation is above $50,000,000,000 annually, 25 percent of the whole national income, $40,000,000,000 is taken by the Federal Government. Some escape income tax because of exemptions and low earnings. Do they escape paying? Everything carries that indirect burden—that package added to production. In many cases it far exceeds any direct tax load that might have been imposed on the individual. Certainly it is time for the consumers of the Nation, especially those with families to support, to get off the sucker list put together by these princes of power and politics.

Let us get our bearings and understand that the two important groups of people in our country are the producers and the consumers. If a healthy atmosphere exists for these two groups the remainder fare all right. When materials and goods are produced there is trade and commerce. Without production there will be disaster and it will fall first on business institutions. The American public has been distracted too long. Let's get on the beam—understand our problems. Give adherence to leaders who lead—voices that get their guidance from production centers and from the consumers. Ghost writers and propaganda-inspired solutions do not present basic answers. Change the viewpoint and the American public will take on a crusader spirit. Give the voters something to fight for and there won't be over 43,000,000 voters failing to go to the polls. In the Nation and in the State many granted leadership have surrounded themselves with "yes men." This has weakened our political virility. When the chief fails his captains do not have a capacity to make decisions because blind adherence over the years has eaten away any initiative.

FACE THE FACTS

Let's face the facts and give the voter something to support or oppose. Ninety-three million voters were qualified to cast a ballot in 1948. More than 43,000,000 did not vote. Did these nonvoters have positive convictions?

Ireland's Last Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the present week has proven an outstanding week in the field of international affairs. Only yesterday a new government took office in India and that country became an independent republic, after early 200 years of British dominance and control. The new Republic of India, with a population of 330,000,000 people, becomes the third largest in the world. Only the United States and the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic exceed India in size.

Earlier in the week the United States signed the first treaty to be negotiated between this country and the Republic of Ireland. This treaty of amity, commerce, and navigation will prove an additional bond of union between ourselves and the Irish, who have always proven

their friendship through the centuries. On numerous instances the Irish have shown themselves to be our strongest supporters, especially in recent European matters where the Irish Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Sean MacBride, has repeatedly supported our position and taken the lead in urging European cooperation.

In addition to these events, President Truman has this week announced that the status of our representation in Ireland will be raised to that of an embassy. This change in diplomatic status is heralded both here and in Ireland as an appropriate recognition of the close ties that bind these two countries. Both the President and the State Department are to be congratulated on taking this step in advancing the international position of Ireland, by placing our mutual diplomatic representation on a par with that of other nations throughout the world.

Today but one step remains to bring about the complete realization of Ireland's hopes and dreams for freedom and independence. For 700 years the Irish have rebelled against British conquest and domination of their country. Today only a small portion of Ireland remains subject to that ancient imperialism. Only 6 counties in the north have not been granted the full independence, which has at last been achieved by the other 26 counties. It is inevitable that all Ireland must one day be free and united, and that no amount of foreign intrigue can long continue to hold sovereignty over this corner of the world.

Since our Government has now determined to give to Ireland the diplomatic recognition that is her due, why can we not also take the necessary steps to aid Ireland in abolishing the border in the north and reuniting the country into the natural unit, which it should be? One word from our Department of State or from the President to the Government of Britain could become the means of terminating this unjust aggression which continues in Ireland. To speak that word at this time would provide Britain the means of gracefully withdrawing from Ireland and would forever eliminate the possibility of riot and rebellion on the part of the Irish to regain their six lost counties.

While we hail the accomplishments of the present week in the international field, we yet realize that there is much more which can still be accomplished, and which must yet be undertaken. While the unification of all Ireland may appear to be a minor problem confronting the world, yet a peaceful solution of this matter is imperative, and only prompt action can assure that bloodshed will not occur in the effort to satisfy Ireland's last demand, namely, that all of Ireland be free and independent, that the border be eliminated and the nation united.

We have negotiated a treaty of friendship with Ireland and have raised the status of our diplomatic representation to that of ambassador. Now let us likewise assist in bringing about the satisfaction of this last wrong that afflicts Ireland, namely, the elimination of the border. Our influence can well be the deciding factor and should be made felt now. No more worthy achievement could be accomplished by our State Department than to bring about the end of partition in Ireland, thus ending the friction with Britain and satisfying Ireland's last demand.

Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith a résumé of the status of legislation based on recommendations of the Hoover Commission as of January 1, 1950. This was compiled by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report:

The Reorganization Record—Status of legislation based on recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government as of Jan. 1, 1950

Subject	House bill No., committee, and date received	Senate bill No., committee, and date received	Notes	Enacted into law
1. (a) Reorganization Act of 1949	Empowers President to submit plans for realinement of agencies. Either House can veto in 60 days.		6 of 7 plans effective: Aug. 20	Public Law 109, 81st Cong., June 20.
(b) General management	H. R. 2653, Expenditures, Feb. 10. H. R. 5535, passed Aug. 12	S. 942, Expenditures, Feb. 14. H. R. 5536, Expenditures, Aug. 15.	Basically important to over-all program.	
	Reorganization Plan No. 4, transfer to the Executive Office of the President the National Security Council and National Security Resources Board.			Effective Aug. 20.
2. Personnel management	H. R. 5181, Post Office and Civil Service, June 15. H. R. 5651, passed Aug. 28. H. R. 1680, passed July 8	S. 2111, Post Office and Civil Service, June 20. H. R. 5651, passed Sept. 30. H. R. 1680, passed Sept. 29	No further hearings scheduled. To conference, Oct. 3. do	Public Law 429, Oct. 26. Public Law 350, Oct. 15. Effective Aug. 20.
	Reorganization Plan No. 5, deals with office of "Chairman, U. S. Civil Service Commission," provides Deputy Chairman and outlines functions of Civil Service Commission.			
3. General services	Combines purchasing functions, records, building management, disposal of surplus property.		Can save $250,000,000 a year	Public Law 152, 81st Cong., June 20.
4. Post Office	H. R. 5177, Post Office and Civil Service, June 15. H. R. 5643, Post Office and Civil Service, July 14. H. R. 5775, Post Office and Civil Service, July 26.	S. 2062, Post Office and Civil Service, June 13. S. 2212, Post Office and Civil Service, July 7. S. 2213, Post Office and Civil Service, July 7. S. 1103, Post Office and Civil Service, out of committee September 30.	No further hearings scheduled	
	Reorganization Plan No. 3 transfers functions of subordinates to Postmaster General, subject to delegation, creates post of Deputy Postmaster General, abolishes Bureau of Accounts, creates Advisory Board on Post Office Matters.			Effective Aug. 20.
5. Foreign affairs	Strengthens staff of Secretary of State, paves way for amalgamation of Foreign Service and Washington Staff.		Partial realization of Commission Plan.	Public Law 73, 81st Cong. May 26.
6. Agriculture	H. R. 5170, Agriculture, June 15	S. 2005, Agriculture, June 13	No hearings scheduled	
7. Budgeting-accounting	H. R. 5823, Expenditures, August 1.	S. 2054, Expenditures, June 13. Amendment, expenditures, August 1.	No hearings scheduled	
8. National security: (a) Under Secretary of Defense. (b) Tydings bill	Created much needed Deputy for Secretary of Defense		First step in better organization of armed services.	Public Law 26, 81st Cong. April 2.
	Unifies armed services, centralizes operating controls, improves budgeting and accounting, creates Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff.		Savings of $300,000,000 annually anticipated.	Public Law 216, 81st Cong. Aug. 10.
9. Veterans' affairs	H. R. 5171, Veterans' Affairs, June 15. H. R. 5288, Veterans' Affairs, June 22.	S. 2019, Finance, June 8		
10. Commerce	H. R. 5180, Commerce, June 15	S. 2056, Commerce, June 13		
	Reorganization Plan No. 7 transfers the Public Roads Administration from the General Services Administration to Department of Commerce.			Effective Aug. 20.
11. Treasury	H. R. 5174, Ways and Means, June 15.	S. 2058, Finance, June 13		
12. Regulatory commissions	H. R. 5173, Expenditures, June 15	S. 2059, Expenditures, June 13. S. 2073, Expenditures, June 14. S. 2330, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, July 26. S. 2340, Banking and Currency, July 27.		
	Reorganization Plan No. 6 makes the Chairman of the U. S. Maritime Commission the Chief Executive and Administrative Officer of the Commission.			Effective Aug. 20.

The Reorganization Record—Status of legislation based on recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government as of Jan. 1, 1950—Continued

Subject	House bill No., committee, and date received	Senate bill No., committee, and date received	Notes	Enacted into law
13. Labor Department	Reorganization Plan No. 2 transfers into the Labor Department the Bureau of Employment Security and the Federal Advisory Council, and to the Secretary of Labor the functions of the Veteran's Placement Service Board.			Effective Aug. 20.
14. Interior	H. R. 5178, Public Lands, June 15.	S. 2067, Interior, June 13		
	H. R. 5469, Expenditures, June 30.			
15. Social security, education, Indian affairs.	H. R. 5175, Expenditures, June 15.	S. 2060, Expenditures, June 13	Senate Expenditures Committee plans to hold hearings.	
16. Medical services	H. R. 5182, Expenditures, June 15.	S. 2068, Labor and Welfare, June 7.	No hearings scheduled	
17. Business enterprises	No bill prepared yet			
18. Overseas administration	H. R. 5172, Expenditures, June 15.	S. 2072, passed Aug. 27	Provides for Overseas Study Commission.	
	S. 2072, Expenditures, Sept. 2	S. 2081, Expenditures, June 13		
	H. R. 6170, Foreign Affairs, Sept. 19.			
Federal-State relations	H. R. 4607, Expenditures, May 3	S. 1946, Expenditures, out of committee June 13.	No hearings scheduled	
Research	H. R. 4846, Commerce, out of committee June 12.	S. 247, passed Senate Mar. 13	Provide for Science Foundation	

Education in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by John A. Hannah, president of the Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, which he delivered on January 26, 1950, at the annual banquet of the Michigan State Society of Washington:

The invitation to address the Michigan State Society of Washington was accepted with some diffidence. Only a foolhardy man would attempt to come into Washington and offer any comments on either domestic or international affairs. This is an unusual audience. Most of you have been called here from Michigan to serve your country because of special qualifications which set you somewhat apart from your fellow Michiganders.

It is a great comfort for one living in faraway Michigan to know that our State is represented here by such able people, and that problems of public importance will receive prompt and efficient attention. All of Michigan are in great debt to all of you.

I have decided to visit with you this evening for a little while about education—the one subject with which I can pretend to have any real familiarity, and the one subject about which I can presume to have any ideas of interest to you. Education is a proper subject to discuss with Michigan people because some of the most distinctive contributions of the Wolverine State to the development of this Nation have been in the field of education.

As you probably recall, John D. Pierce and his associates in the early years of our State devised and established a unique system of primary education, one much copied elsewhere, and one for which Horace Mann gets much of the credit. The University of Michigan was the first of the great universities and has long been the model and inspiration for State universities everywhere. It is to the eternal credit of the university that it was the first State university to admit women as students. We of Michigan can be proud of the fact that the State normal college at Ypsilanti was the first teachers' college west of the Alleghenies. We of Michigan can be equally proud of the fact that our legislature established the first agricultural college in the world nearly a century ago. From that modest beginning at what is now Michigan State College grew the great national complex of institutions known as the land-grant college system. It can be claimed with assurance that in general outline, the Michigan system of education has been used as a model for most of the Western States.

Such a remarkable record was not written by accident. You will remember that the Congress wrote into the Ordinance of 1787 which established the Northwest Territory these powerful words of injunction:

"Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." So impressed were the founders of our State with that philosophy that they copied the enjoinder verbatim, into the first Constitution of Michigan.

Today the importance of education at all levels is recognized by everyone. But we must admire the intelligence and foresight of the pioneers who understood how important education was to be to the young State of Michigan in the years they would not live to see.

Understanding very well the nature of the democratic society that had been established on an experimental basis in this young country, they appreciated the importance of men and women being able to read and write and cipher. They understood perfectly that our system of government, dependent upon the intelligent decisions of its people as expressed by their votes, must for its own sake see to it that the people are sufficiently well educated to be well-informed.

They saw, too, that the State and Nation would benefit if there were opportunities to enhance native skills and aptitudes through education. Even in that distant day it was recognized that a skilled worker contributes more to the general economic well-being than an unskilled worker. For one thing, the skilled worker creates more real wealth because his capacity for production is greater than that of his unskilled brother. For another, in developing his skills and aptitudes, he develops taste and appreciation for things outside the narrow world of his own work. Basically, the wants and needs of the common laborer are easily supplied. Food, shelter, clothing, and simple recreation are his major interests. Not so the lawyer, or the engineer, or the teacher, or the good farmer, or the trained craftsman. He has a wider horizon and a broader vision. In addition to food, shelter, and clothing, he wants travel, and entertainment, and broader social experiences for himself and his family and for each of these he spends some of the extra money his higher skills have earned for him.

Even a hundred years or more ago, it was understood that dollars invested wisely in educational opportunity for able youths at whatever level return great dividends to society.

Succeeding generations of Michigan men and women have adhered to that philosophy. By and large, Michigan has always given strong support to its schools and colleges, in terms of both financial aid and the number of young men and women enrolled in its colleges and universities. Public education has paid the dividends the founders of our State prophesied when the system was established.

No thinking person will question that to a great extent America is what she is today because of our fundamental educational philosophy that makes educational opportunities available to all of our young people. Our preeminence in many fields, particularly industrial and agricultural production, can be attributed in large measure to the training given to our youth by our schools and colleges. We would be sore put to feed a great part of the world if scientific knowledge had not been applied decade after decade to the production of food. We would have been sore put to arm a great part of the world in wartime and support a great part of the world in this prolonged cold war if it were not for the engineers and production men, trained in the majority by the colleges and universities of America.

These are tremendous dividends on our investment in education to date. But I wonder whether our largest dividend has not been paid in a less tangible form—in the stability education has contributed to our democratic social structure.

To answer that question, one must realize that an outstanding feature of the American educational system is its emphasis on equality of opportunity. It was that emphasis which made the American system unique. The educational pioneers were determined that in this country, education was to be available to all, irrespective of economic status. They were determined that not just the sons and daughters of the well to do were to have the advantages of education, but that the sons and daughters of families of the industrial and agricultural classes as well were to have their chances in life, too. We can say with pride that the doors of educational opportunity have been and still are open to the vast majority of our youngsters who have the brains and the courage to take advantage of their opportunity.

I do not believe the importance of that condition can be overestimated. For decade upon decade in this country, youngsters of the poor and the rich alike have been required to attend primary and secondary schools together. For the more gifted, college educations have been available to a more limited extent. The result has been that most of our young people have grown up with the certain knowledge that they need not remain in the economic classes in which they were born, but could climb upward as far as their intelligence and initiative could carry them. There has been no ceiling on opportunity. The transition from rags to riches is almost commonplace with us. By this means, we have come closer to achieving a classless society than those nations which have sought to create such a society by law and dictatorial decree.

Here we have democracy in action. Here we have examples by the million that our system does make it possible for the able to succeed; here we have examples by the million that caste and class are meaningless terms for those with intelligence and ambition. Here, I believe, we have one of the reasons why we Americans have continued to be so loyal to our unique system of government. Here we have a reason why our people listen to the charges and claims of envious foreign governments with amusement and with scorn, knowing as each of them does from personal experience that our system can and does work for the benefit of the greatest number.

I do not claim that more and more education is the cure for the ills of the world; we have too many crackpots among our intellectuals to enable any such theory to hold water. What I do claim is that by making a conscientious effort to insure equality of opportunity through education, we weave unequaled strength and stability into the fabric of our society.

Unhappily, there now is a serious question whether publicly supported education on the higher levels can continue to render this unique service to our Nation. Throughout the whole country, colleges and universities are face to face with a serious financial crisis not of their own making. There is the real danger that within a very few years, our colleges and universities will have to retrench—slip backward—for sheer lack of sufficient income.

The crisis was developing before World War II. The day of reckoning has been postponed thus far simply because the so-called GI bill of rights came to the rescue in the years immediately following the war. With the aid of income paid by the Federal Government for the education of veterans, colleges and universities have been able to carry on and even to improve their public services, despite the unprecedented burden of students piled upon them since the war. But the number of veterans on the campus is shrinking swiftly, and the colleges' income is shrinking at a corresponding rate. At my own institution, for example, our income from veterans' fees is due to drop by approximately $900,000 next year, while our enrollments promise to be about the same as they were this year. This year, the decrease in revenue from veterans' fees from the prior year is in excess of $770,000. Thus, in 2 years we will lose income at the rate of $1,670,000 per year.

Traditionally, support of higher education in America has been left to private, local, and State revenue sources. I do not have the exact figures at hand, but I know that private sources of support for higher education have been drying up in recent years. But as for State appropriations for higher education, I can tell you exactly what the situation is. State appropriations for the support of the land-grant colleges, for example, contributed only 40.3 percent of total income in 1948–49. More significantly, comparing this last school year, 1948–49, with the first postwar year of 1945–46, income from student fees increased by 147 percent, while State support decreased by 5.1 percent.

This trend is the same in both the land-grant colleges and the other State-supported colleges and universities as well. A recent study by the University of Michigan disclosed that while enrollments in State-supported colleges in 20 selected States increased by 154 percent in the 20 years since 1929, State appropriations per student in terms of 1948 dollars decreased by 14 percent. I am not proud of Michigan when I report that in our State, legislative appropriations per student have declined by 35 percent over that period, compared with the over-all average decrease in the Nation of 14 percent.

The significance is plain: The burden of paying for higher education is slowly being shifted from the States to the individual students and their families. The end result, if the trend is not halted or reversed, is equally plain: Fewer and fewer of our capable young men and women will be able to attend college in the years immediately ahead.

Those seeking an easy answer may say: "Too many young people go to college, anyhow." It is an easy answer, but not the correct one. The report of the President's Commission on Higher Education has made it painfully clear that we have not come anywhere near providing universal equality of educational opportunity. Every year, thousands upon thousands of our most talented and capable young men and women graduate from high school with the certain knowledge that college educations are beyond their reach, simply for lack of the necessary dollars.

Even more serious is the fact that we have regressed to the point at which the income of the family pretty much determines the course of study to be followed by even those so lucky as to go to college. This means, in plain language, that we are nearing the point at which the well-to-do parent can make a lawyer, a dentist, a doctor, or an engineer of his son, and his less-well-to-do neighbor will have to restrict his son's ambitions to the less-remunerative fields. It is almost impossible to earn ones way through college in 1950. Why? The high cost of room and board away from home.

These are matters of serious implication to our social system—the American way of living together. These are matters not reflecting great credit upon the richest country in the world, able to spend billions on the underprivileged abroad, billions on the physically, mentally, and morally deficient at home, and still more billions on nonessential pleasures and luxuries.

The danger signals have been observed by a great many thoughtful persons, both in and out of the educational field. That explains why, after surveying sources of income available to the States, they have begun to ask whether the time has come to ask the Federal Government for assistance. Federal aid for education has become a question of the day, and it is not news to you here in Washington that the question is debatable, to say the least.

I have no intention of espousing the cause of Federal aid to education here tonight nor of opposing the current proposals. I would, however, like to make a few general observations in the hope that they may be of some value in the months immediately ahead when this question is being debated in and out of the Congress.

My first observation, based on historical fact, is that it is possible to extend Federal aid to education without risking Federal dictation of educational policies within the States. The land-grant colleges have received subsidies from the Federal Treasury for more than 80 years, and I have yet to hear of one of them surrendering its proud independence to Washington.

Even so, my second observation is that the extension of Federal assistance to education would have to be done carefully to insure independence of action for the colleges. The current dispute between the land-grant universities and the Veterans' Administration is an excellent example of the danger of leaving important matters to the discretion of a Government official. As the Michigan Members of Congress know, the Veterans' Administration recently ruled that many of the land-grant colleges and universities, including Michigan State College, should repay to the Treasury comparatively large sums of money received in past years for the education of veterans. To our way of thinking, this is a capricious and arbitrary ruling, and we are looking with great confidence to the Congress for relief. The issue is too complicated to be discussed here tonight, but I recommend it to you for study and as a warning that the method of disbursement of Federal funds should always be carefully spelled out in statutory law.

My third observation is that it is extremely unfortunate that proposals for extending Federal support to education have already become embroiled in political and religious feuds. These proposals are of sufficient importance to the welfare of our Nation to be debated and decided on their own merits. There is every reason to insist that they should be so considered.

The issue is whether there are to be opportunities in the future for capable young men and women to acquire college educations so that they may contribute their full share to the continued development of this country.

Here is a question on which clear thinking is demanded, and for that reason it should be set apart from the arena of political and religious controversy. Either is enough to sway men's emotions to the point at which they do not think clearly and this is a question to be settled with our heads, and not our hearts.

Personally, my principal regret is that the proposal to extend Federal financial assistance to higher education is being made a part of the President's controversial social welfare program. As a result of that unfortunate entanglement I fear that those who debate this controversial program are almost certain to overlook a major distinction.

That distinction is, in my opinion, that most of the President's proposal is for social-welfare changes seeking to provide benefits for those who are unable, for one reason or another, to repay the sums to be invested in them. Federal assistance to students capable of doing college work could be a good investment. As a group, educated persons are better producers, better consumers, and better citizens.

Regardless of our individual opinions on some of the President's proposals, I am sure that we can all agree that there is a great and fundamental difference between an old-age pension to a retired worker and a scholarship payment to a gifted young man just on the threshold of his life's work. One is a payment to insure a decent minimum standard of existence; the other is a payment to lift the maximum standard of opportunity.

There is a difference between a slum-clearing project financed with Federal funds and a college building program financed with Federal funds. One is a program to do for others; the second is a program to enable others to do for themselves.

I would like to see proposals for Federal aid to higher education debated on their own merits without reference to partisan politics or religion, because I want the American people to be able to make an informed decision on a matter affecting most seriously their future and that of our Nation. Americans have always favored education, and every generation has been willing to sacrifice in order that the next generation might have greater educational opportunities. There is no evidence that they have lost faith in education. All the evidence is to

the contrary. All I ask is that the issues be set forth clearly, for I have the greatest confidence in the ability of Americans to make the right decision when all the facts are available to them.

It is probable that if they had an opportunity to study all the facts, they would decide to support education with Federal funds. If such were the decision, would it be naive to suggest that the Federal Government relinquish to the individual States one of its existing excise taxes, say on tobacco or liquor, with the specific requirement that such funds be spent exclusively on the education of our gifted youngsters? I do not pretend to be an authority on taxation or the Federal Government, but I venture to predict that such an arrangement would find universal favor with the people.

I hope you will forgive me if I have talked too long on a topic about which I am naturally seriously concerned. You who deal day to day with problems of world importance may not agree that the future of higher education in our own country is a matter of the great importance I consider it to be. It is my personal conviction that we soon will have to make a decision on a fundamental question touching on our deepest national interests—the decision whether we are to continue providing college educations at public expense for the most talented and ambitious among our young men and women, as we do now for our veterans of World War II.

It may be that we have reached the point in this country at which we turn away from our historic philosophy that there should be opportunities for every American to accomplish just as much as his own ability and ambition enable him to accomplish. Perhaps we are turning toward the philosophy that safety and security should be guaranteed to everyone by the Government, irrespective of individual ability and effort. Perhaps public investment in higher education will have to be whittled down in the years ahead because we as a people will have become more interested in security than in opportunity. I have no desire to debate the issues involved. I want to say only that before we take too many steps on the road leading away from the system of education we have used successfully for a century we should look at some of the probable consequences of such steps.

These are among the questions that must be answered:

Would the result of diminishing public investment in the education of our gifted young people mean a return to the old days in which those without money and social advantages were barred from college as effectively as though barred by law?

Would this foreshadow a development of fixed class lines within this country? Do we want in America a pyramidal caste system with those caught helplessly below in constant revolt against their more privileged fellow citizens above them?

Do you believe for a moment that we could preserve our democratic institutions in America if we doomed each succeeding generation to the same levels of income and opportunity as the generation which came before?

The answers, I believe, suggest themselves. It is because they do suggest themselves that I would like to have the questions presented fairly to the American people. I would like to have the people told what education has done for this country, and what it is capable of doing in the future if given the support it deserves. I would like to have everyone know of the efforts of our colleges and universities to develop tough-minded young citizens, capable of making intelligent decisions on the great problems now before us, capable of making them on the basis of reason, and not emotion. I would like to have them understand that to a great degree, the kind of a nation we are to be in the latter half of this century will be determined by what is taught, and who are taught, on the campuses of America.

I would like to have them know that the great majority of the colleges and universities of the United States subscribe to the eloquent definition of the role of higher education recently written by the president of one of our oldest and greatest private universities. I quote from President Conant of Harvard:

"The primary concern of American education today is not the development of the appreciation of the 'good life' in young gentlemen born to the purple. Our purpose is to cultivate in the largest number of our future citizens an appreciation both of the responsibilities and the benefits which come to them because they are American and free."

Once our fellow citizens understand that to be the purpose of education, I have faith that they will not let our public colleges and universities languish and do less than the maximum of which they are capable in preserving the advantages and opportunities for all of our people that have made America the envy of all of the peoples of the world.

I would close with a couplet written by Edwin Markham:

"We are blind,
Unless we see that in the human plan
Nothing is worth the making
If it does not make the man.
Why build these States glorious
If man unbuilded goes.
In vain we build the Nation
Unless the builder also grows."

Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, at this time when there is so much controversy over FEPC legislation and the remainder of the civil-rights program, I am proud and happy that the Board of Commissioners of the city of Newark, N. J., have passed the following forthright resolution in behalf of civil rights for all Americans:

Whereas the denial of any civil rights is unjust and undemocratic and contrary to the fundamentals upon which this Nation was founded; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a civil-rights bill which would favorably affect many people in this Nation, who are now denied their civil rights because of their race, creed, or color; and

Whereas the FEPC bill, which prohibits discrimination in employment, will assure all Americans an equal opportunity to make a living on the basis of equality: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, That we hereby request and urge the United States Senators and Congressmen from New Jersey to vote for and support legislation for (a) abolition of the poll tax as a voting requirement; (b) establishment of a Fair Employment Practice Commission; (c) enactment of antilynching legislation; (d) Prohibition of segregation in any transportation facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That we memorialize the United States Senators and Congressmen from New Jersey, to give their full aid and support to the civil-rights program as outlined and requested by the President of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the United States Senators and Congressmen from New Jersey.

STEPHEN J. MORIN,
M. ELLENSTEIN,
RALPH A. VILLANI,
JOHN KEENAN,
LEO P. CARLIN,
Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J.

Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson Keeps Ahead on His Pledge To Provide More for Less Money—Within 12 Months He Would Be Providing as Much or More Military Strength for $1,000,000,000 a Year Less, and by 18 Months for $1,500,000,000 a Year Less

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, every fair, impartial, and sincerely economy-minded Member of this Congress must have thrilled when Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, was awarded a citation of merit just a few weeks ago for the magnificent work he is doing in the Department of Defense by the members of President Hoover's committee on the Hoover Report.

The story of that award was told in full in the extension of remarks made by my good friend, Congressman HAROLD PATTEN, of Arizona, as disclosed in the RECORD of Thursday last.

Having read the wonderful speech of Congressman PATTEN, I had hardly set aside the RECORD before I came upon the fourteenth in a series of articles in which Blair Moody and financial experts in Congress analyze the 1950–51 Federal budget.

Blair Moody is the well-known feature writer of the Detroit News and moderator of the program, Meet Your Congress. Upon this nationally known and popular NBC program many members of both houses have appeared during recent years.

The article was headed "Johnson keeps ahead on pledge to provide more for less money." The Members of this House are interested in all that Blair Moody either speaks or writes because of his terse, clear, lucid, and factual interrogations as well as his factual unbiased reporting of the news.

This article is written in a spirit of decency and fair play about one of the finest men and certainly one of the ablest officials that our Nation has ever

had. It needs no vocal embellishment by me.

Mr. Speaker, I know if our good friend, Louis Johnson, were here he would tell us all that "it is the team which he is heading that deserves all the credit for the tremendous savings effected," men like the Honorable Stu Symington, Secretary of the Air Force; Hon. Gordon Gray, Secretary of the Army; Hon. Francis Matthews, Secretary of the Navy; General Bradley; and the three grand Chiefs of Staff.

I commend this article by Blair Moody to the reading of every Member of this Congress, and on both sides of the Capitol.

All hail from this Congress to Louis Johnson on the coming of his first anniversary as Secretary of Defense.

The article reads as follows:

JOHNSON KEEPS AHEAD ON PLEDGE TO PROVIDE MORE FOR LESS MONEY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the fourteenth in a series of articles in which Blair Moody and financial experts in Congress analyze the 1950–51 Federal budget and offer suggestions for cuts which, if adopted, should not only balance the budget but permit a moderate reduction in taxes. The final article will appear tomorrow.)

(By Blair Moody)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—The demand for economy in Government sweeping across Capitol Hill and the Nation has been emphatically answered by the Department of Defense.

In the first determined, intelligent, effective drive for really major savings in American political history, Secretary Louis A. Johnson is ahead of schedule on his pledge, made to Congress when it passed the Unification Act last August 10, that within 12 months he would be providing as much or more military strength for $1,000,000,000 a year less, and by 18 months for $1,500,000,000 a year less.

This is quite aside from the question of whether President Truman's budget program provides strength enough to meet present world conditions, a question bitterly disputed wherever military, naval, and air men meet in private.

But there can be no question that we are paying less for what we do get. Assistant Secretary Wilfred J. McNeil, right bower to the late Secretary Forrestal and now Johnson's chief ball-carrier in this field, reports that the Military Establishment is already reflecting a saving of $1,200,000,000 a year.

The most widely-publicized part of Johnson's crash dive for economy, of course, is the removal of 147,000 civilians from the pay rolls, a total expected to approach 160,000 by June. But underneath—and quite aside from the controversial reductions and shifts in Navy, Air Force, and Army strength—there has taken place a remarkable tightening up in many fields. Not least responsible for the results is the drive by Johnson to make officers at all levels realize that saving money is important.

A NEW APPROACH

Johnson's approach was different. Just 2 weeks after the unification law was enacted he faced in his office at 9 o'clock one morning more than 100 Senators and Congressmen, including many of Capitol Hill's most prominent battlers for economy, and told them that at 1 o'clock the same day he was announcing a drastic, curtailment of Army posts, Navy yards, and Air Stations from coast to coast, making it possible to eliminate 135,000 civilian employees.

He had called them in, he said, because the reductions were taking place in their districts and he wanted them to know before they saw it in the newspapers.

When he read the list, angry protests came from some of the great economizers. But it quickly developed that Johnson was not asking them, he was telling them. They had been asking for economy and here it was.

"I'll have to give your Senator FERGUSON credit," Johnson says now. "He got up and backed us."

Obviously, Johnson had had the lists of spots that were to be hit nearly ready when Congress gave him the power to act. As Assistant Secretary of War in the late 1930's—and, incidentally, one who chafed noticeably at the lethargy of some colleagues and superiors—he had seen where the waste was.

He knew Army, Navy, and Air operated parallel systems of communications all over the world, at vast duplicated expense. He saw money draining away by millions through pro forma flying time for air officers, surplus civilian employees who would have to wait for another war to find enough to do.

FUNDS SENT FLEET

He found that the Army was operating a big fleet of ships, chiefly transports, bigger by tonnage than the entire Navy. He knew of old the feeling among the little "empire-building" minor executives that one way to make their jobs seem more important and raise their pay is to have more, not less, subordinates.

Forrestal already had ordered a survey by a committee of industrialists, headed by General Motors' Thomas C. Archer. McNeil had moved for a performance military budget in which all costs could be identified by activity, instead of having the budget of an air base or a navy yard obscured in 5 to 30 different long item lists under different labels.

This had brought a conference between Forrestal and Senator LODGE, Republican, Massachusetts, that broadened into the resolution creating the Hoover Commission. Now Johnson called in an industrial efficiency firm, Robert Heller and Associates.

Johnson used Heller as a spur, rather than a whip. He knew that if economy were imposed only from without it would not last. But when the proud Army, Navy, and Air officers saw Heller coming they moved on their own.

Sometime later, when Frank Kimandorf, Heller's top man, came in to superintend the crash, he told McNeil: "You two Scotsmen have left nothing to crash on."

The other Scotsman is Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, holder of many high fighting, staff, and administrative posts, who was named head of Johnson's management committee.

TASK FORCES MOVE

Each service set up task forces to move in on areas where cuts were possible. Heller pointed to places where money is always saved in an industrial reorganization—overuse of automobiles, motor maintenance—a score of ideas which would in no way affect the fighting structure of any service.

Meanwhile McNarney and McNeil reprogramed the plans of all operational services. They found hundreds of items like "new baskets for quartermaster's commissary, $60,000," which came out.

Services like printing in effect were made separate businesses and told if they could not sell their work to the National Military Establishment as cheaply as private concerns they would be wiped out. The result: 77 fewer employees in Washington alone and a sharp drop in costs. Passenger cars were cut 20 percent.

Staffs were cut all across the country, roughly 1,000 civilians being dropped in Michigan, including two-thirds of the personnel at the tiny air base of Oscoda.

"Better work and more defense for less money," says Johnson.

But enough defense to insure the safety of the United States? Economy aside, that is the real issue. It will be discussed tomorrow in the concluding article of this series.

General Eisenhower's Reputed Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I received from Longmont, Colo., the other day, a clipping taken from the editorial page of the Longmont Ledger published by George L. Bickel, which directs my attention to a recent speech claimed to have been made by General Eisenhower, which is so shocking, to put it mildly, that I feel that it should be given Nationwide publicity at this time, even though the reactionary press of the Nation has carefully avoided making any reference whatsoever to it.

This editorial is as follows:

LET THEM EAT CAKE

Italy has the word for it—"stupidine"—and General Eisenhower coined the phrase to fit the word when he stated last week that "the common people ought to stop thinking about pensions and get back to a 'beer and hot dog' diet instead of looking to the Government for an illusory thing called security."

"If all Americans want is security," he said, "they can go to prison. They'll have enough to eat, a bed, and a roof over their heads," he added.

This arrogant attack on the natural longing of human beings for security in their old age will probably go down in history as the most stupid remark since Marie Antoinette's statement of "Let them eat cake" when she was informed that the peasants of France were without bread.

The general failed to tell his audience just one thing, that the Government, whose social-security programs he mistrusts, has guaranteed his own security for life with the very liberal pension of $18,000 a year.

Pensions for the aged and a sound social-security program are among the Nation's most important problems. Students of government and thinking citizens realize that contributory insurance is democratic and sound, that ultimately we will have replaced outright pensions with a sound insurance plan. These problems are real and close to the hearts of many millions of Americans. They can't be flippantly discarded, general.

CCC Food Bargains Listed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John Flannagan, former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, called the attention of the House in the Seventy-ninth Congress to

the fact that the world price, plus the import duty, was less than the support price of many agricultural products. The following is from the Sunday Washington Post:

CCC FOOD BARGAINS LISTED—EXPORT ONLY

(By John W. Ball)

The world's biggest dealer in food commodities last week advertised Irish potatoes for sale at 100 pounds for 1 cent.

Similar bargains in canned meat, eggs, edible beans, peanuts, flaxseed, etc., were made public by Ralph S. Trigg, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Uncle Sam's agency for operating the Government's farm price support program.

These prices, however, are only for export. The goods can't be bought for use in this country.

The sacks in which the potatoes will be sold cost from 10 to 15 cents apiece, or 10 to 15 times as much as the Government asks for them filled with the world's best potatoes.

NEW CCC POLICY

The low prices accompanied announcement of a new CCC policy to encourage export of surplus farm commodities bought by the Government to keep prices in this country high and farmers prosperous.

Americans will still be charged several hundred times the export price. Similar potatoes retailed in Washington this week at 3½ to 4 cents a pound. In other words, the Government is selling potatoes at 100 pounds for 1 cent that are costing American housewives from $3.50 to $4. The potatoes cost the Government about $1.10 a bag.

The entire operation was ordered by Congress in its series of laws for the benefit of the Nation's twenty-odd million farmers.

In addition to the potato bargains, CCC is offering to sell to exporters:

1. Thirty million pounds of Mexican canned meat at 15 cents a can. This was bought from Mexico at about 30 cents a can. These purchases were made to reimburse Mexican cattle raisers whose markets were shut off when this country put an embargo on the importation of Mexican cattle, because of a hoof-and-mouth disease epidemic in Mexico. This meat is not permitted to be sold in this country under the pure food and drug laws because it comes from areas infected with the dreaded hoof-and-mouth disease.

2. Dried whole eggs, 78,000,000 pounds, at 40 cents a pound. These cost Uncle Sam about $1.20 a pound.

3. About 4,750,000 100-pound bags of beans. Pinto beans are offered at $7 a bag (cost about $9), red kidney at $8 (cost about $9.50) and great northern, $6 a bag (cost about $8).

4. Thirteen million bushels of flaxseed at $2.45 a bushel that cost the Government $3 a bushel in 1948.

5. About 50,000,000 pounds of shelled peanuts at 6½ cents a pound, or just half the 16½ cents CCC paid for them.

OATS, BARLEY, AND CORN

Trigg also offered 13,375 bushels of oats, 20,000,000 bushels of barley, and 100,000,000 bushels of corn at not less than market price on date of sale.

Sales will not be made to buyers using ECA dollars or other Government funds. Other methods, such as subsidies, are provided for such sales. Sales of potatoes are restricted for export to areas not normally supplied by United States exporters.

Similar announcements will be made monthly, Trigg said. The prices named last week will prevail until March.

The announcement was met by a sharp break on the Nation's commodity exchanges. Most of the losses were regained later.

"From now on," Trigg said, "exporters will know in advance the commodities and quantities that are available, and the prices for a fixed period ahead. Thus, they will be in a better position to negotiate sales abroad."

LOSSES ABSORBED

The loss the Government takes on such sales is absorbed in several ways. Much is replaced from section 32 funds. Section 32 of Public Law 320 sets aside 30 percent of the Nation's customs receipts. Such sums the law states, shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to:

1. Encourage the export of agricultural commodities by benefits to the exporter, or payment of losses in connection with the exportation or by payments to producers to encourage production of commodities needed domestically.

2. Encourage domestic consumption of farm commodities by increasing their use through benefits, donations, etc., among persons in low-income groups.

Under the first provision, CCC is making the following subsidies available:

1. Four million dollars to exporters of fall and winter apples and winter pears. These may be shipped to ECA countries, and to any Western Hemisphere countries except Cuba, Canada, and Venezuela. They also may be exported to Israel, Egypt, and the Philippines.

These funds may be used to pay half the cost of the commodities.

2. Fifty thousand dollars, to permit payment of 10 cents a bale to exporters of cotton.

3. Seven and a half million dollars to exporters of surplus dried peaches, prunes, and raisins. These funds are to be used to reimburse the exporter up to 50 percent of the cost of the commodities.

4. One million dollars for dried-egg exports.

5. Two million dollars for flaxseed or linseed oil sold for export to any agency * * * furnishing relief to foreign countries.

6. Forty thousand dollars to encourage use of concentrated orange juice abroad.

7. Five million dollars to encourage use of peanuts abroad, to be paid to any Government agency administering relief to foreign countries.

8. Five million dollars to wheat exporters to meet the difference in price between the current domestic price and the International Wheat Agreement price of $1.80 a bushel.

9. Two million dollars for export sales of packed fresh oranges, and canned single-strength orange juice, to be used to meet half the cost of such exports.

Let us consider the above surplus foods:

First. The $4,000,000 worth of apples purchased by the ECA does not equal the $5,800,000 worth of apples imported the last fiscal year.

Second. The $50,000 for subsidizing cotton is small in comparison to the $36,319,000 worth of cotton imported. Over $30,000,000 of the cotton imports were on long-staple cotton as there is a near embargo on short-staple cotton imports.

Third. The $7,500,000 for subsidized fruit exported must be considered in the light imports of $52,644,000 worth of fruit and fruit preparations, not including the $50,657,000 worth of banana imports.

Fourth. The $1,000,000 for dried-egg imports is small in comparison to the $2,198,000 worth of eggs and egg products imported the last fiscal year. Eggs are only 39 percent of parity for the farmers in the Midwest today.

Fifth. The $2,000,000 for subsidized flaxseed and linseed-oil exports is questionable when we imported $3,493,000 worth of flaxseed the past fiscal year.

Sixth. The $40,000 for subsidizing orange juice covered by third paragraph above.

Seventh. The $5,000,000 to subsidize peanut exports when we imported $3,000 worth of peanuts and a total of $55,783,000 worth of nuts and nut preparations the past fiscal year, this does not make economic sense. No one seems to be able to figure out what the peanut subsidies are really costing the United States taxpayers.

Eighth. The $5,000,000 to subsidize wheat exports must be compared to the $2,924,000 worth of wheat imports not including the $6,740,000 worth of wheat milled in bond. The total imports of all grain and grain products was $55,126,000 in value, the past fiscal year.

Ninth. The $2,000,000 for subsidizing exports up to 50 percent in value of canned single-strength orange juice should be considered in connection with third paragraph above.

The total imports of competitive agricultural products was $1,532,000,000, without adding fur imports which are also a competitive agricultural product.

The above shows that the value of subsidized exports of competitive agricultural products does not equal the imports of competitive agricultural products. In other words, we are in pounds, bushels, and tons importing competitive agricultural products faster than we are exporting and giving them away. The CCC should not be held accountable for this situation. While we are subsidizing the exportation of millions upon millions of dollars worth of soil-depleting crops we imported a total of $497,163,000 worth of livestock and livestock products. While we imported millions of pounds of wool, we subsidized or gave away millions of pounds of cotton and then hear much conversation about soil conservation. Unless some kind of an agricultural agreement, like the international wheat agreement, is made these volumes of competitive agricultural imports are going to create a greater and greater loss to the CCC and the American taxpayer.

The Secretary of Agriculture stated before the Agricultural Subcommittee that the support program has cost $1,000,000,000. Assuredly one must realize that this cost has a direct relationship to the $1,532,000,000 of competitive agricultural imports.

Amending the Rules of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a division of opinion among the supporters of House Resolution 133, as to why they wish to restore to six members of the Rules Committee their dictatorial veto powers over the other 429 Members of the House.

One group continues to cling to the threadbare argument that the Rules Committee is the only single committee through which the flood of legislation pouring out of the standing committees must flow. As such, they say, it should act as a floodgate or a traffic cop. They cite the billions of dollars in authorization bills voted out of standing committees in the Eightieth Congress. They seem to claim that it was the Rules Committee and its veto power that prevented these billions from resulting in an enormous Federal deficit.

The hard facts of actual House procedure easily deflate this argument. Authorization does not mean expenditure. Every year billions of dollars in projects are authorized, but no appropriation is made for them. The expenditures are controlled by the Appropriations Committee—and appropriations bills do not go through the Rules Committee at all. They go directly from the Appropriations Committee to the floor of the House. The picture of the Rules Committee acting as a floodgate to check the flow of costly legislation looks pretty silly when you find out that the water really flows around the floodgate and never passes through it at all.

This group carries the argument one step further. It claims that the expected Federal deficit for this fiscal year is caused by the change in the rules voted by the House at the beginning of the last session. It is true that one-third of the increase over the deficit originally anticipated is due to higher expenditures than planned. But these were largely costs fixed by existing statutes—such as the GI education bill—which no one could anticipate. But the other two-thirds was caused by a decline in revenues as a result of last summer's recession. If the Rules Committee feels it has the power to anticipate and to prevent recessions, I shall be happy to reconsider my position in this matter, and I think the country will be happy to know that recessions can be avoided.

The members of the other group are, at least, honest in setting forth their reasons for favoring this rule change. They very frankly state that they want to use any device they can to block what they call a "socialistic" program, even if it means minority rule—a principle contrary to everything America stands for. What kind of people are these who are afraid to allow legislation to be debated by all the representatives of the people—who are afraid that a majority of those representatives might vote this legislation through? What kind of people are these who believe that a minority of six is wiser than a majority of the American voters?

I respect their right to oppose a bill—provided they do so by trying to convince a majority of the Representatives in open debate that their side has merit. That is the American way of deciding issues.

As I understand it, the Rules Committee was never meant to pass on the merits of legislation. That is the proper function of the standing committees, whose members and staffs are the experts in each of the many technical fields of legislation. I do not see how anyone can reasonably expect 12 men to consider intelligently the merits of hundreds of separate pieces of highly specialized and technical legislation.

Perhaps time and experience will tell us that the rule we passed last year needs to be modified in some minor respect. But I hope that time will never tell us that the decisions of a minority of six are better than the decisions of a majority of the whole House. If we are to make mistakes, let them be all our mistakes, and not the mistakes of a tiny few. That, in my opinion, is the basis of the American system.

Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Georgia Congress of Parents and Teachers has a membership of 120,000 members. This organization is a branch of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and is one of the outstanding organizations in Georgia.

The organization's executive committee, on January 11 in Macon, Ga., adopted a resolution opposing any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control.

I concur in the sentiments expressed in this resolution, and I attach a copy of it herewith for the information of Members:

Whereas the Georgia Congress of Parents and Teachers expresses sincere interest in the health of all of the people of Georgia as set forth in the Health Services Act of 1949 and urges enactment in 1950 of similar legislation; and

Whereas the United States has the highest standards of health, of medical care, and of scientific medical facilities of any country in the world, as a result of our system of free enterprise; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance, wherever tried, has caused a decline in national health and deterioration of medical standards and facilities; and

Whereas wherever the Government has assumed control of medical services, the result has been tremendous multiplication of costs over original estimates, extreme tax burdens and national deficits, and gradual extension of socialization into other activities of national life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Georgia Congress of Parents and Teachers does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from the State of Georgia, and that said Senators and Representatives be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

BLANCHE S. BOYD,
President.
CORINNE L. DALLAS,
Secretary.

Workers and Farmers Fight for CVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, in a well-illustrated, attractive, two-page story of the fight for the creation of a Columbia Valley Administration, the Butcher Workman, publication of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, attests once again to the widespread Pacific Northwest interest in the CVA. It follows:

WORKERS AND FARMERS FIGHT FOR CVA

(By Joe Miller)

The cynics who don't believe that the workers and farmers of America can work together to put across liberal issues had better think again. Out in the Pacific Northwest workers and farmers are pulling as one for the creation of a Columbia Valley Administration, the TVA-type agency which will develop the region's vast resources for the benefit of all its people.

The victory hasn't been recorded on the scoreboard yet, but the farm-labor team has pushed the ball down within the 20-yard line. They expect to run it across early in the 1950 session of Congress, and the Northwest's people are rooting hard for them to do so.

The victory will be a terrific blow to the well-heeled private-power lobby, which has been fighting like crazy to stop the CVA. When President Truman sent a special message to Congress asking for CVA last April 13, the cries of rage that were sounded by the Nation's private utilities were as earth shattering as the major earthquake that rocked the region the same day. Howled Purcell Smith, the Nation's top-dog lobbyist at $65,000 per:

"We must do everything in our power to stop the CVA."

Purcell and his cohorts have been doing just that. Thousands and thousands of dollars have been poured into a campaign to smear the CVA throughout the vast region known as "America's last frontier." Private power interests have set up "front" organizations (borrowing a tactic from the Communists, incidentally) to attack the CVA. Modern-day carpetbaggers have been touring the region denouncing CVA as "communism," "fascism," "statism," and whatever other names they can think of.

Gov. Arthur Langlie, of Washington, continually attacks the CVA as "fascism," thereby branding almost 1,000,000 workers and farmers in his own State as fascists.

(Langlie and the two other Republican Governors who oppose the CVA will not debate this pressing issue, however. Challenged to debate by leading Northwest liberals, they say they're "too busy" or "don't want to get involved in politics.")

Yet, despite the slanderous attack, the CVA forces march steadily closer to their goal, with every major farm-labor organization in the Northwest leading the way. Four years ago these groups organized the League

for CVA to promote a valley authority for the Northwest, and it has done a notable job.

The grass-roots support for CVA is so strong that Mr. Truman placed it No. 1 on his list of valley authority legislation—ahead of the better-known Missouri Valley Authority plan.

It is not only the workers and the farmers of the region who favor the CVA. Many businessmen noting what the TVA did for private enterprise in the Southland, have taken a stand for CVA—despite the cries of the power lobby.

One of these is the area's leading businessman, E. B. McNaughton, president of the Portland Oregonian and chairman of the board of Portland's First National Bank. A lifelong Republican, McNaughton told a luncheon of amazed Portland businessmen that CVA "has tremendous possibilities for our region." Admitting that he and practically every Northwest business leader had been against Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams, McNaughton said:

"If Roosevelt hadn't given us these dams, where would we be today?"

It is a question that the enemies of CVA can't answer. The two massive structures, in addition to saving the region's economy, helped produce almost half the Nation's merchant marine and the aluminum for one-third of the wartime Air Force, among other things. They also proved the complete wisdom of Franklin D. Roosevelt's western development policy.

Now Harry S. Truman wants to follow in the footsteps of his former chief. And he has a mandate from the people of the West to do so. With CVA and public power as his prime issues, the President ran up an electoral vote majority of 50 in the Far West.

The reasons behind the region's demand for CVA are obvious, even to the tourist who visits the Pacific Northwest. The failure of the Eightieth Congress to go ahead with the region's resource development has helped create some of the worst problems it has faced since the days of "54-40 or Fight." Here's how they line up:

Floods: The 1948 disaster which struck from out of nowhere took 60 lives, cost $2,000,000,000 in soil losses and $75,000,000 in property damages. And every year the Northwest is hit by severe floods, which ruin homes and destroy crops. Oregon's Grange master, Morton Tompkins, tells the story when he says, "These floods are getting worse instead of better."

(But the present Government agencies have done nothing to halt future floods. The Army engineers-Bureau of Reclamation plan for the Columbia contains no provision for reforestation in the headwaters, where floods start.)

Power shortage: It is unfortunate but true that the Northwest, with 42 percent of America's total hydroelectric potential, is the only area in the Nation with a power shortage. Every winter the Northwest has to brown out, and the shortage has greatly hindered the region's needed industrial growth.

Unemployment: This has cost jobs too. Last winter 153,000 men were thrown out of work by the power shortage, and thousands of jobs have been lost because the Northwest didn't have the power required by industries that wanted to locate here.

With population up 16 percent since 1948, the region's unemployment rate is three times the national average. It hasn't been so bad since the depression.

Yet private power interests continue to curtail development of the region's mighty rivers by telling people the power isn't needed. The president of one company said, "We'll have kilowatts running out of our ears if we build these dams."

Erosion: The Northwest, with all its new soil, has the second worst erosion problem in America and loses 100,000,000 tons of topsoil yearly.

Sure, these are dull figures to many perhaps. But they mean a lot to the general welfare of the Pacific Northwest in particular and of the Nation in general. The crying need of the Pacific Northwest is for a CVA which will accomplish these tasks:

Fully develop the Northwest's vast source of hydroelectric power. This power not only is of mighty value to national defense, as seen by location of the atomic plant at Hanford, Wash.; it is the basis of the region's hope for a diversified industrial economy.

Prepare some 9,000,000 acres of sagebrush land for agricultural development. Reclamation of this land will provide hundreds of thousands of family size farms for new settlers.

Develop a river transportation system which will provide the region's hinterland with cheap and easy access to the sea.

Explore the area's untapped mineral wealth.

Protect and stabilize the Northwest's valuable fishing and lumbering resources, which have suffered from boom and bust exploitation.

Produce an adequate flood-control system like the TVA's.

This is the program the farm-labor groups have brought near reality, despite the opposition of the power lobby, the region's absentee-owned newspapers and eastern capital. The reason for their success is simple. Joseph D. Keenan, director of labor's league for political education, recently told western politicians that "they can no longer afford to do small favors for the land companies and private power lobby no matter how large their campaign contributions." Further Keenan said:

"The little people won't stand for it, and they are watching your voting records. And the little people have the votes."

Thus, the unity that the workers and farmers of the Pacific Northwest have shown in the CVA fight is a hopeful sign for the future. If the farm-labor organizations throughout America pull together as well as they have here, the resources of our Nation will be developed for the benefit of all and not just a selfish few.

Reveals Newsmen Knew of Alger Hiss' Communist Link 10 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a lot of shallow thinkers in this country, masquerading as liberals and progressives, aided and abetted by Communists and Communist sympathizers, were able to laugh off for a long time warnings given by sensible and well-informed people that our Government was being infiltrated by Communists and Communist sympathizers.

The truth has now been established by such overwhelming evidence, that this danger is obvious now to the most skeptical, whether the disbelief was occasioned by plain dumbness or by honest skepticism.

In the Atlanta Journal of January 25, 1950, there appears a very interesting and informative article by Victor Riesel. I believe it is worth while to place it in the RECORD, and under leave previously granted, I insert this article herewith:

REVEALS NEWSMEN KNEW OF ALGER HISS' COMMUNIST LINK 10 YEARS AGO

(By Victor Riesel)

NEW YORK.—The same emotionless Communist lawyers who snared Alger Hiss out of a proud but rather impoverished and suicide-laden Baltimore family, and either for love or money got him to pass vital documents on to a Red courier ring, today are casually doing business as usual just a few streets from where this is being written. And they are whipping into shape a new network to help cripple the Nation if we go to war with—guess who?

How do I know? Well, it would be nice to pass on the vision of Riesel, the demon newsman, in Hollywood fashion climbing into dark places, filching files and planting microphones. It would be nice. But it's more mundane than fire-escape clambering at midnight.

There are many of us who know—and it goes back to the years when our crowd was a lonely hearts club and we belonged to each other because we knew the secrets of who was spying on what and who was keeping this country from putting guns and warplanes into the hands of young soldiers and kid pilots in trenches and in the air around Nazi Germany.

FEW WOULD LISTEN

But few in the Government listened to us, so we talked to ourselves.

Now that jury after jury comes in with verdicts confirming what we've been saying for almost 15 years, this little group of newsmen, magazine writers and former foreign correspondents can sit back and say the Nation's catching up—and hope the people will listen next time. What made us so all-wise? No great talents.

There's Hiss, for example. Some 10 years ago, our circle knew every detail of his activity. I ran into it at a small strategy session of newspapermen fed up with having their guild run by Communist-party members.

We met, I recall, in the home of a radio editor whose father had been a leading Communist himself, before he broke personally with Joseph Stalin. Someone introduced a chap named Whittaker Chambers, from Time magazine. And we listened carefully as he told us of Communist techniques and how to counter them.

Later we walked for hours along New York's East Side and slowly, sensitively he told the story of his break with the spy ring and about Hiss and other Government officials, some still living, some dead, who secretly had terrific impact on the writings and thinkings of the highest administration leaders. Chambers saw to it that we got on our way home and then disappeared into the crowds. Some of us tried to get action, but no one would listen.

Then, in 1945, at San Francisco, I saw Hiss with Secretary of State Stettinius and Truman—and knew whom the heavily guarded V. Molotov invited to his new fashionable soirees, all under surveillance of trigger-happy OGPU agents.

I knew, too, that I would be marked as nutty if I tried to tell Chambers' story about the slim young man on the platform of the gilded San Francisco Civic Opera House as the UN held its first sessions. So, I, like the few others who knew, had to watch this Nation get the oldest doublecross in the world.

There were literally hundreds of such cases. One day, early in the war, we learned the entire Communist section of CIO was whooping it up for a strike at the four-motored bomber plant in Inglewood, Calif.

AN EYE CONVENTION

We knew that some pro-Communist Los Angeles CIO men worked closely with Hans Diebie of the German-American Bund there in distributing isolationist literature—and when we said this was the logical conclusion of the Russian-Nazi pact we were howled at. Then investigators proved we were right.

Each time we made charges, we did so on the basis of disclosures by men like Chambers, who could no longer stand the leitness of Stalinist corruption of their revolutionary sentiments. And so they broke and sought us out, told us what they knew, even as it happens today and every day.

Therefore, it's worth heeding the warning that the same Communist lawyers who first moved into the Government service back in 1934 and migrated in waves from department to department are now working on creation of a new labor network for industrial sabotage and espionage.

They've subtly approached Albert J. Fitzgerald, head of the United Electrical Workers (Independent) to lead it. But he won't fall for this secret maneuver. So they're looking for another innocent. And when they find him they'll be in business again.

Address by Senator Kefauver at Roosevelt Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered Saturday night before a meeting of Americans for Democratic Action, in the city of Louisville, in the home State of our distinguished Vice President.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is with particular pleasure that I come to Louisville to take part in this occasion. There is a peculiar kinship between us Tennesseans and the citizens of the great Commonwealth of Kentucky. This relationship with me has come to be a very personal one through long friendship with such of your distinguished citizens as Mark Etheridge, Wilson Wyatt, and Albert Kling who live here in Louisville.

And I have enjoyed, first in the House of Representatives, and having the chance of passing the time of day on happy occasions since then, with your distinguished Governor Earle Clements. I have high admiration and enjoy my service in the Senate with your capable Senators, VIRGIL CHAPMAN and GARRETT WITHERS. You know VIRGIL and I were in the House of Representatives together and moved over to the Senate at the same time. I sit next to him on the Armed Services Committee and when I go up to the Judiciary Committee, there by my side is GARRETT WITHERS.

And, of course, one of the big reasons all of us love and esteem the great State of Kentucky is that this State has given the Nation and the world a foremost gentleman, statesman, and friend of all mankind—our Vice President—ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

The history of Kentucky is replete with famous and well-known men such as Henry Clay and Irvin S. Cobb but none have more nearly fitted the hour and none have brought more joy and smiles to task-laden people than our own great Vice President. The democratic world, young children, and old people everywhere, are thankful for ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

I am glad to come here under the sponsorship of Americans for Democratic Action. The ADA has shown remarkable leadership and ability in carrying on effectively the cause of progressive government and sound world leadership. The ADA has shown much initiative in sponsoring this meeting. For ADA's substantial work for a great cause, we are all grateful.

This meeting—coming, as it does, at the outset of our midcentury year—assumes a special significance.

We meet tonight to honor the memory of a man who richly deserves the title of "Man of the Half Century."

It is well that we pause to measure the record of Franklin D. Roosevelt—to measure both the man and the time in which he lived and served. These past 50 years have been turbulent years, fruitful ones for mankind in many respects, but tragic years, too. The next 50 years of the twentieth century will be even more challenging and exciting; and as we approach them, it is appropriate that we examine the heritage which Franklin Roosevelt left us. His life and his faith will fortify us as we approach the grave problems which demand solution today, if mankind is to survive.

Numerous candidates have been advanced for the "man of the half century" distinction.

The editors of Time magazine named Winston Churchill.

No one will deny that this living symbol of British courage and determination is one of the heroic figures of this, or any age.

Some have suggested Lenin or Stalin, the founder of Russian communism, and his chosen disciple.

No one will deny that either of these masters of aggression and terror have influenced the world's destiny in the past 50 years.

The Wright Brothers, Henry Ford, Albert Einstein, and a score of others have changed our lives profoundly through their inventions and discoveries.

But no individual surpassed Franklin D. Roosevelt in his vast achievements for the happiness, well-being, security, and freedom of men everywhere. He symbolized, more than any public figure, the strength and vitality of democratic institutions. In the global combat between the forces of light and of darkness, Roosevelt brought inspiration, more than any other, to those who fought the battle for freedom. The death of no leader in modern history brought a keener sense of personal loss than that experienced by millions, the world over, one April afternoon 5 years ago.

We have only to recall crisis after crisis which Roosevelt met and mastered, to acknowledge the depth of his influence or the supremacy of his leadership.

Roosevelt entered the Presidency of the United States in the midst of our most crippling depression. Under his leadership we brought order from the chaos of that time. Although millions of our people were jobless and homeless, our industrial plant was at a standstill, and hunger and discontent were rampant throughout the Nation, our free-enterprise system later emerged stronger and more productive than ever before.

Long before most of us, Franklin Roosevelt foresaw the danger of aggression across the seas. He warned us and other freedom-loving nations to be prepared.

When war came, it was Roosevelt who guided us in the total mobilization of our manpower, industry, and resources. The production goals he set seemed fantastic then, but we met them. We soon challenged, on equal terms, great war machines unrivaled in world history. In 4 years, backed by our industrial might, the Allies brought Germany, Japan, and Italy to their knees.

Franklin Roosevelt did not live to witness the complete triumph to which he had contributed so much, but he had witnessed at first hand, the folly of our course in the aftermath of World War I. He had resolved that America would not again withdraw into its shell. Long before the end of the conflict we had laid the foundations of a world organization to preserve peace.

The most devoted follower of Franklin Roosevelt will concede that he made mistakes, that he was subject to the failings and foibles of any human being, but in the long-range perspective, against the background of magnificent accomplishment for good, the mistakes somehow become dim in their significance.

However, we are not met to eulogize him, nor do we need to do so.

A nation free from poverty and despair, a world saved from Nazi slavery, are eloquent testimony of his good works.

The crisis we face today presents the opportunity—and the necessity—for great accomplishment again. Within the next few years we shall learn if men can harness the mighty hidden powers of the universe to build the most abundant life ever known; or we shall learn if these powers will be utilized for the destruction of civilization as we know it. A Communist tyranny, more devastating and complete in its scope than its departed predecessors, has entered the equation of world politics to threaten our peace and freedom. The specter of atomic and biological warfare thus lends a terrible urgency to our thinking and action in this hour.

We are compelled to examine the qualities of mind and heart and spirit with which Franklin Roosevelt challenged the crises of his time.

We must demand those qualities of ourselves today.

One predominant characteristic of Roosevelt was courage.

Without courage, who could have conquered the tragic affliction which struck Roosevelt down in the prime of life?

Who can forget the moral and psychological "lift" a nation felt when this once helpless cripple dramatically asserted that "we have nothing to fear but fear itself"?

Too many of our people are troubled today by something approaching the blind, unreasoning, paralyzing fear which Franklin Roosevelt described in March, 1933.

While we must acknowledge the danger of an advancing communism abroad, we must not dissipate our total energy in conducting witch hunts at home.

And while we can foresee the terrible consequences of another depression, we must not permit a slight decline in economic activity to throw us into panic.

We cannot afford to approach any decision or crisis, in international affairs or domestic policy, with the idea that nothing can be done.

We cannot afford to throw up our hands in despair.

We cannot afford to be timid.

The times demand bold and resolute action, and the firm conviction that no problem is insoluble.

Franklin Roosevelt, in private and public life, demonstrated that high courage has its reward.

Roosevelt was blessed with vision too.

He once told a group of Young Democrats: "You ought to thank God tonight if * * * you are young enough in spirit to dream dreams and see visions—dreams and visions about a greater and finer America that is to

be; if you are young enough in spirit to believe that poverty can be greatly lessened; that the disgrace of unemployment can be wiped out; that class hatreds can be done away with; that peace at home and peace abroad can be maintained; and that one day a generation may possess this land, blessed beyond anything we now know, blessed with those things, material and spiritual, which make man's life abundant. If that is the fashion of your dreaming, then I say 'Hold fast to your dream.' America needs it."

These objectives were the fashion of Roosevelt's dreaming.

His vision of a prosperous and contented nation, and of a free, democratic, peaceful world set the sights for all America during the 12 years he led us.

We must not lose nor obscure that vision today. We must not become enmeshed in petty quarrels over details or methods if we thus forget the larger objectives we seek.

With courage and vision, Roosevelt had faith, faith in the supremacy of freemen and free institutions over all who would challenge them; faith in the ultimate triumph of righteousness, faith that man could achieve the dignity intended for him by his Creator.

We dare not falter in that faith, or all will be lost.

However, it was not through these qualities alone, nor through his ability to inspire them in millions of others, that Franklin Roosevelt left such an indelible mark upon his era.

His greatest contribution was that he gave new vitality to our concept of Democratic government.

More clearly than any previous American political leader, Roosevelt saw the new role government must play as the guardian of the people's total interest.

The principles of democratic government have not changed since the time of Jefferson who first enunciated them.

We still believe, as Jefferson did, in equal rights for all and special privileges to none.

We still believe that governments are but the masters of the people but their servants.

We still believe that the interests of the majority must not be submerged to the greed of a minority.

We still believe that the protection of property in its legitimate rights is essential, but that in any conflict between property and men, the rights of men come first.

These beliefs are embedded deeply in the faith of the party of both Jefferson and Roosevelt—the Democratic Party.

Yet through the years we found our political leadership attempting to reconcile these principles with another declared by Jefferson—"that government is best which governs least."

When Roosevelt approached political maturity, civilization had grown far more complex. New production techniques, new methods of communications and transportation had contributed to the growth of mammoth industrial organizations. The industrial society had grown so large under laissez faire that neither the society nor the individuals within it could be secure in their rights. Under the leadership of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, the laissez faire system of private enterprise reached its inevitable collapse. America stood at the crossroads. Either we had to revitalize our concept of democratic government or to cast it aside for totalitarianism of the left or the right.

Roosevelt saw that government could not give meaning to the basic theory of Jeffersonian democracy if we carried to the extreme the notion that the less government, the better.

He conceived of government as the one instrument through which our people could achieve a balance of the complex economic forces of modern society.

Thus the New Deal was born, and the New Deal put our Nation on the road to recovery because its fundamental philosophy was the only sound and workable one for our age. The New Deal provided our only hope, both for democratic government and preservation of the profit system.

Its theory was that the vitality of free enterprise depends primarily upon the welfare of those who produce and consume its goods and services, that is, workers and farmers; that through a wise use of its inherent powers, Government could effectively insure a steady flow of purchasing income.

There followed a coordinated program of public works, wages-and-hours regulation, unemployment insurance, soil conservation, crop controls, and farm subsidies to bulwark the worker and farmer against economic uncertainties. The social-security system was adopted to guarantee the worker an income when age would impair his usefulness. Restrictions on credit and security transactions were designed to prevent the wild speculation of the boom-and-bust era.

This program succeeded. Miraculously enough, it raised the income and standard of living of every group of our people without impairing the personal freedom of any group. Its cost was infinitely small when compared to the total expenditure we made for World War II. The money we have spent, in any two postwar years, to preserve the peace would be the approximate equal of all our domestic expenditures in the first 8 years of Franklin Roosevelt's administration.

Even if we should discount his world leadership in war, Franklin Roosevelt's triumphant effort to enlist Government in the people's service would stamp him as one of the great statesmen of history.

Roosevelt always insisted that government must be adapted to the needs of the time.

If bold action was necessary to make government responsive to the will of the people or to protect them in their basic rights, Roosevelt dared to take such action.

If new government techniques were essential to strengthen and preserve our free-enterprise system, Roosevelt dared to experiment.

Roosevelt never committed the cardinal political sin of repudiating imagination as a component of the art of government.

Today our Government is called upon for action, experimentation, and for service to the cause of human dignity on a scale beyond that of the wildest dreams of the founding fathers.

As never before, we need imaginative political leadership.

We are fortunate to have at the helm today a man in whom Franklin Roosevelt imposed utmost confidence—a man who has valiantly carried forward the Roosevelt program, who has given us imaginative leadership in foreign and domestic policy, and who is worthy of our confidence and trust—Harry S. Truman.

Always within the limits of realistic action, the Truman administration has sought to develop a broad strategy for winning the peace, and for establishing favorable conditions for the growth of democratic government throughout the world.

We have given full support to the United Nations, which provides a world forum for the foes of oppression—even though we have not seen it reach full effectiveness.

We halted the march of communism into the Balkans through timely aid to Greece and Turkey.

Through the Marshall plan we countered Communist infiltration in western Europe.

We entered the North Atlantic Pact, drawing ourselves closer into the fellowship of a freer Europe.

Honesty should compel us to admit that we have made mistakes in the conduct of foreign affairs in this postwar period—but the over-all record is one in which we may have pride and confidence.

Thus in our foreign policy we have seen significant examples of imaginative action by Government to meet the challenges imposed by new conditions and events.

No less imaginative decisions must be made in the field of domestic policy.

All Americans are properly concerned that, in fulfilling our world-wide obligations, we do not throw ten the way of life we seek to preserve. We dare not wreck our own economy in order to sustain democracy overseas; and to strengthen our defenses. Simultaneously we must initiate necessary programs for the welfare and opportunity of our own people, many of whom are denied the benefits which they should rightfully enjoy.

Each of these objectives—foreign economic aid, military preparedness, and higher domestic living standards—is costly in its own right.

Our dilemma is to discover a satisfactory method for financing the biggest job our people have ever undertaken.

The only solution lies in the increasing productivity and vitality of our free-enterprise system, which is the keystone in the arch of world peace.

President Truman and the Democratic Party believes that the American people must have assurance against economic insecurity; that they must have adequate health, housing, and educational facilities; and greater protection of human rights to enlist our full moral and material resources in the cause of peace.

President Truman holds the attainment of these ends essential to the preservation of productive free enterprise.

The President believes it to be the Government's duty to maintain conditions which will permit us to reach these goals.

The Truman Fair Deal is the logical successor to the Roosevelt New Deal.

The Fair Deal is not a revolutionary concept.

It is not a radical departure from previously accepted techniques of Government action.

It seeks simply to provide what its name implies—a fair deal for every American, whether he or she be investor, businessman, worker, farmer, or housewife.

The Fair Deal was not devised in hostility to the interests of any of our people, but to advance the prosperity and security of all.

The Fair Deal concept is that the economic interests of all our people are interdependent—that the businessman cannot sell his product unless the consumer can buy at a reasonable price, that the farmer will suffer if the workingman's wages are cut, and that the social consequences of inadequate housing, health, and of failure to conserve our natural resources must be shared by all our people in equal measure.

The same forces which conspired to obstruct the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt are prepared today to fight the Truman Fair Deal to the last ditch.

The representatives of special-interest groups are no less militant today than 15 years ago; perhaps they are more confused, uncertain that they can thwart the desires of the great body of the people for a fuller, richer life.

But their tactics remain the same.

The opponents of Harry Truman advance no alternative program to assure an expanding economy and a higher standard of living for every citizen.

They resort solely to the bitter denunciations, hysterical attacks, and gloomy predictions which have fallen on deaf ears since 1932.

They are inventing a few new scare words to frighten the people and their representatives in Congress.

They are circulating the same brand of myths that were prevalent in Roosevelt's time.

There is the myth that a monstrous bureaucracy in Washington is enclosing its vast tentacles about the American economy and is squeezing the lifeblood therefrom. This frightening creature apparently was not spawned until 1933 when the Democratic Party moved into Washington. Yet after 17 years of Democratic administrations, the American enterprise system has reached record levels of production, income, and employment.

There is the myth that Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman have saddled the American people with an enormous debt either because they were spendthrifts, and knew no better, or because they harbored some insidious design to wreck the national economy. About 89 percent of the national debt directly reflects the cost of World Wars I and II—but it is difficult to acquaint some individuals with the truth.

It is easy to loose a flood of distorted propaganda about any legislative issue—a flood limited only by the imagination of the author, the slush funds at the disposal of the lobby which employs him, the durability of its mimeograph machines, and the receptiveness of the press to such hand-outs.

It is even easier to examine the facts.

There is no phase of the Fair Deal which has not been devised to provide a maximum amount of local governmental responsibility, a maximum amount of freedom for private enterprise, a minimum of Federal regulation in view of the task to be accomplished.

There is little danger that we will pay heed to these harbingers of doom who stanchly resist every item of liberal legislation which is placed before the Congress.

There is great danger, in this campaign year of 1950, that the people who do believe these impassioned warnings will outvote those of us who do not.

It happened in 1946, when the forward liberal march of the American people was interrupted for 2 years because more than two-thirds of the eligible voters in the Nation stayed home on election day.

This must not happen again. The consequences are too great to elect again a Republican Congress with a do-nothing leadership, which is sure to welsh on every obligation to improve the welfare of the people.

Those of us who believe in liberal action know that we will achieve it only through the Democratic Party.

Our task is to send more Democrats to Congress, and to seek greater unity of purpose among those Democrats who sit in the Congress.

We must press on ahead to implement, with imaginative action, the goals of progress and peace which have been charted for us by Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman.

We must work—and fight—for the liberal program of President Truman.

We must protect the millions of small-business men who form the backbone of our enterprise structure.

We must seek a fair labor-management relations act.

We must give the necessary protection to our farmers, through workable price-support legislation.

We must continue the gains we have made in improving the housing of our people, and erasing the Nation's slums.

We must vigorously fight those who would exploit our precious natural resources for private gain.

I do not want us to ever adopt socialized medicine but we must try in other ways to extend to more of our people the miraculous advances we are making in medical science.

We must work for immediate action to strengthen our educational system. What a heavy price the Nation pays for the tragic waste in human resources and talents which is fostered by inadequate schools.

In achieving all these objectives, our Government has a large responsibility. It has asserted this responsibility in the past, and will do so again, without restricting the personal freedom of any American.

If our Government moves ahead along these lines, it will certainly enlarge the liberty and well-being of every American.

Here is a program which is worthy of the man we honor tonight—the man who first dramatized and gave life to the principle that Government is a positive instrument to be utilized in the people's behalf.

Here is a program which is worthy of our best energies and talents. Its accomplishment demands of us the same courage and faith which Franklin Roosevelt summoned to lead our Nation in troubled times of depression and war. It requires of us something of the same tireless, devoted effort which broke Franklin Roosevelt's health and struck him down in his finest hour.

We cannot deny that the effort will be worth while.

Our Nation has the opportunity today to move into a new era of human well-being.

As President Truman pointed out, we have the resources and the manpower to increase our national production 400 percent in the next 50 years—to expand our average income 300 percent.

We have the opportunity to realize Franklin Roosevelt's vision of a "generation which will possess this land, blessed beyond anything we now know, blessed with those things, material and spiritual, which make man's life abundant."

In our ability to seize this opportunity—to move forward to the fulfillment of our national promise—lies the destiny of generations of men the world over. If we accept our responsibility, all mankind will find renewed faith that a strong and stable America is beside them yet in the eternal quest for freedom and peace.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address broadcast by me on January 30, under the headline "Happenings in Washington." This was program No. 17 in a series of broadcasts.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 17)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

Today I want to direct your attention to the effect of the Government's present spending policies on the value of your money.

I want to show you how the high cost of big government, deficit financing, excessive taxation and increasing debt reduces the purchasing power of your dollars.

That means you are able to buy so much less with your salary or wages than you could only a few years ago.

At this time, when the administration in Washington is predicting that in the year 2000—50 years from now—the average family will be earning $12,000 a year, I think it behooves sensible, hard-headed people to sit down and analyze just what that means.

You see, it is mighty sweet bait. Everybody would like to earn $12,000 a year. Everybody thinks of $12,000 in terms of what it can buy today.

But years of deficit financing by this and previous administrations have brought—not stability—but inflation. The dollar buys less and less.

Inflation may sound like a dull word. But don't be fooled.

Inflation is like a thief robbing every one of you. Inflation makes your savings worth less and makes your money buy less. Inflation reaches into the pockets of every working man and woman in Pennsylvania to steal some of the real value of the dollars they work for.

Let me give you one example of what has happened over the years.

Fifty years ago, in 1900, you could buy 6½ dozen fresh country eggs in most cities for $1. Today you will get about 1 dozen and a quarter for $1. Fifty years ago, a quart of milk was a nickel and you could get a good suit of clothes for $10.

Today, in terms of food and clothing, a dollar buys only a fraction of what it bought then.

Now I'm not suggesting that the figures of 50 years ago have any real meaning today, but let us look 50 years ahead, to the times of wealth and luxury for everybody predicted by Mr. Truman.

If things keep going as they have been, the same dollar which now gets you about 15 eggs, should buy you two, or perhaps three eggs, in the year 2000.

And so on with the other items—meat, bread, milk, clothing, building materials, household furnishings, and all the rest.

That is what is happening. The high-taxing and loose-spending program in Washington, is mainly responsible.

Let me paint the picture for you another way.

Millions of Americans own Government savings bonds. Undoubtedly many of you listening to me now went to the bank or the post office in January 1940, and purchased a baby bond for $18.75. The Government promised that if you held your bond for 10 years it would pay you $25—a good, sound, investment.

This month you redeemed your bond and received the $25 in cash as promised. In other words, your money increased by $6.25.

But did your money really increase in value?

The answer, I regret to say, is "No."

It actually decreased.

You can buy less goods with $25 today than you could with $18.75 back in January 1940. You can buy fewer eggs, less butter, less meat, less clothing.

This means that you lent the money to the Government, did without it for 10 years, and what the Government gave you in return had less real purchasing value than the money you lent in the first place.

That is what comes from depreciating the value of the dollar—from inflation.

In our State of Pennsylvania, many elderly, retired people depend upon fixed incomes. They live on pensions or annuities purchased with dollars which had the real buying power of 10, 15, and 20 years ago.

Today those dollars buy only half as much as the aged expected when they invested their savings.

The devaluation of your money, coupled with high taxes and deficit spending in times of great prosperity, can have only one end. It can only weaken America at a time when our country needs to be strong.

The President tells you that it is necessary for the Government to go into the red in years of greatest prosperity when we should be reducing our debt. He says he is

doing it for national defense and to buy prosperity for the western European nations.

He says what he is doing will win the cold war for us and that it will prevent any shooting war.

On the contrary, we are not discouraging the Communists; we are doing exactly what they want us to do. Many of you remember that Lenin and other philosophers of communism predicted that the United States would spend itself into destruction.

The Russians work hard to create situations which stampede our Government into spending beyond its means. Thus, in years of prosperity and dollar income greater than anything we ever had before the war, we are going five, and five and one-half billions a year into the red.

This heavy drain on the resources and productivity of our people must make us progressively weaker.

Any businessman can understand this. Any businessman knows that in good years he must reduce his business debt and set aside a surplus to meet emergencies. He knows that if he operates in the red during the years of good business, he must surely go out of business in bad times.

Any housewife understands it. She knows she must save money when her husband has a good job at good wages.

That is elementary economics.

Everybody seems to know it but the administration in Washington.

This administration is merely building up new spending programs, which mean more deficit financing, more inflation and further depreciation in the purchasing power of your dollar.

It is pushing forward more of what has been described as foot-in-the-door spending. That kind of spending program doesn't cost too much the first year. But thereafter, year after year, the bills mount sharply.

Let me call attention to just a few of these.

Mr. Truman calls for a National Science Foundation which would cost only $500,000 the first year. Very inexpensive. But the cost builds up so that eventually the annual outlays will exceed a hundred million dollars.

Another Truman proposal is for the St. Lawrence seaway which would be so destructive to the important port of Philadelphia and to much of Pennsylvania's business. This calls for a Government outlay of only $4,000,000 the first year. Then it shoots up to a minimum of eighty-two million annually for the next 7 years.

There is the controversial Federal-aid-to-education bill, under which Pennsylvania would be taxed to support schools in other States. The first year it will cost you $200,000,000. But that is just a start. Experts estimate that the annual cost will mount to close to $2,000,000,000 in a relatively few years.

One fancy foot-in-the-door proposal is the Brannan plan of agricultural support. This one is the most dangerous of all. The administration does not even dare to estimate publicly what that will cost. But other official sources have figured that the bill will be several billion dollars a year.

These are all new programs. They are all inflationary. They will all affect the value of your dollars.

What shall we do to curb the policy of spending and spending which has lessened the value of your money and which threatens to make your dollars worth even less in the future?

A number of different approaches have been suggested here in Washington. I commend them for your consideration. I suggest that you let your Members of Congress know how you feel about them.

In my opinion, each of them will serve a useful purpose in getting the nation's spending policy back to an even level, to the kind of stability which will make your dollars buy at least as much food and clothing next year and the year after as they can purchase now.

One suggestion has come from several Members of Congress. It is to have a single appropriation bill. This would enable Members of Congress who vote these appropriations to see the entire spending picture in detail and to make cuts intelligently and fairly.

I wonder how many people realize that now the administration departments send their spending requests to Congress one at a time. Thus, we have a situation where money for some departments is voted through before Congress has even seen what other departments need.

This is poor business policy. But that is the way we have been required to legislate in Washington.

Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, the Republican leader of the House, has appointed a committee to put a price tag, as he expresses it, on all new spending proposals. This committee will study all bills providing for new spending. It will seek to determine what they will cost the taxpayers.

By pointing out that some things will cost more than believed, and much more than they are worth, the committee may halt such proposals.

Now let me call your attention to the suggestion of Mr. Daniel W. Bell. Mr. Bell was Budget Director under President Roosevelt for 6 years. Then for six more years he served under Mr. Roosevelt and then Mr. Truman as Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Bell, let me add, was a career man in Government who started in the Treasury Department in 1911 as stenographer and then bookkeeper. From that humble beginning he worked himself up to the high positions he held in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

So I think you will realize that he talks with authority and with considerable friendliness toward the administration.

In a very recent speech he suggested that there should be no new Government spending for the next 2 years. He suggested that the Federal Government should not take on any new functions and that it should not expand any of its present functions.

During this period of moratorium, he added, Congress should look over what has been done. It should correct mistakes of the past and tighten up the machinery of Government.

Congress should, in a word, seek to create a condition of stability. It should halt the runaway spending which is causing inflation and is weakening the spending power of your dollars.

That is from Mr. Bell. It is one of the soundest proposals I have heard in a long time in Washington. It will protect your savings bonds, your bank accounts, your life insurance, and all forms of annuities and pensions.

It is a good thing to make yourself clear about that to your Congressmen.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

The All-American Conference Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, yesterday in New York City there was launched a significant movement against communism by the All-American Conference Against Communism. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, at this point, some remarks of my own relative to the conference, the resolutions adopted by it, and also the report about the conference appearing in today's issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the statement, resolutions, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ORGANIZATION DEVELOPED FOR ALL-OUT FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM AND ITS RELATED COLLECTIVISTIC CONCEPTS

STATEMENT BY HON. KARL E. MUNDT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. President, communism cannot be curtailed by conversation. Since communism is an international conspiracy which advances its creed by tightly organized units forming the nucleus of a whole matrix of cooperating front organizations it follows that it requires equal effort and equal organizational genius and gumption if America is to defeat the program of communism. As a consequence of the 2-day sessions of the All-American Conference Against Communism concluding yesterday in New York City it appears that at long last this country is to have an all-American, pro-American organization solidly enough supported and with tight enough cohesion among its cooperating associations and groups so that an effective program can be devised and promoted at the grass-roots level on a community-by-community basis to defeat the pagan poisons of the godless Communist conspiracy.

The American Legion takes the lead

The All-American Conference Against Communism on Saturday featured addresses by Lt. Gen. W. Bedell Smith, former United States Ambassador to Russia; George Sokolsky, syndicated columnist and foreign correspondent; Frank H. Gordon, assistant in Communist conspiracy prosecution; James B. Carey, national vice president of the CIO; Matthew Woll, national vice president of the A. F. of L.; and Hon. Jack B. Tenney, State senator of California. The opening address of the conference was delivered by George N. Craig, of Indiana, the national commander of the American Legion, under whose sponsorship this first All-American Conference Against Communism was conducted. At the banquet Saturday night, addresses were delivered by Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen and Rev. Daniel A. Poling.

Sunday morning's session, Mr. President, began with an all-faiths' religious service lead by Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, of New York City, Rev. Daniel A. Poling, of New York City, and Edward J. Carney, O. S. A., national chaplain of the American Legion. The concluding addresses of the conference were delivered by Dr. Francis L. Bacon, of the University of California, and by the present speaker, the junior Senator from the State of South Dakota. A press release containing a digest of my remarks is being inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of this statement.

Mr. President, I am greatly fortified in my conviction this morning that communism is going to be turned back in America and that our citizens are going to reject the centralized political controls which so frequently precede and which so invariably accompany communism by the fact that out of that conference this last week end came some constructive, concrete action. A 17-member committee was appointed in conformity with resolutions adopted at the conclusion of the conference calling for another meeting within 90 days and authorizing this committee to prepare an agenda for the next meeting and to do the spade work preliminary to the creation of a permanent anti-Communist central organization with a definite and detailed program of action to be undertaken not only at the community level but also at the State and National levels.

The resolutions adopted and the identity of the members of the committee will appear following this statement as a part of these remarks. It should be noted, however, that this 17-member committee brings into focus on this problem such varying but important groups as the CIO, the A. F. of L., the Chamber of Commerce, Lions International, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Business and Professional Women's Clubs, the National American Legion Auxiliary, the State legislatures, the Congress of the United States, and religious, and fraternal orders of significant size.

Mr. President, we can win against communism if we work at it but we must work as a team and every community in the land must put into action a program to protect the integrity and the formula of freedom of its own area. If any of you have further thoughts on what can be done by this about-to-be-created permanent national anticommunism organization, I hope you will send them to Commander George N. Craig of the American Legion, care of Legion Headquarters, Indianapolis, Ind., so we can bring to bear on this problem the best constructive thinking of us all. America has no more important problem before it today than to curtail communism abroad and to defeat it at home.

RESOLUTIONS AND STATEMENT ADOPTED AT ALL-AMERICAN CONFERENCE, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 29, 1950

The following statement was adopted by the first All-American Conference at its closing session as expressing the determination of the 60 participating national organizations to pool their efforts to stamp out communism:

"We, the officially designated representatives of 60 major national patriotic, religious, labor, business, civic, service, professional, educational, fraternal, veteran, and social organizations representing the overwhelming majority of the American people, assembled in the first All-American Conference in New York City, January 28, 29, 1950, under sponsorship of the American Legion to form a united front against a common enemy—world communism.

"We assembled as free Americans. We have the right and do assert it, to hold our own and perchance differing views and opinions on problems involving economic, educational, political, religious, and social issues. But here in New York, as free Americans all, we find ourselves in complete accord and agreement that:

"1. World communism is the greatest present threat to domestic security and peace on earth and that its No. 1 targets are God and our American way of life in the United States, the last—a great stronghold of undiluted human freedom.

"2. The steady infiltration of communism into our schools and colleges, into our press, radio, and screen, into our labor and business and into our Government itself has reached a stage where it constitutes an immediate, serious, and growing menace to the very existence of the America that we know and love.

"3. Communism, as practiced in the United States, is not an economic or political philosophy, but it is in fact a deliberate revolutionary conspiracy inspired, directed, and financed by an alien power. It seeks to accomplish the overthrow of our constitutional form of government through force and violence. It seeks to achieve its unholy end through deceit and lies, to divide our people through vicious propaganda, to set class against class, race against race, and creed against creed. It denies the existence of God, seeks to extirpate all forms of religion, and aims to set up the police state as the supreme authority: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the chairman of this All-American Conference, George N. Craig, national commander of the American Legion, be, and hereby is, directed to designate a committee representative of a cross-section of the organizations in attendance at this conference to formulate plans to stimulate and coordinate the efforts of the organizations here represented and others of like mind, to encourage and enlist active public interest in combating the infiltration, influence, and activities of the Communists and all other subversive elements and to act as a clearing house and information center, through which the various organizations may be informed and advised of the activities and experiences of other organizations, all upon the understanding that such committee shall recognize the full independence of the various organizations and shall not attempt to control or supervise them; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That another meeting of the All-American Conference shall be called by the commander of the American Legion within 90 days to establish a permanent pro-American, anticommunism, unified and cohesive organization."

This resolution was submitted to the All-American Conference by a special committee of the delegates, named by National Commander Craig of the American Legion. Members of the committee which drafted the statement and signed it follow:

Harry Reed, CIO, Washington, D. C., chairman.

Dr. Francis L. Bacon, college of education, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Senator Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota.

Mr. Don Belding, president of Freedoms Foundation, Valley Forge, Pa.

Paul Wamsley, Buffalo, N. Y., representing the National Education Association.

Hon. Jack B. Tenney, Los Angeles, Calif., State senator.

Alexander T. Wells, New York, N. Y., past international president of Lions International.

Miss Olive H. Huston, New York, N. Y., executive director, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

The All-American Conference at its closing session on January 29, approved a report of a drafting committee representing a cross-section of the meeting, which recommended that a permanent united front against communism be established.

Upon this authority, National Commander George N. Craig of the American Legion, who presided over the conference, appointed a committee of 17 members for forming a permanent organization and fixing the place of the next meeting to be held within 90 days.

THE COMMITTEE FOR PERMANENT ORGANIZATION

Harry Reed, CIO, Washington, D. C., chairman.

Dr. Francis L. Bacon, Westwood, Calif., UCLA College of Education.

Mr. Paul Wamsley, Buffalo, N. Y., National Education Association.

Hon. Jack B. Tenney, Los Angeles, Calif., California State senator.

Alexander T. Wells, New York, N. Y., past International Lions president.

Hon. Karl E. Mundt, United States Senator from South Dakota.

Miss Olive H. Huston, New York, N. Y., executive director, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

Mrs. Marie L. Sheehe, Rockford, Ill., national president of the American Legion Auxiliary.

Mrs. J. L. Blair Buck, Washington, D. C., president, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, New York, N. Y., executive director, American Jewish League Against Communism, Inc.

Lewis Hines, Washington, D. C., Philadelphia, American Federation of Labor.

Rev. Daniel A. Poling, New York, N. Y., editor, the Christian Herald.

Rev. John F. Cronin, Washington, D. C., assistant director, Department of Social Action, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Dr. Louis H. Bauer, Hempstead, N. Y., chairman of the board of trustees, the American Medical Association.

Jackson D. Holtz, Boston, Mass., B'nai B'rith.

Donald Marcellus, Washington, D. C., manager, northeastern division, United States Chamber of Commerce.

A representative, to be named, of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. President, I now call attention to the press release containing a digest of the address I delivered yesterday to the concluding session of this first All-American Conference Against Communism:

PRESS REVIEW OF ADDRESS GIVEN BY HON. KARL E. MUNDT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, BEFORE AMERICAN LEGION ALL-AMERICAN CONFERENCE

"Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, in an address before the national All-American Conference sponsored by the American Legion, proposed that the 78 participating organizations form—under Legion leadership—a national phalanx-for-freedom.

"The Senator's address concluded the 2-day conference sponsored by the Legion's National Americanism Commission at the Hotel Astor which was called to develop a united national front against communism and subversion and to preserve the American way of life.

"Asked to appear on the program representing the viewpoint of Congress toward the challenge of communism and its related creeds, Senator MUNDT proposed the phalanx-for-freedom to coordinate the efforts of all groups desiring to do something practical and effective at the grass-roots level in helping to influence constructive State and National legislation.

"The Senator's talk was given before delegates from 78 national organizations who were invited to attend the conference by George N. Craig, national Legion commander.

"Senator MUNDT, who was a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities under all four of the chairmen who have headed that group, told the conference that 'the battle to protect our Christian civilization, our American formula of freedom, and our established principles of private ownership and political independence calls for an all-out effort by God-fearing, loyal, and patriotic citizens of every race, class, and creed in this Republic.'

"The South Dakota solon, who served as acting chairman of the Un-American Committee at the discovery of the so-called pumpkin papers which led to the espionage activities of Whittaker Chambers and Alger Hiss, said to conference delegates that 'Victory in this fight against tyranny and the nationalization of both our economic and our political freedoms means as much to the farmer in his field, the workman in his shop, and the professional man in his office as it does to the big banker on the corner, the corporation president, or the very rich with their lush yachts and limousines.'

"He went on to say: 'In truth, this is a peoples' fight against a political plot to centralize our lives under the control of a few political overlords devoted to an alien creed and differing from the autocrats of ancient times only because they believe it is the Kremlin instead of the King that can do no wrong.

"'It is not alone the card-carrying Communist that we must guard against,' Senator MUNDT stated. He explained that 'we must be equally on the alert to restrain and defeat those who would give aid, comfort, and strength to the Communist cause by creating

political monopolies in the field of economic, social, and political controls.'

"He pointed out these monopolies 'can then be taken over by a Communist cabal and thus deny freedom to the people by a coup d'état or a storming of the power centers without even giving the people an opportunity to beat back their power-hungry attempts by rejecting their blandishments at the polls.'

"The South Dakota Senator outlined a step-by-step, community-by-community program which he recommended for consideration and active promotion by the phalanx-for-freedom which he urged the conference to sponsor.

"He recommended sponsorship on a basis to include all organizations 'willing to devote time, energy, money, or talent to the hallowed cause of freedom and to the practical task of educating ourselves and our children to the importance of maintaining in America the irreducible concepts of freedom and independence which are essential if liberty is to thrive and tyranny be turned back at our outer gates and stamped out of our own backyards.'

"Senator MUNDT suggested a local action committee in every American city, town, and country, and his list of recommendations for activities to be sponsored and promoted by this phalanx-for-freedom included the following items:

"Legislative action: Support and enactment of national legislation requiring the registration of all Communist organizations and members, annual financial reports to Congress by all Communist groups, and specific statutory provisions denying Communists the privilege of Federal employment and punishing equally those who deceptively obtain such employment and those Federal officials who knowingly appoint Communists to office.

"Legislation should also be enacted denying Communists American passports to travel abroad, compelling them to identify clearly all literature sent through the mail and all radio programs as to their Communist source, and extending to at least 10 years the statute of limitations on all crimes against the security and defenses of the Government.

"Senator MUNDT also recommended that similar legislation be enacted by each State legislature in order that both Federal and State law-enforcement agencies would have authority to keep from the public pay roll those who would use their official positions to deny freedom to others and to sabotage the functions of political and academic freedoms in this country.'

"Community-action programs: Senator MUNDT recommended that a special short course on What's Right With America be added to the curriculum of every high school of America so that 'each high school graduate will clearly know the basic principles of freedom which have so long and so well provided us with a success formula in America which has been unrivaled and unequaled anywhere else in the world in any era of history.'

"The South Dakota Senator also recommended that every community have 1 week each year set aside for a community-wide program and educational observance to be labeled 'Know Your America Week.' Senator MUNDT recommended that the week's observance start with sermons in every church praising the good features about America and to thank God that the United States—with all of its deficiencies and with all its never-ending need for continued improvement—still offers every church of every creed a better opportunity to render its great service than any other country in the world offers to any church in Christendom.'

"Senator MUNDT also urged that there be oratorical and essay contests for school children on the theme 'Why I Love America Great'; that there be window displays in the stores; exhibits in the exposition halls and public auditoriums; radio broadcasts, editorials, cartoons and newspaper features stressing the values of private ownership, individual initiative, free enterprise, political independence and the cherished freedoms guaranteed in our American Bill of Rights.

"The Senator further recommended that 'special motion pictures be made and displayed during this commemorative week and that street parades, public programs, pageants, posters and all other publicity and educational media be mobilized to the end that by Saturday night every citizen, old and young, rich or poor, can go to bed with a full realization and appreciation of the great privilege that is his in living in America and with a clear knowledge of how well he lives and how richly he is rewarded by comparison with similar citizens under any other creed or living in any other country in the world.'

"A third community objective of the phalanx-for-freedom movement Senator MUNDT proposed as being a continuing effort in every locality to 'project the dividends of freedom in increasing amounts to steadily expanding circles of citizens so that every individual in every community will grow more enthusiastic in his Americanism and more sturdy in his opposition to false and alien creeds by virtue of the fact that freedom is meaning more and more to him in terms of better living, better health, more security, greater opportunity, and a richer and fuller life.'

"Finally, Senator MUNDT recommended that every community 'maintain an outpost to stand guard against tyranny or trickery to make certain its flank in the global battle against communism and national socialism in any form is well-manned, alertly staffed, and adequately prepared so that those who would deceive our youth, betray our freedoms, and destroy our American success formula do not weasel their way into our schools, our church groups, our business, farming, labor, or professional organizations.'

"The Senator warned against allowing these persons to 'supply "packaged thinking" and "pink pills for mental usage" by our women's clubs, our youth groups, or other organizations of any kind.'

"Senator MUNDT recommended exposure in the community itself by alert and active citizens as an effective way to defeat the Communist agitators and propagandists 'since I am convinced that 90 percent of all our Americans of every political party, race, creed, color, and locality would reject the pagan poisons of the Communist conspiracy and its odd assortment of fellow-travelers, witness dupes, and sentimental soulmates if once the true identity and purposes of this army of alien-minded organizations and individuals was exposed to the light of day and the relentless rejoinders of public opinion and patriotic citizens.'

"Included on the speaking program for the All-American Conference with Senator Mundt were: Gen. W. Bedell Smith, former United States Ambassador to Moscow; George Sokolsky, noted columnist and former Moscow correspondent of the New York Times; James B. Carey, of the CIO; Matthew Woll, of the A. F. of L.; Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, Rev. Daniel A. Poling, and Frank R. Gordon, assistant Federal prosecutor in the successful trial resulting in conviction of 11 Communists in the United States."

Finally, Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the news article in this morning's issue of the New York Times on this important conference. William R. Conklin of the New York Times covered the conference in detail and his news report appearing in today's issue summarizes its program and its purposes.

GROUPS WITH 50,000,000 MEMBERS UNITE TO COMBAT UNITED STATES COMMUNISM—PERMANENT BODY, SPONSORED BY THE LEGION, IS COMPOSED OF CIVIC, LABOR, BUSINESS, PROFESSIONAL, AND RELIGIOUS ELEMENTS

(By William R. Conklin)

Representatives of national organizations with a combined membership of 50,000,000 voted unanimously yesterday to establish a permanent organization to combat communism in the United States.

The action was taken on the closing day of a 2-day All-American Conference at the Astor Hotel sponsored by the American Legion. George N. Craig, national commander of the Legion, stressed the role of religion in the fight on communism and invited all loyal Americans to join in. He named a 17-member Nation-wide steering committee to direct the anti-Communist drive.

Before the conferees set up their permanent committee Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, told them that Russia could "knock out the United States in 90 seconds" with atomic bombs. Discussing Communist infiltration of the Federal Government, he said:

"Since Yalta, 151 Communists and fellow-travelers have been fired from the State Department, and the distressing thing is that not one of them ever spent a day in jail."

RESOLUTIONS BLASTS CONSPIRACY

In their resolution the 100 conferees said:

"World communism is the greatest present threat to domestic security and peace on earth, and its No. 1 target are God and our American way of life.

"The steady infiltration of communism into our schools and colleges, into our press, radio and screen, into our labor and business, and into our Government itself, constitutes an immediate, serious, and growing menace to the very existence of America.

"Communism as practiced in the United States is not an economic or a political philosophy, but is in fact a deliberate revolutionary conspiracy inspired, directed, and financed by an alien power.

"Communism seeks to overthrow our constitutional form of government through force and violence. It seeks to achieve its unholy end through deceit and lies, to divide our people through vicious propaganda, to set class against class, race against race, and creed against creed.

"It denies the existence of God, seeks to extirpate all forms of religion and aims to set up the police state as the supreme authority."

CIO MAN IN EXECUTIVE POST

Harry Read of the Congress of Industrial Organizations was chairman of the resolutions committee. Other members included Don Belding, president of Freedoms Foundation in Los Angeles; Dr. Francis L. Bacon of the University of California in Los Angeles; Paul Wamsley, of Buffalo, of the National Education Association; State Senator Jack B. Tenney, of California; Alexander T. Wells, of New York, past president of Lions International; and Miss Olive H. Huston, of New York, executive director of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

The permanent committee named by Commander Craig has Mr. Read as chairman. Mr. Craig appointed Dr. Bacon, Mr. Wamsley, Senator Tenney, Mr. Wells, and Miss Huston as members.

Other members are: Senator Mundt, Mrs. Marie Sheehe, national president of the American Legion Auxiliary; Mrs. J. L. Blair Buck, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs; Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, director of the American Jewish League Against Communism; Lewis G. Hines of the American Federation of Labor; the Reverend Daniel A. Poling, the Reverend J. Francis Cronin of the National Catholic Welfare Federation; Dr. Louis H. Bauer, American Medical Association; Donald Marcellus of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and Jackson Holtz of B'nai B'rith.

Another committee member is to be designated by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which was not represented at the conference.

Under the resolution the committee recognizes the full independence of various organizations and will not attempt to control or supervise them.

MUNDT CALLS FOR ACTION

Senator MUNDT proposed a phalanx-for-freedom movement to coordinate the anti-Communist campaign.

"We live in a world where Russia is stockpiling atom bombs which, in effect, could be labeled 'Made for the U. S. A.'," he declared. "If dropped on 25 or 30 major cities, they could knock out the United States in 90 seconds. This country is blandly permitting Russia to build up its bomb stock piles, and we are doing nothing more than mildly deploring it."

As practical steps Mr. MUNDT recommended Federal legislation to compel Communists to register with the Attorney General and to identify their literature.

He said this legislation should deny Federal employment to Communists and should punish superiors who hired them knowingly. He urged the conferees to support the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston bill now before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

"The bill will pass in the House, as it did in the Eightieth Congress" Senator MUNDT said. "Whether or not President Truman will sign it, I don't know. I suppose it depends on what he hears from Dean Acheson. But hiring a Communist in the Federal Government is like hiring a kidnaper as a baby-sitter."

Mr. MUNDT also recommended regular community programs to emphasize the benefits of American life and a special week each year devoted to Americanism.

"If a functional organization is developed here, this meeting may go down in history as one as important as the tea party given in Boston many years ago," he added.

Dr. Bacon, faculty member of College of Education in the University of California, discussed Communist infiltration of American colleges and universities. He said the country spent less than 3 percent of its national budget on education last year and called for increased appropriations in that field.

Assistance to Small Business Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] at the annual banquet of the Norwich (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce. In his address the Senator from Connecticut very ably discussed the problems of independent business enterprises, and made specific recommendations for necessary legislation which I think were very enlightening, and which should be very helpful to the Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am told by my congressional colleague, Mrs. Woonsocket, that crossing the Connecticut River into eastern Connecticut is like scaling the Great Divide. On my side, the side where the sun sets, is a darkly mysterious civilization of commuters, station wagons, and advertising men. We have replanted our forests with factory chimneys and our land has been tilled into golf courses. Our sons go to Yale, our wives go to art school, and our towns go solidly Republican.

It goes without saying, of course, that none of this has been applied to me. Today I crossed the Rubicon at Hartford with no challenge whatsoever after I had paid my head tax of a dime. And as I rode into the clear air and broad meadows of your countryside I felt not unlike the returning prodigal son.

Not far from here, up in Tolland, are the gravestones of many generations of Bentons. These eastern Connecticut Bentons never were corrupted by money. My mother, who was not born a Benton, says it was because the Bentons couldn't find any in Connecticut that my father ended up in Minnesota. He didn't find much there, either.

The Bentons were Congregational ministers, school teachers, and farmers. I never see the rows and rows of stone fences that are so characteristic of Connecticut without marveling at these folks, and those like them, who scratched a living from this rugged farmland. The monuments of their determination, I often suspect, will outlast the Travelers' Tower or the Merritt Parkway.

They were little people and humble, too. They attached no importance or significance to their way of life. They had to work too hard just to live. But their lives, nevertheless, were eloquent expressions of independence.

This is a point worth recalling tonight before this audience of eastern Connecticut businessmen because the independent, small-business man today is a builder of stone walls in our modern economy. It is about him that I shall talk tonight. He represents the leadership and initiative which have helped this country survive the cold winters of depression and war. Independent small business is the core of our Connecticut community life.

It is a matter of record that over 90 percent of the 4,000,000 business enterprises in this country have fewer than 50 employees. It is also a matter of record that the thinking segment of this huge proportion of our business community feels itself in danger. The independent, small-business man in many respects is the "forgotten man" of this mid-century decade in our national history. He is in danger of a squeeze play that may deprive him of his independence as well as his profits.

On one side, the independent manufacturer, retailer, and serviceman must wage a continual battle for survival against his larger, more powerful competitors. It is true that the keen independent keeps bigger business on its toes by developing new products, improved designs, and advanced methods of sale and distribution. It is also true that as fast as some good independent demonstrates this kind of spunk all too often a bigger fellow comes along and gobbles him up.

The business which is independent and big is not a problem. Unhappily, there are all too few of these in the sense in which I use the word "independent." The real problem is how we can protect and promote the business which is independent and small. The independent business, big and small, is the business which supplies the yeast in our economy. It is the one which continues to provide the competition which gives to our economy the freedom of which we boast. It is the one which we should foster as a matter of national policy.

There is more than one way to collectivize an economy. It can be done by force from without, as we have seen with Czechoslovakia. It can be done by tyrants from within, as Hitler learned from Mussolini. But it can also come through business monopoly practices within any country or any economy. Such practices are the foe of enterprise and of new and independent business. They are a most important part of the problem today in England—and the Labor government can hardly be held responsible for the decline of competition in England and the steady growth of monopolistic business practices over the last several decades.

I believe the English economy again demonstrates the need for the strict and fair enforcement of our antitrust laws. They are the best friend we have of free competition in the United States. They are the best friend of new and independent business. They are the friend and supporter of those who foster enterprise in our economy. They would be a still better friend if they were still further strengthened.

The independent, small-business man has grown to feel, not without reason, that his National Government has not always treated his problems with the attention and sympathy they deserve. You may recall the statement contained in the recent report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. "The businessman believes," the Council says, "it is futile to influence public policy, because he is outnumbered by workers and farmers—and because he believes the Government counts, not thinks."

I recommend this report to your attention as well as the President's own economic message to Congress. They represent a significant, and encouraging, change of attitude toward the business community at the highest level of national policy making. They are most cheering reports to those of us who have pioneered in the development of a more sympathetic understanding by Government of the problems of the business community in the preservation and strengthening of our free-enterprise system. The pioneering, I may say, has also included the development by business of some understanding of the problems and responsibilities of government; for our Government does, indeed, play a decisive role in the determination of the climate in which we as businessmen may thrive and prosper or wither and die. Some of us at least are more willing to admit this crucial and, indeed, indispensable role of business than we were a decade ago.

I like to think that I see in these two recent economic reports many of the ideas which Paul Hoffman, RALPH FLANDERS, and I helped to evolve when we helped organize the Committee for Economic Development, ideas with which many of you must be familiar. Here are a couple of samples contained in these most important documents which have just come from the administration. This is a new kind of language to encourage the independent businessman who believes in enterprise and competition. This isn't the language of the thirties. It is, gentlemen, the language of the fifties. I commend it to the business community. This is from the report of the Council of Economic Advisers:

1. "During the depression years a significant body of thought held that the forces of business expansion had spent themselves and that Government must provide the dynamic force for renewed growth * * * today the doctrine of secular stagnation has been replaced by the firm conviction that our business system, and with it our whole economy, can and should continue to grow."

And again:

"The new generation of Americans should always remember that the depression breakdown resulted from errors on the part of both Government and business; that both joined in forging some of the most practical measures for recovery; and that both must admit imperfection because the recovery was incomplete until the war restored maximum production and employment."

Quoting the President:

"This effective teamwork between free enterprise and Government confounded the enemies of freedom, who waited eagerly during 1949 for the collapse of the American economy. * * * That economy can and must continue to grow. * * * The enterprise and imagination of private businessmen will be a crucial factor in achieving the upward growth of which our economy is capable."

As one Washington reporter put it, "The fire-eating, dragon-slaying approach to business of 10 years ago has been replaced by a concept of government in the role of facilitating and promoting business expansion and welfare."

I think you will agree with me that this is a most sound and healthy development. Further, it is one reason I am optimistic about that future. We have come a long ways, even though we still have much to learn about the proper role of government in our economy. (This is a subject to which I shall dedicate myself in some other speech.)

It is fair to say, I think, that there is usually far less proportional risk and boldness involved in operating our largest capital enterprises than, for example, in opening a new tavern, a new drugstore or laundry, or in launching a new product on the market. The risks to the men who strike out on their own, and how better to guard against some of them, are of vital concern not only to them but to the rest of us as well.

The President of one of our largest steel companies once told me of his experience with the most promising young man in the senior class of a great eastern university.

"Although they were all eager to work for us," he said, "we discovered that they were not so much interested in the steel business as in the security offered by a big company. They didn't mind starting at the bottom of the ladder, but they wanted someone else to hold the ladder."

In a recent issue of Life magazine (and I know you will not attach any political significance to the fact that I subscribe to a Luce publication) the young cartoonist Bill Mauldin cited a poll of 150,000 college graduates in the class of 1949. The poll showed that only 2 percent had any desire to go into business on their own.

"The fact is," says Mr. Mauldin, "that most people would rather work for a steady salary. They can depend on it, plan on it, and turn their attention to things that interest them more than their jobs."

Bill Mauldin may be right. But 8 years ago I wrote a short article for Reader's Digest called Young Man, Be Your Own Boss. After that article was published I received 8,000 letters and 400 telegrams. I have never written an article or made a speech which struck a chord anywhere nearly so responsive. And I continue to believe that there is no economic opportunity which offers such rewards in the form of personal growth and personal satisfaction as starting one's own independent business.

I do not mean to imply that there is anything ignoble about the aspirations of our young people to secure the protection for themselves and their families often offered by the big companies. All of us have always feared the economic hazards of old age and death. Young people have always wanted protection against these hazards. It is only recently, however, that they think they can get the protection. If I had thought I could get it 30 years ago, when I graduated from Yale, I am not one to claim that my own career might not have been quite different. Alas and alack, I might indeed have stayed with that $100-a-month job in the National City Bank.

You may guess from this that I firmly believe in the principle of what we loosely call social security. I believe that some form of assured security income is essential to the sustained welfare, freedom, and dignity of the American citizen.

How can we give the social security which our people want—and which our young people seek—without forcing them into the big companies in order to get it? It is in their interest to step out on their own—to provide enterprise and competition in our economy—to develop new products and new services. Yes, it is in their interest. Even more, it is in the interest of all of us.

I have reached the opinion that our small independent businessman is not only entitled as much as anyone else in our society to the protection offered by social-security laws, but that it is even more important to the rest of us that we have it.

In the last analysis, the security of every individual depends on the success of industry and agriculture in producing an increasing flow of goods and services. Without this increasing flow, an adequate social-security program would bankrupt us all. A system of security insurance for the small-business man will reinforce this drive toward greater production and maximum economic progress. It will encourage him to get going, and it will support him and keep him going in the inevitable days of discouragement. It should indeed cut down on the terrible mortality rate in the small business community.

There is now a bill before the Senate Finance Committee which would extend the Social Security Act to cover about 4,500,000 self-employed, independent, small-business men—storekeepers, retailers, garagemen, contractors, taxicab owners, and insurance brokers. I endorse the principle of extending this protection to the man who has the pride and the ambition to work for himself. By extending it, we shall get more such men.

Complete security, however—like happiness—is not to be had for the asking. More often than not, it is simply the byproduct of some other goal. We do not always find happiness just by searching for it. Similarly we rarely feel secure when we seek only to avoid taking risks.

The Yankee peddlers who trudged out of this State into the wilderness of the American backwoods were drawn by a sense of adventure as well as mere dollars and cents. It might be said they took what our military men would call a calculated risk when they left a sharpshooting, frontier housewife with a supply of wooden nutmegs.

In recent years, it seems to me, Government policy has overburdened small business with an unfair proportion of uncalculated risk in relation to the possibilities of profit. Social-security protection only goes part way toward converting the uncalculated into a reasonable calculation.

I do not think that it was either fair or prudent to retain in peacetime the high rate of excise taxes which were imposed during the war to curtail production in certain areas. These taxes have seriously reduced the volume of business in many lines of retail trade and have caused unemployment in several different kinds of New England industry—in many independent, small businesses of the kind I have been talking about tonight.

The President has now recommended reductions. I concur in this policy, and I look forward hopefully to the eventual elimination of all excise taxes except those on liquor, gasoline, and tobacco.

In his tax message this week the President also recommended the removal of the so-called notch tax on small-business income between twenty-five and fifty thousand dollars a year. The rate is now 58 percent, whereas on General Motors $500,000,000 profit it is only 38 percent. This is manifestly absurd as well as unjust.

The President has also proposed an increase from 2 to 5 years in which losses can be carried over and deducted from profits. I regard this as much more important than the removal of the notch tax. An enterprising new business very often loses money for several years and should have a better chance to get it back again before the taxes begin. Most new businesses are struggling, and it is a rare one which goes quickly into the black.

These two tax measures have been recommended by the Committee for Economic Development. Now the President has urged them on the Congress, they should be enacted promptly. I do not favor holding them up for a general tax review or for any other purpose.

In his economic message the President promised that he would recommend a program for encouraging private financial institutions to furnish small business with equity capital.

There are grave dangers inherent in direct loans and subsidies from Government to business. But I believe the powers of our Federal Reserve System can justly be used to stimulate and educate our commercial banks to better serve the needs of small business. This is a matter of highest importance, I know. I've been to the banks too many times.

The Senate is again studying the possibility of establishing a standing or a special committee on small business. Such a committee would study and investigate a sound program to foster and safeguard the place of independent, small business in the American economy.

Such a committee might study, for example, whether or not small business in obtaining its fair share of basic materials or if the prices it pays for these materials are equitable in comparison to those charged to large competitors. How can the morass of laws affecting business be consolidated and clarified and simplified so that a small-business man can understand them without wasting his substance on high-priced lawyers? What are the special labor problems of small business? What studies by Government or by universities can lead to better business methods in such areas as marketing or accounting? What can the Department of Commerce legitimately do? Should the development of State departments of commerce be encouraged? What about right here in Connecticut? Do our Government procurement agencies sufficiently include small business in their purchasing programs? Is American small business properly represented abroad by our consular services, and is it participating fully in our foreign-aid programs?

More important than the establishment of such a committee is the prompt action by present legislative committees on needed legislation. We don't need more propaganda. What we do need is more action. Congress through its present committees should also press for action from the laggard and reluctant executive departments.

When we talk about small business we are talking about the firms that employ 65 percent of all commercial and industrial wage earners and produce 45 percent of our entire industrial output.

As the CED's own report put it nearly 2 years ago:

When we talk about small business we are, in effect, talking about the American business system.

When we talk about small business we are, in effect, talking about the peace of the world, because this now depends on a strong and prosperous United States, which in turn depends on our business system. When we talk about small business we are talking about our American goal of equality of opportunity for every individual and for every type and size of business.

Such equality of opportunity is vital in preserving a healthy, growing, and productive system of business enterprise, and, by the same token, in preserving the well-being of this country. More important, it is vital to remember that independent, small business produces men as well as goods. The fabric of American life is held together by the local businessman who knows his community, has a personal stake in it, and is eager to make that community a better place in which to work and live.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Concert by the Army Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks made by me at a concert given by the Army Band in honor of Pennsylvania, under the auspices of the Sesquicentennial Commission of the District of Columbia, on Wednesday, January 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Boykin and my fellow Americans, I am deeply grateful for the honor conferred upon the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the splendid program we are enjoying so much tonight.

I welcome this opportunity to bring you most cordial and friendly greetings from the people of Pennsylvania. It is a real pleasure to express to you their sincere thanks and appreciation of this notable event.

In the magnificent structure of the States of the Union, Pennsylvania holds a place of pre-eminence. It has been rightfully called the keystone in the arch of the American Republic.

Pennsylvania is the birthplace of American independence. Its leadership for human rights, equal justice, and freedom of the individual had its beginnings 250 years ago—under the guidance of William Penn.

In establishing his holy experiment in government, the founder of Pennsylvania recognized social, political, and religious freedom as God's greatest blessing upon mankind.

Within the boundaries of Pennsylvania were framed and adopted two immortal documents of freedom—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

Upon its soil patriots and heroes gave their lives in battle that man might be free. Fort Necessity—scene of Washington's first command—Brandywine, Germantown, and Valley Forge are shrines of patriotic inspiration.

Gettysburg—where the Union was preserved—is a monument to the valor of gallant men of the North and the South.

Pennsylvania is justly proud that three of its cities—Philadelphia, York, and Lancaster—have been Capitals of the United States.

Yes, Pennsylvania is rich in historic association with the glories of America.

Its tradition of faith in God, tolerance, and good will has been strengthened through the years by work, self-reliance, sacrifice, and loyalty to the principles of true Americanism.

Those qualities are so important today when evil forces work ceaselessly to undermine and corrupt our system of individual freedom.

Above all else we must be courageous and vigilant to protect and safeguard our precious heritage and all that we hold sacred.

Again I thank you on behalf of the people of Pennsylvania.

The Crisis in the Displaced-Persons Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Harry N. Rosenfield, Commissioner of the Displaced Persons Commission, on January 15, 1950, at the Hotel Astor, New York City, at a gathering of the United Service for New Americans, Inc., a fine organization dedicated to the education and adjustment of immigrants to Americanism and to life in America. It is an extremely thoughtful and provocative address, and discusses the operation of the Displaced Persons Act and its inadequacies. I hope every Member of the Senate will have occasion to read this address prior to the consideration of H. R. 4567 and the amendments proposed by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRISIS IN THE DISPLACED-PERSONS PROGRAM

One of the obligations of public office is the duty to keep the people informed upon the progress of public programs. Having just returned from a 2 months' trip of inspection of the Commission's operations overseas, perhaps I can speak with some more intimate knowledge of developments which affect the success of the displaced-persons program.

There are three crises, not one, which jeopardize the successful completion of the job started by the people of the United States when the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 was enacted:

Crisis 1: The brazen and deliberate effort being made in some quarters to besmirch the displaced persons and the displaced persons program, on the basis of alleged facts which an objective investigation would show either to be untruthful or completely warped out of significant proportions;

Crisis 2: The vicious and cruel effects which the present discriminatory and unfair law causes to innocent and helpless displaced persons who are caught by the law's spider web of arbitrary and capricious restrictions and limitations;

Crisis 3: The unfortunate and callous disregard exhibited by some people toward the quarter million IRO displaced persons who will be left in the displaced-persons camps and areas on June 30, 1950, if the present law is not liberalized and extended.

The first crisis touches upon the very fundamentals of a democratic society, the right of the people to have the facts, unvarnished by personal prejudice. The Displaced Persons Commission has consistently sought to provide the people with full and accurate information, through the statutory method of its semiannual reports to the President and the Congress, through the normal and customary channels of appearing in public hearings before committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and through national and regional meetings with State commissions and voluntary agencies. It is perhaps well to point out that despite the majority vote in the full Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate for action last year, the Senate subcommittee which has been considering this program's operations for over 1 year and which has called people into hearings from all parts of the country, has never once given the Displaced Persons Commission the opportunity to state its side of the story in public hearings.

There have been reckless and false charges leveled against the displaced-persons operation which affect not only the Displaced Persons Commission, but a whole coordinated team of hard-working, loyal, and patriotic Americans in and out of Government. You must remember that the Displaced Persons Commission is only one part of the administration of the displaced-persons law; the Counter Intelligence of the United States Army, the Foreign Service of the State Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Public Health Service, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, on the Government side, as well as America's most distinguished voluntary agencies, which render so signal a role in our national life in war and in peace, are all part and parcel of the administration of this law. Charges of dishonesty, maladministration, and fraud affect all of these agencies as well as the Displaced Persons Commission.

One of the techniques employed by these crisis makers is to utter broad and unspecified charges of wholesale and willful corruption, maladministration—and even disloyalty to our country—which produce a prompt and categorical denial. Then a very few isolated cases are alleged though they are the exceptions and not the rule, to discredit the denial and presumably support the original broadsides. If the isolated cases had been presented along with the original charges it would be like saying everything stinks by pointing to an onion.

What are some of these unfounded charges? First, it is alleged that the gates are down for subversives to enter the United States under the program. There has been such loose talk before, and the Displaced Persons Commission has never been able to get specific cases. Take, for example, the most recent outbursts in this vein; did you see any cases mentioned? If there is anything to the claim, why cannot it be documented? The answer is simply that it is not true. Has the FBI complained that the program is bringing in subversives? No. Has the Attorney General made any such charge? No. Has the CIC of the United States Army (which is responsible for security screening overseas) made any such charge? No; and they know what they are talking about, since all these agencies are engaged in the actual process of security screening.

The fact is that the Displaced Persons Commission has instituted the most comprehensive and thorough security screening ever organized in any immigration program in American history, and that this program is in addition to the normal security screening by the consular service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which

prevails in this program as in normal immigration. In fact, informed and responsible observers overseas, including one of our veteran consul generals, complained to me in Europe that the Commission's security screening was too rigid and caused too much of a slow-down in the arrival of displaced persons in the United States.

Another phony charge is that the program has been riddled by false documents. This, too, is unfair. In any program of this size, and you must bear in mind that over 130,000 visas have already been issued, which means many more cases examined, since 30-36 percent of all cases are rejected or disqualified, there are bound to be some examples of false documents. But the fact is that we are catching such efforts. Apparently, the situation is something like this: If we catch some false documents, that proves that the whole program is riddled with them; if we don't catch them, that proves it too. Thus far some 10 cases of false documents have been alleged, in a program in which over 130,000 visas have been issued. Doesn't that sound like a pretty good batting average to you?

Still another trumped-up claim is that the coordinated team of Government and private agencies have been violating the law. This is merely another example of the loose talk in which some people have been indulging. Again you will look in vain for particulars, for details, for examples, for cases. It's talk, mere talk, and cheap talk. Let me give you an example. At a public hearing in the Senate a claim was made on September 1, 1949, in this same general vein. I officially and respectfully demanded proof and documentation. Receiving none, I wrote to the Senate committee on September 7, reiterating my demand for proof. Today is January 15, 1950, 4½ months after the claim, and we have not yet received one iota of proof, or detail, or even an acknowledgment of my letter. I believe any reasonable jury would come to the conclusion that there is not one scintilla of evidence to substantiate the phony claim. I said then, and I repeat now, that any public official, whether he be in the legislative or the executive branch, commits a breach of public trust if he willfully conceals evidence which he believes would enable a Government agency to prevent or disentitle a violation of law. I can only come to the conclusion that the charge is as unfounded now as it was 4½ months ago. The Commission is always ready to rectify mistakes. We are not perfect. No human agency is. But the Commission always stands ready to investigate any alleged irregularity and take swift correction if the allegation is proved to be true. Wouldn't you think it strange if people claim to have proof of such irregularities and deliberately conceal it, and thereby prevent corrections, for 4½ months, and—in a more recent incident—for 1 year? Is it not fair to assume that such people themselves do not trust the reliability of the alleged information?

Other similarly baseless charges have been made. I want to be understood quite clearly. I am not saying that the people who have made these charges are telling lies, but rather that in many cases they have been deceived by purported evidence which would have been proved groundless had they taken the trouble to investigate such claims. Perhaps, however, some people are so anxious for the wish to become the thought that they prefer not to check the reliability of so-called information supplied to them.

I might add at this point that part of the campaign which seems to be building up against the Commission—as a means of discrediting displaced persons—is to seek to isolate one member of the Commission by engaging in a personal vendetta with him and exchanging recriminations. This is not a personal feud but a question of broad public policy. We on the Commission—all three of us—all hope that this discussion can be restored to the high level which the importance of the subject deserves. No one of us ever intended it should be otherwise.

CRISIS 2

Of a different character, but somewhat in the same tone is the second crisis, which arises out of the vicious and cruel results of the present discriminatory and unfair law which is causing thousands of people to wait needlessly for visas.

Under the law, 30 percent of all visas must be issued to people who not only are coming to farm jobs here but held such jobs previously. Unfortunately, the American people have not been asking for farmers in the proportion of 30 to 70 percent, at a time which would make it possible for the maintenance of an even operation. The major farm organizations have shown steadfast approval of the displaced-persons program, as such, and displaced persons have been making great contributions to our agricultural economy. But, as you know, farm labor is hired at given times in the year, varying with different areas of the country. The Commission informed the Congress that if this provision remained in the law, it would cause an almost catastrophic drop in our shipping, and a consequent serious decline in the number of people coming into the United States. Some Members of the Senate thought we were kidding them, but let the facts talk for themselves. Prior to the institution of controls to achieve the 30-percent ratio, the consuls were issuing visas at an average of between 3,000 to 3,500 per week with a high of 4,400 visas in 1 week. Last week it was only 879 visas. Prior to the institution of these arbitrary controls required by the law, we reached a shipping schedule of 15,000 and 16,000 persons per month. Now we shall have difficulty in maintaining an average of 6,000 per month for the next few months, and this we can do only because of an accumulated backlog developed prior to the arbitrary controls.

Today we are holding back almost 10,000 displaced persons, ready and anxious to be visaed, in order to achieve the 30-percent ratio. This number of people held back needlessly will increase by some 2,000 additional people each month. Why? Because the law says that 30 percent of all visas must go to farmers, and there aren't enough farmers being requested in the United States at this time of the year to reach that proportion. In other words, displaced persons who are being requested by Americans are being held back to await preferential treatment for displaced persons who have not yet been requested by Americans. As many as 20,000 displaced persons may be held up in this way.

This is a cruel effect of the law, and is completely inconsistent with the demands of the American people for the displaced persons being thus ruthlessly held back. I regret to have to tell you that if the present provision for 30 percent remains in the law there is a serious likelihood that, despite the availability of thousands upon thousands of fine assurances for fine displaced persons, the Displaced Persons Commission will not be able to comply with demands upon it to fill the full 205,000 authorized by the law.

CRISIS 3

One-quarter of a million International Refugee Organization displaced persons will remain stranded and deserted in Germany, Austria, and Italy on June 30, 1950—that is, if the present law is not extended and liberalized along the lines of H. R. 4567, which has already been passed by the House. We shall be sabotaging the task we started in the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, a solution of the IRO displaced-persons problem.

There are some people who will tell you that these people are hard-core cases and undesirable. That is not so. I just brought back with me from Geneva, IRO's headquarters, the most recent data. IRO estimates that on June 30, 1950, there will still be some 243,500 displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy. And of this number, only 18,600 are expected to be hard-core cases. Apart from the human tragedy in this unfinished job, most of these displaced persons would still remain on our hands, since they will be the charges of the American occupation forces in Germany. Thus, we would be denying to Americans in the United States the opportunity to sponsor displaced persons whom they sorely need and still continuing a heavy and unnecessary financial burden to the American taxpayer by requiring these displaced persons to remain in these displaced-persons areas.

America hates a quitter. A job worth doing is worth finishing and doing well. This job finished will bring to the United States a larger number of highly desirable and useful persons. This job unfinished will only add fuel to the already serious crisis which exists in the displaced-persons areas.

The Displaced Persons Commission believes that the public should have all the facts. The three crises endanger the successful completion of one of the most magnificent international humanitarian ventures undertaken by this country. I heartily agree with the recent invitation issued to the American people by one of our distinguished Senators that the people express themselves on this problem. It is time now for the people who know the truth to speak their minds and make themselves heard in all parts of the land. If ever it were true that "knowledge is power," this is the time.

The people of the world are looking to the United States. Are we going to let them down? If we know the people of America, the answer will be: These crises are artificially created and must be stopped, and the displaced-persons program must be permitted to go on to a successful conclusion. I am convinced that the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the United States and of the Congress will not permit a small band of willful people, acting contrary to the best interests of the United States, to thwart the will of the American people to see this task completed in the noble American tradition which prompted its initiation.

Freedom Isn't Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very stirring and enlightening address delivered on January 20, 1950, at Knoxville, Tenn., by Mr. Maurice R. Franks, of Chicago. Mr. Franks is president of the National Labor-Management Foundation and editor of its official publication, Partners. His description of a Socialist is "one who has nothing, and is willing to divide it with everybody," or "a Communist with a haircut." The address is replete with many thought-provoking statements.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM ISN'T FREE

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen of Knoxville, I feel deeply honored to be with you tonight, and I am

grateful for this opportunity to speak to you on a subject of vital concern—vital to every man, woman, and child in these United States—yes, vital to our American way of life.

Now I wonder just what this audience would do were an abrupt announcement to be made over this same speaking system at this very moment that war No. 3 had just been declared. I venture to say that there wouldn't be many peaceful minds among us. Instinctively, our first thought would be as to the outcome. With stunned alarm we would wonder if our defenses were adequate to meet the onslaught. We would swiftly count the cost in men and money—and the greater cost of everything we would lose in the event of final defeat. For all of us would know very well that if we were to lose this war we would also lose at the final crack down all the liberties which presently belong to us as citizens of a free Nation. We would know that our very freedom was at stake.

All this would cross our minds in a single sickening flash if the news were suddenly to break in our ears that a new war had just been declared.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, that new war has been declared. We, the American people, are at war, and our present enemy is more ruthless, and I may add, more cunning than any other enemy we have yet encountered in our entire history. His weapons, by comparison, make the atomic bomb look like a cap pistol. For the atom bomb, when exploded, can destroy only a given area, a city, a certain spot of countryside—whereas our present enemy has devices which are capable of destroying our entire Nation overnight.

Now this may sound like a highly exaggerated statement, but I respectfully submit that it is nothing of the kind. For the target here is not a physical one. The target is our midst is the minds, not the bodies, nor the physical faculties of men—and a nation whose mind has been conquered will surely perish.

Who, then, are our opponents? Strange as it may seem, our immediate enemies are not the Communistic Russians, but a growing army of socialistically inclined Americans. These are the foes who are waging a dastardly war against the citizens of the United States and against everything our citizenship stands for. These are the enemies who are working day and night to wrest from us our most treasured possession—our freedom.

Indeed, the hour is one of great national crisis, and it is much later than many of us may think. The situation calls for some good hard knocks at our enemies, and I can think of no better group to do the job than this new organization, Fighters for Freedom. And, incidentally, I can think of no better place to get in some good hard knocks for our side than right here in Knoxville, Tenn.

We all in this country, especially we of the present generation, have become so accustomed to the American way of life that we make the easy assumption that the treasure of human freedom has always been ours to enjoy, and that it is by its very nature a permanent possession, one we don't have to fight to keep. To harbor such a notion is downright folly, for it is based upon anything but fact. The freedoms we enjoy today, and which are guaranteed us by the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States, were not handed to our forefathers on a silver platter. A terrific price was paid for these freedoms. Our freedom was purchased by the blood of sacrifice, than which no greater price is possible. No, freedom isn't free. It didn't come to us as the result of a hand-out. Nor is it self-perpetuating. Let's keep that well in mind.

Freedom isn't free. It never was, and it never will be. It requires constant guardianship and a willingness to pay the price of eternal vigilance. This means that we of this generation must be awake to every threat and be prepared to fight off the array of forces which have arisen to deprive us of our most precious heritage—freedom.

THE ENEMY IS SOCIALISM

There is a great tendency these days to take the Socialist lightly, to set him down as a fair-haired child whose greatest sin is that he is simply badly mistaken. "Oh, the Socialists don't mean much," many of us are telling each other today. "They're just a bunch of silly idealists who don't quite know their way around. They're really good eggs at heart. Certainly, they don't mean to harm anybody."

To which I shout, "Baloney!" I've spent better than a quarter of a century in the labor movement. As a labor leader, I've humped shoulders with Communists and I've humped shoulders with Socialists. I've met plenty of both in every branch of organized labor, in union meetings and on the job, when the sailing was smooth and when the sailing was rough, and this much I say with the conviction born of experience: The only actual difference between a Socialist and a Communist is a hair-cut!

A Socialist, I have found, is no more than a slicked-up Communist, with a book instead of a bomb. He is just as vicious as his Communist pal, only somewhat more subtle and cunning. His social objective is precisely that of the Communist: In the holy name of the people to enslave the people; in the name of security to deprive them of all security; in the name of redistributing wealth to redistribute poverty; in the name of governmental operation to impose governmental domination; in the name of a planned democracy to inflict a damned autocracy; in the name of the New Utopia actually to create a new Siberia * * * In a word, the final aim and aspiration of the Socialist, like the final aim of the Communist, is to deprive you of your freedoms: your right to worship God in your own way; your right to own your own home; your right to live your own life in your own way, with due regard for the rights of your neighbor; your right to a job of your own choosing, and your further right to change that job when and as you yourself desire.

THE SOCIALIST WOULD DEPRIVE

The Socialist would deprive the farmer of his right to till his own soil in the manner he himself sees fit. The Socialist would deprive the teacher of the right to teach fact instead of fiction. The Socialist would deprive the doctor of the right to practice his profession in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience. The Socialist would deprive the union of its full right of collective bargaining. The Socialist would deprive the manager of the right to manage. In short, the Socialist would deprive. Period!

At the very outset, then, it should be obvious to all of us that the objectives of the Socialist are just about identical to those of the Communist, namely, the establishment on these shores of a government above the people, beyond the people, and against the people.

But what is more important is the fact that these Socialists—these Communists who have been to the barber shop—through their genteel appearance thus created have been able to gain full entree into numerous segments of society, and are therefore in an excellent position to do a job of wrecking from within that cannot be done by their unkempt henchmen from without. * * * Which, may I suggest, accounts for the twinkle we detect in Uncle Stalin's eye. For Joe just wants a job done—and he doesn't give a hoot who does it, how it's done, or under what name it is perpetrated—whether the objective is reached via the road of communism, socialism, social planning, a planned economy, the welfare state, social democracy, or even perverted unionism. For Joe, too, knows that Bill Shakespeare was a pretty smart guy—and that communism, like the rose, by any other name is still his pet flower.

INFLUENCE IN THE LABOR UNIONS

These Socialists of ours, in their war against Americanism, have mapped out some very clever strategy, and their generals are meeting with no small measure of success. They are particularly successful in their invasion of the labor unions of this country—many of which, knowingly or not, have practically surrendered to the Socialists.

Now far be it from me to stand upon this platform and accuse such men as Bill Green, Walter Reuther, Philip Murray, or John L. Lewis of being avowed enemies of our American form of government. And far be it from me to assert that any of these gentlemen would consciously lift a finger to aid or abet our national enemies, within or beyond our boundaries. In fact, it's a safe bet that all four of them would jump sky high if ever they were so accused. I can almost hear them shout in unison: "Certainly I'm not a Socialist. I'm an American. I hate socialism."

Well, if these big-time labor leaders, and dozens more in their class have not in fact surrendered to the Socialists, I wonder what they think they are doing when they seek to make of organized labor a political force? If they have not in fact put themselves in a position to serve a growing Socialist machine, I wonder what they think they are doing when they seek to solidify the labor vote and lend it without reservation to a political movement in every way contrived to foist the book of socialism—from A to Z—upon the people of this country? What do these gentlemen mean by "political action"? What is the political effect of the militant doctrines they preach day in and day out? What is the political significance of the class consciousness and class hatred which is their unwavering theme song? Are not the standardized antics of our big-time labor leaders but an accurate reflection of the antics of Britain's labor leaders, a few years back, when they surrendered lock, stock, and barrel to socialism and brought it into power in England?

ORGANIZED LABOR'S POLITICAL MESS

Certainly Messrs. Green, Reuther, Murray, and Lewis have pulled pretty far away from the teachings of Samuel Gompers, the patron saint of organized labor, who on many occasions warned the union men of this Nation against mixing up in party politics or selling out to any political faction which would use the labor movement as a stepping stone to political power. So long as Gompers was the leader of our Nation's union workers, he kept the unions out of politics and regarded collective bargaining as an economic and not a political issue. At every turn, Gompers applied the instrumentalities of collective bargaining, independent of governmental coddling.

Sam Gompers never forked over to any politician a half-million dollars of his union members' funds, as did John L. Lewis to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Nor did Gompers on any occasion get his union into a mess by committing it to any political party, as Lewis endeavored to do on at least two important occasions. Gompers was smart enough to know that what the gods of politics create, the gods of politics can, and generally do, destroy. Had the labor leaders of Britain followed the example of Samuel Gompers, Great Britain today would still be the great economic force it was for centuries. When the British labor unions went political, they lost their souls to socialism and under governmental domination became nothing more than so many puppets on a string, and incidentally played a prominent part in reducing the British Empire to a condition of national and international poverty.

Walter Reuther, I have said, would be vociferous in his denial of any Socialist leanings. All right, Walter, let me ask you this: Where did you get the notion that the automobile manufacturers—such as General Motors, Ford, Nash, Studebaker, and the rest—can be operated by the Government except in a Socialist state? Whoever gave you the idea that the Government should build and operate steel plants? That the Government should erect and administer housing for workers? And whoever gave you the screwball notion that, if ever the Government did take over such industries as the automotive, steel, and housing, this economy of ours could possible hold together? Don't you know, Walter, that the moment such a situation comes to pass, the day of the investor will be a thing of the past—and that without stockholders, there can be little or no new enterprise? And with enterprise at a standstill, don't you also know, Walter, that you will have hordes of idle members, and that these present movements of yours will of necessity degenerate into mere wards of an expanding Socialist government?

Where did you get this crackpot philosophy of yours, Walter? From the teachings of Samuel Gompers? Or did you pick it up over in Russia back in 1934, when you had a job in a Russian factory in Gorky?

No, Walter, you may not call your ideas socialism—you may have some fancier name for them, such as a "planned economy," or "the welfare state"—but no matter what you call them, they add up to nothing short of socialism. And, as such, they run counter to the best interests of this Nation—to say nothing of your own constituents whom you were elected to serve.

And now for you, Philip Murray. You don't look to me like a Socialist, or a Communist. But I'd be a coward if I didn't come right out and say that you do nevertheless look to me very much like a tool in their hands. Certainly the dope of the collectivist program, both the long-haired and the short-haired breed must be licking their chops as they study your maneuvers and manipulations which have repeatedly pushed the entire steel industry toward the brink of disaster—in the form of governmental control and eventual ownership. Probably you're not a Socialist, in either name or fancy, but for many a year you broke bread with gents of the Marxian stripe. Wasn't Lee Pressman, for example, an avowed Communist? And for several years didn't you accept his unlikely guidance in matters economic as well as political? Possibly, then, some of the stain from those unwholesome contacts has remained with you. Possibly some of their foul teachings have stuck to your subconscious mind and, on important occasion, have influenced you to commit acts against the best interests of this Nation. Indeed, it appears that you have not always been content to let your unionism play second fiddle to your Americanism. Or am I wrong?

THE PRINCIPLE OF SAMUEL GOMPERS

As for me, I'll take a man of the Gompers type, a union leader who advanced the cause of organized labor immeasurably but always without sacrifice of a single iota of true Americanism—and with statutory odds against him. The principle of unionism as enunciated by Samuel Gompers was in its essence, "An honest day's pay for an honest day's work, and an honest day's work for an honest day's pay." And unless the labor movement gets back to this fundamental principle, the time is not far distant when unionism in this country will be as inefficient as it is in Socialist Europe—where workers MUST go assigned jobs and where a change in job without specific permission from the powers that be may lead to a change in residence—behind bars, if you please—and where a strike is regarded as an act of treason punishable by death to the perpetrators.

And so—when the fancier ideas of governmental planning, welfarism, and more and greater securitism are dropped in our ears—by a labor leader, a college professor, or even a minister of the cloth—let's not stop to purr over the components. Let's consider the total package, which is, by accident or positive intention, communism pure and simple. Between us and the misty mirage of the Socialist utopia lie all the pitfalls of death to independence.

THE WEAPONS ARRAYED AGAINST US

Thus far, we have identified the enemy and spotted his main objective: the overthrow of our American form of government, our American way of life. Next, let's have a look at his weapons, the armament he is bringing to bear against the minds of our people:

First, there is his air force: the propaganda he drops to the effect that capitalism is outmoded and that the capitalist is the enemy of the people. His artillery is the falsehood he discharges to the effect that private enterprise creates business monopoly and human privation. The booby traps he lays before the unsuspecting are the enticements of a new security from the cradle to the grave: such as full employment, free pension, free medicine, and a long string of public welfare services. Finally, there is his big atomic bomb, which explodes upon the minds of the people and radiates the irresponsible doctrine that it is possible to loaf our way to prosperity.

All this is powerful ammunition in the war for the minds of our people. For who among us wouldn't desire the maximum standard of living for the minimum expenditure of effort? Who wouldn't love to live in the finest of homes, eat the finest of food, drive the slickest of cars, and wear the grandest of clothes; all with the greatest of ease? The promise of something for nothing makes a powerful emotional appeal, an appeal so strong that very frequently it cripples our better judgment.

But common sense should tell us that food doesn't fall like manna from heaven, that houses don't sprout from the ground, that cars don't grow on trees, and that clothes aren't the gift of the sun and the wind and the stars—that, in fact, nothing for man's use and enjoyment is in any way available to win without the expenditure of considerable effort both mental and physical—and that the most initiative we put forth, the more comforts and luxuries we can secure for ourselves. In a word, work is the basis of man's estate.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE OUR CAPITALISTS

Capitalism, free enterprise, the profit motive, these are but expressions of individual initiative striving for tangible incentives. And it was the free play granted by our form of government to this spirit of initiative which created this great capitalistic economy of ours and enabled it to progress to the point where our American standard of living has become the envy of the world. The philosophy upon which our dynamic economy is traditionally based is that he profits most who serves best.

Now this capitalism of ours, to be truly understood, certainly does not apply solely to the owners of industry, to our businessmen big or small, or to the financiers of Wall Street; it applies in comparative measure to every individual among us who has in his possession more than the bare necessities of life; it applies to the men and women who own their own homes, drive their own cars, can boast a change of raiment, and, if only moderately thrifty, have money in the bank, bonds, and insurance policies in the safe-deposit vault, and a personal plan of action in their minds.

Thus any attack upon capitalism here in the United States is not by any means an attack just upon Wall Street; it is no less an attack upon Main Street, and Home Street; yes, upon my street and your street, whoever we may be.

For we, the people of the United States, are the capitalists of this Nation, and it is against us that this war has been declared.

THE NATURE AND ORIGIN OF SECURITY

Curiously enough, the war cry of our enemies is "security." By hook or by crook, they would foist upon the minds of our people the erroneous belief that incentive and initiative are wrong; not only morally wrong, but also mathematically wrong in working out a formula for providing more and more things for more and more people. And this is the most insidious phase of their entire campaign against our way of life. For the principle of the free lunch—provided all citizens by the hand of a fond but costly bureaucracy—may be attractive to individuals not endowed by nature with gumption, but it is bum economics and a phony substitute for the authentic freedoms which render free lunches unnecessary.

Accepting the obvious fact that, by horizontal comparison, the standard of living of the American people under capitalism far exceeds the standard of living of any people under socialism, the fighters for a planned economy nevertheless invariably haul out their books of geography and triumphantly point to the fact that the North American Continent was blessed with an incomparable store of natural resources. Our magnificent standard of living, they argue, is due to those inexhaustible resources—and not to the dynamics of capitalism. But this is a phony of phonies, as we can see at a glance by making a vertical comparison.

For thousands of years, before the white men came to America, the red man held sway on this continent. For thousands of years before the white man arrived and set up his system of capitalism, the socialistic way of life was in full flower on these shores. But, although the American Indian had access to the iron ore of Minnesota, the oil of Pennsylvania and California and the great Southwest, the timber of limitless forests, prairie lands of stupendous fertility, together with the entire inventory of natural resources too numerous to mention, this socialistic-fed man of ours nevertheless lived out the total of his days ill-fed and ill-housed. Throughout the centuries, he was in practical effect a Socialist—without incentive, without the goads of personal ambition, without the rewards of initiative. He was and remained to the end a pauper in a treasure house, a beggar on the doorstep of paradise.

It took the capitalist, with his profit motive, to appreciate the significance of this abundance of natural resources. It took the capitalist, with the energy born of his ambition, to develop them fully—not only to the benefit of himself, but to the benefit of the multitudes as well. Yes, it took the capitalist to create for the first time on the North American Continent a platform for the ideal of real human security to rest upon.

SOCIALISM PARASITICAL

Socialism is therefore not a step forward, it is in reality a step backward into the unenlightened past. And in the event we lose this ideological war to the collectivists, I venture to say that it may not be too many years before the American people can just as well start painting their faces and sticking feathers in their hair—symbolically, at least—for their standard of living under the hand-to-mouth provisions of a planned economy will be rapidly collapsing to that of the redskins.

For socialism is not creative. It is not, as its promoters so loudly assert, paradisical—it is in its truest sense parasitical. It is not a system of give and take, it is a system of just plain take. Which suggests the true definition of a Socialist as a fellow who has nothing himself and is willing to share it with everybody.

Against the tide of progress, thus, the Socialists of this country would tear our system apart and give it back to the Indians. That is the nature of the war they are conducting against us. And that is why there is a job at hand for all fighters for freedom to perform.

If anyone were to step upon this platform tonight and right before our eyes were to attempt to tear this American flag of ours to shreds, it is doubtful he would leave this hall alive—for such an act would make every one of us fighting mad. But, ladies and gentlemen, this very thing is truly happening today—only not here in this particular hall, and not in a manner so crudely obvious. It isn't the American flag, as a piece of colored cloth, that the Socialist enemy would desecrate; the target of his sabotage is the main principle Old Glory stands for: Your freedom and mine.

I thank you.

Morocco Violates Treaty in War on American Traders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Morocco Violates Treaty in War on American Traders," published in the Saturday Evening Post of January 28, 1950. The editorial deals with a matter which was under discussion when the ECA measure was before the Senate for consideration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Editorial from Saturday Evening Post of January 28]

MOROCCO VIOLATES TREATY IN WAR ON AMERICAN TRADERS

It is a strange commentary on the strength of American diplomacy that an individual citizen should be forced to put on a one-man campaign to preserve the right of Americans to do business in a country in which this right is guaranteed by treaty.

Nevertheless this is what Robert E. Rodes, an American businessman and war veteran, has been doing for almost a year. He leads a group of thirty-odd veterans who set up export-import businesses in Casablanca, Morocco. Since 1836 Morocco has had a treaty with the United States according us unrestricted trading privileges equal to those of any other "Christian nations." Treaties signed in 1880 and 1906, countersigned by France, reaffirmed equal treatment of our trade in Morocco with that of France. Morocco looked like a good place for American businessmen to perform a useful function.

However, France has a protectorate arrangement in Morocco which seems to be interpreted in Paris as giving monopolistic commercial rights in Morocco to French businessmen. At any rate Mr. Rodes and his associates were soon subjected to various discriminations admitted by ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman to include "inequitable administration of certain exchange-control regulations, discriminatory valuation of imports for customs purposes, the application to Americans of a number of laws and regulations to which this Government has not given its assent," and to involve what Mr. Rodes calls an illegal embargo on many imports of American goods. The upshot of it all is that the Americans are being compelled to quit the field while their French competitors enjoy an unprecedented prosperity.

Inasmuch as France, which is thus acquiring economic monopoly in Morocco, is receiving a considerable sum from the United States under the European recovery program, it might be assumed that we had enough leverage to conduct a spirited defense of American commercial interests. The reality has been just the opposite. As Demaree Bess pointed out in the Post for June 18, 1949, the introduction of ECA money into the situation was taken to imply American support of French "exploitation" in Morocco, which we had opposed for many years.

Until ECA became a factor the State Department had protected American treaty rights, at least formally, and had protested Moroccan acts in defiance of them. But the fact that we had advanced money for French recovery apparently ended official concern for the right of American citizens to do business abroad. French authorities on December 30, 1948, issued a decree setting up embargoes and restrictions on our products, the result of which has been to turn over almost all our trade in Morocco to French cartels and other favored interests. The State Department first protested this action, then yielded to French pressure and accepted it for a 3-month period. After three other "temporary" periods the Department extended its assent indefinitely on December 31, 1949.

In continuing its approval of the French decree the State Department is ignoring repeated criticism in the Senate and is ignoring the evidence of discrimination to the State Department by Mr. Rodes and other businessmen and trade organizations at a public hearing. This hopeless attitude by a nation which is shelling out billions of dollars to promote the revival of trade among nations bodes ill for whatever success is to be expected from point 4—that is to say, the Truman plan for investment of American capital and know-how in undeveloped areas. If we can't protect the clear treaty rights of a small group of ambitious Americans to do business abroad, what is likely to happen to the billions we export under the chaperonage of bureaucrats and do-gooders?

Editorial Comment on Bill To Restrain Unreasonable Actions of Labor Monopolies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials—one from the Washington Evening Star, one from the New York World-Telegram and the Sun, and one from the Tampa Morning Tribune—commenting on Senate bill 2912, to restrain unreasonable actions of labor monopolies, which I introduced in the Senate on January 23.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 25, 1950]

THE PEOPLE COME FIRST

The bill to amend the anti-trust law which has been introduced by Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON can be traced not to a desire to destroy unions, but to a growing realization that there must be some more effective legal protection of the public interest against abuse by the unions of their great power.

It seems to the Star that the introduction of this bill is a development of some importance. It may not have any immediate prospect of passage. Perhaps there is some better legislative approach to the problem. But here, at least, is a recommendation which has been carefully thought out, and which is based on a painstaking study of the facts and the present state of law as it applies to those facts. There will be some who will deny that there exists a need for such an amendment. But John L. Lewis is proving to be a persuasive witness on the other side of that proposition.

Senator ROBERTSON's proposal has to be appraised against the background of the immunity which labor has acquired by virtue of the laws and decisions of the Supreme Court.

The Sherman Act was passed in 1890. Congress did not intend in enacting that statute to sanction unreasonable restraint of trade by unions, and the Supreme Court so held. Then, in 1914, the Sherman Act was amended by adoption of the Clayton Act. In its pertinent sections, the Clayton act provided that labor organizations were lawful under the Sherman Act, and, further, that certain specific labor activities, such as peaceful picketing, could not be enjoined by the Federal courts. Neither of these enactments, however, gave unions immunity when they engaged in unreasonable restraints of trade or sought other illegitimate objectives.

The big departure came in 1932, when the Norris-LaGuardia Act was adopted. This act was an absolute prohibition, except in the narrowest circumstances, against any Federal injunction applicable to labor unions. Finally, in 1941, a five-man majority of the Supreme Court announced the decision in the Hutcheson case. The effect of this extraordinary decision was to go far beyond even the sweeping immunities extended by the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and to hold, for all practical purposes, that neither the criminal sections nor the treble-damage provisions of the Sherman Act could be invoked against any union activity arising out of any kind of labor dispute.

This was the green light. A period in which the injunctive power had often been flagrantly abused to the detriment of unions and reasonable union activity was succeeded by a period in which unions were put beyond the reach of any effective regulatory power. And it was not long before consequences which should have been foreseen began to be painfully evident. It soon became apparent that union leaders were not much different from industrial leaders. Given great and uncontrolled power, some of them would abuse it. And as the abuses grew it also became clear that all of the people, not just the big industrial bosses, were being made to suffer.

Senator ROBERTSON wants to bring this situation back into balance by amending the antitrust law. His amendment is not designed to interfere with the pursuit by unions of legitimate objectives. What it would do is best summed up in his own words: "The bill which I have offered would in plain and simple language remove the immunizing effect of the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts from (union) conduct which up until 1941 had been almost universally branded as illegal and against the public interest, and which had always been regarded as outlawed by the Sherman Act. It would

leave the Government free to go into a court and it would leave the court free to put a stop to labor-union practices which are so detrimental to the national welfare that some remedy, beyond the temporary stopgap remedy of the Taft-Hartley Act, is essential to protect the people of this country. The Sherman Act would then again serve, as it originally served, as a brake on unions which seek to put their own activities ahead of the national welfare."

This, to many, will seem less a drastic proposal. It will seem increasingly less drastic, however, as the American people, whose welfare should come first, continue to suffer at the hands of irresponsible and unprincipled unions and union leaders.

[From the New York World-Telegram and the Sun of January 26, 1950]

LABOR MONOPOLIES

Senator ROBERTSON, Virginia Democrat, sponsors a bill intended to protect the national economy, health, and safety against unreasonable use of monopoly power by labor unions. It merits earnest consideration by Congress.

In days when organized labor was weak, court interpretations of the Sherman antitrust law gave powerful employers an unfair advantage over unions. The Scripps-Howard newspapers were among labor's supporters in a long battle to correct that situation.

The 1914 Clayton Act, meant to serve that purpose, proved not fully effective. The 1932 Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act went much further toward protection of unions. And, in 1941, a United States Supreme Court decision went too far.

It held that Congress, in the Norris-LaGuardia Act, intended union activities—licit or illicit, wise or unwise, right or wrong—to be exempt from antitrust prosecution if unions acted in self-interest and not in combination with nonunion groups.

By then, organized labor was no longer weak. Government, under President Roosevelt, had promoted vast growth of unionism in size and power. In many cases the power is monopolistic.

Union leaders can, and do, use it to restrain trade by restricting or stopping the national supply of commodities and services essential to public welfare, health, and safety. Because of it, John L. Lewis can decree that coal shall be mined only 3 days a week, or no days a week. And, because of that 1941 Supreme Court decision, Mr. Lewis and his rivals and imitators in the labor movement can do such things without fear of the antitrust laws which would crack down on employers if they dared to do them.

Senator ROBERTSON's bill proposes, in effect, to repeal the 1941 decision and to say that union activity undertaken for the purpose of restricting commerce to control production and prices is subject to, and can be punished by, the antitrust laws.

Legislating in this field is a difficult and delicate task. The need is to protect the public interest by curbing abuses of labor's monopolistic power while at the same time preserving labor's necessary rights.

The Robertson bill may not be the best possible approach to the problem. But the problem is real and pressing. Whether through the Robertson bill or otherwise, we believe, it is the duty of Congress to deal with it decisively and soon.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Morning Tribune of January 24, 1950]

THE FOUCH IN THE DARK

A new threat to John L. Lewis's iron-fisted control of the coal industry is contained in legislation proposed by Senator ROBERTSON, Democrat, Virginia, to make labor unions subject to antitrust action under certain conditions.

The bill would permit antitrust proceedings against unions when their actions constituted "unreasonable" restraint of trade affecting industries essential to the national economy, health or safety.

There is logic behind Senator ROBERTSON's proposal. Under the autocratic rule of Lewis, the United Mine Workers are enforcing the tightest monopoly of a major industry whichever has afflicted this Nation's economy. Lewis lifts his hand and the mines shut down. He crooks a finger, and they open up again. He winks a cynical eye and the normal production of coal is cut 40 percent.

The recognized right of collective bargaining is not at issue here. The undisputed fact is that Lewis is deliberately restricting coal production—rationing the output of an essential product—in order to make coal scarce and thus force mine owners to grant higher pay.

Would the mine owners be permitted to create an artificial scarcity in this manner for the purpose of boosting prices? Certainly not. If they tried it, Government attorneys would slap an antitrust suit on their heads quicker than you could say Harry Truman.

Then are we as a Nation to have two kinds of justice—one for the union and another for the operators? Under present Federal laws, exempting unions from all monopoly restrictions, that is the situation. It doesn't follow the rules of fair play. It doesn't take into account the public welfare. It doesn't make any sense.

Senator ROBERTSON's proposal may not get anywhere in an election-year Congress keenly conscious of labor's organized vote. It will, however, have the endorsement of a great part of the public. To the politicians, a monopoly operated by labor doesn't seem nearly so awful as a monopoly operated by capital, but to the consumer caught in the vise, the pinch is the same.

Depletion Allowances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in view of the President's disturbing tax-message recommendations that depletion allowances for the mining industry be discontinued, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the National Minerals Advisory Council's report on tax revision, submitted to the Secretary of the Interior on December 7, 1949.

This heretofore unpublished report, prepared by an official advisory group representative of mineral producers and metal consumers, reasserts my previously expressed views that the mining industry if it is to survive and prosper must not have its tax burden increased as the President would suggest. Conversely, the tax load must be decreased, as the recommendations of the report set forth.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MINERALS ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORT ON TAX REVISION OF DECEMBER 7, 1949

The exploration for and development of nonferrous and strategic metal and mineral deposits in the United States by individuals and smaller corporations has declined alarmingly. Work by larger corporations is principally in extending the initial enterprise of many individuals and small units. But even these corporations must consider the effect of their taxes and the taxes on their stockholders in determining whether the risk in new endeavor is worth while.

The members of the National Minerals Advisory Council have been selected by the Secretary of the Interior as representative of the industry and acquainted with its problems. It is their unqualified opinion that excessive taxation is a principal cause of the lack of interest in exploration for and development of new mineral reserves. Reduced tariffs and imports from depreciated-currency nations and other conditions have their effect, but our present taxation is such that the individual and the corporation qualified to carry on have little opportunity to recover their investments and still less possibility to realize a profit.

Incentive for mining exploration, development, and operation comes from hope of a gain sufficient to warrant the risk, the effort, and the investment involved. If gains are too greatly impaired by taxation, or if gains are taxed without full allowance for losses, there can be little incentive for new exploration, development, and investment.

The prospect of capital recovery free from tax will not in itself provide incentive. There must be the prospect of gain. But the taxation of capital recovery as if it were income, or the denial or limitation of losses as effective deductions from taxable income, greatly increase the risk and can virtually destroy incentive for finding and developing new mines. This is the situation under the tax provisions and high rates of our present laws.

To remedy these conditions the following changes in the tax structure as applied to mining must be made:

1. Allowance for depletion should be made to the stockholder as well as to the corporation.

Each distribution to stockholders should be considered to represent depletion to the same extent that depletion is allowed against income to the corporation.

2. Tax exemption should be granted to a mine for a period of at least 5 years after beginning of profitable operations.

Such an exemption would be most important in stimulating new development and discovery, as it has in Canada.

3. Development costs after discovery should be recognized as operating expenses.

Such development costs should not be treated as capital expenditures, recoverable through depletion. Their nature and purpose is for operation of and production from the known deposit. The taxpayer should have option to charge them off currently or to treat them as operating costs when the ore related to such expenditures shall be mined.

4. Adequate allowances for percentage depletion should be made.

The present percentage of gross income and the present limitation in reference to net income for mines should both be increased.

5. Losses from unprofitable ventures should be allowed corporations, partnerships, or individuals as ordinary deduction against current income.

When a mine is abandoned or becomes unprofitable or when exploration or development work has not proven the existence of a profitable mineral deposit, or when a shareholder sustains a loss on liquidation of the corporation, the loss should be allowed in full as a deduction from income.

6. Income should not be taxed without full allowance for losses of loss years.

A carry-back for 2 years and a carry-forward of 5 years should be allowed. Depletion and other deductions and credits should be allowed as if the loss year and the income year were a single taxable period.

The Council recommends that Federal tax laws be modified to include the changes outlined in this report as approved at its meeting of December 7, 1949.

The Red Peril of the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial recently published in the St. Louis Star-Times entitled "The Red Peril of the National Debt."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RED PERIL OF THE NATIONAL DEBT

A study by the Brookings Institution proposes that the present patterns of old-age and survivors' insurance be replaced with a genuine pay-as-you-go system. Many people who have seen the deductions on their pay checks may be surprised to learn that the present system is not a genuine pay-as-you-go.

Well, it's not.

It started out on a sound actuarial basis in 1937. But since then Congress has been increasing the benefits and including more people, because this is popular. But it has not been raising the contributions at a rate equal to the obligations undertaken, because to do so would be unpopular. Congress is able to do this for a while, because at first the people who pay into the fund are more than those who take out of it. But eventually, and relatively soon now—1955, 1960, depending on management of the fund in the meantime—the pay-off will come. In view of that pay-off, the Social Security System's present deficit is more than $8,000,000,000, and it is growing every year.

A social-security system that prepared to meet future costs by adequate present contributions, the way a sound private insurance program does, would make sense.

A social-security system that paid for current costs out of current taxation, the way the Brookings' study proposes, would make sense.

But the present so-called Social Security System does neither. It is crazily backward. It is counting on future taxation to meet obligations assumed in the present.

The American people do not know how much the future costs will be. The Brookings study estimates that if the recommendations of Mr. Truman's administration are adopted, the total costs of old-age and survivors benefits, compulsory health insurance, public assistance, and veterans' benefits will range between $26,000,000,000 and $41,000,000,000 annually by 1970, and between $33,000,000,000 and $55,000,000,000 annually by 2000.

Will the productive people of those generations be able to pay for this?

Without adding up the costs of his program, President Truman assumes that they will. He is counting on a continually expanding national income.

If the increase in income merely expresses a decrease in the purchasing value of the dollar, then the dollars received by the aged and their survivors will buy less. If the increase in income expresses an increase in real income, it must be brought about by greater productivity. This can come about only by a sound economic system.

In a speech before the Economic Club of New York, Tuesday, Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, said that the soundness of our economic system is threatened by continued deficit financing.

In his tax message, President Truman vaguely promised that his present program would lead to a balanced budget, because, he said, a number of present expenditures could be reduced in the future.

Which ones?

The military? This item is likely to increase.

Foreign aid? This item also is likely to increase when the program of developing undeveloped areas is started.

Social-welfare programs? President Truman is urging that they be expanded.

And just over the horizon is looming the day of reckoning when the obligations of the present social-security program have to be met out of current taxation.

The American Government has no obligation to its citizens or to its allies that takes priority over the obligation to try to maintain a healthy economy. For the ability of fulfill all other obligations rests upon this.

The best way for the Government to promote the security both of the Nation and of the individual citizen is for it to adopt what Dr. Nourse calls for—a specific and hard-headed plan of getting back to black ink.

A Cut for Soldiers' Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Cut for Soldiers' Home," published in the Washington Times-Herald of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CUT FOR SOLDIERS' HOME

Harry Truman and his deficit-financing cronies are still wailing that they can't balance the national budget unless they boost taxes. They shrink with horror at the suggestion that Government expenses be cut.

That is, they do when their pets like foreign spending and farewell state projects are mentioned. But when they get down to something that ought to be none of their business, boy, can they cut.

MESS RATION SLASHED

For example, the Budget Bureau has ordered a 16-percent trim in the daily mess and dairy rations of the veterans of Soldiers' Home.

The present daily mess ration is 74 cents. The Budget Bureau wants to cut it to 61 cents next year.

The home is maintained by funds paid in fines and assessments by the men in the Regular Army, and a lot of the food is raised right on the big farm on which the home is situated.

Col. D. C. Cordiner, deputy governor of the home, points out that the Army's ration has been cut only 3 percent.

What kind of sense does this make, Harry? Let the old soldiers eat their own food.

Government Silver Purchases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, Utah, on January 25. The article is entitled "Government Silver Purchases and Sound Hard Money Policy."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT SILVER PURCHASES AND SOUND HARD-MONEY POLICY

The Government's silver-purchase program is under attack by several Congressmen. Senator GREEN, Democrat, of Rhode Island, constant silver foe, has again introduced his perennial bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act, and a Joint Subcommittee of the Committee on Economic Report has recommended abandonment of the program.

Admittedly, the silver-purchase program is far from perfect and it may not be wholly sound from a fiscal or monetary standpoint. Under it, silver is a sort of freak hybrid, neither quite all commodity nor wholly money, but having some of the characteristics of both.

Even so, neither the substance nor the motives of much of the attack on the silver program should go unchallenged. First, it seems only fair to mention that the perennial ringleader of the opposition, Senator GREEN, hails from New England, headquarters of most of the big silver manufacturers. Naturally, they would like to see silver wholly as a commodity and dirt cheap, so that they could make more profit on their articles.

But reports indicate that most of the big silver-manufacturing companies already are fabulously rich, and many of them are owned by families or groups that are so small they deem it unnecessary to issue annual reports.

Against their narrow interest of bigger profits is balanced, not just the interest, but the very survival of much of the country's nonferrous metal mining industry, one of the cornerstones of the entire western economy. On which side does the public interest rest?

These critics of the purchase program complain that it is a costly subsidy to silver producers. There are those who will debate that charge, but suppose for a moment that it is true. You don't hear these same Congressmen cry out against Government subsidies on farm products, air-mail haulage, public housing, education, etc., and the proposed subsidies on medicine and nearly everything else. So why is prostrate silver

mining and its thousands of dependents stick a beam in their eye?

But is the silver-purchase program nothing but a costly subsidy? It is true the act directs the United States Treasury to purchase all newly mined domestic silver at the fixed price of 90.5 cents a fine ounce, a figure that is often, but not always, above the world price. But it must not be forgotten that Uncle Sam coins some of this silver and issues currency against most of the remainder at the rate of $1.29 cents per ounce. In other words, the Government makes a seigniorage profit of 38.5 cents on every ounce of domestic silver it purchases, and, in the aggregate, this profit exceeds the total profit made by the owners of the underground mines producing silver. How do the critics figure a loss out of that?

The opponents also complain that the silver program is continuously expansionary and that it is not needed because all the paper money necessary can be issued by the Federal Reserve banks without the silver backing. That argument is inconsistent. Surely silver-backed currency is less expansionary and inflationary than currency backed by nothing. Down through the years the production of silver, as well as gold, and the production of the two metals, has held to a fairly constant pattern. But there has been nothing dependable or constant about printing-press currency.

To be wholly consistent, silver's antagonists would have to stretch gold purchases and the entire idea of backing paper money with precious metal. But the soundest economists on both sides of the political street today are thumping for a return to the gold standard as a means of taking currency manipulation away from Government and providing an automatic check on currency inflation.

After the present orgy of Government spending, currency inflation, the trend certainly should be back to, instead of away from, hard money.

Why Should American Soldiers Live Like Pigs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the February 14, 1950, issue of Look magazine carries an article entitled "Why Should American Soldiers Live Like Pigs?" dealing with the housing conditions in our outposts in Alaska and in the southern Pacific. I ask unanimous consent to have the article published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY SHOULD AMERICAN SOLDIERS LIVE LIKE PIGS?—WITH THE THERMOMETER IN ALASKA AT 60 BELOW ZERO, SERVICEMEN AND THEIR FAMILIES ARE LIVING IN HOVELS. IT'S THE RESULT OF TOO LITTLE TOO LATE, AND IT IS A SERIOUS THREAT TO MORALE ON OUR FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

(By Dr. Daniel A. Poling)

A few days ago I received the following letter from Alaska:

"DEAR DR. POLING: You probably won't remember me, any more than you remember any of us up here—but you visited our shack last May and said you were going to do something about it. My husband is a sergeant and we have a boy and girl. The four of us are still living in the one-room shack you visited. We are still carrying water in buckets across those muddy fields in all that slush that got your shoes and socks wet. We still use oil lamps and we still take turns emptying our toilet (a galvanized pail) in the ditch my husband dug out near the trees on the other side. And we are still paying $140 a month rent.

"Any day now the temperature will go to 60 degrees below zero. We've had a hundred visitors like you promise that something would be done before winter sets in, but now it's too late. I still believe that if Americans knew we are living like wharf rats up here, they would do something about it. Why haven't you told them?

"As far as I can see, the only money they raise in Washington is for Europeans. We Americans who are defending the frontier up here in Alaska should have been born in Italy or Germany. Then we would be eligible for the Marshall plan.

"Yours truly,

"——— ———."

This letter fills me with a deep sense of humiliation and personal condemnation. When I returned from my 6 weeks' flying trip through the Pacific, I made a lengthy and documented report. Then, speaking as a private citizen, I wrote letters, I talked to all who would listen—and still nothing was done. Now, so help me God, I shall cry to high heaven.

Comfortable living quarters for our armed forces and their families are a responsibility which we have failed to meet. The result has been broken homes, lowered moral standards and a general weakening in our defenses. In Alaska and Okinawa, particularly, we have failed. Living conditions in Anchorage and Fairbanks are worse than those in shack towns on city dumps. The barracks in Fairbanks at Ladd Air Force Base, originally constructed for 2 years' occupancy at the most, are powdery inflammables now. An engineer told me: "If an over-heated stove ever blown up in subzero weather, those boys wouldn't have time to roll out of their bunks."

Promises were made to these boys that living quarters would be provided with only reasonable delay. What is reasonable delay? It was September 2, 1945, when Japan signed the final surrender papers. Today, the families of servicemen in Alaska are still living in abandoned railway cars, in cellars, in plywood boxes without even the most rudimentary facilities.

A DANGEROUS SITUATION

Small wonder that morale is deteriorating and that a dangerous situation exists. Governor Ernest Gruening of Alaska states: "The high command in Alaska—Army, Navy, Air Force—is very seriously concerned. It is obvious that, in the event of war with Russia, Alaska would be the first point of attack. But it has been impossible to get Congress to make the appropriations urgently recommended by the military. As it is, Alaska could be taken tomorrow by even a minor scale airborne invasion. * * *"

The services themselves are doing all they can—with too little help from churches and agencies at home—to keep morale high. But without such minimum essentials as decent housing, they are severely handicapped.

True, Congress did finally pass a bill authorizing appropriations for Alaska. But it was an inadequate one, influenced by the hue and cry for economy, and it was not put through until just before adjournment of the last session of Congress. Then it was too late to get the work done. Meantime, winter closed down relentlessly and our boys—your boys—were still wretchedly housed.

Yes, I know what it costs to get a bag of cement to Alaska. But I also know that whatever the cost of cement, men, women, and children are even more costly. We cannot afford to waste and embitter these people.

However acute conditions are elsewhere—and they are acute in many places—Alaska is the No. 1 spot.

Last April, flying from Honolulu to Johnson Island, I met an Air Force captain who had just completed his year with the airlift in Germany. With his wife and two children, he was going to Johnson, a tiny thumb spot in the Pacific for 12 months' duty. He was looking forward to a very happy and profitable year. "Extra pay, no income tax and no chance for the kids to get lost," he said. "Now we'll really get acquainted." Johnson Island is remote, to be sure, but it has just about everything, including radio, movies, and climate. Compared to Alaska, Johnson is a little bit of heaven.

I spent Palm Sunday on Guam, where a truculent major said: "We've paid a thousand dollars for each coconut tree here. The per capita wealth of Guamanians is $7,000 against our $600. They don't need to produce copra any longer."

He was paying $120 a month rent for his house while the same quarters to a civilian were $45. Yet the civilian drew $2,000 a year more in salary. There was a 50 percent housing shortage on Guam. On Okinawa, it was a 70 percent shortage, with hurricanes to complete the picture. But Guam and Okinawa at their worst are definitely better than Alaska.

APPALLING COSTS

I know that overseas construction costs are appalling. The most primitive type of house on a Pacific island or in the Philippines represents an investment of $50,000 or even more.

Civilian construction workers are another problem. The turn-over is rapid; few of them stay more than 6 months. But considering the inadequate food and billeting provided for them by the construction companies, this is not surprising.

Still, if we could act with the speed and determination we showed in the early days of the war, we could keep faith with our servicemen in Alaska and elsewhere.

When I visited Alaska in May, the commanding officer expressed the opinion that if a civilian contractor in the United States were put on the job of building housing units immediately, there would be some hope of relieving the situation. But that was 9 months ago. Even the appropriation was not authorized until October.

Nine months ago in Anchorage, I saw skeleton steel that had been gathering rust for 2 years. I was told that more than $35,000 would be required to get rid of the rust before work could proceed on barracks to house 4,000 men. But that rust still accumulates and waste adds a staggering amount to the already great need. Only one of the proposed structures was ready before January 1.

GYMNASIUMS NEEDED

Not only living quarters are needed, but recreation buildings as well. Gymnasiums, swimming pools, bowling alleys, and the like are much more imperatively needed in places like Okinawa, Alaska, and the Philippines than they are in training camps in the States.

For it must be remembered that few American boys, removed from their communities in peacetime and assigned to duty in a pioneer area, are psychologically, culturally, or spiritually equipped for their new life. Without the dangers and diversions of a shooting war, they are at a loss to occupy their time. Without intending to, most American communities have developed a parasitic type of human who allows other people to provide his entertainment and diversion. We are radio-listening, game-attending, movie-going, auto-riding, television-watching creatures. We are rarely called upon to operate under our own power.

Thus, when boys and young men are confined for 2 years or more within the tiny boundaries of Clark Field in the Philippines or on Okinawa or in Alaska, they simply don't know how to occupy their time. This leads to excessive drinking and other problems.

The problem of drinking is nothing new to the services. Yet in 6 weeks' traveling throughout the Pacific and the Far East, I did not see a single man in uniform under the influence of liquor on the street or in a public place. This does not, unfortunately, hold true for clubs and private parties. Certainly, the services should require that soft drinks be make available everywhere, including all social functions. General MacArthur insists upon this in all areas under GHQ jurisdiction. There is no stigma to soft drinks, and the nondrinker is not unpopular unless he is otherwise a bore. The major criticism regarding the handling of hard liquor overseas is its ready availability—to officers, at least—and its low cost. Too many young men assigned to overseas posts for 2 or 3 years have too much time on their hands. With bourbon at $1.50 a bottle, too many turn to liquor.

PEACETIME RESPONSE

During wartime, we had millions of men overseas, but we were accustomed to a greatly reduced peacetime force. Thus when our armed forces began to expand in 1948, we were unprepared for the needs of these men who, free from war's stimulation of both fear and patriotism, still must stay abroad for an indefinite period of time.

On my trip, I found that practically all commands favored USO traveling shows or their equivalent. But they also wanted to make sure that such shows did not deteriorate in quality after leaving New York and become loose and bawdy by the time they reached the post. All were agreed that commanding officers should have direct and unquestioned control over these troupes.

Leadership of the USO in the field of hobbies and special interests is even more vital. But much is needed in the way of equipment and facilities—not to mention capable men and women to direct such activities. I talked with one sergeant in Hawaii who was so interested in his outfit's local theatrical program that he hadn't been to fabulous Honolulu for 2 months. He was too busy to go.

THAT RESERVE RESERVE

Every command I visited spoke in the very highest terms of the service rendered overseas by the American Red Cross. In spite of this, there are occasional disappointments and even tragedies. Too often in the Pacific, men approved for emergency furloughs could not get planes to take them back. Operation "Vittles" in Germany was making heavy demands on our aircraft. But none of the men, no matter how tragically deprived of a last sight of a loved one, blamed the Red Cross. They suffered inconveniences and sorrows, but this was not the fault of the services. And it is precisely because the spirit of the men is so determined and so willing that I say they deserve better—far better—than we are giving them, particularly in housing.

I am only a civilian, and it would be impertinent for me to recommend how the services should be run. Our own failures right here at home shame me and I feel uncomfortable about offering suggestions to anyone. But I know what I saw in Alaska and elsewhere, and I must speak out.

The young wife and mother who wrote me that letter is making a desperate attempt to hold her family together in spite of terrible conditions. There are thousands like her. While the divorce rate in the United States remains disgracefully high, these young families on our military frontiers are fighting against enormous odds to maintain family life.

In spite of their courage and determination, some fine families have been broken as the indirect result of bad housing—or no housing at all. Character-guidance councils are doing fine work in the services, but they cannot win against squalor and constant discomfort.

Many marriages are broken, of course, when the wife and husband are separated by regulations barring wives—or when there is simply no place for them to live. When divorce becomes inevitable, the services do their best to protect the men.

Everywhere, I found the Army, Navy, and Air Force seriously concerned with promoting character guidance. Commanding officers and departmental chiefs are cooperating to step up information and education programs. Results today may be modest, but there has been far more progress than our home communities have shown. Character guidance is no longer merely VD control.

TOO FEW CHAPLAINS

Another powerful influence in keeping morale at a high level—in spite of separations and filthy living conditions—is the chaplain. He has assumed a place in military life which he never before enjoyed. But there are, alas, still too few chaplains and too many things for the few to do.

Chaplains at Clark Field in the Philippines, and the character-guidance council, suggested that an effort be made by local church councils in America to encourage young seminary graduates to prepare for a tour of duty in the chaplaincy. There would be no better way to give a clergyman a proper lifetime perspective. Living and working with troops for at least a year, preferably just at the conclusion of seminary training, would be helpful for all concerned.

What the services are doing in a spiritual way should make all of us at home ashamed of our own negligence. Home churches of all faiths seldom seem to show much interest in the spiritual and moral well-being of their young men overseas. A chaplain on Okinawa told me that 12 men of his command had been baptized and united with the church while under his guidance. In each instance, he wrote the home church and also the boy's parents. Only one clergyman acknowledged his letter.

Chaplains are deeply concerned with the problem of morals, particularly among teenage GIs. It is almost unanimously agreed that an 18-year-old boy is too young for overseas duty. I was told that 85 percent of the VD cases in Korea during 1947 and 1948 were among the 17- and 18-year-olds. If this is true, it is an indictment of community indifference at home and of the failure of the American people—the American churches, particularly—to support the moral safeguards and the religious guidance opportunities recommended by the Compton Commission.

THE CHURCHES' FAILURE

The religious press and religious leaders had much to say in opposition to what they called peacetime conscription. But they did little or nothing to support a program for safeguarding the morals of youth and for giving young servicemen comprehensive religious guidance. In these particulars, the armed services and commanding officers generally, with their chaplains, have done far more than our leaders at home.

Last summer, I wrote that civilization had pushed the legalized bawdy houses and the "line" back as far as Fairbanks, Alaska. But with the issuance of a new Army order declaring all houses of prostitution "off limits," the situation should improve. There was never any justifiable reason to allow a "line" of wide-open bawdy houses to operate 2 miles from a large military installation which is the principal support of Fairbanks itself. Hard-headed and realistic Gen. Dale Gaffney of Ladd Air Force Base had already made progress on the problem before the blanket order was issued. The churches had also made constructive efforts to meet the situation.

UNNECESSARY HELPERS

While the services are doing fine work in maintaining morale, I feel that in one department a more realistic policy is needed. This is in job assignment. In an attempt to give every man a "well-rounded background," men are sometimes moved from positions to which they are suited to less compatible work. I an officer is a genius in automotive maintenance, I question the advisability of taking him from that job for 2 or 3 years to give him experience in personnel management, for which he may have not the slightest aptitude or inclination. We do not do it in civilian life. Why should we do it in the services?

One other problem remains for the services to solve. This is the problem of equalizing standards of treatment. Inequities exist, not only between civilian and military standards (as in the case of the major on Guam), but also among the services and the ranks within them. The balance does not always favor the civilian. A $6,000 civilian Army employee living in Tokyo without his family is entitled to a tiny, shabby room in a second-rate hotel. A full colonel gets a large and comfortable house, with three servants, free of charge. These standards and others comparable to them are established by Washington, not by theater commanders. An officer in Alaska gets 10 percent extra pay, a civilian 25 percent. An officer assigned to the University of Alaska gets additional pay allowances, while an officer living next door, but not assigned to the university, does not.

Cigarets are sold by the Navy for one price, and across the street by the Army for another. Navy movies are free, but soldiers and air men have to pay for theirs. An air man in Alaska must stay 15 months, a soldier 18. Some of these things are small, but they often add up to the difference between contented and discontented men and women.

There are great distinctions between the various units of the Army command on Okinawa, and even greater distinctions between Air Force and Army installations. Changes can't be made in a day, but they are needed. Some of them may be speeded by the unification program, and I believe unification is imperative.

RULE EXPERIMENT

One experiment in unification is worth noting. Three services in Hawaii have combined their MP units. The MP's work in teams of two, one from each service. The sailor MP (shore patrol) can arrest soldiers, and the Army or Air Force MP can arrest sailors. Besides realizing a great saving in personnel, money, and vehicles, the experiment is significant psychologically. It seems to be paying off.

The services can, however, do just so much themselves. The rest is up to Congress and the American people. Unless decent living quarters are forthcoming, all the work of chaplains, Red Cross, post commanders, and all the others connected with remote bases will be largely in vain.

At its last session, Congress authorized $133,400,000 for Alaska, but much of this was for radio and radar installations. Now the summer is past, the harvest is ended, and I am not saved from a sense of personal failure with regard to my promises to the wretchedly housed families in Alaska.

"We thought you'd do something about it," said my letter from Alaska. Well, brave lady up there under the Arctic Circle, with more courage and loyalty in your soul than I

have been able to find in mind, we don't deserve it, but forgive us if you can.

And to the gentlemen on Capitol Hill. God pity us all for not doing even the impossible—putting that young mother and hundreds like her in decent, safe quarters before the thermometer in Alaska dropped to 60 below.

Army Engineers Earn Praise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I set forth a splendid editorial entitled "Army Engineers Earn Praise," which appeared in the Shreveport Journal, of Shreveport, La., under date of February 1, 1950:

ARMY ENGINEERS EARN PRAISE

Reports from Washington convey the impression that the retention of flood control, inland waterway improvement and kindred projects and service as the privilege and responsibility of the United States Army engineers is being threatened. The threat, which appears dangerous, is contained in the Government reorganization plan of the national administration. The proposed divorcement of authority now held by the Army engineers would be unwise especially because it would place the work under a civilian agency, which obviously would have political handicap. Such handicap now is not in existence. The Army engineers do their work without regard to politics but with the idea of planning and accomplishing bank protection, flood control, and other such tasks from which the people will gain the largest measure of benefits. These engineers, as shown by their long period of successful performance of duty, meet their responsibilities as soldiers in combat against military foes. They accept their assignments, and loyally strive to fulfill them.

Recently we had the privilege of hearing an informal talk by one of the Army engineers of this district, during which he mentioned various projects developed, under way and planned for the territory including all of Louisiana. Millions have been expended on these projects, resulting in untold benefits to the public. The engineers have met their responsibility satisfactorily. There has been nothing political involved. Every citizen having the facts given in that talk would oppose plans to put others in charge.

Among the many groups protesting against the national administration's plan to transfer this service from the Army engineers to a civilian authority is the Red River Valley Improvement Association, through which much of the waterway improvements hereabouts have come about and been promised. Members of this organization, many of them Shreveport citizens, realize the potential hazards resulting from political authority in determining projects, how they are to be built and other operations now having the capable, unhampered attention of Army engineers, men of proved ability and reputation, who do their duty as they see it regardless of what this or that political representative may say or wish to say.

Had the plan now being urged at Washington been in effect some of the projects serving this territory would probably not have been authorized. The proposed transfer from the Army group to those under civilian direction would offer abundant reason for speculation and doubt. By all means, the existing setup, with the Army engineers continuing inland waterways service they have been in charge of for many decades, should go unchanged.

The Red River Valley Improvement Association and other protestants are doing a thoughtful service to this section and others in the great river valleys in trying to prevent the materialization of the national administration's plan to order cessation of the Army engineers' control.

Inconsistency of Government Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us known as the cotton bill is supposed to set up the machinery for establishing quotas to the various cotton growers throughout the United States. In other words, it is limiting the amount of cotton which can be grown. The Department of Agriculture has estimated that cotton growers of the United States will receive at least $750,000,000 from the Government this year, either as price-support payments or for export cotton purchased under the Marshall European-aid plan.

My purpose in speaking now is not to criticize that plan but to call to your attention the fact that we have a most serious threat of overproduction of farm crops staring us in the face. In view of these facts, we find the Department of Interior, and particularly the Bureau of Reclamation, advocating the authorization of a project known as the central Arizona project, a project which is not only not economically feasible but would supply water to an area which would raise more cotton and other farm products which are surpluses today, and they are doing this also in the face of facts wherein this Congress is attempting to cut down all new lands to 9 percent of previous quotas and, in fact, eliminating any new land.

Yes, the Bureau of Reclamation is advocating the central Arizona project which proposes to use water which it does not own, lift it nearly twice as high as the Washington Monument, convey it farther than from Washington to New York at a cost to the Federal Treasury of from three quarters of a billion dollars to a billion and a half dollars, to irrigate 200,000 acres of privately owned war-boom desert land which would not be required to repay any of the construction cost, for raising crops which are now surplus in this country.

I might go still further and say that not 1 cent of interest will be paid on this project and the cost of interest to the Government for the money for which it will have to borrow will be $465,000,000. Surely there should be some consistency between the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Why Was Hiss Protected?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the January 26, 1950, issue of the Peoria Star, entitled:

WHY WAS HISS PROTECTED?

Alger Hiss, once a confidential adviser to a President of the United States, once an important personage in the Department of State, and secretary of the conference which wrote the United Nations Charter, stands convicted of perjury. Since the perjury involved matters pertaining to espionage, the conviction brands him also as a spy.

Whittaker Chambers' revelations which led to the conviction of Hiss are not new. They were given to high officials of the United States Government 11 or 12 years ago. A lot of powerful protection in higher places was necessary in those years to keep Hiss out of trouble. Why was he protected?

President Roosevelt knew the story. He either refused to believe it or didn't care.

Two Justices of the United States Supreme Court appeared at the first Hiss trial as character witnesses for Hiss. Justice Felix Frankfurter, who recommended Hiss as a law clerk to the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes; and Justice Stanley F. Reed, for whom Hiss worked in the Department of Justice, took the stand to praise Hiss' character.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson long ago knew the story but it is not recorded that he was influenced one way or another by it.

Gov. Adlai Stevenson, of Illinois, allowed his name and influence to be used to try to establish a good character for Hiss.

The Federal judge who conducted the first Hiss trial was assailed in Congress for showing partiality to Hiss, and impeachment proceedings were mentioned in the House.

Probably a long list of other influences which were brought to bear in Hiss' favor could be added. Certainly no spy ever had such an impressive group of powerful friends.

Even President Truman sneered that the trial of Hiss was nothing but a "red herring" being dragged across the trail of the mistakes of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

We think that many Americans, outraged by the spectacle of 11 or 12 years of official protection for Hiss, are going to be morbidly unhappy unless an effort is made by Congress to explain that protection.

The protection of Hiss is a worse scandal by far than the revelation of his crime. It is a gross offense against the American people. They are right in demanding that every individual who had a part in the protection of Hiss be called upon to explain. Let the whole sordid story be brought out in the open, just as the wartime graft and the 5 percenters stories were.

Let each citizen now ask the Members of Congress who represent him, "Why was Hiss protected?" And let him continue asking until the question is answered.

Cooperative Housing Projects Called Pattern of Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the House Banking and Currency Committee today commenced its public hearings on the Spence bill, H. R. 6618, to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for families of moderate income.

The article which appeared in the Sunday, January 29, 1950, New York Herald Tribune by Joel W. Schenker could not have appeared at a more propitious time.

Mr. Schenker is an expert in the cooperative housing field. His building firm, the Roth-Schenker Corp., pioneered in the construction of the Bell Park Gardens mutual project for 800 families in Queens, N. Y.

His article follows:

COOPERATIVE HOUSING PROJECTS CALLED PATTERN OF FUTURE

(By Joel W. Schenker)

Broad lawns, trees, and shrubbery, spacious play areas. On the green expanse attractive garden apartment buildings. In these apartments happy families enjoying a degree of living few of them dreamed of having—at carrying charges of only $14 a room.

This is not to wax lyrical. At the Roth-Schenker Corp. we believe this back drop is basic in any discussion of middle-income cooperative housing.

For when we discuss housing we discuss people. And when we discuss people in relation to housing there is this inescapable fact to be faced: that there are people earning from $3,000 to $5,000 a year for whom there is little or no housing. There are people who find themselves in the unhappy position of earning too much to be eligible for public housing projects, and of earning too little to permit them to buy or rent adequate and decent houses or apartments at present prices.

These are the people who obviously need cooperative housing. Housing that is decent, and is the kind they can afford.

BELL PARK GARDENS CITED

Bell Park Gardens, which has been called the pilot project in the 1949–50 era of cooperative housing, was erected by the Roth-Schenker Corp. As the builders, we were afforded the opportunity of studying mutual housing from the inside out, rather than from the outside in.

Without exploding any bombshell we can say frankly that this observation at first hand has convinced us of the need for cooperative housing as the only means of easing the situation in which the lower middle-income group finds itself.

From an academic viewpoint this so-called finding as it relates to the need, was not new to us, nor will it be to others in the industry. It always has been known. Over the years there always has been a shortage. Not in terms of units perhaps, but in terms of adequate and decent housing. Shortages in terms of housing at the right price.

From another viewpoint, however, the findings were startling. Working with these people we were struck with the cold, hard reality of their situation. It is one thing to know in an academic fashion that a need exists. It is quite another thing to experience it as something real.

PARADISE REGAINED

Individually and collectively the Bell Park cooperators are a testimonial to mutual housing—to its need and at the same time to its benefits. For these people came out of what might be called a housing hell where they were doubled up and tripled up, or living in substandard dwellings, and into a housing heaven where they can breathe their own air, live the good life, and realize the dream of Home, Sweet Home.

But these Bell Park families are only 800 families. There are hundreds, thousands more here, and North, South, and West. What about them?

The answer, of course, is mutual housing on a large scale, on a scale never before blueprinted. We know of no other way of solving or even coming close to solving the problem which besets America's lower middle-income families.

Mutual housing enables these families to enjoy better apartments priced at levels they can afford. Well planned mutual housing does not demand a disproportionate amount of their monthly income. Mutual housing takes these families out of the rut of old hand-me-down apartments. Mutual housing provides a healthier environment that aids not only the one family, but eventually accrues to the benefit of the community as a whole.

If there is any other way whereby the lower middle-income group can gain such advantages it has escaped us.

The builder and the industry as a whole have much to gain through cooperative housing. And again we can speak from experience. In agreeing to erect Bell Park we acceded to a contract limiting profits. This was an experiment for us. It has turned out to be eminently fair for all concerned. We received a fair return out of this arrangement, and the cooperators will share excess profits, adding them to their reserves and thereby reducing their charges.

This is one economy in mutual housing, but perhaps the greatest economy comes about through a centralization of effort in that builder who combines, as we did with Bell Park, "know-how," background, and experience with financial resources. Combined, these are the factors that take a mutual housing development over the humps in the many stages of putting one together.

Far from being socialized housing as some would tag it, cooperative housing symbolizes democracy in action. It gives a group of families what they so urgently require—at their price level, and it permits the industry to enjoy a continual flow of fair profit housing construction instead of a spasmodic risk pattern.

With tax exemption, where it is required, or without tax exemption, as it also can be achieved, cooperative housing is, we think, America's new housing economy.

Tempest in the A. & P. Teapot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able analysis of the Government's case against the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., which has been the subject of widespread interest and debate in the country.

This article is written by Mr. A. G. Mezerik, the author of a number of important articles on economic subjects. Mr. Mezerik examines the evidence and defines the issues in this important litigation with the utmost impartiality.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEMPEST IN THE A. & P. TEAPOT

(By A. G. Mezerik)

The housewife, doing her shopping at A. & P., has never worried much about whether A. & P. is a monopoly or an economic force for good or evil. She has known only the end product of A. & P.'s bigness: comparatively efficient distribution and low prices. Together, these have been more effective in creating favorable public opinion than any propaganda which could have been invented by public relations experts. A. & P., in its tremendous advertising campaign, is presently using those low prices as its major line of defense against the Government's antitrust suit.

The Government, however, steadfastly maintains that it is after A. & P. neither because it sells food at low prices nor because it is big. The antitrust lawyers are going down another street. They are building their case around practices of which, they say, A. & P. has already been found guilty, practices which, in the main, do not directly penalize the A. & P. customer but which, since they spell injury and future danger to the rest of the businessmen in the food field, are against the public interest.

Behind the Government action against A. & P. is a theory which has been expressed in these words by the Supreme Court: "The material consideration in determining whether a monopoly exists is not that prices are raised and the competition is excluded, but that power exists to raise prices or to stifle competition when it is desired to do so." In this context the fact that A. & P. prices are low is relevant only when considered with its power and ability to up those prices at will or to sell products far below cost to kill off competition.

Whether or not the record contains proof that A. & P. has the power and ability to manipulate prices and stifle competition, it does show that A. & P. is truly big. Over its 90 years, since the first Hartford opened his little gas-lit tea store in downtown New York's Vesey Street, A. & P. has grown vertically and horizontally. It is a giant of giants. Its 6,000 stores are everywhere and 4,000,000 customers shop in them every day. One hundred and ten thousand A. & P. employees dispense enough canned goods, dairy products, and soap to supply a nation the size of Holland.

A. & P. is its own canner, packing much of the tinned goods it sells under labels such as Sultana, Iona, and Sunnybrook. A. & P.'s meats are purchased and assembled by one of its many subsidiaries, National Meats. Its national bakery division is the country's second largest baking operation, smaller only than Continental. One hundred and forty million dollars' worth of Jane Parker pie, cake, and bread is taken out of A. & P. ovens each year.

A. & P.'s American Coffee Corp. is the world's largest factor in the coffee business, roasting and selling 140,000 tons of Bokar, Red Circle, and Eight O'Clock coffee annually, bought by its own offices in Brazil and

Colombia. A. & P.'s Quaker Maid Co. is a huge producer of baking powder, mayonnaise, beans, puddings, and cereals. In turn, Quaker Maid's subsidiary packs White House evaporated milk. Ann Page preserves and jellies are still another A. & P. business of great size.

That this greatest of all food operations truly reaches from the Atlantic to the Pacific is easy to see. National Fish is a heavy buyer of filets and whole fish on the Boston wharves. Seafood buyers in New Orleans scour the Gulf Coast. Nakat Packing cans salmon on the Pacific Ocean. The vast continental stretch in between is covered by a network which, in addition to those enumerated above, include A. & P.'s National Butter and the National Egg and Poultry agencies. Finally, the Atlantic Commission Co. (ACCO), a main objective in the Government's antitrust case, purchases, through its 70 field offices, over 2,000,000 tons of fresh fruit and vegetables each year. Connected with the New York headquarters by 9,300 miles of teletype, the ACCO men are in Maine for the potato crop, in Michigan when the cherries are ripe, in Texas when the onions are ready.

This bigness in production and purchasing backs up almost $3,000,000,000 in ultimate retail sales over A. & P.'s counters annually, which is more than twice that of its nearest competitor, Safeway ($1,200,000,000) and nearly three times as much as Kroger ($825,000,000), the third grocery chain in point of size. The entire operation, the Government contends, makes the A. & P. the largest purchaser, manufacturer, processor, and retailer of food in the United States—which is not only self-evident but makes the total A. & P. operation bigger even than that of the Ford Motor Co. The A. & P. thereby wins another distinction, being the largest family controlled corporation in the world. Ninety-nine and ninety-seven one-hundredths percent of A. & P. is owned by John A. Hartford and his brother, George L. Hartford, 77 and 83 years old, respectively.

The Hartfords didn't talk when the Government, 7 years ago, started its successful action against A. & P. in Danville, Ill. The Hartfords still are not talking now, though the Government, acting on a complaint brought by the National Association of Retail Grocers, is seeking—on the basis of the Danville decision—to break up A. & P.'s subsidiary plants and agencies into individual holdings and to dissolve the retail outlets into six regional independently managed chains, along the lines of the seven divisions into which A. & P.'s operations are now separated.

But if the Hartfords aren't talking personally, A. & P. advised by public relations expert, Carl Byoir and his subsidiary, Business Associates, Inc., are very vocal indeed. In a campaign unprecedented in history of litigation, A. & P. has taken to the barricades of advertising. The familiar red store fronts are plastered with signs and posters. Customers stuff leaflets into 4,000,000 market baskets. More than 3,000 newspapers carry full-page advertisements setting forth the A. & P. position, which is that Government success in breaking up the A. & P. empire would mean the end of low-food prices for consumers.

The Government is bound to be on the defensive on this low-price issue. Its entire brief includes only one allegation that A. & P.'s prices to its own customers are not as low as they appear on the price tags. The simple charge reads: "The A. & P. officials, from Mr. John A. Hartford down to unit employees, admitted that their stock gains were substantial in amount and the result of illegal practices. They recognized repeatedly that such gains were due to manipulative practices such as short weight and measures and overcharging of customers." Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, implacable congressional enemy of chain bigness, declared that the A. & P. gleaned, from these practices alone, nearly $2,000,000 in 1941 and that between 1935 and 1941, its take totaled $21,714,000.

DOES A. & P. USE COERCION?

However, neither the antitrust lawyers nor Representative PATMAN could believe for a moment that this alleged deception, of itself, is sufficient to up the whole range of A. & P. prices above that of competition. On the contrary, they admit that A. & P. prices are low. They come to the nub of their contention that A. & P. has the ability and power to stifle competition, when they state their reasons why A. & P. prices are low.

The Government says that A. & P., using its tremendous buying power as leverage, coerces its suppliers into maintaining a secret two-price system, that this system—because of special prices and concessions—is low for A. & P. and high for every other buyer. One example used by the Government is in the charge that the Bowman Dairy Co., Chicago, paid A. & P. a $50,000 rebate in 1942 and later agreed to pay A. & P. 11 percent of sales prices for the 1942–48 period, a total of $355,000. The Government contends that kick-backs of this type and other elements of the price system serve two purposes for A. & P. The first is obvious: It results in A. & P. obtaining the lowest possible price for itself. The second purpose, alleged by the Government, is to further the elimination of A. & P.'s competitors who when purchasing from the same supplier are thereby forced to pay two profits, one on the merchandise which the competitor buys for himself and one on the products sold by the supplier at a loss to A. & P.

Pursuing this same theory—that A. & P. is demonstrating its power and ability to restrict and eliminate competition—the Government points to the use to which A. & P. puts the profits of its far-flung subsidiary operations. These profits, which in 1941, amounted to 40 percent of A. & P.'s total earnings, are, the Government charges, used by A. & P.'s retail divisions to subsidize loss selling in whole territories where A. & P. is seeking to undercut all its competitors in the region.

A. & P.'s alleged use of its subsidiaries to damage competition becomes more complicated in the case of ACCO, A. & P.'s produce brokerage agency. ACCO was the target of emphatic rebuke by the trial judge at Danville. He castigated the double-barreled arrangement in which ACCO acts as buying agent for A. & P. at the same time that it is the selling agent for the farmer, not only in sales to A. & P. but to the general market. By using this special relationship to both A. & P. and the grower, ACCO is accused of diverting the best of the produce which it receives to A. & P., thereby forcing its competitor, who buys produce from ACCO in its capacity of agent for the grower, to accept inferior quality. ACCO is the target of another allegation, to the effect that, by bribery and other means and for its own ends, it has grabbed control of cooperatives, that are of course suppliers.

Throughout, these specific allegations do not question A. & P.'s low prices to customers. They all are directed to the point of proving that the practices which make them low are a danger to other businesses in the food industry and against the public interest. Legally, there cannot be much debate about whether or not A. & P. is involved in these practices. All were part of the allegations in the Danville suit in which the A. & P. was found guilty as charged, and fined $175,000. A. & P. without taking advantage of its right to appeal to the Supreme Court, paid the fine in July 1949, when the Court of Appeals upheld the Danville trial judge. In this new antitrust case the Government is seeking to enjoin A. & P. permanently from continuing these practices. To guarantee the discontinuance of these practices, the Government is asking the court—as a means of destroying A. & P. power and ability to control prices and stifle competition—to break the A. & P. into separated companies under separate ownerships as was done previously to Standard Oil, International Harvester, and other great combines.

Whatever the merits for breaking up A. & P., dissolution has not been a fate worse than death for those other companies. Single units of Standard Oil are now bigger by far than the original company. Since A. & P. is a holding company, the recent report of the Securities and Exchange Commission on the experience of the separate units into which utility-holding companies were broken, is pertinent. The total value of the securities of the separated units is today much more than the market price of the holding company securities were 14 years ago when the death sentence on holding companies became law.

The buyer of foods at retail, built up as the victim or beneficiary, depending on whether A. & P. or the Government is talking, is definitely not the main issue in all this. A Government victory, according to Attorney General McGrath, should "result in lower prices for over 90 percent of the public who buy from other grocers who, because of A. & P.'s practices, are required to buy their supplies at higher prices." The A. & P. counters this with a flat statement that a Government victory would put the A. & P. out of business and mean higher prices for you.

But underneath this and a tremendous volume of other language in this vein, all directed at the consumer, are other equally basic questions. If it seems to the Government that independent businessmen, farmers, middlemen, and other small operators are, or can be, forced to the wall by the actions of a large integrated operation, should it, in the public interest, step in? The Antitrust Division seems to be convinced that the Government has such a duty even when, as in the case of A. & P., the action is outside the classic pattern of trust busting. In the past, antitrust action has always been synonymous with trying to break up companies and combinations which, because they are monopolistic, limit production and keep prices high. Obviously, A. & P. policies do not fit that rule. Moreover, the traditional concept of a monopoly was a business which controlled more than 20 percent of an industry. A. & P.'s share of the Nation's food business is less than 7 percent. In none of these three ways does the case against A. & P. follow the accustomed path.

Nevertheless, the issue—the power and ability of large-scale integrated operations to affect the rest of the economy—has now been raised, and whether or not it follows orthodox antitrust patterns is not the most relevant point. More important is a quick determination as to whether the Government has, or should have, the right under the present law to undertake this type of action, and if so, where such issues should be decided. Up to now antitrust actions have been handled by lawyers and courts. Involved here may well be a question of national policy which ought to be decided by congressional policymakers.

One thing is clear: Business has stakes in the real issues behind the A. & P. case, stakes which are more vital than those held by the housewife to whom A. & P.'s tremendous advertising campaigns are now directed and to whom the Attorney General is speaking. The A. & P. case is opening up the fourth dimension of bigness. Modern technology, mass production, integration, and wide-area marketing—all the techniques which make for product quality at lower costs are in themselves the children of bigness. Since monopoly is only a matter of degree, these are also the attributes of monopoly.

Bigness and monopoly have given us automobiles, locomotives, telegraph, electric light bulbs, radios, steel, and many other products.

In some of these areas, the results show that bigness and monopoly are the more efficient modes of economic organization. How to achieve, preserve, and harness such bigness to promote the general welfare merits the most critical attention and it is in this field that the A. & P. case has opened the questions.

Perhaps, in untangling the threads of the A. & P. case, this country can find out for itself what it values most. It faces into the problem of creating a scale in which low prices and the other fruits of integrated operation are weighed against an ever-greater political centralization in Washington, forced into being to counteract economic centralization. The true effect of such concentrations as that of A. & P. on the independent businessman is also up for some research in which facts will take the place of opinions. The independent businessman is the heart of the American middle class which is in turn credited with being the backbone of democratic institutions.

All these are problems raised by the A. & P. case. They must be recognized as having importance at least equal to and probably far beyond the questions of low prices and size.

Let's hope, instead of vague talk about America being a wonderful country on the one hand and big speeches about trust busting on the other, the New Year brings light on the real issues underlying the A. & P. case.

Life Insurance a Favorite Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, House Joint Resolution 371, relating to income taxes of life-insurance companies for 1948–49, will be the business of the House. A pertinent editorial referring to the subject matter of this resolution appeared in yesterday's Hartford (Conn.) Courant and I include this under extension of my remarks in order that it might be available to my colleagues in the House. The editorial follows:

LIFE INSURANCE A FAVORITE TARGET

The life insurance industry has been much in the news lately. Its top executives have been streaming to Washington to testify in separate congressional inquiries into monopoly and investment practices. Representative CELLER, of New York, heading the monopoly investigation, has been a particularly outspoken critic of the industry.

James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, last week leaped into the fray. He urged Federal regulation of all interstate insurance business, the breaking up of all companies with more than $250,000,000 in assets, and an end to the control of insurance in New York and eastern financial centers.

In this week's tax message President Truman also singled out the life insurance companies for none-too-friendly attention. He referred to efforts by the House Ways and Means Committee to arrange now for retroactive taxes for the past 3 years, and urged Congress to pass a new tax law to remove the inequities of undertaxation in this field without impairing the ability of individuals to acquire life insurance protection.

All this hullabaloo, even if much of it comes to nothing, does the industry no good. Mr. CELLER's broadsides create no good will for life insurance, even though he has conspicuously failed to convince Congress of the need for a thorough investigation of the industry. Mr. Patton's gratuitous suggestions about breaking up the business are based on erroneous assumptions. Among them are that State regulation of insurance is slipshod and ineffective; that concentration of many home offices in the East necessarily makes the companies less than national institutions; and that credit for small businesses is less readily available now than it would be if the large companies were arbitrarily subdivided.

Even if the assumptions are false, the proposals will damage the reputation of a vital industry, unless they are effectively answered. The tax situation, too, lends itself to distortion. In 1947 and 1948 life insurance companies paid no Federal income tax, a fact that has given rise to a good deal of ill-informed criticism. The point is that a new formula for income taxation of life companies was adopted back in 1942, with the approval of the Treasury and of Congress. Implicit in that formula was the understanding that if the rate of investment earnings fell below a specified point, there would be no taxable income, and therefore no tax.

That was what happened in 1947 and in 1948. It was the low rate of return per dollar on investments, a direct result of Government fiscal policy, that caused it. If the 1942 formula was unrealistic, it should be revised. Whether it should be done retroactively is another question. Why should it be? In any case the attempt to imply that the insurance companies have somehow been cheating, or have hoodwinked the Government, is ridiculous. You might as well charge the Treasury and Congress with collusion in approving a tax formula that made the industry's virtual exemption possible. It's a pity that some people can't resist sniping at a big and inviting target, no matter what the facts are.

National Children's Dental Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Des Moines Register of January 29, 1950:

CONGRESS ACTS—FOR DENTAL DAY

WASHINGTON, D. C.—After 4 weeks, Congress has sent just one bill to the White House—a resolution authorizing President Truman to proclaim February 6 as National Children's Dental Day.

The Pressure Goes on Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the January 26, 1950, issue of the Peoria Journal, entitled "The Pressure Goes on Again":

THE PRESSURE GOES ON AGAIN

Victorious in the Far East, where the Chinese Communists have consolidated their control of that sprawling country, Soviet Russia once again is turning her attention to the west—more particularly the sore spot at Berlin.

Once again she is setting up road blocks and blockades and hampering free access by American, British, and French soldiers and officials into the German capital. While the blockade hasn't been made very effective, it still is a nuisance and a hindrance and it has led to speculation as to whether or not it might be necessary to reinstitute the air lift that kept Berlin operating for so many months at so high a cost.

Our plans for an air lift to Berlin are still in existence. They could be put into operation again with little loss of time if it proves necessary. But renewal of the air lift would be a tremendous drain on the pocketbooks of the people of the United States.

There is considerable debate as to why Russia is putting the pressure on again now after letting the operations in Berlin continue unhampered for so long a time. One explanation seems more apt to be right than the others. The United States, under the ineffective leadership of Secretary of State Dean Acheson has just backed down in China and Formosa. Mr. Acheson has just justified our Nation's refusal to aid Formosa on the ground that such action might lead to war. The Russians might be feeling us out to see whether that same attitude pertains to Berlin and whether we can be made to back down there. When George Marshall was Secretary of State we showed them that we couldn't be bluffed by setting up the air lift. But a weaker man is now at the helm of our State Department and it might be possible, in Russian thinking, that we could be forced to step backward in order to avoid a conflict at Berlin.

The policy of the State Department ever since Acheson became Secretary has been one of softness and backing down. We have knuckled under to the Communists in China; we have feared to oppose them in Formosa; Acheson even proposes that we back down on the stand that we took against Francisco Franco in Spain. We are following a policy of appeasement and knuckling under that has always led to disaster in the past.

The reason is not hard to find. Our State Department is full of "brilliant, young men" like Alger Hiss, who stands convicted of treason in the eyes of his countrymen even though his trial actually was only for perjury. The State Department and other departments of our Government have been filled with just such "brilliant young men" as Hiss and Acheson ever since Franklin Roosevelt first was elected President. Their sympathies for the enemies of this Nation and their vacillating policies have betrayed us into the hands of our enemies.

The United States needs, as much as anything else, a complete housecleaning of the departments of Government, and the Department of State, the haven of Acheson and his good friend, Hiss, would be a good place to start.

Incongruous Conduct

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very timely and

enlightening editorial written by a great, old-time, Democratic newspaperman, Mr. George Woodward, Sr., who is the editor of the Farm-Labor Press of Council Bluffs, Iowa.

Heretofore I have been very sympathetic to the plight of China, Formosa, and the other far eastern countries, but now I have great doubts about the wisdom of my former sentiment.

I am sure that everyone will be interested in reading this potent editorial and after reading the last eight paragraphs of same, they will begin to understand, perhaps, why many people outside of the Congress are now shedding crocodile tears, allegedly for humanity's sake, over the lost cause of Nationalist China and the recent decision of President Harry S. Truman not to lend our aid, of money and men, in the defense of Formosa.

It is now very apparent to me that many persons not in the Congress are in the fight as pressure groups to work on their Congressmen in an endeavor to secure aid to China and Formosa, et al., because American capital has made tremendous investments in China, Formosa, and other far eastern places, and most assuredly are now anxious to have American men and dollars save their investments for them.

I know that every Member of Congress has not heretofore and will never take up the legislative cudgel for any such group but will be motivated to act by better sources and for more proper reasons, and anything which I have to say will not be taken, I am sure, to apply to any of my colleagues.

I know that many people have wondered why so many of our citizens seem always to be continually living abroad mentally—at the present time in China and Formosa and the Far East.

The first intimation which I had that all was not real grief which crieth and sobbeth was when I read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A857, under date of January 18, 1950, where there appears certain data presented by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. THOMAS J. LANE, entitled "Formosa." It was pointed out that Charles J. O'Malley had stated in the January 10 issue of the Boston Traveler of Boston, Mass., that Boston investors were part owners of Formosa, because the people of Boston and New England have greater ownership interest in Formosa than the Chinese or Japanese and that the real facts were that when Japan defeated China, China sold the Island of Formosa to the Taiwan Electric Light & Power Co. for a sum equal to about $5,000,000 American. The Taiwan Electric Light & Power Co. was the most important industrial development in Japan. It owned and controlled the electric light and power all over the empire and the taking over of Formosa was one of its activities. When this was accomplished it was decided that America would pay for it, and bonds, equivalent to $22,800,000 were issued. These bonds were sold in Boston, New England, New York, and other parts of the United States. In order to accomplish this the company secured the services of J. P. Morgan & Co., Kuhn Loeb & Co., the National City Co., the First National Bank of the City of New York, and the Yokohama Specie Bank, Ltd. When this was accomplished, through the Yokohama Specie Bank, which was the interest involved in Japan, practically all the leading brokerage houses in this country were engaged in the sale of these bonds. Hayden Stone & Co. sold a great many of these bonds in Boston.

Is this why we are asked to help defend Formosa now?

The editorial which I have heretofore mentioned of my good friend, George Woodward, Sr., is as follows:

INCONGRUOUS

The incongruous attitude of the isolationists previous to and during the war, and their attitude of aggression against the administration's hands-off policy in Formosa is the most shameless exposé of political chicanery that could be conceived in the minds of so-called statesmen when the destiny of their country and the lives of their countrymen are at stake.

The isolationists were opposed to our preparation for war against Hitler. They stumped the Nation for Hitler and against the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of their own country. They lauded the infamous speech of Charles Lindbergh in which he made the seditious statement: "The only danger of war in the United States rests in the Jews and President Roosevelt." When war with Germany was imminent, the isolationists voted against lifting the embargo; against lend-lease; against the Selective Service Act; against war mobilization of industrial plants. In fact, they voted against every war measure proposed by the administration, and the treacherous Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor served only to drive the isolationists under ground to carry on in secret their obstruction to the progress of the war.

The isolationists did not want war then; were willing to compromise with Hitler upon Hitler's terms. When we became involved in war, they would not fight or support the Government's policies in the blackest hours of doubt and distress. Why?

Then there were no atomic bombs. Then, all we had to lose was life, property, resources, and time. Then, it was often suggested but never seriously contended that civilization was in peril. However, World War II was climaxed by the dropping of two atomic bombs, one on Hiroshima and the other on Nagasaki, capable of destroying all life and practically all property within a radius of 10,000 feet, and now scientists are awaiting the go-ahead signal to build a hydrogen bomb that could destroy all life—perhaps millions of people—and all property within a radius of 100 miles. We know that Russia our potential rival for world power, has the atomic bomb. We do not know how far behind, or that she is not ahead of us, in pursuit of building deadly weapons, or that she is not already at work building the incalculably more destructive, more devastating, and more dreadful hydrogen bomb.

In view of such possibilities, it would seem that no man whose power of reason rests securely upon its throne would risk fomenting the shallow stream that separates the cold war from boiling over into a shooting war by loudly criticizing the administration's hands-off policy in Formosa. And, who does? Nobody but the isolationists of World War No. 2!

They say we have betrayed China; that we have sold out to Stalin; that Dean Acheson should resign and that President Truman should be impeached, when all the world stands terrified i... dread of the smouldering spark of contention that may ignite the explosion that will destroy all the hopes of mankind, all his achievements and the loftiest development of civilization to which man has ever attained.

There has never been the remotest hope of establishing a democracy in China; freedom, human or equal rights among man. Chinese destiny and doom was sealed in 1927 when Chiang Kai-shek sold the working class, the poor and the humanitarian intellectual people into slavery. When that great military leader accepted an initial loan of $25,000,000 from Shanghai bankers and industrialists, assisted by foreign capitalists (not excluding American vultures), to disarm and dissolve trade unions and peasant leagues; purge the Kuomintang of Communists, and establish a new government in Nanking as rival to the government in Hankow, and Chiang Kai-shek carried out his part of the agreement to the letter.

Thousands of factory workers and intellectuals were slaughtered in Shanghai and other cities, without trial or hearing. In the interior, military governors, army commanders and landlords began killing peasants. Rivers of blood divided the earth of China. Foreign powers called it good and recognized the government at Nanking as the only government in China.

No more despotic, savage, ruthless, murderous, and inhuman government ever existed than the Nationalist Government of China under the regime of Chiang Kai-shek and, the isolationists of World War II, are entitled to all the applause and glory they shall receive from the calloused hearts of big business for their criticism of the administration's attitude toward Formosa and deserve all the contempt organized labor and the common people of America can heap upon them.

The Chinese people, like all the peoples of the world, have always hoped to attain their God-given right to freedom of thought, individual liberty, equal opportunity, and the pursuit of happiness. The intellectuals of China are endowed with human sympathy and reason and capable of statesmanship. If some way could be found to curb the corruption of international bankers and the power of money to bribe the highest and the lowest officials, there is no reason to suppose that China would not establish a free government comparable to our own government.

"What's in a name? That which we call a rose would smell as sweet by any other name." If we laboring people of America demand moral legislation giving us a more equitable standard in social economy, we are called Communists by the arrogant rich, their big newspapers, their commentators, and their political parasites, knowing full well that freedom and liberty to us is worth fighting for, while the rich are content to sit back, rake in the profits of war and sick us on to victory or to death.

In China the war is between the poor down trodden people against the autocratic murderous rich—a subjugated people fighting and dying to throw off the yoke of despotism, and call them whatever name you choose. If the people have a voice in the establishment of a new government, it will not be communism, socialism, or any other than a government of, for, and by the people. The Nationalist Government in China is finished—is as dead as the the dodo bird, and whatever influence our country may have in support of a new government in China should be directed toward the people of that nation and against the rich.

The rich, everywhere, can be depended upon to get along quite well without suffering from want and destitution.

End Excise Taxes

REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a buyer's strike on in America of tragic proportion. Inspired by an administration dangling a cut in excise taxes before the noses of the American people, the buyer's strike is affecting and economically damaging and bankrupting thoughts of small-business men in 48 States.

People are holding back from buying goods bearing heavy wartime-imposed taxes—and they are waiting for congressional action. Congress is waiting for a bill to vote upon.

I submit that virtually all wartime-imposed taxes can be eliminated without turning to new and dangerous levies on business to offset tax loss. I submit the removal of excise taxes will so inspire consumer demand and thereby production and employment and pay rolls that the income loss of excise levies will be more than offset by increased income from business and individuals during the year.

I also suggest that we refrain from thinking that every removal of tax depends upon the addition of new taxes. And especially should we refrain from the imposition of additional taxes until the time has come when we have exhausted every means of establishing a sound and economical operation of our Government.

It is a fact that if the measures recommended in the Hoover report were effected the Government could save enough to remove four billions of dollars in tax levies.

It is a fact that the reduction or ending of certain taxes would aid in bringing to our people a full enjoyment of a greater prosperity and at the same time not affect the efficiency or lessen the services of the Government.

More than 1,000 of my constituents have taken time in the past 10 days to write me personal letters protesting continuation of wartime-imposed excise taxes. They have also tied up their request with an urge to effect economies in Government operation which are obviously extravagant and admittedly ridiculous.

To add to that voice of impassioned protest of the public, I am urging businessmen throughout the country to let Congress know how seriously the excise taxes and the resulting buyers' strike is hurting them. I have suggested to businessmen everywhere that they protest further delay in congressional action in a telegram to the Ways and Means Committee on Thursday, February 2. That day, Mr. Speaker, is End War Tax Day, and it is a day when businessmen will take the only possible avenue of protest open to them.

Each business organization in the country should request its members to join this telegram "blitz" of the committee which has before it approximately 50 bills concerning excise taxes. Perhaps if such response is great enough the committee will appreciate that not only the public at large is against the excise tax imposition, but that business is solidly united in its knowledge that our economic structure is being damaged by war taxes continuation.

In my county of Onondaga, in upState New York, more than 20,000 persons are wearing lapel buttons protesting continuation of the war taxes and asking for an end of Government waste. They are not wearing buttons asking for more taxes on business. Because any thinking person knows that additional taxes on business will be relayed to consumers.

The mothers who deplore taxes on their baby's powder—know well that if corporation taxes are increased the baby powder will cost just as much as it does now but that all the new and old taxes on it will be hidden.

The politically remunerative policy of taxing the rich and levying heavily against business is the aim of the present administration. But we, in Congress, must be wise enough to see through this grim political devise and appreciate that every tax against industry is a tax against the public.

The people pay the taxes that industry is forced to assume. They pay it in every purchase and are told to blame high cost on industry. The laborer who is laid off because business is reduced by Government action, pays Government taxes with privation and denial and a loss of his hard earned benefits.

Wartime-imposed excise taxes were justified once when we were attempting to discourage consumption of goods deleterious to the war effort. They helped put business into war production—they helped channel dollars into Government bonds—they helped reduce demand for certain goods which it was felt weakened the Nation's strength of purpose needed for all-out war.

Now those same taxes have the same effect in peacetime. They reduce consumption of goods and reduce production. They deny each man the right to enjoy the fruits of his labor. They make a mockery of prosperity and high wages and labor's benefits.

I call upon this Congress to demand in a single voice that wartime-imposed excise taxes be removed immediately and that the Congress stand firmly against the imposition of additional taxes on the people.

When we have eliminated the tragic and costly waste in Government operation; and when we have removed the political pump-priming expenditures of the administration; and when we have tried sound economic programs of business encouragement to raise Government tax income through currently levied taxes, then we will find that new taxes are not necessary.

In fact we will find that even more old taxes can be reduced or ended.

Let's be the Congress which removed that tax—not the Congress that fell for the kindergarten philosophy of replacing a business deterent tax with another tax on the people.

This is the time to dedicate ourselves to ending the war—tax-wise.

Sabine River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there are two rivers which are partly in the Third Congressional District of Texas—the Sabine and Neches Rivers. When I first came to Congress, I contacted various authorities of our Government to ascertain what could be done to develop in practical ways these rivers. Too, as a member of the House Flood Control Committee several years ago, I constantly worked to direct attention to the feasible development of these two rivers. The late Senator Morris Sheppard, of Texas, did much work in connection with the prospective development of these streams.

More recently there has been evidence of renewed interest along the line mentioned. A forward step has been the formation of the Sabine Watershed Association, of which Mr. John Ben Shepperd, of Gladewater, Tex., is president. It is hoped the authorities of our Government will help us to complete in the near future the study or survey which currently is being conducted.

One of the most outstanding newspaper writers in Texas is Mr. Robert M. Hayes, who works with the Dallas Morning News; his office is in Tyler, Tex. Mr. Hayes recently wrote a series of articles on the Sabine River development possibilities. They are timely and to the point, in my opinion. Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD these articles, along with some communications:

A WATER SUPPLY FOR EAST TEXAS

(A series of articles on Sabine River development possibilities)

(By Robert M. Hayes)

I. TO AVERT WATER FAMINE

LONGVIEW, TEX., September 17.—All this talk about a threatened water famine—

Is it a real or imaginary danger? Can industry expand with its present source of supply? How long will cities be able to meet normal domestic demands? What is the solution?

Plagued by the fear of a water crisis, East Texans along the Sabine River watershed have organized to fight what alarmed geologists call "a creeping paralysis that threatens the entire Southwest."

East Texas already has felt the pinch. Bids for industries have been turned down because of inadequate water. Lawns and garden plots have become parched because of

the shortage. In a few instances even drinking water supplies dropped to dangerously low levels.

Ample potential supply

Yet water engineers say the potential supply of water in East Texas is ample. There's enough not only for present needs but for all demands of the foreseeable future.

Then why all the alarm? Because the major part of this area's fresh water supply is flowing unused down East Texas streams.

The Sabine River alone empties into the Gulf of Mexico an average of 5,880,500,000 gallons a day. That is enough for a thousand cities the size of Tyler.

Thus the threat in East Texas resolves itself into a problem of conservation and utilization. That's why the newly organized Sabine River Watershed Association has launched a crusade to arouse lethargic East Texans to the necessity of prompt action.

The watershed association is headed by John Ben Shepperd, energetic young Gladewater lawyer and past president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. Its sphere of operations extends from Greenville to Orange and takes in an area of 9,703 square miles.

Shepperd's group will work hand-in-glove with the Sabine River Authority, a State agency headed by John W. Simmons, of Orange. In fact the watershed association expects to do much of the spade work for the long-range program and help finance the organizational activities.

The Sabine River Authority has received a State appropriation of $25,000. This, obviously, will not go very far in a program of such magnitude. Then, too, a restricted membership—nine directors appointed by the governor—tends to limit its functions.

It was largely to overcome these handicaps that the private group was formed. The watershed association has set a goal of 100,000 members and hopes to raise $100,000 a year.

How will the association funds be spent? A statement from Shepperd's office gives the answer:

1. To organize an all-embracing development program for the river and its tributaries.

2. To sell the sprawling watershed area on the urgent need of water conservation.

3. To work with the Sabine River Authority and, if necessary, provide funds for investigation and surveys of practical development projects.

"If our program is to succeed," says Shepperd, "it will be necessary for the great majority of our people to throw their active support to the Sabine River Authority."

The association maintains offices in the East Texas Chamber of Commerce Building in Longview. There is only one paid employee—Byron Tinsley, of Greenville, the executive secretary.

The board of directors is made up of 45 civic leaders from throughout the watershed. There are three vice presidents representing the upper, central, and lower regions. They are Col. Hal Horton, Greenville; Judge Earl Sharp, Longview; and George S. Colburn, Orange. Hugh Sawyer, of Longview, is secretary-treasurer.

A fourth region, across the river in Louisiana, is in the process of organization. A little less than a third of the watershed area lies in Louisiana.

What are the objectives of the long-range program? Heading the list is water conservation. Scores of cities and towns have been warned they are drawing from their underground water supply faster than nature can replenish.

Then there's flood control. Periodical overflows take a heavy toll both in crops and property. Only a few years ago a Government engineer, in reporting on a survey, said: "Floods in the Sabine Basin cause damages principally to crops and, to a lesser extent, to oil properties, railroads, highways, and public utilities. These damages, both direct and indirect, are estimated to average $268,300 annually."

A third objective is the reclamation of overflow lands. By controlling the floods it would be possible to restore approximately 500,000 acres to agricultural production. This, it is estimated, would add $3,000,000 annually to the area's net revenue.

Still other aims include recreation, public health, reforestation, wildlife conservation, and river navigation.

Even though work has not yet begun in earnest, association officials have a tentative answer to the question: How much time will the program require?

If sufficient funds are raised the survey could be completed in 1961. The construction of dams and the straightening of channels should take about 8 years.

"It is highly possible," says Shepperd, "that the over-all project can be brought to a successful conclusion within the next 10 years."

That, engineers believe, would be long before the "creeping paralysis," now centered in the more arid States of California, Arizona, and Nevada, has time to reach east Texas.

II. FOR INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

GLADEWATER, TEX., September 18.—The man with the green eyeshade and a desk littered with funny-looking maps and charts put it this way:

"Suppose you own a small business and have a working capital of $100,000. With money in the bank you feel secure and are not worrying too much about building up a reserve.

"Your withdrawals have been greater than your deposits. But prospects appear rosy and you want to expand. Then you suddenly discover you can't swing the deal with the dwindling balance you have left.

"What are you going to do—go bankrupt or get out and rustle up more business? There's plenty of money in circulation but it won't come to you without an effort."

That's how the water engineer and the city planner eye the problem that confronts most of east Texas today. For the past decade industrial expansion in the area has been spectacular. The trend is gaining momentum and the future would look rosy if the threat of a water shortage could be thwarted.

As a solution to the problem the newly organized Sabine River Watershed Association has undertaken a long-range problem designed to harness and utilize the 6,000,000,000 gallons of water the stream is pouring into the Gulf daily. The association will coordinate its effort with those of the Sabine River Authority, a State agency.

Charts and statistics prepared by State and Federal engineers do not make pleasant reading. Water tables (levels at which ground water is found) are dropping fast. The surface water situation is not bad, but currently only a third of the domestic water supply comes from above ground. And less than 10 percent of the available surface water is impounded.

Prior to World War II, east Texas gave little thought to the water problem. True, it was known that water demands of the State at large had increased more than 7,000 percent from 1890 to 1940, though the population gain had been only 287 percent. But east Texas was not in the drought area and had plenty of live streams. So, why worry?

The Nation's unprecedented program jarred the area out of its complacency. There was a mad scramble for war plants. When applications poured into the War Department the first question asked was: Do you have plenty of water?

Deep wells helped many communities meet the war emergency. Contracts for material were spread relatively thin over the area, and despite handicaps, east Texas plants made a sizable contribution to the war effort.

When peace came, east Texas leaders, spurred by their success, trained their sights on a huge industrial expansion program. Figuratively speaking, their foot was in the door and they were determined to take full advantage of the situation.

During the past 5 years Gregg County has set the pace in its bid for heavy industries. Lake Cherokee, a 4,000-acre reservoir near Longview, has played a vital part in the city's spectacular industrial growth. Engineers say it will care for the needs not only of Longview but of neighboring cities and communities as well.

Tyler, too, has become a busy industrial center. Since 1940 its population has jumped from 28,279 to 42,500. A new water supply, Lake Tyler, will have an important bearing on the city's future growth. The lake covers 3,000 acres.

But how long will these reservoirs meet the demand? What about the demands of 1960? Of 1970?

Here again the water engineer, fortified with maps and charts, comes up with the answer.

During the next 20 years, according to his forecast, the population of the major centers in the Sabine River watershed will increase from 50 to more than 100 percent. The drain on the municipal water supplies will increase proportionately.

Smith County, for example, now has a population of about 57,000 persons who depend upon municipal water supplies. Consumption runs 5,100,000 gallons. In 1960 the population will be 74,704 and the water consumption 6,846,000 gallons. By 1970 the population will have reached 92,058 and the water consumption 8,165,000 gallons.

These figures were taken from tables prepared by J. M. Lloyd, Tyler water engineer, for the East Texas Water Conference.

Gregg County's growth, Lloyd predicts, will be even greater than Smith County's. He says Gregg's present urban population of approximately 49,000 likely will reach 90,200 by 1970 and the water consumption will jump from 4,079,000 to 12,278,000 gallons.

During the same period Wood County's population and its water consumption are expected to increase approximately 100 percent. Panola County, which takes in the world's largest natural-gas field, will show an even greater gain.

Lloyd called attention to the almost limitless possibilities for industrial expansion in east Texas if the water problem can be solved.

"In the east Texas oil field," he said, "there are approximately 27,000 oil wells. In Panola County there is a vast gas potential of 3,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of high B. t. u. gas. These natural resources make possible a huge industrial and manufacturing program. Gas is readily available as a fuel, replacing the more expensive coal.

"Several cities, deeply concerned about their future growth, have decided the only feasible solution to their water problem lies in the construction of reservoirs. It must be understood, however that these steps will only meet the needs for a few years and will not provide for many large industries which consume vast amounts of water."

The late Governor Beauford Jester sounded a similar warning in Tyler last year.

"Prior to 1940," he said, "many of our towns and cities were racking along with just enough water to meet current requirements. When the war came, with its urgent needs for quick action, many of these communities failed to obtain their share of war industries because they lacked the necessary water. They now may fail to obtain their quota of postwar industries for the same reason."

But the Governor's warning was tempered with optimism. East Texas, he said, is more fortunately situated than other parts of the State.

"Stream-flow records," he asserted, "show that the average annual run-off for each major stream of this region is sufficient to supply ample quantities of water for a greatly expanded population. But this future water demand cannot be supplied by the unregulated flow of our streams."

III. A FACTOR IN CONSERVATION

CARTHAGE, TEX., September 19.—Approximately 625 square miles of overflow lands in east Texas will be reclaimed and put into production if the Sabine River Watershed Association's long-range improvement program attains its goals.

That's the equivalent of more than four counties the size of Rockwall, or about three-fourths the area of Dallas County.

Crop production on the reclaimed land should yield a net revenue of $3,000,000. Pumped into the channels of commerce, the added income would mean a sharp rise in employment, increased sales, and the construction of new homes. It would also mean greater tax revenue to build new schools and highways.

These are the figures of John W. Simmons, 37-year-old president of the Sabine River Authority, a newly created State agency. The SRA and the watershed association have joined forces in an effort to harness and utilize the waters of the 578-mile stream.

"The future of east Texas," says Simmons, "depends on water conservation and flood control."

He estimates that agricultural benefits from the projected program would total $50,000,000 a year. This would include not only the revenues from reclaimed land but from irrigation and soil conservation.

Soil conservation and the control of water resources, engineers say, go hand in hand. Rains are not absorbed by barren, denuded lands. The water flows unchecked into the nearest streams and lakes, carrying with it any valuable topsoil that might remain.

Silting lakes and rivers, in turn, add to the flood dangers.

William A. Faught, agricultural economist for the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, makes this observation:

"It is apparent that the improvement and conservation of the soil are closely related to the conservation and management of water supplies. It would be difficult to formulate a satisfactory program to provide a solution for either of these problems if the other were disregarded. Effective methods of conserving soil and water have been developed, and the public, including both farmers and business leaders, is aware of the importance of establishing these methods on the land."

Faught called attention to the steady deterioration of the soil because of unsound farming practices.

"Over large areas of the region," he continued, "the protective cover has been stripped away, exposing the land to the beating action of rain and increasing the rate of erosion. The run-off water into streams and rivers has been speeded up and flood damage has been intensified. Silting, which results from this erosive process, has partially filled many storage reservoirs, and reduced the productivity of lowland fields on which it was deposited."

But reclamation, erosion control, and water conservation are only part of the watershed association's broad improvement program.

Its most popular phase, perhaps, will be recreation. A series of reservoirs and lakes along the 578-mile stretch are of the Sabine would provide facilities for boating, swimming and fishing. It would enable east Texas to make a strong bid for tourist trade, now one of the Nation's largest sources of revenue.

For recreation cannot be written off as nonessential. It has moved into the ranks of big business. The tourist dollar is bolstering the sagging economy of many a drought-ridden State that has reached its limit in industrial expansion. East Texas leaders see no reason why this area, once an ample supply of water is assured, should not train its sights on the tourist trade and an expanding industrial program.

Lake Texoma, near Denison, is a typical close-to-home example of what recreational facilities can do for a community. It has become one of the most popular playgrounds of the Nation. All northeast Texas has reaped the benefits.

Lake Texoma was built by Army engineers for power, flood control, irrigation, and navigation. The recreational center was developed by the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service. The original cost was $54,000,000.

In asking for an appropriation recently for the expansion of its recreational facilities, Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, said a million people visited Lake Texoma in 1948. Of all Federal projects, he added, only Yellowstone Park exceeded this record.

The indirect benefits from a recreational area often exceed the direct. Factory owners have long since learned that a contented worker is more apt to be an efficient worker. Consequently, in crowded industrial areas with inadequate provision for recreation, production is likely to suffer.

East Texas leaders believe the development of recreational areas not only would attract tourists but would be a definite inducement in bids for new industries.

There are two other important phases of the projected watershed development program. They are irrigation and navigation.

Near the mouth of the Sabine in Orange, Jefferson, and parts of Chambers and Liberty Counties, a network of canals and ditches feeds the principal agricultural crop—rice. Orange County alone has a 10,000-acre harvest that brings in $500,000 a year. There are at least 150 miles of canals in the area's irrigation systems.

Further inland, irrigation becomes somewhat of a rarity. A few farmers in Smith and Rusk Counties are using portable systems. Their success may start a trend.

The prospects for navigation in the upper reaches of the stream admittedly are remote, though Carl Estes, Longview publisher, insists that it is coming.

"Many of us," he told a Gladewater audience recently, "will live to see commercial steamers plying the Sabine in the east Texas oil-field area."

Currently, however, river shipping is confined to within a short distance of the mouth. But it has paid off. Water-compelled freight rates have effected great savings for shippers. The Interstate Commerce Commission requires railroads to meet the water rates on any rail shipments originating in the navigable area.

IV. RICE CITY NEEDS

ORANGE, TEX., September 21.—This busy port's hue and cry about a threatened water shortage doesn't make sense to the average inlander.

Only a few miles from the Gulf of Mexico, the broad expanse of the Sabine River appears to offer ample assurance of a plentiful water supply. It is big enough to float a battleship—or a fleet.

Then why is Orange so vitally interested in the development of a water-conservation program along the entire length of the stream? How can a dam at Big Sandy, Longview, or Logansport possibly benefit the coastal area? Why did an Orange man, Edgar Brown, Jr., make the first pledge of $1,000 a year to the Sabine River Watershed Association to help find a solution to water problems hundreds of miles away?

The answer is found in two words that pop up frequently in engineering reports: regulated flow. The people of Orange know that unless the Sabine's flow is maintained at a reasonably consistent level their huge industrial plants will be in constant jeopardy, and that control measures, such as the construction of dams, must be taken on an area-wide, rather than local basis.

The Sabine dumps an average of nearly 6,000,000,000 gallons of water into the Gulf a day. But the actual run-off throughout the year may range from a mere trickle one day to a raging flood another day.

During the period of low flow, local industries face the constant threat that salt water from the Gulf will back up the stream, forcing a shut-down of factories representing an investment of millions of dollars. They must have fresh water to operate.

If they were unable to meet this threat thousands of employees would be idled and the impact would be felt throughout this section of the State.

The Orange Leader, commenting editorially on the projected watershed-improvement program, told how Orange County's irrigation systems had saved the rice crop during a dry spell last year, but added:

"At the same time, something a lot less subject to boastfulness was going on without publicity. Industrial concerns in the area were sweating blood because the supply of fresh water was inadequate. Tremendous quantities were required for irrigation, which seriously affected industrial usage.

"For a time it was nip and tuck with the industries whether they could stay in operation or be forced to close down until the rains came upstream and the river's flow increased.

"It is true that a lot of water flows down the Sabine River to the Gulf every year. But it also is distressingly true that most of this water comes down the stream during about 8 months of each year.

"So far as the fresh-water situation is concerned, the idea behind the present waterways movement is this: If a series of low-level dams can be constructed upstream on the Sabine, the water could be impounded during months when it is plentiful, then released as needed during periods of drought.

"Until this is done, there can be few more big industries requiring large quantities of fresh water built on the Sabine."

The unprecedented gains made by industry in the Beaumont-Port Arthur-Orange area during the last 10 years has attracted Nation-wide attention. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been invested in refineries, shipyards, chemical plants, and synthetic rubber factories.

Most of them take vast quantities of water. A nylon plant near Orange, for example, requires 30,000,000 gallons a day. There is not a major industrial installation in the entire Sabine Basin that does not impose a heavy drain on the current supply.

The threat to agriculture is equally menacing.

Orange County rice growers keep their fingers crossed when talking about their supply of fresh water. Their irrigation systems have served them well. During the dry spell last year irrigation canals and ditches remained free of salt water and not a grain of rice was lost.

But will their luck hold out? In some of the neighboring counties and in Louisiana parishes across the river, the loss was heavy. Rice is the principal cash crop in this area. A few failures would undermine the entire agricultural structure.

When the Sabine River Authority was created a few months ago, an Orange man, John W. Simmons, was chosen to direct its destinies. It was not only because of his qualifications but because he is in a position to realize the gravity of the water problems.

Other Orange leaders have thrown their strength behind the watershed-improvement program. They want dams built all up and down the Sabine to help maintain the flow at a consistent level and at the same time develop new industries that will strengthen the economy of all east Texas.

The late Beauford H. Jester, as Governor, addressing a water conference in Tyler last year, said:

"Texas has been as profligate in its usage and wastage and lack of conservation of its water as it has been in years past with its forests, oil, and gas. We have no more frontiers that we can move to, or more unexplored areas, so to speak, that warrant us in being wasteful of our natural resources. Our job is to conserve and better utilize that most basic of natural resources—water."

The Governor added that the picture is not too desperate in east Texas as this area has perhaps more available water than any other section of the state. But he cautioned that failure to make intelligent use of the existing supply would place a limit on future industrial expansion.

V. A SUMMARY OF ADVANTAGES

Longview, Tex., September 22.—Did you know that—

Texans are using water more than twice as fast as nature can replace it?

A shortage of water threatens to hamper the industrial expansion program in east Texas?

A single industrial plant near the coast uses as much water as Houston or Dallas?

Two-thirds of the economic supply comes from underground, and 40 percent of the surface water flows into the Gulf?

In an effort to arouse east Texans to the gravity of the water problem, the newly organized Sabine River Watershed Association has launched an all-out crusade to pave the way for a long-range conservation program.

Volunteer speakers have been recruited to appear before luncheon clubs, schools, and civic groups. Each has been armed with statistics showing the urgent need for husbanding the water of the Sabine River.

Statistics to people

The figures about the diminishing supply were not gathered out of thin air. They came from Judge Guy C. Jackson, Anahuac, president of the Texas Water Conservation Association.

No alarmist, Judge Jackson says the solution of the problem is simple if everyone will pull together. Waters of the Sabine alone, according to the judge, will support four times the present population of the watershed area if proper control measures are taken.

What control measures are necessary? A series of dams, strategically located along the stream, would impound water for municipal and industrial use. It also would check floods that inundate hundreds of thousands of acres annually. It would help maintain a consistent flow as necessary to industry in the lower Sabine Valley.

And how will the program be carried out? The State legislature early this year created the Sabine River Authority, a nine-man agency empowered to map an all-embracing improvement program. Only $25,000, however, was appropriated for its use. So the private watershed group was organized to do much of the spade work and, if necessary, raise funds to take up the slack.

United States engineers are expected to start a routine survey of the project soon. But with a limited allotment of funds progress will be slow unless additional money can be raised to speed up operations.

Economic benefits

Once the project is given the official sanction of the Government, the next move would be actual construction of the dams. There probably would be three or four major reservoirs and from 15 to 20 smaller lakes that could serve not only as a water supply but recreation centers.

John Dan Shepperd, president of the watershed association, says, "under favorable conditions it should be possible to complete the entire project within 10 years."

Judge Jackson, who has studied the water situation throughout the Southwest, casts an apprehensive eye over California, Arizona, New Mexico, and other States that appear to be fighting a losing battle for more water.

"California," he says, "always brags about its sunshine. Los Angeles, so its boosters tell us, has only nine rainy days a year. But while they brag about the sunshine their water supply has cost the city and the Federal Government nearly a billion dollars.

"Newcomers are pouring into California at a rate of about 2,000 families a week. If that rate continues, California will have to close its gates to outsiders within 20 years because there won't be enough water for all.

Water means life

"In the Arizona country, water definitely means life. One of Arizona's driest counties is using water 18 times faster than nature is replacing it. And another, 11 times. How long can that last? Well, when the cistern goes dry the citizenry must move to a new source of supply.

"The water table (the depth at which underground water is found) has dropped in Arizona more than 55 feet in the last 6 years. In the area around Delano, Calif., it has dropped 220 feet in 20 years. What sort of promise does that hold for the future?"

Judge Jackson keeps records, taken from Government reports, that underscore the essential nature of water in industry.

"During the war," he says, "the Government picked tentative sites for more than 300 war plants, then had to pass them up because water supplies were inadequate.

"That, of course, was during the war. Nevertheless, it should serve as a yardstick. Industry wants to move to the Southwest where raw materials are more abundant and where the climate and labor conditions are better. But the thing that is stopping that movement is the lack of a stable supply of water."

To prove his point, the judge quoted a few figures:

The per capita consumption of water in the United States is 100 gallons a day. That is, a town of 5,000 needs 500,000 gallons daily. This is about four times the consumption in Europe.

It takes 65,000 gallons of water to produce a ton of steel.

To produce a gallon of gasoline, 10 gallons of water are required.

More than 3,000 gallons are required to process 100 cases of green beans.

A gallon of beer calls for 15 gallons of water.

One process of synthetic rubber production requires 95,000 gallons per ton of rubber.

It takes 100,000 barrels of water to raise an acre of oranges.

An iron smelter in east Texas uses about 17,000,000 gallons, and if a proposed steel mill is erected to operate in conjunction with the smelter the requirements will be raised to 70,000,000 gallons.

If the goals of the Sabine River Authority are attained, the huge water-conservation project likely will be operated under State supervision.

Warns of United States control

Ralph McAllister, of Nacogdoches, an active water conservationist whose interests lie in the lower Neches Valley, has warned that if we wait too long the Federal Government will take over our water project and a three-man board, unfamiliar with Texas problems, will control our destinies.

The Sabine River Authority is clothed with broad powers. Under the law it may issue bonds not to exceed $25,000,000. It may sell water for industrial, agricultural, or municipal uses and it may collect revenues from the recreation centers.

Whether the project will be self-supporting is questionable. There is little doubt that the over-all benefits will far exceed the cost.

"We hope," said President Shepperd of the watershed association, "to keep the management within the framework of our Texas government. That sort of policy is more in keeping with our ideas of free enterprise."

CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
OFFICE OF THE DIVISION ENGINEER,
SOUTHWESTERN DIVISION,
Dallas, Tex., August 3, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated July 29, 1949, wherein you have expressed your interest in the completion of the survey of the Sabine-Neches River area, and your desire for information as to whether any request has been made for additional funds for those rivers.

In answer to your inquiry, you are informed that a request was made for additional funds to carry on the pertinent field investigations and office studies for the Sabine River report, in which you are interested. However, because of the limited funds appropriated by Congress for work of this character, and also because of the large number of other reports of major scope assigned to this division, it was found necessary to prorate the allotted funds to assure a reasonable rate of progress on as many reports as practicable.

For your further information, it is presently estimated that the Sabine River report will cost about $141,000, and of that total approximately $35,000 has been allocated to the continued prosecution of the necessary investigations and studies.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS W. PRENTISS,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers, Division Engineer.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
OFFICE OF THE DIVISION ENGINEER,
SOUTHWESTERN DIVISION,
Dallas, Tex., August 11, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Receipt is acknowledged of your note of August 7, 1949, which was written on the bottom of my letter to you, dated August 3, 1949.

In reply to your inquiry as to the amount of funds required for the Sabine-Neches you are informed that the status of funds for the two separate survey (review) reports currently being prepared on the Sabine and Neches Rivers and their tributaries is as follows:

River	Estimated total cost of report	Available funds
Sabine	$141,000	[illegible]
Neches	108,000	24,000
Total	249,000	59,000

In further compliance with your request I am returning herewith for your files my original letter to you with your note thereon.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS W. PRENTISS,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers,
Division Engineer.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, August 26, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your note of August 15, 1949, which was appended to a reply by Col. Louis W. Prentiss, division engineer of our southwestern division, relative to the allocation of funds for the review reports on the Sabine and Neches Rivers and their tributaries, Texas. Your note requests information as to whether all or part of the funds needed for these investigations was requested by the Corps of Engineers for the fiscal year 1950.

The Corps of Engineers in its budget request for funds to prosecute its survey program throughout the country during the fiscal year 1950 included the amount of $48,600 for the investigation of the Neches River and its tributaries and $58,700 for the investigation of the Sabine River and its tributaries. As you have been informed by Colonel Prentiss, the amounts currently available for those investigations total $59,000. Funds included for our survey program in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act for 1950 (H. R. 3734) were allocated to the Corps' field offices during July under the provisions of Public Law 154, Eighty-first Congress, which permitted the allotment of those funds contained in appropriation acts now before the Congress which are not in dispute between the House and Senate.

Your letters are being returned herewith as requested.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS A. PICK,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., September 2, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated July 29, 1949, requesting information on the status of funds for a survey of the Sabine-Neches River area by the Corps of Engineers, and your letter dated August 12, 1949, requesting information on a source from which the recently established Sabine River Authority could receive or borrow funds to plan or complete a study of the area.

With respect to the survey of the Sabine-Neches River area, I might point out that river and harbor and flood control survey funds are contained in lump-sum appropriations from which allocations are made to projects at the discretion of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers. It is understood that allocations are made to as many of the highest priority surveys as may be carried forward within available funds consistent with reasonable and economic rates of progress. I am informed that the Corps has allocated $24,000 to the Sabine-Neches survey through fiscal year 1949, and has tentatively allocated an additional $11,000 for fiscal year 1950. No special budget request has been made for funds to complete this survey.

As to sources of financial assistance for the Sabine River Authority it may be possible that the Authority might qualify for a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I would suggest that inquiry be made at the Public Agency Loan Division of RFC to determine specifically the eligibility of the Sabine River Authority for financial aid through that agency. I am not aware of any other possible source of Federal funds for such purposes.

I hope that the above information meets your present needs.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Acting Director.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, September 13, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your letter of August 12, 1949, concerning the Sabine River Authority which was created by the Legislature of the State of Texas at its 1949 regular session (ch. 110, Laws of 1949). You inquired whether there was any source from which such authority could receive or borrow funds with which to plan or to complete a study.

The only funds available to this Administration at the present time for planning purposes consist of $200,000 appropriated by the Congress under Public Law 266, approved August 24, 1949, to carry out the provisions of section 8 (c) of the Water Pollution Control Act. Copies of the acts referred to herein are inclosed. You will note that section 8 (c) of the Water Pollution Control Act authorized an appropriation to the Federal Works Agency to enable the Federal Works Administrator to make grants to States, municipalities, or interstate agencies to aid in financing the cost of engineering, architectural and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action preliminary to the construction of projects approved by the appropriate State water-pollution agency or agencies and by the Surgeon General.

Under section 5 of the Water Pollution Control Act, the Federal Works Administrator was authorized to make loans to States, municipalities, or interstate agencies for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge by such State or municipality of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into interstate waters or into a tributary of such waters, and for the preparation of engineering reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith. However, no funds have been appropriated by the Congress for the purpose of making loans under such section.

By virtue of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law 152—Eighty-first Congress, approved June 30, 1949, all the functions of the Federal Works Agency and of the Federal Works Administrator were transferred to the Administrator of General Services, and the Federal Works Agency and the Office of the Federal Works Administrator were abolished.

If the plan for which the Sabine River Authority is seeking funds pertains to water-pollution control, and if the Authority believes it can qualify for a grant under the Water Pollution Control Act, I suggest that you advise the Authority to correspond with Mr. W. H. Sindt, Division Engineer, Bureau of Community Facilities, General Services Administration, whose address is 1065 Texas and Pacific Building, Fort Worth 2, Tex.

Assistance that was made available, in recent years, in connection with the provision of public works was rendered through our advance-planning program whereby funds were advanced to States and political subdivisions thereof to assist in the preparation of drawings and specifications for public works proposed for construction with funds to be furnished by the applicant. However, our authorization to advance funds for plan preparation for such purposes expired on June 30, 1947.

In his midyear economic report, the President recommended to the Congress that it enact legislation at this session to assist States and localities to intensify their advance planning of public works. This is one of the recommendations considered by the President as of vital importance in the current economic situation. Such legislation would result in an adequate reserve of public works to be implemented as material and manpower become available, or accelerated if necessary to help stabilize the construction industry. Senate bill 2116 and House bill 5739, which have been approved by the respective Committees on Public Works, contemplate the extension of the advance-planning program, and it is hoped that the Congress will take favorable action on these measures.

Since the Sabine River Authority is a conservation and reclamation district, it may be that the authority will wish to communicate with the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, to inquire whether that Bureau has any funds available for the purpose desired by the authority.

Sincerely yours,

JESS LARSON,
Administrator,
General Services Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., October 6, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: A survey of the Sabine River watershed, concerning which Mr. John W. Simmons wrote to you recently, is scheduled to begin in fiscal year 1951 and is so indicated in our budget estimates recently discussed with the Bureau of the Budget. Previous commitments on other watersheds and carry-over of surveys started before the war have fully taken up the facilities available to us in the current fiscal year. The Sabine survey would be undertaken along with the Neches, the Calcasieu, and Mermentau. The survey of these watersheds is estimated to cost $142,000 and would require 3 years to complete, that is, fiscal years 1951 and 1952.

We have made a preliminary examination of the flood-damage problems in the Sabine watershed which indicated the seriousness of the flood damages in that area and the need for a comprehensive study, as suggested by Mr. Simmons, of the sources and what should be done in the way of watershed treatment to alleviate these damages.

When the survey is started, we shall keep in close touch with Mr. Simmons so that there may be the maximum possible coordination with the objectives of the Sabine River Authority.

Sincerely,

M. T. NICHOLS,
Acting Chief.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, October 10, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your letter dated October 1, 1949, concerning additional funds for the survey of the Sabine-Neches River by the Corps of Engineers. With your letter you enclosed a communication from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget on this subject in which he states that no budget request has been made for funds to complete this investigation, and you inquire whether I could make a request to the Bureau of the Budget for additional funds for this purpose.

For a number of years, the funds provided by Congress for the prosecution of the authorized program of investigations has been insufficient to carry on that program at a desired rate. In the absence of specific information showing the necessity in the national interest of completing the investigation of the Sabine-Neches River at an accelerated rate over that provided for other investigations throughout the country, this office would have no basis for submitting a special budget request for funds to complete this investigation nor would the Bureau of the Budget have any basis for favorable consideration of such a request. However, in the event that a larger appropriation is made in 1951 for carrying on the investigation program every consideration would be given to advancing the completion date of the Sabine-Neches survey consistent with the funds appropriated.

I trust that the information contained in the paragraphs above is sufficient for your present purposes.

The enclosure with your letter is returned as requested.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS A. PICK,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., December 23, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated November 20, 1949, with respect to the survey by the Corps of Engineers of the Sabine-Neches River, Tex.

As Acting Director Staats pointed out to you in his letter dated September 2, 1949, in connection with this same survey, river and harbor and flood control survey funds are contained in lump-sum appropriations from which allocations are made for project studies at the discretion of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers. If the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers determine that the Sabine-Neches River survey should be completed at an accelerated rate, increased allocations could be provided through their administrative action. It would appear that the schedule for completing this survey is a matter of negotiation between representatives of local interests and the Corps of Engineers.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, JR.,
Director.

DEPARTMENT OF ARMY,
January 4, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your note of December 18, 1949, appended to General Crawford's letter to you of November 23, 1949, relative to funds for the Sabine River survey. You ask if the Corps of Engineers would request funds for completion of this or any survey.

Based upon information presently available as to the urgency of the flood problem on the Sabine River this office is unable to justify a request for sufficient funds for completion of the survey in the immediate future. Accordingly, we cannot make a request for funds for early completion of the Sabine River survey. The Corps of Engineers does not make specific requests for funds for completion of any particular survey; however, numerous surveys are completed each year with funds provided in a lump sum for our authorized examination and survey program.

In the event your questions pertain to the use of General Services Administration funds, please refer to my letter of December 9, 1949, in reply to your note on a letter received by you from Mr. Fern F. Seward, Commissioner, Bureau of Community Facilities, General Services Administration, in which it is stated that it appears that General Services Administration funds cannot be used by the Corps of Engineers for prosecution of the Sabine River survey. This conclusion was based on the Commissioner's statement that planning funds appropriated to the General Services Administration under authority of Public Law 352, Eighty-first Congress, are to be advanced to local authorities for the planning of non-Federal public works. Accordingly, it is not proposed to request such funds for completion of the Sabine River survey.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS A. PICK,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

The Indeterminate Length the American Taxpayer Must Go To Make Good the Interest on British Bonds

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, with the help of the Bureau of Engraving and its billions of printing-press money made good as to purchasing power by the ingenuity and enterprise of American industry, and the brawn and productiveness of American labor, coupled with the utilization of oceans of petroleum energy applied in most every line of human endeavor, we have been able to service our huge national debt and at the same time contribute billions of dollars—American purchasing power—to help service the British national debt.

After all, the most important thing to our international financiers is to maintain the integrity of the bonds they hold of the European governments, the so-called Marshall-plan countries.

There seems to be no limit to the financial burden these financiers would induce our Government to place on the back of the American taxpayer in furthering their scheme to put money in the national treasuries of Great Britain and the Marshall-plan countries, so that when the interest coupons on the government bonds of these countries are presented, this money will be on hand to pay them.

Not satisfied with the huge cash contributions the American taxpayers have already made and are now making to the governments of these countries, these financiers want more

A condensation of an illuminating article by the able economist, Herbert Bratter, on the new plan for further financial contributions to Great Britain, taken from the Sunday Star of January 29, is presented here, together with extracts from an editorial appearing in the January 26 issue of the Washington Times-Herald:

[From the Washington Star]

The rumor markets of Washington, and perhaps of other world capitals, have encouraged speculation in the past week or two that the British Government will shortly submit a formal request for the equivalent of a United States loan of $8,000,000,000 for the liquidation of the so-called blocked sterling balances. These are the bank balances which have piled up in London as a result of goods and services which were supplied to the British during and after the war by India, Egypt, and many other countries.

To pay off those war debts, even though slowly, is today a great burden for the British. Whether or not Uncle Sam is now to be propositioned to take over this burden, the possibility does throw a spotlight on an important element in the whole problem of Britain's economic troubles—as well as those of her creditors.

CLOUD OVER ECONOMY

Ever since the war Britain in its financial relations with the rest of the world has been bankrupt in the sense that its obligations have exceeded its capacity to pay. Despite the assistance Britain has received through the Bretton Woods program, interim aid, the Anglo-American financial agreement of 1945, and the ERP, the country's reserves of foreign exchange are dangerously low. In part these reserves are low because of the rate at which London has permitted India and some of the other owners of the wartime-accumulated sterling funds to use them in the purchase of British goods, which otherwise might have been exported there or elsewhere against payment in foreign currencies. During the war the Indians and others gave up goods for London bank balances and got no goods in exchange; now the British in releasing those same balances, are giving goods and getting no other goods back in exchange. This the British call "unrequited exports." There has been strong pressure on the British Government from within the country to slow down the rate of honoring of the piled-up foreign bank balances, and a few weeks ago the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced that payments would be slowed down.

For years now the huge total of the blocked-sterling balances has hung like a cloud over the British economy, yet no solution has been found. When after World War I the British, like others, owed large war debts to the United States Treasury and found the annual payments burdensome, they simply stopped paying and, presumably, we have stopped dunning. But the more than $8,000,000,000 which Britain today reportedly owes to owners of the London bank balances and cannot pay off are not so readily to be canceled for political considerations. The Indians and others want to buy things with their money; in fact, want to buy things here, if possible. They would like to get dollars for their blocked sterling balances, so that they may buy American goods. But Britain has no dollars to give them.

Who owns those $8,000,000,000 or so of blocked balances? India and Pakistan, although they have been allowed to spend substantial portions of those sterling holdings since the war, still have to their credit more than $2,240,000,000 in London. Other members of the Commonwealth hold important amounts, notably Australia, whose balances in London have been growing rapidly in recent years, to a total last June of about $1,000,000,000. Eire, a non-Commonwealth country, owns a bit less than that in London banks. Egypt accounts for more than $300,000,000, it is believed.

PART OF DOLLAR TALKS

These balances have been the subject of Anglo-American official discussion ever since the war. Prior to Bretton Woods the United States Treasury Department recognized them as a potential troublemaker. During the Anglo-American loan negotiations in 1945 the sterling balances were exhaustively examined and in the loan agreement itself the British Government undertook to make settlements with the countries which owned those accumulations; yet settlements have not been made, due to the unwillingness of the owners of the balances to cancel any part of them. * * *

Because the greater part of the blocked-sterling problem is an Asian problem and because the United States of late has become very Asia-conscious, the British understandably are hoping for a way out of these bank-balance difficulties through American aid. Britain doubtless hopes that somehow in the extension of American aid to Asia Washington will persuade the eastern creditors of London to cancel part of the sterling in consideration of dollars supplied by the United States. In Colombo recently Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin stated that the United Kingdom will ask the United States to share the problem of non-Communist Asia. "The United States," he added, "is a very generous country." * * *

The Indians and other creditors would welcome Washington's replacement of the sterling with dollars only if no strings are attached. Indian Finance (Calcutta weekly) sees as the most simple solution for this vexing problem—the taking over by the United States of the entire sterling obligations of Britain. * * *

We are now being told that this country is now helping India through the ERP aid to Britain; that with the diminution and final ending of ERP India will suffer and that, therefore, the Indian and British problems are really one. Americans are thinking more about India than ever before, but what is uppermost in their minds is Britain's inability to get on its feet and the fact that all the financial transfusions of the postwar years have failed to get the European deficits out of our budget. * * *

If history is a guide, therefore, some way will be found, eventually, to help Britain handle the sterling debts.

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

NEW SCHEME REVEALED

A move to give more billions to the British is gathering momentum. Representative WOLCOTT, of Michigan, one of the best-informed Members of Congress on financial matters and a delegate to the Bretton Woods Conference in 1944 by appointment of President Roosevelt, said in a statement last week that an attempt soon would be made to have the United States assume the debt of Britain to India, Egypt, and other foreign countries.

WOLCOTT was the first to describe the details of the new scheme. He said that the United States would pay these British debts by accepting sterling now frozen in London in payment, first, for agricultural products accumulated by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and then for machinery and other items.

All this ties up with the proposal made in December by a study group of United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce. The scheme released by that group was the first suggestion of using money obtained from the American taxpayers to pay old and stale debts of the British Government.

The study group limited the donation to 15 percent of the British debts. The idea now, according to Representative WOLCOTT, is to have the United States assume the entire debt.

The composition of the group in the International Chamber of Commerce which made the original proposal shows the motivating influence. The interests back of the new $8,000,000,000 donation to Britain are the same ones which put over the Marshall plan and then made huge profits out of it. They are also the same ones which backed every other donation of American funds to Britain.

MARSHALL-PLAN BUSINESS

One of the twenty-one named as authors of the scheme is Lamar Fleming, Jr. Mr. Fleming is president of Anderson, Clayton & Co., the principal business of William L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State.

Mr. Clayton was the principal architect of the Marshall plan, directed negotiations with foreign countries in working out the plan, and directed the drive for the passage of the first ECA Act. Mr. Clayton's firm has supplied at least $100,000,000 worth of cotton paid for with ECA funds. ECA transactions with Anderson, Clayton & Co., tabulated by the Tribune, total $79,000,000, with no figures available since September nor between February 1, 1949, and April 30, 1949.

Another member of the International Chamber of Commerce group which suggested unloading British debts on the American taxpayer is S. Sloan Colt, president of the Bankers' Trust Co. of New York.

His bank has, from the first of ECA, had a large percentage of the letter of credit business. Through the end of the year, Mr. Colt's bank has had $281,000,000 worth of business from the Marshall plan. Two directors of the Bankers' Trust Co., Philip Reed and Ward Melville, were members of the Committee for the Marshall Plan—the propaganda group which agitated for passage of the act originally. Reed is also president of the International Chamber of Commerce.

The National City Bank of New York, which has had $310,000,000 worth of ECA business, was represented on the committee to put over the Marshall plan by two of its directors, Sosthenes Behn and Gerard Swope. Now we find two officers of the bank, W. Randolph Burgess, chairman of its executive committee, and Leo E. Shaw, a vice president, on the roster of the study group which brought out the new British aid plan.

BANKS GET THEIR SHARE

Two Irving Trust Co. directors, Henry P. Bristol and David L. Luke, worked hard to get the Marshall plan through Congress. The bank has cashed in on their efforts thus far with $220,000,000 worth of letter of credit business. A vice president of the bank, August Maffry, took a leading part in preparing the International Chamber of Commerce report.

J. P. Morgan & Co. has had $238,000,000 worth of business out of the ECA. I. C. Raymond Atkin, a Morgan vice president, was one of the study group which brought out the suggestion for a new lot of British aid. The Bank of America also can see the point that foreign aid is good for the country or at least the financiers' end of it, as its share of the ECA banking business so far has been $197,000,000. Russell G. Smith, an executive vice president, is on the international chamber's committee.

Those who had the misfortune to invest in foreign bonds which are not being paid or serviced would like to see their debtors helped; so the membership on the chamber's committee of James Grafton Rogers, president of the Foreign Bondholders Protective Council, is understandable. For like reasons, so is that of William S. Robertson, president of the American & Foreign Power Co.

The new plea for British aid at the expense of the American taxpayer is not being promoted by patriotic people who have only the welfare of all the people of the country in mind. It has been launched by persons who have their own private interests in mind. The influence of these people, when combined with that of the eastern Anglophiles, proved sufficient to put over the $3,750,000,000 loan to Britain in 1946 and the Marshall plan.

Unloading upon the United States old and stale debts of the British Government does seem a little more outrageous than the other schemes, but it will all look sweet and reasonable when the internationalists' propaganda has had a chance to dress it up.

Debacle in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune correctly puts its finger on the situation in China. I include it as part of my remarks:

ENOUGH ROPE

Secretary of State Acheson has announced that Russia has absorbed or is in process of absorbing Manchuria, Outer Mongolia, Inner Mongolia, and Sinkiang from Communist China. He did not say whether this was being done with or without agreement of the leaders of the Chinese Communists. He implied, however, that the seizure will turn the Chinese people against Russia and against China's own Communists, and stated that it should be the policy of the United States to give the Soviet Union and Chinese Reds enough rope so that they may hang themselves.

We do not know how accurate Mr. Acheson's report is or whether it is a new development. There is some reason for approaching the matter with caution, for the Secretary has certain axes to grind. His cautionary word against foolish adventures by America is, of course, an oblique defense of the refusal of the administration to give further support to the Nationalist Chinese Government in Formosa or elsewhere. It is also a defense of the administration's original botched policy of intervention in China and of its present do-nothing policy.

Mr. Acheson also, it should never be forgotten, is a faithful stooge of British foreign policy. His parents were both born as British subjects. The British Government, in the hope of protecting its China investment, China trade, and its colony of Hong Kong, has hastened to recognize the new Communist government. Although we have refused to date to follow suit, there is good reason to believe that Mr. Acheson would like to do so in order to uphold the hand of His Majesty's Government.

He can now argue that, in view of the Soviet seizures, American recognition of the Red regime in Peiping might be accepted by the Chinese masses as moral support of Chinese integrity, and that to take this step would make the Chinese friendlier to us. Recognition, he might contend, would line us up with them against Russia, so that at a more opportune time they might side with us against Russia.

There is only one trouble with this position. Unfortunately, it is serious. The Chinese must have short memories, indeed, if they forget that it was Mr. Roosevelt, an American President, who first let Stalin in to rob and then possess himself of the Chinese orchard. At Yalta, in a snap decision, consummated, according to the late Secretary of State Stettinius, in a mere 13 minutes, Mr. Roosevelt gave Stalin the opening he is now exploiting.

As the price for Russia's entry into the last few days of the war with Japan—an action which Stalin had voluntarily pledged 13 months before with no price tag attached—Mr. Roosevelt, without consulting our ally, China, agreed that Russia should receive all the territory she had lost in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904, including special rights in Manchuria.

Thus Stalin was told he might Russianize the port of Dairen, lease the naval base of Port Arthur, take over joint operation of the Chinese eastern and south Manchurian railroads, and count upon Mr. Roosevelt to exact concurrence from Chiang Kai-shek, the leader of Nationalist China. When Japan surrendered, Russia was installed in Manchuria and disarmed the Japanese Kwangtung Army, turning over all of its arms to Chinese Communist forces, who employed them in the conquest of all China against Chiang's Nationalist forces.

Thus the Roosevelt-Truman administration stands as accessory in Russia's reported theft of vast areas of China, and if Mr. Acheson expects the Chinese people to direct their entire wrath against Russia, we fear that he will be disabused.

Something can be said for his doctrine of "enough rope." It is a doctrine which would have made great sense in 1941 when the United States had to appraise the world situation. Mr. Roosevelt refused to let events take their course with Germany and Japan, and, incidentally, with Russia. He had to plunge into war. As the British military

[illegible], Maj. Gen. Fuller, has noted, there was every chance that Germany and Russia, the two dictatorial powers, would have bled each other white if left to fight matters out between themselves. By intervening, Mr. Roosevelt built Russia into a menace compared to which Germany was of slight importance.

The doctrine of "enough rope," now advocated by Mr. Acheson in China, is not the doctrine which the administration he represents has followed. We have spent billions on economic and arms aid and thus pushed ourselves to the point everywhere as a check upon Russia instead of adopting the patient and long view that, left to themselves, events supply their own counteractive. If enough rope will insure Stalin's downfall in China, it will insure his downfall everywhere. Yet Mr. Acheson regards it as a local remedy instead of a general therapy and continues the frantic program of rushing into every trouble spot everywhere, with the sole exception of China.

The Republican Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune:

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD

Speaking at a Democratic conference on Saturday, where the illusion of unity was created by the ingenious device of keeping entirely silent on civil rights, The President BARKLEY departed from his prepared text to prophesy the approaching end of the Republican Party. It is a suggestion he has ventured before, and one that scarcely does credit to the Vice President's natural good sense or optimistic attitude toward life in general. On the same day, in New York, Representative FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT, Jr., was belaboring Republicans shamefacedly and talking as if the Democratic party was purely and undividedly in favor of civil rights reforms. That was a position, it seems to us, which did not do credit to his intelligence.

Not only logic and the record of history cried out against these Democratic orators. On the same day, by a fortunate coincidence, two outstanding Republicans spoke for their party. At a luncheon of the Women's National Republican Club Governor Driscoll and Representative JOHN DAVIS LODGE, of Connecticut, had opportunity to prove that the Republican Party is very much alive and intends to remain so, and that on the crucial issue of civil rights it has acted effectively, rather than engaging in mere talk.

Representative LODGE, who is less well known in these parts than he should be, exhibited in his speech the combination of forward-looking zeal and realistic prudence which is characteristic of the Republican Party at its best. He insisted that the needs of man must find an effective response, and that neither timidity nor a fear of "me too-ism" can justify the Republicans in ignoring them. But these needs, he insisted, also can be met in other ways than by barren centralization and the stifling of incentive. To maintain that the price of social improvement is the granting of plenipotentiary powers to the state is the worst kind of defeatism. It is a defeatism in which Representative LODGE refused to indulge.

On civil rights he properly took the offensive, asserting that in this whole matter the Democrats have been "hesitant, apologetic, and ineffective." What he said was borne out in the speech of Governor Driscoll, whose record in New Jersey, like the record of Governor Dewey in New York, has shown that the Republicans really do believe in reform and do not hesitate to act. Even partisan oratory does not justify the interpretation that during recent weeks in Congress the Democrats have been sincerely anxious to pass civil rights legislation and that they have been thwarted by the opposition. The record needs to be kept straight before the voters, and Driscoll and LODGE have made a timely contribution to keeping it straight.

Cut Everything

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, a familiar trick employed by advocates of deficit spending is to ask those of us who are attempting to economize just where we would make the cuts. Of course the objective back of this question is to try to embarrass those of us who are attempting to save our Nation from economic bankruptcy. They hope that our answer will serve to get us in bad with various groups or organizations who might have their appropriations reduced if our suggestions were followed.

I know that the Members of this House are loyal, patriotic servants of the people. I fear, however, that we may sometimes be influenced by some particular group. There are Members in this body who do not have a smokestack in their district and because of this they vote for each and every proposal which is advocated for the farmer. Other Members do not have a farm in their district but thousands of industrial workers so they vote for each and every proposal which is advocated for labor. Other individuals carry the torch for foreign countries, others for various pension groups, others for educational groups, others for veterans' organizations, and so it goes endlessly.

In my opinion there isn't one pressure group in a hundred who knows or cares what will be the over-all results to our Nation if their particular pet scheme is adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I started this speech in order to answer the question of where I would cut and my answer would be the following:

Cut everything. Cut the farm subsidies. Reduce all subsidies. Cut the rivers and harbors and highway and housing appropriations. Curb the lending powers of Government corporations. Reduce the amounts the Army and Navy and Air Force can spend. Pare down European aid. Cut the pay rolls, yes even our salary if necessary.

Put an economy and efficiency team to work in the Veterans' Administration to cut out the obvious wastes and abuses in administering the GI bill of rights. There are dozens of other activities where money could be saved without diminishing any really essential Government service, and without weakening the national defense.

There is excess fat in the Federal budget, from the Agriculture Department and Atomic Energy Commission all the way through the alphabet. The Government habitually hires at least three people to do what could be done better and at less cost by two. There are more Federal employees in Ohio than there are State employees.

We cannot do all this by saying, "We are for economy but—." What we must say is, "We are for economy, period." And that must mean cutting all the way down the line. We must stop spending money we have not got for things we cannot afford, regardless of their merit.

Now Mr. Speaker, these remarks may rise up to haunt me in the next election. Well so be it. My own personal fortunes in some future election are of small concern when contrasted with the solvency of America.

I refuse to support any peacetime budget unless it is a balanced budget brought about by economy in Government.

The Coal Crisis—What Is an Emergency?

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the coal crisis which has been existing for weeks and weeks is reaching a climax. Coal-burning train service is being suspended, and I have received wires from my congressional district and from the fuel conservator of the State of Minnesota that some kinds of coal already are unavailable. Certain schools will also be closed in the matter of 3 or 4 days.

The Congress has provided a law for an emergency of this type and that law should be carried out.

Mr. Speaker, in our section of the country temperatures range from slightly above zero to as cold as 33° below zero.

The question which I ask is, How many people have to be frozen to death before it is determined that there is an emergency?

Our people are appealing for immediate relief. Action is necessary and coal must be delivered in these emergency conditions. Further delay invites nothing but catastrophe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to convene an extraordinary session of the House of Representatives for the purpose of taking emergency action in the present coal shortage crisis.

I include the following telegrams, letters, and newspaper accounts to show the serious conditions existing:

GLENCOE, MINN., *January 27, 1950.*

Congressman JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
Second Congressional District, Minnesota,
Washington, D. C.:

Ordered carload stocker coal from Old Ben Coal Corp., 230 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill., to be delivered December 27, 1949, or soon as possible. If not delivered in 7 days will have to close St. Peter and Paul School. Please try to expedite.

GLENCOE LUMBER & COAL CO.,
GORDON F. DAHL.

Congressman JOSEPH O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Investigation among coal dealers here reveals serious situation in coal for domestic use. Stoker coal for home-heating plants very low. Under presen severe weather conditions supply gone in week to 10 days, domestic lump sizes soon after. Please do all possible to secure immediate relief in this area.

R. B. WILLARD,
Executive Secretary, South St. Paul Civic and Commerce Association.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 30, 1950.*

Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
United States Representative for Minnesota, Washington, D. C.:

Governor Youngdahl has just wired President Truman as follows, quote: A coal shortage in Minnesota now becoming critical. Industries threatened with closure. Lake-dock supplies running low. Some kinds coal already unavailable. Worst of winter season still ahead. Minnesota now dependent upon rail shipments difficult to secure because of reduced production. Imperative that action be taken to assure an increased supply in immediate future. Unquote. Your assistance in securing intervention of national Government in relieving situation is earnestly solicited.

J. W. CLARK,
Fuel Conservator, State Capitol.

COMFREY TRAIN TAKEN OFF AGAIN

On again, off again. That's the way Northwestern passenger train service to Comfrey and Darfur has been going in the last few months.

Since last Sunday the train is off again. The Northwestern withdrew it for the second time since late last October because of a shortage of coal. The suspension is for an indefinite period.

The suspended train was passenger 16, which leaves Sanborn at 3 p. m., travels through Comfrey and Darfur, and arrives at Belle Plaine, Iowa, at 11:10 p. m. daily except Sunday. The last trip was made last Saturday.

So Gil Iverson, star route carrier from the Springfield post office to Comfrey and Darfur, is back to carrying all classes of mail to these communities. The last time the train was suspended he made 19 round trips between October 29 and November 21. Carrier Iverson makes the circuit every day except Sunday and holidays.

WE'RE GETTING USED TO BELOW ZERO TEMPERATURES NOW

Frigid weather continues to prevail here, but it's the kind of weather Minnesotans expect at this time of year.

High winds kicked up a near blizzard Sunday. Fortunately only 1½ inches of snow were recorded, or this area would have had blocked roads and high drifts. The strong winds hit this area in the early morning hours Monday, but blew out of steam before noon.

Subzero readings have been regular this week; however, daytime temperatures have not been unusually low.

The following week's readings are furnished through the courtesy of Springfield's weather observer, Alez Peterson, United States volunteer official weatherman.

	High	Low
Thursday, Jan. 5	10	−15
Friday, Jan. 6	20	−5
Saturday, Jan. 7	14	−13
Sunday, Jan. 8	35	−1
Monday, Jan. 9	27	1
Tuesday, Jan. 10	17	0
Wednesday, Jan. 11	30	0

JANUARY 30, 1950.

Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

All available supply of stoker coal in Gaylord will be exhausted within a few days. None available from any source. Situation will be serious in a short time. Local school has 1 week's supply on hand. Urge immediate action.

H. A. KNOBEL,
Clerk, Independent School District No. 19.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 23, 1950.*

On Friday, January 20, a check-up of dock coal figured against unfilled orders already placed indicated that our available stocks for dealers or industrial spot orders were exhausted and that we had already drawn heavily against reserves for contracts. Consequently, it was necessary to issue an order that we could not accept further orders for dock coal. This was a hard decision to make but limited working time at the mines last summer cut our lake shipments in half, causing this shortage. We expect to take care of contract commitments.

This fuel shortage can be relieved greatly by all-rail shipments if the mines are put back to work immediately on a 5-day work week basis. We earnestly suggest that all dealers and industries wire or write their representatives, Senators, or Governors, advising of coal needs and asking the necessary governmental orders to insure this much-needed coal production.

NORTH WESTERN-HANNA FUEL CO.

Foreign and Defense Policies of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Sokolsky, from the Washington Times-Herald of January 30, 1950:

THREE WAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

In the face of a potential enemy of the dimensions of the Russian universal state, a national carefully guards its own potentialities. The most serious problem in wartime that faces the United States is the supply of a few essentials, such as raw rubber, tin, and other metals, which are obtainable on the American continents and some of which must be imported.

Uranium, which is more important in war than in peace, is available in Canada; Bauxite in ample quantities is available in Surinam, British Guiana, Curacao, and Jamaica; tin from Bolivia and copper from Chile; antimony comes from Chile, Bolivia, Peru, Honduras, and Mexico; chrome comes from Cuba; cobalt from Canada.

In a word, war requires integration in a defensible area.

From that standpoint, after our frightful blunders in China for which the State Department is responsible, the 10,000-mile supply line from our west coast to southeastern Asia is too long and too difficult to maintain against a fleet of snorkel submarines operating out of the bays and harbors of Soviet China.

Because of our errors it will be difficult to protect either Japan or the Philippines or even Guam and Hawaii. Our first line of defense, in actual war, has been pushed back by Soviet Russia, to the west coast, to Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle.

Taking for granted our favorable relations with Canada, the problem then is, what is our position in Latin America? To maintain more of a union than was achieved at Chapultepec in 1946, it is essential to cultivate not only the self interest but the respect of the Latin-American countries.

With the exception of Brazil, these countries are culturally related to Spain.

They are all Roman Catholic, and that term needs to be understood, for while to most Americans, the Roman Catholic Church is a religious sect, to Roman Catholics it is a culture, a way of life. For instance, a Mexican may be anticlerical, but he is not a Marxist, he remains a Catholic and his wife and children will be trained in the Catholic faith.

To refuse to recognize Spain and to be offensive to Spain, while recognizing Tito, can only strike a Latin as monstrously illogical, and seeking for logic, he reaches the conclusion that Spain has been rejected by the United States because in that country catholicism defeated Marxism.

As a matter of fact, Spain is the only country in Europe where Christianity and communism fought it out and Christianity was wholly victorious.

If the foreign and defense policies of the United States are to be integrated, Latin America is more important than Europe, and Spain is more important than any country in Europe because of its cultural influence upon Latin America.

A sound policy is an integrated one and this country is on dangerous grounds when its foreign and defense policies are operated in conflict.

During the Roosevelt administration, when the State department functioned with adoration for Soviet Russia, communism made tremendous inroads in Latin America, particularly in Cuba and Mexico.

Lombardo Toledano, the leader of Mexican communism, was a great factor in the development of a Marxist enclave. While such influences have become weakened in the Latin countries, they are by no means dead.

Peron represents our greatest error in Latin America. The United States opposed his rise to power which he has never quite forgotten.

Our opposition was based on the utterly false assumption that we could pick between good and bad dictators; that Stalin was a good dictator and Peron a bad one. But Peron turned out to be a very successful one, who not only established himself over the Argentine, but has also pursued an independent attitude, almost a competitive attitude, vis-à-vis American policy.

This country, in its defensive program, must make sure of the Argentine. It could prove to be an Achilles heel, the weak spot that imperils.

In fact, in a knockout war, it might prove necessary to bring wheat and meat from the Argentine to the United States, should our means of transportation be dislocated.

The so-called good-neighbor policy was so inadequately and amateurishly handled, that in spite of huge expenditures its lasting results are not visible. To win the next war, we need to be sure of main American continents.

Fair Employment Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the fair employment practices bill appears to be a reasonable piece of legislation. Members of Congress who have studied it quite carefully believe that if it is finally adopted that it will do more harm than good.

It calls for the establishment of another Federal agency which would have jurisdiction over all employers who employ 50 persons or more doing business in interstate commerce. This agency would be charged with the duty of preventing any discrimination in employment based on race, creed, or color. Further, the sole judge of such a charge would be the Federal agency set up under this measure. Any decree entered against an employer or a union would be enforceable in the courts. Obviously this tremendous power might be exercised for good or evil. One need not speculate very much to understand the strife and contention that might arise, especially in the South. It could easily start a class or race war and its sponsors know it.

A majority in the Congress, if provided with a secret ballot, would vote against it. Party leaders in both Houses know that is true. But both parties are committed to the legislation solely for political purposes and not for the good of the country.

One week ago the Democratic leaders in the House shed crocodile tears in beating a move to restore previous power to the Rules Committee. The breast beaters cried that the effort to restore this power was designed to prevent the FEPC bill from getting to the floor for action. The effort was defeated decisively by a coalition of New Dealers and Republicans. There was no charge that this was a coalition of reactionaries, as the leftists have shouted before.

Now, 1 week later, and FEPC is still bottled up in committee with the help of President Truman and the Democratic leaders in the House. These Democrats do not want the bill to pass in its present form and they will have their way. Vote-hunting politicians have been paying lip service to the measure and a lot of unsuspecting people are being hoodwinked. Many fine colored people and a large group of labor leaders are being taken for a ride and they must be aware of it.

Emergency Situation on Montana Indian Reservations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the emergency situation on Montana Indian reservations, which I mentioned to this House on last Thursday, continues to cause great concern.

It is certain that many hundreds of Indians will have to be supported with food and fuel throughout the remaining months of this harsh winter, particularly on the Blackfeet, Rocky Boy's Fort Belknap, and Tongue River Reservations.

The President has now sent to the House a deficiency request for $800,000 for Indian welfare, and I hope that we will lose no time in making this money available so that further suffering from cold and hunger will be unnecessary.

Meanwhile I can report some improvements in the situation. The Indian Bureau reports that an additional $10,000 has been made available to the Blackfeet Reservation, and another $10,000 for the other reservations in Montana. Also, we have been able to secure release of part of the Blackfeet tribal oil royalty funds which have been tied up by another Government agency.

The various reservations have received or are receiving their shares of the 500 elk taken by Government hunters from the northern Yellowstone Park herd, and this meat will be very welcome.

Reports coming to me also indicate that an effort is now being made to use to the fullest extent the surplus commodities which are available from our agricultural supplies. I cannot understand why this source of food was not fully exploited long ago, and I hope that the potatoes, apples, dried eggs, and other supplies available will be distributed rapidly to the needy Indians.

The yearly repetition of emergency hunger and cold on our Indian reservations is something that is unnecessary and can be avoided.

Dead Animals on Our Highways Dangerous to Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking advantage of this opportunity of calling to the attention of the Congress, and the country, a condition that vitally affects the health of every person in every State in the Union, as well as in the District of Columbia.

On my return to Washington, I recently drove approximately 1,000 miles, through four States and the District of Columbia. On that trip I saw hundreds of dead animals, and parts of dead animals, on the highway. I saw dead dogs, dead cats, dead skunks, dead rats, dead squirrels, dead rabbits, dead possums, dead crows, dead buzzards, dead birds, and other dead animals, that had been run over by automobiles, and their bodies left to rot on the road.

In the summertime we see a large number of dead snakes on the road that have been run over by automobiles. Many of them are poisonous and extremely dangerous.

If any of these dead bodies are affected with contagious or infectious diseases, the germs are picked up by every car that rolls over them.

I am not a doctor, but I know that polio has been spread throughout the country in some mysterious manner that even the medical profession cannot explain.

I know that a great many wild animals are affected with rabies or hydrophobia, one of the most dangerous diseases known to man.

I know that in some States rabbits have become affected with some kind of disease that is not only destroying them but making it dangerous for anybody to eat their flesh.

I know that the body of any dead animal that is in a decaying condition is likely to be affected with disease germs that are dangerous for one to come in contact with.

I want to make two suggestions.

First, that any motorist who kills an animal of any kind on the highway should be required to stop his car and remove its body from the road.

Second, that the highway officials, as well as the public-health officials in every county in every State, and also in the District of Columbia, be required to have the bodies of dead animals removed from the highway as soon as they are discovered, and that every motorist who sees a dead animal on the highway be required to report it to the nearest authority.

In my opinion, this would prevent the spread of some very dangerous diseases and would probably save the lives of large numbers of men, women, and children throughout the country.

House Vote Should Decide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Mt. Vernon (Ohio) News of January 28, 1950:

HOUSE VOTE SHOULD DECIDE

Whether you're for or against the Truman program, you should welcome the administration's victory over the House group that tried to scuttle the new system for bringing bills to the floor.

For many years the House Rules Committee had life-and-death control over legislation. It was like a traffic cop, steering some proposals to a floor vote, blocking others. It could smother any measure it disapproved.

Countless bills that would have passed the House never reached the floor. Some were bad, but some were good. The relatively unknown committee members struck down both kinds—without regard to popular sentiment or the views of the whole House.

Last year administration forces succeeded in breaking the committee's stranglehold on legislation. It rammed through the committee itself, and then the House, a new plan under which a measure could be brought to the floor 3 weeks after the committee turned thumbs down on it. In other words, the committee could be bypassed.

The change was generally hailed as a triumph for more broadly democratic methods over the autocratic impulses of the tiny group of men on the Rules Committee. The new 21-day rule meant that the full House could be assured of making the final decisions on controversial issues.

But as the 1949 session opened, a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats on the Rules Committee took command and reversed the 1948 action. It decided to cast out the 21-day rule and restore to the committee its power to throttle any bill.

Republicans flatly said they hoped thus to block most of President Truman's social-welfare program. Southern Democrats made plain they wanted to stop civil-rights bills.

The administration was seriously concerned that it lose the advantage gained last year. Headed by Speaker RAYBURN, Texas Democrat, Mr. Truman's House chieftains marshaled all the strength they could to keep the 21-day rule. The fight looked close, but in the end the administration won by a surprising 236 to 183 when 64 Republicans came over to its side.

So, once more the old undemocratic system is out the window. That's where it ought to stay. Its supporters argue that legislative traffic runs wild without that check. But it's hard to believe that sensible lawmakers can't devise a way to steer bills wisely without giving the Rules Committee veto power over them.

The House floor is the place to decide the fate of major issues. All the Nation's representatives, not just a chosen few, should pass upon them. If they make a bad choice, the voters can reject them and put in other men who can correct the error. That's the sound democratic approach.

Truman's Spending Spree Based on Theory That Government Has the Right To Take Money From Peter and Give It to Paul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a President who can outspend 32 other Presidents to date has established some kind of a record. Mr. Truman has outdistanced the others by more than eleven billions.

Mr. Henry Hazlitt, in Newsweek for January 23, points out the fallacies in the President's argument for a perpetual spending spree. I commend it to the attention of all Members:

THE FORGOTTEN TAXPAYER

(By Henry Hazlitt)

"This financial program," insisted President Truman in presenting his annual budget, "provide a sound basis on which to proceed." He thought his spending policy one of prudence and restraint. "It provides for essential activities," he said, "on a minimum basis and no more." He spoke of it as if it were an abstemious, almost a niggardly budget. He had denied request after request for additional funds. In fact, he declared at one point: "The major question in my mind is not whether we are doing too much spending but * * * too little."

This budget that Mr. Truman considers to be so sound, prudent, restrained, a minimum and perhaps too little, happens to be in simple fact a continuation of the largest peacetime expenditure ever proposed by the head of this or any other government in the history of the world.

The requested 1951 expenditures of $42,440,000,000, would be greater than our total estimated national income in 1932. They would be more than 5 times the annual rate of spending in the peacetime years of the Roosevelt administrations. They would be more than 10 times the annual rate of spending in the Hoover administration.

This colossal rate of spending, Mr. Truman argues, is necessary to meet the demands which the foreign and domestic situations put upon the people. It contributes to the welfare of our people. It encourages prosperity. It maintains high employment. It promotes an expanding economy.

The real truth is the exact opposite. Mr. Truman's bouquet of fallacies stems from looking solely at what the expenditures do or appear to do for those to whom they are given. He forgets that a government cannot give anything to Paul without taking it from Peter. In brief, he completely forgets the American taxpayer.

Mr. Truman really does assume that we can eat our cake and have it too. He forgets that the Government cannot fill a single need without making it impossible for the individual taxpayers to satisfy other needs. He declares that many Federal expenditures constitute direct supports for important sectors of our economy. But he forgets that the taxes taken to make these expenditures must constitute at least equal depressants on other important sectors of our economy. He sincerely believes that he can pass economic miracles by seizing more and more from the American taxpayer and handing it over to someone else.

Yet you do not help the people to meet their needs by taking away from them the earnings on which they depend to meet those needs. You do not maintain high employment by putting further tax burdens on the industries that provide employment. You do not encourage production by burdening the productive to subsidize the unproductive. You do not create an expanding economy by killing incentives and draining industry of the very capital by which productivity is increased and an economy expanded.

Even with the present unparalleled burden of peacetime taxes the Government stands to raise only $37,500,000,000 in revenues. This means that it plans a deficit in the 1951 fiscal year of more than $5,000,000,000. This deficit alone would be greater than the entire expenditures of the Federal Government in any year in the Hoover administration. It would come on top of an estimated deficit of $6,500,000,000 in the current fiscal year, on top of 18 deficits in the 20 preceding fiscal years, and on top of a national debt of about $250,000,000,000.

What is most outrageous is that the President no longer seems to consider deficits anything to worry about. He expects the country to be satisfied with the vague assurance that we are moving toward budgetary balance in the next few years. Mr. Truman and his advisers seem to believe that they can keep a perpetual boom going by perpetual deficit financing and perpetual inflation. And that belief, as experience shows, has always ended in disillusion and disaster.

Liberal Magazine Pioneers in Western United States Venture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

BY

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Christian Science Monitor carried an article titled "Liberal Magazine Pioneers in Western United States Venture." This article, written by Kimmis Hendrick, concerned the establishment of the new semimonthly magazine, Frontier, published by Gifford Phillips and edited by Phil Kerby.

I was very interested in Mr. Hendrick's account, as I have been a reader of Frontier since its first issue. As a magazine of opinion devoted particularly to the West, Frontier can play an important role in the future development of this great part of the Nation. The magazine is published in Beverly Hills, Calif., but it is printed in Colorado, and its interests include the entire West, from the Pacific seaboard through the Rocky Mountain area. In its first few issues, already it has published outstanding articles by such western writers as Carey McWilliams, Roscoe Fleming, Benton J. Stong, and Robert Stapp.

Every Member of Congress who is interested in trends of thought and action in the West will find Frontier well worth reading. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article "Liberal Magazine Pioneers in Western United States Venture," from the Christian Science Monitor for December 30, 1949, in the Appendix of the RECORD for the further information of Members:

LIBERAL MAGAZINE PIONEERS IN WESTERN UNITED STATES VENTURE

[By Kimmis Hendrick]

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.—Western liberals now have something they have been wanting for a long time—a review devoted to western affairs and similar in outlook to Nation and New Republic.

The appearance here of a modest-looking semimonthly called Frontier is noteworthy for two reasons:

1. It puts the liberal viewpoint on record for a region of tremendous, vital growth—a service that can be useful not only to liberals but to careful, conservative critics of the liberal position.

2. It helps, therefore, to draw the line between the genuine liberal viewpoint and that

wholly fallacious liberalism espoused by Communists—of which, it appears, the far West has too many and too loud.

These two points become all the more emphatic in view of Frontier's definition of liberalism. Liberalism, says editor Paul Kerby, means that which a free people are striving as their concept of society—provided, that is, they are adequately informed.

This proviso is Frontier's great opportunity. The West has liberal institutions, true. But in several western cities, notably Los Angeles, there has been virtually none at all, and it is Mr. Kerby's ambition to see Frontier help westerners get adequate appraisals—not necessarily political appraisals—of developments vital to their future.

This is an ambitious hope. When it is considered, however, that these States represent the newness of America, and that populationwise they represent the biggest migration to a new frontier of this time or of any time, it can be seen as an ambition irresistibly attractive to the liberal editor.

It is even more attractive to the editor who considers, as Mr. Kerby does, that the still-new West presents two fascinating extremes: the already entrenched conservatism of its founders and the uninformed, liberal-tending hopes of the new generation of settlers that has poured in by the millions since Pearl Harbor.

Take Los Angeles. Today it can aptly be called the world in microcosm. A community shaped by hardy, enterprising pioneers whose successes have given it metropolitan status, Los Angeles is even more the camping ground of newcomers who have just two things in common—they are Americans and they like California.

Again, take Hollywood. Here is a place that is not a community so much as an influence. People think of it as the origination point for the neighborhood movie and the gossip column. But it has a bearing on the mores and manners of millions of moviegoers and an undoubted impact on the economic and political affairs of California.

Mr. Kerby believes that a magazine devoted to a review of what is happening in Los Angeles, in Hollywood, and throughout the West can help crystallize and support whatever prominence there is—and, obviously, there must be much—in this evolving picture.

Such a review must rest on convictions. Frontier's convictions, as has been said, are the convictions of liberalism, belief in the individual's instinctive or deliberate quest for self-realization and a truer relationship to the rest of mankind. Such liberalism, of course, has nothing in common with communism, fascism, or clericalism, and Frontier regards these as having no part at all in its ideal.

It takes money to establish a magazine. Frontier has the money. A young Denver millionaire, Gifford Phillips, as publisher, is underwriting the cost for 2 years, anyway. But Mr. Phillips has indicated that the magazine must budget itself carefully and build enough circulation to become self-sustaining. He estimates that 15,000 subscribers will enable it, not to make money, but to pay its bills.

He is printing Frontier at the Golden Press, in Golden, Colo., a suburb of Denver, where he publishes a weekly newspaper. He owns a radio station in Pueblo, Colo. He has television interests in Hollywood. In Mr. Kerby he has an editor of broad experience as a western newspaperman—and he has given him what any editor would gladly call a free hand.

It is Mr. Phillips' good fortune, as a young publisher whose maturity is yet to be tested, to have the opportunity to give the far West something it can profit by, provided the job is carefully done.

The Ohio River Is the World's Most Beautiful River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the word "Ohio" means the beautiful river. Thus the Ohio River was named before the State of Ohio was named.

Besides being the world's most beautiful river, it is one of the world's greatest carriers of freight. The tonnage carried on the Ohio is gradually increasing and the increased usefulness of the Ohio justifies the great improvements which the Government has made on this river in the past 50 years. Greater improvements are yet to come, and with them will come usefulness.

The following newspaper clipping describes the beautiful Ohio in beautiful language:

OHIO: THE BEAUTIFUL RIVER

The Iroquois called the river "Ohio," and the name was later translated by the French as "the Beautiful"—La Belle Rivière. Not a beautiful river, mind you, but the beautiful, with no fear that it might be confused with any other.

The last moments of a sunset on a westering reach of the upper Ohio, smooth-flowing water the color of burnished copper between almost perpendicular stone banks already pitch black in shadow; or the jade green of low winter water on the middle river accented by a cold sun or bordering snowbanks; or a summer morning above its mouth where the broad stream makes a sweeping curve through rich black bottom lands, bound by yellow willows and gnarled white-limbed sycamores—those sights should convince even scholars of linguistics that "Ohio" must mean "the beautiful," no matter what the apparent connotation of the Iroquois noun.

But appreciation of the river's beauty was not limited to French and Iroquois. Charles Fenno Hoffman, urbane editor of the Knickerbocker Magazine, got his first view of the Ohio at Wheeling in 1833:

"The Ohio is beneath your feet. The clear majestic tide, the fertile islands on its bosom, the bold and towering heights opposite, with the green esplanade of alluvion in front, and the forest-crowned headlands above and below, 'round which the river sweeps away, to bless and gladden the fruitful regions that drink its limpid water—these, with the recollection of deeds done upon its banks—contrasted with all the luxuries of civilization that now float securely upon that peaceful current—these make a moral picture whose colors are laid in the heart, never to be effaced: no man will ever forget his first view of the Ohio."

One prosaic Englishman, Abner D. Jones, was prepared to find the Ohio wanting. But after he had viewed its length even Abner added his mite of commendation: "I had often heard the praise of this majestic river sung, and had curbed my expectations lest I should be disappointed. The Ohio is a beautiful river. There are points on the Hudson and Connecticut, and other rivers of the East, which equal anything I saw on the Ohio; but its peculiarity is that it is all beautiful. There are no points bare of beauty; but every mile is as rich in scenery as it was in verdure at the time of my passage down its winding way.

The Cost of Limited Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an interesting item that appeared in The Reporter on the subject of the cost of limited wars:

THE COST OF LIMITED WARS

"Limited" has become a word to watch; world government with "limited" powers, "limited" assistance to Chiang Kai-shek, and so on.

For 4 years, a "limited" war was waged in Greece, in which Greek Government soldiers were armed with American weapons and paid with American money. It has also been called a budgeted war: The Greek Government's expenses had to stay within the budget that the United States Government had approved. Fighting against the Greek Army, which was advised, but not exactly led, by American officers—advice is of course "limited" leadership—were Greek guerrillas. Nobody knows their exact number, but it is generally assumed that at the height of the fighting there must have been around 20,000. The total cost of the Greek "limited" war for the American taxpayer was around $1,000,000,000, or $50,000 per Greek guerrilla (more than twice as much as The Reporter estimated while the war was still going on). A fairly well-fed Greek may weigh around 130 pounds. His weight in gold at the present legal rate of $35 an ounce would be worth $72,800. If the Greek guerrillas had been made of gold, we would have been getting them at a 33⅓-percent discount.

Intervention in Greece, no matter how necessary, was much more expensive to the American Government than to the Communists. A bridge built at the cost of $1,000,000 could easily be blown up, as many were, with a $25 Communist bomb. One wonders why the Communists have put a stop to this drain on American wealth.

Perhaps the reason is that they now see the prospect of another American experiment in "limited" assistance or "budgeted" war. If Chiang Kai-shek, thanks to United States help, were to hold Formosa and spring back to the mainland, he would face a Communist army of from 2,000,000 to 4,000,000 soldiers and guerrillas. At the Greek rate of expense—$50,000 per enemy—Chiang Kai-shek's victory would cost us between $100,000,000,000 and $200,000,000,000. The total national budget of this country, as even the Chiang advocates are supposed to know, is approximately $43,000,000,000.

All this, of course, is true only for a "limited" war, fought by a friendly army with the "limited" or "budgeted" assistance of the American Government.

Tom Shiras

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Tom Shiras was one of the prime movers in the initiation of a program of progress

for the northwest section of Arkansas. I knew him well. He was my friend. He was a constant booster for the development of the water resources of the White River watershed. He was interested also in the development of the latent mineral resources in our section. He literally gave his life in the service of development of that great section. His name is indelibly imprinted upon the progress that has been made and the development which we hopefully expect in the years that lie ahead.

The following editorial from the Baxter Bulletin, published at Mountain Home, Baxter County, Ark., on January 26, 1950, discloses the effort which he lent to his community, his section, and his State. I desire to insert this editorial as a part of my remarks:

TOM SHIRAS, 1879–1947

Three years ago this month Tom Shiras, whose name was synonymous with progress in north Arkansas, left the Ozark hills and hill people who had accepted him as their spokesman for more than 40 years. The hundreds of feature articles he wrote about the Ozarks were published regularly in the magazine section of the Arkansas Gazette and many other newspapers and magazines, and he was at the forefront of every significant move for expansion of industry and agriculture and the utilization of the resources of nature. He collected, in the years he spent as co-publisher of the Bulletin, an unusual wealth of information about the people and the potentialities of north Arkansas, and transmitted this knowledge in glowing terms to thousands of readers.

It was not his capabilities or exceptional knowledge, however, which endeared Tom Shiras to his thousands of friends in the Ozarks; it was his incomparable personality and friendliness. In every hundred thousand men, perhaps, there is one who can talk at any man's level and who makes friends with every man he meets—that was Tom Shiras. In every country store in the 40 hill counties of north Arkansas he told his story, and men of every trade crowded to listen. It was a story of a day when the Ozarks would rival the sections of the North and East in industry and wealth, when the forces of nature would be coupled with the vast resources and local initiative to turn the wheels of industry. That this would eventually happen, he had not a doubt, and he transmitted his energy, enthusiasm, and optimism to all who heard him.

Before Tom Shiras died 3 years ago, he saw this new era begin to unfold. Now the series of dams which he urged so strongly are being built, and surfaced highways are being constructed into the former remote sections where he traveled. He was a man who rose to a high place of esteem in the hearts of the people of Arkansas because of his individual initiative and comradeship. His theory was that every man is entitled to independence and identity. At his passing, the Arkansas Gazette wrote: "Tom Shiras himself was a monolith of a man in character, personality, and accomplishment."

Automatic Control of Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have just read with interest an article that appeared recently in the Memphis Commercial Appeal commenting on a plan of cotton production control. This plan has been proposed by one of my constituents, Mr. E. L. Dean, of Jonesboro, Ark. Although I have not studied Mr. Dean's plan, I would like to place this article in the RECORD for the information and consideration of the Membership.

The text of the article follows:

AUTOMATIC CONTROL OF COTTON PROPOSED BY ARKANSAS PLANTER

(By W. Clarence Adams)

JONESBORO, ARK., January 22.—A Jonesboro planter and livestock grower believes he has a plan of cotton production control that would finally eliminate Federal Government participation in the industry.

He is E. L. Dean, who says he has been working for 20 years on a plan for adequate controls. Mr. Dean, a graduate of the agricultural economics department of the University of Chicago and a former county agent, believes it is high time a concrete plan be worked out to assure the cotton farmer a good living without so much uncertainty.

Because of the competition of rayon and other developed synthetics, it is doubly important now that leaders of the South unite in a demand that Congress draw up an act that is sound economics and which would provide an equitable profit to cotton growers and stabilize the industry, he declared.

PLAN OUTLINED

Mr. Dean's plan calls for Congress to—

1. Authorize a nonprofit corporation for the purpose of marketing all cotton grown in the United States and operate it in the interest of producer and consumer.

2. Provide for the purchase of sufficient stock of the corporation by the Federal Government to furnish necessary margins to handle all cotton grown in the United States. (Provision may or may not be made to retire this stock by the producer at a small rate per bale.)

3. Provide for a United States Cotton Board, appointed by the President of the United States from a list provided by farm organizations.

4. The instruction to the United States Cotton Board should be very definite and specific in the act, leaving nothing to the discretion of the members.

The full operation of the program would be as follows, says Mr. Dean:

"By using the margin provided, the United States Cotton Board should begin at once to buy cotton, starting at parity price. As soon as sufficient cotton has been accumulated, the Board would make known to consumers of raw cotton the kind and amounts of cotton on hand and offer to sell to them at a price 1 cent above parity, the 1 cent to be used to defray necessary expense of handling.

TEN-MILLION-BALE RESERVE

"When and if the Board shall accumulate more than 10,000,000 bales of cotton which shall be considered a normal reserve, the Board must lower the purchase price 1 cent per pound the following year. The selling price must be lowered the same amount and at all times stay 1 cent per pound above the purchase price.

"All price changes must be announced on January 1, of each year but no change shall take place except on July 1, following the announcement. The price shall remain unchanged thereafter for at least a year," Mr. Dean continued.

Mr. Dean asserted:

"If the reserve, or cotton pool, continued to get larger in spite of the reduced price and the increase is due to increased acreage, the same procedure should be followed each year until the increase is stopped. The gradual reduction of price, however, should decrease production and increase consumption to lower the cotton in the reserve.

"If it failed to do so, however, and the amount of cotton in the reserve reached 15,000,000 bales, then the Cotton Board should announce to the farmers that they would have the option of either voting acreage control or accepting a price in the future progressively reduced by an added cent each year until production was checked. Such an election should be sponsored and held by farm organizations," Mr. Dean said. "Farm organizations could influence farm voters to select the proper stopping point for price to pay the needed profit, yet get the desired consumption."

NO MORE GUESSWORK

Mr. Dean asserted that if the reserve should be below the normal mark, a price advance of 1 cent per pound should be announced each year to build up the reserve.

He said he believes the only time guesswork would have to be resorted to would be the first year in fixing the starting price. After the first year, the condition of the reserve would determine the price and the price in turn would determine the amount produced and the amount consumed, he said.

Thus, he contended, the program would become automatic with no further Federal attention needed.

If the Federal Government should choose to subsidize foreign shipped cotton to offset the penalties paid by farmers because of protective tariff, that would be another question but would in no way interfere with this stabilizing plan, Mr. Dean said.

Cecilia Wenz Welcomes American Legion Auxiliary Members to Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion Auxiliary is one of the great patriotic organizations in this country. Last week the national executive committee assembled at its national headquarters in Indianapolis to consider matters affecting the general welfare of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Cecilia Wenz is the national treasurer of that organization, and she was called upon to extend greetings to the women who were present from every State and our Territories. Her remarks were typically "Hoosier" and they should be preserved. I am pleased to extend them at this point in the RECORD:

Madam President, national officers, past national presidents, and members of this executive committee, unaccustomed as I am to public speaking, I've just realized that a great injustice has been done to you, as a result. In all the times that we've been meeting in Indianapolis, seldom has a bona fide native of the State welcomed you to Indiana. Now that's a great shame, because Hoosiers are very friendly people. In fact, it's been said we're so friendly that all you have to do is set your foot inside the State line and the Indianapolis newspapers will refer to you ever after as a native Hoosier. This is a kind of State pride that outrivals that of Texas or Brooklyn. We don't claim we can beat the rest of the country—we're

just crying to absorb it. And so, in addition to welcoming you to national headquarters this morning, I take great pride and personal pleasure in greeting all you former "Hoosiers" back home again in Indiana.

Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution on water pollution

Whereas the Buffalo Sewer Authority has developed a plan for reducing the effect of industrial wastes in the Buffalo River tributary to the Niagara River; and

Whereas the Niagara River has been described as one of the most seriously polluted streams in the United States; and

Whereas the construction of works essential to such pollution abatement would impose a tremendous burden upon this community; and

Whereas it is a public obligation on the part of municipalities in this area to take such action as may serve to reduce pollution reaching the Niagara River: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Buffalo hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to amend Public Law 845, known as Water Pollution Control Act, so as to provide for and allow loans of at least $5,000,000 at an interest rate of 1 percent to municipalities and public authorities for the purpose of constructing works essential to pollution abatement, and to further amend the act so as to include under the term "treatment works" all works directly contributing to the abatement of existing pollution in interstate or boundary waters, and that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be instructed to loan money at the rate of 1 percent for that purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That the Representatives in Congress from western New York and the United States Senators from the State of New York be presented with copies of this resolution.

Do It Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, if each one of the 141,000,000 people in this country would speak in Congress with one voice, it would be "Repeal the burdensome excise taxes and do it now." The large executives have the facilities with which to express themselves on this question.

There is an upsurge from all classes of people demanding relief from excise taxation. The larger the family, the more the child breadwinner has to pay in hidden taxes. There is another group who are suffering from the delay in repealing excise taxes, and that is the manufacturers who find that they are suffering from a buyers' strike as the result of President Truman's message to Congress. Labor is threatened with unemployment because of the delay in repealing excise taxes.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a petition to the Congress of the United States from 51 executives in American industry for the repeal of the wartime excise taxes:

A PETITION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM 51 EXECUTIVES IN AMERICAN INDUSTRY

The wartime excise taxes were passed as wartime controls in 1941, 1942, 1943. They served their purpose well.

But the war is over. It has been over for more than 4 years.

Everyone agrees today that wartime excise taxes are unfair in peacetime.

They are discriminatory. They penalize selected industries, the men and women who work in them, the public which needs and buys their products.

They have created serious unemployment in certain industries and communities. They prevent fair and free competition.

Everyone agrees with this statement of the President in his tax message:

"There is need to reduce taxes which burden consumption and handicap particular business. * * * Some (excise taxes) are depressing certain lines of business. Some burden consumption and fall with particular weight on low-income groups. Still others add to the cost of living by increasing business costs."

And—this statement is just and statesmanlike.

We believe that the same sound reasoning applies not only to the 7 industries for which the President recommended some relief—but applies with equal force and equal justice to all of the wartime excise-tax levies of 1941, 1942, 1943[1] on all of the 27 industries affected.

These excise taxes were justified during wartime. They are unjust and discriminatory during peacetime. To repeal some of them now and allow others to remain is only to alter the shape of the discrimination.

We support the President in his concern for a balanced budget and debt reduction at high employment, and we are convinced, after careful study, that wartime excise taxes are today a dangerous obstacle to the achievement of these goals.

This is a matter of simple arithmetic.

1. How much revenue would the Federal Government lose if the wartime excise taxes of 1941, 1942, 1943[1] were entirely repealed? The net loss will not exceed $1,500,000,000; it may well be less.

2. Can the Federal Government safely accept such a reduction of revenue? The budget now includes $1,920,000,000 to make loans and purchase certain assets, many of which are already guaranteed by Government agencies. Guaranteed mortgages and loans are a major part of this item. This $1,920,000,000 is not an expense; it is a recoverable asset. (See p. 1117 of the Federal Budget just published.)

3. This sum alone is greater than the maximum net loss of all wartime excise taxes of 1941, 1942, 1943.[1]

American consumers have already registered their protest against these wartime levies.

They have done so by drastically cutting their spending in most of the 27 industries affected.

[1] Not including tobacco, gasoline, and alcoholic beverages which present problems of their own.

They are waiting for their Congress to act. Every passing week adds to the cut-back in buying, in production, in unemployment.

Every passing week adds to the crisis.

This committee has been organized for the sole purpose of presenting a just petition for the redress of a serious grievance.

We ask justice for the public which pays these unfair taxes. Justice for those of our employees who have been taxed onto the relief rolls through no fault of their own. Justice for communities disrupted by unemployment. And justice for the men and women who have invested in our companies.

In this spirit, we—active heads and executives of our businesses, Democrats and Republicans alike—solemnly exercise the American right of petition. We appeal to the conscience and the reason of the Congress:

Repeal the wartime excise taxes of 1941, 1942, 1943.[1]

Repeal these taxes completely.

Repeal these taxes now.

National Committee for the Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes: Chairman, Frank McConnell Mayfield, President, Scrugga-Vandervoort-Barney Co.; Vice Chairman, Arde Bulova, Chairman of the Board of Bulova Watch Co.; Vice Chairman, Eric A. Johnston, President of Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America; Vice Chairman, Louis Ruthenburg, Chairman of the Board of Servel, Inc; Secretary, H. Leigh Whitelaw, Managing Director, Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association; Treasurer, James J. Newman, Vice President, B. F. Goodrich Co.; J. Carlton Bagnall, Sr., Executive Vice President, Swank, Inc.; Lester Baker, Treasurer, Dayton Rubber Co.; Robert F. Bensinger, President of Brunswick-Balke-Callender Co.; John M. Biggins, Vice President and Treasurer, Elgin National Watch Co.; H. C. Bickesler, Vice President and General Manager, Cory Corp.; Harold Bosell, President of General Telephone Co.; Henry P. Bristol, President, Bristol-Myers Co.; Thomas A. Buckley, President, The Buxton Co.; J. H. Carmichael, President, Capital Airlines, Inc.; John S. Coleman, President, Burroughs Adding Machine Co.; John Collyer, President, B. F. Goodrich Co.; Robert Driscoll, Vice President, Greyhound Corp.; Samuel B. Edison, Vice President, Edison Bros. Stores, Inc.; Albert J. Feldman, A. Hollander & Son; Marion B. Folsom, Treasurer, Eastman Kodak Co.; John A. Fry, President, Detroit-Michigan Stove Co.; Leonard H. Goldenson, President, United Paramount Theaters Inc.; Julius Green, President, Julius Green Fur Co.; C. R. Harding, President of the Pullman Co.; Lyle C. Harvey, President, Affiliated Gas Equipment Corp.; J. V. Heffernan, Vice President, Radio Corporation of America; Oscar Heyman, President, Oscar Heyman & Bros., Inc.; Stanley H. Hobson, President, Geo. D. Roper Corp.; E. J. Irish, Executive Administrator, A. O. Smith Corp.; Stanley Klein, President, Mendel-Drucker, Inc.; R. A. Lumpkin, President, Illinois Consolidated Telephone Co.; L. R. Mendelson, President, Hotstream Heater Co.; John H. Moore, President of John Hudson Moore, Inc.; Dan J. O'Brien, President, Commodore Perry Hotel, Toledo; George F. Parton, President, Standard Safe Deposit Co.; Brook Pemberton, President, League of New York Theaters, Inc.; Warren Lee Pierson, Chairman of Board, Transcontinental & Western Airlines, Inc.; B. Earl Puckett, President, Allied Stores Corp.; Milton R. Rackmil, President, Decca Records, Inc.; Carl F. Ray, Assistant to the President, Underwood Corp.; Vincent F. Ring, Treasurer, Knapp-Monarch Co.; Carl Rosenberger, Chairman of the Board of Coro, Inc.; Nicholas M. Schenck, President, Loew's, Inc.; Glenwood J. Sherrard, President of Parker House Hotel, Boston; Spyros P. Skouras, President, Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.; C. R. Smith, President of American Airlines, Inc.; Edward Wallerstein, President, Columbia Records, Inc.; Harry M. Warner, President, Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.; Howard V. Widdoes, Vice President, Remington Rand, Inc.; Edward T. T. Williams, President, The Lambert Co.

[1] Not including tobacco, gasoline, and alcoholic beverages which present problems of their own.

Senate Judiciary Changes in Celler DP Bill Unacceptable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under the guise of liberalizing the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, the Senate Judiciary Committee has taken the Celler displaced-persons bill and unfortunately perverted it to the use of German expellees. Cleverly written to leave the impression that it accepts the principle of an increase in the admission of displaced persons in this country, it has completely departed from the principles of the Celler bill.

The Celler bill is designed to deal specifically with the problem of the displaced-persons camps—to look toward their quick dissolution, and to relieve the taxpayer of their burden of support for these camps. All facts point to the conclusion that the passage of the Celler bill will achieve that result. The changes to the Celler bill proposed by the Senate committee, despite their appearance to the contrary, would do no such thing. They leave untouched the central problem which is the elimination of the displaced-persons camps. The Senate committee bill does that primarily by including in its definition of the displaced person "persons of German ethnic origin who are expressly excluded under the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization."

That provision coupled with its other restrictive provision that 30 percent of the authorized visas shall be issued to persons who have been for at least 2 years at some previous time or times engaged principally in agricultural pursuits practically bars entry to those in the DP camps. The Displaced Persons Commission has testified that the agricultural restriction in and of itself has made the present act unworkable because of the difficulty in finding so high a percentage of eligible agricultural workers. There will be no difficulty in finding agricultural workers among the persons of German ethnic origin, but where does that leave the displaced person?

In addition thereto the proposed changes strengthen the provision that 50 percent of the German and Austrian quota shall be available exclusively to persons of German ethnic origin who were born in Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Russia, or Yugoslavia, or areas under the control of any such countries.

Thus we see in effect a bill not for the persons in the displaced-persons camp, but for persons of German ethnic origin. In other words, the persons in the DP camps will have to compete with a heavy and overwhelming advantage in the law on the side of Germans for admission to the United States. This spells out a studied attempt to close our doors to the persons in the DP camp. It means that the American taxpayer will have to continue maintaining these camps for an indefinite period; it means that the DP problem will remain with us to be rehashed and rehashed over and over again; and it means that the hopes of dissolving the IRO on March 31, 1951, to which the United States is so heavy a contributor, will be dashed.

In addition to the expenses borne by the United States in maintaining these camps and in contributions to the IRO, the United States will be called upon to pay for all transportation costs of those persons of German ethnic origin since these persons do not come within the jurisdiction of the IRO. The constitution of the IRO forbids the organization from paying transportation costs for persons so excluded. Let me point out that the IRO bears the costs of transportation of displaced persons within their own definition. It will be noted, of course, that the Senate Judiciary Committee has changed the definition of a displaced person which heretofore has been the definition used by the International Organization. Acceptance of these provisions will mean a denial of our international obligations as well and a rift in the direction of international harmony.

I note, too, that the Senate Judiciary Committee proposes to include the word "Marxist" in addition to the word "Communist" already included in the Celler bill in its definition of excludible persons. It is hardly a legislative word since its definition is many things to many men. What is a Marxist and who is a Marxist is far from being settled and to use so vague a term legislatively is a grave error. Does a Marxist mean George Bernard Shaw, Clement Attlee, or Tito, or Molotov or any or all of them?

The Celler bill at best was a compromise bill, but it does have the merit of dealing directly and centrally with the problem of the displaced person. It has not departed radically from the core of the problem as has the Senate Judiciary version, which includes in its definition of displaced persons such people like the Greeks who reside within their country. That is the most curious of definitions. The purpose of a displaced-persons bill, I emphasize, is not to treat with all unhappy people everywhere.

It is most fervently to be hoped that the debate on the Senate floor will reveal the unhealthy structure of the proposed amendments to the Celler bill and that good statesmanship and good sense will prevail upon the Members of the Senate to reject the Senate Judiciary proposals and accept the House bill.

The Common Cold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. A. M. Washburn, from the Arkansas Health Bulletin of January 1950:

THE COMMON COLD

(By A. M. Washburn, M. D., director, division communicable disease control)

Winter is upon us with the cold in its period of greatest prevalence. The common cold is seldom a serious ailment but has a nuisance value of extensive proportions. Colds and their resulting complications—sinusitis, bronchitis, laryngitis, swollen glands, infection of the ears, and often pneumonia—are said to result in the loss of 60,000,000 work days and $400,000,000 in wages annually. More than half of all absences from school and work are caused by colds. Most persons have one or more colds a year. The incidence does not vary greatly according to age, sex, race, or occupation, but it appears to be highest in children under 5 years of age.

A cold is an acute catarrhal affection of the upper respiratory tract caused by one or more filterable viruses, usually accompanied by a slight rise in temperature on the first day and chilly sensations with coryza (cold in the head), and general lassitude lasting up to 7 days. Colds are highly communicable while the virus remains in the discharges from the nose and throat of the infected person, the source of all new colds. Transmission is brought about by coughing, sneezing, and explosive manner of speech by which droplets of infection are passed from the infected individual to susceptible persons within short range; and indirectly by handkerchiefs, eating utensils, etc. Susceptibility is universal, the cold developing within 72 hours after exposure, usually within 12 to 48 hours. A period of about a month or so of relative immunity follows an attack.

The common cold is largely preventable—preventive measures being of two groups—avoiding exposure and forming daily health habits to strengthen body resistance. The following rules may well be followed:

1. Stay away from crowds and ill persons during the cold season. An individual with a cold should remain at home in bed during the acute stage to protect others and to lessen the chance of complication.

2. Practice sanitary disposal of nasal and mouth discharges.

3. Avoid overheated rooms, too much clothing, and sudden changes in temperature.

4. Form proper habits of eating, sleeping, exercise, and recreation. Eat a varied diet, in moderation, consisting of meat, green vegetables, fruit, and milk, rather than rich pastries and sweets. Get plenty of rest.

5. Keep your hands scrupulously clean and away from nose, mouth, and eyes. Cover coughs and sneezes with handkerchief, or preferably, disposable tissues which should be burned or flushed out through the toilet.

6. If there is any doubt about the seriousness of the infection, see your doctor.

Various types of vaccine have been tried in the past but have not been proved to be effective preventives of colds; however, they may prevent secondary infections and thus complications. Recently the use of antihistaminic drugs under the direction of the private physician has been tried because the early stage of the cold are allergic in nature. Such drugs are not effective unless used in the very first stages of the cold.

California's Great Debt to Ed Hyatt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the January 25, 1950, issue of the San Francisco News praising the services of Ed Hyatt, State engineer in California for 35 years, who is retiring this month. The imprint of Ed Hyatt's planning and effort in California will become even more distinct as time goes on, and I join in the sentiments of the editorial praising his work on the now nationally famous Central Valley project. The editorial is as follows:

CALIFORNIA'S GREAT DEBT TO ED HYATT

On February 1 the man who, more than any other living California citizen, has been responsible for long-range water conservation planning in this State will retire from public office. He is Ed Hyatt, State engineer for 35 years.

Ed Hyatt, together with Col. Robert B. Marshall, drew with daring strokes the picture of California's water needs back in the 1920's. Their long-range vision was shared by few other citizens. They saw that the State's very existence depended upon conserving the waters of the great Central Valley and using them economically for agriculture and industry. They drew up the original State water plan, which was the basis of the Central Valley project, now evolving. As State engineer, Hyatt started the work of putting the plan into execution and carried on until it became so big the Federal Government was asked to take it over.

The News is proud to have supported the plan from the beginning to date and proud also to have been associated with a far-seeing, devoted public official like Ed Hyatt in its development. He deserves public commendation and thanks for the contribution he has made to the fundamental welfare of the Commonwealth.

Our Civil and Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the address delivered at the annual dinner of the Hudson County (N. J.) Bar Association at the Hotel Statler, New York, in December, by Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States.

A distinguished audience of nearly 1,000 lawyers, including many eminent judges, listened with rapt attention to the Attorney General's address. The speech made a marked impression upon those present and commendations of the address were heard on every side.

The speech follows:

OUR CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

With the discovery of the New World, there came to this continent droves of colonists, seeking release from physical and spiritual oppression. Europe was just awakening from the slumber and nightmare of the Dark Ages; and from it went forth the oppressed, searching for freedom from tyranny and freedom to make the best of themselves in a fresh world. On this continent, in 1776, "our forefathers brought forth * * * a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." We have fought two world wars to defend our freedom so that we may live by that faith.

Now, on the continent where a light shone through the darkness to our colonists, America has herself become a light shining to all the world.

To millions of people everywhere, America is the source of new strength and new hope. We are giving our material aid through the European recovery program and in many other channels. We have given our promise of military support. We hold out to all the knowledge that America seeks no aggrandizement but rather the extension of human freedom everywhere.

Unfortunately, there are certain governments which hate the freedom we defend. They are dedicated to the proposition that a small ruling class knows what is best for all. They profess democracy, but in the lands they rule there is no freedom of speech, no freedom of thought, no freedom of religion, no security of the person, no freedom to meet with one's neighbors, no freedom to leave the country and exchange ideas with others of different belief. These governments seek to extend their rule by a world-wide conspiracy against the good order and the institutions of the other countries of the world. They proffer false promises of human freedom. With well-practiced lines, they are competing with us for the minds of men.

As lawyers, all of us here are sworn to defend our Constitution and the guaranties of liberty which it contains. It is, therefore, fitting that in this time of grave division in the world we should consider anew what our freedom means to us, how it has been preserved and some of the things we must do to preserve it for the future.

You will recall that when our Constitution emerged from the Constitutional Convention of 1787 it contained no bill of rights. It made no reference, for example, to freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, or of the press.

The brilliant Hamilton, who was as much responsible for the adoption and ultimate ratification of the Constitution as any man, pointed out that the proposed Constitution guaranteed habeas corpus and trial by jury in criminal cases, and prohibited ex post facto laws, bills of attainder, and the grant of titles of nobility. A bill of rights, he went on to contend, was unnecessary, even dangerous. Said he, "Why, for instance, should it be said that the liberty of the press shall not be restrained, when no power is given by which restrictions may be imposed?" Such a provision on liberty of the press, he argued, could afford a pretext for implying power to regulate the press. Moreover, he wrote, "What signifies a declaration that the liberty of the press shall be inviolably preserved? What is liberty of the press? Who can give it any definition which would not leave the utmost latitude for evasion? I hold it to be impracticable; and from this I infer that its security, whatever fine declarations may be inserted in any constitution respecting it, must altogether depend on public opinion, and on the general spirit of the people and of the Government. And here, after all, as is intimated upon another occasion, must we seek for the only solid basis of all our rights."

Nevertheless the people were alarmed. Many feared that liberties won from the King by the Revolution would be lost to the new Government. Thomas Jefferson wrote from Paris to his friend Madison:

"A bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular; and what no just government should refuse or rest on inferences."

And again, on a later occasion:

"The declaration of rights is, like all other human blessings, alloyed with some inconveniences, and not accomplishing fully its objects. But the good in this instance vastly outweighs the evil."

This clash of views on an express bill of rights was to become a typical phenomenon in the struggle for liberty and equality. We should do well to remember this bit of history in viewing our present-day problems.

To achieve ratification of the Constitution its supporters promised the American people that the Congress at its first session would propose amendments for protecting the rights of the people against violation by the Government. This promise was carried out. The First Congress proposed what became the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known ever since as our Bill of Rights. These amendments were promptly adopted by the people and became part of the Constitution on December 15, 1791—a day we have just commemorated, and which we mark each December 15 as Bill of Rights Day.

Thus we have guaranties that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging freedom of speech or freedom of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. So also we have detailed guaranties that criminal trials conducted by the Federal Government shall be carried on in accordance with basic standards—publicly, speedily, and fairly. There is affirmed the right of the people to be secure from unreasonable searches and seizures in their persons, houses, papers, and effects. These and other rights are guaranteed to all of us by the Bill of Rights against infringement by our Government. The Bill of Rights embodies not by indirection but in the explicit language of law our belief in freedom, our belief that there are some things that the Government may not do under any circumstances, our belief that an individual is an end in himself.

In the years that intervened after the establishment of the American Bill of Rights great changes took place. The original fears of tyranny from abroad and from monarchical tendencies within gradually disappeared. America settled down to an era of material growth, aided by the unprecedented advancement of science and invention, but complicated by such phenomena as slavery and emancipation, tremendous waves of free immigration and later restriction, unheard-of prosperity for many, economic misery for others in the shadow of plenty. The longing and striving for liberty did not change. Only the sources of potential oppression were different. Fear of private exploitation, backed by sometimes corrupt forces of law, replaced the early fear of our National Government. In fact, the National Government assumed the role of protector and mediator in the

struggle to arrive at a balance between property and human rights.

This was particularly evident in post-Civil War days when the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution were adopted. The thirteenth amendment abolished slavery and involuntary servitude. The fourteenth amendment, conferring citizenship on the former slaves, prohibited the several States from making or enforcing laws "which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States," from depriving "any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law," and from denying to any person "the equal protection of the law." The fifteenth amendment forbade abridging the right of citizens to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. All three amendments empowered Congress to provide for enforcement by appropriate legislation. And Congress did. In a series of statutes known as the Civil Rights Acts, Congress in the years after 1866 sought to eliminate the practices and indicia of slavery which, if maintained, would defeat the purposes of the constitutional amendments. The statutes dealt with such things as peonage, and enticement into slavery; equality between blacks and whites in the right to own and transfer property, to make and enforce contracts, to sue, and to serve on juries; nondiscrimination in public accommodations, and, in general, equality in the rights and privileges which all citizens should enjoy. The bitterness of the Reconstruction, and the action of subsequent Congresses and courts, particularly prior to the First World War, reduced or nullified much of this legislation, leaving a residue of a few sections of the original laws. These provided dull and difficult weapons to wield when, in 1939, former Attorney General Frank Murphy, the late Mr. Justice Murphy of the Supreme Court, embarked a group of lawyers in the Department of Justice upon a regular program for enforcing civil rights, which incidentally has been continued by the succeeding Attorneys General in a unit of the Criminal Division known as the Civil Rights Section.

It remained for President Truman, in December 1946, to constitute the President's Committee on Civil Rights, a group of 15 distinguished citizens. The committee was asked to "determine whether and in what respect current law-enforcement measures and the authority and means possessed by Federal, State, and local governments may be strengthened and improved to safeguard the civil rights of the people." The committee engaged in extensive study and research. In October 1947 it handed up its report, containing findings and recommendations, now widely known under the title "To Secure These Rights." Out of further study of this report came the President's message to Congress of February 2, 1948, and his program for action.

I think it important to reiterate, as did the President and his committee, that although our basic human freedoms are better cared for and more vigilantly defended than ever before, there is a serious gap between our ideals and some of our practices. No thoughtful observer will deny that we have in practice achieved a great measure of the Bill of Rights. By the combined conduct of our legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government—local, State, and Federal—and by the vigilance of private citizens, watchful of their own rights and the rights of others, we have built up and defended constitutional liberty to a place where it is, in this country, the rule and not the exception.

Yet we would not, we need not, pretend we are perfect. The Civil Rights Committee report and the President's message afforded us a looking glass. It reflects the imperfections ranging from deficiencies in education and social attitudes to the needs of formalizing certain public policies in legislative and other acts. Perhaps our principal weaknesses and difficulties are in unevenness of application of civil liberties. We are in constant danger of dividing our people, of weakening our unity, if we fail to insure equality of treatment.

When I was a Member of the United States Senate, I had the privilege of studying the President's civil-rights program as a basis for proposed legislation. As a result, I introduced four bills, still pending, designed to carry out the major parts of his legislative program in this field. The factor common to each of these bills is the purpose to eliminate, with regard to the subject matter, discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

The first of these measures—the proposed "Civil Rights Act of 1949"—has a number of objectives. It would set up a permanent Civil Rights Commission in the executive branch of the Government continuously to survey the status of civil rights in this country and to advise the President of measures which might be taken to enhance the security of human rights. The bill would also set up a standing Joint Committee of Congress on Civil Rights, and a Civil Rights Division headed by an Assistant Attorney General in the Department of Justice. The bill would amend some of the few existing statutes in the civil-rights field in an effort to strengthen protection of the individual's rights to liberty and to the privileges of citizenship. Thus, in the case of the existing criminal statute protecting citizens in their rights under the Constitution and Federal laws, it would extend protection to all inhabitants of the United States, whether or not they are citizens, and this protection would be afforded against infringement by persons acting alone as well as in conspiracy. Another amendment makes an enumeration of the principal rights protected against the misconduct of public officers, in order to make more definite and certain the protection which the existing law seeks to afford.

The right to be free from intimidation and coercion in voting in an election for national offices would be extended to primary and special elections as well as to the general elections. The existing statutory protection of the right of citizens to vote at an election without distinction as to race, color, or previous condition of servitude, would be more carefully drawn to ensure against discrimination by public officers in the cases of qualified citizens. A greater use of civil remedies, as distinguished from criminal penalties, would be encouraged by the bill. The bill would also provide equal treatment in the enjoyment of accommodations of any public conveyance or facility operated by a common carrier in interstate or foreign commerce, without discrimination or segregation based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

The second of these bills is the proposed Federal Anti-lynching Act. It is designed to protect against and punish the lawless violence of mob action, which supplants the orderly processes of Government.

The third bill is the proposed Federal Anti-Poll-Tax Act. This bill would make unlawful the requirement of payment of a poll tax as a condition to voting in a primary, general, or other election for national offices. The right to vote—to take part in the selection of those who make and administer the laws—is basic in a democracy. The poll tax, where it is still used as a prerequisite to voting, stands between the citizen and that right. Experience has shown that when voting is conditioned upon paying a poll tax, the number of votes cast is cut drastically; but that when the poll tax is abolished, the number of voters increases very greatly. The poll tax is a way of saying: "The poor shall not vote. The rest of us will decide what is good for them." And so great numbers of citizens, both white and Negro, are barred from the polls where this condition prevails. The counterpart of the bill, which as I said would remedy the situation in elections for national offices, has already been passed by the House of Representatives.

The fourth of these measures is the proposed Federal Fair Employment Practice Act. It is designed to prevent discrimination in employment on grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin. It would apply to employers of 50 or more employees, or labor unions of 50 or more members, engaged in interstate commerce, as well as to the Federal Government and certain contractors with the Federal Government. It is important to note that the bill does not permit anyone to demand employment by a given employer. Except for the causes specifically condemned, the employer may hire or refuse to hire or discharge for any cause that seems proper to him.

In respect of the common purpose running through these bills, it is useful to observe the kind of right which is sought to be stated and preserved. In a sense, it is almost a negative right, expressive of the desire of all freemen to live unmolested—the right not to be treated differently from other men; the right not to be singled out for the special treatment which implies that there is more than one class of citizenship. The bills propose to reiterate and reinforce the guaranties of equality upon which our Government is based.

Some persons, with the earnestness and sincerity of Hamilton, others with less pure motives, will ask: What do we accomplish by declaring equality by law? Can we eliminate prejudice against minorities by legislation?

Statutes on nondiscrimination may not in themselves remove racial, national, or religious prejudices. Admitted. But they can create conditions favorable to the gradual disappearance of such prejudices. Already there are a number of years' experience in your State, New Jersey, with fair employment practice legislation. So, too, there is experience with similar laws in New York, Massachusetts, Washington, Oregon, New Mexico, Connecticut, and Rhode Island—all indicating that this kind of law can create a climate of opinion in which discrimination tends to disappear. And conversely, we know that statutes or public policies which support or condone Jim Crowism, and other forms of caste, simply solidify discrimination, giving it the gloss of respectability. The way to eradicate racial tension, wisely said the Supreme Court of California in a recent case, is not "through the perpetuation by law of prejudices that give rise to the tension."

What I have been speaking of principally, refers to the responsibility of government—the formal organization of our society—in the protection of individual liberties. But the responsibility cannot rest there alone. The individual, no less than his government, must share in serving the ideals of the democratic faith. Obviously, he has a duty to stand up for his own rights when they are invaded. An authority which threatens the rights of one citizen becomes all the stronger if it succeeds, and all the more dangerous to the rights of others. A citizen who asserts his own rights is therefore protecting not only himself but his fellow citizens as well.

But he has a further duty. This is to respect the rights of other persons. He must recognize each of his fellow men as a human being like himself, with wants, and the need for dignity, like his own. He must remember the words of the Declaration of Independence—"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." It was essentially for the protection

of these rights that the signers of the Declaration of Independence declared that—"We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

In the world today, this duty of each American citizen is more than a duty to the particular individual whose rights would otherwise be violated. It is a duty which each of us owes to every other citizen of the country. In one sense, it is a matter of national security.

Racial, religious, or national discrimination is a fearful thing for our country, both at home and in our international relations. At home, it divides us when we should be united. It leads to bitterness in its victims, and the rejection by some of the Americans creed.

In a brief filed recently in the United States Supreme Court, in a case involving alleged discrimination in interstate transportation (*Henderson v. United States*), the Department of Justice took occasion to call the Supreme Court's attention to testimony of a well-known Negro baseball player, who appeared before a congressional committee to answer statements which questioned the loyalty of large numbers of American Negroes. The witness said:

"Just because Communists kick up a big fuss over racial discrimination when it suits their purposes, a lot of people try to pretend that the whole issue is a creation of Communist imagination.

"But they are not fooling anyone with this kind of pretense, and talk about 'Communists stirring up Negroes to protest,' only makes present misunderstanding worse than ever. Negroes were stirred up long before there was a Communist party, and they'll stay stirred up long after the party has disappeared—unless Jim Crow has disappeared by then as well."

Abroad, discrimination embarrasses us in our international relations. It furnishes hostile propaganda to foreign critics. It raises doubt as to our sincerity among friendly peoples. Today, the United States enjoys a position of world leadership. Yet, the very existence of this country, and of the free nations associated with us, depends in considerable measure upon how well we live up to our own ideals at home. We must therefore do more than let the world know that we have the highest standard of living. We must prove to the world that our democracy works. Every one of us, by what he does or fails to do, in the daily business of living—in his contacts with neighbors, fellow workers and even strangers—inevitably affects the composite of our efforts to build a peaceful world.

Our concern, and the concern of all freedom-loving peoples, today goes far beyond the domestic pattern. In many ways we have begun to make it clear that the protection of human rights is a matter of international concern.

Something akin to a constitutional convention of almost the whole world was held in San Francisco in 1945. I am referring, of course, to the San Francisco Conference which framed the Charter of the United Nations. In that Charter universal interest in human rights is expressed more prominently and authoritatively than ever before. "To achieve international cooperation • • • in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion," is stated to be one of the purposes of the United Nations. The General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council, are given responsibility for promoting human rights within their fields of competence. The Economic and Social Council is specifically directed to set up a human rights commission—which it has done. And all members of the United Nations pledge themselves to take joint and separate action, in cooperation with the United Nations, to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights.

There were some at the San Francisco conference who thought that the Charter did not go far enough in the protection of human rights. But there was no time at San Francisco to draft an international bill of human rights. Instead, it was decided that the question of framing one could be taken up by the United Nations organization itself after it got started. President Truman voiced his hope for such an international bill of rights in his speech at the closing session of the San Francisco conference. Under the Charter, he said, "We have good reason to expect the framing of an international bill of rights, acceptable to all the nations involved. That bill of rights will be as much a part of international life as our own bill of rights is a part of our Constitution." And so, just as our Bill of Rights was added to our Constitution after the Constitution was adopted, the United Nations has been taking steps to frame an international bill of rights which, in effect, would be added to the Charter of the United Nations.

A great preparatory step was taken just 1 year ago. On December 10, 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations proclaimed the universal declaration of human rights. This declaration is not a treaty, as is the Charter of the United Nations. But it is, in its own words, "a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations." It declares many of the basic rights set forth in our Constitution and bill of rights, and some which are neither fully realized here nor elsewhere in the world, but which some day may be accorded to everyone.

Coordinately with the drafting of the universal declaration of human rights, the drafting of a proposed treaty was begun, to provide the basis from which to give legal effect to certain of the fundamental human rights. This proposed treaty is called the Covenant of Human Rights. It has been in preparation by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights since 1947 and is not yet finished. It is receiving most careful attention from our Government and the many governments participating in the drafting, as well as from hundreds of organizations in and out of the United States—bar associations prominently among them.

In this way, among others, the United States and other free countries are moving forward together, through the United Nations, in the noble enterprise of weaving their ideals into the fabric of international law.

But always there is the ordinary man and woman, and his and her duties and responsibilities as citizens in a democracy. Individually, at times, the contribution of each, the importance of each, may seem minute. Nevertheless, local governments, State governments, national government, international law, and international procedures cannot do the job without them. We know from experience that a great share of our liberties depends upon the vigilance, the wisdom, the tolerance, and the courage of our citizenry. Each of you, therefore, as a private citizen, has an unavoidable responsibility for the preservation of the American freedoms. As guardians of these freedoms, you are also guardians of the fair name of the United States and of its powers of moral leadership in the world. To this generation of Americans has come the greatest responsibility ever visited upon the citizenry of any nation. You are keepers of the light. Yours is the duty to make sure that it shines for all the world.

Government Favoritism With RFC Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Henry Kaiser owes Uncle Sam $194,000,000. The Kaiser-Frazer Corp. recently secured from the RFC a new loan of $34,400,000 to pay the cost of retooling their plant in order to produce the new 1950 Kaiser-Frazer auto models; and another loan of $10,000,000 to establish a credit set-up for Kaiser-Frazer dealers in order to help them handle the output of the Kaiser-Frazer Corp.

Since the new Kaiser-Frazer car will be sold in competition with other lightweight cars—Ford, Chevrolet, and Plymouth—American tax-payers should wonder why Uncle Sam lends taxpayers' money to some big manufacturers on favorable, liberal, easy terms, while their competitors have to take their chances of borrowing from the banks on regular banking terms, covering interest charges and adequate collateral.

The Lustron Corp. of Columbus, Ohio, is another example of a favored RFC borrower. This corporation is supposed to manufacture prefabricated steel houses, but so far has turned out very few. The promoters of this company put up only $10,000 of their own money, but have already secured loans amounting to $37,500,000 from the RFC and have applied for $14,500,000 more.

When the Lustron Corp. applied to the RFC for their first loan in 1947, it is understood that the application was turned down by the RFC directors, but President Truman personally intervened in the case and forced the directors to reverse their position and grant the loan.

Has Uncle Sam decided to favor certain business friends but handicap, hinder, and punish certain other business concerns because they are not friendly toward the so-called Fair Deal? If the administration takes taxpayers' money and uses it to reward certain business friends and to punish certain business enemies, then we are headed down the road to national socialism.

THE A. & P. SUIT

It is axiomatic that bigness of any kind means power, and power unchecked means power abused. The Federal Government has brought suit against the A. & P. in an effort to break up that organization because the Government charges its very bigness makes it a monopoly, per se. What is a monopoly?

Webster says a monopoly is "(1) a conspiracy to limit production and maintain high prices; (2) an illegal combination in restraint of trade; (3) a combination having exclusive control of." Does the A. & P. limit production and maintain high prices? Of course not;

in fact, it does the exact opposite. Does the A. & P. restrain or restrict trade in any way? Of course not; it facilitates trade rather than restricts trade. Is the A. & P. a combination having exclusive control of? Of course not; it handles less than 6 percent of the Nation's groceries. Then, why the suit?

The Federal Government itself is the greatest economic monopoly on earth outside the iron curtain. The Federal Government not only restrains agricultural production by acreage control in order to maintain high prices, but it also corners the market by buying up millions of pound of butter and billions of eggs in order to control prices. One wonders, therefore, if the A. & P. suit is not a case of the pot calling the kettle black—our bureaucratic Government is a very dirty pot and the A. & P. is a clean, shiny pot. Which is more dangerous, a corporation regulated by Federal, State, and local governments, with its great power diffused by ownership distribution; or a bureaucratic monopoly exercising economic power that is not regulated but is in the hands of politicians of the Pendergast-machine type? This is a question that the voters must ponder over and try to answer in 1950.

Secretary Acheson's Policy For China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Policy Advanced by Acheson for China Declared 'So Extremely Comfortable'," written by Dorothy Thompson and published in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ON THE RECORD—POLICY ADVANCED BY ACHESON FOR CHINA DECLARED "SO EXTREMELY COMFORTABLE"

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, speaking at the National Press Club last Thursday, advanced a policy for China (and we presume, for the rest of the world) which has all the charm of extreme novelty.

"The single, most important fact shaping American policy in the Far East," Mr. Acheson said, "was the attaching by the Soviet Union of the four northern areas of China." "The United States must not now do anything which might divert Chinese attention from Russia," he continued, for the division of China "must bring upon the Russians the hatred and righteous anger of the Chinese people."

PLANNED IT THAT WAY?

So we planned it that way? The reason for the secret treaty at Yalta, giving Russia special privileges in Manchuria, was just to encourage Russia to overreach herself? The reason for forcing the truce upon Chiang Kai-shek in November 1945, and allowing tens of thousands of Communist troops to escape; and for insisting in 1946 that the Kalgan Pass be opened to permit a million Communists to move into Manchuria and be armed by the Russians with the entire equipment of the Japanese Kwantung army, was to be sure that by Russian encroachment in China, the Chinese people would recognize their real enemy?

Do we, perhaps, have a secret agent in the Russian Politburo who directed the Soviet Union to annex the four northern provinces of China, since this is going to make the Chinese people awfully sore?

We don't like the Nationalist Government (runs the argument), so it is well for the Communists to defeat it. But communism being synonymous with Russian imperialism is hostile to the real interest of the people of China, and they will revolt. Ergo, the more successful Russian communism is, the less successful it will be.

No wonder George Kennan, author of the containment policy, resigned from the State Department. To contain communism is "putting the cart before the horse," said Secretary Acheson. "It is the United States' aim to develop within the people a resistance to communism based on the dignity and right of every people to develop their own way • • • any one who violates the integrity of China is the enemy of China and is acting contrary to our own interest."

But apparently, you can't develop a resistance to communism until you first have it, nor rise in righteous anger against the violation of territorial integrity until it is violated.

This is certainly a subtlety outsubtling the Kremlin.

ANOTHER TITO, OBVIOUSLY?

What we want to know, however, is just how the indignation of the Chinese (and other) peoples is going to express itself once the Russian noose is around their necks and all anti-Communist leaders assassinated or exiled?

There are at present some million Nationalist guerrillas on the Chinese mainland. There are 300,000 Chinese Nationalist troops (trained by the United States) in Formosa. There is a leadership, now very reduced, but still a leadership, and all these express the hatred and righteous anger of the Chinese people.

But we mustn't support them. No; we must wait for something more inspiring—obviously another Tito.

Maybe Secretary Acheson has one in mind. We suggest, however, that the Russians have thought of that possibility, and aren't going to let it happen twice.

At any rate, we have a new foreign policy, surely the most remarkable in our history—and so extremely comfortable. Under it we don't have to do a thing except "keep our own purposes perfectly straight, perfectly pure, perfectly aboveboard," and our enemies will do all the rest for us.

Stalin doesn't know it, but he's our ally. The more peoples he subjects, the more he will be hated and, conversely, the more we, sitting still in our perfect purity, will be loved.

Obviously, too, we were wrong about Hitler. If we had just let him take the world, people would have been plenty sore, and would have revolted—the Jews, for instance.

It is incredible. But it's true; it's the policy.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Simmons, from the Washington Times-Herald of today:

COMMUNISM

(By Walter Simmons)

In refusing to help the Chinese Nationalists hold Formosa, the United States has lost its last chance to fight world communism on an equal basis, according to Premier Yen Hsi-shan.

With Formosa gone, the aging marshal said, "communism will sweep like an avalanche through southeast Asia soon controlling half the earth and two-thirds of its population."

When that has happened, Yen said, "it will be too late for Americans and their allies.

"You cannot understand the difficulties of fighting communism militarily until you have tried it yourself," said the war lord, whose epic defense of his Shansi province home was the most prolonged battle of the civil war.

His soldiers built thousands of brick and concrete pillboxes, manufactured their own guns and ammunition, and withstood siege for 9 months until starved out last April.

"Americans do not yet understand that communism has developed an unprecedented and unmatched system of political military strategy," Marshal Yen warned. "The people are so controlled that they are made into a solid enemy body.

"When we entered Communist territory, it was like entering a sea of mud. The stronger our forces and the deeper they penetrated, the more they were hurt.

"No man, whatever his sympathies, dared be friendly or give us information. We were dead and blind. Yet the Communists, 100 or 200 miles away, knew every detail about us.

"You are already facing the same situation in regard to Russia and her satellites—but how many Americans realize it? How much chance do you have of getting reliable information out of the iron curtain countries?

"Yet it is common knowledge that some Americans steal top Government secrets, even those of the atom bomb, and pass them to Russia.

"This is exactly the same problem that confronted us in China. You will discover it for yourself someday. I hope it is not too late when you do."

Marshal Yen admitted incompetence and maladministration were partially responsible for the Chinese Government's failure. He has been among the Government's foremost critics for years, while waging his fight in Shansi Province.

"But it was easy for the Communists to raise troops, because families knew it meant death for all if their sons did not go with the Red army.

"The Government, defending the people, had difficulties in getting them to contribute 5 percent of their crops, because they were hungry. Yet the Communists collected two-thirds of the crops in their areas because the people dared not refuse."

Marshal Yen said American urgings of democracy on the Chinese in 1944 and 1947 crippled their fight against communism.

"At a time when everyone should have been sacrificing the most, democracy meant less burdens and more aid from the Government," he said.

Discontinuance of Passenger Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I enclose herewith two letters, which I think cover a subject matter of great importance to the people of America.

In recent months, the railroads have begun to abandon passenger service, especially discontinuing the operation of passenger trains. In north Louisiana, which is the area which I represent in Congress, two major systems, namely, the Illinois Central and the Texas and Pacific, have abandoned passenger trains. The local people as a result of this abandonment are seriously inconvenienced in their transportation needs.

I have called upon the Post Office Department to make an over-all study of this abandonment, with a view of revamping the postal-delivery system in the localities affected. This may mean a considerable change on the part of the Post Office Department. It may mean the use of trucks, highway post offices, and other means of mail delivery. It may also mean that old routes will have to be abandoned and new routes put into use to meet a situation which has changed considerably because of the contraction of the passenger service by the railroads.

As these letters indicate, I have taken this matter up with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and I feel that a thorough investigation should be made to find out the reasons why the railroads, now operating at nice profits, should abandon needed service. If the railroads are not meeting their responsibility to the public, I think the Interstate Commerce Commission should say plainly that this is the case. Then, too, if the railroad companies are in effect abandoning their franchise, the Interstate Commerce Commission should proclaim this fact, and efforts should be made immediately to assist people in communities without proper transportation to regain the position which they had lost by the recent program of the railroads in discontinuing passenger service.

This is a most important matter, and, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Interstate Commerce Commission will move vigorously and aggressively to find out what the situation may be in those communities and to advise us in Congress if legislation is needed to protect our people from any unwarranted and arbitrary action by common carriers.

The letters to which I refer are set forth, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 25, 1950.

Hon. J. MONROE JOHNSON,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: A number of passenger trains have been discontinued on the railroads in Louisiana, especially in north Louisiana, within the last few months. Two of the big systems, namely, the Illinois Central and the Texas & Pacific, have discontinued passenger trains, to the great inconvenience of the people of a large part of north Louisiana.

The action of these two roalroads in discontinuing passenger service has disrupted the mail service, and the Post Office Department has had to enter the field, put trucks in service and rearrange in general the system of the transportation of the mail. Certain communities are left without any railroad passenger service whatsoever, and since some of these communities do not have bus service, they are in a critical situation regarding transportation.

From the financial records I have been able to obtain, I find these two railroads to be in good shape financially. It may be that they have been losing money on the lines discontinued, but it seems to me some of the railroads are now reaching the point where the question is whether or not, by discontinuing service, they have abandoned their franchise. I understand from others that a similar situation prevails in other sections of the country.

I do not know what power the Interstate Commerce Commission may have. It should have power for investigation purposes. If this is the case, it seems to me very proper that some action ought to be taken by the ICC to investigate the situation developing throughout the country, caused by the great railroad systems: abandonment of service—especially passenger service—and whether or not the abandonment has reached the point that the ICC should act to protect the people of the country affected: or whether a new policy should be instituted for the purpose of guaranteeing communities proper transportation.

From day to day, I am in receipt of letters from communities which are now deprived of passenger service, and which are in great difficulty regarding transportation. I do not know what to tell these people, but I think as long as a railroad is making money, where necessary, it should be required to give service in localities where, even though by doing so, it may lose money in it's operation in certain limited localities.

I will be glad to have an expression from you as to your views on a matter which has become critical in certain sections of the United States.

If you feel legislation may assist you in the performance of your necessary functions, I will be glad to have this expression from you as to what is needed.

Sincerely yours,

OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 25, 1950.

Hon. JESSE M. DONALDSON,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL DONALDSON: Several railroads have discontinued passenger service throughout Louisiana, especially in north Louisiana. This has brought about disruption, in certain instances, of mail service and has created hardship on local people. The Illinois Central Railroad and the Texas & Pacific, for instance, have both abandoned certain passenger service in north and central Louisiana within the last few months. I am receiving complaints from local people about the inadequacy of the mail service as a result of the action by these railroads and others.

It seems to me, therefore, that because of the failure of the Railway Mail Service a full investigation of the situation existing in Louisiana should be begun at once by the Post Office Department. In this investigation, it is my belief that an effort should be made to revamp the entire postal delivery system where inadequacies are found, and in all cases the Post Office Department should move, it occurs to me, to replace promptly the rail service which has been abandoned by speedy postal service.

I previously called this situation to your attention in the case of the Illinois Central Railroad, and you indicated that you would cause an investigation to be made of the matter. I am asking that this investigation go further and include other railroads which have recently abandoned passenger service, especially the Texas & Pacific, which has, I am told, abandoned all passenger service from Shreveport, south to Natchitoches, on what is commonly referred to as the Mansfield branch.

Please advise me what action I may expect to have out of your office at an early date.

Sincerely yours,

OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress.

Lt. Jack Traub

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a mingled feeling of sorrow and pride that I announce to this distinguished body the funeral and interment of Lt. (jg) Jack Traub, of Pekin, Ill., which will take place on February 2, at 2 p. m., in the Arlington National Cemetery. Lieutent Traub was killed in action on Guadalcanal on June 2, 1945. As far as I have been able to ascertain, he is the only distinguished hero of World War II to be buried in the Arlington National Cemetery, who comes from Pekin, Ill., in the district I am honored to represent.

Lieutenant Traub was born in Pekin on January 18, 1921. He attended the Pekin Community High School and graduated with the class of 1939. After studying at the University of Illinois for 2 years his career was interrupted by the war in which he gave his life so heroically.

His parents, Mr. and Mrs. Orville Traub, of Pekin, Ill., as well as all the members of his family, are I know, proud of the lieutenant's distinguished service record. His parents, while deeply grieved, are, I am sure, proud of the brave and fighting spirit shown by their son. His friends and acquaintances will revere his memory more and more as time goes by.

May I, by this means, extend my deepest sympathy to his parents, relatives, and friends, as a token of my respect for the heroism displayed by this young man.

May we, as grateful Representatives, assure them we will work hand in hand in the interests of lasting world peace.

Federal-State Relations to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Dr. James K. Pollock, late of the Hoover Commission and head of the department of political science of the University of Michigan:

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS TO EDUCATION

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Before answering specific questions concerning the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, it is important to clarify the mandate under which the Commission operated.

It was not the task of the Commission to determine policy. Thus, in the field of education the Commission was not asked to determine the size of the budget or the extent to which the Federal Government should participate in this activity. This was deemed to be the task of Congress.

The only task of the Commission was to decide: assuming the present extent of educational activities on the part of the Federal Government, where and how can this activity be best administered within the organizational framework of that Government.

To this end the Hoover Commission applied to education the same standards of judgment which it applied to all other functions of the Federal Government which it investigated. These standards were applied with the following objectives in mind:

1. To consolidate departments, offices, and agencies so as to encourage in Government order, clear lines of responsibility and authority and effective organization.

2. To reduce to the minimum the number of agencies reporting to the President.

3. To set up consistent policies governing the administration, as far as possible, of all aspects of government.

4. To give status to Government functions in relation to the size of the budget it commands and the number of employees on the pay roll.

5. to give general discretion for determining the organizational and operating needs of departments to general administrators irrespective of the functions of their agency as they are best able to determine such decisions in line with the over-all needs of the agency as well as the Government.

Question. Why doesn't the Hoover report agree with the task force report?

Answer. In making its recommendations concerning education the Hoover Commission used the reports of the task force in the same manner that it used them to make recommendations regarding all other functions. In making its choices as to which recommendation of the task force to accept, to modify, or to reject, the commission took into consideration not only the needs and place of the specific Government agency under consideration but the needs and place of that agency in relation to all other Government agencies.

Upon study of the task force report on education, the Hoover Commission concluded that one of its major recommendations, that of the creation of a Federal Board of Education was not sound in relation to the organization of Government as a whole. The commission came to this conclusion on three counts:

1. Education is not a primary function of the Federal Government. It is a function of the States.

2. In comparison with other functions that the Federal Government performs, education is a very small part of the governmental picture both as to amount of money expended as well as number of employees.

3. The function of the Federal Government in education is one of service, advice, and professional leadership.

These conditions being true, the commission would have found itself unjustified in recommending the establishment of a separate agency for education, particularly as one of the chief aims of the commission was to reduce and consolidate the number of agencies and departments in Government.

Question. What are the dangers in a large agency administering a complex of many different services?

Answer. There are few dangers in a large agency administering different services so long as these services are related and well-integrated into the departmental structure.

Since the Commission was not in favor of creating a new and separate agency, education had to remain either in the Federal Security Agency (a "large" agency) or had to be transferred to another "large" agency. Education being closely related to the other functions handled by the Federal Security Agency, the recommendation to leave education there was in line with the general objective of the Commission to group-like functions, whenever possible, in one department or agency.

Moreover, it was felt that such an agency should be headed by a single, appointed, general administrator. Such a general administrator is in a better position than the "functional specialist" (as the educator) to pass upon the importance of each activity which the whole agency must perform in relation to the rest of all Government functions.

Page 44 of the Hoover Commission states: "It is the well-being of the individual, not control by the doctors, educators, or social worker, with which the Government's health, educational, and social-security functions are primarily concerned."

Question. What is the argument favoring including the United States Office of Education in a Department of Welfare (S. 2060), if it would give the Secretary of Welfare the right to determine completely by Executive order educational functions in the Federal agency for education?

Answer. The Commission established in its report concerning education, as well as all other functions, certain basic requirements for effective departmental organization:

1. The reduction of the number of departments reporting to the President.

2. The tightening up of organization, control, and integration of bureaus and agencies below the departmental level in order to do away with the freewheeling autonomous status these agencies have enjoyed to date. The autonomy of these bureaus has too often made them irresponsible and unresponsive to the over-all needs of the whole department under which they operate and even the whole of government.

As concerns the placement of education in a Department of Welfare of Cabinet rank, the justification for such a recommendation is the same as for placing it in the Federal Security Agency which such a Department of Welfare would absorb.

In such a Department of Welfare education would be accorded the importance which it deserves in relation to the sum total of all other Government functions.

If and when Congress decides to expand the budget and personnel of the Office of Education, then is the time to reappraise the need for placing this agency in a more prominent organizational position. But the expansion of the educational activities of the Federal Government is a political decision falling within the scope of Congress and not the scope of the Hoover Commission.

Question. Should the Government appropriate large sums of money for general education?

Answer. This is a question of policy which Congress must decide. As I indicated in my introductory remarks, the mandate under which the Commission operated defined its scope as limited to those questions related to the organization and management of Government.

Question. What about an independent Department of Education with Cabinet rank?

Answer. The proposition of an independent Department of Education with Cabinet rank was not laid before the Commission. Had such a proposal been submitted to it, it would, in my opinion, have opposed such a plan. Again, one of the basic aims of the Commission was to reduce the number of departments, not to multiply them. Moreover, as indicated before, the limited educational activities of the Federal Government do not warrant the creation of a separate department for their performance.

Question. What about S. 656: A Federal Board of Education as proposed by the American Council of School Administrators and supported by the NEA?

Answer. This is substantially the recommendation of the task force. Thus, the Commission would reject this proposal on the same grounds as it rejected the task-force recommendation. In addition, the Commission was particularly opposed to the type of board that this proposal contemplates. It is unsound to permit such a board to operate as an independent agency and to allow it to pick its own administrative officer. This would make the agency head almost completely independent of the President and, therefore, violates every sound principle of executive control and responsibility. It is the President, irrespective of whether he does or does not appoint the agency head, who ultimately must bear the responsibility for the performance of this activity. Moreover, independence of operation without reference to the other needs of government is unthinkable. In consideration of all of these factors, the Commission had no other alternative than to recommend that the Office of Education continue as a subordinate unit in one of the major agencies—the Federal Security Agency.

Question. In an agency with Cabinet rank, the political head obviously would be in authority over the whole hierarchy and determine the functions of even the Education Bureau. Would there not be the same danger in a Federal Board of Education?

Answer. As indicated, the Hoover Commission did not support the task-force recommendation for the creation of such a board. Neither would it have supported an agency with Cabinet rank.

In the case of a Federal Board of Education, I am all for keeping our educational system in consonance with the desires of the people. As one interested in improving the control of the people over their Government, whether education, health, welfare, or any other function, I cannot see any justification for making the process of control more difficult. The interjection of a board, such as the proposed board, between the people and the function to be administered is merely to place another obstacle in the way of effective control by the people.

In addition, in any solution as much care should be taken to avoid too much professional dominance of education as of too much political dominance of education.

Question. What are the possible weaknesses in a Federal board set up at the national level?

Answer. It would seem to me that I have indicated what these weaknesses are when I discussed the philosophy which governed the recommendations of the Commission.

Question. Is a National Board of Education analogous to a State board?

Answer. There is a serious fault in such an analogy. Education is a State function and not a national one. Therefore, if any comparison were to be made between the two, it must be based on two differing sets of assumptions which underlie the respective purpose of each in this activity.

Soil Conservation in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present a most interesting and informative report, compiled by the Soil Conservation Service, in reference to its work in the State of Louisiana. This report shows the extent of soil-conservation work over the period of years and shows the results from this work. The increase in production of agricultural products as a result of soil conservation work is one of the interesting features of this report and highlights the importance of soil conservation work throughout the country. I think this report gives valuable information on the reason for the present remarkable production record which has been set by the farmers of not only the State of Louisiana, but of the entire United States.

Mr. Speaker, the report is as follows:

In the six soil-conservation districts which serve most of the area within the bounds of the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana there are 17,125 farms with a combined area of 1,396,848 acres.

The oldest of the six districts, the Dorcheat soil-conservation district, was organized late in 1938 and started receiving assistance from the Soil Conservation Service April 25, 1939—just 4 days ahead of the D'Arbonne district. The youngest district, Dugdemona, started operation only 2 months later than did the first. All of the districts have been in operation over 10 years.

There are 3,933 farmers in the six districts carrying out active soil-conservation plans on 690,237 acres of land. The number of conservation farmers, however, may not suggest accurately the interest in soil conservation in this congressional district. In addition to those who are actively engaged in a soil-conservation program, there are almost 3,000 others waiting for assistance from Soil Conservation Service technical personnel.

Any educational work or publicity pertaining to soil conservation immediately brings still other applicants to the soil-conservation district for assistance. Of the 3,933 farmers carrying out conservation plans, 687 have their plans on maintenance, which means that this number of farmers have already completed their initial conservation programs on their land and are now maintaining those programs.

A survey taken in 1949, in which detailed information was supplied by 610 Louisiana farmers who had conservation plans on 118,-068 acres, revealed that conservation farming increased Louisiana crop and pasture production an average of 45 percent and also saved labor and equipment use on one farm in two.

These 610 farmers from all sections of the State said that both acre yields and total production had risen sharply after the application of planned practices. With 18 percent fewer acres in cotton, they grew 17 percent more pounds of lint. With 9 percent fewer acres in corn, they produced 42 percent more bushels of corn. And 264 of them said that the conservation program had brought about a total annual cash saving of $37,590 in labor and use of farm machinery.

The farmers reported that their average per-acre yields had increased from 13 to 20 bushels of corn since applying conservation practices, from 199 to 285 pounds of lint cotton, from 19 to 26 bushels of oats, from 13 to 17 bushels of peanuts, from 108 to 157 bushels of sweetpotatoes.

Similar increases were reported in yields of legume, hay, other hay, silage, cow peas, peaches, soybeans, and other crops. Land-use changes made as a necessary part of protecting farms from erosion added many new crops in a trend toward diversification. By putting 4,400 idle acres to work, the 610 farmers have increased grazing land 52 percent, with only a 5-percent decrease in cropland and a 16-percent decrease in farm woodland.

With the use of idle acres, the increased feed and hay yields, and the larger and better pastures, the conservation farmers have been able to start or expand livestock enterprises. The number of cattle has been increased 81.4 percent. The farmers have 42 percent more brood sows, 44 percent more pigs, 29 percent more ewes, 31 percent more chickens.

In spite of fewer acres in farm woodlands, harvest of pulpwood, sawlogs, rail ties, and piling poles has increased from 2 to more than 10 times.

Theo DeSoto, of Mansfield, in the upper West Red River soil-conservation district, was one of the 610 farmers interviewed. In 1937, DeSoto and technicians of the Soil Conservation Service at the CCC camp in Mansfield worked out a conservation plan for his 160-acre farm. At that time yields were low, and erosion was taking more soil every year. Seven acres were idle.

DeSoto had established every practice planned, and most of them had been in effect 5 years when the survey was made. He said that erosion had been controlled, rainfall conserved and soil fertility increased. No land was left idle. Lint-cotton production was 56 percent greater from 20 percent fewer acres. Acre yields of corn were increased 33 percent. Corn acreage declined 23 percent but total production was increased almost 4 percent.

DeSoto increased hay production by adding a new crop, lespedeza. With 7 acres of lespedeza and 6 acres of soybeans, he has 19.5 tons of hay a year as compared with 9 tons before. Livestock carrying capacity of pastures was increased 25 percent an acre, and DeSoto increased the size of his pasture from 11 to 69 acres.

With the greater amount of food and hay produced and the larger and better pastures, DeSoto added beef production as a major enterprise. At the time of the survey in 1943, he had 30 beef cows where he formerly had 2.

Two ponds were constructed on his farm to supply water for the cattle.

The experiences of Theo DeSoto are typical of conservation farmers in this district.

Timber and the other products of the forests are important to the economy of northwest Louisiana as well as to the State as a whole, and the need for intelligent conservation of these lands through reforestation, woodland management, and fire protection is readily apparent.

More than half of Louisiana's 30,000,000 acres of timberland is owned by individual farmers, and more and more of these farmers are learning, with the help of their soil-conservation districts and through aid of Soil Conservation Service field men, the importance of woodland management to their own economy.

Woodland management is a program for sane and efficient use of woodlands—of making it possible for woodland to produce trees at a maximum rate on an unending basis. The trees and other products are harvested much as any other crop, and the farmer is finding that his woodland can be one of the most profitable crops on his farm.

At the end of the last fiscal year there were 312,968 acres under woodland management in the State's 25 soil-conservation districts, which represents an increase of 186,-184 acres in a 2-year period. Though progress is being made in woodland management in Louisiana, there are still thousands of acres of woodland in practically every district in the State which are not being properly managed. This includes the northwestern districts.

The biggest problem in timber management right now is getting farmers to select and cut only the trees that should be cut. A large portion of the farm woodland in Louisiana is now producing 50 to 100 board feet of lumber to the acre per year. Under intensive management production can be increased 5 to 10 times in 20 to 25 years, which isn't a very long time in the life of a tree.

Soil-conservation forestry technicians advise farmers to take certain land, put it to timber, and treat it as a farm crop. It takes no fertilizer and no cultivation. Foresters do not advise a farmer to plant pines on land best suited to row crops or grass.

Recent surveys made by technicians of the Soil Conservation Service reveal that about half of the approximately 3,000,000 acres in three soil-conservation districts in the northwest section of Louisiana should never have been considered for cultivation at all, due to soil, slope, erosion, poor drainage, or other factors. These acres should have been kept in permanent vegetation, such as pastures or trees, to insure their stability and producing power in the future.

Progress is being made in northwest Louisiana. The six districts in the Fourth Congressional District had 159,254 acres in improved pastures at the end of this fiscal year, the D'Arbonne district had 32,058 acres under proper woodland management—a substantial increase from the 8,534-acre figure in 1947—and the Saline district had 46,436 acres under woodland management, which is a like increase over what it was last year. Other districts have increased acres under woodland management accordingly.

With the advent of new-type mechanical tree planters, the job of tree planting is expected to increase rapidly in the soil conservation districts where this work presents a problem. The new Illinois Central Railroad tree planter has been ordered by the D'Arbonne, Dugdemona, and Saline districts with the intention of speeding up tree planting. The D'Arbonne district expects to plant 3,000,000 pine seedlings this year with the aid of the new tree planter.

The strides in farm drainage that Louisiana farmers have made in the last 2 years has been remarkable—more than 300,000 acres. The reported 54,676 acres of farm drainage accomplished in the six soil-conservation districts included in the Fourth Congressional District show that this area is doing a great deal to solve the problem of farm drainage. Drainage is a basic practice, one on which the other practices that make up a coordinated soil- and water-conservation program must wait. It is a practice that almost invariably has paid handsome dividends in increased production. For instance, T. P. Moore, Jr., farmer and supervisor of the Upper West Red River Soil Conservation District, says that drainage has increased his production at least 35 percent.

A part of this benefit, of course, comes from the use of soil improving and soil-building crops which is made possible to a large extent by drainage. Example: A portion of the 161,532 acres of cover crops planted by farmers in the six districts last fall.

Drainage and woodland management, however, are mentioned only as examples of how soil and water conservation measures assist in solving land problems for the farmer. In the case of every farm, it is the combination of the needed measures that must be relied on to bring the farm to a state of stability and continuing productivity.

The program of soil and water conservation in Louisiana is putting the State's agriculture on a sounder basis. Erosion is being controlled, idle acres have been put to productive use. The result has been a more secure and prosperous farm family, a more dependable source of raw materials for industry and a more stable foundation for a tax structure.

The program in Louisiana, as in other States, is well under way. Results and the rate of current progress are encouraging. An appropriation by the State of Louisiana has aided greatly in speeding up application of the program in recent years. The most recent appropriation was $800,000 for the 1948–49 biennium, to be allotted to the soil-conservation districts at $390,000 a year. These funds made possible the employment of personnel and the purchase of needed equipment for the advancement of the soil-conservation program.

The rate of planning and application of soil conservation, however, is limited in a large measure to the number of trained technicians which can be placed, with available resources, at the disposal of the districts.

The following figures show the total achievements of the six soil-conservation districts in the Fourth Congressional District up to July 1, 1949:

	Planned	Applied
Contour farming.....acres...	173,731	[illegible]
Cover cropping.....do....	[illegible]	[illegible]
Crop residue management...do....	[illegible]	144,548
Strip cropping.....do....	149	112
Pasture improvement.....do....	[illegible]	[illegible]
Seeding of pasture.....do....	[illegible]	77,549
Wildlife area improvement...do....	1,785	1,307
Woodland management.....do....	[illegible]	[illegible]
Tree planting.....do....	13,715	7,220
Farm and ranch ponds...number...	821	[illegible]
Terraces.....miles...	12,[illegible]	[illegible]
Field diversions.....do....	87	38
Farm drainage.....acres...	[illegible]	[illegible]
Open drains.....miles...	1,013	[illegible]
Irrigation land preparation.acres...	[illegible]	3
Improved water application.do....	[illegible]	1
Water facilities.....number...	[illegible]	29
Woodland cutting.....acres...	[illegible]	44,381

Conservation needs for Louisiana are:

Contour planting, acres	2,344,802
Cover crops, acres	4,909,133
Crop residue management, acres	5,654,240
Strip cropping, acres	200,888
Range properly stocked, acres	4,449,796
Seeding range and pastures, acres	4,296,693
Farm and ranch ponds, number	14,377
Field and gully planting, acres	192,207
Woodland management, acres	6,276,818
Terracing, miles	199,176
Diversions, miles	8,649
Individual farm drains, acres	2,900,083
Farm irrigation land preparation, acres	152,944
Irrigation systems, installed or improved, number	1,892
Improved methods of irrigation, water application, acres	931,192
Shelter belts, windbreaks, acres	1,379

National Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by William H. McMasters, of 448 Broadway, Cambridge, Mass., before the Senate Finance Committee on January 28, 1950. Mr. McMasters is president of National Old Age Pensions, Inc., and vice chairman of National Pension Committee. He advocates a straight national pension for qualified citizens.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is William H. McMasters, of 448 Broadway, Cambridge, Mass. I am president of National Old Age Pensions, Inc., and vice chairman of National Pension Committee.

I have long been an advocate of a straight national pension for qualified citizens reaching the age of 60 years. Despite the many legislative efforts that have been made to circumvent this basic idea, nationally and in the States, the ultimate trend toward that goal has never shifted. Little by little the old-age assistance title of the Social Security Act has been broadened until today the Federal contributions overmatch that of practically every State in the case loads. This is not so in Colorado, Washington, or in much-publicized California. Here we see the States outmatching the Federal Government.

I feel that it rests with this committee to suggest a simplification of the whole problem of old-age pensions by having it handled entirely by the Federal Government. If this step is taken, the present labor-management troubles with respect to pensions will be solved for all time. The democratic doctrine of equality will supplant the present inequality among the States which exists in the old-age assistance title of the Social Security Act and in no other pension statutes. I feel that it is now time for the elderly citizens of the Nation to be treated the same in Mississippi as in Massachusetts, just as soldiers, postal employees, civil-service employees and all others who benefit either from contributory or noncontributory systems designed to protect them against want in their old age.

The Aircraft Disaster at Washington National Airport on November 1, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, under date of November 10, 1949, 16 Bolivian pilots and aviation instructors addressed a joint letter in Spanish to Eastern Airlines, Inc., at Washington National Airport. The letter of these Bolivian pilots makes serious charges of incompetency against Rios Bridoux. The letter alleges that he has been involved in numerous accidents and has an unsatisfactory flying record. These allegations, if true, cast serious doubts on his ability to fly an American aircraft safely, although he was authorized by the CAA to make noncommercial, that is, not for pay, flights in this country.

The Bureau of Safety Investigation of the Civil Aeronautics Board has received the letter but states that it has not been made a part of the November 1, 1949, accident-investigation record. The reason for not incorporating it in the record, according to a Board official, is that the letter is not in the form of a sworn statement, and the CAB thus far had been unable to obtain verification. The Board is stated to have endeavored to secure confirmation of the charges contained in this letter but so far has been unsuccessful, even though the subject matter of the letter is admittedly relevant to the inquiry. The present Bolivian Government authorities reportedly have been slow in replying to CAB requests for verification of these charges, and have not as yet even sent up the official flying record of Rios Bridoux.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUENOS AIRES, *November 10, 1949.*

EASTERN AIRLINES,
National Airport,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The terrific accident with the DC-4 that occurred the 1st of November at the airport has greatly disturbed the entire world as the major air tragedy in the history of the United States.

It has affected us doubly, for a Bolivian aviator was involved in that horrible tragedy, and so the reputation and the professional standing of Bolivian aviation is also concerned.

It has greatly surprised us that the press and the international news agencies have issued information that is so inaccurate and given to them by people that are interested in hiding the truth—presenting to the world wrong and misleading statements of the facts.

The mention in the news of the name of the Brazilian diplomat, Senor Guillermo Gutierres Vea Murguia allows one to believe that he might have been the one who confused the press, for he was an associate of the pilot and so for that reason, his testimony might have been partial to him.

The two of them, Gutierres and Rios Bridoux, staged a riot in Bolivia June 13, 1946, and received money for that riot, according to the general version. The financier was the industrialist, Carlos V. Armajo according to the information given at that time by the Secretary of State to the Bolivian Ambassador, Mr. Victor Andrade.

It is for this reason that the information of Mr. Murguia regarding Mr. Bridoux cannot be impartial because of their economic and political relations. Furthermore, he does not possess the technical and necessary knowledge to give an opinion on the matter.

The professional background of Rios Bridoux differs from that mentioned by the North American press. The laudatory qualifications and particularly the title, "Lindbergh of Latin America" are inconsistent

with the facts. And this affects the rating and the dignity of Bolivian aviation, to which we belong.

Because of this, we are compelled to make the following statements—that we are ready to verify personally at any time to safeguard the prestige of Bolivian aviation, and of which Rios Bridoux is one of the least deserving of those qualified.

We do, therefore, make these statements as professional pilots with meritorious citations which are recognized throughout the world. We have done our utmost to do our duty with dignity and with a high sense of responsibility.

Mr. Bridoux has the following background:

A. Declared unacceptable as a pilot by Dr. Smith, colonel of the Aeronautical Service of Bolivia in 1946.

B. Accident in May 1946 in Bolivian town of Reyes—violated the ruling on minimum of time and disobeyed orders on flight control. The accident occurred when he attempted to land with an excess of speed, thus landing in the woods which surround the airport. The accident destroyed the Douglas C-47 of the FFAA of Bolivia.

C. Accident in June 1946 while trying to land in an AT-6 Bliss.

D. 1948: When attempting to land during a night flight misused a public thoroughfare in the city of Santa Cruz for the airport and so placed in danger the lives of hundreds and caused panic in the town. He arrived at the airport of Santa Cruz without permission for a night landing since he had been arbitrarily from the town of Trinidad.

E. He was released from the Army in 1946 for offenses committed against the military regulations. One offense was the contraband of rubber in Army planes—ignoring the agreement between the American and Bolivian Governments, as is evident in the Rubber Reserve and its offices in the city of Reyes, the region of the rubber production. The contraband was taken from Reyes to La Paz and Rios Bridoux could do this as a military pilot because the Rubber Reserve had no guard over them.

F. The record of 5,000 hours flying time presented by him is false and there is proof that it has been raised more than 2,000 hours. The version given to the American press is entirely wrong in this matter.

None of these circumstances confirm the qualifying title of "Lindbergh of Latin America" that Senor G. V. M. has given him and that the news services have printed after the horrible accident in which, by an unfortunate cause, Bolivian aviation is stained with blood due to the irresponsibility of Rios Bridoux.

He obtained his present position as Director of Civil Aeronautics as a result of his political work in Bolivia from June to September where he had to shoot at miners and bombard the cities of Cochabamba and Santa Cruz which caused much suffering. Rios Bridoux lacks moral authority as well as culture and sufficient knowledge to accomplish the task that the Bolivian Government has given to him, and so he has caused such disgrace as that which prompts this letter.

The officers who sign this letter have been military professors and aviation instructors in Bolivia and are ready to verify these statements if necessary.

Sincerely yours,

Armando Cortes, Walter Arce, Juan Mercreira, majors; Walter Leigh, head of Lloyd Boliviano Pilots; Javier Cerruto, Raul Zamarain, captains; Raul Pinedo, Jaime Ayala, Walter Cossio, Louis Urzina, all stationed in the United States of America with Lloyd Boliviano Airways; Herbert Bittenadotro, Jorge Belmonte, Fernando Castrillo, Francisco Lazcal, lieutenants; Demetrio Bustamente, with LLA; Lt. Leon Leite Castro, lieutenant stationed in Argentina.

Basing-Point Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received by me, as well as other Senators, from 76 economists of the American Economics Association, urging the defeat of S. 1008, the basing-point bill. These men have given a great deal of study to this issue, and they have no personal ax to grind. For this reason I believe we should pay the greatest respect to their conclusions about S. 1008.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1950.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: We undersigned economists, fully sharing the conviction of the Congress that the traditional American policy of maintaining a free and competitive economy should be preserved, urge that legislation facilitating the use of basing-point or freight-equalization systems of pricing, in particular the bill S. 1008 now pending before the Senate, be rejected.

We are convinced that such systems have been employed as a means of effecting the sort of collusive price fixing that is condemned by the Sherman Act. We believe that they have promoted the suppression of competition and resulted in serious economic waste.

It has been said that the proposed bill would clarify the law. We do not believe this to be the case. Some of its supporters contend that it would legalize basing-point pricing; others insist that it would not. These interpretations of the bill's provisions are so inconsistent as to make it certain that its enactment would occasion far more confusion than may now exist. Another decade of litigation would be required to remove the uncertainties that these provisions would create. In the meantime, collusive pricing practices now outlawed by the court would be reinstituted, and others would go unchecked.

The bill would seriously weaken the antitrust laws and hinder their enforcement. It would impose upon the Government, in the case of industries long habituated to monopolistic systems of delivered pricing, a well-nigh impossible burden of proof. It would permit the issuance of an order terminating an agreement to employ a basing-point system, but it would prevent the issuance of an order enjoining the continued use of the system itself.

The bill would go far toward emasculating the Robinson-Patman Act by restoring the good-faith defense of the old Clayton Act, thus enabling a seller to justify any price discrimination, no matter how destructive of competition, by showing that his discriminatory price was adopted to meet the price of a competitor. This defense would serve to bolster the systematic matching of delivered prices under basing-point systems. But it would not be confined to such cases; it could be offered in justification of every form of price discrimination that is now prohibited by law.

Believing in the superiority of a system of free enterprise and fearing that freedom will be endangered as competition is restrained, we appeal to all members of the Senate to vote against the bill S. 1008 or any other bill which could be so interpreted as to legalize the basing-point system of pricing.

Respectfully yours,

(Signatures attached:)

Gardner Ackley, University of Michigan.
Edward L. Allen, American University.
Richard M. Alt, Johns Hopkins University.
James W. Angell, Columbia University.
George Leland Bach, Carnegie Institute of Technology.
Edgar S. Bagley, Kansas State College.
Roland W. Bartlett, University of Illinois.
Roy Blough, University of Chicago.
Walter M. Breckenridge, Colby College.
Yale Brozen, Northwestern University.
John Buttrick, Northwestern University.
William A. Carter, Dartmouth College.
C. L. Christenson, Indiana University.
Philip H. Coombs, Amherst College.
James F. Corbett, New York City school system.
John M. Crawford, Carnegie Institute of Technology.
Kenneth J. Curran, Princeton University.
Charles R. Dean, Rutgers University.
Marshall E. Dimock, Bethel, Vt.
John F. Duffy, Jr., Denison University.
Durward H. Dyche, Wake Forest College.
Howard L. Ellis, University of California.
Frank Whitson Fetter, Northwestern University.
Milton Friedman, University of Chicago.
David L. Gass, Williams College.
Betti C. Goldwasser, Washington, D. C.
Bernard F. Haley, Stanford University.
Milton Hammer, Milton Hammer & Associates.
Albert G. Hart, Columbia University.
Edward R. Hawkins, Johns Hopkins University.
Charles H. Hession, Brooklyn College.
Henry G. Hilken, Washington, D. C.
Simeon Hutner, Princeton, N. J.
Martin V. Jones, Chicago, Ill.
Richard A. Kahn, University of Miami.
William F. Kennedy, University of California.
Robert R. Kibrick, New York Sun.
Frank J. Kottke, University of North Carolina.
Frank H. Knight, University of Chicago.
Ben W. Lewis, Oberlin College.
Clarence D. Long, Johns Hopkins University.
Arthur F. Lucas, Clark University.
Friedrich H. Lutz, Princeton University.
Fritz Machlup, Johns Hopkins University.
Edward S. Mason, Harvard University.
John W. May, Washington and Jefferson College.
John W. McBride, Washington, D. C.
S. Sterling McMillan, Western Reserve University.
John Perry Miller, Yale University.
Carey P. Modlin, Jr., Princeton University.
Julius L. Okun, Arlington, Va.
Alfred L. Oxenfeldt, Hofstra College.
Shorey Peterson, University of Michigan.
Roy A. Prewitt, Washington, D. C.
Lloyd G. Reynolds, Yale University.
I. Lyman Singer, S. J. Tilden High School.
Caleb A. Smith, Wilmington College.
Richard E. Speagle, New York State Banking Department.
Joseph J. Spengler, Duke University.
George A. Steiner, University of Illinois.
George J. Stigler, Columbia University.
George W. Stocking, Vanderbilt University.
Herbert E. Striner, Syracuse University.
Myrick H. Sublette, University of Virginia.
Carl P. Taeusch, St. Louis University.
Richard B. Tennant, Yale University.
Daniel C. Vandermeulen, Claremont Men's College.
Myron W. Watkins, New York University.
Clair Wilcox, Swarthmore College.

Edward R. Willett, Northeastern University.
John W. Wright, Washington, D. C.
Floyd A. Bond, Pomona College.
Miriam K. Chamberlair, Connecticut College.
A. G. Papandreou, University of Minnesota.
Floyd L. Vaughan, University of Oklahoma.
Jacob Viner, Princeton University.

Highway Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has issued a study of highway needs throughout the Nation. The publication of this report has attracted great interest, and in the Washington Evening Star of last night there was an editorial based on the document. The title of the editorial is "No Time for Bickering." That is an admonition which can apply in many different fields, in addition to the field of highway planning. Irrespective of that, however, Mr. President, I feel that the Star editorial should appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO TIME FOR BICKERING

Against the background of the O'MAHONEY committee's long-view report on Washington's highway needs, current bickering among District and Federal highway and bridge planners becomes inexcusable. At a time when these officials should be working shoulder to shoulder toward realization of a $300,000,000 traffic-relief program of the nature described in the report, they are at an impasse over bridge sites. And the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, created by Congress to bring far-sighted leadership in building a better city, is even proposing a halt to further bridge construction until existing traffic bottlenecks are eliminated.

But the best relief for present bottlenecks is to be found in new channels for traffic—new bridges, freeways of the Whitehurst type, and similar bold, though costly, projects. Instead of abandoning plans for immediate construction of a fourth bridge across the Anacostia River, we should be going ahead with plans for more than one new bridge over that stream and for additional crossings along the Potomac from Alexandria to Great Falls. Meanwhile work should go ahead on interim relief measures, such as underpasses, street widening and relocation, corner cutting and the like, although it is absurd to consider these piecemeal undertakings as an adequate substitute for major relief projects.

No one proposes the launching at once of all phases of the far-reaching highway program envisioned in the report of the Joint Economic Committee. That is at least a 20-year program—longer than 20 years if the present rate of highway-fund allotment is adhered to. Today the District is spending only about 10 millions a year on highways and bridges, about equally divided between repairs and new construction.

Included in the long-range program are some projects which cannot fairly be considered as primarily District responsibilities. The proposed bridge between Alexandria and the Blue Plains area is a good example. That would be essentially a by-pass for the benefit of United States route 1 traffic. In a similar category is the proposed new bridge over the upper Anacostia to serve the uncompleted Washington-Baltimore Parkway. The Federal Government is financing and building this parkway as far as Fort Meade, because of its military value. It would be logical to assess the cost of the parkway bridge against the Federal Government, in view of the national aspect of the whole enterprise.

In fact, so many governmental interests are involved in the orderly development of a comprehensive highway system in the metropolitan area that, as the O'MAHONEY report suggests, an over-all coordinating agency may become necessary to effect joint action. This is a subject for exploration by a commission of inquiry of the type proposed in the pending Bassett bill.

Neglect of Christian Refugees of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Whole of Christendom Neglecting Christian Refugees of Palestine," written by Dorothy Thompson.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE RECORD—WHOLE OF CHRISTENDOM NEGLECTING CHRISTIAN REFUGEES OF PALESTINE

(By Dorothy Thompson)

An investigating mission under the auspices of the American Christian Palestine Committee—composed of Protestant pastors and laymen—has returned from Palestine and reported against UN internationalization of Jerusalem as dangerous and unnecessary.

The group also opposes even the latest, much less inclusive scheme advanced by Roger Garreau, president of the United Nations' Trusteeship Council, to limit internationalization to a small area containing the chief holy places.

In short, it would appear that the mission wishes, as does Israel, to keep the United Nations out of Palestine altogether.

This column agrees with the mission that it would be dangerous to oppose or criticize the state of Israel in any way. It even is dangerous for an American publicist. Israel and its American supporters are claiming an absolutely unique immunity from criticism—as recently pointed out by pro-Israel Walter White.

EVER CHRISTED BY FORCE

Although Israel owes the legitimizing of its existence to United Nations partition, which was accepted by its agents, the state does not conform to that plan, but has been created by force—as what is left of the Arab world in Palestine is held by force. The ports of Jaffa and Haifa were not awarded to Israel, but Israel holds them. The internationalization of Jerusalem was included in the original plan, but is now refused. To protect a UN trusteeship would require force, for without it, force would certainly be used against it. Therefore, it is dangerous.

Whether a UN trusteeship anywhere in Palestine is unnecessary depends on one's viewpoint of necessity. The mission declares it is unnecessary as a means of protecting shrines, and that there is complete religious freedom in Palestine. Maybe there is freedom to worship, but how about the worshipers? Christian shrines remain undisturbed; how about the Christian community? Is it free, even to survive?

The United Nations never took one step to guarantee the lives or property of the indigenous Arab population in Jewish Palestine. Hundreds of thousands of them have been turned into refugees, living in the bitterest want, with all their possessions expropriated by Israel. And those refugees include most of the Palestinian Christians who constitute one of the oldest, most faithful Christian communities on earth.

Their story was told in part by Yusif El-Bandak, son of the mayor of Bethlehem (all Bethlehem is Christian), and in the November 30 issue of "The Christian Century." It apparently surprised Americans to learn that there were any Christians in Palestine. Yet they constitute a tenth of the Arab-speaking population. None of them are converts from Islam. All are either descendants from Christians, of the time of Christ (mostly Philistines or Canaanites), or of the Crusaders.

TIES TO WESTERN WORLD

Throughout history they have had ties to the western world. Their sons have been educated in Christian schools and colleges in the Middle East, and in the west. They have been among the most progressive and prosperous of the native population, and were concentrated chiefly in Jaffa, Haifa, and "new" Jerusalem, where they owned fully two-thirds of all the property, both in private and institutional holdings.

The members of this community are today refugees in the country wherein they have constituted a secure and highly respected community for centuries. Their properties have been confiscated without compensation. In the birthplace of Christ—which would have fallen except for a well-organized defense—40,000 of them have taken refuge, bursting the capacities of a town of 15,000. Although their fellow Christians have taken them into their homes with sacrificial generosity, thousands, like Mary, could "find no room in an inn," and, like Mary, their children are born in stalls, or in caves, or under trees, while over them "the silent stars go by."

All that reaches them is a trickle of totally inadequate relief. Great Christendom neglects them. The Moslems watch their plight with wonderment, asking, "If the United States, overwhelmingly a Christian country, lets these Christians perish in the birthplace of their Lord, whom will the United States protect anywhere?"

Russian agents jeer, "You call us atheists, but where is that Christian world?"

And a "Christian" mission reports about shrines, but not about Christians.

Who will protect this community? Israel, which created their plight? The Moslem world? Who, if not the UN?

Address by Russell W. Davenport in Presenting Award to Displaced Persons Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Let Us Keep the Faith," delivered by Russell W. Davenport at New York City on January 28, 1950, in presenting to the Displaced Persons Commission the annual award of the Association of Immigration Lawyers.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET US KEEP THE FAITH

Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and distinguished guests, it is a great pleasure for me to be here to help perform the little ceremony that is the object of this gathering.

The issues with which our guests of honor have had to deal, and with which most persons in this audience are almost daily concerned, are issues that involve not only the welfare of this country but of the entire world.

As you know, I am a Republican—a member of a party that has had some difficulty in recent years in winning its side of the argument. The Displaced Persons Commission is of course nonpartisan, and in that sense it makes no difference which party your speaker belongs to. Nevertheless, I welcome this opportunity to express my profound conviction that on matters such as we are discussing here, and indeed on all major decisions in foreign affairs, the two major parties must consistently join together to make common, bipartisan policies.

It is often said that the United States has emerged from the two world wars as the most powerful nation on earth. This fact cannot be questioned. But it will be well for us if we have a clear idea of what we mean by it.

Do we mean only that the United States has the most powerful Military Establishment? Potentially, at any rate, that statement might be true. Beyond our shores it is a statement that would be given much credit and much weight. But I do not believe that when Americans speak of the United States as the most powerful nation they have the thought of military power in mind. They mean something else.

One thing they mean, is that the United States is the most powerful nation in terms of industrial and economic productivity. Through our productivity and our industrial know-how we can show other people how to raise their standards of living and how to open for themselves new opportunities. That, for example, is the inner meaning of the European recovery program.

Yet how do we show other people these things? Not, certainly, by military force. Nor yet by economic force. It would not be consonant with any aspect of our doctrine of freedom to force our principles or our way of doing things upon anyone else.

Basically, American power is a moral power. It is that power which arises when an individual or a people is dedicated, for example, to the principle of justice. It is that power which arises when we assert that men are equal, irrespective of race, color, creed, or nationality. It is that power which arises when we insist upon government by law, rather than government for military, economic, or propagandistic advantage.

The power of America is that power that springs from the proposition that all men, not just Americans, of a right ought to be free.

We do not say that it is our task to make all men free. We do say that they ought to be free. We let the moral law speak for us. And insofar as we harness our military and economic resources to the service of that law, we shall be great and we shall grow greater as the future unrolls.

America the military power is just one more nation in the troubled history of man. But America the moral power is something new in human evolution, something of which we have yet seen only the beginning, something that awakens in all men that hope, that faith in the future, without which they cannot be free.

Now, among the moral propositions upon which our power was originally founded there was one that particularly concerns us tonight, the proposition that anyone on earth could become an American.

During more recent times it has become necessary for us to qualify this great proposition. It has become physically and economically impossible for us to accept everyone who wants to come here. Some of these limitations have economic causes and some political.

Let us be crystal clear, however, that the limitations we have placed upon free immigration do not cancel the principle. Americans may still be born anywhere on earth.

But now, just as the economic problems of our time caused us to limit the principle some decades ago, so the terrible problems created by the Second World War have required us to expand those limitations in order to save the principle.

Had we, after the Second World War, insisted upon the rigid application of our prewar immigration quotas, no one in the world would have believed that the United States was still dedicated to the proposition that all men ought to be free. They would have accused us of hypocrisy. It was absolutely essential for the survival of our principle that we set up machinery for the admission into this country of persons who had been uprooted by war and revolution and who literally had no home.

And it was from that necessity that there grew the Displaced Persons Commission, which we are gathered here to honor.

Now, my friends, as you see, I have come to this point in a very unsentimental way. I have not talked to you about the suffering of these displaced persons. I have not sought to make an appeal to what are commonly called the humanitarian instincts of the American people, though these instincts of mercy, of kindness, of generosity are very strong in our people.

I have rather sought to show, that when we properly understand the meaning of those words "American power," we find that the mere preservation of that power, which is a moral power, requires that we stand forth before the world as the defender and upholder of the principles of freedom—not just for Americans, but for everyone. And this means, in the present state of the world, that the admission of displaced persons is not merely a humanitarian act, but, literally, an act of self-preservation. It is an act to preserve the moral power upon which the destiny of the United States is founded.

In the light of this truth our course is clear. What we need is a Displaced Persons Act which will apply this principle in simple and unambiguous terms.

Every qualification that we add to the act raises an ambiguity of some kind. For example, to take the simplest qualification, it is generally recognized that the United States ought to take, as a minimum, 400,000 of these displaced persons. Why, then, do we keep qualifying this figure by writing it down to 330,000 or some other fraction of the minimum? Let us take 400,000 without haggling about it; the extra 70,000 is not going to ruin the United States.

But other and far more serious qualifications keep creeping into this vital legislation. The House bill that was passed last spring wisely and courageously eliminated many of them. But now we find that in the Senate they have crept back again.

We are again confronted with the old restriction that 40 percent of all who are admitted must come from countries annexed since the war by a foreign power—which weights the quota very heavily in favor of the Baltic states.

We are confronted with the restriction, that 30 percent of the quota must have practiced agriculture for 2 years.

Now everyone recognizes the desirability of allocating these new citizens to the farms, where they are much needed. But a rigid percentage requirement like that means that if enough agricultural workers cannot be found others cannot be admitted. The Commission's courageous policy during the past year, of deferring the allocations for these various categories to the last possible moment, is well known. Nevertheless, well over 100,000 able-bodied and desirable persons were excluded because of the impossibility of filling specific quotas.

Even more serious is the effect of such restrictions on the rest of the world, and particularly on the displaced persons themselves. Must they not be puzzled, that in a land which boasts that its citizens can choose their own occupations, a particular occupation is designated as the key that opens the magic door? And must they not be puzzled that a people who believe that all men are equal give an overwhelming priority to persons of Baltic stock?

I say that such restrictions do us more harm than good. Let us abandon them. Let us instruct the Commission to give preference to agricultural workers, and the like, but let us give it power to exercise its discretion.

And then there is the matter of caution. We have heard the charge repeated over and over again, that these displaced and homeless persons are infested with communism and other subversive doctrines. But anyone who will spend time in their camps with an open mind is bound to come out with practically the opposite impression. Owing to their terrible experiences with authoritarian regimes, an overwhelming proportion of these people are dedicated to the ideals of democracy—dedicated with an intensity that is capable of shaming many who already enjoy democracy and take it for granted.

Of course, it is true that there are communists and subversives among them. But the Displaced Persons Commission goes to almost fantastic lengths to screen such persons out. The security protections involved in the administration of the displaced persons law far exceed in severity and carefulness any rules that have ever been applied in the normal immigration law. There are at least seven special protections, as follows:

1. The Commission itself maintains the closest watch on security problems and has issued iron-bound instructions that no one who was ever a member of the Communist, Nazi, or Fascist Parties, or of related parties, for whatever reason, is admissible into the United States under the program.

2. An extensive field investigation is conducted overseas by the Counter-Intelligence Corps of the United States Army.

3. There is a special additional investigation for any displaced person whose country or origin has been overrun by the Communist terror.

4. Special laboratories have been set up for the examination of documents relating to eligibility.

5. The Immigration Service examines all displaced persons overseas, and then again examines them upon arrival in the United States.

6. There is an individual check on every displaced person by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

7. And finally, there is a constant rechecking by the International Refugee Organization, so meticulous that Communist Russia has refused to be a member of the IRO.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, it is a very good thing to be cautious. But as everyone of us knows from experience in his personal life, caution can be carried too far. It can become a disease. The man who is afraid of all the things that might happen to him from the time he gets up in the morning until he goes to bed is a psychopathic case and usually ends up in a sanitarium. He can be healthy only if he counters his daily risks with reasonable care.

In the framing of this new Displaced Persons Act, let us abide by that good American principle. Let us take reasonable care. No less than that, certainly, but no more. And let the qualifications that we make also be reasonable qualifications. I urge that policy upon the Senate of the United States. And I especially urge those Senators who have hitherto obstructed this legislation to remember, that too much caution, and too many qualifications, can so undermine this legislation as to jeopardize the moral power, the good faith, of the United States.

Before I close I want to give you one specific example of how an excess of caution—a pathological excess of caution—is causing a shocking injustice beyond our shores, and is working to our own disadvantage.

Since the Second World War thousands of little children in Europe have been adopted by American citizens. They were orphans. Not only had they no homes, they had no parents. The circumstances of adoption were innumerably varied. Some have been adopted by Americans serving overseas; others by Americans in this country, because they wanted a child in their home or for some other reason.

One of the good provisions of the present Senate bill is that it provides for the admission of 5,000 of these adopted children. However, and here is this old business of qualification again—it imposes the restriction that they must be adopted by servicemen in Europe or by Government employees.

Now in the first place, 5,000 is not enough. The figure should be 25,000, as suggested by Senator TYDINGS.

But, secondly, since when have we so admired Government employees, or so exalted the armed services, that we should appoint them the sole guardians of our orphans? Why is it not possible for an ordinary American citizen, in responsible circumstances, to adopt one of these orphans in like manner and bring him into this country?

Most of these adopted orphans, let us note well, will come to this country some day, somehow—if in no other way, then on the immigration quota. It is manifestly to our interest that we bring them now rather than later; that we begin now to educate them in the American way of life; that we provide them with parents now, father than permit them to develop all those faults and weaknesses which psychologists tell us, are created by the lack of parental care.

I happened on this particular issue through some close personal friends, Mr. and Mrs. Rene Augay, of Scaradale, N. Y. This couple was unhappy because they had no children. Through a friend they heard about a little boy named Peter who was born in Austria in 1946; whose father disappeared, and whose mother soon thereafter died of heartbreak and poverty. Peter had been taken by his maternal grandparents; but they were also poverty stricken and were too old to work. The Augays saw his photograph and were charmed. They journeyed to Europe, met him, fell in love with him, and with the greatest joy adopted him. That was going on 2 years ago.

But then the Augays had to return to America, because they are not rich and Mr. Augay has to work—all the harder now, since he has a third person in the family. Naturally they assumed that they would be able to take their child to this country. But every effort failed. There was nothing in the law to entitle Peter to a visa. He belonged nowhere. The Augays even tried to take him in through Canada; but the Canadian authorities refused him on a simple and logical ground. They said he was an American citizen.

So the Augays had to leave Peter behind. They put him in a children's home in Geneva, Switzerland, and said good-by. And there he is to this day. Peter worships Mrs. Augay, his new mother: whenever a visitor comes to the children's home, he runs out to the door crying, "Maman?" in the expectation that she has come to take him away. But he is always disappointed. When he is naughty, the lady who runs the home turns his mother's picture to the wall—and his father's picture, too. That is the worst punishment in the world for him: he at once behaves, and then begins asking where his mother and father are and why they can't come for him again. I ask that question, too. Why can't they?

Peter Augay is now 4 years old—in fact, I have told you this story because tomorrow, Sunday, January 29, is his birthday. And I would like to give him a birthday present and to have you give it with me. I would like to draw his case to the attention of the American public, in order that the Senate of the United States will at last recognize his right to be an American citizen.

I make no special plea for Peter—nor would he want me to. I appeal in his name, on his birthday, on behalf of the thousands of orphans whom responsible American citizens have adopted. I raise him as a symbol. Not the atom bomb, but this child of 4 is the true symbol of American power; the true symbol of the moral power that has made this country so great.

Let us, then, validate that symbol. Let us change that clause to permit any responsible American citizen—not just a special group—to bring into this country his or her adopted son or daughter. Let us recognize that when great and simple principles become cluttered with timid qualifications justice cannot be done.

Ladies and gentlemen, the business of the evening is to do honor to these distinguished guests, Ugo Carusi, Edward M. O'Connor, and Harry N. Rosenfield, who constitute the Displaced Persons Commission.

I need not tell you, who have struggled with the involutions of the present law, what heroic work these gentlemen have done, against what odds. They have been accused of just about everything in the book. But they have never lost their nerve. And they have never lost their faith in the great principles that it is their task to implement.

There has just been issued, as you know, the report of a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives. This subcommittee inquired into the work of these men in an exhaustive way. And here is what it says and I quote: "The studies and investigations undertaken in Europe have convinced this subcommittee that, on the whole, the administration of the 1948 act is being conducted in a diligent and satisfactory manner."

Well, that is a very fine vindication of your work, Mr. Commissioners. But I think that we here can do better than that. Of course, we do not carry the weight of a subcommittee of Congress. But there is in our hearts a great warmth and a great thankfulness, which, perhaps, official reports cannot properly supply.

There is warmth, because the going has been tough—and we, like all Americans, admire and love men who can do their jobs well under tough circumstances.

There is thankfulness, because you have been good public servants, loyal to principles upon which the power of America is founded.

And I know that there is a great, unseen audience, Mr. Commissioners, who join us tonight, in spirit, in expressing this warmth and thankfulness: the more than 130,000 displaced persons, who—case by careful case—have been admitted by you into this free land of ours; and not merely admitted, but settled into our American life.

And there is still another unseen audience woebegone and hungry, but clinging still to their hopes; those hundreds of thousands who wait in the DP camps of Europe for a chance to enter here.

The Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers, whose purposes center around the just and proper care of those who come to our shores, believes that you Mr. Commissioners, have set such a high standard of public service in the field of immigration, that it herewith presents you with its annual award for the year 1949.

It is my great privilege, gentlemen, to hand you this award. May the good work go on. Let us keep the faith.

Nondiscrimination in Immigration and Employment Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the subject of civil rights and nondiscrimination in immigration and employment practices, published in the January 1950 issue of the magazine known as Goodwill, a soundboard for democratic public opinion.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Among the presently hotly debated questions in the United States and in the United Nations is the question of civil rights and nondiscrimination in immigration and employment practices. Many of the problems arising in the UN, as well as in this country, basically stems from the afore-mentioned questions. Problems abroad between two nations arise from misunderstandings of their respective positions, and mutual distrust toward each other. A protest is lodged in the UN because of the protesting

nation feels that another nation has transgressed or infringed upon her rights.

In a democratic nation all the inhabitants of that nation is supposed to enjoy equal rights and privileges under the laws of its country. The Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights have meant to give those democratic rights to all the peoples of America, without regard to race, creed, or color. There should be no discrimination in civil rights, employment, and immigration and naturalization policies.

Yet, today the United States Government is still practicing discriminatory laws and restrictive measures in immigration problems against orientals. The peoples who are being discriminated against are the Japanese, Indonesians, Malayans, Siamese, Burmese, and a few other smaller nations. They are mostly inhabitants of southeast Asia with an aggregate population of 250,000,000 people. All these peoples are now independent nations or, at least, autonomous, and have already become democratic-conscious and sensitive to a vital relationship towards their own countries. Most of these peoples look toward the United States for inspiration and leadership. Many of them have made more intensive studies of American history and such personalities as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln, than the average American.

The Oriental Exclusion Act, which was enacted by Congress in 1924, to prevent Asians from enjoying the same privileges in America in immigration matters is a slap in the face to all Asiatics. No respectable Asian will tolerate such an injustice and inequality to exist in an alleged democratic nation. There are reports in the papers to the effect that the United States intends to win over the rest of Asia, meaning southeast Asia, to the democratic cause. To a certain extent the United States Government has shown an increasing interest in the welfare of these countries, while President Truman has reiterated his point 4 program of economic and cultural aid to undeveloped countries. Those reiterations, although well-meaning, may sound attractive to radio listeners, but they will not suffice to calm the hearts of formerly suppressed Asiatic nations. To these peoples practical action in the application of democracy in this country and in United States foreign policy speak louder than words.

It stands to reason that the Oriental Exclusion Act is an overly outmoded law. Under that law no Asians could immigrate to the United States or receive equal treatment in naturalization matters. They didn't have any immigration quotas. Recently, this act had been modified in regards to nationals of China, the Philippines, and India. But, otherwise, its continued existence against the other half of Asiatics, is a paradox of American democracy. The speedy repeal of this Exclusion Act is much overdue. We hope that responsible Americans will urge their Senators and Congressmen to proceed with the liquidation of the last remnants of the colonial system. The close of World War II has already put an end to first colonial era abroad.

If America wants to retain its moral leadership in the world, it has to necessarily make certain adaptations to new conditions and attitudes of the people of the world. Laws in all countries have been modified just as fashions change from day to day. In an article in the New York Times magazine, April 2, 1950, Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick, former president of the Rockefeller Foundation, stated:

"Nothing is static in this world, least of all our ideas. Values change from age to age and the interpretation of one generation is seldom the interpretation of the next. Social conceptions must constantly be retranslated and reexpressed in contemporary conditions. Even our conceptions of freedom and democracy are not static principles. The Declaration of Independence was a broader definition of freedom than that which came out of the Revolution of 1688, just as 1688 widened the freedom of the Magna Carta."

Further up he said, "Democracy is another conception which must also be reinterpreted from generation to generation. It is government by the people and for the people, but its limits were not finally determined by the political concepts of the eighteenth century. Rather it is a growing, dynamic faith, a perpetually evolving adjustment between freedom and justice, between individual rights and the demands of society." This adjustment, however, is never perfectly and finally attained; it remains a problem which mankind must solve again and again. "It is provided in the very desence of things," said Walt Whitman, "that from any fruition of success, no matter what, shall come forth something to make a greater struggle necessary."

In conclusion Mr. Fosdick stated, "If democracy means anything at all, it means the promise of growth. Democracy is not a finished project; we are engaged in building it. There is no blueprint which covers all the contingencies that may arise, or the new ideas and patterns that may be developed in the future. There is no final and absolute form of democracy which has been handed down from some political Sinai. We have no Karl Marx in our past. Democracy is a method of evolution, a maturing way of living, a conception of human relations rooted in the worth and dignity of the individual and inspired by the developing idea of freedom."

We feel that America has matured in such a way so as to grant equal opportunities to all its inhabitants and residents regardless of race, creed, or color.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, an article published by Hon. Virgil M. McClintic, publisher, White County (Ind.) Democrat, outlines the experiences of two displaced persons who have been given refuge in White County, Ind.

I submit the article herewith and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two displaced persons from Europe are happily situated in two Big Creek township farm homesteads located across the road from each other at the homes of Mr. and Mrs. B. C. Shell and O. C. Parks and family. The families sponsoring them in their new homes are just as happy as the two young women.

First to arrive in the county was Miss Trooch Agafia, native of the Ukraine, who is with the Parks family. She reached here on June 4. Mrs. Alexandra Kiritschenko from Yugoslavia arrived at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Shell on August 15.

After Congress passed the law June 15, 1949, permitting displaced persons from Europe to come to the United States, announcement was made that 205,000 DP's could come here. The Shells made application June 24 with the Church World Service, through which Protestant churches worked. They requested that they would like a girl 25 to 50, capable of assisting with the housework as Mrs. Shell was crippled with arthritis, and a Protestant. On March 3, this year, they received notice that the girl had been selected and would be ready to come soon. However, Mrs. Kiritschenko became ill with the flu and her voyage was slowed up for 3 months.

LAND AT BOSTON

Applicants who sponsor the DP, must furnish inland transportation from the ports of arrival, Boston, New York, or New Orleans. In June the Shells mailed the transportation. Mrs. Kiritschenko went to Bremen in June and sailed on July 19, on the *General Sturgis*, in which there were 885 DP's. It took them 9 days. The travel bureaus were responsible for taking care of them en route to their destinations over the country. Mrs. Kiritschenko was routed to Detroit, and from there took the Wabash to Lafayette, where the Shells met her.

Miss Agafia landed at Boston, and then came by train to Lafayette.

Mr. Parks put in their application in July 1948, a couple weeks later than the Shells. Their letter was sent to the Ukranian American Relief, and their application was acted upon quicker than through the other agency.

Born in 1913, near Moscow, Mrs. Kiritschenko was the daughter of a railroad engineer. When a little girl she went to live with her uncle and aunt, and they traveled quite extensively as the aunt was a Russian consular, comparable to an American Ambassador. They lived in Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Italy. When a little girl, she learned some English from an American lady. Mrs. Kiritschenko speaks fluent German and Russian and some French. She is a member of a family of six children, three boys and three girls. The family is well educated and hold responsible positions.

TRAINED NURSE

Mrs. Kiritschenko was married to an officer in the Russian Army, but had not heard from him since the war. She had 2 years' nurse's training and worked as a nurse in an X-ray laboratory for 4½ years in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. Since liberation, she had been a nurse in a kindergarten for the last 4 years in Munich, Germany. She stated that first she was in charge of three infants, and then was responsible for seven children ages 2½ to 3, all war orphans.

In the hospital she became acquainted with modern appliances found today in the kitchens of American housewives. She did not hesitate to use the appliances found in the Shell home. She had no trouble in learning. Pat Doremire, a Chalmers High School pupil, assisted her in showing where the things were in the house. She can manage the household very well, and has prepared some fine meals.

Mrs. Kiritschenko is a member of the Greek Orthodox Church, but has attended the Chalmers community church regularly since she came here.

She is an attractive blonde and has natural curly hair. The clothing brought with her is like American women wear. She brought several trunks full, which she described as "my house." She has worn her hair bobbed for a number of years, but when a girl it was long.

Shortly after her arrival at the Shell home, Mrs. Kiritschenko received a letter of welcome to the State of Indiana from Gov. Henry F. Schricker, which she prizes greatly.

Mrs. Kiritschenko enjoys reading the newspapers, but remarked that she has learned more about what is happening in Europe since she came to the States than during the time she was a resident.

Being able to speak some English, it was possible to secure considerable information from Mrs. Kiritschenko. However in the case of Miss Agafia, it was difficult. Both young women were at the Shell home the afternoon of the interview and when these pictures were taken. While they both speak Russian, they are different. Miss Agafia is Ukraine Russian or Polish. Mrs. Kiritschenko assisted with the interview.

NATIVE OF UKRAINE

It was learned that Miss Agafia was a native of Ukraine, but she has no living relatives to her knowledge. She went to Poland, then Czechoslovakia and then to Germany, where she did field labor.

The clothing that she brought had been sent through missions to Germany. Before coming to the States, she worked in the Baptist mission in Munich.

Asked if she was happy in the United States, he replied, "Like it here," with a big broad smile.

She is an expert gardener and flower lover. No weeds grow in her garden. She likes to knit, and has some beautiful sweaters that she made which she brought with her.

The Parks family has a dairy and the cows are milked by machine. Miss Agafia took a delight in seeing the machine work. Afterwards she stripped some of the cows, and a member of the family is quoted as saying that "she stripped the cows so dry they had to prime them the next time to milk 'em." She also enjoys hunting eggs, in fact any kind of out-of-door work. Practically all of her 42 years has been spent on a farm.

Nine Members of the House of Representatives Add Names to List of Sponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 64, To Strengthen United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following statement which my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], and I have issued:

Nine Congressmen added their names today to the 102 original sponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 64, a resolution to strengthen the United Nations, thereby constituting the largest number of congressional sponsors of any foreign policy resolution in the history of the United States.

The new sponsors include Representatives CARL ALBERT, Democrat, of Oklahoma; WILLIAM P. BOLTON, Democrat, of Maryland; WILLIAM M. COLMER, Democrat, of Mississippi; WINFIELD K. DENTON, Democrat, of Indiana; EDWARD H. KEUSE, JR., Democrat, of Indiana; JOHN E. MILES, Democrat, of New Mexico; A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma; DONALD W. NICHOLSON, Republican, of Massachusetts; and MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois.

The resolution, designed to put Congress on record in favor of strengthening and developing the United Nations, is as follows:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

Congressman BROOKS HAYS, Democrat, of Arkansas, an original sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 64, commented: "This increased bypartisan support of House Concurrent Resolution 64 is indicative of the growing belief in the House of Representatives that peace must be obtained through the establishment of world law.

"If we are to stand behind our pledge to support the United Nations, we must use all our moral and political strength to mold that organization into a body truly capable of preserving peace. House Concurrent Resolution 64 aims at establishing through the UN the minimum law necessary to maintain peace.

"In a world divided, we must seek to unite not to aggravate the schism. The sponsors of this resolution want the United States to make it clear that we are willing to sit down with all nations to establish a system of justice and enforceable law in the realm of world security.

"Although we must stay strong, our best resources for peace, as always, are not the arms of war but the strength of our dedication to the values of justice, order, and human dignity."

Congressman WALTER JUDD, Republican, of Minnesota, one of the initial sponsors said:

"In a world engulfed in a shadow of fear generated by the armaments race, we must achieve a positive moral base for our policy decisions. House Concurrent Resolution 64 shows the United States an important way to seize the moral initiative through the advocacy of a strengthened United Nations.

"This policy is not only consistent with the highest American tradition but is an urgent necessity in the present atmosphere of international tension. The establishment of law in the realm of world security is not an easily attainable goal, but should we fail the future is indeed foreboding.

"We must not shrink from what we believe is morally right because of the fear of possible frustration. We must stand firm in the strength of our convictions. We seek now to define our goal and indicate a method by which we shall strive to achieve this end. Failure to act along these positive lines would play into the hands of those who profit by deepening division and despair."

Senate Concurrent Resolution 56 which is identical to House Concurrent Resolution 64, has the support of 22 Members of the Senate. A subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is expected to begin hearings on this and similar resolutions on Thursday, February 2.

Letter to Dr. Montgomery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JANUARY 30, 1950.

DEAR DR. MONTGOMERY: We shall sorely miss you in the House each noon. There was always great comfort and solace to hear your daily invocation. I shall always remember tenderly our friendship that has abided with us for many years. Wherever you may go, and whatever you may do, may health and happiness ever be with you and your dear wife.

You have left with all us Members many unforgettable lessons in religion and morality. They are as enduring as sermons on rivers.

The name James Shera Montgomery will ever be a cherished name in our Halls. You recall what the psalmist said, "Better is the fragrance of a good name than the perfume of precious oils."

Not so long ago, I visited Israel and there the word spoken on meeting and on departure is Sholom (Hebrew for peace).

Till we meet again, Sholom.

EMANUEL CELLER

The Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, no section of this country has been more in the national spotlight recently than the Pacific Northwest, the drainage area of the mighty Columbia River.

In order to give all Members a brief general background of the Columbia region, its natural resources, its history, and its promise of the future, I wish to include in the RECORD a series of articles written by Mr. Leon Starmont, of Spokane, Wash., who for nearly 40 years has been reporting on that region. While Mr. Starmont's articles contain some statements not entirely in agreement with other versions of many of the happenings with which he treats, I think they deserve the attention of those who have been subjected more consistently to other points of view.

The Columbia is so tremendous in its importance to the people who live near it and the Nation as a whole that I believe those charged with planning its future should explore every idea advanced by those, such as Mr. Starmont, who will live with it.

The first article follows:

[From the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash., January 22, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Article 1)

(By Leon Starmont)

During the covered-wagon days of 1850, according to a story related at an off-the-record session of the Columbia Basin Commission the other day, a party of pioneers halted beside the old Oregon Trail, to take counsel, reorganize their ranks, and explore the immediate surroundings.

"We know where we're going," one leader insisted.

"But which is the right road?" asked another.

"We don't know just where we are," remarked a third.

"We're not sure just how we got here," added a fourth.

The point was supposed to be that the whole Columbia Basin comprehensive program is now at the stage reached by that more or less hypothetical wagon train 100 years ago.

Residents of the Pacific Northwest are fairly well agreed on the ultimate goal, which is to bring about in this corner of the continent the finest flowering of western civilization. In simple words, the plan is to make this the best spot on earth in which to live and raise a bunch of kids.

ALL WANT THE SAME THING

There is no important disagreement in the Columbia Basin as to what the people want. There are differences of opinion as to the best way of getting it.

There are even contradictory accounts of how the region reached this present stage of development. One task of this reporter will be to separate the facts from the fables, for the benefit of future historians.

The roads ahead wind into the future, somewhat as the Oregon Trail—a route of many detours, short cuts, and alternate choices—led into the Columbia Basin in covered-wagon days.

These are the main ideas as to how the goal may best be reached:

1. Continuation under the present set-up through the voluntary Columbia Basin Interagency Committee (CBIAC), formed in 1946 after the Spokesman-Review had published a series of articles disclosing the confusion that before then existed.

2. Continuation through CBIAC under the Hoover reorganization plan, in which the Federal agencies concerned with river projects are to be consolidated into one department instead of five.

3. Control by the Western States and financing through taxes or bond issues, in order to avoid the necessity of repeated calls on Congress for authorization of projects and appropriation of money.

4. An interstate compact, under Federal auspices, with a Commission of one man each from Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana, nominated by the governors, and a chairman selected by the President.

5. A Columbia Valley Authority or Administration, modeled to some extent after the Tennessee Valley Authority; several proposals along this line are grouped under the common name CVA.

6. An independent agency directly responsible to the President, operating with its own funds and controlling its own resources, like some of the Federal banking units.

HOW DOES IT WORK?

Before attempting a solution of the five plans offered as substitutes, it may be well to examine the present set-up. Does it click as hoped? Do its wheels mesh?

That is where these explorations start.

The opening articles will merely establish, in terms of that 1830 wagon train, where we are now, and in some cases how we got this far.

Many approaches are possible—chronological, historical, geographic political, industrial, governmental, administrative, engineering. This reporter will try the human angle, the story of who does what and why.

Commissions may be set up, new boundaries established, powers delegated to this group or that, but it takes human beings to keep the machinery running. Often the success of the project depends not on the technical skill or legal acumen of the operators but their ability to get along with their fellow men.

There has to be an order of procedure, a scheme of things, a realization that the whole basin cannot be developed at once, and that pay rolls cannot be equalized among all the taxpayers all the time.

RIVALRIES MAY DELAY

The Columbia drains about 260,000 square miles. Its 1950 population is probably 3,000,000 people.

From the Continental Divide's headwaters in Wyoming to Astoria, at the river's mouth, is 750 miles. From Valemount, British Columbia, where Canoe River turns northward, to Tuscarora, Nev., is 620 miles. All these areas have to be considered.

In past years, local fights over priorities have held back development. That difficulty continues into 1950.

A river does not have a single source. It has as many sources as there are springs and creeks feeding rivulets.

It is usually said that the Columbia rises in Canada. So do the Kootenay, the Pend Oreille (Flathead), the Kettle, and the Okanogan.

Wyoming contributes the main stream of the Snake. Into it flow the Raft from Utah, the Bruneau and the Owyhee from Nevada, the many-forked Salmon and the Clearwater and Palouse from Idaho, the Grande Ronde from Oregon.

Other direct tributaries of the Columbia include the Spokane from Idaho, the Chelan, Wenatchee, and Yakima, from the eastern slopes of the Washington Cascades, the Walla Walla, Umatilla, John Day, and Deschutes from Oregon, and the Willamette and Cowlitz, whose problems are quite different from those of the upper reaches.

MANY CONFLICTS

The number of possible conflicts becomes immense when you start multiplying the number of states and nations involved by the number of counties, cities, and towns, and then again by the distinct industries, the possible uses, and the numerous local districts.

There are port districts, irrigation, drainage, soil conservation, and utility districts. There are national forests, parks, monuments, and wilderness areas.

There are Indian reservations.

And just outside the limits of the Columbia Basin, within the same political divisions, are other cities, such as Vancouver, Seattle, and Tacoma on the coast; Helena and Great Falls, Mont.; Klamath Falls, Oreg.; and Salt Lake City.

How to divide the water and arrange the priorities among all these political subdivisions, cities, towns, districts, and industries is one phase of the problem that now confronts the Pacific Northwest.

Add the clash of human ambitions and personalities.

Toss in deep-seated rivalries among 20 Federal agencies.

Stir the desires of a few hundred political leaders or would-be leaders.

Embellish with the free opinions of numerous regional, State, and local trade associations, development leagues, reclamation institutes, and chambers of commerce.

Is it any wonder that the number of possible conflicts, if stated in figures, would reach from Jasper Park to Crater Lake on a large-scale map?

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on January 29, 1950, entitled "Quit Stalling on Hawaii."

Mr. Speaker, the question of admitting Hawaii to the Union as a State is not a new one. It has been considered by successive administrations for many years now, with good reasons offered in support of such action.

The ties that link our Nation with Hawaii are more than a century old. Voyagers, traders, and missionaries from the United States were among the first occidental people who established lasting relations with the people of Hawaii, long before those islands began to play a role of importance in international affairs.

The history of Hawaii offers strong justification for the proposed admittance of that Territory to statehood. By 1854 Hawaii was already a civilized and Christianized country with constitutional government, highly creditable legislative, executive, and judicial branches, modern industries, personal and property rights secure, and the respect of other nations and independence assured.

Annexed to the United States on the eve of this century, the Hawaiian Islands became a Territory, and an integral part of our Nation on June 14, 1900. Ever since that time the people of Hawaii have been keenly interested in securing statehood. Through their elected representatives they have repeatedly petitioned Congress for statehood, and in a plebiscite in 1940 they voted in favor of statehood by majority of more than 2 to 1.

The people of Hawaii are capable of assuming the responsibility of statehood, and they have proven worthy of it. And our Nation has more than little to gain in admitting Hawaii to the Union as the forty-ninth State. The following editorial enumerates few of those advantages, and it reflects my sentiment that H. R. 49 should be passed by Congress this year.

The editorial referred to follows:

QUIT STALLING ON HAWAII

What has the United States to gain by admitting Hawaii to the Union as the forty-ninth State?

A permanent military bastion in the Pacific, of course. A vacation paradise. An area greater than the States of Delaware, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. A sturdy economic unit that last year paid $90,000,000 in Federal taxes, more than each of 11 States. And a loyal, intelligent, democratic population of 527,000.

What else would Hawaiian statehood do for us? Read what a special committee of the House of Representatives, after visiting the islands, has reported to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Admission of Hawaii will be notice to the people of the Pacific and to the world that this country intends in no sense to retreat from its position of leadership in the Pacific. * * *

"It will be reassuring to the friends of democracy. The United States will give them a practical demonstration of its belief in the democratic system of government by admitting Hawaii to the Union as a State and its people, thereby, to the full privileges of American citizenship. This example will be of far-reaching influence. * * *

"It will provide an effective answer to Communist propaganda that is undertaking to persuade the people of the Pacific, and particularly of the Far East, that there are racial barriers in the American system of Government that militate against people of oriental origin.

"It will serve to bring the people of Hawaii into closer relationship to the people of the rest of the country and the latter to a fuller appreciation of our responsibilities in the Pacific."

This country has dallied too long with the affections of the Hawaiian people. Since 1920 they have been asking for the statehood that they have earned and the representation to which they are entitled. Thirty-six statehood bills have been introduced in the Congress. There have been

at least six congressional investigations in Hawaii. There has never been any serious opposition to statehood, yet the final step is never taken.

Another statehood bill is now before the House. It should be passed there and it should be passed in the Senate. This is not only a matter of party pledges or of keeping the promise long held out to the people of Hawaii. It is, as the House committee said tersely, "in the national interest."

Comparative Welfare Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article from the Daily Times, published at Mamaroneck, N. Y., Friday, January 13, 1950, entitled "Comparative Welfare Costs":

COMPARATIVE WELFARE COSTS

Westchester County, which initiated nearly twoscore years ago much of the social reform which later was adopted at Albany for the State and tremendously amplified at Washington for the Nation, has rarely been accused of stinginess in relief for the unfortunate. And yet it is gratifying, in view of the knowledge that relief funds can easily be wasted, to learn that Westchester's welfare costs are low in comparison to those of the State and Nation.

Let's consider, for example, the three outstanding divisions of old-age assistance, dependent children, and general assistance:

Out of each 1,000 persons 65 years of age or more in Westchester, 70 receive old-age assistance. But the State average is 105.3 per 1,000 population, and the Federal average is 231.

In the matter of dependent children, out of each 1,000 children under 18 in Westchester, 14.7 receive aid. But the State average is 32.6 and the national average is 29.

Similarly, in general assistance, including that extended to veterans and home relief, the Westchester average is 5.5 per 1,000 population, the State average is 12.7, and the national average is 7.6.

In each of these three divisions, it will be noted, the Westchester costs are lower per 1,000 of population, in some cases markedly so. And since these three divisions represent the large bulk of welfare and relief recipients, it may be fairly surmised that Westchester's over-all welfare costs are lower per 1,000 than for either the State or Nation.

This gratifying factor, we are sure, is not due to niggardliness on the part of those responsible for the distribution of public welfare funds in the county. Rather, we like to believe, it is due to efficiency, elimination of waste, and a due regard for the interests of the taxpayer as well as of the applicants.

To some degree, we hasten to add, this fortunate condition may arise also from the fact that Westchester is an above-the-average county in its prosperity and per capita financial ability. But that alone would not be sufficient to bring about the pleasing comparisons enumerated above.

And, whatever the cause, we hope the results remain.

Korean Aid Bill Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following radio broadcast I made recently on the subject of aid to Korea:

A week ago the House defeated the Korean aid bill by a vote of 193 to 191. Previously a motion to recommit the bill to the Foreign Affairs Committee for further study was defeated by a vote of 194 to 190. It is most unusual for a bill to be defeated after a motion to recommit that same bill has been defeated. I cannot remember offhand any instance of this during my service in the House. I voted against providing this money for Korea. I was surprised to learn, during the debate, that our executive officials have so far made no commitment whatever to Korea. The usual policy is for the administration to make some kind of a commitment and then urge Congress to supply the funds, whether the commitment was wise or foolish, on the ground that it was a pledge made by our executives of the United States.

In the white paper on China, issued last year, Secretary Acheson and the State Department definitely declared themselves out of China and, impliedly, out of surrounding sections of Asia. South Korea is a pin-point—half a peninsula—on the Asiatic Continent. Since the State Department has declared itself out of China, I do not see how they can expect us to hold onto a pin-point on the Asiatic Continent while releasing all the neighboring territory. I have a great deal of criticism to offer on the score of our Asiatic policy, and our China policy in particular, although I hold no brief for the Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek. But our own vacillating, shifting methods were at least as much responsible for the loss of Asia as were the obvious shortcomings and corruption of the Nationalist Government. President Truman and Secretary Acheson have refused to take any steps to protect Formosa. I read Mr. Acheson's speech on this subject carefully. There is a good deal to be said in support of his contention about Formosa, in view of the policy adopted in the white paper. Some fog and doubt still surround the facts on this question, but I am perfectly willing to wait for that fog to clear before making any criticism of a decision which may be a sound and wise one.

Taking into account the Chinese white paper and the decision on Formosa, plus the fact that there is no commitment at all in connection with aid to Korea, it seemed to me that this would be money and goods thrown away, or placed where the Soviet Union could absorb it if the Soviet Union decided to do so. Furthermore, the program was a continuing one, lasting over a period of years and amounting to much more than the amount involved in this bill. South Korea is 7,000 miles from San Francisco. Freight charges would absorb 25 percent of the total appropriation—$1 out of every $4 would be used to carry the goods over there. This gives some idea of the impracticability of the whole proposition.

I was going to quote at length from the speech on the floor by Representative JACKSON of California. He is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee who opposed the bill. But after thinking it over, I decided to quote instead from Representative WALTER JUNE's speech, because he voted in favor of the bill, and hence his analysis of the objections would obviously be more impartial. Many of my friends in this area know and admire Mr. JUNE. He is also a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. While he finally voted for the bill he stated about as clearly as anyone the objection to it:

"In the first place, Korea is not essential to our security. No military man says that it is, every military man before our committee said that it is not. Also the Secretary of State last week, in a speech he made before the Press Club, is reported to have said that Formosa is not essential to our security because it is beyond a line he drew from the Aleutians through Japan and Okinawa to the Philippines. Korea is also beyond that line. If Acheson's argument regarding Formosa's dispensability is sound, then he himself ought to be opposing aid for Korea too.

"In the second place, South Korea is not tenable whenever there is any effort by Russia or her satellites to take it. I would like to quote the expert opinion of General Marshall on this point from the hearings 2 years ago when he appeared before our committee:

"'Representative JUNE. If north China and Manchuria should be taken over and organized by the Communists, do you think our position in Korea would long be tenable?'

"'Secretary MARSHALL. I think it would not be tenable.'

"So you can properly argue, if you wish that it is a waste of money to pour millions into an area which cannot be defended because of the situation we have helped produce in Manchuria and China, and an area which we have no intention of making the slightest effort to help defend. Furthermore, it may well be against the interests of Korean security to build it up industrially, making it so much more desirable a prize for Russia's agents to seize and use for Russia's interests and against our own.

"There is no question but that there are people in the State Department who think South Korea is doomed as a result in no small degree of our own Government's blunders in this whole area which they want to cover up. They ask us to put up this money now so that if and when the day comes that Korea goes, they will have their alibi already prepared. They can then issue a white paper on Korea and say: 'Well we did everything we could and Congress appropriated plenty of money. But the Government of Korea was just so incompetent and inefficient and undemocratic and corrupt that it failed to hold the support of the people and so collapsed before the Communists.'

"To those people this bill never was a bona fide effort to save Korea. It is a phony—an attempt to shift blame from themselves for the Communist conquest of Korea which they expect. If we make the money available, they can blame the Koreans; if we were not to pass the bill they could blame the Congress. In any case the primary aim to them is to get themselves off the hook in Asia, to get an excuse for their failure to save Korea all fixed up in advance.

"There is a fourth argument against the bill. I myself feel our greatest need is for a positive, over-all consistent and defensible far-eastern policy. China was important to such a policy, in fact essential to it; Formosa is vital to it. The Philippines, Japan, southeast Asia are all vital to it. South Korea is not."

In the past, our Chinese policy changed every time the wind shifted, now no policy at all.

Representative JACKSON closed his speech dramatically:

"South Korea is a Bataan without a Corregidor, a Dunkerque without a flotilla, a

dead-end street without an escape. If the Congress wills it we shall invest in a gamble of power against an opponent whose major pieces are skillfully jockeyed against both South Korea and the United States on terrain chosen by our opponent and on terms which he alone will dictate. Let us be humanitarian, but let us not close our eyes to reality in a day when the fate of a world depends upon clear judgment and straight thinking."

American Program in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, we know now that our Nation has failed miserably in its German program. We promised the denazification, demilitarization, and decartelization of Germany, but the record shows that none of these has been accomplished. The truth is that we are further than ever from our goal of a democratic Germany. Our muddling, poor management, lack of foresight, and woeful mistakes have cost us our prestige in the eyes of the world.

The collapse of the denazification program was bad enough, and the return of Nazis to great power in Germany, lamentable, but now we come to the worst of all. Shocking and incredible is the news that John J. McCloy, the American high commissioner for Germany, still hesitates to order the hangman to execute the sentences which were passed some 26 months ago on the 16 most dangerous Nazis yet alive. We hear reports that he is considering an amnesty for some of them, and they may all escape the death penalty.

The following article by John Hohenberg which appeared in the New York Post on January 30, 1950, presents the facts very clearly. I agree with the author that more than American prestige is at stake, and that American justice is on trial before the world.

Remember, the condemned had a fair trial at Nuremberg. A few short years ago, stories of their unbelievable cruelties made our blood run cold. They were the masters of the Nazi furnaces, the gas chambers—inhuman planners of mass annihilation of millions of innocent victims. We dare not forget their terrible crimes against humanity. Certainly, the time has come when we must demand that the sentences imposed at Nuremberg be carried out—and at once.

SIXTEEN WORST NAZIS, PLEAS LOST, MAY STILL ESCAPE DEATH

(By John Hohenberg)

This is the incredible and shameful story of Operation Nazi.

At Nuremberg, when the world's conscience revolted against the pitiless extermination of 6,000,000 Jews, it was designed as an act of supreme retribution.

Today it is in danger of being perverted into a bid for the political favor of the Germans who did nothing to halt the slaughter.

John J. McCloy, the American high commissioner for Germany, still hesitates to order the hangman to execute sentences which were passed up to 26 months ago on the 16 most dangerous Nazis yet alive.

There are well-founded reports that he is considering an amnesty for some of them—perhaps all.

McCloy has not forgotten that these 16 were the masters of the Nazi furnaces, the gas chambers, and the execution squads in which German, Polish, and Ukranian Jewry perished. He is reminded of it daily.

Yet, he waits. And in Washington not an official voice is raised in protest.

The State Department, preserving the diplomatic niceties, has adopted a hands-off attitude. It won't do anything for or against the most conscienceless killers of modern times. It helps to translate their appeals for clemency as a matter of convenience.

The Department of the Army, considering itself lucky to be out of Operation Nazi for the time being, acts as a transmittal agency for the writs which they shower on United States courts. Just messenger service, Army officials explain with a shrug.

Only Telford Taylor, the Army prosecutor who fought the case before the international military tribunal at Nuremberg, so far has demanded action from Commissioner McCloy.

"We have shown these Nazis far greater mercy than any convicted American murderer ever enjoyed," says Taylor. "It is time they were hanged."

But they are not.

Why?

First, the legal rights of condemned men had to be complied with. As a democratic demonstration, everybody agreed this was both just and necessary.

LONG DAY IN COURT

They were given every opportunity before the Nuremberg court to demonstrate their innocence and they failed.

Next, they waited while other Nuremberg defendants carried appeals direct to the United States Supreme Court, which refused to review the verdict of the international tribunal.

After that, still another Nuremberg defendant tried the other course of American judicial process—up the ladder through the Federal Court of the District of Columbia, the court of appeals and the Supreme Court. All three said "No."

Then a congressional investigation had to be made on whether there were irregularities in the trials. Now that is completed.

What now remains to deter McCloy?

HE REVIEWS THE REVIEWS

First of all, he has decided on his own responsibility that he must reaffirm the affirmation of sentence passed by his predecessor, General Clay.

After that he believes he must wait for still a third appeal, just filed with the assistance of American authorities, with the District Court in Washington. He need not, as Taylor points out, since that avenue already has been closed.

Finally he says he has been deluged with appeals for clemency from a host of persons for the 16 Nazis.

There is some doubt about the size of that appeal, however. Inquiries in Washington showed that from 3 to 20 letters were received for each of the 16 defendants.

Extreme right wing German Nationalists, riding back into power, could increase that a hundredfold if they chose and the pleas still would be synthetic.

APPEALS MAGNIFIED

However, the disposition is to magnify the importance of the appeals for clemency. That is done for the very good reasons known to the American authorities concerned with Operation Nazi, the men who fix policy for the State Department in Germany.

McCloy's staff takes the trouble to point out that United States lawyers are concerned with the condemned men's fate—but the names aren't available except in Berlin or Frankfurt am Main. The American lawyers are keeping carefully under cover.

A final consideration in McCloy's mind is the length of time the 16 Nazis have been under sentence of death. "Cruel and inhuman punishment," so the legal phrase goes.

TESTIMONY RECALLED

"Cruel and inhuman" for such as Paul Blobel, the architect turned mass assassin who testified before the Nuremberg tribunal:

"When the men were ready for the execution one of my leaders gave the order to shoot. Since they were kneeling at the brink of the mass grave, the victims fell, as a rule, at once into the mass grave.

"I have always used rather large execution squads, since I declined to use men who were specialists for shots in the neck. Each squad shot for about 1 hour and was then replaced."

Such are the 16 who so far have cheated the noose and who now are being considered for amnesty. Such are the factors which are threatening to transform Operation Nazi from an act of retribution into a travesty of justice.

More than American prestige in Germany is at stake.

American justice itself is on trial before the world.

Resolutions of Monroe County (Iowa) Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, on October 25, 1949, the members of the Farm Bureau of Monroe County, Iowa, met in annual meeting at Albia and adopted a set of comprehensive resolutions expressing the position of this great organization with respect to issues and problems that are before this country.

I desire to give to the Members of Congress the opportunity of knowing the position of the Farm Bureau of Monroe County, Iowa, at this time, and I include these resolutions in my extension of remarks:

MONROE COUNTY FARM BUREAU RESOLUTIONS, 1949

The members of the resolutions committee recommend the following resolutions to the general membership as policies of the organization. These resolutions are based on questionnaires completed by members at township meetings and from other current problems facing the farm people of our county.

AGRICULTURAL POLICY

1. We believe some type of farm price-support program is necessary.

2. We favor a program of flexible supports tied to the amount the commodity is in surplus with minimum guaranties or floors and a minimum of controls. We believe this program should be developed through a bipartisan approach.

3. We believe satisfactory compliance with soil-conservation practices should be a requisite to eligibility for price supports.

NATIONAL AID STATE HEALTH PROGRAM

1. We favor Federal aid to enlarge the capacity of medical schools and for construction of more hospitals and for medical research.

2. We oppose compulsory health insurance.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONSH P

1. We believe that the question of wages and working conditions, etc., are social, ethical, and economical in nature and can be settled through mediation supported by legal methods.

2. We believe in the principle of organization for self-betterment but feel that welfare of the public should be placed above the individual or group.

3. We approve some sort of extension service for the betterment of family living conditions for the urban workers.

RURAL

1. We favor changing rural mail routes so that the principle of free mail delivery becomes an actuality to all rural families as road conditions will permit.

2. We favor the establishment of a Federal agency for the purpose of setting up telephone cooperatives modeled after REA cooperative.

3. We request the American Farm Bureau Federation to institute a national advertising program to acquaint the general public with the final distribution of the consumers food dollar.

4. We believe Federal aid for farm-to-market roads should be increased.

President Truman's Budget Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE CONNECTICUT
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.,
Hartford, Conn., January 24, 1950.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: President Truman's budget message reflects a commendable determination to carry out numerous recommendations made by the bipartisan Hoover Commission to improve administration efficiency.

The Connecticut Chamber of Commerce on the whole approves the recommendations of the Hoover Commission report. We understand that approximately 20 percent of the recommendations were enacted in the last session of Congress and that this will mean ultimate savings in Government operating costs of at least $1,250,000,000. The sweeping improvements in Federal purchasing, storage, records management, and other "housekeeping" functions, which are well under way in the General Services Administration, we understand, indicate a potential saving from this source of $250,000,000.

May I take the liberty at this time of calling your attention to important Hoover Commission proposals which apparently have been ignored? The Hoover Commission recommendations on business functions conducted by the Government sought to establish a clearer demarcation between the fields of taxpaying private enterprise and Government enterprise. This was particularly true with respect to commercial banking and lending activities, electric power utilities, and certain other forms of business enterprize. Many of the Hoover recommendations were aimed at restricting Federal expansion in these fields. Of direct Government lending, for instance, the Commission said: "It opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism. * * * It invites political and private pressure or even corruption. * * * Direct lending should be absolutely avoided except for emergencies."

The President's budget message, however, advocates large Federal expansion in these various fields. It seeks additional lending powers for the RFC, an agency whose operations the Hoover Commission roundly criticized. It calls for further expansion of Federal electric power activities, including the creation of a Columbia Valley Administration in the Northwest, and it suggests similar authorities in other parts of the country. Such a program adds up to nothing less than the eventual nationalization of the electric-power industry, an objective certainly not entertained by the Hoover Commission.

The message also backs legislation to enlarge the Government's part in the Nation's home-building industry by launching a program to provide housing for middle-income groups. Other proposals for new ventures into business fields are indicated in competition with taxpaying private enterprises—all adding up to more bureaucracies, more waste, and more tax demands upon the people's pocketbooks.

The Hoover task-force committee on Federal-State relations expressed concern about the trend toward National Government encroachment on the fields traditionally reserved for State and local governments. It called for Federal withdrawal from tax fields properly belonging to State and local governments and for an overhauling of the Federal grants-in-aid structure.

The budget message virtually ignores these proposals. Instead it asks Congress to approve grants-in-aid for 1951 totaling $2,999,000,000, an increase of $738,000,000 over 1950 outlays and an all-time high figure. This increase would include $290,000,000 to initiate the controversial Federal aid to education measure now before Congress, which is opposed by many Governors and State legislatures and by many leading educators as an unwarranted attempt by the Federal Government to intrude upon a public service which is constitutionally and traditionally a State responsibility.

It is the belief of the Connecticut chamber of commerce that one of the chief reasons why the proposed 1951 budget has swelled to the size it has is the increasing tendency of both Congress and the executive branch to resort to foot-in-the-door financing devices to speed approval of new spending legislation which would otherwise encounter rough sledding on Capitol Hill.

For instance, passage of new spending programs of a continuing nature is often made easy because the legislators are told that a very modest appropriation will suffice to get them under way the first year. The extent to which the annual cost will rise in succeeding years is a matter which is seldom explored or divulged. The 1951 budget is full of large expenditures for items which once began modestly enough but have grown steadily through the years. This should provide a warning to Congress, then, to look carefully at the price tags on the many new spending measures advocated by the President or initiated by congressional committees.

Three examples of projected programs bearing a low down-payment tag but destined ultimately to require huge annual appropriations include: (1) The bill creating a National Science Foundation which would spend only $400,000 the first year but would eventually entail annual outlays of $100,000,000 and up; (2) the St. Lawrence seaway which would involve the expenditure of only $4,000,000 the first year but would eventually shoot up to a maximum of $82,000,000 annually for the next 7 years; and (3) Federal aid to education, which contemplates a $290,000,000 expenditure at the start but would reach $2,000,000,000 or more annually as soon as possible, according to the commitments of its sponsors. So on down a long list.

Another foot-in-the-door device, we feel, to get new projects started is the contract authorization, which, as you know, is a grant of authority to a Federal agency to contract for construction or other services in a given amount. This is a sound and even necessary procedure when properly used, but in recent years it has been much abused. For instance, Congress has frequently replaced part or all of a requested appropriation with a grant of contract authority in order to show a budget cut. The taxpaying public, we believe, would rather see Congress make bona fide reductions in appropriations and put an end to such subterfuges as this.

The President's 1951 budget message asks Congress to approve $3,363,000,000 in contract authorizations, of which $1,280,000,000 is for programs requiring new legislation. These sums for the most part are not included in the $42,400,000,000 spending total proposed for 1951. They are in addition to this total, and their cost would be reflected in increased expenditures for 1952 and thereafter.

I know that your desk is piled high with many current proposals now before Congress and I apologize for this long dissertion, but deemed it necessary in order to acquaint you with our opinion. We trust that at the opportune time you will give the above your serious consideration.

Respectfully yours,
WAYNE R. DICKERSON,
Executive Vice President.

Deficit Financing Is Fraudulent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star of January 28, 1950:

DEFICIT FINANCING IS FRAUDULENT

Extravagant spending by the Federal Government was made possible by the adoption of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution in 1913. This amendment gave the Government the authority to seize any part or all of the income of its citizens. Government spending was limited only by the amount which the Government dared take from voters.

Unlimited spending by the Government was made possible by the abandonment of the gold standard early in the Franklin D. Roosevelt regime. When the Government had promised to repay loans in gold, the amount of such loans was limited by the amount of gold held by the Government. But now the Government promises to repay in currency which is unlimited. Thus, we have deficit financing, based on unlimited spending, based on unlimited borrowing.

President Truman's proposal to spend $5,000,000,000 more next year than will be collected in taxation is based upon the Government's privilege of printing unlimited bonds and money. Behind deficit-financing plans is the implied hope that next year or

5 years from now, by some means not now known, tax revenue will be greater than Government expenses, so that the current deficits may be repaid. In time of business depression, such a hope might not be unreasonable, but when employment figures are high and business is active it is absurd to look to the future for a time when the Government may be better able to pay its debts.

Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, the most conservative member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, was forced to resign last fall because he sharply criticized deficit financing. Dr. Nourse said in New York this week that the 2-year deficit of $10,000,000,000 (and possibly $13,000,000,000) has stirred fears of inflation and possibly a rising uncertainty as to the stability of the dollar itself. He added:

"The first order of business in this country in 1950 is to turn from the easy acceptance of deficits as a way of life to the making of a specific and hard-headed plan of getting back to the black ink and a long-run program of sound debt management."

The alternative is certainly inflation. The Government cannot continue to spend money it does not have without inflating currency. Prices will go up as the value of money goes down. And for every cent the value of a dollar drops the Government will be defrauding its people of millions of dollars in savings. Inflation cuts down the value of life-insurance policies. It makes bonds worth less when they mature. Savings deposits shrink in value. Not even the money hoarded in a strong box can resist the destruction of inflation.

President Truman's deficit-financing proposal is a fraud upon all of the people, not only this generation but the next and the next.

President Truman's Tax Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Morris D. Ervin from the Cincinnati Times-Star of January 25, 1950:

MESSAGE FOLLOWS FAMILIAR LINES—THE PRESIDENT ON A PERSONAL TRIP FOR VOTES

(By Morris D. Ervin)

WASHINGTON, January 25.—As a revenue measure President Truman's tax message to Congress Monday is not likely to prove of much value. As a political document it is of considerable interest.

The message may result in more votes for the Truman administration. It is not likely to result in any more dollars for the United States Treasury.

The message follows the lines of an old political device. It is designed to convince the taxpayers that the incumbent administration is intent on taking from the rich to take care of the poor.

In order to accomplish this purpose Mr. Truman's message proposes that certain excise taxes, such as those on transportation, communication, and such consumer goods as electric-light bulbs be abolished or reduced. The total of the reductions which he proposes along this line would amount to about $750,000,000 a year.

But at the same time he proposes that this loss of revenue be made up by increasing the taxes, principally the income taxes on corporations, to bring in additional revenue in the amount of $1,000,000,000.

Now this message makes it appear that if Congress follows the President's recommendations, the little taxpayer will have fewer taxes to pay and the big fellow will have more taxes to pay.

BUT WILL IT?

But will it actually work that way?

Mr. Truman himself, in the first paragraph of his message sort of lets the cat out of the bag. He says that "taxes are the means by which our people pay for the activities of the Government."

Now a truer statement was never made by a President of the United States, though Franklin Roosevelt put it in a little more literary way when he said that: "Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man's brow." (That was before he was President.)

Boiled down to its essentials, what the President proposed to Congress Monday was to repeal or reduce many of the direct taxes on such commodities as electric-light bulbs, cosmetics, luggage, telephone calls, and railroad tickets. He would reduce these taxes to the point where the Government would receive something like $750,000,000 less in revenue from these sources than it now does.

But at the same time he would increase the taxes on the corporations which produce electric-light bulbs, cosmetics, luggage, and furnish telephone service and transportation, to the point where they would pay to the Government $1,000,000,000 more every year than they now do.

THEY ALSO PAY

Well, who do you suppose is going to pay for this? The answer to that one is simple. The people who buy these products and use these services. The same people who are now paying $750,000,000 a year. Under the President's proposal they would pay $1,000,000,000 a year.

There is but one source from which the Government can get revenue and that is from the people. That's what Mr. Truman himself says. It may not collect taxes directly from the little taxpayer. But it collects it from him indirectly just the same. If the ultimate consumer didn't pay these taxes then they just wouldn't be paid. He is, as a matter of fact, the only guy who can pay them.

The Government may decide to repeal direct excise taxes on such things as electric-light bulbs, for instance. And then it may decide to collect an equal amount from the manufacturer who makes electric-light bulbs.

Well, who pays the bill? The fellow who buys the electric-light bulb. If the electric-bulb manufacturer tried to pay the additional bill himself he would go broke. So he passes the bill on to the purchaser in the form of higher prices and in the end the purchaser pays the bill. Only in this case instead of paying $750,000,000 he would pay $1,000,000,000.

HE KNOWS

Now, of course, Mr. Truman knows that Congress knows all about this. It knows who pays the bill. So it isn't likely that Congress will go along with the President on the scheme which the President has proposed, that is, to reduce direct taxes on the consumer and then hand him a still bigger bill in the form of high prices.

But Mr. Truman has set up a scheme to defend himself against that. He warned Congress in plain language that if it tried to reduce direct taxes on the consumer but failed to increase consumer prices by an even larger amount he would veto the bill. Then he would be in a position to say that he had tried to reduce taxes for the "little fellow" but Congress wouldn't pass the bill on to the "big fellow."

And in that case, unless, of course, Congress overrode his veto, the tax structure would remain exactly what it is now and Mr. Truman would get credit for a good try.

As stated before, the President's message is not likely to rank with Alexander Hamilton's famous reports on the fiscal affairs of the United States. But it is more than a little likely to rank as a political document of considerable interest.

Relations With Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, during the months of November and December 1949 my colleagues, the Honorable JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, the Honorable THOMAS S. GORDON, the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS, and I traveled in Europe as a study group designated by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. All of us except Mr. JAVITS visited in Spain on December 9, 10, and 11.

At the request of certain Spanish newspapermen we prepared a statement to be issued to the Spanish press. Our statement, issued on behalf of the group by Mr. PFEIFER, was based upon questions raised by the newspapermen. In answering them, we sought to shed light on certain misimpressions which our conversations had indicated as prevalent in Spain. We had found a disposition to believe that any Congressman's view necessarily reflected the view of our Government, a misunderstanding of executive and legislative interrelationships in our constitutional process, an apparently overoptimistic assurance about the future of relations between our country and Spain, and a feeling that the resolution of issues between the two countries depended solely upon actions to be taken by the United States.

Our statement was an honest effort to bring these matters into proportion. This statement was the only one made by the Pfeifer subcommittee in Spain, notwithstanding any other attributions or quotations which may have appeared in the press here or abroad.

The Spanish press reacted in a manner that we had not anticipated. I see no point in reviewing here the editorial remarks made about us in the Madrid press. Apparently, however, the Spanish reaction has caused the belief among our colleagues that we issued a hostile statement in Spain. To clear up that misunderstanding, it is well to publish the text of the statement:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, DEMOCRAT, NEW YORK, MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, AT MADRID, SPAIN, DECEMBER 10, 1949

This statement has been prepared in consultation with my colleagues, the Honorable THOMAS S. GORDON, Democrat, of Illinois, and the Honorable CLEMENT L. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin. It has their full concurrence.

We are three members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives. That committee exercises primary jurisdiction for the House in regard to legislative problems bearing on the conduct of American foreign policy. The committee includes 25 members. We do not speak for all of them. We speak only for ourselves.

It is always well for people of other countries to keep in mind the proportions and principles of American politics and constitutional traditions when they evaluate statements by visiting Congressmen. Any Member of the Congress speaks only for himself. He controls only his own vote. Our Congress has 531 Members—435 of them in the House and 96 in the Senate. Thus any Member can speak for only about one-fifth of 1 percent of the total membership. It is well that you avoid exaggeration of the importance of passing statements by American Congressmen.

Keep in mind this, also. We have an explicit and long-established constitutional system in the United States. Under that system the primary authority in foreign affairs is an executive function. It is not a congressional function. I do not mean to imply that our foreign affairs are carried on without responsibility. Far from it—our President, as well as our legislators, is responsible to our electorate. He derives his powers only through mandates developed in free elections which must be held periodically. So do not misinterpret what I say when I emphasize that foreign affairs are primarily an executive concern in our country.

Now that I have set the proportions of this statement, I shall go on to a few questions that I have been asked.

I have been asked about the attitude of the Americans toward Spain.

I trust there is no doubt in the minds of Spaniards that the attitude of Americans toward them is friendly. In America we have many jokes about the characteristics of the peoples of other nations. It is in point, however, that we have no stock jests about Spaniards. Spaniards as a people are always spoken of in terms of esteem. Furthermore, a large part of the United States was first influenced by European institutions through the agency of Spain. The institutions of Christianity and the culture of Europe first came to our West as a result of the endeavors of Spaniards.

Spain is a land of romance and heroism in the American mind. Spaniards are thought of in terms of friendship and respect. I think that will endure far beyond the passing difficulties of the moment. I am reassured in this thought by the fine hospitality—the genuine courtesy—that my colleagues and I have enjoyed during every moment of our stay in Madrid.

I have been asked what is the United States going to do about Spain? I think the order of the question is wrong. I do not mean to be harsh when I say that Spain is a secondary problem to the United States. The United States, however, is a primary problem to Spain. The real question is this: What is Spain going to do about the United States? Only the Spaniards themselves can answer that question.

I have been asked to comment on the question of a loan to Spain. Such loans in our country come under the authority of the Export-Import Bank. It is a public institution chartered by Congress and administered by our Executive. The decision ultimately would have to be an executive decision. It would be a presumption for me to attempt to give an answer to so complex a question after so brief a stay in Spain.

I trust, however, that an answer satisfactory to the aspirations of the Spanish people can be worked out. But let me say, again, that it is a matter not simply for the United States to settle. It is, in the last analysis, a question for Spain and the Spanish people to settle. So, I repeat: What is Spain going to do about the United States?

Mr. Speaker, further I would like to include and call attention to the following letter written by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, which appeared in the New York Times of January 13, 1950, and which reflects my personal sentiments for a revised policy for Spain:

A REVISED POLICY FOR SPAIN—CASE FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF RELATIONS WITH PRESENT REGIME PRESENTED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES.

In the current discussion about friendship with Spain an important admission was made in the Times' editorial (Recognizing Franco, December 22, 1949). This reads as follows:

"It was wrong and short-sighted to withdraw the chiefs of diplomatic mission in the first place."

One could go further and acknowledge that the policy of attempted ostracism, adopted under an impression that the Soviets would be suitably appeased, has proved not only bad in principle but also a failure in practice.

It had exactly the opposite effect to that intended: it consolidated overwhelming popular sentiment behind the head of the Spanish state as the symbol of resistance against outside interference. Indeed, according to the Madrid correspondent of the New York Times, the present administration in Spain is stronger than ever. For that result, the constant drumfire of foreign dictation is largely responsible.

The Times is correct, and so was Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, in pointing out that the Spanish question should be considered in its "proper framework" and in the light of all pertinent resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly. But readers of the Times have a right to expect the whole record to be rehearsed and studied.

Although the so-called Franco Fascist regime, without any opportunity for self-defense, was denounced and a resolution was passed in 1946 recommending the withdrawal of chiefs of diplomatic mission from Madrid, it is untrue to assert that such a policy has been reaffirmed by the Assembly.

FAILED OF TWO-THIRDS VOTE

When the identical 1946 resolution was brought up again in 1947, according to the rules, by the Soviet-dominated Polish delegation, it failed to receive the necessary two-thirds vote and in the official minutes of the General Assembly reporter was recorded as rejected.

This is one reason why many experts on international law, including Dr. Edwin Borchard, of Yale University, and Dr. George Finch, former editor of the American Journal of International Law, judge the 1946 resolution to be invalid. Consequently, a number of nations, including some in the Western Hemisphere, considered themselves free to maintain, or to restore, a full complement of diplomatic officials in Spain.

More recently, in May 1949, a decisive majority (26 to 15, with 16 abstentions) supported the motion, proposed by Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, and Peru, to leave all nations free to send, or not to send, ambassadors and ministers plenipotentiary to Madrid.

At the same time, and this is a point of genuine importance, the proposal of Sovietized Poland to repeat the 1945–46 denunciation of the present Spanish Government as Fascist and as having been imposed by the Axis was soundly beaten by a vote of 32 to 11. A similar fate, by more resounding majorities, was inflicted upon all other resolutions urged upon the UN by the iron curtain bloc in the General Assembly. With the defeat of these Soviet-inspired motions, the whole case against Spain fell to the ground.

REVIEW OF POLICY

In view of this historical sequence, it would appear to be reasonable to expect our country, democratically, to review its Spanish policy without delay. Since a mistake, admittedly, was made in 1946, the sooner we admit our error and try to repair the damage done, the more secure will be the people of the United States and the more advantageously we can provide for our national interests.

If we do what is right there is no solid ground for belief that the shock to public opinion in western Europe, and especially in France and Great Britain, would be enormous. Has not Winston Churchill called, repeatedly, for a revision of the bankrupt policy toward Spain? Did not the French Government, despite Leftist clamors, reopen its Pyrenees frontier and resume a lucrative trade with the Spanish people? Has it been forgotten that the Times of London, calling for an end to hypocrisy, in a powerful leading article (April 28, 1949), described the attempted ostracism of Spain a futile gesture?

The public, here and abroad, will recognize a policy of good will and fairness toward the people of Spain.

DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING,
Associate Editor of World Affairs.
WASHINGTON, *January 10, 1950.*

Clear Channel in Radio Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANK WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

CLEAR CHANNEL IN RADIO FIELD

Come February 1, United States representatives will meet in Habana with Cuban spokesmen in an effort to reach an understanding on Cuba's demands for larger representation in the field of clear-channel broadcasting. If Cuba wins its point, necessarily will be involved impairment of improvement to present rural radio service in this country.

The recent Montreal conference on the same subject adjourned without agreement. Clearly some sort of treaty on the allocation of international radio frequency is a necessity to prevent interference. At the present time there is a high degree of voluntary cooperation. The persistent Cuban demand in the face of a lack of engineering standards and control in that republic is a good indication that the best solution will be treaty [illegible].

Our own clear-channel broadcasting is considerably perturbed by the situation. Affected principally are rural areas which can only be adequately served by clear-channel stations. Various farmer marketing groups have gone on record as to dependence on the service for price quotations. Consumers are interested in commodity prices and conditions. Weather reports are of extreme value.

Rural America is dead set against any agreement that will permit inroads on radio channels utilized by the United States. Broadcasting interests realize that the best basis for international dickering lies in complete utilization of clear-channel service now open to domestic service.

Few American observers believe that Cuba could possibly utilize now all of the stations which it asks. But Cuba may be using the familiar bargaining figure device as a means to an end.

The question of international distribution of frequencies has never been given the attention that it deserves. This country, the home of radio-broadcasting development, early set up its own national domestic regulation. But the question of power and frequency beyond the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission will require all of the official skill we have to arbitrate. Certainly everything possible should be done to strengthen our position when we come to the bargaining table.

They Do as They Are Told

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, you own a 112-acre farm in Texas. You want to raise 75 acres of cotton in 1950, to meet your expenses. You thought you could decide what you ought to plant, did you? But, your Government at Washington tells you, you may not plant any cotton this year.

If this sounds like an episode from police state Russia, let me quote the full text of the farmer's letter, as I find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 3, 1950, at page 19:

CHEVY SHADE, TEX., December 22, 1949.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress.

DEAR SIR: I did not get any cotton acreage for the year 1950. I wonder just why. Seems to me like it was an unfair thing. They tell me it was because I did not have cotton in 1946-47-48.

I had truck crops, and seems they did not give me any credit for any war crops. Way things are going to be next year, we may not sell truck stuff, and we have a farm to pay for. I am expecting you to do all you can to help me get an allotment. I think a 75 farm should have a few acres, don't you?

We have 112½ acres and 75 acres in cultivation, and are not allowed any cotton at all.

I appreciate whatever you can do to help me.

ALLEN E. HELLWELL.

A poor, helpless, frightened citizen feels the iron hand of remote bureaucracy. Maybe he has mortgage payments to meet. He wants to plant a money crop to meet his interest.

Here is what our Government—not Russia—wrote to a farmer in New York who wanted to raise his wheat allotment to 21 acres from the 12 acres assigned to him by the Government:

SEPTEMBER 1, 1949.

T. E. MEARSHAW,
Churchville, N. Y.

DEAR WHEAT GROWER: You have expressed a desire in writing for a reconsideration of your wheat allotment for 1950.

The county agricultural conservation committee have set aside Tuesday, September 6, from 1 to 5 p. m., to hear each farmer individually state his reasons for wanting his allotment increased.

You will be given 5 minutes to tell why your allotment is not satisfactory.

Stop at our office at 113 Federal Building for your number in line.

Failure to appear at this hearing may be considered a waiver of your right in connection with such appeal.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR G. ODELL,
Co-Assistant in Conservation.

Mr. Milliman wrote me saying that—

A farmer is helpless in his desire to escape Government controls and at the same time make his farm break even.

For the farm-support price makes the Government the only market possible for his crop. It is much higher than the open-market price which is greatly depressed by huge surpluses.

Yes, farmers may appeal.

But before their appeals are decided, in some far-away place, before some bureaucratic hearing to which they cannot even afford to travel, the time for planting will be gone.

If they do appeal, they have to go to the desk of a bureaucrat and get the number which tells their place in line. Then they are allowed the whole of 5 minutes to tell their story to the all-powerful judge who decides what they may do on their farms.

Will the Truman police state crush these poor farmers into insolvency in the boom of 1950?

If so, remember that this bankruptcy has been dictated from Washington, in the name of the Socialist state. It has claimed that it can build houses and manage crops and prices better from Washington than the people can manage for themselves.

These letters help us in America to see what every other country knows—that Central Government management must be measured in the end by what it does to individual citizens. To our far-away Federal Government they are the poor, helpless, faceless creatures of the States and the counties.

They have no choice but to do as they are told by our very own all-powerful, omnipotent, morally bankrupt Federal Socialist Government.

This is socialism—American variety, in action—here today.

Conciliation and Consultation, Not Coercion, Answer to FEPC Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, a logical and convincing argument for a moderate approach to the problem of discrimination in industry has been voiced by the Christian Science Monitor, one of the Nation's foremost newspapers. In an editorial appearing on January 27, the newspaper discussed proposed FEPC legislation and concluded, "The real reliance is on education and consultation."

Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to the use of force in advancing a policy of nondiscrimination in industry. However, I do believe that the Federal Government should concern itself with this problem. For that reason, I have introduced H. R. 6668, which would employ education and consultation as proposed in the editorial.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the editorial from the Christian Science Monitor:

WHEN ARGUMENTS CONFLICT

Are opponents of civil-rights legislation helping their cause by desperate maneuvers to stave off a debate and vote in Congress? We doubt it.

By obstructive tricks they not only risk damaging democratic legislative processes; they fail to put the emphasis clearly on sound reasons for their position—reasons which should be well weighed by the Nation.

Some of these reasons are based on rights which conflict with civil rights. One is the right of local self-government, usually expressed as States' rights. The Constitution expressly reserved to the people and the States powers not granted to the Federal Government. Such legal rights are supported by practical political wisdom and real questions of justice.

For instance, the civil-rights proposal now most hotly contested—the FEPC bill—would infringe the right of employers and union members to choose their associates. It may be argued that they should be willing to choose their associates without regard to race or religion. But there is a vital difference between should and must. When the State tells the individual how he must choose his associates it is interfering with a peculiarly intimate freedom. To correct one injustice it is committing another.

Quite possibly one injustice is greater than the other, and if the State's attempt at correction promised to be effective, it would be more nearly justified. But the State—happily—is not omnipotent. It cannot by law overnight change social customs and individual concepts of right. There is no question that a Federal FEPC act would be nullified, much as the Stamp Act was nullified before the American Revolution. Without defending nullification—although most Americans rejoice in the Boston Tea Party—we recall that Edmund Burke's statesmanship recognized the folly of inducting a whole people and of trying by coercion to achieve a result which demanded conciliation.

American constitutional practice recognizes that majority opinion is not always a safe basis for legislation. On some questions the intensity of minority opinion is so great as to make compulsion unwise. In the case of FEPC, the fact that divisions of opinion run along sectional lines makes it pertinent to ask if an attempt at coercion will not stir up dangerous bitterness and delay reform.

We can all agree that progress out of discrimination is urgently necessary. This newspaper feels so deeply on the subject that it has supported careful antilynching and anti-poll-tax legislation. Much southern opinion seeks actively to eradicate lynching and would open the polls to literate Negroes. Thus legislation on these subjects has the hope of local support. But FEPC is a different matter. Even in the Northern States which have adopted FEPC laws there have been only the most gingerly attempts at enforcement. The real reliance is on education and consultation.

This method should be extended and tested far more fully before any Federal coercion is attempted. Probably no one who has not experienced the injustices suffered by minorities can know how essential reforms have become. But a sound recipe would be 1 part coercion to 10 parts Christianity—a far greater effort to put ourselves in our brothers' place and love our neighbors as ourselves.

Central Arizona Project Will Cost Over $1,600 Per Acre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona, my good friend Mr. MURDOCK, has made reference to certain remarks made by Congressman RICH appearing on pages 1130 and 1131 of the RECORD for January 30. The gentleman from Arizona took exception to the figures used by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in describing the cost of the proposed fantastic and unsound central Arizona irrigation project. Mr. Chairman, as proposed by this project water would be pumped a height of 1,000 feet into an aqueduct over 300 miles in length to take irrigation water to lands in central Arizona.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania referred to the fact that the cost would be $1,250,000,000 to $1,500,000,000 and equal $1,600 per acre for land in cultivation having a value of about $200 per acre. The gentleman from Arizona stated that the gentleman from Pennsylvania had his decimal point in the wrong place, inferring I presume that the cost would be nearer $160 per acre. Mr. Speaker, I rise in defense of the gentleman from Pennsylvania—he was too conservative in those figures he gave.

Here are the facts taken from the record of the hearings on the proposed bill, H. R. 934, which would authorize the proposed project.

The Bureau of Reclamation in its report and in the testimony of its engineers stated that if the project was not constructed 150,000 acres of land now in cultivation would go out of production and some 73,000 acres which had been in production at some time in the past but was not cultivated now would have to remain out of production. No witness for either the Bureau or Arizona could identify the 73,000 acres or tell where it was located—it is our belief it is new land which would be developed. Incidentally, the Bureau's figures show that about one-half of the water made available for delivery to the land would be required by this 73,000 acres. However, let us accept these figures and say that if the central Arizona project is not constructed, 225,000 acres of land will be out of production; and remember, Mr. Chairman, that is the end result which this irrigation project is supposed to avoid.

Now as to cost—and I again quote from the record—let us consider only the construction costs chargeable to irrigation—exclude power, flood control, recreation, and all other construction costs from the picture and here is what we find.

Without the 80-mile tunnel—which is included in the bill—the total irrigation construction cost is estimated at $399,424,000. Apply this against the 225,000 acres and you find it equals a cost of slightly more than $1,775 per acre—the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated the figure as $1,600 per acre.

Including the 80-mile tunnel and related features, as provided for in the bill, the total irrigation construction cost would be increased by another $550,000,000 making it $949,424,000 for the 225,000 acres this would amount to a cost of about $4,219. Is it any wonder, Mr. Chairman, that we call this project fantastic and unsound?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to the statement by the gentleman from Tennessee, who replied in part to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, which appears on page 1131 of the RECORD. My colleague from Tennessee stated that power to be produced by this project will in time repay the total cost of the project to the Government. He did not tell you that it is proposed to write off as nonreimbursable around $80,000,000 of the cost. He did not tell you that the Government would never receive a cent of interest on this $1,250,000,000 used to build the project. As a matter of fact, after the power has repaid its own cost to the Government, without interest, most of what is left would be required to pay the annual irrigation, operation, and maintenance expenses.

The records show that the total charges the irrigators are able to pay for the water they receive, will equal only about 60 percent of the cost of the power used to pump the water the 1,000 feet of lift into the aqueduct. In other words, sale of commercial power will have to pay the entire construction cost of the pumping plants, aqueduct, and distribution and drainage systems as well as the operation and maintenance costs of such.

End War Tax Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my esteemed colleagues in the House that Thursday, February 2, is a significant day. Thursday has been designated End War Tax Day.

On that day, businessmen from all parts of our country will be sending telegrams of protest to the House Ways and Means Committee and ask for immediate action to report on a bill ending excise taxes.

The reason is simple. The American people were given to understand by high ranking Government officials that excise taxes would be reduced. As a result the people stopping buying dozens and dozens of commodities bearing heavy, unfair, unrealistic, and unwarranted wartime imposed excise taxes.

As a result business has suffered from an administration-inspired buyer's strike which is bankrupting some businesses, severely damaging many others. The buyer's strike is causing widespread unemployment, reduction of production and pay rolls, and threatens to continue until we act to end the war taxes—not just threaten to end them.

Businessmen everywhere are being urged to wire the Ways and Means Committee on End War Tax Day to ask for action, and to point out to our economically naive administration that the end of war taxes does not call for new taxes on business. Such a step would continue to penalize consumers who pay all the taxes anyway.

The end of war taxes will boost consumption, increase production, aid employment, and return to the Government in increased corporation and personal income taxes more money than is now realized by the war taxes.

The day businessmen will tell that to Congress is this Thursday—End War Tax Day.

A Reporter Looks at Whittaker Chambers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able of the many reporters who covered the trial of Alger Hiss for perjury was Victor Lasky of the New York World-Telegram and the Sun.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include an article by him which appeared on January 26 and which sets forth his observations on the conduct of Mr. Chambers during the course of the trial. The article follows:

Ever since Whittaker Chambers told Congress of Communist penetrations in high places he has been the target of a slander campaign which employed every smear and lie technique known to the Communists.

For 18 months Mr. Chambers was called a madman, a pathological liar, an unstable character, a stool pigeon. All because he told the truth. A Federal court jury decided Saturday that he had spy network in Washington in which Alger Hiss was a productive cohort.

The story has made the rounds that Mr. Chambers was consumed by hate and a desire for vengeance in naming Alger Hiss. Why he should have felt this way was never explained by Mr. Hiss. But the facts show otherwise.

They show that Mr. Chambers first told his story in 1939 to the President's security officer, Mr. Chambers gave Adolf A. Berle, Jr., the names of Hiss and numerous other underground Communists. He urged Mr. Berle to ease them out of sensitive Government posts quietly in order to protect the Reds.

Apparently nothing was done. Alger Hiss rose to new heights in the State Department—traveling with Mr. Roosevelt to Yalta and directing the formation of the United Nations later in San Francisco.

Mr. Chambers also rose in the community. He thought he had done his duty in warning Mr. Berle. It was while he was earning $30,000 a year as senior editor of Time that he was subpenaed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Hiss, caught in a web of lies before the House group, came up with the theory that his accuser was crazy. But he admitted having no knowledge. Nevertheless the smear, fed by the Communist propaganda machine, spread through the land.

As Hiss was soon forced to admit that he had known his accuser, the anti-Chambers campaign grew more vicious. Sex vilification was employed.

Whittaker Chambers and his courageous wife said nothing to strike back. They could only await the outcome of the Hiss trial. And a jury of eight women and four men finally vindicated him. They decided on the basis of a mountain of evidence that Mr. Chambers was telling the truth and that it was Hiss who had lived a fantastic lie.

And what did Mr. Chambers say of the verdict? "It would be inhuman to gloat over another man's misfortunes."

Here is a statement of dignity and kindliness which should move even the emotions of a defense psychiatrist.

The Patriotic Contribution of Our Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the address I recently delivered before a meeting of the members of Post No. 32, Jewish War Veterans of the United States. The assembly took place on January 22, 1950, at Worcester, Mass., and the proceedings were broadcast over Station WAAB, in Worcester.

The address follows:

Comrade Commander, officers and members of Worcester Post, No. 32, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, I was very happy to receive the cordial invitation to attend the installation exercises of this post tonight, and was very glad that my congressional schedule was such as to permit me to come here on this occasion, to be with you, the members of this great organization; an organization that was founded 53 years ago.

I think very few people know that it is the oldest organized group of American war veterans existing today, with the possible exception of the Grand Army of the Republic.

The founders of this great organization desires to insure that their descendants would carry on the principles that have made our country the freest in the world.

Most of us are descendants from immigrants, the sons and daughters of men and women who were forced to leave the countries of Europe because of persecutions, because of their race, color, or religious beliefs. Yes, your fathers and mothers fled from lands ruled by Czars and Kaisers, to this country where they could wear a badge of service, but never one of servitude.

That they were ever grateful for this haven where opportunities were so numerous, can never be questioned, whether in peace or war.

In all the wars in which our country has been engaged, the number of Jewish men and women of our armed forces has been larger than the ratio of the American Jewish people to the total population of our country.

They fought to preserve our freedoms and became war casualties in order that no American, whatever his religion, whatever his race, would ever become a victim of tyrannical dictatorship.

They met the first responsibility of good citizenship by defending our country and her philosophy of life in time of war.

You, and I, and all veterans seek for our country, in peace, nothing more than we sought for her in war. We want her to endure as the freest nation in the world. We want her major export always to be the ideals of human liberty and equal opportunity, upon which she has risen to become the great hope of mankind in this hour of world confusion.

You have demonstrated heroic patriotism as members of the armed forces of the United States. I know, and the people of this country know, that the Jewish War Veterans, as citizens, will continue to accept their full share of our cooperative responsibility in preserving America as the land of the free and the light of the world.

FEPC Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Emergency Civil Rights Mobilization, which was held recently in Washington, was conducted in good American spirit and in orderly fashion. Those who organized this rally in Washington should be commended for this accomplishment, no less than for rejecting the support of the Communists and fellow-travelers who made futile efforts to join in on the civil rights mobilization effort and to capitalize on it for their purposes.

The story about this rally in Washington written by Henry Lee Moon appeared in the New Republic, on January 30, 1950, as follows:

FEPC RALLY IN WASHINGTON

(By Henry Lee Moon)

Sponsored by 60 national organizations, the emergency civil-rights mobilization brought to Washington more than 4,000 delegates from 32 States for a 3-day conference and mass lobby, January 15-17. Their presence in Washington dramatized the mounting pressure among rank-and-file members of liberal organizations throughout America for early enactment of the civil-rights program to which both Republicans and Democrats pledged support in their party platforms of 1948.

Observers agreed that the gathering of so large and varied a group was significant in that it was composed of non-Communist, and in many instances strongly anti-Communist, supporters of civil rights. The mobilization, initiated by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, sought primarily the enactment of the fair-employment-practices bill in this session of Congress. Leaders of the movement believed that this objective would be impaired by the participation of Communist elements.

Shortly after the announcement of the mobilization, William L. Patterson, national executive secretary of the Civil Rights Congress, wrote a letter to Roy Wilkins, acting NAACP secretary and chairman of the mobilization, offering the support and cooperation of the CRC and suggesting that Ben Davis, Paul Robeson, Henry Wallace, and Vito Marcantonio be invited to address the Washington conference.

Citing past experience with Communist-dominated organizations and challenging the claim of Communists to be supporters of civil rights, Wilkins rejected Patterson's offer. "We want none of that unity today," he said. "We do not believe that it will contribute to the success of the campaign. On the contrary, we believe it will be a distinct handicap."

Nevertheless, units of the American Labor Party, the Progressive Party, the Young Progressives of America, the suspended CIO unions and other left-wing groups persisted in trying to crash the mobilization. To avert their infiltration, rigid accreditation requirements were set up and a credentials committee appointed under the chairmanship of Willard S. Townsend, veteran foe of the Communists, president of the United Transport Service Employees, CIO, and a vice president of the NAACP. Delegates who failed to present proper credentials on the stationery of an accredited organization and signed by a responsible officer thereof were denied registration. Known Communists were summarily turned back by the committee.

Among the delegates there was unanimity in giving priority to FEPC and other civil-rights measures. Labor delegates from AFL and CIO unions subordinated their demands for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Delegates from the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith sacrificed the opportunity to press for enactment of a nondiscriminatory DP bill.

More than half of the delegates were from local branches of the NAACP. While the majority were Negro, from a quarter to a third were white men, women, and youths from labor, church, Jewish, Catholic, fraternal, veteran, youth, and civic organizations. The presence at the conference of both Negro and white delegates from the Southern States belied the contention that the people of that region are solidly opposed to civil-rights legislation. Among the 291 delegates from the South was an all-white group of 35 from the University of North Carolina. There were also delegations from such institutions as the University of Chicago, Howard, Brooklyn College, and Sarah Lawrence.

For the most part, the delegates were courteously received by their Congressmen. However, there is the story of the 8-person delegation from Texas which visited the offices of 18 Texas Representatives and was received by only 2. The delegates, however, came armed. In each of the 18 offices they left a petition signed by more than 5,000 registered Negro voters in the Representative's district, expressing their desire for the enactment of civil-rights legislation and indicating that they would vote in the Democratic primaries only for candidates who supported the party's platform.

While making it clear that they intended to meet the congressional foes of civil rights at the polls, the delegates indulged in no threats, denunciations, or wrangling with Congressmen. They were serious, orderly, resolute. And on Capitol Hill they made a favorable impression.

The tone of the conference was set by Wilkins when he said in the keynote address at the Sunday night meeting:

"We come today as representatives of 60 national organizations who are interested in American legislation, for the rights of American citizens, in the interest of America and of no other state. We are not here for malicious heckling and embarrassment except as the citation of your shameless congressional record embarrasses. We are here to demand our rights. We are here to protest and to reason with our elected Representatives. We will be heard here and when we return to our homes."

The delegates sought commitments from Members of the House not only to vote for FEPC but also to vote against the dangerous backward step recently proposed by the

House Rules Committee. They buttonholed Senators in an effort to line up votes for cloture as well as for the bills. From President Truman they received assurance that the administration would seek a vote on civil-rights measures if it took all summer.

Psychiatry on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, the appearance of two psychiatrists as defense witnesses at the recent trial of Alger Hiss for perjury has created a great deal of controversy in medical and legal circles.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article which appeared in the New Leader on January 14 by Ellen Johns and one which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and the Sun on January 24 by Victor Lasky.

[From the New Leader of January 14, 1950]

PSYCHIATRY SET BACK 50 YEARS BY TESTIMONY AT HISS TRIAL

(By Ellen Johns)

Psychiatric history was made in a Federal courtroom last week when Dr. Carl A. L. Binger, a practicing psychiatrist and editor of the American Journal of Psychosomatic Medicine, delivered his own profession a blow from which it may well take 50 years to recover.

Testifying in defense of Alger Hiss at his second perjury trial in an effort to discredit the testimony of Whittaker Chambers, the chief Government witness, Dr. Binger proposed to demonstrate a psychopathic motivation both for the appearance of Whittaker Chambers against Hiss and for the body of his evidence. In response to a droning 60-minute reading of a hypothetical question by stubby defense attorney Claude B. Cross, Dr. Binger delivered his considered opinion that Mr. Chambers is a psychopathic personality.

In a rich and rolling baritone which never hesitated and once or twice could not be stopped, he proceeded to demonstrate his enjoyment of the role of expert witness, as well as his shocking contempt for the responsibilities the position entails. He showed repeatedly a definite bias against the subject he was analyzing, in one instance drawing a severe reprimand from correct and courtly Judge Goddard, who reminded him, "Doctor, you are here as a witness and not as an advocate."

As Binger continued the earlier rigid tension of the courtroom was punctuated from time to time by whispered comments which soon deteriorated into laughter, quiet but unmistakable. By the absurdities he repeatedly accepted as a basis for his evidence, by his feeble documentation both of the judgment he delivered and the justification for delivering it at all, he handed skeptics and enemies of psychiatry—the doubters, the haters, and those who fear its implications—a better case against his fledgling science than they could ever assemble by themselves.

Assuming the truth of the defense "question"—a complex fabric of truth, hearsay, and downright falsity, to no part of which Binger offered any objection or qualification—the good doctor announced his diagnosis of "psychopathic personality." This "disease," he said, has been well known and accepted for all of 15 years. He failed to mention that among psychiatrists in general, there is serious doubt of the existence of any such "disease," and that it is a catch-all term which is constantly being redefined and reclassified. Yet he listed among the symptoms "omission of significant truth." He stated categorically, in elaborating on the symptoms that "anything is consistent with the diagnosis," and admitted that there are no statistics on its incidence.

For each of 8 of the 12 symptoms he claimed to find, he could demonstrate only one example of "characteristic" behavior in the 33 typed pages of assumptions which had guided his diagnosis. For 4 other of the 12 symptoms, the "pathological behavior" was something Mr. Chambers had described himself as doing under Communist Party orders or in his efforts to protect himself from the party's wrath after his break. Other bases for Dr. Binger's serious consideration were Chamber's admission that he had lied to the dean at college; that he had written an anti-religious playlet only 2 years after having been caught reading the Bible; that he failed to recall one pen-name he had used (although he did recall a long series of party aliases); and that a character, Sebastian, in Class Reunion, a novel Chambers translated from the German of Franz Werfel, had "certain abnormalities" and "no conscience, like Chambers."

Dr. Binger found it a pathological symptom that on the witness stand Chambers had admitted to perjury about the famous documents, "without apparent contrition, remorse, or shame." He implied thereby that psychiatrists do not expect a mature adult to be in control of his emotions in public. He took no consideration of Mr. Chambers' explanation that he had committed the perjuries deliberately and consciously in order to protect Alger Hiss.

Dr. Binger found Mr. Chambers extraordinarily indifferent to the feelings of others, in spite of public statements such as his reply to reporters' questions after Hiss was indicted: "I would be inhuman if I could take any pleasure in Mr. Hiss' personal troubles."

Not long after citing as a pathological symptom one instance of Chambers' inability to remember what day in April 1931 he had been married, Dr. Binger admitted to a 5-year error in his own recollection of a date. He called it pathological behavior that Mr. Chambers had often looked at the ceiling during his 5 days on the witness stand in the first trial (Judge Goddard was looking at the ceiling at this point in Binger's testimony) and undertook to add mind-reading to his own accomplishments. "He looked at the ceiling as if trying to recall what he had previously said," Binger explained.

In offering his qualifications as expert, Dr. Binger had described his medical career: medicine, epidemiology, researcher in physiology, and finally psychiatry. But he labeled Chambers' different jobs in and out of the Communist Party as clinical evidence of instability. This despite the fact that Mr. Chambers is enjoying the nineteenth year of his marriage and that he was an editor for Time for 10 years. Such trifles obviously, were not material to the analysis.

Dr. Binger found it very strange that Mr. Chambers recalled so commonplace an occurrence as a policeman directing traffic with an Easter lily in his hand. He declared that Chambers joined the Communist underground as a symbolic burial because of a sense of guilt over his brother's suicide—a tragedy which had taken place some 8 years previously. He stated that Chambers' reported claim to know more communism than Stalin and his remark that lying takes many forms, there are liars all about us were proof of paranoid thinking. Malcolm Cowley's unsupported assertion that Chambers accused Francis B. Sayre of heading an underground cell was proof that Chambers was given to pathological accusation. He declared flatly that Chambers was self-centered, and all but stated that when Chambers wrote an article subtitled "The Devil," he was necessarily referring to himself.

Dr. Binger thought it utterly outside the realm of rational explanation that when Chambers withheld the documents from the underground as hostage against possible kidnaping of himself or his family, he should have given them to his lawyer-nephew Nathan Levine rather than place them in a safety box to which he would have held the key.

Not content to stay within his own province of psychiatry, Dr. Binger offered to qualify as a literary expert as well by his judgments on some of Chambers' writings. Giving a resume of a story called The Dam Fool, Dr. Binger was outraged that although he tells the story of a mollycoddle he acts as though he were a hero. Significantly holding back part of the truth. Dr. Binger did not mention that Chambers had discovered and then translated Bambi, a classic of children's literature. Instead, he declared that "all of Chambers' writings and translations emphasized the witness' abnormal characteristics."

One spectator remarked at the end of Dr. Binger's testimony, "That doctor should have his head examined." Since no reputable psychiatrist will attempt analysis without long and repeated personal interviews and the cooperation of the patient, nor attempt clinical assessment of evidence out of context, it is unlikely that we will have a psychiatric explanation of Dr. Binger's motives in appearing as a voluntary witness in the Hiss case.

But the grudging respect that the psychiatric profession has won through the high seriousness of purpose and careful qualification of a majority of its members is worth fighting for. Perhaps its guardians will not be too dismayed by Dr. Binger's body blow to launch a counterattack.

[From the New York World-Telegram and the Sun of January 24, 1950]

HISS VERDICT STIRS CONTROVERSY: JURY VS. PSYCHIATRISTS

(By Victor Lasky)

The appearance of two mental specialists as defense witnesses at the Alger Hiss perjury trial has set off a storm of debate in legal and psychiatric circles.

Both Drs. Carl A. L. Binger and Henry Alexander Murray testified that Whittaker Chambers was a "pathological liar." A jury, after examining the evidence, decided that the former $30,000-a-year magazine editor was nothing of the sort.

NO PRECEDENT

But even before the jury decided it was Hiss who was the liar, the implications of such testimony had aroused considerable discussion. This newspaper learned of the controversy during the course of the trial. However, publication was withheld lest it affect the trial's outcome.

Vigorous opposition to the introduction of psychiatric testimony was expressed by Assistant United States Attorney Thomas F. Murphy. The prosecutor said it was without precedent in Federal jurisprudence and that there was nothing in the record to indicate Mr. Chambers suffered from mental illness.

JUDGE'S RULE

But Judge Goddard, one of the Nation's most highly regarded jurists, allowed it as the outcome of the trial was largely dependent upon Mr. Chambers' credibility.

Dr. Binger, who was certified a psychiatrist 8 years ago, testified that in his opinion Mr. Chambers was a "psychopathic personality."

Dr. Binger based his opinion on a hypothetical question detailing the worst aspects of Mr. Chambers' life, both true and mythical; a selected group of his writings and translations, and on observing Mr. Chambers on the witness stand.

ADVICE TO JURY

Dr. Murray, of Harvard, who never saw Mr. Chambers, agreed with Dr. Binger's evaluation.

In charging the jury, Judge Goddard declared that their opinions were purely advisory and could be rejected if the jurors found the hypothetical question to be incomplete or incorrect or if they believed their reasons to be unsound.

"You yourselves," Judge Goddard admonished, "have seen and heard Mr. Chambers while he was on the witness stand for several days and you have heard all the evidence. It is for you to say how much weight, if any, you will give to the (psychiatric) testimony."

CALLED DANGEROUS

It was learned that the jury did not even consider Dr. Binger's and Dr. Murray's testimony.

However, Judge Goddard's ruling was termed a "dangerous precedent" by at least two Philadelphia judges, both noted authorities on evidence. Judge Louis E. Levinthal, who was adviser on Jewish affairs in the American military government in Germany, declared:

"It could be a dangerous precedent that a litigant who is rich and can afford to employ a psychiatrist can always get some expert to attack the credibility of a prosecuting witness on the ground that he is a psychopathic personality."

JUDGE BOK'S OPINION

Judge Curtis Bok, presiding jurist in Philadelphia's Court of Common Pleas, declared:

"If the defense in every case could do the same thing, every prosecuting witness would be subject to such analysis. Psychiatry is still very young. For the present, I think, the credibility of witnesses can be left to the jury."

The appearance of Dr. Binger and Dr. Murray led several prominent psychiatrists to volunteer their services to Mr. Murphy. Mr. Murphy admits that much of the material he used during cross-examination came from them.

LIMITED VALUE

One psychiatrist, who said he had no direct interest in the Hiss-Chambers controversy, told this newspaper:

"Whether a man is a psychopathic personality can only be determined after weeks of intensive interviewing, and even then we can't be sure. It can't be done from carefully selected passages of freely admitted testimony, poetry, and translations."

Not since the Harry K. Thaw case in 1908 has psychiatry suffered such enormous damage in public opinion, a leading official of the American Psychiatric Association declared.

SUBSTITUTE FOR COURTS

At least one lawyer declared that if psychiatric opinions were accepted as absolutely accurate there would be no need for judges, juries, or lawyers.

"If we ever decide that a psychiatrist has some special knowledge or power enabling him unerringly to separate truth from falsehood," the lawyer said, "there will be no occasion for trials as we now know them.

"The process would be similar to that when an African medicine man performs his rites. The only difference would be that our process would be science, whereas the bushman's rites are nothing more than superstition."

Uncle Sam's Untapped Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today the most vexatious, incessant, and pressing problem that confronts each and every Member of Congress is our present confiscatory, oppressive, and merciless taxation. In spite of the enormous revenues collected by our Government, it continues to spend more than it accumulates. This is due to extravagance, refusal of the present administration to economize, and an alarming tendency on the part of many huge business enterprises to resort to subterfuge in order to evade their share of the cost of government. This later phase of our fiscal problem is admirably discussed and expounded in an illuminating article entitled "Uncle Sam's Untapped Millions," written by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], which appears in the February issue of the American magazine. Believing that this article will be of intense interest to all Members of Congress and especially to those of us in the House of Representatives where all legislation pertaining to revenue must originate, I include it herein, in its entirety, as an extension of my remarks:

UNCLE SAM'S UNTAPPED MILLIONS—WHILE OUR DEFICIT-RIDDEN GOVERNMENT SEARCHES FRANTICALLY FOR NEW SOURCES OF REVENUE, A BILLION-DOLLAR JACKPOT OF UNTAXED PROFITS SIMPERS UNSEEN

(By NOAH M. MASON, United States Representative from Illinois)

Administration leaders today are frantically searching for new ways to raise revenue. I maintain we can raise at least $1,000,000,000 in new revenue simply by taxing the untaxed.

Today there is a great rush by United States businesses to hide behind tax-exempt fronts when tax time comes around—as it is coming right now. If we plug the loopholes in our present tax laws that permit such escapes, we can raise the $1,000,000,000 without adding a single cent to the bill of the regular taxpayers.

The fantastic, jet-propelled growth of these businesses now hiding behind tax-exempt fronts is a serious threat to America's economic health. By escaping the normal 38-percent tax on their business profits the tax avoiders not only legally outwit Uncle Sam, but they achieve an enormous advantage over competitors. They can, and are, forcing thousands of conscientious, tax-paying businessmen to the wall.

More serious, they are shrinking up the taxable pool of United States wealth. Last year alone, several thousand companies, with vast business profits, slipped beyond reach of the tax collector by joining the ranks of the tax exempt. Because of their escape you and I must shoulder an extra burden. And already, as ex-President Herbert Hoover has pointed out, the "average working citizen" works 61 days a year just to pay his taxes.

Our laws as now written exempt charitable, educational, religious organizations; cooperatives; labor unions; and many others. When these exemptions were granted, many years ago, our lawmakers never dreamed they would be used to shield vast corporate, profit-making enterprises. But that is precisely what has happened.

By various and often devious means business organizations are making deals with tax-exempt institutions so that both profit by having the institution take over title of the company. In other cases, the tax-exempt institution simply goes into business itself on a big scale, because our present tax laws are rigged so that the prospects of making a big profit are irresistible.

These arrangements are depriving the United States Treasury of badly needed revenue, since billions in business profits are now going untaxed. I am not criticizing the organizations that make these profits by taking advantage of the laws. Nobody wants to pay more taxes than the law requires. It is the law that needs changing.

A spectacular example of the way our tax laws permit business profits to go untaxed is illustrated by the California & Hawaii Sugar Refining Co. This gigantic company operates the biggest sugar refinery in the world, at Crockett, Calif. The plant stretches for a half-mile along the water front.

The C. & H. is dominated by businessmen who also operate plantations, department stores, etc., on Hawaii. Though C. & H. makes millions of dollars in profits, it hasn't paid a Federal income tax since 1927. In that year it stopped being a regular tax-paying corporation and, its tycoons announced, had become a farmer's cooperative, simply by changing somewhat its corporate structure. (It remained, however, a corporation, with many of the same stockholders.)

Two years ago a House investigating committee pried into this change-of-face. The committee asked William B. Tyler, general counsel of C. & H., why his corporation became a cooperative. Mr. Tyler made this frank reply: "To save taxes."

In my Illinois district there is a little macaroni factory. Its taxpaying owner complained bitterly to me that his business was being hurt by unfair competition from an enormous nontaxpaying macaroni manufacturer in New Jersey. I looked into this matter.

The nontaxpaying Goliath in New Jersey is the C. F. Mueller Co., one of America's largest producers of macaroni, noodles, and spaghetti. The Mueller company used to pay the United States Treasury about $300,000 in taxes each year, until it sold out to a nonprofit foundation acting in behalf of New York University. By taking itself under the protective wing of this NYU-affiliated foundation, Mueller declared it would pay no more taxes, even though it was operating as before. And by not paying taxes it has a tremendous advantage over its taxpaying competitors in the macaroni field.

New York University, I discovered, has blossomed out as quite a protector of tax-escaping factories. Its affiliated foundations now own and operate, in addition to the macaroni factory, a $3,000,000 piston ring factory in Missouri, a $3,300,000 pottery factory, and a vast $35,000,000 leather goods company.

These four companies, protected by NYU, earn many millions of dollars in profits each year. A spokesman for the university has admitted the companies would have to pay $1,500,000 in United States taxes each year if they had not come under the university's protective wing.

The great mushrooming growth of companies doing business behind tax-exempt fronts has occurred almost entirely in the past decade. You don't have to look far to find the explanation. It lies in the great increase in the Federal tax on business profits. In 1916, when the Federal tax was first

levied, the tax was only 1 percent. Today the Federal Government takes up to 38 percent of an ordinary company's business profits in taxes.

Taxes have become a major cost of doing business in America. If you can avoid the 38-percent levy you have an enormous advantage over your competitor.

Hundreds of lawyers and corporate manipulators today are busy trying to figure out ways to convert their companies into tax-exempt operations. Recently a Broadway columnist revealed that "Hollywood moguls are working out a plan to set up film companies as cooperatives to escape many taxes." How this will work is not yet clear.

A few months ago the Wall Street Journal carried an advertisement for a 2,000-acre citrus grove in Florida for $1,700,000. The ad pointed out, suggestively, that the huge orange grove would make a mighty fine investment for some tax-free institution.

I have just received a folder issued by a firm of so-called industrial financiers in Chicago. It is a legal but brazen document pointing out techniques by which private companies and "nonprofit" charitable foundations can get together to their mutual advantage. The beauty of the set-up, it points out, is "the tax-exempt status of the foundation."

The strategy these promoters outline is the same "sale-and-lease-back" method now sweeping America. Dozens of foundations and universities are using this legal strategy. The tax-free institution buys the land and buildings of a company. Being tax-free, the institution can afford to pay a very generous price. It then leases the property right back to the old owner on a long-term basis. He's happy because he now has an abundance of loose cash available for expanding his business. The foundation is happy because it has a good, tax-free, real-estate investment. Everybody wins but the Treasury—and the taxpayer.

Changing your company into a cooperative is another popular strategy to beat the 38-percent tax. Since the beginning of World War II, when regular business profits were taxed up to 90 percent, co-ops have had a heyday. They plowed their tax-free profits right back into the business and grew and grew and grew. Today they are still growing, and this year are doing an estimated $17,000,000,000 business. They manufacture cheese and cosmetics, dig oil wells, run supermarkets and funeral parlors, etc.

How enormous the tax-free advantage can be is painfully known to independent oil jobbers in the Midwest. They have had a desperate time surviving in the face of a great upsurge of tax-free co-ops, which are buying up hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of oil wells, pipe lines, and refineries. (One single co-op owns 805 wells.) They are also selling oil around the world.

For several years the independent jobbers in Iowa begged Congress to pass a law eliminating this tax inequality. Finally, last summer, their powers of resistance were near the collapsing point. Eight hundred of these independents sadly decided to form a tax-free co-op of their own as their only salvation. They began taking the necessary steps.

Since I have a bill before Congress to bring tax equality I went out to speak to these oil men. In essence I said: "I put it up to you—do you want to join the tax exempts, and thus join the opposition to my bill, which you have been pleading for, or do you want to try to hold off a few more months to see if the coming Congress will correct this inequality?"

After long debate they agreed to hold off a few more months. I shall never dare to face those hard-pressed men again if this Congress fails to plug the loopholes in our tax laws which permit such a situation to exist.

There are many ways under our present laws that a business can operate legally for profit while paying little or no Federal tax on their profits. Here I would like to describe the five devices most widely used:

The charity trust device. There are many conscientious trusts and foundations dedicated to public service. But thousands have sprung up in recent years that are little more than pawns in the game of outsmarting the tax collector. Recently a tax-free foundation bought up a skyscraper office building in Houston, Tex., for about $2,000,000. It then leased the building out to a large cotton firm. Since never again, under our present laws, will an income tax be paid on that building's rental profits, the cotton firm obviously gets the advantage of unusually low rental rates.

The Russell Sage Foundation, a conscientious organization, has made a study of some of the newcomers to the nonprofit trust and foundation field. Its report stated: "A disturbing number of such foundations * * * appear to have no headquarters other than the office of a law firm, to be modest to the point of complete silence about any program for social or public welfare, and indeed to be making no present contributions of any sort from their accumulated and accumulating wealth."

The fabulous 95,000-acre Montana wheat ranch of Tom Campbell, America's largest wheat farmer, has been sold to a charitable trust in Omaha for $2,600,000. Its earnings, which have been subject to a 38-percent tax, will now go tax-free. Mr. Campbell will continue to manage his farms at a very handsome income.

The purchase was engineered by an enterprising young Omaha lawyer named Gordon Diesing. He bought the ranch on behalf of the United States Wheat Corp., which Diesing set up last April exclusively for charitable purposes and thus tax-free. This corporation's profits, after paying Diesing's salary, expenses, etc., have to go to another charitable corporation, the Sacred Heart Foundation fund, which is capitalized at $10.

Who do you think runs this second outfit? Mr. Diesing is listed as president, secretary, treasurer, chairman of the trustees, general counsel, and resident agent. In effect, his second corporation, capitalized at $10, bought control of a $2,000,000 ranch. Evidently not much money changed hands.

The Campbell ranch, I found, is not the only purchase Mr. Diesing has made. He also has bought for $4,800,000 the 35,000 acres of cotton land in San Joaquin Valley run by California's cotton king, Russell Giffen. For this he set up another charitable, nonprofit corporation, which he heads. Giffen remains as manager.

One of the most significant aspects of these two deals is that the two ranches in the past year have drawn almost $5,000,000 in United States Government farm loans. Presumably they will continue to draw loans. Thus, in effect, the United States Government will be guaranteeing that they make a profit, while not being able to tax those profits.

Then there is Royal Little, president of Textron Corp., the $60,000,000 textile firm. Mr. Little and his aides set up six tax-exempt charitable trusts which were given title to much of the Textron empire. A Senate subcommittee, under Senator TOBEY of New Hampshire, which investigated this set-up has reported:

"The maze of negotiations, investments, loans, and leases between these trusts and Textron present a fantastic picture of fiscal manipulation. * * * Trustees (of the trusts) were at the beck and call of Textron in shuffling mill properties from one to the other. * * * Large manufacturing companies have been purchased (by the trusts). * * * Many millions of dollars have been received by the trusts and but an infinitesimal portion thereof has been paid to the beneficiaries of the trusts."

The committee report concluded: "It is clear that [Textron] has made wide use of so-called charitable trusts as a means of providing risk capital to itself. * * * These trusts have never paid a cent of income tax. Thus, by this system of using charitable trusts, Textron has gained an unfair competitive advantage over the orthodox textile manufacturers, and the burden of taxation has been thrown more heavily upon the shoulders of all other taxpayers."

Mr. Little, when questioned, acknowledged frankly that abuses had existed, and agreed that legislation is needed to remedy the situation.

The educational device: Our founding fathers decided, properly, that the facilities for education should not be burdened with taxes. But they had no notion that universities would go into business in direct competition with taxpaying companies. That is what several dozen schools have been doing in the past 5 years, largely because their tax-exempt status gives them such an advantage.

We find schools in below old businesses. The University of Michigan now owns Willow Run Airport. * * * Morningside College, of Sioux City, Iowa, owns a streetcar and bus franchise. * * * Gonzaga College, of Spokane, Wash., owns a radio station in that town. * * * Wittenberg College, of Springfield, Ohio, has purchased a $200,000 supermarket. * * * Gouzer College, in Baltimore, owns full interest in the shopping district of Towson, Md. * * * Oberlin College, in Oberlin, Ohio, owns some 5-and-10-cent stores. * * * Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa., through a trustee foundation, operates coal mines. * * * Washington University, in St. Louis, has money invested in 51 business buildings in St. Louis, a railroad freight station, and a switching yard.

In a sense, the University of Louisville is going into the horse-racing business. A tax-free foundation—which will have the university as one of its beneficiaries—has bought the famous Churchill Downs track. The profits of the track will no longer be taxable.

The biggest business deals now being put across by colleges (and their friends) are real-estate purchases employing the sale-and-lease-back gimmick.

Very recently tax-free Yale University (through a subsidiary called Connecticut Boola, Inc.) bought a brand-new department store building which the famed R. H. Macy & Co. had built for itself in San Francisco. The price was $4,500,000. Then Yale turned around and leased the new tax-free building back to Macy's for 21 years at an average annual rental of $540,000. Both sides win. The United States Treasury, of course, loses.

Likewise, the University of Pennsylvania has bought and leased back the huge Philadelphia department store, Lit Bros. The sale-and-lease-back technique was apparently first pioneered for schools by Union College, of Schenectady, N. Y., in 1945, when it paid $16,150,000 for the department-store chain of Allied Stores, Inc.

All of these operations, of course, are legal, but as a newspaper in my district, the Dekalb Chronicle, commented: "It seems somehow to be a blot on the educational system." This newspaper felt that our schools, along with our churches, have a responsibility for setting a high standard of ethics for our Nation.

The religious device. Like colleges, our churches have a tax-free status. Here, too, abuses of the privileged status are appearing, though not yet as flagrantly as with colleges.

Father Divine has purchased the third largest hotel in Newark, N. J., and given it a tax-exempt status. A company publishing a religious magazine in Kansas City is tax-exempt.

Some cities are finding this problem of increasing church property quite serious. Churches are taking millions of dollars' worth of property off the tax rolls. In Milwaukee it is estimated the city is losing $1,500,000 a year in revenue because churches and fraternal organizations have become such large property owners.

More and more church leaders have become disturbed by this trend. A few weeks ago The Christian Century warned its readers that "Tax reckoning is coming." It feared that churches would soon be facing public resentment.

"If the churches refuse to budge when the social implications of their untaxed profits and property are pointed out," it asked, "what will be the effect on their moral and spiritual influence?"

Other church leaders likewise are worried. Methodist officials are known to be disturbed over the untaxed profits some of their churches are making on properties which include on the premises such nonreligious tenants as taverns and pool halls.

Samuel Cardinal Stritch, the eminent Catholic leader of Chicago, has denied permission to the Catholic order that sought to purchase real estate in Lake County near the city. It is known that one factor he took into consideration in his decision was that the county already was seriously burdened by tax-exempt properties.

The Christian Century's stand is that churches should pay their own way on all their property. This, I think, is a bit extreme, but certainly churches should be taxed on all profits from their nonreligious enterprises. The Mormon Church engages in a great variety of commercial businesses. However, it has always set an example which other churches might, but rarely do, follow. It insists on paying its full share of taxes on profits from such business operations.

The cooperative device: Co-ops were given their privileged tax-exempt status in 1916. Then, it seemed like a nice thing to do. Co-ops then were merely small groups of neighboring farmers who formed associations to try to get a better return on their crops. Everyone then was inclined to pity the poor farmer. Furthermore, the Federal tax in 1916 was only 1 percent. Thus, only a minor concession was involved.

Today, however, the situation has changed vastly. The tax concession is not 1 percent but 38 percent. And many of the co-ops today are monster-sized corporations performing multi-million-dollar transactions in fierce competition with taxpaying businessmen. Today 80 percent of the co-ops are corporations. They run vast machine assembly factories, chemical plants, phosphate mines. They sell all around the world. They handle 75 percent of the Nation's fluid milk. They operate vast feed mills. A single mill in Buffalo is valued at $5,750,000. They operate the biggest grain elevators in America. One of them, in Enid, Okla., is about a quarter of a mile long.

Yet some of these co-ops still try to convince the public they're just a couple of little farmers struggling to make a living.

One of these so-called little farmer co-ops is the California Fruit Growers Exchange, which did a $300,000,000 business last year. It markets the famous Sunkist orange and 85 percent of America's lemons. The United States Department of Justice has prosecuted it as a monopoly. Yet this gigantic corporation is exempt from Federal income taxes.

Its operations are so far-flung that it has subsidiaries and subsidiaries. One subsidiary, the Fruit Growers Supply Co., in 1944, casually bought up the entire lumbering town of Westwood, Calif., for $11,000,000. The town has lumber mills, a sawmills, veneer mills, box factories. Also included in the purchase was an estimated $10,000,000 stand of timber. Before the purchase, the town's enterprises paid the United States Treasury hundreds of thousands of dollars in taxes each year. Now they pay practically nothing.

In the United States today there are at least a dozen co-ops that would have to pay the Treasury an average of $1,000,000 each if they were taxed each year on the same basis as their competitors.

Yet they escape most taxes. Why? Because they claim to be nonprofit. When co-ops split a melon at the end of a year they don't call it a profit they're splitting. They say they are handing out a rebate or a refund or a final payment due.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue accepts this flimsy distinction. One reason the Federal Government accepts it is that cooperatives are very potent politically. President Truman himself has courted the favor of co-ops. A few months ago he told Iowa farmers, with whom co-ops are particularly strong: "This Congress will not listen to those who want to tax cooperatives out of existence."

No one wants to tax them out of existence. But they should be put on an equal basis with their taxpaying competitors. Otherwise, they will soon be driving our taxpaying businessmen out of existence at a rate that will cripple our economy. You just can't compete with someone who has a 38-percent edge on you.

The labor-union device: Unions, just like schools and co-ops, have long been on the income-tax-exempt list. When that exemption was granted I'm sure the lawmakers did not realize the unions would branch out into commercial enterprises having no relation to their union needs.

In many cities, unions receive rentals on buildings they own, and pay no tax on the income. The United Mine Workers Union in Springfield, Ill., has a big building with stores and offices which it rents out. In LaSalle, Ill., a local union is in the saloon-renting business.

Nor is that all. Both the CIO and the AFL are mapping plans to operate giant tax-free co-op supermarkets in union towns throughout America. These, of course, will be in direct competition with taxpaying grocers. The AFL has issued a bulletin urging its 7,500,000 members to set up co-ops to produce and distribute necessities on a gigantic scale.

CIO's United Automobile Workers is now backing a multi-million-dollar co-op store operation. It hopes to open a co-op supermarket in every town in America where there is a UAW local, which means any town that has an auto factory or airplane plant. A dozen UAW co-op stores are already open in the Detroit area. They sell groceries, appliances, clothing etc. Their announced aim is to capture 50 percent of all retail trade in the area. These stores, of course, pay little tax on their earnings.

We have seen, in this article, a half dozen of the favorite techniques profit-making enterprises have developed to avoid the tax collector. They have become so widespread that conscientious taxpayers are becoming indignant. Even the United States Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer, has acknowledged this indignation. Recently he made an extensive tour of the country consulting business groups. He has reported that one of the main gripes he encountered was this unfairness of our tax laws.

Our business leaders not only demand relief from tax-free competition from privately owned firms. They also believe that when a Government agency goes into an ordinary business venture—as agencies are doing increasingly—it should be required to pay a tax on its profits. Today the Federal Government operates a barge line on the Mississippi, it makes rum in the Virgin Islands, it runs tourist camps, and it manufactures fertilizer in competition with private companies. Likewise, State governments now own ferries and railroads, and have monopolies on liquor stores.

It is only fair, I believe, that Government profit makers face the income-tax collector just as any other businessman must do. By paying a 38-percent tax, our bureaucrats may come to realize that publicly owned enterprises are not so much cheaper to run, after all.

Some small progress is being made in getting the tax exempts to pay their fair share in taxes. Congress has finally prodded the Army's PX stores to pay taxes, just like anybody else.

As for the private tax avoiders, a little progress also is being made. The Treasury Department has finally forced a show-down with the Mueller macaroni people. It demands that the company pay taxes, even though its profits go to NYU. The Government contends that there is nothing charitable, scientific, literary, or educational in noodle making. The issue is now in the courts.

A few States also are taking action. Indiana has a law taxing business income of all churches, colleges, foundations, co-ops, etc. This law has produced no noticeable hardship.

Partly because of the public outcry, some of the farm co-ops are now voluntarily paying taxes on some of their profits. One of America's largest co-ops, the Cooperative Grange-League-Federation Exchange, of Ithaca, N. Y., has announced that it is going to pay voluntarily $928,000 (or about a 27 percent tax) on its profits of its past fiscal year. True enough, it ought to pay the full 38 percent (or $366,000 more), but the fact it is paying anything is a sign of the growing recognition that all business enterprises, regardless of their form, have a responsibility to help pay the cost of Government.

Isolated State laws and voluntary acts, however, are not enough. What is needed is an overhauling of our crazy patchwork of national tax laws to eliminate tax inequities. I am convinced that action can be gotten at this session of Congress. I would impose the regular profits tax on all commercial enterprises doing business for profit, regardless of who owns them.

Such a change would not in the least hinder schools, churches, unions, and charitable institutions in their primary functions. It would, however, cut the props out from under most of the legal tax dodging by commercial profit makers now going on in America.

Some such law, I believe, is urgently needed. We should tax the untaxed to ease the tax load upon the overtaxed, and provide much needed Government revenue. And we should do it before it is too late.

Extension of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a letter to Dean Acheson by Hamilton Fish, a former Member of Congress, who was among the first to point out the danger of Communist influence in our Federal Government and who now reminds us that this influence, if allowed to affect our present policy, will mean the loss of all Asia and a serious threat to Africa and to our own security.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 9, 1949.

HON. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing, as one of the pioneers in Congress against the extension of world revolutionary communism, to protest the betrayal by the State Department of the anti-Communist cause in China and of the security and best interests of the United States.

The policy of the State Department since 1945 has sided and abetted the Chinese Communists by undermining Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalists by a continuous and ruinous policy of appeasement.

The Chinese Nationalist Government was deliberately stabbed in the back by President Roosevelt at Yalta, threatened and coerced by General Marshall into a disastrous appeasement policy in 1946 with the Communists, and deceived, thwarted, and maligned by a clique of near-Communists and fellow-travelers in the State Department for a number of years with unprecedented success.

I charge that the white paper is a studied plea to exonerate and whiten a series of frightful blunders committed by our State Department, and to incriminate and blacken Chiang Kai-shek and the anti-Communist forces in China.

I charge that the white paper is a distorted account of recent Chinese history, with the object of making Chiang Kai-shek (the arch enemy of Communists) the scapegoat for the incompetency and appeasement policies of the State Department. According to Ambassador Patrick J. Hurley, "Nearly all the officials relieved by me in China because they were pro-Communists are now in the State Department presumably writing white papers."

I charge the white paper with being a contemptible character assassination of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek who was our valiant ally in World War II and a determined and fearless leader against the extension of world communism since 1927.

I charge the white paper with being an essentially negative and defeatist document consisting of a tissue of evasions, contradictions, sly insinuations, and half-truths to serve as a miserable alibi and whitewash for the consistently wrong-horse policy of the State Department.

I charge that the white paper is a monument of deceit and hypocrisy to cover up the tragic mistakes of F. D. R., General Marshall, and the pro-Communist group in the State Department in appeasing the Communists in China.

I accuse President Roosevelt of selling out the Chinese Nationalists by entering into secret and sordid agreements with Soviet Russia at Tehran and Yalta.

I accuse a determined group of Reds in the State Department with instigating the pro-Communist appeasement policy.

I accuse General Marshall of being the unwitting dupe of the pro-Communists in his Department in their plots and machinations to undermine Chiang Kai-shek by appeasing the Communists and stopping the shipment of arms to the Nationalists from 1946 to 1948.

I accuse the State Department of gross incompetency in our relations with Chiang Kai-shek, abandoning and deserting the Nationalists (who had all but driven the Communists out of Manchuria), of affording relief and arms on a basis of too little and too late, of being responsible for a cowardly and disastrous appeasement and do-nothing policy, and still adhering to the same do-nothing policy.

I accuse the State Department of willfully withholding the Wedemeyer report for 2 years until its effect was destroyed, because its recommendations were contrary to those of General Marshall.

I urge that the State Department stop whitewashing itself, cease its recriminations and attacks on Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, and throw all pro-Communists appeasers out of its offices.

I urge that we refuse to recognize the Communist government of China.

I urge that General MacArthur be recalled to testify before the proper committees of the Senate and the House regarding a definite plan to prevent the extension of world revolutionary communism in Asia.

I urge the establishment of a strong united pact of all anti-Communist nations and forces in Asia.

I urge that a truly bipartisan or nonpartisan plan be established to save the remaining nations of Asia from being engulfed by the military might of world communism.

I urge the immediate creation under Government auspices of an international organization to preserve freedom and to combat the propaganda, terrorism, and despotism of international communism.

It is public knowledge that as a result of Communist infiltration into the State Department that a number of its employees were arrested for conspiracy to violate the espionage law through theft of secret material in June 1945. Fifteen thousand confidential Government documents were recovered from the pro-Communist magazine Amerasia in New York by the FBI.

One Government employee, Emanuel Larsen, was fined $500 and assigned to a confidential mission in the Far East by the War Department. Philip Jaffe pleaded guilty and was fined $2,500. Alger Hiss is under indictment for perjury in connection with certain documents stolen from the State Department. Did he have a hand in formulating our pro-Communist appeasement policies in China?

Why has not Henry Julian Wadleigh (who declared in open court that he had stolen secret State Department documents for the Communists) been prosecuted?

How many more pro-Communist appeasers are there in the State Department? How many pro-Communists and traitors have been dismissed from the State Department since the disclosures in the Amerasia case in 1945?

Finally, I accuse the State Department of laxity and incompetency in failing to sustain, in every possible way, the anti-Communist forces in China during the last four critical years when their victory was almost assured. As a result of our State Department's bungling, China is entering an era of communistic terror and chaos.

If all the State Department has to offer is the white paper as a barrier to the conquest of Asia by world communism then I predict that, once China is fully communised, the Red hordes of Asia will sweep over the rest of the Far East, including Indochina, Burma, Korea, Japan, Malaya, Java, and India.

I further predict that within 10 years 4,000,000 well-trained and equipped Chinese soldiers will be on the march to Armageddon and the Suez Canal, fighting and killing American soldiers.

The American people have a right to know who is to blame among its officials for the catastrophic fiasco in China.

Already skilled Red agitators are fanning the flames of revolution throughout the Far East. Unrest, disorder, and civil war will follow as night the day.

We must have a definite and positive policy to stop world communism in Asia. We must not drift, by default, through the back door in the Far East into world war III.

Respectfully yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

What the ERP Has Done for Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Italy is today a better country all around, with more goods and more hope, as a result of the Marshall plan.

The Marshall plan has made three important contributions to Italy's recovery. First is the dollar program, namely, the allocation of dollars which buy very necessary imports such as coal, petroleum, and cotton which keep the Italian economy running, and machinery which remodernizes Italy's industry. Almost $1,000,000,000 have been allocated to Italy for this purpose under the Marshall plan thus far.

As a result of these dollars, Italy's production now surpasses that of before the war. Unemployment has decreased. The bread ration is gone, the black market has disappeared, the quality of bread has improved and the price has declined.

The second major contribution has come through the lira fund, or counterpart fund, which is made up of the lira receipts from the sale at fixed prices of the products that come into Italy free of charge under the dollar program. Approximately 200,000,000,000 lire, the equivalent of over $400,000, have already been deposited in this account.

This fund is being used to finance literally thousands of public works and other improvements all over Italy. These include bridges, roads, railroad improvements, railroad stations, better telegraph and telephone systems, dry docks, airports, thousands of workmen's houses, and the like. Some villages which have never had running water before are getting water as a result of aqueducts financed by the ERP lire funds. Some villages which never had electricity before are now finding magic current coming to them through ERP. Vast areas of land are being reclaimed through drainage and irrigation, farm roads are being run through them, buildings are being constructed, and machinery is being provided under the agricultural program of the lira program.

It is estimated that about 250,000 people will be given employment through this counterpart fund and that when the hundreds of projects in it are completed permanent employment will be given to many tens of thousands of men.

ERP is making its third major contribution to Italian recovery through the technical-assistance clause under the ERP Act. Under this clause ERP finances the sending of Italian experts to the United States or the bringing to Italy of American and other experts so that Italians will learn the latest methods of production, both agricultural and industrial.

Under this program Italian experts in as widely varying fields as electrical-power engineering and hybrid-corn development have gone to the United

States, and American experts in such widely different fields as hotel development and well drilling have gone to Italy.

The Italian experts who have returned to Italy have been eager to spread among their colleagues the many lessons they learned in the United States and the American experts who have gone there have been well received and their words of instruction listened to with real enthusiasm.

It is estimated that long after the end of the Marshall plan the effects of the plan will be felt in Italy through the application of additional knowledge acquired by these many experts.

The technical-assistance program will receive even greater development during the present year.

Italy's economy has felt the beneficial effects of the Marshall plan in many ways:

First, the dangerous inflation that followed the end of the war was checked by the arrival of goods under the previous American Aid Acts and then under ERP. Now Italy enjoys one of the most stable economies in Europe, as was shown by the strong position maintained by the Italian lire at the time of the devaluation of the British pound last September.

Secondly, Italy's national income has risen to the point where, despite all the destruction of the war, it is virtually at the prewar level.

Third, the Government is rapidly cutting down the deficit between incomes and expenditures.

Fourth, exports have increased to a point where they are well above those of prewar and the dollar deficit between exports and imports is narrowing.

The Italians are being kept closely informed of the progress of the Marshall plan in Italy through every medium of public relations possible. The ERP mission in Rome, assisted by the Italian Government, makes liberal use of press and radio, but also employs large and small exhibits, sound and projection trucks, motion pictures, and other devices to inform Italians of what the Marshall plan is doing for them and what it expects of them in the way of increased productivity and greater economic integration in Europe.

Americans working for the Marshall plan in Italy have been greatly encouraged by two facts. One is the keen will of the Italians to reconstruct. Inheriting from the ancient Romans the desire and ability to build, the Italians have effected a miracle of recovery from the devastation of the war. Towns like Cassina which were razed to the ground are now almost or entirely reconstructed and in many cases are better off than they were before.

The second item of encouragement is the universal desire of the Italian people to work on an economic basis with the other peoples of western Europe.

The Italian Government has lent the ERP mission in Rome every support. While naturally some differences of opinion arise from time to time the cooperation existing between the government and the mission has been cordial and fruitful.

Perhaps the most outstanding development since the arrival of ERP in Italy has been the weakening, although not the elimination, of the Communist menace there. The Communist-dominated union organization known as CGIL has been greatly hampered by the fact that 40 percent of its membership left it and formed two anti-Communist organizations. It is reliably estimated that the card-bearing membership of the Communist Party has dropped about 20 percent in the last 21 months. Now when the CGIL calls a general strike for political purposes it does not have anything near the response it used to meet with 2 years ago. Then the economic life of cities virtually died. Now that economic life goes on, though with some diminution which in some cases is so small as not to be noticed.

Everywhere in Italy there is greater confidence, largely as a result of the Marshall plan. There is confidence in Italy's ability to be able to walk on her own feet when the Marshall plan ends without the necessity for extraordinary outside aid. There is confidence that Italy is coming back as a helpful and useful member of the family of nations.

"All Recognize We Cannot Go on Spending at War Year Rates—That No Nation Can Go on With Expenditures of the Size We Have Been Putting Out and Still Remain Solvent—What Can We Do About It?—The Prescription Is Simple—Cut Expenses by Getting Down to Basic Essentials"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE G. BURTON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to be present at the Roanoke Chamber of Commerce annual dinner meeting on January 25, at which our Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, a native of Roanoke, Va., was the honored guest and made the principal address.

Roanoke has been the birthplace of a great many distinguished Americans but the memory of man runneth not to one who brought to public office greater drive, sincerity, and ability than Roanoke's first citizen of today, the Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense.

His distinguished, beloved, and respected mother and father, brothers and sister must have thrilled when they heard the remarkable address given by their son and brother to his friends and to his neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, somewhere was written "a prophet is not without honor save in his own country," but in the personality of Louis Johnson, America has a public official equally well and favorably known in both the Orient and the Occident, respected by his neighbors and kinfolk equally as he is respected by freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

The address made by Louis Johnson in Roanoke on Wednesday night last will never be forgotten by those who heard him speak. It was a statesmanlike presentation which had to do not alone with the history of his home city and State but which constituted a comprehensive statement wherein was crystallized all the issues with which the world is faced.

No statement of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson would be complete if he failed to express himself fully as to the vexatious problems which he seemingly encounters every hour of every day in the administration of the great governmental department and particularly with respect to the expenditure of the huge sums that have been entrusted to his care.

Mr. Speaker, his speech made at Roanoke is so replete with factual data having to do with the economic, social, industrial, fiscal, tax, and foreign problems that I am including it in my extension of remarks. I feel that every Member of this House, as well as those who sit on the other end of the Capitol, would find tremendous interest in his discussion of the multiplicity of subjects covered in this remarkable statement made by our great Secretary of Defense.

That statement reads as follows:

It is always an inspiration for me to return to Roanoke and rekindle so many pleasant memories of my life in the happy surroundings of my youth. Roanoke was my first home and—

"The home we first knew on this beautiful earth,
The friends of our childhood, the place of our birth,
In the heart's inner chamber sung always will be,
As the shell ever sings of its home in the sea."

My roots are deep in the heart of Roanoke. My parents were married here. They still live here. All of their children were born here. When they first came here, there was no city of Roanoke. It was a little village, Big Lick. In the span of their lifetime, my father and my mother have seen it grow from a village crossroads into the magic city of today. May God spare them many more years in which to behold the realization of the even greater promise that destiny holds for this community.

Roanoke always was, and still is, an ideal place to bring up an American family. I am grateful, indeed, that it was my happy destiny to grow up here. It was in the homes and the churches of Roanoke, in its public schools and on its athletic fields, that we learned the true spirit of America. Here we were brought up on the pioneer tradition of self-reliance, courage, and democracy, a tradition that we trace back to the old frontier of the French and Indian wars when our forefathers fought forest, beast, and hostile man to make life worth while in their promised land.

It was characteristic of the frontier to measure man by his individual worth and by his readiness and willingness to cooperate with the other members of his community in a common cause. It is that same spirit that has come down traditionally to us through the ages. It serves as the business

spirit of the Chamber of Commerce of Roanoke today. It serves as the community spirit of our every-day life. It is a spirit that the sons and daughters of our latest immigrants share with the descendants of our earliest pioneers.

As children in Roanoke, we were taught the fundamentals of American living, of love of God and country, of duty and chivalry, of true neighborliness and mutual helpfulness, of free discussion and wholehearted cooperation, of the ideal of live and let live. These are the same fundamentals to which President Truman has been dedicating himself, to maintain them at home and to extend them abroad. And it is toward the preservation of these fundamentals that I, as a member of his Cabinet, am devoting my energies today. For it is my particular job, as Secretary of Defense, to help maintain the United States in an environment of security and peace, so that all can go forward toward the greater realization of our American ideals.

Thanks to these policies, foreign and domestic, of President Truman, and to the wholehearted support of the American people behind them, the United States is currently enjoying unparalleled prosperity at home and wholesome respect abroad.

At home, according to a recent sample survey made by the Federal Reserve Board, every other American family owns at least one automobile. Three out of four families hold life-insurance policies with premiums of more than $100 a year. Seven out of 10 have bank accounts or own Government savings bonds. Forty-five percent own a house or a farm. But why go on with cold, impersonal statistics when practically every one of us can look at himself and measure the strength of his own position? Everyone of us knows that his life is better protected, his opportunity for useful and productive work greater, and his standard of living higher than ever before in our history. And when compared with what the men and women of any other country in the world have today, each of us can well apply to himself the colloquial judgment of our service veterans in occupied territories, "We never had it so good."

Unfortunately, there are some people who refuse to be happy. They seem to be so constituted that they literally enjoy gloom. Of these the pessimists who seem to get a sadistic pleasure out of punishing themselves. They are convinced that only tragedy will overtake us if we persist in following what they regard as new ways.

These dire prophets, however, are no novelty in American life. There always have been some Americans whose affection for the past was such an obsession that they wanted to go through tomorrow's life in yesterday's environment. For them the old way is the best way—the true way—forever. "Oh, for the good old days," is their incessant cry. Any attempt to utilize the inherent flexibility of our Constitution, our laws, our customs, and our manners, to enable us to meet the needs of life in an atomic age, they regard as heretical—as radical and dangerous. They act as if our splendid American civilization is already nearing its meridian when, in fact, "We are yet only at the cock-crowing and the morning star."

We will not listen to prophets of doom. We know that the promise of today and tomorrow for ourselves and our children is still as unlimited as it ever was. Yes; we have problems—fiscal, economic, political, and military; problems of management and of labor; of government and of business; national and international—tougher problems than we have ever had before. But we, the heirs to the tradition of the frontier, are honest enough to face the facts, and intelligent enough and resourceful enough to solve our problems, no matter how difficult they may seem.

It is in that spirit that we have approached our present fiscal problem. In the world of today national defense has a priority lien on the Federal budget. It is not a priority of our own choice. It is a priority imposed upon us by world conditions—by the threat of imperialistic communism and its sinister forces that stand ready and alert to take advantage of physical or spiritual weakness wherever they may find them. The only way to avoid their dangers is to be—

"Strong in will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

National defense, important as it is, however, is but one of the functions of our Government. Our Constitution was adopted not only to "provide for the common defense," but to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity."

The priority on the Nation's pocketbook that national defense must have today is not one, therefore, that can wholly monopolize the Federal budget. No one recognizes that fact any more than we in the Department of Defense. We realize that successful government has many important functions to perform and they have a direct bearing on our ability to wage and win war. The President took all of these factors, of needs in their relative importance, into consideration when he made up his budget for the coming year. It is a well-balanced budget, balanced between the national economy and the necessary costs of government, and balanced within itself among the requirements to serve the relative needs of the American people at this time.

All of us recognize that we cannot go on spending at the rate of the war years. No nation can go on year after year, with governmental expenditures of the size we have been putting out in the last decade and still remain solvent.

What can we do about it? The prescription is simple—cut expenses. Get down to basic essentials. This medicine may be hard to take, but as intelligent, loyal Americans, we know we must take it. Gracefully, therefore, we shall swallow it and, instead of crying about it, we shall redouble our energies and strive to continue to give the American people what they have a right to expect of their Government—a sound and efficient administration.

That is the spirit that permeates the Department of Defense today. It is clearly manifested by our asking from our Government more than a billion less this year than Congress gave us last year; and we are doing so in full confidence that we retain our posture of defense, and our capability to wage war successfully, if necessary. We will get along on less because we are going to make every dollar do more.

Our military budget recognizes the dynamic nature of present-day security. It reflects development in the art and science of warfare. It takes into consideration the capabilities of possible aggressors. It promotes the development of the instruments best adapted to thwart his aggressive designs. It provides the men and the sinews calculated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to meet the minimum requirements of a sudden emergency. It increases the number of men in combat units at the expense of desk jobs in administrative overhead. It buys more aircraft for our Air Force. It provides more money for research and procurement of new weapons for our Army. It meets the Navy demands for antisubmarine warfare. It keeps the strength of the Marine Corps in relation to its parent service, the United States Navy, in the ratio required by law. It calls for the procurement of more guns, guided missiles, tanks, and trucks than we ordered last year. It provides for a reduction from 863,000 man-years of civilian employment this year to 726,000 next year. It continues to wage war on duplication and waste and to promote efficiency and sound organization. In short, it is a budget that says security first, economy second—and provides a sufficiency of defense for the hour.

Even so, it is a budget of some compromises. No one service could possibly get all that it felt it needed. In its initial phases when the budget represented merely the total estimates of all the services, it ran to $20,000,000,000. By the time it was presented by the President to the Congress, and, in its present form, it is, not including strategic stock piling, approximately $13,000,000,000.

The difference between the original estimate and the final figure is not simply an arithmetic answer in subtraction. It is an achievement of unification made possible by military and civilian leaders who, thoroughly loyal to their own Army, Navy, and Air Force, thought, and worked, and planned in a spirit of team effort which placed the good of the defense program as a whole above the interests of their respective services. I am very proud to be a member of such a team.

We still have many problems in the Defense Department and we will continue to have them as long as we exist. Fundamentally they are human problems which human beings with good will toward each other can solve. We will solve these and any other defense problems that may arise, among ourselves in the American way—in the democratic way. We will gather facts. We will plan. We will consult. We will deliberate. We will listen. Finally, we will decide. We are determined not to suffer from the uncertainties that prevail of no decision when a definite decision is demanded. Always, we shall strive for decisions that are right, right on all the facts available, and after all sides have been given an opportunity to express their views. We shall make every effort to make our decisions right and to keep them right. Sometimes we will err, as all human beings must, but they will be honestly made, not errors resulting from undue haste or lack of study or deliberation. But in spite of these hazards, we shall not be deterred from making decisions when decisions are called for. I shall always remember the old maxims of the Field Service Regulations that were taught me in training camp at Fort Benjamin Harrison in 1917. They are still applicable:

"Vague or ambiguous orders indicate vacillation and the absence of any definite decision on the part of the officer responsible for them. Troops have a right to be told, in terms that are direct and unmistakable, exactly what it is their leader wants them to do."

We have made decisions in the unification of our armed forces—budgetary decisions, strategic decisions, personnel decisions—and never without giving all sides a hearing. They are honest decisions, the best possible decisions that such leaders as our Joint Chiefs of Staff and our Secretaries could help make. For these decisions we have assumed full responsibility to our Chief, the President of the United States, to the American people, and to their duly elected Members of the Congress.

On their own, the American people, too, have made certain far-reaching decisions in recent years in international matters. They have decided that our fate is linked with western Europe, that the chances of our survival and the survival of our American way of life depend on a climate favorable to democracy and unfavorable to communism; and we are proceeding accordingly. We are giving economic aid and military assistance to our friends to strengthen their financial structure and their ramparts, and to raise their confidence in their ability to resist communism.

These decisions were made in a series of positive actions taken in accordance with

the established procedures of our Government. They were not sudden decisions. Each took time in the making. Each was aimed to meet a crisis in world affairs. Each was inspired by the President who is keenly alert to the shifting tides of the cold war.

Each decision was preceded by painstaking study and research. We in the Departments studied them. We drew up preliminary plans. We presented them to the President. He approved them and made them part of his program. Congress in committee and its regular session discussed them. Hearings were thorough and complete. The State Department, the Department of National Defense and others had an opportunity to express their views. Risks involved were considered and weighed. Finally, there was the act of Congress and the approval of the President. Thus each decision became a national decision, arrived at in typical American fashion.

Each far-reaching decision—the Truman doctrine, the European recovery program, the North Atlantic Pact, the mutual-assistance program—each ran the gauntlet of the presentation of facts, discussion, deliberation, and decision. Each decision was clear-cut. Each decision was one that not only we in America but peoples everywhere could understand. And the implications of each decision are now clear to all friends and to all possible foes. Peace, I venture, is more secure today than at any time since VJ-day, and it is secure because the American people were not afraid to make decisions that to stand by them.

In the coming months Congress will be called upon to provide the necessary funds to continue to give effect to these far-reaching decisions in international affairs we already have made. My full faith in the good judgment of the Congress leaves me no doubt of the action that will finally be taken. To paraphrase the words of President Truman in his recent message on the State of the Union, I am confident that our Nation will not fail "to put a roof on the house after building the foundation and the walls" in our program of European recovery and national security.

While the blaze of publicity has focused public interest primarily on our decisions affecting Europe, we have also gone ahead nearer home with equal zest to formulate policies to strengthen our hemisphere solidarity against possible war. We in the Americas, dedicated to the same ideals, have long been engaged in working together and striving together to keep our continent out of war and to promote the blessings of peace among ourselves. Before we in the United States had our North Atlantic Pact and the mutual defense assistance program with our European friends we already had established their counterpart with our American neighbors, for the regional defense of our continent, in the Rio Treaty of 1947 and the Inter-American System formalized in Bogota in 1948. So when the time came to draw up the North Atlantic Pact and the provisions for a mutual-aid program for Europe, we followed the model, in words and spirit, of these two monumental agreements with our American neighbors already in effect for the better defense of the Western Hemisphere.

Together the North Atlantic Treaty and the Rio Treaty are twin security measures conceived in the interests of peace and the preservation of civilization. Our decisions and the decisions of our partners on both sides of the Atlantic are the stabilizing factors in today's world of unrest. They have given faith to the weary and the oppressed and courage to the strong and free. Each decision freely reached and resolutely executed breeds additional confidence in us to face new problems without fear. It has been our heartening experience that any issue, no matter how complex, once honestly faced and intelligently and equitably disposed of where citizens of good will, such as our partners and ourselves, sit down to find a solution.

We have entered upon our New Year 1950 with a record of marked achievements but with some issues, national and international, yet to be met. The President has outlined them to the Congress. In the course of the next few months these issues before the American people will be met faithfully and definite decisions will be reached. I am confident the decisions will be sound, that the American people will support them. Under the leadership of President Truman, we will continue to point the way toward a prosperous, secure, and peaceful world.

Are We Headed Toward Collectivism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of all the Members of the House a very timely statement by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, warning us that "we are rushing headlong down the road to collectivism or socialism much in the manner of Great Britain."

The statement follows:

I would define collectivism as a system of government which subordinates individual freedom and initiative to an all-powerful state in which the government supports the people rather than the people the government. But for the sake of those who wish to be academic, the Library of Congress has supplied this definition of collectivism:

"A political or economic doctrine which maintains that the ownership of property, especially land and capital, should reside in the community as a whole or in the state as the designated agent of the people. Collectivism is a broader term than communism in that revolutionary methods are not necessarily advocated. Moreover, the term is to be distinguished from socialism in its advocacy of broader controls over property rights."

It is my belief that we are rushing headlong down the road to collectivism or socialism much in the manner of Great Britain. The foundation stone of democracy, indeed of all our liberties, is the free-enterprise system; we cannot long enjoy political and religious liberty unless we likewise possess economic liberty. But the free-enterprise system is being dealt savage blows—and if the trend is too long continued will be destroyed—by (1) excessive Federal spending; (2) excessive taxation; (3) excessive government regulation; (4) excessive government competition with private business.

It is a very ominous sign that, in a period of peace and high prosperity, our Government has again embarked on deficit spending.

The American people never will knowingly and voluntarily give up their liberties, but the entire trend of government during the past 15 or more years has been gradually and definitely toward a highly regimented state with personal liberty subordinated to bureaucratic control. Those who have determined the course of government during these years have proceeded on the theory that the Government knows best, and that the Government should determine when its citizens should reap and when they should sow. Planned economy has been the fashion, and planned economy, in its ultimate form, is collectivism.

An independent study recently transmitted to the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report by President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers declared that the United States economy "is no longer a purely free and competitive economy." This study, carried through by Drs. Calvin B. Hoover and B. U. Ratchford of Duke University, examined the "impact of Federal policies on the economy of the South." While it was not endorsed by the Council, I am advised that it was sent by the Council of Economic Advisers to the Joint Congressional Committee "with great pleasure."

To my knowledge, this is the first federally sponsored study, originating in the executive branch and transmitted officially to Congress (or a congressional committee), in which it is stated that ours "is no longer a purely free and competitive economy." The authors, however, do go on to say that the economy of this Nation "is not consciously planned and directed by the National Government."

Presidential proposals this year included these:

Authority to control prices, wages, and employment practices; commodity control allocations; extended authority over consumer credit and bank reserve requirements; extended federalized power development through public works; expanded federalized insurance; socialization of agriculture (which turned out to be the Brannan plan); federalized urban redevelopment, housing and farm housing; federally aided education and socialized medicine, the latter being the most costly and far-reaching Federal program yet proposed. Adoption of a Fair Employment Practices Commission, recommended by the President, would empower the Federal Government to enter every private business and say who should be hired or promoted.

Such proposals, if adopted, would expand nearly 100 different programs already spreading out like tentacles from among the 60 principal Federal departments and agencies which extend Federal administration through financial aids, grants, subsidies, and benefits; pay rolls, pensions, payments, and virtually every other form of Government advance and contribution. It is my firm belief—and this is buttressed by history—that the people cannot surrender such vast power without eventually sacrificing basic individual freedoms.

Congress has so far defeated or resisted many of these new recommendations for extending Government control over individual citizens and embarking on new ventures of huge and unpredictable costs. But I say advisedly that if and when these proposals which the President is now urging upon Congress are enacted into law, then we shall have irrevocably committed ourselves to a socialistic state from which there can be no retreat.

Whether or not consciously planned and directed, the influence of these payments and programs of the National Government infiltrates the privacy of individuals, the policies of business, agriculture and labor, and the prerogatives of local, State, and foreign governments.

There are 17,000,000 people in the United States receiving monthly checks supplied by one or another program or payment pipe line from the Federal Treasury. That is the equivalent of 1 in each 9 of the total population, the equivalent of one-third of the total labor force. It should be noted, parenthetically, that when those receiving direct payments from State and local governments are added to the 17,000,000, the number of persons on public pay rolls becomes roughly 25,000,000. That is one-sixth of the population of the United States.

But it becomes impossible to arrive at the total number of persons affected by the programs and payments of the National Government when we include those receiving interest payments on war bonds and other Government securities; and when we add the millions more who benefit indirectly from approximately $25,000,000,000 flowing from the Federal Treasury into business through subsidies, purchases, construction contracts, and other expenditures, including those made in this country for the foreign-aid programs.

These vast spending programs lead directly to excessive taxation, which destroys the seed money necessary for industrial expansion, and on which increased employment depends. We are spending $15,250,000,000 for civilian domestic functions of the Federal Government, exclusive of $5,500,000,000 in interest on the national debt. To this add some $15,000,000,000 for national defense and about $7,000,000,000 for foreign aid—and you have the basis for an estimate that expenditures this fiscal year will come to between $42,000,000,000 and $45,000,000,000.

Against these three figures, the most authoritative estimate of revenue is approximately $37,200,000,000. Thus our deficit in the current year may be anticipated at between $5,000,000,000 and $8,000,000,000. Without retrenchment or new taxes it will be larger in the year beginning July 1, 1950. In the last fiscal year it was nearly $2,000,000,000.

And this chain of peacetime deficits is to be piled upon a postwar debt of a quarter of a trillion dollars. There are some self-styled Washington economists who say it is of no consequence so long as we owe it to ourselves. Stop and think of what that means: that debt means that each of us is responsible for nearly $2,000 of it. It is our debt to the extent that we own war bonds; to the extent that our bank savings are invested in it, and our life insurance for the protection of our families. It belongs to us to the extent that one dollar out of every seven we pay in Federal taxes goes to pay ourselves interest. And it will belong to us if the time ever arrives when the interest is not met or when it cannot be refinanced. It certainly will belong to us if it is not paid off.

There is documented evidence that business expansion is being discouraged. If the economy of this Nation is not consciously planned and directed by the Government, then our lack of consciousness can be traced to a total indifference to the warnings which have been flashing for some time along this economic primrose path.

I say there is literally nothing in the world today so important as to preserve the solvency of the American dollar and the American free-enterprise system.

This free-enterprise system supports the Government of this Nation in its present form and no other economic system can do that.

If the free-enterprise system falls, the Federal Government of the United States as it is known to the world also will fall.

If the American system and the American Government fall, so will the last hope for the preservation of freedom and democracy in the world.

To change our course, I would begin by eliminating the incompetence and extravagance that permeat virtually every branch of the Federal service. By this means, and notably by the dismissal of all unnecessary Government personnel, Federal spending could be drastically reduced. I would balance the budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1950, on a basis of sound fiscal policies. I would abolish functions of government that are too costly and infringe upon the economic freedoms of our people. The exhaustive Hoover Commission report shows—and my own careful and exhaustive research over a period of 15 years confirms—that the Federal budget could be drastically slashed without any decrease in essential services.

I would change the present trend to collectivism by eliminating from high council those who distrust the people and feel that the people are not capable of handling their own affairs with an absolute minimum of Government interference.

I would reverse our present trend by appointing to administrative positions persons who recognize that the free-enterprise system is the foundation stone upon which this Nation was built, and that its maintenance is essential to the preservation of individual liberty and to the advancement of economic, political, scientific, and human progress.

I would reverse the trend also by demanding that governmental administrators heed an economic truism: that excessive Federal spending necessarily must lead to excessive taxation or national bankruptcy; and that free enterprise cannot expand under long-continued oppressive taxation. Insolvency is the only alternative, but if insolvency comes in, freedom must go out.

An essential ingredient in reversing the trend toward collectivism is not new restrictive laws and oppressive regulations, but rather a desire and a determination on the part of those in authority to preserve our free enterprise system and the principles of government that have made us great.

Many civilizations which have entered the domain of history seem to present two evolutionary periods. The first period is that in which the individual seeks to safeguard himself against the excesses of arbitrary power by exacting guarantees from those trusted to rule. The second is that in which these guarantees are gradually surrendered to the collective power of the mass.

Let us always remember that human freedom is not a gift to man. It is an achievement by man, and, as it was gained by vigilance and struggle, so it may be lost by indifference and supineness.

What Is the Difference Between Socialism and Social Welfare?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I delivered on America's Town Meeting, Town Hall, New York, on January 24, 1950, on the subject What Is the Difference Between Socialism and Social Welfare?:

The policy of the administration of the Government of the United States falls squarely between those which are being advocated here by you, Mr. Thomas, and you, Mr. Steinkraus. I am in favor of the administration's policies and programs which, so far, have kept us moving forward on a sound democratic course—avoiding the rocks of reaction on the right and socialism on the left. The people of the United States obviously believe in, endorse, and support the policies of our constitutionally elected Government, since they have approved them in elections for 18 years, and will do so again next November.

Some have called what we have now a welfare state; some have called it a hand-out state—frequently by the same people. I do not know exactly what those terms mean as used by them and I do not propose wasting time by trying to define words and slogans. What we need to define are our objectives.

The best test of democratic government is the efficiency with which it serves the needs of all the people. The policy of our administration is to meet these needs under a system of free enterprise, and I submit that we are better free enterprisers than would be the kind of government which Mr. Steinkraus advocates.

What we seek is to meet the needs of our people in a complex society and at the same time maintain those essential freedoms of choice and action on which our Republic was founded to preserve.

We are striving to follow a policy of bolstering free enterprise in America by making it as really free as it can be in an industrial society.

No government which did not believe in free enterprise would have pushed private ownership of homes and farms as we have—would have made credit available to farmers and businessmen when they couldn't get it any place else, not only to save farms and businesses from failure, but to put families on land of their own and to help more people get a start in business, including many thousands of GIs.

We are really working for free enterprise when we seek to protect small businesses against the inroads of monopoly. We are really working for free enterprise when we seek to protect the bargaining rights of working men and women.

We are working for free enterprise when we help to build a healthy community, one in which people have decent homes, an opportunity for jobs, a right to get a good education. We are working for free enterprise when we preserve and develop our natural resources for the creation of new wealth, which in turn will create new industries and new jobs, for the benefit of all the people.

We are working for free enterprise when we work for economic stability on our farms, and for security during periods of unemployment and in old age.

These are some of the things we are doing. We do them because we do not believe that free enterprise is a privilege for just a few people at the top of the heap, but is the right of all the people.

Government is the means of coordinating our efforts so that we can work together to obtain goals which would be impossible to us as individuals. That may be socialism in the eyes of Mr. Steinkraus, but it is not socialism in the minds and hearts of the American people.

We all benefit when we work together and build a TVA or a Central Valley project.

We all benefit when we work together and devise a system of social security and unemployment insurance.

You can call that what you will. You can call it the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the square deal. You can call it the welfare state. Or you can call it hard times. But to me it is something which comes from the American genius. The ability to make things work. We are trying to make our economic system and our constitutionally elected and responsible Government work for us—for all of us. We intend to be neither the slaves of a system nor the slaves of a group of economically powerful masters. Call it whatever you want, but I call it the American way.

Mr. Lea Discusses the Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to

include a statement by a former distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, Mr. Clarence F. Lea, of California.

Mr. Lea has for a number of years engaged in an intensive study of our system of electing a President and Vice President. As a result of that study he has from time to time urged that the Congress adopt a resolution calling for an amendment to the Constitution that would revise our present system.

In the following statement Mr. Lea sets forth what I consider to be some very pertinent arguments in favor of revision of our present system:

The outstanding question before Congress as to modernizing our presidential election is whether or not Congress will give the people of each State a chance to have their ballots for President credited to the candidates for whom they are voted.

Under the present method of electing the President only one man, the plurality candidate in the State, is given credit for all the votes of that State. All other votes are credited in the electoral college as if cast for that one man. The minority party in the State may be the Democratic or Republican Party, or a third party, but the votes for their candidates are alike ignored.

In the last 11 elections, from 1908 to 1948, the American people indirectly cast 372,546,637 votes for President. Of this total vote, 163,379,535 votes, or over 43 percent, were credited in the electoral college as if cast for the candidates other than those for whom they were voted.

In the last presidential election over 23,000,000 votes, or 48 percent of all cast, were credited to candidates for whom they were not voted.

The last presidential election is simply typical of the present method of crediting votes. In the States he carried, President Truman received 14,808,000 votes in his favor. In the same States his opponents received 13,630,000 votes, all of which were credited to Mr. Truman in the electoral college. In the States he carried he received only about 1,500,000 less votes on account of his opponents' votes than he did for his own votes.

In States Mr. Truman did not carry he was denied credit for over 9,000,000 votes cast in his favor.

Mr. Dewey, in the States he carried, received 9,977,000 votes. He also received credit in the electoral college for 10,336,000 votes cast for his opponents in the States he carried. In other words, he received more credit in the electoral college for the votes of his opponents than he did for his own votes in the States he carried.

In the election of 1912 Wilson, Taft, and Theodore Roosevelt each received more credit in the electoral college for the votes cast in favor of their opponents than they did for votes cast for themselves. (See House hearings, p. 43.)

Either the Republican or Democratic Party may be the minority party in one State and the majority party in another. Whether or not its members belong to either the minority or the majority party should not make a particle of difference as to whether or not the voter's ballot should be credited in every State. The present method is poor sportsmanship. It is necessary and desirable for the prevalence of our party system and for the country's welfare, that each party should have its proper credit in every State.

Every lawful vote is entitled to be credited in the ultimate count of the election, just as a simple matter of political integrity.

Our electoral system provides no logical method of compensating the minority candidate for the votes cast in his favor but denied him in the electoral college. The votes of the minority party are denied it, regardless of whether the plurality be 1 or 1,000,000.

The House hearings show the credit given the two leading candidates in the last election for the first eight States, selected alphabetically, and carried by each candidate. For every 100 votes for Mr. Truman in the States he carried he received credit in the electoral college ranging from 162 to 210, and Mr. Dewey received credit in the electoral college from 176 to 203.

These erratic results of popular voting are due to the fact that the present method of counting votes has no logical relation to the population of the State or to the relative strength of the candidates within the State.

HOW THE VOTES ARE COUNTED

Under our present method of electing a President, there are three fundamental ways of disposing of the States' electoral votes:

First, the only candidate in the State who gets credit in the electoral college for his votes in that State is the one candidate who has a plurality of the popular votes.

Second, the plurality candidate also gets credit in the electoral college for all votes in favor of his opponents in such State. That is true, regardless of the size of the plurality vote or the minority vote.

Third, every candidate in every State is denied credit in the electoral college for all the votes cast for him in every State in which he fails to secure a plurality.

This method of counting votes wholly ignores the real character of our Presidential election. The election is a national election to elect a President for the whole country. It is separately conducted in each of the 48 States, but the issues run crosswise over every State in the Nation. It is a contest to approve or oppose candidates and policies. The political party engaged in the contest seeks to ally all persons throughout the Nation to rally in support of its candidate and its cause.

A HOMELY ILLUSTRATION

The object of an election is somewhat like a census. Suppose the Bureau of the Census was called upon to take a census of sheep and goats. It counts two large groups in one State and finds there are 200,000 goats and 200,001 sheep. Then in its return it would report a total of 400,001 sheep and say nothing about the goats. The enumerator would go to the next State, and he might find there were 60,000 sheep and 100,000 goats. He would report that there were 160,000 goats. Such a method of enumeration would be so devoid of common sense that all would brand it as stupid.

Is it much less stupid when the same method is pursued by a great government in holding an election to determine the will of the people of the Nation under constitutional authority as to who shall be their President?

The election is held in New York. It is found that the candidate with 45 percent of the votes has more than any other, so the report to Congress gives credit for New York as 100-percent Democratic or 100-percent Republican. The election is held in another State in which one party carried by a majority of 600,000. No more credit is given than if it were carried by a majority of 1. Such a method is not only senseless, but it is unjust and vicious.

Now Congress has the chance to give the people of the Nation the opportunity to determine whether they want to continue such a stupid method of voting.

As clearly set forth on page 21 and the following pages of the House hearings, the original unit vote was imposed upon the country 12 years after the Constitution was adopted. In every case the unit vote was engrafted on the electoral system by the dominating leaders of either one or the other of the two political parties then existing. The sole purpose was to prevent the opposite party from sharing in the State electoral vote. That effort is now a matter of history. The unit voting system has acquired no additional virtue in the many decades it has been in operation. It lacks fairness, it is unjust in its operation, and is a constant barrier to the accurate and just operation of our electoral system.

PROPOSED PLAN BASED ON EXPERIENCE OF THE NATION

The plan proposed in the amendment is one mainly based upon the experience of our American political life. Our general method of election, approved by experience as applied to Senators, governors, and Representatives, and other important officials, is to give the final election to the plurality candidate. All lawful votes, wherever cast, are counted and credited to the candidate for whom they are cast. When the totals are added, the election is decided in favor of the plurality candidate.

That is in substance what is proposed here. The Constitution allots the voting power to each State according to its population. Under the plan proposed, the people of the State, by their votes, determine how their electoral vote shall be credited. The electoral votes of all candidates in all States are added up, and the election is settled.

THE ALLOTMENT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

House Joint Resolution 2 and Senate Joint Resolution 2, which are identical, do not propose to change the voting power of the State. That voting power is clearly defined by the Constitution. Each State has votes in Congress according to the number of their Senators and Representatives. Each State has electoral votes in the same number that it has votes in Congress. The Constitution provides "Electors of each State shall have the qualifications requisite for election of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." In substance, the Constitution says to each State, "You shall decide who your voters shall be. All the Constitution requires is that in qualifying voters for Federal offices you shall apply the same standards you apply for the election of your own officials."

Electoral votes are allotted to the States primarily on the basis of population. In substance each State has the same number of electors as it has Representatives in Congress on the basis of population—two electors for each State regardless of population or the number of voters.

As the apportionment now stands, 52 percent of the electoral votes are granted in proportion to the population of the States; 18 percent or 96 electoral votes are granted by allotment of two votes to each State regardless of population.

Under the pending proposal, the presidential elector would be eliminated, and the people of each State would vote directly for President. The State electoral votes would be retained and disposed of in exact proportion to the popular vote in each State. No fairer method of division of electoral votes can be devised so far as the State disposal of its electoral votes is concerned. When votes are allotted to the States on the basis of population, we have a common unit as between the States based on population for the allotment of 52 percent of the electoral votes.

So far as the votes are allotted in proportion to population, they represent a common unit between the States as to the number of people represented, even though the States may differ as to the number of popular votes.

The two-vote allotment is not a common unit either from the standpoint of population or voters. Under the proposed plan, as contrasted with the present, the criticism on the basis of discrimination is very largely eliminated.

In my judgment the best possible common unit between the States is based on equality of population. The best available source of a common unit as to the two-vote allotment is under the plan proposed, which would very greatly minimize any objection that could be made to this grant to the small States regardless of population.

The people of each State determine who their voters shall be. Those selected, regardless of their proportionate number of the State population, represent the State. Those who vote, whether 40 out of 100 or 90 out of 100, represent 100 people in every State. The standard of the Constitution is representation according to population and not according to the number of voters. That is a basic fact we must recognize in appraising our electoral system. Our Senators, our Representatives, or electoral votes primarily represent population and not voters.

Last election only one-third of the Nation voted. The Congressman represents the whole people of his district; not merely the one-third who voted.

CHANGES PROPOSED

As pointed out in the House report on House Joint Resolution 2, it is fortunate that the outstanding defects of our present method of electing the President are comparatively easy to remedy. Each change proposed in our electoral system by House Joint Resolution 2 simply removes an archaic provision, and in every instance substitutes a means more like we use to elect Senators, Representatives in Congress, and State officials generally.

The President must now be elected by Presidential electors. Under the proposed plan he would be elected directly by the vote of the people. Electoral votes would be allotted by popular votes.

Under the present plan, voters by the millions at each election are disfranchised. Votes are counted by the millions contrary to the way they were cast. No minority candidates are given credit in the electoral college. Under the proposed plan every lawful vote would be counted as cast. No candidate, as now, would receive credit for votes cast for his opponent.

Under the present plan the possibility of election in the House of Representatives, except as provided in the twentieth amendment, would be eliminated. Under the proposed plan the plurality candidate would be elected. Under the present method a majority of the electoral votes is necessary to elect. However, the presidential electors are elected by plurality votes.

Fourteen of our Presidents have been elected by a minority of the popular votes. If the Constitution required a majority of the popular vote to elect, 14 of the Presidents would have been defeated unless elected by the House.

THE AMENDMENT PROPOSES AN IMPORTANT CHANGE AS TO THE TWO-VOTE ALLOTMENT

The allotment of two votes to each State regardless of population is manifestly not on a uniform basis either as to the number of voters or the population of a State. If the two electoral votes of the State were divided by a vote of its own people, there is no injustice to the State.

However, the two-vote allotment is of important concern in the apportionment of electoral votes between the different States. Ninety-six votes to be disposed of regardless of population is an important factor in our electoral system.

It may be conceded that the two-vote allotment is not a grant of electoral power on a uniform basis, as measured by either population or the number of voters involved. This grant of gratuitous voting power to each State regardless of population has been defended as one of the checks and balances of our Government. It has a similarity to the Senate, whose Members are likewise not allotted on the basis of either voters or population. Nevertheless the Senate has served as a check and balance, and to the advantage of the country as a whole. It is highly improbable that the country would ever take away this two-vote allotment.

If we look upon it as an objectionable grant of power, the effect of the two-vote allotment is largely minimized by the geographic distribution of the small States which can use the two-vote allotment to their advantage. (See House hearings on House joint resolution, pp. 63–66.)

Those who object to the two-vote allotment regardless of population will find that the proposed constitutional amendment greatly reduces and minimizes any possible objection they may have.

At the present time all these 96 electoral votes are allotted to a plurality candidate. That means that no other party shares in the allotment of the two votes thus granted to each State.

For instance, in a State with four electoral votes, two votes are allotted to the plurality candidate and nothing to a minority candidate. Under the proposed plan, if one candidate, for instance, carried that State by a 10-percent plurality he would receive one and two-tenths electoral votes, while the minority candidate would receive eight-tenths of one electoral vote. So these two candidates would neutralize each other's vote to the extent of 90 percent and reduce the gratis vote from two to two-tenths of one vote.

This is better illustrated by the election of 1944. Mr. Roosevelt received 72 of the 2-vote allotment and Mr. Dewey 24. Had the proposed plan been in operation, the margin of Mr. Roosevelt on account of the 2-vote allotment would have been less than 14 instead of a margin of over 48 votes that he did receive. In other words, the present plan gives the two-vote allotment entirely to the plurality candidate. By the division of these votes between the candidates, the only gratis margin accruing to the benefit of the plurality candidate is confined to the percentage of his plurality.

In view of this change, the two-vote allotment when considered in connection with the geographical distribution of these votes (as explained on pp. 63–66 of the House hearings) would be of minor importance and would very largely remove any legitimate criticism that can be directed at the two-vote allotment.

A DANGEROUS IMPLICATION

Recently I was somewhat amused to read a contention that the pending resolution to modify our electoral system carried a dangerous implication, because the proposed system would credit each person for whom votes were cast for President in each State with such proportion of the electoral votes thereof as he received of the total votes. After 160 years of popular government we find an American citizen arguing that it is a dangerous thing for a lawful voter of the country to have the right to have his vote counted as he cast it. In my judgment, popular government and civilization itself will get a good deal further by counting lawful votes the way they are cast than it will by refusing to count them.

Where is the integrity and the fairness of elections if we insist on refusing to count votes lawfully cast?

Why invite people to vote if we do not intend to count their votes after they are cast?

If the people of the State do not have a right to control the disposal of the votes allotted them by the Constitution, who has such right?

Is there any fairer way that can be devised for dividing the State vote other than in accordance with the will of the voters of that State as expressed at the polls?

It has been suggested that the proposed method of election is by proportional representation. Clearly proportional representation has nothing to do with this proposed plan. Proportional representation applies only where there are two or more offices to be filled.

In the proposed plan we have a division of votes in the same way we have a proportional division of votes in the election of a Governor, a Senator, or a Representative. The popular votes are converted into electoral units to form a common voting unit as between the States. All the votes in every voting area are counted, the totals are established, and the candidate having the greatest number of votes is elected.

Among other things, it has been contended that permitting minority candidates to be credited with electoral votes in proportion to their popular votes would unduly encourage the formation of numerous political parties. The fact is that in 15 different presidential elections the electoral votes have been divided between three or more candidates, and no party has long remained a party of consequence unless it has established itself as one of the leading parties of the Nation. The answer against needless multiplicity of parties is not by suppression of lawful votes.

Whenever a group is able to control the plurality of the State vote, however small that plurality may be, it gets credit for the total vote of the State. It then dominates the State.

Under the proposed method the minority candidates will get credit for their votes, but for the number of their votes only—no more or no less. They will get the credit they deserve, but no fictitious credit.

One of the distinct advantages of the proposed amendment would be that it will minimize the illicit influence that small groups can now exert through claiming a balance of power controlling the whole vote of such States.

What is more important in our electoral system than to have the votes counted as cast? No suppression of lawful votes and no credit for votes for candidates for which they were not cast.

Every lawful voter in this country should go to the ballot booth with the consciousness that his ballot will be counted as cast and have its proper part in deciding who shall be President. Under the present plan an average of 44 percent of our people who vote have no influence whatever in the final count.

Suppression and misappropriation of votes is an offense of a monumental character against our popular form of government. The only remedy in sight is the adoption of Senate and House Joint Resolution 2.

Statement Reds Could Knock Out United States in 90 Seconds Unadulterated "Baloney"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on January 30, 1950:

SENSE AND NONSENSE

Two well-known public officials have just made statements concerning the national defense of the United States. One sounds wholly sensible, the other wholly ridiculous.

Governor Gruening of Alaska says the Territory which he is responsible for could be captured "tomorrow" by one or two parachute divisions coming across the Bering Strait. That sounds sensible. Settlements in Alaska are relatively small and spread far apart. We know that the vast area as yet has little means for defense.

The statement which is wholly ridiculous comes from Senator MUNDT. The South Dakotan says that Russia "could knock out the United States in 90 seconds." This assumes that the United States would know even less about such an attack in advance than it knew about Japanese movements prior to Pearl Harbor. It assumes that atom bombs can be carried around in vest pockets and left in factory lockers. It assumes that our Air Force, Army and Navy, with the greatest defense budgets in our history, have no plans for the protection of the Nation.

Governor Gruening should be listened to, Senator MUNDT.

F. D. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a very thoughtful statement made by Steve Walsh who writes under the column well known to newspaper readers in Massachusetts called the Bell Ringer, which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., Monday, January 30, 1950:

They either held him in high respect or they hated the mention of his name. I'm referring, of course, to the thirty-second President of the United States because today is the sixty-eighth birthday of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And in case it is of momentous interest to anyone, just count me as one who thought a lot of the man; the cripple in the White House, who gets bigger in name as time tolls the bell.

You got to have some form of infirmity to clearly understand what F. D. R. did for his race. Blind malice can always find a mark to shoot at, and in the minds of men of heart the venom of narrow souls poured out plenty of vituperation on Roosevelt. And to even think that there will be a discontinuance of this type of angry spite is like emulating Canute and telling onward waves to halt.

If you want to feel humble take a ride over through Poughkeepsie and then move along to Hyde Park, N. Y. Take a walk through the famed James R. Roosevelt estate, formerly the home of F. D. R.'s half-brother. Just beyond is the memorial building bequeathed by the late President to the people of the United States. Nearby is his grave marked by a simple marble slab; that and nothing more.

Around this plot is a 100-year old hemlock hedge, and though seemingly tens of people are always near you during your short visit, somehow you feel alone. That strange sensation will not live down as you meditate; the thought of what lies before you deep in the bowels of the earth. There are the remains of the man who at one time was the most powerful individual in the history of time.

But that has been changed, and the little mound and marker are all that remains. Unless you want to digress and point out what will be going on Tuesday, February 7, in many States of the Nation. Roosevelt's birthday has usually been the signal for an outpouring of the faithful to get ready for that date. Gayety is the watchword, not solemnity. A hundred-dollar ticket is the credential to a feast that is likened to ambrosia.

For this is the gathering of the boys and their better-halves; this is the long-awaited occasion to look each other over, to talk political shop, to make hay dipped in golddust, to laugh and cheer and applaud with high spirit, to try and emulate the bon vivants of yesteryear; in short, to keep up with the Joneses among whom Jesse Jones is one. But one voice will be missing: the mellifluent tone of the spellbinder, who always could say: "My frans."

Republicans will rave and rant about this sumptuous meal. They will call it undemocratic, and sulk like little children. But the delicious smells from the kitchen will be enjoyed, the tinkling of glasses will ring clear, the appetizing food will be consumed, and Democrats will still call this act "a division of the spoils."

The Challenge to Our Two-Party System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by my able colleague from Connecticut, the Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE, delivered before the Women's National Republican Club of New York last Saturday.

In the usual vigorous and forthright manner which characterizes our distinguished colleague's words, as well as his deeds, Representative LODGE has made an important contribution to the public discussion surrounding the future of the Republican Party. His sincerity, his clarity, and his vision commend his remarks to the thoughtful consideration not alone of his colleagues, but of all voters regardless of their political affiliation.

The speech follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, for some time now I have been looking forward to the pleasure of meeting with you to discuss Republican plans and policies.

A discussion of the future of the Republican Party is, in a sense, like discussing the future of our country. I say this because, if the Republican Party should falter, there does not appear to be another party ready to take its place. And if we had but one party, then, in sober truth, America as we have known it would cease to exist.

In other words, the two-party system is probably the most important single factor in the preservation of American freedom.

If we had more than two major parties our political system would probably degenerate into a myriad of splinter parties reminiscent of Europe. We would then be a prey to the same sort of coalition governments, the same kind of cynical barters and trades which for so many years have been the curse of some of the European parliamentary systems. We would in all likelihood have a minority government which would be far too weak to preserve political stability. We would probably also forfeit the concept that a main purpose of government is to safeguard minority rights while protecting the majority from minority control. Indeed, in those circumstances we would have control by a minority.

On the other hand, if we had less than two parties, we would have a one-party system, and this would completely nullify our Constitution, neutralize our Bill of Rights, and invalidate all our free institutions. Our checks and balances would be but a nostalgic memory and there would be no separation of powers, since all power would be concentrated in one partisan instrumentality.

The two-party system is then an essential ingredient of the free system to which we owe most of our many blessings.

And yet we have a growing body of independent voters in America. More serious still, there were in the last presidential election some 45,000,000 people who failed to vote.

The independent voter represents the balance of power in our elections. To some extent this can be a healthy condition. It can put the major parties on their mettle. It can engender a fine spirit of political competition out of which the country can benefit. It can result in electing the best candidates to public office. It can produce sound policies and progressive programs.

But if independence of party is carried too far it can undermine our two-party system.

The increased independence of the American voter is in large part the fault of the parties themselves. It is due to an inability to make the parties attractive to a larger number of people. The Republican Party contains people of varying views, and this is natural since our party is a national party and since our country includes many races, creeds, occupations, and climates. Politics is in large part the art of conciliating varying and differing groups of people, of bringing them in and keeping them in under one partisan roof. The Republican Party must convince a majority of the people who vote that it has a constructive plan of action which will respond more effectively to the needs and aspirations of all the people than the tired clichés, the reckless promises, and the special interest appeals with which the Democrats have in recent years preyed upon the fears and apprehensions of the voters.

But this electoral independence is also, it seems to me, due to the fact that many people do not associate themselves with the political life of the Nation. It is due to the tendency of the independent voters to think that if the Republican Party should fall by the wayside, if it should succumb for lack of adherents, or because of an excess of independents, then that is tough luck for the Republicans. That is hard on the office-holders and on the party-workers. It is none of their affair. Yet it is, I fear, desperately true that the disappearance of the Republican Party would affect them as much as it would affect the Republicans. It would affect the Democrats. It would deeply affect the lives of all Americans. The American people have a great stake in the survival of the Republican Party. The independent voter depends for his independence upon the survival of the two-party system.

Narrow partisanship is, of course, deplorable. Partisanship which places party above patriotism, patronage above principle, and personalities above policies is highly reprehensible. Yet the best way to discourage such sordid attitudes and such demogogic practices is not to retire to the sidelines in derisive independence but rather to plunge into the political melee and endeavor to influence the party of one's choice in the direction of the people's real welfare. The best, the only way to be effective politically is through the medium of one of our two major parties. We cannot give a vigorous demonstration that we believe enthusiastically in our kind of government unless an increasing number of Americans become increasingly active in politics.

In creating a broader basis of political participation, the women of America play a predominant part. For they have a dual role in politics. In the first place it is to them that we all look to maintain the home which is the most important political unit of all. Indeed, one of the first measures passed by the new Communist government in Russia some 30 years ago was an attempt to destroy the family. Nothing that we can do in Washington will matter if the American home disintegrates. The laws that we pass and the treaties that we sign will avail us little if America is destroyed from behind through our children, the men and women of the future. Certainly the burden of domesticity falls primarily on the women.

The second aspect of this duality is best illustrated by the great gathering here today. It is truly heartwarming to see such a large delegation from Connecticut and particularly from Fairfield County. In my first campaign for public office in 1946 I came to appreciate what a vital part the women of my district play in politics. They are patient in handling details; they are willing to undertake all manner of political chores which are as essential to victory as they are lacking in glamour; but above all, they bring into politics a much needed idealism. They bring it not only in their own status as politicians, but also through their influence with the men. The very qualities of sympathy and tenderness which make for a happy home make also for a more rounded and better balanced national political life.

And then, my friends, let me remind you that in the United States (as of the 1948 estimate of the Census Bureau) there are 1,600,000 more women of voting age than there are men. Accordingly, you not only hold the balance of voting power; you are the power. You are in a position to protect the great heritage of America not only in the home but with the ballot. You have wisely chosen as your instrumentality the Republican Party.

The Republican Party is the only political organism standing between the American people and one-party government.

Let us revive that old phrase which cub reporters used to practice on their typewriters: Now is the time for all good people to come to the aid of the Republican Party. Certainly now is the time. Now is the time for us to be imaginative, coherent, truly progressive.

Let us confront the real issues in an effort to discover how we can be of service to our country.

It has been the fashion in some quarters to think that our party is on the horns of the dilemma of choosing between a philosophy which some have called me-toolism and a point of view which others have labeled as reactionary. But this is not our choice. Certainly we must not follow and imitate where others lead and create. But neither must we be obstructionists. We must not disagree for the sake of disagreement. As I believe our distinguished guest Governor Driscoll has put it, we must not come out against the Ten Commandments just because the Democrats favor them. It is not sufficient for us merely to carp, to criticize, and to condemn. We must above all conserve, construct, and create. In its policies and in its actions our party must reflect the fundamental divisions of thought among the American people.

Now that does not mean that we must be horse-and-buggy die-hards. Nor does it mean that we should advocate the doctrine of laissez faire. It does not mean that we must follow in the recent tradition of a small segment of the Republican Party who classify themselves as isolationists rather than in the far older, more wide-spread Republican tradition that what goes on outside our borders is of great concern to us. It does mean that we must produce feasible alternatives to the schemes of the Democrats which, if they were adopted, would destroy the very welfare of which the Democrats are the self-styled champions.

And, as a matter of fact, if one could believe Democrat oratory the Democrat Party would be the me-too party. A curious example of this attempt to be all things to all men is found in the President's recent message on the state of the Union which, I may say, contained a minimum amount of comment on the state of the Union and a maximum quantity of cynical political bait. The speech is interesting because the President, anxious to appease a growing body of aroused Americans, resorted to the very me-too philosophy which he has often attacked on those occasions when certain Republicans have agreed with him. In an effort to attract the support of those who are alarmed by the increasing cost of government, by deficit spending at a time of high national income, and by the growing might of the Washington bureaucrats, the President stated that "businessmen must continue to have the incentives necessary for investment and for the development of new lines of enterprise."

Yet in the same breath he recommended a program which would go far toward eliminating these incentives, preclude the development of new enterprises, and concentrate more power in Washington.

The President also reiterated his desire for the repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley law although the overwhelming majority of the Democrats in the House are opposed to repeal. Indeed, when repeal of the Taft-Hartley law came before the first session of the Democrat-controlled Eighty-first Congress only 20 Democrats out of 263 voted in favor of repeal. Furthermore, in spite of the President's request for repeal, the Democrat leadership has apparently decided to keep this issue for the 1950 campaign. I believe that this is a grave disservice to labor. I believe that labor is entitled to be influential in both parties. I believe that the welfare of the working men and women of America is entitled to the same bipartisan consideration as that which is accorded to the welfare of the Europeans. Labor and capital are component parts of what is essentially a cooperative effort. It should be the mission of the Republican Party to take labor legislation out of politics.

Furthermore, in order to provide more jobs and higher wages, in order to raise our standard of living, we must increase and improve our tools of production. This we cannot do if incentives are stifled, if risk investments are made so risky that people won't take a chance. This is the paramount interest of all of our citizens and in particular of labor. It has been estimated that the average job in America requires a $6,000 investment. It is a disservice to labor to discourage such investments.

The Republican Party should also point out to what degree the working men and women of our country are weighted down with taxes. Our Federal Government annually costs the average American between $275 and $300. It now owes the average American family of four somewhere between seven and eight thousand dollars. The average American citizen is plagued by dozens of invisible taxes. Yet the President talks of substantial tax increases.

A notable omission from the President's message is that it contains no reference to the Hoover Commission reports and recommendations which hitherto had been thought to have substantial bipartisan support. This is sad, indeed, particularly in view of the budgetary deficit because I believe that the overwhelming majority of the American people, including those who want the Government to do so much, want it done without waste and with efficiency.

And while the Hoover Commission reports and recommendations are not a partisan matter; while they are supported by many citizens in both parties and by independent voters, certainly there is a tendency in some administration bureaucrats to prevent a proper streamlining of our Government. The Republicans should assert themselves to the utmost in order that the President and the Democrat-controlled Eighty-first Congress should proceed with dispatch to the implementation of these recommendations.

With regard to what is often referred to as social legislation, there is no need to embrace the solutions offered by the Democrats. However, neither should we ignore these problems where they exist. It is up to us to demonstrate our imagination and our intellectual vigor by coming out with better solutions. Principally, however, the difference between our point of view and theirs is that for us it should be an effort to respond to a human need while for them it is usually part of a plot to concentrate additional power in Washington. Such centralization is, of course, pleasing to the Communists since it enables them more easily to undermine the morale of our people and to destroy the political fabric of our country.

Because the Government must be the servant of the people it must also be strong enough and wise enough to respond effectively to the problems of the day. While we provide incentives for the creation of new wealth, we must also intercede on behalf of those for whom life is particularly difficult in order that the people should retain their enthusiasm for the private-property system. While in order to raise our standard of living and buttress our economy we should reduce the national debt, effect large-scale economies in Government and return to sound fiscal policies, we must also assist those who have no more than a substandard on which to eke out a meager existence. But although the health of our Nation and the education of its citizens, old-age pensions and social security, minimum wages and unemployment compensation, large-scale production and full employment, rural electrification and flood control, adequate housing and soil conservation are all desirable objectives and all involve the people's welfare, we should burn into our brains the incontrovertible truth that the ultimate, the essential welfare of the American people depends upon the continuation and increase of the vital opportunities inherent in our free society. Aid to the needy, to the unfortunate in our society, is right and just and feasible. But if every family receives housing, food, clothing, medical care, and education from Washington, we shall have embarked upon a course which will cause a break-down not only in the American economy but also in the American character. And when a government attempts to redistribute to the citizens more than the citizens can produce, inflation and eventual dictatorship are the inevitable result.

I believe most strongly that on the issue of civil rights, acting in the clear and vigorous tradition of Abraham Lincoln, we should take a forthright stand. This is in keeping with our platform.

On this matter the Democrats are hesitant, apologetic, and ineffective. We can and must be united and strong. The Democrats have with consummate hypocrisy attempted to use this great problem in human relations for partisan advantage. In the last few days the Democrats have had the chance to bring up legislation involving the right of equal opportunity to work, and they have resorted to every parliamentary trick to avoid the issue. We should take no part in such activities. We should carry the banner on the civil-rights program. This is not only right and just and in the best Republican tradition, but it will also be of great help to us in the battle for men's minds which we are waging throughout the world with the godless forces of Communist aggression.

And this brings me to the primary issue which faces our Nation—the issue of war and peace.

For it is relentlessly true that any social gains we make will melt like snow in the sun if we have war. And while this overriding issue should be met without regard to party advantage, it is more important to be right than to be bipartisan. And it must be increasingly clear to the people of America that it will be to their advantage to have in Washington a government which devotes its time not to a justification of its errors but to correcting them; not to covering up mistakes but to policies which will safeguard the peace. We have a right to demand of our officials that they place loyalty to America ahead of loyalty to their friends and cronies.

The most conscicuous and discouraging characteristic of Mr. Truman's message on the state of the Union is that it made no mention of the catastrophe in China and the Communist threat to Formosa and that it gave no indication as to how the state of the Union is affected by the dire events which in recent weeks have rung down the iron curtain on some 475,000,000 people in Asia. Communists all over the world cannot but applaud this dramatic amends.

While I do not feel that it is necessary or advisable for us to attempt to occupy the island of Formosa, I do believe that aid on the Greek pattern should be tried. It is undeniable that President Truman's statement on Formosa constitutes an abandonment of the Truman doctrine which is world-wide in scope. Formosa is the symbol of the failure of our entire Asiatic policy.

And so, in an effort to throw some light on this dangerous condition, I introduced a few days ago a resolution of inquiry in which I asked certain questions with regard to this entire lamentable affair. It seemed to me that the American people through their elected representatives were entitled to be informed.

It so happens that I have been a nonpartisan supporter of foreign-affairs legislation ever since I have been in Congress. But I do not feel that because I am a Republican, therefore I have no right to criticize or to disagree. I believe that the American people are entitled to a second voice on the great issue of life and death which is involved in our foreign affairs. And I believe that to attempt by cries of partisanship to deprive them of these criticisms in a matter of such grave importance is to subvert the great purpose of our political system at a time of increasing national peril.

If we Republicans abdicate our prerogatives, America may soon become an island of liberty in a sea of slavery.

In order to keep the light of freedom burning ever more brightly in a dangerous world, we in America must create a broader base of partisan political participation. More and more of our citizens must become politically active if we are to preserve the system which makes their political participation possible. Political duties are inevitable corollaries of political rights. Freedoms and responsibilities are inseparable. By discharging these precious responsibilities, we shall at the same time be exercising these cherished rights. We shall also in this way furnish the impetus which America needs in meeting the unprecedented opportunities for leadership which fate and fortune have visited upon us. We shall in this fashion provide America with the grass-roots spiritual and moral strength to safeguard our freedoms at home and to protect our freedoms abroad.

So will we breathe new life into our two-party system, and in so doing maintain the vigilance which we know is the price of liberty.

So will America go forward to new prosperities.

So will the contagion of our active faith in freedom spread to the dark recesses of this troubled planet where the forces of tyranny and oppression are still on the march.

So will we at long last lead the oppressed people of this harassed world out of the morass of suffering and slavery in which they are engulfed and onto the high, dry ground of liberty and peace.

The Republican Party is the best hope of America, and America is the last best hope of earth.

Boston Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following letter that I have received together with a very enlightening statement written by John J. Carey concerning the Boston naval shipyard:

JANUARY 30, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: Enclosed please find a feature article which was in the Boston Post, Sunday, January 22, 1950.

This article, we like to feel, is what an impartial survey would find of our Boston yard. It clearly brings out the many things that we have pointed out to top naval officials in the last year.

We feel proud of this article and felt that you would, too; so that is why we are taking the liberty of sending it to you.

With best wishes, I remain,
Very truly yours,

EDWARD F. HINES,
Secretary,
Charlestown Metal Trades Council.

BOSTON'S PART IN WORLD WAR III

(By John J. Carey)

Recently a group of Boston newspaper men and women were invited to visit the Boston Naval Shipyard, at Charlestown, where, under the direction of shipyard commander Capt. Richard M. Watt, Jr., we would be able to get a comprehensive idea of what was being done currently in this important naval base; and the preparations that were being made for defense and offense in the event of world war III breaking out.

Probably few persons, even among those who daily pass by the Navy yard, realize that this is the second largest General Electric plant at Lynn. It is true, many of the buildings are antiquated and ill-adapted to modern ideas of manufacturing efficiency. But, inside the buildings, the machinery and equipment and the methods employed are up to the last minute.

FIVE BIG UNITS

In addition to the naval shipyard itself, at Charlestown, the First Naval District includes the big submerged oil tanks in East Boston near the Orient Heights section which were built for World War II, and from which, through a pipe line running along the path of the old narrow gage railroad to a point near the old Cunard docks, the Navy ships can be serviced with their fuel requirements.

Another most important adjunct of the naval district is the Commonwealth docks at South Boston wherein was built, in 1914, the largest drydock in the United States; and which is, in fact, only exceeded in size by one other in the world. Still, a third major unit of the naval facilities here are the shipyards at Hingham, which were built by the Government and operated by the Navy for the construction during the last war of destroyers and landing craft. A fifth unit is the big gear works at Lynn.

Assuming that our chief opponent in the event of a third world war would be Russia, Boston is regarded as the first base on what is called in naval circles Route 1 to Russia. This is Boston's position because Boston, among our major naval bases, is hundreds of miles nearest to Russia. Operations against Russia would necessarily be from the Atlantic seaboard as the nearest base to the heart of Russia. Operations in the Pacific would be largely of a defensive nature because of the vast distance to Siberia by water and the further thousands of miles across the Asiatic Continent to reach Moscow.

NEAREST TO "POINT CHARLEY"

Boston's importance, in the event of such a war, lies in the fact that as stated above, it is much nearer to what is known in naval circles as Point Charley, but also because deep water extends much closer to Boston than to the other major yards, at New York, Philadelphia, Norfolk, and Charleston, S. C. Point Charley is the point off the Canadian coast at which ships turn north to take the great circle route to Europe which, because of the earth's curvature, is a shorter route than if a ship sailed directly east.

From Point Charley to within about 40 miles of the Boston naval base there is deep water, which makes it impracticable for the laying of mines; whereas, in the case of the other major naval bases, this deep water ends several hundred miles out from the coast. Because of this advantage of comparative mine safety accruing to the Boston base, practically all ships injured or in need of replenished supplies would make for the Boston base. The need to keep this base in first-class shape physically, and well supplied with skilled workers under the conditions the world is facing, would seem most obvious.

SUPPLIES FOR OUR ENTIRE NAVY

The Boston shipyard at Charlestown manufactures all the rope and chains for the entire United States Navy, and the marvels of modern machinery employed there in this work are not excelled in any industrial plant in the country. Anyone who thinks that rope was for use only in the old sailing ships would be astonished to see the way it is turned out by the mile at Charlestown for our modern battleships and cruisers, and from small sizes that might be used on a rowboat to great hawsers, 6 inches in diameter. Besides the rope and chains, the forge and chain shops at the yard make practically all the other hardware, pipe fittings, hooks, plates, bolts, shackles, jaw-fitting wrenches, and tools of almost every conceivable kind.

The most modern method of anchor-chain manufacture—Dielock—was developed at the Boston naval shipyard in 1926, and it was developed, not by an MIT scientist, but by one of the workers at the yard. Since 1928 it has been recognized and adopted by the United States Navy as official standard.

NEED FOR DEFENSE PROGRAM

The very fact that the Boston naval district has so many advantages over the other major bases on this coast makes it all the more necessary that a comprehensive defense program for the Boston area should be mapped out. The enemy knows of these advantages and, therefore, would be alert to the need of putting the facilities at this base out of commission. Besides the defense measures being taken by the military authorities, there might well be especial need of such a civilian program as has been suggested by Congressman KENNEDY and Governor Dever to supplement what the military chiefs are doing.

I might say in closing that we newspaper representatives were very much impressed by what we saw and heard during our visit to the yard. The naval officers and the personnel were evidently as well equipped and trained to operate the big establishment as any group trained in private industry.

A Report to the People of Kansas City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, this is a report to the people of Kansas City. If a Member of Congress is to do his job well, he must try to keep in personal touch with the thousands of people he serves as their representative in the National Legislature. As the representative of all of you, the people of the Fifth Missouri Congressional District, I have tried to keep you informed of my activities in many ways—through a weekly radio report on Monday nights at 10 over KCMO, by columns in weekly newspapers, through newsletters to those who have expressed a particular interest and, of course, through a large amount of personal correspondence. When the Congress is adjourned I join my staff at our Kansas City service office in the Federal Building at 811 Grand Avenue. This service office is open the year round.

This report is another way to keep in touch—and a chance to discuss with you some of the problems we face together.

DICTATORSHIP VERSUS DEMOCRACY

During 1949 the United States moved farther along the road to world peace. We continued our support of the United Nations. Our votes in favor of continuing the Marshall plan, providing adequate defense forces and giving military aid to our Atlantic Pact partners made clear that we meant to support and defend democracy in the world-wide struggle between dictatorship and democracy.

It seems to me that today, for the first time in history, our great country has a positive and well-rounded foreign policy. While we have not won every skirmish in the cold war, we have made a good beginning. Some of our victories have been spectacular—like breaking the Berlin blockade—other efforts have been less spectacular but just as important, such as plugging away, day after day, over the Voice of America, telling the world about our democracy and our efforts toward peace and world order. But the struggle between democracy and dictatorship will go on for a long time. The Communists will never, of their own accord, give up trying to destroy democracy as we know it. They and the other totalitarians will continue to try to develop fifth columns in democratic nations which is one of the reasons why my vote was cast for adequate appropriations for the House Committee on Un-American Activities. They will keep on exploiting misery, disease, poverty, and unrest wherever these conditions exist as a pretext for attacking the democratic way of life. What we have to do is to help plant the ideas and ideals of democracy firmly throughout the world and work to get rid of the conditions which give Communists their chance to spread their false doctrines among desperate and hungry people. The greatest ultimate security against communism will be found in the eventual elimination of the abject poverty and fearful insecurity in which so many of the world's people live. Peace will not come easily—we have to work at it constantly, with real determination and in cooperation with the other democracies.

ADVANCE OR RETREAT

Just as cooperation with other democracies is the key to the success of our foreign policy, so is cooperation by all the elements in our national community the answer to making our great domestic hopes come true. Our country enjoys the highest standard of living the world has ever known—yet, in 1948, a prosperity year, about one-third of all our families did not get the minimum goods and services they needed for their health and welfare. We cannot afford this.

There are many different ways in which this problem must be attacked if we are to solve it. First we all must recognize that ours can and must be an expanding economy. Despite our enormous production we have not approached our full possible development—there is no good reason why our gross national product 5 years from now should not be increased tens of billions of dollars to $300,000,000,000 a year. We have the means at hand, the resources, energy, and know-how. The achievement of this goal is in the interest of all groups in our national community. To achieve this goal we must all work together.

But if 5 years from now our over-all productivity is increased to $300,000,000,000 the problem of the lower economic third would not solve itself automatically. We must understand that we cannot afford to have millions of our citizens handicapped by low wages and poor working conditions, by the fear of insecurity in old age, by inadequate education and medical care or by opportunities restricted by senseless prejudices.

I believe we must have a program designed to help people to help themselves and develop into more productive workers in our communities and more confident citizens of our Nation. Some say we are trying to do too much—I say we cannot afford to do less. The challenge to us today is as great as those faced up to by the men who founded our great country, the pioneers who opened up our West and those Americans who on the battlefields have fought and died to preserve democracy.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE

In the House, we voted last year to remove the unfair taxes on oleomargarine, and the Senate has recently followed suit. We passed a reasonably good rent-control law which protects the tenant from undue hardships and still assures the landlord a fair business return. A great program of housing and slum-clearance was enacted into law after a long fight in this and previous sessions of Congress. The House passed an expanded and improved social security bill, which the Senate is expected to act upon this year, extending coverage to 11,000,000 new people and increasing benefits on the average of 70 percent. Certain important benefits for disabled veterans and their dependents were also liberalized.

The minimum wage was raised to 75 cents an hour to help keep our laws in step with the times. I strongly supported this measure but was opposed to the amendment removing about 1,000,000 workers from coverage, which nevertheless was passed. An attempt was made to repeal the Taft-Hartley labor-management law and to write more constructive and effective labor-management legislation. I voted against the so-called Wood substitute bill, because it represented the substance of the present act under a different label. I did support the so-called Sims compromise, but when that failed, I joined with the majority in sending the Wood bill back to the committee. This important question remains before us.

Because of the vital need for cooperation among all our economic elements, it is very encouraging that a large number of Representatives from the cities showed an interest in the problems of the farmer. I was happy to have the chance to vote in favor of a bill to make telephones more readily available to rural areas. Part of the over-all housing program which we passed was devoted to the improvement of substandard rural housing. While I am in no way satisfied with the present farm price-support program—I voted for the final passage of the present bill because of the great importance to our economy of reasonably stable farm prices.

An amendment to the Antitrust Act was passed by the House in an important step to curb monopoly and unfair business practices. This bill, if passed by the Senate, would prohibit corporations from buying up the physical assets of their smaller competitors, which some groups had been doing because of a legal loophole in the old law. Individual initiative and healthy competition have helped to make us great, and we should make sure that our laws protect the small businessman from the encroachment of large corporations and great concentrations of economic power.

Despite the opposition of those of us who felt the legislation unfair to consumers, the House passed a bill which, should it become law, would result in greatly increased costs to the users of natural gas.

In my judgment it is not right in a democracy to make voting more difficult for one man than another so I voted in favor of the anti-poll-tax bill which passed the House.

A RIGHT WAY AND A WRONG WAY

A Congressman soon learns that there is more than one way for legislation to be defeated in either the House or the

Senate. One way is the way we all understand—honest disagreement over the merits of the legislation. One side says "we are for it," the other side "we are against it." That is a direct and honest approach. The other approach is less well known. It consists of killing a bill by parliamentary maneuver. On the first day of the first session in 1949, we passed an amendment to the rules of the House which made it impossible for a handful of Members of the House sitting on the Rules Committee to bottle up legislation they did not like and prevent it from coming to the floor for democratic decision by the majority of the Members. An attempt a few days ago to reimpose this gag rule was soundly defeated.

Just as there is a right way and a wrong way for the House to carry on its business, there is a right way and a wrong way to carry into effect the decisions of the Congress. The decisions of the Congress when signed by the President become the laws of the land and are then administered and enforced by the executive departments. Much progress has been made in the field of reorganization of the executive departments. Many of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization have been carried into effect. I have strongly and consistently supported and worked for this program to streamline the functions of our Government and to assure the taxpayers the maximum benefit and service for every dollar spent.

THE NEW AGENDA

We still face many problems. Our Nation's schools are in dire need of assistance from the Federal Government. Laws are needed to assure the unhampered use of the ballot, and the right for all our citizens to compete equally with others for employment for which they qualify. Some of our problems are financial. We are facing a deficit in a year of general prosperity. Our tax structure must be overhauled and modernized. Wartime excise taxes, for example, should be substantially reduced or, in some cases, eliminated, to assure a continued high level of business activity.

Some areas of the country have serious production and employment problems. We are fortunate that Kansas City is in an area which Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer described as "clearly the most prosperous of all the areas of the country."

As a Nation, we have learned our lessons the hard way. We have seen the totalitarian isms grow up and thrive in places where misery and poverty rule and people grasp for any false promise that seems to offer them a glimmer of hope. What we are doing—in the world and here at home—is taking out some insurance against the known hazards of bad economic and social conditions. In the heat of argument and debate your Representatives are trying to devise the ways that this can best be done.

In a democracy we can all share in building the future of our country and working for the communities that make up our Nation. No dictator can tell us what to do and when to do it. We use our democratic processes to tell ourselves what to do through the election of public officials who know us and respond to our needs. But the person who fails to use his democratic rights is not doing his share—he is letting somebody else do his thinking for him, and, more often than not, he is indirectly working against democracy and our way of life. I firmly believe that we cannot afford to let this happen because in these troubled times we face problems that everybody must help decide. We must all play our part. We must all work together. Only our enemies would divide us.

Once in a while, it is good to hear our goals restated. Here is what President Harry Truman said about our hopes in his recent State of the Union message to the Congress and the people:

We work for a better life for all, so that all men may put to good use the great gifts with which they have been endowed by their Creator. We seek to establish those material conditions of life, in which, without exception, men may live in dignity, perform useful work, serve their communities, and worship God as they see fit.

These may seem simple goals, but they are not little ones. They are worth a great deal more than all the empires and conquests of history. They are not to be achieved by military aggression or political fanaticism. They are to be achieved by humbler means—by hard work, by a spirit of self-restraint in our dealings with one another, and by a deep devotion to the principles of justice and equality.

It should make us truly thankful, as we look back to the beginnings of this country, that we have come so far along the road to a better life for all. It should make us humble to think, as we look ahead, how much farther we have to go to accomplish, at home and abroad, the objectives that were set out for us at the founding of this Nation.

As we approach the halfway mark in the twentieth century, we should ask for continued strength and guidance from that Almighty Power who has placed before us such great opportunities for the good of mankind in the years to come.

Textile Workers Union of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to enclose the following article from Textile Labor, official publication of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, January 21, 1950:

JOBLESS INSURANCE FLOPS BADLY IN TIME OF ECONOMIC DEPRESSION!

(By Irving Kahn)

Statistics now show what many jobless workers have known all along—that unemployment compensation is grossly inadequate even in States boasting the highest jobless insurance benefits. One-third of the Nation's unemployed workers already have exhausted benefits. The President's Council of Economic Advisers reports that in some areas the number of workers collecting UCC payments actually is smaller than those who have run out of benefits.

Congress has been told in the President's economic report that in a number of major labor markets, 60 to 75 percent of the unemployed have exhausted payments.

In the third quarter of 1949 alone, 500,000 workers exhausted their insurance, compared to 225,000 for the same period in 1948.

FIRST TEST

These are some of the products of the unemployment compensation system's first test since the war. By prewar depression standards, the test was not a major one. Some sources even described it as merely a period of healthy readjustment. They were not textile workers; for the latter, the test was severe.

But however it is labeled, statistics show that unemployment insurance not only fell far short of meeting workers' needs during a slump, but as it now stands, will fail even shorter in the event of a real depression.

UCC payments did prevent a major collapse in consumer purchasing power but they did not help tide over periods of idleness some 35 percent of the Nation's unemployed. These 1,500,000 workers were left completely without income between jobs in 1949.

SOME SHORTCOMINGS

Regardless of the size of benefits and they varied from a top of $26 plus dependents' allowances for 26 weeks, in some States, to $15 for 12 weeks in others, the same general shortcomings were evident everywhere:

1. Benefits were too low, didn't last long enough, especially in one-industry towns, where other jobs were not available. Nationally, the average payment was only $21.01 a week and the duration was 12 weeks even though based on the highest workers' income credits in the Nation's history.

2. Not enough workers were covered; more than 30 percent still are barred.

3. Payments represented only about 35 percent of a worker's average earnings. When UCC was established in 1935, payments averaged 44 percent with the goal set at 50 percent. In the passing years jobless benefits have lost ground in relation to living costs instead of increasing.

4. Seasonal workers, like those in many branches of textiles, who need jobless insurance most, drew the smallest and shortest benefits.

5. Merit-rating refunds to employers with the lowest lay-offs, may be good in theory; in practice, however, the system is completely cockeyed for it imposes a low tax on employers in good times, when they can afford a high tax, and raises the tax in bad times, when they can afford it least.

REFUND BAIT

The bait of refunds has stiffened employers' resistance to new or improved benefits for workers. It has encouraged employers' groups to keep alive the phony charge that workers prefer to loaf at home and collect jobless insurance rather than work.

The barrage of propaganda has been so great that the public often forgets that jobless insurance is not a hand-out but a right earned and paid for by workers from their wages.

In practice, merit rating actually robs unemployment compensation funds. If eliminated and the full 2.7-percent tax on employers were collected, most States could raise benefits and spread them over a longer period without imposing new taxes.

BOWLES' STUDY

A study recently completed in Connecticut under the direction of Gov. Chester Bowles underlines this point, although it studiedly avoids recommending an end to refunds for employers.

Figures reported by Bowles contend that employers' payments in 1949 were the lowest in the Nation—half of those in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, neighboring States with similar economies. Average payment was 0.07 percent, compared to 2.7 percent allowed by law. In 1950, it was hiked to 1.4 percent.

Bowles reports that 40,000 workers are now receiving unemployment benefits but 52,900

others who drew an average of only $19.60 a week—in a State with one of the highest benefit rates—exhausted their benefits.

Bowles says these people need help—now. He proposes that their benefits be extended to March 31; to do so would cost between $4,000,000 and $10,000,000. He proposes that the money be taken from the State UCC fund which now stands at $158,000,000.

MERIT RATING

But his report shows that in 1948 alone merit-rating refunds amounted to more than $7,000,000. It is obvious that if merit rating were ended, Connecticut could extend present unemployment payments at least 3 months more, or a total of 9 months a year. That would bridge many a gap between jobs and would cut relief rolls.

The situation is more serious in Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

The Bay State paid out in 1949 about $115,000,000, according to Antonio England, former TWUA cotton-rayon assistant director who now is director of the State's division of employment security. The fund now stands at around $107,000,000, lowest since 1941.

RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island last year paid out $30,000,000 and its fund is around $26,000,000 today. In Connecticut, payment was $43,000,000, as against a $158,000,000 fund.

Eliminating merit rating would increase available funds, England concedes, but in Massachusetts it would not solve the basic problem.

On a $3,000,000,000 annual economy, a full 2.7 percent tax would bring in about $81,000,000, still far short of the $115,000,000 spent in 1949.

As far as England is concerned, the basic answer is more jobs. That's the direct way of dealing with a situation in which 127,000 are currently jobless and 160,000 will have exhausted benefits by April 1.

WORK PROJECTS

Massachusetts is thinking in terms of work projects like road construction and veterans' housing.

Rhode Island, where at one time last year 20 percent of all workers covered by the act were collecting jobless insurance, is thinking in terms of Federal aid, although its spokesmen are aware that what it needs basically is a diversified economy.

Seasonal industries like textiles and jewelry create crises by dumping thousands of workers on the unemployment rolls.

The State fund is slightly better off today for an ominous reason. So many workers already have exhausted benefits that the fund is now paying out less than is coming in.

BILL UP

But Rhode Island needs help. Its Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN has introduced a bill in Congress to reinsure State UCC funds and provide Federal grants to States where funds have dropped to the danger point.

Chester Bowles' way seems to be a more lasting answer. By increasing benefits and stretching the period of payment, the cushion under the economy which unemployment insurance has provided in the past can be made far firmer than it now is.

But isolated action by each State also is inadequate. A Federal program is needed. The Forand bill is the best prospect of the moment.

It would preserve the present Federal-State relationship, but fix minimum UCC standards for all States.

It would pay workers at least 50 percent of weekly wages and up to 10 percent more for dependents for at least 26 weeks. It would end waiting periods and some of the disqualifications that bar jobless workers from benefits.

The bill is not up to CIO standards. CIO wants coverage for all workers 52 weeks a year with all disqualifications, including those involving strikers, removed. It also wants the UCC system federalized. It knows that if States are left to act for themselves, nothing will be accomplished. But it is supporting the Forand bill.

Not so most industrialists and businessmen. Despite the lift jobless insurance gave consumers' buying power at the height of unemployment, they're for "toughening up" UCC administration. This means giving fewer people less benefits for a shorter time.

CHOOSE NOTHING

Given the choice of making unemployment insurance fit today's bill or resorting to depression-type WPA programs, the business and industrial community chooses—nothing.

As John W. Edelman, TWUA Washington representative, once told a chamber of commerce institute on this subject, it may require the "equivalent of an economic atomic bomb to awaken employing groups in the country to the fact that our free-enterprise system will not survive unless we speedily enact and honestly apply a comprehensive Federal security system which fulfills in fact the promise that the name implies."

Until that happens, it's up to the Eighty-first Congress to make the choice for business and industry—much in the manner of a doctor forcing medicine down the throat of a sick but unwilling patient.

Veterans' Housing to Veterans' Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, following the war Congress made available by legislation surplus buildings throughout the country for veterans' housing. This program was known as temporary veterans' housing and was sponsored by communities and veterans' organizations throughout the country. In legislation passed during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress it was provided that the Housing and Home Finance Agency could relinquish such veterans temporary housing to municipalities and other entities sponsoring such housing locally. However, such legislation did not provide that the housing and Home Finance Agency could turn over such temporary veterans' housing to nonprofit veterans' organizations chartered by Congress. In instances throughout the country nonprofit veterans' organizations have been carrying on, administering, and sponsoring such temporary veterans' housing. In order that war veterans might continue the use of such temporary veterans' housing I have introduced a joint resolution whereby the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency may relinquish and transfer such temporary veterans' housing to nonprofit veterans' organizations chartered by the acts of Congress, as now being transferred to counties, cities, and other public bodies. This would permit the administration of such temporary housing to be carried on by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans, and other nonprofit veterans' organizations chartered by the acts of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there is included herewith the following copy of the joint resolution:

Joint resolution to amend the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, giving nonprofit veterans' organizations administration of temporary veterans' housing

Whereas public law provided that the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency may relinquish and transfer title to temporary housing provided for certain veterans and their families under title V of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, to State, county, city, or other public body; and

Whereas in numerous cases such temporary housing has been sponsored by the veterans' organizations; and

Whereas said act of October 14, 1940, did not provide for relinquishment and transfer to such veterans' organizations: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency may relinquish and transfer, pursuant to the same general terms and conditions specified in subsections 505 (a) and (b) of the act of October 14, 1940, as added by the act of June 28, 1948, Public Law 796, title to temporary housing provided for certain veterans and their families under title V of said act of October 14, 1940, as amended, to any State, county, city, or other public body, including nonprofit veterans' organizations chartered by the acts of Congress: *Provided further*, That any application for such relinquishment and transfer shall be filed with the Administrator within 120 days after the approval of this act.

Removal of Racial Restrictions Now Prohibiting Admission to United States of Wives of World War II Veterans Asked To Meet Problem Arising in Japan and Other Pacific Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to incorporate the text of a statement issued to the press setting forth the reasons for the introduction today of 24 private bills to remove racial restrictions now barring wives and fiancées of World War II veterans and parents of American citizens to this country.

The statement follows:

The removal of racial restrictions now prohibiting admission to this country of wives, present and prospective, of World War II veterans because they are nationals of Japan or of other countries whose people are ineligible to citizenship, is proposed in a series of private bills introduced in the House today by JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

Delegate FARRINGTON proposes that the same policies that apply to brides of European races should apply to those of Oriental races who are ineligible to citizenship under present law.

He is requesting the House to act on 18 cases on an individual basis insofar as the Senate has failed to act in a period of more than a year on H. R. 120 (the Judd bill)

under which the racial restrictions in our immigration and naturalization laws would be removed.

The action taken by Delegate FARRINGTON today follows extensive correspondence and study of this subject. While in Tokyo in December, Delegate FARRINGTON discussed the problem presented by the marriage, present and prospective, of American soldiers to Japanese nationals with both officials of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's staff and with a large number of individual Americans now serving in the United States Army and in civilian capacities with the American forces in Japan.

Precedent for action on such cases on an individual basis has already been provided by the enactment of individual bills under which fiancées of American veterans who are Japanese nationals have been admitted to this country in order to consummate their marriages.

The bills introduced by Delegate FARRINGTON include:

1. Twelve that provide approval of marriages of American veterans now in Japan to Japanese nationals;

2. Two that would permit the marriage of American veterans to Japanese nationals;

3. That would admit two Japanese fiancées to this country for purposes of marriage to American veterans.

Delegate FARRINGTON at the same time introduced eight bills that would permit the return to Hawaii of alien Japanese parents of American citizens. He pointed out that these for the most part involve parents who lived for many years in Hawaii and failed to maintain their reentry permits so as to allow them to return to Hawaii to live with their children in their declining years.

"The introduction of these private bills to cover individual cases constitutes a very laborious method for dealing with this problem," Delegate FARRINGTON said, "and I have resorted to it only because it seems to offer the only prospect now for bringing relief to people who are suffering discrimination as the result of the continuation of certain restrictions in our immigration laws."

Military authorities who require permits for military personnel before a marriage takes place have no choice but to deny permits to those who intend to marry women of races ineligible to citizenship.

The policy of the Departments of the Army and the Air Force covering marriage in overseas commands is set forth in Special Regulations No. 600-240-5 and Air Force Regulation No. 34-12, issued in Washington under date of February 11, 1949.

The regulations point out that the alien wife of any United States citizen may be approved for entry to the United States on a permanent-residence basis without regard to quota only after having met the statutory restrictions covering the admissibility of aliens.

These regulations set forth the standards that must be met with regard to physical, mental, and moral condition of the individual involved and the restrictions applying to races ineligible for citizenship.

Requirements covering the financial responsibility of the prospective husband are also pointed out.

The policy of the services is that careful consideration should be given to all aspects of the marriage, including the admissibility of stepchildren as well as wives before permission to marry is granted.

Military personnel are required to obtain written approval prior to marrying. The policy of the Departments is to grant approval where personnel have complied with local regulations and the alien fiancées are found on examination to meet all requirements for admission to the United States. The inadmissibility of a fiancée constitutes a reason for denying permission to marry.

In the cases of women of races ineligible to citizenship, such as Japanese, Korean, and certain people of the Polynesian and Micronesian races this is absolute. The latter are ineligible to admission to this country or to citizenship.

The problem this presents is a very serious one with respect to Japanese. A large number of American troops have been and still are stationed in Japan. Among these are a very substantial number of Americans of Japanese ancestry.

The military authorities cannot grant permission for marriages which might otherwise be completely in order, from the standpoint of the character of the individuals involved and their financial responsibility, because the fiancées are ineligible to citizenship and to admission to this country.

The resulting situation has been most unfortunate. It has resulted in marriages which have taken place without the consent of the military authorities, and in a number of instances, the birth of children who did not have proper legal status in this country even though the marriages and births have been in accordance with Japanese law.

It has emphasized in a most unfortunate way the racial barrier against the Japanese race which still remains in our immigration and naturalization laws.

Under date of September 24, 1949, General Headquarters, Far East Command, issued circular 51 containing the regulations covering the marriage of civilian and military personnel in that command.

These regulations contain in paragraph 3, subsection c, this statement:

"Except under very unusual circumstances, personnel listed in paragraph 2 who are United States citizens will not be granted permission to marry persons who are ineligible to enter the United States for permanent residence or naturalization. Approval of requests may be given by the commander in chief, Far East, only."

Shortly after the war, Congress adopted the so-called GI Brides Act and the Fiancées Act in order to facilitate the admission to this country of alien wives and fiancées of American soldiers.

The GI Brides Act permitted the admission of these wives up to the end of December 1948. The law as originally presented did not include wives of races ineligible to citizenship. This denied to many veterans who served in the Pacific permission to bring to this country wives of races living in Pacific countries such as the Polynesians, Koreans, and Japanese, who are ineligible to citizenship.

This law was finally amended but only to permit the entrance of wives where marriages had occurred before August 22, 1947. There still remain a considerable number of men who were unable to marry before that date. These, and others who have married since that time, are confronted with a problem which certainly merits special legislation.

Ground Hog Day

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, Thursday next, February 2, is a great day—Ground Hog Day. And, again, I want to call to the attention of the House, to keep the record straight, that Punxsutawney, Jefferson County, Pa., Nineteenth District, is the home of the ground hog, that great prognosticator of the weather.

For more years than I care to remember—in fact ever since Punxsutawney was founded in 1849—this great meteorologist from his home at Gobbler's Knob, Punxsutawney, Pa., has been keeping the American people informed as to weather conditions for the 6 weeks following Ground Hog Day, February 2.

It is a matter of record that if the ground hog sees his shadow we are in for six additional weeks of cold wintry weather, and if his shadow fails to appear spring is around the corner.

Therefore, it is disconcerting to me and my many friends in Jefferson County, Pa., to see the bold attempts made by promoters of a lot of common alley cats, and so forth, trying to cut in on the ground hog's yearly prediction. This is a grave injustice to this great "seer" of the weather and it makes him very irritable. These brash attempts, which I deeply resent, by the run-of-the-mine fabricators and deceivers have given "his chuckship" in Punxsutawney a great deal of anguish. Last year, right here in Washington the local press tried to cut in on his annual irrefutable prediction with a common caged-up zoo cat posing as a ground hog. You all know the accuracy of weather prediction by this synthetic Washington ground hog. So, I want to impress upon the members that Punxsutawney, Pa., is the home of the ground hog—the originator of this unique and remarkable weather service, and that the Punxsutawney ground hog is the one and the only one that can make true, accurate, and unquestioned predictions on weather conditions for the next 6 weeks following February 2.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I asked the gentleman to yield just to advise him that out in Ohio we honor Ground Hog Day each February 2 by the annual banquet of the Greenville Liars Club, for which I would be very happy to propose the gentleman for membership if he can spell that word "Punxsutawney" or whatever it was.

Mr. GAVIN. It is Punxsutawney.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman can spell the word, I should be glad to propose him for membership in the Greenville Liars Club and pay his initiation fees.

Mr. GAVIN. Well, I will be glad to do that now: P-u-n-x-s-u-t-a-w-n-e-y.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is very, very learned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Cotton and Peanut Acreage Allotments and Marketing Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, we are today confronted with a problem that is

not only of interest to the cotton growers of the Nation, but one that is paramount to the economy of the whole country. Days could be spent in arguing as to who is responsible for this condition, but, after all, where would that get us? Absolutely nowhere.

The important thing is that many cotton growers in this Nation are being unduly penalized through no fault of theirs. Please bear in mind that this bill is only 1-year legislation. It applies only for the year 1950. Just as soon as this legislation is disposed of, the Agriculture Committees of both the House and Senate are going to give careful study and consideration to the whole cotton program. You may ask why the present program is not working in an equitable manner. In the first place, no cotton quota program had been in effect since 1942. There was also the provision in prior laws that farmers who had diverted from cotton to the production of war crops should receive credit for such war crops in future cotton acreage allotments. This Congress should have, and did, keep faith with the farmer who voluntarily diverted his acreage from cotton to the production of some other crop that was in short supply. It now makes no difference what was the motive behind such a diversion. For my part, I believe that in the main, it was done to help the war effort. However, the law only provided that it be done, and since it was done in justice and in fair dealing, we must give credit where it was earned.

There was also a provision that there be an acreage reserve of 10 percent of the State allotment, and a reserve of 15 percent of the county allotment. There has been no uniform reservation of this reserve, either by the counties or by the States. Some counties have not reserved anything at all, while others made a very small reservation. I am not criticizing anyone, but only stating a fact. I am sure that both State and county committees have done the best that they could under the handicap that they have had to work under. This was something new to them and they were severely handicapped by the lack of accurate information. Remember, that there had been no quotas since 1942. There were no records, either on the individual farms or at the county or State level. Out of the nine counties in my congressional district, acreage reserves varied from minus 1 percent in one county to 2½ percent in another, and then all the way up to 15 percent. Out of the nine counties, five reserved over 7½ percent, and four under 7½ percent. However, one thing was done for which I do not believe there is any complaint, and that is the provision that the Secretary of Agriculture should allocate to each State its fair proporation or share of the national acreage. From there, it was the consensus of opinion in the Congress that the allotments to the respective counties and from the county level to the individual farm should be done locally—by those who were more familiar with local conditions than the Department of Agriculture here in Washington. This has not worked out satisfactorily because the law was new and there were many new committees who, on the whole, have done a good job under trying and difficult circumstances. However, in some instances, inequalities and injustices have developed. A condition that no one individual can be charged with, just an unfortunate situation that should and must be corrected.

The House Committee on Agriculture has been very diligent in an effort to correct this injustice, insofar as legislation is concerned. Early in December of last year when it developed that inequities were cropping up, the chairman of this committee requested those members of the committee who were interested to come to Washington for a special meeting. Many members of the committee immediately canceled engagements in their respective districts and came to Washington in an effort to attempt to do something to alleviate these hardship cases. Other Congressmen from the Cotton Belt met with the committee and after a thorough discussion and conference with the Secretary of Agriculture, and members of his staff, the chairman issued a statement to the effect that immediately upon the convening of Congress, that the committee would take prompt action to correct the injustices and inequalities as far as it could be done by legislation.

So, this is the reason we have this legislation before us today. The small increase that is requested will not unduly depress the market. Even with this modest increase, there will be a substantial reduction in cotton acreage this year, and it is estimated that after this increase is provided that we will have at least 5,000,000 fewer acres planted to cotton in 1950 than were planted in 1949. Some have estimated this as high as 6,000,000 fewer acres. We expect to have from year to year a constant and continuing decrease in the amount of cotton acreage until the carry-over is reduced to the point where the total supply of cotton will not exceed the normal supply as specified in the law. This legislation is fair and just.

There is a section in this bill which seeks to correct, for 1 year only, the mistake that was made in the 1949 peanut legislation. During the war, peanut acreage was 3,300,000 acres. In 1949, this was cut to 2,650,000 acres; and in 1950, this year, it has been cut to 2,100,000 acres. Without any hearings and in an effort to be helpful to one State, a provision was inserted in the cotton bill providing that no State shall receive less than 60 percent of the acreage of peanuts harvested for nuts in the calendar year 1948. It was thought and believed by the conference committee that any additional acreage given to this one State would be taken from each of the peanut-growing States. Certainly, those from this State who are interested in this legislation did not intend that one or two of the States should be made to unduly suffer. However, this was just what happened. Alabama and Texas were unjustly and unduly penalized because with a national allotment of 2,100,000 acres, the allotment to Alabama would be around 30 percent below the allotment to Alabama for 1943, whereas the national allotment would only be 19½ percent below the national allotment for 1949.

The farmers of my State know that there must be a cut in peanut acreage. In 1949, they took this cut without complaint and in 1950 were prepared to take another big cut in the national allotment. However, they were not prepared to take a cut in which all of the other peanut producing States did not participate. When farmers voted for marketing quotas on peanuts in 1949, they were assured that if a cut was made in the national allotment, it would apply prorata to all State allotments. After marketing quotas were established, it was unjust, unfair, and inequitable, and unconstitutional to change the law where it worked a decrease upon these farmers. We cannot change the rules in the middle of a game. I know that when the facts are known that no one will object to a clarification of this section.

Mathematical Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, in a little midwestern town, I know of a church of a small denomination that does not own the church building, but instead the congregation rent a meeting place for all of their church services and Sunday school and all general assembly purposes and activities. They pay $1,200 a year rent. Among the various church activities, the women's organization meets in the church parlor for an hour one Thursday afternoon each month for their program. According to one computation from the above facts, a queer and distorted arithmetic might claim that $100 was the cost per hour for the use of the church building by this group of members. To do this, of course, they would have to ignore all other church uses of the building. Such a claim would be distorted, foolish, and untrue. And yet, this is the kind of arithmetic that we have been treated to on the floor of this House and by the propagandists in their recent figuring concerning the central Arizona water project.

To be more specific, this is the arithmetic which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] calls to our attention on page 1130 of the RECORD for January 30. He speaks of spending $1,600 per acre to put water on land in Arizona which would be worth only $200 per acre when reclaimed, and he asks, "Is not that asinine?" My reply is that that certainly would be asinine. I would never endorse such a proposal, and have never advocated such. I would not blame any public official for opposing the spending of $1,600 to reclaim an acre of land which would be worth

only $200 an acre when reclaimed. I know of no public official who is advocating any such thing, but apparently Mr. RICH thinks that I myself am advocating such, judging from the remarks as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I wonder where the gentleman from Pennsylvania got his information? He is wrong regarding the $1,600 cost and equally wrong regarding the $200 an acre final value. He gives us only one factor of the problem by saying that the cost is $1,600 per acre, without being too specific as to the total cost of the thing under consideration and the total number of acres involved. What does he divide into what to get this $1,600? There are three parts to any problem in division. There is the divisor, the dividend, and the quotient. In this case, $1,600 is the quotient. As he computes it is it right or wrong? Correct or incorrect? I say it is fantastically incorrect. Of course, if you pick out a number which is outlandishly distorted as a dividend and divide into that number an insignificantly small divisor, you might get 1,600 as a quotient. But surely we ought to use a correct divisor and a correct dividend, if we want to arrive at a correct quotient.

Not knowing where Mr. RICH gets his figures, but knowing full well the phony figures that have been spewed all over the country by the Los Angeles propaganda machine, I can well guess the actual source of these figures. In this three-part arithmetical problem, the cost of the project—that part being considered—ought logically to be called the dividend. The number of acres to be benefited ought logically to be called the divisor; and if the latter number is divided into the former, we might logically assume that the quotient obtained represents the per-acre cost. First, let us look at the dividend.

What is the cost for the irrigation part only of this central Arizona project? It is not one and a half billion dollars, regardless of who says so. No competent engineer has ever made any such computation. The cost of this project is not $1,500,000,000. It is certainly not even $700,000,000, which is the Bureau of Reclamation estimate of the total cost under the terms of the bill, S. 75, amended and reported by the Senate committee. Mind you, we are talking now about the reclamation phase only of this central Arizona project—diverting the water into Arizona. It is reliably estimated that the cost of bringing water from the Colorado River to the lands to be benefited is $267,000,000. Rightfully and correctly, Mr. RICH and every other person figuring on this project should regard $267,000,000 as the estimated cost of the reclamation part of this comprehensive multiple-purpose project. I want to make it very clear that we are talking about $267,000,000, and not properly $700,000,000 nor one billion nor one and a half billion to which the windy opponents have attempted to blow up these figures.

Well, what is the correct divisor to be used in this problem? We cannot get a correct answer for a quotient—meaning cost per acre of the improved land—until we know how many acres we are dealing with.

HERE IS THE MATHEMATICAL TRUTH

Seven hundred and twenty-five thousand acres call for a supplemental supply of water, and that is the number that should be our divisor. Two hundred and sixty-seven million dollars is the estimated cost for those facilities which will be used solely to bring water into central Arizona for these 725,000 acres of land. Let us divide 725,000—representing the acres to be benefited—into the $267,000,000 estimated cost of facilities to bring the water, and our quotient or answer is a $370 burden upon each acre instead of the fantastic $1,600 which the gentleman from Pennsylvania evidently borrowed from somebody in California.

We must not overlook the fact that the total cost of this multiple-purpose project, now approximately $700,000,000, is more than half chargeable to commercial power production and is highly desired by California opponents of this particular bill. They have repeatedly declared that they want to build the Bridge Canyon Dam for power production only, which power they hope to get into southern California. Arizona needs the commercial power that would be produced at the Bridge Canyon Dam and has offered to buy all of it, so that Arizona power users could and would bear the chief burden of cost in this total project, and all of the money spent would be returned to the Public Treasury.

If certain California interests could kill this legislation for Arizona, in order to take for themselves that water which rightfully belongs to Arizona, thereby dwarfing the future of the youngest State in the Union, I am confident that they would then come before you asking for an appropriation as great, or greater, to duplicate or enlarge upon the power features in this particular bill. The only difference would be that the power would be solely for California's benefit—and they would also have water which belongs to Arizona.

Address by Oscar L. Chapman Before the Nebraska Reclamation Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority leader the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] who is absent on committee work, and at his request, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, before the Nebraska Reclamation Association, at Grand Island, Nebr., on January 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciate this opportunity to visit Grand Island on my first western trip since assuming my duties as Secretary of the Interior.

As you know, I am not exactly a stranger to Nebraska, and I think I could never be a stranger to people who have joined together, to promote the reclamation of the natural resources around them. I congratulate the Nebraska Reclamation Association for its past achievements, and I am glad to meet with you to talk about the future. In many ways we of the Department of the Interior feel more at home out here than at our desks back East.

You are the people who are among the leaders in the battle to conserve our great natural resources in water, power, and land. You have provided magnificent demonstrations of what a people can do to turn these resources to the enrichment of their own lives. You are the people to talk with about the job yet to be done, and you can give us advice on the way to do it.

The West has a big part to play in the building of the country's future.

At this midpoint of the twentieth century, we are entering a period in which we shall have to develop our resources far more aggressively, depending increasingly upon those resources which have not been immediately accessible. Our new task will require thinking about broader areas, and imagining a newer and better kind of life. It will be a life to which Americans are entitled, and one which will come to them through their own efforts.

The resources we have failed to use fully up to now can provide us with an abundance greater than we have ever had in the past. They will give us a new frontier, a western frontier to lift again the living level of our Nation's people.

Reclamation is a word we all understand. It gives us access to the water, land, electric power, and other resources of our river basins. It controls our floods, it provides recreational facilities for better health and enjoyment of life. It provides power and light to help us in our homes, on our farms, and in our business.

It reclaims the material gifts of nature, and directs them toward the betterment of human life.

We are about to close the first half of the twentieth century with the job of reclamation far from finished. The development of irrigation is about half done, when we measure it by present methods, concepts, and legislation. Some 21,000,000 acres have been brought under the ditch by private and Federal action. About 19,000,000 still remain, waiting for water to bring them into productivity.

We have installed 3,000,000 kilowatts of electric generating capacity out of a potential 37,000,000 kilowatts that might be developed from our western streams under reclamation and allied programs.

We have been reaping benefits with over $500,000,000 per year in added crop values and more than $30,000,000 annually in direct revenues from power. Yet our total investment in project facilities has been under $2,000,000,000.

I don't have to ask you whether this has been a sound investment for the people's welfare. I know, and you know, that the people of this Nation are entitled to no less than this.

But what about the job to be done?

One of the best friends of all of us who believe in reclamation is Harry S. Truman.

In his recent message to the Congress, the President promised an economy that can and must continue to grow, an economy that will distribute the benefits of progress to all the

people. He foresaw, within 5 years, an annual national output of $300,000,000,000. He predicted that by the end of this century, family income in America would be three times what it is today. But he added something—that this growth would come only if we made an attempt to attain it, with "conscious effort and hard work."

The part that the West will play in this growth is already clear. Under the spur of a driving, thriving economy that quickly absorbs every acre-foot of water, every new farm, and every kilowatt we can wring from the rivers, we must build and settle this great territory from Nebraska to the sea.

Projects now authorized by the Congress for the 17 reclamation States will provide irrigation water for over 7,500,000 acres of new land and will expand power capacity by nearly 3,000,000 kilowatts.

An outstanding example of the work that lies ahead in the vast national plan is your own Missouri River Basin project. It is of the highest importance.

For too long the mighty Missouri has flooded you out periodically, has washed away billions of dollars in your property and your soil, and then has stranded you dry.

The Missouri Basin program grew out of the tragic drought of the 1930's, when billions of dollars were lost through crop failures, wrecked homes, and dislocated peoples. Most of the States of the basin, including Nebraska, came out of that period with decreased populations. Your State is still feeling the effects of the drought, and the census of 1950 may show that, in population, you have barely held your own during the past decade.

The whole Nation was shocked by your tremendous losses in money and in human assets during and following the great drought. Sectional lines were forgotten as the Congress approved a gigantic undertaking to rehabilitate the entire Missouri Basin—the first basin-wide multipurpose development program. During the intervening years work on this program has progressed slowly. We are only now getting properly under way, and the work is beginning to accelerate at a fast pace.

We are not planning on a small scale. The Missouri is not a small river. The Missouri River Basin project, as now envisioned, will cost more than $4,000,000,000. This is a measure of your Federal Government's faith in this region. It is a measure of our faith in ourselves and our future.

The basin-wide concept of this project is the product of the coordinated work of the Department of the Interior and the Army Corps of Engineers. The execution of the program is going forward with the active cooperation of the basin States, the Department of Agriculture, and the other Federal agencies operating through the Federal Interagency Committee.

There are many reasons why we are doing these things. We estimate that 53,000 new farms comprising 5,000,000 irrigated acres—an area the size of New Jersey—can be established among the millions of acres of lands now relatively unproductive for lack of water.

Even at prewar prices additional crops from these farms would be worth $130,000,000 per year. At current prices they would be worth much more. Stabilized feed supplies, produced in tributary valleys, will permit far more productive use of millions of acres of range lands.

The program as now conceived calls for about 2,366,000 kilowatts installed hydroelectric capacity. This power will be produced without any drain upon our exhaustible fuel supplies.

Low-cost power will encourage new industries in scores of communities. It will permit the local processing of local produce. It will encourage the development of the still untapped mineral resources of the basin.

The control of floods will be of major importance to the people of the entire region. The newly created reservoirs will provide recreation for the people of the basin and for thousands of tourists. Fish and wildlife resources will be improved. Adequate water supply will bring better living and better business to many cities and towns. Control of the headwaters will help provide a navigable channel from St. Louis to Sioux City, providing an opportunity for cheap water freight that can benefit the entire region. The benefits of silt detention and the abatement of water pollution will be felt increasingly as the program is developed.

You who live in this region will have more convenience in your homes and more leisure in your lives, as a result of improved power and water facilities and because of enhanced economic progress.

As we move forward in this planning and building, various segments of the Department of the Interior are working on ways to multiply the benefits from this development in conservation.

In addition to the work of the Bureau of Reclamation, about which you know, the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey are probing the earth's surface, and subsurface, to learn what minerals can be developed and new and economical ways to produce and use them. The Geological Survey is looking after the measurement of the waters that are available.

The National Park Service is developing plans for making the fullest recreational use of the new reservoirs that will be available to the people.

The Fish and Wildlife Service is attending to the enhancement of our fish and game life.

Our Office of Indian Affairs already is exploring the favorable effects of this program in changing beneficially the lives of our original Americans.

The Bureau of Land Management is surveying the problems of improved protection and use of our range and other public land, problems naturally arising in the development of such a broad resource program.

I could go on enumerating the benefits of this program, but I don't believe that I have to persuade the Nebraska Reclamation Association as to its value to the Nation. You were in the front ranks of those who helped to convince the rest of the country of the value of this basin development.

Here in Nebraska you know what irrigation and public power mean. Nebraska was among the pioneering States in public power development. Your North Platte project in the Scotts Bluff area was one of the first reclamation projects undertaken and is an outstanding example of what can be done with dry land through irrigation. You are now among the leaders of those who are working for more irrigation and your work has been rewarded.

The Republican River is being brought under control from its headwaters in Colorado to its confluence with the Kansas River in Kansas. This is being achieved by a series of flood-control and irrigation dams.

Work is under way preparatory to the development of the lower Platt River Basin, including areas up and down the river from Grand Island, and the Loup and Elkhorn areas. Potential irrigation undertaking that may cover more than a million acres along the Platte and its tributaries are now being investigated.

In Nebraska, you still need more flood control, and you still facs other unsolved problems. There are certain water-division questions that you will have to settle among yourselves before current plans can go forward into construction. I need only point out that the people down on the Republican River, too, had a difficult water-diversion problem to work out before we could move effectively there. In some respects, their problem was even more difficult to solve for the project reached across State lines into Colorado and Kansas. But they solved it, as I am confident you can solve yours within the State.

The significance of the lower Platte irrigation and power development is dramatically shown by what has happened on the North Platte. Between 1910 and 1940, the population of Scotts Bluff County rose from 2,500 to 33,000 people. During the 1930–40 census period, while the rural population of Nebraska as a whole was declining by some 10 percent Scotts Bluff County gained about 18 percent.

Acre for acre, the consumption of goods in Scotts Bluff County is more than three times that in central Nebraska, and these goods come from all over the country. The seven-thousand-and-some-odd carloads of freight unloaded at Scotts Bluff station in 1942 came from 39 States.

Most of you have a good idea of the irrigation and power construction now going on in Nebraska, and I assume you have seen the President's budget proposals for the fiscal year 1951.

The Frenchman-Cambridge division again will receive more money than any other single element in the Missouri Basin program, and the Bostwick division also will be one of the major items in the budget. The Mirage Flats project is already complete except for finishing activities.

A sizable share of our proposed transmission-line expenditure will go into Nebraska. We expect to complete three lines and to begin on some of the smaller feeder lines. We also want to build a tie line between the garrison and Fort Randall power plant to the northward.

I will avoid statistical details, but I do want to say something about the rate and distribution problems that have delayed the marketing of public power in Nebraska. You cannot afford, nor can we afford, much more delay. We are actively negotiating and planning for definite contractual arrangements in every basin State except Nebraska.

We realize that you have an unusually difficult problem here. We know that it is a temporary by-product of your progressive public-power program—a program for which we have full sympathy. Nevertheless, we are obligated to proceed in accordance with the dictates of the Congress and the interest of the program as a whole.

One way or the other—through your transmission lines or through Federal lines—we must make it possible for thousands of Nebraskans to share the benefits of low-cost public power from these Federal power plants.

Ultimately the power plants included in the Missouri Basin program, as now conceived, will be linked into a single backbone grid, extending from western Montana into Iowa. We used to hear that we would be producing power for the jackrabbits. Yet, with the Missouri Basin program scarcely begun, it is already apparent that we have not planned for enough power to meet the demands of your region.

Your growing power needs illustrate the impossibility of setting any limits to the potentialities of an undertaking like the Missouri Basin program. Once the resources of a region are opened, there begins a process of economic expansion which is incalculable in size and inconceivable in extent. That has been the history of America. It will certainly be the history of your region.

When the Missouri River Basin program was planned, we contemplated developing only the more advantageous power sites. It appears now that we must consider the possibilities of expanding power from other sites, including installations at some of the smaller dams.

I cannot over-emphasize the importance of power to your economy, and to the successful development of the entire program. We must

have power to pump irrigation water, and we must have power revenues that can carry the financial repayment load which exceeds the water users' ability to repay.

Power production and transmission are being firmly and intelligently integrated, basin-wide, into the physical and financial structure of this program. The Department of the Interior adheres fully to this integration.

The possible power requirements of the basin are so great that we must develop the highest potentiality of power that can be produced from dams.

Your experience here in Nebraska will give you a good idea of the rough road ahead on public power development. Resolution No. 1, adopted by your association in 1948, showed that you are aware of the constant attempts of special-interest groups to block the public-power program or to divert it for selfish purposes.

So far, the legally established and approved public-power program has withstood all assaults. In the 1950 appropriations, the Congress gave the Bureau of Reclamation the funds necessary to make vigorous progress on power. The 1951 budget request contemplates more progress.

Attacks upon the public-power program will continue. They will be both direct and indirect, open and under cover. But as long as the people and their Government remain alert, and fully informed, these attacks will fail.

Our reclamation laws are still sound. They attest to the vision and the superb craftsmanship of the far-sighted men who have fashioned those laws over the past half century. But they need some modernization to help us do the ever-changing job ahead.

We are also giving attention to the important question of sharpening our administrative and technical skills, in order that we can do a better, more efficient, and more economical job.

The Missouri River Basin program presents one of the biggest and most complex planning, construction, and operating jobs ever to challenge the American people in peacetime. Though we are making progress, there is still much room for improvement. We must be constantly alert for defects and inadequacies in legislation and policy, and in administrative machinery, and courageously take action to correct them. As the program develops, we must be prepared to make the changes that are necessary in the best interest of the region and the country.

To plan and build and operate this project requires the efforts of many Federal and State agencies, working together with the people who are in full partnership in this undertaking.

Out here, the 10 State governments are playing a vital role. Sometimes I wonder how your own Governor Peterson can find the time and energy, away from the multiplicity of his other duties, to give this undertaking the prime and effective attention that he is devoting to it. All of the Missouri Basin States' Governors are demonstrating to the world how democracy, in the highest sense, can really serve the people.

Each of the Federal departments and agencies, and each of the States, has its own complex problems of adjusting and integrating conflicting interests. Just as we in Interior must thresh things out among ourselves and settle upon policies that best serve our national interests, so must the people within each State resolve their problems before they can participate fully and effectively in the Missouri Basin program.

This program is a tremendous undertaking in teamwork, and in reaching great common goals through the democratic process. Its results will be worth everything we put into it.

The Government's Social-Security System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The I O U Fraud," published in the Omaha World-Herald of January 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE I O U FRAUD

Some months ago this newspaper proposed that the Government's social-security system be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis.

It is pointed out that the present system of accumulating huge reserves is a fraud, because the money is invested in United States bonds and is used by the Government to finance its deficits. Those bonds eventually will have to be retired by the taxpayers. Thus the people will have to pay for their "benefits" twice—once when the pay-roll taxes are collected, and again when the bonds are retired.

The only way to prevent that fraud, this newspaper pointed out, would be to change the system—to collect each year, in pay-roll taxes, only enough to meet the expected requirements of that year.

That proposal was criticized rather vehemently at the time by Government officials and some of our public-pulse writers. But this week it received the full indorsement of the Brookings Institution, perhaps the most highly respected research organization in the land.

In a report made after long investigation and study, the Institution said:

"The present collection of (social security) taxes on all covered workers produces far more revenue than is immediately needed to pay benefits. The reserves thus created to take care of the heavy future benefits are borrowed and used by the Government for current expenses. Thus the assets of the reserve fund are simply promises that the Government at some future time will obtain the cash by one means or another and place it in the fund."

In discussing the same point, this newspaper said Uncle Sam was putting his I O U in the strong box in place of the people's cash. It amounts to the same thing.

The report continues:

"The so-called reserves will not reduce the taxes future generations will have to pay to meet the costs of social-security benefits coming due in their day. The reserves do not give financial security. Real security rests first on the capacity of the Nation to produce, and second on the use by the Government of its power to tax to compel workers of each generation to support the dependents of that generation."

In other words:

Social-security payments in 1950 necessarily will be paid by the workers and earners of that year. The same will be true in 1960 and the year 2000. Pay-roll taxes, above the amount needed for the current year, serve no purpose except to give the Government ready cash with which to pay its deficits.

Up to now the social-security bureaucrats have managed to keep Congress thoroughly confused. The unbiased, nonpartisan Brookings report should give new light and provide a new weapon for those Congressmen who are trying to put a stop to the I O U fraud.

Public Welfare Needs of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Hon. W. Kerr Scott, Governor of the State of North Carolina, and a statement by Ellen Winston, commissioner of the North Carolina State Board of Public Welfare, touching the public welfare needs of North Carolina.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Raleigh, January 20, 1950.

Senator CLYDE R. HOEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOEY: North Carolina, as you know, is greatly interested in H. R. 6000 now before the Senate Finance Committee because of the need for expanded welfare services to the citizens of the State. The 1949 general assembly, with my full support, made increased efforts to help finance the public-welfare program through much larger State appropriations than in the past, but we are still unable to meet many pressing needs.

We are particularly concerned over the sharply rising case loads in aid to the aged and aid to dependent children due to the fact that farmers and farm workers are not covered by old-age and survivors insurance. We realize that the net result is a much heavier financial burden proportionately for this State in terms of helping pay the cost of public assistance than is borne by the industrial States where the great bulk of older workers and surviving children are taken care of through insurance. We are hopeful that the Senate Finance Committee will expand the coverage of old-age and survivors insurance to include agricultural groups.

At this time I am also particularly concerned over the fact that the Federal Government does not participate in the cost of care of needy persons who do not fall into one of the categories of aged, blind, or dependent children. The bill now before the Senate Finance Committee provides for only a limited additional group, namely, the totally and permanently disabled. The 1949 general assembly went on record with regard to the State's responsibility in this area by enacting a general-assistance statute and setting up State funds to be matched by Federal funds to take care of this group. Unless effective action is taken to modify H. R. 6000 in the Senate, we shall still have many economically unfortunate people who are entirely dependent upon the limited amount of assistance their individual counties can provide. This seems to me to be one of the most important next steps in the program for State and Federal participation in welfare activities.

I am greatly pleased over the new matching formula contained in H. R. 6000 which I

believe is known as the Mills formula. While not a variable grant formula in the strict sense, it will mean much needed additional money for this State and appears to be a sound approach to helping the low-income States care for their needy citizens.

I would like further to call your attention to the need for additional Federal funds for child-welfare services. In this State, I am informed, we now have counties spending at the rate of about twice our annual appropriation under the present provision for Federal funds for child welfare. In order to carry forward this important aspect of the child-welfare program, we urge careful consideration of not only doubling the present allocation for this work as provided for in H. R. 6000, but increasing that amount substantially. Certainly, we would all agree that more attention should be directed toward preventive and protective services for our boys and girls.

I greatly appreciate your own interest in an expanded social insurance and public-welfare program designed to meet more effectively the needs of this State. Please enter this expression of my deep concern for an expansion of our social security provisions in the official hearing record of the Senate Finance Committee.

Sincerely,

W. KERR SCOTT.

TESTIMONY ON H. R. 6000 BY ELLEN WINSTON, COMMISSIONER, NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, UNITED STATES SENATE, JANUARY 23, 1950

I appreciate the opportunity of presenting the public-welfare needs of North Carolina with particular emphasis upon major lacks in the present program and upon how the provisions of H. R. 6000 may be expected to affect the situation.

That North Carolina is a progressive but relatively poor State is well known. In spite of substantial increases in recent years the 1949 per capita income payment for the State was $930 in comparison with a per capita income payment of $1,410 for the Nation as a whole. There are many reasons for this, not the least of which is the high birth rate resulting in approximately 40 percent of the population of the State, July 1, 1948, being under 18 years of age, in comparison with approximately 30 percent for the United States as a whole.

In spite of the disproportionate burden upon the population of working age which results from the large number of children, tremendous effort is being made by the State to provide services commensurate with current needs. On both sales and income taxes, which provide the bulk of the State's general fund revenue, the rates are among the highest in the country. State appropriations for 1949–50 provide that 86.6 percent of the total general fund shall be spent for health, education, and welfare. Even so, not one of these areas of public service is being financed at an adequate minimum level.

The State has made steady progress in its efforts to provide more adequately for its needy people. The State appropriation for old-age assistance for 1949–50 represents slightly more than a 100-percent increase over the appropriation for 1944–45. The State appropriation for aid to dependent children for 1949–50 is almost three times the appropriation for 1944–45. The 100 counties of the State have made comparable increases in appropriations for these purposes. Even so, with present Federal matching formulae these increases make possible an average grant for January 1950 of only $22 per needy person 65 years of age and over and $43 per family of three children. In view of steadily rising case loads, some counties are already reducing these substandard average grants. Since the State appropriation is the same for 1950–51 as for this year the situation is critical. It is impossible to even approach the grants which the Congress has anticipated in providing for matching Federal funds up to a maximum of $50 per aged person and $63 for three children.

A partial approach to this situation of hungry children and needy aged in North Carolina, and to a comparable extent in other low-income States, appears to be variable grants on a formula basis, such as that included in H. R. 6000 which will take into account, more than the present law does, the differences in the fiscal ability of States. We cannot anticipate sufficient State and county appropriations to pay 50 percent of the cost of raising grants from the present inadequate State levels to minimum subsistence needs. The matching provisions in H. R. 6000 together with inclusion of the responsible relative in aid to dependent children families would make possible an increase in average monthly grants from the current $22 to $27 for the aged and from the current $43 for a family of mother and three children receiving aid to dependent children to $64 or $16 per person. Thus even with increased Federal matching the State must obviously continue to increase its appropriation from biennium to biennium if we are to attain adequate grants.

The State has long accepted the principle of equalization. We know that aged persons and children can be just as much in need in one of the poorer counties as in one of the more well-to-do counties of the State and hence a larger proportionate share of the State appropriation is allocated to the poorer counties. We are convinced that the well-being of the State as a whole and the rights of our citizens wherever they may live demand an equalization procedure. We likewise believe that equalization of opportunity to have minimum subsistence needs met should be a primary concern of this Congress in revising social-security legislation. Are we to take the position that because a child happens to be born in a high-income State he shall have his basic needs met in full while a child who happens to be born in a low-income State must grow up as best he can with inadequate food, clothing, shelter, and medical care? It is well to remember also that many of these underprivileged and undernourished children will eventually migrate to large urban centers. For example, in spite of a high birth rate the population of North Carolina increased only about half as much proportionately as the population of the entire country from 1940 to 1948. We export young people to urban centers. Hence it becomes a matter of enlightened self-interest, as well as the essence of democracy, for the high-income States to join with the low-income States in the support of the variable grant principle for assistance programs.

It is unrealistic, however, to look only to increased aid to the aged and to dependent children through the variable grant principle to solve the problem of minimum security. We must also consider expansion of old-age and survivors insurance. We are greatly disturbed by the marked increase in recipients of aid to the aged in North Carolina from 45,000 in August 1948 to 58,800 in January 1950 and of aid to dependent children from 9,500 families to 14,000 families during the same period.

Farm leaders within the State are increasingly seeing the problems created by lack of coverage of agricultural workers by the old-age and survivors-insurance program. The large public-assistance loads in rural States as compared with highly industrialized States is a matter of record. The burden of helping care for a growing number of needy persons is becoming a more and more acute problem for agricultural States. It is the expectation of public welfare administrators that we can look forward over a period of years to a substantial reduction in the public-assistance load as a result of expansion of OASI coverage to include farmers, farm workers, and part-time domestics, and of increased benefits under the old-age and survivors-insurance program. We believe that probably 60 percent of the present old-age-assistance load in North Carolina consists of persons who would be receiving retirement benefits today if the OASI coverage had included these occupational categories when first enacted.

While expanded coverage and more liberal eligibility provisions under OASI and the matching formula for public-assistance categories included in House Resolution 6000 will materially aid in meeting the needs of the aged and dependent children, we will still be faced daily with the problem of children without adequate food, clothing, and shelter who are ineligible for either survivors benefits or an aid to dependent children grant. A liberalized definition for eligibility for ADC would make possible the same help for large numbers of needy children now ineligible that is made available to thousands of children otherwise in similar circumstances. Again, we are concerned not only about the handicaps from which children suffer but also about the inequities in meeting comparable needs of children.

We also want to stress the importance of Federal assumption of a share of responsibility for all needy persons, not just for the three categories of aged, blind, and dependent children. North Carolina is one of the few States which has traditionally left the entire burden of caring for needy persons not covered by the three public-assistance categories to the counties. The 1949 general assembly took account of this and enacted a comprehensive general-assistance law. It also set up a special new appropriation of $350,000 annually, a sizable appropriation in our State, to match any Federal funds which may become available for general assistance.

H. R. 6000 has recognized another group of needy persons in providing for a fourth category, namely, the permanent and totally disabled. It is too limited at present, however, to meet the problems which exist and, at the same time, would be exceedingly difficult to define for proper administration. We hope, therefore, that Senate revisions will provide for aid to the disabled in such a way that we can use this category for periods of temporary need in order that individuals and families may become self-supporting or return to self-support. The importance of an adequate fourth category is clearly revealed by a recent North Carolina study which showed that 70 percent of all recipients of general assistance from county funds, the only source at present, are unable to work and the 30 percent able to do some work are only marginally employable. One-third require physical care. Two out of three recipients are 45 years of age or older. Two-thirds are women. Major causes of need are illness or disablement or loss of the breadwinner. Yet we would probably only be able to certify 25 percent of these desperately needy people as totally and permanently disabled. Federal participation in aid to all needy persons will fill in the tremendous gaps in the present public-assistance program.

The data cited also reflect the need for medical care. The higher and higher costs of medical care and hospitalization are not only bringing people with otherwise adequate incomes into the classification of medically indigent; they are also far outdistancing the ability of local governmental units to provide needed care. Many of our counties have

already exhausted their funds for medical care and hospitalization for the entire fiscal year in the first half of the year. Thus, poverty prevents needed medical care and lack of medical care promotes poverty in the long-recognized vicious circle. In a far-reaching forward step, H. R. 6000 takes account of this by making special provision for medical care of the needy. However, the method of financing provided would be administratively difficult. In our State the recommendation of the advisory council on social security to the committee that financial aid for medical assistance outside the ceilings on payments under the 16 per adult and $3 per child formula would be more effective in meeting the need and more efficient from the point of view of administration.

It is also important to stress the need for Federal participation in the costs of welfare services. More and more emphasis should be placed upon prompt rehabilitation of individual and family problems and upon prevention whenever possible. North Carolina's public-welfare program has for a number of years devoted more time proportionately to social services not involving financial assistance than any other State program involving administration of two or three of the public-assistance categories. County departments of public welfare are asking for much-needed additional personnel. They see the value of preventive programs. They realize the need for more effective services to children in particular. Those of us close to the local scene can cite case after case of what happens to children deprived of needed services. If children are our most valuable resource, surely it is time to make the relatively small investments required for more effectively conserving this resource. Services in North Carolina to individual children have increased from 9,800 in October 1944 to 16,100 in October 1949. Under the present annual Federal appropriation of $3,500,000, North Carolina's annual share is just about half what we are spending this year. This is possible because of some accumulation of funds. If the allocation of $7,000,000 for child-welfare services provided for in H. R. 6000 is made it will only make possible maintenance of our present level of services to children. On every hand, we are being urged to provide greatly needed services and to give more children the benefit of social-service programs. The need exists and is clearly recognized in every local community. Counties are already carrying their fair share of the costs. Only by increasing the Federal appropriation for child-welfare services substantially above the $7,000,000 will we be able to continue to advance in this much-needed area.

In conclusion, we urge that this committee take the necessary steps to amend H. R. 6000 to provide for further extension of old-age and survivors insurance and for Federal participation in a more comprehensive public-welfare program.

Potatoes Without Gravy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Potatoes Without Gravy, by Fern Thomas. This gives another side of the potato story.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mars Hill (Maine) View of January 19, 1950]

POTATOES WITHOUT GRAVY

(By Fern Thomas)

As I read Vance Packard's article in the American magazine entitled "Potatoes and Gravy," I had a feeling of amusement and disgust. Evidently Mr. Packard contacted some tall-story tellers on his trip to Aroostook County, or some people thinking him very gullible and knowing he would swallow all they told him talked for his benefit.

I am not a writer but I would like to state a few truths in regard to Aroostook County. I am past middle age and have lived in Aroostook County the greater part of my life. Yes, I was born and lived on a farm until I was 16 years of age. Let me tell you people who have read Potatoes and Gravy, which appeared in the November 1949 issue of the American magazine, that there were plenty of potatoes at times without any gravy. I have known years when Aroostook farmers sprouted their potatoes and sold them for 15 and 20 cents a barrel.

Some farmers lost their farms as they could not hold them when potatoes sold for that price. Many Aroostook farms were mortgaged and for years some farmers had all they could do to even pay the interest on the mortgage. Regardless of all these hardships they struggled on for Aroostook people are made of the stuff that is not easily licked. They have courage and perseverance and go on regardless of hardships.

Some of the farmers who lost their homes made a come-back through hard labor and shrewd management and left considerable property and money when they passed on.

It is courage and "guts" that has made Aroostook County prosperous. If outsiders are jealous of Aroostook farmers, cultivate some of the above.

I have known farmers and their wives to arise at 3 o'clock in the morning the year around and work until 10 or 11 o'clock at night. Especially through the farming season this seemed necessary as there was so much work to do.

Many farmers after harvesting their crops and plowing their ground for another year would hike to a lumber camp and earn the munificent sum of $1 a day through the winter in order to pay their bills and provide for their families.

The farmers kept sheep, and their wives, after the wool had been sent to the carding mills, spun it into yarn and knitted underclothing, stockings, and mittens for the family. They also wove woolen cloth and made garments for the men and boys. They knitted stockings and mittens and their husbands carried them to the lumber camps and sold them for a few cents a pair—to men employed there.

The wealthy farmers referred to in Mr. Packard's article made their money long before the Government guaranteed price of potatoes. I remember all those nice homes referred to, as a child, and as I mentioned at the beginning of this article, I'm no spring chicken. However, the size of some of those homes were exaggerated as there are very few 22-room houses in Aroostook County—maybe two or three. If people had been building homes since the Government guaranteed price of potatoes they would have constructed them according to modern types and not built the large houses which were built years ago.

Some of our so-called businessmen accused of not knowing a potato bug when it crawled down their nose would very quickly recognize a two-legged "louse" in the form of a newspaper reporter. Believe me, we have real men in Aroostook County and they would recognize potato bugs as well as other kinds of vermin.

A professional man who moved away from Aroostook County some years ago says he is always glad to return to Aroostook County for a visit in order to associate with he-men.

We have heard people who came here from small towns down State to make their living claim that Aroostook people are not cultured. Just why do people like that stay here? I notice they are glad to remain here and pull down a good fat salary.

People in Aroostook County do try to educate their children and some also travel abroad and to Florida and California winters, but not just since the Government guaranteed price of potatoes. People who had money always did those things. As a youngster some of the people I remember visited Europe and spent winters in Florida and California. In regard to education, I noticed last summer when attending college that nearly every county in Maine as well as Aroostook County was represented.

Many people in Aroostook County have money that was not made by raising potatoes. Some of the nice farms have been handed down from one generation to another. The farm I lived on was owned by my grandfather at one time and he did not make money by raising potatoes but by lumbering.

I can remember when Aroostook farmers raised cows and sold butter for 15 and 20 cents a pound. Eggs brought 12 cents a dozen. Is it any wonder they do not care to go back to those times? Would you?

Farmers are not getting as rich as Mr. Packard would lead people to believe. Farming is an expensive business and I'll venture to say the average farmer is just keeping his head above water.

If reporters for magazines are coming to Aroostook County to write about conditions, it would be a good idea to secure correct information and write up articles accordingly.

Why pick on the Aroostook farmer? Hasn't he as much right to some assistance as people in other walks of life in different sections of the country?

I'm for Aroostook 100 percent. Long may the farmers live and enjoy the fruits of their labor.

FERN L. THOMAS.

ROBINSON, MAINE.

Threat to Oil Exploration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Threat to Oil Exploration," published in the Oil City Derrick of January 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREAT TO OIL EXPLORATION

The Treasury Department has taken its periodic dig at the oil and gas industry over the question of depletion allowance, a tax adjustment permitted the industry for many years because of the risks involved and the intangible costs which enter into the continuing search for new reserves.

This time the dig came in President Truman's tax message to Congress. He termed the depletion allowance, or special tax deduction allowed oil, gas, and mining interests, the most inequitable "loophole" in the tax laws and urged that something be done about it. He made no specific recommendations, however.

There is nothing new in the President's stand on the matter of the depletion allowance. Over a period of years, the Treasury Department at regular intervals has attempted to whack the allowance but on each occasion Congress has stood firm and has refused to alter the tax-adjustment provision.

Briefly the provisions complained of by the President permit the owner of an oil or gas well to deduct from taxes 27½ percent of the gross income of his property up to a limit of half the net income from that property, and to deduct from his income expenditures for intangible drilling costs.

The President's recommendation is causing grave concern among oilmen in this area, as well as in all other producing areas of the Nation. And rightly so. For it is generally recognized that elimination or any serious reduction in the present tax adjustment allowed the industry will constitute an alarming threat to further oil exploration.

The oil industry is rated as the biggest gambling industry of them all. The continuing search for new reserves with its subsequent drilling of so many dry or unproductive holes makes it such. It was largely to provide the incentive and meet the risks involved in this extensive exploration work that oilmen were granted the benefit of the depletion allowance in filing income-tax returns.

Take the allowance away and there is grave danger that oil exploration will be seriously curtailed. Action such as that recommended by the President would mean an increase in income taxes for the industry and a cut into the working capital now employed to finance the search for new oil reserves.

Oilmen are particularly fearful of the consequences of any such action on the small independent producers such as make up, to a large degree, the Pennsylvania oil industry. For they, undoubtedly, would be less able to pay the proposed higher income rates without injury than would the larger concerns.

The importance of oil to the future of the Nation cannot be overlooked. The continuing search for new reserves must go on. Congress should not take any action that will hamper future oil exploration.

Senatorial Candidate in Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Confused as to Loyalties?" from the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram of Richmond, Ind.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFUSED AS TO LOYALTIES?

Alex M. Campbell, Fort Wayne attorney, is a candidate for the Democratic New Deal Fair Deal nomination for United States Senator for Indiana.

He is the man who announced that if we Hoosiers would nominate and elect him he would, in substance, not represent us in the Senate. He said he would back President Truman in everything Truman wants. Some citizen to trust with our free institutions, isn't he?

The other night Campbell spoke at a Roosevelt Day dinner at Columbus, Ind. He told all about how that great Red baiter, Harry Truman, was succeeding in driving the Communists out of the Government in Washington, which Truman heads. Campbell did not, however, tell how those Communists happened to get into our Government. How could he at a dinner in honor of Franklin Roosevelt, the man who began giving China to the Reds under the guidance of Alger Hiss?

Campbell praised Truman to the skies for his loyalty campaign. He said Truman has the courage to issue a Presidential directive for an all-out fight on subversives.

Campbell, in case you have forgotten, is speaking about the Harry Truman who snarled at a House committee to investigate subversive activities 2 years ago for bringing out Whittaker Chambers' charges of espionage against Alger Hiss; the Harry Truman who snarled "red herring" at that committee for helping to show up that fair-haired favorite of Franklin Roosevelt and Dean Acheson in the State Department.

Rubber-stamp Alex, he is.

He is willing to back Harry Truman in anything that brainy and loyal American wants.

If Truman wants to protect Reds in the Government from detection, apparently rubber-stamp Alex, as Senator, would support him.

If Truman decides that trying to help the Reds in our Government is getting him in dutch with the ordinary people of the Nation and wants to start a purge of those Reds in order to gain public favor again, rubber-stamp Alex would support him in that.

He is for anything Red-Herring Harry wants.

Wouldn't you rather be represented in the Senate by a loyal American who will always be for what you want under our Constitution?

The National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The National Debt," published in the Christian Union Herald of January 29, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL DEBT

To most thoughtful Americans, one of the very alarming phenomena of the last quarter century has been the rising indebtedness of our Federal Government. Is it any exaggeration to say that an astronomer's measuring stick is needed to compute the accumulated Treasury deficits during the past two decades? In 1926—the year that I finished seminary and entered my profession—the country's financial obligation amounted to a modest $10,000,000,000 or $15,000,000,000. But with the descent of the depression in 1929, a mad spending spree began, which first meant huge outlays of cash to relieve the needy, then involved still greater expenditures to prosecute and win the war, and finally has required such lavish post-war assistance to Europe and Asia, that late reports show our indebtedness to creditors to be $253,000,000,000. No nation in history, to my knowledge, has ever contracted such a debt, and with the Government currently refusing to balance the budget, the end of the sobering spectacle is by no means in sight.

Some political observers make light of the tragedy. They tell us that we need have no concern, because the money is owed, not to any foreign state, but to our own American citizens, and if worse comes to worst, we may cancel the obligation, and small harm will be done. That easy answer to so serious a problem is both morally and economically unsound. Can a country preserve its self-respect and ignore the obligations it owes itself? And what is equally important, would the cancellation of this indebtedness, or even the repayment of the same indebtedness with inflated dollars, not involve the Nation in an immediate and very dangerous crisis? If and when Uncle Sam is unable to redeem with good money his promises to pay, then and there the Government in power will be out, and an emergency government with dictatorial authority would take its place. Such a critical situation could confront our country at any moment now. And you may be sure that no free and democratic society may be maintained if we repudiate our debt, or propose to pay it off with worthless currency.

A few men in Washington who still have a modicum of self-respect, consider the debt to be a moral obligation, but they want to liquidate it by means which would certainly destroy the people's freedom. They hope, through prohibitive taxation of corporations, to make it so miserable for businessmen, that the state may eventually take over all industry and use the considerable profits to clear our country of its staggering debt-load. That move, of course, would mean a socialistic state not unlike the one which obtains in England at the present time. Under such a scheme, free enterprise will flee America as surely as it has flown from the British Isles. And beyond any immediate tampering with business, I dare to think that one area of society after another would be seized by the Government until widespread liberty as we have always known and cherished it, would be cast into the limbo.

This article is written in the interest of American freedom, and is addressed especially to the younger generation. Better than their elders, youth understand the relation of liberty to a country's fiscal solvency, and at the same time have courage to deal drastically with any crisis which affects their future welfare. How may our boys and girls scale down the Nation's great indebtedness, and therefore register victory in a fight where their fathers have so unprotestingly accepted defeat? The answer to that question is anything but pleasant, because it involves both political responsibility and sobering self-denial. The youth of America must, for one thing, demand that the Federal budget be balanced immediately—deficit spending has to stop, even at the expense of dismissing hordes of bureaucrats from the Government pay roll. But they must, for another thing, demand that Federal revenue be increased, not by socialistic controls over industry and

business, to be sure, but by levying higher personal taxes—upon themselves and their offspring. These are stiff requirements, I know, but they are preferable to abandoning this country's freedom.

E. MARCELLUS BENNETT.

Policy of Appeasement of Communism in the East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Concord Monitor, January 6, 1950, entitled "By Default Again," which is a very good analysis of the Communist appeasement policy which we are following in the East.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BY DEFAULT AGAIN?

It goes without saying that the United States has an interest in what happens to the island of Formosa. National defense alone dictates such an interest, for to have any semblance of defense these days a nation must have far-flung outposts upon which it can depend. These may be possessions, or they may be owned by other, but friendly nations.

If the Chinese Communists take over Formosa, as our administration seems bent upon having them do, we have lost an outpost.

This country has access to the Japanese islands to the north, and to the Philippines to the south, and stepping stones to them in the broad Pacific. Formosa, in enemy hands, would breach the line of potential defenses of the far side of the Pacific.

It is proposed by the administration that we do absolutely nothing to help keep Formosa out of Communist hands. Yet, on the other bastion of communism, in Europe, we have given arms and other aid to such nations as Turkey, Greece, France, etc. Nor has such aid led to war. It has, all agree, helped to stem the advance of communism.

This Nation is spending about $15,000,000,000 a year on its armed services, and for that price they ought to be performing useful services. As a matter of fact our armed services believe that Formosa should be kept from Communist control, but the State Department, and now President Truman, say "No."

Our problem is to maintain peace in this world and to preserve the democratic way of life. To maintain peace we must prevent communism from gobbling up any more nations. Already we have in recent times helped the Communists to acquire a strangle hold upon two continents. In the East we virtually gave them Manchuria and part of Korea, though these lands were not ours to give away. We certainly didn't help the Chinese to keep them from overrunning that country, with weapons we had given the Communists.

In Europe we have said that the Communists must be stopped, and we have taken all manner of steps to accomplish that purpose. But, in Asia, we are lying down on the job, and the American people cannot understand why.

A show of force by us isn't going to precipitate war upon us by Russia, any more than the constant show of force by Russia. If Russia really wants to take us on she will use any excuse she pleases. To her a show of force is the only thing she understands and respects. She will holler bloody murder, but that she does all the time, even when we are acting like a scared little boy, which is a failing we too often have in our international relationships.

We have soldiers in Japan and Korea. We may as well have some more in Formosa, rather than keeping them in cozy quarters here at home. If we put our own soldiers on the island, to defend it and to protect the Chinese Nationalist Government and to help it, we would be doing more than we already are doing at numerous spots around the earth. We are protecting the Japanese from Communist absorption, and they were our enemy. The Chinese were an ally.

Once more the weaknesses and inconsistencies of this Nation's foreign policies, and their nonexistence in many respects, is forcefully demonstrated by the Formosa situation. Nothing has been anticipated. We have not been prepared for what obviously was bound to develop in time.

The State Department has been at loose ends for some years. It still seems to be, despite the rather rapid succession of Secretaries who have attempted to head the Department. Under Roosevelt the Department was not under its own steam. Under Truman it seems to be left to its own resources, but it still is at loose ends.

Congress may, and it probably should, seek to find out what the answers are. If it does, the Formosa situation will be the inspiration for efforts to end some of the confusion and contentions within the Government as to foreign policies.

Is Prejudice Poisoning Our Kids?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, it has long been the contention of child psychologists and sociologists that children are born without any sort of racial or religious prejudice, but quickly learn them from their elders. A study has recently been made showing how prejudices are acquired by children, and what an appallingly large percentage of our children are indoctrinated with such prejudices. This study, called the Philadelphia Early Childhood Project, brings out facts which are startling and appalling, and should be studied by all who sincerely believe that prejudices must be eliminated if we want to have a true democracy. I wish to insert in the RECORD an article from the November issue of the Woman's Home Companion entitled "Is Prejudice Poisoning Our Kids?"

IS PREJUDICE POISONING OUR KIDS?

(By Howard Whitman)

"What a shock to learn that my own child is prejudiced!" The speaker was a prominent educator, a good parent, a good American in every sense of the word. His 6-year-old daughter had said, "Let's cross the street, Daddy, here comes a nigger."

"If she had measles," he continued, "I'd know what to do. But this disease frightens me."

This disease may well frighten all America. When adult minds are corrupted with prejudice it is tragic. But when the minds of children are poisoned, it is more than a tragedy. It is a strident summons.

How dark is the record?

We never knew until now. This article has the necessary, if poignant, duty of bringing to light the first comprehensive investigation of prejudice in children. It is an unbeautiful report. Look:

"Catholic people are no good."

"Protestants go to hell."

"We don't like Jews on our street."

"I ain't playing with no more niggers."

These are not the statements of full-fledged bigots. They are the words of little children. They are taken verbatim from the record—out of the mouths of kindergartners, first and second graders, ages 5, 6, and 7.

The investigation was made in Philadelphia. Called the Philadelphia Early Childhood Project, it placed the calipers of scientific measurement upon the social perceptions and attitudes of children in six public schools from kindergarten to second grade. The work took three painstaking years. It was conducted jointly by the Bureau for Intercultural Education, of New York; the Research Center for Group Dynamics, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; the Philadelphia Fellowship Commission and the Philadelphia public schools.

The findings will startle even experts, many of whom have assumed that children are not prejudiced.

"Actually," comments Helen G. Trager, director of the project, "we found many children saturated with prejudice. Nearly all were tainted in some degree."

What are children—little monsters?

Not at all.

They are little images. They are reflections of the adult world. No child was ever born a bigot, but he can become one incredibly early.

Every child is a blank page, as the Companion pointed out in a memorable article on children's thinking pattern, Your Town Can Do It Too (June 1944) and you can write practically what you will on that blank page. States the Philadelphia report: "The individual (child) not only follows the dictates of his environment concerning attitudes toward Negroes, Catholics, et cetera, but he comes to accept these attitude as his own (and) he uses them conveniently."

The Philadelphia project employed a special tool to measure child prejudice. It is called a social episodes test. The children were shown simple drawings, nine in all, illustrating everyday situations which might evoke an expression of prejudice in a prejudiced person. Social scientists call this a projective technique. There's nothing significant in the picture itself; the significance is in what you project into it.

Thus, when one second-grader looked at a picture of white children playing handball with a Negro child, he commented, "The colored kid wants to steal the ball. That's why the white kids have to go somewhere else." There was nothing in the picture to indicate that anybody wanted to steal anything or that the white kids weren't perfectly happy.

The series of nine drawings deals with racial and religious differences, religious symbols and cultural observances. Nothing is said to the child about prejudice or group relations or anything else which might color his responses. He is merely asked such neutral questions as: "Tell me about this picture: Why isn't this little boy playing?" "Is this little boy glad he is colored?" "Is this little boy glad he is Protestant?" "What are these boys—they are watching children leaving a synagogue—going to do?" "Are

these children—leaving a Catholic church—glad they are Catholic?" "Are these children—white and colored—friends?"

The child who has not been tainted with prejudice will have none to project into the pictures. For example, one second-grader, looking at the picture of a colored boy left out of a game, says, "If the colored boy were white they would let him play. Even if he is colored they should let him play. What's different about him?"

Another second-grader remarks, "I like any kind—Catholic, Jewish, or any kind. Any kind of people except bad people."

But such attitudes appeared in only 7 percent of the children.

By contrast, the project report is swamped with attitudes like these:

Viewing the synagogue picture, one child says, "The Christian children laugh at the Jewish children because they go to synagogue." Another, when the tester asks what the four non-Jewish children are going to do, replies, "I think they're going to beat up the Jewish boys because the Catholics don't like the Jewish people * * * and the Jewish people don't like the Catholic people."

Responding to the Catholic church picture, one first-grader says, "Nobody will play with those children if they're not Protestant." Another child remarks, "I'm glad I'm not Catholic. They are bad."

When it came to the Negroes the children showed the saddest symptoms of all. They showed how deeply the adult world has infected them with racial hatred, fear, falsehood, and distrust. Here are the words of 5-, 6-, and 7-year-old Americans viewing the picture of the Negro boy on the sidelines of a game: "White people don't want to play with that colored boy because they know he cheats and is too tough." "All the other children will go away and leave the little colored boy alone. That's what always happens around my street."

Even when viewing a picture in which a Negro child and white children are playing together, one kindergartner, in answer to the tester's question—"What are these children going to do"—says:

"They are going to make a snowball and wash the colored boy's face with it."

There is abundant evidence throughout the study that children come by their prejudices by aping grown-ups. Not necessarily their parents; they ape grown-up culture as a whole. They take their cues from neighborhood incidents, the talk of a truck driver, a remark of a teacher, conversation of others. As Prof. Gordon W. Allport, of Harvard, remarks, "Children are not born with prejudices. They catch them."

What they catch mostly are the stereotypes of prejudice. These are the sweeping generalizations, the hate capsules. Professor Allport points out, "Some Europeans think all Americans are loud-mouthed spendthrifts. This stereotyped judgment is a prejudice."

We who know Americans can spike the stereotypes with ease. We know that some Americans are loud-mouthed spendthrifts. So are some Englishmen, some Frenchmen, and some Afghanistanians. But all Americans are not loud-mouthed spendthrifts.

Summing up the mountains of data, the Philadelphia researchers rated each child on his attitude of acceptance or rejection of various social groups. Toward Jews, 63 percent were neutral, noncommittal, or evasive; only 10 percent accepted Jews and 27 percent openly rejected them. Catholics were openly rejected by 9 percent and Protestants by 1 percent.

When it came to the white children's attitudes toward Negroes, 32 percent were neutral or had mixed feelings, 68 percent openly rejected Negroes, and none at all accepted them.

The report from Philadelphia—City of Brotherly Love—should do more than make adults shake their heads and say, "Imagine." It should evoke more than the bleats of the self-righteous—"Oh, that may be true of other children, but my children certainly aren't prejudiced." Plenty of parents in Philadelphia said that—until the probing tests showed that their children had the virus, too.

Prejudice hurts the prejudiced, psychiatrists tell us. They now know that prejudice is a personality disease.

And the antidote?

I sat over a child's play table in the experimental school for preschool children at St. Joseph College in Hartford, Conn. Across from me was Sister Mary de Lourdes, director of the school. She was explaining that Protestant, Jew, and Catholic, white and colored children, go to the school together.

"We don't want our children vulnerable to ricketts, diphtheria, or typhoid," Sister Mary remarked. "And neither do we want them vulnerable to prejudice. We want to immunize them against it."

This is the new enlightened thinking on an age-old problem.

Sister Mary engaged a Negro teacher for the St. Joseph nursery school. Some of the Hartford parents had been raised in the South and were shocked. But they got over it. One mother, reared in Mississippi, said a few months later—to her credit—"It is a little hard on us, Sister Mary. But I'm extremely happy that my child will never have to get over what I'm having such trouble getting over myself."

How does prejudice harm the prejudiced?

"It restricts the development of personality," says Dr. Frances L. Ilg, assistant professor of child development at Yale.

But the most incisive diagnosis I heard came not from a psychologist or a doctor of medicine—but from a New Haven housewife, Mrs. Gertrude Hart Day, mother of three. Mrs. Day—who has good reason to know about prejudice, as we shall see later—sat in her early American book-walled living room and said:

"The child infected with prejudice is doomed to live a confined life, to build walls around himself and be a prisoner of his own ill feelings. Such a child never can live at ease. He sends out hatred and thus creates enemies—real or imaginary. He must live in fear of these enemies and under the threat that his own hatred will rebound against him."

No one could wish upon his child a life like that. And so thousands of American parents already are doing all they can to bestow free and loving personalities upon their children and not the stingy pinch of prejudice. Many a parent can honestly say, "We've driven prejudice out of our own minds—our children can never catch it from us."

But what about the neighbors, the school, playmates, people on streetcars and street corners, restricted neighborhoods, Jim Crow, college quotas, fraternity exclusion—and all the many clouds of prejudice that hang in our American skies like sultry blots?

Children can catch prejudice on the outside as readily as they can at home.

Willard Johnson, of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, warns: "One family can poison a neighborhood. A few prejudiced children in the block can contaminate your child."

So we who are parents have a special job of protection to do. We must take positive steps to save our children from prejudice as we take positive steps to save them from other diseases. We must start early. Children's attitudes are formed from birth to the age of 6. These attitudes jell from 6 to 12. They solidify from 12 to 18. Thus the Philadelphia project advises us that the saving of children from prejudice cannot be postponed until adolescence, but must be begun in preschool and early school years.

It's the old story: you can stop it if you catch it early. Up to age 6 youngsters' attitudes can be changed with ease; from 6 to 12 the changing is more difficult—but they can be changed.

"We have learned to inoculate against physical disease at earlier and earlier ages. If we do a good job, sometimes we can give the child immunity for life. Immunity against prejudice works quite the same way," counsels Dr. Ilg.

Against the disease of prejudice we ourselves are the health-giving serum. If children catch prejudice from adults, so they catch free and loving attitudes from adults. They can catch from us not just bland and supine lack of prejudice, but powerful democratic attitudes which defy prejudice.

"We can intentionally sit next to a Negro on a bus," suggests Sister Mary de Lourdes.

"We can take our children to visit Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant houses of worship," suggests Willard Johnson.

"We can invite Jewish neighbors into Christian homes and Christian neighbors into Jewish homes," suggests Mrs. Gertrude Hart Day.

When my own daughter was 4 she came in one day and said, "I don't like black people. They're dirty." I felt like my educator friend—shocked that my own daughter was showing prejudice. My wife and I locked horns with the problem then and there. We explained to our little girl, not once but many times over the ensuing months, that God made many kinds of people in this world. He made them many colors, just as He made roses many colors. In color, people are like flowers. Some are red, some are yellow, some are dark, and some are light.

When our little girl is older and studies anthropology she will learn that there are no important differences between peoples of different colors. She will learn that there is actually more similarity between two fat men of different races than between a fat man and a thin man of the same race. She will learn that there is much more similarity between a colored and a white housemaid than between a colored housemaid and a colored schoolteacher.

The first virulent symptom of anti-Semitism often is a child's angry accusation to a Jewish playmate, "Jews are Christ-killers. You killed Christ."

Sister Mary de Lourdes suggests that to spike this stereotype, you give children as much history of the crucifixion as they're capable of understanding.

"Tell them first that Jesus was a great Jewish leader," she suggests. "Tell them that people who were in power at that time were afraid Jesus would come into power. Tell them that finally Jesus was sentenced to death by the Roman governor—who was not a Jew. Above all—help the children realize that all this was long, long ago and that it has nothing to do with the Jewish people of today."

Once at Christmastime Sister Mary sensed that the Jewish children in her school were feeling uncomfortable. She was standing near the Bethlehem scene that had been set up for the holiday. Calling the children's attention to the holy family, she said, "You know, children, Joseph was a Jew and Mary was a Jew and Baby Jesus was a Jew."

Given such attitudes as these, children later can appreciate that it was the hatred in mankind which killed Jesus.

Dr. Ilg, from her years with Dr. Arnold Gesell at Yale's clinic of child development, offers the following suggestions for inoculation against prejudice year by year:

"Age 3," she says, "is a good time to have your child play in mixed groups, if he hasn't already."

Ages 4 and 5, Dr. Ilg suggests, are the times to broaden the child. He should be told about the world and its people; he should learn that China is on the other side of the globe—that its people are yellow; he should know that there are red and black people, Eskimos, Indians, and orientals.

But to eight is what Dr. Ilg calls the rhyming stage. Many clichés of prejudices are passed around in the rhymes and chants which 6- to 8-year-olds sing. We harm the child when we let them pass. We miss the chance to give him healthy attitudes instead of unhealthy ones.

Age 9, Dr. Ilg suggests, is a good time for concrete democratic action. "It is a good age to visit churches and temples," she says. Parents and children should go together, for the point is not merely to get acquainted with other religions. The point is to demonstrate to your children that you have a healthy attitude toward other religions. Let them catch it from you.

What Dr. Ilg calls the intellectual approach can come at age 10. The child is then ready for facts about minorities, about color lines, about scapegoating, about discrimination. Help him to understand prejudice—and be mighty glad he is free from it.

Is there anything more parents can do?

Mrs. Gertrude Hart Day, of New Haven, is an eighth-generation American. She was reared in a house built by her New England forebears in 1738. Today Mrs. Day heads the New Haven neighborhood project—one of the Nation's most effective antidotes to prejudice—because, as she says, "I've had a taste of prejudice. I know how poisonous it is."

During the war Mrs. Day's husband was in the Army Medical Corps and she, with her 8 children, followed him for 2 years through 14 cities from Maryland to Texas.

"I, who had always lived a comfortable life as a member of the accepted majority, suddenly found that I had no status," she relates. "Because I had three children, no one wanted to rent a house to me. The children and I were forced to live with other people who 'didn't belong.'

"Yes, I knew I'd be coming back to my comfortable niche after the war. But what about my wartime neighbors—all those minorities who had no niches to return to?"

So Mrs. Day came back to New Haven to her comfortable niche. She gathered a few other women around her. And in June 1946, the New Haven Neighborhood Project was launched. It first set up a playground. Then it started a nursery school. Then a summer play school. All these for all kinds of children, white and colored, Christian and Jew.

The New Haven parents didn't stop at that. They formed adult groups, they went to work on their own prejudices. "There was Mary, a second-generation American, mother of five children. She knew she didn't like Negroes, though she didn't know why," Mrs. Day relates.

"We who loved Mary were able to help her overcome her prejudice in a simple pleasant way.

"We invited a young Negro woman of Mary's own age and educational background to come to our afternoon teas. She and Mary had in common a rare love of music. Little by little they felt their common interest more strongly until one afternoon they sat side by side on the piano bench to play together."

The New Haven parents meet frequently at one another's homes. They don't have formal pep meetings about democracy. Groups with similar interests simply meet casually. People who like music come together for musical evenings—and it's just incidental that some are white and some are Negro and some are Christians and some are Jews.

"The most important thing," says Mrs. Day, "is that our children peek down the stairway and see us."

When they look in on an evening like that, the poison of prejudice can never touch them.

Attitude of the Secretary of State Toward Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Mississippi Legislature Rebukes Acheson," taken from the Washington Times-Herald of Saturday, January 28, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSISSIPPI LEGISLATURE REBUKES ACHESON—SUPPORT OF HISS IS CALLED SHOCKING

JACKSON, MISS., January 27—Secretary of State Dean Acheson drew a sharp rebuke from the Mississippi House of Representatives today for his comment on the perjury conviction of Alger Hiss.

"I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss," the Secretary said this week after the Hiss conviction.

The legislators unanimously adopted a resolution branding the statement as shocking and unprecedented.

"We have the spectacle in our country," shouted gray-haired delta planter Walter Sillers, "of a man proved of disloyalty, convicted after two trials, being defended by a man in the position of holding and guarding the secrets of his country, who stands by him (Hiss) instead of standing by the people of his country."

The resolution also slapped at the appearance of Supreme Court Justices Frankfurter and Reed as defense character witnesses in the first Hiss trial. It termed their appearance an unprecedented spectacle.

The resolution called for a congressional investigation of the State Department and other departments of the Federal Government, including the judiciary.

It asked that summary action be taken to rid these departments of all persons, from the highest to the lowest rank, who do not measure up to the strictest test of loyalty.

Preservation of Our National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two addresses, one delivered by Mr. Lyle F. Watts, Chief, United States Forest Service, at the dedication of Gifford Pinchot National Forest, on October 15, 1949, and the other, also a very able address by Mrs. Gifford Pinchot, on the same occasion.

I am informed that the cost of printing the two addresses will be $205, and that they will require 2½ pages of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREATEST GOOD OF THE GREATEST NUMBER—ADDRESS BY LYLE F. WATTS, CHIEF, UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE

In dedicating the Gifford Pinchot National Forest today, we honor one of America's great men.

It was Gifford Pinchot who gave conservation its first great impetus in the United States. It was largely through his tireless crusading efforts that conservation has become a part of our national policy. The ideas and forces that Gifford Pinchot set in motion may well determine the future security and prosperity and progress of this Nation. They may indeed determine the future welfare of the entire human race.

There are many here today who knew and worked with G. P., as Gifford Pinchot was familiarly and affectionately known to all his associates. They remember G. P. as a man of tremendous energy and enthusiasm, as an inspiring leader, as a zealous crusader. They knew him as a courageous, unflinching fighter in the public interest and for the public good. His cause did not need to be popular if it was right. He seemed at times to be fighting almost single-handed; but history has shown that the people were behind him.

Pinchot was the first Chief of the United States Forest Service. He was the first American to hang out his shingle as a consulting forester. He engineered the first conference of State Governors for the consideration of conservation policies. He promoted the North American Conservation Conference, the first conservation meeting on an international level. He was a cofounder of the Society of American Foresters, which is participating in these ceremonies today.

Pinchot was a man of many interests and many capabilities. But forest conservation was his first and greatest concern. Some of us here remember when Gifford Pinchot spoke to a group of foresters a few years ago. He said: "I have been a governor now and then, but I am a forester all the time—have been, and shall be to my dying day." He was indeed. At the time of his death in 1946, he was working over the management plan for the forests on his own land. In his last years, Pinchot suggested and promoted a world-wide conservation meeting—the initial impetus for the United Nations Scientific Conference on the Conservation of Natural Resources held at Lake Success just a few weeks ago.

The conservation movement, which Gifford Pinchot played such a big part in launching, has made much headway. Today we have a splendid system of national forests, making many important contributions to local communities and to national welfare. The timber and other resources of these national forests are managed for a sustained yield, for permanent and continuing production and use in the public interest. Our national forests are furnishing an increasingly significant portion of the country's timber supply; they are protecting vitally important sources of water; their grazing lands contribute to the Nation's supply of meat, wool, and leather; they afford recreational opportunities for millions of people. Their returns to the public in timber production, water supplies, flood control, livestock production, wildlife, recreation, and other services far exceed the costs of administration. It would indeed be difficult to place a dollars and cents value on many of their services and benefits.

We have in the various States, many strong, competent State forestry departments that

are doing notable work in forest protection and development. Fifty years ago, when Gifford Pinchot was beginning his crusade for forestry, only feeble beginnings had been made in systematic protection of the forests from fire. Today, State forestry agencies are heading up a cooperative program that provides organized protection for a total of some 340,000,000 acres of State and private forest land. State forests have been established and developed by many of the States, and in many other activities, State agencies are doing a good job for the advancement of forestry.

And so are many private owners of forest land. The forest-management programs of a number of lumber and pulp and paper companies are noteworthy. The forest industries have sponsored a tree-farm program in which hundreds of forest owners have signed up, pledging to manage their timber holdings for continuous production.

I have mentioned these advances in forestry particularly because they are the things with which I am most familiar and most directly concerned. There have been many other noteworthy advances in conservation. An aggressive program of soil conservation is under way. Wildlife management has made great strides. Deer and elk have made such a strong comeback that in some areas the problem is now to control excess populations instead of bringing back the vanished herds.

All of these things add up to an impressive total of achievement. Conservation is definitely on the move.

But we still have a long, long way to go. There is nothing in the record to justify any complacency. For the United States as a whole, we have yet to reverse the downward trend of our timber resources. The annual drain of saw-timber, though below a desirable goal for future production, still exceeds the rate of growth. Furthermore, much of the drain is of high-quality old-growth timber, and especially of the more valuable softwoods needed for construction lumber, plywood, and other important uses; whereas much of the growth is of inferior kinds of hardwoods and other poor-quality material. Millions of acres capable of producing high-grade timber now have only a scrubby, almost worthless growth. The general quality of our timber stands is steadily deteriorating.

Despite the excellent forestry programs of many forest owners, the fact remains that only 36 percent of all this country's operating private commercial forest land is being handled according to practices that assure the forest being kept in reasonably productive condition. Sixty-four percent of the cutting practice must be classed as poor or destructive.

The average grazing capacity of our western ranges is little more than half of what it was originally, or of what it should be now. Many ranges are badly deteriorated; in some areas nutritious perennial grasses have almost wholly disappeared; fertile top soil is being washed or blown away, increasing the difficulty of restoring range and watershed values.

Nearly all of our major rivers run muddy, much or all of the time. When you see a muddy river, you are seeing soil from farms and hillsides being carried off to the sea, or to be deposited along the way to clog stream channels or silt up the reservoirs. Every year, raging floods take a toll of human life and cause millions of dollars worth of property damage. A lot of this damage could be averted by more adequate attention to the watershed lands where the floods come from. Some watersheds have so deteriorated that a flash flood may start from less than an inch of rainfall.

And while too much water is wasted in floods, adequate, dependable water supplies for irrigation, industrial, and domestic use are becoming an increasingly acute problem in many parts of the West, and even in some parts of the more humid East. Many streams that are raging torrents during a rainy spell dry up soon after because not enough water gets into the ground to feed a steady flow. Many valley wells go dry for the same reason.

Such things as these indicate the big jobs ahead in conservation. If I sound like an alarmist at this moment, it is because I believe there is cause for alarm. In the face of a growing population our natural resources are declining. You cannot build an expanding economy on declining resources.

But I see no need for defeatism or despair. We know which way we should go. Gifford Pinchot and other early day conservationists long ago pointed the way. They were the pioneer pathfinders who first signposted what William Vogt, in his recent thought-provoking book, has called the Road to Survival. We can build up depleted resources. We can see that renewable resources are so managed that they will be continuously renewed. But it will take some aggressive, forthright action.

We need aggressive action to control unwise or destructive timber cutting—to establish certain basic rules of practice that will assure continued productivity of the forests. Some 14 States have already enacted legislation looking toward such regulation of forest practices. Their regulatory laws vary greatly in effectiveness and administration. We need Nation-wide standards and action on a Nation-wide scale to protect progressive owners from destructive competition, to stop further forest destruction and deterioration, and so help to maintain a reasonable growing stock as a basis for future timber production. This need was clearly foreseen by Gifford Pinchot. It has grown more urgent with the passing years.

We need also to tighten up still more our protection of the forests from fire. We need more protection work against destructive insects and diseases.

Along with such urgent defensive measures, we need positive action on a big scale to restore and build up resources. We need intensive education and other cooperative services to help forest owners improve their forests and practice real sustained yield management. We need to strengthen the public forests. We need to eliminate overgrazing and build up run-down ranges. We need to improve the condition of many watersheds. We need to replant or reseed millions of depleted acres to restore them to productivity.

And we need to get on with these things now. Time is marching on. For a century and more this country has been taking much from the land but putting little back. You can't keep on that way indefinitely. We have grown rich in worldly goods, but we are getting poorer in the natural resources that are the basis of those goods. And the longer we delay, the bigger and costlier will be the job of restoration that will have to be done if we are to maintain our high living standards and our strong place in the family of nations.

Ours is a Nation capable of doing things in a big way. We should aim high. Our goal should be continued abundance, not just to get by.

When Gifford Pinchot was Chief Forester, the guiding principle was laid down that our national forests should be managed for the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run. That principle has meaning not only within the boundaries of the national forests. It should motivate all public action. That the public has a stake in all natural resources was basic in Gifford Pinchot's thought. He strove to awaken realization of the fact that ownership of the land does not justify its abuse; that we of this generation hold the land in trust for the generations to follow; that it is our responsibility to see that it is used wisely, that it is kept productive.

One of Gifford Pinchot's achievements was in setting a high standard of public service. Under his leadership, the Forest Service gained a fine reputation for unselfish zeal and devotion. Power, prestige, or pay were not the dominant forces that motivated its actions—the public interest came first. Pinchot and his men did not stoop to subterfuge, special favors, nor secret agreements. Their fight was honest and aboveboard.

I think I am justified in saying—and I say it proudly—that the Forest Service still carries on in those traditions. Today we rededicate ourselves to those high standards. We shall not shrink from responsibility. We shall not be afraid of leadership in public policy. We cannot be content to drift with the tide. In the management of this national forest and of all other national forests, in our efforts to promote wise use of natural resources and sound conservation everywhere, our goal and guiding principle will continue to be the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run.

Our entire national forest system, embracing more than 180,000,000 acres in the United States and its Territories, is, in a large sense, a monument to Gifford Pinchot. But to this beautiful forest here in the Cascades of Washington has come the special honor of bearing his name. This national forest was established when he was Chief Forester. Its administration began under his direction. The basic principles for its management were set up under his guidance.

May the Gifford Pinchot National Forest help to keep forever alive and dynamic his conservation ideals. May it help point the way to wise use of all forests and all resources in the attainment of the good life for all men and all nations.

ADDRESS BY MRS. GIFFORD PINCHOT

You will understand how hard it is for me to speak on this occasion, even to thank you for the thoughts you have so beautifully expressed and the tributes you have so generously paid.

I know that every word has been heartfelt. Surely you realize how profoundly grateful I am.

Each one of you, the governor, the foresters, the soil conservationists, the engineers, have expressed, in your own separate fashions, something of the essence of what was Gifford Pinchot in the various fields in which you knew him. I can add nothing to what you have said.

But there is one point I am concerned to bring you which has not been stressed here.

That is the ideal of conservation that was so truly born of Gifford Pinchot's mind and spirit. The conservation philosophy from which he derives his temporal and earthly immortality.

Beyond the preservation of the forests, beyond the reclamation of the soil, beyond the various techniques of land use and flood control, over and above and back of all of these stands the philosophy itself, without which the former are without meaning.

Conservation to Gifford Pinchot was not a vague, fuzzy aspiration. It was something concrete, exact, dynamic. The very stuff of which democracy is made.

The conservation he preached dealt not only with trees but with the sheep herders, with homesteaders, whose means of livelihood in the forest depended upon the kind of protection that could be given them. It dealt not only with erosion and flood control, but with the wise use and development of great river valleys in terms of irrigation and power, such as you are so magnificently working out here.

To Pinchot, you see, man himself is a natural resource. The basic resource for whose material, moral, and spiritual welfare the conservation doctrine is invoked. Man, without whose energy, the energy of coal and oil, of electricity, yes, of atomic science itself, is inert and without meaning.

Believing, as Pinchot did, that the planned and orderly development of the earth and all it contains is indispensable to the permanent prosperity of the human race, conservation in its widest sense became to him one of the guiding principles through which such prosperity might be achieved.

He was trained as a forester, thought as a forester felt like a forester, but before he had practiced forestry long, he realized that there were questions to be answered that on the face of them might be said to have little to do with trees.

In his autobiography he writes about going out some 42 years ago "in the gathering gloom of an expiring day to ride in Rock Creek Park," and how he took with him on that ride the difficult problems upon which he was constantly at work.

Particularly he was thinking of the relations of the forests not only to streams and erosion, but to inland navigation, to water-power developments, to fish and game—he was thinking of the dangers of monopoly control of natural resources—about abuses in the exploitation of mineral deposits on public lands.

What had these to do with forestry, he asked himself, and what had forestry to do with them? What was the basic link between them?

Suddenly the idea flashed through his mind. Here were no longer a lot of different, independent, often antagonistic questions, each on its own separate little island—as he, a forester, had been in the habit of thinking. Instead there was one central question—many-sided, yes—but still a unit. All so closely connected as to make it imperative they be coordinated and treated as part of one coherent plan.

Seen in this new light, all these separate issues fitted into and made up one central problem—the use of the earth for the good of man.

To him it was like coming out of a dark tunnel. He had been seeing one spot of light ahead, and then of a sudden the whole landscape rushed into visibility.

It was a new policy that was needed. A policy not merely national—but world-wide in its scope. A policy that involved not only the welfare of man but his very existence on earth. An international policy in which all nations must cooperate for its fullest development.

In these terms conservation becomes a matter not primarily of techniques, as some moderns seem to think, but of policy, of Government policy on the highest level.

Possibly there are some of you old-timers—old-timers he loved so well—here who still remember the great meeting in 1908 called at the instigation of Pinchot by the then President Theodore Roosevelt. For the first time in history the idea of conservation was spelled out to the American people in terms so simple as to be understood by all.

First they were made to realize that our natural resources are not inexhaustible. That, on the contrary, they were being destroyed and wasted at a rate that was disastrous and might soon become fatal.

The point was then driven home that the natural resources of the country are a national heritage to be made use of in establishing and promoting the welfare, the prosperity, and the happiness of the American people.

Hitherto, said the President, our national policy has been one of almost unrestricted destruction of these natural resources. It was a policy that had led and was leading to exhaustion of many of them. Moreover, it was a policy that gave unequalled opportunity for private monopoly—he proclaimed over and over again.

"In the past," Roosevelt continued, "we have admitted the right of the individual to injure the future of the Republic for his own present profit. The time has come for a change."

Always the protection of the rights of the people marched side by side with the technology of forest management, with the development of water power, extraction of minerals, etc.

Always the emphasis was laid upon the social (humanistic we would call it today) purpose of conservation—the greatest good to the greatest number for the longest time.

Two years later Gifford Pinchot projected his insight into the conservation philosophy still further—this time into the international field—to the relationship between conservation and questions of peace and war.

Why, in the long role of history, had man so persistently gone out to do battle with his neighbors? Could one central issue be traced that underlay and explained such endless wars?

Obviously from time immemorial men had fought to grab from their neighbors or defend their own possession of the best hunting grounds, the most fertile plains, the protected harbors, the richest agricultural lands, the mineral deposits, etc. In early days the thinking was in terms of iron, copper, gold—later of coal and oil.

In our own day it is chrome, rubber, tin, manganese, molybdenum and bauxite, uranium. Natural resources all of them. Nonrenewable at that.

No single nation is self-sufficient in essential raw materials. Pinchot pointed out the welfare of each is dependent upon access to those it lacks. Access without recourse to war. Moreover, the world is beginning to understand that, instead of its being in the interest of any one nation to see another depressed, it is to the interest of each and all to see the rest secure.

Could such access to raw materials be brought about by mutual consent on an international basis?

Well, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, President Truman all in their time believed that conservation on the international level could help to remove one of the most dangerous of all obstacles to a just and permanent world peace.

In 1909 a formal invitation was sent out by Theodore Roosevelt to 46 nations to join together in an international conference on the subject of natural resources and their inventory, conservation, and wise utilization.

Some 30 of these countries, including among them Great Britain, France, Germany, Canada, and Mexico, accepted. Most unfortunately, however, for the cause of peace, Roosevelt's successor, President Taft, whose failure to support domestic conservation precipitated a major political revolt, decided to recall the invitation and to kill the conference.

Wilson, Harding, and Hoover were in turn approached but each of them failed to act.

In 1944 we went to see Franklin Roosevelt. The story of that meeting is both exciting and dramatic. For F. D. R. with his broad and imaginative understanding of history, immediately grasped and welcomed the full implications of the idea; pledged himself to the calling of such an international conference and authorized Pinchot to draw up an agenda; and to draft whatever government officials he might want in the doing.

In a letter to Cordell Hull, dated October 24, 1944, F. D. R. wrote:

"In our meetings with other nations I have a feeling that too little attention is being paid to the subject of the conservation and use of natural resources.

"I am surprised that the world knows so little about itself.

"Conservation is a basis of permanent peace. Many different kinds of natural resources are being wasted; other kinds are being ignored; still other kinds can be put to more practical use for humanity if more is known about them. Some nations are deeply interested in the subject of conservation and use and other nations are not at all interested.

"It occurs to me, therefore, that even before the United Nations meet for the comprehensive program which has been proposed, it could do no harm—and it might do much good—for us to hold a meeting in the United States of all of the united and associated nations for what is really the first step toward conservation and use of natural resources—i. e., a gathering for the purpose of a world-wide study of the whole subject.

"The machinery at least could be put into effect to carry it through.

"I repeat again that I am more and more convinced that conservation is a basis of permanent peace.

"I think the time is ripe."

After F. D. R.'s death, President Truman, who had followed the matter with close personal attention, went ahead on it. In August 1946, he sent to the United Nations a formal proposal as the American plan for such a conference.

This conference, so conceived and so borne, took place last August at Lake Success. It was known as the Conservation and Scientific Conference.

Its story is too long to go into here. Suffice it to say that the humanistic and moral, the economic and political sides of conservation were ignored.

Even more tragic is the fact that mention of peace and war in relation to conservation were deliberately excluded from the agenda.

The sterile little mouse that emerged, while magnificent on the technical side and adequate on much of the scientific, could lay no claim to the name of conservation in which it was conceived.

Such a tragic sidestepping of a major opportunity was bitterly resented by many of the delegates who had looked forward to a great upsurge of sentiment from the people of the world.

However, to dwell too closely upon the details of the past, while it may be good history, is not necessarily sound conservation.

The problems of today differ in many respects from those of yesterday.

How could that not be? Many permanent victories have been won since conservation was first developed as an American policy.

And more than that, many new needs of the American people have come into being.

Much has been learned since that time. New and breathtaking techniques worked out. Scientific clues laid bare that were not even foreshadowed in the old days.

Basically, however, the central purposes of conservation remain the same, spelled out in the clear, simplified words of Gifford Pinchot, "that the greatest good, to the greatest number, for the longest time."

Conservation is central to the domestic and international objectives of the American people. It is still dynamic humanism. It is still a philosophy of government at the highest level.

That fact is what gives the philosophy of conservation its force; its central basic unity.

Gifford Pinchot was always the first to proclaim the principle of growth, of development, of renewal, as central to the conservation idea.

He welcomed, always, the rediscovery of conservation by successive Presidents and politicians. Conservationists always welcome the renewal of natural resources, you know. And the renewal of the Christopher Columbus of conservation is certainly a prolific resource.

Certainly Gifford Pinchot understood that the battlefields of the past would not be the battlefields of the future.

But he also understood that the victories of yesteryear are not to be conceived as an excuse for present-day inertia. The fight for conservation, exactly as the fight for democracy, must be reinvigorated, revived, remanned, revitalized by each succeeding generation.

Its implications, its urgencies, its logistics, translated in terms of their own day by each generation. In other words, conservation is never a static doctrine. It is a doctrine of growth and development, of science, and of insight.

Gifford Pinchot blazed the trail. A man who never turned his back but marched breast forward. He looked to the rest of us, the young men and the young women as they come along, to continue on the long march ahead.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New Hampshire Morning Union, of January 13, 1950, entitled "Our Foreign Policy, Who Makes It and Accepts Responsibility?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FOREIGN POLICY, WHO MAKES IT AND ACCEPTS RESPONSIBILITY?

(By Betty Knowles Hunt)

A friendly China is gone, lost to our side, written off, done with. As the key to all Asia, Communist China now menaces the freedom and independence of the whole Far East, to say nothing of our own American security.

How did it happen? Who is to blame? Currently, the Saturday Evening Post is publishing a series of articles by Joseph Alsop, entitled: "Why We Lost China," which throws considerable light on the facts of the whole disaster. After conceding that the Nationalist regime was far from all-wise or good, Mr. Alsop writes:

"The question is whether we did our best to save China. The answer to this question is contained in the strange, still-secret inner history of our China policy. And this true history—for which the State Department could find no room in all the 1,054 pages of the white paper—may be simply, if grimly, summarized:

"Throughout the fateful years in China, the American representatives there actively favored the Chinese Communists. They also contributed to the weakness, both political and military, of the National Government. And in the end, they came close to offering up to the Communists, like a trussed bird on a platter, over 4 years before the eventual Communist triumph."

For the State Department now to insist that Chiang alone is to blame, that he lost the battle by the incompetence, corruption, and default of his administration, and to say not one single word about the pro-Communist aims and efforts of our own American authorities and advisers in China, is a shameful and disgusting low in American affairs.

Our first big authority in this sorry China story was Gen. Joseph Stilwell, who was anti-Chiang and pro-Communist when he accepted this important assignment in 1942. Almost from his arrival, he insulted, humiliated, and attempted to undermine Chiang in every way he could. He was aided and abetted by his chief political advisers, John Davies, John S. Service, and Raymond Ludden, all of whom favored the Communist side from the start. It was this group, our leading American representatives in China, who sold President Roosevelt on the idea of forcing Chiang into a "coalition government with the Communists." Did these advisers know this would mean a Communist China? The fact that they did is revealed clearly and unmistakably in their own writings.

All of which leads to the question: "Who makes our foreign policy, and accepts the responsibility for it?" Did the American people know that our own leaders were undermining Chiang, even while he was our wartime ally? They did not. Has the administration in Washington ever admitted any responsibility for appointing pro-Communist representatives in China? It has not. It does not even mention them.

Which brings us to Formosa. President Truman on December 27 called a special meeting of the National Security Council, for the avowed purpose of formulating a policy on Formosa. Press reports tell us that the Joint Chiefs of Staff urged an advisory military mission to the Nationalists, while Secretary of State Acheson argued against it. The President sided with Acheson, and that was that. But 6 days before this meeting, on December 20, the State Department had sent a secret dispatch to its officials in the Far East, writing off Formosa in advance to the Chinese Communists, and instructing our officials to play down the island's strategic importance. Why then, did President Truman call a policy meeting on December 20 when our policy had already been made and dispatched secretly 6 days earlier?

Who decided our Formosa policy? Apparently the Joint Chiefs of Staff were not consulted. Apparently our congressional leaders on foreign policy were not consulted. Who was consulted? Is our foreign policy now made solely by the Secretary of State? Or by him and the President?

This would seem to be a far cry from government of the people, for the people, and by the people. Not only are major decisions being made for all the American people by a person or persons unknown, without reference either to us or to our elected representatives in Congress—but the odds are heavy against anybody's taking any responsibility for any errors of judgment. About the most we can hope for is a series of whitewash papers, such as we have had to defend Yalta, Potsdam, and now our China policy. But white papers don't pay the cost of tragic errors. The American people do.

It would seem advisable, therefore, that the major decisions of this crucial era be made by as wide and as representative a group of Americans as possible. The executive branch of our Government is assuming too much power, and accepting too little responsibility for its acts. This is highly dangerous in a land of the free.

Save Two Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with the entire country and the Members of Congress demanding the stopping of waste and spending by the Government, everyone is amazed by the Government agreeing to give the D. & C. Navigation Co. $2,000,000 with interest at 4 percent from the time of taking of the land-locked passenger ship *Greater Buffalo* which operated on Lake Erie. The agreement for this was made in October 1949, after the D. & C. Navigation Co. said it would hold such an offer open for acceptance by the executive side of the Government to October 31, 1949.

Mr. Speaker, by agreement and not after trial on submission of evidence the executive side of the Government agreed to give away $2,000,000 with interest at 4 percent from the time of taking of this ship in face of the fact that the ship was built in August 1924, and had been depreciated at 5 percent per annum, and that the ship for 12 years previous to its taking by the Government earned nothing. In fact the earnings of the ship from 1931 to the date of taking are as follows:

Year	Earnings before depreciation	Earnings after depreciation
1931	−$9,714	−$161,771
1932	−46,189	−218,029
1933	−40,[illegible]	−211,[illegible]
1934	−70,151	−245,[illegible]
1935	−63,742	−214,228
1936	−1,902	−172,410
1937	23,[illegible]	−157,073
1938	−56,629	−227,115
1939	54,449	−158,037
1940	82,[illegible]	−75,[illegible]
1941	73,[illegible]	−[illegible]
Jan. 1, to Aug. 8, 1942	−20,449	−135,555

So that at the time of taking on August 8, 1942, the ship *Greater Buffalo* had an operating loss of $2,009,622 for the previous 12 years and was nothing more than a land-locked fresh-water white elephant with no place to go. The Maritime Commission determined its value as to what a prudent private person would pay at not more than $60,000 plus $35,000 for equipment making a total of $95,000 for the scrap value of the ship at the time of taking. The *Greater Buffalo* had no paying use, for passenger ships operated on the Great Lakes from 1920 to 1948 had gone down more than 50 percent. In 1920 there were 51 American flag passenger ships on the Great Lakes certified to carry 300 passengers or more and this had dwindled to a mere 21 ships by 1948. The fleet of passenger ships operating on Lake Erie from Cleveland, Buffalo, and Toledo had practically ceased to exist, including the large passenger ship *Seeandbee*, of the Cleveland-Buffalo Line, for which $129,000 was paid by the Government in 1941. And which the Maritime Commission says is the nearest instance of a sale of a ship with similar characteristics. And further, at the time of taking, the *Greater Buffalo*, as well as other such fresh-water ships, were worth scrap prices. They were charged off, they had no income, and they made no profit.

Yet, in the face of all this information which was available this agreed payment for the *Greater Buffalo* exceeds by 2,000 percent the administrative determination of just compensation for the taking of ships as previously carried on by the Government, and for which in other

instances criticism was leveled when agencies previously paid 160 percent of such administrative determination of just compensation.

The company carrying out its depreciation of 5 percent annually would leave undepreciated book value of approximately $300,000, and the fact is that it had no earning capacity. This was all done after a tender was made of the actual value of the ship at the time of taking which was set at no more than $95,000 by the Maritime Commission which has had all the Government experience with nonnaval ships.

Mr. Speaker, such offer to pay $2,000,000 of Government money seems to be less than lip service against wasteful spending and Treasury raiding. In view of all this I am asking that an investigation be made covering the cost, the value, and that everything be brought to light covering the agreement for the Government to give $2,000,000 with interest after the Maritime Commission has represented that the ship was worth no more than $95,000 at the time of taking.

I believe that the public is entitled to all of the facts, that the investigation should be held by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee so that the public might know and so that the Appropriations Committee will not be called upon to appropriate more than 20 times the claimed value of a ship that was nearly 20 years old, that earned no profit, and that did not earn its depreciation, and that in fact lost dollars like most American passenger ships on the Great Lakes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the whole matter be investigated by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the House Committee on Expenditures so that the public might have all the facts and also that the Committee on Appropriations will not be called upon to appropriate for this raid on the Treasury.

Young Republicans Show Sound Judgment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Young Republicans Show Sound Judgment" which appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union of January 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUNG REPUBLICANS SHOW SOUND JUDGMENT

The resolution adopted by the Manchester Young Republican Association denouncing American policy in the Far East and calling for defense of Formosa reflects sound judgment and a true appraisal of world affairs.

This resolution is given weight by the large number of veterans who served in its adoption. These men fought the battle of freedom in the Pacific and they realize the dangerous implications of Soviet Russia's maneuvers there today. It is the supreme tragedy that the present administration in Washington has not shared this realization. Instead, as the Young Republicans say, it failed to appraise the intent of the Chinese Communists realistically, and then it tried to cover up its failure by charges of weakness and corruption on the part of Chiang Kai-shek's government. This over-all attitude was inspired by General Marshall's bitter opposition to Chiang because of his refusal to take Communists into his government.

The utter unreasonableness of the administration's position is set forth clearly by the Young Republicans in their statement that a friendly government in China, even if it had weaknesses, was surely better than a government devoted to promoting Soviet Russia's program of world domination. There has never been any doubt that Mao Tse-tung and his associates are the avowed disciples of Communist expansion under Soviet direction.

The administration's policy in the past has been exceedingly unfortunate, and it can only be made worse and our national security jeopardized to a greater degree by further appeasement and retreat in the Far East. The Young Republicans are absolutely correct in their decision that the time has come to make a definite stand against communism in the Far East—to draw the line against a further Communist advance in that part of the world. This means that Formosa should be kept out of Communist hands and that steps should be taken to forestall a Communist advance into Indochina, Siam, Burma, and Indonesia.

This is not a party issue. The Young Republicans speak as Americans. The issue involves the future security of all Americans. The American people generally should, therefore, get behind the proposal for decisive action in the Far East before it is too late, and our national defense and that of all democratic peoples is irreparably undermined.

The Reds March On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial with respect to our Asiatic policy which appeared in the Washington Daily News of January 31, 1950:

THE REDS MARCH ON

There can be little doubt that the Chinese Communist forces and the Red Indochina insurrectionists headed by Ho Chi Minh have joined hands to drive the French out of Asia, as Chiang Kai-shek charges.

Both of these Communist forces get their orders from Moscow.

Now that they are in contact along the French Indochina border they would be expected to work together.

But what can be done about it?

China held the key to the situation on the Asiatic mainland, and when the United States abandoned Chiang Kai-shek's government, the door was opened for the Reds to move down upon the smaller countries on China's borders.

When the State Department issued its white paper, washing its hands of China, Secretary of State Acheson left himself an escape clause. He said: "Should the Communist regime lend itself to aggression against China's neighbors, we and the other members of the United Nations would be confronted by a situation violative of the principles of the United Nations Charter and threatening international peace and security."

But he didn't say what "we and the other members of the United Nations" would do when confronted by that inevitable situation.

Indochina is French territory—the last major foothold of European colonialism left on the Asiatic mainland.

Moreover, the French are backing Emperor Bao Dai in a war against the Communists who are hiding as usual behind the banners of democracy and nationalism.

Having denounced Chiang Kai-shek, the head of a constitutional government, as a dictator, and having accepted the Red cry that anyone supporting Chiang is an imperialist, the State Department couldn't very well go to the front now for a French-sponsored emperor.

The Communists know that, and are picking their spots.

This Red drive, in the opinion of many military men, could have been stopped at the Yangtze River 2 years ago.

Now it is rolling out of China in all directions and it will be difficult to stop anywhere because the anti-Communist forces are divided. They are in danger of being knocked off one at a time.

The New Chaplain of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I am highly pleased over the appointment of Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., as Chaplain of the House of Representatives, to succeed retiring Rev. Shera Montgomery. My home town of Alton, Iowa, is greatly honored to have one of its native sons selected for this distinguished position, for this little town of Alton, where I reside, is the place where Dr. Braskamp was born and grew to manhood.

Another lifelong friend of Dr. Braskamp and one who takes particular pleasure in his election as Chaplain is Claude S. Schekel, one of the Official Reporters of Debates in the House of Representatives. Dr. Braskamp, Mr. Scheckel, and I have known each other since childhood, all three being from Alton. It is a remarkable coincidence that the three of us meet again here in the great forum of the House of Representatives.

Dr. Braskamp, who has spent his entire ministry of 39 years in Washington, is the dean among the 42 pastors of the Washington City Presbytery in length of service. It is stated that among the several hundred clergy in Washington of the Protestant, Catholic, and Hebrew faiths there is only one in the active pastorate who exceeds him in the record of length of service. In 1951, when he completes his 40 years in his Washington pastorate, he plans to write a book entitled "Forty Years a Minister in the Nation's Capital."

The Gurley Memorial Presbyterian Church, which was his first church after being associated with Dr. Charles Wood in the Church of the Covenant, is in fact still his one and only church. It was named in memory of Dr. Phineas D. Gurley, Chaplain of the United States Senate and pastor of the historic New York Avenue Presbyterian Church where President Abraham Lincoln worshipped. Dr. Braskamp was the leader when the Gurley congregation built a new house of worship, and 7 years later he became the leader in merging the Gurley and Gunton-Temple Congregations and in the erection of their present church at Sixteenth and Newton Streets.

During the past 10 years he has officiated more than 175 times as Acting Chaplain in the House, substituting for Dr. Montgomery. During these past 10 years he has also been the Acting Chaplain in the Senate on more than 75 occasions and during the entire 1948 Special Session of the Congress and the vacation periods of Chaplain Dr. Frederick Brown Harris and the late Chaplain, Dr. Peter Marshall.

Dr. Braskamp pursued his education and received degrees from the following schools: Public school in Alton, Iowa; graduated from the Northwestern Classical Academy at Orange City, Iowa, in 1903; first 2 years of college study at Grinnell, Iowa; graduated from the University of Michigan with the degree of bachelor of arts in 1908; first year of theological training in Hartford, Conn.; last 2 years of theological training in Princeton Seminary, graduating in 1911; received the degree of master of arts from Princeton University in 1911, having taken his studies in the department of philosophy. In June 1930 Hanover College of Hanover, Ind., gave him the honorary degree of doctor of divinity.

In June 1947 he was made a Knight of the Order of Orange Nassau, the decoration being bestowed on him by Queen Wilhelmina at a ceremony conducted by Ambassador Loudon in the Netherlands Embassy.

In 1929 he was elected to the office of moderator of the Washington City Presbytery which is composed of 42 churches and in 1940 he was made the moderator of the Synod of Baltimore which is composed of the 153 Presbyterian Churches of Washington City, Baltimore, and New Castle.

Dr. Braskamp has for 15 years been the president of the Princeton Theological Seminary Alumni Association of Washington and is a member of the Washington Princeton University Club.

In September 1925 he married Anna C. Bull, of Milford, Pa. They have two children, a daughter, Anne Bernice, age 22, who graduated from Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa., with a bachelor of arts degree in June 1949, and entered the law department of George Washington University in September 1949. Bernard, Jr., age 18, graduated from Calvin Coolidge High School in June 1949 and is preparing to enter West Point Military Academy in 1950.

Dr. Braskamp was born of humble, God-fearing Dutch parents in Alton, Iowa, a small town of 1,000 inhabitants in the northwestern part of the State where the temperature one winter, during his boyhood days, registered 42° below zero although on the 18th day of February 1887, when he was born, it was only 15 below.

His father and mother were childhood friends and schoolmates in Holland, both having been born in Appeldorn, where the queen has her summer home. His mother was 15 years of age when her parents and their nine children emigrated to America. His father, who was the same age, was a young tinsmith in Appeldorn and when he reached the age of 21 and had earned enough money at his trade to pay for his passage, he also went west to America, the "land of opportunity," where his boyhood sweetheart was living. A few years after his arrival they were married, the bride having been employed as a seamstress and the groom having found work as a tinsmith and clerk in the small hardware store in Alton.

Dr. Braskamp speaks the Dutch language fluently and keeps his command of that language by reading his mother's Bible which she brought with her from Holland. He often calls to mind those pioneer days in the prairies of Iowa when life was a tremendous struggle and there were many hardships.

The house in which he was born was a small frame building with no heat in any room except in the kitchen where there was a cook stove in which corn cobs, purchased from farmers at 75 cents per wagonload, were the only fuel material. He and the other four children in the family slept on straw beds in rooms without heat. The mother, after kneeling with them in prayer, would tuck them in, the last in bed having the great thrill of blowing out the lamp which she carried.

Dr. Braskamp's parents made every possible sacrifice to give their five children a college education. After completing his grammar-school studies in Alton, he went to the Northwestern Classical Academy at Orange City, Iowa, which was 4 miles to the northwest. He usually walked this distance, leaving home at 6:45 in the morning, the starting time being determined by the weather. It was pretty tough going to face the cold northwest wind in the winter months. Like every normal boy he often wished that he could hear the news that the academy had burned to the ground and that there would not be any school.

On the evening of the academy commencement exercises the principal, in his introductory remarks, announced that the 16-year-old Braskamp boy in knee-length pants who was the next on the program to give an oration, had never during his 3 years been late for the 8 o'clock chapel services. Dr. Braskamp gives his mother all the credit for that record for she got up every morning at 5:30 to start the cook-stove fire and to melt enough water in the ice-covered basin so that he could wash his face and hands before sitting down to his breakfast which usually consisted of a large dish of oatmeal, toast, and a cup of hot chocolate. His mother would always put a few home-made cookies or doughnuts in his overcoat pocket which would tide him over until he returned from school at about 1:30 in the afternoon after walking the 4 miles.

After graduating from the academy he went to Grinnell College, Iowa, entering at the age of 16. In his freshman and sophomore years he was the shortstop on the varsity baseball team and the pitcher on his class team. There is one intercollege game whose memory haunts him. Grinnell was playing the University of Iowa and the game was a tie at the beginning of the ninth inning with Iowa University at bat. There was an Iowa runner on third base and two outs. The batter on the third pitch drove a sizzling grounder to the shortstop which he handled cleanly just as he had done with the seven other grounders but something happened and he threw the ball about 20 feet over the first baseman's head and into the grandstand. The game was over for Grinnell failed to score during the last half of the ninth inning. A heart-broken player went home in tears.

Dr. Braskamp completed his first 3 years at Grinnell College in a creditable manner but his parents were financially unable to assist him in continuing his studies. There was very little opportunity for a student to work his way through school at Grinnell. He consequently found it necessary to stay home and spent the year as a clerk in his father's hardware store. It was his job to open the store every morning at 7 o'clock, start the fire in the stove, sweep the floor, and dust the counter. After those chores he was ready to do a rushing business. The hardware business, however, was not a lucrative one, especially during the cold winter months. Frequently, when his father and he were getting ready to close the store at 9 o'clock in the evening, they would find, upon counting the money in the till, that they had sold less than $2 worth of merchandise.

Dr. Braskamp's parents, always ready to make every sacrifice for their children's education, sold their last small tract of farm land, which they had purchased for $8 an acre, in order that he might be privileged to pursue his education. He decided to go to the University of Michigan for those last 2 years. Realizing what tremendous sacrifices his parents were making, he immediately upon arriving at Ann Arbor, Mich., started out in search of work which would help pay expenses. He found work waiting on tables and cutting the lawn of one of the professors. In the wintertime he took care of the professor's furnace. He did not have time, however, for the practice and training that was required of a student who was trying out for the varsity baseball team and therefore gave up his boyhood dream of being a major-league player.

One week in the spring he made big money. He was given charge of the sale of the librettos for the May festival. He made $32 that week but his duties, as sales manager, deprived him of the inspiration and pleasure of hearing

Schumann-Heink who was on the program that year. It was a question of business before pleasure.

In the summertime, during his vacations, he sold maps and the Century Book of Facts. He also made an extra few dollars at the Fourth of July celebration in his home town and the nearby towns for he was quite a sprinter, usually winning first or second place in the 100-yard dash. The men who bet on him would always give him at least 50 cents or a dollar whenever he was the first to hit the tape.

Having been a shortstop on a college baseball team he also frequently made a few dollars by playing for neighboring towns.

At the beginning of his senior year at the University of Michigan he decided to enter the law department after receiving his bachelor of arts degree but a few months before graduation he felt the urge to enter the ministry. Then in September he went to Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn., where he was given a scholarship.

While a first-year student in the Hartford Seminary he had the great privilege of hearing an address by Woodrow Wilson, president of Princeton University. He was so inspired by that message that he decided to go to Princeton for the remaining 2 years of seminary training where he could have an opportunity to hear Woodrow Wilson more frequently. It became his great ambition to obtain a master of arts degree from Princeton University. Consequently the following year he went from Hartford to Princeton. In addition to taking the regular studies in the theological seminary he went over to the university to enroll in the graduate department. At the end of the 2 years he not only graduated from the theological seminary but received the degree of master of arts in philosophy from Princeton University.

He was licensed and ordained to the ministry by the presbytery of Brooklyn, N. Y., in May 1911. In September 1911, he was invited to Washington to become the assistant pastor of the Church of the Covenant, now called the National Presbyterian Church, where Dr. Charles Wood was then the revered pastor.

Address of Hon. Kenneth B. Keating, of New York, Before the New York State Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting an address made by my good friend and distinguished colleague, the Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, member of the New York bar, before the New York State Bar Association on January 27, 1950.

It will come as no surprise to those of us who know Representative KEATING that he deals with depth and understanding with the proposition that Supreme Court Justices should be prohibited from giving character or reputation evidence on behalf of a defendant charged with a crime in the Federal courts.

I hope that my colleagues will read his thoughtful and penetrating exposition of a very difficult subject. For Representative KEATING shows not only a judicial mind but a statesman's vision in analyzing the implications of this question. These implications are portentous for our entire judicial system. They bear also upon our ability to meet effectively the godless challenge of communism.

The subject selected by the association for discussion this afternoon is: "*Resolved*, That no judicial officer shall testify in any action or proceeding as to the reputation and character of any person or as to any matter of opinion."

As I told President Neil Harrison when he called me to ask me to participate in this discussion, I am not at all sure that I would advocate such a sweeping prohibition as is envisioned in this resolution. I do feel strongly, however, that a bill should be enacted along the general lines of the one which I introduced on July 18 last to prohibit Supreme Court Justices from giving character or reputation evidence on behalf of a defendant charged with a crime in the Federal courts. Whether this proscription should extend to opinion evidence is debatable. My inclination is to think that it should for some, though not all, of the reasons advanced for barring character evidence.

The universality of condemnation which greeted the appearance on the witness stand of two Justices of our highest court in the first Hiss trial to act as character witnesses for the accused, prompted my introduction of this legislation. The legal admissibility of this evidence is not open to challenge. It was the impropriety of their appearance which disturbed the American people, who look with awe and reverence upon our Supreme Court. In the cloistered shelter of our law offices, many of us may lose touch with the reactions of the general public. But I can assure you that one in public life, with his ear to the ground, soon becomes accustomed to catching the trends in thinking among our people. I can assure you that public sentiment, if it could be metered on this issue, would overwhelmingly support such legislation as I have offered. True, that is by no means the only test. Democracy itself would probably fail if every issue were determined by majority vote of the people. But orderly government does require that those charged with legislative responsibility give heed to the articulate wishes of the people.

I intended in the introduction of this measure, and intend now, no harsh criticism of Justices Frankfurter and Reed, both of whom are outstanding and able men. Nor do I imply in the slightest degree any impropriety in the action of the distinguished counsel for Mr. Hiss in his first trial, who happens to be my able adversary today. He conducted a brilliant defense of his client and properly employed every legitimate weapon at his command. Whether the more nearly successful result which he achieved than was reached in the second trial is attributable in part to the appearance on the witness stand of the Supreme Court Justices in the first trial, only the masters of surmise and conjecture would venture to state.

Supreme Court Justices should not, of course, be barred from giving evidence as to facts in any controversy of which they may have knowledge. In other words, if they have seen some actions done or heard words spoken which are material in pending litigation, there is no reason why they should not testify about them in the same manner as anyone else. Existing law would disqualify them from sitting in judgment on an appeal to their Court, so that no litigant would be injured through permitting such testimony.

On the other hand, character evidence or opinion evidence seems to me to be in an entirely different category. No case comes to mind where this type of testimony from such a source would be essential to promoting the ends of justice. A Supreme Court Justice could conceivably have been the only witness to an automobile accident or the only person who overheard a crucial conversation. To deprive him of the right to testify in such a case might defeat the ends of justice. It would always be possible, however, to secure other expert or character witnesses without reliance on the Supreme Court as an exclusive source of supply.

Although it is reported that this question has never arisen before, since no other Supreme Court Justice in all our history has sought to testify as a character witness in a criminal trial, it is important that a precedent for such action in the future be not established.

Alger Hiss has now been convicted. If his case reaches the nine Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, I invite your thought about the embarrassing situation there presented. Justices Frankfurter and Reed, will, of course, be disqualified, leaving seven to make the decision. If a larger number of Justices, conceivably all nine, had elected to disqualify themselves, paralysis of our judicial system would have been the result. It seems to me the most extreme embarrassment will be caused the brother jurists of these two Justices in sustaining the conviction of one to whose high character their daily associates have attested. Indeed in the zeal of their brethren not to give undue weight to such testimony, it is conceivable that they may bend over backward to the prejudice of the accused. It is simply a situation which should never arise.

In addition, the very presence in one of our Federal courts of a Justice of the appellate tribunal, either as a witness for the prosecution or defense, results in an influence on the presiding judge and jury out of all proportion to the importance of his testimony, when he is there only to support someone's character. As we all know, those of previously spotless reputation often commit serious crimes. General character evidence is not of too great value at best. Its introduction should, therefore, be surrounded with the necessary safeguards to insure that its value and effect be not exaggerated.

I realize the serious implications surrounding the suggestion that anyone of high or low estate be deprived of the privilege of testifying in our courts. The extension of such prohibitions should be cautiously approached. Yet it is well established that physicians, lawyers, and clergymen are barred from disclosing confidential communications. The preservation of the sanctity of their relationship is considered of paramount importance. I can think of nothing more vital to the welfare and security of our Nation than the perpetuation of the position of eminence and respect which our highest tribunal has enjoyed throughout its history among our people. To permit the Justices of the Supreme Court to vouch for the character of defendants on trial in our Federal criminal courts represents a source of imperilment of the standing of that revered tribunal.

The contention has been advanced that barring Supreme Court Justices as witnesses might be an infringement of a defendant's

constitutional right to produce any relevant evidence to establish his innocence. It may be conceded that a person generally has a right to compel testimony. This right, however, is not absolute, but is subject to certain exceptions such as the well-settled exclusion of privileged communications. Thus it is universally conceded that communications between husband and wife, attorney and client, fellow jurors, Government and informer are barred. In most jurisdictions, the same applies to priest and penitent, and physician and patient. There can be no question but that these exemptions are not invalid under the Constitution, even though the exclusion of such testimony may be a great or fatal hindrance to a party or to the ascertainment of truth. Moreover, State legislatures are constantly adding new groups to these exemptions, as, for example, journalists barred from disclosing sources of information, accountants, as to communications made by a client, social workers, as to information given to them, confidential clerks or stenographers, licensed detectives, and others.

It may be highly relevant and material for a priest to disclose facts given to him in the confessional, or a lawyer, or a physician, facts elicited from a client or patient. Yet to seal their lips does not violate the constitutional protection. No more certainly does it infringe on constitutional guaranties to provide that nine men, while sitting as justices on the highest court in the land, shall not serve as character or reputation witnesses for a criminal defendant in a subordinate Federal tribunal from which an appeal may be taken to the very bench they occupy.

Another analogy may be found in the well-recognized doctrine that the President of the United States is not amenable to the service of process. Indeed, that goes far beyond any contention advanced here, since, as pointed out, it is here sought simply to prevent Supreme Court Justices from giving evidence of a certain narrowly defined character.

Thus Willoughby in his learned work on the Constitution—second edition—at page 1498 says:

"In the trial of Aaron Burr for treason the amenability of the President to a judicial process was brought directly into issue. Marshall, who was conducting the examination, issued, at the request of the defense, a subpena duces tecum directing President Jefferson to appear and bring with him a certain letter to himself from General Wilkinson. Jefferson refused to appear or to bring the letter. That a compulsory process should be thereupon issued to the President does not appear to have been even considered, but upon a discussion as to whether the Attorney General should permit the defense to have the examination of a copy of the letter which had been put into his, the Attorney General's, possession, Marshall said: 'I suppose it will not be alleged in this case that the President ought to be considered as having offered a contempt to the Court in consequence of his not having attended; notwithstanding the subpena was awarded agreeably to the demand of the defendant, the Court would, indeed, not be asked to proceed as in the case of an ordinary individual.'"

Jefferson, likewise, was of the view that the President was beyond ordinary process. He wrote:

"Laying down the position generally, that all persons owe obedience to subpena, he admits no exception unless it can be produced in his lawbooks. But if the Constitution enjoins on a particular officer to be always engaged in a particular set of duties imposed on him, does not this supersede the general law, subjecting him to minor duties inconsistent with these? The Constitution enjoins his constant agency in the concerns of 6,000,000 people. Is the law paramount to this, which calls on him on behalf of a single one? * * * The leading principle of our Constitution is the independence of the legislature, executive, and judiciary of each other, and none are more jealous of this than the judiciary. But would the executive be independent of the judiciary, if he were subject to the commands of the latter, and to imprisonment for disobedience; if the several courts could bandy him from pillar to post, keep him constantly trudging from north to south and east and west, and withdraw him entirely from his constitutional duties?"

In the case of *Mississippi* v. *Johnson* ((1867) 71 U. S. 475), the question was raised whether the President could be restrained by writ of injunction from executing a law believed by Mississippi to be unconstitutional. The Supreme Court did not explore the subject at any length, but did hold that the writ would not issue on the ground mainly that if the President refused to obey the writ the Court was powerless to enforce it.

Commenting on this case, former President and Chief Justice Taft, in his work, Our Chief Magistrate and his powers, said:

"The Supreme Court has a number of times intimated that the President's office is of such high character that officially he is beyond the compulsory processes of the Court."

Despite occasional assertions to the contrary, the weight of judicial opinion and legal scholarship is to the effect that the President, so long as he remains unimpeached, is not subject to judicial process. If this is so, it follows that a defendant charged with a criminal offense would not be permitted to force the attendance in court of the President of the United States to act as a witness for him on any subject.

The bill which I have introduced in Congress does not render a Supreme Court Justice incompetent as a witness generally or prohibit compulsory process to force his attendance. It merely prohibits the giving of a certain type of testimony which concerns the interest of the witness in relation to the interests of the State and the proper administration of justice. Paramount considerations of policy always prevail over the purpose of judicial investigations and the interests of the parties involved in the litigation.

Regardless of the conclusions reached today by those who listen to this discussion, it is certainly a wholesome matter to discuss fully and freely anything which directly affects judicial officers, for whom all of us who practice at the bar are accustomed and desire to maintain at all times the utmost respect. I congratulate the bar association in the selection of this timely subject and express my gratitude for the invitation which you have extended to me to present my views and, no less, for the privilege which you accord me of hearing a statement of the position of those who may differ.

Post Mortem on China White Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following pungent article on the incredible errors our State Department has made in dealing with Communist aggression in China and its alibis for its mistakes. The article is by Mr. Ross N. Young, editor of the Marion (Iowa) Sentinel. I did not think it proper to insert it prior to the conclusion of the trial of Alger Hiss:

FACING THE FACTS

(By Ross Young)

The State Department has issued a book of over 1,000 pages to explain its Chinese policy. St. Matthew required only a few words to describe the betrayal of Jesus. Give Judas credit for three things. He offered no alibis, he confessed his sin, and he hanged himself.

Secretary Acheson, whose principal contribution thus far is having his left profile photographed, does not add to his stature by this report. Serious omissions, alibis, and considerable double talk convict him of dishonest reporting.

If even half the criticisms of Chiang Kai-shek are true, nevertheless, he has been fighting the Japs and the Communists or both for 25 years. In doing so, he was in part fighting our battles.

The decline of Chiang increases the mathematical probability that your boy or his sons may some day be drafted to protect this land from world communism. Even at best, the necessary increases in defense appropriations will take a heavy toll from the standard of living.

We have been told that there is graft in China. There was graft in China when we forced Japan's hand to protect China. Those who make the loudest complaints about Chinese corruption have shown an amiable tolerance toward graft in this country.

The people are baffled by the conduct of their Government toward China, and millions of them are asking angry questions. Why was it necessary to betray China at Yalta? Why did they take to Yalta as an adviser Alger Hiss of all people?

Why didn't the State Department consult such authority and men of character as General MacArthur? Why was the State Department influenced so greatly by those of its employees who not only followed the Russian line but who also used almost the same words as the Communists propagandists?

This is no time to be cute or clever. We have had an expensive amount of that. This is the time for penitence, confession, and penance. Let the whole truth be told at whatever cost. Patriotism requires the protection of America rather than certain reputations.

Discontented Should Move Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, communism is a way of life in Russia, Yugoslavia, China, and other satellite countries.

Socialism is a way of life in Great Britain and other European countries.

Fascism is a way of life in Spain and Portugal.

Capitalism is a way of life in the United States.

Those people who do not like the American system can select the one under which they would like to live. They have a wide choice and their passage should be on a one-way ticket.

Those who are sabotaging our system are not asking for passports so they can live under communism, socialism, or fascism. Yet millions of people who live

under these foreign systems are begging to come to this country. How come?

The answer is a simple one: Only under capitalism does everyone have enough to eat. Only under capitalism is there opportunity to progress. Only under capitalism is there freedom to say and do as you believe. Only under capitalism is there the dignity of self-respect.

Let those who do not like eating nor opportunity, nor freedom, nor self-respect—let them remember there are plenty of places on earth where they can go and do without these great privileges.

China Grumbles, But Reds Push Relentlessly on With Their "Reforms"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Washington Post by William Lewisohn, the correspondent of the London Times in China, where he has lived 40 years. He was the last foreign correspondent to leave Peiping when the Communists, true to type, permit no observation by neutrals of the "democratic" utopia they install. The article demolishes several of the myths which have been so successfully cultivated for years by the Far Eastern Division of the State Department and pro-Communist and liberal writers. First, that nothing could be worse than the Kuomintang; second, that the Communists give land to peasants; third, that the Communists improve the lot of the people; fourth, that there is either democracy or freedom under the Reds; and, fifth, that the Communists cannot rule China because it is too big and the people too individualistic. What a problem our country faces in Asia because of these myths which were so largely believed by misled citizens of our land.

[From the Washington Post of December 18, 1949]

CHINA GRUMBLES, BUT REDS PUSH RELENTLESSLY ON WITH THEIR "REFORMS"

(By William Lewisohn)

In last Sunday's article, the foreign relations of the Communist Government of China were discussed. This remains to be described the effect of the recent upheaval in the domestic side.

The people of China have been between the devil and the deep blue sea. There is no need to enlarge on the mistrust of the Kuomintang in recent years. This party had become extremely unpopular with all sections of the population or, as the Chinese say, had forfeited the mandate of Heaven. That is not to say, however, that the Chinese public looked forward to the rule of the Communists. When, in 1946, you asked a Chinese who was complaining about the Kuomintang whether he preferred the Communists, he would shrug the shoulders and reply, "Well, they can't be any worse."

When, therefore, the Communist armies entered Peiping, Tientsin, and Shanghai, they were received by the mass of the population with only moderate enthusiasm. The attitude was one of indifference or, rather, one of curiosity not unmixed with suspicion. Indeed, after a few weeks the old Chinese saying was much quoted: "The names on the menu are changed, but not the contents of the dishes."

A small section of the population, curiously enough, seeing that the Communists claimed to represent the proletariat, not among the poorer classes, was loud in its demonstrations of welcome. These enthusiasts included the students, among whom the Communists had long been carrying on secret propaganda, and who in recent years had got completely out of hand. Sit-down strikes in the colleges, and violent anti-government demonstrations and parades were the order of the day under the Kuomintang.

After a few months of Communist rule, however, there has been a certain revulsion of feeling among many of the students, and much grumbling, though it is no longer expressed openly. The reasons for this are that the quality of the meals, which are supplied free to students, has deteriorated, and that they are no longer allowed to express their opinions in public by parades and demonstrations. The only public demonstrations allowed are those planned by the new rulers for some political purpose of their own.

Actually, the number of the students at some of the universities has fallen off considerably, because many of them have been lured away by the special school set up to train administrators. They are promised a job after only 6 months, saving them the more strenuous university course, even though that has been cut to 2 years.

There is also a large body of university professors and disgruntled politicians, who had hitherto shown no particular enthusiasm for Communist principles, now climbing onto the Communist bandwagon.

The wealthy classes, needless to say, with few exceptions, are violent opponents of the new system, though they do not venture to air their opinions publicly.

REAL-ESTATE TRICK

Among the peasantry and the urban working class, there is also considerable discontent with the new government. These mostly uneducated and completely unpolitical groups had been led to expect a great and immediate improvement in their living conditions. The peasants are bitterly disappointed over the redistribution of the land. It seemed wonderful when they were given their acre—or whatever the amount was—to dispose of if they wanted to. Actually, it did not work out that way, for their were no buyers. Nobody was anxious to acquire land beyond his own holding, for fear he would then be regarded as one of the wealthy landowners and the extra land would be taken away from him in some fresh redistribution.

Moreover, the peasants are very heavily taxed, the government taking 40 percent of their produce for the army. The remaining 60 percent the peasant has to hand over to the farmers' union which controls the village or group of villages, and each family then receives a daily ration from this general store.

Then, too, the life of the peasants is strictly regimented. At the head of each district there is a Communist commissar, generally some young student, who even decides what crops are to be sown and what labor is to be commandeered for public works. The peasants have to attend political meetings several times a week, and the details of their life are interfered with in every way.

FEARS STILL CHINESE

The urban workers are little better pleased with the new dispensation. After the extravagant promises made them by Communist propaganda, they are disappointed that the cost of living not only has not gone down, but has increased. Wages have not been increased, owing to the bad state of trade, while the quality of commodities has fallen off because of the lack of imported material.

Many workers had expected that when the Communists took over the cities, the capital and stocks of the big concerns would be divided up among them in the same way as had been done with the land in the countryside. Communists had considerable difficulty in explaining that such a division would ruin the businesses of which the workers were now the owners. The only advantage the workers appear to have reaped so far—if it is an advantage—is that in all factories, businesses, and public offices, workers' councils have been set up to fix wages, salaries, working hours, the distribution of profits and sometimes even the whole business policy.

Large numbers of workers have been thrown out of employment by the Communist campaign against the wealthy classes, part of which has been the suppression of all so-called unproductive trades, such as goldsmiths, silversmiths, and the production of luxury goods.

Undeterred by the undercurrent of grumbling, however, the doctrinaire Communist leaders are pursuing their Marxist economic policies. Their efforts to impose their theories on the people are supported by an intensive campaign of propaganda through the press, radio, and government bookshops selling only Marxist literature, and by complete control of all the arts, including theater and cinema. Privately owned newspapers have either been suppressed or taken over by the government. The official newspapers contain nothing but propaganda and are unutterably dull. There is no local gossip or general news about China, and the only foreign news is from the Russian news agency, Tass.

The old Chinese plays, which used to be so popular among the lower classes, have been forbidden, as tending to spread superstitious, feudal, or counter-revolutionary ideas. The propaganda plays which have taken their place bore the public, with disastrous results on the box office. Painting sculpture, literature, and the other arts are permitted only if they draw their inspiration from the lives of the workers and peasants.

CHILDREN ARE INFORMERS

The Communists are making the most determined efforts to undermine the family, which was once such an important influence in Chinese life. Children are ordered to attend Communist schools for indoctrination, whether their parents like it or not. Marriage without parental consent is encouraged.

In general, it may be said that the Communist rulers pay little attention to that part of the population over 30. Their interest is concentrated on the generation now growing up. A widespread informer system has been introduced, in the countryside, in each village, and in the towns in each street; and children are encouraged to report criticisms of the regime by their parents or other relatives.

The argument that communism is opposed to the character and the whole tradition of the Chinese people, even if true, does not necessarily mean that it cannot be imposed on the country. The Chinese are a reasonable and practical-minded people with a strong strain of individualism. But the point to be remembered is that they have no democratic traditions, they are accustomed to being ruled from above and they have always accepted such rule with complete docility, provided it gave them peace and order and reasonable living conditions.

On the other hand, the new Communist rulers are a close-knit, well-disciplined body of fanatics, prepared to go to any extremes in order to introduce the Communist system. It would seem to be highly improbable that any revolt against the system from outside the Communist Party could ever succeed. If the Communist rule in China were overthrown, it could only be by an external war or by a split in the party itself, leading to fresh civil war.

Let's Get Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under permission already granted to me, I wish to set forth in the Appendix a questionnaire, which I intend to send to my constituency:

LET'S GET TOGETHER

DEAR FRIENDS: Let's get together on how you, the people, feel on current legislative proposals.

If you will check off the following questionnaire, it will give me your detailed views, and aid me in deciding how to vote. This is the best way I know for an individual to help decide the legislative policies of his Government. These questions are intended to be unbiased, and not an indication of my own feelings.

I shall be grateful for your cooperation in this project.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

1. Do you favor President Truman's European foreign policy? Yes ☐ No ☐
2. Do you agree with his Latin-American policy? Yes ☐ No ☐
3. Do you favor his policy in China and Asia? Yes ☐ No ☐
4. Do you favor continued aid under the Marshall plan? Yes ☐ No ☐
(a) If so, should this be substantially reduced? Yes ☐ No ☐
5. Do you favor recognition of the Communist regime in China? Yes ☐ No ☐
6. Do you favor use of American arms and men to keep Formosa from the Communists? Yes ☐ No ☐
7. Do you favor Truman's "point 4" program to use American money and know-how to build private business in foreign countries? Yes ☐ No ☐
8. Do you favor the present reciprocal trade agreements policy? Yes ☐ No ☐
9. Do you favor the United States joining a world government? Yes ☐ No ☐

NATIONAL ECONOMY

10. Is our present budget figure of $15,000,000,000 too much to spend on national defense? Yes ☐ No ☐
11. Do you favor Secretary Johnson's method of administering unification of the armed forces? Yes ☐ No ☐
12. Do you favor complete enactment of the Hoover plan of reorganization and economy? Yes ☐ No ☐
13. Do you approve of peacetime Government spending of more than its revenues—for any reason? Yes ☐ No ☐
(a) If so, for what? _____
14. Would you impose additional taxes to meet a deficit or cut Government expenses to eliminate it? Raise taxes ☐ Cut expenses ☐
15. Do you favor increase of taxes on corporations? Yes ☐ No ☐
16. Do you favor elimination of overlapping and duplication of taxes by Federal Government and the States (i. e., gasoline, tobacco, income)? Yes ☐ No ☐
17. Would you eliminate wartime Federal luxury taxes? Yes ☐ No ☐
18. Do you favor continuation of Federal rent controls? Yes ☐ No ☐

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

19. Would you further expand social-security benefits and coverage? Yes ☐ No ☐
20. Do you favor socialized medicine? Yes ☐ No ☐
21. Do you favor a national health program which would not socialize health services but would supply Federal grants and aids to the States and communities for health purposes? Yes ☐ No ☐
22. Do you favor any Federal aid for education? Yes ☐ No ☐
(a) If so, do you favor such aid to children attending nonpublic schools where the laws of the States of residence permit? Yes ☐ No ☐
23. Do you favor Federal old-age pensions of $100 per month for persons 65 years or over, the cost to be raised by taxation? Yes ☐ No ☐
24. Do you favor more subsidized public housing? Yes ☐ No ☐
25. Do you approve of subsidized slum clearance? Yes ☐ No ☐
26. Do you approve of the present system of Government guaranty on home mortgages? Yes ☐ No ☐
27. Do you approve of the Federal Government making mortgages directly to individuals? Yes ☐ No ☐

AGRICULTURE

28. Do you favor the Brannan plan to permit farm prices to seek their own level in the market place, resulting in low prices to consumers, and having the Government pay the difference between the farm price and parity out of higher taxes? Yes ☐ No ☐
29. Do you favor continuance of present high, rigid price supports to farmers? Yes ☐ No ☐

LABOR

30. Should the Taft-Hartley law be repealed? Yes ☐ No ☐
(a) Should it be amended? Yes ☐ No ☐
31. Do you favor increased minimum-wage laws? Yes ☐ No ☐

VETERANS

32. Should present veterans' benefits be further expanded? Yes ☐ No ☐

CIVIL RIGHTS

33. Do you favor Federal laws to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color? Yes ☐ No ☐
34. Do you favor Federal laws against lynching? Yes ☐ No ☐
35. Do you favor Federal laws against poll taxes imposed by certain States? Yes ☐ No ☐

GENERAL

36. Would you favor a national lottery to help defray Government expenses? Yes ☐ No ☐
37. Are you in favor of the move to enact uniform divorce laws throughout the States? Yes ☐ No ☐
38. Would you approve substantial Federal appropriations to help States and cities eliminate pollution of their beaches and harbors? Yes ☐ No ☐

Name _____

Address _____

Please return to Congressman HENRY J. LATHAM, 1118 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Feel free to use reverse side for comments and remarks.

An Effective International Organization or Anarchy and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune of January 1, 1950:

TURN OF THE CENTURY

This New Year's Day is widely celebrated as the beginning of a new half-century, the midpoint of mankind's journey through the twentieth millennium of the Christian era.

Those people are right, of course, who say it is nothing of the sort, and that the second half of the twentieth century won't begin until January 1, 1951. They have logic on their side; but they lose the argument. The world insists on celebrating the turning point of the twentieth century right now. And there is sense in that, if not logic, for it reflects the unquenchable human instinct to make a new start, and to invest that new start with a special significance and hope.

So this is a super-New Year's Day—one on which to study the entrails of the last half century in search of an omen for the next.

Where do we stand, we humans, at this turn of the century? What, in history's long view, has been the thing, in the last 50 years, which more than any other suggests the shape of the problem of the 50 years ahead?

It may well be that the first half of the twentieth century saw the end of nationalism as a sound basis for peace and world order.

If that is true, it is the most important happening of this century.

For almost four centuries the British Empire had been the stabilizing force in the world—fountainhead of liberal institutions, source and stimulator of economic development, world policeman through its navy. Like Rome and Spain before it, Britain had widened human horizons and fostered human progress; and no listing of its mistakes or tyrannies (and they were many) can outweigh the record of what it did to set men's energies and spirits free.

In this last half century, the world has outgrown the British political and economic framework. Two great world wars, a grievous economic depression, and now a cold war between two powers grown greater than Britain—these are symptoms of man's groping for a new basis of world order, something not only to take the place of the British system but to be the framework for a better way of life for all mankind.

That new framework of peace and order and progress cannot be imposed by any one nation. We in the Western World are determined that Soviet Russia shall not be the new Rome, the new Spain, the new Britain. The American people have no ambition to make Washington the capital of a new world imperialism. Even if there were less resistance to a Sovietized world than there is, even if there were a hot desire to set up American imperialism in the world, the chances are that neither would happen or could be brought about.

For it is not likely that any nation ever again can or will rule the world as Rome or Spain or Britain did.

Mankind has "grown up" to a point where every segment of it insists increasingly on a voice in determining its own destinies and conditions of life.

That, of course, is all to the good; it is progress toward government by the consent of the governed.

But it means international anarchy until nations join together in an effective international government with the powers that any government must have to be effective.

To create an effective international government is, therefore, the foremost problem of the next half century. We shall never again know peace, or military or economic security, or an end to "cold war," until we achieve it.

The arguments over what and how will be long and hard and hot. United Nations? Bloc? Atlantic Union? World federalism? Or something else? The Tribune has expressed its views on all of these, and will again—as have and will millions of other voices. But we need have no doubt of mankind's ability to work out the best answer, in such a great debate, if we keep our eye on one central fact.

That fact is that we must want and work toward international government not just because we think idealistically that it would be nice to have, but because we are convinced that it is the only answer to the problem of peace and security and progress in today's and tomorrow's world.

If we will carry that conviction, that lesson of the first half of the twentieth century, into the second half of the twentieth century, the travail of the last 50 years will not have been in vain.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, at Roosevelt Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] on the occasion of the Roosevelt Day dinner sponsored by Americans for Democratic Action, held at the Hotel Shoreham, Washington, D. C., on January 27, 1950. I commend the address to the reading of Members of the Senate and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is a statesmanlike presentation of a great liberal philosophy by a great liberal.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am not making the usual perfunctory statement when I say that I am happy to be here tonight, to be sitting on this platform, in my capacity as a national cochairman of the Roosevelt Day dinners. Of course, this is my second year in that position. But this year I have a somewhat new distinction, of which I am very proud, that of being a Member of the United States Senate. I am not unmindful of the part played in that development by members of the ADA, the organization which is sponsoring these dinners, and by others not so affiliated who are here tonight in this common tribute to him who was my leader and yours, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I am happy to see here tonight many of the good, familiar faces of the members of that true Gideon's army which fought the mighty battles of the New Deal. Those faces are a little older now and not quite so eager as when I first saw them 17 years ago. But it is good to be reminded that there are so many who are still strong in the faith. This occasion, like the others on which we meet, is a glad reunion of the alumni of those days.

But I am happiest of all to see among us many young faces—faces strangely similar to those of 1933—full of hope and full of resolve to carry on the battles led so long, so valiantly, and so successfully by our honored and beloved Franklin Roosevelt.

Five years ago he died. Was it 5 years, or was it 50, or was it yesterday? Time has as little meaning for a figure as towering as his, as inches have for the measure of a mountain.

In those 5 years the world has turned a full circle. The great military victory which Roosevelt conceived and planned was won, but the laurels of that victory have faded and withered away. The world of peace and security which was almost within our grasp has eluded us. Again the heavy clouds of international conflict hover over us.

The outlook in the world and in our country is less dark, it is true, than a year ago, and even less so than 2 years ago. Nevertheless, while we have cause to rejoice, we still have great cause for concern. Sometimes I think we are much too blind to our present dangers, both from within our country and outside it: Like peoples who live at the foot of a smoking volcano or in the shadow of some great overhanging rock, we have become adjusted to our hazards, and accept them as commonplace, although they menace us at every moment.

Yet all this is quite natural. People cannot live forever in a state of passion and alarm. But we need to recall, on every possible occasion, that we do face great perils. We need also to hear the clear and ringing voice of the good cause and the moral principle, the call to arms—not for war, this time, but for peace and for justice. In such a situation it helps to focus our eyes on the heroic figure of Roosevelt and the example he gave us.

Yet it is not easy to guide our steps today by the light of Roosevelt an policies. President Roosevelt was not an inventor of new political principles, ready to be handed down to his disciples and apostles. Roosevelt was rather a translator and an adapter of already existing principles. He was above all a leader and an organizer.

Thus, we cannot easily guide ourselves, in our present predicament, by Rooseveltian aphorisms. We cannot determine from what Roosevelt said in the past what Roosevelt would do if he were alive today. All we can determine is how Roosevelt would have set about solving these present problems. The Rooseveltian method was to marshal the facts and then try by every possible means to solve the problem, using the tools, the materials, and the legal devices which were at hand. He was not interested in brands or labels. He was not interested in theories or in isms. He was interested only in the answers to the questions, "Will it work? Will it meet the need? Can it be done this way?"

That is why the program of the New Deal was neither static nor dogmatic. It was based on neither Marxism nor McKinleyism. Its strength was in its realism. It was designed to meet the needs of the people and the Nation, at the time, and to function within the frame of the American Constitution. How well it succeeded is now history.

Thus the one lesson we can learn from this recent and heroic past is a lesson of method. To solve our problems, today, we need to remember that method and that approach. We need also—and I mean you and I and all of us—to remember, as Roosevelt often said, that any problem was capable of solution. It was just a question of persisting until a solution was found. I think that this contains a profound truth, although it sounds too simple to be important.

The heart of the matter is this: We can succeed in solving our problems as long as we remain free to seek the solution and persist in that search. And that brings me to the subject which is the theme of the Roosevelt Day dinners this year—freedom of inquiry.

This freedom of inquiry is the promise to every man that he is at liberty to seek intellectual, religious, and spiritual fulfillment. Today that liberty is challenged not only by those who openly declare their allegiance to totalitarianism, but also by some who solemnly swear their devotion to democracy. Some of these latter individuals view democracy as a frail and frightened thing. They insist that we must suppress free inquiry in order to preserve our institutions and our way of life.

I judge this attitude to be heresy of the worst kind. I judge it to be, in fact, the denial of democracy. The very soul and spirit of democracy is the toleration of opinions different and even conflicting with those of the majority. The right of criticism of the prevailing government and the prevailing institutions is sacred in a true democracy.

This right of criticism—the right to hold and to preach opinion contrary to generally accepted doctrines—is the greatest guaranty of the vitality and the validity of our form of government. Thus we must even tolerate the holding of completely heretical beliefs, however much most of us might hate these heresies.

Today, in the year 1950, the world shudders under the impact of an aggressive force which calls itself communism. This force is international in form, although it is national in fact. It has found its home in Soviet Russia, and its partisans are now spread everywhere. Moscow is the Mecca of this new faith. Stalin is its prophet. The leaders and chief architects of this movement are cynical men who would use the freedom inherent in democracy to destroy both freedom and democracy. The problem is, How do we in America defend ourselves against this subversive force without at the same time sacrificing some of our democratic principles?

This is a real and ominous danger. Make no mistakes about it. For what will it profit us to fight the Communist conspiracy if, in order to do so we adopt police state methods and abandon the principles we live by?

I do not believe that this is necessary. I do not believe that democracy is so weak and brittle and so lacking in fibre and resource that it cannot handle this problem within a democratic framework. I believe that we can and must continue to protect individuals in their right to hold such beliefs as they choose. But we can and must prosecute vigorously any actual conspiracy against our form of government or against freedom or democracy. We can and must punish acts of subversion and treason and disloyalty. But we must not depart from our principles of democracy or our principles of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence in so doing. The safeguards of our Constitution must be extended to all our citizens. In this, and in this alone, is the true strength of democracy.

I abhor communism, but we cannot afford to have our feelings or our fears color our actions. I am firm in my faith in democracy. I am firm in my faith that the American people or any freedom-loving people will never freely choose communism or follow Communists as long as the people have the alternative of a representative government, freely chosen, and fully responsive to their needs and desires. I want no defeatist faith. We need a vigorous and dynamic faith, which willingly accepts challenge in the free market place of ideas. Of course these are words and generalities. It is easy to say words. It is much harder to apply them to specific situations. One such specific situation is the Federal Government's loyalty program.

Certainly the Government has a right to expect and demand that persons holding what are defined as sensitive positions be fully loyal to the Government, and to its philosophy and principles. Any person holding views inconsistent with our present form of government or our philosophy of government seems to me to be obviously disqualified for any position with access to policy formation or confidential and restricted information.

This would certainly apply to Communists and to fellow travelers. But it should also apply, with equal strength, to Fascists and to believers in racial superiority and other equally un-American concepts. I think that anti-Negroism, and anti-Semitism, anti-Protestantism or anti-Catholicism should be as positive grounds for disqualifying individuals for sensitive Federal Government positions as membership in the Communist Party.

I have heard of a recent case in a foreign country—I will not name the country because I am in the process of making an inquiry into this case—where a responsible American official, when asked why he seemed to prefer individuals of a particular political party in that country, replied—and this was in an official conference—"Do you want me to pick Jews instead?"

If the facts are true this official is certainly no better a representative of America than a member or follower of the Communist Party.

But I have wandered a trifle. My general conclusion is that persons of alien or truly Un-American viewpoint have no place in representative or sensitive positions in the Federal Government. All such persons should be discharged, after the facts are established, as lacking the proper qualifications for the job. And any doubts must be resolved in favor of the Government. But I do not believe that the brand of disloyalty should be placed upon such individuals by any administrative body. These individuals should be discharged, yes. Or if applying for a job, they should not be hired. The integrity of the Government service must be protected. But the basis of this action should be disqualification, rather than disloyalty. Disloyalty stands hard by treason. No such finding should be made for any individual, except after a judicial proceeding, with all the safeguards for the accused which Anglo-Saxon and American law provides.

It deeply disturbs me to think of all the shame and suffering which has been needlessly visited on hundreds and thousands of Government employees over the past 2 years in the process of the loyalty program. Bookkeepers and file clerks, statisticians and messengers, without access or connection with any confidential or restricted material, have been, I have been told, exposed to great expense and suffering in being required to prove, affirmatively, their loyalty to their country. A chance association with a suspected Communist, or a family relationship with one so suspected, or even the holding of some unorthodox view in no way connected with politics has frequently been the basis for charges against some of these individuals.

I hope that some way can be found to bring the extreme and unfortunate aspects of this program to an end. I understand and endorse, as I have said, the objectives of the loyalty program. I also realize that there are those who have criticized this program as being far too lenient. Some reactionaries would be satisfied only if there were public executions, at dawn and at dusk, of every Government employee caught in the act of having a liberal thought. But I sincerely hope that the entire loyalty program may be reviewed, and a better system, more consistent with the American tradition, be developed and established.

This is one of the specific ways in which we must defend and preserve freedom in America. But there is still another way in which we must defend and enlarge the area of freedom and free inquiry. There is still another front on which the battle of freedom must be fought. That is the economic front.

There are those in our midst who would deny to the American people the full economic rights reserved to the people under the general-welfare clause of the Constitution. That clause provides for what has been called the welfare state. I would like to take a moment to explore the relationship between the welfare state and freedom.

The welfare state simply recognizes that government must accept its responsibilities to all the people, and must not merely serve the vested interests of industry and commerce. The people, as well as the privileged and the powerful, must be served.

The connection between freedom and the welfare state is simple. The welfare state provides the people with the means by which individual freedom may be secured and enjoyed. For we have long recognized that no man who is a slave to economic fear or insecurity can be politically or spiritually free.

How can a man who is scarcely able to nourish his body develop his full intellectual capacities and appreciate the full meaning of freedom in any form? Such a man is sometimes persuaded to exchange what appears to him an empty slogan for the promise of a crust of bread.

Freedom of inquiry can have no meaning either, for the uneducated and the unenlightened.

The welfare state must maintain a balance between freedom and security. Through the programs of the welfare state, we must bring to the people adequate housing. We must secure the aged against the degradation of pauperism. We must raise minimum wages, and develop and conserve our natural resources. Through these programs and the maintenance of full employment and purchasing power, we will enable our people to enjoy freedom of inquiry. When we secure jobs and health and education for our people, we remove the fetters of insecurity and ease the awful struggle for existence. Only then will people have the time and the strength and the incentive to nourish their souls and seek spiritual and intellectual fulfillment.

Nor do we intend to restrict the development of the welfare state and the assurance of freedom of inquiry to the United States alone. We have come to understand that only in a democratic world, where other peoples are also free and secure, can we hope to live in peace. We intend to bring to the depressed areas of the world the benefits of our technological skills and thus enable them to raise their living standards, so that they, too, can enjoy the blessings of freedom. Our intentions are made explicit in President Truman's point 4 program. I hope we will press forward with our efforts to make that program a reality for those people who look to us with so much hope.

The way is long. The way is hard. I have outlined a few of the qualities of democracy, a few of the dangers of freedom, and indicated a few of the directions we must travel to meet these dangers. But there are many other dangers which I do not have time to mention tonight. There are many problems to be solved and many tasks to be undertaken. But we are moving forward. We are fortunate in having as President of the United States a man who is in the tradition of Roosevelt, and whose advocacy of the people's cause, and of freedom's cause, is strong and sincere. But we need to give him the tools. We need to give him strength. This organization, the ADA, is one of those which can be counted on to support the President in the liberal programs which he has adovcated and to suggest and to urge other new programs which are vital and necessary. Carl Schurz, a refugee from Germany in his day, and a great American, said in a speech in the United States Senate in 1872, "Our country, right or wrong. When right, to be kept right; when wrong, to be put right." I think that is an fine a slogan for today, as it was in 1872.

Let us not for a moment relax our efforts. Let us not for a moment be satisfied with things as they are. Nor let us abandon hope, because things are no better than they are. We shall suffer some disappointments. We shall lose some battles. But if we know where we are going, and remain constantly on the march, we shall arrive at our goals.

Soak the Rich a Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, recently I completed an analysis of the tax structure of this country with results so startling that I believe they should be called to the attention of the Congress as a whole. This analysis was made public through the medium of a news release issued from my office. The facts revealed speak for themselves and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call the attention of the House to the statement issued from my office on January 9, 1950:

SOAK THE RICH A MYTH

It is very doubtful if the average person with a low or moderate income is impressed by the statement often made by advocates of reduction in taxes and Federal spending that 25 percent of peoples' income goes to support government.

The fact that Federal, State, and local taxes totaling $56,000,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, were almost exactly one-fourth of the estimated 1949 national income of $225,000,000,000—and yet not enough to pay the cost of government—doesn't make too much of an impression on the average wage-earning taxpayer.

The wage earner making $60 a week, the 1949 average for industrial States, is aware—but it doesn't hit him very hard as he doesn't see the money—that, if he has a wife and a dependent child, the Government takes $3 each week from his pay envelope for Federal income taxes. This amounts to $150 a year or about 5 percent of his gross income.

This same wage earner knows that he contributes 1 percent, $30 a year (this year it will be more) for social security. If he owns his own home or lives in a State where there is a sales tax, he is aware of State and local taxes. He knows he pays some excise taxes, particularly on tobacco, gasoline, liquor, and a host of so-called luxury items. He vaguely realizes that there are many taxes upon goods and services which are hidden in the sale price.

SKEPTICAL OF SHARE

Accordingly, he will believe that 25 percent of the national income is drawn off for support of government, but he assumes that high-income people and corporations pay the big share of it. He does not realize that he pays a share of corporate taxes in the price of the things he buys. And it would surprise him to learn that high income taxes by high-income people are a very small portion of the total taxes. Former President Herbert Hoover estimated that if all incomes of over $5,000 annually were confiscated it would cover less than 10 percent of the actual and proposed spending of the Federal Government.

From official figures obtained from Federal Government agencies and through reliable estimates, an analysis has been compiled which shows that a family of three with a $3,000 annual income contributes [illegible] percent of their income to the support of government. A family of four with a $5,000 income kicks in 24.75 percent of their annual gross salary. For a family of four with a $7,500 income, [illegible] percent goes to the Federal Government and their total share of State, local, and Federal taxes is 26.27 percent.

METHODS ANALYZED HERE

The analysis was based on actual withholding taxes and upon the ratio of current consumption expenditures for each type family to national personal consumption expenditures in 1948 and application of percentage ratios obtained to fiscal 1949 tax collections as reported by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in the case of manufacturers and retailers' excise and communication and transportation taxes. In computing the individual's share of corporate taxes, it must be realized that these taxes are usually figured in the selling price of goods or services and hence are borne by the consumer. Some, of course, are borne by the stockholders, but since they are also consumers, corporate taxes were charged in full to the consumer.

Manufacturers and retail excise taxes include the 5- to 25-percent tax on such items as automobiles, radios, gas, electric and oil appliances, photographic equipment, gasoline, jewelry, baby oils, cosmetics, luggage, soap, furs, etc.

Alcohol taxes of $2.25 per quart, cigarette taxes of 7.5 cents per pack and the 30-percent amusement taxes were based on average expenditures for the types of families as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for 1947. No charges of gift or estate taxes were made. State and local taxes were allotted on the assumption that these taxes were in the same ratio to Federal taxes (72.25 percent Federal) borne by them as the total State and local taxes were to Federal taxes.

Summary table

	Family of 3, $3,000 income	Family of 4, $5,000 income	Family of 4, $7,500 income
Individual income	$13.[illegible]	$[illegible]	$[illegible]
Social security	$[illegible]	$[illegible]	$[illegible]
Share of corporate taxes	$[illegible]	$316.00	$414.00
Alcohol taxes	$[illegible]	$[illegible]	$[illegible]
Tobacco taxes	$[illegible]	$[illegible]	$[illegible]
Amusement taxes	$[illegible]	$[illegible]	$[illegible]
Manufacturers' excise taxes	$[illegible]	$[illegible]	$[illegible]
Transportation and communication	$17.[illegible]	$37.[illegible]	$36.40
Retailers' excise taxes	$[illegible]	$[illegible]	$[illegible]
All others	$[illegible]	$[illegible]	$[illegible]
Total Federal taxes	$540.75	$794.05	$1,423.20
Percent of income	17.02	[illegible]	[illegible]
State and local taxes	$198.15	$343.40	$568.60
Total taxes	$738.90	$1,137.45	$1,988.80
Percent of income	23.58	[illegible]	26.27

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address dealing with the subject of displaced persons, which I delivered over Station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., on Sunday, January 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today, as Congress goes forward in another important session, it faces numerous major problems upon whose solution depends the welfare of hundreds of thousands of men, women and children in our own and other countries.

Not the least of these problems involves displaced persons, the human aftermath of the most devastating war in our history, those victims of totalitarian cruelty and aggression.

Despite the great progress already made toward alleviating this human misery, much remains to be done, particularly by the United States. Even though we have done much, we in this country have yet to discharge more fully the responsibility which we accepted upon passage of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

It is true that of the 205,000 displaced persons which that measure authorized to be brought to this country, 110,939 had arrived here as of November 30, 1949, and 2,547 others were en route. It is also true that of the 122,556 visas issued as of November 15, 1949, more than 61,000 had been issued to displaced persons whose quota country is Poland.

Yet the very law under which these people are being admitted to the United States may prevent admission of the full authorized total of 205,000 displaced persons. The restrictions, limitations, preferences, and priorities as established in that law have been proved unworkable in many cases.

Furthermore, if the United States is to carry out its full responsibility in this great international problem, the authorized total should be raised so that additional deserving persons may be admitted.

Thus, it is imperative that Congress at this session pass legislation to amend this act to liberalize it and to make it more workable.

I had hoped, along with many other Members of Congress and such organizations as the Polish-American Congress, that the act would be liberalized in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. That was not accomplished.

We must not permit further delay. We are dealing with human beings—men, women, and children. Many of them have been without homes for years. To them time means everything.

H. R. 4567, the measure passed by the House of Representatives during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, would accomplish considerable liberalization of the displaced persons law.

One of the last acts of the Senate during its first session was to send back to the Senate Judiciary Committee the DP bill with instructions to report it back to the Senate not later than January 25, 1950. So I hope that very early in this session favorable action will be taken to make the DP bill more workable and fairer to those persons the people of the United States are genuinely trying to help.

Time is rapidly running out with respect to making the desired changes. Human beings are waiting. Human hopes and aspirations are involved.

The proposed bill will make several important improvements if passed.

First, it would increase from 205,000 to 339,000 the number of displaced persons to be accepted by this country. Of the additional number, 18,000 would come from the Polish Army, which fought along with us in World War II, and who are now in England. Another 15,000 would be recent political refugees from behind the iron curtain. Refugees from Shanghai would account for 4,000 more, while another 5,000 would be orphans not now eligible.

Second. H. R. 4567 would advance the date line for eligibility from December 22, 1945, to January 1, 1949. This would eliminate one of the major provisions of the present law which has resulted in a pattern of discrimination. The December 22, 1945, date line arbitrarily cuts off 130,000 to 135,000 Jews and Catholics who would be eligible under the January 1, 1949, date line.

Third. This bill would eliminate other discriminatory restrictions. It would establish the basic principle that the selection of displaced persons "shall be made without discrimination in favor of or against a race, religion, or national origin." It deletes the 40-percent reference for de facto annexed areas, the so-called Baltic preference. It omits the 30-percent preference for agriculture but retains farming as preference. It eliminates priority for in-camp displaced persons over those not in such camps.

Fourth. The proposed changes broaden the definition of orphans as to permit admission of many children now barred.

Fifth. The bill would enable displaced persons who arrived in the United States prior to April 30, 1949, to receive benefits of the status of those who had been admitted under the 1948 act.

Sixth. H. R. 4567 would assist American sponsors of displaced persons by providing a $5,000,000 revolving loan fund to meet the expenses of transportation and reception of displaced persons in the United States. This would encourage the widest possible distribution of displaced persons throughout this country.

Seventh. This bill would double the number of ethnic Germans and expellees who may be admitted under the law. The number would thus be increased to approximately 52,000.

Eighth. The House-approved bill would provide additional safeguards to insure the internal security of the United States.

I need not tell you of the cruel sufferings and terrible deprivations of displaced persons, herded like cattle into concentration camps and fleeing into the night from Communist terror. You know and I know that they have no homes to which they can return and that they now live in displaced-persons camps situated for the most part in Germany and Austria who do not want them and whose economies cannot absorb them.

Some persons have questioned the need or the wisdom of increasing to 339,000 the number of displaced persons the United States will accept, arguing that there will be no displaced persons left on June 30, 1950.

Yet the Displaced Persons Commission, in its semiannual report released recently, states:

"The truth, perhaps, is better stated in a recent cable from the Director General of the International Refugee Organization that there will be some 200,000 resettleable displaced persons, plus some 100,000 to 160,000 persons of limited resettlement possibilities left on that date if the present law is not changed."

To me there is no doubt that the people of the United States want to do their part in providing opportunities and new life for a fair share of these displaced persons.

The best evidence of this is the fact that the Displaced Persons Commission, in its latest semiannual report, disclosed that the people of America have been requesting displaced persons on an average of 6,000 every week. The Commission is still receiving and accepting these assurances for jobs and housing.

Of course, the economic situation has changed somewhat in the United States since the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 was passed. But we have accepted responsibility in the solution of the displaced-persons problem, and we cannot shirk it.

You may rest assured that I shall continue to do what is in my power to have Congress improve this existing displaced-persons law. What this committee will report I do not at the moment know, but I am hopeful that it will be helpful, and I want to be one of those to help.

In closing I wish my many friends who may be listening on this Polish-American hour my best wishes for a happy new year.

The Truman Spending Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news bulletin:

THE TRUMAN SPENDING RECORD

Receipts, expenditures, and the public debt of the Federal Government by selected periods from the founding of the Republic through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951

Period	Receipts	Expenditures	Debt at end of period
All Presidents, Washington to Roosevelt, 144½ years, 1789 to 1933	$91,598,076,139	$112,208,207,094	[illegible]
Administration of F. D. Roosevelt, 12 years, fiscal 1934 to 1945	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Administration of Harry S. Truman, 6 years, fiscal 1946 to end of fiscal 1951	268,884,679,897	271,461,104,902	[illegible]

Details of the Truman spending record

Fiscal year	Receipts	Expenditures [1]	Public debt
1946	$45,027,709,908	$93,713,969,417	[illegible]
1947	45,208,533,189	[illegible]	[illegible]
1948	44,745,542,077	39,326,072,233	252,365,797,351
1949	42,773,505,530	40,057,107,857	252,797,625,267
1950 [2]	37,783,000,000	43,297,000,000	258,797,000,000
1951 [3]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total	268,884,679,897	[3] 271,230,195,026	

[1] Expenditures include statutory debt retirements (sinking funds, etc.)
[2] Estimates for fiscal 1950 and 1951 from the Budget.
[3] For the fiscal year 1949, actual expenditures were first reported at $40,057,107,857, but at one time they were reported $40,150,017,513. The figure used is the Treasury's figure of Jan. 3, 1950.

PAUL O. PETERS.

Liquor Advertising in Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the testimony of Rev. Gerald B. Winrod, a minister of the gospel, one of the most public-spirited citizens of the State of Kansas. It is a statement prepared by Dr. Winrod for presentation to a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, dealing with the bill which I introduced to prevent liquor advertising in newspapers, by radio and television, and in interstate commerce. I may say that Dr. Winrod for years has been one of the outstanding men in the State of Kansas in the fight for high morals for the youth of Kansas and of the Nation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Honorable Members of the United States Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

My appearance before your esteemed committee is dictated by a desire on the part of our organization, the Defenders of the Christian Faith, to serve the cause of national sobriety.

Others, better qualified than I, to give expert testimony on the important subject under consideration, will appear before you during the course of these hearings. The record when completed will be a reservoir of information, dealing with both sides of what many believe to be our country's most serious domestic problem.

With your permission, my testimony will be narrowed, first, to a discussion of fraudulent liquor advertising as a menace to national morality, and second, a personal statement regarding conditions in Kansas where we are feeling the effect of a wrong decision made in the election of November 1948, at which time our 69-year-old law against intoxicating beverages was repealed.

Enactment of the measure (S. 1847) proposed by Senator LANGER will go far in correcting evils which are bringing moral decay and death to western civilization. A vitalized conscience to lift the American people out of their alcoholic stupor is the supreme need of the hour.

The following summary of the bill, which appears in the first of its seven sections, will commend itself to all who understand the relation of national character to national security:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That it shall be unlawful for any distiller, brewer, vintner, manufacturer, wholesaler, or retailer, or for the agent, broker, or factor of any of them, engaged in the sale of alcoholic beverages to cause to be transported in the mails or otherwise from any State or Territory or the District of Columbia to any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia any newspaper, periodical, newsreel, photographic film, or record for mechanical reproduction advertising alcoholic beverages or containing the solicitation of an order for alcoholic beverages."

I

Our theory of government presupposes sound national character. The final safeguard of a constitutional system lies in the right purpose of those who vote. There is an intimate connection between moral consciousness and safe government.

Roger Babson says: "Under the old system of centralized government, conditions depended only upon the character of the rulers and not upon the character of the masses. Once a government could prosper, whatever the condition of the churches, or even without any educational system for the people, but today, with every man a voter and with all votes counting the same, the stability of the government depends not upon wealth nor armies, but on the character of the electorate."

Anything that tends to loosen the foundations of national morality must be regarded as a foe of constitutional democracy. The liquor narcotic comes under this indictment because it deprives the user of his normal faculties, dulls the conscience, and when allowed to run its course, destroys the capacity for moral responsibility.

The story of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde has found tragic duplication in the lives of many people who started out as temperate drinkers. Robert Louis Stevenson describes Dr. Jekyll as an honorable man and discoverer of a potion by means of which he can change himself into Mr. Hyde, a loathsome creature who lives without restraint.

He uses another potion to retrieve his position as Dr. Jekyll. After changing character several times, he finds himself lapsing into Mr. Hyde without consuming the potion. Sinking into despair, he commits suicide.

Alcohol is a demoralizing agent, as deadly to society as Dr. Jekyll's fatal potion. We cannot afford to be indifferent to an evil that breeds mass immorality, wars against physical health, befuddles the mind and deadens moral sensibilities.

No prophet is needed to anticipate the future of the America we love, if present trends toward the Hyde level are not reversed. Rome maintained a democratic system until her moral structure sagged beyond repair. Thus weakened, the masses were incapable of governing themselves, and the long line of the Caesars began. Moral discipline must be regarded as a necessity in a democracy.

The conscience of a large segment of our population has become ossified, under a barrage of fraudulent liquor advertising reaching them through magazines, newspapers and by radio. A way needs to be found for arresting the torrent of propaganda, which is sweeping multitudes to destruction and weakening the moral base of the American social order.

Manufacturing and distributing agencies seem intoxicated with power. Standards of decency and ethics in the advertising field mean nothing to them. Integrity has been discarded. They appear willing to resort to any scheme or trick to intensify the appetite of potential patrons and produce wealth for their cankered coffers. The situation has become kindergartenish.

Logic would seem to demand that both the company engaged in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages, and the periodical which publicizes it, should share responsibility for suffering resulting from its consumption.

A friend of mine was recently killed on the outskirts of Wichita by a drunken driver who had been drinking heavily at a nearby night club. He left a widow and two small children. The victim was parked 6 feet off the highway, repairing a tire, when the tragedy occurred.

The woman companion of the murderer stated that she looked at the speedometer just before the crash, and it registered over 80 miles an hour. The driver, being out of his senses, did not know how fast he was going and had no knowledge of approaching danger.

My friend was murdered.

Who was responsible for the crime? Both the manufacturer and the advertiser.

The man who dished the poison over the counter was a mere instrument between these two avenues of humanity.

II

The bill of 1943 witnessed a hard fought battle between friends and enemies of sobriety in Kansas. The struggle was regarded as pivotal because this State had been the first to adopt constitutional prohibition.

The law, enacted in 1880, stood the wear and tear of 69 years. It was repealed by a narrow vote. The liquor interests brought up their heaviest artillery. All the arts of wet propaganda were employed. The public was for weeks bombarded by the kind of falsehoods, with which we have become familiar, through magazine, newspaper, and radio advertising. Liquor groups were especially concerned to win because of Kansas tradition as a citadel for sobriety.

Kansas has been called the moral battleground of the Nation. The first blood for the abolition of slavery was shed on its soil. John Brown was among the early immortals who helped make Kansas a reform State. His efforts kept the territory west of the Missouri River, including the Pacific Northwest, from yielding to the slave traffic.

When he died on the gallows, Victor Hugo exclaimed, "That ends slavery in the United States." Abraham Lincoln was elected President 11 months later on an antislavery platform. The Emancipation Proclamation was issued within 3 years from that date.

There stands in Osawatomie, Kans., a log cabin, built by John Brown as a fort, from which to beat off armed ruffians who swarmed in to establish a slave-holding empire. This unpretentious structure was dedicated as a national shrine by Theodore Roosevelt.

The visitor reads these words inscribed on a marble shaft: "In commemoration of the heroism of John Brown, who died and conquered slavery on a scaffold at Charlestown, Va., August 19, 1859."

This man was a relentless foe of both slavery and liquor. Wendell Phillips said: "He feared God so much that he never feared the face of man."

Maj. J. B. Merwin, who was present when Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, records the latter as saying: "Merwin, after reconstruction, the next great moral battle is to destroy the liquor traffic, and in that conflict I pledge you my heart, my head, and hand."

Kansas played an active part in both of these moral crusades. In fact, she was the State chosen by divine providence, to blaze the trails.

There was, however, an uprising against the white man's firewater among the Indians in Kansas Territory, which antedated both the John Brown crusade and enactment of the State's prohibition law. This occurred in 1856, when advance agents of slavery and the saloon sought to debauch red men by pouring poison down their throats.

The Ottawa and Cherokee Indians are credited with having organized the first temperance society west of the Missouri River. Their chiefs forbade drinking in these tribes.

Mr. Olin Hamilton, the well-known author and journalist of our Sunflower State, says: "Kansas' claim to greatness—or at least to attention, is not so much the production of material things as it is in its men and women with ideas and ideals. * * * The crusader spirit has persisted."

Members of the committee will recall Mr. Stratton as a long-time associate of the Honorable Arthur Capper, who recently retired voluntarily after 30 years' service in the United States Senate.

We are reminded that Senator Capper, reflecting the spirit of the Kansas tradition, introduced a bill before the Senate to prohibit fraudulent liquor advertising similar to, if not identical with, the one now under consideration. It is significant that the fight again both the Senator and our 69-year-old prohibition law, was led by newcomers into the State, namely, the Levand family, owners of the Wichita Daily Beacon.

The solemn promise to reject liquor advertising made by these editors in advance of repeal, and the violation of that promise immediately after the 1948 election, demonstrates the need of legislation anticipated by Senate bill 1947. The facts, briefly stated, are as follows:

The Levands were vociferous in promising that they "would not accept liquor advertising," but the votes were hardly counted before their pages began to drip with paid putrescence. It is estimated that they have realized between thirty and forty thousand dollars revenue, from this source, during these intervening months. Moreover, the public has since learned that they had made plans for going into the wholesale distributing business before the election.

Senator Capper probably never received a more insulting communication from a constituent than the telegram sent by Louis Levand on May 14, 1947, an abridgment of which reads:

"We always believe in cleaning off our own doorstep first. And we are wondering why you are taking up the important time of the United States Senators in discussing advertising of alcoholic beverages throughout the Nation in magazines, radio, and newspapers when in Kansas we have a prohibition situation that is a national disgrace. * * *

"How can you honestly defend a situation that you know loses this State millions of dollars in tax revenue while the bootleggers and the mobsters and the dishonest public officials line their pockets with money which should go to support our public schools, for higher teacher salaries and for good roads.

"Every decent citizen in this State is disgraced by this situation.

"Why don't you use your newspapers in Topeka and Kansas City and your radio station and your farm journals to fight this situation? We can't recall a single crusade you have ever carried on in this State in an endeavor to enforce the prohibitory law through your newspapers and your radio station—although we have conducted many such crusades.

"And make no mistake about this, Senator: The Wichita Beacon will not carry any liquor advertising even if this State does vote for repeal a year from next November. * * *

"Will you please have this telegram read before the Senate committee and have it placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?"

It is often amusing to see notorious wets, like members of the Levand family, use pious and hypocritical phrases to cloak their true purposes. The man who sent the foregoing telegram professed deep love for Kansas and a desire to save it from disgrace—but his real concern was to derive personal income from the liquor business.

This message was included as part of a front-page Beacon editorial, published May 14, 1947, under scare headlines. The promise was repeated in the body of the article as follows:

"The Beacon informed Senator Capper that even though this State might vote for repeal of its prohibition amendment a year from next November, it would not accept liquor advertising."

Not only did these editors willfully and flagrantly break their promise by accepting advertising, but they directed the formation of a company for engaging in the sale of liquor.

The name of the corporation under which the Levand family operates is the Standard Mercantile Co., central offices, 1104 Union National Bank Building, Wichita, Kans., Leonard A. Levand, resident agent, and the capital stock is recorded as being $150,000.

Legal papers filed with the State describe the nature of the corporation's business as being to "Engage in the distribution and wholesale of alcoholic liquor and beverages. To sell, purchase, and otherwise deal in alcoholic liquors and beverages and articles of a like or similar nature, etc."

When Kansas voted repeal, it became necessary for the State to set up a system of regulation. The head of the new department was given the title, "Director of Alcoholic Beverage Control."

Last week's press reports announced that the Standard Mercantile Co. had been caught violating laws which govern the sale and distribution of Kansas liquor. A directive was issued forbidding a certain firm outside the State from making future deliveries to the Levand organization.

This promises to be a hard blow—because it strikes the pocketbook.

I have tried to avoid being tedious in reciting the foregoing details. The case of the Wichita Beacon seems pertinent to the present hearings because it offers a clear illustration of the utter absence of integrity where the sale of liquor advertising is involved.

* * * * *

Only by a firm hand can American citizens be rescued from the sea of alcohol in which they are presently engulfed.

Under a democratic system, the people must look to elected representatives for deliverance from evils that threaten the moral foundation upon which their government rests. Our country cannot be considered safe as long as advertisers of alcoholic beverages, who put self above health and money above morals, are given ungoverned latitude to spread pernicious propaganda which can only weaken and contribute to the downfall of our Republic.

As a minister of the Gospel, editor of a religious and patriotic magazine with over 70,000 circulation, radio speaker on nightly and Sunday morning chain broadcasts and president of the Defenders of the Christian Faith—I beg you to report this bill out of committee for full and free debate on the floor of the United States Senate.

May I, in closing, remind us of the solemn admonition found in the book of Habakkuk, chapter 2 and verse 15:

"Woe unto him that giveth his neighbour drink, that puttest thy bottle to him, and makest him drunken."

Limit on Medical Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "College Heads Assail Doctors for Limit on Medical Students," written by Benjamin Fine, and published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of January 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLEGE HEADS ASSAIL DOCTORS FOR LIMIT ON MEDICAL STUDENTS

(By Benjamin Fine)

CINCINNATI, OHIO.—An unusually sharp attack on the medical profession of this country, rarely before heard in academic circles, was voiced here from a committee of prominent college leaders, studying preprofessional education.

The Nation's doctors were accused of using Petrillo and Fishbein economics in keeping down the number of students admitted to medical schools.

The reference was to James C. Petrillo, president of the AFL American Federation of Musicians, and Dr. Morris Fishbein, former editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association.

THOUSANDS BARRED

Thousands of qualified premedical students are not admitted to these schools, even though the Nation needs more doctors, the committee maintained.

The charges were made before the American conference of academic deans, which met here in conjunction with the annual convention of the Association of American Colleges. One thousand college presidents, deans, and university administrators attended the 3-day sessions, considered among the most important in higher education.

A year ago the American conference of academic deans appointed a committee, consisting of the deans of Wayne, Ohio State, Northwestern, and Kentucky Universities to study the problems involved in admission to the medical colleges.

The report, presented here, assailed the medical profession for its short-sightedness in not keeping pace with the Nation's health needs.

When the committee presented its resolution, a number of college officials sprang to the defense of the doctors. Many delegates were upset over the effect the resolution would have upon the medical profession. The conference eliminated this portion of the resolution:

"Annually several thousand students fully qualified in training, personality, and temperament are denied admission to the professional training of their choice. This set of conditions constitutes a most serious threat to the continued health and well-being of the American people."

FEAR ANTAGONISMS

One of the delegates exclaimed: "A good many people in the medical profession do not believe this to be true. If we adopt the resolution we will create a lot of antagonisms."

According to Dr. William S. Guthrie, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Ohio State University, college students face strict rationing of careers in medicine, dentistry, and veterinary medicine without respect for the country's need.

Dr. Guthrie urged the medical profession to utilize the medical colleges to full capacity, as was done during the war years. During 5 years the schools trained 7,214 extra doctors.

LAG BEHIND POPULATION

His report, presented to the conference, contrasted the number of medical students today with the number in 1905. In 1949, he brought out, 79 medical schools had an enrollment of 23,670 students, with a graduating class of 5,094.

In 1905, there were 160 medical schools in this country, with a student enrollment of 26,147 and a graduating class of 5,606. During this period the population has virtually doubled while the number of students in medical school has decreased, Dr. Guthrie pointed out.

Moreover, in 1905 college students totaled 150,000, contrasted to today's 2,500,000. In 1905, the ratio of medical students to college students was 1 to 5.

"I" DOCTOR PERMITS SCHOOL LIMITATIONS

"I think everybody would agree there should be some expansion of medical education," Dr. Howard L. Horns, assistant dean of medical sciences, commented at the University of Minnesota.

However, he added, two things should be pointed out:

1905's 160 medical schools included "many inferior schools," two or three in Minnesota alone. They have been consolidated into today's 79, mostly of high quality.

A medical school is limited by facilities and staff, and cannot add students beyond capacity without harm.

"Lab space and equipment limit us," Dr. Horns said. "In the final 2 years, furthermore, much of the teaching is in very small groups of four to eight students."

Enrollment in the university medical school is now some 430, and 89 seniors will be graduated in June. Subsequent graduating classes will be larger—there are now, for instance, some 120 freshmen.

During World War II instruction was on a 12-month schedule, but the teaching year has since been reduced to 10 months, a month longer than prewar.

Federal Aid to State and Local Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news bulletin:

FEDERAL AID TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Federal aid to State and local governments will be more than 80 percent higher in fiscal 1951 than actual payments in fiscal 1949, according to the President's budget request. Greatest advance will be in payments to the States for social welfare, health, and security, which will increase $670,000,000, and funds for education and general research will increase $224,000,000.

A summary of the proposed spending for 1951 and the actual spending in fiscal 1949 follows:

Grants-in-aid	Expenditures, fiscal 1949	Budget request, fiscal 1951
Veterans' Administration, grants to States, etc.	$11,587,221	$11,208,143
Social welfare, health, and security	1,091,226,052	1,761,653,540
Housing and community facilities	9,563,830	27,930,405
Education and general research	30,921,433	254,294,625
Agriculture and agricultural resources	96,438,464	113,036,842
Natural resources not primarily agricultural	13,906,252	21,143,803
Transportation and communication	425,640,673	514,825,000
Labor, grants to States for unemployment compensation	149,313,500	185,704,500
Shared revenues	21,262,770	24,506,000
Loans and repayable advances	−75,477,454	185,000,278
District of Columbia, contribution in lieu of taxes	12,000,000	12,000,000
	1,860,984,262	3,304,500,941

PAUL O. PETERS.

The Federal Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cause for Worry," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAUSE FOR WORRY

Edwin G. Nourse, ex-chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, is not an administration gadfly. Had he been averse to Fair Deal goals, he would never have joined Mr. Truman's official family. But he is a hard-headed economist. As such he interposes blunt, objective realism into the President's political concept of national economy.

Like many others with far less understanding of conditions, Dr. Nourse is deeply concerned over the prospect of a Federal deficit that promises to snowball above $10,000,000,000 in a 2-year period. He warns that such a deficit ballooning is a threat to the stability of the dollar, a harbinger of more and frightening inflation.

This man is not a gloom gabbler. It was he who, during the jittery slump early in 1949, told the Nation there was nothing to fear, that we were merely passing through a healthy disinflation. He was right. It was he who predicted a lower cost of living, without demoralizing business. We found out last year he was right. Living costs were scaled down a jot, and prosperity kept rolling.

There is reason for tacking confidence to his danger signs on the deficit highways. It is a rough row he seeks to hoe. The administration is dedicated to deficit spending, the Nation has become accustomed to vast national debt, and the average citizen hasn't the faintest notion of what the whole question means. Dr. Nourse says unless government gets back into black-ink financing, we are setting the stage for a new reveling inflation.

Maybe the average citizen is numb when confronted with the hazards of debt pyramiding. But we ought to have a pretty clear

idea of what inflation means. We struggled with it for a decade. The Government passed laws and made incessant patriotic appeals to stave off a gobbling inflation. Now Washington is casually inviting us down a fiscal road with inflationary perils lurking at every turn.

Dr. Nourse is alarmed because Government in an era of bulging prosperity is making no real effort to balance its budget. The administration—and Congress—has boosted fiscal prudence out the window. Faced by a public refusal to accept more big taxes, the administration has listened to surveyors of economic fantasy and adopted deficit spending as a way of life.

The President's former adviser suggests that Government could get back to a sound fiscal condition within a year or two, and with production and employment kept at a high level. But that means retrenchment. It means, he thinks, Government economy and the reduction or deferment of Mr. Truman's pet schemes of social welfare.

Mr. Truman is an economic dilettante. Dr. Nourse was vice president of the Brookings Institution, a scientific research organization, and headed its institute of economics. From the time it was established in 1922. He left there to head the economic advisers and make national studies of the economy.

But the President is a politician. He accepts the recommendations of deficit-spenders who, one suspects, whisper the advices they think he wants. He won't abandon a single social panacea. He makes genuflection to budget paring, then breezily whisks on down the path of high deficit piling.

Dr. Nourse is worried. There is plenty of fellow for national anxiety.

The Genocide Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD two letters addressed to me and one to the editor, Union-Leader, Manchester, N. H., in regard to the proposed Genocide Treaty, which is currently being considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee. These letters were written by one of New Hampshire's most prominent and thoughtful lawyers, and it is my belief they merit sincere and serious attention.

In its deliberations, I feel confident that the committee will ascertain the exact meaning of the measure. They will not fail to heed the warnings of the legal experts whose duty it is to point out to the American people and to their elected representatives the dangers that lurk in the written words of a legal document.

As for myself, I am anxiously awaiting the conclusion of the committee hearings before formulating my own judgment in this matter.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WYMAN, STARR, BOOTH,
WADLEIGH & LANGDELL,
Manchester, N. H., September 21, 1949.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHARLES: I thank you for sending me the Christian Science Monitor editorial on genocide. It is precisely because of such editorials that I wrote to the Union a very brief review of the genocide situation which was published in both Union and Leader on the editorial page of the Friday, September 16 papers. Though I know it was inadequate, nevertheless I would like to have you read it if you have not already done so.

I may be presumptuous in saying that the editors who write such editorials do not fully understand what they are talking about, but I feel strongly that is so. It is by no means certain that individual human rights—involving such matters as discrimination against Negroes and Jews—are not in question under the proposed convention, as stated in the Monitor editorial. They surely would be if the Declaration of Human Rights and the Covenant of Human Rights were adopted in their present form. It seems to me that Negroes and Jews would be within the description of ethnical, racial, or religious groups under the genocide pact. The measure of mental harm or birth prevention is not given, and no one can know what might amount to conspiracy, incitement or attempt to commit or complicity in genocide.

I might refer for example to the declaration which asserts the right of miscegenation as a human right and ask what may become of those who favor or enact a State law against it—would they be guilty of mental harm to a racial group? And those who advocate birth control?

I am no isolationist. I believe we should take our responsibility as a strong Nation in world affairs, but I do not believe we should enter into a pact which obligates us to interfere with the internal affairs of other nations in times of peace and subjects us to their quite possible interference with our domestic affairs which to date we have handled pretty much to our own satisfaction and without any genocide or human rights violation as we understand those terms.

I put to you another question—having in mind that I understand that protest has already been made to United Nations against the Communist trials now going on in New York—if the Communists here follow Moscow direction, would our action against Communists be interpreted as an act of genocide against a national group for which individuals, officials, and our State or Federal Governments could be brought to the bar of an international tribunal?

The fact that reservations were suggested demonstrates that the pact should not be ratified as submitted, yet no one can be sure that those reservations as suggested would be fully sufficient to protect us against international litigation. It seems to me that such litigation would be a form of war and if after the pact was adopted we ourselves preferred charges against any in another country, we would be accused of warmongering.

I fear the use that might be made of such a pact as a sounding board for Communist attack on our institutions, and I fear the present assumption by us of an obligation to participate in the use of force to stop in other countries what we condemn and what we ourselves will never be guilty of.

I am sorry this is so long—but it might be longer.

Your humble constituent,

LOUIS E. WYMAN.

WYMAN, STARR, BOOTH,
WADLEIGH & LANGDELL,
Manchester, N. H., December 27, 1949.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Temple, N. H.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This acknowledges your letter of December 24 with enclosures which, as requested, I am returning to you herewith.

It may be presumptuous for me as a small-town country lawyer to place myself in opposition to the illustrious gentlemen whose names appear on the literature favoring the adoption of the genocide pact, but I am quite convinced that their propaganda is fully answered by the report of the American Bar Association committee on peace and law. You may have seen the brief summary of my ideas on this subject which was printed in the Manchester Union in September. My thought is, very briefly, that for us to adopt this pact as a treaty is not only dangerous to our institutions, but is also misleading the world. The little pamphlet entitled "Killing One Man Is Murder, Killing a Million Is Not," recites events which shock the conscience and states, "There was no law against it," and that the UN is forging a law against it, and that the United States should be foremost to ratify such a treaty. This sounds to me like nonsense. There is not the slightest possibility that under our form of government this Nation will ever be guilty of genocide as we interpret the pact, yet there is a danger that others might seek to bring us before an international court on some theory of their interpretation that we had violated the pact in seriously injuring the feelings of a minority group. However, if there is no danger of our being guilty of genocide, why must we undertake by treaty to legislate for other countries? If you assume that by the adoption of this treaty there will be a law against it, do we not thereby pledge ourselves to enforce that law? Written law does not seem to me to be particularly valuable unless it is to be enforced and I see no hope of enforcement of this pact under present world conditions unless we are prepared promptly to go to war. It seems to me far better that we should keep our own house in order rather than to enter a pact under which we must police the world.

It seems to me conceivable that under article II, defining genocide, it may be argued that a Communist is a part of a national group and when we undertake to pass laws to restrict and even to outlaw communism we may be charged with doing them serious mental harm or with undertaking to destroy them in whole or in part. If this convention passes we certainly can be charged with such conduct before some tribunal and the proceedings would then constitute a sounding board for further recriminations by persons who do not like our form of government.

I am not here referring to the legal effect of such a pact on our constitutional set-up. That is dealt with in the committee report above referred to, and that alone should be sufficient to warrant rejection by the Senate at this time. I am merely trying to say that no matter how well the proposed convention may sound, no matter how lofty may be the motives which prompted agreement between those who did agree upon its language, it is more likely than not to get this country into trouble. Is is not an isolationistic point of view to assert that we cannot cure or eradicate all evil which exists anywhere. This country can no more feed the starving millions of India and China or undertake to bring their living standards up to ours than an individual traveler could undertake to meet the demands, in any degree, of individual beggars with whom in his travels he might come in contact. This is not intended to suggest that any national group should be compared with a beggar. I know of no nation in any such position. I am merely undertaking to illustrate a financial comparison. I have seen beggars whose condition appeared to be heartrending, but so many that even a few pennies to each would have left me bankrupt, and that general situation of the impossibility of our assuming financial responsibility for the world to me also demonstrates that we cannot assume moral responsibility for the world. As I read the papers it seems to me that there are countries even now guilty of violating such a pact, and if one of the countries were Russia what would we do about it?

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS E. WYMAN.

MANCHESTER, N. H., *September 16, 1949.*

THIS EVENTFUL PRESENT—GENOCIDE—A CASE AGAINST TREATY RATIFICATION

EDITOR, UNION-LEADER:

With reference to your editorial of September 13, headed "Genocide Convention," I respectfully submit the following:

Genocide is a new word to denote race killing. The Genocide Convention or treaty as submitted to the Senate for ratification would make genocide a crime in peace or wartime which the parties to the treaty undertake to prevent and punish.

Genocide is defined as "any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group as such." The following acts are described as "(a) Killing members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group." It is then provided that genocide or conspiracy, or direct and public incitement, or attempt to commit, or complicity in, genocide shall be punishable. Penalties are provided and persons shall be tried before a tribunal of the state or an international penal tribunal. Any contracting party may ask United Nations to take action and any dispute as to the meanings or fulfillment of the treaty obligation are to be submitted to the International Court of Justice.

MORE CENTRALIZED POWER

Under our own Constitution a treaty once ratified becomes the law of the land; hence this treaty would inevitably further concentrate authority in the Federal Government and deprive the States of their rights to suppress crime. That subject is beyond the scope of this paper, but the threat is serious.

Anyone who is inclined to think that the Genocide Convention should be ratified by the United States Senate, or that the American Bar Association should be criticized for opposing ratification ought to pause long enough to weigh a few simple facts. The historical background and the legal complications which may be involved are vital and complex beyond the limits of a brief review such as is here submitted. We now call attention to only a few basic facts.

The convention was transmitted to the Senate of the United States for ratification as a finished document. The President made no suggestion of any need for reservations or declarations of the understanding upon which the Senate should approve the treaty although the State Department, in submitting the convention to the President, did express its understanding of some of the phraseology with which other nations or the international court contemplated by the pact might or might not agree. A point which this survey makes is that this convention received careful consideration by (a) the American Bar Association special committee on peace and law, and by (b) the ABA section of international and comparable law. No member of the special committee and no member of the section recommended that the convention should be ratified in form as submitted to the Senate. In the debate which followed in the ABA house of delegates, no one argued that the convention should be approved as drafted. Even the Solicitor General of the United States, who is a member of the house of delegates and who came from Washington (presumably as the representative of the State Department) to speak to the house in favor of ratification, did not suggest ratification without reservations.

WHAT BUSINESS THEN?

We therefore ask what kind of a document is this which this country is asked to ratify as a treaty when all lawyers agree that it cannot be ascertained from the language used in it that it means what it says or says what it means. As a treaty under our Constitution it would become the law of the land. Lawyers are men specially trained in legal effect of language, and all agreed that as drawn this treaty should not be ratified. If the lawyers of this country and especially the able men of the ABA house of delegates do not know the meaning and effect of treaty phraseology, no one can know it.

Some of these lawyers of the section thought the convention might be saved by reservations, and it was argued to the house that the treaty ratified with reservations would not become effective as to this country until the reservations had been accepted by the other ratifying countries.

To this writer, at least, this seems an unnecessary complication of the complicated. In the first place, it is impossible to be certain that the reservations, submitted at the last moment to the house, are sufficiently complete fully to protect the interests of the United States; and in the second place it would seem more desirable to know in advance whether or not the reservations are acceptable to other countries. If any committee brought in a draft proposal requiring such extensive amendments, as this convention clearly must have before it can be acceptable to this country, the proposal would be promptly sent back to the committee for further consideration. And that is precisely what the vote of the house suggests that the Senate of the United States ought to do.

SATISFACTORY TO RUSSIA

If we remember correctly, the representative of the United States on the committee which framed this convention at one time said in effect that concessions in language had been made to satisfy Russia and that she was not certain that they should have been made. There is today no way in which we can be sure that the reservations proposed are broad enough or definite enough to avoid our becoming involved in controversy through the challenge by some other country of acts or of treaty applicability.

As we understand the meaning of genocide, no lawyer or layman in America believes that there is the slightest chance that anyone in this country is likely to be guilty of that crime. The first reservation proposed undertakes to limit the crime by requiring that the acts enumerated must directly affect thousands of persons. It does not change the intent. The reservation further provides that criminality in the United States is to be determined only by the Federal court of the district wherein the act is alleged to have been committed. Passing what might be a protracted argument as to the meaning of language in the original convention and in the reservations, it is apparent that by the reservations the section on international comparative law has tried to avoid any possibility that a citizen of the United States might be summoned to trial before an international tribunal. Yet the reservations do not make it clear that our States shall retain jurisdiction of crimes committed within their borders if the acts which would otherwise constitute such crimes could be construed as coming within the definition of genocide, and there is nothing in the reservation that will prevent a foreign country or a citizen of a foreign country from filing a complaint that the conduct of some one or more citizens of this country constitutes the crime. Whereupon we would have an international episode.

We wonder if it is not true that some well-meaning citizens of this country believe that other countries may commit genocide. They want this country to be a party to a treaty that will make genocide punishable, and if this is done, then upon request of the United Nations this country would be obligated to step in and stop it. As we said, nobody in this country expects that this country will be guilty, but the proponents of this convention want the force of the United States back of the general condemnation, and if other parties signatory, including Russia, become guilty—as many now think some countries are guilty—we would become involved in the effort to clean up the mess.

OF RUSSIA, CAN WE BE SURE?

It is said that Russia has signed the convention, but we all know that Russia permits no one to know what is going on within her borders. Nor can we tell what interpretation Russia may choose to ask to be placed upon the language of the convention. Inasmuch as the Declaration of Human Rights includes an approval of miscegenation, may it not be that someone will charge that laws against miscegenation in some way involve genocide.

Briefly, then, we have a proposal for a treaty which will make criminal and triable before an international court acts which no one in the United States has ever dreamed of committing, and which will not be committed so long as our form of government shall endure. Why, then, should we not continue our form of government and so govern ourselves as to furnish an example for the rest of the world without undertaking to bind ourselves to take action against the internal conduct of another nation. In the form in which this convention is submitted to the Senate for ratification, we would be subject to international tribunal decisions as to matters which we now consider of purely domestic concern while if we undertook to enforce the covenant against some other country we would certainly be again accused of warmongering.

LOUIS E. WYMAN.

MANCHESTER, *September 14.*

Alien Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following data pertaining to enemy property:

PART I. RETURNS PURSUANT TO SECTION 9 (A)

Nullification and divesting orders

Order No.	Nationality of owner at date of vesting	Claimant	Nationality and/or address at date of return	Description of property returned	Value	Date of return	Vesting order	Date of vesting order
N. O. 1	German	Askania Regulator Co.	United States	Patents	(1)	Mar. 4, 1943	13	May 29, 1942
							151	Sept. 10, 1942
							201	Dec. 23, 1942
N. O. 2	do	Radio Corp. of America	do	do	(1)	do	16	June 4, 1942
N. O. 3	Dutch	Shell Development Co.	do	Patent applications	(1)	do	205	Oct. 2, 1942
							241	Nov. 2, 1942
N. O. 4	French	General Airplane Equipment, Inc.	do	Patent application	(1)	do	203	Do.
D. O. 1	Rumanian	Edgar Ausnit	Cuba	100 percent interest in 2 vested business enterprises.	$8,000.00	Apr. 19, 1943	46	July 2, 1942
D. O. 2	French	L. Gabetlevitch	United States	Patent	(1)	Apr. 27, 1943	306	Nov. 2, 1942
D. O. 3	Dutch	American Lumber & Treating Co.	do	Patents	(1)	Apr. 30, 1943	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 4	do	Welding Research, Inc.	do	Patent application	(1)	June 3, 1943	[illegible]	Nov. 2, 1942
D. O. 5	Belgian	Lucien C. Sturbelle	do	do	(1)	June 21, 1943	292	Do.
D. O. 6	Danish	Bernhard Spar	do	do	(1)	Aug. 6, 1943	290	Do.
D. O. 7	German	Edward G. Budd Manufacturing Co.	do	Patents	(1)	Aug. 18, 1943	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 8	do	William Kroll	do	Patent	(1)	Aug. 19, 1943	296	Nov. 2, 1942
D. O. 9	do	Walter Hamehl	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 10	French	Joseph Blumenfeld	do	Patent application	(1)	do	243	Nov. 2, 1942
D. O. 11	German	The National Cash Register Co.	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 12	Belgian	Leon Thiry	do	Patent	(1)	Aug. 25, 1943	675	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 13	German	Anaconda Wire & Cable Co.	do	do	(1)	Sept. 6, 1943	[illegible]	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 14	Rumanian	Byron Jackson Co.	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 15	Luxemburg	Elton H. Rimington	do	do	(1)	do	[illegible]	Do.
D. O. 16	do	The International Nickel Co.	do	do	(1)	do	16	June 4, 1942
D. O. 17	do	Singmaster Corp. of America	do	do	(1)	Sept. 7, 1943	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 18	Japanese	General Electric Co.	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 19	German	Karl Ludwig Schiff	do	Patent application	(1)	Sept. 10, 1943	68	July 30, 1942
D. O. 20	do	Paul E. Hawkinson Co.	do	Patent	(1)	Sept. 20, 1943	13	May 29, 1942
D. O. 21	do	Remington Rand Inc.	do	do	(1)	do	16	June 4, 1942
D. O. 22	French	Dessey & Alroy Chemical Co.	do	do	(1)	do	[illegible]	Nov. 2, 1942
D. O. 23	Polish	Bronislaw Goldman	do	do	(1)	do	673	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 24	German	do	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 25	do	Allied Chemical & Dye Corp.	do	do	(1)	Sept. 22, 1943	201	Do.
D. O. 26	French	Anglo California National Bank of San Francisco	do	Patents	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 27	German	Bagnak, Inc.	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 28	do	do	do	Patent	(1)	do	[illegible]	Do.
D. O. 29	do	W. F. and John Barnes Co.	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 30	French	Bendix Aviation Corp.	do	Patent	(1)	do	1039	Mar. 8, 1943
D. O. 31	German	Edward G. Budd Manufacturing Co.	do	Patent application	(1)	do	68	July 30, 1942
D. O. 32	Dutch	De Directie van de Staatsmijnen (agency for the Dutch Government).	do	Patents	(1)	do	[illegible]	Nov. 2, 1942
D. O. 33	do	do	do	Patent	(1)	do	721	Jan. 23, 1943
D. O. 34	French	E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.	do	Patents	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 35	German	Bernhard Erben	Great Britain	Patent	(1)	do	[illegible]	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 36	do	Harold G. Henry	United States	do	(1)	do	13	May 29, 1942
D. O. 37	Norwegian	Laboratory for raw materials of the Norwegian Government.	Norway	do	(1)	do	[illegible]	Nov. 2, 1942
D. O. 38	German	Monfort Investment Co.	Liechtenstein	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 39	do	National Cash Register Co.	United States	do	(1)	do	129	Aug. 28, 1943
D. O. 40	do	do	do	Patents	(1)	do	[illegible]	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 41	do	do	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 42	French	David Sinsky	do	do	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 43	Dutch	Shell Development Co.	do	Patent	(1)	do	671	Do.
D. O. 44	German	Wallace R. Turnbull	Canada	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 45	do	Radio Corp. of America	United States	do	(1)	Sept. 30, 1943	141	Sept. 8, 1942
D. O. 46	do	Eugene Mittelmann	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 47	Japanese	I. F. Laucks, Inc.	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 48	Norwegian	Western Precipitation Co.	do	Patent	(1)	do	672	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 49	German	The Anglo California National Bank of San Francisco	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 50	do	United States Metal Powders, Inc.	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 51	do	do	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 52	do	do	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 53	[illegible]	E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 54	[illegible]	Link-Belt Co.	Greece	Patent and patent application.	(1)	do	13	May 29, 1942
D. O. 55	do	Walter Wisbrun	United States	Patents	(1)	do	[illegible]	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 56	do	General Electric Co.	do	Patent and patent application.	(1)	do	112	Aug. 25, 1942
D. O. 57	do	B. S. A. Tools, Ltd.	Great Britain	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 58	do	Davis & Co., Inc.	United States	do	(1)	Oct. 4, 1943	[illegible]	Do.
D. O. 59	do	The Fate-Root-Heath Co.	do	Patent and patent application.	(1)	Oct. 5, 1943	1	Mar. 25, 1942
D. O. 60	do	Radio Corp. of America	do	Patent	(1)	do	16	June 4, 1942
D. O. 61	do	Imperial Knife Co., Inc.	do	do	(1)	do	[illegible]	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 62	do	General Electric Co.	do	Patent application	(1)	Oct. 9, 1943	[illegible]	Oct. 2, 1942
D. O. 63	Italian	Budd Wheel Co.	do	Patent	(1)	Oct. 26, 1943	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 64	German	Franz Puening	do	do	(1)	Nov. 8, 1943	201	Do.
D. O. 65	do	Walter Sabatzinski	do	Securities	100,000.00	Nov. 17, 1943	435	Nov. 17, 1943
D. O. 66	Belgian	Leon Thiry	do	Patent	(1)	Feb. 17, 1944	[illegible]	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 67	French	Abel F. Chermack	do	do	(1)	Feb. 12, 1944	[illegible]	Do.
D. O. 68	do	Dawel Bezborodko; Charles Zucker	do	Patent application	(1)	Feb. 17, 1944	[illegible]	Mar. 4, 1943
D. O. 69	Dutch	Leonard Elion	do	Patent	(1)	Feb. 25, 1944	671	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 70 (not issued)								
D. O. 71	German	Alfred Marshuts	do	do	(1)	do	[illegible]	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 72	do	Aluminum Co. of America	do	do	(1)	May 9, 1944	1	Mar. 25, 1942
D. O. 73	do	American Dburid Corp.	do	do	(1)	do	[illegible]	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 74	French	American Rolling Mill Corp.	do	do	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 75	Danish	Niels B. Bach	do	do	(1)	do	[illegible]	Do.
D. O. 76	Italian	Leon M. De Kanski	do	do	(1)	do	721	Jan. 23, 1943

[1] Because of the nature of patent, copyright, and trade-mark properties, it is impractical to attempt to value these properties.

PART I. RETURNS PURSUANT TO SECTION 9 (A)—Continued

Nullification and divesting orders—Continued

Order No.	Nationality of owner at date of vesting	Claimant	Nationality and/or address at date of return	Description of property returned	Value	Date of return	Vesting order	Date of vesting order
D. O. 77 (not issued)								
D. O. 78 (not issued)								
D. O. 79 (not issued)			United States					
D. O. 80	French	Wsevolode Grumberg		Patent application	(1)	May 9, 1944	[illegible]	Mar. 4, 1943
D. O. 81	German	The Hoover Co.	do	Patent	(1)	do	117	Aug. 28, 1942
D. O. 82	do	Lewis Larsen, trustee	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 83 (not issued)								
D. O. 84	German	Reynolds Metals Co.	United States	Patent	(1)	May 9, 1944	16	June 4, 1942
D. O. 85	Dutch	Willem L. J. Spoor	do	Patents	(1)	do	671	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 86	French	United States Industrial Chemicals, Inc.	do	Patent	(1)	do	666	Do.
D. O. 87	German	United States Radium Corp.	do	do	(1)	do	[illegible]	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 88	Hungarian	George DeBecze	do	Patents	(1)	May 23, 1944	[illegible]	Do.
D. O. 89	Austrian	Robert Homtsberg	Canada	Patent	(1)	do	[illegible]	Do.
D. O. 90	German	Leopold Lion	United States	do	(1)	do	2459	Oct. 20, 1943
D. O. 91	do	Bessie E. Steeves, Admix. of the Estate of Aubrey Steeves.	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 92	do	Georg Sackely	Palestine	Patents	(1)	do	[illegible]	Do.
D. O. 93	do	Leopold H. P. Klotz—North American Investing Co., Inc.	United States	Notes and Capital Stock of Luscombe Airplane Corp.	[illegible]	June 6, 1944	3	Apr. 7, 1943
D. O. 94	do	Maurice Stern	do	Securities	[illegible] 100,000.00	July 11, 1944	[illegible]	Sept. 10, 1942
				Stock of General Aniline Film Corp.				
D. O. 95	do	Chemipals Process, Inc.	do	Patents	(1)	Oct. 31, 1944	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 96	French	Corv, Inc.	do	Patent	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 97	German	The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.	do	do	(1)	do	[illegible]	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 98	French	Freydberg Bros.—Strauss, Inc.	do	do	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 99	German	Mechanite Metal Corp.	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 100	do	Precise Products Corp.	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 101 (not issued)								
D. O. 102 (not issued)								
D. O. 103 (not issued)								
D. O. 104	Dutch	Eelco Nicolaas van Kleffens	Great Britain	Copyright	(1)	Dec. 23, 1944	4051	Aug. 15, 1944
D. O. 105 (not issued)								
D. O. 106 (not issued)								

PART II. RETURNS PURSUANT TO SECTION 32

Return order No.	Nationality of owner at date of vesting	Claimant	Nationality and/or address at date of return	Description of property returned	Value	Date of return	Vesting order	Date of vesting order
1	Rumanian	E. A. M. Biering	Denmark	Cash	[illegible]	July 25, 1946	2302	Oct. 11, 1943
2	Italian	Elizabeth P. King	Italy	Cash	8,058.12	Dec. 27, 1946	1371	Aug. 7, 1943
				Interest in real property	[illegible]			
3	Hungarian	Harriot Daly Sigray	United States	Cash	51,673.25	Jan. 9, 1947	[illegible]	July 19, 1943
				Interest in estates and trusts.	1,337,911.27			Apr. 3, 1943
4	German	Arnold Janowitz; Paul Nickelsberg; Franz Schratzky; Arthur M. Seligman; Delamere Co., Inc.; Norbert Bernheimer; Max Jassby; Inter-Allied Patent Corp.	do	Patents	(1)	Feb. 24, 1947	201	Dec. 23, 1942
5	French	Gaston Desarnat	do	do	(1)	Feb. 27, 1947	666	Jan. 18, 1943
6	Philippine	Philippine Mfg. Co.	Philippine Islands	Patent applications	(1)	Mar. 4, 1947	205	Nov. 2, 1942
	German	Arno Brasch	United States	Patents	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
7	Japanese	James P. Robinson	do	Patent	(1)	Mar. 12, 1947	1031	Mar. 4, 1943
8	German	Walter H. Lowston; Hans Lewin; Innevoll-Rand Co.	do	Patents	(1)	Mar. 17, 1947	201	Dec. 23, 1942
9	do	California Spray-Chemical Corp.	do	Patent	(1)	Mar. 20, 1947	[illegible]	June 4, 1942
10	Belgian	Verne Hass	do	do	(1)	Mar. 25, 1947	675	Jan. 18, 1943
	German	International Shoe Co.	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
	Dutch	Bates Mfg. Co.	do	do	(1)	April 14, 1947	[illegible]	Jan. 18, 1943
	Italian	Celanese Corp. of America	do	do	(1)	do	[illegible]	Dec. 23, 1942
	German	Petrolite Corp., Ltd.	do	do	(1)	do	[illegible]	Do.
11	do	Rudolph Waldman	do	do	(1)	do	265	Oct. 2, 1943
	Czechoslovakian	Uneeda Notions Mfgs.	do	do	(1)	do	676	Jan. 18, 1943
	French	Emil Zipper	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
12	German	Bagnak, Inc.	do	do	(1)	Apr. 16, 1947	201	Dec. 23, 1942
	French	Jackson & Perkins Co.	do	Patent applications	(1)	Apr. 30, 1947	1028	Mar. 4, 1943
	German	The Celotex Corp.	do	Patents	(1)	do	243	Nov. 2, 1942
13	do	Christian Heinrich Holes	do	Cash	[illegible]	do	1177	Feb. 8, 1944
	do	Walter M. Weis	do	Patent	(1)	do	254	Dec. 23, 1942
	do	Maywood Chemical	do	Patents	(1)	May 7, 1947	[illegible]	Do.
14	do	Singer Mfg. Co.	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Do.
	Danish	Clair L. Farrand	do	do	(1)	May 21, 1947	[illegible]	Jan. 18, 1943
15	German	Andrew A. Kramer	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
	Italian	Walter R. Hearst	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
16	French	French National Railroad	France	Cash	324,518.57	May 20, 1947	817	Feb. 8, 1943
				Bonds	122,[illegible]	do	817	Do.
				Copyrights	(1)	do	[illegible]	Do.
				Patent	(1)	do	[illegible]	Dec. 23, 1942
17	Austrian	Albert H. Stronstorff	United States	Cash	1,225.61	do	2423	Oct. 20, 1943
18	Italian	Herbert Raymond Loder	do	Interest in a trust	20,030.00			
19	French	Radio Corp. of America	do	Patent	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
	do	Kislyn Corp.	do	Patents	(1)	do	666	Do.
	Italian	Charles N. Ehrlich	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
	German	R. Hoe & Co., Inc.	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
	Italian	The Light Conditioning Co. of America, Inc.	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
	German	Pyrene Development Corp.	do	do	(1)	do	[illegible]	Do.

[1] Because of the nature of patent, copyright, and trade-mark properties, it is impractical to attempt to value these properties.

PART II. RETURNS PURSUANT TO SECTION 32—Continued

Return order No.	Nationality of owner at date of vesting	Claimant	Nationality and/or address at date of return	Description of property returned	Value	Date of return	Vesting order	Date of vesting order
20	German Bohemian	Eastman Kodak Co.	United States	Patent application	(1)	June 16, 1947	68	July 30, 1942
	German	Shell Mor	do	Patent	(1)	do	[illegible]	Nov. 2, 1942
	German	Dr. August von Borsini	do	do	(1)	do	[illegible]	Dec. [illegible], 1942
21	do	Shell Development Co.	do	Patent application	(1)	do	68	July [illegible], 1942
	do	Ottmar-Loew	do	Patent	(1)	do	[illegible]	Oct. [illegible], 1942
22	Belgian	Ellis Miller	do	Patents	(1)	do	173	Jan. 18, 1943
	German	Buckiers Iron Foundry	do	Patent	(1)	June 19, 1947	201	Dec. 23, 1942
	French	Antonina V. Lachaire	France	Cash Copyrights	$27,[illegible].05 (1)	June 24, 1947	[illegible]	Apr. 12, 1944
23	Norwegian	Titan Co., Inc.	United States	Patent	(1)	do	[illegible]	Nov. 2, 1942
	[illegible]	Hansen Corp.	do	Cash Patent contracts	16,[illegible].61 (1)	do	1239	Apr. 15, 1943
	do	American Chain & Cable Co., Inc.	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
24	do	Standard Brands, Inc.	do	do	(1)	June 19, 1947	201	Do.
	[illegible]	Raymond Saulnier	France	Patents and patent applications.	(1)	do	668	Jan. 18, 1943
							283	Nov. [illegible], 1942
	do	Francoise Seignobosc	United States	Cash Copyrights	2,198.87 (1)	June 24, 1947	3430 3918	Apr. 12, 1944 July 11, 1944
25	German	The Sanoderm Co., Inc.	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
26	Czechoslovakian	Joseph Maher	do	do	(1)	June 26, 1947	676	Jan. 18, 1943
27	French	Raoul R. B. Saraztu	France	Patents	(1)	June 30, 1947	1589	May 25, 1943
28	Russian	Herman H. Frieber	United States	do	(1)	July 11, 1947	201	Dec. 23, 1942
	do	Karl W. Pasnansky	do	Patent	(1)	do	[illegible]	Do.
29	do	Emma Lechner	do	Cash	12,347.62	do	2197	Sept. 18, 1945
							6248	May 8, 1946
							27	June 18, 1942
30	do	Underwood Corp.	do	Patents and patent application.	(1)	Aug. 25, 1947	68	July 30, 1942
							112	Aug. 25, 1942
							[illegible]	Dec. 23, 1942
31	German	Henri W. Jonkhoff	do	Patents	(1)	July 24, 1947	201	Do.
32	do	Stephanie Schybilsky Possinger	do	Cash	2,627.64	do	3037	Jan. 28, 1944
							154	Sept. 17, 1942
	do	Josephine M. Lersch	do	do	14,107.57	do	2663	Jan. 7, 1944
33	Italian	Rose Latino Agnes Latino Frank Latino Biagio Latino Carmela Arnaudo	do	do	1,429.57	Aug. 7, 1947	[illegible]	Sept. 7, 1943
34	German	Jochim Kolbe	do	Patents	(1)	do	[illegible]	Dec. 23, 1942
35	do	Henry J. Beal	do	Cash	111.76	do	[illegible]	Oct. 9, 1943
36	French	Clarence A. Hawley	do	Interest in a patent	(1)	do	166	Jan. 18, 1943
	German	Lawrence Harbury	do	Patent	(1)	do	671	Do.
37	German	Rudolf A. Bemis	do	Cash	1,648.96	Aug. 12, 1947	6686	July 2, 1946
38	do	The First National Bank of Chicago, administrator, C. T. A. of Alfred Quensel.	do	do	30,623.04	Oct. 20, 1947	3647	May 15, 1944
39 (not issued).								
40	French	Georges J. C. Simenon	do	do	7,563.36	Sept. 20, 1947	3430	Apr. 12, 1944
				Copyrights	(1)			
41	German	Helene Zentgraf	do	Cash Interest in a trust	4,332.35 6,858.00	Jan. 12, 1948	3906	July 11, 1944
42	do	Fritz Holzschuemer	Mexico	Cash	7,742.85	Feb. 11, 1948	1282	Apr. 20, 1943
43 (not issued).								
44	Italian	David Jona	United States	Interest in a patent	(1)	Feb. 9, 1948	2246	Sept. 21, 1943
45 (not issued).								
46	French	Enrique Kimmerfeldt	Guatemala	Cash Interest in a vested business enterprise.	26,436.00 1,240.00	Sept. 18, 1947	104	Aug. 17, 1942
47	do	Amalie Friese	United States	Cash	[illegible]	Sept. 30, 1947	5537	Jan. 3, 1945
48 (revoked Apr. 14, 1948).								
49	French	Julien Dungler	Switzerland	Cash Patents	12,096.27 (1)	Oct. 8, 1947	666	Jan. 18, 1943
50	German	Anemostat Corp.	United States	Patent	(1)	Sept. 17, 1947	201	Dec. 23, 1942
							246	Oct. 19, 1942
51	Japanese	Nichibei Kinema Co.	do	Cash 70 motion picture film	15,000.00 (1)	Oct. 27, 1947	1639 1760	June 10, 1943 July 1, 1943
							4628	Feb. [illegible], 1945
52	Norwegian	Erica Rothwim	do	Patents	(1)	Oct. 21, 1947	672	Jan. 18, 1943
	do	Hagbarth Rothwim	Norway	do	(1)	do	294	Nov. 2, 1942
				Cash	1.00	do	294	Do.
53	Hungarian	Varun & Dautch Kremer & Leavitt	United States	Cash	[illegible]	Sept. 30, 1947	1842	July 10, 1943
			do	do	[illegible]	do	1842	Do.
54 (property not vested).								
55	Polish	Barbara Gwiazdowski	do	Cash Copyright	[illegible] (1)	Nov. 25, 1947	4034 4034	Aug. 16, 1944 Do.
56	Italian	Sophie C. Gordigiani	do	Cash	8,397.79	Oct. 29, 1947	[illegible]	Apr. 2, 1943
57	German	Babette Brehm	do	Interest in a trust	19,920.00	do	2990	Oct. 9, 1943
				Cash	196.11	Oct. 30, 1947	5546	Jan. 7, 1945
58	Dutch	Staatsbedrijf der Posterijen Telegrafie and Telefonie.	The Netherlands	Patent	(1)	Nov. 17, 1947	671	Jan. 18, 1943
59	French	Alfred E. Lamarthe	France	Cash Patent contract	4,126.96 (1)	Nov. 19, 1947	[illegible]	Aug. 8, 1944
60	do	Gaston Fleuchel	United States	Patents	(1)	Nov. 26, 1947	666	Jan. 18, 1943
61	German	Serge Koussevitzky	do	Cash Copyright	[illegible] (1)	Dec. 9, 1947	2543 3430	Nov. 9, 1943 Apr. 12, 1944
62	Belgian	Erminia Binda	do	Cash	3,774.13	do	2257	Sept. 22, 1943
				Real property	[illegible]	do	2257	Do.
63	German	Leslie & Co.	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
64	do	Kurt M. Vogel, administrator of the estate of Max Vogel.	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Do.
65	Italian	Carolyn Kent di Robilant	Italy	Cash Interest in estates and trusts.	23,875.58 [illegible]	Dec. 12, 1947	962 1922	Mar. 1, 1943 Aug. 3, 1943
66	German	Elisabeth Lewin	France	Patent	(1)	do	[illegible]	Dec. 23, 1942
67	French	Societe Normande de Produits Chimiques.	do	Patents	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
							1028	Mar. 4, 1943
68	do	Isaac Frenkel	United States	Patent	(1)	Dec. 17, 1947	666	Jan. 18, 1943
69	German	Diedrich and Anna Burgdorff.	do	Cash	8,408.47	Dec. 18, 1947	[illegible]	June 18, 1943

Because of the nature of patent, copyright, and trade-mark properties, it is impractical to attempt to value these properties.

PART II. RETURNS PURSUANT TO SECTION 32—Continued

Return order No.	Nationality of owner at date of vesting	Claimant	Nationality and/or address at date of return	Description of property returned	Value	Date of return	Vesting order	Date of vesting order
70	German	Laura Gruenebarm-Oppenheim.	United States	Cash Interest in a trust	$7,800.61 5,800.00	Dec. 19, 1947	3456	Apr. 17, 1944
						do	[illegible]	Do.
71	do	Herberlein Patent Corp.	do	Patents	(1)	Dec. 20, 1947	[illegible]	June 4, 1942
							[illegible]	June 30, 1942
72	French	Puiseux, Boulanger et Cie. Societe en Commandite par Actions.	France	do	(1)	do	657	Jan. 18, 1943
73	German	Oesterreichische Magnesit, A. G.	Austria	Patents Shares in a vested business enterprise	(1) 153,498.81	Jan. 2, 1948	27	June 18, 1942
						do	68	July 30, 1942
						do	223	Oct. 9, 1942
						do	265	Nov. 2, 1942
74	Philippine	Rafael Gimenez Ruiz	Philippine Islands	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
75	German	Walter C. Voss	United States	do	(1)	do	[illegible]	Jan. 18, 1943
							[illegible]	Oct. 30, 1943
76	do	Ella Miller	do	do	(1)	Jan. 5, 1948	[illegible]	Dec. 27, 1943
77	French	Anna Andreyev	do	Cash Copyright	[illegible] (1)	Jan. 9, 1948	[illegible]	Apr. 12, 1944
78	do	Jeanne M. Badeire	France	Cash Copyright	501.68 (1)	do	3430 [illegible]	Do. Do.
79	do	Etienne Gilson	do	Cash Copyright	1,698.31 (1)	do	[illegible] 3430	Do. Do.
80	do	Marie Eugenie Decourbey Goguel.	do	Cash Copyright	818.98 (1)	do	3430	Do.
81	German	Martha Loeb Banatz	United States	Cash	2,327.71	Jan. 12, 1948	5283	Oct. 22, 1945
				Interest in a trust	13,600.00	do	5283	Do.
82	do	Gisela Altschul	do	Cash	1,597.09	Jan. 20, 1948	[illegible]	Oct. 20, 1943
				do	1,916.44	do	[illegible]	Nov. 29, 1943
83	Italian	Yettchen Behr	Italy	Bond (U. S. Treasury)	1,500.00	do	2655	Do.
				Cash	657.00	do	2586	Nov. 17, 1943
				Interest in a vested business enterprise.	24.00	do	2586	Do.
84	German	Max Hoch	United States	Cash	1,731.98	do	649	Jan. 9, 1943
				Interest in a trust	1,300.00	do	649	Do.
85	Italian	Era McMurtrie Licari	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
86	German	Louis Marx & Co., Inc.	do	Patents	(1)	do	672	Jan. 18, 1943
87	Norwegian	Ludvik Raseh	Norway	Patent	(1)	Jan. 23, 1948	294	Nov. 2, 1942
88	do	Nicolaus Per Mathiesen	do	Cash	15,667.67	Jan. 30, 1948	[illegible]	Mar. 26, 1943
89	Italian	Millicent Drake	United States	Interest in an estate	1,593.00	do	[illegible]	Do.
90	Austrian	Franz Vasarhelyi	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
91	Japanese	Consolidated Amusement Co., Ltd.	Philippine Islands	Motion picture film	(1)	Feb. 6, 1948	1639	June 10, 1943
							1760	July 1, 1943
92	Italian	Adelina Donnini	United States	Cash Real property	13,171.32 3,882.60	do	1600	June 3, 1943
						do	1600	Do.
93	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	do	Cash	103,814.24	Mar. 2, 1948	1961	May 18, 1945
94	German	Emma Meier	do	do	1,876.23	do	[illegible]	June 13, 1946
95	French	Charles Henry Wilen	do	Patents	(1)	Mar. 5, 1948	667	Jan. 18, 1943
				Patent application	(1)	do	1158	Mar. 4, 1943
96	German	Emil Zipper	do	Patent application	(1)	do	[illegible]	Oct. 2, 1943
97	French	Charles J. F. Lafeuille	France	Cash Patents	7,815.64 (1)	Mar. 10, 1948	686	Jan. 18, 1943
98	German	Robert Sommer	United States	Patent	(1)	Mar. 11, 1948	2439	Oct. 20, 1943
99	Japanese	Consolidated Amusement Co.	do	Cash	1,000.00	Mar. 19, 1948	1639	June 10, 1943
							1760	July 1, 1943
100	do	Bishop National Bank of Hawaii.	Hawaii	do Interest in vested business enterprise.	[illegible] 1,[illegible].23	Mar. 24, 1948	2865	Dec. 31, 1943
101	do	Haim Capelluto	United States	Cash	[illegible]	do	88	July 31, 1942
							268	Sept. 17, 1942
							[illegible]	Nov. 18, 1942
102 (property returned not vested).								
103	Hungarian	Margaret Brull	United States	Cash	11,860.34	Apr. 5, 1948	[illegible]	Mar. 7, 1945
104	German	Emmy Carlotta Gertzberg	do	do Interest in real property	[illegible] [illegible]	do	2690	June 28, 1944
105	do	Union Special Machine Co. and the Union Special Machine Corp. of America.	do	Patents	(1)	Apr. 6, 1948	27	June 18, 1942
							68	July 30, 1942
							201	Dec. 23, 1942
							[illegible]	Apr. 12, 1945
106	Italian	Albuquerque National Trust & Savings Bank, trustee—also Isola Bambini.	do	Cash Interest in a trust	[illegible] [illegible]	Apr. 12, 1948	[illegible]	Oct. 28, 1943
107	Norwegian	Johan Bojer	do	Cash	[illegible]	Apr. 19, 1948	4034	Aug. 16, 1944
				Copyrights	(1)			
				Cash	[illegible]	do	[illegible]	Apr. 12, 1944
108	French	Marguerite Clement	France	Copyrights	(1)			
109	German	Eastman Kodak Co.	United States	Patent application	(1)	do	68	July 30, 1942
110 (property returned not vested).								
111	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	[illegible]	Apr. 27, 1948	[illegible]	May 18, 1943
112	German	Auguste Lehmer Schultze William Lehmer Mable Lehmer Heerde	United States	do	2,167.14	do	[illegible]	Oct. 9, 1943
							6853	June 28, 1946
113	Polish	Standard Oil Co. of California	do	Patent	(1)	do	673	Jan. 18, 1943
114	German	Felix Meyer	Belgium	Cash	[illegible]	Apr. 29, 1948	2690	Nov. 10, 1943
				Patent contract	(1)			
115	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	[illegible]	May 5, 1948	1701	May 13, 1943
116	Austrian	Nanbhy Hormasji Moos	United States	Patents	(1)	May 11, 1948	201	Dec. 23, 1942
117	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	[illegible]	do	1701	May 13, 1943
118	Italian	Leonello Bugiotti	United States	do	6,410.71	May 14, 1948	[illegible]	Sept. 30, 1943
119	Hungarian	Annalora Rosenfeld Klein	do	do	1,[illegible]	do	1864	Aug. 3, 1943
120	do	Bertalan Magyar	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
121	German	Ina Luise Guran	Uruguay	Cash	[illegible]	May 19, 1948	400	Dec. 11, 1942
122	French	Rene Francois Jules Paul	France	Patent	(1)	do	667	Jan. 18, 1943
123	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	[illegible]	do	1511	May 15, 1943
124	do	do	do	do	[illegible]	May 24, 1948	[illegible]	Do.
125	French	Superfexit	France	Patent contract	(1)	do	[illegible]	Apr. 2, 1943
126	German	Dr. Ernest Wittkinberg	United States	Cash	8,152.41	do	[illegible]	Feb. 20, 1946
127	French	Societe Rhodiaceta	France	Accrued royalties Patents	[illegible] [illegible]	May 26, 1948	666 [illegible]	Jan. 18, 1943 Apr. 4, 1944
128	Hungarian	Dorothea Neugebauer	Switzerland	Cash Interest in a trust	[illegible] 14,714.54	June 1, 1948	[illegible]	Jan. 14, 1946

[1] Because of the nature of patent, copyright, and trade-mark properties, it is impractical to attempt to value these properties.

PART II. RETURNS PURSUANT TO SECTION 32—Continued

Return order No.	Nationality of owner at date of vesting	Claimant	Nationality and/or address at date of return	Description of property returned	Value	Date of return	Vesting order	Date of vesting order
129	German	Edmund and Robert Abrahamson	United States	Patent	(1)	June 15, 1948	[illegible]	Oct. 20, 1943
130	French	Jean Albert Gregoire	France	do	(1)	do	606	Jan. 18, 1943
131	Danish	United Aircraft Products, Inc.	United States	do	(1)	do	264	Do.
132	German	Martha Daniels, Hermann Schulz	do	Cash	$1,400.00	do	6711	June 21, 1946
133	French	Jean Jobert	France	do	161,167.41	do	3502	Apr. 24, 1944
134	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	do	51,713.71	June 7, 1948	1301	May 18, 1943
135	German	Heilwig Hermann	United States	do	4,450.09	June 18, 1948	1628	June 7, 1943
136	French	Jacques Reinhardt	France	Interest in a trust	4,200.00			
				Cash	3,556.13	June 8, 1948	[illegible]	July 17, 1944
137	German	Walter Bernhard	United States	do	10,456.43	June 9, 1948	6789	May 21, 1946
138	do	Maximillian Heller	Great Britain	Securities	14,370.00	do	7389	July 26, 1946
139	do	Rene Loeb	United States	Patents	(1)	do	191	Dec. 23, 1942
140	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	15,567.74	June 10, 1948	1282	Apr. 26, 1943
141	Italian	Louise Cooke Tamaro	United States	do	64,535.33	June 11, 1948	1241	May 18, 1943
				do	578.00	June 21, 1948	[illegible]	Nov. 17, 1943
142	do	Carlos F. Saavedra	Cuba	do	13,412.76	do	1146	Mar. 29, 1943
143	German	Board of foreign missions, Reformed Church in United States.	United States	Interest in a trust	79,949.78			
				Cash	1,984.55	June 15, 1948	5558	June 27, 1945
				do	438.00			
144	do	David E. Sapper	Guatemala	Interest in vested business enterprise.	20.00	June 24, 1948	104	Aug. 17, 1942
145 (not issued)								
146	German	Lees Kahn	United States	Cash	1,220.98	June 30, 1948	4496	Jan. 3, 1945
147	do	Erich Hanstorf	Canada	Patents	(1)	June 28, 1948	201	Dec. 23, 1942
148	do	Ernest and Alfred Hirsch	Great Britain	Cash	847.74	June 30, 1948	3401	May 3, 1944
149	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	do	139,205.16	June 24, 1948	1301	May 18, 1943
150	German	Fimtiel Mokotoff	United States	do	407.41	June 28, 1948	878	Feb. 9, 1943
151	do	Bernard J. Becker, Executor of the estate of Frank Baumgartner.	do	do	600.00	July 8, 1948	6363	Mar. 5, 1947
152 (property returned, not vested).								
153	Belgian	Francois C. P. Henrotean	Belgium	Patents	(1)	July 19, 1948	575	Jan. 18, 1943
154	German	Elna S. Schmidt	United States	Interest in a vested business enterprise.	200,765.51	July 6, 1948	4727	Mar. 7, 1945
155	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	130,215.85	July 14, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
156	Italian	Adele V. Ferrarese	Italy	do	1,088.15	July 29, 1948	2127	Sept. 7, 1942
				Real property	17,983.00			
157	Danish	Carl Emil Bartens	United States	Patent	(1)	do	664	Jan. 18, 1943
158	German	Heine Kettenbiner	Great Britain	do	(1)	Aug. 11, 1948	201	Dec. 23, 1942
159	Belgian	Simon Mesotten	United States	do	(1)	do	675	Jan. 18, 1943
160	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	123,332.76	Aug. 3, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
161	French	Les Usines de Melle	France	Patents	(1)	Aug. 18, 1948	661	Jan. 18, 1943
162	German	Louise Schneider	do	Cash	2,642.66	Aug. 27, 1948	2491	Oct. 26, 1943
							4078	Aug. 25, 1944
163	do	Otto Construction Corp.	United States	Patents	(1)	Aug. 18, 1948	201	Dec. 23, 1942
							675	Jan. 18, 1943
164	do	Ervin Otves	do	Patent	(1)	do	664	Jan. 18, 1943
165	Danish	Dines Christian Pedersen	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
							664	Jan. 18, 1943
166	Italian	Marcel Del Drago	Italy	Cash	36,610.86	Aug. 23, 1948	[illegible]	Aug. 19, 1943
				Interest in a trust	98,088.05			
167	German	Dr. Ing. Bertold Buxbaum	United States	Patents	(1)	Sept. 17, 1948	201	Dec. 23, 1942
168	French	Georges Valensi	France	Patents	(1)	Sept. 14, 1948	293	Nov. 2, 1942
169	German	Arthur Behrend	United States	Cash	481.16	Sept. 13, 1948	666	Jan. 18, 1943
							3901	July 11, 1944
170 (property returned, not vested).								
171	French	Parent Automatic Supply Co.	Denmark	Patent	(1)	Sept. 17, 1948	[illegible]	Nov. 2, 1942
172	German	William and Alexis Freund	United States	Cash	1,619.29	Sept. 20, 1948	5125	Feb. 15, 1944
173	French	Compagnie Electro-Mecanique.	France	Patent	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
174	German	Victor J. Schneider	United States	Cash	99,781.76	Sept. 17, 1948	[illegible]	Feb. 17, 1946
175	French	Etienne Augustin Henri Honore.	France	Securities	1,161.00			
				Patent	(1)	Sept. 10, 1948	[illegible]	Jan. 18, 1943
176 (not issued)								
177	Belgian	Arkady Fiekler	Great Britain	Cash	532.74			
				Copyright	(1)	Sept. 2, 1948	4031	Aug. 16, 1944
178	French	Raoul Blanchard	France	Cash	2,434.45			
				Copyright	(1)	Sept. 13, 1948	3430	Apr. 12, 1944
179	do	Ateliers de Construction mecanique de Tirlemont.	Belgium	Cash	3,707.22	Nov. 29, 1948	[illegible]	Jan. 18, 1943
180	German	Max Hoster	Argentina	do	4,261.79	Sept. 10, 1948	[illegible]	Aug. 16, 1944
181 (information not available).								
182	Polish	Walery Rudnicki	Poland	Cash	951.06			
				Copyright	(1)	Sept. 10, 1948	[illegible]	Aug. 16, 1944
183	Hungarian	Emil A. Kann	United States	Cash	2,000.00	Sept. 7, 1948	5347	Nov. 20, 1945
184	German	Louise Hardy	do	do	4,527.24	Sept. 10, 1948	2289	Dec. 16, 1943
185	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Interest in a trust	504.26			
186	do	do	do	Cash	57,972.31	Sept. 3, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
				do	88,611.24	Sept. 2, 1948	1501	Do.
187	German	Oscar H. Webb	United States	Interest in a patent	(1)			
188		Martin Behrens	United States	do	(1)	Oct. 14, 1948	[illegible]	Oct. 20, 1942
189	do	Francois Fugie	France	Cash	3,739.70			
		Paul Bourne		Copyright	(1)	Sept. 17, 1948	500 A-1	Dec. 12, 1942
190	French	Frantisek Kudlik	Czechoslovakia	Cash	185.80			
191	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Copyright	(1)	do	[illegible]	Aug. 16, 1944
				Cash	20,357.19	Sept. 13, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
192	German	Arthur Herman Manfred Herman Eric Herman Viola Mayer nee Herman	United States	Cash in equal shares of	3,378.90	Oct. 14, 1948	[illegible]	Feb. 24, 1943
193	do	Julius Fleischer	do	Cash	10,533.47	do	[illegible]	Nov. 10, 194[illegible]
194	Danish	Elna Feldmann	Denmark	Interest in a patent	(1)	Sept. 20, 1948	664	Jan. 18, 1943

[1] Because of the nature of patent, copyright, and trade-mark properties, it is impractical to attempt to value these properties.

PART II. RETURNS PURSUANT TO SECTION 32—Continued

Return order No.	Nationality of owner at date of vesting	Claimant	Nationality and/or address at date of return	Description of property returned	Value	Date of return	Vesting order	Date of vesting order
194	German	Joseph W. Heller	United States	Cash	$223.13	Oct. 14, 1948	[illegible]	Dec. 3, 1943
				Real property	2,500.00			
195	do	Hella Hilde Heyman	do	Cash	23,962.53	Oct. 15, 1948	6812	June 4, 1945
196	do	Alex Hirschberg	Great Britain	Patents	(1)	Oct. 18, 1948	201	Dec. 23, 1942
197	Japanese	Kurt Rothschild	United States	Cash	6,152.39	Oct. 8, 1948	7262	July 26, 1946
198	do	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	do	13,721.70	Sept. 29, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
199	Hungarian	Irene Wesar	United States	do	3,565.00	Oct. 14, 1948	3992	Apr. 4, 1944
200	Italian	Hope MacMichael Garibaldi	Italy	do	23,170.10	Oct. 22, 1948	1311	Apr. 2, 1943
				Interest in a trust	56,529.90			
201 (not issued)								
202	French	Charles William Berthier	United States	Patent	(1)	Nov. 12, 1948	[illegible]	Nov. 2, 1942
203	German	Societe Anonyme de Merbes-Sprimont.	do	Cash	13,262.82	Nov. 3, 1948	809	Feb. 1, 1943
204	do	Arnold Schoenberg	do	do	2,766.86	Nov. 12, 1948	2096	Sept. 4, 1943
205 (not issued)								
206 (not issued)								
207	German	Mart Fryberg	United States	Cash	621.35	Nov. 17, 1948	800 A-110	Sept. 26, 1944
				Interest in copyright royalties.	(1)			
208	do	Mandus Dammann	Canada	Cash	229.73	Nov. 24, 1948	[illegible]	Aug. 22, 1944
							4071	Aug. 25, 1944
209 (property returned not vested).								
210 (not issued)								
211	Italian	Louis Pieroni	United States	Cash	170,289.00	Nov. 24, 1948	628	Jan. 6, 1943
				Interest in a vested business enterprise.	30,985.10		629	Do.
							630	Do.
212	German	Karl Plach	do	Cash	5,719.17	Nov. 29, 1948	[illegible]	Feb. 8, 1943
		Christine Kaupar	do	do	5,779.16	do	[illegible]	Do.
213	Polish	Mieczyslaw Idzikowski	Poland	do	1,[illegible]	Nov. 29, 1948	4033	Aug. 16, 1944
				Copyright	(1)			
214	do	M. Arct Zaklady Wydawnicze Spolka Akcyjna.	do	Copyrights	(1)	do	4033	Do.
215	Belgian	Servo-Frein Dewandre Societe Anonyme.	Belgium	Cash	2,531.72	Dec. 1, 1948	673	Jan. 18, 1943
		Paul Fourmarier, Jr.		Patents and part interests in patents.	(1)			
216	German	Frieda Heinen	United States	Cash	9,173.46	Dec. 6, 1948	1069	Mar. 12, 1943
217	do	Hedwig Fiebusch Meyer	China	do	3,706.57	Dec. 17, 1948	1181	Feb. 18, 1944
218	do	Siegmund Chambre	United States	do	1,518.39	Dec. 13, 1948	948	Feb. 24, 1943
		Max Chambre			1,518.39			
219	do	Ernst Ludwig Kuppel	Great Britain	Patent	(1)	Dec. 13, 1948	201	Dec. 23, 1942
220	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	22,072.84	Nov. 12, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
221	French	Societe des Auteurs, Compositeurs et Editeurs de Musique.	France	do	879,267.84	Nov. 8, 1948	2097	Sept. 4, 1943
							2171	Sept. 10, 1943
222	German	Charles A. Buerk, trustee	Switzerland	do	[illegible]	Dec. 15, 1948	[illegible]	July 1, 1942
		Max E. Bretschger, trustee					136	Sept. 26, 1942
		Ansley W. Sawyer, trustee		Interest in a vested business enterprise.	[illegible]		[illegible]	Oct. 19, 1942
		Jacob F. Schoellkopf, trustee					[illegible]	Nov. 19, 1942
		Louis Wirth, trustee						
223	Italian	Beatrice Rappaport	Italy	Cash	5,000.00	Dec. 21, 1948	2986	Aug. 3, 1943
		Emilia Castelbolognesi			5,000.00			
224	Danish	Wilhelm Hansen Musik-Forlag.	Denmark	Cash	8,185.80	Dec. 17, 1948	3095	Aug. 8, 1944
				Copyrights	(1)			
225	Italian	Elizabeth Marion Tabasso	United States	Cash	2,009.45	Dec. 15, 1948	1875	June 19, 1943
226 (property returned not vested).								
227	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	28,235.78	Dec. 6, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
228	German	Mrs. E. Locker	Switzerland	do	2,475.42	Dec. 15, 1948	[illegible]	Mar. 27, 1947
		Karl Locker						
229	Italian	Maria Clementina Fenoaltea	Italy	do	8,000.00	Dec. 31, 1948	1938	Aug. 3, 1943
230	do	Maria Scaramellini Pironti.	do	do	8,105.79	Dec. 20, 1948	1348	June 3, 1943
231	French	Ateliers Neyret-Beylier et Picard-Pictet.	France	Patents	(1)	Dec. 17, 1948	606	Jan. 18, 1943
							667	Do.
							201	Dec. 23, 1942
232	[illegible]	Fuel Refining Corp.	United States	do	(1)	Dec. 20, 1948	671	Jan. 18, 1943
							664	Do.
233	do	Arthur Fisch	Canada	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
234 (not issued)								
235 (not issued)								
236 (not issued)								
237	German	Theodore Herbert Carter	United States	Cash	21,[illegible]	Dec. 21, 1948	4947	Apr. 15, 1945
		Theodore W. Herbst	do	Patents	(1)	Dec. 17, 1948	201	Dec. 23, 1942
238	do	Malvine Klausner	do					
(?)	do	George Yamaoka	do	Interest in a vested business enterprise.	[illegible]	Dec. 3, 1945	178	Sept. 15, 1942
(?)	do	Franz E. Loes	do	do	1,546.11	Mar. 6, 1946	110	Aug. 24, 1942
(?)	Italian	Wachovia Bank & Trust Co.	do	Cash	4,454.33	Sept. 13, 1946	982	Mar. 1, 1943
(?)	German	Victor Chemical Works	do	Interest in a patent application.	(1)	June 17, 1944	[illegible]	July 30, 1942
(?)	Italian	Alfredo Cerutti, ward	do	Cash	[illegible]	Sept. 30, 1948	1911	Aug. 3, 1943
				Mortgage	12,[illegible]			
				Bank account	[illegible]			
				Bonds	112,877.00			
(?)	German	Herman A. Brassert	do	Cash	92,[illegible]	Oct. 29, 1947	[illegible]	Jan. 6, 1943
(?)	do	Askania Regulator Co.	do	do	22,[illegible]	do	[illegible]	Do.
(?)	Italian			9 ships	(3)	Mar. 16, 1946	52	July 22, 1942

[1] Because of the nature of patent, copyright, and trade-mark properties, it is impractical to attempt to value these properties.

[2] These are supplemental returns with no specific order number assigned. They consist of property returned through judicial proceedings and the return of property vested in error.

[3] This item pertains to the return of Italian ships which were still afloat at the end of the war. Originally 27 Italian ships were seized by the U. S. Government of which 15 were lost while being employed in the war effort. The return was authorized by Public Law 370, 80th Cong., 1st sess. No value was placed on these ships at date of vesting or date of return.

H. R. 87

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee have presently recommended a rule on H. R. 87, relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department.

There has been some controversy of the cost of this bill. I have had the bill analyzed in the light of the report of the Postmaster General and submit these findings for the information of my colleagues:

In the report of the committee the cost of section 1 of the bill is estimated at $27,500,000 for the year 1950. This cost is based on an estimate of approximately 120,000 veterans being eligible for benefits under this section, indicating an average benefit of $229.16. The estimate of the number of employees eligible to benefits is at variance with the figures presented by the representative of the Post Office Department who appeared at the hearings, who testified that approximately 20 percent of the total of 500,000 employees would be affected. (See p. 107, House committee hearings.)

In the form in which H. R. 87 was reported, it would be applicable only to those employees who enter the service prior to July 1 of this year, while the Senate counterpart of this bill, S. 698, would be applicable to all employees who enter the service within a period of 3 years after its enactment. The estimated cost of section 1 of the Senate bill is only $22,000,000; notwithstanding that the Senate bill by its more liberal provisions for those who will enter the postal service at a subsequent date would apply to a larger number of people.

It would appear, therefore, that the estimate of the representative of the Post Office Department that the bill would affect approximately 120,000 veterans, is in line with the Senate figure. At an average benefit of $229.16, the cost of section 1 applied to 100,000 veterans would be $22,916,000.

Any estimate of the number of persons affected by this legislation can only be based on the annual reports of the Postmaster General which indicate an increase of 115,811 employees in the field and departmental services from June 30, 1944, to the last published figures. It appears that these figures are the basis of the cost estimate given in the committee report.

It should be noted, however, that while these figures are valid for most purposes, they do include departmental employees, post office inspectors, assistant postmasters, supervisors, and war service substitutes who are not eligible to the benefits of this legislation. While many of the war service substitutes have been replaced with veterans having civil service status, it is extremely doubtful that this section could under any circumstance be applicable to more than 100,000 employees.

Using the annual reports of the Postmaster General as a base, it is estimated that section 2 of the bill would be applicable to 87,000 veterans. This figure is arrived at taking the total number of employees added to the rolls between June 30, 1944, and June 30, 1948, the last published figures. There were 435,989 employees on the rolls on June 30, 1945, and 503,411 employees on the rolls on June 30, 1948, an increase of 67,546 employees. Of this increase, 296 employees are in the departmental service and are not covered by the proposed legislation; 8 are in the post office inspection service which has a requirement of a minimum of 5 years of service before an employee may even take the examination; 97 are postmasters who are not included in the definition of employee; an indeterminable number are supervisors who must have reached grade 9 before being eligible for promotion and, therefore, could not have entered the postal service from the military service within the prescribed dates; 663 are clerks in offices of the third-class who were not classified employees prior to July 1, 1946, and could not, therefore, be credited with service prior to that date; 1,740 are special delivery messengers who were not classified employees prior to July 1, 1945; and 15,296 are part-time employees, many of whom are not eligible for the benefits of this legislation. It seems certain, therefore, that not more than 50,000 employees are eligible for the benefits of section 2 of this bill, providing that all of them had been in the military service between September 16, 1940, and June 30, 1946. Actual experience demonstrates that only some 75 percent of those who have entered the postal service since July 1, 1945, are veterans and the cost of section 2 of this act should, therefore, be not in excess of $15,000,000 rather than the $26,400,000 given in the committee report.

The total first year cost of the bill H. R. 87 should not therefore, exceed $38,000,000 under any circumstances and will probably be a lot closer to $30,000,000 due to the fact that all employees in the groups eligible to benefits are not veterans and would not be affected by this legislation.

The attached table showing the increase in personnel for the years involved will indicate the maximum number of employees in each group that can receive benefits from this legislation.

Number of employees by groups	1944	1947	1948	Eligible to Senate Bill	
				Sec. 1.	Sec. 2
Departmental employees	1,488	1,526	1,728		
Post-office inspectors	1,134	1,153	1,161		
Postmasters	43,707	41,792	41,695		
Assistant postmasters	3,372	3,431	3,415		
Clerks and supervisors	90,116	88,441	124,087	[1] 33,971	[1] 30,146
Clerks, office of third class			663		
Village delivery carriers	298	188	71		
City delivery carriers	38,040	37,988	78,157	20,051	20,154
Special delivery messengers			1,740		
Rural letter carriers	32,635	32,081	32,542	307	311
Railway mail service	20,967	20,546	24,431	3,864	3,905
Motor vehicle service	3,596	3,831	4,264	668	623
Public buildings operating force	18,187	18,808	15,471		
All others	1,067	3,615	1,383	316	
Total number full-time employees	272,328	279,442	330,862	58,274	55,328
Total number part-time employees	117,472	157,513	172,809	[2] 55,337	[2] 15,296
Total of all employees	389,800	435,989	503,411	113,611	87,456

[1] Includes supervisors not eligible to benefits.
[2] Includes temporary and war-service employees not eligible to benefits.

Opinion by Marvin Jones, Chief Judge, United States Court of Claims, in Pedersen Against the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the opinion rendered by Hon. Marvin Jones, chief judge, United States Court of Claims, in the case of Pedersen against the United States.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPINION BY MARVIN JONES, CHIEF JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS, IN THE CASE OF PEDERSEN AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A dog and a cat may cause complications.

This is a suit by an employee of the State Department who claims per diem allowances for himself and wife, while delayed in Egypt en route from Turkey to the United States during the spring of 1945. Under the regulations plaintiff is entitled to a per diem for himself and his wife "during the time necessarily spent at ports awaiting sailing."

The issue turns on how much of the delay was necessarily spent in awaiting transportation, and how much of the delay, if any, was due to Mr. Pedersen's reluctance to travel without his wife and to Mrs. Pedersen's refusal to travel without being accompanied by her pets, two dogs and a cat, which she refused to leave behind.

The plaintiff claims that none of the delay was caused by the animals, while the defendant claims that all but a few days of the delay was thus caused.

We can well understand Mrs. Pedersen's anxiety about her pets and her reluctance to travel without them.

In our youth we always had dogs, mostly of the mongrel variety, but nevertheless dogs. We placed them just behind people, and when on rare occasions we fell out with any of our playmates, our hounds usually forged ahead.

We have very little respect and no affection for anyone who has not at some time in his life loved a dog. Throughout history the dog has been known for his loyalty and faithfulness. He has been celebrated in song and story. Even books have been written about the dog, his character, intelligence and attributes. The dog has been able to awaken affection in the hearts of every race of people. Wherever man has gone, on the frontier, in the great woods, in the frozen north, the faithful dog has been his constant companion, sharing his hardships and his poverty. When in trouble, humanity finds consolation in his company.

Alcibiades had a handsome dog. Senator Vest described the dog as man's best friend. We meet him first in Homer's verse

"The dog by the Aegean seas."

Scott referred to him as the "companion of our pleasures and our toils," and Mark Twain said the difference between a dog and a man is that "if you pick up a starving dog

and make him prosperous he will not bite you."

It was a dog that licked the wounds of Lazarus in his rags. Rin Tin Tin was a movie star. Neither poverty nor riches, success nor failure, affects his loyalty. It was the dog that served as a test for the army of Gideon. He also performed heroic services in the most modern and greatest of all wars. The poet said that high in the courts of heaven the one sure welcome that awaited was a little dog angel that "sits alone at the gates" and would not play with the others until his master arrived.

The cat also has always been a favorite pet with many people.

But, coming back to the practical, the testimony of the respective witnesses is no more alike than the dispositions of the "gingham dog and the calico cat." It is difficult to determine from the conflicting testimony just what per diem should be allowed. The State Department regulations make no provision for the transportation of animals at any time. Whether or not they can be taken along even in ordinary times depends wholly upon the attitude of the captain of the ship on which passage is booked.

These were not ordinary times. The dogs of war had been unleashed and were running like mad over the face of the earth. In an effort to track them down whole families were separated for years. Our everyday wants, desires, and whims were in most cases sacrificed to the common cause. Anyone who couldn't willingly do this needed to kindle anew the altar fires. Any allowances must be measured in the light of these circumstances.

We must find from the evidence, if we can, the time necessarily spent at Cairo and Port Said awaiting sailing. The plaintiff was not required to travel by air. He was privileged to await sailing accommodations. He could probably have secured transportation for himself and his wife, without the pets, within approximately 30 days, or for himself alone by Army transport within about 15 days.

On May 9, 1945, the vice consul at Cairo informed plaintiff that he thought transportation by plane could be secured if plaintiff would consent to leave his wife in Cairo. This offer was accepted and plaintiff left by plane on May 14, 1945.

We find that plaintiff necessarily waited at Cairo for a period of 15 days. He is, therefore, entitled to a per diem allowance for 15 days.

It is more difficult to determine the allowance for Mrs. Pedersen. Because of wartime restrictions, she could not travel by plane. She was told by Mr. Miller, the American Consul at Cairo, that if she and Mr. Pedersen wished to travel together without the animals, he would obtain transportation as soon as possible, though it would mean a delay of a few weeks; but that if she insisted on carrying her pets, there would be an indefinite delay. She declined to travel without her pets. In giving her reasons for so declining she testified, "I [have] traveled my whole life with dogs and cats."

Mrs. Pedersen actually waited until July 6, 1945, before finally securing transportation that permitted her to take the dogs and the cat along. In the meantime she irritated the officials at both Cairo and Port Said. At the latter place the official stated the innkeeper wanted her to leave because she insisted upon bathing her two large dogs in the public bathrooms. She finally sailed on an American freighter. She had carried her point. The dogs and the cat went along.

The testimony does not disclose either the type or the names of the pets. For the record they must remain nameless. However, they must have been remarkable animals either in pedigree or disposition.

Mrs. Pedersen was certainly within her rights in refusing to travel without her pets. One can appreciate her unwillingness to leave them behind. On the other hand, she had no legal basis for charging the defendant $10 a day for the extra delay cause by her attitude, especially in a time of national peril, when family separations were the rule and not the exception, however appealing her sentiment may have been. We must apply the law as we find it.

Under the regulations Mrs. Pedersen was not justified in refusing to travel without the animals and charging the delay thus caused to the defendant.

The testimony is not quite clear as to the time Mrs. Pedersen would have been compelled to wait had she not refused to travel without her pets. From the record as a whole, we find that such period was 30 days.

Plaintiff sues for a total of $1,742, covering the entire period of delay for himself and his wife. He is entitled to recover for the 45 days which he and Mrs. Pedersen were necessarily delayed, or a total of $450.

It is so ordered.

Title to Submerged Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, there was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6 a statement of the Honorable A. A. Carmichael, attorney general of Alabama, in which he espoused the cause of the Federal Government, as opposed to the position taken by the various States, on the question of ownership of submerged lands within the State boundaries.

A letter from the Honorable Walter Johnson, of Nebraska, special counsel for the National Association of Attorneys General and formerly for five terms attorney general of that State takes issue with the Honorable Mr. Carmichael and presents the position of the States with regard to this vital question of submerged oil lands.

As a former President of the National Association of Attorneys General, and later as Chairman of the Governors' Conference and President of the Council of State Governments, I have been in close touch with the officials of the various States, in their resistance to the efforts of the Federal Government to take over title which in the century and a half of our country's existence, has never been questioned until the past few years.

In the interest of keeping the record complete and correct I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Johnson's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 21, 1950.

Hon. A. A. CARMICHAEL,
Attorney General, State Capitol,
Montgomery, Ala.

DEAR GENERAL CARMICHAEL: There has been called to my attention your statement printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6, in which you opposed the States, including your own State of Alabama, and favored the Federal Government on the question of ownership of submerged lands within the State boundaries.

* * * * *

In your statement, you speak of "the weird assortment of State attorneys general." The National Association of Attorneys General has been in existence for 43 years and is made up of the attorneys general of each of the States. This group has considered the Federal attempt to seize submerged lands within State boundaries as the most serious threat ever made against our American system of constitutional government and have gone on record accordingly. General Carmichael, you have attended the last three meetings of the association and as you know, outside of yourself, there has been only one other States attorney general who has opposed the position of the association.

You and other Federal seizure advocates would give the impression that the issue is nothing more than "tidelands and oil" for a few coastal States. The truth is, the Federal claims cloud the rights of each State in the Union to its lands, harbors, improvements, waters, fish, mineral, and other resources in or under navigable waters and filled lands. The fact that the Governors' Conference (by unanimous vote of 44 Governors), the Council of State Government, the American Bar Association, the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers (representing 803 cities), the National Conference of Mayors, the American Association of Port Authorities, the American Title Association, National Reclamation Association, the National Water Conservation Association, and many other organizations which have no interests in oil, have joined together to fight the Federal seizure, should be evidence enough that the issue is broader than the tidelands oil of three or four States. Officials representing 46 States appeared before the recent Senate and House Judiciary Committees hearings in support of this legislation and not one State official appeared against the same.

The House of the Eightieth Congress passed a bill favorable to the States by a vote of 257 to 2. In other words, more than 99 percent, practically 99 percent of those voting were in favor of the bill. There was not a single vote cast against the measure by the Members from 35 States and in no States was there a majority against the bill. Surely, these elected Representatives of our people were moved by something more than propagandized "tidelands oil."

You and the other "Federal seizure advocates" would give the impression that confirming title in the States to the lands involved would constitute a gift or donation to the States. If a law enforcement officer returned a watch that had been taken from you, would that constitute a gift? The States now have, and from the beginning have had, full use and possession of the property involved.

* * * * *

You and other Federal seizure advocates would make it an unpardonable sin for State officials to express an opinion that the Supreme Court of the United States was wrong in its conclusions in the California case. The Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly held—

"The shores of navigable waters and the soils under them were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively."

Such was the holding in one of the leading cases on the subject, *Pollard v. Hagan* (3 How. 212), decided by the Court in 1845.

It is interesting to note that this case originated in your own State of Alabama, where the United States attempted to grant to private persons, lands which were covered

by the tidal waters of Mobile Bay. Mr. Justice McKinley, in speaking for the Court, stated as follows:

"When the Revolution took place, the people of each State themselves became sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters, and the soils under them for their own use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution."

* * * * * *

"Then to Alabama belong the navigable waters and soils under them in controversy in this case, subject to the rights surrendered by the Constitution to the United States, and no compact that might be made between her and the United States could diminish or enlarge these rights."

This case has been cited with approval in 22 subsequent United States Supreme Court decisions and 244 State and Federal court decisions, and was considered the settled law of the land. Furthermore, all of the members of the Court were not in full accord in the California case as you would imply, and I would suggest that you read the dissenting opinions of Justices Frankfurter and Reed.

I would also like to call your attention to the following language in the majority opinion of the Court as reflecting an obvious hint that Congress should act. We find these words therein to arrest our attention:

"For article IV, paragraph 3, clause 2 of the Constitution vests in Congress 'Power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.' We have said that the power of Congress in this respect is without limitation. * * * Thus, neither the courts nor the executive agencies could proceed contrary to an act of Congress in their congressional area of national power."

Another clear hint of the Court's thinking on this point is found in another portion of the decision in which it was said:

"But beyond all this we cannot and do not assume that Congress * * * will execute its powers in such ways as to bring about injustice to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission."

This and other Federal-seizure advocates would give the impression that continued State ownership of submerged lands would deprive the Federal Government of minerals necessary for national defense. The truth is that an examination of the record will show you that oil production under State control has been far more successful than similar operations. We maintain that in our system of government, State and private ownership of minerals and property would retard production and development of resources. This has been the history of national ownership of coal in England; oil in Mexico, and general nationalization of minerals in Russia. The National Petroleum Council, a group appointed by the former Secretary of Interior Ickes, in its report last year, outlining a national oil policy for the United States, stated:

"7. The petroleum resources of the lands beneath the marginal seas extending to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf can best be explored and developed under State, rather than Federal, control."

* * * * * *

You and other Federal-seizure advocates would give the impression that the States are claiming all the Continental Shelf, while the truth is that the total area within the original State boundaries is only 26,000 square miles or about one-tenth of the total area of the Continental Shelf which is approximately 262,000 square miles.

Your own State of Alabama has 120 square miles of tidelands. Even though you may be willing to surrender to the Federal Government Alabama's 100-year-old claim to these lands, I regret to see you condemn the attorneys general of all the other coastal States and most of the inland States for defending their State's ownership and opposing Federal claims.

General Carmichael, I ask that you make a real study of the history of this matter, and I feel strongly that when you have learned the true facts, you will join the other State officials in advocating confirmation of title in the States of the submerged lands within their boundaries.

Respectfully,

WALTER R. JOHNSON,
Special Counsel, National Association of Attorneys General.

A Cowboy's Views on Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, recently I had the opportunity to read a letter written to Mr. W. M. Rasmussen, secretary of the South Dakota Stock Growers Association. This letter was written by a cowboy named "Neckyoke Jones" and dealt with his opinions on Government spending. As editor of the South Dakota Stock Grower magazine, Mr. Rasmussen published this letter in the November 1949 issue of the magazine. In my opinion this letter expresses in an unusual and amusing style the thoughts of many citizens of the West regarding Government spending. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, at this point, a copy of this letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SECRETARY RASMUSSEN: "I see where our Congressman has come home to git busy with the post bar an' the wire stretcher to do a little fence mendin'." I see to Greasewood, as we was drivin' over the chuck holes in the county road early this week. "Yep," sez Greasewood, who runs a few head of cows along with me here on Long Pine Crick, an' who is awful smart, "you know Congressmen ain't like us stockmen. We got to patch fence up about twice a year—but a Congressman don't do no fence repairin' exceptin' at long intervals—an' it began to look fer a while like Harry Trooman was not goin' to let the boys go home to shake hands with the constitchewints at all. He dog gone near had 'em roped an' picketed out down there on the Patowmick bottom. They wasn't too happy either." "I don't reckon that any Congressman is a very happy feller anyway," I offers, "in fact he is ridin' the rough string most of the time—kinda whip-sawed between the White House an' the old home ranch, so to speak."

"Teasir," sez Greasewood, "an' he is allus tryin' to guess which way the dill pickel will squirt. The city folks wants low prices—an' the farmer, he wants high prices—labor wants to ramrod the outfit—an' industry is spurrin' the boys where the hair is short. I would guess that a Congressman is a most unhappy feller."

"Wha do you make of this here Hoover idea of savin' some blue chips by reducin' the force of hired hands?" I requires, rollin' myself a smoke, "it sure sounds like horse sence to me—an' I hope they lay into it right off—an' I'm writin' our Congrisseman tomorra tellin' him how we feel about it." "You an' about five millyun others," he sniggers. "Well if so many of the people wants this here economy—an' reduction of hands—why the blames don't Congriss put the screws on. It seems to me its dog gone simple—an' they kin whack off a passel of these flunkeys an' let 'em go sheep herdin'. I hearn as how there ain't many herders these days—an' the sheesmen has to pay awful high wages to git a feller to go out an' rustycate with the woolies." I orates, gittin' kinda hot under the collar.

"You ain't got no more idea what's going' on than a Cree Injun," he sez, "the way the sign reads is this. Everyboddy wants that goviment help should be stopped—exceptin' help that they are gittin'. Out here in the West we are jest as bad as anyboddy. The chambers of commerces, an' plenty farm outfits wants irrigashun. They also want subsidizin'—which is killin' two birds with one stone, so to speak—business an' agerculture bein' the two stones. Either way the taxpayer plays it he loses.

"Now take this here joinin' the army an' navy an' the flyers, fer instance. Like as not throwin' the 3 outfits together would probibly be a savin'—but who is goin' to run the outfit? The soldiers thinks a sailor is no good on land, an' the sailors thinks a soldier couldn't paddle a raft on Fryin' Pan Crick. The flyer he thinks neither the soldier nor the sailor could fly even iffen you fed 'em bird seed an' each one wants to boss the rest of the crew.

"It looks to me like Presydent Trooman thinks along with the Army. What does he know about boats?" I ast, now bein' real intrusted. "He's been doin' a lot of sailin' recent like," sez Greasewood, "you know every time Congriss don't do what he wants he goes out for a boat ride on his yatch. They been turnin' him down so much recent like—that he's been doin' a lot of sailin'—which should make him as smart as a admirel—iffen he stick clost to bizness." "What about this here Demfield—this here admirel—who the Presydent jest fired? What about him?" "Well, I'll tell you," sez Greasewood, "as fer as I am concerned it looked like cold-deckin' a man to me. Now, me, I don't know nothin' about bein' a admirel, my only experience bein' a sea-farin' man was when I crossed the Yellerstone on a ferry in the ice—an' the cable broke an' we landed on a sand bar about 8 miles below. That was in 1906, an' I ain't had no hankerin' for water—either inside nor out since. Whatever this here admirel done or didden done don't make no difference. He was fired—an' didden know he was fired until he seen it in the newspapers. Usually when you bounce a feller—you come up an' tell him so. When it come out in the papers—they said the boss of the Navy in Washinton sed it was done for the good of America—an' naval officers should git to be Americans first. Them was kinda rugged words to use to a admirel who had won medals an' had done a top hand's job durin' the war. It don't set well with most folks who likes to have the cards dealt fair an' square. There was a lot of fellers like this here Hess, an' Whittiker Chamber, an' that feller Eisler who took a run-out powder an' jumped his bail an' run off to Rooshey with the only Oregon boot in Washington. Them boys had a finger in the Goviment pie in Washington. They was holdin' top jobs—an' noboddy, even the Presydent, didden call 'em much more than a red herring. To rope an' bust this here admirel an' tell folks he wasn't no American was like rubbin' salt into a saddle sore—an' as near as I could tell firin' him ain't savin' no money fer the taxpayer."

"Well what are we goin' to tell our Congrisseman when we write him, or mebbe he comes around to supper some night? That's what I'm waitin' fer you to tell me?" I demands to know. "You can't tell him nothin'," orates Greasewood, "you probibly want the goviment to fight grasshoppers for you. The cotton grower wants the goviment to fight weevils an' keep the price of cotton up. The wheat farmer he wants the price of wheat up. The chambers of commerces wants big dams built and plenty money spent in town. The old folks wants pensions—an' the young folks also wants 'em—so they don't have to keep paw an' maw—but have money to spend for cocktails, movies an' slot machines. The laborin' man wants unemployment inshurance—so he kin loaf fer a few weeks an' go duck huntin'. A lot of folks wants the goviment to buy 'em wigs, false teeth, wooden legs an' glass eyes with doctor's bills throwed in. Everyboddy wants somethin' but he also wants security—an' he wants that the goviment regulate everyone but him—an' the dog gone country is goin' Sochillist so fast you can't see the trees go by. The goviment is in the hole so fer you couldn't haul it out with a ten horse string team—an' noboddy gives a hoot. They don't want to think about it. Accordin' to some we owe the money to ourselves so it don't make no difference. All I kin say is that if we owe the money to ourselves we sure got a bum banker. So what kin a Congrissman do? Iffen he votes to cut here—he'll have a bunch of voters steppin' on his hocks—an' iffen he votes to cut spendin' there—he's got another tribe trampin' on his tail. Yessir—a Congrissman, I'll bet, is in a awful confusin' condition. It don't do no good to worry about it. I reckon the happiest man in the world would be like ol' Sam Yakey I met once down in the Ozarks when I went through there. He had a cupple acres of corn, a mule, a melon patch, an' a few razor back hogs. He had a jug of corn likker under the floor boards of the lean-to, some smoked side meat hangin' in the shed—an' spent most of his spare time coon huntin'. A city feller come along one day an' ast ol' Sam iffen he was contented. Ol' Sam sez, "I don't owe nothin', don't own nothin', never had nothin' an' don't expect nothing'—an' I don't know nothin' an' I don't give a darn no how!" Looks like to me Secertary Rasmussen that Greasewood's friend Sam Yakey was a awful happy man. Hopin' you are the same, I am

Yure fren,

NECKYOKE JONES.

P. S.—Sody Crick Smith wants to know iffen the goviment gives out subsidy—iffen he should take in a jug to get his'n!

Medical Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the question of an adequate health program for all our people is uppermost in the minds of legislators and the public at this time. In this connection an address delivered by Dr. R. B. Robins of Camden, Ark.—who by the way, is Democratic national committeeman for Arkansas—presents a number of pertinent facts about medical economics and other phases of the health situation which enter very definitely into any consideration of an adequate program of medical care.

I ask unanimous consent that the attached excerpts from the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY MEDICAL ECONOMICS?

(By R. B. Robins, M. D., FACS, Camden, Ark., professor of medical economics, University of Arkansas School of Medicine; read before section on general practice, Southern Medical Association, November 15, 1949)

Mr. Chairman and fellow physicians: I have chosen today to develop my subject by posing five questions and then giving the best answers that I can. The five questions are these:

1. Why has medical economics come to forefront in the last few decades?

2. How much has the cost of medical care increased during he past 2 decades?

3. Since economics is the study of supply and demand, what about the alleged doctor shortage?

4. What do the people get for their medical expenditures? (Health progress chart.)

5. Can we ever have adequate medical care?

In answering my first question I shall try to explain the more important reasons why the problem of medical economics has come to the forefront in recent decades. It is certainly true that for centuries physicians were almost exclusively concerned with the problem of what we today choose to call the scientific side of medicine. We have always had poor people in our midst and I suppose we always will. Over the centuries the physician has treated the people who are truly medically indigent without charge and has made a lower charge for people with modest incomes. And that continues to be the situation where I practice. I think the explanation for the increasing importance of the economic aspects of medicine is not to be found in the traditional problems of medical indigency but, rather, in the great change in certain medical procedures. Medical care is expensive and some types are becoming more expensive. I particularly like the statement of Dr. Harrison H. Shoulder, in his presidential address to the house of delegates of the American Medical Association in June 1947 (JAMA, June 21, 1947, p. 703) in which he said:

"When appendicitis was treated largely by the administration of opium pills and the application of poultices to the abdomen, the cost of administering such treatment was low but the resulting mortality was high. When the physician acquired an understanding of the disease and perfected a technique for its proper treatment, the mortality from the disease went down to a low level but the cost of treatment went up. When diabetes was treated largely by diet and the administration of codeine, the cost of such treatment was low but the mortality was high. The diabetic patient lingered in discomfort for a relatively short while. But when the members of the profession acquired an understanding of the disease and developed a specific method for its treatment and management, diabetic patients were given an almost normal life expectancy in comfort and usefulness. Thus the problems in medical economics have been brought to the forefront."

So, one of the reasons why medical economics has been coming to the forefront recently is that our increasing knowledge of treating the sick has introduced some expensive and complicated procedures. The physicians must undergo longer and more expensive training; indeed, it is quite a task to keep abreast of these new developments.

In my own practice, however, I have observed certain contrary tendencies. As late as 1925 (?) a pneumonia case meant about three dozen calls for me. Today a pneumonia case means not more than five calls. The wonder drugs have brought about a sharp reduction in the medical cost of treating pneumonia. To the pneumonia patient a great gain has come in getting him back on his feet and back to work quickly, as well as in the sharp reduction of the number of fatal cases of pneumonia.

As another illustration of this contrary trend toward lower cost, I might mention the almost complete disappearance of mastoid operations, which were so common up to a decade or so ago. As one outstanding ear specialist in New York City said: "The general practitioner can administer penicillin just as efficiently as my nurse. If the penicillin is administered in time, mastoid surgery is almost always unnecessary."

Yet it seems to me that in the over-all picture of medical care there has been a trend toward more expensive procedures, despite these significant exceptions in the other direction of pneumonia and mastoid surgery.

My answer to the first of these five questions—"Why did medical economics come to the forefront in the past few decades?"—is that, with the exceptions noted, we have developed new procedures which cost more money but which reduce the mortality rate from certain outstanding diseases; secondly, the purchase of medical care is a negative expenditure by the consumer and can never be made as attractive as the advertisers make the purchase of cars, radios, refrigerators, and, I might add, alcoholic beverages.

Finally, how is organized medicine meeting these new problems of medical economics? I would not answer that question fully without making a separate speech. We have encouraged the development of voluntary insurance—Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans as well as coverage by insurance companies. Since the premium for a family membership of the Blue Cross-Blue Shield type costs about 20 cents a day, we have developed a new test for medical indigency for the millions of people to whom these plans are available. This new test of medical indigency for the broad benefits provided by Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans is the ability of a family to pay 20 cents a day—that is, the price of a package of cigarettes, a bottle of beer, or a gallon of gasoline a day. Prior to the 1940's the test of medical indigency for most people was the ability to postpay the cost of an illness which occasionally ran up to several hundred dollars. So, in brief, voluntary insurance has helped the people meet this new problem of medical economics by giving them an opportunity to prepay in small regular amounts instead of postpaying in very irregular amounts. Subscribing families can now choose between "budget and bludgeon" in the matter of medical-care costs.

II

The second of my five questions is: "How much has the cost of medical care increased during the last two decades of rapid advance in scientific medicine?"

According to the bureau of medical economic research of the American Medical Association, these expenditures by the people for medical care for physicians, dentists, hospitals, drugs, etc., have fluctuated closely around 4 percent of the amount spent by consumers for food, clothing, shelter, and all other goods and services (Bulletin 66, The Cost and Quantity of Medical Care in the United States, 20 pp., 1948.)

My statement that these expenditures have been about 4 percent of total personal consumer expenditures in each year since 1929 may seem to contradict the answer to my first question that certain improvements in medical science, which reduce mortality from certain diseases, have made medical care more expensive.

What I am trying to say is that although the number of dollars spent for medical care has increased from $3,000,000,000 in 1929 to $6,500,000,000 in 1947, total consumer expenditures for all goods and services have kept pace with this increase. The American people have chosen to spend about 96 percent of their family budgets on items other than medical care. This is not my decision, it is not your decision, it is not the decision of any official in Washington; it is the decision of all the people. It represents their collective judgment and decision. It is not that they could not afford to spend more for medical care but that they have chosen to spend 96 percent on items other than medical care. The physicians' share of the medical-care dollar has decreased from 33 cents in 1929 to 26 cents; the hospital's share has risen from 13 to 21 cents; while the dentists' share has declined slightly from 16 to 14 cents. I consider the maintenance of this cost level at 4 percent one of the great accomplishments of American medicine.

Some of you may be more interested in the matter of unit prices than in the total dollars spent. Again quoting from the same source we find that, according to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, physicians' fees during the 1940's, hospital-room rates, dentists, drugs, and other basic items in medical care rose about 40 percent while the cost of living was rising 71 percent. Considering the two largest medical-care items separately we find that physicians' fees, according to the Government bureau, rose 36 percent but hospital-room rates soared 112 percent. Those of you who are familiar with hospital operations, whether you are laymen or physicians may appreciate that the hospital buys labor, food, and fuel, items which have risen very rapidly in price, and sells these soon after purchase in the form of food, shelter, and services to patients. The hospital is exposed to the full pressure of contemporary inflation and cannot dodge it. I do not mean to criticize hospital administrators. In summarizing this point I repeat that the prices of all medical-care items, even including hospital-room rates, have risen only slightly more than one-half as fast as the general cost of living, of which these medical-care items constitute about 4 percent. Secondly, for physicians' fees alone the increase is almost exactly one-half the increase in the cost of living.

We physicians are proud of our increasing ability to provide more and more medical care. We appreciate that among the major reasons for this increase in technological efficiency are the wonder drugs and the increasing number and efficiency of our technical assistants—for example, laboratory and X-ray technicians.

Therefore, my answer to this second question on what it costs is that the consumer still spends only 4 percent of his budget dollar on medical care; that the prices of medical-care items have gone up much more slowly than the cost of living, and that 1,000 doctors can deliver much more medical care today than they could 10 years ago.

III

My third question is, What about this alleged shortage of doctors? Is it real or imaginary? I believe it is real. I think that prosperity means shortage. I think that there is a shortage of doctors in exactly the same way that there is a shortage of household help, bricklayers, and school teachers. If there wasn't a shortage I don't think we would be enjoying this period of prosperity which has become somewhat less robust in recent months. But I do not think that this is what most of the advocates of compulsory sickness insurance are talking about when they discuss this alarming shortage of doctors. They often mention the deficit for 1950, placing it at something like 50,000 doctors and at other times as low as 25,000 doctors. What they really mean is that we have a permanent doctor shortage in the United States. While I agree that at first thought there does seem to be a temporary doctor shortage; certainly there is in the armed services—I absolutely deny that there is anything that may be called a permanent, alarming doctor shortage.

There was a real doctor shortage for civilians during World War II when about 40 percent of the physicians were in the armed services taking care of the 9 percent of the population in uniform. The civilians, however, did not die off like flies. The civilian doctors were badly overworked, I admit, but the health of civilians during World War II was very good. Aided by technical assistants who relieved them of routine tests, and by new drugs and methods, which are continuing to increase steadily, the civilian doctor was able to maintain the health of civilians at a high level.

And what of our present situation? The United States has more doctors per 100,000 people than any nation in the world except Palestine, where there is a temporary situation of a large number of refugee doctors who are doctors but are not in the medical practice. Secondly, the medical population of the United States has increased about 14 percent since 1940, whereas the total population has increased only 13 percent. Even the people who are talking about the alarming shortage of doctors predict that the number of doctors per 100,000 people will be greater in 1960 than it is now.

Is there a shortage of doctors in certain communities and areas in the United States? Before I consider that point, I want to tell you that there are 10 counties in South Dakota that do not have a doctor and yet the people of South Dakota are healthier than the people in any of the States that have a large number of doctors per 100,000 population. I do not think these facts regarding South Dakota belittle the medical profession; rather, these facts support the contention that there is more to health than the number of doctors in the county or State.

Now I turn to the supply situation in rural areas. Some small towns are not increasing their population and some are actually losing population. The system of hard roads and automobiles has made small towns a part of a larger trading area. This change in the trading habits of the people has affected the practice of medicine and the distribution of physicians. I doubt that we shall ever again have in the small towns in America the number of physicians that we did before World War II. After all, accessibility of a physician is not so much a question of distance as it is of time, and the time is being constantly reduced by more and better highways and better means of transportation.

Finally on this doctor shortage I should like to point out that an economic depression would reduce the demand for medical services less than it would for some other services, but the reduction would be sharp enough to warrant caution in reaching conclusions during this period of frenzied prosperity about a shortage of doctors in 1960.

The estimates which the advocates of compulsory sickness insurance have made about the doctor shortage in 1960 are based upon guesswork, mechanistic formulas, and an unrealistic approach to the problem of supply. When somebody tells you that there is an undue concentration of physicians in large teaching centers, you should ask him if he means an undue concentration of interns and residents.

IV

My fourth question is: "What do the people get for the 4 percent which they spend for medical care?" What medicine has done in this century, aided by better food, better sanitation, and better houses, is to reduce the fear of death.

V

My last question is "Can we ever have adequate medical care?" A physician may know, for a particular patient suffering a well-known ailment, what constitutes adequate care for that particular patient at that particular time but I doubt that the problem of adequate medical care for the entire American people is that simple. Federal Security Administrator Ewing has been claiming that with socialized medicine he could eliminate 325,000 deaths each year or, in other words, cut the annual number of deaths from the present figure of approximately 1,400,000 down to approximately 1,100,000. I want to say emphatically that he can do no such thing; nor can all the physicians of this country. Why, 1,100,000 deaths a year would be fewer deaths than we had in 1930 when we had only one-half as many people in the United States as we have now! It stands to reason that the number of deaths depends upon the number of people in the country and the death rate at each age. As we get more and older people in the United States, the number of deaths will increase from the present 1,400,000 to 1,600,000 or 1,700,000 in the next quarter century. Administrator Ewing doesn't understand that health progress is one idea and the annual number of deaths another idea.

Medical progress has been so rapid that fatal accidents rather than any of the great natural killers is the No. 1 death hazard of the working people of the United States. Heart disease kills four and one-half times as many persons as accidents, but many heart victims are retired persons, who have completed their working period of life. In 1945, the average age at death of persons dying from heart disease was 65; from accidents, 46. More unrealized working years of life—age 20 to 65—are cut off by fatal accidents than by deaths caused by diseases of the heart.

My answer to the fifth and final question can be summarized in a single sentence—as long as pain comes too often and death comes too soon to us mortals medical care can never be adequate. It can and will be better.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an analysis and comparison of H. R. 4453, as reported in the House from the Committee on Education and Labor, of H. R. 6841, which has recently been introduced, and of the Massachusetts law enacted in 1946, prepared by the American Law Section of the Legislative Reference Service. I hope and believe that the analysis and comparison will be useful to my colleagues who are interested in developing the best legislation possible in this field, if and when the House is permitted to consider the problem.

FEPC, an analysis and comparison of H. R. 4453, H. R. 6841, Eightieth Congress, and the Massachusetts FEPC law, 1946 acts, chapter 368

H. R. 4453 (as reported in House)	H. R. 6841	Massachusetts acts, 1946, chapter 368
A. Name of act (sec. 1). 1. Federal Fair Employment Practices Act.	A. Name of act (sec. 1). 1. Fair Employment Practices Act.	A. Name of act. 1. None.
B. Findings and declaration of policy (sec. 2). The rights of some persons to employment without discrimination because of race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin are being denied. It is essential to the general welfare that these rights be protected. Declares it to be the right of the individual to be free from such discrimination and that this act is necessary: (1) To remove obstructions to commerce. (2) To insure complete enjoyment of constitutional rights. (3) To promote observance of rights and freedoms undertaken by the United States under the United Nations charter and to further national policy with respect to the universal declaration of human rights proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations.	B. Findings and declaration of policy (sec. 2). Declares that the denying of employment opportunities and discrimination against properly qualified persons by reason of race, creed, or color deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production and defense, and burdens, hinders, and obstructs commerce. Declares it to be the policy of the United States to eliminate discrimination because of race, creed, or color in employment relations.	B. Declaration (sec. 1). Declares the right to work without discrimination because of race, color, religious creed, national origin, or ancestry to be a right and privilege of the inhabitants of the Commonwealth.
C. Definitions (sec. 3). Definitions include: "Employer"—a person engaged in commerce employing 50 or more, etc., except States or their municipal or political subdivisions or religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian organizations not organized for private profit but includes a labor organization employing 50 or more individuals which is engaged in commerce. An exemption is made from the act of employers employing aliens outside the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions (sec. 4).	C. Definitions. None.	C. Definitions (sec. 4, ch. 151 B, sec. 1). Definitions include: "Employer" does not include employers of 5 or less persons, social clubs, fraternal, charitable, educational, or religious associations not organized for private profit but does include the State and all political subdivisions, etc.
D. Unlawful employment practices (sec. 5). It shall be an unlawful practice— (a) For an employer: (1) To refuse to hire, to discharge, or discriminate against a person with respect to terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin. (2) To utilize in hiring any employment agency, placement service, or other source which discriminates. (b) For a labor organization: (1) To discriminate against any persons. (2) To limit, segregate, or classify its membership because of race, color, etc. (c) For either an employer or a labor organization: (1) To discharge, expel, or discriminate against a person because he has opposed such unlawful employment practice or participated in any proceeding under this act.	D. Unlawful employment practices. None.	D. Unlawful employment practices (sec. 4, ch. 151 B, sec. 4). Makes it an unlawful employment: (1) For an employer because of race, color, etc., to refuse to hire, to bar, or discharge an employee or to discriminate in compensation, or in terms, conditions, or privileges of employment unless based upon a bona fide occupational qualification. (2) For a labor organization, because of race, color, etc., to exclude from full membership rights, expel, or discriminate against any of its members or any employer or any individual employed by an employer unless based on a bona fide occupational qualification. (3) For an employer or employment agency to print or circulate or use any form of application for employment, make any record or inquiry which expresses any discrimination as to race, color, etc. (4) For any person, employer, labor organization or employment agency to discharge, expel, or discriminate against any person for participating in any proceeding under this act. (5) For any person to aid, abet, incite, etc., the doing of those forbidden acts.
E. Fair Employment Practice Commission (sec. 6). Creates a Fair Employment Practice Commission in the executive branch composed of five members appointed by the President with advice of the Senate for 5-year terms. The Commission shall have:	E. Fair Employment Practice Commission (sec. 3). Creates a similar commission with:	E. Massachusetts Fair Employment Practices Commission (sec. 3). Creates a Massachusetts Fair Employment Practices Commission composed of three members appointed by the Governor with the advice of the council for 3-year terms.
(a) Powers: (1) To appoint officers and employees under civil-service rules. (2) To cooperate with regional, State, local, and other agencies. (3) To pay witnesses the same fees as in United States courts. (4) To furnish technical assistance to further compliance with the act.	(a) Powers: (1) To appoint officers and employees. (2) To cooperate with and utilize regional, State, local, and other agencies and to use volunteer and uncompensated services. (3) To pay witnesses the same fees as in United States courts. (4) To make, amend, and rescind in such manner prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, rules and regulations to carry out the act.	The commission shall have powers (sec. 4—ch. 151B, sec. 2 and 3): (1) To formulate policies to effectuate the purposes of the act, and to make recommendations to officers and agencies of the Commonwealth in aid thereof. (2) To function anywhere within the Commonwealth. (3) To appoint officers and employees within the limitations provided by law. (4) To obtain and utilize the services of all executive departments and agencies.

H. R. 4453 (as reported in House)	H. R. 6341	Massachusetts acts, 1946, chapter 368
(5) To assist an employer acting in good faith whose employees refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of the act. (6) To make technical studies to effectuate the act. (7) To appoint local, State, or regional advisory and conciliation councils to aid in effectuating the act and to make studies and recommendations for that purpose.	(5) To serve processes and other papers, etc. (6) To make technical studies to effectuate the purposes of the act.	(5) To adopt, amend, and rescind rules and regulations to carry out the act and the policies of the commission. (6) To receive, investigate, and pass upon complaints of discrimination in employment. (7) To conduct hearings, subpena witnesses, take testimony. (8) To create local, regional, or State-wide advisory and conciliation agencies and councils to aid in effectuating the purposes of the act. (9) To issue publications and studies to aid in effectuating the act. (10) To render an annual report to the Governor and general court.
(b) Investigatory power (sec. 9). (1) To issue subpenas.	(b) Duties (sec. 4). (1) To make comprehensive studies of discrimination in various sections of the country and of the best methods of eliminating it.	
(2) To administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.	(2) To formulate plans in cooperation with interested public and private agencies for its elimination.	
(3) To apply to United States district courts to enforce subpenas, etc., against contumacious persons.	(3) To publish reports relating to elimination of discrimination. (4) To cooperate with and furnish technical assistance to employers, labor unions, and other public and private agencies. (5) To receive and investigate complaints. (6) To make specific and detailed recommendations to interested parties for its elimination. c. Investigatory powers (sec. 5). (1) To examine and copy evidence. (2) To issue subpenas. (3) To administer oaths, examine witnesses, receive evidence, and conduct investigations. (4) To apply to United States district courts to enforce subpenas, etc., against contumacious persons.	
F. Self-incrimination (sec. 9 (e)). No person shall be excused from testifying or producing evidence in obedience to a subpena on the ground that the testimony or evidence may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture but no such person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture on account of such testimony or evidence except perjury in so testifying. Limited to natural persons only.	F. Self-incrimination (sec. 5 (f)). Same, except no express limitation to natural persons.	F. Self-incrimination (sec. 4—ch. 151 B, sec. 3, 7). Same, except no express limitation to natural persons.
G. Prevention of unlawful employment practices (sec. 7). The Commission shall have exclusive powers to prevent unlawful employment practices under the act but may cede jurisdiction to State and local agencies where State and local acts are comparable to this act. The Commission on a written sworn charge shall investigate and endeavor to eliminate the unlawful practices through informal conference, conciliation, and persuasion. On failure to obtain voluntary compliance by informal methods, a formal hearing may be held before a member of the Commission or designated agent with the right to counsel and to cross-examine witnesses, etc. At conclusion of the formal hearing the record thereof shall be transmitted to the Commission (or three designated members) for decision. The Commission shall then issue a cease-and-desist order or an order of dismissal. The whole proceedings hereunder shall conform to the Administrative Procedure Act.	G. None.	G. Prevention of unlawful employment practices (sec. 4-ch. 151B, sec. 5). The provisions here are, in general, similar to those of H. R. 4453, except that the formal hearing, after the informal methods have failed, is held before the commission itself and an order is issued thereafter.
H. Judicial review (sec. 11). Provides for a petition, by either the Commission or a party aggrieved by a final order of the Commission, to the United States court of appeals under the procedures established by the Administrative Procedure Act. Decision of the court of appeals is subject to a review by the United States Supreme Court.	H. None.	H. Judicial review (sec. 4, ch. 151B, sec. 6). Similar, in general, to H. R. 4453 with review by the superior courts of the Commonwealth in the counties with further review by supreme judicial court.

H. R. 4453 (as reported in House)	H. R. 6341	Massachusetts acts, 1946, chapter 368
I. Enforcement of orders directed to Government agencies and contractors (sec. 10). Authorizes the President to make Federal practice conform to the policies of the act and to prescribe administrative remedies by Executive order with no judicial review. The Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with the Commission's orders. Authorizes the President to make regulations to prevent Government contractors (contracts exceeding $10,000) from continuing unfair employment practices. The Commission shall enforce such regulations.	I. Discrimination in employment by the Federal Government (sec. 6). The Commission shall make a study of discrimination in the Federal Government and recommend to Congress a specific plan for its elimination together with the necessary legislation.	I. None.
J. Notices to be posted (sec. 11). Requires employers and labor organizations to keep a notice prepared by the Commission, with excerpts from the act, posted in conspicuous places on their premises under penalty of a $500 fine.	J. None.	J. Similar with fine of from $10 to $100.
K. Forcibly resisting the Commission or its representatives (sec. 14). To forcibly resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with a member, agent, or employee of the Commission in the performance of duties under the act or because of the same is punishable by a $500 fine and or imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both.	K. Willful interference with Commission agents (sec. 7). Similar, in general, with $5,000 fine and/or imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both.	K. Willful interference with the Commission (sec. 4-ch. 151 B, sec. 8). Similar, in general.
L. Veterans' preference (sec. 12). This act shall not modify Federal, State, Territorial, or local veterans' preference.	L. None.	L. None.
M. Rules and regulations (sec. 13). The Commission shall make, modify, and rescind rules and regulations to carry out the act. The regulations must conform to the Administrative Procedure Act.	M. None.	M. None.
N. None.	N. None.	N. Construction of the act (sec. 4-ch. 151 B, sec. 9). The act is to be liberally construed.
O. Separability clause (sec. 15). The usual provision.	O. None.	O. Similar (sec. 4-ch. 151 B, sec. 10).

Freeman W. Sharp, American Law Section, January 30, 1950.

First Annual Report of Massachusetts Fair Employment Practices Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the major portion of first Annual Report of the Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission covering the period from November 10, 1946, to November 30, 1947.

So as to emphasize one of the most outstanding administrative principles adopted by the Massachusetts commission may I call your attention to the following sentence from the report of the commission to the Governor and the legislature in 1946 when the law was implemented by the creation of the commission:

It has not chosen to conduct a punitive expedition in Massachusetts but has preferred to steer a conservative course of educating employers and workers alike as to their responsibilities and obligations under this law.

I think anyone familiar with administrative law and procedure realizes that the entire success of any such law depends upon the policies adopted by those charged with the administration of the law. If they are such as to turn the administration into a punitive expedition, this will bring violent criticism and justifiable resentment and the administrators alone will be responsible for the possible repeal of the law. If a Federal law in this field is enacted, those who are chosen to administer it will have much of value in the experience in Massachusetts and in other States where similar laws have been so succes.fully initiated and administered.

May I point out also that in this first report you will find another significant sentence, as follows:

The fact that the commission has not been obliged to proceed to a formal hearing with respect to any complaint of employment discrimination filed with it is, itself, a silent endorsement of the wisdom of the act and the manner in which it has been administered.

The following is from the report:

ADMINISTRATION OF THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT AND ITS EFFECTS

On August 21, 1946, the Massachusetts fair employment practice law became effective, thereby giving to inhabitants of the Commonwealth the right to work without discrimination because of race, color, religious creed, national origin or ancestry.

In the report of this commission to the Governor and to the legislature last year appeared the following paragraph:

"The commission has approached the administration of the law with a keen appreciation of the necessity of dealing fairly and peaceably with all persons who are subject to its provisions. It has not chosen to conduct a punitive expedition in Massachusetts but has preferred to steer a conservative course of educating employers and workers alike as to their responsibilities and obligations under this law. The commission has been continuously mindful of this policy in the formulation of its regulations, in the conduct of its educational program and in the investigation and conciliation of complaints."

During the past year the commission has administered the Fair Employment Practice Act with the same approach to the problem of eliminating employment discrimination in Massachusetts. The results have shown clearly the wisdom of that course of administration.

The processing of each complaint of employment discrimination where investigation showed that there was probable cause to credit the allegations of the complaint resulted in the elimination of the alleged discriminatory practice by conference, conciliation and persuasion. Not only did the respondent eliminate the discriminatory employment practice complained of, but also adjusted his entire employment policy to give equal opportunity to all people in the Commonwealth.

Investigations by the commission, subsequent to the conciliation of cases, has shown that changes in the personnel practices

agreed to in conference with the Commission have been faithfully carried out. In almost every case workers of hitherto excluded minority groups have proven to be satisfactory to the employers and have dispelled by their harmonious relationships with other employees the fears of employers that prejudice within would disrupt their organizations.

The fact that the commission has not been obliged to proceed to a formal hearing with respect to any complaint of employment discrimination filed with it is, itself, a silent endorsement of the wisdom of the act and the manner in which it has been administered. Yet the large number of complaints processed by this commission does not tell the whole story of the effect of the Fair Employment Practice Act on employment. The existence alone of the law has awakened many employers to their obligations to give equal opportunity in employment to all people and the evidence of the voluntary cooperation of these employers against whom no complaints whatsoever had been filed is very impressive.

Statistical report of the commission—Nov. 10, 1946–Nov. 30, 1947

Complaints:	
Complaints initiated and received	306
Complaints adjusted by conciliation	153
Complaints dismissed for lack of probable cause	41
Complaints dismissed for lack of jurisdiction	9
Cases withdrawn	1
Complaints in process of investigation	102
Investigations:	
Investigations initiated by the commission	33
Investigations adjusted by conciliation	15
Investigations dismissed for lack of probable cause	14
Investigations pending	6

INDUSTRIES

In January and February 1947, members of the commission met with representatives of the papers of Boston and other cities and towns of Massachusetts and discussed with them the duty of these publications not to print help-wanted advertisements which specified or limited the race, color, religious creed, national origin, or ancestry of applicants for employment. At these meetings the newspapermen manifested complete willingness to cooperate with the commission.

A study of classified advertisements appearing in newspapers published throughout the State was commenced in December 1946. One hundred and four violations were noted during the first month. In November 1947 the number was 14, which is evidence of this cooperation.

LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

The commission has undertaken a survey of employment discrimination in the A. F. of L. and CIO organizations with encouraging results, particularly because these branches of the organized labor movement are apparently complying with the law and in most cases are showing a disposition to cooperate with the commission. A study of the policies of these unions has not been completed, but the majority of their constitutions and bylaws have been screened and no discriminatory clauses found.

The commission is at the present time investigating a number of complaints in which violations of the fair employment practice law by independent labor unions are involved.

EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES

The commission has had occasion to investigate discriminatory practices of some employment agencies. In addition, it has met with representatives of employment agencies with beneficial results. This includes the cooperation which the commission has received from the division of employment security, which operates the Massachusetts State Employment Service.

EMPLOYERS

The largest number of complaints filed with the commission has been against employers allegedly responsible for employment practices which are unlawful under the statute, particularly in the refusal to hire qualified applicants for employment because of considerations of race, color, religious creed, national origin or ancestry. In the processing of these complaints, the Commission has received good cooperation from employers in the following fields: insurance, retail marketing, manufacturing, restaurant and liquor sales, motion picture distribution and exhibiting, transportation, hotel management, packing, general distribution and sales.

EDUCATION

The statute empowers the fair employment practice commission to establish councils throughout Massachusetts.

"The commission may empower them to study the problems of discrimination in order to foster through community effort * * * good will, cooperation and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population of the Commonwealth * * * and make recommendations to the commission for the development of policies * * * and for programs of formal and informal education which the commission may recommend to the appropriate State agency."

Under this authority the first fair employment practice council was established in Springfield with an outstanding membership. Also under the authority of the law a State advisory council of the fair employment practice commission was appointed with an equally outstanding membership and constant efforts were made by all concerned to carry out a State-wide program of education and conferences with many civic, business, industrial, labor, and fraternal organizations.

Second Annual Report of the Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the major portion of the second annual report of the Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission covering the period from November 30, 1947, to November 30, 1948.

May I emphasize two significant paragraphs from that report, as follows:

From the beginning, this commission has recognized that the elimination of discriminatory employment practices based upon individual and group prejudices could be accomplished most effectively by reason instead of force. It has endeavored to deal fairly in every instance with complainants and respondents. It has appealed to the intelligence and sense of justice of employers and workers alike in each attempt to break down the barriers of racial and religious intolerance.

In short, the commission has not conceived of the fair employment practice law as an instrument of compulsion. Rather, it has regarded the statute as presenting an opportunity to wipe out the ignorance and doubts and fears which men have of other men who are different with respect to color, religion, or national origin. Thus in its whole work, it has attempted to substitute understanding for intolerance.

I am sure you will be interested also in the statement that from the beginning of its administration the Commission had handled a total of 445 complaints but had not had a single occasion to conduct a formal hearing, or have a matter which it had settled in conference brought into a court of law for further consideration.

The State advisory council in this period initiated a study of what the public school authorities were doing by way of developing democratic attitudes and behaviors. The findings of that study, as tabulated, revealed what the Commission describes as "an encouraging increase of interest on the part of Massachusetts educators in one of democracy's most pressing problems."

In addition to the Springfield council a greater Boston council was organized during this period again with a membership of outstanding citizens, and a local council was being organized in New Bedford.

The following is from the report:

INTRODUCTION

Two full years have now passed since the effective date of the fair employment practice law. The law declared that equal opportunity to work without discrimination because of race, religion, or origin is an express right and privilege of the people of Massachusetts. It authorized the establishment of a commission whose duties are to eliminate discriminatory employment practices and to foster good will and cooperation among all groups and elements of our population.

From the beginning this commission has recognized that the elimination of discriminatory employment practices based upon individual and group prejudices could be accomplished most effectively by reason instead of force. It has endeavored to deal fairly in every instance with complainants and respondents. It has appealed to the intelligence and sense of justice of employers and workers alike in each attempt to break down the barriers of racial and religious intolerance.

In short, the commission has not conceived of the fair employment practice law as an instrument of compulsion. Rather, it has regarded the statute as presenting an opportunity to wipe out the ignorance and doubts and fears which men have of other men who are different with respect to color, religion, or national origin. Thus in its whole work, it has attempted to substitute understanding for intolerance.

In addition, it is true that the procedures which employers established to remove barriers against the employment of workers because of their color, religion, or national origin have had a marked effect in certain fields of employment. So it happens, that the settlement of one case in a given field has opened up scores of job opportunities to persons belonging to a group which has been the victim of racial or religious discrimination for years.

For example, employment opportunity in the railroad industry in Massachusetts, which gives work to over 75,000 people, has been shackled for years by the restrictive racial policies of the big brotherhoods. In 1948, the railroad carriers sat down with the Massachusetts FEPC and the New York State Commission Against Discrimination and effected an agreement in the matter of certain complaints whereby Negroes have been employed as stewards and machinists and have been placed in other categories of employment from which they had been barred hitherto because of their color.

Again in 1948, as a result of a complaint, the Massachusetts FEPC conferred with representatives of the automobile industry in an atmosphere of respect and cordiality and worked out an agreement which resulted in the hiring of Negro workers in that field on the same basis as white workers.

More and more, captains of industry are becoming convinced, when agreements like these prove of benefit to the employer as well as to the worker, that there need be no real reason to fear friction among qualified American workers of different colors or religions.

Then there is the retail merchandising field. Some employers in this industry had been extremely skeptical about the employment of any but white people in selling jobs. In 1948, FEPC can point to many stores where, as a result of complaints, Negro salesgirls are employed in good number and are no longer a novelty. In these same stores, as a result of the successful experience of employers with Negro salesgirls, equal opportunity is now being given to men and women regardless of their color, religion or origin, in clerical, operating, and supervisory positions. Some of the recent changes in this field have come about by agreement with FEPC, others have occurred through voluntary recognition of the spirit of equal opportunity before and after the fair employment practice law became effective.

In view of what is happening in Massachusetts, it is not at all surprising that the United States Department of Labor in 1948 pointed out that the cities which lead in the number of Negroes employed in white collar, technical and professional jobs in private enterprise are found in areas which have FEPC legislation.

Important are every single new job opportunity which is created by FEPC and each old barrier which is broken down among people of different races and religions. For every time that opportunity and recognition are granted to any individual for achievement regardless of race, color, or origin, the cause of our national ideal of equality of opportunity is advanced.

ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

In 1948, the fair employment practice commission processed 142 complaints of economic discrimination and settled 135 of these after investigation and conference, indicating thereby that some discriminatory employment practice had been eliminated in each case. From the beginning of its administration in the fall of 1946, the commission has handled a total of 445 complaints, involving business organizations employing over 350,000 people, and has not yet had occasion to conduct a single formal hearing or have a matter which it has settled through conference brought into a court of law for further consideration.

In addition, it is true that the procedures which employers established to remove barriers against the employment of workers because of their color, religion, or national origin have had a marked effect in certain fields of employment. So it happens, that the settlement of one case in a given field has opened up scores of job opportunities to persons belonging to a group which has been the victim of racial or religious discrimination for years.

For example, employment opportunity in the railroad industry in Massachusetts, which gives work to over 75,000 people, has been shackled for years by the restrictive racial policies of the big brotherhoods. In 1948, the railroad carriers sat down with the Massachusetts FEPC and the New York State Commission Against Discrimination and effected an agreement in the matter of certain complaints whereby Negroes have been employed as stewards and machinists and have been placed in other categories of employment from which they had been barred hitherto because of their color.

Again in 1948, as a result of a complaint, the Massachusetts FEPC conferred with representatives of the automobile industry in an atmosphere of respect and cordiality and worked out an agreement which resulted in the hiring of Negro workers in that field on the same basis as white workers.

More and more, captains of industry are becoming convinced, when agreements like these prove of benefit to the employer as well as to the worker, that there need be no real reason to fear friction among qualified American workers of different colors or religions.

Then there is the retail merchandising field. Some employers in this industry had been extremely skeptical about the employment of any but white people in selling jobs. In 1948, FEPC can point to many stores where, as a result of complaints, Negro salesgirls are employed in good number and are no longer a novelty. In these same stores, as a result of the successful experience of employers with Negro salesgirls, equal opportunity is now being given to men and women regardless of their color, religion or origin, in clerical, operating, and supervisory positions. Some of the recent changes in this field have come about by agreement with FEPC, others have occurred through voluntary recognition of the spirit of equal opportunity before and after the fair employment practice law became effective.

In view of what is happening in Massachusetts, it is not at all surprising that the United States Department of Labor in 1948 pointed out that the cities which lead in the number of Negroes employed in white collar, technical and professional jobs in private enterprise are found in areas which have FEPC legislation.

Likewise, a recent Nation-wide survey by the National Community Relations Advisory Council disclosed that queries on religious affiliations by employers in Massachusetts (and in New York and New Jersey, which also have FEPC laws) have been occurring only one-sixth as often as in States not having FEPC laws.

Statistical report, Nos. 10, 1946, to Nov. 30, 1948

Complaints:	
Initiated and received	445
Closed after investigation and conference	298
Closed for lack of probable cause	69
Closed for lack of jurisdiction	13
Withdrawn	11
Pending investigation and conference	45
Investigations without formal complaint:	
Initiated by the Commission	60
Closed after investigations and conference	21
Closed for lack of probable cause	26
Transferred to complaint	3
Pending investigation and conference	10
Nature of complaints and investigations:	
Based upon alleged color discrimination	301
Based upon alleged religious discrimination	71
Based upon alleged discrimination because of national origin	39
Based upon alleged discrimination because of ancestry	4
Types of complaints:	
Against employers	313
Against employment agencies	30
Against labor unions	16
Against employees	3
Others	145

In noting the progress which has been made during the past 2 years in accomplishing the purposes of the fair-employment-practice law, attention should be called to the splendid cooperation which the commission has received from the daily and weekly newspapers which are published in the metropolitan areas of Massachusetts. Not only have they been fair and considerate in their reporting of the activities of this commission, but they also have been keenly alert to their own obligation under the law to eliminate help-wanted advertisements which specify or restrict color, religion, or ancestry of the applicant. For example, in December 1946, 104 violations of this type were noted in the help-wanted sections of Massachusetts newspapers. By November 1947 this figure had decreased to 14. A check of the newspapers in October 1948 revealed no advertisement at all of this sort.

In the summer of 1948, the staff of the commission conducted a survey of all cases which had been disposed of by May 1948 to ascertain the extent of and reaction to compliance with the fair employment practice law. This survey revealed: (1) That there had been a considerable increase in the employment of workers belonging to groups which had been discriminated against in the past because of color, religion, or national origin; and (2) that the policy of giving equal opportunity to all people regardless of color, religion, or national origin had proved to be no burden upon employers with respect to either management-employee relationships or employer-customer relationships.

EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Investigations

Under the section of the statute which provides that the commission may study problems of discrimination in fields of human relationship outside of employment, 60 such investigations have been made in 3 years. Among these investigations, FEPC has looked into the matter of certain discriminatory practices which are alleged to exist in Massachusetts hospitals. Also, the commission was active in the summer of 1948 in eliminating discrimination against colored people by certain restaurants and other public places of recreation in the Cape Cod area. It has already taken the first steps to erase religious discrimination from the accommodation policies of certain inns and hotels in the resort areas of this Commonwealth. It should be noted with reference to these investigations that the commission has no power of enforcement but must rely solely upon educational methods.

Police departments

The executive secretary of the commission is contacting the various police departments in metropolitan Boston, which includes 39 cities and towns. A former member of the police force, he has done graduate work at Harvard in human relations. He is suggesting that any instances of tension between groups in the various communities be reported to the commission and is also available as a consultant in such matters. By invitation, he has addressed groups of policemen in different parts of the Commonwealth and has contacted the heads of police departments in many cities. As a result of this work, police officers and executive heads of police departments have taken steps to allay religious and racial tensions in certain areas and have assisted in enforcing the provisions of the act.

The report concludes as follows:

OTHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

1. A quarterly news letter Toward Racial and Religious Understanding was published containing contributions from 49 organizations, most of them private. Increasingly, this news letter is becoming a record of the various efforts to promote intergroup understanding, respect, and good will.

2. Among the educational materials distributed are a summary of the act and an explanatory pamphlet, entitled "What Is the Fair Employment Practice Law?," both of which have been widely read. The Associated Industries of Massachusetts, the Massachusetts Technical and Commercial Employment Association, the A. F. of L., the CIO, and many other groups have helped greatly in the distribution of these materials.

3. The Scrapbook for Teachers, a cooperative undertaking of the commission and the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, contains book reviews and summaries of noteworthy magazine articles. It has been very popular with the general public as well as with teachers, for whom it was especially compiled.

4. Over 600 kits of material concerning the Fair Employment Practice Act have been sent to superintendents of public and parochial schools and to junior and senior high-school principals throughout the State, together with a letter offering the services of the commission in furnishing speakers for assembly programs. The response to the letter has been enthusiastic, and a schedule of speaking engagements has been arranged with the schools.

5. In an effort to extend the work of the commission throughout the State, plans have been made for members of the staff to be located during 1 day or more in some of the larger cities for consultation concerning the purpose and functioning of the law and the taking of complaints.

6. The commissioners have welcomed opportunities to explain the philosophy and provisions of the act. Over 200 addresses have been made by them, and about as many conferences have been held with widely varying groups in the offices of the commission.

The commission feels that its law-enforcing program, as well as its educational program, has been benefited by educational

work preceding the passing of the fair-employment-practice law, governmental groups and private organizations have worked hard, and are still working hard, to promote good will and fair play in Massachusetts. Their success has helped our commission, and their continued cooperation is earnestly desired.

Third Annual Report of the Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the important portion of the Third Annual Report of the Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission covering the period from November 30, 1948, to November 30, 1949.

It is most significant that in 1949 the commission could report that not once had a complaint required judicial review but rather each case had been settled through conference. I call your attention to this most important statement of policy and principle by the commission:

> Once more the commission acknowledges the wisdom of the provision of the law requiring that the first efforts to adjust complaints be made through "conference, conciliation, and persuasion." This process invites cooperation and is the antithesis of swinging a big stick.

The following is from the report:

INTRODUCTION

This is the third annual report of the administration of the fair-employment practice law.

During the years since 1946, when the law became effective, this Commission has processed several hundred complaints alleging unlawful discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin. In addition to this quasi-judicial function, and through its educational activities, it has brought about solutions of other problems involving discrimination outside the field of employment and has resolved with gratifying results to educate employers and employees to the realization that full and complete opportunity in employment on an equal basis is the best answer that Americans can give to the subversive doctrines that this kind of equality is not possible under our form of government.

Now, in 1949, the progress of the Commission may be evaluated in a preliminary way. It is certain that industry as a whole has taken a long step forward and many industrialists appreciate that racial and religious tensions are not heightened when fair-employment policies are practiced. Likewise it has been demonstrated that working men and women suffer no dire consequences from working side by side with persons of other races and religions, and that those individuals enjoying new job opportunities are better able to assume their obligations in our society.

While the accomplishments of these 3 years may be notable, the Commission realizes much work lies ahead. Benefits from anti-discrimination legislation can be more generally enjoyed than at present, especially in the populous areas outside Greater Boston.

Investigations made prior to 1946 indicated that economic discrimination against minorities was not confined to any particular section of the State. However, possibly because of the fiscal necessity of establishing the Commission's only full-time office in Boston, a distorted picture of the extensiveness of illegal discrimination may be developing. Only 5 percent of all complaints reaching the Commission have come from that area beyond 20 miles of the State House. Yet 46 percent of the State's inhabitants live outside the metropolitan district.

It is apparent to observers that an imbalance continues in the proportion of workers of minority groups who fill the menial jobs requiring little or no special abilities. Time alone can correct these inequities. Educational opportunities for minority groups must be enlarged, and the way must be kept clear of discriminatory obstructions for those members of the minorities who take full advantage of their educational opportunities.

ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

In the past 12 months FEPC processed 117 complaints alleging employment discrimination. More significant, however, than the number of cases handled in the past year or the 562 complaints processed since the inception of the Commission is the fact that business organizations employing more than 350,000 have been concerned and have gained first-hand knowledge of the operation of the law. The Commission has settled each concluded case through conference. Not once has a complaint required judicial review.

Once more, the Commission acknowledges the wisdom of the provision of the law requiring that the first efforts to adjust complaints be made through conference, conciliation and persuasion. This process invites cooperation and, is the antithesis of swinging a big stick.

An illustration of how this works may be found in the following: A complaint charging religious discrimination was received against a company of moderate size. During a routine investigation, the investigating Commissioner came to the conclusion that the general policy of the company did not comply with the law, and on a friendly and cooperative basis the Commissioner and respondent sat down together and surveyed the employment pattern of the concern. When the Commissioner later recommended the employment of the complainant and a change in employment policy, the company readily complied. A review has shown the company has since employed many of the same religious persuasion as the complainant, and it has, for the first time, employed colored persons, the most recent example being a cashier.

During the past year FEPC conducted its first industry-wide investigation, involving 55 concerns and 10,700 employees. The study grew out of a series of complaints filed against labor organizations alleging unlawful discrimination in referrals for jobs on the basis of color. The situation reflected a pattern of apparent discrimination, manifested by the almost exclusive use of or segregation of workers according to their color and ancestry. Working in cooperation with the leaders in these concerns, the Commission is convinced that gradually complete and equal job opportunities will be opened to all in this field regardless of color and ancestry.

This year saw the first complaint adjusted by FEPC on the basis of compensatory damages to the complainant, in addition to a provision of employment.

Interstate cooperation among agencies of Government similar to the Commission has proved successful, particularly in cases where the employees of a concern cross State lines in their regular duties.

Statistical report, Nov. 10, 1946–Nov. 30, 1949

Complaints:	
Initiated and received	562
Closed after investigation and conference	341
Closed for lack of probable cause	130
Closed for lack of jurisdiction	17
Withdrawn	19
Pending investigation and conference	55
Investigations without formal complaint:	
Initiated by the Commission	75
Closed after investigation and conference	34
Closed for lack of probable cause	35
Transferred to complaint	9
Pending investigation and conference	8
Nature of complaints and investigations:	
Based upon alleged color discrimination	481
Based upon alleged religious discrimination	88
Based upon alleged discrimination because of national origin	60
Based upon alleged discrimination because of ancestry	8
Types of complaints:	
Against employers	418
Against employment agencies	39
Against labor unions	20
Against employees	3
Others	157

EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Investigations

During 1949 the commission conducted investigations of problems of discrimination in fields of human relationships outside employment "for the purpose of promoting good-will, cooperation and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population of Massachusetts." The subject matter of these investigations was discussed in a number of voluntary conferences with the organizations and associations concerned. For a time the Commission suspended this type of activity but will resume such discussions beginning January 1950.

It is of some significance to note the kind of progress which the Commission was able to accomplish in areas outside of employment. For example, as the result of voluntary conferences with key representatives of hotel and resort owner's associations, the Commission was able to effect an agreement that the matter of discriminatory policies with respect to the admission of guests would be brought to the attention of the proprietors concerned and that means would be adopted to change such undemocratic practices.

Similar voluntary conferences with the appropriate officials of the city of Boston, following an investigation of alleged discrimination against Negro doctors by the Boston City Hospital, resulted in the appointment this year of the first Negro doctor to the staff of that hospital in its history.

In the voluntary conferences on such subjects as have been mentioned, the Commission emphasized that its investigations and studies had been conducted as part of its general educational program. Furthermore, it was careful to point out in each instance that the Commission had no power of enforcement with respect to any suggestions or recommendations which it made to correct the situations under discussion.

Other educational activities

In cooperation with the commission, the Boston Public School Department has developed a unit of study based on the work of this body. This unit is to be taught in history and government classes. It is written for high-school seniors who shortly will find themselves either employees or employers. While other school systems have not developed such a detailed plan of study as Boston, many have used educational materials provided by the commission. In addition, members of the commission and field representatives have addressed school assemblies and pupils in social-study classes in both public and private schools. The commission stands ready to send its field representatives throughout the State to explain the operation of the law and to receive complaints.

The Scrapbook for Teachers, a joint project of the commission and the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, is being revised once more for general distribution.

The commission has continued to publish a quarterly news letter, Toward Racial and Religious Understanding, containing contributions from 49 private and public organizations in the State. The news letter is considered a record of the efforts of these various organizations to promote intergroup understanding, respect, and good will. The commission wishes to express its indebtedness to these many agencies, private and public, that have helped in the success of its work.

Pamphlets and other material explaining the workings of FEPC have been printed and given wide distribution.

The police departments of the Commonwealth have been helpful in assisting in enforcing the law and have cooperated with the educational program of the commission. Conferences with the heads of 36 of the larger police departments have been held by the executive secretary, who came to the commission from the Boston Police Department where he worked on intergroup understanding. Several of the large communities hold training courses for their police officers and he has taken part in these courses. Assurances have been given that the commission will assist any police department in instances of tension between racial or religious groups.

Councils

Assisting the commission in its studies of the problems of discrimination have been the State advisory council and three regional FEP councils with headquarters in Springfield, Boston, and New Bedford. Another council is now being organized in Worcester. Mr. Philip M. Morgan, president of the Morgan Construction Co., will be its chairman.

The State council advises the commission on matters of general policy, and has helped greatly in promoting school activities. The three regional groups have spread knowledge of the operation of the Fair Employment Practice Act through addresses, radio broadcasts, conferences, and of especial significance, through surveys of industrial concerns, banks, insurance companies, and public utilities. These regional councils have been of assistance to the commission not only through educational activities, but by reporting to the commission on local conditions.

The Federal Trade Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by former Senator James M. Mead, Commissioner of the Federal Commission:

THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the Commission has taken on a new look. Two newly appointed members of the Commission have insisted that they must know about what the Commission is doing and have insisted upon acting upon questions of policy themselves as Commissioners. This means that in order to carry out the mandate of the Commission, it is necessary that the work be divided among the Commissioners. When it came to considering who should represent us before this distinguished group, we felt if it was possible to get a Commissioner who had had 20 years' experience in this particular body, who had had two terms in the United States Senate, and who had had considerable experience in his legislative work with budget matters, that we would indeed be fortunate.

So it is with a great deal of pleasure that I have the distinguished honor of presenting to the committee, Senator, now Commissioner, Mead, who has been designated by the Acting Chairman as the Commissioner to make a special study of our budget problems and our budget requests. So I take a great deal of pleasure in turning over this particular part of the Commission's work to Senator Mead.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, as you know, I am a member of the Federal Trade Commission, and at the request of the Commission I am appearing before you today in support of the appropriation estimates for the Federal Trade Commission for the fiscal year 1951. As you also know, I was a Member of the House of Representatives and of the Senate for many years and, although in a different capacity, I am returning today to very familiar and pleasant surroundings. It is necessary to intelligent representative government that those persons charged with the execution of the laws periodically appear before the appropriate committees of the Legislature to give an account of their stewardship of the great public trust of public office.

REQUESTED APPROPRIATION FOR 1951

I have a long statement here; but, from my experience on the Committee on Appropriations, I realize that sometimes we might say too much and, as a result, receive too little. So I think I had better just proceed to get right down to the meat of the statement I have by telling you that the Federal Trade Commission is requesting for fiscal 1951 an appropriation of $4,225,000; that this represents an operational increase of $450,000 over the appropriations for 1950 plus a $43,000 estimated increase of the cost of the pay-raise bill. That makes a total of $4,493,000.

BREAK-DOWN OF INCREASES REQUESTED

This increase allowed by the President and the Bureau of the Budget, together with certain intra-agency transfers, contemplates, as reflected in our proposed method of operations, (1) an increase in the antimonopoly program of $476,200, (2) a reduction of expenditures in the unfair-, deceptive-, and fraudulent-practices program of $64,700, and (3) an increase in the administrative and general operating expenses of $38,500.

In terms of personnel and specifically the operating costs, the increase of $450,000 will provide $68,100 for 16 additional attorney-examiners for the antimonopoly work in the field offices; it will provide $314,300 for 6 employees to establish and maintain an index of concentration and 68 employees for the expansion of the corporation financial reports program to include the wholesale, retail, and mining corporation segments of the industry. It will provide $73,800 to meet the required automatic within-grade promotions and $94,100 for increased travel funds, the cost of work performed by other Government agencies for us, and general operating expenses.

INTEGRATION OF WORK PROGRAM

For the past 2 years, the Commission has been engaged in the execution of a planned, integrated program of work, placing major emphasis on restraint of trade in the basic industries. The Commission now has in the course of trial and/or decision cases in the steel, paper, plywood, furniture, food, clothing, and many other industries dealing with basic commodities, the cost of which affects the well-being and the pocketbook of every individual in the country. It is in the public interest for the Commission to investigate all those matters and, if restraints of trade or unfair practices are found to exist, to take prompt corrective action under the applicable statutes.

PRIMARY DUTY OF THE COMMISSION

While I have only been recently appointed to membership on the Commission, I am keenly aware of the vital importance of the Commission to our economic life and well-being. The President of the United States in his recent State of the Union message again emphasized that business in this country should maintain a spirit of initiative and operate in a competitive economic system. The primary duty of the Commission is to utilize all of the powers delegated to it by the Congress in order to keep our economic system competitive and free from those unfair restraints which injure competition. That is a large order, and the Commission must have adequate tools with which to do its job. These tools can only be made available by adequate appropriations from the Congress.

ACTS ADMINISTERED BY THE COMMISSION

The Commission was created in 1914 on the recommendation of President Woodrow Wilson. The Commission administers the Federal Trade Commission Act, certain sections of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, the Webb-Pomerene Export Trade Act, the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, and certain sections of the Lanham Trade Mark Act of 1946.

BUDGET APPROPRIATION FOR 1951

The Bureau of the Budget has recommended that the Congress appropriate $4,225,000 for the Commission for the fiscal year 1951. This is an increase of $493,000 over the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1950.

ANTIMONOPOLY PROGRAM

The greater part of this increase will be used on the Commission's antimonopoly program, which includes both the case work and the economic and financial reports. The Commission contemplates spending an additional $476,200 on its antimonopoly program, of which $64,700 will be transferred from its unfair- and deceptive-practices program. The Commission is fully cognizant of the importance of its work in the deceptive-practices field, but believes the significance of the antimonopoly program is of such fundamental importance to the economy of the country that this transfer of funds is necessary. The antimonopoly program includes legal investigations, economic studies, and formal proceedings in cases involving such practices as collusive price fixing, restriction of production, full-line forcing, exclusive dealing, tie-in sales, and unlawful geographic pricing practices. It also includes the very important compliance investigations, studies, and enforcement proceedings. After a cease-and-desist order has become effective, the Commission has a continuing policing job in order to insure observance of the terms of the order.

ELIMINATION OF FALSE ADVERTISING

The elimination of false or deceptive advertising of commodities sold in interstate commerce is also a responsibility of the Commission. The public interest in this field is great, because tens of millions of our people purchase goods relying upon the truth of the advertisements they hear on the radio or read in publications. Your constituent, the housewife, is entitled to protection against fraud or deception in these advertisements. In addition to the litigation method in this field, the Commission has developed informal and cooperative procedures designed for wider coverage of law enforcement at a lower unit cost. In the trade practice conference procedures, all members of an industry may meet with the Commission and, in a spirit of cooperation, agree not to use certain practices which may be violative of the laws administered by the Commission. Pursuant to the provisions of the Wool Products Labeling Act, the Commission makes frequent inspections of the goods represented to contain wool on the shelves of processors and distributors in order that the purchasing public may be assured that the wool products they purchased are correctly labeled as to fiber content.

GENERAL ECONOMIC INFORMATION

The Bureau of Industrial Economics of the Commission, in addition to assisting in the investigation of matters preparatory to the initiation of antimonopoly litigation, also makes general economic investigations and prepares reports to the Commission which are transmitted to the Congress. These reports include studies of the trends and concentrations of economic power, and in the past have served as factual background for very important legislation enacted by the Congress. The financial reports on corporations prepared by this Bureau have proved very helpful both to other agencies of the Government and to private parties. The Commission has other important functions which are described in the justification document presented to the Subcommittee.

The Commission is constantly surveying its own procedures so that any duplication or waste may be avoided and that the Commission's business may be handled promptly and efficiently. The Commission has delegated to its secretary and executive director many of the routine duties that were formerly done by the Commission in order to free the Commission for its more important functions.

INCREASE IN JURISDICTION OF COMMISSION

To paraphrase the words of Daniel Webster in speaking of Dartmouth College, the Commission is only a small agency, but it has a great responsibility. The Commission has a smaller number of employees than it did in 1941 prior to World War II. The value of the goods sold in interstate commerce, over which the Commission has jurisdiction, however, has increased by billions of dollars, and the problems of monopoly and concentration of wealth have increased, due, in large part, to World War II. We respectfully ask your favorable consideration of our request for funds and assure you that we will do our best to prevent unfairness in interstate commerce and give the taxpayer a fair deal for his dollar.

So, Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances and by reason of the fact that the President and other authorities have pointed up the antimonopoly program, we are asking for certain increases that will fit the Commission to do that particular task without neglecting its other tasks.

CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER

There is no continuously available information, either in or outside Government sources, as to the trend of the concentration of economic power. Knowledge as to these facts is of major importance to the Congress in the formulation of legislative policy as well as for the Commission in developing its program for enforcement of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act. In a staff report of the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives on economic concentration and monopoly, it was recommended that an index of concentration be developed to meet the existing need and that investigation as to the extent and seriousness of such concentration be centered in the Federal Trade Commission. Approximately $46,000 is included in our budget request to establish this index in the fiscal year 1951.

FINANCIAL INFORMATION REGARDING BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

For many years, there has been a great demand, both in and out of Government, for a current continuing series of reports to provide accurate financial information regarding the operation of business enterprises. Section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission Act grants it the authority to require reports from corporations except those exempted by other acts of Congress, and prior to the war the Commission had exercised this authority and had prepared a large number of such special reports. There are many important demands for basic factual financial statistics about current business conditions which are not being met. The Bureau of the Budget, early in 1946, appointed an interagency committee on needs for financial data in Government, and this committee recommended that a continuing series of quarterly and annual business statistics be instituted as a part of the Federal statistical system.

SCOPE OF INITIAL REPORTS

The recommendation provided that the initial work be confined to manufacturing corporations and then expanded as rapidly as possible to cover wholesale, retail, and mining corporations. Ample safeguards have been provided to avoid duplication of Federal activities in this matter. The Bureau of the Budget designated the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission to operate this joint program because only these Commissions have clear-cut statutory authority and responsibility for mandatory collection of such data.

INFORMATION CONTAINED IN REPORTS

These reports provide information on a current quarterly basis as to aggregate assets, sales, and earnings of manufacturing corporations by industries. The use of approved sampling methods insures the highest degree of accuracy obtainable. The information made available through these financial reports enables the Commission to follow the changes in the relative importance of different industries and to compare the profits of large and small corporations.

SOURCES OF REQUESTS FOR REPORTS

Many requests for these reports are received from individual Members of the Congress. They are also regularly used by the Council of Economic Advisers, the Federal Reserve Board, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, which cooperates with the Federal Trade Commission in the preparation of the reports. They are furnished only upon specific request. Presently there are about 3,000 active continuing requests and additional specific orders are received in substantial numbers for each quarterly report as it is released. The requests come primarily from banking, industrial, and labor groups.

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM

The Commission is now prepared to expand this program to cover the distributive trades and mining, as originally planned under the auspices of the Division of Statistical Standards of the Bureau of the Budget, and funds approximating $200,000 are included in our 1951 request to provide the necessary employees to effect the completion of the original plan of operation.

Although we have streamlined the other divisions and cut their appropriations in some instances as low as we deem advisable in order to minimize the request that is being made by our Commission to carry the work forward, that is necessary under present conditions, and that is in keeping with the recommendations of the President.

Very naturally, I am pleased to be here and happy to renew my old associations, and I hope I will be able to make a constructive contribution to the relationship between the agency I now have the honor to represent in part and the committee that has to do with our appropriations.

Mr. THOMAS. That is a good statement, Mr. Chairman. We appreciate it. It is very helpful.

Mr. MEAD. Thank you.

Freedom: How You Can Guarantee It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article by Dr. Norman Vincent Peale entitled "How To Guarantee Your Freedom." The original article appeared in Guideposts:

HOW TO GUARANTEE YOUR FREEDOM

(By Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, minister, Marble Collegiate Church, New York City)

What are the essential elements of our heritage which we would preserve? Two basic beliefs underlie the American structure of government—the sovereignty of God as the ruler of this land, and the sacredness of the individual human soul.

Broadly speaking, the American tradition flowed down two streams. One stream took its rise in the teachings of Socrates, Aristotle, and Plato. These great thinkers discovered that the human mind is sacred, that it is—and rightly ought to be forever—free, that no man has the right to make a slave of the mind of another man.

The other great stream took its rise in the teachings of Moses. Standing upon some great rock in the wilderness, he proclaimed that God had instructed him to tell men they were, in their own souls, utterly sacred, and as such no man had a right to enslave them. Said he: "You are created in the image of God."

Thus it went across the centuries until finally there came walking into the human story a great sun-crowned, radiant Soul who amplified this teaching, who told men they are brothers and sons of a common Father. He told men they should know the truth and the truth should make them free. He uttered wise sayings, all dealing with the greatness and dignity of the human soul touched by God. These sayings were gathered together in a Book.

Men put this Book under their arms and set forth in little ships across a stormy sea, driven by a mighty conviction that as sons of God nobody could make slaves of them. Thus, landing upon an immortal rock they

consecrated this new land to the ideal of the greatness and sacredness of the human soul and spiritual worth of men.

Never before had a nation been established upon a religious and philosophical base. It was revolutionary; it was unique. There was a strange power in it all. In a century and a half, out of this fertile soil was proclaimed more wealth, more freedom, more human happiness than ever in the history of mankind.

An Irish patriot, John Philpot Kern, back in 1790 declared: "The condition under which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance: which condition, if you break, servitude is at once the consequence of your crime and the punishment of your guilt."

It has come about that today freedom is imperiled and our traditions are in jeopardy.

The solution of America's problem is not in terms of big government, nor big labor, but it is in big men over whom nobody stands in control but God.

Because we have encountered some difficulties, some among us seem to have concluded that we should go back to Europe for types of governmental philosophy which have failed whenever tried. They look to Russia, for example, which has never produced any abundance or creative values worth speaking of, and say with eager impetuosity: "Ah, there is what we want for America."

Foolish men who would barter away the priceless heritage for a mess of pottage. This free society has demonstrated its value. Never in all the history of the world have there been research laboratories where such wonders have been wrought. Never anywhere have men developed the genius to create astounding marvels out of the earth, even out of the air around them.

Samuel B. Pettingill says: "Socialism, fascism, and communism would not have a chance to outlive this generation if they were not financed and subsidized at home and abroad from the earnings, ideas, and inventions of individual competitive enterprise."

In this land of wealth with only 6 percent of the world's land area, we have 35 percent of the world's railroads, 60 percent of the world's telephones, 66 percent of the world's wealth. Too many of us think negatively of the American system. Let us think positively about it and see it for what it is—the greatest system ever devised in the history of mankind, with all its faults, and this system grew out of the philosophy of freedom.

What is wrong with it that they wish thus to change it? Is it because of racial and discriminatory matters for which we must find improvement? Is it because there have been and are selfish men and injustices? Is it possible that they see no discrimination in communism, no cruelties of class, no selfishness?

It is curious and sad the way much of the intellectual climate of this country has changed. Once we roared like lions for liberty, now we bleat like sheep for security.

Fear is lack of faith.

From the very beginning Americans have recognized Almighty God as their Supreme Ruler. He towers above state. The American Republic is predicated upon the Divine Will and the principles of Jesus Christ.

Long ago William Penn said: "Unless we are governed by God, we will be governed by tyrants." Man must have a god. If he abandons the God of the Old Testament and the New Testament, there is only one god left—the superstate. Piteously, then, freemen will quail before the colossal power of the state, their freedom gone.

Let us resolve that our prayers and our service be given to the perpetuity of these sacred principles which make for human freedom and the well-being of mankind. Let us again pledge ourselves to preserving the American tradition.

From the Frying Pan Into the Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in my comments over Station WHFB, covering southwest Michigan and northern Indiana, from Benton Harbor, I endeavored to show how Republicans jump from the frying pan into the fire. That talk was as follows:

Fellow Americans, through the courtesy of WHFB of Benton Harbor, Mich., it is again my privilege to give you an idea of what is happening to the people's economy drive as spearheaded by the junior chambers of commerce.

As said last week, when bills are introduced by Members of Congress, they are referred to the appropriate legislative committee.

If deemed worthy of consideration and acted on favorably by that committee, its chairman then presents the bill to the Rules Committee for consideration.

If the Rules Committee considers the bill has merit, the bill is reported to the House. Otherwise, it is pigeonholed for the session unless, and this is important, a majority of the House membership signs a petition to discharge the committee.

If a majority of the House desire to bring a bill to the floor, nothing can stop it.

For many years, the Rules Committee has been screening proposed legislation. The result? Many a bill, unworkable or calling for ruinous appropriations, has never reached the House floor nor would a majority of the Members, aware of the situation, sign a petition to bring the bill before the House. Bills calling for $9,000,000,000 are now being held by the Rules Committee.

Last year, Mr. Truman and his political advisers changed the rules so that if the Rules Committee fails for 21 days to report a bill, the chairman of any committee can bring it to the House floor, if the Speaker will recognize him.

By that amendment the chairman of a committee and the Speaker, instead of the Rules Committee, program legislation.

A coalition of conservative (some call them reactionary) Republicans and southern Democrats sought to restore the power of the Rules Committee.

Although 85 Democrats voted with us, we lost that fight because 64 Republicans voted with the Democratic leadership, which was fighting for Mr. Truman's program.

Some Republicans who voted with Mr. Truman's forces do not favor his socialistic program, but were fearful of retaliation by powerful pressure groups which favor parts of that program. In this case, the group backing FEPC, consideration of which they thought the Speaker would permit on Monday, frightened them.

Perhaps a few Republicans voted with the Truman forces because bills in which they were interested had not been favorably reported by the Rules Committee.

Other Republicans argued that the Rules Committee was altogether too dictatorial; was acting as a czar.

Unfortunately, the House just jumped out of the frying pan into the fire. This was demonstrated Monday when Speaker RAYBURN refused to permit the FEPC bill to come to the floor.

As the rules stand now, it is up to the Speaker on the second and fourth Mondays of each month and on Wednesday of each week, unless there is a two-thirds vote to the contrary, to recognize or refuse recognition to the chairman of a standing committee.

The Speaker and the majority leadership go all out for Mr. Truman's program. Some Democrats on the Rules Committee—and Democrats outnumber Republicans eight to four—are inclined to apply the brakes on the President's proposals for increased taxation, social legislation—vote with nonspending Republicans.

Republicans who turned down their leaders just traded the more favorable Rules Committee boss for a Speaker boss, who is a dyed-in-the-wool Truman supporter.

So far as the Republican Party is concerned, that defeat last week makes it more difficult, if not impossible, to stop or even slow up during this session of Congress the President's spending campaign, his drive for dictatorial power.

It may be that another attempt will be made to change the rules. If so, those of you—and especially the junior chambers of commerce, who have been doing such effective work—who favor the adoption of the Hoover Commission's recommendations, the defeat of socialized medicine and similar measures, ask your friends and neighbors to urge their Congressman to oppose appropriations for desirable but unnecessary projects—to oppose socialistic measures.

If the issue has not been made clear in this brief time, will endeavor to be more explicit if you write me.

So thanks and good luck until I hear from you.

The Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks this date, I include the second and third articles in the series by Mr. Leon Starmont, of Spokane, Wash., on the Columbia River region, its past, present, and future:

[From the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash., January 22, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 2)

(By Leon Starmont)

The news wires are carrying and will carry articles on the "coordinated, comprehensive plan of development" for the Columbia River Basin. The State Columbia Basin Commission has approved this program and has sent emissaries to Washington to help the Northwest Congressmen in getting it over the hurdle of the Budget Bureau, the House and Senate. One Senate committee has already stamped it "O. K."

Just what is this plan, how did it start, and how did it get this far?

It is, briefly, a program for the orderly development of 405 new Columbia River projects, of which only 98 are marked for immediate authorization.

EDUCATED IN 1926

A plan, like a river, has not one source but many. A rough outline of basin planning was delivered in Seattle in 1926. The occasion was the annual meeting of the Columbia Basin Irrigation League. The speaker was Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce in the Cabinet of President Calvin Coolidge.

Hoover, of course, had many advisers. As these articles explore the files of the Army engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, Federal Power Commission, and interested private groups, it may be possible to date the origin of the "comprehensive plan" much earlier than 1938.

The plan today, however, as related by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, involves a grand total of 405 projects, large and small, single-purpose and multiple-purpose. Of these projects, 98 are recommended for authorization at this time, under the interdepartmental agreement signed on April 11, 1949.

THIRTY-FIVE INVOLVE IRRIGATION

Of these 98 projects, 34 involve irrigation, 16 power, 34 water storage, 71 flood control, and 24 will contribute to improvement of navigation.

The irrigation projects will water 217,386 acres of new land and provide supplemental water for another 90,580 acres.

The power projects will generate 5,337,600 kilowatts.

The storage dams will hold back 21,857,500 acre-feet.

Thirteen projects are those of the Bureau of Reclamation. The others will be handled by the Army's Corps of Engineers.

Only six of the projects are costly enough to be considered big in 1950. Figured at construction costs of last December, they are:

Priest Rapids	$376,124,000
John Day	279,628,000
The Dalles	296,380,000
Libby (Jennings)	239,077,000
Hells Canyon	133,966,000
Fayette division	283,234,000

Three of these are down the Columbia from Grand Coulee Dam, where construction is just starting at Chief Joseph (Foster Creek), and McNary Dam (Umatilla Rapids) is already well along.

Libby Dam is projected at Jennings, Mont., on Kootenay River. Hells Canyon is up the Snake above Lewiston, Idaho. The Fayette division of the Mountain Home project involves both Boise and Payette Rivers in southern Idaho.

THE OTHER 312

The 312 projects covered in the comprehensive plan but placed in the deferred list for authorization includes 234 for which cost data are available based on December estimates. They run to $4,960,681,000. Call it $5,000,000,000.

Of these projects, 196 involve irrigation, 152 power, 295 storage, 180 flood control, 34 navigation, 2 drainage, and 7 domestic water supplies.

In this deferred list is an item of $17,920,000 for addition of irrigation features to the Chief Joseph Power Dam, now being started 53 miles down the Columbia from Grand Coulee.

Deferment of this conversion has caused much concern among residents of northern-central Washington. Working hard for its acceptance are the chambers of commerce from Wenatchee up the river, the Greater Wenatchee irrigation district, and the Chief Joseph Irrigation League, formed last fall at Bridgeport.

Kirby Billingsley, former managing editor of the Wenatchee World, now a part-time employee of the Columbia Basin Commission, has long been working for inclusion of the irrigation feature. The commission sent him to Washington 2 weeks ago, with instructions to work for the comprehensive plan, including the basin account provision.

[From the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash., January 24, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 3)

(By Leon Starmont)

Thomas B. Hill, assistant secretary of Washington State Development Association, has started a movement for publication, perhaps by the State Columbia Basin Commission, of an authentic history of the Big Bend project, later called the Columbia Basin project.

Such a history has been written. It is in the files of the University of Washington.

Its author is E. K. Vande Vere, chairman of the department of social science at Emmanuel Missionary College, Berrien Springs, Mich. The article was his thesis for a university degree. It is actually a history of irrigation in Washington.

SPOKANE-TO-COULEE DITCH, 1903

The idea of using Grand Coulee as a reservoir for Big Bend irrigation dates at least to 1903, according to chapter V of Vande Vere's work, entitled "The Columbia Basin Project." He credits it to T. A. Noble, a Seattle civil engineer employed in 1902 to make an investigation of what was then called the Palouse project, for the Reclamation Service.

In 1909, the manuscript continues, Joseph Jacobs, a former consulting engineer of the Reclamation Service, in contract with the Quincy Valley Water Users' association, inaugurated a preliminary survey for watering about 300,000 acres in Grant County from Lake Wenatchee, under an earlier plan suggested by David R. McGinnis, agricultural agent of the Great Northern Railroad in 1906. Its cost estimate: $12,000,000.

The Jacobs survey report, the next year considered several possible water sources, one of which was from a dam, power plant and pumping station near Priest Rapids, cost of which he figured at $75,000,000. It appears that Jacobs also had access to the earlier reports by T. A. Noble.

GRAND COULEE DAM, 1909

Because of some contradictory accounts recently in circulation, the following passage from the Vande Vere manuscript, with its inside quotation from Jacobs, is given verbatim:

"In a second plan, one that was destined to assume great importance and the credit of which was to be claimed by others at a later date, he 'considered the possibility of a lower pump lift by going to some point higher up on the river, as for instance at the head of Grand Coulee, and thence by gravity canal to the irrigable lands, but this proved too incordinately expensive.'

"His third and fourth plans he thought feasible. In these he considered two water sources, namely, the Pend Oreille River in Idaho, and Wenatchee Lake, but favored a canal heading at the lake, where the water level could be raised 150 feet by a storage dam. The cost of this construction was placed as high as $40,000,000."

The Jacobs report resulted in passage of the Quincy Valley Irrigation Act, which, subject to referendum, called for a $40,000,000 State bond issue. The voters rejected the bond issue in the fall election of 1914.

NOBLE AID STILL ON JOB

The annual reports of the United States Reclamation Service (now Bureau of Reclamation) for 1902 to 1905 carry references to several plans for irrigating the Big Bend, Coeur d'Alene, and Spokane Rivers, as well as Pend Oreille and Palouse Rivers, Lake Chelan, and Lake Wenatchee were studied and considered.

Singularly little attention was given to the Noble plan for use of Grand Coulee as a storage reservoir for a gravity canal.

His detailed draft is now in the office of the Bureau of Reclamation at Coulee Dam, Wash.

Also on the Bureau staff at Coulee Dam is a veteran engineer, C. B. Cox, who was chief assistant to Noble on the Spokane-to-Coulee ditch survey.

"It was all very hush-hush," Cox remarked. "Members of the party were not taken into the confidence of the chief. I gathered the impression that about 3,000,000 acres could be irrigated if the project became a reality but exactly where these acres were I had only a faint idea."

SAW REPORT AFTER 47 YEARS

Just why this survey was not mentioned in later reclamation reports, or in the Army's first "308" report, or in the preliminary discussions after the Columbia Basin project was revived in 1918, it is difficult now to determine. This reporter, who started following Columbia Basin developments in 1918 and writing about them in 1920, did not know of the existence of the Noble survey until early in 1950.

"Maybe," said a Bureau executive at Coulee Dam, "you just didn't ask the right questions then."

Neither did anybody else.

C. B. Cox himself had not seen the Noble report until a few weeks ago, nearly 47 years after the survey was made and the report written.

The actual map started at Lake Coeur d'Alene, and comprised 20 separate sheets, which would make a map 30 feet long. At Coulee Dam last week he made up a map on a smaller scale, part of which is reproduced on the Spokesman-Review's back page of pictures today.

The survey was 160 miles, following the left bank of the Spokane River from the Monroe Street bridge to old Fort Spokane, thence down the Columbia's left bank. Tunnels cut the ditch total to about 130 miles.

Tennessee Walking Horse

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT SUTTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted today to advise the House that the United States Department of Agriculture in a letter to me dated February 1, 1950, has recognized the Tennessee walking horse as a distinct and standard breed.

Since 1935 the Tennessee Walking Horse Breeder's Association has been diligent in their efforts to establish this specific breed, the greatest of all pleasure and plantation horses, recognized in Farmers' Bulletin No. 952. The people of the great Volunteer State of Tennessee and the numerous breeders of the Tennessee walking horse in America, will welcome this news as a recognition that is long overdue.

For the benefit of those who are not familiar with the history of the Tennessee walking horse, I am inserting the material which will go into the farmers' bulletin above-mentioned.

To the horse lovers of America the Tennessee walking horse will be recognized as a strain of horse blue blood. He is not only noted for his easy and cradle-like gait, but likewise his gentleness, poise, confirmation, and loving disposition. The sire of the walking horse belongs to Tennessee. The dam of the walking horse belongs to Tennessee. Tennessee has given this useful and beautiful horse its name and Colonel Tennessee is now happy to share his equine with his neighbors and horsemen throughout the world.

[Farmers' Bulletin No. 952]

The Tennessee walking horse originated and was developed within the middle basin of Tennessee. Allan F-1 (7623 A. T. R.) is designated the foundation sire of the breed, and has been recognized as such by the Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association of America. These horses trace their blood lines back to the thoroughbred, and the standard bred, and the Morgan, and the American saddle horse.

Melted in the crucible of time the breed today has become distinct and is an entity of its own. It undoubtedly came about through a crossing of the thoroughbred with the sturdy stock of saddle horses which the Virginians brought across the mountains in early pioneer days, and through an admixture with the pacer. To this was added the blood of Morgan and the saddle breed.

Thus, throughout a century and more of meticulous breeding, the Tennessee walking horse has emerged as a distinct breed. The Tennessee walking horse averages around 15½ hands in height and will weigh from 1,000 to 1,200 pounds. In color they are sorrel, chestnut, black, roan, white, bay, brown, gray, and sometimes yellow.

In general conformation the Tennessee walking horse has an intelligent and neat head, well-shaped and pointed ears, good big bright eyes, and tapered muzzle. They are short in the back, deep in the body, and well ribbed. Full in the flanks and of good proportion and width in chest. Their necks are long and graceful and are set on well-muscled shoulders that are sloping. They have flat cordy legs and feet of ample size. Their hides are thin, hair is soft and silky, and their bone is smooth, dense, and hard.

The Tennessee walking horse, like all other breeds, has been bred pure for a purpose. This purpose in the beginning and in the early days of the Volunteer State was for utility.

Today, however, they have won recognition on the bridle path and in the show arenas of all sections of the country.

The three gaits of the Tennessee walking horse are all natural gifts. They are called the flat-foot walk, the running walk, and the canter. The running walk has a smooth and gentle spring of limbs, and is where the Tennessee walking horse does his famous nod of the head as he goes along. He sometimes swings his ears and snaps his teeth while in this rhythmatic movement.

Tennessee walking horses are now stabled and are being bred in practically every State in the Union.

The Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association records purebred animals of this breed. Nine volumes of the stud book have been issued and more than 40,000 have been recorded. Miss Syd Houston, Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association of America Building, Lewisburg, Tenn., is secretary of the association.

Investigation of Texas Medical Association

REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN REGAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, our country rightfully points with pride to being the healthiest nation in the world.

Our medical profession has been outstanding in research and untiring in its efforts through the recent decades in bringing about this condition, which has relieved our people of many former fatal and frequent outbreaks of smallpox, yellow fever, influenza, typhoid fever, and the many other epidemics that once decimated our people, until today we are enjoying longevity of three score years and ten that was a rare exception 50 years ago.

For the past few years, Mr. Speaker, our entire medical profession have been faced with the increasing clamor of those in our midst who, while being fortunate in sharing the freedom of our country and the many benefits and blessings that our citizenship is privileged to enjoy, are now seeking an ever-increasing service from our Government without giving anything in return, including the so-called socialized-medicine proposal that would regiment our entire medical profession.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the El Paso Medical Society of El Paso, Tex., through its president and secretary, that the Texas Medical Association is undergoing some type of investigation by the FBI for alleged antitrust violations, and it is the apparent belief of many highly respected members of the medical profession that a political effort is being made to beat down opposition by the Nation's physicians to the so-called socialized-medicine proposals, to which I am thoroughly opposed as being against the welfare of our people, un-American, and a step toward the socialization of our country, which has become the greatest Nation in the world through its safeguards of freedom of our people, who in addition to their rights of freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and the many other protective provisions of individual rights, have the further freedom of selecting their own doctors, dentists, or specialists without Government interference or dictation.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the FBI who have earned, and continue to merit the respect of our people, would not lend themselves or their fine reputation to a cheap political program such as many good members of the deservedly honored medical profession have some reason to suspect.

I wish to include with these few remarks the full text of a resolution recently furnished me to which I referred to above.

The resolution:

Whereas El Paso newspaper stories report that the Texas Medical Association is currently under investigation by the FBI for antitrust violations; and

Whereas more than 20 such investigations of National and State medical societies have occurred in recent weeks; and

Whereas these investigations are no coincidence but rather a political effort to beat down opposition by the Nation's physicians to socialized medicine; and

Whereas such tactics are strongly opposed by El Paso County Medical Society as un-Texan, and un-American, and tending dangerously toward totalitarianism and police-state methods: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That El Paso County Medical Society herewith protests the current investigation of the Texas Medical Association and so informs the elected Senators of Texas and the Representative of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Texas.

RALPH H. HOMAN, M. D.,
President.

JOE R. FLOYD, M. D.,
Secretary.

World Health Organization

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, permit me at this time to speak in behalf of the World Health Organization, commonly known as WHO. It is a young organization. It has only existed since September 1, 1948. It began with 50 nations, now its membership consists of 64 nations. In its short period of existence it has already showed good results, and therefore certainly worthy of continuation and expansion.

The forward-looking aspect of its program is and has been in the field of technical assistance the value of which has been firmly established by the League of Nations.

The President, in his inaugural address, visualized the importance of small expanded programs, and recommended a supplementary operating program to extend the phase of the WHO to a point that it can meet the most urgent demands particularly in the underdeveloped areas.

The first WHO assembly took place in Geneva in 1948. The second was held in the Palazzo Venezia in Rome on June 13 and lasted until July 3, 1949. I had the pleasure of being there as a congressional adviser. I was very much elated of the sincerity and the great ability that our delegation exercised and the high respect that was shown to them by the many other organizations. Our delegation was looked upon as the best assembled. It was headed by Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, our surgeon general. Dr. H. van Zile Hyde also played an important part. In fact every member of the United States delegation is a well-known technical expert with great administrative experience. They were just wonderful; they worked in unison and earned the respect of all present. Mr. Speaker, permit me at this time to congratulate them on their splendid work.

The WHO has a broad program which is divided into short and long terms. It realizes the necessity of establishing effective relations and close collaboration with the United Nations and other existing governmental organizations. It also realizes the advantages from cooperating with the existing health facilities of the countries in which help is to be given.

It strives to develop in those areas that are deficient in their health personnel, educational facilities that would tend to make them more efficient. This WHO tends to create a feeling among nations, of betterment to their citizenry, by not only making them a more healthful nation but indirectly a more productive one. In doing this, let us not forget, that by helping them we indirectly help ourselves. One only has to learn of the large sums of money that are expended at present to prevent disease from entering our shores, and how much easier and cheaper it is to eradicate it at its source.

This holds true for many of the communicable diseases, whether the carrier be flies, mosquitoes, insects, vermin, person, or poor hygienic and sanitary conditions. Certainly, personal contacts should be more easily eradicated and finally eliminated, provided there is full international cooperation. Let us, for example, consider syphilis, its relationship to industry, production, loss of manpower and costs. Do you know that according to the Beerman report of 1940, the cost of syphilis in labor lost in industry — man-hours alone — approaches $100,000,000 yearly in the United States of America. Also the cost of national curative program in the United States was estimated at from twelve to twenty-five million dollars per year and the cost of blindness from syphilis at $10,000,000 per year.

Only by international teamwork operating under international health regulations for venereal disease together with the ILO can one expect some degree of success, and only through stringent international controls can one expect results that would cause a reduction in the number of and perhaps eliminate reservoirs of venereal infections.

One only has to look at the report of Maj. Gen. Raymond W. Bliss, Surgeon General of the United States Army, and in his address in June 1949, in which he stated:

> The primary mission of any public health and welfare program in an occupied country is to improve medical, sanitary, and social conditions.

This, I may say, holds true as well as for unoccupied countries. The general then goes on and tell us what can be done to improve civilian public health by means of an aggressive and cooperative program. Let me quote from his recent address:

> An organization to handle the anticipated public health and welfare problems in Japan was formulated tentatively in Washington, D. C., even before the Japanese surrender. Japanese standards of public health and sanitation, although better than in many underdeveloped countries, were far below those of some of the more modern progressive nations. Smallpox had been on the increase since 1938 and the existing immunization law had not been enforced by the Japanese Government. In 1946 there were 17,800 cases of smallpox. During the following year, the entire 75,000,000 inhabitants were vaccinated or revaccinated, with the result that only 29 cases of smallpox occurred in 1948.
>
> An outbreak of cholera in 1946, when there were 1,229 cases, was cleaned up effectively through cholera immunization of about 34,000,000 persons and through use of stringent measures for isolation, quarantine, and disinfection in areas where the outbreaks occurred. At present there is no cholera in Japan.
>
> An epidemic of typhus fever in the fall of 1945 resulting in a total of 31,141 cases by the spring of 1946, was broken after about 40,000,000 persons were dusted with DDT and over 5,000,000 were vaccinated. From a mean morbidity rate of 41 cases per 100,000 of population for 1946 and a peak of nearly 147 cases per 100,000 in April of that year, typhus fever had dropped to a mean of less than one case per 100,000 during 1948.
>
> A large-scale diphtheria-immunization program for children has resulted in marked reduction in the incidence of diphtheria, also, with a decrease of 73 percent below the average for the 1936-45 period and a decrease of 83 percent in the present morbidity rate as compared with 1945.
>
> To control and prevent outbreaks of dysentery, typhoid fever, malaria, and other diseases, Nation-wide health education and sanitation programs have been conducted. Over 9,000 sanitary teams of 6 men per team, or a total of 54,000 persons, were trained and equipped in the spring of 1946 for environmental sanitation programs including insect and rodent control, education of the people to make them sanitation conscious, and so forth. The control program has involved improvement of water supplies, installation or repair of sanitary facilities and sewerage systems, and education of Japanese health officials as well as the general public in the importance of control measures.
>
> Tuberculosis has always been prevalent in Japan and the leading cause of death there since 1934. A broad tuberculosis prevention and control program inaugurated in October 1946, resulted in a reduction in the tuberculosis death rate from 280 per 100,000 of population in 1945 to 180 per 100,000 in 1948. Mass chest X-raying of small school children, factory workers, and others; tuberculin testing and the vaccination of over 23,000,000 persons with BCG; education of the medical and nursing professions in diagnosis, treatment and care; return of active tuberculosis cases to hospitals under a reorganized program as well as inauguration of a school-lunch program with a more adequate diet for children as a means of resistance to infection have been integral parts of the tuberculosis program.

I may say that similar work was carried on in other countries of the world, particularly as to the detection and the checking of tuberculosis, the antimalarial program in Italy and Greece, and the cholera program in Egypt. From the results already obtained one cannot help to realize the importance of WHO.

Since we are a part of this world's civilization, it becomes the duty of all of us to do all we can, personally and collectively as a Nation, to help our fellowmen, yes, human civilization. Let us not forget that in helping them we help ourselves.

The authorization calling for the continuance of the WHO is small enough in comparison to the work required to obtain the desired results. Let us not forget that this authorization is a part of House Joint Resolution 336. It should pass unanimously for it attempts to make the world a better place to live in.

Poultry Raising $48,000,000 Connecticut Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, several days of Connecticut Poultry Week are still before us, the celebration having been set for January 30 to February 5. Poultry raising throughout Connecticut, my district, is an important industry, annually aggregating $48,000,000. Emphasizing its importance to the people of the Constitution State and to its neighbors everywhere, an article in the Bridgeport Sunday Post of January 29 gives more detail regarding this celebration, the industry and the programs for the week. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the newspaper article be reprinted here, but before that, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues will recall the centennial of the American poultry industry stamp which was issued at New Haven, Conn., in September 1948 as a result of Public Law 621 which I had sponsored. That stamp commemorated the devoted efforts for 100 years of men and women, poultry raisers to an agricultural industry that annually approaches $4,000,000,000 in the United States. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I am told, the total sale of this outstanding stamp exceeded all but one of the commemorative stamps issued in 1948.

POULTRY RAISING $48,000,000 CONNECTICUT INDUSTRY—CHICKENS, EGGS MAJOR PRODUCTS OF STATE FARMS

The $48,000,000 Connecticut poultry industry will celebrate Connecticut Poultry Week January 30 to February 5. According to Arthur Guzman of Vernon, vice president of the State poultry association, "poultry week is an effort on the part of the industry to acquaint the people of Connecticut with the importance of poultry in our State economy and with the superior quality of poultry and eggs raised right here in Connecticut."

PRODUCERS FOR NEW YORK

More than $26,000,000 worth of eggs and $20,000,000 of chickens are marketed each year by Connecticut farmers. Though much of it is consumed within the State, Connecticut is the largest shipper of live poultry to the New York market. About 2,000,000 pounds of fowl, broilers, fryers, and pullets are shipped each month to New York and usually command better prices than poultry from other areas.

New London and Windham Counties are known as the eastern Connecticut broiler area. As many as 226,000 baby chicks are placed on farms each week in that area alone. Most of these will be marketed in about 13 weeks as broilers or fryers. The tremendous growth of this business has rehabilitated certain areas unsuited for other types of agriculture.

The increased production of chickens and eggs in Connecticut as well as in other parts of the country has resulted in overproduction and below cost of production prices on the farm. Connecticut farmers through Connecticut Poultry Week bring to the attention of housewives everywhere that both poultry and eggs are selling at the lowest prices since before the war.

POULTRYMEN MEET TUESDAY

Several hundred poultry farmers will attend the annual meeting of the Connecticut Poultry Association at the Hotel Bond, Hartford, on Tuesday, according to George Wells of New Milford, president.

The program, starting at 10 a. m., will feature talks on many of the pressing problems that confront the Connecticut poultryman today. Walter Berger, president, American Feed Manufacturers Association, Chicago, will speak on Where Do We Go From Here on Poultry Feed Price and Supply? Poultry-disease problems will be thoroughly aired by Dr. Nelson Waters, East Lansing, Mich., Dr. Erwin Jungherr, Storrs, and Dr. R. K. Cole of Cornell University. Other speakers will be professor W. C. Skogland, University of Delaware, Dr. H. R. Bird, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., and Homer I. Huntington, Poultry and Egg National Board, Chicago.

A banquet, featuring Connecticut fried chicken, will be held in the evening. Dr. Earl Butz of Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., nationally known speaker, will have as his subject Prince or Pauper. The 25 voice Beethoven Glee Club of Manchester will provide entertainment.

Hidden Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am glad to bring to the attention of the membership of the House an example of how unfair excise taxes are. In my opinion, many articles covered by these taxes cannot be considered luxuries. I shall continue to exert every effort to bring about a more equitable classification of excise taxes. Below you will find an illustration showing the effect of hidden excise taxes on the price the consumer pays for gas and electric ranges:

Without excise tax:	
Manufacturer's selling price (average)	$100.00
Retail price (40-percent markup)	166.66
With excise tax:	
Manufacturer's selling price	100.00
Excise tax (10 percent)	10.00
Dealer cost	110.00
Retail price (40 percent markup)	183.33
Consumer cost with excise	183.33
Consumer cost without excise	166.66
Extra cost to consumer	16.67

Thus on production: 150,000 units per year, the consumer public pays ($16.67 times 150,000) $2,500,500 more than necessary, out of which the Federal Government receives $1,500,000 in excise taxes which are collected at no charge.

When expanded to national production (2,000,000 gas ranges plus 1,500,000 electric ranges total 3,500,000 units) the consuming public pay $58,335,000 extra for these products and the Government collects $35,000,000 in taxes.

John L. Lewis

REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the village of Cedar Springs, Mich., is about 20 miles north of Grand Rapids. A fine weekly newspaper is published in that community by two very able journalists, Miss Nina Babcock and Miss Grace Hamilton. Recently Miss Babcock wrote a letter, a public editorial if you please, to John L. Lewis, and with your permission I will read it to the Members of the House. The letter is as follows:

AS THE WORLD WAGS

CEDAR SPRINGS, MICH.,
January 24, 1950.

DEAR JOHN L.: I ran afoul of the law recently. I disobeyed a traffic ordinance. The cop caught me at it. He gave me a ticket and I paid a fine. I tried to argue a little. (You know how that goes.) But even for too much lip we little folks often pay heavily. It was evident I had no leg to stand on. There was a law, you know—made for the general welfare, as all laws are supposed to be—and I was an offender. I knew I was wrong, and anyone familiar with the incident knew I was wrong.

It didn't take more than 30 minutes for me to be showed up as a law evader, and as a person who selfishly thought my own interests were more important than the general welfare.

No politics was involved. I had no pull. I'm only a country editor, running a weekly newspaper. I don't control the vote of the some 9,000 people who read my paper. (Some borrow it, some steal it, but they all read it.) The big boys don't even know I exist. Harry doesn't know me, even though we are both native Missourians and were born and reared only a few miles apart in the "Show Me" State. He doesn't know my newspaper, the Cedar Springs Clipper, but I wish he read it every week.

I've been reared and schooled to know that the laws of this land are the laws by which I must live, and that the welfare of the whole people is paramount to my own selfish desires. My more than 13 generations of forefathers in this land believed that, and it has seeped into my blood.

Now, Mr. Lewis, I'm in a mental quandary. And I find that many of my neighbors are in the same mental state. I am scared about this country of ours. I'm scared when the votes of men are more important than the welfare of the land. I'm not too bright about politics, but it is plain that getting votes is controlling Washington and the men elected to look after the welfare of all of us. You probably know more about this than anyone else, but you might not want to divulge political secrets. I've found that it's pretty hard to get dependable statements from politicians.

Here I've rambled on and on, and haven't come to the matter I intended to talk to you about. We haven't any coal in our newspaper plant. We've been cold here since last Thursday. We had to close our office over the week end. You see, we tried to conserve the little coal we had so we could get The Clipper out this week. Our folk expect The Clipper every Thursday, and we have an obligation to our community. We've worked in a cold shop all week. If it weren't for our red flannels we'd be frozen now.

Here I am again off the track, talking about red flannels.

The question is: How can you jeopardize the welfare of so many people? How can you break laws without punishment? How long is this great United States going to give you a free rein to trample on us? How long are you going to be able to evade the Taft-Hartley law? When are we going to get coal?

When are you going to get your ticket?

NINA E. BABCOCK.

Is the Kremlin's Aim Conquest of the U. S. A.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given on the Town Meeting of the Air program, January 17, 1950:

Ten years ago some of us who had lived under the Japanese conquest in China tried to convince our Government and the American people that Japan's real aim was a program of conquest which required the defeat of the United States. We failed, and Pearl Harbor became inevitable. My concern now is that we not make again the same tragic mistake we made 10 years ago. For I am convinced by both the declarations of Communist leaders and the unmistakable pattern of their actions that the ultimate aim of the masters of the Kremlin is—yes, must be—conquest of the United States.

The methods they use are not those of the past—like Hitler's legions marching openly across a nation's border. Their more clever and successful techniques seek to weaken a nation until their agents and followers can seize control from within. That, of course, is aggression.

Moreover, the Kremlin is already well on its way toward achieving this goal. It has gained control of half the land and one-third of the people of the world and their program is steam-rolling in high gear.

What would you do if you were a member of the Politburo, without moral principles, without conscience, without scruples, and embarked on a great program of expansion? Wouldn't you have to make your aim destruction of the one thing standing between you and complete victory—the free government of the United States of America?

How would you go about achieving that aim? Surely the same way the Kremlin has. You would try to soften up and isolate the United States by undermining its friends and shaking their confidence in its Government, cutting off our trade, and forcing us either, as Lenin put it, to spend ourselves into bankruptcy to help our allies stay free; or to let them be taken over, one by one, by this new type of aggression, internal conspiracy, and we thus be left standing alone. That is precisely the pattern the Soviets have followed.

When after the war they tried directly to get control of all of Germany and then western Europe, we were intelligent and forceful enough to prevent it. When they moved against the Middle East, Greece and the Mediterranean, we were vigilant enough to recognize that as a skillful attempt to turn the flank of our roadblock in Germany, and we stopped that move also.

But our State Department has not been alert enough to recognize Communist aggression in China and Asia as merely a wider flanking attack—aimed ultimately at Europe and then at ourselves.

The Chinese understood and resisted. But now, abandoned by us, free China is on the ropes. As a result the Communists feel strong enough to seize American consular property in Peking in order to eliminate all American and pro-western influence in China and completely pull the iron curtain down.

What reason is there to believe the Kremlin's next steps into southeast Asia will falter or fail? If deprived of access to the resources and markets of Asia, how can Europe recover? Where would that leave the United States?

Yes, the pattern of Soviet expansion in our direction is clear; the pronouncements of their leaders are equally clear.

A recent example is the message which Mao Tse-tung, head of the Chinese Communist regime, broadcast last October to Chairman William Z. Foster and other Communist officials in the United States. We have been led by the State Department and by pro-Communist propagandists in this country to believe that Communist aggression in China is merely a struggle to overthrow the allegedly feudalistic, landlord,

[illegible] government of China. But the Communists know better. Mr. Mao didn't even bother to mention Chiang Kai-shek. Rather, he said, "It is the present imperialistic government of the United States which * * * has met with decisive defeat."

How can conquest of China mean decisive defeat for us? Because it produces a drastic shift in the balance of power in the world—for the Soviets and against us.

For there are four main factors which determine power: Territory, resources, manpower, productive capacity.

If Asia falls under Communist control, the Kremlin will have gained preponderance in territory, resources, and manpower. The Russians have demonstrated by constructing the atomic bomb that they can gradually overtake us where we now lead—technical skills. But how can we ever overtake them where they will lead—in territory, resources, and manpower? Time is not on our side.

Yet, our Government still plays the diplomatic game of striped pants. We don't act—we just react. We are reduced to hoping that the Kremlin will make enough blunders in China and elsewhere to save us from our own blunders. That is too risky a policy—or no policy.

Unless there is a change of policy promptly, all Asia will be lost. Then the Middle East and Europe will be in mortal peril. Then we will have world war III—or loss the United States, or both.

Actually all this can still be prevented and we certainly need not have a shooting war, if only we will stir from our slumbers in time. We are in danger only if we fail, one, to understand the nature and the objectives of the enemy we face, and, two, to mobilize quickly and fully all the forces of freedom everywhere.

Fair Trade in Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a most comprehensive letter from Mr. H. V. Simpson, executive vice president of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association.

As the chase of recovery continues, it is well for us seriously to study the problems of our great industries. We want competition in commerce—domestic and world. We cannot have it if, by sins of omission or commission, we grant special concessions to anyone in any way.

WEST COAST LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Portland, Oreg., January 25, 1950.

The Honorable WALT HORAN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HORAN: The largest industry in western Washington and western Oregon is the forest products industry. The value of forest products from this area greatly exceeds that of any other industry and exceeds the value of the products of agriculture. In a large measure the economic welfare of the region depends on the welfare of its forest industries. Forest products provide the largest pay rolls, by far the largest inflow of money from other sections of the United States, the principal cargo for both rail and ocean carriers, and the principal source of taxation.

The welfare of the forest products industries should be the concern of every resident of the area. It directly or indirectly affects the lives of all who are residents of the territory and serious difficulty affecting the industry will seriously affect all those who reside in the territory.

The largest and most important segment of the forest products industry is lumber. This association represents the majority of the lumber production in this territory in many activities. It is one of the responsibilities of this association to represent the industry in foreign trade, both imports and exports.

We are presently concerned with the increasing volume of imports of lumber from western British Columbia, Canada. Lumber produced in that region is of the same species as that produced in western Oregon and western Washington, manufactured in similar plants under similar conditions. The one major difference is in the wage scale. The base wage (minimum) in Oregon and western Washington is $1.45 per hour. In western British Columbia the base wage is $1.07½ per hour. The American labor cost of lumber production is therefore about 35 percent greater than is the Canadian labor cost. In nearly all markets British Columbia lumber is in direct competition with Oregon and Washington lumber. On the basis of wage costs alone most Canadian mills can undersell most American mills and have frequently done so.

Last summer the Canadian Government fixed the exchange rate on the Canadian dollar at 90 cents. One Canadian dollar is now worth 90 cents in American money. To the lumber industry this means that Canadian sawmills can sell their product in the United States, or any other world market where American dollars are available, at the current market price in American dollars and receive a net return at the mill 10 percent greater than can an American mill selling at the same market price. As an example, when common lumber is selling in New York for $60 (freight charges eliminated) the Canadian receives $60 (American) plus 10 percent or $66 (Canadian) net to the mill. Competing American mills receive $60 only.

Large quantities of western British Columbia's lumber are shipped by water from their ports to American Atlantic coast ports, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and others. Largely such shipments are made on tramp steamers of various foreign nationalities. Under the provisions of the Transportation Act of 1920 and amendments thereto shipments of lumber from Oregon and Washington ports to other American ports must be made in ships of American registry. Costs of operations of American ships are substantially higher than costs of operation of any foreign ships, principally due to the much higher wages paid by American shipowners. Freight rates on American ships are therefore nearly always higher than those applying on foreign ships. In recent months the rates on lumber on tramp steamers from British Columbia to the United States Atlantic coast have been $4 to $8 per thousand feet less than rates available from American ports to the same destinations. These freight savings accrue to the advantage of sawmills in British Columbia, giving them that much additional competitive advantage in that market.

Freight on shipments of lumber by rail and by water from Oregon and Washington to any point within the United States are subject to the 3-percent transportation tax. Lumber shipments from Canada are not subject to this tax. Under the terms of the Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1932 most lumber imports into the United States were subject to a $3 per thousand excise tax and a $1 per thousand duty. At the same time, under the Ottawa agreements most American lumber exports to the United Kingdom were subject to a 10-percent ad valorem duty, which duty did not apply on shipments into the United Kingdom from Canada. Other parts of the British Empire had varying duties on American lumber which likewise did not apply on Canadian shipments. Under provisions of the reciprocal trade treaties the duty and excise tax applicable to lumber imports into the United States have twice been reduced until it is now 75 cents per thousand excise tax and 25 cents per thousand duty.

At the same time reductions were made in the various duties on American lumber into the British Empire until under today's conditions, duties are not an influencing factor in much of our export business. And certainly the remaining duty and tax of $1 on Canadian imports is so small that its influence is negligible in view of the other substantial advantages enjoyed by British Columbia shippers. At the present time the American duty and excise tax gives not the slightest effective protection to American producers.

Fortunately, the American lumber market has recently been good. The effects of the Canadian advantage have not yet been fully felt. But no one in the industry doubts that the danger is present and the effects will eventually be sharply felt. At the first slackening of demand British Columbia shippers will drop prices until they can secure whatever business they need. Their total production will remain high even if it means that Oregon and Washington production will decline.

As an example in 1948 the lumber market was erratic. Oregon and Washington mills were just able to hold their shipments to the 1947 level; actually, three one-hundredths of 1 percent increase. During that year imports from western British Columbia into the United States increased 355,503,000 board measure or 255 percent. This 355,503,000 feet was valued at about $16,000,000 which was business lost to the American mills with $8,000,000 in direct pay rolls lost to American labor.

We now have another example of the Canadian mills' ability to underquote. Britain's purchase of lumber just completed went eighty-two million to British Columbia, five million to Oregon and Washington. British Columbia mills underquoted American mills on 95 percent of the business. Yet because of Canada's discounted dollar British Columbia mills will receive more in Canadian dollars per thousand feet board measure net than the American mills quoted in American dollars. This purchase was made with American dollars supplied by ECA. American mills got $200,000 in business of which American labor will get $100,000. Canadian mills got $3,800,000 of which Canadian labor will get $1,900,000.

Canadian mills, taking advantage of ocean freight savings, savings on transportation tax and their discounted dollar have sharply increased their shipments by water to the United States Atlantic Coast. Since the war the record is as follows:

Lumber shipment by water to United States Atlantic coast ports[1]

Year	From Oregon-Washington	From British Columbia
1945	16,673,759	
1946	317,261,068	
1947	478,274,306	
1948	532,724,033	98,071,921
1949—January	33,933,956	12,867,983
February	32,148,348	9,698,982
March	105,457,963	17,222,257
April	91,516,750	23,815,149
May	73,018,492	13,798,798
June	98,926,710	9,821,229
July	64,220,723	6,746,534
August	80,939,511	16,026,514
September	90,010,603	20,478,374
October	99,258,985	41,000,201
November	99,610,720	58,234,161
December (estimated)	105,338,987	67,925,939
Total 1949	1,021,391,929	303,325,439

[1] As compiled by the Pacific Lumber Inspection Bureau, Seattle, Wash.

It is our opinion that the United States Atlantic coast market will not continue to use the quantity of lumber currently moving and that British Columbia shippers will at the first drop in demand make every effort to hold their volume at the expense of the American mills. They will ship it on foreign ships at the expense of the American merchant marine.

Under present coditions British Columbia mills can drop their delivered price to the Atlantic coast about $10.60 per thousand and still net the same f. o. b. mill price in Canadian dollars that American mills are today netting in American dollars; that is, for example:

Freight savings	$6.00
Transportation tax	.60
Exchange	5.00
	11.60
Less duty	1.00
Total	10.60

American mills would have to drop their f. o. b. mill prices a disastrous $10.60 in order to compete. And Canadian mills, with their substantially lower wage costs, can in addition reduce f. o. b. prices to a level which would ruin the Oregon-Washington lumber industry.

In 1949 British Columbia mills received approximately US$14,000,000 on shipments to the Atlantic coast of which $7,000,000 went for direct labor. This is business lost to American mills and wages lost to American workmen. In addition approximately $2,500,000 was lost to American ship owners for freight of which $1,075,000 was for labor. This was business lost to American shipping and wages lost to American maritime workers.

We know nothing we can do as an industry about the Canadian wage rate. We doubt also that the Congress can do anything about it. We know of nothing we can do as an industry about the discount on the Canadian dollar and possibly the Congress is also unable to directly do anything about it. We know of nothing we can do as an industry about the transportation tax, the American duties, or the freight differentials. The Congress can take action on these.

These problems have been given much thought by members of our industry. Our concern over them is great. On our many discussions these suggestions have been made.

A limiting quota might be put on lumber imports into the United States of America. An equalizing tax on ocean freight might be placed on imports of lumber. Duties might be increased. Restrictive antidumping laws might be passed. FHA might require that all lumber used in FHA-financed houses be made in the United States. ECA lumber purchases might be restricted to American production. And certainly the transportation tax can be removed.

The lumber industry has so far as possible attempted to solve its own problems. These present difficulties seem however beyond our range of influence. Yet they are certain to endanger the well-being of our industry and with it the well-being of our labor and our communities. We therefore feel we should tell you of our great concern and ask for your suggestions as to possible remedies. We will gladly supply any additional information that may be required and the writer will if advisable proceed to Washington for a full discussion of the problem.

A similar letter is being written to each Member of Congress from Oregon and Washington.

Yours truly,

H. V. SIMPSON,
Executive Vice President.

Georgia Legislature Repudiates Resolution of 1946 Approving Principles of World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is a significant fact that the legislature in Georgia revoked and repudiated the action it took in 1946 approving the principles of world federation. This should be notice to all Members of this House to scrutinize the purposes behind Resolution 64 and others now pending.

Mr. Speaker, all the great patriotic organizations have spoken out against this resolution, and as part of my remarks, I am including a letter from the national society, Daughters of the American Revolution, on the subject of the resolution in question. It is opposed absolutely to any action by the Congress which might involve the United States in a world government.

Also, as part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am including a copy of the resolution adopted by the Georgia Legislature:

NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS
OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
NATIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., January 28, 1950.

HONORABLE MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The action of the legislature of the great State of Georgia in rescinding its 1946 resolution favoring world government is indicative of the will of the people to follow the advice of our first great President, George Washington.

Entanglements proposed by any and all world government advocates will subordinate the sovereignty of the United States and will pull it down to the lowest common denominator of small nations who for ages have hated one another and who are not yet quite ready for a one world government.

Patriotically yours,

ESTELLA A. O'BYRNE,
President General, NSDAR.
LOLA LEE BRUNGTON,
Secretary, Defense Committee.

GEORGIA RESOLUTION

Whereas the General Assembly of Georgia passed a resolution at the 1946 session of the general assembly approving the principles of world federation; and

Whereas due to changing conditions it is best that Georgia be not considered as one of the 22 States seeking world government; and

Whereas the principles announced in the declaration of the federation of the world as set out in said 1946 resolution are not approved by the general assembly; and

Whereas a copy of said 1946 resolution was sent to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Georgia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That said resolution of 1946 be now repudiated and that the General Assembly of Georgia go on record as opposing the principles of world federation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Georgia.

Passed in Atlanta, Ga., January 1950: Georgia House of Representatives, unanimously; Georgia Senate, 34 to 8.

The Brooklyn Eagle on Mr. Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of Monday, January 30:

UNWISE TO DISCREDIT ACHESON FOR INDISCRETION ON HISS

The Republican Party has apparently found in the policies and the somewhat unfortunate utterances of Secretary of State Acheson acceptable material for political capital. Before they go far with their obvious purpose of trying to discredit Mr. Acheson in the eyes of the American people they should give thoughtful consideration to the political consequences of their attack, and also to its international implications. It is conceivable that the reaction in both instances may be harmful.

Regardless of the violence with which he is being assailed by Republicans in Congress, and the strange reluctance of Democrats to come to his defense, Secretary Acheson's policies with respect to China and Spain reflect practical wisdom and courage. It is significant that informed opinion generally is coming to recognize both the futility and the danger of our deepened involvement in the lost cause of the Chinese Nationalists. They have shown themselves through the years as unworthy of the confidence of their own people and of help from outside. The administration's willingness to restore diplomatic relations with Franco's Spain is a retreat from a policy which, Mr. Acheson frankly concedes, has failed. Nothing is to be gained and advantages may be lost by continuing it.

Unquestionably, Mr. Acheson has played into the hands of his political enemies by reiterating his support of Alger Hiss, the former official of the State Department who is under a sentence of 5 years for perjury. Although there is reason to admire his loyalty to a friend, his discretion must be questioned for taking a position which implicitly expresses lack of confidence in the Government which prosecuted Hiss and the court and jury which passed judgment upon him. There is good reason to criticize Mr. Acheson's utterance but not to make it a political issue.

The loyalty of Mr. Acheson is not open to question. His conduct of foreign relations and his general administration of his office have been marked consistently by sound judgment and fine ability. Yet Republicans in Congress are raising a cry for his resignation.

A logical consequence of this aggressive movement against Secretary of State Acheson is a partisan assault upon the administration's foreign policy. This possibility is cause for deep concern among the American people. It might well be the beginning of a national disunity which would give infinite comfort to the Kremlin and to Communists at home.

The Legislative Program of the Democratic Party in the New York State Legislature for 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Democratic leaders of the New York State Legislature, the Honorable Irwin Steingut, of the assembly, and the Honorable Elmer F. Quinn, of the senate, on January 29, 1950, announced a most carefully thought out legislative program for the great Empire State. Because of its intelligent and enlightened approach to such pressing problems of government as civil rights, housing, rent control, education, agriculture, and other all-important subjects, I believe this statement to be worthy of the careful consideration of my colleagues in the House. I unhesitatingly commend it to you.

The text of the article follows:

THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN THE NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE FOR 1950

Following weeks of intensive study of recommendations made at the legislative hearings sponsored by the Democratic Party in December in New York City, Senator Elmer F. Quinn and Assemblyman Irwin Steingut, Democratic legislative leaders, announced today the party's full 1950 program.

Much of the program has already been implemented by legislation, including the proposal for a $200,000,000 bond issue for State aid for school construction. The remainder will be submitted to the legislature in the next few days.

"This is one of the most carefully thought out programs ever submitted to the legislature of this State for consideration. It is the fruit of considerable research, effort, and study on the part of hundreds of our citizens," the two legislative leaders declared.

"Paul E. Fitzpatrick, the State chairman, deserves the particular gratitude of all citizens of this State for initiating the nonpartisan public legislative hearings in December. More than 100 organizations representing the major social forces within our State proposed more than 1,000 recommendations at these hearings.

"The program that we are submitting to this legislature is the culmination of the recommendations made at these hearings. It expresses the wishes of the people of this State and should have the most careful consideration of this legislature."

The program includes recommendations on many matters of concern to the people, including problems of the aged, agriculture, child welfare, civil rights, education, hospitals, health, housing, labor, legislative reform, mental health, protection of small investors, rent control, social welfare, and veterans.

The program, in full, follows:

AGRICULTURE

We favor:

1. Enhancement and encouragement of cooperative associations among farmers.

2. An immediate report on the progress of the investigation of the milk price spread sponsored by the New York State Temporary Commission on Agriculture.

3. A more adequate milk weighing and butterfat testing program for dairymen. We suggest that activities with regard to weighing and testing in markets with Federal and State orders be delegated to the administrators of these orders, and that the State staff be used among producers not covered by minimum price orders.

4. The relaxation of agriculture and market law B358 relative to restricting the licensing of new milk enterprises.

5. Extension of the principles of the minimum price orders to include producers in upstate markets.

6. Immediate reestablishment of a full-scale agricultural and industrial fair at Syracuse.

7. Completion of rural electrification undertaken by the Federal Government under Democratic administration.

8. Increased State aid to rural schools.

9. Increased State aid for health and hospitalization in agricultural counties.

CIVIL RIGHTS

We favor:

1. Prohibition or forfeiture of any benefits to private housing developments with restrictions of occupancy because of race, color, or creed.

2. The outlawing of restrictive covenants on real estate.

3. A genuine end of segregation in the National Guard.

4. Outlawing of wire-tapping and the use of evidence obtained thereby except in cases affecting the national security, kidnapping, and murder.

5. Repeal of blue-ribbon juries in New York City.

6. State-wide personnel registration.

CIVIL SERVICE

We favor:

1. Legislation to implement the veterans' preference system required by constitutional amendment in November 1949.

2. Revision upwards of salary standardization schedules and elimination of inequities in job classifications.

3. Establishment of sound grievance machinery for complaints by civil-service employees.

4. An investigation of working conditions of State employees.

5. Permissive retirement at age 55, with the employee and State sharing the cost of a pension.

6. Legislative investigation of working conditions and executive abuses of the State troopers.

7. Revision of the present 24-hour-per-day duty schedule of the division of State police to one which will allow members of the division to enjoy a reasonable home life.

8. Repeal of the Condon-Wadlin Act.

CONSERVATION AND PUBLIC UTILITIES

We favor:

1. A sound conservation program for all natural resources, including (1) flood control; (2) the improvement of the State's fish and game practices under a competent and active sportsmen's commission; and (3) reestablishment of the purchase of submarginal lands by the State, the removal of these lands from agriculture, and their development as State forests, parks, and game preserves.

2. Preservation of public ownership and control of water-power facilities of the State.

3. A legislative commission to make a thorough study of our water resources.

4. Regulation of utility companies to guarantee that consumers as a matter of right receive lowest prevailing rates. This should include the adoption of uniform accounting procedures by public-utility corporations and publication of rate schedules so that consumers are aware of cheapest rates.

5. Proper regulation of submetering companies.

6. Completion of rural electrification undertaken by the Federal Government under Democratic administration (also agriculture).

7. Protection of the Adirondack Preserve and opposition to any encroachment upon the forest preserve lands.

EDUCATION

We favor:

1. A $200,000,000 bond issue for school construction.

2. Elimination of the superior-merit rating provisions of the Feinberg teachers' salary law.

3. Broader benefits for all pensioned teachers to correspond with the retirement benefits enjoyed by employees of the city of New York under the New York City retirement law.

4. A permanent program of nonprofit school lunches.

5. State aid to public libraries.

6. Immediate appropriation for building of medical, dental, and nursing centers as part of a State university.

7. Community colleges to be paid for and initiated by the State.

8. Provisions that any increase in educational costs be borne by the State.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE

The Democratic State Committee, striving to serve the best interests of all citizens of this great State irrespective of their origin, color, race, or religion, recognizes fully the great contributions made by Americans of foreign descent in public affairs.

The growth and welfare of New York's citizens of foreign descent has always been of vital concern to the Democratic legislators of this State.

The Democratic Party of the State of New York urges upon the Congress a broadening of the present Displaced Persons Act.

HEALTH

We favor:

1. Establishment of a State hospital commission to exercise general supervision over both public and private hospitals.

2. Increased State aid for voluntary hospitals.

3. Immediate construction of mental hospitals to relieve overcrowding, and the setting up of clinics in urban areas for psychiatric examination and preventative treatment.

4. A State-rehabilitation program for alcoholics, including medical and psychiatric care, education and employment counsel and assistance.

5. A State program for drug and sex offenders, to include adequate facilities for examination, treatment, and rehabilitation.

6. Adequate care of cerebral palsy victims.

7. Construction of adequate facilities and the employment of qualified personnel to care for mental defectives under the age of 5 years.

8. We favor a State-wide health plan providing full medical care for all residents of the State on a cooperative basis among physicians, working people, farmers, and professional people.

HOUSING

We favor:

1. Implementing legislation to provide maximum benefits under the National Housing Act of 1949 in this State.

2. Stimulation of home building by private enterprise, giving the State as well as municipalities authorization to make loans to corporations regulated by law as to rent and profits.

3. Approval of a policy of providing for State loans to municipal housing authorities for construction of housing projects without cash subsidies for those families whose incomes are too high to render them eligible for cash subsidized public housing and too low to permit them to rent those private units which may be available at today's costs.

4. Deduction of veterans' and war widows' benefits from income computations in those housing projects limited to persons of a particular income group.

5. Prohibition of discrimination in any housing development projects which profit from tax exemption, condemnation of land, or other public assistance.

LABOR

We favor:

1. A State-wide minimum wage of $1 per hour.

2. Increase of workmen's compensation benefits: The injured employee to get 75 percent of pay, but no more than $40 a week; increased widow and survivor benefits.

3. Extension of unemployment-insurance coverage to employees and firms with one to four employees.

4. Provision of $3 per week for each dependent person and the increase of weekly unemployment-insurance benefits from the present minimum to $15, and from the present maximum to $30.

5. Enactment of legislation to repeal the so-called merit rating of employers and to prevent the raiding of the unemployment-insurance fund in order to assure its solvency and to assure payment of benefits to workers.

6. Immediate establishment of a system of genuine sickness-disability insurance for persons forced into unemployment through temporary illness. The present law is unworkable and unfair. An adequate and fair law should be under the administration of the Division of Placement and Unemployment Insurance, and not under the Workmen's Compensation Board, as provided by the present Mailler-Condon law. An adequate law should provide protection for a period of 26 weeks. An adequate law should be without discrimination. The present law discriminates against Negroes, against certain minority groups, against women, against the aged, and against those workers who, by nature of their jobs—for example, stevedores—are rarely employed by the same employer for four consecutive weeks. Furthermore, while under the present law the worker bears virtually all of the cost of the plan, he has no voice in its administration.

7. Encouragement of collective bargaining. We are opposed to any crippling amendments to the State Labor Relations Act or to any other legislation which will otherwise restrict or impair the right of collective bargaining.

8. Memorializing the Congress to repeal the Taft-Hartley law. We oppose any similar law in this State.

LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM

We favor:

1. Creation of a "little Hoover commission" to study the relationship of Federal and State Governments, the relationship of the State and its political subdivisions, with a view to eliminating inefficiency, waste, and overlapping bureaus.

2. A split session of the legislature providing: (1) A 5- or 6-week period for introduction of bills; (2) a month for committee and public hearings and action; and (3) a month for debate and disposition by the senate and assembly.

MUNICIPALITIES

We favor:

1. Prohibiting the State from mandating expenditures upon cities and villages unless the State provides definite means of obtaining revenue to carry out the mandated projects.

2. Elimination of local and State laws requiring counties to reimburse towns for delinquent town taxes.

3. Amendment of State highway law revising the arterial highway formula to provide for payment by the State of a fair share of expenses of maintenance and snow removal.

4. Reimbursement by the State of certain administrative expenses such as rental of quarters, salaries of maintenance workers, postage, which are not now reimbursable by the State.

RENT CONTROL

We favor:

1. A comprehensive State-wide rent-control law to become effective immediately upon the expiration of Federal rent control, and the granting of permission to municipalities to enact local rent-control laws to supplement State law in areas where protection provided thereby is inadequate to extend to June 30, 1951.

2. Amendment of the present State rent-control law to provide protection of nontransients in hotels, apartment hotels, cooperatives, and other accommodations.

3. Amendment of the Civil Practice Act to make State-wide the provisions relating to stays of eviction in summary proceedings and extending such stays to 12 months.

4. Prohibition of excessive and unreasonable deposits and tie-in sales by landlords.

5. Extension of the commercial rent-control law for 1 year.

6. Amendment of the commercial rent-control law to include protection of persons who store automobiles in garages.

WELFARE

We favor:

1. Payment by the State to localities of 80 percent of expenses of indigent sick. At present, the State reimburses cities up to 80 percent of the amount cities pay to persons on relief; the State should pay 80 percent of its share for the indigent sick as it does for the indigent who are well.

2. Reimbursements by the State to the communities of certain welfare administrative expenses such as rental of quarters, salaries of maintenance workers, postage, which are not now reimbursable by the State.

(See child welfare and old age.)

CHILD WELFARE

We favor:

1. Adequate day care centers for children of working mothers.

2. Proper supervision of foster homes for permanent placement of dependent children.

3. Placement of children needing psychiatric care under the jurisdiction of the children's court.

4. Extension of the State youth commission.

5. Provision for adequate facilities to be provided by the State for diversified treatment of juvenile delinquents rather than mere custodial treatment. This should include: (1) A youth court to deal with 16-21 year old offenders; (2) specialized institutions for youthful offenders; and (3) establishment of a youth correction authority.

OLD AGE

We favor:

1. A permanent State commission on aged persons to study and to provide a complete program to combat the problems of the aging.

2. A counseling service division for the aged in the State employment service.

3. A State adult recreation council.

4. An adult hygiene and geriatric division in the State department of health.

5. Increased social-security benefits and widened coverage.

6. Proper incentive to employers and employees to work out old-age pension plans.

7. Reimbursement by the State to private individuals for taking care of aged in boarding homes rather than in county institutions.

8. Establishing the right of a welfare district to erect or supply, or establish homes for the aged who are able to pay a part or all of their maintenance without requiring residents of such homes to turn over all their possessions to the welfare district.

VETERANS

We favor:

1. Streamlining of the New York State Division of Veterans' Affairs by eliminating those efforts which duplicate the services of other State and Federal agencies; placing the division under the State department of education, and assuring the veterans of the best available professional service by putting the division's personnel under competitive civil service.

2. Enactment of legislation specifically granting to students enrolled at colleges or universities within the State, whose intention is that the State is their place of permanent abode, to vote at the seat of their college or university (extending court of appeals decision in Shanks Village case).

3. Provision of supplemental subsistence grants to veterans receiving Federal benefits under the GI bill of rights to equalize higher cost of living in New York as compared with the national average.

4. Extension of the State Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act for at least another year.

VEHICLE AND TRAFFIC

We favor compulsory inspection of automobiles every 6 months.

PROTECTION OF THE OFFICER

We favor repeal of the Coudert-Mitchell law which imposes burdensome restrictions on small stockholders who seek to bring large corporations to account for their actions.

Relief of Americans Who Voted in Italy

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, there is no more needed or more humane legislation than H. R. 6616, the bill introduced by my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] which provides for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost their American citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy.

The Committee on the Judiciary has filed a very comprehensive report on this excellent measure and I want to congratulate them upon their painstaking and diligent work. As we all know, this bill was introduced after a thorough study and investigation of the situation by a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which visited Italy last fall. The subcommittee subsequently submitted a report based on their investigation. It is simple justice to provide relief for American citizens who have lost their citizenship through voting in Italian elections or in a plebiscite held in Italy in 1946 and in 1948.

I am sure that most of us recall the Italian election held on April 18, 1948, in which the Italian people had to make a decision which could either tilt the scales toward democracy or totalitarianism in western Europe. People in the United States and throughout the free countries of the world for some time had been much concerned about the outcome of this election. There was much anxiety about it as communism was riding high in Italy. Soviet Russia was giving substantial support to her anti-Christian Communist agents through a skillful and unscrupulous propaganda campaign in an effort to bring the Italian people behind the iron curtain. Thank God,

the election was overwhelmingly in favor of a democratic government and the United States was one of the dominant forces in arresting the Communist tide. During the course of the campaign prior to the election of April 18, American citizens of Italian origin were induced to join a letter-writing campaign to their relatives and friends in Italy urging them to vote in favor of our American way of life as opposed to communism and the police state. I have a large number of citizens in my congressional district of Italian origin, all of whom are patriotic, law-abiding Americans. Thousands of them corresponded with their relatives and friends in Italy urging them to vote to put a stop to the Italian Communist campaign of chaos and terror. It is estimated that somewhere between 3,000 and 4,000 American citizens in Italy at that time voted in the Italian election through inducement and persuasion of their relatives and friends in the United States. Under the circumstances, when they went to the polls and voted they never for a moment realized that their vote against communism would result in the loss of their American citizenship.

These former American citizens are surely deserving of some measure of reward for the courageous stand they took in behalf of freedom and independence. In many instances, their anti-Communist vote has resulted in great personal hardship. Parents have become separated from their children. Many married couples have been broken up by virtue of the fact that one of them voted anti-Communist while visiting or temporarily residing in Italy.

The fact that these folks have been denied the privilege of returning to their United States, which in the majority of cases is their native country, has encouraged the Communist elements in Italy to take particular pains in publicizing the unfortunate position in which they have been placed by the terms of the present law.

As everyone can understand, these involuntary expatriates are perplexed about the uncertainty of their future. The adoption of this just and humane legislation will bring back to them peace of mind and reunite them with their loved ones.

May I therefore urge immediate favorable action on this bill. Such action would surely be an appropriate token of our appreciation for the contribution they have made in helping to establish a friendly democratic government in Italy.

Suction Socket Artificial Legs Now Available to Veteran Amputees

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has issued a release to the newspapers informing the public that the Veterans' Administration is making the suction socket artificial leg available to eligible veterans who have suffered leg amputations above the knee of a character which makes its use medically feasible.

This is cheering news to many leg-amputee veterans. As a member of the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs, I have been deeply interested for years in the experiments that have been made to determine the best possible artificial leg for veterans who suffered this type of disability. In the last Congress, when I was the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, we had several very fine demonstrations of these prosthetic appliances, and the members of the committee were able to see for themselves the progress made under Public Law No. 729, Eightieth Congress, which authorized $1,000,000 annual appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for prosthetic appliance research. Many Members of Congress have remarked to me that they felt that this appropriation was one of the finest ever made by Congress for the disabled veterans. Today's announcement is further evidence of how well that money is being used. I hope every Member will take the time to read it. It follows:

After 3 years of scientifically controlled testing and development, Veterans' Administration is making the suction socket artificial leg available to eligible veterans who have suffered leg amputations above the knee of a character which makes its use medically feasible.

Veterans' Administration said that during the past 3 years, it had tested more than 500 amputee veterans in its experimental program on the suction socket leg. Successful results were obtained in a great majority of the cases, Veterans' Administration said.

This above-knee artificial leg differs from the conventional artificial leg in that it has no pelvic hinges or suspension harness. The leg is held to the stump by moderate suction created in the closed socket each time the leg is lifted from the ground in walking.

The suction socket leg is designed to give greater freedom of movement in all directions, appears more like part of the body and does away with the discomfort of the pelvic belt (a heavy belt with steel hinge fitted to the waist).

The earliest known reference to the suction socket is in a patent issued by the United States Patent Office in 1863 to Dubois D. Parmelee, of New York. The principle of the suction socket was the attachment of the socket to the amputee's stump by atmospheric pressure.

Others, both in this country and abroad, experimented with the suction socket principle of suspension, but it was only after the recent war that this country studied the suction socket leg in a cooperative program of limb makers, medical experts and scientists.

With the joint cooperation of the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs of the National Research Council, University of California, Orthopedic Appliance and Limb Manufacturers Association, the Army, Navy and other interested organizations, the Veterans' Administration sponsored an extensive program to determine the possibilities and limitations of the suction socket limb.

Besides the more than 500 veterans who were tested in the Veterans' Administration program, a much larger number of nonveteran amputees have been fitted with successful results by the artificial limb industry.

Also during the past 2 years, short courses have been conducted in various parts of the country to instruct over 300 orthopedic surgeons and limb fitters in the technical details of prescribing, fabricating, and fitting the suction socket leg.

Effective January 18, 1950, the suction socket leg was made available, upon request, to eligible disabled veterans through the established artificial limb program of the Veterans' Administration. When a new limb is required to replace an unserviceable limb previously issued to the veteran, the suction socket leg may be selected by the amputee upon medical prescription by a surgeon certified by the Veterans' Administration. A list of certified surgeons has been distributed to all Veterans' Administration regional offices, hospitals and centers.

Veterans' Administration emphasized that no suction socket legs will be furnished to veterans without prior examination of the stump by a surgeon on the Veterans' Administration certification list and a written prescription signed by the examining physician.

Amputee veterans who are eligible for a new artificial leg, may obtain complete information about the suction socket leg from the prosthetic and sensory aids unit of the nearest Veterans' Administration regional office.

Research on the suction socket leg was only part of a broad Veterans' Administration program in prosthetic devices and for the development and testing of all types of artificial limbs, aids for the blind, orthopedic braces and hearing aids. This research program, Veterans' Administration prosthetics experts said, will not only aid the disabled veteran, but will ultimately be of benefit to the civilian handicapped throughout the Nation.

Loans to Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been a Member of Congress, I have been very much concerned about the plight of the small-business man and what the Federal Government could do in order to encourage the growth of small business.

When I mention small business, I refer to the small machine-shop operator, the corner grocer, and delicatessen storekeeper, the butcher and the baker, and in general, the energetic small-business man who finds it difficult to obtain loans from banks for new enterprises because of restrictive banking regulations. I am also concerned about the small firms already in existence which have good business records but are in the class of borrowers whose legitimate credit demands are fulfilled with difficulty by usual sources of credit and who find it almost impossible to obtain long-term capital.

I know of the plight of the small-business man because I was associated with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in Buffalo, my home town, as an examiner, making loans to small firms after banks had refused them credit for one reason or another.

Big business, on the other hand, can take care of itself because it has the

wherewithal to do it or can obtain financial aid from banks when necessary.

I am most happy to join Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, in introducing a companion bill in the House, similar to the bill he introduced on Monday in the Senate, which will relax the regulations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and make it possible for thousands of small businesses to apply for small loans from that agency. The regulations governing loans must be liberalized so that small business can get greater consideration when applying to the RFC for loans.

In his recent state of the Union message, President Truman called attention to the necessity for a comprehensive program for the preservation and encouragement of small business in America and made recommendations for a revision of taxes in order to stimulate small business and to assist new enterprises.

The bill which I am introducing today would authorize the RFC to guaranty up to 90 percent loans made on the basis of demonstrated earnings, management skills, and prospective earnings. Under the present law, the RFC is authorized to take up only 70 percent of a loan when it is less than $100,000.

The bill provides that only in cases where loans cannot be made in cooperation with private lending institutions can the RFC make direct loans.

In most cases, the private institution will make the loan with the understanding that at a later date it may call upon the RFC to take up a certain percentage of the unpaid balance. However, in order to insure fuller cooperation and more active participation from the banks, this bill gives the lending institutions priority against the assets of the borrower for the satisfaction of any debt incurred through such a loan.

This bill also provides for relaxing the maturity date of such loans so that they may be extended for periods of longer than 10 years, which is the limitation set by existing regulations.

It is my understanding that there are approximately 1,500,000 small enterprises which require relatively small amounts of working capital, many of which are unable to secure funds from local lending institutions. In order to obtain funds, many of them must mortgage their entire assets or their accounts receivable at exorbitant interest rates.

Two of the most vital needs of small business at present are access to capital and tax relief. The bill which I am introducing may not be an answer to all the problems confronting small business, but I am convinced that it is a step in the right direction.

Small businesses are the backbone of the Nation and merit the consideration and assistance of the Congress. I am sure that most of the Members of this Congress realize the urgency of the situation and I feel confident that favorable congressional action on this legislation will be the saving of thousands of small enterprises throughout the country.

A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, in order to provide more effective financial assistance for small business

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) (1) of section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That in order to encourage small business the Corporation is authorized to give management skills, past earnings, and prospective earnings consideration over security in the form of collateral, in the making of loans either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section for the purpose of establishing new business enterprises or for meeting the long-term capital requirements of existing small business enterprises. The Corporation shall make direct loans pursuant to the foregoing proviso only in those cases where loans cannot be consummated in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) (2) of section 4 is amended by adding before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That any loan made under section 4 (a) (1) for the purposes set forth in the proviso in paragraph (1) of this subsection as amended may be made for such period exceeding 10 years as the Corporation may deem proper for the encouragement of small business."

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) (3) of section 4 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That such participations by the Corporation may amount to 90 percent of the loan outstanding at the time of the disbursement, in the case of loans made for the benefit of small business enterprises in pursuance of the authority set forth in the proviso in subsection (b) (1) of this section as amended. In order to encourage loans in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions under the proviso in subsection (b) (1) of this section as amended, priority shall be given to private lending institutions over the Corporation against the assets of borrowers for the satisfaction of such loans made thereunder."

Ten Years of Fisheries Activities Under the Fish and Wildlife Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Albert M. Day, Director of Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior, addressed the annual convention of the National Canners Association at Atlantic City on January 23, 1950. Mr. Day, during the several years that he has been Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, has made an outstanding record in the conservation and development of our fish and wildlife resources. I would like to commend to all Members of the Congress, for their thoughtful consideration, the following address by Mr. Day:

It is hardly proper for me as Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, one of the agencies that is proposed for reorganization by the Hoover Commission, to discuss whether that Commission's recommendations are sound and should be adopted. Rather, I prefer to make some general observations about the background of the Hoover Commission Report on this particular subject and explain what the Fish and Wildlife Service is attempting to do to aid in the broad development and utilization of the highly important fishery resources of this Nation.

In the first instance, it should be well understood that the final recommendations of the Hoover Commission resulted only after a great deal of conflicting and diverse testimony on this important subject had been given careful consideration. The whole problem is complex because fishery management is complex. It must always be woven into the intricate patterns of land and water uses and human needs in our expanding civilization. This fact is well emphasized when we recognize that the three different task forces studying the organization of the Government came out with three different recommendations when it came to fish and wildlife matters.

The report of one committee would have dispersed the conservation agencies through the Government and would have put the Fish and Wildlife Service in a Public Works Department. The Agricultural Committee recommended a transfer to Agriculture of all major public-land administration activities and functions including the Fish and Wildlife Service. The task force on Natural Resources proposed to abolish the Interior Department and create in its place a Department of Natural Resources, among which would have been a division of the present Fish and Wildlife Service into a Fisheries Service and a Wildlife Service, each separately administered. The final recommendations of the entire Commission were that only the commercial fisheries activities of the Service should be transferred to the Department of Commerce. As evidence of the diversity of opinion among the members of the Commission, it should be noted that dissents to this proposal were expressed by Vice Chairman Dean Acheson and Commissioners James Forrestal, James K. Pollack, and James H. Rowe, Jr.

With this divergence of opinion among the members of the Hoover Commission and the various task forces as to the proper place in Government for the Federal responsibility for fishery activities, it is not surprising that the resultant reactions of the public also have been mixed. The American Fisheries Society, organized in 1872 and now the oldest scientific biological organization in the United States, at a meeting in Winnipeg, Canada, last September, passed a resolution endorsing the task-force recommendations of the Report on Natural Resources, with the exception that the Society opposed that portion of the report which recommends the separation of fisheries administration from wildlife administration.

Likewise, a meeting of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, also meeting in Winnipeg, in September, passed a resolution endorsing the general purposes of the natural resources task force report, but also stated that they opposed the recommendation of the report which would separate fisheries from wildlife in the present Fish and Wildlife Service. Within the past few weeks, the executive officers and the legislative committee of the International association again reaffirmed to Secretary Chapman their strong opposition to this proposal. The international association is made up of representatives of all of the State conservation departments in the country, the great bulk of which administer both fisheries and wildlife in a single organization of the State. In fact, of the 48 States only 8 have separate departments devoted to commercial fisheries. In the other 40, commercial and sport fishery and wildlife management activities are all in the same department. The same, of course, is true in Alaska.

To the contrary, the Pacific Fisheries Conference, composed largely of members of industry operating on the west coast and in Alaska, by action taken at a recent meeting in California, adopted the following resolution, and I quote:

"Whereas the consolidation by Executive order of the former Bureau of Fisheries and the former Bureau of Biological Survey into one bureau in the Department of the Interior, called the Fish and Wildlife Service, has been demonstrated as unsound, illogical, and ineffective, and has not served to further the sound, efficient administration of fisheries; and

"Whereas the Commission for the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, commonly referred to as the Hoover Commission, recommended that the administration of fisheries should be separated from the administration of wildlife: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Conference heartily endorses the recommendation that such separation should be made and also urges that the re-established Division of Fisheries should be transferred in toto to the Department of Commerce or to a new Department of Natural Resources if such a Department should be created and now, in whichever Department placed, fisheries should be under direct charge of an officer of the rank of Assistant Secretary."

It is to the assertion of the Pacific Fisheries Conference that the present organization has been demonstrated as "unsound, illogical, ineffective, and has not served to further the sound, efficient administration of fisheries" that I wish to direct my remarks today. I challenge that statement as incorrect and I call upon the drafters of the resolution to furnish proof of their assertions. The present organization is sound, it is logical, and it is effective. In the 10 years it has been in effect it has done more to further the interests of fishery management, conservation, and utilization than was accomplished in the three or four decades previously.

Memories about public affairs and previous events are short, and I feel that the drafters of the resolution that I have just mentioned must have been unfamiliar with the background and did not know the original reasons for the consolidation of the Bureau of Fisheries and the Bureau of Biological Survey. Both moves are settled matter without good reasons, as was the case in this instance. At the time of the merger in 1940, both of these predecessor agencies were weak and to a considerable extent were discredited in the public mind. The Biological Survey, which I joined in 1918 and in which, together with the present Fish and Wildlife Service, I have served continuously ever since, had suffered from weak administration for several years prior to the merger. Waterfowl, coming under Federal regulation under a treaty with Canada, had been consistently declining over a period of years. The only remedy that the Bureau seemed to be able to prescribe was ever-shortened seasons and ever-smaller bag limits. Because of resultant public dissatisfaction and clamor, President Roosevelt appointed a special committee of citizens to study the problem and to recommend remedies. "Ding" Darling, the famous cartoonist, prominent in conservation circles in the Midwest, served on that special study committee. It recommended a positive action program—the acquisition and restoration of marshes along with severe restrictions on the take by hunters. Darling was induced to serve as Chief of the Biological Survey, an organization that had been virtually leaderless since the disability retirement of the previous Bureau chief. He remained less than 2 years and was succeeded by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, an outstanding scientist and able administrator, but in 1940, when the merger came about, the public had not yet regained confidence in the efficiency of the administration of the Biological Survey.

A similar situation existed in the Bureau of Fisheries. It was a small organization and the morale of its employees, as well as the confidence of the public, suffered severely because of the quality of its leadership. Controversy raged, particularly in the Alaska fisheries field, where the Bureau then had, and still has as the Fish and Wildlife Service, sole regulatory authority over the extremely valuable salmon and herring fisheries. We are still trying to live down some of the things that happened in Alaska in those days.

Government reorganizers concluded that there might be a strengthening of the administration of both fisheries and wildlife programs if the two closely related small Bureaus were merged into one larger group. This has been the trend of Government for many years and, with the exception of the recommendations for the transfer of the commercial fishery activities to the Department of Commerce, was also the philosophy of the Hoover Commission.

When the merger of the Biological Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries came about in 1940, the Biological Survey was on its way back into public esteem under the leadership of Dr. Gabrielson. It was, therefore, logical that he should become the first Director of the new Fish and Wildlife Service. As a minor employee in Washington at the time of his "shotgun wedding" of the two Bureaus, with Secretary Ickes, incidentally, holding the old double-barreled gun on us, I can personally testify that it was an unpopular move with the employees of both Bureaus, particularly those who revere tradition and the "good old days" of the past. I also know that the proposal to return to those "good old days" does not fall upon completely unsympathetic ears with some of the present organization. It is difficult to understand their philosophy, because I cannot think of a single individual who has not personally benefited in rank and salary by the creation of a larger and more important agency. With some, tradition is truly a potent factor.

But, of more importance to you and the other people we are paid to serve, did the mandatory trip to the altar pay off? Let us merely check the records.

First, let's review the appropriations for fishery work for the past 20 years—the 10 years of operations under the present system and the 10 years immediately preceding. Granted that during recent years the costs of operations have risen and appropriations have been more liberal to take care of these factors, appropriation figures are probably still the best over-all yardstick to measure the services the Government gives its citizens in matters pertaining to the fisheries.

In 1930, Federal fishery appropriations amounted to $2,498,550; in 1940, $2,421,075. That represents a decrease during the 10-year period of almost $100,000. The average for that period was approximately $2,000,000 per year. The fishery appropriations for the fiscal year 1950 amount to $10,875,251. Of even greater significance, the budget which the President sent to the Congress within recent days and which Fish and Wildlife Service representatives justified before the Appropriations Committee a week ago carry proposed appropriations for fishery items amounting to approximately $12,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning next July 1. To be more specific as to items in which you are most interested, the work of the Branch of Commercial Fisheries received $229,540 in 1940; $668,500 in 1950. The Branch of Fishery Biology received $390,835 in 1940 as compared with $1,546,000 in 1950; Alaska Fisheries, including the Pribilofs, from $516,460 to $1,480,100 in those 10 years. And the wildlife appropriations have likewise increased at the same time. In 1940, they amounted to $6,149,343, almost 3 times the then appropriated sums for fishery activities. For 1950, they amounted to $16,502,049. This sum included duck stamp and Pittman-Robertson revenues. Not bad for an "unsound, illogical, and ineffective" organization.

At the time of the merger, not a single research or exploratory vessel was owned and operated by the Bureau of Fisheries. Now, the *Albatross III* is carrying on investigations extending from the Grand Banks to the Carolinas on the Atlantic Coast. Within recent months, two vessels, the *Oregon* and *Alaska*, have been acquired through special legislation and appropriations and are now stationed in the Gulf of Mexico. One will do exploratory fishing and the other will do biological research. A new vessel, the *John N. Cobb*, was commissioned at Astoria, Oreg., this month to carry out exploratory and experimental fishing in the North Pacific, reaching far into Arctic waters. The *Black Douglas* is carrying on experimental and biological work in an effort to find answers to some of the perplexing problems surrounding the pilchard fishery off the coast of California and lower Mexico. The *Hugh M. Smith* is conducting biological and oceanographic research, while the *Henry O'Malley* and the *John R. Manning* are doing exploratory fishing in the waters of the South Pacific in a program that has been developed in close cooperation with the tuna fishing industry of the west coast. The *Spencer F. Baird*, the *Theodore N. Gill*, and the *David Starr Jordan*, three well-equipped research and exploratory vessels, are now completing a 5-year study of the South Pacific fisheries in connection with the rehabilitation of the Philippines. It is planned that the *Theodore N. Gill* will soon be stationed in the Great Lakes to undertake the difficult study of the decline in that great fishery, made possible by special legislation and appropriations passed during the present session of Congress. And that adds up to 11 large vessels compared with not a single one at the time of the merger. In the entire previous history of the Bureau of Fisheries, reaching back to 1871, in fact, there were never at one time more than three ships doing that sort of work and that occurred for only 2 years. None had been in service since 1932—8 years before the merger. Does that add up to the assertion that the present Fish and Wildlife Service is an unsound, illogical, and ineffective organization?

Ten years ago, the famous laboratory at Woods Hole, steeped in traditions of fishery research and oceanography since the days of Spencer Fullerton Baird, had been virtually abandoned. Within the past 2 years, we have rehabilitated the station, have transferred the scientific staff of the New England area there for headquarters, and the *Albatross III* is now berthed at Woods Hole. The laboratory at Beaufort, N. C., is being reconditioned and important studies in cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission are being conducted at that point. A new laboratory is being constructed in Hawaii and the technology lab at Ketchikan, Alaska, has within recent months been enlarged and expanded. During that decade, a small laboratory was constructed in Puerto Rico, and fisheries research in the Caribbean area was carried on. In addition, the research stations at College Park, Md.; Milford, Conn.; Seattle, Wash.; and Pensacola, Fla., have been expanded.

Never in the 80 years of Government participation in matters pertaining to the fisheries has there been such great activity in the international field as there has been during the past few years. That is perfectly logical because of the increasing influence of the United States in world affairs. I should like to cite some of the more recent developments, however, as proof that fishery matters are not suffering at the hands of the present organization.

The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention concluded just a year ago and ratified by the President last September 1 brings 11 nations having common interests in the North Atlantic fishing grounds under treaty

arrangements for the first time in history. The fisheries of this great area have been the battleground for some exceedingly tough international problems that date back to days prior to American independence. A convention between the United States and Mexico for the establishment of an International Commission for the Scientific Investigation of Tuna was signed at Mexico City in January 1949, and has been ratified by the President. A similar convention between the United States and Costa Rica for the establishment of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission was signed at Washington in May 1949, and was ratified by the President on September 1, 1949. Three years ago 22 nations, including Canada and the United States, met in Washington and arrived at an international agreement which established the International Whaling Commission, empowered to conduct investigations and regulate whaling throughout all the marine waters of the globe. In 1946 a treaty was negotiated with Canada for the protection and management of the Great Lakes fisheries. This so far has been the least effective of the treaty programs because of opposition of one or two States surrounding the Great Lakes.

I have mentioned some of the more recent developments, but I should record also the continuing activities in connection with the Sockeye Salmon Commission which came into being in 1936, and which has now assumed regulatory powers after the first 10 years of investigation. This has included the construction of the $2,000,000 fishway at Hells Gate on the Fraser River. I serve as one of the American members of this Commission. Assistant Director James is a member of the Halibut Commission, established in 1937, which has done a remarkable job of restoring the stocks of halibut along the stretches of the North Pacific coast.

In the field of management of the fisheries of Alaska, I am proud of the progress that is being made. For the first time in history we are now developing a closely integrated program, using all available manpower and equipment for enforcing both the fishery and wildlife laws and regulations in a joint operation. Enforcement of the fishery regulations is now vastly improved because of the use of Alaska game agents as well as about a dozen transferred from the States each season. During the war years the fishing regulations were probably more liberal than they should have been. This was due to the pressure for food for our own people and our allies. Many of our trained personnel were in the Army and Navy and many Service ships were devoted to military uses. Inadequate observations and patrol, together with overfishing, created a serious depletion in the Alaska fishery. I am happy to say that it looks as though the situation is improving rapidly. Following severe restrictions during the past 3 years, the southeastern Alaska pack of pink salmon responded to the point where the pack last year not only returned to but also exceeded the previous normal 30-year average. Two large vessels have recently been secured by transfer from the Navy to augment our Alaskan fleet, and several smaller ships have been built as a result of new appropriations by the Congress. In the Service's combined Alaskan operations there are now owned and operated 13 vessels, ranging from 40 feet to 160 feet in size, with 11 additional patrol vessels, ranging from 30 to 40 feet. There are also about 100 speedboats used in fishery patrol. Within the past 3 months the Service has taken over from the Army one of the best equipped marine shops on the Pacific coast. It is located at Juneau, and is valued at least at $500,000. Surplus planes have been made available since the end of the war, and we now have a very excellent fleet of 20 planes which services both fishery and game agents in the Territory. Congress, last year, appropriated $280,000 for a new airplane hangar and shop at Anchorage, and as a result our facilities for observation and patrol will be much improved in future years. Moreover, Alaska regulations are now being made and enforced without fear or favor.

Ten years ago there were no effective means of correlating the needs of fish and wildlife with the construction programs of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. That is not the case today. The Fish and Wildlife Service maintains a river basin staff whose responsibility it is to review the plans of the construction agencies while the projects are in the making. We work in close coordination with these two bureaus. Much has been done to protect and increase the fishery potentials in the reservoirs because of this service.

The relations of the Fish and Wildlife Service with the Congress and the Bureau of the Budget are excellent. The needs of both fisheries and wildlife are given sympathetic attention both as to appropriations and as to legislation. This, in my opinion, is due in large part to the fact that practically every Member of the Congress has a personal interest in something that the Fish and Wildlife Service is doing. If he or his constituents are not particularly interested in the commercial fisheries, it is a pretty safe bet that he either likes to hunt ducks and geese or he enjoys fishing for trout or bass or blue-gills. Maybe he comes from the West and is more interested in the coyote and ground squirrel control program of the Service, or perhaps he wants to go to Alaska to hunt moose or brown bear. It is an assured certainty that if there is a Federal fish hatchery in his district, he is anxious to see that it produces as many fish for his sportsmen constituents as can possibly be done. I doubt that there is another single agency of Government that has such wide interest for so many people as do the varied activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Last year there were 15,500,000 people who bought fishing licenses and almost 13,000,000 who bought hunting licenses. Another 2,000,000 bought duck stamps to hunt ducks and geese. Many probably purchased all three kinds of licenses, but yet the fact remains that approximately one out of every five people in the United States is influenced in some degree by the activities of this Service. As such, the single organization known as the Fish and Wildlife Service wields much more power and influence than either the Bureau of Fisheries or the Biological Survey ever did before or would ever do again, if they were reconstituted separately.

I could continue this recitation for all day, but I fear that I have already used my allotted time. I shall close by inviting the members of the resolutions committee of the Pacific Fisheries Conference, or anyone else for that matter, who believes that the "consolidation by Executive order of the former Bureau of Fisheries and the former Bureau of Biological Survey into one bureau in the Department of the Interior, called the Fish and Wildlife Service, has been demonstrated as unsound, illogical, and ineffective" to take a little more careful look at the record. I sincerely believe that if those members of industry who are not satisfied with the present accomplishments of the Fish and Wildlife Service would tell us, and the Congress, frankly, what in the way of accomplishments they want but are not now getting, they will come closer to seeing it done than if they were to depend upon a much smaller agency, with much less prestige. Remember the appropriation figures I gave you—$2,421,075 in 1940 as compared with $10,875,251 in 1950, and approximately $12,000,000 which President Truman has recommended to the Congress for next fiscal year. Again, I say, study the record.

Jewish Federation of Philanthropies Pays Tribute to Hon. Joseph T. Sharkey, Vice Chairman, City Council, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Joseph T. Sharkey, majority leader of the City of Council of the City of New York, is a Christian—a Catholic. On January 29, 1950, he was honored with a testimonial dinner sponsored by the Williamsburg division of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies for his leadership in philanthropic affairs, and for the splendid example of brotherhood and neighborliness he has set in the community.

At this dinner which was held at the Knapp Mansion, 545 Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., the friends of the majority leader who foregathered to pay him tribute contributed in his honor the sum of approximately $30,000 toward the federation's building fund and maintenance campaign. Harvey L. Strelzin, a distinguished lawyer, as chairman of the Williamsburg campaign, presented Councilman Sharkey with a scroll in recognition of his untiring efforts on behalf of Jewry. I had the honor to address the gathering attending the dinner, and I wish to include my speech under my extension of remarks:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I consider it an honor and privilege to share with all of you present this opportunity to pay tribute to a man whose life and accomplishments have made so profound an impression upon the people of this great borough. For me it is also a personal gratification to participate in this occasion because it is my first opportunity since my election to Congress, which took place almost a year ago, on February 15, 1949, to publicly acknowledge to the vice chairman of the city council my deep appreciation for his loyalty, cooperation, and support. I have stated on numerous occasions that Joe Sharkey is like the Rock of Gibraltar. He is a man of high principle, and once he has made a decision and a promise, nothing and nobody, no matter how powerful are the influences, can sway him from fulfilling his obligation.

The Jewish Federation of Charities in honoring him tonight honors itself and acknowledges that it has a friend all Jewry can be proud of. His magnificent record in public life is full of contributions to human welfare. "Joe," as he is affectionately called by his host of friends, is a leader in the field of tolerance and understanding and cooperation among all peoples. Particularly has he attained a high goal in the affection of Jewry. We have long recognized that he possesses sterling qualities—a strong will power, a strength of purpose, and faith in himself and in God. He is a quiet and unassuming man of simple dignity and he respects the dignity of others. He is a great single force in creating good and friendly human relations. That is why, in a district heavily populated by Jews—and I believe the most orthodox Jewish district in the United States—Joe Sharkey is the undisturbed and undisputed leader of the Democratic Party. If I might digress a moment to make an observation

of Joe's political philosophy. I will say he has an unvarying and unyielding rule—that loyalty, ability, service, and capacity are the only standards for recognition and promotion. Neither blood relations nor social relations are ever permitted to interfere with his yardstick. Above all is Joe's capacity for friendship. This I can say with literal accuracy and not as a gracious gesture at a testimonial dinner. No man in this great city is more admired, respected, and loved than our guest of honor, Joe Sharkey. Unconsciously, perhaps, he follows the credo: "Always forgive your enemy; remember, you made him one. Always appreciate your friend; remember, he made you one." Just as the light of phosphorus is more plainly seen when all is dark, so friendship can be best observed when the shadows fall. Any friend of Joe Sharkey's—and I speak from my own experience—who finds himself in gloom can see more plainly the phosphorescence of his friendship.

To those who know Joe Sharkey, the honor which comes to him tonight does not come as a surprise but as one richly deserved. Joe did not come here to gather honors. That is why we honor him. He came here to lend his name and prestige to a cause which he believes worthy. He believes in the great work of the Jewish Federation of Charities. He believes that if you take that cause to your heart, then in future years when you recite the twenty-third Psalm, which begins, "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want * * *," you may perhaps indulge yourself in the same inspired error the little child made when she said, "The Lord is my shepherd, that's all I want."

In the words of the old toast, "May the sun shine on both sides of the street, Joe, when you, your charming wife, and family pass by."

Tax Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from the January 30 issue of the Kingston Daily Freeman, Kingston, N. Y.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a great deal of merit in this editorial suggesting that we revise the entire tax framework. There is no question that on this issue of reducing the wartime-excise taxes, the administration is "me-tooing" the Republicans. The Republicans have been urging the reduction of these taxes for a long time and it is not surprising that the President, in this election year, hows on the issue most popular with the great majority. Our own tax history and more recently that of Canada proved definitely that business increases when taxes are held at a reasonable level. Let us hope that there will be no further delay in reducing the excise taxes and revising our tax laws so they will be on a sound basis.

REVISE ENTIRE TAX FRAMEWORK

President Truman's tax program has issues aims, but it's a real question how close his specific proposals would come to realizing them.

The war saw the Government impose a whole host of excise taxes for the joint purpose of raising money and discouraging civilian consumption. They were declared to be emergency levies only, yet they're still with us 5 years after the war.

Mr. Truman proposes to cut seven of these including taxes on transportation of freight and passengers, long-distance telephone and telegraph, furs, jewelry, handbags, luggage, and toilet preparations. Except for a 3-percent levy on freight, the excises range from 15 to 25 percent.

But the President doesn't say how much the reduction should be nor what should be done about taxes on a wide group of other products.

In view of his past messages on the issue of tax reduction, his new program represents something of a reversal in attitude. Hence it may be expecting too much to imagine he would consider outright repeal of any or all wartime excises at this time. His recommendations nevertheless are disappointing.

There was nothing surprising in his suggestion that money lost through reduced excises be made up—and another $1,000,000,000 drawn in—through closing various tax loopholes and boosting corporate and certain estate and gift taxes.

Whether he may have thought also of advising higher income levies we can only guess. In any event, he bowed to election year realities on that score.

It is plain that if carried out his program would be popular with a majority of citizens and unpopular merely with limited groups affected by proposed increases and loophole-closings. One wonders how accidental that aspect of the President's plan is.

Aside from the excise changes most recommendations are offered as ways of correcting inequities in the tax structure. They may indeed have some value in that direction. But Mr. Truman's sketchy, piecemeal approach to the genuinely complex issue of tax inequity hardly looks sound.

Both Democrats and Republicans concede that the Federal tax set-up is a thing of shreds and patches that has long needed revision. The Republican Eightieth Congress made a stab at a general revision bill but it died after getting through the House late in the 1948 session. Since then nothing has happened.

Mr. Truman and his tax advisers are no help. The notion of revision is always pushed into the future.

We believe it would be a mistake to consider isolated tax inequities without reference to the whole body of tax law. Let Congress and the administration combine to chop expenditures enough to balance loss expected from lowered excises. Meantime, let's get on with at least the real preliminaries of the long-overdue revamping of the entire tax pattern.

International Frequency Allocations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Cincinnati Times-Star of January 16, 1950, regarding the matter of international frequency allocations.

The Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, composed of 15 independently owned and operated clear-channel stations, has reason to be greatly concerned over attempts by foreign nations to make inroads into United States radio channels.

The article is as follows:

RADIO GROUP SEEKS TO PROTECT CHANNELS IN UNITED STATES

"The Clear Channel Broadcasting Service will continue to fight any attempts by foreign nations to make inroads into United States radio channels," Ward L. Quaal, the Washington, D. C., director of the service, stated Monday at the Netherland Plaza, where the group is meeting to discuss matters of international frequency allocations.

Quaal explained that representatives of Canada, North America, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, and Haiti adjourned in Montreal last month following a similar discussion. Mexico, he said, did not participate. He added that there will be a meeting February 1 in Havana between the United States delegation and Cuba in an effort to work out a bilateral agreement. "All the North American nations will meet sometime between April 1 and August 1," Quaal said, at which time it is hoped that Mexico will join in a new attempt to get an international radio treaty.

"We vigorously protested the demands of the Cuban Government made in Montreal," Quaal said. "They would have caused tremendous interference with the stations in the United States known as regional channel stations as well as on clear channels."

Quaal explained that the organization is composed of 15 independently owned and operated clear-channel stations of which the Cincinnati member is WLW.

Our stations," he added, "serve not only metropolitan communities but also large rural and small town areas which would be virtually without radio if it were not for interference-free clear channel service. All farm organizations in the United States have endorsed our efforts to provide better service for rural America."

Mr. E. W. Craig, chairman of the board of Station WSM, Nashville, and chairman of CCBS, presided at the meeting.

Gifts of Government Employees to Official Supervisors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the law prohibiting the collection of money by employees of the Government for presents and gifts to supervisors and other employees is being increasingly violated.

It is a statute "more honored in the breach than the observance."

The law is specific and easy to read and interpret. It is designed to discourage favoritism and that undemocratic practice of fawning and placating the boss or people who are supposed to have an "in" with the boss.

I have written to the Civil Service Commission asking them to promulgate

the law. My letter to Chairman Mitchell reads:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1950.

Hon. HARRY B. MITCHELL,
Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN MITCHELL: During the last few weeks more and more complaints have come to me concerning the vicious practice of collecting small sums of money from Government employees for gifts to superiors and other personnel. This is specifically prohibited by section 113 of title 5, United States Code. Such contributions are solicited for wedding presents, going-away gifts, birthday remembrances, and other tokens. While the sums have not been great, the demands made upon the employees, particularly those in the lower salary brackets, have caused embarrassment and, in many cases, hardships. People generally do not like to refuse such requests. It places them in an awkward position with relation to their fellow employees. Too frequently it destroys the harmony in an office, so essential to good morale.

May I suggest that the Commission publicize the provisions of section 113 above referred to, again calling it to the attention of Government employees.

The law as I read it is plain. It says:

"No officer, clerk, or employee in the United States Government employ shall at any time solicit contributions from other officers, clerks, or employees in the Government service for a gift or present to those in a superior official position; nor shall any such officials or clerical superiors receive any gift or present offered or presented to them as a contribution from persons in Government employ receiving a less salary themselves; nor shall any officer or clerk make any donation as a gift or present to any official superior."

I believe that such action by the Commission would have a tendency to discourage the abuses of which I complain.

If you feel the law is not sufficiently strong I would be glad to discuss with you changes to make it workable and effective.

Sincerely,

GEORGE P. MILLER.

Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, there is much talk but little apparent action being taken in regard to the removal or reduction of excise taxes. Even the President's message regarding taxes took notice of the harm these continued wartime burdens were having. The facts as I find them reveal to me further injury in lines of endeavor to which I had not readily attributed a serious detriment because of the excise taxes.

One of such has most vividly been called to my attention in a letter received from a manufacturer of hardware and sporting goods in my district, the State of Connecticut. The letter reproduced here almost in its entirety, by itself explains quite fully the urgency of immediate action regarding the war taxes and in particular, the necessity of including this item among those to be removed because of the damaging effect on the manufacture of various sporting goods or their discontinuance of manufacture because of the taxes thus causing unemployment and consequent hardship on the former workers and their families.

The letter follows:

The company closed its fiscal year June 30, 1949, with a disastrous loss, and for the first 6 months of its present fiscal year that loss is running at twice the rate of its previous year's loss.

Employment has been reduced from approximately 1,000 to approximately 275, which force is working but 32 hours per week, with operations in both the roller-skate and ice-skating departments suspended indefinitely.

The company manufactures sidewalk roller skates, rink roller skates, ice skates, bamboo fishing rods, steel fishing rods, and, through its subsidiaries, golf clubs, baseballs, and softballs, all of which are affected by the sporting-goods excise tax. For example, this company manufactures ice skates which they sell to shoe manufacturers, who in turn mount them on shoes and merchandise a complete skating outfit. Normally such shoe manufacturers purchase their ice skates in January and February and start manufacturing outfits for the next season during the months of February, March, April, May, June, etc. If the shoe manufacturers wait too long to start their production, they are unable to fulfill deliveries, and consequently a complete season is lost, both by them and the skate manufacturer. Yet because they have to buy skates now on which they must pay the 10-percent sporting-goods excise tax, which tax may be repealed before they sell their outfits in September, October, November, and December, they won't purchase. The same is true of all other sporting-goods items which are seasonable to the highest degree. If the season is missed, the business is lost for the year.

It is, therefore, urgent that the sporting-goods excise tax be removed and that such action be taken promptly, effective immediately, in order to preserve this spring's business.

I do not have the figures before me, but I am informed that the total amount received by the Treasury Department from the sporting-goods excise tax is comparatively small, and it is certain that, whatever it may be, it would be more than made up in income taxes if manufacturers of these items were placed in a position to reduce price to achieve volume, with consequent profits rather than present losses now being incurred.

To take but one illustration of the economic effect of such tax, consider sidewalk roller skates which are used by children up to 14 years of age whose wherewithal to expend for such items is limited. A 10-percent tax on the manufacturer's price means that the jobber adds one-third to that tax and the retailer two-thirds so that the child finally pays twice what the tax would apparently seem to be. In other words, on a roller skate sold by the manufacturer at $2 the child has to pay, in the final retail price, approximately 40 cents more than if there were no tax. Increased cost of manufacture has raised the price of roller skates to the point that any burden on the consumer's price effectively puts them out of the reach of the average child. We have endeavored to ascertain from the Department of Commerce, Government statistics pertaining to the sales of roller skates for the years 1948 and 1949. We were informed by the chief of the Sporting Goods Division of the Department of Commerce that the last figures that they have available, even in preliminary form, are for the year 1947. Such figures would not show what might be termed the disappearance of the sidewalk roller-skate industry from the current American scene, but from what we have ascertained from other sidewalk roller-skate manufacturers, they, too, have been practically out of production during the past year.

We are also confronted with a refusal on the part of the purchasers of our other sporting goods items who refuse to buy in normal fashion for this spring's business, because of the fact that they do not wish to be caught with an inventory of merchandise on which the excise tax situation is in doubt.

* * * * *

If there is any further information that we can furnish or any other way that we can be of assistance to repeal this unjust war-time levy, we shall be more than happy to cooperate.

Resolutions of Wayne County (Iowa) Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, all of us are interested in a long-range farm program that will be satisfactory and fair to those who are engaged in producing food for our great Republic. I have a copy of the resolutions adopted by the farm bureau of my home county in Iowa, Wayne County, where I have lived all of my life, and I desire to have these resolutions printed in the RECORD so that all Members of Congress may have the opportunity of knowing the position that this great organization has taken with respect to national problems and issues confronting the country at this time. The resolutions were adopted at the annual meeting of the Wayne County Farm Bureau held at Corydon, Iowa, last fall and read as follows:

WAYNE COUNTY FARM BUREAU RESOLUTIONS, 1949

We, the members of the Wayne County resolutions committee, after due consideration, present the following resolutions for the approval of the members of the Wayne County Farm Bureau. These are based upon a summary of township resolutions and the work of the county committee after due consideration:

NATIONAL RESOLUTIONS

1. We believe that it is important to have the farm program developed through a bipartisan approach.

2. We believe guaranties of 100 percent of parity as compared with lower supports would result in more drastic controls.

3. We believe that it is important to keep controls at a minimum.

4. We believe there is danger of losing farm programs if the cost is too high.

5. We favor a minimum guaranty or floors under farm prices.

6. We favor flexible supports tied to the amount the commodity is in surplus with a minimum floor established by law and the Secretary of Agriculture having the authority to set support prices from this minimum up.

7. We do not believe that if production payments are used, the prices of commodities

to the consumer would drop enough to have a marked influence on consumption.

8. We believe that a cheap food philosophy established in the minds of the consumer would be dangerous to the long-time interests of farmers.

9. We believe that it is dangerous to have the income of farmers dependent to a large extent upon direct appropriations from Congress.

10. We believe satisfactory compliance with soil conservation practices should be a requisite to eligibility for price supports.

11. We do not favor abandoning the parity concept for the income support standard plan.

12. We favor increasing Federal aid to encourage more men and women to enter the medical profession.

13. We favor a voluntary prepayment health insurance plan rather than a compulsory health insurance program.

14. We favor increasing Federal aid for the construction of more hospitals and in such manner as to locate them in rural areas where they are needed.

15. We feel that labor-management problems that are questions of wages, working conditions, etc., are social, ethical, and economic in nature and can best be settled by the human approach of mediation rather than by legal methods (regular channels of our courts).

16. We favor the establishing of a Worker Extension Service similar to Agricultural Extension Service now in operation.

17. We favor the changing of mail routes so that free mail delivery becomes available to many more families.

18. We favor the establishment of a Federal agency for the purpose of setting up telephone cooperatives.

19. We recommend to the next Congress that they place a high priority on the eradication of agricultural spoodes.

20. We believe Congress should provide Federal aid for public education in order that all children are guaranteed a minimum standard of education but with minimum of Federal control.

STATE RESOLUTIONS

21. We believe we should revise our health programs and adopt a county health unit program for Iowa.

22. We are in favor of keeping taxation on our REA co-ops in line with our municipal, light, and water organizations or systems.

23. We urge that Farm Bureau increase its attention in the legislative program.

24. We feel that Farm Bureau should put more emphasis on encouraging citizens to participate in the activities of the party of their choice.

COUNTY RESOLUTIONS

25. We urge greater cooperation between agricultural agencies for soil conservation in Wayne County.

26. We recommend that the county board of supervisors and the county board of education jointly plan for the construction and surfacing of school-bus routes and mail routes before other roads are considered for construction.

27. We commend the Wayne County newspapers, chamber of commerce, and the businessmen of Wayne County for their cooperation in Farm Bureau activities. We wish to thank those who have assisted in the program of work, membership drive, and this annual meeting.

28. We, the resolutions committee, submit the foregoing resolutions and recommend their adoption.

FOREST FRANCIS, *Chairman.*
HENRY BEHRENS.
MRS. OSWIN MCKEE.
WAYNE EVANS.
WILLIAM HAUPTMAN.

FEPC Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, while the politicians are busy pressing for consideration of the ill-advised FEPC proposal under the assumption that the minority group support they will receive thereby will be politically beneficial, there are thinking people all over this country who are worried about the implications of this further proposal to regiment our people.

Because of my opposition to this proposal I receive many letters from people all over the country expressing their opposition. From time to time I have placed letters and other communications in the RECORD in order that my colleagues from the so-called North might understand that this is not a one-way political street.

In that connection I submit herewith a letter just received from the Reverend Joseph E. Gedra, of the Church of the Immaculate Conception, N Street at Eighth NW., Washington, D. C., which I am sure will be of benefit to my colleagues because of its concise language and convincing arguments.

Reverend Gedra's letter follows:

CHURCH OF THE
IMMACULATE CONCEPTION,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1950.

The Honorable WILLIAM M. COLMER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLMER: It is only because of the far-reaching, bewildering, and cataclysmic effect, I truthfully believe, the passage of the FEPC bill will have upon the fundamental structure of our society, that I write to ask you kindly to consider these few important facts before casting a favorable vote:

1. Cries of antiracial, anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, etc., will skyrocket beyond calculation. Then, to prove all alleged charges will mean jamming our courts, with the resultant bedlamism.

2. Such a bill is contrary to the God-given gift of selectivity. For instance, we select our food, literature, forms of entertainment, friends, etc. People should exercise that right with regard to employees. There are abuses, of course. But the right which a person enjoys from above will be so smoke-screened if the FEPC bill is passed that one will lose sight of this right.

3. Forced consideration, by pressure groups, of one's race, religion, nationality rather than his qualifications will undermine our national set-up.

There appear to be some advantages in this bill. For instance, Catholics may see in this bill a way paved for a Catholic to become President of the United States. But apart from this, the bill can inflame the emotions of our people, making them supersensitive to their color, race, and religion. Herein lies the grave danger. That something should be done, everyone agrees; but, I believe the solution of this acute problem will not be found in the FEPC.

With every best wish, I am,
Very sincerely yours,
JOSEPH E. GEDRA.

Communist Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, since the Russian Communists are now laying claim to have been first in everything, it is not inappropriate to say that they lead the world with a first place as inventors of half-truths and untruths and as prime inventors of the propaganda of hate and the ideology of godlessness.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Kearny Observer of January 27, 1950, entitled "Communist Thinking":

COMMUNIST THINKING

Who invented the electric light? If you say Edison, you're wrong—it was a Russian named Yablochkov. Who invented the telegraph? If you say Morse, you're wrong again—it was another Russian named Yakobi. The radio? No, it wasn't Marconi—it was still another Russian named Popov. How about the first successful flying machine? If you answer "the Wright brothers" you'll have to go to the bottom of the class—a Russian called Moshaisky flew like a bird near St. Petersburg 20 years before the Wrights took off at Kitty Hawk.

These, and similar revelations, are disclosed by Edmund Stevens in the Christian Science Monitor. He found them in a Soviet managine called the Literary Gazette. They show, he says, one of the ways the Soviet Party "woos Russian national pride. The move corresponds to a vital need of Russians to vindicate their self-respect and destroy the residue of an old sense of inferiority. It also increases the Russian's confidence in their capacity to catch up with and outstrip the rest of the world technically at the present time." It is, in other words, an example of the kind of morale-building propaganda the government is now feeding the Russian masses.

Moreover, it is an example of how the Soviet bosses will use any untruth or half-truth to serve their ends. A story has been going the rounds concerning a British Communist who went to a meeting of Russian Communist strategists in Moscow. He was perplexed as to how to argue some ideological point or other in England. The Russians gave him an answer, to which he objected that it wasn't true. The Russians looked at him with amazement—and then burst into gales of laughter over such naivete. It is said that the incident was described to the top Russians, including Stalin, and that they burst into laughter also.

Resolution Adopted Opposing the Proposed Legislation Taxing Insurance Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I addressed the House at some length in opposition to a bill then under consideration seeking to retroactively tax insurance companies.

Since that time the Equitable field organization, connected with the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, adopted resolutions supporting my view. A copy of those resolutions is as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE EQUITABLE FIELD ORGANIZATION JANUARY 26, 1950

Whereas there is pending before the House of Representatives a joint resolution proposing a retroactive tax on the income of life-insurance companies for the years 1947, 1948, and 1949; and

Whereas the failure of the life-insurance companies to earn during those years sufficient income on their assets to warrant the payment of income taxes under existing law was due to the low yield on investments resulting from the easy-money policies of the Government; and

Whereas the investment earnings of the life-insurance companies during those years required to sustain their reserves, and to enable them to meet their obligations under outstanding policies, were, as the Ways and Means Committee report indicates, in excess of their interest earnings and therefore produced no taxable net income under existing law; and

Whereas we in the Equitable field organization do not oppose income taxes on the earnings of life-insurance companies in excess of their annual needs to accumulate reserves, but we resist the payment of so-called income taxes retroactively imposed after the income has either been distributed to the policyholders or has become a part of the accumulated property of the company: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we the agency officers and managers of the Equitable field organization throughout the country assembled in our midwinter convention hereby urge upon both Houses of Congress that they refuse to enact this retroactive raid on the funds of policyholders which will increase the cost of their insurance by reducing the capacity of their companies to pay annual dividends; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate and be brought to the attention, through our agency organization, of our policyholders throughout the country.

Foreign Mines Developed With American Capital Will Not Help United States During War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I present an example of what disgusts and infuriates the American miner. The following item from the Chicago Sunday Tribune of January 8, 1950, indicates that the American Government is spending millions of dollars opening up large-scale mining in Africa while our own mines are permitted to close down. The article states that the Marshall plan has put nearly $230,000,000 into French African territories alone in the last 2 years, and that an example is a recent $3,600,000 contract with an American firm to expand and develop lead and zinc mines of Algeria. This article explains a lot of things. It explains why this administration is bearing down upon the domestic-mining industry and has refused to rescue those mines so seriously in need of help. Obviously there must be a market for the lead, zinc, and other minerals produced with this investment of American capital abroad; that market will not be in the United States if American mines are producing. In addition, this article explains why some American mining firms are opposing help for the American mining industry—they have their hands in the honey pot and are getting immense benefits from this foreign expenditure. I am wondering, though, what will happen if we get into another war and need the copper, lead, zinc, and other strategic and critical minerals and metals here on our own shores where we can use them to keep our tanks, battle fleet, and airplanes fighting. The minerals and metals developed with American money in foreign lands will not help us, and without production of our own we will be easy victims of our own stupidity. The article follows:

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune of January 8, 1950]

PARIS PARLEY TO PLAN AFRICAN PUMP PRIMING—ROAD-AND-POWER FUZZLE FIRST ON AGENDA

PARIS, January 7.—Ways of pumping Africa's untapped wealth into world trade streams come under study here next week.

Colonial officials from Britain, France, Belgium, and Portugal, who together control most of the continent, are to meet with African representatives Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday.

ROADS AND POWER FIRST

Their first job will be to decide on means of improving the roads, railways, bridges, and power supplies of the wilderness areas to speed development of mineral lodes, forest products, and plantations. Technical experts will aid them. Pest control, soil erosion, and public health are other problems.

Politically, the colonial officers are expected to discuss means of opposing a recent United Nations decision calling for a United Nations investigation of conditions in colonial possessions of member nations.

The Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA), which already has poured millions of Marshall plan dollars into African projects, will keep in touch with the meetings.

A. L. Moffat, ECA Deputy Commissioner, is in Nairobi, Kenya colony, studying a lengthening list of developments for east and central Africa. These include control of Nile waters, electric power production in Uganda, and opening up of large-scale mining and agricultural works in almost every territory from Uganda to northern Rhodesia.

TEN-YEAR BRITISH PLAN

Of the four nations to be represented here, Britain has approved a 10-year public works plan for its African territories.

France is developing a similar plan for French West Africa and equatorial Africa. The French program, still tentative pending parliamentary approval, calls for an expenditure of $300,000,000 a year for 10 years to make the territories more attractive to foreign investors. The money would be partly matched by allocations from territorial treasuries.

The Marshall plan has put nearly $230,000,000 into French African territories alone in the last 2 years. An example is a recent $3,600,000 contract with an American firm to expand and develop lead and zinc mines of Algeria.

Included in the mineral wealth that France's territories are expected to yield is manganese, lead and zinc from Morocco and other northern areas, and graphite from Madagascar.

A Life of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, "a life of service." In my opinion no man could wish for finer words to be said or written of him after he has rounded out his span on God's earth.

Dr. John A. Kenney, who has now passed from this way of life, gave just that, "a life of service."

In a world half-bent on destruction, it is well that we pause for a moment and reflect on the life of one who, despite adversities, was so intent in his devotion to his fellow being that he served him well.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following editorial which appeared in the January 31, 1950, issue of the Newark Evening News:

A LIFE OF SERVICE

By any standard, Dr. John A. Kenney, dead at 75, must be accounted a notable figure. His outstanding services to the physical welfare of his race began at Tuskegee Institute, where he was resident physician and from 1902 to 1922 medical director and chief surgeon of the John A. Andrew Memorial Hospital and School for Nurses. He was also personal physician for Tuskegee's two great heads, Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver.

That was for Dr. Kenney not a wide enough service, so in 1912 he founded the John A. Andrew annual clinics, at which Negro and white doctors, working together, treated Negroes living within a 200-mile radius. Terrorism by the Ku Klux Klan drove him from Alabama for his insisting on the right of Negro doctors to practice at a Veterans' Administration hospital.

Alabama's loss was New Jersey's gain, for on learning that Negro doctors were not welcomed at hospitals here, Dr. Kenney established in this city the Kenney Institute, named for his parents. In 1935 it was turned over to the Booker T. Washington Hospital Association. This organization, representing the Negro population of the State, renamed it Community Hospital.

In a subsidence of Klan feeling Dr. Kenney returned in 1939 to Alabama to head for 5 years Tuskegee Institute Hospital. Subsequently he came back to this State and resumed private practice in Montclair. From earliest manhood he devoted himself to the health of his race, and it is entirely in keeping with the spirit and influence of the man that both of his surviving sons should be physicians. His reputation for service is national and deserved.

The Flood-Control Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of January 27, 1950:

THE FLOOD-CONTROL JOB

After disastrous floods in 1937 and 1937, an over-all program for controlling the Mississippi below Cairo was drawn up by the Army engineers. The program called for 1,500 miles of levees built to sufficient height to hold back a record flood. Also included in the design were reservoirs and floodways.

Brig. Gen. P. A. Pettingill, president of the Mississippi River Commission, has now reminded a House Appropriation Subcommittee that the protective system is still not complete and another major flood may be due. General Pettingill pointed out that 400 miles of project levees have yet to be built, and the vital Atchafalaya River Basin floodway is still under construction. Engineers hope to finish the project by January 1, 1953.

During recent high stages of some of the Mississippi's tributaries the retaining walls held and the lower river saw no serious damage. But, as the engineers told the Congressmen, the valley is "living on borrowed time." The day may come when all the tributaries are flooding at the same time. Then we won't want it said that we did too little too late.

What Ails the Shoe Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Lynn (Mass.) Daily Item:

WHAT AILS THE SHOE INDUSTRY?—NEW ENGLAND NOW PRODUCES ONLY 22 PERCENT OF NATION'S TOTAL—BOSTON TRADE PUBLICATION BLAMES LABOR COSTS, LACK OF DIVERSITY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—What's ailing the shoe industry in Lynn and other New England centers? New England once produced 62 percent of the country's shoes, but today it produces only 22 percent. It's main troubles are held to be labor costs, lack of diversified output, inadequate merchandising, and nonidentification of its products on the national market, according to an article appearing in the current issue of Leather and Shoes, published in Boston. Since the preparation of the article, some relief has appeared on the horizon with the announcement that the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor only this week denied a petition for industry-wide exemptions under the new 75-cents-an-hour minimum wage law and limited individual factory exemptions to 65 cents an hour for the first 6 weeks of a learner's employment and to 70 cents for the second 6 weeks. This is a decided boon to Lynn and other Massachusetts shoe factories since it will restrict the differential between the 75-cent minimum already contracted for in this State and the lower minimums sought in other States—some of them as low as 37½ cents an hour. Because of wide local interest in the topic, the Item has received permission to reproduce the Leather and Shoes article in full.)

For the past 50 years New England's shoe industry has been on the down grade. In this period it has consistently made fewer shoes, operated fewer factories, employed fewer workers. The only thing that has increased has been its mortalities, liquidations, and exodus of its former factories. According to all evidence available, the decline of New England's shoe industry will continue downward. It has apparently lost its once-famed virility and initiative; at least other shoe sectors in the country have superseded it.

The facts and statistics demonstrating this contention provide an impressive array of irrefutable evidence.

Fifty years ago, New England's shoe producing States (Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Maine), produced 62 percent of the country's total footwear; today it is down to 22 percent, a fall of 50 percent. A half century past, Massachusetts produced 47.1 percent of the total as against about 17.5 percent today, a drop of about 70 percent. Significantly, these declines have been annually consistent over the 50-year period. The following table illustrates it more graphically:

Percent of shoe output

Year	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Maine	Total New England
1899	47.1	8.9	9.7	65.7
1933	23.4	5.7	6.0	35.1
1948	17.4	5.3	7.7	30.4

The exodus of shoe-manufacturing firms and factories has also been impressive. Twenty-five years ago Massachusetts had 595 shoe plants, but today has only 245; New Hampshire in the same period fell from 65 to 54; while Maine just about held its own with approximately 46.

STEADY SHRINKAGE

New England's once celebrated shoe centers which were the core of the United States shoe industry—Lynn, Haverhill, Newburyport, Brockton, etc.—have shown steady shrinkage. Haverhill, which only 30 years ago accounted for 25 percent of the Nation's total shoe output, today accounts for a mere 3 percent. In 1908 Newburyport was a bustling shoe town with 28 factories, with approximately 6,000 workers. By 1924 the factories numbered only 18. Today there are only four shoe factories there, employing a total of about 1,500, and two of the firms accounting for 1,200 of the workers.

In the past year alone in the Lynn-Haverhill area, 23 of 61 shoe factories have liquidated or moved out. Charles J. Goldman, legal counsel for the Lynn Shoe Manufacturers Association, declares this 55-percent loss in this short period as "the greatest collapse of the shoe industry in history." He further states, "Lynn is the best place in the United States to make shoes. Historically it is the birthplace of the shoe industry. Yet, in spite of all these favorable conditions there has been an exodus of shoe manufacturers to such an alarming extent that recently I caused a bill to be introduced in the Massachusetts Legislature asking that a commission be appointed to ascertain the reasons for the exodus."

A recent and critical blow to New England's shoe industry was the migration of the W. L. Douglas Co. from Brockton to Scranton, Pa. For 70 years this firm has been located in Brockton, but after a 6-month labor-management quarrel, pulled up stakes and left. The firm once employed as many as 3,500 workers.

LABOR'S PART

Much of the plight of New England's waning shoe industry is blamed onto the labor unions. Most of the plants are under contract to one of two unions—the Brotherhood of Shoe & Allied Craftsmen, AFL, a New England local, and the United Shoe Workers of America, CIO.

In 1919 New England's shoe factories employed 114,000 workers. Today it has dwindled to 79,000. Except for Los Angeles and the New York-Brooklyn area, both of which make mostly high-priced footwear requiring more detailed operations and hence higher rates, New England wage rates are higher than in any part of the country.

The relation of direct labor cost to the factory selling price per pair averages 23.18 percent for the Nation. In the Lynn-Haverhill area the direct labor cost averages between 24 to 40 cents. In this same area the union has negotiated contracts providing for a 75-cent minimum hourly, progressing to 80 cents in 4 months. But the same union contract provides for a 50-cent hourly minimum in Ohio and 60 cents in Maryland.

Walter Espovich, counsel for the Haverhill Shoe Manufacturers Board of Trade, stated: "Twenty years ago Haverhill had a differential in labor. Now it has disappeared. Conditions in New England are not favorable due to high labor costs. * * * Haverhill as a high labor cost area gets only the overflow of business."

Is New England's higher labor cost offset by a higher productivity? A Bureau of Labor Statistics study showed that from 1939 to 1945, for the country as a whole, there was an 8.8 percent reduction in labor time per pair of shoes, and that New England shoe plants increased output per man-hour more than producers located in other major centers.

On the other hand, Charles J. Goldman, counsel for Lynn shoe manufacturers, recently told Labor Secretary Maurice J. Tobin: "Not only has Massachusetts the highest labor cost in the country for workers on women's popular priced novelty shoes but also the lowest rate of production of shoes."

Address Before the Washington-Lewis Chapter of DAR, Fredericksburg, Va., Explaining House Concurrent Resolution To Strengthen United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following text of an address I delivered on House Concurrent Resolution 64, before the Washington-Lewis chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, at Fredericksburg, Va., recently:

I appreciate very much the invitation to meet with you tonight, to discuss House Concurrent Resolution 64—what it is, what it proposes to do, and how advocates of this form of international cooperation for peace hope to achieve this worthy objective. I also hope that I can correct some of the misconceptions of the program. I am highly honored that you have invited me here to present, so to speak, my side of the question. Your national organization has publicly expressed disapproval of the idea of world federation, and by asking me here tonight you have demonstrated once again one of the principles which has made our democracy distinctive—a desire to hear both sides of a question.

Federation is no new or revolutionary concept of government. World federation proposes an extension of the idea which binds governments into programs of service, and in this case the proposed service is a truly effective attack upon the war system. It is not, as some of the critics charged, a super-world government with unlimited powers to assume all of the functions of the individual states. The federation I contemplate could not interfere with the internal affairs of the member states; it would not deal with currency or trade problems, nor have authority to consider any matter not related to the world's peace.

The power of a federation such as I envision would be carefully defined and strictly limited. For example, House Concurrent Resolution 64, which I had the honor to introduce and which is sponsored by more than 100 Members of the House, refers specifically to "defined and limited powers," and only in one field—that of preservation of peace. The language is so clear and direct that there cannot be any misinterpretation of the objective of world federation under this measure.

All of us will agree, I am sure, that another war, releasing upon the world terrible weapons of destruction, would threaten modern civilization. All of us are searching for the means whereby peace can be made secure and future aggression prevented. That burning desire, not only on the part of the people of the United States but of other peoples, as well, was responsible for the warm welcome the United Nations received when it was organized in San Francisco in 1945. Since that time millions of freedom-loving people everywhere have placed their faith in the United Nations. We have come to accept it as the world's best hope for enduring peace. But, at the same time, we would be indulging in a dangerous deception to assume that with the creation of the United Nations the fight for world order based upon law has been won. We have made a beginning with the United Nations; the more difficult task lies ahead. The sense of imperfection must not cause us to abandon the United Nations. Those of us who are supporting the idea of federation are careful to point out that we must work through the United Nations and develop that organization into an international agency capable of maintaining the peace.

House Resolution 64 is definite on this score. It states: "It is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United State to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited power to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation and enforcement of world law." A reading of this statment is proof enough of our devotion to the United Nations. We want to give to the United Nations the one thing it lacks—the authority to decide questions of aggression through a judicial system and enforce the decisions so reached. We must recognize that it is still possible for aggression to take place, and this great organization finds itself without power to check potential aggressions.

A system of law, based upon justice, is the only answer. That is the meaning of Resolution 64. We are saying to the world, "What we want is a world governed by law and the principles of justice, not a world of violence and disorder." We are proposing that the principles which have united the people of the United States be extended in this limited sense to the whole world. If we do this, we will have peace and we will have something we love even more than peace itself—we will have justice.

Not many years ago, the State of Tennessee and the State of Arkansas had a sharp clash over the ownership of certain islands in the Mississippi River. Suits and counter suits were filed, and eventually the Supreme Court of the United States was called upon to make the final decision. Both States accepted, without equivocation, the judgment of the Court. Why? Because we have grown accustomed to accepting the rule of law.

The United States marshal of the district which I represent is one of the least violent men I know. He does not often carry a pistol, and yet, he is charged with enforcing mandates of the Supreme Court. No matter how many millions of dollars are involved or how many lives affected, the judgment is enforced and violence is never done. But one day that was not the case. It required force to carry out the mandate of the Supreme Court. In that period we had not, as a people, developed the respect for law and order which governs our life today.

Our goal in international relations is the same universal respect for law but with force sufficient to back up the decisions against aggression if necessary. Certainly that does not call for a world government which would destroy the sovereignty of the member nations.

The world has initiated movements in the past to achieve this ideal but the efforts have ended in failure because we had not developed a system of international justice, nor did we have power to back up decisions. The Kellogg Pact, negotiated by our own Secretary of State, outlawed war, but that treaty was immediately and consistently violated. The League of Nations could only protest, it could not act against the aggressors.

We all realize now that the occupation of the Rhineland by Hitler's troops was an act of aggression. That proved to Hitler that by acting boldly in violation of international agreements he could gain his ends in the face of indecision and timid action on the part of law-abiding Nations who had failed to build a system for unified protection of the peace. We can see now that German militarism could have been stopped then if we had had an international rule of law to brand his actions as violation of world law. Had Hitler persisted, in the face of such a ruling, he would have been confronted by world opinion and then by world police.

Chairman Kee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee had something like this in mind when he declared, during hearings on HCR 64: "If we could have had a world marshal to go in and arrest Hitler and Hitler recognized that the world marshal was backed by a Federation with sufficient power to enforce the orders of the marshal, we would not have had any trouble."

I shall not attempt to outline in great detail the organization of such a federation. I am more interested in having the Congress adopt HCR 64 as a policy statement. Such a clear policy declaration by the Congress would have a great moral effect upon the world. It would demonstrate once again to the world that we in the United States are interested primarily in establishing an enduring peace. We have fought two world wars for the ideals of freedom and justice. We are now in a position of world leadership. By adopting such a policy declaration, supported by the people of all political faiths in this country, we would point the way toward fulfillment of age-old dreams of peace.

Cost Against Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of January 24, 1950:

COST AGAINST SAVING

As flood crests on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers have receded, the Army engineers have calculated that works erected since 1937 averted $15,000,000 in losses in the Wabash and lower Ohio Valleys this year. Levees and flood walls on the Mississippi below Cairo, Ill., are credited with saving $100,000,000 more.

These figures, however, give only a part of the picture. It is certain that the Nationwide flood-control program which Congress set in motion in 1937 prevented loss of human life. While savings in life are not calculable, the engineers point out that hurricane-driven floods on Florida's Lake Okeechobee drowned 2,000 people in 1928. Flood-control works there were finished in 1943, and last year, when the same type of hurricane struck, no lives were lost. In no other year since the Government undertook flood control as a Federal responsibility has the death toll from river floods matched the 428 lives claimed by the Mississippi in 1927. Since 1928, when flood deaths totaled 185, the toll has exceeded 100 only once. In 1943, when the Missouri broke loose, the national toll was 107.

The national flood-control program by the middle of 1948, had prevented losses totaling $5,000,000,000 in the lower Mississippi Basin alone, according to the engineers' estimate. This was accomplished at a cost one-eighth as great. Elsewhere in the Nation the estimated savings on newer works was $500,000,000. This was slightly more than the amount of money spent for completed projects.

When we look at this balance sheet, with lives and property saved listed in one column and the funds spent for flood control in another, the figures are impressive enough. But can losses from floods really be measured in dollars and cents? To people who have known the menace of the advancing water, to people who have lost loved ones to the river, levees, and other protective works mean more than entries on a ledger. They represent guardians against disaster that need not occur again.

Israel's Labor Starts Modern Medical Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item which appeared in this morning's New York Herald Tribune is a very interesting commentary on how

the State of Israel is treating its medical problem:

ISRAEL'S LARGEST MODERN MEDICAL CENTER—HADASSAH PLANS $5,000,000 HOSPITAL AND SCHOOLS FOR PHYSICIANS AND NURSES

(By Paul Tabenkin)

A $5,000,000 medical center, including a 600-bed hospital and medical and nursing schools, has been started 6 miles east of Tel Aviv, Israel, it was learned yesterday. When completed it will be the largest and most modern institution of its kind in the new state.

Dr. Noah Feler, chief surgeon and medical director of the Bellinson Hospital in Petakh Tikvah, Israel, said the institution will be part of Kupat Holim, the medical service of Histadrut, the Israel labor federation.

Dr. Feler, sent to the United States by Kupat Holim to study American surgical methods, said that mass immigration, coupled with a serious shortage of doctors, nurses, and hospital facilities, has resulted in an increase of 25 to 30 percent in the civilian death rate since Israel became a state in May 1948.

The new 6-story hospital will be staffed by 100 doctors and 200 nurses. Each year the medical school will graduate from 20 to 30 doctors and the nursing school 40 nurses.

"We have about 1,500 practicing physicians in a land that must have a minimum of 3,000 doctors," Dr. Feler said. "There is a great need for graduate nurses. Kupat Holim alone needs an additional 400 nurses. Half of our present nursing staff consists of nongraduates. Israel vitally needs 6,000 hospital beds, but we must do the best we can with only 3,000 at present."

"In addition to training doctors," Dr. Feler said, "the new medical center will offer refresher and post-graduate courses to physicians already in practice. At present Kupat Holim sends a number of its physicians to the United States for such work."

"Israel plans to establish 400 new settlements within the next 5 years," Dr. Feler said, "and each must have a clinic staffed by at least one doctor and one nurse." He emphasized that Israel will welcome American physicians and nurses who wish to settle there.

A Secretary of State Is Also an Individual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 27, 1950:

A SECRETARY OF STATE IS ALSO AN INDIVIDUAL

"I do not intend," said Dean Acheson, "to turn my back on Alger Hiss." Immediately hue and cry arises to condemn him.

It would be gratuitous to comment that the criticism comes from expected sources, from political partisans of known hostility. For many another, in swift judgment, seeing Mr. Acheson as Secretary of State, recalling Alger Hiss as a former employee of the Department of State, would likely join the chorus of condemnation.

Mr. Acheson, however, is not speaking as Secretary of State. He is speaking as a man in whose personal code friendship is impervious to weather changes, fair or foul. He makes an indelible case for the right of individual conscience.

The questions addressed to Mr. Acheson on this subject indeed came as result of public statements of obviously political inspiration. It is to his high credit that he did not evade them, as another might have done, by raising this point. Here I am, he seemed to say, and this is what I believe, and you will have to take me or leave me on the strength of it. Of course, he might have added that he expected the questions and was ready for them, because his answer and its Scriptural reference was, however admirable, quite well assembled. This, however, does not detract from its value, which is that of solid precept, useful as a guide to principled behavior.

It is seldom that an official occupied with high public policy, responsible to political considerations and impersonal routine, has an opportunity to relate conduct to personal conscience. Perhaps we would all be better off if this sort of interpretation of motive and action were called forth more frequently from public men. It is not a question of leniency for improper official conduct or its extenuation in betrayal of the public interest. It is a question whether adherence to conscience, wherever it leads one, is not properly a thing for a single standard, in private or public life.

Tulsa Tribune Suggests They Be Impeached

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD the following editorial by Mr. Richard Lloyd Jones, editor of the Tulsa Tribune, Tulsa, Okla.:

"No wise man ever thought a traitor could be trusted."—Cicero.

THEY MUST BE IMPEACHED

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

What's happened to our country? This Hiss conviction has revealed something more than an individual traitor. It has revealed men in offices of high public trust who are defenders of treason.

Justice Felix Frankfurter, one of Harvard's collection of cultural curiosities, should resign from the highest court in our country. And if he hasn't the decency to do that, he should be impeached.

Frankfurter is only one of our high officials who has indicted his own intellect and integrity by sponsoring and repeatedly publicly professing his warm personal friendship for a traitor.

Justice Stanley Reed, also of our highest court, is another friend of traitor Hiss. He should resign, or be thrown out of his judicial robes by impeachment. Our courts and our Congress should be above suspicion.

Frankfurter was the exalted scholar whom the late President Franklin Roosevelt picked as his adviser.

It was Frankfurter who picked Hiss as the prodigy of the Roosevelt administration. It was Frankfurter and Roosevelt who made this traitor Hiss the closest adviser of the President of the United States at a time when not only the security of the American people was imperiled but the peace of the whole world. Roosevelt put the fate of nations in the hands of Hiss.

Added to all this our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, after the traitor is convicted, reiterates that he is the traitor's friend. If he is the traitor's friend he is not fit to be our Secretary of State.

The people's representatives in their Congress should lose no time to impeach and remove this man who could be a friend to a traitor.

This Hiss who helped our enemy was authorized by our Secretary of State and our President to shape the tragic policies that have brought China into communism, and an ally of Russia.

For 10 years, through the interest of the late President Roosevelt, Frankfurter, and others, this fellow Hiss has gone from one position of power to a new position of greater power. For 10 years this intrigue against our Government has been going on and for 10 years high officials in Washington, with full knowledge of these infamous operations, have protected and covered all these trails of treason. The treason story does not end with Hiss. It begins with Hiss. Washington is now filled with frightened public officials.

Even the President of the United States so far forgot his obligations to the American people that when the facts of treason began to be talked he assured the people that it was nothing but a political trick to distract their attention by dragging "red herrings" before them.

The President should have been the first to authorize and insist upon full investigation. He should have been the first to ferret out the truth. But instead of that our President, and his lieutenants, did everything they could to hide the truth and to keep the people in ignorance of their betrayal.

What is the matter with the Democratic Party that it, professing to be a political champion of the American people, should lend itself to the suppression of the truth and make every effort to smear and ridicule those who, in the defense of our country, have sought to establish the truth?

Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, to his disgrace, is just one of the Democratic Senators who have tried to ridicule those who have brought the truths of the Hiss infamies to light.

On February 11, 1945, at Yalta, Franklin D. Roosevelt was a dying man. He had just been reelected without the strength to go through an exhaustive hard political campaign. Yet there at Yalta, this sick man, the choice of his party, was to determine the fate of nations. Of all the able men in America not one was chosen to be his adviser. He chose Hiss and Hiss alone. And it was at Yalta, under the influence of Hiss, that millions upon millions of people were flippantly handled over into slavery under Stalin.

It was this Hiss who, given the power by a Democratic Party and a Democratic President, gave to Russia three votes to our one in the newly formed United Nations. Everything that Hiss did was done to strengthen communism and to weaken America. And he is still the dear friend of our Secretary of State. And to two of the judges on our Supreme Court. And he is just a piece of "red herring" to the President.

Where are the Americans that they witness this with flippant disinterest? Where is our Congress, every Member of which has taken his solemn oath to defend the interests and protect the integrities of our Republic?

Every loyal citizen of this Republic should write every Congressman he knows or who represents him, Senate and House, and demand the impeachment of Frankfurter and Reed and Acheson. Command every Representative and Senator to command the President of the United States to reveal the names of those who have concealed this Hiss, and his associates, in the betrayal of this Republic for the last 10 years.

Already, from the floor of the United States Senate, President Truman has been challenged to reveal the identity of those in our Government who, for 10 years, have engineered the concealment of the espionage evidence that convicted Hiss.

But a challenge is not enough. The whole country is now alerted to the fact that our State Department is honeycombed with trusted and confidential workers who have the funny idea that it is intellectually smart to betray America to the communistic forces.

The Senate should do more than challenge. It should command President Truman to come clean with everything, and himself clean out the traitors and the near-traitors and the friends of traitors in all the departments of our Government.

Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, has demanded the resignation of Acheson and Frankfurter. We would like to see one of Oklahoma's Senators lead the fight for a clean and honest national administration that is above suspicion. It is time that ELMER THOMAS and BOB KERR became articulate with righteous indignation at the "red herring" hypocrisy of Truman.

Cheap and shallow are the gentlemen who sit in the Senate of the United States more concerned with their reelection than they are with the security of the American people. Shallow and sad, are the American voters who think betrayal of a public trust is a clever political trick that merits political reward.

Our Congress is what we voters make it. This Hiss trial has proven many things. Chief of which is that we, the voters, have failed to do our duty. We have elected a President and a Congress that have tried to shield a traitor to the Republic.

The Hiss trial has put ELMER THOMAS and BOB KERR on the spot. This Hiss story will reveal them. Do we expect statesmanship performance? Or are we to listen, as do the Texans, to a Senator who said that those who brought this Hiss to trial and those who convicted him are just trying to make a burlesque out of this.

Betraying your country is not burlesque, Mr. CONNALLY. Oklahoma waits for her Senators to speak.

How the Phrase "In God We Trust" Came To Be on the Coins of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article published by the Chase National Bank:

HOW THE PHRASE "IN GOD WE TRUST" CAME TO BE ON THE COINS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Reverend Watkinson was troubled. In his small parish at the Ridleyville, Pa., he brooded over the low ebb of Union fortunes after Fort Sumter and Bull Run. He deplored the godlessness of a Nation 7 months in civil war.

One cheerless November day in 1861 he sat down at the antique desk in his rectory and wrote a letter of singular eloquence to the Secretary of the Treasury.

"One fact touching our currency has hitherto been seriously overlooked," he wrote. "I mean the recognition of the Almighty God in some form on our coins.

"You are probably a Christian. What if our Republic were now shattered beyond reconstruction? Would not the antiquaries of succeeding centuries rightly reason from our past that we were a heathen Nation?"

Proposing a motto on the theme of God, liberty, law, he concluded, "This would relieve us from the ignominy of heathenism. This would place us openly under the divine protection we have personally claimed. From my heart I have felt our national shame in disowning God as not the least of our present national disasters."

The Secretary of the Treasury was Salmon P. Chase, certainly a Christian and one of Lincoln's ablest Cabinet members. Later he was to become Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and it was in his honor that the Chase National Bank of the City of New York was named in 1877.

The Secretary, deep in problems of war financing, read this letter from the Reverend M. R. Watkinson and promptly recognized the merit of his plea. Within a week he had dispatched a note to the Director of the Mint in Philadelphia, James Pollock.

"No nation can be strong except in the strength of God," the note read, echoing the sentiments of the clergyman, "or safe except in His defense. The trust of our people in God should be declared on our national coins.

"You will cause a device to be prepared without unnecessary delay with a motto expressing in the fewest and terasest words possible this national recognition."

The Director of the Mint acted quickly on the Secretary's order. Before the year was out a bronze pattern for a $10-gold piece with the motto "God, our trust" had been submitted. Shortly thereafter, "Our country, our God" was suggested. But it was not until 1864, that "In God we trust" first appeared on a United States coin, a 2-cent piece. Salmon P. Chase himself had proposed this inscription.

Today this motto has the ring of timelessness, as though it had been given on tablets of stone to the founding fathers of a Republic conceived in a deep religious spirit. Yet until 1864 our country's moneys bore only practical and mundane Yankee slogans. The terse injunction "Mind your business" on the Fugio cent, first coin issued by the United States, illustrates the tempo of those times.

Since then many issues of all our coins have borne this simple affirmation of a Nation's faith, "In God we trust."

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the text of a recent address made by Prof. Carlton Wells, of the University of Michigan, on the Justice for Poland radio program of the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress.

In his introductory remarks, Attorney Joseph F. Furtek paid tribute to Professor Wells for his interest and work in the Polish cause. For many years, Professor Wells has kept in close touch with Polish affairs and during the war, he headed a Michigan committee of Americans for Poland.

The western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress is to be complimented for its fine work in stimulating interest in and making the average American aware of the tragic fate that is Poland's through its regular series of radio programs. We must not give up the fight for this worthy cause. Let all those who believe in freedom, independence, and self-determination join in the fight for the liberation of Poland.

Poland must be free. Let all true Americans rally to the noble cause of the Polish people.

The address of Professor Wells follows:

WHAT CAN AN AVERAGE AMERICAN DO ABOUT THE FATE OF POLAND?

(By Carlton F. Wells)

Let me begin by rephrasing my subject as an average American of Chicopee, Mass., or of Ann Arbor, Mich., might phrase it: How can an average American do anything about Poland? And why should he concern himself about this far-away country behind the iron curtain? To be sure, this average American may sympathize with Poland's present tragedy—her terrible human losses in the war, her devastated territory, her capital reduced to rubble, her political enslavement by Communists taking orders from Moscow.

But an average American is also bound to feel that Poland is, after all, only a small and distant part of a much-troubled world. Our 1950 headlines play up Communist China, Formosa, General MacArthur; Indonesia, India, Yugoslavia; the East-West struggle for Germany; Russia, the atomic bomb, and the cold war; the forthcoming British elections and the welfare state. * * * But Poland? The average American almost never hears of it any more.

And because most of us Americans are practical people and because we usually refuse to worry about problems beyond our power to remedy, we are likely to sum it up by asking the obvious and difficult question: Why should I—how can I—do anything about Poland?

To that question, with all that it implies of hopelessness—I want to give a clear and practical answer. For I believe profoundly that we average Americans have a stake in—and a responsibility for—what is happening today to 25,000,000 Polish people in Poland and to hundreds of thousands of exiled Poles in western Germany, France, Britain, and Italy. I believe that we as Americans ought not to act as though Poland's fate is none of our business, or that we have no responsibilities in the matter.

For we do owe a debt to the Polish people—a debt that I can only summarize here—a debt based on Poland's unique record to the common cause in World War II.

Even the most average of average Americans knows that back in 1939 Poland was first to fight Hitler—and that her bitter, heroic resistance to Germany marked the end of appeasement and the beginning of Germany's ultimate defeat. We average Americans know, too, that subsequently Poland was ruthlessly dismembered by its two totalitarian partners in plunder, Germany and Russia. In the fateful, bloody years that followed, Polish resistance went on—a great army-in-exile stationed in France and later in England, an air corps that played a key part in the battle of Britain, and naval units cooperating with the British Navy. As for Russia's treatment of Poland after 1939—the Communists sent more than 1,500,000 Poles into Siberian mines and into slave-labor camps, and almost certainly murdered at Katyn 10,000 Polish officers. Meanwhile,

in Germany-occupied Poland, the Polish underground—the most effective in all Europe—fought unceasingly. Then, after Hitler invaded Russia in 1941 and Stalin hastened to enlist Poland's aid, a Polish Army formed in Russia under General Anders moved to the Middle East, and in the final years of the war fought skillfully and bravely in Italy (Monte Cassino, Ancona, Bologna). A like record was made by Polish troops in the Normandy invasion and after. In short, the Polish record in the war was magnificent—hailed again and again by Churchill, Roosevelt, Eisenhower, by dozens of other spokesmen for the Allies.

And yet—as average Americans are finally coming to realize—Poland was betrayed—progressively and utterly—into the hands of the Russians: at Teheran, in 1943, where the British and Americans gave Stalin half of Poland's territory without so much as informing Poland's loyal coalition government-in-exile; at Yalta, in 1945, in a capitulation to Russian demands that can only be called appeasement; and in our repudiation of the legal Polish Government for the Communist puppet regime, imposed on the Polish people by the Red Army and kept in power by a totalitarian-style election.

No sensitive American can look at our treatment of our wartime Polish ally without a sense of shame—without realizing that an irreparable wrong has been done a valiant and loyal nation. One cannot read our repeated assurances and pledges given to the Polish people by Britain and America—and by Russia, too—without realizing that a flagrant injustice without parallel in modern history has been perpetrated.

No American can, I suppose, fully comprehend the tragic plight of Poland, or realize how bitterly betrayed the Polish exiles feel. Let me urge my listeners to look at one book—a graphic, restrained, heroic story recently published: General Anders' An Army in Exile—a book that makes crystal clear why no American can fairly say that Poland's fate is not also, in some measure, America's responsibility.

What, then, can an average American do on Poland's behalf? I have two suggestions to make, which I can only outline briefly. Here they are:

1. In America we can help to keep in living memory the great history and the great cultural tradition of Poland. Here, in free America, the Polish traditions of liberty, of patriotism, of liberal western culture, can be kept in remembrance—can be studied in our colleges and recorded in our libraries and represented in our art galleries and concert halls. This tradition is the Polish nation, as a recent writer has said, a great spiritual tradition, possessed of such "latent virtue and strength that it can survive ordinary human trials and vicissitudes. But today Poland has on her back a cynical enemy operating with all the modern means of extermination and repression. A good tradition cannot die but it can be killed. Let the Red war last another 20 or 30 years and there will be no Poland." (Read all of this admirable address on Polish Studies—A New Task for Polish Americans by Helen B. Zand, September 11, 1948.)

We can and we should use Polish scholars-in-exile in our schools and colleges to expand our too meager knowledge of Poland's distinctive literature, her unique national history, her contributions to art and music and science and scholarship and religion. We average Americans can do our small part in making certain that our local libraries have the best Polish books (and the best books about Poland—Jan Karski's Story of a Secret State, General Anders' An Army in Exile, Arthur Bliss Lane's I Saw Poland Betrayed, the United Nations series volume on Poland, and The Cambridge History of Poland; also, such books as The Art of Poland by Irena Piscorska and translations of Poland's older writers from Mickiewicz to Sienkiewicz and Reymont. By such small but practical efforts as these, can we help to keep alive the spiritual heritage of the Polish people.

Now—and finally—my second suggestion:

2. The average American must remember, always, that Poland means people—means individual, human, knowable people. And toward some of these Poles we can extend help of incalculable value. I have known a fairly large number of them—exiled Poles who got to America during or after the war—and I count it my rare good fortune to have known them: a Polish-Jewish artist, selflessly patriotic, ardently devoted to Poland's culture, tirelessly anti-Communist; a Polish soldier, whose wartime record included Siberian prison, military service in Italy, and at long last adjustment at Ann Arbor to American education; a Polish woman from the Polish underground, who fought in the Warsaw uprising in 1944 and who endured incredible conditions as a German slave laborer but who, in spite of all, got to America and into scientific work * * * and I could list a dozen others illustrative of Poland's sterling people who have reached our shores.

There are, however, many, many thousands who have not got to America but who want desperately to come—DP's who deserve a welcome and a haven in the United States.

How can an average American help to bring these Poles-in-exile to America? A word or two must suffice. The present DP law, passed in 1948, is "overly complicated, unjust, unfair, and discriminatory"—and a better law can be got, now, if enough average Americans urge it on their Senators and Representatives. You can help here, by getting in touch with the Nation-wide Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, located at 303 Lexington Avenue, New York City, or by working through your local church or civic organization. Again, as an individual or through a local organization, you can help to bring displaced Polish or other DP's to your home community—an opportunity and a challenge of such human importance that many more Americans should participate. At Ann Arbor a 14-organization DP committee is functioning and effective. In our university six DP students (including three splendid Polish DP's) have been brought this last year by American students. For further information on how you or your community can bring DP's to America and to your community, please write me or write the Polish-American Congress in care of this station.

My modest suggestions, then, boil down to these: We average Americans must not forget Poland's fate. We as a Nation must do all we can as individuals or in organizations, to maintain ties with Poland's great traditions and culture, and to maintain ties with the Polish people—especially at this time by bringing Polish DP's from Europe. We Americans must maintain in the long dark days ahead, an unswerving resolution that Poland's honored dead in World War II should not have died in vain—that by our American efforts, the Polish people shall be brought nearer to the ultimate attainment of Poland's freedom.

The Hydrogen Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

The fact still remains that all of us have a widespread and sincere desire for peace and although the decision of the President to continue work on the hydrogen bomb seems logical under existing conditions with no apparent cooperation from the Soviet Union to eliminate war, we seem to be forgetting United Nations and what its real function was. What can we do to make this group become something other than a name, when its real function was to break down the tensions between the nations of the world and be an effective instrument of peace? Presently the United States spends over $15,000,000,000 annually for its military defense and approximately $24,000,000 annually for the United Nations. How long can we or any other nation afford to continue this armament race? We should take the lead in an effort to relieve the world of the burden of armaments and pray that by making mutual concessions we might achieve the goal of international security.

The editorial follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION

On Friday the President simply stated what, under all the circumstances, was no more than simple fact: that the responsibility for decision as to whether or not to proceed with the hydrogen bomb was his and his alone. It is a subject which cannot be submitted to public debate, on which the President alone has access to all relevant sources of information and in regard to which he bears, as Chief Executive, as Commander in Chief, and as director of foreign relations, the direct constitutional responsibility. His decision has now been announced: "I have directed the Atomic Energy Commission to continue its work on all forms of atomic weapons, including the so-called hydrogen or supertomb." This work "will be carried forward on a basis consistent with the over-all objectives of our program for peace and security."

This newspaper has already indicated its belief that this is the only sound decision; that if the bomb can be made, it now must be made. It is not a moral issue and cannot be so regarded. Mr. Lilienthal, in a difficult and embarrassed interview on Monday, intimated that the secret high-level discussions of recent weeks have not turned on ethical scruples. Such hideous weapons as burning phosphorus—which Mr. Lilienthal himself earnestly promoted during the war—or napalm incendiary jelly are just as terrible for the individual victim as an atomic explosion. The issue has been one in military and political strategy, in the proper allocation of the national effort, in evaluation of the weapon as a weapon.

Conceivably the moral problem might arise if American action could in any way determine Soviet action. But then there would be no problem, for no one would attempt to construct this superhorror if there were any assurance that by refraining from doing so the Soviet Union would be prevented from building such a bomb of its own. There is no such assurance. Dr. Urey's informed guess that, given the raw materials, the development of the hydrogen bomb could not well cost more than around a hundred million dollars is sufficient indication that the technical and scientific problems foreseen are not particularly difficult for any nation which has already achieved atomic fission.

The knowledge and materials are now available. The United States really has no choice save to go forward, to acquaint itself with the possibilities and to be ready with a hydrogen bomb as soon as any other power may be—just as it had no choice during the war save to go forward with the study of such horrible things as modern superpoisonous gases and bacteriological warfare. A moral question can only arise, if it ever does, in connection with the use of the superbomb. We must be very careful how we pin our faith on this thing, assuming that it is successfully developed; we must be wary of the idea that a superweapon can give us a superpower in the world or relieve us of the hard obligations of intelligent policy and diplomacy, of consistency, integrity, and foresight on the basic plane of human relationships. If the bomb can be made, we must make it. The manner of its use is the difficult question, but that cannot arise until we know the results of the directive which has now publicly been given to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Let There Be Laughter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in a world which is deploring the fate of mankind, the words of His Holiness Pope Pius XII contained in the following editorial which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger of February 2, 1950, are indeed worth noting.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein the editorial entitled "Let There Be Laughter":

LET THERE BE LAUGHTER

When Pope Pius XII says there should be more laughter in this world of many long faces, he is deserving of an amen from every American. Introduced to Chick Johnson and Ole Olson with the explanation that they are not Catholics, His Holiness responded:

"Laughter has no religion; there should be more of it in the world."

Those two American comedians have done much to bring laughter to all. Their irrepressible good humor, and their zany antics have lightened many heavy hearts.

With his appeal for more laughter, the Pontiff also calls attention, if only by contrast, to a curious lapse among professional world-savers to the left. It has long been noted that most do-gooders seem to lack the gift of laughter. Perhaps they are too busy decrying the woes of society to laugh either with or at Olson and Johnson.

Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the reading of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the New York Times magazine section on January 22, 1950:

TO SECURE THESE RIGHTS EDUCATION HELPS, BUT LEGISLATION IS NECESSARY TO BRING ALL OUR CITIZENS THEIR CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Robert K. Carr, professor of government at Dartmouth, and formerly executive secretary of the President's Committee on Civil Rights)

In the 2-year period since the members of the President's Committee on Civil Rights went to the White House to submit its final report to Mr. Truman the civil-rights problem has become one of the most bitterly fought political issues in American history. While much of the attack upon the President's civil-rights program has been raucous and emotional, some of its critics have been reasonably calm and intellectual and accordingly their arguments are entitled to careful consideration.

These critics specifically have challenged two findings of the Civil Rights Committee which underlie the specific recommendations which the President has submitted to Congress. These are (1) a call for positive governmental action, much of it Federal in character, in support of civil liberty in America, and (2) a conclusion that segregation of people along racial, religious, or nationality lines must be eliminated from American life.

In the face of the renewal of the civil-rights conflict in the final session of the Eighty-first Congress, it is appropriate to reexamine these two findings, to note the nature of the attack upon them, and to restate some of the arguments in their favor which the President's Committee found persuasive.

The idea that civil rights can be strengthened and supported by Government is suggested in the very title to the Report of the President's Committee—"To Secure These Rights"—a title taken from the Declaration of Independence, where it is followed by the words "governments are instituted among men." Thus, the notion that government can be a friend as well as an enemy of basic human liberties finds firm support in our earliest political traditions.

In spite of this fact, opponents of civil-rights legislation argue that the only sound and successful way of strengthening civil rights is through private, voluntary action—through the education of each man to an understanding of the value of the free way of life, of the folly of prejudice, intolerance, and bigotry, of the need to respect his neighbor's rights if his own are to be secure. The more liberal of the opponents also emphasize the need to shore up the social and economic underpinning of our Nation so that civil liberty may have favorable conditions in which to thrive.

Let it be made clear at once that the President's committee by no means urged the use of laws as an exclusive means of safeguarding civil rights. It saw clearly the important roles which education, and economic measures in such fields as employment, housing, and health must play if our freedoms are to be made secure. But it saw no need to choose between these approaches as though they were rival and mutually exclusive means of reaching the goal. All are necessary.

Because legislation in support of civil rights is the most controversial of the means, the committee devoted much of its report to the development of the case in its favor. The argument may be restated as follows:

A careful reading of American history since 1789 shows that private individuals and organizations have been responsible for many of the most serious encroachments upon civil liberties. This assertion is borne out by the treatment we have given the largest of our minorities, the Negro. There is no denying that the Negro's civil rights have frequently been encroached upon by government. But for every Negro who, for example, has been kept from voting by legal restraints there is at least one other who has been kept away from the ballot box through intimidation by private persons. And while there are 17 States that segregate the Negro by law, can anyone doubt that in many of the other 31 States private action still prevents the Negro from associating freely with other men in the place of business, the labor union, the church, the school, the theater?

Traditionally a democracy copes with the antisocial acts of individuals through criminal laws, such as those dealing with murder, arson, and burglary. Why should we not deal with interferences with civil rights the same way? If one man willfully and deliberately interferes with another man's right to vote, why should that not be regarded as criminal conduct and punished accordingly?

Objection is promptly heard to such a proposal. It is said that civil-rights violations have their roots in prejudice and bigotry and that unfortunately prejudice and bigotry cannot be eliminated by passing laws. And it is commonly asserted: "You cannot change human nature by passing a law; you cannot legislate morality."

These assertions, while at first thought seemingly persuasive, are shown by history to be something less than true. It may be impossible to eliminate prejudice and bigotry or to change human nature by passing laws. But human behavior is often controlled by law. Laws against murder cannot be expected to eliminate all murderous hatred and drives from men. But there can be no doubt that such laws do prevent many potential murderers from putting their hatreds and drives into practice.

The opponents of civil-rights legislation also refer to the practical difficulties of administering such laws and warn us that they will prove as unenforceable as were the prohibition laws, or that it will take a standing army to back them up. Admittedly, civil-rights laws—particularly those carrying criminal sanctions—are not always easy to enforce.

But the difficulties can be exaggerated. For example, the record of the Civil Rights Section of the Department of Justice shows that civil-rights laws carrying criminal sanctions can be enforced, at least to the extent that they are responsible for improvement in the condition of our rights. The work of this agency is clearly one of the forces responsible for the drastic decline in lynchings and the increase in Negro voting during the last decade.

The recent experience of New York State under its Fair Employment Practices Act demonstrates that racial and religious discrimination in employment can be ameliorated by a law which, although containing criminal sanctions, has never taken offenders to court. Much has been accomplished by an administrative commission through negotiation and conciliation without using even its cease and desist order provided by the law.

Actually the choice is not between law and no law. Much intolerance and discrimination are today encouraged by law. This is particularly true of the many States in which Negroes are denied the right of first-class citizenship through segregation laws. Thus, it is not true that those who advocate protection of civil rights through legislation are necessarily trying to force people to abandon private voluntary practices—to interfere with "folkways." Those who are opposed to civil-rights laws on the ground you cannot legislate morality should ponder the possibility that we have been legislating immorality.

If it be admitted that laws may be helpful as a means of safeguarding civil rights, there is still the issue whether such laws should be local or national, with the critics of the Truman civil-rights program insisting that only the local community, or at most the

State, should so use the legislative power. Here, too, it should be made absolutely clear that the Civil Rights Committee believed the battle for civil rights must always be fought in good part on the local front. Accordingly, it directed many of its specific recommendations for legislative action to the States and local communities.

And yet there are certain compelling reasons why Federal action is necessary. Let us consider three:

First, the record shows that whether in civil liberty has been encroached upon by public officers, rather than by private persons, the threat from State and local officials has been greater than that from Federal officials. This is a difficult assertion to prove statistically, but there are certain reasons why it is so.

For example, against the threat offered to freedom of the press by a Federal sedition act, the threat resulting from a local ordinance restricting the distribution of handbills is minor indeed. But analysis of Supreme Court decisions shows that in the collective sense State and local statutes have encroached upon freedom of the press far more than have Federal statutes.

Where a State or a community is either unable or unwilling to prevent its officers from encroaching upon fundamental freedoms, the Federal Government has a responsibility to step in and take action. Indeed, the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution place an express obligation upon Congress to see that the rights protected by these amendments against State action are safeguarded.

Second, logic suggests that the high moral principles of the whole society be used to check the lapses of wayward parts. The many and varied components of the moral fiber of the larger area give it a strength and resiliency that cannot be matched in many of its parts. It is a fact that in our Nation at large we have shown a deeper understanding of the free way of life and a higher regard for civil rights than has been true in certain of our States and communities. Should we not put that greater national sense of moral responsibility to work in protecting our rights?

Third, whether we like it or not, our civil-rights difficulties have become an international issue which the Federal Government must meet. The Civil Rights Committee saw evidence that whenever a lynching has occurred in this country in recent years the word has echoed from one end of the world to the other within a matter of hours. People everywhere, and particularly colored people—who make up two-thirds of the world's population—have looked to the National Government of the United States for an explanation as to how such a shocking event can occur in a democratic country, and for the taking of remedial steps to prevent the recurrence of such outrages.

Recently the Supreme Court has called our attention to the damage which can be done to our interests internationally through irresponsible action by one State. In 1913 California passed an alien land law which made it impossible for Japanese aliens to own or occupy agricultural land in the State. In taking this step California rejected the protests of three Presidents of the United States that such a law would almost certainly cause an adverse reaction inside Japan. In 1948 the Supreme Court declared this statute unconstitutional and in one of the opinions in the case it is stated:

"The passage of the law was an international incident. The Japanese Government made an immediate protest on the ground that the statute was an indication of unfriendliness toward its people. Indeed, the resentment was so strong inside Japan that demands were made that war be declared against the United States. Anti-American agitations grew rapidly."

Who can doubt today that the passage of this State law was one of the things that finally led the Japanese people to feel such hatred toward the United States, or that it made it easier for militarists and extremists to guide Japan down a road that brought ruin to that nation and the ravages of war to this Nation? Or who can be certain that similar action by American States or communities today may not give similar offense to foreign peoples that will one day bring suffering and death to many Americans? Irresponsible action by some of our people can well do grave damage to all of us.

In other words, as a Nation in a troubled world we cannot wait for our slowest State or our most backward community to catch up and see to it that all freedoms are guaranteed to all of its people. The international situation creates a sense of urgency with respect to our civil-rights problem which only the National Government can meet.

Two considerations persuaded the President's Committee that segregation must go. The first was a belief that we must narrow the gap between our principles and practices. Perhaps the most basic principle of the American way of life is a belief that each individual should be judged by his fellowmen strictly on the basis of his own personality, his industry, his achievements.

Recently Gen. C. W. Lawrence reported on the experience of the Air Force which has abandoned segregation at its Lackland Base in Texas, where 26,000 men go through 13 weeks of basic training. He said: "The integration of the base was accomplished with complete harmony. Orders went through to completely end segregation among the trainees on a certain date and when that date arrived the segregation was ended. No unpleasant incidents resulted and the white boys and the Negro boys in the training camp are getting along well together." This and other recent interracial experiments seem to show that where men do live and work together regardless of race and religion, prejudice and intolerance begin to decline and awareness of the importance of the individual as against his membership in a racial group begins to grow.

Secondly, the Committee was convinced that the so-called separate but equal solution to the race problem is a failure. The separate but equal policy is the best rationalization which supporters of segregation have advanced. The argument runs that it is desirable to segregate people solely because of the color of their skin, but they are to be provided absolutely equal facilities to those available to the rest of the population, particularly as to services supplied by the Government.

The evidence shows that, after long years of effort, the facilities supplied the segregated races, while indeed separate, are far from equal and are not likely to become so in the foreseeable future. For example, statistics recently released by the United States Office of Education show that as late as 1946 separate Negro schools, by whatever test employed, were shockingly inferior to white schools. Value of school property per student was $350 for white and $48 for Negroes. School expenditures per student were $104 for whites and $57 for Negroes.

No responsible person can demand the elimination of segregation from American life overnight. The social patterns of segregation have been rigidly set over a long period of years, and it would be folly to attempt to alter them quickly or without careful preparation. Yet here, too, time is a very serious factor. We have made progress in the 80 years the problem has been with us in integrating our racial minorities into the national life. But much remains to be done. And who can doubt that we have far less than 80 years in which to travel the rest of the way to the goal of a truly democratic society?

In his address at Columbia University during his recent visit to this country, India's great statesman, Nehru, warned: "The West has too often despised the Asian and the African and still in many places denies them not only equality of rights but even common humanity and kindliness. This is one of the great danger points of our modern world; and now that Asia and Africa are shaking off their torpor and arousing themselves, out of the evil may come a conflagration of which no man can see the range of consequences."

We must heed the warning before it is too late.

Our Fiscal Crisis—What Can We Do About It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted me I am very glad to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address made by Hon. John W. Hanes, chairman of Tax Foundation, Inc., before the three hundred and tenth regular meeting of the National Industrial Conference Board at the Hotel Astor on January 26, 1950.

His subject Our Fiscal Crisis—What Can We Do About It? is most apropos at this time. The American people are more conscious than ever of the heavy burden of taxation upon their shoulders and there can be no dispute that if our country is to go forward and prosper and if our industries are to expand, the cost of Government must be decreased and the weight of this burden lifted from the people's shoulders.

Mr. Hanes is well qualified to speak on this subject because he is not only a man of affairs and highly considered in the world of business, but he has also served his Government as Assistant Secretary and Under Secretary of the Treasury from July 1, 1938, until December 31, 1939; therefore, he has a wide vision and broad experience in fiscal matters. I hope the Members of Congress may read this clear and factual presentation of the serious fiscal situation which confronts us, and I am sure our country will be benefited by his analysis and recommendations.

The address follows:

The subject assigned to me is The Tax Burden. I should like to divide my remarks into several sections: first, taxes and spending in relation to a sound over-all fiscal policy second, some desirable reforms in tax policy; and third, incentives and socialism.

To some, fiscal policy has a forbidding sound. The very words bring to mind visions of statistics by the pound, complicated formulas, the higher reaches of economics and public finance—in short, a subject to be avoided at all costs and at all times.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Although the techniques for carrying out fiscal policies may be complex, the basic policies themselves are determined—or should be determined—by common-sense principles understandable to any layman.

For instance in drawing up a Federal fiscal policy for the next year beginning June 30, 1950, there are two possible approaches. On the first basic decisions resulting from these approaches, rests the entire fiscal program.

One is the businesslike approach. The fiscal planner looks first at the estimated revenues for fiscal 1951. He finds they have been estimated at $37,300,000,000. And he says, in effect: "We are going to get that much money—a tremendous sum, and what can we afford? How can we fit our many wants to the funds available?"

That is one approach. A second is to draw up a national budget based on what one would like to spend, what is desirable or considered necessary by one voting group or another. This fiscal planner, after finding that the total adds up to $42,000,000,000 for fiscal 1951, goes on to say, in effect: "Let's see what new taxes can be added to reach that total. How much of it can we add to the national debt?"

There is the choice: what we can afford, or what we would like, whether we can afford it or not. A decision in this basic area, understandable to any taxpayer, can determine—has determined—fiscal policy for the most powerful country in the world.

I have begun with this illustration to demonstrate simply that tax policies do not exist in a vacuum; they are dependent on the level of expenditures. And both taxes and spending depend on an over-all fiscal policy developed at the top. It is difficult, if not impossible, for Congress to cut spending without strong leadership from the executive department.

Today the No. 1 fiscal problem of the Federal Government is this: We are living above our income; we are spending more than we are taking in.

There are three ways to meet this problem: First, we can reduce spending; second, we can increase taxes; third, we can increase the national debt through deficit financing.

During the present fiscal year we are spending over $80,000 a minute, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for 52 weeks. As a result of this spending pace, nearly $6,000,000,000 will be added to the national debt by next June 30.

Proposals for reducing Government spending are as numerous as they are unsuccessful. You will remember the situation in Congress last year. A strong effort at economy gathered momentum through June, then aborted in the tangle caused by the out-of-date appropriation procedure. It finally ended with failure of even a somewhat plaintive appeal from Congress to the President to cut down expenditures after the money was appropriated. When it finished work, the first session of the Eighty-first Congress had the distinction of appropriating a larger sum than any other peacetime session in our history.

One ray of hope has been the work of the Hoover Commission. About 20 percent of its recommendations are already in effect with potential savings so far listed at about a billion and a quarter dollars.

But this large sum is dwarfed by the anticipated deficit for this year alone.

There is a solution to the problem of reducing Government expenditures. But it doesn't lie in halfway measures. The Director of the Budget, Mr. Frank Pace, hit the nail on the head, and I quote him:

"A realistic appraisal of the budget outlook must begin with the realization that if there is to be any significant reduction in Federal expenditures, it must be obtained through the curtailment or elimination of programs."

Mr. Pace, unfortunately, was not arguing for the elimination of any programs. But one of his predecessors in office did offer recently a concrete proposal for immediate action. Mr. Daniel Bell, formerly Under Secretary of the Treasury and Director of the Budget, now president of the American Security & Trust Co. in Washington, proposes a 2-year moratorium on new legislation creating any new Government function or the expansion of any function already assumed. He adds, and I quote:

"During this 2-year period, the Congress should devote itself almost exclusively to a restudy of all functions taken on during the past quarter of a century to ascertain whether they were soundly conceived and soundly financed, and whether our economy can afford them. After this study has been completed, Congress should devote the next period to a correction of our past mistakes."

This is an ambitious plan. But, in my judgment it indicates one good method of cutting Government spending enough to lick our basic fiscal problem. The road back to sanity in public spending is going to be a long one, in any case. Trimming Federal personnel rolls and sniping at individual items of Federal expenditure, however desirable, are not enough. Some day we will have to come down to the crux of the matter, which is reducing Government functions.

Alternative No. 2 is to increase taxes to meet budget demands.

It will not be necessary to demonstrate that taxes are a burden. But it is a startling fact that in each of the last two fiscal years, the American economy furnished all Government with more revenues than the greatest amount collected in any year of World War II.

Despite the postwar decline in the individual income-tax burden, American taxpayers as a whole have been called on to pay more in taxes to Federal, State, and local government than they did when we were fighting and trying to pay for history's most destructive war.

Total tax receipts for the three levels of government reached a wartime peak in 1945, when $50,148,000,000 was paid in. In fiscal 1948, this figure was up to $51,042,000,000 and in fiscal 1949 it was an estimated $50,271,000,000. And, Mr. Truman has just proposed additional taxes.

I have bunched Federal, State, and local taxes together for this example. But despite a postwar trend showing increases in State and local taxes, our principal tax problem is at the Federal level. Back in 1939, less than 40 percent of total tax receipts went to the Federal Government. Today, almost three-quarters of all taxes go to Washington, and this makes the problem a Federal one.

It has been said, and I believe it, "there is a point in taxation beyond which Government cannot go without draining away the lifeblood of the economy."

Moreover, with total taxes already at about 25 percent of our national income, that point I believe has been reached. In England, where taxes have risen to 40 percent of the national income, industries have reached the point of stagnation. In the United States, about 700,000 new jobs must be created each and every year for the young people just starting their careers. Consequently, constant expansion of private business must be encouraged. More taxation does just the opposite. It destroys all incentive to expand.

Increased taxation, as a solution to our primary fiscal problem has nothing to offer but a direct threat to the continued health of the economy on which our very existence depends.

The third alternative is deficit spending.

I am convinced that prolonged deficit spending, as we have seen it in 18 of the last 20 years, holds more immediate danger for us than any other domestic problem.

A single year's deficit does not make a crisis. Even a business or a family can have a bad year financially. But it was President Roosevelt who said in 1932 that if a government like a spendthrift, throws discretion to the winds, and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy."

The tragedy in a six-billion deficit this fiscal year and the anticipated deficit of 4 or 5 billions next year is that deficits are becoming, as Dr. Nourse has said, a way of life."

And part and parcel of the fiction that deficits are not important is the idea that the debt and the deficits somehow will take care of themselves. The President in a recent message to Congress implied that the country will some day grow up to the budget, that the national income will increase enough to raise tax yields and bring receipts into balance with expenditures.

Expansion through a policy based on deficits is not growth; it's monetary inflation. And inflation, as has been demonstrated since the war, blows up the Federal budget as fast as it blows up tax yields. On that basis, there never will be a balanced budget.

Even more ominous, however, is the present admission that inflation has been adopted as a fiscal policy by the Federal Government. The latest group of planners in Washington call it a managed inflation, which is somewhat like speaking of a managed atomic bomb.

The adoption of inflation as a fiscal policy has been accompanied by a complete reversal of the administration position in the past year. At this time a year ago Congress was weighing Mr. Truman's demands for great powers to fight inflation. Although deflation was already pecking at the economy, the signs had not yet been read—especially by Government experts. Instead, the President appealed in his budget message for authoritarian power, unprecedented in peacetime, to combat the demon inflation. He also urged a tremendous tax increase of $4,000,000,000.

Six months later, the situation altered drastically. In the interim, our capitalistic system had been demonstrating its resiliency. The inflation was halted before it reached a disastrous peak—not by the Government but by operation of classic economic laws.

Then, in the face of political pressure and coming elections, the administration did a complete turn-about and asked for more powers to combat deflation, simultaneously calling for an orgy of spending which is still developing.

The Government is, in effect, trying to put a floor under the highest point to which inflation has ever driven the Nation. Because of political commitments and promises, the administration can't afford an adjustment of prices to the point where they could do the wage earner some real good. It can't afford to permit a temporary halt in the upward wage spiral until the economy can support a real wage increase in terms of purchasing power.

I am reminded of what Dr. Vannevar Bush said—and I quote—"a people bent on a soft security, surrendering their birthright of individual self-reliance for favors, voting themselves into Eden from a supposedly inexhaustible public purse, supporting everyone by soaking a fast-disappearing rich, scrambling for subsidy, learning the arts of political logrolling and forgetting the rugged virtues of the pioneer."

Under the circumstances, it is a measure of our national strength that so many Americans today turn with disgust from government by hand-out financed by managed inflation.

It should be evident that neither increased taxes nor deficit financing will solve our fiscal problem. The solution is reduced spending through reduced Government functions. And it must be accompanied by a changed fiscal outlook at the top—a resumption of the idea that Federal fiscal policies should be designed to permit the American economy

to grow, to add to the unprecedented standard of living we have already achieved. This definitely does not include replenishing an overheating inflation with what Dr. Nourse has called "monetary and fiscal tricks" that have no power of magic but are a slippery road to misery."

With understanding that the ultimate key to the tax problem also unlocks our entire fiscal problem, we can go on to consider several individual tax policies which impair proper functioning of the enterprise system. I shall discuss only depreciation and the double taxation of dividends, two of the most important of all suggested tax reforms.

Liberalization of the depreciation allowance is a completely desirable reform in tax policy. In the tremendous expansion during and after the war, corporations have had to acquire and pay for new plants and equipment at prices far above prewar costs. At the same time they have had to depreciate old equipment at low rates on a prewar base. To accomplish this they have been forced to retain an ever larger share of current earnings, to dip into their reserves and surpluses, and in many cases to borrow heavily from banks and insurance companies.

There is general agreement that the present method of dealing with depreciation is unsatisfactory. Treasury policies on depreciation are a direct handicap to new risk capital. The tools of industry are wearing out at a greater rate than they are being replaced because corporations must follow archaic and restrictive depreciation schedules. Corporations tend to keep their older facilities in operation instead of modernizing them, since they cannot afford to discard older tools till they are completely depreciated.

I believe there is a simple solution: corporations should be permitted to set their own depreciation rates, with two limitations: First, the rates should be no higher than 20 percent, and second, corporations should stick to their schedules once these are established. If such a liberalized policy is adopted, I will guarantee that the building expansion and renovation of plant in this country will be on a scale never before equaled—and the simple fact of the matter is that it will not cost the Treasury one penny in revenue.

The one drawback to such a policy would be its immediate cost. Every billion dollars of extra depreciation means a temporary loss of $380,000,000 in revenue. This could be overcome by adopting the policy gradually over a period of years. But depreciation reform should be high on the list in any sound program of tax revision.

Even higher on the list should be the elimination of the double tax on corporate dividends. Perhaps because it is so basic, the problem of double dividend taxation is more difficult than most. Three bills designed to mitigate double taxation were introduced in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. One would allow a credit against income tax of 20 percent of the amount received as dividends from a domestic corporation, subject to certain limitations. Another would exclude dividends from the definition of gross income. The third would allow a credit of 10 percent of dividends received.

No action has been taken thus far on any of these bills.

Obviously it is unfair that corporation earnings distributed in dividends be taxed once to the corporation that earns the money and then to the individual stockholders who receive distributions.

But as in the case of depreciation allowances, the cost of such a reform is held to be a handicap. For instance, one of the proposals to mitigate double taxation of dividends would cost about $1,500,000,000 in fiscal 1950. This is a sizable sum, in view of present budget deficits.

Nevertheless, the first steps toward removal of the double taxation on dividends should be taken without further delay. The initial loss in revenues would be made up many times over because of the great impetus such a change would give to business. More risk capital would become available at once. Many corporations would be freed of the necessity of financing their expansion in the banks. The morale of individual investors would receive a wonderful boost.

In other words, incentive would be returning to the economy, and incentive, so important to the formation of risk capital, must be restored to our economy or we will go the way England has gone.

I have already mentioned the economic stagnation resulting in Britain from a tax burden of 40 percent of the national income. There is no magic in a specific figure of 40 percent, or 25 or 50. I am sure we would have maintained the strength of our economy during World War II even if the tax burden had risen to 70 or even 80 percent, because our incentive was a combination of patriotism and self-preservation.

When it is said that England is stagnating under a tax burden of 40 percent, the background of that tax burden is an all-important consideration. Hand in hand with its huge tax burden, Britain has been subjected to a steady undermining of incentive, which is another way of saying individual freedom to make one's own way.

My major objection to socialism aside from the fact that it has never succeeded in any country that tried it, is its failure to preserve individual liberty which is our most cherished possession. The foundation of socialism in Britain is that government knows best. As the British Labor Party platform puts it: "Government must accept responsibility for economic planning for the nation as a whole." Government, however, is composed of men, and men do not become infallible by joining up with government.

But the planners of Downing Street frequently discount the individual completely. Serious inroads have been made in what Prof. John Jewkes calls, in his book "Ordeal by planning," the three economic freedoms. These are freedom in the choice of occupation, freedom in the disposal of income, and freedom to acquire and to hold property. All three of these relate directly to incentive.

Freedom in the choice of occupation means the right to make the financial sacrifices necessary to order one's working life as one wishes. It means the right to choose between work and leisure, the right to choose what work shall be done, when, where, and for whom.

Unfortunately, for the British people, the plan of the British Government does not have room for individual decisions about occupation. During the war, the British had conscription of labor—we almost had it here. After the war, in the British democratic tradition, labor conscription was abruptly ended. But after the Labor Party won the first postwar elections and took control of the government, here is what happened to the workingman.

In February 1948, Sir Stafford Cripps said: "Our objective is to carry through a planned economy without compulsion of labor."

But he was talking before the plan was in action. A year later he was less sure, and more long-winded; I quote:

"We are attempting to make a success of democratic planning and, save for emergency measures such as are necessitated by war, or may be necessitated by some urgent economic crisis, we have not decided to employ, as a normal matter, methods of direction or compulsion of manpower outside the necessities of defense."

On August 7, 1947, the turnabout was complete, and Sir Stafford told the House of Commons, weakly:

"It has been decided to stop, by negative control, further people from going into the less necessary industries."

It became the law of Britain that, with minor exceptions, no man between the ages of 18 and 50 years and no woman between the ages of 18 and 40 years could change his or her occupation at will. Every such change had to be registered at the Employment Exchange, and the Minister of Labor had the power to direct workers changing their jobs to the employment he considered best in the national interest.

Attempts were made to minimize the significance of what had happened. The power was to be employed "to a limited extent." The control was to be negative and marginal.

But the barriers were down. Although the original understanding was that workers would not be moved from their own districts, it was soon announced that single men and women and married men in special cases could be sent away from home.

That is what socialism in Great Britain is doing to the freedom of the individual—freedom which in itself is the greatest incentive that ever lifted mankind.

As Professor Jewkes points out: "The modern planning movement sets out, with good will and noble intentions, to control things and invariably ends up by controlling men."

The sum total of all these controls—these limitations on the incentive of the individual to live his own life in his own way, far beyond what we here consider the public interest—this is the most important failure of socialism as it is practiced in Britain, and as it would be practiced here if some people had their way.

Is there, then, a direct threat to the American economy which has turned over $75,000,000,000 since the end of the war to help Britain and other foreign nations?

It is my conviction that there is a direct threat. Not in the economic philosophy of communism or socialism as a whole. It needs no Gallup poll to demonstrate that most Americans are against socialism and communism as such; they would never accept it—as so named.

But we do accept—we are accepting—the equally fallacious notion that the Government must spoon-feed every citizen in conformance to a distorted interpretation of our Constitution's general welfare clause. Many Americans accept big government, its handouts, and the planned life that are some of the ingredients of socialism, without realizing what they are getting into.

I believe that a new tide may be rising. Actually, it is scarcely more than a ripple as yet. Recently there was a change in the current in New Zealand. Another in Australia. We shall see next month whether the fears of the Labor Party in Britain are justified.

I would not have said this 6 months ago, but now I am convinced that Americans also are beginning to see that a hand-out state financed by inflation and deficits can lead only to complete regimentation and bankruptcy. We are beginning to realize that we shall not preserve our individual freedom by transferring to Government decisions which we should be making ourselves. We should invite and encourage this happy development with our every resource.

If it is true, as I believe, that the "wave of the future" need not be socialism or some other negation of the individual spirit—

If it is true, as I believe, that the desire to live one's own life and make one's own decisions is still an integral part of the American personality—

If it is true, as I believe, that Americans stand ready to reinvigorate our economy by the application of sound principles—

If these things are true, then it is up to businessmen to carry out the difficult task of public education that they are so ably equipped to do—to demonstrate by so doing their faith in our Republic and their confidence in the essential thrift, integrity, and intelligence of the American people.

On decisions made by Americans in the next few months rests the future of our Nation for generations. And what those decisions are may be determined by the action—or lack of it—in the business community.

I'd like to sum up these remarks with words attributed to that noble, but underprivileged railsplitter, Abraham Lincoln. Whether Lincoln spoke these words or not, I am enough of a believer in him to think that were he here tonight he would say:

"You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

My daily prayer is that I may live to see our America again guided by those simple but honest motives which once came to our rescue in the person of Lincoln.

Should Rent Control Be Decontrolled?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, in Huntington, W. Va., there lives a lady, Mrs. E. Wyatt Payne, who takes a great interest in public questions. Recently she debated the question of rent control. The following is a copy of her address on that subject:

Mr. Moderator, tragic opponents, and defenders of the Republic, I am surprised that the opponents would mention the founders with the inference that they always felt the Government should help the schools. This statement proves the point we are discussing tonight, namely, the distorted concept of the American way as warped and practiced by Government agencies. The fact is, that the founders never intended that government should pay for and thus exercise control over the schools. You will note they named them free schools. Our opponents lost another point when they proudly said the Government had always managed the post offices. So they have. And that's the reason it costs 2½ cents to mail a penny post card.

Why control? After World War I a survey was made in Huntington which showed a lack of housing units. Contractors were called in and asked to meet this need and it was met without aid of government or controls. After World War II a similar condition existed here—as elsewhere—but Government regulations, priorities, and red tape kept free enterprise from building the necessary units, causing endless trouble for tenants and landlords alike. The Federal Reserve Board figures show that average rents over the country are only 12 percent. The Government and other agencies recognize 25 percent as the normal figure for that budget item. Although the tenant averages 12 percent for rent the landlord must pay excessive prices for the goods and services needed to keep up the property. The whole situation is untenable from every standpoint and forces many people to buy homes they cannot afford who could, and would pay a fair and equitable rent where they are.

Considering problems the opponents did not anticipate I should like to turn to other important factors in this problem. In logic, we learn that if the premise is correct, the conclusion will be. In successful experiments the principle and practice are one, and so it was in this great Republic when the founders established a government by law instead of directives. I am in favor of rent decontrol because it is type and symbol of the plan to destroy this Nation. It violates every concept, right, and principle of the freedom and initiative that carved out of the wilderness the reality of the dignity of man, under God.

There is no point in discussing this one phase of our destruction without naming it as part of the whole scheme of regimentation and socialization, because it is germane to it. Having failed to control and freeze capital and labor at the beginning of the war, thus preventing the chaotic conditions which developed, they set up the machinery to control everybody and everything all along the line. When Americans are free to think and act, we are a going concern, but when Government puts restrictions and penalties on these important functions, we are concerned about where we are going. Most writers and commentators—and certainly the Government—miss the most tragic and dangerous point in the control dilemma, namely, human relations. Although they prime the pump with our money to make a false economy look real, who and what is priming the spirit of the American people? The great middle class of thrifty, hard-working, dependable, patriotic Americans are beginning to crack up; they are beginning to wonder if they can survive, and if there is reason to hope for the opportunity to live and move and have their being as freemen. Under such mental and physical tensions we are prone to lose our sense of values and also the will to do and to be. The much publicized melting pot, which fused varied races, creeds, and colors into the beautiful experiment in human liberty, called the American way, was made possible only because their very survival depended on faith, work, understanding, and kindly human relations. Let's look at the latter—human relations—through controls for a minute. Control over free people changes human relations. The faith and understanding gives way to fear, doubt, and suspicion between all groups. To be specific, have you noticed that unfamiliar look between tenant and landlord?

A personal experience proves the point. My family represents the average American family; being a school teacher nobody would accuse me of being a capitalist, but, I believe in the system and want to keep the bid open. We have owned a few small houses for rent, but most of our lives we were renters ourselves, looking toward the day when we could own our own home. During those years, as renters we were grateful that others had provided homes for our need. We met our landlord with that attitude, looked after his property as if it were our own and, therefore, he could afford to keep up the repairs and make some money on his investment, which was the reward for thrift and wisdom and his right as our benefactor. The human relations involved between tenant and landlord were typically American, and produced no frustrations, bad feelings, or instability, which lead to discontent and disloyalty, both in people and nations. May I repeat—the loss of kindly human relations inherent in controls superimposed on a free people by a so-called benevolent Government, is the greatest tragedy in our life today.

In the case of rent control we must ask ourselves this question: How can anybody in the judicial, executive, or legislative branch of Government, either in high or low places, construe the Constitution on property rights to be property wrongs? Stripped of all the excuses, red-tape, and verbiage of high-sounding words found in the directives and files of the OPA, the Constitution is crying above the confusion to "We, the people" to remind us that the real issue involved is the control of property is that it belongs to us. If I work and save and buy the house it is mine, and, unless I infringe the property rights of others, I can rent it, let it stand idle, or tear it down. When this property right, guaranteed to me by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, is abrogated or usurped by any source whatsoever, I am not living in a free America. I am existing in a dictatorship, and, I don't like it, and neither do you.

Americans, working—note the word working—on their individual problems and successes, toward the goal of real security, not built on pensions, subsidies, and doles, but rather, on the dual miracle of history, free enterprise, and the American know-how, can build again a fortress for all right ideas for themselves and the world. It is later than we think in this beloved country of ours and unless the human spirit is released from its present bondage of controls—forced on us by the Communist-Socialist planners under the guise of "social progress"—to hitch its wagon to the star of opportunity, we will not have to wait for that new and terrible word genocide to destroy us. The spirit of a free people will have weakened and died and the suicides and a decadent morality will lose for us the last great hope of earth.

Let us, therefore, move quickly to decontrol all Americans, including the tenants and landlords; let us unite to decrease the pressures and tensions on our daily lives that tend to keep us mad instead of glad; let us remind the Government that it derives its just powers from the consent of the governed and that we no longer will acquiesce in this infringement of our rights as free citizens; let us work together to stop the "divide and conquer" campaigns designed to confuse us and weaken our faith in our form of government. Let us reinstate the faith, freedom, and fundamentals that made and kept us "One Nation, indivisible." Only a free America can provide the example, the production, and the incentive for a free world.

Wake up, America, and live.

Antitrust Suit Against A. & P.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting the following letter and an address referred to in it:

JANUARY 28, 1950.

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHURCH: I wrote you some weeks ago about the antitrust suit against A. & P. and I want to thank you for your very nice reply and promise to investigate. Today I was given the privilege to read the enclosed talk by Dwight E. Austin, president middle western division of A. & P. It cleared up several points for me and I thought you should have it. I know you are a busy man but if possible will you look it over and return to me unless you wish to use it further. It pretty well states their side of the story and I believe it is a true picture.

Strange things are happening in this country today and it is good to know that we have a true supporter of our American way of life as our Representative in Congress. I do hope that the recent uncoverings have not come too late to save our United States.

With best wishes for your continued good work for us all.

I am,

Sincerely,

BETH CORE.
(Mrs. Walter.)

TALK BY ROBERT R. ADLER, PRESIDENT, MIDDLE WESTERN DIVISION, THE GREAT ATLANTIC & PACIFIC TEA CO., BEFORE THE NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING EXECUTIVES ASSOCIATION, INC., INDIANSTRIS BEACH HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., JANUARY 23, 1958

Gentlemen, it's good to be with you today.

I really appreciate this opportunity to talk to you men, who, I'm sure, are already quite familiar with the antitrust suit that has been brought against our company. I am sure you have heard all the Government's allegations repeated over and over again on the radio and printed over and over again in the newspapers. You have read our ads, too—I hope.

Even if you have kept abreast of these things, I'm afraid that you—like millions of other Americans—must still be somewhat confused about the whole case. I don't blame you. I'm confused, too.

All this confusion arises out of several things: the vagueness of the antitrust laws; the legal double-talk in which the antitrust lawyers' allegations and statements are couched; the feeling we all have that if an arm of our Government—and particularly the Department of Justice—makes a charge, there should be a sound basis for it.

I hope I shall be able to clarify this whole situation for you a bit. I don't pretend to be a lawyer or a student of economics. But I do know the food industry, and I do know the A. & P.—even better, I think, than the antitrust lawyers say they do.

I need hardly warn you that I am a somewhat prejudiced observer. The antitrust lawyers say that we in A. & P. have adopted a pose of outraged innocence. They are right—all except the pose.

We do have a consciousness of innocence, and we do feel outraged. We don't pretend to be saints or philanthropists; but we do know that we have tried all through the years to run a good, clean, decent business; that our sole objective has been to operate so efficiently and so economically that we could give our customers a more good food for their money. We did this not to satisfy any spiritual yearning, but simply because the founder of this business, and his sons who have managed it since his death, felt this to be the best way to attract and hold customers.

If you knew George Hartford and John Hartford, as it has been my privilege to know them for many years, you would realize that they would never dream of running a business the way the antitrust lawyers allege A. & P. has been run. It has often been pointed out that the only real reason that anyone would intentionally violate the antitrust laws is greed—and there just isn't any of that in the make-up of these men. Both men are well along in years; both are widowers, and neither has any children. They have more money than they could ever spend. Their sole interest in life is running this business which their father left in trust with them. They work at their job 6 days a week, all day. When I go to New York every 3 months to meet with these men and the presidents of the other divisions, I never hear them harangue me about getting higher profits. But, if they think we are underpaying our employees, or not keeping our expenses down, or letting our prices to our customers get too high—we do hear about that.

So, when the antitrust lawyers say that these men are criminals, and that they encourage us to crush our suppliers and fool our customers and destroy our competitors, we are outraged because we know it just isn't so.

I admit that I am prejudiced, and you may be inclined to discount something of what I say. I must warn you, however, that you'd better be careful how much discount you take or you'll have the antitrust lawyers after you, too.

First, let's take up the causes of confusion I referred to.

I need hardly dwell at great length on the vagueness of the antitrust laws. The newspapers you gentlemen represent have been talking about that for a long time. During the last session of Congress, four committees held hearings that touched on this whole broad problem. Only recently the President announced the appointment of an executive committee, headed by Secretary of Commerce Sawyer, whose job it will be to educate businessmen as to the meaning of the antitrust laws and how they can comply with them. In announcing the committee, Secretary Sawyer said that most businessmen want to obey the law but just don't know how.

After all, gentlemen, most of the things that constitute offenses in this complicated society of ours are fairly specific. You know that if you drive a car while you're drunk, or exceed the speed limit, or go through a red light, you're violating the law.

But how can you know what constitutes a violation of the antitrust laws? What is undue restraint of trade? Where does competition end and restraint of trade begin?

Every time I step up my sales program and take a customer away from a competitor, I am restraining his trade. Every time a newspaper puts on a circulation drive it does so at the expense of a competitor. At what point do we step over the line and violate the law? The answer is—at any point that a particular judge decides we do.

Now, it will do you no good to act on the advice of legal counsel, because that doesn't mean a thing when you get into court. Nor will it do you any good to base your behavior on the decision of one judge, because another judge might take a different view of the whole matter.

You have noticed in our ads—I hope—that the antitrust lawyers filed suits against us before. When the cases came to trial, the courts said there wasn't any basis for them at all.

You will recall that they obtained an indictment in Dallas, Tex., making the identical charges they are making now. The Dallas judge sustained our demurrer, saying that the Government's charges did not constitute, in his mind, an offense. And yet when they dropped that suit and brought an identical suit in Danville, Ill., that judge decided in their favor.

I would like to point out that he didn't find us guilty of each of the alleged charges; and that he did say that violation of the antitrust laws was not a crime in the ordinary sense of the word; and that he took occasion to congratulate us on the job we had done in distributing a billion and a half dollars worth of food at less than 1½ cents per dollar profit.

But he took exception to the dual role played by our fresh fruit and vegetable buying affiliate, the Atlantic Commission Co., whereby they acted as buying agents for us and selling agents to the trade for farmers. And he said that that dual role pushed us over the legal line.

It pushed us over the legal line as far as the Sherman Act was concerned, although there is no law on the books that prevents any agency from functioning as the Atlantic Commission Co. had functioned.

Now, that is the terrible thing about the vagueness of these antitrust laws. A businessman may engage in various operations, each of which, in itself, is entirely legal. And yet some judge, when he looks at them all tied together, may decide that, somehow, they constitute this vague thing known as restraint of trade.

Let's consider for a moment the ways in which the antitrust lawyers allege we violate the Sherman Act.

First, they say that we force our suppliers to give us special discriminatory price concessions.

Now, if we did that, it would be illegal; and it is the only allegation they make which in and of itself would be illegal. If we knowingly got special price concessions from our suppliers, that would be a violation of the Robinson-Patman Act. But the antitrust lawyers have said we are not being prosecuted for violating the Robinson-Patman Act. And the judge in Danville said we were not being tried for violation of the Robinson-Patman Act. And in the entire 15 years in which the Robinson-Patman Act has been law, we have never been charged with, nor convicted of, any such violation of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Gentlemen, as I said before, I am confused too. If we did violate the Robinson-Patman Act in this manner, why weren't we charged with it and tried for it? And if we didn't violate the Robinson-Patman Act, why is the Government making it the very heart of its case against us now. I just can't understand it.

As a matter of fact, I know that we have never had any such policy. Of course, our buyers are skilled at their trade and they're certainly going to try to get the best deal to which they are legally entitled. But I know that it has been the company's policy to obey the Robinson-Patman Act, and for that matter, every other law governing business. And if there is any doubt about that in your minds, all you have to do is look at the record of the Danville trial and see the great effort we made to comply with the law. Or you might try to remember back to the days of World War II, when we went out of the coffee and meat business, and many other lines, simply because we wouldn't go in the black market, regardless of how many others did.

Well, I guess you would expect me to protest that we didn't engage in any such activity. But I think the more convincing answer is the fact that, down through the years, many, many thousands of suppliers have voluntarily sought our business; and today they're coming to our defense. I don't think they would be doing that if we had been crushing them, or if they hadn't found our business profitable.

But the point I wanted to make is that of all the Government's allegations, that's the only one that carries with it any inference of illegality. Everything else they charge us with is perfectly legal, in itself. And what's more, the antitrust lawyers themselves admit it.

The second major allegation they make is, that we went into certain areas and engaged in price wars designed to drive competitors out of business; and operated at a loss there in order to do that. And they charge that we made up those losses with profits realized from areas in which we had no competition and where we could charge the consuming public any price we wanted to.

That, of course, is nonsense. You know and I know that there are no areas in which we don't have competition. And if there is any town anywhere in which our prices aren't competitive, we'd like to know about it.

We know that we didn't engage in any such price wars. Of course, we try to keep our

prices competitive everywhere and we try to get a fair share of the business everywhere. We admit that we are pretty tough competition for other grocers. We'd be ashamed of ourselves if we weren't. But they're pretty tough competition for us, too.

Everybody knows the grocery business is just about the most competitive business in the country. There are almost a thousand food chains operating more than 25,000 stores. There are almost 400,000 individual merchants, more than 100,000 of whom are banded together in voluntary chains. All these stores are competing vigorously for the consumer's dollar. All you have to do is look at the food ads in your paper each week to realize just how vigorous that competition is.

And, of course, the public has benefited from this. That's why your grocer—I don't care whether he's a chain or independent—is the most efficient merchant with whom you deal. That's why only 15 cents of your food dollar goes to pay distribution costs, as compared with 35 cents or more in other fields.

Monopoly? It just isn't possible here. It's too easy to open a grocery store. Nobody controls, or can control, the source of supply. And nobody controls a single customer. The minute we fail to satisfy her she's going to move right over to one of our many competitors

It's inevitable in such a competitive business that there should be areas in which our business is not as profitable as it is in other areas. I don't think there's any business in the country that isn't making more money on one item or one department or in one place than another. Even in the case of a newspaper, its suburban circulation would be less profitable on an actuarial basis than its city circulation. And any business takes care of its weak areas with the earnings from its stronger areas.

Of course, we have stores that operate at a loss from time to time for any one of a variety of reasons—competition, poor management, poor location. But I'll let you in on a secret. Contrary to what the antitrust lawyers would have you believe, we are not in business for the purpose of operating stores in the red. Just as fast as they get that way, we try to get them out. And if we can't get them out of the red, we close them up.

Now, the third thing about us the antitrust lawyers say they don't like is that we manufacture some foods we sell and that we use profits from these manufacturing operations to subsidize our retail operations.

That's nonsense, too. We admit that we are in the manufacturing business not to make big manufacturing profits, but to enable us to give our customers better food at lower cost. What's wrong with that? Not a thing, legally. And it certainly gives the consumer a break.

This is the thing that the antitrust lawyers call "vertical integration." And it exists all through the food business. Of course, if you said "vertical integration" to the average delicatessen operator he wouldn't know what you were talking about. But when he mixes up a batch of potato salad in the back room and sells it in the front room—that's vertical integration. The same thing applies to the bakery that sells at retail, or the farmer who owns his herd of cows, processes the milk, and runs a wagon route. All those things are customary in our field, as well as many others, and they're entirely legal.

In any such set-up, there is no such thing as a true manufacturing profit. You can't make a profit from selling something to yourself. That's just like saying that our warehouses operate at a loss. All of the operations in A. & P. are geared to the retail end. We are food merchants. There is only one profit in our business, and that is when we sell food to our customers.

It's just as if the antitrust lawyers came up to a newspaper and said, "Look, you fellows are violating the antitrust law because you lose money on the papers you sell, and you are subsidizing the sale of your papers with your advertising revenues." Maybe they'll get around to that idea yet.

But the point I'm making is that here are all these activities, admittedly legal in themselves, and yet the antitrust lawyers put them together, throw in a few nasty-sounding adjectives and nouns like "predatory," "vicious," "blacklist," "boycott," and "price war," stir the mixture well and come up with a crime.

You gentlemen are experts in words. You know what "boycott" means, as applied to this case? It means that we refused to buy from a manufacturer who was charging us with what we knew to be too high a price. It means that we allegedly said to him, "If you can't get your price down to a reasonable figure, we'll make this food ourselves, because we know we can."

So if your wife goes into a delicatessen store and says, "Mr. Schultz, $1.50 a pound is too much for baked ham. Unless you lower your price, I'm going to start baking ham at home." If your wife does that, it's boycott.

Now, gentlemen, I tell you this is actually the way in which normal trade practices and innocent business transactions are distorted to make them sound illegal.

It can happen to anybody. I'll admit that it's much more likely, today, to happen to you if you're big and successful. But under the present vagueness of the antitrust laws, and the present policy of the antitrust division, it can happen to anybody.

As a matter of fact, it is this use, or perhaps I should say "abuse," of the meaning of words that causes much of the confusion in antitrust suits.

Just look at the legal doubletalk employed by the antitrust lawyers in our own case, for instance.

They say that A. & P. is not being attacked because it is big.

They have to say this because there is no law on the books that makes bigness illegal. Actually, do you think we would be under this attack if we were not big? The whole purpose of this suit is to break up A. & P. into small pieces and destroy its size.

They say they are not opposed to A. & P.'s low prices.

They have to say this because there is no Federal law that says low prices are illegal. But, do you think we would be under attack if our prices were not low? Yet, the effect of the suit would be to destroy many of the efficiencies which make these low prices possible.

They say they are not opposed to the fact that we manufacture many of the foods we sell.

They have to say this because there is no law on the books that says it is illegal for a food retailer to manufacture food, too. And yet, they ask the court to order us to get rid of all our manufacturing operations.

They say that this suit is not punitive.

They have to say this, for this is a civil suit, and if they admitted it was punitive, it would be thrown out of court. Actually, what could be more punitive than breaking up this company into small pieces and forcing the present owners to sell off the pieces to someone else?

They say the sole purpose of this suit is to keep A. & P. from violating the antitrust laws.

They have to say this because it is the only legal basis on which such a suit could be brought. Actually, they are not simply trying to enjoin us from violating the law. They ask the court to put us out of business.

They say this suit will not close a single A. & P. store.

Actually, if they win this suit there will be no such thing as an A. & P. store, as you know it, left.

They say that this suit will lower food prices instead of raising them, when any high-school economic student, or any housewife could tell them differently.

Now, the third element that contributes to the confusion about this whole case is the respect that you and I and every other good American has for the courts of this country, for our Government, and particularly the Department of Justice.

Many people feel that if the Department of Justice makes a charge against you, that charge must be true. Believe me, gentlemen, that is a very powerful weapon the antitrust lawyers have. And believe me, they are using it.

You've heard their speeches and you've read their releases. There are undoubtedly people who have done business with us, either as customers or suppliers, and who like us and believe in us, but who are honestly troubled and confused when they hear or read these charges.

That is why we have had to take our story to the people. We had to do it to protect our business. If everybody believed what the antitrust lawyers are saying, our suppliers wouldn't want to sell to us, our customers wouldn't want to buy from us, our employees wouldn't want to work for us, and we wouldn't blame them.

The antitrust lawyers, as you know, have taken violent exception to our advertisements. They say we have no right to buy space to give the public our side of the case. They imply that somehow we are trying to influence the court's decision.

Of course, that's silly. We don't believe for a minute that anything we are saying in our ads, or anything that the antitrust lawyers are saying in their speeches, is going to have any effect on the judge who eventually hears this case. If that were our plan, we would never have to run these ads in any papers outside of New York City, where the case is going to be tried. Certainly, no judge in New York is going to even know about an ad we run in the Hoopeston (Ill.) Chronicle-Herald.

The real reason we're running these ads in 2,500 newspapers is because when you get in a fight like this, actually you are being tried in two courts—the court of law and the court of public opinion. Eventually, after long and expensive litigation, you may win free in the court of law, but in the meantime, your reputation is damaged and your business jeopardized in the court of public opinion. We say that we have not only the right, but the responsibility to defend ourselves through advertising or any other legitimate means in the court of public opinion, just as we propose to defend ourselves in the law courts.

You and I know that no business such as ours could earn and hold public patronage over a period of 90 years except on a policy of fair dealing.

I tell you that every executive in the A. & P. Tea Co. knows that this is, and always has been, our company's policy. We want the millions of American citizens who have a stake in our operations to know it, too. And we are using the best medium we know of to tell it to them.

We've been heartened by the fact that this suit against us has brought a great wave of public support. We undoubtedly have made some enemies. But obviously we have made many millions of friends. We are hopeful that we will be permitted to continue to serve these friends for many years to come.

Amendment of Federal Home Loan Bank Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to go on record in support of H. R. 6743, because it is intended to strengthen and make more effective the work of the building and loan associations of the Nation.

It is impossible to estimate the good that has been done in furthering the purchase and building of homes by the people, by these associations.

There can be no question but that a nation of home owners is a stable and freedom-loving nation. Home ownership stimulates the self-respect and pride of every family so fortunate as to own its own home. The home owner is not an easy prey of the proponents of the many strange isms that appeal to some portions of our population.

Of course, it is true that in the large cities, and to some extent even in the smaller cities, it is not possible for every person or every family to own a home. In the large cities the high cost of real estate makes individual home ownership impossible. So I do not mean to say that the great number of our people in the large cities, who are forced by circumstances to forego the benefits and the pleasure of home ownership are unstable and unpatriotic. It is true that where home ownership is possible it strengthens social and patriotic ties and makes a real contribution to the stability and welfare of this great country of ours.

In the Seventh District of Georgia, which I have the honor to represent, there are several of these building and loan associations, and all of them have made a distinct contribution to the welfare of the community in which they exist. So firm a believer am I in these organizations that I have made from time to time small deposits and investments in several of them. All of these institutions in my district are thriving and are rendering a distinct service to persons and families, who are anxious to own their own homes. Many of them have made loans to veterans when the veterans could not obtain a loan from other lending institutions. All of this has resulted in a great increase in the number of individually owned homes in the district.

For all of these reasons, it is truly a pleasure for me to support and vote for H. R. 6743, which will make investment in these associations more attractive and secure. This in turn will enable these associations to extend their benefits to countless more individuals and families.

In passing I would like to say that the building and loan associations in many of the cities in my district have made most remarkable records during the past year. Never before in history have they been so prosperous and of such service to home owners and the private building industries. The private building industry is to be congratulated also on the remarkable record it has made in the past few years in supplying our people with homes, which have been so badly needed since the war.

I am a great believer in private industry and our free-enterprise system. At the same time I realize that, especially in the large cities, there are housing problems which private industry has not to date been able to solve. It was for this reason that I voted at the last session of Congress for the bill providing for public housing in slum areas. The prosperity of the private building industry and of the building and loan associations and other members of the Federal home loan banks seems proof to me that the undertaking by the Federal Government to eliminate slums and provide decent housing accommodations for those areas where private industry has not succeeded in solving the problem, has not in any way affected free enterprise as represented by these associations and those engaged in the private building industry.

Again let me say I am happy that I have the opportunity of voting for and speaking on behalf of H. R. 6743. I congratulate the great Committee on Banking and Currency for its wisdom in bringing this bill before the House, and guiding it to what I am sure will be its prompt adoption in the House.

The Example of the Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun:

THE EXAMPLE OF THE PATRIOTS

Today is one of the most important anniversaries in the long and proud history of the United States, for it was 172 years ago that the embattled farmers of Middlesex County, with little other than their dogged determination to shake off the yoke of the oppressor, fired the shot heard round the world.

They gave notice to the world that a new nation, dedicated to the principle of freedom, was in the making. They carried on under the most grueling conditions to achieve their goal.

They were united in their purpose; had there been bickering and dissension with factions working at cross-purposes, the outcome might have been different and this great country might never have succeeded in asserting its independence.

The lesson of Patriots' Day should be studied with greater zeal than ever before by all who call themselves true Americans. There were no Communists among the patriots who stood their ground against the redcoats at Concord and Lexington—they were all loyal and steadfast, working together in a common cause.

There was no fifth column operating among the pioneers, and there were no quislings working furtively to give aid to the enemy.

The sentiments of the Massachusetts patriots, their ideas and ideals have been expressed many times since the country was founded, particularly in the Bill of Rights, and, more recently, in the Atlantic Charter.

These are the men who established the American way of life. Are the principles for which they fought and which are now held up to ridicule by some of the subversive elements that are now working in all parts of the country going to be sacrificed?

The Revolutionary War brought about the creation of a new land, governed in a way that recognized individual freedoms. The pattern was made by the patriots of 1775—are we now going to stand by and see them renounced in favor of radical poppycock?

The Nation, from coast to coast, should rededicate itself to the democratic principles that were first expounded during and immediately after the Revolution; it should make short work of any and all elements that are yammering for a change in the American way of life.

Our Asiatic Foreign Policy With Especial Reference to the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made recently by Emmet O'Neal, a former Member of the House of Representatives, who recently retired from the Ambassadorship to the Philippines:

Gentlemen, the population of the world is 2,278,000,000.

Over one-half—1,194,300,000—live in Asia, not including Asiatic Russia.

Passenger planes fly to Asia on regular schedule in less than 48 hours. The flying time is being reduced each year. Rocket planes are even now able to fly that distance between daylight and dark.

Yet most of our thinking, planning, and assistance has been given to Europe. No doubt it was necessary, because of the dangerous emergencies existing there. It is a short-range program and it is hoped that Europe can be put on its feet in a comparatively short time.

America, apparently, has never been engaged in long-range planning in its foreign affairs. Years fly quickly, and it is wise to think in terms of 5, 10, and 20 years, as well as to plan only for 2 or 3.

Our peace has not been greatly affected by Asia, except when an Asiatic nation attacked us at Pearl Harbor. Our foreign wars were nearly entirely of European origin. In the future, and particularly in the more distant future, Asia may be the chief breeding place of threats to our peace and to world peace. Now is the time for a well thought out American foreign policy as to the half of the world population in Asia. It must project its thinking further than 1, 2, and 3 years and try to plan intelligently for a much longer time.

We need now a far-reaching, long-range program to enlighten that part of the world as to the democratic way of life. It should not be a part-time job of a department of our Government. It should be a major activity, planned and executed by the best brains America has at its command. We know that a police state, totalitarianism in

communistic form or otherwise, encourages wars and human hate and destruction. We believe devoutly that our democratic way of life, if adopted sincerely by all nations, would almost be a guarantee of world peace. Nations which have a democratic form of government are far less likely to plan or initiate wars of aggression.

Europe is set in its ideologies as far as the individual nations are concerned. It is very difficult to affect the thinking of their leaders. The vast Orient where live one-half of the world population, is now awakening. The countries in that area are seeking freedom and a better way of life. Their minds are more open. They are impressed by what they see.

Is there anything more important to America and to the world's future peace than to make a major effort to show those nations that a democratic form of government is the best way to bring the greatest good to the greatest number. The stake is so great we should attack the problem as one of our greatest objectives. We should start a program now and any plan should immediately recognize the importance of the Philippines in such an effort. There is no spot on earth more potentially important to the cause of future world peace and human freedom than the Philippines.

A successful Philippines can affect the thinking of the Eastern World more than propaganda from any source. The Philippines are a part of Asia, and a world cross roads. Ships from everywhere, going to all places on the globe anchor there in one of the finest of all harbors, Manila Bay. What is seen there is talked about by the thousands of travelers when they return home. The Philippines are on the doorstep of China, Malaya, Indonesia, Japan, Siam, and other populous countries. The Asiatic mainland is closer than Chicago is to Washington. It is a matter of a very few hours by plane from the Philippines to all parts of Asia and Australia. Passenger planes daily carry large numbers of people to and from the Philippines to other countries.

The leadership of all those awakening nearby countries are watching with extreme interest the progress of democracy in the Philippines. To them it is a demonstration of the democratic way of life in the Orient, and it carries with it implications as to the value of American friendship and cooperation. They are watching to see if a democracy can succeed in Asia. Its influence now on the future of the governments of Asia cannot be overestimated. If the Philippines succeed in demonstrating that its democracy is bringing all the freedoms to all its people, and a better life to its citizens than any Asiatic country ever saw, it could lead countless millions to demand a true democratic form of government. In this way the chances of peace in the decades to come would be enhanced greatly.

If there were no iron curtain in Russia and Russians could see a democracy in action, they, themselves, would soon end communism for communism in action is totalitarian and tyrannical.

There is no iron curtain in China or in Asia. The Philippines experiment will be seen and studied. Nations may work out their own destinies according to convictions based upon observation and investigation of the Philippines. It could bring results more satisfactory than those obtained by the expenditure of millions by this country in other ways.

The Philippines have done a remarkable job since becoming an independent nation in 1946. Our assistance has been helpful and kindly given.

America should give the greatest consideration to the Philippines as a matter of duty and enlightened self-interest.

The Philippines are the only Christian nation in that part of the world.

It is the only democracy there.

It is the only country in the Orient which is openly and avowedly our friend, and unequivocally on our side.

It has a higher percent of literacy than any far-eastern country with the possible exception of Japan.

It has lived under a democratic form of government for over 50 years.

Perhaps at least 85 percent of its people were born under the American flag.

It has a public-school system something unique in Asia, and it is a counterpart of the American public-school system. American educators planned it and directed it.

The Philippines are as free as we are, and they will protect with their lives their heritage, from America, their liberty. In the Philippines, you feel as though you are in one of the States of our Union. The people still feel that they are part of the United States and there remains an almost unbreakable tie between us.

They respect and love the flag under which they were born, and they appreciate what was done for them by the benevolent rule of the United States.

The governing of the United States was not perfect; there were mistakes of omission and commission; there was even some selfishness, but the Filipino knows that no other country in the history of the world, ruled a dependent nation, with so much kindness, unselfishness, and benevolence. They are grateful, and their loyalty to America during World War II was proof of their feelings toward us. Large numbers of Filipinos were in the American Army, attached to it or fighting independently on the side of America. This was the case with most of the men of fighting age, and their families at home were loyal and true to the United States.

The aftermath of war is there in like proportions of families which lost their fathers and brothers, and every city and village has its maimed and sick. There can be no question but what America has a friend in the Orient, the Philippines.

The two Presidents of the Philippines have each said, in effect, that should America again be forced into war, the Philippines would take up arms on America's side without delay or question.

To the thinking people of Asia, the Philippines are the product of America, and an example of American democracy.

It must succeed, to be a beacon that will lead the oriental countries to adopt for themselves a democratic form of government. If that is accomplished, the cause of world peace has been greatly advanced.

We should and must adopt a plan extending over a period of years to see that the Philippines pass successfully this, the most critical period in its history. The most critical period in American history followed for 10 or 15 years after independence. The Philippines have some of the same problems and others which our forefathers did not have.

In July 1946 they received their independence. It came immediately after World War II, during which a brutal and vandalistic enemy occupied and denuded their country. In the closing months of Japanese occupation, the Japanese destroyed in vicious resentment hundreds of millions of dollars of property. In order to dislodge the fanatical soldiery of the enemy, the Americans had to do equal or more damage to Philippine property. It is difficult to believe, but Manila's destruction was exceeded only by Warsaw and Stalingrad. The Philippines, it is said, was the most devastated country in the war. The estimates of the damage have ranged from 2 to 4 billion dollars, and even higher. It is regretted that much of it was done by American military might. It is not possible to estimate in dollars and cents the loss to the Philippines caused by the slaughter of its civilians and soldiers in large numbers. Those who died were representative of the best-trained citizenship.

With these impossible handicaps, Philippine independence was launched, and it is remarkable that such an unseaworthy and battered vessel could survive. It has survived, prospered, and made a remarkable record. The Philippines have had the support of the United States, and that has been a material factor in their success. But it is not the sole reason, for the Filipinos have shown intelligence and wisdom in the solution of their problems. The main cause of their success so far is that they believe in and have established a government which guarantees to their citizens the exercise of all the freedom we enjoy. No doubt many mistakes have been made, many things have happened which should not have occurred, but the Philippine citizen today is as free as an American citizen, and the Filipino is living on a higher and better plane than in most parts of the world. These things are observed and known throughout the Far East.

In spite of the successes since independence day, the war damage was so great that industry, agriculture, and other fundamentals have not come back to a point which will insure survival. We have been generous since the war in providing appropriations and other aid for the Philippines, but what values we have provided are far less than the values our valiant armies destroyed. It is not argued that these amounts should be equalized. The purport of this article is to urge in our own self-interest, that we recognize the burdens of this small country, and through all types of intelligent cooperation, stand by the Philippines until they have passed through this critical period of their history.

The Philippines can be one of the two or three most important nations in the Orient.

They are far ahead of most countries in that area in their knowledge and understanding of government.

Their educational system is years ahead of any neighbor, except Japan.

They have a population of 18,000,000 people, which is larger than that of any European country, with the exception of three or four. Its population is greater than most of the countries in North and South America.

The Philippines are very rich in known natural resources, and much of it has not been fully studied and explored.

The Filipinos generally have adequate housing, food, and clothing.

It has every chance for success, if it can be wisely assisted over this its most critical period.

What will it mean to America in the future and to world peace, to have the Philippines a powerful, successful, happy, and free democracy showing the way in Asia to a better life through a democratic process?

If our foreign policy is to bring results, we must think in terms of decades rather than years. In our Asiatic foreign policy if we recognize the importance of the Philippines and think in terms of 5 and 10 years, we will advance the cause of democracy beyond our present power to evaluate.

Bouquet for State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, there have been so many speeches made on the floor of the House criticizing the

State Department, I think it would be well for the Members to read the following letter from Saul Cohen, of Gary, Ind., who throws a verbal bouquet to the State Department.

He extends special commendation to Elvin Seibert, the American Consul at Mexico.

The letter follows:

GARY, IND., *January 30, 1950.*

SECRETARY OF STATE,
Department of Foreign Service,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On January 7, 1950, my family and I were driving home from a vacation in Mexico when we were unfortunately involved in a rather serious automobile accident in Ciudad Mante, Tampa, Mexico. My wife was seriously injured as well as my son and myself.

Needless to say, being in a foreign country with only a slight command of the language, I was immediately confronted with many problems.

My first and foremost obstacle was to get my wife and son to the States as quickly as possible where proper medical care could be given her. The American Consulate at Tampico, under the direction of Mr. Elvin Seibert, AMERICAN Consul, was in truth a lifesaver.

I am entirely satisfied in my own mind that had it not been for their prompt and intelligent efforts, in spite of the fact that the accident took place on a week end when Mexican officials were difficult to reach, we would have been in a much more serious condition when we finally reached the States.

I have been an American taxpayer for many years as well as a native-born citizen, but I never knew until that week end of this accident, what it meant to be able to call for help on one of our consular offices and how truly invaluable such an office could be in a time of stress.

I want to go on record that we who remain at home in the United States and those who grumble at taxation would do well to bear in mind that the type of service that was rendered to me and my family by the Foreign Service cannot be measured in dollars, and furthermore, every attempt should be made at all times to properly support this Department as well as many others who render service to the citizens of the United States, so that they can continue to safeguard their interests, both personal and financial, outside the borders of our country.

I wish to commend this particular office of the Foreign Service, Mr. Secretary, and whatever I can do as a citizen of this country to further support its efforts, I most certainly will make every effort to do so.

Very truly yours,

SAUL COHEN.

Truth and Other Things

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, there are numbers of Members of this House who remember with affection the Honorable Edgar Howard, who served so ably in this body for 12 years. Mr. Howard is an outstanding Nebraskan and an outstanding member of the Democratic Party. He is editor of the Columbus Daily Telegram, and although he has passed the age of 90, he continues active and his editorials are quoted in many newspapers and magazines of our land. In spite of his age, Mr. Howard keeps in close touch with the activities of his former colleagues in the United States Congress. One of his recent editorials entitled "Truth and Other Things" should be of special interest to the Members of this body at this time when the memberships of the various subcommittees on appropriations are holding hearings and listening to the officials of various departments justifying gigantic appropriations for the next fiscal year. By leave previously granted me by the Speaker, I include this editorial with my remarks:

TRUTH AND OTHER THINGS

How much Federal tax did the people of Nebraska pay for 1949? The usually excellent authority—the Scottsbluff Star-Herald—says the Federal levy upon the modest commonwealth of Nebraska was $523,000,000. That's awful. But let's forget what has happened, and try to avoid something worse. Let's forgive every one of our representatives in either branch of the Congress—7 Republicans and 1 Democrat—for their bad voting records which aided the great spender's administration to carry the country to the very brink of insolvency. But let's keep wide-open eyes on the voting record of our Senators and House Members during the present session of the Congress. Let's tell our Nebraska boys in the Congress that we want the enormous burden of Federal taxation lifted—not increased—and it will be increased if the Congress shall meekly comply with the demands of the great spender. Watch out, all you Nebraska boys in the Congress. Your personalities are good. Some of your voting records have not been the best. A government with an empty treasury is no more competent to work the welfare of the country than a farm horse tied to an empty manger is competent to work the welfare of the farmer who owns him. The picture is not overdrawn. Nebraska farmers will vote this year for congressional candidates who during the present session have voted to lift this greatest republic of all the world out of the shameful ditch of financial depression.

The Plight of the Conservative in Public Discussion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor and privilege to deliver the address of welcome to the thirty-fourth annual convention of the Speech Association of America which met in Chicago, Ill., last December.

At the opening session on December 28, James H. McBurney, dean of the school of speech, at Northwestern University, delivered an excellent speech, The Plight of the Conservative in Public Discussion.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting it in the RECORD:

THE PLIGHT OF THE CONSERVATIVE IN PUBLIC DISCUSSION

(Address by James H. McBurney, dean of the school of speech, Northwestern University, and president of the Speech Association of America, presented on December 28, 1949, at the opening general session of the Thirty-fourth annual convention of the Speech Association of America, Stevens Hotel, Chicago)

The plight of the conservative in American public life is a fact which hardly needs documentation. An analysis of this plight was presented in a recent issue of the Chicago Daily News in which opinions from grass-root voters to political and educational leaders were reported. Says the News: "Whether it was called a 'welfare state,' 'creeping socialism,' 'fascism,' 'a regimented state,' or something else, it boiled down to a belief that individual freedom and initiative are being threatened by the Government." When queried by the News, Franklyn B. Snyder, president-emeritus of Northwestern University, added this: "Complacency today is the greatest foe of the conservative."

I think this hits the nail on the head. Complacency it is! And this complacency affects public discussion in America in ways which are good for no one, least of all the conservatives.

I have the temerity to argue that the conservatives in America have become inarticulate to a point where their voice does not do credit to their ideas and often does their cause a positive disservice. I think my analysis is not a partisan one. I confess to a conservative bias, but my concern here is a professional interest in public discussion and debate. In a very real sense, discussion is the essence of the democratic process. Whatever weakens discussion in America, weakens America. A monolithic society is not conducive to vigorous discussion of public questions. We need differing points of view, and we need articulate spokesmen for these points of view.

For the past 8 years, I have had charge of the Northwestern University Reviewing Stand, a national radio forum originating in radio station WGN, Chicago, and carried by the Mutual network. We are on the air each week with discussions of contemporary problems, mainly social, economic, and political questions. Our speakers are members of the university faculty and distinguished guests from business, industry, labor, government, and the press. As moderator of these discussions, I am the recipient of an amazing volume of letters and comments from all over America. One of the most persistent criticisms is the charge that we are radicals, Reds, and even Communists. To be sure, we are often labeled radicals and reactionaries on the same program, but the charge of radicalism far outruns any other single criticism.

Why this persistent charge of radicalism? I am sure the answer does not lie in the sponsorship and management of our radio forum. Even our critics express surprise that we should be the ones to commit this indiscretion. What is more, precisely the same charge is directed against the other leading radio forums. The answer must be sought in the discussions themselves.

In the first place, we usually discuss changes in the status quo—questions of public policy. That is an important function of discussion. All kinds of social, economic, and political changes are analyzed in the interest of better understanding. The conservative, by definition, opposes change; he supports the status quo; he usually takes the traditional position. The very fact that discussion concerns itself with change may suggest that discussion supports such

change. Actually, of course, it does not. Properly conceived, discussion is a method for analyzing problems and considering solutions to those problems. It is not even a good vehicle for propaganda.

More important are the persons who take part in these programs. In organizing discussions of controversial questions, we naturally try to secure the most competent spokesmen available for all points of view. We have little trouble getting the advocates of change, the liberals, the radicals. These people invariably accept our invitations with pleasure and alacrity; but not so with the gentlemen on the right, the representatives of business and industry, the conservatives. More often than not, they are too busy, have other commitments, or refuse to appear on the same platform with other speakers we have invited. Sometimes they say quite frankly that they are afraid of give-and-take discussion.

As moderator of these discussions, I frequently find myself wanting to come to the aid of the conservative spokesmen. Often they are nervous and inarticulate. Especially is this true when their basic assumptions are challenged. They lack facility in verbal analysis and synthesis, in give-and-take argument, in rebuttal and refutation. More often than not they are no match for rhetorically seasoned liberals, with long experience on every kind of platform from a cracker barrel to a radio microphone. There are notable exceptions, but my description is faithful to the rule.

I think this is the reason why our radio forum is charged with radicalism—the conservative spokesmen do not come through. It is either this or the less charitable explanation that the conservative position in America today is not tenable in public discussion. Whether or not the conservative position, or any other position, is tenable is precisely what public discussion is designed to test. Given spokesmen of high competence and reasonably equal competence, it provides one of the best tests democracy has been able to devise. Unless these conditions are met, we run the risk of serious distortions in public policy.

If this problem were confined to radio forums, I would not take your time with it. It most emphatically is not so confined. These forums are just a small sample of the kind of discussion that goes on all over America—in homes, schools, churches, places of business, legislative assemblies, and deliberative bodies of all kinds. In this larger arena, we can witness the full measure of the rhetorical bankruptcy of the conservative.

For many years past in America, the conservative has been in the saddle. The industrialist, the banker, the businessman have been the backbone of America—respected, accepted, and looked to for leadership. Whether this reputation was deserved is neither here nor there. It is a fact. But this long, unchallenged tenure has not been an unmixed blessing. The conservative grew soft under it. He came to take his position for granted. He became complacent. And he lost his voice, except for occasional ceremonial chants and cries of distress. In the meantime, the little fellow on the outside grew in strength and lung power, until one day there appeared on the scene a great spokesman for the ill-fed, the ill-housed, and the ill-clothed. Since that time we have lived under New Deals and Fair Deals.

How have the conservatives responded to this rude unseating? Not too well, I fear. The National Association of Manufacturers invited a number of students to attend their annual convention in New York this month. Time magazine reports some of the reactions of these young observers:

"Too many of the NAMsters, the students felt, talked in such platitudes and generalities about the drift toward socialism, the welfare state, taxes, that what they had to say lost its effect. What was needed, said one student, was a clear, fresh exposition to the man in the street in terms of the simple why and wherefore of the price of his bread."

"A further student criticism was that, in panel discussions, the NAMsters were often unqualified to answer our questions."

"One student, put his finger on NAM's biggest trouble: its failure to capitalize on opportunities to catch the public's ear."

Quite obviously the answer to this problem is not a simple one. Indeed, there may be no answer which the conservatives will like. Whether or not an intransigent liberalism is good for America must be ground out in countless discussions and debates all over America. My hope is that the conservatives will find the means of developing an effective voice in these discussions and debates. I think they are lost unless they do. And I think America stands to lose without their best counsel. I would say exactly the same of the liberals were the situation reversed.

I realize that this thesis comes easily from a teacher of discussion and debate and a moderator of public forums. Some will say the plight of the conservative is dictated by economic, social, and cultural realities in the American scene which have little or nothing to do with talk about these realities. I do not propose to assess these realities in this paper, but I do profess to know something about the influence of talk in building attitudes and shaping events. Talk influences men, and men influence events. The case for making good sense and good taste articulate is a familiar one to most teachers of speech. We have substantial experimental data to support this thesis.

In the first place, we know that attitudes toward social problems do change significantly as a result of discussion. In other words, something is accomplished in discussion; people do change their positions on public questions as a result of listening to discussions and participating in them. Secondly, we know that the initial or prediscussion dispersion of attitudes is significantly reduced as a result of discussion. People get closer together. There is a significant tendency toward concensus. Thirdly, we know that people develop superior attitudes toward public questions through discussion, as measured by the opinions of experts. In other words, discussion has the effect of developing sound positions on social questions. Finally, we know the greatest influence in discussion is exerted by the more competent people, as measured by standard tests of personal competence, such as personality inventories, intelligence tests, social-maturity scales, and the like.

I cite these data to make the point that public discussion is a democratic tool which no segment of American society interested in social attitudes can afford to neglect; and by the same token, it is a matter of great importance to American society that all social groups be competently represented in public discussion.

Several suggestions for developing effective spokesmen in deliberative councils are implicit in what I have already said. I should like to spell these out in greater detail.

In the first place, men in executive positions in business and industry must be willing to participate in public discussion. As the president of the United States Rubber Co. put it last June:

"The eleventh hour is here for business to speak for itself. Now, and from now on, the men who run American business must devote as much—if not more—time and effort to the public relations of their business as they spend on finance, production, and distribution. Unless they do, they will not need to worry about the latter problems. Government will be glad to handle them all."

In the second place, the paid spokesmen of the conservatives, the public-relations officers of business and industry, must be selected with careful attention to their qualifications for serious intellectual discussion and vigorous public debate. The main job of such officers is developing relations with the public rather than with their brothers in the bond. This requires social, political, and economic literacy of a high order and top-notch dialectical ability.

Thirdly, the conservatives urgently need to develop greater sensitivity to the changing pattern of communication in America. This pattern is characterized by a growing emphasis on logical values in place of high pressure mumbo-jumbo; by simple, direct statement rather than verbal obfuscation; and by a sense of relativity in language usage in place of arbitrary, dogmatic assertion. These changes are inevitable in a democratic society which is becoming more conscious of the processes of communication and more sophisticated in their use. Any speaker ignores them at his own peril.

Fourthly, the conservatives must rid themselves of some unfortunate stereotypes. In this so-called era of the common man, the conservative is depicted as the foe of the common man. Unfortunately, this role can easily be given specious plausibility because the conservative does have vested interests in the status quo. In a society in which men are living longer and specialized economic functions tend to draw class lines, it is easy to think of the conservative as an old man who has lost the common touch. Actually, the interests of the common man on any given issue at any given time and place may be just as completely identified with the conservatives as with the liberals. Most certainly it begs the question to assume otherwise. The lines between conservatives and liberals in America need not, and should not, be drawn on the basis of age or class. They should be determined in free and widespread discussion, and the conservatives must learn how to conduct themselves in such discussions in ways which will enlist the sympathy and understanding of common men.

The conservatives have also succeeded in alienating many of the intellectuals in America. Witch hunts in the colleges and universities, journalistic caricatures of the mortar board, and frantic name calling are hardly designed to win the understanding of men who place a high premium on objectivity in discourse. Moreover, there are echelons in the intellectual hierarchy in which there are fashions in ideas just as there are in goods. In some of these quarters, I fear, the conservative position has lost caste for reasons which have very little or nothing to do with its merit.

A minimum program of education and training for the kind of public discussion I am talking about should include: (1) a broad understanding of social, political, and economic issues in American life and culture; (2) clear insight into personal and social values as they affect these issues; and (3) specific training in the philosophy and method of democratic participation.

On this last point may I add with some feeling that such training is not to be secured in classes in after-dinner speaking and polite elocution. What is needed is sound education in discussion, debate, persuasion, and semantics under conditions which provide opportunities for realistic experiences in participation and leadership under the direction of competent teachers.

In conclusion, I wish again to make it clear that I do not present this analysis to plead the cause of the conservative, nor do I mean to question the ability and integrity of the conservative. It is my purpose rather to point out that conservatives generally are not doing their cause justice in public discussion and debate, explain

why this is the case, and suggest some of the ways in which this weakness can be corrected. I believe this to be a problem of more than ordinary importance in American public life, and certainly one of great significance to students and teachers of speech.

As Aristotle put it, over 2,000 years ago, "Truth and justice are by nature more powerful than their opposites; when decisions are not made as they should be, the speakers with the right on their side have only themselves to thank for the outcome."

Ground Hog Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to enter into this controversy but I received a telegram from the renowned lawyer, Mr. Charles Marghetti, which very emphatically backs up the assertions made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]. I will now read the telegram:

PITTSBURGH, PA., *February 1, 1950.*

Hon. HARRY J. DAVENPORT,
House Office Building:

Each February around the land is deluged with pretenders to the throne of the Punxsutawney groundhog who for nearly a century has ruled supreme at the lord high programmatic of Gobbler's Knob and points east, north, west, and south. Disregard particularly the pretentions of striped kitties whose promoters wear long gowns to protect their clothes, high hats to cover their low brows, gas masks to enable them to breath while pretending polecats preie about the weather, shadows, and the like.

CHARLES J. MARGHETTI.

Thoughts at Income-Tax Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by one of my constituents to the Cleveland Press:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

THOUGHTS AT INCOME-TAX TIME

Today I sent in my income-tax papers and I hope I am straight with the collector. I find I worked for Uncle Sam from Thanksgiving to the end of the year.

Years ago, when I began paying income tax, I always felt proud to think that I was carrying my share of a reasonable expense to run the best Government on the earth. Today I feel that perhaps somebody is taking advantage of me.

It seems to me if a fellow has to kick into the kitty the least he should be able to do is send along a statement on how he does or does not want his money spent. I think my statement would be predominantly negative.

None of my money should go for tax-free entertainment funds. Nothing for Government buying of eggs, butter, peanuts, potatoes, etc., ad nauseam, so that when I go to buy such articles at the store, I won't find my own money competing with me and creating an artificially high price.

Nothing for bureau employees who spend their time and my money planning my future. Nothing for bureau employees who think $600 exemption is enough today but want to give me a $100 pension when I am 65.

I'd settle for firing the planners and take the $100-a-month exemption now and worry about my sixty-fifth birthday when it comes.

None of my money for dreamers on a world-wide scale who think 150,000,000 people can make millionaires of themselves and the other several billion people throughout the world. None of my money to support the people who have the laws and refuse to use them to curb selfish individuals who put their own interests above those of the majority of our people.

Last, but most important of all I want none of my money used to support anyone in Washington or elsewhere who feels that a government's chief purpose is to do my thinking for me; who feels they have to save me from myself; who has to keep me from being exploited; who feels they have to take care of me in my old age; who thinks they can persuade me they are going to give me something for nothing; who thinks they can slowly and insidiously, by diverse means, take from me my birthright of free, independent thought and the right to take care of myself and my family and substitute, therefore, dependence on a benevolent, paternal Great White Father whose interest in me is so all-consuming that before long I lose my identity and end up a mere social-security number.

I paid my taxes because I had to. Under the present system of profligate spending and even more profligate promises, I wonder if my money is not helping subsidize a system whose subtle purpose is my dissolution as an independent individual.

GEORGE F. HOUCK.

Bureaucratic Nonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from a letter from a man from Montana and two of his poems:

After reading your remarks of October 10, 1949—Financial situation of the Government—I believe you are thinking along the same lines that I have been for several years past. If any of these New Deal spenders should ever try to stump you with their stock question of just which of their pet projects you would cut down on, please show them my enclosed Bureaucratic Nonsense, and ask them to explain the sense of spending millions of the taxpayers' dollars on the irrigation of more land at a time when there is such a surplus of land under cultivation in America that we have to subsidize the farmers on that land.

BUREAUCRATIC NONSENSE

Our bureaucrats in Washington;
Now, aren't they wondrous wise;
They're forcing prices up, until
They almost reach the skies!

They killed off lots of little pigs,
Not many years ago;
The price of pork went up and up;
It had been nice and low.

And now, they're buying 'taters, too;
The price was low, they found;
They're dumping them around, to spoil
And rot upon the ground.

And still they are not satisfied
With what we now can grow;
They want more 'taters, and more pigs,
To be destroyed, and so

They're building irrigation works,
To irrigate more land,
And raise more spuds and little pigs
Upon the desert sand.

And you and I, who taxes pay,
Can watch those taxes rise;
And bless the men in Washington
Who are so wondrous wise!

—G. H. E.

AUGUST 6, 1947.

My New Deal Blues is a statement of my own personal predicament at the present time. I did not ask to be retired; I would a great deal rather have continued working at my old job and my old salary than to be loafing on $53.67 pension and $45.20 social security. It seems to be a crime to reach one's sixty-fifth birthday; that's why I was fired. I have found a part-time job, but if I earn more than $14.99 in any one month, I lose my social security for that month.

MY NEW DEAL BLUES

We skimped and saved for many years
Out of my wages, slim,
So we could have an income, when
My eyes were old and dim.

And then the New Deal came along,
With spending, big and grand,
Which forced both tax and prices up
All over this fair land.

And then, when I was sixty-five,
They took my job away;
And left me with a pension, small,
To use from day to day.

And now, our lifetime savings,
Which now we have to use,
Have only half their former worth;
So, hence My New Deal Blues!

Now it seems to me we are trying to regulate the people of this country, especially those who have the will to work, and I say it is about time to put a stop to it.

Listen to what William R. Williamson, former actuary for the Social Security Administration, told the Senate Finance Committee. He said the social-security program is a flop. He urged the rejection of the social-security revision bill (H. R. 6000) saying, "Let's have no more tampering with an intrinsically bad law, until a thorough study outlines the logic of a sound program." Furthermore, he recommended that social security be replaced by a program giving everyone $30 a month, a sum lower than the subsistence level. He said the present program involves muddy bookkeeping and insults American citizens by assuming incapacity and a lack of will power.

Observance of One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of Patriots' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill I have introduced:

Joint resolution to provide for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775

Whereas the 19th day of April 1775 witnessed the first military engagement between the American colonists and British troops, and the fighting that then occurred at Concord and Lexington, in Massachusetts, formed the prologue to the mighty drama of the Revolution and determined the character of its first campaign; and

Whereas the significance of April 19 in the history of our country is not to be measured by the extent of the military forces that engaged in local battle in 1775, but by the direction and strength of the intangible forces then set in motion which in due course established the United States of America; and

Whereas a frequent recurrence to the events out of which this Nation rose, and a better understanding of the principles upon which our forefathers grounded their independence cannot fail to stimulate and renew that high sense of patriotism which has ever been the glory of our country;

Whereas each such dramatic struggle onward in the process of world civilization has been marked by a ceremonial indicating the formal and official conclusion thereof, the first Commander in Chief and General of the Continental Army purposely selected the 19th of April as the date for a peace proclamation which he read to assembled troops on April 19, 1783.

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Patriots' Day Celebration Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") and to be composed of eight commissioners, as follows: The President of the United States; two Members of the Senate, one from each of the two major parties, to be appointed by the Vice President; two Members of the House of Representatives, one from each of the two major parties, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and three individuals from private life, to be appointed by the President of the United States. The commissioners shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare and carry out a comprehensive plan for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775. In the preparation of such plan, the Commission shall cooperate with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and its cities and towns in order that there may be proper coordination and correlation of plans for such observance and celebration.

SEC. 3. (a) Without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the Commission is authorized to appoint and prescribe the duties and fix the compensation of a director and such other employees as are necessary in the execution of its functions.

(b) The Commission may make such expenditures as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution, including all necessary traveling expenses and subsistence expenses incurred by the commissioners. All expenditures of the Commission shall be allowed and paid upon presentation of itemized vouchers therefor, approved by the chairman of the commission.

(c) The Commission shall cease to exist within 6 months after the date of the expiration of the celebration.

Percentage Depletion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, in his tax message to the Congress, President Truman recommended an ending of certain abuses that have developed in connection with percentage depletion.

The special benefits of percentage depletion and the option to expense intangible developments costs should be limited to the oil industry and not remain available as a means of tax avoidance to movie actors, manufacturers engaged in businesses unrelated to the oil industry and private investing interests.

It is a notorious fact that during the war years, ordnance companies, paint companies, and almost every other kind of manufacturing company recklessly speculated in the oil industry with excess profits dollars. Their operations were notoriously unsuccessful and they were risking and largely wasting tax dollars which would otherwise have come into Uncle Sam's coffers. The new oil reserves which they developed were inconsequential.

It is an equally notorious fact that private investing interests and wealthy individuals are using these special benefits, designed to encourage the oil industry itself to the maximum development of oil reserves, to offset their large incomes from other sources and thus avoid the payment of income taxes which would otherwise be payable by them on such unrelated incomes.

This was not the intended purpose of these special tax benefits and represents an illegitimate use of them. I favor appropriate legislation continuing but limiting the availability of these benefits to the oil industry for which they were originally designed.

As to percentage depletion, I favor limiting the availability of that deduction to those owners of oil wells who originally took the drilling risks or who are generally engaged in the risk part of the oil business. The deduction should not be available to those outside of the oil industry who buy developed oil properties as investments free from drilling risks.

Issuance of Paper Money of Different Hues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of February 1, 1950:

NO SERIOUS OBJECTIONS

CONGRESSWOMAN EDITH NOURSE ROGERS has revived her campaign to have the Treasury Department issue paper money of different hues. Last year the Department adopted a sleepy view of the proposal and it was finally pigeonholed.

But there are new and more pressing reasons for the change now. In the first place, it could conceivably have a powerful effect upon bringing some of the stolen Brink money to light, or else cause the loot to be practically worthless.

It would also cause many billions that have been hoarded by big-time professional gamblers into the open, so as to be exposed in part to the Department of Internal Revenue.

And again, as was argued last year, it would speed up all business transactions if bills of varying denominations were printed in uniform colors.

The arguments in favor of the measure far outweigh the objections and it is time that the Treasury Department should stifle its yawn and accept this constructive idea.

Mercy Killing Is First-Degree Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from a sermon delivered by Rev. Thomas F. Coakley, Sacred Heart Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., entitled "Mercy Killing Is First-Degree Murder":

Those favoring mercy killing are not the forward, progressive thinkers of the day. They are the reactionaries, the group that would push us back again into the law of the jungle, proclaiming the survival of the fittest, and setting up the barnyard ethics of dog eat dog. It was the savage and the barbarian who killed the old and the sick lest they become a burden to him. It was Christianity that took the power of life and death out of the hands of despots and arbitrary tribal lords and taught the world the beauty of compassion for the sick and suffering. The hospital is an invention of Christian charity.

Euthanasia, mercy killing, sterilization, contraception, planned parenthood, birth control, abortion, all hang together. These foul practices should not be given fancy names to cloak over their malevolence. They touch the very valsprings of our civilization for they deal with the gravest fundamental problems of life and death. You can

no more have mercy killing than you can have mercy robbery or mercy extortion. It is a vile attempt to couple the Christian virtues of mercy and compassion with the ugly concept of homicide. It is another effort to legalize the doctrine that the end justifies the means, however immoral the means may be.

There is absolutely no convincing argument against mercy killing unless one believes in God, in the divinity of Christ, in the immortality of the soul, in the reality of heaven and hell, and a final judgment in the next life to render an account of our doings on this planet. For those who believe in God's moral law, the commandment "Thou shalt not kill," binds their consciences. No exception was made for physicians, who have a special responsibility for preserving human life. But euthanasia will make executioners of physicians. Are we going to classify the medical profession as a gang of salaried murderers? Are doctors willing to be thus catalogued? Mercy killing defiles a noble profession that mankind has reverenced through all ages. The doctor has always been looked upon as a friend, a helper in our trouble. It has been difficult always to find a hangman because their trade was revolting. If euthanasia prevails every physician will be despised and labeled as a fit subject for murderer, and we will replace our hospitals by death cells for condemned patients.

Who will be the judge as to when and how a patient is to be murdered? Are we now starting to copy the horrors of Hitler and his Nazi gas chambers at Buchenwald, and these other hucksters of death, the German doctors and scientists, who were tried at Nuremberg and held up to the execration of the world? Is it not significant that Dr. Sander who is about to go on trial for mercy killing studied medicine in Nazi Germany, where the German doctors practiced mass killing? Does this not make us stand aghast at the shamelessness with which presumably reputable doctors and even ministers of religion give impetus to the gathering movement of revived nazism and its mass killings?

The ministers who defend and even applaud Dr. Sander cannot avoid the accusation that they share with Lenin his doctrine that religion is the opiate of the people; that mass murder is justified in the interests of the state, and that a human being and a block of stone are on the same level. Such are the prophets of defeat and despair, led either by their moral illiteracy or their diabolical cynicism to espouse voluntary murder and suicide, practices as loathsome as any in the history of degeneracy.

For a Christian one would suppose that the agonizing death of Christ on the cross gave suffering a supernatural value; that pain patiently endured in imitation of Christ had a high spiritual quality. Surely Christian ministers should boldly proclaim these truths instead of denying them or advocating their surrender or repeal, or proposing instead an atheistic doctrine that man is ultimately destined for this world only, not for the next.

A Harvard professor and the officials of the Euthanasia Society tell us that mercy killing is going on all the time secretly. If this is true, what effect will it have on the patients in our public or private hospitals? What guaranty will they have that they will not be murdered in their sleep? Will not the vast majority of the sick avoid hospitals as they would the plague?

What about the rich kinfolk and heirs and relatives, whose wealth is desired by their greedy heirs? Would any of them ever enter a hospital if murder was the prospect? What about life-insurance companies who would face bankruptcy if they were confronted with the mass murder of their policyholders who were insured for large sums? What about the small minorities, racial and religious, if the Government sanctions the extermination of any individual or group who displease the momentary majority in the country? All will remember how Jews, Catholics, and Protestants were put to death by the millions in Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany because the law of force which they instituted authorized mass killing.

Euthanasia will spell the death of all progress in medical science. A disease will remain incurable as long as doctors do not try to cure it. The problems of disease and pain will never be solved by killing the patients. Such an evil law would put a premium on lazy, incompetent, unscrupulous physicians who would solve a difficulty by denying that it exists. The medical profession has made marvelous and spectacular advances by laboring with unwearied patience and skill to cure sick people, not by killing them. Mercy killing is marching to the rear; it is progress backwards.

Euthanasia would not long be restricted to the sick and incurable. It would shortly be extended to the culturally unfit, the crippled, the mentally sick, the socially undesirable, to those who are not in agreement with the dominant political power, to the unpleasant elements in the community, to those who annoy their fellow men by their way of life, however saintly. Who knows but what, if mercy killing is condoned that Pope Pius XII or President Truman may be murdered by their enemies, who may think them a nuisance to society.

Against all this stands the law of God: "Thou shalt not kill," and this applies to physicians and to all others.

Brooklyn Honors Brig. Gen. Paul F. Yount, Commanding General, New York Port of Embarkation, as Man of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks at this time to include an article from the Brooklyn Eagle of Sunday, December 18, 1949, honoring Brig. Gen. Paul F. Yount, commanding general, New York Port of Embarkation, as Brooklyn's "man of the week." It is a deserving tribute to the general who is doing such a splendid job as head of the Army base in Brooklyn—the Army's largest single transportation installation:

BROOKLYN'S MAN OF THE WEEK—ARMY BASE CHIEF ENJOYS KEEPING THINGS MOVING

(By Richard J. Roth)

The Brooklyn Army Base, prawling hub of the Army Transportation Corps on the Bay Ridge waterfront, is bustling. And, as far as Brig. Gen. Paul F. Yount is concerned, that's exactly the way it should be.

"I like anything that's moving—either people or things," explained the youthful commanding general of the New York port of embarkation, which, with the Brooklyn base and four giant piers across the Narrows on Staten Island, is the Army's largest single transportation installation. "It doesn't make any difference whether it has wheels or wings or if it floats."

With such leanings, it's hardly surprising that the 41-year-old general is enjoying his present assignment. Tons of cargo and hundreds of passengers move in and out of New York through the NYPE every day as the United States discharges its occupation and foreign-aid obligations overseas.

Glancing out of his office window the other day at a loading operation being performed three floors below by a few of the 10,000 civilian employees at the 100-acre base, through which half of the passengers and cargo entering New York City pass, he said.

PLACE TO SEE PROGRESS

"This is a place where you can always see progress, in terms of people and tonnage. That's why I like it here in Brooklyn. I inherited a fine operating installation, and my only hope is that I may leave one just as good."

General Yount received his "inheritance" from Maj. Gen. Ewart G. Plank, when the latter retired 6 months ago, and since then he's been busy learning his way about the NYPE. Not that he had a great deal to learn about the transportation business; in his 20 years of military activity, he has packed in a lifetime full of experience in moving people and things.

Born in Alliance, Ohio, near the Pennsylvania border, September 9, 1908, the blond officer was one of four children of William C. Yount, "the only maverick of the Yount family that went west" from the Yount farm in western Pennsylvania. The elder Yount was connected with the Ohio Telephone Co.

ACHIEVES TWO AMBITIONS

"I had two ideas when I was a boy," General Yount confessed. "One was to become an engineer and the other was to become an Army officer."

Unlike many youngsters, he achieved both ambitions. Following his graduation from West Point in 1930 as a second lieutenant and an initial assignment to river and harbor work in Buffalo, he was sent to Cornell University for a postgraduate course in engineering.

While at Buffalo he met and married Elizabeth Reybold, the daughter of Lt. Gen. Eugene Reybold, now retired, who was chief of the Army engineers in World War II. Elizabeth, as an "Army brat," had no problems of becoming adjusted to the frequent moving of military families. They have one daughter, Margaret, 16, who is attending Packer Collegiate Institute on Brooklyn Heights.

"Moving around is no problem for us," General Yount smiled. "As a matter of fact, when my 'infant' is in a place for about 2 years she gets restless. She sees other 'pappies' moving around and begins to wonder what's wrong with us. During the year we've become pretty expert at picking up our gear and moving on."

THREE AT WEST POINT

The Younts picked up their gear in 1934 and returned to West Point, where the general served as an instructor for 4 years. Following several assignments in various Corps of Engineers posts, he was serving on the United States-Iranian Mission when the war broke out. His first war mission was the command of a supply base in the China-Burma-India theater, center of the early battle against the onrushing Japs, and he won the Legion of Merit for this duty.

Moving on again back to Persia, he became general manager of the military railway service in the Persian Gulf command, supervising the supply line to Russia. "Strictly a transportation operation" is the way he describes it, and it was a vital one. For his outstanding achievements here, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal.

In 1944 he returned to India to head a similar operation on the Stilwell Road, gaining an oak-leaf cluster on his original Legion of Merit. Following the war he was assigned to the Office of the Chief of Transportation in the Pentagon Building, and before he came to Brooklyn he was assistant to the chief.

BROOKLYN IMPRESSES HIM

Brooklyn has impressed General Yount. "I don't know of any city in the country that's more proud of its heritage than Brooklyn," he said seriously. Then he grinned as he added: "Between Brooklynites and Texans we have quite a time. They're certainly two proud areas. I've learned one thing—you call them Brooklynites, not New Yorkers."

Particularly impressive for the general was the way Brooklyn mobilized to bring the State freedom train to the borough. He played an important part in this undertaking, too, by providing an Army base siding free of charge for the train, which concludes its 3-week Brooklyn visit today. General Yount was honorary cochairman of the Brooklyn Heritage Fund Committee, which sponsored the stop here.

There are 13 miles of rails extending around the Army base, and freight cars moved ceaselessly about the installation, picking up and depositing cargo. After a busy day at the base, it would be understandable if the general were completely happy about getting away from the railroad business which has occupied much of his time for two decades. But, as General Yount points out, "It's a hard business to get away from."

He ought to know: In the attic of his Fort Hamilton home, Paul Yount spends much of his spare time fixing up his authentic model railroad system. He has 2 scale miles of track set up already, as he pursues this self-styled busman's holiday.

In Honor of an "Old-Timer," Roger S. Erdman, Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. H. LICHTENWALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, in this city, on the evening of the 21st of January 1950, the Panama Canal Society of Washington, at its midwinter dinner paid special tribute to a constituent of mine, a fellow Pennsylvanian, Mr. Roger S. Erdman, who was employed for 40 years in consecutive service in the construction and maintenance of the Panama Canal. The principal speaker on this occasion was Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, formerly a member of this body from Kentucky, and who, during the construction of the great Isthmian enterprise, served as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, in charge of the work; and as Governor of the Canal Zone. He paid high tribute to Mr. Erdman, and under leave granted, I am extending my remarks in the RECORD, with inclusion of Governor Thatcher's address:

ADDRESS OF HON. MAURICE H. THATCHER

Mr. President, members of the society, ladies, and gentlemen: This evening it is our purpose to do honor to one of the most faithful and loyal members of the society, and one who has served his country and the Panama Canal for a great many years with the utmost efficiency and fidelity. The man to whom we strive to pay our tribute is a native of Macungie, Pa., a town located in the eastern part of the State. After leaving the public schools of Macungie, he attended Keystone Normal School at Kutztown, Pa., completing his junior year there, after which he took the commercial and stenographic courses in the American Business College at Allentown, Pa., graduating in 1906. Thereupon he left Macungie to make his home in Allentown, and his first employment was with the Lehigh Portland Cement Co., at its manufacturing plant at Ormrod, near Egypt, Pa., serving as one of its first employees, as clerk and timekeeper.

About the year 1909 he entered the employ of the Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. at Bethlehem, Pa., as stenographer and clerk; and later was transferred to its offices in New York City as a rate clerk. After that he went with the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. in Philadelphia as stenographer in its passenger department, which at that time was in charge of George W. Boyd, as passenger agent.

While in New York City, in an effort to become an expert stenographer, he practiced his art on various speeches made by Bourke Cochran and William Jennings Bryan to such an excess that he sustained what is known as writer's cramp. This compelled him to terminate in 1904 his service with the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.; and after great efforts to overcome the indicated handicap, he decided to seek employment in the construction of the Panama Canal; and accordingly, sailed for the Isthmus in October 1906, hoping that with an entire change of climate and conditions he might obtain relief. On arrival on the Isthmus he was rated as a rodman in the Canal work and he was therefore given outside employment rather than indoors.

It turned out that climatic and other conditions of the Isthmus did effect the cure he sought; and thereupon he went back to clerical work, and was transferred from the field to the office of the Chief Engineer, in charge of Colonel Goethals, in 1910; this in connection with personnel activities. He was made Chief of the Personnel Bureau in July, 1916, and remained as its chief until May, 1921, when he was transferred to the Washington office of the Panama Canal, for duties in connection with personnel activities and the gathering of wage statistics for use in computing wages and salaries of employees on the Isthmus. In May, 1927, he was promoted to the post of Chief of the Appointment Division of the Washington Office; and in November, 1941, was made Appointment and Transportation Officer.

During his life on the Isthmus he entered upon the most important adventure of his life. In January, 1915, a very charming young lady, Miss Ann H. Young, a graduate nurse of Mercy Hospital, in Baltimore, came to the Canal Zone, and served as nurse in Ancon Hospital; and, according to the judgment of those then and there in charge of the hospital, proved herself to be one of the most capable nurses ever to serve in that great institution. In Isthmia's romantic setting they met, and met again, with the result that they were married, on the Isthmus, on July 5, 1917; and ever since have lived most happily in marital companionship.

He whom we honor has always taken pride in the fact that he served a single branch of the Government throughout, and for such a long and continuous period; although, as he believes, he might have bettered his financial situation by transferring to some other Government activity, or else gone into private business. His loyalty to the Canal work was such, however, that he remained with it, and finally retired, on October 31, 1946, upon completion of 40 years of service. At the time of his retirement he could have served another year before the compulsory age limit of 70 years would have affected him. I can bear special testimony touching his faithful and efficient work for the Panama Canal after I left Congress in 1923. My law office in Washington was near his official quarters, and I saw much of him, and was impressed with his untiring and effective labors for the Canal, and by his unfailing loyalty to the cause he had served so long and so well. During this period, until his retirement, his work was very burdensome, but he was on the job for as many hours of the day, and for as many days in the week, as the exactions required.

Also, I know something of his tireless and effective efforts in behalf of the legislation which broadened the scope of the act of May 29, 1944, enacted for the benefit of old-timers—those who had been engaged on the Isthmus, in the actual building of the Canal. During the pendency of the legislation he often conferred with me about it, and I am sure that he did much to bring about the enactment.

Hence, practically all of his active working career has been bound up in the service of the Panama Canal, in one or another form; and there are few officials or employees of the great Isthmian enterprise who may have a comparable period of service.

Such has been the life work of Roger S. Erdman. Not only are we glad to pay him our tribute on this occasion for what he has done through the years; but, as well, because he stands as a symbol for thousands of other American citizens who participated in the work of construction of the Panama Canal, and in its maintenance and operation after construction. Not many can claim the long tenure of service that has been his, nor the lengthened period of his connection with the Canal. However, others in varying periods of service and in like positions of responsibility have discharged their duties well and faithfully, and what we now say of Roger Erdman in these connections may be applied also to these others. All of them deserve the highest credit for what they have done. As American citizens, most of them civilians, in a strange land, under the fierce glare and torrential rains of the tropics, those whom we call old timers wrote an imperishable record of efficient and patriotic service, not only in behalf of their own country and flag, but as well, for the good of the entire world; and the United States and all lands and peoples owe them an everlasting debt of gratitude. In like manner should that gratitude extend to those who, since the last lone yard of the link was done, have operated and maintained the Canal. Most of these never crept into the headlines of the daily press, but they did the jobs to which they were assigned, and without their effective services there would have been no headlines for anybody or for the Canal. Surely the recording angel has made note of all of this; and, thus, we are pleased to believe that all these have wrought far better than they have ever known.

And to Roger and his faithful spouse—who also lived and worked on the Isthmus, and who shared with him the Isthmian life—let us all join in wishing them many more years together: years of health, happiness, and prosperity.

Defeat for 5 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which I believe to be highly important to the American people and which appeared in

the February 1950 issue of the magazine The Sign. This article was written by Richard L. Stokes, reporter and war correspondent for many years, who covered the State Department for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. This item deals with incidents vitally affecting our foreign policy and the men entrusted with the safety and well-being of our country.

The article follows:

DEFEAT FOR 3 TEAMS

[By Richard L. Stokes]

Three anecdotes, never before published, rear like milestones along the pathway of American diplomacy since 1941—a thoroughfare of disaster and enormity which has led Catholics to wonder whether Satan has not fixed his lodging in the State Department, having chosen that heart of the democratic and Christian world as his curtain room and capital seat.

The date of the first incident was September 4, 1939. According to Hatch, President Roosevelt was breakfasting in bed at the White House. Morning papers were scattered about the coverlet. Their banner lines almost cracked the frames with epic news. On the day before, England and France had declared war against Germany. Nazi tanks were 3 days beyond the Polish frontier. Less than 2 weeks had passed since Joseph Stalin rang up the curtain on World War II by signing a nonaggression treaty with Adolf Hitler.

Visiting the President and wearing an anxious look was Adolf A. Berle, Jr., an intellectual prodigy of renown, an arch New Dealer, and Assistant Secretary of State. He stammered that Hitler's accomplice and America's foe, Joseph Stalin, had set up an espionage apparatus in this country with pipe lines into its most treasured secrets.

His informant, said Berle, was Whittaker Chambers, Communist go-between, whose "contact," a protege of Associate Justice Felix Frankfurter, was assistant to the State Department's adviser on political relations. The name was Alger Hiss.

President Roosevelt was far from diverted. As soon as he caught the drift of the warning, he broke in upon it with his kilert sciences of chemistry.

"Adolf," he grated, "it's a beautiful, sunshiny morning. Take a walk around the block, and you'll feel better."

The White House was also the scene of the next episode, but the time was January, 1945. Roosevelt was on the eve of his blackmened flight to Yalta. There, among other iniquities, Catholic Poland was to be surrendered to armed atheism, and doles were to be opened for handouts of the United Nations through the Russian veto and for Communist domination of eastern Europe and the Orient.

A chief of mission from one of the continental states sought an interview with Mr. Roosevelt for the purpose of implaring him to be on guard against Stalin's cunning and malice. The President's smile was one of Olympian amusement.

"Mr. Ambassador," he drawled, "I see you haven't much confidence in my famous charm."

The diplomat was appalled. "Mr. President," he gasped, "I hope you won't have too much confidence in it yourself."

For the third anecdote the locale shifts to China and the hour to the spring of 1946. Gen. George C. Marshall was absorbed in a mission to implement policies drafted by the State Department's left-wing cell. His fated victim, Chiang Kai-shek, had embellished to injury after injury.

At Marshall's command he accepted an armistice on the brink of triumph over the Communist enemy. He laid down his most potent weapon, the Nationalist Air Force. He unlocked the Kalgan Pass for Red Star troops, who thronged into Manchuria and were armed by Russia with material from Japanese arsenals.

But the generalissimo, for 20 years the Orient's pillar of flame against communism, mutinied when he was ordered to invite Chinese Marxists into his cabinet. For this one-time chief of staff, such disobedience was an outrage of military insubordination. It was punished with an embargo, which lasted 18 months, upon shipments of munitions from the United States to Nationalist China. With that mandate it became positive that sooner or later China would be engulfed by the Soviet police empire. But President Truman's ambassador, at the moment, was proud of his ukase.

"During the war," General Marshall said to a friend, "I armed more than 30 Chinese divisions." He added with satisfaction: "Today I disarmed them."

Incidents like these are telltale flashes upon the landscape of foreign affairs under the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. The general survey which follows will impugn no motives and assess no judgments—though it appears manifest that the statesmen concerned have wrought harm to their country, wittingly or unwittingly, beyond the most traitorous dreams of Benedict Arnold.

West Point's renegade could not have imagined an overturn comparable to that suffered by the United States during the last 5 years. In 1945 it enjoyed throughout the world a supremacy in arms, a moral prestige, and a repute for statecraft probably unique in history. That hegemony, spiritual as well as military, lies at the outset of 1950 in ruins equivalent to those of shattered Berlin. The American people have been maneuvered into a degree of isolation which bids fair to condemn them to fight world war III, if or when it comes, without one strong and trustworthy ally.

In an effort to prove its innocence, the State Department has flooded the land with a vast confusion of remonstrances and denials, explanations, white papers, and pronunciamentos. But, when the eye turns from special pleadings to assured, notorious facts, there starts into view a line of conduct as distinct and unswerving as a traffic band on a motor highway. It is as if Vyacheslav M. Molotov or Andrei Vishinski had been Secretary of State since June 1941 and had ordained this directive, to be pursued at all costs:

"The settled policy of the United States shall be to aid and abet the Soviet Union in creating vacuums of power for occupation by communism."

With American help, acquiescence, or feeble opposition, such voids have been dredged on a fantastic scale in Europe and Asia, to be overflowed by Stalinist seas. Bodily annexed by Russia since the war have been 122,000 square miles, with a population of more than 22,000,000, in Poland, Rumania, northeast Prussia, the Kuriles, Sakhalin, and Tanu Tuva in China. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, proper, today boasts an area of 8,473,444 square miles and a census of 221,384,000.

Above and beyond these figures, the Soviet system, as a result of the war, has swept into its orbit regions of Europe and Asia which total 4,861,860 square miles, with a population of 570,000,000. Thus, 14 men in the Politburo exercise more or less absolute sway over a grand aggregate of 13,335,304 square miles and about 791,384,000 human beings—that is to say, one-fifth of the globe's land surface and one-third of all mankind.

Not yet occupied, but at various stages of readiness for the process, are further tracts and multitudes in southeast Asia, India, Japan, the Philippines, Korea, the Levant, and western Europe.

Gulfs scooped away and then filled by communism had their genesis in the Roosevelt doctrine of unconditional surrender. It overthrew German and Japanese militarism, but also blasted the dams of armed strength which theretofore had held back Muscovite imperialism in Occident and Orient.

The headlong dismantling of America's fighting machine after the war and the homeward stampede of its troops, ships, and planes, by Atlantic and Pacific, left the Red army as the only surviving military power in the Eastern Hemisphere. The giant Eurasian land mass was prostrate at the Kremlin's feet.

A backstage glimpse of the mechanism at work was afforded in testimony given by Adolf Berle on August 30, 1948, before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

It was common knowledge in the State Department, he said, that by the fall of 1944 there had arisen a contest between two cliques regarding policy. A pro-Russian group was captained by Dean G. Acheson, then Assistant Secretary of State, with Alger Hiss, Deputy Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs, as his chief lieutenant.

The opposing faction, led by Berle, was not at all hostile to the Soviet Union but ventured to hint at doubts as to whether its spirit of cooperation was not a trifle below all-out friendliness.

The opposition was strong enough, Berle continued in effect, and sufficiently ardent in the Soviet cause, to brush him out of diplomatic life by way of demotion to the ambassadorship in Brazil. That was his penalty for having dared even to question the attitude of Moscow.

Light on attacks against Berle's veracity is thrown by published records of the State Department. They present evidence of something like a clean sweep of his adherents and a singular upsurge of fortune in the case of Acheson's disciples.

In August 1945 Acheson himself found reward in his advancement to the office of Under Secretary of State, which he held until July 1947. Because of frequent overseas journeys by Secretaries James F. Byrnes and Marshall, Acheson during much of this period served as Acting Secretary, administering policy, attending Cabinet meetings, and representing the Department in other top-level functions. After 18 months of private law practice, he became Secretary of State on January 21, 1949.

Compensation for Alger Hiss was rapid. In January 1945 he was promoted to full Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs. General Marshall's top adviser during the Chinese mission was W. Walton Butterworth, Minister-Counsellor at Nanking. By way of recognition of his services in helping deliver China to communism, he was appointed Director and then Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs.

Among Foreign Service officers sent home by Ambassador Patrick J. Hurley, who accused them of leaking information to the Chinese Communists, were John S. Service, second secretary in Chunking; and John P. Davies, Jr., political adviser to Gen. Joseph W. "Vinegar Joe" Stilwell, the evil genius of China.

Service is now Director of Far East Placements in the Division of Foreign Service Personnel. If a candidate fails to hew closely to the orthodox line, Service is in a position to shunt him away to Zanzibar or Patagonia. Davies is Far Eastern expert of the Department's Policy Planning Staff, where his views must have clashed bitterly with those of its Director, George F. Kennan.

In that case Service had power enough to defeat his boss, though Kennan is recognized as the most brilliant star of the Foreign Service. On January 1 he was relieved of two key jobs—Director of the Policy Planning Staff and counselor of the Department. With elaborate and dubious explanations he was sent on a tour of South America and Africa and announced that he would retire in June. He is known to have been shocked

by the Department's abject failure in China and had no reticence about saying so.

Another Foreign Service man of whom Hurley disapproved was Raymond P. Ludden, a staff officer of the rival embassy which State Department career men set up on behalf of General Stilwell. When John Leighton Stuart was made Ambassador to China in 1946, Ludden emerged as counselor and first secretary. He came to be rated as actual chief of Mission, with Stuart, now in his seventy-fourth year, as a figurehead. Today, Ludden is Counselor of Legation in Dublin.

Alleged to have been the Department's spy on Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer was another Foreign Service officer, Philip D. Sprouse. Wedemeyer, who replaced Stilwell, was suspected of being less than fiery in his admiration for the Communist leader, Mao Tse-tung. Sprouse's job was to sit in and report on all the general's conversations. He was summoned to Washington in 1947 and recently became Director of the Office of Chinese Affairs.

As Under Secretary, Acheson was responsible for instructions which guided Marshall's Chinese errand, but which undoubtedly had the general's personal approval. Drafting of the actual papers is attributed to John Carter Vincent, then Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs. His recompense was advancement to the class of career minister. He was slated to be Ambassador to China. But it proved impossible to obtain Senate confirmation without a solemn pledge that Vincent would not be assigned to any post in the Far East. He was sent as Minister to Switzerland.

Casualties on the other side, in addition to Berle himself, are listed as including Ambassador Hurley, a former Secretary of War; Joseph C. Grew, wartime Ambassador to Japan and later Under Secretary of State; Dr. Stanley K. Hornbeck, special assistant to the Secretary, who was disposed of with an appointment as Ambassador to the Netherlands; Joseph W. Ballantine, Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs, who was eased into another unit of the Department and escaped to the Brookings Institution; Everett F. Drumright, consul at Nanking; and Grew's first assistant, Eugene H. Doonan.

To Loy W. Henderson belongs the distinction of having twice been exiled for independence of character. As assistant chief of the Europe Affairs Division, he was found lacking in reverence for the Roosevelt-Stalin idyl and was packed off to be Minister in Iraq. Brought home to direct the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs, he took the unpopular side of the Palestine issue and was banished to Pakistan.

Three men outside the Department are credited with having given notable succor to the Acheson thesis. The most conspicuous is Owen Lattimore, former political adviser to Chiang Kai-shek and deputy director of Pacific operations for the Office of War Information. An early champion of Red China, he has consistently supported its interests and is charged with front-rank liability for the Chinese debacle. He is director of the Page School of International Relations at Johns Hopkins and one of the Department's most valued consultants.

Dimmer to the public eye are Edward C. Carter, secretary-general of the left-wing Institute of Pacific Relations; and Mortimer Graves, administrative secretary of the Council of Learned Societies. The Institute of Pacific Relations is Acheson's recruiting ground for ace personnel. A directory of individuals with far-eastern experience has been kept for years by the Council of Learned Societies, which has become the Department's principal recourse in screening applicants for jobs in that region. This service is maintained with Rockefeller funds.

In 1940 Graves promoted a concert at the stadium in Washington, nominally for Chinese relief, with Paul Robeson as soloist. Among the patrons, until they withdrew, were Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, the Chinese Ambassador, and Mrs. Gifford Pinchot. There was a scandal when Mrs. Pinchot charged publicly that half the proceeds were earmarked for a Communist organization, the National Negro Congress.

A Red Cross worker by profession, Carter was president of Russian Relief in 1941–45 and was decorated by the USSR with the Order of the Red Banner. From the Institute of Pacific Relations, Acheson mustered two of his committee of three for drafting a new Chinese policy—its former chairman, Prof. Philip C. Jessup, and its quondam treasurer, Everett N. Case, president of Colgate University.

Besides acting until recently as ambassador-at-large to the United Nations, Dr. Jessup compiled the white paper with which dying China was stabbed in the back. His committee, as it was selected to do, reported that the betrayal of China was actually a high-minded extension of the open door and that choice of their form of government should be left to the Chinese people—signifying, under present circumstances, the Chinese Communists.

Over a period of years the Rockefeller Foundation has contributed more than a million dollars to the Institute of Pacific Relations and has given important backing to the Council of Learned Societies. Raymond D. Fosdick, president of the Foundation, was the third member of Acheson's China policy committee.

History, of course, will seek to adjudge responsibility for measures which have brought not only the United States, but democratic and Christian civilization, thus far on the road to disaster.

Absent from the roster of defendants can scarcely be Franklin D. Roosevelt, who for more than 12 years was his own Secretary of State; and Dean Acheson, who for 9 years—except for 18 months—has been a continuing and secendant luminary in the firmament of state.

Russia's immense gains could not have been achieved without Roosevelt's great gamble—as he himself termed it—that trust could be reposed in Joseph Stalin's good faith, though the past record was scarlet with his crimes of duplicity and malevolence.

With Acheson in charge, Spain was outlawed from the household of peoples and is being forced deliberately into bankruptcy and collapse. The Nationalist regime is the only power to have met communism face to face, in arms, and to have defeated it. That, possibly, is Franco's unpardonable offense.

Under the leadership of Roosevelt and Acheson, the American people have been persuaded to put all the eggs of their destiny in a pair of highly fragile baskets—western Europe and the United Nations. Disarmed, demoralized, impoverished, and honeycombed by Marxism, western Europe cannot be relied upon, either now or in the calculable future, to stand up in war against the Soviet Union.

Like the Maginot line of France, the United Nations may serve to lull the United States into a passive psychology and false sense of security. Already this proposed rampart of defense has been riddled again and again by the Soviet veto. It is so wanting in realistic strength that it has been defied with impunity by the small Union of South Africa and was challenged lately to a show-down of force by the Israeli Republic, a nonviable colony of American Jewry which would perish without subsidies wrung from earnings in the United States.

There are signs that Stalin has construed the surrender of the Western Powers in China as another Munich, flashing the green light for his long-revolving plan to hurl a communist German Army from the east upon west Germany in a campaign of national liberation. With Marxism on the Rhine, France would be expected to collapse and with it all that remains of free Europe.

Then, like mists before a hurricane, would vanish those gossamer walls of security which the United States has constructed at such expense and which are particularly associated with Acheson's name—the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Treaty, the arms assistance program, the western European union.

Since Roosevelt's death, Acheson, for good or evil, has had things largely his own way, though serving under three Secretaries of State and a new President. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., was only a stop-gap. Byrnes, a small-town politician, knew nothing about foreign affairs and troubled himself still less. Believing in his heart, as a West Pointer, that war alone can settle anything, Marshall despised diplomacy.

Foreign policy is several stratospheres over Harry S. Truman's head. Commonly he does as he is told, unless, as in Palestine, matters chance to touch upon the single trade he knows—winning elections and influencing ballots.

Before what he fancied to be Marshall's soldierly grandeur, Truman groveled in awe. He is impressed to the point of terror by Acheson's Harvard intonation, his air of patrician insolence, and a fluency of rhetoric which must seem, for an artless boy of Independence, Mo., to partake of the supernatural.

It is possible that Alger Hiss has the makings of a Robespierre. Like him, at the Harvard Law School, Acheson enjoyed the privilege of being indoctrinated by Professor Frankfurter. But Acheson strikes one as an astute careerist, with the ethics of a lawyer and the morals of a sophist. As Assistant Secretary of State, with Roosevelt for client, he cheerfully followed the Moscow line. On his own, under Truman, he is anti-Communist in Europe and Russophile in Asia. Like a sophist, he is prepared at a moment's notice to improvise an ingenious discourse on either side of the same question or on both sides at once.

There is temptation now and then to wonder whether he is ever haunted by ghosts—for example, the specters of James V. Forrestal, Secretary of Defense; John G. Winant, Ambassador to England; Lawrence Duggan, for 9 years Chief of the Division of American Republics; and Sumner Welles, for 6 years markworthy and puissant as Under Secretary of State.

At least Acheson is suspected, on one occasion, of having known a twitch of remorse. Perhaps that also has never been published. Shortly after becoming Secretary of State, he made a confession to an American who is prophetic in his zeal against nonsumnism.

"You know," the Secretary murmured ruefully from the depths of a chair, as he stretched his legs toward the fireplace, "I was 100 percent wrong about Russia."

But a lone swallow of repentance does not make a summer of conversion. And there is a popular pleasantry which is attaching itself more and more to Dean G. Acheson. Justly or unjustly, it labels him as the Red Dean of the State Department.

Nebraska Farm Bureau Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted me, I include with my remarks part of the resolutions

adopted at the thirty-first annual convention of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, November 30, 1949:

AGRICULTURE

7. We urge continuance of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation policy of flexible price supports of 75 to 90 percent of parity in the six basic farm commodities. We oppose the price-support policy of the so-called Brannan plan or any other plan whereby we depend upon congressional appropriation for a substantial part of our farm income. We would also oppose the principles of the Brannan plan if they were applied to labor or industry.

8. Resolved that the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation go on record favoring the use of surplus crops industrially and favoring further chemurgic research.

9. Resolved that the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation go on record opposing livestock-production controls.

10. We commend the hatcheries of Nebraska for the progress made in their voluntary program of pullorum control and urge them to continue their efforts toward pullorum-clean ratings.

11. The Nebraska Farm Bureau is cognizant of the overlapping functions in the Department of Agriculture. We believe that it is for the best interests of the public and the farmers that the dual administration of soil conservation in the United States be modified. We feel that the existing administration of soil conservation, which permits the Production and Marketing Administration and the Soil Conservation Service equal rights as to performance of technical services but with only the Production and Marketing Administration having authority to approve or disapprove soil-conservation payments, increases the cost of administration, creates friction between the agencies, obstructs conservation, and, in the final analysis, the individual farmer suffers the loss.

We recommend that the Secretary of Agriculture delegate to the soil-conservation district boards of supervisors the authority to approve or disapprove soil-conservation payments in those areas where a soil-conservation district has been organized. In the event the Secretary of Agriculture does not now have such authority by law, we recommend that legislation be enacted to give him such authority.

12. The Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation recognizes and heartily commends the great contribution the Farm Credit Administration has made through the years in providing a dependable source of credit for agriculture, in establishing favorable terms for agricultural credit.

Especially to be commended is the ideal of complete farmer-ownership which the Farm Credit Administration has always encouraged the cooperative lending institutions in the Farm Credit System to achieve. The Federal land banks and the national farm loan associations are now entirely owned by the farmers and stockmen who borrow from them. Many of the production credit associations have also reached this goal, and many others are nearing it.

The Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation believes that the cause of agricultural credit will be served best when all the cooperative lending institutions sponsored by the Farm Credit Administration are fully owned by the farmers and stockmen and farm cooperatives that do business with them.

13. We firmly believe that a substantial appropriation is necessary to encourage agricultural producers to carry out necessary erosion, flood-control, and water-conservation practices. We feel, however, that the appropriation should be used solely for the carrying out of the soil-conservation practices. When counties have unexpended funds, we believe a reallocation of such funds should be made to other deficit counties.

14. We recommend a continuation of the present legislation which permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide for supplemental storage of farm commodities which are in surplus supply to the extent for which terminal storage is not available. Any program for the extension of storage facilities should first emphasize increased storage on the individual farm for the commodities which store successfully.

15. In order to increase consumption of surpluses, we urge the American Farm Bureau Federation to expand the present research programs in the use and distribution of agricultural commodities.

16. We recommend a continuance of the present legislation authorizing use of the International Wheat Agreement. This agreement serves as a protective measure to the current price support program in years when we experience production over and above the amount required for domestic use.

17. We recommend a continuance of the present policy of administering agricultural programs at the local level by elected community and county farmer committeemen; and further, we insist that the policy of elected personnel be expanded to include the administration of the program at the State and National levels.

18. We feel that present Government crop forecasts are unrealistic and generally in error by overestimation. We urge that efforts be made to devise a more accurate method of crop forecasting.

19. The Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation highly resents the abuse of the franking privilege and the use of public-tax moneys by the United States Department of Agriculture to promulgate and propagandize any program which has its conception entirely within its framework, but which is not law.

We feel that the primary purpose of the United States Department of Agriculture is to administer agricultural legislation enacted by Congress and is completely outside its jurisdiction when it seeks to influence public opinion or establish policies regarding any so-called farm program.

20. We recommend that legislation be enacted enabling a tax not to exceed one-half cent a bushel on wheat and one-quarter cent a bushel on corn at the producers' market; the moneys raised to be used to develop new markets and uses for these commodities. We recommend that such fund be administered by a committee appointed by the Governor of the State from a list furnished by the general farm organizations and the dean of the College of Agriculture; a majority of whom must be producers of the commodities. We further recommend that this program be coordinated with States having similar programs.

21. We believe in a more rigid control of infectious and contagious diseases in livestock sold through community sale barns.

22. It is evident that there is a great deal of sentiment for some regulation in the farm program which will give credit for the summer fallow practice in those areas of Nebraska where it is a good farm practice. We hesitate to recommend that the amendment to the cotton bill in regard to the establishment of 1950 wheat allotments be reenacted because of inequities which resulted from its application between farms and between areas. As a substitute, we recommend very strongly that production controls for wheat be changed from an acreage to a bushel basis. We believe this change will have two principal advantages over the present program:

A. It would place upon the farmer who produces the surplus the responsibility of financing its carry-over.

B. It would result in a more equitable adjustment of production between farms and between areas.

Under this plan, county marketing allotments would be established by giving equal weight to the average production of the most recent 10 years and the most recent 3 years.

23. The farm program has become a major factor in our agricultural economy. Therefore, we recommend that a Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation farm-program committee be inaugurated. This committee shall be a 12-man committee appointed by the President, with the approval of the board of directors. A chairman shall be elected by the committee. The personnel of this committee shall be three farm-bureau members from each farm-bureau district. They shall hold a minimum of four meetings annually. Membership of this committee, being representatives of all areas of the State, will represent all major farm commodities produced in the State. The duties of this committee shall be to discuss all phases of agricultural farm programs and make recommendations to the board of directors for legislative action. This committee should return to farmers in their own areas a better understanding of the problems of other areas with different crop practices as well as legislative needs.

ROADS

24. We recommend to the 1951 session of the Nebraska Legislature a bill which will provide for the appointment of a proven efficient business manager, other than the State engineer, to head the State highway department; said man to be appointed by the Governor and subject to the approval of the unicameral legislature.

We recommend that all records of the department of roads and irrigation be kept in a simple and comprehensive manner and subject to a detailed audit by the State auditor's office and available for inspection and publication.

SCHOOLS

27. We wish to reaffirm resolution XV of the 1948 Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation resolution which reads: "We do not favor the principle of Federal aid for schools." In the event that such legislation should be enacted, we strongly believe that such disbursements should be made on grant-in-aid basis through State and county governments to insure a maximum retention of local control.

TAXES

28. We favor a reallocation of the gas-tax funds so that they will be more equitably distributed to meet rural needs.

29. We urge the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation support the campaign to repeal by referendum vote the gas-tax increase and the license-fee increase laws. We urge that steps be taken to insure more efficient operation of the highway department. We do not favor an increase of these taxes until a sufficient need has been demonstrated, following more efficient use of highway funds.

30. We recommend that the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation go on record in favor of a sales and/or income tax; this tax to be a replacement tax for personal-property tax and real-estate tax.

31. Since under the present Nebraska constitution, farmers who reseal 1948 commodities are suffering a double taxation, we request a revision of Nebraska's constitution, and we further request a comprehensive study of Nebraska's tax system, toward a more fair tax for all citizens of our State. If a legislative committee of the Nebraska unicameral does not make this study, we authorize the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation to do so, since we believe this is the first step essential to the relief of an intolerable tax situation.

32. We urge that the taxes on farm buildings, except the dwelling, be removed so as to encourage land owners to leave buildings stand; to encourage and not discourage farm owners to improve and maintain their farmsteads. The tax income lost to the county, exempting farm-building taxation, would be added to the over-all land valuation because it would still be to the farm community's advantage by requiring the outside investor and farmer to pay his fair share of county taxes.

33. We request the repeal of the transportation tax, communication tax, and all excise taxes, except so-called luxury goods including alcoholic liquors and tobacco.

Nebraska paid well over $10,000,000 in excise taxes to the Federal Government last year; much of which was levied on necessary equipment and supplies used in regular farm operations.

We strongly urge the American Farm Bureau Federation to take steps to follow this through in the next session of Congress; as the retaining of this amount within the State (and comparable amounts in other States) would relieve the necessity of a large amount of Federal and State matching.

34. We go on record in favor of the present refund law on agriculture gasoline.

35. We recommend that the American Farm Bureau Federation through its Washington office do everything in its power to get Congress to control deficit spending and start reducing the national debt.

HEALTH

36. We do not favor socialized medicine and we urge the American Farm Bureau Federation to continue opposing any bill introduced in Congress that favors socialized medicine.

37. We are opposed to the extension of social security to farm people.

38. We commend the fine work being done by the tuberculosis and blood bank mobile units and suggest that more units be made available to the public. We urge more universal use of units when available.

39. We urge more intensified research on cancer, polio, diabetes, and undulant fever, and all diseases with a high degree of morbidity.

40. We recommend adequate funds be appropriated for a continuation of the Nebraska brucellosis control program. The Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation feels that present legislation is adequate but that the department of animal industry has been handicapped by insufficient funds.

MISCELLANEOUS

41. We commend the Nebraska Legislature for retaining the use of dairy products in our State institutions.

42. We feel that present noxious weed laws are adequate but should be more rigidly enforced.

43. We oppose any increase in postage rates until the abuse of the franking privilege is rectified.

44. We request the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation be authorized to represent its members and oppose any unjustified rates or curtailment of services of public utilities.

45. We urge the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation to investigate and use their influence in obtaining extension and improvement in rural telephone service.

46. There is need for additional facilities to assist farm people of Nebraska and their organizations in presenting agriculture's point of view to the general public; and there is need to bring to the farm population of Nebraska additional facts and information on agricultural markets, taxes, schools, roads, and many other problems; therefore, we recommend that the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation make the farmer-owned radio plan one of its major projects of 1950.

Two Congressmen With a Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said pro and con about American Congressmen making investigation trips overseas. It is my personal opinion that, without these studies, Congress would not have the benefit of a first-hand picture of what we have to contend with in our battle against communism. How can a Member of Congress intelligently evaluate the Marshall plan, ECA, the United Nations, reciprocal trade treaties, our military aid program, and a dozen other subjects involving the welfare of this country without seeing first-hand conditions in foreign countries and the results of our economic and military efforts to insure a just and lasting peace.

In this connection I wish to insert in the RECORD an article by Mr. John Reynolds, in the Houston Post, concerning a joint trip and study made overseas by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. Our colleagues, Mr. CHATHAM and Mr. RIBICOFF, are two of the most able and hard working members of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the information that they brought back to us has been invaluable. The article mentioned follows:

LETTER FROM LONDON—EUROPE IMPRESSED BY UNTIRING MOBILITY AND GENEROSITY OF CONGRESSMEN ON ECA CHECK

(By John Reynolds)

LONDON, November 12.—Just what does an American Congressman do when he trips through Europe on one of those ever-more-frequent investigating junkets? Does he take his work seriously, or is he more interested in looking into Paris night clubs than into the effects of Marshall plan aid or the possibility of a western European union? What impressions of Europe does he take back with him, and what effect does he himself have on Europeans?

We cannot answer for all of them. But we have just spent a good deal of time with two, and are happy to report that, if they are at all typical, America is well served by the Congressmen she sends abroad.

They are ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democratic representative of Hartford, Conn., and THURMOND CHATHAM, from Winston-Salem, N. C., also a Democrat; both sent over here by the Foreign Affairs Committee to make a study of the workings of ECA; both keen, intelligent and workmanlike.

We met them first on their way to Europe, on the Nieuw Amsterdam, and it was obvious from the beginning that their trip was to be no joyride. Several hours a day were spent going through economic pamphlets and reading European history books for background. The rest of the time they "investigated" the passengers, most of whom were Dutch and French.

They were indefatigable in their questions. Why was not more being done to further Western Union? What did the Dutch and Belgians think of Benelux? What industrialists, what labor leaders, what politicians might help them most in their European education? Wherever one went on the ship one was sure to see either CHATHAM or RIBICOFF or both surrounded by a little group of well-chosen people, intently discussing everything from the price of food in London to the threat of communism in France.

After we left the ship at Southampton, we did not see them again till they turned up in London after a hectic 8-week trip that took in Belgium, France, Germany, Italy and Switzerland, and included long sessions with Count Sforza, Ambassador Bruce and the pope ("one of the best brains in Europe").

In London they showed the same extraordinary mobility. In their 2 days here they saw high embassy and ECA officials, they interviewed Ernest Bevin and many other cabinet and civil service members, they sat in on a House of Commons debate, they talked to taxi drivers, shopkeepers, and chambermaids, and in between times "Ann" RIBICOFF managed to broadcast a report to constituents back in Hartford.

With it all, they managed to get a pretty sensible view of English life and English problems.

Though they saw most of the same people and the same scenes—RIBICOFF, however, concentrated more on politicians, CHATHAM on businessmen—they will take back with them by no means the same impressions.

RIBICOFF, a young New England lawyer, has taken great pains to understand rather than judge the European situation. He has been particularly impressed by England. He likes the British people's cheerful ability to do without a lot of the comforts of life in order to pay their way honestly in the future. He admires their integrity and their courage; and when he returns to Hartford he hopes to be able to explain to his constituents that England's present troubles are not all caused by its Socialist Government, but by two wars, an adverse trade position, and other forces in large measure outside its control.

CHATHAM, a southern industrialist, mildly unreconstructed, has on the contrary seen nothing in England to modify his strong distrust of socialism, in any form, though he joins forces with RIBICOFF in his friendly feeling toward the individual Briton.

He found himself much more attracted toward France and would like America to bend all its reconstruction efforts to strengthening France, preferably under the leadership of de Gaulle, and making it the economic and political leader of Europe. As for England, he considers its economic situation so bad that trying to save it is simply a waste of American money.

CHATHAM is not to be budged from this position even by the argument that in a crisis America is likely to find Britain a far more reliable ally than France.

Both men had as their trip's main purpose the investigation of the all-too-slow progress toward western union. They will return as convinced of its necessity as ever but far more aware of the enormous difficulties to be overcome. They know now it cannot be accomplished by simple fiat. They are also sure that ECA aid must continue, in some form or other.

Our two Congressmen learned about Europe not only through interviews with the higher diplomatic brass. They managed, too, to get around on sightseeing and shopping trips much like the average tourist. We took RIBICOFF on a shopping tour one day and realized ourselves for the first time just what a wealth of goods London still has to offer the customer. And, for the foreigner, all at a remarkably low price, what with the devalued pound and the avoidance of the purchase tax (66 to 100 percent on luxury items).

Europeans were pretty taken with RIBICOFF and CHATHAM, too. For one thing they

were in themselves almost perfect examples of that American generosity that has made ECA possible; they brought with them dozens of nylons, cartons of cigarettes, crates of bacon and eggs, which they distributed with a lavish (but not patronizing) hand to their most casual acquaintances.

But more than that they were intelligent and friendly, obviously men of good will who could meet on common ground with men of good will of any country. They could not have been more different from the noisy, conspicuous American abroad, which European caricaturists have so long delighted to draw—often from life. America could do with more ambassadors like these two Congressmen of ours.

Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, all of us here on the House side are following with eager interest the hearings now proceeding before the Senate Finance Committee on H. R. 6000, the bill we passed last year by the overwhelming vote of 333 to 14 to strengthen the social-security system and especially to strengthen the contributory social-insurance program on which organized labor and all working people pin their hopes for a retirement consistent with American concepts of dignity and decency. Many of us sincerely hope that the Senate will, after studying the problem, go further in the direction of a comprehensive program paying adequate benefits, as a matter of earned right, in their years of retirement to all workers not now covered by satisfactory public retirement systems, including farmers and farm workers.

I was, therefore, much amazed and dismayed to learn that a witness from my own State of California, Mr. George McLain, appeared before the Senate Finance Committee on January 23 to denounce retirement benefits paid as a matter of right and to advocate their replacement by a universal means test program making benefits contingent on poverty. He stated that, to use his own words:

> I have never held to the philosophy of granting a pension as a matter of right.

He then proceeded to castigate as "a special privileged group of pensioners reminiscent of class legislation of the most inequitable kind" all those who, by years of patient struggle, and by their own contributions have won for themselves retirement systems. Who are these privileged groups to whom he would deny the very benefits for which they have paid week after week, month after month, with their own pay-roll deductions? His list includes and I quote:

> Federal, State, county, and city civil-service employees—judges, school teachers, policemen, firemen, etc., employees of quasi governmental institutions, public utility and railroad employees, semiprivate and private corporate personnel—members of our State and National legislative bodies—and those now covered by the Federal Social Security Act.

To these people already protected by retirement systems and all others who have petitioned this Congress for recognition of their desire for a dignified retirement system Mr. McLain proposes the indignity of a means test investigation, "a single standard uniform pension system that will embrace all our citizens and that will recognize but one requirement. That requirement to be—need." Are people after a useful life and after paying from their own wages for retirement benefits to be harried by an army of investigators? Are they to be denied benefits for which they have paid unless they take a pauper's oath?

To these people, now enjoying or seeking the dignity of a contributory program of old-age and survivors insurance, Mr. McLain offers the cold comfort, if they can pass a means test investigation, of California's present payments under its old-age assistance program. This they are already entitled to if they can show need, so what do they gain for the rights they have lost? Mr. McLain states in his testimony:

> It is my considered opinion that the Federal Government should today be paying a pension of $75 per month to those who can prove they need it. Such recipients should be allowed an outside income, in addition, of a value of $30 a month.

Thus, one must assume, a worker who, through his industry, thrift, and foresight has managed to provide for himself more than $30 a month in retirement income or has income from other sources such as veterans' benefits must forfeit his social security benefit or have it reduced proportionately.

Most amazing of all in the fact of this poor-law approach to social security is Mr. McLain's proposal that the employer be relieved of his present responsibility to share equally with his employees, through a pay-roll tax, the cost of financing social-insurance benefits. Instead the worker is to continue to pay a pay-roll tax for benefits which he has no assurance of receiving, and the Government is to take over the employer's share. This ill-begotten concept of financing has neither the advantages of assuring the equity rights implicit in individual pay-roll deductions or of universal payments based on a progressive ability-to-pay tax system. The worker is first deprived of the very rights his pay-roll taxes are assumed to assure and then asked to pay the bill all over again through his income and excise taxes.

I wish to assure the Congress that these are not the views of Californians who value human dignity and the rights of labor. I wish to assure the organized workers of California that their hard-won battles for retirement benefits based on right rather than the whim of a means test investigator will be respected whether under the Social Security Act, the Railroad Retirement Act, State or local retirement plans, or private agreement. I wish to assure all workers that our efforts will be for more adequate, more dignified, more universal insurance programs in which a means test has no place.

I wish also to assure those who have already retired and therefore cannot hope to benefit from insurance programs based solely on years of employment in covered occupations that their interests are not forgotten. I personally have long advocated that the Government purchase social insurance coverage for all those who have passed retirement age without acquiring insured status at a benefit level consistent with present living costs. This would then become the minimum benefit level for everyone under the social-insurance system with proportionate increases above this amount related to the previous earnings of insured workers.

I expect shortly to introduce a bill which would assure every man over 65 and every woman over 60 a minimum social-security benefit of $75 a month with an additional 15 percent of their previous average earnings plus dependents' benefits. I do not quarrel either with the State of California or Mr. McLain on the necessity of a $75 floor under old-age retirement.

I would, however, like to see this paid to all as a matter of right and not to a few as charity.

I would like to see the Government bear the whole cost for those who, through the historical accident of their birth date rather than any choice or fault of their own, reached retirement age before a universal social-security system could become effective. The cost to the Government would be temporary, would be offset by reduced assistance costs, and would be a good investment if it brought to an end these unscrupulous demagogic appeals to those already retired to join with reactionary efforts to destroy the retirement systems so painfully sought and won by working people. I am for old-age security for everyone and I am opposed to all efforts to turn social security into a political football for the private purposes of Mr. McLain or his associates.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Address by the Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner address delivered by our distinguished Vice President at Raleigh, N. C., January 28, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster and friends, I was greatly complimented by the invitation to address

this great gathering in the capital of North Carolina, and am happy over my ability to accept it.

I am not in strange territory nor on strange ground in North Carolina. In this great State my grandfather and my ancestors, running back beyond the American Revolution, were born, reared, and fought for the liberties of their country, and there are many descendants of the Barkleys, the Stevensons, and the McKenzies still in North Carolina, all of whom contributed to the blood that flows through my veins.

During my service in the two Houses of Congress, extending for a generation back to the beginnings of Woodrow Wilson's administration, I have enjoyed the friendship and the fellowship of many great North Carolinians, whose names are too numerous for me to catalog here, and I still enjoy the great privilege of serving and cooperating with North Carolinians who are members of both Houses of Congress and of the executive branches of our Government.

North Carolina has been for more than a generation a leader among all the States of the Union, and, particularly, the States of the South, in adopting progressive measures of government looking to the greater enjoyment of the benefits conferred by government, when that government is kept close to the people and serves them with single-minded devotion.

I am proud of my North Carolina antecedents, and of my North Carolina friends, and I am happy to be here in the company of my two colleagues now in the Senate, and many others in the House of Representatives, and many others who have served in one capacity and another in maintaining the high traditions of this great Tar Heel State.

I express the hope that the organization of Democratic forces in the Nation will not fall apart merely because a victory has been won in a single election. The battle for democracy is like the battle for liberty. It requires eternal vigilance. The Democratic Party, through its long and glorious history, has represented and achieved enough for the welfare of the American people to justify continuous and coordinated labor on behalf of all Democrats, in and out of office, to keep the light forever burning which points the way to progress and to solid achievement in behalf of America and everything for which she stands.

In all of its history, the Democratic Party has been the liberal party of America. Practically every legislative act for the protection of the people and the advancement of their welfare has been brought about through the advocacy and the insistence and the intelligent foresight of the Democratic Party.

The first act to regulate commerce, passed in 1887, 100 years after Congress was given the power to regulate commerce by the Constitution, was passed in the Democratic administration of Grover Cleveland.

The initiation of rural delivery of mail to the four corners of this land came about under a Democratic President.

It was Grover Cleveland, the first Democrat to occupy the White House after the War Between the States, who said that "Public office is a public trust."

It was the far-sighted advocacy of many reforms on the part of William Jennings Bryan that gave us the income tax, the election of Senators by direct vote of the people, and many other legislative achievements, for which the Democratic Party stood, even in the days of its defeat.

It was under the great liberal administration of Woodrow Wilson, one of the South's great sons, that the Federal Trade Commission was established, the Clayton antitrust law enacted, the Federal Reserve System inaugurated, Federal aid in the construction of highways was initiated, and both farmers and laboringmen given a charter of liberty by an enactment that relieved them of prosecution as violators of the antitrust law, merely because they belonged to a farmers' or laborers' organization.

It was under the Democratic Party that the Department of Labor was established, in all of its power, to seek the advancement of the welfare of laboring men, and that the Department of Agriculture became the greatest agency in history of America for the advancement of the welfare of farmers and their families throughout the Nation.

It was under the Democratic administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt that the Communications Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Securities Exchange Commission, were established to protect the people in the enjoyment of their rights in modern and complex age of transportation and communication, and the sale of securities in interstate commerce, in which the people needed the agency of the Government for their protection.

It was under the Democratic Party that flood-control legislation was enacted, protecting the inhabitants of our great river valleys from the wholesale destruction of life and property.

It was under the Democratic Party that the soil-conservation program was inaugurated, seeking not only to protect the fertility of what soil there is left, but seeking to reclaim that which has been wasted by improvidence and wasteful negligence.

It was under the Democratic Party that our Nation recognized its obligation to the aged, the infirm and the unemployed, by providing a system of social security, the extension of which President Truman has repeatedly recommended, which recommendation was carried out in the last session of the Congress in the House of Representatives by the passage of a bill extending social security and increasing its benefits.

It was under the Democratic administration that rural electrification was inaugurated, not by gifts to the people, but by financial aid to cooperative organizations seeking to install electric lights and equipment upon the farms of the Nation, by reason of which 5,000,000 farm homes today enjoy the benefits of electricity. The loans which have been made by the Government, without which this great advancement could not have been made, are being repaid on schedule.

There are many other enactments which might be cited as evidence that the Democratic Party is and has been the forward-looking, progressive, liberal party of the Nation, seeking always to make the Government the agent of the people in their protection and in their advancement.

There have been unavoidable controversies among our people, and among some members of the Democratic Party, with reference to the speed and degree of these advancements on the part of our Government. But, regardless of any technical differences of opinion as to speed or degree, I think we are all prepared to admit that in this modern, complex age in which we live, government must assume its responsibility in the field of economics, of industry, of labor, of agriculture, of health, of education, and of social advancement, because in many such fields there is no other agency upon which the people may depend, that has both the power and the authority to administer to their needs.

We are celebrating tonight the lives and the achievements of two great Americans—Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

If there are controversies now among honest men and women concerning the questions of government, there were likewise controversies in the day of Jefferson and in the day of Jackson.

Thomas Jefferson was the most advanced statesman of his day. He was the most accomplished statesman of his day. He was not only a great political philosopher, a great administrator, a great preacher of democracy, but he was a great musician, a great agriculturist, a great botanist, a great historian, a great founder of institutions in America. He was one of the greatest political organizers in the history of America. He did not organize the forces of democracy by speeches. He organized them through the power of his logic, through letters and pamphlets so numerous that even yet they are being discovered and collected in various parts of the country.

Thomas Jefferson believed in the people. He believed in their education. All through his writings can be found his constant belief in, and his constant effort in behalf of, the education of the masses of the people.

He believed in the right of the people to change their government if they saw fit, and in his Declaration of Independence, that eternal doctrine is announced as part of the fundamental doctrine upon which our independence was founded. Thomas Jefferson believed that when constitutions or laws became out of date, the people had a right to change them, and he went so far as to advocate that every 20 years the Constitution ought to be revised, because, he said, "No dead generation had a right to bind a live generation."

Thomas Jefferson was such an advanced advocate of liberty, freedom, and the rights of the people, that he was denounced as a demagog, but each recurring year brings fresh evidence of his political soundness and his true devotion to the principles of democratic government.

When he wrote his epitaph, he forgot he had ever been a member of the Virginia House of Burgesses, Governor of Virginia, Member of the Continental Congress, Minister to France, Secretary of State, Vice President or President of the United States. He did not want to be remembered by the things the people had done for him, but only by what he had done for them. So he gave himself credit for three things—the Declaration of Independence, the Virginia statutes for religious liberty, and the University of Virginia.

What man in our history could claim authorship for that trinity of achievements—political liberty, religious liberty, and intellectual liberty?

There may be speculation over what Jefferson would do today if alive and confronted with the complex problems of our civilization. He has been many times quoted as having said that "That government is best that governs least." I have never been able to find where he said that, but undoubtedly, in an uncomplicated age where every man desired to do justice by his neighbor and not encroach upon his rights anywhere, it would be a beautiful theory, if it could be truthfully said that that government governs best that governs least. But, if that aphorism should be true, it would be only another step to say that that government is best that governs not at all, and surely Jefferson did not mean to create any such impression. Out of our experience as a great democracy, not absolute but relative, we have learned that each year each one of us grows more dependent upon others; each community more dependent on other communities; each State more dependent on other States; and each nation more dependent upon other nations in the world, for the advancement of civilization and the protection of human rights.

The liberalism and progressive outlook of the Democratic Party stems directly from Thomas Jefferson. It comes almost in an unbroken line of descent from Jefferson to Jackson, who on the battlefield and in legislative halls and in the executive chambers, stood for and fought for the rights of the

people against all and sundry who would encroach upon them or seek to destroy them. Thomas Jefferson became the moral and philosophical founder of democracy. Andrew Jackson became its fighting advocate and preserver. Down through the years, whether under the leadership of Samuel J. Tilden, Grover Cleveland, William Jennings Bryan, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, or Harry S. Truman, the golden thread of loyalty to the people, to the rights and privileges of the common man in America, has indicated the continuity of our service to the people of the Nation.

In the advocacy of these immortal principles, we are not afraid of controversy, we are not even afraid of friction. We do not shun discussion or disagreement. We welcome it. Because, out of the friction of intelectual processes, there finally comes a consensus of public opinion which has a right to control the deliberations of those who represent, or claim to represent, the people of our country.

No political party in the history of the Nation ever consummated so comprehensive a program as the Democratic Party has consummated, and as evidence of its soundness, no organized political opposition, by whatever name it went, has dared to threaten to destroy it.

We are now faced with tremendous problems at home and throughout the world. The enemies of democracy are seeking to batter down the ramparts of true liberalism and of popular government throughout the world. Not only are they seeking to batter down ramparts of political liberty, but they are seeking to destroy the foundations of religious faith and belief. It is the religion which has helped to make America the great stronghold of democracy and of righteousness.

During the past generation we have fought two world wars. We have expended in them more than $350,000,000,000 and we have accumulated a national debt of more than $250,000,000,000. We have been compelled to maintain a military establishment far beyond our desires because of our inability to induce another nation to engage, in good faith, in the effort to make and preserve the peace.

As a result of these expenditures of treasure and precious human lives we have added nothing in territory, nothing in reparations, nothing in selfish advantage, except the advantage of living in peace with the nations of the world. In spite of discouragements, in spite of draw-backs, in spite of handicaps, in spite of the intransigent attitude of the enemies of democracy, I believe it is but the truth to say that the prospects of success are brighter today than they were a year ago, and it may be they are brighter than they have been since the end of actual fighting in 1944.

In order that we may be able to accomplish what seems to be our mission as the leader of the nations of the world, it is necessary for us to maintain not only a strong military defense but to maintain a strong and sound economic structure which will give force and validity to all our proclamations and all our efforts.

If, out of the travail through which the world is going today, if, out of the expenditure of treasure and out of the loss of life which is involved in every conflict, there can come peace—not only in our generation but in all generations—not only for our Nation but for all nations—it will be worth the price we have to pay. And the democracy which Jefferson proclaimed, which Jackson fortified, and which millions of Americans have given their lives to preserve, shall be established throughout the earth, as Jefferson himself would have established it, and as Jackson would have defended it. We shall be able to rejoice beyond the limits of any political party. America's business with destiny has been fulfilled.

Moderate-Priced Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the housing commissioner of the State of New York, Mr. Herman T. Stichman, recently made a public statement in which he criticized certain provisions of S. 2246, the middle-income housing bill now pending before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. Commissioner Stichman took exception to the low interest and long-term amortization features of this legislation which, in my opinion, are essential to the success of the whole program. I, therefore, wrote a letter to my colleague the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. MAYBANK), in his capacity as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, advising him of my views on this legislation and urging most strongly that his committee approve the provisions of S. 2246, providing for 3-percent interest rate on loans to housing cooperatives and a 50-year-amortization period.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my letter to the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 30, 1950.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: I have followed with great interest the work of the Banking and Currency Committee on S. 2246, the housing bill, and have taken special interest in the amendments which you introduced on January 6 of this year. I should like to say that I am in full accord with the objectives of these amendments. They seem to me to initiate a vigorous program which will help cooperatives and other nonprofit corporations provide housing at monthly costs which families of middle income can afford. I feel that such a program is urgently needed now in order to fill the major gap in our present housing plans.

You may have noted in the press that on January 28 the housing commissioner of my own State, in an address to the building and construction department of the American Federation of Labor, made some criticisms of your amendments. I thought you would be interested to know that in my judgment these criticisms do not reflect the feeling of the people of New York State. They surely do not accord with the facts as presented in the course of the hearings. Certainly the two features which Mr. Stichman criticized—a low rate of interest and the long amortization period—are essential to the success of the entire program which S. 2246 seeks to carry forward.

There is certainly no other feasible way in which sound and suitable housing can be made available to middle-income families at monthly costs which such families can afford. To deny these two essential parts of the program would be to make a wagon without wheels. I was very glad to learn, therefore, that the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the major veterans' organizations, and many other public-interest groups have declared themselves in strong support of your amendments, particularly those provisions relating to the low rate of interest and the 50-year amortization period.

The New York housing commissioner stated in his speech that the interest rate on loans to cooperatives, as proposed in your amendments, was unsound and undesirable because it was too low. He said that this interest rate, which is expected to be about 3 percent, was too far below what savings banks need to get on their deposits and below the return life-insurance companies calculate on their investments in determining premiums. This argument, it seems to me entirely overlooks the fact that under your amendments, the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives would obtain the funds to make its loans by selling its debentures in the private investment market. As I understand it, these debentures would be fully guaranteed by the United States Government, both as to principal and interest. Securities of this type, of course, involve no servicing costs to the purchaser. The rate of interest on such securities is therefore a net rate. The rate on mortgage loans is a gross rate. As I recall, figures were presented at the American Life Insurance Convention in Chicago in the fall of 1945 which indicated that mortgage loans bearing interest at 4½ percent represent a net rate of about 3 percent, after deducting the costs of procuring and servicing the loans, together with a pro rata share of administrative expenses. Since these figures were those of the large life-insurance companies, who have the advantage of geographical diversification and a better balanced loan portfolio than most banks, the net return for these insurance companies would certainly be more favorable than the return for many lenders for whom a 4½-percent gross rate on the mortgage loan represents a net return of less than 3 percent. Hence I would consider the provision in your amendments of an interest rate of approximately 3 percent a fair one.

The securities issued under your amendments would certainly represent a sound and profitable investment for life-insurance companies, trust accounts in banks, investment portfolios, and similar types of investors. Far from decreasing the amount of interest for saving banks' depositors, or decreasing premiums which life-insurance policyholders might receive, these securities would actually be one of the soundest sources of a steady rate of return for savings banks or for life-insurance policyholders.

The New York State housing commissioner was also critical of these provisions of your amendments which would provide a long-term amortization period of 50 years. He said that, with such a long period of amortization, 99 out of 100 members of the cooperative would never pay off their mortgages in their lifetime but would die in debt. The theory that a dwelling unit must be paid for in 25 or 30 years has no real basis except in a traditional practice. This practice was based not on the life expectancy of the building, but on the life expectancy of the owner of the building. It was designed not for the benefit of the purchaser, but for the benefit of the seller, and has worked, over the years, to prevent families with modest incomes from being adequately housed.

I feel that the longer period of amortization, in combination with the lower rate of interest, will be very beneficial to the cooperatives, without being at all detrimental to the lenders of the money.

It seems to me that under your amendments, the individual cooperators do not contract a fixed debt. They contract to pay monthly charges for their houses, as long as

they are members of the cooperative and live in the housing. Unlike the ordinary renter, however, they accumulate an equity or ownership of interest in their housing by paying the monthly charges. If a cooperator should find it necessary to move, his equity or interest would be repurchased by the cooperative. If he dies, his equity would be an asset in his estate. It has a cash value. It is not a liability. This is certainly not true in the case of rents.

I understand that it was thoroughly brought out, in the course of the hearings on S. 2246 and on your amendments, that the middle-income families, whom this measure proposes to assist, would be able to save 10 to 12 dollars a month because of the longer period of amortization. The cooperative provisions eliminating profit and the savings made possible by cooperative management would cut the cost to the middle-income families by another $13 monthly, making an average saving to these families of $25 a month. I would therefore judge the low rate of interest and the long amortization period to be essential provisions of the entire proposal.

The third and final point made by the New York housing commissioner was that your amendment would prove to be a boon to speculators rather than a benefit to labor and to middle-income families, unless the profits of the contractors are specifically limited by law. Naturally, I would be deeply concerned and disturbed if there were such a possibility. It was for this reason that I made direct inquiry of you regarding this matter. I was pleased to be assured, as I expected, that there is a specific provision in your amendments that the benefits of this program will not be dissipated through speculative devices. I would assume that the officials administering this program must, among other things, insure that no contractor is allowed to make a speculative profit. I agree that speculation may sometimes develop in unforeseen manners. Only vigilant administration can prevent this. I assume that vigilant administration will be forthcoming. I certainly expect that the legislative history of the consideration of this measure will give full assurance that it is the intent of Congress that speculative profits be prevented. In general it has always seemed to me extremely undesirable to inject into legislation the minutiae of regulations which would, in the long run, only result in hampering sensible and efficient administration.

In closing, I want to take this opportunity to express my high admiration for your able and energetic leadership in developing this housing legislation. This country will derive years of life and benefit from the Housing Act of 1949. I hope your committee will approve your pending amendments and that they will be brought to the Senate floor where, I am confident, they will receive overwhelming support.

Very sincerely yours,
HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

Senator Capehart's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Businessman Senator," from the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 28, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESSMAN SENATOR

The political arm of the American Federation of Labor, which calls itself Labor's League for Political Education, has put out what it calls a scorecard to direct people with no minds of their own how to vote in this year's congressional election. The AFL hatchet enterprise, which is dedicated to the purge of 8 Senators and more than 100 Members of the House, marks its intended victims on right votes and wrong votes.

It is hardly accidental that almost all of the alleged wrong votes are chalked up against Republicans who have resisted the New Deal rush toward state socialism and the demands of the labor bosses that they be freed of all restraints and given their way in everything.

As a good example, the voting record of Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, Republican, may be cited. On nine issues, the AFL marks him wrong eight times. He voted to defeat the anti-injunction amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act, introduced by Senator LUCAS. He voted to support Senator TAFT's amendments to the same act—a measure which passed the Senate but was sidetracked in the House.

Senator CAPEHART, among other issues, voted against installation of a steam plant by the TVA and thus against the further socialization of power; against the extension of public loans for housing on farms, and against confirmation of the left-winger, John Carson, as a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. CAPEHART was able to approach these questions with a particular qualification. In that, unlike most of his colleagues, who are lawyers and professional politicians, he is a businessman who never ran for office before he attained the senatorship. The business judgment he brings to debate and roll call provide valuable balance to the judgment of the Senate as a whole.

Mr. CAPEHART has refused to fall for socialist mirages and has consistently striven to keep enterprise free, as the best means of assuring prosperity for everybody, which means, primarily, for wage earners and farmers. In his proposal last year to trim $3,000,000,000 from the Marshall plan, he showed a commendable interest in preserving the Nation's fiscal solvency.

It is to be doubted that such attacks as that made by the AFL are going to damage Mr. CAPEHART's standing in Indiana. Hoosiers in general being marked by the same sort of good sense as their Senator. The AFL's campaign to buy a Congress of yes men can only be considered presumptuous.

Control of Floodwaters in the Tennessee, Cumberland, and Ohio River Basins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by the United States Army engineers and the Tennessee Valley Authority regarding the operation of flood-storage reservoirs in the Tennessee, Cumberland, and Ohio River Basins.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States Army engineers and the Tennessee Valley Authority issued a joint statement today revealing that operation of flood storage reservoirs in the Tennessee, Cumberland, and Ohio River Basins, including Kentucky Reservoir, master-valve control of the vast TVA system, had lowered the Mississippi River crest at Cairo, Ill., by about 2½ feet during the still-continuing flood crisis.

This operation, effected through close coordination among all agencies and offices involved, prevented the flood crest at Cairo from rising above a stage of 55.3 feet, making it unnecessary to legally blast open the fuse-plug levee of the Birds Point-New Madrid floodway in southern Missouri—as contemplated under the so-called Jadwin plan of Mississippi River flood control. Many people had been evacuated as a precautionary measure, but even so, millions of dollars in flood damages in that area were prevented.

"It should be pointed out however, that high water still exists for many miles along the Ohio and Mississippi. Until stages are perceptibly lower and until flood storage within some of the reservoirs can be released, the situation will still be critical.

"Efficacy of the flood-control reservoirs has been proved. Had it not been for the vast storage provided by these structures, a crest at Cairo of 60 feet or more would have resulted instead of 55.3 feet."

The record crest at Cairo is 59.21 feet, recorded at the height of the 1937 Ohio River flood.

So far as the Mississippi River is concerned, the greatest and most widespread damage was wrought by the 1927 flood—before authorization of the so-called Jadwin plan and construction of the present vast system of levees and floodways. During that flood, the gage at Cairo went to 54.4 feet.

"Since early in January, Army and TVA engineers have been carefully watching the increasing flood in the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. As the flood rose to near the flood stage of 40 feet at Cairo, these engineers, in cooperation with the United States Weather Bureau, began exchanging flood data on the Tennessee, Mississippi, and Ohio Rivers by phone and wire daily as has been the custom for 10 years or more so as to be informed at all times as to flood conditions and to be ready to operate the reservoirs in case of necessity. At the same time TVA began to discharge water from Kentucky Reservoir at relatively high rates in order to pass the excess water down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers ahead of the flood crest at Cairo, and this was continued until it became desirable to reduce the discharge and lower the crest at Cairo. When this time arrived on January 14, the release from the Tennessee River at Kentucky Dam was reduced from 325,000 cubic feet per second to 150,000 cubic feet per second and again on January 16 it was further reduced to 100,000 cubic feet per second and held at this rate until the crest had passed and the flood began to recede. This discharge was about 170,000 cubic feet per second less than that which would have been flowing in the river if there had been no dams there to regulate the flow."

Meanwhile, discharge from all Corps of Engineers reservoirs had been shut off except for a small amount necessary to produce power at Dale Hollow Dam in Tennessee in order that they might produce the maximum effect possible on the flood.

Private Capital for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, widespread interest was exhibited in the press yesterday and today in the bill which I introduced yesterday to authorize the establishment of a private system of capital banks to provide both debt and equity capital for independent business. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Associated Press story from the New York World-Telegram of February 2, the New York Times story of February 3, and the Wall Street Journal story of the same date.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York World-Telegram of February 2, 1950]

NEW 36-BANK SYSTEM URGED TO FINANCE SMALL FIRMS—SENATOR O'MAHONEY WOULD PUT THEM UNDER RESERVE

WASHINGTON, February 2.—A plan to set up 36 banks under Federal Reserve supervision to provide loans and capital funds for small business was proposed today by Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, Wyoming.

"This is machinery by which our free-enterprise system may work," Senator O'MAHONEY told a news conference in announcing he will introduce the necessary legislation.

Although the plan appeared to be similar to those previously advanced by some Federal Reserve spokesmen, Senator O'MAHONEY said he is introducing the bill without consulting or committing other Government agencies or officials.

PROPOSE THREE FUNCTIONS

He said the proposed 36 new banks, each with a minimum initial capital of $1,000,000 would have three functions:

1. To make loans to small business for terms up to 12 years at interest rates determined by the banks under supervision of the Federal Reserve.

2. To buy shares or stock in small business, up to 20 percent of the bank's assets or lending authority.

3. To insure loans made by commercial banks up to $10,000 for any small business for periods up to 5 years.

Senator O'MAHONEY said his plan grew out of hearings by the Joint Congressional Economic Committee on the problems of small business in attracting investments. He is chairman of that group.

WOULD AVOID RFC

If the new bank plan works, Senator O'MAHONEY said it should eliminate lending functions of the Government's Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It has lent billions of dollars, especially during the war, to what Senator O'MAHONEY termed chiefly big business.

The Senator said the 36 regional banks could be set up by use of up to 1 percent of the capital and reserves of Federal Reserve banks. He said this would be about $72,000,000.

The bank's stocks then would be bought by other banks, including members and nonmembers of the Federal Reserve System, other financial institutions, corporations, or individuals.

Chief incentive for investments in these banks, the Senator explained, would be exempting the earnings of the banks from taxation for 15 years.

[From the New York Times of February 3, 1950]

SENATE BILL PLANS $MALL LINE BANKS—O'MAHONEY MEASURE PROVIDES FOR SYSTEM OF 36 SET UP WITHIN FEDERAL RESERVE—HEARINGS DUE AFTER FEBRUARY 15—MAYBANK COMMITTEE TO HOLD INQUIRY—WOULD BE STRICTLY PRIVATELY OWNED

WASHINGTON, February 2.—Creation of a country-wide system of private banking corporations devoted exclusively to meeting the financial needs of small or independent businesses was proposed in a bill introduced today by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, presented the measure to the Senate as possible solution to the growing problem of providing sufficient venture capital to fill the demands of an expanding national economy.

With some existing financial institutions unable and others unwilling to provide needed capital to small business, he noted, the private enterprise system "is starving for a lack of debt and equity capital" despite record private savings throughout the country.

PURPOSES ARE OUTLINED

The bill is designed to provide the machinery for channeling private savings "to the place where capital is most needed," the Senator said.

It would authorize establishment within the Federal Reserve System of 36 regional banking corporations with power to aid small or independent businesses by stock purchases, loans, and loan insurance.

As incentives to the formation of such corporations, the bill would exempt them from corporate income taxes for 15 years and permit Federal Reserve banks and members of the Federal Reserve System to invest in them, up to specified limits. Stock of the corporations would also be available to any other private financial institution or individual.

The new corporations would be required to have minimum initial capital of $1,000,000 each.

The bill was the outgrowth of recent hearings on investment problems by a joint economic subcommittee which Senator O'MAHONEY conducted. It stemmed directly from a proposal by A. D. H. Kaplan of the Brookings Institution, who testified at the hearings.

Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK, Democrat, of South Carolina, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which will have jurisdiction, said his committee was prepared to start hearings on the measure any time after February 15.

While declining to commit himself to the bill pending further study of its terms, Mr. MAYBANK told a reporter that it was "about time we did something to help the little business man."

Senator O'MAHONEY emphasized that the proposed banking corporations would be "strictly privately owned." Although they would be subject to supervision of the Federal Reserve Board, they would receive no grants in aid or other Government support.

SEEN BANK SYSTEM AID

"Through the authority to insure small loans they would provide cooperation and support for the existing banking system," he said. "Through the authority to make term loans they would be able to finance sound little and local enterprises which cannot now obtain working capital because so many local banks do not have sufficient capital to meet the demand.

"Through the authority to purchase equity stocks they would be enabled to provide the venture capital now so necessary to bring about development of existing business opportunities."

While he acted independently in introducing the bill, Senator O'MAHONEY told questioners that he believed its enactment would help to answer President Truman's call for congressional action to stimulate investment.

One effect, he said, would be to relieve the pressure for use of Government funds to aid business including demands on the RFC for loans.

Business eligible for aid by the 36 proposed corporations would be defined by the Federal Reserve Board in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce. But none would be eligible that "is affiliated through stock ownership or otherwise with any other enterprise in the same trade or industry which is determined to be dominant in the trade or business in which it is engaged," the bill stipulates.

Each of the new corporations would have nine directors, three appointed from the public by the Federal Reserve bank in the district and six elected by the stockholders.

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 3, 1950]

PRIVATE SYSTEM OF CAPITAL BANKS TO HELP SMALL BUSINESS PROPOSED BY O'MAHONEY—UNITED STATES AID EXCLUDED

WASHINGTON.—A new system of privately owned capital banks to help finance small and independent business without Government loans or insurance was proposed yesterday by Senator O'MAHONEY (Democrat, Wyoming), chairman of the House-Senate Economic Committee.

Senator O'MAHONEY told newsmen that if his scheme is enacted and if it works, there will be no further need for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the business loan field. He declared that unless the owners of private capital devise some method of channeling funds into small business, the reliance on Government will continue to grow.

To stimulate investment in the capital banks they would be exempt for a period of 15 years from all Federal, State, or local taxation, except that any real property held by the corporations would be subject to local levies. Individuals or institutions investing in the corporation, however, would pay taxes on any dividends they received.

The O'Mahoney proposal was developed at recent hearings by the Investment Subcommittee of the Economic Committee. The subcommittee is expected to issue a report within the next few days endorsing the capital bank idea. The proposal was first laid before lawmakers by Dr. A. D. H. Kaplan, Brookings Institution economist.

WOULD SET UP 36 CORPORATIONS

The O'Mahoney measure would authorize a capital banking corporation for each Federal Reserve bank and each Federal Reserve branch district. Thus 36 such banking corporations could be organized.

The banks would be empowered to make loans to small and independent firms, by their equity securities, or insure or buy loans made to eligible borrowers by existing commercial banks. The Federal Reserve Board, advised by the Secretary of Commerce, would define small and independent business firms eligible for financial aid under the O'Mahoney measure.

The O'Mahoney bill was proposed as an amendment to the Federal Reserve Act. It would repeal the present section 13 (B) under which Federal Reserve banks are authorized to make 5-year industrial loans.

The new capital banks would get their funds from a variety of sources. First, each Federal Reserve bank would be permitted to invest in the corporation for its district up to 1 percent of the aggregate of the capital and surplus of all its member banks. Each member bank could invest 1 percent of its capital and surplus in the new corporation.

SHARE OWNERSHIP LIMITED

Stock in each corporation could also be purchased by any nonmember bank, any financial institution or by individuals. However, no one individual or institution could own shares in more than one of the capital banks, nor more than 10 percent of the total outstanding shares of any one of the banks.

Each corporation could borrow money and sell debentures or bonds under general conditions laid down by the Federal Reserve Board. At no time, however, could one of the corporations have liabilities outstanding in excess of the sum of its paid-in capital stock and surplus.

The Federal Reserve Board could not permit one of the proposed capital banks to begin business until its paid-in capital and surplus had reached $1,000,000.

Under the O'Mahoney measure, the banking corporations could not insure more than 10 percent of the amount of loans made by any one insured bank, nor more than 25 percent of any individual loan. An insured loan could not be for more than $10,000, nor have a maturity of more than 5 years. The rate of insurance premium and the interest rate on insured loans would be fixed by the Federal Reserve Board.

COULD JOIN OTHER BANKS IN LOANS

In making loans the banking corporations could make advances either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions. However, obligations acquired by the corporation under this provision could not run for more than 12 years.

The corporation also would have power to buy common or preferred stocks, income bonds or other capital shares of small and independent firms. The amount invested by any one of the corporations in such securities could not exceed 20 percent of the combined capital and surplus and authorized indebtedness of the corporation.

While there would be no limit on the size of a loan the corporations could make, no corporation could invest more than 25 percent of its funds in loans or security purchases in the sum of $250,000 for any single enterprise.

Each corporation would be run by a board of nine directors. Three of them would be appointed by the Federal Reserve bank of the district in which the corporation is located. These three would be subject to Federal Reserve Board approval. The other six directors would be elected by holders of the capital shares of the corporation and would not be subject to Federal Reserve approval.

Roosevelt Day Dinner Address by Benjamin V. Cohen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Hon. Benjamin V. Cohen, one of the most distinguished Americans, who has been in recent years delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations and counselor of the State Department, made a speech at Chicago before the Americans for Democratic Action which I believe to be deserving of study and attention by all of us. Mr. Cohen is a man of great intellect and great insight. In this speech he sets forth his understanding of the principles and meaning of the life of Franklin D. Roosevelt. No man has a greater right to speak of these matters than Mr. Cohen. He also discusses the legal and ethical implications of the Federal loyalty program. I ask unanimous consent that this fine and thoughtful speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are assembled here to express our respect and homage to the man who had the greatest influence for good on American life in the first half of the twentieth century—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

It is particularly fitting that this and other dinners in his memory throughout the country should be held under the auspices of Americans for Democratic Action and affiliated organizations like the Independent Voters of Illinois. For the ADA groups, by their courageous sponsorship of progressive measures, are helping mightily to maintain the Roosevelt tradition as a vital factor in American political thought and action.

I am particularly happy to speak in Chicago tonight. Chicago was once my home and it was here that I received my first schooling in political thought and action.

The people of Chicago and the people of the State of Illinois have already demonstrated to the Nation their devotion to the Roosevelt tradition. Those who would belittle the Roosevelt tradition would like to think that it sprang only from the charm of a magnetic personality and that it could not long survive the mortal life that inspired it. But United States Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and Gov. Adlai Stevenson of this State are living proof that the seeds which Roosevelt planted have struck roots deep into the American soil and that properly nurtured, they can and will bring forth rich and perennial crops.

It would be a mistake, I think, to consider that the greatest contribution of the late President Roosevelt to our political life and thought lay in any one or more of the great programs which he encouraged, supported, or carried through. It seems to me that his greatest contribution lay in the understanding he gave us of the nature of the twentieth-century world and the realistic approach he taught us to the problems of our times.

He sensed intuitively as well as intelligently the growing interdependence of men and nations in an age which has witnessed and is witnessing marvelous but frightening advances in science and technology. These advances have not only enormously increased man's control over nature and his capacity to produce but have almost obliterated barriers of time and distance. These advances have brought in the last century greater changes in the economic habits and living of men than occurred in the preceding 19 centuries. The paradox is that so many of Roosevelt's opponents regarded him as an advocate of dangerous change. In fact he was primarily concerned to find the means by which men could adjust themselves to the truly revolutionary changes which had already occurred in industry and agriculture, in finance, commerce and communications. His concern was how men could adjust to these changes in time without losing the great ideals of freedom and tolerance which he considered the most precious heritage of western civilization.

He was suspicious of all theories or magic formulas. Certainly he had no liking for totalitarianism. Nor did he believe that in a highly developed industrial state things would run smoothly if nature were allowed to take its course and the devil take the hindmost. Like Lincoln, Roosevelt believed that there are things that the state can and should do which individuals cannot do as well if at all. But he saw no virtue in the state doing what free enterprise can and should be able to do as effectively or more effectively than the state. With Brandeis, Roosevelt believed that if we would guide by the light of reason we must let our minds be bold. And with Brandeis he thought it more important to understand the facts of life than the theories of life.

Roosevelt felt deeply that individual freedom was threatened by the insecurity of man in an increasingly interdependent and potentially richer world. As a realist he could not believe in the inevitability of poverty amid plenty. Nor could he understand why the unavoidable—and I emphasize unavoidable—hazards of old age, sickness, and unemployment, of the loss of crops and of markets, should fall most heavily upon those least able to bear them or to protect themselves from them. Roosevelt believed as an English judge said some centuries ago that "necessitous men are not free men." He fought to make life in America and throughout the world more secure not because he loved freedom less but because he loved freedom more—freedom to live and to venture, not only for the strong and powerful, but for all mankind.

To Roosevelt freedom and security were simply two sides of one coin. Men could not long enjoy one without the other. To deny men the security necessary to their freedom in this interdependent world would, Roosevelt believed, discredit not only the principle of security but the principle of freedom itself. But security without freedom was, he thought, wholly illusory. He could not conceive of man really being secure in a totalitarian society in which no one could be free of fear in his own home or even in his own mind.

He was the master and not the slave of words. He looked behind words to realities. He thought in terms of people and resources. When he saw idle men and idle factories, and unused materials and unused crops, he inquired how they could be put to work and how they could be used to enrich the lives of individual men and women and to husband their farms and factories, their forests and their waterways.

He encouraged his advisers and coworkers to develop their own ideas, at times encouraging them to develop competing or even conflicting proposals. When it became necessary for him to approve or disapprove a proposal, he did not ask is this statism or even is this the welfare state. In fact, Roosevelt was very little concerned about the labels which either his friends or his enemies attached to a proposal he had to consider. But he was very much concerned to ascertain whether and how the proposal would work and what effect it would have on the lives of people, their jobs, their homes, their future.

When men were unemployed and factories idle and materials and crops were unused he was impatient with those who said nothing could be done about it, that the Nation must wait until deflation runs its course and confidence somehow or other returns. But when the war came and our factories and manpower were fully employed and new proposals were put before him requiring the use of more men and more materials, he was the very opposite of the character of Santa Claus or Lady Bountiful which some have ascribed to him. Then he would ask where are the men and where are the materials to come from and why are the new proposals entitled to priority over the work that is already absorbing the full energy of our people and the full use of our resources?

Some detractors of the New Deal like to say that Roosevelt changed during the war years and forgot the New Deal. But there was no

change in Roosevelt's realistic approach to the problems which confronted him, no change in his practice of judging in terms of men and resources, free from any ideological bias, what could and should be done to safeguard the freedom and welfare of the people. And that is my mind is the essence of the Roosevelt tradition and the basis of the New Deal.

When my friend and former chief, Mr. James F. Byrnes, then Secretary of State, returned from the Paris Peace Conference in October 1946, he stated:

"America stands for social and economic democracy at home and abroad. The principles embodied in the social and economic reforms of recent years are a part of the American heritage.

"It would be strange indeed if in this imperfect world our social and economic democracy were perfect, but it might help our Soviet friends to understand us better if they realized that today our social and economic democracy is further away from the devil-take-the-hindmost philosophy of bygone days than Soviet Russia is from Czarist Russia.

"Whatever political differences there may be among us, we are firmly and irrevocably committed to the principle that it is our right and the right of every people to organize their economic and political destiny through the freest possible expression of their collective will. We oppose privilege at home and abroad. We defend freedom everywhere, and in our view human freedom and human progress are inseparable."

If, as I think nearly all Americans believe, human freedom and human progress are inseparable, we need full, fair, and free discussion of our vitally important problems. The Roosevelt tradition demands inquiring minds, not minds that blindly accept or blindly oppose every new proposal. We believe in a two-party system and if that system is to function properly the opposition party ought not to be either a me-too or a view-with-alarm party. It should seek out the vulnerable points in the position of the majority party. Its concrete and intelligent criticisms should keep the majority party alive and alert and on its toes.

But unfortunately we do not get that sort of constructive opposition from a party that couches its criticisms in fatuous words breathing sound and fury and signifying nothing.

The absence of an opposition party willing to face up to the facts of American life and destiny in the twentieth century world threatens the effective functioning of the two-party system. It is bad for the country because it deprives the party in power of the intelligent criticism and effective competition that it needs. It is bad for the country because if the country should tire of the party in power, it brings into power another party which is ill prepared to assume the responsibilities of government or to give the people the sort of government that they really want. Until we do have an opposition party that can keep step with the times, ADA will have to serve as the independent conscience of American liberalism.

The truth is that America has been a welfare state for many years. The truth is that in this mass-production society of ours practically no one produces, with his own labor, the food, clothing, shelter, and transportation he consumes or uses. In this interdependent society we are all dependent upon the state doing the things necessary to keep our economic machine from being stalled at dead center. The modern community may be compared, as Roosevelt compared it, to a modern factory where none of us can work or be free or secure at our chosen tasks when the conveyor belts stop moving.

The real issues are in deciding just what tasks the modern state should undertake and how the tasks should be executed to make certain that the conveyor belts keep moving.

The real issues center and should center about problems of effective administration and democratic control and most importantly upon the practical effects of particular state actions on the lives of our people.

Take, for example, the Federal labor-management legislation. The opponents of the Wagner Act used to attack it as socialism. But today not even the NAM attacks the Taft-Hartley Act as socialism. But that does not make the Taft-Hartley Act a good law. Few today, however, would seriously propose that the Federal Government remove itself entirely from the labor-management field. But we do recognize that the issue is not a simple choice between socialism or laissez faire. And so it is with most of the great current issues like medical care, pensions, housing, aid to education, aid to agriculture, and even our relations with the Soviet Union, China, and Britain.

To all these problems we should apply the Roosevelt approach. This will give us no simple, automatic answer. This will require us to think through our problems fearlessly and boldly and avoid rubber-stamping our prejudices. The Roosevelt approach obliges us to inquire just how state action and private action affect the freedom and welfare not of the few but of the many. It requires us to think through just how necessary governmental functions can be administered, financed, and controlled so as not to discredit the great objectives they are intended to serve. But the Roosevelt approach requires confidence in ourselves and in our futures, and the potentialities of a nation of 150,000,000 people, free, enterprising, healthy in body, mind, and soul.

But in recognizing the great increase in the necessary functions of government in our interdependent society we must take heed that government remains the servant and does not become the master of the people. All power is subject to abuse. Public power no less than private power may be misused. Public power no less than private power may be influenced by the pressure of selfish groups. Public power no less than private power may bog down in the quagmire of administrative confusion and inertia. The wielders of public power no less than the wielders of private power may be more intent on holding their power than on doing their duty.

Safeguards against the arbitrary exercise of public power affecting the lives and liberties of millions is certainly no less essential than safeguards against the arbitrary exercise of private power affecting the lives and liberties of thousands. It used to be said that no person had a right to a particular job and that a private employer could hire and fire at will. As industry grew and one employer came to control tens of thousands of workers, it soon became evident that the right to hire and fire had to be subject to some safeguards. Thus also when government was small it used to be said that no man had a right to a Government job and he could be discharged at any time for any or no reason. But today Government is not small. Millions of people work for the Government. Some are specially trained for Government service and opportunities for the use of their special training outside Government are limited.

Roosevelt saw clearly the dangers of expanding the functions of the modern state without a Government service qualified to administer them. Roosevelt believed that the public was entitled to quality in the Government service. But he also believed that quality in the Government service could not be had unless the public respected and protected quality in that service.

It shocks me to hear it said today that such safeguards as protect the public servant in his job are only a matter of grace and not of right. And this is particularly true when the good name and repute of a public servant is involved. While the Government has a responsibility to protect the security of the United States, it also has a duty to protect its employees from being branded as disloyal or unworthy of public trust by star-chamber proceedings.

Of course, the situation confronting the Government is not simple. It is not a situation where we can say that in order to avoid any danger of individual injustice the Government must ignore any danger to the state.

The use by the Soviet Union in this and other countries of the Communist Party as an instrument of Soviet foreign policy does create dangers which no independent state can ignore. The dangers may be exaggerated at times but they are real and must be guarded against. Yet it is one thing to take reasonable measures to protect the national security and quite another thing publicly to accuse or to adjudge citizens as guilty of disloyalty without observing traditional judicial safeguards. The branding of an individual as disloyal or even as a poor security risk may affect his life and livelihood no less seriously than his conviction for an infamous crime. Persons known to have been dismissed or refused Government employment on loyalty or security grounds are not likely to find it easy to secure private employment.

The loyalty procedures of the Government may be an improvement over the ill-defined and indefinite procedures which they supplanted. But in my judgment the current loyalty procedures still have grave shortcomings and present grave dangers to individual rights.

Generally speaking acts of disloyalty should be defined by the Congress and punished by the courts in accordance with our century-old traditions. It is extremely difficult to see the need for individual loyalty investigations for the myriads of Government employees who are not in strategic positions in which they may acquire knowledge, the divulgence of which would really threaten the security of the United States. The blanket annulment of civil service rule I adopted in 1884 forbidding inquiry into the political opinions or affiliations of the applicant is entirely unwarranted. Every Government employee is now required by law to take an oath of loyalty. If he swears falsely he can and should be subject to prosecution for perjury. But dragnet efforts to determine by administrative process the individual loyalty of all Government employees offends the spirit and the letter of the Bill of Rights.

On the other hand individual investigations of the background, judgment, and trustworthiness of Government employees in security-sensitive positions is not only warranted but necessary. But the question should be considered as a question of the fitness and qualification of the individual for a particular position rather than a question of eligibility for the Government service generally. The duty of responsible administrative officials is to protect the security of the United States not to punish guilt or to proclaim suspicion.

Reasonable doubt as to the qualifications of an applicant for a security-sensitive position must be resolved against the applicant. But no person should be branded as disloyal and disqualified for service in non-security-sensitive positions unless, in accordance with our common-law traditions, he has been given the benefit of a jury trial and of every reasonable doubt.

The present loyalty procedures are not restricted to security-sensitive positions. Charges for which no one is obliged to vouch are now made against individuals who are obliged to prove the charges false beyond a reasonable doubt without even seeing the reports on which the charges are based. The FBI makes the initial investigations but the FBI denies any responsibility for making any evaluation or appraisal of the results of its investigations. Most loyalty boards, fearful of making their own evaluations and without staff assistance to aid them, file charges on the basis of a few unchecked derogatory statements which may crop into an FBI report and leave it to the accused to prove his innocence.

It is not necessary for me to labor the anxiety, bewilderment and heartbreak caused to an innocent person and his family by charges reflecting upon his integrity and loyalty. Of course the proceedings are supposed to be secret. But the accused cannot keep the secret from his wife and his friend or even from relative strangers from whom he must seek affidavits or supporting testimony. He usually is so worried and troubled that he feels that he must take a leave of absence to prepare his case even if he is not involuntarily suspended from his job. He must get a lawyer and sometimes that costs money. Of course, after months of anxiety he is usually cleared—but that rarely stops the rumors that he is under suspicion.

On January 4, 1939, President Roosevelt listed among the costs of dictatorship "the cost of being afraid to walk down the street with the wrong neighbor." We have no dictatorship in America. But today a Government employee may well be afraid to walk down the street with someone whom some undisclosed and unknown observer may consider the wrong neighbor.

The statistics published on the loyalty program as of November 1949 seem in a sense reassuring. Of the millions of employees affected less than 10,000 have had to go to the loyalty boards for adjudication. So far the loyalty boards have adjudicated 6,694 cases. In only 413 of these cases has the accused been found ineligible for employment. Of these adjudications, however, 107 or one-fourth have been reversed on appeal. One hundred sixty-one or more than a third are pending appeal or further consideration. Only 152 persons have in fact been dismissed as a result of the loyalty program. But 939 persons resigned while charges against them were pending adjudication by the loyalty boards. And I should hesitate to assume that all of these were in fact disloyal or questionable security risks. Some of them may have preferred to give up Government service rather than to submit to trial because they have been denounced by undisclosed informers.

If we assume that all the adjudications so far made and not reversed will stand and that all resignations pending adjudication were cases of ineligibility, we would have only 1,245 cases (306 adjudications and 939 resignations) of ineligibility determined by adjudication or resignation out of 7,633 cases (6,694 adjudications and 939 resignations).

It is reassuring to know that so few of our Government employees are found to be ineligible for employment on loyalty or security grounds. But it is difficult to understand why it is necessary for the loyalty boards to file charges requiring formal adjudication in so many cases where the charges cannot be sustained. In less than 1 out of every 6 cases in which persons are requested to answer formal charges before the loyalty boards is there found by adjudication or resignation to be a reasonable doubt as to the accused loyalty or security risk. Indeed excluding the cases of resignation and considering only the cases actually adjudicated the charges are sustained in less than 1 out of 20 cases.

It is interesting to contrast these figures with the figures of the criminal cases adjudicated in the Federal courts. Of the persons formally accused of offenses in the Federal courts, more than 80 percent are usually convicted or plead guilty before trial. In other words, in more than four cases out of five in which persons are required by the Federal Government to answer formal charges of law violation, the persons accused plead guilty or are found to be guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Most of these plead guilty before trial, but if we eliminate convictions obtained before trial and cases dismissed by the Government before trial we find that of those actually tried in the Federal courts more than 3 out of 5 are convicted.

Various reasons may undoubtedly be offered to explain these figures, and the situations are not exactly comparable. Yet I am convinced that a principal explanation is that a Federal prosecutor would not think of going before a grand jury or court without making some effort to evaluate the available evidence and to assure himself that he had some sort of a case, while as a general rule no comparable effort is made by any responsible official before formal charges are made in loyalty or security cases.

Let me give you just one example of the harassment to which an innocent Government employee was inexcusably subjected. Miss A, a woman secretary, was requested to answer formal charges because of her alleged association with Mr. X. Witnesses before the Un-American Activities Committee had charged Mr. X with being a part of the Communist apparatus while he was in the Government. Miss A is said to have served as Mr. X's secretary. The facts at the hearing revealed that Miss A had worked in a Government office some time before Mr. X, whom she had not previously known, was assigned to the office as her acting chief. She continued at her usual work under the chief her Government had assigned to her. She remained at the same job after Mr. X was assigned elsewhere, and she had no further contact with Mr. X. Of course she was cleared by the loyalty board, but only after she had been obliged to employ counsel and had for months wondered what she could have possibly been thought to have done to be under such grave suspicion. Certainly in cases like this a little checking and evaluation of the evidence before the filing of charges could avoid needless anxiety and heartbreak.

I know one small law firm in Washington which has felt obliged to handle, with little or no compensation, 20 cases involving formal loyalty or security charges. In all 20 cases the accused was exonerated but not until after months of tension and hardship, and in some cases nervous break-down, and in one case a wife's miscarriage. The two members of this firm are very able lawyers, having held responsible positions in Government, but it is their view that every one of these cases could have been disposed of without formal charges, and with full protection to the Government's interest, by a reasonable effort to evaluate the evidence before the filing of formal charges.

Big government brings its problems, no less than big business, and we must not flinch in meeting the problems that both present. These are days fraught with great events. Dangers must be faced and met; opportunities must be seized and realized. But those of us who do not believe that dangers can be avoided and opportunities gained by seeking refuge in isolation and laissez faire must prove to those of little faith that we do not seek security at the expense of freedom.

We must stand firm against those who, in the name of security, would walk roughshod over our Bill of Rights. Only at our own peril can we allow Government service to become unattractive to those with inquiring nonconforming minds. In these critical days we need in Government men and women who are not only loyal and trustworthy but who are also alert and resourceful.

Roosevelt was always fearful of a regimented Government service. Some even called him a poor administrator because he would not always logically delegate responsibility or rigidly impose a line of command to eliminate conflict within his administration. He usually liked to test his own ideas with many and varied minds and to feel that the ideas he accepted from others had also been subject to similar testing. He was always wary of his administration falling too completely into the hands of one school of thought. It was no accident that he wanted the counsel of James F. Byrnes, Bernard Baruch, Cordell Hull, Henry Stimson, and Will Clayton, as well as of Harry Hopkins, Harold Ickes, Robert Jackson, William Douglas, and Thomas Corcoran. He knew how to get the best out of all of these. And don't forget that he was among the first to discover and appreciate the very unusual qualities of Harry S. Truman. But what was even more important he had the knack of making those in the Government service who seldom had direct contact with him feel that he valued initiative and imagination and was not afraid of new ideas. He inspired into all echelons of Government a new spirit of intelligence and devotion.

We must see to it that new spirit is not transformed into a dull conformity that forbids the mind to inquire or to venture. We must never forget that "where there is no vision, the people perish."

Ministry Outweighs the Law for Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and well-written article entitled "Ministry Outweighs the Law for Him," by Richard L. Neuberger, special writer for the Oregonian.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINISTRY OUTWEIGHS THE LAW FOR HIM—PORTLAND ATTORNEY GIVES UP PRACTICE FOR CHURCH PULPIT

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

I remembered Corwin Calavan as one of the most brilliant students at University of Oregon law school.

In Portland, before the war, I heard occasionally of his steady progress up the staircase of the legal profession. His success as a lawyer seemed assured. Indeed, in large measure, it already had been achieved.

Then I lost touch with him, except to know that he was in the Navy while I was serving in the Army.

A few weeks ago he called on the telephone, asking me to speak at his church. To me, at the time, his church merely meant the parish to which Corwin Calavan belonged. It was St. Matthew's Episcopal Church.

But my friend of college days more than belonged to this church in Maywood Park, on the eastern fringe of Portland. He was its rector, a fact made obvious by the cassock and clerical collar he was wearing.

In 1946, when he was 36 years old, Corwin Calavan had abandoned the practice of law and gone to the Church Divinity School of the Pacific to study for the ministry. After 3 years of theological preparation in Berkeley, Calif., he now was commencing a totally new and different career at the age of 39.

That night we talked long and earnestly in his basement study at 9824 Northeast Mason Street.

"My business is about 25 percent of what it was when I was an attorney," began Corwin Calavan, "and I'm happier and more at peace with myself than ever before in my adult life."

Because contentment is the most universal of goals, Calavan's decision fascinated me. What was the specific appeal of the church which had lured a man with two children and another on the way from a prospering law practice?

C. Corwin Calavan was born in Portland February 11, 1908, the son of a dentist. He attended Jefferson high school and got his law degree at University of Oregon in 1935. His campus career was orthodox and he was a member of the Deppa Sigma fraternity.

After embryonic legal work, he formed a partnership with Milton R. Klepper, an older attorney. Calavan undertook a good deal of civil trial work. He also drafted wills, contracts, and similar documents. In the summer of 1941 he entered the United States Navy and served until the end of 1945.

He emerged from uniform with the two and a half stripes of a lieutenant-commander. His principal duty was that of staff legal officer for the aircraft arm of the Seventh Fleet, assigned to the South Pacific amphitheater of war.

In 1942 Calavan had met a girl with a peaches-and-cream complexion named Frances Krumenacher at a Sunday afternoon garden party and married her. Today there are two children—bespectacled Sharon, aged 6, and Charles Corwin, Jr., 4. A third offspring is expected by spring.

These are the bare biographical facts of a career which was altered so drastically in mid-passage.

Was there one, incisive moment which, above all others, influenced Calavan's decision?

It was, he believes. It occurred on the island of Manila, in the Admiralty Archipelago off the New Guinea coast. In the darkness of a Christmas eve, Lieutenant Calavan trudged over the brow of a tropical hill and heard hymns coming from a chapel. Beside the chapel, in the naked glare of arc lights, men bare to the waist were digging graves. Coffins lay promiscuously among the brown mounds of earth. Out in the harbor barked dimly the superstructure of a convoy about to start for Lingayen Gulf in the Philippines.

"I stood there," said Calavan, "while the incongruity of it all sank into my consciousness. In the chapel men were celebrating the birth of the Saviour of mankind, the Prince of Peace. On the other side of the walls, men who had fallen in war were being buried. Soon our ships would leave to kill other men, or themselves be destroyed in the attempt."

Calavan continued: "Many terrible questions seemed unanswered. I wondered what I, in my profession, was doing to help unravel them."

Calavan moved on to the Philippines with the Seventh Fleet. With his natural inquisitiveness, he shared frugal meals with native families which owned nothing except a few cotton rags. These families had been bereaved by the war that the great powers of earth were conducting all around them. "Yet these simple men and women," recalled Calavan, "appeared to be contented and happy."

He went on, "I began to see that the important things were within a person. Genuine peace of soul was of far greater value than those external trivialities—transitory luxuries, expensive cars, fine clothes."

The lieutenant commander came home to Portland and resumed his torts and contract work. "All about me," he said, "I met people who had become rich during the war. Some of them were my clients. Their bank books bulged with impressive digits. But these people were not happy. Money was the only thing of tangible reality to them."

Calavan said he thought hard and stubbornly about his own fleeting role on earth.

"While practice of the law unquestionably was useful," said he, "it did not appear to be solving the problems which I had come to regard as basic. I realized I was not contributing what I wanted, in my heart, to contribute. As a lawyer, I was skimming the surface of mankind's troubles. As a minister, I might probe them to the depths."

Calavan had been raised a Presbyterian. He was a Presbyterian on the day he decided to sell his case reports and other legal references. But the religion which suited him the most, personally, was the Episcopalian.

"I liked the formalism of the Episcopal Church," he explained. "To me worship is not an intellectual process. It needs symbolism and ritual. These things make people feel their religion, and I believe religion should heavily involve the emotions. A person should worship God with all his senses, not merely the intellect. For these reasons, the formal nature of Episcopal services appealed greatly to me."

The attorney went to see Rt. Rev. Lenjamin D. Dagwell, bishop of the Portland diocese. They never had met before, but to the older man Calavan poured out his soul. He was through with the law. He wanted to be an Episcopal minister.

Dagwell made it possible for Calavan to enroll in divinity school of the Episcopal Church at Berkeley. He graduated in June of 1949 with the degree of bachelor of divinity, the GI bill of rights having helped to finance the Calavan family during the 3-year course.

The new rector asked the bishop for a pulpit which would be a challenge. He feels that Dagwell satisfied this request.

Not only is Calavan a new rector, but St. Matthew's is a new church. The ex-lawyer is its first clergyman. The church began with only 15 or 20 parishioners. Today its membership is 130, and still growing. Does Calavan find being a minister a profound difference from being a lawyer?

He does, indeed.

In the first place, he has far less free time. Four or five nights a week he is occupied with the men's club of his church, with the various women's activities, with arranging day nursery programs, with visiting individual homes.

Calavan regards personal counseling as extremely important. During the summer of 1948 he attended the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston to observe the work of psychiatrists and the general staff of the institution. Other clergymen joined him in this project.

"We learned a great deal about human behavior and human psychology," revealed Calavan. "Perhaps most fundamental of all, we learned to be good listeners. Some ministers may do too much talking themselves. I found out that distressed men and women can relieve their tensions and anxieties if they can tell what is disturbing them. I believe I have trained myself to be an intent and patient listener."

The rector of St. Matthew's deprecates the fact that his present income is only about a fourth of what it totaled as a lawyer. "So what?" sums up his attitude.

"We've dropped a few private clubs, curtailed my insurance program, and drive a smaller car," he added. "But what do these things amount to? They entail no real sacrifice. We eat all we want, and my wife and children are perfectly satisfied."

Pretty Frances Calavan corroborates this opinion. She enjoys being a clergyman's wife. "Our phone rings a lot more," she continued, "and I have a good deal more extensive social duties. But my relationships with the families of the church seem extremely worth while, and I share Corwin's pride in our new way of life."

Calavan believes he is not unique. He thinks the dislocations of the war induced many men to revaluate their careers. In one Wisconsin diocese of the Episcopal Church, for example, he explains that no fewer than 13 men who were in business or trade are preparing themselves for the cloth. "A time of great upheaval," said he, "tends to make us get down to fundamentals in our thinking."

The former barrister looks the part of his new profession. He has a long, serious face and a prominent, aquiline nose. A heavy mat of black hair, now heavily threaded with gray, surmounts a scholar's high forehead. His voice is pleasant but capable of a burning intensity. This tone comes into it when he says, "Religion to me is the channel by which people arrive at a better relationship with God. It gives men and women a sense of true fulfillment."

Calavan never has regretted his epic decision.

During his divinity studies at Berkeley, a long-distance call came through from Portland. A prominent lawyer wanted Calavan to take over his practice. It might yield a $20,000 annual income the first year. This would be five or six times the pay of a fledgling rector. Calavan did not hesitate in turning down the offer.

"I never gave the matter a second thought," he added.

We walked out on the level lawn in front of the parish house. A few flakes of snow were falling desultorily in the December night. They mingled with the fir needles on the frozen ground and were lost. "The basic thing," maintained Calavan, "is that I wasn't contributing as a lawyer what I was best equipped by temperament and conviction to contribute."

And he concluded: "Be sure to make people understand that."

I looked back at him. In the bright doorway of the little rectory he waved a hand in farewell. I thought then that his thick shock of hair stood up like a plume.

Proposed Change in Counting Electors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Proposed Change in Counting Electors," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of February 2, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—THE PROPOSED CHANGE IN COUNTING ELECTORS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—The amendment to the Constitution which more than the required two-thirds of the Senate agreed yesterday to submit to the States has taken only the first step on the long road to ratification. If the State delegations in the House of Representatives, which has yet to act, align themselves proportionately as the Senators did on this proposal to divide presidential electors on the basis of the popular vote in each State it will attract more than the two-thirds majority needed there also.

But this will not assure that the legislatures of three-fourths of the States will give the majorities of both branches that must be forthcoming before the Constitution can be amended.

The President hazarded a guess today that the process will still be incomplete when the voters of the United States go to the polls in the next general election, in 1952. Since the terms of the submission allow 7 years in which the States may consider the change, and it may well encounter local opposition which was not indicated in the Senate debate, that seems a good guess. But if the Senate vote truly represents mass opinion, and not chiefly that of politicians, toward a new method of choosing Presidents and Vice Presidents, the amendment may be added in far less time.

The majority in the Senate was made possible by the favoring vote of 16 southern Democrats who, with 30 northern and border State Democrats, joined 18 Republicans to make an approving total of 3 more than the essential two-thirds—64—of those "present and voting." If any 4 of these southerners had followed the 2 Virginians—Senators BYRD and ROBERTSON—in opposition, the Lodge-Gossett resolution, in which Senator KEFAUVER and former Representative Lea of California, also pioneered, would not have been submitted to the States.

The debate made very clear the reasoning by which these 16 Democrats were attracted to the proposal. They are at odds with the President's larger party group over the so-called program of civil-rights legislation. They believe that its genesis as the national party platform rests in the balance-of-power strength which is attributed to the Negro voters in non-Southern States with large blocs of presidential electors. If hereafter electoral votes are allocated in proportion to the popular vote in each State, these southern Democrats believe that balance-of-power groups, actual or claimant, will lose the power to dictate national Democratic policies because they will no longer be able to deliver a complete State electoral bloc by their affiliation.

The southerners are confident also that they will lose few electors in their own States by the change, unless that is the strategy of the Democratic organization; and that it will not stimulate in the South the rise of a two-party system, though this is one of the virtues asserted for the amendment by its advocates from all sections of the country. Convinced of these two things, the southern Democrats see in the amendment a sure way to reestablish their ancient power in the national councils of the party. They can, they foresee, deliver their electors substantially en bloc, or they can let some or all go by default to the opposition national ticket.

Others, apparently including Senator BYRD, regard these expectations as fallacious. They see situations in Northern States where splinter groups, unable to apply their present pressure on the major parties, will combine on independent tickets and get the bulk of the electors with a minority of the popular vote, then being able to wield a mightier balance of power. They see in the amendment also a bar to an independent Democratic movement in the South, as in 1948, because under the electoral change the political control of the State would then go, with most of its electors, to the Republicans.

But what probably troubled the Virginians most about the Lodge-Gossett amendment is an aspect which got no notice in the Senate debate but is sure to get it during the process toward ratification. This is its effect toward further dissolving States as units, thus amounting, as some see it, to another move toward a wholly Federal Government structure and away from the original Union of sovereign States.

When the Colonies which became States created the Federal Union they reserved all powers not otherwise delegated by them to the central Government in the Constitution, and in every other way the unit character of each State was stressed and protected. Hence, for example, the expressed will of a majority of Virginians was always to be registered in the Nation as the decision of Virginia. And this was true of all the other States, a concept maintained in the system whereby—with very slight deviations—all a State's presidential electors are allotted to the candidate who gets a popular majority vote.

Under the Lodge-Gossett amendment the will of a State in national elections is disunified. The voting majority gets some electors, the minorities above a certain fraction get the others, and both groups melt into a broad national alignment. Opponents of this result find it as unacceptable as they would a law prescribing that only 51 percent of a statute was enforceable because that was the size of the majority which approved it. And they are the more convinced that the amendment is an opening wedge for the direct election of Presidents because Senator LODGE announced that he introduced this amendment only because he never could get three-fourths of the States to ratify the Nation-wide method.

Displaced-Persons Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in this morning's Washington Post entitled "Closed Door." We will soon be considering various amendments to the Displaced-Persons Act, and this fine editorial clarifies one of the proposed amendments which would bar so-called Marxists from obtaining visas under the act. Such a prohibition raises some serious questions not only for the effective administration of the legislation, but also for cherished American principles of free expression and peaceful change.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLOSED DOOR

Senator MCCARRAN has added, let us presume in the interest of national security, an interesting new gimmick to the Displaced Persons Act. The amendments reported after so much delay by the Senate Judiciary Committee supplement the safeguards of the existing law against admission of undesirable persons by providing that "no visas shall be issued under the provisions of this act, as amended, to any person who is or has been a member of the Communist Party or a Marxist, or of any organization which has been designated by the Attorney General of the United States as a Communist organization * * *."

What interests us most in this catalog is the prohibition against any person who is or has been a Marxist. This means, of course, any person who is or has been a supporter of the present government of England. It means the entire body of Social Democrats who provided the most effective resistance to Hitler before the war and are now the most vigorous opponents of communism in many European countries. It means persons like Leon Blum and George Bernard Shaw and Pietro Nenni. In short, it probably means anyone to the left of Friedrich von Hayek or Ludwig von Mises. If Senator MCCARRAN had only thought to bar, in addition, any person who is or has been a Keynesian, he could have double-locked the door against anyone critical in any degree of the economic status quo ante bellum.

The ban on Marxists poses an obvious administrative impossibility. The term is too vague to convey any meaning, and individual political sympathies are too inscrutable to be determined by any consular examination. We hope the Senate will strike out this stipulation, however, not merely because it is absurd but even more because it is extremely dangerous. The punishment of unorthodox opinion is usually begun in relation to some helpless group such as aliens seeking admission to the United States. But once accepted, it is liable to be applied at home, say, to persons seeking employment in the Government. Marxists (or non-Marxists) who want to overthrow the Government of the United States by force can properly be excluded from this country, as they are under existing law. Marxists who believe in a peaceful change of the economic system can be excluded only at peril of imposing a sterile conformity.

Capehart Versus Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Capehart Versus Acheson," published in the Washington (Ind.) Herald of January 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPEHART VERSUS ACHESON

It was a bold thing to do when Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART stood on the floor of the United States Senate a week ago and demanded that President Truman request the resignation of Secretary of State Dean Acheson on the basis of revelations brought out in the Hiss trial. It was a bold thing to do but when Senator CAPEHART had finished documenting his case there could be no doubt in the mind of any reasonable person but that he had right and justice on his side.

Senator CAPEHART pointed out that it was in 1938 that Whittaker Chambers first came to Washington to lay the information he had about Communist activities in the Government before President Roosevelt. Presidential Secretary Marvin McIntyre referred Chambers to Adolph Berle, who then was in charge of intelligence matters in the State Department.

Berle listened to Chambers' story, including the part concerning Hiss, who was then employed in the State Department. Mr. Berle testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee that he discussed the matter with Dean Acheson, who then held a top post in the State Department. Nothing came of it. In fact, only a few months after the Chambers information concerning Hiss was developed to Acheson, Hiss received a promotion.

For the past 12 years Acheson has had full knowledge of Hiss' activities during a 3-year period, 1936-39, in filching top-secret documents from the State Department and delivering them to Russian spies. He had this knowledge but he did nothing about it. On the contrary, he participated in promoting Hiss to positions of increasing responsibility, even to the post of confidential adviser to President Roosevelt at the Yalta Conference.

And after the second Hiss trial when Hiss was convicted of perjury; after a jury had said that Hiss was guilty of filching secret papers from the State Department and passing them to Russian spies; after Hiss had been proved to be a traitor; after all that, Mr. Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States, is quoted as having said, "I will not turn my back on Alger Hiss."

What other course could Senator CAPERHART have taken and still retained his self-respect as an American citizen and as a Member of the United States Senate? What other course was available to him, but to stand on the floor of the Senate and request that President Truman demand the resignation of Dean Acheson?

We know not and care less what the "long hairs" in Washington may think, but to the good people of Indiana such straight talk and two-fisted action makes sense. We want no part of any person or group of persons who are disloyal to the United States.

The Potato Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 3, 1950, entitled "Potatoes: Shocking Example of Wasteful Program."

This article emphasizes the need for an immediate lowering of our farm support price level, and point out how such action will benefit both the farmer and consumer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POTATOES: SHOCKING EXAMPLE OF WASTEFUL PROGRAM

Federal support of farm prices at unreasonably high levels has, in the case of potatoes, led inexorably to the shocking situation in which the Government is faced with the necessity of destroying some 80,000,000 bushels which cost the taxpayers about $1.25 a bushel.

In the face of such flagrant proof of the waste involved in the present farm-price program it would be reasonable to expect demands for a prompt review of Federal policy. Instead, a move is under way to give the Commodity Credit Corporation some $2,000,000,000 more with which to buy up additional agricultural surpluses.

The housewife paying unnecessarily high prices for potatoes will be the first to recognize the need for lowering the price-support level to such a point that production will once again be geared to the level of consumption. Until this has been done the outlook is for a continued piling up of foodstuffs, many of them perishable, in Government warehouses at a constantly mounting cost to taxpayers.

Potatoes became the first crop to embarrass the Federal planners, but the situation with respect to wheat, corn, eggs, butter and other products differs only in degree.

Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan acted properly in going to the Senate Agriculture Committee for advice concerning what disposal should be made of the Government-owned potatoes, for his dilemma stems directly from the failure of Congress to lay aside political considerations and enact realistic farm legislation.

The committee's refusal to make any suggestion should deceive no one. In this instance Secretary Brannan has simply carried out a program laid down by Congress—a program with which he has been in disagreement.

The crisis in potatoes provides a most convincing demonstration of the necessity of a general lowering of farm-support price levels to a point where, without depriving producers of protection against sudden fluctuations of the market, food will be raised for the dinner table and not to be stored for a time in bulging Government warehouses—and then thrown away.

Proposed National Board of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter which Dr. Hollis P. Allen, professor of education at Claremont College, California, and the compiler of the Task Force Report on Education for the Hoover Commission, recently sent to Pres. James B. Conant, of Harvard University.

The letter, in my opinion, presents a cogent argument in favor of establishing a National Board of Education, such as is proposed in the substitute measure, S. 656, which I introduced on October 19, 1949.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 6, 1950.

President JAMES B. CONANT,
Harvard University,
Cambridge, Mass.

DEAR PRESIDENT CONANT: As compiler of the Hoover Commission Task Force Report on Education (pt. 3 of appendix P of the Commission publications) I am particularly pleased to note your selection as chairman of the schools and university committee of the citizens committee on the Hoover report. I recall your generous assistance to me in presenting data concerning the effect of the various Federal activities in education as they concerned Harvard.

There is so much good in the Hoover Commission findings and recommendations in general that I am extremely sorry to find it necessary to take issue with it in respect to its particular report concerning education. I do hope that you may see your way clear to approach these problems in the constructive manner which has been so typical of your past valued service to education throughout the country.

With many others who have the best interests of education at heart I am greatly concerned over the failure of the Hoover Commission to give serious consideration to any of the proposals and recommendations of this task force report concerning education. I suspect that this may have been due to the very brief time which the Commission was able to devote to its final deliberations. I trust that I am not imposing on you to present a few considerations:

1. As pointed out in the task force report, our difficulties concerning education at the Federal level has been largely due to lack of any consistent policy. Both the Brookings Institution, which prepared this and other welfare task force reports, and I had understandings with the Commission that policy consideration was an essential prerequisite to determination of organizational matters in education. In reports of progress to the Commission staff I stressed that evaluation and development of Federal policy in education must precede and to a considerable extent determine Federal organization for education, a point which was mutually agreeable.

In spite of this the Commission stated in its Report on Social Security and Education—Indian Affairs (p. 4) that "it is not the province of this Commission to pass upon policies." Again on page 12 it stated "this Commission is not dealing with policies." Under the same cover, however, in dealing with Indian affairs (p. 63) it first considered policy and stated "this policy should be the keystone of the organization and of the activities of the Federal Government in the field of Indian Affairs." If policy is the keystone in Indian Affairs it is many times more so in respect to education. Apparently the Commission could consider policy when it so desired.

2. The act of Congress which established the Commission specifically charged it with the following:

(1) Limiting expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services.

(2) Eliminating duplication and overlapping of services.

(3) Consolidating services of a similar nature.

(4) Abolishing services not necessary.

(5) Defining and limiting executive functions.

Our task force report makes specific recommendations in respect to each of these functions of the Commission, yet all have been ignored. For instance, the school-lunch program of the Department of Agriculture overlaps and duplicates similar activities of the Office of Education. Thus we recommended that this program—$92,000,000 in fiscal 1949—be consolidated in the Office of Education. In spite of the fact that the task force on agriculture made a similar strong recommendation, these two task force recommendations, in complete harmony, were entirely ignored. There is extensive overlapping and sometimes conflict between the Agriculture Extension Service and the program for vocational education in agriculture, particularly on the local level. This was treated both in the Agriculture and Education task force reports, and suggestions made for improvement, but these suggestions were ignored by the Commission. We felt it highly desirable to limit executive functions, in order to eliminate a partisan type of thought control which could easily permeate present programs of education, yet this has been ignored by the Commission. Many other illustrations could be given.

3. Our task force report took the position that educational activities on the Federal level should be evaluated in terms of the effect on States and local institutions where the basic responsibility for education rests. Both policy and organization should be developed in terms of similar criteria. At the one place where we most fear control or an authoritarian approach to education we have given it the fewest safeguards. We have made recommendations to overcome this and to strengthen educational responsibility and leadership in States and in local institutions, yet they have been ignored by the Commission. The Commission has taken the point of view that what looks neat and streamlined in an organization chart, where partisan influence can be exerted, is of more importance than keeping education democratic and close to the interests of the places where basic responsibility should rest.

Out in the open I have little fear of undue Federal control of education. But with hidden and totally uncoordinated and highly specialized educational activities tucked hither and yon over most of the Federal departments and agencies, with no central or over-all plan or policy, I greatly fear a more subtle type of control which we now have and which is constantly increasing. The Commission would have this continue. Neither it nor I want a large and powerful Federal educational agency. But it is essential that we have an agency which is sufficiently effective to bring some semblance of order out of this chaos; sufficiently out in the open and unsubordinated to partisan considerations to be an adequate influence in coordinating these activities and keeping the American public informed of educational trends on the Federal level.

4. Frankly, when I started my study for the Commission, I held the hypothesis that a Federal Department of Health, Welfare, and Education was appropriate. As my evidence accumulated, however, I reluctantly had to desert this position as unsound and damaging to the best interests of education. After reviewing arguments for and against the various proposals, I firmly came to the conclusion that an independent agency for education, with a National Board of Education, holds by far the greatest promise for overcoming the present and potential dangers and the current chaos in educational activities of the Federal Government. Under our proposals I believe we can develop much highly effective teamwork between Federal, State, and institutional agencies in education which can be of material benefit in increasing the potentialities of education in the national welfare.

If you have not already done so I hope you can at least take time to read chapter V (pages 361 to 378 of Appendix P) of our task-force report. Unfortunately, this report was rather hurriedly condensed from more voluminous materials, and I consider it quite unsatisfactory in many respects. However, McGraw-Hill is publishing my complete manuscript in February of this year under the title "The Federal Government and Education." I hope the latter may have a desired effect in acquainting the public with the important issues and possible solutions to the many problems involved.

Sincerely,

HOLLIS P. ALLEN,
Chairman, Committee on Teacher Education.

Development of the Columbia River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two letters and appendices, dated February 1, 1950, and written by Frank Pace, Jr., Director of the Budget, to the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior, respectively, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. These letters which discuss the Pacific Northwest will be of interest to every Member of Congress and to all citizens of the area in question.

There being no objection, the letters and appendixes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1950.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On July 15, 1949, you transmitted to the President your report on a plan for the development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin. This report has been considered along with the related report of the Secretary of the Interior, and in connection with the provisions of H. R. 5472, now pending in the Senate.

Because of the close relationships between the reports and the bill, particularly if H. R. 5472 is amended to include authorization of projects for the Bureau of Reclamation, it was felt that in the main, the President's views should be set forth in one letter. Accordingly, I have transmitted to the Secretary of the Interior a letter which, together with its appendices A, B, and C, and this letter, set forth the conditions attached to the President's approval of the two reports, and contain his views respecting amendment of H. R. 5472. A copy of the letter to the Secretary of the Interior is enclosed.

In summary, your report is approved for submission to the Congress, and the President recommends authorization by the Congress at an early date of the projects which are listed in appendix B, with the limitations indicated therein. This approved list omits certain navigation and flood control projects, listed in appendix A, and certain flood protection works for which sufficient data are not at present available to provide justification. These limitations and omissions are made without prejudice to their later reconsideration at such time as sufficient data are available to permit final determination concerning the need and economic justification for them.

You are requested to seek amendment of H. R. 5472, so far as the Department of the Army is concerned, to eliminate the Columbia Basin projects now included in it which are not listed in appendix B, and to include those projects listed in appendix B which are not at present in the bill.

The President has asked me to express his appreciation to you and to the Secretary of the Interior for the cooperative efforts made by the two Departments to present their respective plans in a complementary and coordinated framework.

A copy of this letter is being sent to the Secretary of the Interior for his information, and it will be appreciated if you will transmit a copy of it to the Congress along with your report.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Director.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
February 1, 1950.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter sets forth the conditions under which your report on plans for the development of the Columbia River Basin is approved by the President for submission to the Congress, and replies to your letters of January 6, 1950, concerning amendment of H. R. 5472, now pending in the Senate.

Columbia River Basin report: On June 30, 1949, you transmitted to the President a supplemental report on a plan for the development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin. This report, together with the related report of the Secretary of the Army, sets forth a plan of engineering works for the physical development of the basin's water resources, which, subject to certain qualifications noted below, is approved by the President for submission to the Congress.

The works projected by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers represent a construction program which will extend over a period of about 20 years. When completed, they will make the Columbia River system the greatest source of hydroelectric power in the world and will yield additional benefits in terms of flood control, navigation, reclamation, and other beneficial uses of water. The President recommends the authorization by the Congress at an early date of the projects herein approved, so that orderly plans for construction and budgeting may be laid out.

At the same time, as you pointed out in your letter of June 30, 1949, an engineering program for the construction of physical works falls far short of meeting the need for truly comprehensive and coordinated development of the water and other resources of the Pacific Northwest. First, the program, concerned with one river system, is planned for construction and operation by two departments of the Government. Further, the program is confined to river projects and does not extend to such equally important aspects of resource conservation and development as soil conservation and land management, reforestation and forest management, and mineral exploration and development. For these reasons the President strongly endorses your view that authorization of this program by the Congress will make it more important than ever to establish a better organizational framework and a more uniform statutory basis for the conservation and development of all natural resources in the Pacific Northwest, such as would be provided by the Columbia Valley Administration he has already recommended.

We are only at the beginning of a tremendous development program in the Pacific Northwest. If the Federal Government is to carry out its part in this program effectively, in proper coordination with State and local governments and private activities, there must be unified Federal responsibility for scheduling, designing, constructing, and operating multiple purpose water control projects, and for assuring wise planning and integration of the contemporaneous activities of all the Federal agencies concerned with the land, forest, and mineral resources of the region.

In the meantime, it is obvious that the coordination of their respective programs which has been effected by the Departments of the Interior and the Army is essential. The agreements which they have reached on certain policies concerning the interrelationship of their programs in the Pacific Northwest appear to represent a practicable plan under which the two Departments can work together within the shortcomings of the present Federal pattern of piecemeal legislation and divided administrative responsibility. The President expects that the two Departments will continue to operate in conformity with agreements of this general character. However, such agreements, by their very nature, should be considered only as operating agreements, to be changed and brought up to date from time to time. Their form and content should not be frozen by statutory enactment.

To meet one outstanding deficiency in present laws the two Departments have recommended the establishment of a so-called basin account to permit a more intelligent accounting for power revenues from the

various Federal plants in the Pacific Northwest and for the various costs which are to be returned from these projects. Such an accounting method is obviously necessary to permit efficient management of the Government's power operations in the Columbia Basin and a proper assignment of power revenues to return the costs of irrigation facilities which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay. Subject to specific detailed changes in the proposed legislative provisions authorizing its establishment referred to in subsequent paragraphs, the President approves the establishment of a Columbia Basin account and recommends its enactment by the Congress.

The following numbered paragraphs set forth certain detailed comments on your report and that of the Secretary of the Army which reflect the position of the President concerning them.

1. Authorization for construction of the power-generating facilities proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers would be in accord with the program of the President except for the power features of the Garrison Valley Dam and Power Plant of the Mountain Home project, which are not approved at this time because of their relationship to the irrigation features of the project.

2. Authorization for construction of flood control and navigation facilities by the Corps of Engineers would be in accord with the program of the President except for the specific items set forth in appendix A, which should be used as a basis for recommending such amendments as may be necessary in H. R. 5472.

3. Authorization of all irrigation projects would be in accord with the program of the President with the exception of the Mountain Home project. Objection to authorization of the irrigation features of Mountain Home project at this time is without prejudice to its reconsideration after the report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission has been received. That report will deal with a number of major policy issues involved, including the maximum length of time for repayment of irrigation costs, the levels of subsidy payables for irrigation projects, the source of such subsidies, and related considerations.

Two reservations are made with respect to irrigation projects. First, it is understood that in connection with the Crooked River project, investigation of an alternative dam site (Post Reservoir) is about to be completed and that the alternative site may be preferred by reason of being more economical. A final report and justification of the site decided upon is to be submitted for approval in the usual manner before any request for funds is made. Second, in the case of the Canby project, while it would appear that the works proposed are economically justified and can be paid for in full in a 40-year interest-free period, it is noted that the project is located in an area of 42 inches of annual rainfall. This fact raises questions of national policy as to irrigation of lands in humid areas and even in the Eastern States where there are occasional shortages of rainfall. Approval of the project at this time does not constitute a precedent for general endorsement of similar projects on a nation-wide basis.

4. A consolidated list of all projects approved by the President for authorization is attached as appendix B. This should be used as a basis for recommencing amendment of H. R. 5472.

5. Allocations of construction costs to pollution abatement, salinity control, recreation, and sediment control are not approved at this time. The benefits of recreation and sediment control as approved by the President in my letter to you dated January 27, 1950, concerning amendment of H. R. 1779, would be without objection.

6. Reallocations of cost are approved subject to the limitations set forth in the amendments to H. R. 1779 proposed in my letter of January 27, 1950.

7. Further discussion of the basin account and the use of the interest component on the power investment to the return of nonpower costs will be found in a subsequent paragraph dealing with specific amendments to H. R. 5472.

Amendment of H. R. 5472: There is no objection to the submission of your proposed report to the Vice President as attached to your letters to me dated January 6, 1950. The relationship to the President's program of specific amendments to the bill (as suggested in attachments to your proposed report) is discussed in subsequent paragraphs.

8. Section — (a) (as drafted for inclusion at the appropriate place in the bill), if enacted, would approve the reports of the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Chief of Engineers; would authorize construction of the projects, works, and improvements recommended in the reports as coordinated by the agreement of April 11, 1949; and would, in effect, provide statutory ratification of the responsibilities of the two agencies as set forth in the agreement.

As has already been pointed out, approval of the reports as submitted will not meet the requirements of the President. Authorization of projects is approved only to the extent indicated in appendices A and B. Statutory enactment of the interagency agreement is both unwise and unnecessary for reasons already indicated. Since the present bill already authorizes the projects of the Corps of Engineers, only textual changes are needed to bring its provisions in accord with the positions set forth in preceding paragraphs. New language, however, is needed to authorize the projects of the Bureau of Reclamation and to authorize appropriations for them. Proposed text for these purposes is attached in appendix C in the form of a new section for insertion in H. R. 5472. The President requests that you confer with the Senate committees in working out the details concerning the list of projects to be inserted in the section. He has authorized me to suggest that the aggregate total authorization for appropriations for projects for the Bureau of Reclamation be held at this time to $200,000,000, about half of the total required for the projects approved.

9. Section — (b) of your amendments would authorize the basin account. Since receipt of your letters of January 6, staff discussions have resulted in agreement as to the exact form of authorizing provisions to be recommended for enactment by the Congress. The text of these provisions will be found in appendix C in the form of a new section for insertion in H. R. 5472. I believe that the underlying concepts of the basin account, the revenues to be included in it, the charges to be made against it, and the other terms and conditions surrounding it are largely self-explanatory.

Four points are worthy of special mention. First, the basin account will provide a better method of accounting than is now the case, but it will in no way affect the flow of funds to and from the Treasury. Present law will continue to control the processes of making appropriations for constructing and operating projects, and of paying receipts into the Treasury. The basin account, in short, is for accounting but not for funding purposes. Second, projects will be included in the basin account only upon specific approval by the Congress. Third, the provisions concerning power rates require interest to be charged on the outstanding Federal investment in power facilities; that is, the amount of the investment less amounts for depreciation and amortization which have been repaid to the Treasury. Fourth, in setting rates for the sale of power, the Secretary may consider the application of interest on the power investment, from the various projects covered by the account, to the return of nonpower costs, only to the extent that he can do so under reclamation law—existing or as hereafter amended. As you know, this is one of the matters on which recommendations are expected from the President's Water Resources Policy Commission.

10. The provisions proposed in your amendments as subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) have been replaced in the proposed provisions in appendix C, or eliminated as unnecessary.

11. Elimination of section 208 of the bill (Alaska) would be in accord with the program of the President for the reasons set forth in your statement. The amendments which you suggest with respect to Grand Prairie-Bayou Meto, the study commission for the Arkansas-White and Red River Basins, and the study commission for the New England river basins would be in accord with the program of the President. It is believed, however, that provisions should be made to extend the jurisdiction of the New England Commission in such manner as to insure that it is authorized to consider the Passamaquoddy project and to take into account the interrelationships between development of power in New England and development of power in New York State and internationally along the St. Lawrence River.

A copy of this letter is being sent to the Secretary of the Army for his information and guidance, and I am enclosing a copy of my letter to him.

It will be appreciated if you will transmit a copy of this letter to the Congress along with your report.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Director.

APPENDIX A

COLUMBIA BASIN RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NAVIGATION AND FLOOD CONTROL HELD NOT IN ACCORD WITH THE PROGRAM OF THE PRESIDENT

Project: Snake River navigation channel and harbors on Snake River.

Comment: The benefits developed in the report are based entirely on a speculative demand for limestone for agricultural and industrial uses in the lower Columbia Basin. Use of the facilities is also contingent on completion of lower Snake and Columbia River dams, upon which construction may be under way for a decade or more. The navigation features may be determined feasible upon development of a firm demand for limestone products and upon completion of necessary downstream control units.

Project: Harbors on Columbia River.

Comment: Data sufficient to permit final determination of the size and location of necessary harbor facilities are not available. Local needs may be more accurately predicted when construction is advanced on The Dalles, John Day, and McNary Dams.

Project: Kootenai River at Bonners Ferry, Oreg.

Comment: Benefits to be realized through raising of levees at Bonners Ferry would be of an interim nature, since the protection would not be required after regulation of the stream by Libby Dam. There appears to be a lack of local interest in provision of additional levee protection at Bonners Ferry. Relative infrequency of flood stages sufficient to overtop existing levees appears to render an interim protection at this location inadvisable at this time. In case construction of Libby Dam is not undertaken within a reasonable period of years, this project might be resubmitted for consideration.

Project: Willow Creek at Heppner, Oreg.

Comments: The economic ratio of the project based on valuable benefits is less than unity because of the infrequency of excessive flows. The project would contribute little, if any, toward elimination of flood damages along the main stem of the Columbia. A more modest proposal for protection at this locality may prove economically justified.

Projects: Cascadia Dam, Lewisville Dam, Gate Creek Dam, Wiley Creek Dam, modification of Fern Ridge Dam.

Comments: These projects or project modifications, in Willamette subbasin, having economic ratios of unit or less are held not in accord with the program of the President at this time.

Project: Supplemental levees, Willamette subbasin.

Comments: The report indicates that to prevent damage through overtopping, construction of the levees must be held in abeyance pending completion of all upstream storage units. Since the present economic ratio of the recommended work is considerably less than unity, this item is considered not in accord at this time. It is possible that the agency may wish to resubmit the proposal for authorization if and when a decline in construction costs may result in a more favorable economic ratio.

Project: Overflow channel closures, Willamette subbasin.

Comments: The report contains insufficient data to permit determination of location or design of necessary closures. It would appear that the effects of several reservoir evacuations would have to be observed to ascertain need for these structures. This fact, combined with the present economic ratio, indicates the advisability of delaying authorization of the feature.

Project: Engineering research and experimental laboratory.

Comments: The value of working models in solution of design problems is recognized, and their use in connection with advance planning on units of the proposed Columbia Basin project should be encouraged. A $15,000,000 laboratory to accomplish the experimental program, does not, however, appear necessary as an adjunct to the Columbia Basin plan. Construction of elements of the project will be prosecuted over several decades. The magnitude of the program will not in itself justify the laboratory since planning and design should conform generally with the anticipated construction program. The existing laboratories of the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation available for this work can be expanded without additional authorization if necessary.

APPENDIX B

COLUMBIA BASIN RECOMMENDATIONS CLEARED FOR AUTHORIZATION WITHOUT OBJECTION

Corps of Engineers

Main control plan: Libby Dam, Albeni Falls Dam, Priest Rapids Dam, John Day Dam, The Dalles Dam. Lower Columbia River levees and bank protection works: The necessity for levees and bank protection on the lower Columbia River will diminish progressively with completion of upstream reservoirs. The recommendation for authorization is cleared without objection, subject, however, to the condition that requests for construction funds for this purpose should be subject to annual review to insure conformity with local requirements.

Willamette subbasin plan: Hills Creek Dam, Fall Creek Dam, Holley Dam, Tumtum Dam, Cougar Dam, Blue River Dam, Green Peter Dam, Waldo Lake storage development, White Bridge Dam, Meridian Dam power features, Dexter Dam. Although these projects or project modifications have economic ratios of unity or less the need for meeting anticipated power requirements in the shortage area together with the greater cost involved in building transmission facilities to meet the shortage from alternate sources justifies clearance without objection.

Willamette Falls fish ladder, channel improvements for flood control and major drainage, bank protection works, channel clearing and snagging.

Subbasin plans:

Jackson Hole levees, Snake River, Wyo.

Umatilla River at Pendleton, Oreg.

Local flood-protection projects, Columbia Basin: The report indicates that data sufficient to determine final design and justification of all proposed local flood-protection works are not available. Pending completion of current investigations which may indicate possibility of some additional items, the following features are cleared for authorization, subject to a limitation of $15,000,000:

Clark Fork: Missoula, Mont.; St. Regis River, Mont.; Lightning Creek, Idaho.

Yakima River at Ellensburg, Wash.

Okanogan River, Wash.

Methow River, Wash.

Entiat River, Wash.

Wenatchee River, Wash.

Crab and Wilson Creek, Wash.

Upper Snake River: Heise-Roberts area, Idaho; Shalley area, Idaho; Blackfoot area, Idaho; Teton River, Idaho; Blackfoot River, Idaho; Portneuf River and Marsh Creek, Idaho; Mud Lake area, Idaho; Little Wood River, Idaho; Camas Creek area, Idaho.

Central Snake River: Malheur River, Oreg.; Boise Valley, Idaho; Payette Valley, Idaho; Weiser River, Idaho.

Middle and Lower Snake Rivers: Whitebird, Idaho; south fork of Clearwater River, Idaho; Kendrick, Idaho; Palouse River, Oreg.; Grande Ronde River, Oreg.

Minor tributaries below the Yakima River: Lower Walla Walla River, Wash.; Mill Creek, Wash.; Touchet River, Oreg.; Umatilla River, Oreg.; John Day River, Oreg.; Prineville, Oreg.; Randle, Wash.; Lower Cowlitz River, Wash.; Umatilla Harbor, Oreg.; Columbia slough channel; Baker Bay channel, Washington; Westport slough channel, Oregon.

Other: Hydrometeorological reporting network for Columbia Basin and hydrologic reporting network for Willamette subbasin. Any requests for funds for these purposes should contain information relative to the plan of operation and should indicate the manner and extent of anticipated participation by cooperating Federal agencies and affected States.

Bureau of Reclamation

Mountain Home project, Idaho, following features only: Upper Scriver Creek power plant, Lower Scriver Creek power plant, Smiths Ferry Dam, Smiths Ferry-Scriver Creek tunnel, Scriver Creek Dam and Reservoir.

Cambridge Bench project, Idaho: Council project, Idaho; Hells Canyon project, Idaho. This item is cleared without objection, subject to elimination of transmission facilities ($120,000,000). These facilities, if and when required, would come more approximately under another Federal agency.

Bitterroot Valley project (including Woodside unit), Montana.

Canby project, Oregon.

Crooked River project, Oregon. Cleared subject to understanding that final report and justification of site decided upon will be submitted for approval before any request for funds is made.

Vale project, Oregon, Bully Creek extension.

The Dalles project, Oregon, west unit.

Grand Coulee Dam, Wash., modifications for flood control.

Upper Star Valley project, Wyoming, and the following projects, previous authorized under the Water Conservation and Utilization Act: Mann Creek project, Idaho; Missoula Valley project, Montana, north side unit.

APPENDIX C

DRAFT OF SECTION AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 5472

(For insertion at appropriate place in bill)

SEC. — (a). The following projects are authorized to be constructed, substantially in accordance with the report of the Commissioner of Reclamation dated May 2, 1949, by the Department of the Interior under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, who in prosecuting his activities under this section, and in operating and maintaining such projects, shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto):

(List to be inserted here)

(b) The sum of $300,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the partial accomplishment of the projects authorized in this section.

SEC. — (a) In order to provide a method of accounting which reflects the interrelationship of certain projects in the Pacific Northwest, the Secretary of the Interior shall establish a Columbia basin account. The account shall be credited with all power and miscellaneous revenues, including revenues on account of benefits to downstream power plants which result from upstream Federal improvements, derived from or incidental to the operation of Federal power plants now existing, or authorized heretofore or in this act, within the Pacific Northwest, including all transmission lines and other facilities incident to the marketing of power from such plants. The account shall be charged with all operation and maintenance costs of such power plants, transmission lines, and other facilities, with all construction costs of such plants, lines, and facilities that are allocated to power purposes, and with interest as provided in subsection (c). The account shall also be charged with all reimbursable costs properly allocable to purposes other than power, but which are assigned for return from power revenues, in connection with all projects now existing, or authorized heretofore or in this act, within the Pacific Northwest, whether or not such projects include power features: *Provided*, That assignment of such costs of existing or heretofore authorized projects in excess of amounts which are so assignable under the Federal Reclamation Laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) shall be made only upon specific authorization by act of Congress. Revenues and costs in connection with projects hereafter authorized to be constructed in the Pacific Northwest shall be included in the Columbia Basin account only upon specific authorization by act of Congress. For the purposes of this section, the Pacific Northwest shall be defined as the area, within the United States, comprising the Columbia River Basin, the basins of other streams entering the Pacific Ocean between the Canadian boundary and the California-Oregon boundary, and the closed drainage areas of Oregon.

(b) As of the close of each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1951, the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress on the status of the Columbia Basin account, and on the revenues from and cost of constructing and operating Federal facilities in the Pacific Northwest for the supply of water for irrigation, municipal water supply, or other reimbursable purposes. The Secretary's report shall be prepared in such a manner as accurately to reflect the Federal investment in power plants and facilities, and in water-supply facilities, and the progress of return and repayment thereon.

(c) The revenues and costs credited and charged to the Columbia Basin account, together with estimated future costs and revenues, shall be taken into account in fixing

rates for the sale of power and energy from Federal plants and facilities in the Pacific Northwest. Such rates shall be fixed from time to time by the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the Federal Power Commission, at levels which in the aggregate will be at least sufficient to cover (1) the operation, maintenance, and all other costs of generating, transmitting, and disposing of such power and energy, including among such costs depreciation on the depreciable properties included in the construction costs allocated to such generation, transmission, and disposition, plus amortization, over a reasonable period of years, of the nondepreciable properties included in the construction costs so allocated, and including interest on the balance of such construction costs remaining after the deduction of depreciation and amortization, at rates not less than those specified in existing applicable laws or, where no rates are so specified, at such rates as may be determined from time to time by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate, having regard to the probable term of the power investment and the rates payable on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States; and (2) any additional amounts which may be required to return the reimbursable costs properly allocable to purposes other than power, but assigned for return from power revenues. In setting rates for the sale of power and energy, the Secretary of the Interior may take into consideration, for all properties served by the Columbia Basin account, the application of interest on the power investment to the return of costs properly allocable to purposes other than power, but assigned for return from power revenues, to the same extent that application of interest on power investment to the return of such costs may be taken into consideration under the Federal reclamation laws.

(d) Allocations of construction costs for projects authorized in this act to be constructed in the Pacific Northwest, and for other projects included in the Columbia Basin account as to which allocations have not heretofore been made, shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior in the case of the projects constructed or to be constructed by the Department of the Interior, after consultation with the Secretary of the Army as to allocations to flood control and navigation and with the Federal Power Commission as to allocations to power. Such allocations shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Army in the case of projects constructed or to be constructed by the Department of the Army, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior in the case of allocations to irrigation and the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and with the Federal Power Commission and the Secretary of the Interior with respect to allocations to power.

(e) The Secretary of the Interior shall contract for appropriate repayment to the United States, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws, for all irrigation services provided by or obtained from all projects in the Pacific Northwest constructed pursuant to the laws affecting the prosecution of works for the improvement of navigation and the control of floods.

(f) Except as specifically provided in this section, nothing herein shall be construed as repealing, modifying or affecting in any way the Federal reclamation laws, the laws affecting the prosecution of works for the improvement of navigation and the control of floods, the act of August 30, 1937 (50 Stat. 731), as amended, the act of June 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 270), the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), or the act of March 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 22). Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to projects of the Bureau of Indian Affairs or to supersede existing provisions of law relating to the protection and conservation of fish and wildlife.

Germany's Relations With Eastern and Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Made in Germany" appearing in the No. 32 issue of the magazine Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MADE IN GERMANY

"UNTIL THESE PLANS ARE CHECKED, THEY WILL PRESENT A CONSTANT MENACE TO POSTWAR PEACE AND SECURITY"

"We long for a sword, but no God can give us one now." This was the fateful verdict of the Versailles Treaty, according to Gustav Stresemann, Germany's Foreign Minister from 1923 to 1929. God had failed the Germans. The time had passed when the Germans could count on some supernatural force to restore their power and glory.

Stresemann's judgment pointed the way out. The Germans must dispense with the guidance and help of God and take matters in their own hands. God had not only failed them, but was apparently on the side of their "mortal enemies." To discard illusions of a democratic peace, to exploit to the fullest the weaknesses of her adversaries, to disarm them morally and materially, to break up their solidarity, and to pit them against each other—this would be the German way.

In a brilliant analysis of Germany's relations with eastern and western Europe, Prof. Gordon A. Craig, of Princeton University, quoted Herr Stresemann's exposition of the strategy that German foreign policy must pursue:

"The question of a choice between east and west does not follow from our entrance into the League of Nations. One can make such a choice only if he has military power at his disposal. In our case, unfortunately, that is lacking. We can neither become a continual dagger for England, as some desire, nor can we trust ourselves to a German-Russian alliance. I warn against the utopia of flirting with Russia. Once the Russians are in Berlin, the red flag will fly from the castle; and in Russia they will be satisfied with having bolshevised Europe to the Elbe and will allow the rest of Germany to be gobbled up by the French. On the other hand, we are perfectly ready to deal with the Russians on another basis in order to prevent selling ourselves to the west. * * * The most important task of Germany foreign policy is the liberation of German soil from any occupying force. We must get the strangehold off our neck. On that account German policy will be one of finassieren (of finesse), and of avoiding the great decisions."

Out of this policy of finesse and the avoidance of the great decisions Germany was able to forge a new and more potent sword.

During the Weimar Republic, when the world—shortsighted then as it is today—hailed the advent of democracy in Germany, the Germans began their steady march along the new path outlined by Stresemann. The Germans bargained with the Russians and when the western powers became alarmed, they turned around and made deals with them. They posed as friends of the Bolsheviks against the plutocratic west and then promised to defend western civilization against the communist menace.

By keeping Europe in a turmoil and blinding her conquerors, Germany was able to mask her true designs. Thus the Germans succeeded in preventing the consolidation of the peace after Versailles. But this was only the beginning. The next step was to smash the solidarity of the western allies. They were out to disarm the victorious entente and succeeded by offering assurances of security to the victors.

In 1925, Stresemann said: "Our policy of offering the entente powers a security pact was undoubtedly correct * * * It broke up the entente."

Having split their opponents, the "democratic" Germans had reached a point where they could extract a maximum advantage for themselves and destroy all other security provisions of the Versailles Treaty. The sensational victories of the Stresemann plan paved the way for Hitler's Third Reich.

Hitler was a leading apostle of the Stresemann strategy. He never forgot the childish statement of Britain's Foreign Minister Austin Chamberlain to Stresemann, "Whenever we make a concession to you, instead of acknowledging it, you ask for more." Hitler had to deal with the half-brother of this British statesman, Sir Neville Chamberlain, who bent the knee each time the Fuehrer raised his voice.

The peoples of the west were told that a strong Reich would guarantee peace and stability in Europe and ward off the Communist threat. This was Hitler talking through the mouths of the western politicians. The peoples of the west were told that the Germans needed room and space; that German economic power was the sine qua non for a prosperous Europe. This, too, was Hitler talking through the voice of western statesmen and business leaders.

But as soon as these words were spoken and as soon as concessions were made, Hitler bellowed for more. And when the time came for the pay-off, Hitler turned around and made his pact with the Russians, while the western powers were trapped and blitzkrieged into submission.

This was to have been the grand climax of the Stresemann plan. But the horrors and devastations inflicted by the Germans, both east and west, unmasked for a moment the real intentions of the Germans. The lesson was clear. Only by joint military efforts could the Germans be defeated. The victims of the Stresemann plan were further taught that the future peace could only be preserved and maintained by thwarting the schemes of the Germans to evade their responsibilities for the war which they brought upon a trusting but deceived mankind. These lessons were embodied in numerous agreements made by the victorious Allied Powers. They solemnly pledged to one another that they would eliminate Germany's capacity to wage war, break up the German cartel network, rid the world of the war criminals, and force the Germans to compensate, at least in part, for their looting and spoliation.

To the common man who honestly believed that a new day was dawning, it was inconceivable that the ghost of Stresemann would so soon emerge from the ruins of World War II. Yet, as early as April 1946 the State Department made the following announcement which we, for reasons of space, can only quote in part:

"The Department of State announced today that reliable information collected by allied governments clearly indicates that the Nazi regime in Germany has developed well-

arranged postwar plans for the perpetuation of Nazi doctrines and domination. Some of these plans have already been put into operation and others are ready to be launched on a widespread scale immediately upon termination of hostilities in Europe.

"Nazi Party members, German industrialists, and the German military, realizing that victory can no longer be attained, are now developing postwar commercial projects, are endeavoring to renew and cement friendships in foreign commercial circles and are planning for renewals of prewar cartel agreements.

"An appeal to the courts of various countries will be made early in the postwar period through dummies for unlawful seizure of industrial plants and other properties taken over by Allied governments at the outbreak of war. In cases where this method fails, German repurchase will be attempted through cloaks who meet the necessary citizenship requirements.

"German technicians, cultural experts and undercover agents have well-laid plans to infiltrate foreign countries with the object of developing economic, cultural and political ties."

In connection with this announcement, Julius C. Holmes, who was then Assistant Secretary of State, revealed:

"In August of 1943, von Papen, the German Ambassador in Turkey—and he's the self-same von Papen who violated all the rules when we were neutral before we entered the first World War and whom we deported in 1915—von Papen told a close friend of his in 1943 that Germany could no longer hope to win the war, and that every possible move should be made to save German industry and military power for the future."

In disclosing these documents, the State Department admitted "Until these plans are checked, they will present a constant menace to postwar peace and security."

Look around—look at the state of the world today. Is it not clear that the ghost of Stresemann still stalks the earth? Is it not clear that our State Department and, for that matter, the foreign offices of Soviet Russia and England, have failed miserably in checking these plans?

Where is that much heralded Allied policy which announced to the world that Germany was through as a spawning ground of aggression? In truth, the policies which are now followed by Washington, Moscow, and London correspond to the German plans. They fit in so neatly with German strategy that one might be justified in saying that they were actually made in Germany.

The Germans knew that the only way they could obtain advantage and new power was by pursuing a conscious and well-thought-out program that would undermine the unity of their military opponents. Only in a climate of political and economic unrest, in an atmosphere of war fever, could the Germans begin to operate as they did after World War I.

The developments of the past 4 years since the defeat of the Germans militarily, show that this strategy is working and making alarming headway. They have been able to capitalize on and, yes, encourage the differences between Russia and the United States. They have graciously allotted part of their energy to making deals with the Russians but simultaneously they flatter and cultivate western sympathies. They encourage every move on the part of the Russians that could challenge the security of the west, but at the same time they egg on the western powers with assurances that only the Germans can be relied upon as a bulwark against Soviet Russia.

To these attractive guarantees the Germans have attached their price. They called for the destruction of denazification, and both Russia and the west raced for the honors to comply. They demanded a halt to the reparations program and again their opponents trampled over each other in order to meet the German diktat.

As matters stand, there seems to be no end to this disgraceful retreat from victory on the part of the west and east. The mad bid for the bloody hand of the former enemy continues. Illusion has become the soil out of which foreign policies grow. Thus the New York Times rushes in with a new plea to the Germans: "It should be clear to all informed Germans that the west is offering them a free and decent future." The informed Germans know exactly what they are gaining from the west, as they know what they are extracting from the Russians who have taken over the German slogans of unity. Both sides are dancing to the Pied Piper. Both sides are being drawn into the web which has been woven so artfully by the German spider. And as they become more enmeshed in this web, they prate about their success with the Germans.

We have no intention of oversimplifying the basic causes of enmity between Russia and the western powers today. But it is certainly no oversimplification to state that German hopes for the future are based on the continuation of this breach even if it means a new and more terrible war. If any such eventuality should arise, the Germans will be in the position where they can choose and make decisions and play their usual role of blackmail, deceit, and treachery.

The break-down of the Allied occupation with its dangers to world security no longer seems to be of account to those who make policy. These Allied officials have either been hypnotized or have become the willing mouthpieces of the renewed Stresemann plan. Each of the occupying powers visualize a rearmed Germany fighting by its side against the others. For only this can explain the deliberate sabotage of their agreed aims to eliminate Germany's capacity to wage war. This sabotage, however, is a double-edged sword and the Germans are carefully sharpening both ends. The Germans are experienced hands at creating tensions and turmoil. They know how to fan the flames of war which broaden the scope of their own operations.

The Herrenvolk carefully cultivate the illusion that a strong and powerful Germany will ever be grateful to the west. But the Germans show only one part of their face—for the other part looks toward the east. Thus, the rebuilding of German war power can really become a one-way ticket to disaster.

It is an illusion to say that the alternative is—whether the west or the east will dominate Germany. The Stresemann plan does not contemplate such a finale, nor do the schemes of the present German political leaders of all parties. On the contrary, the real question is how west and east can prevent their own subjugation to German designs. This is not fantastic as the State Department documentation demonstrates. It is the aim of the Germans today, whether they live in the eastern zone or the western zone. It is expressed privately and even publicly by their politicians, their military and their industrial war lords.

It is for this reason that of all the nations in Europe, it is precisely Germany which finds the danger of war to be her own salvation. Through blackmail to victory—that is the latest edition of the Stresemann plan.

This is the reality of today which is ignored by the occupying powers who thereby fail to discharge their great responsibility to mankind.

When will the statesmen wake up?

When will they throw off the hypnotic spell of German slogans?

When will they discard the influence of the German cartel partners and other special interests?

When will they get down to the serious task of unmasking the war plots of the former enemy and hammer out a peace of the victors?

If they will fail to act in time, war will also be "Made in Germany."

Catholic Schools Become a British Election Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 1, 1950:

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS BECOME A BRITISH ELECTION ISSUE

State support for sectarian schools is certain to become an issue in the British election. The Catholic Church is leading the fight to force candidates of all parties to state their views. The question now is not whether church schools shall receive state aid; they do receive it in fairly large amounts. What the church is attempting to force, and to enlist the aid of all denominational schools in forcing, is a pledge that the government will actually take over parochial schools, leaving the church the right to decide who will be employed as teachers, and, presumably, to conduct some sort of religious observance on school premises.

This goes, of course, far beyond anything American Catholics have asked of government. But in its beginning the British Catholic problem was not very different from the one now confronting Americans. The seeds of today's trouble in England lie in the methods proposed by the Education Act of 1924 to remedy the often marked disparity between parochial and State schools. The British law proposed to grant denominational schools sums of money designed to bring their buildings, curricular and general facilities up to a par with the State's schools. But the parishes and foundations themselves had to promise to meet minimum standards in order to become eligible for this aid.

The bill was eagerly welcomed when it was first passed by schools of all denominations. Since then, the gap between existing church schools, many of them old and entirely inadequate for modern educational methods, and the Government's minimum standards has become increasingly obvious. Scores of parochial schools, unable to meet the minimum, find themselves ineligible for aid and see their pupils attracted by the undeniably better facilities of State schools.

Efforts to force the Government to provide still larger sums for modernization of church schools have not succeeded. The Government cannot very well divert funds from its own huge schools program which is already far behind expectation. And neither major party is likely to welcome the proposal that scores of small, inadequate school buildings, many of them in locations already well served by State schools, be taken over as is, improved at tremendous cost, but left free to maintain their status as a unit of parish life, subject to clerical control.

The Catholic drive is not aimed wholly at the Labor Government. The Education Act was a creation of Winston Churchill's wartime coalition. It is an excellent law and

has had full support from the Socialist Party, but neither party is likely now to commit itself to a billion expenditure which would make church schools everywhere a part of the state system in everything but control of educational policy. There may and probably will be some concession to present pleas, but it will by no means satisfy Catholic demands, or solve all future problems for the worried sponsors of church schools.

Republican Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled, "A True Orthodoxy," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 2, together with the preamble, the section entitled "Foreign Affairs," and the section entitled "Human Rights," from a policy statement framed by the New York Young Republican Club—Blueprint for a Better America, to which the editorial refers.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(From the New York Herald Tribune of February 2, 1950)

A TRUE ORTHODOXY

The widespread and growing realization that the Republican Party must reshape its program in the light of current problems has led many groups and individuals to try their hand at a blueprint. Few have gone about the task with more care and imaginative good sense than the Young Republican Club of New York. The Republican policy statement framed by this group is printed, unfortunately in a much abbreviated form, on another part of this page. It deserves a sympathetic reading in high quarters.

The Young Republicans are orthodox in the basic and original sense of that much-abused word. They do not follow blindly any particular leader, but they adhere to the underlying principles and ideals of their party. Thus on civil rights they are at the same time traditionalists and infinitely more progressive than the Democratic Party as a whole can afford to be. On social issues like old-age insurance, education, and health they show in new forms the concern for human values, and the adaptability to new needs, which their party has revealed in its best days. Yet they hold fast to an insistence that the individual must be kept free of centralized authority, oppressive debt, and paralyzing controls. They are convinced that the individual can be kept free and at the same time provided with safeguards against insecurity.

Not everyone will agree with all the details in this document; little newspaper could criticize it at several points. But we believe that the spirit in which it is drawn is the right spirit, and that it bodes well for the Republican Party.

PREAMBLE

The goal: At home—an opportunity society that offers each individual a maximum chance for achievement, well-being and security.

Abroad—a world at peace working out the common problems of mankind through effective international organization in a spirit of mutual trust and cooperation and with an increasing regard for the dignity of every man.

The promise: At home—increasing economic prosperity with a renewed faith in moral values. New energy sources, new products and new production techniques can greatly improve the material well-being of each citizen in our time. But the pursuit of material wealth must be accompanied by a renewal of spiritual and moral values on the part of the individual, the family and the Nation.

Abroad—a community of free nations living at peace. The free exchange of goods and ideas among nations affords the best hope for maintaining the peace and raising the standard of living in all countries.

The threat: At home—gradual surrender of individual freedom. In our country, the danger to our democratic way of life lies chiefly in our adopting schemes for attaining economic security which compel or result in the surrender of individual freedom.

Abroad—breakdown in international relations. Failure of the United States to develop a sound affirmative foreign policy to meet the threat of Soviet imperialism and the revival of fascism, and to assume its responsibilities of world leadership, may lead to a breakdown in international relations resulting in economic or military warfare between nations.

Our position: The present administration is neither realizing the promise nor warding off the threat. Instead, it is creating a hand-out state which slowly destroys individual initiative and enterprise, limits the right of the individual to make personal decisions, and compels a surrender of individual decision and action to a bureaucratic central government.

Our own position can be summed up in two main principles: "Individual freedom with security" at home and "International responsibility" abroad.

INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM WITH SECURITY

Individual freedom has always been the cornerstone of our Constitution, of liberal thought, and of Republican Party action. It includes civil liberties such as freedom of speech and freedom of religion. It means freedom to choose a home, a job, and a way of life. But it also means freedom for the individual to exercise his initiative, ability, and judgment, to develop his own personality, and to realize his dreams and aspirations. These aspects of individual freedom are being threatened by bigness and bureaucracy in Government.

Individual security is also one of our common aims. The complexity of our modern society requires that the individual be assisted when his economic security is imperiled by physical or economic disaster, such as unemployment, sickness, disability, old age, or death, over which he has no control and against which he is unable adequately to protect himself. The need is for an intelligent balance between the extremes of selfish individualism, on the one hand, and the irresponsible hand-out state, on the other. The socialist governments in Australia and New Zealand were ousted neither by a reactionary nor a radical movement but by parties which combined a belief in economic security with a recognition of the roles of individual initiative and efficient government.

The ultimate purpose of our society is to preserve the freedom of action of the individual. We should be especially watchful, therefore, that we do not confer upon our governmental institutions powers beyond those required to attain our common goals, for the ultimate and fatal curse of big government is the regimentation of the individual.

INTERNATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

As a nation, we must never forget that this is one world. We must live up to our responsibility of active leadership in the world community. While we do not seek to impose our form of government on other countries, we must contribute to world-wide economic health and political security so that all peoples will have the opportunity to establish and maintain free governments of their own choosing.

Further, we recognize that the United States, as the leader of the democratic forces in the world, must do more than adopt a merely negative policy of containing totalitarian aggression. Our foreign policies must be directed toward rekindling the love for freedom in the hearts of all men throughout the world, and toward enlisting their enthusiastic support for the establishment of free governments everywhere. We believe that such a policy must be founded upon the active practice of democratic principles here at home. Only by practicing these principles can we demonstrate to the world that men who are free can best provide for their common material security, and that a free society is the only means for achieving moral advancement and spiritual freedom.

We approach the second half of the twentieth century with an abiding faith in the ability of our democratic system to meet and conquer each new problem as it arises. We are confident that our common goals and ideals can be achieved so long as we keep open the channels of free expression. In this spirit of optimism, we present, from the young Republican point of view, a blueprint for a better America.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

WORLD ORGANIZATION

Problem: If world war III becomes a reality, it could well mean the paralysis of freedom, if not the end of civilization. With the monstrous weapons of mass destruction man has developed—atomic and hydrogen bombs, rockets and biological warfare—wars can no longer be won by any nation. The present armament race consumes billions of dollars which might otherwise be devoted to education, medical facilities, housing and other basic human needs. Moreover, the cost of past wars and the burden of preparedness for future wars threatens to tax and regulate individual freedom and private enterprise out of existence.

Proposal: A fundamental objective of our foreign policy should be to support and strengthen the United Nations through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law. The United States should take the initiative in calling a convention, in accordance with the provisions of the UN Charter, for the purpose of making the UN the means to achieve this end. The abolition of the veto is a major element in such a program.

RUSSIA

Problem: The central problem in the field of foreign affairs is the relationship between Soviet and non-Soviet nations.

The foreign policy of Soviet Russia is primarily a reflection of its internal political structure. With the ruling Communist Party a minority in Russia itself, a dictatorship has been established in which all opposition and dissent have been effectively eliminated. The party leaders exploit the Marxist-Leninist concept that capitalism abroad is a menace to Russia, and use capitalist encirclement as justification for continuing to deprive the Russian people both of their freedom and of the material benefits which have been promised them.

Externally, claiming that it requires friendly nations on its borders, Russia has either annexed outright or, through fifth-column activity and the pressure of her armed forces, converted into puppet states the now-familiar list of formerly independent countries. China is the latest and most significant acquisition.

In 1947 a policy of "containment" of world Communist aggression was enunciated by the administration. While that policy has been adhered to in Europe, it has never been effectively applied in the Far East. A policy of containment can be effective only if we are steadfast in our determination that the area of freedom shall not be further reduced. Moreover, containment by means of United States efforts alone is not enough. If civilization is to be saved, a coordinated plan for the defense of all free nations must be devised.

Proposals: 1. The Atlantic Pact, in which the United States and 11 European countries are associated, should be supplemented by a "Pacific Pact," which all non-Communist Pacific nations may join for the purpose of mutual protection in case of aggression.

2. Economic aid, within the limits of our resources, must be extended to nations which demonstrate their willingness to resist Soviet aggression and to maintain basic freedoms, as well as their need for such aid.

3. The freedom of movement of Soviet diplomats and their large staffs in the United States represents a startling contrast to the prisoner-like status of the few American representatives in Russia and her satellites. Reciprocity should be required. Conditions under which Russian and American envoys carry out their missions should be equalized.

4. The forum provided by the United Nations should be used to full advantage by American spokesmen to reveal the differences between Soviet theory and practice. No charge should remain unanswered, no lie should pass unexposed. Only mobilized world opinion can convince the Soviet Union that its aggressive and subversive designs will not be permitted to succeed.

WESTERN EUROPE

Problem: The tremendous sums devoted to postwar European relief and recovery by American taxpayers indicate continuing interest in the protection of this area against Soviet expansion, and in a healthy European economy. But such a financial burden cannot be borne indefinitely. The best hope for a self-sustaining Europe lies in the elimination of trade and monetary barriers, the continuation of the reciprocal trade policy, and the development of new non-European markets.

A related European question is the political and economic—but not the military—rehabilitation of Germany, so that Germany can contribute to the stability and prosperity of western Europe.

Proposals: 1. Continuation of our commitments under the European recovery program, with a view to termination by 1952.

2. Encouragement of a western European union.

3. Admission of western Germany into the European community and gradually greater delegation of responsibility to the west German government, but with continued Allied control over German foreign relations and military affairs.

4. The German economy should be dovetailed as far as possible into that of western Europe, to promote interdependence.

5. Maintenance of Allied military occupation of Germany as long as the East-West division continues.

THE FAR EAST

Problem: The recent loss of China to the Communists requires reexamination of our entire far-eastern policy.

In Europe our program of helping war-devastated countries to help themselves, and of aiding legally constituted governments in their resistance to Soviet-directed revolts has met with partial success. Not so in Asia.

Indecision on our part, the withholding of aid at a critical period, and secret concessions to Soviet imperialism made by the administration at Yalta have all contributed to the Communist victories.

What happened to China must not happen to other nations of the Far East.

Proposals: 1. Recognition should be withheld from the Chinese Communist Government as long as that Government remains an instrument of Soviet policy.

2. The Japanese economy should be utilized in raising the standard of living of non-Communist Asia.

3. Technical and economic assistance to aid agricultural and industrial development in non-Communist Asia should be offered. Where local conditions are favorable, American private investment should be encouraged. Above all, we must demonstrate to the newly independent Asiatic nations that in offering help and advice we respect their right to control the development of their own resources.

4. A "Pacific Pact" (see discussion on Russia) should be concluded as part of a coordinated plan for the mutual protection of all free nations.

BIPARTISANSHIP

Problem: A bipartisan foreign policy can help the United States to fulfill its responsibilities for world leadership. However, it is essential that the principle of bipartisanship be thoroughly understood. Bipartisanship should not be used as a means of cutting off free and open debate. The basic concept of bipartisanship is that foreign policy will be formulated by joint consultation and that neither party will seek partisan advantage therefrom. This principle has not been accepted by the administration in good faith.

Proposal: The initiative in establishing true bipartisanship lies with the President and the Secretary of State—not with the Republicans in Congress. The disastrous failure of American foreign policy in those areas where Republican advice was not sought requires that the administration demonstrate its intention either to seek full bipartisan assistance and to consult in advance with Republican leaders, or to abandon the pretense of favoring a bipartisan policy.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Problem: Discrimination because of race, color, or religion condemns a large segment of our population to limited opportunity for useful employment, to substandard housing, to inadequate educational institutions, to denial of full voting rights, and at times to outbursts of violence. Moreover, when the entire world looks to the United States for encouragement and leadership in the constant battle of ideas between the forces of freedom and slavery, it is more important than ever that we practice the principles that we preach.

The Republican Party was formed and first brought to power on its opposition to the spread of Negro slavery. The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments and eight of the nine civil-rights statutes enacted by Congress were passed during Republican administrations. In contrast to the inherent division within the Democratic Party, the Republican Party has no large and solid bloc of votes which consistently opposes any civil-rights legislation. The Republican Party can meet one of the great challenges of our times by acting in adherence to its own traditional principles and the principles of the Constitution.

Proposals: We believe that voluntary recognition and acceptance of the principle of equal opportunity for all men regardless of race, color, or creed offers the most desirable and permanent solution to the human-rights question. The efforts of social and religious groups directed to this end are therefore to be commended and encouraged. However, in view of the plight of our minority groups and our responsibility for world leadership in preserving the rights of man, we recognize that more immediate action to eliminate the evils of discrimination is required. We therefore propose the following:

1. A Federal fair employment practice act should be enacted which will declare that the opportunity for employment without discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is a civil right of all the people of the United States. A Federal commission should be set up to carry out the policies and provisions of this act, and this commission should be given power to use effective sanctions against any offenders.

2. The Taft-Hartley Act should be amended to prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from certifying as bargaining representative any labor organization which denies full membership rights and privileges to, or which segregates or otherwise discriminates against, any employee because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

3. Segregation or any other form of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry in any of the armed forces of the United States should be prohibited.

4. Legislation should be enacted to prohibit segregation and other forms of discrimination in public places and on public conveyances in the District of Columbia.

5. The Interstate Commerce Act should be amended to prohibit segregation of passengers on interstate carriers because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

6. Legislation should be enacted to prohibit the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in any Federal election.

7. A Federal antilynching law should be enacted to provide for criminal penalties and also to authorize civil suits in the Federal courts by lynch victims against individual offenders.

8. The displaced-persons law should be amended to eliminate occupational, religious, and nationality discriminations.

9. Legislation should be enacted to prohibit discrimination on account of race, creed, or color in the expenditure of Federal funds for housing, health, or education.

10. A permanent congressional committee on civil rights should be established to study and recommend further ways of promoting individual civil rights in the United States.

11. The Senate cloture rule should be amended so that two-thirds of the Senators voting can invoke cloture on any measure or motion to take up a measure, including a motion to change the Senate rules. If it is necessary to face a filibuster in order to bring this proposed amendment to a vote, we recommend that the Senate remain in session until such vote be taken.

Coddling of Communist Agents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Coddling Communist Agents," published in the Washington (Ind.) Herald of January 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNIST AGENTS

The revelations of the Hiss trial and the revealed actions of Government officials, before, during, and since the trial serve to spotlight a situation which has received little, if any, publicity.

At the time President Roosevelt agreed to recognize the Communist regime in Russia in 1933, one of the conditions was that Russia would cease and desist from any efforts to spread its propaganda and extend its system to the United States.

It is a fact well known that Russia has paid no attention to that stipulation. It is a fact well known that the Russian propaganda machine has worked at top speed in the United States and that Communist agents have been working at top speed to build up the Communist organization in the United States.

All that has been going on for years but this is the first time that such facts have been brought out in a formal trial and made a matter of Federal court record.

Now that the facts are established as a matter of court record, what does the administration propose to do? Will it ignore the facts and go ahead playing footsie-under-the-table with Communist Russia? Or will it bring the situation forcibly to the attention of the Russian Government and demand the immediate withdrawal of the Communist agents (the FBI knows who they are) and sever diplomatic relations with Russia if they do not do it?

To go ahead as we are only makes us a laughing stock for those Russian officials who know of the 1933 agreement and how it has been completely ignored.

The Alger Hiss Conviction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Liar and a Spy," which appeared on Monday, January 23, 1950, in the Journal-Every Evening, Wilmington, Del.

I agree completely with the editor that the country owes a deep debt of gratitude to Representative NIXON and other members of the Committee on Un-American Activities for their persistence in uncovering this situation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LIAR AND A SPY

Unless the verdict is reversed on appeal, Alger Hiss will stand before his fellow citizens as a liar, a spy, and as one who was willing to hand over his country's secrets to the agents of a foreign power. For a man like that, whatever his gifts in other directions, Americans may have pity but not the slightest sympathy. He was the enemy of all of us.

And this is what President Truman called "a red herring," an effort by the Republicans to draw attention away from their own shortcomings in the days when they had control of Congress. It is now plain that the only red herring in the case was the one which was dragged across the trail by Mr. Truman himself and which, if Representative NIXON is to be believed, is involved in the furious campaign which was waged by high-ranking officials of the administration to keep the affair from ever seeing the light of day.

As a result of this verdict there should be on the part of many Americans a new attitude toward the Committee on Un-American Activities. It will now be an indifferent citizen who will dare to say that this committee is not needed or that it should be shorn of its authority.

Sordid as the whole story may be, there is one cause for pride. Mr. Hiss had as fair a trial as it was possible for any man to receive and there were times when the court actually leaned over backward in its consideration of the interests of the defense. And whatever happens, Mr. Hiss will still be alive. He can thank his lucky stars that it was America and not the Soviet which he sought to betray.

Why Not an Anti-Cominform?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, all over the world, and significantly inside Russia and in her satellites, there is widespread unorganized opposition to the Cominform. The problem is to unite behind one banner this deep-seated antagonism. A resident of my State, Siegfried Wagener, writing in the January 1950 edition of Plain Talk, has come up with a provocative suggestion. At least he has a plan which should challenge the thinking of every anti-Communist in the world. I ask unanimous consent to insert his article on Why Not an Anti-Cominform? in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT AN ANTI-COMINFORM?

(By Siegfried Wagener)

In the heartland of the Cominform Tito is visible evidence of what is going on in the minds of millions of outwardly loyal subjects of the Kremlin. In the Russian zone in Germany morale is so low that soldiers not on duty are confined behind barbed wire, and 20 minutes' absence without leave is treated as desertion. How can we exploit this state of affairs to win tactical advantage in the cold war?

The best defense being attack, why not strike now by organizing an Anti-Cominform and watering the seeds of democratic rebellion which are germinating behind the iron curtain? Why not advance at the hostile Cominform with its own weapons on its home ground?

Military defense measures are costing us $15,000,000,000 annually in direct expenditures, not counting the billions for ECA, aid to the North Atlantic Pact nations, private relief work, etc. This drain on our national resources is so heavy that the Kremlin and many Americans are, for once, unanimous in considering it only a matter of time before we shall be exhausted.

An Anti-Cominform, on the other hand, would cost us little. One hundred million dollars for a starter would carry it a long way. Even if its maintenance would cost us annually several times that much it would be comparable only to a minor item in the military budget. Should it succeed, it would have prevented the nation from bleeding itself white before the first A-bomb was dropped.

The Anti-Cominform would not rely on educational propaganda of the type of the Voice of America, nor on economic and military aid to countries threatened by communism. It would supplement these measures by forming revolutionary action committees staffed by the rank and file of refugees from the iron-curtain countries. Modeled somewhat along the lines of its Russian counterpart, it would set up these revolutionaries, give them the means to proselytize the Russian and vassal peoples by radio, pamphlet, direct underground contact, and furnish the arms they will ultimately need. It would pursue its objective on all fronts in Asia and Europe, wherever the spark of rebellion can be fanned into overthrowing Soviet tyranny.

Uncounted DP's, refugees and deserters would rally, including many old hands experienced in the business of revolution; the Anti-Cominform would give these people, for the first time since their exodus from home, a hard-fisted cause to live, fight, and if need be, die for. There are so many of them that great care must be taken in screening them, weeding out Cominform infiltrators, unreliables, and adherents of fascism and reaction.

The Anti-Cominform would work under strictly American control and direction. We have men like Col. Heber Blankenhorn, who helped foment the German revolution of 1918 and who was prevented from repeating the performance in 1944; Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, of the erstwhile Office of Strategic Services; his associate, Allen Welsh Dulles, who kept his finger on the pulse of the abortive anti-Hitler rebellion in 1944; and a number of others in whose judgment of, and sympathy with, revolution as a means of democratic survival we can trust.

The American conspirators could work right out in the open as there is no ethical or practical need to keep the Anti-Cominform under cover. Nor would there be any sense in hiding the fact that it is, as the case may be, either an agency of the United States Government or a private organization with Government approval. The Cominform against which it operates is a direct part of the Soviet Government and the Red Army, overtly aiming at the overthrow of self-government in the United States.

Hence, if the Anti-Cominform constitutes an unfriendly act in our relations, with the U. S. S. R., let Cominform propaganda make the most of it. Every single mention the Kremlin would make of our organization would be a boost for millions of silently suffering, praying, hopeful Russians. They who have been so often and so excruciatingly disappointed by their own and outside governments would at last feel reassured if they knew that the Anti-Cominform agent who contacts them is backed by the United States.

What are the chances for success?

First of all, we could not lose, no matter what the future holds in store. If war came our psycho-political warfare would be organized down to the last detail if it had not already succeeded in laying the groundwork for internal Russian combustion. Conversely, should the Kremlin mend its ways and meet us on sensible terms, we would recall our Anti-Cominform simultaneously with Russia's dissolution of the Cominform; among realists there need be no hard feelings, although the very existence of the Anti-Cominform might have assisted in bringing this desirable turn of events.

However, neither of these possibilities being immediately feasible, we are faced with long protraction of the present stalemate whose peaceful termination the Anti-Cominform is seeking. For this the prospects are substantially brighter than is generally conceded.

Nobody knows how many millions of Russian dissenters rot in slave-labor camps and prisons, or are liquidated. Estimates range all the way up to 1 out of every 10 Russians. Western Europe harbors millions of displaced persons with more coming every day. And how many thousands of Red Army deserters are quietly cared for by American-British forces is a military secret.

This indicates a far better precondition to revolution than existed in Nazi Germany where we had a good chance and threw it away—a catastrophical mistake which we cannot afford to repeat.

The evidence is now in and well documented that German labor and underground leaders were right when they assured me in London that Germany was ripe for revolution during World War II. They pleaded for American help. Mainly due to our politically unwise unconditional-surrender policy this was refused. Thus we probably missed shortening the war by many months, sparing ourselves long-term occupation and reeducation of Germany, and we missed the chance to keep Russia out of central Europe.

By now it should be clear to all that we have already crossed the Rubicon. For the Anti-Cominform would only invigorate and bring to climactic effect existing agencies and organizations working in precisely the same direction.

At present these movements and efforts are extremely minor, widely scattered, and uncoordinated. At best, they affect only pinpricks in Moscow but, uncontrolled as they are, they could also cause the kind of irritation which in a tense situation might lead to a premature incident.

The Anti-Cominform would give them unity of purpose, discipline, wherewithal, and efficiency. Moreover, it would be controlled. Behind its task force of freedom-loving legions would stand in solid ranks the anti-Communists of this country and the world—churches, industry, labor, the arts and sciences, the professions, and last but foremost, the Government of the United States.

"Help From America"—in the form of Wilson's Fourteen Points—was the magic slogan of the German revolutionaries of 1918, of whom I was one. It could have been the key to Germany in 1944. We can start a subterranean rumbling throughout Russia and shake her rulers either to their senses or have them overthrown by her own oppressed masses. In this role America would emerge as the true champion of freedom in the world.

Wards of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Wards of the Government" delivered by Dean Russell at the convention on individual liberty held at Billings, Mont., on January 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARDS OF THE GOVERNMENT

(By Dean Russell)

(This is the text of a speech delivered before the convention on individual liberty at Billings, Mont., January 20, 1950. The convention was sponsored by the Montana Chamber of Commerce. Dean Russell is a member of the foundation staff.)

The constitutions of former American slave States generally specified that the masters must provide their slaves with adequate housing, food, medical care, and old-age benefits. The Mississippi Constitution contained this additional sentence:

"The legislature shall have no power to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves * * * [except] where the slave shall have rendered the State some distinguished service."

The highest honor that Mississippi could offer a man for distinguished service to his country was personal responsibility for his own welfare. His reward was freedom to find his own job and to have his own earnings, freedom to be responsible for his own housing, freedom to arrange for his own medical care, freedom to save for his own old age. In short, his reward was the individual opportunities—and the personal responsibilities—that have always distinguished a free man from a dependent.

What higher honor can any government offer?

THE RIGHTS OF A SLAVE

But many present-day Americans are trying to avoid this personal responsibility that is freedom. They are voting for men who promise to install a system of compulsory, Government-guaranteed security—a partial return to the old slave laws of Georgia that guaranteed to all slaves "the right to food and raiment, to kind attention when sick, to maintenance in old age." And the arguments used to defend this present-day trend toward the bondage of a welfare state are essentially the same arguments that were formerly used to defend the bondage of outright slavery.

For example, many of the slaveholders claimed that they knew what was "best for the slaves." After all, hadn't the masters "rescued" the slaves from a life of savagery? The advocates of Government-guaranteed security also claim that they know what is best for the people. Many of them argue in this fashion: "After all, haven't the American people conclusively shown that they are incapable of handling the responsibility for their own welfare?"

Many of the slaveholders sincerely believed that the dumb, ignorant slaves would starve to death unless their welfare was guaranteed by the masters. And the advocates of compulsory security frequently say: "Are you in favor of letting people starve?"

MOST PRECIOUS OF ALL

But as proof of the fact that personal responsibility for one's own welfare brings increased material well-being, consider the emancipated slaves. Among them, there were old and crippled and sick people. They had no homes, no jobs, and little education. But—most precious of all—the former slaves were responsible for their own welfare. They were free. They had the privilege of finding their own security.

Now compare the remarkable progress of those former slaves to the lack of progress of the American Indians who were made wards of the Government; who were given State-guaranteed "security" instead of freedom with responsibility. In 1862, most American Negroes were slaves. Today they are about as self-supporting and responsible as other American citizens. Meanwhile, the Indians as a group have become less self-supporting and more dependent on Government aid. It has been claimed that many thousands of Indians will actually die of starvation unless the Government feeds them. If this is true, why is it so?

CONTRASTS

There seems to be no scientific basis for calling the Indians an innately inferior race. As has been proved by the success of many individual Indians, they have just as much capacity for understanding and advancement as the Negroes and the so-called Nordics. But today there are more than 12,000 Federal employees directly taking care of the 233,000 reservation Indians who are still classified as wards of the Government. The number of Government caretakers for the Indians has been steadily increasing over the years. As a result, the reservation Indian is becoming less self-sufficient and more dependent upon what he calls "the Great White Father in Washington."

Instead of freedom, the Indian has Government-guaranteed security. Instead of individual responsibility, he has a Government bureau to handle his personal affairs. There are special laws governing his right to own land and to spend tribal money. Under that system of bondage it should surprise no one to find that many thousands of Indians have remained uneducated, hungry, diseased, and mismanaged.

THE ONLY SOLUTION

The only lasting solution is for the Indians themselves to handle their own affairs on the basis of individual freedom and personal responsibility. If this is not true, then the blessings of freedom would appear to be fanciful myths. But for some queer reason, we Americans seem to believe that just because our pioneer fathers once subjugated the Indians, we in turn are obligated to keep them in the bondage of Government security. As a result, the Indian has the status of a ward instead of a citizen. Instead of being a responsible person, he is a dependent.

And in a like manner, if we free Americans continue to turn to Government for our security, we, too, will surely become dependent wards instead of responsible citizens. There will be a commissioner to control our personal affairs and our individual responsibilities. Instead of calico and blankets, we may be promised a hundred dollars every month. But since the principle is the same in both cases, the results will also eventually be the same.

A RETURN TO BONDAGE

The advocates of this compulsory security honestly seem to believe that most Americans—including the Indians—are too ignorant, or lazy, or worthless to be trusted with their own destiny; that they will literally starve in the streets unless their welfare is guaranteed by a benevolent Government. However good their intentions may be, these disciples of a relief state are demanding that they be given the power to force mankind to follow their plans. In the name of liberty they advocate bondage.

This is true because the persons who receive support from the state are thereby led to expect—and then to demand—more support from the state. They become dependents. Thus they enter into a form of bondage. They lose their individual freedom of choice to whatever extent the state assumes responsibility for their personal welfare. In time, as is now the case in the welfare state of Russia, the people become completely subservient to the state. In effect, they become slaves of the benevolent government that has promised to solve all of their personal problems for them.

Admittedly, this is not the intent of the planners. Apparently, most of the advocates of government paternalism really believe

that they are able to know and to do what is best for all of the people. Most of them may honestly desire to help the people. But their efforts always result in some form of bondage. For example, the leaders of the Labor government of Britain probably never even dreamed of bringing compulsory labor to its supporters. Yet that is what they did. In England today the democratically elected leaders can—and do—force persons to work where the Government decrees they are most needed. And if the person objects to his Government's decision, force is used to make him conform.

THE ROAD TO HELL

In Russia we find another example of the fact that good intentions are no guarantee of freedom. For instance, in the beginning Lenin and Stalin probably had no desire whatever to bring slavery to Russia. Their announced plan was to free the Russian people from the slavery of an all-powerful government. But look what happened.

We Americans of today are following this same path toward the bondage of a welfare or slave state. Just as the law once guaranteed adequate medical care for American slaves, so a law to guarantee adequate medical care for all Americans is being demanded today. And who will determine what is adequate medical care for a person? Not the person, but the Government official who has the authority.

And jobs? Of course the Government can guarantee every man a job—just as every slave was guaranteed a job; just as every Russian is guaranteed a job. But it is impossible, of course, for the Government to guarantee everyone a job of his own choosing. Some persons must be guaranteed the scavenger jobs. They may not like it, but dependents have little choice.

THE FREE MAN

It is true that many citizens in this country are old and crippled and sick and homeless. Possibly some of them are jobless through no fault of their own. The same conditions existed during our Revolutionary War. But our ancestors knew that their only hope for permanent security lay in their own individual efforts. They knew that the main purpose of Government should be to protect whatever security the people were able to attain individually or in voluntary cooperation. They knew that electing or appointing a man to public office cannot endow him with wisdom; it can endow him only with power. Thus they took no chances on this power of government being used to encroach upon their individual liberties and their personal responsibilities. In America, they put positive restrictions on all office-holders. And as a final guarantee of freedom, they specified that any powers not expressly given to the Federal officials were to remain with the individual citizens and their local governments.

THE USE OF FORCE

The American Constitution naturally did not list virtues—such as compassion, charity, and respect for one's fellow man—as functions of government. The statesmen who founded our Government knew that all virtues are purely personal and voluntary. It is utter nonsense to imagine that a person can be forced to be good. Government can and should use force to punish a person who commits a crime. But this same force cannot be used to create kindness and compassion within the mind and heart of any person.

Thus the authors of our Constitution left compassion and charity—aid to the unfortunate—on a strictly voluntary basis. They designed a form of government based on individual freedom, personal responsibility, and equality before the law for all citizens. Wisely, they made no attempt whatever to separate freedom of choice from the resulting reward or punishment, success or failure. Since they recognized the absurdity of passing laws to protect a person from himself, they left all citizens free to make their own decisions concerning their own personal welfare. From all viewpoints, including that of material security for the so-called common man, those decisions concerning the proper functions of government proved to be the most effective that the world has ever known in this field.

BREAD AND CIRCUS

If this state-guaranteed security idea were new, it might help explain why so many people insist on trying it. But it is not new. It was written into the Code of Hammurabi over 4,000 years ago. In one form or another, it has been tried time and again throughout history—always with the same result. In the Roman Empire it was called "bread and circus." More recently, Karl Marx called it socialism. He believed that the state should take "from each according to his abilities" and give "to each according to his needs."

Marx said that it was the duty of government to provide all people with adequate housing, medical care, jobs, and social security. Word for word, the advocates of government security in this country are saying the same thing today.

And just as the Russians are enslaved to a welfare state, so this country is being carried into bondage by accepting the same false principle. Just as force is used in Russia to make the people conform to the security laws designed "for their own good," so we also are now forced to submit to American security laws designed "for our own good." And just as the Russian state punishes any objector, so the American state will now imprison us if we refuse to conform.

ENEMY OF THE STATE

If you doubt that compulsory socialism has gone to that extreme in this country, just test it, for instance, by refusing to pay the social-security tax that is taken from your salary. The Government will do the same thing to you that it did to the owner of a small battery shop in Pennsylvania who balked at the idea of compulsory social security. First, the state confiscated his property. Still he refused to obey. Then the state preferred criminal charges against him. And in January of 1943, the Government gave him the choice of conforming or going to prison as a criminal—an enemy of the state because he refused to pay social security. He paid. And his 6-month prison sentence was suspended.

Next may come total Government housing—for our own good, of course. Then the state will assign us so many square feet of adequate living space. This is true because, under complete state ownership of housing, there is no other way that Government can do. We may ask for more space, a different location, better service, or a choice of neighbors. But we already know the Government's answer. Even today, a person has no real choice when he lives in Government housing.

Next may come full employment with Government-guaranteed jobs for everyone. A person will say: "I don't want this job." And as happened under England's program of Government-guaranteed full employment, the American welfare state will also answer: "We will put you in jail as a criminal unless you work at your assigned task."

Along about then, the advocates of Government-guaranteed security may begin to understand the inevitable result of their ideas. They may realize that it is power that makes a dictator, and not what he's called or how he's elected. When that fact has become obvious to everyone, the advocates of compulsory security will then exclaim: "But we didn't mean this!" It will be too late to turn back at that point. Just as the night follows the day, so Government aid to the individual is followed by Government control of the individual, which necessarily means Government force against the individual.

NO EASY WAY

Fortunately, it is not yet too late for America to turn away from the evil that is a welfare state; a slave state. But, unfortunately, there is no simple or easy way to do it. Both major political parties—along with the smaller ones—seem to be trying to outbid each other by promising more Government housing, more social security, more "free" medical care, more Government "welfare" projects, and more special privileges to various groups and interests.

Most of our movies, magazines, newspapers, and radio programs generally endorse—directly or indirectly—the idea of some form of Government-guaranteed security. Even the few objections seem to be aimed mostly at poor administration instead of a recognition that the theory is wrong in principle.

And, whether we like it or not, many of the instructors in our schools and colleges are teaching the desirability of the relief state, the planned economy, and Government ownership in general.

GOLDEN RULE REJECTED

Finally, even some of our church leaders are teaching that the force of government should be used to make people charitable and good. Some of these Christian leaders seem to have forgotten that the principles of the Good Samaritan and each individual doing unto others as he would have others do unto him are voluntary principles. In many cases these principles have now been discarded for this evil slogan: "It is the duty of government to care for the sick, to feed the hungry, to aid the unfortunate, and to build houses for those who need them." Probably one of the main reasons for the declining influence of the church is that the church is defaulting on many of its own responsibilities by turning them over to government. Many of our church leaders are rendering unto Caesar that which does not belong to Caesar.

But the politicians, periodicals, schools, and churches generally reflect the opinions of the persons who support them. Thus the final decision rests on the attitude of each individual American. If enough of us accept the degrading idea of a welfare state—a relief state, a slave state—the process will soon be completed. But if enough individual Americans desire a return to the personal responsibility that is freedom, we can have that too.

THE CHOICE IS OURS

Before choosing, however, consider this: When one chooses freedom—that is, personal responsibility—he should understand that his decision will not meet with popular approval. It is almost certain that he will be called vile names when he tries to explain that compulsory Government security—jobs, medicine, housing, and all the rest—is bad in principle and in its total effect; it saps character and strength by encouraging greed and weakness; it destroys the individual's God-given responsibility for self-help, respect, compassion, and charity; in some degree, it automatically turns all who accept it into wards of the Government; it will eventually turn a proud and responsible people into cringing dependence upon the whims of an all-powerful state; it is the primrose path to serfdom.

No, the choice is not an easy one. But, then, the choice of freedom never has been easy. It never will be easy. Since this capacity for personal responsibility—freedom—is God's most precious gift to mankind, it requires the highest form of understanding and courage.

The Global Challenge to the GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Global Challenge to the GOP," written by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and published in the United Nations World magazine for February 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GLOBAL CHALLENGE TO THE GOP

(By WAYNE MORSE, United States Senator from Oregon)

(In this hour of decision when the battle for Asia moves toward a climax, a far-sighted Republican statesman warns that for the United States to give up its bipartisan foreign policy is to play politics with peace.)

Is the Republican Party about to abandon the principle of a bipartisan foreign policy, a policy which Senator VANDENBERG—one of its chief architects—has rightly described as "our best available insurance for peace"? I don't believe it. For this would mean that the United States is on the verge of another postwar era of perilous nationalism.

It would mean that the forces which would have America embark on a course of imperialism, which is the partner of isolationism, have staged a comeback. It would mean a return of dollar diplomacy. It would mean that certain harsh preconditions would be imposed on countries now receiving Marshall-plan aid on the ground that they must conduct their domestic affairs in a way that meets our entire approval—or else. Fortunately, at the Philadelphia convention in 1948, the Republican Party firmly backed the bipartisan precept. Its platform officially pledged the party to continue that kind of policy. In its plank No. 8, written in anticipation of a Republican victory, the GOP declared that the minority party (i. e., the to-be-defeated Democrats) would be invited to join "in stopping partisan politics at the water's edge." That kind of plank is still the core of official foreign policy for the Republican Party. Those within the party who deride the bipartisan program perhaps need to be reminded that to differ over the practices of a united American position in international affairs does not in any way justify the scuttling of the bipartisan principle. On the contrary, the shortcomings which have developed merely dramatize the urgent need to perfect the mechanics of cooperation. Surely the reasons for a bipartisan foreign policy are plain enough. What we Americans want is to achieve and maintain international peace and security in a world of free men and of free nations. We want a world where human rights are not merely an exercise in verbal piety, but a living embodiment of human dignity and individual opportunity. To fulfill our obligations as a leader among free nations, we must have a foreign policy clear in its aims and consistent in execution.

National security itself demands that our foreign commitments can weather changes in the political direction of our Government. Any Member of the Congress who searches his heart must agree that a strong effective and dynamic American policy in foreign affairs is to be preferred to a strictly Democratic policy or Republican policy—even in the heat of an election year.

What, then, are the indispensable ingredients for a workable bipartisan foreign policy? They would seem to be obvious enough and yet they need to be restated in view of the charge that to support bipartisanship signifies "me toolism" and GOP addiction to the dubious virtues of the rubber stamp.

First of all, Republicans and Democrats must agree that bipartisanship means that "both parties are committed to working together" for world peace. In the second place, the responsible party leaders must achieve and display both mutual tolerance and common readiness to strive together in the common cause. They have to agree that all pertinent information will be shared and that ample time be spent in advance consultation and scrutiny of every issue.

During the past decade, very earnest efforts have been made to attain a functional interparty cooperation in coping with foreign affairs. Soon after Hitler attacked Poland, the late President Roosevelt invited key figures of both parties to the White House for some extremely candid discussion. And the next day he told the joint session of Congress that "these perilous days demand cooperation between us without a trace of partisanship." There have been many heartening examples of constructive and fruitful interparty teamwork as exemplified by lend-lease, the establishment of the UN conference and the drafting of its Charter, the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact. Despite the strains and tempers which accompanied three national election campaigns, bipartisanship has survived. Sometimes its workings have been very far from perfect. But its imperfections hardly warrant the palpitant yearnings to go back to an isolationist past that can never be recaptured. Our only sane and sensible course is to summon forth our most creative and constructive efforts to tool up the machinery of bipartisanship and make it run more smoothly than ever before. Only thus can America really present a united front whether to eager foes, reluctant friends, or enthusiastic co-opters.

Perhaps today's heaviest obligation for both Republican and Democratic Parties is to foster and further a bipartisan foreign policy and to carry it out in a spirit of good faith. By this means the long-range stake of the American people in winning the peace will be placed above and beyond any short-range partisan advantage. The leaders of neither party can justify playing politics with peace.

A genuine bipartisan foreign policy contains within it the obligation upon the party in the White House—whether Democratic or Republican—to consult in advance with the leaders of the minority party before entering into any international understanding which would commit the United States to a definite course of action. Nobody can be permitted to forget that it is a two-way street between the White House and Capitol.

It is true, of course, that under our Constitution, the primary responsibility for formulating foreign policy rests with the President of the United States. But it is equally true that whenever foreign policy questions generate friction between the White House and the Congress our country is greatly embarrassed in its overseas concerns. This is particularly important whenever the President makes an international pledge or agreement which later may require implementation by the Congress. Much of the confusion which now surrounds American foreign policy at the moment derives from the regrettable fact that in recent years Presidents and Secretaries of State too often have entered into understandings with the heads of foreign governments without prior consultation with Democratic and Republican leaders in the Congress. The latter indeed were kept in ignorance until discord and misunderstandings of potentially serious propositions had developed.

It is not too wise to discard entirely the use of hindsight when charting a course for future action. The defects of our bipartisan foreign policy on they have been revealed over recent years can be appraised in calmer perspective by a realistic analysis of some of the errors which have resulted from this very failure of Presidents and Secretaries of State to take into their confidence and to consult with congressional leaders from both parties. For it is upon these men that the administration must in the last analysis lean heavily to gain and to preserve congressional support for any international commitment. The Cairo understanding, the Yalta agreements, the Potsdam pledges, the administration's improvisations in China during and particularly since the war, all exemplify flaws and faults in applying the spirit of a bipartisan foreign policy. Nobody can for a moment think that the extents reached by the President with representatives of foreign powers at Cairo and Yalta would have been acceptable, even at the time they were made, to the bipartisan leaders of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The Cairo and Yalta decisions involve not only the prosecution of the war but also the building of the peace. Historians will undoubtedly record that these international conferences of the Roosevelt administration represented, in a very real sense, an attempt to write peace treaties on the installment plan. It is difficult to answer the charge put forth by many Republican spokesmen, that in these conferences the treaty-making clause of the Constitution was circumvented by the President of the United States. In any case the conduct of the executive branch was not consonant with the essential aim and purposes of a bipartisan foreign policy. Even the Potsdam agreement cannot escape its need of criticism on this score.

If bipartisan leaders of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had been given an opportunity to present the Potsdam proposal to their committee, they would have raised some pertinent and pointed questions about America's prerogatives in Berlin. Certainly the failure of the agreement to clarify America's ability to enter and leave a city in which she was to have joint occupational rights and obligations with Russia would have been avoided.

The administration's handling of our policy in China, particularly since the war, cannot be fitted into a traffic design of two-way coordination and communication between the White House and the Congress. For many months the State Department failed to discuss with the bipartisan leaders of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee its plans for China, if any. Warning signals of dissension and criticism were raised in debate in the Senate many times during this period. On one occasion during the Eightieth Congress, the Republican chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—and the man who is perhaps more responsible than any other living American for a willing acceptance on the part of Republicans, and for that matter Americans generally, of the need for national unity in support of a bipartisan foreign policy—admitted under questioning on the floor of the Senate that the State Department had not consulted with the Foreign Relations Committee for many months on any phase of the China problem. He declared in the course of that debate, that the contents of the Wedemeyer report had not been made known to the bipartisan leaders of the Foreign Relations Committee.

At that time, which was the fall of 1947, a series of cracks and fissures developed in

the course of America's bipartisan foreign policy. It should have been remented very quickly by a mutual exchange of points of view and information between the State Department and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Instead, the misunderstandings and criticisms in respect to American policy in China became greater throughout 1947, 1948, and 1949. True, the predominant tendency in the Congress was to favor any administration proposal offered in the name of a bipartisan policy. Nevertheless, those of us in the Senate who strongly supported the idea of maintaining a bipartisan foreign policy were both grieved and handicapped on many occasions when the State Department neglected to inform the bipartisan leaders of the Congress about what Americans intended to do in Asia.

A great deal of the dissension which marked debates over the European recovery program, both in 1948 and 1949, was rooted in the dissatisfaction of some Senators with the administration's lone-hand attitude in Asia. In the closing weeks of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, Senators who were baffled and displeased with the administration's seeming unwillingness to make clear its position on China, gained considerable support not only in the upper Chamber but also from public opinion.

THE CHINA INCIDENT

When the second session of the Eighty-first Congress convened on January 3, it was from the outset obvious that the administration would be confronted with a serious attack upon some aspects of its foreign policy, particularly those relating to China.

It is not too late to arrest and reverse the trend toward partisanship in the field of American foreign policy. It is not too late to replace with a spirit of confidence and participation, the distrust which some Senators have of the administration's foreign policy. If the administration will hasten to assure the people of the United States that the leaders of both the Democratic and Republican Parties in the Congress will be consulted before major policy on any international issue is formulated by the State Department and the White House, the breach can be healed before irreparable damage is done.

This today is the acid test as to whether a bipartisan foreign policy actually prevails. No other course on the part of the administration will ever satisfy those who are questioning not only the existence, but the worth, of a bipartisan foreign policy. No other kind of cooperation will sufficiently strengthen the hand of the great VANDENBERG. Nothing else can place him in the powerful position he deserves to have within the Republican Party when he is faced with laying an administration foreign policy request before the Republicans in the Senate for approval.

A bipartisan foreign policy does not mean that Members of the Congress should refrain from criticizing any proposed course of action contemplated by the administration in the name of a bipartisan foreign policy. Rather, it is the duty of the Congressman to voice doubt and disagreement whenever, in his honest judgment, these are due. However, experience shows that mutual cooperation and mutual exchange of ideas and viewpoints between the administration and the leaders of Congress, in advance of an international commitment, usually presents any basis for fair and just criticism.

What is more, the greatest guaranty the administration has for maintaining a united American people behind the foreign policy of our country is to keep it bipartisan from conception to delivery. The American people can be counted upon to endorse and help effectuate a foreign policy which results from the cooperative efforts of the leaders in both the Democratic and the Republican Parties. Whenever a split occurs between those leaders, then division of a perilous nature is likely to develop.

American foreign policy cannot be separated from the cause of peace. The destiny of the American people depends upon winning that peace. Hence, they have the right to look to the party in the White House, Democratic or Republican, in the years immediately ahead to raise the issue of foreign policy above the level of partisan politics. They have the right to expect that the leaders of the minority party in the Congress will cooperate in good faith with the majority party and the Executive in formulating a foreign policy bipartisan in blueprint and in building.

A Factual Digest Detailing the Background and Significance of the Conviction of Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, under permission granted me by the Senate, I call attention to the following copy of a letter I have just sent to the editor of the largest and most widely read daily newspaper in South Dakota. It includes a condensed summary prepared at his request of some of the most significant factors in the Alger Hiss case as they were brought out in my speech on the Senate floor during the afternoon of Wednesday, January 25.

Due to the unusually wide interest which is developing in the background and significance of the conviction of Alger Hiss, I am taking this means of calling this digest to the attention of the Congress and the country.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1950.

Mr. FRED C. CHRISTOPHERSON,
Editor, the Daily Argus-Leader,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

DEAR FRED: It was indeed good of you to write and let me know that you had come across my address on the Senate floor entitled "What the Hiss Trial Actually Means," and telling me you had read the address in its entirety.

I certainly agree with you, fully, that the Hiss case is destined to go down in the annals of history as one of the strangest—and perhaps one of the most significant—chapters in our American history. Surprisingly enough, a great many of our otherwise very well informed citizens have never gone far enough into the actual evidence and ramifications of the Hiss case to realize its full importance and its far-flung significance.

I think your suggestion is therefore most timely and valuable; it is certainly true that editors, commentators, public officials, and most of our active private citizens are all very busy these days, and so your proposal that I prepare a condensed summary of the more important factors in the background and significance of the Alger Hiss case is entirely sound. I am grateful for it.

Enclosed with this letter is the digest high lighting some of the major points of the case, and more careful students can of course have access to the full text of my address starting on page 889 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 25 or the address covering the same record which was recently made by Congressman NIXON on the floor of the House and which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 30. As you know, DICK NIXON and I devoted many weeks almost exclusively to the congressional investigation which revealed the evidence on the basis of which Hiss was convicted.

Due to the many requests which have come in for the full text of my analysis of what the Hiss case actually means, I have had a limited number of reprints made of my address of January 25. I am enclosing one herewith.

Again thanking you for your constructive and helpful suggestions and with best wishes and kindest regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
United States Senator, South Dakota.

P. S.—If any of your friends desire a copy of the complete address for historic reference or to acquaint themselves fully with its full significance I shall be glad to send them a copy direct if they will write me here in suite 433 of the Senate Office Building in Washington.

A FACTUAL DIGEST DETAILING THE BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CONVICTION OF ALGER HISS

(Prepared by request by Senator KARL E. MUNDT who, as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Eightieth Congress, was chairman of the subcommittee handling the investigations leading to the conviction of Alger Hiss)

1. Whittaker Chambers, at that time a $30,000-a-year member of the editorial staff of Time magazine, was not a voluntary witness before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He came in response to a subpena served on him by the committee after it had been learned from independent sources that Chambers was a former member of the Communist Party. Chambers was not motivated by dislike or personal enmity for Hiss—in fact, if anything, throughout the hearings Chambers tended to protect Hiss by refusing to volunteer incriminating evidence against him.

2. Since it is an established fact that Chambers for years was a functionary of the Communist Party operating both as a transmission belt ferrying secret information out of Washington to the Communists and as a Communist agent seeking to influence the thinking and attitudes of top policy makers in high Government officialdom, the vital aspects of his relationships with Alger Hiss do not rest upon the court trials leading to his conviction but in the admissions which Hiss himself made while testifying under oath before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

3. As a witness before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Hiss first denied knowing Whittaker Chambers or anybody resembling his likeness. Later, when confronted with a vast body of testimony from Chambers demonstrating that Chambers knew many intimate details of the home surroundings, and the personal habits of Alger and Priscilla Hiss, Alger Hiss admitted that he did know Chambers under the name of "Crosley." He, in fact, admitted he knew Chambers so well that the Hiss and Chambers families had lived together under the same roof, that Hiss had loaned Chambers his furnished apartment for a period of several months without pay, that he had "loaned or given" Chambers the Hiss family automobile, and that he had loaned Chambers money. Incredible as it may sound, Hiss finally disclosed that he knew Chambers so intimately and well that it was only after an inspection of his teeth that he was willing to identify him positively!

4. At the time of the associations which Alger Hiss told the committee under oath he had with Chambers, Whittaker Chambers

was a paid Communist agent assigned to the Washington Communist apparatus in the dual role as an espionage agent and a man planted here to contact high American officials for the purpose of influencing their thinking and their policy decisions. At this period of history, Alger Hiss was an important figure in the State Department in Washington serving here as an assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State.

5. The court case in New York City dealt only with the question of the specific date that Hiss last associated with Chambers—in the trial, Hiss did not deny his past close associations with Whittaker Chambers. The trial also dealt with the truthfulness of Hiss when he denied smuggling State Department security documents from their official files and giving them to Chambers to photostat and relay to his Communist employers.

6. The conviction of Alger Hiss for perjury because he was accused of lying when he denied continuing his associations with Chambers down to a specific date—was made certain on the testimony of Mr. and Mrs. Chambers, supported by the corroborative testimony of a maid who worked in the Chambers household at that time and other evidence.

7. The conviction of Alger Hiss on the second count of his perjury indictment, however—the charge that he stole and delivered State Department security documents to Chambers—was based on a vast amount of documentary and tangible evidence in support of the testimony of Whittaker Chambers. For example, there was the unchallenged evidence that Chambers had these highly secret and important security documents in his possession. There was the evidence that the contents of many of these security documents had been typed on a Woodstock typewriter which Alger Hiss admitted belonged to him. No denial was made that the Hiss typewriter was the one used in transcribing the documents. There was the evidence that Chambers had several photostats of documents made in the handwriting of Alger Hiss; no denial was made that this was the handwriting of the accused. There was the admitted fact that Alger Hiss in the State Department had access to the documents the contents of which were found in the possession of Communist agent Chambers. Thus those who through lack of information suggest that no jury should take the word of an ex-Communist like Chambers either speak without knowledge of the documentary evidence in support of the perjury charge or else deliberately for reasons best known to themselves refuse to face up to the fact that it was the documentary evidence against Alger Hiss which resulted in his conviction in New York City.

8. Now that the country knows—or has available to it—the evidence showing that Alger Hiss was (by his own admission) a close associate of the Communist, Chambers, and since tangible and documentary evidence has convicted Hiss of lying when he denied supplying Chambers with State Department secret documents, it becomes highly important to know just what part Alger Hiss may have played in the history-shaping decisions which were made during the time that he served as a high-ranking State Department official. It is important as well to know how many close associates of Alger Hiss, whose present employment in Government may have been made possible by his intercession in their behalf, are still in position to sabotage our policies and to serve the cause of Soviet Russia and communism.

9. What, then, are the positions of vast influence held by Alger Hiss during his long career in Government?

Overlooking for the purposes of this digest, his other positions in Government, there were at least four strategic positions which Alger Hiss held in which he was in an ideal position (1) to influence high-policy decisions in the field of international relations, and (2) to seek, secure, and smuggle out vital secrets essential to our national security and the success of our foreign policy.

These four strategic positions were as follows:

(1) Hiss was a high functionary in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, where recommendations originate concerning our foreign policy toward China.

(2) Hiss was the executive secretary of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference—one of the forerunners of the San Francisco Conference.

(3) Hiss was the Secretary General of the San Francisco Conference, where Time magazine reported he was in an ideal position to "have a lot to say behind the scenes about who gets the breaks."

(4) Hiss was one of a very small group of personal and confidential advisers to President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius both before and during the entire Yalta conference.

10. This digest will not permit detailing the specific functions of Alger Hiss in each of these important posts. Those seeking more complete information will find it in my address on the Senate floor delivered on January 25.

At Yalta, however, the books written by Stettinius, James F. Byrnes, James A. Farley, Arthur Bliss Lane, and Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson (all quoted literally in my address) provide ample testimony of the important part that Alger Hiss played at the Yalta conference.

In addition, Hiss was one of the very small coterie of advisers taken by Stettinius to Yalta prior to their meeting with President Roosevelt there, and at which meeting the State Department advisers were briefing and counseling Stettinius on what he was to urge President Roosevelt to do, to say, and to decide at Yalta. It is hard to conjecture a more vital spot in the entire Government for rendering a permanent disservice to this country than the succession of offices held by Alger Hiss and by the part he had in determining the decisions at Yalta.

11. Up to now, no committee of Congress has had made available to it a list of the State Department employees or other Government officials who may owe their appointments to Alger Hiss or whose promotions to positions of enhanced influence may have resulted from recommendations by Hiss. President Truman, unfortunately, has issued a "freeze order" denying all committees of the Congress access to these employment records.

12. It is now common knowledge that President Truman, Dean Acheson, and others high in Government endeavored to discredit the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in conducting the investigation and hearings leading to the indictment and conviction of Alger Hiss. President Truman—not once, but at least twice—publicly denounced it as dealing only with a "red herring." The President said it was simply a political attempt to draw attention from his special session of the Eightieth Congress.

13. Even after the discovery that Chambers had in his possession the security documents from the State Department, a United Press news dispatch issued on December 1, 1948, stated, "The Department of Justice is about ready to drop its investigation of the celebrated Alger Hiss-Whittaker Chambers controversy, it was learned today * * * officials said privately that unless additional evidence is forthcoming, they are inclined to forget the whole thing." (Entire text of news story was inserted with my address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25, beginning on p. 889.)

14. Against the opposition of the White House and overcoming the lethargy of the Department of Justice, the House Committee on Un-American Activities stuck doggedly to its task until the documentary evidence was discovered which resulted in the conviction of Alger Hiss.

It stands today as an uncontroversible fact that had it not been for the House Committee on Un-American Activities, this country would never have learned about the activities of Whittaker Chambers and Alger Hiss and the celebrated "pumpkin papers" would never have been located or disclosed.

15. Observers endeavoring to analyze the scope of activity engaged in by the particular Communist apparatus in the Federal Government which was operated by Whittaker Chambers should bear in mind that Alger Hiss was not the only member of this apparatus. Henry Julian Wadleigh, also of the State Department and also named by Chambers, has confessed to his important part in this espionage and policy-fixing apparatus. In fact, every important member of the apparatus named by Chambers has by this time either confessed, been convicted in court, fled from the country, or is dead.

16. In evaluating Yalta, and the importance to Communist sympathizers that policies agreed to there should be favorable to the Soviet and detrimental to the forces of freedom everywhere, we should bear in mind that it was at Yalta that (1) Poland was divided and its eastern portion given to the U. S. S. R.; (2) China was doomed as an autonomous country under its own government because at Yalta the United States of America yielded to the demands of the U. S. S. R. that the power spots in Manchuria—"The Ruhr of China"—should be turned over to the Communists; (3) the weird arrangements, which were later confirmed at Potsdam by President Truman, were devised whereby the American occupation forces in Berlin were to be entirely surrounded by the unfriendly Red armies of Russia; (4) the fate of the Balkans was sealed; and (5) the extra votes for the Soviet and the veto in the United Nations Charter were agreed upon which have done so much to enable the U. S. S. R. to sabotage the peace-preserving efforts of that great international organization.

17. There are other serious and important consequences disclosed by the trial, the activities, and the conviction of Alger Hiss, but those wishing to pursue the subject exhaustively can find this material in the printed hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in my address on the Senate floor on January 25, in the report of Congressman NIXON's analysis of the same subject as it appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 30, and from the files of the Library of Congress and the House Committee on Un-American Activities. More careful students can find much information also in the printed transcripts of the two trials in New York City which resulted in the conviction of Alger Hiss. This digest simply chronicles some of the more significant and obvious factors involved in this epochal case.

18. Out of this experience the United States should learn some lessons and take some action which will tend to strengthen its security and to protect more adequately this last great bastion of human freedom on this earth. Among these lessons are the following:

(A) Since the statute of limitations necessitates crimes of this type being disclosed within 3 years, or grants the offenders complete immunity from punishment, Wadleigh, Chambers, Hiss, and others will go scot free, insofar as punishment for their espionage activities is concerned. Hiss has been sentenced to 5 years in the Federal penitentiary solely because the jury found him guilty of perjury for lying about the part he played in this great conspiracy. Therefore, the statute of limitations for crimes of this type against the security of our Government should be promptly extended to at least 10 years.

(B) Strangely enough, this free Republic has no law of any kind which prevents the employment of Communists on the Federal pay roll or which punishes these traitorous agents when they work their way into such employment and are caught in the act. There is real need for the early passage of some such law as the Mundt-Nixon bill which passed the House in the Eightieth Congress by a vote of 319 to 58 but which was never acted upon in the Senate. This bill has been modified and rewritten and is again before Congress having been introduced in the Eighty-first Congress by Senators HENNY, Pennsylvania, and JOHNSON of South Carolina. It should be passed despite the Communists' boast that they have spent over a million dollars in a successful effort to block its passage in the Eighty-first Congress.

The aggressive and adroit propaganda and campaigning of the Communists and their fellow-travelers has entirely misrepresented the contents and purposes of this legislation until many who have never even read the bill have lent their good name to those desperately opposing its passage. Unless this country acts to protect its public offices against disloyal elements who desire to take them over and infiltrate them we are apt to so weaken our internal defenses against communism that it will be impossible to defeat it successfully by military might and by expenditures of time and effort on our external defenses alone.

(C) Appropriate committees of Congress should make a thorough check to determine to what extent our State Department and our other Governmental offices are still permeated and peopled by Communists and their sympathizers and workers. All disloyal elements should be summarily weeded out without further apology or appeasement—the time is amply here when once again we should "place only Americans on guard."

(D) A complete reappraisal should be made of the so-called loyalty checks now being conducted by the administration at great expense but with highly inadequate results insofar as protecting the public interest is concerned. What we are actually getting is simply a name check and not a loyalty check at all. Only those who openly affiliate with some obviously Communist group are now detected and removed. At least in the more important posts in public office we need a security check rather than a name check to determine merely whether a person has openly indicated disloyalty by joining a Communist group. There is still inexcusable laxity in high places in the matter of preventing the employment on the Federal pay roll of disloyal individuals.

(E) The House Committee on Un-American Activities should be strengthened and it should be encouraged to continue the great work it has done in the past. Carping critics and chronic accusers of this hard-working committee should not be permitted to drive it into ineffective idleness. It should be adequately staffed and courageously manned. No political party should be permitted by the public to stifle its work or to soft pedal its disclosures.

(F) As a consequence of the currently sorry situation which has developed in our foreign policy and the disturbing ineffectiveness of policies detrimental to American interests as well as the revelations that atomic secrets, information on the new H-bomb, and diplomatic security matters have been freely funneled out of this country to Russia, a careful, candid, and complete reappraisal should be made of the entire international situation. A positive, constructive, freedom-asserting, and peace-preserving foreign policy should be developed as the result of the best efforts and thinking of both of our major political parties rather than by either one of them.

The Republican Party should begin measuring up to its responsibilities as a great and independent political party. "Me-toeism" in foreign policy should be stopped. A political party which is too timid or too tired to make constructive, positive, and realistic foreign-policy proposals of its own and to match them in debate and discussion with the suggestions of the White House and the Secretary of State can scarcely expect the public to entrust it with their future and their fate. We Republicans have not for several years met our full obligation in this regard as a great political party.

To preserve America and to protect the peace, we must do so now. Once a foreign policy is established by merging the best ideas of both political parties and all good American minds into a common pattern, it should have complete support by both political parties and by all good citizens. That is true bipartisanship in foreign affairs. Our foreign policy of the future must not be isolationism, it must not be narrow nationalism, it must be global in its thinking and realistic in its operation and it must serve the best interests of the United States; because in so doing it best serves the interests of permanent peace and of the entire world.

The foregoing is a sketchy digest only of the 3-hour discussion of the ramifications and background of the Alger Hiss case which I delivered on the Senate floor on January 25. The full account begins on page 889 of the RECORD for that day. In limited numbers I have some extra copies of that detailed discussion available to those who care to request them by post card or letter addressed to me here in my office, No. 432, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

The Road to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "The Road to Peace" appearing in the January-February 1950 issue of the magazine Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROAD TO PEACE

It will be recalled that after each concession granted to Adolf Hitler, the Nazi propaganda machine would announce to the world that there were new "problems" which demanded immediate solution. This would invariably cause western diplomats to put on an expression of pained surprise—sometimes indignation.

The shock quickly wore off and again concessions were made to Hitler. Again demands by Hitler. Again surprise. Yet, these diplomats were filled with optimism. In his book, Defense of the Peace, Georges Bonnet, the French Foreign Minister, during the late 1930's relates that "Mr. Neville Chamberlain furthermore wondered whether the European situation was as black as Daladier believed. He doubted very much that Hitler desired the destruction of the Czechoslovak state or of a refashioned Czechoslovak state; he did not believe the Fuehrer wanted an anschluss."

As we now know, Mr. Chamberlain's hopes were unfounded. Hitler obtained new concessions—made new demands—then caused Mr. Chamberlain to express astonishment again.

This routine continued right up to and including the fateful Munich sell-out. During all those years, peoples in western Europe and the United States were fed the delusion that there was no real connection between old concessions and new demands. Their failing to perceive the underlying strategy of the Nazis enabled Hitler to grab a good part of Europe without risk or opposition.

When the people awoke to the fact that appeasement had its own deadly logic, the bombs were already falling on Rotterdam, Coventry, and Warsaw. Must we pay the same price again? Shall we allow ourselves to be taken down the road to disaster step by step?

Since the day that the Allied Powers declared as their common objective "the complete disarmament and demilitarization of Germany and the elimination or control of all German industry that could be used for military production," this war-torn world has witnessed ever-increasing violations of this sacred pledge.

The Germans demanded that denazification cease. The Allied Powers hastily acceded to their wish. Even the members of the German general staff have been spared.

The Germans demanded that the war criminals be spared, and the Allied Powers forgave these criminal elements, with few exceptions.

The Germans demanded that their cartel empires be preserved, and the Allied Powers have acceded.

The Germans demanded that there be a halt to the reparations program and the Allies scaled down reparations deliveries to an insignificant level.

The Germans demanded the retention of prohibited industries which are the basis of a war potential, and the Allied Powers complied.

The list of concessions, demands, concessions, demands, is by no means complete. But is it not clear that there is an organic connection between the concessions granted and the new demands made? Is it not plain that the logic of this steady retreat from victory points to the rebirth of the German army? The authoritative London Economist naively declares: "The problem of the part that Germany should play in its own defense has suddenly sprung to the surface of thought and discussion." There is nothing sudden about this development. It is merely the end result of the steady deterioration of our original policies and position in Germany.

Shall we rearm Germany? The question is unreal and when it comes from the lips of the German-Firsters who have such thorough control over the occupation, it is downright dishonest. For the bitter truth is that Germany is being rearmed. You do not build up a modern army without first building up the steel plants, the ball-bearing plants, the synthetic oil plants, the machine-tool plants, the chemical plants—and these are going full blast again.

In addition, the tradition of militarism and pan-Germanism has also been preserved. Pensions are paid to former members of the German general staff. Even the little children are being groomed for their future role. Military toys are reappearing this Christmas season in Germany.

As the Society for the Prevention of World War III has revealed in previous issues, the east German police are being attuned for new tasks of a more portentous nature. According to western military intelligence sources, the police forces are the precursors

for a new German people's army. Presumably this army will have to save the Germans from the imperialist plots of the Anglo-Saxons. But what about the West? Are our statesmen Simon-pure? The answer by this time is obvious, we believe. It does not make military sense to preserve a war potential far in excess of Germany's peacetime needs and yet piously assure peace-loving peoples that there is no intention to organize a German army.

For weeks, official denials have been crowed up by weasel-worded qualifications. You can pick up magazine after magazine, newspaper after newspaper and you will find reports and rumors about a new west-German army. For example, in the November 25, 1949, issue of the United News and World Report we read the following:

"Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, signaled a vital turn in United States policy when he traveled to Germany to promise things to the Germans instead of having German officials representing a defeated nation travel to a meeting with United States officials to ask for favors, hat in hand. Original United States plan to turn Germany into a sheep pasture is revised into a secret plan to rearm the Germans into a powerful nation."

It has been said that General Bradley has spoken off-the-record on the practicability of a west-German army.

General Lucius D. Clay, who shares in the responsibility for the decline of American prestige and authority in Germany, is openly lobbying for a German army. Some Americans have expressed surprise because 10 months ago General Clay told American correspondents that if the United States allowed the creation of a new German army "We should never have come over here in the first place." His change of mind stems from the very policies he pursued which laid the groundwork for the rebuilding of Germany's industrial war potential.

According to newspaper columnists, Viscount Field Marshal Montgomery, a recent visitor to this country, has adopted the same line as General Clay.

And what about the Germans? There has been no official denial that Chancellor Adenauer has requested war equipment for 25 German divisions. As a matter of fact, Adenauer has recently said that he would, under certain conditions, be ready and willing to organize a new Wehrmacht.

Adenauer seems to have a short memory because in the agreement of November 24, 1949, Adenauer's government pledged as follows: "The Federal Government further declares its earnest determination to maintain the demilitarization of the Federal territory and to endeavor by all means in its power to prevent the re-creation of armed forces of any kind. To this end the Federal Government will cooperate fully with the High Commission in the work of the military security board."

Adenauer did not wait very long to shatter the illusions of some naive politicians about the new Germany. When Dean Acheson visited the German leaders on November 13, he expressed his aim to establish a relationship of trust and confidence and feelings of personal regard with the Germans. (New York Times, November 14, 1949.)

The Germans are playing their cards carefully. They do not wait to make any premature promises until their economic power has been fully revitalized. The Germans do not want to open all their cards until they are in the position where they can dictate the terms and conditions upon which they would agree toward the reestablishment of German armed forces.

The London Economist, in discussing the question of an army for Germany, recently admitted that an independent German Army would be on every score politically disastrous. But it then urges a practical plan to integrate such an army under the control of the Western Allies. The London Economist apparently believes that the Germans will consent to play the role of European Gurkhas. On the other hand, the President of the Bonn Government, Mr. Heuss, told newsmen "Frankly, I cannot see the people's police waging a Socialist Unity Party crusade to conquer and subdue democratic west Germany, just as I cannot see the west fighting the men from the Soviet zone. This would not be the German way of handling internal political matters."

The London Economist should ponder the words of Herr Heuss. And while it does so, it should recollect the fateful September days of 1940 when Goering's Luftwaffe poured tons of bombs on London. Indeed, the Germans will not accept an inferior position. They regard the creation of a German army as an internal political matter, for such an army must first and only be at the service of the Germans.

What does this all mean? First, let it be said that our society is dedicated to the prevention of a new holocaust. It does not believe that war is inevitable. Yet the Germans have been able to extract concession after concession on the assumption of the inevitability of a new war. It is therefore understandable that the Germans should have a vested interest in keeping the pot boiling.

Only by maintaining a war-charged atmosphere can the German plan for resurgence succeed. There are people who believe it far more practical to allow the Germans rather than Americans to do the fighting and the dying in a new war. But is it not far more prudent to put an end to German intrigue which thrives on the mounting tensions and cultivates the propaganda of the inevitability of a new war between east and west?

If the Germans were deprived of their ability to pit east against west as they are succeeding in doing today, then the inevitability thesis would not be as plausible as it seems. The German strategy can be checked by an honest and determined effort on the part of the four occupying powers to neutralize Germany. Our concept of neutralization calls for a four power agreement to deprive Germany of those instruments of economic, political, and military power which have enabled her to blackmail east and west. (As can be seen, our concept of neutralization has nothing in common with similar projects advocated by the so-called Nauheimer circle of Prof. Ulrich Noack, whose background we have on various occasions exposed in these pages.)

The American Friends Service Committee prepared a report last summer in which it discussed ways and means of reducing tensions between Russia and the west and thereby decreasing the chances of a new war. It, too, advocated the neutralization of Germany "for the United States and the Soviet Union to continue the competition for Germany will almost certainly lead to disaster."

It is encouraging to note that responsible groups dedicated to the brotherhood of man are aware of the fundamental importance of Germany with regard to the future peace and security of the world. We have said this on frequent occasions: "For so long as Germany remains a potential asset to one or more of the Allied Nations she will be used for ulterior, selfish, political, military, and economic purposes. And so long will the world remain insecure. So long as Germany is available for one of these marriages, she will be in a good position to recapture her military strength. Only when we have conclusive proof, supported by acts, that the big powers will not establish any liaison with Germany to use her as an eventual ally in any extra national activity, will there be a reasonable chance of destroying mutual suspicions and of establishing a genuine world collaboration for peace."

This statement was published in our magazine, Prevent World War III, in April 1948, long before there was any apparent sign that the Germans were climbing back to positions whence they could enthrall the world in a new war.

We refused to live in Mr. Chamberlain's dream world of the 1930's, because we were already aware of the violation of common agreements made by the Allies to eliminate Germany's war potential. Thus all the talk and noise today about new German armies in the east and in the west is not surprising to us.

It must be said that German armies will inevitably be created again if the present policies which are repeating the same blunders made by the Allies after World War I, are continued.

The neutralization of Germany can be a major step toward the prevention of new conflicts. Such a neutralization requires the following steps:

A. The establishment of a four-power disarmament committee to prevent the remilitarization of any of the zones in Germany.

B. Four-power agreement to hold the level of German steel production to peacetime needs—not exceeding present permitted levels.

C. Prompt fulfillment of the original reparations program under four-power control.

D. Four-power agreement on the elimination from key positions of former Nazis and Hitler supporters.

E. Four-power action to break up the German cartel empire.

F. Genuine international control of the Ruhr to prevent the reestablishment of German economic domination of her neighbors, and, at the same time, give Germany a viable economy for peace.

The carrying out of these measures and subsidiary steps would take Germany out of the international arena as a major bone of contention between east and west.

The hour is late, but it is up to us, the living, to make our final decision. We must bear in mind that a German army is inevitable if the people consent to policies which preserve a dangerous war potential in her heavy industries. It would be wishful thinking to believe that the creation of German armies, east or west, would be a boon to either side or to mankind in general.

President Heuss has told the truth: An east German army will not fight a west German army or vice versa. They will unite and when they unite, the betrayal of the peace and the security of the United States and her friends abroad will be complete.

Does the Republican Party Want the Negro Vote?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been an increasing attempt by the Republican Party to avoid the blame for the failure of Congress to pass FEPC legislation.

With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from a singularly clear explanation of Republican political strategy. It is an article by Arnold Aronson and Samuel Spiegler published in the Crisis, official magazine of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

It points out that the Republican Party has been responsible for every major defeat of civil-rights legislation in the last year. Beginning with the fact that President Truman campaigned courageously on the civil-rights issue while Dewey was silent, these writers find the Republican Party record consistently against civil rights.

They cite the revealing fact that in last year's civil-rights filibuster fight five of the Republicans' nine-member Senate judicary committee voted with the Dixiecrats.

They quoted Mary McLeod Bethune, famed educator, as remarking on that same fight closed by the anodynic Wherry resolution:

> The loss of the battle, while disappointing in itself, was not so piercing a blow as the way the Republicans appear to have insulted our intelligence.

These writers recite the same stories in California, Ohio, Illinois, and Pennsylvania Legislatures where Democrats went down the line for FEPC, but Republicans used parliamentary jockeying and direct votes against the measure when necessary to prevent enactment into law.

DOES THE REPUBLICAN PARTY WANT THE NEGRO VOTE?

(By Arnold Aronson and Bernard Spiegel)

Once again a congressional session has come to a close without enacting any civil-rights measure. FEPC was fought through committee in both Houses in the last session and is on the calendar in both the Senate and the House of Representatives ready for floor action when Congress reconvenes in January. Thus, while poll tax, antilynch, antisegregation, Army Jim Crow, and other civil-rights bills rest in committee pigeonholes, the most important of all civil-rights measures is in a position to be taken up forthwith when the legislators resume their seats.

There is no doubt about the crucial character of FEPC in the whole civil-rights struggle. It is this measure to which virtually every Negro assigns first priority. As one Negro spokesman has put it, FEPC means bread and butter, rent and fuel, shoes for the baby, and clothing for millions of colored people. Moreover, not only Negroes, but Jews and other minority groups, religious and labor organizations, and liberal bodies of all sorts, have called for enactment of FEPC as the real test of congressional sincerity on civil rights.

Next year, 1950, is an election year. One-third of the Senate and the entire House of Representatives goes before the electorate. Not only will the strategy of the major parties in dealing with FEPC quickly reveal where they really stand on civil rights when the chips are down, but the way Senators and Representatives vote in crucial tests on this issue may determine how they, and their parties, will fare at the polls in 1950 and 1952.

* * * * *

Traditionally the Negro tend to be a Republican. Until 1932, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt swept the country, including the Negroes, into the Democratic fold, the Republican Party, the party of Abraham Lincoln, the adversary of southern white oppression, commanded the Negro's support. Since that time, the Negro vote in every national election has gone Democratic. Only Wendell Willkie, with his unequivocal stand against racial discrimination, recaptured any significant part of this vote.

* * * * *

Republican strategy has seemed to many Negroes deliberately designed to alienate rather than to attract their support. During the Presidential campaign, Dewey made no move to exploit his excellent record on civil rights as Governor of New York. At no time did he or any of his major supporters make any reference to the pioneer laws against employment discrimination or discrimination in educational institutions which New York State had adopted during his administration. While Truman made capital of his civil-rights proposals, Dewey kept silent about his civil-rights accomplishments. While Truman made a major campaign speech in Harlem, New York's Negro Metropolis—the first Presidential candidate ever to do so—Dewey, Taft, Stassen, and other Republican bigwigs campaigned in the solid South. While Truman defied and denounced the Dixiecrats, Republican spokesmen all but openly invited the dissident Southern Democrats into the Republican Party. While the Republican platform pledges on civil rights in 1948 represented a retreat from the position taken by the party in 1944, the Democratic civil-rights plank was the most far reaching ever to be adopted by a national party convention.

While Congressman DAWSON of Illinois was named assistant to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee and secretary of the Democratic Congressional Committee the Republicans failed to give any Negro a position of prominence or importance in the party organization.

NEGRO REPUBLICANS DISMAYED

Influential Negro Republicans were confounded and dismayed. The Republican American Committee, comprising Republican Negro leadership in 38 States, as early as August 1947 felt impelled to warn the party leadership of the dangers which lie ahead if it continues its policy of inaction in respect to these issues (i. e., civil rights). Negro leaders both inside and outside the party became steadily more and more convinced that they were being offered lip-service and political double-talk.

One of them, a life-long Republican, said:

"In 1944 our party pledged itself to the enactment of FEPC. In 1946 it had the opportunity to make good on that promise. It did not do so. You cannot say it failed. The plain, and, regrettable truth is that it did not try."

A writer in the Republican, the national party magazine, for October 1947, took up the warning. Apparently addressing the white leadership, he wrote:

"If the Republicans don't wake up to the factor behind the Negro vote, it will soon be too late. * * * If the shoe were on the other foot and you were the Negro seeking political affiliations, would you be honest in considering the Republican Party as your party today? Wouldn't you demand better treatment and more recognition from the Republican Party than you, as a Negro, have been receiving?"

VOTE WRITTEN OFF

This cursory review of Republican campaign behavior suggests that the party leadership may have decided, quite deliberately and as a matter of long-range political policy, to write off the Negro vote. If such is the case, the decision must have been taken with a view to attracting some larger or at least off-setting advantage. What might have been?

Perhaps Senator TAFT offered a clew in his speech at Nashville, Tenn., when he told a southern States' rights audience, "There is a basic agreement between the southern Democrats and the Republican Party." It is not necessary to interpret this as a reference to a deal in order to support the conjecture that the Republican Party may have been making a genuine bid for a basic realinement of political forces. The endorsement of Dewey and Warren by Jesse Jones, of Texas, Secretary of Commerce in the Roosevelt administration, and the apparent willingness of the Byrd machine to see the Virginia electoral votes go Republican lend credence to this conjecture. Also supporting such speculation is TAFT's prediction that the Republicans might carry Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Georgia. Most of the Republican votes in those States, he said, would come from conservative Democrats.

After all, a Republican victory was expected by virtually everyone. The Republicans may have been convinced that they did not need the Negro vote to win, and that the occasion was ripe for breaking the solid South once and for all. If this was, indeed, their objective, the prize was a tremendous one; perhaps tempting enough to induce the Republicans to gamble the election on it.

Having lost the election, and having failed to win any southern electoral votes, the Republicans might have been expected to seek to regain some of the Negro vote which had been such a major factor in their defeat.

REPUBLICAN BEHAVIOR

Does their behavior in the present Congress suggest any such basic change in strategy on their part?

Following the defeat of the antipoll-tax bill by a filibuster during the special session of Congress in the summer of 1948, Republican leaders pledged a change in the Senate rules governing cloture as the first order of business in what they confidently expected would be a Republican-controlled Eighty-first Congress.

Rule XXII of the Senate, the point at issue, was adopted in 1917 to "terminate successful filibustering." It provided that debate on a "pending measure" would be brought to a close by a favorable vote of two-thirds of those Senators present and voting. However, the rule proved largely ineffective. Only four times in the 32 years during which it was in force had cloture been invoked successfully—and never on a civil-rights bill. Despite repeated passage of civil-rights measures by the House they were always filibustered to death in the Senate; and all efforts to invoke cloture failed for want of the necessary two-thirds majority. It was abundantly clear, therefore, that a more liberal cloture rule, which would permit limitation on debate by something less than two-thirds of those present and voting, was basic to the enactment of civil-rights legislation.

* * * * *

CRUCIAL TEST

The crucial test came on a ruling by Vice President BARKLEY which in substance declared that rule XXII applied to any business before the Senate whether technically a motion or a measure. Had this interpretation been upheld the filibuster on Senator LUCAS' motion to take up the cloture change would have been brought to a close and the Senate enabled to debate the issue itself. A reversal of the Vice President's ruling left the road open for endless filibustering subject only to the limitations of lung power. By a vote of 46 to 41 the Senate overruled the Vice President. A shift of but three votes would have changed the result.

The 46 Senators who voted to override Mr. BARKLEY were divided equally among Democrats and Republicans. Of the 23 Democratic Senators who voted against the Vice President's ruling, 18 were from the South; the remaining 5 from the border States of Arizona, Oklahoma, Kentucky, and Nevada. Southern opposition to any anti-filibuster resolution was to be expected, however. It was much more difficult for Republican leaders to square the 23 negative Republican votes with the party's professed zeal for civil rights legislation, and it was probably not pure coincidence that a majority of the 23 were from such States as the Dakotas, Maine, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin, States where there is no appreciable Negro vote. The top-level character of the

Republican back-turning on its civil rights platform pledges may be gleaned from the fact that 8 of the GOP's 9-man policy committee voted with the southern Democrats as did 15 of the very Republican Senators who originally had challenged Senator LUCAS to take up the cloture rule.

The same coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats then pushed through a new cloture rule bearing the name of Republican floor leader KENNETH WHERRY and the blessing of Dixiecrat strategist, Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia. The new rule extends the application of cloture to any "measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate," and to that extent is an improvement on the BRIT rule. More fundamentally, however, instead of lowering the hitherto unattainable two-thirds present and voting requirement, the Wherry substitute upped the number necessary for cloture to two-thirds of the entire Senate; that is, to 64 votes. In addition, any future attempt to liberalize the rule is specifically excepted from any limitation on debate. This 64-vote requirement for cloture has, perhaps, scuttled civil-rights legislation for many years to come.

NEGRO REACTION

Negro reaction was immediate and violent. The NAACP called the Republican role in the Senate rules makeover a sell-out. In a special message to its branches throughout the country, the association adjured its members "to fix firmly in your minds for 1950, and following election years, the names of those who tried to stop the clock so far as civil rights are concerned."

The chairman of the politically important Negro Republican American Committee in a letter to WAYNE MORSE expressed his heartfelt thanks for the Oregon Republican's speech against the transparent sham of the Wherry compromise. The writer of the letter, remarking that he had "been a delegate to as many Republican national conventions as any man alive today," called the debate on the rules change a cream puff farce, and the amendment "an absolute and complete surrender to the ideas and policies of the Ku Klux Klan. The defeats of 1921, 1936, 1940, 1944, and 1948," he wrote, "have not taught the Republican leadership anything about the wishes, hopes, and aspirations of colored Republicans to become full-fledged citizens of this great America."

Efforts of Republican leaders to justify the Wherry resolution on the ground that it closes the loopholes in the old rule have therefore merely aggravated the resentment of Negro voters. As famed educator Mary McLeod Bethune put it: "The loss of the battle while disappointing in itself was not so piercing a blow as the way the Republicans appear to have insulted our intelligence."

This recital scarcely supports the conjecture that the Republican strategy was designed to appeal to the Negro voter. What might its objective have been? Some observers have suggested that it was the achievement of the same practical result through coalition with the southern Democrats which had been denied the Republicans in the election, namely, control of Congress. If this was so the Republican strategy, it must be conceded, paid off. But much has been done by the present Congress over Republican opposition.

It is possible thus to explain Republican congressional tactics. But it is not possible on the same grounds to explain the actions of Republicans in state legislatures during the sessions just ended. In the States there are no southern Democratic blocs with which to seek coalitions, and there are no bases for fundamental reorganizations of party lines. Yet in legislature after legislature, Republicans have voted against bills which had been given the highest priority by Negro citizens.

Let us look first at the Republican record in the three key States of California, Illinois, and Ohio, where, as we have seen, the Negro vote may well have determined the outcome of the last presidential election.

In California, where the Republicans will be contesting in 1950 for the United States Senate seat now held by Democrat SHERIDAN DOWNEY, Governor Warren's administration has a moderate but firm majority in both houses of the State legislature. Democratic sponsors fought desperately to get an FEPC bill through the Assembly, California's lower chamber. The bill would have created a State commission modeled closely on New York's successful State commission against discrimination. It was voted on unfavorably in a Republican-dominated committee, the vote being 11 to 8 on straight party lines. However, three record votes on the measure were forced on the floor.

A motion to discharge the bill from committee first carried 41-34; but the Republican leadership swung into action, and a few days later the body voted 49 to 28 to reverse itself. The bill's sponsor charged that the Republican speaker of the assembly had threatened committee chairmen with loss of their jobs if they did not vote for the reversal. Four committee chairmen did in fact change their votes, and a fifth absented himself from voting. A further and final attempt to get the bill out of committee was defeated 35 to 31. An analysis of the voting reveals that only one of the 35 Democrats in the assembly voted against FEPC on all three tests; whereas 28 of the 45 Republicans did so.

Illinois, for the first time in many years, emerged from the 1948 election with a Democratic Governor, Adlai Stevenson, and a lower legislative house under Democratic control. In the senate the Republicans retained an almost two to one majority. The United States Senate seat, now occupied by majority leader SCOTT W. LUCAS, will be in contest in 1950, and a Republican victory would represent a major set-back for the Truman administration.

With both party platforms pledging enactment of FEPC, passage of a fair employment act in Illinois seemed almost assured. But the succession of events paralleled that in California. The Democratic-controlled house passed a bipartisan FEPC bill sponsored by no less than 57 members, by a vote of 81 to 33. Sixty-nine Democrats and only 12 Republicans voted for it; 40 Republicans and but 3 Democrats opposed it.

But it was in the senate that the crucial test came. Here the 32 Republicans comprise a clear majority of the 50 members. The Democrats lined up early in support of the measure; by early June, 16 of the 18 Democratic senators were committed to vote for it. Although the Republican caucus publicly announced that it was taking no party position on the issue, it was reported that a secret caucus committed the Republican members to oppose the measure. Whether this is true or not, the Republican leadership, in debate, did demand that Republican senators vote against the bill as a matter of party regularity. One Republican stated on the floor, in explaining why he was voting against the bill, that he was doing so against his convictions; that not only had political and economic pressures been applied to him, but his wife and his children had been threatened with social ostracism if he supported the measure.

FORMY NEGRO VOTE

* * * * *

On the final test, FEPC lost, 26-23. Twenty-four of the 25 adverse votes were cast by Republicans. Only 7 Republicans joined 16 Democrats in support of the legislation.

Although the final vote was three short of the necessary constitutional majority, actually the bill would have passed had one more Republican been for it. The lone Democrat who voted against the measure, and one Republican answered "no" only when and because it was evident that enough votes could not be mustered for enactment. Had one more Republican came forward and committed himself to vote for FEPC before the roll call, Illinois would today be among the States which have prohibited discrimination in employment because of race, color, or creed.

* * * * *

OHIO STORY

The story was the same in Ohio. Senator TAFT's present term expires in 1951, and it is generally agreed that, with labor grimly determined to accomplish his political demise, and liberal sentiment generally opposed to him, he will face the toughest campaign of his long career in 1950. The Republicans slipped badly in 1947 in Ohio. The State legislature went Democratic for the first time in history, but by a small majority, so that the Republicans held the balance of power on many controversial issues. In the circumstances, one might expect the Republicans to be even more than ordinarily solicitous of the interests of so influential a group of voters as the Negroes.

The Republican State platform in 1948 had promised to enact an FEPC law, and early in the session a bipartisan bill was introduced. But Republicans promptly introduced a substitute bill, establishing a purely educational commission, generally considered worthless by FEPC advocates. This was defeated in the house by one vote, 67 to 66. The support for this measure was unanimously almost wholly Republican, the opposition almost wholly Democratic. The house then passed, 70 to 61, the original, effective bill, 62 Democrats and only 8 Republicans comprising the majority, with 55 Republicans and 6 Democrats opposing.

The senate, however, by a vote of 17 to 15, passed the same ineffective bill which the house had rejected. The vote in the senate on this measure was crucial. Favoring the innocuous bill were 13 Republicans and 4 Democrats. The 15 votes in opposition were solidly Democratic. If a single Republican had voted against the measure it would have been defeated. Friends of FEPC exerted every form of persuasion to obtain that critically needed Republican vote. George Bender, chairman of the Cuyahoga County Republican Committee, warned Republican legislators: "Our party's platform pledge will be a crucial issue in our 1950 campaign," he telegraphed. "The political implications of this question may be of decisive importance in determining the outcome of these elections." TAFT was importuned to use his influence, but to no avail.

A conference committee of senate and house which was appointed to iron out differences between the strong house measure and the weak senate bill agreed upon a compromise. The Republican Cleveland News said editorially that this seemed "fair and cautious." It urged its adoption, resting its advice, it stated, on political considerations: "We want to see Republicans get credit among the sympathy groups in the large Ohio cities so that more or less dissident groups can be wooed to the Republican cause in the 1950 and 1952 elections." But even this compromise was rejected by the senate, 17 to 15. Not a single Republican voted in favor of the conference report.

MICHIGAN SHORT

Other case histories could be recounted. They would all fall into the same pattern. Take Michigan for example. A Democrat introduced a bill for an effective FEPC. Bipartisan sponsorship was sought but rejected by Republicans. The bill was bottled up in

committee. An alternative bill was introduced under Republican sponsorship late in the session. This tacked features which FEPC advocates considered essential. Amendments to strengthen it were added in committee, and Democratic members of the legislature announced that they would support this measure as amended, even though it was known by the names of its Republican sponsors. The committee failed to report it out. A motion to discharge the committee from further consideration, which would have had the effect of bringing the bill to the floor of the House, was defeated by a straight party vote: 87 Republicans voting no, 33 Democrats voting yes.

PENNSYLVANIA

Somewhat more labyrinthine is the history of FEPC talent in Pennsylvania. Several bills were introduced by Republicans in both senate and house. Pledged to enactment of fair employment practices legislation, Governor Duff publicly declared that the Republican Party had an unmistakable obligation to pass an FEPC act. One bill, specifically supported by the Governor, became known as an administration measure. The Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association opposed the bill. Its president, Republican National Committeeman G. Mason Owlett, after an interview with the Governor, told newspaper reporters that the Pennsylvania Republican Party was united (despite to the deep differences between the Governor and the Grundy-Owlett machine), that the administration's legislative program would go through, but that passage of FEPC seemed unlikely. Both senate and house committees kept FEPC bills bottled up. In an effort to obscure responsibility for the action, the senate committee on judiciary finally voted by secret ballot to kill FEPC. A Democratic motion to discharge the bill from a house committee lost, 107 to 89, every Democrat in the house and one sole Republican voted for discharge. An effort to discharge a senate committee met a similar fate, the motion losing 35 to 15 on a straight party vote. An example of newspaper comment was a front-page Philadelphia Inquirer article headlined, "Death of FEPC looms as big '50 issue.'"

At a meeting of the executive committee of the State council for a Pennsylvania FEPC, coordinating body for groups backing the legislation, following defeat of the bill, it was recommended that FEPC should be exploited as a political issue by using education to induce voters to change their political affiliations, if necessary, especially in areas where the Republican representatives were against FEPC.

In Minnesota, Republican Governor Youngdahl's efforts to redeem his campaign pledges by getting an FEPC bill through the legislature were thwarted by members of his own party. In Colorado, FEPC passed the Democratic-controlled house, the Republican-dominated senate passed an emasculated measure and blocked all efforts at compromise on an acceptable bill. In Indiana, young Philip Willkie, son of the late Wendell Willkie, was the only Republican member of the assembly to vote for FEPC.

* * * * *

In the Northern States, FEPC has become a touchstone not only for Negro voters, but for large blocs of others as well—church bodies, labor groups, members of non-Negro minority groups, and great numbers of independent voters who merely want to see legislation enacted against racial repression and discrimination.

On the evidence of the past year, the Republican Party, by seeming design, appears to have cut itself off from any reasonable hope of support by precisely that crucially pivotal segment of the electorate which it once could rely upon, whose defection played a major role in costing the Republican Party the last national election, and which now appears alienated beyond any possibility of reconciliation short of a drastic turn-about in the Republican approach to civil rights. Republican performance on FEPC in the coming session of Congress will provide the test.

Address by Hon. William Benton, of Connecticut, Before Connecticut Editorial Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] before the Connecticut Editorial Association, at Waterbury, Conn., on February 4, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I shall start with a confession. I admit frankly that I am a rarity in gatherings such as this—a man who doesn't claim that he used to be a newspaperman himself.

I am sorry about it, too; I wish I had been one—note that past tense—because I suspect I might be a better Senator if I had been a newspaperman. I've always had a special weakness for newspaper people, in part because they've enjoyed one of the few types of experience in the field of human communications that I admit I have missed.

I've spent all of my adult life in the field of communications. I started in it—as I suspect many of you did—because somebody once told me I could write.

For example, I have been in every branch of broadcasting except television: In commercial broadcasting, in boiler-plate broadcasting, in educational broadcasting, in international short-wave broadcasting. I spent half of my time or more for 9 years in university work—in education—surely the most serious of all forms of communication. I have published books. I have produced classroom motion pictures and now I find that part of my job is this lower (or perhaps even lowest) form of communication—making speeches.

The moral from the foregoing may be the danger of telling a young man he can write.

The conclusion I draw, however, is that a principal motif of my existence is this: My deep belief that human communication is the most important—potentially the noblest—certainly the most characteristically human—of all human activities and pursuits.

Let me assert this as dramatically as I can. I do not believe that communism as such, or the USSR as such, or the Red Army as such constitute public danger No. 1. I do not believe that the atomb bomb, or even the hydrogen bomb when the Russians learn how to make it—is public danger No. 2. I do not believe that any of the familiar dangers, such as depression and disease, can compete for the No. 3 position. Public enemies Nos. 1, 2, and 3 are ignorance, the willful effort anywhere in the world to preserve ignorance, and the fear and suspicion and hatred that ignorance engenders.

Ignorance cannot be cured except through communication. Surely the hydrogen bomb is no cure. And if I can, as a United States Senator, advance the cause of better human communication, even in the smallest degree, I shall count myself a success. Parenthetically—I shall be a greater success if I can also help advance the cause of communication in Connecticut.

There are two sides of the problem of communication. They are equally important; one I shall call a negative side, and the other positive. The first is merely the freedom to communicate—which means simply that no one may dictate to you what you can or cannot say. This is indeed a negative freedom. It forbids interference with an inalienable right. You will find me an ardent champion of this freedom. You will find me fighting all man-made barriers against this freedom. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of information in any medium—these are the beginning and the foundation of good human communications. They are the father and the protector of all other freedoms, and of all human rights.

The other side of human communications, the positive side, is the substance of what is communicated—the copy, if you will. It is the use we make of our freedom of speech. It is the integrity of the information that flows among men. It is its constructive quality. About this positive side I am also deeply concerned. On this, we have a very great deal to learn. Perhaps you will agree with me that even newspaper publishers and editors have a very great deal to learn about improving the quality of the information which flows among men.

No country in the world has a press more free than ours. The first amendment to our Constitution is a classical—and classically brief—guaranty: "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press." The amendment was born out of a long history of attempts by strong rulers to interfere with the press; and indeed you will find that the only successful bills of rights in past centuries have been cast in this negative form—as curbs on tyrants or strong governments. Our newspapers are properly vigilant to every threat against freedom of speech and the press, however minor.

Our first amendment was drafted on the solid premise that out of the free conflict of fact and opinion the truth would emerge; and on the hope that out of this competition would emerge not only diversity but adequacy—and an ever-increasing quality and responsibility in the press. This hope needs constant rekindling.

As far as the press is concerned, one present ground for concern is the decline in the number of American newspapers, and the tendency toward standardization of content and centralization of control. This applies to the weekly field, as we know, as well as to the great urban centers. The New Yorker magazine made the appropriate comment on the recent death of the New York Sun. It mourned the passing of the Sun not because of any special attachment to the Sun, or out of nostalgia for its colorful past, but because one more newspaper had disappeared.

No one knows better than you men here who are editing and publishing Connecticut's home-town weeklies the struggle involved in putting out a paper which is both independent and profitable.

It is not enough just to be free. You must be able also to exercise that freedom.

The small weekly—the small, independent weekly—is as traditional to our New England way of life as the village green. And as our village greens are being carved away by bus terminals and superhighways—so the spark and spirit of our community newspapers are also threatened by boiler plate and chain operation.

We cannot afford this kind of progress, any more than we can afford to trade our conscience for vitamin pills.

But what I want to stress in the balance of this talk is not the problem of our Connecticut press or even our domestic American press. I want to direct your thought today toward the international flow of information—between peoples everywhere throughout the world. This is a field in which I have really had intensive experience, perhaps more of it than anybody here today. And let me assert my position as dramatically as I can.

If we could achieve international freedom of information, and extend it to all the peoples of the world—and this would indeed be a colossal achievement—and if we could find means positively to stimulate the integrity, the responsibility, and the constructive quality of this freely flowing information—then we would, in my judgment, reduce the danger of war by a factor of 90 percent. Is that a goal worth pursuing or isn't it? Is there any other such goal—anywhere in the world today? This goal, my friends, holds the real answer to the hydrogen bomb. It is the only real answer.

Now what progress are we making toward this goal?

The hard fact is that, on a world-wide basis, freedom of the press and freedom of communication are in worse shape today than they have been for decades. Four years ago International News Service made a study which showed that more than half of the member states of the United Nations practiced some form of censorship. Last month the Associated Press in its semiannual survey on the subject reported that the world situation on press freedom has declined still further. Mr. Robert Brown, of Editor and Publisher, wrote me 2 weeks ago that progress has been backward instead of forward. "Around the world," he wrote, "more barriers to freedom have been set up in the last year, and none have been torn down."

Now if I thought this were an irreversible trend then I should indeed despair. We cannot despair. We must not concede that this trend is irreversible. The instinct for freedom—including freedom to communicate—is one of the deepest of all human drives. It is only in the last two or three centuries that men of the western world have learned how to build freedom of communication into their political and economic institutions; but the lesson has been deeply learned. The fact that there has been retrogression and reaction in major areas of the world in the past 30 years does not prove that the great historical movement toward freedom has been permanently reversed. The task of statesmanship is now to restore that great movement before the reaction causes a cataclysm.

I had the privilege, 2 years ago, of serving as chairman of the United States delegation to the United Nations conference on freedom of the press at Geneva, Switzerland. It was the first international conference of its kind. Every one of the 54 nations present professed its devotion to the free-press ideal. So powerful is this ideal that even the Russians pay lip service to it. But the Communist version of a free press, is, in effect, a press free to advance the truth as laid down by the Kremlin. It is a press free from what the Kremlin regards as error. It is a press free to say that war is peace, slavery is freedom, depression is prosperity—and black is white.

I went to Geneva fully realizing that there is no hope at the present time of converting the Russians to real freedom of the press and determined that the United States would not compromise on the basic principle. Our strategy was to rally the forces of freedom, and to strengthen the will of the waverers. The measure of our immediate success was that on almost all important issues the Russians and their satellites found themselves voting as a lonely bloc of six.

The United States delegation brought to Geneva a draft convention which proposed, for the first time, to give the protection of international law to the free movement of foreign correspondents, and to the movement of their copy, with military secrets the only legitimate subject for censorship. After we had staved off a number of dangerous proposed amendments, this convention was finally approved by the Geneva conference, with only the Soviet bloc in opposition. Since the conference, this convention has run the gantlet of the Economic and Social Council and the United Nations General Assembly. It is now scheduled to be opened for signatures this coming autumn. It has been somewhat weakened in the gantlet process but in my judgment it still represents—without compromise on principles—a major advance for the cause of world-wide freedom of information.

I have been disappointed that this convention has been subjected to so little analysis in the United States newspapers. Our newspapermen are usually ready to editorialize on the subject of a free press and I can only conclude that they are discouraged at the tedious pace of international agreement, and at the fact that a proposition which seems so self-evident to us should require so much debate. (Let me give you, parenthetically, just one example of why the danger of censorship over the press is not always self-evident to others. (The Indian spokesman at Geneva illustrated the need for press "censorship" by stating that a single false rumor appearing in a Hindu or Pakistani newspaper at that time of tension might have ignited riots, before the rumor could be corrected, that would cost thousands of lives.)

The point I am trying to make here is that we must keep everlastingly at the job of freedom—internationally as well as domestically. If I am right that freedom of information at the international level is necessary for peace, then the lives of all of us are at stake—in keeping everlastingly at it.

The most important development now to watch is the action to be taken on article 19 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, as approved by the United Nations General Assembly 14 months ago. It could scarcely be more sweeping: "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion without interference and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers." I invite you to watch the efforts of the Commission on Human Rights over the coming months to translate this article 19 into a legally binding treaty, applicable to every citizen of every nation that signs it. This is important to the United States press as it is to every United States citizen.

The objective of this treaty is to tear down the man-made barrier to international freedom of information. The theme of the treaty is the negative theme of no interference. The first task is to work incessantly to lower the political barriers represented by censorship. The second is the reproduction of other types of obstacles to the free flow of information—chiefly economic—for example the shortage of newsprint and modern communication equipment in many parts of the world. You can't use radio without microphones or a printing press without paper.

Now what about the positive side of the freedom of information issue? Let me begin by citing China as an example.

Chiang's army in 1945 was stronger than the Communist army. The Russian army was not involved. But Chiang could not produce or project a program that appealed to the masses of the Chinese people, and the Communists, with incessant and skilful propaganda, could and did.

I listened to General Marshall speak at the Press Club in Washington when he was back from his mission to China in 1946. He spoke off the record, but since he spoke to 500 newspapermen, perhaps I can paraphrase a few sentences.

General Marshall described the great problem of communication in China. He couldn't get around fast enough. He couldn't communicate with the various conflicting groups and their constituencies. They couldn't communicate with each other. He called for the use of radio and the motion picture on a scale hitherto undreamed of.

The implication of his remarks seemed clear to me then and now, though nothing was done about them or has been done. The Marshall plan in the field of ideas still awaits development and leadership.

With adequate communication, the history of General Marshall's mission to China could be a very different one. The history of China could be very different. I shall go further. It would be very different. How important would that be to us? How much might it be worth to us in cash? We shipped billions of dollars in arms to China and vast quantities are now in the hands of the very Communists for whose destruction they were given. Would we not have been wise to have invested a few tens of millions in radio broadcasting and in motion pictures? I omit newspapers, not only because General Marshall omitted them but because, as I once said in a congressional hearing, if you pasted the Associated Press dispatches on every tree in China this could not be wholly effective because 80 percent of the Chinese can't read and far more than 80 percent in some areas. The impact of these on the minds of the Chinese could be of benefit to us still—even though the Communists are in power. The impact could change the history of China in the future, even if this Communist wave could not have been turned in the past. Here is an investment in peace and our security which is still largely neglected by our media of communications in the United States and by our political leaders.

The inventions of this century in the field of communications are as outstanding technically as those in any other field of human activity. They are potentially far more important to the future of mankind than any others. I contend they are far more important to the future of mankind than any others. I contend they are far more important to our future than the development of atomic power. They, too, are a matter of life and death. No other problem rivals the enormity of the international misunderstanding we now face.

We are not yet using the radio and the motion picture and the printing press in the international field. Their impact today, in our interests, is that of a midget. They have the potential strength of a giant. Let us give them a chance. They are our best chance. Fortunately, we now have two new agencies which can stimulate their constructive use. One is the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, which has not yet begun even to realize its own potential. It needs real support and nourishment from our national leaders. This it has not yet received.

The second is the program of our State Department in international information and educational exchange. For 2 years in the State Department I read daily reports of the distortion of American life and American policy presented to foreign peoples, and saw their effects on our international relations. Much of this distortion was traceable to Communist propaganda. Make no mistake, the Communists are professionals. We are in comparison amateurs. They are skilful, determined, and successful. The Red Army is merely a reserve force; the front line troops are propagandists and political agitators.

We cannot and should not copy tactics. But we must tell our story straight, and see that the story of the free world is told straight. In many areas, and in some media, our private agencies cannot operate profitably across the globe.

The United States Advisory Commission on Information, headed by Mark Ethridge, has just issued its semiannual report to Congress. This report criticizes the State Department and the Budget Bureau for slashing the program of the Department's overseas information division. We are spending on this program today less than the Procter & Gamble Co. spends in advertising its soaps. At the same time we are spending twenty billions a year for defense, including the foreign-aid programs. Much of this twenty billions is indirectly psychological in purpose—to deter aggression, and in the belief that hungry and hopeless people are easy victims of Communist propaganda.

I propose now that we start at once to spend 1 percent of these twenty billions for programs that have a direct and constructive psychological impact on world opinion and world peace. Specifically, let us begin, immediately, to plan for a true world radio network, capable of laying a signal into every radio receiver in the world, even if it costs as much to build and operate as the battleship Missouri, including hauling it off the shoals of the Chesapeake. The American people are prepared and ready for such a program. They want to hear it discussed. They want to read about it. They fix their eyes on Washington seeking leadership. Senator McMahon won a warm response, as you may have noticed if you read the right papers, for his efforts along this line in his eloquent speech on the floor of the Senate on Tuesday.

Now my talk today may seem remote from the problems of a Connecticut daily or a Connecticut weekly. I hope it does not for I believe me it is not. The world would be a far happier place if we could lay a copy of a good Connecticut paper, or its counterpart, regularly on every doorstep in the world. They are editorially free papers, and what we seek is freedom. They build the sense of community, and I do not see how a better world order can develop without a growing sense of world community.

It is to this task, building a world community of free men, that freedom's past inspires us. It is to this task that freedom's future calls free men everywhere in the world today.

Career of Fulton Lewis, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the New York Post performed a valuable service to the American people a few weeks ago when it published a series of articles by its Washington correspondent, Mr. Charles Van Devander, analyzing the career of Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr.

It is because I share many of the conclusions arrived at by Mr. Van Devander and because I consider the articles to be a public service that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first two installments in the series appearing in the New York Post for December 3 and 4, 1949.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be published in the RECORD as follows:

INSTALLMENT I

(By Charles Van Devander)

WASHINGTON, December 5.—Nightly at 7 o'clock, Monday through Friday, somewhere between five and ten million Americans religiously dial their radios to local stations of the Mutual Broadcasting System to have their prejudices massaged.

Last Friday, this multitude was regaled with a fresh assault on the long-dead Harry Hopkins.

Mostly, Lewis' listeners are the irreconcilables—the people who have never ceased to regard all phases of the New Deal and the Fair Deal with profound distrust and suspicion.

The high priest of this 7 p. m. radio cult is Fulton Lewis, Jr., an exuberant, robustly self-assured, full-throated broadcaster, who, under the guise of news, reports his own peculiar version of the daily Washington scene. It is a scene unrecognizable to most of the Capital's residents.

Lewis cannot be explained or understood except in conjunction with his specialized audience. Nightly he confirms and gratifies his regular listeners in their conviction that the Government is being run by fools and knaves. They, in return, provide him with a devout support which makes him a potent minority force in public affairs and, incidentally, enables him to earn about $5,000 a week as radio's golden voice of reaction.

For 12 years—right through the war no less than in times of uneasy peace—Lewis has spread the seeds of confusion, doubt, and distrust of Government over the stations of the Mutual chain.

He has assailed and misrepresented with destructive effect such vitally important national endeavors as wartime rationing, price control, the veterans' housing program, and the present work of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Government officials in charge of these programs have been singled out for personal abuse and attacks on their characters, against which his victims have no adequate defense.

His bitter and long-continued campaign of harassment against David E. Lilienthal almost certainly contributed to the final decision of the Atomic Energy Commission chairman to surrender the doubtful privilege of public office.

Others who have known the frustration that accompanies an all-out Lewis attack are Chester Bowles, Wilson Wyatt, Leland Olds, John Carson, and dozens of lesser Government officials.

His heroes make up an equally significant list. They include the Un-American Activities Committee, Senator Bridges, Republican, New Hampshire, and assorted right-wing Republicans, Senator Byrd, Democrat, Virginia, John L. Lewis, and almost anyone else who is willing to assail the motives or practices of the national administration.

Lewis' methods are unvarying. His prejudices parade usually as facts, seldom as opinion. His voice is superb. Its calculated stumbling, the deprecatory chuckle, convey an impression of sincerity. He repeatedly professes his own impartiality. A casual innocent listener, open-minded for an interpretation of the kaleidoscopic and confusing Washington scene, may be taken in for months.

Lewis' Washington, which he recreates nightly on the air, is peopled almost entirely by left-wing radicals and their well-meaning but inexperienced colleagues in Government, all pursuing crackpot or hair-brained schemes, and by Fulton Lewis and a few stalwart legislators on guard to expose them and protect the public.

Lewis is no sour-visaged, pinch-faced misanthrope, as many of his enemies assume. On the contrary, he is robust, blustery, and completely self-confident. He is blond and blue-eyed, walks with a strut, and is as positive in private conversation as he is on the air.

He strides determinedly through the welter of Washington news, contemptuously brushing aside everything which does not fit into his preconceived pattern and gleefully grabbing every scrap of news or opinion which can be made to serve his purpose.

He has been described by one biographer as being as innocent of guilt as a collie.

Lewis is a member of an old and vaguely aristocratic Washington family. He was born here April 30, 1903. He was graduated from Western High School and then attended the University of Virginia, where his academic record was less than distinguished.

In college he gave most of his interest to music and drama. He won a $25 prize for composing the Cavalier song, which is still played at Virginia football games, conducted his own orchestra, and picked up spending money by playing the organ in a movie house. His music nowadays is confined to the piano, which he is said to play somewhat better than does President Truman.

THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOUR ADVERTISERS SPONSOR HIS PROGRAM

Lewis solidified his place in Washington society in 1930 when he married Alice Huston, daughter of the then chairman of the Republican National Committee. It was a big June wedding, and President Hoover sent a gift. They now have two children, Betsy, 17, and Fulton III, 14, and live on a farm in Maryland, outside of Washington.

Lewis started work in 1924 as a cub reporter for the Washington Herald (since absorbed in the Times-Herald). From 1928 to 1937, he was a reporter in the Washington office of the Hearst news services. Meanwhile, he made a few radio broadcasts and attracted the attention of William Dolph, then owner of WOL, the Mutual station. The present 7 p. m. program was inaugurated on WOL November 27, 1937.

The Lewis program is now carried by 440 Mutual stations, although he is sponsored on only 249 of them. His 325 sponsors, who pay for an advertising spot on a single station one or more nights a week, are all local concerns in the various cities.

This multiple sponsorship makes Lewis virtually immune to the pressure of public indignation, since if one sponsor is persuaded to drop him, there are 324 left, and some other admirer may pick up the open spot.

In Washington, where the listening public has the best opportunity to recognize the distortions and falsities in his nightly program, his sponsors have tended to become discouraged rapidly in recent years.

MERCHANT SWITCHES TO ELMER DAVIS

Major Masterpieces, a Washington retail furniture store which sponsored Lewis on WOL for 5 years, dropped him after his anti-OPA campaign of 1946 and switched to Elmer Davis on another network station. Meyer Masor, the owner, told this writer that the change was made as a result of widespread protests by customers, who not illogically assumed that the store would not sponsor Lewis unless its management was sympathetic to his peculiar viewpoint.

"Elmer Davis just gives the straight facts," Masor added.

Since then Lewis has had a long succession of sponsors in the city from which he operates and with whose affairs he is chiefly concerned and at times has gone unsponsored for weeks. At present his program is sponsored here on a part-time basis by a stockbrokerage house and a motor-sales company.

Throughout the country Lewis' request and flagrant distortion of the facts has gradually built up an opposition which, while it has no ready means of expression, is as fervent and possibly as numerous as his admiring audience.

FIGHT ON CO-OPS SHOCKED FARMERS

Thousands of farmers—perhaps the most susceptible victims of Lewis' antigovernment propaganda—were shocked and disillusioned when he conducted a virulent campaign against cooperatives, to which about 5,000,000 farmers belong with satisfaction and profit.

Other thousands of essentially nonpolitical citizens who gave their time and effort to voluntary work in rationing and price control, were outraged by Lewis' barefaced misrepresentation of that endeavor, of which they had first-hand knowledge.

More recently he received the doubtful distinction of having his postwar broadcasts selected for a case study of "Irresponsibility on the Air." This study, by Giraud Chester, former assistant professor of speech at Cornell University, resulted in a scholarly and documented exposure of some of his most flagrant distortions of fact and outright misstatements. It was published in the spring, 1949, issue of Princeton University's Public Opinion Quarterly.

INSTALLMENT 2

WASHINGTON, December 6.—Among the many harassments to which a liberal-minded servant in present-day Washington may be subjected, nothing quite equals the frustration that accompanies a concentrated attack by Fulton Lewis, Jr., Mutual's 7 p. m. news commentator.

Night after night the hapless individual singled out for Lewis' attention will hear himself ridiculed and maligned over the air, his efforts misrepresented, his work hampered, his accomplishments undermined.

There is little that he can do to defend himself. Lewis usually stays just inside the laws dealing with libel and defamation of character. Even when he may have wandered outside those legal bounds, most public officials have figured they had more to lose than to gain by court action.

Several high-ranking public servants who attempted to fight back in Lewis' own medium have forced the Mutual Broadcasting System to grant them the opportunity to reply over the air. In such cases, Lewis blandly, and incorrectly, assures his audience that he has given up his time voluntarily and in the interest of fair play. And with that, he returns to the attack with even more deadly venom.

The experience of David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and one of Lewis' major targets, proved that silence under the radio broadcaster's attacks is an equally futile defense. Far from tiring of his subject, Lewis kept up a steady drumfire of misrepresentation and distortion against Lilienthal and the atomic energy program for 2 years. He was largely responsible for Senator HICKENLOOPER's charges of incredible mismanagement, which led to a formal congressional investigation of the AEC last summer. While the charges fizzled out into nothing, the investigation tied up top officials of the AEC for months.

Lewis opened up on Lilienthal immediately after President Truman nominated him for the AEC chairmanship in 1947.

He took the position that no one who had run the Tennessee Valley Authority—whether he had run it well and successfully was beside the point—should be named to head the AEC.

"The thinking behind it (TVA) is the same thinking and the same philosophy that rules the Soviet Russian Government and the economic structure," Lewis declaimed on his news program.

In a period of slightly more than 2 years, the Mutual broadcaster devoted all or part of 52 broadcasts to attacks on Lilienthal, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the witnesses, whom he pictured as running the Nation's atomic-energy program. These broadcasts were, as usual, completely one-sided. Under the thin mask of an objective Washington radio reporter, Lewis was actively creating distrust of the atomic-energy program and the men in charge of it.

His own attitude toward atomic energy and the underlying dispute over military or civilian control was revealed February 2 of this year when he suggested that it would be a good idea to say how many ready-to-drop atom bombs this country had, in order to induce what he thought might be a much more respectful attitude on the part of Soviet Russia. Lewis airily assured his listeners that this would be entirely safe since there was complete agreement that Russia did not have the secret of the atomic bomb and wouldn't have it for considerable time yet.

The implied confidence that information as the number ready-to-drop United States bombs would be gratifying to this country and terrifying to the Kremlin apparently didn't strike Lewis as incongruous with his criticisms of the inefficient AEC management.

His sporadic attack on Lilienthal turned into an incessant daily drumfire early in January 1949 when Lewis discovered that the AEC had overridden its supercautious Security Advisory Board to grant an atomic energy security clearance to Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM, then president of the University of North Carolina, and now a member of the United States Senate.

Dr. GRAHAM is a distinguished educator and scientist, and a public-spirited citizen who earlier had served on the War Labor Board. Using some of the less reliable data of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Lewis smeared him as a supporter of Communist fronts and implied that he was an outright party-liner or fellow-traveler.

To fit this incident into the pattern of his attack on Lilienthal, Lewis blurred the fact that the five members of the AEC had unanimously approved Dr. GRAHAM for access to classified and secret atomic energy data. He reported that Lilienthal had maneuvered through the Commission, the clearance for his friend and fellow left-winger, Dr. GRAHAM.

Lewis was at the height of his campaign against GRAHAM (as a means of hitting at Lilienthal) when Senator Broughton, of North Carolina died unexpectedly in March and Gov. Kerr Scott—no Communist sympathizer even by the weird standards of Fulton Lewis and the Un-American Activities Committee—appointed Dr. GRAHAM to fill the vacancy in the Senate.

With his carefully built-up case against GRAHAM and Lilienthal in dust, Lewis breezily told his somewhat shaken listeners:

"Administration Democrats persuaded the Governor to appoint Dr. GRAHAM as a means of getting Mr. David E. Lilienthal, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, off the hook. * * *"

Following this fiasco, Lewis dropped the subject of Lilienthal and the AEC for more than a month. Then, on May 10—a historic date in the Lewis saga—he was back with an even bigger sensation.

Hans Priestadt, one of hundreds of students to whom an AEC agency had granted fellowships for scientific study, had turned out to be a known and admitted Communist. Moreover, he was a student at the University of North Carolina, "the same university, ladies and gentlemen, of which Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM was until recently the president," and so on.

Apparently convinced that this time he had the AEC cold, he went through the unaccustomed procedure of telephoning that agency and actually reported, in his broadcasts, its viewpoint.

"They said," he told his radio audience that night, "that they did not go into the loyalty background of any individual until the time comes for that individual to be placed in a position in which he will have access to confidential and secret information."

PERHAPS PART OF A PLAN?

Lewis concluded:

"Now is it a fair question to ask, ladies and gentlemen, whether this could be just a matter of stupidity, or does this perhaps pass stupidity and become perhaps part of a plan? What do you think?"

When Lilienthal issued a statement on the Priestadt case, Fulton Lewis reported that "it's too long to go into details about tonight * * * (but) * * * It's as full of holes as Swiss cheese."

Hammering away nightly on the subject, Lewis said it was preposterous to be using tax money to provide a free education for Communists, whatever the purpose or ultimate objective may be—a view which would suggest the need for a loyalty check of every grammar- or high-school student.

The argument that intellectual freedom was involved, he observed, was sheer sophistry, of the first water. Don't swallow it for a single moment.

When noted scientists voluntarily came to the defense of Lilienthal and the AEC, Lewis promptly questioned their loyalty and good sense.

"It was an amazing performance," he said. "Sitting there listening to them you wondered whether you were hearing correctly. For example, one witness said that among the reasons it is dangerous for any loyalty tests to be required of scholarship students is that it is worrying to the older scientists for fear they, too, may be investigated for loyalty, can you imagine that statement?"

Not content with giving his own radio audience a completely biased and one-sided account of the alleged theft of uranium 235 from a Chicago atomic laboratory, Lewis reproved the Associated Press for sending out a clarifying statement by the AEC, "as though it (the AEC statement) was gospel fact."

On July 6, when Lilienthal testified before the congressional committee, Lewis gave less than 30 seconds (about 80 words) of his broadcast to a summary of his testimony, and then went back to the attack with this prelude: "It would seem to be a fair question to ask how that is an explanation of the lax security conditions, the squandering of untold millions of dollars unnecessarily."

The following day, he was back with this account of "the top of the news as it looks from here:"

"Mr. David E. Lilienthal, head of the Atomic Energy Commission, presented a further array of his scientists and contractors and assistants before the AEC investigating committee of Congress today in defense of his administration * * * and once again there was nothing specific in what he said; no specific explanation of the evidence against the Lilienthal administration which has been brought out to date. It was as yesterday merely a continuing series of general personal opinion on the part of the individuals who testified and after all they are unprejudiced witnesses, being part of Mr. Lilienthal's organization."

The hearing on the HICKENLOOPER charges finally petered out completely for lack of any further evidence, and Lilienthal soon afterward submitted his resignation.

Lewis asserted that this action would "leave forever moot" the question of whether the HICKENLOOPER charges had forced Lilienthal out of office.

The story ends, for the present, with one of the biggest of all Lewis whoppers.

It arose from a Presidential order to Attorney General McGrath to see that laws dealing with military security were strictly enforced. The order was occasioned by some loose-mouthed talk by Senator EDWIN JOHNSON, Democrat of Colorado, about the development of an atomic bomb 1,000 times more powerful than any so far known.

Lewis, ignorantly or deliberately confusing military security with atomic secrecy, asserted on his news program that the President's position was diametrically opposite to that of Lilienthal, when, in fact, the two were in complete agreement.

This theory was not merely in some quarters, Lewis said, "that the President made his security views known to Lilienthal some time back and Lilienthal declined to go along with them and the President gave Mr. Lilienthal the opportunity of resigning before putting them into effect."

This theory was not merely unfounded; it was so obviously false and at variance with the known facts that no capable and conscientious reporter could ever have entertained it for a moment, much less broadcast it with his approval.

Price Survey Comparison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a study made by the Bureau of Education on Fair Trade of New York, on the subject of fair-trade laws.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST COMPARISON PRICE SURVEY SHOWS FAIR-TRADE STORES FAVOR CONSUMERS—COMPREHENSIVE STUDY INDICATES RETAILER EFFICIENCY HIGHER IN FAIR-TRADE STATES THAN IN NON-FAIR-TRADE AREA

HARTFORD, CONN., February 1.—A price survey of 18 of the country's best-known nationally advertised brands of drug products reveals the American consumer pays slightly less for 12 of these products in States with fair-trade laws than in those without fair trade, and slightly more for only 6.

These findings were disclosed here today by Maurice Mermey, director of the Bureau of Education on Fair Trade for which the survey—the first of its kind—was made, in an address before the CONNECTICUT PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION at its midwinter convention at the Hotel Bond.

At the same time, Mr. Mermey also made public the results of a companion study on retailer efficiency "which shows that drug stores in the 45 fair-trade States—in the aggregate—have a lower operating cost than do those in the non-fair-trade area (Missouri, Texas, Vermont, and the District of Columbia)."

"Since all products in the price survey are typically used as loss-leaders by predatory price cutters in the non-fair-trade area," Mr. Mermey said, "the scant price differential noted in the price survey proves that fair-trade prices are, indeed, the lowest at which a retailer can sell these products and earn an honest profit. They also show conclusively that the protection of trade-marks, manufacturers, distributors, and consumers, the objective of the fair-trade laws, is achieved at no cost to the American people."

The cost of operations study, Mr. Mermey said, showed that operating expenses in 1948 of drug stores in the fair-trade States averaged 26.17 percent of sales while comparable figures for stores in the non-fair-trade area was 27.57 percent of sales. "Thus, in terms of retailer efficiency, there is an absolute difference of 1.4 percent in favor of fair-trade stores," Mr. Mermey explained, "but expressed as a percentage of the lower operating cost figure, stores under fair trade show 5.35 percent greater operating efficiency."

This study on operating costs was made for the Bureau by William B. Spurlock, director of the economic research division of Eli Lilly & Co., from data which the company compiles for its annual Lilly Digest.

PRICE PICTURE FAVORS FAIR TRADE

Covering leading national brands of dentifrices, laxatives, and headache remedies, the comparative price survey was conducted by a well-known independent research agency for the Bureau's research advisory committee, according to Mr. Mermey.

The data were gathered from 700 stores in the 45 fair-trade States and 70 stores in the non-fair-trade area, thus maintaining the proportion between fair-trade and non-fair-trade areas. Included in the sample were independent and chain stores in both rural and urban areas. Similar types of stores were compared, and prices were weighted according to sales volume, Mr. Mermey pointed out.

The figures on prices were collected over a 2-month period (July 15 to September 15, 1949), with the September 1, 1949, price representing the average for the period—the average being weighted to reflect volume. Mr. Mermey presented the following detailed break-down of the price survey:

Consumer prices in fair trade—Non-fair-trade areas

Brands	Fair trade minimum price	Consumer prices—all stores	
		Fair-trade States	Non-fair-trade States
Dentifrices:			
1	$0.43	$0.433	$0.416
2	.59	.590	.596
3	.43	.472	.438
4	.43	.439	.435
5	.53	.540	.534
6	.77	.789	.790
Laxatives:			
7	.23	.237	.238
8	.39	.303	.322
9	.31	.317	.322
10	.36	.392	.421
11	.39	.411	.439
12	.39	.419	.435
Headache remedies:			
13	.67	.574	.567
14	.49	.503	.598
15	.24	.256	.274
16	.19	.216	.235
17	.59	.609	.622
18	.19	.209	.229

STUDY ON RETAILING EFFICIENCY

In addition to showing that retail efficiency in the drug field, with respect to keeping operating expenses down, is greater under fair trade, the Lilly survey, Mr. Mermey disclosed, reveals that the cost of sales in fair-trade areas is 67.46 percent of the stores' total sales volume in 1948 as compared with 67.26 percent in the non-fair-trade area.

"The slightly higher cost of sales in fair-trade areas obviously reflects the slightly lower consumer prices in those areas," Mr. Mermey noted. He added that net profit for fair-trade stores is found to average 6.37 percent of sales while net profits for non-fair-trade stores averages 5.17 percent of sales.

In the Lilly survey, a sample of 1,051 stores in the 45 fair-trade States was used, plus 71 stores in the 3 non-fair-trade States and the District of Columbia, Mr. Mermey pointed out. Stores were broken down by size, in terms of dollar sales volume in 1948, ranging from under $50,000 to $100,000 and over. The sample was also analyzed with respect to community size, ranging from a population of under 5,000 to 500,000 and over.

Mr. Mermey presented the following summary of comparative figures from the study on retail efficiency:

Summary comparison of average operating data of drug stores in fair-trade and non-fair-trade classification

[In thousands of dollars

	Fair-trade classification		Non-fair-trade classification		Combined	
Number of stores	1,051		71		1,122	
	Amount	Percent of sales	Amount	Percent of sales	Amount	Percent of sales
Average sales volume per store	$95.4	100.00	$81.4	[illegible]	$95.1	100.00
Consisting of:						
Cost of sales	[illegible]	67.46	54.8	67.26	58.1	67.44
Operating expenses	[illegible]	26.17	22.4	27.57	22.6	26.25
Net profit (pretax)	5.1	6.37	4.2	5.17	5.4	6.31

Government Financing and Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the National Industrial Conference Board, in New York, on January 26 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOCK AND ALARM

If this Nation is not shocked by the President's recommendations to the current session of Congress it is because we are stupefied by overindulgence in debt and deficit spending.

The Federal Government has been in the red 18 of the last 20 years. We had surpluses in fiscal years 1947 and 1948. We then started deficit spending again in fiscal year 1949.

Against this background, it is alarming enough that the President would launch us into a third deficit decade by his admitted incapacity—for the third consecutive postwar year—to hold expenditures to the level of revenue. But the President three times in the first 3 weeks of the session has, in effect, deliberately recommended that Congress refrain from balancing his budget for the coming year.

The ominous part of this postwar deficit spending is that we are unable to balance the budget in time of greatest prosperity. If we cannot balance the budget now, I ask you, when can we?

ADVERSITY AND PROSPERITY

There are a few businessmen, or heads of families, who have not experienced the necessity of borrowing in times of adversity, but there are no successful men of integrity who have not hastened in periods of prosperity to liquidate their lean-year debts.

From their own experience, there may be many men who could sympathize with some of the deficit financing in periods of depression and war, and even in periods of prewar emergencies and postwar foreign aid. But, no domestic emergency confronts us now. The President himself recommends

reductions in war-related expenditures for foreign recovery and veterans. And he says we are in a position where we can look forward to early reduction in defense costs. No recession in business is on the present horizon. National income is at or near its all-time peak, and so is employment, with the exception of those who choose the idleness of strikes precipitated by the distorted ego of labor czars.

The country is admittedly prosperous, but the prosperity is suspended dangerously from the unpredictable economics of a Federal debt already more than a quarter of a trillion dollars. The sound course is obvious to every prudent person. Yet, the President proposes that we pile up more debt with the continuation of deficit spending at the rate of nearly a half billion dollars a month.

INSOLVENCY AT SEVEN

The influence of the President of the United States and the prestige of his office must not be underestimated in consideration of the fact that the sound fiscal course under existing conditions is not obvious to him at a time when the solvency of the Nation may be at stake.

The President first brought in an expenditure budget and urged Congress not to cut it to meet revenue. Then he brought in his tax proposals which admittedly were not even designed to meet expenditures.

If we followed this advice we would nullify one of the fundamental tenets which have safeguarded this Government from its beginning. In their infinite wisdom, the founding fathers tied all the fiscal procedure of our Government to what they believed was a fool-proof system of checks and balances. They believed excessive spending would be checked by excessive taxation; that the hardships of taxation would act as an irritant to compel the Congress to reduce spending and thereby keep the budget in balance on a basis of taxation within the ability of the people to pay.

This official embrace of chronic deficit financing, written into Presidential messages, in time of peace and prosperity poses the question: How long can we continue to add to our debt and remain solvent?

VIOLENCE BY SPENDERS

One fundamental reason this Nation is greater than others in all respects, including living standards, individual security, civil rights, and personal privileges, is the productive capacity of our private-enterprise system, operating under a democratic form of government. Neither can exist in insolvency. Solvency requires balanced budgets.

You may be sure that under a balanced budget, within our ability to finance it, the havoc irresponsible spenders could wreak upon our system and form of government would be limited to misdemeanors. But an unjustifiable policy of indefinite deficit spending such as the President proposes would invite violence by the spenders to our system, our form of government, and our way of life.

Thus, nothing at this time is more important to democracy and freedom in the world, than for Congress to balance the Federal budget for the year beginning July 1, and then while keeping it in balance start gradual reduction of the public debt.

A balance can and must be achieved by reduction in expenditures. It cannot wait until deficit financing inflates income up to $300,000,000,000 to make the revenue available, as the President suggests. Insolvency would inflate money far more than that, and sooner. It should be noted in passing that inflation is always reflected in the cost of all the Government buys just as it is in the pocketbooks of all of us as individuals.

TAXES

If the President thought the Nation could take the taxes to pay for his expenditure proposals, he would have asked for them. He did last year. When he forecast a deficit of only $600,000,000 he asked for $4,000,000,000 in new taxes, and a recession in business followed.

In the present volatile state of our economy new taxes could easily accelerate a minor business decline into a major business recession. Federal revenue from taxes on corporation income now totals more than $11,000,000,000. If we attempted to cover the President's expenditure requests with additional taxes on corporation income it would require an increase of 50 percent on this source. And if the deficit were erased by increased taxes on individuals, it would mean an average increase of nearly 90 percent in our personal income taxes.

This would be in addition to a 34-percent increase in postage rates and a 43-percent increase in pay-roll taxes which the President already had proposed.

Indisputable calculations confirm my estimate that such increases in individual, corporate, and pay-roll taxes would raise the total tax take—Federal, State, and local—dangerously close to the confiscatory level.

Even the existing tax rates are drying up the Nation's venture capital, and this is the lifeblood of production expansion required to produce more of what people need at prices they can pay.

EXPENDITURES

Thus, it is clearly seen that reduction in Federal expenditures to balance with revenue is the only sound course open to us. To say that this cannot be done is not only fatalistic. It is inaccurate. It can be done if there is the will to do it. It can be done if the President and the Congress believe that a solvent Government should be preserved. As proof I submit that in the 18 months of peace and prosperity since the end of fiscal year 1948 we will increase Federal expenditures by $8,250,000,000 if we enact the President's recommendations.

I have proposed an over-all expenditure budget totaling $36,000,000,000. This is four times as much as we expended the year before the war and nine times as much as we spent when I came to the Senate in 1933.

I give you the Byrd budget in contrast with the Truman budget:

A $36,000,000,000 budget for progress, in tabular form with comparisons

[In billions of dollars

Expenditure categories	Fiscal year 1948 (which ended June 30, 1948), actual	Fiscal year 1950 (which will end next June 30), estimated; Jan. 9, 1950, revisions	Fiscal year 1951 (which begins next July 1)	
			Byrd $36,000,000,000 budget	President's Jan. 9 proposals
I. Domestic-civilian (exclusive of veterans and interest)	35.8	41.4	36.9	42.2
Social welfare, health, and security	11.9	12.5	3.5	10.7
Housing and community facilities (including RFC secondary mortgages)	.1	1.0	1.0	1.3
Education and general research	.1	.1	.1	.4
Agriculture and agricultural resources (including CCC)	.6	2.7	2.2	2.2
Natural resources	1.1	1.4	1.2	1.3
Transportation and communication (including postal deficit)	1.3	1.9	1.3	1.7
Finance, commerce, and industry	.1	.3	.1	.3
Labor	.2	.3	.2	.3
General government	1.5	1.3	1.0	1.1
II. National defense	11.9	13.1	11.3	13.4
III. Veterans	6.6	5.9	5.5	6.1
IV. Foreign	4.5	6.0	4.3	4.7
V. Interest on the Federal debt	5.2	5.7	5.7	5.6
Grand total expenditure budget (see below)	58.2	63.1	58.8	62.4
Revenue	[1]42.2	[2]37.4	[3]37.5	[3]37.5
Deficit surplus	[1]−16.0	[2]−25.7	[3]+2.0	[3]−24.9

[1] Actual.
[2] Maximum estimate.
[3] Minimum estimate.

NOTE.—Detailed figures may not add precisely to totals due to rounding and omission of reserves.

AT THE END OF THE RAINBOW

It is in the domestic civilian programs detailed in the table that the spenders are having their field day. And, it is in these programs that we are chasing a mirage of easy money in the form of deficit dollars flowing through expanding Federal programs which are undermining the will of individuals, regimenting the production of agriculture and labor, controlling the practices of business, curtailing the sovereignty of States and reducing the self-determination privileges traditional in our local government.

Make no mistake. It is socialism which lies at the end of this rainbow and the predominating color in the spectrum before us is the red of 19 Federal deficits in 21 years, including the one now proposed by the President in this time of highest prosperity.

When debt destroys confidence, insolvency sets in. Our private-enterprise system cannot survive in an insolvent nation. The private-enterprise system is fundamental to our form of government, and without it democracy, as we know it, cannot exist. The alternative is socialism.

THE FOUNDATION

The foundation for socialism in this country has been well laid by legislation enacted over the past 20 years usually in the name of temporary expedients to meet emergencies. But almost invariably it has been this type of legislation which opened the gate leading to the socialistic destination now looming ahead. A few of these Government programs—not many—have been repealed but their objectives almost without exception have been picked up and reincarnated in the legislation for the next emergency.

AS WE STAND

As we stand today there are 100 different programs spreading out from among 60 principal Federal departments and agencies (with a thousand units), and the President has just announced that payments to the public through these programs this year will total $42,500,000,000.

These payments are being made in Federal aids, grants, subsidies, pay rolls, pensions, and virtually every other form of government advance, contribution, and expenditure.

Too many of us regard this deluge as easy money overlooking the facts that a great

part of it is in deficit dollars from borrowed billions, and that binding strings are attached.

It is through these give-away programs that Federal plans, administration, control and regimentation are extended over individuals, their private lives, their agriculture, their labor, their business, their State and local governments, and their general welfare.

The extent to which we have gorged ourselves is indicated by the fact that 17,000,000 individuals are now receiving regular direct payments from the Federal Government. Add Government payments to business are equal to more than half of corporate profits after taxes are paid. The number of people receiving regular public payments increases to 25,000,000 when State and local employees and other pensioners are included.

A LOOK IN THE MIRROR HERE'S

Those who think they are benefiting from Federal payments and expanding federalized programs should take a look at England. In all that great country there are 70 Britons with net incomes of $4,000 after taxes. The so-called well-to-do in England have already been liquidated. But the worst of the British situation is that the liquidation of the middle-income group has extended to an alarming degree. There remain only 120,000 Britons with income of $1,000 to $5,000.

If we like what we see in English socialism, we are justified in stuffing ourselves with gratuities from a paternal Central Government until we bankrupt the greatest nation in all history.

If socialism is what we want, there are three more Federal programs pending in Congress at this moment which, if enacted, will irrevocably commit us to a state of socialism from which there is no appeal.

The first of these climaxes programs is for more socialized housing. Part of this vast public-housing program has already passed, and exclusive of the new proposals, the program as it stands is estimated to cost $25,000,000,000.

The second climaxes program is socialized medicine, which within 10 years will cost $90,000,000,000 annually.

The third and crowning program is the Brannan plan. The most accurate thing Mr. Brannan has said about this plan is that he cannot estimate the cost. The American Farm Bureau estimates that its application to milk alone would cost $2,000,000,000, and both of the great farm organizations—the American Farm Bureau and the National Grange—are opposed to it. Despite this, politicians are exerting their most powerful effort to force this highly unrealistic plan upon farmers and consumers as sop to labor leaders.

EVIL COMPANIONS

While inadvisably resulting from deficit-financed Federal programs which stifle individual initiative and private enterprise will be the overpowering force behind our capitulation to socialism, if that is to be our fate, evil loves company.

The evil companions of this unbridled deficit ogre are: (1) Confiscatory taxation; (2) Government competition with private enterprise and business; (3) Federal usurpation of State and local prerogatives; (4) Government invasion of private privileges; and (5) Disregard of constitutional processes.

Confiscatory deficits and growing public debt in company with these natural ghosts are virtually synonymous with socialism.

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION

We have already discussed confiscatory taxes as such, but they should be considered in conjunction with the fact that along with higher and higher taxes goes more and more Government competition such as that which results from the development of huge valley projects and tremendous so-called business loans such as those to Liberian and Kaiser.

The spenders make capital of this type of expenditure, and have been influential in having a whole section set up in the Federal budget to list them. They claim they are capital investments in the form of loans. The Government is not in business for profit and therefore it has no reason for capital investments. If they are sound loans they are in competition with private business, and if they are not sound loans, they are expenditures and must be regarded as such on the Federal books.

As if this were not enough Government meddling in business there is also the continuing threat of Government controls such as those requested at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress on prices, wages, commodity allocation, consumer credit, bank requirements, and employment practices.

STATE, LOCAL, AND PERSONAL PREROGATIVES

If you think these threats are dormant, your attention is invited to the pressurized maneuvers for the so-called civil-rights program which in its entirety would be the greatest mass invasion of States' rights, local prerogatives and the privileges of individual self-determination ever perpetrated on this Nation.

I am a southerner but I think my record will clearly show that I have never been guilty of any public act or attitude persuaded by racial intolerance. I think also the fact that as Governor of Virginia I was instrumental in the enactment of the tightest anti-lynching law of all time, along with my public advocacy of poll-tax repeal by State action, demonstrates that I speak without bias on this subject. Following this preface, I assert that the civil-rights program as proposed by the President and his Committee of Advisers, would invade the States' prerogatives with respect to the franchise and invade local prerogatives with respect to police power.

As to invasion of personal privileges, the FEPC would establish another costly powerful and inquisitorial Federal bureau to extend the strong arm of the National Government from Washington into the daily transactions of virtually every man's private business, dictating to employers as to whom to hire, whom to fire, and whom to promote.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES

Government regimentation of individuals and Government control of business is socialism, whether you choose to call it welfare state, collectivism, or give it some other meaningless name.

There is no retreat from socialism once it is entrenched, primarily because the state usurps not only the machinery of agricultural, mineral, and industrial production but also the sources of wealth and capital which would be required by private enterprise to recapture its vitality.

And with socialism goes frequent disregard for our constitutional processes which have made ours a Government of laws and not of men.

We have just experienced a foretaste of this byproduct of our socialistic tendencies when prompt invocation of the law in the case of the coal strike would have averted an unnecessary assault on the general welfare.

THE KEY IS SOLVENCY

I do not believe the people of the United States want socialism. Despite the fact that we are moving rapidly toward this end, I hope the American people, as always in the past, will awaken to their danger, and when they do they will smite down all Government programs and actions which can lead only to socialism.

This will take a lot of doing at this late date, and I realize that it cannot be done suddenly. But I am convinced by my own careful study of the whole Federal fiscal situation and all of the Government's programs that a start on Federal retrenchment can be accomplished now with neither harm nor great inconvenience to anyone involved, and the plan I have submitted with great detail would achieve this immediate objective. The plan requires only that Members of Congress be encouraged by their constituents to retrench within existing Federal policies and programs and to allow no unnecessary new ones.

This is not all that I desire and it is not all that is required to put this Nation on a long-term program of sound prosperity and constructive achievement, but it would balance the budget in the coming fiscal year, break the strangle hold of chronic deficit financing, and snatch the Nation from the clutches of the irresponsible spenders who would stifle us into socialism.

THE FOLLOW-THROUGH

To follow through from this beginning we must search every Federal program and policy and throw out all of those which were not soundly conceived and all those which our economy cannot afford.

It is true that more than $27,500,000,000 of the President's $42,500,000,000 expenditure budget for the coming fiscal year is for items tied to long-term commitments or other obligations carried over from prior years. Relatively few people regard all these programs as sacrosanct; but millions of people regard one or more of these programs (those affecting them) as sacrosanct.

To accomplish the job which has to be done to make this Nation sound for the future will require some personal unselfishness on the part of the vast majority of us.

For example, businessmen must withdraw from the easy money of some of the Federal subsidies, nonessential Federal contracts, and their advocacy of useless expansion of Federal activities to their localities.

States and localities must withdraw from Federal aid which has been increased from little over $1,500,000,000 in 1947 to nearly $3,500,000,000 proposed by the President for the year beginning in July.

Farmers must withdraw from some of the lucrative Federal payments which are not required as insurance against price decline that would precipitate depression.

Young and able-bodied veterans must withdraw from political pap programs having no connection with the bona fide obligation the Nation owes them for war-connected sacrifices.

Government employees must withdraw from nonessential public jobs and we must see to it that they are not refilled.

And the Government itself must withdraw from competition with private enterprise in the name of housing, banking, development of natural resources, etc.

A NEW GENERATION

These are the things required to make this country financially sound, to guarantee our permanent solvency, and to provide the true democratic progress of which this country is capable.

But it cannot be overlooked that in the coming fiscal year a whole new generation will have reached its majority under a deficit-financed Federal Government, and while children have been growing up young men have been growing old. Two decades of Federal hand-outs by a paternalistic Government are bound to influence the philosophy of all of us.

To change this philosophy, now so deeply rooted, may require some individual sacrifice during the period of readjustment, and it certainly will require complete and continuous devotion to the objectives, and the constant dissemination of facts presented in a manner which may be universally understood.

I know we do not want to go the way of England and I believe that so long as we can

keep this country financially sound the door will not be closed to recovery of the freedoms of private enterprise in democracy.

We must keep constantly before us the fact that the last hope of freedom-loving people in the world hangs upon maintaining the integrity of American money. The key to our fiscal solvency is balanced budgets when there are no domestic emergencies.

Thus, balancing the Federal budget is the first and vital requirement for the preservation of our own security and the security of democracy throughout the world.

The Coal Situation and 1952 Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, no matter how hot a man may get under the collar, it will not warm his family hearth or keep the fire burning in his shop or factory.

But millions of Americans are hot under the collar because of the temporizing with the coal situation, which continues in almost every interest—except the public interest.

The editor of the Omaha World-Herald, in my opinion, has stated the situation most pungently, and I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his editorial appearing in the February 1 issue of the Omaha World-Herald under the title, "Into 1952 Politics."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTO 1952 POLITICS

Following the precedent set in the steel strike, President Truman is seeking to settle the coal strike by unofficial persuasion.

He has asked the miners to go back to work and the operators to reopen the mines for a period of 70 days while a Presidential fact-finding board studies the problem. After the fact-finders make their report, according to this proposal, the miners and operators will sit down with Cyrus Ching, Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and decide what to do about it.

"The parties or either of them," said the President, "would be free to accept or reject the recommendations of the board as they see fit."

That is about the same thing he said in the steel strike. In that case the union quickly accepted the recommendations of the fact-finders, and the operators, under considerable pressure, capitulated one by one. They were free to accept or reject—provided they accepted.

In his letter offering the fact-finding plan, the President stressed that this would be "voluntary action, not compulsion," in accordance with "not only my personal conviction but the national policy."

That is not quite an accurate statement of the case. National policy is defined by laws passed by Congress, and there is no law which provides for a fact-finding board.

There is a law—the Taft-Hartley Act—which provides how the President shall proceed to end a strike which jeopardizes the Nation's well-being. That law provides that the President may obtain a court order requiring the strikers to go back to work for a period of 80 days.

As in the case of the steel strike, the President chose to ignore that law. He did so, not because of national policy, but because it is Harry Truman's policy to ignore and try to discredit the Taft-Hartley Act.

Yet that act is the only real weapon. If it were not on the books, if the President did not have that club in reserve, the fact-finding proposal would be only a scrap of paper.

Whether it will prove to be more than that, even under present circumstances, remains to be seen. At this writing neither the union nor the operators have replied to the Presidential letter.

But whatever their replies may be, it is clear that the coal strike has been thrown all the way into 1952 Presidential politics.

John L. Lewis has no more liking for Mr. Truman than Mr. Truman has for John L. Lewis. But their mutual and aggravated dislike is complicated by an equally mutual disapproval of the Taft-Hartley Act.

So:

How can the President get as much as possible for the miners, and thereby prove himself a stout friend of labor, without allowing credit for the victory to go to Lewis?

And how can Lewis now win a famous victory for his men, and thereby reinstate himself in their graces, without permitting Harry Truman to reap political benefits?

A large-sized dilemma. And if it is to be solved it must be done without recourse to the despised Taft-Hartley Act.

The fact-finders, if they are appointed, will have their work cut out for them. And that work will be enormously complicated by the fact that nobody but John L. Lewis himself knows precisely what the miners are demanding. In the protracted negotiations with the operators, he has talked about almost everything except the issues.

The seams of fact, in this case, are overlaid with hard strata of political rock. Whoever tries to dig them out will be engaged in hazardous work.

Value of High Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Value of High Dams," published in the Paris (Tenn.) Post-Intelligencer, of January 18, 1950, which, I submit, supports my bill, S. 338.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALUE OF HIGH DAMS

The mighty Mississippi River has reached the highest mark since 1937, but there is no cause for alarm as it is still several feet below the crest of that flood year.

What would be happening along the lower reaches of the Ohio and the Mississippi if the Tennessee were not harnessed with a series of high dams running its full length is anybody's guess.

The Tennessee development was not completed in 1937 and it poured all its floodwaters into the Ohio at Paducah, including the swollen current of the Cumberland. We all remember the consequences.

Opponents of TVA have accused the Government of tricky bookkeeping by charging a part of construction costs of dams and locks along the river to flood control.

It takes an emergency such as the present one to remind us flood control is actually one of the major functions of TVA. Cheap power is only a side line.

When we think of folks living in Paducah and Cairo we are reminded of something we heard a young woman say during the war.

The American Army started to cross the Rhine River into Germany and the papers said it was costing the Army something like $5,000,000 a mile to lay down an effective smoke screen to permit soldiers to cross the river in safety.

This report was causing the usual criticism of Government waste when the young lady spoke and said she thought the smoke screen was cheap.

Being questioned as to the basis for her opinion it was disclosed her husband was among the soldiers crossing the Rhine.

We suspect folks in Paducah and Cairo think about like she did so far as the Government's investments in locks and dams is concerned.

Editorial Comment on the Hiss Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Acheson Should Resign," from the Indianapolis Star, January 27, 1950; another editorial entitled "They Must Be Impeached," from the Tulsa Tribune, January 28, 1950; another editorial entitled "A Dramatic Scene From the 'Inside' at Yalta," from the Wheeling Intelligencer, January 27, 1950; and another editorial entitled "How Naive Can You Be?", from the Indianapolis Star, January 29, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(From the Indianapolis Star of January 27, 1950)

ACHESON SHOULD RESIGN

The depth to which morality and principle in Government have sunk was strikingly revealed by the position taken by Secretary of State Dean Acheson in regard to Alger Hiss. Acheson publicly defends Hiss as his friend, he publicly casts doubt on the court that convicted him, and the judge that sentenced him. He states unequivocably that he will not turn his back on a man convicted of lying, exposed as a traitor to his country. Thus he either condones Hiss' actions in stealing State Department secrets on the grounds of friendship in case Hiss' conviction is upheld, or he is using his high office to influence the decisions of higher courts before those decisions have been made.

Men in public office owe a higher loyalty than mere friendship. They owe their first loyalty to the institutions and to the people they serve. Does friendship with a murderer justify the murder? Does friendship with a traitor justify treason? This is what Acheson implies. He is saying clearly that he either believes Hiss innocent despite the decision of the courts, or else he is saying that

his friendship with Hiss condones Hiss' perjury and his treason. By what moral standard can he justify this stand? His invocation of the Sermon on the Mount borders on blasphemy.

President for Acheson's defense of his friend has been well established in Washington by an even higher public official. The President of the United States publicly defended a convicted tax dodger, a vote stealer, a cynical and dangerous political boss, Pendergast of Kansas City. Out of friendship or loyalty to the boss he even pardoned the man who sent that criminal to prison. The morals of those in highest positions sink down through to the lowest and we are not surprised at the low state of morality and principle in the administration which now governs the American people.

The first loyalty of the President and the Secretary of State should be to the people of the United States, regardless of friendship, regardless of their political beliefs, regardless of what they think of the courts, or of the people, or of themselves. Hiss has been convicted, as Pendergast was convicted. If that conviction is upheld he is a traitor to his country. Dean Acheson has no right to use his high office to influence the coming decisions of the higher courts. He has no right to cast doubt on the decisions of the jury that convicted Hiss, nor on the sentence of the judge. He has no right to put his friendship for Hiss above his responsibility to his Government and the people of the United States.

Acheson has disqualified himself for service to the American people, not only because he defends Hiss, but because he contributed to the campaign of secrecy and protection of Hiss while Hiss was in the Department of State. Henceforth every action of his will be suspect by the American people. He should resign.

[From the Tulsa Tribune of January 28, 1950]

THEY MUST BE IMPEACHED

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

What's happened to our country? The Hiss conviction has revealed something more than an individual traitor. It has revealed men in offices of high public trust who are defenders of treason.

Justice Felix Frankfurter, one of Harvard's collection of cultural curiosities, should resign from the highest court in our country. And if he hasn't the decency to do that he should be impeached.

Frankfurter is only one of our high officials who has indicated his own intellect and integrity by sponsoring and repeatedly publicly professing his warm personal friendship for a traitor.

Justice Stanley Reed, also of our highest court, is another friend of traitor Hiss. He should resign, or be thrown out of his judicial robes by impeachment. Our courts and our Congress should be above suspicion.

Frankfurter was the original scholar whom the late President Franklin Roosevelt picked as his adviser.

It was Frankfurter who picked Hiss as the prodigy of the Roosevelt administration. It was Frankfurter and Roosevelt who made this traitor Hiss the chief adviser of the President of the United States at a time when not only the security of the American people was imperiled, but the peace of the whole world. Roosevelt put the fate of nations in the hands of Hiss.

Added to all this our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, after the traitor is convicted, pronounces that he is the traitor's friend. If he is the traitor's friend, he is not fit to be our Secretary of State.

The people's Representatives in their Congress should lose no time to impeach and remove this man who could be a friend to a traitor.

This Hiss who helped our enemy was authorized by our Secretary of State and our President to shape the tragic policies that have brought China into communism, and an ally of Russia.

For 10 years, through the interest of the late President Roosevelt, Frankfurter and others, this fellow Hiss has gone from one position of power to a new position of greater power. For 10 years this intrigue against our Government has been going on and for 10 years high officials in Washington, with full knowledge of these infamous operations, have protected and covered all these trails of treason. The treason story does not end with Hiss. It begins with Hiss. Washington is now filled with frightened public officials.

Even the President of the United States so far forgot his obligations to the American people that when the facts of treason began to be talked about he assured the people that it was nothing but a political trick to distract their attention by dragging "red herrings" before them.

The President should have been the first to authorize and insist upon full investigation. He should have been the first to ferret out the truth. But instead of that, our President, and his lieutenants, did everything they could to hide the truth and to keep the people in ignorance of their betrayal.

What is the matter with the Democratic Party that it, professing to be a political champion of the American people, should lend itself to the suppression of the truth and make every effort to smear and ridicule those who, in the defense of our country, have sought to establish the truth?

Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, to his disgrace, is just one of the Democratic Senators who have tried to ridicule those who have brought the truths of the Hiss infamies to light.

On February 11, 1945, at Yalta, Franklin D. Roosevelt was a dying man. He had just been reelected without the strength to go through an exhaustive hard political campaign. Yet there at Yalta, this sick man, the choice of his party, was to determine the fate of nations. Of all the able men in America not one was chosen to be his adviser. He chose Hiss and Hiss alone. And it was at Yalta, under the influence of Hiss, that millions upon millions of people were flippantly handed over into slavery under Stalin.

It was this Hiss who, given the power by a Democratic Party and a Democratic President, gave to Russia three votes to our one in the newly formed United Nations. Everything that Hiss did was done to strengthen communism and to weaken America. And he is still the dear friend of our Secretary of State. And to two of the judges on our Supreme Court. And he is just a piece of "red herring" to the President.

Where are the Americans that they witness this with flippant disinterest? Where is our Congress, every Member of which has taken his solemn oath to defend the interests and protect the integrities of our Republic?

Every loyal citizen of this Republic should write every Congressman he knows or who represents him, Senate and House, and demand the impeachment of Frankfurter and Reed and Acheson. Command every Representative and Senator to command the President of the United States to reveal the names of those who have concealed this Hiss, and his associates, in the betrayal of this Republic for the last 10 years.

Already, from the floor of the United States Senate, President Truman has been challenged to reveal the identity of those in our Government who, for 10 years, have engineered the concealment of the espionage evidence that convicted Hiss.

But a challenge is not enough. The whole country is now alerted to the fact that our State Department is honeycombed with trusted and confidential workers who have the funny idea that it is intellectually smart to betray America to the communistic forces.

The Senate should do more than challenge. It should command President Truman to come clean with everything, and himself clean out the traitors and the near-traitors and the friends of traitors in all the departments of our Government.

Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, has demanded the resignation of Acheson and Frankfurter. We would like to see one of Oklahoma's Senators lead the fight for a clean and honest national administration that is above suspicion. It is time that ELMER THOMAS and BOB KERR became articulate with righteous indignation at the red-herring hypocrisy of Truman.

Cheap and shallow are the gentlemen who sit in the Senate of the United States more concerned with their reelection than they are with the security of the American people. Shallow and sad are the American voters who think betrayal of a public trust is a clever political trick that merits political award.

Our Congress is what we voters make it. This Hiss trial has proven many things. Chief of which is that we, the voters, have failed to do our duty. We have elected a President and a Congress that have tried to shield a traitor to the Republic.

The Hiss trial has put ELMER THOMAS and BOB KERR on the spot. This Hiss story will reveal them. Do we expect statesmanship performance? Or are we to listen, as do the Texans, to a Senator who said that those who brought this Hiss to trial and those who convicted him are just "trying to make a burlesque out of this."

Betraying your country is not burlesque, Mr. CONNALLY. Oklahoma waits for her Senators to speak.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer of January 27, 1950]

A DRAMATIC SCENE FROM THE INSIDE AT YALTA

A challenging and dramatic inside picture of the scenes at Yalta has just been given by United States Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, Indiana, in relation to the part allegedly played there by Alger Hiss, who has just been convicted by a jury on two counts of perjury to conceal his turning over to a Communist espionage apparatus certain documents of the United States Department of State. For the traitorous offense of which he was convicted, Hiss, former aide of the late President Roosevelt at Yalta, has been sentenced to 5 years in prison. Senator CAPEHART says:

"At one meeting, Stalin, President Roosevelt, Alger Hiss, and a Russian interpreter were the only ones in the conference room. When Mr. Roosevelt and Alger Hiss came out of that room, they advised those waiting outside that an agreement had been reached to give Russia three votes against one for the United States in the United Nations organization."

Can you not call up this picture in your own mind? How Generalissimo Stalin appeared in his new uniform, with the sleeves too long, and the bottoms of his trousers flopping somewhat about his ankles for the same reason? And Alger Hiss with his confident, audacious, and even infectious grin? And the late F. D. R. with his long, tragic-looking cape of Navy blue, his wan and emaciated face, betokening the strain of the war years, and possibly the imminence of the malady which was to end his life a few months later? Mr. Roosevelt was in full possession of his mental faculties, however, according to his biographer, Robert Sherwood, in the voluminous book, Roosevelt and Hopkins.

Were there some knowing looks and glances exchanged between Presidential Aide Hiss and Generalissimo Stalin behind the back of F. D. R. while the best interests of the United States and China were being sacrificed at these Yalta conferences? We believe this a fair question in view of all the circumstances. Mr. Roosevelt, according to Mr. Sherwood's biography, was a tired man when he consented to turn over to Soviet Russia dominance in Manchuria, all of Saghalin, the Kuriles, Outer Mongolia—yielding to Moscow unnecessarily, and without General Chiang's knowledge, what virtually amounted to handing China to the Soviets on a silver platter. We believe it no more than right and just to the American people to be given the full part played by Alger Hiss at the Yalta parley, which did so much to aggrandize Soviet Russia, increasing its total dominion over the nations to 750,000,000 people. We should know, in full if possible what part Alger Hiss played in influencing Mr. Roosevelt, when the latter trusted Hiss implicitly, and apparently had no idea that Hiss had been betraying United States State Department secrets to the Soviet Government of Russia.

It is not too often that we find ourselves in agreement with the Chicago Tribune, but the following editorial from the Tribune, relating to the admitted friendship between Hiss and United States Secretary of State Dean Acheson, we believe will be of profound interest to the American people. Twice, in recent months under the same heading "Acheson must go," we have contended in the Intelligencer that Mr. Acheson has demonstrated his unfitness for the vital post he holds. The Tribune bases its demand for his removal on somewhat different grounds, as follows:

"ACHESON MUST GO

"The dismissal of Dean Acheson from his post as Secretary of State should follow automatically on the conviction of Alger Hiss.

"The relations between the two men were and are intimate. Mr. Acheson has described Hiss as his friend and, in this connection, has noted that he does not give his friendship lightly. The Secretary found in the traitor not only a sympathetic personality but also a helpful collaborator whose views on foreign policy he shared. We know this from the testimony of Adolf Berle who said that when there was division in the State Department in 1944 on a policy toward Russia, Acheson favored the soft line and Hiss was Acheson's principal assistant in promoting it.

"In the circumstances, the best that can be said for Acheson is that he has shown himself to be so poor a judge of men and events as to be disqualified for the management of this country's foreign relations. He misread Russia and Hiss. Or did he?

"Either way, Acheson's continuance in office is a danger to the Nation and an affront to every loyal American."

Notwithstanding the above editorial, Mr. Acheson persists in avowing his friendship for Hiss, even after Hiss has been convicted by a jury and before a judge who was scrupulously fair to give the defendant every resource to attempt to prove his innocence. Mr. Acheson now goes even further than he did in the interview quoted yesterday from the New York Times. A later United Press dispatch quotes Mr. Acheson as saying:

"Whatever the outcome of the appeal, I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss. I think every person who has known him has on his conscience the serious task of deciding what his attitude will be. Each must decide according to his own standards and principles. For me there is no doubt as to these standards and principles. They were stated a long time ago on the Mount of Olives."

It seems rather strange that Mr. Acheson would say that he feels constrained by Christian principles to stand by a man who has been convicted of aiding the espionage of Communists, who if they had their way, and are permitted to triumph by treason in our own State Department, would crush all religion, including the Christian religion in the United States. Does Mr. Acheson have no awareness whatever of such dangers to our traditional religious freedoms here in America? It would seem to us that the normal man, confronted by the evidence of such treachery in his own household would wax exceedingly wroth and indignant, especially when the convicted traitor was found in alliance with Communists and as a cog in the top Communist apparatus would be required to subscribe to the tenets of militant atheism.

It raises a series of questions: If Mr. Acheson is so quick to deal lightly with Communist aides in his own Department, and turn the other cheek, is he himself a proper person to be entrusted with policies that could mean the life and death of our Republic? The people also have a right to ask, in view of Mr. Acheson's tolerance of the author of Communist machinations in his own Department, does he know more about Alger Hiss than he has revealed? What is the reason for this strange friendship, in which some will see a perilous mesalliance?

The long delays before the sinister role of Alger Hiss was recognized by Washington officialdom have justifiably aroused the suspicions of the United States people. They will not be content now until the full glare of research is turned into every nook of the United States Department of State.

[From the Indianapolis Star of January 29, 1950]

HOW NAIVE CAN YOU BE?

Like addle-headed Dean Acheson, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt now throws up her hands in horror that such a nice boy as Alger Hiss should have been convicted as a liar and a traitor to his country. "I just don't like it at all," she says. "It seems rather horrible to condemn someone on the testimony of another person who by his own admission is a perjurer and a former Communist." Whittaker Chambers is the one who is guilty in her mind, for doing dirt to Alger Hiss.

Let's keep the record clear. Whittaker Chambers' testimony wasn't what convicted Alger Hiss. The facts convicted him. There were documents in his own handwriting. There was his typewriter which had been used to type other secret papers. There was the testimony of Hede Massing and of Edith Murray. There were facts aplenty, facts which Hiss tried to deny, but which kept coming back to haunt him.

As prosecutor Robert Murphy said to the jury, "I told you * * * that the facts would be proven by immutable documents. * * * What do they prove? Treason."

The jury of 12 honest American men and women decided after careful deliberation that that was exactly what they did prove. Treason. And Mrs. Roosevelt says that people are overhysterical because they attack Dean Acheson for publicly defending this convicted liar.

Who's overhysterical? If anybody is emotionally tangled up it is Eleanor Roosevelt and Dean Acheson. They have allowed their feelings to blind them to the simple fact that a jury of his peers convicted Alger Hiss of lying, stealing state secrets, and treachery to his country. There is nothing hysterical about the conviction. And there is nothing hysterical about scorn for a traitor. That is the normal reaction of Americans since the time of Benedict Arnold. If Mrs. Roosevelt and Mr. Acheson don't feel it there is something wrong with their heads.

Proposed Fair Employment Practices Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a splendid editorial entitled "A Problem for the States," which appeared in the February 2, 1950, issue of the New York Journal American. This editorial is in reference to the so-called Fair Employment Practices Commission bill. It is so clear and logical and so soundly states a fundamental principle of American Government that I believe it will be of value, and will command itself to the thinking of the Members of the Congress. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROBLEM FOR THE STATES

I would be a sensible action if both parties in Congress should agree to drop the controversial legislative proposal for a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission, and return the issue to the States where it belongs.

Of course, there should be no discrimination between citizens in such matters as employment and wages, just as there should be no such thing as prejudices because of differences of race, color, or religion.

But if these faults occur, they are faults of the mind and of the heart, or of social inheritance, which can be eradicated only by education and example.

They are not faults that can be corrected by compulsion.

Furthermore, no law can be effective if it is not acceptable to the people affected, and a national FEPC law would be unenforceable in a very large section of the country.

Such a law would provoke resentment and lawlessness, and be worse than no law at all.

Even assuming, however, that legislation of this nature is practicable it is extremely doubtful if Congress has jurisdiction.

Under the Constitution, Congress has no powers not delegated to it, and it would seem clear that the States—which alone may determine the qualifications of voters—have also reserved to themselves jurisdiction in the field of social relationships.

And, since these relationships are necessarily local to every community and various as among the States, the legislatures and the local councils would be the proper agencies to act.

If legislation, is desirable, therefore, the place in which to strive for it is in the self-governing areas that would be affected.

The persistent effort to obtain congressional legislation, uniformly applying to every area of this diverse country, is essentially demagogic and rabble-rousing.

One of its most vociferous advocates is the Communist Party.

The loudest supporters must realize this truth, although it would be politically inconvenient for them to say so.

As regards Congress itself, it is quite intolerable that its important business should be continually rolled and frustrated over an issue that does not arise in Congress under the doctrine of States' rights.

Relations Between Coal Operators and Coal Miners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the negotiating representatives of the United Mine Workers of America, by John L. Lewis, to the President of the United States, regarding conditions in the coal mines.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We represent great numbers of men. They are citizens and taxpayers. They are men with family responsibilities. They perform an essential service. They serve a harsh and brutal industry. Its toll of broken men and the wreck of human flesh are without parallel in modern industry. Their employers are, in a controlling sense, greedy, grasping, and devoid of ordinary compassion.

The mine workers have the same ideals and dreams as other Americans. They wish to provide for their families, and serve their God and their country without reserve. To do so, they must eat and have shelter to face the mishaps of the years and to retain the courage to combat the terrifying vicissitudes of their toil.

The industry contract expired June 30, 1949. For 8 months, the organized coal operators have refused to execute a successor agreement. For 8 months, the operators have gloried in the protection given them by an oppressive Federal statute. For 8 months, Mr. President, they have boasted that the abomination, known as the Taft-Hartley Act, rendered it unnecessary to concede anything, and that in the end your high office, wielding Taft's club, would beat the mine workers into submission.

So now it comes to pass, Mr. President, that as a penalty for refusing the coal operators' cherished labor peace offers arbitration by three strangers, who know not of this industry nor the human beings who delve in it.

With due respect, Mr. President, the mine workers do not wish these strangers, however well-intentioned but necessarily ill-informed, to fix their wages, define their working conditions, define their living standards, and limit the educational opportunities of their children. Such strangers cannot see into a mine worker's home, nor peer into the hearts of his loved ones. The mine workers believe that as free citizens in a free country they have an inherent right to pass upon these vital considerations themselves, and that no stranger, however affiliate, should be given such power over their lives.

It is no answer, Mr. President, to suggest that your plan, as set forth in your telegram of January 31, permits acceptance or rejection by either party after rendition of judgment by your agents. The mine workers know that any rejection of your agents' findings, after issuance, would cause them to face the oppressive legal sanctions of TAFT'S bill of attainder against labor unions. The mine workers know also, Mr. President, that the heavy hand of Government would not be laid concurrently on the shoulders of the coal operators as they make wassail in the privacy of their exclusive clubs.

For 7 months since the expiration of the agreement, the mine workers have made personal sacrifices to insure the country sufficient coal. It is a travesty upon justice that they should now be slugged by a legal blackjack to satisfy the overweening avarice of their reactionary employers.

To use the power of the state to drive men into the mines, on the terms and for the profit of private employers, is involuntary servitude, violative of the spirit, and perhaps of the literal text, of the thirteenth amendment. It is questionable whether one could postulate that such mass coercion would insure enthusiastic service from grateful men.

Respectfully submitted.

NEGOTIATING REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
JOHN L. LEWIS.

Tribute to Lt. Col. Albert L. Vreeland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an announcement of a presentation of the Army's commendation to Mr. Albert L. Vreeland, an ex-Congressman from New Jersey, and a lieutenant colonel in the Organized Reserve Corps. I am making this insertion at the request of the Bronx County Disabled American Veterans and ANU.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Albert L. Vreeland, ex-Congressman from New Jersey, and a lieutenant colonel in the Organized Reserve Corps, received the Army's Commendation Medal at a ceremony held January 23, at 11 a. m., in the office of Col. H. A. Cooney, chief, New York military district, 90 Church Street. The presentation was made by Colonel Cooney.

Colonel Vreeland, who is vice president of the Celanese Corp. of America, as well as general counsel for the same firm, receives the decoration for his wartime service.

A Member of Congress at the time of the United States entry into war, Colonel Vreeland first served with the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, then was recalled to Congress to finish out his legislative term.

When returned to duty with the Army, Colonel Vreeland became commanding officer of the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Southwest Pacific area.

Colonel Vreeland is currently assigned to the One Thousand Five Hundred and Sixty-Eighth JAGC Training Center, New York City, and lives at 415 Prospect Street, East Orange, N. J.

Minnesota Welcomes the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some remarks of mine at the time of the President's visit to the State of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA WELCOMES THE PRESIDENT

Mr. President, the people of Minnesota welcome you to their great and progressive North Star State. You have honored us by your visit on this historic occasion.

Tonight we celebrate two great events in the history of a growing and expanding American democracy—the Minnesota Centennial and your miraculous victory in November 1948.

One hundred years ago America was in the midst of a great internal controversy over the issue of slavery versus freedom. The establishment of Minnesota as a Territory and her subsequent admission as a State gave strength to the forces of liberty and emancipation in the tragic conflict which later on convulsed our Nation. Then, as now, there was a struggle for the minds of men. Then, as now, the principles of democracy were being challenged within and without.

In the year 1948 we saw a world in the midst of a great controversy. The issue now, as a century ago, was whether or not a people can live half slave and half free. To be sure, the stage for the great human drama was in the dimensions of a world and not merely a nation, but the principle in our generation is the same as that of a hundred years past. And as if history would repeat itself, the people of Minnesota again made a great contribution to the cause of human freedom. That contribution, Mr. President, was their confidence and faith in you. That contribution was made real and tangible by the overwhelming vote you received from the people of Minnesota in that crucial election of 1948. Our people now, as 100 years ago, place their faith and hope in the principles of the dignity of the individual, freedom of conscience, and a brotherhood of man.

These are not merely idealistic pronouncements or comforting phrases of a democratic ritual. The dignity of the individual has real meaning in the social, economic, and political fabric of our State. We jealously guard and protect as inviolate that sacred principle of freedom of conscience. We not only preach and proclaim the brotherhood of man, but as a State of almost 3,000,000 people we tirelessly work toward its realization.

Yes, Mr. President, if ever one State could justifiably claim that it represented the dynamic spirit of America, our State of Minnesota feels justified in making that claim. Permit me to indulge myself in a recitation of our case for this honor.

Here in Minnesota people from all sections of the world have learned how to live, to build, and to work together. Our people represent the finest qualities of every race, creed, and nationality. Our standard of honor and respect is not that of birth or race. Our standard of honor and respect is that of achievement and of individual ability.

We have placed our faith, Mr. President, in the people. That faith has been justified by the accomplishments of our people in a free America. Here before you tonight you see living testimony to the virtues and truth of the democratic way of life.

Less than a century ago this vast expanse of land which now is known as Minnesota was an undeveloped and almost unknown region. Today it stands out as one of the most progressive and prosperous areas of a strong and mighty Nation.

The pioneers, the immigrants, the sons and daughters of those who came from many lands, have applied their minds and bodies to creating a prosperous and democratic society. Our people have taken the iron ore from the earth to supply the steel furnaces of the industrial East. Our woodsmen have cut the forests to produce the timber and the lumber required by growing America.

Our seamen have sailed the ships from the great harbor of Duluth, Minn., to carry the iron ore, the grain, and the lumber to the processing and manufacturing plants in other areas of our Nation.

Our farmers have tilled the soil and produced the food that was needed by a growing population.

Yes, Mr. President, there is no place in all the world where one will find a more industrious, a more enlightened, a more devoted, and a more patriotic people than here in middle America.

We have created new industries. We are rich with a supply of skilled labor. Our workmen take justifiable pride in their productive skill and ability.

Our industry and business community have demonstrated unusual initiative and ingenuity.

Minnesota points with pride to its hospitals, its clinics, its programs of public health and recreation, its great State university and its many colleges, its splendid system of public and parochial schools.

We have emphasized the human values. We have believed, and will continue to believe, that the richness of America is in its people. It is because of this faith of the people in themselves that we have placed particular emphasis upon the health and the welfare and the education of our people.

Like you, Mr. President, we believe in human welfare and we have dedicated much of our efforts and a sizable portion of our resources to the creation of a social, economic, and political environment that is conducive to the betterment of the people.

We in this State know that a deep concern for human welfare yields dividends. This emphasis upon the welfare of people has given us a rich and productive economy. It has given us an enlightened citizenry that is capable of conserving and improving the great storehouse of natural resources in land, water, forests, and mines with which God so generously blessed us.

We in Minnesota in this generation have repudiated not only the exploitation of human and physical resources—we have likewise repudiated for once and for all the false doctrine of isolationism.

We are of the people—yes, of the people of all the world. Therefore we are interested in people no matter where they may be or who they may be.

We do not need to ask ourselves the question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" We already know the answer. Our political and social convictions are deeply rooted in a religious faith. We gratefully acknowledge our humility before one God. We know that man does not live by bread alone. Our strength is not merely that of material blessings. Our strength and faith are guarded and protected by a sense of religious and spiritual obligations and principles.

It is in this spirit, Mr. President, that we welcome you. What has been said of our State typifies your character, your philosophy and your program.

You, too, are of the people. You have placed your confidence in the people. Your great victory in 1948 was made possible because you went to the people with your message. They received you and gave you inspiration to carry on.

You, too, Mr. President, are known for those sterling qualities of honor, integrity, industry and a man of deep faith.

You are in the midst of many friends—friends not only in the social sense, but friends in spirit and mind.

There is a bond of fellowship between our people and their President.

I have the honor and the privilege of presenting to you the President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman.

Tribute to Harry Hopkins by Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute by Hon. Winston Churchill to Mr. Harry Hopkins, appearing in the New York Times under date of January 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On January 10 a gentleman arrived to see me at Downing Street with the highest credentials. Telegrams had been received from Washington stating that he was the closest confidant and personal agent of the President. I therefore arranged that he should be met by Mr. Brendan Bracken on his arrival at Poole Airport, and that we should lunch together alone the next day. Thus I met Harry Hopkins, that extraordinary man, who played, and was to play, a sometimes decisive part in the whole movement of the war. His was a soul that flamed out of a frail and failing body. He was a crumbling lighthouse from which there shone the beams that led great fleets to harbor. He had also a gift of sardonic humor. I always enjoyed his company, especially when things went ill. He could also be very disagreeable and say hard and sour things. My experiences were teaching me to be able to do this too, if need be.

At our first meeting we were about 3 hours together, and I soon comprehended his personal dynamism and the outstanding importance of his mission. This was the height of the London bombing, and many local worries imposed themselves upon us. But it was evident to me that here was an envoy from the President of supreme importance to our life. With gleaming eye and quiet, constrained passion he said:

"The President is determined that we shall win the war together. Make no mistake about it.

"He has sent me here to tell you that at all costs and by all means he will carry you through, no matter what happens to him—there is nothing that he will not do so far as he has human power."

Everyone who came in contact with Harry Hopkins in the long struggle will confirm what I have set down about his remarkable personality. And from this hour began a friendship between us which sailed serenely over all earthquakes and convulsions. He was the most faithful and perfect channel of communication between the President and me. But far more than that, he was for several years the main prop and animator of Roosevelt himself. Together these two men, the one a subordinate without public office, the other commanding the mighty Republic, were capable of making decisions of the highest consequence over the whole area of the English-speaking world. Hopkins was, of course, jealous about his personal influence with his Chief and did not encourage American competitors. He therefore, in some ways, bore out the poet Gray's line, "A favorite has no friend." But this was not my affair. There he sat, slim, frail, ill, but absolutely glowing with refined comprehension of the cause. It was to be the defeat, ruin, and slaughter of Hitler, to the exclusion of all other purposes, loyalties, or aims. In the history of the United States few brighter flames have burned.

Harry Hopkins always went to the root of the matter. I have been present at several great conferences, where 20 or more of the most important executive personages were gathered together. When the discussion flagged and all seemed baffled, it was on these occasions he would rap out the deadly question, "Surely, Mr. President, here is the point we have got to settle. Are we going to face it or not?" Faced it always was, and, being faced, was conquered. He was a true leader of men, and alike in ardor and in wisdom in times of crisis he has rarely been excelled. His love for the causes of the weak and poor was matched by his passion against tyranny, especially when tyranny was, for the time, triumphant.

Federal Employees in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of February 1, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPLOYEES IN POLITICS

With some reservations, this newspaper has supported the broadening of the Hatch Act to permit nearby Federal employees to participate in local partisan political campaigns. Understandably, leaders of the nonpartisan movement in Arlington view this extension as a device whereby the Democratic machine can renew its hold on local offices. Their discomfiture is increased by the apparent glee of the machine over the amendment. Our feeling is, however, that legislation cannot be particularistic. It would be unfair to Federal workers living in areas where the nonpartisan movement does not prevail to deny them participation in local Government because of the possible bad effects in Arlington. The answer is to strengthen the nonpartisan movement.

Now, however, serious questions have been raised about both the constitutionality of the Senate amendment as now phrased and the means by which it was accomplished. Apparently public hearings were not held on this particular section of the amendment (which was not even considered in the House) and many groups which have sought an opportunity to be heard have not been given the chance. This is an unhealthy situation which should be remedied, and the best way is for conferees to remand the entire amendment for full discussion. Certainly nothing could discredit the Hatch Act more than to have it distorted by sneak amendment.

Welcome to White County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the White County Democrat, of Monticello, Ind.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME TO WHITE COUNTY

The White County Democrat takes pleasure in introducing two new residents of White County, two young women, displaced persons from Europe, who recently arrived to make their home with two Chalmers farm families. Both are very pleasant and are anxious to do things the American way.

Miss Trosch Agafia, native of Ukraine, is right at home with the O. C. Parks family, neighbors of the Shells. She likes farm life, and did field labor in Germany. No weeds grow in her garden. Trosch is fond of knitting. She has a number of articles she brought with her. Before coming to the States, she worked in a Baptist mission.

Miss Mrs. Alexandra Kiritschenko from Yugoslavia, who is at the home of Mr. and Mrs. B. C. Shell, just a mile north of Chalmers. She has a fine education, and has lived in a number of European countries. She speaks intermediate English, but very fluent in German and Russian, and knows some French.

Two displaced persons from Europe are happily situated in two Big Creek township farm homesteads located, across the road from each other, at the homes of Mr. and Mrs. B. C. Shell and O. C. Parks and family. The families sponsoring them in their new homes are just as happy as the two young women.

First to arrive in the county was Miss Trosch Agafia, native of the Ukraine, who is with the Parks family. She reached here on June 4. Mrs. Alexandra Kiritschenko from Yugoslavia arrived at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Shell on August 15.

After Congress passed the law June 16, 1948, permitting displaced persons from Europe to come to the United States, announcement was made that 205,000 DP's could come here. The Shells made application June 24 with the Church World Service, through which Protestant churches worked. They requested that they would like a girl 25 to 40, capable of assisting with the housework as Mrs. Shell was crippled with arthritis, and a Protestant. On March 8, this year, they received notice that the girl had been selected and would be ready to come soon. However Mrs. Kiritschenko became ill with the flu and her voyage was slowed up for 3 months.

LAND AT BOSTON

Applicants who sponsor the DP, must furnish inland transportation from the ports of arrival, Boston, New York, or New Orleans. In June the Shells mailed the transportation. Mrs. Kiritschenko went to Bremen in June and sailed on July 19, on the *General Sturgis*, in which there were 865 DP's. It took them 9 days. The travel bureaus were responsible for taking care of them en route to their destinations over the country. Mrs. Kiritschenko was routed to Detroit, and from there took the Wabash to Lafayette, where the Shells met her.

Miss Agafia landed at Boston, and then came by train to Lafayette.

Mr. Parks put in their application in July 1948, a couple weeks later than the Shells. Their letter was sent to the Ukranian-American Relief, and their application was acted upon quicker than through the other agency.

Born in 1913, near Moscow, Mrs. Kiritschenko was the daughter of a railroad engineer. When a little girl she went to live with her uncle and aunt, and they traveled quite extensively as the aunt was a Russian consular, comparable to an American ambassador. They lived in Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Italy. When a little girl she learned some English from an American lady. Mrs. Kiritschenko speaks fluent German and Russian and some French. She is a member of a family of six children, three boys and three girls. The family is well educated and holds responsible positions.

TRAINED NURSE

Mrs. Kiritschenko was married to an officer in the Russian Army, but had not heard from him since the war. She had 2 years' nurses' training and worked as a nurse in an X-ray laboratory for 4½ years in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. Since liberation she had been a nurse in a kindergarten for the last 4 years in Munich, Germany. She stated that first she was in charge of three infants, and then was responsible for seven children, ages 2½ to 3, all war orphans.

In the hospital she became acquainted with modern appliances found today in the kitchens of American housewives. She did not hesitate to use the appliances found in the Shell home. She had no trouble in learning. Pat Doremire, a Chalmers High School pupil, assisted her in showing where the things were in the house. She can manage the household very well, and has prepared some fine meals.

Mrs. Kiritschenko is a member of the Greek Orthodox Church, but has attended the Chalmers Community Church regularly since she came here.

She is an attractive blonde and has natural curly hair. The clothing brought with her is like American women wear. She brought several trunks full, which she described as "my house." She has worn her hair bobbed for a number of years, but when a girl it was long.

Shortly after her arrival at the Shell home, Mrs. Kiritschenko received a letter of welcome to the State of Indiana from Gov. Henry F. Schricker, which she prizes greatly.

Mrs. Kiritschenko enjoys reading the newspapers, but remarked that she has learned more about what is happening in Europe since she came to the States than during the time she was a resident.

Being able to speak some English, it was possible to secure considerable information from Mrs. Kiritschenko. However, in the case of Miss Agafia, it was difficult. Both young women were at the Shell home the afternoon of the interview. While they both speak Russian, they are different. Miss Agafia is Ukraine Russian or Polish. Mrs. Kiritschenko assisted with the interview.

NATIVE OF UKRAINE

It was learned that Miss Agafia was a native of Ukraine, but she has no living relatives to her knowledge. She went to Poland, then Czechoslovakia, and then to Germany, where she did field labor.

The clothing that she brought had been sent through missions to Germany. Before coming to the States, she worked in the Baptist mission in Munich.

Asked if she was happy in the United States, she replied, "Like it here," with a big broad smile.

She is an expert gardener and flower lover. No weeds grow in her garden. She likes to knit, and has some beautiful sweaters that she made which she brought with her.

The Parks family has a dairy and the cows are milked by machine. Miss Agafia took a delight in seeing the machine work. Afterwards she stripped some of the cows, and a member of the family is quoted as saying that "she stripped the cows so dry they had to prime them the next time to milk 'em." She also enjoys hunting eggs, in fact any kind of out of door work. Practically all of her 42 years has been spent on a farm.

Roosevelt's Promise to Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

ROOSEVELT'S PROMISE TO CHURCHILL

Winston Churchill's war memoirs have reached the year 1941. This was the period in which Mr. Roosevelt took the final steps to push the United States into a war to which the overwhelming majority were opposed.

HOPKINS CARRIES THE "FIRE HOSE"

On January 10, 1941, Mr. Churchill recalls, Harry Hopkins arrived in London as the emissary of Roosevelt to Churchill. Hopkins bore a personal message from the President. It was that Roosevelt would aid Britain at all costs. There was nothing he would not do.

This, almost to the day, coincided with Roosevelt's successful campaign to get the lend-lease bill through Congress. That, he told the American people, was to be regarded as the lending of a fire hose to a neighbor to keep the fire from spreading to our own house. Lend-lease was going to keep America out of war.

The Roosevelt deception went further back than that. Churchill discloses that the mission of Vice Adm. Robert L. Ghormley, sent to London in July 1940, as American naval observer, was not merely to coordinate with the British Admiralty all American aid short of war. Ghormley was also to consult with the British on American participation as a belligerent.

This was 4 months before candidate Roosevelt, speaking at Boston, assured the mothers of America "again and again and again" that he was not going to send their sons into any foreign war.

MATSUOKA'S MANEUVERS

Perhaps, the most important of Churchill's current disclosures, however, concern the former Japanese foreign minister, Yosuke Matsuoka, and his unsuccessful effort to get Japan into the war 6 months before Pearl Harbor. The incident is vital because Churchill's account plainly demonstrates the means by which the United States could

have remained at peace had not Roosevelt been so avid for war.

Matsuoka was one of the real warmongers. It was he who negotiated the treaty that put Japan into the Axis. In March 1941, he set out on a journey to Moscow and Berlin. Hitler and his aids besought him to get Japan into the war against Britain. At the same time they disclosed that their relations with Russia were uncertain, and that they wanted at all costs to avoid war with the United States.

Matsuoka stopped in Moscow long enough to negotiate a nonaggression pact. Like Stalin, he had no taste for two-front war. According to Churchill, he assumed Roosevelt would have the same sensible aversion, therefore saw no reason to conciliate America, which Roosevelt was pushing toward war with Germany.

On his return to Tokyo, however, he found the remainder of the cabinet of Prince Konoye arrayed against him. Instead of seeking war with this country, Konoye and his government were at that very moment seeking a general Pacific settlement, which they hoped would be started by American mediation between Japan and China.

Matsuoka not only lost his argument for war, he lost his job. He lost prestige tremendously when Hitler attacked Russia 7 weeks later.

AXIS EFFORTS TO DUCK WAR

Thus, in Churchill's view, confirmed by the documents we found after the occupation of Tokyo, the Konoye government was genuinely anxious to avoid war with the United States. It was unable to do so because Roosevelt was beginning to realize about that time that neither lend-lease nor the active participation of the American Navy in the battle of the Atlantic was going to goad Hitler into attack.

Lend-lease was followed by Roosevelt's proclamation of an American security zone in the Atlantic. He informed Churchill, the latter says, that the American Atlantic Fleet would actively seek out German submarines and surface raiders in the area so that the British could attack them. Following the occupation of Iceland, American ships were assigned to actual convoy duty. Some of them were placed under British command.

These were acts of war under any possible interpretation of international law, but Hitler refused to rise to the bait. Instead, he ordered his submarines not to fight back against American destroyers.

Roosevelt did not have to be particularly bright, after a few months of this, to recognize that if he was going to fulfill his pledge that there was nothing he would not do to aid Churchill, he would have to find his war somewhere else than with Hitler directly. The Japanese negotiations gave him his opportunity.

Churchill notes that the great obstacle to Japanese-American understanding was the American demand that, as a preliminary to any peace discussions, Japan should withdraw from China.

Complete withdrawal would have caused the immediate fall of any cabinet that proposed it. Yet Roosevelt and Secretary Hull stuck to that demand in all the negotiations through the summer and fall of 1941, and incorporated it in the ultimatum by Secretary Hull on November 26, 1941, that started the Jap Fleet for Pearl Harbor.

If our mission in the Pacific was the protection of China, as the Roosevelt idolators say, it is incumbent upon them to explain why Roosevelt's aides and his successor, having got their war and crushed Japan, have now abandoned China to the Communists. Was that, also, the intended fruit of his farseeing foreign policy?

Report to the People of the Fifth District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I set forth herewith a report to the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Michigan of my voting and attendance record during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

The purpose of this report is to make available, in concise form, information which is scattered over thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information which, from a practical point of view, would not be available to the majority of the voters of the district which I am honored to represent here in the House.

It is my hope that this report, which includes all roll calls in the covered period, will enable my constituents to be intelligently informed of the voting record of their Representative in Congress.

If more complete information on any measure considered, or an explanation of any particular vote, is desired, I shall be glad to furnish that information to those who may so request:

Roll Call No.	Date (1949)	Identification and result of vote	My vote
1	Jan. 3	Quorum call	Present.
2	do	Selection of Speaker of the House (Rayburn, 255 to 160)	Martin.
3	do	H. Res. 5: Amendment to House Rules, permitting committee chairmen to bring to floor any measure not reported by Rules Committee within 21 days (adopted 275 to 142).	Yea.
4	Feb. 7	H. Con. Res. 22: Postponed date of submission of legislative budget from Feb. 15, as required by 1946 Reorganization Act, to May 1 (passed 290 to 142).	Nay.
5	do	H. R. 2361: To provide for reorganization of Government agencies (passed 356 to 9)	Yea.
6	Feb. 9	H. Res. 78: To provide $200,000 for investigations by House Committee on Un-American Activities (passed 353 to 39)	Do.
7	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 1211: Reciprocal trade agreements bill, to committee with instructions to retain peril-point provision in law (motion lost, 151 to 241).	Do.
8	do	H. R. 1211: Extending authority to President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements (passed 319 to 69)	Do.
9	Feb. 15	Quorum call	Present.
10	do	H. Res. 99: Waiving all points of order against H. R. 2632, first deficiency appropriation bill (adopted 242 to 121)	Nay.
11	do	Quorum call	Present.
12	do	do	Do.
13	Feb. 16	do	Do.
14	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 2632: First deficiency appropriation bill to committee with instructions to insert $9,000,000 to handle State backlog of unemployment claims (lost 146 to 257).	Yea.
15	do	H. R. 2632: First deficiency appropriation bill (passed 367 to 19)	Do.
16	Feb. 17	Quorum call	Present.
17	do	Motion to recommit to committee, H. R. 1661: Continuing Presidential authority for control of exports, instructing committee to report bill deleting such authority for agricultural commodities, supply of which certified to be in excess of domestic needs (motion lost 139 to 222).	Yea.
18	do	H. R. 1661: Continuing Presidential authority for control of exports (passed 250 to 102)	Nay.
19	Feb. 21	Quorum call	Present.
20	do	H. Res. 75: Authorizing Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations (passed 321 to 4)	Yea.
21	Feb. 22	Quorum call	Present.
22	Mar. 1	Motion to recommit H. R. 199: To provide immigration quotas to Asian and Pacific peoples (defeated 39 to 336)	Nay.
23	Mar. 7	H. R. 2663: To provide for administration of Central Intelligence Agency (passed 348 to 4)	Yea.
24	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 11	do	Do.
26	Mar. 14	do	Do.
27	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 3347: To provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia (defeated 163 to 181)	Yea.
28	do	H. R. 3347: To provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia (defeated 166 to 176)	Nay.
29	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
30	do	Williams "home rule" amendment to H. R. 1721: To extend rent control (adopted 227 to 186)	Yea.
31	do	Rains amendment to delete authority to recontrol hotels which had been decontrolled (adopted 227 to 175)	Do.
32	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 1731. Rent control bill, instructing committee to extend existing law 3 months (defeated 154 to 269)	Do.
33	do	H. R. 1731: Extending time and scope of Federal rent control (passed 261 to 153)	Nay.
34	Mar. 16	H. Res. 148: Providing for consideration of H. R. 1437, authorizing composition of Army and Air Force (adopted 368 to 1)	Yea.
35	do	Quorum call	Present.
36	Mar. 21	do	Do.
37	do	H. R. 1757: Extension of District of Columbia rent control (passed 247 to 117)	Nay.
38	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
39	do	H. R. 1437: Authorizing composition of Army and Air Force (passed 396 to 4)	Yea.
40	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 2681: To provide pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II, to committee (failed, 187 to 223)	Do.
41	do	Motion to strike out the enacting clause of H. R. 2681: To provide pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II (failed 130 to 294)	Do.
42	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
43	Mar. 24	do	Do.
44	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 2681: To provide pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II, to committee for further study (carried, 208 to 207)	Yea.
45	Mar. 25	Quorum call	Present.
46	Mar. 28	do	Do.
47	do	S. 155: To authorize Board of Commissioners of District of Columbia to establish summer daylight saving time (passed, 222 to 120)	Nay.

Roll Call No.	Date (1949)	Identification and result of vote	My vote
48	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
49	Mar. 29	do	Do.
50	do	Amendment to H. R. 3734: Appropriations for civil functions of Army, to prevent acquisition of lands at Garrison Dam, N. Dak. (failed 194 to 216)	Yea.
51	do	Amendment to H. R. 3734: Appropriations for civil functions of Army, providing funds for project at Clinton River, Mich. (adopted 256 to 138)	Do.
52	do	Amendment to H. R. 3734: Appropriations for civil functions of Army, adding $6,000,000 amount for lower Mississippi flood control (adopted 277 to 117)	Do.
53	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 3704: To provide additional revenue for District of Columbia (lost 177 to 218)	Nay.
54	do	H. R. 3704: To provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia (passed 216 to 180)	Yea.
55	do	Conference report on H. R. 1731: Extension of Federal rent control (adopted 263 to 143)	Nay.
56	Mar. 30	Quorum call	Present.
57	do	do	Do.
58	Mar. 31	do	Do.
59	do	H. Res. 160: To provide for consideration of H. R. 2023, to regulate oleomargarine and repeal certain taxes (adopted 253 to 9)	Yea.
60	do	Quorum call	Present.
61	Apr. 1	do	Do.
62	do	Force substitute amendment to H. R. 2023: To regulate oleomargarine and repeal certain taxes (adopted 242 to 157)	Nay.
63	do	H. R. 2023: To regulate oleomargarine and repeal certain taxes (passed 257 to 89)	Yea.
64	Apr. 4	Nonoperation amendment to H. R. 1822: To establish Women's Reserve of Coast Guard Reserve (adopted 193 to 153)	Do.
65	do	H. R. 1822: To amend China Aid Act of 1948 (passed 279 to 76)	Do.
66	Apr. 7	H. Res. 162: Providing for consideration of H. R. 4016, appropriations bill for State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, and waiving all points of order (adopted 248 to 137)	Nay.
67	do	Quorum call	Present.
68	do	Motion to adjourn (rejected 145 to 212)	Yea.
69	Apr. 8	Quorum call	Present.
70	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 4046: Deficiency appropriation bill, with instructions to include funds for War Claims Commission (lost 149 to 190)	Yea.
71	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Present.
72	do	do	Do.
73	Apr. 11	do	Do.
74	Apr. 12	do	Do.
75	do	H. R. 2792: Extension and amendment of Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, Marshall plan (passed 354 to 49)	Yea.
76	Apr. 13	Quorum call	Present.
77	Apr. 14	do	Do.
78	Apr. 26	do	Do.
79	do	H. Res. 191: To provide for consideration of H. R. 2032, to revise the Labor Relations Act of 1947 (adopted 369 to 6)	Yea.
80	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
81	Apr. 28	do	Do.
82	Apr. 29	do	Do.
83	May 3	do	Do.
84	do	Wood amendment to H. R. 2032: National labor relations law revision (adopted 217 to 209)	Yea.
85	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
86	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 2032: National labor relations law revision (agreed to 213 to 209)	Nay.
87	do	Quorum call	Present.
88	May 5	H. R. 2337: To incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation (passed 273 to 62)	Yea.
89	May 9	H. R. 2447: To provide for a decennial census of housing (passed 228 to 51)	Do.
90	do	Quorum call	Present.
91	May 10	Amendment to H. R. 6303 Swiss war damage claims bill, to prevent payment of interest on claims (rejected 172 to [illegible])	Yea.
92	do	Quorum call	Present.
93	May 11	do	Do.
94	do	H. R. 2749: To amend Commodity Credit Charter Act, and the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock-Piling Act (passed 326 to 52)	Nay.
95	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
96	do	Conference report on H. R. 2632: First deficiency appropriation bill of 1949 (adopted 292 to 17)	Yea.
97	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
98	do	H. Res. 199: Providing for consideration of H. R. 195, to assist the States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes (agreed to 322 to 24)	Yea.
99	May 18	Overriding Presidential veto of H. R. 1036: Claims bill for destroyed internal revenue stamps (overridden 318 to 49)	Do.
100	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
101	do	do	Do.
102	May 20	do	Do.
103	May 24	do	Do.
104	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 4521: Armed services pay bill (agreed to 227 to 163)	Nay.
105	May 26	Conference report on H. R. 3704: District of Columbia revenue bill (adopted 194 to 152)	Yea.
106	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
107	do	H. R. 4617: To liberalize the requirement for pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II (passed 365 to 27)	Yea.
108	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
109	June 16	Motion to recommit H. R. 4092: To provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges (lost 135 to 195)	Yea.
110	June 21	H. R. 4205: To amend National Bank Act and Bretton Woods Agreement Act, so as to permit national banks to deal in securities of World Bank (passed 232 to 15)	Do.
111	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
112	June 23	do	Do.
113	June 24	do	Do.
114	June 27	do	Do.
115	June 28	do	Do.
116	June 29	do	Do.
117	do	Amendment to H. R. 4009: Public-housing and slum-clearance bill, to strike out public-housing section (rejected 204 to 200)	Yea.
118	do	Amendment to H. R. 4009: Housing bill of 1949, barring payment of salaries to employees who fail to sign antisubversive affidavit (adopted 283 to 129)	Yea.
[illegible]	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 4009: Housing bill of 1949 (lost 170 to 241)	Do.
120	do	H. R. 4009: To provide Federal aid for public housing and slum clearance (passed 226 to 185)	Do.
121	July 6	Quorum call	Present.
122	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 4406: Yugoslav claims bill (lost 181 to 177)	Yea.
123	do	H. Res. 277: To provide for consideration of S. 1008, to define application of Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices (basing-point price bill) (adopted 305 to 22)	Do.
124	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
125	do	Amendment to S. 937: Authorizing payment of certain claims, to reduce amount to be paid (adopted 187 to 142)	Yea.
126	July 13	H. R. 3942: To amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones (passed 282 to 109)	Nay.
127	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
128	do	do	Do.
129	July 20	do	Do.
130	do	do	Do.
131	July 21	do	Do.
132	do	Senate amendment to H. R. 5240: To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (farm-price support) to continue present program for 1 year (adopted 204 to 170)	Yea.
133	do	H. R. 5240: To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (farm-price support) (passed 363 to 25)	Do.
134	July 25	Motion to adjourn (rejected 102 to 241)	Nay.
135	do	Previous question on approval of Journal of proceedings for July 22 (carried 209 to 88)	Yea.
136	do	Approval of Journal of proceedings for July 22 (approved 285 to 56)	Do.
137	do	Motion to adjourn (defeated 113 to 262)	Nay.
138	do	Previous question on adoption of H. Res. 278: To consider H. R. 3199, Federal anti-poll-tax bill (ordered 262 to 100)	Yea.
139	do	Motion to adjourn (defeated 110 to 262)	Nay.
140	do	H. Res. 278: To consider H. R. 3199, Federal anti-poll-tax bill (adopted 265 to 100)	Yea.
141	do	Quorum call	Present.
142	July 26	do	Do.
143	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 3199: Federal anti-poll-tax bill (lost 123 to 277)	Nay.
144	do	H. R. 3199: Federal anti-poll-tax bill (passed 273 to 119)	Yea.

Roll Call No.	Date (1949)	Identification and result of vote	My vote
145	July 27	Motion to recommit conference report on S. 1154, to encourage construction of rental housing in areas adjacent to military installations (lost 82 to 289)	Not voting.
146	do	Quorum call	Absent.
147	Aug. 1	do	Present.
148	do	H. R. 3282: To repeal Indian liquor laws in certain parts of Minnesota and Wisconsin (defeated 131 to 168)	Yea.
149	do	H. R. 5602: Authorizing the Secretary of State to provide for the relief of Chinese students in United States (passed 264 to 69)	Do.
150	Aug. 2	H. R. 5598: To increase disability and death-compensation rates, and liberalize dependency allowances for veterans with service-connected disabilities and their dependents (passed 356 to 0)	Do.
151	do	Conference report on H. R. 5623: To promote efficiency and economy in National Military Establishment (adopted 366 to 7)	Yea.
152	do	H. Res. 289: To provide for consideration of H. R. 29, to provide parity for tung nuts (adopted 335 to 21)	Do.
153	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
154	Aug. 3	do	Do.
155	do	do	Do.
156	Aug. 4	do	Do.
157	do	do	Do.
158	do	H. Res. 210: Providing for the consideration of H. R. 1758, to amend the Natural Gas Act (adopted 233 to 113)	Yea.
159	do	Quorum call	Present.
160	do	do	Do.
161	Aug. 5	do	Absent.
162	do	do	Do.
163	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 1758: To amend the Natural Gas Act (lost 134 to 187)	(?).
164	do	H. R. 1758: To amend the Natural Gas Act (passed 182 to 121)	(?).
165	Aug. 6	Quorum call	Present.
166	do	Amendments to H. Res. 153: To provide for consideration of H. R. 5856, amendment of Fair Labor Standards Act (adopted 269 to 124)	Nay.
167	do	H. Res. 183: Providing for the consideration of H. R. 5856, amendment of Fair Labor Standards Act (adopted 351 to 17)	Yea.
168	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
169	do	do	Do.
170	do	Motion to instruct conferees to insist upon disagreement to Senate amendment to H. R. 4830, making appropriations for foreign aid, which amendment restored "watchdog committee" (carried 210 to 154)	Nay.
171	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
172	do	Lucas amendment to H. R. 5856: Amending the Fair Labor Standards Act (adopted 225 to 181)	Yea.
173	Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
174	do	H. R. 5856: Amending Fair Labor Standards Act (wage and hour law) (passed 261 to 30)	Yea.
175	do	Quorum call	Present.
176	Aug. 12	do	Do.
177	do	do	Do.
178	do	Amendment to H. R. 5626: To authorize the President to delegate executive powers to other officers, which amendment would confine the delegation to "routine administrative duties" (failed 114 to 162)	Yea.
179	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
180	do	H. J. Res. 339: Making temporary appropriations through Aug. 15, 1949 (failed two-thirds vote for suspension of rules 176 to 145)	Nay.
181	do	H. R. 2734: Amending Clayton Antitrust Act to control purchase of assets of one company by another (passed 223 to 92)	Yea.
182	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
183	do	do	Do.
184	Aug. 17	do	Do.
185	do	Amendment to H. J. Res. 339: Making temporary appropriations (amendment set Sept. 15, rather than indefinite continuance of appropriations) (adopted 213 to 114)	Yea.
186	do	H. Res. 327: Providing for consideration of H. R. 5895, military assistance program (agreed to 275 to 47)	Do.
187	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
188	do	Amendment to H. R. 5895: Bill providing for military-assistance program, reducing appropriation from 2 years to 1, and halving amount (adopted 209 to 151)	Yea.
189	do	H. R. 5895: Providing for military assistance to European countries (passed 238 to 122)	Do.
190	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Absent.
191	do	do	Do.
192	do	Amendment to H. R. 6008: Supplemental appropriations bill, amendment eliminated $2,000,000 for Sesquicentennial Commission of District of Columbia (adopted 150 to 129)	(?).
193	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
194	do	do	Do.
195	do	do	Do.
196	Aug. 24	do	Do.
197	do	Motion to adjourn (carried 186 to 132)	Nay.
198	Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
199	do	H. Res. 342, making suspensions of the rules in order for 1 day only (adopted 270 to 1)	Yea.
200	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
201	do	do	Do.
202	do	H. R. 4426: Postal pay raise, leave, longevity, and promotion bill (passed 332 to 2)	Yea.
203	Sept. 28	Quorum call	Present.
204	do	Motion to recommit conference report on H. R. 5895: Military assistance program for foreign nations (lost 113 to 213)	Yea.
205	do	Conference report on H. R. 5895: Military assistance program for foreign nations (approved 224 to 109)	Do.
206	Sept. 29	Quorum call	Present.
207	do	Motion to instruct conferees to recede and concur in Senate amendment to H. R. 4830, making appropriations for foreign aid (amendment provided $150,000,000 additional loan authorization) (motion prevailed 177 to 134)	Nay.
208	Oct. 3	Quorum call	Present.
209	do	H. R. 5908: To amend Hospital Survey and Construction Act (passed 236 to 43)	Yea.
210	do	S. 2116: To provide for advance planning of non-Federal public works (passed 210 to 69)	Do.
211	do	Quorum call	Present.
212	do	Motion to instruct conferees on H. R. 3734, civil functions appropriation bill, to disagree to any funds for flood-control project at Gavins Point, S. Dak. (rejected 101 to 153)	Nay.
213	Oct. 4	Quorum call	Present.
214	do	Previous question on H. Res. 372, providing for consideration of H. R. 6000, amending the Social Security Act, under a closed rule with no amendments in order (ordered 175 to 154)	Nay.
215	do	H. Res. 372, providing a closed rule for the consideration of H. R. 6000, amending the Social Security Act (adopted 190 to 135)	Do.
216	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
217	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 6000, social-security bill, with instructions to substitute Keogh bill, H. R. 6297 (lost 112 to 232)	Yea.
218	do	H. R. 6000, amending the Social Security Act (passed 333 to 16)	Do.
219	Oct. 6	Conference report on H. R. 5300, third deficiency appropriation bill (adopted 269 to 18)	Do.
220	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Present.
221	do	do	Do.
222	do	Motion that House insist on its disagreements to Senate amendment to H. R. 4146; National Military Establishment appropriation bill (58 versus 48 air groups) (motion prevailed 305 to 1)	Yea.
223	do	Quorum call	Present.
224	do	Motion that House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments to H. R. 4146; National Military Establishment appropriation bill (retaining appropriation for stock piling of strategic materials) (motion prevailed 305 to 0)	Yea.
225	do	Quorum call	Present.
226	Oct. 11	do	Do.
227	do	Motion to recommit conference report on H. R. 6008; supplemental appropriation bill, to strike out $3,000,000 for Sesquicentennial Commission of District of Columbia (carried 139 to 132)	Yea.
228	Oct. 13	Motion to recommit to committee, H. R. 1379: A bill authorizing three new municipal judgeships for District of Columbia (lost 30 to 299)	Do.
229	do	Adoption of rule for consideration of S. J. Res. 134, extending certain provisions of National Housing Act (adopted 289 to 34)	Nay.
230	Oct. 14	Quorum call	Present.
231	do	Motion to recommit S. 1008: A bill to define and permit basing-point pricing (motion failed, 138 to 176)	Nay.
232	do	Adoption of conference report on S. 1008: To permit basing-point pricing (adopted 200 to 104)	Yea.
233	Oct. 17	Quorum call	Present.
234	do	S. 2655: To stimulate exploration for and conservation of, strategic materials (failed necessary two-thirds vote for suspension of rules, 176 to 144)	Yea.
235	do	Quorum call	Present.
236	Oct. 18	do	Do.

[1] Not voting, paired against.

[2] Not voting, paired for.

Republican Principles and Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement of principles and objectives adopted by the Republican Members of the House of Representatives and the Republican Members of the Senate, and concurred in by the members of the Republican National Committee on February 8, 1950:

To win lasting peace, to build a country in which every citizen may make the most of his skill, initiative, and enterprise, and to hold aloft the inspiring torch of American freedom, opportunity, and justice, assuring better and happier life for all our people, we dedicate our efforts and base this statement of principles and objectives supplementing the Republican platform of 1948.

We shall not passively defend the principles stated here, but shall fight for them with all the vigor with which our forefathers fought to establish what we now seek to advance and perpetuate—human liberty and individual dignity.

We pledge that in all we will advocate and in all that we will perform the first test shall be: Does this conduct enlarge and strengthen or does it undermine and lessen human liberty and individual dignity.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The American people face the hard fact that though they won the war nearly 5 years ago they have not yet won the peace. We offer them leadership in new efforts to achieve this vital end.

We favor a foreign policy in which all Americans, regardless of party, will join to secure peace with justice in a free world while maintaining the independence and the rights of the American people.

We insist upon restoration of our foreign agreements to their proper place inside the Constitution and we insist that the United States shall not be bound to any course of action unless the spirit and letter of our constitutional procedure are followed.

We oppose secret commitments, and we denounce the refusal of the administration to furnish accurate and adequate information to the Congress.

Under our indispensable two-party system, we shall be vigilant in critical exploration of administration foreign policy. We favor consultation between executive and members of both major parties in the legislative branch of Government in the initiation and development of a united American foreign policy; and we deplore the tragic consequences of the administration's failure to pursue these objectives in many fields, particularly in the secret agreements of Yalta, subsequently confirmed at Potsdam, which have created new injustices and new dangers throughout the world.

We favor full support of the United Nations and the improvement of its Charter so that it may be an effective international organization of independent states prepared to mobilize public opinion and the armed forces of the world against aggression. We favor full support of the Inter-American system as an integral part of the international organization, and of our treaty obligations in the North Atlantic community.

We advocate a strong policy against the spread of Communism or Fascism at home and abroad, and we insist that America's efforts toward this end be directed by those who have no sympathy either with communism or fascism.

We support aid to those states resisting communism but such aid should be given only if it is essential to our national security, if it is within the total limits which the American economy can afford, if it will be effective, if it is beyond the ability of the aided nation to supply for itself, and if there is a program for progressive reduction.

The Republican Party has always believed in a strong national defense. We must maintain our armed forces at a strength completely adequate for the security of our people.

We favor the promotion of world trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and we assert that this can be done within the Republican principle that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to this country on terms which imperil the living standards of the American workman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry. A strong American economy is a vital factor for our security.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

The major domestic issue today is liberty against socialism: whether we shall remain in this country a free people in constant control of our governments, or whether we shall delegate to an all-powerful Federal Government with unlimited power to tax and spend, the rights to direct and operate our agriculture, industry, labor, and local communities and the daily lives of our citizens. We believe there is no frontier beyond which devotion to the American system may not increase our knowledge, character, and material welfare; but we believe these goals can only be secured in a framework of liberty, equality, and justice, with adequate incentive and rewards to workmen and to industry for ability, knowledge, character, hard work, daring, and genius.

Basic American principles are threatened by the administration's program for a planned economy modeled on the Socialist governments of Europe, including price and wage control, rationing, socialized medicine, regional authorities, and the Brannan plan with its controls, penalties, fines, and jail sentences. This program is dictated by a small but powerful group of persons who believe in socialism, who have no concept of the true foundation of American progress, and whose proposals are wholly out of accord with the true interests and real wishes of the workers, farmers, and businessmen.

As the iron curtain descends on half the globe, and as nation after nation samples the drug of totalitarianism, the Republican Party is the champion of human liberty and the essential dignity of the individual. To it falls the task of offering not only its opposition but of proposing a program to restore faith in free institutions, and bring about stability, opportunity, and progress.

We hold that government can use its just powers to foster national health, promote real security for the aged, develop sound agricultural and labor-management policies, and advance civil rights. These ideas are in keeping with the earliest and finest Republican traditions, and can be achieved without establishing socialism or discipline or dependence. The Democrats have also professed these ideals, but the stark truth is that after 18 years of Democratic control and endless talk, they have reduced this whole field to confusion and futility. The administration is seeking to make demagogic appeals rather than enact sound legislation. It seeks to keep glittering goals intact to lure votes in anticipation of favors to come. Such a cynical procedure raises the naked issue of sincerity, of responsibility, and of achievement.

To achieve our objectives, we offer certain fundamental proposals, and constructive undertakings to rebuild a prosperous and progressive America:

I. The economy

Liberty cannot breathe the air of bankruptcy and live.

Reckless and extravagant spending by the Federal Government, as now advocated by the Democratic administration, with recurring annual deficits or continually increasing taxes, can result only in disaster and ruin for our country. It will further cheapen the dollar, rob the wage earner, impoverish the farmer, and destroy the savings, pensions, insurance, and investments of millions of people. Therefore we urge:

A. An end of deficit spending and a return to a balanced budget.

B. That Federal spending be materially reduced.

C. The achievement of efficiency and economy in Government especially by adoption of measures along the lines of the Hoover report.

D. A policy of general tax reduction to be accomplished as rapidly as reduction in Federal expenditures will permit. We favor immediate repeal of oppressive wartime excises and reduction of taxes on small business to stimulate new industry and growth. This will create new jobs, new wealth, and eventually greater tax revenue. It will provide opportunity for youth, furnish incentives for stable employment and retention of older employees and encourage lower prices.

E. Strict enforcement of the laws against monopoly and unfair competition.

F. Establishment of a nonpartisan commission to study and recommend a sensible redistribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue between the Federal, State and local entities, to secure the sovereignty of the several States with as much decentralization as is compatible with the national welfare.

II. Agriculture

A prosperous agriculture is fundamental to a prosperous America. We join farm organizations in condemning the Brannan plan which would regiment our farmers, cost untold billions of the taxpayers' money, and would mean the ultimate nationalization of agriculture. Its inefficiency and increased costs would adversely affect both the producer and the consumer. It would place every farmer in a state of complete dependency on Government for a large part of his income from uncertain annual congressional appropriations. We deplore the maladministration for political purposes of the present agricultural law by the Department of Agriculture.

We will continue to work with the farmers, farm organizations, and all friends of agriculture to bring about a sound solution of the many problems confronting the farmers of this country. Such farm policies must be developed in the interest of the farmer, the consumer, and the national economy. Agriculture is a growing and dynamic industry undergoing constant change and improvement. No farm program can succeed which is not in harmony with this concept. Specifically we propose the following:

A. A program to provide a fair price for the farmers' products in the market place, aided by a system of price supports and by protection against the dumping of competitive commodities produced by underpaid foreign labor, to the end that the farmer's standard of living will be in line with the contribution he makes to the national economy.

B. Continue and enlarge programs of research and education, both in production and marketing, with particular attention to cheaper and more effective production, a better and more effective marketing system, especially for perishable commodities, sound cooperative marketing, and the development and expansion of industrial uses for agricultural products and byproducts.

C. Continued development and restoration of our soil and water resources through soil conservation and reclamation.

D. Expansion of animal agriculture as a means of reducing surpluses, rebuilding the soil, and providing a better diet for our people.

E. Special encouragement for the development and ownership of family-sized farms, improvement of rural living conditions, and completion of the rural electrification program.

F. Development of export markets for the surplus crops which can be efficiently produced in this country.

III. Labor-management relations

Industrial harmony and justice are essential to the country's well-being. To that end, government should encourage and promote free collective bargaining. On management and unions falls an equal responsibility to act in good faith toward each other and toward the country. We favor:

A. Continuation of the Taft-Hartley law because it has restored equality between employer and employees, guaranteed the right of collective bargaining, the recognition of unions and the right to strike, while protecting the rights of the public and the union members. Under this law union membership has increased to new highs, wages have risen to record levels, and strikes have decreased.

B. Continuation of our efforts to enact such improvements in the law as have been shown to be necessary to accomplish its purposes more effectively and achieve more complete equality. We deplore the action of the administration in playing politics in this vital area of human relations, thereby blocking the enactment of necessary amendments to the law.

IV. Civil rights

The right of equal opportunity to work, to vote, to advance in life and to be protected under the law should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. Therefore, we shall continue to sponsor legislation to protect the rights of minorities.

V. Social responsibility

The obligation of Government to those in need has long been recognized. Recognizing the inequities and injustices of the present program of social security, we urge:

A. The extension of the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program, reduction of eligibility requirements, and increase of benefits to a more generous level, with due regard to the tax burden on those who labor.

B. A thoroughgoing study of a program of more nearly universal coverage including the principle of pay as you go.

C. Federal aid, where the need is clearly demonstrated, to States and through States to their subdivisions, to assist them in affording subsistence, shelter, and medical care to their citizens who are unable to provide for themselves. Such aid, including unemployment compensation, must be based on State and local initiative, operation, contribution, and responsibility without Federal bureaucratic interference. It must avoid socialization of the medical profession or of any other activity. Federal aid must be in amounts which do not impose an unreasonable burden of taxation on the American people who pay the bills.

VI. Veterans

A grateful nation demands that those who fought in its defense, their widows and orphans, must never be forgotten. We urge:

A. Continuing and sympathetic consideration of the rights and deserts of the veterans and their dependents.

B. Prompt and efficient handling of claims and other problems of veterans.

VII. Loyalty

Communism is an international conspiracy aiming at world-wide dictatorship and the suppression of religious, political, and economic freedoms throughout the world. It corrupts ideals, corrodes basic religious teachings, destroys the fiber of man, and denies the existence of God. It is imperative that the nations of the world develop new methods to offset this frontal attack on civilization.

We condemn the failure of the administration to recognize the full implications of this threat to our security. We deplore the dangerous degree to which Communists and their fellow-travelers have been employed in important Government posts and the fact that information vital to our security has been made available to alien agents and persons of questionable loyalty. We denounce the soft attitude of this administration toward Government employees and officials who hold or support Communist attitudes. We pledge immediate action to bring about:

A. A complete overhaul of the so-called loyalty and security checks of Federal personnel.

B. The prompt elimination of all Communists, fellow-travelers, and Communist sympathizers from our Federal pay roll.

C. Closer coordination between our intelligence agencies, with full use of the facilities of the FBI for protecting our security.

CONCLUSION

To this program we subscribe, confident that the overwhelming majority of Americans cherish our heritage of freedom and will join us in this crusade to see that it shall not perish from the earth.

Our people must arouse themselves to preserve our precious liberties and freedoms—the right to worship God in our own way; to speak freely our minds without fear; to conduct our lives and our affairs without officious meddling by too-powerful government. We must revivify those qualities of diligence, economy, courage, initiative, and patriotism which enabled our forefathers to make this Nation great.

This Republic is the custodian of human liberty. The Republican Party will endeavor to see to it that we are worthy of this guardianship.

President Truman and the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE MAGEE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, the other day I received a letter from a business executive at St. Louis, Mo., wherein he discussed President Truman and the budget. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include his letter and my reply:

AMERICAN REFRIGERATOR TRANSIT CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., February 3, 1950.

Hon. ELMER MAGEE,
Representative in Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: If there is any financial responsibility whatever in the present Congress as a whole, something which, reluctantly, I am beginning to doubt, it will certainly tell our financially irresponsible pseudo President what to do with his nightmare budget.

May I hope, as one of your constituents but more as an American, that you will display financial responsibility when Congress comes to pass upon the fearful spending so blithely proposed by this shallow executive.

Won't you tell him by your vote that it is his job to trim that budget by not less than $7,000,000,000 and that it is his job, not that of the Congress, to do the trimming. Won't you do your part to pin this President to his responsibility for being specific and not vague about the taxes he asks the Congress to eliminate and about those he wants increased to support his intolerable spending. Won't you tell him by your vote that in this peace year, 5 years after war ended, when production is at high level, the Nation's budget not only must be balanced but that, besides, substantial reduction must be made in the national debt.

Above all, won't you, by your vote, tell this President that if he is honest—as of course he is not—in blaming the tax reduction of the Eightieth Congress for the deficit he now proposes, that he should be equally honest to propose restoration of the taxes that responsible Congress eliminated.

People generally, Mr. Congressman, even fuzzy-minded neoliberals, the get-something-for-nothing people who applaud spending, are beginning to wake up to the fact that Government can spend no money it does not first take in taxes from the people. They are beginning to see also that they are "the people." In my opinion, a rude surprise is rapidly building up for the planners, promisers, and spenders—a surprise package which they will dislike opening come next election.

I would be pleased and proud to hear that you stand for fiscal sanity.

Yours truly,

O. M. STEVENS.

FEBRUARY 6, 1950.

Mr. O. M. STEVENS,
President and Manager, American Refrigerator Transit Co.,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR SIR: Your letter addressed to Hon. Elmer Magee has been received at my office. My first name is not Elmer, but maybe you had a purpose in mind by so addressing me. I recall that at Legion conventions the boys would go around saying: "Where's Elmer?" It appears he was always an elusive character who was lost. Perhaps you have considered my record in Congress and think I'm lost.

Yours was quite an interesting letter; but I just wonder if you haven't been in the refrigeration business so long that it's chilled your heart. You refer to our "financially irresponsible pseudo President." You mention the "nightmare budget," and then proceed: "May I hope, as one of your constituents but more as an American, that you will display financial responsibility when Congress comes to pass upon the fearful spending so blithely proposed by this shallow Executive."

You then suggest that by my vote I tell him that the budget should be trimmed by $7,000,000,000. In a later reference you question the honesty of the President.

Most legislators appreciate getting helpful, constructive letters and suggestions. We desire the viewpoints of people, even though they may not coincide with our own. All this is democracy in action. However, your letter was none such. It was mean and hateful, full of venom and calculated to reflect dishonor on our fellow Missourian who holds the high office of President.

My inclination was to reply in like vein and call you a factious facsimile Fascist, attempting to play the role of a modern Fafnir. However, I will be kinder than that. No doubt, you have just paid some income tax and it has made you ill. I'll just say that you are a pained paleface in need of paregoric because you can't have your pie and eat it, too.

Of course, I never met you, never heard of you before, and if I never meet you it will be soon enough; but to you, the American who refers to Mr. Truman as "shallow" and "dishonest" and a "pseudo" or sham and fake President, I address these questions: Where

were you when Harry Truman was leading his troops in the Vosges operations, in bloody combat at St. Mihiel, or the offensive in the Meuse-Argonne? Where were you when Harry Truman was trying to get in active service in the Second World War? Where were you when Harry Truman headed a Senate investigation committee and worked his heart out to save the taxpayers a few billions?

Oh, I've heard this song of hate before. I've heard Harry Truman called "the small man from Missouri." Let me say to you and Sir that this small man stays with his own kind. He's for the small people all over the world. The late mother of the President once said: "Harry could always plow the straightest furrow of any farmer in our community." Harry Truman is still plowing a straight furrow—a straight furrow for the American people, a straight furrow for democratic ideals everywhere.

Of course, we all want a balanced budget when we can safely have it, and we are working with that goal in mind. We are attempting to correct some tax inequities. We want to restore some agents in the Department of Revenue so that we can check up on some tax evaders. You may recall that your friend, the Eightieth Congress, was responsible for our not having the men to do this. We expect to effect substantial savings by passage of the Hoover Commission recommendations.

There is one thing you may have overlooked. The Government's system of bookkeeping is different from what it was a few years back. It now lists as expenditures all loans made by such lending agencies as the RFC, Commodity Credit Corporation, etc. There are some $[illegible] of such loans now listed as expenditures. We hope that most of these will be repaid. For example, you might be interested in knowing that in our State of Missouri no electric cooperative is in default and [illegible]ent, and the REA loans will probably total about one-half billion this year. Actually the deficit spending is nearer $1,000,000,000 than $3,000,000,000.

It would be interesting to know just where you would cut off $7,000,000,000 of the present budget. Out of every budget dollar, 31.9 cents will go directly for national defense. How much would you cut this? The interest on the national debt is 12.1 cents. Of course, no cut can be made here. Veterans' benefits amount to 14.3 cents. How much would you take from the defenders of our country? Security grants to foreign nations take 11.1 cents. How much would you reduce that? There is earmarked for atomic energy development 1.9 cents. Is Communism a threat? Is national defense necessary? If not, we can beat your suggestion for a saving. We can quadruple the amount you suggest.

You will note that the above accounts for 72.4 cents out of every dollar of Federal spending.

In a subsequent paragraph of your letter you speak of "Tussy-minded neoliberals, the get-something-for-nothing people." I assume you refer to the aged, the blind, and otherwise handicapped who get 3.6 cents out of every budget dollar. The average payment made to the aged who draw assistance is something over $40 per month. Just how much do you think these payments should be reduced? Or would you take something off of other social and health services which amount to 2.6 cents? Purchase of housing mortgages is 2.3 cents; housing and slum clearance is 1 cent; aid to agriculture is 3.3 cents; RMA and rural housing is 1.6 cents; and subsidies to business is 2.9 cents. The items total 15.8 cents of the budget dollar, and include the loans which we trust will be mostly repaid.

What do we have left? If I figure correctly, this leaves only 8.8 cents for the ordinary costs of Government. You have the figures. Now, Mr. Stevens, you can take pencil in hand and start lopping off that $7,000,000,000.

I wonder if you have ever thought that even though taxes are high the average businessman or property owner could pay the present tax rate for two or three decades and it wouldn't cost him as much as one good old depression would cost. You probably recall a depression such as we had when your friends were running this Government under the old theory of "free enterprise" and "individual initiative."

You close your exhortative epistle with the statement that "a rude surprise is rapidly building up for the planners, promisers, and spenders—a surprise package which they will dislike opening come next election." I haven't gone and won't go 100 percent with this administration; but I believe in a planned economy within our democratic framework, so I might be labeled a "planner." I made certain promises to my folks back home on how I would vote, so no doubt I am a "promiser." I believe that in a great country such as ours, with its vast wealth and resources, no one should be in want. I believe in opposing communism. I believe in national defense. Therefore, I am a "spender." So I come in the category you mention. Now, Mr. Stevens, I'll take back what I said about not wanting to meet you. I've decided it would be a pleasure. It would be nice to meet you in public debate in my district in the next campaign, and certainly I want you present when I open that "surprise package come next election."

I believe it was Lord Beaconsfield who said, "The man who does not look up will look down, and the spirit which does not dare to soar is destined to grovel." I think Harry Truman is looking upward. I think the spirit of America is looking upward as it seeks to lead the way to a fuller life and to portray to all the world a type of government that grants the greatest good to the greatest number.

Sincerely yours,

CLARE MAGEE,
Member of Congress.

The Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, Successful Farming, the magazine of farm business and farm homes, is published in Des Moines, Iowa. In the January 1950, issue of that popular and well-known magazine appeared a most interesting and thought-provoking article entitled "We're Not Through With the Brannan Plan." Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the article herewith:

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—For almost 30 years Congress and farm organizations have debated solutions for farm problems, chiefly surpluses. Intervention of World War II absorbed surpluses which had been steadily mounting in spite of crop controls, marketing quotas, and other expedients calling for heavy outlay of tax money (yours). Again there is growing concern that farm production may exceed our effective needs. Like all other business, farming must make adjustments.

(Has experience taught us anything? Must farmers surrender their freedom of action and decision? Will free market price no longer perform its function of guiding production? And from the taxpayer must we draw increasing sums of money to cover up the errors of judgment of the planners? We may escape the short-time adjustment that way. In the long run we will have achieved growing inefficiency and frustration.)

Guaranteed high income to farmers and low-cost food to consumers. That's the basis of the farm-price-support plan Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan proposed to Congress. And that's probably what 148,000,000 of us Americans would want if that were all there were to it. Certainly no one could ask for anything more.

The question is, How would it work? Is the plan in your long-time interest as a farmer? What about the rest of the people and the national economy as a whole? How much will the Brannan plan really help the low-income farmers? Or just how will it fill the Nation's bread basket with cheap food? What about the cost to the Government (which means tax costs to you)? And would you want to put up with all the Government controls you are certain to run into under such a plan?

These are some of the questions you should answer before definitely deciding whether the Brannan plan is or is not the long-time answer to the problem of maintaining your farm income at a satisfactory level.

Frankly the Brannan plan promises to be the most marvelous program to strike this or any other country—that is, if it could be made to work and if Congress could or would tax enough money away from you, your neighbors, and city people to keep it going.

First, let's take a look at this farm income support proposal Secretary Brannan recommended to Congress last summer. Let's remember, too, that despite set-backs, the present administration in Washington hopes to hammer away in an attempt to have the plan or some version of it passed by the Eighty-second Congress.

Briefly, here's how the plan would have applied in 1950: It would be an attempt to support your farm income at a figure that would buy as much as your average annual income did during the period 1939–48.

To do this, you and the other 6,000,000 people classified as farmers in the United States, need a total cash farm income of around $26,000,000,000 next year. In order to achieve this national income figure, support prices on commodities next year would need to be 25 percent higher than the average price received by farmers during the last 10 years, 1940–49.

As examples, wheat support prices would be around $1.85 a bushel; corn, $1.46; potatoes, $1.50; milk, $4 a hundred; eggs, 45 cents a dozen; beef cattle, $16.90 a hundred; and hogs, at $19. Anyone who wants to know the detailed plan which Brannan used to figure the income support standard, may turn to page 84.

The big problem in any price-support program has been to find a way to support prices to farmers at the guaranteed level. Brannan proposes to continue the use of commodity loans and purchase agreements for storable commodities such as wheat, corn, and cotton. Prices for your nonstorable commodities such as hogs, eggs, and milk, on the other hand, would be permitted to seek the open-market level determined by supply and demand. Then you would receive a Government check for the difference between the market price and the price-support standard determined by the plan.

As an illustration, the price of hogs would be left free to rise or fall on a free market. But Mr. Brannan is thinking of a farm price-support standard of $19 on hogs. Under his plan, if you sold hogs for only $17, the Government would dig down and pay you the $2 a hundred difference between the standard and the market price.

To be eligible for price supports you would need to meet certain demands. First, Brannan believes farmers should be required to follow certain soil-conservation practices as determined by Government officials. Second, they would have to comply with whatever control programs are found necessary, such as acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and marketing agreements. And third, he would limit all farms to a certain specified volume of production on which price supports would apply.

That's the Brannan plan conjured up in Washington's agricultural bureaucracy. That's the plan they're trying to sell to the Nation's millions as the panacea for most of this country's economic ills. "An effective farm-production and price-stabilization program to serve the interests of all the people."

In his plan, Brannan first recommended that not more than 1,800 comparative units of production per farm be made eligible for price supports. Production beyond 1,800 units on any farm, regardless of acres or type of farm, would not be supported.

Here are several farm commodities and the pounds, bushels, or dozens equivalent to Mr. Brannan's unit of production:

Corn	bushels	19
Wheat	do	7.77
Soybeans	do	5.75
Potatoes	do	9.18
Flaxseed	do	3.40
Oats	do	17.70
Butterfat	pounds	21.82
Hogs	do	76.00
Cattle	do	86.00
Whole milk	do	346.09
Lambs	do	79.00
Chickens	do	50.34
Cotton	do	52.16
Eggs	dozens	31.88

In other words, supports on any farm would be limited to 18,000 bushels of corn, 13,986 bushels of wheat, or a combination of any commodities whose unit-of-production values don't go over the 1,800 limit. This 1,800-unit idea was worked out in such a way that price supports on any farm would be limited to a total production with a cash value around $26,000.

Mr. Brannan figures the 1,800-unit top would be reached by only about 2 percent of the Nation's farms. But let's remember that these farms account for nearly 25 percent of all the agricultural products marketed.

As you think over Brannan's ideas, there are many other things to consider. And those things will have far-reaching effects outside the strictly farm field.

Remember, for one thing, that it was only last year that city consumers were howling that price supports were responsible for 90-cent steaks and 70-cent pork chops. Actually, your hog market prices were far above the support level and you had no support on cattle. But pressure for repeal of farm price supports neared the danger mark.

In the face of all that, Secretary Brannan comes along with a plan that not only would support your farm prices at levels considerably above the old 90 percent of parity but also pegs farm prices to the highest support level on record.

The Brannan plan proposes to abandon the old parity formula which has been used for the last 20 years in measuring farm prices. It substitutes a new formula tied to an abnormal wartime-postwar period of distorted prices, incomes, and price controls. Thus, the plan sets up a goal of wartime purchasing power for farmers. And it allows little or no way for farm prices to adjust along with other prices in our country. A farm-income standard is the objective of the plan, but even so, the same old type of price supports and production controls are the means of reaching this goal.

Aside from the fact that the plan defies simple and basic economics that must accompany a good farm program, farmers are beginning to realize little could be worse than turning the problem into a political football. That is exactly what Brannan has done. They fear it means that any farm program in this country is destined to be picked up and cut up at every opportunity by opposing parties. Obviously if this happens, there will be little to which farmers can look forward with certainty. Already, this has been apparent in Congress.

The board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation are unanimous in their opposition to Brannan's plan. They have said, "The philosophy of the Brannan plan is so dangerous to agriculture that we vigorously oppose * * *

"Under this proposal, the farmer's only hope for a fair income would depend on Government hand-outs from annual appropriations by Congress. We maintain that it's unreasonable to stake the welfare of agriculture upon such a hazardous possibility.

"Cost of the program would be staggering. There is no good reason why the Government should pay part of the grocery bill for every citizen.

"Price goals of the plan are so high that farmers constantly would be under rigid controls in production and marketing.

"Whenever Government undertakes to make the decisions on which volume and quality of production must depend, the result is inefficient and costly production with continuously increasing Government subsidies."

Of course, labor-union spokesmen have been loud in their support of the Brannan proposal. They welcome the idea of cheap food at the expense of the Government Treasury. More than that, they served notice on farmers that labor expects and demands farmer support in the fight for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act—a sharp political swap.

But after all, there is only just so much production and national income each year. What income there is results from the labor, capital, and the brains of all the people. The Government, itself, doesn't produce the wealth it has to spend. Every dollar that goes into any support program has to be taken away from the people in taxes.

Mr. Brannan proposes to guarantee prices to farmers which are high enough to yield around 100 percent of parity in 1950. Under his formula, supports would rise still further in the years ahead. That would happen as the relatively low prewar years are dropped from the computations and higher years following the war are added. This means that the Government would be called upon to support your farm products and farm income far above the free-market level. There would be little or no drop in the farm-income standard until there would be an appreciable drop in prices paid by farmers. And that's regardless of the general economic conditions, unemployment, and hard times outside the farm field. Even arm-chair economists know it is nonsense not to provide for adjustments to weaker demands or a supply that is too great.

Although Mr. Brannan himself failed to venture a guess as to cost, several agricultural economists have estimated the cost of the Brannan plan could run well over $5,000,000,000 in 1950—maybe 7 to 15 times the average cost of the entire farm program each year from 1933–1939. And taxes, we don't have to remind you, are pretty high already. Also, during last year, the most prosperous year on record, the Federal Government spent nearly $2,000,000,000 more than it was able to take in from taxes.

Another argument against Charlie Brannan: Price supports before the war were never higher than 75 percent of parity. Even so, by the time the war came along, huge stocks of Government-owned corn, wheat, and cotton were becoming a real headache. The big question in the Department of Agriculture was fast becoming one of what to do with all the surpluses. So, can anyone doubt the necessity of regimentation and control of every farmer under such high supports? How long would Mr. Brannan's promise of $19 for hogs continue without limiting farmers on the number of pigs they could farrow or sell?

Also, if you think you can operate outside any Government program of controlling agricultural prices and products, you had better think again. Once marketing quotas are approved by two-thirds of the producers voting, all farmers producing that crop must go along or pay a stiff penalty. In the case of wheat, the fine is 50 percent of the support price for any production in excess of the allotment. The Brannan plan would expand the penalty provisions under present laws. For example, it would make farmers liable for fines up to $500 for failure to keep and furnish records as requested by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Nor can we overlook what these artificially high support-price levels would do to our foreign-trade policy of encouraging more and freer trade among nations. The world dollar shortage already has been cutting in on American exports. Flax, which has been obtained by our Government through price-support operations, is finding no market abroad right now. Other countries are able to get it at a cheaper price than this country is asking for it. And whenever we sell food or fiber such as this abroad at less than cost, we actually are subsidizing foreign consumers at the expense of American taxpayers, which means all of us.

Our tremendous export-market demand for wheat is not expected to continue, either. When wheat prices in this country are supported at around $1.90 a bushel and the world price is less, the only way we can expect to export wheat is to dump it abroad. In a dumping operation, the Government takes the loss between the prices here at home and the world market. Other countries don't like this and neither do we.

Brannan bases the need for his own particular plan on a comparison of income of farm and nonfarm people. He says the per capita, average, net farm income in this country last year amounted to $609. The average, per capita, net nonfarm income was $1,569. And the plan, of course, would work to bring them together.

But the average, net farm income for all farmers is far from a fair basis for comparison. The last United States census taken in 1944 reported more than 2,500,000, or more than 40 percent, of the Nation's 5,856,859 farmers were small or part-time farmers. (Anything more than 3 acres in the country is considered a farm.) Really not farmers at all, this group reported an average gross production of $544.

The same census reported more than 3,200,000 family-sized farms with an average, gross farm production of $3,966. In 1948, subscribers to Successful Farming had an average, gross farm income of around $10,000. Mr. Brannan's shotgun approach of $609 includes all kinds of farmers and people who live on acreages. It includes the very largest operators as well as hundreds of thousands of acreages that produce only a few dollars of food for market.

Isn't it apparent that real market prices for farm products are important to only about half of the people classified as farmers? The other half raises only about 10 percent of our total agricultural production, and they consume at home most of what they grow. In point of view of workers there are more consumers of agricultural products than there are producers. Actually they stand to lose more than they gain from high support prices through taxes and controls, as does everyone else. You see, this is a fine example of taxing ourselves in order to pay ourselves. And that's not good business.

So, in the end, we are beginning to realize more and more that real, permanent, long-range aid to farmers could better be brought about through greater stability in the general price level than through tinkering with

individual commodities. This calls for intelligent management of the public debt, of the tax, credit, and fiscal policies of our National Government.

Finally, it was only a few years ago that Joseph S. Davis, director of the Food Research Institute at Stanford University, Calif., asked the question, "What kind of an agriculture does America want?" His answer was then and would be now: "America wants an agriculture that earns its way, instead of being continually and increasingly dependent on Government props, vulnerable to political shifts, and forced to accept the accompanying regimentation. It wants an agriculture that, proud of its strength, competes in domestic and foreign markets on the basis of efficiency and fair play, independent of import restrictions and export subsidies. America wants well-tested programs continued and improved, and ill-starred and dangerous programs abandoned or replaced by better ones. America wants genuine, nonpolitical soil conservation, economically achieved. America wants redress of flagrant inequities, wherever they appear, but no truck with guaranties of equality for any individuals, groups, or conspiracies.

Acheson Speaks Unwisely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which appeared in my own daily newspaper, the Racine Journal Times, at Racine, Wis., reflects my own views on Mr. Acheson's attitude toward Alger Hiss. I am including it at this point in the RECORD:

As an individual Dean Acheson had a perfect right to his own opinions on the conviction and sentencing of Alger Hiss. But because he is Secretary of State, and, as such, a shaper of American policy against the expansion of communism, his public defense of Hiss was unwise and unfortunate.

Acheson's remarks can only confuse the American people and foreign governments with whom he must deal. Hiss was convicted of perjury by an American jury after a fair trial. In effect, the decision meant that he was guilty of treason back in 1948. Though he could not be tried on that charge because of the 3-year statute of limitations.

It is not appropriate for the head of the State Department to defend a man who committed the acts of a traitor while working in that same Department—a man who was branded by the Government prosecutor as an aide of spies for the Soviet Union and found by a jury to have been guilty of lying about it.

The Hiss case is being appealed and may be heard by the United States Supreme Court before it is finished. But it would have been much better if Secretary Acheson had refrained from comment as an official, instead of throwing suspicion and casting aspersions on the judicial system. He has placed himself in the untenable position of defending a perjurer duly convicted according to the law of the land.

This Nation today faces a problem of revising its foreign policy because of communistic expansion in the Far East. This policy must be worked out by the State Department in cooperation with the Senate. Secretary Acheson's remarks about the Hiss case certainly will not contribute toward the harmony and understanding in his relations with the Senators. Dissension and distrust already voiced in the upper House may imperil this Nation's foreign policy. If a Secretary of State does not have the confidence and respect of the Senate, he loses his usefulness to the Nation.

What Is Kansas?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT A. MEYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1950, the great State of Kansas celebrated her eighty-ninth birthday. In the years following her admission to statehood she has in her high type of citizenry met and fulfilled the challenge of her proud motto—"Ad astra per aspera"—"To the stars through difficulties."

One of her devoted and loyal sons, Gordon P. Martin, a young newspaperman of Topeka, in commemoration of this birthday event, has painted a word picture that so beautifully portrays the true meaning and substance of Kansas. I feel it should have the widest dissemination possible. To that end, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I quote it herewith:

WHAT IS KANSAS?

You ask me: What is Kansas?

And I reply: Kansas is all things to her sons and daughters.

Kansas is the lilting call of the meadowlark wafted across a meadow where a rock-cradled creek beckons sheep to water; the shrill whistle of the bobwhite, a bird dog frozen on point, and the silence-shattering explosion of a shotgun.

Kansas is the smell of moist earth in springtime, the puffing labor of a farmer's tractor, and the cheery call of a driver to his willing horses.

Kansas is the redbud of the Elk River Valley, the rocky glens of Atchison, and the silent wildness of Scott County.

Kansas is the mass of wheat that rolls for miles like a golden ocean under the driving, growing rays of a summer sun, the sweat-soaked shirt of a harvest hand who pauses for a cooling drink from the water barrel.

Kansas is the frosty morning when frisky animals welcome the bite of the late October air, the swirl of snow which beats against windows while a family gathers 'round the hearth.

Kansas is appreciation for the public schoolhouse as the first great hope of a living democracy, the swelling roar of Rock Chalk Jayhawk K. U. booming down from Mount Oread.

Kansas is the stubborn belief in moderation and the reluctance to depart from inate conservatism, but having chosen new ways, seizes upon them with a zest to know the truth.

Kansas is the guts to fight drought and pestilence and all adversity with a will to win.

Kansas is the political fight that asks no quarter and gives none, the reason why the mayor of the town declares that on his main street are the most solid citizens of the Nation, the reason why the weatherman says his elements demand and breed a vigorous people.

Kansas is the return of the native who has wandered far and comes home with full heart to the earthly strength of his forebears.

You ask me: What is Kansas?

Why, Kansas is all these things, and more, as she goes onward, sometimes inching, sometimes marching, sometimes rushing, but moving, always moving, toward a greater dawn tomorrow.

GORDON P. MARTIN.

Future of Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star of December 26, 1949, under the title of "Future of Rehabilitation."

The editorial is timely, dealing as it does with a problem now under consideration by the Congress. That problem in my opinion is not that of a reorganization of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation—OVR—for such an effort, unless thoroughly and advisedly considered, might well result in disorganization. And, as the editorial aptly says, neither is the problem that of whether the OVR shall be maintained in action. All persons everywhere who know of the accomplishments of this organization are agreed that its great work should not only be continued, but it should be expanded.

During the last fiscal year alone, 2,400 disabled persons were processed by this service in the District of Columbia. The work load of the agency in the District is steadily increasing, and it is extremely doubtful whether or not the agency can meet this increased work load without an increase in its appropriation. It is hoped that the Congress presently in session will give to this matter its sympathetic consideration.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

FUTURE OF REHABILITATION

When the Congress meets again in January, one of the problems which it will be asked to consider will be that of the expansion of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. This useful and helpful agency now is a part of the Federal security establishment. It serves handicapped men and women seeking to improve their opportunities to live normal lives through the exercise of their own capacities. Naturally, its major objective is to make these citizens self-supporting. There are economic reasons, social reasons, spiritual reasons why it is desirable that they should not be dependent upon others. They themselves want self-sufficiency. The OVR program from its inception in 1920 has operated in the direction of promoting wage-earning abilities. Its success has been noteworthy.

During the fiscal year 1949, 36,000 persons were rehabilitated. Seventy-four percent were unemployed at the time rehabilitation was started, 100 percent had jobs when it was completed. The wages paid to these people reached $94,000,000, or almost five times the previous earnings of the entire

group. More than 400 disabled residents of the District of Columbia were included in the roster. The cost of the services rendered to them was $202,346, of which amount $177,346 came from the Federal Treasury, $25,000 from District funds.

In this connection, it should be remembered that the expense of vocational rehabilitation is not a continuing burden upon taxpayers. Once it is paid, the cost becomes merely a matter of history. What continues is the increasing economic worth, the improved wage- and salary-earning power of the beneficiaries. A blind man who is taught how to operate a vending stand has to be instructed during only a few weeks or months. Thereafter he is on his own—a productive worker. The same rule applies to handicapped fellow Americans who are taught the techniques necessary for employment in sheltered workshops and at home. Any investment of public funds which adds to their ability to earn a living yields abundant dividends in the form of taxes which they themselves soon are able to meet.

The gain in morale, of course, cannot be measured or computed. It goes beyond statistical tables and charts and is best appreciated when it is witnessed in process of development—as it easily may be in many neighborhoods. The problem which Congress must face is not that of whether the OVR shall be maintained in action. Rather, it is whether it shall be reorganized. Several proposals to that effect have been offered. Before Congress decides upon any revolutionary change, it should be demonstrated that it is desired and will be justified, not simply in political advantages but in larger benefits to the handicapped and the Nation as a whole. Change for the sake of change might disorganize the OVR in such fashion as to require years for the correction of the mistake.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, we learned from members of the great Committee on Education and Labor that this committee has heretofore passed a resolution to go into executive session on tomorrow and stay in session from day to day endeavoring to agree upon, and report, a bill providing for Federal aid to our public schools.

I believe that this committee will work diligently and faithfully to accomplish this great purpose. There is no bill pending before the Congress from a domestic standpoint that will confer greater benefits upon the American people and go further in strengthening the moral, intellectual, and economic fiber of our Nation than this bill. No state or nation can rise above the intellectual and educational standards of its people.

Because of economic conditions prevailing in this great Nation of ours, educational opportunity for the children of the various States are not equally distributed. If we are to have one united nation with equal opportunity for all of its citizens, we must have Federal aid to our public schools. It has been heretofore demonstrated and it is a fact that many States of this great Nation do not have and cannot obtain sufficient economic strength within the borders of the States to properly and equally support their public schools. If we could elevate and equalize the educational opportunities of the youth of this entire Nation, it would bring into society many young men and young women able to earn more and contribute a much larger share to the economic welfare of the entire Nation.

Because of the lack of educational opportunities in many of the States, many thousands of physically fit young men were excluded from the draft during World War II and the extra burden thus caused was thrown onto the youth of the more-favored States that possessed a better primary and secondary education. This is a national problem from every viewpoint.

In my own good State of Kentucky a much greater effort has been and is being made by the citizens and taxpayers than the national average to provide our children with an adequate education. Our economic wealth and our yearly income are not sufficient without Federal aid to public schools to accomplish this.

Many other States of this great Nation are in the same situation that Kentucky finds itself in. There is a direct effect upon the wealthier States by permitting the youth of the poorer States to grow up in ignorance and without an adequate education. A very large percent of the young men and young women from Kentucky and many other States situated as she is migrate into other States where opportunities for work and employment are better. Most of them spend their adult life in and become citizens of other States.

Kentucky, like many other border and Southern and some Western States, has many more children to educate per thousand of the total population than the richer, more prosperous Northern and Eastern States. There are approximately 260 children of school age in Kentucky per thousand population as compared to approximately 200 children per thousand population on a national average. While our per capita income in Kentucky is less than $900 per year and less than $4,000 per school child, the national average income for the entire United States is much higher and in some of our great wealthy States there is an income in excess of $10,000 per school child, yet Kentucky spends a greater percent of her average income upon the education of her children than does the average State of the Union. This condition has prevailed for many years in Kentucky and in other less fortunate States. Although these things are true, it has been demonstrated throughout the history of this great Nation when some few of the Kentucky young men and young women do obtain proper training, equipment, and education the product is most satisfying and they have contributed a great deal to the leadership and welfare of this entire Nation and to many of her sister States by Kentuckians going to the very top in our national life and in the affairs of other States where native-born Kentuckians migrate and live in other States.

Our people have the native ability, the intellectual strength, and the moral fiber to become great contributors to the American way of life if they can obtain a fair and equal education. There is now a great shortage of qualified teachers in Kentucky. Other fields of endeavor that pay more have been a constant drain upon the teaching profession, yet many loyal qualified teachers have remained in the teaching profession at great personal sacrifice to themselves.

We should turn our attention as a Nation to the lost generation of youth that is growing up among us. Additional strains are being placed upon the education systems of many States because of the tremendous increase in the birth rate over the past several years. The condition, in the absence of Federal aid, is growing worse instead of better. We have lost, in the Eighty-first Congress, much valuable time. I believe this great committee that has jurisdiction over this vital subject is aware of their tremendous responsibilities. Every friend of the public schools of this Nation should unite together to encourage this committee to allow nothing to divert them from their determination to bring out a good bill to public education as soon as reasonably possible. Of course, we are all agreed that in such a bill there should be no Federal interference.

What the school systems of the various States of the Union need is Federal money to supplement the money raised by taxes on the local level. This great Nation of ours takes in taxes approximately $800,000,000 per year from the citizens of my great State. Yet, in contributions back to the State of Kentucky, our great Nation furnishes less than $150,000,000 per year.

Considering our great need, the good that can be accomplished to all the Nation, there is no reason why there should not be passed at the present session of this Congress a Federal-aid-to-public-schools bill that would furnish to the school teachers and children of Kentucky the small comparative sum of approximately $16,000,000.

This Nation has been generous with other nations throughout the world. I think it should be our first consideration to look after and improve the young people of America.

American Small Business, Constituting the Warp and Woof of Our Nation's Economy, Is the Very Keystone of Private Enterprise; 90 Percent of All RFC Loans Go to Such Small Business and Industrial Enterprises, Thereby Saving More Than 30 Small Concerns From Financial Disaster Every Working Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, who is there among us brash enough to say,

"Let us repeal the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, do away with the Coast Guard Service, abolish all safety laws in these United States, take down the lightning rod from off the Washington Monument, or terminate the wonderful work being done by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation"?

Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from one of our leading, most representative, public-minded, and contemplative citizens in the State of Alabama. It was written with respect to and in appreciation of the wonderful work that is being carried on today by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

It is a short, terse communication. It puts down, ink on paper, the opinion held by millions of our citizens, businessmen, and labor leaders concerning the need not alone for continuing but for perpetuating the operation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Originally published in Forbes Magazine of Business under date of November 15, 1949, a copy was sent to me by my good and lifelong friend, Howard Scott. Mr. Scott is a member of the law firm of Scott & Porter in the town of Chatom, Washington County, Ala.

His letter reads in part as follows:

Now, Congressman FRANK, as you so well know, here in the Southland we are desperate in our need for credit. One of the reasons we have such low wages in the South is that we have to do much of all labor by hand, inasmuch as we do not have available capital with which to buy machinery. We need sound term credit. Our complaint, if we have any to make, is that RFC is too conservative.

I live, as you well know, in a small town and consequently my perspective is necessarily limited. The few bankers with whom I have been associated recognize only the salvage value of the security. They exclude entirely the going concern value of the business in question. This establishes an entire lack of confidence in the American spirit of business success and capital venture.

Were RFC to be eliminated, it would mean the immediate closing down of many small businesses here in the South, with the net effect of considerable additional unemployment. Some of the larger companies would gobble up the assets of the smaller ones for little or nothing. Particularly would this be true as applied to the lumber industry, inasmuch as 65 percent of the lumber manufactured in the South is by small concerns, many of which, though basically sound, cannot possibly get a loan from a bank. This is entirely due to the enactment of both Federal and State banking laws which narrowly limit available banking facilities.

In order to comply with the new 75-cent-minimum-wage law it is going to be necessary here in Washington County for the smaller mills to immediately get new, labor-saving equipment. I know personally of several concerns who simply cannot buy this much-needed equipment without the assistance of the RFC.

We certainly agree with your general philosophy that the Government should not engage in business activities, but if private business does not choose to, or for some reason beyond its control, cannot assume the privilege and duty of financing fundamentally sound and basically worthwhile undertakings at reasonable rates * * * then it should not complain if the Government recognizes this absolute need for credit and does something about it.

Yours very sincerely,

SCOTT & PORTER,
HOWARD SCOTT.

CHATOM, ALA.

Mr. Speaker, I would have you believe with me that Mr. Scott expresses the sentiments held by the little-business men throughout the entire cotton-producing South inasmuch as our small-business enterprises have in general long depended upon the facilities of the congressionally established RFC to prosper them in their business activities.

Conceived during the dark days of the world-wide depression in 1932, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has long since proved itself to be of inestimable value to all business—large or small—in the First District of Alabama.

Time, and time again, when the merchants, manufacturers, and agricultural processors in my district, due to restrictive banking laws, were not able to avail themselves of the credit facilities of local banking institutions, the facilities of the RFC saved their employees from unemployment and the borrowing business concern from receivership, if not from insolvency.

It is because of these facts that every citizen in every town and village throughout the land, be he employer or employee, has a vital stake in its continued existence. In the brief time I have allotted myself for this discussion I am not going even to attempt to trace back, through the 18 years that the RFC has been engaged in its beneficent work, the benefits that have accrued to small-business concerns that have availed themselves of the unique and peculiar credit facilities provided by this Congress to help them in times of financial difficulties. Any fiscal agency that merely accomplished this task would have done a good job. Certainly a financial agent of Government, the policies of which have proven so factually, economically, and financially sound as to do the job at no cost to the taxpayers or to the Federal Treasury, is deserving of recognition and merit. Charging but low interest rates on their loans, the RFC, because of the enormous volume of business done, actually made a profit of more than $573,000,000, of which $338,000,000 profit has been paid into the United States Treasury as a dividend on the investment made by the Government which holds the preferred stock of that Corporation.

In accordance with good business practices, ample reserve had been established and been provided even before that huge sum was covered into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I will grant that at times it is seemingly difficult for business to negotiate a loan with the RFC and, moreover, that sometimes those who have made application become disheartened by the demands made upon them—income, expense, sales, and other statements—in order to obtain the credit.

That, Mr. Speaker, is because those historically charged with its operations and loan approvals have lived within both the letter and the spirit of laws as we here in Congress laid them down—and the further fact that its every function has been administered in accordance with the rules and practices—of good, sound fiscal policies established, ardently adhered to, in negotiation of its every last loan.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress placed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on a peacetime basis beginning July 1, 1947. In the short 2½ years that have elapsed, the RFC as now constituted has already made a total of 10,770 loans, aggregating $1,022,050,000.

Of that sum $884,000,000 were advanced by the RFC while local banks participated to the extent of $138,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, now hear me well on this. In order to more fully inform my own mind with respect to the facts in the case, I took time to make inquiry as to just what number of the total loans approved had been made to small-business houses and came upon the following:

Out of the total of 10,770 loans, a total of 9,695, or more than 90 percent of all were loans of less than $100,000 and of that number 10,646 or 98.9 percent of all were under the $1,000,000 mark.

Thus it becomes clear that by far the greatest number of loans effected by RFC even in those last 2½ years were made to the small-business men whose enterprise constitutes the warp and the woof of a national economy fabric which reflects every shade of its colorful occupation design.

I seriously doubt if in the history of our Nation any department agency ever established in Government has made a more enviable record of public service than that which distinguishes the operations of the RFC and its subsidiary organizations.

A study of the high character of every man who has served on its board—or participated in the direction of its fiscal policies—from the time of its establishment is reflected in each succeeding financial report of its successful administration and operation.

Marked as have been the successes of his predecessors, this great governmental Corporation was never chaired by one more capable than by the good friend of every Member of this House, the Honorable Harley Hise, now Chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, there are very few public officials that have ever brought to their office the demonstrated resourcefulness, ability, skill, and tact that characterize the present chairman, Mr. Harley Hise.

When President Truman nominated Harley Hise to be the Chairman of the RFC, he knew he was no hereditary banker. He did know however that he was schooled in law and a highly skilled accountant. He knew that the honors and successes which are his were earned by him in the hard school of long experience and, I would have you know with me, that there is no type or phase of the banking business—as we know that great profession—in which Harley Hise has not acquitted himself with distinction.

He is well and thoroughly acquainted with the financial needs of agriculture, mining, industry, banking, long-term as well as short-term loans, home-owners loans, farm land banks, small homes and business properties, and construction loans.

These are but a few of the many, many banking experiences which enrich Harley Hise's abilities and make him one

of the most valued men holding public office in these United States today.

As it is with Harley Hise, so it is also with all members of the Board of Directors of the RFC. The membership of both Houses of Congress know these estimable gentlemen—Mr. Walter L. Dunham, Mr. Harvey J. Gunderson, Mr. Henry A. Mulligan, and Mr. William E. Willett. They know them to be men of exceedingly rare abilities, experience, and talents. Individually and collectively you will find no group of directors in the field of banking—possessed of superior qualifications—either in or out of government.

Not alone do I know of no other agency which has more carefully and successfully carried out the fiscal principles and policies declared by the Congress, but I know of no other agency that was called upon to engage in such a multiplicity of diverse activities carried on by its subsidiaries, in peace as well as in war. Its every congressionally imposed function has been discharged, not alone with dispatch, economy, and efficiency, but with great distinction and credit to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The problem of quickly, economically, and efficiently expanding the tremendous armament, war plant, and production necessary to the successful conclusion of World War II is not alone a tribute to the work accomplished by RFC and its skilled personnel—but, the fact that the industries of this country were able by and with its fiscal aid, technical advices, and financial help—to reconvert to peacetime affairs from wartime activities constitutes a record of industrial banking by the RFC of which this Congress and Nation is justly proud.

Mr. Speaker, one frequently hears it said that "the Reconstruction Finance Corporation does not make small loans." That impression, however, is far from fact. Established in the dark days of 1932, one of the principal banking activities carried on by that organization has been the making of loans to small-business enterprises—despite the fact that only the few larger advances to banks, railroads, and huge industrial enterprises are the ones that always get the headlines in the press.

Mr. Speaker, there are those among us who are inclined to feel that the need for the activities which have engaged the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the last 18 years no longer exists. To them I would say that the activities carried on by the RFC are in a manner more or less comparable to the lightning rod that protects the Washington Monument or all other great structures throughout these United States. The Washington Monument is capped by an apex of metal to which is welded a stout cable, the other end of the cable being buried deep in the wet bowels of the earth.

Thousands of lightning and electrical storms of greater or lesser magnitude assail that great structure, and have during its long life. Any single bolt was possessed of power enough to crack it asunder and cause it to come tumbling to the ground. But there, silently functioning, doing its work throughout every night and day of the year is the "lightning rod" to attract and absorb enormous currents that accumulate and dart through the heavens. These charges were absorbed. They were silently and imperceptibly conducted into the earth without any injury whatever to the great structure itself.

Every great electric-generating station in these United States, as well as the huge high lines, are likewise equipped with lightning rods or as they are sometimes called, lightning arrestors. Silently, they also keep the electrical energy continually flowing out of the generators over the wires into the mines, the mills, the factories, and the farms of our Nation, despite the great electrical surcharges of lightning which constantly assail them from the heavens. It is only when they fail to do their allotted work that we begin to appreciate the great service which they render in caring for our normal operations and normal life.

Mr. Speaker, as it is with the lightning rods that protect our monumental structures and the lines that power this Nation from the sources of nature, so it is with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, an agency that protects the financial economy and stability of the Nation and, particularly its small business concerns when they find themselves confronted with financial problems, which although based upon sound credit, cannot be handled by local banking institutions and facilities. Moreover, the RFC, like the lightning rod does its allotted task, silently and without ballyhoo or fanfare.

Mr. Speaker, hear me well on this point. The great volume of the financial assistance handled by the RFC does not in any way mean that the loans which it has made have been granted indiscriminately. The fact is that more than 50 percent of the loans which are applied for are either withdrawn or declined.

Out of the years of experience in this highly specialized and technical field of credit, the RFC set up a group of expert analysts or examiners charged with determining whether an applicant should be given financial assistance. Often a business loan would prove a great disservice to a borrower. This would be particularly true where the examination discloses that despite the fact that a loan was granted to the business, for one of many reasons, it could not hope to succeed.

Conversely, there are thousands of instances where the applicant had figured his financial needs too closely and had not allowed himself sufficient capital for various requirements and aspects of his business. Here again the RFC is helpful and may, as is sometimes the case, recommend that the application be increased by an amount sufficient to provide the margin of safety that will definitely insure success of the venture and the consequent repayment of the loan.

But whatever the action on any application, it receives consideration only because the financial aid requested was not otherwise locally available and at reasonable rates.

Local banking facilities must participate in making the loans to the full measure of their legal and fiscal abilities.

The Congress recognized the importance of protecting the established lending institutions as the foundation of our national economic structure and has wisely made provision that only after a bank or other lending institution had determined that it could not make the loan could the businessman expect assistance from the RFC.

There are, as all well know, many, many reasons why a bank cannot or will not make a loan. Among them are statutory loan limitations enacted by both the Federal and State governments, the local requirements of a diversified portfolio and the type of loan requested. One of the most common problems arises from the fact that most banks today as never before desire to be liquid in order to meet any contingency. As a consequence thereof, there is little money available locally for loans running for more than 180 days. Whether the borrowers realize it or not, experience has long since proved that a loan for such a short time is of little or no value to most businesses.

Concomitant with the drying up of the main well springs of long-term credit is the distressing fact that the principal sources of venture capital are also being exhausted. It is in this field—the furnishing of venture capital and as a source of long-term loans—that the RFC can and is proving of inestimable value. So long as there is a lack of ready funds in either of these fiscal areas, there is a needful place in our national financial structure for an agency like the RFC in all of the foreseable future.

Mr. Speaker, all of the foregoing is representative of the feeling of the business people of not alone my district in Alabama, but throughout the country. It is, indeed, fortunate in this connection that we have available in the RFC a highly qualified personnel whose years of experience is backed and complemented by an able Board of Directors, each of whom, after great study, was appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Three of the Board members have come up through the ranks of the Corporation they so well serve. They are, therefore, well acquainted through first-hand knowledge with its purposes, policies, and aims, past, present, and prospective. Their long experiences and day-by-day contact with the difficulties reflected in the thousands of cases that have come to their notice make them most sympathetic and understanding of the problems of the little fellow diligently trying to operate a small business so as to support himself and his family.

It is an incontrovertible fact that the economic stability of the country can best be fostered and maintained if the small fires of business adversity which dot our economic landscape are promptly extinguished. Unfortunately some, however, feel that the ends of our economy would be served if small business or the small flickering flames of private enterprise were allowed to burn themselves out of existence. They who belong to that school hold that the RFC should be called only to the five-alarm financial conflagrations, and to where a real and readily recognizable financial crisis already exists. The latter view, more often

than not, means that we arrive with too little too late, padlocking the barn as it were when the horses are gone.

The question has been asked: Should the RFC concentrate on helping new enterprises or should it extend assistance only to old-established ventures? Here again the question cannot be answered categorically. Important as new activities might prove to our well-being, newness alone does not warrant financial assistance. The RFC extends aid to a business which has a reasonable possibility of being successful and of contributing to the national welfare. On the other hand, when an established business finding itself in financial straits makes application for a loan merely for that reason, it cannot be dismissed lightly. If this course of reasoning were to prevail and become the accepted policy, much valuable experience and know-how would be irretrievably lost. An old business, even though in financial distress, might well be essentially sound but harassed with easily corrected weaknesses and poor management, overproduction or lax collections could be readily relieved of its financial distress. In any event, whether the business be old or new, RFC has one steadfast policy: a policy of deciding each case individually and on its own merits.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard more or less furor over loans made for the national defense in World War II and which, under a law passed by the Congress, were not required to be as fully secured as reasonable to assure payment. The lack of understanding as to these transactions has given rise to a din which drowns the purring hum of the vast array of smooth-running machines in thousands of factories, which together with their operators would be idle but for RFC.

Mr. Speaker, and you, my colleagues, hear me now well on this.

When the Board of Directors of the RFC tells me that "the Kaiser-Frazer loans are well secured and will be repaid," that "they will insure a level of production which will insure a profitable operation," that "they will provide employment for thousands of workers," that "they will assist and encourage many small businesses and will increase production in a number of fields," who am I, in all fairness, to say that such is not the case?

None but one either with the same fund of factual information, knowledge, and experience as possessed by the Board could speak authoritatively on that subject. What we hear to the contrary is but one man's opinion. It is entitled to be given that much weight, not one grain more.

Whatever problems yet remain to be solved, it is a noteworthy fact that direct attempts are being made to meet issues squarely. One fact stands out above all others—that is that the RFC is the sole certain source of venture capital available to American small-business establishment, development, and the security of private enterprise today, without putting the United States Government itself into the management of business.

It is in the best American tradition and in accordance with the history of our democracy. It is essential to the future of that democracy that the trust and faith imposed in our public servants be truly warranted and zealously guarded to the end that we may work and walk together toward the goal of world leadership which is our destiny.

Mr. Speaker, on February 2 the great RFC celebrated its eighteenth birthday. I know I speak the sentiments of this House when I extend to that great financial organization the congratulations and best wishes from the people in general and small-business men of these United States in particular.

Mr. Speaker, it is only in part because of the foregoing that I want to see the RFC made a permanent institution in the forward and progressive march toward preserving private initiative in these United States.

Percentage Depletion Not Tax Loophole as Applied to Mining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I must vigorously criticize any portion of the administration's viewpoint on taxes which calls percentage depletion a loophole in the tax laws.

One would think the mining industry was taking advantage of some slick technicality in the tax regulations, barely legal and certainly immoral. This is plain nonsense. The 15-percent depletion allowance was specifically granted the mining industry by law after long study by the Ways and Means Committee. It is a legitimate way for a mining enterprise to recover its capital, ore being a wasting asset. Mr. Chapman's industry advisory committee on mining has pointed this out clearly, calling not only for adequate depletion allowances but insisting further that such allowances should be made to the stockholder as well as to the corporation. In fact, the committee advises increases in allowances by a change increasing the present percentage of gross income and the limitation in reference to net income.

I wonder why the agencies have these industry advisory committees, spending good time in Washington several times a year and giving the benefit of their brains and experience free to the Government, if their recommendations are to be so blatantly ignored.

It is certain that all Members of the House who understand these matters will stand up valiantly against this new onslaught against the mining industry—an onslaught calculated to sap away its very lifeblood. I have pointed out many times the disadvantages our domestic mining industry is laboring under. It is, outside of the very substantial operators, dying out. We need encouragement, not abuse. We need more aid, not less.

When the mining industry is taxed out of business, priced out of business by rising costs, and put out of business by low prices, an attack on such a fundamental point as percentage depletion may well be the blow which will render it impotent to supply our commercial needs, let alone those of war.

I, for one, will never rest until the foes of domestic mining within the administration—an administration of which I am in general an ardent supporter—are ejected from their high places or at least told bluntly by the Congress that they are wasting their time in these abominable attacks upon the industry most vital to our basic economy and security.

Court Picketing Should Be Outlawed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans States:

COURT PICKETING SHOULD BE OUTLAWED

We understand that the bill outlawing picketing of Federal courts has not yet been placed upon the Senate Calendar.

It certainly should be.

And it ought to be enacted, as soon as possible.

It is a matter of record that this measure, which was conceived and drafted by Cuthbert Baldwin of New Orleans, passed the House of Representatives during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress by unanimous vote. It was introduced by Representative BOGGS.

Introduced by Senator ELLENDER in the upper Chamber, the bill was blocked by Senator LANGER of North Dakota when the Louisianian asked that it be brought up to a vote on unanimous consent.

One man and one man alone, Senator LANGER, defeated the measure last year.

Most Federal judges and most lawyers are for this bill. It was approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States and the American Bar Association. What it does is to prevent the picketing of Federal courts where a trial is in progress, and where picketing might tend to influence the judge, the jury, or officers of the court. The practice of court picketing is only a recent development; it has occurred at least twice on the west coast, but it reached its peak in the picketing of Judge Medina's court in New York during the trial of the 11 Communists.

Pictures printed at the time showed proponents of the defendants massed shoulder to shoulder on the sidewalk completely surrounding the front entrances of the Federal building. All bore signs, some very inflammatory.

What will be the ultimate of this sort of pressure to sway the path of justice?

What is to prevent these goons from picketing the homes of jurors? Or their places of business, or the schools of their children? Or their wives going to market?

Those who believe that this picketing ought to be allowed will point to the conviction of the Communists and say: "You see, no harm was done. Nobody was swayed by these tactics."

That is quite true.

But it is true only because Judge Medina was the sort of judge and man he proved to be. He was patient, he wouldn't be badgered into a situation which might cause a mistrial or a reversal; and all of this was bound to become reflected in the jury's actions. But Judge Medina is a rather unusual man. There is no guaranty that just because the Red tactics failed to pay off in the picketing of his court that they won't pay off by influencing a jury trying a case before a hesitant or a hot-tempered jurist.

This picketing bill ought to become law. And it is up to the United States Senate to enact it. The House already has. The Senate shouldn't let Senator LANGER hold up this necessary legislation. Majority Leader Senator LUCAS ought to place it on the calendar.

Choosing a President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an exceedingly interesting and enlightening letter in the Sunday New York Times by a distinguished Princeton professor of history and constitutional law, Dr. Edward S. Corwin, concerning reform of the electoral college system.

CHOOSING A PRESIDENT—SHORTCOMINGS SEEN IN PROPOSAL TO REFORM ELECTORAL SYSTEM

(The writer of the following letter is McCormick, professor of jurisprudence, emeritus, at Princeton University. He is at present an editor in the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Library of Congress, directing a project in international law.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Congress is at last seriously considering the Lodge-Gossett joint resolution to reform the present constitutional machinery for choosing a President. There are some commendable features to the proposal, but there are some which, in the opinion of this writer, might lead to undesirable results.

The word "elector" means one who has the power to elect; that is, one who exercises a choice. Save for two or three instances when their doing so made not the least difference in the world even to themselves, no presidential elector has ever exercised the smallest conceivable particle of independent judgment in the casting of his vote for a President of the United States.

In the first two elections George Washington was the universal choice of the American citizenry. Since that time electors have been party stooges taking their orders from the party higher-ups. The proposal to abolish the college, so-called, which is one feature of the pending joint resolution is, therefore, considered for itself alone, not open to serious criticism. By the same token, the adoption of this feature of the proposal would of itself make no practical difference.

PLURALITY METHOD

Nor, on the other hand, is the effort to get rid of the present method for determining a presidential contest in which no candidate has received a majority in the electoral college open to important challenge. In that event the House of Representatives, voting by States, today chooses from among the three top contestants in the college.

For its negative features alone the Lodge-Gossett proposal—which, in the main, only repeats several previous ones—is not open to important adverse criticism. But how about its positive features? These are three in number: First, while the electoral college is abolished, each State remains an electoral unit; and, as such, is entitled to the same electoral vote as before in the choice of a President; secondly, this electoral vote is to be divided in each State among the political parties which are recognized by it, in proportion to their popular vote for President; thirdly, a plurality of electoral votes suffices to choose a President.

What the proposal does, therefore, is to apply the principle of proportional representation in the election of President; and this, it is objected, favors the rise of splinter parties, a tendency which the provision that a President may be chosen by a mere plurality of electoral votes will further encourage.

RESPECT TO INSTABILITY

What is more, it is argued, once introduced into our system, the proportional representation principle may be adopted to the choice of Representatives, which could easily be done by requiring that Representatives be chosen, not by districts, as at present, but as they once were in some of the States, on State-wide tickets. And, the argument proceeds, splinter parties, being pressure-group parties, are inveterate foes both of political moderation and—since their tendency is to regroup—of political stability, lessons with which the annals of parliamentary government on the Continent of Europe are replete.

This argument certainly has some force. At the same time, it must be recollected that splinter parties are by no means beyond the realm of possibility under the present system, as was shown in the last election.

What, however, are the chief advantages that the sponsors of the Lodge-Gossett proposal urge for it? Aside from the fact that it would eliminate the participation of the House of Representatives in the choice of a President when no candidate has an electoral majority, there appear to be two. The first is that under the proposed amendment electoral strength would directly reflect popular strength, whereas under the present system the successful candidate in the electoral college may have been the choice of a minority of the voters.

The argument seems to me to have little weight. It is true that when a strong third party has appeared on the scene a majority in the electoral college has been backed by only a plurality of the voters. But this fact hardly constitutes an argument for the Lodge-Gossett proposal, which provides in terms for plurality Presidents.

EFFECT OF STATE-WIDE TICKETS

The other argument for the Lodge-Gossett proposal is weightier, although the fact that makes it so is probably an illegitimate feature of the present system. Owing to the now well-established practice of choosing presidential electors on State-wide tickets, the entire electoral vote of say New York may be swung for the Republican candidate by a few hundred votes, while the heavy Democratic vote in New York would count as nothing toward the choice of President.

One consequence of this is that in the so-called one-party States no effort is made by the other parties to educate the electorate in their various points of view, whereas under the Lodge-Gossett proposal there would be every inducement for minority parties in a State to roll up as big a vote as possible, since this would be converted automatically into electoral strength. But this desirable result could, it seems to me, be achieved, or at least approximated, much more simply, namely, by doing away with the State-wide ticket system and instituting in its place the choice of electors by districts, which—if we are to believe Madison—was the system the framers had in mind, and which was in fact employed in several of the States in early days.

CHOICE BY DISTRICTS

It is my own belief regarding reform of the electoral system, first, that, ridiculous as it is in some aspects, the electoral college, so-called, should be retained, but that its members should be chosen in districts, to be laid out by Congress every 10 years; secondly, that the requirement that the President receive a majority of electoral votes should be retained; thirdly, that when any candidate fails to receive such a majority, the House of Representatives should choose, as at present, except for the important change that it vote per capita and not per State.

A President thus chosen would come near at least to being the people's choice and, moreover, would probably be guaranteed at the outset of his term a House of the same political complexion as himself.

Presidential influence has become the most prominent, the most dominant, element of our constitutional system, and this fact of itself forbids the idea of our instituting a system of presidential election which might make plurality Presidents the rule rather than the exception. It also forbids the idea of supplanting geographical parties with pressure-group parties which a President can at any time wheel into action to do battle for his pet schemes provided he concedes them theirs. The proposal is careless of both these dangers.

EDWARD S. CORWIN.

PRINCETON, N. J., January 31, 1950.

Honor for Dr. Montgomery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 3, 1950:

HONOR FOR DR. MONTGOMERY

The House of Representatives honored itself when it made the Reverend Dr. James Shera Montgomery its Chaplain Emeritus at the regular salary of the position. He came to the service of the lower branch of Congress in 1931 and has grown old in his ministry to it. Eighty-seven now, he merits as much rest as he may desire. But the House very properly does not wish to let him go in the sense of parting with him definitely, finally, and altogether. It has told him in effect to stay around. And the whole community of Washington is glad to hear of its decision.

Dr. Montgomery arrived here in 1911 to be pastor of Metropolitan Memorial Church. Later he preached at Calvary. Then he returned to Metropolitan. The summons to the chaplaincy of the House resulted from popular response to his work as a missionary. He was known as a gifted pulpit orator whom ordinary people could understand—and did. A keen sense of humor was one of the qualities for which he was appreciated. He still loves a joke even when it happens to be at his own expense.

But Dr. Montgomery is serious enough where his vocation is concerned. No man of his time has cared more deeply for religion as such. He has been a Bible Christian, striving to accomplish the great spiritual objectives of the Gospels in a world rife with confusion and turmoil. If the prospect of achievement generally has been bleak, he has been undiscouraged. A friend who

than not, means that we arrive with too little too late, padlocking the barn as it were when the horses are gone.

The question has been asked: Should the RFC concentrate on helping new enterprises or should it extend assistance only to old-established ventures? Here again the question cannot be answered categorically. Important as new activities might prove to our well-being, newness alone does not warrant financial assistance. The RFC extends aid to a business which has a reasonable possibility of being successful and of contributing to the national welfare. On the other hand, when an established business finding itself in financial straits makes application for a loan merely for that reason, it cannot be dismissed lightly. If this course of reasoning were to prevail and become the accepted policy, much valuable experience and know-how would be irretrievably lost. An old business, even though in financial distress, might well be essentially sound but harassed with easily corrected weaknesses and poor management, overproduction or lax collections could be readily relieved of its financial distress. In any event, Whether the business be old or new, RFC has one steadfast policy: a policy of deciding each case individually and on its own merits.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard more or less furor over loans made for the national defense in World War II and which, under a law passed by the Congress, were not required to be as fully secured as reasonable to assure payment. The lack of understanding as to these transactions has given rise to a din which drowns the purring hum of the vast array of smooth-running machines in thousands of factories, which together with their operators would be idle but for RFC.

Mr. Speaker, and you, my colleagues, hear me now well on this.

When the Board of Directors of the RFC tells me that "the Kaiser-Frazer loans are well secured and will be repaid," that "they will insure a level of production which will insure a profitable operation," that "they will provide employment for thousands of workers," that "they will assist and encourage many small businesses and will increase production in a number of fields," who am I, in all fairness, to say that such is not the case?

None but one other with the same fund of factual information, knowledge, and experience as possessed by the Board could speak authoritatively on that subject. What we hear to the contrary is but one man's opinion. It is entitled to be given that much weight, not one grain more.

Whatever problems yet remain to be solved, it is a noteworthy fact that direct attempts are being made to meet issues squarely. One fact stands out above all others—that is that the RFC is the sole certain source of venture capital available to American small-business establishment, development, and the security of private enterprise today, without putting the United States Government itself into the management of business.

It is in the best American tradition and in accordance with the history of our democracy. It is essential to the future of that democracy that the trust and faith imposed in our public servants be truly warranted and zealously guarded to the end that we may work and walk together toward the goal of world leadership which is our destiny.

Mr. Speaker, on February 2 the great RFC celebrated its eighteenth birthday. I know I speak the sentiments of this House when I extend to that great financial organization the congratulations and best wishes from the people in general and small-business men of these United States in particular.

Mr. Speaker, it is only in part because of the foregoing that I want to see the RFC made a permanent institution in the forward and progressive march toward preserving private initiative in these United States.

Percentage Depletion Not Tax Loophole as Applied to Mining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I must vigorously criticize any portion of the administration's viewpoint on taxes which calls percentage depletion a loophole in the tax laws.

One would think the mining industry was taking advantage of some slick technicality in the tax regulations, barely legal and certainly immoral. This is plain nonsense. The 15-percent depletion allowance was specifically granted the mining industry by law after long study by the Ways and Means Committee. It is a legitimate way for a mining enterprise to recover its capital, ore being a wasting asset. Mr. Chapman's industry advisory committee on mining has pointed this out clearly, calling not only for adequate depletion allowances but insisting further that such allowances should be made to the stockholder as well as to the corporation. In fact, the committee advises increases in allowances by a change increasing the present percentage of gross income and the limitation in reference to net income.

I wonder why the agencies have these industry advisory committees, spending good time in Washington several times a year and giving the benefit of their brains and experience free to the Government, if their recommendations are to be so blatantly ignored.

It is certain that all Members of the House who understand these matters will stand up valiantly against this new onslaught against the mining industry—an onslaught calculated to sap away its very lifeblood. I have pointed out many times the disadvantages our domestic mining industry is laboring under. It is, outside of the very substantial operators, dying out. We need encouragement, not abuse. We need more aid, not less.

When the mining industry is taxed out of business, priced out of business by rising costs, and put out of business by low prices, an attack on such a fundamental point as percentage depletion may well be the blow which will render it impotent to supply our commercial needs, let alone those of war.

I, for one, will never rest until the foes of domestic mining within the administration—an administration of which I am in general an ardent supporter—are ejected from their high places or at least told bluntly by the Congress that they are wasting their time in these abominable attacks upon the industry most vital to our basic economy and security.

Court Picketing Should Be Outlawed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans States:

COURT PICKETING SHOULD BE OUTLAWED

We understand that the bill outlawing picketing of Federal courts has not yet been placed upon the Senate Calendar.

It certainly should be.

And it ought to be enacted, as soon as possible.

It is a matter of record that this measure, which was conceived and drafted by Cuthbert Baldwin of New Orleans, passed the House of Representatives during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress by unanimous vote. It was introduced by Representative BOGGS.

Introduced by Senator ELLENDER in the upper Chamber, the bill was blocked by Senator LANGER of North Dakota when the Louisianian asked that it be brought up to a vote on unanimous consent.

One man and one man alone, Senator LANGER, defeated the measure last year.

Most Federal judges and most lawyers are for this bill. It was approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States and the American Bar Association. What it does is to prevent the picketing of Federal courts where a trial is in progress, and where picketing might tend to influence the judge, the jury, or officers of the court. The practice of court picketing is only a recent development; it has occurred at least twice on the west coast, but it reached its peak in the picketing of Judge Medina's court in New York during the trial of the 11 Communists.

Pictures printed at the time showed proponents of the defendants massed shoulder to shoulder on the sidewalk completely surrounding the front entrances of the Federal building. All bore signs, some very inflammatory.

What will be the ultimate of this sort of pressure to sway the path of justice?

What is to prevent these goons from picketing the homes of jurors? Or their places of business, or the schools of their children? Or their wives going to market?

Those who believe that this picketing ought to be allowed will point to the conviction of the Communists and say: "You see, no harm was done. Nobody was swayed by these tactics."

That is quite true.

But it is true only because Judge Medina was the sort of judge and man he proved to be. He was patient, he wouldn't be hedgered into a situation which might cause a mistrial or a reversal; and all of this was bound to become reflected in the jury's actions. But Judge Medina is a rather unusual man. There is no guaranty that just because the Red tactics failed to pay off in the picketing of his court that they won't pay off by influencing a jury trying a case before a hesitant or a hot-tempered jurist.

This picketing bill ought to become law. And it is up to the United States Senate to enact it. The House already has. The Senate shouldn't let Senator LANGER hold up this necessary legislation. Majority Leader Senator LUCAS ought to place it on the calendar.

Choosing a President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an exceedingly interesting and enlightening letter in the Sunday New York Times by a distinguished Princeton professor of history and constitutional law, Dr. Edward S. Corwin, concerning reform of the electoral college system.

CHOOSING A PRESIDENT—SHORTCOMINGS SEEN IN PROPOSAL TO REFORM ELECTORAL SYSTEM

(The writer of the following letter is McCormick professor of jurisprudence, emeritus, at Princeton University. He is at present an editor in the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Library of Congress, directing a project in international law.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Congress is at last seriously considering the Lodge-Gossett joint resolution to reform the present constitutional machinery for choosing a President. There are some commendable features to the proposal, but there are some which, in the opinion of this writer, might lead to undesirable results.

The word "elector" means one who has the power to elect; that is, one who exercises a choice. Save for two or three instances when their doing so made not the least difference in the world even to themselves, no presidential elector has ever exercised the smallest conceivable particle of independent judgment in the casting of his vote for a President of the United States.

In the first two elections George Washington was the universal choice of the American citizenry. Since that time electors have been party stooges taking their orders from the party higher-ups. The proposal to abolish the college, so-called, which is one feature of the pending joint resolution is, therefore, considered for itself alone, not open to serious criticism. By the same token, the adoption of this feature of the proposal would of itself make no practical difference.

PRESENT METHOD

Nor, on the other hand, is the effort to get rid of the present method for determining a presidential contest in which no candidate has received a majority in the electoral college open to important challenge. In that event the House of Representatives, voting by States, today chooses from among the three top contestants in the college.

For its negative features alone the Lodge-Gossett proposal—which, in the main, only repeats several previous ones—is not open to important adverse criticism. But how about its positive features? These are three in number: First, while the electoral college is abolished, each State remains an electoral unit; and, as such, is entitled to the same electoral vote as before in the choice of a President; secondly, this electoral vote is to be divided in each State among the political parties which are recognized by it, in proportion to their popular vote for President; thirdly, a plurality of electoral votes suffices to choose a President.

What the proposal does, therefore, is to apply the principle of proportional representation in the election of President; and this, it is objected, favors the rise of splinter parties, a tendency which the provision that a President may be chosen by a mere plurality of electoral votes will further encourage.

TENDENCY TO DISTRACTION

What is more, it is argued, once introduced into our system, the proportional representation principle may be adapted to the choice of Representatives, which could easily be done by requiring that Representatives be chosen, not by districts, as at present, but as they once were in some of the States, on State-wide tickets. And, the argument proceeds, splinter parties, being pressure-group parties, are inveterate foes both of political moderation and—since their tendency is to regroup—of political stability, lessons with which the annals of parliamentary government on the Continent of Europe are replete.

This argument certainly has some force. At the same time, it must be recollected that splinter parties are by no means beyond the realm of possibility under the present system, as was shown in the last election.

What, however, are the chief advantages that the sponsors of the Lodge-Gossett proposal urge for it? Aside from the fact that it would eliminate the participation of the House of Representatives in the choice of a President when no candidate has an electoral majority, there appear to be two. The first is that under the proposed amendment electoral strength would directly reflect popular strength, whereas under the present system the successful candidate in the electoral college may have been the choice of a minority of the voters.

The argument seems to me to have little weight. It is true that when a strong third party has appeared on the scene a majority in the electoral college has been backed by only a plurality of the voters. But this fact hardly constitutes an argument for the Lodge-Gossett proposal, which provides in terms for plurality Presidents.

EFFECT OF STATE-WIDE TICKETS

The other argument for the Lodge-Gossett proposal is weightier, although the fact that makes it so is probably an illegitimate feature of the present system. Owing to the now well-established practice of choosing presidential electors on State-wide tickets, the entire electoral vote of say New York may be swung for the Republican candidate by a few hundred votes, while the heavy DEMOCRATIC vote in New York would count as nothing toward the choice of President.

One consequence of this is that in the so-called one-party States no effort is made by the other parties to educate the electorate in their various points of view, whereas under the Lodge-Gossett proposal there would be every inducement for minority parties in a State to roll up as big a vote as possible, since this would be converted automatically into electoral strength. But this desirable result could, it seems to me, be achieved, or at least approximated, much more simply, namely, by doing away with the State-wide ticket system and instituting in its place the choice of electors by districts, which—if we are to believe Madison—was the system the framers had in mind, and which was in fact employed in several of the States in early days.

CHOICE BY DISTRICTS

It is my own belief regarding reform of the electoral system, first, that, ridiculous as it is in some aspects, the electoral college, so-called, should be retained, but that its members should be chosen in districts, to be laid out by Congress every 10 years; secondly, that the requirement that the President receive a majority of electoral votes should be retained; thirdly, that when any candidate fails to receive such a majority, the House of Representatives should choose, as at present, except for the important change that it vote per capita and not per State.

A President thus chosen would come near at least to being the people's choice and, moreover, would probably be guaranteed at the outset of his term a House of the same political complexion as himself.

Presidential influence has become the most prominent, the most dominant, element of our constitutional system, and this fact of itself forbids the idea of our instituting a system of presidential election which might make plurality Presidents the rule rather than the exception. It also forbids the idea of supplanting geographical parties with pressure-group parties which a President can at any time wheel into action to do battle for his pet schemes provided he concedes them theirs. The proposal is careless of both these dangers.

EDWARD S. CORWIN.

PRINCETON, N. J., *January 11, 1950.*

Honor for Dr. Montgomery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 3, 1950:

HONOR FOR DR. MONTGOMERY

The House of Representatives honored itself when it made the Reverend Dr. James Shera Montgomery its Chaplain Emeritus at the regular salary of the position. He came to the service of the lower branch of Congress in 1931 and has grown old in his ministry to it. Eighty-seven now, he merits as much rest as he may desire. But the House very properly does not wish to let him go in the sense of parting with him definitely, finally, and altogether. It has told him in effect to stay around. And the whole community of Washington is glad to hear of its decision.

Dr. Montgomery arrived here in 1911 to be pastor of Metropolitan Memorial Church. Later he preached at Calvary. Then he returned to Metropolitan. The summons to the chaplaincy of the House resulted from popular response to his work as a missionary. He was known as a gifted pulpit orator whom ordinary people could understand—and did. A keen sense of humor was one of the qualities for which he was appreciated. He still loves a joke even when it happens to be at his own expense.

But Dr. Montgomery is serious enough where his vocation is concerned. No man of his time has cared more deeply for religion as such. He has been a Bible Christian, striving to accomplish the great spiritual objectives of the Gospels in a world rife with confusion and turmoil. If the prospect of achievement generally has been bleak, he has been undiscouraged. A friend who

knows him well and salutes him devotedly says of him that he personifies fellowship and the capacity of the human soul to press on to an ideal goal. When the House rose in tribute to him, it gave expression to its realization of the worth of the example he has set.

Dr. Montgomery's successor, the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp, of Gunston-Temple Church, will carry on the chaplain's duties in the same spirit.

Cut in Tax Leeway for Oil Wildcatters Seen as Death Blow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the appendix of the RECORD a statement by Col. C. H. Reimerth, on the question of the reduction of depletion allowances presently in force for oil and gas operators, as published in the Casper Tribune, of Casper, Wyo., on January 30 last. Casper is the center of the oil and gas industry in the Rocky Mountain area. Colonel Reimerth is an authority on the matter, and I am sure that his statement will be of great interest to Members of Congress.

The Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the Ways and Means Committee on Friday last and appeared again before the committee today. The Secretary proposes to make two cuts in the depletion deduction presently allowed to oil and gas operators. In the first instance, the Secretary proposes to reduce the depletion allowance from 27½ percent to 15 percent and, secondly, he proposes legislation requiring the deduction of intangibles from the gross income and then applying the depletion exemption of 15 percent to the balance.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that thousands of small independent oil operators throughout the country will be forced out of business if this legislation is enacted.

It is very unfortunate that the Ways and Means Committee has determined to hear oil and gas representatives on Tuesday, February 7, and I have requested the distinguished chairman of that committee to give these small operators of my State at least 2 weeks to prepare their case and present it to the committee. The following statement of Colonel Reimerth is ample proof of the devastating effect of this proposed legislation on a vital industry of my State:

CUT IN TAX LEEWAY FOR OIL WILDCATTERS SEEN AS DEATH BLOW

"Reduction or removal of depletion allowances for the oil industry will spell the death of wildcatting for new oil fields in Wyoming and the Rocky Mountain Region," Col. C. H. Reimerth, prominent Casper income-tax expert, told the Tribune-Herald today.

He referred to President Truman's recent reference to excessive depletion exemptions now enjoyed by the oil and mining interests.

Loss of whittling down of this 27½-percent exemption from payment of income taxes, which was set up to compensate for the hazards of wildcat drilling, will dry up most of the risk capital coming into Wyoming for drilling, exploration, and other costs, the accountant declared.

RISKS TOO GREAT

"No sensible person will invest money in a wildcat promotion in the belief that it is a safe or conservative investment," Mr. Reimerth said. "It takes venture or speculative capital to do this and the reward must be commensurate with the risk involved. This depletion allowance is, and has been, the inducement for all of this venture capital which has brought outside money into the search for new oil fields in Wyoming. It has also brought all of these small, independent operators, drilling contractors, supply houses, and thousands of technical and field workers into the State."

He went on to say that the allowance has also made it possible for landowners to realize returns on previously undeveloped lands, through oil royalties, and has brought millions of dollars to the people of the State through additional royalties for schools, the universities, and roads.

"Without the depletion allowance," he asserted, "the hazards of wildcatting would be so great that only the major companies could survive and even they would have to curtail any wildcatting and limit themselves to known and proven structures. That's a conjecture but I believe a very reasonable one, for the reason of the high cost of labor and materials in operating even producing fields.

NOT SELF-SUFFICIENT

"If it were President Truman's idea to curtail new oil-field discoveries for some reason of his own, the elimination or reduction of the depletion allowance will surely accomplish this purpose. It is not any military secret that this country is not self-sufficient in oil reserves in the event of war and now in peace it resolves on us as a Nation to develop to the maximum degree all of our potential oil reserves."

Mr. Reimerth pointed out that Canada, with a higher tax structure than the United States, gives oil operators a depletion allowance of 30 percent to develop large new oil reserves in Alberta.

Removal of the exemption, coupled with heavy foreign imports of oil, would cripple independent producers in this country, Mr. Reimerth added. Many would be forced out of business.

The accountant recommended that the President, in seeking additional tax revenues, turn his attention to the recommendations of the Hoover committee for reorganization of the Government. So far, he said, only 20 percent of the Hoover committee's recommendation has been adopted. Enactment of the other 80 percent will save more than $1,000,000,000, he declared.

The speaker urged all civic groups and individuals in the State to contact Wyoming's Senators and Representatives protesting any change in the income-tax laws which would alter the present depletion provisions.

Needed Reform of Our Electoral System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an exceedingly valuable contribution to the debate about proposed changes in the method of electing Presidents. It is by a distinguished Princeton scholar, Lucius Wilmerding, Jr. It will well repay the reading by Members of the House and others vitally interested in this question. It follows:

NEEDED REFORM OF OUR ELECTORAL SYSTEM

FOREWORD

One of the most important reforms is in the method of electing a President and Vice President of the United States. Section 1 of article II of the Federal Constitution provides that—

"Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress."

In all of the States today the method of choosing electors is by general ticket. It is also the practice for the electoral vote of a State to be cast as a unit. As a result, even though the plurality for a Presidential candidate in a State should be only one, that State's entire electoral vote would be cast for that candidate. In the case of the State of New York this would mean 47 votes, which is about 10 percent of the total of 531 votes in the electoral college. The harmful results of such a system are obvious.

Two methods of remedying this defect are proposed in resolutions now pending in Congress. The first is a system of proportional voting contained in a joint resolution introduced in the Senate by Senator LODGE and in the House by Representative GOSSETT. The second is contained in a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) introduced in the House by Representative COUDERT, providing for the election of each Presidential elector in the same manner as his counterpart Member of the Congress. With the exception of a few Congressmen elected at large, the Representatives are elected by districts.

Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., has written an excellent article on this subject under the title "Reform of the Electoral System," which has been published in the March 1949 issue of the Political Science Quarterly.

In this article Mr. Wilmerding argues very convincingly that the district system of election is to be preferred to both the system of proportional voting prescribed by the Lodge-Gossett amendment and the present system of election by general ticket.

In his article he says:

"I would suggest that the system of proportional voting be dropped from the Lodge amendment and the district system substituted. This, I repeat, is the mode which was mostly, if not exclusively, in view when the Constitution was framed and adopted. It is also the mode which was advocated after some experience with the Constitution by Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, Gallatin, James A. Bayard, J. Q. Adams, Van Buren, Benton, Webster, Story, and many others."

ROBERT B. DRESSER.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *June 2, 1949.*

REFORM OF THE ELECTORAL SYSTEM

INTRODUCTION

It is my purpose in this article to examine those features of our electoral system which have been singled out for reform in the amendment to the Constitution recently proposed by Senator LODGE and now under public debate.[1] I must begin, however, by pointing out and commenting upon two things which the Lodge amendment does not do, but in respect of which there has been much popular misconception.

In the first place the Lodge amendment does not provide for a direct election of the President of the United States by the people at large. The intermediate electors are

[1] 81st Cong., 1st sess., S. J. Res. 2 (Jan. 5, 1949).

abolished, but the electoral vote is retained. This means that it would still be possible for a candidate receiving a minority of the popular vote to receive a majority of the electoral vote. Take two States each having 24 electoral votes, and assume that 4,000,000 popular votes are cast in one, 2,400,000 in the other. In State A the Republican receives three-fourths of the popular vote, the Democrat one-fourth; in State B the Republican receives one-eighth, the Democrat seven-eighths. The popular vote in the two States together is 3,200,000 for the Republican, 3,100,000 for the Democrat. But under the Lodge amendment—which provides for prorating the electoral votes of each State between the candidates in proportion to their popular votes therein—the Democrat is credited with 27 electoral votes to the Republican's 21. The proportional voting system may therefore reflect the Nation-wide popular vote even less accurately than the currently used general ticket—winner-take-all—system, under which in the given case the two candidates would be credited with 24 electoral votes apiece.

In the second place the Lodge amendment does not get rid of the present unequal weighting of the electoral vote in favor of the small States. Each State will continue to have the number of electoral votes to which its population entitles it, plus 2. Vermont, entitled to 1 vote, will still have 3; New York, entitled to 45 votes, will still have 47. This means that, other things being equal, a voter in Vermont will still have the weight of almost 3 voters in New York.

These facts being understood, it may be asked why Senator LODGE's amendment should not be criticized on the ground that it does not sweep away the whole system of electoral voting and substitute a system of Nation-wide popular voting. The answer is complex but will probably satisfy most minds.

To begin with, a good case can be made for the proposition that each equal mass of persons (comprising voters and nonvoters alike) is entitled to an equal voice in the choice of a President. If the qualifications requisite for voting are higher in one mass than in another;[1] if, in order to express their disapproval of their party's policy, the voters in one mass stay away from the polls while those in another cast their ballots for opposition candidates; if local issues vary the proportions of the electorate voting in different masses; if stormy weather keeps more voters at home in rural areas than in urban areas—none of these is a valid reason for reducing the weight of the masses casting the fewer votes. The electoral vote may reflect the will of the people—of all the people not merely of the active voters—more correctly than the popular vote.

This argument, it is true, does not go to prove the propriety of allowing masses in small States a greater weight than equal masses in large States; and I, for one, regard it as a constitutional solecism that one mass in Delaware should count for as much as three in New York. It is frequently asserted, indeed, that the two extra votes allotted to each State are given to it on the Federal principle and reflect the equality of the States as corporate entities. But the alleged equality is a figment of the legal imagination, invented to justify what was in its origin a mere act of force. When the Thirteen States first associated themselves in the Continental Congress, each was given a single vote. The arrangement was intended to be temporary, however. As was pointed out by Benjamin Franklin in the Federal Convention, the method of voting by States "was submitted to originally by Congress, under a conviction of its impropriety, inequality, and injustice. This appears in the words of their resolution. It is of September 6, 1774. The words are: 'Resolved, That in determining questions in this Congress each colony or province shall have one vote; the Congress not being possessed of or at present able to procure materials for ascertaining the importance of each colony.'"[2]

That force, not principle, was the controlling factor in the allotment of two Senators and two additional electors to each State will be plain to anyone who will bother to read the debates.

Hamilton said:

"The truth is it is a contest for power, not for liberty. Will the men composing the small States be less free than those composing the larger? The State of Delaware, having 40,000 souls, will lose power, if she has [in the Senate] one-tenth only of the votes allotted to Pennsylvania, having 400,000; but will the people of Delaware be less free, if each citizen has an equal vote with each citizen of Pennsylvania?[3]

Paterson, of New Jersey, speaking for the small States, admitted the charge:

"It was observed (by Mr. Wilson) that the larger State gave up the point (in the Continental Congress), not because it was right, but because the circumstances of the moment urged the concession. Be it so. Are they for that reason at liberty to take it back? Can the donor resume his gift without the consent of the donee?"[4]

The retention in the Lodge amendment of the unequal weighting of the electoral vote in favor of the small States cannot therefore be justified on grounds of justice. The reason for retaining it is expediency: no proposition could at the present time pass the Senate which would deprive the small States of their privileged position.

This same consideration, it is plain, also makes it useless to propose any scheme for electing the President by direct Nation-wide popular vote; for the continuance of the small States' privilege depends on the continuance of an electoral voting system. Senator LODGE is entirely right when he says that "to eliminate the credit given for Senators (that is, the two extra electoral votes), or to eliminate any electoral allotment to each State, would destroy any possibility at all of electoral reform."[5]

So much for what the Lodge amendment does not do. Its positive proposals may be arranged under three heads. If adopted it would (1) require the electoral votes of each State to be divided between the several candidates for President in proportion to the popular votes cast for each within the State; (2) discontinue the use of intermediate electors; (3) discontinue the umpirage of the House of Representatives in all cases where no candidate has received a majority of the whole number of electoral votes, leaving a plurality sufficient to elect. Mutatis mutandis, it would do the same things in respect of the Vice President.

THE MODE OF VOTING

Let us begin with a bit of history. The Constitution of the United States provides that each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress; these electors are to meet in their respective States and vote for President and Vice President; and so on. In the early elections no uniform mode of appointing electors was followed. The three most usual modes were: (1) election by the legislatures; (2) election by the people in districts; (3) election by the people on a general ticket. Of these only the third is at present practiced. According to Madison the district mode—which "was mostly, if not exclusively, in view when the Constitution was framed and adopted"—was "exchanged for the general ticket and the legislative election, as the only expedient for baffling the policy of the particular States which had set the example."[6] The legislative election—under attack from the beginning as violating the spirit and perhaps the letter of the Constitution—gave way to the general ticket in Jackson's time.

That the general ticket is an improper mode of election is not to be denied. Its evils were never better set out than by Senator Benton in 1824:

"The general ticket system, now existing in 10 States was the offspring of policy, and not of any disposition to give fair play to the will of the people. It was adopted by the leading men of those States, to enable them to consolidate the vote of the State. * * * It contributes to give power and consequence to the leaders who manage the elections, but it is a departure from the intention of the Constitution; violates the rights of minorities, and is attended with many other evils. The intention of the Constitution is violated, because it was the intention of that instrument, to give to each mass of persons, entitled to one elector, the power of giving that electoral vote to any candidate they preferred. The rights of minorities are violated, because a majority of one will carry the vote of the whole State. * * * In New York 36 electors are chosen; 19 is a majority, and the candidate receiving this majority is fairly entitled to count 19 votes; but he counts, in reality, 36; because the minority of 17 are added to the majority. These 17 votes belong to 17 masses of people, of 40,000 souls each, in all 680,000 people, whose votes are seized upon, taken away and presented to whom the majority pleases. * * * To lose their votes, is the fate of all minorities, and it is their duty to submit; but this is not a case of votes lost, but of votes taken away, added to those of the majority, and given to a person to whom the minority is opposed."[7]

Jefferson, it is true, may be quoted to the contrary. Defending in 1800 the action of Virginia in exchanging the district system for the general ticket, he declared that it was

---

[1] On July 25, 1787, in the Federal Convention, Madison, arguing that a choice of the President by the people, or rather by the qualified part of them, was the best mode of appointment that could be devised, noticed the difficulty which arose from the disproportion of qualified voters in the Northern and Southern States, and the disadvantages which this mode would throw on the latter. In replying to this objection he remarked, "(1) that this disproportion would be continually decreasing under the influence of the republican laws introduced in the Southern States, and the more rapid increase of their population; (2) that local considerations must give way to the general interest. As an individual from the Southern States he was willing to make the sacrifice." Max Farrand, editor, Records of the Federal Convention, II, 111. The acceptance of electoral voting made the sacrifice unnecessary.

[2] Farrand, I, 200 (Franklin). For the remarks of Wilson, Gerry, Gouverneur Morris and Madison condemning the equal vote of unequal States as improper and founded on coercion, see ibid., I, 168, 467, 522; II, 8.

[3] Ibid., I, 466.

[4] Farrand, I, 250.

[5] See his letter of January 12, 1949, in the New York Times of January 18. In a letter to the author dated November 4, 1948, Senator LODGE indicated that he was personally in favor of a direct popular election of the President and Vice President, but he knew that such proposals had never made any headway in the past and he thought that they would make no headway in the future.

[6] Madison to Hay, August 23, 1823. Gaillard Hunt, editor, The Writings of James Madison (New York and London, 1910), IX, 151-152.

[7] 41 Annals of Congress, 169-170.

"merely a question whether we will divide the United States into 16 or 137 districts."[1] The reasoning is, however, fallacious. It would be valid only if the States were roughly equal in population and had each an equal number of electoral votes. Besides, as Jefferson himself knew, the number of districts is much more than a mere question. Madison, writing in 1823, pointed out:

"The States when voting for President by general tickets or by their legislatures, are a string of beads; when they make their elections by districts, some of these differing in sentiment from others, and sympathizing with that of districts in other States, they are so knit together as to break the force of those geographical and party noxious parties which might render the repulsive too strong for the cohesive tendencies within the political system."[2]

Senator Lodge proposes to get rid of the evils of the general ticket by a mode which has often been advocated before: proportional voting, that is to say, the division of each State's electoral votes between the candidates in proportion to their popular votes. In 1912, for example, New York's 45 electoral votes, instead of all going to Wilson, would have been cast (to the nearest whole number) 19 for Wilson, 13 for Taft, 11 for Roosevelt, and 2 for Debs.

At first blush this might seem an eminently fair arrangement, and indeed there are probably few today who would not sympathize with the complaint of the Federalist minority of Virginia when the legislature of that State changed in 1800 from the district mode to the general ticket: "We are apt to fancy ourselves called, as citizens of the United States, to vote for the highest officers of the Government. But the late assembly has separated us from our brother citizens of the Union, and compels us to speak the voice of Virginia only."[3] Second thoughts, however, may lead us to believe that, though the object of the Lodge amendment is sound, its method is faulty.

I would point out, to begin with, that the principle upon which this amendment would divide a State's votes is the same as that which underlies the system of proportional representation—PR as it is briefly called. Carried to its logical extreme it would require the creation of a plural executive (as recommended by Benjamin Franklin and others in the Federal Convention) in order that the several parties might share in it in proportion to their numbers. The reasoning is simple. If it is unfair for a candidate who has received 54 percent of the Nation-wide popular vote to receive 54 percent of the Nation-wide electoral vote, why is it not even more unfair for him to receive 100 percent of the prize?

It is, to be sure, unlikely that the adoption of the Lodge amendment would actually lead to the creation of a plural Executive. There is more danger that it might give countenance to a move for some form of proportional representation in our legislative bodies, National, State, and local. If the electoral vote of a State should be divided between the several parties in the same proportions as its popular vote, why not its representation in Congress also? Why should the votes of minorities in geographical constituencies be lost instead of combined with the votes of like minorities in other districts to make up mathematical constituencies or quotas? The answer I think is this: If a legislative body is to work, its mass must be men of moderate sentiments; for, without compromise between like-minded men of unlike parties, nothing but violent legislation would result. A Member whose constituency is geographic must almost perforce be a moderate man; he must have regard for the opinions of the minorities within his district or risk defeat at the next election. But a Member whose constituency is mathematical—all Democrats, all Republicans, all antivivisectionists or what have you—must almost necessarily be immoderate; he must be wholly subservient to the wishes of his party managers, or of the splinter ism which elects him, or risk being replaced at the next constituency making by someone who is.[4]

The connection between electoral voting and representation in Congress is very close. The electoral body has often been likened to Congress in joint convention.[5] Senator Baldwin, of Georgia, who had been a member of the Federal Convention, once remarked that the electors were a constitutional branch of the Government as respectable as Congress, and in whom the Constitution in the business of electing a President, had more confidence than in Congress.[6] Many of the early amendments, proposing the establishment of a uniform mode of appointing electors by the people in districts, suggested the same mode for choosing representatives. Many of the plans introduced in the 1870's, similar in principle to Senator Lodge's, but continuing the electors, would have worked equally well for Representatives; Senator Lodge's own plan could be adapted to Representatives by giving the odd congressional seats remaining after each party's integral quota had been filled to the parties having the largest fractions.

I submit, therefore, that the danger to be apprehended from the adoption of proportional voting for the Presidency is real. It ought not to be ignored merely because the mode of choosing representatives is not dealt with in the amendment. We must remember the remark with which Senator Hillhouse, in 1808, introduced the set of constitutional amendments which some have supposed were meant as the framework for a new confederacy: "All (partial amendments) are aimed at particular detached parts; which, without examining or regarding the bearing on other parts, like partial alterations in a curious complicated machine, may, instead of benefiting, destroy its utility."[7]

What then should be done? I would suggest that the system of proportional voting be dropped from the Lodge amendment and the district system substituted. This, I repeat, is the mode which "was mostly, if not exclusively, in view when the Constitution was framed and adopted." It is also the mode which was advocated after some experience with the Constitution by Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, Gallatin, James A. Bayard, J. Q. Adams, Van Buren, Benton, Webster, Story, and many others. Senator Benton explained it very well in 1824:

"It would divide every State into districts, equal to the whole number of votes to be given, and the people of each district would be governed by its own majority, and not by a majority existing in some remote part of the State. This would be agreeable to the rights of individuals: for, in entering into society, and submitting to be bound by the decision of the majority, each individual retained the right of voting for himself wherever it was practicable, and of being governed by a majority of the vicinage, and not by majorities brought from remote sections to overwhelm him with their accumulated numbers. It would be agreeable to the interests of all parts of the States; for each State may have different interests in different parts; one part may be agricultural, another manufacturing, another commercial; and it would be unjust that the strongest should govern, or that two should combine and sacrifice the third. The district system would be agreeable to the intention of our present Constitution, which, in giving to each elector a separate vote, instead of giving to each State a consolidated vote, composed of all its electoral suffrages, clearly intended that each mass of persons entitled to one elector, should have the right of giving one vote, according to their own sense of their own interest."[8]

All the objects of the Lodge amendment would be attained equally well by the district system as by the proportional voting system. It is correct to say with Senator Dickerson, author of what used to be called the New Jersey plan of districting, that "upon a calculation of chances, the probabilities of a fair expression of the public will are increased by dividing the States into districts, and in the ratio of the number of districts to the number of States."[9] But the district system is preferable to proportional voting because it maintains the geographical constituencies and gives an equal voice to equal units of population rather than to equal aggregations of actual voters.

The significance of this last consideration in the distribution of a State's electoral votes should not be overlooked. Under the district system each group of, say, 300,000 persons residing in contiguous territory would be entitled to cast one electoral vote, and it would cast this vote regardless of how many of its citizens actually went to the polls. Under the proportional voting system the weight of these equal groups would vary with the turnout. Bad weather, for instance, might give the urban communities a fortuitous advantage over rural communities, as it does today under the general ticket system. Or an unusual interest in some local issue might lead to a community's exercising a disproportionate influence in the choice of a President. In fact, all the arguments which I have brought together in my introduction to justify the principle of electoral voting as against Nation-wide popular voting apply with equal force to the system of voting within a State—excepting only that which is based on the disproportion of the qualifications requisite for voting.

The manner of dividing a State into districts should present no special difficulties. Most of the early district system amendments provided for the establishment of as many districts in each State as that State was entitled to electors—the qualifications requisite for voting to be the same as those prescribed for congressional elections. The mode is inconvenient only insofar as it prevents the States from using the congressional district as the unit of voting. It might be better, therefore, if each State were divided by the legislature thereof into as many districts as will equal the number of representatives to which such State may be entitled in Congress. This would enable though it would not compel a State to use its congressional districts as its voting units. The two extra electoral votes to which each State is entitled under the Constitution might be given as a sort of game-winning bonus to the candidate carrying the State as a whole, or the State might be divided into two superdistricts, each to cast one vote. In this connection I would point out that in Michigan in 1892 the election was by the people in districts, with the exception of two electors, one of whom was chosen by the eastern, the other by the western part of the State. Such an arrangement has the advantage of bringing into a clear view the principle of equal masses, equal votes. It also exhibits the compromise in the electoral system between the popular and Federal principles.

One objection to the district system ought not to pass unnoticed. It is possible, indeed probable, that in districting a State for presidential elections the legislature thereof might resort to the iniquitous practice of gerrymandering.

"What is to become," asked Edward Everett in 1826, "of the minorities on the district system? I could here tell the gentleman something about that arrangement in my own State, to which he alluded by a name—which, out of respect to a venerable patriot and statesman of the Revolution, now no more, and who had nothing to do with the transaction, I shall not repeat. At a time when the parties in the State were nearly balanced, there was a small majority on the Federal side; 51,000, perhaps, on one side, and 49,000 on the other. In that state of public feeling, by virtue of a system of districts, consisting of adjacent territory, and the same amount of population (for in all these details, I believe the division was perfectly fair). It was so contrived that the minority chose 29 State senators, and the majority chose 11; and more votes were given for these 11 than were given for the 29. This is, indeed, an effectual protection afforded by the district system to the minority."[10]

The solution would be, in the first place, to provide in the Constitution that the districts should be compact and contiguous territories containing, as nearly as practicable, equal numbers of inhabitants—language which appears in the act of 1911 prescribing a single-member district system for Representatives. In the second place, it would be to entrust to Congress the same power to make and alter the State regulations regarding presidential elections that it now has in respect to the election of Representatives.

Every argument advanced by Hamilton in Nos. 59, 60, and 61 of the Federalist to justify the power of Congress to regulate the election of Members applies with equal force to the appointment of electors or, in the event of their abolition, to the casting of electoral votes. The same may be said of the arguments of Madison in the Federal Convention:

"The policy of referring the appointment of the House of Representatives to the people and not to the legislatures of the States, supposes that the result will be somewhat influenced by the mode. This view of the question seems to decide that the legislatures of the State ought not to have the uncontrolled right of regulating the times, places, and manner of holding elections. These were words of great latitude. It was impossible to foresee all the abuses that might be made of the discretionary power. Whether the electors (that is, the voters) should vote by ballot or viva voce; should assemble at this place or that place; should be divided into districts or all meet at one place; should all vote for all the Representatives; or all in a district vote for a number allotted to the district; these and many other points would depend on the legislatures, and might materially affect the appointments. Whenever the State legislatures had a favorite measure to carry, they would take care so to mold their regulations as to favor the candidates they wished to succeed. * * * It seemed as improper in principle—though it might be less inconvenient in practice—to give the State legislatures this great authority over the election of Representatives of the people in the General Legislature, as it would be to give to the latter a like power over the election of their representatives in the State legislature."[11]

Against this it ought to be said that Congress has not been very successful in preventing the gerrymandering of congressional districts and would probably be no more successful in respect of electoral districts. Perhaps so. But the evil would be less. Congressional gerrymandering affects measures; presidential gerrymandering could affect but a single individual. At the very worst it could result in the choice of a man who was considered by the second largest group of persons in the country as the best fitted for the office. And even here it might have a countervailing merit. If the electoral districts were gerrymandered on the same plan as the congressional districts (as they probably would be), the result of the election would be to produce a President in political sympathy with the majority of the House of Representatives.

I would conclude, therefore, that, on a relative view of the merits and demerits of the district system and the proportional-voting system, respectively, the palm must be awarded to the former. The district system is clearly to be preferred to the present general-ticket system. Of the proportional-voting system we must speak more doubtfully.

THE INTERMEDIATE ELECTORS

The idea of abolishing the intermediate electors and committing the choice of the President and Vice President to the people voting in districts, in States, or in the United States at large, is an old one. First advanced in the shape of a constitutional amendment by Senator Benton, of Missouri, in 1823,[12] it had long been hinted at. In 1801 Jefferson wrote to Gallatin of an "amendment which I know will be proposed, to wit, to have no electors, but let the people vote directly, and the ticket which has the plurality of the votes of any State to be considered as receiving the whole vote of the State."[13] And in 1803 Representative Holland declared that he would "have preferred an immediate suffrage to this indirect mode of electing by electors."[14]

The argument which is usually brought forward to support the proposal is very plausible, if not altogether sound. I give it in the words of the report of a select committee of the Senate made January 19, 1826:

"It was the intention of the Constitution that these electors should be an independent body of men, chosen by the people from among themselves, on account of their superior discernment, virtue, and information; and that this select body should be left to make the election according to their own will, without the slightest control from the body of the people. That this intention has failed of its object in every election, is a fact of such universal notoriety, that no one can dispute it. * * * Electors, therefore, have not answered the design of their institution. They are not the independent body and superior characters which they were intended to be. They are not left to the exercise of their own judgment; on the contrary, they give their vote, or bind themselves to give it, according to the will of their constituents. They have degenerated into mere agents in a case which requires no agency, and where the agent is useless if he is faithful, and dangerous if he is not. Instead of being chosen for their noble qualities set forth in the Federalist, candidates for electors are now most usually selected for their devotion to a party, their popular manners, and a supposed talent at electioneering, which the framers of the Constitution would have been ashamed to possess."[15]

There are some things about this argument which call for comment. While it is doubtless true that the character of the electors has sunk from the standard of perfection visualized by the framers of the Constitution, it is very doubtful that these electors were ever intended to act a part wholly independent of the people. The electoral system was not the invention of that part of the Federal Convention which distrusted the people[16] but of that part which trusted them. First proposed by James Wilson, it seems to have been regarded by him as an equivalent to an election by the people.[17] In the debates it was advocated not so much as a means of correcting the judgment of the people (and never as a means of ignoring or superseding it) but as a device for getting over the difficulties of disproportionate voting qualifications and Negro representation.[18] And when it was finally adopted, Madison had no hesitancy in saying that "the President is now to be elected by the people."[19]

However this may be, it cannot be denied that the electors at the present time exercise much less discretion than was originally expected of them. The founding fathers regarded the electors as analogous to representatives. Hamilton called them "a special body of representatives, deputed by the society for the single purpose of making the important choice."[20] Abraham Baldwin, as we have

[1] Jefferson to Hamilton, January 12, 1800, P. L. Ford, editor, The Works of Thomas Jefferson (New York and London, 1905), IX, 90–91. Jefferson's point was that it would be better for all the States to use the general ticket than for some to use it and others the district system: "All agree that an election by districts would be best, if it could be general; but while 10 States choose either by their legislatures or by a general ticket, it is folly and worse than folly for the other 6 not to do it."

[2] Madison to Hay, August 23, 1823.

[3] Daily Advertiser, June 8, 1800. Quoted from C. A. O'Neill, The American Electoral System (New York and London, 1887), p. 75—an invaluable work.

[4] The fallacies of PR are ably set forth in Bagehot's English Constitution, ch. vi.

[5] E. g., 33 Annals, 142.

[6] 10 Annals, 39 (1800).

[7] 17 Annals, 333.

[8] 41 Annals, 169.

[9] 33 Annals, 142.

[10] 2 Register of Debates, 1583–1584.

[11] Farrand, II, 240–241.

[12] H. V. Ames, Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States (Washington, 1897), p. 89. Benton himself asserted the novelty of his proposal, 41 Annals, 168.

[13] Jefferson to Gallatin, September 18, 1801. Such an amendment would have fixed the general ticket system on the States. The Norris amendment of 1934, as finally voted on by the Senate, was of the same type.

[14] 13 Annals, 735.

[15] 2 Register of Debates, Appendix, p. 121. Nowadays, in States using the Australian (or short) ballot, the names of the candidates for electors are not printed, so that the people have no idea for what agents they are voting.

[16] When George Mason declared "that it would be as unnatural to refer the choice of a proper character for chief magistrate to the people, as it would to refer a trial of colors to a blind man," he spoke for the minority.

[17] Wilson's plan, seldom or never correctly explained in secondary works, was to divide the United States as a whole into a certain number of districts, each to consist of one or more States, and each to elect a certain number of persons who, meeting as a single body, would choose the Executive. This plan, submitted June 2, 1787, was an elaboration of his proposal of the preceding day that the Executive be chosen by the people at large. Nowadays, to be sure, an election by the people at large means a direct vote by Nation-wide referendum, but it was not necessarily so in the eighteenth century. Madison, in the Virginia convention, declared that under the scheme actually adopted the President would be "the choice of the people at large" (Elliott's Debates, III, 487). And in the First Congress he spoke of the President as being "appointed at present by the suffrages of 3,000,000 people" (1 Annals, 461).

[18] "There was one difficulty, however, of a serious nature attending an immediate choice by the people. The right of suffrage was much more diffusive in the Northern than the Southern States; and the latter could have no influence in the election on the score of the Negroes. The substitution of electors obviated this difficulty" (Madison, July 19, 1787; Farrand, II, 97).

[19] Farrand, II, 587.

[20] Federalist, No. 68.

already seen, referred to them as a constitutional branch of the government "as respectable as Congress and in whom the Constitution on this business has more confidence than in Congress." [29] And representatives were regarded by the founding fathers, not as State ambassadors to be "the mere agents and advocates of State interests and views," but as "the impartial umpires and guardians of justice and general good." [30] "We stand not here," said Thomas Hedgwick in the First Congress, "as the representatives of the State legislatures * * * but as the representatives of the great Body of the people." [31] Nothing of this view remains today as regards the electors. An elector is viewed as an automaton, a mere organ for conveying the names of his constituents to the electoral college. A notable proof of this fact was given in 1876 when James Russell Lowell, being asked to cast his vote for Tilden in order to prevent the success of a gigantic electoral swindle, replied that he was a mere delegate of his constituents, a trustee to carry out definite instructions, and that to refuse to comply with his mandate would be "treacherous, dishonorable, and immoral." To the founding fathers it is the countenancing of a fraud that would have seemed "treacherous, dishonorable, and immoral."

In the light of these considerations the proposal to abolish the intermediate electors is a reform which must appear very reasonable. If the electors are automata, merely registering the will of their constituents, why not assert that will directly? The case is not so simple, however. Madison, first consulted on this subject in 1823, later made a very pertinent remark:

"One advantage of electors is, that altho' generally the mere mouths of their constituents, they may be intentionally left sometimes to their own judgment, guided by further information that may be acquired by them, and finally, what is of material importance, they will be able, when ascertaining, which may not be till a late hour, that the first choice of their constituents is utterly hopeless, to substitute in the electoral vote the name known to be their second choice." [32]

There have been cases where exactly this course has been followed. In 1824, for example, the electors of North Carolina were pledged both to Jackson and Adams with the understanding that they would vote for the one who had the best chance of success." And as recently as 1912 "the Roosevelt ticket of electors declared before election that, if Theodore Roosevelt could not be elected and it should become a contest between Taft and Wilson, they would vote for Taft."

Under the present arrangements this advantage of electors may be thought a small one. The operation of the general-ticket system has been such as invariably to give some candidate a majority of the electoral vote. No combination of minority parties could affect the result. But if the general ticket were to be broken up—either by the district system or by proportional voting—occasions might frequently arise when a majority opposition to a plurality candidate might make itself felt. On such occasions the advantage mentioned by Madison would be very considerable.

A second advantage of electors is that they act as a connecting link between the Presidency and Vice Presidency. Being pledged to support the candidates of their parties for both offices, it can seldom happen that the popular election will result in the choice of a President of one party and a Vice President of another. It is conceivable, however, that in a close election under the Lodge amendment a popular Vice Presidential candidate of a minority party might succeed where his principal failed. The twelfth amendment to the Constitution, it will be remembered, was adopted precisely to prevent such a result.

Against these advantages there are, to be sure, disadvantages. Perhaps the most serious is this. The use of intermediate electors limits the choice of voters in each State to those candidates who have electoral tickets, and, more particularly, to those candidates whose electoral tickets appear on the printed ballots. In 1856, for example, it proved impossible for the voters in most of the Southern States to cast a single vote for Fremont and Dayton. In 1912 a Californian could vote for Taft and his unnamed colleague [33] only by writing in the names of 13 electors. In 1948 the Alabama voters were precluded from voting for Truman and Barkley.

It would appear then that the desirability of abolishing the intermediate electors is not quite so self-evident as it seemed at first glance. What should be done depends mainly on what changes are made in other parts of the electoral system. Principally, as we shall see in the next section, it depends on whether or not some proper mode is introduced of taking the sense of the Nation in cases where no candidate for President or Vice President has obtained a majority of the electoral vote. With such a mode most of the advantages of electors would disappear. Without it, the case might be different.

THE UMPIRAGE OF CONGRESS

The twelfth amendment to the Constitution provides that the person having the greatest number of electoral votes shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; but if no person have such majority, then the House of Representatives, voting by States and not by heads, shall immediately, by ballot, elect the President from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President.[34] A majority of all the States is necessary to a choice. The same rule controls the election of the Vice President, except that the Senate, voting by heads, makes the choice from the two highest numbers on the list, a majority of the whole number of Senators being necessary to a choice.

The impropriety of this mode of determining the eventual choice of the Executive has long been noticed. Jefferson, writing to George Hay in 1823, had no hesitation in saying that he had "ever considered the constitutional mode of election ultimately by the legislature voting by States as the most dangerous blot in our Constitution, and one which some unlucky chance will someday hit and give us a pope and antipope." [35] Madison was of the same opinion:

"The present rule of voting for President by the House of Representatives is so great a departure from the republican principle of numerical equality, and even from the Federal rule which qualifies the numerical by a State equality, and is so pregnant also with a mischievous tendency in practice, that an amendment of the Constitution on this point is justly called for by all its considerate and best friends." [36]

Senator LODGE has proposed precisely such an amendment. He would provide simply that the person having the greater number of electoral votes for President shall be President. In the event of a tie (an impossible case under the decimal system of computing the electoral vote [37] but quite possible if the electors were to be continued), then the one for whom the greatest number of popular votes was cast shall be President. A similar rule would control the election of the Vice President.

High authority can be quoted for the idea of making a plurality sufficient to elect. James Wilson, perhaps the leading member of the Federal Convention, when the subject was under debate, once declared that the concurrence of a majority of people is not a necessary principle of election, nor required as such in any of our States.[38] Mason and Williamson preferred making the highest though not having a majority of the votes, President, to a reference of the matter to the Senate.[39] Madison and Williamson moved to strike out the word "majority" and insert "one-third" so that the eventual power might not be exercised if so many as one-third of the electors should vote for the same person.[40]

High authority and strong arguments, however, can likewise be brought forward to sustain a different view. The members of the Federal Convention as a body decided that a majority vote would be necessary for the choice of a President both in the first election by electors and in the contingent election by the House of Representatives. The Eighth Congress and the States, in passing the twelfth amendment, extended the majority principal to the case of the Vice President.[41] Madison, commenting in 1823 on a proposal identical with that of Senator LODGE, remarked:

"The mode which you seem to approve, of making a plurality of electoral votes a definitive appointment would have the merit of avoiding the legislative agency in appointing the Executive; but might it not, by multiplying hopes and chances, stimulate intrigue and exertion, as well as incur too great a risk of success to a very inferior candidate? Next to the propriety of having a President the real choice of a majority of his constituents, it is desirable that he should inspire respect and acquiescence by qualifications not suffering too much by comparison." [42]

It is worth observing that these arguments would gain in force by the introduction of a system of proportional voting and the abolition of the intermediate electors; for the former would tend to multiply the number of candidates and the latter would make impossible the subsequent reduction of that number by the device of electors voting their constituents' second choices. It might happen that the leading candidate might have a very small proportion indeed of the popular or electoral vote. He might even be totally obnoxious to a great majority of the Nation. As Madison stated to Henry Lee:

"In what degree a plurality of votes is evidence of the will of the majority of voters, must depend on circumstances more easily estimated in a given case than susceptible of general definition. The greater the number of candidates among whom the votes are divided, the more uncertain must, of course, be the inference from the plurality with respect to the majority." [43]

This consideration alone may be thought sufficient to decide the issue. We must also take into account, however, the certainty that it will not be debated solely on its merits. The present mode of voting in the contingent election is advantageous to the small States. The present mode of appointing electors is advantageous to the large States. The abolition or modification of the one may therefore be regarded as a political equivalent for the abolition or modification of the other. The connection has long been noticed. As early as 1826 Representative McDuffie declared that "the small States will never consent to give up their eventual equality in voting for the President, in this House, unless the large States will consent to break their power of concentration and combination" in the initial electoral voting.[44]

If then, we accept the desirability, or even the political necessity, of retaining some mechanism of taking the final sense of the majority of the Nation, we may briefly review the modes which might reasonably be adopted.

A mode first recommended by Representative McDuffie in 1826 deserves consideration: "In case the primary vote of the electoral colleges shall fail to decide the election, I propose that the two highest candidates, respectively, shall be referred back to the people, voting directly for the President and Vice President by districts." [45] Such a scheme could be operated without the intervention of electors at all, and the obstacles to it, being chiefly temporal, could easily be overcome.

An amendment introduced by Senator Van Buren in 1823 proposed that, in like circumstances, the electors should meet again and choose the President from the two persons receiving the highest number of votes at the first election.[46] Such a scheme would transfer the umpirage of elections from the Congress to the electoral college. In view of the present character of electors, it has not perhaps much to commend it.

Assuming that the umpirage is retained by Congress, the most proper mode of deciding presidential contests is that which Representative Tucker is said to have suggested in 1819—that in electing a President the House of Representatives should vote by heads and not by States.[47] The overriding advantage of this mode is that the President and House of Representatives would surely be of the same political sympathies. It would, however, utterly deprive the small States of the over-representation to which they have become accustomed in the choice of a President.

Perhaps then the mode which has the best chance of success is that which was voted by the Federal Convention when it contemplated allowing the national legislature to choose the President in the first instance—an election by joint ballot of the two Houses, each Member to have one vote. Such an arrangement would preserve to the small States the advantage which they now have in the electoral college but would deprive them of any additional advantage.

As regards the Vice President, we need only say that his appointment should depend on the same body that appoints the President. Under the present system, the House might choose a President of one party and the Senate a Vice President of another.

One point remains: From how many persons should the eventual selection be made? In effect, the question is between 3 and 2, for none, I suppose, will wish to restore the number, 5, prescribed in the original Constitution, or advocate 7 or 13, as did Sherman, Spaight, and Rutledge in the Federal Convention. Here again Madison has supplied the answer:

"It might be a question, whether the three instead of the two highest names might not be put within the choice of Congress, inasmuch as it not unfrequently happens, that the candidate third on the list of votes would in a question with either of the two first outvote him, and consequently be the real preference of the voters. But this advantage of opening a wider door and better chance to merit may be outweighed by an increased difficulty in obtaining a prompt and quiet decision by Congress with three candidates before them, supported by three parties, no one of them making a majority of the whole." [48]

Whether any provision should be made for the case where there is an equality of votes among several highest on the list is a moot question. The original Constitution made none, and John Taylor, of Caroline, thought that none was necessary.[49] Others have thought otherwise.

LOUIS WEIMBERG, Jr.

PRINCETON, N. J.

---

[29] Annals, 30. On the other hand, the Supreme Court in *Fitzgerald v. Green* (134 U. S. 379 (1890)) has said that "Presidential electors, although they are appointed and act under and pursuant to the Constitution, are no more officers or agents of the United States than are the members of State legislatures when acting as electors of Federal Senators, or the people of the States when acting as electors of Representatives in Congress." The founding fathers would have denied the analogy; for they likened the electoral body to the persons chosen (Senators and Representatives) rather than to the persons choosing them (State legislatures and the people).

[30] Farrand, I, 402.

[31] I Annals, 743.

[32] Madison to Robert Taylor, January 30, 1824.

[33] C. O. Paullin, Atlas of Historical Geography of the United States (Washington and New York, 1932), p. 98.

[34] Ibid., p. 103.

[35] The Republican candidate for Vice President died before election day. It was not until after the election that the Republican National Committee determined that the Republican electors should vote for Nicholas Murray Butler.

[36] The quoted language is very obscure. "I will venture to say that three-fourths of the people who shall read it, will think it is intended to confine the election to three persons; and yet, I understand, it is the intention of the Senate only to confine it to three classes. * * * The three highest numbers may refer to 40 persons, if they should be equal." (Representative Griswold, December 7, 1803; 13 Annals, 677, 678.) It has also been suggested that the words "not exceeding three" imply that the House might, if it chose, confine the election to the persons having the two highest numbers on the list or to the persons tied with the highest number. (Representative Baldwin, December 7, 1803; Ibid., p. 679.)

[37] Jefferson to Hay, August 17, 1823. Works, XII, 303.

[38] Madison to Hay, August 23, 1823. Similar sentiments may be found in the debates of Congress on the twelfth amendment, notably in the remarks of Senator Taylor, of Virginia (John Taylor, of Caroline).

[39] In prorating the electoral vote of each State the calculations are to be carried to three decimal places, "unless a more detailed calculation would change the result of the election." The probability of two candidates receiving an equal vote to an infinite number of decimal places is virtually nil.

[40] July 17, 1787.

[41] September 5, 1787.

[42] September 5, 1787.

[43] The Constitution, as originally adopted, never notices a vote for Vice President, and no vote was in fact given for such an office. Each elector wrote the names of two persons on a piece of paper called a ballot: these were his alternative choices for President; either of them might become President. The Vice President was, in effect, the runner-up in the Presidential contest. He might or might not be the choice of a majority of the electors, depending on whether his vote was or was not in excess of one-fourth of the electoral vote.

[44] Madison to Hay, August 23, 1823.

[45] Madison to Lee, January 14, 1824.

[46] 2 Register of Debates, 1376.

[47] 2 Register of Debates, 1366.

[48] 41 Annals 74, 368.

[49] 34 Annals, 1450.

[50] Madison to Hay, August 23, 1823.

[51] 13 Annals, 98.

Restoration of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to comment upon the passage by the House of H. R. 6616, a bill which restores citizenship to persons who, while citizens of the United States lost their citizenship solely by having voted in a political election in Italy after October 13, 1943, and before January 1, 1949.

I am truly delighted that the House took this action.

As you may recall, during the months immediately preceding the Italian election of April 18, 1948, I did everything in my power to assist those millions of Italians who were attempting to resist the godless tide of Communist oppression. It was my privilege to speak on short wave to Italy on a number of occasions. My wife also gave much of her time to this effort. All right thinking Americans recognized that the Italian election of 1948 was of tremendous consequence to the people of the United States. If Italy had succumbed to the Communist tyranny at that time the national security of the United States would have been vitally impaired.

Several thousand American citizens, including many from Connecticut, native born and naturalized, in Italy on either business or travel, cast their votes in the Italian elections thereby losing their American citizenship. All were urged to participate in the elections by friends in the United States and by various authorities. Many cast their votes because of their conviction that by so doing they were acting in the common interest of all freedom-loving peoples. The pressure on these American citizens in Italy to vote was very great indeed. That they did so is a credit to them. Yet by so doing they have lost their citizenship.

In an effort to remedy this situation, I introduced H. R. 6777, which is similar to H. R. 6616, the bill which passed the House.

I did so in order to unite American families which have been cruelly separated by virtue of their participation in this historic election.

I did so in an effort to reward those who understood the grim necessities of the hour and who acted to preserve all that we hold dear.

The letter killeth and the spirit giveth life.

This favorable action on this legislation by the House of Representatives corresponds with the relentless realities of the world in which we live. It is in the true spirit of the heritage and culture

which in such large measure is shared by the American and Italian people.

I believe that just as the United States and Italy have many common traditions so shall we partake of a common destiny.

It is my hope that the Senate will soon consider and pass this bill, thereby enabling these expatriated Americans to return to their homes in America and rejoin their families here.

Formosa Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Henry Chamberlin from the New Leader of January 21, 1950. I do not agree with Mr. Chamberlin's suggestion that the United States should establish American bases on Formosa—such action would be neither wise nor necessary. But it is of vital importance to our security that we give effective assistance to those defending the island in order to deny it to the Communists and the Kremlin—our avowed enemies:

FORMOSA FOLLY

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The decision to take no action calculated to keep the island of Formosa out of the hands of the Chinese Communists is the biggest political, moral, and strategic blunder the American Government has committed since the days when appeasement of Soviet Communism dominated our foreign policy. Everything about this decision was wrong: the substance, the manner and the timing.

The opinion of the military experts, of whom General MacArthur was the most prominent, that Formosa is essential to America security in the Far East was brushed aside. There was no sounding of Congressional opinion through consultation with the Senate and House Committees on Foreign Relations. A heavy blow was struck at the basis of bipartisan foreign policy.

SENATOR VANDENBERG, who has always taken a national, not a party view in this field, and who has come under the heavy fire of some of his fellow-Republicans for that reason, was fully justified in the measured criticism which he offered:

"Like Yalta and Potsdam, and many other unhappy chapters in China policy, Congressional advice is precluded. I regret that these conclusions precede the factual reports which have been anticipated from the Jessup mission and particularly from the Far East conference between our Chiefs of Staff and General MacArthur."

This last point was certainly worth emphasizing. The President gave the abandonment signal in regard to Formosa without waiting for the results of the military conference between the Joint Chiefs of Staff and General MacArthur.

What serious reason was there for this haste to announce a decision certainly calculated to excite joy in Moscow and in every Communist satellite capital in the world? Secretary Acheson's lame explanation is that "there was a good deal of confusion in the minds of our people." But this confusion was rather intensified by a curious statement emanating from Mr. Jessup in Tokyo. He asserted that we do not intend to abandon China (could it be that the China of Mao Tse-tung has abandoned us?) and that the United States opposes Communist practices of overthrowing governments by subversion.

But at the very moment Mr. Jessup was announcing this opposition, Truman and Acheson were declaring a policy which can only help the Communists to consolidate their grip on China and to extend that grip to Formosa.

These two issues, China and Formosa, should be kept strictly separate. It would probably be beyond our power, and would certainly be an unwarranted commitment of American military strength to try to reconquer China for Chiang Kai-shek.

Formosa, on the other hand, as an island a hundred miles off the China coast, could easily be held with a very moderate display of American naval and air power. Suggestions that this would mean war, even a third world war, are ridiculous. How could the Chinese Reds capture Formosa when they have neither a navy nor an air force worthy of the name? Far from promoting war, the establishment on Formosa of American naval and air bases would be the surest means of preventing the extension of war to the island. It would be an obvious, practical, and bloodless means of containing communism in Asia.

But, so the apologists for the administration's do-nothing policy argue, this would be imperialism and violation of the supposed right of China to rule Formosa. However, this right, from any moral standpoint, is nonexistent. The decision of Roosevelt and Churchill at Cairo to hand over Formosa to China was one of the many blunders of the war and was a cruel injustice to the 6,000,000 inhabitants of the island.

* * * * *

An independent Formosa, secured by American naval and air power, bolstered in its formative period by American technical advice and economic aid, would be the best solution of the problem posed by this rich and beautiful island. Economically there are natural links between Japan, with its surplus manufactures, and Formosa, with its surplus of sugar, rice and citrus fruits, all of which find a ready market in Japan.

From the strategic standpoint, it is an act of grave irresponsibility to let Formosa pass in to the hands of a hostile power. And Communist China must be considered a hostile power until there has been a drastic change in its policies and methods. A submarine base in Formosa could endanger all our communications with Japan. An air base could be a constant threat to the Philippines. From the southernmost promontory of Formosa one can see the northernmost islands of the Philippine archipelago.

The Chinese Communists, of course, have neither airplanes nor submarines at the present time. But there is nothing in their record to suggest that, once they are in possession of the island, they would refuse a fraternal offer from Moscow to build such bases—and stock them with the necessary weapons.

The passive abandonment of Formosa to Mao Tse-tung's dictatorship is defended on the ground that Mao is a potential Tito. But Titoism is something that must first be proved by deeds. If and when Mao breaks with Moscow, there will be other means of rewarding and supporting him, without handing over to his rule an island which there are the strongest political, economic and strategic reasons for keeping outside the Asiatic iron curtain.

Secretary of State Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is entitled to a detailed statement by Dean Acheson making crystal clear that he recognizes all the ramifications of the dual capacity in which he says he finds himself by virtue of his position as Secretary of State.

His right to some private life as an individual has not been questioned. But he also has certain duties and obligations as an official of the Government.

As an individual, Dean Acheson may be granted the right to choose his personal friends. However, as Secretary of State, he has no personal choice of either friends or enemies—the United States selects those for him and he must abide by that selection.

Probably not many people would object if Acheson said that—as far as his private life as an individual is concerned—he would not "turn his back" on any friend. That, for example, if his friend's children had no food, clothing, or shelter, he would help them as one friend helps another. But—and Acheson should make this emphatic—that as Secretary of State he cannot regard Alger Hiss as a loyal citizen unless and until Hiss is able to satisfy the people of the Nation that he—Hiss—is a loyal citizen of this country. That must be established to the satisfaction of the people of the Nation, not simply to the satisfaction of Dean Acheson.

Whether we accept the best or the worst that can be said of Hiss at the present time, we arrive at the same conclusion. At worst, he is a traitor who has betrayed his country; at best, his loyalty to this Nation is in grave doubt. By either viewpoint, Secretary of State Acheson must not now regard Hiss as a loyal citizen.

I have been told that the above is exactly the position of Acheson. If so, Acheson should make that clear to the country.

General Romulo Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished gathering of military and civilian personnel participated in an unusual ceremony on January 31 at 9:30 a. m. in room 3E912, Pentagon Building, Washington, D. C. The occasion was the presentation of the Legion of Merit (degree of commander) to His Excellency Carlos P. Romulo, president of the General Assembly, United Nations. General Romulo, who served in this body as a resident commissioner from the Philippine Islands, is known to most Members of this House. I feel that it is fitting that the statement in connection with this ceremony and the citation itself be made a part of the official CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and by leave granted me by the Speaker, I include it herewith as part of my remarks:

GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO AWARDED LEGION OF MERIT

Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, President of the General Assembly, United Nations, today received the Legion of Merit (Degree of Commander) from Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, who made the presentation on behalf of President Truman.

General Romulo was discharged yesterday from Walter Reed General Hospital, where he had been under treatment for a throat illness.

The award to General Romulo was accompanied by a citation that it was made because of his exceptionally meritorious military services to the United States during World War II.

Called to active duty as a major in the Philippine Army Reserve in 1941, General Romulo became press aide to Gen. Douglas MacArthur. In 1942 he served on Bataan and Corregidor and from January to April 1942 operated the Voice of Freedom.

General Romulo continued to serve as General MacArthur's aide in Australia after the general ordered him out of Bataan in April 1942.

In September 1944, while serving as Resident Commissioner in Washington, D. C., he was appointed brigadier general. He was chairman of the Philippine delegation to the San Francisco Conference on International Organization in 1945.

General Romulo was appointed chairman of the Philippine delegation to UNRRA in 1946, and later became permanent delegate from the Philippines to the United Nations and to the United Nations General Assembly.

Born in Manila January 14, 1899, General Romulo received a bachelor of arts degree at the University of the Philippines, a master of arts degree at Columbia University, and doctor of laws (honoris causa) at Notre Dame University. He has been a newspaper editor, publisher, and a professor of English. Articles which he wrote while on a tour of the Orient addressing Rotary Clubs won for him the Pulitzer prize.

The Legion of Merit citation follows:

"Brigadier General Romulo, Philippine Armed Forces (Reserve), formerly Philippine Army, performed exceptionally meritorious services to the United States as an officer on the staffs of the commanding general, United States Army Forces in the Far East, and of the commanding general, United States forces in the Philippines from December 12, 1941, until April 12, 1942. As press aide to the respective commanding generals of the United States Army Forces in the Far East from early December 1941 until he was ordered to escape from Bataan on April 12, 1942, Brigadier General Romulo (then lieutenant colonel) was in charge of the Public Relations Section for the United States forces in the Philippines. He was responsible for radio broadcasts, censorship of news, propaganda material, and all matters dealing with the press. He displayed remarkable skill and unusual judgment in all matters connected with those responsibilities. His daily articles, which were broadcast over the local radio station on the Voice of Freedom program, contributed immensely to the maintenance of a high state of morale among all of the troops in the Philippine Islands. His work was so outstandingly thorough and his judgment so unfailingly sound that the commanding general frequently consulted him on matters pertaining to the Philippine Army. His work in all branches connected with his office contributed greatly to the defense of the Philippines."

Facts and Figures on Lobbying Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, I would like to call the attention of Members of Congress to the section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, January 31, devoted to reports filed under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946.

This section, which runs to about 47 pages of fine print in the RECORD, contains 870 quarterly reports on Form C filed by active registered lobbyists for the fourth quarter of 1949. Also included in Tuesday's RECORD were 68 new registration statements on Form B received by the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate in the preceding 3 months, up to and including January 20 of this year.

As the Members know, Mr. Speaker, the registrations on Form B are in the nature merely of notices of intent to engage in lobbying activities "for pay or for any other consideration," while the quarterly reports, on the other hand, on Form C, are the periodic disclosures of income and expenditures, and so forth, of those who have previously registered and who acknowledged engaging during the particular calendar quarter in actual lobbying activities or in activities which might be regarded as constituting lobbying.

A TOTAL OF 2,074 REGISTERED LOBBYISTS

As of January 20, when the list of registrations contained in Tuesday's RECORD was made up, a total of 2,045 persons, mostly individuals, but including also law firms, public-relations firms, corporations, and some pressure-group organizations, had registered since the act went into effect in 1946, complying with section 308, which requires that—

Any person who shall engage himself for pay or for any other consideration for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States shall, before doing anything in furtherance of such object, register with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate and shall give to those officers in writing and under oath, his name and business address, the name and address of the person by whom he is employed, and in whose interest he appears or works, the duration of such employment, how much he is paid and is to receive, by whom he is paid or is to be paid, how much he is to be paid for expenses, and what expenses are to be included.

The number of such persons who had registered stood at 1,999 as of December 31, 1949, but went over the 2,000 mark on January 2. By January 20, when the current list of 68 new registrations appearing in the RECORD of January 31 was sent to the printers, the number stood at 2,045. I checked this morning, and the number is now 2,074.

NO MACHINERY FOR WITHDRAWAL

These figures by themselves are a little misleading, for the simple reason that some registrants have registered two, three or even more different times for separate accounts or employer interests. Some have died, others have retired or changed jobs or are otherwise no longer subject to the act. A few of these have withdrawn their registrations, but there is no official machinery provided for that purpose and so they are still carried in the total number of registrants.

Our committee staff is now in the process of cataloging these various registrations for the purpose of arriving at more definitive figures.

In any event, however, it is obvious that less than half of the approximately 2,000 registrants now on the books have acknowledged engaging in actual lobbying activities, or in activities which might be regarded as coming within the scope of the act, during the calendar quarter recently ended, since the RECORD of January 31, as I said, contains only 870 quarterly reports, and some of those are multiple reports from the same registrants for the same employer interests but covering different calendar quarters. And, of course, the multiple purpose registrants who represent a number of different interests filed separate quarterly reports for each. Those who did not file for this past quarter presumably were not active as lobbyists during that period.

Nevertheless the reports contained in the RECORD of January 31 reflect a significant picture of tremendous amounts of time and money being expended by pressure groups and pressure interests throughout the country in seeking to influence actions by the Congress of the United States. For that reason the 47-page section of that RECORD is of great importance and warrants study by each Member of CONGRESS.

EACH MEMBER OF CONGRESS SHOULD SAVE THE LOBBY REPORTS PRINTED IN THE RECORD OF JANUARY 31, 1950

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that each Member clip out of Tuesday's RECORD the section containing the lobbying reports and keep those pages on his desk for future—and I hope frequent—reference. This is about the only handy reference material readily available to us and to the public on the activities of individual lobbyists who have registered under the act—their employer interests, their salaries and expenses, and, where this fact is included, the legislation which

they are engaged in promoting or retarding or otherwise influencing in the Congress.

Although the information contained in many of these reports is extremely sketchy, they can still be helpful to us and should be utilized constantly by the Members.

We are all fairly well acquainted with the citizens in our own districts who take more than a casual interest in pending legislation and who inform us of their views or speak on behalf of organized groups or for various social, economic, or political interests in our own districts. But each of us, in our capacities as national legislators and as members of committees dealing with important national issues, are subject at all times to constant pressures from a multitude of other sources. The lobby registration statements and quarterly reports provide us with one of the few instruments we have for assessing the representations made to us in regard to legislation by the various spokesmen—official, unofficial, self-appointed, or pretended spokesmen—for this or that pressure group or economic interest.

So, limited as some of these reports might be in the information they provide, they are still a useful guide and should be used by the Members in checking the claims of lobbyists and lobbying groups against the statements they have filed under oath.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON PRESSURE GROUPS FILED WITH CLERK OF THE HOUSE

In addition to the material printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, however, there is a wealth of additional information on lobbying and lobbying activities on file with the Clerk of the House, submitted by organizations, associations, and other pressure groups which solicit or spend money for the purpose of influencing legislative action by Congress, and which have decided to report under section 305 of the act. These reports, made on Form A—as distinct from the Form C reports made by registered agents and which are printed each quarter in the RECORD—are not printed but are available to the public for inspection in the Clerk's office.

They show the amounts of money collected by these organizations, during each quarter and cumulatively for each calendar year, the names of all contributors of $500 or more, and usually a complete break-down of all expenditures of $10 or more, showing to whom the money was paid and for what purpose.

These Form A reports tell a whole lot more about lobbying activities on the larger scale than do the individual Form C quarterly reports filed by those who file as paid agents of these various pressure groups. It is my hope that our committee can devise some practical method for making the information contained in these organizational reports more generally available to the Congress and to the public. In their present form, many of these reports are quite voluminous, and printing them in full would probably be impractical and uneconomic. But I believe we can devise a form for pressure groups to file which we could then print in the RECORD along with the others.

REPORTS SHOW FIFTY-FIVE MILLION COLLECTED—TWENTY-SEVEN MILLION SPENT IN 3½-YEAR PERIOD

I have had some preliminary studies made in connection with these Form A—pressure group—reports and the data we have accumulated so far is most interesting. A few significant facts emerge:

First. A total of 490 organizations, associations, corporations, firms, or other groups which acknowledge receiving and expending money for purposes of influencing legislation under the terms of the Lobbying Act, and which, in most cases, employ one or more paid lobbyists, have filed quarterly reports on Form A at one time or another in the past 3½ years. Actually, however, no more than 291 of them had filed for any single quarter, and that was for the second quarter of 1949. For the fourth quarter, only 249 such pressure groups had reported. The rest have not indicated whether they were operating in that quarter. Presumably they were not.

Second. These various pressure groups—and it will be noted that not all of them file for every quarter of every year—have reported collecting more than $55,000,000 since this act went into effect in 1946 and of spending $27,304,952.10. In many cases receipts and expenditures of all kinds, whether bearing on legislative activities or not, are reported in the total, but in a great many other cases, and particularly those of many of the big lobby groups, the receipts and expenditures reported are carefully segregated to include only those regarded as dealing with legislative matters. The figures, in any event, are startling in reflecting the size of America's pressure-group industry operating on the Congress of the United States.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it is shared by Representatives LANHAM, ALBERT, DOYLE, HALLECK, BROWN, and O'HARA of Minnesota, the other members of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, that before we finish our work we will be able to give the Congress a more complete and a more definitive picture of this so-called Third House of Congress—the lobbyists—than is presently ascertainable.

LOBBYING LAW REQUIRES ONLY THAT ACTIVITIES BE OUT IN THE OPEN

I personally believe, as do a lot of other Members, that lobbying is necessary and essential. Most lobbyists, I believe, perform a real service, not only to their own employer groups but to the Congress in keeping the Congress informed, with informed facts and informed opinion, on pending legislative issues in which those groups are not only interested but on which they are expert.

Nevertheless, the Congress has decreed that this activity designed to influence legislative action by Congress be carried on out in the open where we can all see it and assess it and recognize the special interest aspects of it. That is all that the Lobbying Act requires. It will be the purpose of my committee, I feel safe in saying, to make sure that the principle of full disclosure and open and above-board activity be adhered to.

Lost Tribe of Indians in North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which, in effect, will recognize what might be called a lost tribe of Indians in North Carolina. The story of these Indians is both interesting and tragic. James Evan Alexander has written me a letter telling this story and, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting it in the RECORD:

WILMINGTON, N. C., *February 5, 1950.*

Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POULSON: Attached to this letter you will find a draft of a bill designed to transfer certain lands into a Federal trust status and grant a small group of Indian people the privileges and benefits of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934. I am taking the liberty of asking you to introduce this bill because I am one of your constituents, although the people to be benefited by the proposed legislation are located in the Seventh Congressional District of North Carolina.

My first knowledge of these Indians was acquired while visiting my wife's family who have a farm within 40 miles of the Indian village. Hoping to find a saleable story or article, I contacted the chief of the tribe and after hearing a brief account of their troubled existence, I offered to assist them in any way I could in exchange for their cooperation in my writing project. To accomplish this purpose my wife and I moved into the Indian village where we have been residing with one of the families for the past 4½ months. Thus the project, on which we had originally intended to spend 30 days, stretched out over this long period of time. As our investigation revealed the conditions of oppression, prejudice, fear, and actual want, our interests were gradually transposed from an ordinary business deal to an association full of warm human understanding and a strong feeling of kinship.

Our research has proved to our own satisfaction that these people are descendants of a tribe known as the Waccamaw, and a member of the eastern Siouan Nation. I will not burden you with an attempt to prove the rights of these people to Federal recognition, but rather the need for recognition and the protection and aid such recognition would afford.

The present members of the tribe reside on approximately 2,000 acres of land in one of the swampiest regions of the coastal plain, 4 miles north of Bolton in southeastern North Carolina. This land straddles the county line of Columbus and Bladen and lies in the swamps of Buckhead, Doehead, and Ricefield. Of the 2,000 acres, less than one-fifth is arable land. This arable land being a series of islands that dot the swamp which surrounds them. Not to be misled by the word "island," it must be stated that these so-called islands are merely patches of higher ground which rise a foot or two above the water level of the swamp. The excessive amount of moisture keeps the production of crops far below that which would be considered economically profitable. Inasmuch as this area has an average of 40 inches of rainfall per year, it is not unusual for the waters of the swamps to rise and inundate the islands, thus destroying the

entire season's crop. These crops consist chiefly of field peas, corn, sweet potatoes, and collards, which are raised for the sustenance of the tribe and not as a market crop. Little tobacco is grown due to the nature of the soil and extremely small tobacco allotments. Some hogs are raised, but these too are mostly for tribal consumption.

Hunting, which at one time provided much of their food, is now extremely limited. This limitation is due to the fact that the woodland surrounding the Indian land has been acquired by several large paper companies, and hunting privileges are granted only to recognized hunting clubs upon application and payment of fees of several hundred dollars per year. Hunting was further restricted by the setting aside of a large tract of land as a game refuge of the State of North Carolina where no hunting is permitted.

The principal source of cash income for the tribe is from logging and pulpwood. Due to the lack of nearby markets, the Indians are, for the most part, dependent upon truckers who scour the swampland regions and buy the timber products at the side of the road. My investigation reveals that the Indians are paid approximately $8.50 per cord for pulpwood decked and ready for delivery.

The unproductivity of the land, plus the extremely low prices paid for their labor, presents a dismal economic picture. These factors are translated into a condition the result of which is malnutrition, frequent epidemics of diseases, high infant-mortality rate, and a short life expectancy. Though these conditions are the result of the Indians' economic condition, the economic condition itself is not a cause but rather an effect. The cause can be attributed to the social environment in which they exist.

This social problem is a complex one in which these Indians are caught between the color lines of a South which is predominately and almost equally divided, white and black. Exhibiting the fierce racial pride which is the trait of Indians generally, the Waccamaws have consistently resisted all efforts of their white neighbors to designate them as Negroes. This resistance brought further indignities upon them. I should like to note that from my experiences with these people I am sure that they would have resisted with equal determination any effort to designate them as white.

Instead of generalizing on the social problem of these Indians, I will cite some specific cases for the purpose of acquainting you with the social conditions under which these people live.

The first remembered attempt to institute a system of education in the Indian settlement was made by tribal members in 1891. A school committee was formed and a one-room, 16-by-20-foot building was constructed to serve as a schoolhouse. Tribal members furnished the material and labor for this structure. Each family, having children of school age, were assessed the sum of $40 per school year to create a fund for payment of a teacher's wages. Many of the families were unable to contribute this amount, so the school operated sporadically, more frequently closed than open. At a later date, now unobtainable, aid toward paying the teacher was granted by the State. In 1921, at the beginning of the school year, a new teacher arrived prepared to take up her duties. She was a Negro. Joe Patrick, then head of the school committee, ordered the teacher to leave the community and nailed up the schoolhouse door. This was the first knowledge the Indian people had that, under the State-aid program, their school was classified as Negro. Following this, the parents threatened armed resistance to the attempts on the part of white school officials to force the Indian children to attend colored schools.

The church served as a school from the year 1924 to the year 1930. Indian teachers were procured from Robeson County. They were boarded in turn by members of the community and paid, when the school committee had money to pay them, the sum of $40 per month.

Early in the thirties a collection was taken from the tribe members, and the money pooled to sue the county of Columbus. The Indians, having no educated people in their group, hired a white attorney and suit was filed, naming the county school board as defendants in the action, and praying that the county would provide the Indian settlement with a school. On the day of the court hearing, the attorney, for reasons known only to himself, arose in court and asked for a nonsuit in the case of the Indian inhabitants of the *Ricefield-Buckhead Section* v. *the County of Columbus.*

Not to be daunted by such a set-back, they again collected a sum of money and hired another attorney who proposed taking their case directly to the State capital, Raleigh. This attorney, with a delegation of four members of the tribe, proceeded to Raleigh and registered at a hotel. Their case was to be heard the following morning. During the evening the attorney received a telephone call. He informed the delegation that it was imperative that he go to Lumberton at once, but he would return to present their case at the designated time. Exit attorney, period.

Though the plight of these people is a pathetic one, there are certain incidents not without their humorous side. A vivid imagination is not required to visualize rotund Robert Jacobs firmly wedged by the tail of his coat in the hotel's revolving door, or lanky Joe Patrick standing outside in his frozen oilskin raincoat, refusing to attempt to negotiate its frightful circle of travel. As one of the delegates, R. T. Freeman, so aptly expressed it, "Ole Mr. Joe jes' stood out there in the wind rattlin' like a mess 'o corn shuks."

There was no humor in the situation that existed the following morning. The attorney failed to return, and the Indians had no idea where the alleged hearing was to be held, so they started their long trek home in a blinding snowstorm. Their mode of travel was a battered and ancient model T Ford touring car. The Indians took turns in running along side of the car to keep from freezing to death. It was only after they had reached familiar territory near home that they dared stop, find wood, and build a fire to warm themselves.

Inasmuch as a portion of the Indian land lies in Bladen County, Alex Patrick picked up the fight with the Bladen County school officials. He was granted the privilege of tearing down an old condemned "white" school building in the town of Council for the purpose of building a school in the Indian settlement. The Bladen County Board of Education agreed to furnish teachers if the community would construct the school building.

The task of wrecking the building was accomplished by volunteer Indian labor, and the material transferred to the new school site by mule and wagon. The project took 15 months to complete. The building consisted of two rooms. A community with a cooperative spirit is evidenced by the fact that much of the labor was contributed by the fathers of the Columbus County children who would not be eligible to attend this school. In 1941, Bladen County agreed to accept the students from the Columbus County side of the line, provided additional land and rooms were added to the existing school. The tribal members again dug into their scanty resources to purchase material for an additional two rooms. This, too, was built with volunteer labor from the community.

The school was put into full operation in 1942, and consisted of four rooms, four teachers, and an enrollment of 208 students. It included grades through the eighth. There is no means of acquiring an education above this grade except by establishing residence in one of the counties that provide Indian schools and defraying all of the costs attached thereto. This is an effective barrier to a higher education for the Waccamaw Indians.

The present school is inadequate. It is poorly constructed, drafty, overcrowded, lacking in books and desks, and portions of it have never been ceiled on the inside. Bare studs in the rooms add to the general dismal appearance. There are no cloak rooms; no entry halls. Access to certain rooms are only through another. No playground or playground equipment. Three of the rooms have an ordinary tin, wood heater. The fourth is provided with no heat at all. Its construction, as well as lack of exits, create an extremely dangerous fire hazard. There is no fire-fighting equipment or extinguishers. The only source of water is a hand-pumped well which requires priming.

There are presently enrolled in the school a total of 117 students. An additional 20 students, who have completed the eighth grade, have no place to go.

Even though the Indians took a certain amount of pride in finally having acquired an Indian school, they fully realized its inadequacy and know that it falls far short of being equal to the other schools in the nearby territories.

One blow to their pride happened very recently. They found that the Wide Awake Indian School in Bladen County (their own school), was listed on the State rolls as being a white school. At the same time Columbus County officials sit back and declare that if they get any school at all it will be colored.

Additional current problems are roads and drainage. The majority of the families live on roads that transverse the community. Others live off the main roads, deeper in the swamp. These families are frequently marooned several days at a time during storms when the swamps are in flood stages. The land is fertile, but the excessive amount of water frequently destroys the crops. The WPA drained most of the land in the vicinity of the Indian settlement, but did not include their area. Due to this excessive moisture, Robert Jacobs harvested less than 20 bushels of corn per acre this year on deep rich topsoil that, properly drained, could have produced in excess of 100 bushels per acre.

Medicine and hospitalization is another problem of long standing. Due to the nature of the roads and distances to travel, it is extremely difficult to get doctors to attend the sick or injured in the settlement. Infant mortality rate is high, and many of the adults meet an untimely end due to the lack of proper medical attendance. The following case occurred in August of 1949 and is set forth as a typical example.

Penny, the aging wife of Robert Jacobs, had been under the care of a doctor at Lake Waccamaw for a liver complaint. During one of the longest and hardest storms of the rainy season, her condition took a turn for the worse. The land of Robert Jacobs is on an island in the swamp and off the main road. In order to reach this main road it is necessary to cross the Ricefield Branch. Unable to get a doctor to call on the patient, and the roads being impassable to automobiles, Mrs. Jacobs was loaded into a wagon drawn by a mule. The swamp was forded as the patient lay on boards across the wagon sides to keep her out of the water that came up into the bed of the wagon. Upon reaching the road, she was transferred to a car and driven by her sons to Lake Waccamaw. The doctor prescribed some medicine; advised rest, and told

the young men to take their mother home. They explained the road conditions and pleaded that she be hospitalized. The doctor believed that it was unnecessary, inasmuch as she would be all right in a day or two. The patient was returned to her home in the same manner she was taken from it.

Three days later the storm had not abated. It was obvious to the family in attendance that Mrs. Jacobs was, not only critically ill, but on the verge of death. An Indian was sent to Clarkton in an attempt to reach a doctor there and ask his assistance, but the doctor was out on a baby case. Another went for the doctor at Lake Waccamaw. This doctor assured them that he would come except for the fact he suffered from an asthmatic condition that prevented him going out in the wet night air.

Someone waded out from the island to the residence of W. J. Freeman (this was late in the evening) and W. J. returned to the island to offer his assistance. As he waded back through the swamp the water rose over the top of his hip boots. Another person was sent to Chadbourn to get the ambulance from the Peacock Funeral Home. The men of the community rallied around W. J. and they all began a futile attempt to build a bridge across the black, waist-deep waters.

At 11 p. m. death came.

At 7 a. m. the following morning the ambulance crossed the rickety structure and took away the last remains of Penny Jacobs.

Early in 1943, six Indians from the settlement were drafted. They appeared on the specified day and learned they were classified as Negroes. They advised the head of the draft board that they would not be inducted as Negroes but sought the privilege of being inducted as Indians. When refused this privilege they returned home. In the subsequent trial in which these six young men were charged with violation of the Selective Service Act, Judge I. M. Meekins summarily dismissed the charges against them. M. Butler Prescott, who was the probation officer for the Federal court, in a recent letter to E. T. Freeman, summed it up as follows:

"My presentence investigation led me to conclude as a fact, that these young men, members of the group of Indians living in the vicinity of Bolton, N. C., were Indians, and that the efforts to designate and induct them as Negroes was due primarily to the prejudice of the white people in that vicinity."

The ultimate solution of the local draft board's problem of disposing of the Indians was a simple device. All subsequent Indian draftees were classified as 4-F.

On November 21, 1949, my wife and I brought a delegation from this tribe to Washington, D. C. There we met with John Provinse and D'Arcy McNickle of the Office of Indian Affairs, and presented them with the compiled history of their right to be recognized and aided by the Federal Government. Mr. Provinse advised us that in the absence of a treaty with the Waccamaws it would be impossible to render any assistance without legislation in their behalf. He further advised we contact other people including Representative F. ETHEL CARLYLE from the Seventh Congressional District of North Carolina and Senators CLYDE R. HOEY and FRANK P. GRAHAM also of North Carolina. This we did and received prompt assurances of their interest and willingness to assist in the case of the Waccamaw Indians. On December 9, 1949, Senator HOEY forwarded to me a copy of a letter from John H. Provinse of the Office of Indian Affairs. I am setting forth the last paragraph here inasmuch as the course of action suggested by Mr. Provinse is the procedure I have attempted to follow:

"Congress, of course, has authority to provide for the welfare of the people in question by legislating in their behalf. I should be happy to discuss the problems of these Indians with you, if you desire. It is my impression that the group is in need of educational facilities, and perhaps some assistance in making better use of the resources they now possess.

"I appreciate you bringing this matter to my attention.

"JOHN H. PROVINSE,
"Assistant Commissioner."

Just before Christmas my wife and I went to New York and secured the promise of assistance from several organizations, including the Civil Liberties Union, the Home Missions Council of North America, and the Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc. The board of directors of the Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., met on December 19, 1949, and agreed to support and sponsor the necessary legislation in behalf of the Waccamaw Indians. Dr. Alexander Lesser of the association, directed Felix Cohen, their Washington counsel to prepare a draft of a bill to accomplish this purpose.

I discussed the matter of introducing this proposed legislation with Senator HOEY on January 12, 1950, and he advised that he would not introduce the bill unless he could be assured that it was the desire of the entire tribe to have this legislation enacted. I returned to North Carolina and procured the following resolution:

"The Council of the Waccamaw Tribe, having met on January 15, 1950, to consider the attached bill to grant Federal recognition and help to our tribe, respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to enact this bill.

"We have submitted this bill to the referendum vote of our tribe. Of 157 adult members, 157 voted. Of the votes cast, 157 were in favor of the bill and none were opposed.

"We are attaching to this resolution the papers showing all votes cast on this proposition. The marks of those who could not write were witnessed by this Council."

This was signed by the Council of Waccamaw Indians and certified by Chief Freeman.

The original resolution and petition was delivered to Senator HOEY on January 18, 1950, and typed copies were delivered to Senator FRANK P. GRAHAM and Representative F. ETHEL CARLYLE.

I have discussed this matter with Dr. Alexander Lesser of the Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., and Felix Cohen, counsel for the association. We feel that this bill should be introduced in order that the claims of these Indian people can be investigated by the proper authorities and Federal legislation enacted in their behalf.

Mr. POULSON, 340 people, including babies and children, are anxiously awaiting the outcome of this activity in their behalf. My wife and I know that these people's problems seem insignificant in a world concerned with H-bombs, Marshall plans, and Atlantic pacts, but when your world only encompasses a small area of poverty-ridden green swamp, these problems assume gigantic proportions. They become the opponents in the battle for survival against the all-to-frequent winners: malnutrition, exposure, and disease.

We have nothing to offer in the way of recompense other than our thanks and the gratitude of an humble and industrious band of people—the Waccamaw Indians.

Very truly yours,

JAMES EVAN ALEXANDER.

Policy Statement by New York Young Republican Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, the sections on labor, health, old-age pensions, education, and housing from a policy statement by the New York Young Republican Club entitled "Blueprint for a Better America."

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Problem: Young Republicans believe that the free collective-bargaining process offers the best means by which employers and employees can meet and resolve their mutual problems. Constant and direct participation by the National Government in the settlement of industrial disputes is inconsistent with our system of private enterprise and is rejected both by labor and by Government as a solution to the problem. The role of Government should be limited to enacting legislation which will foster and encourage free collective bargaining, and will remove, whenever possible, existing causes of friction.

There have been two major legislative attempts to achieve these ends—the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act. Both have proved inadequate. The Wagner Act of 1935 was hailed as labor's "bill of rights." This act guaranteed to the individual worker and his union, for the first time, many of the rights which are now regarded as fundamental in a free society. There are few, if any, who today mourn the departure under the Wagner Act of the yellow-dog contract and the blacklist. However, the legislators who enacted the Wagner Act failed to impose responsibilities correlative with the rights granted. The period of unprecedented industrial conflict which followed was coupled in many instances with union irresponsibility that made a mockery of the collective-bargaining process and the integrity of contract. The Taft-Hartley Act sought to impose certain responsibilities upon unions and union leaders, equated to the rights which they had enjoyed and continued to enjoy. The act was designed to be a bill of rights and responsibilities.

However, the experience of the last year and a half has revealed that the American economy is still being subjected to frequent and wasteful industrial conflict and that many of the problems of labor-management relations are not met, or are improperly dealt with, under the later act. Several of the provisions of the act have proved to be unnecessarily restrictive and in some cases superfluous.

WORKER-UNION RELATIONS

In view of the economic pressure which unions can bring to bear upon employers to discourage the use of nonunion labor, the ability of an individual worker to join a union is in some cases tantamount to his ability to get a job. Yet many workers today find that union membership, and consequently job opportunities, are closed to them by reason of the discriminatory and exclusionary practices employed by some unions.

There are at least 32 unions, with a total membership of 2,500,000, which exclude Negroes.

Over 70 unions deny the right to join either because of citizenship, sex, religious creed, or closed membership policies.

The constitutions of 17 unions require that all members be white and Christian.

Particularly in the craft unions there has developed a complex but effective pattern of exclusion from union membership through apprenticeship requirements, competency tests, work permits, licensing requirements, and prohibitive entrance fees. As a result of such exclusionary techniques, many workers are denied the opportunity of pursuing a vocation of their own choosing and the Nation is confronted with a shortage of skilled craftsmen.

While the collective action of unions should be protected against the inroads of an unorganized labor market, the denial of job opportunity through the denial of union membership is inconsistent with an opportunity society. The right of another to work must be respected by those who have already gained that right for themselves.

Even after union membership is attained, the individual worker is frequently denied any voice in the affairs of his own organization. In some unions the rank and file is subject to disciplinary action, including expulsion, for such vague offenses as undermining the union and creating dissension. In these unions the official hierarchy usually has the last word on what constitutes a punishable offense under the union's constitution.

Many unions which have clearly defined and narrow grounds for punishment of their members lack adequate procedural safeguards against arbitrary conviction. In a few unions the union leadership acts as grand jury, prosecutor, and judge, denying to the accused member any semblance of an impartial hearing.

In some cases financial accountability to the members has been either skimpy or nonexistent. A financial report by the national office of one union at a recent convention purported to cover a period of 30 years, in just three lines.

Member participation in national policy making is almost completely foreclosed by the concentration of power in the hands of a few top officials of certain national unions. Moreover, reports of convention proceedings indicate that the top officials of many unions do not hesitate to depart from parliamentary rules where an important issue is involved or their own power is threatened. One union constitution gives the president absolute power to abrogate both the constitution and the bylaws whenever he sees fit.

This lack of internal democracy in the unions leads inevitably to irresponsibility on the part of union leaders and exploitation of the individual union member. Regardless of the frequency or infrequency of actual abuses, the importance of the individual rights at stake demands all possible safeguards.

While the Taft-Hartley Act attempted to meet some of the problems of worker-union relations, it failed to provide adequate protection for the rights of the individual worker. Moreover, since the act as a whole does not have the support of the worker himself, a new legislative approach to the problem is required.

THE PUBLIC INTEREST

We firmly believe that the United States cannot enjoy increasing prosperity so long as our economy is subjected to frequent and wasteful industrial conflict. In 1946, the peak year for strikes in the United States, there were 4,985 work stoppages, involving 4,600,000 workers and resulting in a loss of 116,000,000 man-days of production. The gravity of frequent and prolonged work stoppages, in terms of lost wages and lost goods and services, cannot be over-emphasized. The cost of strikes runs into millions of dollars annually and results in a lower standard of living for the entire country.

The interests of the general public have also been adversely affected by the recent development of large national or international unions representing for collective bargaining purposes the employees of many competing employers. In most of our basic industries a single national or international union and its locals represents all or nearly all of the workers in the industry.

This centralization of functions and concentration of power in a few national unions has led to the development of "pattern bargaining" and "industry-wide bargaining," both of which have hurt the American consumer. When the industry-wide demands of national unions are resisted by the competing members of an industry, the strikes which occasionally follow are national in scope and catastrophic in effect. In the case of basic industries, the national health and safety may be immediately endangered. On the other hand, when these demands are not resisted but are willingly accepted, competition is stifled and prices become fixed at the expense of the consumer.

Proposals: 1. A bipartisan nonlegislative commission, similar to the Hoover Commission, should be established to investigate all phases of labor relations, to conduct public hearings, and to make specific recommendations to the President and to Congress for the enactment of a new comprehensive labor law.

This recommendation is made in recognition of the fact that many of the problems in the labor field today urgently require resolution if our private-enterprise system is to survive; and in further recognition of the fact that the labor issue has now become so hopelessly complicated by political issues that clear and dispassionate legislative action is practically impossible.

2. As an interim measure, pending the return of the commission's report, the Taft-Hartley Act should be amended immediately to resolve more pressing problems now arising out of labor-management relations and worker-union relations.

HEALTH

Problem: The level of health in the United States is superior to that of almost every other country in the world. There are at present 7,335 hospitals of which 1,900 are operated by Federal or State agencies. The United States has 140 doctors per 100,000 population, one of the highest per capita ratios in the world. The life expectancy of the American male has increased from 48 years in 1900 to 70 years in 1950. In the last 33 years, the rate of infant mortality has been cut by about two-thirds.

However, the health in certain economic groups and geographic areas continues to be substandard. While this condition is due in part to poor diet, overcrowding, and lack of health education, it is also due to inadequate medical care. In certain areas, there is a severe shortage of medical personnel and hospital facilities. Indeed, the country as a whole does not now have facilities to furnish complete medical care to the entire population.

More important, however, is the inability of large segments of the population to pay for adequate medical attention. It has been shown that families with an annual income of $3,000 or less are not medically self-sustaining. Two groups in particular require financial assistance. One group, while able to pay routine medical expenses, is unable to provide against the catastrophe of serious illness or accident. The second group, composed principally of the aged and incapacitated, and those with many dependents, is unable to afford the cost of even minimum medical care.

The public medical facilities of the Federal Government currently serve about 26,000,000 people free of charge. However, this includes about 18,500,000 veterans, most of whom receive such assistance only to the extent that facilities are available. In view of this, more and more people are turning to private health insurance.

The highest estimate of membership in some kind of voluntary health insurance plan in 1949 was 61,000,000 persons. Nineteen forty-eight saw an increase of 8,500,000 persons, or 16 percent, in the number covered with regard to hospital expense. However, most voluntary health insurance plans provide only limited protection. The average monthly cost of voluntary health insurance is estimated to be $2.90 per individual and $5.50 per family.

Estimates regarding the initial yearly cost of proposed compulsory health insurance legislation vary from the administration's figure of between four and six billion dollars to the American Medical Association estimate of $15,000,000,000. Both predict subsequent increases in cost. In Great Britain, it was originally estimated that the health program would cost about $620,000,000 for the first year. Yet expenditures for the first 9 months exceeded estimates by $234,000,000.

Proposals: 1. Sufficient tax sources should be returned to the States to enable them to supplement the contributions of their citizens to voluntary non-profit-health-insurance plans. Where local tax sources are insufficient, Federal funds should be made available to the States. This would result in increased coverage and expanded benefits.

2. Dental education and examination at the primary school level and the expansion of facilities for the treatment of chronic and mental illnesses (which should not be included within the coverage of health-insurance plans at the present time) should be encouraged by Federal grants-in-aid to the States.

3. Federal funds should be made available to the States to enable them to maintain and expand medical facilities for those unable to afford voluntary health insurance.

4. Any shortage or maldistribution of medical personnel or facilities can best be corrected by proper administration at the State and local level. A reallocation of public-health personnel should be effected to supplement available medical service in substandard areas.

These recommendations assure a program which will preserve to the patient his right of privacy and free choice of physician, and will preserve to the medical profession the valuable incentive of private practice free from political control.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Problem: Today 11,000,000 persons are over 65. By 1980 this figure may rise to 22,000,000. How can we assure a living standard consistent with human dignity to our aged population?

At present old-age pensions do not afford even a minimum level of subsistence. The average pension payment for a retired worker is less than $26 a month and for a retired worker and his wife only $41 a month. Many persons who are eligible and might otherwise desire to retire are forced to stay at work. Nearly 25 percent of those who do retire are

compelled, with great damage to their morale, to seek old-age relief from local authorities to avoid destitution. The problem is even more alarming since over 23,000,000 employed and self-employed are not covered by any old-age law at all. The largest groups here excluded are farmers, farm workers and the self-employed.

Industry pension plans also leave much to be desired. A depression might destroy many such plans. Workers are covered only so long as they remain with a particular employer. If they change jobs, their pension rights are lost. This discourages a fluid labor force and reduces opportunity for young people. A great percentage of workers go unprotected because their companies cannot afford pension plans for them.

No American feels that the aged should be left to destitution in their nonproductive years. Yet, while provision for the aged is a responsibility of the community, no plan to date has proved adequate. None will prove adequate until it is apparent that (1) the national productivity is sufficient to provide for the needs of the retired aged without unduly burdening the productive members of our society, and (2) we as a Nation accept the responsibility of maintaining an equitable balance between the needs of the productive and the nonproductive members of our society.

If each aged man or woman were to be paid $100 per month, the cost would be $19,920,000,000 in 1950.

If such pensions were financed entirely by employer-employee contributions it would be necessary to establish reserves far out of proportion to our present national wealth.

If pensions were financed entirely out of current Government funds, the burden would fall more and more heavily on the younger person. There are today 8 young people for every individual over 65; by 2000 this ratio will be reduced to about 4.9 to 1 if the life span continues to lengthen.

Proposals:

1. The Federal old-age pension system should be geared to our rising national income so that our society can quickly guarantee at least a subsistence income to every person who reaches the age of retirement.

2. Twenty-five million employed and self-employed, who are not presently covered, should be brought immediately into the existing program. But, thereafter, no further implementation of the present system should be undertaken until a sound workable program has been achieved.

3. We propose that Federal funds now granted to States on a matching basis for old-age relief be devoted to increasing Federal old-age pension payments.

4. We urge a comprehensive investigation and analysis by qualified technicians of old-age pensions, provisions for full employment, and other social security measures.

EDUCATION

Problem: A good education is the birthright of every American child. To this end education has traditionally been the responsibility of the entire community. The strongest assurance we have that our free society shall endure is education for all its members in an atmosphere free from governmental control.

The initial problem is at the primary and secondary school levels. In this field the educational facilities provided by local communities have not kept pace with the Nation's need. The demand for qualified teachers exceeds the supply; rising birth rates require more new teachers; because of low salaries many teachers have been lost to higher-paid jobs outside the teaching profession; the rising cost of living has nullified past pay increases; many school facilities are inadequate.

Although the problem varies in intensity from one area of the country to another, the lack of adequate educational facilities can be attributed in large part to the insufficiency of State tax sources. The virtual monopoly of the Federal Government on present tax sources has accentuated the problem for all States.

Today, at least 2,000,000 children are suffering a major impairment in their education due to inadequate teaching facilities.

In 1947 about 5,000,000 children between the ages of 5 and 17 attended no school whatsoever.

A teacher's average annual salary was $900 in 1920, $1,515 in 1930, $1,565 in 1940 and $2,375 in 1947.

The States are spending $3,000,000,000, or almost one-third of their total revenues, for education, but this is less than 2 percent of our national income.

On a national basis the average sum spent to educate one child for 1 year is $148. Most southern States fall below this average; North Carolina, which spends $89 per child, tops the southern States.

Proposal: Federal funds should be made available to States unable to raise sufficient funds from their own revenue sources to provide for the expenditure of an amount per child at least equal to the present national educational average. Each State receiving a share of these funds should have complete control over the administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, and methods and materials of instruction, but subject to the following conditions:

1. It must expend such funds for education at the primary and secondary school levels.

2. It must continue to utilize at least the same proportion of its taxable resources for education as at the present time.

3. It must expend such funds without discrimination as to race, creed or color.

HOUSING

Problem: There are two major aspects of the housing problem, each of which needs solution in order properly to attack the fundamental question of adequate, decent shelter for all of the American people. These are (a) subsidy of low cost housing and (b) fostering of private building.

It is regarded as axiomatic that inadequate, unsanitary, congested housing is a breeding ground for crime and disease. Somewhat less dire in its results, but none the less serious, is the effect on young families having to double up with in-laws, or else devote a disproportionate share of their income to housing.

About 1,500,000, families in this country are doubled up against their wishes.

There are over 5,000,000 housing units in this country so badly in need of repair as to be considered substandard.

Twenty-two percent of nonfarm families in this country have incomes of $2,000 or less and cannot afford more than a very small rental. For example, approximately 4,000,000 housing units rent for $20 per month or less—a return so inadequate that private landlords cannot afford to make even essential repairs to existing buildings, much less build new housing units for this income group. The result is further deterioration of already substandard housing, and no new building by private industry for low income groups.

At present it costs between $6,000 and $7,000, in most parts of this country to build even a simple four-room house, making new housing prohibitive in cost to families whose incomes are less than $3,000.

We feel that there is a way completely consonant with the private-enterprise system, by which those problems can be successfully met.

Proposals: 1. We recommend Federal fiscal aid to State governments in their handling of the problem of subsidizing low-cost housing for low-income groups. While the 1949 Housing Act provides, in general, an adequate working basis for a comprehensive program in this field, the research provisions of this legislation should be more adequately utilized than has been true to date. And in no event should the Federal Government go into the housing business. It should encourage private action primarily, not provide a substitute therefor.

2. We favor a continuation of Federal insurance for home mortgages.

3. We submit that a substantial reduction of building costs could be effected by:

(a) modifying antiquated local building codes to conform to present technological development;

(b) breaking up monopolies in the building-material industry;

(c) eliminating restrictive practices in building-trade unions;

(d) eliminating many of the hidden taxes on construction materials which at present are passed on to the consumer.

For a New Approach to the Labor Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, without question, one of the serious problems before the American people is to find a solution as to how to obtain better relationship between management and labor. I do not wish to state that one group is more responsible than the other. I think that Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, has ably introduced a new approach to this problem. I am inserting his statement in the RECORD:

FOR A NEW APPROACH TO THE LABOR ISSUE

ERIC JOHNSTON PROPOSES THAT MANAGEMENT AND LABOR, NOT POLITICIANS, REVISE THE LAW

(By Eric Johnston)

I would like to see management and labor jointly draft new labor legislation to present to Congress. This suggestion would have been ridiculous a few years back. Today there are powerful stabilizing forces in industry which make it possible and desirable. Labor and management are closer together in their basic thinking than they ever were.

The ridiculous thing today is to leave labor-legislation drafting to the politicians. They gave us the Wagner Act, which business didn't like, and the Taft-Hartley Act, which labor doesn't like. Neither act gave us what everybody in this country wants, and that's peace in industry. Rightly or wrongly, both were dubbed punitive measures, and peace never results when one party believes it has been unjustly treated.

When it's left to Congress, the kind of labor law we get depends on which side can influence Congress with the promise of the most votes—the friends of labor or the friends of management. If labor legislation continues to be the outgrowth of a political

power struggle, we can despair of ever achieving industrial peace.

In this article I want to make three points:

1. I want to amplify the reasons why I think there's no chance of industrial peace if it is left to the maneuvering of political parties.

2. I want to discuss the surprising new stabilizing forces which have been evolving in the last 5 years.

3. I want to outline my ideas of how labor and management can draft their own rules as a basis for a labor law acceptable to both that would provide a reasonable assurance of more peace in industry.

It is the practice of politicians to exploit controversial issues. Among the most hotly disputed is the kind of labor law we're going to have. The Taft-Hartley Act will be made an issue by both sides in the 1950 elections. Left to politics, there is no knowing what kind of act we will have in 1952. If the past is any guide to the future, it will not be one to inspire industrial peace.

Left to politics, we will continue to get labor legislation inclined toward labor one year and management the next: first a Wagner Act, then a Taft-Hartley Act. Every time this happens, either labor or management is affronted and basic issues are not resolved.

True enough, labor has exaggerated the effect of the Taft-Hartley Act. Labor said the law would smash unions. It has not. But management exaggerated the virtues of the law. Management said it would stop strikes, bring industrial peace. It has not. Labor exaggerated the virtues of the Wagner Act. Labor thought it was a Magna Carta for the working man. It was not. Management exaggerated its flaws. Management said it would wreck business. It did not.

Extremist legislation either way meets no real need in our sensitive economy. It perpetuates ill will between management and labor when greater cooperation is necessary. Extremist legislation is a contradiction of the democratic principle of compromise and accommodation.

All of us—not just labor and management alone—are acutely affected by labor legislation today. The livelihood of everyone depends increasingly on uninterrupted production in industry. So do our commitments to the democratic world. Our industrial disputes look bad in the eyes of the world we are supposed to be leading; they look good in the eyes of those who think that our type of capitalism is doomed to collapse.

Our people are aware of how acutely they are hit by industrial feuding. Major work stoppages in industry affect all levels of our system. Public opinion polls place strikes as the Nation's most alarming problem for 1950—ahead of the cost of living; ahead of how to handle Russia; ahead of war.

What the people want is a law that is neither prolabor nor probusiness. They know you cannot operate efficiently under rules slanted in favor of one side or the other.

The kind of impartial labor legislation we are all hoping for can be drawn only on the basis of rules agreed to by management and labor in advance of congressional action. The only men who can write impartial rules for labor and management are the rational leaders of both groups, acting in concert and determined above all else that henceforth politics shall not make a football out of industry disputes.

This has been tried before, but it failed because the timing was wrong. I am utterly convinced it is time to try again.

That brings me to my second point: that fresh stabilizing factors now exist in industry. They have evolved. They were unplanned. They were unintentional. But they are brand-new indicators of the American capitalistic system's ability to work toward the answers to its own problems. Three of these stabilizing forces stand out:

Stabilizer 1 is that high wage levels and a high standard of living for the American worker are proving deterrents to the use of the strike as a weapon for labor advantage. If living standards continue to rise, the strike may yield to more civilized methods as trial by combat in the feudal days yielded to the courts of law and the judgment of juries.

It would be naive to suggest that the high-wage theory so commonly accepted by industry today as good business will work around to an assurance of peace in industry. As a stabilizing force, it should not be exaggerated. In all candor, the strike has been the weapon that enabled the worker to achieve much of his present fortune. We can never delude ourselves that labor will grow soft on the subject of strikes until a more civilized way of settling industrial disputes has been developed.

Just why are workers becoming more reluctant to strike? The answer lies in terms of people and not in terms of statistics or theories. Suppose we visit, in fancy, the home of a typical industrial worker in the year 1900—a half century ago. What kind of living standard did he have?

His home was probably more of a shack than a house. Undoubtedly it was rented. Kerosene lamps did the lighting, and the heating was in charge of a rickety stove or two. The plumbing was rudimentary. If the man of the house had a "Sunday suit," he was among the lucky ones. A clean apron was sufficient dress-up costume for his wife—and probably all she had.

Refrigerators, electric irons, vacuum cleaners, and other household work-savers were unknown. People other than industrial workers did not have them either, but they probably had their 1900 equivalents—an ice box, a carpet sweeper. The industrial worker lacked these conveniences.

His children left school as soon as the law allowed. If they could earn a few pennies, the earlier the better. By and large, the industrial worker lived on a shoestring. To paraphrase the sometimes useful Karl Marx, he had nothing to lose by striking except that shoestring. In many cases, it was only a question of keeping fed while a strike was in progress, and soup kitchens, like as not, supplied that need.

Now suppose we visit an industrial worker's home today. It may not be utterly typical; it may not be absolutely average, but we would not need to hunt long to find one like it. This union man, let us assume, is a steel worker. In the last steel strike, he found it immensely difficult to keep going after the strike had lasted only a few weeks.

Why? Because he could not keep up his overhead. He had had a long stretch of prosperity—good wages and steady work—and his living standard had hit a new top. Ten years of good times—a long pull in our economic history—had changed his habits and his circumstances. Very much like a businessman, his credit had expanded and he had been using it. He was buying his home, and there were payments to be met. He was buying—on time—an electric refrigerator and other labor-saving devices. There was a telephone bill, an electric bill, and a gas bill.

One of his sons was in college. The wages of a skilled worker in steel could afford that now. There were some medical bills—for illnesses for which the worker of 1900 would never have dreamed of calling in a doctor.

This is the story of so many industrial workers that it accounts for their growing dislike of the strike. Their long stretch of good times has found them giving hostages to fortune. The bosses' luxuries of yesterday have become the workers' necessities of today.

Stabilizer 2 is management's growing social consciousness.

Let's visit, in fancy, the front office of a corporation in 1960. We won't need to stay long to learn that the workers are so many ciphers on the pay roll; that labor, in management's eyes, is a commodity. Get it as cheaply as possible, spend as little as possible on the working environment; if the man gets sick, that's his bad luck; when he's too old to work, pitch the old guy out on the ash heap of the community. That's the mood of the scene. It allowed for checkerboards of machines—but not of men. A strike brewing? Have the Governor call out the National Guard.

By contrast, suppose we visit the front office of a big corporation in the year 1960. It could be the Ford Motor Co. Here is an atmosphere utterly at variance with that of 1900. The high-wage principle is actively at work. Collective bargaining is an established institution. Pensions go to the retired worker. He has health insurance. Above everything else, he is a respected person, virtually a colleague, never a commodity.

It could be General Motors, where the pay scale is geared not only to the cost of living, but to benefits from increased production. It could be any one of scores of concerns where justice has been enthroned in the factory as it has in the courthouse. It could be any concern where the worker has been given a direct sense of participation in the operation—and in our whole system—by sharing in the benefits of new techniques, in the new wealth made possible by better machines, and in the fruits of increased production.

The high-wage level has forced management to more efficiency; but the worker must accept, along with his new high wages, the higher productivity theory. More and more he does. Sound labor leadership knows that high wages which necessitate high prices are self-defeating, and so said Labor's Monthly Survey, that excellent publication of the AFL, not long ago.

Stabilizer 3 is the growing acceptance by management that social progress must keep in step with technical progress. The welfare fund is the natural corollary.

What high wages will do for industrial stability will be repeated by the welfare fund. The United Mine Workers are finding that out. When no coal is mined, funds stop flowing. No coal, no welfare fund. I think it is safe to predict that union leaders will not tend to jeopardize welfare funds as they become more and more a part of the workers' standard of living.

That, at least, has been the experience in the ladies' garment industry. Unions get a vested interest in the continuity of production. In the form of pensions, workers earn a franchise in the plants which employ them. The security of the individual is tied to the security of the institution, and it becomes viewed in that light.

The welfare fund cannot be advocated without some caution. These funds can't operate as stabilizers long unless they are actuarially sound; they must be free from domination by either management or labor; they must be wisely administered, with impartiality assured by a third party on the board, jointly chosen by labor and management.

These stabilizing forces—a high living standard, social justice, and the welfare fund—are combining to change the character of our industrial society from one of constant warfare to a higher pitch of civilized living together. Their emergence means that many things which fomented dispute in industry are behind us: the recognition of unions, the acceptance of the principle of collective bargaining, and the acceptance of the principle

that wages must keep pace with profits out of increased productivity.

We have come further than we sometimes are aware. We are sometimes unaware of how strong is our present base from which to move even further. What we need to do now is to translate the changed conditions into a smoother working arrangement, exploiting our new advantages into positive factors for industrial progress and peace.

That brings me to point 2: How labor and management can write their own rules as a basis for new labor legislation. Knowing what we do—that the American people are insistent on industrial peace, that a Nation-wide strike might paralyze our country, and that industrial peace through politics is hopeless—labor and management have no reasonable excuse today not to convene once again to write their own rules. When I say rules, I mean a set of general principles of agreement between labor and management which would then be written into the draft of a law for the House and Senate Labor Committees.

Past failures in reaching a lasting accord between management and labor need not deter us. I am naturally thinking back to the time when the last attempt was made. It was just about 5 years ago that the President of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, with the presidents of the CIO and the AFL, worked out a simple declaration of accord and signed their names to it. It was labeled a management-labor charter for industrial peace. The president of the CIO, then as now, was Philip Murray; the president of the AFL, then as now, was William Green. I was president of the National Chamber at the time.

The effort was a failure. The accord was short-lived. We failed because labor and management were simply not ready for a step as big as this. The war was still on. Both sides were concerned about the post-war years. The bugaboo of a depression after the victory hovered over the deliberations. Each side was maneuvering for advantage in the uncertain years ahead. More importantly, there were no stabilizing forces in evidence then as they so clearly show themselves today. In five brief years the whole atmosphere has changed in tone.

Men from management and men from labor can meet at a conference table this time with new faith in our system and with new faith in each other. And when they meet, what rules should they draft for industrial peace?

I believe the rules should encompass these points:

1. That increased prosperity for all involves the highest degree of production at wages assuring a steady advancement in the standard of living.

2. That the rights of private property and free choice of action are the foundations of our Nation's expanding economy.

3. That management has an inherent right to direct the operations of an enterprise.

4. That labor has fundamental rights to organize and engage in collective bargaining.

5. That we must cooperate in building an economic system which will protect the individual against the hazards of unemployment, old age, and physical disablements beyond his control.

Agreed to and spelled out in law, there is room within these broad principles of accord for labor and management to work together better than they ever have in the past.

These principles are not new. They were encompassed in the labor-management charter of 5 years ago, but in the perspective of today the thought and the language itself were in advance of the times. They could well be the core of the labor legislation we need now, for they are the antithesis of the principle of punitive legislation.

As an ally to the law, I suggest that at the same meeting at which the rules are written, a permanent council of management and labor be formed. This council would not be a substitute for collective bargaining. It would concern itself only with the broader aspects of management-labor relations. It would make public its reports, and most importantly, it would meet often. It would be reassuring to the public. It would be another great stabilizing force.

Who would take the leadership in a call to draft such rules? It is obvious that it will not be done at all if it is left to everybody. The simplest procedure, it seems to me, would be a joint invitation to the representatives of labor by the two leading business organizations, the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Chamber of Commerce. It should be done promptly.

Now, while the hour is propitious, in advance of the political campaigns if possible, but during them, if need be, is our great chance to take labor legislation out of the area of politics and lift it into the realm of business and labor statesmanship. Now is the time to exercise a new kind of patriotism, demonstrating to the world the versatility of the American system.

Msgr. Maurice W. Chawke: "His Boys" Mourn His Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article from the Detroit News of Monday, January 30. This article is a tribute to a saintly priest whose death on January 29 was a great tragedy to the people of Michigan who knew him so well, to the generations of boys who were the objects of his inspiration and guidance, and a deep personal loss to those who, like myself, valued his friendship so highly.

The lives of few men have been so filled with that thought and action which springs from a self-less devotion to youth. His was a devotion that did not know the boundaries of race, religion, or color.

Father Chawke as he was known to so many, even after the church saw fit to bestow an ecclesiastical rank upon him, burned with an ardor and spirit of self-sacrifice which was the inspiration for the youth organizations which now reach into every part of our country. Although his interest lay chiefly in providing athletic recreation for his boys, the guidance he gave them did not stop there. Many of his protégés have joined him in the priestly ranks, and success in other fields and walks of life has visited nearly all of them.

Following the example of him to whose service his whole life was dedicated, and taking to his big and sympathetic heart the words of his Master, "Suffer the little children to come unto Me," Father Chawke gave himself to the boys of Detroit and the youth of the Nation. Knowing him as I did, I can say that few men have ever given so much.

It was a singular blessing to have known him and I am sure that his greeting will be "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

The article follows:

AN ORIGINAL WORKER IN YOUTH MOVEMENT PASSES WITH A PRIEST'S DEATH

(By Harry Leduc)

"Father Chawke is dead."

Dozens of Detroiters passed that word Sunday and are repeating it today as they pause in prayer and reverence for the memory of the Catholic priest who was the first spirit of the boys' movement in Detroit and Michigan, as well as an inspiration undoubtedly to the founding of Boys Town in Nebraska and other movements in the world of youth.

Details of the 79 years of his life and death are recorded in another part of the News, but the sport section obtains the privilege of reporting his contributions to the phase of life of which sport pages treat.

"Firsts" marked his career from the time he entered old Detroit College, precursor of the present University of Detroit.

He played on the first football team Detroit College ever had.

He organized and played on the first great sandlot baseball team in the city's history, the Avon Tigers.

He built the first parish athletic club in the city's history, the St. Louis YMC. Membership was a quarter and dues a nickel a month and no boys were barred.

From his work and inspiration developed the present Catholic Youth Organization, with its boys' clubs on the West and East Sides, its full city-wide program of athletic activity, and with one of his own St. Vincent boys (Father Harold J. Markey) wearing his mantle as head of the CYO.

In a broader sense, Father Chawke 50 years ago understood the boy and worked and fought for him until today city government is spending millions to provide facilities for baseball, football, boxing, tennis, handball, skating, and all the other myriad activities once nonexistent for youth.

His protégés would fill a column. He organized the Avon Tigers at the turn of the century, after his 1897 Detroit College graduation, in the summers between his studies for the priesthood at Baltimore and Cincinnati. "Wish" Egan, chief scout of the Detroit ball club today, was one of his Avon pitchers. Others of that team were Claude (Blink) Stark (brother of the News' George W. Stark), "Nig" Clarke, Jerry Utley, Ed Killian, all of whom went into organized baseball successfully. Bill Hayes, Randolph Duchene, and Joe Schiappacasse were others.

The Avons played the best ball clubs in Michigan and met the famous DAC teams annually. They were just kids but they always gave the star-studded DAC club a battle.

After his ordination, Father Chawke was assigned to St. Vincent's and he quickly erected a building that still stands. It had a court where basketball and handball both were played, wrestling mats, billiard tables, and a room for checkers and other games.

In the light of present recreation centers, it does not pale—and to what he called the St. Louis Young Men's Club Father Chawke welcomed all boys regardless of creed.

As were the Avons, the St. Louis YMCA ball club was one of the city's best. Mike Maurer, a lefthander, was its great pitcher, Wobbles McLaughlin the catcher, and in the line-up were such as Burt (Birdie) Herzog, Al O'Driscoll, Jack Cronin, Joe Marshke, Pete LeFebvre, Bull Drean, Joe Scribner, and Tony

Dugray. His basketball teams were equally well-known and hard to beat. Maurer starred in basketball, too, along with Frank and Walter Hardy, Charley Faber, Ray Eister, and Bob Bowerman.

Marshke, LeFebvre, and the Hardy brothers all entered the priesthood. Cronin today is head of Fisher Body, Faber is the DSR's chief accountant, Herzog is a prosperous businessman, and success in one form or another came to all the others.

Later, out of the St. Louis YMCA, came the boy Markey who today is the priest who organized and heads the CYO.

Father Chawke was a big man but his heart was bigger than his tall and athletic figure. He could put his hand on the head of a tike and the youngster felt not only the kindliness of the pat but the sense of being next to greatness.

Yes, he had a church title at his death (monsignor), but he'll always be "Father Chawke" to all of "Father Chawke's boys."

Admiral Blandy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, Admiral Blandy's retirement on February 1, 1950, is a great loss to the Navy which he has served so magnificently for over a third of a century. He is one of the finest officers, one of the ablest, one of the best grounded in the art of naval warfare in the great history of the Navy. Throughout the naval service he was recognized as not only an outstanding leader but one whose remarkable grasp of the strategy, techniques, and tactics of naval warfare made him a truly Navy great, a fitting compatriot of the greatest Navy leaders of the past.

I regret keenly that Admiral Blandy has terminated his active naval service. His departure from the active list will be felt throughout the fleet, and will have an impact on all of the Nation's defense planning. From my personal associations with him, from the associations of my friends in the Navy who have served many years in the Navy with him, I can say with the deepest conviction that the retirement of Admiral Blandy takes from the active list of the fleet one of the finest combat officers I ever expect to know.

I know all my colleagues in the House join me in a rousing "well done" to Admiral Blandy, and will enjoy reading the remarks he made when he turned over command of the Atlantic Fleet to Admiral Fechteler. His statement follows:

REMARKS OF ADMIRAL BLANDY UPON BEING RELIEVED

I wish to take advantage of this final opportunity to thank and congratulate the Atlantic Fleet upon the progress made in the past 3 years.

In spite of two large turn-overs of enlisted personnel since the war, during one of which one-third of the fleet was immobilized by lack of men, you were able to meet all your essential commitments. Those commitments took you from the pleasant waters of the Caribbean to the cold mists and stormy seas of the Davis Strait, and from the Atlantic seaboard to the eastern Mediterranean. I am sure many statesmen will agree with me when I say that the presence of our ships and planes and men in Mediterranean waters and ports has played a major part in strengthening the resolution of countries along Europe's southern coast to reject the slavery of communism.

The Atlantic Fleet today is manned by the finest men it has ever had. Your combat efficiency, already high, is rapidly progressing toward the higher level which your country expects of you. I am pleased with your progress in all forms of training, and I am particularly gratified by the advances made in the past year in all phases of antisubmarine warfare.

I naturally have some regrets at giving up command of the greatest fleet in the world today, which my superiors have entrusted me to hold for 3 years. But that is long enough for any man to hold it; and my regret is tempered by the satisfying knowledge that I am delivering it into the capable hands of my distinguished successor, Admiral William Fechteler.

You can be sure I will always follow the progress of the Navy, and especially the Atlantic Fleet, with the keenest interest. What the future will bring in sea warfare and the air warfare which will always accompany it, cannot now be accurately forecast. Perhaps before I die, warfare on, under, and over the sea will again change as radically as it has during my active service. In any event, I can say with confidence that the Navy's mission of controlling the sea, in order that we may use it as a highway, and keep the enemy's traffic off it, will remain for a great many years a major role in war, involving a wide variety of tasks, and requiring a multiplicity of talents. I fervently hope that our highest leaders responsible for the national defense will always have the wisdom to give the Navy the tools needed to do its complex job.

Certainly at the present time our best hope of peace lies in a strong national defense team, adequately equipped and adequately trained.

In conclusion, I wish to think the American people for the honor and privilege they have accorded me, in permitting me to serve them for the past 40 years. And I thank all of you here, and all others in the Navy and the other armed forces, who have made my 40 years of service such a thoroughly enjoyable and soul-satisfying experience.

Address of Lawrence M. Kocinski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following speech delivered by Lawrence M. Kocinski, national commander of the Polish Legion of American Veterans of the United States, at the grave of Gen. W. Kryzanowski, at Arlington Cemetery, Virginia:

Comrades, we are gathered here today to honor the memory of Gen. Wlodzimiers Kryzanowski, who died 63 years ago.

But the glory of his deeds lived on beyond him.

Like his compatriots, the immortal Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Kazimiers Pulaski, he was in the forefront of the struggle for our fundamental and basic liberties, for the right of every man to live in freedom, and to live in peace.

Like them, he hated tyranny.

Like them, he was always on the side of justice, democracy, and equal opportunity for all.

These great patriots were the sons of Poland.

And following in their footsteps, and inspired by their noble sacrifice, countless other sons of Poland, countless Americans of Polish parentage, have rallied to the defense of our American ideals whenever these were threatened by a foreign or domestic foe, and have gone forward into battle, to fight for freedom.

They fought in one world war against the oppression of the Kaiser, and they fought in the Second World War to wipe off the face of the world the blot of Hitler butchery, brutality, and crime.

In that titanic struggle for our very civilization, Poland lost 6,028,000 men, women, and children of her population (half of the entire population of the Dominion of Canada).

Of every 1,000 inhabitants, Poland lost 170 at Hitler's hand.

And, in addition, the destruction and ravages of war cost Poland $58,000,000,000.

These losses were greater than those suffered by any nation of the world during the last war.

And because the democratic nations of the world took cognizance of these tremendous losses, and to help Poland rehabilitate herself, they returned to Poland lands which had been a part of Poland in 962.

Today the government of western Germany asks that this land be once more taken away from Poland, and there are some among the statesmen of the democracies who have failed to cry out against this new iniquity, and who are not averse to having these new losses inflicted upon Poland.

We, of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, maintain that because it was Poland that suffered the most tremendous losses of all nations in the last war, because iniquity and injustice must not be rewarded through further injury to their victims it would be a denial of justice—it would be a grievous wrong—to grant our enemies of not very long ago that which they seek.

On these hallowed grounds we affirm our determination: To do everything within our power, as citizens of this greatest democracy in the world, to resist the campaign of vicious propaganda aimed at depriving the Polish people of this land. During the past 5 years Poland has expanded a tremendous effort in that area, and has struggled valiantly to reestablish its economy.

Five million people, brought from other parts of Poland, were resettled on the land.

Today, as we place this tribute upon the grave of Gen. Wlodzimiers Kryzanowski, as we recall all that he had done to help establish freedom and justice in our own beloved Republic, let us remember, too, the great nation of which he came, a nation that today also pleads for justice.

As veterans of America's own battles, as Americans of Polish descent, it is our sacred duty to continue fighting for the preservation of those principles of equity and justice for which we had battled in two world wars, to preserve that heritage of freedom which our patriots entrusted to us.

We shall ever be on the alert to preserve Poland's western frontier—the frontier of peace itself.

Georgia Legislature Rescinds Humber Resolution for World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, Mrs. Lois Lee Bruington, executive secretary of the defense committee of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, issued a news release in Washington regarding the action of the Georgia State Legislature in rescinding its 1946 action in passing the Humber resolution for world government.

Under leave previously granted, I insert this news release herewith, and also a copy of the resolution passed by the Georgia Legislature repudiating the resolution adopted in 1946:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 24.—Action of the Georgia State Legislature rescinding its 1946 action in passing the Humber resolution for world government, was hailed today by the Daughters of the American Revolution as the first victory against world federalist advocates since their drive for a constitutional convention on the subject.

Mrs. Lois Lee Bruington, executive secretary, national defense committee, praised the action of the Georgia House of Representatives for its unanimous vote to rescind the measure, while the Senate voted 34–8.

The new bill called upon the legislators to rescind the action taken by the 1946 legislature in adopting the Humber resolution which called for declaration of a federation of the world.

Mrs. T. Earle Stribling, DAR State chairman for national defense, Atlanta, Ga., led the fight for adoption of the new bill. She was aided by veterans and other patriotic groups.

Mrs. Iris Blitch, only woman member of the Georgia Legislature, declared her stand against world government, and she was supported by Lt. Gov. Marvin Griffin and Speaker of the House Fred Hand. Senator Frank Gross, who introduced the Humber resolution in 1946 and succeeded in having it passed, worked strenuously for its repeal, stating that from additional information gathered, he did not believe that the State of Georgia was ready to back an attempt at federation.

Mrs. Bruington, in issuing this information from DAR national headquarters here, said that her Georgia committee has the full assurance that Gov. Herman Talmadge will sign the new measure.

Whereas the Georgia Assembly of Georgia passed a resolution at the 1946 session of the general assembly approving the principles of world federation; and

Whereas due to changing conditions it is best that Georgia be not considered as one of the 22 States seeking world government; and

Whereas the principles enumerated in the declaration of the federation of the world as set out in said 1946 resolution are not approved by the general assembly; and

Whereas a copy of said 1946 resolution was sent to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Georgia: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That said resolution of 1946 be now repudiated and that the General Assembly of Georgia go on record as opposing the principles of world federation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Georgia.

Passed in Atlanta, Ga., January 1950. Georgia House of Representatives, unanimously; Georgia Senate, 34 to 8.

Effect of Taxation on Our National Economic Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a very important and instructive statement by Mr. George K. Batt on our national economic situation with special emphasis upon the effect of taxation:

STATEMENT BY GEORGE K. BATT, VICE PRESIDENT, DUGAN BROS. OF NEW JERSEY, INC., AND VICE PRESIDENT, NEW JERSEY STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, THIRTEENTH ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL DINNER, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1950, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

We know that you of the New Jersey delegation in Congress are dealing with many issues which gravely affect the fortunes of our country and its people. I doubt whether any previous Congress ever had so large a work load as that which confronts you. And as more laws are enacted which take the Government into new fields, your work load grows rather than diminishes. I would imagine that it has already become physically impossible for any Member of Congress to acquire a comprehensive knowledge of all the important measures that come up for debate and decision.

Doubtless it would help you greatly if more of the folks back home would write you, giving you the facts as they see them about the effect which specific proposals would have upon their daily living and upon the life and development of their communities. It has been my experience that all of you have welcomed such letters; you have often found them helpful. Some of you have, in a friendly way, criticized our New Jersey business men at times for not availing themselves of this opportunity to inform and advise you regarding legislation which will affect them. I hope tonight's meeting will be a step toward correcting this situation.

We are informed that Capitol Hill swarms these days with a bewildering convergence of pressure groups and counter-pressure groups, many of them presuming to speak for people and interests back home. The spenders—those having vested interest in the spending of public funds—are said to be especially active these days. If it is at all reassuring to you, may I say that we of the New Jersey State Chamber come here seeking nothing that will help New Jersey at the expense of Uncle Sam. We have for some years refrained from being a party to any demands for Federal funds for any local purpose. We have urged chambers of commerce and other business groups in New Jersey to do likewise. You will not find us in the pork-barrel parade. On the contrary, we have considered it much more important to all the people of New Jersey that the Federal Government reduce its spending burdens so that we in New Jersey may have more funds to perform those public services which can be best administered at the State and local levels. We are convinced that, all in all, we get more service value for our tax dollars spent at Trenton or in our city halls than we get from those spent in Washington, D. C.

We also believe it vitally important that our Federal budget be balanced without further delay, so as to protect the value of the dollars we spend in our local governments, in our households, and in our business.

The $42,500,000,000 Federal budget proposed for the next fiscal year will cost the people of New Jersey $1,400,000,000 in Federal taxes, plus interest on whatever deficit is incurred.

This $1,400,000,000 Federal-tax burden is nearly three times the total amount of taxes which will be collected in New Jersey this year to finance our State government, all our county and municipal governments, and all our public-school systems combined.

The total amount of all Federal, State, and local taxes collected in New Jersey last year very nearly equaled the total amount of wages and salaries paid by all New Jersey industries.

The Federal Government expects to wind up this year with a $5,500,000,000 deficit, and next year with another about as large. This means an eleven-billion-dollar increase in the Federal debt. The interest on this deficit alone will add some $270,000,000 to the Government's yearly spending burdens. Do you know that New Jersey's share of this increased interest charge will be about $8,500,000? Do you know that $8,500,000 is three times the amount now needed to meet the interest charges on our entire State government debt?

While New Jersey collected $14,767,000 in alcoholic beverage taxes last year, the Federal Government collected $92,574,000 from New Jersey in the same kind of taxes. And our State and local governments do most of the policing of the alcohol industry.

The State government of New Jersey last year collected $9,106,000 in inheritance taxes, while the Federal Government extracted $39,737,000 from New Jersey out of the same tax sources.

Don't you think it's about time we began to take stock of this situation?

We would offer three constructive proposals for consideration by you and your colleagues on Capitol Hill:

First, the answer obviously is not to be found in imposing new Federal taxes. If wartime excises are to be reduced, the reduction should be made on the merits of the case. It should not be conditioned upon increasing other Federal taxes. What is needed is a gradual leveling off of Federal spending, so that the over-all Federal tax burden may be reduced. The President's budget for 1951 includes nearly a billion dollars to initiate 34 new spending programs. We estimate that when these new programs are fully under way, they will add about four billion dollars to the Federal spending budget. This is simply traveling in the wrong direction.

Second, get behind the Federal-State fiscal program of the Conference of Governors, which calls for two things: (1) A step-by-step withdrawal by the Federal Government from tax fields properly belonging to the States; and (2) a gradual curbing of the Federal grants-in-aid evil. This would be done by rejecting proposed new aid measures and by an intelligent cutting of present grants of doubtful necessity. Governor Driscoll, as you know, has been spearheading the fight for this program, which has won the support not only of most of the governors and legislatures, but of the Hoover Commission and of many thoughtful leaders, including General Eisenhower.

Our third proposal is this: Insist upon and work for congressional approval of the economy proposals of the Hoover Commission. Many of these proposals are being resisted by bureaucratic and other spending lobbies, which, for their own selfish reasons, prefer to see our Government continue to blunder along in the thick morass of inefficiency, duplication, and wasteful spending. We particularly call to your attention those Hoover Commission recommendations which point toward the adoption of the Governor's Conference tax program to which I just referred, and those which would draw the line upon further Government intrusion into public power, banking, medicine, and other fields in direct competition with taxpaying private enterprise.

The time has come for congressional leaders in Washington to recognize the fact that the States and their local governments are still principal component parts of our American system of government. We have confidence in the ability of people at the local level to conduct their public affairs adequately and competently. We have local problems, to be sure. We presently have a State revenue problem. But I repeat this assurance in your presence, that our State chamber is intent upon working with the governor, the legislature, and others interested to bring about a constructive solution to New Jersey's tax problems, to the end that full responsibility for education, police protection, highway development, and the other essential services within the State and local domain may be fully met.

In short, we of New Jersey enterprise cannot help but find ourselves becoming increasingly alarmed at the whole picture of a Central Government growing larger every year—draining an ever-increasing tax income away from our citizens, and competing in more and more ways not only with private enterprise but also with State and local governments.

The concept of a huge Federal Government inevitably clashes with the generally accepted characteristics of our American opportunity system. Business spokesmen groups, such as the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, are of one mind in feeling that governmental units should be only as large as they need to be, and not as large as they can contrive to be. And they are of one mind also in feeling that there must be sufficient legitimate freedom for every enterprise and every individual to work and contribute to the fullest for the common good.

To put our economic house in order, and, more fundamentally, to demonstrate that genuinely American principles are to prevail over the monopolistic principle of a large Central Government, three major objectives must be given topmost importance in the efforts of both private citizens and public officials. These three major objectives are:

First, we must bring the cost of government—and this means predominantly the cost of Federal Government—down to a level commensurate with the real cost of performing essential governmental services, and proportionate as well to the ability of both individuals and enterprise to pay the bill without imperiling the flow of money so vital to the continued growth of our system.

Second, we should refrain from enacting and imposing laws and regulations which by every reasonable measure would do nothing but hamper productive enterprise.

And finally, basic to all of our actions, both as citizens or as lawmakers, we should alert ourselves to the lengthening shadow of a socialistic trend in government. This threat places upon each of us a personal responsibility to resist those seemingly worthy legislative proposals and actions of government which cannot help but lead us further down the road to socialism.

Cold Won't Stop Budworm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the East Oregonian of January 21, 1950:

COLD WON'T STOP BUDWORM

(Western Pine Association Service)

Any hopes that cold weather might freeze out the 2,000,000-acre tree-killing budworm epidemic in Pacific Northwest timberlands were dashed today by the scientific record.

Ernest L. Kolbe, chief forester of the Western Pine Association, said the vast insect horde that menaces billions of feet of fir timber in Oregon and Washington, is "just about frostproof."

"When it comes to cold, the budworms can sure take it," said Kolbe. "In Quebec and Maine they have weathered 40 below zero many times. In eastern Oregon last winter temperatures dropped to 30 below without decimating the budworms. Chances are they could get along fine at the North Pole if they only had some of our nice, juicy needles to eat.

"Reason they are more or less immune to cold is that during hibernation they are well insulated by a silken nest, or cocoon that they spin around themselves. Also, they are protected by bark behind which they hole up for the winter."

"But there's one thing they can't take, and that's DDT," said Forester Kolbe, who heads a private-State-Federal joint action committee formed here a year ago to fight the record-breaking insect outbreak. The group has mapped an aerial-spraying project for this coming spring to cover about 1,000,000 acres of the worst infested areas in the two States. It will be the largest single aerial-spraying job ever undertaken," Kolbe said.

Listed for treatment are various areas in the Blue Mountains, near Walla Walla, Pendleton, Elmuna, La Grande, Enterprise, Wallowa, Heppner, John Day, and elsewhere; also south of Mount Hood, out of The Dalles; the Sisters region, and numerous danger spots west of the Cascades, including several near Roseburg. Last year 270,000 acres, chiefly near Eugene and Oakridge and east of Mount Hood, were sprayed with near-perfect results.

"The budworm," said Forester Kolbe, "is vulnerable only during a period of about 2 weeks in the spring. That's when you have to hit the caterpillars, or not at all. It is a tremendous job to get such a huge spray project ready. We must stock pile a trainload of DDT and line up a veritable armada of specially equipped spray planes, build some roads and airstrips, spot stray storage tanks at strategic points, and have everything ready to go by nature's deadline in May or June."

He said preparatory work is marking time now pending action by Congress on a requested $880,000 emergency appropriation to cover the Federal share of costs. Already the two State governments and private owners of lands to be sprayed have underwritten their shares, totaling $314,000. More than two-thirds of the infested areas to be sprayed are Federal lands.

"We can't even hope to proceed on this huge project without Federal participation," said Kolbe, "and if we don't spray, heavy losses in timber are inevitable. It has to be a three-way cooperative job—private, State, and Federal, as these properties are intermingled. If the United States Government keeps us on tenterhooks on the financing matter beyond mid-February, it will be too late to get ready."

Box Suppers Offer Less Political Nourishment Than Bender's Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent column by Lowell Mellett. I invite particular attention to the wisdom of the advice offered by a former Republican Member of the House, George H. Bender, of Ohio, to those to whom his counsel applies:

ON THE OTHER HAND—BOX SUPPERS OFFER LESS POLITICAL NOURISHMENT THAN BENDER'S ADVICE

(By Lowell Mellett)

This you wouldn't believe if you didn't see it but there it is right in the paper, a two-column paid ad for that Lincoln Day celebration the Republicans have planned as an offset to the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day shindig of the Democrats.

You remember the original announcement concerning this affair. It was to be a dramatic demonstration that the GOP is still the party of Lincoln, the poor man's party. The Democrats might throw $100-a-plate dinners in the name of their twin patron saints, but a more fitting tribute to the founder of republicanism would be a simple dollar dinner. That's what it was to be, a spontaneous, inexpensive expression of the party's loyalty to its original principles. The country would see who are the political plutocrats and who are the plain people.

DEAL DIDN'T TAKE HOLD

But apparently the idea didn't take hold in the manner hoped for and it has become necessary to advertise for customers. So, look what you'll get for your dollar: Fred Waring and his Pennsylvanians. Square dancing and round dancing. Entertainment, with George Murphy and Robert Montgomery, all the way from Hollywood, acting as masters of ceremonies. The dinner? Well, you don't even have to eat that; you can have dinner at home, but there will be complete chicken dinner for an extra dollar if you want it.

Nothing is said in the ad about speeches, but if there are not to be any it surely would say so, since that would help draw a crowd. However, even if they have speeches, it's a good guess that the big hall will be filled and that everybody will have a good time. Presumably they will all go home filled with a new appreciation of the greatness of Lincoln and the fidelity of his party to his principles.

The Jackson-Jefferson Day meal won't draw any more customers—the estimate for each

affair is about 5,000—but there the similarity ends. The Democrats attending will have paid $100 per plate in advance and they will have to listen to speeches. No big name band. No square and round dancing. No Hollywood entertainers. Just a good, wholesome dinner on a red, white, and blue tablecloth. For this and for the love of Harry Truman, Thomas Jefferson, and Andrew Jackson they will pungle up $100 each. At least that's part of the idea, the other part being the profit on the proceedings, which goes into the party's campaign fund.

And presumably the elegant eaters will all go home resolved to be more like Jefferson and Jackson and Truman.

GOP LEADERS IN PIE

Which is enough of nonsense. Seriously the Republican Party leaders should be doing something about the ridiculous fix they are in, as exemplified by these two contrasting celebrations. The answer won't be found in silly box suppers. It will be found in an improved course of action.

"As matters stand now, the Republican Party is in the most difficult position in its history," said George H. Bender, former Ohio Congressman-at-large, writing last May in the National Republican, which he publishes. "It may receive little or no credit for any assistance it may render in the passage of legislation. It will be blamed justifiably for any stand it may take in conjunction with reactionary elements of the Democratic Party. But this dilemma must be faced realistically.

"It will profit the Republican Party nothing if it chooses the path of obstructionism in the Eighty-first Congress. The political consequences of any conduct which can be interpreted as an unholy alliance with nonprogressive elements must prove catastrophic."

The first half of the Eighty-first Congress has passed into history with little to indicate that many of the party leaders believe Mr. Bender. The second half is under way and the indications haven't greatly changed. But there is still time—unless the Republican leaders really prefer box suppers.

The Church Federation of Greater Chicago Commits Itself Wholeheartedly to the Christian Principles of FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, that my distinguished colleagues in the House may understand the depth and the universality of the public sentiment of the great metropolis of the inland, Chicago, supportive of H. R. 4453, I am extending my remarks, by unanimous leave graciously granted, to include the following letter from the Church Federation of Greater Chicago, which includes Protestant churches of all denominations:

JANUARY 30, 1950.

The Honorable BARRATT O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The board of trustees of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago has declared that discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry is unjust; and a denial of Christianity and brotherhood; and that it is favorable to the principle of legislation which would prohibit such discrimination, such as the present House bill H. R. 4453.

We urge you to do everything in your power to bring this legislation to the floor of the House as soon as possible, and to keep it on the floor until a final vote has been taken.

Your party pledged support of a Fair Employment Practices Commission in its 1948 platform. We trust that you will not fail now in securing the passage of adequate FEP legislation.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER B. MINTON,
JOSEPH L. ROBERTS,
Cochairmen, Commission on Race Relations.

P. S.—Please sign discharge petition No. 20.

Following is my reply to the above letter:

FEBRUARY 6, 1950.

Mr. LESTER B. MINTON and Mr. JOSEPH L. ROBERTS,
Cochairmen, Commission on Race Relations, The Church Federation of Greater Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIRS: This is to acknowledge receipt of your form letter concerning H. R. 4453. I am happy to note the position taken by the board of trustees of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago in support of legislation aimed at removing discrimination in the opportunity to obtain and hold employment.

Such legislation, reflecting as it does the Christian concept of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God, could not fail to inspire deep sympathetic interest among the men and women whose spiritual strength is maintained and augmented by attendance and worship at the many Protestant churches of all denominations comprising the membership of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago.

It is heartening that your board of trustees has responded to this universal sentiment among Christian people in our community by officially declaring the support of H. R. 4453 by your federation, truly representative of and the spokesman for the United Protestant Churches of Greater Chicago.

You request me to sign discharge petition 20. I am happy to inform you that I was one of the first to sign this petition and that I also signed discharge petition 31, which is of a similar nature. Discharge petition 20 was filed by Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT and discharge petition 21 by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. It is significant to note as indicating no division among those supporting FEPC that ROOSEVELT signed POWELL'S petition, as well as his own, and POWELL signed both his own and ROOSEVELT'S petition.

As the 1948 national platforms of both major parties pledged support of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act I see no good reason why any individual Member of the House should not feel free to sign any or all discharge petitions, the objective of which is to bring an early vote on proposed legislation redeeming the pledge of both parties. Certainly if each individual Member applied to his own actions the test of his fidelity to campaign pledges of his own party it is inconceivable that a discharge petition for H. R. 4453 would fail of the required 218 signatures.

Regardless of the fate of the discharge petitions now on the Clerk's desk, I can assure you with the utmost confidence that H. R. 4453 will reach the floor of the House early in this session and be passed by a substantial majority. The sincerity and determination of the President and of the House leadership is beyond question, and I am sure there is equal sincerity and determination that the FEPC bill shall be passed among sufficient numbers of the opposition party.

The action of the board of trustees of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago has been a stimulating contribution, of real value, to a good fight for the good cause of a functioning democracy geared to the conception of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

Relocation of Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, California has had the greatest population increase since the war of any State in the Union. The question of employment, therefore, is of first importance. The possibility that a factory may close or a shipyard shut down in a given area is of grave concern not only to the people who live there but to the people of all California.

A number of proposals have been made and continue to be made as to the dispersal of vital industries from both the east and west coasts because of the possibility of eventual air attack upon the continental United States.

Mr. A. J. Hayes, international president, International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C., tried to ascertain from Mr. Hubert E. Howard, Chairman of the Munitions Board, what the policy of the Munitions Board was to be with respect to vital industries on the west coast.

A press release issued by the Chairman of the Munitions Board making public Mr. Howard's letter to Mr. Hayes clearly states the position of the Munitions Board in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the above-mentioned press release; together with Mr. Hayes' letter in acknowledgment of the letter from the Munitions Board:

Hubert E. Howard, Chairman of the Munitions Board, today made public a letter to A. J. Hayes, international president, International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C., which states that the Department of Defense is not advocating the relocation of defense industries from one area to another.

The Department of Defense program for dispersion of industries, Mr. Howard pointed out, is to encourage separation of vital facilities by at least a few miles.

This reiterates a statement made by Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson before the New England Council, at a meeting in Boston, November 18, 1949, when he said:

"I have been told by three or four of those sitting on this platform as we were in in the ante-room, that you governors and you members of the council have been distressed by publicity and rumor that we of the Department of Defense favor the moving of factories from New England. There isn't and there never has been a word of truth in those rumors. Our job in the Department of Defense is the defense of all America. I do beg of you in accepting that statement of mine, when you build the new plants, don't put them too close together. Put them a few miles apart."

Mr. Howard's letter to Mr. Hayes is made public as a statement of the Department of Defense policy:

"DEAR MR. HAYES: The resolution of December 7, 1949, expressing the position of the International Association of Machinists in regard to the dispersal of defense industries, which was forwarded to the President and the Secretary of Defense, has been received. This matter was referred to me as Chairman of the Munitions Board for reply because of our interest and responsibility in the security of vital defense industries.

"The Department of Defense program for dispersion of United States industries is to encourage vital facilities to separate major industrial plants by at least a few miles. For your information a copy of a booklet entitled, 'National Security Factors in Industrial Location,' published by the National Security Resources Board in September 1948, is attached. The general guidance on dispersion to be found in this booklet is being followed by the Department of Defense. Particular attention is invited to the fact that industry is spending 12 to 14 billion dollars annually for new plants and equipment. A substantial portion of these plants are being located in highly industrial areas, thereby increasing such areas' susceptibility to attack. As pointed out in the booklet, the separation of major industrial plants by only a few miles is sufficient to give any single installation considerable protection. When private industry expands existing plants or locates new plants, the benefits to be gained by this comparatively small space can be had without any marked effect on the local economy, dislocation of experienced craftsmen or additional cost to the taxpayers.

"Although modern strategy is based on the fact that any area of the United States can be attacked, the staggering cost in material and energy of such an extensive attack would require that it be planned so as to accomplish the maximum damage to our production facilities. The area of major destruction from an atomic blast generally can be enclosed within a circle of 3 miles radius. The fewer vital plants located within any given 3-mile radius, the less desirable it is as an atomic target.

"The Department of Defense program is to disperse within areas and not to disperse from one area to another. We do not advocate dispersion by the relocation of industries from one area of the United States to another because of the serious social and economic factors involved, such as those pointed out in the resolution. In addition, under our form of government, no executive authority exists to direct private industry to move its plants or its production from one location to another. The transfer of the aircraft plant from Connecticut to Texas, referred to in the resolution, was based on reasons quite apart from security considerations and was financed in its entirety by the company concerned.

"I would like to assure you that the Department of Defense is planning the protection and defense of the entire United States and is not planning the defense of any one area to the detriment of another. Our program for dispersion is designed to make all areas less desirable for an atomic target by advocating that the location of new plants or the expansion of existing plants be made in areas outside of a 3-mile radius from other vital facilities.

"Sincerely,

"HUBERT E. HOWARD, *Chairman.*"

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MACHINISTS,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1950.

Mr. HUBERT E. HOWARD,
Chairman, Munitions Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOWARD: This will acknowledge your letter of January 13 which was sent as a result of and in reply to a resolution regarding the dispersal of defense industries, recently adopted by the executive council of the International Association of Machinists.

We are greatly pleased to learn that the Department of Defense is not presently contemplating the relocation of industries from one area of the United States to another. The International Association of Machinists is highly in favor of defense plans or a defense program which will adequately protect our people, our industries, and our form of government. It is our considered judgment that this type of protection can be afforded only by the building of adequate defenses to protect all of the vital section of the United States and its Territories.

We are principally concerned with defense because we want to protect our way of life. This, of course, includes our free-enterprise system. We are not in favor of cutting the main arteries of our economic system on the basis of the unilateral judgment of experts in one field. If, in the final analysis this is necessary we favor it, but if possible we prefer adequate defense of all of our country, including our industrial and economic systems.

Respectfully yours,

A. J. HAYES,
International President.

Situation of the Jews in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD today a very interesting study on the Jews in Russia. It was prepared by an able and outstanding scholar, Dr. Sergius Yakobson, who is Chief of the Foreign Affairs Section of the Legislative Reference Service, in the Library of Congress.

This excellent study should help in clearing up a good deal of the misinformation and the many untruths about the Jews in Russia, which have been spread these past few years by individuals and groups who are interested merely in keeping alive the flames of hatred and prejudice. Dr. Yakobson discusses in his study such factors as the number of Jews in Russia, their social composition, their legal position, and the factual situation of Jewish life under the Communist regime. He delves into the causes of the failure of the colonization project at Biro-Bidjan, in the Soviet Far East, which are not generally known.

Most important, however, is the last part of his study which he devotes to an analysis of anti-Semitism in present-day Russia and the Soviet attitude to the State of Israel. He reaches the conclusion, on the one hand, that "the current attitude of the Soviet Union toward the Jews has many of the characteristics of traditional anti-Semitism," and on the other hand, he concludes that "although it has recognized and entered into diplomatic relations with Israel, the Kremlin is determined not only to prevent the Jews in the Soviet Union from emigrating to the new state but even from supporting or manifesting their sympathy with their friends in Tel Aviv."

Mr. Speaker, I commend this brief study to the attention of the Members of this House:

THE JEWS IN THE U. S. S. R.

(By Sergius Yakobson, Chief, Foreign Affairs Section, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress)

1. NUMBER OF JEWS

The last Soviet census of January 17, 1939, registered 3,020,141 Jews in the U. S. S. R., establishing them as the seventh most numerous national group after the Russians, the Ukrainians, Belorussians, Uzbeks, Tatars, and Kazakhs. The question of nationality in the 1939 census was given a purely psychological-cultural definition indicating the group with which each individual felt that he and his children were most closely identified.

With the incorporation of the Baltic republic, eastern Poland, and Bessarabia, into the Soviet Union in 1941, about 2,200,000 persons were added to the Soviet Jewish population. Allowing for a slight natural increase, the grand total of Soviet Jews prior to Hitler's attack on Russia in June 1941 amounted to about 5,300,000.

At present, after Hitler's mass extermination of Jews, the numerical strength of the Jewry in Russia is estimated at from two to two and one-half million people.

2. SOCIAL COMPOSITION

The social composition of the Russian Jewry has undergone remarkable changes. It consisted at the turn of the century when the last prerevolutionary census was taken in 1897, of—

	Percent
Merchants, entrepreneurs, and indefinite professions	54.4
Handicraft workers and artisans	20.4
Employees	19
Industrial workers	4
Agricultural workers	2.2

In 1939, prior to the outbreak of the war, the main groups of the Jewish population were:

	Percent
Employees and professionals	48.2
Industrial workers	23
Handicraft workers and artisans	20.8
Collective farmers and individual peasants	5.8
Others	2.2

3. LEGAL POSITION

After the downfall of the monarchy in Russia, the Provisional Democratic Government at St. Petersburg promulgated on April 2, 1917, a decree finally repealing all restrictions and discriminations against Russian citizens of Jewish faith, as well as other minorities. Thus, the end of anti-Jewish legislation in Russia has to be credited to the victory of democratic and liberal forces in the March revolution of 1917. The political freedom which the Provisional Government gave the Jews delighted them to such an extent that they were not interested in deriving any further benefit from the revolution.

The Communist Government of Russia in power since November 1917, proclaimed in one of its first decrees issued on November 15 of the same year, equality and sovereignty of the peoples of Russia and abolition of each and every privilege or restriction based on nationality or religion. Later on, in August 1918, a special statute called upon the Soviet people to fight anti-Semitism by all possible means. The Council of People's Commissars instructed "all Soviet deputies to take uncompromising measures to tear out the anti-Semitic movement by the roots. Pogromists and pogrom agitators were to be placed outside the law." Any kind of hatred against any nation was declared "inadmissible and shameful."

In 1926, the Russian Criminal Code made anti-Semitism a criminal offense. This law stated that incitement to discrimination of any kind was punishable by a jail sentence of up to 2 years; during times of stress, incitement to discrimination was punishable by even longer terms of imprisonment and also by death.

Finally anti-Semitism was outlawed by the Soviet 1936 Constitution. According to Article 121 of the Constitution "equality of rights of citizens of the U. S. S. R. irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social, and political life is an indefeasible law. Any direct or indirect restriction of the right of, or conversely, any establishment of direct or indirect privileges for citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt, is punishable by law."

Thus, by law, the Soviet Jewry is put on an equal footing with all the other ethnic groups inhabiting Soviet territory. However, neither Judaism nor the Hebrew language is encouraged by the Soviet government. In the words of Dr. Morgenstern, former president of the Hebrew Union College at Cincinnati, "The great Jewish community of Russia is lost to Judaism and perhaps to the Jewish people. Judaism cannot survive in Russia, any more than can any other religion."

Article 124 of the present Soviet Constitution guarantees to all Soviet citizens freedom of religious worship and freedom of antireligious propaganda, but significantly, not the freedom of religious propaganda. As before, organized religious teaching is not permitted in the Soviet Union. Religious instruction, including Hebrew, may be taught children under 18 only privately within the families of the kin.

Like all other Soviet citizens, the Soviet Jews are not permitted, with very rare exceptions, to leave the Soviet Union and migrate to foreign countries. The Soviet Government has also for a long time been violently opposed to Zionism as a "bourgeois movement bound up with foreign imperialism." Lenin himself was the first to suppress the Zionist movement in Soviet Russia.

The attitude of the present Soviet leaders to zionism was best summarized in a talk which Bartley Crum, a member of the Anglo-American Committee on Palestine, had with the powerful Ukrainian Foreign Minister Dmitri Manuilski in London early in 1946. "He, Manuilski, in his own city of Kiev, had seen the sufferings of the Jews, he told me," writes Crum. "He knew what they had gone through. He was proud that anti-Semitism was not tolerated in Russia. But he would be less than honest, he added, if he didn't tell me also that there is a large Mohammedan population in the Soviet Union. 'Does Moscow still believe that Zionists are the tools of British imperialism?' I asked. He smiled again. 'They are not active tools of British imperialism, Mr. Crum, but Dr. Weizmann and his group have such confidence in the integrity of the British that Russia feels sometimes they are the unconscious tools of British imperialism.'"

4. FACTUAL SITUATION

(a) Jewish life in Russia after the revolution:

The revolution of 1917 put an end to the Jewish ghetto in Russia. But Russian Jewry had to pay dearly for the Communist revolution. The downfall of the Romanov dynasty gave the Russian Jew political equality, but the establishment of the Soviet regime destroyed the foundations of the social and economic life of the Jewish masses in Russia. The so-called Jewish question, which, in 1917, had been solved in the political sphere, now reappeared on the economic plane.

One of the first aims of the Moscow Communist government was the destruction of bourgeois society in Russia. Its economic policy was directed primarily against all forms of private ownership in industry and trade. Russian Jewry became one of the main victims of the Bolshevist experiment. It was estimated that before the revolution 50 percent of the Jews were tradesmen, 40 percent small artisans, 6 to 7 percent belonged to liberal professions, and only 2 to 4 percent were working in the factories or on the land. The Soviet policy led to the pauperization of the Jewish masses. It deprived them of their savings, their means of production, and of hope of employment in the near future. The Russian Jew became a "declassé." Neither Soviet industry, which itself underwent a severe crisis; nor the bureaucracy, which could take only the best-equipped; nor the party, whose numbers were artificially kept very low; nor the black market, condemned in Soviet Russia as "economic prostitution," could absorb the very large number of the unemployed Jewish population. The unemployed Jewish worker tried to become an artisan or to open a little shop. But the ranks of Jewish artisans were soon depleted due to shrunken markets, the lack of tools, and heavy taxation. The Jewish tradesmen, even under the New Economic Policy, were badly handicapped by the lack of goods, prohibitive taxes, and hopeless competition with state and state-protected cooperative trade. Besides, the position of the Jew as a middleman between the town and countryside made him a special suspect in the eyes of the Soviet government. It also endangered his position and nourished anti-Semitism. Particularly hopeless seemed to be the situation of the Jewish youths, who, unless they were members of the Young Communist League, could hardly find a place in the new Soviet society.

How was a solution to be found of this problem of the Jewish masses, which threatened to affect the whole social organism of Communist Russia? As all doors to other occupations seemed to be shut, the settlement on the land and agricultural activities seemed to offer the only logical chance for the regeneration of the Jewish ethnic groups in Russia. This exodus to the land began quite spontaneously, first entirely unorganized and on a purely voluntary basis. The Jews turned first to places close to the towns in which they lived and obtained land as individuals. But soon the land around the towns was no longer free for settling. Many Jews therefore now had to emigrate to new districts farther away from home in order to seek work on the land. They were particularly attracted by the free steppes in the Ukraine, and in 1922 Jews began to migrate thither.

Only as the economic situation became more acute and the number of Jews ready to migrate increased steadily the Soviet government decided to assume control of this colonization. The Committee for Land Colonization of Jewish Toiling Masses (Komzet in Russian, Komzed in Yiddish) was organized in August 1924 with the idea of establishing through migration 100,000 Jewish families in the course of 10 years. But only 10,000 families were settled on the land during 1925 to 1937. During these 3 years only a small part of the expenses was borne by the Government, the greater portion being provided by the foreign Jewish organizations. An official report of the Komzet states that the Jewish organizations from abroad brought in 9,500,000 rubles of the total sum of 14,500,000 rubles.

As a result of this Jewish agricultural colonization in the U. S. S. R. during 1923-27 large Jewish settlements could be formed as nuclei of a series of national Jewish regions. In fact, the Jewish Communist press spoke already of a Jewish republic in the Crimea. However, in 1928, all these plans had been abandoned. The reasons for this change of policy were never explained in the Soviet press. At that time the region of Birobidzhan, in the Soviet Asia was suggested as a substitute. Through an investigating committee sent to the Far East the Komzet discovered that in respect to climate, territorial size, and natural resources Birobidzhan was suitable for Jewish mass immigration and was capable of absorbing economically in compact groups tens of thousands of families. In 1928, the Komzet requested the All-Union Executive Committee of the U. S. S. R. that Birobidzhan be set aside for Jewish colonization as a means of alleviating the plight of the economically and socially uprooted Jewish populace.

Many factors appeared to favor the success of Birobidzhan project. The settlement of Jews was to be carried out in a territory connected by land with the motherland. True enough, it was situated thousands of miles from the original homes of the Jews but these need not face the difficulties of an overseas migration. Further, the two contracting parties usually responsible for the operating of different settlement projects—viz, the government of the territory selected for settlement and the agency responsible for the project—were here identical, to wit, the Soviet Government. This eliminated a good deal of friction, facilitated the planning of the project, and its execution. Besides, the Soviet State was prepared to take upon itself the bulk of the expenses for melioration work, extensive drainage, clearing of forests, etc., without exacting the repayment of the allotted funds.[1] Birobidzhan—unlike the ordinary settlement projects—was an economically diversified entity. Agricultural and industrial colonization went hand in hand. The natural features of the region favored such a development. Birobidzhan had both plenty of fertile land and an abundance of timber and mineral resources. Finally, the settlement of Jews in Birobidzhan took place in an almost uninhabited country upon which no local populations had claims.

There is no doubt that some degree of economic progress was achieved in Birobidzhan. However, in spite of economic achievements, Jewish mass settlement in Birobadzhan resulted in a threefold failure.

1. Birobidzhan did not become a sanctuary or a spiritual center for the entire toiling Jewish population. In fact, only a small number of non-Soviet Jews, altogether 784 persons (101 from Lithuania, 63 from Latvia, 116 from Argentina, and the rest from Poland and Palestine) were reported to have come to Birobidzhan. The agreement signed in 1936 by the American Committee for the Settlement of Foreign Jews in Birobidzhan (Ambidzhan) with the Soviet Government for the admission of an initial quota of 1,000 Jewish families from Poland has never been put in force, and nothing came of the promise made by the Soviet Government in the spring of 1938 that in the course of the year 4,500 foreign Jews would be settled in Birobidzhan.

2. Birobidzhan did not become the national home for Soviet Jewry; it also did not become a Soviet Jewish state. At least until 1939—and this is still the case today—the Jews remained a minority in the Jewish autonomous region. Thus, the results, in spite of the steadily increasing total number of Jews in Birobidzhan, in no way measure up to the high expectations for mass migration to this country. The goal was the settling in the first 10 years of approximately 150,000 to 200,000 Jews. But in 1939, 11 years after the beginning of the Birobidzhan project, only 40,000 Jews, according to pro-Soviet figures

[1] Between 1928 and 1932, government appropriations for Birobidzhan amounted to 9,250,000 rubles. The Ozet (a society to assist Jewish colonization) furnished 2,400,000 rubles. Later both the government appropriations for Birobidzhan as well as contributions of voluntary organizations (labor unions, factories, etc.) showed substantial increases.

(23,000 according to conservative estimates), were present in the Jewish autonomous region.

Due to the lack of accurate and complete Soviet official statistics the figures given by private investigators on the population movement in Birobidzhan differ in detail but all of them agree as to the tremendous turnover in Jewish settlers. An extremely high number of Jews who migrated to Birobidzhan came as immigrants but turned out to be only visitors. About a half, or at the best 75 percent of the Jews who migrated to Birobidzhan in the years 1928-36, became permanent settlers in the region, while the others either returned home or left Birobidzhan for the neighboring provinces.

3. The problem of reconciling simultaneous agricultural and industrial colonization with an establishment of an organic and sound relationship between the city and the countryside was not solved in Birobidzhan. We are here faced with the same phenomenon of flight from the land familiar to us from other settlement enterprises and the economies of nonsocialist countries. Only a part of the Jewish settlers in Birobidzhan remained on the land; the greatest majority settled in, or moved at the first opportunity to, the towns of Birobidzhan, preferably to the largest city, that is Birobidzhan—where, in 1939, about one-half of the population of 40,000 was Jewish. The Jewish agriculturists in Birobidzhan were also attracted by the glamor of the neighboring towns of Khabarovsk and Vladivostok, the rapid growth of which can at least partly be traced back to the infiltration of the Jewish element.

"What do we desire?" complained the chairman of the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet Union, Kalinin, at a meeting on August 8, 1936. "Do we desire to create a new western region, a Jewish population in the cities and a non-Jewish one in the villages? What kind of a national Jewish state will this become?"

Furthermore, physical hardships and psychological hurdles handicapped the colonizing effort. The conquest of this virgin land proved to be more than a match for quite a number of Jewish settlers with very little or no previous farming experience. The Jews who came to Birobidzhan—but for a few exceptions—were no pioneers, but average, everyday Soviet citizens. No pioneering urge or spirit of adventure but sheer necessity, unemployment, social dislocation put the poverty-stricken Russian Jew on the way to Birobidzhan. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that, as soon as changes for the better occurred at home, the chief incentive for moving to Birobidzhan instantly disappeared. The chances of making a living in the old country or, preferably, in Moscow and other large Russian industrial centers, mainly accounted for the Jewish reemigration from Birobidzhan, as well as for the set-back to Jewish eastward migration.

In order to overcome the crisis in the Jewish migration to Birobidzhan it was proposed that the Commissariat for Internal Affairs and the secret police aid in recruiting, selecting, and transporting settlers. This introduced an element of forced migration but was officially justified by the need for special precautions in settling border districts.

The Jewish mass migration to Birobidzhan was a failure. It is still an undeveloped, underpopulated "backward" country. There is still a huge reservoir of almost untapped natural resources, of fertile land, water power, timber, and minerals. There still remains the unique geopolitical and geoeconomic position of this region on the confines of the Soviet Far East and Manchuria. The proximity of iron and coal reserves can make Birobidzhan into a powerful metallurgical base of the Soviet Union, even overshadowing the Donets Basin and the Kuzbass, and the configuration of the three rivers—Amur, Ussuri, and Sungari—makes Birobidzhan a land of great promise. But it is hardly to be expected that future settlers of Birobidzhan will be Jewish. Much speaks against it.

(b) Anti-Semitism in present-day Russia.

The legal and social segregation of the Jews in Russia disappeared after 1917 and a high percentage of Soviet Jews were absorbed into the ranks of ordinary Soviet citizens through frequent intermarriage with the Russians and through voluntary assimilation. Anti-Semitism and the primitive rather emotional anti-Semitic prejudices among the different nationalities of the U. S. S. R. are, however, still in existence in the Soviet Union of today.

They continued in the first years after the revolution in spite of the official policy of the Communist government. Remnants of the anti-Jewish feeling persisted and while it was not widespread, sporadic outbursts of anti-Semitism occurred.

The survival of anti-Jewish prejudices even became a part of the general picture. As early as 1921, on his visit to Georgia, Stalin, for instance, was astonished at the lack of the former solidarity among the workers of the various trans-Caucasian nationalities. "Among the workers and peasants," he complained, "nationalism has developed; suspicion against their own comrades of other races has strengthened; there are far too many—anti-Armenian, anti-Tatar, anti-Georgian, anti-Russian and other such nationalistic expressions to be heard."

The new wave of anti-Semitism was even reflected in the proletarian literature of the period: a number of articles by Maxim Gorky and other noted writers deploring the anti-Semitic tendencies of some of their colleagues were published.

Anti-Semitic excesses continued to occur, however, and the Government was compelled to enforce the law vigorously. Conductors were required to stop trolley cars and have militia men arrest passengers, sober or drunk, who uttered anti-Semitic invectives or cast aspersions upon the Jews or other minorities of the multinational Soviet state. In 1928 the press denounced anti-Semitic manifestations. All cases were thoroughly investigated and offenders severely punished. Schools, factories, farms, offices, and trade unions were instructed to expel members guilty of such action. In March 1932, two anti-Semitic judges at Krasnoyarsk were dismissed; 1 month later a Kharkov court passed a death sentence on five Ukrainian peasants found guilty of raiding a Jewish colony and killing several Jews. Anti-Semitism was particularly rampant among the Crimean Tatars.

Later in the thirties, when Hitler's accession to power in Germany and the expansion of the Japanese to the Asiatic mainland promoted the rise of nationalism in the Soviet Union, anti-Semitic feeling in Russia received an additional impetus. A Jew became now identified as a Trotskyist. By repeated actions and purges of Trotskyists, the left international wing of the Communist Party was completely decimated in Soviet Russia and simultaneously the radical Jewish element with a few exceptions disappeared from the Moscow government. By the end of 1938, all the outstanding leaders, up to 100, of the Jewish Communist group in Soviet Russia were liquidated. The Jewish press was suppressed. Russification of Jewish cultural life progressed rapidly. At the same time all contact with Jewish foreign organizations interested in Birobidzhan was interrupted, and even some of their representatives were imprisoned. "You Jews," said Stalin to the German writer, Feuchtwanger, in 1937, speaking of Radek, "have created one eternally true legend—that of Judas." Jews who formerly played a conspicuous role in the Soviet bureaucracy were dropped now en masse from the neo-Nationalistic Soviet Government, the Soviet Diplomatic Corps, and the high offices in the various agencies of the Soviet administration. Even during the recent war, the United Press correspondent in Moscow, Harrison Salisbury, never saw at the Soviet Foreign Office a young Jewish attaché around the place, and he had a feeling that blond Nordic types were preferred. And in the late thirties it was a popular Soviet joke to compare Stalin with Moses for having achieved the exodus of Jews from the central executive committee of the Soviets.

The recent war years, the time of terrible hardships in Russia, strengthened furthermore the anti-Semitic sentiment in various Soviet quarters. They even revived the old accusation of Jews dodging active military service in spite of the fact that the Soviet Jewry ranked fourth among the national groups receiving Soviet military decorations. A total of 123,822 Jewish Red Army fighters and war workers received the Order of Lenin, the Order of the Red Banner, the Medal of the Patriotic War, and other Soviet medals and orders.

The growth of anti-Jewish feeling in wartime Russia forced even Ilia Ehrenburg to speak openly against this dangerous development at a meeting of the Jewish anti-Fascist Committee in Moscow in March 1943. And it is remarkable that in view of the strength of anti-Semitism in Russia, in none of the Soviet war slogans or posters has there been particular reference made to the plight of the Jewish people under the Nazi regime. The Soviet leaders avoided scrupulously any chance of being accused of waging a Jewish war. After the end of hostilities, the anti-Semitic sentiment in Russia seemed to have subsided to some extent. However, new anti-Jewish excesses were caused by the return of the Jewish evacuees from their evacuation places in Russia to their old homes in the war-devastated regions of the Soviet Union with their terrible housing conditions. And a new and significant turn in Stalin's national policy is finally indicated in his address of May 24, 1945. Here Stalin spoke openly for the first time of the Russian people as the most outstanding nation of all the other nations forming the Soviet Union and as the leading force of the Soviet Union. Thus, the Soviet dictator is inclined now to put the Russian people in the same privileged position with regard to other Soviet peoples as the one which the Communist Party enjoys as the "vanguard and the leading core of all organizations of the working people" with regard to the proletariat of the Soviet Union.

As early as 1903 Lenin attacked the Jewish Bund, which was a Jewish socialist organization founded in 1897, on the ground that the Jews were not a nation and that their destiny lay in being assimilated by the people of the area where they resided. Lenin condemned the bund for trying to combine Zionist views with those of socialism, insisting that "the idea of a Jewish nationality is contrary to the interests of the Jewish workers and engenders in them a feeling of hostility toward assimilation."

Stalin has also attacked the Bund in an article republished in 1946, but actually written much earlier. Stalin contended that the Jews were not a nation because they "did not have a broad stable section tied to the land which naturally consolidates a nation." Only 3 or 4 percent of the several million Russian Jews were engaged in agriculture, Stalin pointed out, and he implied that for this reason they would be assimilated. He considered the Bund to be contrary to the purposes of the proletarian revolution and was, therefore, to be opposed.

With the advent and establishment of a Jewish state in the Near East, Soviet warnings against Zionism became strong and explicit. During 1948 articles began to appear in the Soviet press warning Soviet Jews that

their future lay in the Soviet Union and not in Israel. The famous journalist Ilya Ehrenburg, himself a Jew, repeated in the Communist Pravda of September 21, 1948, the old Communist concept that the fate of the Jews lay in their being assimilated in the countries in which they were living and that the idea of an international Jewish culture was mystical. And a month later the Jewish newspaper Eynikeit reminded the Jews that while their sympathy should be with the Israeli proletarians struggling against capitalism, they should not "consider Israel their homeland." In short, although it has recognized and entered into diplomatic relations with Israel, the Kremlin is determined not only to prevent the Jews in the Soviet Union from emigrating to the new state but even from supporting or manifesting their sympathy with their friends in Tel Aviv.

Coincident with this opposition to Zionism within the Soviet Union has appeared a chauvinistic prejudice against "international bourgeois culture" or "cosmopolitanism" which is, to a large degree, identified with Jewry.

During 1949 the campaign of the Soviet Government against "antipatriotism" and against other deviations and "errors" in the realms of art, literature, the theater, and other cultural activities assumed to a great extent an anti-Semite coloring. In a very prominent position among those thus attacked were persons with Jewish names. In numerous instances Russian names were followed by the original Jewish names in parentheses. "Cosmopolitanism," which was largely identified with Jewish international culture, was harshly castigated. In particular Jewish literary critics in the Soviet Union were pictured as living corpses, renegades, men wearing traitor's masks, and they were accused of playing up the "cosmopolitan idea of the existence a world-wide Jewish literature and of putting Soviet writers on a par with burned-out businessmen of America and Palestine."

These officially inspired press attacks did also assault the Jewish religion. The novel, Years of Life, by Alexander Iabakh, was, for instance, taken to task for propagandizing in favor of and describing in detail the services in a synagog.

Thus it may be said that the current attitude of the Soviet Union toward the Jews has many of the characteristics of traditional anti-Semitism which hardly can encourage or terrify the Russian Jews into "resigning themselves to spend the rest of their days in the Soviet Union under a dictatorship," as pointed out by Joseph Newman in his recent series of articles on Soviet Russia which were published in the New York Herald Tribune.

VA "Fight's On" Over Hoover Commission Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, there is printed herewith a radio talk made by me during the past week:

Friends and fellow Americans, an evening broadcast is opened with the statement, "Soup's on." Let me open this report with the statement, "Fight's on."

Over WHFB, local chambers of commerce have been urging the folks to write their Congressman to support the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. They did.

The writers wanted economy and efficiency in the Federal Government. So do I, and, unless we get it—and that right soon—everyone is going to pay—as the old expression has it—through the nose—whatever that may mean.

Through the generosity of WHFB, I was given opportunity to reply to those requests, and then stated what I thought everyone knew—that I, too, was for more economy, greater efficiency, in the Federal Government.

The home folks were advised that, as the various bills designed to put the Hoover Commission's recommendations into operation came before the Congress, those who thought they would be adversely affected would vigorously oppose them.

The expected has happened. Today the battle is on. The Hoover Commission recommended changes in the Veterans' Administration. From veterans, from veterans' organizations, the letters are now pouring in, opposing the recommended changes.

Typical of the American Legion's position is a letter dated January 12, 1950, from R. Gerald Barr, commander of the American Legion, department of Michigan.

I quote Mr. Barr:

"The American Legion, as you will recall, carried on a great fight for many, many years to see that veterans' rights were placed under a single, central agency so that there might be greater efficiency in the management and coordination of veterans' benefits. This fight, which was carried on for many years, finally resulted in 1929 in the creation of the Veterans' Administration under which all veterans' benefits and their coordination and management were placed. The Veterans' Administration has continuously operated for some 20 years since that date.

"Although there is constantly room for increased efficiency in the Veterans' Administration, we believe that its record since 1929 has been a creditable one; certainly greater efficiency has been promoted by having all phases of the veterans' program under the same roof where immediate reference can be made to master indexes and master files for many phases of the veterans' program. We in the American Legion are wholeheartedly in favor of seeing the veterans' program administered under a central agency where greater efficiency can at all times be realized.

"However, we do not oppose the recommendations of the so-called Hoover Commission as a whole or in their entirety. We are very much opposed to those recommendations as they pertain to veterans."

On the other hand, the Washington branch of the Citizens Committee for the Adoption of the Hoover Report, on the 25th, last, announced that it was only trying to improve service to the veterans by reorganizing the veterans' agency, which has been attacked even by professional veterans organizations' leaders for slowness and inefficiency in handling claims.

It issued the following statement—and I quote:

"Those leaders of veterans' organizations who are maintaining that the Veterans' Administration does not need a major reshuffling must be creating considerable surprise among their members who have had to wait 6 weeks for a letter to be answered, or who know a veteran's widow who has had to wait four times as long to collect on her husband's National Service life insurance policy as is required to collect from an insurance company.

"We are sure that most members of veterans' organizations will greet some claims of their leaders with healthy skepticism. The Hoover report would definitely speed up and improve the service to veterans—and the veterans know there is plenty of room for improvement."

The Hoover Commission Task Force which investigated the VA was headed by a former Legion national commander, Col. Franklin Dollier, of Newark, N. J.

The Task Force found, for example, that, in the handling of veterans' insurance, the Government agency employed four times as many clerks per policyholder as do commercial companies.

That Task Force also recommended merging veterans' hospitals in a general Medical Administration; recommended transferring the GI home loan programs to the regular Federal Housing Agency; giving the Interior Department the responsibility for construction of veterans' hospitals.

On January 25, George M. Craig, national Legion commander, held a conference with President Truman. Then, on the 26th, he talked the situation over with former President Herbert Hoover. It is understood that he told both gentlemen that the Legion would fight the proposed changes at the polls.

So here in Washington, Congressmen are on the spot.

Junior chambers of commerce no doubt many of their members Legionnaires—millions of citizens throughout the country, insist they want economy and that we'll get it if we adopt the Hoover Commission's recommendations.

Present officials of the Legion and no doubt all other veterans' organizations and individual veterans say, "Yes, we, too, are for economy, but"—as Department Commander Barr wrote me—and again I quote—"we are very much opposed to those recommendations as they pertain to veterans."

If the former national commander of the Legion who recommended the changes is all for them, and if the present commander of the Legion is all against them, what is a dumb Congressman to do?

One thing this dumb Congressman does know—and no one is going to argue him out of it—and that is that a lot of veterans, veterans' widows, veterans' dependents, are writing him for help in adjusting their differences with the Veterans' Administration, and he'll sure be glad of a procedure which will give the veteran better service, people generally less expense in connection with the administration of veterans' affairs.

Prayer To Make Democracy Worth Defending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, a real old-timer of the desert is Alice Salisbury, of Barstow, Calif., a fine and growing city of the Mojave Desert region. No longer young, Alice Salisbury still has the vigor and forthrightness, the optimism and belief in the future of the pioneer woman. She has composed a prayer which in this day of struggle echoes the aspirations of millions of Americans. I place this prayer in the RECORD where it may be read by many:

PRAYER TO MAKE DEMOCRACY WORTH DEFENDING

God of our Fathers, we thank Thee for America, her fertile plains, her majestic mountains, her age-old forests, and the treasures that lie in her bosom.

We thank Thee for the heritage of faith and courage and fortitude that our Nation-building forefathers entrusted to our keeping.

We thank Thee for the pattern that they wrought for our guidance—crusade against tyranny, defense of the rights of the individual, preservation of the institutions of democracy.

Now, O Lord, when the forces of greed and untruth are again threatening the citadels of civilization, we, the wives and mothers of America, pray that we may come to know the true meaning of democracy, the democracy born of the agony of Valley Forge and nurtured in the heart of martyred Lincoln.

O God, make us large enough in word and thought and deed to face valiantly the problems besetting our Nation, and at the same time help us to bring unprejudiced minds to an understanding of the problems of other people struggling today to emerge from war ruin into strong and sustaining national life. To that end, O God, guard us against racial intolerance and denial of world brotherhood.

Above all else, help us to make our homes strongholds of true democracy; help us to fortify those homes against false and misleading doctrines; help us to teach the children those homes shelter, to face clear-eyed the hideous aspects of war, without weakening their belief that liberty is worth dying for.

Help us to convince these children of ours that the very existence of civilization is at stake today, and that we are calling upon them to become guardians of that civilization. Help us to teach them by precept and example that the patriotism of today calls for a courage, fortitude, and honesty, a capacity for labor, self-sacrifice, and self-discipline such as America and the world may never need more urgently.

Help us, O Lord, to make democracy here in our United States worth defending against the onslaughts of tyranny, greed, intolerance, and unbelief.

ALICE SALISBURY.

Some of the Meanderings of Nebraska's Reactionary Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, comes now David Martin, of Kearney, Nebr., attorney and counselor at law, and proctor in admiralty, and also Republican State chairman from Nebraska, a man whose forebears were shrewd enough to elude, some people say, the mountain feudings of the Coys, and with high hope and stout voice starteth to maketh by caravan, of either one or two automobiles, an extensive trip through now prosperous rural Nebraska, with the avowed, fell purpose and intent of recapturing the farm vote lost by the Republican Party in Nebraska at the last election.

This election blow delivered by the Nebraska farmers to the very pit of the elephant's stomach seems by coincidence to have been as identically severe as an 80-day cool-off period of the Taft-Hartley law to labor after the issuance of a "yellow-dog injunction" because the caravan comes creeping about 80 days after the blow.

The old fear plays of what will happen to you if you do not vote Republican and the old squeeze plays of the banks and holders of the mortgages and the dispensers of the credits, are all things of the past. The farmers of Nebraska have not only grown to be ultra courageous but also exceedingly smart since the awful, suffering days of President Hoover.

The Nebraska farmers have paid up their mortgages and notes, now pay cash as they go, and have money in the bank, and sometimes own the blamed old bank since the Democrats took over the reins of National Government, and the Democratic Party put its kindly, sheltering arms about the shoulders of the troubled Nebraska farmers.

I am sure that Mr. Martin by this time realizes that all of the farmers of today "can see above the grass in the summertime and the snow banks in the wintertime." Although the soil of Nebraska is most fertile, even the river-bottom slough grass does not grow that tall anymore, and when the blizzards come the Democrats, if need be, under the able direction of that great Democratic engineer from Alabama, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, can dig them out if need there be.

I am sure that Mr. Martin will have his ingenuity taxed to the utmost in trying to figure out some plausible recapture conversational methods, for that is the only method left for reactionary, greedy, and selfish Republicanism to pursue in Nebraska or elsewhere.

I wonder if Mr. Martin will tell the farmers and other Nebraskans that the Republican Party in the Eightieth Congress made the wartime excise taxes permanent so as to give the big boys a big income tax cut, that that same Congress cut off all money for grain storage bins in an effort to force grain storage into the private grain elevators and if need be force the grain which they could not store on their farms, on the market at less than could be secured from a Government loan; that that same Congress was against a 90-percent parity for basic farm crops, and passed a sliding scale parity law providing for a base 75 percent and a high of 90 percent of parity so as to tumble the prices of basic farm crops and make the farmer again the legitimate financial prey of the now financially lean middlemen who were wont to farm the farmers; and many other unfriendly legislative gestures which time will not permit me now to call my readers attention to.

I do not suppose that Mr. Martin will call the farmers' attention to any of these wrongdoings, but I feel sure that the farmers will remind him of them and hereafter steer their future political courses far, far away from the Republican help which blighteth and destroyeth farmers and those who are dependent upon farmer's incomes for their own livelihood.

In conclusion I want to direct your attention to the following news story which appeared in the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star, a liberal Democratic newspaper, on January 31, last, and written by Ray Hansen, one of its staff members:

DENNEY HITS ACTIONS OF GOP LEADERS—"PARTY OF OLD PEOPLE" POLICY IS UNDER ATTACK

(By Ray Hansen)

FAIRBURY, NEBR.—The dilemma facing the Republican Party was exemplified in Fairbury Tuesday.

The party wants—and needs—votes, but it doesn't want to sacrifice the cherished principles that made America great to get them.

That is well pointed out in two observations of a young Fairbury attorney when the GOP caravan held its second meeting of the second week of its cross-State tour here Tuesday. He exorcised the leaders for making the GOP a party of old people, and reprimanded State leaders for getting radio commentator Fulton Lewis as a speaker for Founders Day.

The attorney was Max Denney, unsuccessful candidate for the State chairmanship last November.

Denney, who is chairman for the legislative district in Jefferson County, set forth his views in a brief talk to party leaders who are conducting the tour. He said Republicans should answer affirmatively every issue they face. "Unless there are constructive answers to all questions," he declared, "the party will continue to lose votes."

In particular need of all the answers are county precinct workers, Denney said. "And it is the job of State headquarters to provide the answers," he added.

HERE REVIEWED TOUR

Sixteen farmers, workers, businessmen, and housewives turned out to hear State Chairman David Martin, of Kearney, plead for renewed vigor of party workers. Accompanying Martin were National Committeewoman Edna Batson Donald, of Grand Island, and John Binning, Lincoln attorney representing Young Republicans.

Vice Chairman Eve Bowring, of Merriam, and Finance Chairman Joseph Wishart, of Lincoln, who were with the caravan on the first week of its tour, returned to their homes over the week end when hit by flu.

The ostensible purpose of the meeting is to get the feeling of what the common people want from the Republican Party.

But that does not seem to be followed. For instance, Chairman Martin tells the handful who gather for each meeting that the party leaders are here to get your ideas on what the party should do.

But he then proceeds to tell the workers what should be done, by stressing the evils of the Democratic administration, the dangers of socialism, and why the party should make deficit spending the main issue of their attack. Declared Martin, "It seems to me you're more concerned with the money being spent than anything else."

The minor leaders who follow Martin then echo his assertions.

Binning emphasizes the importance of interesting young people in party work. He urges county leaders to give young man and women offices of responsibility.

Following the meetings, Martin meets with the county chairmen and they revise the list of precinct workers—in some cases cutting away deadwood and injecting new blood.

The one-car caravan left Fairbury at noon and went to Beatrice, where they will meet with Gage County leaders late Tuesday. On Wednesday they go to Pawnee City, Thursday to Auburn, and late Friday to Lincoln.

Alaska and Hawaii Statehood Vital to National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement made recently by Hon. FRED L. CRAWFORD, of Michigan, on Alaska and Hawaii statehood which appeared in the Hearst papers throughout the Nation:

ALASKA, HAWAII STATEHOOD VITAL TO DEFENSE OF UNITED STATES—ABSTENTION WOULD BE LETHAL BLOW TO RED COLD WAR

(By FRED L. CRAWFORD, Representative in Congress from Michigan)

WASHINGTON, January 21.—Congress must grant Hawaii and Alaska statehood—now.

The reasons are imperative.

They are key areas of our strategic defense against Russia.

They are key areas in our cold war against the world spread of communism.

As Territories they are weak.

As States they would be strong.

Japan struck at both Territories in World War II.

Hawaii and Alaska today are the prime targets under the American flag of the most powerful enemy that has ever threatened the United States.

Statehood would strengthen them internally.

And statehood would vastly strengthen America's position in the ideological and economic conflict now being waged by Russia throughout the Pacific.

Proof that was given me on my recent tour of all our island possessions in the Pacific, Japan, the Philippines, Okinawa, Hong Kong, and other parts of the Orient.

It substantiated completely earlier impressions I had gained on visits to Alaska and other territorial possessions.

The actions of our Government toward its territories speak louder to the peoples of the Orient and the Pacific than all the flossy double talk emanating from our State Department.

We will be on the losing end of the cold war in the Pacific as long as we limit the peoples of Hawaii and Alaska to a mere territorial status.

Today Communists everywhere can and do make capital of these admittedly unfortunate facts:

1. Hawaii, an area with a population greater than that of 11 of our sovereign States, has no vote in Congress and no voice in the Senate of the United States.

2. Alaska, with an area one-third as large as our entire continental United States, likewise has no vote in Congress or voice in the Senate.

3. They are excluded from even discussions of foreign relations within the appropriate committees of the House and Senate.

4. Their citizens contribute richly in taxes to the Federal Treasury—without representation.

5. Their people, their business enterprise and their investments in recent years have been stalled even Federal production.

As territories, both Hawaii and Alaska have been powerless to deal with paralyzing strikes which Harry Bridges' Pacific longshoremen's union either engineered or in which his union has been actively involved.

Bridges is now on trial in the United States District Court in San Francisco on perjury charges that he swore falsely at a naturalization hearing in 1945 that he never was a Communist.

There is voluminous testimony before that trial that he is or was a Communist and a leader among Communists.

As Territories, Hawaii and Alaska are helpless to deal with such types.

EQUITY ROLE

As States they could protect the interests of their citizens and their economy at least to a greater degree than they can now or have been able to during recent strangling strikes.

Statehood is more important to Hawaii and Alaska.

It is even more important to the United States that Hawaii and Alaska become States.

There is a crucial role in our national security.

They are our western bastions of defense.

They represent to the peoples of Asia, the Orient, and the Pacific the one example of unity and equality among the three great Pacific racial groups.

In their Territorial activities Hawaiians and Alaskans have long demonstrated the highest qualities of citizenship and abilities for self-government under the free American system.

Hawaii and Alaska are entitled to statehood and statehood will enable them to more effectively fill their vital roles.

Consider these roles separately.

Alaska as a vast Territory of very great, yet undeveloped, resources.

We are spending money up there as if we intended to use Alaska as a buffer between the United States and Russia, which lies only across a narrow strip of water where the two countries almost touch.

CANNOT CONTINUE

The United States has set itself up as a buffer between Russia and the rest of the world.

Unless Alaska does serve as a strong buffer between Russia and ourselves, the United States cannot continue indefinitely as a buffer between Russia and the rest of the world.

It is as simple as that.

The United States needs Alaska as a State.

It needs Alaska much more than Alaska needs the United States.

It needs Alaska's space, her strategic geographic position, her industry, her resources, and her potential products.

We need everything Alaska has—fish, timber, minerals, oil—and everything that Alaska can develop and produce.

We need them in relation to our industrial and economic position, and in relation to the international obligations we have assumed throughout the world.

NEEDS PEOPLE

Alaska needs people, lots of people, in addition to its present population which today is larger than that of a third of our States when they were admitted to the Union.

She needs people to develop her vast resources.

Alaska needs transportation so that tonnage to build industries and defenses can move to Alaska, and the products and raw materials of Alaska can move to us.

To Alaskans this means a railroad, and it should mean the same thing to us.

A railroad is the only safe and economic method of transportation that can be provided.

Ocean transportation to Alaska has been shut off repeatedly by maritime union strikes.

POWERFUL INFLUENCE

Every strike has impaired our defense program in Alaska.

Russian submarines would menace our sea lanes in event of war.

The Alcan Highway is a dusty road that starts far north of Edmonton and is connected with closer highways only by an unimproved dirt road constantly in bad condition.

This is because Canada's railroads exert powerful influence in Canada and they want it that way.

What is needed is a railroad east of the coastal range where it could be defended and where it would supply both Alaska and Canada with transportation for their goods and people, and transportation of goods and people from Alaska and Canada to the United States.

In the face of Russia's huge submarine program and her vast construction program across the Bering Straits from Alaska, a railway to Alaska is a must.

What does this have to do with statehood? This:

Alaska needs—and we need—two Alaskans in the United States Senate who can inform us about Alaska and her needs, both economic and for defense. We need their voice, their action, and their vote.

Alaska needs—and we need—a Representative in the House who has a vote.

BENEFIT TO ALASKA

Alaska would benefit—the United States would benefit—and, I believe, our international relations in view of the obligations we have assumed to help most of the world, would benefit as well.

Hawaii is in a somewhat different position, but is just as much entitled to statehood as Alaska, although for somewhat different reasons.

Militarily, Hawaii stands at one corner of our inner Pacific defense triangle that extends from Alaska's mainland down to Hawaii and across to our Pacific Coast.

Hawaii also is a pivot for our outer Pacific defense triangle that extends southward to encompass the Pacific islands now under our trusteeship, Samoa and Guam; extends westward to Okinawa, and extends north to the tip of the Aleutians.

Hawaii has almost reached the zenith of her agricultural development and resources.

LOYAL POPULATION

Her population is large and relatively stable. Her people are industrious and loyal. Hawaii is American. In every way Hawaii is the equivalent of States with similar populations—except that she is not a State.

Hawaii has met all qualifications of statehood ordinarily required by Congress and definitely should be a State.

Statehood for Hawaii would have priceless value to the United States in the Pacific and in our international relations with the world.

Only in Hawaii have the cultures of the Orient, of Micronesia and Polynesia, become completely absorbed within the American concept of human dignity and government under law.

The mere knowledge that Hawaii has been granted statehood would have dynamic effect throughout Oceania and the Orient.

It would be the greatest blow to Stalin and communism in the Orient that America could deliver, for it would prove this:

Where Russia can only offer slavery, starvation and loss of face, the United States has offered to a population that includes their racial strains full partnership as a State.

Let us achieve this victory in the cold war in the Pacific now.

Make Hawaii a State.

United States Neglects Own Defense While Bolstering Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Sunday Star of February 5, 1950:

UNITED STATES NEGLECTS OWN DEFENSE WHILE BOLSTERING ALLIES—ANALYST SAYS OUR 48-GROUP AIR FORCE IS LARGELY ON PAPER AND THE GATES ARE OPEN FOR POSSIBLE ATTACK

(By Constantine Brown)

No nation which is not fully prepared—arms in hand—to fight for its freedom can survive. This has been amply demonstrated throughout history, from the decline of the Roman Empire to the fall of France of 1940 and of China of 1949.

Whatever wishful thinkers may say, the United States is in a more critical situation than ever in its history. We are the direct target of a ruthless, oriental despotism which has at its disposal an enormous mass of manpower and almost limitless raw materials.

The U. S. S. R., which we pampered during World War II and the years immediately following, has succeeded through exploitation of our mistakes in becoming the world's foremost military power. When after VJ-day we pulverized the most formidable military force the world has ever seen under the impact of almost hysterical propaganda, the Russians proceeded to a thorough reorganization of their armed forces.

While we were reducing our air, ground, and naval power to a mere token, the Soviet military establishments were modernized and improved. During the war Russia had masses of manpower, which it used with utter recklessness. But it lacked completely the know-how to develop technical weapons, which mean as much as manpower these days.

We hid nothing from them. What was not given Moscow officially was handed over surreptitiously by the legion of ideological agents who filled our Government departments.

REDS KEEP BUILDING

The possession of important military secrets was not of much help, however, since Russia was known to lack the technicians who could turn blueprints into actual weapons for destruction. But Russia obtained the needed technicians from Germany. Highly skilled men who had worked a lifetime in laboratories where V-missiles, snorkel submarines, and the A-bomb were studied either were impressed or cajoled into Russia's service.

Today, according to reports which are considered correct by the most authoritative services in America and England, there are upward of 10,000 scientists and skilled technicians working in Russian arsenals and navy yards.

Never in modern history before World War II was Russia able to develop a single prototype for a naval vessel, and in 1939 Soviet authorities pleaded to be permitted to buy a couple of modern American battleships. But today Soviet arsenals have produced improved snorkel submarines, with greater speed and longer underwater endurance than the originals she received from Germany. Russia has many more such undersea vessels than all the other powers combined.

The same thing applies to Russia's air force, which not too long ago was lamentably weak. During World War II the Russians had to rely exclusively on American lend-lease planes, but they did not use them extensively. Russian aviation was limited principally to ground support and its pilots flew at tree-top elevation.

Russian authorities confiscated American long-range bombers which made forced landings in Siberia and obtained secrets which were not communicated officially to Moscow. Today the Soviet has 14,000 first-line planes, including the latest jet fighters and long-range bombers, which probably are not inferior to our B-36's, the pride of the United States Air Force.

PROBABLY HAVE H-BOMB

For a while we appeared to have a monopoly on the atomic bomb. While the Russians were not expected to produce such a bomb for several years yet, there was a howl from Russian sympathisers that we either do away with that destructive weapon or that we share our secret with the U. S. S. R.

No such howl is being heard any longer. The Russians, according to President Truman's unequivocal statement of last September, have produced and tested the atom bomb, which now is in production in the many plants in Central Russia, Siberia, and Outer Mongolia.

The German technicians, who have been working on atomic energy longer than our own scientists, are likely to have produced both the atomic and hydrogen bombs. The fact that we have not yet received an ultimatum from Moscow to cease our effort to frustrate Russian expansion is an indication, in the minds of our military leaders, that the Soviet has not yet produced the number of bombs needed to create a real threat to this country. It is only a matter of time, however, until enough have been produced.

This is not a race, however. When we have the hydrogen bomb in production we shall stow it away for use only in retaliation. When the Russians have a sufficient number they probably will use them in a blitz, hoping to catch us by surprise in the same way as the Japanese caught us at Pearl Harbor.

The Russians are concentrating their power on targets which they have selected as vital for the day. We are dispersing our weak forces to the four corners of the earth. After possessing a formidable ground force at the end of the war, we now have some 11 divisions, less than 7 percent of the Russian ground strength. These are divided between Japan, Germany, Austria, and Trieste. Only two divisions are available within the United States for the defense of our territory.

Strategic Alaska is completely lacking in any ground force. The maintenance crews of the three air groups stationed there are being trained in their spare time to handle machine guns and rifles for defense against a potential enemy airborne force of three divisions which is known to be located in eastern Siberia.

FEARS OF STRATEGISTS

Congress last year approved 70 air groups as a minimum for the security of the United States. Today we have only 48 air groups, and those are largely on paper. The necessity for stringent economy to reduce the deficit of $5,500,000,000 prompted the administration to cut military expenditures drastically. But the administration is still spending cheerfully this year an amount equal to the budget deficit to help western European countries.

We are now in the process of sending $1,000,000,000 worth of military equipment to the Atlantic Pact nations. The administration will require at least twice that amount for the military-aid program next year and will put up a real fight to maintain the European recovery program appropriation at $3,000,000,000. But there is not enough money in the Treasury, we are told, to permit the expenditure of about $300,000,000 to house at least one ground division in Alaska where most military men expect the blow to fall.

The spending on western European rearmament is predicated, strategically, on the conception that if Russia decides to change the cold war into a shooting war, its troops will march either toward the Rhine or into the Balkans, the Middle East, and the Near East.

BUT TOO LATE

But nobody seems to have told the American people the nightmarish fears of some top American strategists. What, it is asked, if Russia decides to bypass Europe and the still unconquered countries of the east and moves quickly on the strategic bases from which it can ruthlessly bomb American industrial centers? What if Russia, instead of following the classic pattern ascribed to its strategists, decides to rush its paratroopers—of which the Soviet is reported to have about 13 divisions—into Alaska, Greenland, and Iceland, all totally undefended territories?

Are we really ready, as Defense Secretary Johnson so frequently states, to meet a Soviet attack on those territories? The composition of American forces is no military secret any longer. And there is no indication that those particularly strategic bases are in any way ready to repel an attack by Soviet airborne forces which will try to establish and hold air bases for the Russian long-range bombers and fighters. The area between Los Angeles and Buffalo is only 5 or 6 hours from Alaska, Greenland, or Iceland.

Yet, while many billions have been found available every year since 1941 for all kinds of schemes in Europe, there is not sufficient money in the Treasury to close the gates of the United States to any enemy force.

Moscow has left nothing to the imagination as to how it feels toward the United States. All our diplomatic efforts to cajol, appease, and, more recently, to adopt a semi-firm attitude toward the Kremlin have brought no improvement. The men in the Kremlin continue to regard us as the only obstacle to their ambitions to dominate the world.

The tragic part of our spending money on foreign nations without substantially strengthening our own military forces is that if Russia decides to move against the United States directly from the polar bases none of the countries which we are now supporting can or will come to our aid. The one exception is Canada, which from the strategic point of view is integrated with American territory.

Those countries cannot create a diversion by threatening western Russia because even if the full military-aid program is fulfilled they will still be far weaker than the Russian forces which are guarding the approaches of the iron curtain countries. But what is even more likely is that as soon as the reports of a successful Soviet air attack on the United States have reached Europe the present governments will disappear and the Communists will take over. The new regimes immediately will place their respective countries under the protecting wing of the U. S. S. R.

REARMAMENT TIME

There is still time to offset these great dangers to our own security. But nothing can be done diplomatically at this time. If Russia were to learn that we have decided to build a very powerful American air force and at the same time that we are proceeding with the organization of strong defensive positions backed by full-strength divisions in the "polar areas," she might think twice before acting rashly.

The answer to the present concrete threat to our own territory is to be found in our immediate rearmament, regardless of what other international or domestic commitments we may have to ignore, or how much larger the deficit may be this year or next. If the administration were to take the American people really into its confidence and tell them bluntly what could happen if we continue in the present state of unpreparedness, there would be few, regardless of political party and beliefs, who would not be willing to buckle their belts and even forego some necessities in order to hand out some more cash to pay for insurance for the Nation's freedom—an adequate military force at home.

The whole program for welfare of the people as understood and contained in the platform of the Democratic Party may be important. But it will only be money wasted if the country is not in a position to defend itself if attacked. And today we are not capable of warding off the first deadly blows of a potential enemy, regardless of what the politicians say.

We are alone. We can help those across the Atlantic after we mobilize our forces, even if large sections of Europe are invaded by the Russians. The reverse is not true. The war-weary Europeans have neither the ability nor the will to come to the rescue if we ever need their help. We are alone, 160,000,000 Americans (including the Canadians) against an oriental mass four times as great, which has learned to produce and use the most modern scientific inventions for destruction.

Well-prepared in advance we can weather any storm. But today we are neither psychologically nor physically prepared to meet what many describe as an inevitable danger.

Colorado River Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

COLORADO RIVER BOARD
OF CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, January 24, 1950.

Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: During the past year, as the Colorado River controversy between California and Arizona intensified, a great deal of misleading propaganda has been disseminated by proponents of the central Arizona project.

Arizona supporters, both in and out of Congress and others, publicize two major subjects which have the effect of confusing and deluding the public and the Congress into believing that California does not need its legal share of Colorado River water. These subjects are: (1) Conversion of salt water into fresh water; (2) importation of water into southern California from the Columbia River.

Through published stories, speeches, and testimony the opponents of California have succeeded in deceiving the unwary and the uninformed into believing that these panaceas are available just around the corner. I hardly need tell you that the opposite is the truth.

I wish to be most emphatic in stating that California is not opposed to any scientific experiment which might result in relieving the water problems of the Nation, and desires to support bona fide research for the purpose.

Meanwhile, the Colorado River controversy is real, and it must be settled in the interest of an economic security that cannot be obtained with mere faith in experiments. The people of California have invested more than half a billion dollars in projects to bring Colorado River water and power to their farms, homes, and factories. This great investment, which must be paid for regardless of future events, was made years ago to assure us adequate water and power in days ahead. Those days have now arrived. Every increase in water needs from now on must be met with water from the Colorado River.

The highest scientific authorities are agreed that it may be years, if ever, before conversion of sea water can be accomplished cheaply enough to be used in industry and agriculture.

Southern California does not need water from the Columbia or any other distant river, if the Colorado River water awarded to California years ago in Federal Government contracts can be retained.

I appeal to you to help in defeating the propaganda of the Arizona proponents which may deceive those unfamiliar with the facts into believing that California might soon be supplied with water from the sea or some other unproven source.

The fight we now face is a fight to determine whether 5,000,000 people will be assured of an adequate water supply, or whether a few large landholders in Arizona will get water to grow more crops that are already surplus and subsidized.

California must win this fight. This is a fight for southern California's economic life. A proven and dependable water supply cannot be abandoned.

With kindest personal regards.

FRANKLIN THOMAS,
Chairman.

The Mindszenty Trial: A Chapter in Infamy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit the following article entitled "The Mindszenty Trial: A Chapter in Infamy," which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and the Sun on February 4, 1950, and which was written by Gabriel Pressman.

Mr. Pressman covered the Mindszenty trial while in Europe on a Pulitzer traveling scholarship. His application for a visa to Hungary first was denied but finally was issued—apparently by mistake—to "Orabriel Stanley, American pressman." Stanley is his middle name. He gives here an eye-witness account and his impressions on the first anniversary of the infamous trial, as follows:

THE MINDSZENTY TRIAL: A CHAPTER IN INFAMY—PROSECUTION OF CARDINAL CONVICTED RED JUDGES IN EYES OF FREE WORLD

(By Gabriel Pressman)

A year ago today, I saw brought to trial a brave man who acted like a coward. I saw a people's court from which the people were barred. I saw an ex-Nazi sitting as a Communist chief judge. I saw a defense attorney out-prosecute a prosecutor.

On February 4, 1949, second day of the trial, I was admitted to a dimly lit courtroom in Budapest, where Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty and six co-defendants sat before the bar of Communist justice. Edward Korry, of the United Press, and I were the only American correspondents representing American publications admitted to the trial.

There was one catch: I could not choose an interpreter, I was told by Ivan Boldizar, pudgy, nervous-eyed government press chief.

The government would supply me a bright young Communist to translate for me.

GUNS GUARD COURT

The courtroom was two flights up—with six checkpoints of submachine gunners from the door of the dirty, red-brick courthouse on Marko Street, to the door of the trial room itself.

It was a small, dark room. Not much light pierced the huge windows. On the dais sat the people's court president and four associate judges. On the first bench beneath were the seven defendants, charged with a royalist conspiracy to overthrow the government.

Their faces were drawn. Their attitudes ranged from indifference to resignation. Alongside each sat a militiaman. Throughout the courtroom, militiamen stood or sat among the carefully screened spectators. Only seven relatives of defendants were present.

FROM NAZI TO RED JUDGE

Through an American's eyes, it was a trial of paradoxes. There was Vilmos Olti, before and during the war one of Hungary's foremost Nazis, now playing Communist chief judge.

Olti fired an endless stream of questions at the defendants, methodically building up the case against them with "Yes" and "No" answers. He allowed seven prosecution witnesses, no defense witnesses. As he carried the case through in a lightning 3 days, the hard-faced prosecutor-juror seldom looked up from the papers he read.

The trial seemed a little academic. The defendants had confessed everything days before at the headquarters of the dread secret police, 60 Andrassy Street. And the government had the confessions bound neatly into a yellow book for the convenience of Red propagandists.

READY TO CONFESS

The defendants vied constantly to confess. Once it was even too much for the court. The cardinal tried to read a repudiation of his prearrest warning against any future confession, but Olti silenced him: "You don't want to read that now." So the cardinal sat down and read it when directed.

Young Andreas Zakar, the cardinal's secretary, was once his stubborn, good right arm. Now pathetically trying to follow wherever Olti led. And the judge coached him benignly, like a teacher with a backward child.

Zakar used the word "democratic" in the Western sense. "Liberal, bourgeois democratic, or people's democratic?" Olti demanded.

Zakar (searchingly): "Er * * * liberal."

Olti (with fatherly severity): "That means against progress."

Zakar: "Yes, sir."

ROLE FOR CARDINAL

The Cardinal, an excellent orator before his arrest, spoke monotonously, reading from prepared papers. Under prodding from the rasp-voiced director, the Cardinal said: "I'm very sorry" about everything—the book he had written, letters, money manipulations.

The script called for a Mindszenty of repudiation, confession, and apology. And this, the Communists wanted the world to believe, was the same man who in a last interview said stanchly: "I will never take back anything I have said against the Communist government. * * * Hungary has degenerated into a gigantic chamber of horrors, a den of robbers and thieves."

Crudest of the crudities was the attitude of the so-called defense attorneys. They spent most of the trial twiddling their mustaches or gazing into space. I didn't see them take a single note, nor consult each other once.

Kalman Kiczko, a Communist of 30 years' standing, defended the cardinal. Joseph Groh, prominent Catholic lawyer, had been jailed for offering to serve.

Kiczko pleaded well * * * for Kiczko. Most of his final speech told how much he, Kiczko, loved the people's democracy.

Then, removing his spectacles, he denounced Western newspapers: "The foreign press has written numerous calumnies against Hungary." He disputed that the trial was unfair: "Nobody either at home or abroad can accuse us of restricting freedom." He cringingly thanked the prosecution for bringing up the charges against his client. And, when he sat down, even Olti smiled.

A year has passed and the world still wonders what made the defendants act as they did. Was the cardinal tortured, drugged, or hypnotized?

Pro-Communist correspondents reported the cardinal seemed perfectly normal in every respect. It was hard to agree when you saw a man weak and cowardly, whose actions for 4 years had spoken strength and courage.

CHANGED MAN AT TRIAL

Was he in his right mind when he offered to resign if the charges against him were dropped? Only the Pope could accept such a resignation. Before his arrest, he could deliver a perfect sermon from a few notes. At the trial he forgot frequently and—the interpreters did not hide it—had to be prodded by the court.

The key to what happened is, of course, the 38 days the cardinal spent with the secret police before the trial. I did not speak to the cardinal—the government forbade it—but I have spoken to others educated to confess at 60 Andrassy Street. The Communists have a standard curriculum: questioning for days on end under bright lights, standing with arms overhead until faint, repeated blows with blunt instruments on the kidney, electric shock treatments.

It is possible that all the standard methods and perhaps more were used on the defendants. Perhaps Zakar was tortured to arouse the cardinal's pity. Zakar's white face and trembling impatience to please marked him a likely graduate of the torture chamber.

Not all the clues were outside the court. In the cardinal's final speech, he spoke with some feeling for the first time:

"I stand here with half a century of basic principles * * * principles that guide us as railway tracks guide trains. * * * I was not and am not an enemy of the Hungarian people * * * worker or peasant."

Perhaps the cardinal here revealed his true thoughts—that he believed as he always did, that he still loved the people but not the Communist government.

REFUSE TO BOW TO RED

Significantly, the Hungarian press and radio did not carry the statement. For weeks before the trial, these government-controlled media trumpeted the cardinal's guilt. "A pittable worm, a scared scoundrel, a bloodthirsty beast of prey," they called him.

Meanwhile, the government had nightly press briefings to tell correspondents what to write. Boldizar, the press czar said: "Tell your readers that the cardinal is not a brave hero of freedom but a weakling and a coward." The second night Mr. Korry and I refused to sign a Communist-sponsored resolution, signed by the others, affirming there was no censorship and translations were accurate.

A Hungarian journalist secretly applauded our stand: "There are two kinds of censorship: one where the censor's pencil scratches out the words, the other where the fear in your heart scratches them out." He told me how every Hungarian-speaking person in that courtroom had been intimidated.

After my refusal to sign, the government pretended I did not exist, withdrew even its slanted help. I had to scrape together at least the official version of what was happening—and that was damning enough.

FINAL COURT SCENE

Time will never dim that last, sad scene of February 8. The defendants stood for more than an hour while Olti issued an anti-Western political tirade and their sentences.

The cardinal's head was slightly bowed, his hands clasped before him. As he was sentenced to life imprisonment, his cheek twitched. Princess Esterhazy knelt in prayer. A government camera's flashbulb exploded.

There was a weird moment when Laszlo Toth, almost deaf Catholic editor, stepped forward to hear Olti shout his fate—10 years.

Then it was over. The heavily guarded defendants filed out. In the corridor I stopped gray-haired Hildegarde Zaher, the defendant's sister. Glancing nervously at detectives, her eyes moist, she said in French:

"My brother is a good boy. He has always served God. If God wills it, then this must be."

The reaction of the people in the streets and coffee houses was bitter. Through a Hungarian-speaking American, they told me: "They were afraid to give him the death sentence because they know his hold on the people is too great."

HIS PLACE IN HISTORY

The cardinal, says the Hungarian underground, languishes today in Gyujtofoghar jail, 10 miles north of Budapest.

Whatever happens, Cardinal Mindszenty's place in history is assured. A Hungarian student friend expressed it well that last night in Budapest as we strolled along the banks of the Danube. I had just come from a final press conference at which Boldizar said: "The trial is over, but the trial of you correspondents has just begun. You must tell the world the truth about this traitor."

My friends looked up at the sky. "You know, for once Boldizar is right," he said. "This was more than the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. In the court of world public opinion, a cardinal has convicted his judges and communism stands condemned."

Implementation of Hoover Commission Reports and Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the staff of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has prepared a staff memorandum, which is a brief summary or analysis of the progress which Congress has made thus far toward the implementation of the Hoover Commission reports and recommendations. I believe this will be of interest to Members and others. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES
IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
February 3, 1950.

STAFF MEMORANDUM No. 81-2-12

Subject: Why hasn't the Congress taken action upon the Hoover Commission Report?[1]

The public appears confused over three important phases of the Hoover reports: (1) Action taken to date by the Congress to implement the reports; (2) possible economies in Federal expenditures expected to result; and, (3) the distinctly different methods of effectuation required.

The facts are:

1. ACTION BY THE CONGRESS

Half (9 of 18) of the Hoover reports have been acted upon favorably—in whole or in part. They are:

No. 1, General Management of Executive Branch.

No. 2, Personnel Management.

No. 3, General Services (Supply Activities).

No. 4, The Post Office.

No. 5, Foreign Affairs (Department of State).

No. 8, National Security (Department of Defense).

No. 10, Department of Commerce.

No. 12, Regulatory Commissions.

No. 13, Department of Labor.

(For details see S. Rept. 1158, October 12, 1949, and Senate Committee Rept. No. 7, February 1, 1950.)

Legislation is pending to effectuate in varying degrees every report not already approved.[2]

A recapitulation of congressional action on the Hoover reports reveals that 12 major statutes were enacted, 6 (of 7) reorganization plans submitted by the President were approved, and some 36 other measures were processed toward enactment (passed Senate or House, reported favorably by committees, or hearings held) during the first session, Eighty-first Congress. As a result, significant reorganization has been effectuated or authorized in these broad executive areas: (1) Personnel, (2) Federal Supply, Buildings Management and Records, (3) the Department of Defense (including revision of budgeting and accounting methods) (4) the Department of State, and, (5) the Department of Labor.

(In October, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, a research organization founded with Mr. Hoover's approval to further the adoption of the Commission's report, estimated that approximately 20 percent of the entire report had been effectuated. "More reorganization has been accomplished than at any previous time in the Nation's history," the committee stated.)

2. HOOVER REPORT "DOLLAR SAVINGS"

No hard and fast figure upon Hoover report dollar savings exists, or likely will. At best, the estimates which have been made are of necessity a "guess." Their chronology follows:

In December 1948, Mr. Hoover stated in a press release that if the whole of the Commission's recommendations were adopted "there should be a saving of about $3,000,000,000 a year."

In January 1949, the Hoover Commission conducted a "staff study" of its task forces'

[1] A question repeatedly asked Members of Congress. This is a summary of action taken by the Congress. It supplements S. Rept. 1158, October 12, 1949; and Senate Committee Rept. 7, February 1, 1950, which present more detailed analyses of action taken, legislation pending, and areas awaiting action.

[2] Where legislative action is required. See Methods of Effectuation.

estimates of savings in their respective areas. Fourteen of the 24 task forces made no estimates. The estimates of 10 totaled $3,234,950,000.

In June 1949, the Citizens Committee estimated savings at $3,000,000,000 a year; in October 1949, "of approximately $4,000,000,000 a year," and in December 1949, "three to four billions, possibly more." Various speakers, the source of whose information is unknown, since have raised the estimate to as high as $5,000,000,000 a year. The variance of such estimates indicates the difficulty of accurately forecasting economies.

The citizens committee estimates savings in fiscal 1951, as a result of reorganization effectuated to date, will total $1,250,000,000—$1,000,000,000 from reorganization of the National Military Establishment, $250,000,000 from consolidation in General Services Administration of supply, buildings management, etc. These estimates stem from the Hoover Commission staff study which a year ago predicted military savings at "from one to two billion per year" within "a reasonable period" of time, and savings through consolidation of supply activities at $245,200,000 per year.

Many students of reorganization believe Hoover Report economies have been oversold. They point out that the primary objective of the Hoover Commission was not to achieve immediate economies, but greater efficiency through better rearrangement of the executive branch, which could be expected to effect improved administration and produce long-range economies. Emphasis, therefore, should be placed on increased efficiency of government and improvements in the Federal service, to insure a greater return for the last dollar expended. It is extremely difficult to pin point future economies in reorganizations without a broad margin for error, and often, even more difficult to prove them once reorganization is accomplished. Two-thirds of the Hoover task forces declined to estimate economies, probably for these and other reasons. It remains reasonable to expect economy from some of the Hoover Commission reorganizations, particularly consolidations and eliminations of functions. Just what the amount will be cannot be reckoned accurately until operations have been conducted under such readjustments over a definite period of time.

It is doubtful that any accurate evaluation of Hoover report "dollar economies" could be made until that has been done.

3. METHODS OF IMPLEMENTATION

Many Members report this inquiry from constituents: "Why can't all the Hoover Commission recommendations be sent through Congress in a 'single package'—one bill?" On the other hand, some organizations have expressed the fear that all the commission's recommendations will be considered in an omnibus bill—thus precluding "individual treatment" of their special interests.

Aside from the obvious legislative infeasibility of attempting to enact the same 268 Hoover recommendations in one bill, the more important factor is that the Congress actually is responsible for initiation of only slightly more than one-third of the recommendations made.

Few appear to realize that the Hoover recommendations require three distinct types of effectuation: (1) Administrative action by the agencies concerned; (2) Reorganization plans submitted by the President; and (3) Substantive or appropriation legislation by the Congress. The Bureau of the Budget has classified the 241 individual actions necessary to effectuate the 268 recommendations as follows:

Actions and methods of effectuation:

One hundred and twenty-two (or 50.9 percent): Administrative action by executive branch.

One hundred and ten (or 21.7 percent): Substantive legislation by the Congress.

Eighty-two (or 34.8 percent): Reorganization plans (initiated by the President).

Twenty-two (or 8.6 percent): Appropriation legislation by the Congress.

Total, 331 (100 percent).

Thus, according to the Bureau of the Budget, of the 331 actions necessary to implement the Hoover Commission's recommendations, 61.7 percent require initiation by the Executive Branch (through administrative action or reorganization plan) and 38.3 percent require initiation by the Congress, through legislation.

Beyond that fact, such matters as committee jurisdiction, coordination with other interrelated legislation and the necessity of conducting extensive public hearings upon many of the reorganization proposals, would preclude, from a time factor if none other, single-package processing.

PUBLIC LAWS ENACTED

A tabulation of public statutes enacted and reorganization plans approved by the Eighty-first Congress, first session, to effectuate the Hoover Commission Reports, with a terse description of each, and reference to related Hoover reports, follows.

(Status of other pending legislation is available in detail in Senate Report No. 1158, Progress on Hoover Commission Recommendations, October 12, 1949; and in condensed form, in committee print No. 7, Legislative Action on Hoover Commission reports, February 1, 1950, prepared by the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.)

PUBLIC LAWS

Public Law 109 (Reorganization Act of 1949), June 20, 1949 (Hoover Rept. No. 1): Empowers President to submit reorganization plans to the Congress. (Expires April 1, 1953.) The President transmitted seven plans in 1949, six of which were approved.

Public Law 92 (Travel Expense Act of 1949), June 9, 1949 (Hoover Rept. No. 1): This act increased the Federal travel per diem from $6 to a maximum of $9 per day, in accordance with recommendations of the Commission's task force on Federal field services, filed with Report No. 1.

Public Law 429 (the Classification Revision Act of 1949), October 28, 1949 (Hoover Rept. No. 2): This act revised the civil-service classification system to promote simplicity, efficiency, and economy. It would correct distortions among present pay schedules; provide additional classifications for top management, professional, and scientific positions; provide incentives for employee contributions toward more economical administration; require each agency to establish a performance rating plan; and require the Civil Service Commission to submit its recommendations for improvement of the efficiency rating system to the Congress by February 1, 1950. (Report referred to Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, February 2, 1950.)

Public Law 359 (the Executive Pay Raise Act), October 15, 1949 (Hoover Rept. No. 2): This act increased compensation of Cabinet officers, heads of departments, and other administrative officers, establishing pay schedules for Cabinet officers at $22,500; and for Under Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries, and heads of agencies, commissions, bureaus, and boards, at rates ranging from $14,000 to $20,000 based upon relative importance of the respective positions.

Public Law 189 (Civil Service Retirement Act), July 24, 1949 (Hoover Rept. No. 2): This act consolidated various Government retirement programs; repealed the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act and the Canal Zone Retirement Act, to bring subject employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Public Law 167 (10 professional and scientific positions in NACA), July 13, 1949 (Hoover Rept. Nos. 2 and 8): This act authorized the establishment of 10 positions at salaries from $10,000 to $15,000 per year to provide for scientific research relating to national defense by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Public Law 152 (Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949), June 30, 1949 (Hoover Rept. No. 3): This act established the General Services Administration. Transferred Federal Bureau of Supply, Federal Works Agency (including Public Buildings Administration, and Bureau of Community Facilities) and National Archives to GSA, thus consolidating in one general service agency all housekeeping functions, including Government procurement, buildings management; records management, transportation supervision, and surplus-property disposal.

Public Law 231 (to improve operations of Post Office Department), October 16, 1949 (Hoover Rept. No. 4): This act provided for a long-range development program for improvement in methods, procedures, equipment, and supplies used in the postal service.

Public Law 73 (reorganization of Department of State), May 26, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 5): This act vested authority, previously administered by subordinates, in the Secretary of State for the conduct of foreign affairs; authority to promulgate regulations necessary to the execution of such functions, authority to delegate certain responsibilities to subordinates under his immediate direction; and, in general, provided for a thorough reorganization of the Department.

Public Law 216 (Reorganization of the National Military Establishment), August 10, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 8): This act converted the National Military Establishment into a Department of Defense, centralized management, improved fiscal reorganization upon basis of performance budget, created a Chairman for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and, in general, provided for further unification of the armed services.

Public Law 110 (Central Intelligence Agency), June 20, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 8): This act granted the CIA the necessary authority to improve its internal operations. It clarifies functions relating to procurement, expenditures of appropriated funds, protection of confidential operations, and other administrative activities.

Public Law 36 (to amend the National Security Act of 1947), April 2, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 8): This act created an Under Secretary of Defense to exercise the power of Secretary of Defense during the Secretary's official absence.

REORGANIZATION PLANS

Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1949, August 20, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 13): Transferred the Bureau of Employment Security from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor.

Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1949, August 20, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 4): Increased authority of the Postmaster General by transferring to him functions of each Assistant Postmaster General, the Purchasing Agent, the Comptroller, and the Bureau of Accounts. Authorized Postmaster General to delegate functions.

Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1949, August 20, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 1): Transferred National Security Council and National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President.

Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1949, August 20, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 2): Provided for executive direction by the Chairman of administration of the United States Civil Service Commission, but maintained advantages of bipartisan membership.

Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1949, August 20, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 12): Strengthened administration of the United States Maritime Commission by vesting in the Chairman responsibility for (a) administration, (b) appointment of personnel, and (c) supervision of personnel.

Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1949, August 20, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 10): Transferred the Public Roads Administration from the General Services Agency to the Department of Commerce.

MILES SCULL, Jr.,
Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

The Story of Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and thought-provoking editorial entitled "Only the Big Ones," from the Boston Post of February 1, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONLY THE BIG ONES

The lifetime comments on men and modes which G. K. Chesterton, brilliant British writer, penned in his day, outlive him. One was the immortal essay on why people laugh when somebody slips and falls down. He attributed it to a subconscious memory of man's fall from grace in the Garden of Eden.

It would take a bearded philosopher many years and many volumes perhaps to prove it. But Bostonians know why their city becomes the immediate target for guffaws, at home and abroad, when it stubs its toe. No one bothers to chortle when a pee wee topples. It's when the big fellow goes down that the big laugh comes.

Boston was where America began on King Street, now State Street, when five citizens fell under the withering fire of the Redcoats for freedom's sake. It was Boston money and Boston pioneers who developed much of America, building far-flung cities and sowing the western plain. It was Boston men who sent clipper ships roving the earth to bring back the spices which Columbus sought.

But Boston did not rest on those laurels. Today it is the cultural center, the history center, the educational center, the medical center, and the religious center—big, busy, and seeking to be better. As such there is bound to be envy, satire born of little minds, and laughter which indirectly adds up to flattery. If Boston did not count—did not amount to anything—it would be ignored.

If Boston was morally unctuous, instead of right, it would accept rowdy lines in plays that would not be used in the living room; it would overlook the purple passages in books that are put in purposely to sell them and gloss over motion pictures it feels, in some parts, are not fit for children.

Such an attitude makes Boston free game for pseudo-liberals and phony intellectuals who at heart are nihilists in public conduct. When there is an incident like that involving the visiting Japs, which is contrary to everything Boston and which all thinking Bostonians deplore, we are scandalized. When Brink's is robbed, the comedians in a city not so far away, where jewel thieves steal half as much in a night, have a holiday.

However, Boston is not dismayed. There will be a great jubilee here in May. A new city hall will rise on the traditional School Street site. Futuristic ramps and circles to relieve traffic problems will soon be started. Mayor Hynes lops $50,000 from the refuse contracts in his economy drive. There are other happy, progressive steps being taken which spell the important thing—prosperity—the kilowatt that spins the flywheel.

Out of error will come good. Public and private safeguards on money and life will be increased here and Nation-wide because of Brink's. The Jap incident, which the State legislature in Boston rectified yesterday, will only hasten the demise of the 22-man council. But Boston should create, and at once, a citizens group to combat the censure, libel, and half truths. We cannot afford to be complacent or indifferent. Some mud might stick. By telling the Boston story, the real story, we can fight back.

Open Primary System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 7, 1950.

Hon. WILLIAM H. HILL,
Chairman, Broome County Republican Committee, Binghamton, N. Y.

DEAR BILLY: According to the Binghamton Press, you are still determined, despite terrific pressure, to maintain the open primary system which your worthy leadership has always advocated as the fairest possible method of selecting Republican nominees.

You are deserving of the greatest praise for your courage in the face of the most vicious plot to wreck the Republican Party in Broome County in the twentieth century.

This gang would never dare challenge your will in this matter were you not confined to a hospital bed.

This underground wrecking crew has just about ruined representative government hereabouts and is dedicated to a rule-or-ruin policy, come what may.

They advocate the closed primary for two reasons, and I will describe them in detail, as follows:

1. They are afraid of facing the voters in a free primary, because they know only by strong-arming a so-called party endorsement can they survive the natural dislike which Republican committee people and party members alike have for their overbearing arbitrary methods.

2. They have for years been pointing to ganging up on me in the party primary, because they realize that is the only place they can even begin to accomplish their sordid scheme.

Whatever few differences you and I may have had since I have served this district in Congress, I have always recognized in you a champion of the Republican Party of Abraham Lincoln. It is shameful and tragic to think that this great organization should now be honeycombed by a myriad of termites boring from within, having but one objective, complete sabotage of the lofty principles of the Great Emancipator.

A public official should be unafraid of primary competition. Your policy has made a fair fight out of what could have been a below-the-belt, one-sided battle.

On the basis of the open primary, I have always welcomed other candidates. The more the merrier, I say. Those who are appearing most desirous of the opposite view seem to be afraid of equal competition.

While I have never been a power in the little circle of trouble-makers who for the most part are self-appointed apostles of this un-American brand of lousy politics, you have, nevertheless, my pledge of unqualified support in your brave and gallant struggle to keep our Republican Party free in Broome County.

I join with you in trying to preserve the American electoral system against these modern Huey Longs, these Boises Pendergast, these Henrich Himlers, who want to turn our party's primary into a Nazi plebiscite.

Most sincerely, I remain,

Your Congressman,
EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

The President and the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix, I include the following remarks delivered on Monday, February 6, over the Mutual network by our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] a member of the Committee on Education and Labor:

At long last President Truman has decided to invoke the Taft-Hartley law in the coal dispute.

For weeks we have pleaded with Mr. Truman to do what he finally did today.

Had he taken this action 6 weeks ago, the Nation's coal supply would not now be at its present dangerous low.

But that is what might have been.

Now the President has decided to use the very law that he has condemned so often * * * the same law his party expects to use as a political issue during the coming congressional elections.

Well, the people will remember that it was the only instrument available to the President of the United States to protect the Nation's health and safety.

Even Democratic politicians should now be thankful for the Taft-Hartley law.

Even they must now admit that when the President took his oath to enforce the laws of the United States, he had his tongue in his cheek with regard to Taft-Hartley.

That his actions and statements since then have bred disrespect for the law, that may have a vital bearing on its enforcement.

Federal-State Relations to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following statement by Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary, National Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D. C.:

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS IN EDUCATION

(By Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary, National Council of Chief State School Officers)

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Assuming that only the present educational activities of the Federal Government are being considered, most educators favor a Federal board of education to replace the appointed politicians now in charge of the United States Office of Education. This board would determine internal policies of the Office relating to educational appropriations by Congress, publications, staff assignments, library, research, and advisory services.

As the task-force writer in education for the Hoover Commission has said, the Commission's recommendations for education were "innocuous and reactionary." Educators desire to remove education, somewhat as the judiciary has been removed, from control by partisan politicians and to reduce the possibility that any politician will ever be in a position to control education in the United States as Hitler and Stalin have controlled the educational systems of Germany and Russia. Control of education by partisan political officials is fundamentally out of harmony with American experience. Our colleges, universities, and public-school systems are universally governed by boards of education and operate most effectively where they have best protection against partisan politicians. The Federal agency for education requires the same protection if it is to operate efficiently and economically.

It is absurd for the Hoover Commission to say there must be a basic educational bureaucracy in Washington before the Office of Education can attain status worthy of education.

The major functions of the Office involve services to education in the States without Federal control of State programs of education, not services to other Federal agencies.

Question. Why doesn't the Hoover Report agree with the task-force report?

Answer. Since education is primarily a State and not a Federal function, the Hoover Commission erred fundamentally in treating the Federal agency for education exactly as it treated Federal agencies exercising functions primarily Federal. The services of the Office of Education cannot be effective under the personal control of a hierarchy of noneducational politicians.

The Commission recommended retention of some independent Federal agencies and a new independent agency for health services. The reasons for an independent agency for education are far more compelling than the reasons for a new independent agency for health. Neither can the independent agencies recommended for retention, with few exceptions, present a case for autonomy comparable to that of education.

Question. What are the dangers in a large agency administering a complex of many different services?

Answer. Any of the services in the agency favored by its political head could use the Office of Education for political ends, thus ending its usefulness to educators throughout the country. Under the Hoover Commission recommendations, education would be dominated by a huge welfare organization devoted to crusades for such programs as compulsory health insurance. Education must be nonpartisan, and must not be placed where it can be used to promote partisan political programs of this kind. To place a small professional Office of Education far down in a neat organizational chart of political hierarchy is to invite Federal control of education in its worst form.

The statement of the Hoover Commission that "It is the well-being of the individual, not control by the doctors, educators, or social worker, with which the Government's health, educational, and social-security functions are primarily concerned" is irrelevant and a gratuitous insult to our profession. We ask for control of the Office of Education by a nonpartisan board of laymen and the Congress of the United States, not by either professional educators or appointed politicians only remotely responsible to the people.

Question. What is the argument favoring inclusion of the United States Office of Education in a Department of Welfare (S. 2060), if it would give the Secretary of Welfare the right to determine completely by executive order educational functions in the Federal agency for education?

Answer. The arguments are (a) that the Secretary of Welfare should have power to assign educational responsibilities as he desires anywhere within his agency to assure coordination and integration, (b) that the Secretary of Welfare will speak more effectively for education in the Federal Government than will a Federal Board of Education.

The present small amount of autonomy in the Office of Education, which the Commission would have abolished, has prevented its complete emasculation and subordination to welfare. The process of coordination and integration has been going on for several years, and has reduced both the prestige of the Office of Education and the value of its services to education.

The Office of Education would not be adequately represented in the Federal Government by a Secretary of Welfare. His would be a partisan, welfare-dominated voice and it would interfere with the hearing of the real voice of education. A nonpartisan board of laymen could speak for education within a statutory framework established by the Congress in a manner which would command the respect of all the people.

Question. Should the Government appropriate large sums of money for general education?

Answer. Congress must decide. Political scientists who worship streamlined charts need to study the precedents for State financing of local schools without control of their programs of education and the history of Federal aid to education.

Should general Federal aid for elementary and secondary education be appropriated by the Congress, all our experience in education indicates that a nonpartisan board of laymen would provide more protection against Federal control of the State education programs aided than could possibly be provided under the administration by political officers recommended by the Hoover Commission.

Question. What about an independent Department of Education with Cabinet rank?

Answer. We do not favor it. We don't want Federal control of educational programs. A Cabinet official is always a politician and we can't afford to make education political. It might easily lead to a Federal educational agency too large for safety, especially if the recommendation of the Hoover Commission that all Federal agencies be given status according to the size of their pay rolls should be accepted. The temptation to build up his department is next to irresistible for a political officer sitting in the Cabinet.

Question. What about S. 656: A Federal Board of Education as proposed by the National Council of Chief State School Officers and supported by the NEA? (Other organizations which passed resolutions in support S. 656 are the County and Rural Area Superintendents, the Southern Work Conference, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the American Association of School Administrators, the New York State School Boards Association, etc.)

Answer. Within its appropriation and statutory authority, the Federal Board would determine the policies of operation of the United States Office of Education and administer the Office through its professional executive, the Commissioner of Education.

This organization for education has been most successful in colleges, universities, and all levels of public education. Educators merely desire to substitute a board of citizens for a single politician with personal political power over educational policies. Dealings by teachers, administrators, and State officials with Federal agencies on educational matters is most effective when such dealings are on a nonpartisan basis.

Question. In an agency with Cabinet rank, the political head obviously would be in authority over the whole hierarchy and determine the functions of even the Education Bureau. Would there not be the same danger in a Federal Board of Education?

Answer. No. The effect of a nonpartisan Federal Board of Education would be just the opposite. Educators and citizens generally are willing to trust a nonpartisan board of laymen to represent the public, but not a partisan politician. In any event, the argument that education must be turned over to the politicians in order to keep it close to the people is fallacious. The entire history of our public schools and our colleges and universities demonstrates otherwise.

The notion that education must be protected in behalf of the general public against both professional educators and politicians accords with the views of educators but not with those of the Hoover Commission. Educators do not seek such control, but favor the exercise of such control by a board of laymen broadly representative of the general public. They would protect education against both educators and politicians. The Hoover Commission on the contrary, would apparently turn the entire educational enterprise over to politicians.

Question. What are the possible weaknesses in a Federal board set up at the national level?

Answer. It has been contended that persons who do not give full time to paid jobs do not serve efficiently, although volunteer services of citizens to the Federal Government in the past have failed to prove this. Some college, university, and public-school boards have been wiser than others, but it should be possible to rely on the President to appoint a board of high quality, of whom no more than 6 of the 11 members may be of one political party, under the provisions of S. 656.

Question. Is a National Board of Education analogous to a State board?

Answer. Education at the Federal level is not a duplicate of education at the State level, but there is much resemblance so far as the relationships of the Board of Education and its professional staff to educational policies are concerned. The special requirements of Federal relations to education due to the fact that education is a State function and not a Federal function have often been grossly violated by politically administered Federal agencies of the type proposed for the Office of Education by the Hoover Commission. Such special requirements for the Office of Education, due to the differences in functions, would be more likely to be observed by a nonpartisan board of citizens than by a politician. The Federal Board would confine its functions to the legal scope of the Office of Education, just as State or local school boards or university boards of education would act within their respective areas of statutory authority.

Flood Wall at Vincennes, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. NOLAND

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Mr. Curtis Kimmell, the city attorney of Vincennes; Mr. R. S. Robertson, secretary of the Indiana State Flood Control Commission; Mr. Joseph Perrey, engineer of the Indiana State Flood Commission and I appeared before a House Appropriations Subcommittee requesting an initial appropriation of $500,000 to start construction of a floodwall at Vincennes, Ind.

This project constitutes the greatest emergency in the State of Indiana today. The following newspaper article from the Indianapolis News demonstrates beyond all doubt how seriously this new floodwall is needed:

VINCENNES WAS FARRER DISASTER THAN IT KNEW—MINOR SLIP WHICH MIGHT HAVE FLOODED MOST OF CITY REVEALED

VINCENNES, IND., January 25.—James White, flood coordinator, today revealed how a minor slip a week ago Sunday night came near causing inundation of four-fifths of Vincennes.

White said following the heavy rain, a leak was detected in Niblack Boulevard along Kelso Creek, and men were pulled from other sections of the city's levee to avert a flooding of North Vincennes.

After the danger had been averted, a patrol passing along the section of secondary sandbag levee near the Ebner Ice and Storage Co. discovered water running over the top tier of sandbags, threatening to wash out this bulwark.

Soldiers and volunteers were rushed to the spot and worked frantically to avert the mishap that would have brought flooding of 60 percent of Vincennes, and most of southern Knox County.

This incident was not revealed publicly until after the flood crisis had passed.

"Some of these floods," White said, "are going to sweep over Vincennes, just because of a minor slip, if the Government doesn't awaken to the peril here and appropriate money with which to construct an adequate floodwall."

Representative JAMES E. NOLAND, Democrat, of Indiana, is taking a plea for the proposed $3,000,000 floodwall directly to President Truman tomorrow. He will ask Truman to support spending of $500,000 next year to start work on the wall, already planned by Army engineers.

Franklin Roosevelt, Jr., Being Groomed for Albany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent:

FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT, JR., BEING GROOMED FOR ALBANY—COLUMBIAN DEMOCRATS PREPARE FOR GAINING NOMINATION FOR GOVERNOR

(By Frank R. Kent)

The efforts to build young Franklin Roosevelt up to a size where he must be nominated by the Democrats for Governor of New York next November is not going so well. For this there are several reasons.

The chief of these seems to be the source and character of his publicity. Most of this comes from interested persons so close to him personally as to make the fulsomeness of their praise slightly sickening. A second trouble is their technique. Their notion of an argument is to assert that the mere suggestion of either James or Franklin Roosevelt achieving success in politics is enough to cause all the rich old reactionaries in the country to tear their hair in a rage or swoon with fright. This is considered not only effective politically but screamingly funny. It is, of course, pretty silly stuff but it does give an idea of the caliber of the new gubernatorial aspirant and his journalistic managers.

It is interesting to note that in none of the printed grease in which young Franklin is now being drenched is there any reference to his qualifications for the governorship. Great emphasis is placed on his personal charm, his extraordinary victory in the district last year and the vote-getting asset of his name. Not a word is said about either his character or his ability. No mention is made of his public record. Of course, as yet, he has no public record. Nor has he ever been in position where his ability could be judged. As to his views, his speeches have merely mouthed the word of the welfare state administrationists and he has carefully echoed the Americans for Democratic action propaganda. If since he came to Congress—or before—he has done any thinking for himself about issues or measures or men, there has been no sign of it.

Notwithstanding the spoiled child characteristics which protrude, when he first came to Congress the disposition of his colleagues was rather to like him personally. He has done a good deal to change this recently. Among the incidents which do not reflect credit on him may be mentioned his slightly degrading controversy with Clayton Powell, Negro Congressman from New York, who accused him of discourteously usurping Mr. POWELL's prerogative to present the petition to bring the FEPC bill out of committee in order to glorify himself and promote his gubernatorial ambitions. Another was his attack upon Congressman Clarence Brown, of Ohio, who, in replying, gave the rather startling figures of the number of important roll calls Junior had missed since he took his seat and suggested that he could not learn House procedure in New York night clubs nor by nocturnal meditations on Fifty-second Street. A third was his inexcusable use of the word "chicanery" in referring to the greatly beloved and respected Congressman JAMES W. WADSWORTH. He also indicated his belief that Senator TAFT and ex-President Hoover were somewhat hypocritical. And, finally, there was the typically bumptious reply to the question of why he refused to debate with Wendell Willkie's son Philip over the radio. "Why," he asked, "should I make that fellow a big shot?"

All this has combined to create the impression of an unpleasantly immature and self-assertive playboy, chiefly interested in promoting himself politically as fast as possible, but not to be regarded as raising either the mental or moral level of the House. Of course, he may correct this idea in the present session and make a record that will commend him generally. But no one will claim that he has yet made a start in that direction. His publicity promoters have practically drawn a blueprint of how, with the aid of his friend, Ed Flynn, of Bronx-paving-block fame, he can get the gubernatorial prize through the old labor union-Negro combination. It is to be worked for him by his political aides and agents. He is to stay in Washington (mostly) and "stick to his knitting," pretending not to be interested in anything except his seat in the House, while his friends "saw the nomination up for him."

Perhaps, it will work out the way they have it planned. However, there are a good many hurdles to take and quite a few persons to push out of the way. Also, there is the question of being elected after being nominated. Junior's boosters insist the name alone will carry him. "Junior," they say, "is just the boy to do the trick." But that is not necessarily so. For 10 years now, the Democrats have not had a real majority in New York State. In that time they have carried the State for President and for Senator by the grace of the so-called Liberal Party housed by David Dubinsky, the labor leader, and the American Labor Party, admittedly dominated by the Communists.

Combined, the two parties poll upward of 700,000 votes. Without their support, President Roosevelt would not have carried the State in either 1940 or 1944. With their support, President Truman failed to carry it in 1948 and Senator LEHMAN would have been overwhelmingly beaten last year but for them. The indisputable truth is that for its success in the greatest State in the Union, the Democratic Party is completely dependent upon these two splinter parties. It isn't a savory situation. If the people of New York ever really grasp the character of the men who control their State and what a shabby, subservient instrument the Democratic Party has become there, it will take a good deal more than Junior has to do the trick.

The American Legion and the Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the following interesting and factual radio address was recently delivered in my district by Mr. Don Eva, legislative chairman of the American Legion for the State of Oregon, relative to the American Legion and the Hoover report. It is worthy of consideration by all persons interested in the Hoover report and the welfare of the veterans. All of my colleagues will find time to read it:

My fellow Americans, the American Legion, as you know, is dedicated to God and country.

Probably never before in our long and proud history have we of the Legion been put to a more severe test in living up to that sacred dedication than we are today.

Do not believe those who would tell you that the American Legion is a pressure group, interested only in putting all veterans on a gravy train. That is either a

vicious lie or an accusation based upon ignorance of the true ideals of the American Legion.

True, the American Legion's obligation is to fight for the rights and proper privileges of our disabled and needy veterans. It always has been and it always will be.

But the American Legion today stands in the forefront among all patriotic organizations in the United States in the cause of Americanism. It is in the interest of Americanism—Americanism and true national economy that I have the pleasure of appearing before you today.

First of all, permit me to state that the American Legion is not opposed to the Hoover Commission Report in its entirety.

The American Legion from its national commander down to its more than 3,000,000 post members is wholeheartedly in favor of economy in Government, good, sound, common sense economy. After all, American Legionnaires are citizens and just as much taxpayers as any other good American citizens.

The conception that the American Legion is opposed to the complete Hoover Commission Report is wholly erroneous. Much of it may prove of real assistance in bringing about economy. Some of it already has.

The American Legion does however oppose most strenuously that section of the Hoover report which would dismember the Veterans Administration, which has proven itself for more than 20 years to be the most efficient of all large Government agencies into five or more separate bureaus, some of them purely experimental and certainly more costly to the taxpayers of the United States.

Many people seem either not to know or to have forgotten that the Veterans Administration was created by recommendation of Herbert Hoover himself when he was President of the United States.

Mr. Hoover, then President, said to the Nation in 1923 that in the interest of efficiency, economy, more uniform administration and better definition of national policies, the Veterans Bureau, the Pension Bureau and the National Home for Volunteer Soldiers should be brought together into a single agency.

So the Veterans' Administration was created by act of Congress on July 3, 1930, as the last word in streamlined service to veterans.

The Veterans' Administration today is exactly what its name implies. It administers all laws relative to benefits or services to former members of the armed forces and their dependents. These include disability and death compensation, disability and death pensions, medical and hospital services, domiciliary care, United States Government and national service life insurance, vocational rehabilitation and education, guaranty of loans for purchase of homes, farms, business properties, everything applying to veterans.

The wisdom and the economy of creating the Veterans' Administration as the one agency to administer all veterans benefits has been proven to the complete satisfaction of the Government and the people of the United States.

During 20 years of careful scrutiny by and cooperation of the American Legion, the Veterans' Administration has been developed and so operated that in spite of some existing imperfections it stands alone today among all large Government agencies as the one not subject to political pressure and free from pork-barrel raids.

That economies even now may be effected in the Veterans' Administration we do not for one moment deny. But from years and years of experience and close cooperation with this great one-thing agency, the American Legion, which itself fought alongside then President Hoover for consolidation of a number of bureaus into one agency, both in the name of economy and efficiency. The American Legion maintains that further economies can best be brought about within the present set-up of the Veterans' Administration.

But what has the Hoover Commission suggested? It proposes that the major functions of the Veterans' Administration be split up into five or more agencies.

It recommends that hospital and medical attention be turned over to a new experimental bureau—a United Medical Administration—that hospital construction be transferred to the Department of the Interior, that all insurance matters be handled by another new and experimental agency, a Veterans Insurance Corporation, that home loans be taken care of by a Housing and Home Finance Agency, and that only the lesser veteran benefits remain under the charge of the Veterans' Administration.

Ladies and gentlemen, such dismemberment of our Veterans' Administration is unthinkable.

Emasculation of this most efficient of all large Government agencies into five separate Federal bureaus, as proposed, would not only be a stunning blow to our veterans, particularly the disabled, it also would entail an additional drain on America's already overburdened taxpayers.

I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, where could economy be effected in such a set-up?

As I have stated, the American Legion has proven itself for more than 30 years the most experienced group in the world on veteran affairs. The American Legion's rehabilitation experts, its National, State, and post officers and members have labored through these three decades in building up a most efficient Veterans' Administration.

But the suggestion that the Veterans' Administration be vivisected was made without any consultation with either the American Legion or any other recognized veterans' organization.

Four times the American Legion asked the Hoover Commission for permission to present the Legion's side of the case. But no such permission ever was granted.

The very fact that all members of the Hoover Commission itself were not in accord, and that neither the group of insurance executives nor a big engineering firm called in by the Hoover task force would recommend such changes as have been proposed, is evidence in itself of the folly of the portion of the reorganization plan that would dismember the Veterans' Administration.

Permit me to read the following from the report of the Trundle Engineering Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, to the Hoover Commission:

"From the very beginning the Veterans' Administration has been the beneficiary of the advice and constructive criticism of organized veterans' groups—of which the American Legion is by far the largest, with a membership of more than 3,000,000—who have acted as spokesmen and representatives of ex-servicemen and their dependents. Formal recognition was extended to these groups by congressional enactment in 1936, naming several national organizations, and authorizing the Administrator to add others at his discretion.

"The full-time representatives of these accredited organizations do valuable work in connection with cases that otherwise would have to be done by Veterans' Administration personnel. As intermediary counsel and later as advocate, they save time for the contact officers, the rating boards, and adjudicators.

"Examination of this program indicates that it is sound both in intent and operation. * * * The Veterans' Administration, representing the Government, acts as a judge in determining a veteran's entitlement to benefit. As a claimant he is entitled to the assistance of an advocate fully familiar with the laws governing his rights. This need is met by these accredited representatives of recognized service organizations, who render this aid free of charge and with a minimum of self-interest.

"This policy of recognition offers a corollary benefit to the Veterans' Administration as well as to the veterans themselves. The close working of its personnel with well-informed but independent groups serves to provide a source of constructive criticism of procedures, rulings, and possibly activities that is most wholesome. Service organizations through their executive offices in Washington and elsewhere maintain a vigilant watch over its activities and are not hesitant to express pertinent comment when it seems desirable. A number of the service organizations contribute materially to the operation of veterans affairs by appearing by invitation before congressional committees. They either advocate or oppose proposed measures and thus permit examination by the public as to the merit of such proposals."

Thus the Trundle firm, in its report, lauded the American Legion and other veterans' organizations for the priceless service rendered by their rehabilitation experts to the Veterans' Administration.

Would the United Medical Association, the Department of the Interior, the Veterans Insurance Corporation, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Veterans' Administration all continue to utilize most beneficially this invaluable service?

Or would the taxpayer be saddled with the cost of such service?

We have mentioned the five bureaus into which it is suggested we experiment with veteran affairs, now handled efficiently by one established agency. Then what would we have?

The Hoover Commission proposes that the hospital care and medical treatment presently available to veterans, under the direction of the Veterans' Administration, be taken over by a new colossal Federal agency. It is to be known as the United Medical Administration and contains a cruel joker.

This experimental bureau would not render service exclusively to veterans.

Instead of the wise and efficient course demonstrated by the Veterans' Administration through the years, the new agency would administer hospital care also for the merchant mariner, civil-service employee, Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps personnel and their dependents. This is definitely the beginning of an attempt to divorce the veteran from his identity as a veteran.

That's how this one change would affect the veteran. Now how will it affect you and me as taxpayers.

The creation of any new governmental agency, such as the proposed United Medical Association, inevitably would mean the creation of thousands of new jobs.

It would mean the training of many inexperienced new officials. This would require both time and money.

It would involve many duplicating functions, such as existed in the dark 1920's, with faint hope that any good would result.

In such a program there can be no economy.

Veterans, active servicemen, merchant mariners, civil-service and other Government employees are hospitalized under completely disimilar authorizations. A veteran no longer must be accounted for on a morning report, a sick book, a clothing report and a pay record, but for the active serviceman in the United Medical Administration hospital all these records must be accurately kept.

The handling of some five or six classes of patients would make the paper work in United Medical Administration hospitals chaotic.

Such ramifications would not work for economy.

They would be stupendous and costly to the taxpayer.

Of all Government agencies, only one is familiar with the needs of veteran hospital construction and experienced in this highly technical work—the Veterans' Administration. If recommendations of the Hoover Commission were followed, this all-important and specialized work would be transferred to the Department of the Interior.

Veterans' Administration hospitals have been and are being built for less money per cubic foot than those constructed by the Army and Navy and compare favorably with private hospital construction. Certainly the taxpayer could not benefit by the transfer of this work to the Department of the Interior.

The Hoover Commission states that the Insurance Division of the Veterans' Administration is inefficient. Yet, it proposes to correct this alleged inefficiency by creating an additional experimental corporation to handle this tremendous job—a new Veterans' Insurance Corporation.

The Hoover Commission wants to take from the Veterans' Administration the handling of all home loans made possible under the GI bill of rights, which the American Legion fought so tirelessly to enact into law. The Commission would give this part of the Veterans' Administration's responsibility to yet another Federal outfit—the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Commission's failure to make mention of administration of farm and business loans remain unexplained. The natural inference is that additional complications may result from a further division of veteran loans into still other agencies.

Should the recommendations of the Hoover Commission be adopted, there would remain in the hollow shell of the Veterans' Administration only a relatively small part of its present services, including:

A Veterans' Benefit Service, charged with administration of pensions, retirement benefits, disability compensation, and guardianships.

A Readjustment Service, to administer the vocational rehabilitation, education, and readjustment allowance programs, as well as the certification of veterans for loan guaranties.

The Office of Legislation would be consolidated with that of the General Counsel.

If such an emasculation should conceivably be adopted by the Congress, the pushing around plight of our veterans in 1920 would be only a circumstance to the bewildering chaos into which our veterans of today and tomorrow would again be plunged.

The American Legion will fight to the last ditch to prevent a recurrence of the infamous Economy Act of 1933. That part of the Hoover report dealing with veterans proposes to repeat the Economy Act on an even greater scale. It would divorce all veterans from their identity as veterans, dismember the Veterans' Administration, take their hospitals from bed-ridden veterans, deprive all veterans of preference in Government employment, leave the 19,000,000 veterans of the Nation without a unified service agency, and all centralized Government responsibility for the welfare and rights of veterans, and leave the dependents of those who fell in battle at the mercy of bureaucratic red tape.

The American Legion contends that the cost of rehabilitating the human wreckage of war is as much a part of the cost of waging war as is the building of battleships, tanks, planes, and guns. Those weapons are paid for in cash on the barrel head. The Government leans over backward to see that every wartime contractor gets a square deal. But the human costs of war are put on the cuff. They constitute a sacred obligation of the Nation. This debt cannot be honorably discounted or evaded by simply writing it off as a so-called economy measure.

A so-called economy measure that cannot conceivably mean economy.

How many of you recall the plight of our veterans immediately following World War I?

Back in 1920 the American Legion discovered that the veteran was far from receiving the services a grateful American people had voted for him. Then a labyrinth of agencies was going through the motions of trying to serve the veteran. The result was overlapping, inefficiencies, and tremendous expense. For his various rights the veteran was pushed around from the Pension Bureau to the Public Health Service, to the War Risk Insurance Corporation, to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, and back again.

Because of this chaos, President Harding appointed a committee of 10 prominent Americans to study this deplorable situation and recommend action. This committee, headed by Brig. Gen. Charles G. Dawes, himself later Vice President of the United States, recommended that all services to veterans be placed in one agency. From this report came the Veterans' Bureau, established by law in 1921. The Dawes committee said in part:

"It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the present deplorable failure on the part of the Government to properly care for the disabled veterans is due in large part to an imperfect organization of governmental effort. There is no one in control of the whole situation. Independent agencies by mutual agreement now endeavor to coordinate their action, but in such efforts the joint action is too often modified by minor considerations, and there is always lacking that complete cooperation which is incident to a powerful superimposed authority. No emergency of war itself was greater than is the emergency which confronts the Nation in its duty to care for those disabled in its service and now neglected."

Then, upon the recommendation of President Hoover, came the further consolidation resulting in the creation of the Veterans' Administration in 1930.

Now comes the recommendation by Mr. Hoover's Commission that this great institution, the Veterans' Administration, the magnificent monument to the American Legion and other veterans, be torn limb from limb.

Mr. Hoover's task force must have failed to study, and it certainly failed to heed, the bitter experience of the past. The Hoover recommendation of dismemberment, which would return veteran affairs to the chaotic conditions of 1920, is not consistent with the usual sound thinking of this great American.

Just suppose General Motors was told: "You may retain your administrative functions, but you will have to divorce yourself from the other operations of your corporation. Ford will take over your production. Engineering will go to Studebaker. Your distribution will be conducted by Chrysler. And your sales can be handled by Kaiser-Frazer."

That is substantially what the Hoover Commission recommends so far as the Veterans' Administration is concerned.

In such a situation, could you possibly expect more efficiency, more economy?

As we have tried to make clear, the American Legion does not oppose the Hoover report verbatim.

The America Legion, as much as any other patriotic group, insists upon economy.

But we do maintain and most sincerely trust you will agree that that part of the Hoover report dealing with veteran affairs does not mean economy. It will not reduce taxes.

It means a house divided—five experiments to replace one success.

It means more agencies and more taxes.

And that is what nobody wants.

Budget Pruning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Budget Pruning," published in the Washington Post of February 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGET PRUNING

Section 138 of the Reorganization Act providing for a legislative budget is a dead letter, and should be replaced by a workable substitute providing congressional appropriations committees with the information required to do an intelligent job of budget pruning. The joint congressional committee set up under this act includes all the members of the four appropriating and taxing committees of both Houses. It is handicapped by sheer size. Furthermore, the committee is required to report its estimates of over-all receipts and expenditures, with accompanying recommendations, much too early in the session. Senator McCLELLAN proposes to correct these defects by replacing this unwieldy committee by a small body consisting of five members of the House Committee on Appropriations and an equal number of members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The budget committee's work would be continuous; it would be assisted by an adequate technical staff; and it could call on Government agencies to transmit duplicates of all requests for funds submitted to the Budget Bureau.

This procedure would enable the budget committee to assemble detailed information on all the items contained in the executive budget, and the utilization of such data by the committees on appropriations would speed up legislative processes, now delayed by long and tedious hearings.

As Senator McCLELLAN notes, the need for the services of a really effective legislative budget committee has been accentuated by the decision to combine all appropriation measures in a single bill. For it will be late in the session before the House will act on the omnibus bill, and the Senate Appropriations Committee will have little time to consider it before the end of the fiscal year. However, if both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees were supplied in advance with detailed, up-to-date information on the budget and given time to study the recommendations of the budget committee, an omnibus bill could be disposed of without undue delay.

Wisely, in our opinion, the McClellan bill does not authorize the reconstituted budget committee to report directly to Congress. It would be a strictly service committee, making reports to the appropriations committees and, in some cases, to other standing committees of both Houses. The effectiveness of the plan would depend very largely upon the caliber of the experts employed to assist the budget committee, and on the size of the staff. It would cost a good deal to build up an organization equipped to do a good job of screening executive budgetary requests, but the money spent for such

purposes would undoubtedly yield rich dividends by cutting down wasteful and discouraging excessive expenditures.

There is some danger that the authorization given the budget committees under the bill to examine the records of Government agencies and request them to furnish estimates of their budget requirements might bring it into conflict with the Budget Bureau. However, Senator McCLELLAN stresses the fact that the purpose of the proposed legislation is not to hamper the Budget Bureau, but simply to enable Congress to discharge its responsibility for fiscal policies more intelligently. If Congress keeps that implied admonition in mind, we believe that adoption of the McClellan proposal would result in better working relationships between the legislative and executive branches of Government, which are jointly responsible for the formulation of taxing and spending programs.

The Nation's Capital and the Man Who Planned It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Nation's Capital and the Man Who Planned It," published in the Freedom Fair News, issued by the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission. This being the sesquicentennial of the Capital, I believe the article will be of interest to everyone.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATION'S CAPITAL AND THE MAN WHO PLANNED IT

Few Americans realize that their Nation's Capital, Washington, is the only Capital City in the world that was born out of a wilderness and based on a government that was created on paper before it was created in brick and stone.

This city, which is celebrating its sesquicentennial year as the Nation's Capital, was George Washington's last great legacy to the American people. Today it has become, as Lafayette prophesied in 1824, "the central star of the constellation which enlightens the whole world."

The debate on the permanent Nation's Capital began in the Continental Congress even while the last shots of the American Revolution were still echoing. Definite action was not taken until the year 1787 when a provision was inserted in the new Constitution for a federally controlled District where the permanent Capital of the Nation was to be established.

The design for the new permanent Capital became a pressing consideration immediately after General Washington was inaugurated first President of the United States on April 30, 1789. The residence bill, which located the Nation's Capital on the Potomac, passed the Congress in July 1790. President Washington was thus faced with producing a plan for the new Federal city and he made it clear that the Nation should provide for a magnificent seat of government commensurate with the expected growth of the Nation. In his instructions to the first three Commissioners of the District, President Washington said it should be remembered that, if a city such as Philadelphia, capital of one State, occupied two or three square miles, the Capital of the then 13 States of the Union should require a city of due proportions.

To plan this ideal city, this permanent home of the best Government the world has ever seen, President Washington selected Maj. Pierre L'Enfant, a talented French artist and engineer, who had come across the Atlantic in 1777 to fight for America's independence. L'Enfant had served at Valley Forge and was severely wounded at Savannah. He was known as the Artist of the Revolution.

The fact is, soon after Washington took office, Pierre L'Enfant applied for the task of designing a future permanent Capital of the Nation. In his formal application, L'Enfant said, "The plan should be drawn on such a scale as to leave room for the aggrandizement and embellishment which the increase in the wealth of the Nation will permit it to pursue at any period however remote."

L'Enfant's dream was of a Capital City for a nation of 50 States and 500,000,000 people.

Soon after President Washington had picked the actual site of the future city he and Pierre L'Enfant rode together across the fields and swamps that are now the heart of downtown Washington, and on to the crest of what was then Jenkins Hill, now Capitol Hill. This was March 29, 1791. The next day, March 30, 1791, President Washington met the 19 original landowners, mostly farmers, in a tavern in Georgetown and there made his celebrated agreement by which these farmers turned over their land to the United States for its future permanent Capital.

Quickly, L'Enfant produced his historic plan for the permanent Capital of the Nation, a plan in which he envisioned a city of great parks, spacious circles, broad avenues, beautiful vistas, imposing public monuments and buildings, as well as a thousand and one features that delight the eye of the American people.

L'Enfant was both draftsman and artist. He produced a city plan of great beauty and reality. The plan was approved by both President Washington and Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson. President Washington then directed Major L'Enfant to proceed with the execution of this plan. It was in the execution of his own plan that L'Enfant's artistic temperament collided with the practical views of the first three District Commissioners, a collision that brought his dismissal within 1 year after he had undertaken the task.

Pierre L'Enfant it was who selected Jenkins Hill as the site of the Capitol. He referred to it in these words: "Jenkins Heights stands ready as a pedestal waiting for a superstructure." Pierre L'Enfant it was who selected the site of the President's house, the hallowed mansion, home of our first citizens, which we today know as the White House. Pierre L'Enfant it was who selected the locations of the Capitol and the White House as the focal points of his masterly plan, thereby creating the famous axis of the Nation's Capital. Pierre L'Enfant today lies buried at Arlington, on the brow of the hill just in front of that historic mansion. Above him is a table of white marble on which is carved his original plan for the Nation's Capital.

There is no monument today in the city of Washington to Pierre L'Enfant, and certainly the Sesquicentennial of the Nation's Capital is an opportune time to erect one. However, in 1909, when L'Enfant's remains were taken from an obscure grave in Maryland and brought to lie in state in the Capitol, on his way to Arlington, a great Frenchman, Monsieur Jusserand, the French Ambassador, and a great friend of the American people, voiced the sentiment of the Nation when he said to those assembled: "Major L'Enfant's monument is your beautiful city of Washington."

But L'Enfant's dream has come true. The exquisite development of the Nation's Capital in the last half century is but the unfoldment of what Pierre L'Enfant envisioned way back in 1791. So also has the dream of President Washington come true. Shortly before his death, Washington made this remarkable prophecy: "A century hence, if this country keeps united (and surely it is its policy and interest to do it), will produce, on the banks of the Potomac, a city, though not as large as London, yet of a magnitude inferior to few others in Europe."

Where Are We Going?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Donald R. Richberg at the dinner of the Albany Chamber of Commerce, Albany, Ga., on February 2, 1950:

WHERE ARE WE GOING?

On January 4 the President explained the state of the Union today by predicting that 50 years from now, in A. D. 2000, national production would be about $1,000,000,000,000 and "the real income of the average family would be about three times what it is today." This was an extraordinary flight of fancy even in a political manifesto.

The President cheerfully omitted any reference to the gloomy fact that 10 years ago, in peacetime, the average family was taxed only one-fourteenth of its income by the National Government, but today, in peacetime, it is paying one-fifth of its income for national taxes and one-fourth of its income for the total of State, local, and national taxes.

He also cheerfully avoided any estimate of the increased taxes which would be required in the coming years to pay for the prodigal spending which he recommended. But, it is quite evident that long before A. D. 2000 an unreformed, prodigal, parental government will be taxing away the greater part of every man's income, and spending it for the declaimed purpose of doing him good. Indeed, the submissive citizen can be quite sure that, in doing a lot for him and to him—and all at his expense—the tax-eaters of Washington will, in common language, really "do him good."

The prognostication of the President somehow reminded me of the boy who learned his figures quicker than his alphabet. After a few weeks in school he reported his progress to his mother in these words: "Ma, when I comes to a crossroad sign, I can always tell how far, but I can't ever tell where to."

It's easy today to prophesy how far we are going, if we keep on going at our present pace. But, where we are going is a much harder question.

Our industrial progress is terrific. Every year we make more and more machines to give more and more people more and more leisure to enjoy life less and less.

Our financial progress is amazing. Every year we make more and more dollars for more and more people to spend in buying less and less for a dollar.

Our political progress is wonderful. Every year we enact more and more laws to restrict the freedom of businessmen, in order to preserve free enterprise. We socialize

more and more industries in order to avoid socialism. We write more and more laws to equalize the spendthrift and the thrifty, the incompetent and the skillful, the dullard and the wise man, in order to save ourselves from communistic equalizers. We promote more and more monopolies by labor managers in order to protect ourselves from monopolies by business managers. We authorize more and more tyrannical regulation by a remote National Government, in order to escape from the lesser evils of more lenient regulation by neighborly local governments.

In a word, we create more and more instruments of despotic power to rule our lives, for the proclaimed purpose of setting us free from the risks and burdens of a self-reliant, democratic control of our own lives and fortunes. We have made amazing progress in a few years in transforming the United States of America into the "Benighted States of Demagogia."

Of course this political progress has been made possible by a great intellectual advance. In the early days of our Republic, we were essentially a humble, God-fearing people. Confessing our ignorance of the great design of human existence, we believed that it was the simple obligation of every man to work hard for a livelihood which would permit him to take care of himself and his dependents, and to develop a personal security against the inevitable hardships and misfortunes of living.

In this spirit men and women of many races and creeds found the ways and means to work together for individual and common gains, with such success that the most powerful and prosperous nation ever known was built up by the mighty energies of a free people. Not only the material power but also the intellectual power of the American people steadily increased. The level of ordinary education and higher education rose rapidly under universal encouragement of schools which were open to all who had the capacity and patient determination to deepen their minds and improve their ability to realize their ambitions.

The scientist, the inventor and the philosopher became honored even more than the managers of business and finance. Our respect for learning grew so great that millions of people began to feel that a political or economic creed, founded upon the dogmas of the learned, was of greater importance than a religious creed founded upon a faith which could not be proved by a test tube or by a heavy volume of statistical facts.

Millions of people lost sight of the elemental ignorance of great scientists. They did not realize that the masters of electrical science did not even know what electricity was. They did not realize that the mystery of the atom remained a mystery, even after the atomic scientists split the atom. They did not realize that consciousness, the supreme fact of life, was still a mystery to the greatest of biologists—or philosophers.

One of the outstanding modern scientists, Dr. Robert A. Millikan, wrote 20 years ago that "fullness of knowledge always and necessarily means some understanding of the depths of our ignorance."

He also wrote down his judgment that "if the influence of American churches in the furtherance of socially wholesome and forward-looking movements, in the spread of conscientious and unselfish living of all sorts, were to be eliminated, our democracy would in a few years become so corrupt that it could not endure."

Unhappily there have been many lesser scientists, and a multitude of those who have assumed to assert a small or large intellectual leadership, who have not retained the humility appropriate to their fundamental ignorance. We see great numbers of fanatic reformers and noisy politicians who are now undertaking to play God and to hurl the lightning of political compulsion against all who will not submit to laws written to enforce their concepts of morality.

A man-made government may wisely and safely establish rules to maintain an orderly society which will provide security for the individual from violence, theft and fraud. Only in such security can men and women enjoy the benefits of community life, and work together in enterprises of common gain. Government also offers a practical means through which the more capable or more fortunate members of society can fulfill their humane obligations to alleviate the sorrows of their less capable or more unfortunate neighbors.

But this does not prove that government offers a desirable or practical means of guaranteeing economic security to all persons within its domain. On the contrary, let the free man go on guard whenever government moves into any project of restricting individual freedom of action for the purpose of creating a pattern of living or working which is supposed to be for the benefit of society as a whole, or for the purpose of redistributing the rewards of labor, or determining where and when and under what conditions men shall or shall not be permitted to work, individually or in cooperative enterprises.

Let the free man, and his would-be guide or master, remember that the dominant characteristics of human beings, have persisted for thousands and thousands of years during the long slow rise of man from the jungles into the refinements and complexities of modern civilization. Among these are self-preservation, love of liberty, individuality in likes and dislikes and ambitions, a customary energy in free labor and a customary apathy in compulsory labor.

These enduring characteristics of human nature are not going to be changed by law. Men and women, forced into a planned economy, regimented into socialized industries, will not remain the docile servants of a fictitious master called the State. They will soon learn that their real master is a human being, a political tyrant who is trying to usurp the throne of the God who created them—who created them free.

Why do we seem to be going in the direction of national socialism, which is just a way-station on the road to communism? Why are millions of unhappy people in many lands subject to a communistic tyranny? Why is the shadow of such tyranny spreading over other lands? Why do notable political leaders in our own prosperous land dare to advocate more and more socialism for our free people?

The answer to this last question is that too many of our intellectuals, and too many of their swarming pupils, have inflated themselves in two or three generations from the humility of conscious ignorance to the arrogance of half-educated egotism.

They have not learned enough to know how ignorant they still are. They have not retained the humility of a truly learned man. They have learned just enough to discard childish fears of a finite God, but not enough to gain a mature devotion to the infinite God. They have not learned enough to know that, although their animal eyes will never see God, He is visible through the eyes of a faithful soul. They have not learned enough to know that there are divine laws that overrule all human laws; and that, when God created a world of free men and women, the divine law of self-preservation was established, not a law that human life must be preserved, but that human freedom must be preserved, even at the cost of human life.

You must forgive me for preaching this short sermon, but I am convinced that, whether we are going to make America eventually a heaven or a hell on earth, depends upon whether we continue to pursue happiness as free men and women, which appears to be the divine plan, or whether we shift to a socialistic slavery, planned by half-educated politicians and godless fanatics.

One of the essential steps in persuading a free people to accept the rule of Socialists is to establish the moral conviction that all men are created equal (which is a biological falsehood) and that in a democracy they should enjoy economic and social equality, although the fundamental virtue of a free and democratic society is that it offers the opportunity to enjoy a better living and better associations to those who have better abilities. In truth, the leveling down of citizens to the same income and the same privileges, regardless of the value of their services to others, would destroy all the values, purposes, and objectives of political freedom and democracy.

So the Socialist morality must be based on the assertion and repetitious reassertion of an outright falsehood which is that a Democrat must believe in the equality and equal rights of all human beings. This is supported by another falsehood which is that men are not free unless they are legally free to go where they please, to do what they please, and to associate with whom they please. But even a child can see that every freedom legally granted to one person to do anything means that other people must be denied freedom. If I am free to go into your home, or your place of business, or to use your property in any other way, then your freedom to use your own property as you please is denied. If I am free to force my company upon you, then your freedom to choose your own company is denied.

What the Socialist moralisers are in fact demanding is not equal freedom for all but a special privilege for a favored few to violate the long-accepted freedoms of all the rest of the people. Even as a demand for a special privilege the alleged moral issue is a crafty fraud because no one will be really free in a state of national socialism. The use of moral slogans to accomplish an immoral end is a favorite device of every hypocritical political schemer. A moral purpose is an essential shield for hideous deeds. The lie is an ever-useful weapon of the politician; and the Socialist lies are the seeds of tyranny which bear fruit in vainglorious cruelties of a Mussolini, the inhuman cruelties of a Hitler, the calculated cruelties of a Stalin, and the apologetic cruelties of a Labor government in England—or America.

We can obtain complete social security only in a Government prison. We can attain social equality only in the cold rigidity of death. Neither of these are the avowed goals of our Socialist equalizers, but they are beckoning us to follow them into a national penitentiary and into the death agonies of a free people.

So, let the free man also go on guard the instant the Government undertakes to establish and enforce by law any moral doctrine that has not been sanctioned by the customs and habits of millions of human beings from time immemorial. The cardinal sins have been similarly defined and identified by many races and creeds for thousands of years. The cardinal sinner is a confirmed enemy of society, whom the Government has the right and duty to prosecute and punish.

But the greatest moral precepts ever uttered, which are found in the Sermon on the Mount, cannot be written into law and their observance enforced by a policeman's club. How utterly muddle-headed and wicked are the petty moralists of today who would enact their dubious dogmas of right and wrong into law, and have a Federal police force pound them into the heads of a protesting people, or ram them down their throats with bayonets.

Communists, supported by a host of zealous socialisers, are advocating compulsory Federal laws to compel men to associate in work or play with persons with whom they are

unwilling to work or to play. The Communists would enjoy enforcing such laws, because they thrive on discord and renounce all religious moralities. But, how many of the non-Communist socialists, how many misguided churchmen, for example, would be willing, or would dare personally, to attempt to force other men to employ persons or to associate intimately with persons with whom they are unwilling to associate. The moral right of any free man to choose his companions is so clear, his moral right to a free-will choice, based on reason or whim, based on like or dislike for race, color, or religion, if you please, that moral right is so clear, and the moral wrong of compelling him to accept an offensive association is also so clear, that no one who sincerely believes in human freedom could have the moral courage to face the righteous wrath of a deliberate violator of his oppressive law. No, he would leave law enforcement to men paid to do the dirty work of enforcing this vicious law he made.

This need to employ men to do unto others what you would not do unto them yourself might well be used as a test of the morality of any law. Would you be willing or able to enforce it yourself? Could you face the noble rage of a law violator who was ready to defend at any cost his freedom from your arrogant assumption of a moral dictatorship? Would you dare to try to enforce your law in a community which refused to obey? Or would you order the hired help in brass buttons to do the dirty work for you? A genuine moral leader is usually found facing the guns—not crawling along behind them.

It is particularly difficult to see where we are going today because so many of our misguiders are sincerely trying to achieve good ends by leading us into evil ways. They are trying to help their fellow men by depriving them of the power to help themselves. They are trying to find peace and security by fostering tyrannies that make more wars and greater insecurity inevitable.

They are clamoring for enforcement of what they call the civil rights of minorities, without calling for a corresponding enforcement of the civil obligations of minorities, and with no regard for the necessity of preserving our constitutional protections of the rights and liberties of all the people.

Let me make this misguidance clear by reviewing briefly three major items in the original Communist program that have been adopted by Democratic and Republican politicians.

First, is an anti-poll-tax Federal law. Although payment of taxes by all citizens might well be made a qualification for voting, it can be persuasively argued that it is unfair to deprive only the citizens of a few States of the right to vote unless they pay taxes. However, the Constitution of the United States definitely leaves the right to vote subject to State laws, with only the requirements that the right shall not be denied because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude or because of sex.

It is a far more serious wrong for the Congress to attempt to exercise a power denied to it by the Constitution than for a State to exercise perhaps unfairly a power which it undoubtedly has under the Constitution. As a matter of personal opinion, I think it might be well for every State to enact a law making the right to vote dependent on the filing of a tax return—not on the payment of a tax, but on the making of a tax return. In this way a multitude of tax-dodgers who are now insisting on their right to vote, but evading their obligation to pay taxes, would have the exercise of their civil right made dependent, as it should be, on the fulfillment of their civil obligation to support the government they wish to control. If taxation without representation is tyranny then representation without willingness to pay taxes is also tyranny.

Second, is an antilynching Federal law. No one can morally defend mob rule when there is an orderly, impartial administration of justice provided for the punishment of crimes. But, here again the Constitution definitely leaves authority in the States to prevent and punish all ordinary crimes, and it is an offense of more far-reaching evil consequences for Members of Congress, who are sworn to support the Constitution, to violate the Constitution than for an individual to violate the rights of another individual. To write and enforce a law which you have no authority to make is a form of lawlessness for which there is no emotional excuse.

If there were a widespread campaign against the failure of State governments to enforce their criminal laws, or to protect the victims of crime, or to protect the rights of those accused of crime, we might well consider the wisdom of supplementing State powers with Federal powers in the field of criminal justice. This would, of course, require an amendment to the Federal Constitution.

But, on the contrary, there is not today even a widespread demand to have the National Government exercise the power which it has under the Constitution to prevent and punish crimes that seriously obstruct interstate commerce. The punishment of criminals who, in a labor dispute subject to Federal law, slug and maim and kill their opponents, and often disinterested people, is left to local police who are frequently helpless to resist the numbers of deliberate law breakers who establish mob rule. Only the development of an effective counter mob brings demands for Federal intervention to protect the alleged civil rights of those whose criminal conspiracies are immunized by Federal law.

What justification is offered for an unconstitutional antilynching law? There was one lynching in the entire United States in 1947, according to the Tuskegee records. In that same year there were recorded by the FBI over 7,700 murders and over 17,000 cases of rape in the United States. There were only 6,571 persons arrested for criminal homicide and only 9,742 for rape. Obviously a very large number of murderers and rapists were not apprehended or punished. We know from many newspaper reports and other investigations that a shameful number of the murders were committed by gangsters and other organized criminals. We know from official reports that there were in Detroit 112 murders, in Chicago 309, in New York 333, which are three notorious hotbeds of gangsterism and labor warfare.

Is there a strong demand from the crime-ridden cities of the North for a Federal law to protect the lives of their citizens? There is no such demand. On the contrary we find the Representatives in Congress from these cities and States generally yielding to the demand of pressure groups that they violate their oaths of office and enact a Federal law to prevent and punish mob lawlessness of one kind only, through which only one man in the United States lost his life in 1947. From the graves of 7,700 others murdered in 1947 might well arise an echo of that divine protest: "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are as graves which appear not, and the men who walk over them are not aware of them."

Time will permit me to add only a short comment on the third item on the pseudo liberal program, that is the proposal of a Federal law to undermine the private management of private business. This proposal is piously called a Fair Employment Practice Act. It would grant power to a Federal commission to review every act of every sizable employer in the Nation in order to decide whether in hiring, or firing, or promoting, or otherwise dealing with an employee, or an applicant for work, he had given any consideration to his race, color, or religion.

Under this act, as similar laws have been administered, no employer could exercise his freedom of speech or freedom of the press, or exercise his religious freedom, even to inquire as to the race, color, or religion of applicants for work or of his employees. Under this act Federal bureaucrats could override an employer's judgment as to whom he should hire or promote, on the basis of their opinion as to whether he was influenced by any preference for or against a person because of his race, color, or religion. The employer would be forced to accept this outside, arbitrary judgment, or else engage in an expensive lawsuit—not to vindicate his freedom of choice but to demonstrate that his motives were free from any taint of a politically created immorality. He must demonstrate that he has acted free from the prejudices against or in favor of race, color, or religion which have influenced the opinions of mankind since the dawn of history and still influence the opinions of almost every human being, including the half-educated, intolerant Communists who originally gave birth to this new moral doctrine—and devised the new political program of thought control by forced education.

I get easily wound up on the subject of the viciousness of the FEPC program. I must stop myself before I exhaust both the subject and my audience. So, I will leave you to draw your own conclusions as to your respect for the intelligence, or the loyalty to his oath, of any Member of the Congress who supports such legislation. I fear that if I continued you might apply to me the comment of a man who was told that an ancient clock would run 8 days without winding, and who said: "I wonder how long it would run if it was wound up."

In conclusion let me attempt a brief answer to my question: Where are we going?

Our destination, and our destiny, depend on whether a dominating number of the American people will turn away from the allurements of the devil, who offers to all fear-ridden mortals a mythical world of security and plenty, if they will only surrender to him their God-given love of liberty. That was once the political religion of America, burgeoning out of the reverent faith of Americans in the divine origin and purpose of human life.

Surely a majority of Americans will not join those who are willing to put all their faith in Government, because they have lost faith in themselves. We have not lost faith in ourselves. We have not lost faith in our God—who made us to be free.

Fair Deal Mathematics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, mathematics used to be considered an exact science, and the multiplication table was recognized for years as a fixed pattern of consequences. Comes now the Fair Deal, however, with an endeavor to twist the science of mathematics to suit its own purposes and to justify its political conjectures. Tampering with the

mathematical formula is a very interesting pastime for pundits and professors, but from the standpoint of a man owning a Government bond or trying to finance his old age by a pension program the consequences are both serious and tragic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Magazine of Wall Street which deals with the intriguing subject of Fair Deal mathematics.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO TIMES TWO EQUAL SIX

(By Vermont Royster)

The economic experts of the new school are promulgating a new kind of arithmetic in which things equal to the same things aren't equal to each other. It's already being used in arguments to prove that inflation won't rob the people of any benefits from their social security and pension plans.

Inflation, say the modern mathmaticians, will not milk these planned savings programs for financial security because the programs can be enlarged and expanded to keep pace with the depreciation of the dollar just as wages and prices can adjust themselves to inflated money values.

Even the most liberal economist admits that inflation equals a depreciation in the value of all other forms of dollar savings, as for example, bank deposits. But the Government's security programs and the new industrial pension plans are to escape this ersty hile inflexible rule by the abracadabra of the new arithmetic.

This advance in mathematics comes as a great boon to the planners, who have long advocated inflation as a means of raising dollar wages. Now they have an argument, to allay fears that inflation will rob the worker of his retirement savings funds.

The new view can be discerned in President Truman's economic message to Congress. There he forecast a steadily rising wage-price level (a $12,000 annual average wage) implemented by Government spending; he also simultaneously praised the growth of social-security programs, public and private, which he said were thrift-wise preparations for our old age. There was no suggestion in his message that the one development might adversely affect the other.

There was much more than a hint of the new logic in the report of the Council of Economic Advisers, which endorsed inflation so long as it does not proceed too rapidly. And this philosophy is explicit in the economic programs of the labor unions.

The arithmetic of the argument takes many forms. One of the simplest runs as follows:

A company establishes a pension plan. Let us say that this year it sets aside $100 for employee Smith's retirement 25 or 30 years hence. Now if next year it develops that the dollar's purchasing power has depreciated, the plan is inflated too. If the dollar's depreciation is about 10 percent, the union will demand—and get—$110 put in his pension account that year. The third year this is again increased by whatever is necessary to match the decrease in the dollar's buying power.

Naturally the number of dollars in the pension Mr. Smith is to draw on that happy future day is likewise increased. And so on, and on.

Now how is inflation going to hurt him? As the years roll by he will pay more dollars for his butter and eggs, but he will also find more dollars in his pay envelope. And even his enforced savings in the pension plan are going to be safeguarded by this expansible economics.

It is a neat and plausible argument, and it is obviously politically effective since people seem to be accepting both inflation and the pension plans without much cavil.

Of course what is lost sight of in this little logical progression is what will happen during this inflation to the $100 Mr. Smith has now, in 1950, to his credit. With inflation that $100 is as hard to keep track of as the evanescent queen in the old game of three-card monte.

To see what will happen to that $100, look back at the hours it took the average worker to earn $100 in 1940. Consider the quantity of food and clothes and other goods he had to do without to set it aside. And consider now what he could buy with it if he were drawing on it for retirement income. The deferred payment for his 1940 labor has been sliced in half.

The same thing will happen to Mr. Smith's pension plan if inflation continues. This year he has $100 of savings put aside. Whether he pays it directly or whether his employer contributes it doesn't alter the fact that it is his kitty for the future. That $100 represents a measurable quantity of wealth; today it's equivalent to about 50 bushels of wheat. Those dollars are to Smith the personal equivalent of food stored away for the day he can no longer toil.

Now, it is quite true that as inflation comes his escalating pension plan will credit him with more dollars in succeeding years. In the above example he would get $110 in 1951, and if everything were properly adjusted to the new price level this would again let him save the equivalent of 50 bushels of wheat. He seems to be keeping up with inflation.

But, in the meantime, what has happened to his little hoard put away in 1950? It is still $100, but that $100 is no longer the equivalent of 50 bushels of wheat. With the cheapening of the dollar by inflation, that sum will buy only about 45 bushels of wheat. Mr. Smith, in 1951, has been robbed of 5 bushels that he had in 1950.

At the end of 2 years without inflation he would have $200 in his retirement fund—the equivalent in goods of 100 bushels of wheat. With inflation and his elastic pension plan, he will, at the end of 2 years, have $210 to his credit. But in terms of goods he has the equivalent of only 95 bushels of wheat—and it's goods, not pieces of paper, he needs to live on when he retires.

And so it goes. Further inflation in 1952 robs the 1950 kitty further. It also robs the 1951 investment. Each succeeding year quietly steals from all the hopes of each preceding year.

Until recently no one denied this. It was too obvious that inflation robbed savings. Politicians who advocated inflation and economists who justified it simply ignored the fact, arguing that at worst it only robbed the well-to-do. Indeed, inflation was oftentimes urged precisely because it robbed a minority of savers for the benefit of a majority of nonsavers.

Now, it has become necessary to alter the argument. With the growth of pension plans, union welfare funds, and Government social security, it would not longer do politically to urge inflation through deficit financing and to concede still that it would rob the people's savings, and so the new arithmetic.

Henceforth the pedagogs of the new school will have to teach that inflation is a means of dividing the value of money savings—except where those savings are in a Government or union pension plan. In that case a different set of rules will be taught. Then inflation will be called a means of multiplying the worker's thrifty hoard against a rainy day.

The Point 4 Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS ON IMPORTANCE OF THE POINT 4 PROPOSAL BY J. T. SANDERS, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL, THE NATIONAL GRANGE, JANUARY 12, 1950

Point 4 involves one of the most important national problems our Nation was be called on to consider during the current postwar period. It involves the question of whether or not we will fit our position wisely and soundly into the present troubled world.

The point 4 proposal is a part and parcel, a continuation of our effort to adjust ourselves into the new world which began with UNRRA, then moved over into our efforts to supplant a failing UNRRA by the ECA. We now realize that ECA was a transitional agency that merely took over where UNRRA was rapidly failing, and now as we pass the midpoint of the contemplated life of ECA we are faced with the realization also that with the second try we have not set our feet as a nation on the path that leads to the proper assumption of our inevitable position as the world's wealthiest, most productive, most admired, and most feared nation.

Until we realize that we occupy this position in the world, and that it cries mightily for a quick, long-time adjustment to a position of real world leadership, we fear that we will continue to grope through other temporary UNRRA's and ECA's, and thus fail to move directly and surely into a better world. Both UNRRA and ECA were great and serviceable agents and undoubtedly led us toward a better world; but as a worker in UNRRA it is my judgment that it lacked both the means and the will to move from a position as a relief agency to a permanent international policy agency, while ECA lacks the former.

As we view the point 4 proposal, and if it is to become truly an instrument of long-time value in solving the world's present economic difficulties and uncertainties, we must be guided by what seems to us the main objectives we as a nation seek. The objectives appear to us to be as follows:

(a) Our immediate and urgent objective is to close the five to six billion gap in our export-import balance and to stop at the earliest possible moment wholesale international charity, that has been just as necessary for us as for the recipients.

(b) Another and dominant objective, it seems to me, is for our Nation to assume a sensible, sound, and inevitable position as the world's main investor nation, and thus to help us in the coming intermediate years to balance and help stabilize the world's exchange situation.

(c) To develop and conserve presently wasted natural and human resources, and thus expand the economy of other nations, and, with their expansion, expand our own economy.

(d) To create a sound, economic base for a peaceful world.

(e) To strengthen the UN as an instrument of world government and hence world peace.

It will be noted that I have not listed humanitarian aims as one of our motives. This does not mean that we think that this

is not, and should not be, one of the all-pervading motives we have in helping to set up and taking the necessary initiative in setting up a sound point 4 program. But the less this can be said to be one of our direct aims, the more practical it seems to me will be our approach. What the world is seeking earnestly, what we should strive for, is an abandonment of unbelievable charity at the earliest time.

This point 4 proposition must be approached with the maximum realism. This Nation must of necessity be even a greater proportionate financial contributor to a world-wide or international point 4 program than we were with UNRRA—over two-thirds of all its financial support. The main difference is that UNRRA was a one-way street; point 4 must truly be mutually profitable to the suppliers of financial support and to the recipients. As long as we believe implicitly in the superiority of the capitalistic system and in democracy, practical politics tells us that point 4 cannot be set up so as to stimulate the growth of a totalitarian economy in any country. That, to my way of thinking, was the basic reason the United States abandoned support of UNRRA. Yet any point 4 program will miserably fail if it incorporates means whereby investing nations can aid or interfere with the liberty and freedom of the recipient nations.

The faith of the National Grange in the point 4 program rests mainly on our belief in the fundamental soundness and the ultimate triumph in the world of the principles incorporated in the Grange Golden Rule as follows:

1. All prosperity springs from the production of wealth; or anything which retards the production of wealth is unsound.

2. The compensation of each should be based on what he contributes to the general welfare.

3. The prime purpose of government is to protect its citizens from aggression—both physical and economic.

We as a farm organization are deeply interested in the development of an internationally and nationally sound point 4 program. We know that the underdeveloped nature of the nations which a point 4 program will directly help, is due to an unsound balance between their agriculture and their nonagricultural industry. A rough estimate of the occupational distribution in these countries would probably be 80-percent agricultural and 20-percent nonagricultural—the opposite of the situation in our country. Essentially, therefore, a sound point 4 program would work constantly toward a shift from agriculture to industry, and this is indeed a slow, long-time laborious task.

We also cannot support any point 4 proposal that does not coordinate integrally with and enhance the functions of the UN. Our official pronouncement on this score is forceful and unmistakable as follows:

"We are convinced that our policy should be one of wholehearted support of the United Nations and that we should do everything in our power to build it and strengthen it as an instrument of peace. A strengthened United Nations undoubtedly should provide a legislative body to enact laws related to world peace, with some practical and equitable system of weighted representation, a world court to interpret the law, and a world police force to enforce it."

In view of our emphasis on production as the basis of a peaceful world we favor the approach to increased world production, both agricultural and industrial, which is contemplated as the goal of point 4. We feel that the bill, H. R. 5615, represents a farsighted step toward the exercise of United States leadership in improving the productive resources and the conditions of life and labor for those vast populations of the world now far below the standard of economic life which our modern technology can make possible.

The implications of the point 4 program are great. The Grange is not expert in all phases of the contemplated program. But we have studied the two bills before your committee, and studied the official explanations of the program made available to us. We would like to set forth certain general, basic principles which we feel should guide the Congress in writing the point 4 concept into law. These principles are:

1. Since we favor maximum use of the UN, we believe that through the point 4 program nations must act in concert for common ends in the present world, where even a powerful nation as the United States cannot afford to stand alone. If we support the principle of cooperative action with other nations, we must do everything possible to effectuate that principle. Having set up the UN, we must use it so that it can mature in capacity and effectiveness as a world government and consequently as an agency of world peace.

2. Even though we know that our motives toward the under-developed areas are not those of the exploiter, we must realize that real fears of this exist—and can be fanned into flame—against the United States and her alleged imperialist schemes. The way to counteract this is to retain our program as it is contemplated in the Kee bill, but to lean over backwards in our every word and deed to make our intentions incapable of misinterpretation. Use of the UN is one of the best ways we can show our genuine intent to give assistance, not dictation.

3. We must not forget that other countries have technical resources which will be as valuable to under-developed areas as is our technology. Especially can better pooling of technical assistance be achieved through UN, and channelling the major part of the technical-assistance program through UN will also insure that other countries contribute their share of costs. Therefore we approve of the plans laid out in the Kee bill for providing a broad technical-assistance program through which the scientific advances of the industrialized nations can be shared with nonindustrialized areas whose methods of producing the necessities of life are still at a relatively primitive level.

4. It is important to recognize, however, that method must be supplemented with financial aid or investments if productive capacity is to be measurably increased. It is highly desirable that one phase of the technical assistance offered to under-developed areas be that of fiscal advice to the governments, so that every possible step can be pointed out to them for channelling their own available wealth into productive investment. Further, it is apparent that a substantial flow of foreign investment must be directed to these areas. It is hoped that additional study will be given by the United States Government to determining how best to stimulate private investment. It may be that a considerable volume of public investment is needed in the initial stages of a region's economic development, especially in the matter of development of such natural resources as water power, before the area will attract equity capital. We are not prepared to make recommendations on this question, but we do feel strongly that the program should not be limited to technical assistance. Technical assistance is an ingredient in economic development, but technical assistance alone cannot yield the results we want from this program. Intensive study should be given to ways of insuring that economically under-developed areas increasingly gain access to domestic or foreign sources of investment capital.

5. Since United States help to under-developed areas is a program which should involve all segments of the Nation's economy, it appears that an advisory board should be established by law, composed of representatives of agriculture, business, labor, and the professions. This board should be a real advisory body to the administrator, and should be composed of informed men and women of experience in matters affecting public policy. It would serve the purpose of keeping the program as close to the citizen as possible so that the honest humanitarianism and good practical sense of the average American can be incorporated into the missions of assistance which we send abroad. For the spirit in which this program is undertaken will determine its success as much as anything else.

Is the West Against Itself?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS at Stanford University, California, November 11, 1949:

IS THE WEST AGAINST ITSELF?

I appreciate greatly the opportunity that you are giving me to speak at Stanford University on a question of public policy. Your university is well known throughout the length and breadth of the land as a center for thought and reflection, for investigation and teaching. In creating this occasion you are saying, if I interpret your invitation correctly, that a university may also offer itself, upon appropriate occasion, as a place where the university community may gather with members of the public to hear discussion of great public questions—even by a person who is active in the political life of the State. I appreciate this occasion and I respect its high character.

Your institution has been playing a role in the life of the West, now for some 60 years. In those two generations you have identified yourselves as contributors to its cultural and material growth. It has seemed proper to me, therefore, that I have chosen the West itself, as my topic of the evening. I should like to tell you some of my thoughts about the West—its past and its future, but especially its future. Also I want to tell you some of the questions that come into my mind as I contemplate the programs and forces that are shaping our future. They are serious questions, they demand answers, and I ask your help in finding the right answers.

Last May a great Californian was asking Congress a question, "Is the West against itself?"

A few weeks after he asked it Richard J. Welch, of San Francisco, died, leaving the question behind him to be answered.

Dick Welch's long consistent fight to develop western waters will place him, in the history of Congress, among the men who for a hundred years have understood how to realize the full benefits from our land and water resources, for all the people. His name will stand alongside the defenders of the Homestead Act—Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee; Galusha Grow, of Pennsylvania; George Julian, of Indiana—and beside those

Members who fought, or are now fighting, in defense of reclamation—Newlands of Nevada; Hansbrough of North Dakota; Mondell of Wyoming; Norris of Nebraska; Hayden and Murdock of Arizona; Murray of Montana—and others with a similar sense of the future.

There are men in Congress, today as always, who do not see the need of solving problems until the problems press so hard that all can see them; they are the men who arrive after the house has caught fire.

Then there are those others—the Norrises and the Welches—who look ahead, seeking to prevent the social and economic tragedies that men of the first type recognize only after they run into them face to face.

There are still others who are indifferent, and there are some who, for one reason or another, create obstructions.

Dick Welch is remembered now by the people of San Francisco with affection. He will be remembered in the years to come by the people of the entire West with gratitude and respect.

Is the West against itself?

Dick Welch asked this question on May 4. He was defending the unity of Central Valley development against those others who, for reasons of their own, were willing to see it destroyed on the American River.

Is the West against itself?

It is a seaching question and a fair one.

Fifty years ago the West was not divided against itself. Western men were united by a common purpose. They wanted fuller development of western waters. They wanted actual settlers to get the water so they could make homes on the land. They wanted them to get the water without having to pay anything to speculators. They wanted no monopoly.

In 1891 western citizens began to meet annually, first in one city then in another, to see how the costs of what they wanted could be met. They examined very possibility and came to an agreement. They agreed that if left to private corporations alone, only the less expensive river diversions would be made, because corporations could not afford the costs of the great reservoirs that are the backbone of full development. They agreed—and the records of Congress are explicit on this point—that even if, like the railroads, corporations were to receive great blocks of land out of which to recoup themselves, they did not want the monopoly and speculation in water and land that that method would create. They agreed, somewhat reluctantly, that the States were not able to pay the costs. They agreed that the Federal Government alone could finance this job.

It was necessary to convince the Federal taxpayers, most of them in the East, that they ought to help the West to develop. A formula fair to all had to be found. It was found, and in 1902 Congress wrote it into the statutes, and called it the national reclamation law.

By its terms the beneficiaries were to repay the capital cost of irrigation in installments spread over many years. The Federal Government would grant the money interest-free, a simple formula that cut the cost to irrigators to less than half. Since 1902 still other ways to increase the amount of Federal assistance to western irrigators have been added to the law.

When the reclamation bill was in debate prior to passage, the representatives of the entire country, West and East alike, agreed that the expenditure of public money could not be justified if it was to result in private monopolies of water.

So they wrote into the law, with care and pride, a provision that if any private lands should receive the benefits of reclamation law no individual landholders could receive more water than sufficient for 160 acres. Remember that no landholder was obliged to ask for the benefits of reclamation law, but if he chose to do so, he had to comply with its terms. As a citizen he could not receive more than this—his share.

The congressional delegations of all the Western States were solid in their support of the reclamation bill. When President Theodore Roosevelt signed it on June 17, 1902, it became law.

I am telling you about a great episode in western history. Sometimes I think there are those who would like us to forget it, or at least to forget the part of it that records a determination that western waters developed by public money shall not be turned to the uses of monopoly. A determination that our society shall be molded in forms that benefit the many, not the few.

I think there are those who would like us to forget that in 1902 Theodore Roosevelt said the purpose of reclamation is to make homes on the land.

I think there are some who would like us to forget the western Congressman who said: "The policy of the Government is—not to encourage the prosecution of agriculture by large corporations."

Sometimes I think that in these days when corporations and individuals with tracts of 1,000, 5,000, 10,000, and more acres wait hopefully to have their great holdings watered and their land values increased at public expense, there are some who would like to have us forget Thomas Jefferson.

Thomas Jefferson knew what makes a good society and a just one. In 1776 he brought before the legislature of the colony of Virginia his famous bill to abolish entailed estates. "In the earlier times of the colony," he said, "when lands were to be had for little or nothing, some provident individuals procured large grants; * * * desirous of founding great families for themselves. * * * the transmission of this property from generation to generation in the same name, raised up a distinct set of families * * * privileged by law in the perpetuation of their wealth, (and) thus formed into a patrician order * * * to annul this privilege, and instead of an aristocracy of wealth, more harm and danger than benefit to society, to make an opening for the aristocracy of virtue and talent, which nature has wisely provided for in the direction of the interests of society, and scattered with equal hand through all its conditions, was deemed essential to a well-ordered Republic." The colonial legislature deliberated, then under the leadership of Jefferson struck down the legal device of entail by which large landed estates then were perpetuated. Primogeniture went out the same way, and Americans of a former day felt secure that monopoly of the land, and of the power over the lives of other men which it confers, never would survive in America.

There are men today who seek repeal of the 160-acre water limitation. Whether these men understand that by doing so they are strengthening the pillars of monopoly and weakening the supports of democracy, I do not know. But I have faith that the people can understand.

No one had to ask the question in 1902: Is the West against itself? For the West knew its own best interest, and no voice from within was raised against it.

This is the centennial year of our State. We are telling again the old story that gold was the cornerstone of California. True, when this State was not yet 10 years old. The 1850's had not run their course, however, before man were saying that gold was only one of our resources. They had already turned to the rivers in the foothills to bring water to the land.

Today we have a new technology they did not have. We can use the power of the falling waters to create industries and jobs as well as to irrigate the land.

The future of California depends on how we use our natural resources—our forests and soils, our oil and natural gas, but above all our water.

Water is the perpetual self-renewing resource. By its proper use we can turn the deserts into farms, and make electric power—like food and fiber—into a crop that will spring into life anew each year with the rhythm of the seasons.

Our generation has this chance—to lay a foundation for the perpetual sustenance and well-being of the generations to follow. That is why the use of water is the highest issue of public policy within our Commonwealth today.

When Dick Welch asked the question, "Is the West against itself?" He was asking whether the people understood the foundation of their own future.

I, for one, believe that if Californians do understand it, they will not work against themselves. They will defend their heritage and protect their future.

This evening I want to discuss the Central Valley.

When I speak of Central Valley I am talking about a vast valley that stretches from Mount Shasta in the north to the Tehachapis in the south. From the crest of the Sierra on the east to the hills of the coast range on the west—one-third of California. I am talking about an area as large as the State of Massachusetts, the State of Connecticut, the State of Rhode Island, and one-half the State of New Jersey.

I am talking about a project in that valley that will extend over the next 50 years. I am talking about a project in which the ultimate Federal investment will be perhaps three times the Federal investment in the Tennessee Valley.

The President of the United States recently authorized the Secretary of the Interior to transmit a report to Congress on full development of the Central Valley Basin. Congress has received the report. It is being printed now. I suggest that you obtain a copy when you can, and study it.

This Central Valley Basin report proposes a unified system under reclamation of 38 major reservoirs, 3 enormous pumping plants, 15 major canals covering almost 1,500 miles, together with thousands of miles of laterals and drains, 26 hydroelectric power plants, supplementary steam plants, and power transmission lines to carry the power generated at the dams to the giant pumps that form links in the canal systems, as well as to factories in the cities, to the irrigation pumps and milking machines on the farms, and to homes everywhere.

It proposes to protect 360,000 acres in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta from the intrusion of salt from San Francisco Bay. It provides for bird refuges, for fish ladders and hatcheries, and for recreation on a chain of lakes within easy reach of the floor of the valley.

Construction started on the first part of this great program in 1935. More than $300,000,000 has been spent on Shasta, Keswick, and Friant Dams, on the Delta cross-channel, Delta-Mendota and Friant-Kern canals, and on power generators, transmission lines, and pumping machinery. This construction could not have begun until men conceived and accepted the idea that the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys are parts of the same watershed that man can make into an effective unit.

Nature has distributed water and land unevenly in the Central Valley—about two-thirds of the water in the Sacramento, and about two-thirds of the irrigable land in the San Joaquin. The present construction will impound most of the floodwaters of the San

Joaquin River behind Friant Dam, then release them north to thirsty land through Madera canal, and south for 150 miles through the Friant-Kern.

The flow of the San Joaquin River, diverted in this way from its natural course, will be replaced and augmented by water from the Sacramento River, carried through channels across the delta, hoisted 200 feet up, through huge steel and concrete tubes, by a battery of pumps, then let flow for 120 miles, down a concrete-lined canal that slopes gently—to Mendota where it will refill the channel of the San Joaquin and replace the waters diverted above at Friant Dam.

There would be no present project without unity between the Sacramento and San Joaquin. We never will get the fullest possible use of the waters of Central Valley without unity throughout the basin. Without unity we cannot coordinate the various streams within the various parts of the basin.

Flood control demands empty reservoir space at some seasons. Irrigation requires that as much water as possible be held back in winter, for release months later. Power generation requires that water be released in a flow through the turbines coordinated carefully to the fluctuating power load. These requirements of flood control, irrigation, and power are partly in conflict with each other. Therefore, only the most skilled operation in control of the entire system, can strike the essential balances that will wring the maximum benefit from every drop and snowflake that falls on the 500-mile watershed. California cannot afford to waste one drop.

Yet there are some, who for whatever reasons, have not hesitated to work for the destruction of unity in the Central Valley.

The Central Valley Basin report now in the hands of Congress proposes to make water available for nearly 2,000,000 acres of land now irrigated inadequately, and for about 3,000,000 acres not now irrigated at all. It proposes to generate 8,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity every year. With unity this can be done. Without it, some water will waste to the sea every year, some land needing water that could have it will not get it, and some electricity that might have come work will never be generated.

I suggest, if you want to see this spelled out, that you get from your library a copy of the recent report by the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. Ask for the volume that contains the Task Force Report on Natural Resources, and read the special study that tells part of the price of destroying Central Valley unity on the Kings River.

The program for unified development of the Central Valley Basin is a program to enable our sons and grandsons to employ their skills and ingenuity to the greatest advantage, and to dig their roots deep into the soils that nourish our democracy.

I believe that the people of California will defend and support a fair and full and unified development of water. Why do I believe it? For many established localities, this kind of development is not a theoretical issue. It is a matter of survival.

A few weeks ago the people of Orange Cove celebrated the first bringing of project water to that community and the surrounding farms. Out of a man-made river—the giant Friant-Kern canal—came water to a community where the citrus and olive groves, the vineyards and the truck-farms were threatened because the underground water on which they depended had practically disappeared. On July 10 water came to Orange Cove. It had been carried 45 miles from the man-made lake behind Friant Dam to the people of Orange Cove. Because men have vision water had been stored for the day of use, instead of wasting to the sea. Little wonder the people celebrated.

They could not wait for a permanent distribution system to be built. When water released at Friant, the day before, came to Orange Cove on July 10, 1949 they siphoned it out by all manner of crude but ingenious devices. The Central Valley project was placing a firm foundation under their community. They had signed a water contract with the United States: "Stabilized the community" is the way one of the founders of Orange Cove put it. He proudly gave me a copy of a letter he had sent to the newspaper to express his feelings toward the whole reclamation program. This is what he had to say:

"'Young men dream dreams, old men see visions.' Thirty years ago the Central Valley project was a young man's dream, and for many years remained only a dream, and to this day would have remained so, and a faded dream at that, had it not been for the Bureau of Reclamation, coming to our rescue in transforming these dreams into visions and the visions into vivid reality.

"While the picture of the 30 years ago situation is now happily turned to the wall, it may be impressive to take a parting look at what it 'might have been' had it not been for the saving grace of the Reclamation Bureau and its quota of able men to do the job. We of Orange Cove and other communities of similar situation could be walking down the road with packs on our backs talking to ourselves about 'what it might have been,' instead of the happy event of celebrating the coming of the water."

I think I know how this "young" man of 86 years felt. I stood on a citrus farm in his district that canal water had not yet reached. I watched the farmer's pump suck air instead of water on three strokes out of every four. I saw the withered leaves on his citrus trees and the stunted oranges the size of walnuts.

In another place I met a man who had helped to organize his neighbors into an irrigation district for the purpose of signing a contract for water from the Friant-Kern Canal.

He was in the field picking his last squash of the season. He told me the wells there, too, were being pumped dry. Unless the district can get emergency water, its farmers face the prospect of having to turn wholly to dry farming. He pointed and said, "These fields were once planted in vineyards and orchards. You can see there are only a few left, and there is hardly enough water for them."

The soil was rich. He told me that in his opinion a family could make a good living on 20 acres if they had water.

It may not occur immediately to some that labor and industry and the cities have as big a stake in full water development as these farmers in their fields. But they have. And as recently as last year during the power shortage many laborers and industrialists had good reason to learn it. I have talked with some of them.

Around the bay there are industrial plants that know what it means to curtail operations and even to shut down for lack of power. More than 5,000 factory workers have had to count the dollars cut from their pay checks for the same reason. The State of California found that in 39 factories the average weekly earnings had dropped from $62.04 in February 1948 to $53.17 in March because of power shortages. Every electric clock in northern California ran slow, the entire State went on daylight-saving time, and stayed there in the winter, because power was short. Little children went to school in the dark because power was short.

Some people said power was short because rainfall was short. It was not so much the lack of rain as it was that some men lacked foresight and were willing to retard the public-power building program in Central Valley for their own purposes at the hazard of other men's incomes and other men's earnings and other men's jobs.

That shortage of power in 1948 is a warning of the price this State may have to pay again and again. We need not expect that new industries will be established here unless we face this fact and get ample supplies of low-cost power.

The issue of water and power in our State neither can nor should be kept out of politics. For under our Constitution politics is the arena where the principles to guide public policy are decided upon.

In the highest sense, this issue rises above partisanship.

Its proper solution affects every segment of our population—industry, labor, agriculture, commerce. On its material side it will determine our standard of living in the future. On the cultural side it will go far to determine the quality of our society.

For these reasons the Republican, Richard Welch, could press for the unity of the Central Valley under reclamation law, and the commission of ex-President Hoover could point to the placing of the Army engineers in charge of Pine Flat Dam on the Kings River as a sacrifice of the public interest.

And Democratic Congressman CECIL WHITE can lead the movement to bring the Kings River into the great Central Valley project and introduce legislation to transfer the functions of the Army engineers to the Department of the Interior as recommended by the Hoover Commission.

As a practitioner in politics, I wish to pay tribute to the contributions that universities make to the solution of the problems that I and my colleagues must grapple with. It has not escaped me that the Hoover Commission study of the Kings River was made by a Harvard professor, Arthur A. Maass, and that the most illuminating and objective book on the Central Valley, The Thirsty Land, by Robert de Roos, bears the imprint of Stanford University Press.

I hope that universities generally will support this kind of study and that they will carry their public education even further on great questions. I invite them to investigate, for example, into why some men work for ends that destroy the unity of Central Valley, and inquire, What will be its results?

Why were the Army engineers injected into the vitals of the Central Valley project area on the American and Kings Rivers? What can we expect the results to be of the fact that Congress has not united the American River with Central Valley project, but has left the Kings outside?

When efforts are made from within the legislative branch of Government to control individuals in the executive branch, does it promote or injure good public administration? Does it make the public service more attractive or less attractive to young men choosing their career?

How will it affect the Central Valley and the State of California if Congress should not sustain the 160-acre water limitation?

These are the kind of problems that press, and I assure you that many of us in political life will welcome the results of your investigations.

This is the Armistice Day of World War I, the war men fought, in the words of Woodrow Wilson, "for democracy." In coming to your university this evening, it has been in my thoughts that to discover the truth about the issues I have laid before you and to decide them rightly, will be a real contribution to the perpetuation of the democratic faith for which they—regardless of party, race, or creed—fought through that war to its end.

Address of the National Commander, the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present the address of National Commander George N. Craig before the twenty-seventh annual national rehabilitation conference banquet of the American Legion at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., Monday night, February 6, 1950.

Commander Craig made a most forceful speech, in which he called upon the membership of his organization to fight against the recommendations of the Hoover Commission as they pertain to the Veterans' Administration.

When Commander Craig appeared before our Committee on Veterans' Affairs on January 17, I assured him of my wholehearted opposition to the Hoover Commission VA proposals. On January 31, I spoke at length here upon the matter. I hope every Member will read Commander Craig's address. It follows:

My fellow Americans, I am grateful for this opportunity to discuss with you certain problems that not only face the veterans of this Nation but the general public as well.

All citizens are affected by certain proposals of legislation now pending before the Congress and certain proposed legislation that is being authorized by certain sponsors.

Throughout our 31 years of existence, the American Legion has attempted to preserve in time of peace the principles of Government and human conduct for which we fought in time of war.

Realizing as we do the tremendous cost in health, welfare, and life by which these principles were purchased upon the battlefields and seas, our Nation, based upon a system of free enterprise, has paid heavily for the burden of war. The tools of war were paid for in cash. The human cost of war was charged—charged because amounts could not be calculated and only future events and circumstances could determine the requirements. Because of the human cost of war, veterans' legislation, since the inception of our Nation, has been enacted not with the view of giving to the veteran of wars a bonus or a premium, but with the sole purpose of rendering him more capable of competing in a highly competitive society.

All of the displaced persons are not in Europe. A man or woman who gives valuable years of his or her life, who gives of health, who gives of mind is less able to take his place in society and to maintain a standard of living comparable to that of his fellow who has not been compelled to make these sacrifices and, too, he will die younger. Therefore, a wise Congress, speaking for a grateful people, has from time to time placed upon the statute books certain laws in an attempt to give the veteran equal opportunity.

Marked efforts in this field came succeeding World War I, but our Nation found itself without experience. As a result, much money was wasted and a slight degree of proficiency was achieved. Separate and distinct bureaus and commissions were formed, each attempting to carry out the responsibilities of their office and each failing because of a duplication of effort, because of the lack of central authority, because of the lack of experience in handling such an emergency.

You formed the American Legion to act as counsel to the Government in carrying out rehabilitation. You were most fitted for this purpose because you yourselves had experienced war, you knew at first hand the problems confronting the individual, you knew the toll that war takes in the life of any man who engages in it. You knew of the lessened opportunities, the hardships; you knew what it was to see the fine sentiments borne of our society blunted and blurred in the minds of persons who were required to destroy life so that our Nation, our homes, and our families might remain free; this, even though an individual may be sound of limb and mind.

You knew the great difficulty experienced in the attempt of an individual to reorient himself, to try hard to retake his place in society and to contribute the maximum which is the duty of every law-abiding citizen.

Finally, after bitter experiences, after much suffering and hardship, and 11 years after the cessation of the first war, the Veterans' Administration, at the suggestion of President Hoover, was formed. Here, for the first time, was created a bureau whose responsibility was fixed to carry out its purpose. Here for the first time was unified under one roof and within four walls an agency whose sole purpose was to care for those who had served in war.

To be sure, the Veterans' Administration has not at all times performed without error duties imposed upon it. But basically it has impartially and without political interference performed its intended function. To be sure, its operation is expensive to the taxpayer. Wars are expensive, the care of the disabled veterans of this Nation is still a cost of war.

In 1947, the Congress of the United States thought it wise to inquire into the executive branch of our Government with the view of making a study to determine whether or not economies could be exacted and efficiency improved. Upon the recommendation of the Congress, the President of the United States appointed a Commission to give study and make report. Heading this Commission was the Nation's only living ex-President, Mr. Herbert Hoover, who has a record of public service second to none. His very name rightfully has become a synonym of integrity in Government because of his civic virtues and his unassailable loyalty to American principles.

Four million members of the American Legion and its Auxiliary bear good will, affection, and respect toward him. Would that there were more men of his caliber in our public life.

However, this small Commission could not in itself delve into the details of each department of our executive branch of Government, and so 24 task forces were appointed to serve under the over-all Commission to report to it. And tonight, I wish to speak of that portion of the report that deals with the matter of veteran affairs. In so doing, I do not for one second criticize any other portion of the report. As a matter of fact, the American Legion commends those savings in Government that have been made in the Department of Defense under Secretary Johnson, the unification of the armed forces that has stemmed from the study made by this Commission, and I am confident that within the remaining 13 volumes of information there is much good and many wholesome axioms that would be wise for the American people to follow. After all, the American Legion is for economy in government. It is for the maximum efficiency in the discharge of governmental functions. In the expending of taxpayers' money for the disabled and needy veterans of this Nation, we are more interested than anyone else to see that each tax dollar is devoted to a maximum of service with a minimum of administration burden.

For many months, the veterans' task force deliberated. It met only four doors from our headquarters here in the District of Columbia. On four separate and distinct occasions, four representatives asked the privilege of placing before this group the experience of 31 years gained and upon four separate and distinct occasions they were refused that opportunity. The excuse given was that the task force was not interested in the experience of the past, and it was seeking an objective view devoid of interference.

It is also interesting to note at this point that the Veterans' Committee of the House of Congress was not called upon to give its views and versions, even though it had for 26 years been charged with the responsibility and study of this great social problem.

It was with shock, chagrin, and manifold disappointment that we learned when the report was made it called for the American people to destroy and dismember the handiwork of Government born of time, study, and experience. It was with equal amazement and concern that we learned that there has been formed throughout this Nation a committee of varied interests known as the citizens' committee, subsidized by powerful interests, whose sole purpose was and is to ask the American people to adopt these 19 volumes of reports without consideration or study. They stated then and they state now, either you take the entire package or you are against the recommendations.

Now, we Americans gained proficiency in government by careful consideration of laws and modes of human conduct. We have a free, God-fearing democracy only because we have looked to the experiences of the past and weighed them heavily in our considerations for the future.

The people of the United States don't buy "pigs in a poke," and other nations have disintegrated and vanished because of blind acceptances. So we of the American Legion and its auxiliary, joined by the other veterans' organizations chartered by Congress, ask the American people and their representatives to weigh carefully the facts placed upon the scales of economy and efficiency.

The first dismemberment that the citizens committee would ask you to approve is to take from the Veterans' Administration its medical facilities. Those facilities that have made such great strides in the advancement of medicine, those facilities that have been the recipient of the services of the finest medical minds in the world, those facilities that have made such great progress in curing the minds and health of those of your citizenry who can no longer speak for themselves, and who must rest their case in your hands.

They would place it in the hands of a governmental gargantua known as the United Medical Administration, and combined with it would be military and naval medicine, the medicine of your Federal penitentiary, the medicine of the merchant marine, and with this galaxy of patients, the veteran would be required to stand in line. What chance would he have? There are already 20,000 veterans awaiting beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals. But the proponents of the citizens committee say, "We are not going to destroy the Veterans' Administration." Let us see.

What do they secondly consider? The matter of Government insurance. Do you know what they propose to do with that? In the name of economy and efficiency, they

have decided to form a new Government corporation, a corporation that must of necessity bear administration costs in itself. Our experience has been, and I am confident it is true of all people, that Government corporations are expensive. And so they would divest the Veterans' Administration of this particular function, but they still say, "You will have a Veterans' Administration."

The next matter they consider is the building of hospitals, and who do you suppose they would place this responsibility with? The Department of the Interior—the branch of our executive department that is charged with rivers and harbors, public grazing lands, and reclamation. A department that is, of course, necessary in function, but whose history is replete with political government and pork-barrel raids. And here there would be injected politics in hospital construction, a matter that for some time has been divorced from veterans' affairs. But the citizens committee says, "There will still be a Veterans' Administration."

Next, they consider the matter of loans and guaranty, and do you know what they propose to do with that? Why, bless you, they insist that it be placed with the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Federal housing, if you please. Under the GI bill of rights, loans for the building of homes were obtained from local banks. To be sure, the Government guaranteed repayment, but private capital was given the privilege to invest, and it has to the extent that 1,746,000 veterans have obtained homes by this medium. Only seven-tenths of 1 percent have defaulted, establishing the veterans of your last war as the highest and finest credit risk your Government has, and they want to put it in the class and category of Federal housing. When the GI bill of rights was written, Federal housing did its utmost to obtain jurisdiction over veterans' housing, and I say that the proponents of this recommendation now are more interested in expanding and making larger Federal housing than they are in administering to the needs of their former defenders. But they still say, "You will have a Veterans' Administration."

I imagine the building will still be standing over here on the corner, but I am confident it will be unoccupied.

The Veterans' Administration is granted the right to handle pensions, retirement benefits, disability compensation, and guardianships, but where in the world would the records be? United medical records would have to have some; the insurance corporation would have to have some; Housing and Home Financing would have to have some; the armed forces, of course, must retain some; and by the time a poor claim would have run the gauntlet and passed through the maze of bureaucratic machinery and red tape, the claimant would have either passed to his reward or given up in disgust. All of this in the name of economy and efficiency, in the name of trying to help the veteran.

I indict the authors and proponents of these suggested changes as men without experience in the matter of veterans' affairs. I indict them for asking the American people to not look, to not study, to not consider suggested changes relative to a sacred duty. The American Legion, its auxiliary, and the 16,000,000 persons for whom it may speak indict the paid hirelings of the citizens committee for its attempt to blind this Nation with propaganda composed of half-truths and falsehoods. I am confident in my mind that the majority of the members of the citizens committee is not familiar with the conduct of some of its paid agents. I am confident that the great majority of the committee members wish to see economy in government, wish to see efficiency and desire fervently to see those cared for who can neither care nor speak for themselves.

As I have previously suggested, I am not one who says that the Veterans' Administration is perfect. I am confident in my own mind from the studies made that savings can be effected, administration simplified—matters that should be corrected within the structure. It is an old saying that you need not tear down the house to fix the chimney.

The attack of the American Legion upon legislative suggestions trickling from the report does not lessen our desire to cooperate with all who seek good government. Nor would we for one moment wish that anyone would lessen their action to assist in the passage of such laws because of our attack upon this portion. We, of the American Legion, are only doing what we know to be right and proper.

To combat the noxious propaganda flowing from the heavily subsidized citizens committee, you have but one weapon—the truth.

The truth consists of facts and figures which the American Legion has gathered so that you can meet hostile and misleading propaganda with statements of actual conditions, problems, and needs. This factual information was compiled by our national staffs in Indianapolis and in Washington, by our national rehabilitation, legislation and economic commission, and by a great many well-informed and experienced Legionnaires. To all of them I am very grateful for a fine job.

There is no more loyal task force in the American Legion than that made of the thousands of our department and post service officers. They are the ones who have made the name of the American Legion the greatest name of rehabilitation. They too have rallied to repel this attack upon the welfare of the Nation's veterans. We are proud of our service officers. They exemplify the finest ideals on which the American Legion was created.

We face a tough fight. The American Legion alone cannot defeat these ill-advised proposals of legislation spawned by the citizens committee. But I am confident that when you have carried your message of truth to the American people that they and their representatives will place the stamp of disapproval upon the advocacies of the citizens committee.

The majority leader of the House of Representatives, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, correctly states:

"In its recommendation on veteran affairs, the Hoover Commission failed to recognize that the Veterans' Administration was already set up on the one basis on which veterans' affairs could be handled with the greatest dispatch and the least cost. The lesson of the past is most emphatic that there must be no division of authority in the vast operation of administering the affairs of 19,000,000 veterans. Yet the Commission proposes such a division of authority. It is uneconomic because divided authority means divided responsibility. Divided responsibility means no responsibility.

"If the Hoover proposal to split up the Veterans' Administration into five separate Federal agencies should be adopted, it would wreck the principle of unified service and of single responsibility in the handling of veteran affairs. It would require more time, more labor and more money to administer the affairs of veterans.

"I do not think it is in the interest of the veteran or of economy to divide the Veterans' Administration as presently constituted and in particular to take away from this agency the control and operation of veteran hospitals and transfer them to a new or another agency."

I regret to say that the campaign that has been conducted by the citizens committee has attempted to bring into disrepute the veteran. And while it has only been a few short years since the last shots were fired, which terminated the slaughter of our friends, an attempt is being made to vilify the veteran, to charge him with being a Treasury raider. Why even in the press if a crime is committed it's not a lawyer who committed assault; if he has had service it is as a veteran that he is charged. If civil suit is brought against a person, it isn't a truck driver who is being sued, it is a veteran who is being sued, an attempt to defile the status. For those who did their best in time of emergency, to preserve our Government, I ask the American people in your name, not for special privilege, not for premium, I only ask them for that which is equitable, right, and just. So as we go down through the years together meeting the common problems to us all, each contributing in his own way to carry out the responsibilities and duties of citizenship, working together with all lawful interests, having confidence in ourselves and in one another, believing in America and having faith in divine guidance, we will permanently preserve the principles of America and bring to the world enduring peace.

Unification and Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, while reading the Infantry Journal magazine for February 1950, my attention was directed to an article written by Commodore Dudley W. Knox, United States Navy, entitled "Unification and Integration." My curiosity was aroused. What is an article on naval aviation doing in an Infantry Journal?

The central theme of Commodore Knox's essay is found in the following two quotations:

After World War I, naval aviation pursued a policy of becoming more and more closely integrated with the general body of the Navy until by World War II it was an inseparable part of naval bone, sinew, and flesh.

Army aviation, on the other hand, followed the Army tradition of semi-independent corps and departments until it became a completely separated and independent Air Force.

My own conclusion, after reading this article, is that the Army and the Air Force should bear in mind that unification does not mean jealousy, suspicion, and hostility, but rather a cooperative spirit of sane and sensible men working hand in hand to accomplish a job in the most efficient and proficient manner that is possible.

The article follows:

UNIFICATION AND INTEGRATION

(By Commodore Dudley W. Knox)

Those with the welfare of our country and its armed forces at heart have naturally felt great concern over the constant bickering that has become associated with processes leading toward the unification, now prescribed by law. The admirable degree of harmony that prevailed in wartime seems to have deteriorated and become transformed into a predatory spirit of jealousy,

suspicion, and even hostility. Such a spirit could surely defeat genuine unification, regardless of the organizational and administrative measures that may outwardly seem to give it effective form and substance. The intangibles of conviction must be resolved first. Otherwise unification can only be a deceptive sham.

As I view the matter, the respective service prides and loyalties commonly assumed to be the principal obstacles are usually secondary. The real trouble is much deeper and more basic. In War College terms it is conflicting conceptions of war. We think differently of the ways war should be organized for and conducted. In a word we are indoctrinated differently.

A great part of this conflict lies in the traditional differences between Army and Navy in their organizational and administrative concepts. And these are in turn a product of operating conditions. Of necessity a ship must be a tightly integrated unit. A fleet of such units needs to be, and is instinctively, itself well knit. But an army has no such basic need. Ours has always been a loosely woven aggregation of corps or branches, each one semi-independent. A corps complex still prevails in our Army's conception of unification, whereas to the Navy a much more intimate integration is implied. In these basic respects the two services think in different terms, and the Air Force has inherited the Army viewpoint. The Marines cling to the Navy concept.

I may be in a better position than most officers to understand these basic differences. Having been born a yellow leg and become a deserter to the Navy at a tender age, I have an ingrained sympathetic interest in both the Army and Navy. And this extends to the Air Force through a long friendship with the late Billy Mitchell. In the days when Billy, as a Signal Corps officer, was learning to fly, he and I collaborated in undercover publicity for preparedness. We could not write under our own names because of President Wilson's ban against it during the long period of American neutrality in World War I. So Billy sought my naval advice and used it in his articles, and I was similarly guided by him on military questions.

After the Allied victory in Europe, and Billy's brilliant part in the air operations that led to it, we had frank and friendly talks on the future of aviation, including its organizational relation to other branches of the services. He was sold on the British solution of an independent Royal Air Force. But I had served most of the war in London and talked to British officers of all services, and I favored the integration rather than the separation of aviation * * * more especially for the Navy.

Since then Billy Mitchell's way has become the gospel for the Army. The cleavage between aviation and ground forces grew wider and wider until the Air Corps became a completely independent Air Force after the British pattern. To our Navy this was a mystifying evolution, for during the same era, which included World War II, development of naval aviation took an opposite course, the wisdom of which was proven by a wealth of experience. Starting in 1919, the top-level naval policy was to integrate naval aviation more and more closely with the general body of the Navy. And by now naval aviation is so intimate a part of naval bone, sinew, and flesh as to be inseparable.

How could such diametrically opposite developments come about—in the same era and the same war—in American sister services? The conflicting causes are even yet so vigorous and uncompromising that they actually give impetus to the deplorable feuding between Air Force and Navy, within the unified national defense organization created to gain harmony and cooperation.

And in this situation how can the Army seemingly stand supinely aside with but a flabby interest in providing for its ground forces the tactical aviation they so sorely need? It seems possible to explain this paradox and seek a remedy for it only by examining the enduring habits and customs of the different services—what psychologists or sociologists might call their "mores."

Since its very origin the Army has been split up into corps, each a semi-independent empire. The cleavage between Cavalry, Infantry, and Artillery was for long very great. More recently these branches have been merged at top level into the Army Field Forces. But even yet they do not seem to be well integrated at the lower levels. In addition, there have been the Corps of Engineers and the Quartermasters, Adjutants, Inspectors, Judge Advocates, and so on. And each of these has been largely sufficient unto itself, though perhaps only less so today than in the past. And as the art of land warfare grew in complexity and armies increased in size there was ever a strong tendency to create additional corps. Within recent decades Artillery was split into two corps (Field and Coast) and new corps included Signal, Ordnance, Chemical, Transportation, Finance, and Air.

With different service conditions, the naval tendencies have been just the opposite. Early in the present century the Navy's Engineer Corps was amalgamated with the line, and later the same was done with its Construction Corps. And much consideration has been given to similarly amalgamating the Supply Corps, whose officers and men have battle stations when afloat. The same strong trend to integration has ever characterized the Marine Corps within itself.

And so the coming of aviation as a major element of combat and reconnaissance naturally reacted upon the Army as a reason to add one more to its large assortment of greatly independent corps. Whereas the Navy chose instinctively the opposite path of closely integrating its aviation. And so did the Marines. Thus, for the Navy and Marines aviation developed into a vital organ, not merely an appendage as in the Army—an appendage easily separable.

This profound difference largely accounts for the heated controversy that developed between the Navy and the Army Air Corps. The latter looked upon naval aviation as something almost apart from the Navy, as loosely knit to it as the Air Corps was to the Army. It saw it more as an extra leg or arm than as a circulatory or nervous system. It saw it as something which could readily be severed from the Navy and attached to itself. But from the Navy's viewpoint, to have a circulatory system dissected out of its general body clearly meant a fatal operation.

The late war seemed to demonstrate amply the soundness of our Navy's solution of air organization. The armies and navies that employed planes closely integrated with surface forces were conspicuously successful, so long as their total means permitted success. Illustrations could be multiplied. The spectacular successes of the German Army offer sufficient examples on land, though Russian practices are also worth noting. Afloat, only the American and Japanese navies had well integrated aviation with which to start the war, and their performances clearly prove the point.

On the other hand, the want of adequate air support resulted in trouble and even disaster almost without exception, even when surface forces were otherwise in superior strength. A striking illustration is the early British experience in North Africa, where at first the Royal Air Force planes operated independently of the troops. Whenever the commanding general needed air support from planes close by his forces, he could only get it by communicating with London, and the air authorities there might or might not meet his request. The result was a series of disasters on the ground. The tide turned toward victory only when the local aviation was placed under the direct control of the ground commander.

Both ashore and afloat the independence of the Royal Air Force worked badly for the British. In theory, due air support was to be given as needed to military and naval forces. But in practice such support proved very inadequate. The aviators lacked proper understanding of surface problems. And surface forces were unable to appreciate air problems. In short, the Air Force was so engrossed in strategic bombing that it neglected what it regarded as secondary missions—those of close cooperation with the Army and Navy.

A great wealth of experience in the late war has made it axiomatic that adequate air support is essential to success in surface warfare. The better the support from aloft, the more certain and more complete becomes the victory below. It does not require close reasoning to conclude that the value of air support depends not merely upon its quantity but even more upon its quality; nor that its quality is first of all a product of proficiency of the men in the air.

However good an aviator may be as a flyer, and however good the combat characteristics of his plane, he cannot be proficient enough in supporting surface forces unless he understands how they fight and what their combat problems are. And it is similarly important for surface personnel to have a due comprehension of the capabilities and needs of aviation. The two arms must work together as a well-coordinated team. They must be thoroughly integrated if the full value of air support is to be realized.

And there lies the basic difference between the thinking of Navy and Marine Corps, on the one hand, and Army and Air Force on the other. And this difference offers the main explanation for the superlative effectiveness of the Navy and Marine Corps aviation in the close support of surface forces. However good the Air Force may be in strategic bombing—however greatly we admire its superb contribution to victory by paralyzing German communications during and after the Normandy invasion—hundreds of cases can be cited to reveal its substantially lower efficiency in the combat role of close tactical support, compared with naval and marine performance in this role.

The fundamental reasons for this naval-marine superiority are clearly put by Admiral C. M. Cooke in a recent article in Foreign Affairs, entitled "Soldiers Need Wings." He points out that since 1920 "a naval aviator was a qualified naval officer, and naval officers, many of them aviators, became increasingly indoctrinated in aviation. Naval officers were air-minded, and, no less important, air officers were surface-minded; without this general understanding of naval principles, and experience and proficiency in surface operation, the air officer could not understand the possibilities of his own arm." Neither could the surface officer otherwise appreciate the tremendous potentialities of a truly integrated air-surface force.

Admiral Cooke goes on to argue for applying the same principles and practices to our Army. He believes that "years will be required to create an experienced body of ground-indoctrinated air personnel and air-indoctrinated ground personnel and to develop special equipment and methods. This growth will be accompanied by continuously changing tactical concepts, and even changes in strategic concepts, to fit in with the increased mobility and offensive power that

our ground-air force will require." He feels that "the integration of our ground forces, which are first rank in quality, with an expanding ground-air element, is today the most pressing task of our military leaders."

These views find strong corroboration in the example of the Marine Corps. The Marines are the only proficient ground-air and air-ground organization in the country. There are many potent reasons against the half-baked suggestions that have been made to abolish this splendid corps d'élite, or to abolish its aviation element. Among the strongest of them is simply that the art of close aviation support to ground troops would be lost in this country, and many years would be required to regain it. It is paradoxical that such abolitions are advocated at the very time the Army is urging the Air Force to begin providing almost nonexistent suitable Air Force planes, and to begin appropriate training of personnel to give our ground forces a sorely needed, adequate tactical air support.

There is room for misunderstanding of what constitutes close tactical air support to troops. As I am using this term, it refers to what the marines call "close-in" air support. They define it as: "Attack by aircraft of hostile ground targets which are at such close range to friendly front lines as to require detailed integration of each air mission with the fire and movement of the ground forces, in order to insure safety, prevent interference with other elements of the combined arms, and permit prompt exploitation of the shock, casualty, and neutralization effect of the air attack."

The marines consider that their aviators should be competent to make such attacks effectively on targets as close as 200 yards from their front-line troops. This accurate and extremely helpful performance was not uncommon for them in the late war, not only in support of Marine infantry units but also Army infantry. On Okinawa they gave support as close to troops as 50 yards with great success. It is obvious that an aviator should be a well-trained soldier first, before he can clearly understand what is expected of him and how best to do it. And before he is entrusted with such difficult tasks as these.

Perhaps less of the soldier is required in an airman for interdictory attack at greater ranges. Yet the better his military understanding and training, the better will he succeed in supporting ground forces at any range. Besides, interdictory attacks and "close-in" attacks are likely to merge in the course of battle. For both of them, general direction and complete general control of air operations must necessarily rest with the ground commander, if satisfactory results are to be expected below. And certainly the ground commander must also be proficient in this vital part of his authority and responsibility.

Whether the present defense organization will be able to properly develop and integrate ground tactical air with the ground forces is a question that Admiral Cooke thinks "remains to be seen." "It certainly will not do so," he says, "unless the top command in both Army and Air Force place greater emphasis upon its importance," and effect necessary changes in organization "worked out by the two services in close collaboration, aided and prodded by the Secretary of Defense."

The most favorable factor for a happy solution is the availability of the Marine Corps pattern for imitation. The greatest obstacle appears to be the Army's traditional "corps complex," resulting now in insufficient mutual understanding between air and ground personnel of each other's techniques and problems, with a corresponding want of interest and sympathy. Had there been a warm sense of an important common need of unity, the Air Force never would have driven so hard to separate itself from the Army. Nor would the Army have consented to that separation with such seeming indifference.

One of Billy Mitchell's strongest early complaints was the Army's lukewarmness toward the importance of aviation. In this he was probably well justified at the time. The same criticism can be leveled at the Navy before 1919. Until then, pioneer naval enthusiasts were met principally by skepticism from the Navy at large. But being themselves naval (or marine) officers, their vision looked toward ways in which aviation would enhance naval power, and accordingly they made and won that fight within the Navy itself on those grounds.

On the other hand, Mitchell's similar frustrations from the Army turned him against it. Having had no considerable line training or experience, with correspondingly little understanding of line problems and techniques, his natural impulse was toward the development of air functions quite independent of the combat ground forces—thoroughly believing in fact that aviation would supersede them, or render them quite secondary in warfare. Merely as one of many examples of this attitude, he strongly contended that the principal future role of ground armies would be to occupy territories conquered by air forces. This general doctrine was ardently seconded by his followers. And so persistently was it supported that we have now witnessed the actual severance of the Air Force from the Army. And this, paradoxically, under the guise of unification.

Such a background seems a rather sterile one in which now to begin cultivating the true integration between combat ground forces and the tactical aviation which is so indispensable to military success on land. Certainly British experience after creating their independent Royal Air Force at the end of World War I is not reassuring. In theory their Army and Navy were to receive from the RAF such air support as they might require. In practice their naval aviation and ground tactical aviation became mere stepchildren. Neither the proper types of planes nor good specialized equipment were developed. These grave deficiencies in World War II cost many lives and nearly cost the war.

I understand that some such arrangement as the British tried out after World War I, to their great sorrow, is now proposed for our Army's tactical air support. The Air Force is to supply the planes, equipment, and aviators. What degree of control the Air Force will retain over them, I do not know. Presumably it will at least have control over the all-important funds. Let us pray, sincerely, for the sake of future blood and victory that whatever arrangement is made will work out with pronounced success. Personally I cannot help but be skeptical and fearful unless true integration is achieved.

The potency of the lessons from naval and Marine Corps experience in this regard are beyond doubt. The integrated forces must be under single control and command. And this not merely for combat operations but also during the needful years of preliminary training and indoctrination. Neither the aviation nor the ground elements in such an integrated force can serve two masters well and stay a hard-hitting team.

Obviously, in the final analysis this may well mean that the Army must have complete control of its own aviation as an integral part of itself, and graduate out of the corps complex.

Economic Problems of the Year Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the following article, entitled "Economic Problems of the Year Ahead" appeared in the New York Times Sunday magazine of February 5, 1950. Its author, Sumner H. Slichter, holder of the highest professorship in economics at Harvard University, is well known and respected as an economist throughout the country. I think it is fair to say that he generally is regarded as a conservative, rather than a liberal thinker, if those labels have retained any meaning at all.

Because of Professor Slichter's reputation and his position in the field of economics, I think it is noteworthy that he advocates, under certain circumstances, a permanent, or at least a very long-range Federal deficit as an intentional part of a fiscal policy designed to maintain prosperity and high employment. He says:

Many people believe that anyone who does not advocate that the budget be balanced over the period of the business cycle or that the debt be gradually reduced is indifferent to sound fiscal policy. This is far from true. It is just as important that the Government deficit be not too small as not too large.

I am not an economist myself, and so I cannot presume to pass expert judgment on this argument. But at a time when deficit financing is almost universally deplored, I think it is important to note that another side to this problem can be supported by an economist as highly regarded as Professor Slichter.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF THE YEAR AHEAD

(By Sumner H. Slichter)

"As 1950 opens," said President Truman, in his economic report to Congress, "renewed confidence prevails in the American economy. This confidence is in itself an element of strength; and it is justified by the facts." Mr. Truman goes on to give the country the goal of reducing unemployment from 3,500,000 to 2,500,000, or possibly to 2,000,000, during the next 12 months. Since the normal yearly increase in the labor force is about 600,000, this would mean a total increase of 1,600,000 to 2,100,000 in the number of people at work—a fairly substantial expansion.

Although Mr. Truman has reason to be well satisfied with the present state of business, difficult problems are raised by the fact that the cash budget of the Federal Government for the present fiscal year shows a deficit of about $5,000,000,000. At a time of high employment such as the present, ordinarily the budget ought to be in balance or perhaps show a surplus. But increases in taxes might produce a contraction in business, and cuts in Government disbursements would reduce the incomes of many individuals and enterprises, which would also be depressing. And yet many persons fear that failure to cut or eliminate the deficit would lay the foundation for inflation.

What is the business outlook for 1950? Is the President unduly optimistic in suggesting that unemployment can be reduced to 2,500,000 or even 2,000,000 in the next 12 months? What should be done about the budget? Should taxes be increased? Should expenditures be cut? Should taxes be cut?

I. THE GENERAL OUTLOOK

In judging the outlook for 1950 one should distinguish between the first half and the second half of the year. The outlook for the first half is bright. In this period business will receive important stimulus from the large special insurance dividend paid to veterans. The outlook for the second half is quite uncertain. After the middle of the year a moderate decline in business is more than likely. The prospect that a decline can be averted is good, but far from certain. Underlying conditions are strong and give reason to believe that the economy will be responsive to efforts on the part of business concerns and Government to stimulate demand. The great question is whether business enterprises and Government will make the necessary efforts and whether action will come soon enough and be vigorous enough.

Even since the end of 1948, gross private investment (outlays on plant, equipment, housing, and inventories) has been slowly dropping. Only prompt and well-planned policies by business and Government will bring the slow drop in private investment to an early halt and will cause consumer expenditures to rise sufficiently to offset the gradual weakening stimulus from the insurance dividend to veterans.

II. THE FIRST HALF YEAR

What are the reasons for being optimistic about the first half of 1950? It is true that the drop in private investment which has been going on since the last quarter of 1948 will probably continue at least throughout the first half of 1950. Present estimates are that the outlays of nonagricultural business concerns on plant and equipment during the first quarter of 1950 will be about 14 percent below the corresponding quarter of 1949. A moderate further drop in business expenditures on plant and equipment during the second quarter of 1950 would not be surprising because more and more enterprises are catching up on investment needs which accumulated during the war.

Despite the prospect that gross private investment will be slowly decreasing, the level of business during the first half of 1950 will continue to be high and will possibly continue to rise. There are three principal reasons for this belief.

One is the prospective high demand for consumer goods for which the special life-insurance dividend of approximately $2,800,000,000 to veterans will be partly responsible.

A second is the large volume of construction contract awards and of new housing starts during the late months of 1949. Both contract awards and housing starts were substantially above the corresponding months of 1948. This assures an abnormally high level of construction during the early part of 1950.

Finally, the cash deficit of $5,000,000,000 in the budget for the fiscal year 1949–50 means that the Government is adding to people's incomes more than it is taking from them. All in all, a very satisfactory level of activity for the first half of the year is in prospect.

III. THE SECOND HALF YEAR

The outlook for the second half of 1950 is much less favorable. Even Mr. Truman does not appear to believe that he will achieve his goal of reducing unemployment during the next 12 months to two and one-half million or two million. In estimating the Government's revenues he assumes virtually no change in incomes, and that means, at fairly steady prices, little change in employment.

There are three principal conditions that make a decline in business likely in the second half of 1950. One of these is that the level of private investment is likely to be lower than it is at the present time, and may be continuing to drop. By the middle of 1950 outlays on private plant and equipment, and possibly housing as well, will probably have dropped to normal levels. There is a possibility, it is true, that private investment may not fall below normal because the backlog of deferred demand has not been entirely met. Furthermore, as I shall point out, prompt steps to stimulate private investment would probably bring about a rise by the middle of the year. Nevertheless, one is not justified in counting on such a rise until steps to stimulate investment appear imminent.

A second reason for expecting a decline in business during the second half of the year is that much of the effect of the large life-insurance dividend payments to veterans during the first part of 1950 will have worn off by then. Of course, the effect of the payment will not have entirely died out because a large part of the incomes generated by the payments will continue to be spent.

A third reason for expecting some decline is the prospect that expenditures by government will be less. The States and cities will probably be spending more in 1950 than in 1949, but it looks as if the Federal Government will be spending less. The expenditures of the Federal Government were boosted to an abnormal high in the fiscal year 1949–50 by the dividend payment to veterans of $2,800,000,000. There will also be a drop of about $1,000,000,000 of Marshall-plan aid. President Truman is asking for some cuts in expenditures, and there is powerful support in Congress for reductions. Increases in certain items asked by the President will not be granted. Consequently it is likely that the cash outlays of the Federal Government for the next fiscal year will be at least $4,000,000,000 less than in the present one. This would more than offset any rise in expenditures by State and local governments.

The tendency for a drop in investment expenditures to reduce the demand for goods will be mitigated to some extent by a drop in the rate of saving. Corporations have recently been doing about half of the saving of the community. As outlays on plant and equipment drop, corporations will pay out a larger proportion of profits to stockholders. The proportion of personal incomes saved also will drop. The large rise in personal savings during 1948 was caused in the main by large purchases of houses by individuals and of plant and equipment by owners of unincorporated enterprises. If these expenditures of individuals and unincorporated enterprises decrease, the proportion of incomes spent on consumer goods will rise.

Unfortunately, the shift into the buying of consumer goods cannot be counted upon to prevent a drop in total demand for goods. The reason is that, as corporations and individuals reduce their expenditures on plant, equipment, and housing, they will use a larger part of their incomes to repay their debts. Hence a drop in investment expenditures will mean some decrease in the total demand for goods.

IV. STEPS TO AVERT DECLINE

Can the prospective drop in business during the second half of 1950 be prevented? Fundamental conditions are favorable to a high level of business. For example, expenditures on consumers' goods are small in relation to personal holdings of cash and demand deposits. At the present time the annual rate of personal expenditures for consumer goods is only three and six-tenths times the average personal holdings of cash and demand deposits, as against five and nine-tenths times the average in 1939. Under such favorable conditions it ought to be possible to maintain a high level of sales. President Truman, in his economic message, indicated he might have some real interest in encouraging investment. Such a change in Government policy under present favorable conditions would have important effects.

The steps which might be taken to avert a business contraction during the second half of 1950 may be divided into three groups—those relating to private investment; those relating to consumer expenditures; and those relating to Government spending and tax policies.

1. Steps to encourage private investment: Since the amount of private investment depends immediately upon the decisions of business concerns, managements have the best opportunity to influence its volume. The opportunities of enterprises to spend a dollar in order to save or make a dollar are enormous. Some managements are more cautious than others, and managements as a whole are more cautious at some times than others. There is danger that caution will be overdone, and that an undue proportion of capital expenditures will be held in abeyance pending political and economic developments. An economy which is too cautious will not be very progressive. In particular, there is little prospect that the postponement of investment expenditures will enable business concerns to buy plant or equipment at substantially lower prices.

Several useful steps might be taken by the Government to encourage investment. One would be to permit losses to be carried forward against income for 5 years instead of 2 years, as at present. This change in the tax laws would be particularly helpful to new concerns, which frequently do business at a loss for a year or two. Such enterprises should have a good chance to earn enough to offset their initial losses before becoming subject to the full corporate income taxes.

The present corporate income tax makes corporations with incomes of less than $50,000 pay a 53-percent tax on all income between $25,000 and $50,000. The standard corporate income-tax rate is 38 percent. Thus the corporate income tax makes it harder for small corporations to grow to moderate size. Such a provision in the tax law is preposterous and should have been eliminated long ago.

Still another way in which the Government might stimulate investment is by permitting enterprises to charge off new equipment in a 5-year period rather than over the life of the equipment. This change would permit depreciation allowances to be adjusted to the state of economic visibility. In the long run the change would undoubtedly yield the Government an increase in revenue because it would stimulate business activity. More important, by encouraging earlier replacement of equipment which is not ready for scrapping it would raise the productivity of industry.

2. Steps to increase consumer expenditures: Persuading individuals to buy consumer goods is primarily the job of business concerns. If a good proportion of enterprises are aggressively attempting to increase their share of sales and willing to give better quality or lower prices in order to take business away from competitors, the total volume of sales will expand. Unfortunately, much business planning is done on the assumption that the concern can expect to get only its present share of the sales in the industry.

This kind of planning does not lead to general expansion of business. Expansion is produced by aggressive driving for a larger share of the sales and by willingness to give better quality or lower prices in order to take business away from competitors. During the sellers' markets that have existed most of the time since 1946, there was not much occasion for price cutting. At the present time the economy needs plenty of price cutters.

The worst offender is keeping up prices is the Government. The competition between Democrats and Republicans for the votes of the farmers has led to legislation which is raising the Government's spend $1,600,000,000 during the present fiscal year supporting the prices on farm products. (Incidentally, the British are spending almost an equal amount in subsidies to keep the price of food down.) Support prices for agricultural products made sense as a device to encourage agricultural output during and immediately following the war. Likewise, some support to agricultural prices is desirable during periods of more or less severe unemployment because prices of farm products are unusually sensitive to drops in demand.

The present, however, is a time of high employment. At such periods farm products should be permitted to sell for what the market will bring. At the same time that the Government is spending $1,600,000,000 on the support of agricultural prices, it is putting into effect acreage-restriction schemes. Same procedures belong in Allen in Wonderland.

Congress would be wise to modify the price-support program so that it would come into operation only after prices are well below "parity." This would save the Government over $1,000,000,000 which it would otherwise spend during the coming fiscal year on keeping up the prices of farm products. This saving might well be promptly passed on to the community as a whole by reductions in excise taxes, thus also stimulating the sale of various nonfarm products.

2. Adjustments in Government spending and tax policies: The fact that the cash budget shows a deficit of about $3,000,000,000 at a period of high employment leads many people to believe that an immediate effort should be made to balance the budget. If the budget cannot be balanced during a period of high employment, will it ever be balanced?

Some of the proposals to balance the budget would greatly increase the likelihood that business might contract during the latter half of 1950. Certainly tax advances now would greatly increase the danger of a decline in business because they would reduce the ability of individuals and business concerns to buy goods. Consequently, President Truman's proposal of even moderate tax increases is ill-timed. The demand for retrenchment in Government expenditures is widespread and has much merit. Such retrenchment would stimulate business to the extent that they created the hope of eventual cuts in taxes—provided that they were not made by reducing the productive services furnished by the Government. Cuts in disbursements by the Government, however, would have the immediate effect of reducing the incomes of individuals and enterprises and, to that extent, of inducing contraction in business. Consequently, the Government should not cut its disbursement without passing on most of the saving to individuals and enterprises in the form of reductions in taxes.

If cuts in expenditures are offset in large measure by reductions in taxes, how and when will the budget be balanced? As a matter of fact, the condition of the budget is not as bad as the figures suggest. A substantial part of the deficit of $3,000,000,000 is caused by the dividend disbursement of $2,000,000,000 to veterans—a nonrecurring expenditure. Furthermore, the Federal Government is spending about $1,000,000,000 during this fiscal year in purchasing guaranteed mortgages. These mortgages may properly be regarded as an investment.

The best way to reduce the deficit in the budget is to let the normal growth of the national output raise the revenue of the Government. Under present tax rates the normal growth of output and incomes will increase the revenue of the Government by over a billion dollars a year. If increases in expenditures are stopped, the normal growth of the economy will eliminate the deficit within several years.

V. A BALANCED BUDGET?

Is it clear that the Federal Government should aim at least to balance its budget over the period of the business cycle, or even to achieve a net surplus in the budget over the period of the business cycle, so that the national debt can gradually be reduced? Most people undoubtedly believe that the Government should avoid a long-run increase in the public debt and should gradually pay off the debt. And yet an attempt to balance the budget over the period of the business cycle, and even more to reduce the national debt, might prevent the supply of money (cash and bank deposits) from increasing rapidly enough to prevent a decline in prices and the development of chronic unemployment.

Little attention has thus far been paid to how rapidly the country needs to expand its supply of money and what is the best way for it to get the needed increase in money. Unless there is a rise in the rate at which money is spent (and the rate has been decreasing for many years), the country will need to increase its money supply during the next 30 years by about $120,000,000,000, or approximately 75 percent. This is merely the growth in money supply that will be needed to avert a drop in prices. Such a rise in the money supply would be the slowest in the history of the country. During the last 20 years the money supply of the United States trebled; in the 30 years between 1900 and 1929 it increased about sixfold.

How can the country increase its money supply by about $120,000,000,000 in the next 30 years? Part of the increase may be expected to come from the growth in short-term borrowing by business enterprises from commercial banks. It would be undesirable for the short-term borrowing of business to rise faster than the dollar volume of production because a high ratio of short-term business debts to output makes the economy unstable. If short-term business borrowing rises no faster than production, and if the price level is stable, an increase of about $30,000,000,000 in the money supply might be obtained during the next 30 years from short-term business borrowing.

Perhaps another $30,000,000,000 increase in the money supply might be obtained by purchase of mortgages and other long-term private, municipal, and State securities by commercial banks. Such an increase would mean a very rapid rise in the buying of such securities by commercial banks. Still another increase of $30,000,000,000 in money might be produced by imports of gold of about $1,000,000,000 a year. Gold imports will be large because the United States levies no duty on gold and is always willing to buy it in unlimited quantities at a fixed price. If gold imports are about a billion a year the stock of gold at Fort Knox would be somewhat more than doubled in 30 years.

There would remain about $30,000,000,000 of money supply to be obtained from some source. It might be provided through the banks' buying up part of the public debt, but concentration of the public debt in the hands of the banks is not desirable. Hence an increase in the public debt would probably be the best way to obtain the remaining $30,000,000,000 of new money. This would mean that during a 30-year period the budget would need to be in the red, on the average, about $1,000,000,000 a year.

If the debt of the Federal Government rose from $257,000,000,000, the present level, to about $287,000,000,000, while the net national product was rising from about $247,000,000,000 to over $400,000,000,000, the burden of the debt in relation to the net national product would substantially drop.

Many people believe that anyone who does not advocate that the budget be balanced over the period of the business cycle or that the debt be gradually reduced is indifferent to sound fiscal policy. This is far from true. It is just as important that the Government deficit be not too small as that it be not too large. Once a judgment has been reached as to the rate at which the money supply needs to increase and as to the extent to which the rise in the money supply should be made possible by growth in the public debt, it becomes important to insist that the average size of the deficit correspond to these judgments—that it be no larger and no smaller.

Allowance must be made for the possibility that the operation of collective bargaining will require a slow rise in the price level of the country. If unions push up wages faster than engineers and managers are able to raise output per man-hour, prices must rise in order to prevent the growth of chronic unemployment. In that case the increase in the money supply must be large enough to make possible the needed rise in prices. If the community does not like a rise in prices, it must insist that employers do a good enough job of bargaining to prevent wages from outrunning output per man-hour.

VI. THE NEED FOR WELL-PLANNED AND VIGOROUS POLICIES

What conclusion does one reach about the outlook for business in the second half of the year? The sound underlying condition of the economy indicates that efforts to stimulate demand have a good chance of being successful. It is uncertain, however, whether business and Government will act soon enough and vigorously enough. Only prompt and well-planned policies will halt the slow drop in private investment, will offset the gradual weakening stimulus from the insurance dividend to veterans and will prevent the prospective drop in Government expenditures from reducing the demand for goods.

Surpluses

REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] said that we had a surplus of potatoes. She intimated that they were rotten, and that the Congress was to blame for that situation. I deny that the Republican Members of Congress are responsible for the potato, the egg, or the milk situation. Nor is the Congress to blame for the rotten Communists who are in this Government of ours.

If my recollection is correct, the potato and other similar legislation came down here with the blessing of the administration, and the Congress, with the Democrats in the majority, put that through. The House, on the other hand, did its utmost to get rid of the Communists, just as smelly as any potato that ever rotted, but the Congress was not successful. The Congress was opposed all along down the line from the time the committee to expose subversive activities was first created, from the time that Mr. Dies had charge of it and was finally driven out of Congress, right down to and since the President accused that House committee, or more accurately the Republicans on it, of drawing a "red herring" across his political trail. The House opposed by the administration then in power from the day that committee was born until after Hiss was convicted.

If we have too many potatoes now, sound or rotten, and if we have too many Communists now, all rotten, the fault lies right on the doorstep of the present administration.

You Can't Compromise With Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the article entitled "You Can't Compromise With Communism," written by Hon. Charles Solomon, appeared in the January 1950 issue of the American Federationist. I am happy to commend this article to the attention of my colleagues. I have known Judge Solomon for many years, during all of which time he has been an ardent foe of totalitarianism in all its forms and in all its disguises.

The article follows:

YOU CAN'T COMPROMISE WITH COMMUNISM

(By Charles Solomon)

Between communism and the democratic way of life there is a basic and irreconcilable divergence. Contrary to Winston Churchill's characterization of Communist Russia as "a riddle wrapped in an enigma," the literature of communism is unequivocally clear as to its objectives and methods.

The spokesmen for communism have taken pains to leave no possible doubt as to their purpose and the means by which they propose to achieve it. One is reminded of Hitler's full disclosure of his aims in Mein Kampf, which was generally available and as generally either unread or not taken seriously.

We can be thankful for the fact that circumstances have finally compelled our own national leaders to take to these sources for this indispensable information in dealing with Communists. The result has been a somewhat belated disillusionment and awakening, which explains our stiffened attitude and such policies as the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the North Atlantic Defense Pact.

Certain basic facts must be faced if we are to understand why our relations with Communist Russia are as they are; why, in fact, it is impossible to have with Russia the kind of relations we enjoy with other countries, such as Britain, France, Italy, Canada, and Australia. These facts are so foreign to the democratic orientation they are at first difficult to grasp. Furthermore, they have implications the significance of which is not always readily apparent, especially to the uninitiated.

To begin with, communism represents a fundamental and unbridgeable break with the ethics, morality, and way of life of the democratic world. What we regard as decent, honorable, fair—these and similar concepts are contemptuously rejected by communism as so many bourgeois prejudices and bourgeois superstitions by which Communists in pursuit of their revolutionary objections will not permit themselves to be encumbered or deterred.

This primary Communist postulate controls regardless of where the particular Communist finds himself—in a labor organization, a cultural group, a religious group, a fraternal organization or in public office or employment.

Lenin gave positive expression to this article of Communist faith in the following language:

"It is necessary * * * to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of truth" in the pursuit of Communist ends.

On another occasion Lenin enunciated the Communist doctrine of the ends justifying the means in these words addressed to a young Communist group:

"In our own opinion, morality is entirely subordinate to the class war. Everything is moral which is necessary for the annihilation of the old exploiting social order. * * * We do not believe in external principles of morality. * * * Communist morality is identical with strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat."

We can trace this revolutionary morality back to the anarchism of Bakunin who many years ago, in the Catechism of a Revolutionist, wrote:

"Everything which promotes the success of the revolution is moral; everything which hinders it is immoral."

The principle followed by the Communists is that if lying, deceit, duplicity, and misrepresentation will promote the achievement of Communist objectives, they are thereby sanctioned. If the democratic world chooses to believe in fair, decent, and honorable dealing, so much the worse for it. That is the Communist code.

I have referred to the significance of the implications of this position. No kind of agreement can be permitted to stand in the way of what the occasion may require from the Communist point of view. Signatures are affixed to otherwise solemn documents with the reservations herein recited. And this goes for high and solemn compacts between Communist Russia and other non-Communist states.

Words frequently cease to have what we regard as their commonly accepted meaning when used by Communists. This is outstandingly so when we talk of democracy. When we use this word we mean, among other things, freedom of speech, press, and assembly; the right to petition for a redress of grievances; the right of habeas corpus; the existence of multiple political parties, free labor, and other free organizations. Yet Soviet Russia, where none of the foregoing exists, is denominated by Communists as the only true—the new—democracy.

Notwithstanding statements made for public consumption by Communist spokesmen in high positions, including Stalin himself, to the effect that the Communist and democratic systems can live together in the same world, the accepted literature of communism reveals a completely contrary belief.

Communism is committed to total war on our way of life, in which they can find not a single saving grace and which they hold must be exterminated, root and branch, by any means effective under the circumstances. Here we have an intriguing resemblance to fascism, between which and communism ideologically there are deep and striking similarities. In fact, communism, which preceded fascism, can be said to have been its schoolmaster. Stalin, who has on several occasions publicly stated—speaking as the head of the Russian state—that Communist Russia and we can live alongside each other in peaceful competition, has in his capacity as Bolshevik theoretician taken his position squarely on Lenin's pronouncement:

"It is inconceivable that the Soviet republic shall continue to exist for a long period of time side by side with the imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet republic and the bourgeois states are inevitable."

Here we have the ideological background of the bitter and concentrated attack on the United States, strongest of the bourgeois states and bulwark of the democratic way of life. We are to the Communist world the principal barrier to what it regards as the certain, ultimate triumph of bolshevism. Only in the light of this teaching does the vicious attack on the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the Atlantic Pact become intelligible.

Unless our Nation understands the unvarying ideological motivations of the leaders of communism, from Stalin down, we shall flounder in a morass of confusion and futility. It shall ever be a case of too little and too late.

Communist Parties the world over are essentially identical. This goes for the Communist Party of the United States. Note I do not say the American Communist Party because there can be no American Communist Party. The concepts of Americanism and communism are completely antithetical.

For the true Communist there is one exclusive loyalty—to Soviet Russia—which is regarded as "the workers' fatherland" which can do no wrong.

Communism is more than a political philosophy. It is for many millions tantamount to a religion, evoking fanatical and unquestioning dedication. If this spells betrayal of country, friends, those whom we would regard as loved ones, fellow trade unionists, this would only appear as "revolutionary virtue" in the eyes of a true Communist.

In a now almost unavailable Communist publication entitled "The Communist Party, a Manual on Organization," by J. Peters, it is stated:

"The conditions for membership in our party are contained in the following pledge read by Comrade Browder to 2,000 workers who were initiated into the party in the New York district in 1935."

The heart of this pledge is contained in the following excerpt therefrom:

"I pledge myself to rally the masses to defend the Soviet Union, the land of victorious socialism. I pledge myself to remain at all times a vigilant and firm defender of the Leninist line of the party, the only line that insures the triumph of Soviet power in the United States."

Not a single word in the entire pledge indicating loyalty to the United States and its democratic institutions and way of life. Communist leaders throughout the world, including William Z. Foster, in our own country, have made it clear that in the event of war between their own countries and Soviet Russia they would refuse to defend the former against the latter.

That our own Communists fall completely into this category is revealed with blunt forthrightness by Foster in his book entitled "Toward a Soviet America." The title should be sufficient to indicate the thesis of the author. If you would know what a Soviet America would be like, if you are not already apprised, you need only contemplate Soviet Russia, with its brutal dictatorship, with its totalitarianism, which extends into every walk of human life—literature, art, science, poetry, architecture, the theater, philosophy. All must rigidly toe the ideological mark.

Communist parties cannot be compared to political parties as we know them in the western democratic sense. There is a basic divergence in the purpose of political organization and activity. This is strikingly revealed by Stalin himself. In his Foundations of Leninism he has written as follows:

"The revolutionary will accept a reform in order to use it as an aid in combining legal with illegal work; to intensify under its cover the illegal work for the revolutionary preparation of the masses for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie."

This "overthrow of the bourgeoisie" can only be accomplished through civil war and by resort to violence. We have LENIN'S own authoritative statement in this respect.

"The replacement of the bourgeoisie by the proletarian state is impossible WITHOUT a violent revolution," wrote Lenin in State and Revolution. The proletarian state is only another way of saying dictatorship of the proletariat and the latter is defined by Stalin himself in Foundations of Leninism as "the rule * * * unrestricted by law and based on force * * *" of the proletariat."

William Z. Foster has set forth what a Communist dictatorship would mean in our own country.

"Under the dictatorship," he says in his book, "all the capitalist parties—Republican, Democratic, Progressive, Socialist, etc.—will be liquidated, the Communist Party functioning alone as the party of the toiling masses. Likewise will be dissolved all other organizations that are political props of the bourgeois rule, including chambers of commerce, employers' associations, Rotary clubs, American Legion, YMCA, and such fraternal orders as the Masons, Odd Fellows, Elks, Knights of Columbus, etc." And, adds Foster, all this "will mark the birth of real democracy in the United States."

Winston Churchill, in a message a year ago to the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation dinner, said:

"We are a socialist government—you may have heard of that." He did not say, although he sound have done so, "There is a socialist government in Britain," or "They have a Socialist Government in Britain." Churchill employed "we" and thereby hangs a tale. Churchill was saying, in effect, that there had been a democratic parliamentary election in his country; that the Labor Party and the Conservatives had been the chief antagonists in that campaign; that each had had a full and democratic opportunity to present its side to the people; that under these circumstances the people had gone to the polls and overwhelmingly chosen Labor.

Therefore we have a Socialist Government in Britain.

This is the democratic concept. Such a concept is utterly foreign to communism. This kind of give-and-take, this kind of compromise rests on the mutual acceptance of certain common basic postulates. These are the basic postulates of our democratic way of life. Such give-and-take, such compromise has no place in the Communist lexicon. To Communists "we" in the sense that Churchill employed the term, does not exist. No government is that of the Communist unless it is a Communist Government and that government is his, commanding his unswerving loyalty, regardless of where it happens to be. For Communists, every other government, no matter how arrived at, exists only to be overthrown.

What does all this mean? One of the things it certainly does mean is that there can be no agreement in our sense of the word between Communist Russia and ourselves; no genuine compromise or give and take. To compromise sincerely and genuinely with the bourgeois world is, in the minds of Communists, to betray the revolution.

If we will only look these facts squarely in the face, the rest is comparatively simple.

We must make and keep strong increasingly all the agencies and institutions of democracy.

We must be strong economically, politically, morally.

We must confront the Communist world with superior power, the one thing the Politburo understands and respects.

We must do all this and more. We must do social justice by eliminating economic, social, and political injustice.

Here the trade union movement is contributing valiently. The democratic way of life has no firmer pillar.

Rivers and Valleys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address which I delivered at the Thirty-first Annual Convention of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., on Monday, February 6, 1950, to wit:

RIVERS AND VALLEYS

There are two statues at the entrance to the National Archives Building in the city of Washington. On the pedestal to the right is the figure of an old man in a thoughtful mood, and beneath the statue is the arresting phrase: "Study the past." On the left is the statue of an attractive woman with an open book in her hands. There is an appropriate inscription below the figure: "What Is Past is Prologue." The study of the past of countries and nations is useful as we plan in the present for the future.

PURPOSE

The study of the neglect of soils and waste of waters in the civilizations of the past is most helpful as we plan to improve our natural resources. Water gives life and must be conserved. Where it is scarce it must not be wasted. Where it floods it must be curbed. The purpose in all plans is most important. The Spaniards came to the New World in search of gold. They sought and they won gold, but they lost their empire. The Pilgrim Fathers came to Plymouth Rock in search of freedom. They won their freedom, and their descendants won their independence.

Civilizations must promote the welfare of all the people. The dynasties of Egypt, the golden age of Greece and Rome, the Renaissance in Europe were great eras; art, science, literature, and philosophy flourished, but the civilization promoted wealth and fame for the fortunate few. It was founded on slavery.

The basic concept of free enterprise is the dignity of the individual. Today modern machines and inventions have given to every man, woman, and child in this country the equivalent of the power and services of 80 slaves.

The rise and fall of civilizations through the centuries have been largely determined by the conservation and the utilization of the bounties of nature. The misuse of land is a warning that the resources of nature are not inexhaustible, and that once lost, it is difficult to replace. The pioneers of America may have had both land and water to misuse and waste, but their descendants are not so fortunate. The natural resources of the United States enhanced by science and invention are the foundation of the unparalleled production in World War II that made our country the most powerful in history.

The United States is determined in the programs for reforestation, soil conservation, flood control, and river and harbor improvements, to profit by the experiences of other countries. An inescapable conclusion from the study of the past is that the problems of soil erosion and overpopulation go hand in hand.

There is today a connection between the peasant revolt in Italy and soil erosion, for the lands of Sicily are constantly eroded as overpopulation obtains. The Carthaginians used elephants when they invaded Sicily. The people of Sicily used a scorched-earth policy against the elephants of Hannibal. They burned the forests. For 2,000 years forests have been burned. The problem of erosion is tremendous. There is overpopulation in Sicily today.

STREAMS AND LAKES

Nothing in nature is more interesting to me than streams and lakes. They appeal to poets. They are the inspiration of artists. They are useful to the historian. They are the delight of sportsmen. They invite lovers. They are attractive to the writers of fiction as well as verse. They appeal to the engineer as he dreams of building and ministering unto man.

Above the streams and lakes are the sources of both; there are the brooks, there are the forests that have aptly been termed the cradles of rivers. Walking by the side of the still waters of lakes appeals to me, and nothing is more delightful than to roam through the green pastures of valleys. As I linger along streams, my thoughts as I have dreamed for years always turn to the improvement of rivers and to the protection of valleys. Nothing intrigues me more than "the journey of the raindrop to the sea."

WONDERS

The Pyramids, Karnak, Persepolis, and other wonders of the ancient world, are not to be compared to the bridges, dams, skyscrapers, highways, and great cities of our country. The flood control works and the river and harbor improvements of the United States surpass those of this or any other age and of any other country. No nation has ever made more or comparable progress in production and construction than the United States.

As we go forward at present and plan for the future, we recall the lines from Longfellow:

"Build on and make the castle high and fair,
Rising and reaching upward to the skies."

SPIRIT

We must carry on in the spirit of the founders and the defenders of the Republic and in the spirit of those who fought in World War II on all continents, in all skies, and in all oceans to preserve freedom. That spirit is embodied in the following lines:

"From dream to deed, and from that deed again,
To further dream, and deed more mighty yet."

FOUNDATION

The Corps of Engineers was organized by George Washington, and it has functioned in river and harbor improvements authorized by Congress since 1824. Flood-control improvements beginning with the organization of the Mississippi River Commission 70 years ago and culminating in the declaration in the Flood Control Acts of 1928 and 1936 that flood control is a national problem rests upon the solid rock of a sound national policy. The foundation is that in all improvements the benefits must exceed the costs.

RIVERS AND HARBORS

There have been authorized some 1,300 river and harbor projects in the United States and Territories. They provide 26,000 miles of improved waterways, 490 locks and dams, and 270 harbors. One billion six hundred sixteen million one hundred forty-five thousand six hundred and ninety dollars have been appropriated. The vast inland waterway, coastal, and Great Lakes networks are without a peer. An all-time record high total of 791,541,717 tons of water-borne traffic was reached in 1948, which is more than double the tonnage of 15 years ago. There are many more harbors to be constructed and waterways to be improved.

FLOOD CONTROL

Some 1,000 projects for flood control have been authorized; $2,434,092,409 have been appropriated. At the close of the 1948 fiscal year 36 dam and reservoir projects and 170 local protection projects had been completed at a total cost of $483,000,000. The engineers estimate that the amount of damages already prevented is in excess of $500,000,000. The project for the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, including projects in the valley authorized as a part of the project is substantially 60 percent complete. Already the project is preventing damages that aggregate $5,000,000,000, or about eight times its cost to date.

The improvements of the rivers include dams for the generation of power and for navigation. They save the lives and property of river basins and increase the supply of power for industry, for homes, and for production to keep America invincible. The accomplishments of flood control under the sound program that constitutes its basis are outstanding. The people of all river basins are anxious to have the construction extended from the basins where the improvements have been made to the basins where they live. There are 160 separate river basins, and there are valleys of more numerous small streams. Most of these valleys are subject to flooding of various degrees of destructiveness. The works planned will prevent 75 percent of this flood damage. The policy is realistic. The program contemplates that it is not practical to prevent all damage. To be authorized the benefits. I repeat to emphasize, must exceed the costs. Flood control pays for itself. All improvements are capable of being expanded. The works are among the more valuable assets of the Nation.

RECLAMATION

Another national policy was adopted in 1902. Reclamation was authorized. The progress has been notable. The desert is being made to blossom as the rose. Waters are being conserved. Lands are being preserved. The program is sound.

APPROPRIATIONS AND ESTIMATES

The appropriations for flood control, rivers and harbors, and reclamation for the current fiscal year, while the largest ever made, were not finally approved until late in the first session of the present Congress. The civil-functions bill for the current year was approved October 13, 1949, although the fiscal year began on July 1, 1949. Valuable time was lost. Good weather was not utilized. Such weather is essential for river improvements. The budget estimates for the next fiscal year provide for $354,119,100 for reclamation, including $321,000,000 for construction. The budget estimates for national flood control for the next fiscal year are $478,477,000, which is an increase over the estimate of the current year of approximately $110,000,000. The estimate for rivers and harbors is $240,714,000 against the estimate for the present year of $197,985,790. The budget estimate for the Mississippi River and tributaries is $72,000,000, whereas the estimate for the current year was $70,000,000. I repeat that while the full amount of the estimates for the current year was not appropriated, the largest amount ever appropriated was made available by the Congress. It was most unfortunate that many months elapsed at the beginning of the fiscal year before the appropriation was finally made. This delay should not occur during the present year. The program will be promoted by funds being made available at the beginning of the fiscal year.

REORGANIZATION

Formerly appropriations for rivers and harbors were contained in the appropriations for military affairs. Some years ago separate bills were considered. The bill for flood control and rivers and harbors is now called the civil-functions appropriation. For the first time the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives during the present session has determined to submit one over-all appropriation bill for all of the departments of the Government. Hearings will be conducted by the subcommittees, but it is planned to report one bill. It is an experiment. A one-package bill should be of benefit with respect to balancing the budget. Departments can be more familiar with appropriations for other departments. I trust the policy will be successful. Such a policy obtains in the English Parliament. It is an experiment in the United States. I am apprehensive of delay. This association is always on guard. I am sure that it will spare no effort to urge that the appropriations be promptly made.

PENDING BILL

There is a second matter that is vital and of importance to the country. The House Committee on Public Works, after comprehensive hearings, reported probably the most constructive flood-control and river-and-harbor bill ever submitted to Congress. It provides for increased authorizations in river basins. It provides for new projects in both flood control and rivers and harbors. All projects were carefully screened. The bill was unanimously reported by the committee. Meantime, appropriations for all purposes increased. They were at an all-time high. The committee was diligent in applying for a rule. The leadership was cooperative. However, a rule for the passage of the bill was not granted. Finally, under the amendment adopted to the rules of the House at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress, the bill was brought up for consideration on August 22, 1949, and after much opposition and over many difficulties, the bill was finally passed by the House by the overwhelming vote of 202 to 1. It was a great victory, but this association and other advocates of river and harbor improvements cannot rest upon their laurels. The bill is pending in the Senate. It was there for 2 months before the session adjourned. It has not been taken up on the floor as yet. The Senate has always been cooperative. I trust that the bill will be promptly passed and approved by the President. It is a prior objective with this association, and I am sure that the leadership of the association will continue to cooperate for its prompt passage.

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

The Mississippi River is one of the world's greatest rivers. None holds more interest. None wields more influence upon the country through which it flows than does the Mississippi. No river has so vast a drainage basin. Its supply is drawn from the vicinity of the Delaware on the Atlantic seaboard and to the State of Idaho in the Rockies and near the Pacific. Mark Twain said that the basin of the Mississippi is the body of the Nation. All other parts are but members, important in themselves, yet more important in their relationship to the body. The basin contains 1,200,000 square miles. One-half of the people of the United States live in the basin. One-third of the total population of the country resides within a 50-mile radius of the Mississippi River and its tributaries. This basin is the bread basket and the storehouse of the Nation.

As has been well said, "As a dwelling place for civilized man, it is by far the first upon the globe." It is the second great valley of the world. It is exceeded only by that of the Amazon. "Ol' Man River" starts to rolling at the Twin Cities, and it flows as it just keeps rolling along to the Gulf, where it discharges 3 times as much water as the St. Lawrence, 25 times as much water as the Rhine, and 338 times as much water as the Thames. With the Missouri, it is the longest. In some places the Mississippi is the most crooked river in the world. In one section the distance as the crow flies is 675 miles, but as the river flows it is 1,300 miles.

The flood-control project of the Mississippi River and tributaries is the most gigantic ever adopted by any nation. The lower or alluvial valley consists of 30,000 square miles. The improvement of that river and the protection of that valley was never more important than it is today. As the valley grows so will the Nation grow. Progress is rolling through the basin today as new industries are being established in the valley. The opportunity with soil, oil, and rivers is unparalleled. The eyes of the Nation are turned toward the Mississippi Basin today as never before in the history of the Republic. Progress rolls just as "Ol' Man River" rolls in the Mississippi Valley.

COOPERATION

A great flood is passing down the Mississippi River today. It reached a maximum height at Cairo. In the beginning of the TVA, essentially a power project, and in former maximum floods, there was general complaint of lack of cooperation, as was in the case of the flood in 1937. The country knows that the TVA will not prevent floods along the lower Mississippi River, but the country also knows that, especially with the recent Kentucky Dam and with the two dams under the supervision of the Corps of Engineers along the Cumberland, flood heights at Cairo can be reduced. It is estimated conservatively that reduction in the present flood crest at Cairo was 2½ feet. There was cooperation. Government agencies, like individuals, as they grow older become more sensible. I commend to the Corps of Engineers and to the Bureau of Reclamation the very sensible example of cooperation that has obtained during the flood that is now in progress on the Mississippi River as the kind of cooperation that the country expects in the Missouri, Columbia, and California adopted projects.

WARNING

There is a campaign for Government reorganization. Such reorganization is greatly needed. To be sound it should eliminate waste and extravagance. It should prevent duplication. The program is generally sound. Personally, I have sponsored it in the past. I support it at present. Often, however, reformers, without supporting reason, advocate under the guise of reorganization the crippling, if not the destruction, of existing agencies that have proved their worth, of agencies that have been tested, and of agencies whose construction has been approved and whose plans are sound.

For years theorists or selfish individuals have advocated stripping the Corps of Engineers of their civil functions and have urged that their civil functions be removed from the Department of the Army. We should make no mistake. The enemies of the Corps of Engineers are still active. Their supporters should be on guard. Many fallacies are urged. Coordination is emphasized.

I have answered that contention by showing the coordination between the Corps of Engineers and the TVA in the flood of 1950. Again it is fallaciously urged that there would be better coordination in reclamation and flood control. The answer is that a new agency to supplant a successful and an established agency may result in disorganization and inefficiency. There should be coordination, and such coordination obtains today in the Missouri Valley where there is both reclamation and flood control. It will obtain in the Columbia River Valley. The remedy is to promote coordination and not to provide for the experiment of a new construction agency to supplant the Corps of Engineers whose experience in peace is most valuable for war. It is unthinkable that the Corps of Engineers should be deprived of their civil functions when their achievements are without parallel. We say to the advocates of reorganization that the public welfare in the

future as in the past will be promoted by continuing the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, and by continuing to authorize the construction of flood control and river and harbor improvements by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

No agency of the Government has ever wrought better than the Corps of Engineers. George Washington appreciated their worth. A great administrator, he provided for the construction of non-military works by them 175 years ago. They are the servants of the Congress, the elected representatives of the people. They are selected and appointed to West Point by Senators and Representatives. The corps is selected from the high men of the class. They take postgraduate courses after graduating at West Point. So engineers are better trained. They are prepared to meet the challenges of peace as well as war, of emergency, and of disaster. They respond when there is an explosion such as occurred at Texas City. They are on the job when cities, states, and regions are snowbound. They respond to rehabilitation from hurricanes and storms along the Gulf and the ocean where disaster strikes, and where emergency calls. They serve the American people in rain, and in sunshine, in prosperity, and in adversity. They should be encouraged. I believe in flowers for the living as well as flowers for the dead. The civil functions of the Corps of Engineers must be preserved and strengthened.

The services of the Corps of Engineers are essential to the protection of our valleys and the improvement of our rivers. The dams prevent erosion below them as they prevent floods. They also prevent silt below as they prevent floods. They prevent reforestation as they store the waters above the dams. The flood dams raise the low-water flow, and they lower the high-water flow. While the Corps of Engineers needs no eulogy or defense at my hands, when I think of their achievements, and their opponents, the lines of Wordsworth come to me:

"Him, only him, the shield of Jove defends,
Whose means are fair and spotless as his ends."

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

I would like to say that there is no more occasion for depriving the Bureau of Reclamation of its functions than there is in destroying the Corps of Engineers. It is an established agency. It is doing an outstanding job. It should be strengthened and encouraged. It would be more unwise to supplant the achievements of this organization for almost 50 years by an untried agency.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

There is pending in Congress today a coordinated plan for the Columbia River Basin with the projects named and with careful studies covering the economic and engineering problems involved. That coordinated report with division of authority between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation should be adopted. It should not be supplanted by the creation of an administration that would duplicate at the very beginning the years of studies and investigations made by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The two existing agencies would be destroyed. Their works would be duplicated at the expense of the taxpayers under the guise of coordination, but in reality for lump-sum appropriations and for supplanting the way of life in the region.

DISCRIMINATIONS IN LAWS

I am not saying that our flood-control and reclamation laws are perfect. I emphasize that they are on a sound foundation. Much of the criticism that now obtains, however, can be eliminated by the Congress of the United States. I like to be constructive. I want to help my friends. I always want to be fair to my enemies. I want to help the agencies of the Government that control our rivers and reclaim our lands. The remedy is not the creation of administrations, but the forward step is legislation eliminating differences in laws by the Congress of the United States. I believe that such legislation will do much to defeat the authorization of expensive and spending administrations.

I assert that in evaluating benefits the same rate of interest should obtain; the same charge for the disposal of power and the same system of costs and benefits with allowance for the essential differences that may be involved should obtain in both reclamation and flood control. The discriminations in existing laws between flood control authorizations and reclamation authorizations should be abolished. The two agencies have grown older, and with age they have grown more sensible. Dissension will be eliminated, expansion will be promoted, and new agencies will be defeated by the passage of a statute that would prevent and eliminate the fundamental differences in the laws that now obtain between reclamation and flood control authorizations.

WATER, RAIN, AND DISTILLATION

The attention of the country is being focused on waters today. The mismanagement of waters gives rise to fears that we are running out of water. The fact is that we have ample water. The demand with increasing populations and increasing needs, however, is increasing. Formerly there was ample water in the East. The lack of water for domestic purposes in New York City has appeared constantly in the headlines in recent months. When I visit the Great Salt Lake in Utah and the Salton Sea in California, and when I am on the Atlantic and on the Pacific, and whether near New York or Los Angeles, I am reminded that the water problem is most important, and it brings to mind the lines of Samuel Coleridge in the "Rime of the Ancient Mariner," written 150 years ago:

"Water, water everywhere, nor any drop to drink."

Experts tell us that the supply of water is ample and that if we conserve the supply there will be ample water. Research will be of aid. Here again science will play an important part. Today artificial rain is being studied by private and public agencies. They have not yet perfected plans to obtain water, but there is hope that the clouds as they are sprinkled with dry ice may provide rain. If the process is developed, it can be applied to arid regions where the need is greatest and to other regions where water is sometimes more precious than gold.

The methods of salt-water distillation used for stranded airplanes especially during World War II is being further explored. If scientists can produce the hydrogen bomb, they can surely eliminate the salt from the waters of the gulf and ocean. It is particularly important at the mouths of the rivers. Salt water distillation will result in the supplying of water that will make the deserts of the west more productive than most of the fertile valleys in other parts of the country.

ENGINEERING AND RESEARCH

Engineering and research have made possible the spanning of our rivers, the reclamation of our deserts, the construction of transcontinental highways, the building of transcontinental railways, the harnessing of mighty waterfalls, and the bringing of pure water through mountains, under gorges, and across lands to supply the teeming millions of cities. With the advance in engineering discoveries, science, and invention, there is the opportunity for free America to extend and maintain the highest standards of living ever attained by man.

GREAT OPPORTUNITY

Following war, and even in the uncertain days of peace, and with hope of a permanent peace, with unparalleled natural resources promoted by invention and science, the United States has the greatest opportunity in human history to provide for the well-being of man. In the Republic all are equal. There are no classes. The door of opportunity is open to all. If we keep faith with the lads who went out in World War II never to come back, and if we put first things first, there will be a new era of progress in the United States. There is opportunity for peace and for progress in the United States that has never been afforded to any people of any other country. Our plans must be sound. Our Government must be stable, and our faith must be abiding in man, country, and God.

DANGERS

After the stress of war, there is always danger. The tendency is to be soft. The temptation is complacency. We think more and more of our rights. We overlook our responsibilities. We think more of security than sacrifice. We confuse the meaning of public welfare. We must take advantage of our opportunity for progress, but unless America is strong, the opportunity may be lost. The Government must be stable. Public expenditures must not exceed public revenues. A paternal state must be avoided. Emphasis must be more on the responsibilities than on the rights of citizens. There are always dangers, and there are many dangers to the freedom of democracy in the United States today. I mention a few. There is confusion of the meaning of welfare. The private welfare and public welfare must not be confused. Those who advocate the so-called welfare state point out that Jefferson's program to purchase Louisiana was opposed by the conservatives of his day. There is a difference between the public welfare as promoted by the extension of our national domain and the private welfare of those who expect the Government to do for them what they should do for themselves. An unbalanced budget is a danger. The government that cannot live within its income in prosperity is in great danger of being destroyed in the event of either war or widespread inflation. It is time to think clearly and to speak frankly. Measures for the general public health are in order, but socialized medicine is a national danger. Home-owning is to be encouraged, but socialized Federal housing will result in the socialistic if not the communistic state advocated by those who first proposed public housing. Socialized farming will result in the regimentation and control of the farms and food of the Nation.

The plan of subsidizing agriculture has been tried, and it has failed. No course can more fully lead down the path to state socialism than the socialized programs that lead to a soft citizenship that deprives the country of the initiative and the independence of patriots. I cannot help but believe that the appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, while adequate defense is imperative, can be reduced, and I believe that we can reduce the appropriations that we have been making for the past 2 years for the recovery and the rehabilitation of the countries of Europe. A sound America, and a strong America is the best assistance that can be rendered to the oppressed peoples of the earth today.

ATOM BOMB

The strength of America does not consist in the atom bomb nor in any other source of power, but the strength of America consists in the faith and spirit of the people of America. The splitting and utilization of the atom should be applied for the benefit

and not for the destruction of man. I am a lot more afraid of other bombs than the atom bomb. For the want of a better name, I am apprehensive of the spending bomb that is likely to explode in unbridled inflation and national bankruptcy to the destruction of the American economy unless checked and checked now.

We must be prepared for war, for there is still both chance and change in the world, but there is no occasion for fear of the destruction of the world in the event of another war. I do not underestimate the effect of the atom bomb, but it takes something more than the bomb to make the bomb effective in war. Only the rich nations can produce the atom bomb, and only the rich nations can transport it to the enemy country when it is produced. I repeat, I do not underestimate the importance of the atom or the hydrogen bomb, but it is well to keep in mind that Japan was really begging for peace with the destruction of her air force and her navy when Nagasaki and Hiroshima were bombed.

It would be most unfortunate if America were dependent upon the atom bomb or any other weapon. We would relax and become soft. We would not be vigilant. America will only lose its liberty when it abandons it. I do not underestimate the force of the atom bomb, but I believe that the scientists who split the atom will provide for a defense against the atom bomb. Our weakness is in the selfishness of minority groups, in high taxes, and in unsound spending rather than in providing for permanent measures in the public benefit. When we encourage paternalism, when we encourage the Treasury raids of the minorities, we are destroying the freedom of the individual. It is time today in America to stop, look, and listen. If we do not watch our steps, it may be most difficult to retrace them. The strength of America is in the faith and courage of the people.

SYLVANUS

I spoke of the prologue as I began. I come now to my epilogue. "It is time to steady the national ship of state." It is not an accident that the United States is the leading democracy of the world today. Those who founded our Nation were sturdy souls. They suffered persecution. They sought to exchange the oppression of the Old World for the freedom of the New. They endured sacrifices. They paid the price for freedom. We must be willing to pay the price for continued freedom. We must be realistic. We must convert our dreams into realities. We must take advantage of our opportunity as a nation. We must be "guided by the stars and not by the lights of each passing ship."

MAN MAKING AND NATION BUILDING

I am anxious for the security of America. I know that security can only come with the strength of America. I am ambitious that America may grow and prosper. I would like for our generation to be constructive. The individual, like the government, that does not grow will die. Democracy is not only a growing but a dynamic faith. Over the gate of a city in the interior of ancient China is found an inscription which, when translated, reads, "It is later than you think." What was true centuries ago is true in the world today. Only in the United States today is there peace. Only in North America today is there security. Time is running out. It is later than we think. It is time for all citizens to take their places in the front lines of citizenship as we plan and build for the future.

A lad in the invasion in World War II wrote to his father as the American forces were landing on the Normandy beaches: "I am not in the grandstand nor on the sidelines, but in the front line of the invading forces." There was no place for the summer or sunshine patriot in that invasion. It tried men's souls. There is a place today in the front lines of citizenship for the patriotic American as humanity advances toward a better day.

No man or nation was ever great whose primary concern was security. The men who engaged in great adventures and the nations that took the risks have made the greatest contribution to the world. George Washington was a wealthy man. He did not seek a soft or an easy place. He was not satisfied with mere personal security. If he had lost, he would probably have died a traitor's death and forfeited all of his property. He took the risk. He is among the immortals.

Jesus of Nazareth did not seek mere security for Himself. He said that the man who loses his life in service shall save it. He dared to bring to the world a new appreciation of values and a new way of thinking. He gave His life for humanity. He dignified and loved man. Citizens must have faith in themselves and in their country. They must prefer sacrifice to security. The old-fashioned virtues of honesty, industry, thrift, and self-reliance are essential to a better man and a greater nation.

I close with these lines of Edward Markham:

"We are all blind until we see
That in the human plan
Nothing is worth the making if
It does not make the man.

"Why build these cities glorious
If man unbuilded goes?
In vain we build the world unless
The builder also grows."

Franklin Delano Roosevelt: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been glad and proud to identify myself as a Roosevelt Democrat for so long that I can scarcely remember any other badge of political devotion that I have worn.

My admiration for and devotion to the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt has been made a matter of record in many ways. I was not slow to recognize him as one of the greatest of all Americans, and one of the greatest men of all time, worthy to walk with the great leaders of history, a man who shaped his own destiny and the destiny of the world about him.

However, the hatred he evoked from a powerful and vocal minority in America is equally green in my memory; I can still see in my mind's eye some of the scurrilous and slanderous cartoons, lampoons, editorials, and articles published in derogation of that great man by lesser men.

You can understand, therefore, with what pleasure I read a full-page editorial in the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon eulogizing the late great wartime President. Under leave, I am inserting the text of the editorial in the RECORD. Since the rules do not permit its reproduction in its original format, I want to make special mention of the fact that the page is set up in very large type so that truly "he who runs may read".

This, Mr. Speaker, is recognition indeed, from the rock-ribbed Republican plains of Kansas, of a great man; and the display given by the Wichita Beacon is a gracious gesture from a newspaper which seldom agreed with his domestic policies in his lifetime.

It gave me pleasure to read this tribute and it gives me pleasure to place it in the RECORD.

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT—"MAN OF THE HALF CENTURY"

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the thirty-second President of the United States, who served 14 years as this Nation's Chief Executive after having previously played a major role in American history, is the choice of a vast majority of the world's peoples as "man of the half century."

Certainly no other man ever did so much for so many in a lifetime of public service. The tradition-shattering presidential career of Mr. Roosevelt spanned turbulent years of peace in which he worked to lift the Nation out of its deepest depression and tumultuous years of war when he played a dominant role in charting an Allied victory.

Mr. Roosevelt, without whose able leadership the Second World War, greatest conflict known to man, might have been lost, had attained a substantial international stature in the years when he was concerned primarily with applying revolutionary remedies to an economic blight rooted in World War I.

And after the flames of a second global conflict were kindled, he became the pivotal statesman of more than 30 united nations which pooled their might to smash a German-Italian-Japanese Axis.

Kings and queens, presidents and prime ministers traveled to the White House to consult him. International conferences on a scale never before seen in history resulted from Mr. Roosevelt's tremendous driving energy during the trying years immediately preceding and during the great conflict.

The military strategy of nations representing 75 percent of the earth's surface and 60 percent of its population—a strategy that sent American fighting men, American war weapons, American food, and American dollars to combat the Axis—was mapped at conferences in which he took the leading role.

A big man physically as well as mentally, Mr. Roosevelt shouldered burdens heavier than any ever before carried by a chief executive of any nation. When he went into the Presidency at the age of 51, the United States had an estimated 12,000,000 persons unemployed, prices were depressed to new low levels, foreign trade shrunken, and the national banking system on the brink of collapse as the result of widespread bank failures.

War was far from the thoughts of most Americans when Mr. Roosevelt declared in his inaugural address of March 4, 1933, that the only thing America had to fear was fear itself. Those words did much to relieve the minds of the masses who were faced with starvation. The drastic economic changes he offered to Congress were accepted and a new feeling of security was born. Faith and dignity returned to the common man. Security was just beginning to be felt by the American people when the rise of totalitarianism swept some parts of the world.

Mr. Roosevelt saw the threat as something more significant than a mere change of government in western European nations. He warned the world that dictators were threatening the very existence of democracy. He piloted this Nation through its greatest preparedness program. He told the rest of the world that America was ready to fight to preserve the rights of free men everywhere. It was up to the American people to do the rest. Pearl Harbor cemented American opinion behind the President and his stewardship led us successfully through the greatest war in world history.

Thirty days after Pearl Harbor, Congress gasped when he proposed a 2-year production of 125,000 planes, 120,000 tanks, 35,000 antiaircraft guns, and 8,000,000 tons of shipping. He told the world that the militarists of Berlin and Tokyo started this war, adding that the massed, angered forces of common humanity will finish it. Production goals, mammoth though they were, were met and surpassed and the Allies achieved a crushing superiority of arms over their foes. Four years after the United States entered the war, it had 11,500,000 men under arms, with more than 7,000,000 overseas fighting in all parts of the world.

By every standard by which global renown is measured Franklin Delano Roosevelt is head and shoulders above any other man on the world scene during the first 50 years of the twentieth century. In every standard of measurement—as a leader, as a statesman, as a man, as a power in world politics—he dwarfs all others during this 50-year period.

Mr. Roosevelt was more widely loved and respected, the world around, than any other person in the past half century.

Yalta Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago on February 7, 1945, at Yalta, a secret agreement was made which doomed the gallant Poles to Communist slavery and which condemned the anti-Communist Chinese to the reign of oppression to which they are now subjected.

I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a challenging statement by Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish-American Congress, regarding the sad and unbecoming actions which occurred at Yalta. Many of the difficulties with which we are now faced in the international field stem from this original sin. Much of the threat to American national security for which we are now desperately seeking an escape are the result of the ignominious betrayals of Poland and China at Yalta. No one can foretell when or by what means Poland and China will be liberated from their subjugation by these godless despots. But this we know: That aside from the fact that our own national interest was heavily involved and was badly served on this occasion, we have a great moral commitment to the freedom-loving peoples in both these nations.

It is time that we returned to the policy of open covenants openly arrived at. It is time indeed that we launched a great moral crusade. There can be no better beginning than by recognizing our moral commitments to the people of Poland and to the people of China. Let us not allow the high moral tone which we should assume at this time to be in any way diminished by the shameful and cynical expediencies to which we resorted at Yalta.

The statement follows:

DEAR BRYON: The abandonment of Nationalist China by Britain and the United States, brings to mind the forsaking of another loyal and valiant ally, Poland. The fate of both these allies was sealed at the same time and at one and the same place, at Yalta, 5 years ago, on February 7, 1945.

Today, no penetrating analysis or any deep study is needed to properly evaluate what Yalta was or is. A mere glance at the map of Europe and Asia is all that is needed to see the results of the shameful bartering of loyal nations that took place in that obscure Crimean town.

Yalta, was that single moment at the tragic crossroads of history that decided the life and death of millions of people, the fate of many nations and the outcome of the Second World War. There it was where we lost the peace while winning the war.

As long as the apparition of Yalta is upon us, so long will our hopes for peace remain but idle dreams. We must break away from Yalta so that history's course can again find its proper channel.

The Yalta decisions were not only politically pernicious but what is more, they bore the seeds of future conflict. The evil seeds sown at Yalta are now bearing evil fruit.

It was always the opinion of the six million Americans of Polish descent united in the Polish American Congress that the Yalta agreements would bring nothing but trouble. We knew that the course of American foreign policy which led to Yalta was not charted with the knowledge or consent of the American people and their Representatives in the United States Congress.

The Yalta agreement was never ratified by the United States Senate and is, therefore, null and void.

Speaking of Poland, which lost the most at Yalta, half her territory and what was left made into a puppet of Communist Russia—freedom and democracy can be restored to her people only if and when America repudiates all Yalta decisions regarding that country.

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President, Polish American Congress, Inc.
CHICAGO, ILL.

"Pie in the Sky" Tariff Slashes—Third Round Coming Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the phoney "pie in the sky" philosophies of the administration and the Democratic Party should now be crystal clear to the midwestern farmer. While his alleged friend, the Secretary of Agriculture, attempts to talk up a farm depression and further depress farm prices, the administration's policy is to preach fear—fear of surpluses. The same spokesmen who stated that they favored a broader price-support program with higher price-support levels are, in practice, curtailing the price-support program and threatening more and more control. The Secretary of Agriculture, who is so concerned about the farmer's income, gleefully slashes production and reduces the farmer's income through acreage allotments and marketing controls.

Fact is that the Secretary of Agriculture is not attempting to move our food surpluses. Fact is that he apparently is trying to build them up. The free-trade tariff-slashing policy is hitting right at home, at our own farmers, and directly forcing further curtailed production and lower price-support levels. The Secretary of Agriculture has the power and the authority to stop the flooding of our markets with foreign food products that we have in surplus supply or under price-support programs. The fact is he is not. There is a case on record in the Department of Agriculture that dates back to the fall of 1948. The nut growers protested the reduced tariffs and heavy imports of foreign nuts into the American market. They have petitioned and protested, but Secretary Brannan has failed even as yet to take any action.

In progress is the third round of tariff slashes since the end of the war. The lists are being prepared and the final meetings are scheduled to get under way next September. This, in spite of the recent report by the Department of Agriculture that many countries are beginning to be faced with surplus and marketing problems for their own agricultural products. During the period July-November 1949, we imported approximately $45,000,000 in value of food commodities that we had in surplus supply—Commodity Credit Corporation loans and inventories. Certainly our losses on these same commodities would have been reduced by this amount. But the flood of imports is but starting. Our exports meantime are being curtailed.

From July to November we imported 795,000 bushels of wheat—Government stocks on November 30 were over 375,000,000 bushels.

From July to November, we imported 288,000 bushels of corn—Government stocks on November 30 were over 400,000,000 bushels.

From July to November, we imported 18,500,000 bushels of barley—Government stocks were on November 30 over 58,000,000 bushels.

From July to November, we imported over 12,000,000 bushels of oats—Government stocks on November 30 were over 40,000,000 bushels.

From July to November, we imported 45,480 bags of dried beans—Government stocks on November 30 were over 9,000,000 bags.

From July to November, we imported the equivalent of 90,000,000 shell eggs in shell, frozen, and dried form—imported most of them from Red China, where the industry is being expanded and shipments increased. Farm wives were getting 30 cents a dozen for their eggs, which were then dried and added to the over 70,000,000 pounds now owned by the Government. From July to November, while hog prices skidded badly throughout the Midwest, we imported over 1,500,000 pounds of pork and pork products.

How long can this give-away last? When is the Secretary of Agriculture going to act to protect our farm markets?

Should the American People Finance the Puerto Rican Rum Campaign?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, public funds are now being used to advertise and promote the sale of liquor and whether they know it or not, the American people today are lending their direct support to the subsidization of a $1,500,000-a-year Government campaign of advertising and publicizing of Puerto Rican rum.

This campaign has now reached such proportions that its promoters are seeking to entice our teen-agers to sample this Puerto Rican product.

The clever way in which this propaganda is being packaged prevents the average citizen from realizing what is involved.

Here is how it works. The government of Puerto Rico, whose officials have publicly announced that that government is a partner in the rum business, have realized annual revenues ranging from $5,000,000 to $60,000,000 per year from Puerto Rican rum sold in the United States. Out of these funds last year the Puerto Rican government appropriated $1,500,000 for an advertising and publicity campaign directed at American consumers of that Puerto Rican product. In other words, the Puerto Rican government is taking $1,500,000 out of its treasury to spend on this campaign. It is just the same as the Congress of the United States appropriating from United States Treasury funds several million dollars a year to propagandize Kentucky whisky or any of the other alcoholic beverages manufactured in this country.

Now, how is this Puerto Rican campaign being designed to entice our young boys and girls to sample that island's demon rum? Well, one of the first endeavors of the propagandists working on this campaign was to get someone to dream up what they at least hoped would become a popular song hit in the United States. And they called it Rum and Soda. They had recordings made of the song and sent it, together with samples of Puerto Rican rum, to practically every disc jockey in the United States, obviously hoping that the samples would put the disc jockeys in such shape that they would push the tune over the air right into your home and mine. Naturally—and the Puerto Rican rum campaign propagandists know this as well as you and I—it is the teen-agers who follow these novel tunes on the air, so there can be no doubt that these rum salesmen were setting their sights on our children as the best target for their rum sales.

It would appear that this government-sponsored and supported Puerto Rican rum campaign is a new low in a business that has already done enough to bring suffering, misery, and wrecked homes and lives to the people of the United States.

Puerto Rico is a part of the United States. Its citizens are citizens of the United States.

The Federal taxes collected on tobacco grown in South Carolina goes to the United States Treasury. So do Federal taxes collected on products made in other States. Why then should Federal taxes collected on rum be returned to Puerto Rico just because it happened to be made there? It is clear they have abused the use of this money. Therefore, I propose that the law be amended to require that this money go to the United States Treasury.

A typical example of the brazen efforts of the Puerto Rican rum interests to promote the sale of Puerto Rico rum in the United States is the following advertisement of the Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co. of San Juan, P. R.:

HERE'S SWEET MUSIC FOR YOUR CASH REGISTER

Newly released by MGM records, Rum and Soda is a sparkling song hit. It's written and played by Noro Morales, the rhumba king. It's dedicated to the Governor of Puerto Rico. And it's being promoted by a great campaign.

All of that promotion for Rum and Soda promotes your business. National advertising—bar and record shop streamers—cooperative displays by Canada Dry at retail club-soda outlets—newspaper publicity—it all adds up to a hard-hitting campaign that shouts rum and soda to millions of people, including your customers.

So the smart thing to do is to get on the bandwagon. Help promote Rum and Soda—not just the song but the drink. Suggest it to customers. Put your Puerto Rican rums where they can be seen—at eye level on a center shelf, and a few bottles right out there on the counter.

As the old Puerto Rican proverb says: Sweeter than the guitar is the rustle and jingle of cash. Or, in other words, sell, brother, sell.

This is another concrete illustration why favorable action should be taken by Congress on the Langer and Bryson bills prohibiting all liquor advertising in Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Role of Farm Co-ops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Wisconsin Rapids Tribune of February 2, 1950:

ROLE OF FARM CO-OPS DISCUSSED AT JOINT MEETING OF CLUBMEN, FARMERS

"Farm cooperatives have operated in the United States for over 100 years—they want to be recognized for what they are, a small but vital force in American life."

That was the opinion expressed by C. L. Jackson, assistant secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, speaking Wednesday evening at a joint meeting of the Wisconsin Rapids Kiwanis Club and Wood County Farm Supply Cooperative held at the Congregational Church in Vesper.

Jackson, who substituted on the program for Milo Swanton, council secretary, originally scheduled to speak at the meeting, charged that while farmers have always done an excellent job of production, they have fallen down in their public relations with other groups.

"There has been too much pitting of one group against another. The policies of farmers affect those of businessmen and labor, and we must get together to learn what the other fellow is doing," he urged.

Concerning farm problems, Jackson said that the average American must look beyond the daily newspapers and radio programs for sufficient information to form sound opinions. He declared that the general public too often takes a portrait of a single farmer, as presented in a national magazine, as representative of the general situation.

Three problems were listed by the speaker as the most urgent now facing Wisconsin farmers: (1) The decline in prices paid for farm products, (2) the oleo producers' attempts to escape restrictions in marketing their commodity in competition with butter, and (3) the attack on the cooperative movement by various groups.

Jackson stated that farm income in Wisconsin has decreased 30 percent in the last year without "a comparable drop in the cost of operations. Instead, freight charges have increased 52 percent, and costs of labor and equipment have remained at high levels," he said.

He added that consumer services, including such things as distribution and delivery of farm products, are one of the biggest items in the cost of food, remarking that the price of a 16-cent loaf of bread would decrease only to 14.7 cents if the farmer donated the wheat for it. Jackson listed comparable figures for several other commodities, and urged that the probable solution to the problem was for the farmers to organize selling cooperatives in the same manner in which they have organized supply cooperatives.

As for the oleo battle, the speaker asserted that 29 huge corporations have fought the battle for repeal of Federal taxes, and that success on their part would be the beginning of the marketing of filled milk products of all sorts. He added that repeal of the tax will allow movement of yellow oleo in 32 States, pointing out that 75 percent of the butter produced in Wisconsin is marketed outside of the State in just such areas.

Turning to the problem of the cooperatives, Jackson said that the farmer has two alternatives: To ask the Federal Government to completely underwrite agriculture, or to build their own organizations. He expressed the opinion that the latter solution is the much more effective one, but hastened to add that he did not therefore envision a "co-op commonwealth."

Jackson explained that farm co-ops are taxed in the same manner as private business owned individually or in partnership, and denied that they are monopolistic. Of all the businesses in the United States, 86.4 percent are owned either by individuals or in partnership, 13 percent are corporations, and only 5 percent are cooperatives, Jackson said. He further stated that cooperative growth has not been relative to the growth of farm business in the past 15 years, and ridiculed the charge that cooperatives are communistic, pointing out that they depend upon the same set of values as other business organizations.

A. F. Bean, president of the Wood County Farm Supply Co-op, which was host to the Kiwanians at a 6:30 dinner, briefly outlined the history of the organization. He said that the first step was taken on July 28, 1907, when a cranberry co-op was formed that was in existence for about 10 years. The present organization came into being later when three Farm Bureau groups at Arpin, Pittsville, and Vesper were merged with a total capital of $150,000, he said.

Max Leopold, of Arpin, manager of the farm organization, and Martin Roosevold,

president of the village of Vesper, also extended welcomes to the visiting Rotarians. Jackson was introduced by W. W. Clark, of Vesper, Wood County assemblyman.

Prior to the dinner, a tour of the cooperative building at Vesper was taken.

Any Extension of the Selective Service Act Should Prohibit Discrimination and Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, following is a statement which I submitted to the Armed Services Committee today. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, a little more than a year ago I introduced a bill in the House, H. R. 1403, which was referred to this committee. Specifically I sought to amend the National Defense Act by adding a paragraph which provided that Federal aid is to be withheld from National Guard organizations which practice discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, or creed.

The exact wording of that paragraph was as follows:

"Whenever any unit of the National Guard practices discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, or creed with respect to members of, or applicants for membership in, such unit, the National Guard of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, as the case may be, of which such unit is a part shall be debarred from receiving from the United States any pecuniary or other aid, benefit, or privilege authorized or provided by this act or any other law."

Now, you have under consideration a bill to extend the Selective Service Act, which is due to expire in June of this year. In the event your committee decides to recommend to Congress a further extension of this act I hope and trust that it will at the same time make an earnest effort to correct some of the abuses still rampant in our armed services whereby some of our citizens are reduced to the status of second-class citizenship.

I am referring specifically to the treatment of Negroes in our armed services. How can we truly and honestly expect the Negro to fight for democracy, when he himself is a victim of racial prejudice and is not given the opportunity to enjoy the benefits of democracy? How can we ever expect the Negro to enter our armed forces and not grow increasingly resentful and distrustful, when he discovers that he is faced with the same limitations and Jim Crow treatment he had to endure in civilian life?

It is, therefore, imperative that your committee should amend the Selective Service Act along the following lines:

(a) Prohibit discrimination and segregation in the entire selective-service program. Persons subjected to such treatment should have the right of injunctive relief and writs of habeas corpus in Federal courts.

(b) Discrimination and segregation should be prohibited in interstate travel on buses, trains, planes, and boats by all military people; where practiced or enforced, such act should be a Federal offense.

(c) Any attacks upon or lynching of a person in military uniform shall be a Federal offense and severely punished.

(d) Prohibit discrimination against members of the armed forces by public authorities or in places of public accommodation, recreation, or other public service.

(e) Private contractors or commercial firms, as a condition of getting Government contracts under the Selective Service Act should be required to use fair-employment practices in their hiring of labor.

(f) Segregation in the National Guard must be forbidden, and no one should be exempted from selective service by virtue of service in a segregated National Guard unit.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize particularly the last section where I refer to the National Guard organizations. By incorporating my suggestions concerning the National Guard, you will include some of the purposes I had in mind when I introduced my bill last year. My original suggestion to withhold Federal aid from National Guard units which practice discrimination still stands, and I am as much in favor of it today as I was a year ago.

I hope the committee will give serious consideration to the amendments suggested above and will incorporate these in any Selective Service Act you may recommend.

In conclusion, permit me to extend my sincere thanks to your committee for the opportunity to present this statement to you.

Development of California's Electric Power Potential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more vital to the continued growth of California than a full development of its electric power potential. The people of California know this and are fighting for such a development for both present and future needs. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I bring your attention to two editorials on this subject from leading newspapers in the State. The first of these is "Governor Warren's Answer Is Vital" from the San Francisco News, and the second is "CVP Steam Plant Should Be Started This Year" from the Sacramento Bee.

The editorials follow:

[From the San Francisco News]

GOVERNOR WARREN'S ANSWER IS VITAL

The question of public versus private development of hydroelectric power on the North Fork of the Kings River will have to be answered by Governor Earl Warren (through his representative, Public Works Director Charles Purcell) by the middle of next week. His decision might settle the controversy between the United States Bureau of Reclamation and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. over rights to build power plants on the river.

Last fall the Bureau recommended a program of development that would exclude the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. from the river entirely. Under provisions of the 1944 Flood Control Act the recommendation was referred to the United States Army engineers and Governor Warren. The act provides that they must approve or disapprove the recommendation within 90 days. That would be by January 25. If they approve, the project becomes automatically allocated to the Bureau. If both ignore it, their action is construed by the law as tacit approval. If they disapprove, the matter goes to Congress for special legislation.

Several weeks ago the P. G. & E. won approval of the Federal Power Commission for a project to enlarge its present power developments on the river. A rehearing on that decision has been granted for March 20 to enable the Reclamation Bureau to present its further claims. However, it is the contention of bureau lawyers that approval by the governor and the Army engineers would settle the matter finally regardless of the FPC decision.

The outcome is important in connection with a Central Valley project plan to bring water to the dry west side of the San Joaquin Valley, now rapidly becoming California's dust bowl. That plan involves building a reservoir on San Luis Creek into which water would be pumped from the Delta-Mendota Canal in period of heavy winter run-off and stored for irrigation use in the rainless summer months. Some 250,000 acres would be brought under irrigation thereby.

To pump water from the canal to the reservoir would require an abundance of cheap power. That's where the Kings River power project comes in. It would be the source for the west side project pumps. Private power would be too expensive.

The question thus posed to Governor Warren and the Army engineers, therefore, is whether to encourage with their approval this plan to put water into the western dust bowl, or to reject the plan and thus subject it to the uncertainties of the Congress.

Anticipating that eventuality, Congressman CECIL WHITE, of California, has introduced a bill authorizing the Reclamation Bureau to acquire the P. G. & E. power works and rights on the river, and to build additional power facilities, as well as to operate the power features of the Pine Flat Dam the Army engineers have been authorized to build.

It is likely Governor Warren would be asked to express his approval or disapproval of that legislation when and if it reaches the voting stage in Washington. Inasmuch as the proposed development is entirely within the State of California, the Governor's attitude is important and should be influential in Congress' final decision.

What does Governor Warren say?

[From the Sacramento Bee]

CVP STEAM PLANT SHOULD BE STARTED THIS YEAR

Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman is urging Congress to approve funds to begin construction during the next fiscal year of the Central Valley's project steam plant. President Truman's budget recommendations include $2,000,000 for this purpose.

The case for the steam plant and for the immediate start of construction is a strong one.

The Federal Government definitely is committed to the policy of public transmission lines from Shasta Dam. It would be folly of the first water to haul the kilowatts to the central California market areas and then virtually abandon them to the privately owned power utilities.

Shasta power can be of benefit to the public only if it is firmed up by the adjunct of a steam plant.

Secretary Chapman told the House Appropriations Committee this week that Government power is necessary to pump the Sacramento River water into the San Joaquin Valley irrigation canals, and to supply Government installations and other users in central California.

The need for haste in getting the steam plant built is underscored by the fact the irrigation operation is scheduled to begin in the summer of 1951.

There should be congressional agreement with Secretary Chapman's statement that "it is most important the steam plant be placed under construction at once."

The private power lobby, of course, will be on hand in force to try to kill the CVP steam-plant appropriation.

This lobby fought for years to block the construction of transmission lines, in order to make it necessary for the Government to sell the power at the generating plants to a private utility.

But, having lost the transmission-line battle, the lobby now will concentrate on blocking the steam plant in an attempt to keep the transmission lines from being of practical benefit to the people.

In many respects this is a crucial contest, and Congress should deal with the power lobby in the steam-plant controversy as it did in the transmission-line fight—only it should not take so long.

How Federal Funds Are Wasted on the Apple Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following letters show the complicated, costly trade program:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., December 23, 1949.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: I have your letter of December 16, 1949, requesting information concerning the quantity and value of United States apple imports and exports during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

United States imports of apples for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, amounted to 1,900,000 bushels, valued at $5,800,000; exports during the same period amounted to 1,300,000 bushels, valued at $5,500,000.

To furnish you with basic information on the trade in apples we are enclosing a copy of a reprint from our Summaries of Tariff Information with statistics brought down to date.

If we can be of further service, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR B. RYDER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1950.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of December 16, 1949, asking the number of bushels of apples purchased for the school-lunch program this year, and their value.

Through December 17, 1949, the Department had purchased a total of 1,673,931 bushels of apples from the 1949 crop. These apples are purchased under authority of section 32, Public Law No. 321, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended, and are delivered to agencies authorized to receive such commodity for distribution to nonprofit school-lunch agencies, and to other agencies and institutions eligible to receive them. The estimated total delivered cost of these purchases is $4,373,820. Approximately 85 percent of the total purchases are used by the school-lunch agencies.

The total quantity to be purchased will depend largely upon market conditions for apples. For this reason we have not yet established an absolute quantity to be purchased.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, the above official letters show, first, that we imported 1,900,000 bushels of apples valued at $5,800,000 and exported 1,300,000 bushels valued at $5,500,000; second, that we used section 32 funds to dispose of surplus apples that represented 1,673,931 bushels valued at $4,373,820 for the school-lunch program.

The facts are that more apples were imported than were given away and $4,373,820 of the taxpayers' money was spent on the program. This is just a sample of the other programs being followed wherein we imported over $1,532,000,000 worth of competitive agricultural products at the same time other millions are spent to subsidize exports of other agricultural products. Is this not another argument in favor of an international agricultural agreement similar to the international wheat agreement, as proposed by Mr. Albert Goss, of the National Grange, and the FAO?

Yalta: Crime Will Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, 5 years have passed but the passage of time has not diminished the lingering stench of the foulest, the stealthiest, and the most shameless diplomatic maneuver of all time.

The Yalta agreement dangles over our heads like the sword of Damocles and history will forever point to our glaring repudiation of moral standards. The United States will not be able to forget that disgraceful retreat when a friend, a faithful ally, was left in the lurch. The world will continue to remind that we were partners in crime with Churchill and Stalin in a tragic betrayal of Poland. At Yalta the United States agreed to the fixing of the Curzon line as the western border of the Soviet Union, thereby incorporating a sizable area of prewar Polish territory. What hypocrisy. The Atlantic Charter specified that there would be no territorial changes that could not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. But, apparently in our great haste to appease Stalin these considerations were left by the wayside, for little imagination is needed to realize that earlier in this game of betrayal the State Department with its horde of pro-Soviet advisors prepared the terms of the Yalta Agreement and upon arrival in Yalta when notes were compared there was scarcely anything to pick up for disagreement between the Western Powers and the Russians. Alger Hiss had masterminded and engineered the terms to the satisfaction of the Soviets.

The administration in power at the time of the Yalta agreement and currently holding the reins of Government and messing up not only our foreign policy but everything in general should be held to account for the reckless trampling of the principles of humanity and liberty. The blame for the dismemberment of Poland comes to rest squarely upon the shoulders of the Democratic Party, for the Yalta agreement is undoubtedly the most monstrous and grievous diplomatic faux pas of our time.

When it is remembered that Poland was deliberately forgotten and abandoned and 40 percent of her territory turned over to Russia it is amazing that the blush of guilt does not continually cover the faces of the members of the Democratic Party. We demanded unconditional surrender from our enemies and then with one stroke at Yalta President Roosevelt surrendered ignominiously and unconditionally to Stalin, thereby setting in motion the gigantic totalitarian expansion in eastern Europe and the present debacle in the Near East.

In the light of what we have learned to date there certainly was no need for the meeting at Yalta. We were winning the war—supplying the needs of a worldwide struggle and yet we were appeasing Stalin. We were giving early indication of fearing Russia. Our dealings with her indicate a continuing parade of concessions. The State Department and the administration just simply neglected to remember that the honor of the United States as a protector of free peoples is an important factor in our relations with other countries and should be upheld at any cost. But what is worse is the fact that the American people and the Congress were left completely in the dark as to the deals at Yalta which shoved Poland, our valiant ally, behind the iron curtain, and set off a chain of similar tragedies in eastern Europe.

The administration is responsible for Alger Hiss and his ilk that clutter the State Department with their Soviet-slanted advice and assist in formulating the cock-eyed foreign policy which has been causing the United States such discomfort and loss of prestige throughout the world that the possibility of graceful extrication from this dilemma appears remote for some time to come.

We have all been given ample proof that the pledges made at Yalta were utterly disregarded by Stalin.

The decisions of Yalta no longer bind us. We have every right to repudiate that ill-conceived venture that is steering us into another conflagration. Nothing is to be lost by throwing away something that was worthless to begin with.

After 5 years of keeping the Yalta document under wraps is it not high time to bring out into the light of day, for all to see, the details of that infamous cabal.

Since the Yalta agreement is presumably long overdue in the Senate of the United States there should be no further delay and it should now be sent to the Senate for consideration.

Our stand at this point in our history should be expressed by a firm and convincing action aimed at restoring to

Poland and other nations swallowed up by the Communists, the freedom that has virtually disappeared from their midst.

There has been no ratification of the Yalta Agreement by the Senate of the United States and there is no earthly reason why we should continue to honor a piece of paper that has no meaning except to further the Soviet expansion in Europe and the world. We have gone far enough along that road. It is time to call a halt.

More on the Jews in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, only yesterday I brought to the attention of this House the very interesting study of the situation of the Jews in Russia, which was made by Dr. Sergius Yakobson of the Library of Congress. I have many of the Members found the opportunity to read this study which I placed in the RECORD.

Entirely by coincidence, the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, at its meeting in Miami, Fla., issued a statement urging quick ratification of the genocide convention and in it the charge is made that Russia is trying to wipe out the Jews behind the iron curtain. The A. F. of L. council says: "The new drive to make impossible the continued existence of Jews in Russia and in its satellite areas is going on under the flag of a savage war against so-called cosmopolitanism."

At the same time, we still hear the ridiculous charges made by anti-Semitic elements of a Zionist-Communist global plot" and the illogical reasoning that every Jew is a Zionist and every Zionist is a Communist. It should be clear by this time to anyone who is honest with himself and with his fellowmen that, in the light of Russia's attitude to the Jewish religion and its treatment of its Jewish nationals, there is no future and no hope for Jewish survival in Communist Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD two items which deal with this subject. One is from the Washington Star, February 8, 1950, entitled "AFL Charges Russia Is Trying To Wipe Out Jews as Hitler Did"; the other is from the New York World-Telegram and Sun, February 2, 1950, "Red-Hater Don Levine Swings at Right, Hits Hart as Anti-Semite" by Frederick Woltman. They are as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 8, 1950]

AFL CHARGES RUSSIA IS TRYING TO WIPE OUT JEWS AS HITLER DID

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., February 4.—Leaders of the American Federation of Labor charged today that Stalin is trying to wipe out Jews behind the iron curtain.

The AFL's executive council said Russia is patterning Hitler by making life miserable for Jews as a class in a way that means virtually sentencing these human beings to death.

Those charges were included in a council statement urging the Senate to ratify quickly the pending international treaty against genocide. This is the terms that has been given to the international destruction of racial, national, or religious groups.

BASED ON CULTURAL GROUNDS

The AFL council said what Stalin is doing to the Jews is a tragic extension and frightening innovation in this crime of mass murder.

The American Federation of Labor keeps a force of trained observers in Europe operating closely with underground movements in Russia-dominated territory.

The council's statement said:

"Behind the iron curtain—and particularly in Soviet Russia—governmental authorities have developed a Sendish plan based on cultural grounds and have launched a terrific campaign to wipe out entire groups of their population.

"The new drive to make impossible the continued existence of Jews in Russia and in its satellite areas is going on under the flag of a savage war against so-called cosmopolitanism.

"Their crime is that they have, or might develop, a culture different from the ultranationalist and imperialistic brand supported by the ruling party, by the totalitarianism dictatorship in Russia.

"VICIOUS CAMPAIGN

"A vicious campaign is afoot to chase out all Jews from employment in occupations entailing contact with the mass of people in the U. S. S. R. or with the people of other countries.

"All citizens of Jewish origin have been eliminated from the Soviet occupation administrations in Austria and Germany. Jews are no longer permitted to be members of Soviet delegations and foreign missions or to undergo training for diplomatic service.

"The door to employment in the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade has been slammed hard in the face of Russia's Jews—on cultural grounds. The same process of elimination of Jews continues ruthlessly in the ranks of the ruling Communist Party and its government apparatus."

What is happening in Russia, the council said, means that prompt international action to check the spread and stop the perpetration of this heinous crime is most urgent.

The council said the genocide treaty would mean international sanctions could be applied against this treatment of the Jews and against the destruction of life through slave labor.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of February 2, 1950]

RED-HATER DON LEVINE SWINGS AT RIGHT, HITS HART AS ANTI-SEMITE—SAYS NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL BREWS ZIONIST-COMMUNIST MYTH

(By Frederick Woltman)

Plain Talk, the monthly magazine which specializes in exposing the Communists, today delivered a blast in another direction.

The leading article of its February issue, signed by Isaac Don Levine, editor, attacked Merwin K. Hart, founder and president of the National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building.

It charged that the head of the council, which lists prominent industrialists and businessmen among its backers, is in the business of merchandising anti-Semitism.

QUOTES HART ON ZIONISTS

"And," continued the article, "he wraps his contraband in packages bearing the labels of free enterprise, anticommunism and Christian love."

His Economic Council Letter of December 15, according to Plain Talk, "leaps to the startling conclusion that 'the controlling influence in the world is not the United States, nor the UN, which the United States did so much to set up, but the Zionists'."

This was part of a 2-year design by Mr. Hart to create the myth of a Zionist-Communist global plot to destroy the Christian religion, wrote the editor. It ignores, he added, the fact that Communist Russia was the first modern power to outlaw Zionism as far back as 1920 and that thousands of Zionists have been sent to Soviet slave-labor camps, many of them to perish.

CITES EXHORTATION TO ARM

That every Jew is a Zionist and every Zionist is a Communist is an integral part of the Hart myth, according to Mr. Levine.

To show he is in dead earnest, Mr. Hart wrote in his January 15, 1948, council letter:

"We have one concrete suggestion to make to every citizen who is impressed by the potential danger.

"Let him possess himself of one or more guns, making sure that they are in good condition, that he and other members of his family know how to use them, and that he has a reasonable supply of ammunition."

CONCERNING JEWISH NAMES

The letter went on to advise its readers to acquire the weapons in accordance with the statutes of their particular States.

Like the press of Nazi Germany and the Communist press of Russia, according to Mr. Levine, "Mr. Hart knows how to underscore Jewish-sounding names and to put in quotation marks non-Jewish-sounding names when it is common knowledge that their bearers are of Jewish origin."

Among the council's supporters or deluded followers, Mr. Levine pointed out, are captains of industry, prominent members of the bar, politicians, clergymen, and educators.

SEES COMMON ENEMY SERVED

"The tragedy is that Mr. Hart brings to the noble cause of freedom the disease-carrying elements of hate and civil strife," declared Plain Talk.

"He unwittingly serves the common enemy and furthers the divisive and wrecking operations of Stalin's fifth column."

Isaac Don Levine for decades has written against Soviet totalitarianism and the Red underground in this country.

A Necessary Amendment to the Electoral College Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary has approved House Joint Resolution 2, commonly known as the Lodge-Gossett Resolution. This resolution proposes certain changes in the provisions of the Constitution for the election of the President and Vice President.

I am strongly opposed to House Joint Resolution 2 in its present form for the reasons presented in my minority views which are appended to the report of the Judiciary Committee.

Among my reasons for opposing the resolution is my conviction that its provision for the division of each State's

electoral votes in proportion to the popular votes in that State would result in further restrictions upon the franchise in the safe or solid States.

In my minority views I stated that when the resolution reached the floor I would offer an amendment to prevent this most undesirable result.

By my amendment each State's electoral votes in any particular election would be reduced in the proportion that the number of persons actually voting is less than the total number of citizens of voting age in that State.

The text of House Joint Resolution 2, showing my proposed amendment, is set out below. My amendment would eliminate the language printed in brackets and would add the language in italics, which appears immediately thereafter.

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (*two-thirds of each House concurring therein*), That an amendment is hereby proposed to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States. Said amendment shall be as follows:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as herein provided.

"The electoral-college system for electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin. [Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress.] *Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes in any election for the Presidency which bears the same ratio to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress as the total number of votes cast in such State at such election for all candidates for the Presidency bears to the total number of citizens of voting age in such State according to the last preceding decennial census.*

"Within 45 days after such election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the official custodian of the election returns of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons for whom votes were cast for President and the number of votes for each, and the total vote of the electors of the State for all persons for President, which lists he shall sign and certify and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives open all certificates and the votes shall then be counted. Each person for whom votes were cast for President in each State shall be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes thereof as he received of the total vote of the electors therein for President. In making the computations, fractional numbers less than one one-thousandth shall be disregarded. The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President. If two or more persons shall have an equal and the highest number of such votes, then the one for whom the greatest number of popular votes were cast shall be President.

"The Vice President shall be likewise elected, at the same time and in the same manner and subject to the same provisions, as the President, but no person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"SEC. 2. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution and the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 3. This article shall take effect on the tenth day of February following its ratification.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

Percentage Depletion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I am including an editorial that appeared in a recent issue of the Oil and Gas Journal. The article is entitled "Percentage Depletion."

This statement, in my judgment, sets forth quite concisely the position of the independent oil operators with respect to the proposed legislation to reduce the depletion allowance presently in effect.

PERCENTAGE DEPLETION

The President's attack on percentage depletion in the oil and mining industries as a tax loophole is in character for an administration which knows that it can perpetuate itself only by continued reckless spending, and which is desperately seeking new sources of revenue which will not have unwanted political repercussions in an election year.

Nothing new has developed indicating that the present oil and gas depletion provisions should be ended or reduced as to percentage. In fact, if a fair and complete investigation results, the weight of the evidence will be on the side of liberalization.

The Depletion Act became effective in 1926, after long investigation by Congress. It was a practical application of a taxing principle previously recognized by Congress and which in turn had a background of English mining law going back more than three centuries.

Briefly reiterated, the 27½ percent depletion allowance isn't a "tax gift," a "tax avoidance," or anything of the kind, but represents a return of capital to those engaged in the hazardous pursuit of finding and producing oil. In principle, applied to an irreplaceable asset, it is exactly the same as depreciation allowance for manufacturing enterprises and other replaceable business operations in arriving at taxable income.

The 27½ percent depletion figure originally was a compromise figure of the two branches of Congress, arrived at after an investigation had shown that the allowance should be in excess of 30 percent in an industry-wide application. Actually, because of the statutory limitation based on net income, operators as a group do not receive the full 27½ percent.

So much for the position of the oil and gas industry. What about the depletion provisions in relation to public policy?

A practical objective of the depletion allowance is to encourage operators to find plenty of oil. This they have done—too much at times for their own good. These supplies have not only been large enough to take care of the steadily expanding needs of a peacetime economy but have been adequate for two major war emergencies.

Then there is the matter of petroleum's cheapness. The latest Government report shows the all-commodity index to be 152.2, that of petroleum 110.1. This means yearly savings to users of petroleum many times greater than the total depletion allowances.

Outstanding efficiency in production, refining, and transportation are factors in the low index of petroleum extending over many years, but it starts with the fact that the capital protection that depletion affords producers has supplied in part the wherewithal needed to find sufficient oil. Without THE incentive oil prices most assuredly would be more in line with the commodity levels.

The oil industry has much at stake in defending this latest attack on its tax position, but that of tens of millions of consumers is much greater.

A Plea for Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the East Orange (N. J.) Record of February 2, 1950. I think this fine and thoughtful editorial is deserving of the attention of all Members, particularly at this time when the legislative proposals to implement the Christian concept of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God are under such violent attack. As the writer of the editorial observes, our need for brotherhood is even greater today than it was when the Republic was founded. If we are to survive as a Nation, we must give unreserved allegiance to the credo upon which our great country was established and wipe out the breach between ideals and practice so that all Americans can enjoy full civil and political rights.

A PLEA FOR BROTHERHOOD

"Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that Thou will keep the United States in Thy holy protection; that Thou will incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government; to entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large."

It is fitting that Washington's prayer after his inauguration should be the prayer with which we celebrate Brotherhood Week. Our Nation was founded upon the principle which is the foundation of all monotheistic religions—the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. We pave allegiance to this credo when we accepted as the cornerstone of this Republic, the declaration that all men are created equal.

Consider the prayer of our first President. He prayed first for divine protection for the United States. Next for the willingness of Americans to submit themselves to the laws which they themselves should make, to the will of the majority, and lastly he prayed that they have brotherly affection and love for one another as fellow citizens. By submission to law, Washington did not mean blind subservience. His formula left room for laws to be tested, to be subject to repeal, to be put to a high and supreme authority to establish their justice. Those rights come under our procedures as Washington understood them.

Here was no mention of creed, race, or color. Here were drawn none of the differentiating lines of the Old World. He prayed to the Father of all mankind that His children might recognize their kinship and display the spirit of brotherhood.

Our need for brotherhood is even greater today than it was when the Republic was founded. If we are to survive as a Nation, if we are to take our proper place in the world of nations, we must have brotherhood—not a condescending charity toward those whose ancestry, faith, or work is different than ours, but a wholehearted acceptance of the kinship of all right-thinking men, of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. America is made up of all races and creeds, but Americans to be true Americans, must respect individuals for what they are individually, regardless of color or creed.

The strength of brotherhood is the strength of love. If we as individuals cannot get along with our neighbors, how can we ever hope to live peaceably with other nations. Prejudice and bigotry are the subterfuge and the foundation of all wars.

The full expression of brotherhood is the Golden Rule which has never been surpassed as the most practical rule of life and as the only basis for peace on earth. As we celebrate the birthday of the father of our country during Brotherhood Week, let us pause to pledge ourselves again to that golden rule of life—"Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that man should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets."

It Is Vitally Important That We Work Out a Plan Whereby Every American Citizen, in All Areas of Our Country, Have Medical, Surgical, and Nursing Services Adequate to His or Her Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, subsequent to adjournment of this House on January 20, our colleague, FRANCES P. BOLTON, flew back to her congressional district in Cleveland. She made that journey in order to discuss with the Cleveland Medical Library Association, holding its annual meeting on that evening, various phases of a national health program as comprehended in the many bills that have been introduced into the hoppers of the House and the Senate, by Republicans and Democrats alike.

Mr. Speaker, there is probably no Member of Congress who has given more time, thought, substance, and study to the problems of public and private medicine, nursing, and child care, to the field of preventive and curative medicine and related fields, than has our distinguished colleague from the Twenty-second District of Ohio.

We in this House who know Congresswoman BOLTON, for years have listened while, with knowledge and logic, she has urged the passage of bills that looked to the welfare of the Nation's children, its mothers, its sick, its indigent, and blind.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no one in this body who can speak from a greater personal experience and with a more sympathetic understanding on any question involving the mental, physical, and spiritual health of the American people than can FRANCES BOLTON.

Rich in its quotable parts, the Congresswoman's address to the Cleveland Medical Library Association discloses in large measure the important changes that have taken place here in these United States which give rise to the question as to the adequacy of existing medical and hospital services available to our people, regardless of their age group or economic status.

It is because of the factual and practical manner in which Mrs. BOLTON addresses herself to this problem that I am asking the unanimous consent of the Members of this House to insert into the records of our proceedings today the address which Congresswoman BOLTON made on January 20. I commend its reading and study to every Member, with the assurance that if and whenever such a bill comes to this floor for passage, the House will have the benefit of the perception and experience of this great humanitarian.

Congresswoman BOLTON's address to the Cleveland Medical Library Association follows:

Mr. President, members of the Cleveland Medical Library Association, ladies and gentlemen, I am greatly honored to be the first woman to address this distinguished group of Cleveland physicians and surgeons and those interested in various fields of care for the sick and prevention of disease.

No old Clevelander like myself could come to this Allen Memorial Library and not be flooded with memories of the many consecrated physicians who have influenced the life of this great community. This beautiful building in itself is evidence of a certain capacity they had for bringing the layman to recognition of the part he should play in making medical and nursing care available to all the sick. It is a monument to the constructive altruism of those responsible for great wealth.

Cleveland has become known everywhere for its social conscience and for its community spirit, a spirit that makes one both proud and humble to be a Clevelander.

This library has on its shelves and in its archives priceless material for those who search out historic backgrounds, as well as for those who reach out with eager and never-ceasing curiosity into the realms just beyond the proven wonders, into the areas still to be proved.

Who knows, friends, what new life may not be stirring at this moment within the hearts and minds of those who come and go in this building? Who can say what the membership of this medical library will bring to birth at the appointed time?

There are many matters I should like to talk over with you—all of them far reaching—all of them having to do with the one great problem with which we must come to grips—the protection of freedom here in these United States.

I am particularly appreciative of the opportunity to come here tonight and participate in your proceedings because one of the most vital matters before us all is that of the physical and mental well-being of our people—not parts of them, but all of them.

I am referring to the so-called national health plan and program which, as advanced by the Federal Security Administration under Mr. Oscar Ewing, is, in fact, a proposal to inaugurate a new Federal pay-roll tax to be superimposed upon the pay-roll deductions and other taxes already being collected from the workers in these United States.

The compulsory plan as proposed would, by law, compel the employer to take out of the pay envelopes of the employees an additional 3 to 4 percent on every dollar earned, in order to create annually in the Federal Treasury a fund of from three to six billion dollars, to be redistributed by some newly created Federal agency employing an estimated fifty to eighty thousand new Federal pay-rollers.

But more about this later.

I feel it altogether unnecessary for me to point out to this audience of Cleveland physicians and surgeons the all-consuming interest I have maintained for some 40 years in matters affecting the health and welfare of our people. The record of that service began more than a quarter of a century before I went to Congress—in the field of health and hygiene, as well as in the field of public-health nursing. It began in the early days of the Visiting Nurse Association with what was known as the Brownie Club. This little group became the surgical dressings committee of the Visiting Nurse Association. We were given the task of making the dressings used by the nurses. We went out eagerly with the visiting nurses into the homes, carrying their bags, tidying up the houses, washing anything that needed washing, helping the nurse at every turn. As I look back upon a full life I know that no experience I have had was more vital to my understanding of life as it really is rather than as we hope that it will be.

I shall not spend my short time with you elaborating upon the accomplishments made by the medical profession which have come within my personal experience since the turn of the century. The over-all accomplishments of medicine have opened up vistas of well-being beyond those of any other science.

Humanity will ever affirm that the work of Louis Pasteur in his researches with respect to germs, of Drs. Norton and Long in their discovery of anesthesia, of Koch in isolating the tuberculosis germ, of Madame Curie in radium, and many others have not alone brought greater comforts to mankind, mental as well as physical, but also were the early waymarks that have brought us into new areas of scientific knowledge.

For we stand today at the end of a momentous half century. We are at the gateway that opens into an area awesome to contemplate. One prays that those who deal with nuclear fission, who dare to propose upsetting the balance of disposition of so volatile and terrible a force as hydrogen—in essence the central spark of light and

fire—that those who deal with it will be constrained by sheer love of humanity from bringing upon the earth a destruction beyond the imagination of man to conceive.

Because health is so vital to sound judgment, at a moment in time when not only judgment but great wisdom are imperative if freedom is to survive, I could not come to you tonight without discussing some of the problems awaiting solution in this field and in the field of adequate care of the sick.

The solution of this problem, sought and found within the American formula for freedom, as I believe it can be, will indicate the direction in which we, as a Nation, will go in the second half of this century.

The questions uppermost in our minds are: Shall we accept the suggestions that are being poured out upon us that Americans can no longer do for themselves, or shall we gird up our loins, alert our minds, face the facts, and solve the problem?

Do we want the Federal Government to reach down into every department of our lives? Grafted that there are many things which we as individuals, as communities, and as States can no longer do without Federal help, but surely we can find methods by which freedom from an all-encompassing central authority can be maintained.

It is in the light of this fundamental need to protect our basic freedom that I want to discuss for a few minutes the principles involved in a national health program, for just as it is on your minds every day, so is it a matter of constant argument and discussion in the cloakrooms of the Congress.

May I say to you that more than a million words, on every issue and on every side of this question, have already been written into the records of committee hearings during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

It is definitely incumbent upon all of us to have a clear understanding as to what constitutes the national health problem. Once the question is clearly posed, and not until then, can we formulate principles and policies which, when enacted into law, will retain all of the benefits and eliminate as much of the error as can be discovered in the free-enterprise system that we have historically enjoyed in the practice of medicine as part of our way of life here in America.

We can well be proud of what has been done for the health of our people. Nowhere on earth are so many of the results of scientific research available to such numbers. We cannot close our eyes, however, to the fact that there are still areas in our country—there are still groups of our people—unable to secure the medical care they need. It is of utmost importance that we work out a way by which every last one can have a plentitude of medical, surgical, and nursing services commensurate with and adequate to his or her needs.

Now, as never before, there is a patent and a particular need for some national health program, and that need, of which we hear vocal expression on every hand, makes it the more necessary that we take the formulation of such a program out of the hands of the economic crackpots and political "do-gooders" scattered throughout every bureau in the National Government in Washington.

If we are to maintain the American way, such a plan cannot be laid down along lines which will regiment the medical, surgical, and nursing professions and the technicians serving with them, giving society services rendered under a compulsory system, supported by taxes taken out of the pay envelopes of the workers, and later dispensed by a federalized medical bureaucracy—by doctors employed by the Government.

"Economic crackpots" are nothing new! Years ago when congressional enactment of a compulsory medical system was first discussed, I was talking with the editor of a nationally known publication about the program advanced at that time to establish a cabinet post—with a Secretary presiding over a newly created Department of Health. The proposal, then as now, was that any man appointed to administer such a post should by no means be a medical man!

When one fully appreciates the tremendous economic, social and financial changes that have taken place in Government during these last 20 years, one can more clearly understand and weigh the demands being made by the electorate that something be done by the Federal Government in the field of medical care.

First and foremost of the factors which give rise to these demands is the fact that the national system of taxation as administered during the past 2 decades, has in a large measure dried up the sources of private funds which long gave philanthropic support to extended and never-ending research in the field of both preventive and curative medicine.

I have quite recently done some interesting research on the subject of "Foundations" and our "Public Trusts" * * * their effect upon our society at the turn of the century and what, generally, is happening in regard to them today. I would like to give you some of my findings.

A study of the larger "Foundations," "Trusts," and other types of "Endowments" as reported in the World Almanac of 1949, reveals most important and significant facts that have to do with the present problem of health and nursing care. Statistic-wise, they set forth the year the trusts were founded * * * the amount of the original endowment * * * other assets, and the amount expended between the years 1902 and 1941.

During the 10-year period 1939–49, there was expended by our foundations listed in that decade the small sum of $2,500,000, of which $821,443 was spent right here in the city of Cleveland, by our own Elizabeth Severance Prentiss (Allen) Foundation.

In the preceding 10 years, the expenditures of these foundations amounted to the sum of $65,000,000 * * * while in the previous 20-year period they averaged $56,000,000 annually, or a grand total expended by the trusts and foundations established by our wealthier class of the stupendous sum of $1,127,000,000.

The over-all purpose for which these bequests were made was to promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world. Particular emphasis in many instances was placed upon certain specific fields: medical sciences (psychiatry); natural sciences (experimental biology); public health (development of general public-health activities and study and control of certain diseases); social sciences (projects contributing to the understanding of important social problems and to the development of personnel and methods); the humanities (efforts to raise the general cultural level and to promote cultural interchange between countries).

Millions were annually donated for public health, to the support of other agencies, and for training, through post doctoral fellowship, of competent personnel in the various fields of medicine and surgery.

Instead of enjoying the benefits of similar bequests and gifts, we today see similar contributions restricted to drives, and popular appeal made for the bestowal of small contributions in order to fight polio, cancer, heart, tuberculosis, and other diseases.

It becomes more evident each day that the inroads made upon private initiative by Federal legislation and tax policies are drying up the past sources and subjecting the people to an even greater overburden of taxation than meets the eye.

The decline in the number and amounts of the philanthropies enjoyed by the medical and educational professions during these last 18 years, is in direct ratio with and clearly traceable to the confiscatory high rates of taxation imposed upon income by both the Federal and State Governments, whether that income is derived from gainful employment, capital gains, inheritance, gift, or other sources.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that with what seemed an inexhaustible supply of endowed capital cut off by our newly applied tax system, these "do-gooders" now propose to levy additional taxes upon those less able to pay them in order to replace the funds which used to flow as freely into medical channels as rivers flow to the sea.

There is no gainsaying the fact that there are certain areas, and even certain income groups in these United States, whose requirements are not now serviced with adequate medical, surgical, and nursing service.

I remember well a statement made by Mr. Harvey W. Brown, long-time president of the International Association of Machinists, a man well and favorably known to the people of Cleveland—a man of vision, of deep convictions—when he testified before the House Committee on Labor and Public Welfare June 2, 1949. This was just a few days before his voluntary retirement as president of the great International Association of Machinists, an organization with a membership of more than 600,000 workers. Mr. Brown told of the long researches conducted by his organization in the field of medical and nursing services. Let me quote him, because his words must be listened to:

"After careful study, and recognizing the needs of our 625,000 members and their families * * * our conviction is that we need Federal health insurance * * * Our conviction is not alone based on technical and scientific charts or figures. To a great extent it comes from the first-hand knowledge that our families live under a constant fear of costly medical expenses which they cannot at present guard against * * * The well-to-do and the charity patients are for the most part adequately cared for. Present voluntary plans at best can only supply part of the in-between group with partial financial assistance."

This is a statement made by a leader of organized labor * * * a labor statesman * * * one who after serving his people in our country for nearly 40 years, was chosen by our Government to serve abroad. He is at the moment doing an outstanding job as director of labor affairs in the office of John J. McCloy, United States High Commissioner for Germany.

One reason I have made such a supreme effort to be with you tonight is because I believe that in this great city where I was born and grew up, there is no group more able to address themselves to this whole broad question of adequate medical care for all our people * * * in the American way * * * than you of the Cleveland Medical Library Association.

As for me, I am not this evening speaking in behalf of any particular bill that has been introduced, either in the House or in the Senate.

I am well acquainted with the provisions of (S. 1679) the Health Act sponsored by Senators THOMAS of Utah, WAGNER, PEPPER, CHAVEZ, TAYLOR, HUMPHREY, and MURRAY.

I am cognizant of all the discussion there has been with respect to S. 1581, the National Health Act of 1949 as sponsored by Senators TAFT, DONNELL, and SMITH of New Jersey.

I have studied with deep interest the Voluntary Health Insurance Act (S. 1656) as sponsored by Senators HILL, O'CONOR, WITHERS, AIKEN, and MORSE.

I have likewise studied S. 1106, the Medical Aid Act of 1949 as proposed by Senator LODGE, together with H. R. 4918, cosponsored by my colleagues in the House, Representatives HESTER, AUCHINCLOSS, CASE, PUTNAM, HALE, JAVITS, MORTON, and NIXON; and by Senators FLANDERS and IVES in the Senate.

My desire is to emphasize the fundamentals that must be taken into consideration in whatever action results, if we are to retain our heritage of freedom.

Somewhere I once saw a little verse which, as I remember, read something like this:

"So many Gods, so many creeds,
So many roads that wind and wind,
When just the art of being kind,
Is all this old world needs."

I am reminded of that verse because when I had completed my study of these bills as they were introduced at both ends of the Capitol, and had read the long pages of testimony given by the endless number of witnesses who appeared before the respective committees of both the HOUSE and SENATE, it became evident that all were aiming at the self-same goal: to insure the physical and mental well-being of all the people of this great country of ours.

I believe that we must find ways to insure sick care and a better chance for health to all of our people. That whatever method we decide upon, provision should be made that the Federal Government provide moneys with which to make a totally disinterested national survey to ascertain in exactly what geographical areas, income groups, and other criteria our people stand in need of additional medical services.

That survey should include the regional and local evaluation of all hospital facilities available, of the additional medical educational facilities needed to keep a flow of young, virile professional personnel in sufficient numbers to fill the existing deficiency.

In addition thereto, the plan should make provision that all aged and indigents shall be afforded the same high character of medical, surgical, nursing assistance that is afforded to the most fortunate among us.

We should also institute a general health-education program more intimately to inform our citizens on a Nation-wide scale of the benefits that would accrue to them by their voluntary association with one of the many hospitalization and surgical groups now existent, or the formation of new insurance groups in special areas.

But above all else, it is my studied conviction that what is to be done should be done on a basis of some form of medical insurance, not to be made compulsory by the legal collection of taxes to be taken out of the pay envelopes of the wage earners of these United States by their employers.

In other words, the over-all improvement in medical service throughout the country to be attained by some one of the programs advanced in both Houses of Congress to date, can be accomplished by the extension of the voluntary groups now common to our life in these United States.

In his appearance before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on May 19 last, J. Donald Kingsley, Acting Federal Administrator, and speaking for Mr. Oscar Ewing, the Administrator, made this significant statement: "Health insurance has made gigantic strides and now affords protection to 82,500,000 Americans, or a third of the Nation."

It is true that Mr. Kingsley questions the amount of protection that health insurance affords, granted it covers as yet only one-third of our people. Well, if voluntary health insurance does not afford sufficient protection, let us extend the coverage so that it will afford what in Mr. Kingsley's and Mr. Ewing's opinion is a coverage needful and necessary to insure the health and comfort of our people.

"Most voluntary insurance policies," Mr. Kingsley continued, "are issued by Blue Cross hospitalization plans. * * * About 60 percent of these policies are held by citizens of six rich industrial States, which contain approximately 38 percent of the total people of the United States. * * * Only about 17 percent of the Blue Cross members," Mr. Kingsley went on, "live in Northern and Western States, representing 43 percent of our total population. Less than 3 percent," he said, "of the rural population now belong."

Therein lies a great deal of the confusion that gives rise to the demand for a compulsory national health plan.

These regional variations will readily be made known by point No. 1 of the program which I have outlined.

The above figures, indicate the need for an extensive educational program conducted on a Nation-wide basis to make the people who live in our rural areas aware of benefits that would accrue to them by affiliation with medical, surgical, and hospitalization groups such as Mr. Kingsley advises now serve the 82,000,000 people in the more affluent areas of the Nation.

More highly significant than the foregoing is the fact disclosed by Mr. Ewing that more than two-thirds of our people have not availed themselves of protection of any kind. Thus the more reason for the Federal Government to lend assistance to an educational program looking to the extension of the growing voluntary services.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have said that there is a particular need that the aged, the indigent, and others not able to afford adequate medical care should find it available to their requirement. I do not propose, however, that any program to which I shall lend assistance shall comprehend the so-called means test (ability to pay), if that test will result in any delay whatsoever in extending needed services.

If there is to be any one determination as to ability to pay, the means test should be applied only after the person has received the assistance requisite to their needs. I know full well from the nursing services which I rendered years ago, that I personally could never withhold food, coal, or wood from a needy mother and her brood until after I found out why she was needy. Rather, first we provided the necessities and then made our determinations as to why the needs arose.

In conclusion, friends, may I say that to me the strength of these United States lies fundamentally in the courage, the integrity, and the vision of each individual. This is a land where men and women have recognized their individual responsibility toward each other and toward the Nation whose formula for freedom has protected them from the domination of a centralized government. We feel we have the right to freedom, but if we are not to lose it we must assume the full responsibility for it. There is no country in the world where the people have enjoyed more opportunity, where they have more comfort and economic security, more chance for happiness than here in the United States.

The strength, the honor, and the integrity of our country must be maintained both at home and abroad. This cannot be done just on Capitol Hill. Every one of you, every citizen of this country, must carry a share of this responsibility.

So I would say to you in the immortal words of Abraham Lincoln: "With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in."

The Housing Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, daily, Members of Congress are bombarded with propaganda from the real-estate lobby opposing further housing legislation and rent-control extension.

Briefly we are told that such measures constitute either the "welfare state" or "statism."

These things, according to the lobbyists and propagandists of special privileges, are threats to our American way of life.

Mr. Speaker a far greater threat to our American way of life is the undermining of the institution of marriage and the American home. Our housing situation is still sufficiently acute as to retard marriages by young people; so as to retard the establishment of homes and families. This, Mr. Speaker, is a far greater threat to our American way of life than all the phony issues the high-priced propagandists can think up in a hundred years.

To illustrate the acuteness of the housing situation, and to illustrate the problems faced by young people, I include as a part of my remarks a letter received by me from a constituent together with my reply thereto:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 31, 1950.*

Hon. ROBERT L. RAMSAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RAMSAY: I am writing you with regard to a problem with which I am confronted—that of housing. It seems that here in the District of Columbia and vicinity, apartments are not to be had unless you happen to be a friend of the owner, resident manager, rental agent, etc. Also, the new apartments being built are so far out so that an automobile is an absolute necessity. Not only that, but a one-bedroom apartment rents on the average of $80 per month so that a Government clerk earning $2,650 per annum is not in a position to rent one of these apartments in view of the fact that his weekly earnings do not equal the monthly rental.

My fiancé, Mr. Darwin H. Lalk, of Hermann, Mo., and I plan to be married on June 13. Mr. Lalk is a veteran, employed with the Department of Defense with a salary of $2,650 per annum, and starting February 15, will begin a course in accounting at Benjamin Franklin School of Accountancy. I plan to continue working as long as possible.

My question is, what good earthly reason is there as to why apartments cannot be built and rent for prices we can afford? I am certain that there are hundreds upon hundreds of couples facing this same problem.

What do you suggest, Mr. Congressman?

An early reply will be deeply appreciated.

Very truly yours,

MISS ELENA C. FORMIS.

(Daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John Formis, 672 Virginia Avenue, Follansbee, W. Va.)

FEBRUARY 2, 1950.

Miss ELENA C. FORMIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MISS FORMIS: Reference is made to your letter of January 31 advising of your forthcoming marriage and relating the problems you face in obtaining housing.

You have my every wish for a long life of happiness. Mr. Lalk is a very fortunate young man.

As far as housing is concerned, I can only suggest you have patience. Your personal problem merely highlights the need for continued rent control and additional housing legislation. If you have followed the papers, you know what a fight the real-estate lobby has made against rent control—and they have been successful to the extent of whittling away at safeguards to a great extent. You recall the very great difficulty we had passing the low-income housing measure, and the opposition, spearheaded again by the real-estate lobby, to the present middle-income housing bill.

I firmly believe, however, we shall eventually get these programs in operation. Of course, in the meantime, young couples have pretty hard lines, and I venture to say many marriages are delayed and postponed. In time, I feel sure, we can convince the opposition that preventing the establishment of homes is a far greater danger to our American way of life than the phony danger of statism.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. RAMSAY.

As the Twig Is Bent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fay George Child, who is now editor of the Maynard News, Maynard, Minn., is well known to many Members of the House through his service as secretary to Hon. HAROLD HAGEN. Mr. Child has been crusading against infiltration of Communists into our Government service, and under leave previously granted, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial he has written which is well worth the attention of every Member of Congress:

AS THE TWIG IS BENT

This editorial is being written after much deliberation, research, consultations with cooperative local school authorities and conferences with officials of the State department of education in St. Paul.

A copy will be sent to the superintendent of each public school in Minnesota.

The editorial will concern itself with what this writer considers to be subversive propaganda in publications widely used by the students in the public schools of Minnesota—and the Nation.

I am fully aware that the subject matter of the editorial is taboo with many of the intelligentsia, and to dare to write about it poses the possibility of being subjected to vituperative denunciation ranging from book burner to Red baiter.

Most schools in Minnesota have subscribed to the Public Affairs Pamphlet Series, published in New York City, and issued on the average of one a month for the nominal price of 10 cents apiece. These pamphlets, 143 in number, are intended for school libraries, to be used for research and supplemental reading by the students in connection with their various classes.

Many of the pamphlets are written by competent authorities, but in most cases the material is compiled by the editor of the series from many sources. In some instances, the pamphlets are written after consultation with reputable organizations such as the United States Chamber of Commerce, American Jewish Committee, the Boy Scouts, etc. In justice to schoolmen who order the series for their classrooms, we must state that it is almost impossible to detect the sly, subtle propaganda so carefully and sparingly injected into the pamphlets. Probably only 3 or 4 percent of the series can be identified as obnoxious propaganda, designed to give the students of the Nation a leftist slant in their thinking. Many of the pamphlets are excellent, and are not objectionable.

It was by sheer accident that this writer stumbled across one of the pamphlets that contained leftist propaganda, and because my curiosity was aroused, I contacted a friend in Washington, D. C., who at one time was an investigator for the Committee on Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives. This was his reply:

"Relative to the Public Affairs Pamphlet Series, published in New York. Please let me know who is behind the series. I think that Maxwell Stewart is one of the sponsors—if that is true it is strictly left-wing. Stewart is one of the foremost Communist-fronters in the United States."

The editor of the entire Public Affairs Pamphlet Series is Maxwell S. Stewart. He has editorial privileges as to selection of sources and material that go to make up the pamphlets. His is the guiding hand. He is the key man.

Further inquiries have resulted in a compilation of documented history about Editor Maxwell S. Stewart; and a strange history it is for a man who is working tirelessly to shape the thinking of our young people.

After I had accumulated and assayed the information which came to my desk about Mr. Stewart, I forwarded most of it to the commissioner of education of the State of Minnesota, with a letter requesting information as to whether or not the State department of education has any jurisdiction over books and pamphlets used in Minnesota public schools.

With Commissioner Dean Schweickhard's permission, I am quoting his reply:

"The series of pamphlets with which you are immediately concerned has been deposited here, but so far as can be ascertained has never been made a part of any traveling library or reading list in connection with any course of study issued by the department.

"Power to adopt or prescribe textbooks and other instructional materials is placed under the authority of local boards of education in Minnesota Statutes, section 125.06, subdivision 9."

On being informed that the Maynard News would publish an editorial on the pamphlet series and send a copy of the editorial to superintendents in Minnesota, Mr. Schweickhard commented as follows:

"I am sending you also a copy of the Minnesota Educational Directory. On page 28 there appears a list of all superintendents of graded elementary and secondary school systems. Any information which you can supply to these superintendents along the line of material you now have here under consideration or any other one of equal importance will assist them in their selection of instructional materials for use in their schools."

The following testimony will be of interest to school authorities and readers of the Maynard News.

State Senator Jack B. Tenney, chairman of the legislative committee in California investigating un-American activities, gave the following testimony before a congressional committee in Washington, D. C., March 26, 1947:

"We found a book in the public schools in California called Land of the Soviets. The book is prepared for the use of seventh- and eighth-grade children, and is written by Marguerite N. Stewart and edited by Maxwell Stewart. * * * Both Margureite Stewart and her husband, Maxwell, taught at that institute at Moscow (Russia). Mr. Stewart is a correspondent and has been correspondent for the Moscow News and is connected with practically every (Communist) front organization of any consequence on a national scale in the United States for the past 7 or 8 years." (Hearings and reports, vol. 1, p. 247.)

As long ago as November 22, 1938, Mr. Stuart Lillico of New York City, newspaper and magazine correspondent in the Orient for several years, testified before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Washington, as follows:

"Mr. LILLICO. Let us take up the case of the American Friends of the Chinese People. I have here a letterhead from this organization, including the names of the officers and members of the national advisory board.

"Maxwell S. Stewart, the chairman, appears also as a member of the editorial board of China Today, the official organ of the American Friends. He is widely known as either a secret member of the Communist Party or as what might be called a fellow-traveler. At one time he was an associate editor of the Moscow Daily News, and taught in the Moscow Institute. He is also connected with the organization known as the Friends of the Soviet Union, and is an associate editor of the Nation." (Public hearings, vol. 4, p. 2512.)

The organization, American Friends of the Chinese People, was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (U. S. Cong.) on March 29, 1944.

If this editorial serves to further alert schoolmen and school boards in Minnesota to the dangers that beset our democracy, I will be adequately compensated for the expenditure of my time, effort, and money, to say nothing of braving the inevitable repercussions from the "left" when this editorial hits home.

The fight to preserve true democracy and free enterprise in America will not be easily won. We cannot engage in battle at our own convenience. The welfare-state planners and the Socialists and Communists have set the pace.

We have been challenged.

We cannot afford the terrible consequences of not meeting this challenge head-on.

What do you intend to do about it?

Korea Is a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL T. WAGNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I incude the following editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer:

KOREA IS A MUST

When the House of Representatives voted by a margin of just one vote to withhold economic aid from South Korea, it was clear that a foolish and somewhat partisan action had been taken. Undeniably, there is always a risk in giving assistance to a country which is under Soviet pressure and might conceivably be taken over in the future. But there is even greater risk in suddenly cutting off aid to a country which our military forces liberated and then started on the road to self-government.

To abandon South Korea now is to sacrifice what we already have spent there in an honest and reasonably skillful attempt to build a bulwark and to establish democracy in a long-neglected country. Furthermore, abandonment of South Korea would be taken by other countries, even in Europe, as proof that the United States cannot be relied upon for consistent support.

Korea is far more important to our strategic position in the Far East than Formosa. It faces squarely up to Soviet-controlled territory. It is on the front line of Russian-Western rivalry. It juts out into the Pacific

in such a way as to [illegible] the flank of vital positions in south Manchuria. More important still, Korea in hostile hands would be a real threat to Japan, which is the northern anchor of our entire position in the Far East.

On this basis, we have every right to expect the House to reconsider its precipitate action on the $60,000,000 Korean aid bill. Everyone knows that we must draw the line somewhere. We cannot give assistance to every country under threat. But Korea surely is not the place at which to draw the line. We have too much already invested there. It is too vital to other positions we now hold and intend to keep. And there is a moral commitment to South Koreans that we cannot ignore without losing the confidence of many other peoples who have put their trust in us.

Letter from Hon. Hamilton Fish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Hon. Hamilton Fish, of New York, to President Truman:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 23, 1950.*

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On December 23, 1948, more than a year ago I wrote you as follows: "You have persisted in attacking the Un-American Activities Committee, duly appointed by the House of Representatives, and denouncing its recent startling exposures of spies and traitors in our midst as 'red herrings.' I sincerely respect you, Mr. President, because you were a tough combat officer in World War I, and on account of your Missouri bumptiousness, but there is such a thing as carrying stubbornness too far. You must know by this time that you were wrong in raising the 'red herring' issue."

Mr. President, I now repeat, who appointed Alger Hiss to the State Department, recently convicted virtually of spying for Soviet Russia?

Who appointed him an adviser to F. D. R. at the Yalta Conference?

Who appointed him as Executive Secretary at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference in 1944?

Who appointed him as Secretary-General of the San Francisco Conference for the Organization of the United Nations in 1945?

Mr. President, you wrote me on January 5, 1948, that: "I read your letter of December 23 with a lot of interest and sometime or other I shall explain just exactly the situation to which you refer."

In all fairness, I think you will agree that the time has come, and the American people are entitled to an answer to the forthright questions that I asked of you more than a year ago.

Mr. President, the American people are also entitled to know how many other spies may be lurking within the State Department, transmitting secret information and documents to the agents of Soviet Russia.

Why not dismiss Secretary of State Dean Acheson (the acknowledged and proclaimed friend of Alger Hiss) who has outlived his usefulness? Isn't he responsible for the continuation of the tragic and ghastly appeasement policy in China? This deplorable and cowardly policy has resulted in the seizure of that nation by the Communists, the most disastrous diplomatic defeat in our history, which will plague us and our children's children.

With high esteem,

Respectfully yours,

HAMILTON FISH,
Chairman of the House Committee To Investigate Communist Propaganda and Activities in the United States, 1930–31.

The Hydrogen Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I indicated my approval of the President's order to the Atomic Energy Commission to develop the hydrogen bomb. I did this because I feel that in order to insure peace in the world, the United States must be ready to defend itself at any time against any aggressor and further, according to recent developments, it seems apparent that Soviet Russia will have the H-bomb available to it within a few years' time. Accordingly, I feel that the United States must keep pace with the rest of the world in scientific development, even though it be in such weapons of destruction as the H-bomb.

I have received the following letter and petition from a group of 84 Protestant clergymen from 12 denominations whose churches encompass greater Buffalo, which I have the honor to represent.

While my views with regard to development of the H-bomb do not coincide with theirs, I think this petition is important enough to bring to the attention of the United States Congress so that the Members may be given the benefit of the thoughts of this distinguished group on world peace.

While I do not agree with their position regarding development of the H-bomb, I do heartily subscribe to the suggestion contained in their resolution that a disarmament conference be called immediately under the auspices of the United Nations, at which should be discussed the control or abolition of such viciously destructive weapons of war as the H-bomb, the A-bomb, and bacterial warfare.

In order that all peoples may live in harmony with each other, we must solve the problems which imperil the peace of the world and the efforts of all nations must be directed unceasingly toward that goal.

RIVERSIDE SALEM CHURCH,
Buffalo, N. Y., February 4, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TAURIELLO: As the one designated to release it, I am enclosing a copy of a public statement on the "H" bomb signed by 84 Protestant clergymen from 12 denominations who serve churches in greater Buffalo.

You will, without doubt, be hearing from several of the men who reside in your district as they express their profound concern and distress over the course which the Nation is now following.

I am sure that all of those signing are anxious to see some change in American policy commensurate with the high moral principles which the Nation avows.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN B. PEABODY, *Pastor.*

PUBLIC STATEMENT ON H-BOMB BY CLERGY OF BUFFALO, N. Y., AND VICINITY

We, the undersigned ministers of the Niagara frontier, regret the decision of President Truman to proceed with the development of the H-bomb. As a nation, the United States is morally bound to use its position and power to promote peace in the world.

The period during which the United States was the sole possessor of the A-bomb was marked by the greatest expansion of communism throughout the world. Therefore, the H-bomb is no guaranty that communism can be contained by military power.

We are of the mind that use of money, natural resources, and human energy, intelligence, and ingenuity in development of destructive power cannot be morally justified in a world where millions of God's children are ill fed, ill clothed, and ill housed.

As citizens and as followers of the Prince of Peace, we repent for our share in the growing militarization of America and for our failure to bind up the wounds among the nations. The growing nationalism and militarism of the world make us mindful that it is "not by might, nor by power," but by the Spirit of God incarnate in human life which will bring fulfillment to the peaceful aspirations of all men.

The Christian faith affirms that war is not inevitable and that peace on earth will come through good will toward all men.

We would, therefore, urge the calling of a disarmament conference under the auspices of the United Nations. H-bombs, A-bombs, bacteria, gases, and poisons should be included in the list of weapons forever abolished.

Rev. Renato G. Alden; Rev. Glenn B. Alty; Rev. Albert W. Asquith, Rev. Robert M. Atkins; Rev. Charles O. Bayard; Rev. Carl Berges; Rev. Derrick M. Bird; Rev. Herbert A. Bosch; Rev. Gary Bousman; Rev. J. J. Braun; Rev. Herbert A. Brethauer; Rev. Osmond H. Brown; Rev. Nicholas H. A. Bruinix; Rev. Earl R. Burdick; Rev. Merideth H. Dallman; Rev. Erford W. Daniels; Rev. Richard J. Davey; Rev. J. Ralph Davis; Rev. Merritt Dietterich; Rev. William H. Dudley; Rev. Elijah Echols, Sr.; Rev. Leo J. Engler; Rev. Herman A. Penske; Rev. Carl Fiscus; Rev. John Fleck; Rev. Paul G. Frankenfield; Rev. Forrest Freeman; Rev. Edward P. Gill; Rev. Artemas P. Goodwin; Rev. John W. Guyer; Rev. Rodney Heckman; Rev. J. Erick Holmer; Rev. William H. Norner; Rev. E. Franklin Jackson; Rev. Mitchell Johnson; Rev. Paul Jordan; Rev. Peter M. Kemper; Rev. John Kochner; Rev. Irvin F. Kracke; Rev. Julius Kuck; Rev. Franklin B. Laundry; Rev. Theodore T. Lehmann; Rev. Marshall P. Lucas; Rev. John O. Mabuce; Rev. Burnie C. McCarley; Rev. Walter Meisenheimer; Rev. William Melberg; Rev. Richard A. Mikolon; Rev. Clytus F. Mowry; Rev. John R. Neubert; Rev. Urban L. Ogden; Rev. Roland L. Osgood; Rev. Alan B. Peabody; Rev. Oscar C. Plumb; Rev. J. J. Post; Rev. Emory Proctor; Rev. S. Leslie Reid; Rev. Dean Richardson; Rev. Roland Roehner; Rev. Ralph E. Rott; Rev. Michael Salmen; Rev. Robert O. Smith; Rev. Paul G. Smithson; Rev. Harold J. Snither; Rev. Edwin E. Staudt; Rev. John F. Steve; Rev. Alexander Stewart, Jr.; Rev. Alexander Stewart, Jr.; Rev. Paul E. Strauch; Rev. Benton S. Swartz; Rev. William H. Tempest; Rev. Harold Thiedt; Rev. Shirley L. Travis; Rev. Gordon L. Tritchler; Rev. Donald N. Tubbs; Rev. Alfred L. Underhill; Rev. Harry W. Vere; Rev. Carl G. Voglemann; Rev. William R. Walch; Rev. George W. Walker; Rev. Bradford G. Webster; Rev. Charles A. Williams; Rev. Gilbert W. Wieting; Rev. Arthur S. Wright; Rev. Robert N. Zearfoss.

(The 84 signatories represent 12 denominations.)

Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from a letter from a constituent, whose name I am omitting for the reason that I did not ask her permission to mention it. Her letter, however, is of such timely interest that I feel it my duty to share it with others:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RICH: Though Drew Pearson took occasion to call you a "broken record" I know many of us are so glad to have someone reiterate and reiterate certain things such as "Where are we going to get the money?"

As you know I come from a great farming district. I would like to tell Mr. Keyserling to learn how the Amish farmers get so prosperous without being subsidized. I believe it is against the religion and rules of the Amish to accept such checks and yet there are no better farmers anywhere, nor more prosperous ones.

Let Mr. Keyserling also take note when he says "We had to find ways to keep production and demand in balance." Does he not know that not one middle-aged woman and many younger ones would think of eating potatoes and bread at the same meal? In fact most of the women I know just do not eat potatoes more than two or three times a week, if that often. I do not.

We destroy millions of pounds of potatoes and lower the tariff and import millions of pounds. Sensible?

The Fair Deal bought up over $450,000,000 worth of wheat and at the same time imported over $3,000,000 worth. Sensible?

We imported $8,000,000 worth of barley and bought up $40,000,000 worth at the same time. Sensible?

We imported over $90,000,000 worth of wool and bought up $76,000,000 worth of domestic surplus. Sensible?

With as many pounds of dried eggs in a Kentucky cave as we have gold we import 2,500,000 dozen "fresh" eggs and hundreds of thousands of pounds of dried ones. Sensible?

Why are we paying 85 cents for butter with 100,000,000 pounds of surplus butter in storage?

And yet Mr. Keyserling talks about the necessity of keeping supply and demand balanced.

My grandma used to quote, "Put a beggar on horseback and he will ride to the devil." Haven't we done just that?

My objection to that is, that I have to pay for his horse.

Mr. Keyserling surprised me by even mentioning the word balanced. I was not aware it was in the New or Fair Deal dictionary.

Miss Sara Ann Stauffer, who heads our juniors, wrote a one-act play which I wish could be seen by all the women in this country; it might go far toward presenting a clearer picture of where our tax-dollar does go.

Please keep right after Mr. Keyserling and his ilk.

There just isn't enough money to make the American women eat more potatoes or bread, even with the present budget, so please try to persuade Mr. Brannan not to support them any longer.

May I be broken-record like and repeat—please keep after them.

The Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the fourth and fifth in a series of articles on the Columbia River region by Mr. Leon Starmont.

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 4)

(By Leon Starmont)

Just to keep the record straight, let's fix another "first" from official records in connection with the Columbia Basin project and the comprehensive plan into which it has developed.

The Bureau of Reclamation demonstrates that the use of Grand Coulee as a reservoir was proposed by a Reclamation Service engineer in 1903. Files of the Quincy project, which became the Quincy-Columbia or West Columbia unit of the three-district project in central Washington, show that Grand Coulee Reservoir was coupled with a dam at the site as early as 1909. But before either of those dates there had been numerous suggestions for watering the Big Bend or for developing water power on the Columbia.

CANAL STARTED IN 1892

The unpublished history by E. K. Vande Vere, printing of which has been suggested at State expense, relates that wells were sunk in Douglas County at State expense in 1889, and that an irrigation canal was started in 1892 for 20 miles from Palouse River through Washtucna. This venture was stopped by the panic of 1893.

The Army's Corps of Engineers, according to records in its Seattle district office, conducted both power and navigation surveys along Columbia River, from the Canadian line to its mouth, as long ago as 1881. In one of them, Lt. Thomas W. Symons, chief engineer of the department of the Columbia, suggested a power dam at Priest Rapids or in that vicinity. Priest Rapids is now part of the comprehensive plan.

Who first suggested a power dam at the present site of Coulee Dam has not been determined, but Symons called attention both to this site and to Foster Creek, where Chief Joseph Dam is now being started. Other reports, all by congressional authority, were made by the Corps of Engineers in 1884, 1888, 1892, 1895, 1905, 1908, 1911, 1914, and 1917.

SERIES OF DAMS PROJECTED

Up to that time all plans for a dam at the head of Grand Coulee had assumed it would be a power dam with navigation locks. The next dam below would be at Foster Creek; the next dam above, at Hawks Falls. These and many others are discussed in the first 308 report of the Army engineers, ordered by Congress in 1927, and printed in 1934.

Before taking up later developments, and starting a tour of the projects now under construction, let's return to that survey made in 1903 of an irrigation canal from Spokane to the head of Grand Coulee, 130 miles.

Charles B. Cox, second in charge of the party, now on the USBR staff at Coulee Dam, tells about it thus:

"The cost of the project was estimated at around $100,000,000 and as the Reclamation Service could not hope to have more than $4,000,000 allotted to Washington from its limited funds, the Big Bend project was impracticable at that time. In fact, I never expected to live long enough to see it developed.

WOULD HAVE SAVED MILLIONS

"Today, the development of the entire project will probably cost close to $750,000,000. We would have saved a little money could we have built it in 1903.

"I recall that we worked a 60-hour week, slept four men in an 8 by 10 tent, ate prodigious meals, and helped ourselves to a gunny-sack full of peaches every night—after dark, of course—while camped near the little town of Peach, now inundated by the waters of Roosevelt Reservoir.

"Rattlesnakes along the survey route were so numerous that hardly a day passed without encountering one or more.

"Time was the essence of our survey, and the hike to and from camp was made at the rate of 4½ to 5 miles per hour, with a similar pace maintained between stations during the day. After supper at night, we turned in promptly, and after a few tall tales were soon asleep. Once a month, however, our level man sat up all night relieving the cook of his $40 monthly pay check at poker. Both thought they were good players, but the level man had the advantage of being a good player—at least he always won the money.

TIP FOR WASHINGTON

"Surveys didn't cost much in those days. The entire monthly pay roll of seven men was less than $500, and we really turned out the work. I was paid $60 a month and "found." At a good restaurant today, my "found" would amount to well over $5 a day.

"Saturday nights we washed our own clothes by tying them firmly on the end of a rope and letting them swing back and forth in the swift current of Spokane River all night. I still maintain that this method has marked merit, and the results were surprisingly bright with absolutely no "Dum" whatever.

"Our musical education was not neglected on the survey. I had my violin along, and the chief of party wrestled many evenings with strictly classical music, horribly off the pitch. He was particularly pertinacious after a couple of sings of whisky, which he kept in his tent and never passed to the crew.

"Our level man was a fiddler, and while not overly fussy about playing strictly in tune, his style and rhythm were marvelous. The cook was a steady singer of salacious songs, and always ready to oblige."

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 5)

(By Leon Starmont)

This is an "itty" article, but no understanding of the Columbia Basin plan is possible without recognition of the numerous unrelated events that led to the present stage of accomplishment.

Jim Rowan, in 1917, would have gone goggle-eyed in amazement if anybody had told him a call for a general strike in Northwest

fields and pasture woods would result in construction of great multipurpose dams at Grand Coulee and Bonneville, Umatilla Rapids and Foster Creek, Hungry Horse, Priest Rapids and maybe Albeni Falls, Ice Harbor, and Hells Canyon.

Jim Rowan was regional secretary of the Industrial Workers of the World, a radical labor organization which had its head office in Cleveland and its Inland Empire headquarters in Spokane. He strike, called for August 20, 1917, was a fiasco.

BLAINE SEES PEND OREILLE

Ernest Lister was then governor. World War I was on. E. F. Blaine, a well-to-do irrigationist of Grandview, in Yakima Valley, had been named State reclamation commissioner, but with the war he became Governor Lister's trouble-shooter, or as some others have put it, "the Colonel House of the Lister administration."

Violence had followed the efforts of IWW organizers for 10 years, and they had been arrested and tried in many localities on charges of impeding the war effort, or outright sabotage or treason. Spokane was a hotbed of radical agitation, and among the strike-threatened areas were Newport, Ione, and Metaline Falls, on Pend Oreille River.

Several Spokane businessmen wired Governor Lister asking for troops to quell expected outbreaks. The Governor sent E. F. Blaine to see how bad the situation really was.

"You can have martial law if you insist, but I don't think you'll like it," he told the businessmen. They did not insist. Federal and local authorities handled the situation. Blaine went on to Newport and the Pend Oreille.

BLAINE INTERESTS MILES

Sight of that great river fascinated Blaine. He had earlier envisioned the Sunnyside project in his own Yakima Valley, and had seen the Yakima, Wenatchee, and Okanogan convert veritable deserts of sagebrush into bountiful gardens of Eden.

He knew that power projects were already scheduled for Z Canyon on the Pend Oreille, and for Kettle Falls, Priest Rapids, and other locations down the Columbia below the Pend Oreille's mouth. He knew that hundreds of dreamers and scores of engineers had worked on the problem of reclaiming the Big Bend, meaning roughly that portion of central Washington half encircled by Columbia River between the mouth of the Spokane and the mouth of the Snake.

A year later, on a Great Northern train east-bound, he expounded his theories to his friend, B. Lloyd Miller, of Sunnyside, and tried to get Miller to "front" as spokesman for the idea then forming.

"It's your baby," said Miller. "You spring it yourself. I'll help all I can."

Miller is now a member of the State Columbia Basin commission, doubtless the oldest member of that group in years of service to the project. Antecedents, make-up, and workings of that oddly formed State body will be discussed in a later article.

OTHER HAPPENINGS

There are half a dozen other points in Columbia Basin history where apparently unrelated occurrences had a hand in shaping destiny. One need not dwell too much on their relative importance.

If the Kansas Legislature in 1912 had not passed the first State blue-sky law there might not have been a panic in 1929, and in that case President Hoover would have been reelected in 1932.

If Senator Miles Poindexter had not depended too much on the inner life of a deal he made with a Washington correspondent in 1910, he would not have gone down to defeat by C. C. Dill in 1922.

If Dill had not been in the United States Senate in 1933, the chances are that President Franklin D. Roosevelt would not have started Grand Coulee Dam on the basis of the Army engineers' report made to Congress in 1932.

If Gordon C. Corbaley, a Seattle chamber of commerce employee, had not ridiculed the name "Big Bend" in 1919 it is unlikely that the name "Columbia Basin" would have been substituted. (Who actually suggested the name is still in doubt.)

SMARTER REGIONAL THINKING

If the name "Columbia Basin" had not been attached to a comparatively small part of the Columbia Basin the chances are the possibilities of region-wide planning would not have occurred to Secretary of Commerce (later President) Herbert Hoover and his numerous advisers.

If several hundred engineers, officials, journalists, civic leaders, and politicians had made different choices at any of twoscore decision points between 1918 and 1932, history might be quite different. There is no necessity for going into events of those 14 years in these articles, except as they bear on the present situation at projects or in institutions not yet examined.

The story of Low E. F. Blaine returned from Washington, after his trip with H. Lloyd Miller, and electrified the whole Northwest with his revival of the Big Bend's dream has been told too frequently of late to need repetition.

Americans All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., under date of January 10, 1950.

It is brief but timely. It high lights a fact which confounds those who hope to divide our unity by promoting racial and religious tensions.

It proves that our way of life opens the door of opportunity to all and will recognize merit regardless of race, color, or creed.

It illustrates the one great hope of humanity.

The United States would not be the great Nation of free men and free women that it is if it did not recognize, and welcome, the talent and the character implicit in those of our citizens who point with pride to their Polish heritage.

Sturdy, industrious, neighborly, and God-fearing; these, and their passionate faith in democracy, are virtues which we believe in, admire, and share. We are happy to note the increasing participation of our Polish friends in the public life of our United States because it brings strength to our common cause.

Here follows the editorial:

DESERVED RECOGNITION

The banquet tendered by the Polish residents of our community to Alderman Alexander W. Dzongelewski, the first citizen of Polish-American descent to be elected to a position on that board, was truly deserved.

The Polish people are rapidly becoming a more important factor in our community life than ever before. They deserve recognition in the events, in the civic life, and in our municipal government. Some of outstanding, most loyal, efficient and faithful employees in the various departments of the city are the Polish young men and women.

We extend a hearty welcome to them into the broader aspects of the American way of life and judging by their past records, they will make capable leaders and fine citizens.

How To Kill an Oilman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous permission granted me by the membership of the House, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Tulsa Tribune under date of January 24, 1950.

The article is entitled, "How To Kill an Oilman." This statement is particularly interesting at the present moment for the reason that the problem involved is presently under consideration by the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

The article follows:

HOW TO KILL AN OILMAN

If President Truman had set out deliberately to destroy the independent oil-producing industry in the United States, he could not have picked a better way than to urge elimination of the depletion clause of the Revenue Act, or a more opportune time, when producers are harassed by other serious problems.

Crude-oil production in the United States has been curtailed substantially because of increasing imports of foreign oil. A large part of the export market for American oils was lost through the British ban on imports of American-dollar oil into sterling areas. More will be lost, in fact, our oil export trade may be wiped out, when Europe completes its vast program of expansion of oil-refining facilities, partially financed by American taxpayers' dollars through contributions by the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Elimination of the depletion clause would wreck the independent producing business in the United States. It would prevent producers from getting back capital invested which is necessary if they are to continue in business. It would reduce exploratory work and the finding of new oil reserves to an extent which would menace the security of this Nation. It would make us, within a few years, dependent on foreign oil which might be shut off in case of war.

President Truman's references to the oil-depletion clause, in his tax message to Congress Monday, are most misleading. He evidently was given information on a few abnormal cases and based his statements on them rather than on actual conditions which obtain for the oil-producing industry as a whole.

No other industry is as hazardous as that of the oil producer. During last year 52 percent of all wildcat wells drilled in the United States were dry. Only 15 percent found oil and 3 percent were gas wells. Even in an area where oil already has been found, drilling is a big gamble. Of all such wells drilled last year, called development wells, 25 percent were dry, 65 percent produced oil, and 9 percent produced gas. Of the total number of wells drilled in the United States last year—wildcats and development wells—37 percent were dry, 56 percent produced oil, and 7 percent produced gas.

Congress realized this situation and the necessity, if exploratory work were to be continued, of returning to producers, tax-free, capital invested in finding and producing oil. Capital is not taxed. Only income from capital is taxable.

So Congress, in 1916, adopted the cost-depletion method of returning capital to producers. It was difficult to figure depletion on that basis and in 1918, Congress passed the recovery-depletion method. This involved endless engineering, legal, and accounting work so Government made a survey of oil production operation for the years from 1918 to 1925 to determine a fair and simple depletion law.

That survey by Government showed that during those years the annual average depletion of capital invested by producers in finding oil and producing it was between 32 and 33 percent of the gross income of producers. So the House of Representatives in 1926 passed a bill providing for a percentage-depletion allowance on gross income from a producing property of 30 percent in figuring taxes. The Senate passed a bill permitting a depletion allowance of 25 percent. In conference, the present percentage-depletion allowance of 27½ percent of gross income from a property (but in no event more than 50 percent of the net income from the property) was adopted and enacted into law.

When oil or gas is produced from a property, there is a reduction in the capital represented by that oil or gas in place. The depletion allowance is designed not only to permit the producer a return of that amount of capital, tax-free, but also a return of capital invested in finding that oil or gas.

That is a point Mr. Truman failed to mention. He stated, "In the case of oil * * * the depletion exemption goes on and on, year after year, even though the original capital investment in the property has already been recovered tax-free, not once, but many times over."

Each individual producing property, or lease, is considered separately in figuring the depletion allowance. Some producers have drilled 20 wells before finding oil. Their capital investment in finding oil is far greater than the capital invested in that twenty-first well.

So, while the depletion allowance for one producing property may, over a period of years, total more than the investment in that one property, it still falls short, in most instances, of returning to the producer all the capital he has invested in various properties in search for production. As the Government survey showed, the depletion allowance for the producing industry as a whole should be 32½ percent instead of the present 27½ percent.

Independent oil producers constitute only a part of the number of persons who would be harmed by elimination of the depletion clause. In 1948, the oil industry paid out $1,200,000,000 in oil royalties and lease bonuses and rentals. This money was expended in 27 States, 23 of which are oil-producing. Farmers, merchants, and others in all lines of business benefited from these payments. More than 200,000,000 acres, or 10 percent of the area of the United States, is under lease for oil and gas exploration and development by oil and gas companies.

Government says this Nation is running out of oil. The Department of the Interior is urging the oil industry to construct costly plants to manufacture synthetic fuels from oil shale, gas, and coal. Producers are investing vast sums in exploratory and development work in an effort to find new oil reserves. The discovery well in the Elk City field of Oklahoma cost $750,000 to drill and that cost did not include $750,000 to $1,000,000 spent previously in exploration and preliminary development work.

Does anyone believe Shell Oil Co. would have spent that amount of money, and many millions more in developing the field, if it had not felt it would get back at least part of its capital investment through the depletion allowance?

A policy which would eliminate the depletion clause in the revenue act and still permit large imports of foreign oil would be more than the domestic oil industry in the United States could bear.

If Congress wishes to hasten the end of this great industry, so vital to the welfare of the Nation, to business, and the American standard of living, let it go ahead and adopt this twin policy of destruction. If it wants to foster this vital industry, it will continue the present depletion clause in the revenue act, and restrict imports to a figure which would supplement, not supplant, domestically produced crude oil.

Ernest Lynn Kurth—Man of the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on December 14, 1949, Mr. Ernest Lynn Kurth was honored in Lufkin, Tex., by two awards presented to him on that date. One was a certificate from Dixie Business Magazine, published at Atlanta, Ga., certifying that he was chosen as the South's man of the year for 1949 in a poll of editors, industrialists, bankers, and other leaders of the South. This award was delivered by Col. Hubert Lee, editor and publisher of Dixie Business magazine.

The Houston Post in its issue of December 14, 1949, carried an interesting article regarding the exercises at which the awards were made. Under leave previously granted, I am inserting this article herewith:

HIGH TRIBUTE PAID TO KURTH AS "MAN OF THE SOUTH"

(By Brian Spinks)

LUFKIN, December 14.—Ernest Lynn Kurth, a 64-year-old industrial giant of the East Texas piney woods, a native son hailed as a living example of what free enterprise can accomplish, officially became the "man of the South for 1949" Wednesday night.

He was formally notified of his selection for the honor at a testimonial dinner here as the culminating event of what had been planned as an all-day program in which a grateful community, State, and region accorded him an impressive accolade. It was a tribute such as few men receive in their lifetime.

High governmental officials, headed by Gov. Allan Shivers and United States Senator TOM CONNALLY, joined with leaders of business, industry, and finance, and with residents of Angelina County in showing their appreciation for what he has done to bring industrial progress and prosperity to Texas, the South, and his part of the State in particular.

Two awards were presented Mr. Kurth at the dinner. One was a certificate from Dixie Business magazine, published at Atlanta, Ga., certifying that he was chosen as the South's man of the year for 1949 in a poll of editors, industrialists, bankers, and other leaders of the South. He received it from the hands of Hubert Lee, editor and publisher of the magazine.

The other was a certificate from the Texas Manufacturers Association naming him the industrialist of the year. It was presented by Ed C. Burris, vice president of TMA.

At the dinner in the Lufkin High School gymnasium, attended by hundreds of visitors from over the State, including a large group from Houston, Mr. Kurth heard himself lauded for his vision, for his business courage, for his humanitarianism for what he has done to open new vistas of opportunity for the entire South, for his sense of civic responsibility, and for his contribution to the economic growth of the State.

A cold rain which fell throughout the day interfered with what had been planned as a full day's program of activity. The bitter, unpleasant weather cut down substantially the number of visitors expected for the event.

A parade of Angelina County industry scheduled for the afternoon was called off, although some of the floats drove through the streets in the rain. It had been planned for Governor Shivers to lead the procession, but he was delayed in arriving from Austin.

The 200-piece band of Texas A. & M. College showed up despite the weather, but there was no parade for it to march in.

A reception for the notable visitors was held late in the afternoon at the Lufkin Country Club, just preceding the dinner.

A. E. Cudlipp, Sr., chairman of the local committee for the observance and vice president of the Lufkin Foundry, presided as master of ceremonies for the banquet, which was high lighted by the two presentations to Mr. Kurth.

The keynote address was given by Senator CONNALLY. The other speakers were Governor Shivers, former Governor W. P. Hobby, president of the Houston Post; Judge Ireland Graves, of Austin, Mr. Kurth's roommate at Southwestern University; Dr. C. C. Cody of Houston, Mr. Kurth's physician; Morris Frank, of Houston, and Don G. Mitchell, of New York, president of Sylvania Electric Products Co.

Miss Mona Paulee, mezzo-soprano star of the Metropolitan Opera Co., who flew here for the event, sang, accompanied by Dr. Leonard Grimmett of Houston. Doctor Grimmett is with the M. D. Anderson Foundation and formerly was a concert pianist in England. There also was music by a string quartet.

Melvin Kurth, of Houston, brother of the honored industrialist, responded to the presentation of the Dixie Business Award by Editor Lee, while Mr. Kurth himself accepted the TMA certificate.

Cal C. Chambers, president of Texas Foundries, Inc., gave a eulogy of Mr. Kurth in behalf of the citizens of Angelina County. The invocation was by Dr. William F. Finch, trustee of Southwestern University, Georgetown.

Jesse H. Jones, of Houston, was scheduled to introduce Senator CONNALLY, but was unable to attend. The Reverend James Savoy, Episcopal rector of Lufkin, gave the invocation.

Mr. Kurth, in his acceptance speech, said:

"In our community we have a partnership, no so-called leaders, but a partnership of people with honest regard for one another * * * a partnership of people with an eye to progress and the well-being of their neighbors.

"To me, this partnership reflects the highest ideals and traditions upon which our country was founded. It graphically represents, with all its glistening qualities, the ability of men working, dreaming, envisioning new horizons together to accomplish good and lasting things."

That is why, he said, he accepted the honor also for the men and women of Angelina County, for his friends, and for the future generations who will chart new paths to progress.

Governor Hobby, in his tribute to Mr. Kurth, described him as a country boy who

went to town in a big way and took his town along with him.

"God never made a better man, and the eyes of the South never looked upon a nobler son," he said.

He had begun his speech by saying that although Mr. Kurth was being called the Man of the South for 1949, people in Texas know that he is the man of the South for all time.

"Mr. Kurth is more than the pioneer of the newsprint paper industry in the South," Governor Hobby went on to say. "When we say 'Tree enterprise' we think of him as the kingfish," he said. He pointed out that Mr. Kurth, who heads 16 east Texas firms and advises dozens more, is the son of one of the earliest lumber men in the State, and was one of the first to advocate and practise forest conservation.

Nor has Mr. Kurth overlooked the humanitarian side of human needs, Governor Hobby said. He pointed to the fact that Mr. Kurth is president of the first and only hospital in the United States built by an employer expressly for the use of his workers.

After reviewing Mr. Kurth's youth and early business career, Governor Hobby remarked:

"It has always been a policy of the Kurths to share their good fortune with the community that has made their prosperity possible."

He mentioned that Mr. Kurth's mother, Mrs. Hattie Martin Kurth, built the first church home for the Keltys Methodist Church, and that his father, Joseph H. Kurth, Sr., gave Lufkin its beautiful Kurth Memorial Library in her memory and endowed the Kurth student loan fund.

It was only natural for Mr. Kurth to put a large part of his profits as a businessman back into Angelina County and the South.

The way he chose to do this, Governor Hobby said, was to help young enterprises to get started, to lead the South in saving its forests and to open a whole new industry—"one that has meant more to the South than any development of this decade."

Mr. Hobby called the testimonial to Mr. Kurth an epochal expression of esteem for a great citizen.

Earlier, Governor Hobby, in paying his tribute to Mr. Kurth, saluted him as "Mister East Texas." Wednesday was, the Governor said, not only a great day for Lufkin, Angelina County, and east Texas, but also for the entire State. He commended Mr. Kurth as a man interested in seeing that freedom is cherished in the future as in the past.

United States Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who was added to the program to introduce Senator CONNALLY, because of the inability of Mr. Jones to attend, told the large audience that filled the gymnasium that Mr. Kurth's career offered a lesson.

Recalling how Mr. Kurth helped his employees to help themselves during the depression years, Senator JOHNSON said:

"If all businessmen had been what Ernest Kurth sincerely tried to be, there would have been no WPA for the jobless. There would have been no NYA for the youths who needed help so badly, and there would have been no soup kitchens in our metropolitan areas.

"Through all his years of leadership, Ernest Kurth has never permitted any government to take over the duties of his conscience and his heart," the Senator said. "He has not allowed the state to be a better neighbor than he is."

Harry M. Seaman of Houston, president of the Southern Pine Association, a position which Mr. Kurth once held, presented Mr. Kurth with a token of appreciation from the lumber industry. It was a Swiss clock mounted in pine.

Mr. Mitchell, whose subject was "Let Us Not Sell Our Birthright Short," pointed to the basic conflict between security and freedom and held out the trend toward industrial decentralization as offering an opportunity for young men and women of the South to find opportunity close to home.

Senator CONNALLY, in his keynote address at the dinner, praised Mr. Kurth as a businessman, as a citizen, as a civic leader and above all as a great pioneer in the American tradition.

He said that he took a personal interest in the Southland Paper Mills project and assisted Mr. Kurth in getting favorable action on his plans by the War Production Board and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Senator CONNALLY said that Texans do not want a State that is wholly industrialized.

"We want a State balanced in its economy. We want industry and we want agriculture and ranching and the other enterprises which we have had in the past," he said. "We do not, however, want to pay unnecessary tribute to the manufacturing industries of other sections. We want to utilize our own resources and contribute to the economy of our own people."

In his praise of Mr. Kurth as a pioneer, the Senator said that he is the type that built America and Texas.

"He pushed out into untried and unknown industrial development, in which there was hazard; in which there was risk; in which it took courage to achieve," the Senator said. "He went into new fields and has reaped rich rewards."

Despite all of his achievements, the Senator went on to say, Mr. Kurth has remained democratic in his attitude and devoted to the well-being of all people.

The certificate presented to Mr. Kurth by the Texas Manufacturers Association designating him as "industrialist of the year" was signed by Mr. Burris and Robert E. Clements of Amarillo, president of TMA.

Mr. Lee, in presenting the certificate for Dixie Business magazine, said that although many publishers have dreamed of developing an American newsprint supply, Mr. Kurth was the first to do it.

Mr. Lee explained the manner in which Mr. Kurth was selected for the honor. His nomination, incidentally, was seconded by Oveta Culp Hobby, executive vice president of the Houston Post, he said.

Mr. Kurth received 5,000 votes out of more than 50,000 cast. Many of those who voted were not readers of his magazine, Mr. Lee said, and some are in foreign countries. The selection of Mr. Kurth was made from a list of 50 of the South's foremost business leaders.

Scores of congratulatory telegrams were received by Mr. Kurth, some of which were read at the dinner. One was from Mr. Jones.

Mrs. Connally, wife of the Senator, and Mrs. Hobby were among the women who were introduced at the dinner.

Ruhr Authority Farce—I. G. Farben Still the Boss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two editorials that appeared in a recent issue of the magazine Prevent World War III issue of November-December 1949, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc. These editorials are entitled "Ruhr Authority Farce" and "I. G. Farben Still the Boss:"

RUHR AUTHORITY FARCE

With front-page headlines in the press and pompous speeches by top officials, the Allies announced to the world last year that Germany's war arsenal, the Ruhr, would be a thing of the past. In accordance with the deepest desire of all peoples, so these announcements read, the Allied powers had set up an International Control Authority for the Ruhr. This so-called international authority was supposed to be the last word in the development of super safeguards that would prevent the Ruhr from being employed again as an aggressive instrument. In addition, the Allied representatives in Germany boasted that this international authority would take all steps to insure that the Ruhr would work for all of Europe.

Most people reading the contents of this agreement applauded the decision as evidence of the good faith and intentions of the occupying powers. Those of us, however, who read between the lines of the agreement, found little comfort.

In its press release of January 1949, the Society for the Prevention of World War III called a spade a spade. We said that those who were responsible for the new plan to "internationalize" Germany's war arsenal, the Ruhr, achieved a notable victory in public relations. Though the agreement served to placate those who feared a resurgent Germany, in reality it was mere window dressing, hiding the fact that the control of the Ruhr was not international, nor did it meet the security and economic requirements of Germany's victims.

The reemergence of the Ruhr magnates who served Hitler with enthusiasm should have been a broad enough hint to all peoples concerned that the international control authority for the Ruhr could only be nominal, because it lacked the power to truly prevent the Ruhr from becoming a new base for German aggression and economic domination. Yet there were many sincere people who, while in accord with our analysis of the agreement, suggested that we give it a chance before making a final judgment. Well, almost a year has passed, and as the saying goes, "By their fruits ye shall judge them."

We challenge anyone to tell us just what this International Ruhr Authority has accomplished since its inception. As recently as September of this year the press reported that members of the International Ruhr Authority complained that they received no authority to implement the powers allegedly granted to them. They made a further revelation. It was disclosed that the German coal and steel trustees "were in a position to receive more information and to carry out more authority than the International Ruhr Board itself."

The Ruhr Authority has not only been twiddling its thumbs all these months, but it has been grossly understaffed and many of its top officials are either glorified office boys or men who have not the slightest understanding of the Ruhr and its role in German history.

Matters have recently reached such a point that the French representative on the Authority, Ambassador Maurice de Jean, threw up his hands in disgust and despair at a meeting, realizing that it is just a paper organization which acts as a front for the real control which is vested in the Germans themselves.

In spite of all its shortcomings, the International Ruhr Authority could have played a significant part in controlling the resources of the Ruhr with a view toward facilitating economic recovery and independence of Germany's neighbors. This could have been achieved providing that there was a genuine desire on the part of the Allied authorities in Germany to infuse the Ruhr Authority with real powers. But nothing of the sort has occurred as yet. On the contrary, there seems to be a deliberate plan to discredit the International Ruhr Authority, to limit its scope of activities, and thus paralyze its usefulness. This is the German hope and was expressed in a speech made in January 1949 by one of the top politicians of Chancellor Adenauer's party, Dr. Walter Strauss. He told his fellow Germans that the powers of the International Ruhr Authority must be abolished for "it should be appreciated that the German claim is for priority to be given to the requirements of the German economy * * *."

Strauss was not talking through his hat when he said that the International Ruhr Authority must be subordinated to the interests of the new Germany. This became clear when the French recently urged that the International Ruhr Authority investigate Germany's deliberate price discrimination on the export of Ruhr coal. It is a decisive issue in the economic recovery of Europe today.

The general practice of the Germans is to sell Ruhr coal abroad at a higher price than that which it obtains in Germany itself, which means that it is far more expensive, for example, for the French to produce a ton of steel than for the Germans. This, in turn, enables the German steel industry to keep down the steel industries of other nations and rise again to its former power when German steel dictated the politics of the Continent.

In reply to the French request that the International Ruhr Authority investigate this situation, the New York Times reported that United States officials opposed "this use of the organization." Here was a concrete instance where the Ruhr Authority could have made an invaluable contribution toward making a more equitable economic relationship among the nations of western Europe, but the United States representatives vetoed the suggestion. Which leads up to the question: What is the International Ruhr Authority supposed to do? If it cannot exercise prerogatives which, according to the agreement, were given to it, why should the taxpayers of this country and our allies support it?

It would have been far more helpful if the United States officials, who are protecting the interests of Hitler's industrial warlords, announced to the world that in reality their aim is to curtail the powers of the International Ruhr Authority. Such an admission, at least, would dispel the illusions which have confused the people as to the character of this organization. On the other hand, the continuation of this farce can only serve the purposes of the Germans and their American Charlie McCarthys. This, of course, is precisely what the Germans want.

It should be remembered that when the International Ruhr Authority was organized, the Allies assured the world that it would never become an instrument of German interests. It was supposed to work for all of western Europe and was intended to be recognized as an independent power whose recommendations and activities were to be respected by all those who joined in establishing it.

The refusal of the United States and British representatives to allow the International Ruhr Authority a semblance of its potential powers exposes another of the postwar tragic comedies to which the people have been subjected since the end of the war.

I. G. FARBEN STILL THE BOSS

In the last issue of Prevent World War III we published a short editorial in which the notorious record of Herr Herman Buecher, I. G. Farben "trust buster" was disclosed.

We pointed out that Buecher is the chairman of the I. G. Farben Dispersal Panel (Fardip) which is charged with the administration of the Farben assets. This organization is supposed to play a key role in "breaking up" the Farben empire. We indicated, however, that Buecher was one of Hitler's staunch supporters, a friend of the German banker, Von Schroeder, who was the midwife of nazism. Buecher was also a director of Hermann Goering's 12-man Armament Council.

Taking advantage of these powers, Herr Buecher was able to expedite the delivery of efficient electrical devices to the Siemens Trust which were used in the gas chambers of Auschwitz and Buchenwald. On the basis of our findings concerning Herr Buecher, intuition told us that with a little research we could uncover similar facts with regard to some of his associates on Fardip. We were right! There was ample documentation published by the United States Government and its agencies which reveal the character of some of his German cronies in the Farben Dispersal Panel.

For example, take the case of Gustav Brecht, a member of Fardip. Brecht was a key director of the Deutsche Bank which, in cooperation with the Nazis, played a decisive part in the looting of Europe. Furthermore, Brecht had long been associated with the German coal cartel. He was an active operator in many of Germany's war industries and participated in the aryanization of companies which did not conform to Hitler's racial theories. Because of his "selfless sacrifices" for the Nazi cause, Brecht was rewarded by Hitler and received the title of "Wehrwirtschaftsführer" (war economy leader).

According to a report on the Deutsche Bank made by members of the American Military Government, "the phenomenal upswing in Brecht's career after March 1933, shows that he was a participant and beneficiary in the nazification of Germany." Though he denied direct affiliation with the Nazi Party, the report discloses that Baron Von Schroeder "has repeatedly characterized Herman Brecht as a Nazi." If anyone was in the position to know who was a Nazi among Germany's industrialists—Baron Von Schroeder was certainly the man.

One of Brecht's companies, "Rheinbraun," and its sister companies and subsidiaries, were notorious employers of slave labor. It has been estimated that up to 30 percent of their working forces consisted of peoples from all parts of Europe who were thrown into the Nazi slave pens. Like a hungry vulture, Brecht followed the Nazi machine in Europe, despoiling property and stealing it from its legitimate owners, under the protection of Nazi bayonets.

The American investigators of Brecht's activities characterized him as "a reluctant, inconsistent, and evasive prisoner." (Who freed him and why?) They concluded that within the meaning of Paragraph 1A of Article II of the Control Council Law No. X dealing with the prosecution of German war criminals, Brecht had committed "a crime against the peace." So much for the war criminal Brecht.

Another Hitler supporter on Fardip is Dr. Eugene von Ritter. Von Ritter is a partner in the German bank Merck Fink & Co. American investigators in Germany reveal that his bank participated with the Deutsche Bank in the creation of a special German bank for Japan that would facilitate the opening of a "new and potentially important channel for expansion in the Far East." This new bank underwrote the alliance between German and Japanese imperialism in the Far East and was guided by Hellmuth Pollems, the right-hand man of Herman Abs, one of Hitler's most dependable henchmen.

The War Department in its study of Germany's industrial war lords, classified Von Ritter as one "who in an outstanding way thrived under National Socialism, who welcomed it in the beginning, aided the Nazis to obtain power, supported them in office, shared the spoils of expropriation and conquest or otherwise markedly benefited in their careers or fortunes under the Nazis."

The Farben rogues gallery, however, is by no means complete. True, there was a trial which had as its ostensible purpose the prosecution of some of Farben's top officials. But this trial now turns out to be a mere formality, for it is now clear to those who have closely followed the Farben story that most of the old gang is back in power again.

This is especially true in the British zone where a flock of Farben officials have returned to power. At Leverkusen, for example, one of Farben's chief officials, Ulrich Haberland, is the general director. He was involved in the slave labor traffic up to his neck. When American prosecutors tried to take him into custody for interrogation, the British refused to let him go.

Another gentleman who has returned to the scene of his crime at Leverkusen is Wilhelm Mann. Mann is in charge of pharmaceutical sales. This is his specialty, for he ran the Bayer agency of I. G. Farben abroad prior to the war. He was a faithful servant of the Nazi program. As early as 1933, he directed a purge of his organization to insure that "only those representing the National Socialist point of view and acceptable to the Nazis" would be employed in the Farben outlets throughout the world. His pro-Nazi activities were so clear-cut that he was actually placed on the docket at Nuremberg, but he escaped punishment.

Gajewski, another Farben criminal and former defendant at the Nuremberg trial, is also free and is running the Elberfeld plant in the British zone. To a lesser extent, the same situation is found in the French zone of occupation.

The characters mentioned above are only a sampling of the many Farben empire builders who are back at their jobs.

Here is a tragic picture which hardly needs comment, for it clearly reveals the degree of moral bankruptcy which is undermining the original aims of the occupation of Germany.

How can one explain the growth of this nest of Farben war criminals and their accomplices, when all the facts about their crimes have been documented by the occupation authorities themselves? How can one dare to justify the retention of the three German war criminals, members of Fardip, who have been entrusted to break up I. G. Farben?

The Garland-Ferguson Committee which made an admirable report on the deliberate failure of American officials to decartelize Germany, declared that Farben was an exception. We believe that they would have never reached that conclusion had they been presented with the above-mentioned facts and additional material which is kept under lock and key. General Clay, as Military Governor, was in the position to know the facts which we have cited. If he was unaware of them then he was indeed a poor representative of the people's interests in Germany. On the assumption that he knew the character of these men and that they were entrenching themselves again in the Farben set-up, why did he fail to act?

The facts must also be known to his successor, Mr. John J. McCloy. But apparently he is too busy these days discrediting the dismantling program.

It is true that these disgraceful conditions are, to a large extent, the immediate responsibility of the British. They have always been reluctant to upset the sacred status quo in their zone of Germany. Their record is black indeed as far as decartelization and the prosecution of German war criminals is concerned.

There was a time when the United States could do little about the goings-on in the British zone, because it was solely British responsibility. But that day has passed.

When Germany-friters, in and out of the military government, wanted to curtail the delivery of reparations, they found the means to make the British comply.

It is obvious that if Mr. McCloy had the desire to clean up the Farben scandal, he could very easily do so.

In the first place, the American set-up to control Farben in the United States zone is grossly overworked and understaffed. There are hard-working Americans in the organization, but how can a few watch over a vast empire which stretches from Berlin to Buenos Aires? McCloy is fully conversant with this situation but has failed to take remedial action thus far.

In the second place, Mr. McCloy's past connections with the Farben empire should also be taken into consideration. In our judgment, Mr. McCloy will move only when the pressure of public opinion can no longer be ignored.

No Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "No Emergency," from the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune of Wednesday, January 18, 1950:

NO EMERGENCY

It must stand as a very dark blot indeed on President Truman's record that he has insisted upon playing politics with the coal situation and Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Truman has placed politics ahead of his country's welfare.

A certain bigness of character is expected of the President of the United States. It is not to be expected that the President would permit an economic weak spot to endure in the country if he had the power to do something about it.

The miners have not worked full time since last June. That is fair neither to the miners, who need the work, nor to the Nation, which needs the coal they could produce.

The miners were granted good wages and certain other demands by their employers last year, but they have not had the opportunity to enjoy what they have been given. They have not had a full year's work in a long time because of Mr. Lewis and his desire to display his power once a year.

There are generally two sides to every question. Yet, the plain facts appear to be that the chief of the United Mine Workers will not let his men work a full year or a full week.

It is not to his credit that he has stalled for months in his demands nor that he has adopted the attitude of "I'll win this fight if it breaks every coal miner in America."

In neighboring Pennsylvania communities to our west, miners are facing difficult times. Some company stores have ceased to extend credit. Miners' bills have been mounting. Their families and their children are beginning, even, to want for food.

Over in Pittsburgh, a steel company has cut production and laid off 1,000 men. The city's biggest electric utility company warns that it must shut off industrial electric power Friday for want of coal. If that occurs, many industries will be forced to close, many will be out of work.

Coal dealers have wired the President that "the emergency in coal has become a crisis."

If cold weather seizes the district many persons may suffer, the dealers warn.

Generally those who suffer most in such instances are the poor, who cannot lay in sufficient reserves of coal to see them through the winter.

We do not know, of course, how Mr. Truman views an emergency.

He and the New Deal have developed one emergency after the other in this country in the last 15 years or so. Perhaps the coal crisis does not now threaten the very fabric of our Nation, if that is what Mr. Truman now means by "emergency."

But certainly an emergency exists in the lives of many thousands of Americans due to Mr. Lewis and his enforced coal shortage.

There is one means at hand provided for just such an occasion as this long coal crisis. It is the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. Truman has used it several times. But he campaigned on a prominent plank calling for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. It would weaken his political ammunition if he were forced to use the Taft-Hartley Act now even if it would solve the problem, as it is generally believed would be the case.

The miners themselves are rebelling. Mr. Lewis' suggestion that they go back to their 3-day week Monday was refused by some 81,000 up until Tuesday night. They said they are disgusted, sick of the 3-day week. They need the work. It is "3 days or nothing" they are saying.

Union officials deny it is a revolt. But, put it how you will, the men are not doing as John L. says this time.

Despite this pressure from the public, Mr. Truman said Tuesday again, for the third or fourth time, that he plans to do nothing, since no national emergency exists. "The time has not yet arrived," Mr. Truman told Senator Brewster.

Is Mr. Truman waiting for national catastrophe? For economic collapse, for riots, joblessness, stalled industry, cold and hungry people?

Is that an emergency? Or does an emergency exist when such dire things are threatened.

It seems ridiculous, tragic, even, to quibble thus in the face of such an important national need, a need to which the President consistently has refused to rise.

It is time Mr. Truman stops playing politics, and acts for the real welfare of the people instead of talking vaguely about a welfare state, which would mean only their ultimate ruin.

Mr. Speaker, events have transpired, and the President is now invoking the Taft-Hartley Act. It is a good, workable piece of legislation, for the best interest of labor, management, and the country. But the Taft-Hartley Act will not work unless the President of the United States, whose duty and responsibility it is to see that it is executed, is sincere in his desire that it work. Remember the old saying: "You can drive a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink." You can force the coal miners into the pits but you cannot make them work.

It seems to me we as a Nation are getting in pretty bad shape when arrogant, radical labor leaders are able to tie this country up to the point of strangulation. When we reach such a point, watch out labor; watch out capital; watch out, Mr. President, that Joe Stalin does not take us over. History proves this is the way he operates.

This warning is meant as much for the President of the United States as it is for the worker, the Member of Congress, or any good sound-thinking American citizen.

A Parable on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I bring to your attention the following parable by Mr. Karl Baarslag, the able and energetic research expert of the Americanism division of the American Legion, which I present for the enlightenment of the American people. It should be read carefully and the proper moral should be drawn from it:

THE PARABLE OF THE VANISHED VILLAGE

Once upon a time, long, long ago, there was a peaceful and contented village hard by a rocky and desolate ravine. In a cave in the ravine lived a wild and ferocious beast. For many years the villagers ignored the existence of the animal because village elders and wise men had decided that it would speedily succumb to its own suicidal tendencies and lack of common sense. When the beast began to raid the flocks of the village grazing in the upper stretches of the ravine, the herdsmen prudently withdrew their animals to an area closer to the village where they could be better guarded. Nevertheless, the emboldened beast ranged farther and farther in its nocturnal depredations, finally destroying and running off with cattle and sheep close to the village limits. It also had killed a hunter returning from the forest and had seized and devoured a small child which had strayed from the safety of the village confines.

Badly alarmed and deeply concerned, some of the villagers now began to hold numerous emergency meetings on what to do about the beast. Debates raged far into the night but they found themselves badly divided in opinion. Some argued that the beast was really not carnivorous or destructive but had become so accidentally and that it would undoubtedly return to a vegetarian diet later when it found meat unavailable. Learned men and philosophers, none of whom had ever seen the beast or studied its ways, speculated at great length and with profound wisdom on its nature, origin, and destiny. Others, obviously the victims of hysteria, described it as a most frightful monster which bore no resemblance to any other form of animal either they or their ancestors had ever encountered. Some of the more practical and solid citizens argued sagely that the beast had already received too much hysterical publicity and that it should be ignored out of existence. One of the most respected of the village elders even thought that it should be laughed out of existence.

That night two more children were horribly killed by the prowling beast. Several fine beef cattle also were destroyed, substantially cutting down the village's food supply. This led some of the village witch doctors and medicine men to the belief that only positive means should be adopted and that they should breed cattle and sheep able to outrun the beast and with improved breeding methods they might be able to develop herds whose flesh and hides would be practically resistant to the wild animal's fangs and claws. That night 16 sheep and several more beef cattle were destroyed.

The villagers thereupon tried every conceivable countermeasure advised by their medicine men and witch doctors. A stockade was built across the upper ravine. The beast simply outflanked this by coming over the mountain and descending on the village from

another direction. It ran off with a small boy after killing a woman gathering berries. After this berry picking was banned and all children were confined to their huts. The infuriated and apparently mad beast trampled down their crops and harried a number of sheep and cattle to death, apparently for the sheer lust of senseless destruction. Fires were built and tom-toms beaten all night long to frighten it away. The village's best orators held forth in long declamations against the animal which had now become the scourge of their existence. Medicine men and witch doctors exhausted their ancient arts by brewing every known form of magical potion and casting every known and secret form of incantation and spell. The beast fell upon several of these tom-tom drummers and mumbo-jumbo men at the edge of the forest, harrying them to death. That night the destruction of their stock was the heaviest in years, with the already drastically curbed food supply dwindling day by day.

It was now plain that the beast or monster, whatever it was, had wheiped, as there were smaller-size tracks in evidence after this most disastrous foray. The village debates now became embittered and furious. Everyone agreed that something must and should be done but they were unable to agree upon any recourse or remedy. The local chapter of the Society of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, for example, argued that the beast and its young had to eat in order to live, and that it had, under their basic law and constitution, the very selfsame rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of its own admittedly peculiar form of happiness as they claimed for themselves. Destroying the beast would be but a step to destroying their own cherished freedoms. This humane principle won wide support among the more intelligent and liberal element of the villagers. And those who had no children and no cattle to lose and who lived safely near the center of the village and who had never seen even the track of the animal seemed to be full of far more advice and knowledge on what not to do than the direct victims of the beast's marauding.

By this time the villagers were panic-stricken. All normal village pursuits and means of making a living had become impossible, as the emboldened beast and its whelps ranged far and wide, raiding and destroying by day as well as by night. The village elders were in practically continuous session trying to find ways and means of ending this frightful incubus which was poisoning their very existence.

At this point a few of the village's hunters came forward with an altogether unique and revolutionary proposal. They had tracked and studied the beast from hiding places in the trees near its cave. They reported that while the animal was of enormous size and far better equipped with saber-like teeth and destructive claws than any other animal previously encountered in their past, it definitely was not supernatural or invincible. Why not simply organize a mass hunting party of the most fearless and trained fighters of the village, proceed to the cave and destroy the evil animal and its young thus ending for all time the horrible nightmare. This extraordinary proposal was promptly rejected by the village elders and wise men as entirely impractical and "a purely negative approach to the problem." It was further intimated that these "beast-baiters" as they came to be known really suffered from hallucinations and that they probably thought they saw the beast under every bed. That night three of the medicine men engaged in casting spells in the direction of the cave were pounced upon at the outskirts of the village and horribly mangled to pieces. Their few remaining cattle were also nearly decimated.

The villagers now sat frightened and huddled in their huts never knowing where the dread animal would strike next. They no longer dared to forage abroad for food for their hungry children many of whom died of malnutrition. With time on their hands the village wise men and elders debated endlessly and futilely on the nature of the beast and what, if anything, they should attempt to do about it. They were never able to reach any agreement, each villager having different ideas and suggestions. The beast-baiters had been locked up in a strong hut set aside for the feeble-minded. It was perfectly plain to the rest of the more level-headed villagers that their perfectly idiotic idea of proceeding to the cave and destroying the beast and its young was not worthy of serious consideration as it was entirely negative and impractical and dangerous besides. Strongly worded resolutions and fiery denunciatory speeches were deemed far more efficacious. Others insisted that emphasizing the undeniable benefits of their communal life and their cultural advances as compared with the horrible, dank lair of the monster were the only correct and positive approaches to the problem.

Centuries later archaeologists stumbled upon the ruins of the village. The few remaining inhabitants had apparently died of starvation while debating on the village green despite the fact that their valley was a particularly fertile and sheltered one. The scattered skeletons of other villagers indicated that they had been destroyed by some extremely ferocious and powerful animals. No other trace of their culture or cause of their extinction was apparent. They appeared to have been a people with a high order of intelligence, well equipped with weapons and otherwise perfectly capable of defending themselves.

United States Withdrawal Policy in Asia Encourages Reds on All Fronts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the following article by the distinguished foreign-policy analyst, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, is the first public statement I have seen that the Truman administration is prepared, if necessary, not only to let the mainland of Asia go to the Reds, but also to abandon Japan and the Philippines, too, if the Communists make a determined move in their direction. This has actually been the policy for a long time. The dust for whose settling the State Department is waiting was thrown in the air by itself to keep our people from seeing the stark bankruptcy of American foreign policy in Asia. Many people have known the truth for months but I for one had hoped that before it became public knowledge, to the Kremlin as well as to us and its victims, the administration would come to its senses, forget about its face, and start thinking about our security enough to change the policy—adopting for Asia the policy of helping free peoples resist Communist subjugation which it has followed successfully thus far in Europe.

However, the President's fateful announcement on January 5, 1950, that the United States would not give any assistance in the form of military advisers and supplies or even moral support or encouragement to our beleaguered ally, the free Republic of China with headquarters on Formosa, has tossed the fat into the fire. The Kremlin now knows it has practically a green light on the Asiatic mainland as far as we are concerned, and its prompt stepping up of aggressive pressures in both Asia and Europe is the inevitable result. The peoples of Asia know that without strong American support they are almost certainly doomed. The American people are the only ones who do not know the score. I can see nothing to gain by trying to keep them longer in ignorance of what the rest of the world already understands fairly clearly. Hence, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the article.

The only statement in it with which I disagree is in the first sentence. It is not quite accurate to say that the Truman doctrine has been abandoned as far as Asia is concerned; the stark fact is that it never was extended to Asia. What has happened is that that fact is now admitted and its ominous implications—including its probable failure now in Europe—ought to be recognized by all.

UNITED STATES WITHDRAWAL POLICY IN ASIA ENCOURAGES REDS ON ALL FRONTS

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The United States has abandoned the Truman doctrine so far as Asia is concerned. As a result, not only Formosa but Japan, the Philippines and the entire Pacific area as far back as Hawaii and Alaska are considered by the American armed forces as expendable.

This is not the fault of the armed forces. Our generals and admirals would have liked nothing better than to save China and to stop Soviet expansion everywhere. It is the fault of the administration when it discovered that the cost of implementing the Truman doctrine everywhere in the world would have limited the social gains promised to the American people.

The natural trend of any democracy to put butter ahead of cannon was strengthened by the claims of the American Air Force to win any war by intercontinental bombing. It was further strengthened by the State Department's acceptance of the theory that to use American force anywhere in Asia to stop communism would mean to drive the awakening Asiatic masses into the arms of the Kremlin.

The result was that the United States is retreating—has perhaps already retreated—from those areas which we conquered from the Japs by years of bloody fighting.

ATLANTIC PRIORITY

At a certain time, as can be ascertained by reading between the lines of statements by the Secretary of Defense and the badly embarrassed chiefs of staff, the administration decided that the cost of world-wide containment of a communism was prohibitive. The military chiefs had to draw up a priority list of areas. Those in the Atlantic, perhaps quite properly, came first.

Therefore, we signed the Atlantic Security Pact with the west-European countries. We are sending them arms though not enough. We would presumably fight to defend a bridgehead in Europe, the Atlantic islands of Iceland and Greenland, the Caribbean, the coast of Central and South America and the northern border of Canada.

The military leaders would be ready to do the same in the Pacific. They are forced to tailor their suit to their cloth. The administration is not asking for, and Congress is

not voting, enough money to contain communism in Europe, the Middle East, and Asia. Therefore, American forces may not defend badly threatened, Indochina or Hainan Island or Formosa. If these places hold, so much the better. If not, as matters now stand, they will have to go.

DEFENSE PERIMETER

Just as before Pearl Harbor, the American forces available to defend Japan and the Philippines are small. If seriously attacked, these places may well be abandoned. So with the Pacific islands for a long way west. There is also talk of withdrawing from the Mediterranean those American naval forces that have for the last 4 years stopped Soviet expansion in that area by their mere presence.

So long as this policy of restricting the Truman doctrine was not public, its harmfulness was limited. Now, however, that the debate over holding or not holding Formosa has revealed the limited nature of American strategic intentions, the Communist world is becoming increasingly bold. Chinese and Soviet radios are already announcing the coming liberation, meaning conquest, of Tibet and of Indochina. Pressure on India is increasing.

For if these regions can expect no military help from the United States, why should the Soviet Empire cease expanding? Once Senator TOM CONNALLY has told the world that the United States would not risk getting into a war to defend Formosa, why stop anywhere in Asia?

RE-ARMAMENTS

The American policy of disavowing Chiang Kai-shek and of withdrawal from Asia has, of course, been an invitation to the Soviets to take those countries over. Now that Moscow knows that the United States will not fight for Formosa, it will quite obviously push forward into other areas. Perhaps the partial revival of the Berlin blockade was an attempt to test out our will to fight for that city. Certainly, the hasty withdrawal of American forces from the Railway Administration building in our zone which we had legitimately occupied would seem to confirm the Soviet suspicion that the United States was bluffing.

Quite obviously, should such a suspicion become general, it would cost us our already none too confident European allies just as it is already costing us the confidence of our friends in the Pacific. It could be that the public decision not to defend Formosa marked the end of a successful policy that had lasted since we saved the Dardanelles and Iran in 1946.

Whittaker Chambers Spikes Malicious Rumors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks the following transcript of a Nation-wide radio broadcast by Bert Andrews, of the Washington bureau of the New York Herald Tribune, in an interview with Whittaker Chambers, Saturday, January 28, 1950:

Good evening, this is Bert Andrews, reporting from Washington. With me tonight is one of the most controversial figures in America. He is Whittaker Chambers, the former Communist courier, whose disclosures led to the perjury conviction of Alger Hiss, former State Department official. Mr. Hiss' conviction and his sentence to 5 years in prison is being appealed. Meanwhile, it has stirred intense interest and widely contrasting reactions in Washington and throughout the country. Secretary of State Acheson, as you know, has stated that he will not turn his back on Alger Hiss even if the highest Court in the land upholds the verdict of the trial jury. Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt has said that she thinks it was "rather horrible" of the jury to condemn someone on the word of someone else who admits to guilt. The Mississippi State Legislature has passed a resolution assailing Secretary Acheson for his defense of Mr. Hiss. Because of the continuing conflict in the minds of so many people, I am going to ask Whittaker Chambers some of the questions I believe our listeners would like to ask him. First, Mr. Chambers, what do you think of Mrs. Roosevelt's recent comments on the outcome of the trial?

Mr. CHAMBERS. I think that Mrs. Roosevelt, like some other people, is too inclined to consider this as a contest between Alger Hiss and Whittaker Chambers. This is a line which the defense has been urging to distract attention from the bigger conflict. She overlooks the fact that the jury did not reach its verdict merely on the basis of the stories of two men. She overlooks the fact that the jury decided there was corroboration from many witnesses and from other forms of evidence of the charges against Mr. Hiss. I believe the American people still accept the verdicts of their duly selected juries rather than the personal opinion of any well-meaning individual, no matter how highly placed that individual may be.

Mr. ANDREWS. Now, Mr. Chambers, since you agreed to answer tough questions as well as easy ones, I'd like to ask this: What about all the stories that have attained national circulation in scuttlebutt fashion? I mean the rumors that you were once in a mental institution, that you were a heavy drinker, that there was something in your relationship with Hiss that has not come to light?

Mr. CHAMBERS. These stories were assiduously spread by Mr. Hiss's sympathizers. I have never been in a sanitarium of any sort. Period. I almost never touch hard liquor. I may have five or six glasses of wine a year. The whole truth about my friendship with Alger Hiss was placed before the jury. Right here I'd like to ask a question of you: Do you imagine that the defense would have failed to bring out evidence relating to all those rumors if they had been able to find an iota of evidence about them?

Mr. ANDREWS. I can't answer for the defense in the case, Mr. Chambers, although I must admit it would be logical to think they produced all the evidence they could on all points. Now how about another rumor—that you acted from a motive of revenge. I might tell you that I received a letter only yesterday containing that rumor in a new form. It said that a man who claimed to know the lowdown argued that you were and still are a Communist. He argued that Alger Hiss was once a Communist but broke with the party. And that the Kremlin ordered you to become an apparent renegade so that you could set out and get Hiss.

Mr. CHAMBERS. I know all of those stories, Mr. Andrews. Usually they say that I am working out some old grudge or some old hatred. I do not hate Mr. Hiss. We were close friends but we are caught in a tragedy of history. Mr. Hiss represents the concealed enemy against which we are all fighting. If I had been trying to destroy him personally, why would I have waited 10 or 11 years? I tried to persuade him to change his mind when I abandoned the Communist movement.

Mr. ANDREWS. Another question that bothers many people is this, Mr. Chambers. I'll quote from the language of one of the Congressmen who heard you testify before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He raised this point: Why should an American who has prospered under the American system and who is assured of security and a worth-while future—why should such a man join the Communist Party in this country and try to overthrow the American system?

Mr. CHAMBERS. To answer that question, it is necessary to think for a moment about the world in which Mr. Hiss and I came of age. It was a world racked by global wars and social struggle. Like me, Mr. Hiss came of age from a proud but impoverished middle-class family. As a young man—a thoughtful young man—he must have asked himself what caused the world's wars, what caused the global depression, and what should he do about it. Like me, he thought he had found the answer. Like me, I believe he saw in the decline of his family the image of a society in decline.

Mr. ANDREWS. That's not quite responsive, Mr. Chambers. Mr. Hiss's personal financial future seemed assured. Why should he or anyone else want to kick such a future aside, or endanger it?

Mr. CHAMBERS. That mere fact that a man is making a good living does not necessarily blind him to the troubles of others and the world. They find the world full of moral confusion. Some of them think that Marxism and Leninism offer a simple explanation of the causes and a program for action. The very vigor of the project appeals to some of the sheltered middle-class intellectuals who feel a sense of guilt because others do not have as much as they have. And so some of them turn to communism without realizing that communism destroys the very rights they would like to see granted to the underprivileged.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chambers, most of the reporters who attended the second trial agreed that a witness who may have been the one witness to sway the jury in the direction of a guilty verdict was Mrs. Edith Murray, who once worked as a maid in your home. She did not testify at the first trial. She appeared at the second trial and identified Mr. and Mrs. Hiss as persons who had called on you and Mrs. Chambers at your home. Can you tell me why she didn't testify in the first trial?

Mr. CHAMBERS. The FBI had not been able to find her for the first trial. My wife and I remembered her only as Edith. We gave the FBI that name but they could not trace her. Between the first trial and the second trial my wife found an oil painting she had done of Edith back at the time in question. She turned it over to the FBI. It was a good likeness. They took it through various neighborhoods in Baltimore.

Mr. ANDREWS. And someone recognized it?

Mr. CHAMBERS. Yes. Finally they found a woman who said, "Why, that looks like Edith Murray." Once the FBI had the last name they were able to find Mrs. Murray without difficulty. She appeared as a surprise witness. She corroborated another phase of the story.

Mr. ANDREWS. Another thing that has puzzled many Americans is this, Mr. Chambers: How could people know each other only by so-called cover names—or first names?

Mr. CHAMBERS. Unlike Europeans, Americans do not have a long history of conspiracy. Therefore, they find it difficult to understand the true nature of a conspiracy. But history teaches that just such methods have been used by conspirators since time immemorial.

Mr. ANDREWS. As I told you at the outset, Mr. Chambers, I have some tough questions. You know that you have been assailed by

many as a self-confessed Communist agent, a self-confessed traitor, and a self-confessed perjurer. You know that many people have argued and still argue that nothing you have said should be believed because of your past. What is your answer to that?

Mr. CHAMBERS. I am particularly glad that you asked that question. It goes to the heart of what I have tried to do. In exposing the conspiracy, the problem was to find a man who had first-hand knowledge of the facts—who was willing to testify to them publicly. This had to be an ex-Communist who was willing to tell all the facts about his own activities as a Communist as well as the activities of others. In short a man who would sit in the witness chair and accept all of the criticism that could be thrown at him. But again, Mr. Andrews, let me say that it was not merely a matter of my word against another's word. There was other evidence. If there had been no other evidence, it is possible that my word alone would not have satisfied a single juror. But there was other evidence. And it was accepted as sufficient by 8 out of 12 jurors at the first trial—and by all 12 jurors at the second trial.

Mr. ANDREWS. But I was talking about your past, Mr. Chambers. You were a Communist courier. What made you change?

Mr. CHAMBERS. My own experience and the record of events made me change. They taught me that communism is a form of totalitarianism—that its triumph means slavery to men wherever they fall under its sway, and spiritual night to the human mind and soul. I think we have only to look at the situation in countries behind the iron curtain to realize that that is true. I realized it back in 1937 and I broke with the party.

Mr. ANDREWS. A great many people ask just why did you wait until August 1948 to volunteer your information to the House committee?

Mr. CHAMBERS. I did not wait—and I did not volunteer it to the committee, Mr. Andrews. I gave the information to Government officials in 1939, 2 days after the Hitler-Stalin pact was signed. Nobody gave it any credence, and nothing was done about it. When the House committee took up the case in 1948, I was subpenaed without any advance notice.

Mr. ANDREWS. On another phase, Mr. Chambers, I remember that the House committee once asked you if you would be willing to take a lie-detector test. You said you would. They did not ask you to take such a test because Mr. Hiss, in writing, had declined to take one on the advice of friends who informed him the test was not reliable. Now that the trial is over, are you still willing to take such a test?

Mr. CHAMBERS. I am not only willing to take one, Mr. Andrews, I am eager to do so. I am eager to take this test under the proper auspices.

Mr. ANDREWS. What do you mean by proper auspices, Mr. Chambers?

Mr. CHAMBERS. I mean that the person or persons administering the test must be free of any suspicion of complicity with Communists or close ties with Alger Hiss and his sympathizers.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you mean that you alone, Mr. Chambers, would want to decide who would give the test and assess it?

Mr. CHAMBERS. Not at all, Mr. Andrews. I would stipulate that the Federal Bureau of Investigation be satisfied as to the character of the person or persons giving the test.

Mr. ANDREWS. Would you demand that you be furnished in advance with the list of questions?

Mr. CHAMBERS. Certainly not. I should merely insist that one question be included—was there ever anything peculiar in your relationship with Alger Hiss or any member of his family?

Mr. ANDREWS. I take it that that goes back to some of the scuttlebutt rumors I asked you about before?

Mr. CHAMBERS. It does. I particularly want to spike the rumor that Alger Hiss is shielding someone. He is shielding nobody but himself.

Mr. ANDREWS. Let's go back to another phase we were discussing, Mr. Chambers. I'd like to get a more definite answer on it. A lot of people find it hard to understand why you testified against Mr. Hiss, on the one hand, while, on the other, you insist you have no personal resentment against him. Can you explain it a little more fully?

Mr. CHAMBERS. Point 1, Alger Hiss was, of course, only one of a numerous group against whom I testified. Point 2, I assume that Alger Hiss is a man of intense convictions—convictions which I once shared. I believe that I also am a man of intense convictions. Due to the social struggle which is the dominant theme of our age, Hiss' faith and mine are now diametrically opposed. But I cannot fail to respect even an enemy who shares with me the feeling that only that life is worth living for which a man is prepared to dare all and die at any moment.

Kuomintang May Be Disbanded To Bring Liberals to the Fore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the February 6 issue of the Washington Daily News relative to the possible disbandment of the Kuomintang:

KUOMINTANG MAY BE DISBANDED TO BRING LIBERALS TO THE FORE

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

TAIPEH, FORMOSA, February 6.—Formal disbandment of the Kuomintang (Government party) and its rebirth as the Democratic Revolutionary Party—Minchukemintang—under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek is reliably reported to be in the planning stage.

And a separate organization of Nationalist liberals under the leadership of Dr. Hu Shih, one of China's prominent scholars, is expected to emerge under the name of the League of Liberal China—Chungkuotseyutungmen.

Dr. Hu, now in the United States, is expected either to return and give the league its official send-off or remain there and in collaboration with such learned Chinese as T. F. Tsiang seek to advance its recognition as the main repository of Kuomintang liberalism.

It is understood Generalissimo Chiang has given his blessing both to the projected League of Liberal China and the reorganization of the Kuomintang into the Democratic Revolutionary Party. For years he has generally refrained from taking sides in intra-Kuomintang politics.

Much of the support for the league is said to originate among the Generalissimo's own advisers. It appears that the two reformative ideas are closely linked through overlapping sponsorship.

TO CONVINCE UNITED STATES

The principal objective of the two moves, though it may never be enunciated in so many words, would be to convince the United States Government that the Kuomintang contains elements of sound liberal and democratic thinking and is capable of its own reform.

Kuomintang liberals believe that if the Chinese are to show any middle-of-the-road tendencies which the United States State Department has said it is looking for in China they must come from the anti-Communist side.

If there are any liberals with the Communists, they must be a hamstrung lot, it is reasoned here, and reform of the Kuomintang and the emergence of the League of Liberal China might offer attractive rally points for them—if they can ever get out from under the Reds.

It is reported from Peiping that the so-called "democratic personages" are not even permitted to leave the Red capital.

REVERSE NAME CHANGE

The Kuomintang has gone through several name changes since Dr. Sun Yat-sen organized the Hsing Chung-hui (Regenerate China Society) in Macao in 1892. The Hsing Chung-hui was the Kuomintang in its earliest form.

Dr. Sun's Three Principles of the People—nationalism, democracy, and the people's livelihood—would continue as the central and historic inspiration of the Democratic Revolutionary Party, but the League of Liberal China would embody most liberal Chinese thought on how to insure their fulfillment.

WEEDING OUT LIKELY

It is likely the party would weed out much of the old Kuomintang membership and subordinate leadership—especially that which, right or wrong, has given the party a reactionary reputation. The time for that was never more pressing.

The bulk of membership has always lain with Government employees. The Kuomintang reached its peak membership of 400,000 mostly civil servants, at the end of 1929. Now, Nationalist civil servants number only a few hundred and active leadership has been pared to a core.

But this core contains conservatives and liberals. It seems the League of Liberal China would include liberal elements within the larger framework of the Democratic Revolutionary Party. Whether the league would function independently as a party is doubtful.

No. 1 Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Brighton-Pittsford Post is not a paper of wide circulation. It serves, primarily, two suburban communities on the edge of the great city of Rochester, N. Y. But from the pen of the editor of this paper, Mr. Leroy Percy, comes some of the clearest thinking and most convincing common sense brought to my attention. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following recent editorial on Government spending, which is very much to the point:

NO. 1 ISSUE

As the second session of this Congress got under way, news reports emphasized that the domestic issue of the greatest concern to many Senators and Representatives of both parties was the cost of the Federal Government, taxes, and deficits.

The news reports said further that congressional leaders, on either side of the aisle which divides Republicans and Democrats, were determined to do everything possible to cut appropriations, to abstain from raising

taxes, and to make the next budget show a surplus instead of a deficit at the end of the fiscal year.

These are splendid aims but it must be recorded that they are usually honored more in the breach than in the observance. Practically everyone is for rigorous economy—for the other fellow, and for ample spending when the money will benefit him.

That is why enormous pressure is exerted on Congress by groups of all kinds for bigger and better appropriations. And that is why Congress must have the courage to resist this pressure if the Nation is to avoid financial disaster. Government, like individuals, can spend beyond their incomes and dissipate their resources only so long. The only difference is that Government can stave off the day of reckoning longer. But when that day does come, the repercussions are felt everywhere.

The Hoover Commission, for one, has shown us how we can heavily cut the cost of Government without undermining any necessary function. Let this Congress do it—and if it does, let it be given the thanks of a grateful union.

Is Joint Chiefs of Staff Tour in Asia Merely Smoke Screen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington News of December 31, 1949. When I read it almost 6 weeks ago it was hard to believe our Joint Chiefs of Staff would go all the way to Asia supposedly on a survey tour and not go near the most critical area there—Formosa. Apparently, the editorial's predictions were correct. If so, it can only confirm the fear that this Government makes its diagnosis and prescribes treatment—or no treatment—first, and then makes its examination—but not of the patient, only the patient's neighbors. Are we or are we not concerned about Communist expansion in Asia?

SMOKE SCREEN

The Joint Chiefs of Staff will make a personal tour of inspection to Hawaii and Japan early in February for a first-hand check of the critical situation in China, it has been announced.

Formosa, the immediate trouble spot in the Pacific, will not be visited.

This is akin to going to London and Paris for a first-hand check on Marshal Tito and the Balkan situation.

Why don't the Joint Chiefs dispense with air travel altogether and conduct their survey from Palm Springs? The California climate yields nothing to Hawaii's at this season.

The explanation that the Joint Chiefs are going to Japan to discuss the Chinese crisis with Gen. Douglas MacArthur makes little sense. General MacArthur's views with respect to the Chinese situation are known to the Department of Defense, and if his recommendations need to be brought up to date that could be accomplished by an exchange of cables within 24 hours.

President Truman's meeting with the Security Council on the Formosa problem, the sending of an aircraft carrier and two destroyers to reinforce our Pacific Fleet, and now this projected tour of the Joint Chiefs of Staff all seem to be parts of one pattern. But the whole pattern has little relation to reality, and as a smoke screen it won't cover the State Department's colossal blundering in the Pacific.

The President faces a storm in Congress on this issue, for Congress has been hearing from the people. But something more than face-saving gestures will be needed to convince the public that a sincere effort is being made to protect American interests in the Pacific.

Maintaining Our National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the most recent developments concerning the American watch manufacturing industry in general, and the Waltham Watch Co. in particular, I am again urging the Members of this House to take action to preserve an essential contribution to our national defense system.

It is indisputable that the watchmaking industry involves the preservation of irreplaceable skilled craftsmanship in the manufacturing of precision instruments that are vital to the sound defense of this entire Nation. Great Britain recognized the terrible mistake they made in permitting the disintegration of their watchmaking industry and are today, through direct government action, taking corrective steps. In time of emergency they are wise enough not to be left again, as they were in the recent war, without a domestic source for supply of the timing devices which are of paramount importance in modern atomic warfare.

Although, in the past, I have repeatedly presented the testimony of qualified experts on the essentiality of protecting the people of this country through the preservation of our domestic watch-manufacturing industry, I regret to say that no substantial effort toward this objective has been demonstrated. Today I, and our distinguished majority leader, have formally requested the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee to appoint a subcommittee to make a survey or inquiry as to the contributions of the American watch business during World War II and its importance as a part of our national defense in the event of any future emergency.

We are doing that with the intense conviction that an official committee report will show the desperate urgency and obligation of this House and this Government to take immediate action for insurance of the lives and safety of the American people. I earnestly hope that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the committee members, despite their pressing burdens, will promptly act so that full information and details on this vital subject will be available to you at the earliest possible moment.

We have been and we are now generously concerned with helping and protecting the citizens of almost every country in the world. Let us not forget our own people. Our first obligation, under our Constitution, is to the citizens of the United States.

The agencies of our Government have been created for the purpose, primarily, of serving and aiding the citizens of this country. We must make certain that our people do not lose their faith, trust and confidence in the institutions and divisions of Government whose only reason for being in existence is to assist them. It appears, in some communities, that this is exactly what is happening and I deeply feel the Members of this House will appreciate knowing it. I am, therefore, calling to your attention a pertinent editorial, titled "Untimely Desertion" which appeared on the front page of the Waltham, Mass., News Tribune in its daily issue of February 4, 1950. I earnestly ask that each and every Member of this Congress read it.

The editorial follows:

UNTIMELY DESERTION

Just at a time when the Waltham Watch Co. appears to have its finest opportunity in years to reestablish itself, the stopper is pulled from the drain. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is both short-sighted and lacking in faith when it refuses to make available the working capital so vitally needed.

The fate of the 100-year-old industry hinged upon RFC willingness to set aside an original restriction of $2,000,000 of its $6,000,000 loan to machinery and research. RFC, in denying the company's request, automatically condemns it to receivership and liquidation.

The Government's lending agency is being pound wise and penny foolish. The firm couldn't possibly place itself in a position to utilize new machinery until the ambitious sales program just launched had a chance to prove its worth. This chance has been spiked.

On the initial grant of $4,000,000, the RFC wasn't doing the Waltham Watch Co. much of a favor. Three-quarters of the sum was designated to wipe out debts owed Boston banks, leaving less than a million dollars for working capital. So small was this amount, in relation to the total problem, that circumstances dictated the half-price inventory sale which stirred a controversy in many places.

It looks to us as though the Waltham Watch Co. is being made the scapegoat by the RFC to cover up its embarrassment over the sorry Lustron affair. Under congressional fire for its advancing of money to the metal housing pioneer outfit, RFC turns a hard-fisted policy on a firm which has proved itself a vital link in national defense. It may well be sounding the death knell to a concern it provided only token assistance to in the first place.

The original watch-factory need was established at $9,000,000. If granted, the allocation to banks and reserve for machinery could have been set up and a reasonable amount of working capital made available.

If the RFC really believed Waltham Watch was essential to national defense and endowed with long-range value as a going concern—as the Government officials stated in their approving statement—it was supporting the belief with a trivial gesture.

The domestic watch industry is being dealt a crippling blow. Once there were nearly 60 American manufacturers. Until yesterday only three existed. The number may well be reduced to two, and the strangling process is condoned by President Truman and the State

Department because of failure to do something about the import situation.

Attorney Lyne, one of the original reorganization trustees, phrased it aptly when he said the firm is being sold down the river.

Nobody is quitting on the Waltham Watch Co. hereabouts. Walter W. Cenerazzo, union president, who has been in the forefront of the struggle all the way, intends to carry the fight on. We feel that at the very least it can be readily established that the RFC's policy of too little help has been a tragic delusion to thousands of employees.

How Harmful Are Cigarettes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a reprint of an article appearing in the January 1950 Reader's Digest entitled "How Harmful Are Cigarettes?" The increase in the use of cigarettes by the American people is phenomenal, and the ill effects from the use of tobacco are alarming, as this author so ably points out.

The article follows:

HOW HARMFUL ARE CIGARETTES?

(By Roger William Riis)

In all the history of human habit, there have been few changes so remarkable as the tidal-wave increase of cigarette smoking in the United States. Within a single generation, a new habit has laid hold upon an entire people to an extent which we do not begin to realize, and with effects which we certainly do not understand.

Last year 20,000,000 Americans consumed 400,000,000,000 cigarettes. Every year, some 800,000 nonsmokers join smoking ranks. Two out of every three men, two out of every five women, one out of every seven boys of 14 smoke cigarettes. The average consumption is 10 a day. We spend some $4,000,000,000 a year on tobacco products and supplies—twice as much as we pay all the public-school teachers in the United States.

Up and up runs the graph at a towering angle, with no sign of leveling off. We are, at a lively pace, engulfing ourselves in one giant Nation-wide cloud of cigarette smoke.

What is this substance which we breathe into our mouths and lungs in such stupendous clouds? It contains a number of ominous-sounding chemicals.

Two of the chemicals are under grave suspicion: benzopyrene, which chiefly affects the respiratory tract, and nicotine.

Nicotine is the essential ingredient of tobacco. It is what makes tobacco tobacco and not just another weed.

When one smokes, most of the nicotine escapes into the air. About a third gets into the mouth, where a little is absorbed. Of what goes into the lungs, perhaps a fifth is absorbed. The effect of smoking a cigar is equal to that of four or five cigarettes. A pipe gives one a trifle more nicotine than does a cigar.

The hotter the burning surface, the more nicotine is taken into the system. Thus, the faster one smokes, the more nicotine one gets; smoking twice as fast results in 10 times as much nicotine. And the closer to the end of a cigarette one smokes, the more nicotine also, because the butt, having filtered the first part of the cigarette, has more than its share of nicotine.

In pure form nicotine is a violent poison. One drop on a rabbit's skin throws the rabbit into instant shock. The nicotine content of a trifle more than two cigarettes, if injected into the blood stream, would kill a smoker swiftly. If you smoke a pack a day, you inhale 400 milligrams of nicotine a week, which, in a single injection, would kill you quick as a bullet.

In factories which make nicotine insecticides, cases of acute poisoning occur now and then. One worker sat on a stool the concave seat of which held a little spilled nicotine. In less than 2 minutes he fell to the floor, blue in the face, apparently dead. Rushed to the hospital, he recovered quickly, as one does from light nicotine poisoning. But when he returned to the shop and put on those nicotine-soaked trousers again, again he fell headlong on the ground, and had to be revived a second time.

Aware that nicotine is a killer, men have tried for years to keep it out of their systems while still enjoying the smoke. All types of artificial filters take out some nicotine. The kind which uses another cigarette as a filter is said to remove 70 percent; the kind which uses a silica-gel cartridge removes 60 percent, according to claims of the manufacturers confirmed by the American Medical Association. But with a filter one is likely to smoke a cigarette until it is shorter than if a filter had not been used—usually 20 percent shorter—and that extra length is the nicotine-filled butt.

Tests of various popular brands show that the average nicotine content of Virginia-blend cigarettes is around 6 percent; of Turkish cigarettes, 1½ percent; of the so-called denicotinized cigarettes, just over 1 percent; and, strangely enough, of the strong-looking West Indian cigarettes, least of all—.86 percent.

In the 400,000,000,000 cigarettes we smoke each year there are nearly 23,000,000 gallons of nicotine. Administered with precision, this is enough to kill a thousand times the population of the United States—a wild idea, of course, but nevertheless suggestive of nicotine's lethal power.

If nicotine is such a poison then why doesn't smoking kill us? Partly because the remarkably adjustable human body can gradually build up a tolerance for larger and larger doses of poison; partly because, in smoke, it is not accumulated in sufficient quantities. Just what the harmful effects of smoking are the reader will judge for himself from the following evidence.

Do cigarettes irritate the throat? Yes, say some physicians. But other physicians say they don't. This conflict of expert opinion matters a great deal to smokers. Let us weigh various opinions and the factual experience back of them.

First, no doctor claims that smoking soothes the throat. The argument, as an editorial in the Journal of the American Medical Association puts it, hinges on "the extent to which cigarettes irritate the throat."

If you smoke a pack a day you take in 840 cubic centimeters of tobacco tar in a year. That means that you have drenched your throat and lungs with 27 fluid ounces, or 15 full cocktail glasses, of tobacco tar containing benzopyrene.

The brown stain in filters or on your handkerchiefs when you blow smoke through it is not nicotine, for nicotine is colorless. It is incompletely burned tar products, like the soot in a chimney. Many physicians suspect that its main constituent, benzopyrene, though an irritant rather than a poison, is a greater threat to heavy smokers than nicotine.

In 100 smokers who average 20 cigarettes a day, Dr. Frederick B. Flinn, of New York, found 18 with congestion of the throat, 60 with coughs, 7 with irritation of the tongue. In the AMA Journal Dr. Emil Bogan reported on 100 smokers; 80 complained of mouth irritation, and 90—not necessarily the same—complained of coughing. Said Dr. J. L. Myers, of Kansas City, "Nicotine irritates the mucous membranes of the respiratory tract. Tobacco tar injures these membranes."

It matters far more how you smoke than what you smoke, stated Dr. Arthur W. Proetz, nose and throat specialist of Washington University and editor of The Annals of Otology, Rhinology, and Laryngology: whether you puff briskly or gently, how far down the butt you smoke, how long you hold the smoke in the mouth and lungs. Rapid smoking, reports Maj. C. W. Crampton in the Military Surgeon, "greatly increases the irritation" because it brings the smoke into the mouth at temperatures up to 135° Fahrenheit.

There is probably no steady smoker who is not convinced that smoking does irritate his throat. Doctors familiar with this field comment on the persistent way smokers have of changing brands every so often in an incessant search for a less irritating cigarette.

Do cigarettes affect the stomach and digestion? Every smoker has noticed that a cigarette seems able to still the pangs of hunger for a while. This is not a delusion. The sensation of hunger is caused by contractions of the stomach walls and smoking can suppress these contractions.

By the same process, smoking interferes with the appetite and thereby with good nutrition. "We all have friends who have quit smoking and have promptly gained in weight and look like new persons," says Dr. Walter C. Alvarez, editor of Gastroenterology and specialist at the Mayo Clinic. "When a man smokes excessively he is not likely to eat well."

Excessive smoking may cause gastritis. By favoring an accumulation of acid secretions, it brings about heartburn. Relief comes in a matter of hours after the smoking stops.

Excess acidity of the stomach provides the kind of climate ulcers like. The most recent work in this field, done by New York University, showed that patients who continued to smoke during treatment for their peptic ulcers had more relapses than those who did not, or those who had never smoked at all.

At the great American clinics ulcer patients are told not to smoke. The Ochsner Clinic in New Orleans refuses to treat an individual unless he totally abstains from smoking. In Boston doctors had an interesting case some years ago, a man who had all the symptoms of duodenal ulcer. Even the X-ray showed it. But an operation found no ulcer at all. The patient stopped smoking, under orders, and his "ulcer" left him. Three months later, feeling quite well, he took up smoking again, and back came the "ulcer." This time, however, the doctors ordered him off cigarettes completely. Since he stopped smoking, he has had no more "ulcers."

Nonsmokers, in 4 years at Yale and at Amherst, grew more in height and weight and lung capacity than did their smoking colleagues. At Yale the increase in chest development of the abstainers was 77 percent better, their increase in height 24 percent greater.

At Wisconsin students were asked to hold a small metal point in a small hole, trying not to let it touch the sides. Electrical connections registered the number of times it did touch. Regular smokers were 60 percent more unsteady than nonsmokers.

Coaches are almost unanimous in saying that muscular power is lowered and fatigue begins earlier in smokers. Knute Rockne was definite: "Tobacco slows the reflexes, and any advertising which says it helps an athlete is falsehood and fraud."

Which raises the question of change in the sugar content of the blood, due to smoking—that famous "lift" which cigarettes are supposed to give the weary mortal.

Like many other claims of cigarette advertising, this one was destroyed by research. Studies at the Harvard Fatigue Laboratory concluded that there was no significant change in blood sugar in connection with smoking, hence there was no lift.

Nowhere is there any medical evidence—despite the advertisements—that smoking improves an athlete's abilities.

What does tobacco do to the heart? As to the long-run effects, medical opinions differ. As to the immediate effects of cigarette smoking upon the mechanism of the heart and upon the arteries and veins, there is no difference of opinion, for these effects are easy to observe and measure.

Smoking speeds the pulse by as much as 20 beats per minute. In this respect individuals vary, and the same individual varies at different times. The average increase in pulse due to smoking is 10 beats.

Smoking can produce arrhythmia, an irregular stop and jump of the heart which often thoroughly frightens its owner. The pulse of an unborn baby is raised when the mother smokes. Habitual smokers have a 50 percent higher incidence of palpitation of the heart than nonsmokers.

Smoking raises the blood pressure, markedly and quickly. The higher your blood pressure is, the more sharply does tobacco lift it. Apparently the blood pressure does not develop any tolerance for tobacco, as does the digestive system. Nevertheless, smoking does not cause permanent high blood pressure. When the smoking stops, the pressure falls slowly to normal.

Smoking constricts the blood vessels, especially those of the feet and hands. The smaller the blood vessel the tighter is it constricted, and often smoking closes the tiny vessels under the fingernails entirely. As soon as one starts a cigarette, the rate of blood flow in the hands decreases to less than half normal, and it stays down for about an hour.

The effect of this constriction is curious. The temperature of hands and feet drops. "Practically all the subjects who inhale show a definite drop in surface temperature at the fingertips," reported Drs. Irving Wright and Emil Moffat at New York Post Graduate Hospital. The drop averaged 5.3 degrees, was frequently more than 10 degrees, and occasionally as much as 15.5.

Nicotine constricts the veins; alcohol dilates them. When we drink and smoke at the same time, we are in effect prodding ourselves with a pitchfork to get a lift and beating ourselves on the head with a club to offset it. Hence the popular belief that taking a highball offsets the effect of taking a cigarette. Drs. Roth and Seward at Rochester, Minn., went into this interesting possibility, making 121 tests on 68 persons. The winner was nicotine. It was more potent than alcohol; "the constricting effects of smoking cannot be prevented by alcohol."

Buerger's disease—fortunately rather uncommon—is characterized by loss of circulation in hands and feet, sometimes so serious that gangrene may form and amputation be necessary. Doctors are cautious souls and do not say that smoking causes Buerger's disease. But in a study of 1,500 sufferers from Buerger's disease 1,000 turned out to be smokers; and of another 1,400 cases checked at Mount Sinai Hospital, New York, 1,400 were smokers. A group of 100 cases were studied for more than 10 years; in all of them the disease was arrested when smoking stopped. Dr. Irving Wright reports that in 100 consecutive cases amputation was avoided in 97 cases, but was necessary in 3—the only 3 who would not stop smoking. Only a few isolated cases have ever been reported among nonsmokers.

No more vivid and disturbing comment on the strength of habit could be imagined than the reaction of one Buerger's patient, who was told repeatedly that he must choose between smoking and progressive amputation of feet and hands. Some years later one of the doctors was hailed on the streets of Chicago by an armless, legless beggar on a little wheeled platform.

"Hey, Doc, remember me? Say, be a good scout, light a cigarette for me and stick it in my mouth; will you?"

There is no proof that smoking causes heart disease. But there is evidence that heart disease is more prevalent among smokers than among nonsmokers, and that smoking may intensify existing heart disease.

Doctors selected 1,000 men over 40 who smoked and 1,000 who did not smoke. Of the nonsmokers under 50, 1 percent had coronary disease, of the smokers 4.8 percent. Of the nonsmokers in age group 50–60, 2.6 percent had coronary disease, of the smokers 6.2 percent.

Virginia doctors, in an article on angina pectoris, point out that "coronary disease develops before the seventh decade significantly more often in smokers than in nonsmokers."

It would be difficult to select a better-qualified group of heart specialists than Dr. Paul D. White, of Boston, Dr. Robert Levy of New York, Dr. Edwin P. Maynard, of Brooklyn, and Dr. Samuel Levine, of Harvard. In brief, these four men testify as follows:

Dr. White: "Tobacco causes no actual heart disease, but may produce irregular pulse, precipitate or aggravate the angina pectoris of coronary heart disease."

Dr. Levy: "Smoking does not increase significantly the work of the heart. The more important cardiac conditions for which smoking should be prohibited are congestive heart failure, acute stages of cardiac infraction, active rheumatic carditis, and peripheral vascular disorders (disorders of the blood supply of hands and feet)."

Dr. Maynard: "In certain individuals smoking is harmful to the heart. We do not know how to tell which patient should smoke and which should not."

Dr. Levine: "In former years I used to tell patients with angina pectoris or coronary artery disease to smoke not more than two cigars or eight cigarettes a day. Now I am more inclined to urge them to omit smoking entirely."

What does all this add up to? The chief difference of opinion is as to how much damage smoking does to the heart. All doctors agree it can damage sick hearts. It is, in short, never a help and often a menace.

This probably refers to the most extensive and reliable research yet made in this field, which is now being completed by Dr. Evarts Graham and Ernest Wynder, one of his senior medical students at Washington University, St. Louis. Dr. Graham's studies will cover close to 2,000 persons in St. Louis, New York, Chicago, and Salt Lake City—the last because orthodox mormons do not smoke and therefore offer an excellent control. It is expected to show that over 95 percent of patients with lung cancer smoke a pack of cigarettes a day or more, and have done so for many years.

"Will you be able to say clearly that smoking causes lung cancer?" I asked. Dr. Graham shook his head.

"No," he replied, "but we will say that it is curious how very few nonsmokers develop lung cancer."

"Very few" is one-half of 1 percent of the victims of this disease. This contrasts with the 95 percent who are steady smokers.

Cancer of the lung, Dr. Graham stresses, has shown a shocking increase in the last 35 years. "As a possible cause," he says, "we must look for some factor in our civilization which has shown a similar increase. We eliminated carbon monoxide after examining traffic policemen who breathe it in large quantities."

While all other types of cancer were declining in frequency, the age-adjusted death rate for respiratory cancer rose steadily from 3.7 per 100,000 in 1930 to three times that in 1947. In Georgia mortality from this cause rose from 23 per 100,000 to 200 in 10 years. Dr. Alton Ochsner of the Ochsner Clinic in New Orleans says: "25 years ago I saw only one cancer of the lung in 4 years. In the last 15 years I have seen thousands. I am convinced that there is a definite relationship between smoking and cancer of the lung."

It is generally agreed that cancer of the mouth, tongue, and lips is unduly prevalent among smokers. Researchers in Michigan, Illinois, and Pennsylvania have come independently to the same conclusion: that the majority of victims of cancer of the tongue are excessive users of tobacco, that pipe smokers who develop lip cancer get it at the spot where the pipe has always rested, and that tobacco chewers, if they develop cancer, develop it at the place where the tobacco has been held.

Can smoking shorten your life? Some 10 years ago the late Dr. Raymond Pearl of Johns Hopkins studied the life span and smoking habits of 6,813 white American males. His carefully tabulated statistics tell us that if you take 300 people at the age of 30—100 of them nonsmokers, 100 light smokers and 100 heavy smokers—

Of the 100 nonsmokers, 66 will reach 60 years.

Of the 100 light smokers, 61 will reach 60.

Of the 100 heavy smokers, 46 will reach 60.

"The conclusion is clear," said Pearl, "that smoking was statistically associated with impairment of life duration. The amount of impairment increased as the amount of smoking increased."

If tobacco is so deadly, ask the doubters, why don't insurance companies consider this in their rates? Perhaps they will before long, for they have been thinking about it. Harry Dingman, in the book Risk Appraisal, published by the National Underwriter Co., says: "Use of tobacco entails extra mortality. In assessment of risk, why ignore it?" And a company medical director at an insurance meeting said, "We don't give standard insurance to excessive drinkers. I think we shouldn't give it to excessive smokers."

Higher mortality among smokers was noted in a study made by Dr. Robert A. Godell of the Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Co. This covered 5,000 smokers and 5,000 nonsmokers.

To sum up, we can do no better than quote other figures in Mr. Dingman's insurance book: Habitual smokers have 62 percent higher incidence of gas on the stomach, 65 percent higher incidence of colds, 76 percent higher incidence of nervousness, 100 percent higher incidence of heartburn, 140 percent higher incidence of labored breathing after exertion, 167 percent higher incidence of nose and throat irritation, and 300 percent higher incidence of cough.

What does it all come down to? Think over the many theoretical and actual kinds of damage which smoking causes. Discount them all you want. Then look in vain for any evidence of any measurable good effect. Then speculate with incredulity as to why we go right on smoking.

Every day, of course, people stop smoking, and stay stopped. Given a good enough reason, almost every confirmed smoker will stop. The trouble is that the good reason usually only comes when (and because) it is too late for the smoker's health.

All this being so, why do not physicians warn their patients more helpfully about smoking? Because doctors are human, too, and many of them smoke, because many of them therefore hesitate to believe the worst about the cigarette; and, as one physician noted sadly, "because forbidding tobacco makes the doctor unpopular."

The physicians most concerned about the dangerous effects of smoking are those who have had greatest personal experience with research into those effects.

America's Expanding Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address which the able senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] delivered before the congressional district meeting of the West Virginia Petroleum Association in Charleston, W. Va., on Thursday, February 2, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S EXPANDING ECONOMY

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, it is a great pleasure to attend this meeting and talk with you leaders in the oil industry and the truck and bus associations in this congressional district. I feel a great kinship for everyone engaged in the oil industry. As many of you know, I grew up in the oil fields of northern West Virginia. My father was a wildcatter, and I spent a great deal of my boyhood with him in the oil fields. The days were long and the work was tough, but I enjoyed it very much. Most of the old-timers I knew as a boy are gone, but one sturdy soul—Mike Benedum—still carries on in Pittsburgh. He is a grand old man—old in years, but young in spirit.

The oil industry has come a long way since those days when I worked as a boy around my father's rigs. I think it has achieved its present-day greatness because it has combined a competitive spirit of hard work and vision. The history of the oil industry is a story of great progress, a story of Americans at work eager to find new sources of oil and to develop more and better products to make our living easier and more comfortable. It is the story of an industry that has grown with the times.

When I received your kind invitation to attend this dinner, I thought I would confine my remarks to the growth of the oil industry and its role in America's present-day economy. But sitting in my office late one night last week reading a huge stack of letters from constituents I changed my mind. I decided to tackle a more difficult subject—the Nation's budget for the new fiscal year and its relationship to America's economy.

It is customary for many Americans, especially businessmen, to speak of the economy of the country in terms of how many tax dollars they give the Government. But actually that is not a true yardstick. The economy of the country can only be measured in terms of the economic status of all the people of the Nation.

The true measure of prosperity is the amount of goods and services produced by our country and the distribution of these among all the people. It is important for us to remember that our production of goods and services today is just double the level it was in 1935. Our national income today is just about 4 times the 1935 level.

This is the only true yardstick for measuring the national economy. We must examine Federal spending not in terms of some oversimplified bookkeeping approach but in terms of our basic objective of keeping our industrial plant going at full blast, keeping it growing and producing the maximum of goods and services for all our people.

If we measured our national budget on the same basis as many private businesses measure theirs, we would carry a good part of our expenses as investment. A good portion of the budget represents investment in physical facilities like roads, improvement of rivers and harbors, public works, and such physical assets—all of which contribute directly to the expansion of our productive capacity. The improvement of the Nation's health and educational opportunities directly increases the productivity of our citizens and this increased productivity means, of course, greater prosperity for the Nation as a whole. The development of our natural resources is an expense that can only be viewed as an investment.

Any fair-minded person will have to agree that conditions are better today for the great majority of Americans than at any other period of our history. Nevertheless, we still have many parents who do not earn enough money to properly care for their families. We still have too many people who live in slums, whose diet is poor. We still have too many children attending overcrowded schools with inadequate teaching facilities. We still have too many people unable to pay their doctor bills or unable to find adequate medical facilities in their community even if they can pay.

The charge is often made that many of these people are shiftless, that they are unwilling to exert the effort required to earn a better life for themselves. This may be true in a few cases, but it is not true of a large majority of that group aptly described as underprivileged. There are numerous examples of the great strides made by these so-called shiftless people when they received the opportunity to improve their living conditions and become more productive members of our society.

We have not yet achieved our goal of a decent life for all Americans, but tremendous progress has been made as we continue a program that considers the welfare of the human being and no some economic statistic as the real measure of our success.

The charge is often made that the Government, by helping its citizens, is bringing on a welfare state. The charge is also made that the Government, by helping its citizens, is threatening their liberties. I believe these charges are sheer nonsense. Such charges have been made thousands of times since 1933 and yet not one thoughtful person can show that the Government has deprived any person of any essential freedom. We have not and we shall not sacrifice any essential freedom by continuing to raise our economic goals. On the contrary, we are adding two new freedoms to those cherished by all Americans—freedom from fear and freedom from want. These are essential, almost as essential as freedom of religion and freedom of speech, if we are to preserve our democratic form of government and our system of free enterprise.

Many people say that social security is good, that Federal aid to education, slum clearance, and low-cost housing are good, that it would be a fine thing to have more medical schools and more doctors and nurses, but they also say: "We cannot afford them."

I believe that no community, no state or nation can realize its full potential if it follows an attitude of "We just cannot afford it." No nation could have become as wealthy and powerful as ours if it had not set its goals high and then encouraged the people to achieve them.

America has never been a country that was penny-wise and pound-foolish. We have always been capable of great thoughts and great actions. Any man who claims that America cannot afford to wipe out its slums, to eliminate malnutrition, to educate its children properly, and to take care of its aged or disabled citizens who cannot take care of themselves—I believe any man who claims this lacks the faith that has made our country great.

We have seen in wartime how gigantic is our ability to produce material wealth. We must continue to devote our great productive capacity to the maintenance of peace, to the elimination of unnecessary social evils, and to a more abundant life for ourselves and our children. Actually, this is the only way we can assure the survival of free enterprise. We know that in the last analysis our prosperity depends on the ability of the people to purchase the goods produced. Free enterprise can survive only if a great majority of Americans are prosperous.

I have mentioned the importance of programs like social security, improving the Nation's health, providing better educational opportunities, and substituting decent homes for slums. These are the basic programs for improving the national welfare. And yet it is interesting to note what a very small part of the Federal budget goes for these purposes. In the 1951 budget, only 6 percent of the total budget is proposed for all our social welfare, health, and security programs—and barely 4 percent for slum clearance, housing, and education.

Those who claim that welfare is the reason for our budget deficit should take a close look at the budget dollar and how it is allocated. Thirty-two cents of that dollar is going to national defense; 15 cents to veterans, 11 cents for international items, and 13 cents for interest on the debt. In other words, defense, foreign aid, veterans' programs, and debt interest account for almost $30,000,000,000 out of a total estimated expenditure for 1950–51 of $42,500,000,000. This accounts for 71 percent of the budget.

The rest of the proposed budget, about $12,500,000,000, goes for all other Government functions. This includes Federal aid to education, housing, agriculture, health; for the development of communications, power, and natural resources; for the promotion and regulation of trade and industry, and for the hundreds of other activities which the people have indicated they wanted and needed over the years.

This is the picture—and it has to be viewed in its entirety to be seen in true perspective. I am not any more enthusiastic than anybody else about deficit financing in a period of full employment. But the point to remember is that if we try to achieve a balanced budget by the meat-ax method, we could very easily bring about a downturn in our whole economy which would cause a severe drop in employment and the production of goods.

It has been estimated that the last brief and not-too-severe downturn in 1949 cost us $13,000,000,000, which represents the difference between what we could have produced and what we actually did produce in 1949.

A drastic cut in our budget right now could have disastrous results not just for our own economy but for the world-wide effort toward peace and economic security. That is the danger the administration had uppermost in mind in formulating the budget.

The administration has pointed out that we are moving toward a balanced budget within the next few years. Decreases in foreign aid, in our commitments to veterans, and perhaps in our military needs will make this possible. Our program of an expanding economy will bring us to that desired goal of a balanced budget in a much shorter time than many of the critics are prophesying today.

The administration hopes through the implementation of the Hoover Commission recommendations to bring about better administrative policies, eliminating duplication, and thus saving on administrative expenses. Through such Government reorganization, through an expanding economy, and through the eventual decrease in foreign aid and the cost of our military establishment, we can look forward to both a balanced budget and healthy prosperity as well.

We must keep uppermost in our minds that an expanding economy is necessary not only to maintain domestic prosperity but in order that we can carry out our commitments in the struggle for world peace. I do not believe President Truman was overstating the case when, in his economic report to the Congress, he said: ". . . our programs for national security and international peace . . . are the defense of the world against disaster. Upon them, our whole future depends."

Our foreign-assistance program is one that has been given the most careful study by various executive agencies, by the President, and by the Congress. The funds that have been allocated to the European economic-recovery program and the funds which have been allocated to the military-assistance program, as well as every other sum loaned or given for foreign aid, have all been studied in the light of American interests, as well as the wider interests that indirectly affect us.

Our primary objective is a peaceful and prosperous world, because peace and prosperity for America alone cannot be insured in a vacuum. We cannot afford to lull ourselves into the complacent theory that our only concern is our own immediate welfare. The twentieth century has turned the word "welfare" into an international concept instead of an individual concept. If 150,000,000 Americans fare well, this cannot fail to influence the economy of other nations. By the same token, if the other peoples of the world fare badly, their political and economic despair cannot fail to affect our own economy. In the words of a famous poet, "There are no islands any more." There is no escape from the impact of external events on our own affairs.

That will be the dominating thought in my mind when I am called upon, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, to go over foreign-assistance appropriations. As a member of that committee, I can assure you that every item, both domestic and foreign, in the budget will be carefully scrutinized. Wherever possible, items will be cut. I think it may be possible to make some reductions in foreign-assistance items, but, at the same time, speaking for myself, I am going to look at each proposed cut from two carefully balanced viewpoints: What will it mean to the budget now, and what will it mean in terms of prosperity and world peace tomorrow?

This country has been struggling toward big goals and big ideals for many years now—in fact, ever since this Nation was formed. Would anybody have believed 170 years ago that we would become the richest and most powerful country in the world? With the same courage and common sense that brought us this far, we can achieve the goal we are presently striving for—peace and security for ourselves and for the whole closely knit world. We can do it by keeping our own economy expanding and healthy and by giving other countries the opportunity to find peace and security for themselves.

Award of Poor Richard Medal of Achievement to Paul G. Hoffman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on January 17, 1950, Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, our very able ECA administrator, was awarded the Poor Richard Medal of Achievement at the annual Franklin Day celebration held in Philadelphia under the auspices of the Poor Richard Club of Philadelphia. I believe that no one could more richly deserve an award that is given with the ideals of Benjamin Franklin in mind. In Paul Hoffman can once again be seen the imagination, optimism, and faith of Ben Franklin. And in him we see a man who, like Ben Franklin, is ever ready to meet the challenge of the times in a courageous and confident manner. Mr. Hoffman, an American businessman, is, in his role as Chief Administrator of the ECA, handling a job that embodies every American principle of integrity, a job that is worldwide in its scope, a job that is of the utmost importance if we are to gain world peace and security.

At the Franklin Day celebration Mr. Hoffman delivered a speech which I think should be of interest to all of us. That speech not only explained what ECA has done and is continuing to do but it also paid high tribute to the American spirit—a spirit of freedom and integrity—which has played a tremendous role in the shaping of world affairs and which must and will continue to do so.

At the same celebration I was also given the privilege of addressing the audience. However, my duties here in the Senate prevented me from arriving in time to deliver the address myself. The speech was delivered on my behalf by Mr. William Berry, past president of the Poor Richard Club.

I ask unanimous consent to have both Mr. Hoffman's address and mine at the Franklin Day celebration printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN MEMORIAL BUILDING

(This speech was delivered by William Berry, past president of Poor Richard Club, in behalf of Senator MYERS, who was unable to attend.)

We are paying tribute today to a distinguished American whose interests, like Franklin's, are not confined to one field.

We are honoring a man who has proved that he is not afraid of new ideas; who has shown that he is capable, as Franklin was, of adapting himself to change. A man who has something of Franklin's bold imagination and optimism and faith, who like Franklin courageously and confidently has met the challenge of his

Paul Gray Hoffman fits the description of world statesman in the finest meaning of the words. For the job that he has done in a difficult assignment and at a critical period in our history, he has earned the gratitude of his countrymen and has carved for himself a place of prominence and importance in the annals of this century.

I think it is most fitting at this particular moment in world history that the Poor Richard Club should award its gold medal of achievement to a businessman. Business has a tremendous role to play in the rehabilitation and development of the world economy, in the securing of human freedom and dignity to all people who desire it, and are willing to pay the price for it. Particularly will this be true when someday, in the not far distant future, our Government's large-scale aid to nations, now struggling for their living against Communist aggression, must be reduced or ended. Not this year or next year—because, as Paul Hoffman will tell you, the weak are not yet strong, the fires are not all out. But when the day does come, when ECA has completed its unprecedented and supremely essential mission, then will American business assume a role of heroic proportions as it is called upon to revitalize and expand the world's economy.

Many Americans and people of other countries are coming to realize that there is an economic base which supports political and religious freedom. Religious and political liberty walk hand in hand with a free economy and with the free exchange of goods and ideas. We have seen in totalitarian countries a pattern which tragically demonstrates this truth. Where private enterprise has been destroyed, political and religious freedom have fallen too.

That is why, at this time, I feel your choice of a business leader as your gold medal recipient for 1950 is a singularly appropriate one. Paul Hoffman represents a new kind of businessman, a type of businessman who has developed out of the needs of our times. He deserves to be called an enlightened businessman, if you please, an industrial statesman. He has none of the provincialism that has characterized so many American businessmen in the past. He has a wider vision, a truly global outlook. An acute realization of the necessity for American business to recognize its social and world responsibilities, and particularly its obligation to provide industrial and financial leadership and "know how" for the world, a leadership that only it can provide.

You know, there is no reason why a businessman should be provincial or concerned only with business affairs. Benjamin Franklin demonstrated that. Perhaps we don't often think of Franklin as a businessman, but he was one of the most successful businessmen of his day. He made a great deal of money, so much that he once offered to pay for the tea that some hot-headed patriots dumped into Boston Harbor, although it would have cost him $75,000. He was the most successful newspaper and magazine publisher of his generation. He built so well that one of his publications, the Pennsylvania Gazette, still is being published under the name of our own city's Saturday Evening Post. Another, Poor Richard's Almanack, was born again as the official publication of the Poor Richard Club.

The catalog of Franklin's amazing accomplishments is a familiar one. Writer, publisher, inventor, educator, scientist, diplomat—one of the two or three most versatile geniuses the world has ever known. Yet despite all this enormous activity, he found time—as Paul Hoffman has—to serve his country—and how brilliantly, every school child knows.

But Franklin was a great businessman. He bargained with his neighbors and with nations. He believed devoutly in the importance of trade. He took the lead in helping to develop new enterprises and profitable investments in the then undeveloped colonies which became with the passage of years the great industrial heart of these United States. Franklin was willing to invest his capital, to take the risk, of backing new enterprises throughout the American Colonies and even in the West Indies in the establishment of their own businesses, taking for himself a return from earnings.

I call your attention to this phase of Franklin's business activities because I feel the times demand the same kind of faith and enterprise from American businessmen and investors on a world-wide scale.

In his inaugural address in January of 1949, President Truman listed as point four of his program for world peace and prosperity the investment of American dollars and "know how" in the development of the still undeveloped areas of the earth in order to raise standards of living for the people of other nations and to make it possible for them to enjoy some of the material benefits which we in America enjoy. Such a program would be in our own self interest, as well, because only in a world where other peoples can enjoy prosperity can we in America live in prosperity and peace.

It seems to me that the only logical and eventual successor or substitute for the European recovery program and for aid to the Far East, which is, after all, a temporary expedient, is the development of the underdeveloped areas of the earth, the building of new businesses and industries and customers, on a really gigantic scale by American private enterprise. This is the challenge which faces American business and the American investor today.

To meet this challenge will require the daring imagination, the faith, and confidence which Franklin so well exemplified. With American businessmen of the caliber of Paul Hoffman to lead us, I am confident that it is a challenge that will be met successfully.

I know of no one who so richly deserves the honor you are about to bestow upon him. Paul Hoffman, by his achievements, has reflected credit upon his country and upon the whole of American business.

Thank you.

ADDRESS BY PAUL G. HOFFMAN, ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATOR

It was with some initial misgiving that I heard I was to receive the Poor Richard Award. I wondered what Poor Richard himself would have thought of any award being made to me in his name. Here I am, a man administering a program involving billions of dollars, the greater part being distributed as gifts. True, I think those billions will bring us great returns, but even in the case of the loans I cannot point to excellent security or a high-interest rate. The returns on both the loans and gifts must be measured largely in terms of intangibles. But those intangibles are such that, as I have studied the life of Benjamin Franklin, I felt much easier in my mind and I decided I could accept the award with a reasonably clear conscience.

Benjamin Franklin was many sorts of a man. He was a scientist, inventor, statesman, philosopher, editor, and, may I proundly add, a businessman. Now he wasn't all of these things separatively, he was all of them at once and together. One of the reasons, I think, for his notable serenity was the fact that the many parts of his life were brought together into an integrated whole. Perhaps that integration also accounts for the fact that, though a businessman, he lived to enjoy an ulcer-free old age. At any rate, it was this breadth of integrated interest that gave soundness to Franklin's life and soundness to his contributions.

Benjamin Franklin's first reaction to this $15,000,000,000 program of ECA's would undoubtedly be one of great shock. But after that initial shock, he would, I am sure, in order to get perspective, want to look around and see how this project would fit into the current world scene. And then, from the vantage point of that knowledge, he would direct his inquiring and penetrating mind toward the objectives of ECA, and the manner in which we were going about achieving them.

The initial shock of a $15,000,000,000 figure on Franklin would undoubtedly be softened once he learned that our annual gross income today had reached the astounding figure of $250,000,000,000. He might be distressed, but would unquestionably be impressed, by the cost of the wars we have fought. You can guess for yourself what he would think when told that the out-of-pocket cost of World War II to the United States of America alone was between three hundred and forty and three hundred and eighty billion dollars, and that the ultimate cost, according to Mr. Gordon Gray, Secretary of the Army, will be in the neighborhood of $1,400,000,000,000. If you want my guess, Franklin would think, in view of these costs, that a way must be found to insure future peace. He would, of course, marvel at the telephone, radio, television, the steamships, automobiles, airplanes, and the atomic bomb. He would be astounded by, but understand, some of the great developments in the field of electronics far better than most of us here understand them. I rather think the modern development which would impress him most is the speed of travel, and the manner in which that has shrunk the world. With his quick mind, he would not need to be told that a shattered European economy is a liability to the United States, to every family in this vast and once isolated land of ours; and the further fact that a prosperous and thriving European economy is a vital asset to the United States and to every American. He would, I am sure, approve what we are doing to help get Europe back on its feet. To him, that would make economic sense. It would appeal to his common sense too, because he knew that the most useful charity is that charity which raises people above the need of charity.

Benjamin Franklin would also, I believe, agree that the job we are trying to do in Europe makes political sense. We are trying to help the Europeans to create those conditions under which free institutions can flourish and free men live in decency and dignity. The Europeans, with our help, are going about that job in a hard and practical way. They have devoted themselves to increasing production in the plants and on the farms, to freeing markets, and to facilitating convertibility, one with the other, of the various national currencies.

Yes, I believe that Benjamin Franklin would heartily approve of the economic and political objectives of ECA. But that doesn't necessarily mean that he would approve the very large expenditures called for by the program, some of which have been made, some only planned for. He would have to be shown and it would be up to us to show him.

In seeking his approval, we would, first of all, want to impress him with the scope of the undertaking and the conditions under which we were laboring.

The first broad principles which led to ECA were laid down by General Marshall, then Secretary of State, in his historic speech at Harvard University on June 5, 1947. In that speech, General Marshall called upon the nations of Europe to join in a vast, cooperative effort to repair their shattered economic health as the only means whereby political stability could be restored, progress resumed, and freedom once more set firmly on its feet. For our part in that undertaking General Marshall declared that the Government of the United States stood ready to "do whatever it is able to do to assist." There were no ideological strings attached to that offer. It was an offer made in good faith. It was backed by good will. Its sole objective was a more prosperous world in which peace and freedom would be more secure. And when that offer was made, we believed—or at least we hoped—that that was an objective which every government shared, and that that was a task in which every government would be not merely willing but eager to join.

The nations of Europe quickly accepted our challenge. In Paris, hardly a week after General Marshall's speech, the representatives of most European nations—east and west—met to accept our offer and begin to turn that challenge into practical achievement. That meeting was attended by the representative of the Soviet Union in the person of Mr. Molotov, its foreign minister. It looked for the moment as though, on this technical and desperately urgent level of economic recovery, something close to joint cooperative action for the common good was about to be achieved. For 3 days, Molotov attended that Paris meeting and for those 3 days the hopes of freedom-loving, peace-seeking nations ran high. Then on the third day, Molotov, with his entourage of satellites in tow, walked out of the meeting and enplaned for Moscow.

That departure, as we now know, was not merely another uncouth Communist gesture. We know now as Walter Lippmann so trenchantly said, that it was a declaration of a "cold war." It was a declaration of war by world communism against recovery in the free world. And the issues brought into conflict by that declaration were no less momentous for us because the tactics employed were those of a cold war rather than a hot war.

Thus it appears that ECA today is not what it started out to be. It is much more than that. It is true that through ECA America's dollars are being used for foreign aid; but it is not true—in fact, it is dangerously untrue—to describe ECA any longer merely as foreign aid or to regard it any longer as merely a foreign-aid program. The truth is that ECA has become not only a first line of defense for western civilization, but an instrumentality for advancing the cause of freedom—not only America's freedoms and America's free institutions, but freedoms and free institutions everywhere. To regard ECA as any less than that is to reveal a perilous lack of knowledge about the menacing facts of our world. It is to reveal a perilous lack of understanding of what is required of us if we are to help establish a world in which the children of free men can live in peace.

Once Benjamin Franklin knew the scope of ECA's activities, and the conditions under which it has been endeavoring to carry out its mandate to help the Europeans get Europe back on its feet, he would be all the more eager to know how the battle was going. Instead of reporting myself, I would call his attention to the report of a fellow Philadelphian, because he had infinite faith in his neighbors. The Philadelphian is Moreley Cassidy of the Philadelphia Bulletin, and here is what he wrote after a tour of the Marshall-plan countries:

"With American help, Europe has suddenly come alive. The stumbling, bewildered, sickly Europe that cringed with fear at every Communist frown is gone.

"In its place is a Europe that feels blood in its veins again.

"Its people are better fed and better dressed. Their houses are warmer. They

are working hard, with better tools, and producing more of everything, from electric power and veal to wheat, butter, and baby buggies.

"Because they are stronger, they get angry instead of cringing when Communists try to smash their efforts to rebuild. They have begun to fight back."

If that report of Mr. Cassidy's did not persuade Benjamin Franklin that we are getting on with our task, nothing could. Unlike a few of his fellow Americans, I don't believe that Franklin would need any persuading that this program of ours should be carried through for its full 4 years. In all his long life he never quit a job half done. He would not only approve our finishing it, but I feel certain we would have his enthusiastic support. That certainty of mine stems from my belief that there is a further aspect to soundness—the kind of soundness Franklin believed in. When I was thinking about this talk someone very thoughtfully brought in a copy of Poor Richard's Almanac. When I opened it, I saw—somewhat to my surprise—that the first maxim was this: "The noblest question in the world is this: What good may I do in it?" That, I like to think, would still be Franklin's first maxim; just as, I believe it is America's first maxim. After we have judged the economic and the political soundness of the enterprise we are engaged in, there is still a more basic test to pass. That is the test of moral soundness. The test of finding out—not merely whether it is economically or politically sound—but whether it is right.

That is a test that has always been—and still is—soundly American. For America is more than the sum total of all its resources. It is more than the accumulation of all its political experiences and institutions. America, basically, is a moral achievement. As a Nation, we are what we are because of what we believe, and because—with all our failings—of our success in living up to our beliefs. As Americans, we have had a way, in our history, of doing the right thing for no other reason than that it was the right thing.

And this desire on our part has been above selfishness and above self-interest. From the very beginning Americans had a sense of mission about America. They believed that the great and good society which they were founding here was not for their own good, only, but for the good of all mankind.

Let me quote you a few sentences from Abraham Lincoln. This was in February 1861. Lincoln was on his way from Springfield to Washington for his first inaugural. Secession had already begun. The Union was torn. America was passing under an ominous cloud. On the way to Washington Lincoln stopped here in Philadelphia. A crowd gathered at Independence Hall to hear him. There, speaking informally, Lincoln said: "I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the Declaration of Independence * * * I have often inquired of myself what great principle it was that kept this confederacy so long together. It was something in that declaration giving liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope for the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all should have an equal chance. This is the sentiment embodied in the Declaration of Independence * * * I would rather be assassinated on this spot than surrender."

That was the authentic voice of America—of an America, conscious and proud that its mission involved a better life for all men everywhere. And because of that high concept of what America was, because of the fire of hope which America lighted in men's hearts, millions of people came here and found what they had dreamed of, but scarcely dared to hope for. America has been what its founding fathers deeply believed it could be.

Perhaps—as some people sometimes say—there is very little political sex appeal in idealism. But I don't believe it. I am proud of the fact—and every American should be proud of it—that this great enterprise, the Marshall plan, is economically and politically sound. But I am even prouder—and every American will share that pride—that it is morally sound. I believe that ECA is America being American, as Benjamin Franklin intended America to be.

Fifty Million Bushels of Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter from a constituent, Mr. Harold K. Burt, and signed by a considerable number of fellow constituents, in which they call attention to the fact that as citizens they have bought 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes. They humbly petition that each of them may receive his proportionate share of the potatoes which they have bought. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] that 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes amount to 200,000,000 pecks, which would entitle each citizen to 1 peck.

Mr. FLANDERS. To a peck and a third.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINDSOR, VT., *February 3, 1950.*

Hon. RALPH E. FLANDERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FLANDERS: It is currently reported in the newspapers that the Secretary of Agriculture has 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes that he does not have the business ability to dispose of at anywhere near cost price to the Government, and that he threatens to sell these at a loss or to destroy them.

We understand there is a population of approximately 150,000,000 people. By arithmetic, my share of this surplus of potatoes would be one-third of a bushel. Having been unable to purchase anything but second-grade potatoes during the past winter because the Department bought up all of the good potatoes, will you kindly transmit this request to the Secretary of Agriculture, and ask him to send me, parcel post forthwith, my one-third bushel share of the potatoes which the collector of internal revenue can certify that I have paid for through my tax bills. My wife is also entitled to her one-third bushel. Please have them sent at the same time.

I believe, sir, that it would be a crime against this country and its taxpayers, and an everlasting insult to God Almighty if this portion of our food should be wantonly destroyed to satisfy some political whim or ulterior motive on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I am joined in these sentiments, and in this request, by certain other fellow citizens who are likewise married people and entitled to potatoes for themselves and their wives, and their names and addresses appear below.

You will understand, of course, that I am not holding you personally responsible for this outrageous situation, and I trust that you are doing everything possible to bring back a little sanity into the operation of our Government in Washington.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD K. BURT.

We, the undersigned, join in the foregoing request to have our share of the surplus potatoes sent to us for our own use.

John E. Rockstrom, H. H. Weld, G. H. Pratt, C. P. Audette, W. H. Washburn, C. E. Miller, Windsor, Vt; Leon Cleveland, Ascutney, Vt.; Wm. Pierne, Windsor, Vt.; George Northrop, Plainfield, N. H.; R. S. Lombard, N. L. Nichols, Gordon F. Cushing, Wm. C. Farrell, Windsor, Vt.

National Security Resources Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column entitled "Washington Scene," by George Dixon, which appeared in the Times-Herald this morning, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Mr. Dixon is a difficult person to either startle or shock. What has caused him concern may arouse a similar interest in others.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON SCENE

(By George Dixon)

Eleven months ago the Senate turned down Mon Wallgren for Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, one of the four most important positions in the world, on the ground that the job was too big for him.

Wallgren, in addition to being a renowned poker player, had been a Member of the House of Representatives, Governor of the State of Washington, and a United States Senator. Yet his former colleagues decided the National Security Resources Board required a man of wider economic and industrial experience and competency as Chairman.

Wallgren was handed the final thumbs down on March 15, 1949. The job hasn't been filled with a permanent Chairman yet.

Ho! ho! and haw! haw! Who do you think has been doing the actual work of running one of the four most important positions in the world since the former Representative-Governor-Senator was rejected as not having the stature?

Wallgren's former clerk.

To top the irony—pardon me a moment while I giggle some more in unholy glee—President Truman has since nominated Wallgren to the Federal Power Commission,

and the Senators agreed he was competent enough for a job like that.

But the work that was considered far beyond his capabilities has been handled by the man he brought with him to Washington to run his errands.

The disclosure that Wallgren's former minion, Jack O. Gorrie, is running the works came about at a hearing before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Armed Services and caused not a ripple. The committee members heard it without apparently recognizing its significance.

But the appropriations come over to the Senate in a couple of weeks and you can look for squawks that will shake the Chamber. Senator HARRY P. CAIN, of Washington, who led the fight to bar Wallgren, will probably give vent to conniptions.

CAIN, who made the battle almost a personal one (he abhors Wallgren with devoted abhoration), will cry for blood when he gets the full pitch on Gorrie.

In theory, and on paper, Assistant to the President, John R. Steelman is Acting Chairman of the National Resources Security Board, but he can't give much of his time to it. The redoubtable Dr. Steelman has too many other things to do.

The House subcommittee did not crowd Gorrie on who is running Security Resources, but the Senate will. In the report of the House hearings the testimony as to the time devoted to the Board by the Acting Chairman was confined to three short paragraphs.

Representative GEORGE H. MAHON, of Texas, chairman, asked Gorrie: "How much time does Dr. Steelman, the Acting Chairman, give to the work of the Board?"

Gorrie: "He is in the office almost every day. He comes over to the office and spends from an hour to sometimes almost a full day. Most of the time I would say he was there on an average of possibly 2 to 2½ or 3 hours. Usually it is in the afternoon of each day.

"We are in contact with him on the telephone, of course, on questions which arise when he is not there physically."

Don't you love that "almost every day"; "sometimes almost a full day"; "an average of possibly," etc., etc.?

How many of you, my gentle readers, have jobs that take up an average of possibly, approximately, almost, well nigh, pretty near, some of almost, approximately, possibly, every day on an average?

Roosevelt Day Dinner Address by Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Roosevelt Day dinner address by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on January 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Throughout the land, speakers at ADA-sponsored dinners in memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt are discussing freedom of inquiry in a democratic society. In this age of anxiety, of tensions, and of great changes, few subjects are more worthy of discussion. Franklin Roosevelt, with his great insight, knew this well. "Freedom to learn," he said, "is the first necessity of guaranteeing that man himself shall be self-reliant enough to be free."

Why is it necessary to stress freedom of inquiry today? Does not everyone agree with Thomas Jefferson's observation that inquiry leads to truth? Certainly no one who ever went to second-year high-school science class can dispute it. When we wanted to see what a microbe looked like, we put it under a miscroscope. We inquired, and we found the truth.

No, you can't deny that inquiry leads to truth. But there are many who regret that it does, because they don't want the truth to be known.

This, I think, is why it is important that we discuss freedom of inquiry tonight. In this country and in the world there are powerful forces who would close the channels of inquiry, require a strict conformity from all the people, and keep our society right and unchanging. Regardless of the specific names they are known by in their own land, they all stand for the unquestioning acceptance of things as they are. They equate inquiry with subversion and conformity with patriotism.

But this has never been the way the American people have wanted it. From the early days of the New England town meetings our country has always stood for free discussion—freedom to question, freedom to examine, freedom to inquire. If I may quote President Roosevelt again, in one of those perceptive remarks we learned to expect from him: "You will never have a completely stable world without freedom of knowledge."

There are two ways of reporting history. The first is in terms of battles won and lost and the fall and rise of government; the other is in terms of the discoveries of the mind. In every generation the mind of man reaches out to new length and never shrinks back to its former dimensions. Fortunately, though man is mortal, his thoughts and ideas are immortal. Each generation salvages the immortality of the preceding ones to create a steady progression of civilization.

The creative ideas of man have developed fast in recent years. It was only 300 years ago that man began to seriously question himself about the nature of the physical world in which he lived.

The seventeenth century was characterized by the great intellectual revolution, the age of science. Men became possessed with the idea that the physical universe was their concern—that they could ask questions about natural phenomena without incurring the wrath of God. They became possessed with the idea that there were physical laws they could fathom. Here, indeed, was the triumph of Copernicus, Galileo, Newton—men of ideas, men fearlessly inquiring into the unknown.

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were characterized by new inquiries, by new ideas that possessed men—the idea that if there were physical laws of the universe that men could fathom and ask questions about, then why not inquire about the nature of man-made society.

With this inquiring, the ideology of democracy came into being.

Until the First World War this ideology of democracy was on the offensive. The action against it was rear guard, defensive, and uncertain. Democracy was the concept of today and tomorrow. Men everywhere heard of it and spoke of it and acted to achieve it.

But, in this generation democracy has been challenged by another ideology. In Italy, Germany, and Russia the leaders talked of what they said was a "new order"—something new and streamlined.

But what did we see when we examined this "new order"? We have found it wasn't new at all. It was the old, old doctrine of authoritarianism, pushed with the force of guns and marching feet—yes, nothing more than the ancient curse of "divine right" of the strong to rule the weak.

Democracy met and conquered this old concept years ago in nearly every civilized nation of the world. Today, if we fully understand the power of inquiry, the power of our idea and its full meaning, we can easily maintain the eminence of the democratic faith that only yesterday spread from mind to mind and heart to heart throughout the world.

Of all people who should understand the strength of freedom of inquiry, the power of democracy, the American people should be the first. Our idea of democracy was embodied in the Preamble to the Declaration of Independence, and in the words of our Constitution. It has as its philosophers Samuel Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Tom Paine, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt. These men all spoke of the same ideology; all were possessed of the same idea. They sought to free men from fear; to free them from poverty; to free them from social and economic injustice, and from insecurity, they sought freedom of inquiry.

Strange as it may seem, America has let loose upon this world the most powerful and dynamic political and social force in the history of man. It has its roots deep in the spiritual substance of Judeo-Christianity. It receives its political inspiration from the logic of the stoics, the compassion of the martyrs, the faith of the philosophers of natural law. We are of the first to present to the modern world a coherent political faith based upon the dignity of the individual, the equality and fraternity of mankind. We are of the first to pattern a structure of government and a form of society in which the liberties of a people were guaranteed and opportunity was to be assured.

This was an idea—or better to say—an ideology more powerful than the armies of the conquerors. History proves this fact. It was our call to freedom in 1776 and our realization of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people that let loose in this world a social and political revolution. This revolution upset the thrones of Europe and convulsed the continent. It put into the hearts and breasts of the colonial people, the under-privileged, and the subjected, the consuming desire of individual liberty, a desire which today is manifested by such rebellions as we see in Indochina, in Indonesia, and in the fact of India's freedom. We never moved a battalion or a regiment on the continent of Europe in the 1800's, yet the idea of the Declaration of Independence produced the doctrine of the rights of man and broke the back of oppression and the power of kings.

Today, too, the vital force in the world is the search for freedom. We see many manifestations of it: the rise of nationalism of the colonial peoples; the oppressed and the poverty stricken following the leadership of those who use the symbols of freedom, even though their purpose may be otherwise. We find economists and political philosophers talking in terms of abundance within the framework of individual freedom. Men are no longer just content to talk of their security. They want security and liberty. The humanitarian of this generation is one who understands the interdependence of these two principles—freedom and security.

There are those who today feel we have moved away from this idea, when in fact it is but maturing. It is growing strong in its own sense of competence and rich in its experience. The great political and social experiments taking place in Europe—in the free countries of Europe—are but another expression of this idea of democracy. Our groping and experimentation in the hall of

Congress, evolving such programs as the new freedom and the New Deal are but further expressions of a people with the desire to emancipate themselves from fear, from insecurity, and from oppression.

No better example of our maturing democracy can be found than the ever-growing demand that all people, regardless of race, color, or creed, be guaranteed full and equal civil rights. The morality of our democratic faith compels us to cleanse our body politic of the guilt that arises from our distortion of democratic principles through discrimination and bigotry. The American people are acting to redeem their honor. In city after city—in State after State—human rights are being reaffirmed and protected by law. The democratic spirit of the people now calls upon our National Government to destroy the last vestige of intolerance.

Our maturing democracy calls for the recognition that all must be free from insecurity. All must be privileged to enjoy the opportunity of good health, of productive work, of education, of adequate housing, and of decent living conditions.

This is democracy's answer to the challenge of totalitarianism.

One of the finest examples of the spirit of freedom and free inquiry in a democratic society was the investigation and report 2 years ago of President Truman's Commission on Civil Rights. Its report added immeasurably to America's store of knowledge about itself: 64 lynchings in 11 years, with not a single person given the death penalty for these crimes. The poll tax and other ballot restrictions, denying the vote to literally millions of Americans. Newspapers help-wanted ads offering jobs for which only whites or gentiles need apply, and job seekers required to list their religion on application blanks. The demonstrable fraud of separate but equal schools for whites and Negroes. Job discrimination keeping minority groups in relative poverty.

On the basis of these findings, President Truman formulated his civil-rights program and sent it to Congress. These proposals have languished there for 2 years, kept in the shadows of inaction by the combined power of Republicans and Democrats. But the test is approaching. I'm sure many of you heard about the national emergency civil rights mobilization which took place in Washington earlier this month. Fifty-three national organizations took part in it, including AFL. The 4,500 people who attended the mobilization were earnest, devoted, non-Communist liberals. They buttonholed practically every Member of the Senate and talked frankly to them on the civil-rights bills, and particularly FEPC. Many of my colleagues were deeply impressed. Given this kind of encouragement, we who are committed to the civil-rights proposals can make a much better fight when the issue comes up. It will come up shortly, and I promise you that the fight for fundamental decency in human relations will be made.

The reactionaries, the rackets, the monopolists—all of them are loudly protesting their love of freedom these days. They profess to see danger to freedom in the minimum standards of security which the people are seeking to set up through their Government. But the conservatives' devotion to freedom hardly ever embraces protection of basic civil liberties against the peril of contemporary hysterias and the intolerant demand for unquestioning acquiescence in things as they are.

That is why this country so desperately needed a Franklin D. Roosevelt. That is why it needs today the vigor of the liberal movement that honors him on this day. That is why America needs an ADA.

Today we are a country incomparably the strongest, the richest, the best protected in the globe. Our Union and our Constitution have withstood the vicissitudes of 160 years. Our people are intelligent and they are moral, they are devoted to freedom.

The real danger we face is that a fear of free inquiry will produce an atmosphere of suspicion and timidity that will discourage independence of thought, original investigation, and association. The real danger we face is that a program of suppression will seriously endanger effective operation of our democracy.

The real danger we face is that a spirit of hysteria will endanger the morale of American science by putting a premium on mediocrity in a field requiring independence, originality and full freedom of inquiry and communication.

The real danger we face is that a society gripped by fear strengthens the hand of the military in areas traditionally and wisely entrusted to civilian control.

The real danger we face is that freedom of teaching will be imperiled by requiring conformity to standards, by introducing the grave peril of censorship in textbooks and ideas and drive away from the teaching profession men and women of independent minds. We must guard lest it create an atmosphere in which teachers find safety not in orthodox ideas, for they will never know fully which ideas are orthodox, but safety in no ideas.

Yes, the real danger we face is that the right and necessity of criticism is threatened. No government can operate successfully without criticism and no government which censors its critics can get the criticism that it needs.

Finally, the real danger we face is that the hysteria we are confronted with, strikes at one of the most precious of all rights, one essential to the effective operation of democracy, the right of association. As Professor Commager recently pointed out, the practice of voluntary association is a peculiarly English and American practice. The Pilgrim Fathers associated themselves into a compact and since that time Americans have customarily operated around hundreds of voluntary associations: Political parties, parent-teacher, Federal, business, fraternity, philanthropic, recreational, learned and others. It is in these associations that the average American has found the training for government and real democracy to take the place of the town meeting. Any policy which discourages or crushes voluntary associations will totally dry up the very roots of American democracy.

Our security lies not in secrecy but in the preservation of peace and in the encouragement of free inquiry; our real long-term security lies in perfecting our own democracy. Even as our society now exists, it is the freest in the world and confers the most benefits on the humblest of citizens. We must make sure that it is kept free and fertile.

National Youth Rehabilitation Center of Jerusalem Hebron Yeshivah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a dedication to the National Youth Rehabilitation Center of Jerusalem Hebron Yeshivah. The statement is a foreword to the journal of this organization which will be published in connection with its benefit dinner on March 19, 1950. The journal will depict 50 centuries of Jewish history and will be dedicated to the common brotherhood of all men of good will.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Yeshivah Hebron is a landmark in the Eternal City where every site is a pageant, featuring centuries of awe-inspiring history; where every cave is a labyrinth and her every alley reflecting the immortality of her heroes and prophets, rebels and saints, kings and princes shrouded in timeless majesty.

Her harness, studded with Biblical jewels, Jerusalem discovered in Yeshivah Hebron, yet another shield. Though soft and pipulistic, the voices that emanate from the great yeshivah set the music to Jerusalem's ornamental lyrics and open the vaults to her Torah treasures.

The voice of the melodious shepherd sounds yet in prophetic rhapsody—"from Zion shall come forth Torah and the word of God from Jerusalem."

Yeshivah Hebron cannot be estimated as the exclusive property of any one region or populace, because of her territorial periphery she is a panoramic to which every Jew may lay claim. Nothing circumvallates her edifice; her influence and authority is not restricted to her seat in Jerusalem. On the contrary, her very structure and concept makes Yeshivah Hebron the common responsibility of all Jews as is, indeed, the Eternal City.

To understand fully the function of Yeshivah Hebron it is imperative that we give here the origin of yeshivahs and a brief but concise history of their relation to world Jewry.

The term "yeshivah" and the Aramaic equivalent, "mesivtah," both found in the Talmud, originally meant a session, a council, or a meeting of scholars, over which presided the elder. The patriarchs were all elders of a yeshivah (Yuma 28b).

During the Talmudic period, the principal Eretz Yisrael Yeshivahs were at Sephoris, Tiberias, and Caesarea, while those of Babylon were at Mahuza, Nehardea, Sura, and Pumbedisa.

In Babylon and Levant during the fourth century, the yeshivahs assumed the functions of rabbinical colleges, where young men were prepared for the rabbinate. Until the beginning of the ninth century, the Jews in European countries and elsewhere depended entirely on, and abided by, the decisions of the authorities in the yeshivahs of Babylon which they supported liberally. It was largely due to the encouragement of Charlemagne—who jointly with his brother Carloman, ruled over France, Germany, Spain, and Italy—that the learned men of Babylon emigrated and established yeshivahs in France and Germany.

With the beginning of the eleventh century, the seat of the yeshivahs was firmly established in France, Spain, Germany, Italy, Holland, and Poland.

Not until the sixteenth century did yeshivahs again begin to flourish in Eretz Yisrael—in Safed under Berab; in Caro—and in Jerusalem under Levi ibn Haviv.

During the rise of the Hasidic and Reform movements, which the yeshivahs regarded as a threat to the method and style of study augmented by Reb Elijah, the Gaon of Wilna, Reb Hayyim of Volozhin, a pupil of the Gaon, organized in 1803 the celebrated Yeshivah of Volozhin, a small town in the state of Wilna, and his own birthplace.

When God decreed the death of Moses, the prophet's primary request was "Let the Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh, set a man * * * that the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep which have no shepherd." Reb Hayyam Volozhin lived to see the new shepherds whose destinies were shaped by their very tenacity to uphold the yeshivah traditions. They were Reb Moshe Mordechai Epstein and Reb Noson Zvi Finkel.

In 1883 these renowned Talmudists founded a yeshivah in Slabodka (Lithuania) which was inconspicuously transferred in 1924 to Hebron, Palestine, and thence became known as the Hebron Yeshivah. Following the Arab riots of 1929, the yeshivah moved to Jerusalem.

Now, that great edifice stands as a tribute to the sainted memory of its founders, engendering a steadfast faith, unabated by sorrow, and a loyalty unmitigated by seridom.

The students of the yeshivah have, for more than a half a century, withstood the challenge of anti-Semitism in Russia, and outlived the Nazi holocaust in Europe. These men of every generation and decade treasure neither gold nor silver; they favor neither steel nor blade; they are dedicated to the justice of their divine principles—ancient and hollow. They feed on faith uncorrupted and, like the cedars of Lebanon, stand undaunted against the stridulous and subrosa evils of the secular world.

"And the sun stood still and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies" (Joshua 10:13). Indeed, time stands still for these men who observe the ancient traditions and rituals as on the day God commanded their ancestors to do. Such is the caliber of the man who aspires to leadership in the great yeshivah; such is the caliber of the yeshivah-ordained rabbi who tutors and guides Jews throughout the world; teachers who are the link between God and the Jew at large in a bond unbroken by the cavalcade of disaster.

Hundreds of rabbis who serve the spiritual needs of Jews all over the world received their training and ordination at the great Yeshivah Hebron. Two-thirds of Israel's rabbis were graduated from this, the greatest institution of learning.

In addition, the Yeshivah Hebron inspired and sponsored the growth of yeshivahs throughout Israel. Six such institutions are drawing on the renaissance of Yeshivah Hebron.

With the independence of Israel, Yeshivah Hebron expanded and received her share of the new influx of immigrants. The yeshivah's new dormitory, which will be known as the national youth rehabilitation center, equipped to house and care for thousands of young men, is now nearing completion—making your contribution a pillar upon which this edifice will stand and endure.

Why the Difference?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, the widow of a veteran who had been declared totally and permanently disabled has asked me the following question: "Why does the widow of a veteran who died as a direct result of his service-connected disability receive more pension than the widow of a veteran who was adjudged totally and permanently disabled, service-connected, but whose death could not be directly attributed to his service-connected disability?"

Mr. Speaker, I can readily understand why a veteran with a service-connected disability should receive a greater degree of compensation than one with a non-service-connected disability. However, I cannot understand why any widow of a veteran should receive a greater degree of compensation simply because the husband of one died as the direct result of his service-connected disability while the other one did not—remember, both veterans' disability being service-connected.

The price of all necessities of life cost the same for the widow in either case and it seems to me, in all fairness, that if a veteran has been declared totally and permanently disabled, service-connected, that all widows of veterans with this type of disability should be compensated equally, regardless of the cause of death.

Jackson-Jefferson Day Dinner Address by Hon. Oscar L. Chapman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner address by Hon. Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, in Los Angeles, Calif., January 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEFFERSON-JACKSON IDEALS STILL LIVE

I am happy to be among you tonight to pay a tribute, at once humble and proud, to those two great protectors of the general welfare of the people, President Thomas Jefferson and President Andrew Jackson. The Democratic Party is reinvigorated on occasions like this when the liberal Jefferson and the rugged and popular Jackson can walk again in spirit among their friends.

We of the Democratic Party are the heirs to their great tradition, and it is we who stand among the people as the guardian of their democratic ideals.

Thomas Jefferson was the philosopher of our democratic state, and he played a masterful part in its creation. It was his hand that so often guided his contemporaries from the paths of error and unwise compromise. It was his voice that appealed repeatedly to the people and to their Congress for undivided support of the Constitution for which he had, in his own words, "a zealous attachment."

His insistence on the inclusion of a Bill of Rights in the Constitution is a matter of history well known to us all. To him, this was a guarantee against the invasion of men's lives by habits accepted in an old world grown weary from congestion and conflict.

But Jefferson's legacy to us is far more dynamic than this. In a world where those about him were subject to the will of monarchs and masters, he recognized in men themselves an essential dignity, and a power to determine their own destinies and make them free.

This belief in the common man—an abiding faith in man's ability to govern himself—was the eternal spring of Jefferson's philosophy. In his first inaugural address, he stated it simply: "Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question."

For President Jefferson, we can say that while tyranny still lives in the world, his question has been answered. The Government of this Nation has been kept, as he hoped, "close to the people."

We of the Democratic Party are proud to state that we have followed his admonition for "the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad." We as a people can affirm his own claims for us as "the strongest Government on earth." We still believe, with Jefferson, that our Constitution is unquestionably the wisest ever presented to men.

To Andrew Jackson we pay tribute for the renewed application of practical democratic principles to a national life growing ever more complex as our frontiers pushed onward to the West. The movement toward the West had all begun by Jackson's time, and the spirit of the West was beginning to be felt.

These pioneers were the people whose voices were heard in the White House, asking from Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee, a square deal in national administration. This Jackson proceeded to give them, and the Nation assumed new vigor and new hope. He was the leader of the rising democracy of our Nation, and like the Democrats of today, a firm believer in our Constitution.

We who are joined here tonight do not have to be told how the Democratic Party has carried out the ideals of Jefferson and Jackson. It is proper, however, to review the progress we have made, for in the review we dedicate ourselves again to the principle of government for all the people. It is right that we examine what the Democratic Party has done for their welfare.

The people have always benefited during Democratic administration. This has been particularly true since 1932. In that year, the people of the Nation took back unto themselves the control of their Government, and handed the legacy of Jefferson and Jackson to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

In 1948, the people knew with certainty all of the things they wanted done for their own welfare. This was the year when they handed their Government to a man who possessed an unfaltering faith in the people of this Nation to choose what was best for their own welfare, to the man whom nobody wanted but the people, Harry S. Truman.

Franklin D. Roosevelt knew and understood, and Harry Truman knows and understands the meaning of the West to this Nation.

This is the territory that Jefferson felt would serve the needs of the Nation's people for a thousand generations, not only to make the Nation great, but also to strengthen the Democratic ideals to which he devoted his life.

It is also, I am proud to say, the land which has claimed rightly a great share of attention from the Government department over which the people now permit me to preside.

The national income during the year 1945, when the Department of Interior was established, and when our population was about 23,000,000, amounted to little over $2,000,000,000. In 1948, this income reached a high of $230,000,000,000.

The role now played by your Government in the development of the West during those hundred years is recorded for all to see. I think, we can be justly proud of that role. With you, we have looked with wonder at your vast, fertile, and productive land. We have seen your growing industry. We have joined you in exploring for the wealthy minerals hidden in your mountains and valleys.

We have imagined with you the possibility of watering your dry acres. We have come with you as you made plans to give your electric power to your Nation, to provide water for your people, and to grant to all the people of this Nation an opportunity to re-create themselves in your forests and your parks. And, then, under Democratic leadership, we have moved ahead with you.

The vast resources which the West has held in custody for the Nation are far richer than Jefferson or Jackson could have imagined. The social pattern for the protection of this precious possession of all the people was set long ago. In his plans for the government of the Louisiana Territory, Jefferson made certain that monopoly in land could never be established.

Andrew Jackson, in his successful fight against the Bank of the United States, settled the question as to whether the Government could protect its citizens against a small minority who had achieved wealth and power through the monopoly of a vital instrument of the Nation's economy.

The Democratic Party has continued to follow the ideals of Jefferson and Jackson in holding the interests of all the people of this country as paramount to the desires of special interests or particular groups. We are unlike many people who speak of our great Abraham Lincoln loudly and in awed tones while privately serving the interest of those who oppose most strongly the liberal ideals for which Lincoln lived and died.

We believe that the vast resources of the West—water, land, and minerals—constitute a national wealth which should be used for the enrichment of life for all our people. In the last 17 years, we have made greater strides in the use and control of these national resources than have been made in all the years of our history.

You know well the value of your water. The world wars have brought to the Western States a new industrial economy and people to swell your population. The demands on your water supply, for irrigation, for power, and for your civic needs, have been increased. The way in which these demands are met will determine the soundness of your new economic foundation.

Only too recently, you have seen shortages in electric power for lighting your homes and for operating the utility and industrial requirements of your cities, your factories, and your farms.

You know now that problems involved in maintaining adequate water supplies are too large and too complex for individuals and groups to handle without help. They transcend State lines, and they affect the welfare of the entire Nation. You have asked your Government for help in planning. Under Democratic leadership, it has provided that help, and it intends to continue to do so.

The Grand Coulee, Bonneville, Central Valley, Boulder Canyon, and smaller projects, multipurpose in design, are now mighty servants of the people. It is important to your lives and to the Nation that public projects like these be anticipated.

Our Bureau of Reclamation has been able to report that water has now been made available to 90,000 farms, totaling 4,600,000 acres. Crops on reclamation land alone were valued last year at about $600,000,000. Installed capacity on western Federal power projects alone totaled 3,000,000 kilowatts by 1948.

This is the way in which the Democratic Party has planned with you for your own control over your water and your power and for your own right to build your mighty power plants and your transmission lines. These are your heritage in the West, and they must remain yours, never to become the instrument of profit and special privilege to some few among you.

Yes; under Democratic leadership your Government has led the way in stopping "water, the destroyer," as it flooded your valleys, eroded your soils, and poured wasting into the sea. It has redirected "water, the builder" into activity which promotes life, provides it with leisure, and lights its way.

If this kind of Government service to the people is the welfare state, I am for it, and I think you are for it.

The conservation of mineral resources is of the highest importance to the West and to the Nation. In the face of rapid depletion of some of these resources, the Government under Democratic leadership is moving steadily to find out exactly what your mineral resources are, and to develop methods of lower-cost extraction and processing. The maintenance of a sound mining and mineral industry is of vital importance to the Truman administration.

The land of the West has always been its richest physical resource. We now know that our resources in forest and grazing land must be protected to serve all of our people. This the Democratic Party is doing.

I believe that you want these rich resources to be conserved for your children and their children. I believe you want to use them to make a better life for our people as well as in the future. If you do, and if this is the welfare state, I am for it, and I think you are for it.

Now look with me at yourselves, as the reason for all of these things. Resources and their development are not ends in themselves.

You, the people of this Nation, are its greatest natural resource. In your example of democratic living and government, you are one of the rich resources of the world.

You knew your power as a people when you placed your faith in one of the noblest of our citizens, Woodrow Wilson, and enthusiastically welcomed his "new freedom." It was not of your making that a handful of short-sighted and willful men thwarted your wishes and his ideals for an America assuming its place in the councils of the world to secure a lasting peace.

You knew your power in 1932 when you asked Franklin D. Roosevelt to make your voices heard in the land, in your factories, your homes, and your schools.

You knew your strength as a people when you told Harry S. Truman to guard again your rights to a Fair Deal.

The Democratic Party has been your voice, and your general welfare has never ceased to be its goal. Let us look at what has happened to us under its leadership:

The people are secure in employment and income. Our factories are busy. Our commerce is moving. We are educating our children, and we continue to maintain the highest standard of living in the world. We are helping our neighbors who bore the brunt of war, and we are sharing the responsibilities of nations for maintaining the peace.

Vast numbers of our people can look forward to old-age assistance under our social-security program. Workers are protected against want during periods of forced unemployment.

There has been progress in many directions under the Democratic administration, and most of it has touched your lives. Cash income of farmers in 1932 was less than $2,000,000,000. In 1948 it reached more than $20,000,000,000. Here in California your farmers' income rose from about $404,000,000 in 1932 to over $2,000,000,000 in 1948.

Nearly 95 percent of California's farmers had electricity at the end of June 1949. When REA was established in 1935 only 50 percent of these farms had electric lights.

This, however, is the almost unbelievable accomplishment. Only 11 percent of the Nation's farms had electric lights in 1935. Under these years of the Democratic administration, over 78 percent of all farms are electrified.

Like the people of the rest of our Nation, you have needed houses, and you have asked for help to get them. Here is what has been happening, and the State of California has been typical. At the end of 1948 the Federal Housing Administration had outstanding in this State over 908,000 insured loans on small homes for property improvement, with insurance totaling over $342,000,000. It had underwritten the construction of over 13,000 units in large apartment projects, and had insured 342,000 mortgages on 1 to 4-family homes.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation had aided over 57,000 families by refinancing home loans totaling over $148,000,000. By June 30, 1949, all but about $5,000,000 of these loans had been repaid.

If all of these things are the welfare state, the Democratic Party is for the welfare state, and it proclaims it to the people proudly.

The Republican Eightieth Congress set out to destroy many of the progressive benefits which you as a people had chosen for yourselves. You are all too familiar with the way in which special interests made inroads into your rights under the Constitution.

The Democratic Eighty-First Congress reversed this trend, and many things have already been done to serve the people of the Nation. Funds for continuing important reclamation and power projects have been restored. Provision has been made for a Nation-wide program of low-cost housing and slum clearance. Rural electrification has been strengthened and extended. Minimum wages for working people are higher than ever before.

The Economic Cooperation Administration has been authorized to carry on for us its great work in resisting the advances of communism by strengthening the democracies of Europe.

We cannot be content, of course, with these accomplishments. The dynamic philosophy of Jefferson and Jackson which took them through new frontiers of thinking and planning still means for us a never-ending crusade to better the life of our Nation and the lives of its people.

President Truman has told us that we can soon achieve a national income of $300,000,000,000 annually. He has predicted that the average family can receive, by the year 2000, a real income about three times what they receive today.

To do these things, we must maintain a stable economy, avoiding the economic boom and bust cycles too frequent in our past history.

Under Democratic leadership, your Government intends to stimulate increasing returns of capital into new productive investment. It will curb monopoly and provide incentives to new and independent enterprise.

It will take all steps necessary to see to it that the benefits of economic growth extend to all groups.

Farmers will be protected against economic and physical forces over which they have no control. The products of their land and their work must be made available to consumers in increasing quantities and at reasonable prices. Farmers themselves must be guaranteed a fair return for their services to the Nation.

Labor must have lifted from its back the weight of one-sided labor legislation which now stifles its efforts to express its needs in the democratic way.

The social-security laws must be extended until almost all of our people are covered by their benefits.

The health of our people is the well-being of our Nation. With a vast segment of the population lacking medical care, some form of national insurance must be enacted to provide this care. Our doctors must increase in number, and the number of our hospitals must be multiplied greatly.

Thomas Jefferson held as a fundamental tenet of democracy, equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious, or political. In our time, our concept of democratic rights has extended with the development of our Nation. The recognition of the civil rights of all men and women has been long since accepted as a tenet of the Democratic Party.

All citizens have equal rights to gainful employment and economic advancement; to security of their persons; and to the right of franchise. We intend to support legislation which will establish these rights within the law of our land forever for all our citizens.

We shall continue, under Democratic leadership, to work actively in the council of nations to maintain peace in the world. More than this—your Government intends to give example to the world in the use of resources for the people's welfare. The President's point 4 program will be accelerated, that less advanced nations may come to know the vast benefits of their resources, just as the west has done. We shall help these nations to direct their resources to lift the standard of living for their citizens.

You know that, if these things are to be done—and you have to count on Democrats to do them—the President needs a Congress overwhelmingly Democratic.

The elections in 1950 will return a Democratic Congress, but there must be even greater numbers to support the President as he moves on to the goals I have mentioned.

Here is a challenge to you who join me here tonight. Your administration and your party need you, and they count on your help in this election that is coming. The people must be told the story of what we are trying to do, and they must come to the polls. California helped to elect Harry Truman. Now it must strengthen his hand as he works for the interests of its people.

We are the people of a great Nation. We stand as a symbol to the world of man's faith in himself, and in the thoughts, abilities, and motives of those around him. This, my friends, is the philosophy of Jefferson and Jackson. The magnificent determination of President Harry S. Truman and Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY to rest upon the decision of the people in 1948 proved that this was their philosophy. It is your land and my land. We have kept it secure under our Constitution, and the Democratic Party proposes to keep it secure for us, the people of America. Yes, Jefferson's questions have been answered. This Government is "close to the people." If this be the welfare state, I am joined by the millions of our people in seeking to maintain it for our children and our children's children.

What Is a Reactionary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interesting article by former President Herbert Hoover, which appeared in the February issue of Coronet:

WHAT IS A REACTIONARY?

(By Herbert Hoover)

The new era of today seems united in the notion that they have just discovered real liberalism and that all previous eras are reactionary. Well, there is something to be said for the old reactionary notions which held to basic freedoms of mind and spirit.

In the years since the founding fathers, a God-fearing people under these reactionary blessings have built quite a plant and equipment on this continent. It teems with millions of comfortable farms and homes, cattle, and hogs. It is well equipped with railroads, power plants, factories, highways, automobiles, and death warnings. It is studded with magnificent cities and traffic jams.

The terrible reactionaries have filled the land with legislatures, town councils, free presses, orchestras, bands, radios, juke boxes, and other noises. It has a full complement of stadiums, ball players, and college yells.

Furthermore they have sprinkled the country with churches and laboratories, have built 10,000 schools and 1,000 institutions of higher learning. And somehow these reactionary minded taxpayers are squeezing out the resources to maintain 1,000,000 devoted teachers and 100,000 able professors, and to keep more than 2,000,000 students in colleges and universities.

Possibly another ideology could do better in the next 174 years. But I suggest that we continue to suffer certain evils of free men and the ideal of equal opportunity rather than die of nostalgia.

Increased Sugar Production in United States Areas in 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1950

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, between thirty and thirty-five million acres of good farm land in the United States will be taken out of customary production of corn, wheat, cotton, peanuts, and tobacco in the crop year of 1950. Approximately one-half of this acreage is taken from wheat and corn areas. The farmers in the wheat and corn section are looking around for other crops to plant on the idle acres. But they find it exceedingly difficult to locate another farm crop for large-scale planting without adding to existing surpluses.

Sugar is a deficiency crop in the United States. Sugar beets can be grown in most wheat and corn sections, and sugarcane production can be increased in Louisiana, Florida, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. We annually import 2,504,000 short tons of sugar from Cuba. A very substantial portion of this sugar could be raised in United States areas.

While the economy of Cuba is largely dependent on the production of sugar for consumption in the United States, certain developments have taken place in Cuba, which I feel warrant a reexamination of our sugar policy by Congress.

For the past 50 years Cuba has purchased most of its wheat flour from United States flour mills. In fact, Cuba has been our best foreign customer for flour. Flour imports by Cuba from United States mills for five calendar years—in hundredweights—are shown as follows:

1945	4,611,000
1946	3,453,000
1947	3,701,000
1948	2,583,000
1949 (estimated)	3,064,000

American wheat farmers and flour mills are about to lose the Cuban market for wheat flour to a newly established flour-mill company in Havana, which is known as Molinos de Harina Burrus, S. A. The new flour-mill company, which eventually expects to produce all of the flour required for Cuba, is being constructed and financed by a Mr. Jack Burrus, a prominent American miller from Texas, under the most extraordinary concessions from the Cuban Government. Under the concessions, which I will outline, it is anticipated that the Burrus Cuban flour mill will import most of its wheat for flour production from Canada, Argentina, and other foreign countries, instead of the United States, because of the lower prices for wheat in those countries. The wheat farmers and flour mills in Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Minnesota, Indiana, New York, and other sections will be the losers. Eventually, when the Burrus mill gets into full production to fill all Cuban requirements, the outlet for wheat produced on 530,000 acres in the United States will be gone.

Amongst the concessions given by the Cuban Government to Mr. Burrus are:

First. Import of wheat into Cuba for the mill, cancellation of import duty and tax.

Second. Complete exemption from all taxes on machinery and materials imported for construction of the mill.

Third. Complete exemption from all taxes on the export of currency necessary to pay for imported construction material and machinery.

Fourth. Exemption from all taxes on the export of currency necessary to pay for wheat and other raw materials imported for the operation of the mill.

Fifth. Exemption from taxes on capital and capital stock.

Sixth. Exemption on all tariffs, consular fees and other types of excises and supercharges now being levied for the importation of raw materials necessary to the operation of industries located in Cuba.

Seventh. Exemption from general Cuban utilities taxes.

I understand that the State Department has given its approval to the concessions awarded to Mr. Burrus in his Cuban venture. Possibly it was done to advance President Truman's dynamic point 4 program to assist undeveloped countries to become self-sustaining. It is difficult to understand the reasons for the action taken by the Cuban Government against the interest of its neighbor country and its best customer for sugar and other commodities.

In view of the fact that the Cuban Government has undertaken a policy to

curtail and finally stop imports of American wheat flour, and since United States areas are curtailing production of sugar in order to provide a market in this country for Cuban sugar, I will ask the Committee on Agriculture to review the sugar quota law. There will be at least 10,000,000 idle acres of corn and wheat land upon which sugar beets can be grown, and I am positive that sugarcane production can also be increased in Florida, Louisiana, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. This matter should be promptly investigated so additional production of sugar can be made available from the 1950 crop.

Freedom Through the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on January 26, 1950, it was my pleasure and privilege to address the mass meeting of the Ahepa chapters at the Pythian Temple in the city of New York. These people know only too well how important it is that we never, for one moment, relax in our efforts to gain freedom for all peoples of the world. They have seen their Greek countrymen continually threatened by oppression during recent years. They have seen the peoples of neighboring countries suffer under the stranglehold of oppression for centuries, with the flame and hope of freedom flaring forth time and time again, only to be smothered by some new enemy. They know what a very real fight the fight for freedom must be.

The Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine, Mr. President, have been our weapons in recent years in the fight for freedom for all peoples. They have been effective weapons. We have seen the tide turn again and again in countries which feared the oppression of communism. We have seen the Greek people succeed in their efforts to retain their ideals of freedom. We have seen Europe once again on the road to freedom and security. The Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine have done a tremendous job, but their job is not completed. America must continue to strive for the freedom of all peoples by every means possible, for only through freedom can the world obtain peace.

I ask unanimous consent that my address before the Ahepa chapters be printed in the Appendix in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For millions of people, the ideals of freedom for which the world fought the bitterest war in history are ideals which have not yet become realities.

It was, I believe, Winston Churchill who gave the world a suitable name for what has happened in eastern Europe in the years which have followed the end of World War II. In a speech given in the spring of 1946, Mr. Churchill remarked that an iron curtain had been drawn across the continent of Europe. He went on to say that behind that curtain lay the ancient, great capitals of eastern Europe: Berlin and Warsaw, Prague and Budapest, Belgrade and Bucharest, and Sofia.

For centuries the people of eastern Europe have seen their homelands turned into bloody battlegrounds. For centuries, the efforts of the eastern European peoples to achieve peace with their neighbors, and freedom from oppression by their rulers, have been efforts thwarted by the countless and merciless forces of history. Great states with free governments, with free elections, and with free people, have risen only to fall when some new vanguard of oppression overwhelmed them.

The people of eastern Europe have lived with tragedy for centuries. They have seen fortune turn against them again and again. To me, however, the most hopeful note of all lies in the fact that the desire for freedom has survived in the hearts of these people despite the tragic history of their efforts to obtain liberty.

While I realize that in the minds of most of us the events of recent years are remembered with a painful clarity, I would like tonight to look back briefly over some of the things which have happened since the close of World War II; I would like to review for you some of the things which have been done constructively to rekindle the hope for peace and freedom in the future; and, in short, to sum up for you where I think matters stand now, and to outline for you, as I see them, some of the steps which remain to be taken.

I think it is fitting to illustrate this unhappy period for the people of eastern Europe by directing our attention to what has taken place in Greece since 1946. I say this for several reasons. Perhaps the most important is the fact that the Greek people have shared with the Estonians, the Latvians, the Lithuanians, the Poles, the Czechs, the Slavs, the Ukrainians, the Hungarians, the Rumanians, the Bulgars, the Serbs, the Croats, and the Albanians, the threat of oppression by a single philosophy of totalitarian control. Another reason, obviously, is the fact that this control has been imposed upon all these peoples from without—imposed upon them by a system which seeks the domination of the entire world—imposed upon them with such an overwhelming threat of force that they have been reduced to pawns in the gigantic game for mastery of the planet.

Let us look at Greece by the end of World War II. Her people were starving. Her agricultural economy was so badly broken that it could not conceivably undertake the job of feeding her people. What industry had existed in Greece prior to World War II was so badly crippled that only 40 percent of it was in operation.

Yet, in 1946 there were two free elections held in Greece. On the last day of March in that year, general elections were held to select representatives to the Greek Parliament. In September of the same year, a majority of the Greek people decided, again in a free election, that it wished to see the restoration of its monarchy. Both of these elections were held under the watchful eyes of international observers, whose duty it was to assure the Greek people of an opportunity to vote as they wished to vote—to vote without fear of retaliation for speaking their minds.

Trouble followed. Defeated at the polls, a handful of hardened Communist revolutionaries, backed with assistance furnished them across the borders of Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, sought to achieve through violence what they had failed to accomplish through democratic processes. They sought to destroy every vestige of democracy in Greece, and they were backed in these efforts by the Cominform, a body I scarcely need identify for you.

The Greek Government was in a poor position to ward off an organized, systematic attack upon it—an attack made possible through arms furnished by the Soviet Government. As I have already said, the Greek economy was close to collapse, thanks to the merciless treatment it had received in the hands of the occupying Nazi forces during World War II.

The Greek Government appealed to the Security Council of the United Nations, and as a result of that appeal, a special commission was appointed to investigate the charges alleged by the Greek Government. That commission reported back to the Security Council, saying in effect, that the charges alleged were, in fact, true. Efforts were made immediately by the American and British delegates of the Security Council to act in Greece and put an end to this threat. The Russian veto killed off any hope that the Security Council might act.

It was in this setting that the Truman doctrine was born. In March of 1947, President Truman urged the Congress to undertake a vast obligation in southeastern Europe. He did so because certain facts were absolutely clear. First, it was clear that without help the Government of Greece would fall, and the country would become a Soviet satellite. Turkey needed help. It was also clear that the Russian veto would stop any effective action by the Security Council of the UN.

We had a fight, of course, in the Congress, as you might have expected, for there is still a noisy handful of Senators and Representatives who believe that America is round—of those who still believed that America could be kept strong and free even if we let the rest of the world go hang. I think all of you know that this group does not truly reflect the sentiments of an overwhelming number of American people, and thus it was that the Congress endorsed President Truman's proposal a short time after it was made.

The flow of American assistance into Greece and Turkey gave birth to a new hope that the fate of Communist oppression could be avoided. I think we must be realistic, however, in admitting that the year which passed between the spring of 1947 and the spring of 1948 was a year of fear for those who believed in democracy and freedom. It was in this period that the outcome of Communist efforts in Greece and Turkey was gravely uncertain. It was in this same year that the economy of all of Europe staggered so badly that it seemed virtually impossible to avoid a complete collapse, and it was in this same year that the Communists secured their positions in eastern Germany, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary, and in the Balkan countries to the south. The winter of 1947 and 1948, as all of us recall, was the winter the veterans cast anxious eyes at the uniforms they had laid aside, wondering whether, in a matter of weeks, they would be called on once more to save democracy through the merciless and inhuman mechanism of war. A Communist-inspired general strike threatened calamity in France. The general elections due in Italy in the spring of 1948 gave rise to the real fear that the Communists would gain control of the Italian Government. This was, in truth, a year of paralyzing terror for millions of the world's people.

I have a deep and humble pride, however, in the fact that the American people rose to the challenge of the cold war. We were not paralyzed; we were thinking, and we were thinking constructively. In June of 1947 our great soldier-statesman, George C. Marshall, had thrown out the suggestion of the plan which later was to bear his name. It is true, of course, that 10 months passed between the birth of the Marshall plan idea and the day that the Congress of the United States created the European recovery program. While we did not hear much about it at the time, a tremendous amount of planning and blueprinting was accomplished in the dark months which followed General Marshall's statement at Harvard in June of 1947. The blueprints for the Marshall plan were drawn up, not by Americans alone, but by the true believers in democracy that were still to be found in the free countries of Europe. Without that planning there never could have been a European recovery program, and, despite the fact that it took us 10 long months to complete the blueprints, the job was done in time.

I have often felt that one phase of the Marshall plan has not been clearly understood. In General Marshall's original outline of his program he invited every government of Europe to participate in the joint and necessary enterprise of rebuilding the European economy. He added, however, one proviso. He made it equally clear that American assistance would not be given to foster antidemocratic developments. There had been initial requests made by representatives of many governments behind the iron curtain to participate in Marshall plan assistance. Pressure from Moscow forced these countries to withdraw their requests. I can scarcely tell you what a bitter disappointment it was to all of us that the countries behind the iron curtain were powerless to participate in the Marshall plan.

Less than 2 years have passed since the ECA was born. We, of course, continued throughout this period to furnish military assistance to the governments of Greece and Turkey, in order to make the Truman doctrine effective. In these 2 years we have passed the turning point in the cold war. The combination of the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan is paying off.

By the 1st of September 1949 the Government of Greece was able to announce that the Communist guerrillas had been driven past their borders, and that civil order had been restored. Turkey was secure. In country after country that had participated in the Marshall plan, the Communist group had been resoundingly turned down at the polls, and there was new life and new hope in all of the free countries of Europe.

The job isn't done. I think, however, we can say, without being smug or complacent, that tremendous progress has been made in these 2 years—progress which I am confident will lead us ultimately to a free and democratic world which will live in peace.

We have a great deal of work yet to do. For example, the Marshall plan was drawn up on the assumption that economic recovery in Europe could be achieved by 1952. Thus we are at the half-way point in that program. Those who know most about Europe and its problems are united in their belief that we must continue the recovery program until its job is done. These same experts agree that all our good work in Europe would be undone in a matter of months if we were to discontinue the recovery program before its task is completed.

Returning for a moment to Greece, her troubles are not yet over. Civil order has, as I've said, been restored. American assistance in the economic recovery of Greece has brought back her agricultural production to a level which is now higher than prewar. Industrial production in Greece has been doubled since the end of the war. These accomplishments are not enough. We can be deeply grateful that there is no longer famine in Greece, that there is enough to eat now. The road ahead for the Greek people, however, must lead them in the direction of far greater industrial development, in order to be self-sufficient and independent of foreign charity, and that is the problem which the Greek Government and Marshall-plan representatives are devoting most of their attention to at the present time.

There is a further problem for the Greek people. During the guerrilla warfare, during the days that arms and food and support for the guerrillas flowed across the borders of Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, there was another kind of traffic moving in the opposite direction. Thousands and thousands of Greek children crossed those borders and are, today, held captive in these surrounding countries. The disappearance of those children poses a problem which is above politics. In appealing for the return of those children to their families, we must appeal in the name of humanity. There is no deeper human emotion than the emotion with which we regard the ties of family and the importance of home in the development of our children into responsible, sensitive, and peace-loving citizens. World public opinion decries the retention of these children in foreign lands, away from their families and away from their homes. On two separate occasions the General Assembly of the United Nations has endorsed strongly worded resolutions in protest of this. In addition, I can assure you that President Truman, the State Department, and the Congress are fully informed of these facts. I am sure all of you here know of the recent exchange of messages between President Truman and His Grace, Michael, orthodox archbishop of North and South America.

President Truman assured Archbishop Michael that this Government intended to continue to give the utmost support to the efforts of the United Nations and the international Red Cross organizations in seeing to it that the children removed from Greece during the guerrilla warfare will be returned to their homes and families.

Then, a week ago today, Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, introduced what is now known as Senate Resolution 212. This is a short resolution that, I think you will agree with me, is effective in what it says, and I shall read it to you now.

"*Resolved*, That the Senate profoundly condemns the action of the Communist guerrilla forces in Greece in abducting thousands of Greek children and carrying them off into servitude in countries of eastern Europe during the course of the recent Communist guerrilla warfare in Greece, and request the President to exert all of his powers, acting through the United Nations and other international organizations and directly with the governments of the countries where these children are confined, to the end that these thousands of children shall be speedily returned to their homes and homeland."

This resolution is now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I give you my pledge that I shall support it with every effort when it is brought before the Senate for a vote.

I have tried in a brief way to summarize in general terms a great deal of history, but I do not believe this summary could be complete without some brief discussion of the displaced-persons program. The DP law which was passed by the Congress in 1948, despite the fact that it has been of material assistance to thousands and thousands of refugees driven from their countries as a consequence of World War II, is, as it now stands, an inadequate law. I firmly believe that within a matter of weeks we will have cured most of the defects of the present act. I have fought for a decent DP law in every way possible, and I am now absolutely certain that my efforts and the efforts of those who have also fought for a good law will be successful. One of the major things that we intend to do in amending the 1948 act is to change a date. Let we explain what this means. Under the existing law, no person is eligible for admission to America under that program unless he was driven from his own country prior to December 22, 1945. We intend to advance this date to January 1949. This means that thousands and thousands who, because they opposed the Communist regimes of eastern Europe, were forced to flee, will soon find it possible to enter America where they may live in freedom. Just as I left Washington today, I learned that the Displaced Persons Commission has recommended that the Senate alter the DP bill which has already passed the House of Representatives to provide for a total of 10,000 people of Greek descent who had been forced into exile from their homeland between 1940 and January 1, 1949, as a result either of the Nazi occupation or of the Communist guerrilla warfare. I intend to give this amendment my full support.

Ahead of us, as I have already indicated, lie grave responsibilities if we are to achieve the desired peace and freedom in the world which is so deeply hoped for everywhere. I can tell you that I sincerely believe we are headed in the right direction. Our efforts to contain the spread of communism are unquestionably proving successful. What remains to be done is to peel back the borders which now represent the extent to which communism has spread. We in the democracies are armed with the truth: our institutions, because they exist in an atmosphere of liberty, are enduring institutions, and the truth about them is penetrating the "iron curtain" every day. We in the democracies are tremendously assisted by the longing for freedom that is in the souls of all the people who today exist under the ruthless totalitarian dictatorships which the Communists have thrust upon the countries of eastern Europe. This longing for liberty in the hearts of the people behind the "iron curtain" has not been killed, and it will not be killed by any efforts the Communists may attempt. A faith in freedom is an abiding faith that no amount of empty promises can do away with.

The Communists have charged that America has world-wide aims. I will accept that charge. We do have a world-wide aim, and it is this: It is our goal that all peoples in the world shall have the opportunity to choose their own Government through democratic processes. It is our goal that the people shall be masters of their governments, and not that the governments shall master the people. It is our goal that every man shall achieve for himself the right to worship as he chooses to worship, the right to speak as he wishes to speak, the right to think as he wishes to think, and the right to live secure in a job of his own choosing in a world of peace. This is America's world-wide aim, and if we work hard enough at the job, as I believe we intend to, I am sure that we will succeed.

Taxes Set to Verse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a poem on taxes by C. H. Foster, Fairbanks Morse & Co., Beloit, Wis. I commend it to all Members of the House.

If we want to know how England
Will continue to exist,
If we're worried 'bout the Germans
And their late financial twists,

If we wonder just how China
Could endure another war,
And we feel that money matters
Cause the Japs to feel quite sore.

We can pack away our troubles
In that little old kit bag,
And just settle down to working
Day and night without a lag.

For the politicians, many
Feeling sorry for the Axis,
Will eliminate their troubles
Just by boosting all our taxes.

And as soon as they have gathered
All the money that's in sight,
They will pose as peace defenders
And our sons will have to fight.

There is only one more action
That remains to rate a tax,
And we feel that soon 'twill happen
If we get the least bit lax.

For a small machine could easily
Be made for installation,
On those of us who labor hard
To keep away starvation.

'Twould let us breathe quite freely
For a given length of time,
After which, 'twould shut our breath off
'Til we plugged it with a dime.

But there is a way to settle
And avoid a lot of trouble,
If the country will stop spending
Foolish dough on fairy rubble.

For respect from other nations
That is bought with U. S. dough,
Will not last a minute longer
When donations cease to go.

The Victim of the New Deal Character-Assassination Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, therefore granted, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Dr. Wirt, of Gary, and the Hiss Liberals," which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of February 3, 1950:

DR. WIRT, OF GARY, AND THE HISS LIBERALS

The evidence proving Alger Hiss a Communist spy proved also that Dr. Wirt, the Gary schoolmaster, knew what he was talking about back in March 1934, only a year after the New Deal came to power.

The substance of Dr. Wirt's testimony was that many young Communists had found influential places in the New Deal administration and were promoting revolution from the inside.

Dr. Wirt's charges were explosive because he was the first to state publicly what many had come to suspect but couldn't prove. The accusation came out almost by accident. James H. Rand, testifying before the House Committee on Interstate Commerce at the end of February 1934 gave Dr. Wirt as authority for the allegation of treachery within the administration.

The Roosevelt idolators were enraged at this attack on their hero and demanded vengeance on the schoolman.

Dr. Wirt had been present at a dinner party attended, as he said, by some of the brain trusters. They had told him that by restricting recovery and by the use of propaganda to undermine the people's confidence in the free economy and representative government, they could gain their end. Among the words Dr. Wirt quoted were these which he attributed to Laurence Todd, correspondent in Washington of the Soviets' Tass news agency:

"We believe that we have Mr. Roosevelt in the middle of a swift stream and that the current is so strong that he cannot turn back or escape from it. We believe that we can keep Mr. Roosevelt there until we are ready to supplant him with a Stalin. We all think that Mr. Roosevelt is only the Kerensky of this revolution."

THE SIXTY ARE OF MUD SLINGING

Dr. Wirt was summoned to appear before a congressional inquiry. He became one of the first Americans to receive the smear treatment. Representative BULWINKLE, the chairman of the investigating committee, said in a speech in Congress that Dr. Wirt had served a term in jail during the First World War for pro-German activities.

This was wholly false, as Mr. BULWINKLE later confessed. He said that the information had come to him from what anyone would consider reliable sources. He did not name them but acknowledged that "the report is not true and therefore as a man and as a Member of this House, I tender my apologies to Dr. Wirt."

A few days later, however, Mr. BULWINKLE said that, though his committee itself did not intend to press charges of perjury against Dr. Wirt, "there is no reason why the district attorney and the grand jury shouldn't be able to take notice of the case."

Fifteen years later another grand jury did take notice of the case, but with a very different purpose and result.

Harold Ickes was another of the mud slingers. Mr. Ickes said that Dr. Wirt had sought unsuccessfully to obtain Public Works Administration funds to develop a section of beach along the Indiana dunes. Dr. Wirt had paid several visits to PWA headquarters, said Mr. Ickes, and was quite willing to use communistic money for his private enrichment.

Dr. Wirt replied as promptly as he could that "I have not been interested and no one else connected with Dune Acres, Inc., referred to by Secretary Ickes, has been interested in securing any money from any Federal, State, or local government for any sort of project."

Dr. Wirt supplied a quantity of detail in support of his assertion, but Mr. Ickes had the louder voice and it may be doubted that the denial ever caught up with the accusation.

A pretty good measure of a citizen's political sagacity is the credence he gave at the time to Dr. Wirt's accusation. Those who believed the man from Gary was telling the truth were politically intelligent.

Several other touchstones to political acumen and integrity at that period are available. Those self-styled liberals who didn't recognize the Republic Steel massacre in South Chicago for what it was—a Communist promotion—were not very bright. The same must be said of those who wasted sympathy on the bonus marchers, another Communist promotion.

TESTS OF INTEGRITY

The most serviceable index of all, of course, is the attitude of an individual toward the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The best that can be said of anyone who at any time sought to disband the committee is that he is a jackass. The worst is that he is a traitor.

To the everlasting credit of the Members of successive Houses of Representatives is the fact that the great majority of them never yielded to the propaganda, the smears, and the threats of the jackasses and traitors, but kept the committee in being to perform its great service in the defense of the American Republic against the traitors in the New Deal administration.

Sponsoring Farmers All Praise DP's—Virginia's DP's Fast Taking Root

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Dushnyck, from the Washington Post of February 5, 1950:

SPONSORING FARMERS ALL PRAISE DP'S—VIRGINIA'S DP'S FAST TAKING ROOT

(By Walter Dushnyck)

The great majority of Virginia's new Americans—as displaced persons are affectionately called—are well on the road to readjustment and resettlement, according to a survey in Orange and Madison Counties.

More than 1,000 DP's have been resettled in Virginia. Of these, some 880 came to this country under the auspices of War Relief Services-National Catholic Welfare Conference, while the remainder had the help of other American volunteer agencies. These include the National Lutheran Council, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society and the United Ukrainian American Relief Committee of Philadelphia.

The national backgrounds of the Virginia displaced persons are chiefly Polish, Ukrainian, Lithuanian and Latvian (in that order). There are smaller groups of Estonians, Hungarians, Czechs, and Jews.

The overwhelming majority of Virginia's new Americans work on dairy and beef cattle farms.

In the course of our survey, we talked to both farmers and DP's, to representatives of religious organizations and social-welfare groups, and to State farm authorities. What we heard is encouraging. American farmers and European DP's are endeavoring to help each other with the least friction possible.

GOD-FEARING PEOPLE

The Reverend Andrew Taillieu, I. H. M., a Belgian missionary priest who serves two Roman Catholic parishes in Orange and Culpeper, Va., spent one evening and an entire day taking us to various farms where his DP families are working.

"All the farmers I know who accepted European displaced persons are well pleased with them. With the spring they might take some more," said Father Taillieu. "As a general rule, these DP's are God-fearing and law-abiding people, and they are worthy of any help Americans can give them."

Father Taillieu added that if the DP is a genuine farmer, there is usually only the initial difficulty that comes from lack of English and unfamiliarity with American farm machinery. When the European is also a carpenter, his additional aptitude comes in handy on any farm.

"One encouraging thing," said Father Taillieu, "is that farmers who have DP families often send for the DP's farmer relatives or neighbors."

There are 13 DP families in Orange County and 12 in Culpeper County. All 25 families are Catholic, and the largest number is Polish. There are 8 Ukrainian, 3 Lithuanian, 3 Latvian, and 2 Hungarian families.

"Only one family left our neighborhood," said Father Taillieu, "and we think they were not farmers, although they worked hard and in every respect seemed to be decent people. When the opportunity arose, the family, with two boys of 21 and 23 years of age, took off for Youngstown, Ohio, where they had some distant relatives."

THE LANGUAGE BARRIER

What sometimes causes misunderstanding between farmers and DP's is the lack of a common tongue. It takes time before the sponsor and the DP can understand each other even in sign language.

"There are psychological reasons that add to the initial misunderstanding," said Father Taillieu. "For instance, the DP's despite their harsh treatment in Nazi or Russian concentration or slave-labor camps, are terribly disappointed when the houses in which they have to live here are quite dilapidated. After these are repaired, they take their initial difficulties with a light heart."

The DP's on farms usually work 10 hours a day, 6 days a week, with every other Sunday free except for the regular chores. Their wage is usually $60 to $80 a month, plus some groceries, meat, milk, butter, wood for fuel and, of course, a free tenant house.

The Rev. T. A. Graves, minister of the Hebron Lutheran Church at Madison, Va., has helped Luthern DP's, mainly Latvians and Estonians, to settle in his county.

"In my experience with the DP's, I have found nothing but complete satisfaction," he said.

"They are gradually overcoming the language and custom difficulties, and so are being slowly integrated into American life. Of course, we had one or two cases that 'did not work,' but these were exceptions."

FARM LABOR NEEDED

"There is plenty of room here for honest people willing to work," said John C. Estes, county agent of Orange County. "Sponsors in our area are generally well satisfied with their DP families. The demand for farm workers is above normal.

"Any dissatisfaction with the DP's can be attributed to a variety of causes. Among them are the following:

"1. Some sponsors who need DP's most badly are those who have always had trouble with local help and cannot keep any help very long.

"2. It has been proved that placement of persons on a farm who had better conditons in their home countries before the war is not the best way of helping them or of giving satisfaction to the sponsor. When these people have not been farmers, even if they try their best, a feeling remains that they are not making any progress.

"3. Finally, in cases where the DP-sponsor combination does not work, it may be that the DP's are getting unfair treatment."

Estes was full of praise for the Lutheran and Catholic organizations which work to resettle DP's on farms.

"We county agents," he said, "could place our applications directly through the United States Displaced Persons Commission in Washington, but in my county we prefer that any application for DP's be approved also by the pastor or the priest of the church to which the applicant belongs. It works much better."

Estes said that the DP's were quickly adapting themselves to the American way of life. The men and children are doing this more rapidly than the DP women, because of their everyday contacts with American people.

ALWAYS DOING GOOD

Estes spoke of his own Lithuanian DP family, named Paleckis:

"The man is an excellent worker and a good human being, always wanting to do something beneficial.

"I don't pamper my DP family," Estes said. "I treat them just as I would treat any American family, and the same way I would like to be treated if I were in their place."

Asked about the behavior of the DP's, Estes said:

"The DP's in Orange County have had no tangles with the law. There is no indication whatsoever that they might be engaged in any subversive activities.

"If you hear occasional complaints about DP's by American sponsors, you should not be surprised. The good cases as a rule don't make the news, and in our country the DP cases are overwhelmingly successful in every respect."

Estes said complaints that DP's are slower workers than Americans, and that they are not used to American farm machinery, are to be expected, but that these things do not prevent successful resettlement.

YOUNG TEACHERS

Douglas Hill owns a large dairy farm at Orange, Va. He has accepted the Marian Dudzik family, a Polish couple and five children. The family had worked on a farm in Poland, and Hill said that he could not wish for any better family to work on his farm.

While the 18-year-old son, Czeslaw, helps his father, three other children, Joseph, 15; Genevieve, 13; and Tadeuss, 12, attend public school at Radiant, Va. These children come home from school and teach their parents English, thus helping them to overcome the language barrier.

Robert Sisk, manager of Mayhurst Farm, Orange, owned by Frank E. Daniel, said there is an excellent relationship between him and his wife on one hand and the Polish DP farmer, Roman Wajler, on the other. The Sisks often visit the DP family, which lives in a good tenant house a few hundred yards from the manager's home.

Here we found something rather unusual. Daniel, the owner, is building a new house for Wajler's parents and sister, who are still in Europe. That is something concrete to demonstrate the usefulness of DP's to American farmers.

PRAISED BY ANOTHER

Hartsell Spence, the writer (One Foot in Heaven; Happily Ever After), and his wife have a Latvian family on their place at Somerset, Va. They were warm in their praise of Philip and Antonina Skapars, but Spence added:

"I made my position clear at the beginning of their stay with me. I told them that I do not expect them to stay with me forever. As soon as they get on their feet, they may leave for something better. I would never hold them back if they could do better somewhere else."

Spence, however, would like to have them remain and eventually become coowners of the farm.

Skapars is running the farm, with some supervision, and is repairing and painting all the outbuildings on his own volition. He also has proved to be an experienced veterinarian; he saved Spence's horse while Spence was away.

"My DP's certainly are not bashful about asking questions," said Spence. "At the beginning, it was sign language and pantomine. Then the children became a great help. When we are tired of gesticulating at one another, we wait until Antonina comes home from school. She translates our conversation.

"The children are doing very well in school. They have already been advanced one grade."

J. T. Walker, principal of the public school at Orange, said that the 16 DP children in his classes are fully accepted by the other children.

"After the first day in class," he recalled, "a DP boy was invited to a drug store by some of the older boys for a chocolate soda.

"On the whole, the DP children are extremely diligent workers. The only difficulty is that of the language and that, too, is overcome rapidly."

SOME "CASUALTIES"

We discussed the over-all DP picture with the Rev. F. Harold Nott, vice chairman of the Richmond Diocesan Resettlement Committee for Displaced Persons. He pronounced the program a success and said that, in the case of Catholic DPs, the success was due mainly to the work of the local parish priests.

He, too, spoke of the inevitable "casualties," i. e., DPs who could not stay on farms. But those casualties are rather insignificant in comparison with the overwhelming successes in Virginia.

From the moral viewpoint, the DP's in Virginia are excellent people. There has not been one crime committed by a DP.

These people also remember what happened when their homelands were taken over by the Russians. They are overwhelmingly anti-Communist and do not hide their feelings about Russia.

Father Nott believes that for continued successful resettlement of DP's in Virginia, the following points should be stressed:

1. The DP's who are going to farms should be genuine farmers—a first condition of success.

2. Nationalities should not be mixed on one farm, for not all of them get along well together. It is always better when two or more DP families of the same nationality are put together.

3. The sponsor and the DP's should not live in the same house, for several reasons. One is the difference in language; another, the difference in customs and habits.

4. The sponsor should see that the DP's have the opportunity to attend mass on Sunday. This is generally observed, and here interreligious cooperation has met all difficulties. The Lutheran sponsor takes his Catholic DP's to the nearest Catholic church.

LAW NEEDS TEETH

When asked about the possibility of further settlement of DP's in Virginia, Father Nott said there is still a need for genuine farmers and domestics. He believes that some sort of State board should be set up to intervene in difficulties arising between sponsors and DP's.

He also believes that the DP law should have "teeth" in it; that DP farmers who sign an agreement to work on farms should be obligated to stay there a certain time, to give the sponsor a chance to get back the money he invested in rebuilding the tenant house or in paying the DP's overland transportation.

This survey of the DP situation in Virginia was made possible through the cooperation this writer received from Father Nott; Miss Joan Midkiff, secretary of the Richmond Diocesan resettlement committee; Jack McGann, of Washington, area director of war relief services-NCWC, and the sponsors and DP's who provided information.

Our Irresponsible Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. Henry Hazlitt which appeared in Newsweek for February 6. This is a timely editorial and should be read by all members of this House, as we shall soon be considering the new budget.

Whatever may be thought of the President's tax message to Congress as a 1950 campaign document, there is only one possible

judgment of it as a statement of fiscal policy. It is irresponsible.

In his budget message, for peacetime, for a year expected to record one of the three highest national incomes of our history, Mr. Truman planned a deficit of $6,000,000,000. He now joins the popular clamor for reducing excise taxes. He asks Congress to impose compensating taxes, most of which would be even more harmful than the taxes he asks it to reduce. In order to reduce taxes which burden consumption he proposes to increase taxes which burden production. But even if all his proposals were carried out, and if the resulting yields came up to his expectations, he would still be recommending a deficit of more than $4,000,000,000.

If there is any fiscal responsibility in Congress itself, its course is clear. It should return his proposed 1951 budget to Mr. Truman without approval, and request him to submit a responsible, balanced budget, with provision for a minimum debt reduction of $500,000,000.

If it agrees that it is desirable to cut excise taxes by, say, $700,000,000, and to allow not less than $500,000,000 for debt reduction, and if it agrees that other taxes are already at if not far beyond the highest levels that our economy can tolerate, Congress should become even more explicit. It should point out to the President that his present proposed expenditures of $42,440,000,000 for 1951 must be slashed by a minimum of $5,440,000,000 to make a responsible, balanced budget possible. The total expenditures under such a responsible budget, in other words, could not exceed $36,000,000,000.

A responsible Congress would further inform the President that he ought not to place upon it the impossible burden of trying to find where all the wastes, inefficiencies, and nonessential items in his budget are; and that if he wishes to avoid what he calls "foolish budget slashes" it is his job to make the cuts himself. Congress should tell the President, in other words, that he will have to learn to get along on a mere $36,000,000,000 in the next fiscal year, even if this is only four or five times the rate at which the Roosevelt administration spent in peacetime and nine times the rate of spending under the Hoover administration.

A responsible Congress would go on to demand executive responsibility. The proposals in the President's tax message are extremely vague. Congress should insist that the administration spell them out in detail; tell exactly what excise taxes it wants on what; exactly what new corporate rates it wants; and exactly what new provisions for oil and mine depletion. Congress should ask the administration, in brief, to draft and submit the complete text of its proposed tax-law changes. Congress is under no obligation to adopt these administration proposals; but Congress and the country should insist on knowing precisely what they are. That is the only way to get executive responsibility.

Mr. Truman's tax message is honeycombed with contradictions. He permits in declaring, for instance, that the deficit of more than $4,000,000,000 which he plans for the fiscal year 1951 "will be due largely to the eleventh-hour tax reduction enacted by the Eightieth Congress." If Mr. Truman really believes what he says, his only consistent course is to recommend immediate restoration of the higher tax rates prevailing before the cut. He actually declares, on the contrary, that "nothing could be more foolhardy than to attempt to bring about a balanced budget in 1951" by "drastic increases in tax rates" or "drastic cuts in essential expenditures." So he denounces the Eightieth Congress for bringing about a deficit that he insists upon maintaining.

The country is in grave financial peril unless the Administration can be brought to end this political double-talk and recognize its responsibilities.

Middle-Income Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, one of the important measures that will be considered shortly by the Senate is the so-called middle-income housing bill. The passage of this bill will mean that thousands of people who have hitherto been unable to finance new homes will be able to do so. In a recent news letter to the people of Pennsylvania, I have explained various provisions of the bill, and I ask unanimous consent to have this news letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 26, 1950.

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Even if you aren't planning to build a new home, you may be affected by the middle-income housing bill due for consideration shortly by the Senate, having passed the House—because our home-building industry is a cornerstone of our whole economic life.

Our economy prospers when home-building flourishes, and we head for a slump when building falls off.

One-fifth of our domestic private investment goes into residential construction.

Our mines, farms, and thousands of businesses depend on a steady flow of their products into home construction in order to stay profitable.

And new homes provide markets for thousands more producers, distributors, and retailers of household furnishings and materials for home maintenance.

So, whatever your plans, you should be familiar with the new housing proposals, because the well-being of our economy affects you.

Increased production of privately owned homes is a major purpose of the pending bill. The Housing Act of 1949, as you recall, provides for publicly owned, low-rent housing for those in the bottom-income brackets who simply could not otherwise afford decent shelter. The new bill is designed to assist those who could afford to buy a home, but are unable to find adequate financing arrangements under today's prices.

Homes costing less than $10,000 will be encouraged, because the need is greatest among families who can afford to buy in that price range; the market for higher-priced homes is starting to dry up—either because those who can pay above $10,000 have bought recently, or are satisfied where they are; home construction will drop, and the industry sicken, unless new markets develop.

Smaller down payments will be required on FHA-approved loans—and FHA mortgage insurance will be easier to obtain for soundly constructed homes costing up to $9,000. By liberalizing mortgage insurance provisions, private investment in smaller homes will be encouraged—and such investment will be encouraged still further by enlarging the secondary mortgage market.

Cooperative housing will be developed under title III of the proposed bill. Co-op housing is a development of this century in America, but it has a long history in many other countries. Members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has made glowing reports on the co-op developments they saw during their European visit last fall.

Co-ops work thus: A group of families buys some land together, forms a cooperative to purchase materials, to hire a building contractor, and to maintain the homes after their completion. The bill proposes a new Government service to furnish technical advice to those who wish to form cooperatives—and provides short-term planning loans to assist in getting things started. The co-op would be financed by private investment in debentures that are Government-insured. A 2½ percent down payment in the co-op is proposed, and the interest rate is expected to be about 3 percent—much lower than in ordinary home financing. Nonprofit rental housing projects will be aided in the same fashion.

Veterans will find home loans easier to obtain. The bill proposes to do away with the confusion of separate FHA and GI loans by combining them into a single loan running up to $10,000 at an interest rate of 4 percent. The GI home loan hasn't worked out as expected 5 years ago. The bill will make the GI loan work by permitting veterans unable to obtain a loan through private sources to borrow direct from the Government. And, as a result of the Myers-McMahon amendment I introduced, widows of veterans who died from service-connected injuries will also be able to obtain GI home loans.

I support the middle-income housing bill. It will be a big help in ending the housing shortage, and thus ultimately ending the need for rent control. It will encourage private ownership of homes. And by increasing the output of new homes, it will keep one of the basic industries in our free-enterprise system expanding and healthy.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Harmony in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Harmony in the Armed Services—An Exclusive Interview With General Eisenhower," from United States News and World Report. I am informed by the Public Printer that the article is estimated to make two and a half pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $205.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARMONY IN THE ARMED SERVICES—AN EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW WITH GENERAL EISENHOWER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—No man in the world today can speak with such authority as Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower on the value of coordination where different military services are concerned. His experience covers not only the coordination of Army, Navy, and Air Force of our own in Europe but also the bringing together of the forces of Allied countries. The general responded to an invitation to come to the conference rooms of United States News and World Report and answer the questions of its editors on some

of the basic principles of interservice harmony.

(In accordance with our usual practice, the full text of this interview is being released this week to the press and radio.)

Question. The popular conception, General Eisenhower, is that in Europe you had a more effective coordination of the three armed services than existed in other theaters. What lesson can be derived from that experience?

Answer. There were not present with us some of the causes that might have led to friction in other places. For example: The second the soldier went ashore in Europe a general started commanding. There is another system under which the Navy stays in charge of men going ashore until, as it is said, the Army can take feasible command. This difference grows out of differences in experience, and, under some circumstances, the second arrangement is good. But because it introduces a determination by two men to be based upon judgment as to feasibility, friction can easily develop.

BASES FOR COOPERATION IN EUROPE

Also, in other theaters, operating forces often were a long, long way from their top commander. I, on the other hand, could always be right next to my command. There was no chance for an argument to build up—they could call over to me and say: "What do you want us to do now?" And hence there were absent, I think, some of the causes of friction.

Also, from the beginning in the Pacific there were two separate theaters of operation—one from Australia and one from Hawaii. We did not have that to contend with in Europe. So I should certainly be the last to maintain that there was any special qualification or any special genius in directing this problem in Europe. We probably did not have as difficult a situation.

Question. Did the Navy cooperate freely with you?

Answer. At the beginning of the war, when I was designated as the European commander, Admiral [Ernest J.] King [Chief of Naval Operations, 1942–45] called me in. We sat in his office and he said, "Now, look—this is the first attempt in American history to operate combined forces under the principle of single command. We have talked about some meaningless words called paramount interest. He said, "I want you to understand, General, as far as the United States Navy is concerned, you're in command as long as you're in command."

It was then that he invited me to wire him directly if I ever saw any trouble with any part of the Navy. Once, I think it was just a slip of a pen somewhere, we were suddenly to lose all of our naval staff officers except three. I wired Admiral King and the order was countermanded in 20 minutes.

Our operations, except for landings, were chiefly ground and air. Naval losses and day-by-day functioning were not an intimate part of our activities. But the naval role was clear and vital, and naval failure would have meant failure for all.

BUILDING A WORKABLE COMMAND

Question. Doesn't the real difficulty arise in understanding of the word "unification"? Isn't "coordination" of the armed forces what really happened in your operation?

Answer. Except, of course, if you have people working together as partners and in the proper atmosphere, there are a few questions that have to be referred elsewhere for decision.

I think there is one principle that applies with any combined command. I am sure it applies with an allied command. The principle is that you really must build your way into command. When you start in you've got to do a lot of urging and cajoling. But finally there comes a time when everybody suddenly realizes that this machine is working pretty well.

There is built gradually for the allied team that same kind of loyalty that you have for your own division or your own battalion. Governments get confidence in the headquarters and its personnel, and once that confidence is built up, your recognized right to issue orders, which you could not possibly have issued a few months before, becomes quite clear.

For example, the highest British officials told me several times in the early days of our plan to invade Normandy: "General, please remember that any officer of the British forces serving under you is there because you want him. Any expression of dissatisfaction on your part will be instant cause for his removal."

You could not have imagined such a statement being made to any Allied commander on the first day we started off to war. At the beginning we are all imbued with the thought: "My duty is to protect my country against this ally here and that ally there." Since I saw that attitude disappear in war, I think that finally there is going to disappear a man's belief that his primary duty is to protect his service against the decisions of the whole security establishment.

STEPS TOWARD EFFICIENCY

Question. Would that be helped if we made the three services divisions of one service?

Answer. I do not think so. I think that in arguing these details of organization we are just setting up straw men to whip. It is not for me to preach, but I say this: Anyone who is really interested in our country's security can help a lot by beginning to express confidence in the theory and say: "We've had all sorts of trouble and we do not for a minute believe that any single person has been to blame. We take back nothing we've urged in the past, but the time has come to hammer on the constructive side for the future."

That is what I believe, and I believe it so thoroughly that I did not want to go before the House Armed Services Committee last autumn. The authorities insisted, so I came down. I said, "I won't talk about this quarrel. There has been enough name calling and I think this committee as well as everybody else has got to start looking toward the future."

For that is all we're really concerned about. Why are we spending this defense money? It is for the future. It is not to make applicable somebody's concept of how I should have used the Navy at Salerno, or how someone else should have used the Army at Okinawa, or somewhere else.

We ought to be turning our eyes to the future with an approach that will help our service staffs to get together. Because, like the rest of us, they are all human. They have their little prejudices, their stumbling blocks. But I have tremendous confidence in their capacity to do work together.

Question. Isn't it true that the feeling within the services is that they get along better outside of Washington than they do in Washington?

Answer. Yes. Several times I have observed that efficiency in unification grows in proportion to the distance you get away from Washington. Of course, there is a reason—because here in the National Capital is that one great basic problem—the division of the dollar. Once you get away from that problem, there is less friction.

LAWS OF STRATEGY AND LIFE

Question. A great many laymen have advanced the idea of a single service in one uniform. What do you think about that?

Answer. I have often said how nice it would be if we were all in the same uniform with just differing tabs to distinguish us. I was only trying, in somewhat exaggerated form, to illustrate the spirit that we ought to have. I certainly believe in the benefits of competition—the benefits of specialization. But what we must do is never carry those things too far and not be arbitrary about them. So we should keep our traditional uniforms.

Remember this: When you get high enough up in command, you cannot have a mind that is technically trained in all the specialties you must employ. For example, the highest command in this last war consisted of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill. Mr. Roosevelt may have read some naval history and Mr. Churchill was once a young cavalry officer, but that was the extent of their professional military training. Yet in the final analysis they made the highest military decisions.

As long as your viewpoint is broad enough you do not have to worry too much about professional or technical training in top commands—such as theater of operation. It did not make any difference, for example, that I didn't know how to shoot the latest artillery piece in order to be able to use artillery.

The broad laws of strategy are roughly the broad laws of life, you might say. When you begin to talk about cooperation and surprise, concentration, and maneuver, really you are talking about the way you handle the affairs of your life. You merely are following certain common-sense rules that somebody who called himself a scholar codified and called "principles of war." They sometimes make me chuckle—because you break at least one of those principles every time you fight a battle.

Question. Do you think the public is conscious of the enormous increase in costs of everything the armed services have to have?

Answer. No. When we begin to compare costs these days with those of the past, we make the mistake of just comparing moneybags. I sometimes wonder whether we shouldn't stop calling them dollars and call them dollarettes—so as to convey the idea we are not talking about the same thing we did in 1939.

But I do believe that something could be done toward educating the public by just carrying the price tag of some things. When we talk about a great big B-36 or a F-85 or 86, or whatever it is, or an aircraft carrier, or anything else, or the cost of keeping a regiment through a year, we should just put the price tag on what it now costs compared with a comparable thing in prewar.

Question. There are only so many dollars to spend in any event, and those dollars must be divided between three services, must they not?

Answer. That's right. I feel that in our services we have today the best-educated group of military people that this world has seen. There is something a little bit haywire that makes it difficult for them to work together. I am quite sure that they themselves, in the end, are going to discover that they are not quite doing their very best to work together. When they do it will be fine.

I think that all argument must retreat from the extremes if it is to be valid. A way will finally be found down the big, broad middle of common-sense, logic and conciliation that will be effective. I do not mean to say we are ever going to end all arguments.

Question. You mean arguments within the services?

Answer. Oh, yes; within each of them. We are always going to be dealing in deficits.

Question. What do you mean by deficits?

Answer. Deficits under a professionally calculated force or strength. I am not speaking of strength to assure absolute safety, because all of us are smart enough to realize that there is no such thing as absolute safety in weapons. But there is a very definite relative security that you can calculate.

Professional calculation as to the total that prudence requires for relative security will never be matched in its aggregate total, by

the dollars that we can reasonably make available in time of peace, year after year. Therefore, you have to do the best you can. There must be a compromise between endurable cost and what you would really like to have.

Question. How much weight has ever been given in councils of that sort to the principle of a nucleus from which you can expand in wartime, and how much has been given to the idea that you must be ready at all times?

Answer. The more nearly that the unit about which you are speaking becomes a machine, merely operated by men, instead of men carrying the battle directly to the enemy—in that ratio you become committed to the force in being. You cannot build a warship in a month, and you can't build an airplane in a month.

For example, there wasn't a single airplane used by the American forces in combat in World War II that had not been designed before the war started. The design was on the drawing board before the war started. Therefore, both navies and air forces stress very much this business of force in being—because of the danger of a sudden, paralyzing blows by the initial blows of an enemy.

The skeleton force has always been uppermost in the Army's calculations. Get a small nucleus that can multiply itself—like the amoeba, you know. They go in for that more in the Army than they do in the other two services, for the reason that the other fellows' services have more ready at the moment of attack.

Question. In recent discussions of military organization hasn't there been rather a lack of interest in tactical air for support of ground troops?

Answer. In public discussions there may have been, but it is a matter that has been important to all of us, certainly since 1941, at which time we thought there was a very grave lack of concern.

You realize that in Europe the Army with its supporting Air Force became the predominating factor in victory. Indispensable as was the naval role, the campaign was a continental one, and the chief battle assets were ground forces, air forces and supply. So we were peculiarly sensitive to this business of tactical air support.

During the war and since the war I've heard no lack of discussion about this vital matter. But again, there is this matter of compromise. In the measure that you believe a paralyzing shock delivered, let's say, against the industrial centers of a potential enemy may be a really grave deterrent and hold him up while you're doing some other thing, you may finally have to curtail construction of a smaller, fighting kind of aircraft in favor of the big ones. So, you are always struggling to get what you think you will need on D-day and with the least possible damage to things that, though necessary will not be vital.

BASE FOR SPECIAL PLANES

Question. We have been told that aircraft were not interchangeable as between strategic and tactical air—that is, special types would have to be developed for tactical air. Is that true?

Answer. I think that is true only within limits. I know that we failed the very finest ship you could put on the front lines was the pursuit ship especially equipped for support. You could put a bomb under each wing and turn 51's and 47's into attack ships. I do think as they go more and more to terrific speeds in jet-powered fighter planes that probably we are going to have to have special planes for ground support—which would be too bad, but there it is.

Question. Special planes for the use of ground operations?

Answer. Yes; unless they find some way of developing a flexibility in speeds and maneuverability needed in ground operations.

Question. Some people feel that your book did not deal adequately with the work of the Navy in Europe. How do you feel about that?

Answer. If that is true, it is something I regret, but it was certainly never meant. I have looked up people who had been present at a number of my press conferences during the war and I think there was not a single press conference in which I did not go out of my way to stress that we were a triumvirate. I emphasized the three services all the way through—and I meant to do it in the book.

Question. What do you think was the importance of naval power in your ground operations?

Answer. When we started planning what turned out later to be the invasion of Europe, it was in January, February, and early March of 1942. I would like you to remember how we then were looking at the world situation. We were losing ships by the score every week coming up from South America. We had graveyards of ships along the Florida coast and all across the Atlantic, so all of the plans were up against the utter necessity, first, of gaining control of those Atlantic lanes. The first thing that entered into our calculations was naval power and the assurance that it would be adequate in strength.

When you start an operation of the kind we were calculating—which eventually was going to consume some millions of men—you cannot have interrupted sea lanes, with convoys being chased and scattered as they were being chased and scattered in the spring of 1942.

There was a very, very great belief that the Atlantic wall the Germans were supposed to be constructing could not be breached tactically, so at the same time that we were counting on the Navy to control the Atlantic we also had to count on smashing of the areas back of the beachheads by means of air. This became a basic thought or idea of the plan. Yet the airplanes to do the job did not exist. A start was just being made to build them.

So the plan had to be constructed with complete faith in two things: The certainty that the United States would have great naval power and the certainty of great air power.

Question. In the North African landing was naval power essential?

Answer. Absolutely.

Question. To make sure there was no opposition from an enemy fleet?

Answer. Not only that. I think that the feat of the Navy in bringing the African operating forces ashore with the loss only of one ship was one of the most amazing things in naval annals—almost a miracle. The German submarines at that time were everywhere. The Allied navies brought this force of General [George S.] Patton's all the way from the United States. They brought the others from England and took these forces through that bottleneck in the Mediterranean, most of them through Gibraltar, the others down to Casablanca. Yet before landing we lost only one ship. We lost a lot afterwards because the enemy could gang up around the entrances to these ports.

DEPENDENCE ON NAVAL GUNFIRE

Question. You used naval forces in the landings in the south of France, of course?

Answer. Everywhere.

Question. When you went up to the Normandy landing you had several battleships, didn't you?

Answer. Oh, yes, both United States and British.

Question. What function did they perform?

Answer. One, of course, was bombardment. We knew we weren't going to be able to search out and break up all of the coastal batteries by air-bombing attacks alone. The Navy, all the way through the war, had been gaining for itself an increased respect for its gunfire. With spotter planes they can do a lot—at Gela, in Sicily, for instance, they broke up a tank attack with their gunfire. They're good—they're very good. So we had come, by the time of Normandy, to depend very seriously upon naval gunfire in getting ashore, so much so that I was asking all the time for more than they could give.

Question. Were those naval long-range guns helpful?

Answer. Oh, indeed, yes. As a matter of fact, I was just reading a report made by two German commanders in Cherbourg. Along about the 23d or 24th of June 1944, they wanted to surrender. They were really taking punishment because we were dumping everything we had on them and pushing them very hard on the ground, and in the air. Finally, about the morning of the 24th, these two admirals sent a radio begging permission to surrender because they said, "The Navy's opened up on us too." So it was coming from everywhere.

RISKS OF AMPHIBIOUS WARFARE

Question. All through the operation in Europe we controlled the sea. Was this vital?

Answer. Yes, and the Navy supported the landings. You know an amphibious landing is not a particularly difficult thing, but it's a touchy and delicate thing, and anything can go wrong. In some ways, from the land fellow's viewpoint, it is one of the simplest operations. You put your men in boats and as long as you get well-trained crews to take the boats in, it is the simplest deployment in the world—the men can go nowhere else except to the beach. But, nevertheless, it is a very, very delicate thing and you need all the gun power you can get. We faced a number of enemy batteries along the Normandy beaches that annoyed us for several days after the landings and the Navy kept pounding on them until we captured them.

Question. Was the Navy in charge?

Answer. It was in charge of putting men ashore. Admiral [Chester W.] Nimitz [Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet, 1941–45] and I used to talk about this point of "changing command." The Navy's experience in the Pacific was hopping from island to island. You knew what was there—you could, in other words, calculate your battle plan down to a more minute detail than you can in a continental land mass, where a landing is nothing but a prelude to a campaign. You know that if you can get ashore firmly on an island you can stay there, because you know approximately what is ashore, how much you've got and what you can do.

In Normandy when we got ashore we didn't know what was going to happen; no one did. And the Navy had to stay right there and do its part all the way through—Admiral [Alan G.] Kirk [commanding United States naval task forces, invasion of Normandy, 1944] was just as much a part of my planning staff as was my chief of staff. He allotted his gunfire down to include particular batteries—and the Navy even helped to break up counterattacks.

What I constantly try to make people see is that there are all kinds of warfare. No one ought to draw arbitrary lessons from the European campaigns alone, because always, except where we went into Africa—where we were invading a neutral country to make an ally—we always had air bases that were close by.

Now, of course, this has its disadvantages. That's the reason the Germans could figure we would land at Salerno. We had one British aircraft carrier in the Mediterranean but we depended upon the fighters that were based in eastern Sicily. The reason we had to pick Salerno was that it was within effective range of our fighter craft. The Germans knew we weren't going to land out of fire range, so Salerno was indicated clearly.

Question. What if we had been able to develop large air-borne forces that could be landed inland?

Answer. There are all sorts of difficulties yet in the way of air landings, unless you can do so undisturbed and have pretty good airfields; you need them for true mobility on the land. An air-borne force is a very immobile thing because it doesn't have the trucks and tanks and self-propelled guns and all the other heavy equipment that a mobile force needs.

What it really amounts to is that with an air landing you establish a blocking force, under present conditions. We will get better and we will develop better and lighter equipment; we will progress. We are not yet at the point, in my opinion, where you can establish an inland air head and then from that, as a base, start a real campaign that would be in the nature of the one on the Normandy beaches where we brought boxcars ashore.

Some genius thought of putting rails on the bottom of an LST (landing ship, tank) and of bringing across boxcars and running them across a makeshift connection up to the French railroads. We would have a boxcar out of England and operating in France in 24 hours. Now you cannot do that with an airplane—not yet. I don't know what we will do if they some day put wings on the *Queen Mary*, but that's where we are now.

ADVANTAGES OF CARRIER FORCE

Question. Do you feel that amphibious warfare will be a part of warfare for a long time to come?

Answer. My first remark is that I hope there will be no more warfare. But I could not give an unqualified answer, for the simple reason that it is very hard to figure where any war is going to be fought and under what conditions it is going to be fought.

I would say this: We would be foolish today to allow to die in our services the very great knowledge we have of that type of operation. We are ahead of everybody in amphibious operations. We are certainly equal with the British in doctrine and we've got more and better equipment. We are better equipped to produce that equipment. It would be foolish for us to drop back. We should keep pushing ahead. I would be very much against letting that type of warfare be neglected.

It's the same way with aircraft carriers—in the peacetime calculations. One great thing about war is that, if and when such a tragedy visits us again, it is always going to happen under circumstances, at places and under conditions different from those you expect or plan for.

The one great thing about a stable aircraft-carrier task force is its great flexibility. Suppose a war should start in the Mediterranean. Suppose it should start on the west coast of Africa, or Siberia, or the Persian Gulf. Aircraft carriers can operate in those areas. I cannot tell what are going to be the scientific discoveries of the future and therefore what is going to be the increasing vulnerability and the increasing efficiency of these weapons. But I do know that you can calculate in detail only with what you can see with some certainty for today and tomorrow. We establish staffs which are thinking in hazier future terms. But now we are speaking of current plans. A flexible carrier task force has a high place in my own personal priorities. This same observation applies also to a sizable bombing fleet.

To revert for just a moment to the question concerning the Navy and its part in the European war—when we were preparing for the final assault across the Rhine, we brought the Navy into it. We had had wonderful experience with the Navy in going ashore. We just said to the Navy, "Come on, take us across the Rhine." We had these LCVP's (landing craft, vehicle, personnel)—they were maybe 40 feet long—mounted on truck trailers. They were taken right across France, dumped in the water and the Navy took us over.

HOW THREE SERVICES WORKED TOGETHER

Question. That certainly was a unified operation, wasn't it?

Answer. Yes. One of the things—one of the reasons that I've shied so definitely away from any public participation in the arguments between services was my complete respect for the three services and the way they operated with and for me. I have no complaint whatsoever, I assure you. The two or three times when I thought, for example, that the Navy didn't understand, I sent direct cables to Admiral King and he just answered, "Yes." I couldn't have been supported in the field more definitely or completely by anyone than by Admiral King. Admiral King was not of the back-slapping type. I never had anything but the utmost respect and liking for him.

All this applies also to the Army; I have merely mentioned the naval support because, after all, I wore the OD uniform and therefore expected perfect Army support.

It's a difficult business, you know, planning the forces you need for relative security. You make a generalization and say, "We must have a given number of tanks." This might be first priority, but when you get those tanks, what then is the priority on the next hundred tanks as compared with something of another kind? That is the job that has to be done each year, and it's one of those things that create heat because each fellow in this business will become very, very confident of his own forces. He has had experience with them.

Take a paratrooper, with his very, very high morale. A paratrooper really thinks that if you give him two bazookas and a jeep, he'll go anywhere and whip the world. Of course, it's a fine spirit. But the fact is that each service gets this almost cocky confidence in its own forces and then the heat of argument starts as all come to realize that there is not enough money for everything.

PROBLEMS IN COMBINED COMMAND

Question. Is the idea of a combined command still accepted by other countries?

Answer. I think at least to this extent—when (Viscount) Montgomery was over we had a long talk, and certainly with him single field command is completely accepted as a must. Now I think that all of the people with whom I've talked—people like (Baron) Tedder of the Royal Air Force and most of my naval friends are going out of the picture over there—they all believe in it.

But I don't think that countries other than ours will ever use it in time of peace because for them it introduces new problems of a kind that are not encountered so much in our service. In Britain their chiefs of staff are almost part of the cabinet. They fit in with the defense cabinet, which is part of the big cabinet. Professional commanders are always present when military decisions are rendered. Military problems are not neglected and allowed to pile up. One of the reasons I have always believed we needed a Defense Department over here was so that these questions, when they could not be settled by strictly professional cooperation, would have some civilian part of Government instantly familiar with them and solving them. Whether or not it's always done perfectly is sometimes not quite as important as the fact that it's done satisfactorily.

The British are not likely to accept, in peacetime, a unified method for the control of British forces along with the forces of other countries. But they have accepted it, I am sure, as a necessary type of command in war.

Question. Of course, some people have been hoping that we would get an international police force—if we ever got the principle of combined command——

A. Well, yes—but that is a question of highest international policy.

National Security and Individual Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a summary of a penetrating statement on national policy issued by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development, on December 14, 1949, entitled "National Security and Our Individual Freedom."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SECURITY AND OUR INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

I. THE THREATS TO OUR NATIONAL SECURITY AND INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

We live in a world of insecurity, in a critical period which may last a generation. We are now faced with entirely new problems. Changes in the world distribution of power, added to revolutionary developments in military weapons, have fundamentally changed the character of our security problem. For the first time in our history, we, in effect, share a common border with powerful potential enemies.

Today's conditions make a major security program necessary. In this new situation we Americans are painfully learning that our security program cannot be kept to a minor budget nor to an incidental effect on our peacetime lives. While we continuously exert every effort to prevent war, at the same time we must be prepared to fight at a moment's notice.

Our security program is only partly a matter of rearmament. The European recovery program, atomic energy, our foreign broadcasts, and the conduct of our diplomacy and incoming intelligence are also in large part security measures.

During the next few years, the annual cost of rearmament and other forms of security expenditure, at home and abroad, is expected to amount to $20,000,000,000 or more as an annual minimum. This is nearly a tenth of our national production. It is truly a tremendous expenditure of national resources.

The security program is a necessary and, at the same time, a dangerous force in our society.

Our security program threatens our individual freedoms. Under it there has been a great increase in the role of the military in our Government, a great increase in bureaucracy, an expanding dominance of government over industry and in increasing interference with individual freedoms. When we increase the share of our resources devoted to security, we unavoidably enlarge the scope of government in every sphere of life.

Security measures, uncurbed by the requirements of freedom, can undermine our free institutions. Public apathy and the pressure for security can lead us down the road that ends in the garrison-police state.

We must seek both national security and individual freedom. Some measures can serve both objectives. But other measures

to increase one can operate to decrease the other. Where there is such conflict, the problem is to work out an acceptable balance. In time of war, security takes temporary predominance over individual freedom. At the present time, the balance must be weighed in the direction of freedom.

Freedom itself, and the self-discipline necessary to true freedom, contribute to security. The maintenance of individual freedoms creates the greatest bulwark of our security—the energy and intelligence of freemen working together to build and to save their own and their country's freedom. Even more important, freedom and the dignity of the individual are the very foundation of our society, and the ends for which we are striving. Without them security loses its purpose.

II. ON WHAT DOES OUR FREEDOM DEPEND?

The security program threatens two major institutions on which our freedom depends: the traditional supremacy of the civilian over the military and our system of individual liberties. At the same time, freedom depends on an adequate security program. Herein lies the dilemma.

Civilian supremacy is essential to freedom: The men who drafted our Constitution provided that a civilian, the President, should be commander in chief of the armed forces. They also insisted on the civilian control represented by the authority of Congress, and, beyond this, by the power of citizens to elect the Congress and the President. Appointment of civilian secretaries to the defense departments, civilian control of the War Production Board in World War II, and civilian control of the Atomic Energy Commission have also advanced this principle.

The purpose of civilian control of the military is clear: (1) To protect free institutions; (2) to insure that military measures fit into the larger programs of national security and national policy of which the military is only a part; and (3) to promote efficiency in the Military Establishment itself.

There is today no direct challenge to the principle of civilian supremacy nor to the legal chain through which it can be exercised. But the magnitude and character of our security program make the effective exercise of civilian supremacy increasingly difficult and all the more necessary.

The President faces difficulties in exercising civilian supremacy. He is the constitutional manager of our security system. In the discharge of his responsibilities, he must work through many agencies. To assist in coordinating the work of these agencies, the President relies on his Cabinet, upon a few immediate advisers, and upon several staff agencies.

The complexity of our security organization suggests the magnitude of the burdens placed upon the President. He urgently needs an effective staff to provide him with a comprehensive and balanced review of the security program. For such a review the President requires the efficient operation of the two top-level Cabinet committees created in 1947: the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board.

The National Security Council was established to advise the President on the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policy. Its members are the President, the Vice President, the Secretaries of State and Defense, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. The President may add additional members. So far the National Security Council has not fully lived up to its high potential, though it has made important recent progress. It does not appear that it has yet drawn up a comprehensive set of current and long-range security policies. As a result, the President is handicapped in carrying out his responsibility to recommend a balanced security program to the Congress and to the people.

The National Security Resources Board consists of a civilian chairman and the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Defense, Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, and Labor. It was created to advise the President on the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization. It, too, has not fully lived up to its potential. Despite recent progress, it has been characterized by a lack of clarity of purpose and by inability to establish satisfactory working relationships with other security agencies. This handicaps the National Security Council and further weakens the hands of the President.

The Congress, like the President, faces difficulties in exercising civilian supremacy. At least two-thirds of the committees of both Houses are concerned in one way or another with security policy. Problems come before Congress in piecemeal fashion. Neither House has a committee structure designed to secure a balanced, comprehensive view of security policy as a whole. Congress is not yet organized to deal with security problems on a broad and balanced basis.

The citizen also faces difficulties in exercising civilian supremacy. He suffers in carrying out his responsibilities from the faults in the present organization of the legislative and executive branches of Government. The citizen also needs much basic information he now lacks. While certain specific information must be withheld in order to keep it from potential enemies, our Government is now leaning more heavily toward secrecy than in any previous peacetime period.

Great danger is inherent in a poorly informed public. Even more important is the public apathy toward security policies due to lack of adequate and reliable information necessary for responsible discussion and judgment. An alert and well-informed citizenry is essential to the effective working of civilian supremacy on which our democratic processes depend.

Maintenance of our system of individual liberties is essential to freedom. The requirements of security and the fear and hysteria generated by the threats to our security require constant vigilance to preserve our individual liberties.

One threat to individual liberties comes when the loyalty of individual citizens is called into question. Loyalty investigations can degenerate into witch hunts.

A more indirect threat comes when the security program endangers the free economy which underlies so much of our individual freedom. A security program of the present size threatens the free economy in three major ways: (1) by the burden of taxes on economic incentives; (2) by the control of business activity through Government contracts; and (3) by the likelihood of recurrent proposals to impose direct controls over economic activity in the name of security.

Security bought at the cost of destroying our system of individual liberties of our free economy would be self-defeating.

An adequate and balanced security program is essential to freedom. Though our freedom is threatened by our security program it would be threatened even more gravely without it. Freedom cannot survive in today's world without reasonably adequate security. An adequate security program obviously requires a large military establishment. But it must also include such nonmilitary weapons as diplomacy, world information, economic aid and an effective intelligence service.

At the present time, there is reason to believe that our security program is neither efficient nor in balance. There are serious instances of disregard of civilian authority. There are evidences of low efficiency in the Nation's defense forces. A balance must be kept between the various parts of the security program and programs serving other objectives of national policy.

Proposals need to be made by the executive branch after balanced consideration of all aspects of national policy. Our lawmakers must keep America solvent as to both ideals and resources. An informed public needs to remain alert to the dangers to both security and freedom.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS TOWARD IMPROVING OUR NATIONAL SECURITY AND PRESERVING OUR INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

There can be no simple solution to the problems of security and freedom. We must look to time and the wisdom of public discussion to find the answers. But public wisdom cannot be brought to bear if the chain of civilian control is ineffective, if the basis for informed judgment is lacking, or if policy is approached in a piecemeal fashion.

The recommendations which follow are only a step toward bringing public discussion to bear on these continuing problems. They are not the only possible steps. They are concerned almost entirely with organization and procedure. Their aim is to strengthen the machinery by which adequate and balanced discussion of security policy and its relation to freedom can be carried out at all levels. It is our belief that these recommendations, if put into effect, will lead to a powerful strengthening of both freedom and security.

Toward more effective exercise of civilian supremacy

The strengthening of civilian control requires action at each level to aid the President, the Congress, and the individual citizen in the exercise of their respective responsibilities.

At the executive level: To aid the President in developing a balanced policy with respect to security and freedom, we recommend:

1. That the National Security Council be developed as the principal executive agency on which the President relies for formulating and reviewing comprehensive and balanced security policies.

2. That there be added to the Council three full-time civilian members without other governmental responsibilities.

3. That the role of the National Security Resources Board be further clarified and developed.

4. That a full-time chairman of the Board be promptly appointed.

5. That within the Department of Defense there be a strong civilian staff independent of control by the military services to aid in developng and evaluating defense policy.

At the congressional level: To strengthen the hand of Congress in achieving a proper balance of security and freedom the Congress should take positive steps to coordinate the various aspects of security policy. To this end we recommend:

1. That a Committee on National Security be established in each House of Congress, representing all committees of each House whose jurisdiction covers a significant part of the field.

2. That as far as possible these Committees on National Security act together in the manner of a joint committee.

At the public level: To encourage and assist the citizen in exercising his responsibility for security policy we recommend:

1. That one full-time member of the National Security Council be made responsible for a more effective flow to the public of information relating to national security.

2. That the President devote a part of his annual message to the Congress and to the public on the state of the Union to a discussion of the problems involved in the national security program and their relation to freedom.

3. That vigorous effort be made to stimulate discussion throughout the Nation on the problems of national security and their relation to freedom.

Toward preserving our system of individual liberties

To strengthen the forces which operate to preserve our individual liberties we recommend:

1. That one full-time member of the National Security Council be made responsible for reviewing the effect of security measures on individual liberties and advising the President thereon.

2. That the section of the President's annual state of the Union message devoted to the national security program (recommended above) include a review of the relation of the security program to individual liberties.

3. That the National Security Council, in reviewing the security program, give particular attention to the danger of undermining the free economy.

Toward a more balanced and efficient security program

The recommendations made for preserving our freedom will also help to produce better balance and reduce waste in the security program. In addition we recommend that both the executive and legislative branches of the Government conduct a continuing review of the security program to see:

1. That waste and inefficiency in security expenditure is kept at a minimum.

2. That the security program itself is kept in internal balance, both as among the various types of military expenditure and as between military and other forms of security expenditures.

3. That measures to further the security objective and measures to further other important objectives of national policy are kept in balance. An over-all review of all national policies, their timing and their economic cost is needed to appraise their effects on both security and freedom.

Vigilance is the price of freedom

In the last analysis, the economic strength and the freedom and security of this country rest on the moral and spiritual vigor of its people. A free society can be preserved only by responsible citizenship. The new requirements of national security threaten our freedom. Only an alert and responsible citizenry can insure that adequate security is obtained without the loss of essential freedoms. We are confident that the American people can and will solve this problem.

Beware of German Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the January–February issue, No. 33, of Prevent World War III, the official publication of the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., of 515 Madison Avenue, New York 22, called "Auction for Germany."

I am including a second article from the same source headed "Revealing documents."

Needless to say, I fully endorse the position taken in each editorial; America, and the civilized world, must be on constant guard against the ruthless, cynical, and effective propaganda of Germany, in strength or in weakness, if civilization is to survive.

AUCTION FOR GERMANY

The confusion of the German situation, which has been growing steadily in the past year, recently reached a new peak. It is almost unbelievable that the situation should have touched the point where even the question of German remilitarization and of a German army is strongly advocated by certain powerful circles.

Tempora mutantur—times change—but the naivete, if not the stupidity of the period following the First World War prevails again. Or are we witnessing the unfolding of a well-calculated plan preferred by the powers that be? It is true that there are other factors in the German problem today which were not present after the First World War. But the hysterical arguments in favor of a strong, rearmed Germany, as advocated at present by wishful thinkers and political opportunists, so soon after the end of hostilities, are fantastic and outrageous.

It is no secret, and the fact has been stated in these pages many times previously, that both Soviet Russia and the Western Powers are frantically bidding for Germany. The London Economist recently called this bidding an auction for Germany. The imbecility of this auction, unfortunately, has not been fully realized by those responsible for shaping German policy. Every intelligent political observer knows that Soviet policy in Germany, to quote the Economist, "has been one of long-sighted and realistic conspiracy for power," while American policy—we still quote the Economist—"had gone through 180-degree revolution since 1945." It should have been clear for a long time that in a continuous bidding for Germany's favor, Moscow definitely has more advantages to offer. It also should have been made clear for a long time that in an open bidding the Western Powers, for very obvious reasons, could only be the losers. It is mathematically certain that the Western Powers, being democracies, would never be able to outbid totalitarian Soviet Russia for the good will, friendship, and alliance of totalitarian-minded Germany.

There is still time, perhaps, for those of our policy makers who are under the delusion that we can win Germany to our side against Soviet Russia to awake from their wishful dream.

An editorial in a recent issue of the New York Post—a paper which consistently opposes Soviet policy of expansion—has given an excellent analysis of this situation.

"Have we finally been deluded into the belief," the editorial states, "that we can compete effectively with Soviet expansionism only by embracing the old Nazi cabal?"

And it adds:

"Unquestionably, the Russians are holding hands with their former Nazi adversaries. There is powerful evidence that the Nazi come-back is just as swift or even more phenomenal in the Soviet zone than in the western realm. This is no justification for American policy or lack of policy. It proves nothing about the nature of the problem concerning us in Germany. It proves only that the old Nazi contingent is doing quite well on both sides of the German fence. The Nazis were always remarkably flexible fellows; they will play 'footsie' with anyone who takes care of their immediate needs. They can love or hate Bolsheviks, as they proved in August 1939, and June 1941. But they can never make real peace with democracy."

The editorial furthermore emphasizes that it is nonsense to think that a strong Germany would prove an efficient bulwark against communism. It should not be forgotten that it was a strong Germany that signed the Nazi-Soviet pact.

Needless to say, we most heartily endorse the viewpoints expressed in this editorial, especially the following:

"(The Germans) will sing anti-Soviet songs in the western zone even while their counterparts in the Soviet-ruled territory dream of a grand new alliance with the Soviets. They will profess their devotion to 'free enterprise'—even as they endeavor to rebuild the cartel system. They will bring neither peace nor security to the world."

Many times in the past we have pointed out in these pages that it would be criminal for the western powers to rely on the Germans. To think seriously that if we were to remilitarize and build up western Germany—even if we were to recreate the German Army—the Germans would become our partners and friends and not those of Soviet Russia, is plain nonsense. In this connection it should be pointed out that even extreme conservatives, to say nothing of rightwing elements in western Germany, openly play with the idea of a new Russo-German alliance.

It is true that some of their colleagues occasionally show a strong anti-Communist attitude. But is this not done to fool us and to throw sand in our eyes? We need only to mention the strange activities of people like ex-Ambassador Rudolf Nadolny, university Prof. Ulrich Noack, etc., men who despite their conservative backgrounds are strong protagonists of a German deal with Soviet Russia.

Even a man like Pastor Martin Niemoeller recently tore off his mask of nationalistic double-talk and openly stated that if unification is not granted he would rather see Germany become Communist than continue to live in its present divided condition.

The question put to Niemoeller after his return from a 3-month visit to Australia was, "Do you think that, in order to reunify east and west Germany, most Germans would be prepared to pay the price of having a Communist regime?"

"Yes," Niemoeller answered without hesitation. "Given the alternative of a continual split in Germany or the prospect of reuniting the country under a fallen dictatorship—that of Russia—the Germans would prefer to take the risks of communism."

Such a statement, coming from the mouth of a man generally considered one of the most outspoken of the conservative German nationalists, speaks for itself. No comment is necessary. But we think this significant statement of Pastor Niemoeller should help clarify the situation.

It is our firm belief that Niemoeller's pro-Soviet pronouncement should destroy, once and for all, the myth that if we give them everything they want, the Germans will be a bulwark against communism.

They never will be a bulwark against communism because the totalitarian and autocratic features of communism are much dearer to the hearts of the Germans than the features of democracy. It should be kept in mind—and history will undoubtedly confirm it—that far from being a bulwark against communism, it was Adolf Hitler and his Nazi Germans who opened the door of central and western Europe to communism.

REVEALING DOCUMENTS

The politics of war is a subject which received the closest attention of the German General Staff. During the crucial period of World War II, the General Staff sought to influence the outcome of the military struggle by every possible political means. This explains the secret instructions of Admiral Walter Wilhelm Canaris, chief of the secret service of the German High Command to his agents which were found in the files of the German Foreign Office.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that Allen Welsh Dulles, former head of the OSS in Switzerland, makes frequent mention

of Canaris in his book about Germany's so-called underground. He tells about negotiations he conducted with some of Canaris' agents in Switzerland who were supposed to be anti-Nazi. Whether these agents were anti-Nazis or not is a moot question. But we do know that Admiral Canaris was the "brain" of the German espionage service and a ruthless agent of the German General Staff. He fully understood the importance of the political factor in warfare.

As disclosed in the Canaris documents, the Germans knew that they could not win the war unless they succeeded in checking their enemies by heightening political tensions and suspicions among them.

If this were merely wartime strategy on the part of the Germans, these documents would only serve as an historical curiosity. But we know that the Germans today have a vested interest in holding tensions between East and West at war pitch. As in war, so the Germans today are fanning the flames of mutual suspicions among; their former adversaries. By intensifying the divisions among the victorious powers and pitting East against West, the Germans were easing the responsibilities of their crimes and aggressions. Thus, the Canaris strategy, which was frustrated during the war itself, has reemerged with greater success in this period of peace. It is the context of present day developments that the Canaris documents assume a sinister significance.

Following is the verbatim translation of two of these documents containing Admiral Canaris' instructions for two German agents abroad.

"OKW—ABWEHR, SECRET STATE MATTER, MARCH 13, 1944

"At a meeting of the representatives of the A. S., S. D. and the department of defense, the following resolutions were adopted for unified action of all the leaders in foreign countries:

"1. Utilize to the fullest extent all available possibilities in neutral and enemy countries, in order to strengthen our military effort with political and propaganda campaigns.

"2. Our goal is to crush the enemy's plan whose object it is to destroy forever Germany militarily, economically, and culturally.

"3. The new regulations put into effect by the political leaders for the disciplination and disintegration of the enemy bloc should be carried out more intensively. We must do our utmost to create a state of confusion among our enemies. Each state of disunity would enable us to sue for a quick separate peace with either side. While it is true that the efforts made in that direction have failed so far due to the implacable hate policy of Roosevelt and Churchill, it does not mean that someday under different conditions, the unnatural front of our enemies could not be broken. Roosevelt's electoral defeat this year could have momentous political consequences.

"The political and military leaders are of the opinion that Germany has nothing to expect from the Russians; on the contrary, should the war take a turn for the worse, the Slavs may retaliate the harsh treatment we inflicted upon them. Nevertheless, every alley should be explored in order to create a political state of mind which will induce the Russians to negotiate a separate peace with us.

"In the event of a negotiated peace, or should we be defeated—on a long-range plan Germany has everything to gain by cooperating with the east.

"Right now, the chances for a separate peace with the west are a little better, especially if we succeed, through our propaganda campaign and our 'confidential' channels, to convince the enemy that Roosevelt's policy of unconditional surrender drives the German people toward communism.

"The opposition against Roosevelt's alliance with Stalin grows constantly. Our chances for success are good, if we succeed, to stir up influential circles against Roosevelt's policy. This can be done through clever pieces of information, or by references to unsuspicious neutral ecclesiastical contact men.

"We have at our command in the United States efficient contacts, which have been carefully kept up during the war. The campaign of hatred stirred up by Roosevelt and the Jews against everything German has temporarily silenced the pro-German bloc in the United States of America. However, there is every hope that this situation will be completely changed in a few months.

"If the Republicans succeed in defeating Roosevelt in the coming Presidential election, it would greatly influence the American war policy toward us.

"The KO-leaders abroad and their staff have innumerable opportunities of constantly referring to Roosevelt's hate policy.

"They can at the same time hint to the danger that Germany may thereby be forced to cooperate with Russia. The greatest caution has to be observed in all conversations and meetings by those who as 'anti-Nazis' maintain contact with the enemy. When fulfilling missions, they have to comply strictly with instructions.

"CANARIS."

"BERLIN, *June 28, 1943.*

"Strictly confidential.

"To KO-DIRECTOR, Bern (Switzerland).

"We informed the chief of the Swiss Espionage Defense, in a friendly way, not to disturb the connections between certain enemy posts in Switzerland, and our agents, who are camouflaged as anti-Nazis. If there should be any difficulties please inform OKW and SD at once.

"CANARIS.

"Copy to Foreign Office, Commissioner for Defense, and SD."

This statement was published in our magazine, Present World War III, in April 1946, long before there was any apparent sign that the Germans were climbing back to positions where they could embroil the world in a new war.

We refused to live in Mr. Chamberlain's dream world of the 1930's, because we were already aware of the violation of common agreements made by the Allies to eliminate Germany's war potential. Thus all the talk and noise today about new German armies in the east and in the west is not surprising to us.

It must be said that German armies will inevitably be created again if the present policies which are repeating the same blunders made by the Allies after World War I, are continued.

The neutralization of Germany can be a major step toward the prevention of new conflicts. Such a neutralization requires the following steps:

A. The establishment of a four-power disarmament committee to prevent the remilitarization of any of the zones in Germany.

B. Four-power agreement to hold the level of German steel production to peacetime needs—not exceeding present permitted levels.

C. Prompt fulfillment of the original reparations program under four-power control.

D. Four-power agreement on the elimination from key positions of former Nazis and Hitler supporters.

E. Four-power action to break up the German cartel empire.

F. Genuine international control of the Ruhr to prevent the reestablishment of German economic domination of her neighbors, and, at the same time, give Germany a viable economy for peace.

The carrying out of these measures and subsidiary steps would take Germany out of the international arena as a major bone of contention between east and west.

The hour is late, but it is up to us, the living, to make our final decision. We must bear in mind that a German army is inevitable if the people consent to policies which preserve a dangerous war potential in her heavy industries. It would be wishful thinking to believe that the creation of German armies, east or west, would be a boon to either side or to mankind in general.

President Heuss has told the truth: An east German army will not fight a west German army or vice versa. They will unite and when they unite, the betrayal of the peace and the security of the United States and her friends abroad will be complete.

War on Russia's Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask that an exceptionally newsworthy and revealing article published in the December 1949 edition of the United Nations World, entitled "New German Blueprint: War on Russia's Side," written by T. H. Tetens, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. Tetens is an authority on pan-Germanism and geopolitics. In this article he has put his finger on the greatest single danger facing America in Europe: the danger that a rebuilt, rearmed supernationalist Germany will unite in totalitarian brotherhood with the Soviet Union in a third attempt in this century to conquer the world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW GERMAN BLUEPRINT: WAR ON RUSSIA'S SIDE

(By T. H. Tetens)

From a secure base in Argentina, a group of top German political and intellectual leaders, all brought up on Prof. Karl Haushofer's geopolitical bible, are engaged in shaping a German policy which could threaten the safety of the United States even more than Hitler's drive for world dominion.

Although still lacking authority or official position, these men are the potential leaders of an unreconstructed Germany, rather than Presidents Heuss or Pieck. They are on the way to laying the foundations of the German political thinking of tomorrow. But already their influence upon their fellow Germans has assumed an importance difficult for Americans to understand.

What makes the activities of this clandestine political general staff so dangerous to the basic interests of the United States and the whole free world is their decision that, in the event of a Third World War, the German people must side with Soviet Russia.

The organ of the group is a monthly called Der Weg (The Way). It is the new testament of Realpolitik. It is the bible of nationalist Germans everywhere. It is also the progeny of Dr. Karl Haushofer's famous Zeitschrift fuer Geopolitik—Journal of Geopolitics, source book for the Nazi drive toward world dominion.

* * * * *

Der Weg is printed in Buenos Aires in the Duerer House at Sarmiento 632. An attractive monthly on coated stock, its 80 pages contain many columns of advertising. Its editors are Eberhardt Fritsch and Gustav Friedl. The magazine attracts a galaxy of significant writers and thinkers of strong nationalistic convictions, whether residing abroad, or in Germany and Austria. Der Weg was started in July 1947, and became an immediate success among embittered Germans to whom it held out hope for a better—even a grandiose future. Although occupation authorities banned the publication from the American zones of Germany and Austria, it is smuggled into the fatherland by the thousands.

The chief editorial writer of Der Weg hides under the pseudonym "Observator." His articles sum up and express with forceful logic the political decisions which Der Weg accepts and promotes. Among the visible pundits of the Buenos Aires group are such stalwarts of German nationalism and aggressive expansionism as the notorious Dr. Colin Ross, one-time head of the Nazi propaganda machinery in the United States, Dr. Anton Zischka, Hans Grimm, Dr. Walter Pahl, Prof. Dr. Ferdinand Fried, and others. These intellectuals, however, are far from being an isolated assortment of thinkers. In their mansions, hotel suites, and clubs, in Buenos Aires, a large and influential clique of South American Germans are engaged in financing and developing the activities of the planners. Among them are the great financiers and industrialists of German extraction who are the big wheels of Argentina's economic life; theoretical economists like Ludwig Freude, Peron's personal adviser; former high ranking Wehrmacht officers now occuying important positions in the Argentine Army; scientists like Prof. Dr. Wilhelm Westphal, outstanding German authority on atomic energy; or ex-Luftwaffe flyers who had escaped from the allied armies. Prominent among the latter are General Baumbach, who used to be a top man in the Luftwaffe's training division; Gen. Adolph Galland, a fighter-pilot with 102 planes to his credit; Col. Thieben and Col. Hans U. Rudel.

* * * * *

When Der Weg started in 1947, its program called for collecting data on the comparative strength and weakness of the Western allies on the one hand, and of the Eastern bloc on the other. The group took the position that Germany must remain free from definite commitments to either side, and reserve its allegiance until such time as the distribution of power in the postwar world is clearly revealed. Through their emissaries, the planners warned political leaders active in Germany that it was their duty to follow the same line.

The reversal of that policy came in the summer of 1948. It was at that time that Haushofer's heirs in Argentina, on the basis of their carefully collected evidence, deduced that from a show-down between East-West Russia would emerge as the undisputed victor. On this premise they saw only one possible course of action: Germany must throw her lot in with Russia.

The exiles are convinced that as soon as the military occupation of Germany is ended, they will be able to return to the fatherland and transplant their organization. They are sure that they will be able to take over the signs and seals of power and put their plans into official operation with popular consent. Meantime, over and above the visible activity of Der Weg, Argentina is also the conspiratorial cellar where from the Rio de la Plata to Patagonia even more extreme groups hatch plots for the come-back of a more successful nazism.

Lest the confidence of Der Weg's circle be dismissed as an exercise in collective megalomania, it should be recalled that Lenin and a similar band of exiles prepared the blueprints for the Bolshevik administration far from their homeland, and then transformed their plans into world-shaking reality.

The background for this latest historic conspiracy centered in Argentina is furnished by the ardent wooing of Germany by Washington and Moscow.

The long-term occupation of Germany agreed on at Potsdam has been abandoned by both east and west. Neither fears Germany longer—except as an ally of the other. On both sides the men who make the policy are apparently convinced that the trend has turned in their favor.

An objective appraisal of the facts unhappily discloses that on this score the Russians are right and the Americans are wrong. Russia is right because its economy has already profited from the Soviet occupation, and because it has gained German military allegiance of the first magnitude.

America is wrong because its military men and financiers are both sponsors and victims of what Walter Lippmann has called the official mythology of the United States. Briefly, their credo runs something like this:

"Germany is the heart of Europe. To prevent Europe from going Communist, we must restore Germany's industry in the west, acquaint her with our democratic way of life, and slowly change German mass thinking, aggressiveness and authoritarian behavior to resemble our individualistic, friendly and democratic behavior. Meanwhile, the increased output of the gigantic Ruhr industries will help to bring the other nations of Europe back onto a sound basis and enable Europe as a whole to resist communism."

In line with this view, America's economic policy in Germany has been to restore "peaceful" industries, providing management guidance and other incentives where necessary.

On the other hand, Russia's economic policy has been to take as reparations, in the form of either goods or transplanted factories, all the German industrial production its soldiers and diplomats could lay hands on.

Russia has already benefited measurably by its control of eastern Germany and by obtaining goods and machinery from western Germany.

If the United States has failed to forge for itself a dependable German allegiance, and there is nothing to prove that it has, it follows that Russia will eventually benefit by every American dollar, every American machine, every Germany factory restored or saved from dismantling by American aid. For the chances are that those dollars, machines, and factories would be turned against the west in any third world war.

United States military men have been no more successful in Germany than their financial counterparts. It is no secret that their primary concern has been the establishment of a body of hard-fighting German troops, armed and equipped by America to stand between the aggressive Russians and the Rhine.

But the vision of a German army that will fight Russia out of German fondness for America is one of the maddest illusions fostered by the official myth. To date no group of staff officers, no army of German fighting men have gone over to the United States. Contrast this with the roster of German military personnel who have lined up with the Russians.

Among the Soviet's outstanding converts are such military notables as Field Marshal Friedrich Paulus, the defeated hero of Stalingrad; Gen. Walter von Seydlitz, who organized the Committee of German Officers in Moscow; Gen. Vincenz Muller, commander of the east German police force of some 100,000 former Nazi soldiers and officers; Colonel Markgraf, chief of the force in Russian Berlin. Another former colonel, Walter Lehwess-Litzman, who served on Goering's General Staff, is a Communist lecturer and editorial writer, while Dr. Otto Korfes, a former major general, today is the chief of the central archives in the Soviet zone. Where among the friendly Germans of the west can one match this evidence of Germans who have chosen sides so unequivocally?

Walter Lippmann has not been alone in seeing through the flimsy, wishful mythology of United States administrators in Germany. Ex-Secretary of State Sumner Welles, ex-Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., William Shirer, Edgar Mowrer, Delbert Clark, Drew Middleton have also understood clearly that Germany can still exploit a potential alliance with Russia as a potent diplomatic weapon.

After the Allies had won Germany's unconditional surrender, a new and violent rephrasing of prophecies on eventual Russo-German accord appeared in the United States. Heinrich Hauser, a German newspaperman and refugee anti-Nazi, wrote and Henry Holt published an angry book, The German Talks Back.

The book, which became a best seller in the German neighborhoods of New York, Chicago, Cleveland, and St. Paul, explained at length why Hauser and other Germans had only contempt for western democracy and scorn for capitalism—particularly as both were exemplified in the United States.

* * * * *

Hauser's explanation is that the Germans "must be provided with a dream powerful enough to justify the sacrifice of eight or ten million lives," and he adds:

"There is only one great ideology left which as a nation we have not yet tried, which therefore has not yet failed—communism. If the Germans accept communism, for their new dream and ideology and do it quickly, they will be lifted almost overnight from the status of outcast lepers to the status of allies of the biggest land power on earth. * * * If one has to embrace communism in order to get lebensraum, what of it?"

This is the voice of German Realpolitik speaking through the lips of an anti-Nazi German, and is by no means an isolated case. The temptation of playing both ends against the middle induced even such a staunch anti-Communist as Friedrich Stampfer into using the threat of German-Russian rapprochement. In December 1944 he published an article in the Neue Volkszeitung, New York. He severely criticized the western Allies for planning a long-term occupation, demilitarization of Germany, and eradication of its war potential.

Stampfer warned the west that, unless leniency was shown, the Germans would turn to the east. He wrote:

"There is a way out for Germany from total defeat and—we have to say it openly—the Western Powers are pushing Germany systematically toward that way. Germany can change this situation (of defeat) decisively and at once by lining up with the only real power on the Eurasian Continent, with Russia. * * *

"Germany (even in defeat) can give many things to Russia—the open way to Hamburg and the Rhine, trained general staff officers, technicians, skilled workers, soldiers, warships, tanks, bombers, and the most modern weapons of destruction. * * * [It can] bring about the final destruction of the French-British barrier, the liquidation of the British Empire, and the end of west European colonial rule. This would mean the establishment of German domination over Africa."

* * * * *

Today the proponents of partnership with the east have on their side the German, or

Prussian, national memories that go back through two recent world wars and the Napoleonic conquests to the Seven Years' War. In every case these memories summon forth success for German arms when allied with Russia, but defeat and failure when fighting against Russia.

* * * * *

As a consequence, therefore, this group of Haushofer geopoliticians operating in Argentina represents, in German eyes, a source of irrefutable logic and guidance. Dr. Colin Ross, Professor Fried, Mesart, Grimm, Mahler, Eschlen, and the others are accepted throughout Germany as a body of policy shapers who are weighing the evidence of the past and present with scientific objectivity, and are building up a fool-proof national action program for the triumphant Fourth Reich of the future.

Long before the war in Europe ended, military intelligence knew that the brains of Germany was in flight—by air or submarine—often by way of Spain, to South America. There, in Argentina, and to a lesser extent in Brazil, the Haushofer School now flourishes, well-financed with funds shipped out of Germany before VE-day, and also getting generous donations from the pan-Germans who have prospered under General Peron.

The plan evolved by Haushofer's heirs and assigns in geopolitics features elaborate courses of action in case of both peace and war. For peacetime, the basic policy is economic cooperation with Russia. For wartime, the prescription is full-fledged military alliance with Russia.

Germany's cartel-minded industrialists see their western markets taken over by the Atlantic states, chiefly by the United States.

They therefore endorse the aim of the Argentine geopoliticians to end the occupation by whatever means, then to remove a united Germany and throw in their lot with Russia. Since they prospered under the totalitarian regime of Hitler, they think they can prosper under the totalitarian regime of Stalin. Their immediate goal in peace is to capture the vast, hungry markets that lie between Riga and Vladivostok—and wealthy and now in Berlin.

Every move made by Hitler's former Ambassador to Moscow, Rudolf Nadolny, all the unpublicized conversations he conducted with political, military, and industrial figures in both west and east Germany, have had as their purpose not merely restoration of a united Germany but, even more, the restoration of a strong Germany which will be able to deal with Russia on a basis of comparative equality.

Thus there is developing in Germany an unbelievable national front. The Communists in the east and the ultranationalists in the west are jointly orienting the dynamic militaristic instincts of the German people toward an alliance with Russia against the west.

The men who are blueprinting Germany's economic future, based on business with Russia and her communist neighbor states, know that their program appeals to much to conservative manufacturers anxious about profits as to broken militarists yearning for revenge.

* * * * *

Again and again in their blueprints, the German planners make clear that, once freedom of action is assured, Germany will begin a furious drive to funnel the necessary goods eastward and to siphon back the grains and metals, the timber, furs, oil, and other raw materials from Russia.

* * * * *

They are convinced that Russia can gain full command over Europe and the Middle East within a few weeks after the outbreak of hostilities. In any such event, they point out, the eastern allies would acquire a tremendous advantage in the war potential of resources and manpower. They stress the point that Russia is not inferior in modern weapons—about which they may well know much more than any non-Russian general staff. Readers of Der Weg were told that Russia had an atom bomb long before President Truman reported it to the world.

Der Weg's editors also know a great deal about Russia's bacteriological warfare, because German scientists collaborated in designing the laboratories in the secret-understanding days of the Black Reichswher and the Rapallo Treaty. They refer guardedly to other, new unproved weapons which the Russians are developing with the aid of German scientists. There are references to submarines, rockets, and even rays, as well as to atom bombs. The final conclusion of the German planners is that the free west is riding for a fall.

* * * * *

Meanwhile the planners—and the German people—await Der Tag. If it comes soon, only the paramilitary police force of the East will be equipped and trained to fight side by side with the U. S. S. R. The thin lines of Allied occupation troops can only retreat—in good order, if possible.

* * * * *

If Der Tag is delayed long enough for the "sovereign" western state of Germany to acquire an Allied-approved, trained, and equipped Panzer force, the planners foresee that it will not long continue to fight on the side of the west. Where, how, and when it will surrender to the Russians and turn on the fleeing American, British, and French is a tactical question. The answers will remain military secrets—only the strategy is discussed openly.

There is no doubt that the blueprint has been sold to the German people, pro-Communist and anti-Communist, neo-Nazi and Roman Catholic. This, of course, is not a question of Communist sympathies. Rather, many conservative leaders are fully convinced that Russia's need for Germany will persuade the men in the Kremlin to leave Germans as masters of their destiny as far as their internal political and economic system is concerned.

* * * * *

Franklin Roosevelt's nightmare of a Russian-American split over Germany, followed by a German-Russian combination against the United States, has all but come true. The blueprint has been drawn, the plans are set. On the evidence, whatever America does, Germany will become a partner of Russia. And if it comes to war, Germany will fight on Russia's side.

Policy Statement of New York Young Republican Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the sections on rent control, agriculture, wasteful big government, private enterprise, public regulation of business, taxation, and the citizen and politics—from a policy statement entitled "Blueprint for a Better America" by the New York Young Republican Club.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENT CONTROL

Problem: Rent controls are still necessary and desirable in many areas where there is a shortage of low and medium cost housing to prevent landlords from exploiting tenants who have nowhere else to live. On the other hand, the evils which accompany rent controls must not be disregarded. They create an artificial demand by holding prices too low. They discourage new building. They discourage proper maintenance and repairs. They deprive the landlord of a fair return on his investment. They add another unit to the vast Federal bureaucracy.

Rent controls began as a wartime measure. They are the only important wartime controls still remaining and should be removed just as soon as the war-created housing shortage is over. It would be tragic if, for purely political reasons, they were allowed to continue indefinitely, and if, as in France, they were permitted to throttle construction of new housing units.

The problem, therefore, is to provide adequate rent controls wherever and whenever there is a shortage of housing, and at the same time to set up machinery that will remove rent controls as soon as the shortage is over in any area.

The present Federal rent-control law became effective April 1, 1949, and expires June 30, 1950. It represents an improvement over earlier legislation in at least two important respects: (1) A State legislature, with the approval of the governor, is given the power to remove the State from Federal rent control, or to substitute State control, and (2) landlords are allowed rentals sufficient to provide a fair net operating income.

Seventeen million housing units were under rent control at the peak in April 1947; 14,500,000 units were under control when the present act went into effect in April 1949; and 12,000,000 units were under control in January 1950.

Proposals: 1. Rent-control legislation in substantially its present form should be renewed when it expires on June 30, 1950.

2. More rapid decontrol in areas where a housing shortage does not exist should be provided for under the new legislation. If controls are removed in some areas and rents rise too sharply, controls may be reimposed.

3. High-rental residential units should be decontrolled. There is much less of a shortage in this price range than in low-rental housing, and the tenants are usually not hardship cases.

AGRICULTURE

Problem: The problem of farm income is primarily a problem of farm prices. The instability of farm prices results chiefly from general business fluctuations over which the farmer has little control. Thus, the basic causes for the farm problem do not lie within agriculture; rather they lie in the economic and political relations between agriculture and the rest of the economy.

The problem of surpluses is parallel to the problem of price and 1950 finds American agriculture with dangerous surpluses mounting in virtually all of the grains and cotton. Surpluses give rise to proposals for crop quotas, acreage restrictions, and other forms of governmental control. The farmer, as America's most rugged individualist, intensely opposes such measures since he, more than anyone else, believes that personal prosperity springs from one's own production. Because of this basic philosophy of the farmer, agricultural production remains fairly constant despite the effects of business

fluctuations, area weather conditions, or governmental efforts to curtail production.

The farm population comprises one-fifth of our total population.

During the two decades of 1920–39, the net migration from farms was 10,000,000 persons; yet the supply of food produced increased.

Under the AAA, wheat acreage was reduced 13 percent; yet production increased 21 percent—acreage allotments not proving satisfactory for regulating production.

Ten cotton States have 43 percent of the United States farm population, but only 25 percent of the farm income (due in part to smaller farms, lack of fertile soil, smaller capital investment, inadequate farm management, risk from weather and insects, and dependence on exports).

For the individual, parity prices have meant higher taxes and high consumer prices and, for the Nation, a collision between our domestic and foreign policies. The Government subsidizes to produce, stores the excess, then subsidizes to get rid of it as exports. At present, the Government has over $3,000,000,000 tied up in farm commodities and is faced by a declining export market. In addition high subsidies tend to encourage an artificial diversion of capital resources into agriculture, thereby increasing production and ultimately causing surpluses. They keep the inefficient high-cost producer in business.

Chronic overproduction, whether caused by inability or unwillingness of producers to adjust output to demand, by price supports or by controls, indicates that we are not making the best alternative use of our human and land resources. Nobody gains if everybody is subsidized equally—yet no single group can or should expect to gain at the expense of the rest of the population.

The Brannan plan is a political rather than a grassroots program. It leaves the farmer dependent upon annual appropriations by Congress. As one farmer put it at the Sioux City conference:

"The Brannan plan reminds me of a friend of mine in Shiawassee County, who went fishing in a leaky rowboat. He couldn't bail fast enough, so he rowed it back to shore and instead of patching the leak, he merely got a bigger pail to bail with."

Proposals:

1. We favor continuing the present price-support program during 1950. A sudden end to these supports would substantially impair the farmers' financial stability. Moreover, the present state of international relations demands that we carry moderate surpluses.

2. We propose, on the other hand, that serious consideration be given to reducing gradually the support-price levels in 1951 and to substituting a price floor below which farm prices will not be allowed to fall. Such a floor price should be low and should be announced a year in advance so that farmers can make their plans accordingly. Since a low floor price would result in taking some marginal land out of production, those leaving unproductive lands should be assisted in securing jobs elsewhere.

3. Curtailment of production is inconsistent with the incentive system of an opportunity society and, moreover, ignores the fact that many people throughout the world are hungry. Accordingly, we favor a stock of emergency remedies to meet critical surplus situations and long-range measures to stimulate consumption as follows:

(a) Temporary food-stamp plans to meet specific surplus problems.

(b) Cooperation with community efforts to improve the diet of children through dietary education and school-lunch programs.

(c) Greater exports to needy areas to meet specific surplus problems.

(d) Increased on-the-spot industrialization of farm products and expansion of industrial and byproduct use.

(e) Encouraging production of livestock and livestock products to utilize grain surpluses.

(f) Further streamlining of the processing and distributive systems for farm products.

(g) Charitable and community feeding of underprivileged families.

(h) Better on-the-farm storage facilities.

4. We favor an amalgamation of the flood control, navigation, reclamation, and irrigation functions of the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation as proposed by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been wasted in the Columbia and Missouri Valleys and Central Valley of California due to the competition in water resource development between these agencies.

WASTEFUL BIG GOVERNMENT

Problem: The Federal Government is today the biggest single organization in the free world. Some 2,000,000 people are employed in 9 departments, 104 bureaus, 12 sections, 108 services, 51 branches, 460 offices, 631 divisions, 19 administrations, 6 agencies, 16 areas, 40 boards, 6 commands, 20 commissions, 19 corporations, 5 groups, 10 headquarters, 20 units, 3 authorities, and 263 miscellaneous and functionally designed parts. Without reducing essential services, $3,000,000,000 a year might be saved by introducing efficient management into the Federal Government.

Veterans' Administration insurance death claims take four times as long to be paid as private insurance claims; yet the Veterans' Administration employs four times as many insurance workers per policy as do private companies.

There are 30 agencies in the Federal Government actively engaged in lending, guaranteeing, and insuring loans.

There are 390,000 Indians under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Bureau employs over 12,000 persons to administer its work—one employee for every 32 Indians.

Many Government business agencies invest their idle Government surplus funds in Government securities. Result: the Government pays interest on its own money.

Construction cost of Government hospitals runs from $20,000 to $51,000 per bed, compared with an estimated $16,000 per bed for voluntary hospitals.

About half of the 3,000,000 Government purchase orders issued each year are for $10 or less. The average cost of paper work involved in each order exceeds $10.

Proposal: We propose adoption of the remaining suggestions for economy contained in the report of the Hoover Commission, a bipartisan task force created by the Eightieth Congress in 1947 to examine and report on the Federal Government. Adoption of these suggestions would be a long step toward helping the Federal Government balance its budget without reducing essential services.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Problem: Private enterprise has given this country the highest standard of living ever known in the world and enables the United States to stand today as the great bulwark of freedom-loving people against the forces of oppression and totalitarianism.

The United States possesses more than half of the world's telephones, telegraph and radio networks, more than a third of the railways, more than three-quarters of the world's automobiles, almost all of the world's radios, and consumes more than half the world's coffee and rubber, two-thirds of the silk, a quarter of the coal, and nearly two-thirds of the crude oil.

But today the vigor, flexibility, and capacity of our private-enterprise society are seriously threatened by constant and haphazard governmental interference and control.

Proposals: Recognition and support by the Republican Party of the following basic principles:

1. That insistence on preservation of private enterprise clearly distinguishes the Republican from the Democratic Party.

2. That under our economic system there is today, as in the past, the opportunity to rise from the humblest beginning to the top of one's calling; and that the drift to socialism in many countries of Europe has resulted from the old stratification of society and the inability to make such a rise except over many generations.

3. That private competitive enterprise offers the only incentives for production that are consistent with individual freedom.

4. That a plentiful supply of venture capital is indispensable to the ample production of goods and the creation of job opportunities. Encouragement of private investment should be emphasized in the formulation of future legislation and in the administration of existing laws.

5. That continued deficit spending creates inflation, progressively reduces real income and destroys the savings of the thrifty. Deficit spending is justified, therefore, only in time of war or major depression.

6. That an unbridled "laissez-faire" economy, as opposed to responsible private enterprise, is no longer compatible with the general welfare of our people.

PUBLIC REGULATION OF BUSINESS

Problem: During the past few years, the antitrust laws, through judicial review and administrative interpretation, have become a source of utter confusion to businessmen, both large and small. This confusion has spread to the Justice Department, the Federal Trade Commission, and even the Federal courts. Consequently, the antitrust laws require immediate reexamination, revision, and amendment. In addition, too many unlawful trade practices, which are extremely harmful to small-business men and consumers, escape prosecution.

Proposals: 1. The antitrust laws should be reexamined by Congress and should be redrafted or amended to make them more definite and consistent. If Congress, after its investigation, considers it feasible, it should enact legislation which specifically sets forth those practices which are lawful and those which are unlawful. In any case, the standards to be applied should be clarified by comprehensive regulations.

2. Serious consideration should be given to the economic utility and social desirability of the giant corporation in our competitive economy. For the curse of bigness, in business as well as in government, is the regimentation of the individual and the curtailment of his freedom.

TAXATION

Problem: Taxation imposed by the Federal, State, and local governments during the past year will take from private individuals and businesses over $50,000,000,000 or almost one-quarter of the national income. Just 10 years ago the take in taxes of these three governments was under $12,000,000,000 or less than one-fifth of the national income. The Federal Government's share of these taxes has increased during that period from under 40 percent to over 70 percent of the total.

During the same period the general Federal tax structure has remained approximately what it was in 1939—a haphazard system of taxes falling unequally on persons and businesses in like circumstances, unnecessarily restricting the expansion of production and employment, and raising insufficient revenue to pay for Government expenditures. Furthermore, the existing laws fail to offer sufficient incentive for foreign investment.

Proposals:

1. While an over-all reduction in taxes represents a desirable objective, any substantial reduction must be geared to a corresponding reduction in Federal expenditures.

2. The present Federal tax structure should be completely overhauled for the purpose of stimulating the flow of risk capital into new enterprises and thereby creating additional job opportunities.

3. Pending an over-all revision of the Federal-tax structure, the following inequities of the existing law should be remedied immediately:

(a) More liberal provision should be made for the averaging of income by individuals over a period of years and for the offsetting over a period of years of losses in prior or subsequent years. The present Federal income tax based primarily on an annual accounting period discriminates unfairly against individuals with fluctuating incomes such as wage earners subject to irregular employment, actors, authors, and small-business proprietors.

(b) The sale of residential property occupied by the taxpayer as a home should be treated as a tax-free exchange if the proceeds are used to purchase another residence for occupancy by the taxpayer.

(c) The provisions imposing high surtax rates on corporate income between $25,000 and $50,000, which discriminates unfairly against small corporations, should be modified.

(d) The provisions restricting the deductibility of nonbusiness bad debts by personal lenders tend to discourage investment in speculative enterprises and should be eliminated.

(e) Since most new businesses operate initially at a loss, business operating loss carry-overs should be extended to 4 years in the case of new businesses.

(f) Wartime Federal excise taxes, such as those on cosmetics, telephone service, transportation, and baby products, should be eliminated.

4. Those provisions in the Federal tax laws which affect income received from foreign sources should be thoroughly integrated with a negotiation of new treaties with foreign countries where investment is to be stimulated. Subject to modification by an overall revision of the Federal tax structure and in the terms of treaties negotiated with foreign government, the following specific changes should be made:

(a) Expand the provisions in the Federal income-tax law granting exemption from surtaxes in the case of Western Hemisphere trade corporations to corporations doing business in other parts of the world.

(b) Remove the present requirement that a domestic corporation must own a majority of the stock of a foreign corporation to be eligible for a tax credit based on foreign taxes paid.

THE CITIZEN AND POLITICS

Problem: The ill health of American politics was strikingly revealed in the 1948 presidential election when almost one-half of those eligible to vote failed to cast their ballots. This indifference and apathy to participation in elections constitutes a real threat to effective representative government. It is also a serious indictment of the major political parties which have the responsibility for providing the link between the citizen and his government.

Too many Americans feel that the individual ballot does not have any real importance, that politicians and political parties are basically dishonest, and that all politicians make promises which they never intend to keep. This explains in part why so many Americans refuse to interest themselves in the practical workings of democracy.

As our Government has become more impersonal and centralized, the individual citizen has felt increasingly unable to participate in the making of important public decisions. The Government no longer is Councilman Jones up the street, but rather a vast and disturbing hierarchy of nameless Federal officials.

Proposals:

1. More careful selection of able Republican candidates who will support sound programs reflecting economic, social, and political realities.

2. Bold and sincere efforts by Republicans at all levels of party organization to broaden the base of party support among all economic, racial, and religious groups.

3. Weeding out of political deadwood and paper organizations at all levels and supplanting them with younger and more aggressive party workers.

Social Security Act Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include comments on the statement of George H. McLain, chairman, National Pension Committee, and chairman, board of trustees of the California Institute of Social Welfare, Los Angeles, Calif., presented to the Senate Finance Committee in the course of hearings on H. R. 6000, Saturday, January 28, 1950, as prepared by Mr. Nelson H. Cruikshank, director of social insurance activities, American Federation of Labor:

I

Mr. McLain's statement reveals that he completely fails to grasp the concept of social insurance. The working people of America have repeatedly demonstrated, that what they want is to be able to insure their wage incomes against the hazards that are a part of our modern economy. They do not want an economy that is static and limited in opportunity. They want an economy that is free both for the employer and the worker. They realize that such freedom entails certain risks. Among these risks are unemployment, sickness, and dependent old age. They want to insure their incomes against these risks just as businessmen want to insure their capital investments and farmers want to insure their crops.

The wage earner in unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor have expressed again and again through resolutions by local unions, State federations, national and international unions and in conventions of the American Federation of Labor that they are perfectly willing to pay through regular pay-roll contributions their share of the cost of such insurance.

The Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Finance Committee, which consisted of 17 members, wrote on page 1 of their report their views in regard to the principle of social insurance. This statement of policy was adopted unanimously by the council, which included not only representatives of labor, but also some of the leading economists of our outstanding universities as well as business leaders. Included in the last group is Mr. Adrien J. Falk of California, president of the S & W Fine Foods, Inc.

THE METHOD OF SOCIAL INSURANCE

"The council favors as the foundation of the social-security system the method of contributory social insurance with benefits related to prior earnings and awarded without a needs test. Differential benefits based on a work record are a reward for productive effort and are consistent with general economic incentives, while the knowledge that benefits will be paid—irrespective of whether the individual is in need—supports and stimulates his drive to add his personal savings to the basic security he has acquired through the insurance system. Under such a social-insurance system, the individual earns a right to a benefit that is related to his contribution to production. This earned right is his best guaranty that he will receive the benefits promised and that they will not be conditioned on his accepting either scrutiny of his personal affairs or restrictions from which others are free."

The workers of America are in wholehearted agreement with that position. They regard this approach to the problem of security in old age as the one which is most sound and practical. They want benefits as a right—a right which derives from their having made regular contributions from their wages. They want this right established in a manner to remove the question of their old-age security from the uncertainties of political fortunes. They are aware that there can be no genuine security which rests only on a vague promise that their future will be taken care of if need should arise. They remember too well the uncertainties of the relief handed out from month to month during the depression. Workers want benefits as a right because they want not only security, but they want security with dignity. Too many of them know too well the indignity of the means test.

There is no indication anywhere in Mr. McLain's statement that he understands the nature of the American worker's desire for security or that he understands the principles upon which our program of social insurance was established.

II

In his statement, Mr. McLain speaks of the groups who are presently under one of the social insurance programs as "special privilege" group. We agree that the coverage today is far from adequate; that there are entirely too many people deprived of this protection, but to use the term "special privilege" is completely inaccurate. This is proven by an analysis of the groups which for the last 10 years have been asking for a broadening of the coverage, as opposed to those groups which wanted to limit and restrict it. The very groups which have enjoyed what Mr. McLain calls special privileges have pressed hardest for the broadening of the program. When was it ever known that a special privilege group sought to extend that privilege to others? The industrial wage earners of America have constantly sought to extend the protection of social insurance to those outside the system, while certain segments of business (but certainly not all business leaders) have been responsible for keeping the coverage limited. It is easy to point to the deficiencies of the present social-security system and Mr. McLain has correctly pointed out some of its major limitations. The American Federation of Labor wants to correct these deficiencies. We want to correct them constructively, not by wiping out the entire system as Mr. McLain proposes.

When Mr. McLain speaks of special privilege groups, he includes those under the civil service retirement system and the railroad employees who are under the Railroad Retirement Act. Does he mean to wipe out the civil service retirement system and the railroad retirement system? While he does not say so in so many words, clearly the plan which he suggests would supersede these programs. Mr. McLain should say in so many words whether he means to destroy or supplant these two outstanding social-insurance programs which have proven their acceptability to millions of workers in these fields and in which billions of dollars of their own contributions are now invested. The proposals contained in H. R. 6000 would leave these plans intact.

The general position taken by Mr. McLain is in harmony with the new line which is now being taken up by the conservatives on all sides, including Senator TAFT and Congressman CURTIS. The current confusion in the pension and retirement field could have been avoided if the Eightieth Congress had undertaken its responsibilities constructively, rather than approaching the problems with a meat ax. The time to have made the basic changes in the social-security program was from 1946 to 1948. They could not have been made earlier, as the program was just getting started when this country went into a war economy. The need for constructive change was clearly brought out in the report of the House Ways and Means Committee prepared in 1945 and 1946, but men like TAFT and CURTIS who, during the time they were in control of Congress did nothing to repair the deficiencies of the program, now point to its admitted inadequacies as a reason for discarding the entire system. The workers of America are too well acquainted with the intentions of such men to trust their future security to any schemes that they propose. Mr. McLain's testimony indicates that he has joined their ranks.

III

The failure to grasp or understand the basic needs and desires of working people revealed in Mr. McLain's statement leads to some glaring inconsistencies:

1. In the opening paragraph he describes his plan as a "pension." In the same paragraph he states that payments should be made only in case of need. What is it that he proposes? Is it a pension or a dole? The two are radically different and if Mr. McLain is aware of the difference, his statement fails to resolve it;

2. Mr. McLain proposes that the payments are to be made in case of need, but he fails to indicate at any point as to how this need is to be determined. No one has ever found a way to provide a public relief or Government charity without some kind of a means test.

At one point he states that a flat $75 per month should be paid to "those who can prove they need it," and at another point indicates that an additional $30 a month should be paid to those who need medical care or service. The suggested flat payments are in contradiction to his proposal to pay in cases of proven need. If payments are to be made to meet need, some will need less than $75, and some will need more. Certainly most elderly people will need more than the $30 which he suggests for medical aid if they need medical aid at all.

3. It is interesting to note that with regard to financing, Mr. McLain states frankly that he has no idea what his plan would cost. He is clear on one point: he wants to relieve the employer of any direct cost, suggesting that Government contributions take the place of the present employer contributions. However, he thinks employees should continue their contributions. Under his proposal, the employee would pay twice: once through direct pay-roll contributions and again as taxpayers—unless, of course, Mr. McLain is among those who believe that workers don't pay taxes. In fact, Senator MILLIKIN pointed out this weakness in the plan and asked Mr. McLain directly if that presented any difficulty to him. Mr. McLain replied that it did not, that it only seemed to him that his proposal spread the tax base—a nice phrase for asking the employee to pay double.

4. Mr. McLain refers to "the keen observer" of the problem of security and apparently means to identify himself as such. When he states his belief, however, that the administrative costs of the program that he proposes would be less than that of the present plan, it is quite plain that his observations have not been very keen. For the Federal Government to undertake to make payments to all elderly persons on the basis of proved need, an army of investigators and snoopers the like of which has never been seen would have to be employed. To say that that kind of program could be operated as efficiently and as economically as a social-insurance program is fantastic. The present old-age and survivors program has 80,000,000 current wage accounts, and the entire cost of administration is only 3 percent of the contributions. This is the largest insurance system in the world, and it operates at the lowest per capita cost.

We in the American Federation of Labor believe that our system of contributory social insurance has proved its worth, even on the limited basis on which the reactionaries in Congress have forced it to operate over the last 10 years. It should be broadened and brought up to date and not destroyed, as Mr. McLain proposes. We have no fear that the workers will be deceived by any such impractical and uncertain promise of security as that which Mr. McLain offered in his statement to the Senate Finance Committee last Saturday.

Undermining the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the Hearst papers had never published any other constructive thought nor advocated any other patriotic action, the editorial which they carried Tuesday, February 7, 1950, more than justifies their publication.

That editorial calls attention to the several proposals now pending before the Senate to surrender our sovereignty, commit our youth to fight in every war anywhere in the world which the representatives of contentious, ambitious, quarrelsome, bankrupt nations may decide will advance their collective or individual interests.

The editorial is as follows:

THE NEW BOOTLEGGER

(By Burris Jenkins, Jr.)

UNDERMINING THE REPUBLIC

Do the American people want to betray the founders and the defenders of the Republic?

Do they want to renounce the principles confided to them by their patriots?

Do they want to defile the civilization instituted by their worthy ancestors?

Do they want to desert the noble flag for which their sons and brothers have shed devoted blood and enroll themselves as a fragment of a nondescript horde under an ensign of universal subjection?

Do they want to repeal their Declaration of Independence?

Do they want to annul the Constitution of the United States?

Do they want to submerge their nationality in a welter of world government which will have steadily encroaching power to dictate their laws, to alter their currency, to tax their incomes and property, to adulterate their citizenship, to decree their wages, to confiscate their goods, to expropriate their savings, to control their industries and agriculture, to punish them for vague and undefined crimes, and to establish over them for all these purposes an alien police?

Do the American people realize that all this may be—and in fact is being—inflicted upon them through the servile agency of their own State legislatures, which they themselves elected?

On January 19 of this year a resolution was introduced in the New York Legislature requiring Congress to assemble a national convention—"for the sole purpose of proposing amendment of the Constitution to expedite and insure the participation of the United States in a world federal government."

This extraordinary proposal in the legislature of one of the Thirteen Original States was not devised there.

It came from one of the several visionary internationalist groups which are promoting world government in America.

And, while the public at large has been uninformed and indifferent, similar resolutions have been adopted by the lethargic legislatures of 23 States—and recently recanted by one, the State of Georgia.

New York, with its commanding wealth and prestige, would thus be the twenty-third State on record.

An additional 9 States—32 in all—would compel the Congress to act affirmatively.

The movement has been astutely and covertly conducted.

The world-government propagandists have disclosed to their own followers, in their own restricted literature, their design as summarized in this editorial.

Yet in no State has any decent public notice been given of legislative intentions.

In no State have representative committee hearings been held, nor have any adequate inquiries or reports been made.

The world-government project is being bootlegged through the State houses and into the Capitol at Washington.

Once again, since they cannot rely upon their trusted lawmakers, it looks as if the American people must depend upon themselves to defend their institutions, their national integrity, and their freedom.

In legislatures where the world-government proposal has not been approved, it must be defeated.

In legislatures where the un-American resolution has been adopted, it must be repealed.

Well do I recall that, when, in January of 1942, I made two speeches on the floor of the House condemning the proposal to haul down the Stars and Stripes, I was hailed before a grand jury which the Washington Post and the administration was then attempting to use through its henchman, William Power Maloney.

Apparently I was summoned to appear before that grand jury because the Washington Post and its stooge, William Power Maloney—who was characterized in more polite language by the United States Suprem Court as a shyster and who was later convicted of a drunken assault on a representative of the Chinese Government—wanted to learn by whom and in what quantities copies of my speeches had been circulated.

If more publications had the conviction and the courage of the Hearst publications, the danger to the Republic would not be so great. The people, once aware of the present attempts of some well-meaning but misguided citizens to overthrow our Government by the creation of one world or whatever they call it, would receive less support.

If our youth must continue to fight in world wars, let them at least fight under our own flag, our own officers—not as mercenary or puppet soldiers of an international group of ambitious, power-hungry world politicians.

What Should the United States Policy in China Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me in Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C., January 30, 1950:

The time is rapidly approaching when it will no longer be of much use to discuss United States policy in China. If the last stronghold of the Chinese Government, Formosa, is overwhelmed by the Communists, it will not make much difference whether we get a China policy or not. Should the Nationalist Government finally be overcome by the blows rained upon it both by its Communist enemies and its supposed friend and ally, the Government of the United States, then the followers of the Kremlin will have power in China that cannot be challenged in any foreseeable future, no matter how unhappy or angry the Chinese people may be. American influence in that vast area will be almost a thing of the past. We will have suffered the greatest defeat in our history.

But as long as Formosa stands as the final bastion of the free Chinese, there is still a chance for the United States to play a decisive role in preventing such a catastrophe to our own security and interests. It should be our policy to help the free Chinese maintain on Formosa the legitimate government of the Republic of China—first, to maintain a symbol of hope and encouragement to the hundreds of millions of our wartime allies now rapidly disappearing behind the Asiatic iron curtain; second, to afford an effective deterrent to Communist seizure of Formosa which would give Russia use of a perfect air and submarine base in the heart of our western Pacific security system; and third, to encourage Chinese to work toward eventually removing China from the Soviet side of the balance and returning her to the side of free nations in the gigantic cold war in which we are engaged throughout the world.

The first requirement of a policy is that we wake up to the real nature of the Communist movement in China and to the fact that its real target is ourselves. The State Department and many writers on China for years followed the line that there was some hope in the Communists in China, and none in the Chinese Government. On the other hand, many of us maintained that there was some hope in the Chinese Government, and none in the Communists, because they are committed to dictatorship and to world conquest. The policy of supporting the Chinese Government and those who are resisting Communist subjugation will not require a large expenditure of effort, money, or materials on the part of the American Government and people. It will, however, require positive action and a genuine determination really to help the free Chinese resist those who would enslave them. Until there is such a will on our part, there can, of course, be no way.

Second, we should not grant diplomatic recognition to the Communist regime at Peking. Such recognition would bring us no benefits, and would greatly weaken the will-to-resist of the Chinese already under the Communists on the mainland, the free Chinese in Formosa, and the strong communities of Chinese in all the countries of southeast Asia. It would shake the confidence in us of the peoples in Asia still on the fence. Our greatest immediate stake in Asia is to keep them on our side. If they were to witness official abandonment by the powerful United States of an ally which stood by us during the nightmare period following Pearl Harbor, could they then be expected to have any faith in our present declaration that we will resist the spread of Communist aggression beyond China and help them against Communist threats to their own independence? Would not they rather decide that in view of our debacle in China, it would be foolish to put their faith in us? Would not it be the part of wisdom for them to seek the best terms they could get from the Communists, rather than depend on American support with no assurance it would ever come?

Furthermore, to recognize the Communist regime would put an avowed enemy instead of a proved friend in the Chinese seat on the United Nations Security Council. We would have enemies instead of friends in all Chinese embassies, legations, and consulates all over the world, carrying on espionage conspiracy and propaganda against ourselves in the very midst of the countries which we hope to keep out of their control. Surely that would not be in our interest.

Third, we should make a forthright statement of support to the Chinese Government and all other anti-Communist forces, in their struggle to remain free. More than anything else the Chinese—exhausted from 12 years of war and invasion, discouraged because of betrayals and abandonment by their allies—need moral support, the same sort of support we have given to the Greeks, Italians, Turks, and others in Europe engaged in exactly similar fights to prevent being taken over by Communists and made Soviet satellites. The governments of some of them do not come up to our standards either.

Fourth, we should extend effective military aid to the defenders of Formosa. By effective military aid I mean the same sort of military-assistance program we have carried out successfully in Greece, but have not tried in China since the recall of General Wedemeyer in early 1946.

Effective military aid includes first of all, putting in charge of America's security in that part of the world, the most experienced and successful man we have in dealing with East Asia. That man, of course, is General MacArthur.

It includes some top-flight American military sparkplugs, like General Wedemeyer, Admiral Cooke, or Admiral Badger, with adequate American staffs to train and advise the Chinese armed forces at all levels—and in strategy, tactics, and operations—which our previous mission in China was not permitted by our Government to do.

It includes a relatively small amount of munitions, equipment and supplies carefully planned for the particular type of operation needed. It includes spare parts and fuel for the Chinese air force and navy. It might include about 50,000 World War I type rifles and ammunition therefor, in addition to the 130,000 rifles we have sent under the program the Congress voted in 1948.

A military aid program does not include American combat troops. I do not know anyone who has ever suggested that we should send American combat troops to Formosa, or that we should occupy it with American forces, even though the State Department is busily engaged in shooting down that straw man set up by itself. Such a policy is unnecessary and would be most ill-advised. It would be neither justifiable nor advantageous for the United States to occupy or seize Formosa for herself; it is extremely important to our security that it be denied to our enemies. The way to accomplish that end, and at the same time to strengthen the spirit of resistance among all Chinese and other free peoples in Asia, is to help the Chinese and Formosans hold their island, as many of our best military students of the problem believe they can do with such aid, and with the natural advantages Formosa has as a result of the hundred-mile barrier of water between it and the mainland, and the fact the Communists do not have either a substantial navy or air force.

In short, what China has most needed all along and most needs now is not more aid but proper aid, which is what we have not given since 1945. Munitions without American advice and assistance in their use cannot succeed any more than advice without munitions could succeed.

If we had tried in China the sort of policy we have followed in Greece, or if we had followed the recommendations made by General Wedemeyer 2½ years ago, and still failed, then neither I nor any other person could say a word of criticism. But we have not tried. How does anyone know whether we can succeed or not, until we do try?

Fifth, we should continue to give economic assistance to the Chinese Government on Formosa. One of the reasons the economy of the island is sorely strained is because it is having to export materials needed for home consumption, in order to get foreign exchange to buy commodities like cotton and oil which must be obtained from abroad. If we help with such commodities, exactly as we are helping Korea and Japan and helping western Europe, under the European recovery program, and in Korea and Japan, the economy of Formosa can be made reasonably stable. Ordinarily it has a favorable balance of trade, in sharp contrast to that of England, for example, which we are helping even though it almost certainly can never again become self-supporting.

Sixth, we should give every possible assistance and even leadership in encouraging the free peoples of Southeast Asia to get together in a mutual assistance defense pact, such as we have sponsored in the North Atlantic. Without some such cooperative effort to defend the whole area, there is every reason to expect that the Communists will be able to pick the countries off, one by one. Without access to the resources and markets of Southeast Asia on a mutually beneficial basis, what chance is there for England, France, Holland, and western Europe to become self-supporting? If we are compelled to continue beyond 1952 the heavy burden of supporting these free countries of western Europe, how long can we ourselves remain solvent and safe?

That brings me to the compelling reason why I believe we should adopt some such positive policy in place of the pro-Communist wait-and-see do-nothing-effective policy our Government has followed with such disastrous results these last 4 years. That reason is the basic instinct of self-preservation.

I am not and never have been interested in any persons, groups, or parties in China. I am interested in the security of the United States of America, and in freedom, world order, and peace. It is the job of responsible American officials to find means of achieving those goals; not reasons for not achieving them. If they think nothing effective can be done in China, then they should step aside or be removed to make way for those who believe something effective can be done and must be done.

The primary objective of an intelligent nation's foreign policy must always be one thing—the nation's security. How can we attain that objective? There are two main methods. We must seek by all legitimate means to prevent the development or expansion of any power or powers hostile to ourselves to the point where they might be able to attack us with chance of success;

we must seek by all legitimate means to keep as many nations as possible free and strong and on our side.

In a jungle world such as ours, survival depends to no small degree on the capacity to distinguish friend from enemy. Whatever the weaknesses and shortcomings of the Chinese Government, it is a friend whose loyalty to us, even in the darkest days after Pearl Harbor, has never been questioned. Whatever the strengths or alleged virtues of the Communists, they are our avowed enemy.

In such a situation it has always seemed to me the decision as to what we ought to do should be extremely simple: We should oppose whatever assists our mortal enemy; we should assist whatever opposes that mortal enemy. However great the risks and difficulties of such a positive policy may be, the risks of a policy of doing nothing effective are even greater.

It is not enough just to recite the weaknesses of China—the five adjectives which the apologists of our Government's negative policies always use as their excuse for not giving effective aid, namely, that the Government of China is "inept, incompetent, inefficient, undemocratic, and corrupt." Those conditions exist in China, just as they do in every Asian country and everywhere else in greater or less degree, especially after long exhausting wars. They are the problems it is the business of responsible statesmanship to solve; not the alibi for failure to solve them.

I am fully aware of all the myths which have been so successfully propagated regarding the Communists in China: for example, that they are not really Communists but just agrarian reformers, patriotic peasants leading spontaneous revolutionary forces against warlordism, landlordism, and feudalism; that they are not connected with or subservient to the Soviet Union; that they won't be able to organize and administer a government in China without our help, which will make them susceptible to our influence; that they will not be able to convert the Chinese to communism; that they will not be able to solve China's economic problems; that they will probably develop Titoism; that they will have to cooperate with the West. All of these myths have proved or are being proved cruel hoaxes. They were designed to lull us to sleep while the Communists were getting control of China. They have been exceedingly successful.

If we cannot decide what is best in China, because we think neither side, Nationalist or Communist, is good, then let us decide what is worst, as a physician does when confronted with no good alternatives. What is the worst thing that can happen to China? There can be no question about that. The worst thing from the standpoint of our own interests, those of the Chinese people, and of world peace is for China to come wholly under the Communists and become another satellite of Russia. Therefore, that is the thing which we must, if possible, prevent.

The first requirement of our security in the Pacific is not a democratic Chinese Government or even a better Chinese Government; but an independent Chinese Government. The present disaster began when we abandoned in 1945, starting at Yalta, our historic policy of supporting resolutely "the sovereignty, the independence, the territorial and administrative integrity of China."

We got off the track because some officials high in our Government failed for some unexplained reason to realize the nature of the Communist movement in China as an instrument of Soviet aggression, and allowed themselves to be beguiled into thinking or hoping that it was just one faction in an internal conflict that was none of our business. Now it is plain to all that the Communists have all of Asia and ourselves, not just China, as their aim.

Unless immediately—and I have warned for 3 years it may already be too late—there is a drastic reversal of our policy in Asia similar to that we executed 3 years ago in Europe, namely, a shift from appease Communist aggression to oppose Communist aggression—then history can only record that we defeated Japan but Russia won the war in the Pacific. We and the free world lost it.

However late it is today, it will be still later tomorrow. However much it will cost—about $26,000,000—to make the effort now, our choice is not between that and something less; it is between that and something more. Which do we want?

There are two lessons we could still learn from our experience in Europe if we would. The first is that when Communist expansion is stopped, it begins to fall apart, because it cannot deliver on its fancy promises. The second is that it cannot be stopped except by resistance all along the line of its advance. This requires assistance to all in its path, even though some of the governments involved do not meet with our full approval. If we will apply those lessons with imagination and resolution in Asia, the situation may still be retrieved. There is hope if we try; there is none if we don't try.

We have learned that to keep western Europe free there must be a regional effort—assistance to all in the given area. If we would keep Asia free, there must be a program of regional defense there also.

Ultimately, and soon, there must be global defense against the strong, cruel enemy we and the free peoples of the world face; or all of us, not just weakened and exhausted China, will fall before its ruthless and skillful onslaughts from within and without. Must we once more dawdle and daydream until after the blow actually falls, and then have to fight for our own survival under the most difficult circumstances possible?

A Fruit Grower's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from Les Boyd, an outstanding citizen of southwestern Berrien County, in the State of Michigan, comes the following article, as published in the January 7, 1950, edition of the Herald-Press of St. Joseph, Mich.:

POLITICS ARE FELT IN FRUIT DEAL, TOO, BOYD DECLARES

(By L. A. Boyd)

Politicians receive a lot of criticism, but did you ever stop to think that this American democracy was founded on politics?

A group of early settlers objected to King George's rule, and the American Revolution started us on our freedom.

As I see it, our elected officials for the most part are a fine class of men. There are some who fall by the wayside, but the majority try to do the right thing for the masses of people.

Our main trouble is with the appointive officers who get jobs because they helped elect someone to office.

They get into Federal and State offices, Department of Agriculture, Secretary of State's office and colleges and schools. Some of them who are supposed to help the growers with better packing think more of the convictions they can get.

We have some good men who try to do a good job, and then we have some who forget the people who furnish the tax dollar that pays them.

These appointed officials are all well paid, and hold their jobs through civil service and pensions.

Then comes the politics played by different departments from the USDA down through the State of Michigan.

One of the main items is the lobbying to get all the funds possible for their promotions, whether good or bad. It's a merry scramble.

Then comes the commissions appointed by the different groups, generally five men, and, with a change of governors, it is a "party man," whether he is fitted or not.

The different departments work to get their man on the commission. If there is a group known as radicals, those that do not agree with them, they may concede appointment of two from the radical group to satisfy them, but there is always "three agin them."

Take with agriculture. It is always a fight and lots of hard feelings. The growers have nothing to do with it; they take what they get.

This does not help the growers much. Seventy-five percent of the money spent goes to stir the "political pot." Time and effort is wasted that should have been spent on the advancement of the growers' interests.

If anything comes up about trucking, grades, or things close to the Benton Harbor fruit market, these boys want a delegation to come to Lansing for a hearing.

Generally, things are all settled before the hearing, and the growers' time, money, and effort is wasted just to appease the psychology of your officials.

They have an expense account. They are supposed to be your servants. Why not have meetings with the growers and save this needless waste of time and energy? Who gets the benefits?

Then there is the jealousy among departments. If one group does an outstanding job in which another does not have a part, they are in the dog house.

Our county politics are in good shape, and one receives courteous treatment from our elected officials. You know them.

Sheriff Erwin Kubath and his deputies have done a good job in protecting farmers' crops and in handling labor trouble that always comes up with "floating labor."

Our board of supervisors and township boards give us better service for less money than any branch of Government. We can always vote them out. We know them, and the majority of them help their people.

What are we heading for?

There is a movement under way to centralize your county and township governments. This means that your assessor and treasurer will come from St. Joseph. You will pay your taxes there, and I know that a lot of farmers do not have the time nor means of transportation to go to the county seat for all the little things that come up.

This all ends for a bigger political machine, and I am sure that we have had all the rationing, reports to Government agencies, plus rent controls, that we want. Let's remember this deal.

Times have changed in Michigan.

There have been a lot of people from the large cities, workers in steel mills, and other factories, who have bought 5, 10, and 20 acres of land to insure their future security with a farm. That's their dream.

They build a home. They plant grapes, peaches, plums, and apples on low ground when they should be on high ground. They plant blueberries on sweet soil when they should be on sour soil. They plant berries anywhere.

We have had some outstanding county agents in the past, notably Frank Simanton and Harry Lurkins. They spent their days calling on the larger growers, and at night held meetings in the school houses and in the homes in the various communities.

These new growers, as a class, knew nothing about soil testing, fertilizers, irrigation, and air drainage, or spraying.

When the crops came in they knew nothing about packing.

They had roadside stands, and still have them, and these, with the other roadside stands, are a problem.

We had three men in this country—Bill Boslinger, Sid Smith, and Al Hastings—who used to spend some time with any grower and show him how to put up an honest pack, and that helped a lot. They always had a smile.

Things have changed a lot in a great many ways, and in our mad rush through the war years we forgot the roadside stands and the grocery stores. They all handle locally grown produce; the farmer is their customer.

How about the tourists who flock to Michigan each summer, stop at the roadside stands, and buy some fruit that is swell on the top of the basket, with marbles and inferior fruit on the bottom?

The grocery stores have the advantage. They weigh it out and know where they bought it, but they still have their losses.

This tourist customer will not have a good taste left in his mouth for more Michigan fruit.

Here are some of the things which our farmers cannot understand, and which show the national trend and what happens.

Quote: "Apple growers hold meeting at Quincy, Ill., and decide to pull out their apple trees." This means the famous Senator Scarborough Redbirds. How do they feel?

Quoting from a recent newspaper: "United States Gives Spuds Away"—17,600,000 bushels, bought through the Commodity Credit Corporation; part went to schools; the balance was offered for sale at 1 cent a bushel. They cost an average of $2.10 per bushel.

The next items mentioned to go the same way are dried eggs, dried milk, cheese, and butter.

Now they want to remove the tax from oleo, just to help the solid South. We have been helping them since the Civil War.

To top it off, with floods throughout the Middle West, and cold weather, they quibble in Washington over the coal strike. Just why is it necessary to play politics with the things that are so vital to our American way of life?

These things are vital to the factory worker, the farmer, the manufacturer. Why pick on the people who produce your very existence?

It will be well to let our politicians know that America comes first, that internationalists are a thorn in our side; they want to police the world.

I don't think we can properly police ourselves, much more try to police the world.

The Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include articles 6, 7, and 8 in the series on the Columbia River region written by Mr. Leon Starmont. Since these articles contain much information about the history of Columbia water-resource development not generally known to Members of Congress who today are considering important legislation affecting that river, I commend them to all. It should be remembered, however, that all statements in them are Mr. Starmont's own and that many of the actions taken over a period of the last 50 years are subject to varying interpretation.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of January 27, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 6)

(By Leon Starmont)

Early Spokane papers, including the rival Spokesman and Review, the original Times and the Chronicle, campaign for irrigation of the Yakima, Wenatchee, and Okanogan Valleys and the Big Ben country long before the railroad reached the present sites of Yakima, Ellensburg, Ephrata, Wenatchee, and Kennewick, and before Pasco became a city.

Numerous laymen, too, had elaborate schemes for developing the Columbia and for putting water on the Columbia plains, which is a title long used for the area now generally called the Big Bend. The name Big Bend at one time was confined to the area around Delrio, Mansfield, and Waterville, west of Grand Coulee, and in some instances even west of Moses Coulee.

LAUGHLIN M'LEAN'S IDEA

Nobody can now say with certainty who first thought of diverting Columbia River into its ice-age channel, Grand Coulee, or what paper first publicised the idea.

One proposal that attracted wide attention was made in 1892 by Laughlin McLean, a dealer in farm land in the Big Bend and Grand Coulee areas.

Yellowed clippings from the Spokane Daily Spokesman indicate that his vision included a dam so high it would back the Columbia well up the valleys of the San Poil, Spokane, Colville, Pend Oreille, and Kootenay.

It would also bare the present course of the Columbia for gold mining at some seasons of the year, and would provide a supplementary channel capable of carrying barges through Grand Coulee from the upper Columbia to the lower end of the locks, somewhere around Priest Rapids.

Many newspaper articles in Spokane and other cities played with the idea of running river steamers to Spokane, of connecting mid-Columbia navigation with the busy lines on the Arrow Lakes, and even of connecting the Spokane and Pend Oreille by means of a canal at Newport, Wash., where the Little Spokane rises within a few hundred feet of the Pend Oreille.

"BILLY" CLAPP'S IDEA

Laughlin McLean's plan was revived in the summer of 1917 by William E. (Billy) Clapp, an Ephrata attorney, now counsel for the Quincy-Columbia irrigation district. He took it up with three friends, W. Gale Matthews, head of the Grant County Abstract Co.; Paul D. Donaldson, also of Ephrata, still active in basin planning; and A. A. Goldsmith, who then lived at Soap Lake but later moved to Grandview. They discussed the idea several times and mulled over it for a year.

Then, in July 1918, Rufus Woods, editor of the Wenatchee World, stopped in Ephrata and called on Matthews. Matthews took him to see Clapp, and the resulting story of Clapp's revival of the McLean River diversion plan was carried, as an entertaining feature, on an inside page of the Wenatchee World.

"Billy" Clapp, much to his own embarrassment, has been labeled "father of Grand Coulee Dam," an honor he smilingly and modestly disclaims. For, as Clapp and his friends explain, Grand Coulee had then been long considered both as a reservoir and a dam site, and the scheme of diverting the river into the coulee has little resemblance to the plan finally agreed upon by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation some 13 years later.

SOUTHARD PLAN, TOO

Another Ephrata resident, W. E. Southard, followed Clapp shortly with a modified idea. He would build a Columbia River dam only high enough to divert water by tunnel into lower Grand Coulee, below Dry Falls, at what is now Sun Lakes State Park. Southard got quite a bit of front-page display in Spokane and other newspapers, and his plan was later mentioned seriously in official documents, as the McLean and Clapp projects never were.

There was some official notice of the Clapp proposal, however, after E. F. Blaine had revived interest in the Big Bend development after visiting Washington in its behalf and delivering his now famous address to the Spokane Chamber of Commerce.

On November 27, 1918, C. W. Duncan, then county engineer at Ephrata, wrote the county commissioners that he had scouted the area looking for a possible dam site for the river diversion plan and recommended "exploring the valley of Columbia River in the vicinity of the head of Grand Coulee and Box Canyon * * * to bring the river to the level of the floor of Grand Coulee."

Hugh Cooper, who had a dam site at Z Canyon on Pend Oreille River, told members of the Spokane Columbia Basin group late in 1919 that the best way to irrigate was by a low dam at Grand Coulee, which could supply power to pump irrigation water into the bed of the coulee. They discounted his ideas, believing he was motivated by fear that diverting part of the Pend Oreille at Albeni Falls would endanger his Z Canyon project.

Cooper later expounded in Spokane, Wenatchee, and elsewhere his ideas he had picked up from reading the Noble, McGinnis, and Jacobs reports and from examination of the site.

James O'Sullivan, whose name is now preserved in the dam at the south end of the projected Potholes Reservoir, became interested about this time, and wrote a number of articles about the Army engineers' proposals for dams at Priest Rapids, Rock Island, Box Canyon, Grand Coulee, Hell Gate, and Kettle Falls.

Late in 1920 O'Sullivan wrote in the Wenatchee World a proposal that 500,000 acres be irrigated by a 100-foot dam at Grand Coulee and the rest of the project, then 1,850,000 acres, by gravity from Albeni Falls on the Pend Oreille.

The 1920's brought construction of Rock Island Dam on Columbia River below Wenatchee. Rufus Woods first opposed the Rock Island project, maintaining the site should be preserved for the city of Wenatchee and neighboring irrigation districts. His opposition was later withdrawn.

These matters are significant now only because Woods is a member of the State Columbia Basin commission.

Private capital then had plans for dams at Priest Rapids and Kettle Falls, and Army engineers had plans for several localities, including Grand Coulee and Hell Gate, which lies between Grand Coulee and the mouth of Spokane River. The Army also had started to improve a navigation channel through Rickey Rapids, permitting boats to run up the Columbia to the international boundary.

While engineering studies were still going on, Woods undertook a campaign for a high dam at Grand Coulee, which was to eliminate two upper dam sites, wipe out all possibility of continuous navigation, and reduce the irrigable land of the Columbia Basin project by nearly 45 percent.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of January 28, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 7)

(By Leon Starmont)

Eastern Washington now faces the sobering fact that the great Big Bend irrigation project, renamed the Columbia Basin project, on which thousands of earnest citizens expended much time and money and great effort beginning in 1918, has been reduced from its original 1,850,000 acres, in round figures, to a scant half million.

Three principal factors in this shrinkage are substitution of the dam-and-pumping plan for the gravity plan of irrigation, withdrawal of wheat land that was to be watered from the East High canal, and removal of most of the rich Wahluke slope, taken over for security by the Atomic Energy Commission in connection with the Hanford plutonium plants.

SOME CAN BE RECOVERED

Some of this loss can be recovered.

Spokesman for the Columbia Basin Commission at Ephrata, and the Bureau of Reclamation at Coulee Dam, still speak of a "million-acre project." They assume the Wahluke slope will ultimately be released by the AEC, and the East High canal, which takes off above the new Long Lake Dam north of Stratford, will eventually be built.

They are not so optimistic about the acres that would have been irrigated under the gravity plan, but are too high to be reached with water from Grand Coulee Reservoir.

Ralph D. Nichols, a former Seattle State senator, has an elaborate plan, however, for using Kootenay, Pend Oreille, Spokane, and Palouse River water in a great high interconnecting reservoir that would inundate several townships in eastern Washington and northern Idaho, and let water out down either the Pend Oreille, the Kootenay, the Spokane or Little Spokane, the Palouse, Hangman Creek, or Rock Creek, wherever it might be needed or required.

ENGINEERS IGNORED PLAN

Army engineers, during last year's public hearings on the revised 308 report, listened to Nichols' explanation of his scheme, but gave it little or no serious consideration.

Many of the areas to be inundated had already made their protests known at hearings on the Springston and Boundary Dam projects and the three-dam plan once considered for a greatly expanded Pend Oreille lake.

Nichols, one of the original municipal ownership advocates in Seattle, has been plugging for the seven-valley dam since 1946, and has made numerous attempts to interest members of the legislature.

ACRES VERSUS KILOWATTS

The Nichols proposals are physically possible, from an engineering point of view. There are several other spots in the upper Columbia Basin where exchange of waters between tributaries is possible. One of them now being studied would create a high lake from which water could be directed down either the Columbia or Kootenay from Canal Flat, British Columbia.

Balancing the gains and losses caused by the gravity-to-pumping switch is a task that makes experienced engineers quail. A layman should therefore attempt it with extreme caution.

Stated simply, perhaps oversimply, for every acre lost a kilowatt was gained.

One engineer indicated that 400,000 acres may have been irrevocably lost to irrigation by abandonment of the gravity canal. To compensate for this, he said, the river would have lost enough water at Albeni Falls to reduce by 400,000 kilowatts the possible power output at Z Canyon, Kettle Falls, Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, and the other dams down the Columbia.

This reporter lets it go at that.

You can drive out past Cheney and see the 400,000 acres, representing some of the best land tributary to Ritzville, Lind, Connell, Washtucna, Kahlotus, and Pasco.

At no place can you see the kilowatts.

The ultimate basin-wide goal is 8,500,000 acres and 20,000,000,000 kilowatts.

The rate of exchange, therefore, was 4¾ percent of the acreage for 1¼ percent of the kilowatts.

NAVIGATION ADVOCATED

Early in the 1920's, it now appears, the Army engineers gave up their idea of developing the upper Columbia and the middle Snake for navigation.

Bargemen on the lower river still insist a mistake was made. This came out during hearings on the 308 revised report in connection with Hell's Canyon Dam on Snake River.

"Let's not repeat at Hell's Canyon the mistake made at Grand Coulee," cried Capt. Arvid Leppaluoto. "Let's make it possible to run barges up to Boise."

Idaho Power Co. spokesmen also protested Hell's Canyon, saying power could be delivered much earlier by a series of low dams, including the company's Oxbow and other sites, which could include navigation locks.

Nevertheless, the revised "308" plan includes Hell's canyon, with its bar to upriver navigation and its much delayed power development.

Most residents are inclined to concede that abandonment of the international navigation channel on the Columbia, and delay of several years in power delivery, are more than outweighed by the advantages the high dam brought.

IRRIGATION SUBSIDY

There is another consideration, also, which induces all but a few of the original irrigation group to accept the pumping plan and its lower acreage.

That is the subsidy paid by power users to water users.

In some cases, of course, this is the same as moving pennies from one pocket to the other. Most users of irrigation water also use power.

But many power users and prospective power users do not use irrigation water, and question a policy that makes them pay part of the bills of those who do.

True, all power users buy groceries, and if the lower water rates are reflected in lower grocery bills they haven't much to kick about—except the principle of the thing.

It may become a definite part of western or national policy to have farming subsidized by industry. There have been no loud protests so far.

But a number of people in high official circles have indicated some concern as to how far this policy can or should be carried.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of January 29, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 8)

(By Leon Starmont)

It may be news to many that the original 308 report, on which the present comprehensive Columbia Basin program is based, did not recommend Bonneville or McNary Dam and did not recommend immediate construction of Grand Coulee.

It was, however, the deciding factor in abandonment of the gravity plan for irrigating 1,850,000 acres and substitution of the pumping plan, with its subsidy feature, for a much smaller acreage.

Maj. John S. Butler was district engineer at Seattle when the study was made. This is what he said in his summary about Grand Coulee Dam in 1932:

"Under proper conditions it would be capable of returning the investment with interest. * * * It doesn't necessarily follow that the proper conditions exist at the present time."

WARRENDALE ADVOCATED

District engineer for the Army at Portland was Maj. Oscar O. Ehrentz. His report covered the Columbia below the mouth of the Snake. It listed 17 possible dam sites, but eliminated 13 of them "because of not economically fitting into the general scheme of developing power * * * or on account of foundation difficulties."

Five received closer study "in order to determine the best plan of development." These were, reading down river, Umatilla, Arlington, John Day, The Dalles, and Warrendale.

The final recommendation was: "A power dam at The Dalles with its pool at elevation 330, a power dam at Warrendale with its pool at elevation 54, the navigation features for passing craft through these dams, and the irrigation, at such time in the future when it may become economically justified, of 378,000 acres by pumping from the pool created by The Dalles power dam."

Warrendale is 3 miles below Bonneville. The dam recommended in the first 308 report would have had its north abutment against Beacon Rock, now a State park.

ROOSEVELT TO THE RESCUE

This is what the original "308" report did recommend for the upper Columbia:

1. That the comprehensive plan be adopted as Federal policy.

2. That future dams require provision for navigation locks.

3. That permits be denied for power dams at Kettle Falls on the Columbia and the Narrows and Fishhawk sites on Spokane River below Little Falls.

4. That priority of irrigation over power be established.

Senator C. C. Dill, realizing there was little chance of getting money from Congress in a depression year on the strength of the Butler report, went directly to President Roosevelt. A. S. Goss, master of the National Grange, went along. They sold Roosevelt on the idea of using $60,000,000 PWA funds to start a low dam at the head of Grand Coulee, with the understanding it might later be built to the level indicated by Butler.

But Senator Charles L. McNary insisted Oregon share in the program, so the President ordered another dam built down the river first. The site was changed in the early 1930's from Warrendale to Bonneville.

LOCAL PRESSURE COUNT

It is interesting to watch the play of local pressures as the comprehensive plan takes tangible form and its units come into existence.

Cities in the center of their States, such as Wenatchee, Bend, Butte, and Bailey, tend to emphasize the "rights" of these States as opposed to their neighboring States. Seattle has much the same attitude, although it is outside the Columbia Basin.

Cities close to State lines, like Portland, Pasco, Walla Walla, Lewiston, Spokane, and to some extent Boise, seem to see more clearly, through their spokesmen, the necessity for interstate cooperation and a common front.

McNary Dam was substituted for The Dalles as the second project on the lower Columbia. This reporter does not attempt to say whether local pressures had a part.

Efforts were made to have Foster Creek (Chief Joseph) placed ahead of McNary, and similar efforts succeeded in getting it started ahead of either Ice Harbor or Albeni Falls—the latter not yet authorized. These efforts make the southern directors of the State Columbia Basin commission, who come from the Pasco area, unhappy.

They also create antagonisms in the Walla Walla country, in Whitman County, and in the sovereign State of Idaho.

DWORSHAK VOICES OBJECTION

Idaho's Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK, former publisher of the Burley Bulletin, expressed it in a recent letter to Marshall Dana, an editor of the Portland (Oreg.) Journal, one of the early directors of the Columbia Basin Irrigation League, and former president of National Reclamation Association. Wrote DWORSHAK to DANA:

"Idaho makes a valuable contribution to our basin resources with the Snake, Salmon,

Clearwater, and other tributaries, providing valuable water for the Columbia River. In exchange for this cooperation * * * Portland should give our State realistic cooperation in addition to the verbal greetings of good will. They should, likewise, enlist the active support of their congressional representatives.

"During the last year Washington has sidetracked essential upper basin projects.

"Two years ago the Army Engineer Corps recommended the construction of Ice Harbor Dam, one of the important elements of developing navigation on lower Snake River. Funds were requested to initiate this project, but during the recent session of Congress appropriations were diverted from this project to the Chief Joseph Dam, which has recently been given priority over the Snake River dams.

"'BIG BROTHER' SHORTCHANGED

"This means that once more preference has been given to the betterment of dams which for many years have been approved as essential, in providing not only navigation, but flood control and electric power.

"If we are to have 'one region,' it is time to equalize the benefits of Northwestern development. Idaho does not want more than its share, but it wants equity.

"There are powerful political influences which have militated against Idaho's full development. I appeal for a realistic approach with genuine cooperation in preventing further delay and to insure Idaho's place in this regional development."

Address by Hon. Frances P. Bolton, of Ohio, Before the Woman's Club of Richmond, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, during my service in the House of Representatives it was my privilege to enjoy a warm friendship with two able and outstanding Representatives of the Twenty-second District of the great State of Ohio—the late Honorable Chester C. Bolton and his public-spirited and talented wife, Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, who succeeded him in the House. The Commonwealth of Virginia, our capital city, and the members of the Women's Club were signally honored on the night of January 9, 1950, when Representative BOLTON was the guest speaker at the Club's annual dinner meeting.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the news item of January 5 from the Richmond Times-Dispatch announcing the address to be made in Richmond on the ninth by Mrs. BOLTON and a copy of her remarks on that occasion.

There being no objection, the news item and the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch of January 5, 1950]

MRS. BOLTON WILL ADDRESS WOMAN'S CLUB—CONGRESSWOMAN TO SPEAK MONDAY

FRANCES PAYNE BOLTON, Congresswoman from Ohio, will address the membership of the Woman's Club of Richmond as guest speaker on the president's program here Monday, according to an announcement made at the club's meeting yesterday.

Miss Frances Leigh Williams, president of the club, will preside at the Monday session.

Mrs. BOLTON was Ohio's first woman elected to Congress, and is now serving her tenth year in the House of Representatives from Ohio's Twenty-second District. A native of Cleveland, Mrs. BOLTON entered the political field after more than 30 years of homemaking.

An honorary alumna of Colgate University, Mrs. BOLTON was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws by Colgate in 1940, and was awarded a similar degree by Ohio Wesleyan University in 1942. She received her education at Hathaway-Brown School, Cleveland, Miss Spence's School for Girls in New York, and in a school in France.

Before she entered public life, Mrs. BOLTON was an active worker for higher standards of nursing education and service. She spoke in Richmond at the commencement exercises of St. Philip's School of Nursing in May 1941.

Before his death, Mrs. BOLTON's husband, Chester C. Bolton, was a State senator in Ohio, and later served in the United States Congress. He died in October 1939, in the midst of his fifth term.

ADDRESS OF HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON, OF OHIO

Madam Chairman, members of the Woman's Club of Richmond, as I drove down from Washington this morning I thought of many matters about which I wanted to speak with you, matters of great moment, for these are days when the fate of our civilization hangs in the balance.

With each mile I found the challenge of your invitation beckoning me more and more, and I wondered increasingly how I could tell you my deep appreciation of the privilege you have given me.

To come to Richmond is always a particular pleasure, for Richmond has a peculiar flavor, an atmosphere all its own, and Richmond women have a well-earned reputation for culture, intelligence, and charm. To come under these auspices is a rare and treasured opportunity.

To all Americans Virginia has a special meaning, for is she not the mother of the man whose dream, whose vision and whose indomitable courage made us a nation?

To me, the Ohio vice regent on the Mount Vernon Ladies Association, Virginia has come to mean much, to symbolize even more. I could not be a member of that board, living right there during council where Washington lived, without feeling closer each year to the Virginia of his day, to the Virginia he served and loved deeply all the days of his life, the Virginia that has given so much to America.

I know there is no need for me to recall to you that here in beautiful Virginia for three quarters of a century before the Declaration of Independence was signed, your people were stump speaking on Virginia court days for the expansion of liberty, of justice, and of freedom. Yet I would like to remind you that here in your Commonwealth there was a deep-seated antagonism to government from across the sea. And that antagonism constituted an excellent schooling for those who later led in the fight for the eventual freedom of the colonies and the birth of the United States of America.

Unlike the northern colonies, the Virginia system of government concentrated the administration of all local affairs in the hands of a few well-born county families who in those times were eminently fitted for the development of skill in leadership. This so-called aristocratic selection developed within your government a people trained to a remarkable degree in political economy. Hence it is not strange that this habit of parliamentary discussion enabled Virginia in those early days to give us men like Washington, Jefferson, Mason, Madison, and Marshall, and of a certainty this was a group of well-born leadership that has seldom if ever been equaled in all of history.

Moreover, it is indeed no happenstance that the Eighth Congressional District of Virginia—now and long represented by my good friend, the Honorable Judge HOWARD SMITH—not alone produced five men who later became Presidents of these United States—Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Taylor—but also the most distinguished and preeminent of all gentlemen, statesmen, soldiers, and patriots, your own beloved and revered Robert E. Lee.

Virginians have never had to apologize for the fact that their forebears brought from their mother country strong aristocratic prejudices and marked distinctions as to rank.

Here in Virginia the word "gentleman" had a very distinct meaning, and carried with it not only an ease of life but also a definite responsibility. Your many beautiful plantation homes are monuments to a way of life and of an economy very different from the severe, puritanical methods of my own forebears in old New England.

How different the life in these two sections of colonial America. In the North the elements themselves forced the already dour Pilgrims into a life dependent upon staple products and stable employment in which one must be assured gainful work as hired or purchased labor.

Here in Virginia the plantation needs were filled by the labor of imported indentured servants and slaves.

Life on the plantations of the Virginia Commonwealth was a life of isolation. Here each man settled where he found a convenient unoccupied plot of land. The parish churches, the county courts, and the election of your burgesses, bringing the Virginians together, kept up a fairly high degree of adult education. The parishes were extensive, and as there were but few schools, parochial and political rights of the minorities were in some measure—and rather unavoidably—curtailed.

The culture of tobacco was then, and in a large degree still is in some sections, the main source of cash income, though there were those who had little success with their tobacco. Oddly enough, Mr. Washington was among those who put himself through some difficult times in his attempt to make this one of his main crops.

As a matter of fact, the low price at which tobacco then sold afforded but scanty resources to the free planter obliged to rely on their own labor. Hence the management of local affairs fell under the control of but a few wealthy men possessed of large tracts of land which they cultivated partly with slave and largely with indentured white labor.

Thus it was that the Commonwealth of Virginia, through its landed gentry, inciting all of its people to clamor for liberation from the yoke of foreign government, liberated not only the Virginians themselves, but nurtured the seed for all mankind in the New World to develop what in this day and age has come to be known as the American way of life.

When at long last liberty had been wrested and the separation from the British throne had been completed, the strong arm that led the Nation on the field of battle lifted its pen at Mount Vernon to point out the path that lay ahead.

In writing the Governors of all States subsequent to the time he disbanded the Continental Army, George Washington said in part:

"According to the system of policy the States shall adopt at this moment, they will stand or fall; and, by their confirmation or lapse, it is yet to be decided whether the revolution must ultimately be considered as a blessing or a curse—a blessing or a curse not to the present age alone, for with our fate will the destiny of unborn millions be involved. There are four things which I humbly conceive are essential to the well-being, I may even venture to say to the existence, of the United States as an independent power:

"(1) An indissoluble union of the States under one Federal head;

"(2) A sacred regard to public justice;

"(3) The adoption of a proper peace establishment; and

"(4) The prevalence of that pacific and friendly disposition among the people of the United States which will induce them to forget their local prejudices and policies; to make those mutual concessions which are requisite to the general prosperity; and, in some instances, to sacrifice their individual advantages to the interest of the community."

The names of Virginia's Washington and Jefferson are as much a part of the Constitution of the United States as the Bill of Rights itself. This was so eloquently stated by your own Edmond Randolph who, in writing to General Washington and urging that he should accept the Presidency, said in part:

"The Constitution would never have been adopted but for a knowledge that you had once sanctioned it, and moreover, the expectation that you would execute it."

Thus it was that Washington, son of Virginia, became the first of the great galaxy of its sons whose names, having reached stardom, will be held in perpetual honor by the people of these United States.

High in your firmament—part of the great contribution Virginia has made to the inherent strength of this great country of ours—are the Pages, the Nelsons, the Tuckers, and the Lewises; the Douglases, Stuarts, Spotswoods, Howards, and Beverleys, few of whom are now left; the Blakeleys, the Fairfaxes, the Williamses, the Harrisons, Carters, Welfords, and Careys; and last but not least, that eminent and distinguished Virginian who now serves as the senior Senator from your great Commonwealth, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD.

I say to you with deep sincerity that no man who ever served his State and his Nation in the Congress of these United States has given more of himself to his country than does HARRY BYRD. He stands as a pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night, pointing the way whereby in economy and in truth we must all unite in the common cause of saving this Nation from the pitfalls which lie ahead, pitfalls indicated by President Washington when he said: "It is yet to be decided whether the revolution must ultimately be considered as a blessing or a curse—a blessing or a curse not to the present age alone, for with our fate will the destiny of unborn millions be involved."

Virginia was proud of HARRY BYRD when he was Governor. She had reason to be, and the Nation looked to Virginia as an example of administration second to none. Virginia then sent this strong son of her loins to the Senate of the United States where he stands out as one of the few men whose eye sees clearly, whose hand points the way, and whose heart holds a courage, a loyalty, and a passion for truth and for freedom that is as a light on a dark road.

Surely it is no happenstance that once again Virginia, through one of her sons, is playing a strong role in the country she started on its way.

It cannot be by chance that it is another great Virginian who stands in the Senate of the United States and points out the dangers that lie ahead under the guise of the welfare state, proposed by the Chief Executive, who is the titular head of the left wing of the Democratic Party.

America is fortunate that this distinguished son of Virginia with whose opinions on matters of bureaucracy and of economy I am in complete accord, should be pointing out daily that literally billions of dollars can be saved annually by the simple expedient of honest determination to do away with the duplications, the extravagance, and the waste now inherent in the administration of our national and Federal affairs.

Any thinking American today, especially such women as you who come out of the free soil of Virginia, cannot but see that Federal powers are reaching out from Washington into every hamlet and home in this great free land, largely under the guise of beneficence under implied powers of the Constitution insidiously destroying the sovereign rights and freedom of the States.

I need not remind you that Federal taxation is already overburdening. Nor do women need to be told that the man—or the nation—that lives on borrowed funds eventually exhausts them at the source and goes bankrupt.

But I do urge you to face up to the facts of our fiscal situation with a determination to know the truth, that with the high courage that runs in your blood you can take hold of your share of responsibility to the oncoming generations.

Never was there a time in history, friends, when we as women had so heavy a responsibility, we who have been full citizens of this last stand of freedom, lo, these many years.

So many have asked me:

What can a woman do as a full citizen in a free land? Let me quote from an editorial of 1946 in the Christian Science Monitor:

"She can start quite basically and simply within her domestic sphere, remembering that politics, like charity, begins at home. She can teach her children that the word 'responsibility' is a companion word to freedom; she can teach them to play and work happily with children of other races, creeds, and colors, and that difference in cultures are to be appreciated and enjoyed—not to be sneered or laughed at. She can lay aside her soap operas, bridge parties, and 'escape' reading along with the other toys of her childhood and do a little home work in the problems that confront her in the grown-up world. She can learn to base her opinions on something firmer than hysterical headlines. She can watch the voting record of her Representatives in Congress and reject or accept them on the basis of that record. She will go to the polls with a bow of gratitude to the men who plowed through abuse and ridicule to give her the suffrage, and exercise her vote."

Let me remind you that a nation is not a tangible thing, not a building of bricks and mortar that will crash to ruins at the first strong blow. It is an echo of the past and a whisper from the future, the whole bound together with the lives, the hopes, and the endeavors of millions of men and women.

I have stressed the splendid efforts of Senator BYRD in the whole matter of our national economy and fiscal policy. I would be amiss if I led you to believe that in my opinion the current dangerous trends here in these United States are primarily economic in character.

Liberty is a thing of the spirit, and freedom is lost when the spirit falters. Liberty as we have known it in this country is the greatest privilege man has achieved. America is the land of liberty, a land built on the certainty that the individual is a part of the very essence of the living God, and on the belief in the right of that individual to build his own home, to live his own life, to worship in his own way—a land built upon the recognition by each individual of his responsibility to protect his freedoms and to render full stewardship to the God from whom he received a riches transcending all imagination.

We who are women citizens of this great Republic must make ourselves more intelligent in all matters pertaining to government, and we must assume responsibility for the future with a keenness and a courage which we are peculiarly able to give.

Is it not our job to protect our children? Is it not ours to see that every man (and woman) accepts his part of the burden right in the home community for the health, the living conditions, and the education of the children.

We who are mothers and teachers should be keenly aware that children for whom too much is made easy do not grow into strong men or capable women. We should therefore recognize the dangers of the welfare state which turns private citizens into public charges. What strength there is in those two words: "private citizen." How they emphasize the proud independence of the individual in the kind of America George Washington envisioned and millions of Americans have been trying to build for 3½ centuries.

Surely all of us wish passionately to remain private citizens, but we must do something about it every chance we get.

We have a wonderful formula of government that divides the very power of power in order to assure to the individual protection from Government itself. Underlying the whole plan, in Madison's memorable words, is "that honorable determination * * * to vest all our political experiments on the capacity of mankind for self-government."

Said William Penn: "We have put the power in the people."

We have a two-party political pattern which in itself is an anchor to windward in these stormy days when free institutions are being swept by tides of strange forces of centralized power.

This system is so fundamental to our political structure and of such protection to the rights of the sovereign States that we cannot give too much thought to it.

When we turned over many of the sovereign powers of our separate States to the Federal Government during the war, we were doing what must always be done in like emergencies. But we have not recognized the implications of our failure to reassume at the State and local levels many of these responsibilities.

It is imperative that we recognize the inevitable results of continuing wartime measures in peacetime—even though peace be but a mirage on the face of the earth.

If there is to be freedom, then we who have a formula, we who have been made stewards of liberty, we must accept the burden of our privilege.

Now, what does that mean in concrete terms?

I have already given you a glimpse of what each individual woman, no matter what her state in life, no matter where or how she lives, must assume if she values her citizenship.

But there is more for each of us to do because American citizenship is twofold in character. We are citizens of sovereign States with aims and purposes not only to protect personal freedom but to protect the individuality and the sovereignty of the States themselves, and we are citizens of that great Union of States, the United States of America.

We are faced today, as our Nation has always been faced since its very inception, with problems that are both national and local in scope.

The answers to these problems must be sought with infinite wisdom—yes; and with infinite patience—if they are to be solved within the framework of a system that has as its goal the preservation of individual freedom from the hands of centralized power, and preservation of the identity of a nation that can take its place of leadership in the great family of nations.

There are many questions before us daily which we must relate to this basic formula for freedom which made us a nation and upon which we have built prosperity and strength. Often we do not stop to do this.

We look at the immediate moment only, failing to recognize the implications for the future.

Let me give you instances.

At what level does the local responsibility for proper teachers' salaries and school buildings fall? Where does the State's responsibility begin and end?

Is our State citizenship, our State and local pride, so weak that we must turn to the Federal Government at every corner?

If so, are we ready to accept the dictation, the control, that is the inevitable result?

One of the inevitable results of turning to the Federal Government—or of expecting the State to do something which, with some effort and a bit of common sacrifice the local community can do—is that the further away we get from the actual need at the community level, the more complicated and expensive the solution becomes.

You mothers and grandmothers, you wives and sisters, look ahead and think twice before you ask for outside help. Get together with your own families, with your neighbors, and tap the unmeasured strength of your own possibilities. Face the cold fact that no matter how beneficent the outward form of government help may be, there are strings to it that grow rapidly into chains that will ultimately bind not only your activities but your hopes and dreams.

There are other questions about which you, in your double citizenship, must concern yourselves.

What of the tidewaters of the States? To whom belong the minerals, the oils, that may be under them—to the States or to the Federal Government?

Who shall own the water sources and the water that flows from them? Who shall own and dispense the grazing rights? Who shall say that forests must be kept if we are to sustain our rainfall and prevent encroachments of deserts upon our fertile land?

These and many more are questions to which each American should be giving consideration, for upon the answers depend more than we know.

These United States of ours that joined together in order that freedom might be protected and extended, were given a formula elastic enough to meet every changing demand—for I remind you that freedom is the manifestation of that liberty which is of the spirit. We are charged with the responsibility to preserve this that was given into our hands. None of us is free of the responsibility that rests upon us as citizens of this great country.

We women who know all too well the irksomeness of restriction must at this moment awaken to a full sense of what citizenship means, remembering vividly that home of this is ours. For the "Earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof."

All too long have we left our talents buried under the ground; all too long has our candle been under a bushel. No longer may we sit by the roadside. Rather must we gather ourselves together and with our eyes fixed upon the stars, our feet solidly upon firm ground, our hearts in God's keeping, humbly but with shining faith in the ultimate victory of liberty under law, go out into our own land, strengthening her every fiber that he in her own destined hour may indeed prove herself to be the light set in darkness that shall bring all men to peace.

Where are we going, you ask? I will tell you.

"Towards happiness that is beyond dreams;
Towards truth that surpasses thought;
Towards realization of something that is both within and beyond you;
Towards freedom, peace, and love."

—Teresteland (Earth).

During 1949 and From Every State in the Union, as Well as From Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, to the RFC Came 11,127 Applications for Business Loans—4,559 Applications Totaling $592,647,000 Were Approved—Pending as of December 30 Were 1,686 Further Loans Aggregating $433,866,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday last I addressed this House with respect to the wisdom of continuing, if not perpetuating, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in behalf of small business and other industries of these United States.

I, at that time, pointed out what the record of the RFC discloses as to the beneficent effects upon the national financial economy as well as labor that have continuously flowed out of the activities carried on by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from its inception in 1932.

Additionally thereto, I pointed out to this House that the RFC, a federally owned corporation, had covered into the Treasury of the United States in excess of $308,000,000, as profits on its preferred stock, all of which is held by the Government of the United States.

Moreover, I pointed out that these were not so-called paper profits but were profits taken in the coin of the realm.

Mr. Speaker, since I made that talk some 72 hours ago, I have been in receipt of many letters, telegrams, and telephone calls. These came not alone from Members of both Houses of Congress, but from lawyers, manufacturers, bankers, industrialists, the heads of public utilities, lumber and mining companies.

Without exception, all commended the stand I had taken in advancing the splendid work now being done by the RFC, and that it should be continued.

The writers pointed out that not alone would it be false economy to abate or in any manner curtail RFC activities at this time, but that to do so now would be to doom thousands of business concerns that are now attempting or will in the next few months attempt to avail themselves of RFC lending facilities.

Several of the letters stated that the writers are as of this very hour negotiating for RFC loans. One writer said that whether or not the RFC was curtailed and if for that or any reason they failed to receive the temporary financial help now needed, and which is not available to them through their local banks, they would be compelled to—

First. Scrap their plans for increasing production by virtue of an inadequacy of working capital.

Second. Curtail their credits and shrink their inventory to a point that would eventually and adversely effect their probable operations.

Third. Continue production as in the past, with high-priced hand labor, pay increased wages under the new minimum-wage law instead of meeting competitive prices by availing themselves of decreased production costs through the acquisition of costly automatic machinery, or else

Fourth. In order to save what they could of their present invested capital, to liquidate their affairs, shut down operations, sell the plant and equipment, take their loss now, and discontinue business.

Mr. Speaker, that is but a typical case of the difficulties that face many small business enterprises throughout the country.

The general tenor of these letters so disturbed me that I called upon the RFC to make specific inquiry as to how many loans were now subject to negotiation; the total volume of money involved in these applications, the nature of the applicant's business and exactly what number, and from what types of business, and general areas from which they expected to receive applications for processing loans in the next 12 months.

In response to my telephone inquiry, I learned that during the calendar year of 1949, 11,127 applications for business loans were filed with RFC. Of that number, 4,559 applications aggregating $592,647,000 were approved, and that at the close of business December 30, 1949, there were pending and undisposed 1,686 applications with an aggregate amount of $433,866,000. The applications were received from every State in the Union and, in addition, from Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Speaker, there was one telephone call that I received from a Member of this House about which I would particularly like to speak. I want to do so in order to clarify the minds of all with respect to just how the expense of running the RFC is met each year.

The good friend who called me is a new Member of this body. He was laboring under the impression that because the RFC appeared in the annual appropriation bills, as passed each year by this House, the Congress was annually making appropriations to the RFC for meeting their expenses.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that that is far from the fact. I want not only to reiterate but to elaborate on what I said last Monday with respect to the RFC being a self-supporting organization. As we all know, it is a governmentally owned private Corporation. The capital with which it operates and loans out was made available to it by this Congress from the Treasury of the United States. The Corporation charges a reasonable rate of interest, comparable to that charged by private banks, and certain other expenses on all moneys loaned to borrowers.

Rather than having cost the Government of the country any taxpayer's money, the fact is that the RFC has earned the taxpayers of the Nation, as of this hour, a net total of $573,000,000—$265,000,000 of that sum being retained by the Corporation to set up, as do all

safe and sane banking institutions and other commercial concerns, a reserve for bad accounts. The reserve for bad accounts that has been established was likewise set up solely out of the profits earned by the RFC.

Now, Mr. Speaker, hear me well on this. The difference between the net total of $573,000,000 that has been earned by the RFC and the $265,000,000 which has been set aside as a reserve amounts to the $308,000,000 that have been covered into the Treasury of the United States.

The deposit of this huge sum into the Treasury of the United States, and in behalf of the American taxpayers, has decreased the cost of operating the Government by just that much money—which would otherwise have to be raised by taxing our people.

Mr. Speaker, now let me continue and point out just why it is that the financial costs of operating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation do appear in the President's budget as sent here to Congress.

While the moneys which the RFC expends for operation do appear in the appropriation bills as they come to the floor of this House, there is this significant difference between the sums voted for RFC and the sums appropriated for other agencies and departments.

All other agencies and departments are voted appropriations to pay for their operations directly from the Treasury of the United States, whereas in the case of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and some several similar organizations, what the Appropriations Committee recommends to the Committee of the Whole House actually is the maximum amount which, in our judgment and findings, the RFC can spend out of their profits in carrying on their operations.

The Government Corporation Control Act of 1945 placed practically all Government corporations under the annual review of the Appropriations Committee of the Congress. What profit they earn goes to the United States Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat: We in this Congress do not make an appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury to the RFC. We merely authorize or, more precisely, limit the amount they might use of the corporate funds or earnings for administrative and all other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the wonderful economic and financial accomplishments of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are too well known to the Members of this House for me to dwell on that subject at greater length. I am, however, in receipt of one letter which has to do with their modus operandi that so clearly exhibits and pictorializes the splendid work an RFC loan accomplished in behalf of one borrower that I am going to place that letter, together with the comments of its writer, into the records of our proceedings today.

That communication comes from a man not alone well and favorably known to the Members of this House but well and favorably known to business and financial interests throughout the United States.

There is no man in all of our great South country more intimately respected, more conservative, more righteous, or is there another who in the last two decades has done more to raise the standards of life and living of all of our people in the cotton South than has Jim Allen, executive vice president of the St. Regis Paper Co.

Mr. Speaker, from first-hand knowledge I can testify that lumbermen and forest farmers everywhere throughout the South recognize in Jim Allen the greatest living force in forest conservation and utilization that has ever lived.

One of the pioneers in the manufacture of kraft paper from slash pine trees, he was responsible for the establishment of the Mobile mill of the International Paper Co. It has been said that he has done the most inconceivable things with a pine tree—"practically everything except to fix it in some manner that would make it edible."

From country boy to empire builder, he has interested and concerned himself in dozens of successful enterprises in some 18 States.

At the time that this letter was written in May of 1945, Jim Allen was president of the Florida Pulp & Paper Co. with its main interests in Pensacola, Fla. He was active in the development of the great Southern Kraft Corp. which now operates mills in Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, Florida and South Carolina.

In the years 1934 and 1935, while associated with the Union Bag & Paper Corp., he planned, organized and built the first pulp and paper mill at Savannah, Ga., and that, Mr. Speaker, was a development that was made possible only through the aid of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Today the Union Bag & Paper Corp. plant at Savannah is the largest and by far the greatest pulp and paper mill in the whole world.

The people of Savannah willingly acknowledge that it was this development, by and with the participation, and the sympathetic understanding of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that made Savannah the prosperous community which it is today. This is but one of the communities and one of the many developments that our cotton South can point to with pride and a feeling of gratitude to the RFC.

There are innumerable projects in my own First District of Alabama as well as elsewhere in the State that were successfully financed by the RFC, the loans of which have been completely amortized as of today. The great Bankhead tunnel was financed by the RFC. The Cochrane Bridge was constructed with an RFC loan. This is another which has long since been paid in full. In my opinion, the great development and growth in trade and commerce between the cities of Mobile, Ala., and Pensacola, Fla., is in a very large measure directly traceable to the helpfulness and services extended to our people by this fiscal governmental agency.

Mr. Speaker, for more than a decade past and while representing my district in the Congress of the United States, I have had innumerable opportunities to know of many small business groups which made their application for financial assistance to the Birmingham office of the RFC. I would be remiss in my duty and wholly unappreciative of work well done if I failed to tell this House of the great help, courtesy, consideration and aid that the men who represent the RFC in my State have extended to my own constituency in the discharge of their duty.

I am proud to stand here in the well of this House and express to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all of my colleagues, that I have the utmost respect for and confidence in the abilities of men like Fred Poy, RFC agency administrator in Birmingham, Jack Holliday, his assistant, and all of the rest of the personnel of that district office who work so ardently and unstintingly in the discharge of their official duties.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that the Birmingham office has probably turned down more requests for loans than they have approved, but I assure you that, to my personal knowledge, not one penny of the money that they ever loaned on any security was not absolutely necessary and at the same time absolutely essential to save small business from distress, from foreclosure and bankruptcy to the end that our people could earn a living and at the same time continue to serve the trade and productivity of our great Nation.

In my Washington connections I am more than gratified to have found men with the ability of Frank Prince working on the staff of the RFC. I knew Frank Prince when he was a banker in the South, and I have first-hand knowledge that he could today be president of one of our greatest banks in Alabama were it not for his devotion to the aims and principles of the RFC, where he is now serving as Chief of the Loan Operations Division. I know that it is at great personal sacrifice that he continues with untiring willingness to serve the large as well as the small enterprises seeking their aid. Frank Prince gives unselfishly of himself through every hour of the day and night in discharging with honor and dignity the job entrusted to his care.

Mr. Speaker, if there is anything that I can say that is derogatory to the RFC organization, insofar as my experience with it is concerned, is that they are far too conservative, too careful; yes, far too careful in the handling of their funds.

The letter from Jim Allen, which I have heretofore said I would insert as part of my remarks, is dated May 17, 1945. It was written to the Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, who then had in turn succeeded the Hon. Jesse H. Jones and the Hon. Fred M. Vinson as the Loan Administrator, charged with the handling of all Federal lending agencies, including the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I wish that every Member of this House would take time to read that letter from Jim Allen to John Snyder. I wish that they would take time to trace this single loan made by the Reconstruction

Finance Corporation to a business organization which, after having discharged with interest every penny of the $1,878,000 loaned to them, wrote in grateful appreciation of the splendid service afforded to them by the RFC.

Trace with me the temporary financing of what is now a huge enterprise, step by step. Note the care with which the equity security was scrutinized, evaluated, and checked.

Note, also, the way the RFC invoked the so-called matching dollar formula, and the serious consideration given to the postwar program of creating new jobs by the examiners and other officials of the RFC.

Mr. Speaker, note the care with which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation persuaded every party financially interested in this transaction to participate to the limit of their abilities to the end that each would have an actual cash stake in the risk that the RFC was assuming. This participation by interested individuals and concerns was from as little as $1,700 by one equipment company to as much as $725,000 by the principles.

Study the income, the operation, and the expense statements graciously given by the beneficiary of the loan after the entire sum of $1,878,000 that had been advanced had been repaid.

Note the profits which that concern has derived from its successful operations. Mark well the great benefits which have been added to the natural forest reserves of these United States, and above all else, note the one significant paragraph from the letter Jim Allen wrote:

We simply could not have gotten started, in the beginning, without help from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. We just weren't eligible for private bank financing.

Mr. Speaker, that project is wholly typical of the hundreds of millions of dollars of loans now pending with the RFC and it is for these reasons that I repeat what I said to this body last Monday:

Let us not alone continue the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, let us in behalf of small enterprise throughout the Nation and in behalf of our national economy, make the RFC a permanent institution of Government.

Mr. Speaker, I now hand to the reporter a copy of the communication written by Mr. J. H. Allen addressed to the Honorable John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, on May 17, 1945, at which time he was serving as Federal Loan Administrator of the RFC.

That letter is preceded by the self-explanatory cover letter written to me by Mr. Allen under date of February 1, 1950.

FLORIDA PULP & PAPER CO.,
New York, N. Y., February 1, 1950.

Congressman FRANK BOYKIN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: I note from the press that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been under criticism by some who certainly must not know of the creative work the Corporation has done.

We had a great experience here in the Pensacola area with the use of funds of the Corporation. On May 17, 1945, I wrote the directors and officers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, telling them of our appreciation of the services they had rendered the commerce of this area. I am attaching to this letter a copy of the letter I wrote at that time. All of the directors acknowledged receipt of this letter. I am also attaching a copy of the acknowledgement of the letter from Mr. John W. Snyder.

My letter points out clearly the value of this Corporation to those seeking equity capital. If the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were destroyed or limited, I would hate to contemplate just what the result would be to commerce generally. This sort of contraction at this time would bring on a stoppage of expansion, caused by new projects that would stifle commerce.

I hope you will do all you can for those who need capital to keep this great enterprise as a part of our public facilities.

Sincerely,

J. H. ALLEN.

MAY 17, 1945.

Mr. JOHN W. SNYDER,
Federal Loan Administrator,
Reconstruction Finance Corporation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: On May 14 we paid our entire indebtedness to your Corporation, which amounted to $869,308.51. This is the balance due on a loan we received from you on June 17, 1940, amounting to $1,878,000. We have met all interest payments and all monthly payments, in every case, on the due day.

As we are now closing a 5-year association with you, we want to express our appreciation for the very splendid advice and financial service we received from Mr. Ribenack and the courteous attention from the Jacksonville agency, not only in the promotion and operation of our business, but particularly in the service rendered in helping us make our business a permanent business, which shall prove to be, we feel, one of the most complete, unique, and permanent forest project developments in the South.

We simply could not have gotten started without help from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. We just weren't eligible, in the beginning, for private bank financing.

The story, we believe, is worth recording.

NINETY-TWO THOUSAND ACRES OF LAND AND $2,700,000 IN CASH TO GO

In the beginning, Mr. James G. Pace and his family owned 92,000 acres of land which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation valued at $800,000. That was the only asset the Florida Pulp & Paper Co. fell heir to in the beginning. The Pace family took the most distant junior securities for their stock. That is, they took the last place in equity.

The lands were fine, but we needed $2,700,000 in cash, with which to build a mill and operate the project.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation used the formula of matching dollars with us, for the cash and/or any fair asset value we put in. This meant, of course, that we had to raise, out of equity securities, approximately $1,078,000, in addition to the $800,000 in land referred to above.

(The matching-dollar formula, when applied to new projects, is most difficult, and we feel that, in your postwar job-creation plan, you should give serious consideration to liberalizing this formula. It might become necessary for you to do, for new job-creating industries, what you did when you saved the banks, namely, buy preferred stock and let the management place the senior securities. This is simply a suggestion.)

HOW WE RAISED THIS EQUITY MONEY

Messrs. Hilton-Green, Finlay, and Ed Leigh McMillan agreed to sell to the Florida Pulp & Paper Co. 35,000 acres of very fine timberland for $245,000, and agreed to accept, in payment for same, 4 percent in the common stock of the company, and 96 percent in the 15-year debenture notes of the company. This accounted for $245,000.

Mr. and Mrs. John C. Pace subscribed for 15-year debenture notes in the amount of $62,000, and common stock in the amount of $6,000.

Mr. Ben Mintz, of the Trinity Bag & Paper Co., subscribed for 15-year debenture notes in the amount of $96,300, and to common stock in the amount of $8,000.

Mr. S. A. Allen, of Savannah, Ga., subscribed for 15-year debenture notes in the amount of $48,300, and to common stock in the amount of $4,000.

The purveyors of equipment agreed to take part pay for their equipment in our 15-year debentures. These fine concerns and the amount they subscribed are listed below:

Babcock & Wilcox Co., New York, N. Y.	$41,200
The Black-Clawson Co., Hamilton Ohio	126,700
Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., Chicago, Ill.	18,300
The Dorr Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.	5,100
Improved Paper Machinery Co., Nashua, N. H.	23,700
International Pulp & Equipment Co., Bee Bee, Quebec	1,700
Layne-Central Co., Memphis, Tenn.	14,200
Lockport Felt Co., Newfane, N. Y.	10,200
Pittsburgh Piping & Equipment Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	74,400
Swenson Evaporator Co., New York, N. Y.	5,200
Warren Steam Pump Co., Warren, Mass.	6,000
Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	160,100

The city of Pensacola purchased our mill site and improved it partially, for $50,000, and gave the company a 99-year lease on same. We pay 1-percent interest on this money.

The Frisco Railroad Co. built our sidetracks for $25,000.

All of these items are considered as part of the asset value management had to raise.

As stated above, you then stood ready at any time after we had spent our equity money, to make available to us $1,878,000. This you did, and without a hitch.

The Citizens & Southern National Bank, through Mr. William Murphey, advanced us the promotional money necessary to arrange for timber surveys, engineering, legal expenses and, in fact, all promotional expense.

Mr. Ed. Lane, of the Atlantic National Bank of Jacksonville, along with the Citizens & Southern National Bank, agreed to handle some early financing of the subscriptions made to junior securities of the company by some of the companies above listed.

The local banks in Pensacola loaned some money to Mr. John Pace to be used for the purchase of junior securities of the company.

You can see from the story that the city and county governments, the Federal Government, the railroads, private banks, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and private industry all had a hand in the creation of this development. As far as we know, there has not been a disgruntled purchaser of any of our securities.

OPERATION

I shall give you herewith summary of the performance of this mill from the date it started in 1941, up to and through the year 1944. We do this just to show you what an investment of $3,700,000 can do.

Comparative profits, taxes, sales, expenses—Years 1941 to 1944, inclusive

	Profit before interest and depreciation	Interest	Depreciation	Income tax	Net to surplus
1941	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
1942	652,925.32	121,947.67	132,973.04	[illegible]	[illegible]
1943	895,024.89	121,899.43	117,288.59	124,450.27	329,588.41
1944	1,356,466.56	105,082.36	150,090.72	448,940.41	562,452.17
Total	3,149,115.90	608,362.25	621,997.79	815,406.17	1,703,125.84

	Gross sales	Discount and commission	Freight	Net sales	Tons shipped
1941	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
1942	2,742,157.43	183,154.96	255,408.52	[illegible]	[illegible]
1943	3,945,306.07	275,265.28	375,205.79	3,353,832.90	26,059
1944	4,775,705.28	288,170.32	410,780.86	4,113,174.18	38,274
Total	12,966,750.09	725,420.48	1,136,395.45	10,720,905.87	110,303

The first 4 months of this year, 1945, we have added approximately $190,000 to surplus:

Current assets	$1,234,785.25
Other assets	437,298.24
Fixed assets	3,998,478.47
Total	5,670,511.96
Current liabilities	678,731.53
Deferred liabilities	2,003,034.61
Net worth	2,988,745.82
Total	5,670,511.96

(NOTE.—Not included in the above: Our timber holdings have appreciated approximately $1,000,000 since purchase.)

Today we are working in the woods and in the mill better than 1,000 men. Our pay roll and wood costs are running, currently, at the rate of:

	Yearly
Pay roll	$1,350,000
Wood	900,000

Approximately 60 percent of the wood cost is labor.

We own, in fee simple, 172,000 acres of land. We are raising better than 86,000 cords of wood yearly, which is about the volume of wood our present plant is consuming. We know that our timber farms are sufficiently productive to keep this mill running forever. Therefore, the jobs referred to above are permanent jobs.

As soon as we became eligible for private financing, two very fine banks, the Citizens and Southern National Bank of Savannah, and the Bank of the Manhattan Co. of New York, agreed to purchase our two notes of $900,000 each, dated May 5, 1945, due in 5 years, with interest at 3 percent.

Believing that it was the intent of Congress for a concern to pay up the Reconstruction Finance Corporation when its own securities became seasoned and salable, we issued the notes and made the loan, and, as stated in the beginning of this letter, we took up all of your indebtedness, as well as all of our 15-year debenture notes.

WHAT HAVE WE PROVEN TOGETHER?

We have proven that, in forestry, through the medium of pulp and paper making, permanent jobs can be created, and that, in your postwar planning, if you are able to secure experienced managements in forest projects, thousands of permanent jobs may be created.

We have been able to select capable executives to manage this enterprise. The writer was attracted to this development when he was vice president and director and in charge of an expansion program for the Union Bag & Paper Corp., and resigned his connection with that very fine company the fall of 1939, to undertake this promotion, construction, and operation; and, together with A. D. and J. C. Pace, entered into a long-term contract for the management of this business.

The whole enterprise has been pleasant and constructive and full of cooperation by all parties in interest.

In the beginning the company was assured of a market for all the trees it might raise, and cut from its forest farms, by the Trinity Bag & Paper Co. of New York, who are large and wise distributors of pulp and paper throughout the United States.

In closing let us say again that we are grateful to you for making this very fine project successful and permanent, for you can take it from us, the forest-project development here shall not be "gone with the wind," but, quite to the contrary, it is here to stay.

Yours very sincerely,

FLORIDA PULP & PAPER CO.,
J. H. ALLEN, *President.*

FEDERAL LOAN AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., May 24, 1945.

Mr J. H. ALLEN,
President, Florida Pulp & Paper Co.,
Pensacola, Fla.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: Please let me thank you for you nice letter of May 17.

Expressions of appreciation such as this help make this job of ours here in Washington seem tremendously worth while.

I hope you come in to see me the first time you are in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. SNYDER.

Statement by Hon. Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine, on Social Security and Old-Age Assistance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the subject of social security and the old-age assistance program, which I made on February 3 before the Senate Finance Committee in connection with House bill 6000.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am pleased to be here at this part of the committee's hearings.

The highlight has been the testimony of Dr. Francis Townsend. Certainly no one has done more on the problem of old-age assistance than Dr. Townsend, and he deserves the thanks of every American citizen.

The legislation which you are now considering is probably the most important domestic problem now confronting our people. From the cradle to the grave—from the first cry of the baby until the last beat of the heart—each and every one of us strive for the same things—happiness and security.

Individual independence and the capture of security through sacrifice, hard work, and saving should be the goal of all of us before we first turn to the Government as the dispenser of security to us. But not all of us are endowed with the tools and ability to achieve security through individual effort.

Circumstances, or "breaks" if you want to call it that, have granted some of us greater ability to achieve happiness and capture security. We have been endowed with greater productive or creative ability or with greater financial resources or with the rare and admirable ability to be happy with less of the material things than what the next fellow has.

Others of us are not so lucky. Our mental or physical capabilities have been limited from birth or have not been developed because of lack of means of development or have been impaired by misfortune. Depression, war, and inflation in unbroken succession have shaken the faith in the belief that man is the master of his own destiny. These conditions have proved beyond question that our Government must cope with the problem of social security and old-age assistance.

I think most everyone today readily agrees that our present social-security and old-age assistance program is woefully inadequate both in coverage and amounts of payments. It has been for a long time and this legislation is long overdue in the interest of a happy and stabilized America.

Only one out of every five of our senior citizens over 65 years of age receive any old-age assistance, and the average payment is less than $45 a month or less than $1.50 a day. This is not even bare subsistence in the face of today's cost of living.

If we possess the genius to build an atomic bomb, a hydrogen bomb that can threaten the very existence of the world, surely we must possess the will to provide the means of security for ourselves and our fellow Americans in our old age after we have given the best years of our lives to the development of our country.

Insecurity breeds war. A happy and secure people are the best guaranty against war. Adequate social security can make a great contribution to the realization of permanent peace. And the best place to start is right here at home in America—right here before this committee—right here in Congress.

Need for Veteran Hospitals in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the acute shortage of well-staffed hospital facilities in California for care of dis-

abled veterans was discussed by the California congressional delegation and representatives of the American Legion Department of California at a meeting held February 7.

The serious problem which confronts us is not new. Decisions making its solution possible have been postponed many months. On Monday, December 12, Congressman CECIL KING and I called together the southern California members of our State's congressional delegation in Los Angeles to meet with representatives of the veterans organizations and the Veterans' Administration to gather up-to-date evidence and coordinate our efforts to obtain adequate hospital facilities. Veterans organizations represented at the meeting were: American Legion by Messrs. Stoneker, Merryfield, and Dunn; Veterans of Foreign Wars by Mr. Hendricks; Disabled American Veterans by Mr. Lucas; and Military Order of the Purple Heart by Mr. Sutro.

Those attending the meeting, congressmen, veterans representatives, and the local Veterans' Administration officials unanimously agreed upon the need and the kind of action we must take.

At the meeting on February 7, after hearing further testimony from the American Legion, Department of California, we determined to proceed as a delegation on this problem. A resolution was drafted by the veterans committee of the California congressional delegation recommending that the Veterans' Administration acquire the military facilities including the McCornack General Hospital in Pasadena, Calif., the naval hospital at Corona, Calif., and the Long Beach Navy and Mare Island Navy Hospitals. The motion was adopted unanimously and our veterans committee was instructed to transmit the delegation resolution to General Gray, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, and Mr. Frank Pace, Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the action of the California delegation will hasten decisive action by the executive departments to meet California's critical need of hospital beds for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert factual material supplied by the American Legion in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[The American Legion, Department of California, Lewis K. Gough, commander. Rehabilitation commission: Stanley S. Coffey, chairman; John C. Dunn, vice chairman; Lewis S. Stoneker, director. Department service officers: Charles H. Farrington, J. Earl Marshall, Frederick Fish]

FEBRUARY 1, 1950.

HOSPITAL BED SITUATION FOR VETERANS IN CALIFORNIA

(Compiled by rehabilitation commission, through the office of the director, 1380 Sepulveda Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.)

It is well to again review what progress has been made on approved construction for additional Veterans' Administration hospitals, and additions to existing Veterans' Administration hospitals in California. For this purpose we will list them as to their intended types of treatment in this order: Neuropsychiatric, tuberculosis, and general medical and surgical.

Hospital	Type	Date approved	Approximate date of maximum use for patients	Number of additional beds
San Francisco area	Neuropsychiatric	Oct. 19, 1946	No construction started; no bids called, site selected only.	1,000
Los Angeles area	do	do	Not even a site selected	1,000
Livermore	Tubercular	Dec. 17, 1943	Undetermined	119
San Fernando	do	Oct. 16, 1945	do	130
Fresno	General medical and surgical.	Sept. 12, 1944	July 1950; dedication March 1950	250
San Diego	do	Oct. 19, 1946	Site obtained; bids called for; low bidder announced then entire project canceled.	[illegible]

The slow and unexplained progress made toward completing the construction already approved is very discouraging and believed inexcusable. Added to this delay the canceling of one of the hospitals approved for California by the executive branch of the Government is further disheartening to the sick and disabled veteran.

The Veterans' Administration being fully aware of not having enough beds to meet their requirements in California, entered into contracts with the Army and Navy, to hospitalize veteran patients in several of the armed services hospitals. The peak of such contracts, including 50 beds at the United States Public Health Hospital at San Francisco, reached 1,750 beds as follows:

	Peak contract	Closed, announced closed, and reduced	Contracts expected to remain
United States naval hospital, Mare Island	150	150	0
Letterman General Hospital, San Francisco	175	0	175
United States Public Health Hospital, San Francisco	50	0	50
United States naval hospital:			
Oakland	400	0	400
Long Beach	400	400	0
San Diego	250	50	200
Corona	[illegible]	225	0
McCornack General Army Hospital, Pasadena	100	100	0
Total	1,750	925	825

There is no assurance that the Veterans' Administration will maintain the present contracts for hospitalizing veterans in Army and Navy hospitals. In fact, it is evident that they may soon lose all such contracts. According to the Army Times Vet-Letter of November 19, 1949, Maj. Gen. Raymond W. Bliss, Army Surgeon General, confirmed to the Vet-Letter, the Department of Defense has under consideration the feasibility of terminating 5,500 beds in Army and Navy hospitals now at the disposal of the Veterans' Administration. The Vet-Letter goes on further to quote Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration, when asked about this, said: "That's the way the wind is blowing."

The trend of doing away with hospital beds for Veterans' Administration patients in Army and Navy hospitals is further indicated in the Army and Navy Journal of November 19, 1949, on page 326, third column, under the caption "Medical service cut." The article infers that Brig. Gen. Richard L. Meiling, USAFR, OSD, Director of Medical Services, stated that the service to nonmilitary patients may be cut at service hospitals and that it includes beds being used for veterans' care. With the already existing shortage of hospital beds for veterans in California, we understand that by the stroke of a pen in Washington, D. C. would eliminate the remaining beds for veterans in Army and Navy hospitals in California.

Another possibility of losing these beds for veterans has been demonstrated by the Army closing its McCornack General Hospital in Pasadena, Calif., the Navy closing its hospital at Corona, Calif., and the announcement by the Department of Defense of the closing of Long Beach Navy and Mare Island Navy Hospitals. By the closing of those 4 hospitals, 875 beds are lost for veterans' care. The Veterans' Administration records will show that aproximately 1,200 veteran patients per month were admitted to these 4 hospitals. This is another clear indication of the mistake in canceling the new 200-bed general medical and surgical hospital on San Diego, the site for which had been selected, bids had been called for and the low bidder had been announced. It should be built without further delay.

Further evidence as a sound reason why additional hospital beds are needed for veterans in our State is the waiting lists at the various Veterans' Administration hospitals. The waiting lists are made up of veterans who have made applications for hospitalization, have been found to be legally and medically eligible, and have been placed on the waiting list because no beds are available. Included in this list is the approximate number of veterans with active tuberculosis who have been hospitalized outside of Veterans' Administration hospitals and outside of our State because of the shortage of Veterans' Administration tuberculosis beds.

To further point out the need for additional beds for psychoneurotic patients, the figures below will show the crowded, overcapacity conditions, in addition to the existing waiting lists:

Neuropsychiatric hospitals

	Number on waiting list
Palo Alto (Jan. 23, 1950)	503
Standard bed capacity, 1,161.	
Patient population, 1,430.	
Over capacity, 269.	
Brentwood, Los Angeles (Feb. 1, 1950)	1,000
Standard bed capacity, 1,842.	
Patient population, 2,053.	
Over capacity, 211.	
Other Veterans' Administration hospitals	18
Present waiting list	1,521
Veterans patients in State mental institutions, 2,965, of which 1,111 show on Veterans' Administration waiting list, leaving balance of 1,854 who, too, should be hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration	1,854
Present neuropsychiatric beds needed	3,375

Of the 1,521 on the waiting list for mental and nervous conditions, it is interesting to know just where these veterans, who have been declared legally and medically eligible

for Veterans' Administration hospitalization, are located:

At home without proper supervision or care	311
In understaffed, overcrowded State hospitals	1,111
In private and other Government hospitals	99
Present total	1,521

It does not require very much imagination to see the menace to society and the unfairness to the veterans caused by the failure of these men to be hospitalized by the Federal Government.

Tuberculosis hospitals

	Number on waiting list
Livermore (Jan. 23, 1950)	125
San Fernando (Feb. 1, 1950)	128
Birmingham (Van Nuys) (Feb. 1, 1950)	31
Present tuberculosis waiting list	284
Service-connected patients in county and private hospitals	152

Tuberculosis hospitals—Continued

	Number on waiting list
California veterans patients sent out of State for hospitalization due to bed shortage in our State	150
California men in service with active tuberculosis who would be transferred to Veterans' Administration hospitals and discharged from the service, were Veterans' Administration beds available	100
Present tuberculosis beds needed	686

Relief to the extent of the 249 beds for tubercular patients is expected sometime in the future by the additional construction at Livermore and San Fernando hospitals. The additional construction is completed, patients and the administrative offices have been transferred from the old building to the new construction. Renovation, repair, and some construction in the old buildings prevent full utilization. While this renovation, repair, and construction has been approved by the Veterans' Administration, the work is being held up due to lack of funds.

General medical and surgical hospitals

Hospitals	Beds lost	Further need for general medical and surgical beds	Number on waiting list	Total
Fort Miley, San Francisco			42	
Oakland			44	
Birmingham, Van Nuys			34	
Wadsworth, Los Angeles			139	
			259	
Mare Island Navy	150			
Long Beach Navy	400			
Corona Navy	225			
McCornack General Army	100			
	875			
Occupying domiciliary beds, Los Angeles		400		
Probable loss of remaining contract beds in service hospitals		825		
	875	1,275	259	
Total				2,259
Gained by opening Veterans' Administration Hospital, Fresno				250
Present general medical and surgical beds needed				2,109
Domiciliary waiting list:				
Veterans' Administration Center, Los Angeles			501	
Veterans' Home of California, Yountville			205	706
Grand total of all waiting lists				2,770

[1] Announced closing.
[2] Closed

Due to the shortage of general medical and surgical beds, the Veterans' Administration for the most part are rejecting hundreds of veterans badly in need of hospitalization for disabilities and diseases coming under this category, because they have had to make a more restrictive determination as to need for hospitalization. If true waiting lists were kept at these general medical and surgical hospitals is is safe to say it would be four or five time larger than is shown. This is partially explained by them giving appointments to hundreds of veterans instead of placing them on waiting lists when no beds are available. Added to this are the poor unfortunate victims classed as medically ineligible that would be hospitalized if beds were available.

In estimating the need for additional Veterans' Administration hospital beds for general medical and surgical cases in California, consideration should be given to the continued large influx of disabled veterans to our State, many of whom are chronic cases who will require long periods of hospitalization. Several hundred beds in general medical and surgical hospitals are frozen with chronic cases that require mostly nursing, attendant and dietetic care. It is safe to say that California has a higher percentage of these types of cases than any other State in the Union.

The only chance we see for immediate relief is for the Veterans' Administration to take over the Army's former McCornack general 500-bed hospital in Pasadena, and the Navy's 1,350-plu-bed tuberculosis and general medical and surgical hospital in Corona. The closing of these two service hospitals and the announced closing of the Mare Island Navy and Long Beach Navy Hospitals should be seriously considered as a solution for the shortage of general medical and surgical, and tuberculosis beds for veterans in California.

It is apparent from the information coming out of the White House, the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration that if California is to receive adequate hospitals and domiciliary facilities for its veteran population of 1,750,000 veterans, favorable action on the part of the Congress itself will be necessary.

Additional important facts for consideration are:

1. A high percentage of Veterans' Administration hospital and domiciliary beds in California are used by veteran patients from out of the State.

(a) The Veterans' Administration Tumor Clinic for the western part of the United States is at Los Angeles.

(b) Their paraplegic center for the western part of the United States is at Van Nuys.

(c) Their psychoneurotic patients from Arizona, Nevada, and other Western States for the most part are hospitalized in California.

(d) The large influx of veterans to California consists of a high percentage of sick and disabled veterans.

2. Veterans' Administration records will show that California has a higher percentage of veterans drawing compensation and pension than any other State in the Union.

(a) Of the Nation's 77,569 100-percent service-connected total and permanent disabled World War II veterans, California has 9,830, or 12.63 percent.

(b) California has the highest number—38,023 service-connected World War I veterans. New York is second, with 32,840.

(c) California has the highest number—5,619 service-connected regular establishment. New York is second, with 2,603.

(d) California has the highest number—13,827 Spanish-American War veterans drawing compensation or pension. New York is second, with 8,402.

While there has been a curtailment in the number of hospital beds for veterans in California, the number of applications for hospitalization continues to show a steady increase of approximately 18.5 percent. For the fiscal year 1948–49, 96,503 applications were received.

The number of veteran case folders transferred into California Veterans' Administration offices over a 30-month period show 227,497 as compared with 194,223 transferred out, indicating that 33,274, or 1,100 per month new veterans with active cases took up permanent residence in California.

It is clearly indicated therefore, from actual facts and figures that regardless of the Veterans' Administration's estimate on veteran population in California, that California must have a higher ratio of hospital beds per veteran population than any State in the Union, if the veterans from our State and those coming from all other States to California are to be cared for.

The Great Lakes Waterway Must Be Completed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the vital necessity of completion of the Great Lakes waterway. I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. WILEY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—A NECESSITY IN THE ATOMIC AGE

Mr. President, I have in my hand one of the many fine issues of the splendid magazine published by the Great Lakes Harbors Association entitled "Great Lakes Outlook." This periodical, as usual, in its January 1950

issue, contains a wealth of vital statistics on Great Lakes shipping in relation to our entire economy.

LAKE-OCEAN SERVICE

It, for example, reports that an all-time record was established in the number of ships operated directly between the Great Lakes and foreign ports in the 1949 navigation season. Twenty-five ships in the direct service last season ran up a total of 71 sailings from the Lakes, compared with 56 sailings in the previous year when 22 ships plied the route.

Mr. President, these and other statistics belie the false and foul charges which enemies of the Great Lakes waterway have hurled at the proponents of this vital project. These and other facts point up the truth that the opponents of the seaway are as backward looking yes, as reactionary if you please, as those blind souls who opposed the Panama Canal in 1900 on the ground that it would not be used. Let me point out, Mr. President, that the Soo locks alone last year passed some 96,000,000 tons of freight, of which over 71,000,000 tons were iron ore, 8,000,000 tons wheat, other grain 3,000,000 tons, and soft coal 6,500,000 tons, and so forth. Vessel passage through the Soo locks totaled 27,147.

These facts underline the vital shipping role that a deepened 27-foot Great Lakes seaway could play in the future, not to mention, of course, the vital role it could play in connection with the generation of 2,200,000 horsepower of needed electricity through the power project that would be associated with it.

TOO MANY SURVEYS, TOO LITTLE ACTION

In other words, Mr. President, the Great Lakes waterway project will not down, it cannot down and be defeated. Why? Because it is so fundamentally right and its enemies are so fundamentally wrong. On February 27, hearings are scheduled to be opened in the House Public Works Committee on this issue on which there has unfortunately been so much talk, talk, talk, investigation, double investigation and triple investigation, but so little conclusive action unfortunately in the last quarter century.

The facts emphasize the necessity for action now in this critical technological age.

According to the statistics which were secured by the Foreign Relations Subcommittee, which I headed in the Eightieth Congress, the waterway would have a potential traffic of between 56,000,000 and 64,000,000 tons per year. Let us mark, Mr. President, that these estimates were made prior to the tremendous information now available on the subject of crucial iron ore that will be brought down from Labrador, now that the Mesabi Range is being depleted. How can we possibly safeguard our defense if we deny ourselves the elementary materials for United States armament?

NATIONAL SEAWAY COSTS

The Great Lakes seaway would be entirely self-liquidating. The latest estimates fix over-all costs at $966,768,000 for a 27-foot channel. Of that sum, $492,596,000 would be for new construction, $148,525,000 would be allocated to Canada, and $373,461,000 would be allocated to the United States.

These sums are admittedly large, but not when one considers the enormous sums which are appropriated for projects elsewhere that (a) would not be self-liquidating, (b) would not contribute to the welfare of so large a number of people as the 50,000,000 people in the valley of the Great Lakes, (c) would not contribute to national defense, (d) have not been endorsed by outstanding leaders of both parties and by every President of the United States in the last quarter century.

Mr. President, we serve notice on the enemies of the waterway that we intend to battle through until we achieve victory. Recently President Truman indicated more than personal fervent approval of the dual-purpose project. We only wish that certain members of his party were equally zealous in abiding with his position.

MIDWEST IS ORGANIZING FOR SELF-INTEREST

We of the Midwest will not always take this throttling of our legitimate rights lying down. Already there are rumblings of grass-roots organization action to come, so that the Midwest will not always be a stepchild of this Nation and so that Midwestern legislators will receive effective support for their efforts on a bipartisan basis.

We have been short-changed far too many times while other sections have been deluged with Federal funds. We are not asking for hand-outs. We are not asking for pork barrels. We are simply asking for our rights.

We have not been allocated any maritime surplus vessels out of the 5,000 ships available for disposal. Our package-freight service on the Lakes has never been reinforced to make up for war losses. Milwaukee alone lost 500,000 tons in annual package-freight service. These and other instances of Washington neglect of the Lakes could be cited ad infinitum.

It is not only we who have suffered, but the whole Nation as a result.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, referring again to the Great Lakes Harbor Outlook, I should like to have printed at this point one of the particularly fine articles which summarizes the great job being done by the Milwaukee municipal port. We of Wisconsin are proud of that port just as we are proud of all the other great ports which the Badger State possesses on the Lakes. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this summary be printed at this point.

The matter referred to is as follows:

"MILWAUKEE MUNICIPAL PORT BREAKS ALL RECORDS IN 1949

"In a year-end review prepared by Mr. Frank H. Ranney, president of the Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners, he describes 1949 "as one of the significant years in Milwaukee's history as a port." He outlined some of the high lights of the year at Milwaukee Harbor as the following:

"Water-borne commerce through the municipal outer harbor reached an all-time high.

"Operating revenues from municipal port operations reached an all-time high, crossing the quarter-million-dollar mark for the first time.

"The number of ocean vessel sailings was at an all-time high in 1949.

"Petroleum traffic through the port of Milwaukee again broke all records, exceeding a million tons during the past year.

"Use of river-type barges for Lake Michigan operation was firmly established during the past year and may be the forerunner of future regular water service between Milwaukee, Mississippi River points, and the Gulf of Mexico.

"The outlook for the St. Lawrence seaway project was greatly improved as the result of developments in 1949.

"Water-borne grain traffic was at the highest level in recent years and general port commerce flourished, although the coal strike resulted in a large reduction in water-borne coal receipts and considerably reduced the over-all water-borne commerce through the port.

"The port of Milwaukee has set its sights on becoming the principal heavy-lift port of the Great Lakes. The Milwaukee port authority, which, in 1949, contracted for a new 70-ton capacity electric gantry crane, is confident that the crane will attract large tonnages of export freight through the Milwaukee gateway. Although intended to serve the export needs of heavy machinery manufacturers in the Milwaukee area, the new crane will be publicized throughout the Middle West to persuade exporters in the area to consign heavy-lift traffic via Milwaukee.

"Illinois exporters have been using Milwaukee's present 25- and 30-ton cranes to transfer heavy freight from railroad cars to lake and ocean ships for several years past, due to the lack of crane facilities in the port of Chicago.

"The new Milwaukee crane will cost about $125,000, including the expense of reinforcing a section of the municipal open dock terminal to take the heavy weight of the equipment. The crane itself will weigh 225 tons. Its rated capacity will be 70 tons at a 45-foot radius, but its potential capacity is considerably greater at shorter radii and by use of its overload capacity. Without unduly straining the equipment, the Milwaukee board is confident that 90-ton lifts can be handled on occasion, making the Milwaukee crane comparable to practically the finest equipment in any salt-water port.

"THE 1950 IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

"The Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners has scheduled a large improvement program for 1950, entirely at municipal expense, which will set the pace for all lake ports. Improvements scheduled for the Milwaukee water front this year include the building of a new outer harbor pier 1,026 feet long, exclusively for petroleum tankers, at an estimated cost of $350,000; construction of a modern dock office building, $60,000; 9,250 feet of new water mains for harbor fire protection and industrial water supply, $115,000; lake-front airport improvements, $150,000; railroad trackage and sewers, $25,000. In addition, the new heavy-lift crane and dock reconstruction will entail another $130,000 as noted. The total estimated cost of the 1950 construction program is $830,000.

"Petroleum traffic through Milwaukee public docks in 1949 exceeded 1,100,000 tons, an all-time record, and about 350,000 tons higher than the 1948 volume. Milwaukee is fast becoming one of the major petroleum ports of the Great Lakes. About 350-tanker cargoes of gasoline and fuel oil were received at that port in 1949. Another innovation at Milwaukee has been the establishment of barge traffic on Lake Michigan, between the Illinois River and the Chicago refining district for movement of petroleum products to Milwaukee by barge. Scores of barge movements have been made during 1948-49 on Lake Michigan between the two ports without incident or accident.

"Although traffic through Milwaukee's municipal wharves reached an all-time high in 1949, the total commerce of the port will probably show some decline as a result of the coal strike and the 3-day week in the coal mines. According to Mr. Ranney, coal receipts at the port were at the lowest ebb in the modern history of Milwaukee, with receipts of only 2,600,000 tons compared to 4,000,000 tons in 1948.

"Grain receipts and shipments by lake were at the highest level in years, totaling 14,416,000 bushels. While a substantial boost from the 8,700,000 bushels handled in 1948, the grain increase was far from sufficient to offset an estimated 1,400,000-ton loss in coal traffic."

Proposed Extension of Federal Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in view of the great concern of our public employees at State and local levels over the possible effect of H. R. 6000, the Members of the Senate cannot be urged too strongly to consider carefully an amendment to that measure whereunder all public employees in positions covered by a retirement system would be excluded.

I hold in my hand a statement by John J. Goff, chairman of the Committee of Associated Pension Funds of New Jersey, in opposition to the enactment of H. R. 6000 in its present form, which merits the study of the entire Senate.

To the end that this statement may be properly before the Senate, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a resolution on the same general subject, sponsored by me as a State senator and adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Jersey on March 23, 1942.

There being no objection, the statement and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. GOFF, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE OF ASSOCIATED PENSION FUNDS OF NEW JERSEY, IN OPPOSITION TO THE ENACTMENT OF H. R. 6000 IN ITS PRESENT FORM

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate Finance Committee, my name is John J. Goff. I am chairman of the Committee of Associated Pension Funds of New Jersey, embracing the pension and retirement organizations which are listed immediately hereafter:

Board of Health Employees, Newark, N. J.
Board of Health Employees, Paterson, N. J.
Board of Education Employees of Essex County, N. J.
Essex Council No. 1, New Jersey Civil Service Association.
Employees' Retirement System of County of Essex, N. J.
Employees' Retirement System of County of Passaic, N. J.
Newark, N. J., Board of Works Pension Fund.
Newark, N. J., Municipal Employees' Pension Fund.
Newark Firemen's Pension Fund.
Newark Policemen's Pension Fund.
New Jersey Civil Service Association.
New Jersey Education Association.
New Jersey State Health Officers' Association.
State, County, and Municipal Employees' Retirement System of New Jersey.
State Prison Officers' Pension Fund.

There are approximately 50,000 employees throughout New Jersey represented who are members of existing public employees' pension and retirement systems.

Many of these funds are affiliated with the National Conference on Public Employees' Retirement Systems, of which I had the honor of serving as chairman for 4 years. At the present time the pension and annuity organizations affiliated with the national conference have a total membership of approximately 1,000,000.

I am an active participating member of a pension fund. As such, I am well aware of the concern which my fellow members have pertaining to the question of the possible extension of social security to public employees and I can speak from personal knowledge of their feeling toward such extension which would include public employees who are now members of, or who may become members of, these legally constituted pension and retirement systems.

The membership of these State and local systems have a vested interest in the continuation of their own retirement plans, without impairment by Federal legislation.

For many years, public employees such as policemen, firemen, teachers, civil-service employees of all classes have devoted themselves to public service as a career, in considerable degree only because of the large measure of security in old age assured by their membership in various pension and retirement systems.

In most instances, one of the compelling reasons which led to acceptance of a State, county, or municipal position was reasonable assurance that after the stipulated number of years of service had been rendered, the employee would receive a retirement benefit that would at least enable him to live free of the fear of want.

Most public employees in New Jersey are now covered by retirement funds established by State authority. In all instances these funds provide a retirement annuity which is more adequate for the career employee than that now provided or proposed under social security. And they make it possible for public employees, many in hazardous occupations, to retire at an earlier age than under social security.

Consider what might have happened during the recent war, when private industry began to bid for manpower by raising salaries higher and higher. Had there not been this picture of lack of fear and want which had been assured them for their old age, many public employees undoubtedly would have left public employment and accepted jobs in industry, with their promise of large immediate financial gain. The fact that public employees, members of existing pension and retirement systems, did not in any large degree shift to industry dispels the statement that shifting in and out of State and municipal employment is similar to that in other employments.

Not at this time, nor since the Committee of Associated Pension Funds was organized some 9 years ago, have we ever expressed any opposition to the extension of social-security benefits to those public employees who at present have no protection from want in their old age. As a matter of fact, we concur in the resolution adopted by the National Conference on Public Employees Retirement Systems on April 2, 1942, which reads in part, as follows:

"It is the sense of this conference that it takes no position on any pending legislation in the Congress of the United States, except insofar as the same may tend to diminish, defeat, or impair the interests, present or future, of any public employee in any existing pension system."

Although we do not oppose the extension of social security to those public employees who are not members of public pension funds, we are unalterably opposed to the extension of social security to public employees who are members of, and eligible for membership in, any State, county, or municipal pension or retirement system. To include such public employees would inevitably lead to the destruction of their own local systems, because the local taxpayer will not support both, nor is it reasonable to expect him to do so. Also, the superimposing of social security upon existing retirement plans would impose a double burden of contributions upon the underpaid public employee.

A technical staff for a previous Ways and Means Committee, in a painstaking report, made reference to the problem of the lack of coverage for so-called migratory public employees. This question was answered during the war. The records will reveal that very few public employees who were members of existing systems left public employment for the higher salaries that were offered. However, any loss sustained by migratory public employees could be negligible in comparison with the loss which career public employees now covered by their own retirement systems would sustain, were they embraced within social security, or if a Federal-State voluntary agreement, or pact, were provided, which loss would be the ultimate destruction of their own retirement systems.

As this committee well knows, there was no coverage of State and local employees under social security at the time the act was passed in 1935, because at that time there was no thought of taxing State and local employees, let alone the taxing of States and political subdivisions.

The first suggestion for covering State and local employees under social security was contained in the original Wagner bill introduced in August 1940. Such coverage under that bill would have been compulsory, and public employees challenged the right of the Federal Government to collect social-security taxes from States and their political subdivisions. They also protested against the policy of covering State and local employees, since many were already protected against the hazards of old age through State and local retirement systems.

This committee may remember the political repercussions in the fall of 1940 leading Senator Wagner to announce (1) that he had no intention of jeopardizing State and local retirement systems, and (2) that he would amend his original bill to exclude members of State and local retirement systems from the proposed coverage. That bill, of course, did not pass.

Then came the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills, of the Seventy-sixth Congress. Then the Kean bill of the last Congress, which was objectionable; however, Mr. KEAN agreed to amend his bill to meet the objections of public employees, members of existing funds. Then the Ways and Means Committee of the first session of this Congress drew and passed H. R. 6000 under the gag or no amendment rule.

Mr. KEAN, of New Jersey, tried to have his bill H. R. 6297 which amply protected public employees who are members of existing pension or retirement systems, substituted for H. R. 6000. However, sufficient votes were not available to recommit H. R. 6000.

It may be said that the referendum in case of retirement systems which is found on page 82, line 10 of the bill is ample protection. To this we say "No"—because it will place existing systems in constant jeopardy. There could be one referendum after another. It will permit the Social Security Board with its unlimited funds to deluge the persons concerned with well-planned propaganda. Speakers from Washington will appear before every group of employes that can be persuaded to welcome them.

The referendum permits voting by persons already retired. In many instances these will not understand the issue involved. They may even believe that if they vote in the affirmative they would receive both their pension and social security even though they never were in covered employment as required by the social-security statute. Similar attitude may be taken by many employees believing also they would receive both. But as before stated, it is hard to conceive that the taxpayers would pay for both or is it reasonable to expect them to do so.

The referendum requires a two-thirds affirmative vote, but does not state two-thirds of what. Is it two-thirds of those voting? Two-thirds of all eligible to vote? The possibility is that we may have a compact approved by a number far less than a majority of all existing members of a system.

The dangers inherent in the referendum section become apparent only after one studies what will happen to the members of existing systms if a referendum is decreed in any State.

The public employees, members of existing pension systems, are not asking for anything, just to be left alone, with security

President Truman indicated once more his

Heavy-lift trains via Milwaukee.

In view of the great concern of our pub-

after our own State's ideal, security to continue in the enjoyment of our existing systems, where most of us have benefits superior to those offered by social security.

In closing we ask that the proposed amendment to section 218 of H. R. 6000, as follows, be included in the bill before it is reported by the Senate Finance Committee.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 218 OF H. R. 6000

Strike out section 218 (d) (1) (beginning with line 16, page 82, to and including line 17, page 83) and substitute therefor the following paragraph:

"(7) Such agreement shall exclude all public employees in positions covered by a retirement system, as previously defined in subsection (b) (4) of this section."

Which amendment was submitted by the National Conference on Public Employees Retirement Systems and is supported by the Municipal Finance Officers' Association of the United States and Canada as well as all public employees who are members of existing pension funds.

This, gentlemen, we believe to be a most fair and reasonable request and I wish to thank each member of this committee in behalf of the more than 50,000 public employees in New Jersey, now enjoying the benefits of their local retirement systems.

Present here today are Frank Walker and Charles L. Levine, whom with myself were directed by the New Jersey Civil Service Association to oppose H. R. 6000 unless it is amended to provide total exclusion of public employees, members of existing pension and retirement systems. They concur in my statement and remarks.

Attached hereto and made a part of this statement, please find a resolution which was adopted by the Legislature of New Jersey on March 23 and was signed by the Governor of New Jersey on March 23. It is known as Joint Resolution No. 4, laws of 1942.

To the Members of the United States Congress, Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution was adopted by the Legislature of New Jersey on March 23, and was signed by the Governor of New Jersey on March 23. It is known as Joint Resolution No. 4, Laws of 1942.

(State of New Jersey, introduced February 9, 1942, by Senator Hendrickson)

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to refuse to enact any legislation which would impair the rights of public employees of the State of New Jersey and its political subdivisions

"Whereas the Federal Social Security Act as enacted by Congress in the year 1935 and as subsequently amended, excludes from its provisions employees of the United States Government and of any State or political subdivision thereof; and

"Whereas under the provisions of the Federal Social Security Act, each State and its political subdivisions are immune from the tax imposed upon employers by the act aforesaid; and

"Whereas the employees of each State and political subdivision thereof are immune from the tax imposed upon employees by the act aforesaid; and

"Whereas there are one or more bills now pending in the Congress of the United States which would have the effect of extending coverage of the Social Security Act to all States and their political subdivisions and the employees thereof; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has said that the objectives of the Social Security Act should not and need not be attained at the sacrifice of protection now available to some municipal workers through existing pension and retirement systems; and

"Whereas there are approximately 50,000 public employees in the State of New Jersey who have contributed to and are members of approximately 150 statutory pension funds; and

"Whereas the extension of the provisions of the Social Security Act would not only impose additional taxation upon the State of New Jersey and many of its political subdivisions and the employees thereof, but would likewise tend to impair the benefits and protection which have been gained by public employees now members of existing pension funds: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:*

"1. The Legislature of the State of New Jersey looks with concern upon any proposal to extend the present Federal Social Security Act to the State of New Jersey, its political subdivisions and the employees thereof who are now members of existing legally created pension and retirement systems and, therefore, respectfully urges and petitions the Congress of the United States to refuse to enact any legislation which would extend the provisions of the Social Security Act to those public employees now members of legally constituted State or local pension, retirement or annuity systems.

"2. The Secretary of State be and he is hereby directed to transmit copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Jersey in the Congress, the Federal Security Administrator, and the Federal Social Security Board.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately."

Although the terms by its own terms provides that certified copies be sent to certain Members of Congress, serving on the Ways and Means Committee, this resolution is sent to you together with all other Members of Congress, for your information, through the courtesy of the Committee of Associated Pension Funds of New Jersey.

JOHN J. GORT, *Chairman.*

NEWARK, N. J., *April 10, 1942.*

Nation Was Economical When the People Insisted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very timely article entitled "Nation Was Economical When the People Insisted," written by Herman Lowe and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION WAS ECONOMICAL WHEN THE PEOPLE INSISTED

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, January 20.—This is a capsule course in escapism for you who get jitters over the growing national debt, continued deficit financing, and the descent into the soothing quicksand of statism. It turns back the calendar to the good old days when the Nation paid as it went, and when Federal fiscal statistics ruffled nobody.

So, if you get heebie-jeebies over "whither are we drifting"—and, brother, your number is legion—a good dose of these statistics will soothe you more than mother's cooking.

Do you have a roaring in your ears when you hear of our $257,000,000,000 national debt which is still climbing? Astronomical debt figures are a thing of the past 15 years. Relax and turn back the pages to the beginning of the Republic. In 1791 the year opened with a national debt of $75,000,000, mostly taken over from the Colonies which had become the Original Thirteen States. By 1812 it had been worked down to $45,000,000. The war which broke out with Britain that year sent the debt soaring back to $127,000,000 by 1816. Then the Nation really buckled down to economy. By 1835 the national debt was an almost invisible $38,000—yes, thousands.

That is the closest the United States Government ever came to being completely debt free—wonderful memory for those who live under the $257,000,000,000 debt. It was not until 1863, in the middle of the great Civil War, that our debt crossed the $1,000,000,000 mark for the first time. It fluctuated up and down and dropped below $1,000,000,000 during 1892 and 1893.

Do you have nightmares at the thought of the $5,500,000,000 deficit the President announced for the current fiscal year and the $5,100,000,000 he predicts for the next fiscal year?

Relax with this. In the period 1789–91, the National Government took in $4,413,913. It not only ran for 3 years on that but actually wound up with a surplus of $150,000. There have been lots of surplus years in our history. However, the only two since 1930 were during the much-damned Republican Eightieth Congress.

Lots of folks don't sleep nights when they think of a peacetime appropriation of $13,500,000,000 for national defense. It was better in 1792. The Navy Department, exclusive of civil functions, got an appropriation of $53 (yep, 53 bucks). The War Department, including rivers and harbors, cost $1,100,000.

The great pork barrel of public spending continues to be public works. For the current fiscal year it is costing just short of $3,000,000,000. President Truman has asked Congress for $3,500,000,000 for the coming year.

Turn back the clock to 1791. The Government spent $23,000 on public works. Most of it seems to have been to build lighthouses.

Another current source of irritation is the postal deficit amounting to several hundred million dollars a year. Earlier administrations and earlier Congresses saw to it that the Post Office Department paid its way. Year after year there was a surplus to turn into the Treasury. Up to 1820 there had been a deficit during only 1 year—a deficit of $2,248. Not until 1841 was money voted to cover a post-office deficiency.

Once we used to make ends meet in the National Government, because the American people insisted upon it. If the people should insist upon it now, there is no doubt the Government could and would make ends meet again.

Shubert Theater Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have made a check on the Shubert strangle-

hold of the theater in this country and I find a very malodorous picture.

The Shuberts control over 60 percent of the theaters presently operating in New York, and approximately 90 percent of the theaters throughout the country. They dominate the League of New York Theaters, arrange for the allocation of tickets to their own pet brokers, using kick-backs of all kinds. In Boston, the sister of the Shuberts has control of the brokerage agencies, and on "hit" shows it is almost impossible to get tickets unless one gets them through an agency. If the agencies are unable to sell them, the tickets are returned to the box office just before curtain time and many of the theaters are empty as a result. In Chicago and in Philadelphia, this is true only to a minor extent. There, they control only the box offices of the theaters they rent, through the distribution of tickets and affiliation with the ticket brokers.

I ask this question: What happens to the amusement tax on the mark-up of their tickets? The answer is that the Government is cheated out of its rightful revenue. You can bet all the tea in China, no income tax is paid on South Pacific tickets which sell for $25 plus.

Theater people hesitate to testify. They are afraid of being put out of business, for they don't know where they could house their productions either on the road or in New York, if they were to speak out.

The Shuberts have kept even the critics out of certain of their theaters if they disapprove of their reviews. Wolcott Gibbs and Louis Kronenberger are two examples of this practice.

This Shubert monopoly and its baneful practices are drawing the public away from the legitimate theater.

Gordon Gray, an Enlightened Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, an editorial in the Washington Post of this morning, entitled "North Carolina's Gain," expresses the sentiments of most of the Members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, with reference to the Secretary of the Army, Gordon Gray. We regret losing the services to the Federal Government of such a capable and conscientious public servant. We know, however, that as president of the University of North Carolina he will continue to make a great contribution to the Nation. The South needs the leadership of such men as Gordon Gray, and we know that more understanding and progress will come to the Southland as a result of his presidency at the University of North Carolina.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Post be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH CAROLINA'S GAIN

The University of North Carolina will gain a public servant of truly exceptional ability and stature in its new president, Gordon Gray. Mr. Gray has progressed through the Army ranks from private and captain to Assistant Secretary, Under Secretary, and finally Secretary. He has profited from the experience. In actuality he has been the first civilian executive since Henry L. Stimson who has really run the Army. His firmness, however, has been accompanied by an almost inexhaustible patience and a North Carolina charm that have won him the stanch admiration not only of the other services but also of the generals.

It was he who engineered the unanimous Gray Board report on the National Guard, a project that took both persuasion and courage, and it is by no means to Mr. Gray's discredit that political pressures resulted in the selving of the report. As Assistant Secretary he did valiant work in helping to place the procurement work of the Munitions Board on a sound basis. As Secretary he has approached the ticklish problem of race relations in the Army with both principle and realism, a realism he has carried over in his advocacy of the continued need for the foot soldier as against the slick claims of the pushbutton and aerial blitz addicts. In short, he has been an Army Secretary of extraordinary merit who will be extremely difficult to replace. The one consolation is the knowledge that he will be in a position to continue his public service in his home State.

The Boy Scouts of America Conclude 40 Years of Service to American Youth and American Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal these days about the mid-century. Many writers have looked back at the past 50 years while comparatively few have looked ahead to the next half century.

America's future lies in its youth. We have heard that expression many times. It gives me pleasure to bring to the attention of the House the fortieth birthday anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America which is being celebrated by Boy Scout Week, February 6 to 12. Here in Washington just 40 years ago yesterday, February 8, 1910, the organization was incorporated, and in 1916 the Congress of the United States granted the Boy Scouts a Federal charter.

The purpose of Scouting, reads the Federal charter, "shall be to promote, through organization and cooperation with other agencies, the ability of boys to do things for themselves and others, to train them in Scout craft, and to teach them patriotism, courage, self-reliance, and kindred virtues."

Scouting has become so woven into the American way of life it is difficult to recall when our Nation did not have this character-building, leisure-time program for its youth.

Today there are 2,579,515 boys and adult leaders enrolled—the highest active enrollment at any time. Since 1910, more than 16,500,000 American boys and men have had the benefits of the training, fellowship, handicraft skills, and high adventure of Scouting. America is all the richer for it. Many men in high places in American affairs today proudly credit Scouting's influence in their lives.

The year-in, year-out civic and emergency service to the Nation by the Boy Scouts needs no recital here. Scouting brings to boys at an important time in their lives a program of worth-while activities, under high-grade, volunteer leadership.

Simply stated in the words of their chief Scout executive, Dr. Arthur A. Schuck, "the Boy Scouts of America is dedicated to the high purpose of enriching the Nation by helping its boys and young men grow physically, mentally, morally, and spiritually so that our heritage of freedom will be strengthened in the citizens of tomorrow."

Many of us will have the opportunity this summer of seeing for ourselves what makes Scouting grow.

At historic Valley Forge next June 30 to July 6, some 40,000 Scouts and leaders, from every part of the Nation and a few hundred guest Scouts from overseas, will live together in their own tent city at the Second National Jamboree. There will be boys of every race and creed, and of every economic level, sharing in a great adventure that will be the climax of the Scouts' 2-year "crusade to strengthen the arm of liberty."

If you get out to the hallowed ground of George Washington and his heroic Continental Army, and mingle with the Scouts, you will be assured that our Nation in the years ahead will be in strong and dependable hands.

Newsprint Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, of which I am chairman, has received complaints that the price of newsprint is excessive. Accordingly I have announced that hearings will be held on the question of monopoly in newsprint.

In a preliminary way I would say that we want to know whether the prices on imported newsprint are excessive. We want to know whether American producers are following the import prices,

and if so, whether they are operating at capacity. If American mills are operating below capacity, why do they not lower their prices enough to get full capacity? Has anyone recently considered setting up new paper mills in American territory, including Alaska, and if so, what happened to these projects?

Other questions will appear as the investigation proceeds, and I hope that persons having authentic information on this problem will offer their aid to this subcommittee.

Arming Our Future Adversaries by Shipping Arms to the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD a very able letter to the editor from the New York Times of February 1, 1950, signed by Dr. Manfred Sakel. The letter discusses the curious State Department pattern of action and inaction in the Middle East, not exhaustively, but capably. I feel, personally, that the present Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, has gone far toward correcting the startling imbalance of the middle echelons of State Department officials; but I agree with Dr. Sakel in this essay:

ARMING ARMS QUERIES—SECRETARY ACHESON IS CRITICIZED FOR STATEMENT CONDONING THIS TRAFFIC

To the Editor of the NEW YORK TIMES:

The statement made recently by Secretary of State Dean Acheson, condoning the shipment of arms to the Middle East, in answer to Congressman JAVITS' question, as reported in the New York Times of January 19, should be of grave concern to every citizen of our great Nation.

Two points seem particularly distressing and contradictory. The condoning of such traffic of arms is directly counter to our inherent and oft-stated policy of nonsupport to aggressors, even latent ones. But their own Declarations, several of the middle-eastern countries who have been supplied with arms have recently stated that they have suffered a loss of their military prowess of aggression. They frankly give as their reason for their present need of arms their wish to recapture their lost military aggressive pride. We, as a nation, by nature and officially, deplore aggression and we do not knowingly encourage the aggressor. The Secretary's statement, however, seems to weaken this position of ours and, at the very least, undermines our pronounced stand on these principles.

REPEATING EXPERIENCE

The second and more important point is our apparent reluctance to help one of our closest allies avoid repeating our painful and costly experience in the Far East. It is clear that our State Department, that of the greatest nation on earth, is sometimes unable to free itself of the influence of the permanent officials of the national office of our ally, the once-powerful Britain. We seem disinclined to try, at least, to point out to them the very bitter lessons, at the expense of several billions of dollars, which we learned from our far eastern experience: that, by supplying arms to those unwilling or incapable of using them, we are actually supporting those groups whom we did not intend to, for these very weapons find their way into exactly those hands opposed to those we originally wished to help. Consequently, our actions indirectly and inadvertently helped subvert our aims and defeated our chosen friends. In turn, it alienated all of them from us.

If the strategic planning of the Government of the United States has decided that the Middle East is so vital to our defense, how can we abet the colonial office in repeating these very same miscalculations? If these officials continue, with our acquiescence, to practically give their armaments (at the ultimate dollar expense of our taxpayers and at the expense of the blood of our citizens) to those who are not in a frame of mind or who are not capable of using them effectively, and will lose them eventually to a potential adversary of our Nation, as was demonstrated in the most recent historical events in th Middle East, are we not again driving our more capable friends into the opposite camp and so helping to defeat the purposes to which we are dedicated? Will not their present acts tend to alienate the only people in this strategic area who so recently have proved themselves both willing and able to use arms effectively in defense of the very principles of democracy and peace to which we subscribe?

WEAKENING LINK

It would be reassuring to the citizen to know that the State Department is aware of the fact that any chain is as strong as its weakest link, and that goes for the chain of defenses too. Against the background of this fact, it seems the State Department is weakening the potentially strongest link in the chain.

This letter is written by one who does not claim to be too well versed in politics, and, therefore, does not wish to give political advice, but who, choosing the science of logic as his field, wishes merely to point out the contradictions in the policy devised by the State Department.

MANFRED SAKEL, M. D.

NEW YORK, *January 25, 1950.*

The Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include articles 9 and 10 in the series written by Mr. Leon Starmont on the Columbia River region:

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of January 30, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 9)

(By Leon Starmont)

Potholes Dam having been officially renamed O'Sullivan Dam, Foster Creek rechristened Chief Joseph, and Umatilla Rapids changed to McNary, State and Federal officials connected with the Columbia Basin irrigation project point to three other opportunities to honor men identified with basin development or Northwest history.

South Dam at Coulee City is virtually complete. It holds water in the reservoir in Grand Coulee. U S 2 runs along its top. A bill was introduced in Congress to attach the name O'Sullivan to South Dam, thus honoring a pioneer worker for the project and long-time secretary of the State Columbia Basin commission.

For some reason James O'Sullivan's friends wanted his name attached to Potholes rather than South Dam. This leaves South Dam open for another name.

LONG LAKE CONFUSING

North Dam, now under construction on the outskirts of the city of Grand Coulee, is the north end of the 27-mile equalizing reservoir.

Long Lake Dam, overlooking Stratford, also needs a new name, as it is duplicated in the largest dam on Spokane River. It is part of the main canal, and has no separate power or storage function.

Of these four dams only North Dam was provided for in the original 308 report at its present location. South Dam was first planned for a location 3 to 5 miles north of Coulee City, and Long Lake and O'Sullivan (Potholes) Dams were not in the original scheme of things at all.

The original plan called for a bifurcation works at Bacon siphon, a few miles south of Coulee City, with the west main canal running down the east side of lower Grand Coulee to Soap Lake, around its north end and on past Ephrata and Quincy. There is no change in the present design south of the Soap Lake siphon.

CONSTRICTED REVERSED

The main east canal, in the original 308 report, was to follow roughly the line of what is now mapped as the east high canal, with construction deferred indefinitely. It reversed, at a somewhat lower level, the first-planned north canal under the gravity ditch as projected in 1920.

Towns or railroad stations which were below the main canal in the original report, but are now above the main canal, include Stratford, Ruff, Warden, and Cunningham.

Lind, which was within the gravity irrigation area, was about 5 miles from the area reached under the original pumping plan, and is now 15 miles from the district to be reached by the east low canal.

The easterly limits have been moved a dozen miles west by the dropping of the east high canal.

HAD THREE MAIN LATERALS

Most of the area reached by the Potholes east canal and its Wahluke lateral was to be reached by a long ditch from Ruff, under the original plan. The southern part, however, was to be served by a lateral leaving the main canal just north of Cunningham and running west of Hatton to the present location of the Pasco pumping unit.

Another lateral from near Sulphur, on the Connell branch of the Union Pacific, was to serve the section east and south of Eltopia.

These numerous changes in design have complicated the problem of locating highways, particularly in the east and south Columbia districts. Where to put the roads, and how to finance them is one of the main problems before the State Columbia Basin commission, which has scheduled a session on this subject at Ephrata today.

As a general rule, the Bureau of Reclamation bears the expense of bridging the major canals wherever there is an existing road. But when a new road is put through the expense falls on the counties, which already are bothered by growing pains in school finances.

MINOR CHANGES

Other changes made since the pumping plan was adopted involve town locations, wasteways, and supplementary reservoirs.

When O'Sullivan Dam was first planned, about 1944, it was to create a reservoir including Moses Lake, which was to be raised

a few feet and the whole developed as a recreational area.

Announcement last year that the reservoir would not include Moses Lake created consternation at the city of Moses Lake, formerly Neppel. Many residents had bought business and residential property there in expectation of placing boats on the 22-mile waterway that would extend from O'Sullivan Dam to the mouth of Rocky Ford Creek. This change is still being protested.

One change then announced has been canceled. This is the decision not to run fresh water from wasteways into Moses Lake.

The latest is that Winchester and Rocky Coulee wasteways will not be extended to the lake, but a new supply of fresh water will be directed into its southeast corner, near the creeping Barcan dunes and the proposed bypass that will take U S 10 south of the town.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of January 31, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 10)

(By Leon Starmont)

If there is anything these days that makes residents of the Columbia Basin irrigation districts fighting mad, it is the question of what road will be built first, and where it will go.

This was illustrated at yesterday's meeting of the State Columbia Basin commission at Ephrata, which only three of the seven members were able to attend. Chairman Jack Rogers, ex officio member as director of conservation and development, was present, with Frank T. Bell, Ephrata hotel operator, representing the Quincy-Columbia district, and Leon L. Baille, of the south Columbia district, who also is president of the Washington State Reclamation Association.

ROAD ARGUMENT BITTER

It was away below zero in most of central Washington, and many roads were blocked, but 125 residents of the districts, and others from Yakima valley and Seattle, were on hand. So were W. A. Bugge, State director of highways, and James Travis, assistant manager of the Atomic Energy Commission's Hanford works, which is involved because of its closing of the Connell-Yakima cut-off via Wahluke ferry.

Rogers emphasized that no subject was to come before the meeting except roads. Later meetings, he indicated, might take up schools and domestic water. The meeting was held in the Ephrata community hall.

Principal disputants were the advocates of the Warden and Othello routes for the projected north-south highway through the district, from Pasco to Coulee Dam.

In 1945 a route was proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation, based on a joint State and Federal investigation, which left U S 395 at Eltopia and ran 2 miles east of Othello and 3 miles west of Warden, veering westward and following the Connell Northern branch of the Northern Pacific almost to Adrian. At that point one branch turned west to Soap Lake and another east to Stratford.

ANOTHER ROUTE BUILT

Another road has been improved, however, running straight north and south through Warden, about 3 miles east of the route recommended in 1945. It starts on U S 10, 12 miles east of Moses Lake, and ends on an east-west road about 6 miles east of Othello. If continued north it would reach Coulee Dam without going near Grand Coulee reservoir at all. If continued south it would hit U S 395 about Eltopia.

Othello objects strenuously to this road, and wants a more westerly route selected for the ultimate improvement. Its route is about 3 miles west of the 1945 proposal, and generally 6 miles west of the Warden route.

Othello is without a good highway now, although it is on a direct line between Pasco, metropolis of the South Columbia district, and Moses Lake, largest town in the presently irrigated district crossed by U S 10.

Advocates of these routes made it clear that the 1945 compromise satisfied neither side. Debate grew bitter at the morning session, but Chairman Rogers calmed the waters with assurance that no snap judgment would be taken.

Another dispute raged over the projected Burke cut-off, which would create a beeline from Ephrata on State Highway 7 to Burke Junction on U S 10, west of Moses Lake. This projected route bypasses Quincy.

Result of the discussion was passage of a resolution, addressed to Gov. Arthur B. Langlie, asking that he declare a state of emergency on Columbia Basin road problems, and that the legislature be petitioned to give priority to county and farm-to-market roads in the irrigation districts, instead of to the State highways.

The resolution makes it clear that the suggestion comes from an informal public meeting, called by the State Columbia Basin Commission, but not from that body.

Advocates of the various routes are expected to prepare the strongest cases they can make, for their respective routes. Decisions probably will be made by the State Highway Department and the Bureau of Reclamation, although either agency would like to rid itself of the necessity.

OTHER ROADS IN BASIN

Bids were to be opened today for a bridge across Lind Coulee near O'Sullivan Dam, but because of the deep snow in the area the opening was postponed to February 14, the Bureau of Reclamation announced. It has been impossible for prospective bidders to examine the area, the Ephrata office of the bureau explained. The same contract would call for relocating of about 6½ miles of county roads wiped out by construction of O'Sullivan Dam, near the south end of Potholes Reservoir.

Meanwhile work is being rushed on the new speed-ball highway along the east edge of Grand Coulee Reservoir, between Coulee City and Coulee Dam.

Also undergoing extensive improvement is the middle route (W. 7) between Davenport and Ephrata, which when linked to Spokane via the proposed Four Lakes cut-off east of Harrington will be the shortest route to a good share of the East Columbia and Quincy districts.

Blueprint for a Better America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the conclusion from a policy statement entitled "Blueprint for a Better America" by the New York Young Republican Club.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCLUSION

We believe that the basic difference between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party is clearly defined. It is not a difference in goals. It is a basic difference in the necessary consequences of the policies pursued in attaining our goals. This difference is reflected in the completely dissimilar political and social philosophies prevailing within each party. The choice between these two philosophies lies with the American people—a choice between:

1. SELF-HELP VERSUS HAND-OUT

The leaders of the Democratic Party pursue a policy of unlimited Federal spending for the purpose of appeasing pressure groups which command large blocs of votes. Their program is not one of prudently conceived assistance to the individual in need, but it is rather a program of creating a reliance upon government, from the cradle to the grave. The result has been the slow destruction of self-reliance and of individual incentive to provide for a rainy day. By appealing to the something-for-nothing instinct, the Democrats have endeavored to obtain widespread support of their program.

We firmly believe that the American people are a self-reliant, independence-loving people, and that they will grow to resent being made the involuntary objects of permanent charity. The American people prefer to rely primarily upon their own industry, ability, and decision to provide not only the necessities, but also the luxuries of life, rather than to rely upon the uncertain benevolence of Government. Assistance to those who, through no fault of their own, are either consistently unable to obtain the necessities of life or unable to cope with sudden physical or economic misfortune is accepted as the responsibility of a humanitarian society; it should not be made a substitute for individual enterprise.

2. PAY-AS-YOU-GO VERSUS EXTRAVAGANCE

The Democratic administration has pursued a policy of spending each year billions of dollars more than the annual Federal income in order to effect more and more Government hand-outs. The result has been a meteoric rise in the national debt—which today is equivalent to a mortgage of $7,000 on every American family. Lenin once boasted: "We shall force the United States to spend itself into destruction."

We believe that the American people will not continue to support such spendthrift policies and that they will demand strict adherence to a pay-as-you-go Government program. The Republicans must refuse to out-bid the Democratic administration, and must develop a program which is geared to what we can afford. Our immediate goal should be a balanced budget and a gradual but substantial reduction of the national debt. Within these strict limits, we favor expenditures for health, housing, old-age security, and other services and benefits as previously proposed in this blueprint. We are confident that our human, technological, and natural resources can provide a rising standard of living for our people far superior to that offered by a permanent Government dole.

3. HOME RULE VERSUS BIG GOVERNMENT

Under the Democratic administration, the Federal Government has preempted many areas of taxation, economic regulation, and social welfare formerly reserved to State and local governments. The result has been the development of a gigantic Central Government, with an alarming concentration of powers in the executive branch. The theory that the Central Nationa' Government should and must be given all major powers and functions is diametrically opposed to our concept of a system of sovereign State with a Federal Government of enumerated powers. Concentration of power is but one step removed from abuse of power.

We feel that the present concentration of power in the National Government is dangerous and inefficient. State and municipal governments must be permitted and encouraged to perform those functions which relate to matters of local concern. We firmly believe that a minimum of governmental interference with the individual's decision and action is alone consistent with an opportunity society.

Under the Old Pricing System Farm Products Were Worth No More Per Unit of Measure Than the Value Placed Upon the Needless Surplus Products—Every Panic, Depression, or Recession Marked by Industrial Unemployment Can Be Directly Traced to the Archaic, Unjust Pricing of Agricultural Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of one of the finest talks on agriculture that I have ever read. It was directed to my attention by Col. C. C. Hanson, secretary of the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture.

I need not remind my colleagues that the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture is an association made up exclusively of the duly elected public officials of the 16 cotton-producing States, who have been charged by their electorate with the care and the well-being of the agricultural industry within their respective States.

The speaker was the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, of the Twenty-second District of Ohio, and the address was delivered before a State-wide meeting of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation in Columbus, Ohio, November 23, 1949.

In transmitting this talk, Colonel Hanson told me that he regarded it as one of the "clearest expositions he had ever read of the agricultural problem facing this Nation today and the need for full parity prices to be paid the farmer for his products."

Complimenting Congresswoman BOLTON upon her depth of understanding of this problem facing the American farmer, to say nothing of repercussions upon the American industrial workers, Colonel Hanson commends its consideration to Members of Congress and others who are interested in the Nation's welfare problems. In his letter of transmittal he said:

> If the Congress had more Representatives like Mrs. BOLTON from the great metropolitan areas who could grasp the problem of the farmer with the understanding and the wisdom exhibited in her Columbus talk * * * the American farmer would achieve a parity of price for that portion of the fat, food, and fiber consumed within these United States, and without either the purchase of a single dollar's worth of farm commodities by the Federal Government or appropriation by Congress of a single dollar of taxpayers' money * * * to support agricultural prices in this or any other year.

The address follows:

PARITY PRICE IS AN ECONOMIC, NOT A POLITICAL PRINCIPLE

You have done me a signal honor in inviting me to address you, the representatives of the Ohio farmers, gathered here in annual convention tonight.

My anticipation has been keen, and I want you to know that there is a deep measure of satisfaction in having opportunity to talk with this great audience of Ohio farmers here tonight because I come of solid farm stock and count myself very much as one of you.

My brother owns the rocky little farm in Connecticut that my father's people worked for more than 150 years. My father's father left three fingers of his left hand in the mill there to which he took the grain of one fall's harvest to be ground into the winter's supply of flour.

My mother's people came west and farmed both in Geauga and Cuyahoga Counties. Payne's pastures are only memories today and Nathan Perry on his pony riding across his farm seems like a dream—for a great city has swallowed most of it up. But next time you come to Cleveland go past Euclid Avenue and Twenty-first and Twenty-second Streets where the Perry pastures once were. You'll see a sign "Perry Parking" and in the middle, raised above the cars a yellow house. The central section was built in 1824—there my mother and my grandmother grew up—and there I spent many years of my own youth.

How I used to love the excitement of crawling under the barn and finding the eggs. I think it was such memories that made me rather resent the all-too-organized life of the modern hen when my own sons came along. There is no better foundation for living life than a farm youth—and I am deeply happy that at least one of my sons has kept up the tradition not only of my family, but of his father's as well. Franchester Farms and its golden Guernsey milk, its strong strains of useful animals is no doubt known to many of you. Just as the old farm down town was crowded out, Franchester Farms in Cuyahoga County has begun to make way—and most of the animals and all of the real farming has moved down to beautiful Wayne County. Even my chickens have gone.

Although my life has been devoted in the main to widely diversified interests quite apart from agriculture, the roots of it go deep into the soil—nor can I imagine losing my interest in diversified farming. Some day—when I have served my tour of active duty I shall find myself a tiny farm where my hens can lay their eggs in exciting places and there will be a cow that won't mind yielding her milk to my fingers rather than to the machines.

You see, to me farming has been and will always be more a matter of a principle of life—a mode of living—than just a means of livelihood. To me you who till the soil, who plant and harvest, who contend with nature, whose understanding of God's law is a part of your very being, are the rock upon which this Nation stands. Yes—farmers—dwellers on the land, producers of the food man must have to live all over the world, know the deeper meaning of life as no city dweller can ever know it. Even as you know the bitter cost of labor you know the sweet, the indescribable joy of planting that new life may come from the seemingly dead earth. You know, as none but farmers know, the deep gratitude that wells up when the harvest time is successfully over and your bins are full, and your surplus sold. To you the Thanksgiving season is one when you have often gone out alone perhaps at dawn or at sunset-time and raised your heart to the God whose tool you know yourself to be, under whose great laws you have known freedom. You know that a man must sow, he must care for his fields, his orchards, his stock with his own hard labor if he is to reap. You know also the joy that such living gives.

Men follow many lines of endeavor—their vocations are increasingly diversified—but there is none that gives greater dignity than that which agriculture affords. It is the most basic of all industries. When I say basic I mean that of all the tens of thousands of commodities known to man—of goods that satisfy our senses—that afford us all the comforts of life—physical, intellectual, spiritual—the farmer alone is the producer of that commodity without which all life would in the last analysis perish.

In reality there are just two classes or kinds of goods in this world: Those which are dispensable to human life and those which are indispensable. The farmer produces the indispensables—the fat, the food, and the fiber. It is the farmer who produces those things which feed and clothe and house us. Oh, I am not saying that there are not scores of other commodities which to a modern civilization may seem necessitous to human life, but again I repeat, it is only the farmer who produces those things which are indispensable to all life

There is not time for me to go into detail in the matter of the well-being of the farmer. Suffice it for me to say quite categorically that the thoughtful people in this country know that when American agriculture is prosperous all America is prosperous. When agriculture slows down, unemployment is present in every mine, every mill, and every factory in the land.

Nor is it only that those who live in cities are dependent upon the farmer for their food and all other of life's indispensables, but they are exceedingly dependent upon him for his purchasing power.

As a Representative of the Congress of the United States, I find it difficult to understand some of my colleagues who seem to feel there is no justification for paying our farmers for the products their toil wrings from an often reluctant earth. I have contended with them that if, through some unjust system of agricultural economics our farmers are paid too little for the products of their labor they, in turn, cannot buy the products of American manufacture. That if the farmers are paid justly; yes, generously for the products of the farms, they then in turn can buy generously of the thousand and one gadgets and other things that are processed in the great cities of the land, and in that wise afford gainful employment to the industrial workers who run our great American industries.

Read history and you will find that every human crisis, upheaval, panic, depression, recession, or what not that has ever temporarily stopped or caused marked distress to the financial structure and the progress of our country, has been directly traced to unjust pricing of agricultural products in these United States.

This unjust system of pricing decreed that the annual crop was worth no more per unit than the value placed upon a needless surplus.

The farm parity of price formula is a keystone upon which the economic security of these United States today can be dependent. That security must not rest upon the possible direction of political winds, it must rest quite simply upon basic economic principles. When I use the term "parity of price" I do not mean any laws in which are written formulas or even provisions to pay 60 or 70 or 80 or even 90 percent of parity. Parity to me would mean par, justice, equality. When made applicable to agricultural income in this year of 1949 in these United States, parity to me means that we should pay to the American farmers a price commensurate with—or shall I say, in parity with—the prices which, under the modern system of pricing, the farmer is compelled to pay for the industrial goods which he finds necessary to his enjoyment of the American way of life.

It is certainly not economically unsound or unjust to fix the price of basic crops in behalf of the agricultural producer, when society in general and Government in particular has practically fired the prices on everything the farmer has to buy.

Are not taxation rates, railroad freight and passenger rates fixed by law? Isn't the price of electric current and gas per thousand feet also fixed by law? Aren't you fixing the price of the industrial products the farmer must buy when you regulate hours of labor and minimum wages paid? It would seem rather clear that society as a whole cannot continue with all the price fixing that has been done to bolster industry, transportation, communications, public utilities, insurance, et cetera, without doing something to insure the farmer a parity of price for the products of his toil, his risk, his faith, without which we would all die.

I rejoice today with American farmers everywhere, with those who farm their little tracts to cotton, or to peanuts or to tobacco in the forks of the creek in the great Southland. I rejoice with those who cultivate their broad acres on the plains of Kansas and in the Dakotas, and with those who practice the diversified type of farming which we follow here in the great Buckeye State.

I rejoice that the day has dawned when the American people at long last are learning to pay their just debt to their agricultural producers, cattle and dairy men, for the endless toil and privation spent in producing the fats, the foods, and the fibers without which this Nation would perish in a single crop year.

American agriculture has not alone built America great, but for more than a hundred long years our exportable surpluses of farm crops—whether beef, pork and pork products, lard, tobacco or cotton—have maintained the balance of our foreign trade against the world.

Yet, my friends, in spite of these things there are those today who say our farmers constitute a pressure-lobby group—that parity formula is a species of political relief.

To them I would say that the principle of parity of price is an economic principle, grounded in equity and justice, and that we should never permit it to be traduced and made use of as a political football by any political party at any time.

How many people in our country realize that they are eating a greater variety of food of a better quality than ever before in the history of this Nation?

When I was a girl in Cleveland, oranges were a rarity except at Christmastime, and grapefruit was unknown. Figs and dates were something a few of which one might find in a Christmas stocking. Lettuce, radishes, string beans, green onions were garden vegetables which we then enjoyed on our tables but a few weeks in the year, in the late springtime season.

Strawberries were something that we knew in strawberry time. Peaches, in peach time. Raspberries, blackberries, and blueberries, in berry time. Today strawberries are available in the market places of America when winter snow is 2 feet deep outside the food shops in our cities.

Lettuce and string beans, radishes, celery, fresh fruits and green vegetables of every variety are today available to the American people the year around, from the rock-bound coasts of Maine to where the Pacific Ocean laps our shores on the west, and from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico.

The American consumption of citrus fruit and juices has increased more than 382 percent in the last decade alone, that of canned fruits and vegetables has likewise increased by more than 20 percent, while frozen vegetables and fruits—a thing unknown to the American people as short a time back as 1935—have made the prodigious increase of 725 percent.

As it has been with fruits and vegetables, so it has been with meats; the annual per capita consumption of which now stands at an all-time high.

There is no scarcity now, nor has there ever been a scarcity, of meat for the American table. Americans everywhere are eating more meat than ever before. I am especially glad to say that this is particularly true among the low-income groups. Moreover, they are eating better cuts of meat and eating more of them.

The limited supply of choice cuts of pork and beef, steaks, chops, hams, bacon, and what not, is in no wise due to any shortage of cattle or swine, or any decrease in the production or slaughter of the same. The cattle and beef slaughter is heavier than ever. It is merely that there is now a sharper competition between all income groups for the better grades and better cuts of all meats and meat products, that prices are high, and the better cuts are in short supply.

And here is an even more amazing fact. This great superabundance of food consumed by the American people (which in 1935 required 31,000,000 people, working on 6,600,000 farms, to feed 140,000,000 people) now is being produced by 28,000,000 farmers working on 5,900,000 farms, and feeding more than 149,000,000 people—our population as of today.

Somewhere in the Scriptures it is written: "By their fruits ye shall know them." And so I say to you, the members of the American Farm Bureau Federation, that it is by the fruit of the things that the American farmer has produced that we do know him, and the work that he has done and is doing among us.

My friends, some several weeks ago I had occasion to make inquiry of the Fats and Oils Division of the United States Department of Commerce, with respect to the declining prices on hog lard. The decline in prices had been more or less reflected by the increased importation of competing coconut, cotton, and other vegetable oils and fats used for cooking and shortening purposes.

Complaint had reached my desk that hog lard, a product upon which America had from the inception of the Nation built its brain and brawn, was destined to be thrown into the soap kettles. My problem was to find out why. You can imagine the economic shock I received when facts and figures were presented for my consideration to show that America was eating higher up on the hog today than ever before in all our history.

And because of that change in eating habits, the packers of pork and pork products have no longer found it profitable to pack, ship, expose, and offer for sale such things as pigs feet, pigs knuckles, backbone, chitlings, and other secondary cuts of pork and pork products which for decades past have been enjoyed on the tables of the great masses of American people. Now, for want of profitable markets, these valuable food products are actually being dumped into soap kettles, there to be boiled into soap.

It grows more and more apparent that people in the cities are no longer content to eat the end chops off a loin. I have seen the end chops or loin butts sell at a discount of 10 cents a pound below the price of the center cuts. And despite this—shall I say a standard of high living—we are still paying the American farmer a less percent of the average industrial income for food than we had previously paid for the smaller quantities, lower qualities, and a far less diverse diet. If I had not investigated, I would not have believed that the people in the cities, when they buy such breakfast cereals as corn or wheat flakes in the individual 1-ounce packages—which retail at about 4 cents apiece—are compelled to pay at the rate of $38.40 per bushel for the corn or the wheat which they contain.

Let me remind you that Saturday on the Chicago commodity market corn sold at a price of $1.29½ per bushel and wheat at $2.16⅝ per bushel.

When you buy a cereal in a hotel such as this—at 15 cents per individual package—you pay for the corn or wheat which the cereal contains at the rate of more than $100 per bushel.

These facts prove beyond all doubt that the high retail prices in the food shops of America today are not the fault of the farmer.

I have no complaint whatsoever to make with the attractive, sanitary, and hygienic methods that now characterize the packaging and the marketing of our food products, for while they are tremendously costly and add to the cost of living, nevertheless they do guarantee us standards of cleanliness and quality heretofore unheard of.

Certainly I would rather buy and pay for a package of Uneeda Biscuits wrapped in waxed paper, with both moisture-proof wrappers and moisture barriers covering the same, than go back to the day when at the corner grocery the clerk would stir a broomstick in the cracker barrel to chase out the rats before reaching down to take up and weigh out a pound of ofttimes stale, damp soda crackers to be carried home in a paper bag.

But by the same token this standard of high living represents the difference roughly between $1 and $38.40 per bushel of corn and can be laid at the door of our modern system of packaging, distribution, and marketing.

In conclusion, my friends, let me repeat what I have heretofore stated: that if the American people pay the farm producers of this Nation too little for the fat and the food and the fiber necessary to sustain their lives, that our farmers can in return spend but little to buy the products of the mines and mills and factories of America.

So long as the American people pay our farmers in equity and in justice a parity of price for the products of their soil and toil, then can the American farmers buy generously and maintain the millions of factory workers at gainful employment in the industries throughout America.

It is not, perhaps, as simple as I am making it sound—for the moment is upon us when we must reevaluate existing methods and conditions. We must find ways to put these basically important matters clearly into the field of sound economic principle, where they belong. We must take them definitely out of politics.

We know that when agriculture declines, America declines. We know that when the American farmer is prosperous, America is prosperous. We know also that at this critical moment in the life of man on this earth America's prosperity is the key to world peace. Unless we are prosperous there will be nothing with which we can express that curiously deep desire that is in the heart of every American to help those who need help, to protect others from bondage, and to see freedom under law the lot of all men.

Great as are the problems facing the farmer today, difficult as are those facing the workers in the mines, the factories, the shops, the stores, and the offices, they are but parts of the whole great future of America, and we must face them and solve them as such.

The strength of the United States, of this wonderful Nation of ours, must be increased—the honor and integrity of our America must be maintained—we must give constant proof that here in this land of ours men and women recognize their individual responsibilities toward each other and to the Nation whose formula for freedom has given more comfort, more opportunity, more joy to more people than any formula in known history.

If we, as farmers, seek our own particular solutions with no thought of America as a whole, if industry or labor or the white-collar worker looks after himself only, we shall find ourselves in a dead-end street instead of on that great road to freedom upon which destiny placed this Nation of ours.

True as it is that America prosters in proportion to prosperity on the farms, it is no less true that unless America as a whole swings along with everything in balance, with all the instruments of her great symphony of freedom synchronized and in harmony, not only the people of America, but the people across the world will find themselves lost in an intolerable darkness.

You, who contend with nature—who are close to the earth and her seasons, to the beauty of twilights and dawns, to the wonder of silence, the miracles of life, you know that a nation is not a tangible thing, not a building built with bricks and mortar—you know a nation is not its laws, its customs, its behavior, even its history. It is its people. You know, too, with a deep certainty of experienced knowledge, that the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein and that it is to Him that we are responsible.

We can carry this responsibility with worthiness and abiding joy if we remember that to Him all people matter—not just one or two groups. Remembering this we can find the right method of application of the principle of parity of price for the farmer, of the principle of just recompense for the men and women in industry, and all its ramifications for teachers and preachers, for scientists, for those who care for the sick.

Remembering our responsibility to the Infinite Father of all mankind we can and must solve the many problems we have made for ourselves that America may be strong in freedom, in justice, in humility, and in peace.

United Ireland Urged by Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, recently the supreme board of the Knights of Columbus met in Washington for their regular midwinter meeting to arrange the forthcoming program for the Knights during the current year. Among the various resolutions adopted was one of particular interest to the Congress, since it recommends the passage of the Fogarty resolution, now pending before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. John E. Swift, of Boston, supreme director of the order, was chairman of the committee which drafted the resolution, which urges the complete unification of all Ireland unless a majority of all the voters in Ireland should by a plebiscite determine otherwise. No fairer means of solving this very controversial issue could be employed than the holding of a free plebiscite of all the people in Ireland, who alone have the right to determine whether any part of that small island country should be cut off and attached to the dominions of a foreign nation. Certainly the foreign parliament of that foreign nation does not have that right, even though they presumed to accomplish just that by an act of the London Parliament.

I trust that the recommendation of the Knights of Columbus will be given full consideration. The text of the resolution unanimously adopted by the Knights of Columbus reads as follows:

Whereas the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, Representative in Congress of the Second Rhode Island District, submitted to the House of Representatives, June 28, 1949, the following resolution (H. Res. 270):

"Whereas the House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress (1919), third session, by House Joint Resolution 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desired to live; and

"Whereas in the intervening 30 years, the people of Ireland have so determined but the effect of their determination has been thwarted, and they have in fact been deprived of the right to the form of government under which they desire to live; and

"Whereas 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has, as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary"; therefore be it

Resolved, That the supreme board of directors of the Knights of Columbus endorses the sentiment and purpose of House Resolution 270; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this action of the supreme board of directors be forwarded to Congressman FOGARTY and to the members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Point Four

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement of our decision to make the hydrogen bomb has now forced us all to think seriously and realistically about the foreign policies of this country. There are many who feel that all hope for the preservation of civilization is gone. I do not shut my eyes to the terrible facts that confront us; and I commend the President for his forthright decision of a few days ago. But I suggest that we should not lose sight of the genuinely constructive leadership of the President and his advisers, clearly manifested in his recommendations for a point 4 program. This program, embodied in proposed legislation, is now under active consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member. The point 4 program is an effort to make permanent and lasting improvements in the world by assisting the stable development in areas of the world that are at present economically underdeveloped. One aspect of this program is the development of a favorable climate for private investment.

Americans generally, and Chicagoans in particular, are deeply interested in the various problems that affect the successful accomplishment of the point 4 program. On February 1, 1950, the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, with the cooperation of the Inter-American Council of Commerce and Production, sponsored a luncheon at which the principal speaker was the Honorable Edward G. Miller, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Mr. Miller's address was an important contribution to our thinking on this subject, and I feel that it should be read by all of us. The address follows:

A FAVORABLE CLIMATE FOR PRIVATE INVESTMENT

I

I feel honored that you have asked me to be with you today here in the heart of our country. I was last in Illinois a little over a year ago, when I came to attend the inauguration of your Governor, Adlai Stevenson, whom I am proud to count as one of my dearest friends. The record he is making should be an inspiration to men of talent and high purpose, attracting them to the public service. Illinois is also fortunate in the two Senators who represent it in Washington. Senator LUCAS, as majority leader, set a high standard of performance during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. Senator DOUGLAS has in 1 year established himself as one of the most respected Members of the Senate. No State is better represented in that great body than is yours.

This audience of leaders in the business and professional world affords an excellent occasion to deal with a subject now under intense discussion in financial circles. That is the question of creating favorable conditions for private investment in Latin America. This question, in turn, raises further questions as to how the economic development of the Latin American countries can best be achieved.

The basic position of the United States is clear. We want to support the efforts of our sister American Republics to achieve economic maturity. No nation in the world's history has ever embarked so deliberately upon a policy of helping other nations to strengthen themselves. The point 4 program is the true expression of a national ideal, an ideal that is shared by business and labor and is reflected by our Government. Accordingly, we are prepared to extend loans of public funds to other American countries to help them build basic projects essential to their development. The two great lending agencies in Washington, the Export-Import Bank, and the International Bank, have made many loans for undertakings such as highways, agricultural development, railroad improvements, hydroelectric power, and other projects suitable for public financing. These banks have between them more than enough capital to take care of the requirements of the underdeveloped areas, in terms of feasible projects, for some time to come.

Loans of public funds, however, cannot of themselves bring about economic development. They may help to create the basic structure, but the main job must be done by private capital. Now, the plain fact of the picture in Latin America as we confront it today is that, large as United States private investments are, the rate of new investment is slow, much slower than it need be or should be.

Why is the rate of private investment in this area so slow? What can be done to attract new capital? What do we mean when we talk about a favorable climate for private investment?

The first thing we mean is confidence—and confidence involves personal considerations. It is no accident that the first article of the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Economic Development recently signed with Uruguay is entitled "Entry and Basic Personal Rights," and that the second is entitled "Protection of Persons." Unless management can

follow capital in reasonable numbers, there will be no investment. Unless the managerial staff receives personal protection, there can be no stability of investment. I am talking about basic concepts—the inviolability of the home; the right to pursue one's own religious beliefs; the right to a prompt and fair trial in case of accusation of crime. If one of our nationals is the victim of a personal crime, it is reasonable to expect that effective police and judicial measures will be taken against the criminals. Where criminals go unpunished, as in some cases in which managerial personnel have been murdered, the result is necessarily a lessening of confidence.

The basic factor of confidence is thus inseparable from a second factor, namely, the kind of government that exists in the country which seeks foreign investment. Our people cherish the ideal of stable, representative, democratic institutions. They have fought and died for this ideal throughout our history. Though we have deep emotional and sentimental feelings about this ideal, it is based on sound practical considerations. Our people know that stable democracy provides the best governmental structure under which private enterprise can operate. And let us not forget that, though there is much governmental regulation today, this is still a land of free enterprise. Indeed, much of the regulation—such as the antitrust and fair trade laws—is specifically designed to insure the survival of free enterprise.

The great economic development of this country could not have taken place if stable, democratic government had not functioned here since the earliest days of the Republic. It could not have taken place if investors had lacked confidence in the stability and continuity of the National Government, if they had lived in fear from week to week of abrupt changes in the Presidency, with all the attendant uncertainties. It could not have taken place if the security of their persons and their businesses had been subject to the whims of a dictator with arrogated powers to tax and to destroy. Secretary Acheson was referring to this basic concept in his speech on Latin American policy last September, when he said:

"In countries where [favorable] conditions are provided, it will follow that we can collaborate more effectively in working out development programs. Public and private capital will be attracted more readily to such countries. While this is dictated by logic rather than emotion, it has been our experience that these conditions are generally found in countries where constitutional and political democracy exists."

The third basic factor essential for the attraction of foreign investment is local investment. Our Nation has always been open to foreign capital, but one of the circumstances which encouraged foreign investors to come in was the fact that our own capital would be working side by side with theirs. In countries where foreign investment is the only investment, foreign investment is an oddity and its managers are intruders. The foreign enterprise, by its conspicuousness, is exposed to dangers which would not arise in a setting that included domestic as well as foreign investment. Moreover, an active and healthy degree of local investment activity is bound to insure a richer market for the products of foreign investment whatever they may be. Investors are not ordinarily attracted to areas that are stagnant economically. Finally, many businesses operating abroad want local partners. They want guidance in local affairs. Many of the most successful foreign ventures of American business are carried on in collaboration with local capital, and some of our companies have even been satisfied to take minority stock positions.

The inadequacy of local capital is, in fact, one of the substantial deterrents to new investment in Latin America. Age-old habits of investment in real estate—the epitome of a stagnant economy—cannot be easily broken. In many countries you find, among the peoples themselves, symptoms of an essential lack of confidence. The most obvious symptom is the flight of capital. So long as a great part of private Latin-American capital is invested in the more developed countries there is bound to be a shortage of locally available capital. Another symptom of lack of confidence is the tendency to amortize an investment in the least possible time. A return of 10 percent per annum on an equity investment is often regarded as too small. Twenty percent or more is not regarded as excessive in some countries. This kind of thinking about the function of capital investment is obviously different from our own.

It is not only private investment from abroad that is inhibited by the shortage of local capital. Loans of public funds are also held back. It has not generally been the policy of our public lending institutions to provide for local currency expenditures. In an irrigation or hydroelectric project, however, local expenditures may represent a great part of the total enterprise. One of the major impediments to the making of loans in such cases has been the difficulty that confronts local sources, including governments, in providing for the local currency costs without causing inflation.

A fourth requirement for a favorable climate is absence of discrimination against foreign investment. A foreign company may be an attractive target, especially if it is big. Discrimination may take the form of direct action, such as expropriation or exclusion from certain types of normal business activity; or especially onerous taxes may be imposed upon foreign enterprises. It is our policy to eliminate the threat of discrimination by negotiating treaties of friendship, commerce, and economic development with our fellow American republics. Such treaties are designed to provide a set of rules under which foreign investment activities may be carried on. I have already mentioned the signing of one such treaty, with Uruguay. Negotiations for others are now impending. These treaties will go far toward establishing confidence by reducing the threat of discrimination. Furthermore, they will furnish a basis for discussing a broad range of problems relating to foreign investments with the governments concerned. Finally, being reciprocal, they will constitute a reaffirmation of this country's age-old policy of freedom of opportunity to capital from anywhere in the world.

A fifth factor essential to United States foreign investment is confidence on the part of the investor that if he earns money abroad there will be dollars available for the transfer of his earnings. There are only six or seven countries in the Hemisphere that do not have dollar shortage difficulties. Some of the others have, nevertheless, assigned a high priority under their exchange-control systems to the transfer of current earnings on foreign investment. What is more, the standard form of the treaty of economic development contains general assurances on this point. The stark fact, however, is that any assurances of this nature—regardless of their sincerity—are subject to the availability of foreign exchange at any particular time. That dependence on the supply of foreign exchange cannot be completely eliminated by any written document. This situation has no counterpart in the field of domestic investment.

To deal with this problem of convertibility we have asked Congress to authorize the Export-Import Bank, on the basis of funds already available to it, to extend certain limited guaranties to foreign private investments with respect to risks peculiar to such investment. The most important risk is that to which I have just referred, which arises out of foreign-exchange shortages, although other risks, such as those of expropriation and war damage, could be included. A similar guaranty provision has been included in the ERP legislation. The present proposal has substantial backing in business circles. It also has opposition in business circles. Part of the opposition is based on a fear that the proposal threatens established American enterprises abroad. I do not, myself, find this fear well founded. The proposal involves only an extension of the Export-Import Bank's present authority. The Bank already has ample power to purchase many types of securities and notes of American companies or their subsidiaries abroad. It has always administered this authority with due regard for established American businesses. Since it has not misused the authority which it already possesses, there is no reason to suppose that it would misuse its extended authority. Furthermore, the Bank proposes to make it clear that guaranteed investments rank in all respects with all the other United States investments in the country involved and that the nature of the treatment accorded them will reflect this equality. Any local currency received by the bank in connection with a guaranteed investment will rank with local-currency proceeds of other United States investments in regard to priority of claims upon the exchange resources of the country concerned.

Some critics have objected to the guaranty program because they believe that our Government should not associate itself with private business in such a way. These critics have overlooked the extent to which our Government has, throughout our history, helped private industry right here at home. Where would Chicago be if railroads had not been helped through land grants and subsidies? What of the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which does not merely incur contingent obligations with respect to private businesses but actually advances funds for their support? Our aviation and shipping industries receive direct subsidies from the Government. Our agriculture is based on various types of subsidy to which both political parties are committed to different degrees. The guaranty program is much more limited and indirect than any of these examples. It involves no present appropriation of funds. In the long run it may involve no outlay whatever by our Government.

A sixth factor in attracting foreign investment is that of a fair and rational system of taxation. Prospective foreign investors pause before the prospect of double taxation. They are even more hesitant to involve their funds in the uncertainty that characterizes the administration of the tax laws of some foreign countries. Our Treasury Department is now negotiating tax conventions with a number of American republics. These should provide incentives to investment through real concessions on both sides. Such treaties will lay down the rules of the game in the tax field. They will prescribe mutual formulae for such unglamorous but vital questions as the determination of income and of allowable deductions. They will also prescribe methods of consultation between the administering agencies of both governments. They should, consequently, go far toward improving the climate for foreign investment.

A seventh element in attracting foreign capital is the technical competence and know-how to make the capital productive. The absence of technical competence in underdeveloped areas—and that absence is a prime characteristic of such areas—raises a

problem akin to that of the chicken and the egg. Technical skills attract capital and capital is accompanied by technical skills. Through the Institute of Inter-American Affairs and other agencies of our Government we have been actively helping the peoples of the Americas to improve their basic skills in agriculture, public health, and industrial arts. We have asked Congress under the point 4 program for an increase and expansion of such cooperative activities. But help of this sort must come in very large part from private enterprise in conjunction with private investment. That is the only way through which to produce, eventually, a managerial class competent in modern methods of plant management, cost accounting, inventory controls, and the distribution of finished products. It is the only way to produce, eventually, skilled industrial labor. The necessary skills cannot be exported by themselves. They are inseparable from the going enterprises with which they have been developed.

I might add a word about the role of labor in all of this. Nothing could be more conducive to a rapid rate of investment than an increased recognition of the important role of responsible and progressive trade-union movements. By this we mean unions dedicated to increased productivity and improved working and living conditions and not those serving the political ends of a foreign country.

■

I have outlined some of the major factors affecting the rate of private investment in the other American Republics. I have also mentioned some of the things that we are doing about it.

What more should we be doing?

I must say to you, first, that the job is not ours alone, and it is not even primarily ours. It is not, in the first instance, the job of our Government nor of private enterprise in this country.

Our 20 fellow republics in this hemisphere are juridically our equals. Like us, they have their own sovereignty and enjoy the dignity of their own independence. Like us, they assume responsibility for themselves. Each carries its own destiny in its own hands. Each regulates its own affairs with no less authority than that which we exercise over our affairs in this country. Each must decide for itself what it will do about its own economic development. Each must decide for itself whether it wants foreign private investment and, if so, whether it is prepared to establish the conditions necessary to such investment. It would be an impertinence on our part to presume that we could make these decisions for our neighbors in the hemisphere. We come into the picture only when they come to us, as a source of capital and technical knowledge, and request our support of the efforts they are prepared to make for the strengthening of their own economies.

There is a basic principle involved here that we must all keep in mind—we in this country and our friends in the other American Republics. Secretary Acheson expressed it effectively when he said on January 12 before the National Press Club that American assistance can be effective when it is the missing component in a situation otherwise favorable with respect to economic and political progress. Most of the components in the situation we have been contemplating must be furnished by the other American Republics. They must furnish all seven of the components I have discussed, though we can help with some of them. Only they can furnish other components, tangible and intangible, that bear upon the possibility of conducting business under fair conditions. For example, the rate of exchange fixed by a government may, without being discriminatory, be so arbitrary in its operation as to make it impossible to conduct business in the country. Again, even though an exchange rate is realistic, the operation of an exchange control may obstruct progress. The system of justice in a country may be such as to create doubts as to contractual rights. We have all seen how nationalistic tendencies, when they affect fiscal and governmental policy, may stultify the possibilities of foreign investment. Finally, I shall allow myself to depart from diplomatic practice just long enough to say to you that there are cases, as we all know, in which administrative venality is a major impediment to investment and to the economic development of a country. These things are not wholly unknown anywhere, our own country included, but wherever they exist they are a local responsibility.

The creation of favorable conditions for private investment depends fundamentally upon the will of the country concerned. In the absence of that will, nothing we could do would create those conditions. The treaties I have talked about would be of little use. Public loans would not lead to the private initiatives on which economic development depends.

This, then, is the setting in which our State Department must perform the role which falls to it. This role, as I see it, is through good will and mutual effort to help, first, to bring about a clear understanding of the factors that affect investment, of the need for programs of positive action by the governments that want investment, and of the things that can be done by governments to attract investment. By and large, this process resolves itself into tedious and unspectacular efforts in specific situations.

The suggestion has been made that we withhold all economic cooperation except on condition that the other country enter into a treaty of friendship, commerce, and economic development with us. I respect the thinking of those who make it. Nevertheless, I think it confuses the form with the substance. It substitutes the device of a treaty for the objective of a treaty which may be attained by a variety of other and in some cases better means. It substitutes indirect compulsion for the willing reciprocity that must exist in the long run between cooperating nations. For 20 years we have been trying in our Latin-American policy to erase the old notion that we would not scruple to throw our weight around, to use our economic power in order to force concessions from other nations. Though we have made great progress, the notion still has some currency in Latin America. The fact is that we are cooperating on a voluntary basis with the other American republics in our common interest because the health of our entire community depends on the development of each one of us. The common good, which is the objective of our policy, must not be confused with petty bargaining advantages. The spirit of reciprocity is not a bargaining matter. A bargaining attitude on our part would, in fact, destroy it.

At the same time, it should not be thought that the State Department is disposed to favor large loans of public funds to countries which do not welcome our private capital. In some countries so many difficulties have been erected in the way of private investment, local as well as foreign, that private productive investment is infinitesimal. In such circumstances it is difficult to see how United States financial assistance could be fruitful from the standpoint of achieving sound economic development. We do not intend through public lending to compensate for the failure to make the most of natural resources through vigorous economic activity on all fronts. Our Government will naturally favor making public loans to countries where the broader objectives of our program can be accomplished. We will, in general, select situations where public loans will be accompanied by private activity, local or foreign. If our record of public lending is scrutinized, it will be seen that the recipient nations have generally been those where our loans can do most good in terms of these objectives. It will also be seen that they have been those with the highest development of stable democratic government. This is because our public-lending agencies, like private investors, must have confidence in the investment climate. And for them, as for the private investor, confidence in general is synonymous with democracy and all that democracy stands for.

While there are obviously hard problems ahead, we find that some countries have made encouraging progress. In these cases the adoption of a few additional measures of self-help and mutual aid should complete the necessary basic framework for rapid and continuing economic expansion.

The fact is that the Latin American republics are more keen today than ever before to do something positive for the achievement of their economic development. In many countries it has become the principal preoccupation of their governments. I have an impression, moreover, that they are increasingly aware of what it takes to achieve economic development. They are learning to think about the heavy disadvantages of a narrow economic nationalism. They are learning the importance of making themselves attractive to capital.

That brings me, finally, to what we can all do in a positive fashion to improve the climate for foreign investment in the other American republics. Our foreign enterprise must so conduct itself as to justify a welcome reception abroad. It must act in good faith. It must understand the essential principle of mutuality, that both parties must profit. Just as the investor must be assured of fair and sympathetic conditions, so the country receiving the investment must be assured that its own vital interests will be honored. We must be willing to justify such assurance by our conduct.

It is only fair that, having referred so undiplomatically to some failings among our neighbors, I should also state that some American businesses have, on occasion, behaved in a fashion that has tended to make all American business enterprise unpopular. Such behavior has always been exceptional and it is rare today. I assure you, however, that our Government, if only in the interests of American business as a whole, is not going to encourage this kind of foreign investment. One of the most encouraging elements in the whole situation today is the statesmanship that most United States enterprises are displaying abroad and their growing regard for public opinion in the countries concerned. This is the kind of thing that will in time contribute more than anything else to a favorable climate of investment.

I am glad that I am not alone in the point of view that I have expressed today. After I had prepared this speech, a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Chairman KEE of the Foreign Affairs Committee and Republican Congressman HEARTE, under the name of "International Economic Development Act of 1950." This bill—which is the proposed legislation implementing point 4—has bipartisan support. You will be interested in the following excerpt from the statement of policy in the bill:

"International investment can make its maximum contribution to economic development only where there is understanding of the mutual advantages of such investment and where there is confidence of fair and reasonable treatment and due respect for the legitimate interests both of the people of the country in which the investment is made and of those who make the investment. This involves confidence on the part of the people of the underdeveloped areas that investors will conserve as well as develop local resources, will bear a fair share of local taxes and observe local laws, and will provide adequate wages and working conditions for local labor. It involves confidence on the part of investors, through intergovernmental agreements or otherwise, that they will not be deprived of their property without prompt, adequate, and effective compensation; that they will be given reasonable opportunity to remit their earnings and withdraw their capital; that they will have reasonable freedom to manage, operate, and control their enterprises; that they will enjoy security in the protection of their persons and property, both industrial and intellectual, and nondiscriminatory treatment in taxation and in the conduct of their business affairs."

If we in our country and the peoples and governments of our fellow American republics proceed along these lines, confidence will grow and over the years a vast development of the American republics will occur through wholesome private enterprise.

Economic Aid to Korea and Non-Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to vote for the bill S. 2319, which provides for limited economic assistance to the Republic of Korea and to areas of non-Communist China. I do not care to do so, however, without making the following clarifying statements.

Last month I was one of those who voted against the bill to provide certain economic aid to Korea. I voted in that manner at that time not because of any failure to understand the Korean need, and not because of any lack of desire to help the freedom-loving people of Korea. I voted against the other bill because it was piecemeal legislation and because I sincerely hoped that it would force those formulating our foreign policy for the Far East to draft a more complete, more coordinated program of a realistic nature, having a greater opportunity to be effective.

The present bill before the House falls far short of reaching those goals. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I consider it to be progress in that direction, and, therefore, as I have said, I expect to give it my support.

In voting for this bill today, I wish to direct attention at this time, however, to the following facts. The committee has stated in its report that the major portion of the funds needed to carry out the provisions of this bill have already been appropriated. It is therefore assumed that these funds for aiding non-Communist China, which have been available for many months, will now actually be used in the most effective manner possible. Furthermore, the committee in its report has stated that this bill makes it explicit that the authorizations contained in the bill are limited to the fiscal year 1950 and that subsequent authorizations must be considered on their merits; in other words, that this bill contains no pledge of continued assistance.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my vote for the pending bill should be interpreted to reflect my interest in establishing world stability and peace through American foreign economic assistance, but it must not be construed as any pledge or any commitment for additional foreign economic aid. In other words, as the committee itself has stated, requests for subsequent authorizations are to be considered solely on their merits and with full regard for their effect upon our own American economy and stability.

It must be remembered that it is vitally important to free people throughout the whole world that the credit and leadership of the United States remain strong. We must ask ourselves how long the credit, security, and economic stability of the United States can endure under a continuing policy of deficit financing and tremendous burdensome national debt. It is my firm opinion that under this administration policy of operating in the red, our Government is seriously impairing its ability to provide help and leadership in the great struggle for freedom and world peace. By continuing this destructive policy we are weakening our ability to meet even our obligations to our own people. If we are to continue to make enormous assistance grants to other nations, then those who formulate such a policy should also accept the responsibility for advocating additional revenue sources to offset these additional expenditures. It is only in that manner that our people here in the United States will realize and feel today the full impact of this policy.

Americans have always been known for their generosity and their humanitarianism. Coupled with these splendid American characteristics there must be, however, a full evaluation of the facts and a practical realism so that we will not unduly weaken ourselves in our efforts to strengthen others.

Democracy in Northern Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of a news release from the Irish Legation in Washington which clearly shows that the Special Powers Act of 1922 is still being enforced in Northern Ireland. Recently the world had been informed that provisions of the act had been repealed and the inference was made that this undemocratic piece of legislation had been abandoned.

The Special Powers Act in Northern Ireland established the pattern for similar legislation under Hitler and Stalin in their forced control of occupied areas. Under that act, trial by jury has been denied, imprisonment for prolonged periods without filing of any charge is authorized and has been employed frequently and numerous other recognized civil rights have been abrogated. That such legislation should continue to exist and be employed in a country which claims to be democratic seems unthinkable. Little wonder that Stalin belittles democratic nations and their avowal of democratic principles.

In the instance cited in the news release it is evident that the display of any flag is permitted, even the Soviet flag, with the sole exception of the flag of Ireland. Yet, Great Britain recognizes Ireland as an independent republic, and hence her flag should be given the same recognition as granted to that of any other nation. Or is it that Northern Ireland, realizing that those six counties are rightly a part of the Republic of Ireland, so fears the display of the true flag of the area that, their consciences quaking at the sight, the puppet administrators of the government must resort to tyranny to preserve the usurpation of power in that area.

Interesting is the fact that Mr. MacEntegart, who carried the Irish flag and was thereupon arrested, had served during the recent war with the British forces. His arrest is part of his reward for his wartime services. During World War II it is estimated that between 150,000 and 180,000 men from the 26 counties volunteered for military services. While no official figures on this have ever been released, this estimate is considered to be quite conservative, according to the article appearing in the January 1946 issue of the Foreign Affairs Quarterly. In addition no less than seven Victoria Crosses were awarded to citizens of the Republic of Ireland during the war. This award is Britain's highest military award and is granted in very limited numbers, even in wartime. I am sure that the record for service in the six counties will not outshine that of the rest of Ireland, in spite of the so-called neutrality of Eire.

Perhaps the real reason behind this arrest was the fact that the incident occurred during the welcome-home ceremonies held in honor of Senator J. G. Lennon and Mr. Malachy Conlon, M. P., members of the Belfast Parliament, who had just returned from a speaking tour in the United States, during which they repeatedly decried the continuance of the partition of Ireland and urged a prompt elimination of that unnatural border which divides the country. The only answer available to the demand for an end of partition is this unwarranted exercise of the Special Powers Act and the continued denial of civil rights under its undemocratic provisions.

The full text of the release from the Irish legation reads as follows:

IRISH FLAG FORBIDDEN IN OCCUPIED IRELAND BUT SOVIET FLAG ALLOWED

Prosecuted by the six-county government for displaying a tricolor consisting of three vertical stripes, green, white, and yellow, purporting to be a flag of the Irish Republic, on the occasion of the return from America of Senator J. G. Lennon and Mr. Malachy Conlon, M. P., to Armagh on the 4th of December last, a former member of the British forces, James MacEntegart, appeared in Court Armagh on January 26. With another defendant, Anthony Smith, he was further

charged with obstructing a police officer in the course of duty. In court, witnesses described the procession welcoming the two northern leaders on their return.

Giving evidence, a Royal Ulster constabulary policeman said that MacEntegart was told by police "Take down the flag" and that he would not be allowed to carry it on the street. MacEntegart replied, "It is the flag of Ireland—you have no authority here—I fought for the freedom of small nations for 6 years under the Union Jack and was proud to do so. I am now fighting for the freedom of Ireland and I shall continue to fight under its tricolor." Defending Counsel MacSparran asked, "Supposing that it had been the Soviet flag—would you have interfered with it?" The policeman replied he would not have interfered with the Soviet flag. MacSparran continued, saying, "This case has been brought under the Special Powers Act of 1922; an act recognised not merely by the present British Government but by members of the present Northern Ireland administration as a repressive act. It has now endured for 28 years. Most people are under the impression that the regulations under it had ceased to exist by virtue of the statement made last year and many would be surprised to learn that one of the most obnoxious regulations of the act is still valid. Surely it is an absurdity that Britain should recognise the validity of the Irish Republic Army and national emblem and yet in part of the British Commonwealth there should be a situation whereby a person displaying the flag of a recognised state within the community of nations should be prosecuted."

The prosecution was brought under regulation 28 (c) Special Powers Act of 1922.

Trade With Soviet Satellites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following report from the Scarsdale Inquirer of a timely warning on trade with Soviet satellites by J. Anthony Marcus, president of the Institute of Foreign Trade of New York:

POLITICAL FORCES AMONG THEIRTEEN SALES EXECUTIVES

"What Becomes of the Sales Executive When Stalin Takes Over?" was the title of an address given this winter by J. Anthony Marcus, of 55 Church Lane, president of the Institute of Foreign Trade of New York and a famous international trade adviser in Washington. The occasion was a meeting of the Association of Commerce of South Bend, Ind. Says Mr. Marcus of his talk, "It is not pleasant, but we are not ostriches. We must face facts no matter how discouraging they may be. We can still master the situation if we act before it is too late." The Inquirer prints excerpts of Mr. Marcus' speech which many of the community will find it worthwhile reading.

In a number of countries in recent years freedom has been liquidated; the free enterprise system murdered, and with all that the sales executive has vanished. Being the product of a free society, he dies when freedom perishes. In Russia and the satellite countries freedom, even the most elementary forms of freedom and liberty, are a thing of the past.

The evil forces that have brought this about have been on a rampage since 1917. They have brought death and suffering to untold millions. This far very little has been done to assure the ultimate defeat of the Red plague. We have a North Atlantic Pact, to be sure, we have been pouring out billions first through the mismanaged UNRRA. Now, through the superbly administered ECA by your illustrious citizen, Paul G. Hoffman, we are pumping new billions of dollars into the rehabilitation of the economic and industrial power of the free nations of Europe, but that is not enough. Money alone will not do the job; wishful thinking, a pastime of many of our so-called liberals and religious groups, will do even less. Unless all of us recognize pretty soon that Red fascism is an irreconcilable force which will continue to wage war against civilization of one form or another until either "we" or "they" survive, as Lenin had proclaimed, it might be too late to save civilization from inevitable doom.

There is much that our Government can and should do to help eradicate this plague that is not being done. But there is much that the free citizens of the world must do and should do, but are not doing. Since history has decreed that ours shall be the leader in this struggle, what should be some of the first steps our Government should take?

INSIGNIFICANT MARKET

Sever trade relations with the Soviet Government at once. In 1913 President Wilson, outraged by the Tsarist's government persecution of a Russian Jew named Mendel Beilis on a trumped-up charge of the ritual murder, abrogated our trade treaty with that government. Since 1945, numerous American citizens, military and civilian, have been arrested without cause, kept in prison incommunicado for months and subjected to uncivilized treatment. All this after we had poured out billions of our treasure and rivers of blood of our young boys to help liberate Russia from the Hitler tyranny. And what did we do? We engaged in a diplomatic word battle.

The Russian market is the most insignificant of all in the world to us. It will never amount to anything as long as there is a Soviet Government in Russia. During the 20 years preceding the last war Russia's average purchases in this country amounted to about $60,000,000, while during that time she stole from us technological know-how worth billions of dollars. Severing trade relations and a complete stoppage of sales to Russia will do great injury to the Soviet economy, despite the lying claims of their government that practically every invention known to man has been created by their people.

But most of all, such severance of trade relations will serve as a tonic for the tens of millions of Russians who hate their government with an ever-burning hatred; it will hearten them to carry on the struggle against their tyrants. The mere fact that there are from nine to twelve millions of men and women in slave-labor camps in Russia, with many more millions in concentration camps and jails is conclusive evidence that the people are resisting the Communist regime. Had it not been for the stupid agreement with Stalin in Yalta, there would have been today several million Russian enemies of Stalin in Europe, men and women who preferred hardships in a strange land rather than return to the so-called paradise of the workers.

Many a time top-ranking Russian officials in Moscow and other cities have said to me: "Why do you Americans come here to trade with our Government? You are only enhancing their prestige; you are helping tighten the noose around our necks." Those remarks came from their wounded hearts; they were brave men, for they knew that they could have been liquidated without trial if overheard or if I chose to report them to the police.

TREATY VIOLATIONS

Insist upon scrupulous observance by Russia of our treaty which was a condition of recognition by us in 1933. They have been violating it almost since the day it was signed, according to the statement of our former Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. Our leniency is being interpreted by them as cowardice and stupidity on our part. For 2 years, since 1948, the Soviet-owned Amtorg Trading Corp. had been flouting the alien registration law and only after my testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee on July 28, 1949, did the authorities wake up to act and arrested the top officials of that agency which has been the center of economic espionage in this country.

And unless they live up to the very letter of treaty obligations, diplomatic relations should be broken completely. They are not and never will be friends with us. No pretty diplomatic verbiage will ever change matters.

If Vishinsky and company want to take a walk out of the UN, let us wish them "Skotyertyoo dorogu"—a smooth journey like on a table cloth, the Russian version of our good riddance of bad rubbish. According to Stalin's own teaching, they are in the UN and any other international body of nations merely for propaganda purposes, to bore from within and to destroy the institution, just as the parliamentary struggle is a school and an aid in organizing the battles outside the parliament, according to Stalin.

There can never be a silver lining to the Soviet horizon in its relations at home or abroad. If from time to time they do change their tone, it would be well to remember the Biblical passage: "The voice is the voice of Jacob but the hands are the hands of Esau." Don't trust them; treat them as they do us—enemies.

The next time an American civilian or military person is molested by them, don't use diplomatic niceties. It is futile. Act. Arrest 10 for 1. That is precisely what should have been done in the recent incident in Prague. When two of our embassy personnel were expelled from Czechoslovakia on 24-hour notice, four of theirs should have been hustled out of this country and instead of giving them 24 hours, it should have been 12 hours. This is the only language Communists understand and respect.

It is high time for our UN delegation to have at least one member who can speak Russian perfectly, who knows the true nature of the poisoned men of the Kremlin better than anyone now in our Government. Such men are available; they could be used with effect in dealing with the tricky Vishinsky and company—men whose culture is that of the head hunter and the manners of cavemen.

The Soviet diplomatic and business personnel in this country should be held down to the exact number of Americans allowed in Russia. Stalin's government must be taught the lesson reciprocity. A Russian Communist explained to me their meaning of the term: "You give us everything and we give you nothing." And a second official present added: "And we will repay you by helping bring about a Soviet Government in your country through a revolution."

ASSERT OURSELVES

What should the citizens of this and other freedom-loving countries do? For 32 years the Soviet Government has been fomenting uprisings, creating fifth-columns here and everywhere to bring about the destruction of our way of life by means of force and violence. Only gullibles like Henry Wallace and some of our ignorant university professors and parlor Bolsheviks refuse to recognize the underground work of the Soviet tyrants. The time has therefore come for our citizens, as distinct from our Government, to assert themselves. We must not leave everything to Washington. The best brains, the most courageous ones are still in civilian life.

With the zeal and courage of the founding fathers we must begin to take certain steps which would help the Russian people overthrow their tyranny. They can and will do it themselves, if we get behind them to encourage them and help them directly and indirectly. Our Revolution in 1776 did not secure liberty to us for all time without our doing something to keep it secure. A new force, an evil force the like of which has never existed before, and certainly one of which Washington, Jefferson, and the other statesmen could not have imagined would ever arise, is working with all its might and main to destroy freedom here and elsewhere.

I am not advocating a new organization. America is overorganized as it is. But let the thousands of clubs, trade organizations, labor unions, church organizations, etc., discontinue many of their unnecessary activities and devote their time, money, and energy to this goal—the ridding of the world of the Red plague.

For this purpose we have in Russia at least 90 percent of the population as our allies. The mere news of the formation of such a movement will hearten them and steel them to the supreme effort to liquidate their liquidators. They have done it before; they will do it again. But they need our encouragement. We can and must give it to them.

A coordinating committee to guide the thousands of citizens' organizations in this work will soon be formed. I have been working on this plan since 1927. Our people have yet to realize that we are living in an emergency, that the war is not over. We have downed two adversaries and have helped rear a third—the Soviet power. The incompetent men who helped guide our late President to his dealings with Stalin and Molotov are much to blame for the situation which is now plaguing us.

The hundreds of thousands of Russian DP's in Europe and now being scattered all over the world have a story to tell that must be heard. Our press, unfortunately, has hardly scratched the surface in this connection. But first of all the story must be told in telling terms in Europe. American ingenuity is needed badly in this work in Europe. Stalin has too many ideological brothers in Italy and France. The European countries have done a miserable job about exposing the true physiognomy of the Soviet state. Let this be our task No. 1.

We have failed thus far because we are not accustomed to dealing with arch-conspirators such as the Communists are. We must outdo them in their tactics. They have already hurt so many tens of millions of people in Russia and the newly annexed countries that we would be unworthy of the freedom we still enjoy if we did not take full advantage of their eagerness to join with us in this undertaking.

Let us keep before us at all times the following basic philosophy of Stalin as published in volume 8 of his collected works:

"What is this country of ours which is building socialism if not the base for the world revolution?"

This fundamental goal will never be changed regardless of who is on the Kremlin throne—Stalin, Molotov, Malenkov, or anyone else. And as long as that is the case, there can never be lasting peace for us, and we will have to tax ourselves to the limit to prevent this scourge from consuming us as it has already consumed hundreds of millions in other lands. With a little effort by comparison with the billions we are now spending and might have to spend in the future, without sending our boys abroad to die on alien lands, we can encourage the discontented tens of millions in Russia and the satellite states to do the job and do it promptly. Five or 10 years from now it might be too late.

Supersonic Ram-Jet Engines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I desire to have inserted into the RECORD a story appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on February 2, 1950, about the supersonic ram-jet engines for intercontinental guided missiles, which are being developed at the new jet engine laboratory at Wood-Ridge, N. J. These engines simulate flight speeds of 2,600 miles an hour at altitude conditions up to 80,000 feet.

The story is written by Mr. Ansel E. Talbert, the aviation editor of the New York Herald Tribune, also president of the Aviation Writers' Association. Mr. Talbert is recognized as one of America's leading aviation writers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW JERSEY LABORATORY BUILDS JETS FOR GUIDED MISSILES—AIR FORCE PLANT SIMULATES SUPERSONIC SPEEDS AND ALTITUDES OF 80,000 FEET

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

WOOD-RIDGE, N. J., February 2.—Supersonic ram-jet engines for intercontinental guided missiles are being developed here at a new jet engine laboratory which simulates flight speeds of 2,600 miles an hour and altitude conditions up to 80,000 feet.

The laboratory opened today for the first time to nonmilitary observers. It was constructed by the Wright Aeronautical Corp. for the Air Force, which, together with Navy and the Army Field Forces, is pushing "a national guided missile program."

This program includes investigation of the best methods and techniques for conducting intercontinental warfare, and already has progressed from subsonic to supersonic missile speeds.

DEFENSIVE EXPERIMENTS

On the defensive side, United States strategists expect the introduction of surface-to-air guided missiles to bring extensive improvements in the ability to defend local areas from intruding planes and missiles.

The ram-jet engine, most effective at speeds in excess of 760 miles an hour—the approximate speed of sound at sea level—is favored by many missile designers as the ideal power plant for high-speed, long-distance propulsion. Although proposals for ram-jet missiles were made in Europe during the war, the engine was largely in the drawing-board stage at war's end and has been developed mostly in the United States since then.

A ram-jet can be compared to a flying stovepipe with no moving parts, or to a giant milk bottle with the large end sawed off to make an exhaust for the high-temperature gases created by combustion of fuel in the engine's interior. When a ram-jet engine moves at high speed, small end forward, and fuel ignites inside under pressure created by the air flow the resulting exhaust gases give the engine tremendous power.

PERFORMANCE STILL SECRET

The faster the engine goes the more efficient it becomes. In the new Wright Aeronautical laboratory here, ram jets up to 20 inches in diameter may be operated in the new test chamber and future modifications of the chamber will make it capable of testing units twice this size.

Although the output of ram-jet engines to be tested here is classified as secret, the laboratory's capacities give a good indication of the power which can be obtained from this engine type.

Fuel pumps supplying engines undergoing tests are capable of delivering more than 6,000 gallons of fuel an hour—or the contents of 14 railroad tank cars a day. A series of steam jets, which can produce steam at the rate of 150 tons an hour, are pointed into the exhaust system to aid or retard the escape of exhaust gas.

By varying the air pressure for the test chamber, which is supplied at the rate of 140 tons an hour from the turbine compressors at a nearby $3,500,000 gas turbine development laboratory, it is possible to starve or overfeed an engine and create the effects of altitude or speed.

UP TO 4,000°

In parts of the ram-jet test chambers near the exhaust end the temperature of the gases reaches 4,000° Fahrenheit. Because this heat causes the test chamber to expand more than 1 inch over its entire length, the designers of the chamber put it on rollers. To muffle roaring of the ram-jet exhaust gases and steam jets, three silencers, each 45 feet high, have been installed at the end of the exhaust line.

The central test cell of the new Wright ram-jet laboratory is a steel tank 12 feet in diameter and 96 feet long. The ram jet to be tested is mounted in a platform in the center of the test chamber and connected to electronic thrust measuring instruments.

In 1948 the first facilities contract for the present ram-jet laboratory was awarded to Wright Aeronautical. Ground for the laboratory was broken in December of the same year and the main testing chamber was installed last fall. The first check runs on the laboratory as a complete unit were run last winter.

Equal Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article referring to a rider attached to the equal rights amendment. This comment was written by Florence C. Kitchelt, chairman, Connecticut Committee for the Equal Rights Amendment, and which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on February 3, 1950. It follows:

EQUAL RIGHTS—AMENDMENT RIDER CRITICIZED AS MISPLACING THE ISSUE

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

There is no doubt of the good intentions of the Senate in voting a rider to the equal rights amendment, last week, guaranteeing women benefits and exemptions.

It was done because some Senators interpreted the amendment as menacing protective legislation, laws providing seats for women in factories, etc.

The amendment does not mention either men or women. It says: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." We logically conclude that

if it menaces protective legislation for women it does the same for men. Are laws safeguarding sailors on the high seas, miners in coalpits, soldiers ready to give their lives in war to be endangered, but stools for factory women guaranteed? This puts the self-seeking of women in a very unlovely light.

The rider misplaces the issue. Legislation in regard to health and welfare comes under statutory law, the work of State and national legislatures. The amendment is a constitutional principle like that in the Charter of the United Nations.

Women are now inferior and adolescent under the law. The amendment would give them full adult citizenship. This legal inferiority has been stated clearly in a speech by Attorney Helen Elizabeth Brown before the Lawyers Civic Association of Maryland:

"Men, aliens and corporations are persons entitled to the equal protection of the laws in this country; American women are not.

"It is unconstitutional to try a Negro man with a jury from which Negro men have been excluded; it is not unconstitutional to try a woman, black or white, with a jury from which women have been excluded.

"It is unconstitutional to place restrictions on men's liberty to contract; it is not unconstitutional to restrict women's liberty of contract.

"It is constitutional to bar women from any lawful means of earning a living; such laws as to men are unconstitutional and void.

"Women may be subjected to labor restrictions; men may not.

"Women may be excluded from business and the professions; men may not.

"Women in business and the professions may be discriminated against; men may not.

"Women may be stripped of their property without due process of law; men may not."

Miss Brown quoted the cases before the Supreme Court which decided that a woman was not a "person" and entitled to equal protection of the laws. She recalled the statement of Bishop Hoadley that whoever interprets the laws is the lawgiver. As Justice Holmes said, the Constitution is what the courts say it is.

The dean of Barnard College, Mrs. Millicent McIntosh, is reported as saying that civilization still tries to thwart woman's intellectual development by imprisoning it within mid-Victorian concepts.

We submit that the Bennett rider, with its reference to "the female sex," is mid-Victorian as well as misplaced. The issue is not seats in factories for women. We rely upon the common sense of our legislators for that. The issue is the full humanity and dignity of all the citizens of the United States.

FLORENCE L. C. KITCHELT,
Chairman, Connecticut Committee for the Equal Rights Amendment.
NEW HAVEN, CONN., *January 31, 1950.*

Address of Robert P. Boylan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Robert P. Boylan, chairman of the board of governors and president pro tempore of the New York Stock Exchange, at a dinner meeting of the Association of Stock Exchange Firms at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., on Tuesday evening, February 7, 1950:

This dinner of the Association of Stock Exchange Firms, held so fittingly in the Nation's Capital, is of special importance because it brings together representatives of Government and business. We are accustomed to being on the receiving side in listening to Government. This time the position is reversed and Government is going to listen to business. I hope that all of you enjoy the experience. We are happy indeed to have so many distinguished Members of both Houses of Congress and of the executive branch of Government with us tonight.

This year, 1950, marks the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the moving of the seat of government from Philadelphia to Washington. As many of you know, plans are under way to hold a Freedom Fair here next year to celebrate 150 years under a free economy. It is being sponsored by the Government. Congress has approved it. All sections of our national life have been invited to participate. Such an exposition has great possibilities in dramatizing the progress of our country under our American system—way of life—call it what you will—which has brought us so far in the last century and a half.

The New York Stock Exchange, formed not long after the Revolutionary War, and now but 3 months from its one hundred and fifty-eighth anniversary, is proud of the historic parallel between it and the Republic. To me, the significance of this parallel lies in the fact that free markets and a free economy—you cannot have one without the other—have existed in the United States for a century and a half, drawing their strength from increasing consumption and from thrift and investment.

During those 150 years, the well-being of the Nation has been at all times dependent upon a proper balance between consumption and investment. Imbalance is always upsetting to the American economy. To cite an example: In the twenties, consumption was neglected. Income was not well distributed. There was too much at the top—not enough at the bottom. A condition of underconsumption developed. Today, investment is neglected. Underinvestment is evident on the part of individuals and of business. This is an alarming trend, particularly when we consider that it takes about $5,000,000,000 annually in new investment to create some 700,000 new jobs for young people entering the labor force each year.

Industry cannot provide these new jobs unless it can raise ownership capital. Ownership capital is not now available on favorable terms. Last year, as measured by Moody's, the average yield was 2.96 percent for corporate bonds and 6.63 percent for common stocks. Thus, it theoretically costs a company two and one-fourth times as much to obtain ownership capital as to go into debt.

Faced with the necessity of going into debt to finance improvements and expansion, or of drawing on current earnings, a company, unless exceptionally situated, usually will undertake only the essential. It will not invest the large sums needed for growth and development. Thus, it cannot utilize research and productive efficiency to create the new and better products at lower prices needed to improve the living standards of the lower income groups.

Permit me to review for a moment the reasons why underinvestment is putting a cloud on the economic horizon. During the depression preceding the war, in an effort to stimulate consumption, the Government taxed and spent freely. This tax philosophy still underlies our Federal tax policies. It has not been changed, although during the war and afterward consumption rose to levels that were undreamed of at the time this tax theory was accepted. Meanwhile the equally vital problem of investment continues to be neglected.

In a sense, I speak for the American investor. I do not pretend to do so with his authority. Certainly, however, from my vantage point as the chairman of the board of governors of the New York Stock Exchange, I am in a position to appraise the attitudes of investors. I know what the investor, the former investor, and even the potential investor are thinking about in terms of their willingness or unwillingness to supply capital. The New York Stock Exchange has some 600 member firms with more than 1,500 offices located throughout the country. We are constantly in contact with these firms. They, in turn, are in contact with those who own the securities of American industry. Our member firm organization, far flung as it is, is acutely aware of the fact that an extremely large number of people would like to employ their surplus funds. These people would form the habit of investment if conditions were made attractive for them.

A free economy, under which we have prospered for more than 150 years, cannot continue to expand and meet the needs of a rapidly growing country without an increasingly larger number of investors. It has been truly said that the American investor is the forgotten person in this country. Yet, the millions of men and women who invest in American industry and whose numbers would greatly increase if given reasonable assurance that they and their invested dollars would receive fair treatment, are among our most useful citizens. I am speaking of them not only as the suppliers of capital, without which our system would perish; but I have in mind also their qualities of thrift, their faith in American industry, their devotion to our free economy and our free institutions, and their rejection of the forces and influences that endanger our country.

May I tell you, briefly, what causes the fears that are uppermost in the minds of these millions of people:

1. Restrictive taxes (and this is the factor of most immediate concern). I am referring to taxes that diminish the incentives of both the stockholders and the managers of business.

2. The enormous growth of the Federal establishment, together with the indifferent attitude of large numbers of people with respect to the necessity of shrinking the size and the cost of government.

3. Tax-free organizations that are now doing an estimated $10,000,000,000 business annually, resulting not only in unfair competition, but in a substantial loss of tax revenue to the Government.

4. The taking over by Government of lending functions which properly belong to our private capital markets, except when emergency conditions exist.

I would like to take this opportunity to mention another factor which is disturbing to investors and to business. This is a very widespread impression that Government and business are unfriendly—that some deep-seated antagonism divides them. I doubt whether this will stand up under analysis. Congress fully recognizes the urgent necessity of keeping our economic system strong and in this it is in complete agreement with business. Congress is an able, hard-working body, both vigilant and courageous with respect to the best interests of the country. I am sure that those who are acquainted with the complex problems with which it has to deal and with the pressure under which it works share my sympathy and respect for our Senators and Representatives.

A friendly relationship between business and Government is highly desirable, and never more so than at this juncture in our national life. The need for harmony among all segments of our population has never been greater than at this time. I earnestly appeal to all for restraint in the interest of internal strength and solidarity.

Whatever weakens business confidence, retards the country's economic progress. All of us can remember the time when it seemed to be popular in one breath to praise the genius of American business and in the next breath to denounce the creators and guardians of our prosperity as men engaged in exploiting an unsuspecting public. Of course, this doesn't make sense.

As to the necessity of keeping our economic system strong, I would like to remind you that the rewards for achievement are taxed so steeply that they reduce the incentive of those who operate business and the incentive of those who would otherwise supply its capital. Such taxation is eating away the forces that have given America its strength—a strength that grew out of incentive and a strength that is unique among the nations of the world.

What we call the good life, for all of our people, can only be provided by a dynamic and expanding economy stimulated by incentive. Only the Government, through wise monetary, tax, and debt-management policies, can give full scope to the dormant energies of American industry.

I commend to all of you, as preferred reading, a study by Prof. W. L. Crum, of the University of California, who shows that incomes of stockholders—especially small incomes—bear a much heavier tax burden than those of citizens not owning stock. Considering the importance of the stockholder in our economy, can there be any excuse for this discrimination? The answer is "No."

Now as to the measures that would remove the fears of investors and of businessmen. The steps that should be taken to substitute confidence for anxiety are indicated in the four principal causes which I have outlined. A variety of remedies are, of course, necessary, but what we need above everything else are national policies and attitudes that recognize the investor as indispensable in the processes by which jobs and opportunities are created.

I am amazed, in my contacts in different parts of the country, to discover how few people realize the extent to which incentive has been destroyed in this country. I have never understood this. Given proper encouragement, our economic machine will operate at such a rate as to assure not only progress and prosperity for the Nation, but adequate revenue for the needs of government. The effectiveness of policies shaped around incentive has been demonstrated in the past. Our policies, particularly our tax policies, should be so shaped again. Why not try incentive?

I say restore the incentives needed to activate the businessman, the enterpriser. Thus, a dynamic economy can be developed in which the country certainly can attain a national income of $300,000,000,000 or larger. Such an income certainly cannot be attained soundly without incentives. With a national income of that size, the cost of carrying the war debt and its relation to the economy will assume proper proportions. The obstructions to the investment of equity capital have prevented our capital markets from reflecting the true value of private wealth. The present Government debt of $257,000,000,000, not to mention many other forms of debt, is compared in the public mind with a national wealth of $310,000,000,000 figured at prewar prices. As a result, many people have reached the conclusion that the country is near bankruptcy. It is not, of course.

The restoration of confidence will require, however, a change in tax philosophy which was based on the false assumption that the United States had reached a position of economic maturity. These policies are retarding investment ownership. They are eliminating the able, the competent, from the fields of enterprise.

Our tax problem is really not as complex as it appears. It is a matter of choosing those taxes which retard enterprise the least. Let us take a familiar symbol—the man with a pack on his back. It is true that the heavier the pack, the greater the handicap. But, it is also perfectly clear that a pack skillfully adjusted can be carried more readily than one which is badly arranged. Because of our heavy obligations, there are limits to the reduction which can be made in the over-all tax burden. But, we can redistribute the tax load in such a way as to stimulate equity investment and spark the economic machine.

Canada is showing the way by demonstrating that the gradual elimination of double taxation on dividends is both basic and possible in a modern nation. I would like to quote Canadian Finance Minister Douglas Abbott. He said, in announcing a sweeping tax cut last spring, and I quote: "It seems to me that, under a system of private enterprise, which depends for its existence on a steady flow of venture capital, we cannot afford to neglect the implication of this defect of double taxation in our tax system. * * * It is a matter of concern for the future under a system where we depend, and must depend, for full employment and the creation of new wealth on the willingness of our people to risk their money in constructive enterprises." End of quotation.

Our Canadian neighbor has put his finger on one of the most indefensible features of our tax structure, and that is the double taxation of dividends. I have yet to hear any logical justification for this particular tax policy. It is unjust, it is unsound and it outrages the investor's sense of fairness. It has been proposed to allow individuals to take a credit equal to 10 percent of their dividends in computing their tax liability. This would be an encouraging first step toward a long overdue correction of an injustice which crept into our tax system as long ago as 1913.

Another serious inequity in the tax structure which has very damaging consequences is the capital-gains tax. There is an easy remedy for this tax which, to be realistic, is not a tax but a form of confiscation. It has been in our tax structure so long, however, that its complete elimination is too much to expect at this time. An approach to a solution which is widely favored would be to reduce the rate to 10 percent, to increase to $5,000 the amount of capital losses which could be offset against ordinary income each year, and to reduce the holding period to not more than 3 months.

Originally, the objective of the capital-gains tax was revenue. Later on, it was regarded as a means of soaking the rich. This was and is an absurd idea. By making the acceptance of capital gains optional, you cannot levy on the rich through a capital-gains tax. All you can do is to deter the taxpayer from selling an old capital asset and from putting money into a new one. You can stop him from using his own best judgment and thereby needlessly interfere with the functioning of a free market. The investor who finds that he cannot use his own judgment because of an arbitrary time factor becomes apathetic in regard to risk-bearing and finds shelter in tax-exempt securities.

I have merely attempted to point out a list of alarming conditions and trends that are endangering a Nation grown great through the magic of incentive. Unless these trends are checked, much that we have today will disintegrate, and once the light of a great, free, industrial economy is extinguished here it may be a long time before it is relighted anywhere.

Our enterprise system will continue to grow if national economic policies in general are directed to release its potentials. I believe that people everywhere can be most effective in reversing dangerous trends by constantly drawing attention to every tax, every attitude, and every action that is suspect, as regards their effect upon incentive, enterprise, and initiative. In doing this, they are contributing to the common welfare. National policies must be modernized to fulfill the needs of a dynamic America.

I thank you.

The Eleventh Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon by Rev. Clarence R. Haden, Jr., rector of St. Philip's Episcopal Church, Durham, N. C.:

THE ELEVENTH HOUR

(Septuagesima, February 2, 1950)

We are in the throes of a social, political, and economic revolution. So far the changes have been effected gradually and through legislative processes. There is always a lag between what people want and believe in and legislative enactment. Our legislators, because of self-interest as well as their purpose of representing their people endeavor to keep in touch with the desires of their constituents. That this is a difficult task, no one will deny, for lobbyists and pressure groups often confuse the issue by the exertion of influence beyond their importance. Reconstruction is bound to come, however, for the ferment of unrest throughout the world makes it certain. This ferment itself may in part be due to an awakened conscience to the needs of man.

The standard of the market place is contractual in nature, but a more basic standard is what is best for man. His welfare is of greater importance than monetary considerations. As a business executive stated to me recently, "Beginning wages are much higher proportionately than ever before. After a level of around $60 weekly is reached, and it is soon reached, it is slower and more difficult to advance." This it seems to me is sound principle. A man is given more than he is worth, economically speaking, to begin with because of his basic needs, and then advancement is dependent on manifested skill and talent. This present status has been reached because of society's conviction, implemented by minimum wage laws, organized pressure, etc., that man has a basic need which must be met. Such other boons as old age pensions and unemployment insurance are also based on this consideration for the welfare of human beings.

The standards of the Kingdom of God are those of family life wherein each member is of significance and worth. Toward the achievement of these standards society is moving, and great gains have been made, though much still remains to be done. There are times, no doubt, when we feel that democracy is so slow, inefficient and unwieldy, that it should be abandoned. But when we compare the status of social consciousness in the United States with that in the other countries in the world, we know that it is our most valuable asset and must be preserved so that even greater progress may be made. The development of a social conscience was possible because of the democratic way of life.

The world civilization wherein rival systems are warring for supremacy should awaken us to the great danger that is confronting society. With the advent of first the atomic bomb and now the hydrogen bomb, the future of civilization, even civilization itself, is in question. No one has any right to be complacent in the face of what will inevitably happen if we get in another war. Dr. Harold Urey, the great scientist and expert on nuclear fission, has said that if the hydrogen bomb is used, it will render whole countries uninhabitable for thousands of years. Dr. Clifford Morehouse, editor of the Living Church in an open letter to the President of our country, points out that no weapon of war has ever been developed and not used. This is the most sobering of facts in view of the estimated destructiveness of the hydrogen bomb. We cannot afford to use, we cannot allow, the hydrogen bomb to be used.

It is all very well to recognize the awfulness, the horror, of the hydrogen bomb, but we are faced with doing more than saying it must not be used.

No nation can have a monopoly on the hydrogen bomb, just as no monopoly on the atomic bomb was possible. It will take two years for us to manufacture the hydrogen bomb, and it is estimated our potential enemy, Russia, will have it in four years. We are already in an armaments race, the end of which is sure and certain—war and destruction—unless. Civilization hangs in the balance—we are at the eleventh hour, so this "unless" is of infinite importance to you and to me and to all mankind.

Unless international control of the atomic and hydrogen bombs is effected in the very near future, we shall be destroyed. I am aware that the United States has proposed a plan of international control which Russia has consistently refused to accept. I am also aware that Russia will claim that our possession of the hydrogen bomb is a threat to world peace. Through vitriolic denunciation she will accuse us of all manner of imperialistic designs. But we must now allow the world or ourselves to be confused or deluded by the motives she imputes to us. Russia does not want war with us within the next 4 or 5 years. She is trying to keep us fearful of her until she thinks she is strong enough to withstand the world. It is sad but true that each passing month she fortifies herself more strongly behind the so-called "iron curtain."

We blindly watched the Nazis take more and more territory and get stronger and stronger and thought they would finally stop before we were sucked into the maelstrom. Our residence in this fool's paradise was abruptly terminated. We refused to take a stand for justice, for our principles while we could have done so without resort to war, and then inevitably we were drawn into war. We are making the same old mistakes of thinking we can work with Russia on the basis of right and wrong. They have no standard of right or wrong. Their policy is openly and avowedly one of expediency and opportunism. They will do whatever is best for Russia. Lying, double-dealing, inhumanity, brutality, fear and oppression are basic to their political philosophy. They will never rest until they achieve world domination. This goal is plainly stated in their writings, just as Hitler's plan was clearly presented in Mein Kampf.

So what can we do now to help avert war?

Firstly, this is one world under one God. Nations must surrender their sovereignty to a larger organization, such as the United Nations. The United Nations must change itself by the five leading nations giving up their veto power. The United Nations needs a police force to carry out by power if necessary its rulings. If Russia will not give up her veto power, then let her withdraw from the United Nations. We can show our good faith by proposing that the five nations relinquish this veto power.

Secondly, we as a nation must carry forward our desire to effect an adequate international control of the atomic and the hydrogen bombs. No longer can Russia and her satellites be allowed to sit in the council of the nations of the world when she consistently refuses to cooperate with the others. This will have the effect, no doubt, of lining the world up into two camps, but I submit that that is just what exists today—only we stumble along, hoping that despite all the evidence we shall somehow avoid war. When the differences are clear-cut, we shall know, and the world will know, just where we stand.

Thirdly, we of the Christian Church have the spiritual resources to help change the world. We of the Episcopal Church at this moment of history are endeavoring to send more missionaries throughout the world to proclaim the gospel of Jesus Christ which essentially is the Fatherhood of God and its corollary the brotherhood of all men. Human dignity and freedom rest on the foundation of God. When we work to implement such beliefs, we are on God's side and He will bless and further our efforts. We must give generously in this eleventh hour of mankind to missions at home and abroad.

To demonstrate our desire to avoid world destruction from the use of atomic energy, I urge you to write our two Senators, the Honorable FRANK GRAHAM and the Honorable CLYDE HOEY, and our Representative, the Honorable CARL DURHAM, and advise them of your personal belief that the Congress of the United States should vote for us to relinquish our veto power in the United Nations in conjunction with a majority of the five nations now holding same, and that the United States push with all the influence and power at our command the establishment of adequate international control of atomic energy including its newest development—the hydrogen bomb.

Operation of Television Stations in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the great city of Chicago by the City Council of Chicago, passed a resolution on January 20, 1950, requesting the Congress to take necessary steps in order to provide the city of Chicago with adequate facilities for the operation of seven television stations. Seven television stations were allotted to Chicago by the Federal Communications Commission, but only four authorizations were issued for operation in the Chicago metropolitan district.

The New York metropolitan district and the Los Angeles metropolitan district were each allotted seven television stations and they were respectively issued seven authorizations. Certainly this discrimination should not continue, particularly in view of the fact that the importance of Chicago as a center of commerce and industry is further evidenced by the fact that it was selected as the site of the first United States International Trade Fair to be held in August 1950. Chicago should have its full quota of television stations.

The resolution as adopted by the City Council of Chicago follows:

REQUEST FOR CHICAGO FACILITIES FOR OPERATION OF SEVEN TELEVISION STATIONS

Whereas Chicago has always been a leader and pioneer in radio broadcasting and manufacturing and the many allied industries; and

Whereas many Chicago residents are gainfully employed in said vocations and rely thereon for their livelihood, including technicians, actors, musicians, scientists, and advertising, management, and research personnel; and

Whereas in the production and origination of programs for Nation-wide distribution by networks or otherwise, Chicago has been and remains in strong competition with the cities of New York and Los Angeles; and

Whereas television is a new and recent development in this general field of broadcasting that promises to attain dominance thereof in the very near future; and

Whereas the importance of Chicago as a center of commerce and industry is evidenced by the selection of Chicago as the site for the first United States International Trade Fair to be held in August 1950; and Chicago should have its full quota of television broadcasting stations; and

Whereas adequate television broadcasting facilities are a basic essential to the growth and progress of all industries related to and dependent upon broadcasting; and

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission by regulation has allotted seven television stations to New York metropolitan district, seven to the Los Angeles metropolitan district, and seven to the Chicago metropolitan district; and

Whereas a sufficient number of applications were filed in each city to provide for the assignment of all allocated facilities; and the Commission did issue authorizations to seven applicants in New York and seven in Los Angeles for the operation of said stations, but has issued only four authorizations for operation in the Chicago metropolitan district; and

Whereas the failure of the Commission to issue authorization for all seven television stations in Chicago is attributed to a suspension of the processing of applications by said Commission pending a review of Commission regulations concerning television; and

Whereas in September 1948, when the Commission suspended its processing of applications, there had been pending for many months applications for all the facilities allocated to Chicago; and

Whereas the Commission's review of its regulations has developed into a complex and time-consuming procedure which will delay the commencement of further operations in Chicago for at least 18 months and perhaps for another 3 or 4 years; and

Whereas it appears that the authorization of the three additional television stations already allocated to Chicago need not hinder a satisfactory solution of the issues the Commission is currently considering in review of its regulations; and

Whereas a delay of 18 months to 4 years in the establishment of such additional facilities will grievously injure Chicago industries and residents and will seriously, if not permanently, impair the ability of Chicago to compete with its principal rivals in this field, and all of this without countervailing benefit to the Nation as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the mayor of the city of Chicago be, and he is hereby, directed to advise the delegation of the State of Illinois to the Eighty-first Congress that it is the sense of the city council that all necessary and appropriate steps be taken to the end that authorizations for the operation of additional television facilities in the city of Chicago, allocated by the Federal Communications Commission, may be issued forthwith; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be, and he is hereby, directed to send a copy of this resolution to Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS and Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, to each Representative from the State of Illinois in the Eighty-first Congress, and to the Chairman and members of the Federal Communications Commission in Washington.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
County of Cook, ss:

I, Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the certain resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago at a regular meeting held Friday, the 20th day of January A. D. 1950.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago this 2d day of February A. D. 1950.

LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER,
City Clerk.

What Should the United States Policy in China Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD the following speech, delivered by me at the Washington Town Meeting, January 30, 1950. The other participants were Senator Paul Douglas, Congressman Walter Judd, and Barnet Novèr, of the Denver Post:

In any discussion of China policy two premises ought to be agreed upon at the outset. Unless they are, we will end by obscuring the very issues which we are supposed to clarify.

First of all, China is not merely a group of political and military chieftains on the island of Formosa. Nor is it a few Chinese Marxist theoreticians in Peking, or—as they are at present—in Moscow. We mean or should mean when we speak of China the 475,000,000 Chinese people who possess a very ancient and distinct culture and who, during the past half century, have come to develop an increasing awareness of their national unity. They constitute the China toward which the friendly hand of the United States traditionally has been extended. They are the China we have long sought to encourage in the direction of democracy and freedom from foreign control.

In the second place, we ought to agree that China policy is not solely the question of "to aid or not to aid" Chiang Kai-shek, but rather the whole course of action and inaction in our relations with that country. The question we must ask ourselves is whether the course we have set is the best that can be pursued under existing circumstances. Does it serve all the interests of the United States? Not merely our commercial interests in China, although they are of some importance; not merely our strategic interests in the Far East, although obviously those, too, are important—but the entire range of American concern with China, the Far East, and the rest of the world.

If we keep these two fundamental facts in mind, we shall find, I believe, that the policy followed in turn by General Marshall and Secretary Acheson during the administration of President Truman has been on the same bipartisan track pursued by administration after administration—Republican and Democratic—during the past half century. It should be kept on that track despite the efforts of those, who for reasons of sentimentality or politics, would derail it.

So much heat and so little light has been shed on this policy by the debate of the past few years that I should like to review briefly just what we have done and what we have not done with respect to China.

During the war and immediate postwar period the United States extended both economic and military assistance to the Chinese. The amount of that assistance was not large enough to satisfy some people. It was much smaller than that which went to Russia or Great Britain. At the time, however, most of us were concerned not with dividing the American inheritance equally among our allies, but with using available resources in a manner best calculated to defeat our enemies. The fact that we are meeting here tonight seems to indicate that the decisions of our wartime leaders in this respect were at least reasonably correct.

Assistance given to China during the war, limited though it may have been, was the critical factor in saving a valued ally from collapse and I think it is about time we stopped being ashamed of it. American interests were served by this aid in that we were able to share the terrible human sacrifices demanded by the war. China's interests also were served since that country emerged from the conflict in a stronger and more independent position than it had ever before occupied in the modern world.

Partly to complete our wartime commitments and partly to equip China for its greatly enhanced and important international role, the United States continued aid to China during the months following the end of the war. The Chinese people wanted the removal of the 3,000,000 Japanese remaining in China. They wanted internal stability and rapid economic and political reconstruction. And above all they wanted an end to civil war.

The intention of our postwar aid was to assist them in realizing these objectives; we were not concerned with furthering the interests of any particular group of Chinese officials. If we extended our assistance through the National Government, it was because the available evidence indicated that, at the time, most of the Chinese people still looked to the generalissimo, who had led them in war, to continue to supply them with leadership in peace.

General Marshall's mission similarly was in accord with the wishes of the Chinese people. The general did not go to China to force Chiang Kai-shek to accept Communists into his government as has been so recklessly charged by some in this country. He went to help achieve what the Chinese people clearly and desperately desired—what the generalissimo and the National Government had repeatedly proclaimed as their official policy—a settlement of the internal problem of unity by peaceful means.

When it proved impossible to achieve such a settlement, President Truman reiterated the traditional policy of the United States—that we would not become directly involved in a Chinese civil war. That decision was applauded by the people of China, who were overwhelmingly opposed to the suicidal conflict being precipitated among them. As the civil war spread, we sought ways to alleviate the suffering it caused and to prevent China from collapsing into utter anarchy.

The cost of these American efforts to help the Chinese people has been great. An official calculation placed the total amount in excess of $2,000,000,000 in loans and grants since VJ-day. It is possible to argue about the exact amount and millions of words have been wasted in proving that it was closer to one billion or to three billion.

The significant facts, however, are these: During the first few weeks after the defeat of Japan the United States transported by sea and air 400,000 to 500,000 National Government troops over and around the Communist forces to key sectors of East and North China. The purpose of this undertaking was to insure an orderly surrender, disarmament, and repatriation of the Japanese. Fifty thousand American marines held such vital cities as Peiping, Tientsin, and Tsingtao for months, thus preventing their seizure by the Chinese Communists. By the end of 1945 we had delivered sufficient tonnage to equip 39 divisions of National Government ground forces and an eight and one-third group air force. Whatever Japanese equipment the Chinese Communists obtained with the facilitation of the Russians in Manchuria was offset by the Japanese equipment surrendered to the Nationalist forces in North, Central, and South China.

In December 1945 Chiang Kai-shek held a numerical superiority in combat forces over the Communists of five to one. He had a monopoly of heavy equipment and mechanical transportation and an unopposed air arm. Yet by December 1948, exactly 3 years later, this preponderance of strength had been so dissipated that General Barr, head of our advisory mission in China, was forced to conclude that without direct American involvement with its combat forces the complete defeat of the Nationalist armies was inevitable.

What lies behind this colossal failure? We have the answer from General Marshall, General Wedemeyer, General Barr, and practically every other competent observer who has had the opportunity to view the situation in China first hand. The failure was due not to any lack of arms and ammunition. The failure was due to the incredible ineptitude of the Nationalist Army command. It was due to the inability or unwillingness of the Chinese Government to take the necessary and repeatedly advised measures of social, economic, political, and military reform which alone could have retained for it the support of the soldiers and the common people of China. It was due to the downright corruption in official circles.

In the face of the mass of evidence, there are still people who cling to the theory that the Yalta agreement is at the root of all of China's difficulties. It follows, then, that since we participated in this dark and wicked conspiracy we are guilty of some sort of gross betrayal.

Let us see what this much-maligned agreement actually provided. Under its most pertinent clause, the United States committed itself to intercede with the Chinese Government in order to obtain the return to the Soviet Union of certain limited port and naval concessions in Manchuria. They were substantially the same as had been lost by Russia to Japan in 1904. In return the Russians agreed to enter the war against Japan. They also reaffirmed their recognition of China's sovereignty over all Manchuria, and consented to give assistance and support to China exclusively through the National Government.

Military considerations were largely responsible for the American decisions at Yalta. It is all very well, with the wisdom of hindsight, to ridicule these considerations. But at the time, the war with Japan was still of uncertain duration. Without the unforeseeable impact of the atomic bomb on the outcome, hundreds of thousands of additional casualties might have been the price of the defeat of Japan. The administration wanted to share that toll as far as possible with other countries. No one, it seems to me, is justified in talking glibly of such a contingency.

The fact is that we could not have prevented, by any method short of war, the penetration of Manchuria by Russian imperialism, so we tried to limit it. The American people have never indicated a willingness to go to war for the ejection of non-Chinese control from Manchuria. Our traditional China policy has never countenanced such a step. We did not go to war when the Russians originally penetrated the area toward the close of the nineteenth century. We did not go to war when the Japanese replaced them in 1904. It was, as a matter of fact, President Theodore Roosevelt, who arranged that first "Yalta" agreement. And in 1931, another Republican administration refused to lead us into war over this issue when the Japanese expanded economic concessions into political domination of all Manchuria.

We have placed on record in the past our conviction that Manchuria is Chinese territory. At Yalta we did so again. And we still believe Manchuria remains Chinese territory, regardless of the advantages taken by predatory neighbors in this time of China's weakness. But the task of restoring Manchuria to China in fact as well as in name is primarily the task of Chinese nationalism. It is not now and it has never been the responsibility of the United States armed forces.

Rather than speak of Yalta as a gross and iniquitous betrayal, I think it is time to recognize it for what it was—the best possible chance, at the time, of preserving the long-term interests of both the United States and China.

Another hopey has now made its appearance in connection with the island of Formosa. This time the administration is accused, not of betraying the Chinese, but of betraying the Formosans who, incidentally, are about 98 percent Chinese.

At the Cairo Conference in 1943 the United States pledged the restoration of Formosa to China. There was practically unanimous approval of that decision both in this country and in the allied world. When the war ended, the Formosan Chinese welcomed the return of the National Government as a liberator. Chen Yi, an old friend of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek was appointed the first governor. Chen Yi found living standards on the island better than on the mainland. He found a populace both industrious and law-abiding. And he found no Communists. After a little more than 1 year of Chen Yi's carpetbagging maladministration, the island was rocked by a fierce uprising against the mainlanders. Chen Yi crushed the revolt with a ruthlessness that claimed several thousand lives. It is not surprising that many Formosans believe their lot—bad as it might have been under the Japanese—was preferable to what they have suffered under the National Government. Successive and more enlightened governors, Wei Tao-ming, Chen Cheng, and K. C. Wu have not been able to wipe out the bitterness and hatred which the Formosan Chinese feel for their oppressors.

It is into this ugly situation that we are now invited to project ourselves. Since a peace treaty with Japan has not yet been signed, a legal loophole exists whereby we might assume some sort of protectorate over Formosa. In this manner we might conveniently avoid or postpone in Chiang Kai-shek's interest the pledge given to the Chinese people at Cairo. This ignores the fact, however, that for 3 years we have not questioned Chinese control over the island and to do so now would be unabashed interference in internal Chinese affairs.

The "gunboat" policy for Formosa currently being advocated in some quarters is not a new one. It was first proposed a hundred years ago by Admiral Perry and decisively rejected by the American people them. If we were to follow it now, we might be able with superior force to discourage the present Communist masters of China from seeking to take the island. But in doing so, we would give credence to the anti-American propaganda in the Orient that charges us with using our power for imperialistic purposes. We would build, in the final analysis, a lasting heritage of hatred just as the Russians are now busily doing in Manchuria, Sinkiang and Mongolia.

The situation in Formosa points up the key difficulty involved in keeping our China policy on the right track. We must discriminate between what we can do and what we cannot do both in a material and an ethical sense. There is no virtue in doing in foreign affairs just to be doing, and there are times when inaction is more effective from the point of view of American interests than action.

The cardinal principle of United States China policy must remain what it always has been—recognition of the fact that the internal problems of the Chinese people, whether on the mainland or on Formosa, must be solved primarily by the Chinese people themselves. They do not want and they will not acquiesce indefinitely in solutions forced upon them by foreign intervention.

We cannot make ourselves responsible—militarily or otherwise—for a regime which has been abandoned by the Chinese people. To do so would be the certain way of diverting attention from the real threat to their nation arising in the north.

We cannot continue to supply armaments to a government which the Communist leader Mao Tse-tung has callously, but unfortunately with much accuracy, labeled his supply service for the delivery of American equipment.

We cannot, by conducting naval exercises in the path of an impending engagement in the Chinese civil war find a cheap and involvement-free solution to the complex problem of China policy. It is irresponsible and dangerous to threaten force unless you are prepared to use it. And I doubt that even those who advocate such a policy are ready to go to war over Formosa.

We cannot, on the other hand, give recognition to a Chinese Communist government which shows little regard for the rights of our citizens and little respect for even the most elementary international usages. There would appear to be little point, moreover, in our association with a regime which claims to speak with the authentic voice of China but which has the accent of the Soviet Union. At the conclusion of the present and unexpectedly long talks in Moscow we may know better whether that regime has abandoned the accent or China's fundamental interests.

What we can do in the present circumstances is to maintain our faith in China—not in a handful of exalted figures but in the Chinese people themselves. We can continue to help those people with the limited means at our disposal—through public and private channels—in whatever regions remain open to us. The Chinese people will not forget acts of genuine friendship in their hour of trial.

We can, moreover, through the Voice of America, the United Nations, and other feasible ways, keep the attention of the Chinese and the world focused on the Soviet exploitation that is now going on in China's remote provinces. Through the United Nations, we can also seek to prevent the present Communist masters from pushing the peaceful Chinese people into aggressive campaigns beyond China's borders.

By lending encouragement to legitimate Nationalist aspirations and by extending practical economic assistance under point 4 to the countries surrounding China, we can demonstrate our genuine interest in the progress of all Asia.

Finally, we can keep our thinking on general foreign policy flexible. Only in this way will we be able to act appropriately in any given circumstances. Above all, we must avoid the fallacy of believing that consistency in foreign policy lies in acting precisely in the same manner in every part of the globe. It is, for example, fantastic to suggest that what we have done in Greece we must also do in China, which has 58 times as many people, 60 times as great an area, and a vastly different set of political and strategic problems.

The only consistency we need be concerned with is the consistency with which we devote ourselves to the protection of the security and all the legitimate interests of the United States. That is the basic ingredient of a nonpartisan, nonpolitical approach. Beyond it let us exercise a little imagination and a lot of discretion.

The Secretary of State and the Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times of January 27, 1950:

IN THE NATION—THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND THE MAN

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 26.—To comment as Mr. Acheson did on the conviction and sentencing of Alger Hiss was politically explosive, and in his capacity as Secretary of State he was fully aware of that. Also, experience and observation must have shown him that an officeholder, especially of his eminence, cannot divest himself of official status and speak or act as a private person when the matter concerned touches a public issue and the setting is the place in which he conducts the public business.

These circumstances of Mr. Acheson's comment, combined with the fact that he deliberately expanded it beyond the remark that it would be "highly improper" for him to discuss the legal aspects of the Hiss case while it was still before the courts, led this correspondent to a certain conclusion. It is that Mr. Acheson expected the question and determined that when it was asked his conscience as a man and his ethical concept as a Christian required him to reply as he did despite the obvious consequences—at any rate the immediate ones—and the inseparability of Dean G. Acheson from the Secretary of State in the premises.

A minority among the many in Washington who were heard to discuss the incident today approved the decision he reached as Mr. Acheson, and some of these held that the compulsions of conscience entitled his comment to be weighed as that of an individual only. In this opinion, any who believed in his right as a man to say what he did have no grounds for criticizing him for doing so because of the office he occupies and the world importance of the popular estimation of its occupant.

That opinion may become general as the event is discussed and rehashed not only in the political community of the capital but in countless gatherings of the American people. Personal, deliberate courage, loyalty to friends in dire trouble and professions of the Christian ethic of compassion are admired and respected in Western and other civilizations. And all these were displayed by Mr. Acheson.

VIEWS OF THE CRITICS

Nevertheless, among those whose opinions were heard today the critics outnumbered the defenders, and on these grounds:

In two jury trials 20 of 24 jurors decided that Hiss was guilty of perjury as charged. In the second of these trials, though the attitude and rulings of the court were more satisfactory to the prosecution, it allowed the defense to present evidence excluded from the first trial and urged by the defense as vital demonstrations of the innocence of the defendant.

Trial by jury is basic among democratic institutions, and Mr. Acheson's citation of the Last Judgment of Jesus against the background of Hiss' conviction was bound to leave a critical implication toward the operation of that system in this instance with the verdict still before the courts. If Mr. Acheson had waited to cite the doctrine of compassion for all sinners until the verdict was affirmed, which he could have buttressed with another quotation from St. Matthew (12: 31), this implication would not have touched a pending case. For the present, Hiss has been found guilty of perjury in relation to accusations of disloyalty to his country and breach of official duty for which he could not be tried under the statute of limitations. As a lawyer, Mr. Acheson should merely have observed that the case is still in court.

As Secretary of State he should have confined his comment to the remark about propriety. He should have done so because (1) it is his duty to keep his office out of unnecessary controversy, and this was unnecessary; because (2) the former connection of Hiss and certain others with the Department of State has already hampered its effective operation by arousing the distrust and resentment of many worthy Members of Congress and the public, and yesterday's comment was sure to stimulate these at the expense of the general welfare, and (3) because Mr. Acheson's personal and business relations with Mr. Hiss and his brother make him a biased observer in the minds of many.

A POLITICAL JUDGMENT

Those who evaluated Mr. Acheson's comment wholly on the scales of politics and foreign policy found the heart of the matter in its possible effect on these. Some who support the domestic and foreign policy of the administration were disposed to criticize the Secretary, though in private, as having committed an irresponsible act in the circumstances which no prompting of conscience or religious doctrine could excuse. They agreed with the others that Mr. Acheson should have awaited the final judgment of the courts before he amplified his refusal to discuss the legal issues that remain, adding it is plain that, if the jury's verdict does not stand, the reason can only be a legal technicality.

Even then, said these critics, whether the case goes back to the courts on a technicality or the verdict is sustained, Mr. Acheson should weigh the effects of what his conscience as a man might prompt him to say or do against the consequences of these on the great public duty he has accepted. Then, since he knows the obligations of his office and the nature and sources of his opposition, he should resign as Secretary of State if to follow his conscience required him to do so in the interests of his country. And, in this opinion, Mr. Acheson is a practical enough judge of consequences to know when resignation would serve those interests best.

Place Names in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the place names of West Virginia have been studied by the State's industrial and publicity commission, and many quaint and curious pieces of lore have been uncovered. They smack of the early pioneer life of Americans in a rough mountain region. I find in the Monroe Watchman, of Union, W. Va., a reproduction of the commission's report, and it is with pleasure that I commend it to my colleagues, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD:

PLACE NAMES IN WEST VIRGINIA

West Virginia place names do more than merely designate locations. They give us a graphic picture of the life and times in the State's early development. In fact, a study of West Virginia's names is a study of its history.

Take Mohawk and Mohegan, Mingo, Seneca, and Guyandot—names of the great Indian tribes that inhabited or hunted this region. Wyoming, Shawnee, Potomac, and Watoga are places and rivers that recall the rich beginning of our recorded history. Even before the Indian there lived the Moundbuilder, hence Moundsville.

Many streams in West Virginia still carry descriptive titles of the colorful Indian language. Monongahela was known to the Delawareans as the "river of falling banks." Pocatalico was the "river of fat doe." Ohio means "river of many whitecaps." The Great Kanawha pays tribute, not to the river, but to the once great tribe of Canoys.

The little town of Pickaway, in Monroe County, is a rough pronunciation of the tribal name, Piqua.

Names give us a true insight on the life of the early pioneers. Moreover, in names like Little Italy, Ireland, Polandale, Welsh Glade, and Germany Valley, we discover the origins of these people. Helvetia, in Randolph county, is the Swiss name for its settler's native country. Ronceverte, meaning Greenbrier, shows the French influence in the southeastern area.

Many of West Virginia's commonplace names depict the environmental conditions of those early days. Names like Elelber Run, Ramp, Spice, Sang, and Seng Runs reveal the pioneer dependence on root and herb medicines. Panther Fork, Elk River, Copperhead Branch, and Wild Cat Knob emphasize the wild unsettled conditions. Pigeonroost, Cow Creek, Bull Run, Goose Lick, and Turkey Wallow Branch indicate agricultural pursuits. Names like Tunder Hill Run, Mount Storm, Hurricane, and Tornado show the settler's deep awareness of natural forces.

Perhaps it was the pioneer women who gave us such names as Cupboard Run, Kitchen Creek, Kettle Run, Pot Branch, Skillet Run, and Tub Run. Tearcoat Hill, Mitten Ridge, Scissorsville Branch, Wash Hill Fork, and Suds Run can be credited to them, too. What stories lie behind names like Peddler Run and Gunbarrel Hollow?

Even foods are immortalized in names like Apple Pie Ridge, and Potato Hole Knob. An early day humorist probably gave us Pickles Fork. And to show that the frontiersman was of sturdy stuff, there is Grogg Run, Mash Fork, Rum Creek, and Still Run.

Religion played an important part in the lives of the pioneers. Such names as Canaan Valley, Eden, Herode Creek, Pharaoh Run, and Pisgah are taken from the Bible. There is a Job Knob, a Moses Creek, also a Christmas Ridge. Names like Paradise, Purgatory Knob, Devil's Tollgate, and Hell For Certain Branch mirrored the moral fiber of these places. Desolate Branch, Shades of Death Creek, and Troublesome Valley reveal more somber aspects of frontier life.

Feelings and emotions are betrayed in names like Big Ugly Creek, Hardscrabble, Desolate Branch, Stinking Creek, and Hateful Run. Soak Creek and Lizzie's Roost connote humorous incidents of long ago.

Proving that the pioneers also explored the great world of literature, Avoca, from Moore's Irish Melodies, and Ravenswood, from Sir Walter Scott, are added to the list. A knowledge of Greek and Roman literature is hinted in Caesar Mountain, Socrates Mountain, Eureka Island, Polemic Run, and Styx River. Geography is evidenced by the Congo, Nile, and Rhine Rivers.

The building of railroads resulted in such names as Ross Siding, Engle's Switch, Switchback, Jones' Crossing, Vivian Yard, Tunnelton, and others. Combo evolved from the Cumberland Valley and Baltimore & Ohio Railroads.

Wars are responsible for such names as Brandywine and Bunker Hill. Dunmore and Cornwallis were named for famous generals. Jefferson, Washington, and Lafayette are names of districts; counties are named for Lincoln and Grant. Civil War heroes are recognized by the districts of Stonewall, Lee, Sheridan, and Sherman. Scott and Winfield were named for the hero of the Mexican War of 1847.

Nearly all the Presidents are represented in some way. There is both a Woodrow and a Wilson in West Virginia. Women, too, have been honored by place names. Both Belva and Lockwood were named for the famous women's rights advocate of 1877. More recently, the little Putnam County community of Eleanor was named for the wife of the late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Excise Taxes Should Be Immediately Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is clamoring for repeal of the wartime excise taxes, which have served their purpose long ago.

I present an editorial from the Washington Daily News for January 30, which gives added reasons why these excise taxes should be repealed immediately. If not, thousands of small firms may go out of business because buyers are waiting for Congress to repeal these taxes.

The editorial will be of interest to Members of the Congress and readers of the RECORD.

It follows:

PARALYZING BUSINESS

Wartime excise taxes, still in effect 4½ years after the war ended, are depressing certain lines of business.

President Truman says so, and everybody else knows it to be true.

The original chief purpose of most of these taxes was to discourage travel and business-as-usual, thus releasing transportation facilities, manpower, and materials for war work.

They continue to serve that purpose when all lines of business need every possible encouragement to produce and sell, thus providing more jobs and more Government revenue from individual and corporate income taxes.

They serve that purpose, as Mr. Truman says, with particular detriment to low-income groups.

And now, since Mr. Truman has advocated reducing many of these excise taxes, they serve that purpose more effectively than ever.

For customers are putting off buying excise-taxed goods in the belief that the taxes will soon come off or come down.

The effect on some lines of business has become worse than depressing. It's paralyzing.

But Mr. Truman tied a string to his recommendation for cutting such taxes. He said that Congress must replace the revenue lost by closing tax-law loopholes which now permit some groups to escape their fair share of taxation. Otherwise, no excise-tax cuts.

Closing the loopholes is a difficult, time-consuming job, which Congress apparently intends to study for several months before acting.

A few months of stagnation in the market for excise-taxed goods could put a lot of employers out of business and a lot of employees out of jobs.

We believe that Congress should do quickly whatever it means to do about reducing or repealing excise taxes, and should firmly commit itself to offset any consequent loss of Government revenue by cutting down Government spending.

Report on European Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of my visit to military headquarters, units, and installations in Germany and Austria, and certain other points in Europe, November 9 to December 9, 1949, made to the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services:

This report of the trip made by the undersigned to Europe commencing November 9 and concluding December 9, 1949, is designed to make available to the members and staff of the committee essential information gathered and the views and impressions gained on such trip. While the main mission of my tour was to inspect American military installations and American troops in the occupied zones—Germany and Austria—nevertheless because our overseas military missions are largely determined by social, economic, and political conditions abroad, I spent considerable time investigating those conditions. And although certain of the matters coming to my attention are not directly within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, it is believed that they may be of general interest to the other Members, particularly those whose schedules did not permit them to visit Europe during the past year.

ITINERARY

During this trip stops were made at Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts; Lagens, Azores; Frankfurt, Heidelberg, Weisbaden, Berlin, Munich, Germany; Vienna, Austria; Rome, Paris, Iceland, and Newfoundland. The major portion of the time overseas was devoted to the study of installations in Germany, with 2 days in Austria and 4 days each in Italy and France.

The following items and conditions with respect to our troops in Europe were noted during this trip:

The number of American troops in Europe today represents merely a token force whose mission is that of maintaining law and order. Nevertheless the mere presence of American troops very obviously means much to reassure the peoples of the occupied zones that the United States is vitally concerned with their welfare and their problems.

PERSONNEL

The health, appearance, and discipline of our forces in Europe were uniformly good. American military leaders in Europe, under General Huebner, and more recently under General Handy, have made substantial strides in these fields; and our military personnel by their appearance and conduct reflect credit upon the United States.

The strength of the United States forces in Germany has been gradually reduced since the close of hostilities, and today our troops constitute a very small number particularly in comparison with their missions, or the number of troops maintained by certain other powers. Under such conditions, it is doubly important that the highest quality personnel be recruited and trained, and that the maximum combat strength be organized from the personnel available. I am not convinced that these objectives are being fully attained. Due to the requirements of the Selective Service Act of 1948, and the shortage of voluntary enlistments, the Army lowered its personnel standards to a degree. Furthermore, there are still substantial numbers of military personnel in Germany assigned to more or less nonmilitary duties, such as the operation of hotels, service stations, restaurants, etc. The fact that such activities are necessary for the maintenance and convenience of our occupation forces does not, in my opinion, require that, in the stabilized conditions now prevailing, military personnel be directly assigned to such activities. The State Department, through the High Commissioner for Germany, Mr. John M. McCloy, has taken over the responsibility for civil government, economic affairs, and most policy matters affecting the German population. It would appear that they should also take over, or make suitable arrangements, for the support and maintenance of their personnel, and that our armed forces should be reorganized to emphasize their strategic and tactical combat missions. Furthermore, it may be noted that among the personnel assigned to nonmilitary duties a substantial number have been engaged on such activities for 2, 3, or 4 years. While such specializations may contribute to technical efficiency in the particular job concerned, it does not advance over-all training or develop maximum potential combat strength.

Some units and headquarters appear to be overstaffed with officers as compared to actual needs. This condition, I understand, has come about principally because during the period following the seizure of Czechoslovakia by Communist forces, and enactment of the Selective Service Act of 1948, the Army anticipated an increase in its effective strength from 550,000 to over 800,000, and encouraged a large number of emergency and Reserve officers to volunteer for 3-year tours of duty. Subsequently, the President determined not to increase the armed forces to the extent authorized by the Congress; but the Army and Air Force still had a substantial number of officers in excess of actual requirements. This problem is clearly understood, and I understand efforts are being made to solve it, by relieving Reserve officers on their own application and by limiting the recall to extended active duty of others. However, some forced attrition has become necessary, resulting in the involuntary separation of certain Reserve officers. Needless to say, such a program, no matter how fairly and efficiently carried out, creates uncertainty and injures morale among those who have gone overseas expecting a 3-year tour of duty and now find themselves subject to possible involuntary separation. It would appear to be in the best interests of all that the policies to be followed in this matter be promptly disseminated, and that the program be carried through as expeditiously as possible.

TRAINING

One infantry battalion of the First Division is stationed in Berlin, where, together with a battalion of the constabulary and one battalion of military police, it constitutes our tactical force. This infantry battalion has not been afforded opportunity to rotate with other similar units of the First Division; consequently, while the individual training and discipline are at a high level, it scarcely can be considered fully trained as a divisional unit. It would appear possible, now that the Berlin blockade has been lifted, to replace the battalion concerned with another similar unit in order to provide the personnel better opportunities for combined-arms training.

With respect to the Air Force units in Germany, it may be noted that current directives authorize a maximum of 4 hours flying time per month for combat pilots, and limit the operation of aircraft to those of the type to which the officer is regularly assigned. While the need for economy and efficiency in our military affairs is recognized, I do not believe that 4 hours flying time per month is sufficient to maintain the proficiency of air crews, particularly on high performance or combat-type craft such as fighters. As a temporary measure, such limitations on training may produce economies, but by reducing the readiness of our combat squadrons and pilots they weaken our defenses, and subject the personnel concerned to undue hazards. I recommend that the committee take up with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Air Force the matter of maintaining real flying proficiency, particularly by those air crews assigned to duties with tactical units in Europe.

EQUIPMENT AND QUARTERS

The equipment of our ground force elements in Europe is generally satisfactory. The standards are those of 1944 or 1945, and the problems of maintenance and repair have required great ingenuity and resourcefulness on the part of the leaders concerned. In general, though, our Army forces have sufficient weapons, transportation, and other equipment to meet their needs. In an effort to maintain in serviceable condition the maximum amount of motor equipment, the Army has taken over and is now operating in the vicinity of Munich a major industrial plant constructed by the Bavarian Motor Works for the manufacture of aircraft engines. There, unserviceable trucks, cars, and jeeps are completely dismantled, inspected, and rebuilt, by the labor of several thousand German workers. Due to the efficient organization of the plant, the skill of the workmen, and the low rates of pay (in comparison to United States industry), as well as the saving of transportation costs, the operations of this plant and others in the United States zone have achieved very substantial economies. Of course, the process of rebuilding and repairing used motor vehicles cannot go on indefinitely, but the Army and particularly the Ordnance Department, deserve the sincere commendation of this committee for the resourcefulness and initiative shown by this operation, and the efficient results obtained.

So far as aircraft equipment was concerned, the only deficiency noted appeared to be at Neubiberg Air Force Base where our most advanced fighter units were still equipped with World War II planes. The reasons for delay in equipping these units with modern jet fighters are not known, unless it be the need for extended runways which are now under construction; but every effort should, in my opinion, be made to provide such units with the newest and best equipment available. This Air Force base is approximately 20 minutes from the Czech frontier and 1 hour from Berlin by air. If they are to perform their mission in combat, the units stationed there should have the very best that American industry can provide in the way of weapons and equipment.

The problem of quarters for officers and enlisted men of our services stationed in Europe is one of unusual gravity. During the last months of the war in Europe, and the first year following, the United States Army took over, by requisition, large numbers of dwellings as billets and quarters. Subsequently, General Clay, in an effort to stabilize the situation and to avoid unnecessary drain on the German economy, discontinued requisitioning and in many areas turned back substantial numbers of quarters to the Germans. The transfer of several staff functions from Berlin to Frankfurt, and more recently to Heidelberg, has produced a severe shortage of family quarters in those areas. Another factor has been the increasing tendency since conditions became more stable for officers and enlisted men to bring their families to Germany. In any event, there is now a serious shortage of family quarters for assignment to Army and Air Force personnel of all grades, with the possible exception of senior general officers. I did not, during this trip, have time or facilities to determine what solution should be reached, but I am convinced that the problem urgently requires more thought and effort on the part of the responsible commanders than it has heretofore received. One minor aspect of the problem is that, due to the interpretation placed upon the definition of dependent parents (under sec. 102g, Public Law 351, 81st Cong.) some officers and enlisted personnel are encouraged to transport overseas parents who could be better cared for in the United States. Such interpretation appears unnecessary and the results are entirely wasteful and injurious. It appears that our Army and Air Force should be required in Germany for a very substantial period in the future. As will be noted in a subsequent paragraph, the Germans have already regained a major portion of their spirit, and if our troops are to be effective they must maintain the dignity and prestige of the United States. In order to do so, and to maintain reasonable morale, those officers and men with families must be provided quarters in the areas where they are stationed. Their presence constitutes a very major addition in the valuable form of the dollar exchange to the German economy; and I believe that economy is now sufficiently recovered to provide shelter for the personnel concerned by means of leases, requisitions, or otherwise, as may be best adapted to each particular location.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY AND ECA

While matters in these fields are more clearly within the purview of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I believe that the other members of this committee are, like myself, interested in the results which our numerous and very substantial programs of aid have obtained. Since the end of hostilities in Europe, Congress by means of UNRRA, Interim Aid, United Nations Welfare and Relief organizations, funds for the government and relief of occupied areas, loans and credits to Britain, and the Economic Cooperation Act have made available very large sums for the relief, rehabilitation, and recovery of the European economy. According to a Commerce Department report carried in the press on January 3, the United States has laid out nearly $30,000,000,000 in postwar aid to foreign nations, including $3,385,000,000 subscribed to the World Bank and Monetary Fund and $24,802,000,000 in aid furnished directly to foreign countries. I will mention certain specific situations in the various localities in an appendix; but, in general, the following are my impressions and conclusions:

With the exception of Berlin and other industrial cities of Germany, the war damage in western Europe has been largely repaired. Railroads, highways, electric power systems and many industrial plants are back in production.

ECA and similar programs have largely filled the pipe lines and restored inventories. Shipments of foodstuffs, textile fibers, and other raw materials have resulted in a marked increase in business activities; and today the stores in Europe are well stocked with a wide variety of goods and foodstuffs.

Problems of markets for restored western European economy have not been solved. Export business is very limited on most items to other European countries. The amount of imports which this country can absorb is limited.

The problem of payment for food and raw materials imports likewise remains unsolved. Significant amounts of imported foodstuffs are necessary in order to maintain the populations of western Germany, Austria, and Italy. Thus far, the United States Government has shipped large quantities of food and raw materials, some of which were surplus under the domestic-support program to Europe. Whether such programs should be continued without reimbursement is the question for the American people, and the extent to which such activities can be carried out without impairing the solvency and credit of the United States and weakening our economy is a matter which must be determined by the Congress.

It is my own opinion that the economies of western Europe are not, in general, now self-supporting, although the recovery has been amazing. They are well on the mend. And it is also my opinion that the necessary arrangements to achieve that end will not, as anticipated, be effective by 1952. Large-scale efforts to achieve balanced economies in those countries will take the form of future industrialization, leading inevitably to increased competition with our domestic industry and producers, either in the United States market or in overseas areas such as South America. I believe that we must recognize and face the fact that some aid will be required long after 1952; but the amount of such aid should be drastically reduced, starting with the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1950, as it is questionable how long the economy of our country can continue to stand the terrific strain on our finances and resources without finding ourselves in difficulties.

Finally, it must be noted that maintenance of sizable United States military forces in Europe, and the assistance to be furnished, under the military-aid program, will both result in substantial economic benefits to Europe.

CONCLUSIONS

The United States is committed, as a result of the policies and decisions reached during World War II to the maintenance of forces in Europe for a number of years. We likewise find ourselves committed to the economic support of numerous areas where the population exceeds the means of subsistence, until a new European economic system is evolved or export markets become available. Under such conditions, it is imperative that all possible measures be taken to maintain and increase the morale, efficiency, and prestige of our limited military forces. It is likewise essential that the programs for European aid, whether in the form of loans, economic aid, or otherwise, be scaled down to a level which the United States can support.

DETAILED NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS BY SPECIFIC LOCALITIES

Westover Air Force Base, Mass.

This base, located near Chicopee Falls, Mass., is the United States terminal for MATS Atlantic flights, and serves as a general port of aerial embarkation. The strength at this base is almost 6,000, including some 670 Navy personnel. There are very few permanent buildings on the base—a few hangars, a photo laboratory, four sets of officers' quarters, and four sets of noncommissioned officers' quarters. There are projected, and under way, 750 sets of family quarters to be constructed under the provision of Public Law 211, Eighty-first Congress (Wherry housing bill). While this amount of construction will assist in developing the base, additional permanent construction is urgently needed. Maintenance and operation of temporary wartime-type buildings, particularly in the climatic conditions prevailing, is neither economical nor efficient.

Lagens, Azores

This base is an important installation in our military air-transportation service for any ferrying operations between the United States and Europe. However, quarters and buildings are still of a very temporary nature, inadequate for permanent use, particularly at this important station. If the United States is to maintain an air base at this location, appropriate steps should be taken immediately to provide permanent quarters and, so far as possible, a dependable water supply.

Frankfurt

Maj. Gen. George W. Hayes, deputy to Mr. John J. McCloy, concerning the economic problems of Germany, pointed out that west Germany would be in a favorable position if markets for its products could be made available. Western Germany faces two major difficulties: The first is markets for manufactured goods, and the second, sources of food and raw materials, within western Europe, or otherwise available to them. Concerning the problem of refugees from Russian-dominated areas of Europe, General Hayes estimated that these persons are still arriving from east Germany and Communist-dominated countries at the rate of approximately 100,000 per month. While General Hayes regarded this matter as a German problem, it is apparent that the addition of such large numbers of persons in an area already overcrowded and short of housing and employment, constitutes a serious economic burden.

So far as the ECA counterpart funds are concerned, Germany has been relatively slow to develop plans for submission concerning their use. However, this delay is being overcome and will in the future diminish.

Berlin

As a result of conference with Maj. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, and inspection of various areas and units the following was developed:

(a) The situation with Russia is less tense than it was a year ago.

(b) Berlin is suffering a severe depression, due to the fact that sales from western zones of that city to the surrounding Russian area are almost impossible so long as the west German mark is worth approximately 6 east marks. Furthermore, the dismantling and stripping of industrial plants by Russia, immediately following the termination of hostilities, has required the use of improvised

or old equipment which is less efficient than the relatively modern machines in the west zone. As a consequence, there are now unemployed in Berlin some 250,000 workers, constituting 26 percent of the employable populace.

(c) A visit to a battalion of the Eighteenth Infantry located in Berlin and commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Barker, indicated that individual training is now carried out in Grunewald. There is no rotation with similar units in the United States zone. Most of the battalion's enlisted personnel are very young soldiers, only 10 percent having served during World War II. The barracks and quarters in this unit were very good.

(d) The Seven Hundred and Fifty-ninth Military Police Battalion in Berlin is commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Lanzer. This unit is responsible for supervising the police in the United States sector of Berlin, and for negotiating with the Russians concerning incidents and arrests involving United States personnel. Within this military police battalion, there is always available one alert company with a minimum strength of 100 men, capable of being mobilized and ready to move within 30 minutes. Lieutenant Colonel Lanzer stated that the number of incidents with Russian forces has decreased during the past several months, but they still picked up quite a few Americans for interrogation or information if found within their zone. This battalion and its equipment made an excellent appearance, but there are too many young, inexperienced soldiers assigned for duties requiring mature judgment.

(e) A constabulary battalion, commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Prunty, is the other major United States tactical force in Berlin. This unit is equipped with light reconnaissance vehicles and guns, and make a very good appearance.

(f) A visit to the refugee reception center at Anhalter Bunker, where political refugees from the eastern zone and Communist countries are received, showed that the Germans are endeavoring to meet this problem with their limited facilities and resources. The refugees themselves present a pitiable sight, having mostly only ragged clothing on their backs and giving every evidence of having been terrified before or during their flight to the western zone.

(g) In general, the western sectors of Berlin present a hopeless economic picture. People there are definitely less prosperous than those in the western zones of Germany. There has been some reconstruction, mostly minor repairs, but the future of this area is far from clear. The municipal government is unable to meet the problems of mass unemployment and depression by any means available to it; and no solution was suggested other than continued United States aid. We cannot abandon 2,250,000 people—a considerable number of whom would be marked for liquidation—to Russia, but there is no early termination to the need for United States assistance; i. e., support.

Vienna, Austria

The briefing at this headquarters, conducted by Mr. Ashenese, was very informative and excellently handled.

There is more consciousness in the military headquarters in Austria of the need of efficiency and economy than in many other places. Careful studies have been made as to the most economical methods of carrying out our missions in that country, and those responsible deserve great credit.

With the United States aid, including that under ECA, the Austrian economy has made remarkable recovery, and production has increased markedly from 1948 levels. Nevertheless, the requisitions by Russians in the eastern zone of the country constitute a heavy burden.

At conferences with Chaplain [Rabbi] Lipschitz and General Woods of the IRO concerning displaced persons and refugees, it was manifest that very few potential immigrants eligible for admission in the United States remain in Austria. Only the hard core who would not be eligible for admission, even if vacancies were available, are left.

Despite the spirited and efficient efforts of the Army and the Department of State, in the rehabilitation of Austria and the recovery thus far achieved, the future of that country as an independent nation, it would seem, depends on continued United States subsidies. Austria lost her empire in World War I, and is now located within the Russian orbit. While United States funds for economic recovery will alleviate distress, they can scarcely alter the basic situation. The Russians have taken over the Danube River shipping, and control the only oil field in that country, which they are exploiting in a manner which is certain to reduce its life. From the oil production, they take a significant proportion prior to refining and a large output from the refineries. They also requisition substantial amounts of wheat and beet sugar. In addition, they claim an extraterritorial status for a number of industries and plants as German assets. The relative amounts of Russian acquisitions as compared to United States aid is not known; but I fail to see how we can ever place that country on its feet, no matter how much money we pour in, so long as the present drain continues.

Munich

This city is being rebuilt at a rapid rate and with great energy. Construction work is in progress in every quarter and significant results are being achieved. The countryside around Munich appears to be prosperous and the farms look in excellent condition with well-tilled fields and buildings in a good state of maintenance.

So far as military units are concerned, there are several important Army and Air Force installations in this vicinity. There is an acute shortage of quarters for families, as discussed in the main body of this report and immediate action should be taken to alleviate the housing shortage.

At Garmish, Partinkurken, the Army operates a large recreational center with a capacity of 200 officers and 750 enlisted men. This worth-while activity is a self-supporting establishment, the cost being provided from nonappropriated funds or assessed against those participating in the use of the facilities.

While in Munich, the undersigned at regional headquarters of the United States Displaced Persons Commission talked with Mr. Main, formerly of Immigration and Naturalization Service, and Mr. Taylor and Mr. Young, who work in that office. This agency is charged with screening and processing prospective immigrants under special legislation enacted for the relief of displaced persons. According to information gained, the general administration of this law has been markedly improved during the past few months, following the visit of Commissioner Carrual, but there still remain a significant number of eligible refugees. The requirements of the Displaced Persons Act concerning the proportion of farmers and farm laborers pose some difficulties; and it is hard to find sponsors for potential employment for professional men, such as doctors, lawyers, etc., many of whom are of high type and would make valuable citizens of the United States, even if they are required to accept employment in less-skilled fields.

Rome

Conference with Mr. Dayton, acting ECA chief in Italy concerning the program in that country developed that to date progress has been largely in the fields of agricultural aid and reclamation. The United States has assisted Italy by approximately $2,000,000,000 of aid, since the war, of which ECA has spent $700,000,000. In addition, that agency has a program for approximately $500,000,000 more. Real progress has been made in agricultural rehabilitation and reclamation, but industrial equipment has been slow to arrive. So far as the rehabilitation or recovery from war damages is concerned, the ECA program in Italy is about concluded. If further improvement is to be made in fostering Italian economic plans, it must be through broadened and expanded markets in other European countries, or overseas. Mr. Dayton has an excellent grasp of the economic and political difficulties involved and realizes the obstacles in the way of European integration. He is of the opinion that such unification should be carried out now while the United States economic aid is available. There are now some 2,000,000 unemployed persons in Italy out of a labor force of twenty to twenty-five million, and, in addition, industries are carrying a million more without real need or justification. The result is, of course, high costs of production resulting in high prices and limited export markets. On the other hand, Italy has a chronic food deficiency which can only be met by imports.

While visiting the office of the military attaché of the United States Embassy, the undersigned had a very interesting conference with Lt. Col. John F. Franklin, member of the survey team outlining the military-assistance program for several European countries. While plans were just getting under way, Lieutenant Colonel Franklin advised they contemplated an Army, Navy, and Air Force team in each country under command of a general or colonel who will be responsible to the chief of the mission (generally a State Department employee). Each military staff will have sections for training and logistics. The State Department chief of mission handling this program in each country will work with the ECA representatives and political advisers to the Ambassador.

The highest organization of the military-assistance program is extremely complicated; and I entertain serious doubts whether such a complex organization can be sufficiently flexible to meet changing requirements in time of peace, let alone tactical problems in event of an emergency.

Paris

During the few days available in Paris the undersigned had the privilege of an extended conference with Gen. deLattre de Tassigny, formerly chief of staff of the French Army and now commander of the ground forces, under Field Marshal Montgomery, for the western European powers. In response to questions concerning the status of the French Army and plans for a unified force, General deLattre outlined the history of reconstruction of French forces during the postwar period. At the end of World War II, French forces comprised some 12 divisions, largely deriving logistical support from United States and British sources. Following the end of hostilities, the French Army command was faced with the difficult problem of integrating various diverse and hostile groups—prewar French forces who had largely been taken prisoners in 1940—the resistance group or maquis who had carried on guerrilla warfare against the Germans, and the colonial forces from Africa who had participated in the liberation of France. It was necessary to allay the suspicions and hostilities of these various groups, meet minimum needs without adequate financial support, and improve the general caliber of the officers' corps.

In this conference General deLattre stressed the problem of French Indochina which he described as a key spot. It appears that the best French officers and troops have been sent to that area in an effort to hold it against native occupancy and Communist infiltration. According to the general, there is a shortage of new and serviceable equipment, particularly tanks and motor vehicles.

With regard to the western European army, General deLattre stressed that it would require work, strength, and confidence. He stated that the French will have an army which, together with the available British and Belgium forces, will provide the basis for a strong ground force. He expressed his personal pleasure at the participation of the Italians in such force, and stated that he would also like to have the Spanish infantry, which he described as very good. As for equipment, he emphasized the need for United States supplies, which he says should be strictly modern and ready for employment. Otherwise the delays and costs involved in the conversion would negate the anticipated benefits. In regard to the staff organization under the military-assistance program, my conclusions from talking with General deLattre were that there were too many large international committees of political, military, and fiscal experts to permit rapid and decisive action.

It was a distinct pleasure to talk with an experienced military leader who clearly recognized the difficulties facing the Western Powers, but who is determined to carry out the job of organizing and equipping a modern ground army. Whether the United States can or should assist Indochina is beyond my knowledge. I do agree with the general that whatever military equipment is furnished western Europe should be of the most modern type and fully serviceable. Any other course will involve a waste of money for processing, and shipment, and a loss of confidence on the part of those furnished such material.

The undersigned also had the pleasure of a conference with Mr. Averell Harriman, American Ambassador in charge of ECA affairs in Europe. Mr. Harriman feels that the ECA has fulfilled its essential objectives, and that the major problem now remaining is the integration of the separate and conflicting European economies into a single system. It is further his opinion that an essential element of such European integration is the incorporation of Germany into the western European economy. Regardless of my personal views on other aspects of European economic matters, I am in thorough accord with this last statement.

L. H. GAVIN.

Federal Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered over Station WHAM, Rochester, N. Y., on February 6, 1950:

Yes, I believe that Congress should pass an enlarged Federal housing program.

We Americans like to think of the typical home as a vine-clad cottage, with roses growing on trellises, and trees and grass in the yard; and with all this we associate the pleasing and lively sounds of healthy children at play. It is one of the glories of America that so many of our homes are of that kind—or, at least, equally attractive.

But it is one of our moral, political, and economic responsibilities to do something to lift more homes at least to the minimum level for satisfactory living. The 15,000,000 or more Americans who live in blighted areas are not inferior to the rest of us. They are only less fortunate. Imagine how you would feel if you and your family were housed as they are. Trouble does not come from men who are living agreeable lives. It breeds among men who are frustrated, ashamed, and envious.

Congress is at last recognizing one of the most crying needs of the American people. In both the House and Senate the best brains of both parties are combining to push through a housing measure which, in its broad outlines, will represent one of the most solid achievements of the Eighty-first Congress.

The impressive cost of the low-rent housing program loses much of its impact when one considers what the measure offers in the way of results. Some 810,000 dwelling units will be built by local housing authorities in the next 6 years with the aid of Government subsidies.

Equally important the measure provides for a 5-year plan to raze some of the Nations disgraceful slums and a broad farm-housing program, an aspect of the housing program or problem that frequently has been overlooked in the emphasis on urban needs.

To applaud the passage of the housing bills does not necessarily mean that one feels the problem has now been solved and all that remains is to sit back and watch slums tumble down and edifices rise up in the wake of an avalanche of Federal dollars. Indeed, the Senate has demonstrated its desire to solidify an extended housing program by passing additional legislation designed to stimulate the construction of privately owned homes. This it plans to do by increasing the amount of money that may be used by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance on secondary real-estate mortgages.

It is a victory for the people who have long been demanding better roofs over their heads and now seem likely to get it.

Federal aid in providing decent housing is not an issue of Big Republicanism versus Big Democracy. It is an issue on which the two parties should have got together long ago.

Housing is an issue that both Houses of Congress should be interested in. Senator TAFT, one of the administration's arch foes on other measures, is in complete agreement with the housing program. In fact, Senator TAFT got a similar bill through the Senate in the Eightieth Congress, but the House refused to pass it. The fact that thoughtful legislators favor this program and have helped to shape it on the basis of a careful study of the situation may be taken as evidence that its critics have exaggerated its potential weaknesses and overlooked the strong points in its favor. The strongest of these points is the simple fact that during the past decades blighted areas have grown more blighted and the construction of new low-cost housing has lagged far behind our population increase of 17,000,000 since 1940.

Proposed housing bills and those already passed will have an economically and socially wholesome effect on the future life of the Nation. A large number of builders and real-estate men have bitterly opposed housing but their arguments have been based on false premises.

Housing programs as authorized by the Federal Government will result in a good deal of healthy progress, during the next few decades, in a field where there is certainly a very clear need for construction on an extensive scale.

Critics of the bill hold that it will lead to far-reaching Federal intervention in local affairs; that private industry can meet the current demand without Government help; that the program will endanger free enterprise in the field, and that it is not only economically unsound but also socialistic. Rather the law carefully assigns the dominant role to the localities; that private industry is definitely unable to do the job all by itself; and the whole undertaking, far from being socialistic or a menace to free enterprise, represents a wise long-range investment promising to pay rich dividends in terms of contracts for independent builders and enduring social betterment for a large segment of the population. It will provide Americans with good homes at prices they can afford, that will give builders a fair but not an exorbitant profit, that will keep things on an even keel so that there will be work for those employed in the forests, in the mines, in the mills, in the factories, on freight trains and trucks that produce and bring the materials that go into the final product of the home.

Housing, may I repeat, is a long-range policy under which the Government will help local communities. It is a policy that is sound and practical even though it may have to be inaugurated on a small scale compared to the need.

Socialism is not the issue though this may be the cry of housing opponents. Americans have never regarded it as socialism to aid families who, by reason of misfortune or low income are forced to live in squalor or unhealthful environment. Housing is predicated on the belief that private enterprise should provide housing for all the families that it can possibly serve. Beyond its reach, however, are vast slum areas that must be wiped out by governmental effort to save our cities from an incredible burden of crime, delinquency, disease, and social malaise. Our highly integrated society cannot neglect this problem without risking its own health and stability.

I would favor solving the housing problem by private effort if it could be done that way. But since it cannot, I think the National Government must do it. When the soil resources of this Nation were threatened by erosion, the National Government properly set to work to save them. It must act similarly when human resources are threatened. The situation is badly out of control and will speedily grow worse if all building is left to private enterprise or capital. Only a major operation can handle this problem and only the National Government can perform that operation.

We have seen some wonderful illustrations of private enterprise at work. But, to assure a reasonable profit, homes had to be so high as to create other problems of congestion. This must be recognized and must be solved through and with the assistance of the Government.

The apparent cost of an enlarged housing program will run into millions, but the benefits will be inestimable. It is not an investment in the narrow sense. It is an investment in American ways of living, and in ever-rising American aspirations. It is an investment in social and political stability. It is an investment in the fundamental resource of this free country—the people.

I feel that our Government has been dangerously slow in recognizing that decent housing is a basic necessity for the public welfare. There is no sense in waiting longer, because it is now plain that only governmental aid can solve this national problem.

The Creeping Shadow of Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I am glad to insert an address made recently by Mr. George E. Stringfellow, vice president of the Edison Industries and a prominent citizen of New Jersey, before the young-man-of-the-year award dinner given by the Camden County Chamber of Commerce, on the subject, The Creeping Shadow of Socialism.

This is a timely address and I hope that every Member of Congress will take the opportunity to read it.

THE CREEPING SHADOW OF SOCIALISM

"Cherish public credit and avoid the accumulation of debt," said George Washington in his Farewell Address. Let's see how well we have followed this advice.

The total debt of this Nation 18 years ago was less than $20,000,000,000. By June 30, 1951, the President tells us it will have reached $264,000,000,000. The annual cost of running the Government has increased from $5,000,000,000, 18 years ago, to approximately $50,000,000,000 today. The President has consistently underestimated Government expenditures. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the President budgeted a deficit of $900,000,000. This deficit will probably exceed $6,000,000,000. He has budgeted a deficit of $9,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951. This deficit can conceivably reach $10,000,000,000. The debt, therefore, may appreciably exceed $264,000,000,000 by June of next year.

The budget of this Nation has been balanced but once in 20 years. It was balanced by the Eightieth Congress, which the President said was the second worst in the Nation's history. Its successor, the Eighty-first, which the President has characterized as the best, has authorized the expenditure of more money than any other peacetime Congress in our history. President Truman gives us no assurance when we will stop the accumulation of debt or when the budget will be balanced. He predicts it will be balanced when the income of the Nation is greatly increased over what it is today.

If our business were in the red and we told our directors we couldn't do anything about it until sales increased, they would likely say, "Cut your costs or we will find new management." I think that is exactly what we must tell our Government through our elected representatives.

"Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns," said Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932 when the Government was spending a little more than it was earning. "But," he continued, "you and I know that a continuation of that habit means the poorhouse."

Poorhouse for a government means inflation. Inflation means dictatorship. When a corporation gets into financial difficulties, the courts appoint a receiver and either it is liquidated, or, if there are enough assets left, the corporation is reorganized, new officers are elected, and the corporation often becomes a going concern again.

When a government gets into financial difficulty, there is no court to appoint a receiver. A self-appointed dictator usually arises and takes over. The people lose their liberties, their savings, and their property. Their way of life is prescribed by the dictator. History shows that this has always happened when a government habitually spends more than it takes in. Uncontrollable inflation has always followed and it always will.

It was inflation that produced Mussolini; it was inflation that produced Hitler; it was inflation that produced Stalin and if continued is certain to produce a similar dictator in America.

When leaving Independence Hall in the late afternoon of September 17, 1787, following the signing of the Constitution, Benjamin Franklin was asked by an unknown woman, "Dr. Franklin, what have we got?" The wise old man replied, "We have a republic—if we can keep it!"

If we are to keep our republic, we must avoid inflation; if we are to avoid inflation, I repeat that we must tell our governments—State and National—through our elected Representatives, to stop spending more than they take in. That is your responsibility and it is mine. If we do not discharge it, we will be derelict in our duties as citizens and should not complain about the consequences.

The cash-in value of all the life-insurance policies in this country is $44,000,000,000. This would run the Federal Government, at its present rate of expenditures, for 10½ months.

Twenty years ago the total cost of the Federal Government was about two-thirds of the total income of the citizens of the State of California. Today the cost of Federal Government is equal to the total income of the citizens of every State west of the Mississippi except Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa and 11 percent of Minnesota; and as long as it continues to increase, it will continue, like a creeping shadow, until it reaches Maine; our entire Republic will then have been engulfed by state socialism. This creeping shadow of socialism should concern every American citizen who values his liberty and his way of life.

The difference between capitalism and socialism is one of principle. The difference between socialism and communism is one of degree. Capitalism produces things for people to divide; socialism divides the products of capitalism, and when there is nothing left to divide, chaos reigns and communism takes over.

One of the things which is spreading the socialistic shadow consists of the large grants we have made and are making to foreign countries. For example, since World War I we have given Britain $44,000,000,000. Since World War II we have given other foreign countries $33,000,000,000; yet the outpour continues. Much of this money, we are told, was given to fight communism. Since World War II we have given Communist Russia $440,000,000 and her satellite Poland, $480,000,000. This, of course, has had a tendency to strengthen communism at its base at the expense of the American taxpayer. At the time we were aiding Russia and Poland with grants, we gave Greece over $600,000,000 with which to fight communism. We recently purchased rye from Poland thus aiding her economy. We have in this country a great surplus of rye which we don't know what to do with.

In a recent radio broadcast, Sir David Maxwell Fyfe, a conservative and former attorney general told British working men that without American financial aid, there would be 1,500,000 unemployed in Britain.

Our State Department, with the President's approval, appears to have advanced the interests of the Communists in China more rapidly than Molotov or Stalin could have done had they been left alone. General Marshall, a great general but anything but a diplomat, did much to undermine Chiang Kai-shek and help communism to engulf China and weaken our prestige and influence in Asia.

In speaking over the radio the other day, Clement Attlee, Prime Minister of Britain's Socialist Government, said that in general his Government was doing nothing in a social manner or in an economic manner that the Truman government is not doing in this country. The difference is, of course, that Truman calls his socialistic activities Fair Deal while in England they call theirs socialism. It's a distinction without a difference. Winston Churchill recently said that the difference between Truman and Attlee is that Truman has a Florida tan and is smooth shaven while Attlee is anemic and has a little moustache.

The drive for socialized medicine continues in this country despite the fact that we have the best hospital system in the world, despite the fact that our health is better than ever before, despite the fact that the lives of our people have increased about 20 percent over the last quarter of a century, and despite the fact that all of this has been accomplished on a voluntary, private-charity basis.

Sixty years ago, someone asked James Russell Lowell, United States Minister to the Court of St. James's, "Dr. Lowell, how long will the American Republic endure?" Lowell responded, "As long as the ideals of the men who made it continue dominant."

Those who would socialize our people, destroy their initiative, and confiscate their wealth through taxes, are not imbued with the ideals of the men who made America.

"Our representatives in Trenton and Washington will not save us from socialism unless we can stimulate our citizens to understand, to act, and demand that our representatives throw overboard all socialized principles and return to those of our founding fathers," said former United States Senator from New Jersey, Albert W. Hawkes.

Our representatives in our National and State capitols want to hold their jobs. They will be responsive to the will of the majority. Have you registered your will with them?

"It is not the duty of the Government to support the people," said Grover Cleveland. "It is the duty of the people to support the Government."

There are so many large groups of people receiving benefits from the Government today in one way or another that it is extremely difficult for them to vote on the merits of the issues presented at the polls. Many of them fear that they run the risk of losing, directly or indirectly, their grants or subsidies. Then, too, the Federal pay roll has grown so large that in many States it has a tremendous influence on the outcome of elections.

Twenty years ago there were approximately 600,000 employees on the Federal pay rolls. Today there are more than 2,000,000.

The administration did everything it could to bring about the election of LEHMAN as United States Senator from New York and to defeat Dulles, who opposed socialism. There is little doubt that a large majority of the 183,000 Federal employees in New York voted for LEHMAN, the "welfare stater," who defeated Dulles by about 183,000 votes.

* * * * *

The pay roll of Federal employees is continually growing. If we reduce the cost of Government, these pay rolls will be reduced, thus correspondingly reducing their influence on elections, especially their use to elect men who, unlike our founding fathers, are less interested in the public welfare than in perpetuating themselves in office at the taxpayers' expense.

Our form of government, as conceived by our founding fathers, was something to live under. It was motivated and controlled by the citizens. It was a servant of the citizens. Millions today seem to think it is something to live on—a vehicle intended for a free ride.

May I cite an example of free rides in two directions at the same time. The United States Department of Agriculture is engaged in two expensive programs which are basically contradictory. It employed $3,146,500,000 of the taxpayers' money during the first 10 months of last year on a program to take foodstuffs off the market and store them in warehouses and eaves, where they are rotting or being given away. This program did three things:

1. Kept the cost of living fictitiously high;
2. Increased national debt; and
3. Exhausted national wealth.

The purpose of this program is to get the farmers' votes.

On the other hand, the Agriculture Department is spending hundreds of millions of dollars a year to increase the farmer's yield per acre, thus tending to aggravate the very problem which the first-mentioned program was designed to correct.

The Brannan farm plan would let the price of farm products fall to their natural competitive levels. This is intended to appease the consumers and get their votes. The Brannan plan would tax you and me to provide the funds to make up the difference between what the farmers receive for their produce in the market and what the politician determines they should receive for it. It has been suggested that the housewife would pay the market price and the husband would pay in hidden taxes the difference between the market price and that determined by the politician. This plan is designed to please the consumer and the farmer and hoodwink the taxpayer.

No one knows what the Brannan Plan would cost, not even Brannan. That appears not to interest the Fair Dealers. They are interested in the farmers' votes, much more than in what it may cost you and me and future generations in dollars or in the fact that it gives further impetus to the creeping cloud of socialism.

The politicians have not cherished public credit nor have they avoided the accumulation of debt as urged by the Father of our Country.

It is the duty of the individual citizen to lift his voice above the self-serving, conniving politicians and force them to cut extravagances, force them to balance budgets, stop further inflation before it is too late, and thus preserve our way of life.

"Duty," said Robert E. Lee, "is the sublimest word in our language. Do your duty in all things," charged this great patriot. "You cannot do more, you should never wish to do less."

The times call for men in public office of:

"Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and willing hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor, men who will not lie;
Men who will stand before a demagogue and damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, suncrowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking."

It is your duty and it is my duty to ferret out such men, urge them to seek office and, once they are in office, to support them. In no other way can we serve America, and thus roll back the creeping cloud of socialism.

Lutheran Day Schools in Western New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said of the tremendous influence for good which has been made by religious groups of all denominations in connection with the education of our young Americans.

Among the foremost in New York State is the Lutheran School Association of Erie County, the territory of which encompasses my hometown, Buffalo. This association occupies a respected and unique place in our community and has achieved an enviable record in religious, educational, and community matters and in bringing about cooperation and mutual understanding among the church and schools groups of various denominations in western New York.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Buffalo (N. Y.) Courier-Express of January 30, 1950, which discusses the possibility of expanding the Lutheran day schools in western New York:

SCHOOLS' LACK OF RELIGION POINTED OUT—LUTHERAN EDUCATION DISCUSSED AT RALLY

To discuss possible expansion of Lutheran day schools here, a rally sponsored by the Lutheran School Association of Erie County was conducted yesterday in the First Lutheran School, 427 Goodyear Avenue. About 275 persons, representing 20 churches, attended the affair.

The principal speaker was Vernon H. Koehler, principal of the east end Lutheran school in Pittsburgh, who said, "Democracy cannot function without religion * * * but democracy at the present time is not making adequate provisions for religion in education."

Discussing the purpose of Lutheran schools, he stressed the fact they "inculcate a Christian philosophy of life and since Christianity is not a mere acquisition of knowledge but is a way of thinking, living, and interpreting all life, therefore there can be no such thing as a secular subject."

The speaker said the curriculum of Lutheran schools is of the best available, comparable to that in any school system anywhere.

He maintained the curriculum of Lutheran schools "is patterned after, although not identical with, the curriculum used in Buffalo public schools. The difference in the curriculum of Lutheran schools is that it is Bible and Christ-centered."

"The Lutheran day school is an agency of the Lutheran Church to promote the heritage of the Reformation," he said. "The great reformer, Martin Luther, wrote a language, advocated schools and penned textbooks for the propagation of the divine truths he rediscovered.

"Luther's educational conclusions were a natural outgrowth of his knowledge, faith, and gratitude to God. Luther was truly a steward of the truth he found. The Lutheran churches in Buffalo are endeavoring to carry out their stewardship responsibilities through the establishment of the Christian day school."

Speakers during the afternoon session included Orville W. Richter, principal, First Lutheran School, who discussed phases of school management and control; the Reverend Oswald A. Waech, pastor of Gethsemane Lutheran Church; Dr. William J. Weinbach, school board member, and Robert J. Schutrum, school board member and church legal counsel.

HIGH SCHOOL DISCUSSED

During the evening meeting, the Reverend Bertwin L. Frey, pastor of Bethany Lutheran Church, declared the time is not ripe for the establishment of a Lutheran high school.

He pointed out that before a high school is created there should be an elementary school enrollment of about 700 pupils "which would give us a potential high-school enrollment of about 200 pupils." Present elementary school enrollment totals about 300 for the area, he added.

Other evening speakers included the Reverend Ernest E. Heuer, secretary of parish education, eastern district, Missouri synod, and Arthur E. Will, school board chairman. The Reverend Walter E. Succop, pastor of St. Andrew's Lutheran Church, was moderator.

Keep America Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., minority leader of the United States House of Representatives, before the Advertising Club of Baltimore, at the Emerson Hotel, Baltimore, Wednesday, February 1, 1950:

I am honored by your invitation to review with you today the state of the deficit.

I am delighted to come here with my good friend and your able Congressman, TED MILLER. Congressmen BEALL and FALLON are detained because of an important committee meeting affecting Maryland.

As a newspaper publisher, it is always a pleasure for me to get together with advertising people. Nobody realizes better than a publisher how much the advertising fraternity contributes to the general welfare.

How many times I have wished in my reflections in Washington that we might somehow harness all the wonderful skills, energy, and genius of the advertising clubs throughout the country in the great battle that is now being waged for solvency and constructive order in Federal administration.

This battle being fought in Congress may well determine the future, not only of our own country, but the free world as well. The importance of this struggle is why we must have the united support of all people—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike.

This country must continue to be free; it must continue to function under the constitutional requirements of three separate and independent branches of government. It must continue as a nation with an honest dollar and a people who will continue to pay their debts and obligations with an honest dollar.

A new session of Congress is under way.

Although these grave issues confront the country, both in the realm of domestic affairs and foreign relations, this new session thus far has not indicated a firm sense of direction. Beyond the fact that we face another deficit of more than five billions for the new fiscal year there is not much to be said with certainty of the Eighty-first Congress.

There is the annual demand for more taxes, and yet more taxes.

But there is also a growing determination in Congress to put the brakes on Government spending. We on the Republican side—and many fine, patriotic Democrats in both the House and Senate—insist that the American people and American business are already heavily overburdened with taxes. We contend that economies in Government—through elimination of waste, extravagance, and duplicating functions—is the true American way to a balanced budget at this time.

There are limits to how much the Government may spend. There are limits to the amount of taxes which safely may be extracted from the national economy. These

are limits to the percentage of personal incomes which can be diverted to government for new ventures in state socialism.

This year of 1950 affords a challenging turning point in history. The first half of the fabulous and war-torn twentieth century leaves the whole world with a staggering legacy of debt. We have seen two world wars in a single generation. Some Democrats say we shall all be paying the bill for at least another hundred years. Some say it will never be paid as the future generations will be frustrated in their better aspirations through the yoke of this big debt.

As we look forward to this hundred years or more of debt, let us also look back the same span of years and renew our vision of the America that was—the America which was the light of the world before the present era of bureaucratic domination.

Just 100 years ago, in 1850, President Zack Taylor reported the total national debt as the very modest figure of $63,300,000.

That was a debt of $2.85 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

But today our national debt is $258,000,000,000, which means $1,700 for every man, woman, and child.

Today the average American family of four owes $7,200 as its share of the Federal debt.

In 1850 there were 21,000 Federal employees in the entire civil service. Today there are more than 2,000,000 Federal workers, not counting the Army, Navy, or Air Force. And worst of all, we are still trying to think of new ways to add to the burdens the people must carry.

In 1850 the Post Office Department reported a surplus of $370,000. Today we face a postal deficit of more than $500,000,000 for the current fiscal year.

Big government is the real challenge before us today.

Big government takes more than 31 cents from every dollar of income we can earn.

Big government saddles upon the people a gigantic bureaucracy of regulations and controls, and these new instruments of public power are the stepping stones to the police state, the state which governs by the old creed of tax and tax, spend and spend.

Such is the real significance of our new Federal budget—a budget which calls for more than $42,500,000,000 of Governmental spending in Washington in the 1951 fiscal year.

During the last 21 years, there have been only two balanced budgets reported out of Washington. They were for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948—the 2 years in which Republican majorities were in control of the House and Senate.

It was a Republican Congress—the Eightieth—which passed the last income-tax reduction—the bill which was vetoed three times before it became law.

I make the prediction today that that tax reduction will stand for many years as the last income-tax reduction enacted by an American Congress.

The planners are now off on another wild-spending spree. In the three fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951, by their own figures, they will run up a combined deficit of more than $12,500,000,000. And this at a time when tax collections are the highest in the peacetime history of the Nation.

If we cannot live within our income now, what will happen if the tragedy of a depression should hit us.

More than a year ago we presented in the House a bill to repeal and reduce many of the wartime excise and corporate taxes. These rates were imposed to retard sales and to drive manufacturing to essential wartime production. The principal argument for these excessive rates vanished with the end of hostilities. They should be repealed without delay.

This bill would have taken $700,000,000 a year from the Washington spenders and returned it to the people to spend for themselves.

There is a curious theory developing these days in Washington. The thinkers and planners tell us that if the Government spends one of your dollars, that's good, but if you spend the same dollar yourself, that's bad. If you spend your own dollar, that helps make inflation. But if the Government spends the same dollar from your pay envelope before you ever see it, that's not inflation.

Let me remind you that Canada, our good neighbor to the north, already has cut back her wartime excise taxes.

Canada already has repealed the wartime tax on transportation. We still pay 15 percent.

Canada already has repealed the tax on amusements and admissions. We still pay 20 percent.

Canada also has repealed the wartime taxes on telephone charges; reduced the taxes on jewelry by more than half; cut back the taxes on cosmetics by more than half; reduced the tax on luggage, hand bags, fountain pens, and many other items.

And all of this is on top of three different reductions in the Canadian income taxes since the end of the war.

The personal exemption from income taxes in Canada today is $1,000 per person, against $600 in this country. Yet Canada, in spite of its tax reductions, reported a surplus of $87,000,000 at the end of its last fiscal year.

We could do the same. The removal of these excises would not cost the Treasury a single penny. They would stimulate business, put millions of people to work. Through income taxes from happy, prosperous, busy workers, we would gain revenue and at the same time, reduce spending for unemployment.

The serious budget problem is one far beyond the recriminations of narrow partisanship.

There are many influential Democrats all over the country who support the Republican demand for an honestly balanced Federal budget—a budget to give the American people the kind of government they want at a cost they can afford to pay.

Let me quote just one of these Democrats—Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. In the House on January 9 this year Chairman CANNON reviewed the budget submitted by his fellow Missourian in these grave terms—

"From every technical and statistical point of view, our fiscal situation is the most unfavorable in the peacetime history of the Republic."

And Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, has said—

"Canada is moving in the right direction. We can and must follow a similar path."

There is obviously a broad common ground upon which men and women of all parties can meet to enforce policies of prudence and common sense in the administration of the Federal business. That broad common ground is the ground of old-fashioned American patriotism—a sense of loyalty and devotion to America and her cherished institutions of freedom.

We must not permit reckless men and irresponsible policies to drag America into the treacherous paths of statism.

One reason for our confused financial situation in Washington is that there is division and conflict in the highest councils of Government. The President's advisers are at war with themselves. The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Nourse, resigned several months ago because, as he stated publicly, he could not go along on another round of deficit financing, higher prices, more taxes, and more governmental controls.

Let no one be deceived that he stands to gain by the inflation program now clearly mapped out for this mighty Nation.

It is true that we are promised an income of $12,000 for each family by the year 2000—50 years forward.

But did President Truman mention what the dollar would be worth in buying power by the year 2000?

He did not.

Maybe he doesn't know.

But he does know that today's dollar buys only 60 cents worth of goods as measured in 1939 purchasing power, and less than 30 cents worth of goods as measured in the purchasing power of the year 1900.

If the purchasing power of the American dollar falls off as much in the next 50 years as it has in the last 50, it will be worth about 18 cents. Then the $12,000 income for each family will represent $2,160 in 1939 purchasing power.

We must beware of the economic narcotic of inflation.

So much for the problem of red ink in Washington.

Let us now explore, in our friendly, informal way, the problem of the red herring.

The red herring is a special White House dish—served up by press and radio whenever a protected Communist or fellow traveler unexpectedly falls into the hands of the law.

When a committee of the House reported in the summer of 1948 that vital State Department documents had been stolen, microfilmed, and delivered to couriers for transmission to Moscow—that was a red herring.

When some of the microfilmed documents were discovered on a Maryland farm, in a hollow pumpkin shell—several weeks after the 1948 election—that was more red herring.

When the FBI reported to Congress in 1943 that there were more than 2,600 persons on the Federal pay roll whose loyalty was open to question, that was the beginning of the red-herring era.

Nevertheless I feel that there is a real sentiment in America in support of the proposition that we should root out the Communists and fellow travelers who now frustrate and sabotage operations within the very structure of the Federal Government itself.

The Eightieth Congress set down the principles that Communists have no place in the Government of the United States. In that Congress, in 1947-48, we appropriated more than $17,000,000 for a loyalty check of suspected subversives in the Federal departments and agencies.

It is now a solid fact of history that the first conviction of a Communist within the Government structure—the first conviction since 1933—did not come until 1947, when the Eightieth Congress had been in session almost 4 months. That was the Marzani conviction, a State Department employee, who had been in charge of secret maps and war plans during the African campaign in 1942 and 1943.

It is also a solid fact for history that the Eighty-first Congress—the one now in session—did not renew the appropriation for the loyalty check of Government workers challenged by the preliminary inquiries of the FBI and the Civil Service Commission.

This is the one point at which economy in Government became a virtue—for the first time since Pearl Harbor.

The exact point where red ink and red herring meet is where money is requested to weed out subversives, spies, and saboteurs in government.

But I insist there is no place in our Government for these Communist traitors.

Communists despise our American system of private enterprise and ordered liberty under law.

Communists have only contempt for our cherished American ideal of justice and equal opportunity for all.

Communists mock and jeer our aspirations for peace and order in the world. They veto every effort toward world accord. They can govern only with the tools of tyranny and oppression.

It is a matter of official record that the secrets of the pumpkin papers were revealed to an Assistant Secretary of State in 1939.

But the American people did not hear of these stolen documents until 1948.

Where were these vital secrets during those ten long years?

Who bottled them up in the cloisters of the State Department?

Certainly the American people are entitled to some explanation. They deserve something better than to hear their Secretary of State rush to the defense of his friend, Alger Hiss, after being convicted of treachery to his country.

The American people gave unnumbered thousands of dead and wounded on the fields of battle, and poured out billions of their wealth during those 10 years to save China from the cruel fate of aggression.

And now China has been abandoned to the Communist aggressor.

What will the secret, hidden documents impounded for 10 years by the State Department tell us of this amazing posture of American policy in the Far East?

I say it is high time that we open the sheltered cloisters of the State Department to fresh air of American public opinion.

The American people are entitled to know what our real policies are abroad; and they are entitled to ask frankly if those policies are being applied by men and women who are in full sympathy and accord with our traditional American ideals of freedom, justice, and fair dealing all around.

Woodrow Wilson stirred the hearts and minds of Americans when he pronounced the doctrine of open covenants openly arrived at. He thought, as many of us do today, that the people who suffer, sacrifice, and die have a right to know the facts. No man in America should be powerful enough to defy the people of America, and through the use of high office, prevent the people from getting the truth. The truth should be known in time, and not years afterward, or after we have been plunged into a bloody war.

Let me remind you the United States is a republic, we must maintain the Republic and in maintaining it we must demand with Woodrow Wilson that no one shall conceal the truth about the acts of our Government officials either at home or abroad.

I am aware that your Maryland traditions of freedom and resolute independence trace as far back into American history as do the traditions of my own Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

There is a kinship here which I am certain transcends all considerations of faction or party.

As Americans we are the guardians and custodians of a precious heritage. We must all be true to the faith that is in us. We must all resist the tides of passion and hate which would rip us from our stout spiritual moorings and set us blindly adrift in a boundless sea of Socialist experiment and irresponsible public finance.

Common sense tells us all that we can take no more out of Government than we put into it—whether we measure our contributions in spirit, energy, work, or dollars.

It is not mere partisanship which condemns the hollow promise that holds out to the people the lure of something for nothing.

We hold it humiliating to the true spirit of America to see ambitious men conniving in a persistent and calculated effort to aline our people in bitter classes of race, creed, or economic station.

The great work of constitutional restoration is a call and a challenge to men and women of all parties. A crusade of patriotism is forming to redeem mighty America from bungling bureaucrats and spendthrift party-liners. We must stop this growth of bureaucracy and meddling by Washington into all the details of our daily lives.

The power to determine taxes and to appropriate money was vested by our wise forefathers in the Congress. Yes, so anxious were they to keep this power in the hands of the people that they further required that such bills originate in the House of Representatives, which was popularly termed "The People's House."

When we see the executive branch usurping this power, this great Republic is in danger.

Congress must fight to be independent, and you must support that fight. This is not a minor issue. It is one upon which hangs the fate of popular government. We must not fail to uphold this precious heritage.

Maryland will have her traditional part in that crusade.

Resolution Against Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY CAVALCANTE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Knights of Columbus, Uniontown Council No. 1275, Uniontown, Pa., on December 13, 1949. This resolution against Reds was later adopted by Bishop O'Connor, fourth degree, Knights of Columbus, Connellsville, Pa.:

RESOLUTION AGAINST REDS

Uniontown Council No. 1275, Knights of Columbus, is the first religious fraternal group in the United States to take a positive stand supporting J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI against attacks launched by the National Lawyers Guild, an alleged Communist-front organization.

A resolution, presented at a regular meeting, December 13, 1949, was approved by the council, and it was adopted later last month by Bishop O'Connor, fourth degree, Knights of Columbus, Connelsville, Pa.

The resolution:

"Whereas the Lawyers Guild, an organization with principal place of activities situated in the city of New York, has been listed as subversive to our national security and our way of life by the Un-American Activities Committee of the Congress of these United States; and

"Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation is maintained and entrusted by the people of these United States with the delicate and arduous duty of detecting and bringing to justice the enemies of our security and our American way of life; and

"Whereas it is indispensable for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to operate in secret and to keep the results of its investigations in secret until such time as the enemies of our security and our way of life are brought before our courts of justice to be tried in accordance with the laws of our democracy; and

"Whereas the aforementioned Lawyers Guild has taken action to petition the President of these United States to appoint a commission for the purpose and with power to subpena the files and agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for examination and inspection; and

"Whereas the uncovering of the operations and files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has long been sought after by the enemies of our security and our American way of life; and

"Whereas the action of the Lawyers Guild in so petitioning the President of these United States is indicative of aid and comfort to these enemies of our security and our American way of life; Now, be it

"*Resolved by Council No. 1275, Knights of Columbus, at Uniontown, Pa.*—

"1. That the action of the Lawyers Guild is subversive to our American security and our American way of life.

"2. That the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its agents deserve the protection and gratitude of the American people for the courageous and vigilant manner in which they have so far guarded our security and our way of life against subversive elements, domestic and foreign.

"3. That it is indispensable to the security and way of life of these United States that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, its agents and files, should operate and remain in secrecy until such time as the results of their operations, files, and investigations are subpensed by proper courts of justice against the enemies of our security and our way of life.

"4. That a copy of these resolves shall be sent to the President of these United States, to J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus; Congressman Anthony Cavalcante; Walter Winchell because of his untiring efforts to quash communism and to any other party of which the grand knight shall be advised.

"RALPH CAVALCANTE,
"*Grand Knight.*"

Foreign Trade Agreements—One Year Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 year ago today I stood before this House to speak for the first time. At that time I was discussing the Reciprocal Trade Act, which was then up for renewal. I warned of the disaster which would strike my district in northern California and many other parts of the country if the act were renewed without adequate checks and safety valves.

Today I am sorry to have to tell you that many of my predictions have come true. Thousands of Americans are jobless, factories are closed, and our farmers have been forced to take tragic losses because of the cheap goods from abroad that are flooding this country.

The administration's chickens are coming home to roost.

When the Reciprocal Trade Act was being considered by Congress 1 year ago, I said that I favored its principle. I still do. I still believe that we should do everything within our power to expand world trade on a sound basis.

But I also said that I opposed importing unemployment and starvation wages and a miserable standard of living, and bankruptcy. The way to avoid these tragedies was through a peril-point clause and an escape clause. These clauses are simply common sense.

The peril-point clause would say that the President could not reduce tariffs on foreign goods below a figure that would damage United States producers without first telling Congress why he was doing it. And the escape clause would say that if a tariff-cutting agreement with a foreign country caused great injury to United States producers, the United States could ask to change or repeal the tariff cuts.

These two provisions had been placed in the reciprocal-trade law by the Republican Eightieth Congress, and they had done much good. They had protected the American farmer, workingman, businessman, from the unfair competition of countries with wages far below ours.

With a number of other Congressmen, I fought against taking out the peril-point clause and the escape clause, but we were defeated. Congress last year renewed the Reciprocal Trade Act for 2 more years without any such safeguards for the American economy.

Today we can see the results all around us. To understand how the reciprocal-trade treaties are menacing American producers, we need only look at my district in California—at the lumber industry and the fishing industry and at the hop, walnut, olive, almond, prune, grape, cherry, and many other industries.

The hop industry is a good example. Two years ago the United States and Czechoslovakia negotiated a treaty under the reciprocal-trade program. The treaty reduced the tariff on hop imports from Czechoslovakia from 24 cents a pound to 12 cents. This was done in spite of the protests of California hop growers, who pointed out that even with a 24-cent tariff, the American market was being swamped with cheap Czech hops.

Before the treaty went into effect on April 21, 1948, Czechoslovakia became a Russian satellite, with semislave labor and nationalized industries. In view of this development, American hop growers asked our State Department to cancel the tariff cuts, but the State Department refused. It said that if it turned out that American hop growers were being injured badly, something might be done under the escape clause.

So the tariff cut went into effect. Czech hops immediately began pouring into this country at an even faster rate. Imports increased by 40 percent. As a result, the bottom dropped out of the American market. Prices dropped from 75 cents a pound to 30 cents, while it was costing American producers as much as 50 cents a pound to grow hops.

Our California growers, who had invested millions of dollars in land and equipment, faced ruin. We appealed to President Truman, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and the Tariff Commission to investigate their plight and cancel the tariff reduction. But we were turned down. We were told, in effect, that it was just too bad about our hop growers. We were told, in effect, that it was too bad if our California people were thrown out of work.

This is not an isolated case. The same thing is happening daily throughout the country. On October 15, 1949, the California Farm Bureau Federation telegraphed to ask for my help in obtaining price supports for the olive industry to compensate "for the serious loss they will sustain through the recent drastic lowering of tariffs on olives, olive oil, and other olive products."

Foreign competition was forcing United States olive oil prices down to disastrous levels. This was possible because the average worker in the Mediterranean area is paid $1 a day, while the average wage in the California industry is $1 an hour. You can see what this means to my district when I tell you the olive industry is highly important to California as a source of employment during December, January, and February, when other work is scarce in our agricultural valleys. Most of the olives are grown in modest family-size farms averaging 9 acres by people who are in no position to stand heavy losses from cheap imports.

Up in Massachusetts we see the same forces at work. Last Friday the Waltham Watch Co., a 100-year-old firm, closed its doors, throwing 1,231 employees out of work on 1 day's notice. Walter W. Cenerazzo, president of the American Watch Workers Union, told why the plant had been forced to the wall. It happened, he said, because of a flood of cheap Swiss watches that came into the United States under the reciprocal-trade program. These Swiss watches, he said, were made "under conditions which we would not permit in the United States."

Waltham was one of only three watch companies remaining in this country. The Federal Government, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, had previously loaned Waltham $4,000,000 in an attempt to keep it going, but now even the Government has given up, in the face of the Swiss watches which are still flooding the country under our tariff system.

Just yesterday we read how Canadian potatoes are being permitted to come into this country under the reciprocal trade program and compete with our own potatoes. In New Orleans 1,000,000 pounds of imports from Canada were being unloaded from a single ship, while we are trying to support the price of our home-grown potatoes. How can our American farmers obtain decent prices when they are being undercut by foreign producers with far lower wages and living standards? How can our American farmers obtain the benefits of price supports when cheap foreign goods are pouring in by the shipload?

I see nothing "reciprocal" about our tariff system when all the benefits flow in only one direction—to foreign producers. Last October, after Congress passed the administration's bill for extending the so-called reciprocal program, the State Department signed tariff-cutting agreements with ten foreign countries for no less than 350 items. Most of the reductions in United States tariffs were up to 50 percent.

This was the second time in 2 years that the administration had lowered its tariffs. The reduction covered such items as wrapping paper, paperboard, and plywood from Finland; olives and olive oil from Greece; olive oil from Italy; matches from Sweden; and butter and cheese from Denmark. These are the type of tariff cuts that mean jobs and bread and butter in my district.

What did the United States obtain in return for these favors? Almost nothing. Even the State Department admitted there will be no benefits for a considerable time. Most foreign nations still restrict the imports of goods from the United States, as the people in my district know only too well when they try to export their fruit and many other products.

It is easy to see where all this is taking us. Only yesterday the Federal Government admitted that unemployment is now up to 4,480,000. We have more people walking the streets for jobs than at any time since the war, and the number is still going up.

Fortunately, more and more people are joining the fight to defend American agriculture, American labor, and American business against cheap foreign goods. Last month more than 100 representatives of labor and management met here in Washington to form a permanent organization to protect American wages and living standards from attack from abroad. The meeting was called by the Wage Earners Protective Conference of the American Federation of Labor, and 16 AFL unions were represented.

As for myself, I will continue my efforts to help American producers before it is too late. I have introduced a bill—H. R. 6902—to restore the peril point and escape clauses in the Reciprocal Trade Act, and I am going to press for action on the bill. I hope that all who are sincerely interested in the welfare of our country will join me. We must defeat all attacks upon American jobs. The American producer must be permitted to sell in his own market.

Saving Jobs and Preventing Suffering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the President has this week decided to use the tools furnished him by the Congress to deal with strikes imperiling the national health and safety. Although he has said he does not want this power, it is a fortunate thing that he had it. It affords some protection at least to the general public, most important of all, the working people of this country.

The only question is whether he waited too long to invoke the powers which he has. We must all hope that he has stepped into this critical situation in time.

It was 2 weeks before he acted that his Director of the Bureau of Mines, who had been studying the effects of the partial strike on the economy, reported to him that a crisis was in the offing. His words were "unless there is an immediate resumption of substantially increased coal production the national economy, health, and welfare is now, or soon will be, impaired."

Even though the machinery has at last been set in motion to restore full production in coal, nothing tangible can result, at the earliest, before the middle of next week. The fact-finding board which has been appointed must report to the President, which, we have been told, will be done next Monday. After that he must review their report and ask the Attorney General to take appropriate action if he feels it is warranted by the facts.

These are 10 days that can certainly be ill-spared in the middle of winter when coal stocks are at the lowest level in many years. Then, there is, of course, still the question whether anything further will be done and, if so, what it is.

It certainly must be apparent to everyone, however, that without some law to deal with this situation, we would now face a complete chaos in our economy. Even now, I am told that there is serious doubt in the community which I represent whether it may not be necessary to put into effect some kind of a rationing system on gas and possibly steam and electricity before relief can be afforded. If that is done, the curtailment is likely to come first in industrial plants, which means no jobs or, at least, short work. We have read that railroad service will be drastically reduced tomorrow.

Just today I have received a telegram from a small plant in my community in which they say:

> We wish to register our protest against the long delay in handling the coal strike. Our plant will close February 14, throwing 125 men out of work and will cause shortage of material critically required in building program.

In this case, apparently relief has come too late. Unemployment in midwinter with all its attendant suffering and disruption of normal family life cannot be prevented. No doubt all over the country such situations are being repeated manyfold.

Laws are of no value on the statute books unless they are enforced. Everyone who works for a living should be grateful that there was in existence a law to cope with the catastrophe which faced our Nation when the supply of coal stopped. Despite the belated action of the President, we can only hope and pray that his delay will not entail the loss of too many jobs and cause too great hardship.

The Root of All Evil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to present to the House of Representatives an unusually interesting and timely address by a great statesman, the Honorable C. A. Christopherson, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. Mr. Christopherson for a long time was a Member of this distinguished body, serving the people of South Dakota ably and well. He is now chairman of the board of the Union Savings Bank of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and has continued his intense interest in State, national, and international affairs. I am sure the senior Members of both parties will long remember the outstanding service of Representative Christopherson. The following address, appropriately called The Root of All Evil, was presented by Mr. Christopherson over radio station KISD, Sioux Falls, on January 22, and clearly reflects the clear thinking of an able and alert senior statesman, a man of whom every South Dakotan can be proud, and to whose eminence and prominence I, who now represent them in Congress, can only humbly aspire:

Have had in mind for some time a discussion of that which has frequently been termed "the root of all evil," viz: money, of which commodity everyone strives to get all they can. To designate money as the root of evil is a misnomer, a statement without any basis of fact to support same.

The brief and generally understood meaning of money is that it is a medium of exchange, which is a correct definition. People in the remote past did not have money. In the period of early recorded history there was no generally recognized medium of exchange. It was barter and trade. This answered the purpose, when people lived in what might be termed "community groups," and there was no interchange of commodities with people in other areas. If one person raised more potatoes than he needed for his own family, he would trade the surplus to someone who had a surplus of wheat, corn, or something which the potato grower did not have. So down the line; a general exchange of whatever one had he did not need, for something of which someone else had a surplus.

But as the human family developed, began to pay visits to neighboring groups, the exchange business grew and was carried on to an ever-increasing extent. This created a problem. It became difficult for the potato grower to find people who had what he wanted, who were in need of his potatoes. So, with all commodities. To make the deal it was necessary for the one who had a surplus of anything, to find someone who was in need of his particular commodity, and who also had a surplus of the very things of which he himself was in need. It can readily be understood that as the human family developed and expanded in its activities, trade and barter between the different groups became a factor in the daily life of each one.

It has been said, "Necessity is the mother of inventions." So with money. As the problem of barter and trade became more difficult, someone sought an article that would command a trade value at any place. That commodity was readily at hand, viz: Gold. This rare mineral had been discovered. People had learned how to find same in streams of water, placer mining; to excavate ore which carried a small percentage of the precious metal, and how to separate the gold from the slag.

Gold held a fascination for people from the very earliest days. It was scarce and precious; it could be hammered or pressed into any shape desired. As a consequence, people sought gold, which they fashioned into trinkets, finger and ear rings. These they wore with pride. As civilization progressed, and the houses of worship came into being, gold was used to adorn their altars. All of which gave gold a value wherever human beings lived, in community life or illiterate tribes. It could be exchanged for something else; it had a universal value.

Gold was therefore especially adapted to the use as a medium of exchange, in that it was plastic and could be pressed or molded into any form desired. It could be buried in the ground, or exposed to the elements without any deterioration. At first, and even as late as our time, in the mining areas, it was exchanged by weight. But many years ago, it was discovered that it could be pressed into disks, of certain size and weight, on which could be stamped its value, thereby greatly facilitating exchange. In fact, that was money; a medium of exchange which everyone recognized.

Money is often termed wealth, which is not a fact. The phrase "Rich as Croesus" is often heard. Though he was the last King of Lydia he was the first to press gold into the form of coins and use same as an exchange medium—money in fact. Money in itself has no especial value. It was created for convenience and as such has become a very effective part of the complex system of trade and commerce. Gold itself, which is recognized as a valuable mineral by all people, is at times of greater value as a material which the dentist uses to repair decayed teeth. Therefore, we should recognize that money, as such, does not have the value frequently ascribed to it. If on a desert island, money in any form would be to its possessor of no value. In such circumstances, food and garments would be of use, but not so any money the lonely occupant might have. We have, however, come to think of money as wealth. In this appraisal, we should ever be mindful of the fact that money has been tampered with, to the loss of the people in the years that have gone by.

It has been said that the two outstanding inventions are money and printing. Each one of these has played an important part in the progress of civilization. Printing, in the dissemination of news, information, exchange of ideas—in truth, learning, and education. Money, the medium which has facilitated business, trade, and commerce to a degree it could not have achieved without its use. But money has no definite, constant, and fixed value. In normal times gold has a fairly stable value, but the kings of ancient days found methods by which they enriched themselves through tampering with the gold coins of the people.

When a monarch found himself in financial distress, he called in the coins of the realm, melted them down, recast them with only one-half as much gold. Thereby he doubled his wealth. That method has been frequently resorted to in the past.

We, here in the United States, indulged in some high finance, some years ago, when we, without either rhyme or reason, raised the price of gold nearly 60 percent. That, of course, increased the price of the gold our

Government had in reserve, its money. But it also stimulated the mining for gold. In Africa, mines which had not operated for 50 years became of the low-grade ore, with the higher price, resumed operation and sent millions of dollars worth of gold to our Treasury which we readily purchased at the increased price, thereby incurring further indebtedness, and now we have the gold stored in Kentucky.

When this increased valuation of gold was announced, I made an effort to learn just what was back of it all and what benefit we could possibly derive from this surprising move in finance. I contacted people in Washington, but failed to get any understandable explanation. Some years later I had the opportunity to attend a meeting where there were to be four financial experts from Washington. Some were from the United States Treasury and some were from other departments. Notices were sent out that they would answer any questions which anyone wished to propound. The question was to be sent in on or before a certain date. Here, I thought, is the opportunity to find out about this high price of gold, set by our Government, so far as known, on its own motion. I, therefore, prepared a question, asking the real cause for this increased price and what if any advantage had we derived from the purchase of foreign and sales gold at this above-market price. At the meeting in question, the four financial experts (all Government officials) were there. They devoted some two hours to answering questions, relating largely to banking, credit, exchange, etc. My question was ignored. I then concluded that that is the answer—there is no logical reason for our Government raising the price of gold near 60 percent, and buying all gold offered at this premium price. We, thereby, gave to foreign miners, profits running into the millions. The only reason appears to be that some bright genius thought this a good idea; our officials approved, and in the experiment we incurred added billions to our national debt.

Oh, yes, we have the gold, to be sure. Already foreigners are looking upon this pile of gold in Kentucky as world wealth to be distributed. You will recall last fall an official in Europe suggested this very procedure, viz, that the United States should make a distribution of this gold in order to bolster the financial status of Europe. A very thoughtful suggestion, to give to Europe gold which we had purchased from their miners at a price 60 percent over its market value. I am surprised that our officials, who have shown such deep interest for the welfare of Europe did not fall for this gentle hint from abroad. Though we did not take this hint seriously, the day is coming when we will, in all probability, take a loss running into the billions, on our gold stock. It will come about in this way. The time will come when it will be expedient to again return to the gold standard. To this all will agree, but the statement from abroad will say to Uncle Sam, "You have all the gold; we cannot come in, etc." Then there will be some haggling over price, which will ultimately end in our selling other nations gold, for reserve against their circulating medium; no, not at the high price we paid, but at a figure of less than 25 percent of the cost to us. Loss—billions more swept into the European gamble in which we are holding a hand. What would George Washington and his colleagues say if they could view our foreign attempts to regulate civilization? Shocked, to say the least. As said, "A great game if you do not weaken," but can we continue the present pace without weakening to a marked and dangerous degree? Time to think.

We like to refer to the kings and monarchs of the Old World for examples of juggling the money of the realm. But we have one example in our own land which points a lesson to what can happen to the medium of exchange.

Many articles have been used as money, among others, what became known as wampum. This is a type of beads which the noble red man of the West made. It consisted of beads—white ones made from the shell of the periwinkle and black ones made from the black part of clam shells. These were attractive, were made into belts, necklaces and other articles for personal adornment. This "wampum" was so attractive that it was used as money. It came to be recognized by the Americans, and in some of the colonies, was by legislative act made legal tender. But soon the red men learned a lesson. The shrewd white man developed a method by which they could make these in competition with the Indian. The white man found it an easy matter to dye the white beads black thereby adding to their value. Also found beads somewhat similar, but of less value; fixed them to imitate the real ones; thus, flooding the market and making the real wampum worthless. That was, so far as I know, the first inflation in this country. And that is just what it was, so far as the Indian was concerned, an inflation. His money suddenly lost its buying power, and the legal-tender privilege soon was repealed.

We have had several inflationary periods. You have frequently heard the expression, "Not worth a continental." That refers to the continental currency which, of course, became worthless as a consequence of the revolution. Then, there was the pronounced inflation, following World War I. A definitely pronounced inflation which had set in before World War II, and has been spiraling upwards ever since. War always brings about such conditions. Inflation is simply a recurrence of the wampum money. To meet war expenditures, our Government was obliged to borrow in sums running into the billions. This was in turn paid out to meet expenses; in short, distributed throughout the land, adding greatly to the circulating medium, thereby reducing its buying power. Our dollar is now down to about one-half of its former value.

The war is over, so far as actual combat is concerned, but we are still engaged in war expenditures, beyond our income. That tends toward more inflation, which if not checked may break loose some day in an uncontrolable wave which will overwhelm us, as it has other nations in the past. I mention this, because so many with whom I have discussed money, and its present value, do not seem the least concerned about that phase of the matter. In truth, it is of vital concern to each one. That great reservoir of savings of the American people, life insurance, amounting to billions of dollars has been cut in two by the depreciation of our dollars. The same depreciation in all securities, to be sure. This, through no fault of the insurance companies; solely by reason of inflation brought about by deficit financing on the part of the Government. In war this is necessary; in times of peace it is the height of Government mismanagement. It endangers our status as a Nation, and the security of every individual.

The Hiss Verdict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 27, 1950:

REWRITING THE HISS VERDICT

Alger Hiss has been convicted by a jury and sentenced to 5 years in the penitentiary for lying when he said he did not steal secret Government documents for Russia's spies. To read a good many editorial pages, however, it might seem that Hiss either deserved a medal or was a much maligned traitor.

Mr. Willard Edwards, who reported both Hiss trials for this newspaper, has discussed the "loaded" presentation of the trial offered their readers by the New York Herald Tribune and Washington Post. We were not particularly surprised to learn that pro-Hiss treatment of the news was pronounced on the eastern seaboard, for both Communist inclinations and internationalism are most marked in that area, and Hiss typified both.

In sentencing Hiss, Federal District Judge Goddard stated, "This should be a warning that a crime of this character may not be committed with impunity." It might be thought that among patriotic citizens there would be no dissent from the view that it is not praiseworthy conduct to be a traitor, or that a man who had been found out in his double dealing deserved neither admiration nor sympathy.

But loyal Americans would be underestimating the extent to which fluffy communism has spread through the ranks of editorial writers and columnists if they were to believe that this was the unanimous position of the American press. Newspaper after newspaper playing the New Deal line, the internationalist line, and the State Department line found it possible to reserve sympathy for Hiss, condemnation for Whittaker Chambers, his accuser, and doubt for the wisdom of a jury which received all of the facts, knew how to appraise them, and had the courage to act on its conviction.

The Louisville Courier-Journal, as was to be expected, wept over the ruined life of Hiss and bemoaned the truth still hidden. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch thinks that, despite the evidence and the conviction, the citizen still cannot be sure, and tosses in the thought that the Government should have a sound basis for such serious charges, as if there were no evidence in the 40 days of courtroom presentation.

The late E. P. Adler's Davenport Times, also in character, expresses relief that Hiss was found guilty of something. It says he could never quite completely sweep aside the evidence of the stolen papers and his own typewriter, upon which the papers were copied for Russia. This publication achieves a far-fetched parallel to the Dreyfus case and finds the Hiss case worked up emotions which had little to do with the national welfare. It might be thought that it was no service to the Nation to expose public officials working in the service of a foreign state.

Marquis Childs, the columnist, would suggest that, if some Americans served Russia, others, with a like "failure of faith," used to look up to Hitler and Mussolini. We never heard of a fascist or a bundist who got into the bureaucracy and sent secret papers to Berlin or Rome, whereas the Communist network, existing by New Deal tolerance in Roosevelt's Washington, was widespread, effective, damaging, and has been thoroughly proved to have had a real, not a fanciful, existence.

Mrs. Roosevelt, who during the first trial of Hiss used her daily column to whip up sentiment in his behalf, has issued two statements since the verdict was reached. The first: "I have never heard anything that I could think would approximate the idea that Alger Hiss was a Communist. It is difficult for me to accept what Whittaker Chambers has to say." The second, "It's a very difficult case to know what to think. I never once heard him say anything that would approach the idea that he was a Communist. I feel he may have perjured himself, but I don't feel he ever sold any secret papers."

This is the same columnist who, on August 17, 1948, wrote, "Smearing good people like Lauchlin Currie, Alger Hiss, and others is, I think, unforgivable. * * * Anyone knowing either Mr. Currie or Mr. Hiss, who are the two people whom I happen to know fairly well, would not need any denial on their part to know that they are not Communists."

A review of post-trial comment ought to warn readers of a good many "liberal" newspapers that they are justified in greeting the pap served out to them with the utmost reservation. Some of these organs are so steeped in propaganda attitudes that they are even ready to take the side of traitors against the United States.

The Hiss Verdict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, with no intent of attempting to minimize the importance of the personal and public reaction to the finding of Alger Hiss guilty of perjury in the recent trial, but with the thought that there has been far too much politics in the thinking of the people who have made public utterances, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Sentinel of Grand Junction, Colo., published by former United States Senator from Colorado, Walter Walker, which quotes an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune. I wish to state that the editorial specifically expresses my personal thoughts in this matter.

GUILTY

Because it is, in our opinion, fair, sound in its reasoning, and entirely justified, we are reprinting the editorial comment from Monday's edition of the New York Herald Tribune on the verdict of guilty in the case of Alger Hiss. We give the sentiments expressed in this editorial our full endorsement. It follows:

"There can be no sense of vindictiveness, now that the long proceedings against Alger Hiss have ended in a verdict of guilty. The personal tragedy is great; the evidence of fine talents perverted, of promising careers wrecked, of prolonged mental suffering, made the trials painful to observe. And the national tragedy is even greater. No judicial action, no penalty, can wipe out the hard facts that stand on the records of the court, of disloyalty at the heart of the Government and the knowledge that trusted men were unworthy of their trust.

"What redeems this sorry picture, and does give cause for solemn satisfaction, is the painstaking manner in which the American judicial system operated to safeguard the interests of both the defendant and the community, to seek the truth through the mazes of a tangled jungle of evidence and allegation. Alger Hiss was given every opportunity—expert counsel, a judge who was learned in the law and administered it without favor, an intelligent jury which approached its duties conscientiously, and performed them decisively. Indeed, the protection which the law affords an accused person does not end with conviction; the right of appeal to higher courts is still open to Mr. Hiss, and his lawyer has announced that he will take advantage of it.

"Many recent instances have served to heighten the contrast between the workings of American processes of justice and those prevailing in Communist-dominated lands. It is a very real source of pride and strength in this country that in a matter of this kind involving complex human relationships, intricate problems of personality and motive, and capable of stirring strong passions, the courts move deliberately and the juries apply themselves diligently to the question at issue. Whatever private moral judgments may be delivered on the case, whatever heart-searching may be applied to discover how, in our society, a man like Alger Hiss could come to his present pass, it is good to know that 12 men and women, representing the American people, after hearing the fullest and fairest possible basis for a verdict reached, without haste, a decisive result."

Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Indianapolis Times of January 24, 1950:

Marquis Childs, a writer whose sincerity we respect, sets forth on this page today an opinion with which we wholly disagree.

It is on this page at all only because we believe it expresses a point of view that is going to be heard quite often as the apologists for Alger Hiss go into action—and one that appears already to be widely held among his associates in our Government.

Mr. Childs portrays Alger Hiss as a naive, innocent, sincere young seeker after truth who was somehow forced by the great depression into a hard choice between communism and fascism—and maybe chose the better of the two.

Poppycock.

Alger Hiss was a sophisticated, informed Government official. He had been educated in the best universities in this country. He held a confidential post in the innermost circle of our State Department. He had access to the facts. Not one American in a million had his chance to know the score.

No American had to choose between communism and fascism—if, indeed, there is any difference between them.

Alger Hiss had already sworn loyalty to the United States and to the principles of this Republic. He chose to betray that oath, and the trust placed in him, in behalf of another nation and contrary principles, and he lied about it when he got caught.

That's what he was convicted of doing.

He was not on trial for the ideas he held. He was on trial for the direct and overt violation of laws he had solemnly pledged himself to uphold.

And he was found guilty.

The suggestion that those who turned to communism in this country did so to save the soul of America from fascism could hold no validity for any convert above the grade of a retarded moron.

Where were they when Hitler and Stalin and Mussolini were allies, hurling their armies together for the destruction of democracy and liberty and human decency?

We heard no protest from them.

They still served communism—and fascism—together.

Waste no tears on Alger Hiss.

He knew what he was doing.

Back to Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, because I think it is worthy of the attention of the membership, I enclose an editorial appearing in the Bridgeton Evening News of January 28. The theme is Back to Reality. It helps us to reappraise some of the fantastic paths we are now treading.

BACK TO REALITY

In 1948 a New England editor coined the phrase "Have had enough" and urged its adoption as the Republican slogan in the congressional election of that year. The suggestion was generally taken up, with the result that the people responded to it by giving the Republicans control of both Houses of Congress, much to their surprise so far as the Senate was concerned.

We are now face to face with another congressional election. The people in the intervening 4 years have had more than enough of the New Deal administration and are ready for a bold leadership and sound, forward-looking governmental program to lead them out of the financial, economic, and foreign policy morass in which the country has become involved; but the program to achieve its purpose, that of again conferring control of Congress on Republicans, must be bold, not only strongly attacking the present administration for its misdeeds, but promising the people a return to a conduct of Government on a sound basis, a high level of living, adequate returns for their labor, whether in industry, cultivation of the soil, professional life, or investment, and full and free opportunity to carve out their own destinies, free from Government control or interference, through a Government economically administered for the equal benefit of all, and such a policy made so clear and explicit that there can be no misunderstanding of its purpose and assurance.

During a conversation with a lady a few days since, she surprised us by suddenly digressing and asserting with vigor that she didn't know what the future of the country was, but she thought it was high time that the thinking people organize themselves into clubs or leagues to rescue the Nation from the administration and policies now in control in Washington and adopt a slogan under which to move forward. Continuing, she said the women of the Nation should take the lead in such a move and throw their every effort into the work, and she suggested "Back to reality" as a good slogan for the crusade—"for crusade," she said, "it should be."

Back to reality.

On second thought it must be plain to anyone that that is the prime need of the Nation today, to get back to reality.

We are not living in a real world in this country. We are living on a bubble that is liable to burst any day involving the country in a vortex of disaster that will take us years from which to recover, and that bubble is as sure to burst as that the sun will rise tomorrow morning unless we speedily retrace

our steps. We cannot live on false promises, borrowed money, and inflation forever.

Yes, we want to get back to reality.

Here are some realities we want to get back to—

A foreign policy that is the same in Asia and the Isles of the Pacific as in Europe, but is first, last, and all the time in the interest of the United States.

A State Department whose first objective in its diplomatic dealings with other nations of the world is the protection of the interests of the United States, and staffed by men and women from the head of the Department to the scrub women all 100-percent loyal Americans.

A financial policy based on the gold standard, which will give the people a 100-cent dollar instead of the 51-cent dollar we now have, and will put us back on a solid financial basis, wipe out the inflation we are now living under and again put in circulation the hundreds of millions of gold now buried in Kentucky hills.

A Federal Government conducted on a strictly efficient economic peace basis and not one conducted, as at present, to provide structures for thousands of employees of useless bureaus and agencies, all for political purposes and to spy on the people.

A Federal judiciary manned in all branches and learned in the law, instead of one largely filled by men in payment of their political services and usefulness, as is now the case.

An economic domestic policy assuring to every citizen the opportunity not only to earn a high standard of living but to carve out his future by his own energy and initiative, in accordance with his ability, but not try to boost one class of citizens at the expense of another, as has been done for the past 15 years at a terrible cost to the people.

Restore the old, proud feeling of every American citizen that he was as good as any of his fellows and free to carve out his standing by his own efforts and knew no class distinctions and hatreds until unleashed by the New Deal Party, which lives on class and race hatreds.

Restore the moral standard of all business, industrial, and agricultural life, which has been sadly lowered as a result of the broken and unfulfilled promises of the New Deal and which has affected the entire social fabric.

Make real effort to live within our income instead of loading down the taxpayers with a back-breaking burden of taxation, the proceeds of which are spent on wasteful socialistic schemes and profligate conduct of the Government.

W. E. M.

Tribute to War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, following is the text of the inspirational message delivered by National Chaplain Edward J. Carney, of the American Legion, before the special conference of department commanders and other representatives assembled in Indianapolis, Ind., January 7 and 8, 1950, for briefing on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on veteran affairs.

My fellow Legionnaires, "It is a holy and a wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins."

These words are taken from the Old Testament, the Book of Maccabees. After some of the soldiers, who probably had the taint of sin upon their souls, were killed in battle, Maccabeus brought some money to the temple to ask that the priest therein would spend some time in praying for the repose of the souls of those who had not paid the last farthing.

With those words in mind, this morning I am going to tell you one of the most beautiful things ever written by Sir Walter Scott was of a character called Old Mortality. Old Mortality was a Scotsman who day after day, week after week, and year after year, felt it his duty to go to the graves of his fellow countrymen and make sure that the moss didn't gather too deeply on their gravestones, and that the emblems that marked the Divisions to which they belonged were not erased. Sir Walter Scott says of him that he was probably as wonderful a character as one would know because he remembered with his notices of devotion the old men who had gone before him, who had fought for a cause of their country and their God. He wanted all generations behind him to remember these things, and therefore he brushed these things up from time to time, that they might read the inscriptions, and that they might know that "it is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for those dead," lest they be forgotten and in order that they might be relieved of their punishment should any have befallen them.

Whenever veterans get together, I know too in their hearts they always have a feeling of their fellow veterans who have gone before them, fellows with whom they walked and talked and laughed and smiled and had the social amenities of life. When we pay them tribute, our heroic dead, we certainly know that we are giving tribute to men who lived a life and died a life in sacrifice that these great American institutions might endure. Some way in our life we try to emulate them.

What is true of all veterans as we pay this tribute is often too rare. Once a year we have a memorial service, but this should be constantly in our mind because "it is a holy and a wholesome thought to pray for the dead." We should, especially Legionnaires, pray for the men who have done so much for this great organization. Forever enshrined in our minds should be the names of Teddy Roosevelt, Galbraith, Bill Doyle, Jerry Twomey, and the rest of those countless men who have given their all to this great organization's cause.

We who are of World War II stand in awe and admiration for your accomplishments, gentlemen. We want you to know it is with deference and respect that we approach you and we ask you to be kind to us if we haven't the full understanding of the many sacrifices you have undergone in order that the cause of the veteran might be furthered.

If you ask any one of the men who have gone before—men who have given of their last drop of blood for God and country in this great organization—what their greatest request is, what their last will and testament is, it was the same as the fellows who were left on the battlefields, who as they breathed their last breath said: "Don't bother with me. Take care of our sick buddies who can make it and those who are wounded."

We are gathered together at a time like this, and you know that you have a great cause on your hands. You know that you have a principle to fight for. Most of all we should measure this principle in a spiritual value.

You know they say of a man who doesn't catch on very fast and who can't see through things, that he is dumb. But I say to you that two of the principal things that should be indelibly impressed on the memories of each and every one of us here today, is a divine sense of humor. Not a sense of humor just to make somebody laugh, but a divine sense of humor—that is, to see through things. See in the snowflake the purity of God; see in the mountain the power of God, and see in the rainbows and in the heavens the beauty of God.

That divine sense of humor is most essential for us, for when we go about our work of rehabilitation, when we go about our work of preserving the good things and carrying out the last testaments of our dying comrades, we shall see to it that when we take care of a fellow in room 262, we are not only taking care of a fellow in room 262, but we are taking care of somebody in the name of Christ, somebody that He died for, somebody that He loves. And as a reward for that, we have a promise some day in store for us: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

I didn't do anything. I'm sorry. I didn't. But, you gave a cup of cold water, you fought for a cause in the Legion's program to help one of those lads to see to it that they weren't thrown out in the streets, out of the hospitals, because of some false economy. You saw to it that these, our heroes, were enshrined and never to be forgotten in our hearts. That cup of cold water that you gave took on a spiritual investment in the bank of heaven where the rust and the moss cannot destroy, nor thieves break in and steal. You placed these things in spiritual value and every effort that you extend to that end will pay great dividends.

I said that you needed two things, not only a divine sense of humor, but you have to have the knowledge of the pain of an incision. Not necessarily a physical incision, but an understanding of pain.

You know, these lads who left the classrooms became history's graduates. Left at home they were to be probably the greatest statesmen this country has ever known. They grabbed the rifles and marched off to war. They might have been the scientist who would discover the cure for cancer, they might have been a captain of industry, they might have been a rabbi, a minister, or a priest who would bring spiritual consolation to future generations. They might have been an artist, or a painter, or a sculptor.

But today many grope with the blindness inflicted upon them by battle. They are warped in mind because they still scream in the psychopathic wards, hearing the ghost-guns of battle. They clutch with stumps of hands. They are carried around in wheel chairs, and you who are here today must know and have an understanding of pain in order to give them your all.

These are the things that I would like you to make a part of your mental make-up. Leave on the indelible tablets thereon there impressions.

What you do, you do well before the throne of the most high God.

Two thoughts, therefore, in conclusion.

Remember your dead who have done so well for you in days gone by. Remember them where remembrance counts—at the altar of God. And don't forget their last wish and will and testament. Take care, at all costs, take care of the sick and the wounded and those who are suffering on beds of pain.

Achievement in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, the honorable ambassador, Warren R. Austin, representative of the United States at the United Nations, addressed a joint session of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico. The legislature assembled at the special call of Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin.

I regret I was not able to be in San Juan at the time. I would have been thrilled to participate in this grand occasion, close both in flesh and in spirit to my people in the island. Unfortunately, I was able to participate in spirit only, because the pressure of urgent duties here entailed by representing in Congress 2,000,000 Puerto Rico Americans who toil and struggle up hill, confident and courageous along the roads of democracy and the "four freedoms."

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Austin has delivered a message of great significance for the people of Puerto Rico. He made before our legislature, an informal report on the work of the United Nations, on our participation in that work, and on the prospects for peace.

He did this, I am sure, because he knows the American citizens of Puerto Rico are as much represented in the United Nations by him as are the citizens of any of the great sisterhood of States. And he realizes that we Puerto Rico Americans know it, too.

So we feel and know that Ambassador Austin speaks there for our ideals of peace and fair play, for freedom for all, for respect to the dignity of man, for the security of the democratic way of life in this shrinking world—in short, for the ideals which have made this Nation great, and which are as much loved and upheld in San Juan, Ponce, and Mayaguez as in any other community within continental United States.

There is additional significance in Ambassador Austin's words. As he put it, he went to Puerto Rico to report, and after doing that he could come back and report further. He found in Puerto Rico, a self-respecting people trying to help themselves and making themselves deserving of outside assistance. He saw the people of Puerto Rico, even within their meager and limited resources, not only striving to help themselves, but to help others help themselves. He observed what contributions Puerto Rico could make toward our common goals and he saw that Puerto Rico is making them.

As the Representative of Puerto Rico, I should like here to express my profound thanks to our honored Ambassador at the United Nations for his illuminating and inspiring words delivered before the joint session of Puerto Rico's Legislature. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the distinguished membership of this Congress should be acquainted with what Ambassador Austin had to say at San Juan.

ACHIEVEMENT IN GOVERNMENT

Your excellencies, Gov. Muñoz-Marin, Mr. Speaker of the House, Mr. President of the Senate, it is good to be here again in a sunny corner of the United States which holds pleasant memories for Mrs. Austin and me. The time we spent with you in 1937, on a mission of the United States Senate, gave me an opportunity to become acquainted with your problems, and to meet and know your people.

Our special objective was to ascertain what, if anything, Puerto Rico needed from the Congress with respect to her judicial system.

During that study we had an extremely pleasant welcome from agriculturists, manufacturers, and educators. I believe that the most vivid impression given us was at the university. There we were shown research projects respecting possibilities of diversification in crops, and the development of parasites to eliminate certain pests that attack agricultural and horticultural products. We were entertained beautifully at social events in different parts of the island. Mrs. Austin and I have often recalled many an enchanted evening when we danced out under the stars in your salubrious climate. The warmth of personal generosity and friendliness that was lavished upon us enriched our lives.

This time we are in Puerto Rico as your representative, as the representative of the United States at the seat of the United Nations. As such, I feel that I owe you an informal report on the work of the United Nations, on our participation in that work, and on the prospects for peace.

Before commencing that report, I must express congratulations to Gov. Muñoz Marin for the progress of this part of the United States under his gallant leadership in his Operation Bootstrap. This great progress which has occurred since our visit and to which, I am sure all Puerto Ricans have contributed, is positively helpful—not only in the Caribbean, but the world—because of its proof that under the inspired leadership, and by diligent application to the welfare of a state, its inhabitants can speedily raise the standard of living and increase the moral power of the community.

We who work at Lake Success are acutely aware of certain public misgivings and the reasons for them. We are poignantly conscious of the fact that our negotiators have not reached agreement on effective means of international control of atomic energy. Now, the walk-out of the Soviet Union has frustrated continuing efforts among the sponsoring powers. We know only too well the widespread uneasiness that has resulted from inability to reach agreement on the setting up of the peace forces contemplated by the United Nations Charter. We are aware of the public's concern over the abuse of the veto and over all Soviet walk-outs.

It is a function of my office, not only to consult the other 58 states in the United Nations, but also to inform our own people of our policies and transactions, to aid them to arrive at sound opinions, which are necessary for the strength of American policy. Therefore, I bring to you an accounting for the conduct of our mission.

In my opinion, United States policy in the United Nations is an open-minded policy. On the question of atomic energy, for example, an overwhelming majority of the nations have expressed satisfaction with a control plan worked out by the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. We support that plan. It is the only plan we know of that would maintain safeguards effective and enforceable against use for destructive purposes. At the same time, we have repeatedly expressed our willingness to consider any other effective and enforceable control plan.

This is typical of our attitude on every controversy within the United Nations. The reasonableness and the fairness of our approach is attested, in my opinion, by the great majority of member nations that have reached conclusions similar to ours.

The troublesome question is always, "Why is it so difficult to reach agreement with the Soviet Union?" In answer, I will not go into the possible motives of the Soviet Union. I need not discuss questions of Soviet aggression and interference in the political affairs of other countries, for it will be enough if I simply assert that the Soviets are an intensely isolationist country—far more isolationist than the United States ever was—and that reason is enough to make agreement exceedingly difficult. Here is an illustration:

In Geneva, Switzerland, last summer the Economic and Social Council had up for discussion a question relating to narcotics. Narcotic experts had decided that if the United Nations had a laboratory in which its experts could conduct a scientific analysis of opium seized in illicit traffic they would be better able to trace its source and track down the illegal operators. The United States offered laboratory facilities to the United Nations without charge. The question before the Economic and Social Council was merely whether this offer should be accepted. The Soviet Union voted against acceptance.

The representative of the United States was astonished, and said so, asking the reason for the negative vote. The Soviet representative merely stated that his Government preferred national action to suppress the illicit opium traffic.

It is not surprising, then, that a country which refuses to cooperate in a sphere so universally established as the international control of the narcotic-drugs traffic declines to accept effective international control of atomic energy.

This illustrates not only the narrowness of the internationalism currently apparent in Soviet foreign policy. It illustrates that international cooperation through the United Nations requires two steps, not just one. It requires first participation in the making of the decision. This the Soviet Union usually does. But it requires in addition that the country carry out what the United Nations decides to do. This the Soviet Union usually does not do.

To illustrate I will not repeat the well-known political examples, such as the Soviet boycott of United Nations peace efforts in Greece and Korea. I cite instead what the International Children's Emergency Fund has accomplished and the noncooperation of the Soviet Union.

The International Children's Emergency Fund is not solely a collecting agency; it is an operating agency. It has not been a relief program solely; it requires an equal effort on behalf of the recipient countries—a matching system is in practice by which the equivalent value in supplies or services has been added either by the Government, the locality, or some voluntary organization. The matching food supplies—bread, vegetables and other indigenous products—were made available out of limited stores, but, with what the International Children's Emergency Fund was able to add, an extra meal was made possible for millions of Europe's children in time of dire need. During the peak period in 1949, 6,000,000 children, including Arab and Jewish refugees in the Middle East, received daily lunches; the vaccination of millions of children for tuberculosis has been accomplished; several million children received one or more garments, for which the emergency fund supplied the raw cotton, or the raw wool. Another several millions of youngsters were given shoes for which the fund provided the leather. The fund was able to produce, at a generously reduced price, more than 100,000,000 pounds of dried milk from the United States stores. This milk, when reconstituted, will fill 1,000,000,000 cups, and, because the fund is available, it can now extend its child feeding this winter to many more children, including those in countries in Asia and Latin America that have not so far had feeding assistance.

The expansion of the program has brought the total number of countries and territories aided, or shortly to be aided, by the International Children's Emergency Fund, to more than fifty. The Soviet Union had a representative on the executive board which made the policy and operational decisions. Yet, while small nations like Iceland and Norway and New Zealand gave cod-liver oil and hides for shoes when they couldn't give dollars, and while the United States

gave $73 for every $100 contributed by all other countries combined, the Soviet Government made no contribution.

Of such are the difficulties in the way of universal cooperation in the United Nations. Even so there is a more positive side.

When the United Nations Charter was created in San Francisco in 1945, the public received the impression that an instrument had been forged with teeth in it. In those days, we were accustomed to thinking in terms of armies and navies and air forces, in terms of military force. Then when the peace forces of the United Nations were not set up at once, a certain amount of public disappointment resulted.

But in 4 years of extensive experience the United Nations has discovered and developed new forces behind its decisions. I refer principally to the moral force of world opinion. The discussions of the United Nations General Assembly, and of the Security Council, and of other United Nations bodies, is picked up and radiated throughout the world by modern means of transmission and communication. The result is a body of opinion world-wide in scope. That opinion is a force for any nation to conjure with. It is an immense power in support of United Nations activities.

We first became aware of the tremendous effectiveness of this force early in the history of the United Nations when the little country of Iran complained that the big Soviet Union, in violation of a treaty commitment, had refused to withdraw its military forces. The issue came to dramatic focus in the Security Council. The Secretary of State of the United States himself came to New York to speak on behalf of this country. The Soviets found themselves unable to defy the world censure aroused by the case. The Soviet troops were withdrawn from Iran.

The case of Indonesia is also in point. In 1948 there was a disturbance there involving the use of military forces on both sides. The issue was brought to the Security Council of the United Nations. Without peace forces, and without the threat of sanctions of any kind, but through the aid of a Good Offices Commission of the United Nations, the Netherlands and Indonesia were brought to pacific settlement. Peace, order, and freedom were established for the 77,000,000 of people in Indonesia. Within a year a new and independent republic had been formed—public opinion had demanded it—and the good will and sense of justice of the parties, aided by the United Nations, triumphed.

But the development and maintenance of world opinion requires increased vigilance and understanding on the part of citizens of the world. It takes form through independent personal judgments becoming composite.

It is vital, therefore, that we protect the processes by which we are able to make these decisions. We must guard those human rights, such as freedom of the press, freedom of speech, free assembly, freedom of movement, which permit each one of us to obtain essential facts. For without the facts our judgment becomes warped. Only well-informed judgments aid the cause of peace.

Another force we discovered in the United Nations is the force of technical assistance to under-developed countries. Here by pooling our brain power in the interest of others, we help them to help themselves.

This is a field in which the people of Puerto Rico have provided me with a liberal education. I came hoping to report certain progress to you. But it is I who am receiving from you knowledge that I can apply positively in the discharge of my responsibilities when I return to Lake Success. When I see what you are doing here, I am tempted to declare that if all the peoples of the world will face their problems in the spirit in which you are facing yours, the solution of the problems of the world will be in sight.

You in Puerto Rico are today demonstrating a cardinal principle in the achievement of a better life. This principle is that of looking to oneself first and to others second for the solution of one's own problems. I refer, of course, to your adoption of Gov. Muñoz Marin's "operation bootstrap" as an alternative to "operation lament." You have not rejected Federal assistance—you have, in fact invited it—but you are demonstrating here that such assistance as comes to you from outside is effective in direct proportion to the effectiveness of what you do for yourselves by yourselves. What you do for yourselves and by yourselves is what justifies you, as self-respecting people, in asking for cooperation from outside. I have in mind the important bearing of this principle, and your demonstration of it, on the whole concept of assistance as set forth in point 4 of President Truman's inaugural address a year ago. Assistance to a country that is doing nothing for itself is assistance wasted. But assistance that supplements the all-out efforts of the people who receive it, is assistance rendered under conditions that are bound to make it effective. That is one lesson I presume to read into what you have shown me here.

This kind of initiative already has come to my attention in United Nations affairs. Not long after President Truman delivered his inaugural address, your honorable Governor, Muñoz Marin, was in the State Department offering a number of scholarships at the University of Puerto Rico to train experts under the point 4 program. More recently, at the invitation of your government, Assistant Secretary of State Willard Thorp and a team of experts came here to study technical assistance in Puerto Rico. They returned vastly impressed by what they saw and learned, and I can readily understand that from what I have seen since I arrived.

The initiative taken by your insular government to contribute what this island has to offer for the constructive development of the point four program gives hope that your experience here will have a salutary impact on the problems of areas in the world at large. At this stage, of course, I can only speculate. It does seem to me, however, that you might well provide procedures and an organization that would make it highly desirable to bring individuals from other countries here for technical and administrative training. You are overcoming, here, problems that are in many respects similar to the problems of a number of other agricultural countries in the tropics. You offer here the example of an effective democracy in action in a rural community of predominantly Latin speech, and you offer an illuminating picture of the successful coexistence of the two cultural streams—the Anglo-Saxon and the Spanish—each tolerant of and helpful to the other, preserving and developing a national life according to the wishes of the inhabitants.

I also envisage the possibility that this island, perhaps through the University of Puerto Rico, might provide some preliminary guidance to technicians from the continental United States who are on their way, for the first time, to work in the countries of Latin America. That would depend, I suppose, on what facilities were developed here. Given the right circumstances, the point four program of the United Nations and the point four activities conducted by our Federal Government might well profit from the intelligence and generosity of your whole approach to the problem of cooperating in the development of underdeveloped countries.

Indeed, examples of Puerto Rico's contribution to the training of technicians from other countries are already well known. To mention one, I need only refer to the arrangement with the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, by which a score of experts from Haiti have been brought to Puerto Rico over a 4-year period for advanced training in agricultural matters.

I hope that something of this sort proves feasible. I know that a number of your citizens already have given distinguished service to the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Your treasurer, Señor Descartes, has performed valuable service for the International Trade Organization. Chancelor Jaime Benites, of the University of Puerto Rico, similarly has contributed to the development of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Your Commissioner of Labor, Señor Sierra Berdecia, recently attended the International Labor Conference in Montevideo.

It is clear that Puerto Ricans, drawing from both their valuable experience and their youth and vigor, can contribute increasingly to the United States effort toward peace in the United Nations. We are observing your efforts with interest and expectation.

The moral of what you and the insular government of your own choosing exemplify, however, has still wider and more significant application. Up in the United Nations, at Lake Success, we use a good many technical terms with which you people are familiar from your newspapers. One of them is the term "dependent peoples." Another is the term "non-self-governing territory." Whatever the technical meaning of these terms may be, it is apparent to me that they have little application in a literal sense to Puerto Rico and to the people of Puerto Rico. I find among you Puerto Rican Americans an independence of spirit no less than that which characterizes us Americans from the continental States. This does not fit in with any literal conception of a dependent people. What strikes me most forcibly, however, is that it is your own doing, it is what you have made of yourselves, that makes the term "dependent" so incongruous in its application to you as Americans. The lesson you have to teach in this respect is that true independence is not something that is conferred from without; it grows from within, and that is where it must always reside.

The term "non-self-governing" is also subject to qualifications in its literal implications as applied to this island, which is a part of our Federal association. It is true that the progressive development of your position with respect to our whole Federal Union has not given you yet the opportunity to vote for the constitutional instrument under which you are developing yourselves. I understand that you are working on this fundamental principle, and I am confident that you will have cooperation in your high purpose. I see here self-respecting adult Americans with their destiny in their own hands. Is it not a significant fact that the United States Department of the Interior, which has Puerto Rican affairs in its jurisdiction, is unrepresented by any commissioner or commissar or resident official of any sort in San Juan? Is it not a significant fact that the statesman who does exercise the executive powers of your insular government is not designated by Washington, but freely chosen by yourselves from among yourselves, that he is the servant of the Puerto Rican people and not the servant of Washington?

The world may well take note of this dignity that the Puerto Rican people have achieved; and it may also take note that they have achieved it within the terms of their relationship to the metropolitan United States. Just as we would not ourselves be bondsmen, so we would not have others in bondage to us. That is why we have welcomed and, indeed, supported the development that makes you today our associate under an insular government of your own creation. The friendly nature of our association is a tribute to our common democracy.

Let us all throughout the United States of America join your distinguished governor in his inspiring slogan "¡Jaida arriba,"[1]

[1] "Uphill" in a rather dynamic sense.

The Conviction of Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Henry Chamberlin, from the New Leader of February 4, 1950:

THE CONVICTION OF ALGER HISS

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The verdict of guilty on two counts of perjury brought in by the jury after the second trial of Alger Hiss is an event of profound significance. It should be regarded not as an end, but as a beginning. Hiss the individual is unimportant. Hiss the symbol of Soviet and Communist infiltration into high Government circles is alarmingly important.

The best means of insuring that there need never again be an Alger Hiss trial is to open up a long overdue painstaking investigation of indications of treasonable and espionage activities which have been coming to light in piecemeal fashion of late. There are many questions on which the American people are entitled to an answer.

Why, for example, were there so many notorious fellow travelers, if not card-carrying Communists, in the OWI? Three of the most influential individuals in the Polish section of that organization, Herz, Arsky, and a woman named Balinska, subsequently turned up in Stalin's satellite Poland, blackguarding the United States as hard as they could. Annabelle Bucar, the amorous lady who changed sides in Moscow, left her post in the American Embassy and wrote, or signed her name to, a scurrilous book about State Department and Embassy personnel, was an OWI alumna.

For some time after the war it became second nature for me, when reading a magazine article attacking the United States and apologizing for Soviet communism, to see whether the author was not formerly connected with a Government institution. Often this proved to be the case.

Why our chief agency of psychological warfare was so vulnerable would be a subject of rewarding inquiry. Did it just happen that way in the general wartime excitement, with the many accompanying illusions and delusions? Or did some person or persons plan it that way?

Another subject on which intensive research might yield interesting results is the origin of the Morgenthau plan. Most people think of this as a wild scheme of economic revenge which was fortunately not put into full effect. But there is food for thought in the last part of the plan which has been generally overlooked. Here is the precise wording of this provision:

"The primary responsibility for the policing of Germany and for civil administration in Germany should be assumed by the military forces of Germany's continental neighbors. Specifically these should include Russian, French, Polish, Czech, Greek, Yugoslav, Norwegian, Dutch, and Belgian soldiers.

"Under this program United States troops could be withdrawn within a relatively short time."

It is easy now to understand that military control of Germany by its continental neighbors, to the exclusion of the United States and Great Britain, would have meant turning over Germany, and Europe, to Stalin.

Does this reflect political illiteracy, or the blindness which often afflicts schemes of revenge, or a more deliberate purpose? The late Harry Dexter White was one of the principal authors of the Morgenthau plan. He was named by Whittaker Chambers as a source of information to Communist spy rings. Was there any connection—unbeknownst to Mr. Morgenthau—between these two facts? Or can the whole thing be laid to the wartime innocence and/or stupidity of some of our leaders?

These are only a few samples of scores of questions which arise in connection with Soviet and Communist infiltration and espionage before, during, and after the war. An authoritative investigation that would make a more coherent picture of the fragments of information which we possess might be of great service, in exposing the guilty and in clearing the innocent, and in showing conclusively what America is up against.

As for the Hiss trial, both its conduct and the final decision of the jury should redden the faces of those whose standard practice is to shout "Red baiting," "lynching," "hysteria," whenever anyone is accused of pro-Soviet, or pro-Communist activity. Anything less hysterical than the proceedings against Hiss can hardly be imagined.

He was indicted only when the pumpkin papers furnished clear evidence that Chambers was not inventing stories of espionage. In the two trials he enjoyed every opportunity to prove his innocence. Indeed, the rulings of the court in the first trial seemed definitely favorable to Hiss, notably in the exclusion of the very important testimony of Hede Massing. And Judge Goddard may be considered to have stretched a point in favor of the defense when he admitted the dubious "psychiatric" testimony. The psychiatrists, incidentally, were handled very effectively by Prosecutor Thomas Murphy.

The jury evidently felt that the main exhibit in the case of the prosecution, the typewriter, the memoranda in Hiss' handwriting, the corroborative testimony of Hede Massing, the confession of Wadleigh, the effective confrontation of the Hisses with the former maid of Chambers, heavily outweighed the psychiatrists and the parade of the character witnesses.

Some of the latter may indeed be well advised to be more reticent in the future, especially when they are considering their attitude toward a man against whom there is strong prima facie evidence. The idea that Hiss "could not" have committed the acts laid to his charge because he was well educated and possessed a "proper" social background, is fantastic and could easily be refuted by dozens of examples in history and in Communist undergrounds in other countries. This is apparently what the jury thought also.

Court of Current Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday evening, February 7, it was my good fortune to appear on the well-known television program, Court of Current Issues, which emanates from New York City, and which on this occasion marked its second anniversary of continuous presentations. I say it was my good fortune to appear on this program, for I welcome every opportunity to bring my views on certain subjects to the American people.

Television in recent months, with the expansion of coaxial cables, is a new media with which the great American public can be reached with a variety of subjects, keeping them informed of the trends of the times, and allowing them, in normal democratic processes, to decide what is good or bad for America.

It is then with a great deal of personal satisfaction that I pay my respects to Irvin Paul Sulds, the originator of the Court of Current Issues. It was he who conceived this plan to have leading citizens of the Nation, representatives of schools, scientists, lawyers, and others skilled in their professions but differing in their opinions, to come before the public through this exciting new medig.

Visual education has long been acknowledged as a great form of impressionism. This was greatly developed during the years of World War II in training our soldiers, sailors, and marines. Today programs such as the Court of Current Issues can bring this visual education into the living room of virtually thousands of homes, and give the public information on a variety of subjects. Once the facts are presented, the public is left to draw its own conclusions and make its own decisions.

It was gratifying to me that Mr. Sulds' efforts during the past 2 years were recognized last night by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, who through their senior vice commander-in-chief, Charles C. Ralls, of Seattle, Wash., presented him an official citation, signed by Commander-in-Chief Clyde A. Lewis, which said:

TO IRVIN PAUL SULDS:

In recognition of the second anniversary of the initiation of the Court of Current Issues, of which program he is the originator, and in commendation of the outstanding service of the program to America's service personnel and veterans in furthering public understanding and evaluation of important national and international issues pertinent to their interest and to the interest of our Nation, whose proud American tradition they fought to uphold.

So long as we have forward-looking citizens such as Mr. Sulds, whose ambition it is to bring information and the light of day in a very interesting and entertaining manner to the people of the Nation, I am sure that we can reasonably expect our people to make basic decisions in the best interests of all of us.

I hope that the Court of Current Issues will continue the splendid work which it has carried on for the past 2 years, and it is my further opinion that should like programs be developed and presented through the media of television, we can look forward to a period in our immediate future when we will have the best informed public of any nation in the world.

Philippine Surplus Storage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about war surplus property in

the Philippines. Charges have been made of considerable waste and many erroneous stories have been printed in the press.

Today I had a discussion on this subject with Mr. John A. O'Donnell, one of the Commissioners of the Philippine War Damage Commission, who is presently in Washington. Mr. O'Donnell called my attention to an article written in the Christian Science Monitor, Friday, January 27, 1950, entitled "Basic Aims Won Despite Manila War Surplus Waste." I have read this article carefully and Mr. O'Donnell assures me that, based on his 3 years' experience in the island, including travel throughout the archipelago, that this article clearly and succinctly states the facts. In order that the membership of the House may have these facts because there is now much discussion on this subject, I include same as part of my remarks:

BASIC AIMS WON DESPITE MANILA WAR SURPLUS WASTE—VAST STOCK PILES CREDITED SELLING

(By David T. Sternberg)

MANILA.—When the Philippine Government closed its books in October on the surplus property deal, many felt that had affected the body social almost as profoundly as did the 3 years of enemy occupation.

The deal was that in which the United States Government turned over to the Filipinos a quantity of military surplus material ranging in diversity from bulldozers to beans and having an estimated procurement value of more than 2,000,000,000 pesos.

When the Philippine Government finally dissolved the Surplus Property Commission, its estimated total receipts in liquidation were about $17,000,000, plus perhaps another $2,000,000 peso worth of goods allotted to government agencies.

There was little excitement here over that announcement.

MORAL LIABILITY

There was a feeling almost of relief, for thoughtful Filipinos came to regard the stock piles of war goods as something of a Pandora's box. Most of the government's scandals have stemmed from surplus, and much of the nation's lawlessness has bred in its temptingly vulnerable piles.

Morally, the gift was undoubtedly more of a liability than otherwise.

Looking at the record, American critics are inclined to charge bitterly that the Filipinos have wasted and dissipated a great treasure trove which could have gone far toward restoring their war-damaged nation. Filipino critics, with equal bitterness, are hinting darkly that they were short-changed. Neither comes very close to the truth.

Army surplus has gone far toward restoring the Philippines to a stage of well-being which compares more favorably with that of any other war-torn country in the world today. And the task has been accomplished with material which originally may have had a procurement value of more than $1,000,000,000, but which, when turned over, was estimated by the donors at only $100,000,000.

To understand the story of military surplus, it is necessary to visualize the stocks and their disposition physically.

CURRENT EXPERIMENTS

In 1944 the Philippine Islands were to be the staging area of the final all-out offensive against Japan. Along their shores were poured millions of tons of military supplies to support the offensive—supplies of high procurement value because they were produced under pressure of time, without regard for cost, and because built into them were certain military virtues absent from their civilian prototypes.

Custodians of these stores were men schooled to a concept of combat expendability, men who, even when well behind combat areas, could grin and shrug their shoulders when a barge tipped and sent three crated trucks and a Sherman tank to the bottom of the Pasig River.

Military logistics, logically enough, had made no provision for permanent storage and warehousing of these supplies. They were dispersed wherever space and strategic requirements permitted over the length and breadth of the archipelago, sheltered only by flimsy temporary roofs and tarpaulins.

VJ-day in 1945 found the bulk of the stores unexpended, and thoughts turned to the problem of surplus. But before much could be done the enthusiastic "bring the boys back home" had swept across the Pacific even to the service echelons which had seen no combat and relatively short terms of service.

COSTLY WASTE

The pace of subsequent demobilization and green replacements created a labor turn-over which would have sent the management of any private industry screaming into the streets, but the more philosophical military merely shrugged, murmured something about "citizen army," and started to nibble at the gargantuan task.

Nibbling, however, was no match for the elements. By late 1945, when the United States Foreign Liquidation Commission here first started limited sales of surplus, typhoon rains and tropic sun—plus GI handling—had reduced such surplus items as heavy trucks to rusty, stripped hulks with rotting tires. By the time the Philippine Rehabilitation (Tydings) Act finally was passed in 1946 by the Seventy-ninth Congress, more than $1,000,000,000 in procurement value was needed to make up an estimated fair value of $100,000,000, the amount granted by the act.

Both valuations could be little more than estimates, because the skeletonized military could barely cope with the minimum demands of maintenance and security, let alone the preparation of inventories.

Both under America's FLC and the Philippines' SPC, not the least deterrent to swift and economical disposal of surplus was a mass of well-intentioned official red tape. Restrictions intended to thwart favoritism and speculation in surplus goods served only to breed greater evils.

CORRUPT SALESMANSHIP

Corruption in the sale of surplus started when the first lieutenant discovered that his strategic position between the impatient buyer and the next desk in a long line leading to official approval could mean easy money at no greater effort than leaving some documents to gather dust in his outgoing basket. And it has continued to the present.

There is a bright side to the picture, however. What the United States may see as a billion-dollar tragedy of waste, and what the Philippine Government sees as a disappointing financial transaction can be regarded as such only in terms of bookkeeping.

It is true that useful equipment was rendered valueless by stripping and looting at the sprawling, vulnerable depots dotting the islands. It is true that fraud and corruption permitted vast quantities to slip out at a fraction of actual worth. It is true that years of costly administration and security have eaten deeply into the proceeds of sale and left the Philippine Government with perhaps a third of expected revenue. But it also is true that private enterprise has performed the minor miracle of reassembling, reconditioning, and converting the original contents of those depots into a well-rounded basic national economy.

INGENUITY PAYS OFF

In many areas the Filipino still eats surplus food, wears surplus clothing, and derives his livelihood from the use or sale of surplus materials. Twice as many vehicles are registered as before the war, and the vast majority are surplus trucks, jeeps, and trailers. Surplus sawmills are cutting timber which is being hauled to cities and piers by surplus trucks and trailers. Agricultural lands are being cleared and cultivated with surplus bulldozers and tractors to the extent that rice production this year will exceed prewar levels. Interisland shipping is almost back to normal with surplus bottoms.

Surplus cranes, cement mixers, road graders, and rollers in numbers and type unknown to the Philippines before the war, are speeding public and private reconstruction. From the uncounted jeeps, ingeniously converted to carry six or eight passengers, which offer cheap mass transportation, to the pots and pans fashioned from aircraft fuselages, there is scarcely a phase of Filipino life today which does not derive benefit from surplus.

An additional factor which the Philippines must use in appraising its surplus treasure may be illustrated by the history of a surplus crane. Turned over by the Army at a fair value of $2,500 because of a battered cab and missing parts, Filipino manpower alone served to restore it so that it performed, and continues to perform, the functions of a civilian unit costing $12,000—and not until recently available.

Un-American Probe Should Be Continued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash., for January 30, 1950:

UN-AMERICAN PROBE SHOULD BE CONTINUED

The manner in which President Truman dodged the questioning of White House correspondents last week on the Alger Hiss case indicates the degree of embarrassment with which the administration is now confronted as a result of Secretary Acheson's strange defense of Hiss.

It was President Truman who months ago termed the congressional probing of the Hiss record as a red herring. This earlier effort to stand by Hiss and other possible fellow travelers in high Government office did not prevent the House Un-American Activities Committee from pursuing the case, but it did hamper the work considerably.

The Hiss case eventually found its way into the Federal courts, and thanks to the cooperation of the Department of Justice, particularly the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the once-high State Department official was given an imminently fair trial and convicted of perjury.

This type of cooperation was not forthcoming, however, on the release to the congressional committee of a list of Government officials suspected of belonging to Communist-front organizations. Mr. Truman suppressed the loyalty report months ago and continues to do so.

It is hoped that the present House Un-American Activities Committee will continue to ferret out the facts on Communist infiltration into Government offices, and that Secretary Acheson, particularly, be called upon to explain why he continues to defend Alger Hiss.

Alice Morrison Nash and the Vineland Training School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago Alice Morrison Nash, of Vineland, was the guest of honor at a dinner in New York, at which some of the most distinguished citizens of the Nation joined in paying tribute to her half century of selfless humanitarian work at the famous Vineland (N. J.) Training School, which is located in my district.

In Time of January 23, 1950, there appeared a brief sketch of the work done by this outstanding woman, which I herewith include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FIFTY YEARS OF SMALL VICTORIES

When 20-year-old Alice Morrison unpacked her Saratoga trunk in her tiny room at the Vineland (N. J.) Training School in 1900, she had a sinking sensation. The silent, halting students she had just seen were far different from the kind she had been taught to cope with at the New Hampton (N. H.) Literary and Biblical Institution.

In 1900, when Alice Morrison came to Vineland, it was one of three pioneer institutions for the mentally deficient, had been going just 12 years. The rest of the United States knew precious little about retarded children (i. e., those with an intelligence fixed below the 12-year level) or what could be done for them. Horrified and grief-stricken parents hid the unhappy children in back rooms or sent them to be cared for in inadequately equipped asylums.

A STAMMERED GRACE

When Alice Morrison arrived, the school owned 6 buildings and had 200 students. She spent a long day looking around her and sizing up her job. As she surveyed the children's bowed heads at the evening meal and listened to one youngster repeat a stammered grace, she made up her mind to stay.

She stayed. She married one of the school officials, Charles Emerson Nash, set up housekeeping in the administration building. To many of the children whose parents never visited them, the Nashes became "mother" and "pop."

As director of studies, Alice Nash was continually exploring new possibilities for her limited boys and girls; music, dramatics, dancing, and a variety of handicrafts as well as slow-motion versions of the three R's. Vineland became known as one of the foremost schools for mental deficients in the United States.

PLACES IN THE WORLD

Most of her victories were small ones: Teaching a mongoloid boy (with a 3-year-old's intelligence) to plow a straight furrow; coaxing a few words from a 6-year-old who had never spoken; teaching a girl to sew a straight hem or weave a towel. But she also fought for places in the outside world for students she felt were ready, every year sent 15 or 20 out to earn their own way. During World War II she had the satisfaction of seeing a hundred of her boys accepted for service.

Last week, as Alice Nash completed her fiftieth year there, Vineland's 93 buildings spread over a broad 1,100-acre campus. A hundred Vineland boys ran a 400-acre farm which helped feed the school's 550 students. The school had already fostered five other New Jersey institutions for the mentally retarded, served as the model for such schools as far away as Australia. The next step was a $1,000,000 fund-raising drive to build a new research center and expand the school's facilities.

As the drive got under way, 70-year-old Alice Morrison Nash sat in the crowded ballroom of Manhattan's Statler Hotel one night last week and listened to tributes from Nobel prize winner Pearl Buck, stateswoman Ruth Bryan Rohde, and New Jersey Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll. She nodded happily at the applause of friends, former students, and parents who had gathered to honor her, then prepared to return to her boys and girls at Vineland.

There Are Times When Damon's Bound To Unload Pythias

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert C. Ruark from the Washington Daily News of January 27, 1950:

THERE ARE TIMES WHEN DAMON'S BOUND TO UNLOAD PYTHIAS

(By Robert C. Ruark)

NEW YORK, January 27.—I believe friendship, along with respect for motherhood and other abiding institutions, has long been on the editorial free list as an unassailable commodity. So I do not propose to knock friendship as a whole, but would merely like to speculate on some rather odd aspects of it.

Dean Acheson's stanch and Biblical back-stopping of the convicted Alger Hiss seemed rather brave and admirable in a man, rather silly as a diplomat, and downright shocking as a Secretary of State. Mr. Truman's sterling advocacy of his old pals, such as the Pendergast mob, and his stubborn protection of that great buffoon, Harry Vaughan, also has been a fine example of butt-headed loyalty.

I am now beginning to wonder just how far you can carry this friendship operation if you hold public office and the respect and welfare of your country weighs upon your back. I am prone to challenge the nobility quotient of friendship if it leads an Alger Hiss, a high and trusted public servant, to snitch vital state papers for delivery to his Communist bosom buddy, Whit Chambers. I even knock love a little bit, too, if it moves a Judith Coplon to swipe the FBI's private files for her Russian boy friend.

Somewhere along the way, it seems to me, Damon is morally bound to unload Pythias, if Pythias gets completely out of hand, and Cupid may even be shot as a spy if he starts pegging his arrows at the wrong people. In some cases this friendship assumes the proportions of the distraught dame who is standing over her lover with a smoking gat and proclaiming that she loved him. This is of short comfort to the chilled gent on the deck.

I believe that friendship should endure until death, that friendship is a perfect blendship if indulged in privately, but when somebody else's friendship is inflicted on the public time then it is strictly friendship, "schmendship," in my book. Nobody is ever criticized for continuing an amiable relationship with some old, sodden bum you played ball with as a kid, but you don't have to put him in charge of foreign relations or appoint him to run the FBI or sit in the Supreme Court.

Mr. Acheson's Bible quotations and jut-jawed loyalty to his old pal therefore leave me a touch cold and I begin to wonder about Mr. Acheson's own standards and qualifications to steer us safely through the moment's emergencies.

After what happened to China, under State Department hands, the unpleasant thought strikes me that maybe the joint is leaping with Hiss admirers, and for all I know a big business in hot documents to the Russians is flourishing there. I seem to remember an old saw about man being known by the company he keeps.

I lack Mr. Acheson's nobility of mind. Even if Hiss had been my best chum, fraternity brother, and steady bankroller, I would be inclined today to regard him as a lavatory rat, and dump him, fast.

Lincoln Day Celebration Speeches, Washington, D. C., February 6, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD the speeches made by the Republican Members of Congress and the Senate on the occasion of the annual Lincoln Republican celebration in the form of a box supper held February 6 at Uline Arena, Washington, D. C., where at least 12,000 people were in attendance and 3,000 were turned away because space was not available to accommodate them:

CONGRESSMAN GEORGE A. DONDERO, OF MICHIGAN, CONGRESSIONAL EXECUTIVE CHAIRMAN

May the day never come when we can no longer stand up, as a free people, and sing "My Country 'tis of Thee." May all Americans who still believe in our country and its Republican form of government join with the Republican Party tonight, in celebrating the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, who still stands as the greatest symbol of freedom the world has ever known.

Lincoln knew that any man worthy of the name would rather be free than safe; because when freedom is lost, all is lost.

We dedicate ourselves tonight and join together to stop the creeping socialism being forced upon our country by the present administration. We pledge ourselves to fight for the preservation of our free institutions—for the freedom and self-respect of the individual—to the end that this Nation of free men shall continue to be free.

GUY GEORGE GABRIELSON, CHAIRMAN, REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Thank you, fellow Republicans.

As your national chairman, there are many things that I would like to say to you tonight, but I feel that since we have now issued a statement of principles of the Republican Party, the time for talking is past and the time for action is here.

However, I wish to make one brief pronouncement. From this night on, the Republican Party is going to be the strongest, most active and vigorous opposition party that has ever been known in the history of our country. We are at present the minority party but we have no intention of remaining so—and we mean to become the majority

party in 1950 and, with the help of all patriotic Americans who believe in constitutional government, to elect a Republican President and Vice President in 1952.

TAXES—CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. HALLECK, OF INDIANA

The Republican Party is the party of low taxes and economy in government.

It was the Republican Eightieth Congress which reduced taxes for the first time in over a generation. This was done over the opposition and veto of the Democratic administration.

The Republican Eightieth Congress forced a Democratic administration to balance the budget for the first time in many long years.

Today, under a Democratic Congress and a Democratic administration, the budget is again out of balance—hopelessly in the red. "Mr. Spender-in-Chief" has again sounded the call. He wants more taxes.

To that the Republican Party says—

"Let's cut the cost of government and reform taxes—not increase them. Let's balance the budget. Let's be sure we have a sound economy."

DEFICIT SPENDING—SENATOR HERMAN E. WELLBY, OF NEBRASKA, SENATE MINORITY LEADER

Fellow Americans, deficit spending leads to national bankruptcy.

The reckless and extravagant spending by this administration can result only in disaster and ruin for our country.

It will further cheapen the dollar, rob the wage earner, impoverish the farmer, and destroy the savings, insurance, and investments of millions of people.

Why, the only, sound, sensible thing to do now is cut the cost of government, balance the budget, get on a pay-as-you-go basis, cut the debt, and cut taxes.

Carry this issue to the country, and we will elect a Republican majority in both Houses of Congress in 1950, and a Republican President in 1952.

SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH, OF MAINE

I am glad to be here tonight because I honestly hope that this event will start not only Republicans, but more important, Americans on the road to something that is far more important than any one of us—you and me—the Republican Party, or any other political party—to a truly free America with free people—to a land of free opportunity—away from government paternalism—away from government by hand-out—away from government by deception, that promises something for nothing—in which individual freedom is bartered away for the mental drug of politically-promised security.

Yes, all summed up, away from a government that daily dictates our life, that tells us what we can and can't do in matters that we used to decide for ourselves.

I hope with all my heart that tonight the Republican Party will be starting America, you and me, back to that most basic of all freedoms that we used to cherish and enjoy—the freedom to be let alone.

FARM PROGRAM—CONGRESSMAN ANDREW H. ANDERSEN, OF MINNESOTA

The Brannan farm plan is a fraud upon both farmers and consumers.

For the farmer it means full Government control of all his operations and the ultimate nationalization of American agriculture as has occurred in Socialist Britain. It means that every farmer will become completely dependent upon Congress and the Government for a large part of his annual income. It means inefficiency and increased costs in agricultural production, which is the end results in starvation and high food prices to consumers.

It makes the Secretary of Agriculture an economic czar over American farmers, and in the end, due to the inability of the taxpayers to finance this multimillion-dollar Utopia, the farmers will wind up in bankruptcy and without any farm program whatsoever.

American farmers are justly entitled to an American farm program that will assure them an income and standard of living on equality with other segments of our American economy as against the ruinous political scheme proposed by the Truman administration.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE—SENATOR HOMER E. CAPEHART, OF INDIANA

The people of the United States have achieved the highest standard of national health the world has ever known under our system of private medicine, aided by Public Health Service.

The Democratic administration now seeks to Trumanize and socialize the practice of medicine.

They ignore the failure of the British experiment.

The power-drunk dreamers want to herd the American people into regimented groups and assign them to doctors and dentists who are identified by number as if they were in prison—well, maybe that is more than a descriptive thought.

The idea, of course, is to make a stomachache a Federal offense.

Seriously, folks, we feel the Government's job is to make possible the education and training of more doctors and nurses.

It is to help provide funds for the erection of more hospitals and research laboratories.

It is to aid in the spread of medical facilities in the areas where they do not now exist.

Socializing medicine will not do these things.

We Republicans would rather place our confidence in a practice we know to be successful than in a theory which so far has failed to work.

MRS. JOSEPH E. FARRINGTON, NATIONAL PRESIDENT, WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUBS, PAST PRESIDENT, LEAGUE OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

Thank you, Mr. Murphy.

As president of the National Federation of Women's Republican Clubs, I wish to address this appeal to all women within the range of the sound of my voice.

In the last general election, 45,000,000 eligible voters failed to use their ballot. This is a situation that must not continue. Let us—all of us women—everywhere—here and now dedicate ourselves to the proposition of persuading those of voting age of the importance of being alert to the present-day issues: the necessity of finding out who the candidates are and what they stand for—the need for women to be active in politics—then, by all means, last but most important—to cast their votes for those candidates who best exemplify human freedom and American liberty.

If we succeed in achieving this goal—and I know with woman force we shall succeed—the year 1950 will go down in history as the year of the second emancipation.

ROBERT TOFT, PRESIDENT, YOUNG REPUBLICAN NATIONAL FEDERATION

This opportunity for Young Republicans to honor our ideal among statesmen is a privilege. As chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, we support the dynamic principles of the Republican Party. The utilization of our ideas, our ideals and our energies in this year's congressional and senatorial campaigns will do much to insure victory.

Lincoln opposed a country half free and half slave. We oppose a country half free and half Socialist. We unite in the fight for a Republican victory. In the fight for freedom, we invite other like-minded people to join us.

MRS. THOMAS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO THE NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY, NIECE OF THE FIRST GENERAL OF HER RACE TO SERVE IN THE ARMED FORCES, THE ILLUSTRIOUS GEN. B. O. DAVIS

I am very happy to have this opportunity to honor the man who did so much for my people—the great Abraham Lincoln.

We in the Republican Party honor his memory and intend to carry forward the principles of government and humanity that he believed in so firmly.

Thank you.

BIG GOVERNMENT—CONGRESSMAN LEONARD W. HALL, OF NEW YORK, CHAIRMAN, CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

Section 4, article 4, of the Constitution, says "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this union a republican form of government."

Today we are plagued by a monster known as big government, a monster which has not only gobbled up the rights and privileges of the States but also many of the rights of labor, management, and the individual citizen. It is a thing of unlimited appetite.

The time has come to do away with this monster. We subscribe to the belief that the founding fathers knew what they were doing when they formed this Government of ours. We are certain that for 150 years it has been the finest type of government known to man.

The time has come to return to this republican form of government, a government of the people, by the people, and, particularly, for the people.

CHINA POLICY—SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, OF CALIFORNIA

Our bankrupt China policy stems from Yalta. In a secret deal, the Democratic administration—without the knowledge or consent of the Chinese Republic—gave vital Manchurian rights to the Soviet Union.

The action was taken without the consent of the American Congress or the American people.

More recently, a State Department leadership that is reluctant to turn its back on Alger Hiss has turned its back on effective aid to non-Communist China.

In that area of the world they appear more interested in saving face than in saving freedom.

HISS-ACHESON—SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Tonight we are gathered together to honor Abraham Lincoln. On the bill of fare we have old-fashioned American fried chicken, but there are some people in this town tonight who are attempting to eat their own words—and they are finding those words hard to swallow and highly unpalatable.

Today one Alger Hiss stands convicted and sentenced. His crime? He sold his country down the river—a Russian river. The Democratic administration was first told of Alger Hiss 11 years ago—in 1939; then again in 1943; then again in 1948. Again and again and again.

When questioned about this, one important executive's answer was: "No comment." Another man high in the Government reaffirmed his affection for his former associate.

Yes, indeed there are folks in this town tonight who are eating "red herring," but they are not Republicans. This red herring can only cause us to end up with a horrible case of national indigestion. And how can this indigestion be cured? By substituting a government by intelligent Americans who can very easily distinguish foreign "red herring" from American fried chicken.

THE ATOM BOMB—SENATOR OWEN BREWSTER, OF MAINE

Russia has the atom bomb. The free world trembles. How did she get the atom bomb? The story is now unfolding.

We have exposed our Coplons, our Hisses, our Wadleighs—and now Britain's Dr. Fuchs. When will this parade of traitors end?

Russia got the atom bomb not by independent research—but through traitors within our ranks. The present administration, through stupidity or by design, has coddled Communists, shielded traitors, and aided and protected enemies of our Republic. All of this being treason, let us make the most of it.

We Republicans believe that spies should be arrested and dealt with as spies, that traitors should be treated as traitors, and that the uppermost concern of all elected representatives of Government should be the preservation of our national security, and the safety and protection of our Republic—from enemies within and without.

FBI—CONGRESSMAN FRANK B. KEEFE, OF WISCONSIN

In years past there have been many attempts made to discredit the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its great leader, J. Edgar Hoover.

I wish to state here and now that the Republican Party has complete faith and confidence in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Hoover and his men have done a magnificent job under the most difficult circumstances. They have earned the confidence, the praise and the esteem of the American people.

The Republican Party intends to see to it that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is allowed to continue its good work. We will not stand by and allow the left-wingers and the pinkos to discredit the Federal Bureau of Investigation with a campaign of lies and deceit.

We are certain that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is an important cog in the preservation of the American way of life, and we intend to see that it is allowed to function and continue its important work unhampered.

VETERANS—CONGRESSMAN JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the past, as in the present, the Republican Party has always championed the cause of the veterans.

We feel the men who fought our wars are entitled to a decent break from their Government—the disabled, the sick, their widows, and their orphans.

Most of the benefits enjoyed by veterans today were enacted by Republican administrations or passed over the vetoes of Democrats.

As all veterans know, the Economy Act of 1933—written by a Democratic President and jammed through a Democratic Congress—took away many benefits from our comrades of the Civil War, the Spanish-American War and World War I.

Today the veteran is getting a curious kind of deal from the so-called Fair Deal. While he is being given a refund for passed overcharges on his insurance premiums, he is being deliberately overcharged on his current payments. Then one of these days, when an election is in the offing, he may be given another refund.

The Republican Party wants no part of this kind of political shell game. We want a square deal for the veterans.

CENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT—SENATOR CHARLES W. TOBEY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Stop the trend to centralized government in Washington. It was Jefferson who warned: "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread. * * * When all government, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington, as the center of all power, it will become venal and oppressive."

And our own Abraham Lincoln confirmed this when he said: "The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of free society."

Wake up, America. Understand how far your individual liberties have been encroached upon; and then, as we celebrate Lincoln's Birthday, join with me in hurling his warning to the Democrats: "You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time."

Wake up, America, cast the scales from your eyes, rebuke the greed and lust for power, so rampant in Washington today.

How? Vote Republican.

FOREIGN POLICY—SENATOR HARRY P. CAIN, OF WASHINGTON

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm supposed to speak tonight on foreign policy. I find it a very difficult subject, and honestly and truly I don't know what our foreign policy is.

All sorts of secret agreements have come to light from time to time, and there is no way of telling how many more we'll discover as time goes on. To my way of thinking, if we have a policy, it is the most confused conglomeration of inconsistencies that has ever been contrived to plague a nation. It has no definite form and definitely is not the result of bipartisan cooperation. It is more probably the complete work of the Democratic administration—ably assisted by Acheson, Hiss, and company.

I propose that we must have a definite foreign policy, discussed and agreed upon by the elected representatives of the people—and most important—I insist that the Congress and the people have a right to know what our commitments are, where our Government is leading us—and most important of all—our foreign policy must be designed for the welfare and protection of the United States of America.

LABOR—SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO

The Republican Party has restored equality between employer and employee; outlawed secondary boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, and other unfair labor practices; and guaranteed to every workman the right to work, the right to have his union recognized, the right to strike after a proper waiting period. It has given the President power to protect the public against threats to its safety and health. Under Republican legislation, union membership has increased to new highs. Wages, working conditions, and services and pensions are at their highest point in history. The number of strikes has been reduced. The Republican Party will be vigilant always to protect the rights of the workmen against unfair employers and also against arbitrary union bosses.

THE HONORABLE JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS, HOUSE MINORITY LEADER

Ladies and gentlemen, we are nearing the close of this magnificent tribute to Abraham Lincoln. You have heard Republican Members of the Senate and the House tell you where the Republican Party stands on taxes, deficit spending, communism, the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, foreign policy, the atom bomb, our veterans, and labor.

Late today the Republican Members of the Senate and House adopted, and the Republican National Committee concurred in, a new statement of party policy which I consider a great document. On foreign affairs it contains eight specific and positive proposals. On domestic affairs it makes 23 more fundamental and constructive recommendations. Even more important, it sets forth the great issue of today: liberty against socialism.

America as we know it and love it is the last outpost of freedom. We in the Republican Party are dedicated to the proposition that the America of free men, free competition, and free speech shall never die, and we will take this issue to the voters next November, convinced that every thinking American will join us in this crusade to save our country.

Why Does Acheson Defend Alger Hiss?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash.:

WHY DOES ACHESON DEFEND ALGER HISS?

One of the strangest statements to come out of Washington in recent political history is the affirmation by Secretary of State Acheson that "I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss."

To create an aura of martyrdom over the perjury conviction of his former associate, Mr. Acheson refers to the Sermon on the Mount. In so doing he is using a powerful weapon to try to repudiate the decision of the Hiss jury and to assure the Hiss sympathizers within his own Department of State that he will stand by and protect them from a fate similar to that which has befallen their comrade.

Secretary Acheson is granted to be a devoutly religious man and he gives every indication of having been deeply moved by the Hiss conviction. Only time and revelations yet to come will show whether he expressed a sincere concern for a victim he believes to be innocent or whether he has utilized a sacred mechanism to cover up what might be a conspiracy even greater than that openly revealed before congressional committees and at the two Hiss trials.

Mr. Acheson declined specific comment on the legal aspects of the celebrated case, but what he said in support of Hiss had a far more damaging effect upon his own reputation as a lawyer, a scholar, and as America's leading foreign policy spokesman than any discussion he could have advanced on the purely legal phases of the trial and conviction.

That trial and conviction was in the American tradition and was carried through with finite regard to the principles of due process of law. For a high official of the Truman administration to question the verdict in the manner in which he did and to utilize an emotional-religious lever to appeal to public opinion to overrule that verdict is strange conduct indeed for our Secretary of State.

Mr. Acheson's pretrial and posttrial defense of Alger Hiss calls for further probing by those agencies and those men who are attempting to ferret out the forces that have been trying to undermine our Government and destroy our democracy.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me for Lincoln's birthday, 1950:

It has been a matter of lasting regret to me that I was not personally acquainted with the Midwestern Member of the House of Representatives who declared on the floor of the House: "* * * The President is in never settled with his own positions. First he takes up one, and in attempting to argue us into it he argues himself out of it, then seizes another and goes through the same process, and then, confused at being able to think of nothing new, he stumbles up the old one again, which he some time before cast off. His mind tazed beyond its power, is running hither and thither, like some tortured creature on a burning surface, finding no position on which he can settle down and be at ease.

"He is a bewildered, confounded, and miserably perplexed man."

I should like to have known the man who said these words.

That man was Abraham Lincoln.

He said these words on January 12, 1848, while a Member of the House of Representatives from Illinois.

All Americans pay particular homage to Abraham Lincoln on February 12, 1950—the one hundred and forty-first anniversary of his birth. The America into which he was born, and in which he spent his youth and his manhood, has changed in a material way. Spiritually, our America and Lincoln's America are one and the same. The great principles for which he lived and died have not changed.

Let us search those enduring principles for clues as to what we twentieth century Americans must do to insure the very survival of our republican form of government.

One of Lincoln's own favorite quotations was Thomas Jefferson's profound statement that "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap we should soon want bread. * * * When all government, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of power, it will become venal and oppressive."

When Lincoln was born (1809) the total Federal Government income from all sources was approximately $13,568,000. In that same year—after all expenses of Government were paid—the Treasury books showed a surplus of $3,970,000.

When Lincoln was a Member of the House of Representatives (1847-48)—when Lincoln was at odds with then-President Polk for engaging in the Mexican War—the total Federal Government income from all sources was approximately $38,345,000. In that same year the Treasury books showed a deficit of $8,338,000.

When Lincoln was President (1861-65), during the great Civil War, the total Federal Government income from all sources was approximately $180,907,000 per year. The average yearly deficit for this period was $522,878,000.

Compare those figures with those of President Truman in his 1950 budget message. President Truman said that the Federal Government took in $39,946,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949 while spending $40,087,000,000. This is a deficit of $141,000,000. President Truman went on from there to estimate the 1950 deficit at $5,100,000,000 and the 1951 deficit at $5,500,000,000.

These boxcar figures bring us back with a jolt to the aptness of Abraham Lincoln's reasoning when—at the age of 34—he stated: "As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest, and next, no one left to borrow from, so must it be with the Government."

Keeping his Government solvent was one of the major motivating forces in the life of the Great Emancipator. His devotion to the American system of free enterprise was another motivating force, of equal stature.

On July 1, 1854, almost 7 years before he became President, Lincoln declared: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere." This was a powerful restatement of what he had already said on the floor of the House of Representatives on July 27, 1848: "We see it, and to us it appears like principle, and the best sort of principle at that—the principle of allowing people to do as they please with their own business."

How vividly Lincoln's wisdom applies to American old people today who, living lives of thrift and obedience to law, find, in their old age, that their livelihood is being taxed and regulated out of existence.

"Tax, tax, tax, to spend, spend, spend"—the current battle cry—keeps down the pioneer vitality of American youth whose promise of the future Lincoln underlined in his Cincinnati speech of 1859: "The prudent penniless beginner in the world labors for wages a while, saves his surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account for another while, and at length hires another to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all, gives hope to all, and consequently an improvement of condition to all."

The restoration of the right of old age to enjoy the fruits of the labors of a lifetime; the restoration of the right of youth to a tomorrow of unimpaired opportunity—these should be the rallying points of all Americans today. These things have not changed.

Still another motivating factor in Lincoln's triumphant career has remained the same—the Lincoln concept of the place of State and local government as against Federal Government.

Speaking in Columbus, Ohio, in 1859, Lincoln declared: "I believe there is a genuine popular sovereignty. I think a definition of genuine popular sovereignty, in the abstract, would be about this: That each man shall do precisely as he pleases with himself, and with all things which exclusively concern him. Applied to government, this principle would be, that a general government shall do all those things which pertain to it, and all the local governments shall do precisely as they please in respect to those matters which exclusively concern them. I understand that this Government of the United States, under which we live, is based upon this principle; and I am misunderstood if it is supposed that I have any war to make upon that principle."

These words which I have just finished quoting are a guidepost back to the road to national sanity for which the American people have been devotely searching. The American people need seek no further. Lincoln found the way. His way is still the way.

Lincoln never envisioned farmers being dictated to by Washington bureaucrats.

Lincoln did not approve of teachers being told what to teach by Washington.

Lincoln did not advocate telling the people of Nebraska how to run their State, county, and community governments.

Lincoln did not propose the enslavement of physicians.

Lincoln did not stand for the binding of merchants by coils of red-tape regulations.

Lincoln did not support the idea of sending snoopers to pry into the private lives of law-abiding citizens.

He believed—and he repeated over and over—that the best Federal Government was the least necessary Federal Government.

Because of what Lincoln believed—because of the beliefs for which he lived and died—I am proud that his name will forever be associated with the State of Nebraska. I am cheered by the thought that on July 29, 1867—3 months and 28 days after Nebraska became a State—the Capital was removed to a new site. I am further encouraged by remembering that on the very day the site became the State Capital its name was changed from Lancaster to Lincoln. This act was a public acknowledgement that the State of Nebraska had chosen to take the principles of Abraham Lincoln as the principles of our State.

It is my firm opinion that the people of Nebraska have nothing to fear from the future so long as they cling to the ideals of Lincoln—under whose banner this State was born.

Where then should Nebraskans look for possible threats to their way of life? Lincoln said in his Cooper Union speech, "At what point is the danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

What should we do when we feel that this land, this great Republic our ours, is menaced by internal dissent, by the setting of race against race, and occupation against occupation? Lincoln said: "I am driven to my knees over and over again because I have nowhere else to go." Let us follow Lincoln's example. Let us get down on our knees—and pray. When we have finished praying, let us rise to new courage, new determination.

Lincoln is gone from us in body. But what he said and what he did are still here to lead us in the right way—his way. On Lincoln's birthday, 1950, the American people must—and, I believe, will, dedicate themselves to their Nation. They will say, as one, so that all enemies of this Republic—both those without and those within—will hear and tremble: "We will follow Lincoln's road. We will not let him down. We will not fail the eternal spirit of the man who never failed his people."

That spirit we will long remember.

Stealing the Savings of the Thrifty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt

from an address by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Member of the House of Representatives, entitled "Stealing the Savings of the Thrifty":

STEALING THE SAVINGS OF THE THRIFTY

At a dinner party in New York City some 15 years ago I was urging the responsibility of bankers to do all they could to prevent rot in the dollar. In reply, a vice president of one of the country's biggest banks said to me, "The responsibility for money rests on the Government. If the Government pays off its bonds in cigar coupons, we will have the cigar coupons to give to our depositors."

I will never forget this complete abdication of trusteeship as a banker, and as a citizen. Under our system who is the government anyway?

I was one of the few men in Congress who voted against the repudiation of the gold clause. Under the circumstances then prevailing I knew the Government could not meet all demands in gold. But I knew we had suspended specie payments once before—and resumed them. To me it was one thing for a debtor to say: I regret that I cannot pay now. It was a different thing to say: I will never perform my promise. I ventured to say at the time that this act of national dishonor would sow dragon's teeth to grow into bitter fruit in the years to come.

Having cast my vote, I was, of course, gratified when the United States Supreme Court later held unanimously that Congress had acted unlawfully with "all the wrong and reproach," to use Chief Justice Hughes' words, that repudiation carries when done by a private citizen. But, as the case was presented by the holder of Government bonds, the Court held that while he had been wronged, he had not proved his damage. Four of the judges said, even with respect to the gold clause in private contracts, that "the impending legal and moral chaos is appalling." When the people were denied the right to demand gold for Government paper, their hands were taken off the brake of profligate public spending.

The dragon's teeth thus sown, in 1933, have now sprouted everywhere. The abdication of moral responsibility for the welfare of the thrifty and industrious and therefore the most useful members of society has permeated governmental action. The devaluation we excused in 1933 is now a world-wide example of moral and financial decadence. A United States Government bond for $100 bought in 1939 has lost 40 percent of its then value. A French Government bond bought that same year has lost 98 percent of its value. A French worker gets 15,000 francs a month. What trash will be in the American's pay envelope a few years from now?

Unless public opinion is changed, the following facts prove to me that the trend, not over the next few months, but over the years is toward more inflation—more repudiation, more stealing.

What do I mean by inflation? Assuming that money continues to circulate, the guts of inflation is simply this: More dollars for no more goods or services. That makes money cheap. That makes prices rise and steals the wages and savings of the thrifty.

What proves that the trend is toward more dollars for no more goods?

Most important of all, perhaps, is the politically promoted mass hallucination that people can vote themselves rich, the witchcraft that government can create wealth, that politicians have a magic cornucopia filled with the more abundant life, that "we owe us"—and therefore debt is harmless.

Even some business editors have fallen for the witchcraft that Government spending sustains the Nation's economy. But we have been prosperous when spending was negligible. It ought to be plain to a school child that the Government can't make you rich by spending your own money.

Next, unbalanced budgets during 17 of the past 19 years have poured into the economic bloodstream more dollars than the Government has taken out in taxes. This has developed the habit.

Next in order is that evil sleight-of-hand by which the Government converts its debt into money. This is removed from outright greenbacks or printing-press money only by the fact that debt still carries some interest.

The political need of appearing to tax the people as little as possible to pay interest on the debt leads the borrowing government to force interest rates down, which makes money cheap, and thus dilutes all savings payable in a fixed number of dollars. At the same time the political spendthrifts have the need to cheapen money in order to force wage payments up into higher dollar brackets so they can collect more through the withholding tax.

The loss of the peace—the substitution of Russia as a threat to the world in place of Germany and Japan—has resulted in enormous armament spending, which, however necessary, pours billions of dollars into the economy without the offset of consumable or commercially useful goods.

The next big inflationary factor are Federal politicians paying for votes by putting pressure on employers to force more dollar signs to be written on pay checks or pension checks—more dollars for no more goods.

Labor monopolies and industry-wide bargaining, granted by politicians for votes, permits ruthless men, competing with each other for place and power, to force the Nation to pay more dollars for no more goods. The repeal of the Taft-Hartley law would tighten their grip on our throats.

Price supports for farmers—again more dollars for no more goods. Billions of dollars worth of eggs, potatoes, cotton, wheat, meat, etc., are taken out of the market by the Government and put in vast caves and warehouses under lock and key until they rot and are fed to hogs, or are shipped abroad.

Then we have the prevailing rage of State governments, which had no direct responsibility for the war, to vote bonuses to veterans wholly irrespective of need or injury in the country's service—again more dollars for no more goods.

Next is the boost to minimum wages—more unemployment compensation and longer periods to enjoy it—the increase of pay of civil-service workers—more dollars for no more goods.

Such are some of the powerful long-range forces at work to make money constantly cheaper. But there is more to the story.

Those of you who have read Andrew D. White's classic on inflation in France in the 1790's will recall how one issue of assignats so cheapened money that the politicians printed more assignats to offset the evil effects of the previous issues, thus causing a chain reaction which was not stopped short of total collapse. That same chain reaction is at work in America today as workers demand more and more wages to offset the rising cost of living, or as Congress votes bigger social-security payments because present payments buy so few goods. With a few exceptions, such as HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, or BOB TAFT, of Ohio, politicians have no cure for the evils of inflation except more inflation—more dollars for no more goods.

This chain reaction is also at work as floors under farm-commodity prices cause city workers to demand more wages, which increases the cost of shoes and clothing and machinery to the farmer who then demands that his parity price be raised still higher. And so the music goes round and round.

Another chain reaction is this. The Federal vampire sucks so much tax money out of the pockets of the people and the cities and States in which they live, that they feel poor and so demand Federal aid for housing, doctor bills, education, and all the rest. So Federal power grows on what it feeds on and Marx goes marching on. If the politicians on the Potomac let the people and States keep what they make, they could pay their own bills. There would be just as much purchasing power in the country and a lot more freedom.

Taxes and especially progressive income taxes discourage production and reduce the output of goods which might otherwise keep dollars and goods in balance. The blight of taxes is seen in the steady drying up of risk capital. It is a startling fact that the securities of 9 of the 15 largest American companies are selling today on the exchanges for less than the book value of their assets. And this in a year of record prosperity. This means that if these companies were not in existence, the money could not be found to create them.

The graduated income tax—borrowed from the Communist Manifesto of 1848—lays its heaviest hand on the most dynamic and productive members of our society—the managers, risk takers, and job creators. States and cities are now adding their own graduated income taxes to those imposed by the Federal Government. This penalty against efficient men slows down the production of goods. As Cal Coolidge said, "When the Government takes 30 percent of what a man makes on Monday, 40 on Tuesday, 50 on Wednesday, and 60 on Thursday, he won't show up for work the rest of the week."

Last, we have the blight of socialism and the so-called welfare state. Socialism has an incurable disease. It is that men generally will not work as hard or produce as much for the Government as they will for their own wives and children. Socialism produces less goods per dollar paid out. It encourages shirkers and discourages workers. It lures men away from doing their best by its promises of shorter hours, longer vacations, and more dollars for less work. Socialism is parasitical—by its very nature. The private-property system must be productive—by its very nature. The hope of profits sees to that, whereas crushing taxes and strangling red tape produce fewer goods per dollar spent.

The popular appeal of the welfare state is that it promises to pay the masses more than they pay the government. The very nature of this promise creates greater and greater pressures on those who made the promise to make more promises. After taking all they can from those who are above the average in income, the promise will finally be paid only in rotting money, as the workers of Europe are finding out. The immutable law of socialism demands that their politicians plunder the savings of the thrifty, first by taxation—and then by inflation and confiscation. The money of any socialist government must be sold short for the long pull.

There is, of course, no need for America to breathe any more of this contagion of rotting money. With our marvelous productive capacity—with science, invention, research, and technology anxious to work their miracles, we can produce such a flood of goods as to keep goods and money in balance. We can start prices downward again and bring integrity back to the dollar.

But under the prevailing political climate, despite our almost unlimited capacity to produce, the price of the basic needs of life is being pushed upward by this chain reaction of cheap dollars—food, shelter, clothing, coal,

steel, freight and passenger rates, wages, hospital and medical care, education, life insurance—most of these are higher in price today than in 1930 years. No one can produce goods as fast as politicians can print money.

Historically, due to constantly better tools, production per man-hour has increased 2 to 3 percent a year, or from 20 to 30 percent per decade. But the Cleveland Trust Co. reports that the gain in the past 10 years has only been 8 percent. And in some cases, it has been zero, or less. But hourly wages have gone up 118 percent. This is inflation in every language. One hundred and eighteen percent more dollars for 8 percent more goods. Despite our huge investment in new tools and the harnessing of mechanical energy, which should bring all prices down for everyone, we are largely denied the benefits of our technology by feather-bedding practices, and the narcotic of the promise of security without work.

Before turning to the remedy for our ills, note how the moral chaos predicted in the gold-clause case is spreading. Leaving the war and cold war out of consideration, I refer to the immorality of those sections of the Federal Government which cause more dollars to be issued for no more goods—for example, mortgaging the debt, or putting pressure on employers to write more dollar signs on pay checks.

This adulterates all dollar savings. Just as a dishonest farmer pours water into milk. But there are five groups of voters numbering millions who have an even stronger case than some of us against the pickpocket or Robin Hood state. These five groups hold the direct contracts of the Government itself.

First are those who loaned the Government their money; that is, bought its bonds. At one time these totaled $[illegible]000,000. What right has the Government to take any action, not forced on it, to cheapen the dollar in which its contracts are payable?

Next, some 40,000,000 men and women are compelled to deposit some of their wages with the Government to be returned years hence in what is called "social security." The Government has become the banker for millions.

Third, are 2,000,000 Federal civil-service employees—including your postman—who have also been forced to surrender part of their wages for retirement pensions.

Fourth, are millions of ex-GI's who are paying premiums on life-insurance policies issued by the Federal Government.

Fifth, are the veterans who lost limbs and eyes and health in protecting their country, and who now hold the sacred promise of the Government to ease their loss to some degree. These millions hold contracts against the Federal Government as borrower, banker, and life-insurance company.

Who thinks of these millions today whose contracts are being stealthily repudiated as politicians cheapen money by swipping public funds for votes? What right has any government—Federal, State or local—to take any action not forced on it that will cause the price to rise of food and coal and clothing for the blinded veteran and his little family? A government that promises social security when it is continually adulterating money is not only a hypocrite, but morally a thief.

The remedy I propose is votes. The time has come again, as in 1896, to campaign for sound money.

It is said that the tide toward socialism cannot be turned for want of a mass base. That base exists. It is these millions of thrifty Americans.

Their nest eggs are being sucked dry by the vampires of taxes and inflation which is only another form of taxation and the cruelest of all, for it lays its hand not only on those in the prime of life, but on the widow's mite, and the little hoard of the aged.

For some years many efforts have been made to inform voters that they get nothing from the Government that they do not first pay to the Government. In fact, they get less, for the political brokerage is always deducted. We are familiar with these programs of tax education. They are all good.

But hidden as some of these taxes are, nothing so stealthily steals the savings of the thrifty as inflation. This vampire has not been really exposed. No one mentioned it at the last Presidential campaign. All we heard was talk about rent and price controls to conceal inflation—not expose it. Inflation is like the giant squid that squirts ink into the sea so it can hide. Inflation surrounds itself with an air of fictitious prosperity—$2 jingling in our pockets where $1 previously made no noise. So inflation needs to be explained. "Old age and want, thou ill-matched pair" is a legitimate political appeal. It proved itself in the recent Australian elections. Sound Democrats and sound Republicans can use it in every district and State. It worked in 1896. Nothing has a better chance of working now. It beats the sterile cry of "statism" a hundred times over.

The stage is being set by events. Up to now the great labor organizations have campaigned for one wage increase after another. They will continue to do so. But they now want something else—pensions, millions of pensions, to be paid not next week but years hence. For the first time, they are ripe for a discussion on the future value of their dollars. Every labor union that has signed up for pensions should warn its members of the vampire of inflation. A company that warns its employees of the danger of accidents, but not of the danger of rotting money to the pension plan, to which it is a party, is defaulting in its duty to its men and itself.

Life-insurance executives are beginning to publicly assert their moral responsibility to their policyholders. An insurance president has recently pointed out the blight of cheap money and high taxes on insurance. A paid-up policy for $10,000 in 1940 is now worth only $6,000 to the widow. Tell that to the women. A typical policyholder now needs 70 percent more insurance to provide the same protection as in 1929.

Mrs. Asa V. Call, of Los Angeles, president of the Life Insurance Association of America, has just said, "We must now frankly face the fact that our Government has become predatory." In short, it is stealing the savings of the thrifty. Tell that to our 80,000,000 policyholders—90,000,000 more voters than those who cast ballots for President last time.

A Government bond costing $750 in 1939 has shrunk in true worth to $594. In short, there is a 20-percent loss in principal and a 100-percent loss in the accrued interest. Much of the loss of course represents the waste of war. But a $6,000,000,000 deficit this year, and more next year, rubs it in. Except in depression, deficit spending increases the demand for goods. It makes prices high and dollars cheap. The people pay twice—in prices today, and in taxes tomorrow.

This is the reverse side of the welfare state. As Mr. Francis Truslow, president of the New York Curb Exchange says, "The same policies which whet the thirst for security debase the money in which that security is measured." A government that is always borrowing is morally insolvent and moral bankrupts become financial bankrupts.

Then you have the millions of depositors in savings banks and building and loan institutions who used to get 4 percent on their life's savings and now 1½ percent—a loss of income on savings of 62 percent. Isn't this a fine commentary on the Government guaranty of bank deposits?

Then you have the social-security-card holders—35,000,000 of them—and the retired firemen, policemen, school marms, ministers, and other pensioners trying to exist as cheap money drives up their cost of living in old age. Then you have the tens of thousands of loyal alumni of our hundreds of fine private colleges which are facing slow starvation as cheap money reduces income on their portfolios and crushing taxation liquidates their benefactors.

In words that bounce along the sidewalk, we must tell what makes money cheap and who is hurt, and how.

Make an appeal, also, to the moral sense of our people—the conscience of Americans. Ask our well-meaning but leftist clergymen why it is a crime for a candidate for office to use his own money to bribe A to vote for him, but right for the candidate to promise that if elected, he will take from B who has worked hard all his life and give to A, who has been a loafer.

"That's votes in them thar hills." Far more is involved than saving the savings of the thrifty. You save also our private property system, which can live and grow only in the savings of the thrifty. It is plain that the vampire of socialism lives only on political spending. Cut off the spending and you stop it in its tracks.

Whatever other arguments are used, we must unite on one point, easily understood, which touches the pocketbook nerve of millions of voters. This is the grand strategy of freedom.

Rotting money and a rotting republic go together. Lenin told us that—"debauch their money." As Jefferson said, we must make our choice "between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude." Give us sound money and a free country! You cannot resign from this struggle.

Emery A. Odell: A Great Newspaper Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country will never fully appreciate the work that has been done by pioneer newspapermen. One such outstanding individual is the owner and publisher of the Monroe Evening Times, Monroe, Wis. This distinguished citizen and newspaperman started to work in his father's shop at the early age of 10, and for 67 years he has been actively engaged in bringing vital news to his section of the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article which was recently devoted to his career:

Sixty-seven years of newspapering have dulled none of the early enthusiasm of Emery A. Odell for his calling and for his community.

Monroe has grown considerably in those 67 years, and the Evening Times has paced progress for the last half century while its founder and publisher kept a vigilant interest in both.

Mr. Odell was born in Janesville, October 25, 1871, son of John W. and Mary Christina Lincks Odell. He was only 10 when his father moved his printing plant to Monroe, in 1881, and founded the Weekly Gazette. The shop upstairs was in the Corson Building, on the east side of the square.

It was only natural that the son should take his place at the type case in his father's shop after a proper period of seasoning as a broom wielder. He swept the shop and once a week, on press day, turned the roller which distributed ink for the Washington hand press, shoving the inked roller across the type.

When he turned to setting type by hand it was necessary for him to place a thick Ayer's Newspaper Directory on a high printer's stool to reach the case. That directory years later was to show his Evening Times to be one of the outstanding small dailies of the Nation.

His pay as a novice typesetter was 50 cents a week, finally moving up to about $2 a week. He was learning a trade and he was learning the things which people found interesting to read.

At 17, he was ready to go out into the world to prove himself as a journeyman printer. First stop was Janesville, where he pegged away by kerosene lamplight through long nights setting type for the Janesville Recorder. A hand-set paper, it also used stereotyped plates received by express early each morning. Press time was daylight with a water-driven drum cylinder furnishing the power.

Part of the drudgery of every printer of that day was redistributing the type after printing. The faster type was put back into the case the sooner the printer could start setting his string for the night. Printers were paid by the combined length of proofs on completed composition. This method was a challenge to the ambitious and it developed Emery Odell into a "swift" at early age.

From Janesville he went to Madison, where in 1891 he saw the first Mergenthaler linotype machine in Wisconsin go into service. Printers were skeptical of the line caster, but it spelled the doom of hand-setting.

Mr. Odell moved on to Milwaukee in 1893 to the Morning Times started in opposition to the Sentinel. Milwaukee papers were still hand set. He was recognized as a top man in his trade by that time, having served as chairman of the typographical union chapel while at Madison.

A business depression folded the Morning Times summarily and the young printer took a trip to Chicago to the Columbian exposition, returning afterward to Monroe.

His father's weekly had become a daily and the son, after mulling over the changing outlook for typesetters, turned to the news side. In November 1893, he succeeded his father as editor.

From his study of big-town papers, he introduced lively headlines, enlarged on the local briefs of the weekly style and "made the home news whistle."

"People liked the signs of new life," he recalls.

It still was an age of merger, however, and with the advent of consolidations—recounted elsewhere in this edition—he eventually found himself editor of the Daily Journal and no longer associated with his father's enterprise.

When his new employer refused to do anything about the weekly wage, Emery Odell left the editor's helm. After sounding out public reaction to his idea, he revived the Monroe Evening Times, dropped in the recent merger, on October 13 1898.

Capital of the new paper was 99 percent ambition and optimism. Subsequent success indicates there was a generous reserve of integrity, character, and ability.

Knowledge of news interests of Monroe and Green County folk was coupled with a keen business sense which took the Times through its struggling days.

"The Times learned early that it had to have news, income, and business management. It went on a cash basis, has never made exchange agreements, and at the outset discontinued subscriptions on expiration. To this day it does not take due bills," Mr. Odell emphasizes.

Mr. Odell's marriage to Miss Amelia Burgy, daughter of Jacob and Barbara Luchsinger Burgy, took place December 14, 1898. Her father was a native of Switzerland and a pioneer Washington township stock raiser.

The publisher and editor of the Times during the lean years was no chair warmer.

"I was reporter, make-up man, manager, and collector," he recalls. "Daily I rattled around the boardwalk on courthouse square, climbed stairways to offices, legged it to the railroad depots, a half mile away in opposite directions, taking down notes, writing copy by pencil."

The few telephones were no help since no one involved in regular news beats had one.

He solicited the ads, prepared the copy, and generally kept the daily ticking by constant application. The Evening Times was a very personal enterprise.

But better days were ahead. Launching into the political battlefields, the Times supported the La Follette cause and gained attention by the strong role played on the local scene.

In 1910 came an unsought honor, appointment as postmaster. After 12 years of one-man journalism, Mr. Odell welcomed a change which stretched into 15 years of service. During much of that period he continued in charge of the paper's daily production, but there were other hands to write some of the news and other legs to climb the stairs for daily items.

Each progressive step in development of the Evening Times however, was planned and initiated by Mr. Odell. On the eve of the paper's twenty-fifth anniversary, he moved it into the present modern building.

The Lincoln Memorial, Washington, D. C.: An Inspiring and Perpetual Refreshment to American Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, so few folks seem to visit the inspiring Lincoln Memorial right here in the midst of our beloved Capital and so few folks residing away from the District of Columbia seem to know much about its creation and what is inside of it—and since it is admittedly such a famous and everlasting inspiration to those who do have the pleasure of visiting it—that I am pleased to use this unanimous consent to give you who have not had the privilege of seeing the inside of the memorial or of reading the detail about it the following.

On the interior of the north wall of the memorial, engraved on the marble wall, appears Lincoln's second inaugural address, as follows:

Fellow countrymen, at this second appearing to take the oath of the Presidential office, there is less occasion for an extended address than there was at the first. Then a statement somewhat in detail of a course to be pursued seemed fitting and proper. Now, as the expiration of 4 years during which public declarations have been constantly called forth on every point and phase of the great contest which still absorbs the attention and engrosses the energies of the Nation, little that is new could be presented. The progress of our arms upon which all else chiefly depends is as well known to the public as to myself, and it is, I trust, reasonably satisfactory and encouraging to all. With high hope for the future, no prediction in regard to it is ventured.

On the occasion corresponding to this, 4 years ago, all thoughts were anxiously directed to an impending civil war. All dreaded it; all sought to avert it. While the inaugural address was being delivered from this place, devoted altogether to saving the Union without war, insurgent agents were in the city seeking to destroy it without war—seeking to dissolve the Union and divide effects by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war, but one of them would make war rather than let the Nation survive and the other would accept war rather than let it perish, and the war came.

One-eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the Union but localized in the southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was somehow the cause of the war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union, even by war, while the Government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it. Neither party expected for the war the magnitude or the duration which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the cause of the conflict might cease with or even before the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier triumph and a result less fundamental and astonishing. Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces, but let us judge not that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered—that of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purposes. "Woe unto the world because of offenses, for it must needs be that offenses come, but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh."

If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which in the providence of God must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove that He gives to both North and South this terrible war as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those Divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him. Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives

us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

And on the south wall of the memorial appears Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as follows:

Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great Civil War testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But in a larger sense we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men living and dead who struggled here have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Then there has been, appropriately published by the United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Newton B. Drury, Director, National Capital Parks, the following comments about the memorial:

Had Lincoln been an ordinary ruler—even an ordinary hero—an ordinary monument would have sufficed and doubtless would have been built quickly. More than half a century elapsed before a fitting memorial was dedicated to this simple, heroic man whose name has penetrated to the ends of the earth and universally called to mind with reverence and hope wherever aspiration kindles the heart of youth, or tyranny oppresses mankind. The memorial, neither palace nor temple nor tomb but partaking of the nature of all, seems to gather within its marble walls the very essence of his upright character, steeped in tolerance and the belief that all people should be free—free to think, free to express themselves, and free to apply themselves to various enterprises.

INCEPTION AND HISTORY

The first concerted effort looking to the erection in Washington of a monument in honor of Abraham Lincoln appears to have been made about 2 years after his death by an act of Congress, approved March 26, 1867, which incorporated the Lincoln Monument Association. An appeal for subscriptions was sent out. Plans were submitted, but no practical results appear to have been accomplished from this legislation.

The next effort to secure authority from Congress for such a monument, or memorial, was made in December 1902. Numerous additional efforts were made in the following years, but it was not until February 1911, with the passage of a bill "To provide a commission to secure plans and designs for a monument or memorial to the memory of Abraham Lincoln," that these efforts were crowned with success.

The Commission created by the act held its first meeting on March 4, 1911. At its tenth meeting on February 3, 1912, the Commission decided to locate the memorial in Potomac Park on the axis of the Capitol and the Washington Monument, as recommended by the Commission of Fine Arts. After viewing designs prepared at its invitation by Henry Bacon and John Russell Pope, architects, of New York, the Commission at its fourteenth meeting selected Henry Bacon to prepare a final design, which Congress approved January 29, 1913. Ground was broken for the foundations of the memorial on February 12, 1914, and the cornerstone was laid February 12, 1915. At subsequent meetings, Daniel Chester French was selected as sculptor for the Lincoln statue, and Jules Guerin as architect to design and execute the murals for the end walls and the ornamentation on the bronze ceiling beams. The memorial was dedicated on Memorial Day, May 30, 1922.

THE ARCHITECTURE

The exterior of the Memorial symbolizes the Union of the United States of America. Surrounding the walls of the Memorial hall is a colonnade of the States of the Union, the frieze above it bearing the names of the 36 States existing at the time of Lincoln's death. On the attic walls above the colonnade are inscribed the names of the 48 States existing today. These walls and columns enclose the sanctuary containing three memorials to Abraham Lincoln. The place of honor is occupied by a colossal marble statue of the man himself, facing the Washington Monument and the Capitol. On the north wall to the right of the central space where the statue is placed, and separated from it by a row of columns, is inscribed Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address. Similarly, on the south wall the Gettysburg Speech is memorialized.

There are some architectural refinements not common in modern buildings. The columns are not vertical, but are slightly tilted inward toward the building, and the tilt of the corner columns is even more exaggerated. The outside face above the columns is also inclined inward, but less than the columns. The wall of the Memorial Hall inclines inward least of all. This was done to avoid the optical illusion of bulging at the top.

THE BUILDING

The foundations of the memorial rest upon bedrock from 44 to 65 feet below the original grade. The superstructure of white Colorado-Yule marble is approximately 80 feet high and rests on a base composed of three immense marble steps. Masonry approaches from the direction of the Washington Monument and the Capitol ascend a terrace retained by a 14-foot granite wall. This wall on the east and west sides is 256 feet 10 inches long and 187 feet long on the north and south sides. The walls of the memorial are encircled by a contiguous colonnade 188 feet 4 inches long and 118 feet 6 inches wide. The 36 columns in the colonnade, including the 2 standing in the entrance, are 44 feet high, 7 feet 5 inches in diameter at the base, and the shafts are composed of 11 drums each.

Greek ionic columns 50 feet high and 5 feet 6 inches in diameter at the base divide the interior of the memorial into three chambers. The walls of the interior are Indiana limestone, and the ceiling, which is 60 feet above the finished floor, is designed with bronze girders ornamented with laurel and pine leaves. The panels between the girders are of Alabama marble saturated with melted beeswax to produce translucency. The interior floor and the wall base are of pink Tennessee marble. The central chamber, containing the Lincoln statue, is 60 feet wide and 74 feet deep. The side chambers are each 63 feet wide and 38 feet deep.

The two tripods on the two buttresses flanking the steps leading up to the entrance to the memorial are each 11 feet high. Each is cut from a single block of pink Tennessee marble. The carving upon them was done by Piccirilli Bros., of New York. The decorative carving on the stonework of the building was executed by Ernest C. Bairstow, of Washington.

THE STATUE

The outstanding feature of the memorial is the statue of Abraham Lincoln designed and modeled by Daniel Chester French. It is placed in the central hall of the memorial where, by virtue of its imposing position in the place of honor, it predominates. The statue represents Lincoln as the war President seated in a great armchair 12½ feet high, over the back of which a flag has been draped. The gentleness, power, and determination of the man have been wonderfully expressed by the sculptor, not only in the face but also in the hands which grip the arms of the massive seat. Twenty-eight large blocks of Georgia white marble compose the statue, which is 19 feet high from head to foot. The extreme width, including the drapery over the chair, is 19 feet.

The carving of the statue was done by Piccirilli Bros. in their shops at New York, where it was also worked on by Mr. French personally. Some 6 years were devoted to the creation and execution of this work. The statue rests upon an oblong pedestal of Tennessee marble 10 feet high, 16 feet wide, and 17 feet deep, which in turn rests upon a platform of Tennessee marble. On the wall above the statue is the inscription: "In this temple as in the hearts of the people for whom he saved the Union the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined forever."

THE MURALS

The two murals by Jules Guerin typify allegorically the principles which were evident in the life of Lincoln. They are affixed to the north and south walls above the memorial addresses and are each 60 feet long and 12 feet high. The piece of canvas upon which each was painted weighed 600 pounds, and about 300 pounds of paint were used. The mural above the Gettysburg Address (south wall) centers around a group portraying Emancipation. An Angel of Truth is freeing a slave. To the left and right are groups typifying justice and immortality. Above the second inaugural address (north wall) the mural has for its central theme, unity. An Angel of Truth is joining the hands of the laurel-crowned figures of North and South and is flanked by Fraternity (left group) and Charity.

ADMINISTRATION AND VISITOR SERVICE

The Lincoln Memorial is administered by the National Capital Parks for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. All inquiries should be addressed to Irving C. Root, Superintendent, National Capital Parks, Washington 25, D. C. This national memorial is open daily from 9 a. m. to 9 p. m., closing only on Christmas Day.

Again, I respectfully urge each one of the Members of Congress to take the privilege and to receive the inspiration of personally visiting the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park at Hodgenville, Ky. But, my colleagues, before you do that, be sure to go and personally pause amply in the presence of the great statue of Abraham Lincoln majestically resting in the interior of the Lincoln Memorial itself here within just a few minutes of where you and I have the privilege of working daily on the Hill.

I am here privileged to present to you an outline furnished me, at my request, by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I know it contains much important and interesting data which may be known to some, but is not known to most of us:

SELECTED DETAILS CONCERNING ABRAHAM LINCOLN AS CONGRESSMAN

Abraham Lincoln was elected as a Whig to the Thirtieth Congress, March 4, 1847, to March 3, 1849, from the Seventh Illinois District, comprising the counties of Putnam, Marshall, Woodford, Tazewell, Mason, Menard, Cass, Morgan, Scott, Logan, and Sangamon.[1] The combined population of these counties in 1840 was 61,424, and in 1850 it was 93,428.[2] At the time of Lincoln's election to Congress, the population of the district might therefore be estimated as approximately 85,500.

Lincoln first came to Washington to serve in the Thirtieth Congress, arriving December 2, 1847.[3] The session opened December 6. Various conflicting accounts of the trip from Springfield, Ill., to Washington, D. C., have been published, and we are still dependent upon conjecture for part of the trip.

John W. Starr, Jr., Lincoln and the Railroads, imagines the trip thus:

"When he left his home in Springfield, in October 1847, to take his seat in the House of Representatives at Washington, Lincoln was eagerly looking forward to the journey, for it would be the first time in his life that he had been east of Ohio and Kentucky. He went by way of his native State, desiring to stop at Louisville to see his erstwhile Springfield friend, Joshua Speed.

"At that period of American history his passage from Springfield to Washington would necessarily have been made chiefly by other means than rail transportation. He would have gone by stage as far as Louisville, by way of Terre Haute and Vincennes, Ind. After leaving Speed the stage would again be made use of into Frankfort, where a short rail line operating between Frankfort and Lexington could have been used to the latter point. * * *

"From Lexington to Covington, Va., over what is known as the Boone Trail, the stage would again be used, as also from the latter point into Winchester, Va., by way of Staunton. Thence to Washington he must have gone by rail over what is now known as the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, but which then followed a more roundabout route than that of today.

"When Lincoln went over it, the line running from Winchester to Harper's Ferry was called the Winchester & Potomac Railroad. Thence to Relay Station it was known as the Baltimore & Ohio; and from Relay Station into Washington, it was known as the Washington branch of the Baltimore & Ohio, having been built under a separate charter.

"Lincoln reached Washington * * * on December 2. We find his name registered on that day, at Brown's Hotel. As he had left his home in October, the trip, counting his visit with his friend, Speed, must have taken over 6 weeks."[4]

Some points in the foregoing account are clearly erroneous. Lincoln did not reach Kentucky by stage through Indiana, but went from Springfield to St. Louis and up the Ohio by boat. If he did not stop to visit his friend Joshua Speed near Louisville it may have been because he knew Speed to be in St. Louis. Speed was registered at the same hotel as the Lincolns in St. Louis when they were there.[5]

The journey from Lexington to Washington is conjectural and may or may not have been as outlined by Starr.

Another account is given by William H. Townsend, Lincoln and His Wife's Home Town:

"By the middle of October, he had completed plans for the journey to Washington. It was arranged that Mrs. Lincoln and the two children should accompany him, and that they should stop off at Lexington for a leisurely visit with the Todd relatives. * * * So, early Monday morning, October 25, Congressman Lincoln with his wife and two small boys, Bob, four, and Eddie, a year and a half old, climbed into the stage that carried them overland to St. Louis, where they boarded a steamboat for Louisville.

"The little party did not stop in Louisville, although Lincoln's intimate friend, Joshua Speed, lived nearby, but caught the first train east, and as the poky little locomotive puffed up the winding grades toward the Blue Grass, Lincoln could not help marking the contrast between his first visit to Lexington and the present journey.

"For the next 3 weeks, Abraham Lincoln enjoyed immensely the first real vacation of his life. * * *

"November days were drawing to a close. Senator Crittenden and other members of the Kentucky delegation were starting to Washington for the opening of Congress. On Thanksgiving Day * * * on the afternoon of that day, the Lincolns said good-by to Lexington and with their two little boys boarded the stage for Maysville, where they would take a steamboat up the Ohio on their journey to Washington."[6]

This account is also inaccurate. The Lincolns could not have "caught the first train east" out of Louisville, because the railroad between Louisville and Frankfort was not completed until 1851.[7] And no source is cited for the statement that they went from Lexington to Maysville by stage and thence up the Ohio by steamboat; this statement may be conjectural.

Beveridge also tells the story inaccurately:

"Then came the time for Lincoln to go to Washington and take his seat as Representative in Congress of the Seventh District of Illinois. Mrs. Lincoln and their son, Robert, now in his sixth year, accompanied him. They went by way of St. Louis, up the Ohio on a steamboat to Pittsburgh, and thence by rail to Baltimore and Washington."

A footnote adds:

"A regular stage carried passengers from Springfield to St. Louis (Sangamo Journal, December 13, 1848). The other route to Washington was by the Lakes to Buffalo, thence by rail to New York and Washington; but Mrs. Lincoln says that they did not take that route."[8]

Regarding this account it may be noted that Robert Lincoln would have been in his fifth year instead of his sixth;[9] there was no railroad from Pittsburgh east to Baltimore in 1847.[10] That this was the route taken may be an assumption arrived at by elimination of the route via Buffalo, referred to as "the other route to Washington." But Starr, quoted above, suggests a still different route, overland by stage to Winchester, Va., and this alternative is favored as probable by Benjamin P. Thomas, who was familiar with these variant suggestions."[11]

However, the route by Pittsburgh should not be ruled out too hastily. For "by 1839, with the opening of the Pennsylvania Canal, Philadelphia was brought within 3 days' travel of Pittsburgh at a passenger rate of 2 cents a mile."[12]

It seems likely that the Pittsburgh route by boat and train would be more desirable in point of comfort in the wintertime for a family with small children than the long stage trip through Virginia. If the Lincolns traveled by Pittsburgh they may have experienced the interesting complexities of travel described thus, only proceeding in the opposite direction.

"When the State-owned project was completed in 1834, Philadelphia was linked with Pittsburgh by an extraordinary combination of transportation facilities. Coaches fitted with flanged wheels were drawn by horses from various points in Philadelphia to the railroad in Fairmount Park. There they were hauled by a stationary engine to the top of what is now Belmont Plateau, and there hooked together for the trip to Columbia [by steam railroad]. After a 10-hour journey, passengers were transferred to a packet boat on the central division of the Pennsylvania Canal, traveling 172 miles up the Susquehanna and Juniata Rivers to Hollidaysburg, passing through 108 locks on the way. At Hollidaysburg they changed to coaches of the Portage Railroad, which were pulled up five inclined planes to the crest of the Alleghenies, almost 2,500 feet above sea level. * * * Five inclined planes on the western slopes of the mountain provided the descent to Johnstown, where the trip was resumed by canal to Pittsburgh. The entire journey from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh, over a route of 394 miles, required 4 days."[13]

In view of the conflicting accounts, about all we can be sure of is that the Lincoln family must have had an interesting trip, and traveled by stage, by steamboat, and by railroad, somewhere on the way.

Sources:

Beveridge, Albert J., Abraham Lincoln, 1809–1858, volume I. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1928. E457.3.B57, volume 1.

Clark, Allen C., Abraham Lincoln in the National Capital. Washington, D. C.: 1925. E457.C58.

Congressional Directory, Thirtieth Congress.

DeBow, J. D. B., Compendium of the Seventh Census. Washington: Beverley Tucker, Senate Printer, 1854. HA201. 1850.C.

Dictionary of American Biography, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933, volume XI. E176.D56.

Division of Maps, Library of Congress, Railroad Maps of Pennsylvania for 1848.

History of the Ohio Falls Cities and their counties, volume I. Cleveland, Ohio: L. A. Williams & Co., 1882. F459.L8H6.

Johnston, J. Stoddard, Memorial History of Louisville, volume I. Chicago and New York: American Biographical Publishing Co. (1896 or 1897). F459.L8J7.

Starr, John W., Lincoln and the Railroads, New York: Dodd Mead & Co., 1927. E457.S78.

Thomas, Benjamin P., Lincoln, 1847–1857, Being the Day-by-Day Activities, etc. Springfield, Ill.: The Abraham Lincoln Association, 1936. E457.4. T43.

Townsend, William H. Lincoln and His Wife's Home Town. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1929. E457.T84.

Writers' Program, WPA, Pennsylvania: A Guide to the Keystone State. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946. F154.W94.

Mr. Speaker, in closing these remarks, may I say: I know that we, as Members of the present Eighty-first Congress, cannot sit between these walls on any occasion without realizing that Abraham Lincoln also worked here. This

[1] Congressional Directory, 30th Cong.

[2] De Bowe, Compendium of the Seventh Congress, pp. 218–224.

[3] Clark, p. 3.

[4] Starr, pp. 47–48.

[5] Thomas, p. 44.

[6] Townsend, pp. 140, 141, 144, 161.

[7] History of the Ohio Falls Cities, p. 58; Johnston, vol. I, p. 320.

[8] Beveridge, vol. I, p. 398.

[9] Dictionary of American Biography, vol. XI, p. 266.

[10] Railroad Maps of Pennsylvania for 1848, Maps Division, Library of Congress.

[11] Thomas, p. 48.

[12] Writers' Program, WPA, Pennsylvania, p. 298.

[13] Ibid., p. 90.

fact must, of necessity, renew our determination to make it literally true that we assume the great task remaining before us and that the honored dead of our wars for democracy shall know that we dedicate an increased devotion to the cause for which they gave their lives and that, in like manner, we, at this birthday season, do again highly resolve that they shall not have died in vain and that we, as Members of the same Congress of the same great Nation which Abraham Lincoln served as a Member of Congress, shall daily dedicate our lives to the proposition that, because of our unselfish service to our Nation, that Nation shall have a new birth of freedom and that we shall make it truer than ever that "Government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Democracy's Traitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Daily News of January 28, 1950, by Victor Riesel:

NEW YORK.—The same unscrupulous Communist lawyers who smeared Alger Hiss out of a proud by rather impoverished and suicide-laden Baltimore family, and either for love or money got him to pass vital documents on to a Red courier ring, today are casually doing business as usual just a few streets from where this is being written. And they are whipping into shape a new network to help cripple the Nation if we go to war with—guess who?

How do I know? Well, it would be nice to pass on the vision of Reuel, the demon newsman in Hollywood fashion climbing into dark places, flicking flies and planting microphones. It would be nice. But it's more mundane than fire-escape chambering at midnight.

There are many of us who know—and it goes back to the years when our crowd was a lonely-hearts club and we belonged to one another because we knew the secrets of who was spying on what and who was keeping this country from putting guns and warplanes in the hands of young soldiers and kid pilots in trenches and in the air around East Germany.

But few in the Government listened to us, so we talked to ourselves.

Now that jury after jury comes in with verdicts confirming what we've been saying for almost 15 years, this little group of newsmen, magazine writers and former foreign correspondents can lift hair and say the Nation's catching up—and hope the people will listen next time. What made us so all-wise? No great talents.

There's Hiss, for example. Some 12 years ago, our circle knew every detail of his activity. I ran into it at a small strategy session of newspapermen fed up with having their guild run by Communist party members.

We met, I recall, in the home of a radio editor whose father had been a leading Communist himself, before he broke personally with Joseph Stalin. Someone introduced a chap named Whittaker Chambers, from Time magazine. And we listened carefully as he told us of Communist techniques and how to counter them.

Later we walked for hours along New York's East Side and slowly, sensitively he told the story of his break with the spy ring and about Hiss and other Government officials, some still living, some dead, who secretly had terrific impact on the writings and thinking of the highest administration leaders. Chambers saw to it that we got on our way home and then disappeared into the crowd. Some of us tried to get action but no one would listen.

Then, in 1945, at San Francisco, I saw Hiss with Secretary of State Stettinius, and Truman—and knew whom the heavily-guarded V. Molotov invited to his new fashionable soirees, all under surveillance of trigger-happy OGPU agents.

I knew, too, that I would be marked as nutty if I tried to tell Chambers' story about the slim young man on the platform of the gilded San Francisco Civic Opera House as the UN held its first sessions. So, I, like the few others who knew, had to watch this Nation get the oldest double-cross in the world.

There were literally hundreds of such cases. One day, early in the war, we learned the entire Communist section of CIO was whooping it up for a strike at the four-motored bomber plant in Inglewood, Calif. We knew a Lew Michener, then a CIO Auto Workers' Union official, was a Communist and with others, back of the stoppage at the critical moment when we were trying to put bombers in the British skies.

So we screamed—and we were smeared. But, only a few weeks ago, Michener got on the witness stand during the Harry Bridges trial and admitted he was a Communist then.

We knew some pro-Communist Los Angeles CIO men worked closely with Hans Diebel of the German-American Bund there in distributing isolationist literature—and when we said this was the logical conclusion of the Russian-Nazi pact we were howled at. Then investigators proved we were right.

Each time we made charges, we did so on the basis of disclosures by men like Chambers, who could no longer stand the leiness of Stalinist corruption of their revoluntionary sentiments. And so they broke and sought us out, told us what they knew.

Therefore, it's worth heeding the warning that the same Communist lawyers who first moved into the Government service back in 1934 and migrated in waves from department to department are now working on creation of a new labor network for industrial sabotage and espionage.

They've subtly approached Albert J. Fitzgerald, head of the United Electrical Workers (independent) to lead it. But he won't fall for this secret maneuver. So they're looking for another innocent.

When they find him, they'll be in business again.

No More Cheese After the Trap Is Sprung—Workers Beware the Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Warner & Swasey Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, have made a pertinent observation on the welfare state in an ad that appears in Newsweek for February 6, 1950. The admonition contained in it should be clearly understood by every worker in this great Nation. The ad referred to follows:

THEY DON'T KEEP FEEDING YOU CHEESE AFTER THE TRAP IS SPRUNG

All welfare states are alike. They promise you anything and everything if you'll vote them into power—security, more money for less work, sharing the wealth, soaking the rich.

So you vote them the power—and then find you have voted away your freedom. You find that all such promises of something for nothing were false—as such promises must always be. For example:

One welfare state government (England) recently used troops to break a strike. Another (Russia) destroyed the importance of the very unions which had helped it to power, and, boasting of its love for the common man, cut the value of his money by nine-tenths, without warning.

Look out for all those promises of something for nothing. They don't put that cheese in the trap just because somebody loves mice.

No government, no individual, can give you anything worth having for long. The only thing you'll ever have and keep is what you yourself produce. And then you have your self-respect, too.

Whose Way on Rivers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of Tuesday, February 7, 1950, entitled "Whose Way on Rivers?" which is a discussion of the Hoover Commission recommendation concerning rivers and harbors and flood-control work. It is a very thoughtful editorial, and I am making it available to my colleagues:

WHOSE WAY ON RIVERS?

The Mississippi Valley Association's annual meeting here runs true to the form of the last several years. The speeches and reports are carefully integrated into a blanket defense of the Army engineers' role in Federal river work.

That this again takes the form of all-out criticism of the idea of regional valley authorities is a matter of course. The Mississippi Valley Association took its position years ago against the socialism, the totalitarianism, and the superstate that its leaders see in the Tennessee Valley Authority. It doesn't want anything like a TVA to be imposed on the Missouri Valley or any other valley.

But since the last meeting of the association there has come a new threat to the Army engineers' way of building dams and levees. This was the Hoover Commission recommendation that the Army turn its flood-control and rivers and harbors functions over to a reorganized Department of the Interior.

And so some of the big guns of the Mississippi Valley Association now are trained on the Hoover Commission's effort to reorganize and streamline the executive branch of the Federal Government. An association committee has reported that removal of the Army engineers from river work would destroy one of the most valuable and efficient operating agencies of the Federal Government. And Representative WILL M. WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi, came here to tell the meeting that he is for Government reorganization in general but against any meddling with the Corps of Engineers. "Often," he said "reformers, without supporting reasons, advocate the crippling if not the destruction of existing agencies that have proved their worth."

The best answer to the committee, to Representative WHITTINGTON and to the Mississippi Valley Association is in the words of the Hoover Commission. In its summary of reasons for transferring river work from the Army to Interior, the Commission gave these:

1. To secure coordinate policies in these fields.

2. Elimination of disastrous conflicts and overlaps which cost the taxpayer enormous sums annually.

3. Provision of a center for more energetic development in water resources.

4. Provision of a center for coordination of State and Federal action in these fields.

5. Elimination of competition for construction labor and materials.

Members of the Hoover Commission were not starry-eyed reformers, as Representative WHITTINGTON implies. They were asked to look for ways to improve Government and save money. They found glaring defects and inherent conflict in the present agencies concerned with river development.

In the end it is the taxpayer who is most concerned with this conflict. He must foot the bill for the projected multibillion-dollar river program. Whom should he believe—the Hoover Commission or the Mississippi Valley Association?

The choice should be easy.

Our Nation, the World Needs the Philosophy of Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, February 12 is to be observed as the one hundred and forty-first anniversary of the coming to birth of Abraham Lincoln.

Ever since I was a small child, I have had an increasingly vigorous awareness of the fact that the birth, life, and death of Abraham Lincoln has been a definite blessing to my own humble experience. I can clearly remember that when I was an elementary-school boy the public-school teacher not infrequently came and cracked my knuckles with a ruler because she found me drawing pictures of the birthplace cabin of Abraham Lincoln instead of studying.

During the recent congressional recess my wife and I deliberately drove to Hodgenville, Ky., en route to Long Beach, Calif., in order that we might have the inspiration of being in the presence of that birthplace cabin of which I began to draw pictures on scratch paper when I was about 10 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the inspiration of being president of the Abraham Lincoln Club of my home city; and, being a Member of this great Congress during the Seventy-ninth and Eighty-first sessions, has made it possible for me to have the privilege and inspiration of serving as one of the directors of the Abraham Lincoln group of Washington, D. C. And this is an invitation to you, one and all, to attend the Abraham Lincoln anniversary program at the Lincoln Museum, 511 Tenth Street NW., Sunday, February 12, at 2:30 p. m. The outlined program is as follows:

Chairman, Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, Member of Congress, California.

Address: The Washington That Lincoln Knew, by Edward Boykin, director, National Capital Sesquicentennial Celebration.

Vocal concert: United States Army Band chorus.

Presentation of bust of Abraham Lincoln: Eloy Alfaro International Foundation.

Presentation of Lincoln Memorabilia: Washington Lincoln Group.

Benediction: Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the United States Senate.

Under the unanimous consent approval extended me, I herewith call to your attention a portion of a very worthy editorial in the National Tribune—The Stars and Stripes, "the voice of the veterans of the United States," dated February 9, 1950. It should be significant, Mr. Speaker, that the masthead of this veterans' paper carries the following quotation on every one of its issues: "To care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan." The following is the portion of the editorial to which I refer:

On next Sunday there will be observed the one hundred and forty-first anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, a man of humble beginnings who served as this Nation's Chief Executive during a period of its greatest trial. Having faith that right would create the strength to overcome immorality and defeat evil intentions, Lincoln furnished the inspiration needed to keep our country truly united. He was an inspired foe of injustice and malice. He was possessed of a charitable mind, and, resultantly, he forged the America of 85 years ago into a single whole after a long civil conflict that threatened to tear it asunder. In the clash of opposing ideals, he chose to support those that promised clearly the preservation of national solidarity as the only single means of defending the priceless liberties that had been won at frightful cost by our founding fathers. Indeed, Abraham Lincoln was in his day the savior of our country.

Every year, as we pause to learn anew the ageless lessons taught by Lincoln and his predecessors, we derive fresh courage from them. A glance around the troubled world of today brings home as never before the need for that union to which our sixteenth President devoted himself and for which he gave his life. If ever there was required the sensible and solid thinking of his time, it is wanted now, because other forces are intent upon dividing the house that has long been united on the solid foundation of freedom. Nation-wide organizations, led by astute and self-seeking spokesmen and supported by millions whose fervent desire for peace has blinded them to the wrongs which attend the movements they have joined, are directed toward objectives that would destroy forever the liberties they now enjoy. Too many, instead of fighting to hold what they have, would give up essential freedom to buy a little temporary safety, and in doing it, are threatened with the loss of both. * * *

Veterans also remember Lincoln as a short-time soldier, but as one who was so close to the servicemen of the great Civil War that he knew and understood their needs. Far from believing that war veterans should be classed with all others under a system of social equality, he recognized their special service to the country and many times voiced his concern about their security as a class and about the welfare of the dependents of their honored dead. We have moved ahead far as a nation during the past nine decades, and our thinking has had to be adjusted to new developments as they have occurred, but we believe that Lincoln would have protested in horror at advocates of social planning and world freebooting who would spend untold billions for impractical and liberty-destroying projects but practice penury when it comes to protecting those "who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan."

On this, another anniversay of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, the veterans of America think the time has come for a lot of people to unscramble their confused thinking and to dedicate themselves once more to the homely philosophy of Lincoln and others like him. Also attributed to the savior of our country is this remark: "You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time."

Republic of Lithuania Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 16, of this week, all Americans who believe in liberty and self-government will commemorate the Lithuanian nation for the outstanding fight its patriotic people are making to restore its former freedoms and self-government.

Gov. Henry F. Schricker, of Indiana, has issued a proclamation proclaiming February 16, 1950, as the Republic of Lithuania Day in the State of Indiana.

Mayor Frank J. Migas, of East Chicago, Ind., has also issued a proclamation setting aside February 16, 1950, as Lithuania Day in the city of East Chicago. There will also be held in the city of East Chicago commemorating services at St. Francis Church Hall, wherein prominent citizens will pay tribute to the fighting spirit of the Lithuanian people who will continue the battle against the communistic tyranny in an effort to save their country from slavery. The minds and hearts of all true Americans beat in unison for the Lithuanian people in their noble battle for freedom and independence.

I herewith present to the Members of Congress a radio address delivered by Petras Dauzvardis, consul of Lithuania at Chicago:

It gives me very great pleasure to express my official and personal gratitude to His Excellency Henry F. Schricker, Governor of the State of Indiana, for the proclamation of Republic of Lithuania Day in Indiana, Thursday, February 16, 1950, and for the

sentiments and wishes expressed in said proclamation.

In his proclamation the Governor recounts the historical facts and present appalling plight of Lithuania, and urges the citizens of Indiana to give serious thought to the sufferings the Lithuanians are undergoing, and to hope that all freedom-loving people will raise their voices to end the extermination of the gallant nation of Lithuania.

In conjunction with this proclamation and commemoration of the Independence Day of Lithuania, it is proper to make a few reflections upon Lithuania's past, and to glance at its present state. Lithuania is a many centuries old state; she was first occupied by Russia in 1795. That occupation and enslavement of the Lithuanian nation lasted for 123 years, and was terminated by the nation's constant fight for freedom and determination to be free and independent, and the resultant declaration of independence of Lithuania on February 16, 1918. Soviet Russia took cognizance of this declaration, renounced for all time all rights to the territory of Lithuania, and recognized Lithuania as a sovereign and independent state. The United States of America and other nations also recognized, and continue to recognize Lithuania's rightful independence and sovereignty.

The free and independent Republic of Lithuania made remarkable progress in every phase of its life, and was acknowledged as one of most cultured, progressive, industrious countries of the post World War I period.

Lithuania's independence was suspended and achievements destroyed when it was occupied by Russia for the second time in 1940. The Nazis wrested the occupation of Lithuania from the Soviets in 1941, continuing it until 1944, when the Soviets reoccupied the country, and continue to occupy and rule it by force to this day. The Nazi-Soviet occupations have deprived Lithuania of approximately one million people. Unremitting and aforethought concerted acts by the Soviets threaten to annihilate the Lithuanian nation. Recent reports state that the 1941 Soviet plan to exterminate 700,000 (25 percent) of the Lithuanian nation has been amended so that 85 percent of the indigenous population of Lithuania is subject to elimination and liquidation.

Up to now the liquidation of Lithuanians was carried out by arrests, tortures, and deportations to the Soviet slave labor camps of Lithuanians thus doomed to a lingering death. Mass purges and executions are now imminent, since capital punishment has been reimposed in the Soviet Empire.

Because of these ominous signs of a speeding up of the annihilation of the Lithuanian nation, Lithuanians throughout the world are joining Governor Schricker in the hope that freedom-loving people will raise their voices against the Soviets by protesting against the impending destruction of the Lithuanian nation and in demanding that the Soviet Union: (1) Halt the deportation and murder of Lithuanians; (2) return Lithuanian deportees from Russia to Lithuania, to their homes; (3) withdraw the Soviet army, police, officials, agents, and colonists from Lithuania; and (4) restore sovereign rights and self-government to the people of Lithuania. These demands are based upon international law, the Soviet-Lithuanian peace treaty, the Atlantic and United Nations Charters, and various wartime pledges and undertakings.

Should the Soviet Union disregard these demands and continue violating the law of nations, she should be proclaimed an outlaw aggressor and a perpetrator of the crime of genocide.

The tenets of man's inalienable rights, of law, and of the United Nations Charter must be given meaning and effect lest they become meaningless and subservient to totalitarian might and brutality. Lithuania and the other Soviet-occupied and tyrannized countries afford a case for the test of right and democracy against might and slavery. May right prevail over might and thereby bring freedom, peace and security to all peace-loving countries, including Lithuania and the other two Baltic states.

Kosciusko, Like Lincoln, an Emancipator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Lafayette Park, here in Washington, wreaths were placed at the inspiring statue of Tadeuz Kosciusko and in the memory of that great son of Poland and of liberty a magnificent audience gathered on the greensward facing the monument to listen to the tributes to the life and works of Kosciusko voiced by the Honorable SCOTT LUCAS, majority leader of the Senate, and three Members of the House, the Honorable CHESTER A. CHESNEY, the Honorable ALVIN O'KONSKI, and myself. Under leave granted, I am extending my remarks to include my address on that occasion:

Much has Poland given to the enrichment of mankind and the betterment of the world. Great has been the contribution of men and women of Polish blood to our own United States of America.

The story of the life of Tadeuz (Thaddeus) Kosciusko has been an inspiration to brave deeds and noble thoughts to the generations that have come and gone since, as is so well said in the marble lettering in the monument in Lafayette Park here in the Nation's Capital: "Freedom shrieked when Kosciusko fell." The influence of his life will be reflected in all the generations to come. His name is high on the roll of the heroes of immortal fame.

Today, which also is the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, I would dwell on a quality in character which the great son of Poland shared with the rail splitter from Illinois whose name with Kosciusko's is on that roll of immortals.

Kosciusko came to America on borrowed money. He remained here for 7 years of service, sacrifice, and danger. An engineering genius and perhaps the greatest master of the use and tactics of artillery of his day, no officer under Washington was a more vital part in the winning of the victory for independence. To him is attributed the triumph of American arms at Saratoga, the turning point in the long, painful struggle of the Colonies and the victory that decided the action of France in coming to the side of the American patriots. He directed the building of the defenses at Philadelphia and at West Point on the Hudson, guarding our line from an English advance which could have come from either the east or the north. Then, fighting as a guerrilla, the uniform and insignia of rank he discarded, the pride in his brilliant reputation he forgot, as well as all sense of danger and desire for personal security, and in the most hazardous situations battled as a private side by side with the most daring of the American guerrillas.

Thomas Jefferson said of him: "He is as pure a son of liberty as I have ever known, and of that liberty which is to go to all, and not to the few and rich alone."

And from the great Washington came this tribute: "To his care and sedulous appreciation, the American people are indebted for the defenses of West Point."

In recognition of his service of incalculable value the Congress voted him a large tract of land in what is now the site of the city of Columbus, Ohio.

Here was the test of the character of Kosciusko. There is not in all of history a better example of self-abnegation nor a more stinging rebuke to those who question the sincerity and the lack of self-interest motivation in the heroes of action and of idealism who serve for country, freedom, and humanity.

Plutarch was his favorite author and his favorite character in the writings of the great Greek biographer was Timoleon who yearned to liberate his country, taking nothing in return.

Having spent seven hard and hazardous years of his life in aiding the liberation of the country to which later hundreds of thousands of Polish men and women were to come, he returned to Europe, taking nothing in return for his glorious and priceless service. He returned, still penniless, the money that he had borrowed to come to America remaining to be repaid from his labors after the 7-year intermission during which he aided so brilliantly in the liberation of the country now become the strength of the world. He took nothing from America for the much that he had given to America. Like that of Timoleon the name of Kosciusko will stand throughout the ages for pure unselfishness in the doing of great public works.

I return now to the lands on the present site of the city of Columbus, Ohio—lands given him by a grateful Congress and which well might have lifted his poverty and assured the security of his later years. This is the disposition he made of these lands; I read from his will:

"I, Tadeuz Kosciusko, being just on my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that, should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States, I hereby authorize my friend, Thomas Jefferson to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own slaves, or any others, and giving them liberty in my name; in giving them an education in trade or otherwise; in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality, which may make them good neighbors, good fathers and mothers, husbands and wives, in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country, of the good order of society, and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful; and I make the said Thomas Jefferson executor of this. 8th of May 1798."

Two centuries have passed, and many mighty events have shaken the nations of the earth and the destiny of mankind, since a mother in Poland gave to the world the son who was to give his all for liberty and accept for himself nothing. Nothing except the glory which forever will attach to his name as an inspiration to noble deeds and one who is outstanding among the great characters in the world's history as a practitioner of the gospel of self-abnegation.

That which was given him for his service to the young American Republic he returned to purchase freedom for other Americans, of another race and another color and then slaves, and to provide for their education and training that they might be good neighbors, good fathers, and mothers, and sons, and daughters, and happy in their families and communities would be defenders of liberty and of their country.

He who loves liberty as did Kosciusko will not rest on his oars when liberty for himself and his own people has been attained but there are still peoples of other

races and of other nations remaining in bondage and lashed by the cruel whip of discrimination. Liberty like virtue to Kosciusko was priceless in itself and for itself—liberty, as the air itself, the common heritage of all men.

Two centuries or so after his birth—the exact date of which is not definitely established—I am thrilled to be an humble member of this magnificent gathering in the Capital of the world's mightiest Nation, the powerhouse of liberty, honoring his memory.

Ugly Spy Disclosures Indicate Administration Covered Up Dr. Fuchs—Information Available 5 Years Ago—Who Blocked FBI Investigation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting as part of my remarks an outstanding article by Felix Morley which appears in the current issue of Human Events. The information Mr. Morley sets forth is grounds for impeachment of the President, in my opinion. I commend it to all Members who are interested in learning some of the hidden facts underlying the recent spy disclosures.

A chain reaction operates in the journalistic estimation of news value. The belated arrest in London of Dr. Klaus Fuchs on charges of atomic espionage did not of itself warrant the explosion of press and radio publicity that erupted over here. In the English newspapers a less-excited editorial judgment played the incident down.

It was much the same last September when President Truman announced portentously that a trial atomic bomb had been exploded in Soviet Russia. I happened to be in London at the time, and the universal reaction was "Why not?" In western Europe all well-informed people have long been aware of the subtlety of the Russian spy system and of the skill with which Communists are infiltrated into governmental posts where they can be most useful to the Soviet fatherland. It is different here, where this infiltration has gone very deep.

One of the charges against Dr. Fuchs is that in this country 5 years ago—in February 1945—he transmitted atomic-research information "useful to an enemy." That news is certainly not surprising.

An English Communist colleague of Dr. Fuchs, the physicist Allan Nunn May, was caught that same year in the Canadian atomic espionage disclosures and is now serving a 10-year jail sentence. The report of the special Canadian Royal Commission then pointed out that there were many connections between the Canadian spy ring, revealed by Cipher Clerk Igor Gouzenko, and the larger ring operating in the United States. All the Canadian information was made available to our Government by the personal orders of Prime Minister Mackenzie King. The subject was discussed when Mr. King came to Washington in November 1945 to consider atomic-energy problems with President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee.

So the mystery in the Fuchs case is not how secret atomic information could have been passed on to the ubiquitous Soviet agents. The detailed Canadian revelations long since disclosed the manner in which this business was handled, in this country as well as in the less-important Canadian cases.

The mystery is why it has taken years for the Truman administration to make even a tentative start on disclosures that the alert Canadians cleaned up at their end in a few months. And the unresolved question is why our responsible officials failed to follow the Canadian leads.

Evidence justifying the arrest of Dr. Fuchs has been available for exactly 5 years. But the FBI was not allowed to investigate atomic espionage until 1947 and is said to have been working on the Fuchs case for less than a year.

Why, and by whom, was the FBI blocked off from this and similar cases? That is the unrevealed story behind the story, justifying the headlines appropriate to a mystery affecting the safety of us all.

II

We know now that the Soviet spy ring in Canada was operating full blast, and very successfully, at least as early as June 1943. There is very good reason to suspect that an even larger and more efficient apparatus was then well established in the United States. Certainly the unknown person to whom Dr. Fuchs is accused of passing top-secret data in February 1945 was no casual stranger.

All Americans familiar with Communist techniques were at that time aware of the general outline of what was going on. But it was impossible to make the truth prevail over the strong pro-Soviet attitude of the Roosevelt administration. Indeed any attempt to do so, on the basis of definite evidence, was immediately countered as isolationist, or even as pro-Nazi. Human Events was greatly daring when it ventured to say, on March 8, 1944, that: "The administration seems to be the prisoner of the Communist Party."

And it was not merely the administration. Mr. Wendell Willkie, Republican candidate for President in 1940, made a hurried trip to Russia in the summer of 1942 and on his return told all, in a slap-happy compilation entitled "One World." In this he advised Americans (p. 86) not to be mistrustful of Communists. "Russia is neither going to eat us nor seduce us. * * * No, we do not need to fear Russia."

About a year later, Mr. Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State until his split with Mr. Roosevelt in 1943, wrote the Time for Decision, appropriately chosen as the book-of-the-month for July 1944. It stood up for just about that length of time.

This book was in some respects critical of Mr. Roosevelt's leadership. But not where the President's faith in Soviet Russia was concerned. To call Stalin's Russia a dictatorship, said Mr. Welles (p. 309) is only "superficially true." Actually: "The Russian people today are satisfied that their government is devoted to the popular interest. * * * The Soviet Government today is guided by the popular will. * * * Certainly in the immediate future the foreign policy of the Soviet Government will continue to represent what the people want." It would be pleasant if we could say as much for the United States.

These samples of the stuff Americans were fed go far to explain why honest efforts to unmask Soviet espionage during its most active period were unavailing. Yet the attempt was conscientiously made, for instance by a small group of Congressmen headed by Representative Busbey, of Illinois, shortly before the election of 1944. To this President Roosevelt, in a speech on October 5, replied:

"It is a source of regret to all decent Americans that some political propagandists are now dragging red herrings across the trail of this national election."

III

This red-herring phrase, like much else in the Roosevelt bag of tricks, was used more lately, and less successfully, by President Truman. The revelations before the House Un-American Activities Committee which led to the indictment of Alger Hiss were also called a red herring, to keep the public from considering the bad record of the Eightieth Congress. Now that Mr. Hiss has been found guilty it is no longer possible to write off the effort to expose Communist infiltration as political propaganda. But it would not have become an issue, even in an election year, except for the strange behavior of Secretary Acheson, and perhaps not then except for the even more strangely retarded development of the Fuchs case.

Americans are a generous as well as a politically unsophisticated people. Throughout the country there has been much sympathy for Alger Hiss, wholly aside from the realization that a verdict in the court of first instance is subject to appeal.

Many were therefore willing to reserve their final personal judgment on Alger Hiss, and additionally were anxious to see the case kept out of politics. Come what may, this former high official of the State Department is now a broken man; his career is ruined and his fall is harder because his earlier pretensions were so great. The general desire, as one could see in editorials and private conversation, was to forget the whole miserable business.

And then Dean Acheson, with that strange ineptitude which so often afflicts clever men, suddenly made it impossible to drop this case. The Secretary of State, speaking in that capacity at an official press conference, made prepared remarks which, however guarded, could only be interpreted as an aspersion on the judicial process. Coming from a Cabinet officer, after the verdict, Secretary Acheson's defense of Hiss was actually executive infringement on the independence of the judiciary, and was promptly resented as such.

Before the echoes of this blunder had subsided—while the legislatures of Southern States were still voting resolutions demanding the resignation of Secretary Acheson—came the arrest of Dr. Fuchs in London. And thus was set off the chain reaction referred to at the outset of this analysis. This is big news primarily because of the growing realization that all these ugly disclosures fit together, and are part of a pattern of which much—perhaps by far the greater part—is still to be disclosed.

IV

The significance of the case of Alger Hiss might well have been forgotten. Now it will not be.

Simple people who have not given the matter much thought heretofore will now realize more fully that Hiss was convicted, in effect, of passing confidential State papers of the highest importance to active Communist agents. It will be recalled that he was subsequently at the center of activities which in the upshot have proved extremely helpful to Soviet Russia; extremely detrimental to the United States. Mr. Hiss gets much credit for the Yalta Agreement, which led directly and swiftly to the Communist conquest of China. He also gets much credit for securing approval of the Charter of the United Nations in a form that has made it easy for Russia to use that organization as a base for continued espionage, while insuring its worthlessness as an agency for the maintenance of peace.

There was at first no widespread suspicion over the alacrity with which high officials of the administration rushed to the defense of Alger Hiss. There is such suspicion now. And it is strengthened because there is as yet no explanation of why it has taken over 4 years to open up the case of Dr. Fuchs. A

lot of pieces in the jigsaw puzzle are still missing. Some of them seem to have been carefully swept under the carpet. But enough are being belatedly fitted together to give the pattern a certain shape. It is not a pleasant shape.

If a nation cannot clean its house of corruption, not even hydrogen bombs will give it security—the less so if the formulas have already been handed to the Kremlin. And that is why Communist infiltration is bound to become a political issue of the first magnitude—this year—in spite of popular reluctance to have it so.

St. Peter's Evangelical and Reformed Church, Buffalo, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, recently, St. Peter's Evangelical and Reformed Church in Buffalo, N. Y., celebrated the one hundred and fifteenth anniversary of its founding.

This thriving parish, which is located in my home town, has had a brilliant history of over a century of splendid service to its country, its community, and its parishioners.

Since the establishment of this church, its ministers have labored diligently, competently, and fruitfully in giving of their faculties to advance the spiritual morale of their charges.

St. Peter's has attained an aura of venerability in the past century, but it is youthful in its ebullience and vigor. It occupies a respected and unique place in Buffalo and has achieved an enviable record in religious, educational, and community matters and in bringing about cooperation and mutual understanding among the churches of various denominations in western New York.

The seeds sown by its pastors have been productive of an abundant harvest, and its parishioners today carry with them the priceless inheritance bequeathed them by the founders of the parish over 115 years ago.

I want to join heartily with the people of Buffalo in offering to St. Peter's Church my heartiest congratulations on its anniversary and my sincerest wishes for many more years of good work for God and community.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following article from the Buffalo Courier-Express in connection with this historic event:

FAITH OF MAN MAKES EFFECTIVE ARMOR WORKS

St. Peter's Evangelical and Reformed Church, the oldest church of its denomination in Buffalo, observed its one hundred and fifteenth anniversary yesterday.

A keynote sermon was delivered at the morning service by the Reverend Willard A. Krats, minister of Salem Church at Catasauqua, Pa., and vice chairman of the Commission on Christian social action.

Referring to the Apostles' Creed, which was recited by the congregation, the Reverend Mr. Krats said it is an ancient statement of man's conviction in the power of God to help him, as opposed to the destructive powers of what man called evil.

"The character of man has been affected by this conviction of his," he declared. "He has discovered that he is capable of imitating evil, which we call the devil, as well as being noble by the power of good, which is God in us."

The Reverend Mr. Krats continued:

"The character of man as an individual affects his relationship to a community of individuals which we call the congregation and, when joined with people of like convictions, he is able to exert an influence beyond his own individual character. This witness of his faith is not only individual and local but it is world-reaching."

The Reverend Mr. Krats paid tribute to the church's minister, the Reverend William H. Tempest; former pastors; and to Henry Eisenberger, superintendent emeritus of the Sunday school of the church, at Genesee and Hickory.

To Promote the General Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, from the pen of a distinguished clergyman, Rev. William H. Hudnut, D. D., pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church in Rochester, N. Y., comes one of the clearest expressions I have seen on the much-discussed subject of the general welfare.

Under leave to extend my remarks, it follows:

TO PROMOTE THE GENERAL WELFARE

The Constitution has a phrase that is an apt description of one of the necessary functions of government "to promote the general welfare." No responsible government can ever be insensitive to that, and most citizens believe in the welfare state in that sense.

Recently, however, a school of thought has arisen that would rewrite the Constitution at this point and make it read "to guarantee the general welfare." This is something that no democratic government can undertake without in the process impoverishing its citizens and becoming a dictatorship. It is one thing to promote the general welfare, it is quite another thing to guarantee it.

The moment government guarantees my job, food, clothing, and shelter, that moment it both pauperizes and enslaves me. If one employer is not free to fire me, another is not free to hire me. If I am not free to quit one job and seek another, I am bound indeed. But things like that are what guaranteeing the general welfare would involve. The necessary prelude to this kind of welfare state is a police state. All that freedom guarantees is change, insecurity, and choice; but these are priceless.

Remember that guaranteeing our welfare is something that God himself has never tried to do. God gives every bird its food, but He does not throw it into a nest. The bird must work for it and so must man. And as a man works, without every contingency foreseen, without every corner cushioned, and without his physical well-being from cradle to grave a guaranteed conclusion, a strange thing happens to him—he develops independence and character.

Representative WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, is right when he observes that freedom from want, if interpreted as freedom from the necessity to struggle, would be a calamity if ever realized. This is not to say that there should be no planning by government for the good of all, but it is quite different from saying that there should be total planning. No nation can remain free whose citizens transfer to government the initiatives that are rightfully their own responsibilities.

The attempt to promote the general welfare makes men, the attempt to guarantee it makes masters—and puppets.

Was Lincoln a Reactionary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona Tribune of February 11, 1950:

WAS LINCOLN A REACTIONARY?

One of the visible hallmarks of American institutions comes in pairs—a pair of portraits. They are to be found in all American public schools. They are to be found in public libraries, colleges, organizational meeting places, and, in fact, at every place where Americans gather, at home and abroad.

These portraits are of Abraham Lincoln and George Washington, whose birthdays are observed this month.

Abraham Lincoln was famous, among other things, for his clear understanding of his country's basic precepts, for his appreciation of the things for which his country stood. This understanding he was able to use to the benefit of posterity because of his rich gift of expression.

Observe some of the statements which have been the acme of American wisdom since the Civil War:

"You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money."

"You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich."

"You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and his independence."

"You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer."

"You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred."

"You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn."

Last year the President of the United States, replying to criticism of his spending policies and his point 4 to spread American resources around the world, referred to his critics as reactionaries.

The criticism aimed at Mr. Truman was based upon just such Americanisms as those we have quoted from the wisdom of President Abraham Lincoln.

Perhaps that also would make the Great Emancipator a reactionary.

But if that is so, then we need more reactionaries in America.

If we are to accept the word with relation to Lincoln and in the meaning accorded it by the Communists, reactionaries are those who oppose communism and who stand for the American system.

Sadly, our American institutions and our American wisdom seem to mean less to us than they did two decades ago. Our statesmen pay lip service, but their acts belie their words.

What is government for except to preserve the freedom of the people? Beyond any doubt that is the primary purpose of government.

Big government ultimately serves only one major purpose: to build up a clique of big government officials, a class of government Mr. Bigs.

We see them arise wherever big government flourishes. They start out by promising every man a job, a pension, perpetual Federal care. Remember Hitler's speech of 1935, in which he promised every German one of the new people's cars?

Generally, we can see by the record, that political pledges of security and government care develop into realization only for the politicians who make the promises.

In this respect, notice our Government trend toward providing tax-free salaries, or expense accounts, for the President, and other top officials.

Our President now has a staff of 3 secretaries, a special counsel, 5 administration assistants, 3 armed service aides, and numerous persons of mere menial category, for a total of 225, exclusive of the aides, the Secret Service, and the police. The President also has at his service, a yacht, two other craft, including a cabin cruiser, a palatial airplane, the *Independence*, and a fleet of autos, soon to be supplemented by leased armored, bulletproof-glassed limousines.

Most of his staff also have their own Government-owned limousines.

All of this seems to be a world apart from Mr. Truman's socialistic programs to take away man's initiative and independence.

Americans never will have any real security that they haven't earned for themselves unless they are willing to accept servitude to a central government as a condition of security; and, as General Eisenhower said not long ago, the only real economic security available is that "enjoyed" by the inmates of penitentiaries. They don't need to worry about tomorrow, either.

With all this in mind, one more warning from Lincoln offers food for thought:

"If destruction be our lot, we ourselves must be its author and finisher. As a Nation of free men we must live through all time or die by suicide."

J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEBRUARY 6, 1950.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD,
Michigan Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FORD: Sunday night, February 5, Walter Winchell made a plea to his radio audience in behalf of J. Edgar Hoover. It seems the FBI have been tapping Communist telephone lines which has brought about the request for the removal of Mr. Hoover from the Department. I hope I am just one of many thousands that heard this broadcast.

This sort of action, as Mr. Winchell stated, would be as stupid a reflection against our American people as the criticism made against our armed forces commanders in using flame throwers against the Japanese during World War II. What can our American people be thinking of by tearing down our means of protection against forces attempting to disrupt our country?

I am a veteran of World War II with 4½ years' service, 33 months of which were spent fighting the Japanese. It is my understanding the Thirty-second Division had more combat experience than our other fighting units so my basis in criticizing these people is not unfounded.

During the years 1941 to 1945, it seems to me the American public heard enough of the treatment of our boys in service that were unfortunate enough to be captured by the Japs alive. Do these very people ever stop to realize our boys also faced such things as flame throwers and other weapons of destruction that we alone were not guilty of using? Who is it that answers for the captured enemy equipment that was stamped "made in U. S. A."?

Those people not facing these things in reality and continually criticize our country's means of protection from aggression have much to learn.

Any method our FBI uses to stop this aggression inside our own country should be commended not condemned. Above all, we should not lose the one man who has headed this Department so intelligently in the past and most capable, in my opinion, to handle any future activities of our FBI. I must be wrong in thinking any American would think of taking such action for the protection we get from the FBI. These actions must have backings from only communistic organizations.

In such times as these, and with the crisis that faces our freedom today, our country should be protected at all costs be what they may.

Very truly yours,

JAMES W. WELLS.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

Our Nation's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, may I offer a patriotic prayer that was originated by one of my constituents, Rev. Francis C. Young, known as the poet priest, pastor of St. Juliana's Church in Chicago. This patriotic prayer was first presented by him 25 years ago at an installation of Portage Park Post of the American Legion at Chicago in my congressional district.

It has received the formal approval of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and Roosevelt and has been accepted by all patriotic Americans as indicative of our confidence in our country and in the Almighty. The prayer is as follows:

OUR NATION'S PRAYER

O Lord, a sacred peace we crave,
For this, with all our leaders brave
We pray that Thy almighty hand
Will guard and guide our wondrous land.
We'll melt with love the swords of men
To make of them the noblest pen.
With this, dear God, our hope and aim,
Let us enshrine Old Glory's fame.

For us our fathers died by sword
And loved ones spent their lives. O Lord,
Give us unselfish hearts like theirs
To prove our worth as loyal heirs.
Direct our thoughts to holy deeds,
Let love abide among all creeds;
Pray, keep us in Thy watchful care,
We seek, dear Lord, Thy help in prayer.
Amen.

The people of America, regardless of creed, in these days of national and international distress should raise united voices asking for His divine protection, guidance, and assistance.

The spirit expressed in Our Nation's Prayer has moved our national leaders and the people of America since the founding of our Republic.

Legislation From the Committee on Education and Labor Enacted at the First Session of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over Station WJR, Detroit, Mich., on February 10, 1950:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, I want to give you a brief resumé of some of the important legislation that has been reported out of the House Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am the chairman, and was passed by the Congress in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

First, let's talk about the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act which went into effect January 25, 1950. A million and a half workers are now getting higher pay because this law provides that a worker must be paid not less than 75 cents an hour if he is employed in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. No oppressive child labor can now be employed in commerce or the production of goods for commerce, and no children may be employed in agriculture during school hours. For the 22,000,000 workers who are covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act the 75-cent minimum wage means that they once more have real protection for their own living standard even though they may be getting much more than 75 cents an hour because they are now protected from the unfair competition of employers who were paying as low as 40 cents an hour and thus were undercutting all wages in the industry. The business health of the whole country is strengthened, and the children of this country are given greater protection. The entire country benefits from this advance in the improvement of the Federal law establishing minimum fair-labor standards.

The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 was made the law of the land by the Democratic Party under President Roosevelt and has been expanded and modernized in line with our changed economic conditions by the Democratic Party under President Truman. The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 has proved itself an effective instrument for carrying out its liberal aims and its beneficial economic purposes. It has been a good law for the worker and a good law for the employer. It went far to correct substandard labor conditions. It went far toward removing from the great majority of employers of this country who are fair-minded and who want to maintain decent labor standards the fear and the pressure of unfair competition from those who would seek to gain a market at the expense of their own employees. But conditions have changed greatly since 1938. We have moved to a $250,000,000,000 economy, and the 40-cent minimum wage had become out of date. It was

time to reexamine the law. This the Congress has now done under the leadership of a Democratic administration. The new minimum-wage rate of 75 cents an hour directly benefits a million and a half workers whose pay had lagged behind the times. Indirectly, it affords protection to the 23,000,000 workers who are covered by the law. And it is an additional protection of the Nation's economy. Under the Fair Labor Standards Act as it stands today there is vastly greater protection for the children of our country. For the first time oppressive child labor is prohibited in interstate commerce. This will prevent the exploitation of child labor in such fields as transportation and communication. The act now provides clearly and directly the authority needed to deal with the vicious aspects of industrial homework. The fair-labor standards amendments of 1949, is a great achievement and another step forward in our unceasing efforts to promote the general welfare of all the people.

However, I want to point out that in spite of the improvements in the wage-and-hour standards which were made in the past session, I do not believe that the duty of Congress was fully discharged in the field of fair-labor standards with the passage of the 1949 amendments. During the whole session in 1949 I fought for a minimum wage of at least $1 per hour with greatly expanded coverage which would have granted the benefits of this law to millions of additional workers. To this end I introduced H. R. 3053. I was not able to get these provisions in the bill which finally was passed but I am determined to continue the fight and I will not be satisfied until every worker covered by the wage-and-hour law is paid a wage of at least $1 an hour.

Another important bill which was reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor and was passed by the Congress in the last session is a law to provide for the education of children residing on nonsupporting, federally owned property, and children residing in localities overburdened with increased school enrollments resulting from Federal activities in the area. This law provides that assistance should be given only to those school districts that showed a deficit in their maintenance and operation program for this school year—that the total amount of funds available to the school district from all sources was not sufficient to provide a normal school program and that the deficit was caused by defense-incurred school enrollments or reduction in school revenue resulting from the acquisition or ownership of land by the Federal Government. The bill authorized an appropriation of $7,500,000, although the Congress actually appropriated only $7,250,000. Under this law eight school districts in this great State of ours applied to the General Services Administration for assistance. They are:

1. Warren Consolidated school district No. 1, fractional, Warren, and Sterling Townships, Macomb, Mich. Applied for assistance in the amount of $30,000 for the current school year.

2. Lavonia Township school district, Wayne County, Plymouth, Mich. Applied for $[illegible],543.

3. School district No. 7, Nankin Township, Inkster, Mich. Applied for $[illegible],185.

4. Ypsilanti township school district No. 1, fractional, Willow Run Village, Washtenaw County, Mich. Applied for $[illegible],170.

5. School district of the village of Wayne, Wayne County, Mich. Applied for $60,151.

6. School district No. 2, fractional, Erin and Warren Townships, East Detroit, Macomb County, Mich. Applied for $132,968.

7. Romulus school district, Romulus Township, Wayne County, Mich. Applied for $65,206.

8. School district No. 4, Erin Township, Mosertlle, Macomb County, Mich. Applied for $18,944.

The final determination as to eligibility and approval of the amount of allotments has not yet been made. The General Services Administration must determine the total amounts needed by those eligible school districts that have been recommended for allotment and compare this to the $7,250,000 appropriated. It is the hope of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and my personal hope, that we can devise legislation at this session of Congress that will meet this problem on a permanent and uniform basis whenever and wherever it occurs. Such permanent legislation will permit local school authorities to make their plans in advance without waiting each year for the Congress to pass temporary relief legislation.

And now let me tell you about the Federal employees' compensation amendments of 1949. This bill was also reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor and passed by Congress in the last session. It is a law to provide for Federal employees who get injured as a result of their work. Who are these workers? Many of them are your neighbors and friends—the man who delivers your letters or from whom you buy your stamps at the post office is a Government employee. So is the food and drug inspector who protects you as a consumer against filthy food and impure drugs. So is the mechanic who works on airplane motors at a Government air base. So is the weatherman and the typist at the Census Bureau. Every year about 11,000 of these people have an accident on the job. They can't work while they are injured. They or their families would suffer if we didn't provide for their loss of wages. If you were laid up, could your family survive very long without help? Under the old law a permanently and totally disabled man could never receive more than $116 a month for himself and family. Many injured workers received much less. The first thing we did in the new law was to increase the benefits for injured workers and for their families in case of death. A man with a wife and children now can receive up to 75 percent of his former wages if he is completely and permanently disabled. If he is killed on the job his family has similar protection. Here's an actual case: A few months ago a postal employee picked up a parcel-post package. The package exploded in his hands. The employee, a 29-year-old veteran, lost both arms up to the elbows and the sight of both eyes. He will never work again but his wife and several young children will be protected under the new law. The second thing we did in this new law was to include postmasters and other groups of Government workers not covered under the old law. By the way, the old law hadn't been revised for 22 years, in spite of great increases in wages and living costs during that time. The third important thing in the new law is a schedule of payments for permanent disabilities such as injury to the face or head, loss of hearing, loss of a hand, a leg, or a thumb. It goes all the way from a 15-week benefit for loss of a fourth finger to a 312-week benefit for loss of an arm. This new law has been in operation for only several months. The first case decided under it was that of a 72-year-old disabled man who suffered complete loss of his right eye from a flying nail while working as a carpenter for an Army general depot in 1944. Under the amended law, his present benefit check will be doubled for the next 160 weeks, and he will continue on the Federal workmen's compensation rolls as long as he has a loss of wage-earning capacity due to his injury.

Another important piece of legislation which has been reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor is the FEPC bill. This prohibits discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry and creates a Fair Employment Practices Commission to prevent discrimination. A great deal has been said about the efforts of southern Members of Congress to delay or prevent consideration of this bill. I would like to say now that it is my firm conviction that in spite of everything our opponents may do I will be able to force a vote on the FEPC bill at this session of the Congress and that it will pass the House.

Before closing I want to mention that since February 7 the Committee on Education and Labor has been in executive session considering a bill to authorize an appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools and for the general welfare. This bill is better known as Federal aid to education. I believe that this bill will be reported out of the committee at this session.

Let's Deliver Two Blows for Democracy in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States of America have taken their stand at the head of the forces of freedom in the world's war of ideas. They look to us here in Congress—their spokesmen and representatives—to make the thrusts and lay home the blows which will win the fight for men's minds.

It occurs to me that some of us here in Congress are overlooking one of the most effective weapons we could use in the ideological war in the Pacific. It is a weapon which will cost us practically nothing yet will win us the good will of all of the people whose home shores border on or lie wholly within the vast Pacific Basin. I refer to statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

The peoples of the Pacific know of Hawaii and Alaska. They know that they are parts of the United States. They know, too, that for many years the United States has held Hawaii and Alaska at arm's length and has denied them full fellowship in the great Republic of which they are a part.

We are in an all-out struggle with imperialistic Russian communism. The burden is on the United States to defend the democratic way of life. We must convince the world that freedom and democracy, not communism, is the road to a better future for the individual.

What good is it that we talk of equality under law while we continue to deny the full measure of democracy to many of our own people—the people of Hawaii and Alaska?

The Fifty-sixth Congress, which in its infinite wisdom, enacted legislation to annex Hawaii to the United States, saw the picture in the Pacific through the eyes of prophecy. The Fifty-seventh Congress, which in 1900 enacted Hawaii's

Organic Act, made Hawaii an integral part of the United States. Thus, the great Americans who occupied the seats of Congress at the turn of the century envisioned the future of democracy in the Pacific. They gave Hawaii a government of law after the pattern of the governments of the States and the Territories of the American Union. They incorporated Hawaii into the Union as a Territory—a State in being. They made the citizens of Hawaii American citizens.

The annexation of Hawaii occurred in 1898. The United States was then engaged in a war with Spain. We needed the islands as a forward base for operations against our then enemy. Spain was lodged in the Philippines and the small islands of the central Pacific. Hawaii was vital to our young Nation in its war with Spain.

Almost 50 years later, in World War II, the Territory of Hawaii again was vital to our survival in the Pacific. The attack on Pearl Harbor brought home to the people of the United States the knowledge that Hawaii is America. Without Hawaii our survival as a free Nation is threatened.

When the bombs fell on Pearl Harbor the American people cried:

"We have been attacked."

There was no one in America to say:

"Wait. Hawaii is not yet a State."

The 45 United States who welcomed Hawaii into their Union at the turn of the twentieth century have now increased to 48. Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma, then Territories, have since been admitted to the Union.

The American flag has flown over Alaska since 1867. In 1912, the same year that Arizona and New Mexico came into the Union as States, Congress enacted Alaska's Organic Act.

In World War II when the Japs threatened the Aleutian Islands, they threatened the United States. Americans did not draw back and say, "Oh, no. The Japs haven't attacked the United States. They have merely attacked an organized territory."

Today, as we start the second half of the twentieth century, Hawaii and Alaska are far more vital to the United States than at any time in our history. Our only potential enemy is already strongly entrenched on the shores of the western Pacific and is making ominous movements into southeast Asia.

The great Americans who purchased the vast Territory of Alaska and who annexed the Hawaiian Islands saw the future of our great country better than many of us do today. They viewed democracy as an ever-expanding force always moving forward to greater horizons.

As we sit here in this, the Eighty-first Congress, and debate and discuss the admission of Hawaii and Alaska to statehood, more and more of the people on the shores of the Pacific are forsaking—involuntarily—the ways of freedom. While we look with hesitancy at the aspirations of our fellow Americans in Hawaii and Alaska, Russia through its satellites and puppets is taking the millions of Asia to its bosom.

Is it not logical, therefore, that these parts of the United States—Alaska and Hawaii—be taken to our bosom? Is it not logical at this juncture of history that we should bind our own people into our Union with all of the ties at our disposal?

Those who are joining up with the new Russian imperialism are the unwitting victims of a false ideology. They are succumbing to a new superweapon—a monstrously false philosophy which destroys the faith of men in the free way of life.

It is our job to fight this false ideology with the true ideology of democracy. There is no better weapon than truth and ever-recurring professions of faith in the things we stand for.

We must be careful, however, to see to it that what we do matches up to what we profess and what we say. And it is therein that I derive my zeal for immediate action on statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

To my way of thinking, the time has come for Americans to make a profession of faith in democracy in language the world will understand. The time has come for us to get on the street corners of the world and announce that Hawaii and Alaska, at their own request, have been admitted into the American Union of sovereign States as equals. They have both earned this right.

Prayer at Lincoln Day Banquet at Lock Haven, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include one of the most beautiful and inspirational prayers I have ever had the pleasure of listening to. It was offered by Rev. Burleigh Peters, pastor of St. Johns Lutheran Church, Lock Haven, Pa., at the Lincoln Day banquet sponsored by the Clinton County Republican Committee, Friday, February 10, at which our own beloved GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan, was guest speaker:

Ever blessed God, our heavenly Father, through whose righteous will everyone of us is sustained and whose goodness is evident upon every hand, we truly call upon Thee at the beginning of this meeting. Let it not be in a perfunctory manner but rather with a deep sense of our great need of Thee and Thy wisdom and counsel as colaborers with Thee in the execution of Thy divine plan for good, sound government in our beloved land. Help us as instruments in Thy hand to raise up honest, God-fearing men as aspirants for public office. Endow those in office with a new clarity of comprehension to see, o'er the night time comes upon them and us, the exceedingly dangerous road we are traveling toward the socialistic welfare state. Teach us again, O God, to lift up our eyes unto the hills, for from whence shall our help come but from Thee? May our Nation truly turn from the materialistic gods of our day unto Thee, the true God, the God of our fathers, who can and will give again unto our people the good grain rather than the empty husks of glorified promises. As our forefathers trusted so implicitly in Thee in the forests primeval and in that faith so wisely laid the foundations of our great Nation and whose labors have been abundantly blessed with high honor, great integrity, and immense wealth among the nations of the earth, so give use now the wisdom, determination, and vision to arrest this tragic descent e'er we slip entirely from off that foundation into utter ruin. Be pleased, O our Gracious God, that never shalt Thou see nor history record, the collapse of the United States of America because she lost her faith in Thee.

May this meeting and all similar ones in this campaign be animated by the spirit of true statesmanship rather than just politics. The hour our Father, has arrived in our history when all true, wholehearted, God-fearing, Americans must stand up and be counted that this Government perish not from the earth. May all be done here tonight in the interest of good government.

Even the food of which we shall soon partake came from Thee. For it we are truly thankful, and may the deep interest in our good American heritage prevail now and henceforth. We pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

Roles of Alaska and Canada in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the following editorial, under leave to extend my remarks, which appeared in the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin:

JOINT DEFENSE WORK

Alaska is so close to Siberia that it is impossible to ignore the possibility of a drive into the North American continent at that point, and it is folly to set up a first line of defense in Europe without giving thought to what might happen if Alaska should be left unguarded or poorly so.

While Alaska is American territory, Canada adjoins it and cannot fail to recognize that any invasion of Alaska would, or could, mean the overrunning of Canada unless there are adequate means established to prevent it. The logical defense therefore lies in strengthening Alaska, but it is impossible for Canada to overlook the need of looking carefully to its defense plans in that direction.

Through the cooperative efforts of the two countries which have maintained peace for more than a century, and which have worked together loyally when they have had to face emergencies created by others, the means of preventing war through defense sufficiently strong to discourage an aggressor must be recognized on this continent as well as across the Atlantic. Much dependence will naturally be placed on the United States but there is a part which Canada should and doubtless will take. The joint maneuvers which have been arranged in Alaska indicate that the Dominion is giving thought to its responsibility.

Valley Authorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement on valley authorities from the Government Affairs Legislative Daily of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America for January 10, 1950, as follows:

A little cofferdam was thrown across the Tennessee River in Alabama before the close of the First World War.

Later—30 years and hundreds of millions of dollars later—it develops that the little dam was the start of the now controversial valley authority idea.

What happened?

In 1933 President Roosevelt told Congress that something must be done to protect what had become a great national investment in the Muscle Shoals area. He asked Congress to create a Tennessee Valley Authority which would have the "broadest duty of planning for the proper use, conservation, and development of the natural resources of the Tennessee River drainage basin and its adjoining territory for the general social and economic welfare of the Nation."

"If we are successful here," he concluded, "we can march on, step by step, to a like development of other great natural territorial units within our borders."

Congress, a little later that year, did create the TVA, avowedly for primary purposes of flood control and navigation.

In 1934, the President said that the valley authorities were going to be copied in every State in the Union before we get through.

Today, the Tennessee Valley Authority has developed into an octopus whose tentacles have spread over seven southeastern States.

Taxpayers in every State of the Union have contributed to a Government corporation which has fixed assets, before depreciation, of $611,300,000 as of June 30, 1948.

Most people are well acquainted with the activities of the TVA, the one existing valley authority. They know, for example, that TVA generates and sells power to consumers and industries in the valley; that the Authority administers flood control, navigation, and soil-conservation programs which in other parts of the country are administered by the Army engineers and the Department of Agriculture; and that the Authority subsidizes the production of fertilizer in competition with an established fertilizer industry.

The average person also knows that the economic function of generating electrical energy in the valley is performed by the Federal Government and not by people through their self-supporting business institutions, and that power is sold at about half its cost.

The earliest proponents spoke of the valley authority idea as an expression of the need for a body politic intermediate between the State and the Nation, as an expression of the inappropriateness of existing State boundaries, and as an outgrowth of the federalizing tendency which requires closer articulation between State and national activity.

The planners, however, saw no chance that State boundaries could be changed or that a regional body politic could be superimposed upon these States. They needed a way around these difficulties and the valley authority idea provided a method.

In 15 years, there has been no fundamental change in the thinking that lies behind the valley authority idea. The idea now, as then, is Federal-regional planning with the plans administered by a single agency directed by three men. Furthermore, those selected to direct this enterprise must start free from loyalties to competing Federal bureaus, and then, as now, it was considered imperative that the three men have a public, rather than a private point of view.

Fifteen years ago, the planners called for national control of all the running waters of the United States, from the desert trickle * * * to the rushing flood waters of the Mississippi. This is still a number one objective.

Thirteen years ago these planners were united in their opposition to the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. "Neither the Corps of Engineers nor the Bureau of Reclamation," they wrote, "should be assigned to this new regional operating service." They believed that the idea that people and existing agencies could work together for the common good was an out-moded, tradition-bound, and static concept. Instead, the unique character of the task and its key importance called for the creation of a new and special Federal operating agency.

If the essence of the valley authority idea is three Federal appointees controlling a region, then there is a pattern for the future under which 48 States with their governors and legislative bodies are to be forced into the background to make way for government by 27 men to be appointed—and thereby controlled—by one man.

The question for all citizens to decide is whether under the pattern of the valley authority idea this Nation would still be the United States of America.

OMNIBUS LEGISLATION

The valley authority idea was incorporated in two different types of bills in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress—bills which are still pending, of course. The first is an omnibus measure which would create nine valley authorities to blanket the Nation.

Representative RANKIN, Democrat of Mississippi, introduced a bill (H. R. 894) which would create these regional operations:

Atlantic Seaboard Authority.
Great Lakes-Ohio Valley Authority.
Tennessee Valley Authority.
Missouri Valley Authority.
Arkansas Valley Authority.
Southwestern Authority.
Columbia Valley Authority.
California Valley Authority.
Colorado Valley Authority.

This omnibus bill is designed to (1) "develop, integrate and coordinate plans, projects and activities for or incidental to" navigation, flood control, reclamation, and generation, sale and distribution of electric power; (2) improve living conditions; (3) aid commerce among the States; (4) strengthen the national defense; (5) conserve water, soil and forest resources; (6) stabilize employment and relieve unemployment, and (7) otherwise protect and promote the national interest.

Under H. R. 894, the President would appoint an administrator for each authority, except TVA which would continue in its present form. The Authority could acquire by purchase, lease or condemnation any property it deems necessary. Regional policies would be made to conform to national policies with due regard for regional and local requirements. Each authority would consult and cooperate with the States insofar as practicable.

Should Congress approve any such project, the Authority could at once proceed with its construction and operation. To encourage wide use of power and water, the authority could acquire or build or maintain such canals and transmission lines as it deems necessary. Priority in purchase of the power would be given to States, districts, counties and municipalities.

Although each authority could determine how it kept its accounts, the United States Comptroller would be required to audit the accounts at least once a year. All receipts of the authorities would go into the United States Treasury.

One of the most important of the provisions appears near the end of the bill. It reads: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

THE CVA BILL

The second type of enabling legislation that has been introduced is the actual bill for creation of one of these valley authorities.

It is S. 1645 which was introduced last spring by Senator Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington, for himself and Senators Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennessee; Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota; Chavez, Democrat, of New Mexico; Murray, Democrat, of Montana; Langer, Republican, of North Dakota; Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois; McGrath, Democrat, of Rhode Island; Pepper, Democrat, of Florida; Sparkman, Democrat, of Alabama; Hill, Democrat, of Alabama; Green, Democrat, of Rhode Island; Wagner, Democrat of New York; Taylor, Democrat, of Idaho; Gillette, Democrat, of Iowa; Johnston, Democrat, of South Carolina; and Johnson, Democrat, of Texas.

An examination of S. 1645 is appropriate because it could serve as a pattern for authorities for other sections of the Nation. It provides the basic legal structure for regional authority control, but leaves much to the uncertainties of administrative ruling and interpretation.

1. Declaration of policy: The Government's policy in the CVA would be to use the area's water, land, forest, and other natural resources for fostering commerce among the States, strengthening the national defense, developing the lands of the United States, and for promoting the general welfare. The area to be included would be the United States portions of the Columbia River, its tributaries and watershed areas, plus major portions of Washington and Oregon not in the watersheds.

2. Creation of a Government corporation: A Columbia Valley Administration would be created under the general supervision of the President of the United States. It would have all authority of the Federal Government and would me managed by a 3-man board of directors appointed by the President, who would name the chairman. Two of the three directors would have to be bona fide residents of the region and all members would have to profess a belief in the feasibility and wisdom of the act. The board would be responsible directly to the President—not to Congress.

3. State and local participation: The Valley Administration would seek the advice, assistance and participation of the people to the fullest practicable extent. There would be consultation with appropriate representatives of the people; advisory boards could be set up as may be necessary or appropriate and their comments shall be included in the annual report.

The Administration would be free from any State or local control even from the jurisdiction of State courts, for any proceedings brought against it in a State court could be transferred at once to a Federal district court. That provision is especially important where water rights are involved.

4. General powers: The Administration would construct, operate, and maintain projects for navigation, flood control, conservation of land, development of resources, and generation, transmission, and disposition of power and for the execution of such other

responsibilities as are vested in the Administration pursuant to this act. To the extent found necessary or appropriate, the Administration could acquire real and personal property.

The Administration would undertake experiments and practical demonstrations. It would determine the necessity for the character and amount of its expenditures and how they should be paid. It could work with other agencies.

Construction work would be carried out by contract so far as practicable, but the Authority could do the work itself in emergencies or unusual circumstances, when no reasonable bids are received or where necessary to provide certain employment for maintenance crews.

5. Coordination of plans: The administration would prepare plans and projects and programs for consideration of the President and Congress. Such operations would provide for water use and conservation, improvements by irrigation and drainage, conservation of wildlife, recreational facilities, and for the use of the mineral, forest, land, water, fish, and other resources of the region as a balanced and stable economic development. The CVA directors would decide whether proposed projects are economically sound and in the public interest. All programs, projects, and activities would have to be effectively coordinated with related national policies and programs.

6. Sale of power: The Administration would sell electric energy so as to encourage its wide use at low rates, with preference to Federal agencies, States, and their political subdivisions, and to cooperatives. The CVA directors would build or acquire transmission lines. Sale of power to private utilities would be under contract, which contract could be canceled by CVA upon written notice (not more than 5 years) and which could contain such terms and conditions as the Administration may deem appropriate for carrying out the purposes of the act. Thus it would be possible to starve many existing companies.

7. Reclamation provisions: The Administration, the bill says, would proceed in conformity with State laws relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used for domestic, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes, and in the acquisition of land incident to the construction of dams, reservoirs, etc. But, nevertheless, it could condemn water rights appurtenant to such land. And the reclamation activities would have to be consistent with national agriculture policies.

The Administration would establish the maximum size of farm units within each project for the reclamation of lands * * * but no farm unit shall contain more than 160 or less than 10 acres of irrigable land. No benefits from such projects could be made available to owners of lands whose individual holdings exceed the maximum area unless the owners agreed to sell acreage in excess of maximum.

8. Financing: A Columbia Valley Administration fund, of unspecified size, would be created in the Federal Treasury with funds Congress would appropriate. The CVA could then tap those funds in such amounts as the Administration may deem necessary. The money would be repaid over a reasonable period of years, receipts from projects and activities may be used to repay project costs. No major project could be undertaken unless it was included in the CVA's annual budget program which Congress must approve, but need do nothing more.

9. Tax payments: The CVA would attempt to avoid impairment of the finances of a State because of removal of property from its tax rolls. In fact, the CVA could be required to make tax payments to States but under certain conditions which CVA directors would determine. CVA would be guided by, among other things, the amount of increase in taxable values and other benefits arising from the activities of the Administration. The CVA property franchises and income would be expressly exempted from any taxation. Here is a case where the taxpayer decides how much taxes are due, if any.

10. Personnel: The Administration would be required to employ and fix compensation of officers, employees, attorneys, agents, and consultants without regard to the civil-service laws.

11. Legal interpretations: This act shall be liberally construed to carry out the purposes of Congress to provide for the disposition of and make needful rules and regulations respecting Government properties entrusted to the Administration, provide for the national defense, improve navigation, control destructive floods and promote interstate commerce and the general welfare.

THE ISSUES

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States is strongly opposed to regional authorities.

It believes that if the Columbia Valley Authority were to be established, it could lead to creation of a network of authorities blanketing the country.

The valley-authority idea should be rejected for the following principal reasons:

1. The carefully developed and coordinated planning for resource development that has aided the Pacific Northwest over the years would be abandoned in favor of a three-man board of political appointees, responsible only to the President.

Eighty-six major power dams already operate in the Columbia Basin. There are 32 major irrigation dams. And there are 12 major multipurpose dams. More than 500 miles of flood-control levees protect the land. About 9,800,000 acres are under irrigation.

Seventy percent of the basin's forests are maintained on a scientific perpetual-yield basis. Sixty percent of all farms are in soil-conservation districts. A much higher percentage of farms are electrified than in the TVA. The average use of electricity is higher and the average price is lower.

Four years ago Federal and State agencies formed the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee to coordinate development of the area.

It is understandable, therefore, that the idea of creating valley authorities comes not from the people, except from some locals of the CIO and the Farmers' Union, but from the Federal Government. The Governors of Oregon, Idaho, Washington, Nevada, and Wyoming—five of the States that would be affected—have expressed opposition to CVA.

2. The Supreme Court has interpreted broadly the powers of the Federal Government involving water rights and reclamation development. It has decided (a) that the Federal Government has full power and authority over all navigable streams; (b) that Federal control of navigable streams extends to the entire basin of the streams; and (c) that if State laws conflict with Federal control over local waters, the State law need not be complied with and may be ignored. Thus, State rights could be obliterated. Directors of a valley authority could determine upon a course, consulting only as much as they deemed necessary with States, regional groups, and local communities. The value of interstate compacts could be wiped out.

Language in the various valley-authority bills is vague. So until the identities of the three board members became known and they had a chance to put their own interpretations on that language, it is difficult to appraise precisely the extent of the problems that would be created. As former Chairman David Lilienthal of the TVA once said publicly: "TVA, if it were politically managed, could become a curse to this valley."

3. Former Interior Secretary Harold L. Ickes, while favoring valley authorities under certain conditions, frankly told a Senate committee during hearings in 1945 on a Missouri Valley Authority bill: "There is before you a major step in the basic reorganization of the Government of the United States as we have known it for the 150 years. * * * It is a theory that strikes at the very roots of present Government organization."

4. An authority, in the form of a Federal corporation, having substantial autonomy, would be free of many of the legal and congressional checks and restraints.

Projects probably could be initiated at the will of the authority directors. Their purpose could be that of the directors only. Accounting methods would be determined by the directors. They could deal with whom they pleased. They would have broad powers of eminent domain and condemnation. They would not be subject to regulation by any State or Federal commission.

Usually Congress authorizes the construction of separate projects in an area. Subsequently it has to appropriate the actual money for them. The valley-authority idea would give Congress only one chance to gage the merit and cost of new construction. And Congress would be asked to set up a general authority found in the Treasury which CVA directors could tap at will.

5. Untold new billions of dollars in taxes would have to be raised. Estimates are that CVA would cost at least $3,000,000,000 for water projects only and the Missouri Valley Authority about $5,000,000,000 for water and agricultural projects. The valley-authority idea contemplates nine authorities to blanket the country.

6. Flood control versus power development: Anyone who can build dams can control floods. One of the first, if not the first, jobs of an authority is to supply power. The fuller the reservoir behind a dam, the more power. The emptier the reservoir when floods come, the more flood control. There's a major conflict—unless a dam is large enough to adequately serve both purposes.

NATIONAL CHAMBER POLICY

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States believes that the Federal Government has a responsibility for the development and use of water resources for navigation. So have the States and so has private enterprise. The chamber has repeatedly reaffirmed its advocacy of national legislative policies which recognize the interests and rights of the States in water utilization and control and afford full opportunity for States and their communities and private enterprise to participate in the development and operation of water-resource projects.

The national chamber holds that the Congress is responsible for the wise management of this Federal interest in water and that it should establish, and adhere to, a consistent and progressive water-resource policy for the United States, defining the scope of the duties and obligations which the Federal Government legally can and should assume. Only the Congress should authorize the projects and assign their construction and operation to the appropriate Federal agency.

The national chamber advocates such development only upon sound engineering and economical principles and in aid of well-defined purposes. Complete cost analyses should be maintained for all beneficial uses. Commercial uses, such as power, should provide for taxes, interest, and other cost factors common to business enterprise.

The Comptroller General should be vested with jurisdiction over the application of all

revenues for multipurpose projects, with authority to require the deposit of such revenues to the purposes prescribed by Congress.

All local agencies, both public and private, should, by participating in a regional power pool, have opportunity to distribute and sell surplus power at Government dams.

The national chamber believes that under the foregoing principles applicable to water-resources development, there is no place for regional authorities. Therefore, it has declared repeatedly that:

"Federal regional authorities are opposed. They substitute Federal controls over natural resources by encroaching upon or displacing State jurisdiction. The extension of the regional idea to the entire country would mean the eventual disregarding of State lines and a new subdividing of the United States on a regional basis. Local and State government would be subordinated to centralized Federal control, not only of the waters, but also, in large degree, of the national economy. The Federal Government should continue to use its regularly established agencies, operating on a national basis, for activities properly belonging to the Federal Government in relation to natural resources."

The Progress of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to enclose the following article from the Exeter News-Letter, Exeter, N. H., Thursday, February 2, 1950, by Mr. James P. Lynch:

THERE IS NO ROOM FOR INTOLERANCE

(By James P. Lynch)

If we were to tell some people that they were supporters of certain communistic doctrines they would be provoked. Yet in their everyday life, they unconsciously, by word and deed, embrace, to a certain extent, the program of communism. The number is relatively small but, nevertheless, there are such contributors.

If these people would only realize that when they carry the torch of intolerance the only one who gains satisfaction is the master of the Kremlin. We have seen in the past several months many cases of intolerance among the wealthy and also among the poor. Internal friction in America is of grave concern to each and every one of us. Some have forgotten that we all are created equal.

The United States has been going forward and we cannot afford to allow intolerance to creep in and halt such progress. Our forefathers came here because they knew it was a land of freedom—a land of love and brotherhood. Regardless of what kind of blood ran in their veins—Irish, English, Scotch, French, Polish, Spanish, Swedish, or the many other nationalities—they left behind a land that could in no way compare with the freedom-loving United States. Here they were given opportunities. They were interested in tolerance. They had seen the pitfall of a Europe where the peoples from one nation were set against another. In fact, within the borders of their own states they were accustomed to diversity. Love thy neighbor was just these words to many of them.

The big gap between the words "hate" and "love" was quite descriptive of some of their homeland. When they arrived in this country they did not want the word "hate" accompanying them, they were interested only in the word "love."

When hate creeps in, regardless of the methods used, division follows. Harmony is in good company when it goes along with the word "freedom." However, when hate and fear step into the picture harmony steps out. Also the government weakens and as a result the future problems are similar to those that confronted the Old World.

Every American, whether he speaks in a small private group or in a large public gathering, should be denounced vigorously if he is guilty of committing the crime of intolerance. Race and creed hatred shall never be a substitute for love and respect.

Many months ago a young Jewish lad from Lynn, Mass., was the victim of assault by some of his little neighbors. The boy was beaten because he was a Jew. It was very unfortunate that such a deplorable incident occurred. To put the entire blame on these youngsters would be wrong inasmuch as the parents of these children were more to blame.

This case created considerable comment not only within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts but also throughout the country. People denounced the tactics. The remarks made by Oscar J. Toye, Massachusetts department commander of the Jewish War Veterans, were of an exceptional nature and they are a great contribution toward the much-needed promotion of tolerance in America. Toye sent a letter to the little Jewish boy, Laurence Goldstein, and gave him some real good American advice. In part of the letter he stated: "Your job and mine is to see to it that the few people who do not understand America do not get hold of it and spoil it."

That was advice from a prominent person to a little youngster. It was advice that each and every American should follow during his everyday life. We need not be reminded that during recent years there are certain radicals that have been doing their utmost to get in top positions throughout the Nation. One bad apple can spoil a bushel. This youngster's severe beating because he was a Jew should be a challenge to the people to stop the spread of the deplorable tactics used by those that have no love or affection for their fellow man.

No man or woman cares to have his religion or his ancestry torn to shreds. It is regrettable when people stoop so low that they are able to instill such debauchery into the hearts and minds of their little youngsters. This was the case in Lynn. We all realize children must be taught, and the youngsters that beat up this little boy because he was a Jew would never have acted as they did if they were not subjected to such slander in their own homes.

Commander Toye proved that instead of being intolerant, the best way to win your case is through love and affection. In discussing the uncalled-for assault he pointed out that the youngster received an undeserved beating at the hands of ill-bred and misinformed youngsters who were brought up in an unwholesome atmosphere.

Unwholesome atmosphere and ill-breeding is not necessarily confined to any certain section of a city or town. The rich and the poor sections alike can produce the condition.

It should not be necessary to remind those bigots that under the American way of life people make no distinction between Christian or Jew, white or colored. Also, we in America have the right to pray to God as we wish and to express our minds as freely as we want.

Toye tried to persuade the youngster of the dire need for love and kindness in winning the battles throughout life and to use force only when forced to do so. As he stated: "I am very much afraid that because of these boys who beat you and called you 'Jew,' you might be led to believe that you were assaulted by Christians. I want to say to yourself that these boys were not Christians. Christians do not hate others or beat them. The Christian religion, like the Jewish religion, teaches love for one another. I do not care of what parentage these boys are or to what church they go. When they did what they did to you, they took themselves out of the Christian faith and out of any other religion, and they have no further right to call themselves Christians."

This could be so aptly put in referring to a portion of the adults that go around, day after day, ridiculing people because of their religious beliefs. The time they spend on such a deplorable cause could be used to much greater advantage in attending to their business of bringing up their children in the spirit of love and respect for other human beings, regardless of race, creed, or color.

These religious and racial agitators more recently have used a form of approach that is below gutter level. It has been brought out by commentators and newsmen during the past few days. In all cases it has been denounced because of its filthy falsifications, and use of false signatures. It is a letter supposedly signed by a Catholic attacking some Protestant missionaries. However, the Official Catholic Directory has no record of a Catholic priest by the name employed. The directory lists every recognized Catholic ecclesiastical organization, as well as every Catholic priest in the Nation. The attempt to denounce the Catholic Church and to make use of such a vicious and false letter, the object of which is to foment bigotry and discord, has little place in the American scheme of things.

Unfortunate, too, for the promoters of tolerance, is the bickering of certain lecturers and preachers. We heartily agree that it is much wiser and much more beneficial to be for something than against everything.

Those that are willing to participate in spreading bigotry and the false teachings of hate are un-American. They belong to that small poisonous group of people who live in America but who are very definitely our real enemies.

Many people probably feel that these intolerant disciples will sooner or later quiet down and the threat will be just a memory. It would be far better to be assured that intolerance could be erased for the well-being of ourselves and the children of America. Check it before it is too late. The elimination of hatred in America will be a severe blow to those that desire to spread the communistic doctrine in our land. We could write a thousand laws to combat the infiltration of such wicked tactics but the greatest contribution to the cause is for the freedom-loving people to denounce such radicalism right in their own section, before it starts to spread.

Pottery Industry Faces Collapse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, a serious condition exists in one of the important segments of our vast and diversified field of industrial enterprise. It has developed as a result of the reciprocal trade agreements negotiated by the State Department at Annecy, France, last summer. It brings to our attention another example of the lack of vision and incompetence of the Department in handling economic affairs. As I will show you, the continuation of such policies will lead to a wider rupture of the industrial life of the Nation, with increasing unemployment and other economic distress.

The situation I particularly wish to emphasize and call to your attention concerns pottery and glassware. Factories manufacturing these products in Ohio are closing down. Many workers who have grown up and are skilled in this type of work are being forced out of their jobs. It is time for the Government to arouse itself. Japan and Europe are copying the designs and manufacturing pottery and glassware items, and sending them to this country. Because of the low tariff rates agreed to by the State Department, an unfair competitive situation has arisen which is putting our workers and factories out of business.

As you know, it also has been reported that 80 percent of the reciprocal-trade agreements made at Annecy affected farm commodities. When the farmers wake up to this, I am sure you will hear a roar of protests and demands for a quick reversal of this policy.

With this section of our industry already hard hit, it is the start of a trend which will grow from these ill-considered trade agreements.

Figures from the United States Tariff Commission of December 1949 clearly show what is happening. Total imports of table and art glassware for the first 11 months of 1948 amounted to $2,121,-305; for the corresponding period of 1949 they amounted to $2,665,692.

Is it any wonder the domestic glass business is folding up?

Before this snowballs into greater proportions and rolls into other fields of industrial activity, let us take action. And at the same time do something to help the workers and the glass and pottery industry.

I also wish to include with my remarks a copy of the letter I have written to my colleague, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, of which I am privileged to be a member, urging that the committee take the lead in investigating the reasons for the economic plight of the pottery business and initiate efforts to help all small business to assure us a strong, expanding economy.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1950.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: In this letter, I wish to express two things: First, my disappointment over the statements made in the release on Small Business Organizations.

I have two reasons for objecting to this: First, I never understood that the committee was authorized to release such a report. The copy of the minutes I have show that it was not authorized. The report also is superficial and makes unwarranted insinuations in regard to the firms investigated.

My second purpose in writing is: I believe the committee should take constructive steps to solve the problems of small business. For instance, the pottery and glassware industry in Ohio is closing down. Men are losing their jobs. I feel that part of the economic problems of this industrial enterprise can be laid at the door of the State Department as a result of reciprocal trade agreements entered into without knowledge, consent, or advice of Congress. When small business like this is being hurt, I think it is our duty to investigate the causes, and to help find a solution, if it is at all within our power. I contend that the committee's efforts should be along this line, rather than trying to pin a tag on some group of alleged business representatives. Our job is to help small business, and to see that legislative action is taken to assist this important part of our economy. Small business—no matter in what field it functions—is the backbone of our great economic heritage.

Because of the serious economic plight of the pottery and glassware industry, I am making a statement on the floor of the House bringing it to the attention of the Members. I believe that the Small Business Committee could be of great assistance by cooperating and taking the lead in starting an investigation to dig out the facts and, if possible, get this small-business enterprise back on its feet.

Thanking you for your interest and consideration, with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours.

(Copy to Hon. CHARLES HALLECK.)

What Mr. Truman's Yearly Expenditures Mean to Each County in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the tables listed below there are three columns that show each Nebraska county's share in this year's Federal expenditures, in the total national debt, and the 1948 assessed valuation of the land in each county.

Mr. Truman's budget calls for $42,439,-000,000. The proportionate cost of this spending budget for each county is based on the 1948 consumer-income figures.

The President estimated the Federal debt will be $263,800,000,000 at the end of the coming year. Each county's share of the national debt is based on population estimates of January 1, 1949, and a per capita debt of $1,759.

The assessed valuation for the farm lands shown in the third column is taken from State reports in the Library of Congress based on 1948 appraisals.

To illustrate what is involved in these tables let us take the case of my home county, Kearney. Based on that county's income they will have to pay $1,251,900 as their share of the coming year's spending of the Truman administration.

Kearney County's share of the national debt, on a per capita basis, is $11,081,700, while the value of all their farm land, and it is distinctly a farm community, is $9,890,745.

It is estimated that Lancaster County, with the greatest assessed land worth in my congressional district, will have to pay $38,220,200 as its share of 1 year of spending by the Truman administration. The value of the farm lands in Lancaster County—and they are very fine lands—is only $28,038,235. Lancaster County's share of the national debt, based on a per capita estimate, is $189,972,000.

It will be interesting for the citizens of Nebraska to inquire of their county treasurer how much tax he collects for schools, roads, townships, counties, and State governments in 1 year.

County	Share of fiscal 1951 Federal expenditures of $42,439,000,000	Share of Federal debt of $263,800,000,000 at end of fiscal 1951	1948 assessed farm valuation
FIRST, NEBRASKA			
Adams	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Chase	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Clay	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Dundy	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Fillmore	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Franklin	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Frontier	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Furnas	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Gage	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Gosper	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Harlan	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Hayes	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Hitchcock	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Jefferson	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Johnson	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Kearney	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Lancaster	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nemaha	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nuckolls	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Pawnee	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Phelps	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Red Willow	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Richardson	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Saline	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Thayer	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Webster	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total	[illegible]	[illegible]	
SECOND, NEBRASKA			
Cass	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Douglas	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Otoe	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Sarpy	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Washington	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total	[illegible]	[illegible]	
THIRD, NEBRASKA			
Antelope	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Boone	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Burt	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Butler	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Cedar	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Colfax	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Cuming	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Dakota	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Dixon	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Dodge	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Hamilton	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Knox	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Madison	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Merrick	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nance	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Pierce	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Platte	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Polk	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Saunders	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Seward	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Stanton	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Thurston	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wayne	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
York	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total	[illegible]	[illegible]	
FOURTH, NEBRASKA			
Arthur	171,300	[illegible]	[illegible]
Banner	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Blaine	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Box Butte	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Boyd	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Brown	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Buffalo	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Cherry	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Cheyenne	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Custer	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Dawes	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Dawson	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Deuel	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Garden	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Garfield	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Grant	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Greeley	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

County	Share of fiscal 1951 Federal expenditures of $42,430,000,000	Share of Federal debt of $250,000,000,000 as of end of fiscal 1951	1948 assessed land valuation
FOURTH, NEBRASKA—CONT.			
Hall	$10,281,400	$15,538,200	$12,330,[illegible]
Holt	2,668,000	4,077,800	11,054,760
Hooker	[illegible]	2,248,700	1,317,775
Howard	1,210,100	3,016,600	5,[illegible]
Keith	1,416,900	1,433,400	6,261,305
Keya Paha	676,400	4,797,500	2,225,600
Kimball	934,300	6,084,200	5,258,591
Lincoln	6,378,100	8,930,200	11,654,920
Logan	357,700	2,462,600	1,996,665
Loup	226,300	2,814,400	1,626,948
McPherson	175,200	1,750,000	1,[illegible]
Merrill	1,708,200	4,509,200	7,035,175
Perkins	1,160,800	3,443,200	6,056,375
Rock	810,200	3,094,700	3,[illegible]
Scotts Bluff	10,512,500	17,434,800	17,[illegible]
Sheridan	2,270,100	6,364,600	8,[illegible]
Sherman	1,126,100	1,991,700	6,[illegible]
Sioux	438,700	1,806,700	5,288,805
Thomas	286,900	2,246,700	[illegible]
Valley	1,[illegible]	2,[illegible]	7,175,535
Wheeler	188,100	2,900,300	3,258,468
Total	78,133,700	[illegible]	

A Plea for Our Domestic Mining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, a most critical situation exists in our domestic mining industry, and for the information of my colleagues I am appending hereto the statement of a representative of the small-mine operators of Idaho before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, on February 9, 1950:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM R. NEW BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 9, 1950

My name is William R. New, of Hailey, Idaho. I am secretary of the Idaho Small-Mine Operators Association and director of the bureau of public relations of the western division of mining activities.

Our entire national economy is based on the production of raw materials, the products of our farms, mines, and forests.

The combined income of agriculture and mining is always one-fifth of our national income; and every time there is a reduction of $1,000,000,000 in mining or agriculture, our national income must drop $5,000,000,000.

No segment of our society can escape the effect of this economic law. It affects the retailer, the wholesaler, the manufacturer, and wage earner alike.

Labor may think it can escape this law by keeping wages high, but the percentage of reduction in our national income will be reflected in unemployment.

The farmer may think he can escape it by subsidies, but unemployment will bring reduction in consumption and continue to pile up huge surpluses.

Seventy percent of our metal mines are now closed and this will adversely affect employment and every line of business.

While our own mines are being closed, we are importing foreign metals which will not be available to us in the event of war; and I want to say very frankly to you that unless something is done to put our mines in operation, we are going to lose the next war.

In closing, let me emphasize that rather than reducing the present depletion allowance of 15 percent, I believe it should be increased to at least 25 percent to compensate the mines for the exhaustion of their mineral resources.

Let me emphasize again the fact that unless legislation is enacted, making it possible for our mines to go into full production, we cannot hope to win the next war because we cannot depend on the importation of foreign metals.

Surrendering Just a Little

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the one worlders, those who would commit us to some form of a united states of the world, are out in the open.

Here are excerpts from the testimony of Justice Roberts which would seem to indicate that, to him at least, the writers of the Constitution, those who have fought so hard to preserve us a Nation, have just been mistaken.

The testimony was given before a committee of the other body last week and is as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE OWEN J. ROBERTS, FORMER JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT, PRESIDENT OF THE ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE, ON THE ATLANTIC UNION CHARTER RESOLUTION BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, WASHINGTON, D. C., SENATOR ELBERT D. THOMAS, CHAIRMAN OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

Senator KEFAUVER. Mr. Justice Roberts.

Justice ROBERTS. I have proposed this statement more or less as a lawyer would prepare a brief. * * *

Senator WILEY. You are sure it is not a judicial decision, instead of a lawyer's brief. * * *

Justice ROBERTS. No, sir. It's an advocate's presentation. * * *

This resolution requests the President to appoint citizens delegates to such a convention and invites the other six nations who joined with us in the Atlantic Pact to send similar delegates. In other words, it is the old pact of the Convention 1787, when the States sent their citizens to discuss the thing and report back.

They are wondering when the Marshall plan runs out what is going to happen to them. They are wondering if we are going to be a little too late with military aid to them; in fact, I don't see how military aid to western Europe will prevent Russian overflow of the whole country, but, be that as it may, they are none too happy, and I think this sort of a great gesture would give moral courage all over the world.

Senator WILEY. You make yourself very clear. However, while your argument is persuasive in that regard, we had, of course, to fight the Civil War to determine whether we were a Union or not. South Carolina and other States made up their minds they had a right to step out, and do otherwise what we asked them to do. Now, you run into a situation that is apparent in Europe today, and I think it goes to the will and desire, and what you might call the faith of these people, who have been pounded through the centuries.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. I have only one question, Mr. Justice; it embraces all the others. Assume that you and I are appointed delegates to the conference, assume we have drawn up a constitution, or whatever you want to call it, and we have come back to report to our country. Will you dare come back with me if I go on the floor of the Senate and say that we have made arrangements whereby I have got to admit that the flag is removed from the Capitol?

Justice ROBERTS. I don't see why you should say that.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. I shall explain more, because it is the most important point of everything. The fact that the veto was put in the United Nations was made very, very emphatic by a speech in Congress that the flag remains on the dome of the Capitol. Now does it remain?

It remains because we have the power to veto any action suggested. Now, are you and I brave enough without that veto power? [Laughter.]

Justice ROBERTS. I am; come on. [Laughter.]

My goodness, now, listen Senator, if we are in the trenches on that——

Senator THOMAS of Utah. That is your whole point.

Justice ROBERTS. All right; if we are in the trenches on that, then God help you for finding the funds to support our national economy. Go to it, if you can. I don't think it can be done. Just because that flag means, you can't tell us what to do, ever, then we have got to play a lone hand in the world, we can't do it.

I come from a little country county called Chester County, Pa., and we have a slogan out in Chester County, and it is this: "The United States against the world, Pennsylvania against the Union, Chester County against the Commonwealth." We are still flying the flag of Chester County there. It isn't down off the courthouse, but we like the United States flag pretty well, too. We are liable to hang them both out of the same window.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. That is the point I want to make, Mr. Justice, that these ideas about a flag, and about the loss of sovereignty, about the inability to say "No" to something are purely fictional.

Justice ROBERTS. Absolutely.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. And they have been fictional ever since the concept or the naming of the concept of sovereignty came into existence but, at the same time they have occupied the minds of men to such an extent that we have been able to go forward.

Justice ROBERTS. Absolutely. Take another fictional thing: Suppose you and I come back from this convention and present a plan, a frame, think of the debate which will go on in this country—all the way down to the cracker barrel in the country store; my Senator is for it; mine is against it; mine is for it for this reason; mine is against it for that reason. We will have the greatest political debate, since the debate in the States when the Constitution of the United States was ratified, and we will have some real education and people will forget what you are talking about, that this flag is all-important, and nobody must ever tell us where to get off. It is fictional and they have got to learn and they don't know.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Can anyone help me from this situation I got myself into. [Laughter.] I am exceedingly glad to have brought out the point.

Justice ROBERTS. Yes; I am glad you did.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. The objections of any union, whether it is under the auspices of this resolution or any other resolution, are objectives to prevent war, and the techniques which we will use will not be absolutely necessary in a practical way,

although they may be very new in a fictional way, and the world that you are trying to make a survey of is a world to find out if men are willing to give that much of their own which they have always given to bring about a better world.

Justice ROBERTS. That is right.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I may say, Mr. Justice, there is one problem you will have, of course, in getting the people convinced of the wisdom of this and that, and that Uncle Sam still might be paying the bill for the group instead of for himself.

Justice ROBERTS. That is a false position.

Senator WILEY. I just want to ask one question along the line that Senator SMITH brought out, because I am very much interested in this flag incident. To me, instead of "taking down the flag," if you bring about peace and security, you are raising the only flag in the world that stands for that.

Justice ROBERTS. Right.

Senator WILEY. Now, then, I assume that when you and Senator come back from that international pow-wow with the other folks, then you will come back with the rather restricted notions as to how you start out this big show with the idea that you could amend it, as we have amended our Constitution.

Justice ROBERTS. Certainly.

I don't know what strange poison there is in this nationalism, but even in military things you know how difficult it is to get the defense forces to agree on command, on policy, and material. The British have one idea, we have another, and they fight as they battle about it; in the meantime Rome burns, and when you get to economic things it is even worse. What is there in nationalism that so poisons the ability to be broad and to see the other fellow's point of view?

Senator MCMAHON. Mr. Justice, if you would have sat with me on the hearings on the Genocide Pact for 4 days—I am afraid that you might think that the difficulties in the way of bringing this proposal into being were superhuman in character, that is you need superhuman strength to overcome it.

Justice ROBERTS. As I said to Senator THOMAS, the chairman, I do not know what the poison is that is in nationalism, etc. I would be glad to have any Senator suggest any alliance that has worked satisfactorily for any length of time. They fall apart.

Senator KEFAUVER. I believe Dr. Urey is the witness. Before he proceeds may I say, Mr. Chairman, Senator GILLETTE is not on the committee but one of the sponsors. Senator GEORGE is expected to comment.

Justice ROBERTS. How long is our economy going to stand this—What will we do? I think that we will have to become a Fascist state with a Fuehrer, we will have to be regimented, and we will have to stop eating well. We will have to be rationed. In other words the Russian system is the perfect system for keeping your feet under you for military purposes, because you can starve the proletariat.

I question the propriety of Congress stating what is the foreign policy of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there is also printed herewith a letter received by me, which refers to this same testimony:

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF NEW ENGLAND WOMEN,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1950.

Hon. CLARE HOFFMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: At last the true aims of the one-worlders has come to light as predicted by you in your able address of 1942, Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes.

On February 8, former Justice Owen J. Roberts, president of the Atlantic Union Committee, which advocates eventual world government and partial world government now, in testifying before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said that he would be willing to take the flag down from the Capitol. Chairman THOMAS asked him if he would be brave enough to return with him as delegates from such a proposed "Federal convention" without the veto power and prepared to take the flag down from the Capitol. Justice Roberts replied, "I would. People will forget this flag is all important, they've got to learn. I am completely puzzled by this poisonous nationalism."

This Owen Roberts and Joe Stalin are working toward the same goals. Both would take down the flag from the Capitol of the United States.

Once the American people understand that the aims of the one-worlders parallel the concurrent lines of the Communists and that it means unconditional surrender by the stroke of a pen, they will have no part of the scheme to sell America down the river.

There are many kinds of traitors. To work to break down the Constitution of the United States is treason. Benedict Arnold was a piker—he only betrayed West Point. This is a betrayal of the United States Government from within.

An investigation should be begun at once as to who these people are who want to haul down the Stars and Stripes millions of past and present patriots have given their lives and their sacred honor to raise and keep flying. Let our veterans' organizations know the true aims of the one-worlders and we predict the feeling of inspired nationalism and patriotism, the same spirit to which we owe the very existence of this great Nation, will overwhelm the poisonous traitors in our midst.

Very sincerely,

MADALEN DINGLEY LEITCH
(Mrs. William Dougal).

Socialism in Action Proves Disastrous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the administration's farm program, better known as the Anderson plan, is nothing in the world but socialism in action. It is the result of the Government interfering with the free market and the attempts of a few men to substitute their planning for the workings of a free market.

Everybody — literally everybody — is losing by such a stupid course on the part of our Government. Let us remember that the New Deal started these various "plans" to cut down acreage and, in effect, to kill little pigs and plough under cotton and corn. It was economically absurd then and everytime the so-called "farm program" is "improved upon," the whole thing becomes more and more absurd.

The taxpayer loses because he is taxed heavily, whether he is a city man or a farmer, to pay for support prices, and all this other foolishness. He also loses because he has to pay higher prices for the products he consumes. By running the price of food up, or holding it up, the Government is unjust both to the farmer and to the consumer in the city. Because laborers have to pay more for their food, they strike for higher wages. These higher wages are reflected in the cost of the manufactured articles which the farmer must buy. Hence, nobody wins in the long run, on the average. It is true that certain individual farmers and certain extremely fortunate union members, and labor leaders, win by all the confusion, and because of factors not here examined, but by and large everybody loses by the Government intervening in the free market.

Right now, we are witnessing a most amazing spectacle. The United States Department of Agriculture is engaged in a subtle campaign to make people angry at the present stupid farm program so that it can sell its even more stupid program—the Brannan plan. The Brannan plan is not a farm plan, but a plan further to socialize the farmer. Let's call it what it is.

The Republicans, instead of defending the present economic miasma, ought to use the Department of Agriculture statistics to sell a better way to the American people. That better way would consist of lowering support prices, or doing away with them in most instances, particularly on cotton, and to work toward a free market again in agriculture. That better way would consist of promoting the Department of Agriculture as a service institution, to carry on research to help farmers grow and market produce, not administer plans to rule the farmer and drive him into economic slavery. The Republicans should stand for freedom of price at every possible stage in the economy, for only by working back toward the free movement of goods and services can we get away from the present course, which is toward more and more control over every segment of the economy, and, of course, over every action of a man's life.

We are faced with a perfectly ridiculous situation today, because of the operations of the Fair Deal in the farm field. With close to 3¾ billions of dollars tied up in supporting crops—and more supporting to be done yet—the Government surplus problem continues to grow.

The plans to destroy up to 40,000,000 bushels of potatoes, while our tariff policies encourage the import of Canadian potatoes, simply serve to dramatize the troubles a policy of socialism in action brings about. At the same time, we learn that Uncle Sam will continue to buy eggs, to support the price, although the Government already has more than $100,000,000 worth of eggs.

Then we come to the problem of storage. This can be seen by looking at the situation in grains. The Commodity Credit Corporation is building still more of the huge storage bins which already dot the country. When the new wheat harvest starts, farmers will dump surplus grain grown in 1949 on the Government. The CCC, with 375,000,000 bushels of storage capacity, has all but 40,000,000 bushels of the space filled. So it will have to buy space for another 100,000,000 bushels.

All of these facts merely high light the utterly ridiculous economic position into which the Fair Deal has worked us. Mr. Brannan might think that he can sell

more socialism by peddling these facts to the newspapers, but the facts really indicate that Uncle Sam should be finding ways of getting out of the farm field, instead of getting deeper and deeper into the mess he has created. The object of a Federal program—if one ever is inaugurated by emergency or necessity—should be to restore some degree of normalcy and then to withdraw. As the New Deal and Fair Deal programs have worked through the years, they have pulled the Government more and more into the farm business until today the Federal Government has the greatest stake of any organization in the farm field. It has more employees than ever, more money invested than ever, and more problems than ever, because none of its programs ever has solved a problem, but merely have created new problems to compound the evils we face.

The Republicans ought to spend a great deal of time on a specific farm program that will assure farmers a fair income for a transition period, during which both the people and the Government will work to get the Government out of the farm business and to keep it out.

The Rest of This Century Belongs to the Mississippi Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Lloyd J. Cobb, president of New Orleans worldwide famous International House, recently made an address in St. Louis, which commends itself for consideration of the entire American people.

I commend it to you:

We are met today, here on the banks of the Mississippi, at one of its oldest ports, in a conference predestined to stand in history when the greatness of this gigantic valley is discussed. We are on the threshold of another half century of life on the Mississippi, reflecting on its past, considering its future, and planning actively for its continued present development.

With a sense of awe, I pause to consider with you the majesty, the vastness, the limitless wealth and indescribable power of this, the world's largest and richest river valley. Its potential is beyond the comprehension of mere man, and yet we are the trustees of its development and of its ultimate destiny.

Today, Old Man River is on the march in world affairs, from its headwaters in Minnesota to the bayous of the Louisiana Delta, with trains, trucks, and barges carrying the goods of the valley and the products of foreign lands up and down the Mississippi and its tributaries. New industries are locating on the banks of these same rivers, and river towns of a hundred years ago are rubbing the sandman's harvest from their eyes and stirring anew in the rebirth of river activity.

At the southern end of this great valley, the port of New Orleans is busy handling its foreign trade with the nations of the world, tonnages loaded with five times the amount of cargo of 10 years ago.

This valley consists of two component parts, the Middle West, as you here call it, and the South, or as we call it, the "world of opportunity."

Your own intimate knowledge of the Middle West constrains me to pretermit a discussion of this vibrant area, but I do want to talk to you a little about the South. No true son of Dixie could or would pass up an opportunity to tell you with swelling pride and ringing voice about what is going on here today.

Many Americans unfortunately think of the South as too many of our national magazine editors picture it—a backward, unreconstructed and involuntary appendage to the Union. Without delving into conditions as they existed not so many years ago, I should like to tell you briefly about our new South.

First and foremost, we have dismissed our detractors and apologists and we have gone to work. Our people, both white and black, are on the march toward lofty horizons of desire and accomplishment. Together, under God's canopy of mutual understanding and good will, they are moving with reasoning and courage toward new goals of achievement not even imagined only a few years ago.

In agriculture, some of the greatest progress in this Nation is being recorded in an unspectacular but solid manner. At Louisiana State University is the world's greatest plant breeder, a horticultural genius surpassing Luther Burbank in the benefits he already has contributed to mankind. He is destined soon to be recognized as the most accomplished botanist the world has ever known. His influence has created hundreds of millions of dollars of new agricultural wealth throughout the South. Great scientist that he is, his work has been little publicized, but any southern planter, white or Negro, knows about Dr. Julian Miller and acknowledges almost with reverence the things already done to improve his standard of living.

The nostalgic, lackadaisical days of yesterday are fast being forgotten all over the Southland. Natchez was a catchword in a song for southern dreaminess a few years ago. Today it is a booming metropolis, and one of the South's future great industrial cities. The same holds true for Baton Rouge. Memphis will be as big as St. Louis now is within 20 years. Dallas, Atlanta, Birmingham, New Orleans, and Houston will pass a million population with a decade or two, and several will be as large, or larger, than the Chicago we know today long before the century is over. On the Gulf, Beaumont, Pensacola, Mobile, Corpus Christi, Lake Charles, Port Arthur, Tampa are all great cities and expanding fast.

There is more undeveloped rich farmland in Louisiana than in the entire United States, outside the South. Water—now scarce in many agricultural areas—is one of Louisiana's problems, too. But her problem is too much water—not a lack of it. When adequate drainage projects are fully established, millions of acres of rich delta soil, washed down from the Middle West, will flower into profitable agricultural production.

There is probably enough water daily flowing by New Orleans' door to irrigate all of the United States needing irrigation. Someday we will find the answer to this problem of too much water here and not enough there, and the South's water system will carry supplies by pipe line to areas now on the verge of exhaustion.

The forests of the South are being restored through intelligent reforestation, developed by our own people. Our universities are on the march, nurturing and training the leadership we so long lacked. Our natural and mineral wealth exceeds any other like area on the face of the earth.

The South is God's chosen land. It is on the threshold of its greatest years. Only an area so rich could have withstood the exploitation it has undergone, and yet Southern resources are practically untapped. In a large sense the South is still virgin country. We have the climate, the resources, the people, the energy, and now we have found the initiative to forge ahead intelligently.

We are doing so. Throughout Dixie the whistle of the donkey engine on the peckerwood sawmill has given way to the whistle of factories which have sprung up everywhere. There is an upsurge of industry in the South that will amaze you all when the 1950 census statistics have been analyzed.

Today we have virtually solved our greatest problem in the South—the Negro problem—but the solution has come without gratitude for many unwise, radical Northern influences. Unlike a decade ago we have Negro schools today, many of them new, which are just as fine and up-to-date as any white school, and infinitely superior to many white schools of a few years ago.

In New Orleans, or in any other large Southern city, you will find equal opportunities and impartial justice for both races. Age-old prejudices, fanned by intolerance, are being abolished. There are 25,000 registered Negro voters in New Orleans today, and in a recent city election, in which 90 percent of the city's registered voters, including these Negroes, went to the polls, there was not a single instance of molestation or interference. Here is a practical demonstration of tolerance and mutual understanding.

Our very progressive mayor did not spurn the Negro vote, nor did the other major candidate. Both spoke openly before Negro rallies and solicited this vote just as actively and intelligently as they did any vote. We still have as many problems as anyone else, and some of them are very hard ones, but we know or are working out the answers, and rapidly we are moving to set at rest our most vexing difficulties. We need patience, time, and tolerance, and we have it in 95 percent of our Southland.

All over Dixie today I can show you farm land that can be bought for thirty to fifty dollars an acre and which is just as rich and just as productive as the finest corn lands of Iowa.

The cattle population of the Nation is about 80,000,000 for approximately 150,000,000 people. Argentina has 40,000,000 cattle, or half as many, for only 16,000,000 people, or about one-tenth of our population. A benign climate, improved pasture, and solution of our traditional feed-deficiency problem today make the South the great cattle frontier of the future. No area on earth can produce better cattle or produce them as economically.

Cheap land in the South will not last long. The South is filling up rapidly with people who are finding out about these opportunities, are wondering why someone didn't tell them about these things a quarter or half century ago. In defense, if for no other reason, the southerners are digging in to take advantage of their opportunities.

Stop anywhere in the South today and you will find that city or town is on the march. Stop in any coastal town or city and you will learn that if it has no port, one is being planned. I know at least half a dozen Louisiana and Texas cities well in from the sea that are planning ports. The same is true in Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida.

Our South, and the Middle West, with which it is interdependent, form the world's greatest, richest valley—the true land of opportunity. This last half of the twentieth century belongs to us. Before it passes, the Gulf of Mexico will be our new frontier and Latin America our greatest market.

The Gulf coast is the real gold coast of America, the golden horseshoe cutting up from Mexico and running around to the Florida beaches. Within a few miles of its shoreline are sufficient resources, energy, and opportunity to enrich all of present-day America. Another few years and we will find a hundred million persons living adjacent to this coast and looking to it as their outlet to the sea.

Foreign trade to them is a reality today just as it will be for everyone in this Nation within a few years.

New Orleans calls itself the international city and has always had an international outlook. It is that viewpoint that I want to explain and pursue now to the conclusion of this talk. I will not be too long.

It is as the gateway to the rich Mississippi Valley—the link between that valley and the world—that New Orleans has thrived and prospered through more than two centuries. It was the Nation's leading port a century ago when the whole valley was piling its docks with cargoes of furs, grain, and cotton. It suffered with the rest of the South during and after reconstruction. It was only within the last decade that a reorganization of its administration along businesslike, nonpolitical lines, and a new awareness by its leading citizens of the importance of foreign trade combined to put into motion the international trade-development program which today serves the Mississippi Valley with New Orleans, the second port in the Nation.

You are all familiar with what we have been doing along these lines, but let me tell you about two results of this work which are of far-reaching consequence and importance throughout the valley.

The first has been to bring producers of this great heartland of ours closer to foreign markets and the producers of other lands. Time was when our Mississippi Valley was considered the home of isolationism, and our merchants and producers thought along jingoistic lines of "buy American" and let the world shift for itself. A great war and an atomic age have changed isolationist thinking. We thank our own efforts in bringing together men of good will and business desire from all over the world have had some part in changing the thinking of those who believed foreign trade meant nothing to them.

St. Louis, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Chicago, Little Rock, Kansas City, Louisville, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and the rest today are all just next door to cities all over the world.

It was my good fortune 3 weeks ago to lead a party of 40 fine midwestern and southern newspapermen to Panama and Peru on the occasion of new nonstop flight service from New Orleans to Panama. Returning, we had supper in Lima and 12 hours later, after only one stop, this regular service put us in New Orleans in time for breakfast. We could have lunched in St. Louis, Indianapolis, or Chicago. Today, a 3,000-mile flight is an overnight journey, like a pullman trip of a decade ago.

Within another decade every major city in the Mississippi Valley will be an international city, with an international airport or seaport. Using jet-propelled machines, flights will leave St. Louis with the first stop Brazil or Honolulu or take off from Minneapolis-St. Paul nonstop for Calcutta or Tokyo. Chicago will have direct nonstop service with Europe and Africa, and we will call the whole world neighbor.

This is not fantastic dreaming. These things are coming very soon, and it is well to consider them now. This shortening of distance and tightening up of the world is of greatest significance to our once isolationist Mississippi Valley area, especially in transportation and air-borne cargo.

International airports open all kinds of possibilities for our big cities, with international houses and trade marts similar, in their way, to our own twin organizations in New Orleans. Foreign trade zones also then become a possibility, where goods from abroad may enter and be stored, processed, or handled in any way short of manufacture without paying duty until taken out to enter, technically, the United States.

Our international development program at New Orleans is based entirely upon the productivity and buying capacity of the Mississippi Valley—not on our port itself. New Orleans is but a service station on the highway of international trade—a gateway, receiver, forwarder and handler. We are trustees for the great valley with our port, but without products of the valley to handle, or markets of the valley for goods from abroad, our foreign trade would wither like grapes on the autumn vine.

This land between the mountains which we call the Mississippi Valley is the future of America. This is our land, our valley, now coming into its own in development. Here is the last frontier of American industry—raw materials, labor and power. Here, too, lies the richest agricultural land under cultivation in the world. This is the heart, the backbone, the future of America. The east dominated the first half century. This second half belongs to us. This fact we accept with confidence and pride. We must lay our plans now for the next 50 years and the transcendental development which they will bring.

In the South we have great confidence in our Mississippi Valley as a trade area and area which will make our gulf ports the world's greatest. It is this confidence which has delineated our actions in New Orleans over the last few years and which has sent us on missionary trips through the valley selling world markets and foreign trade in the cities and towns of 24 States. As a result, thousands of firms, large and small, which had never thought of trade in anything but terms domestic, are now inquiring about foreign markets, channeling part of their production abroad and imparting noncompetitive goods. We are balancing the world's trade picture and bringing about a true and lasting peace based on mutually profitable world commerce and international understanding at both a business and cultural level.

The second result of our efforts is that this new interest is not all one-sided. The nations of Europe, Asia and Latin America are, in turn, taking a second look today at the great Mississippi Valley and realining their trade plans, both export and import to include this area. Habitually through the years they have thought too much of America in terms of the Atlantic seaboard and New York. This great interior of ours was an unknown quantity which they felt was little interested in them and in which they, in turn, were little interested.

But the Mississippi Valley today is very much in the minds of foreign nations as a market place for their goods and source of supply for products they need. The valley, in its great industrial cities, produces everything these nations are seeking—farm machinery, heavy equipment, automobiles, appliances, textiles and a host of other products eagerly sought in the markets of the world. At the same time, these nations' industry is underway again and they are eager to place their goods in our rich valley markets.

Trade commissions which had comfortably established themselves in New York are awaking to the tremendous trade potential of this valley. Numerous consulates—Sweden, Belgium, Italy, Great Britain, Norway, Switzerland, to name only a few—have opened trade offices in connection with their consulates in New Orleans and are sending men up the valley to study and develop new markets in our towns and cities. Harold Wilson, president of Great Britain's Board of Trade, recently made a swing through the valley, and in speeches in England now urges his nation's exporters to "go West" when they seek to sell in the United States.

Belgium is a graphic example of this new interest in the valley and how it is paying off. A year ago its exhibit opened at the International Trade Mart. So successful were Belgian exhibitors that this year the exhibit's size doubled, additional exhibits were opened in Chicago, Kansas City, and Dallas, a new consulate was established in Kansas City, and a band of twelve trade prospectors has been hired to comb the valley from north to south to develop additional markets.

Too long the world has considered the United States as one market, rather than a series of markets with different likes and dislikes. Now it is awakening to this thriving and prosperous valley of ours, and we are awakening to foreign trade. You need only look about at the international clubs, trade organizations, language classes and other manifestations of this interest in your own cities to sense the new international feeling. The Mississippi Valley World Trade Conference, now in its sixth year, brings hundreds of foreign traders from all over the valley to New Orleans annually, when a decade ago such an organization probably could not have mustered a hundred, or even be organized.

Here again, it has been the great Mississippi system of inland arteries which has enabled us to carry out this program of an awakening of international trade. Millions of tons of foreign trade move down the Mississippi and its tributaries annually to the wharves of New Orleans, and other millions of tons move up river to new industries along its banks, using the rubber from Africa, copper from Chile, tin from Bolivia, bauxite from Guiana, mahogany from Central America and Africa, and numerous other raw products.

A network of transportation services at favorable freight rates prevails in the valley basin and gives this area an added advantage in developing trade with foreign nations.

Four ideas that have enriched the life of this valley in the past quarter century came out of New Orleans, spawning ground of ideas. Now I seize upon this opportunity to suggest another.

Three of these ideas are realities. I refer to this very association, born and nurtured through infancy in New Orleans, then transferred to St. Louis. The same is true of the great National Cotton Council, the most successful venture in public relations for greater consumption of a crop that the world has seen. It, too, came out of New Orleans and is now domiciled in Memphis.

The third was International House, permanently located in New Orleans. Only 5 years old, it is the South's most famous civic institution, known and respected throughout the world, a vibrant new business voice of the South and the envy I assure you, of a great many cities in our own and other nations.

The fourth great idea has yet to flower. It is as great as the rest and it affects all of us. I refer to the Alexander seaway at New Orleans—the Tidewater Channel to the sea which this association has endorsed and which everyone has been busily engaged in promoting for nearly a decade. It is still on the drawing boards, unfortunately, desperately as it is needed. The Corps of Engineers has approved and recommended its construction but it has been put in deep freeze by the Bureau of the Budget. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has taken such action in direct opposition to the recommendations of all the engineers involved in the study of the construction and, apparently, the needs of commerce in the area which is served by the port of New Orleans, and the requirements for national defense have also been given very little consideration. But I sincerely believe that we have the intelligence, the initiative, and the drive to bring this plan to reality within a few years. We then will see ships of any

draft moving out of the port of New Orleans through a man-made canal not subject to the power and vagaries of the great Mississippi River. This channel, when finished, will unlock the greatest part of this Nation, the port of New Orleans, great port and the great natural port of the Middle West and valley.

I come now to the fifth idea, which I shall preface by quoting briefly from a description I read recently by E. L. Cherhill on the Mississippi River region, which was originally published in 1891. Cerhill said:

"That giant stream (the Mississippi River), with its head shrouded in Arctic snows, and embracing half a continent in the hundred thousand miles of its curious network, and coursing its majestic way to the southern Gulf, through lands so fertile that human ingenuity is overtaxed to harvest their productiveness, has been given by its immortal architect into the jealous keeping of this Republic. The garden which it beautifies and enriches, contains 792,000,000 acres of the finest lands on the face of the globe; enough to make more than 150 States as large as Massachusetts. * * *

"This great valley lies between those parallels of latitude that are known to be most conducive to health and to the development of the mental and physical energies of man. In its capacity to produce the cereals, grasses, cotton, sugar, tobacco, hemp, vegetables, and fruits of every kind; in the richness and variety of its mineral wealth, the grandeur and value of its forests, its inexhaustible quarries; in a word, in all the natural resources which conspire to increase the wealth and power of a people, the bounty of providence has been most wonderfully manifested.

"The stream which in every direction penetrates this favored region, and is the grandest natural feature of North America, holds in its embrace the destinies of the American people. Sooner or later it must give to the dwellers within this valley, power and dominion over this whole immense continent. * * *

"The commerce of this great empire will, in time, certainly exceed that of any other in Christendom."

In our very early history the Mississippi River was recognized as the heart of America and most dominant trade artery within the Nation. It seems to me it is high time we commemorated and honored this great stream which has played such a vital part in our history, and I know of no better way to do so than for the forward-looking businessmen of St. Louis and New Orleans to get together and work out a plan.

Over half this great valley was acquired 147 years ago through the foresight of one of our great Americans, a man who constantly thought beyond his time or even the time of his children's children. I refer to Thomas Jefferson, who purchased the Louisiana Territory in 1803.

It seems fitting that we should begin to consider now some sort of celebration or observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of this act in 1953, and I have in mind an International-Mississippi Valley-trade fair linking St. Louis and New Orleans, two great cities which have grown from that purchase and from the river—the one with its industry and as the gateway to the West; the other with its foreign trade and as the financial center of the South and gateway to the world.

This is a project to which all of us in the valley might well give serious consideration. It would be the opportunity to show, alike, the wealth and progress and future greatness of our valley, and exhibit the products of the world which flow in foreign trade into this great area. St. Louis, now a seaport with steamships coming up the river to load and discharge cargo, could open the fair in the spring and summer, and it could close in New Orleans in the fall and winter, with the actual ceremony reenacted in Jackson Square on the same flagpole which bore aloft the Stars and Stripes in 1803 when the French Tricolor was hauled down.

It would be a time for a rededication of ourselves and efforts to a greater Mississippi Valley, and for proclaiming to the world that the Mississippi Valley has come into its own. The rest of this century belongs to us.

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Denver Post of January 16, 1950, by Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman, on the timely subject of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii:

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii has been urged and reiterated until now the question is clearly posed before the United States. The addition of two new States is important everywhere but the expansion of the West through the addition of Alaska and Hawaii is of utmost importance to the Rocky Mountain empire and the Pacific Coast States.

The distance between Washington and Juneau or Washington and Honolulu might have been considered a barrier at one time, but today with our rapid communications it cannot seriously be considered an argument against statehood for either of our two great Territories. News travels in a flash. Messages can be delivered in an hour. A man can make the trip by regularly scheduled airplanes to either of the Territorial capitals in less than 24 hours. When Oregon and California were admitted to the Union and for scores of years thereafter, Sacramento and Salem were days and even weeks of travel farther away from Washington.

The populations of Alaska and Hawaii are thoroughly American. Alaska has been United States territory for more than 80 years and Hawaii for more than half a century. The English language is used throughout both Territories and each has a fine record in two world wars. The population of Alaska is about 100,000, which is twice as many as some of the States had at the time they entered the Union. Hawaii has more than half a million.

Both the islands and the northern territory are important to the United States. They have resources that enhance our economy. They hold promise of further development and, without question, can play a mature role in the family of States that make up our Federal Union.

In the West, the bestowal of statehood on a territory has deep significance. It has not been so long since 1912 when Arizona and New Mexico were admitted. The thrill that the people of a territory feel when this milestone in American progress is reached can still be remembered here. Reaching statehood, the bringing of responsible local government home to the people to be operated by them is an essential to the maturing of any part of our country.

In the Interior Department, which traditionally has been the sponsor of our Territories before the country, evidence crosses my desk nearly every day that shows the disadvantages of the territorial form of government to the people living there. Too many things have to be done by extremely long arms reaching out of Washington when the responsibilities of statehood have not been imposed. This deters the economic development of a region and it restrains the political development of the people. In a democracy, both of these results are bad.

The community of interest which binds Hawaii and Alaska to the West and to western attitudes is a established fact. For this reason, the Western States should take strong positions in support of the ambitions of the "little brother" Territories.

The southern terminus of the Alaska Highway is at Great Falls, Mont. The principal airlines operating to Alaska use the Seattle-Tacoma airport and the Minneapolis-St. Paul airport as points of departure. The shortest routes to the Orient are along these lines and through Alaska. In the future there will be air routes over the short route across the pole, again through Alaska. All of the new developments of the twentieth century have bound Alaska and Hawaii closer and closer to the States. There will be no reversal of this trend.

For all of these reasons, the slogan is "50 States in 1950."

Woodland Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony by me before the Agricultural Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, Friday afternoon, February 10, 1950:

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear out of turn in behalf of the forestry activities of the Department of Agriculture.

On other occasions I have stressed the importance of forests and forest products to the well-being and prosperity of our Nation. I know you are pressed for time, and I will go direct to the forestry measures which I consider of paramount importance today. I want to refer specifically to the items listed on page 448 in the budget for the fiscal year 1951, under the heading "Farm and other private forestry cooperation." I note that the Budget Bureau allowed an increase of about $850,000 for cooperation with the States in the procurement, production, and distribution of forest-tree and shrub seeds and plants. In Iowa we have one State-operated nursery at Ames cooperating in this program. There are similar State-operated nurseries in 40 other States growing trees for distribution to farmers and other private woodland owners. The tree-planting needs are tremendous—over 62,000,000 acres on private lands nationally and 650,000 acres in my State, Iowa. We are just now beginning to assume a fair share of the responsibility on behalf of the Federal Government. This increase, if allowed, will give added stimulus to a program which must be vigorously pursued each year if we are ever to plant the millions of idle and unproductive acres now found on our farms, ranches, and other privately owned properties that are suitable only for the growing of trees.

My State, Mr. Chairman, through the land-grant college at Ames—Iowa State College—is cooperating with the Department of Agriculture in an educational program which consists of demonstrating to the farmers the

advantages of wise management and careful protection of their woodland acres. We have two extension foresters now cooperatively employed. I heartily endorse this kind of educational effort and am most pleased to note that the Budget Bureau allowed an increase of some $150,000 for expansion of the work nationally.

I am disappointed, however, to see that the Budget Bureau did not allow an increase for farm foresters to work with the small woodland owners and thus make this educational work more effective. This cooperation with States and private forest owners in forest-management service work is essential if we are ever to secure good forest-management practices on the 261,000,000 acres of small, privately owned woodlands throughout the Nation. In my own State, we now have three farm foresters that go direct to the woods and advise the woodland owner in the proper husbandry of his tree crops. We have almost 80,000 small woodland owners in need of this direct service type of assistance.

Last year I introduced H. R. 2952 which gave special attention to the work of the farm foresters. A similar bill, H. R. 2396, was enacted and is now known as Public Law 392 of the Eighty-first Congress. The legislation provides increased authorizations for tree planting, extension educational work, and cooperative fire protection; but I regret to report that the section dealing with farm forestry which was approved by the House was dropped by the Senate. Fortunately, there is existing authority under the Norris-Doxey Act to provide additional farm foresters, and it is my considered judgment that any action this distinguished committee might take to increase the appropriation for farm foresters would be a step in the right direction. The in-the-woods type of service provided by the farm foresters appeals to me as the practical way of helping millions of woodland owners throughout the Nation to learn good forest-management practices.

Mr. Chairman, many people think of Iowa as being a prairie State with only fringe woodlands bordering the streams. But this is by no means the case. The value of Iowa's standing timber alone is over $75,000,000. Each year the woodland owners harvest more than $20,000,000 worth of forest products. Recreation, much of which centers in Iowa's wooded areas, is a $35,000,000 business annually. Moreover, the protection that Iowa woodlands afford the watershed of the Mississippi and other rivers is inestimable. Fire protection of a resource so valuable is only good common sense. Some 2,000,000 acres of the woodland in my State are now receiving organized protection under the provisions of the Clarke-McNary Act, but much of the timberland needs more intensive protection. Many forested areas in other States likewise have inadequate protection or none at all. Consequently, I am pleased to note that the Budget Bureau has allowed a $1,000,000 increase in cooperative forest-fire protection. I heartily endorse this cooperative effort by the States and the Federal Government. Our woodlands serve all of our people. Their products are found in every corner of the Nation. Protecting this great resource is an obligation we cannot afford to take lightly.

At this point I should like to read some brief excerpts concerning the need for increased funds for forest research and farm forestry which I have taken from a recent letter addressed to me by a distinguished conservationist, Mr. Don C. Kern, chairman of the forestry committee, Iowa division of the Izaak Walton League of America, as follows:

"The President's budget provided increases for some forestry activities, but it largely overlooked the needs for expanding forestry research and farm forestry. This is hard for us to understand since research must lead the way in all improvements in forestry practices. Also because farm forestry is the means for getting good forestry practices applied on over 50 percent of our country's commercial timberland which is a part of farms or in small forest properties mainly intermingled with farm lands. * * * Surely, if we are to undertake, with private and public funds, the restocking of our denuded lands with trees and grasses—the rehabilitation and maximum utilization of our forests and woodlands—we must first acquire the best possible knowledge of the most practical methods for doing the enormous tasks discussed above. Such knowledge can be secured only through intensive research—research that precedes and keeps ahead of the actual application of technological advancements in the woods and on the range. * * * The farmer and the man-on-the-street are talking economy and reduction of Government spending; but their thinking does not consider or imply that false economies in funds for restoration and conservation of such natural resources as our forests, lands, and waters should be imposed upon the people of America."

There is one other forestry item, Mr. Chairman, to which I wish to direct attention at this time. I refer to the deadly disease known as oak wilt which is spreading unchecked through the upper Mississippi River Valley. Cities as well as undeveloped regions are threatened with the extinction of their oaks. For example, in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, the city arborist estimates that 500 oak trees are dying annually—since 1941 this community has lost 40 percent of its oaks. The disease is destroying all species of oaks in Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and Missouri. Michigan's valuable timberland as well as the Ozark Mountain forests will be next to suffer from this devastating blight unless forceful steps are taken promptly to check it.

It is known that the disease is caused by a fungus which grows in the sapwood of the trees, but it is not known how the disease spreads. Insects, animals, and birds, or the wind may be the carriers; possibly it is spread through root contacts, or perhaps a combination of all these. In any event, for lack of funds the Department of Agriculture is unable to conduct the necessary research. Some work has been carried on in Iowa State College at Ames and in the University of Wisconsin at Madison. Also, the Iowa State Conservation Commission and other State conservation agencies have subsidized oak wilt studies. But the problem is so large and complex that individual organizations cannot set up a program of sufficient scope to meet the challenge. Furthermore, much valuable time can be conserved, and thousands of trees thereby saved, if duplication of research is avoided and if the Department of Agriculture and the various State conservation agencies are enabled to coordinate their efforts. The following extract from a letter addressed to me by Mr. R. K. Alman, city arborist, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, several months ago, offers a logical solution:

"The National Shade Tree Conference, the Illinois Association of Nurserymen, the American Association of Nurserymen, the Illinois Academy of Science, and the State Foresters of all the States where oak wilt disease is found are deeply concerned with this problem. We feel that an appropriation for research work on the control of oak wilt disease is of vital necessity, both to protect our shade trees and our forest resources in the upper Mississippi Valley. We feel that the appropriation should amount to $60,000, one-half of which would be used by the Division of Forest Pathology and one-half by the Division of Forest Insect Investigation of the Department of Agriculture. Your interest and assistance in obtaining these funds will be appreciated, both personally and by the associations mentioned above."

In line with this suggestion, I propose that your committee make the following increases in the Budget Bureau's recommendations: On page 423 of the Budget, under the item "Forest diseases," there is ample authority for the Forest Pathology Division of the Bureau of Plant Industry to make an investigation of oak wilt. I urge, therefore, that the committee provide $30,000 to be used by the Forest Pathology in studying the problem. On page 427 of the Budget, under the item "Insect investigations," there is ample authority for the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine to conduct oak-wilt research. I urge, therefore, that the committee provide an additional $30,000 for this Bureau to carry on similar studies in its field.

I want to impress upon the committee that the oak is extremely important as a timber-producing tree, to say nothing of its value as an ornamental tree. As just one example of its importance, I may say that a friend of mine who recently visited the naval shipyards at Bremerton, Wash., in Puget Sound, informs me that the oak is still the chief material used in the construction of the superstructure of our small naval craft. I mention this merely to call attention to the importance of the oak in one of our national-defense items. It is used, of course, in thousands of other products with which we come in daily contact.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to express again my appreciation for this opportunity to testify on the forest items which are of most urgent importance to Iowa and the other Central States. I speak for the people of the great agricultural Midwest in urging your thoughtful consideration of these problems. By taking adequate steps to preserve our forest resources we will not only insure an abundant supply of timber for future generations but we will also help to promote the conservation of our soil, our water, and our wildlife.

Abraham Lincoln's Philosophy of Government Should Guide Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMAN C. CROOK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD pertinent to what the birthday of Abraham Lincoln should mean to every Member of this Congress and every citizen of the United States.

Abraham Lincoln said:

The strongest bond of human sympathy outside of the family relation should be one uniting all working people of all nations and tongues and kindreds.

Abraham Lincoln was born of humble parentage; his log-cabin homes in Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois were open-faced to partake of the invigorating elements of the wilderness and out of his arena of poverty his body, mind, and soul grew saturated with the essence of modesty, freedom, democracy, and an indefinable love for the integrity of the human soul and the sterling brotherhood of all mankind.

On this birthday of Lincoln, few statesmen, but many politicians, have extolled the virtues of Mr. Lincoln in their orations and have conspicuously

expanded their chests in claiming him as the pioneer of their philosophy, political policies, and their way of living.

Words are yet to be designed that would permit me to adequately describe the incalculable contribution that Abe, the orator, statesman, humanitarian, and emancipator made to our beloved Nation as he unconsciously groomed himself to die a martyr for the cause of liberty and humanity.

So, to the politicians that find such a revered character to eulogize, I extend my profound respect for your appraisal of Mr. Lincoln, just trusting that you will be fully stimulated to practice Mr. Lincoln's philosophy down the pathway of life in every day of living, be you Republicans or Democrats. If you will only follow Abe's doctrines, selfishness, greed, exploitation, deception, prejudice, and human slavery will fast vanish from our land to make way for honesty, righteous living, contentment of the minds, enhanced standards of living for all, respect for the integrity of the human soul, reenforcement for democracy and the economy of our Nation, conditions conducive to promoting a just and lasting peace for the troubled world and a brotherhood of man the like of which our Creator intended. Surely we should be willing to practice what we preach about Mr. Lincoln on February 12 of each year. Ladies and gentlemen, Abe, obsessed with unimpeachable ideals, pioneered the trail of unselfish and righteous living. May we, in our humble wisdom, follow his well designed concepts of government dedicated to the general welfare of all classes of citizens, regardless of race, color or creed, and continue to build our bulwark of democracy more grand and stately.

Lincoln, Jackson, and Jefferson Would Turn Over in Their Graves—FEPC in New York—White Americans Betrayed

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if Lincoln, Jackson, and Jefferson could come back here today and see what is going on, and what misrepresentations are being made in their names; see the attempts to destroy America by insidious communistic movements which they attempt to justify by misapplying quotations made by them, what a shock it would be to those great leaders.

You have just heard one Member speak here and quote Jefferson, whose words Lincoln used in his Gettysburg address, to the effect that all men are created equal. Jefferson was a slaveholder, and his words would not have been construed at that time to mean that there is no difference between the races.

I received an invitation to attend a Jackson Day banquet by paying the small amount of $100. If Andrew Jackson could come back here today and see the attempts being made in his name to further the cause of communism through the so-called civil-rights bill, or FEPC—the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation with which this country has ever been threatened—he would be shocked beyond measure.

If Abraham Lincoln could come back and read that communistic monstrosity, which certain individuals are trying to force upon the American people, and hear his name used in their arguments for its support, he would spurn such a proposition with utter contempt.

YIDDISH COMMUNISM VERSUS CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION

These individuals who prate about slavery do not hesitate to join in this communistic movement to enslave the white people of America, to destroy the American way of life and to wreck everything for which the great mass of the American people stand.

You have an illustration now. Our Yiddish Solicitor General has taken it upon himself to go into the Supreme Court and misrepresent the American people by filing a brief in the Henderson case, for the purpose of trying to wipe out all segregation, and destroy our separate schools throughout the country. He pretends to be doing this for the benefit of the Negroes. He and his gang do not give a tinker's dam about the Negroes. They are doing the Negroes infinitely more harm than good. This is a part of the communistic program, laid down by Stalin approximately 30 years ago. Remember, communism is Yiddish. I understand that every member of the Politburo around Stalin is either Yiddish or married to one, and that includes Stalin himself.

They have murdered more white Christians in the Ukraine in the last 30 years than have been killed in all the rest of the world since the crucifixion.

Washington has just read the disgusting report of a little Yiddish woman lawyer here by the name of Ruth Weyand. A Negro woman sued her for alienating her husband's affections. She comes back now and says she has been married to this Negro for years.

This same Ruth Weyand has filed a brief in the Supreme Court of the United States in the Henderson case, trying to tell the decent white people of America what to do. I wonder if the Supreme Court of the United States is going to be misled by this element.

I was glad to note that my friend, Lloyd Benford, of Memphis, has banned the showing of any pictures of Ingrid Bergman. I hope the Christian people of America will all join in protecting their children from having her loathesome pictures paraded before their eyes now and hereafter.

Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous for Members of this House to use the names of Lincoln, Jackson, and Jefferson in their argument for the passage of this infamous FEPC—as I said, the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation with which this country has ever been threatened.

In my speech to the House on February 13, 1947, I called attention to the fact that they had put this measure on the ticket in California and let the people vote on it. They beat it by a clear majority in every single individual county in California. The majority against it throughout the entire State was more than a million.

In that speech I said:

> You simply destroy business with a measure like this. That is what the FEPC did here. Men have gone out of business all over the country in the last few years because of the persecution that was carried on by this outfit here in Washington, the personnel of which I shall insert later on.
>
> A few people are going around urging us to pass it as a national law, to put everybody else in the same predicament. These people who are carrying on this racial agitation are using the Negro as a smoke screen. They do not give a tinker's dam about the Negro. They are not trying to help the Negro. They are doing them more harm than anybody has in the last 50 years, and the decent law-abiding Negroes know it.
>
> But let me show you what they have done in New York, and let me give you some of the regulations or rulings, as they are called, and ask you if you would like to have them in your State. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Dirksen, how he would like to have them in Illinois, or how you would like to have them in Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, or in Missouri, or in any other State in the Union.
>
> Here are the regulations, or rulings, issued by the State of New York. They are headed:
>
> "State of New York Executive Department. State commission against discrimination. Rulings."
>
> Here are the rulings:
>
> I want to show you some things you cannot ask in the State of New York when you go to employ a man.
>
> Remember that State has no gas, coal, or oil, and very little water power. The rest of the country does not have to go to New York, or to any other State to get what it needs in the years to come. The American people in every section of this country are in a position now to take care of themselves. You put this measure on in one State after another and you will simply penalize those States beyond reason, and when they ask you to pass it for the whole United States and put it on the entire American people, after the fiasco they have made of it here in Washington in the last few years, it is simply unthinkable to a man who knows what he is doing and has the interest of the people of the country at heart.
>
> Here are some of the things you cannot do under the law of New York:
>
> UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES BEFORE HIRING ANYBODY
>
> Those words are written in capitals. Here is the first unlawful practice:
>
> "Inquiry into the original name of the applicant for employment, whose name has been changed by court proceedings or otherwise."
>
> If you inquire as to his name or what his name used to be you violate the law. You commit an unlawful practice. For instance, take this man who writes for PM, who calls himself I. F. Stone. His name was Isadore Feinstein, as Cordell Hull once pointed out. Suppose he comes to you asking for employment and you ask him that question. Then you will have committed an unlawful act.
>
> Here is the next one:
>
> It would be unlawful practice to make—
>
> "Inquiry into the birthplace of the applicant for employment, the birthplace of his parents, spouse, or other close relative."
>
> How would you like that in Iowa, Illinois, Texas, or Nebraska? In California I know you do not like it, because you have just voted on it.
>
> Here is the next "unlawful practice":
>
> "Requirement that the applicant for employment produce a birth certificate or baptismal certificate."
>
> That would be an unlawful practice under this FEPC Act in New York.
>
> I was surprised to see Governor Dewey get his mustache in the wringer on this proposition. I do not see how he is ever going to get loose from it.
>
> Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
>
> Mr. RANKIN. I yield.
>
> Mr. MASON. What about this requirement during the war that every person employed in certain industries had to prove that he was born here before he could get a job?
>
> Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. If we had had this law all over the country then, the Japs would have had a spy at the elbow of every man in a key position; so would the Germans, and so would every other enemy country.
>
> I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his timely suggestion.
>
> It is an unlawful practice in New York, under this law, to make—
>
> "Inquiry into the religious denomination of an applicant for employment, his religious affiliations, his church, parish pastor, or religious holidays observed. Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist."
>
> Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist is forbidden, although you may be publishing literature for the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, or any other denomination.
>
> Another thing, an applicant for employment—and I am reading from the rules laid down by this Commission:
>
> "Applicant for employment may not be told that this is a Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish organization."
>
> In other words, if you are in the business of publishing religious literature, you cannot even give him that information under this law which the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Dirksen, now proposes for the whole country, including Illinois.
>
> Here is another unlawful practice:
>
> "An applicant for employment may not be told that the following holidays will be observed by the firm and no others, naming the holidays; e. g., Decoration Day and the Fourth of July, etc."
>
> You cannot tell them under the laws, rulings, and regulations of the State of New York that they may observe the Fourth of July.
>
> Here is another unlawful practice:
>
> "An applicant for employment may not be told that employees are required to work Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur."
>
> Frankly, I did not know there were any such days until the last few years.
>
> Another thing, it is an unlawful practice under this New York law to make "Inquiry into the complexion of an applicant for employment."
>
> Inquire into his complexion and you are likely to get yourself tangled up with the law of the State of New York.
>
> Here is another unlawful practice:
>
> "Requirement that an applicant for employment annex a photograph."
>
> That would be an unlawful employment practice. You are not supposed to know how he looks.
>
> Remember, this is not in Russia, but in New York.
>
> Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
>
> Mr. RANKIN. I yield.
>
> Mr. MASON. And yet the State Department in order to grant a visa requires a photograph of the person to be presented with his application.
>
> Mr. RANKIN. Certainly; and they ought to do so. Much as I respect the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], I certainly would not want to employ him unless I knew how he looked. If I had never seen him, I would certainly want to see his picture.
>
> Here is another unlawful practice:
>
> "Inquiry whether an applicant for employment is a naturalized or native-born citizen; the date when the applicant acquired citizenship; whether the applicant's parents or spouse are naturalized or native-born citizens of the United States; the date when such parents or spouse acquired citizenship."
>
> You cannot inquire into those questions under this FEPC law in New York.
>
> Here is another unlawful practice:
>
> "Requirement that an applicant for employment produce his naturalization papers or first papers."
>
> He may lie to you and tell you that he is a naturalized citizen, but you cannot ask to see his papers.
>
> Another unlawful practice in New York is to—
>
> "Inquire into the lineage of an applicant for employment, his ancestry, or national origin."
>
> You remember a few years ago the Dallas News inserted an advertisement for a colored janitor, and this FEPC outfit down the street, ordered them to take it out, said it was an unlawful practice.
>
> One member of this FEPC outfit here in Washington went into the office of Swift & Co., in Chicago. This FEPC man asked them: "How many Negroes do you have on your board of directors?"
>
> The answer was "None."
>
> Then the FEPC man asked him: "Why haven't you?"
>
> That was the FEPC down here in Washington a few years ago before it died because a few radicals could not browbeat Congress into perpetuating it.
>
> But it is now in force in the State of New York.
>
> Here is another unlawful practice under the New York law:
>
> "Inquiry into the location of places of business of relatives of an applicant for employment."
>
> It is an unlawful practice to make—
>
> "Inquiry into the place of residence of the parents, spouse, or other close relatives of an applicant for employment."
>
> I am reading from the records at Albany.
>
> Here is another unlawful practice:
>
> "Inquiry into the maiden name of the wife of a male applicant for employment and/or inquiry into the maiden name of the mother of a male or female applicant for employment."
>
> The other day we had the Rislers down here. One of them has been shown to be representing the Comintern, according to his sister's testimony. He has a brother out in California, who seems to be poisoning the public mind through the moving-picture industry. He tries to defend his brother and refers to this woman as "my former sister." If you wanted to employ any of them and check the name of at least one of them as given here, you could not inquire into those names at all—if you are trying to do business in the State of New York—even though one of them has a half dozen aliases. You could not even ask where they came from or when they got here or when they changed their names.
>
> Here is another unlawful practice, in New York:
>
> "Inquiry into the general military experience of an applicant for employment."
>
> I wish every ex-serviceman could read that, and the next one.
>
> Here it is. It is an unlawful practice to make—
>
> "Inquiry into the whereabouts of an applicant for employment during the First World War, that is, during the period from 1914 to 1919."
>
> In other words, inquiry as to his whereabouts in the period from 1914 to 1919 is forbidden as an unlawful practice in the State of New York.
>
> Is that what you want in Colorado? Is that what you want in Massachusetts?
>
> Mr. GIFFORD. We have it.
>
> Mr. RANKIN. Get rid of it, and we will help you.
>
> Is that what you want in Kansas, in Ohio, and in other States?
>
> Let your States vote on it. Michigan is going to vote on it right away. If you will tell the people of Michigan the whole truth, let them know the whole truth about this monstrosity, I will guarantee you they will beat it worse than they did in California.
>
> Here is another unlawful practice:
>
> "Inquiry into the organizations of which an applicant for employment is a member, including organizations the name or character of which indicates the religion, race, or national origin of its members."
>
> I presume, if they should ask me if I am a member of the Masonic lodge, I could have them jerked up and brought before this inquisition board or probably prosecuted at various places throughout the country.
>
> Mr. Speaker, I am not criticising the people of New York. I have long since learned in going from one State to another that real Americans are about the same everywhere. I believe if they had a vote on it the people of New York would beat it, just as they did in California.
>
> They are having a vote on it in Michigan because a little minority group has been attempting to browbeat the Legislature of Michigan into passing it. I dare say when it goes on the ballot in Michigan and the people of Michigan understand what it means they will defeat it more thoroughly than they did in California. The same thing would happen in probably every other State in the Union.
>
> Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
>
> Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.
>
> Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman tell us what the penalties are in New York?
>
> Mr. RANKIN. In addition to being harassed to death with orders and directives to cease, desist, rehire, and so forth, there is a punishment provided of "imprisonment in a penitentiary or county jail for not more than 1 year or by fine of not more than $500, or by both."
>
> Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
>
> Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.
>
> Mr. GIFFORD. I want to remind the gentleman that we have that law in Massachusetts.
>
> Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that.
>
> Mr. GIFFORD. I was thoroughly amazed when I looked into it; I had not learned what the rules were. But perhaps we carried it too far. I am so sorry, and I have been, and I am not in favor of this, I can assure the gentleman.
>
> Mr. RANKIN. I know the gentleman is not, and I am sure the people of Massachusetts would not favor it if they had a vote on it.
>
> Mr. GIFFORD. Employers always inquire and must know whether you come from a respectable family or not. They are so careful. Perhaps they overdid it. But I think a man ought to be able to find out whether he came from a respectable family.
>
> Mr. RANKIN. There are a great many questions that should be asked, which are forbidden under this law.
>
> Mr. Speaker, in order to give the new Members an idea of what a mess this FEPC was

here in Washington during its existence under Executive order, I insert a speech I made on this subject in 1945.

It reads as follows:

"FEPC A BETRAYAL OF WHITE AMERICANS

"(Speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, July 12, 1945)

"Mr. RANKIN. Mr. CHAIRMAN, the passage of a law at this time legalizing this so-called FEPC would be a betrayal of the white people of the country. If every individual in the United States could understand just what it means, there would be such a roar of protest coming from every State in this Union that it would have to see the light of day.

"If every Member of Congress would screw his courage to the sticking place and vote his convictions on this so-called FEPC, it would not get 50 votes out of the entire membership of 435.

"It is a most dangerous and brazen attempt to fasten upon the white people of America the worst system of control by alien or minority racial groups that has been known since the crucifixion.

"When I read the names of the personnel of this outfit you will understand what I mean.

"To sanctify this organization by law would give the lie to everything we have told our American boys they were fighting for. Instead of coming back to liberty, freedom, and democracy, they would find themselves sold into this bondage, hobbled, humiliated, and regimented by alien influences directed by a foreign comintern representing the deadly doctine of Karl Marx that is based upon hatred for Christianity and for everything that is based on Christian principles.

"It is a manifestation in legislative form of that infidelity that has slowed thousands of Christian churches in Europe and been responsible for the murder of untold millions of Christian human beings.

"This measure is not directed altogether at the white people of the South. If it were, you folks in the North would not have so much ground for alarm. We in the South know how to combat subversive elements. As Henry Grady once said, we wrested the South from such domination when Federal drum beats rolled nearer and Federal bayonets hedged closer to the ballot box of the South than it ever will again in this Republic.'

"But you people in the North have not had that training, and this FEPC is likely to bring grief, strife, hatred, race riots, and chaos in your northern cities if this vicious agency is perpetuated and sanctioned by your votes.

"Do not forget that the returning servicemen know what this thing means, and they are going to call you to account next year—beginning with the primary. They are not going to wait until the general election.

"Do not forget that every businessman, every farmer, every professional man, and every other independent individual whose blood glows with the instinct of American liberty is going to join these men, and those other patriotic forces that are fighting to save American institutions for which these boys have been fighting and dying upon every battlefield in the world.

"If every man and every woman in the United States could just read the list of individuals that compose the personnel of this crazy FEPC, and its subsidiaries throughout the country, I dare say there would not be enough of you left who vote for it, even if nominated in the primaries next year, to form a corporal's guard.

"For your information, and for the information of the American people generally, I am going to read you the official personnel as it exists today. Remember, this list is taken from the official record. This is the group that wants to lose life and control every business in the United States. Remember, they can search the files and records of every business establishment in America where some disgruntled individual is willing to trump up a charge of discrimination. They can drag them all over the country and try them, and in that way destroy any ordinary business concern.

"The next thing they are going to try to do is get control of your schools and force their communistic henchmen into the schools and teach your children their subversive doctrines.

"Read these lists carefully, which, as I said, are taken from the official records here in Washington, and you will see that not one out of ten on these rolls is a white Gentile American.

"Here is the official list:

"Committee on Fair Employment Practice, Washington, D. C., Office of the Chairman

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ross, Malcolm	Chairman	White	$8,000
Johnson, George M.	Deputy Chairman.	Colored	8,000
Hubbard, Macee	Hearings examiner.	do	5,600
Bloch, Emanuel	do	White	5,600
Copper, Evelyn	do	do	5,600
Berking, Max	Assistant to Chairman.	do	3,800
Alexander, Dorothy	Secretary to Chairman.	Colored	2,600
Clifton, J. Jeanne	Secretary to Deputy.	do	2,000
Brooks, Mary	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Banting, Myra	do	White	1,800

"You will note that in this office of the chairman, consisting of 10 people, there are 5 Negroes and 5 white people, most of whom have foreign names. One of the whites is a stenographer who receives the smallest salary of anyone on the list.

"Remember that the members of this group preside over the destiny of every business enterprise in America, and are using their assumed powers to harass white Americans out of business.

"This is the organization Members of Congress are being asked to perpetuate by the passage of this bill.

"FIELD OPERATIONS

"Here is the Division of Field Operations:

"Field operations

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Maslow, Will	Chief	White	$6,500
Mitchell, Clarence	Principal fair-practice examiner.	Colored	5,600
Davidson, Eugene	do	do	5,600
Beall, W. Hayes	Senior fair-practice examiner.	White	4,600
Mercer, Inez	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Rogers, Eleanor	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Saito, Otome	do	Japanese-American.	1,800
Thompson, Mildred	do	Colored	1,800
Cornick, Emma	do	do	1,620

"You will note that it consists of nine people—five Negroes, one Japanese, and three others—two of whom have records of affiliations with Communist-front organizations, according to the reports of the Dies committee.

"Imagine this group going about over the country riding herd on the white American businessmen of the Nation, telling them whom they shall employ, whom they shall promote, and with whom they may associate.

"It would be interesting, and probably enlightening, to check up on these people and see how many of them are native-born Americans.

"Members of Congress had better do this now, before they get caught in this trap, because this question of un-American activities is going to be an issue in every congressional district next year, beginning with the primaries.

"The people are not going to wait until the general election for someone who holds a commission as a result of the pernicious activities of Sidney Hillman and his gang to wrap the party cloak about him and shout to the people of his district that 'I am a Republican' or 'I am a Democrat.'

"More than 2,000,000 young men have already been discharged in this war, and they are organizing now to try to save America for Americans. They are going to read your records, and they are likely to ask you some very embarrassing questions when you get home.

"REVIEW AND ANALYSIS DIVISION

"Now look at this list and see who reviews all these records of racial discrimination when they come to Washington, and you will understand how the editor of the Dallas News felt and how other white gentiles feel, including Cecil B. DeMille, the great American movie producer, when they are harassed out of business.

"Here is the list:

"Review and Analysis Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Davis, John A.	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Lawson, Marjorie	Research analyst.	do	3,800
Golightly, Cornelius.	Compliance analyst.	do	2,[illegible]
Hemphill, India	do	do	2,[illegible]
Coan, Carol	do	White	2,[illegible]
Davis, Joy P.	do	Colored	2,[illegible]
Hoffman, Celia	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Spaulding, Joan	do	Colored	1,800

"You will note that it consists of six Negroes and two white people, one of whom is named Carol Coan and the other Celia Hoffman, a white stenographer receiving the lowest salary on the list.

"Now, if you sign the petition to bring out this bill or vote for this monstrosity, do not forget that when you get home those white American businessmen who help to sustain this Nation in time of peace and whose sons are fighting its battles in time of war are going to want to ask you some questions that you may not be able to answer.

"LEGAL DIVISION

"But if you want a real laugh, look at this Legal Division.

"Legal Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Reeves, Frank D.	Attorney	Colored	$4,600
Stickgold, Simon	do	White	4,600
Gordon, Jerneslive	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800

"You will note that this so-called Legal Division consists of two Negroes and a Simon Stickgold.

"INFORMATION DIVISION

"Now we come to the Information Division. If you want information about this outfit, write to this Division:

"Information Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Bourne, St. Clair	Information specialist.	Colored	$3,800
Whiting, Margaret	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

"You will note that it consists of two Negroes, one registered as an information specialist and the other as a clerk-stenographer.

"BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

"Now we come to the Budget and Administration Division. This Division not only makes up the budget but administers the regulations. Here is the list:

"Budget and Administration

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Jones, Theodore	Chief	Colored	$3,800
Jeter, Sinclair	Assistant administrative officer.	do	3,200
Baker, Vivian D.	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Jackson, Rosalee A.	Clerk-typist	do	1,620
Paynter, Minnie A.	do	do	1,620
Holloman, Irving	Clerk	do	1,440
Selby, Ralph R.	Chief, fiscal	do	2,600
Ross, Sylvia B.	Voucher auditor	do	2,600
Nelson, Otella	Accounting clerk	do	1,620
Carpenter, Elizabeth.	do	do	1,620
Brent, Pearl T.	do	do	1,620

"This outfit, which is composed of 11 Negroes, and no whites at all, not only makes up the budget for financing this aggregation, but it seems to have the power of administration. I hope you will read this list to your white businessmen, farmers, and ex-servicemen at home when you get back and ask for renomination in the primaries next year.

"MAIL AND FILES DIVISION

"Now, here are the ones that have control of the mails and filing system:

"Mail and Files

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Douglas, Lela	Chief, Mail and Files.	Colored	$3,[illegible]
Welch, Selena	Docket clerk	do	1,800
Gamble, Jessie	File clerk	do	1,620
Phillips, Rose	do	do	1,440
Reed, Charles	Messenger	do	1,[illegible]
Mitchell, Regina	File clerk	do	1,440

"You will note that this division is composed entirely of Negroes—six Negroes, and no whites at all. I wonder why they discriminated against the white race in setting up these two powerful branches of this most dangerous agency?

"REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW YORK

"Now, let us turn to the regional offices and see who is going to harass the business people back in the States. Here is the list for the State of New York:

"Regional office, New York

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Lawson, Edward H.	Regional director.	Colored	$[illegible]
Jones, Madison S.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,600
Jones, Robert G.	do	do	3,[illegible]
Donovan, Daniel R.	do	White	3,[illegible]
Irish, Miriam	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	2,000
Asopha, Tillie	do	White	1,[illegible]
Schwartz, Sonia	do	do	1,620

"This is the list that is going to help Governor Dewey harass the white American businessmen of the Empire State. You will note that it is composed of four Negroes and three white people. Please read the names of the three white people and see if you can figure out their antecedents.

"Businessmen of New York are going to have a hard time after this war without having all this communistic conglomeration to deal with, to say nothing of the one which Governor Dewey and his political henchmen have now heaped upon them.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, PHILADELPHIA

"Now, let us turn to Philadelphia, the birthplace of the Constitution—the City of Brotherly Love. At the risk of causing glorious old Benjamin Franklin to turn over in his grave, I read you the list:

"Regional office, Philadelphia

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Fleming, G. James	Regional director.	Colored	$5,000
Greenblatt, Mildred.	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Manly, Milo A.	do	Colored	3,800
Risk, Samuel R.	do	White	3,800
Grimage, Willard	do	Colored	3,200
Gorges, Helen	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Klinger, Karyl	do	White	1,800
Brown, Grayce	do	Colored	1,440

"You will note that it is composed of eight individuals—five Negroes and three whites, Mildred Greenblatt, Samuel R. Risk, and Karyl Klinger.

"Don't you know there will be some brotherly love when that crowd gets going on the businessmen of the Philadelphia area?

"REGIONAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

"Now, here is the regional office in Washington, D. C., the Nation's Capital, where there has been so much persecution of white gentiles in the last few years. Here is the list:

"Regional office, Washington, D. C.

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Evans, Joseph	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Houston, Theophilus.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,200
Kahn, Alice	do	White	2,600
Chisolm, Ruby	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Urback, Dorothy	do	do	1,[illegible]

"You will note it consists of four Negroes and Alice Kahn. Just what chance a white gentile will have with this group is entirely problematical, to say the least of it.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, CLEVELAND

"Now, let us move out where the West begins and take a look. Here is the list in the Cleveland regional office:

"Regional office, Cleveland

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
McKnight, William.	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Abbott, Olcott R.	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,600
Glore, Lethia	do	Colored	3,200
Kelley, Bernina	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,620
Wasem, Edna	do	White	1,800

"You will note that this group is composed of three Negroes and two whites, Olcott R. Abbott and Edna Wasem.

"Don't you know the white people of Cleveland will enjoy being dominated by them?

"CINCINNATI REGIONAL OFFICE

"Cincinnati seems to be largely under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland office since it only has two people:

"Cincinnati

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
James, Harold	Fair-practices examiner.	White	$4,600
------	Clerk-stenographer.	------	1,800

"DETROIT REGIONAL OFFICE

"Now let us move on to Detroit, Mich. Here is the regional office for Detroit:

"Detroit

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Swan, Edward	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$4,600
Sese, Doris K.	Clerk-stenographer.	Japanese-American.	1,620

"You will note that it is composed of one Negro and one Japanese. I know the businessmen of Detroit are grateful for this consideration.

"I should like to hear some of the comments they will make to you gentlemen from Detroit when you get home next summer, if you support this vicious measure.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, CHICAGO

"Here is the list of the regional office in the Windy City:

"Regional office, Chicago

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Henderson, Elmer	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Gibson, Harry H. C.	Fair-practices examiner.	do	3,600
Schultz, Joy	do	White	3,600
Williams, Le Roy	do	Colored	3,200
Zeidman, Penny	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Ingram, Marguerite S.	do	Colored	1,620

"You will note it is composed of four Negroes, Joy Shultz, and Penny Zeidman. I am told that a representative of this group went into the office of Swift & Co. and asked how many Negro members they had on their board of directors. The answer was, 'We have no Negro members on our board of directors.' Then the question came back 'Why haven't you?' This just shows what this supergovernmental set-up is driving at. They want to communize America and destroy everything which our glorious ancestors have left us and for which our boys are now fighting and dying all over the world.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, ATLANTA

"Here is a list of the Atlanta office:

"Regional office, Atlanta

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Dodge, Witherspoon.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Hope, John	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,[illegible]
McKay, George D.	do	White	3,200
Chubb, Sally	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Ingram, Thelma	do	Colored	1,800

"You will note that it consists of two Negroes and three whites; the most important post in this office, that of examiner, is held by a Negro. I wonder how the people of Georgia enjoy the domination of this

group. I may have more to say about them later.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, KANSAS CITY

"Here is the list of the Kansas City office:

"*Regional office, Kansas City*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hoglund, Roy A.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Ormsbee, Eugene	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Mildred	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620
Schlam, Helene G.	do	White	1,620

"You will note that this office force consists of three whites and one Negro. You can read the list of whites yourself and then judge how many of them really represent the people of that area.

"ST. LOUIS REGIONAL OFFICE

"Here is the list of the regional office at St. Louis:

"*St. Louis*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Theodore Brown	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$3,800
Morris Levine	Examiner	White	3,200
Armetha Jackson	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620

"You will notice that it consists of two Negroes and Morris Levine. Just how they came to select these particular [illegible] to preside over the destiny of the white businessmen of the great State of Missouri I cannot understand.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, DALLAS, TEX.

"The members of the regional office at Dallas are as follows:

"*Regional office, Dallas*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Castenada, Carlos	Regional director	White	$4,600
[illegible]	Fair-practice examiner.	[illegible]	3,200
Gutleben, Willetta	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,620

"You will note there is one vacancy. Last year that position was held by a Negro, namely, Roy W. Williams. The other two members, Carlos Castenada, the regional director, and Willetta Gutleben seem to be in charge of the office at the present time. This is the regional office that attacked the Dallas News last year for carrying an advertisement for a Negro janitor. This fellow Castenada, the director, held the same position that he holds now. If this set-up is made permanent, then I presume the rest of the white American businessmen in Texas may expect to be harassed just as the Dallas News was.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW ORLEANS

"The regional office at New Orleans consists of the following members:

"*Regional office, New Orleans*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ellinger, W. Dan	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Morton, James H.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,200
Banning, Evelyn	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,620

"You will note that there are two whites and one Negro in this office. As the Negro is the fair-practice examiner, just what the decent people of Louisiana may expect at the hands of this outfit is something to contemplate.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, SAN FRANCISCO

"The San Francisco office consists of the following individuals:

"*Regional office, San Francisco*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Kingman, Harry L.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Rutledge, Edward	Fair-practice examiner.	do	4,000
Ross, Bernard	do	do	3,800
Seymour, Virginia	Administrative assistant.	do	2,000
Mason, Jewel	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

"This is the only office we have found yet that consists entirely of white (?) people. Just what the background of each one of them is I am unable to say.

"LOS ANGELES REGIONAL OFFICE

"The Los Angeles regional office consists of the following:

"*Los Angeles*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hunt, A. Bruce	Hearings examiner.	White	$5,600
Brown, Robert E.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,600
Lopez, Ignacio	do	White	3,800
Vetter, Vera G.	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Lerma, Marie	do	do	1,620

"You will note that there are four whites and one Negro in this office, the Negro being the fair-practice examiner. I do not know what consideration the white businessmen of the Los Angeles area are receiving at the hands of this group, but from what I can hear there is considerable gnashing of teeth over the situation.

"Mr. Chairman, this FEPC is a supergovernment of commissars, with more power for evil than any other agency that has ever been created in this country. If Congress should ratify it and make it the law of the land, then we will have sacrificed and destroyed that sacred freedom for which our brave men are now fighting and dying on every battle front in the world.

"We have no right to pass such a drastic, revolutionary measure that literally changes our way of life, as well as our form of government, while these boys are away from home in uniform, fighting to sustain American institutions.

"As I said before, we are going to carry this battle against such un-American activities into every congressional district in the United States next year, in the primary, so that no one can crawl behind the party cloak and claim immunity at the hands of any segment of our people.

"This is a battle for the survival of free constitutional government, for the survival of the American way of life, for the survival of free enterprise, for the survival of American liberty itself.

"It is a battle to save America for Americans."

Poland Will Rise and Live Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting and proper that on this day we honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln. February 12, however, is the birthday of another apostle of freedom, Thaddeus Kosciusko. Providence works in strange and devious ways. It is more than coincidence that Lincoln and Kosciusko—two outstanding champions of freedom from two different continents, and from two different generations—should be born on the same dates.

Hence, while honoring the memory of Abraham Lincoln on this day, let us also honor the memory of Thaddeus Kosciusko—the heart, the blood, the spirit, and the inspiration of millions of Poles scattered throughout the globe. Today, more than ever, the name of Kosciusko is dear to the hearts of freedom-loving people the world over. Because today, like during the days of Kosciusko, Poland is the sad victim of betrayal by its friends—the memory of Kosciusko is heavy on all the hearts of Poland.

Providence directed that Lincoln and Kosciusko be born on the same date, even though more than a generation apart. Providence must have directed this because the two had everything in common. To both—freedom was their life work.

Lincoln emancipated the enslaved in America. Yet, long before that time Kosciusko gave of his possessions to buy freedom for the enslaved. It was with funds from Kosciusko's will that there was built the first trade school in America at Newark for Negroes.

Kosciusko came from Poland to America and for 6 years fought to create our Union. Lincoln more than a generation later fought to preserve that Union.

Whenever any nation anywhere in the world was threatened by dismemberment by bigger and corrupt neighbors—Kosciusko was always ready to help the unfortunate victims. Lincoln, as our President, by his force for good had always used his offices to protect the weak and small nations from their greedy and corrupt neighbors. To Lincoln and Kosciusko appeasement was the lowest form of betrayal.

Lincoln is known the world over for his philosophy that "a house divided against itself cannot stand." Kosciusko's philosophy went beyond that. His was the belief that a world divided against itself cannot stand. Lincoln believed that if freedom was in danger in one part of our Union, it was in danger all over the Union. Kosciusko believed that if freedom was in danger in one part of the world, it was in danger all over the world.

A close examination of the lives and works of Kosciusko and Lincoln will reveal their likeness and greatness in almost every respect. It is easy to see the hand of providence in that their birthdays come on the same date.

Mr. Speaker, I beg your indulgence in order that I might briefly review Kosciusko's contribution to the cause of freedom—freedom not only for Poland but our own freedom—and freedom for the world.

When our Union was engaged in the struggle that gave it birth in 1776, there came from a strange and far-away land a young man who gave his fortune and life to our cause. Then, like now, Poland was always a champion of freedom. Polish land, way back at that time, already was drenched with blood in its traditional fight for freedom. When the people of Poland heard of our struggle in 1776 they became gravely concerned. Every heart and every breast of Poland prayed for the Union's success. It was this universal wish among all of the people of Poland that sent Thaddeus Kosciusko to America to help us gain the freedom for which Poland on many occasions bled and died.

In the beginning things did not go so well in our Union's struggle for freedom. With justified pride Poles regard the role played by Kosciusko in the victory at Saratoga, a victory which won for America not only a battle but France's recognition of our independence. This was one of the turning points of the War for Independence.

In our Union's fight for freedom, the question of the defense of the Hudson had been of paramount importance. Kosciusko was assigned that responsibility. He choose West Point for its commanding position. Little is now left of the fortifications, but the monument erected to his memory by American youth will remain a grateful tribute forever. That America today can regard West Point with pride is, in large measure, due to Kosciusko, who first suggested for a national military school the spot where it now stands.

In the summer of 1780, Kosciusko was transferred to the South. Here he saw the Negroes at close quarters and was brought face to face with the Negroes in slavery. It was then that, with his keen susceptibility to every form of human suffering, he acquired that profound sympathy for the American Negro, which 17 years later was to dictate his parting testament to the New World.

Kosciusko was present through the whole campaign of the Carolinas and was regarded with strong affection and admiration by General Greene. When the campaign changed to one of guerrilla warfare, he fought as a soldier, not as an engineer. At length Charleston fell, and on December 14, 1782, the American Army entered the town in a triumphal procession, in which Kosciusko rode with his fellow officers, greeted by the populace with flowers and cries of "Welcome."

Peace soon followed. Our Union was born. Kosciusko helped give our Union its birth. The prayers of the people of Poland were answered. America was free. Poland, a country to whom freedom means more than life, helped make our Nation free.

Kosciusko had fought for 6 years in the American Army. Nathaniel Greene best sums up what the Pole had done for America and what he had been to his brother soldiers:

Colonel Kosciusko belonged—

Wrote Greene—

to the number of my most useful and dearest comrades in arms. I can liken to nothing his zeal in the public service, and in the solution of important problems nothing could have been more helpful than his judgment, vigilance, and diligence. He was fearless of every danger. He never manifested desires or claims to himself, and never let the opportunity pass of calling attention to and recommending the merits of others.

Congress, in 1783, belatedly conferred upon Kosciusko the rank of brigadier general with an acknowledgment of its high sense of his long, faithful, and meritorious service.

In the fall of 1784, Kosciusko returned in his native country. For the next 12 years he remained in Europe—through the infamous partitions of Poland and the many battles fought in connection therewith. It was in 1794 that Kosciusko was seriously wounded in battle and was taken prisoner by Russia, not to be released until 2 years later. Then, like now, Poland became the prey of the Muscovite Bear—while the rest of the world looked the other way. Then, like now, Poland was the pawn of hyprocrites and betrayers.

Wounded, sick at heart and body, on the 19th of December 1796, Kosciuski left St. Petersburg to go back to America. In good time he arrived in Stockholm, where he was greeted with enthusiasm. Later, Kosciusko embarked and after a 3 weeks' passage landed in London.

The Gentlemen's magazine announced: "Kosciusko, the hero of freedom, is here."

The whole of London made haste to visit him. Politicians, men of letters, and the rules of fashion, all alike thronged to his rooms. To Walter Savage Landor, then a mere youth, the sight of Kosciusko awakened a sympathy for Poland that he never lost, and to which English literature owes one of his Imaginary Conversations. More than half a century later he looked back to the moment in which he spoke to Kosciusko as the happiest of his life. The Whig Club presented Kosciusko with a sword of honor; the Duchess of Devonshire pressed upon him a costly ring, which went the way of most of the gifts that Kosciusko received—he passed them on to his friends. Tokens of admiration had counted for nought in Kosciusko's life. They were the merest baubles to him who had seen his own country fall. In the portrait that without his knowledge Cosway painted, we see him lie with bandaged head in an attitude of deep and sorrowful musing—for his native Poland.

Bristol was at that time the English port for sailing to America and it was there that, after a fortnight's stay in London, Kosciusko betook himself. He found in Bristol old friends of American days, and now was the guest of one of them, at that time United States consul. A guard of honor received him, processions of the townsfolk flocked to catch a glimpse of the hero, a military band played every evening before the consulate, and he received as the gift of the city a handsome silver service. One who visited him here records his impression of a soul unbroken by misfortune, by wounds, poverty, and exile.

The journey down the Avon to where Kosciusko's ship lay at anchor was a triumphal progress. He was accompanied by English officers in full dress, by the American consul, and hosts of well-wishers. All heads were bared as he was carried on board. The whole length of the river handkerchiefs were waved from the banks. Farewell resounded from every rock and promontory, where spectators had crowded to see the last of the Polish hero. Boats shot out from the private dwellings on the waterside, laden with flowers and fruits for the departing guest. Not a few men and women boarded the ship and accompanied Kosciusko for some distance before they could bring themselves to part with him.

The ship had sailed on June 18, 1797. For 2 months Kosciusko and his Polish companions tossed on the Atlantic, on one occasion near shipwreck. Philadelphia, their destination, they reached on August 18, 1797. Claypole's Advertiser for August 19, 1797, reported:

In the ship *Adriana*, Captain Lee, arrived here last evening, from Bristol, came passenger, that illustrious defender of the rights of mankind, the brave but unfortunate Kosciusko, the Polish general. On his landing he was received with three cheers. And, as a further mark of popular respect for this great character, the citizens insisted upon drawing him to his lodgings. The general appears to be in good spirits, but has suffered very materially from his wounds and inhuman imprisonment. We trust, however, he will long live to enjoy in these peaceful shores, that liberty and happiness which he assisted in fighting for, but which he fought in vain to obtain for his native land.

Eight days later Washington, from Mount Vernon, congratulated Kosciusko on his safe arrival and welcomed him to the land whose liberties he had been instrumental in establishing.

No one—

Said Washington—

has a higher respect and veneration for your character than I have, and no one more sincerely wished, during your arduous struggle in the cause of liberty in your country, that it might be crowned with success. But the ways of providence are inscrutable and mortals must submit. I pray you to believe that at all times, and under all circumstances, it would make me happy to see you at my last retreat, from which I never expect to be more than 20 miles.

Kosciusko was, however, never able to visit his commander at Mount Vernon.

At this time Kosciusko drew into great intimacy with Thomas Jefferson, at that time Secretary of State. Jefferson wrote to Gates:

I see Kosciusko often. He is the purest son of liberty among you all that I have ever known.

Sometime in March 1796 a packet of letters from Europe was handed to Kosciusko. His emotion on reading the contents was so strong that, despite his crippled condition, he sprang from his couch and stepped without a helping hand to the middle of the room. "I must return at once to Europe," he said. At that time he received news that Poland was again being massacred. Before leaving America he gave Jefferson his power of attorney and wrote out the will in which more than half a century before the Civil War the Polish patriot advanced the cause of emancipation:

I, Thaddeus Kosciusko, being just in departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that my friend Thomas Jefferson employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own as any others and giving them liberty in my name; in giving them an education in trades and otherwise, and in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers or mothers, husbands or wives, and in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country, and of the good order of society and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful, and I make the said Thomas Jefferson my executor of this.

T. Kosciusko.

3th Day of May 1798.

By the end of June or early in July 1798, Kosciusko reached Paris. His arrival centered upon him the gaze of the whole world. Sympathy with himself and the Polish cause he heard expressed upon all sides. He negotiated at length with the Government of France for France's help in the restoration of Polish independence. This was promised him many times, but his cautious request for guaranties was never complied with. Then, like now, Poland was betrayed by its friends and used as a pawn to gain temporary peace, expediency, and advantage.

But Kosciusko's intercourse with his American friends did not slacken. In 1800, at Paris, at the request of Gen. William R. Davies, then envoy from the United States to France, Kosciusko prepared in French his Manœuvres of Horse Artillery, and it was published. General Davies requested the United States Military Philosophical Society at West Point to have the manual translated and published. This was done in the same year, and Colonel Williams, the translator, presented President Jefferson with a copy of this work, the first upon its subject to be published in America and used for many years as a basic text in our country.

Napoleon was now big man of Europe. In 1806, from Berlin, he summoned Kosciusko to assume the leadership of the revolting Poles. But the former Polish commander in chief had little faith in the fortune of the Emperor and none in his promises. He declined to obey the call and remained in Paris. He refused to use Poland as a pawn to promote a dictator. He refused to barter his honor and the honor of his native Poland. Appeasement hypocrisy was not part of his life.

In May 1815 Russia, Austria, and Prussia signed an agreement for a new partition of Poland, just like they did at Yalta. An autonomous Kingdom of Poland was to be formed with the Czar as King, but it would be but a small part of the true Poland. Kosciusko heard these things. In dismay, he wrote to the Czar. In vain he waited for an answer. Kosciusko refused all offers of office and honor in the newly partitioned Poland—now a puppet of the Czar. He felt that his very presence, even, would lend sanction to the new partition. He despised puppets and quislings. He chose, therefore, a voluntary exile among the Swiss.

In serene communion with nature, among eternal mountains, in unceasing meditation upon the future of Poland, he spent the two last years of his life. And here, on the sad autumn evening of October 15, 1817, far from his fatherland, though close in spirit, among strangers, with not a Polish face nor a Polish word to gladden his heart, Kosciusko died. Even in his loneliness he was faithful to Poland—her purest soul and the greatest of Poles. And his greatness in that it was not his own personal greatness; merely, it was the greatness of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, the greatness of Kosciusko is the greatness of Poland. The spirit of Kosciusko has always been the spirit of Poland. Wherever freedom needs a friend there you will always find Poland the first to bleed and suffer. No soil of any nation the world over is so saturated with blood gashed for freedom as it is in Poland. There in that land at all times freedom had a loyal and trusting friend. Kosciusko is dead—but his spirit still guides Poland and its people.

Let us go back just a few years to 1938 and 1939. The whole world was afraid of a little paperhanger from Austria, then the big man of Europe. I remember at that time even in our own country when I denounced the leader of the "master race" I was told I should temper my words because Adolf might get mad at us. Among all the nations of the world there was no voice courageous enough to even call Adolf Schickelgruber a bad name. The leaders of the world licked the boots of the tyrant. They went to Munich. Chamberlain even took an umbrella with him, hoping that he might get the privilege and high honor of protecting the paperhanger from the rain. Shaking in their boots the powers of Europe appeased and fought for the favors of the big man of Europe. Even the mighty Red Bear of Russia embraced the madman of Europe and plotted with him the murder of small and helpless people of small and helpless nations.

In all the world during these tragic years, 1933 and 1939, there was only one nation and one people courageous enough to call the paperhanger's bluff. True to the spirit of Kosciusko, the people of Poland said, "We care not what course other nations take, but as for us we shall stand up and fight. The cause of freedom is at stake. We would rather fight and die for that freedom than lick the boots of any tyrant."

How courageously the people of Poland fought is written in the records of the past 7 years. To the last man, woman, and child they stood up. In the long struggle ahead—6 years—there could not be found in Poland a single quisling. The spirit of Kosciusko was prevalent in the hearts, minds, and breasts of every single Pole—fighting and dying for their freedom, as well as ours.

Meeting the mightiest military power in all history, they fought on. Alone they bore the brunt of the killers of Europe. After 19 days of glorious resistance, they were stabbed in the back by one of Hitler's pals—the bear of Russia. The bank robber of Georgia—not a Ruslan—and the paperhanger of Austria—not a German—were now butchering and dividing the spoils and carcass of prostrate Poland. Now Poland was attacked from both sides by two of the mightiest powers the world had ever known. Still they fought on. Still the spirit of Kosciusko urged them on. Never in the history of mankind has there been such an exhibition of glorious courage and resistance. Poland did not get lend-lease to spur on their courage. The spirit of Kosciusko was all the inspiration these people needed.

As Members of Congress we know the story full well. Poland was not a warring nation. All they had to offer was courage, life, and blood. But that was not enough to stop the bank robber of Georgia and the paperhanger from Austria. Poland was overrun and destroyed. The paperhanger enslaved the Poles in the west in labor and concentration camps and the bank robber from Georgia took the Poles from the east and sent them to Siberia.

But it takes more than murder to destroy the spirit of Poland which is the spirit of Kosciusko. Enslaved and betrayed by the rest of the world Poland still fought on. They fought harder and longer than any of the Allies of this war. A few months after Poland fell, a Polish Army was fighting in France in the Maginot line. When mighty France folded up, the Poles were the last to lay down their arms in the Maginot line. From there the Poles went to England. Six months after Poland fell 12,000 Polish boys were flying in the British Royal Air Force. They shot down one out of every five planes during the London blitz. One of the Polish squadrons was named the Kosciusko Squadron.

The only help the Allies sent Norway was a small contingent of Polish boys and what was left of the Polish Navy. All this after Poland was destroyed and overtaken by the Red and Brown Fascists of Europe. By now Hitler was running wild in Africa. It was a group of Polish boys that gave Hitler his first defeat at Tobruk. This after Poland had been overrun. This Polish Air Force helped in the evacuation at Dunkerque. So did what was left of the Polish Navy. The spirit of Kosciusko will never be destroyed, nor will the spirit of Poland.

What American is there who does not remember the deadly battle of Monte Cassino Hill? It was a Polish general and a Polish Army that captured that murderous fortification and paved the road for the Allies on their march to Rome. Nor did Poland refuse to play a part in the invasion of Normandy. Side by side with the Allies Polish forces marched through France, Holland, Belgium into Germany. Never in the annals of history have so few done so much for the cause of freedom and humanity. Wherever there was a fight there you found Poland. The first to resist—the first to be destroyed—yet out of the ashes of that destruction Poland contributed manpower for the air forces exceeded only by the United States and England. The first to resist and the first to be destroyed—yet Poland provided fighting troops in an amount larger than all the nations combined outside the United States, the British Empire, and Russia.

If all this were all it would be more than enough. But the people who stayed in Poland—what part did they play? True to the spirit of Kosciusko the people of Poland organized the largest and most effective underground in Europe. Every Polish man, woman, and child was a part of that underground. The Polish underground was the most effective weapon the Allies had in their march through Europe. In one uprising—the Warsaw uprising—alone, in August of 1944, 250,000 Polish men, women, and children laid down their lives. Even though betrayed by its own allies, the underground fought on. With true Kosciusko spirit they had faith in Almighty God.

The courage and the sacrifice by Poland in this last war has no parallel in the annals of history. More than 8,000,000 of her people gave their lives. That comprises almost one-fourth of her population. When in the annals of man has any nation paid so high a price for freedom? If Kosciusko were alive today he would be proud of his native land and its people; to whom freedom means more than life, and to whom freedom is so priceless that it can never be compromised.

But I am sad to say that there is one thing Kosciusko would not be proud of. I might also say that there is one thing Lincoln would not be proud of. I might add that there is one thing that decent people the world over are not proud of. It is the shameful and unprecedented betrayal of a brave and a gallant people by its own allies.

Poland has had a sad history. It was dismembered time and again. Three times before the nineteenth century—the fourth time by a bank robber and a paperhanger in fateful September 1939. But these partitions were by enemies. That is to be expected and endured. If you, as a person, are robbed by your enemies, it is sad but understandable. However, when you get robbed by your own brother or sister, that is hard to understand, let alone endure. Yet that is what happened to Poland. It was partitioned by its brothers and enslaved by its brothers, as a result of the crime of Yalta. What a shameful reward to a brave and gallant people—a people that gave us a Kosciusko and a people who gave 8,000,000 dead for the same cause for which we gave more than 300,000 dead:

O feeble statesmen,
O ignominious times
That lick the tyrants' feet,
And smile upon his crimes.

Shame on us. Shame on Britain. Shame upon the world for such cowardly appeasement. Shades of Munich. Shades of Chamberlain. But Munich is a Sunday-school picnic compared to Yalta, and Chamberlain a Sunday-school teacher compared to the big men of Yalta. I say Yalta will go down in history as worse than Munich and its conspirators worse than Chamberlains.

What did Poland ask for its sacrifice? Did they ask for four or seven billion dollars from American taxpayers? No. Did they ask for the atom bomb? No. Did they ask for us to ever bail them out and rebuild Poland? No. Poland did not even ask for bread.

Then what did Poland ask? They merely asked for their own land and their own government. In the name of truth, mercy, and freedom Poland had a right to expect that simple and honorable request to be fulfilled. But the answer Poland received from one of the White House palace guards was, "You Poles are just like the Irish; you are never satisfied."

So lo and behold—all this gallant blood of Poland was gashed in vain—because Poland by the acts of greedy and power-hungry men of Yalta—lies prostrate again. But mark you, fellow countrymen—Poland is not this sad drama's closing act. Its tragic curtain will rise anew again and again. On Poland's gashed breast today the beast of Red fascism plants his hunger and consults what nation's breast shall next be gored. This is just the beginning. There will be more and more stupendous slaughters of the free.

To gallant Poland we can well say—as other nations fall one by one—then and only then will they know what it means to be betrayed like Poland was betrayed. When these nations fall one by one they will miss Poland. As they fall one by one and plead for mercy on bended knee—then and only then will they understand the glory that belongs to Poland.

To you Members of Congress—the elected custodians of America—I wish to warn that the fall of the Polish eagle, caused by betrayal, is big with fate to man. If the New World is to begin by a broken word, it would be better not to be born. Our own strife is coming. You cannot sell out the freedom of your friends and neighbors and keep your own secure. The beast of Red fascism from the ashes and blood-soaked soil of betrayed Poland shall forge the fetters and fate of our sons yet unborn. It will not be a kind fate. It will be a hideous, murderous, and shrieking fate. Today its Poland—tomorrow it will be another—after that another, one by one, and us, too. It is nearer than you think. Someday and soon the world will understand the words, "Poland's setting star is the world's disaster-rising morn."

In conclusion, Poland, the world will someday mind how you bore the brunt of fate and how you bled for humankind. Poland, so hallowedly have you played your part that freedom-loving people everywhere have your name written on their heart. Poland, your sorrow in nobility transcends. Your conquerors' and betrayers' joy make their own cheeks blush. But shame never has and never will tinge the cheeks of Poland. Thank God that Poland never has and never will change her conscience, cause, and name for all the wealth and all that goes with a felon fame.

Poland might be dead for a while. Poland has died before. But the spirit of Poland has never died and never will die. Because Poland is the spirit of Kosciusko—even after suffering defeat in victory—the spirit of Kosciusko shall make Poland rise again and live again as it has before. Why do I say that?

I say Poland will arise and live again, because the Polish people have a patriot's spirit, an unconquerable spirit. Just a few days ago, for instance, 50 young Polish orphans left India for the United States to seek haven in various convents in America. When they boarded the ship in India, in unison they sang, "Jescie Polska nie Zginela," which means Poland is not yet lost. All the orphans of Poland, morning, noon, and night sing in their hearts "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." There are 250,000 Polish troops who bled all over the world for their freedom and ours. They are now in the beet fields of Canada and in the mines of England, but morning, noon, and night they sing "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." There are 12,000 gallant Polish airmen scattered over the four corners of the world without a country and without a home, and morning, noon, and night they sing "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." There are 6,000,000 Poles in America, proud and happy citizens of our own native land, yet morning, noon, and night they sing "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." There are 25,000,000 Polish people being tortured under the heel of Red fascism in Europe, but morning, noon, and night in their hearts and minds are the words of the immortal Polish song "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." That is the spirit of Poland; that is the spirit of Kosciusko. It is an unconquerable spirit that will never die.

I say that Poland will arise and live again, because they have a profound affection for their native land. I might mention that it is an old custom in Poland that when a citizen leaves that country, his last deed is to pick up a bit of Polish soil to take with him so that it can be buried with him in case he never returns to Poland. Such profound affection for a native land is unique among all people of the world.

I say Poland will arise and live again, because the Polish people everywhere have an abounding faith in Almighty God. You can steal their country and the Poles will be sad, but they will sing and pray "There is a God." You can murder their loved ones, but the Poles will sing and pray "There is a God." You can destroy every last segment of their nation, and the Poles will pray and sing "There is a God."

With the immortal spirit of Kosciusko, with profound and everlasting love for their country, and with an abounding faith in Almighty God, Poland will arise again, and live again, and be forever free.

Tragically, but with no surprise, honest Americans now learn the sad truth that the architect who at Yalta was largely responsible for the selling out of Poland to Communist Russia, was none other than

the convicted traitor in America, Alger Hiss. Tragically, we now learn that he was the planner appointed by President Roosevelt and our State Department who had the most to say regarding the future of Poland at Yalta. Poland today is a sad victim and lies prostrate because of the work of an American traitor and spy by the name of Alger Hiss.

We Members of Congress, in commemorating Lincoln and Kosciusko today, would do well to repudiate the work of this convicted spy and traitor and declare ourselves openly and loudly for a free and independent Poland.

This Is Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans, comprising the minority on the Ways and Means Committee, on the first day that it opened hearings on taxes, moved that the first order of business should be the reduction of excise taxes. The motion was voted down, every Republican voting for the motion and every Democrat voting against it. The buyers' strike swept over the country as soon as the President's message was delivered to the Congress, in which he suggested an elimination of excise taxes covering a few—a very few—excise taxes. In the first session of the Eighty-first Congress 56 bills were introduced by Republicans asking for the reduction of excise taxes, and yet here we are well along in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress and the delay still continues. This refusal to meet the tax situation promptly and forthrightly is doing irreparable damage to the economy of the country. The only subject in which the administration seems to be interested is how to increase taxes and spend the people's money.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting as a part of my remarks an article by Sylvia F. Porter which appeared in the New York Post under date of February 7, 1950:

THIS IS MURDER

(By Sylvia F. Porter)

This is murder. All this publicity out of the White House, the Treasury, and Congress about near-term cuts in the wartime excise taxes—but no action.

Every day, more would-be buyers of jewelry, cosmetics, luggage, furs, etc., are deciding to postpone their purchases until the taxes are reduced or eliminated.

Every day, as a result, more workers in the industries involved are being thrown out of jobs.

Every day, more of the manufacturers and stores are caught in the squeeze and are going broke.

This is slow murder—via Washington befuddlement and red tape. It simply must be stopped and stopped at once.

It was bad enough when President Truman decided to stop the slide just before Christmas, mind you) that he wouldn't be opposed to cuts in the 15 to 25 percent excise taxes if other means were found to offset the revenue loss.

That was an open invitation to the buying public to hold off on all except essential purchases until the cuts became effective. They held off—in droves. Truman's few casual words did million-dollar damage.

It got worse after Truman sent his official tax message, mentioning only seven excise taxes he thought might be cut. For he didn't specify any figures, he didn't leave the list open and he didn't close it, either, and he did hint strongly at a Presidential veto if Congress did not vote offsetting increases.

Now with Congress taking its time on debating a tax bill and discussing revenue increases before it gets to excise taxes, it's a 100-percent mess. The customers have all but disappeared.

Either Congress should cut the excise taxes quickly or it should dispense with the question. It should cut them.

Either Congress should slash the taxes enough to stimulate activity in the industries and thereby permit the Treasury to pick up some extra cash from taxes on profits and incomes or it shouldn't bother going through the motions. It should slash them.

What's happening now is not only cruel to the businessmen and workers involved. It's also a shameful financial waste.

In St. Louis, a big jewelry store sold three important pieces right before Christmas. All three have since been returned with a request for credit. The explanation? The buyers frankly admit "We're waiting for the tax to go off."

In Denver, a large department store revealed it didn't make a single fur sale in January. (Denver has had freezing weather.) The store's executives had just about decided to close the department and fire all the clerks; then, last week, they agreed to try once more. They're now running ads promising buyers "your tax will be refunded if a reduction is voted before April 1." A few customers have returned.

In New York, the major fur sellers have been advertising this tax refund angle to pull in the reluctant buyers. "Otherwise, we'd be flat on our backs," said one of the best-known furriers.

Fur sales were down 32 percent in December from 1949. Currently, they're running 50 percent below, it's estimated.

Jewelry sales were down 17 percent in December. Currently, they're running 20 to 25 percent below.

"The spring season already is being ruined by this uncertainty," a luggage manufacturer told me. "Distress merchandise in the jewelry industry is fantastic," a watch company official disclosed.

"Excise tax collections are reclining at a rate of $450,000,000 a year because of this," a tax expert reported. "The Treasury is losing out on this too."

What's occurring is easy to grasp. The tax-cutting publicity is encouraging buyers to strike, pending a decision.

But while their attitude is certainly understandable, it's murder for the businesses and workers concerned.

What's the answer? As far as the individual sellers go, I'd suggest they all investigate the fur trade's angle during this difficult twilight period. The "fair-trade" laws in the various States may be an obstacle. But many stores are making under-the-counter tax deals with their customers anyway.

As for Congress, it should—and must—stop this dawdling, put through the cuts, make them sufficiently broad to matter and settle the question. Every day's delay is cruel, unintelligent and wasteful.

Destroying Surplus Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including several editorials on the order of Secretary Brannan to destroy surplus potatoes.

I wish it were possible to include cartoons in the RECORD since the one in today's issue of the Washington Daily News by Talburt so effectively depicts what is going on in this instance with poor old John Q. Taxpayer pictured as a dazed goat with a tin can tied to his tail, standing on the top of a mountain of 65,000,000 bushels of potatoes, with two other mountains in the background of 219,000,000 dozens of eggs and 96,000,000 pounds of butter.

The first editorial is from the Boston Post, which is the leading Democratic paper in New England. It is as follows:

POTATO DEMENTIA

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan appears intent on dumping the 1949 potato crop, in one way or another. Balked in his plan to destroy some 40,000,000 bushels outright, by an outraged public opinion, he has finally decided to sell them back to the farmers at the give-away price of 1 cent per 100 pounds, after first dyeing them so they can't be sold for human consumption. Once again the emphasis is on not allowing them to be eaten, although it is all right to use them as fertilizer or livestock feed.

With so much starvation in the world and poverty in our own country, such a plan seems almost criminal. There are so many people, in so many places, that would welcome these surplus potatoes that to literally throw them away seems a travesty on good sense. Mr. Brannan says he can't use them in school-lunch or relief programs without spending additional money, but with all the millions already wasted on them, it would certainly seem wiser to spend a little more now to allow the human race to get the benefit of them, than to have them turned into fertilizer. Also, a more determined effort might have been made to get industrial users to buy them at bargain rates.

Mr. Brannan seems more intent on showing that the farm price-support program, which he wants ditched in favor of a plan of his own, is not working out than in getting the maximum value for the millions invested.

The second is from the Boston Herald and is as follows:

SOME COLD POTATOES

May we put a few 2's and 2's together, and then see what 4's we get on the interesting matter of potatoes.

1. Some time before the 1948 election the Commodity Credit Corporation sold a lot of grain-storage facilities. This had gone on over a period of years, so that storage capacity was reduced from 292,000,000 bushels to slightly over 41,000,000, but it continued even while President Truman, campaigning in the West was denouncing the Republican-dominated Eightieth Congress for failing to provide on-the-farm storage for surplus grain.

2. Also shortly before the election the Department of Agriculture not only failed to apply the support program on corn, but also withheld purchases for export, with the result that the price dropped to $1 a bushel on the farm. But during the 3 weeks immediately following the election, over 80,000,000 bushels of corn alone was handled under the support program. Low farm prices at election time were useful in persuading farmers that their salvation lay in President Truman and a Democratic Congress.

3. The Department of Agriculture is making a great show now of dumping 50,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes. The spuds are to be allowed to rot on the ground as fertilizer. This is the first time since the national scandal of potato burning some years ago that the Department has resorted to dumping. It handled a surplus of 134,000,000 bushels last year in other ways. For an additional expenditure of $15,000,000 extra, the Department could put all this year's surplus to industrial uses. But though it spent $25,000,000 shipping last year's surplus, it won't spend $15,000,000 this year.

4. The political league of the American Federation of Labor has just reported that a growing farm revolt against Republican policies will help elect a Congress next fall to insure Taft-Hartley law repeal. The league's director says farmers have grown increasingly fearful of GOP price support in view of falling farm prices and prospects for more farm surpluses.

5. The Brannan plan for income support for producers of perishable goods is advanced by the administration as a way in which the potato farmers could have their support without surpluses.

You add all these things up, and you get an inkling of why Secretary Brannan is inviting the Nation to witness a mass destruction of good food, why he is courting another public scandal. He wants it that way because it will help in the congressional campaigns this fall. The Democratic candidates can offer the Brannan plan as a way to avoid the surpluses that result from the old price-support plans that have been advanced by such Republicans as Senator AIKEN.

No less an authority than Professor Black of Harvard has pointed out that the Brannan plan simply wouldn't work for potatoes. The 1949 crop, which supported at 60 percent of parity, would have cost the taxpayers $400,000,000 under the Brannan plan, instead of the eighty to one hundred million dollars it is now costing. And under the Brannan plan the farmers would have the incentive of full parity, not 60 percent of parity.

But whether the Brannan plan is practical or not, the administration is going to make the present system as unpalatable as possible. It is said that an offer by Spain for some of our surplus potatoes has been turned down, and there are reports that the Government has not been buying as many for school-lunch programs and welfare institutions as in the past. To make the thing look even more threatening, the majority leader in the Senate, LUCAS, has suggested scuttling the potato support program.

All this evidence of political manipulation of the farm program by the administration is pretty damning. It suggests that the party which makes so much of its solicitude for the farmer, is really simply using the farmer for its political ends. Not merely by promises it cannot fulfill, which is bad enough, but by the actual perversion of administrative functions.

The third is a portion of an editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Union, as follows:

MORE ABOUT POTATOES

We didn't know whether to laugh or cry over the loss by fire of 50,000 barrels of Government-owned potatoes stored in a Worthington warehouse. We hope the warehouse was insured, as it doubtless was.

While the dispatch was very revealing, it left us rather confused, if not actually dazed. For example, the potato loss is estimated at $70,000 though the Department of Agriculture, which has already destroyed 50,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes, was preparing to bag the Worthington potatoes "for use as required by the United States."

We think the Government could learn something from this incident. Charles Lamb depicted a character who got roast pig following a fire which burnt his house down. Thereafter there was a veritable epidemic of house burnings and roast-pig feasts in the neighborhood.

Instead of hauling away for destruction in one way or another the stored surpluses, why not set fire to the warehouses in which they are being made ready to use "as required by the United States"? It might be cheaper to pay for the burned warehouses.

Of course, no tears are being shed over this incident by Agriculture Secretary Brannan, who is being accused of playing politics with federally owned farm products, acquired to prop prices. All this publicity about dumping excess foods is playing directly into his hands. The public doesn't like this terrible waste. If it can be aroused sufficiently it might create a public demand for a trial for his own scheme.

But the Brannan plan has been so thoroughly discredited that it will take more than aroused public sentiment against waste under the present program to demand a trial for the Brannan "production payment" idea. Particularly when it is suspected that the Department of Agriculture is actually putting obstacles in the way of distributing the surpluses.

Each of these editorials express a unanimous opinion as to the real reasons for this destruction order. It is my hope that someone in the Department of Agriculture will make these editorials available to the Secretary.

Navy Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Navy Department issued its rather amusing instructions directed at controlling the very speech of sailor men, I have wanted to say something about it.

The editor of the New Orleans States, generally recognized as the most accurate and reliable afternoon newspaper in New Orleans at this time, has said in an editorial what I would like to have said when I first read the press releases on the subject. Since what he said could not be said better I have asked the privilege of directing the following editorial to the attention of the House:

NAVY LANGUAGE

The Navy seems to have hit rough seas. First there was the Denfeld incident. Then the *"Mighty Mo"* was stuck in the mud. Now comes another blow. Colorful terms, such as "brass hats" to designate high-ranking officers, have been declared verboten under the new Navy regime.

We like to think of our sea arm as a hairy-chested institution that sparkles with color, tradition, and individuality. That has been the concept down through the years of the men who went to sea. They lived and spoke strongly and to the point.

In the Navy, as in other branches of the service, use of a humanized, workable language in lieu of the formal phraseology of the manuals and orders was a natural development. It was the practical thing to do.

Now the policying of thought in the new unification plan, on orders of the civilian Secretary of the Navy, is extending even to the use of common terms. No longer can the Naval Academy graduates be referred to as "trade-school boys." No longer can the naval aviators be dubbed "airedales." Navy personnel must avoid the use of "black-shoe Navy," "mustangs," "gyrenes," and other similar terms.

It seems to us that the vigorous old Navy is becoming just too, too divine—simply out of this world.

Alaska Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

BY

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Mr. Louis R. Huber, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of January 19, 1950.

Mr. Huber, a well-known writer of Seattle, Wash., is thoroughly conversant on Alaska matters, and I especially commend the following article as reflecting the feelings of the vast majority of Alaskans who are seeking statehood now:

PLEA ACCENTS MUTUAL HELP, 83-YEAR WAIT

(By Louis R. Huber)

WASHINGTON.—"Please, Uncle Sam, give us statehood. We need two Senators and a Representative in Congress to help us develop as the other 48 States have developed. Statehood for us will be good for you, too—both to bolster national defense and to prove to the world that you mean what you say about democracy."

That is what Alaskans are saying to Congress, and they have American tradition on their side. Alaska has waited long for statehood—83 years, if you count from the 1867 purchase from Russia, or 38 years, if you count from the year the District of Alaska became a Territory (in 1912)—with explicitly implied future statehood.

A cornerstone of American political structure, the question of statehood is one that nobody ever answers with "No." Alaskans have been repeatedly told "Not yet—later," or "Wait until you can afford it."

TRUMAN SUPPORT

In fairness it must be said that President Truman has advocated statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, too, in recent messages to Congress. The bills for statehood that were introduced in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, however, became hopelessly stuck in the Rules Committee.

It should be said also that Alaska, though long in weak financial condition and even now with a deficit of $221,645, last year enacted in its nineteenth biennial legislature

measures which will more than balance its budget, and prepare the way for statehood.

If matters had taken their traditional way, however, Alaska would have become a State about 1910. Each of the Western States, upon acquiring a population and some degree of economic promise, was promptly made a State—and Alaska had all that in 1910.

[illegible] MYTH [illegible]

The northland's wildest development immediately followed the gold rushes of '98 (the Klondike) and '99 (Nome). The flood of prospectors—perhaps 50,000, at the peak—that came to the north found not only gold but extensive copper and coal deposits, and agricultural land. The [illegible]ebox myth of former years melted and the newcomers set about developing the new land.

But President Theodore Roosevelt withdrew the Alaska coal lands from entry in 1906; and, of roughly 1,900 coal claims, all but a handful were declared in 1911 to have been fraudulently filed.

It is generally believed today that the fraud charges of 1911 were groundless; be that as it may, the coal-claim action pulled the prop out from beneath Alaska's boom. Four railroads had been planned and construction was under way; it was promptly halted, and an estimated 20,000 would-be-Alaskans went south.

DELEGATE LAW PASSED

While the coal fight was going on, Alaskans also were struggling to secure self-government at home and representation in Congress. In 1906 the delegate law was passed, giving them one voteless representative in Congress—which is all they have today.

The 1911 coal-claims ruling told them in certain terms that economic development of the northland was not welcome; and it was cold comfort for them to receive home rule in 1912 through the organic act. It gave them a Territorial legislature of very limited powers. The real government was vested in fifty-odd bureaus 5,000 miles away—in Washington, D. C.

"Your Delegate occupies a very minor position in Washington," said Delegate James Wickersham, about this time. "Despite the fact that he represents more coal than the 2 Senators and 96 Representatives from Pennsylvania, more gold than the 2 Senators and 13 Representatives from California, more fisheries than all the Atlantic-coast Senators and Representatives combined, and more copper than Montana's entire delegation."

Alaska's political circumstances have not changed one bit since the day Mr. Wickersham made his statement. It is not astonishing that Alaskans should have voted nearly two to one in 1946 in favor of immediate statehood.

"We want only the simple justice that is guaranteed all Americans in the Constitution—self-government, the right to vote in national elections, and representation in Congress," say the Alaskans. "But there are even more powerful reasons why you should give us statehood."

SOVIET ACTIVITY CITED

They point to the statements of military authorities who have visited Alaska and repeatedly urged statehood as a strong corollary to effective defense in the northland. The contention of the military men is that a vigorous economy alongside national-defense installations makes those installations immeasurably easier to service and maintain.

Alaskans also cite the Russian promotion of communism in the southwest Pacific that they believe is made easier by withholding statehood from Alaska and Hawaii. The Russians point out to the Asiatic peoples, say the Alaskans, that the United States is not sincere about democracy—how could it be, while denying sovereignty to Alaskans and Hawaiians?

"Alaska has, in fact, convinced nearly everybody it has earned the right to become a State," says Alaska's Gov. Ernest Gruening. "Nearly all the large national organizations—business, labor, patriotic, fraternal, State legislatures, and the past three conferences of governors—have gone on record unanimously favoring statehood for Alaska.

"The Nation's press is almost unanimous in urging Alaska statehood, editorially. We have on our side such diverse papers as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Post, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, the Washington Times-Herald, the Hearst newspapers, and the Chicago Tribune."

What To Do About the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an outstanding address, revealing high statesmanship, and characteristic common sense, delivered by the distinguished minority leader of the House before the sixty-first annual dinner of the Builders' Exchange of Rochester, N. Y.

The address follows:

It is an honor to be here tonight to help celebrate your sixty-first anniversary. In these days of crumbling institutions you are to be congratulated not only for being 61 years young, but for the fact that it looks like you will be around for quite awhile yet. In fact, Rochester has a number of reasons to be proud of the high-type organizations it has, such as yours, and the character of the men it produces. It happens to be my privilege to work with one of them in Congress, a man young in years but wise and prudent in his judgments. I refer to your Congressman, KENNETH B. KEATING. KENNETH KEATING is a Congressman who is going far in public life, and I am confident that the people of his congressional district have the same faith in him that we all do in Washington, and I would like to pay tribute to another great Congressman who shares the privilege of representing Rochester. I refer to JAMES W. WADSWORTH. He is an outstanding statesman and one of the great Americans of our day. I regret absence from the city prevents my old and valued friend of many years, your patriotic and philanthropic citizen, Frank Gannett, from being with us.

I want to talk to you tonight about the biggest problem that faces the American people—what to do about the Federal Government. It is a problem that is on the minds of everyone—builders, real estate men, labor leaders, housewives, businessmen, and farmers alike. There are three sound reasons for this growing anxiety. First, the American people are genuinely concerned about the trend toward socialism in Washington. Second, the American people are aroused, as never before, over the ever-increasing cost of government and the ever-increasing burden of taxes they bear. Third, there is great uneasiness over the high cost of living.

I hope to show you that the first is causing the second, and the second is causing the third. I think I can demonstrate that the way to cut the cost of Government and to reduce taxes is first to get rid of the socialist schemers and planners in Washington; and the way to cut the cost of living is to reduce the cost of Government and the burden of taxation that we all bear.

It is almost impossible to discuss what is going on in Washington today without taking a look at what has been going on in the world for the past century. The root of our trouble today goes back in a large measure to the philosophy of one man, a man named Karl Marx. Marx wrote thick books about his theories and published lengthy papers and manifestos about a revolutionary doctrine which he called socialism. If you examine the thousands upon thousands of words that he wrote and uttered, you will find that he was preaching one thing—that the stomach deserved more attention than the soul; that the physical necessities of life were more important than religion, liberty, or spirit.

Since the beginning of time, man had been struggling against oppressive government in all forms. Essentially, he has struggled for freedom of spirit, and for his own dignity as an individual. And he had made enormous gains, he had prospered and he had become more productive than ever. But the history of man is that when he gains something after a long struggle, his children and his children's children too often forget how he won it.

Marx, because he proclaimed that the state could give shelter, food, and clothing to all, began having an increasing appeal to those who enjoyed freedom but had not been forced to fight for it. As the followers of Marx made headway, they divided into two groups. One group called themselves Communists and advocated infiltration, violence, and revolution as a means of gaining power. The second group was more tricky. Calling themselves Socialists, they contended the way to achieve power was to do it on a piecemeal basis.

Both groups were amazingly frank and outspoken—but people simply did not believe them. It did not seem possible, for example, that 2 percent of a population could seize control of the remaining 98 percent. But the Communists in Russia finally proved it could happen.

In Great Britain, before the turn of the century, the Socialists banded together in a group which called itself the Fabian Society. And where do you think the name "Fabian" came from? They took the name from Quintas Fabius, a Roman general who believed that the best way to fight a battle was to fight it piecemeal—by quick thrusts and quick withdrawals. Slowly, the Socialists in Britain made headway. They won one minor skirmish after another, getting approval of this radical law and that radical law as time went on.

Although the Communists and Socialists differed in method of attaining power, they agreed on most everything else. They agreed, for example, that the more you taxed the people, the less they would be able to help themselves, and the more they would have to depend on government. If they were taxed long enough and high enough, they would soon be helpless and socialism would take over.

During most of these years, the spread of socialism was confined to Europe. It made no headway in the United States, but one European country after another was falling prey to the Socialist concepts. Russia went Communist in 1917; Italy went Fascist in 1922; Germany embraced nazism in 1933; Britain finally fell into the grip of the Socialists in 1945. In every one of these nations—Russia, Italy, Germany, and Great Britain—taxation was raised to almost confiscation levels, the tools of production were nationalized, and the people fell under the yoke of statism. Government drained off their savings and their capital and cut more deeply into their income—all in the name of providing them with the needs of life.

In America, the advent of the New Deal flung wide open the doors that had long been shut to the Communists and Socialists. They poured into Washington by the hundreds. They took modest jobs and worked like beavers. They hatched schemes by the score and they saw a few of them actually enacted into law. The Wadleighs, the Chamberses, and the Hisses went even further. They secretly joined the Communist spy apparatus. Those of us who, back in the thirties, tried to tell the Nation that this was going on were laughed at and ridiculed. We were called reactionaries, Lord Macaulays, and Tories. This abuse was heaped upon us because we still believed that the cherished freedom of Americans should not be traded for empty promises—promises that Government could provide shelter, food, and clothing if the people would only let Government manage their affairs. I am proud of the record we made. The American way of life was worth fighting for then and it is worth fighting for today.

It is noteworthy that during all this period Federal taxes rose steadily. From soaking the rich, the Government turned to soaking the poor, and there was scarcely a man or woman who did not feel the ever-increasing pinch of taxes as rates went up and the tax base spread.

The Second World War completed the job. Because every American willingly undergoes heavy taxation in time of war, no one could rightly complain as taxes went up. But war has always been favorable to the disciples of socialism and communism. War always tends to make people helpless—either by oppressive taxation or by outright destruction. Scarcely had the war ended than the proof of this was upon us. The iron curtain descended on a dozen European countries; Britain went Socialist; France and Italy teetered in the balance; China felt the pangs of a Communist revolution.

In the United States at the end of the war, most people breathed a sigh of relief, reached out their arms to those who had returned alive, and looked forward to some years of peace, happiness, and prosperity. But the breeze that had been sowed in the thirties was to be reaped as a whirlwind in the late forties. The planners and socialistic schemers were firmly entrenched in Washington. In the White House was an Executive willing to listen to their schemes and to advocate them. Taxes instead of going down went up. Total Federal, State and local tax collections in the years that followed the end of the war were actually higher than at any wartime peak.

Now, as a great political leader in this State used to say, "Let's take a look at the record." In 1933 total tax collections amounted to roughly $2,000,000,000. By 1941 the Federal taxes imposed almost three times that burden, and by 1948 the increase was 22 times what it had been in 1933. Of course, war was responsible for a great deal of this enormous leap in the tax burden. But the war has been over for nearly 5 years and the burden is still with us. The only tax reduction the American people have had in all that time was voted by the Republican Eightieth Congress when we relieved 7,000,000 people in the lowest income brackets of having to pay any Federal income tax at all, and we spread the benefits of that tax reduction in such a fashion that 71 percent of the total cut was given to people making less than $5,000 a year. By this tax cut, if nothing else, the Eightieth Congress enacted the first real road block in the path of socialism.

And what happened? With almost 45,000,000 people remaining at home in November 1948, the United States for the first time in this century elected a President who didn't have a majority of the popular vote. President Truman, with less than 50 percent of those voting behind him, was back at the old stand, advocating socialism and contending he had a mandate.

To those 45,000,000 people who did not vote in 1948, this much should be obvious: Complacency will never stop socialism.

The 1948 election proved one thing for certain—if the American people want socialism, they can have it by staying away from the polls.

But if the American people cherish their liberty and love their country, as I am convinced they do, there is one way they can stop socialism in its tracks—they can stop it by the greatest out-pouring of voters next November that this country has ever seen. They can stop it, as our founding fathers intended such alien philosophies should be stopped, by registering and voting their will.

At this moment in Washington, there are bills in Congress that paint a dire picture of the future for America if this administration stays in power. There are proposals in legislative form to socialize agriculture, to socialize medicine, to socialize credit, and to socialize the natural resources. These proposals have one thing in common—they require huge outlays of money and the most rigid controls.

It has been estimated that if the administration's entire program, as outlined in the President's state of the Union message, were to be enacted tomorrow, the cost of Government would double. At the present moment, the American people are paying almost 27 percent of all they earn simply to support government, Federal, State, and local. If the administration's program went into effect, government would soon be taking almost 50 percent of what the people earn.

Let the man on the tractor, the worker at the lathe, the bookkeeper at his ledgers, the businessman in his store or factory, and the housewife in her home, ask themselves this question: If half of their income were taken away from them, could they support themselves?

The answer in almost every case would be "No."

Yet this is the prospect we face, and the President makes no mystery of it. In his first three messages to Congress this year, he made it plain that taxes must go ever upward, and he asked for $1,000,000,000 more in revenue this year as a down payment on future increases.

Yes; the prospects have been made abundantly clear. The President in his messages used such words as "foolhardy," "foolish," and "unwise" in discussing possible cuts in the cost of Government and reductions in taxation. The President drew a picture of the future extending to the year 2000, and, in all the words employed to describe that vision, he could not find room in a single place to mention reduced cost of Government or relief from the tax burden. I think he has greatly underestimated the American people's patience. They are in no mood, if I am any judge, to wait 50 years for another tax cut.

There is a great awakening occurring in America. The people are discovering at last that whether they pay a Federal income tax or a State income tax or pay neither, they are still paying plenty of taxes in hidden levies.

This awakening is one of the greatest things that has happened to the American people since the Boston Tea Party. They are on the march. They are beginning to ask merchants and businessmen about the taxes that are passed on to them, the consumers. They are beginning to look at their phone bills, at their railroad tickets, and their theater admissions, with a practiced eye for the tax bite.

It is beginning to occur to people that the consumer in the long run is the great American taxpayer. They are discovering that duties, excises, and corporate levies are being passed on to them to pay in full. They are startled to find that practically everybody can pass on some or all of their taxes except the last purchaser, and that means it is Mr. and Mrs. Consumer who get stuck—everyone of them.

It is no longer a mystery that if the Government imposes more taxes at any level, it is the consumer who eventually pays. In short, it is at least dawning on the American people that high cost of Government means high cost of living.

Let's take a look at some these taxes, hidden and otherwise.

If you buy a new car in the $2,000 price category, you pay approximately $511 in taxes. Why, only a few years ago, you could buy an automobile for a few hundred dollars more than the tax itself today. Every time you buy gasoline, every time you buy a quart of oil, every time you buy a tire, you are paying Federal taxes, which, together with State and local taxes, add another $81 a year just for the privilege of operating your automobile.

I repeat, high cost of government means high cost of living.

Did you buy a refrigerator after the war for, say, $200? You paid a Federal tax of $20 on that refrigerator. When you paid your $6 phone bill the other day, $1 of it went to the Federal tax collector. If you got a new handbag for your wife, one-fifth of the price went to the Federal tax collector. If she bought a box of face powder, one-fifth of the price went to the Federal tax collector. If you recently took a rail, plane, or bus trip, one-seventh of the fare went to the Federal tax collector. If you attended the theater, and bought a $3 ticket, 60 cents went to the Federal tax collector.

Do you have a baby in the family? Well, for every dollar's worth of baby oil or baby powder you have bought, 20 cents went to the Federal tax collector.

I repeat, high cost of government means high cost of living.

Now, someone may say that things aren't so bad—at least food isn't taxed. Let's take a look at that proposition. There is a national organization devoted to studying taxes, known as the Tax Foundation. It recently made a study of a loaf of bread baked and sold in Indianapolis by a commercial bakery. The foundation study showed that by the time the single loaf of bread had been bought by the housewife, it bore 151 hidden taxes. Now, who paid those 151 hidden taxes on that single loaf of bread? You know the answer—the housewife.

Let's not fool ourselves. In the final analysis, it's not the farmer, it's not labor, it's not the businessman who is to blame for the high cost of living—the blame rests squarely on reckless Federal spending and exorbitant taxation.

Yes; high cost of government means high cost of living, and it means a lot of other things, too. It means that you have little hope of affording many things you want as long as the present administration is in power.

I pointed out earlier that a $2,000 automobile bore $511 in taxes. A lot of folks have been wondering when we are going to have low-cost automobiles again. Mr. James D. Mooney, who recently retired as president of Willys Overland, and who knows as much as anybody in America about building a low-cost automobile, has said: "The present tax rates make it impossible to get back to a real $1,000 car—a car that just is not a motor scooter."

A low-cost automobile would mean jobs for a lot of people who would be needed to make the cars. A low-cost automobile would mean cars for a lot of people who do not have an automobile. It should be clear to anyone that high cost of government means not only high cost of living, but it means we do without a lot of things we want and a lot of production that would mean jobs.

Exactly 1 year ago today I introduced a bill in Congress to repeal the wartime excise taxes. So while you and your organization

are celebrating your sixty-first anniversary tonight, my bill and I are celebrating our first. But I must say that you are doing better than my bill. Mr. Truman doesn't like it. He is looking for tax increases, not tax decreases.

My 1-year-old bill, which is a pretty popular baby in Congress, has been bottled up in the House Ways and Means Committee by the administration for 10 long months. From the present temper of the Congress I would not be a bit surprised if we took it off the bottle within a few weeks. President Truman has at last grudgingly admitted that perhaps there should be "reductions" in excise taxes, but he says that he will veto any bill containing such reductions unless it is accompanied by compulsory increases amounting to an additional billion dollars.

The probability is that he will get to exercise his veto, because most Members of Congress know what the American people are thinking, even if the administration doesn't. The Members of Congress know that excise taxes were enacted during the war to discourage sales of goods made out of materials needed in the war, and they know that those same excise taxes are still discouraging sales today and costing people jobs. They also know that this country cannot stand another billion-dollar tax increase. They know that if these excise taxes were repealed, the general stimulating effect on business and jobs would more than make up the relatively small amount of revenue these levies now bring. So Congress is not likely to vote a tax increase this year.

But Congress cannot stem the tide forever, nor can Congress stem it if the American people do not express themselves in one great voice at the polls next November. We are at the midpoint of the century in this year of 1950. We are also at the midpoint in a crisis threatening our form of government. Given one small shove in a forward direction and socialism will be upon us, with the Brannan plan, the compulsory health plan, the regional planning authorities, and all the trimmings, including bigger and bigger taxes for everybody.

The issue has been clearly cast. The American people, having watched the British debacle under socialism, know what is in store for them if we continue down the dead-end road the administration has chosen.

I have always contended that if the American citizen is given a clear-cut choice, he will make a clear-cut decision. His self-reliance is known around the world. His fear of big government is the product of 175 years of freedom and individual dignity. I am convinced that in this crusade to save America, that there are untold millions ready to join the fight. We cannot and must not fail them.

Military Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call to the attention of all Members the following article, which appeared in the February 8 issue of the New York Times, on military living conditions in Alaska and other areas. The conditions described in the article based on the recent visit of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to Pacific bases were high lighted in an excellent article which appears in the February 14 issue of Look, containing a report by Dr. Daniel A. Poling on similar conditions as found by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I also commend that issue of Look to the Members' attention. Dr. Poling, editor of Christian Herald magazine, made an extensive trip to visit Alaska and Pacific installations of the Military Establishment early in 1949 as a member of the President's Committee on Religion and Welfare in the Armed Forces.

The article from the New York Times follows:

MILITARY HOUSING IN PACIFIC IS LABELED SLUMS BY BRADLEY; VANDENBERG HORRIFIED

HONOLULU, February 7.—Military housing in the Pacific was sharply criticized today by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who arrived here on their return trip to Washington following conferences in the Far East.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley told a press conference that shabby service housing in Alaska, Guam, Okinawa, Kwajalein, and even Japan constituted "military slums."

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Air Force Chief of Staff, said that he was "horrified" by some of these housing conditions, and that "we talk about slum clearance at home, but find conditions for troops in Alaska and elsewhere much worse."

The Staff Chiefs said that they were impressed by the combat readiness of the Pacific military forces despite these adverse circumstances.

Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, said that Russia's submarine strength in the Pacific was a matter of concern. He added that he had no knowledge of how close to Hawaii these submarines were operating, but that their presence in the Pacific pointed up the need "for strong naval forces" in this ocean.

The Admiral reported that American destroyers were being modified for Pacific anti-submarine duty. Asked if the strength of the Navy in the Pacific was sufficient to guarantee the security of the scheduled atomic tests on Eniwetok, he replied that it was.

Admiral Sherman said that the poor housing criticized by his colleagues was preventing shore installations from properly servicing the fleet, and that the problem of mere existence took too much of the men's energies. He noted that some Quonset huts on Guam and Okinawa were in use after surviving 8 years and several typhoons.

General Bradley said that "it is quite common for families to wait 6 to 10 months before joining husbands, and then they find they must use quarters which would be classed as slums back home."

The length of the Hawaiian stopover of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the fourth member of which is Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, is indefinite, but they are expected to stay 2 or 3 days. During that time, they will inspect military installations in the Hawaiian area.

Changing the Color of Money

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, late yesterday afternoon a representative of the United Press said that a Phoenix, Ariz., newspaper had requested my views regarding a hold-up there involving $130,000. They wanted to know how the colored money bill which I have been trying to get passed for 3 years would have affected that. Of course, I feel that if that bill were enacted it would be very easy to apprehend the robbers. I hope the Secretary of the Treasury, without legislation, will request a change in color of the money every 5 years, and that these robbers may be apprehended.

Faker Einstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr Speaker, one of the greatest fakers the world ever knew is Albert Einstein, who should have been deported for his communistic activities years ago.

Ever since he published his book on relativity to try to convince the world that light had weight, he has capitalized upon his alleged reputation as a scientist.

According to the Committee on Un-American Activities, he has been engaged in communistic activities in this country for a long time. At this point I am inserting some excerpts from the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities received by me today showing what some of those subversive activities were.

Every time the word "Daily Worker" is used in this report it means the Communist Daily Worker—that is, a Communist newspaper published in New York by the Communist Party and dedicated to the overthrow of this Government.

He had no more to do with the development of the atomic bomb than if there had not been such a thing. American scientists developed the atomic bomb, as General Groves will tell you, and old Faker Einstein had nothing to do with it.

The "bunk" that he is now spreading to try to get this country into a world government, for the American people to assume the responsibilities of all the other nations of the earth, to fight their battles, and to pay their debts, is simply carrying out the Communist line.

At this point I am inserting excerpts from the report which I have received from the Committee on Un-American Activities today relative to Mr. Einstein. It reads as follows:

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 13, 1950.

For: Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN.
Subject: Albert Einstein.

A check of the public files, records, and publications of the committee has revealed the following information concerning the individual listed above:

According to a letterhead, dated October 27, 1943, Prof. Albert Einstein was one of the

patrons of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship. He was a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, as shown on Call to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, November 6-8, 1943 (p. 4); and a memorandum issued by the Council on March 18, 1946. He signed an open letter to the American people, sponsored by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, as shown in the New York Times of May 18, 1943, page 17C.

The Congress of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as a Communist-front organization in Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944; the same report shows that "in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian has been known as the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship." Attorney General Clark cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as subversive and Communist in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board, which were released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.

The Daily Worker of February 26, 1942, page 4, named Albert Einstein as one of the sponsors of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" in Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944. The organization had previously been cited in Report No. 2277 of the committee, dated June 25, 1942. The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Clark in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948.

Albert Einstein was an endorser of the North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, as shown in the Daily Worker of April 16, 1937, page 2; he was named as a sponsor of the North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, Medical Bureau, in New Masses of May 18, 1937, page 25. In Reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1940, and March 29, 1944, the North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy was cited as a Communist-front organization. In a list furnished the Loyalty Review Board by Attorney General Clark, which was released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, April 25, 1949, the organization was cited as Communist.

Albert Einstein was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, according to letterheads of that group dated February 26, 1946, and February 3, 1948; he signed a petition in defense of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, as shown in the Daily Worker of April 28, 1948, page 4; and was cochairman of the national reception committee for Madame Irene Joliot-Curie, whose speaking tour was sponsored by the joint anti-Fascist refugee committee (invitation to dinner, New York City, March 31, 1948).

The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Clark in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board which were released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; it was cited as a Communist-front organization in Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944.

Attorney General Clark cited the American Council for a Democratic Greece as a subversive and Communist organization formerly known as the Greek-American Council in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board, which were released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948. Albert Einstein sponsored a petition of the American Council for a Democratic Greece, as shown in the Daily People's World of August 23, 1948, page 2; he signed a statement of the council condemning the Greek Government, according to the Daily Worker of September 2, 1948, page 7.

Dr. Einstein was a sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, as shown on a letterhead of that group, dated at New Haven, Conn., November 16, 1939, and a pamphlet entitled "Children in Concentration Camps." The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign as a Communist-front organization in Report 1476 of January 3, 1940.

Albert Einstein contributed a manuscript for Spanish aid to the League of American Writers, according to the Daily Worker of February 18, 1939, page 7.

Both Attorney General Francis Biddle and Attorney General Tom Clark have cited the League of American Writers as a Communist-front organization (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pages 7685 and 7686; letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948). The organization was cited as a Communist front in Reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944.

Albert Einstein signed a letter pledging support to China, which was issued by the American Friends of the Chinese People, as shown in the Daily Worker of July 16, 1940, page 4. He was an endorser of the Committee for Peace through World Cooperation, according to the Daily Worker of April 2, 1938, page 4. Both American Friends of the Chinese People and the Committee for Peace through World Cooperation were cited as Communist-front organizations in Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944.

Albert Einstein was a sponsor of the Freedom Crusade of the Civil Rights Congress, according to the Daily Worker, issues of December 15, 1948, page 2, and December 31, 1948, page 3.

In Report 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities, entitled "Civil Rights Congress as a Communist Front Organization," dated September 2, 1947, the Civil Rights Congress was cited as being dedicated "not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "Controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it." The Civil Rights Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Clark in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.

Albert Einstein was a signer of a declaration honoring Georgi Dimitrov, former head of the Communist International, as shown in the New York Times of December 22, 1943, page 40. The declaration was sponsored by the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee, cited as a Communist front in Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944.

As shown in the Daily Worker of April 22, 1947, page 4, Albert Einstein was a speaker under auspices of the Council on African Affairs, an organization cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Clark in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.

Albert Einstein has been a contributor to the publication Soviet Russia Today (issue of June 1942, p. 6); he was a sponsor of the Soviet Russia Today dinner celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Red Army (Soviet Russia Today, February 1943, p. 34).

Soviet Russia Today was cited as a Communist front in reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated June 25, 1942, and March 30, 1944.

Albert Einstein is named as a member at large of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions on an undated letterhead of the organization (received January 1949). He was a sponsor of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace held in New York City, March 25-27, 1949, under auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, according to the conference program, page 14.

Both the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace and the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions were cited as Communist-front organizations in the Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated April 19, 1949, which is entitled "Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace Arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions."

I do not see how any man can read this record and not realize that this man Einstein is not interested in the welfare of the United States.

Defense of Alaska and the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to have included the following speech delivered by Hon. Ernest Gruening, Governor of Alaska, at the meeting of the All-America Defense Association on January 12 in Washington, D. C., relative to the importance of Alaska's defense to the whole Nation:

"Through to this day, Alaska has never received the attention in national defense planning that it deserves."

This moderate factual statement is not mine. It is found on page 204 of that very excellent book entitled "Global Mission," published within the year by our only General of the Air Force and great war leader, Hap Arnold. I doubt whether there is any better authority. And further on he says, after stressing the great strategic importance of Alaska:

"But we were never able to get the money or allocations for the Air Force that we really needed there to give us the kind of bases we required then—and need more than ever now."

Those of us who have been closely associated with Alaskan affairs for years—in my own case for over 15 years—realize the stark truth of this presentation. Alaska was virtually defenseless on the eve of World War II. For years previous to Pearl Harbor our Delegate in Congress—our voteless Delegate, for a Territory can be represented in the Congress only by a voteless representative in the House of Representatives—had pled for the defense of Alaska. From the floor of the House he had warned repeatedly that Alaska was undefended and vulnerable. Indeed, he prophesied exactly what would happen in the event of war with Japan. He foretold that Alaska would be invaded and occupied. And Alaska was invaded and was the only part of the American Continent that for a time was

held by the enemy. And while it is true that after over a year of occupation the invader was driven out and defeated in that theater of operations as in every other theater, the entire campaign was unnecessary. With adequate Alaskan defense it need never have taken place. It was needlessly costly of American lives, of shipping of material. But for the success of the American forces at the Battle of Midway, which stopped the Japanese advance in the Pacific, the occupation of Alaska would have progressed further.

Now, 4½ years after the termination of World War II, Alaska is similarly defenseless. Alaska is similarly defenseless in the face of a far greater and more imminent danger of invasion than existed from the Japanese enemy.

Let me state briefly the obvious facts—known to everyone—but by a strange paradox not acted upon.

There is today only one potential enemy of the United States in the world. That is the totalitarian police state which stretches from the Baltic to the Bering Sea. During World War II Russia and America were allies in a war against totalitarianism and ruthless aggression. In the 4 years since the termination of that war the American people have hoped for an era of peace and self-rule on the part of the peoples of the world. Those high hopes have been bitterly disappointed. Instead of their fulfillment we have seen that police state extend its power and tyranny first over the Baltic and Balkan states. We have seen it roll over Hungary. We have seen it overrun and crush the most democratically minded people of central Europe, the Czechoslovaks. We have seen it attempt to carry that penetration throughout the continent of Europe, where its further advance has been stopped, fortunately, because of the economic aid given the peoples that were still not under the Soviet boot. We have seen how the Marshall plan and the Truman plan together have thus far managed to contain the advance of the iron curtain beyond these frontiers.

That is very gratifying, and, with the economic aid thus rendered and to be rendered, plus the military aid voted by the last Congress, it is to be hoped that a further advance of totalitarian tyranny on what might be considered the eastern front of freedom has been halted.

But in the meantime, what has happened on the western front? Within the last 2 years the Communist hordes have overrun China. Except for the southern extensions and peninsulas of that continent, they now hold all Asia.

Its broad ocean such as the Atlantic separates the Asiatic mainland from the American mainland. The shores of Soviet Siberia are visible to the naked eye from the shore of Alaska. The distance across Bering Strait is only 54 miles. American and Soviet islands are actually closer to each other than that. It is a shorter distance from St. Lawrence Island, belonging to Alaska, where dwell American citizens, to the nearest Siberian headlands. Between American Little Diomede and Russian Big Diomede there are only 2½ miles.

Under these circumstances it would seem logical and proper that the defense undertakings of Alaska on our western front should bear a relation comparable to those on our eastern front. But, as General Arnold has indicated and as we all know, no such thing has happened.

After the close of World War II most of our Alaskan bases were abandoned either wholly or in part, and decommissioned. Practically all of these were, of course, constructed on the eve of or during the war with Japan, for purposes solely related to that war and in many cases not appropriate to or adequate for the type of war that we now must guard against in the second half of the twentieth century.

But in these 4½ years when it has been increasingly and tragically evident that we cannot count on an era of peace and international friendship with our neighbor across Bering Strait, next to nothing has been done to defend our western frontier. We do not have to go back, although we may well do so, to the warning of Billy Mitchell, that great prophet and pioneer of military air power, that "he who holds Alaska holds the world," to realize that Alaska should be, and can be made the great bulwark of defense not merely for the United States but for the entire Western Hemisphere. And that means for the entire world or part of the world where rests the hope of peace, civilization, and freedom for all mankind.

Consider that Alaska, with an area of 586,000 square miles, an area one-fifth as large as the United States, is the only portion of our North American continent under the American flag which fronts on the Arctic Ocean, one of the great airways of the future and one that obviously should be protected against attack.

Consider, likewise, that Alaska is the only portion of the American continent within naked-eye view of our totalitarian neighbor.

Consider, finally, that Alaska is the only portion of the American continent which, with its island extensions, reaches well into the Eastern Hemisphere.

Elementary common sense would require making Alaska as nearly impregnable as possible. Common consistency with our wise policy in Europe would require that the United States do the equivalent in the matter of economic and military aid to our own fellow citizens on our northern and western boundaries—frontier in the Arctic and in the Pacific of freedom, and democracy. But no such thing has happened. During the 4 years from 1945 after VJ-day, till the summer of 1949 next to nothing was done for the building up of Alaskan defenses. Congress, which so generously voted funds to check the advance of imperial communism in Europe, voted next to nothing to prepare against a similar advance to Alaska and the American continent. Finally, in August of 1949, less than 6 months ago, we in Alaska were stupefied to learn that the extremely modest request of our military for an authorization of $137,000,000 for defense housing and public works in Alaska would be shelved and not acted upon during that session of Congress. At almost the same time, we received definite indications that some of these same military authorities were deeming that the northwest portion of the United States, the Puget Sound area, was vulnerable and were proposing and, indeed, had begun to transfer some of the airplane production located there since the beginning of aviation to what was deemed a safer point in the Prairie States on the other side of the Rockies.

I need not rehearse this episode which is now fairly familiar to most of us. Suffice it to say that as a result of the most emphatic protests from Alaska and great efforts on the part of the military, the first session of the Eightieth Congress in its closing days reconsidered in part its decision to postpone the beginning of adequate defense for Alaska. In almost the final hours Congress authorized an expenditure of some $96,000,000. And for that we are grateful, and all those who believe that permanent peace is made more likely by adequate defense, as we in Alaska firmly believe, are and should be grateful for that action of the Congress.

But note that the requested authorization of $137,000,000 was slashed drastically. The $96,000,000 reduced from $137,000,000, a cut of nearly one-third, contrasts with the almost unhesitating authorizations and appropriations for what was asked by the administration for the defense of our western front in Europe. Earlier, the same first session of the Eighty-first Congress had voted $5,700,000,000 for economic aid, plus $1,300,000,000 for military aid, a total of $7,000,000,000 on top of previous vast sums previously voted by the Eightieth Congress. Contrast this with the piddling $96,000,000—less than 2 percent of the amount readily appropriated for defense of European countries a few months earlier.

Now, the point is that these requests for Alaskan defense are minimal requests. They represent what, in the opinion of the military authorities in Alaska—in whom, incidentally, those of us who know them have the greatest faith and confidence—consider the absolute minimum required in the event of a sneak attack. Until these defenses are established, and they will not be for at least a year or more, because of the 4-year interval since VJ-day in which little or nothing has been done—until these defenses are established, Alaska continues defenseless and can be, as I have stated publicly before, taken by a minor scale airborne invasion.

What is needed for the minimal defense of Alaska is a complete radar screen, work on which has now been authorized, and sufficient housing to take care of the necessary ground troops to hold our airports in the event of a parachute attack and, finally, enough planes and air personnel to intercept and destroy any air attack directed at the northwest coast of the United States and passing over Alaska. It seems incredible that we should have to plead and fight and beg for such minimum requirements.

In this connection, let me pay a warm tribute to the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Stewart Symington, who not only is fully aware of and alerted to the paramount importance of Alaska defense and its needs but has been working unceasingly to bring this about. Coming to Alaska in the late summer to survey the situation, he subsequently gave up his Christmas vacation to return to Alaska for further investigation in order to be able to give to the congressional committees the first-hand information which they will undoubtedly require.

It is very unusual for Government officials inspecting Alaska to come up there in winter. But here we have the case of a top-level official foregoing the pleasures and comforts of the Christmas holidays at home, traveling about Alaska in the closing week of December for that purpose in order to see for himself how our soldiers had been forced to live under winter conditions in the Arctic and sub-Arctic. I desire to express the deep appreciation of Alaskans and my own gratitude to Secretary Symington. I hope that his efforts will be successful and will bear early fruit in this session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Hopeful as I am that Secretary Symington's efforts and those of the rest of us will be successful, I cannot forbear to terminate with the conclusion that Alaska will never be adequately defended unless and until we get statehood. This is perhaps not the place or time to elaborate fully the overwhelming evidence that leads to that conclusion. Moreover, adequate defense is only one of many compelling reasons why the Congress should grant statehood to Alaska at this session. But the history of our Nation during recent years demonstrates overwhelmingly that the development of Alaska, the defense of Alaska, the realization of Alaska's current mission and destiny, and statehood are inseparable.

That current mission and destiny, incidentally, are worth stressing. I have talked this evening about the need of defending Alaska for the sake of national security and as a preventive against enemy attack and the catastrophe of a third world war.

While we are all struggling, as all sane people must, to avert such a third world war, we are engaged in another form of conflict, the so-called cold war. This is a contest of ideologies. It is a competitive effort to demonstrate to all of mankind that a free society is better than a fettered one; that democracy is better than dictatorship; and that government by consent of the governed, majority rule, and protection for the minorities, the basic tenets of our American faith, are more productive of happiness and therefore more enduring than the converse policies practiced wherever the Soviet idea dominates. If we are to win this war of ideas, if we are to gain adherence among the neutral and wavering peoples of the earth, it is essential that we live up to our professions, that we demonstrate by deeds rather than by declamations that we mean what we say.

And that means, among other such acts to prove our good faith, granting statehood to our Pacific Territories which, after a long period of semicitizenship and colonial rule, have requested statehood, have requested self-government on the established American pattern, have requested the full equality of citizenship which is their right.

The majority of the press of the Nation, public opinion, and every major national organization have endorsed this aspiration.

The Governors of the 48 States at three successive annual meetings have by unanimous vote endorsed statehood.

In both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses the House committee which investigated statehood reported favorably—by a unanimous vote in the Eightieth Congress, with but one dissenting vote in the Eighty-first.

Can we continue to be the torch bearers of democracy in a darkened world if we deny statehood?

To win the cold war as well as to avert the calamity of a third world war, Alaska, above all else, needs statehood, and needs statehood now.

Mark of a Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Sunday Star of February 12, 1950:

MARK OF A STATESMAN

(By Bruce Barton)

In 1937 Fiorello LaGuardia, Senator Copeland, and Judge Mahoney were candidates in the primaries for mayor of New York.

There was hardly any talk about local issues. That might have been dangerous; it might have lost votes.

Senator Copeland's theme song was: "Vote for me. I am brave. I denounced Hitler in the Senate."

Judge Mahoney boasted: "I made Hitler mad by keeping our American boys away from the Olympic games in Berlin."

LaGuardia screamed: "I called Hitler a so-and-so."

Mr. Mahoney beat Copeland, and Mr. LaGuardia beat Mr. Mahoney.

Most of our political campaigns are like that. Most politicians are like the one in Sam Riser's poem, who practiced his speeches before the mirror. Shaking his fist, he would shout that—

"White is white and black is black.
And he swore that even torture would not make him take it back."

Lincoln had a different kind of courage. In the closing days of the Civil War a delegation visited him in the White House—men so powerful that they could swing the votes of Illinois, and Illinois could swing the national election. They demanded a reduction in the draft quota of Illinois; her fathers and mothers, they said, had suffered enough.

Joseph Medill, owner of the most feared newspaper in the Middle West, was their spokesman. Quoting his own words, Ida M. Tarbell tells the story.

"I shall never forget," said Mr. Medill, "how he (Lincoln) suddenly lifted his head and turned on us a black and frowning face.

"'Gentlemen,' he said, in a voice full of bitterness, 'you called for war until we had it. Now you come here begging to be let off from the call for men which I have made to carry on the war you demanded. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. I have a right to expect better things of you. And you, Medill, you are acting like a coward. You can influence great masses, and yet you cry to be spared at the moment when your cause is suffering. Go home, and send us those men.'

"I couldn't say anything," Mr. Medill continued. "It was the first time I ever was whipped. We all got up and went out, and when the door closed, one of my colleagues said:

"'Well, gentlemen, the old man is right. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves. Let us * * * go home and raise the men.'"

Lincoln had won his point, but he had risked powerful support to do so. That was real political courage—the hallmark of a statesman.

The Movement for Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the growing movement for a union of Atlantic democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Pact is less than 1 year old. It announced its formation on March 15, 1949, and then embarked upon all-out support for the pact. On July 26, 5 days after the pact was ratified, the Atlantic Union resolution—H. R. 107–111 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 57—was introduced into the House and Senate.

This resolution, as former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts has said, "offers a minimum of commitment with a maximum of hope." It provides in its resolving clause:

That the President is requested to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet this year with delegates of the United States in a federal convention to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principle of free federal union.

This resolution is now before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Hearings on it by a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are scheduled for early February.

Since the introduction of this resolution the Atlantic Union Committee has grown both in size and importance. Headed by Justice Roberts, former Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, and former Under Secretary of State Will L. Clayton, it now includes more than 270 distinguished Americans from all sections of the country on its national council and has active chapters or community leaders in every State. More and more thinking Americans are beginning to realize that its proposal offers the broadest and safest road to peace and prosperity.

The Atlantic Union Committee is endeavoring, as the resolution indicates, to bring about early exploration of the possibilities of federating the Atlantic democracies. It seeks no commitment other than to explore; any proposals for action which might develop from such exploration would be submitted to the Congress and the American people for full discussion and consideration. Any actual steps in federating with other democracies would require amendment of the Constitution.

The practicality of this procedure has been underlined by two developments which occurred during 1949. The first of these was the adoption of the North Atlantic Pact, which furnishes a springboard for efforts by its parties to form an Atlantic Union. Article 2 of the pact pledges them to contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which those institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being and to encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

The second development was the discovery that Russia can make atomic bombs. When American cities have become exposed to atomic attack, the American people cannot afford to be content with small measures in their search for peace and security. They cannot afford to indulge in the tragic tendency of democracies to do too little and to do it too late.

How far the Atlantic democracies will be willing to go in federating cannot be foreseen now, since that can be determined only when their leaders and experts in government meet to consider together the complex problems involved. At this stage, we can do no more than point to the experience of existing federal unions, the greatest of which is our United States. They have been built upon a division of powers, certain specified powers being granted to the Federal Government and the rest reserved to the local governments. Among those granted to the Federal Government have been the conduct of foreign relations and defense, regulation of trade and communications, and powers to issue currency, raise revenue, and grant citizenship.

We can, furthermore, even at this stage, survey some of the consequences of successful creation of an Atlantic Union loosely comparable to the federal unions which have been established in the past. These are so far reaching as to indicate that the birth of the Atlantic Union would mark a turning point in history and make the second half of this

century an era of peace and unprecedented prosperity.

Peace and security are foremost in all our minds today. The Atlantic Union at its creation would possess 80 percent of the world's industrial capacity. Endowed with so vast a war potential and wide dispersion of territories, it would be too strong to be defeated in war. With or without atomic bombs, no aggressive government, and certainly not the cold-blooded Kremlin dictatorship, will undertake a world war unless it believes it can win.

The Union would possess at its birth a world predominance of power. This predominance, moreover, would grow progressively as a result of two developments. The first would be the rapid increase in the productive capacity of all the Union's people resulting from economic integration. The second would be the expansion of the Union resulting from the voluntary accession of additional free peoples. Thus the security of the union would grow year by year and decade by decade, affording to all its peoples a prospect of enduring peace which does not appear attainable by the methods we have pursued thus far.

The Union could be expected to establish a stable currency, and to create, at a relatively early date, one great economic area comprising more than 300,000,000 consumers. Such a stable currency and decreasing fear of war would stimulate private investment by both Americans and Europeans on an unprecedented scale. Its huge economic area, free from barriers to trade, would permit within a market twice as large as the United States the full development of the mass production and specialization which have made our American standard of living so high.

All the expected benefits of European integration would be multiplied many times in Atlantic integration covering a region which, unlike western Europe, would possess a balanced economy. These results would soon become evident in increasing productive capacity, rising standards of living, better business, more income, and more wealth.

These economic advances, moreover, would make the burden of defense progressively easier to bear. For Union would decrease defense costs not only in relation to income, but also in actual size. The inherent strength of the Union would enable it to maintain security with a smaller military establishment than the total of those the democracies would need separately. To take one example, its navy would not need to be as large as the combined navies of the United States and Great Britain. At the same time unification of forces and command, standardization of weapons and equipment, and specialization of functions and of production would make its forces far more efficient than the combined national forces of the democracies could be.

Such savings in defense costs, plus those resulting from elimination of United States Government aid to western Europe and of many thousands of officials engaged in functions which Union would render unnecessary, could be expected to reduce the burden on the American taxpayer by billions of dollars.

There is something else which Americans have proved that they prize more than either peace or prosperity. That is freedom. In the last 20 years the frontiers of freedom have drastically receded. In the last few months we have seen Communist despotism overrun the whole of China.

Creation of the Atlantic Union would reverse this process and set in motion a progressive expansion of freedom. It would not only bring victory in the "cold war," it would also wrest the initiative from Russia in the war of ideas and show up communism as the reactionary autocratic movement which it actually is.

Due to the magnetic attraction of the union's security and prosperity, many peoples who had not maintained free institutions would hasten to establish them in order to become eligible for inclusion. Once these peoples were included, those institutions would presumably be guaranteed by the union government, as a republican form of government is guaranteed the States in our own country. Meanwhile the peoples of the dependent territories of the Atlantic democracies within the union would be developing self-government and evolving toward the status of states or nations.

To appreciate the importance of these developments, we must remember that about two-thirds of the peoples of the world now have close ties with the Atlantic democracies. Atlantic Union would strengthen these ties, not weaken them, since these peoples would rely more on the union for security, markets, and industrial products than they do now on the democracies separately. Many of these peoples, notably those in South America, could be expected to seek to join the union at an early date. Others, hoping to join it eventually, would establish in the meantime some special relationship with the union government. In all of them and over the greater part of the earth, creation of the union would stimulate the expansion of freedom and the development of free institutions.

Supposing that we Americans prove to have wisdom and vision as our forefathers did, sufficient wisdom and vision to take this great forward step, what can we expect the world to look like a few years from now? There will be a union of free peoples, too strong to be crushed in war and growing progressively in strength, extent, and prosperity. There will be hundreds of millions of other peoples associated with the union and aspiring toward eventual inclusion in it. Freedom will be on the march. Communism will be on the defensive, compelled to concentrate on a task at which autocracy has always failed in the end, the maintenance of its grip upon subject peoples. Mankind will be advancing by a road which is broad and direct, even though it is long, toward an eventual free world.

How Do You Like Your Potatoes, if Any?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of February 2, 1950:

HOW DO YOU LIKE YOUR POTATOES, IF ANY?

And so the Government is getting ready to destroy 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes. It may let them rot in the fields or burn them or spray them with dye so they can't be dumped on the market. Under the law, you see, prices can't be suffered to go down, either for the consumer or the taxpayer.

It sounds terrible. And it is terrible, when you think of potatoes in terms of mouths to be fed and stomachs to be filled by this most filling of food. It sounds just as bad when you think that at $1.25 a bushel the Government has put out $62,500,000 of the taxpayers' money for these same potatoes.

However, nobody wants to buy them—and a lot of people can't buy them at the retail price which is kept high by the program of guaranty. Nobody seems to want them even for free, if this calls for paying the freight from fields or storage warehouses.

We have to begin at the beginning of the Government's sad experience with potatoes to find the villain in the case. And even then we can't be quite sure. Some signs point to the potato producer himself. Some point to the farmers' political friends. Some point to the whole system of price supports and particularly to the method of supporting prices by purchase which takes food off the market to keep the price up.

Early in the war, it was found that potato requirements for military, civilian, and lend-lease were about 50,000,000 bushels greater than the peacetime production. The Secretary of Agriculture asked for increased production. Under the law, this brought potatoes under the support plan at 90 percent of parity until 2 years after the end of hostilities.

Nobody was troubled much at the time. Wasn't the Government, to get war production, subsidizing the construction of huge plants, subsidizing profits, granting tax recovery in a postwar pinch, and taking huge losses in sale of surplus plants? But in potatoes, and other food crops, the production was bigger and better than expected, and the surpluses began to accumulate, and the guarantees began to work.

The Government tried to cut down losses by curtailing acreage. But the farmers were pretty good. As they were assured of a price for all they could grow, they set about to make the fewer acres produce more. They increased the yield as the acres decreased. In 1943 acres harvested totaled 3,339,000; the average yield, 141.7 bushels an acre. Last year, with only 1,900,000 acres harvested, the production was 401,000,000 bushels. This was 2 percent over the 1938–47 average—on little more than half the 1943 acreage. It was no skin off the potato grower's nose if his product never got to market, though it was cash in his pocket.

The supports did not end at the specified time, because the farm politicians in Congress extended them. Potatoes, like almost everything else, are under the support provisions of the present law. The pressure

from constituents and logrolling farm lobbyists worked well. It is a commentary on the system that even as Secretary Brannan announced the plan to destroy unwanted potatoes, Congress was yielding to the pressure of cotton growers and increasing the acreage allotments for that crop—with the certainty of more cotton to come, more drains on the loan funds, more surpluses.

At this rate, if the American Farm Bureau and the other pressure groups don't look out, they will find themselves hard put to stave off something like Secretary Brannan's plan to end supports, let prices fall in the market place, and pay the farmers a production subsidy to keep their income stable. Certainly they are likely to find public revulsion for the plan of support by Government purchase (and destruction) of surpluses. They may find production controls substituted for acreage controls. We have an idea that any or all of these things won't make the consuming public a bit mad. At any rate, the consumer couldn't be madder than he is at news like the potato shocker.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my speech on the Lincoln's Day broadcast, National Broadcasting Co., New York City, February 11, 1950:

Throughout history the words of great men have been used by other men to justify their own thinking on important issues.

In our own country the words of Washington, of Jefferson, of Jackson are often used in an effort to prove some point or other. We argue endlessly about what these great figures would do if they were faced today with this or that problem.

No American has been more quoted, not only in our own country, but in every land, than Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we will be celebrating tomorrow.

Lincoln is quoted by many men for their own purposes and their own ends. He is held up for veneration by many men whose actions show that they do not believe what he believed, but who use his words to lend to themselves some of the coloring of his deep humanity, something of the greatness which attaches to one of the most beloved of all the men born in the Western World.

That is so. Some people seek to employ the words and the memory of Lincoln for small purposes. But it is also true that he cannot be truly quoted on both sides of a question. With his simplicity of mind and spirit, with his steadfastness of heart, Lincoln kept a straight clear line in this love and respect for all the people. And the people know it, and that is why their devotion to this man's memory is so profound.

Lincoln cannot be quoted on both sides of any question touching humanity, since we know so clearly where he stood. We know as well as if he were speaking to us today what he would have said about some of the problems which confront us now.

Before our Nation is the grave problem of civil rights, the granting of the benefits and opportunities, as well as the obligations of our democracy, to all our citizens with no regard to race or creed or color.

Congress has before it today a program to assure full civil rights for all of our people. As a part of that program it has before it a bill to establish a Commission whose purpose would be to see that race and creed were not used as bars to equal opportunity to earn a living.

Where would Lincoln stand on the question of an FEPC?

Lincoln said that the leading object of our Government—and these are his exact words—is "to elevate the condition of men; to lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to clear the paths of laudable pursuits for all; to afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance in the race for life."

Can anyone doubt where he would have stood?

Listen to what Lincoln says to us today: "What constitutes the bulwark of our liberty and independence?" he asks us. And then he replies, "It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoast, our Army and our Navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of those may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty, which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors. Familiarize yourself with bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample the rights of others, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you."

Where would Lincoln have stood? We know, how well we know.

The question is, Where do we stand?

Do we measure up to his great, long dream of us, of an America great because it was free, and free for the very least among us?

Where do you stand?

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, in honoring Abraham Lincoln on this one hundred and forty-third anniversary of his birth it is befitting that I recall to this distinguished body a brief history of his service as a Representative of the Seventh District of Illinois.

Abraham Lincoln was elected as a Whig to the Thirtieth Congress on March 4, 1847, to March 3, 1849, after having been nominated at a convention held at Pekin, Ill., which I am proud to say is my home town. The Seventh District of Illinois was, at that time, comprised of the counties of Putnam, Marshall, Woodford, Tazewell, Menard, Mason, Cass, Morgan, Scott, Logan, and Sangamon. While Lincoln's service as a Member of Congress was not spectacular, he began evidencing at that time some of the courage of personal conviction that made him one of the outstanding leaders in world history.

Some of the words which he uttered at the time of his service, and afterward, are well worth repeating here, especially at this time when we are being carried in this headlong rush toward socialism. Lincoln said:

1. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.
2. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.
3. You cannot help strong men by tearing down big men.
4. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.
5. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred.
6. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.
7. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.
8. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn.
9. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence.
10. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

The Lonely Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of February 12, 1950:

THE LONELY LINCOLN

All of his biographers speak of how lonely Lincoln was. Gamaliel Bradford says: "He lived in a solitude which neither man nor woman ever perfectly penetrated. * * * He ruled over millions of men and women who loved him; yet he was enormously alone." The words here quoted were written 25 years ago. They confirm the declaration of R. H. Dana in March 1863: "He has no admirers, no enthusiastic supporters, none to bet on his head." To multitudes who cared about him were far from him, distant as the poles, inarticulate, perhaps dismayed by their instinctive apprehension of the tragedy they sensed coming.

Doubtless it generally is so. Shakespeare's divinity that "doth hedge a king" extends to presidents. The elevation of a man to leadership removes him from the people, Lincoln felt that; "thought of it," as Mr. Bradford remarks, "all the time." The melancholy of the uncommon commoner traced back to his isolation, and he mourned the fact. Yet nothing could be done about it. Lincoln was above, beyond human fellowship. There are many theories intended to explain this, but they are not adequate; they remain mere guesses as the years go by.

What matters most, however, is that Lincoln still is magnetic, still dynamic. He is one of the half dozen great world figures of the nineteenth century who continue to possess power to stir men's thoughts, to influence their actions. If he be the symbol of America as Whitman, Vachel Lindsay, James Oppenheim, and other poets have believed, then he represents all of us in the experiences, the ordeals of our lives. Our ways are cast in bitter times as his way was. We, too, are lonely. Moving in millions,

closer in terms of improved facilities of communication than our fathers ever were, we yet are like Lincoln in our insularity, one from another.

But it would be an error to fail to note the automatic, inescapable bonds by which humanity is identified with its best exemplars. Their destiny is that of the least of their fellows in the shifting kaleidoscope of history. If we are affected by the enemies of mankind, we are as truly are advantaged by those who are our friends. Lenin in his mausoleum in the Red Square at Moscow is dead, despite the Soviets, while Lincoln—even though he still is lonely in his shrine by the quiet Potomac—never has died. The difference is an affair of the enlightened spirit. Read again the familiar lines from the second inaugural, cut on the wall of his temple: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us * * * do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

These words remain a compelling affirmation. America is noblest in the ratio of its approach to the ideal which they represent. The same observation applies to the world at large.

There's Some Fine Print in Farm Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of February 4, 1950:

THERE'S SOME FINE PRINT IN FARM PRICE SUPPORTS

Potatoes are eye-deep in politics today. It is a shocker that 58,000,000 bushels of them may have to be destroyed—and by the Government, at that—though potato prices keep high in the stores and people are hungry in this land of surpluses. It is no wonder that there is more than the usual amount of buck-passing in Washington.

The highly dramatized situation seems about to open the eyes of Congress as well as the public to the inconsistencies of the farm program, to the evils of Government purchases that create scarcity and high prices. If Members are stirred to action it will be worth all the $58,000,000 the potato-dumping is likely to cost.

There are signs that eyes are being opened and political consciences stirred. There are signs also many a Member of Congress is ignorant of much of the fine print in the Agricultural Act that was passed last fall. All that many of them seemed to see at the time was the headlined fact that price supports would be kept high—90 percent of parity—and that on the surface this would mean that farmers would stay happy, and vote to keep their faithful Representatives.

However, blinded by the dazzling thought that they were voting themselves political credit, and brushing off several more practical alternatives, they fairly outsmarted themselves. This was certainly the case as to the potato politicians. By dint of logrolling here and there, helping the champions of other groups in consideration of help for their own crop, they held potatoes in the bill as subject to mandatory price supports.

Previously it was possible for the Government to help clear potato surpluses by sending large quantities for school lunches and welfare institutions. The law permitted the Government to pay transportation and handling costs, so that the whole transaction was free, potatoes and incidental charges as well. But it applied only to "perishable nonbasic agricultural commodities," which were not under mandatory supports. Once the friends of potato-growing constituents got their product on the mandatory-support list, they were stopped by section 411 of the act from most of the benefits of free distribution.

The curious law permits the Government to pay freight and handling only if price-supported perishable foods are to be used to feed livestock. Potatoes might come under this head. But if the same perishables are to go to school lunches, welfare groups, or commercial processors, it must be f. o. b. at the shipping point. Secretary Brannan told the Senate committee this week:

"The paradox of a situation in which we would pay transportation costs on potatoes going for livestock feed, but would be forced to assess such charges to those who wanted them for human food, is so obvious that we feel obligated to discontinue paid-freight distribution for livestock feed."

And so the country is beguiled by the prospect of destruction of food for no other reason than that the law says its price must be supported; and that, being supported, the food is over-produced by farmers who know a good thing when they see it.

The potato situation is but one item, and a comparatively small one, in the price-support picture. This newspaper hopes to discuss shortly the broader aspects of the law and to point out what it considers to be follies and dangers. If Members of Congress, aroused by the potato scandal in which they have abetted the big commercial growers, don't move swiftly to mend matters, where will be the end?

Memorandum on the Proposed Bill To Provide for Certain Exemptions From the Federal Admissions Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is proposed that the Internal Revenue Code be amended so as to provide that admissions to a limited number of political facilities be exempted from the tax levied on admissions by section 1700 of the Internal Revenue Code. The proposed amended Code seeks to have admisssions to swimming pools, bathing beaches, public parks and other similar facilities, operated and maintained by the United States, or any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or any political subdivision of a State or Territory, declared exempt from the so-called Federal admissions tax. The proposed amendment also provides that no penalties shall be assessed in respect to past offenses relating to taxes on admissions to such facilities enumerated and specified in the proposed exemption.

The revenue cost to the Federal Government from this proposed exemption is almost nil. The consequences to the public health and juvenile delinquency programs of cities will be great.

The impetus to propose this amendment was precipitated by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Wilmette Park District against Campbell, Collector of Internal Revenue, on December 12, 1949. In that case the Court held that the Wilmette Park district, a political subdivision of the State of Illinois, was liable for penalties for failure to collect, return, and pay taxes which were due and owing on admissions charged to enter the park and bathing facilities operated and maintained by the park district. The Court held that the charge made by the park district for use of its swimming beach were in fact admissions within the purview of section 1700 of the Internal Revenue Code and that the park district had the duty to collect and remit the Federal tax levied on such admissions. It was also emphasized in the Wilmette decision that under the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, Congress did not intend to exempt any admissions to activities like those here involved, that is, not conducted for gain, although Congress might readily have done so.

Many governmental units, and particularly those at the local level, have maintained and operated for many years swimming pools, bathing beaches, and public parks for the benefit of their citizens. Problems of local finance have, in many instances, required that nominal admission charges be levied in order to operate and maintain such facilities. These facilities are designed to fill an important public need by affording wholesome and beneficial recreation and relaxation chiefly to children, and in some instances to adults, who are unable to afford similar facilities operated by private organizations. The health value of such programs and their tremendous value in combating juvenile delinquency are obvious, as these facilities give children something wholesome to do during summer months when schools are closed. The public welfare requires that any admission charges to such facilities be kept at a minimum as children have only a few cents to spend. While the Federal admissions tax is not a large levy, it increases the charge to be paid by those who can ill afford anything but a token charge for recreation and relaxation, and imposes difficult duties upon the cities operating these facilities—duties all out of proportion to the small amount of revenue to the Federal Government derived from this source.

Some cities, counties and other political subdivisions have in the past collected, returned and remitted taxes on admissions to swimming pools, bathing beaches and public parks. Unfortunately, however, many other local governments have not collected, returned or remitted such taxes in the sincere belief that section 1700 of the Internal Revenue Code levying a tax on admissions did not apply to such public facilities. The impact of the Wilmette decision on such communities will be of considerable magnitude for the decision allows United States collectors of internal revenue to assess penalties against local governmental units in the amount of the taxes which should have been collected. The assessment of such penalties would add immeasurably to the already staggering burdens of local finance and the serious ramifications of local taxation.

This memorandum in support of the proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code, to exempt admission charges to swimming pools, bathing beaches and public parks operated by governmental units and to provide that penalties shall not be assessed for past offenses relating to the taxes now levied on such admission charges, has been prepared in summary form, but it is believed it covers the great problem from which cities need the proposed legislation. Realizing the importance of such facilities to local communities, the dire and pressing fiscal problems of all governmental units, and the importance of sound local government to the welfare of the Nation, it is hoped that the Congress of the United States will enact the proposed amendment providing for the aforesaid limited exemptions from the Federal admissions tax.

Four Hopeful Movements in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by Rev. E. Stanley Jones, which I had the pleasure of hearing delivered at the Calvary Methodist Church of Washington, D. C.

Dr. Jones has been and is an outstanding religious leader of the world.

FOUR HOPEFUL MOVEMENTS IN THE WORLD TODAY

(By E. Stanley Jones)

There are four hopeful movements in the world today. Amid the encircling gloom, four things stand out as stars of hope: (1) The movement for world government. (2) The Christian missions movement. (3) The movement to win the 70,000,000 Americans who are members of no church—Jewish, Catholic, or Protestant. (4) The movement to unite the churches of America.

The movement for world government is a growing pressure from beneath, pressing on governments for action—a people's movement. It will probably go through the United Nations, or if this is impossible, then around the United Nations through a peoples' convention to the establishment of a world security for everybody. Under this security of world law, Russia would have a chance to carry out her way of life, within Russia; America would have a chance to carry out her way of life, within America. All other nations the same. Then the one with the best order would win. I am not afraid of that test, for underlying our civilization we have something lacking in Russia, a Christian basis. In the long run that will be the deciding factor. If this collective security were honestly set up for everybody, I am persuaded that the satellites of Russia would desert her and take world collective security instead of Russian security.

While this is a peoples' movement, yet the political leaders are in it too—over 100 in the House of Representatives of the United States, and over a hundred members of the British Parliament are committed to world government now. Twenty-four State legislatures have already voted for world federal union. Sixty-five percent of the people of America voted in a poll for America to delegate sovereignty to a world federal union. It is a rising tide as the half-answers are proving incapable of bringing peace and security for all.

The second hopeful movement is the movement of Christian missions, especially in relation to Japan. When I landed on the airport at Tokio a newspaperman ran up and said, "Sir, all Japan is talking about Christianity, what have you to say in regard to it?" An exaggeration, of course, but Christianity, from being a marginal sect, had moved to the center of the life of Japan as the subject of a national choice. With the disastrous defeat of Japan the bottom dropped out of the inner life of that people. They had been taught that they were a divine people, with a divine emperor, with a divine destiny to rule. That whole concept went down in blood and ruin and left a moral vacuum in the soul of Japan. Shintoism and Buddhism are too feeble to reorganize the inner life of Japan. Two virile forces are rushing into that vacuum—communism and Christianity. The life of Japan will be organized around one or another of these systems and that perhaps in 10 years. For the time being Christianity has the inside track I have done evangelistic work around the world for 42 years but never have I seen such spiritual responsiveness and hunger as Japan. They hang on your words wanting some sure word from God to fill the awful inner vacuum. In some places they charged admission, 10 yen, to get into evangelistic meetings and everyone was given a decision card when he went in and his name registered. They packed the buildings. In two meetings in Matsuyama 930 people signed cards saying they wanted to follow Christ, be baptized and come into the Christian church. In Tokio in one meeting 715 signed cards. We begged them not to do it through mere politeness, but only if it meant a real decision to go through the whole meaning of being a Christian. Even with these brakes on over 8,000 people signed cards within a month. Cut it in half and say only half really meant it, though for the life of me I don't see why they all didn't mean it, and yet the opportunity is amazing.

General MacArthur, whom I consider the author of the most outstanding piece of constructive work since the war, said to me: "The church has not faced a situation like this in 500 years anywhere. Where you have sent one missionary send a hundred and lay the foundations broad and deep to make this a Christian nation, for Japan will never become a democracy until it becomes Christian."

We have prayed for an open door in Japan and now the whole half side of the house is out. We must give Japan our best without any strings attached. For if the Japanese become Christian they can be the natural evangelists to the whole of the Far East. The old dream of national conquest has gone down in blood and ruin and a new dream of being the agents of a new order, the Kingdom of God, is beginning to take shape. They are virile people and will go far.

The third hopeful thing on the horizon is the fact that in America 38 denominations representing 38,000,000 Christians have united to make this mid-century year the year of evangelism in a concerted effort to win the other half of America to Christ. A vast mission field of 70,000,000 is at our doors. And the church is beginning to realize that if it can't convert it has lost its right to be called Christian. For the Christian faith is a contagion or it is not Christian. The laity are being mobilized to go out two by two and win people to a double allegiance to Christ and the church. This is putting evangelism where it should be—in the soul of the laymen. This will help individuals to a new life and will strengthen the moral and spiritual foundations of this country for the half century ahead.

The fourth hopeful movement is the movement toward an ecumenical church. This means that the Christians are beginning to feel the sense of solidarity of being Christians, that if we belong to Christ we automatically belong to each other. We may betray that brotherhood, but we cannot deny it.

The ecumenical movement will be precipitated into some form of union. There are four proposals for union before the American people: (1) That union be organized around the existing councils of churches on the local, State, National, and international level. (2) That the churches federate to do certain things together. Both these two proposals are good but not good enough, for they are this side of union leaving the denominations sovereign and intact, surrendered to nothing beyond themselves. (3) Merger. Where denominations have sufficient affinity with each other to merge, without splitting, then I'm in favor of it. But, if merger is taken as an over-all strategy for union, then it will result in a minority merging, leaving the majority outside, which would not be church union, but a union of some churches. We must have church union. (4) Federal union offers the possibility of church union now. The principle of Federal union would mean that the denominations would come together on the same basis as the Colonies came together—a Federal union but with local self-government or States' rights in the constituent branches. There would be one church: The Church of Christ in America," or "The United Church of America," but under it there would be branches, no longer separate, sovereign churches, but branches of the one church—the Episcopal branch of the Church of Christ in America, the Lutheran branch, the Baptist branch, etc. Within those branches there could be local self-government. If any branch wanted bishops or adult baptism by immersion it could keep such distinguishing characteristics but it wouldn't compel the rest to take them as the price of union. Then would be a union of diversity and not a union of uniformity.

Federal union puts together two urges—the desire for union with the whole, and the desire for local self-government. Applied to these States it has made us the most united people on earth—united in difference. Applied to the churches it could mean a union of rich diversity, for God has raised up these different denominations to emphasize forgotten or neglected truth. Now the same spirit of God that raised them up is moving on them to bring together these emphases and share them with the rest, not by compromise but by comprehension.

There is a peoples' movement on. In the 125 cities where we have gone with this crusade for a united church the most that have ever voted against federal union were 11 people out of an audience of 4,500 in San Antonio, Tex. The Christians, with the largest single allegiance, hold the balance of power in this country. United they could go anywhere and do anything—anything that's right. Christians of America, unite; you have nothing to lose except your dividing walls.

Oil-Depletion Allowance and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD a statement I made to the Committee on Ways and Means in regard to the necessity for continuing the 27½ percent depletion allowance for the oil industry.

I hope the Members will read this statement, since the reason for this allowance have become so confused to those who do not have an intimate working knowledge of the Nation's oil industry. I strongly feel that we will endanger our national defense by crippling this vital industry if this depletion allowance is eliminated or reduced, since it is almost entirely true that the present healthy oil-development program in the United States is created by this allowance.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I ask this opportunity to place before you my views on the proposed oil tax depletion clause because of the great harm I am sure will result from eliminating or reducing this allowance.

I presently represent one of the largest oil-producing districts in America. My district is of particular significance because of the fact that a large part of the oil activity in my district is carried on entirely by small independent operators. This is the group which does the most in the field of oil exploration and development and which is now receiving the greatest benefit from the oil-depletion clause. If this allowance is cut, this part of our oil industry will be driven out of business. Any person who has an intimate knowledge of the oil industry knows that we must maintain our independent operators if we want to maintain a growing industry.

This is true because in the field of "wildcatting" it is the independents who will spend the time and money required to find new oil reserves. This activity is such a great financial risk that few of the major companies are willing to engage in this field.

Elimination of the depletion clause would wreck the independent producing business in the United States because it would prevent these producers from getting back capital invested which is necessary if they are to continue in business. It would reduce exploratory work and the finding of new oil reserves to an extent which would endanger the security of this Nation. It would make us, within a few years, dependent on foreign oil which might be shut off in case of war.

References made in the President's tax message to Congress are most misleading. These evidently were based on information from a few abnormal cases rather than on actual conditions which obtain for the oil-producing industry as a whole.

No other industry is as hazardous as that of the oil producer. During the last year, 23 percent of all "wildcat" wells drilled in the United States were dry. Only 15 percent were producers and 3 percent were gas wells. This so-called wildcatting deals with the problem in areas where no oil has been previously produced and is the way in which all new oil reserves are discovered.

After an area has been proved by such a "wildcat," drilling still remains a big gamble. Of all the wells drilled in the United States last year in these so-called proved areas, 25 percent were dry, 66 percent produced oil and 9 percent produced gas. Since oil was first discovered in America to the present day total drilling shows that only one well out of each seven wells drilled has produced oil or gas in paying quantities. Congress realized this situation long ago. Efforts made to provide the oil industry with sufficient help culminated in 1926 with what we now have as the 27½-percent depletion allowance. This figure was reached by compromise after a survey of the industry from 1918 to 1925 disclosed that actually the depletion figure was between 32 and 33 percent.

When oil or gas is produced from a property, there is a reduction in the capital represented by that oil or gas in place. The depletion allowance is designed not only to permit the producer a return of that amount of capital tax free, but also a return of capital invested in finding that oil or gas.

That is a point Mr. Truman failed to mention. He stated, "In the case of oil * * * the depletion exemption goes on and on, year after year, even though the original capital investment in the property has already been recovered tax free, not once, but many times over."

Each individual producing property or lease is considered separately in figuring the depletion allowance. Some producers have drilled as many as 20 wells before finding oil. Their capital investment in finding oil is far greater than the capital invested in that twenty-first well.

So, while depletion allowance for one producing property may, over a period of years, total more than the investment in that one property, it still falls short, in most instances, of returning to the producer all the capital he has invested in various properties in search for production. As the Government survey showed, the depletion allowance for the producing industry as a whole should be 32½ percent instead of the present 27½ percent.

Independent oil producers constitute only a part of the number of persons who would be harmed by elimination of the depletion clause. In 1948, the oil industry paid $1,200,000,000 in oil royalties, and lease bonuses and rentals. This money was expended in 37 States, 28 of which are oil-producing. Farmers, merchants, and others in all lines of businesses benefited from these payments. More than 200,000,000 acres, or 10 percent of the area of the United States, is under lease for oil and gas exploration and development by oil and gas companies.

I estimate as a conservative figure that at least 95 percent of the total population of my congressional district will be directly or indirectly affected to a harmful extent, if this depletion allowance is cut or taken away. It will be a general hardship that my communities cannot withstand.

Another illustration of why the depletion clause is important to the continued success of the American oil industry can be found in a recent development in western Oklahoma. The discovery well in the new oil field at Elk City, Okla., cost $750,000 to drill and that cost did not include $750,000 to $1,000,000 spent previously in exploration and preliminary development work. This new source of oil for our Nation is now available because independents were willing to gamble and risk such huge sums. They took this risk because the depletion allowance gave them a minimum hope of recovering their capital. Acreage in this same area was held by major oil companies for more than 20 years without a single cent being spent by them in wildcatting.

If this depletion clause is cut or eliminated, the time will not be long before foreign oil imports will have to supplant, not supplement, American production because no new fields will be discovered. This is a historical fact proven by a study of the entire search for new oil reserves. You must have the wildcatting independents if this phase of the industry continues.

Loss of revenue to the States by reason of a declining oil production will upset fiscal programs in virtually every oil-producing State. Unemployment will become widespread throughout all oil-producing areas. The ultimate cost to the Government in relief and other means of absorbing this impact on our economy will far offset any immediate tax-revenue benefits the Government can hope to gain by taking away this tax exemption of the oil industry.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot emphasize too strongly the point that all is not black gold that glitters in the oil industry. We must not, for the sake of the Nation's economy and for national defense, make the mistake of thinking that a few isolated cases of immense riches that an oil strike brings is any more typical of the oil industry than could be said of any other industry.

Strange as it may seem, the fact still remains that more money has been invested in the search for oil and oil producing in the United States than has ever been earned from such investments or gambles. This is true only because the oil-depletion clause constitutes an invitation for risk capital in the most risky of all industries that otherwise will not be available.

Increase this already terrific gamble and risk, and you will stop the balanced and continuing search for new oil reserves that this Nation needs and must have.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONFERENCE OF PRESIDENTS OF
NEGRO LAND GRANT COLLEGES,
KENTUCKY STATE COLLEGE,
Frankfort, Ky., February 6, 1950.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am authorized by above-named organization to communicate to you its prayers and hopes that your Education and Labor Committee will report favorably on S. 246.

Our organization has a long record in support of legislation to provide financial assistance to the States for education because we know such aid is necessary for promoting the type of education which the people need and which our democratic society requires.

It is requested that this communication be made a part of any records, reports, or proceedings that the committee might issue.

May we hear from you?

Very sincerely yours,

R. B. ATWOOD,
Secretary.

Address by Secretary of the Air Force Before the Graduating Class of Baylor University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a most inspiring address by the Honorable W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force, which was delivered before the graduating class of Baylor University, Waco, Tex., on February 1, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For some years now I have been a member of your national defense structure, America's team of land, sea, and air; and certain observations might be of interest to you today in connection with problems incident to the future security of the United States.

In his recent message to Congress on the state of the Union, our great President outlined the position and responsibilities of our country at this turn of the mid-century. In that challenging address he said in part:

"The human race has reached a turning point. Man has opened the secrets of nature and mastered new powers. If he uses them wisely, he can reach new heights of civilization. If he uses them foolishly, they may destroy him.

"In the world today we are confronted with the danger that the rising demand of people everywhere for freedom and a better life may be corrupted and betrayed by the false promises of communism.

"While the world remains unsettled * * * and as long as our own security and the security of the free world require, we will maintain a strong and well-balanced organization."

It is common knowledge that the source of the unsettled conditions to which our Commander in Chief referred is the threat of communistic aggression. Four years ago World War II ended. In 1922, 4 years after the close of World War I, the major powers were able to sit around the conference table in Washington, in a conciliatory atmosphere, and arrive at an agreement for the reduction of armaments. This they accomplished because no major power threatened the peace.

Ever since the end of the last war, however, America has become increasingly aware there can be no true peace while there is this threat of Communist aggression.

Indeed we may have already lived so long in this postwar cold-war atmosphere that unrest and instability are now being taken for granted and, therefore, disregarded.

If so, that is a very serious matter, because such lack of interest might result in loss of our freedom.

Such disregard may be natural for normal, healthy, peace-loving people. In this air-atomic age, however, it is dangerous, because the cause for this unrest—Communist aggression—is a threat not only to the preservation of the peace but also to our existence as a nation.

Never in the history of the United States has it been more important to recognize the truth about the world we live in; to recognize that truth, and then to follow the proper course necessary for America's preservation, no matter what the sacrifices required.

As our President said, "We know now that this is not an easy task or a short one." Prof. Arnold Toynbee, famed historian, recently predicted that these sacrifices might be required for the next 50 years. Toynbee assumed, of course, there would be no successful world conquest by the Communists.

Some 12½ years ago, in the summer of 1937, I went to the seat of a great world empire, a gay and busy city. It was the end of the London season. There were the usual number of parties. Some of the wealthy were watching their horses race; others were taking off for the Continent. With the exception of very few men, always and primarily Winston Churchill, foreign affairs were viewed with but normal apprehension. Many were sympathetic with Hitler. There was fear of Communist Russia, and fear of the growth of communism in the French Army, which was considered the greatest army in the world. As against these two fears, many favored Hitler's Germany as providing a balance of power and a bulwark state.

Douglas Reed, of the London Times, sounded consistent warnings from his post in Berlin. Churchill pleaded with the good people of his country, in epochal speeches which later composed a famous book, While England Slept.

Appeasement, however, was the order of the day. World trade and the stock dividends from it were important. Some were trying to buy security through appeasement—as if any nation can ever buy security through compromise with evil.

Fourteen months later came Munich. Some countries, particularly Czechoslovakia, felt they had been sold down the river. By then, however, there was no alternative, because the wolf had taken off his sheep's clothing. Hitler and his gangsters had revealed their true intent, and neither England, nor any other democracy, had adequate armament with which to trade against the war now sure to come.

In all free countries men stirred uneasily. They realized that soon they might be called upon to fight and die. They asked one another: "How did we ever get into this position so soon after having won before?"

How did they? That is the point of such critical importance to us today.

Less than 4 years later I again visited London, in early 1941. We sneaked up the coast of Portugal by air, praying for bad weather, hoping to avoid Hitler's dominant Focke-Wulf, long-range bombers, as they returned over the Atlantic from their attacks on Allied shipping.

Times had changed in London. Nobody took off for the continent of Europe except in battle planes, because the Nazis controlled that continent, just 20 miles away. Horses were being eaten instead of raced, and most of the entertainment was deep in the shelter of basements, comparatively safe from the bombs raining down overhead.

One of Britain's greatest battleships, the *Hood*, had been sunk. Worse to them, a large island, Crete, had just been conquered from the air.

The British people stood up with indomitable courage. Their leaders knew, nevertheless, that all which stood between them and slavery was the potential production, wealth, and manpower, of the United States.

At this point let me ask you—in case our country in turn is caught with its defense guard down, what nation has the strength to stand behind us as we stood behind England?

At present the people on this earth are, in effect, split in two main political groups. One group is headed by an aggression dictatorship, ruling some 285,000,000 people directly, plus many millions indirectly through puppet or satellite regimes. This central Communist dictatorship has reiterated many times to its own people and to the rest of the world that it is conducting the modern equivalent of a holy war against all nonbelievers.

In every issue of Cominunist dogma, under the title "Problems of Leninism," published over the signature of Stalin, appears this basic Communist tenet:

"We are living not merely in a state, but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialistic states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable."

The above statement of Communist policy has been reiterated many times, and as recently as after the close of World War II in 1945.

Furthermore, Communist leaders denounce all spiritual faiths, dictating as a substitute the cynical and materialistic doctrine of communism. As we all know, but sometimes are prone to forget, the Communist does not believe in God. That is part of the foundation of his philosophy. He has always fought to destroy religion.

The leaders of Russia have not only constantly reiterated their goal of world domination; they have also predicted the doom of all other political systems, especially capitalism. They have inflamed all Communists against all non-Communists, wherever the latter may be. They have sealed off their own people behind an "iron curtain," while taking advantage of free access in other countries to create constant distress and confusion from within.

Theirs has been a ceaseless campaign of aggression; ideological political and economic; and wherever expedient, that campaign has been supported by guns and marching men.

In the middle thirties it was important to know what the people of France and England and Holland and Denmark and Belgium and Norway were doing. It was far more important, however, to know what the Nazis were doing. Were they really rearming? Did they really believe their marching slogan, "Today we rule Germany, tomorrow the world"?

I believe that in these United States, at this midcentury mark, the most important question for all of us today is, "What are the Russians doing?" Not what we are doing in the way of rearming, at some slight expense to our standard of living, but what are those other people doing—those people who say they cannot live in the same world with our way of life? What is their weapons program, and why?

Surely we Americans do not want to be caught at any future time the way the democracies were caught by Hitler in the thirties.

This we know. Those who reiterate America must be destroyed now have—

1. A ground army greater in numbers than the combined armies of the United States and its allies;

2. An Air Force whose strength in nearly all categories is now the largest in the world and growing relatively larger month by month; and

3. The world's largest submarine fleet; and an intensive submarine development and construction program.

It is our belief that if any democracy attempted to maintain in peacetime a comparable regular armed force, the free economy of that democracy would be wrecked. In Communist countries, however, the will of the rulers, and not the economy of the nation, is the controlling factor. People under a dictatorship do not know when great

streams of national wealth which could be used to raise their standard of living, are diverted instead to further the aggressive ambitions of their rulers.

The Communist government dictators have no problems of money, because all money is owned by the state. The coin of the realm is the order of the dictator.

Nor have these bosses any problem of labor, because they have millions of slaves, captive prisoners from other countries, as well as their own political slaves. From our standpoint, every citizen of their state is but a slave to the handful of rulers at the top.

All men in such positions of dictatorial power, uncontrolled by the checks and balances of representative government, disdainful of the dignity and rights of the individual, and dedicated to the belief that the end justifies the means, are, and always will be, a threat to the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

Here are three facts which every American should know, because this is the world in which we live:

1. Behind the iron curtain there has been an atomic explosion.

2. Behind that curtain is the air equipment capable of delivering a surprise atomic attack against any part of the United States.

3. We have no sure defense against such an attack.

The bleak picture is that today we have a group of dictators dedicated to destroy our way of life. They are capable now of unleashing, without warning, the world's largest ground army, air force and undersea fleet. The gravity of this situation is multiplied many times by our knowledge of achievements being made by Russian scientists in the field of atomic energy.

I ask you, if these leaders want peace, why are they building their armed strength to such staggering proportions?

Today America holds the position of world economic, moral, intellectual, and in some respects, material leadership, in a struggle as bitter and fundamental as that in the Middle Ages between Islam and Christianity. In that ancient conflict the battleground was religious belief. It is with difficulty that we now understand the intensity of feelings which led to those holy wars. Many feel these dedicated to communism are, in effect, now waging a new religious war, with the dialectic materialism of communism the basis of a godless faith.

In the past the United States has been relatively safe, because our allies have given us the time necessary to build our defense against attack. Then we were at relatively safe distances from our enemies. That is no longer true. Distance is no longer any protection from the long arm and smashing fist of modern military air power. In this air-atomic age the oceans and polar wastes are not barriers against attack. Remember Russian soil is but 5 minutes flying time from the American soil of Alaska; and but a few hours away from our great cities. Waco is but an 18-hours flight from Moscow for the bombers we know Russia is now producing in quantity.

Based on these facts, are there any who would question the importance of this country maintaining as much military strength as will provide what George Washington called a respectable posture of defense? Would any of us like to forfeit either (1) the capacity to defend ourselves as best possible against sudden atomic air attack, or (2) the strategic air capacity necessary for instant effective retaliation against those who would make a surprise move against this country?

America is reconciled to the necessity for a peacetime defense program greater than ever required in the past. We must remain steadfast and alert until that day—God hasten it—when we can have complete assurance that any power, or combination of powers, which threatens peace will abandon their aggressive schemes and participate effectively in the community of nations to advance, and not destroy, civilization.

History teaches that mere races for armed might do not prevent wars. History also teaches, however, that weakness invites aggression.

Our patience in seeking peaceful solutions must not be interpreted as weakness. Rather it constitutes evidence of our own lack of aggressive designs, a manifestation of our sincere hope that as one member of a world organization, we may help to realize the aspirations of mankind for a permanent and responsible peace.

It is a basic dilemma of our time that those who menace our way of life may force arms expenditures of a magnitude that could cripple our economy and thus imperil our free institutions. I submit, however, that those who are critical of this administration for not bringing the national budget into balance may be guilty of ignoring the grim realities of the world in which we live.

I share the businessman's traditional dislike for deficits and am not unaware of the desires of the American taxpayer to have his burden made lighter. But under the circumstances of today, I am convinced that no loyal and informed American would knowingly consent to dangerous concessions in our security program in order to achieve some otherwise desirable fiscal objective. The risks involved are too great—the stakes too high, for any such false economies.

The arithmetic of the distribution of your tax dollars and mine establishes that during the current and coming fiscal year one-third of that dollar, or 33 cents, is being allocated to the Army, Navy, and Air Force. This figure does not include foreign aid, part of our payment for security, which averages 14 cents.

Those who say they would destroy the United States are thus forcing us to spend heavily from our resources, not only for our national defense but also for the rehabilitation and strengthening of our Allies. They hope to force us into economic collapse.

This danger is always present—consequently efficiency and quality assume transcendent importance in all our preparations; and selectivity in the building of our defense structure grows increasingly vital to our solvency.

If it is more important to balance the budget than to guarantee our security, it would be a relatively simple matter for our President to do so by recommending still further reductions in appropriations for national defense.

Based on the facts presented to you above, however, I ask again, is there any American who wants to see our defense budget reduced further?

We have made the mistake more than once. Let us consider what a single mistake of this kind cost us in money alone—not to mention hundreds of thousands of American lives.

In 1913, at the start of the First World War, the national debt was a little over $1,000,000,000. That war heavily taxed our resources; and a few years later we went through the greatest depression of them all.

A new President came in. He helped those people who wanted work but couldn't find a job. He did so because he believed that human dignity was better for the Nation than poverty and want.

At the time we started, somewhat leisurely, rearming for the Second World War, the national debt was around $40,000,000,000.

Today this debt is about $257,000,000,000.

Could there ever be clearer proof of the cost of unpreparedness?

If reports received from behind the iron curtain are correct, in a short time Russia will be at its strongest position in armaments; and under their present program that position will increase steadily year by year. So, I say today that further reduction in our payment for national security is unthinkable.

Our able and conscientious Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, is doing everything possible to promote true unification of the services which will guarantee the taxpayer maximum security at minimum cost. He is doing a fine job. But, it was Mr. Johnson himself who said recently that our "watchword should be military security first, economy second."

Both he and our President were front-line fighters in one war waged to preserve our way of life. They know that peace can be lost—but they know also, and you know, that the current price to America of losing any modern war is slavery.

I remind you that there is little, if any, peace in the world today. We don't have peace just because the guns are silent. Tragically, we do have fronts where the shooting could begin at any time; and no one knows when or where.

The history of Texas is the history of a battle for independence. May you in this great State, and in all our other States, remember the cost of such battles. When those who want to represent us in the halls of our Government consistently close their request for votes with the stressing of two words—peace and prosperity—let us remember the long rows of those who have passed on to us another heritage, and who believed that we in turn would pass that heritage on to our children, and our children's children. Let us ask our statesmen to add a third word to the appeal of peace and prosperity. From Sam Houston to SAM RAYBURN one word is engraved on the heart of every Texan, every true American. That word is "freedom."

Second-Class Mail Rates Have Been Increased Many Times Since 1879

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the information was given out during the recent consideration of H. R. 2945, that the second-class mail rates have never been increased since they were first established in 1879.

This is contrary to the truth and fact as the rates have been revised several times, both downward and upward, and more often increased. The rates have been changed in the following years: 1885, 1917, 1925, 1928, and 1932.

I am glad to insert in the RECORD a brief history of the various changes, revisions, and increases in second-class mail rates since the Congressional Act of March 3, 1879, which established the second-class mail privilege and rates. My source of information is the report on second-class mail to the Postmaster General, submitted by Charles E. Hiss, special consultant, on May 21, 1946, pages 17, 18, and 19.

It follows:

PRINCIPAL CHANGES IN SECOND-CLASS POSTAGE RATES SINCE 1879

The act of March 3, 1879, established a flat rate for second-class matter of 2 cents per pound or fraction thereof for other than (a) free-in-county service; and (b) for newspapers—other than weeklies—and periodicals deposited in a letter-carrier office for delivery by its carriers: 1 cent per copy except for copies exceeding 2 ounces in weight for which the rate was 2 cents per copy.

The act of March 3, 1885, reduced the 2-cents-per-pound rate to 1 cent.

The act of October 3, 1917, established a flat rate for reading matter portion and zone rates on advertising portion as follows:

(a) Reading matter:

1. On and after July 1, 1918, and until July 1, 1919, 1¼ cents per pound.

2. On and after July 1, 1919, 1½ cents per pound.

(b) Advertising portion:

	Date effective			
	July 1, 1918	July 1, 1919	July 1, 1920	July 1, 1921
	Cents per pound	*Cents per pound*	*Cents per pound*	*Cents per pound*
Zones 1 to 2	1¼	1½	1¾	2
Zone 3	1½	2	2½	3
Zone 4	2	3	4	5
Zone 5	2½	3½	4¾	6
Zone 6	2½	4	5½	7
Zone 7	3	5	7	9
Zone 8	3¼	5½	7¾	10

The act of February 28, 1925, reduced, effective April 15, 1925, the rates of postage on the advertising portion, as follows:

Zones and amount per pound

	Cents
Zones 1 and 2	2
Zone 3	3
Zones 4, 5, and 6	6
Zones 7 and 8	9

This act also increased the rate of postage on nonprofit religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, and fraternal organizations from 1¼ cents per pound to 1½ cents per pound.

The act of May 29, 1928, reduced the rates per pound on advertising portion, as follows:

Zones and amount per pound

	Cents
Zones 1 and 2	1½
Zone 3	2
Zone 4	3
Zone 5	4
Zone 6	5
Zone 7	6
Zone 8	7

The act of June 6, 1932, increased for a 2-year period, effective July 1, 1932, the rates on advertising portion, as follows:

Zones and amount per pound

	Cents
Zones 1 and 2	2
Zone 3	3
Zone 4	5
Zone 5	6
Zone 6	7
Zone 7	9
Zone 8	10

During fiscal years 1933–34 the volume decreased: These rates were lapsed, effective July 1, 1934, and the rates in effect prior to July 1, 1932, were restored, as follows:

Zones and amount per pound

	Cents
Zones 1 and 2	1½
Zone 3	2
Zone 4	3
Zone 5	4
Zone 6	5
Zone 7	6
Zone 8	7

These are the zone rates now in effect.

Cooperative Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of William Green, president, American Federation of Labor, on the cooperative housing bill, H. R. 6618, before the House Banking and Currency Committee, February 14, 1950:

I am very glad to appear before your committee today to discuss a subject that has always been close to my heart, the problem of providing decent, comfortable housing for America's workers.

I consider this appearance in behalf of the American Federation of Labor of the highest importance. I have just returned from the winter meeting of the A. F. of L. executive council, at which the cooperative housing bill, H. R. 6618, introduced by Congressman SPENCE, was thoroughly considered. I bring to you this message: The American Federation of Labor pledges its full support for this middle-income cooperative housing program because we believe that, more than any previous housing legislation, it will really meet the needs of workers and their families. I am attaching a copy of that statement as an appendix to my testimony.

At our sixty-eighth convention, which met last October in St. Paul, Minn., a resolution was adopted unanimously urging enactment of the cooperative housing bill then before the Congress. The resolution pointed out that our postwar housing legislation has thus far failed to meet the needs of workers in the so-called middle-income group. It is because this new program is designed especially to meet the needs of the middle-income group that the convention unanimously urged that the cooperative housing bill be enacted at the earliest possible moment.

We in the American Federation of Labor have never supported any social or economic program unless we were convinced that the proposed program would meet a genuine and a specific need. We certainly apply that criterion to the subject of housing. It is because we believe that the cooperative housing program will meet a genuine and specific need which is not now being met that we are vigorously urging its immediate enactment.

I want to present our views regarding the present status of home building in this country before I discuss the specific points of the bill itself. I know that opponents of this legislation who have come before you during the past few days have argued that the private building industry which has just completed a record year can meet all of the housing requirements of the American people. If this were true, certainly there would be little need for the program you are now considering. Let us, therefore, examine the actual record of the private building industry to see if it is really meeting the housing needs of the American people and particularly of our moderate-income families.

An examination of the actual record will show that private builders have failed to pass two simple housing tests: quantity and quality. First, a word about quantity. The private builders are congratulating themselves on the fact that 1949 was a record home-building year with about 1,020,000 units constructed, as compared with the previous record of 937,000 units in 1925. Yet when we consider the growth in the Nation's population, the facts show that the 1949 record actually falls considerably below 1925, for in the latter year our population was smaller than it is today by more than 25,000,000.

Impartial sources agree that in order to meet our over-all housing requirements we need, not 1,000,000 homes a year, but a minimum of 1,500,000. Thus the 1949 record construction is only two-thirds of what is required to meet our minimum housing needs.

Nor does this 1949 record compare favorably with the output of other major industries. Compared with the 1920–29 decade, production of housing has increased much less than output of other commodities. Thus, in 1949, when industrial production was more than double our Nation's annual output during the twenties, housing construction had risen only 45 percent.

Not only is our housing woefully lacking in quantity, but in addition its quality is far below our standards for decent family living.

Gentlemen, I want you to find out about this quality for yourself. Last year a group of Senators and Congressmen, including, I believe, some from this committee, made housing history by visiting the District of Columbia slums within the shadow of the Capitol Building.

Now I am asking you to make housing history once more. I want you to make a visit to a number of private housing projects in the metropolitan Washington area to see for yourself whether private builders are meeting the housing needs of the American people.

You can get some idea of what you would find by studying a recent report of the United States Department of Labor analyzing housing units started in the Washington metropolitan area during the third quarter of 1949. According to this report, only 12 percent of the more than 11,000 apartment units built during that period had four and one-half or 5 rooms, and not one had more than five rooms. This means that only 12 percent of the units had two bedrooms, none had three bedrooms, and the remainder had one bedroom or none.

In the construction of one-family houses for sale, the report indicates that 60 percent of the homes started in the Washington area during this period contained only one bedroom, or no bedroom at all.

More detailed data concerning the survey are attached as appendix B.

To my mind, these figures are really shocking. They are a clear indication that private builders are forcing American families into housing units far too small for adequate family living.

Why has this been allowed to happen?

Let me call this to your attention. All of these apartments have been built with help from the Federal Government through the device of a Government-guaranteed mortgage approved by the Federal Housing Administration. I say that a chief reason for this shameful condition is the absurdly low standards which FHA uses to pass upon an application for an FHA guaranty. Let me point out one example of what I mean.

FHA sets a certain minimum size of space for rooms in a dwelling unit which builders of houses and apartments have to meet before they can get approval for FHA guaranteed loans. These standards simply do not provide enough space for decent family living.

Of course, in many cases builders do not construct apartments as small as they are allowed to by FHA, but in the Washington metropolitan area during the past few months, the situation with regard to size of apartments has definitely been getting worse.

Recently, our A. F. of L. housing committee noticed that some two-bedroom apartments now being made available in the Washington area were renting at $75 to $80 a

month instead of $65 to $85. Encouraged by this apparent trend, we asked a member of our research staff to inspect these apartments. He found that although the rents in these apartments were indeed somewhat lower than in most new apartment developments in this area, the living space had been reduced more than proportionately. In fact, the living space in these apartments is actually at or near the absolute minimum required by the FHA. For example, a typical two-bedroom apartment which our staff member inspected had the following measurements:

Living room: 10 feet 2 inches by 15 feet.

Bedroom: 10 feet 6 inches by 10 feet 2 inches.

Second bedroom: 8 feet 3 inches by 10 feet 8 inches.

Kitchen-dining space: 15 feet by 6 feet 2 inches.

This is an over-all area of about 440 square feet, which means that the total area of the apartment is about 525 square feet. These are apartments which are being rented to veterans in the Washington area with one, two, and sometimes even more children.

These are the housing units which private builders are constructing, and FHA is approving, for middle-income families. These facts by themselves are startling enough but they become even more vivid when we realize that the housing units the Federal Government is approving for middle-income families would not meet the standards set for low-income families in public-housing projects by the Public Housing Administration. In our opinion, the public-housing standards represent an absolute bare minimum for decent family living. A comparison between the standards set by FHA and those set by FHA for a two-bedroom unit as well as a three-bedroom unit is included as appendix C.

Gentlemen, I speak with the utmost sincerity when I say here today that if we permit these trends to continue, we are not only encouraging the construction of the slums of tomorrow, but we are creating definite psychological and community problems which will have a seriously injurious effect on every aspect of American life.

One of the most important reasons why we favor the cooperative housing bill is just because it can do so much to arrest this trend toward the construction of so-called homes which simply do not permit decent family living. We believe that this bill provides a workable method whereby moderate-income families can get together in cooperatives to build decent homes at prices that they can afford to pay.

No doubt others who have appeared before you have discussed the provisions of this bill in detail. I simply want to mention a few items with which we are particularly concerned.

Perhaps the major change in the bill now before you as compared with the legislation which your committee considered last summer, is the provision which will enable this program to be privately financed rather than supported by a system of direct Government loans. We approve the creation of a National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives which would raise money by selling Government-guaranteed bonds and in turn loan this money to voluntarily organized cooperative housing associations. We believe that the financing arrangements in this bill will make possible an effective program under which the monthly housing costs in the projects constructed will fit the pocketbooks of middle-income families.

This bill will permit a 3-percent interest rate and a 50-year amortization period for the cooperative projects. I want to emphasize the fact that any increase in the gross interest rate or any decrease in the amortization period will be reflected in an increase in the required rents or monthly payments. This inevitably would mean closing off from the benefits of the program some of the families who are most in need of it. Likewise, any increase in the down payment will make it impossible for many middle-income families to participate in this program.

We have only one major criticism to make of the proposed amendment. That pertains to the question of administration. The legislation which you are now considering establishes a division within the Office of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator which would be charged with the administration of this program. We strongly believe that the cooperative housing program would be handicapped under such an arrangement.

A cooperative housing program for middle-income families represents a tremendous undertaking and an entirely new departure from previous housing programs. It must be headed by an individual who believes completely in the program, is vested with a certain amount of independence, and is fully responsible for the success of the program. That means that the agency he heads must be on the same administrative level with the Public Housing Administration and the Federal Housing Administration. It means further that the individual in charge of the program should be appointed by the President. We, therefore, strongly urge the establishment of a new unit, to be known as the Cooperative Housing Administration, within the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which would be responsible for the administration of this program.

I want to close my statement this morning by telling you in concrete terms what we think this cooperative housing program can accomplish.

We think that most of the cooperative groups organized under this program will construct multiunit developments, many of them so-called garden-type apartments. We think the savings made possible under this program will permit construction of apartments which, unlike so many of the apartments now being built under the FHA program, will be very attractive and of a decent livable size. These apartments could be built at an average cost of $8,000 for a 4½-room unit involving rents or monthly payments of no more than $55 to $65. This compares with rents for comparable units insured under the FHA of about $85 to $95 a month. These savings will be made possible through the nonprofit nature of the program, a very low vacancy rate, the use of tenant maintenance, and by the very substantial reduction achieved through the favorable financing terms.

Not all of the cooperative housing groups will wish to construct apartment-type projects. In some communities, particularly rural or semirural areas, members of such groups will undoubtedly want to construct free-standing homes. To cover such a possibility, the bill wisely provides a means whereby such families can eventually acquire individual ownership of their own homes after utilizing at the outset all the advantages of participation in a cooperative nonprofit group.

The American Federation of Labor is proud to have taken a leading part in the movement to obtain the cooperative-housing program for middle-income families. We have done so because we think it is the only program that can adequately meet the housing needs of millions of workers and their families. But I do not want to leave the impression that industrial workers will be the only group to benefit from this program. The fact that we have worked very closely with representatives of veterans, church, housing, and other public-interest groups indicates the broad support and the widespread appeal this program has.

I confidently expect that when this legislation is enacted members and affiliates of the A. F. of L. will play a leading role in making this program a success. I know from my own intimate knowledge of the housing needs of the American workers that there will be an immediate favorable response from A. F. of L. members and groups all over the country. I am sure that they will be taking a leading part in organizing cooperative housing projects for middle-income families. All of them are looking to your committee for the opportunity to participate in this great program.

APPENDIX A

STATEMENT ISSUED BY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, ON HOUSING AND RENT CONTROL

There has been much self-congratulation by the real-estate industry because 1949 was a record home-building year.

However, we feel it necessary to view that record realistically to find out how far it has contributed toward meeting today's acute housing shortage. Upon examination, it develops that the 1,019,000 homes built in 1949 is only slightly higher than the number constructed in 1925, a year when our population was smaller by more than 35,000,000.

Compared with the 1920–29 decade, production of housing has increased much less than production of automobiles or other consumer goods. Indeed, the 1949 record still represents only two-thirds of the level that is necessary if we are to lick the housing shortage within the next decade.

Not only has the 1949 level of construction failed to meet the over-all need, but it has particularly failed to meet the needs of moderate-income families, including, in particular, the majority of American workers. The average wage of factory employees today is about $55 a week. According to recognized standards, these workers cannot afford to pay more than 25 percent of their income or $60 a month for housing purposes. Last year, however, under the existing FHA private-housing program, rentals of new apartments averaged $90 a month and prices of new homes for sale averaged about $8,000, involving a monthly housing cost upward of $80. Clearly the housing needs of American workers and their families are not being met.

The real-estate interests point to the fact that moderate-income families are moving into these high-rent apartments and are buying these high-priced houses. The fact that soon moderate-income families may have somehow managed to pay far more than they can afford for privately built homes and apartments, in many cases at the expense of their health and well-being, does not indicate in any way that the real need of hundreds of thousands of middle-income families for decent homes at a price they can afford is being met under existing programs.

The crying need among American families today is a middle-income housing program. Such a program is now before Congress.

In the Senate, the Banking and Currency Committee is considering S. 2246 introduced by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, as modified by an amendment introduced by Senator BURNET MAYBANK. In the House, a similar bill has been offered by Congressman BERNT SPENCE.

These bills would make possible private financing of long-term low-interest loans for cooperative housing projects for middle-income families. We estimate that under the terms of this bill rents for an average 4½-room apartment would be reduced to $55–$65 a month. This corresponds with rents of similar dwellings offered by private builders of $80 a month or more.

This program offers a practical means of obtaining decent homes for thousands of middle-income families at prices they can afford to pay. We urge its immediate enactment so that we can begin to meet the acute housing shortage of our moderate-income families.

However, we recognize that at the present time, the housing shortage is still with us. Until the middle-income housing program as well as the low-rent public-housing program enacted last summer greatly increases our supply of homes, an effective rent-control program must be continued. We can safely remove rent controls in only one way—by building an adequate supply of homes that fit the pocketbooks of the millions of families who are without decent housing today.

JANUARY 31, 1950.

APPENDIX B

Housing started in Washington, D. C., Metropolitan Area, July–September 1949

ONE-FAMILY HOUSES

Number of rooms	Units		Average (square feet)	Comments
	Number	Percent		
Less than 3½	30	1		No information available.
3½ and 4 rooms (1 bedroom)	430	14	700	Approximately ½ less than 700 square feet.
4½ and 5 rooms (2 bedrooms)	1,450	45	850	Over ⅙ less than 800 square feet.
5½ and 6 rooms (3 bedrooms)	1,200	38	1,160	Over ⅙ less than 1,000 square feet.
Other and unknown	60	2		No information available.
All houses	3,170	100	[illegible]	30 percent less than 800 square feet, 20 percent more than 1,200 square feet.

APARTMENT PROJECTS

Less than 2½ rooms (no separate bedroom)	2,370	21	[1] 430	25 percent less than 400 square feet.
2½ and 3 rooms (no separate bedroom)	3,540	31	580	28 percent less than 500 square feet.
3½ and 4 rooms (1 bedroom)	4,590	36	655	33 percent less than 600 square feet.
4½ and 5 rooms (2 bedrooms)	1,270	12	770	46 percent less than 700 square feet.
All apartments	11,770	100	600	23 percent less than 500 square feet, 9 percent more than 800 square feet.

[1] Approximate.

Source: Characteristics of Homebuilding in the Washington Metropolitan Area, Third Quarter of 1949, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. Department of Labor, Dec. 24, 1949.

APPENDIX C

Comparison of minimum space requirements Federal Housing Administration and Public Housing Administration, Washington, D. C.

Room	FHA requirement (square feet)	PHA requirement (square feet)
2-BEDROOM UNIT		
Living room	150	190
Kitchen-dining space	90	100
First bedroom	100	120
Second bedroom	70	110
Total	410	600
3-BEDROOM UNIT		
Living room	170	190
Kitchen-dining space	90	120
First bedroom	100	120
Second bedroom	70	110
Third bedroom	70	110
Total	[illegible]	650

Source: Minimum Physical Standards and Criteria for Planning and Designing FHA-Aided Low-Rent Houses, Dec. 13, 1949, Public Housing Administration. Minimum Property Requirements for Properties of Three or More Living Units, August 1948, Federal Housing Administration, p. 34.

About That Controversy Over Colorado River Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it was with pleasure I accepted an invitation from radio station KFI to send a transcription about 14 minutes in length on any subject which was thought to be of interest to the radio audience in the section around Los Angeles. I could think of no more important topic to discuss than one or two phases of the water controversy over pending legislation. There are so many aspects of this controversy and so little can be said in a 14-minute presentation, that I confined my radio talk to the two phases of the discussion which I thought of greatest interest to that radio audience. I wanted to make it clear to the people of the Los Angeles area that their municipal water supply was not endangered by my legislation, and I also wanted to make clear that any legal question as to who might rightfully use the waters flowing in the Colorado River could be determined by the Supreme Court of the United States under a provision inserted by two able Senators in the Senate version of the bill, and that the desired definite judicial decision would not be effected or even hastened by the various suit resolutions which have been so vociferously called for by some in Los Angeles. The transcription is as follows:

Friends, I am grateful to radio station KFI in Los Angeles for this opportunity to speak to this radio audience. As Congressman from the neighboring State of Arizona, I am deeply interested in our mutual progress. Commercially, Arizona is the hinterland of Los Angeles. We are in the same trade zone, and we have commercial and business ties that are very close. What hurts one hurts the other, and what benefits one benefits the other. Therefore, we ought to consider our mutual relations with great care. There exists a controversy between Arizona and California, or rather between Arizona and certain agencies in southern California over the division of the waters of the Colorado River. This is a tremendously vital problem which I want to discuss, but first let me say I have many personal friends throughout the great State of California and I have a deep personal interest in the State of California, second only to my interest in the State of Arizona. Now to this controversy.

All Members of Congress from Arizona are sponsoring legislation such as S. 75 and H. R. 984 in the present Congress which would provide for building another large dam on the Colorado River at the head of Lake Mead at the Bridge Canyon site, very much like the HOOVER DAM which forms Lake Mead. Another feature of this legislation besides the dam and the power plant would be an aqueduct and facilities to carry 1,200,000 acre-feet of water annually from the Colorado River into central Arizona, very much as the All-American Canal and the metropolitan aqueduct are now carrying water into southern California. This central Arizona project as a whole is estimated to have a total cost of a little over $700,000,000. However, less than $300,000,000 of that would be the cost of the facilities to carry the water where it is greatly needed in central Arizona. Competent engineers and water authorities, not only in the Government but outside the Government in the Western States, have given long and careful study to this Arizona proposal and have approved it in spite of all contentions raised against it. Can all of these water authorities and engineers be wrong? That question ought to be considered by every citizen of the Pacific Southwest who does not want to be hoodwinked by a fog of propaganda.

The chief opposition to this Arizona project emanates from Los Angeles. Most of the witnesses who have appeared before congressional committees have been members of, or attorneys for, the Colorado River Board of California who have contended that Arizona has no such quantity of water to be legally used by her out of the Colorado River and that should Arizona be given the use of that quantity of water, it would deprive California of the use of water which is legally hers. That is what they say or clearly imply. That contention I most emphatically deny and I shall presently explain why I deny it.

The widespread propaganda which is being carried on conveys the idea to the millions who are reached by it that this Arizona move, if successful, would deprive Los Angeles of her municipal water even to the extent of robbing kitchen faucets today and would also prevent the great metropolitan aqueduct from serving the purpose for which you built it. This spirit of propaganda is very misleading. They may not say in so many words that the present aqueduct is running full now with water for Los Angeles which would be taken to Arizona, but they imply as much and millions of people believe that such is true. Such is not true. Arizona wants to take no water from Los Angeles.

The metropolitan aqueduct is a great piece of engineering. It is a waterway capable of carrying a billion gallons of water daily from the Colorado to Los Angeles. To build another today like it would undoubtedly cost a half billion dollars, but it would not be necessary, as this one is scarcely used. How much is the metropolitan water district using their aqueduct today? Let me tell you. I fear it would make the citizens of Los Angeles very indignant if they knew how little it is being used and for what they are paying. The United States Geological Survey knows to the gallon how much water has been diverted into that aqueduct out of Lake Havasu on the Colorado River during the 9 years from 1941 to 1949, inclusive. Has it been used to full capacity? No. Or to three-fourths capacity? No. Or to one-half capacity? No. Or to one-quarter capacity? No. During the 9 years of its use it has been used to less than 7 percent of its capacity. If there is a water shortage in Los Angeles, there need not be, because Lake Havasu behind Parker Dam is a great man-made lake in the Colorado River from which that aqueduct leads and it has always been ample during the past 9 years to supply Los Angeles with approximately a billion gallons daily if the authorities had seen fit to use the aqueduct's capacity. Your experts testified in Washington in 1948 that

Los Angeles was using one sixty-fourth—mind you, one sixty-fourth of its capacity.

Ah, but some of you who know the fact that Los Angeles is getting her water supply from other sources may say, "We are holding the Colorado aqueduct in reserve for future when our population has doubled." Well, how much could Los Angeles expand ever and above the present population and still be amply provided by the present Colorado aqueduct? According to reliable figures, the present population of Los Angeles might double today and still not require the billion gallons daily of additional water from the Colorado River which the aqueduct could bring to add to the present supplies from the Owens River aqueduct and local sources. Ah, but you say, "Los Angeles is going to more than double in population within the next 19 or 20 years. In fact, the population has doubled each decade since 1900." Yes, we are told in congressional hearings, that the population of Los Angeles has doubled every 10 years for a half century, and the implication of one witness was strong that he expects the population of Los Angeles to continue to double each decade for the next 80 years. If such should be a fact, which I more than doubt, it would mean that the Los Angeles area, by the close of this century, would have a population of 100,000,000 souls. Such a notion is ridiculous. Let us combine sense and justice in our planning.

No, my friends, if the metropolitan water district would carry through the Los Angeles aqueduct 1,212,000 acre-feet of water annually which it can carry, that amount, in addition to the supply from your local sources and the Owens River, will provide for a population of more than 10,000,000 souls according to the best authorities. The additional water for the metropolitan aqueduct is in the Colorado River and no one in Arizona will deny that it is California's water. Why do I say that? Because California is allotted a supply of 4,400,000 acre-feet by Federal law and also by California law, which is not disputed by Arizona, and that amount is exactly four times what the big aqueduct was designed to carry. Think of it—you could build three more such aqueducts of the same size and still be within the large amount legally allotted to California.

Well, you say if it is a matter of legal right, let's have it settled by the Supreme Court. I too would like to have the Supreme Court tell these two States—Arizona and California—definitely just how much water they are legally entitled to out of the main stream of the Colorado River. The problem is to get such a controversy squarely before the Court so that it will take jurisdiction and make that definite decision. Certain Californians have proclaimed loudly that they want a Supreme Court decision and have introduced suit resolutions ostensibly to obtain such a decision by the High Court. But such resolutions will not effect a decision. Although these various suit resolutions have been fully considered by four different committees of the House and the Senate in the Eightieth and in the Eighty-first Congresses, none of these four committees has taken favorable action on these resolutions. Since these committees are made up mainly, or entirely, of distinguished lawyers, their refusal to report out these resolutions is very significant.

I am positively convinced that enactment of one of these suit resolutions would not bring about an effective judicial settlement which we want. Instead, I believe that had one of these California-sponsored suit resolutions been favorably acted upon by Congress, that stalk would have had the effect of stymieing all necessary legislation by Congress without furnishing Arizona or California a day in court. The effect of such a resolution, instead of furthering a settlement by the High Court, would have been a blind alley—a dead-end street—which would have gotten us exactly nowhere toward a final judicial settlement.

It's easy to say that a controversy of this sort ought to be decided by the highest court of the Nation, but we must remember that it is necessary to have a justiciable issue—that is, to get the issue squarely before the Supreme Court so that it can take judicial notice and jurisdiction. Now, what is the situation? Arizona can get no water out of the Colorado River, even though it is clearly her own water, unless we have legislation by Congress authorizing it. California needs no further legislation since the Boulder Canyon Act of 1928 granting her 4,400,000 acre-feet of firm water, and California has the physical equipment to take three times that amount of water out of the Colorado River.

What Arizona is asking for now in House Resolution 934 is an act of Congress authorizing Arizona to use her share of water, just exactly as Congress authorized California to use her share of water in 1928. Incidentally, California did not ask for any Supreme Court decision either before or after the passage of the Boulder Canyon Project Act which authorized the Hoover Dam and the All-American Canal.

If it is true that the supply of Los Angeles' water is not jeopardized, why are all these highly paid lobbyists here in Washington opposing the Arizona measure? It is plainly apparent that authorities of Los Angeles have been willing workers, along with a small group of Californians managing the Imperial Irrigation District, to prevent Arizona from getting any water out of the main stream of the Colorado River. They have put up the same fight unsuccessfully before.

Now, Imperial Valley is a great winter garden spot. Does it need water? Yes, but it has more water than it can use, so that the managers of the All-American Canal which furnishes the water to the Imperial Valley have been wasting into the Salton Sea more water annually than the Colorado Aqueduct could carry to the west coast. If you ask them why, they say they have more land bordering Imperial Valley to irrigate. But the Federal Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the University of California have all declared that such land is not irrigable.

No, citizens of Los Angeles, there is really no quarrel between your city and my farmers. Your water supply is not jeopardized by my farmers or even by the farmers in the Imperial Valley, who are using more water than they need and who could give up some. Your water supply from the Colorado River is being jeopardized, just as Arizona's water supply is being jeopardized, by Californians who want that water to pass the Parker Dam (where your supply is diverted) in order to use that water, not for irrigation even in California, but for profitable use on and beyond the Mexican border. This is a matter which needs a thorough understanding of the people of the metropolitan area.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Kenneth S. Wherry, of Nebraska, at San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at San Francisco, Calif., on February 9, 1950, at a Lincoln Day meeting under the auspices of the California Republican State organization and the San Francisco County Republican Committee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, tonight we celebrate, with other meetings across the land, the one hundred and forty-first birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln, the great emancipator, the great American, the cofounder of our party, and the molder of its never-dying principles.

The American people believe in the precepts, the admonitions, and the examples of Abraham Lincoln.

"Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

True, oh, so true, are those words of Lincoln.

And again:

"Now, we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether this Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure."

Once again that crucial test confronts us: whether we shall preserve in America individual freedom or surrender it to an all-powerful Federal Government; and whether, in foreign affairs, we shall restore constitutional procedures or continue to lose the peace by secret agreements, inefficiency, and drift.

Upon the decision of the American people hangs the life or death of our Republic.

We shall fight for our American heritage.

We will fight against the radical, alien-minded forces that are plunging America down the road to an all-powerful, spendthrift, socialistic Federal Government.

And, of one thing I am sure, this time, in the 1950 election, we Republicans are going to fight.

In our opposition to their phony panaceas we shall give no quarter, no compromise, no "me too."

Red socialism has not worked anywhere, and we don't want it here.

Oh, yes; there are those who say: Don't worry; just relax.

They say all the President and his followers in Congress are attempting to do is to lure votes; making demagogic appeals; and that they have no intention to enact their socialistic spendthrift legislation.

This view of such a cynical procedure raises the naked issue of sincerity.

But challenges of insincerity will not stop this menace which threatens our form of Government. It can only be stopped by the Republican Party in the 1950 election.

I come to you from the firing line in Washington; and make no mistake about it, the President, over and over again, has officially demanded adoption of his radical schemes, which lead straight to the police state.

Don't let anyone mislead you. President Truman is going all-out to socialize America, just as they are socializing Great Britain. That is the pattern.

He has asked officially for power, power, and more power: power to deliver to the pressure groups; power to put ceilings over prices and wages, and floors under prices and wages; power to build and operate steel plants, and any other plant, in direct competition with private enterprise, to meet his ideas of what a balanced national economy should be; power over education, housing, health, and worst of all: power over food from farm to table.

He seeks to impose the monstrous Brannan plan, under which farmers would become the regimented wards of Government bosses, and all taxpayers and consumers would be swindled.

Under its provisions, the farmers will have to account for every head of livestock and every head of cabbage.

It will take a Gestapo to enforce it, penalties, fines, and jail sentences.

And, you consumers, out of your hard-earned dollars will be taxed to pay the bill.

Ah! don't be fooled, you are not going to get something for nothing.

All of these proposals are before the Congress. Many of them are on the calendar. And this administration is going all-out to elect Congressmen who will help force passage of these measures.

His campaigners will promise you this, and they will promise you that, but they never tell you what they will cost.

They will cost billions and billions of dollars; and, think of it, the Federal Government, today, is broke, flat broke.

The Government will be in the red five billion this fiscal year, much more next year, and the national debt is now more than the actual wartime peak.

The President is playing hocus-pocus. He is manufacturing money, through the banking system, to cover up the deficit.

This administration is spending $250 more than it takes in—every time your watch ticks.

This administration wrote 274,000,000 checks last fiscal year.

These deficit-spending dollars are contagious inflation dollars. They are Typhoid Marys. The President and his lieutenants, boldly attempt to justify deficit spending. They glorify it, but let me remind you, it has wrecked every government that has tried it.

It is just as certain with the Government, as it is with you, if you continue to borrow more than you can repay.

Deficit spending leads to national bankruptcy. And the first victims, already hit by the shrinkage in the purchasing power of the dollar, are people who live on fixed incomes, people who hold life-insurance policies, people who have saved for the rainy day, and for their children's education.

At the rate this administration is going, our dollar, which is already a rubber dollar, will be worth about as much, in the market place, as a bale of Chinese currency.

To finance his venture into the great blue yonder, the President asks for higher taxes.

He says he will relieve you of additional taxes by placing them on business.

But, again, fellow Americans, don't be fooled.

You carry the tax burden.

Wherever taxes are taken from business, they are passed on in your cost of living.

Do you know that in the building or the purchase of a house, there are 639 Federal and State taxes?

Do you know that in a loaf of bread there are more than 150?

And, now, you ladies listen to this: Do you know that when you buy your Easter bonnet, you will pay 150 different taxes?

When the Truman campaigners tell you that a little socialism won't hurt, remind them of Lincoln's simple words:

"Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

The warning alarm of insolvency is coming from all sides.

Democrat Representative CANNON just said: "From every point of view, our fiscal situation is the most unfavorable in the peacetime history of the Republic."

Remember what Lenin, the Russian dictator, said:

"Some day we will force the United States to spend itself into destruction."

Is this terrible prophecy coming true?

Fellow citizens, the day of reckoning is here. What are you going to do about it? Why, the only sound, sensible thing to do now is cut the cost of government; cut government down to size; balance the budget; get on a pay-as-you-go basis, and provide for orderly reduction of the public debt.

Stand firmly on this Republican economy platform, carry it to the people; and you will elect a Republican Congressman in every district in the State of California, and a Republican President in 1952.

When the Republicans have a majority in Congress we will have a government by law and not by man. We will stand for no more bypassing of law, such as President Truman has done to the Taft-Hartley Act. In the coal dispute he has been playing politics with human misery.

He has made commitments to labor racketeers to sabotage this law, or he is befuddled by sheer incompetence. A long-suffering public at long last has compelled the President to enforce the Taft-Hartley Act in the coal dispute.

We Republicans believe in the continuation of the Taft-Hartley Act, because it has restored equality between employer and employees, guaranteed the right of collective bargaining, the recognition of unions, and the right to strike, while protecting the rights of the public and the union members.

Under this law union membership has increased to new highs; wages have risen to record levels; and strikes have decreased.

There is a desperate need for a strong policy against the spread of communism within our gates. And we insist that America's efforts toward that end be directed by those who have no sympathy with communism.

We condemn the failure of the administration to recognize the full implications of this threat to our security. We deplore the dangerous degree to which Communists have been employed in important government posts. We shall see to it that no Communist is on the pay roll of the Federal Government.

There is no room in our Government for the Alger Hisses and their fellow travelers.

We Republicans are fighting communism on all fronts. And in the front ranks is your own Congressman NIXON, who has made an all-out effort to expose these enemies of our Republic.

We need more NIXONS to get out and hit communism wherever it raises its ugly head.

Fellow citizens, there is the President's record of confusion, confusion that deficit spending is a sound fiscal policy; mounting national debt is an asset, not a liability, and higher and higher taxes can be imposed without killing initiative, incentive, and enterprise.

The President is confounded by the prolonged stoppage in coal production when, at the same time, he refuses to enforce the law.

He is bewildered by failure when it is pointed out his administration is infected by disloyal persons.

He reminds one of what Abraham Lincoln said of another President in his time:

"His mind, tazed beyond its power, is running hither and thither, like some tortured creature on a burning surface, finding no position on which it can settle down and be at ease.

"* * * He is a bewildered, confounded, and miserably perplexed man."

This confusion also holds true in foreign affairs, chapter after chapter of failure and defeat.

The American people face the hard fact that although hundreds of thousands of lives have been sacrificed, and billions have been spent, 5 years after the explosions of war we do not have peace.

The root cause of this failure goes back to recognition of Communist Russia, in 1933, when self-styled New Deal Democrats captured control of our Government.

Republican Presidents had refused to recognize Soviet Russia, because her dictators gave no assurance against spreading their propaganda to undermine our Government.

Unfortunately, no such guaranty was demanded in 1933. It was then that the Red rulers of Russia were welcomed into the family of nations.

At Cairo, Yalta, and Tehran, through secret agreements, the gate was thrown wide open for the expansion of Russia.

All of these secret deals to remap the world and freeze the ultimate peace were ratified and confirmed by President Truman at Potsdam.

The Republican Party had no part in those secret agreements, under which Soviet Russia gained jurisdiction over Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other Balkan countries, and under which China was eventually to be taken over by Moscow-directed Communists.

When the terrible consequences of the secret agreements became apparent—the appeasement of Russia, the Morgenthau plan to keep Germany forever an agricultural state, and the impossibility of shifting of millions upon millions of people from one jurisdiction to another—it was then the President called in some Republicans, ostensibly, to initiate and develop a bipartisan foreign policy.

But, the President, confronted by his own signature ratifying the betrayals of Cairo, Yalta, and Tehran, picked and chose his spots for advice, leaving out wide areas of foreign affairs.

From then on the administration has been using the bipartisan label as a pretense to cover up its own mistakes and escape responsibility for its tragic failure to win lasting peace.

Around the entire executive branch the Truman administration has built an iron curtain against information going to duly authorized committees of the Congress.

The President has issued orders that no department head or bureau chief shall give testimony to congressional committees at variance with his views.

This attitude of the President is in conflict with the principles of good government, and in defiance of the right of Congress, the policy-making branch, to information necessary for the discharge of its duties.

Is it any wonder we have no firm peace?

Is it any wonder we are losing the cold war? Russia has grabbed and annexed into its orbit over 13,000,000 square miles and about 800,000,000 human beings.

So, while Secretary Acheson and his pal Alger Hiss were calling the signals in the State Department 14 men in the Moscow Politburo have captured control of one-fifth of the globe's land surface, and one-third of all mankind.

Since the end of the war wrangling and back-biting have raged in the National Defense Establishment. The President, as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, long ago could have put an end to this scandalous situation with one forthright order: unify, cooperate, or get out.

Our defenses in Alaska are woefully weak in the light of modern warfare, spear-headed by long-range bombing, rockets, guided missiles, atomic bombs, and now the hydrogen bomb.

Gov. Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, reported to Congress the defenses there are so weak that two air-borne divisions could capture Alaska in 1 day.

The blackest chapter in America's history, save one—Pearl Harbor—is the loss of China to Communist Russia by appeasement of this administration.

But there is still time to stop the Red tide in the Pacific, as has been so ably pointed out by your Senator KNOWLAND of California, if only the administration had the will to do so.

The first step is to assure China, and other countries in Asia, that the United States

morally supports their cause. This should be backed up by economic and military aid, wherever feasible.

Most important of all, take Acheson's hands off our military strategy, and keep the defense and national security in the Department of National Defense where they belong.

Formosa is the last citadel of freedom-loving people of China. Hold Formosa against the Communists and there will be kept alive active resistance by millions of Chinese on the mainland who want liberty and are eager to fight for it.

The Chinese nationalists have never asked for American troops to help them hold Formosa. They do desperately plead for military equipment.

Surplus military equipment is already in the Pacific and should be supplied them. Congress has authorized this aid and provided the funds, but the President refuses to act.

On the European front the American people have been most generous in helping ECA countries recover from the war's devastation.

More than $20,000,000,000 of your money, and your children's money, have been poured into western Europe, in 28 different money-spending schemes.

All the ECA countries have reached goals of productivity far above prewar levels. The economic problems, which now confront them, can only be solved by themselves.

Our procedures, in aid, for those countries now, should be directed toward restoring peacetime, private channels of commerce.

To attract private capital, the ECA countries must eliminate trade barriers, establish free convertibility of their currencies, and recognize that Germany's recovery, minus war-making power, is vital to the recovery of all Europe; and that Germany must have the tools to earn her living.

Fellow Americans: The solution of these problems, foreign and domestic, is up to all of us, every American. Public opinion, when aroused, is the strongest force in the land.

It is your job, and the job of every American, to see to it that the people never lose sight of the truth, that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Let us, here and now, rededicate ourselves to the proposition: "That this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Let us go forward, as modern Paul Reveres and minutemen, sounding the alarm. Carry the facts to the people, into your business, the shops, the homes, the farms, into every precinct, and into the wards.

Ring all the doorbells and tell the American people:

We Republicans stand for a government in which the elected representatives and public officials are servants of the people, and not their masters.

We Republicans maintain Government can help its people to prosperity, by lightening the burdens of debt and taxes, laying down rules of fair play, and by protecting those whose own strength and resources are not sufficient to protect themselves.

We Republicans stand for the maximum of freedom of choice for the individual, consistent with the right of all to the same freedom.

We Republicans stand for competitive enterprise, under just laws fairly administered.

We Republicans stand for efficiency and pay-as-you-go economy in Government.

We Republicans stand for an equitable distribution of our tax burden, to stimulate enterprise to give incentive for investment in new and expanding plants for the increase of productivity, and to provide jobs at fair wages.

Tell them, the American people, we offer them a new leadership for the achievement of a lasting peace.

We Republicans insist upon restoration of our foreign agreements to their proper place inside the Constitution, and we insist that the United States shall not be bound to any course of action unless the spirit and letter of our constitutional procedure are followed.

We Republicans oppose secret agreements, and insist upon restoration of our foreign commitments to their proper place inside the Constitution.

We Republicans favor full support of the United Nations.

We Republicans support aid to those states resisting communism, but such aid should be given only if it is essential to our national security, if it is within the total limits which the American economy can afford, if it will be effective, and if there is a program for progressive reduction.

We favor promotion of world trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition. We assert this can be done within the Republican principle.

Products of underpaid foreign labor should not be admitted to this country on terms which imperil the living standards of the American workman, or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry.

Fellow Americans, on these principles we take our stand.

On these principles America will go forward to greater and greater strength, financially, economically, and spiritually.

This is the road to lasting peace, prosperity, and contentment for the American people.

And for the Republican Party this is the road to victory.

Air Engineering Development Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am honored to be able to request to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most enlightening address by our most able Secretary of the Air Force, W. Stuart Symington, delivered at a meeting of the Nashville Chamber of Commerce, Nashville, Tenn., on February 10, 1950, at which time a large number of the high-ranking staff of the Air Corps were present, together with scientists, educators, members of the press, and interested citizens of Tennessee and the Southeast. The meeting at Nashville was a very enthusiastic one, and certainly demonstrated the wholehearted cooperation of Tennessee and the Southeast in their desire to help the National Defense Establishment and the Air Corps in the development of this highly necessary air engineering development center. Tennesseans were delighted with the announcement of Secretary Symington that the center will be named in honor of that foremost American airman, Gen. Hap Arnold.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is my privilege to be here today in this great city of the South, center of all that America cherishes, home of the immortal Andrew Jackson, who believed that all the people of our country should be represented in and by their Government.

It is particularly fitting that this part of the country, which has such a record of devotion to the cause of liberty and freedom, should be selected as the location of this new project, so essential to our national security, and approved by our Secretary of Defense, our President, and the Congress.

At one time it did not appear as if such was to be the case, because many people for many reasons, desired that this development should not be placed on the waters of the Tennessee Valley.

Some felt it should go farther west, because they felt the West was the future of America.

Some announced that Tennessee was unhealthy. They probably had not met your great senior Senator.

Some even questioned whether, and I quote, "the brains of America would be willing to live in the Tennessee Valley."

I mentioned this to your own Congressman at a dinner for the President last Saturday, and just about ruined his dinner. We sat next to each other and with every course, my good friend Congressman PRIEST said, "The more I think of that remark, the madder I get."

All of those opinions were against the recommendations of those qualified engineers who studied this question of the right site for many years.

The history of the American people has been one of free enterprise and fair competition, always against any form of consolidation for special interests. This should be especially true in matters that affect national security.

Someone has said the last war was won by the small-town garage, and the boy on the farm, who could fix any kind of engine. In New Guinea, the Aleutians, all over the world, the American GI knew how to make the motors work.

But the war of tomorrow will require far more than mechanical ability. It will require real knowledge of such basic technical arts as electronics.

As an illustration, our reenlistment rate in electronics is less than half what it is in other branches of the service.

Investigation shows the reason is the desire of the airmen to go into the industry of television.

In other words, the taxpayer trains these boys; and they then leave to accept far larger salaries in private industry.

There is no such problem in any totalitarian state. You work where you are told.

It seems to us, therefore, that all parts of our country, not just a few locations, or a few institutions, or a few corporations, should be the core of America's security. It would seem all of America should be that core. Every engineering university in this part of the world should have the same opportunity to obtain this type and character of work as any institution in any other part of the country.

This Air Engineering Development Center will require programs that in turn will demand extensive engineering work in many laboratories; and regardless of some of the opinions mentioned, I believe that, given the same start, those engineers can be obtained just as much from the boys in the Tennessee Valley—boys of Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Mississippi, Kentucky, and Alabama—as they can from any other part of the country. I hope that in the future not only will large wind tunnels and test stands be at the AEDC at Camp Forrest, but also that many small ones will be in the universities which make up our great and growing South.

As we go into this air-atomic age, the more such vital questions as supersonic speeds and nuclear fission are disseminated throughout the youth of American schools, the greater will be our chance of survival.

The term "supersonic speeds" is one of those technical terms used in connection with this Air Engineering Development Center—words like "sonic barrier," "subsonic," "transonic," "supersonic," and "hypersonic." One can hardly discuss the AEDC without using those words.

Here are some summary definitions.

The "sonic barrier" is an invisible wall encountered when the flight of an airplane approaches the speed of sound—the later being 764 miles an hour at sea level. When an ordinary airplane approaches this speed, strange things begin to happen; its wings and controls flutter, excessive vibration sets in, and usually the airplane is difficult, and sometimes impossible, to control.

This sonic barrier is so important to modern aeronautical design that airplane speeds are now measured in terms of percentage of the speed of sound. This percentage is known as the mach number. Aeronautical engineers give the speed of sound a value of (1), and any speed up to nine-tenths of the speed of sound they call subsonic speed.

Speeds between nine-tenths of the speed of sound (about 680 miles an hour) and up to about one and two-tenths times the speed of sound (about 915 miles an hour) are called transonic—in other words, the speed at which we pass through the sonic barrier.

Beyond that barrier, speeds up to five times the speed of sound (around 3,500 miles an hour)—they call supersonic; and speeds beyond five times the speed of sound—that is, more than 3,500 miles an hour—they call hypersonic.

The Air Force has had subsonic and transonic wind-tunnel facilities for many years; but it has never had wind-tunnel facilities for tests at supersonic and hypersonic speeds. That is one reason why these tunnels to be built at the Air Engineering Development Center are so urgently needed.

It is no secret that before World War II other nations were far ahead of us in supersonic research and development, as in many other aspects of national preparedness.

Now here are some more facts about this Air Engineering Development Center.

In technical terms, this AEDC initially will be what is known as a propulsion test center, where we will use laboratory-type tests, under closely regulated conditions, to help solve design and manufacturing problems encountered during the manufacturing and development stages of engines of all kinds. The test units are designed to simulate various conditions of altitude, temperature, and speed; and we expect to obtain much information which in the past we could get only by building the equipment and testing it in flight—an extremely costly and time-consuming method compared to what will be done here.

When fully developed, this new location in Tennessee will be one of the greatest aviation test centers of the world.

Who can forget the startling news in August 1944 that our pilots in P-47's and P-51's, which flew only about 440 miles an hour, had encountered jet and rocket-powered Nazi Messerschmitt 262's and 163's which flew between 500 and 600 miles an hour? In that connection, remember also that our 500-mile-an-hour jet fighter, the P-80, never got into action.

No airplane was used by the United States in World War II which had not been designed before we entered the war. Only improvements were made after Pearl Harbor; there was no change in fundamental design in any plane which saw war service.

I am glad to say we profited by that lesson. Since that time we have come a long way; and in 1947 the Air Force XS-1 penetrated the sonic barrier—an achievement ranking in importance with the first flight of the Wright brothers.

AN EXAMPLE OF UNIFICATION AT WORK

One could hardly find a better example of unification at work than the evolution of this project from its initial beginnings as a technical staff study at Wright Field in 1945, on through the passage of Public Law 415, Eighty-first Congress, which authorized the unitary wind-tunnel plan, and established the AEDC as an element of that plan.

The official language of that law describes it as "An act to promote the national defense by authorizing a unitary plan for construction of transonic and supersonic wind-tunnel facilities and the establishment of an air engineering center."

In other words, AEDC is just one part of an integrated unified plan to provide this Nation—the military as well as private institutions and industry—with the necessary facilities for exploring that relatively unknown world of flight beyond the sonic barrier, so that we may continue to improve our ability to use the air space more effectively, both in peace and war.

This whole over-all plan is the result of careful studies, extending over the last 5 years, by the Air Force, Army and Navy; the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; the Research and Development Board; the Air Force's Scientific Advisory Board; many private institutions, including colleges and universities engaged in aeronautical research; and private industries.

These studies took a long time, not only because of the highly technical nature of the subject, but also because it was necessary to establish without question that there were no existing facilities that could be altered or improved to meet the capacity requirements for the proposed supersonic and hypersonic test work; and therefore, it was necessary to build a new facility.

As a result of these studies, and the legislation authorizing the unitary wind tunnel plan, we may be sure that the effort is being truly integrated on a national scale.

When completed, the AEDC will serve not only the Air Force but also the Army, Navy, private educational and research institutions, and private industry.

WHY CAMP FORREST WAS SELECTED AS THE SITE

Camp Forrest was selected as the site of this center after many possible locations throughout the United States had been exhaustively studied by an expert firm of consulting engineers. They devoted 3½ years to studying possible locations, seeking a site which offered the best possible combination of many features.

The three most essential requisites were:

1. An adequate supply of electric power, huge amounts of which would be required. Camp Forrest met that requirement because it is within the power network of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and can furnish the necessary power without curtailing its service to other customers.

2. A large dependable water supply, particularly for cooling purposes. Anyone flying over this area will see ample proof that there's no water shortage in the Tennessee Valley.

3. A sufficient land area. The State of Tennessee took care of that by offering to donate some additional 33,000 acres.

The final report of the engineers, submitted to the Air Force in November of last year, pointed out that although no possible site could be superior to all others in all of those essential features, they believed that the Camp Forrest area was the best site for the country. After carefully reviewing that report, the Air Force agreed with the private consulting engineers; and accordingly, with the approval of the President, Secretary of Defense Johnson, and the Research and Development Board, Camp Forrest was selected as the site.

SUMMARY SCHEDULE OF DEVELOPMENT

It is difficult to give a brief yet clear picture of how such a tremendous, long-range project is to be developed, but I shall attempt to present a quick over-all summary of our plans.

First, a word about legislative authority.

By Public Law 415, the Eighty-first Congress authorized $252,600,000 for the Unitary wind-tunnel program, and specifically earmarked $100,000,000 of that amount for the Air Engineering Development Center.

That, however, was the authorization bill, not the money bill; the latter was Public Law 420, which appropriated an initial increment of $30,000,000 in contract authority and cash, to begin construction of AEDC during the fiscal year 1950.

With this $30,000,000 it is planned to begin construction of three principal test facilities.

The first facility planned is the high-altitude engine-test unit, which will make possible the testing of engines under conditions representing 75,000 feet pressure altitude. Incidentally, the nucleus of this unit is a jet-engine test plant taken over from the Germans at the end of the war, and modernized and expanded to increase its capacity. We have had that German equipment in storage since the war, but our existing facilities lacked the power capacity necessary to operate it. This unit would test jet engines much larger than those now used in our jet aircraft. It would have a testing capacity 6 to 8 times the capacity of Wright Field and would require about 85,000 horsepower.

The second principal test unit would be the hypersonic wind tunnel—capable of development-evaluation testing of models of aircraft and guided missiles at speeds in excess of 3,500 miles an hour. Here again we would be taking full advantage of captured German designs and drawings, as well as the services of the German designers. These German designs have been thoroughly checked by competent American authorities and have been modified to incorporate the most recent developments.

The third principal unit would be a supersonic propulsion wind tunnel, designed for development testing of scale models of high-speed aircraft, as well as aircraft power plants. The speed range of this tunnel covers an important part of the supersonic range from the high transonic—above 700 miles an hour—well into the supersonic, which goes on up to several thousand miles an hour. Approximately 200,000 horsepower will be required to operate this tunnel—a power demand equivalent to that of the entire greater Nashville area. By comparison, the 20-foot wind tunnel at Wright Field requires only 40,000 horsepower.

Construction of utilities and buildings should start in the near future, in order to be ready to receive the test equipment as soon as it is produced. In accordance with standard policy, all construction of structures and utilities will be handled by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Construction on the site is planned for midsummer this year. If everything goes according to plan, the center should begin limited operation within the next 2 or 3 years, and should reach full operation within 4 to 5 years from now.

HOW CONSTRUCTION PLANS

As businessmen, you will want to know what we intend to buy, and when we expect to begin letting contracts.

Answers to both those questions depend upon actual release of funds. Thus far, of the $30,000,000 already appropriated by Congress, $1,000,000 has already been released. This money is being used to complete the master plan for the project, also to provide initial funds for the Army engineers.

Our able Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, desires that there be no duplication in these facilities and that every dollar expended will bring maximum return to the taxpayer, this especially because of our already high cost of security. The Air Force has pledged to him that such will be the case. Plans will be reviewed constantly to insure that everything installed is essential to our national defense.

Pending release of additional increments of that first $20,000,000, we have authority to proceed with the preparation of procurement specifications for $20,000,000 worth of equipment, the issuance of circular proposals, the reception of bids, the award to the bidders, and preparation of contracts up to the point of signature.

During the rest of this calendar year the population of the center will be relatively small because the work to be done is preliminary, and requires only a small force. Thereafter, and of course, contingent on congressional appropriations, the center's activity and population would pick up rapidly.

AN ESSENTIAL ELEMENT OF OUR NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

Up to this point, I have discussed this project from the technical and financial standpoint, and what it means to the South.

Of course, from the standpoint of our national security, it means a great deal more—not only to you but to your children and your children's children.

Two years ago, when the United States enjoyed a monopoly of atomic weapons, the President and the Congress each appointed committees to analyze our national-defense problems with respect to the role of air power in defending our freedom. Both of these distinguished groups—the President's Air Policy Commission, and the Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board—pointed out that our security would be jeopardized unless we achieve and maintain technological leadership.

The Congressional Aviation Policy Board said:

"Technical preeminence is fundamental to air power. This can be achieved only through intensive research and development. The frontiers of aeronautical knowledge must be continually explored and pushed back through research to obtain new information required for the development of our air equipment."

And the President's Air Policy Commission said:

"For national security, second best military aircraft are simply not good enough. On the commercial side, inefficient or unsafe aircraft and unreliable or inadequate navigational aids cannot be tolerated.

"We must keep ahead in the race for military supremacy. And it is a race. Although the great aeronautical laboratories of Germany, Italy, and Japan have been dismantled and destroyed, other strong contenders are now in the field."

Have you ever considered the fact that the four scientific achievements which make possible the existence of the very long-range bomber and the atomic bomb, all have occurred within the memory of living persons? I refer, of course, to the gasoline engine, invented in 1885; the airplane, in 1903; radar-electronics, in 1922; and nuclear fission—the atomic bomb—in December 1942.

Could there be any clearer illustration of why the Air Force attaches so much importance to this air engineering development center; and why you, as leaders of this southeastern region, have a great opportunity to serve both yourselves and the Nation by giving this project your full support and cooperation?

Lincoln Day Dinner Address by Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, at the Lincoln Day dinner held last night at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City by the National Republican Club, Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, made a notable address which I am happy to call to the attention of all of our colleagues here in the Senate.

In behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and myself, I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was Theodore Roosevelt who once said that the Republican Party "in the days of Abraham Lincoln was founded as the radical progressive party of the Nation." From the standpoint of our lineage we are therefore assembled here as "radical progressives." We know what a radical is. He is anyone who does not agree with us! But a progressive? If he cannot be defined, he can at least be identified. He is not only a person, he is an idea; he is not static, but flexible; he is not reluctant, but prudent; and if I were to place him in the environment of today, I would describe him like this—as one who thinks as much in terms of freedom as he does in terms of welfare.

Now, no party has a monopoly of these qualities. It was in 1894 that Democratic President Cleveland called out Federal troops to suppress the Pullman strike. It was in 1902 that Republican President Roosevelt averted a coal strike by compelling arbitration and motivating a settlement advantageous to labor. It was Republican President Taft, speaking in 1912 before a group similar to our meeting here tonight, who told you that "the development of business (has) provided problems which call for additional action by the Government to prevent the abuses of the concentration of wealth and the combinations of capital." It was Democratic President Roosevelt who assured the Commonwealth Club of California meeting in San Francisco in 1932 that "the Government should assume this function of economic regulation only as a last resort."

1860 PLATFORM QUOTED

We have come a long way since Lincoln led us to our first victory on a party platform (of 1860) which promised to secure "to workingmen liberal wages, to agriculture remunerating prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor, and enterprise and to the Nation commercial prosperity and independence." The world has since grown smaller. People and ideas now crowd each other within the confines of an industrial society. The frontiers of learning have taken place on land boundaries on the horizon of mankind. Political, social, and economic questions which were once the concern of a colony, a nation, or a continent are now the concern of the world.

We have come a long way only to find ourselves once again on the doorstep of conflict and destruction. No one can be certain why we are where we are or what the outcome may be, but every one knows that we are now reaping the harvest of careless war and postwar promises, of trifling with communism, of fumbling with containment and of squandering our assets. I venture to predict that when the history of this age is written, it will once again be the destiny of the Republican Party to preserve union—union within our own boundaries, union within the United Nations, and ultimately union within the hearts and minds of the people of the world.

What can America best do to steel herself against the force of its yet forming world responsibilities? The answer to this question is more important to our future as a nation, to the welfare of the little man and the big man, to the conservative and the liberal, than any of the battles of words and labels that would divert us from the problems of survival itself. It is to this question that I would like to address myself primarily tonight, not from the point of view of spelling out new principles or even of testing old ones, but rather to bring to bear the meaning of some of the experiments in our laboratories of democracy—the States and local governments—in terms of what we know to be the foundation requirements of national security.

Long before big government, big spending, and big taxing became commonplace at the national level, the torch of liberalism was lighted in the individual States. In the States, Republican administrations were adopting social and labor legislation to meet the needs of growing industrialization. Workmen's compensation, industrial-safety laws, minimum wages, eight-hour day, unemployment compensation were originated in the States. Even today, of the five States having temporary disability (cash sickness) benefits laws in operation, four of them were developed, sponsored, and enacted under Republican administrations. All of these four allow full opportunity for private enterprise and initiative. To assert that this is "me-too-ism," is to indict the course of history and to belittle Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, the authors of The Federalist Papers, because they recognized common problems and concurred in some solutions. Let us not divide our house against itself by an inability to say yes.

The Republican Party, still in the progressive tradition, stands committed to a government fully conscious of the needs of our industrialized age, ready and willing to take care of its casualties whenever and wherever they may occur. The real issues of today, however, are essentially of method rather than objective. Some would have us assume a defensive attitude, limit our objectives and orientate our party in favor of a vanishing order. We cannot come to praise Lincoln and at the same time to bury his philosophy. The creed of liberal Republicanism asserts broad social objectives sensitive alike to the needs of competitive business and interdependent labor in an industrialized society, to a constructive view of party responsibility and to adapt government to the requirements of private initiative and enterprise. To use Lincoln's words: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they have need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities."

This is the dilemma of our day. To the party now in power the answer is: The people can do little for themselves—big government, a paternalistic philosophy, and a socialized economy are the answers. To the party we represent the answer is very different—the people can do much for themselves, self-government, a self-sustaining philosophy, and a free economy are the answers. But there can be little hope of even a start toward a solution of this dilemma so long as we are governed under that version of liberalism which promises the southern planters and the eastern labor unions the same utopias, and all at the expense of the western rancher and the Pacific fruit grower who need not worry because it is all coming out of the Marshall plan anyhow. This is not even paternalism—it is false, disappointing, and dangerous.

HUSBAND OUR RESOURCES

Our position in the world as the sole remaining arsenal of democracy is reason enough to hold the line on new expenditures. Republicans are doing this in the States and fighting for the same policy in Washington. The one thing we can all do for the cause of peace is to husband our resources. It is foolhardy to act as if the capacity of the American people to buy and pay for more and more government knows no limits. If we spend ourselves to death in peacetime, what hope can we have for survival in an emergency? What hope can we have to survive at all?

The country is beginning to understand that starry-eyed predictions of the gross national product at the end of the next half century cannot hide the fact that those who make them are already being buried under increasing deficits and mountains of surplus potatoes. Suppose our total national income should be quadrupled by the year 2000, and suppose the average family's income in today's dollars should be $12,000 by the year 2000. The same method that arrives at that rosy prediction would give us a National Government taking no less than 40 percent of the total production of the country. Even last year it was 14.4 percent. If we project the future of the dollar in the same way that the President would project the future of the national income, those people who have any dollars left in the year 2000 will be able to buy 18 cents worth with each dollar. It has been estimated that this will mean a mere $3.75 for a pound of roast beef and $250 for a medium-price suit. Who is the administration trying to fool?

FOUNDERS OF DEMOCRACY

This promise of a government which grows bigger and bigger, of prices which rise higher and higher, and of taxes which take more and more is fitting from a party which has already given us a wonderland of bureaucracy. Money would circulate like mad. The taxpayer would pass his earnings on to the big government faster and faster. We would truly live in a different country—if we are not there already—the like of which can be seen only through the eyes of Alice after she had been driven by the queen to run faster and faster.

"The queen propped her up against a tree and said kindly, 'You may rest a little now.'

"Alice looked round her in great surprise. 'Why, I do believe, we've been under this tree the whole time. Everything's just as it was.'

"'Of course, it is,' said the queen. 'What would you have it?'

"'Well, in our country,' said Alice, still panting a little, 'you generally get to somewhere else—if you ran very fast for a long time as we've been doing.'

"'A slow sort of country,' said the queen. 'Now, here, you see, it takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that'."

We have not come a long way only to get nowhere. The plain dealing of Lincoln can still mean a balanced budget followed by true tax reduction. The formula is simple: stop promising every one too much from too few. It has been said that the function of finance is to be sure that nothing is ever decided upon the basis of finance. But it is common sense to demand that the price of merchandise be plainly marked and to look at the price before we buy. This is neither liberal nor conservative, it is prudence—if we want pensions and annuity benefits to provide what our present hard-earned premiums are supposed to be buying.

A vital, liberal, progressive Republican Party can offer the America of our day, as Lincoln did in his, something better than government by political expediency. We can offer stability as well as security—by taking full care of those who need and want government programs, without treating the butcher, the baker, the grocer, and the manufacturer like so many children for whom Uncle Sam knows best. That is, we can provide a floor of security below which no one would be permitted to fall, but we would not knock every one down to the floor to prove the point.

The common man would still rather place his emphasis upon individual initiative and private enterprise than dependence upon government. What we object to in the welfare state is not that it implies a "state of welfare," as Governor Dewey has so well described it, but rather that it would make us all wards of the Government with only incidental private enterprise. The Republican Party still believes that liberalism and progressivism thrive best in the free air of competitive ideas—that they will wither and die under any form of authoritarian government—even under the sweet-sounding phrases of welfare. We are steadfast in our faith in the ultimate rightness of the many as opposed to the select judgment of the few. But let the many confide the great powers of big government to the few and the few will contrive to defeat the will of the many—this is the common knowledge of mankind.

We are ready and willing to take a new approach to the weakness of bigness—uncontrolled power—wherever it occurs, in big business, big unions, or big government. The curse of bigness does not lie in bigness as such. What was big in Lincoln's day might be small today. Big machines require big investment of capital. Big production for lower prices requires big management. Big industry requires big unions. What we oppose is not size but bigness which produces power or responsibility which can neither be controlled, managed, nor held accountable. This is the kind of bigness which is just as much a threat to the liberal as to the conservative.

NEW FUNCTION FOR PARTY

We have already staked out the answer to big government through decentralization to the States. This is a matter of party policy which might imply a new function for the political party in our Federal system of government. This function is to become the balance wheel of federalism by formulating Federal-State policies to be carried out in the Congress. These policies would turn over to the States—even as the present unemployment-compensation system—the responsibility for more and more services of government. This is the only way to prevent a socially minded Federal Government from crushing its citizens by its own weight. It is the best way to restore government to the people.

A century ago both parties to the conflict deprecated war, but one of them would make war rather than let the Nation survive, and the other would accept war rather than let it perish, and the war came. Today, both parties deprecate second-class citizenship, but one would rather talk about it, while the other would rather act. In our neighboring States of New York and New Jersey, Republican administrations have acted. Here, Governor Dewey has shown the way, and every citizen knows his name, his efforts, and his accomplishments. Throughout the Nation, Republicans want action. It goes to the heart of decent and responsible government at home, as well as a respected government abroad, to set ourselves squarely to the guaranty of one first-class citizenship throughout our Nation.

In another day and under the stress of arms, Lincoln declared:

"Our popular Government has often been called an experiment. Two points in it our people have already settled—the successful establishing and the successful administering of it. One still remains—its successful maintenance against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it."

There are ways to destroy a popular government without armed rebellion—ways more subtle but more devastating. There are those who would destroy the substance and leave the frame—that is the method of world communism. Our task is to combat it without losing that for which we fight. Others would bleed popular government to death by squeezing it into their own pattern of interest. The task of a political party is to avoid attachment to any one interest or group and to express the best interests of all.

The force of political absolutism is, perhaps, the most subtle of all dangers to popular government today. It thrives on the emotional appeal of majority vote. Its symptoms are an unshakable faith in the infallibility of government and an unquenchable capacity to tell other people how to dispose of their earnings.

It is startling to think of how much absolutism may flourish in a democracy—the absolutism of a rampant majority, the absolutism of a boss-controlled political machine, the absolutism of business monopoly, the absolutism of boss-minded union leadership, the absolutism of taxing authority which knows no restraint. One is as bad as the other. One weakens our capacity to meet our world responsibilities as much as the other. These are the common problems of the liberal and the conservative today. The Republican Party is free, willing, and able to face them honestly and effectively. In the true heritage of Lincoln, this can yet be our greatest contribution to the security of popular government and to the welfare of the common man.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Kenneth S. Wherry, of Nebraska, at Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at Los Angeles, Calif., on February 10, 1950, under the auspices of the California Republican State organization and the Los Angeles County Republican Committee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an honor to come to California and join you Republicans in celebrating the one hundred and forty-first birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln.

Glory hallelujah His truth marches on! Under his leadership, our Republic was saved when its life hung in the balance. And,

it will take that kind of leadership, the Lincoln leadership, to save our Republic now.

The American people are downright worried over the disastrous trend in our domestic and foreign affairs.

They face the hard fact that though they won the war nearly 5 years ago, they have not yet won the peace.

They see we are losing the cold war.

They are alarmed by the mounting cost of government, deficit-spending, and administration demands for more taxes.

And, worst of all, they are fearful of losing their freedom in alien-minded government spellers.

In Lincoln's day the issue was preservation of the Union.

Today, the crucial, fateful issue is whether we shall preserve in America human liberty, the dignity of the individual, and freedom of choice, or, surrender them to an all-powerful government, which seeks to control our lives and all of our activities; and whether, in foreign affairs, we shall restore constitutional procedures, with evenhanded justice, or continue to see the peace frittered away by secret agreements, incompetence, and drift.

The people want, and deserve, that the issues be clearly drawn.

The Republican Party adopted a platform in Washington this week, which gives the people a clean-cut choice on the issues in the 1950 elections.

It is your job in California, my job in Nebraska, and the job of all Republicans, to see that candidates are nominated who stand foursquare on those issues.

Let those who believe in free competition, and the right of the individual to make the most of his skill, initiative, and enterprise, come into our corner.

And, let those who are for spendthrift socialism, get in President Truman's corner.

In the elections of 1950 there can be no compromise. There is too much at stake.

Liberty and socialism won't mix. One or the other will be destroyed.

As Lincoln said: "This Government cannot endure permanently half-slave and half-free."

During the past few months, as I have traveled across the length and breadth of the land, I have been asked this question, over and over again: "What can we, as citizens, do about it?"

The answer I gave them, is what I say to you now.

You cannot win the fight or preservation of the principles of our Republic, by wishful thinking.

You cannot stop inflationary deficit-spending, by wishful thinking.

You cannot stop passage of the Brannan Farm Plan to evicting the American farmer, by wishful thinking.

You cannot prevent compulsory health insurance, by wishful thinking.

You cannot get rid of Communists and their fellow-travelers, by wishful thinking.

And, you cannot by wishful thinking, win the cold war through the administration's incompetence, vacillation, contradictions, and confusion.

Your job as Americans is to insist in the cause of freedom, see that those who represent you restore stability and competence in Government, and keep open the doors of opportunity.

These are worth fighting for.

And this time, we Republicans are going to fight.

Most of our troubles, the secret agreements at Yalta, the armament race, back-breaking taxes, inflation, and deficit spending, stem from a leadership that is tainted by a concept of government, which does not square with the American heritage.

Is it any wonder that an administration which harbors so many radicals at home, is tolerant of the spread of socialism and its twin brother communism abroad.

We all know that foreign policy is like a chess game, move after move, a long series of moves. The decisive moves now being made will determine whether the principles of our Republic will prevail.

The present administration's foreign policy line was laid down in 1933, when the self-styled New Deal Democrats captured control of our Government.

Republican Presidents, up to that time, had refused to recognize Soviet Russia because her dictators would give no assurance against spreading their propaganda to undermine our Republic.

Unfortunately, no such guaranty was demanded and none given in 1933, when Soviet Russia was officially recognized and taken into the family of nations.

At Cairo, Yalta, and Tehran, through secret agreements, the gates of the world were thrown wide open for the expansion of Russia and her Godless communism.

All of these secret deals to remap the world and freeze the ultimate peace, were ratified and confirmed by President Truman at Potsdam without the knowledge or consent of the American people or their Congress.

At Yalta, with approval at Potsdam, the Red rulers of Russia were handed Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other Balkan countries; and China, our faithful war ally, was betrayed into the grip of communism.

Even the text of the monstrous Yalta agreement was kept secret by the Truman administration until the Republican Eightieth Congress, under threat of refusal to authorize Greek-Turkish aid, forced publication of its hideous terms.

The terrible consequences of these secret deals, bombed the free world into confusion.

Couched in no uncertain language were appeasement of Russia, the revengeful Morgenthau plan to keep industrial Germany forever an agricultural state, and, the herding of millions upon millions of human beings, from one jurisdiction to another.

When President Truman attempted to put these terms into effect, chaos spread around the world. It was then, he called in some Republicans, ostensibly to initiate and develop a bipartisan foreign policy.

But, confronted by his own signature at Potsdam, he picked and chose his spots for advice, leaving out China, and other wide fields of foreign affairs.

Already the way had been paved for Russia to grab and annex into her orbit over 13,000,000 square miles and about 800,000,000 human beings.

While Secretary of State Acheson and his pal Alger Hiss were calling the signals in the State Department, 14 men in the Moscow Kremlin, captured control of one-fifth of the globe's land surface and one-third of all mankind.

In its conduct of foreign affairs, the administration has broken faith with the Republican Party and the Nation.

It has bypassed constitutional procedures.

The administration has been using the bipartisan label as a pretense to cover up its own mistakes and escape responsibility for its ghastly failure to win lasting peace.

Around the entire executive branch of government the President has an iron curtain against information going to duly authorized committees of the Congress.

He has issued orders that no department head or bureau chief shall give testimony to congressional committees at variance with his views.

He has exerted his powerful influence in efforts to smother congressional exposure of Communist spy rings that have run through the Government like water through a sieve.

When the House Committee on Un-American Activities uncovered the Alger Hiss scandal the President cried "red herring."

But, he knows differently now. He learned the hard way.

He has ordered withheld from Congress the official loyalty records of Government employees.

Think of it, fellow Americans, such an attitude when Congress, the policy-making branch, has the inherent right to all information necessary to the accomplishment of its duties.

That kind of government must end.

Instead of suppressing information and yelling "red herring," the President should give the FBI the "go" sign to get rid of these Communists.

And, right here, I just can't help mentioning that your Congressman RICHARD NIXON is doing a great job in the battle against communism. He is a credit to California and the Nation.

We need more men like NIXON, who have the courage to expose Communists and their fellow travelers in our Government.

Since the end of the war wrangling and back biting have raged in the National Defense Establishment. The President, as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, long ago could have put an end to this scandalous situation with one forthright order:

Unify, cooperate, or get out!

Our defenses in Alaska are woefully weak in the light of modern warfare, spearheaded by long-range bombing, rockets, guided missiles, atomic bombs, and now the hydrogen bomb.

Governor Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, reported to Congress the defenses there are so weak that two air-borne divisions could capture Alaska in 1 day.

The blackest chapter in America's history save one, Pearl Harbor, is the loss of China to Communist Russia by appeasement policies of this administration.

There is still time to reverse the Red tide in the Pacific.

Your Senator, BILL KNOWLAND, has been battling in the front line at Washington, prodding and pleading with the administration to act, to do something, get off dead center, and toss overboard its policy of abandoning all China to the Moscow-directed Communists.

The first step is to assure China and other countries in Asia that the United States morally supports their cause.

This should be backed up by economic and military aid—wherever feasible.

Most important of all, take Acheson's hands off our military strategy and keep the defense and national security in the Department of National Defense where they belong.

Formosa is the last citadel of freedom-loving people of China.

Hold Formosa against the Communists and there will be kept alive active resistance by millions of Chinese on the mainland who want liberty and are eager to fight for it.

The Chinese nationalists have never asked for American troops to help them hold Formosa. They do desperately plead for military equipment.

Surplus military equipment is already in the Pacific and should be supplied them.

Congress has authorized this aid and provided the funds but the President refuses to act.

In Europe, the American people have been most generous in helping ECA countries recover from the war's devastation.

More than $30,000,000,000—$30,000,000,000—of your money and your children's money, have been poured into western Europe in 23 different money-spending behemoths.

All the ECA countries have reached goals of productivity far above prewar levels. The economic problems that now confront them can be solved only by themselves.

But ancient nationalistic patterns again are taking shape over there, thwarting the intent of Congress in authorizing ECA.

Those countries should be eliminating trade barriers, establishing free convertibility of currencies, and recognizing that

Germany's recovery is vital to the recovery of all Europe and must have the tools to earn her living. If these countries are to get any more cash and goods they should be required to carry out the purposes of the act.

They should now be looking forward to a return to private channels in commerce rather than depend upon the United States to finance and support them indefinitely.

Our foreign commitments are having a terrific impact upon our domestic economy.

The administration is bolstering socialism abroad. And when we charge them with socialistic programs for the United States, they say we are using scare words.

Well, let's see if these are scare words.

If the administration's bill, to give the President—one man—absolute power to put ceilings over prices and wages and floors under prices and wages is not socialism, what is it?

If giving the President, one man, power to build and operate steel plants and other plants in competition with private industry is not socialism, what is it?

If federalized education, through control, is not socialism, what is it?

If compulsory health insurance, managed and directed by the Government, is not Government control of the lives of the people, what is it?

If Government, all taxpayers, paying part of the construction cost and rental of homes for some of the people, dictating the design, size, and type of house they shall live in, is not socialism, what is it?

If the making of foreign-trade agreements in secret and refusal by the President to explain, when he cuts tariff rates to ruinous levels for American industries, agriculture, and labor, is not socialism, what is it?

And, worse of all, is the Brannan plan, a plan to sovietize the farmers. It is a swindle.

Under it, farmers would work for the Government. They would produce surpluses of food so that prices would be low. The farmers would be paid a production subsidy, and the American taxpayers would pick up the check.

Whenever the farmers are forced to stand with tin cups in their hands, in exchange for their freedom, then a long step toward complete regimentation of the food industry, from producer to consumer, will have been taken.

Fellow Americans, the solution of all of these problems, foreign and domestic, is up to all of us, every American.

The road to peace, security, prosperity, and individual freedom is clearly marked in the 1950 Republican platform.

Your job is to see to it that the people never lose sight of the truth that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

So let us, here and now, rededicate ourselves to the proposition: "That this Nation under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Go forward as modern Paul Reveres and Minute Men.

Carry the facts to the people, in your business, the shops, the homes, the farms, and into every voting precinct.

Ring the doorbells.

Tell the people, every voter, the fate of the Nation is in their hands.

Tell them:

We Republicans offer a new leadership, untainted by communism, that will win the peace.

We Republicans insist that the United States shall not be bound to any course of action, unless the spirit and letter of our Constitutional procedure are followed; and that means no secret agreements bartering away their rights and liberty.

We Republicans stand for a strong policy against the spread of communism at home and abroad, and we insist that the offices of Government shall be purged of those who are disloyal to America.

We Republicans favor aid to other countries resisting communism, only if it is essential to our national security; if it is within the total limits which the American economy can afford; if it will be effective; and if there is a well-conceived program for progressive reduction.

We Republicans favor the promotion of world trade on the basis of fair competition, within the Republican principle that American industry, agriculture and labor must be protected against ruinous importations.

We always have and will continue to insist that the national defenses be completely adequate to any emergency.

We are for the Taft-Hartley labor law, because it guarantees the right of collective bargaining and recognizes unions and the right to strike, while protecting the rights of union members and the public.

Under this law union membership has increased to new highs and wages have risen to record levels.

We favor amending the law in the light of experience under its fair and just provisions.

We won't stand for any bypassing the law.

At long last the President has been compelled by public opinion to enforce the Taft-Hartley Act in the coal dispute, after months and months of playing politics with human misery.

We Republicans, true to the example of Lincoln, the Great Emancipator and cofounder of our party, believe the right of equal opportunity to work, to vote, to advance in life and to be protected under the law, should never be limited in any individual, because of race, religion, color, or country of origin.

We Republicans believe agriculture is fundamental to a prosperous America.

We favor a fair price for the farmers' products in the market place, aided by a system of price supports and tariff protection.

And, fellow Republicans, carry this message to the people:

Deficit spending leads to national bankruptcy.

Deficit spending will further cheapen the dollar, rob the wage earner, impoverish the farmer, and destroy the savings, pensions, insurance and investments of millions of people, winding up in jobless millions and a national poorhouse.

We believe the only sound, sensible thing to do now is cut the cost of government, balance the budget, get on a pay-as-you-go basis, cut the debt, and cut taxes.

Fellow Republicans, all these Republican principles and objectives will build and maintain a strong America; strong economically, strong financially, and strong spiritually.

The overwhelming majority of Americans cherish our heritage of freedom and will join us in this crusade to see that it shall not perish from the earth.

America is the custodian of human liberty.

Let us be worthy of its guardianship.

Opposition to Ratification of the Genocide Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Honorable Leander H. Perez, district attorney of Louisiana, against ratification of the Genocide Convention before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at a recent public hearing.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY LEANDER H. PEREZ, DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF LOUISIANA, AGAINST RATIFICATION OF THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

The Senate has been requested to ratify a United Nations Genocide Convention which calls for the punishment of individual citizens of a state for the newly defined crime of genocide, and which, if ratified, would compromise our system of constitutional government and would internationalize matters which are solely within our domestic jurisdiction.

At the same time this Genocide Convention would not make any contracting party or government responsible for genocidal crimes committed by it against its own nationals, nor would it add to the existing responsibility of any government for genocidal acts committed by or at its instigation or with its complicity against nationals of a foreign state.

Therefore this proposed Genocide Convention is nothing more than rank meddling with our domestic affairs, and is a violation by the United Nations of the article of its Charter which prohibits it from intervening in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.

THE EXECUTIVE MESSAGE

On June 16, 1949, the President delivered a message to the Senate urging ratification of the International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and submitted an explanation of the Acting Secretary of State in support thereof (81st Cong., 1st sess., Senate, Executive O).

The report condemns the genocidal acts of the Nazi government, and cites that disintegration of the mind caused by the imposition of stupefying drugs may destroy a group—evidently referring to such well-known acts recently committed by the Communist governments of Europe in their so-called treason trials.

But this horrifying build-up for support of this Genocide Convention is shown by the report itself to be entirely irrelevant and immaterial.

GOVERNMENT'S NATIONALS UNPROTECTED

When the representative of the United States voted in favor of the Genocide Convention in the United Nations General Assembly, he made the statement that if "responsibility of a state" for genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article 3, is not used in the traditional sense and if these words are intended to mean that the "state can be held liable in damages for injury inflicted by it on its own nationals, this provision is objectionable and my Government makes a reservation with respect to such an interpretation." Then the Acting Secretary, with the endorsement of the President, recommended to the Senate that it ratify the Genocide Convention "with the understanding that article 9 shall be understood in the traditional sense of responsibility to another state for injuries sustained by nationals of the complaining state in violation of principles of international law, and shall not be understood as meaning that a state can be held liable in damages for injuries inflicted by it on its own nationals." (See p. 6, Executive C.)

Therefore it is clear that the Genocide Convention is not aimed at governments which may commit genocide against their own nationals. Furthermore, under established international law, governments are and have been responsible to other states for killings or injuries of their nationals in violation of the principles of international law.

International law applies to nations and governments in their international relations.

Further, all members of the United Nations are ipso facto parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice, which has jurisdiction to decide controversies between them in accordance with the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations.

Article 93 of the United Nations Charter, clause 1, provides:

"All members of the United Nations are ipso facto parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice."

The Statute of the International Court of Justice, article 38, section 1, provides:

"The Court, whose function is to decide in accordance with international law such disputes as are submitted to it, shall apply: * * * c. the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations."

GENOCIDE INTERNATIONAL CRIME

The fact is, that all civilized nations, members of the General Assembly of the United Nations, have recognized "that genocide is a crime under international law," by its adoption of resolution 96 (I) dated December 11, 1946. (See p. 7, Executive C.)

Therefore, we see that "genocide" has been recognized as a crime under the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations.

So, what would be the purpose of the Senate ratifying this Genocide Convention, when, first, genocide under general principles of law recognized by all civilized nations is an international crime, and secondly, the International Court of Justice has jurisdiction to adjudge against states through whose governmental policy or complicity genocide may be committed. Surely the ratification by the United States Senate of this proposed Genocide Convention, with the recommended reservation that it would not make a state or government liable for injuries inflicted by it on its own nationals, could add nothing to the international crime of genocide.

GENOCIDE CONVENTION AGAINST PERSONS

It is plain that the whole purpose of the proposed Genocide Convention is to make the international crime of genocide apply to individuals and thereby to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the state.

Article I of the proposed Genocide Convention confirms what the United Nations General Assembly has already sufficiently declared by its resolution 96, that genocide "is a crime under international law"; articles II and III define the crime of genocide, and article IV limits the commission of the crime to persons (not states or governments), and article V provides:

"The contracting parties undertake to enact, in accordance with their respective constitutions, the necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the present convention and, in particular, to provide effective penalties for persons guilty of genocide or of any of the other acts enumerated in article III."

Regarding article II defining genocide, including the killing or maiming, or causing mental harm to, any member of any national, racial, or religious group, the United States representative on the United Nations Legal Committee said: "However, if an individual is murdered by another individual, or by a group, whether composed of private citizens or government officials, as part of a plan or with the intent to destroy one of the groups enumerated in article II, the international legal crime of genocide is committed as well as the municipal-law crime of homicide" (p. 4, Executive O).

The purpose, therefore, of this proposed Genocide Convention adopted by the United Nations is to extend the international crime of genocide to the individual citizens of a state.

THE VIOLATES ITS CHARTER

Bear in mind that article II, paragraph 7 of the United Nations Charter specifically provides that nothing contained in that charter shall authorize it to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state. Therefore, it is plain that by the United Nations proposing such a Genocide Convention to operate against citizens of the state, or to interfere in local law enforcement within a state, which is essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the state, is nothing more nor less than rank intermeddling in the domestic affairs of the state, and is a violation of the specific provision of the United Nations Charter.

Therefore, how can the United States Senate be asked, or urged, to ratify this so-called Genocide Convention which is a direct encroachment on the domestic affairs of this country under the Constitution of the United States, in face of the fact that adoption by the United Nations of this so-called Genocide Convention is a flagrant violation of one of the solemn provisions of its own Charter, or a violation of that part of the international agreement by which the United Nations came into being?

The fact that the Acting Secretary points out (p. 3) that this so-called Genocide Convention was prepared under the chairmanship of the United States representative and that the United States delegation played an important role in the formulation of the convention, offers no alibi for the violation of the United Nations Charter provision in article II, paragraph 7, that the United Nations shall not interfere or meddle in domestic affairs of member states.

The American members should have known better. They should have been duly respectful of the provisions of our Constitution under which the municipal sovereignty of law enforcement is reserved to the individual states of the Union and not to the National Government, such as would result if this so-called genocide convention were ratified by the Senate and would become the supreme law of the land. If such convention as submitted were ratified, it would become the supreme law of the land and would displace State constitutions and laws wherever they may conflict with the broad provisions of the Convention.

TREATIES UNDER FEDERAL AUTHORITY

The United States Constitution provides, in article VI, clause 2 "that all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Article III, section 2 of the Constitution provides that "the judicial power of the United States shall extend to all cases arising under treaties made, or which shall be made, under authority of the United States."

The United States would become a contracting party if the Senate should ratify the Genocide Convention.

Under a decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416) the conclusion of a treaty by the Federal Government confers upon it authority in fields of action reserved to the States which the Federal Government would not have without such a treaty.

The ratification of the Genocide Convention, as submitted, would therefore confer upon the Federal Government jurisdiction which it does not now possess under the Constitution, and likewise deprive all States of the Union to the same extent of their jurisdiction, police powers, and the right of law enforcement in any cases which might be claimed to be genocide, or crimes or offenses committed against any person or persons of a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group, whether it be homicide, mayhem, assault, libel, or slander, or other mental harm to person or persons of any such group (art. II).

BROAD FIELD INVOLVED

It must be noted in this regard, and should not be overlooked, that the crime of genocide applies to all persons regardless of whether he is of the same national, ethnical, racial, or religious group.

In other words, the crime of genocide is not limited to a crime committed against persons of different national, ethnical, racial, or religious groups, but to any individual of any such group, even when committed by one or more persons of the same groups.

Therefore, if the Senate should ratify the Genocide Convention and make the United States a contracting party thereto, a vast area of police powers and criminal law enforcement could be transferred from the State and local governments under State laws, to the National Government under laws to be enacted by Congress and enforced solely through the Federal courts.

Thus, at one fell swoop a large part of the municipal sovereign reserved to all the States of the Union over the domestic affairs of their citizens and their police powers and law-enforcement authority would be supplanted.

If this ever comes to pass, then State and county criminal judges, prosecutors, and law-enforcement officers would become largely unnecessary, and they might as well be supplanted by the Federal police, prosecutors, and courts.

CONSTITUTION INVOLVED

Every member of this committee and of the Senate and Congress well knows that the Bill of Rights was adopted as amendments to the United States Constitution promptly after its adoption by the American people, and that the States entered into the compact to create the United States Government with a solemn understanding that the States, or the people of each State in their collective sovereign capacity, would retain their right of self-government, regulation of law enforcement in regard to their domestic and personal affairs, and that these powers of government specifically were not granted to the United States.

The provision for control of their own internal affairs was the chief concern of the States in their Constitutional Convention which wrote the United States Constitution in 1787 and they were careful to delegate to the United States Government only those powers which were deemed necessary to enable it to perform the functions of a central government which were beyond the powers of a single State, such as military operations, interstate and foreign commerce, and foreign affairs.

So, to make the position of the States and their people more secure, the Constitution was ratified by the various States, with reservations which were later embodied in the Bill of Rights, including the tenth amendment which reserved to the States, or the people thereof, all rights and powers not delegated to the National Government nor prohibited to the States.

After the adoption of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, there were those who contended for the United States Government, that its authority had been extended over the legal rights of individual persons, but the United States Supreme Court held in various cases (*U. S.* v. *Cruikshank*, (92 U. S. 589 (1876)) to a late case, *Adamson* v. *California* (332 U. S. 319 (1947)) that while the fourteenth amendment protected citizens of the United States against any State violation of their civil rights, individual invasion of individual rights was not the subject matter of the amendments, and they did not invest Congress with power to legislate upon subjects which were within the domain of State legislation or to create a code of municipal law for the regulation of private rights as between individual citizens.

In 109 United States, page 18 (1893), the United States Supreme Court held that—

"Such legislation by Congress cannot possibly cover the whole domain of rights appertaining to life, liberty and property, defining them and providing for their vindication. That would be to establish a code of municipal law regulative of all private affairs of man and society. It would be to make Congress take the place of all State legislatures and to supersede them.

"It is repugnant to the tenth amendment of the Constitution, which declares that powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the United States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people," (p. 24).

Thus what has been prohibited to the Federal Government, is attempted through the route of the so-called Genocide Convention which plainly is not aimed against a repetition of the genocide horrors of the Nazis during the last war, nor of the reported liquidation of many thousands of Russians and of other nationals by their own governments behind the iron curtain; all of which would be exempted from the Genocide Convention, according to the reservation made by the representative of the United States Government when voting to adopt the Genocide Convention, and by recommendation of the President and Acting Secretary of State in the message submitted to the Senate, because the ratification would leave a government's own nationals unprotected.

WOULD COMPROMISE CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

We submit that the only effect of the ratification by this Senate of the Genocide Convention would be to make the United States a contracting party so as to give the Genocide Convention the effect of an international treaty and under article VI of our Constitution, would make it the supreme law of the land and under article III, section 2, would extend the judicial power of the United States to all criminal cases which could be put in the category of genocide and would effectively annul all applicable State criminal laws, the police powers and the right of law enforcement by all the States of the Union, in any of the kindred crimes under which the broad mantle of the so-called Genocide Convention could be thrown, and would in large measure repeal the tenth amendment of the United States Constitution.

Thus, the ratification of the Genocide Convention would most seriously compromise our system of constitutional government prevailing in the United States. It would displace State constitutions and laws wherever they may conflict with the provisions of the convention, which is very, very broad because it applies to all persons of whatever national, ethnical, racial, or religious group, without exception. It would convert the simple misdemeanor of slander or libel which causes mental harm to any person of any national, racial, or religious group into the category of the international crime of genocide just as it would all physical crimes whether of assault, mahem, or homicide, which now are all covered by the common law or State criminal codes.

We should bear in mind that, with the exception of France, the United States is the only nation in the world whose Constitution provides that its treaties (or conventions) are included among the supreme law of the land on the same basis as provisions of the Constitution and acts of Congress pursuant thereto. Certainly we are not committed to destroying our constitutional form of government nor of destroying the reserved right of States and their people to the right of self-government, police powers, and law enforcement by any international commitment assumed in the Charter of the United Nations. To the contrary, article II, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter specifically provides that nothing contained in that Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State.

VIOLATES SENATE RESERVATIONS

It is pointed out in editorial comment of the American Journal of International Law, volume 43, October 1949, at page 735, that when the Government of the United States accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under article XXXVI of the statute, the Senate attached the Connally reservation which retained for the United States the determination of whether or not a matter is within its domestic jurisdiction. The Genocide Convention bypasses this reservation, as well as the Vandenberg reservation relating to the interpretation of multilateral treaties, and confers jurisdiction upon the International Court of Justice in all disputes relating to the interpretation, application, or fulfillment of the convention at the request of any party to the dispute (art. IX).

Therefore it should be remembered in this connection that, according to an advisory opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice, a matter solely within the domestic jurisdiction of a state becomes a matter of international concern when a treaty is entered into on that subject. This principle of international law must not be overlooked if we are to maintain the internal enforcement of our constitutional rights without risk of alien interference or submission to an international appellate jurisdiction.

For the above and other reasons which will be submitted by representatives of the American Bar Association and other opponents of the Genocide Convention, we therefore respectfully submit:

1. That this committee report unfavorably on the matter of ratification of the Genocide Convention by the United States Senate;

2. That the United States Senate refuse to ratify the Genocide Convention; and

3. That the committee and the Senate suggest to the United Nations that the crime of genocide, properly defined, is inherently one committed by or at the instigation or with the complicity of a foreign state which already has been declared to be a crime against international law; that this proposed Genocide Convention adds nothing to the responsibility of governments or states in their international relations, but is only an attempt to inject the United Nations in the domestic affairs of member states, in violation of article II, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter.

Respectfully submitted.

LEANDER H. PEREZ,
District Attorney of Louisiana.

JANUARY 24, 1950.

The CVA and Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter entitled "The CVA and Conservation," to the editors of Nature magazine, written by Mrs. Winton Weydemeyer, master of the Montana State Grange.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CVA AND CONSERVATION

OPEN LETTER TO THE EDITORS, NATURE MAGAZINE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

JANUARY 7, 1950.

GENTLEMEN: Having been a member of the American Nature Association for a quarter of a century, perhaps it is my privilege to comment on the editorial, What About CVA? appearing in the current (January 1950) issue of Nature magazine. This editorial, as I read it, places a general stamp of approval upon the proposed CVA legislation, as the essential basic approach to coordinated-resource management in the Columbia River Valley. It repeats the familiar charge that some of the opposing groups are merely fronts for the power interests; it implies that all programs of the three directors would be responsive to local views because the administrators of any such agency as CVA would be continually on trial before Congress; it expresses opposition to super-governments and dictatorial tendencies, but seems to decide that these should be risked in the interest of natural-resource management. The closing sentence carries not only a challenge, but an accusation that seems unjustified. "If the opponents of the specific proposals now before Congress would exert as much energy in constructive suggestion as they now do in blind and often uninformed opposition, there would be happier prospect of a solution vital to all of us."

I shall comment briefly on these statements, consider the main conservation issue involved, and finally answer the challenge and accusation of the final sentence of the editorial. But first I think it will be agreed that endorsement of the pending CVA legislation automatically carries endorsement of the full plan for dividing the entire Nation into a group of watershed regions administered by huge Government corporations to be known as Authorities or Administrations.

Now it is true, and it is perfectly logical, that power interests are opposed to this national plan as patterned by the CVA bill before Congress (S. 1645). For the system planned would not merely regulate power companies to prevent monopoly in private enterprise; eventually it would eliminate them completely, creating in their place one gigantic power monopoly little subject to regulation by the people. It is also true that some of the opposition to CVA bears—in the words of the editorial—the "invisible fingerprints of equally opposed power interests"; but it is likewise true that much of the support for CVA arises thusly: "If the damned power interests are agin it, I'm all for it." Neither side has a corner on blind and often uninformed opinion.

"What about CVA?" carries the belief, doubtless sincere, that the provision for local advisory groups and the need for the administrators to stand continually on trial before Congress would insure responsiveness to local views and interests. If this theory works in practice, why is the National Grange—one of the two leading general farm organizations of the Nation—asking that provision be made for court settlement of disputes between the United States Forest Service and citizens having a voice through present local advisory groups? The CVA bill provides that the directors shall establish such advisory boards and councils as they may decide to be necessary or appropriate to achieve the objectives of the act—as they interpret these objectives. Such a provision is hardly reassuring to those of us who feel that conservation programs must have maximum flexibility to deal with local conditions. Neither is the editorial's continually on trial before Congress statement reassuring when the CVA bill gives the directors power to

determine the necessity for and the character and amount of its expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid; provides for lump-sum appropriations from which the directors may allocate construction costs (of dams, reservoirs, buildings, industrial plants, hydroelectric plants, and transmission lines) without approval by Congress; and provides that the directors may use receipts of power and other projects to pay for costs incurred in projects constructed according to their own allocations.

Let us examine two general arguments in the editorial, What About CVA. In support of arguments for a coordinated conservation program: The topsoil of other watersheds washes down the river for lack of an integrated soil-conservation program and funds to carry this through. Denuded watersheds erode for lack of funds to reforest, as a part of an over-all plan. Fish and wildlife suffer as a byproduct of both of these situations." In other words, the present Soil Conservation Service, United States Forest Service, and Fish and Wildlife Service are failing to do their conservation job for lack of funds granted by the people through Congress—in our democratic manner. Contrast this with an earlier statement that under the CVA the functions of these present Services "would not be taken over by CVA but coordinated into its over-all conservation and development plan for the area. Such a plan the CVA would be charged with preparing, having it upon consultation with all Federal, State, local, and private agencies in the region." The reasoning behind these statements postulates one or the other of two theories: (1) That upon creation of a CVA the taxpayers will gladly shell out the extra dollars for which the Forest Service has repeatedly been asking for replanting of denuded lands, and the money which they have been refusing the Soil Conservation Service for the reduction of soil losses; or (2) under the CVA funds can be used for conservation—according to the ideas of the Directors—without consent of the people. The first theory appears merely to be wishful thinking; the second raises the fundamental issue involved in CVA and related schemes—an issue more important and far-reaching than valley authority legislation itself. Can conservation best be accomplished by Government planners or by the people?

Perhaps because a necessary foundation in resource conservation in America was laid by Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot through providing Government ownership and administration of vast land, forest, and mineral areas, we conservationists through the years have overemphasized the role of public ownership or control of natural resources. Even today, with conservation becoming such a popular religion that it is used to camouflage numerous political power and vote-getting schemes, it is essential that public ownership be employed to save resources which we wish to preserve in their natural state for the benefit of all people, such as our national park areas; to set aside for national defense needs certain mineral resources; and to insure adequate administration of areas having multiple-use values, such as our western mountain and plateau watershed areas. But it is high time we realize that programs of conservation for use can never be adequately successful if supplied primarily as Government programs devised by the planners and dictated to our citizens—even if Congress approves. The wise function of government is to provide tools with which its citizens, independently or cooperatively, can accomplish the field work of conservation. If enlightened through conservation education to the necessity of—and opportunity for—proper soil, water, forest, and wildlife conservation rather than compelled to action by legislation or forced to support Government programs through taxation, the citizens of America can and will do the job with vision, vigor, and generous use of elbow grease.

If anyone doubts this statement, let him consider carefully the amazing development and accomplishment in soil and water conservation under the democratic soil-conservation-districts system. Under this successful program, local farmers elected by their neighbors study the needs of their area, devise and finance their own conservation activities, and carry them out with the use of technical tools provided by the Soil Conservation Service and other public agencies. The local citizens themselves plan and administer the programs, while Government experts act as advisers—just the reverse of the CVA set-up. And the system works—it results in conservation achievement. It is working so well that in a dozen years it has been extended to cover three-fourths of the Nation's farms—by voluntary vote of the landowners themselves. It has given the rural people of America a chance personally to use their own brains and brawn in saving the land they love. It is providing the means for expanding programs of forest and wildlife conservation on private lands. It refutes completely the familiar argument that Government must step in with sweeping conservation programs because private citizens won't do the job.

Some conservation programs, of course, are too large for such local action. Some are geographically too extensive for separate States to deal with. I heartily join the writer of What About CVA? in the statement "We are convinced that coordinated handling of all the natural resources of such a geographical and biological unit offers the only answer" to adequate watershed resource management. I am forced to disagree, however, with the assertion made regarding the needed broad plan, "Whether it is CVA or some other combination of initials is not too important." It is vitally important. To eliminate the weaknesses of present separate local, State, and Federal agencies by adopting the CVA plan would be like eliminating spot fires by fanning the whole forest into one flame. Administration of the CVA and other valley authorities could easily destroy the successful democratic soil-conservation-districts programs; it could put an end to the gradually improving conservation programs of the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Soil Conservation Service; of State and local game, forestry, and water-conservation agencies; and the cooperative programs of citizen organizations. It would divide Glacier National Park between two authorities, Columbia Valley and Missouri Valley—with these two perhaps squabbling for jurisdiction of that large section of the park lying in the Saskatchewan River watershed.

The valley-authority plan is like so many bright dreams of public-welfare planners; if it could be administered by angels, it would establish a measure of heavenly peace and well-being upon earth. But with human nature being what it is, adoption of such a plan would reveal the basic mistakes of most vanished civilizations and crumbled nations of history; the concentration of too much power and authority in too few hands, and denial to the individual citizen of opportunity personally to contribute to the welfare of his country according to his own beliefs.

In closing, lest the labels "tool of the power interests" and "uninformed groups" be applied, let me say that I am supporting the vigorous stand against CVA and similar valley authorities taken by members of the Montana State Grange and the Montana State Farm Bureau after long and careful consideration of the issues involved; and that I am writing as a long-time member and supporter of a dozen of the Nation's leading conservation organizations. I have written at some length because I appreciate the influence of Nature Magazine, and feel that the views herein expressed should come to your attention.

In further reply to the closing sentence of the editorial, may I refer you to the plan of watershed administration being proposed by the National Grange, featuring coordination of activities of present State and Federal agencies, study of economic feasibility of projects proposed, emphasis on agricultural values, and regional policy-making boards of which the majority membership would represent the watershed area. Your near neighbor in Washington, Dr. J. T. Sanders, at National Grange headquarters, 744 Jackson Place NW., would be glad to explain the plan further.

Most sincerely yours,

WINTON WETZMEIER,
Master, Montana State Grange.

Development of the Cumberland River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid editorial entitled "Looking Forward," by Mr. W. Percy Williams, publisher of the Paris (Tenn.) Post-Intelligencer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOKING FORWARD

Tennessee and Kentucky Congressmen have petitioned the President to exercise a provision of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act to permit a thorough study of possibilities for developing flood control and electric potentialities of the lower Cumberland River.

At the time the TVA was established it was thought that someday the Cumberland watershed would, and should, come under its jurisdiction and consumption of electricity by the Government has developed so rapidly that a larger output will be needed to supply increasing demands for power on the part of the public for industrial and domestic purposes.

When TVA was established no one dreamed there would ever be such a thing as the Oak Ridge Atomic Energy development, nor the new airforce installations to be constructed at Tullahoma, both of which will require enormous supplies of electricity. We did not even anticipate the large increased use of current for industrial purposes.

TVA is the only source of power for a large territory in five States and it must keep pace with the increased demand. We would expect the same from private industry if it were the source of supply.

There will always be those who regard TVA as socialistic, and accuse the Government of tricky bookkeeping by building dams for flood control and using them to produce electricity for sale in competition with private industry, but they are 15 years too late to present arguments against the practice.

The taxpayers have invested a billion dollars in TVA for flood control and power production and, while there is an honest difference of opinion on whether it was right to do it, it is an accomplished fact now and we had might as well make the best of it, which is exactly what we people of the Tennessee Valley are doing. If TVA were in New England we suspect the folks in that area would do the same.

It is our opinion that the taxpayers' investment in TVA would be justified as a flood-control proposition even if the Government didn't produce a dime's worth of electricity. We think that has been proven since the first of the current year.

We have had more rainfall in the watershed of the Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, and Tennessee Rivers this year than we had in 1937 when flood damage was estimated at more than $50,000,000. If we have saved that much this year by controlling the flood we have earned at least 5 percent on the full amount invested in river development.

It will be up to Congress to determine whether the Cumberland shall be placed under TVA jurisdiction eventually, but we believe our Congressmen from Kentucky and Tennessee have acted wisely in asking the President to proceed without delay a study of the possibilities.

Conditions in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Three Bad Weeks," written by Mr. Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THREE BAD WEEKS

If our object is to make everything as easy as we can for Moscow and as difficult as possible for ourselves, then we have managed one way and another to do a lot during the past 3 weeks. But if we are still trying to win the cold war, we have hurt our own cause very seriously indeed in Asia and in Europe.

The Republican minority in Congress which adheres to Chiang, unable to impose its own policy on the administration, has nevertheless succeeded in impairing, perhaps ruining, the chances of any other policy. It cannot be their intention to hamstring the United States Government. But that is precisely what they are doing.

The record shows that when they were overruled by the President on the issues of intervention in Formosa, they did not accept the decision but instead took steps to nullify it. Their method was to vote against economic aid to Korea in the House in order to log-roll the administration into giving additional support to Chiang in Formosa. Their plan was to compel the administration to keep itself tied to Chiang or to sacrifice the American position in Korea.

The President and Secretary Acheson chose to appease them and agreed to buy aid to Korea with aid to Chiang. This act of appeasement was followed promptly by Chiang's use of American planes to bomb Shanghai and by his threat to bomb Peiping. When we protested against our being involved against our will in this massacre of Chinese civilians, Chiang rejected our protests haughtily. He felt able to defy the American Government and to bomb the American power plant in Shanghai and the installations of the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., and to kill or maim a thousand Chinese civilians. Why? Because he interpreted the actions in Congress as meaning that he had such strong supporters in Congress that he could thumb his nose at the President of the United States.

And what is Chiang's purpose in these raids? They have no conceivable military value in his war with the Chinese Communists. It is an insult to anyone's intelligence to argue that Chiang from Formosa with his tiny air force can defeat, or seriously injure the Red regime of the Chinese mainland.

Chiang's purpose in these raids is not to fight his war but to keep us entangled so that his war may become our war. By using American planes and American bombs against defenseless Chinese civilians he means to provoke the Chinese into reprisals against Americans and westerners generally. Chiang's object is to embroil us in a Chinese war. For he thinks that then he would get unlimited money and arms.

Nothing could suit the Kremlin better. Their object is to force Red China into the Soviet orbit and to isolate it from the United States. That is easy to do if America is represented in China only by Chiang's American airplanes killing Chinese civilians. The Russians have nothing to fear from Chiang or from any military help that Senator KNOWLAND or Representative JOHN DAVIS LODGE could or would get Congress to give to Chiang. But the Russians have everything to gain by keeping us permanently entangled with Chiang and forever embroiled and hated in China.

That is their very best insurance against any form of Titoism in China. It is their very best way of diverting the attention of the Chinese from the north, where Chinese and Russian interests conflict, to the south. For if China can be provoked into becoming engaged in a struggle for Indochina and Thailand and Burma, what will be the result?

The struggle will surely be indecisive. But it will also be exhausting both to the Chinese and to the western nations involved. The Chinese will be too weak to win in the south against the British, the French, and the Americans. They will be too weak to resist the Russians in the north. On the other hand, the French will not be strong enough to reconquer Indochina—they already have their whole professional army engaged and have denuded themselves of effective military power in Europe. But with American help the French will be strong enough to remain pinned down in a cruel and indecisive little war.

What could suit the Russians better than to have the only land army in western Europe fighting guerrillas in Indochina? If there is a cheaper and easier way to nullify the military-aid program of the Atlantic Pact, I do not know what it is.

Chiang's Republican friends in Congress are assuming an awful responsibility.

And simultaneously we have gravely injured our position in Europe by the thoughtless frenzy of our dealings with the hydrogen bomb. The net result of the announcements, congressional hearings, and press conferences on that subject has been to inform our Allies that we do not know how they can be defended because we are afraid we cannot even defend ourselves. That, I repeat, is the net result, the practical, human consequence of the unmanly, demoralizing, and most un-American yielding to panic at the sudden and belated discovery that we do not have undisputed military superiority.

This cannot go on, or we shall destroy our influence in Asia and in Europe, and we shall worry and frighten ourselves into a humiliating and dangerous isolation. We have before us the inordinately difficult task of reorienting our foreign policy, which has been overextended and miscalculated, to what Mr. Acheson calls the existing situation of fact.

It cannot be done while we are frightened out of our wits, and so divided among ourselves by partisan hatreds and personal suspicions that we think only with our viscera and not with our minds. We shall have to become sane again if we are to be safe, and we shall have to rally to some standard and close our ranks.

That standard cannot be raised by the minority members of a minority party. It will have to be raised by the President of the United States.

The Fulbright Exchange Program in Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in the news letter of the American Council of Learned Societies for December 1949, there appears an article entitled "The Fulbright Exchange Program in Operation," by Charles E. Odegaard. I think the article is one of the best on the subject, bringing up to date the operation of the program. Therefore I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The manuscript as submitted is estimated to require two and three-fourths pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $225.50.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FULBRIGHT EXCHANGE PROGRAM IN OPERATION

(By Charles E. Odegaard)

With a truly substantial exodus of American professors and students to foreign parts under Fulbright awards beginning in the fall of 1949 the time has finally come when the influence of the Fulbright Act will be felt throughout the length and breadth of the United States as well as in a number of foreign countries. It has been more than 3 years since Senator FULBRIGHT's highly significant proposal became law (Public Law 584, 79th Cong., approved by the President, August 1, 1946), and many persons in America whose hearts skipped a beat at the thought that they might study or teach abroad have long since wondered if anything would ever come of the Fulbright Act and if their personal dreams would ever have a chance to be realized.

Now that a considerable number of Fulbright exchanges of persons between the United States and other countries are taking place, it seems especially appropriate that more people know something of the procedures which have been developed for the administration of the Fulbright program, and of its difficulties and limitations. The description which follows is drawn from the personal experiences of one who has served this past year as a member of the Committee on International Exchange of Persons established by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils. It is not an official statement of the Committee, nor of course of the Department of State. It is partial in the sense that it does not concern directly exchanges in the student category or in the primary and secondary school teacher category, although many things said here apply to these categories as well as to the research scholar and professor category. It is hoped

that this description will provide interested persons with some understanding of the present operation of the Fulbright program.

It is important to note at the very beginning that the basic legislation establishing this program of educational exchanges, the Fulbright Act, is in substance an amendment to the Surplus Property Act of 1944. Where outside of the continental United States, Hawaii, Alaska (including the Aleutian Islands), Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, there was United States surplus property at the end of World War II, and where the countries concerned are able to pay the United States Government for it only in their own currency but not in dollars, there, and there only, is the possibility of negotiating a Fulbright educational-exchange agreement. The entire Fulbright program rests financially on this semi-lire base in those specific countries in which surplus property owned by the United States happened to be located. There are no dollars available for grantees, and this fact constitutes one of the rigid limitations of the program with which individual Americans and foreigners must reckon in any plans for the utilization of a Fulbright award. The hope that supplemental dollar aid might come from the Smith-Mundt Act has only recently materialized, and there seems to be good reason to believe that supplemental dollar aid from this source will always be limited.

Under the act the Secretary of State is authorized to enter into executive agreements with foreign governments for the disposition in each case of not more than the equivalent of $20,000,000 to be spent on educational exchanges at a rate of not more than the equivalent of $1,000,000 a year. The maximum figure of $20,000,000 will probably be available only in the United Kingdom, Italy, France, and China, though conditions in the last country obviously threaten the extinction of a Fulbright program there. For other countries which now participate or might participate in Fulbright exchanges, the available sums fall at different levels below this maximum.

Executive agreements were signed long enough ago with Burma, China, the Philippines, Greece, and New Zealand that Americans have actually been present in these countries on Fulbright awards during the academic year 1948–49. The program with China has perforce been suspended, but for the year 1949–50, except for China, there will be Americans abroad on Fulbright awards in these countries and also in Norway, the Netherlands, France, Italy, Belgium-Luxembourg, and the United Kingdom and its colonies. Agreements have recently been signed with Iran, Egypt, and Australia, so that awards will presumably be made for 1950–51, if not before. It is possible that in time agreements will be signed with Austria, Korea, Siam, Turkey, Pakistan, and India, thus permitting exchanges with these countries.

For any understanding of the Fulbright program and an evaluation of its present operation it is essential that one grasp at least the main outlines of its administrative peculiarities and the reasons for them. The Secretary of State is responsible for the general administration of the program but for the purpose of selecting students and educational institutions qualified to participate in this program and to supervise the exchange program the President was authorized to appoint a Board of Foreign Scholarships consisting of 10 members serving without compensation. It is this Board then which actually approves policies for the educational programs under the act and the types of programs and projects to be undertaken, which selects the institutions abroad approved for participation, and which makes the final choice among candidates for awards, both American and foreign.

These onerous responsibilities could obviously not be borne unless the Board received substantial assistance. To bring together all the elements involved into a working program of exchanges it has been necessary to establish a rather elaborate machinery. Responsibility for gathering together the recommendations from various agencies concerned and for taking the necessary action pursuant to the Board's decisions is vested in its immediate secretariat, which is located in the Division of Exchange of Persons of the Department of State, the Division which carries the responsibility within the Department for the administration of the act.

Since the Fulbright program is established through diplomatic agreements with foreign countries to permit educational exchanges both ways, it is obviously necessary to have a base of operations in the foreign countries. In accordance with the act, there is therefore established in each country a United States Educational Foundation, the exact character of which is determined in each case in the executive agreements negotiated by the Secretary of State. In most instances the Foundations consist of 10 members, half of whom are United States Embassy officials or other Americans resident in the foreign country concerned, the other half being nationals of the foreign country who are associated with the educational and research activities of their own country. Since the funds are actually impounded abroad, the Foundation abroad is responsible for their disbursement in accordance with directives of the Secretary of State based on policies approved by the Board of Foreign Scholarships. The foundations, however, play a very large role in the determination of the actual character of the exchanges. They prepare in the first instance the program proposal for each year of operation, including recommending fairly specific allocations within the budget. Since the act requires that Americans going abroad be associated with schools and institutions of higher learning, the Foundations recommend the foreign institutions with which they should be connected and negotiate with these institutions to secure their acceptance of American candidates who have been recommended for awards. The foundations also screen and recommend to the Board of Foreign Scholarships foreign candidates for what can be in the nature of things merely travel grants to the shores of the United States, there being no dollars available in the Fulbright program for the support of foreigners while they are in the United States. Some of the implications of these responsibilities of the foundations will be discussed later.

The recommendations of the foundations to the Board of Foreign Scholarships clearly call for analysis and subsequent implementation which in kind and in amount exceed the capacity of the board to bear alone. For this reason it has asked for the assistance of the so-called cooperating agencies. The act provides for "financing studies, research, instruction, and other educational activities of or for American citizens in schools and institutions of higher learning." The Board of Foreign Scholarships and the Department of State have construed the act to permit the granting of awards to Americans who fall into three main categories: (1) Students, and for the present this means students at the graduate level, (2) teachers in elementary schools, secondary schools, and junior colleges, and (3) professors, specialists, and advanced research scholars. To secure recommendations concerning American applicants, program proposals originating with the foundations, and other related matters, the Board of Foreign Scholarships turned for assistance to agencies already in existence with well-established means of tapping appropriate information concerning persons and policies in American education. Accordingly students are directed to make application to the Institute of International Education, 2 West Forty-fifth Street, New York 19, N. Y., which maintains a national committee to review applications and submit nominations to the board. Teachers are directed to submit applications to the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Washington 25, D. C., whose committee performs a similar function for these applicants. Professors, specialists, and advanced research scholars are directed to submit applications to the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, 2101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington 25, D. C., composed of representatives of the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Council on Education, the National Research Council, and the Social Science Research Council, organizations whose connections reach out into all areas of research and instruction in higher education in America.

A further word is appropriate here concerning the actual screening procedures used by the conference board. Responsibility for submitting specific nominations in its behalf is vested in its Committee on the International Exchange of Persons which consists of eight members representing the various areas of concern to the four councils (Messrs. Bellinger, Bronk, Brumbaugh, Counts, Graves, Herring, Trytten, and Voegelin). The operations of the committee require a substantial secretariat which is directed by Dr. Gordon Bowles, executive secretary. The applications received by the conference board, complete with the individual letters of recommendation, are distributed in appropriate groupings for review by experts on standing committees of the councils or ad hoc committees established for the purpose as circumstances require. If there are only a small number of applications in given areas, this review may be conducted by mail. If there is any considerable number in a given area, as is often the case, these committees meet in person to discuss the candidates and prepare their recommendations. The reports of the screening committees are then reviewed by the conference board committee which makes the final nominations but always within the limitations set by the country programs as proposed by the foundations and subsequently approved with or without modification by the Board of Foreign Scholarships.

The nominations of the conference board committee, like those of the Institute of International Education and of the United States Office of Education, are submitted directly to the Division of Exchange of Persons within the Department of State, where they pass through an additional stage before they are presented to the Board of Foreign Scholarships. The Department forwards the application of each candidate to the United States Educational Foundation abroad, for the Board of Foreign Scholarships must look to the foundation for assurance that the candidate will be welcome in the host country, that he will be acceptable to an approved institution or research center in that country, and that the facilities for carrying out his project are sufficiently adequate to insure him a reasonable measure of success. It is on the basis of these assurances and other information, including possible evidence of disloyalty, that the Board of Foreign Scholarships makes its final selection among the applicants included in a recommended panel.

Many will remark immediately that this machinery is cumbersome. Yes; but it is difficult to see how, without some such structure which takes into account all the interests involved, an international educational exchange program can be operated at all. With more experience it will be possible to speed up and to streamline the various parts of this complicated process, thus reducing the long intervals of waiting so disheartening and exasperating for the applicants. There will always be, however, an irreducible minimum time required for action on applications, and those who aspire to receive Fulbright awards will have to accept a certain period of waiting.

So much for the bare machinery for operating the program. Now for a discussion of some of the problems which vitally affect the character of the program but which can be understood only against the administrative background here described.

This article is addressed to an American audience. The first reaction of individuals within this group is likely to be, I wonder if I can obtain a Fulbright award to permit me to go to this or that country to continue study, research, or teaching in this or that special field in which I have a great interest. The answer may turn out to be in many cases a very flat "no" regardless of the high competence of the individual and of his particular fitness for study in the country of his choice. No applicant can be successful no matter how great his qualifications, unless he personally is accepted abroad for a particular billet within the annual program of the country concerned. There are these two elements in the program which are insufficiently understood by Americans; namely, the availability within the program of an appropriate billet and the acceptability of the individual applicant to the foundation and to particular institutions abroad. On having these unexpected elements in the program explained to them, some Americans are wont to snap back in irritation at discovering this unforeseen possibility of the frustration of their hopes: "What do these foreign institutions have to do with this program? It is based on our money, isn't it?" Unfortunately—though perhaps in the long run it is not a complete misfortune—the Fulbright program is based on foreign currency which may technically accrue to the United States Government as credit for the sale of surplus property but which cannot be spent without the cooperation of the foreign government. There is then a bilateral aspect to the Fulbright program which cannot be ignored. No educational exchange program could work successfully anyway on a strictly unilateral base. The opportunities for study, research, or teaching abroad desired by Americans almost always depend upon a hospitable welcome from foreign institutions. It is by no means then a complete loss that circumstances require their consent in fact to the Fulbright exchanges.

The foundations have exerted a profound influence on the character of the exchanges to date. The highly commendable effort of the board of foreign scholarships and the Department of State to set the program in operation as quickly as possible has in the past often precluded the possibility of extensive review of country proposals by the cooperating agencies in the United States prior to the acceptance of the program by the board of foreign scholarships. As the program in various countries moves into the second year of operation, there is more time for such review. It must be admitted, however, that there are serious difficulties in any last-minute attempt to make significant modifications in these proposals in view of the danger of the charge of American cultural imperialism. There is a very real need of increased understanding of all parts of this program on the part of foundations, cooperating agencies, the Department of State, and the board of foreign scholarships. More is required than good will—of which there has been an ample stock in this past year. There is needed also considerable knowledge and information. Americans need to know more about the special circumstances, needs, and opportunities in the various Fulbright countries. The foundations in turn need to know more about the potentialities and aspirations of Americans. The kind of knowledge required is not gained overnight, certainly not in the atmosphere of haste and emergency action which has prevailed of necessity during the last, really the first, year of significant exchange operations.

The Department of State has endeavored to instruct its emissaries abroad in the operation of the program, a few of whom, being recently in the United States, have discussed various aspects of the program with the cooperating agencies before going to their foreign posts. In a number of cases in the spring and summer of 1949 the Department arranged for persons associated with various foundations to come to the United States to discuss the program with appropriate persons. This has been most helpful; and it is to be hoped that there will be still more activity of this kind. The cooperating agencies and the State Department officials concerned with Fulbright matters are far better equipped now, after reviewing the programs for 11 countries and endeavoring to operate under them, to discuss problems and possibilities than they were 6 months ago. It would seem highly advantageous not only to continue bringing individuals associated with the foundations to the United States but also to send to the Fulbright countries a team of experienced persons representing the Department of State and the cooperating agencies. Such a procedure in the early phases of the Fulbright program should ensure the establishment of annual programs which are more likely to be mutually satisfactory. Discussions of this kind prior to the submission of the annual program proposals are likely to be far more effective than any modifications suggested after the foundations have made formal submission of them; and from such discussions Americans are likely to gain a better understanding of the conditions and purposes which underlie these proposals.

It has been an interesting experience this past year to discover as one program after another has been submitted how widely the basic conceptions of the foundations have differed. The earliest programs received tended to be especially rigid, giving relatively little room in which to accommodate a professor or research scholar whose specialty did not happen to coincide with very specific interests expressed in the program. The New Zealand program affords a good illustration of this tendency, partly because of the very clarity with which it was presented. The professional and research billets were carefully described and grew out of a specific stated need in New Zealand, generally of an applied character. In a number of instances the foundation stated the special problem which it wished a particular named American to undertake. A program of this sort containing a large percentage of these billets is often very difficult to fill for lack of American candidates with these specific interests who in the given year are free to leave their normal habitat for a year abroad. Meanwhile there may be other well-qualified Americans desiring awards who cannot be given serious consideration. When faced with this situation, the conference board committee has tried to loosen up the program by submitting the names of a limited number of well-qualified Americans for whom there are no stated billets in the hope that the foundations will take a favorable interest in these nominees for positions in the program which have not been filled.

The British program, one of the largest, is very different in character; it has proved to be one of the easiest to manage and in all probability will be the one in the first year of operation which will bring the greatest satisfaction to both countries concerned. This is due in large part to the happy circumstance that Sir Hector Hetherington, vice chairman of the foundation, visited the United States prior to the submission of the British program to discuss the Fulbright exchange with all parties concerned. In the course of this visit he made a notable contribution to the thinking of many persons concerning the operation of the program. The basic plan of the British program is very simple. It assumes that the American agencies know more about the personal qualifications of American candidates and should be left with the responsibility for nominating good candidates with serious interests which may presumably be furthered by a year in Great Britain. The foundation, being better informed concerning institutions in Great Britain, endeavors, in the spirit of a good host, to determine if there is a suitable place available for the nominees. The British program has not specified a large number of rigidly defined billets, thus leaving room for a relatively free expression of interest on the part of Americans which may be gratified. The foundation has indicated a very limited number of special fields in which for some particular reason it hopes to see an American representative nominated. The generosity of spirit which pervades the program as proposed by the foundation obviously invites strenuous efforts on the American side to gratify these few special wishes.

In judging any program one must, of course, take into account the special circumstances of each country in relation to the interests and possible contribution of the United States. A program such as that of Great Britain is calculated to work easily and well when the intellectual developments, scientific skill, and educational institutions of the foreign country and the United States are roughly comparable. This condition prevails with reference to the west European countries, and in the category where there might be some difficulty, that of the professors, a policy such as that adopted by the Netherlands, would go far to eliminate difficulties. The Dutch universities have chosen to regard the courses offered by visiting American professors as outside the normal curriculum. In this way the American is free to make his contribution without having to fit his offering into a preexistent scheme with which he may not be familiar and which might place upon him cramping burdens which are not truly essential to a profitable educational exchange.

In the case of countries where educational interests and institutions are not comparable to those of the United States, the program is likely in each instance to take on a special character. For example, the Burmese Foundation, eager to reconstruct its educational institutions and to improve the welfare of its rural population, places a heavy emphasis on filling particular vacancies in its university structure and on agricultural extension activities. The Philippine Foundation, seeing in the Fulbright program an opportunity to obtain American assistance in building a public-school system which will raise the general level of education of the Philippine people, places a heavy emphasis on educationists in its program.

It is inevitable that the foundations, using as a starting point an analysis of needs of the foreign country, will tend to propose programs which involve bringing to their countries Americans who, it is believed, can make a contribution to these needs. Sometimes the requests within the programs prove to be unrealistic in the sense that they cannot be filled. For example, there is an impressive number of requests for nuclear physicists, but the premium on them is so high in the United States that there is little likelihood that they can or will leave the United States. The demand for specialists in various kinds of medicine is often difficult to fill.

Starting with an analysis of needs in the foreign country, foundations have a natural tendency to overlook interests which Americans may have in study in their countries. Those countries which are impressed by what they regard as their need of American technology and science, out of their very humility tend to think that Americans can have very limited research interests which would lead them to wish to come to their countries. Yet there may be Americans who wish to study their human culture and their physical

environment and who could conduct field studies very profitably even if there is no highly developed program in those subjects in their educational institutions.

The aspects of the program which have been discussed affect particularly the professor and research scholar category of awards. There are similar complications with reference to the teacher category, especially in view of the fact that the linguistic hurdles are greater at this level in educational institutions and that many countries have licensing requirements for teachers in the school systems which interfere seriously with utilizing Americans. Foundation proposals are least rigid with regard to the student category, though students have to face serious limitations in the great difference in opportunities for actual study in the various countries.

The comments presented here have had to do primarily with factors affecting the flow of Americans to foreign countries. It has been indicated, however, that the program is based on more than a unilateral agreement permitting a flow in one direction. It is based essentially on a bilateral agreement which permits a flow in two directions, of Americans abroad and of foreigners to the United States. To secure the kind of cooperation needed for the reception of Americans abroad and, indeed, to serve the ultimate high purpose which is at the base of Senator FULBRIGHT'S plan, a mutual understanding among peoples, Americans must not forget the need of encouraging the flow of foreigners to the United States. Indeed, a considerable measure of responsibility for insuring the success of these exchanges rests with individuals in the American academic world, administrators and professors, who have the opportunity to show initiative in procuring the dollar support necessary to permit foreigners to teach or study in the United States. Fulbright funds can be used in most cases to pay the travel expenses involved in bringing to the shores of the United States foreigners who have been recommended as qualified by the foundations. The United States Government has only very limited dollar funds which can be tapped. In very few instances are the foreigners able to procure from their own governments or from private sources abroad the necessary dollars. In almost all cases, then, the dollars must be provided by agencies within the United States.

By showing some ingenuity, American universities and colleges have created opportunities for a considerable number of scholars to visit them for the purpose of teaching, study, or research. Most institutions at one time or another discover that they have funds available which cannot be used for long-term commitments, but which could be used for a short-term grant. Since the larger part of the travel costs can be paid for with Fulbright funds, fairly modest sums may enable the institution to bring a scholar or student to its campus.

The Board of Foreign Scholarships has recognized the importance to the program of bringing as many foreigners as possible to the United States, and at the same time the difficulties in obtaining extensive dollar support, by permitting shorter term grants for foreigners than for Americans. Americans going abroad can be supported in full with Fulbright funds, and much the largest part of the Fulbright funds will accordingly be used for the expenses of Americans. There is, then, no strong practical reason why Americans cannot stay abroad for a period as long as a normal academic year. Only under exceptional circumstances has the board approved grants for periods as short as 6 months. Because of the shortage of dollars the board has been willing to make grants to foreigners who have secured sufficient dollar support for shorter periods within the United States. The board has even approved grants for foreign professors who were invited to teach in summer sessions. It would certainly be preferable, however, if more of the opportunities offered foreigners were for longer periods of time.

Thanks to this foresight on the part of various individuals in American institutions, a fair number of foreigners will attend American institutions in the year 1949–50. It would be desirable from all points of view to see more such opportunities. In most cases in the past exchange arrangements have been made by direct contact between an American institution and a foreign scholar in person or his institutional connection. Subsequently application has been made to the foundation for a Fulbright travel grant. The American interest could be equally well served if institutions willing to receive a foreign scholar or student, submitted the specifications of the opening, along with an indication of the dollar support available, to the appropriate cooperating agency in the United States for forwarding to the foundation. In particular, openings which could well be filled by visiting professors from abroad should be called to the attention of Dr. Gordon T. Bowles, executive secretary of the conference board committee. The foundation could then nominate qualified candidates. It should be remarked that American institutions would have the same veto power now possessed in fact by the foreign institutions in that their failure to accept the nominee would preclude the possibility of the board's giving the nominee a travel grant.

The Fulbright program is by all odds the greatest fellowship program in the world's history. Anyone who has had the slightest connection with the operation of a fellowship program within a single college or university knows the difficulties involved in making proper selections. These difficulties increase when more institutions become involved. In the case of the Fulbright program the wishes of innumerable institutions in a variety of lands with very diverse traditions must be considered. There is, and will continue to be, a steady stream of new problems calling for rational analysis and policy determination. Many of these cannot be foreseen in advance. Under these circumstances there are bound to be delays, and what may turn out to be in some cases outright mistakes. The indulgent sympathy of the entire educational world in America and abroad is needed. The cooperative agencies are certain to welcome constructive comments on various aspects of the program and its awards; interested persons should not hesitate to write them.

At the same time, it is important that those who are gratified with various aspects of the program as it now unfolds should make that gratification known. The Fulbright Act is a tool which has been fashioned in the expectation that it would lead to better international understanding. Support by the United States Government of such efforts is still in its infancy. Those who believe in such efforts have a responsibility not merely to criticize mistakes of operation, but also to make known in all appropriate places the full meaning in terms of human experience and understanding of a Fulbright year.

Jefferson as a National Planner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party is preparing to honor two great Democratic Presidents—Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson—at our annual Jefferson-Jackson day dinners, and while we do so, the atmosphere is filled with the anguished cries of reactionary politicians and Wall Street plutocrats about the "evils of Democratic planning" and the dangers of the welfare state. I believe that the best answer to these calamity yowlers is found in the words, deeds, and philosophy of Thomas Jefferson. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the article entitled "Jefferson as a Planner of National Resources" which appeared in the July 1943 edition of the magazine Ethics, and which was authored jointly by the eminent political scientist at the University of Chicago, Prof. Charles E. Merriam, and my good friend Mr. Frank P. Bourgin, of Virginia, Minn., a former graduate student at the University of Chicago:

JEFFERSON AS A PLANNER OF NATIONAL RESOURCES

(By Charles E. Merriam and Frank P. Bourgin)

The clue to the understanding of Jefferson is found in his idea of liberty. Jefferson was for freedom, not only from something but for something. Jefferson hated tyranny and demanded freedom from oppression, but he also demanded the pursuit of happiness. In his thinking, equality, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were real and inseparable parts of a world in which human beings might best develop. Underlying this was his confidence in the perfectibility of mankind, in the possibilities of continuing growth and development.

Jefferson was against tyranny in any form, whether physical or mental, whether by public or private agencies, whether by State, church, land jobbers, or bankers. The tyranny of landlords and land speculators, the tyranny of central government or local government, the tyranny of ignorance—all these were the objects of his attack from time to time. What may seem inconsistent in the thinking of Jefferson arises from failure to observe his real objectives—the ends toward which he moved in the emancipation of mankind and in the equipment of men for the pursuit of happiness.

Jefferson was not merely a philosopher; he was also a statesman and a social engineer—also a party leader, to be sure, but that is not our present topic. Jefferson not only set forth the ends but also planned constructively the means of attaining liberty, equality, the pursuit of happiness, and the consent of the governed.

Jefferson was a planner and, indeed, the first great American and democratic planner. But he was first, last, and always a planner with a philosophy. The roads he indicated might wind round and at times even seem to be going in opposite directions, but his sense of direction remained the same.

The keen intelligence of Jefferson, which found recognition in his repeated election as president of the American Philosophical Society, led him to elaborate his programs and plans, not alone in the grand manner of philosophy but with the care and pains of the practical observer and technician. Jefferson's Notes on Virginia was the first report on State planning in the United States and may well be compared with some of its later followers in forty-odd American States. He was concerned from the first with the development of all the resources of his State and, later, his Nation—both physical and human resources. Thus he brought over the Italian, Mazzei, to advise him regarding the development of olive growing and wine making in Virginia; and in like manner he organized the University of Virginia and personally supervised the construction of the first buildings. His land planning, his educational planning, his transportation planning, and his broad national expansion planning are marked all the way by their broad range of vision and also by their minute attention to technical detail. He planned not only a land and free-labor policy for the Northwest Territory, but also the method of land survey. He was concerned not only with education as a basis for democracy, but with the way the bricks were being laid in building the University of Virginia.

LAND PLANNING

Jefferson was deeply concerned with land planning, thinking of agricultural development as a basis of democracy. From his earliest days Jefferson planned energetically and constructively for the development of democratic land resources. He sought to incorporate a homestead provision into the Virginia constitution. In his draft of the new constitution this paragraph appeared: "Every person of full age, neither owning nor having owned 50 acres of land, shall be entitled to an appropriation of 50 acres, or to so much as shall make what he owns or has owned 50 acres in full and absolute domain." The Virginia convention refused to incorporate the free-land-grant principle into the constitution. But Jefferson went further to attack the land problem from other directions.

In Virginia, in the first session, after the Declaration of Independence, the privilege of primogeniture was abolished and also entails. Furthermore, it was provided that the land of intestates should be divided equally, "These laws," said Jefferson, "drawn by myself, laid the ax to the root of pseudoaristocracy."

No less important than the abolition of feudal land tenures for the future of America's democratic land system was the establishment of a system of land disposal avoiding the dangers of large-scale land speculation. Few persons today realize the dangers that existed at the close of the Revolution, threatening our whole land policy.

For years prior to the Revolution speculative land companies, made up of some of the most influential persons both in England and in America were engaged in intrigue at the royal court to obtain grants of land in the Ohio Valley amounting to millions of acres. Following the breach with England, the scene of conflict for land-grabbing shifted from the royal court to the new State legislatures. The extent of the speculators' power may be judged by the fact that, through their influence over certain legislatures, they were able to delay for over 3 years the ratification of the Articles of Confederation. Had they been successful, it is possible that the vast territory of the Northwest would have been organized into great baronial estates rather than a multiplicity of small land holdings. Had the land speculators been able to seize the territory of the Ohio Valley in a few great tracts, Congress would probably have been precluded from launching its constructive land surveys and territorial policies.

As a landowning gentleman, cultivating his own acres, Jefferson had a healthy dislike for the practices of the land jobbers. He disdained personally to adventure in land speculations, and he readily appreciated that it was completely at odds with his own policy of saving the land for the actual settler. He was not slow in acting to make sure that the land speculators would get no more of Virginia's western lands than was unavoidable. The great northwest territory was saved by Jefferson from the land jobbers and speculators and held for land settlers. Virginia did not cede its western lands until it was given assurance by Congress that the land would be disposed of for the common benefit of the United States.

Jefferson's engineering mind went further and led him to the organization of a rectangular survey system. He even attempted, but unsuccessfully, a decimal land system, corresponding to the decimal coinage system he was endeavoring to apply on a national scale. Great pressure was brought to repeal the land-survey system inaugurated by the act of 1785, but these efforts were unsuccessful and the Land Act of 1796 settled the principle.

Most significant of all, however, was Jefferson's plan for free labor in the new land economy. After the year 1800 it was provided that there should be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the States organized in this new area. In his Notes on Virginia Jefferson explained his legislative program for the abolition of slavery in that State through a process of gradual emancipation on reaching the ages of 18 and 21 for females and males.

Jefferson likewise planned in great detail for the rehabilitation of southern agriculture, with which he was thoroughly familiar. He proposed a threefold scheme for the betterment of agriculture in his own State. It comprised (1) the gradual abolition of slavery, (2) a gradual breaking away from the one-crop tobacco culture, and (3) the introduction of household manufactures. On the basis of his own experience he recommended a diversification of products, with a view to giving greater strength and stability to the agricultural economy of Virginia.

But not only did this planner plan for the development of agriculture in Virginia and in the Northwest Territory; he also reached out to acquire further lands in the famous Louisiana Purchase. He believed that the foundation of freedom in the United States for many years to come rested upon the abundance of its lands and also that Congress should declare the policies for the newly acquired areas. When the chance to acquire the new vast domain of Louisiana was placed within his reach, he seized the opportune moment and extended our national boundaries as far as circumstance would permit. He contemplated an extensive program of economic development by the Government of the United States for the Territory of Louisiana.

EDUCATION

Jefferson held that education is fundamental to a democracy. "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." On the subject of extending equal opportunities, Jefferson wrote: "The object is to bring into action that mass of talents which lies buried in poverty in every country, for want of the means of development, and thus give activity to a mass of mind which in proportion to our population shall be the double or treble of what it is in most countries."

The reservation of the sixteenth lot of every township for the maintenance of schools in the land ordinance of 1785 was one step in this direction. Congress also reserved the sixteenth section of every township for schools and also two complete townships for universities when it arranged for the sale of lands in the Northwest Territory to the Ohio Company in 1787. In 1802, however, when Jefferson was President, the United States Government made land reservation for education a fixed and binding policy of the Federal Government. When the public lands in the southwestern part of the Louisiana Purchase were offered for sale in 1806, the same policy of reserving the sixteenth section for the use of schools was continued. With the exception of the States of Texas, Maine, and West Virginia, every State admitted into the Union since 1802 has received a grant of land from the Federal Government for the endowment of its public schools.

In his own State of Virginia, Jefferson planned the development of the University of Virginia and gave much personal time and attention to the details of organization and construction. On a national scale he looked with interest and sympathy upon proposals for the national establishment of education and also upon Barlow's plan, modeled on the National Institute of France.

Nowhere is Jefferson's belief in the close affinity between democracy and science more clearly and concisely summed up than when he referred to the "value of science to a republican people; the security it gives to labor by enlightening the minds of citizens; the protection it affords against foreign power; the values it inculcates; the just emulation of the distinction it confers on nations foremost in it; in short, its identification with power, morale, order, and happiness."

TRANSPORTATION

Jefferson laid the foundations of a national transportation system, to be developed at public expense. The farmer was having trouble transporting his products to market and needed the Government's help in road and canal improvements. Jefferson and his Secretary of the Treasury, Gallatin, planned to provide relief for the transportation needs of the Nation. This plan centered in the famous Gallatin report of 1808.

This document did not merely propose an expanded program of Federal aid; it was also an exact plan to establish a national system of transportation improvements, accompanied with a detailed financial program of how this was to be done. It was proposed that $20,000,000 be appropriated from the anticipated Federal surplus over a period of 10 years for the construction of roads and canals. The specific improvements recommended were as follows: (1) Great canals along the Atlantic seacoast, uniting New England with the South; (2) communications between the Atlantic and the western waters; (3) communications between the Atlantic, the St. Lawrence River, and the Great Lakes; and (4) interior canals and roads.

Gallatin argued in his report that his transportation program would aid in promoting the economic development of the Nation by making the maximum use of its natural and financial resources. The kind of projects outlined were on too large a scale for private organization alone. Without subsidy from the Government, they could not be built at all. Gallatin estimated that the transportation costs saved by new roads and canals would in the long run pay the costs of their construction. In addition, the value of the unsold public lands held by the Government would be enhanced. The Government could easily sell the improved lands at a higher price if the produce of the land could find better markets. Gallatin was not dogmatic as to the specific method to be used in pursuing these objects. The Government might itself undertake the improvements, but Gallatin believed in private enterprise where possible. Under such circumstances the Government might make loans to private companies or, preferably, might subscribe to shares of their stock. Detailed problems of this kind could be worked out in practice. As an immediate step he urged that surveys be made to determine more definitely the feasibility of each project.

Gallatin's transportation program was also urged as a necessary measure for our national security. Not only would roads and canals shorten distances so as to promote commercial intercourse but they would, in addition, improve our defenses and provide an alternative to maintaining a large standing Army and Navy. Good roads would make possible mobility of our existing military forces and afford the means of rapid concentration of that force and a formidable body of militia at any given point.

Jefferson also planned to finance the proposed transportation improvements by allocating a fixed portion of future revenues for that purpose.

In addition to offering to the newly admitted State of Ohio the sixteenth section of every township for the support of schools, it was proposed that the State be given one-tenth of the net proceeds of all lands sold thereafter by Congress (after deducting the expense of the sales) to "be applied toward laying out and making turnpike and other roads, first from navigable waters emptying into the Atlantic to the Ohio and afterward continued through the new States; such roads to be laved out under the authority of Congress and of the several States through which the same will pass." Such some form of compensation to the States was necessary for their loss of revenue due to the fact that the public lands, being sold on credit, could not be taxed for a 5-year period thereafter. Gallatin devised this scheme for reimbursing the States and also for obtaining future road improvements. This proposal was accepted, although the grant of the net proceeds of the land sales was reduced from one-tenth to one-twentieth, or 5 percent. In a subsequent act, Congress remitted 3 of the 5 percent to the States for constructing roads within the State; the remaining 2 percent was retained by the Federal Government as a fund for the construction of the national road.

In 1806 Congress appropriated $30,000 for a survey and authorized the President to appoint three Commissioners to report a plan for the road. The amount of money contained in the 2-percent fund was obviously not sufficient to construct a road of the dimensions planned. In 1807 Gallatin wrote President Jefferson that the "money already appropriated would be sufficient to construct about 4 or 5 miles of the road." He was determined to build the road "in the most complete manner just as many miles as the money will pay for." Once the road was begun he felt sure that Congress would appropriate enough money to complete it. He regarded it "as a national object of primary importance." He estimated that the road would effect an annual saving of transportation costs of over $200,000. "Ten thousand tons will be carried westward annually and perhaps 300,000 barrels of flour brought back."

The Cumberland National Road represented the first completed part of Jefferson's national transportation program. Because of shortage of funds, the completion of the road was seriously delayed. The first 10 miles of the road west of Cumberland, Md., were not completed until 1812. Jefferson and Gallatin planned to extend the road west as far as St. Louis, on the Mississippi River. The rapid growth of railways during the decade of the 1830's made unnecessary the extension of the road as originally planned, and it was never built beyond Illinois.

INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISE

It is quite true that Jefferson was primarily concerned with the development of an agricultural economy, just as his contemporary, Hamilton, was primarily concerned with the industrialization of the United States. It cannot be too hastily concluded, however, that Jefferson was indifferent to industrial development, particularly in the later years. In time Jefferson came to be more familiar with the facts of America's growing industrialization. Concerning the Nation's reliance for its national security upon its ability to produce its own armaments, Jefferson's later views were substantially similar to those of Hamilton in his Report on Manufactures. In 1816, for example, he acknowledged to Benjamin Austin his change of policy:

"You tell me I am quoted by those who wish to continue our dependence on England for manufactures. There was a time when I might have been so quoted with more truth, but within the 30 years which have since elapsed, how circumstances changed."

He insisted that views must be governed by conditions of time and place. The trend toward industrialization in the United States required corresponding adjustment of our national policies:

"To be independent for the comforts of life, we must fabricate for ourselves. We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist. The former question is suppressed, or rather assumes a new form. Shall we make our own comforts, or go without them at the will of a foreign nation? He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufacture, must be for reducing us either to dependence on that foreign nation, or to be clothed in skins, and to live like wild beasts in dens and caverns. I am not one of these; experience has taught me that manufacturers are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort."

Jefferson even raised the question whether or not the national growth of manufacturers might some day permit going beyond our own supply, and he characteristically answered that no a priori answer could be made:

"If it shall be proposed to go beyond our own supply * * * will our surplus labor be then most beneficially employed in the culture of the earth, or in the fabrications of art? We have time yet for consideration, before that question will press upon us; and the maxim to be applied will depend on the circumstances which shall then exist; for in so complicated a science as political economy, no one axiom can be laid down as wise and expedient for all times and circumstances and for their contraries."

PLANNING FOR THE GENERAL WELFARE

Jefferson's plans for social improvement were contingent upon the prosperity of the country and upon the resulting state of Federal finances. The policy had been marked by success; as the Government commenced its second term of office, only $10,500,000 of Federal bonds remained to be immediately discharged. For the first time the country could relax Gallatin's policy of stringent economy. The Government could choose between a reduction of taxes or a diversion of the surplus revenues to other objects.

In order to understand why Jefferson adopted the latter course, it is necessary to understand the nature of the Federal tax structure at this time. Of approximately $11,000,000 constituting the total annual revenue of the Government at the beginning of Jefferson's administration, about 90 percent was derived from customs duties. The Government had, in effect, continued the tariff rates established by the previous administrations and had not seen fit to alter them. Opposition to them was virtually nonexistent, even in the purely agrarian sections of the country. For the greater part, they bore chiefly on luxury imports. They afforded, furthermore, some measure of encouragement of domestic industry. The internal taxes had been abolished in 1802, and, as far as the mass of the people was concerned, taxes for the maintenance of the Federal Government hardly existed. Some additional revenue was derived from the sale of public lands and from postage, but this was more in the nature of fees for services rendered. There could be few justifiable complaints against the continuation of the import taxes.

The problem of the surplus offered its own answer. The solution lay in a continuation of the existing taxes and in a diversion of the surplus revenues to realizing objects of social improvement which would not otherwise be possible. In his second inaugural address, Jefferson indicated his intention of converting the Federal surplus into a permanent fund for creating public welfare:

"Redemption once effected, the revenues thereby liberated may, by a just repartition among the States, and a corresponding amendment to the Constitution, be applied, in time of peace, to rivers, canals, roads, arts, manufactures, education, and other great objects within each State."

It was proposed that the annual amounts set aside for debt payment be reduced from $8,000,000 to four and a half million, thereby leaving three and a half million for public improvements and defense expenditures.

Again, in his annual message of December 2, 1806, Jefferson informed Congress that the goal of full redemption of the debt was rapidly being approached. Did Congress thereupon propose to suppress the import duties on foreign goods, he asked? To his own question he replied negatively. The elimination of the tariff would only give an advantage to foreign manufactures over our own. He pointed, furthermore, to the fact that the most of the goods upon which the impost was paid were luxuries, purchased only by those who could afford them:

"Their patriotism would certainly prefer its continuance and application to the great purposes of the public education, roads, rivers, canals, and such other objects of public improvement as it may be thought proper to add to the constitutional enumeration of Federal powers."

He looked forward to the time when a continued, wise utilization of surplus revenues might achieve on the Federal level many of the reforms which Jefferson and his colleague Gallatin had fought to effect through action by the States. Nowhere in his writings did Jefferson better express the policy he envisioned for the United States than in his letter to his friend, du Pont de Nemours:

"We are all the more reconciled to the tax on importations, because it falls exclusively on the rich and, with the equal partition of interstate's estates, constitutes the best agrarian law. In fact, the poor man in this country who uses nothing but what is made within his own farm or family, or within the United States, pays not a farthing of tax to the general government, but on his salt; and should we go into that manufacture as we ought to do, we will pay not one cent. Our revenues once liberated by the discharge of the public debt, and its surplus applied to canals, roads, schools, etc., the farmer will see his government supported, his children educated, and the face of this country made a paradise by the contributions of the rich alone, without his being called on to spare a cent from his earnings. The path we are now pursuing leads directly to this end, which we cannot fail to attain unless our administration should fall into unwise hands."

It should not be supposed that Jefferson at all times necessarily favored defining Federal powers within extremely narrow limits. He believed in a written enumeration, to be sure, but the enumeration of powers was not intended to become a governmental strait jacket. Jefferson's constitutional doubts did not prevail when he feared he might fail to acquire the Louisiana Territory. He did not prepare a written draft of the constitutional amendment which he recommended to make possible his program of public improvements. For one who is generally accredited with desiring to keep Federal powers within the narrowest scope, the number of powers which he would have conferred on the Federal Government is truly astonishing. In addition to empowering Congress to dispose of the land of the new territory and to exchange lands with the Indians, he proposed "to work salt springs, or mines of coal, metals, and other minerals within the possession of the United States or in any others with the consent of the possessors; to regulate trade and intercourse between the Indian inhabitants and all other persons, to explore and ascertain the geography of the province, its productions and other interesting circumstances; to open roads and navigation therein where necessary for beneficial communication; and to establish agencies and factories therein for the cultivation of commerce, peace, and good understanding with the Indians residing there."

That Thomas Jefferson was a national planner, and a distinguished one, can hardly be doubted in view of the evidence presented in these pages. His activities show clearly his concern with the systematic and intelligent development of our national resources. The various proposals offered by Jefferson reveal not only his philosophy but also the technical care with which he proceeded. While appealing to the interests of the immediate beneficiaries of his plans, he was consciously trying to shape a policy for many years to come.

We may now summarize his contributions toward planning. (1) Jefferson anticipated the Homestead Act by about 85 years. As long as the finances of the Government could permit a generous policy, he recommended donating small tracts of land to actual settlers. Society would be compensated, he said, by the increase in the wealth and income that would result from more rapid settlement of the land. (2) In his own State Jefferson successfully brought to an end all feudal survivals in the land laws. By laying the ax to primogeniture and entail, he influenced their abolition elsewhere, thus further promoting democratic equality on the land. (3) The beneficial effects of Jefferson's activities in frustrating the attempts of the large speculative land companies were so great that they cannot be measured except by comparing the early Federal policy with that practiced in almost all the States. The national land policy, without doubt, not only was more democratic but also promoted more orderly settlement. Had Congress early parted with the title to the western lands, our history would have been written quite differently. (4) Jefferson contributed directly to the development of the land surveys by his land plan of 1784 and by his consistent support for the survey system. (5) The Northwest Ordinance of 1787, one of the great monuments of national policy, bears undeniable evidence of having been influenced by Jefferson's territorial plan of 1784. (6) In the period after the Revolution, Jefferson was most vigorously opposed to slavery. He tried to abolish it in his own State and, having failed, sought to arrest its growth by prohibiting its expansion into any of the Territories. (7) Jefferson's purchase of Louisiana was an outgrowth of that agricultural expansion of which he had always been an ardent advocate. (8) Jefferson laid the foundation for our democratic system of education. (9) Jefferson's plan included a broad system of national transportation.

We may measure Jefferson's open-mindedness by the fact that he was convinced of the desirability of encouraging domestic manufactures. His thinking was at first dogmatically opposed to the conduct of manufacturing enterprises in this country. Later, as he began to see how machines not only made goods more plentiful but also improved the comforts of life, he too began to sense some of the possibilities of the industrial revolution. Here he joined hands with Hamilton.

We conclude that Jefferson was not only a philosopher of democracy; that he was not only a party leader; that he was not only a great statesman, but that he was also, in the modern sense of the term, a planner of national resources, both physical and human. The Jeffersonian planning equipment included a knowledge of trends and tendencies, a keen insight into surrounding conditions, ability to use the latest developments of scientific techniques with imagination, courage, and practical judgment, and, above all, broad social vision giving him a sense of direction toward the realization of the higher and finer values of life.

Deliberately and systematically, Jefferson planned to put a floor under equality and liberty: first, through a free public land system, matching and complementing Hamilton's commercial system; second, through a broadly conceived transportation system; and, finally, through an American democratic educational system, of which he laid the foundations. Jefferson planned not only liberty from evils but also liberty for something—for the pursuit of happiness of all men.

World Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, some publicity has been given recently to the fact that the Georgia Legislature rescinded a resolution passed some time ago in support of the organization of a limited world federal government.

In the last session of the Maine Legislature held in the winter of 1949 a similar resolution had been adopted by the Maine Legislature. In a special session of the Maine Legislature held last week an attempt was made to rescind the action taken at the general session. This attempt was defeated in the State House of Representatives by a vote of 58 to 57.

For the information of the Members, I append the text of an editorial from the Portland Evening Express of February 9, 1950.

MAINE'S DECISION STANDS

The House of Representatives of the Maine Legislature has done well in its refusal to make the lawmaking body of this State look ridiculous by recalling the pledge of support given less than a year ago to the proposition that world peace might best be secured under a world federation of national governments.

In its regular session of 1949 the legislature had adopted a memorial urging the Congress of the United States to do everything in its power to seek a limited world federation of governments in the name of peace.

But the Maine Senate on Wednesday, by a roll-call vote of 18 to 10, and at the urging of a Knox County member who made the absurd charge that some sources behind the World Federalist movement "have been found to be * * * Communist in tone," approved a memorial to Congress which would have rescinded last year's memorial in support of the Federalist plan.

The House yesterday—albeit by a 57-to-57 tie vote which was broken by Speaker of the House Nathaniel M. Haskell—defeated the Senate proposal, which means that last year's legislative memorial favoring world federation will stand.

The State of Maine will not be made to appear, therefore, like a community incapable collectively of making up its mind and standing by its avowed principles from one year to the next. Instead, the memorial sent by the State of Maine to Congress in 1949 continues to represent Maine's made-up mind in 1950.

As for the Knox County senator's heated charge that "some sources behind the World Federalist movement have been found to be non-American, Communist in tone, and directly opposed to anything we call American," we have today the strong rebuttal from Chairman William E. Clark, of the United World Federalists of Maine, Inc., who reminds the senator that:

"Those who seek to pin the label 'Communist' upon every person or cause they oppose for any reason are unwittingly playing the Communist game." And Mr. Clark adds:

"I charge that those who shout 'Communist' at every new solution proposed for today's political, social, and economic problems are unintentionally disloyal to democracy.

"It is nothing less than stupidity to give the Soviet Union or its Communist agents here credit for every decent impulse which arises on the American scene."

Amen to that.

Educational Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereto append an article by Mr. Branch Spalding, headmaster of Christchurch School at Christchurch, Va., which I earnestly commend for the consideration of those who may be disturbed by the present trends in public education.

The article appeared in the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch under date of February 5, 1950.

DANGEROUS EDUCATIONAL TRENDS SETS

(By Branch Spalding)

Phony educational philosophies abroad in the land constitute the heaviest handicap laid upon the school of 1950. They have resulted in a tampering with the high-school curriculum which has misshapen it out of recognition as a pattern for preparing youth for either college or vocation or citizenship.

Boys and girls graduate from Averageville High with credit units in band, physical education (meaning not even good athletics), music appreciation, social studies (not usually meaning sound history or economics), language arts (not French or Latin or English seriously taught), general mathematics, and other gimcrack courses.

This might be all right if parents had the money to spend on such mildly beneficial indulgences in addition to what students really need. But these taxed parents are paying for something more substantial. Their sons and daughters are entitled to get it.

Moreover, the preponderant majority of these parents wish their offspring to go to college, and the offspring share the desire. This program of study does not prepare anybody for college. It simply cheapens the quality—but not the price—of a product still sold under an old and respected label, diploma.

VICIOUS CIRCLE

And herein enters the expanding effect of lowered standards backed by law:

State-supported colleges must admit the high-school students on the strength of such credit units—in many States as few as 15 of them. Inevitably the colleges, to accommodate the boys and girls from Averageville High, must lower their standards. The law requires that they accommodate them. Thus grows a vicious educational circle.

A most detrimental tenet of the current educational philosophies is that there is no

failure. A student must not be told that he failed; that might impair his morale. Surely he has gained something in the nine months spent in this course; pass him on up to the next grade.

Result: It bring human nature to take the line of least resistance, even capable students study and learn but little. Why should they when they will be promoted anyhow? Why work when reward comes without it in this convenient kindly world? Along with the lazy and the incapable, they move up from grade to grade, and finally to a false diploma.

It is obvious that this process spells a lack of sound learning. Worse still, for the Nation, it involves a plethora of dangerous false learning: namely, that good things may be had without hard work. "Life is that way, society will look out for me. In fact, the world owes me much; I owe it nothing."

WRONG PHILOSOPHY

If this scheme of schooling does not conduce to some such citizen logic, then a guiding philosophy does. Instead, have the Nation by the hand; America gets a break. For no procedure would seem better designed for development of a colossal welfare state on this broad north continent. It is like that if Joseph Stalin himself were permitted to draw the plan for that end, he might not change one line of this blueprint.

Be that a far-hauled jeremiad or not, it is false teaching and a moral wrong to youth to instill in the young mind the idea that there is no failure and that good ends are achieved otherwise than by hard work in high emprise.

It may be rightly argued that the high school is not simply to prepare youngsters for college; there are vocational and living purposes. But it may be rightly answered that in an attempted straddle Averageville High is not doing either. It permits the obviously unqualified college candidate to remain in school (complying with truancy laws) and offers him no good preparation for any useful vocation.

What with the great American white-collar fallacy it is insulting to tell a young man he should not go to college. But it ought not to be taboo to tell a teen-ager that, while he has failed in mathematics or science, that does not mean that he or she will fail in auto mechanics or bricklaying or cooking. They are vocations highly useful to society—and highly profitable and satisfying to those who do them well.

WHITE COLLARS—ALL

We have defaced the dignity of labor. Not enough of us want our children to become good carpenters, electricians, dietitians, machinists, and housekeepers.

We do not recognize that the usefulness of the occupation should combine with the temperament and talents of the individual in governing vocational selection. And many of us are pathetically prone to think that nature automatically invests the temperament and talent to be a doctor or lawyer in the sons of men engaged in those professions.

Nature is whimsical with her gifts. Man cannot afford to be so in administering education to implement them. He faces a categorical imperative to find them in the sons and daughters of artisans, or anywhere else, and adapt the education accordingly. A sound democratic society allied with individual happiness lays down this imperative. Averageville High has no department of vocational education to which the moneyless material must go.

The lamentable watering down of the curriculum is due in large measure to another line of crooked thinking by the supremely dominant educational philosophy, the vicious tenet that the purpose of education is to enable one to adapt himself to his environment. Hence it is that courses born in automobile driving, personality, salesmanship, and a form of civics which resembles too closely communism, spineless public welfare, and other side-line social quarterbacking.

MUST SHAPE ENVIRONMENT

Aren't these false prophets of pedagogy tending to blink the fact that social and spiritual evolution of man has had its impetus from leaders who devoted their talents to shaping their environment rather than to adapting themselves to it?

While Mr. and Mrs. American Taxpayer Parent have given priority to other business, the self-appointed philosophers have gone about their redesigning of the curriculum to the near-exclusion of geometry, history, foreign languages, English grammar and composition, and science worthy of the name.

The old bone and flesh of the structure can scarcely be found for the bibated overbarding frill and fancy dress. But life, for which this education must prepare, is not fancy dress.

The present situation is aptly stated in a recent comment of a sane authority on education: "It would seem that they are not running schools but welfare agencies."

And then the matter of financial support for education. It has been kicked around in the press until the public labors under a dangerous delusion: "All that the schools need is money." They need money, true; but all the gold of Croesus will do them little good without removal of these other evils only tenuously related to financial need.

SCHOOLS STINTED

This does not at all minimize the penuriousness of Mr. and Mrs. A. T. Parent. They have been downright miserly toward the most important function of a democratic society. In this they present serious contradictions. Never before did they have so much money, and never did they, in spending it, make the proverbial drunken tar so closely resemble a skinflint.

They do not hesitate to spend hundreds running into thousands for another car, a trip to Florida, a television set, an elaborate party, or other superficial accretions of mid-twentieth century civilization. But when it comes to investing a thousand in the sound education of a fine boy or girl—now there is another matter; there is cause to pause. For the most precious potential they and the Nation possess is purchased a cheap product at a cheap price. They will get what they pay for—or less.

The latest patent medicine afforded under specious ballyhoo to cure this ill is Federal subsidy of education. The spuriousness of it lies in the double-barreled fact that it will cost not less but more, and that it is an extremely hazardous thing for a democracy. It is all right for a collectivist state headed by a dictator.

A NEW DANGER

If Americans have not already learned the bitter lesson of extravagance in bureaucratic centralization of citizens' functions in Washington, when will they learn? It is evident they have not learned that lesson and have not otherwise thought through this vital decision now before the public mind, for all the handwriting on the public-opinion walls proclaims the early enactment of legislation for Federal subsidy of education, in all its aspects.

It is more than an accidental coincidence that one of the first official acts of a Mussolini or a Hitler or a Stalin upon gaining control of a nation is federal subsidy and supervision of all education—control of the mind.

Mr. and Mrs. Average Taxpayer Parent are a kindly, well-meaning, even sentimental, couple. At moments, they appear stupid. Just now they are enjoying no end of pleasure in this splendid American civilization that has come to them through clear convictions, accompanied by stalwart courage and vigilance in their ancestors. They are drawing off a rich cream in national wealth and spending it on themselves, buying luxuries hitherto undreamed of.

They are not spending it in keeping with the realistic vision and patriotism of their forebears. They are not investing it in the future of this America, their own potentially fine children. They are defaulting to the teacher for development of that human national resource and denying her the essential means for its development while they buy other things. They are getting what they want.

They think they are paying for it, but democracy is apt to pay in the end. The darkest omen for a self-reliant democracy is its mature citizens wanting the wrong thing.

Will Mr. and Mrs. Average Taxpayer Parent's epitaph read: "They sold their finest birthright for a mess?" Will that automatically be the epitaph of American democracy?

Unfinished Task in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Saturday, February 11, 1950:

UNFINISHED TASK IN POLAND

The story of Thaddeus Kosciusko, who was born at Siechnowicse, Poland, on February 12, 1746, has been told many times, so it need not be repeated here today as America prepares to salute on Sunday the memory of the Polish soldier who fought for United States liberty and died in exile in Switzerland because his own beloved country was enslaved then as now.

The conditions that prevailed in Kosciusko's last days were not unlike those prevailing today. It was in 1815 that Russia, Austria, and Prussia signed an agreement to partition Poland again. The Russians had promised an autonomous kingdom of Poland with the czar as king, but this was to be only a small part of the true Poland, just as today so much of Poland is incorporated into Soviet Russia and what remains is a puppet state.

Kosciusko, true patriot, refused all offers of office and honors in the newly partitioned Poland. He would not lend sanction to the act of partition by his presence. Instead, like so many Poles of this generation, he chose to remain in exile, first in France and later in Switzerland where he died on the evening of October 15, 1817, far from home but surrounded by a few devoted friends who shared his love for Poland and liberty.

The birthday anniversary of Kosciusko tomorrow not only recalls the life of one who has been called the greatest of Poles but it focuses attention again on the present plight of his country. Save for a brief spell of freedom between the First and Second World Wars, Poland has not achieved the objective for which Kosciusko and others struggled and sacrificed so much.

In the hearts of the people of Poland, the name and spirit of Thaddeus Kosciusko live on. We may be certain no tribute will be paid to him tomorrow by the Soviet stooges in Warsaw, but that does not mean the day will go unobserved in Poland or elsewhere in the world where men and women with Polish blood in their veins are gathered. They will take courage from his inspiring example and they will rededicate their lives to the unfinished task before them.

Quakers Warn Against Intervention in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a letter appearing in today's New York Daily Compass written to the President by Mr. Clarence E. Pickett, executive secretary, American Friends Service Committee:

QUAKERS WARN AGAINST INTERVENTION IN CHINA

DEAR EDITOR: The following letter has just been mailed to the President, expressing the views of the American Friends Service Committee on our policy toward China:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The executive board of the American Friends Service Committee has asked me to express to you its gratification at your statement of January 5 on China. It seems to us most appropriate for you to have stressed the moral basis for our country's policy, viz: international respect for the territorial integrity of China, and, no desire to obtain special rights or privileges.

For over 8 years, Friends have been engaged in relief work in China. Some 400 people have taken part in our projects there and have seen intimately the sufferings of that country under conditions of peace and war. Of these 400, approximately a hundred have lived, traveled, and worked in both Nationalist and Communist territory. They have constantly impressed on us at home their concern that the United States should not follow "a course which will lead to involvement in the civil conflict in China," to quote your recent statement. The primary consideration is moral, but in addition, we would like to present some of the practical facts that have led our workers to the conclusion that further American intervention is unjustified.

First of all, we wish to point out that the Communist success in China is a phase of a deep-seated revolution that grows out of the ancient sufferings of the Chinese people. In 1911, the revolution was proclaimed by Dr. Sun Yat Sen, the leader of the Kuomintang. For many years, the Kuomintang was the party of the revolution. Now the Communist Party has assumed leadership of the revolution and it is largely because of this leadership that they are now in power. They are riding on a tide which has been swelling for many decades. They have received a very large measure of popular support among the peasants and the educated classes of China. Our workers have observed a marked enthusiasm for the new regime among the people, not just among the members of the Communist Party, who number only about 3,000,000. The younger generation of educated Chinese has thrown itself into governmental activities with a self-denying and enthusiastic spirit that is in striking contrast to the despair and cynicism with which those same students regarded the Kuomintang government. This attitude toward the Communist government, whether justified or not, is important to reckon with.

Secondly, our protracted observations in Communist territory during the past 3 years have led us to the conclusion that the success of the Chinese Communist Party cannot be attributed to the Russians. We have never had any workers in Manchuria and, therefore, cannot speak for that part of China. But none of our returned workers with experience in many parts of Communist-held China below the Great Wall has ever seen any Russian military equipment or Russian military advisers. Our observations confirm the view generally held by others who have been in China during recent years that the Communists have won because the Nationalist Government has lost popular support.

Thirdly, we have been struck with the sensitivity of the Chinese people to foreign intervention. The Chinese people as a whole are opposed to military aid from the outside. Not only is the Chinese Communist movement an outgrowth of the economic revolution, it is also a manifestation of the growing nationalism of China. The people of China are determined not to be puppets of any foreign government, and the Communists have adopted an aggressively nationalist attitude in order to capitalize on this determination. The large-scale American military intervention during 1947 and 1948 has played into the Communists' hands in a most dramatic and effective way, of which we could cite many instances. Countless towns and village in north China have been indiscriminately bombed by American-made planes which this country furnished the Nationalists. Some of our own workers in China have had to take shelter in trenches from these bombing attacks. This has helped them appreciate the feelings of the peasants with whom they shared the trenches. Quantities of American arms have been captured by the Communists when Nationalist armies have surrendered. The ordinary people all over China have been quick to notice these evidences of American intervention, and the Communists have not let them forget it.

AID TO NATIONALISTS DEPLORED

The foregoing facts and others appear to us to refute the assumptions on which the proponents of further aid to the Nationalists rely. These assumptions are:

(a) That the Communist victories in China represent the conquest of China by Russia, which has imposed a puppet regime upon the unwilling Chinese people; and

(b) That the United States can by force thwart this Russian penetration.

On the contrary, our observations indicate:

(a) That the Communist movement in China has been committed primarily to carrying out a revolution within China. It has close ideological ties with Moscow, but has framed its program with reference to the conditions and traditions of China;

(b) That American intervention has impelled the new government in an anti-American and pro-Russian direction. The Chinese people are hostile to foreign intervention from any source, and at present that hostility is directed primarily against the United States.

(c) That no amount of future intervention short of war can turn the tide.

We believe that further intervention will result in the hardening of Chinese resentment against America, perhaps beyond redemption, and the strengthening of Sino-Russian ties. In the future we should give ample evidence of our sympathy for the welfare and wishes of the Asian people. We believe that by treating Communist China as an enemy and by refusing to recognize her, we are not isolating China, we are isolating ourselves and throwing away the chance of influencing the course of events in the Orient.

It is part of wisdom to know the right limits of power and the right methods of influence. There is a time for waiting and a time for action. The United States must now wait in China, whether we like the turn of events or not. The time will come when the United States can once again take positive action of a constructive sort. Through voluntary religious and welfare groups, through international organizations, including UN, through encouragement of private capital and through technical assistance and other aid as set forth in your point IV, our country can someday restore the good will we once enjoyed in China, which is the only reliable basis for peace between nations.

On behalf of the executive board of the American Friends Service Committee,

CLARENCE E. PICKETT,
Executive Secretary, American Friends Service Committee, 20 South Twelfth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Should the Hoover Commission's Fishery Recommendations Be Adopted?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, public interest in and demand for the reforms suggested by the so-called Hoover Commission prompt me to insert in the RECORD a pertinent discussion which took place at the National Canners Association convention last month.

I had the honor of presiding at this discussion, and I listened to both sides of the general question: Should the Hoover Commission fishery recommendations be adopted? The opinions were so interesting and enlightening to me that it impresses me they might well have a similar effect on my colleagues. I, therefore, insert them under leave granted:

SHOULD THE HOOVER COMMISSION'S FISHERY RECOMMENDATIONS BE ADOPTED?

STATEMENT BY DONALD P. LOKER, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC RELATIONS AND LABOR RELATIONS, FRENCH SARDINE CO., AND CHAIRMAN, FISHERY PRODUCTS COMMITTEE, NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION

One of the most important and constructive pieces of legislation ever approved is Public Law 162, Eightieth Congress. This law led to the creation of a body entitled "Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government," or as it is more familiarly known—the Hoover Commission.

For once, partisan politics seemingly had no part in a proposal to promote economy and efficiency in Government, since a far-seeing Democratic President appointed a Republican ex-President to head the Commission, which itself was made up of 12 members, consisting of 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans.

The commercial-fishing industry took a keen and sincere interest in this legislation and in the Commission set up to carry out its purpose. Our industry just as any other, or indeed, as any good citizen, is interested in efficient and economic government, and like all industries—and in both management and labor—it contributes many millions of dollars each year in taxes to pay the cost of running our Government.

But the commercial industry had an exceptional interest in the activities of the Hoover Commission, as it was required to make recommendations as to the proper placement of fisheries in the Federal Government.

For more than 75 years there has been in existence in one form or another some agency of the Federal Government directly concerned with fishery matters. The genesis of such an agency was the act of February 9, 1871. By statutory authority more and more fishery functions have been delegated over the years, so that the present agency now exercises a very considerable degree of influence over the fisheries of the Nation, whether they be sport or commercial. Today that organization is known as the Fish and Wildlife Service and is incorporated among the units in the Department of the Interior.

Nevertheless, as is true to some extent with most Government agencies, the Service has been built up in a most haphazard manner. It is quite possible that less basic planning has gone into the evolution of the Service as now constituted than in the development of any other Government group.

Let us go back a little into recent history and see what this Fish and Wildlife Service is and how it was put together.

The Bureau of Fisheries and the Bureau of Biological Survey were transferred to the Department of the Interior July 1, 1939. In the message transmitting this reorganization plan to Congress, the President stated:

"The plan provides for the transfer to the Department of the Interior of the Bureau of Fisheries from the Department of Commerce, and the Bureau of Biological Survey from the Department of Agriculture. These two Bureaus have to do with conservation and utilization of the wildlife resources of the country, terrestrial and aquatic. Therefore, they should be grouped under the same departmental administration, and in that Department which, more than any other, is directly responsible for the administration and conservation of the public domain."

It should be noted that the President's only reason for transferring these two agencies to the Department of the Interior was that each was connected with the conservation and utilization of the wildlife resources of the country, but the President failed to mention or apparently to take under study that in the Bureau of Fisheries there were many functions involved relating to the importance of fish as a commercial food product.

Congress gave little consideration to the desirability of this transfer. And there were no hearings, no printed committee reports, and very little discussion on the floor of Congress. In fact, as Congressman Dirksen pointed out in the House, the reorganization plan was approved by the Senate in approximately 6 minutes. And for your information this transfer of the Bureau of Fisheries and the Bureau of Biological Survey was not even mentioned on the floor of the Senate.

In 1942 the President went one step further and consolidated the Bureau of Fisheries and the Bureau of Biological Survey into one agency—the Fish and Wildlife Service, in the Department of the Interior. In his message transmitting to Congress the reorganization plan which accomplished this change, the President stated:

"Reorganization Plan II transferred the Bureau of Fisheries of the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Biological Survey of the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior and thus concentrated in one Department the two Bureaus responsible for the conservation and utilization of the wildlife resources of the Nation. On the basis of experience gained since this transfer, I find it necessary and desirable to consolidate these units into a single bureau to be known as the Fish and Wildlife Service.

"The Bureau of Biological Survey administers Federal laws relating to birds, land mammals, and amphibians, whereas the Bureau of Fisheries deals with fishes, marine mammals, and other aquatic animals. The natural areas of operation of these two Bureaus frequently coincide, and their activities are interrelated and similar in character. Consolidation will eliminate duplication of work, facilitate coordination of progress, and improve service to the public."

Here again, the sole reason for the consolidation seems to be that both agencies had some relation to conservation. Again the President failed to mention those additional activities in the Bureau of Fisheries which relate to the use of fish as a food.

Congress again appeared disinclined to consider the merits of this reorganization plan and the consolidation of these two Bureaus. There were no committee hearings, no printed committee reports, and no discussions on the floor of Congress. This reorganization plan also went into effect and opponents of such a consolidation were given no opportunity to be heard.

Perhaps you can understand now why the commercial fishing industry was so intensely interested in the creation of the Hoover Commission and in the task force which was set up to study natural resources.

I see no reason why I should take the time at this point to go into the report of this task committee, since that report, together with supplementary material, may be readily obtained by anyone. For the benefit of those who may not have read it, however, it is known as Task Force Report on Natural Resources (appendix L), prepared for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

This task-force report is briefly summarized as follows:

1. That the Federal functions dealing with fishery resources be consolidated in a Fisheries Service.

2. That the other responsibilities of the Fish and Wildlife Service be placed under a Wildlife Service.

3. That both the Fisheries Service and the Wildlife Service be placed in a Department of Natural Resources.

4. That the basic data and research activities of the Fisheries Service and the Wildlife Service be made adequate to assure the development of sound policies and effective administration.

5. That the Federal Government give adequate attention to the need for sound development of fishery and wildlife resources and the needs of an expanding fisheries industry.

6. That adequate provision be made for the coordination of the work of the two Services with each other and with other agencies of the Department of Natural Resources and other departments.

The Hoover Commission then submitted to the Congress reports containing its recommendations as to proposals to reorganize the Departments of Commerce and Interior.

These reports, approved in toto by eight Commissioners, contained the recommendation that all commercial fishery activities of the Department of the Interior be transferred to a Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in the Department of Commerce. Four of the twelve dissented from this recommendation but three of the same four supported in part the recommendations of the Natural Resources task force. The fourth dissenter simply favored retention of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior.

It is significant that all concerned with this study—all completely disinterested persons, mind you—agreed that reorganization would promote efficiency in Government handling of fishery matters. All here today do not necessarily agree with that premise but I am sure all of us are interested in the increased efficiency and effectiveness of a fisheries department. We may have different ideas as to what is needed. Some, for example, may feel that all that is necessary to improve efficiency is increased appropriations; some may feel decreases in some appropriations would accomplish the same result, while others present may—and I might add, certainly do—feel that other steps are necessary to achieve the most efficient management of fishery matters.

What then does the commercial fishing industry think of the foregoing recommendations?

The commercial fishing industry agrees with all of the recommendations in part but not in whole.

It definitely favors the separation of fisheries from wildlife, whether fisheries be transferred to Commerce or whether a new Department of Natural Resources be created.

May I explain:

President Roosevelt's statement of the advantages to be gained by the consolidation are very compelling and if experience since 1940 had shown that advantages have resulted in respect to fisheries, our case would be very weak indeed. In actual practice, however, these advantages simply do not appear. The natural areas of operation seldom coincide. Consolidation cannot reduce duplication of work because there is very little duplication. It does not facilitate coordination of programs which by nature are separate. A wildlife biologist cannot be substituted for a fishery biologist and this has not been attempted. The administrative details of fishery programs are so different than those of wildlife programs that they cannot be handled except by men who have different backgrounds, training, and experience.

These are but a few examples of areas where because of the comparatively close relationship, it was expected the claimed benefits would materialize, but experience has proven it necessary to have fisheries work done by people with fisheries training and wildlife work handled by people with wildlife training. The lack of promised benefits from the consolidation has not been our only worry. One of our primary concerns has been that consolidation of fisheries activities with wildlife activities has resulted not in coordination but in subordination.

A logical reason for this is the chain of command in the Fish and Wildlife Service. Not only is the Director and one of the two Assistant Directors from the Wildlife branch, but so are all of the regional directors. Not only is the director of the Alaska region a Wildlife man, but so are the directors of the New England region and the Pacific coast region. There we have men with no experience or training in fisheries, directing Federal fishery policy in regions now producing 4,000,000,000 pounds of essential food annually and probably where, with efficient management, this harvest could be vastly increased.

The most important fishery functions of the Fish and Wildlife Service is the conservation of the Alaska salmon fisheries under the White Act of 1924, by which the Service is given authority to adopt and enforce regulations for the protection of Alaska salmon. Although the Service, by virtue of this authority, has undertaken an extensive program of research and regulation, the fact remains that production from the resource has been steadily going down. A few pack figures will suffice to illustrate this point:

	Cases
1935	6,155,826
1936	6,454,948
1940	5,026,378
1942	5,089,509
1945	4,338,692
1946	3,971,109
1947	4,302,466
1948	4,010,612

Why is this condition present?

Subordination of interest in fishery matters and lack of sympathetic understanding of this resource has resulted in inefficiency, misdirected research, improper and insufficient regulations, and inadequate enforcement.

Of course, it may be claimed that wildlife enforcement officers have been assigned to enforcing the Alaska fishery regulations on occasions, but those occasions have been few and far between; the number of men so assigned is extremely small and there is some question as to whether the assignment of men inexperienced in problems of these fisheries has contributed at all to the effective enforcement of the fishery regulations. As a matter of fact, there is reason to believe that enforcement of the Alaska fishery regulations has suffered by reason of diversion of funds, and of planes and patrol vessels which could have been operated with those funds, to enforcement of Alaska game regulations. And these are some of the reasons why experienced and capable fisheries experts have resigned from the Service in great numbers in recent years, or have been transferred to other assignments, and have thereby crippled the program.

The situation in Alaska had become so dangerous that the Alaska salmon industry itself in 1947, in cooperation with the University of Washington, established the Fisheries Research Institute, financed entirely by the salmon industry, but under the complete control of the university, to find the answers to the problems that the Fish and Wildlife Service had been looking for, but which, as has been indicated above, it failed to find.

We have been told by representatives of the Fish and Wildlife Service that one of the reasons fisheries have been better off since the transfer of the old Bureau of Fisheries from the Department of Commerce, and the consolidation of the fisheries with wildlife in the Department of Interior, is that the Fish and Wildlife Service has been able to obtain appropriations of far greater size for fishery work than was obtained by the old Bureau of Fisheries.

Let us examine that for a moment.

I wonder whether we are getting as much return per dollar spent as we obtained while the Bureau of Fisheries was in the Department of Commerce. The commercial fishing industry feels that we are not, for while we may be getting more dollars, inflation has lowered the dollar value to such a degree that increased appropriations are woefully offset.

The correct scale to use, from the standpoint of conservation, business, or just plain common sense, is what has been accomplished? Very frankly, not enough, and the industry feels that proper attention has not been accorded our fishery problems, and as a result the industry is profoundly disturbed.

And again, let me emphasize at this point—it is not necessarily the number of dollars appropriated—maybe we have enough now. What counts is how efficiently those dollars are used toward the solution of our grave and pressing problems.

The only other reason I have ever heard advanced by those who oppose the separation of fisheries from wildlife is that such a splitting up would be a step backward. But they cannot tell us why.

I spoke a moment ago about subordination of fisheries to wildlife. If this were the only instance wherein handling of fisheries were subordinated, it would be bad enough, but the facts are that fisheries are not only subordinated to wildlife by the authorities of the Department of the Interior, but fisheries are subordinated to every other single activity in that Department where there is even the slightest contact between the respective interests.

I merely mention this now to remind you that the reason for this subordination is the fact that fisheries apparently are considered only a minor part of a not-too-important unit within the Department of the Interior.

Now may I call your attention to an important point that is frequently overlooked by our friends in the wildlife field as well as by a good many of our friends connected with recreational fishing interests. This is that the fisheries functions of the Federal Government and the interests of the commercial fishing industry are concerned almost entirely with high-seas fishery resources, with the notable exception of the Great Lakes fresh-water fisheries. Only to a minor degree, moreover, do the inland sport fisheries of the Nation, the fisheries of our streams and lakes, come within the scope of the Federal Government. The Federal Government's activity in this field is limited to the operation of some hatcheries and to some minor biological studies, but nowhere does it have the authority to regulate the inland fisheries. In fact, except in the Territory of Alaska, and the sponge fishery of Florida, the Federal Government has no authority to initiate regulations for any fishery. Recreational fishing on the high seas by comparison with commercial fishing on the high seas is extremely minor. It must be recognized, however, that many of the fishes in the commercial fisheries are important to the recreational fishermen and it is for this reason that the commercial fishing industry, while attempting in no way to speak for the sport fishermen of the country, feels that all fishery functions of the Federal Government should be together and that any attempt to separate them might prove unwise. Not only could it lead to conflicts between the two groups when there is no real conflict of major interest, but in all probability it could result in a loss of efficiency and too much duplication of effort. The area wherein the interests of both groups coincide far exceeds the area wherein their interests differ.

The commercial fishing industry, as well as the sportsmen, is intensely concerned with the conservation of resources and, we believe, to an even greater degree, for fish are the necessary raw material of our business.

Our interest in conservation is neither theoretical nor recreational—it is absolutely essential—for if the fishery resources decrease, our business becomes uneconomic and we go broke. We conserve properly or we die.

To show what I mean, let me list a few illustrations of the conservation activities in which the commercial fishing industry is directly involved:

1. The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission: This is the organization of all the States on the Atlantic seaboard which was set up under authority of Congress and 11 State legislatures to correlate and extend the fisheries conservation work of the Atlantic States. In the 7 years of its activity it has accomplished a great deal toward this end.

Commercial industry men pushed this compact in the Congress and the State legislatures and industry men from each of the States serve as commissioners, and the chairman of the commission is the owner of a thriving commercial fish business.

2. The Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission: This, like the one above, was adopted and put into action through pressure by the commercial fishery people who serve actively on its advisory board, and strongly support conservation research and proposals for proper fishery management.

3. Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission: This is almost identical with the Atlantic States Commission. Industry men pushed for its adoption, act as commissioners, and are interested in pushing its program for conservation research.

4. International Fisheries Commission: The halibut fishery is the outstanding example of fishery conservation management in the world. The halibut industry forced the adoption of the treaty between the United States and Canada that set up the Commission, has worked with the Commission at every step of its way for 25 years, and is continuing to do so today. This is the strongest and most strictly regulated commercial fishery in the world. The industry not only supports the regulations of its activities but is pressing both Governments today to give the Halibut Commission additional regulatory powers.

5. There are four other similar international treaties to set up commissions which will have the responsibility for conservation in fisheries which produce nearly a billion pounds of fish per year for American fishermen. These are (1) The International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, (2) the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, (3) the International Commission for the Scientific Investigation of Tuna, and (4) the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

In each case the commercial fishing industry has pressed for the adoption of these treaties and in the Salmon Commission has already participated for several years in planning and carrying out intensive regulations governing the catching of salmon covered by the Commission's authority.

6. California Sardine Advisory Commission: Let me tell you about something of which we Californians are a little proud. A few years ago our California sardine began to decline in productiveness. Immediately the sardine industry forced through the California Legislature a measure which doubled our tonnage tax and set aside new funds for conservation research. I do not know of another United States industry that has voluntarily increased its tax bill for the specific purpose of having investigations made which would restrict its activities, and a comment as to this fact appears in the State of California Legislature.

7. Fisheries Research Institute: The Alaska salmon industry, alarmed by the decrease in the source of their raw material, as I have already reported, voted to tax themselves voluntarily so much per case of salmon packed in order to provide a fund for biological research to find out what was the matter with the present conservation regulations and where they could be improved to maintain normal abundance, which so obviously was imperative, if the Alaska salmon industry was not to perish.

This voluntary program of taxation has been going on for 3 years and has raised more money for biological research than the Federal Government itself puts into the Alaska fisheries. It comes directly out of the salmon canners' pockets and it is given willingly. This program has, in fact, been broadly increased in each of the 3 years since its inception.

We are trying to be foresighted, for we realize the necessity of these treaties, these investigations, these regulations, before the resource is depleted and not afterward.

I have dwelt in some detail on what the industry is doing to get the information necessary for adequate conservation regulation. Where conservation is needed we not only help to get it, we demand it, and we are proud of the record of the commercial fishing industry in the conservation of this great resource.

But while we have intense interest in fish conservation, this is only half of the worries we have with raw material. We have a problem of supply and we must explore continually for new sources to feed the Nation and to meet the growing demand for our product.

Also, as a food industry we are in the fortunate position of dealing with one of the greatest potential sources of protein food in the world.

Centuries of land abuse in every civilized country have lessened the ability of that land to produce essential protein foods, but the vast resources of our seas have scarcely been touched.

Rich new areas are known to be available close to the United States in both the Atlantic and the Pacific and are believed to be in the Gulf of Mexico.

The reason why these and other fishery resources all over the world are not being utilized is that at the present time they cannot be brought to market at a price the consumer can pay. We need to know more about the seasonal abundance and occurrence of these resources so that our fishermen can be adequately informed. Too, there are a thousand and one other problems that we have in getting the costs of harvesting, processing, and marketing down to the point where we can afford to get the food out of the sea onto the consumers' table where it does good.

This is where our problems depart widely from those of the inland fisherman and hunter. The game and fish resources of the land and inland waters are known and are certainly less than we would like. Production from those resources can only be maintained and increased by strong conservation regulation measures. Here there is no room for expansion of any consequence, and all thinking must be directed toward conservation.

But for our major ocean fisheries the emphasis must also be on better and cheaper means of harvesting.

I want to drive home to you as hard as I can that waste from underutilization is just as dangerous as waste from overutilization, and more food is being wasted in the sea each year from underharvesting than is being taken from the sea. This is our problem, too.

Besides conservation, both sport and commercial groups have another point in common which should weld us together. The noncommercial fishing groups emphasize the recreational feature of the Nation's fisheries, but they would be the last to claim that there is no commercial importance attached to recreational fishing. Indeed, they hasten to point out the tremendous value to the Nation's economy of the sale of tackle, boats, bait, and also the vast revenue derived by the States from the sale of fishing licenses. It would seem, therefore, that the recreational fishing interests would, of necessity, derive definite benefits from being included within a department whose primary interest is the welfare of the business economy of this country. And to us it seems quite obvious that this reasoning points to the Department of Commerce.

The preceding discussion has clearly expressed the convictions of the fishing industry, and we are sure that the Department of Commerce would support those convictions.

Surely no department would wish the destruction of this natural resource of our country, nor would the fishing industry allow it. Therefore, we concur with the Hoover Commission's recommendation that the Bureau of Fisheries be established in the Department of Commerce, while a Bureau of Wildlife or a Wildlife Service remain in the Department of the Interior.

Such a move would insure that fisheries would be managed by men whose primary interest would be fisheries; whose training would be in fisheries, and whose outlook would be a practical businesslike outlook.

Additional advantage would result from the removal of fisheries to a department where their interests would not be subordinated—again note the use of this word subordinate—to the interests of other groups, and policies of other bureaus concerned with empire-building and paternalistic schemes. In plain, blunt language, I am referring to the domination of the Department of Interior by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the various power administrations. The record of the treatment accorded fisheries when any seeming conflict of interest arose between it and these other groups is shameful indeed. Ask any salmon packer, commercial salmon fisherman, or any man who fishes salmon for sport on the west coast, about the proposals to destroy this valuable salmon resource by the unwise construction of dams. Their side of the story reveals facts of interest and importance not only to them but to every citizen in our country. The benefits we were told would result from the reorganization which threw the Bureau of Fisheries and the Biological Survey together simply did not materialize.

The Hoover Commission recommended splitting fish from wildlife and putting the former in the Department of Commerce. The task force on natural resources recommended splitting fish from wildlife, but putting both resulting services into a new Department of Natural Resources.

We in the commercial fisheries think the transfer of fisheries to the Department of Commerce, where it functioned so well for so many years during the growth of our fisheries would be the soundest move.

We are, however, not at all adamant on this point and if it is the consensus of the majority that the task force recommendations be followed, we will not complain.

Where we are adamant is that the basic recommendation of the Hoover Commission be followed; that is, to split fish from wildlife so that we can once again have efficient management for both of these valuable natural resources.

We must have a fisheries service in the Federal Government which is administered by men who know fisheries, who have been trained in fisheries administration and fisheries research, and who by experience know how to deal with a fishery problem when it is put before them.

We must have a fisheries service that has a sympathetic interest in fisheries, staffed by men who have the imagination and vision required to plan fisheries programs of their own and coordinate those programs with the programs of the sovereign States, the commercial industry, the sportsmen's associations, and the trade associations.

These men must review the basic objectives of Federal policy concerning fisheries and organize a dynamic program for the maximum utilization and sound conservation of this valuable resource.

This revitalized service must be capable of providing expert guidance and efficient aid to the fisheries agencies of the 48 States and the Territories in dealing with the problems of sport fish in inland and coastal waters. It must be able to lead the industry and the State agencies in high seas biological and oceanographical research; it must establish vastly improved programs for technological problems of gear utilization and development, marketing of species not now utilized, consumer education, and we must have additional help in surveys of potential foreign markets; collection of statistical data; and the analysis of marketing trends and developments in the United States market, and in the markets of the world.

In short, gentlemen, we must have a fisheries service that will know fish, think fish, and dream fish. A service which will represent our industry at high level in the Federal Government and which we can proudly support. A service, finally, which will lead us to the full utilization and proper conservation of the fisheries resources of the sea.

STATEMENT BY C. R. GUTERMUTH, VICE PRESIDENT, WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

It is a distinct pleasure to attend this large gathering of food processors and to participate in this panel discussion on natural resources. Heretofore, my contacts with your industry, other than that of a consumer, have been limited almost entirely to fighting with some of your contemporaries about stream-pollution abatement.

Much has been said and done in recent years to encourage better land use throughout the Nation, but it took a critical water shortage in one of the largest population centers in the world to focus public attention on the importance of water and upon the seriousness of stream pollution. New Yorkers ultimately may be able to use heavily chlorinated water from the upper Hudson for drinking purposes, but they may have to use toothpicks after each drink for a while until they get those upstream industrial and municipal wastes out of that badly polluted river which flows past their door. Today, on Times Square, you can hear, "Water, water, everywhere, but not a drop to drink."

Those so-called sentimentalists, the conservationists of the country, have been pleading for consideration for a third of a century or more, and when it gets so bad that prosperous Wall Street brokers can't shave on Fridays, then things begin to happen. President Truman appointed a temporary Water Resources Policy Commission but it is questionable if that recently created body will make any new or different recommendations.

All of us must be concerned with the wise use of natural resources. There can be no other choice since health, wealth, and security stem from nature's bountiful gifts which form the basis of all commerce and industry. Agricultural production may be high now with hybrid corn, more potent fertilizers, and everything, but how long can science continue to compensate for those deficiencies resulting from improper use?

Freedom, continuing prosperity, and everlasting enjoyment of the high standards of the American way of life depend upon the sound management of our shrinking resources, which for generations have been regarded as inexhaustible.

The time has come in this modern age when critical decisions must be made. We must adopt a well-defined and efficient pattern of land and water use on this continent to avert a crisis. There may be objectionable features to the Hoover report, but they recognized the problems and called attention to the imperative need for action.

The Hoover Commission, after a long study of Federal Government activities, made the following recommendations that would have a pronounced effect on the administration and utilization of natural resources. The Commission would retain the Department of the Interior but would make that agency more of a water-development and mineral-management service. To accomplish that objective the Commission suggests a construction agency in Interior created largely by combining the present activities of the Bureau of Reclamation and Army Corps of Engineers, together with the construction functions now assigned to other agencies.

Briefly, the recommendations are as follows, it being understood that the present bureaus in Interior would remain there unless otherwise indicated.

1. The Department of the Interior should be given clear major responsibility for governmental development of the Nation's water and mineral resources. Since those activities require large public works, other major public works also should be managed by this Department.

2. To these ends, the Interior Department should take over the flood-control and rivers and harbors works of the Army engineers, plus public building construction and community services from the Federal Works Agency. It also should manage certain other major construction on assignment from other governmental agencies.

3. The following agencies should be shifted from Interior to other departments: (a) Bureau of Indian Affairs to a new department; (b) Bureau of Land Management (except minerals) to the Department of Agriculture; (c) Division of Commercial Fisheries to the Department of Commerce.

4. A Board of Impartial Analysis for Engineering and Architectural Projects should be created in the President's office, consisting of five members of outstanding abilities appointed by the President. It would review and report on the economic, social, and technical worth of all projects proposed by the Interior Department. It also would review authorized projects periodically and advise as to their progress or discontinuance.

Although the Hoover Commission tactfully refrains from mentioning it, such a board, with sufficient prestige, might materially diminish congressional logrolling and pork-barrel grabs.

The Hoover Commission, in its final recommendations affecting conservation agencies, did not follow the reports of any of the task forces which made extensive proposals regarding renewable natural resources. The report by one committee would have scattered the conservation agencies through the Government and would have put the Fish and Wildlife Service in a Public Works Department. The Agricultural Committee recommended a drastic reorganization of the Department of Agriculture and included a transfer to Agriculture of all major public-land administration activities and functions. The task force on natural resources developed an even bolder and more far-reaching program. It would abolish the Interior Department and create in its place a Department of Natural Resources, consisting of a consolidated water-development service to administer the present functions of the Bureau of Reclamation the river-development functions of the Corps of Engineers and numerous related activities of other governmental agencies and departments. It recommended the division of the Fish and Wildlife Service into two units, a Fisheries Service and a Wildlife Service.

The minority report, by Vice Chairman Acheson did not disagree too much with the task force on natural resources. The minority did disapprove of the separation of the Fish and Wildlife Service but recommended:

1. A Department of Natural Resources consisting of a Water Development Service (including the Bureau of Reclamation and river-development functions of the Corps of Engineers), a Forest and Range Service, Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, National Park Service, and Fish and Wildlife Service. The Department of the Interior would cease to exist.

2. The consolidated Forest and Range Service would be based on the present Forest Service and furthering its general policies, but including the functions of the Bureau of Land Management, now in Interior, and research functions of the Agriculture Department relating to forest insects and diseases.

3. Retention of the Tennessee Valley Authority in its present form but the establishment in the President's office of a board of review which would coordinate the programs of the Department of Natural Resources and those of the new regional authorities, if any, with each other and with such governmental agencies as Agriculture and the National Military Establishment.

Although the Commission steered a somewhat midway course among the committee recommendations, the final report included the feature of consolidating all water services in Interior, but retained the Department of the Interior as presently constituted, except that the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Division of Commercial Fisheries, one unit of the present Fish and Wildlife Service, would be shifted out of the Department.

Needless to say, there are differences of opinion over the recommendations which should receive support. Those conservation organizations interested primarily in forests tend to support the recommendation of the transfer of public lands administration to Agriculture which would leave Forestry in Agriculture where it has been for many years and where it has fought vigorously to stay. The agricultural task force based its recommendation on the premise that trees and grass are crops. It argued that research, management, and conservation of all crops might well be concentrated in one organization. It recommended a drastic regrouping of present functions and assignments which would cause most of the present agencies in the Agriculture Department to disappear or be divided and distributed between regulatory services, conservation services, extension services, research services, and others.

Regardless of the name by which the Department would be known, it seems that the recommendations in the minority report, with minor exceptions, offer the soundest conservation program. Ignoring the perennial contest between Interior and Agriculture, this report urges the placing of the water-development services and public land-management agencies under one head. This approaches closely the idea of a Department of Conservation that has been advocated by many conservationists for several years.

Perhaps the one point that will be raised most frequently will be to question the advisability of combining all water services into one huge unit and then placing fish and wildlife, national parks, and other relatively small but exceedingly important units in direct competition with the large division. Some will feel that this might intensify the disadvantage under which small bureaus operate in Interior now when their need for funds or their programs conflict with proposals of the Reclamation Service. Nevertheless, if a coordination and review board were established in the Office of the President simultaneously with such consolidation, perhaps there would be some check on the apparently endless ambitions of Government-paid engineers to make over the entire face of America in the shortest time possible.

The one inconsistency that stands out in a review of the Commission's recommendations is the one which would divide the Fish and Wildlife Service into two units, a Fisheries Service and a Wildlife Service. With this single exception, the Hoover Report recommends consolidation and closer coordination. Only in this instance does the Commission recommend the division of one small unit into smaller units. In my judgment, it would be a serious mistake to follow this suggestion. This would divide the present Fish and Wildlife Service, which is small now compared to many Government bureaus, into still smaller units which might make it even more difficult to deal successfully with large issues. Furthermore, I can find no logic in the recommendation.

In many States the same agency is handling the administration of both resources. The basic biological problems are largely the same, differing only in details rather than fundamentals. The only argument advanced in favor of this recommendation is the understandable one of tradition. The Biological Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries were operated separately for many years and some of the present members of the Fish and Wildlife Service can remember this condition. Perhaps they hope to restore it.

Prior to the consolidation, Dr. Gabrielson, who served as Director of the Service for many years, opposed the plan largely because he already had plenty of troubles in the administration of wildlife work. Gabrielson, who is president of the organization that I represent, now admits that most of his fears proved groundless and that from an administrative standpoint, there were good reasons for the merger. The obvious advantage to both groups has been that of presenting a united front. Both lines of work have secured increased appropriations. They have had additional money to more adequately perform their responsibilities, and more than they ever were able to secure alone.

Consolidation gives those interested in outdoor recreation, both hunting and fishing, a single unit to deal with on their problems. There is an obvious advantage from this standpoint. Therefore, I believe that the recommendation calling for the division of the Fish and Wildlife Service into two units is unsound.

The proposal to put the commercial fisheries division by itself in the Department of Commerce borders on the ridiculous. There can be no logical reason for it other than perhaps the desire of some commercial fishing interests to have a group which might be more sympathetic to their pleas.

A few States have separate units for commercial and sport fisheries, the latter usually combined with the fish and game agency. In the majority of such cases, however, the two fishery units have spent fully as much time trying to undermine each other as they have in conducting their work. The same thing could be expected if the commercial fishery groups succeeded in getting the commercial fishery activities in a unit by themselves. In fact, the basic reasoning behind the desire for separation is one of the strongest arguments for keeping the administration of the resource in one agency.

It obviously would be foolish to divide administration and research work for one group of fish into two separate parts, depending upon whether the man who catches it is going to eat it himself or sell it for someone else to eat. Such a procedure would be comparable to breaking down the administration of agricultural production by establishing one branch to handle regulation, research, and so forth for the parts of crops consumed by farmers and another unit for those to be processed by you folks or sold in the market place. The fishery resource is a unit and should be administered as a unit. Establishing two competing administrative groups would be a long step backward and an invitation to duplication of effort and wasted funds, which the Hoover Commission was intended to correct. Such an idea deserves no support from those who really are interested in the wise, efficient, and economical management of a valuable resource.

If the eventual reorganization follows the recommendations of the Hoover Commission report, those interested in fish and wildlife will be confronted with a rather difficult dilemma. Fish and wildlife are affected by both land and water management. If the Commission report is followed, water development will be in one agency and land management in another. In that case, the fish and wildlife unit, wherever it is placed, will be faced with the necessity of working across departmental lines to secure proper management.

The minority report and the one by the natural resources task force recommended a Department of Natural Resources which could administer both the public lands and water resources. It is the only plan which would place to a considerable extent in one department the administration of both the public lands and the water resources, and that would afford an opportunity for closer cooperation. Even then, these agencies still would have to cross departmental lines to work with the others dealing directly with farmers and private landowners on crop and pasture land.

In conclusion, it seems that the proposal for the establishment of a Department of Natural Resources comes nearer to meeting the requirements of a sound, Nation-wide conservation program. We certainly should not separate the Fish and Wildlife Service.

STATEMENT BY ROBERT O. BLIXT, CONSERVATION DIRECTOR, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

I believe I should take just a moment, preceding my remarks on the vital question before us, to clarify for you just what the

Izaak Walton League of America is. Although the name may connote otherwise, it is much more than a sport fisherman's club. The league is a broad-gage organization of laymen, operating through 550 chapters and its State divisions in the United States and Alaska. The organization has as its principal objective the fostering of sound management, in the long-range public interest, of all renewable natural resources. Broadly speaking, the league concerns itself with promoting better management of, and disseminating to its membership and the public factual information about soil, forests, waters, fisheries and wildlife.

A large number of our members are held together by a common interest in fishing and hunting. A great many more—perhaps 25 percent—have never gone afield with rod or gun and probably never will. We believe—we know—that good fishing and good hunting are but byproducts of the proper use and husbandry of our basic natural resources, land and water.

As the fisheries of the Nation, at the and the same time, are a vital recreational, economic and food resource to the people, they come well within our legitimate field of interest and have received a large share of our attention over the years.

The question before us today is broader and more basic than just that of whether the Hoover Commission recommendations on fisheries should be adopted. That something is wrong with the management of the Nation's fishery resource, both sport and commercial, we all agree. The basic questions are: "What can we do about it?" and "What should we do about it?" By "we" I mean a sizable segment of the American public made up of assorted interests in the whole resource, most of them legitimate interests and some of them certainly in conflict.

The Hoover Commission, in its final reports to Congress on the Department of the Interior and the Department of Commerce, has proposed one solution. The Commission recommended that the commercial fishery activities and functions of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Interior, be transferred to a Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in the Department of Commerce. Enabling legislation which would, among others, translate this recommendation into fact was introduced in the Senate on January 11, 1950, by Senator CAIN, of Washington. That's Senate bill 2632.

As far as we can gather from the assorted Commission reports, the chief reason given for this suggested transfer is:

"A Bureau of Fisheries can be one of the most important industrial and commercial agencies in the Government. It is related to industry, to commerce, and to the merchant marine at many points."

In our opinion the recommendation completely ignores three basic facts: (1) (And this is pointed out by a dissenting opinion of 4 of the 12 commissioners) that the chief problem is one of how to achieve better management, exploration, and development of the fisheries as a natural resource, rather than how better to exploit the fishery commercially as a dollar resource; (2) that the dollar value of the recreational fishery is exceedingly important and, in fact, closely approaches that of the commercial fishery; and (3) the commercial and sport fisheries are closely interdependent in the natural environment.

I'd like to discuss my reasons for these two statements in a little more detail, but in so doing want to make it perfectly clear that it is not my hope, nor my intention in any way to widen further the breach in points of view between commercial and sport fishing interests.

Such a breach apparently exists in some places in spite of honest and sincere efforts by many parties to close it. By the very nature of any natural resource, which is subject, first, to the laws of nature and, second, to man-made laws, nothing will be gained by either group in the long run taking a "stand off and let's fight it out" attitude. Much can be gained, however, if both parties will stand to one side together and try to look at the total fishery as a vital present and future natural resource. That is what I am trying to do here.

We concur that the commercial fishery resource needs considerably more and careful attention and development, but it needs these things along two lines, (1) in the field of marketing and manufacture, and (2) in its management as a renewable natural resource. We know all too little about what makes for sustained-yield populations of commercially valuable fish species. There is only one example of a fishery resource that has been successfully studied and conserved over most of its range—that is the Pacific halibut administered by the International Fisheries Commission since 1930. This is the only fishery agency that has to date come even close to being adequately supported with money and personnel.

Far too little is known of the life habits, cyclic influences, and other factors affecting the abundance or scarcity of fishes, especially with regard to salt-water species.

There is ample testimony available to show that an important reason for the decline of many commercially valuable species has been overexploitation over the years—taking too many fish of too small a size the year around without regard to spawning seasons, migration habits, etc. Placing the management and administration of the commercial fishery back in the Department of Commerce, whose chief function is the development of industry for economic reasons, would, it seems to me, be inviting more of the same, and would be a dangerous and false solution to the problem.

I do not think I am being idealistic about the practical economic problems facing the industry when I say that. I believe, in fact, that I am being quite hard-headed, for I am thinking about what the economic status of the fishery will be 10 or 20 years from now. Nobody profits if there are no fish and we are rapidly approaching the "no fish" stage, for practical purposes, with many commercially valuable species in more than one area.

The second basic fact which the Hoover Commission report on Interior ignores in its recommendation is the close interdependence between sport and commercial fisheries, plus the great economic value of the sport fishery itself.

The same basic problems of lack of adequate research, personnel, and management which plague the commercial fishery also plague the sport fishery. The latter is by no means picayune from an economic standpoint, yet under the Hoover Commission recommendations receives bare lip-service recognition.

Let me show you, in dollars and cents, what status sport fishing has as big business in this country. For the year ending June 30, 1949, 15,478,570 American citizens bought angling licenses. Most of these are freshwater anglers, as only one State I know of, California, requires a license for salt-water sport fishing. Conservative estimates place at an additional 5,000,000 the anglers who fish costal and off-shore waters from Maine to Texas and from Washington to southern California.

In 1944 the Fish and Wildlife Service, as a part of its river basin work, began studies to determine the amounts of money fishermen and hunters spend in pursuit of their respective sports. They determined that the average annual outlay for fishing tackle, which represents but 5 percent of the fisherman's total expenditure in pursuit of his sport, was $6.35 per person. Even if we ignore the estimated 5,000,000 nonlicense buying anglers, that amounts to $99,740,000 annually for tackle alone. The other 95 percent includes what anglers spend for transportation, clothing, meals, and lodging and miscellaneous items of equipment including $32,657,940 annually for licenses. It makes a total of $1,995,000,000 spent annually by fishermen in pursuit of game fish. Bear in mind that these are 1944 cost figures applied to 1949 angler numbers. As such, the total undoubtedly is quite conservative.

In Colorado, the National Opinion Research Center made a survey of thousands of resident anglers and hunters on what they spent to pursue their sport in 1946. Among other things, they found that warm-water fishermen spent an average of $47.80 each and trout fishermen, $76.22. The number of resident fishing licenses sold in Colorado last year was 257,925, of which number, it is safe to say that four out of five were trout fishermen. The money placed in circulation by Colorado's resident anglers last year amounted to upward of $18,192,000.

Colorado's tourists were estimated by official State sources to have spent $216,000,000 in the State in 1949. It has been calculated by the same sources that sport or family food fishing is the major attraction for approximately 35 percent of the visitors. They generally spend at a considerably higher rate, per capita, than the residents—based on the above figures, about $75,500,000 annually. Added to the amount spent by resident anglers, that's upward of $93,500,000 spent for sport fishing in just one State.

Colorado is fairly representative of most of the 11 Western States with the exception of California which had a considerably larger number of license buying fishermen; 1,030,617.

These figures are not just pulled out of thin air. They are based on just as careful statistical surveys, interviews, and inventories as are used in business. As a matter of fact, it is business, big business.

The economic value of the sport fishery, therefore, and the number of persons in industries employed directly and indirectly in meeting the sport fisherman's needs in the tackle, boat, railroad, air line, auto, gasoline, restaurant, and resort businesses, compares quite favorably with the 1947 estimated consumer value of commercial fishery products, of $1,000,000,000 which furnished employment directly and indirectly for some 525,000 persons. These figures are taken from a report on the commercial fisheries to the natural resources task force by a technical consultant representing the industry.

The other fact to remember has been well stated in the report of the task force on natural resources: "Sport fishing is becoming increasingly dependent on commercial fishery resources." But one example of this is the increasing numbers of fish species which are sought after by both the commercial and the recreational angler. Here are but a few: In fresh water—the salmons, yellow perch, walleye or yellow pike, smelt, catfish and bullheads, sheepshead, paddlefish, buffalo, red horse, white bass, crappie, northern pike and pickerel, hickory shad; in salt water—amberjack, tuna, barracuda, bluefish, bonito, cod, haddock, halibut, mackerel, sea trout, croaker, shad, porgy, sea bass, striped bass and many others. The basic biological research and controls needed to better manage many of these species would be of lasting benefit to both commercial and sport fishing interests.

But the Hoover Commission would separate the management of commercial and sport fisheries. Certainly the management of sport fisheries does not belong in the Department of Commerce. Even if we could honestly agree that commercial fisheries did, we would not support such a move on the basis of its demonstrated interdependence with the Nation's sport fisheries.

I have probably taken too much time on this one question but it seems the principal problem before us and one difficult to cover adequately in a short time.

The other two recommendations we should briefly consider are those of the task force on natural resources and the minority report on the Department of the Interior signed by Dean Acheson, James K. Pollock, and James H. Rowe, Jr. Both of these recommend a Department of Natural Resources with cabinet status. As you know, they differ with respect to treatment of the fisheries.

The task force recommends that fishery functions and wildlife functions be split, in a proposed Department of Natural Resources, into a Fisheries Service and a Wildlife Service. The minority recommendations appended to the Hoover Commission report on Interior opposes this split for lack of adequate definitive study to show the need for it.

There is another basic difference between the two reports which I want to call to your attention. The task force report has no status before Congress today. It has served its function. As a document it is today proud but poor—proud, as perhaps the best blueprint yet drawn for the sound management of the Nation's publicly owned and publicly controllable natural resources; poor—as a document which will begin to gather dust on the shelves unless the people decree otherwise. The minority report, on the other hand, does have status as part of an active document presented to Congress for translation into legislation.

The question is: "Split 'em or not split 'em?" In my opinion, the only things we are splitting by devoting a lot of time and worry to that question are hairs.

The task force gave a few not too specifically documented reasons for splitting. The minority dissenters said: "That's not proof enough." As far as we in the Izaak Walton League are concerned, based upon the evidence we have seen on both sides, it is a question needing further specific study and proof one way or the other. In its arguments for a split between wildlife and fisheries, the task force gaves some excellent additional reasons for not separating commercial from sport fisheries.

From the standpoint of the long-range good of the total fishery resource and its subsequent benefit to the people, the question of separating it from wildlife hinges, I think, on whether we would have a Fisheries Service and a Wildlife Service operating together in a Department of Natural Resources or whether we would have a Fisheries Service in Commerce or Public Works and a Wildlife Service in Interior or Agriculture or—God knows—maybe the Army Engineer Corps.

This much we do know today: The Department of Natural Resources idea, without the split, is before Congress. As an organization, the Izaak Walton League has gone on record in favor of such a department. It has not yet been demonstrated conclusively to us that a split between fishery and wildlife functions is either necessary or desirable. On the other hand, the beginnings of a good argument for a split have been started and have demonstrated that the commercial fishing industry, as well as the sport fishing industry, is in crying need of better administration, financing, and management. We would, however, support legislation for a Department of Natural Resources regardless of whether fisheries and wildlife were separated.

That's a good safe middle-of-the-road course on a burning issue perhaps. But we do not take it through any desire to avoid an issue. Those of you who are acquainted with the work of the Izaak Walton League know that, I am sure. We take it rather because we are trying to view the ever-all natural resource picture of which fish and wildlife are just a part—albeit an important one.

We do not speak for all of the organized groups of sport fishermen in the country, by any means. But this you can be sure of: We will fight until the last goose is hung for what we believe to be the best plan for the wise use and husbandry of all the Nation's resources. In this particular case the Department of Natural Resources transcends in importance the question of whether fisheries and terrestrial wildlife should be managed together or separately. We would not bicker over the question to the detriment of whatever chance such a department might have.

That some better set-up for administration of commercial and sport fisheries is needed, we agree. Frankly, we don't know the answer. We do not set ourselves up as experts in administrative matters. We do believe strongly, however, that the administrative and management changes in the fisheries as currently proposed by the Hoover Commission and as outlined in S. 2633 would work to the ultimate detriment of the fishery resources of the Nation.

You have heard, or will hear, ample testimony today in favor of the split, and you have heard, or will hear, ample testimony opposed to it. The thing we must all do is remember that we are considering first and foremost the long-range welfare of a vital renewable resource which in all its aspects provides revenue, food, and the increasingly important health and well-being through recreation for a sizable segment of our population. Let us first determine how we can surely perpetuate that resource, and, secondly, how best to use it to the benefit of all concerned.

STATEMENT BY ALBERT M. DAY, DIRECTOR, FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

It is hardly proper for me as Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, one of the agencies that is proposed for reorganization by the Hoover Commission, to discuss whether that Commission's recommendations are sound and should be adopted. Rather, I prefer to make some general observations about the background of the Hoover Commission report on this particular subject and explain what the Fish and Wildlife Service is attempting to do to aid in the broad development and utilization of the highly important fishery resources of this Nation.

In the first instance, it should be well understood that the final recommendations of the Hoover Commission resulted only after a great deal of conflicting and diverse testimony on this important subject had been given careful consideration. The whole problem is complex because fishery management is complex. It must always be woven into the intricate patterns of land and water uses and human needs in our expanding civilization. This fact is well emphasized when we recognize that the three different task forces studying the organization of the Government came out with three different recommendations when it came to fish and wildlife matters.

The report of one committee would have dispersed the conservation agencies through the Government and would have put the Fish and Wildlife Service in a Public Works Department. The Agricultural Committee recommended a transfer to Agriculture of all major public land administration activities and functions including the Fish and Wildlife Service. The task force on natural resources proposed to abolish the Interior Department and create in its place a Department of Natural Resources, in which would have been a division of the present Fish and Wildlife Service into a Fisheries Service and a Wildlife Service, each separately administered. The final recommendations of the entire Commission were that only the commercial fisheries activities of the Service should be transferred to the Department of Commerce. As evidence of the diversity of opinion among the members of the Commission, it should be noted that dissents to this proposal were expressed by Vice Chairman Dean Acheson and Commissioners James Forrestal, James K. Pollock, and James H. Rowe, Jr.

With this divergence of opinion among the members of the Hoover Commission and the various task forces as to the proper place in Government for the Federal responsibility for fishery activities, it is not surprising that the resultant reactions of the public also have been mixed. The American Fisheries Society, organized in 1872 and now the oldest scientific biological organization in the United States, at a meeting in Winnipeg, Canada, last September, passed a resolution endorsing the task force recommendations of the report on natural resources, with the exception that the society opposed that portion of the report which recommends the separation of fisheries administration from wildlife administration.

Likewise, a meeting of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, also meeting in Winnipeg, in September, passed a resolution endorsing the general purposes of the natural resources task force report, but also stated that they opposed the recommendation of the report which would separate fisheries from wildlife in the present Fish and Wildlife Service. Within the past few weeks, the executive officers and the legislative committee of the international association again reaffirmed to Secretary Chapman their strong opposition to this proposal. The international association is made up of representatives of all of the State conservation departments in the country, the great bulk of which administer both fisheries and wildlife in a single organization of the State. In fact, of the 48 States only 8 have separate departments devoted to commercial fisheries. In the other 40, commercial and sport fishery and wildlife management activities are all in the same department. The same, of course, is true in Alaska.

To the contrary, the Pacific Fisheries Conference, composed largely of members of industry operating on the west coast and in Alaska, by action taken at a recent meeting in California, adopted the following resolution, and I quote:

"Whereas the consolidation by Executive order of the former Bureau of Fisheries and the former Bureau of Biological Survey into one Bureau in the Department of the Interior, called the Fish and Wildlife Service, has been demonstrated as unsound, illogical, and ineffective; and has not served to further the sound, efficient administration of fisheries, and whereas the Commission for the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, commonly referred to as the Hoover Commission, recommended that the administration of fisheries should be separated from the administration of wildlife: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the conference heartily endorses the recommendation that such separation should be made and also urges that the reestablished Division of Fisheries should be transferred in toto to the Department of Commerce or to a new Department of Natural Resources if such a Department should be created, and now, in whichever Department placed, fisheries should be under direct charge of an officer of the rank of Assistant Secretary."

It is to the assertion of the Pacific Fisheries Conference that the present organization has been demonstrated as "unsound, illogical, ineffective, and has not served to further the sound, efficient administration of fisheries" that I wish to direct my remarks today. I challenge that statement as incorrect, and I call upon the drafters of the resolution to furnish proof of their assertions. The present organization is sound, it is logical, and it is effective. In the 10 years it has been in effect, it has done more to further the interests of fishery management, conservation, and utilization than was accomplished in the three or four decades previously

Memories about public affairs and previous events are short, and I feel that the drafters of the resolution that I have just mentioned must have been unfamiliar with the background and did not know the original reasons for the consolidation of the Bureau of Fisheries and the Bureau of Biological Survey. Such moves are seldom made without good reasons, as was the case in this instance. At the time of the merger in 1940, both of these predecessor agencies were weak and to a considerable extent were discredited in the public mind. The Biological Survey, which I joined in 1918 and in which, together with the present Fish and Wildlife Service, I have served continuously ever since, had suffered from weak administration for several years prior to the merger. Waterfowl coming under Federal regulation under a treaty with Canada had been consistently declining over a period of years. The only reason that the Bureau seemed to be able to prescribe was ever-shortened seasons and ever-smaller bag limits. Because of resultant public dissatisfaction and clamor, President Roosevelt appointed a special committee of citizens to study the problem and to recommend remedies. "Ding" Darling, the famous cartoonist, prominent in conservation circles in the Midwest, served on this special study committee. It recommended a positive-action program—the acquisition and restoration of marshes along with severe restrictions on the take by hunters. Darling was induced to serve as Chief of the Biological Survey, an organization that had been virtually leaderless since the disability retirement of the previous bureau chief. He remained less than 2 years and was succeeded by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, an outstanding scientist and able administrator, but in 1940, when the merger came about, the public had not yet regained confidence in the efficiency of the administration of the Biological Survey.

A similar situation existed in the Bureau of Fisheries. It was a small organization and the morale of its employees, as well as the confidence of the public, suffered severely because of the quality of its leadership. Controversy raged, particularly in the Alaska fisheries field, where the Bureau then had and still has as the Fish and Wildlife Service sole regulatory authority over the extremely valuable salmon and herring fisheries. We are still trying to live down some of the things that happened in Alaska in those days.

Government reorganizers concluded that there might be a strengthening of the administration of both fisheries and wildlife programs if the two closely related small bureaus were merged into one larger group. This has been the trend of Government for many years and, with the exception of the recommendations for the transfer of the commercial fishery activities to the Department of Commerce, was also the philosophy of the Hoover Commission.

When the merger of the Biological Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries came about in 1940, the Biological Survey was on its way back into public esteem under the leadership of Dr. Gabrielson. It was therefore, logical that he should become the first Director of the new Fish and Wildlife Service. As a minor employee in Washington at the time of this "shotgun wedding" of the two Bureaus, with Secretary Ickes, incidentally, holding the old double-barreled gun on us, I can personally testify that it was an unpopular move with the employees of both Bureaus, particularly those who revere tradition and the "good old days" of the past. I also know that the proposal to return to those "good old days" does not fall upon completely unsympathetic ears with some in the present organization. It is difficult to understand their philosophy, because I cannot think of a single individual who has not personally benefited in rank and salary by the creation of a larger and more important agency. With some, tradition is truly a potent factor.

But, of more importance to you and the other people we are paid to serve, did the mandatory trip to the altar pay off? Let us merely check the records.

First, let's review the appropriations for fishery work for the past 20 years—the 10 years of operations under the present system and the 10 years immediately preceding. Granted that during recent years the costs of operations have risen and appropriations have been more liberal to take care of these factors, appropriation figures are probably still the best over-all yardstick to measure the services the Government gives its citizens in matters pertaining to the fisheries.

In 1930, Federal fishery appropriations amounted to $2,498,550; in 1940, $2,421,075. That represents a decrease during the 10-year period of almost $100,000. The average for that period was approximately $2,000,000 per year. The fishery appropriations for the fiscal year 1950 amount to $10,875,251. Of even greater significance, the budget which the President sent to the Congress within recent days and which Fish and Wildlife Service representatives justified before the Appropriations Committees a week ago carry proposed appropriations for fishery items amounting to approximately $12,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning next July 1. To be more specific as to items in which you are most interested, the work of the Branch of Commercial Fisheries received $229,540 in 1940; $668,500 in 1950. The Branch of Fishery Biology received $390,835 in 1940 as compared with $1,546,000 in 1950; Alaska Fisheries, including the Pribilofs, from $516,460 to $1,480,100 in those 10 years. And the wildlife appropriations have likewise increased at the same time. In 1940, they amounted to $6,149,343, almost three times the then appropriated sums for fishery activities. For 1950, they amounted to $16,502,049. This sum included duck stamp and Pittman-Robertson revenues. Not bad for an "unsound, illogical, and ineffective" organization.

As the time of the merger, not a single research or exploratory vessel was owned and operated by the Bureau of Fisheries. Now, the *Albatross III* is carrying on investigations extending from the Grand Banks to the Carolinas on the Atlantic coast. Within recent months, two vessels, the *Oregon* and *Alaska*, have been acquired through special legislation and appropriations and are now stationed in the Gulf of Mexico. One will do exploratory fishing and the other will do biological research. A new vessel, the *John N. Cobb*, was commissioned at Astoria, Oreg., this month to carry out exploratory and experimental fishing in the North Pacific, reaching far into Arctic waters. The *Black Douglas* is carrying on experimental and biological work in an effort to find answers to some of the perplexing problems surrounding the pilchard fishery off the coast of California and lower Mexico. The *Hugh M. Smith* is conducting biological and oceanographic research, while the *Henry O'Malley* and the *John R. Manning* are doing exploratory fishing in the waters of the South Pacific in a program that has been developed in close cooperation with tuna-fishing industry of the west coast. The *Spencer F. Baird*, the *Theodore N. Gill*, and the *David Starr Jordan*, three well-equipped research and exploratory vessels, are now completing a 3-year study of the South Pacific fisheries in connection with the rehabilitation of the Philippines. It is planned that the *Theodore N. Gill* will soon be stationed in the Great Lakes to undertake the difficult study of the decline in that great fishery, made possible by special legislation and appropriations passed during the present session of Congress. That adds up to 11 large vessels compared with not a single one at the time of the merger. In the entire previous history of the Bureau of Fisheries, reaching back to 1871, in fact, there were never at one time more than three ships doing that sort of work and that occurred for only 2 years. None had been in service since 1933—8 years before the merger. Does that add up to the assertion that the present Fish and Wildlife Service is an unsound, illogical, and ineffective organization?

Ten years ago the famous laboratory at Woods Hole, steeped in traditions of fishery research and oceanography since the days of Spencer Fullerton Baird, had been virtually abandoned. Within the past 2 years we have rehabilitated the station, have transferred the scientific staff of the New England area there for headquarters, and the *Albatross III* is now berthed at Woods Hole. The laboratory at Beaufort, N. C., is being reconditioned and important studies in cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission are being conducted at that point. A new laboratory is being constructed in Hawaii and the technology lab at Ketchikan, Alaska, has within recent months been enlarged and expanded. During that decade, a small laboratory was constructed in Puerto Rico, and fisheries research in the Caribbean area was carried on. In addition, the research stations at College Park, Md.; Milford, Conn.; Seattle, Wash.; and Pensacola, Fla., have been expanded.

Never in the 80 years of Government participation in matters pertaining to the fisheries has there been such great activity in the international field as there has been during the past few years. That is perfectly logical because of the increasing influence of the United States in world affairs. I should like to cite some of the more recent developments, however, as proof that fishery matters are not suffering at the hands of the present organization.

The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention concluded just a year ago and ratified by the President last September 1 brings 11 nations having common interests in the North Atlantic fishing grounds under treaty arrangements for the first time in history. The fisheries of this great area have been the battleground for some exceedingly tough international problems that date back to days prior to American independence. A convention between the United States and Mexico for the establishment of an International Commission for the Scientific Investigation of Tuna was signed at Mexico City in January 1949, and has been ratified by the President. A similar convention between the United States and Costa Rica for the establishment of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission was signed at Washington in May 1949, and was ratified by the President on September 1, 1949. Three years ago 22 nations, including Canada and the United States, met in Washington and arrived at an international agreement which established the International Whaling Commission, empowered to conduct investigations and regulate whaling throughout all the marine waters of the globe. In 1946, a treaty was negotiated with Canada for the protection and management of the Great Lakes fisheries. This, so far, has been the least effective of the treaty programs because of opposition of one or two States surrounding the Great Lakes.

I have mentioned some of the more recent developments but I should record also the continuing activities in connection with the Sockeye Salmon Commission which came into being in 1936, and which has now assumed regulatory powers after the first 10 years of investigation. This has included the construction of the $2,000,000 fishway at Hells Gate on the Fraser River. I serve as one of the American members of this Commission. Assistant Director James is a member of the Halibut Commission, established in 1937, which has done a remarkable job of restoring the stocks of halibut along the stretches of the North Pacific coast.

In the field of management of the fisheries of Alaska, I am proud of the progress that is being made. For the first time in history, we are now developing a closely integrated program, using all available manpower and equipment for enforcing both the fishery and wildlife laws and regulations in a joint operation. Enforcement of the fishery regulations is now vastly improved because of the use of Alaska game agents as well as about a dozen transferred from the States each season. During the war years the fishing regulations were probably more liberal than they should have been. This was due to the pressure for food for our own people and our allies. Many of our trained personnel were in the Army and Navy and many Service ships were devoted to military uses. Inadequate observations and patrol, together with overfishing, created a serious depletion in the Alaska fishery. I am happy to say that it looks as though the situation is improving rapidly. Following severe restrictions during the past 3 years, the southeastern Alaska pack of pink salmon responded to the point where the pack last year not only returned to but also exceeded the previous normal 20-year average. Two large vessels have recently been secured by transfer from the Navy to augment our Alaskan fleet, and several smaller ships have been built as a result of new appropriations by the Congress. In the Service's combined Alaskan operations, there are now owned and operated 13 vessels ranging from 40 feet to 150 feet in size, with 11 additional patrol vessels ranging from 30 to 40 feet. There are also about 100 speedboats used in fishery patrol. Surplus planes have been made available since the end of the war and we now have a very excellent fleet of 20 planes which services both fishery and game agents in the Territory. Congress, last year, appropriated $250,000 for a new airplane hangar and shop at Anchorage, and as a result our facilities for observation and patrol will be much improved in future years. Moreover, Alaska regulations are now being made and enforced without fear or favor.

Ten years ago there were no effective means of correlating the needs of fish and wildlife with the construction programs of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. That is not the case today. The Fish and Wildlife Service maintains a river basin staff whose responsibility it is to review the plans of the construction agencies while the projects are in the making. We work in close coordination with these two Bureaus. Much has been done to protect and increase the fishery potentials in the reservoirs because of this service.

The relations of the Fish and Wildlife Service with the Congress and the Bureau of the Budget are excellent. The needs of both fisheries and wildlife are given sympathetic attention both as to appropriations and as to legislation. This, in my opinion, is due in large part to the fact that practically every Member of the Congress has a personal interest in something that the Fish and Wildlife Service is doing. If he or his constituents are not particularly interested in the commercial fisheries, it is a pretty safe bet that he either likes to hunt ducks and geese or he enjoys fishing for trout or bass or bluegills. Maybe he comes from the West and is more interested in the coyote and ground squirrel control program of the Service, or perhaps he wants to go to Alaska to hunt moose or brown bear. It is an assured certainty that if there is a Federal fish hatchery in his district, he is anxious to see that it produces as many fish for his sportsmen constituents as can possibly be done. I doubt that there is another single agency of Government that has such wide interest for so many people as do the varied activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Last year there were 13,500,000 people who bought fishing licenses and almost 18,000,000 who bought hunting licenses. Another 2,000,000 bought duck stamps to hunt ducks and geese. Many probably purchased all three kinds of licenses, but yet the fact remains that approximately one out of every five people in the United States is influenced in some degree by the activities of this Service. As such, the single organization known as the Fish and Wildlife Service yields much more power and influence than either the Bureau of Fisheries or the Biological Survey ever did before or would ever do again, if they were reconstituted separately.

I could continue this recitation all day, but I fear that I have already used my allotted time. I shall close by inviting the members of the resolutions committee of the Pacific Fishing Conference, or anyone else for that matter, who believes that the "consolidation by Executive order of the former Bureau of Fisheries and the former Bureau of Biological Survey into one Bureau in the Department of the Interior, called the Fish and Wildlife Service, has been demonstrated as unsound, illogical, and ineffective" to take a little more careful look at the record. I sincerely believe that if those members of industry who are not satisfied with the present accomplishments of the Fish and Wildlife Service would tell us and the Congress, frankly, what in the way of accomplishments they want but are not now getting, they will come closer to seeing it done than if they were to depend upon a much smaller agency, with much less prestige. Remember the appropriation figures I gave you—$2,421,075 in 1940 as compared with $10,875,251 in 1950, and approximately $12,000,000 which President Truman has recommended to the Congress for next fiscal year. Again, I say, study the record.

Poem by Horace G. Carlisle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following poem by Horace G. Carlisle, poet laureate of Washington, titled "There's But One Way, Then Why Delay?"

If the natural law of supply and demand,
And the Master's divine Golden Rule,
Were obeyed by Americans, throughout the land,
And they all would quit acting the fool,
By engaging in covetous methods and schemes
To acquire more than their just dues,
The peace past understanding would come,
And our dreams
Of a prosperous day would come true.

Russianized communism can't grow in a soil
Wherein faith, hope, and charity thrive—
Communism depends on confusion, turmoil,
Hate, and enmity, to keep alive—
There is no force on earth, anywhere, that retards
Communism's advance, that we know,
More than true Christianity, which it regards
As its most indestructible foe.

When Americans practice what they'd rather preach,
In the church and the home and the school,
Communism's defeat will be within their reach;
For the Master's antique Golden Rule
Is effective today—as it ever has been—
And by it alone just wars are won—
The peace past understanding all nations will win
When they pray, "Not my will, Thine be done."

Grass Roots Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to present to the House of Representatives an editorial that records the progress of a unique farm program in Pike County, Miss. This program is unique in that it did not originate with a bureaucrat or a swivel-chair farmer. The businessmen and farmers of Pike County worked out definite goals to obtain, and the editorial reports the amazing progress that has been made in the 2 years of its operation. Oliver Emmerich, editor of the McComb Enterprise-Journal, suggested this program and it was aided and encouraged by his newspaper. Recognition of his leadership was recently made when he was named "man of the year" in the service of agriculture by the Progressive Farmer, one of the South's most widely circulated farm magazines. The achievements of this program, as recorded in the following editorial of the McComb (Miss.) Enterprise-Journal of February 8, 1950, prove that local citizens can help themselves more in 2 years than an all-powerful, all-benevolent Federal Government can in a hundred.

GRASS ROOTS PROGRESS

HISTORY OF 16-POINT PROGRAM

Cooperation has made the Pike County 16-point farm program the success that it is recognized to be. Now in its third year, the program has kept pace with the dreams of the men and women who have sponsored it. It was set forth as a 3-year program with 16 projects and involving the close partnership in community activity of the business leaders of McComb, Magnolia, Summit, and the farmers of Pike County.

The idea was first suggested editorially by the McComb Enterprise-Journal. Five Pike County banks actively participated.

The Illinois Central railroad system, the Pike County board of supervisors, the Mississippi Power and Light Co., the Mississippi Agricultural Extension Service, all have worked hand in glove.

The community leadership picked up the challenge and 110 sponsors, including individuals and firms, have worked earnestly to make it succeed. The budget called for an expenditure of $20,000 annually for each of 3 years. The first year's expenditures, that of 1948, amounted to $20,882, and all of this money was paid into the program's treasury. The second year cost was $17,526.79.

Committees from numerous counties and parishes have visited Pike County to witness the program in operation. From Tangipahoa Parish alone, in Louisiana, came a delegation of 55 citizens to learn of the program. The good work is spreading. The third year of the farm campaign, 1950, gives promise of far exceeding the achievements of 1949. The sponsors know that farming is basic in Mississippi and to the end that agriculture may prosper farm and business leadership will continue to march arm in arm to new triumphs.

NEW FARM INCOME, $1,383,833

The leadership of Pike County carried a campaign of basic economy improvement to the grass roots of America. Herewith is presented results of the achievement during

the second year of a widely recognized program: 1949 was a bad cotton year. Cotton production, on same acreage as 1948, dropped 3,200 bales. Cotton income in Pike County in 1949 dropped $690,000. But farm income from other sources increased $1,362,625. Rain may hurt cotton but it makes grass grow.

HIGH YIELD OF FORTY BUSHELS

The 1947 announcement was that the goal of the 16-Point Farm Program in 1947 was to double the corn yield in Pike County on the same acreage within 3 years. What has happened since 1947? Think of a county with a goal so ambitious.

With use of hybrid seed and proper fertilizers corn yield increased: 1947—28,000 acres averaged 15 bushels per acre, value $420,000. 1948—28,000 acres averaged 24 bushels per acre, value $672,000. 1949—31,000 acres averaged 25 bushels; 7,000 acres averaged 49 bushels. Value of gain $448,000. 1949 average per acre, 31 bushels.

The corn yield of Pike County was doubled on the same acreage, not in 3, but in 3 years.

NEW MONEY FROM BEEF, BITE, HOG

In 1947 the number of beef cattle in Pike County was 17,300. In 1948 the number of beef cattle was 18,500, with value of increase, $142,000. In 1949 the number of beef cattle was 20,100, with value of increase being $172,500.

SPRING CATTLE SHOW SUCCESS

In the spring cattle show 299 head of cattle were shown in 1948, 290 in 1949, with prize money to farmers in the amount of $2,650. Receipts from calves sold were $9,225, with a total value of $11,875.

COWS BRED ARTIFICIALLY RISE

In the artificial insemination program 875 cows were bred in 1947, 1,507 in 1948, and 1,948 in 1949. Nine hundred and eighty heifers thus bred showed milk increase over their dams valued at $46,315.

In the artificial insemination program, the total cows bred artificially in 6 counties bordering Pike in 1948 was only 800, while the total cows artificially bred from Pike plant in 6 counties in 1949 was 3,[illegible]. The total number of cows thus bred in 6 counties plus Pike County in 1949 was 5,[illegible]. The Pike County program is expanding values over other Mississippi areas.

In the investment in bulls, the number of bulls at the artificial breeding plant in 1948 was 6; in 1949, 9, with a value of $15,000. This program is benefiting all of southwest Mississippi. The number of cows bred throughout this area in 1949 5,924. The valued increased milk flow to this area, $138,943.

GIRLS DAIRY CHAIN GROWS

In the 4-H Club dairy chain, the Illinois Central Service Club donated two heifers in 1948. The Magnolia Rotary Club donated two heifers early in 1949. Value of calves from this dairy chain, $3,000. This chain will go on forever.

4-H BEEF CHAIN GROWS

In the 4-H beef cattle chain, McComb Lions Club donated two purebred heifers in 1948. The Summit Rotary Club donated one purebred heifer early in 1949. Value of calves from this chain, $1,800. This endless chain will go on indefinitely.

In the 4-H Club banquet program, two banquets were staged for top-flight members—one for white clubs and one for Negro clubs. 4-H Club membership increased from 2,346 in 1948 to 2,826 in 1949. Value of 4-H Club products, $72,195.

BANG'S DISEASE FIGHT LAUNCHED

In the eradication of Bang's disease program, as a result of leadership of the Magnolia Rotary Club, the board of supervisors has launched a county-wide Bang's disease program with a value of immeasurable possibilities.

BIG INCREASE IN LIME

In the pasture-land improvement program, 33 carloads of lime were imported in 1947; 208 carloads in 1948; 224 carloads in 1949; and in 1949, 11,000 acres were mineralized. The value of this program in meat and milk is $250,000.

The total number of acres of improved pasture in Pike County in 1947 was 2,000 acres; in 1948, 10,000 acres; and in 1949, 21,000 acres. The total acres of potential pastures in the county, 45,000 acres. The goal is 100 percent.

DAIRY EXHIBITS INCREASED

In 1948 there were seven counties with 165 head of cattle that participated in the State dairy show established by the 16-point farm program with the cooperation of the Mississippi Legislature. In 1949 there were 14 participating counties with 195 head exhibited. In the highly competitive dairy circuit 13 Pike County cattle won top prizes at five dairy shows. Value of fair prizes won: $3,154.85.

SWEETPOTATO FESTIVAL STAGED

In 1949, 600 acres commercial sweetpotatoes were grown, 600 bushels commercially stored, and 11,000 bushels farm stored. The profit through improved production and handling, $23,200.

The sweetpotato festival, sponsored by the McComb Exchange Club, with the purpose "to glamorize the yam," exhibited 24 individual farm exhibits, 23 4-H Club exhibits, and 4 community exhibits. A farmer was crowned king and a 4-H Club girl queen. Top price for potatoes at festival was $25.50 per bushel.

The sweetpotato festival parade was widely publicized. In 1948 the parade provided 9 community and commercial floats, while in 1949 there were 68 floats in the parade. It is growing bigger, and one of the biggest crowds in local history came to town to the 1949 parade.

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY THOUSAND DOLLAR GAIN IN POULTRY

In 1947, 4,900 birds were produced every 12 weeks, with annual value of $20,000. In 1948, 31,000 birds were produced every 12 weeks, with annual value of $124,800. In 1949, 60,000 birds were produced every 12 weeks, with an annual value of $200,000. The 1950 goal is 150,000 birds every 12 weeks.

The corn yield of Pike County was doubled on the same acreage between 1947 and 1949, but poultry production increased 1,000 percent. All Pike County merchants and all Pike County people are asked to give Pike County birds first choice when purchasing poultry products.

FORESTRY METHODS PRODUCE PROFITS

In the forestry improvement with adult farmers in 1949, 356 farmers made forest-land improvement, 3,500 forest acres were checked by foresters, 1,070 units of pulpwood were marked and sold, 2,870,100 feet of saw logs marked before sale, with resultant increase in sale value of above being $64,910.

In the forestry improvement with 4-H Club members, sponsored by the Summit Rotary Club fire prevention was guaranteed on 21,484 acres of forest land. Conservation schools sponsored with adult farmers and 55 4-H Club boys in marking timber and other forest improvements to an increase in value amount to $21,484.

ONE MILLION THREE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-TWO THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIVE DOLLARS FROM $10,026.79

Cost of Pike County's 16-point farm program (NOTE: This does not include cost of regular farm and home agents and their 4-H Club assistants) shows the following figure: State extension service, $2,160; additional county appropriation, $5,400; contributions of 119 sponsors, $10,026.79. The total cost in 1949 was $17,586.79. Return in extra farm income, total, $1,362,625.

It was reasoned that the way to overcome hazards of a one-crop cotton system was through diversification and improved land utilization. Here are the results of 1949 as compared with same categories in 1948:

Actual dollar value increase of 1949 over 1948

1. Sweetpotatoes	$23,200
2. Artificial breeding	138,945
3. Corn-yield increase	448,000
4. 4-H Club projects	72,195
5. State dairy show premiums	2,465
6. Poulty increase	180,000
7. Beef chain	1,800
8. Dairy chain	2,000
9. Lime program	220,000
10. State compensation	2,160
11. Bang's disease fight	(1)
12. Yam festival	(1)
13. Spring cattle show	11,875
14. Beef production	172,000
15. Forestry improvement	87,285
16. Pasture contest (prizes)	700
Total	1,362,625

[1] Inestimable.

Early Excise Tax Action Imperative To Aid Small Business and Its Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have publicly stated that war-imposed excise taxes should be reduced or eliminated at an early date. I now reiterate that point of view.

However, Mr. Speaker, irrespective of the merits of that position, I consider it imperative for an entirely different reason that a definite decision be made at the earliest possible date with respect to the action which the Congress is going to take on the reduction or elimination of all or selected excise taxes. An early decision must be made to prevent further losses being incurred by small businesses and their employees by reason of the understandable unwillingness of prospective purchasers to purchase taxed articles while so much talk about excise taxes causes the buying public to expect widespread and appreciable tax reductions.

Mr. Speaker, unbiased surveys show that in Delaware and throughout the Nation small manufacturers, distributors, and retail merchants are suffering substantially from a lack of sales, and workers are becoming unemployed in increasing numbers for the same reason. These facts show that all lines of merchandise on which there are excise taxes are considerably affected, but that those suffering most severely are businesses engaged in the production, distribution and retail selling of furs, luggage, jewelry, handbags, and cosmetics. The public is simply waiting for the taxes to be reduced or removed, and the decline in sales of these articles ranges from 20 to 50 percent in comparison with sales of 1 year ago.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I urge that in the interest of small businesses and of continued employment that final action on the subject of excise-tax adjustments be brought about at the earliest possible moment. I understand that certain delays are unavoidable because of our legislative procedure and the desire for fair and adequate consideration of all interested parties. However, I do urge that whenever it is known that excise taxes in certain categories will in no way be altered by this Congress, that appropriate announcement to that effect be made to the public. The public, as well as small businesses and employees in the affected industries, have a right to be so informed. Furthermore, it may be added, unnecessary delays will result in additional revenue losses to the Government not only in the form of excise taxes, but in the form of seriously reduced corporate income taxes as a result of unprofitable or less profitable business.

Resolutions Adopted by United Farmers of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to attend and address the annual convention of the United Farmers of Minnesota. This organization is made up of actual farmers, who are vitally interested in the future welfare of American agriculture. Mr. Martin B. Tongen, a farmer in my home county in Minnesota, is the president of the Minnesota organization. He and his associates in the organization are men of courage and conviction. Since farm legislation is still an important matter before Congress, I feel that Members of the House of Representatives will be interested in studying the following resolutions, which were adopted at the annual meeting of the United Farmers of Minnesota:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE MINNESOTA UNITED FARMERS (SECOND STATE CONVENTION)

To the Congress of the United States and to the State Department we submit the following resolutions, adopted at the second State convention of the United Farmers of Minnesota, Inc., assembled at Wanamingo, Goodhue County, Minnesota, November 26, 1949:

We resolve that—

1. The Department of Agriculture be made entirely independent from any organization representing farmers. Taxpayers are, at present, actually helping support an organization representing farmers by paying taxes for the support of the Department of Agriculture, the Extension Bureaus, and the Colleges of Agriculture.

2. The cost of producing any agricultural product must be the primary basis for determining the market price for that product. Cost of production floor prices in the market place for all agricultural products shall be determined by Federal statute and enforced just as industrial wages are set at a minimum of 75 cents per hour. Subsidy programs, such as the Brannan plan, and government buying of surpluses under the Agricultural Act of 1949, are not the answer to a lasting farm program because of the excessive cost involved in tax money and because of the unpopular and unnecessary regimentation through acreage allotments and marketing quotas. Farmers want no hand-outs, but simply protection of equal opportunities in a free-enterprise system.

3. Cost of production floor prices must be high enough to secure for agricultural workers an average net income in balance with the average net income of nonagricultural workers. Such a price program alone can provide a true parity for agriculture, in contrast with the "outmoded, theoretical parity" of the past. Setting up a guaranteed income for farmers is not advisable since it may result in inefficiency, but setting up guaranteed cost of production floor prices on individual products will be an incentive to raise more products, thus resulting in higher efficiency.

4. The Granger bill be enacted. Anyone importing fats and oils in competition with domestic fats and oils shall pay a fee on the import making its price equal to the cost of production floor price of fats and oils produced here. The failure of the Government of controlling these imports has had a widespread depressing effect on the prices of not only oil-bearing crops but on almost all farm commodities. It is advisable, for the benefit of our whole national economy, to have this bill extended to cover all farm products that are imported in competition with products we can produce domestically.

5. The present Federal tax on oleomargarine, colored to imitate butter, be continued. The dairy business cannot survive if butter must compete with yellow oleo.

6. Purchases must stop of agricultural products raised in foreign countries to be given away under the Marshall plan when the same products are bought up as surpluses and stored in our own country. Any farm surpluses not needed for domestic use or for reserve stock piling shall be offered to world trade at world prices. Our Government shall not try to support world prices.

7. The proposed plan of compulsory health insurance be rejected. It is an undemocratic, socialistic scheme.

8. Federal employment, Federal taxes, and the Federal debt be reduced, and Federal spending be cut to the minimum. This will aid our national economy by encouraging new private enterprise and increasing the national income.

9. The trend toward socialized education be discouraged. Reorganization of school districts must be carefully undertaken as not to result in too much centralization of control.

Nature Songs To Make America Conservation Conscious During Wildlife Week, March 19–25, Featuring the Antlers of Flint, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting an article from the National Wildlife Federation, of Washington, D. C., featuring nature songs appropriate during Wildlife Week, March 19–25, in which the Antlers of my home city of Flint, and the Nation's third-ranking quartet, play a prominent part:

It shouldn't require a water-shortage crisis in New York City to arouse Americans into becoming conservation conscious, according to the National Wildlife Federation.

Americans like music, especially old-time barbershop harmony, so why wouldn't a song like Cool Water, as harmonized by a barber-shop quartet—the Antlers, of Flint, Mich., for example—help to promote the idea of conserving cool, clear water, and other natural resources, the federation would like to know.

Anyway the federation wants Americans to sing songs of the outdoors and nature in connection with the celebration of its thirteenth annual National Wildlife Restoration Week, March 19 to 25. It will be assisted by 600 city and small town chapters of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc.

The Antlers, the Nation's third-ranking quartet, recently became the first SPEBSQSA foursome in the society's 12-year history to entertain at the White House, as well as to sing barber-shop harmony for a world-wide radio audience through the United States State Department's Voice of America transcribed programs. The Antlers are among the quartets being considered to accept a United States Army invitation to tour the Far East to sing for our troops there next spring.

After entertaining in the east wing of the White House, the Antlers, past Michigan champions, presented albums of their latest recordings, including Cool Water, to Maj. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan, military aide to the President, for himself and the President, a member for several years of Kansas City chapter of SPEBSQSA.

Later the Antlers sang Cool Water for Carl D. Shoemaker, Washington correspondent of the National Wildlife Federation, and member of the Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board. The occasion was Mr. Shoemaker's appearance before the International Board of SPEBSQSA, in convention assembled at Hotel Statler, to thank President O. H. King Cole, of Sheboygan, Wis., and the society's directors for their cooperation to "keep America singing" during wildlife week.

Already barbershoppers are participating in conservation radio programs in New Jersey, according to the Federation's representative in that State, Reuben Cain, of Plainfield, and in other States they are preparing for special wildlife-week events.

Milwaukee's High Life Quartet has volunteered its services for wildlife week to Rudy Korneta, of Milwaukee, president of Conservation Unlimited, Inc., Wisconsin State affiliate of the National Wildlife Federation. This quartet features a special wildlife-week version, written by its tenor, John Sutschek, of a song, Way Up North in Wisconsin, originally composed by Edward Berg, Milwaukee barbershopper and group chairman of the industrial-arts department of Washington High School.

Herbert McKnight, of 51 Cherrywood Avenue, Toronto, Canada, has written the words and music of a song for wildlife week, about a 4,000-acre wildlife sanctuary, in which he states he has made 9 lakes "for wild water birds to rest during the migration period in flight to and fro between Canada and the United States." Mr. McKnight has offered his song to the Federation "to further wildlife conservation" in the United States and Canada.

To aid in the musical activities in connection with the wildlife-week conservation drive, SPEBSQSA headquarters in Detroit has furnished a selected group of songs from a recent society compilation of 205 songs arranged for four-part harmony.

The list includes the Hunters' Chorus, for hunters; I Get the Blues When It Rains, for sport anglers; Trees, for foresters; Listen to the Mocking Bird, for bird lovers; Deep River, for boating enthusiasts; and My Music Mountain Home, for mountaineers.

Several songs are suggested for farmers and soil conservationists, such as By the Watermelon Vine, Old MacDonald Had a Farm, the Three Little Figs, and Coming Through the Rye.

For zoologists, the list includes Down in Jungle Town, the Monkey's Wedding, and Don't Go in the Lion's Cage Tonight. Dog lovers can sing Old Dog Tray and You Gotta Quit Kicking My Dawg Around.

For trail riders, there are Old Pal of My Saddle Days, the Old Grey Mare, and I Found a Horse Shoe. For cattlemen, Home on the Range. For hikers, While Strolling Through the Park One Day. For yachtsmen, Moonlight Bay. For apiarists, When the Bees Are in the Hive. For horticulturists, Sweet, Sweet Roses of Morn. For water conservationists, How Dry I Am; the Old Oaken Bucket; and Old Man River.

Even insect collectors have songs familiar numbers as Moth and the Flame and Blue Tail Fly; while mineralogists can harmonize Down in a Coal Mine; geologists, You're Not the Only Pebble on the Beach; and orchardists, In the Shade of the Old Apple Tree.

In the Good Old Summertime appeals to millions of recreation seekers, while feathers devotees have Cockles and Mussels, and motorists, Highways Are Happy Ways.

According to the federation, there are literally hundreds of American songs relating to water, soil, trees, plants, and wildlife, all essential to human living, that are appropriate for Wildlife Week harmonizing.

"Barber shoppers" are distinguished as civic-minded preservers and encouragers of barber shop quartet singing, the federation said, and they set an example for 150,000,000 Americans to be militant preservers and encouragers of sound conservation and wildlife management practices.

Some species of wildlife today are only a memory, and unless Americans take conservation problems more seriously still other species will be remembered by future generations only in song and story, the federation warned.

Shall I Wasting in Despair would fit the situation if the conservation battle were to be lost, it has been suggested.

Let's preserve our natural resources together with the good old songs of the outdoors, and Americans will lead truly harmonious lives for many generations to come, the federation declared.

As reminders of our heritage of wildlife and plants, the federation is distributing millions of its 1950 series of full-color wildlife conservation stamps in connection with Wildlife Week. Proceeds from the sale of these stamps, depicting birds, mammals, flowers, and trees, are used for maintaining its conservation-education program and its news and legislative reporting services.

National chairman of Wildlife Week is to be announced. Honorary chairman is Bing Crosby, famed songster and outdoor sportsman. Governors of the 48 States have been asked by Federation President David A. Ayiward to serve on the National Wildlife Restoration Week Committee. Several governors are already preparing to proclaim Wildlife Week in their respective States, including New Hampshire, Ohio, Oregon, and Tennessee.

Veterans' Newspapers Favor National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, on the inspection trip I made with members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee last fall, I noticed that a great many of our neighboring countries used a national lottery to support their eleemosynary institutions. They have found that Government-controlled gambling will help defray a great part of the necessary expenses for hospitals of all kinds, homes for the aged, and so forth.

Here in the United States we have not looked with favor upon legalized lotteries either in our States or in the United States as a whole. I was surprised to learn, however, from the following editorial, that our forefathers helped finance the Revoluntionary War with a national lottery which was voted by the Continental Congress in 1776.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the December 17, 1949, issue of the Vet-Times, together with the February 1950 Veterans Report editorial entitled "Vote National Lottery":

[From the Vet-Times of December 17, 1949]

We think the time has come to plan the method to be used in paying a Federal bonus to the veterans of World War II.

We think we have the logical plan, but it is up to you veterans yourselves to say whether or not you want us to begin and carry on the long and costly crusade which will be necessary.

Here's the idea: Do you think the Federal Government should finance the payment of a bonus by legalizing and holding regular national lotteries?

We say "Yes."

The only objection we have ever heard raised against a Federal bonus is the cost involved. We have been told—falsely—that it would bankrupt the country. We have been told that the veterans themselves would have to pay for the bonus in taxes.

We think that the time has come when the problem of a bonus and the method of paying such a bonus should be looked into in the light of common sense. A national lottery is the logical answer to all of the problems involved.

The readers of the Vet-Times have long since proved themselves accurate barometers of veteran opinion throughout the United States. Therefore, if a preponderance of our readers vote to endorse payment of a bonus by means of a national lottery, we shall forthright launch a crusade to get Congress to enact the required legislation.

Such a crusade will not be an easy one. There has been public agitation in this country for a national lottery before. This time, however, the wishes of 16,000,000 veterans and their families should be given some heed by the Congress.

During the progress of any such crusade the Vet-Times will expect to be the target of editorial abuse in many areas. The "do-gooders" and the supermoralists will cry "shame."

But once the crusade is launched and backed by your support and the support of your buddies in every walk of life, we can't lose.

Aside from the great advantages accruing from a national lottery in the payment of a Federal bonus, we believe that it will play a substantial part in decreasing the kind of crime which breeds upon such illegal forms of gambling as the numbers racket, off-track horse-race betting, etc.

The arguments in favor of a Federal bonus lottery are many and valid. Every year the American people expend billions of dollars on gambling in one form or another and more often than not become lawbreakers in the process. Too often the odds are all against them.

Horse racing—the sport of kings—has become such big business in this country that it now gives direct employment to about 260,000 people and its annual take runs into the multimillions.

The numbers racket, flourishing illegally in every major American city, reaps a golden harvest for those who operate it outside the law and is charged with corrupting and demoralizing law-enforcement agencies through the pay-offs that are necessary for unhampered operations.

Rarely do the profits from such illegal sources of income find their way into the United States Treasury in the form of payment of taxes in full.

There is no way to stop Americans from gambling if they want to gamble any more than prohibition laws could stop Americans from drinking if they want to drink. And today, with the Treasury receiving huge dividends from liquor taxes, those who oppose drinking on moral grounds still do not drink themselves.

While almost all forms of gambling are illegal in this country, Americans gamble constantly. Seldom is there anything pernicious in the type of gambling that attracts the majority.

Money from this side of the Atlantic makes up more than half of the millions which are gambled yearly on the famous Irish sweepstakes. But hospitals in Ireland—not veterans in the United States—are the beneficiaries of this money.

Although lotteries are banned in every one of the 48 States, churches and other charitable projects from coast to coast are financed by lotteries, disguised in a variety of forms to get around the legal ban that few believe in and even fewer obey.

Office pools on football and baseball games, election bets, turkey drawings, bingo games, slot machines, pinball machines, even those friendly Friday night poker games, usually involve gambling and as such are illegal.

Millions of dollars in monthly revenue would pour into the Treasury through a national lottery. The proportion of the money necessary to finance prizes for winners and to pay the costs of administration would be deducted from the pool and the balance deposited in the Treasury for use in paying the Federal bonus.

Most veterans of World War II were drafted in a national lottery. If it is legal to draft men to fight and die by lottery, why should it remain illegal to use a lottery to give them a small reward for their service?

[From the Veterans Report]

VOTE NATIONAL LOTTERY

Our forefathers financed the Revolutionary War with a national lottery, voted by the Continental Congress in 1776.

If you don't believe it, just check the files of the Library of Congress, which further reveal that prizes were awarded the holders of lucky numbers in the form of United States Treasury notes which could be converted into cash within 3 to 5 years.

We don't have the figures on the kind of money collected by our founding fathers to fight the British, but we do have the figures on what gambling racketeers are collecting annually, in many instances outside the law and without benefit of taxes.

They pocketed $21,500,000,000 last year, exclusive of such forms of gambling as lotteries, raffles, and carnival games.

That's a whale of a lot of money that rightfully should be diverted into the United States Treasury, which today is spending more than it takes in to finance the staggering cost of modern government.

The biggest item in Government today is national defense. We appropriated roughly $13,500,000,000 this year to guarantee defense of the United States against a potential aggressor.

That is a tremendous amount, and even though it represents a large proportion of every dollar collected in taxes in this country annually it still is $8,000,000,000 less than organized gambling syndicates in America are grossing each year.

With the remaining $8,000,000,000 we not only could pay a bonus to every veteran of World War II, thereby rewarding him for the sacrifices he made to defend our country against Germany and Japan, but we could also virtually eliminate the tremendous drain on the Treasury incident to Veterans' Administration costs, which amount to $7,000,000,000 per year.

What's all this talk about the necessity for more taxes to pay current governmental obligations, when with one stroke of the pen our President could sign into law a bill that would serve to wipe out our multi-billion-dollar deficit in slightly more than 10 years?

We speak of a bill to authorize a national lottery—just such a bill as was passed by the Continental Congress in 1776 at a time when the United States was struggling for independence.

Last month we cautiously suggested in a small editorial that depending on the reaction of our subscribers, Veterans Report might suggest to Members of Congress that a national lottery should be authorized to pay a World War II bonus.

Since our January issue was published, we have thrown all caution to the winds, for we know that our subscribers are behind us, and, further, we know that there is an excellent historical precedent for authorization of a lottery in time of national emergency.

From now on, Veterans Report will actively campaign for a national lottery, not only to pay a bonus, but also to guarantee defense of the United States against all potential aggressors, and to ensure balancing of the Federal budget, while at the same time guaranteeing a more abundant life for the underprivileged of our great Nation.

Who says a bonus for World War II veterans would be a grab on the United States Treasury if financed by a national lottery? Rather, we say it would be a grab on the purse strings of the gambling tycoons in America, who are making more money illegally today than it costs to rearm against the Soviet Union.

Since January, hundreds of ballots favoring a national lottery have been arriving in the office of Veterans Report with every mail. These are not enough, we need thousands of ballots in every mail so that we can put sufficient pressure on Congress to bring the matter of a lottery to a vote this year.

Throw those ballots in. You'll find yours on page 6 of this issue. If you need more ballots, write us, and we'll send them to you for circulation among your friends.

To fight your battles, we need your full support.

The Rising Demand for Sound and Economical Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, many earnest and thoughtful citizens of this country are demanding a change in Government policies and cessation of wasteful spending.

There is submitted herewith for the consideration of my colleagues a letter from prominent residents of Idaho:

EMMETT, IDAHO, *February 9, 1950.*

DEAR MR. WHITE: We are very much in favor of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and sincerely hope it will be put into effect very soon to stop this vicious senseless waste of taxpayers' money. We do not mind paying taxes but when there is such a terrible waste and still up goes the cry for more and more taxes, we feel a stop should be put to it. The budget certainly should be balanced and if it isn't in times of such prosperity just when is it going to be? It can be now and with lower taxes, too, if this criminal waste is stopped. Many of the policies of the present administration are mighty hard to take to say the least. This food surplus fiasco is a disgrace. Why are potatoes coming in from Canada when 50,000,000 bushels of our own are to be destroyed? Why are dried eggs and milk coming in from Communist China when we have a huge surplus? To think that a country and one of the few in the world which has enough food should have men in power who order that food destroyed is almost unbelievable and such tragic, vicious nonsense should be stopped. These are only a few of the things that weigh heavily on us and we are wondering why such policies are being continued. It is a Democratic (so-called) Congress it is true, but it seems to many of us that there are enough Republicans and others too, who, if they do not agree with these policies, could change them if they wanted to. If the opposition would spend some of the time on these problems that they spend disagreeing with each other perhaps more needed changes could and would be made. Look at some of the proven charges against some of our officials. Shameful to say the least. Still some seem to want to discredit Mr. Hoover of the FBI. Seems to many of us that Mr. Hoover has given much more service to his country than he has been paid for and that he, if anyone, needs not only more pay but more men too. There are so many things that point to our country being sold down the river that we are just getting plenty tired of it and feel our Representatives and Senators alike can do something about it while there is still time. Let's hope that one of these days we will have the kind of government resembling the one built on the principles that made our country great.

We are,

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. FRANK LEECE.

Rent Control Robs an Infant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, all too often the administration and the Congress, under its control to remedy some real or fancied hardship, has forgotten the principles laid down in the Constitution.

Let us lay aside the thought that legislation is sometimes enacted because those who desire it, who will be benefited by it, are voters and outnumber those who do not want it, who would be injured by it.

Nevertheless, it is true that when the administration or the Congress under its guidance attempts to take from one class of citizens a part of the income from its property, make another group the beneficiaries of that income so taken, it violates that provision of the Constitution which guarantees that a man shall be secure in his property, that it shall not be taken from him, even by the Government, without just compensation.

In recent years, the Supreme Court has been giving us judicial legislation. Apparently, instead of seeking out the true intent of the Congress and measuring that intent by the standard set up in the Constitution, it has, by judicial legislation, imposed upon the people its theory of what the law should be.

I am familiar with the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Woods v. Miller Co.* (333 U. S. 138), where it upheld the validity of the rent-control law, but, notwithstanding that decision, I assert that it is unjust and unconstitutional through rent control to deprive an individual of a part of the rent from his property in order to benefit another citizen.

Neither the Congress nor the Court has authority to take from one man even a part of his property and give it to another.

An example of how the rent-control law robs an infant is found in the following correspondence, I quote:

ROLLIN R. WINSLOW,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
St. Joseph, Mich., February 3, 1950.

The Honorable CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Member of Congress.

DEAR CLARE: I am reluctant to bother you knowing the heavy demands upon you in these difficult times. However, the application of the rent-control law in one of my cases seems so very unfair and unreasonable that I feel constrained to do so.

As the guardian of the estate of Joan Faith Pitcher, a minor and the victim of a broken home, I leased the only asset in the estate, a residence in Niles, under date of February 14, 1949, at $420 payable semiannually for a term of 3 years. The lease was approved by the probate court. The lessees were very anxious to obtain the premises at this rental.

The rent director, as you will see by the enclosed correspondence, admits that at the time the lease was executed the premises were not under rent control as they had not

been previously leased having been occupied by members of the family; nevertheless, he tells me that I must cease accepting payment 6 months in advance and threatens to reduce the rent from $70 a month to $45 a month unless I can show comparable [illegible] on similar properties in the neighborhood as of April 1, 1941. You can realize in view of the increased cost of living since 1941 how much of a chance I have of doing that.

The area rent attorney denies that the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 thus operates ex post facto and, though the rent is reduced by $25 per month and cannot be collected in advance, yet he maintains that this does not vitiate the contract (see penultimate paragraph of his letter dated January 11, 1950).

I am asked to refund to the lessees all rents over $45 per month since April 1, 1949, or $275. The estate does not possess this sum as the taxes are high and I have paid $25 a month for the child's care and comforts since lease was signed under auspices of the probate court so you may have to bail me out of jail as I certainly will not pay from my own funds.

The rent attorney (Cholis) is well thought of. This matter is no reflection upon him as he probably gets directions from Washington.

Sincerely yours,

ROLLIN R. WINSLOW.

P. S.—If the estate had any money I would fight the matter in court but that is not possible.

JANUARY 12, 1950.

Re 520 Cedar Street, Niles, Mich.
Docket No. M-[illegible]

R. L. JACKSON, Esq.,
Rent Director, South Bend, Ind.

SIR: I acknowledge the receipt of Form No. D-402 stating that you have been advised that I am in violation of the rent regulation.

As guardian of the estate of Joan Faith Pitcher, minor, I did on February 14, 1949, with the approval of the probate court enter into a 2-year lease of the above premises to Emerson Vaughn and Cleo Vaughn, husband and wife, for the sum of $2,520, i. e., rent of $420 payable semiannually in advance.

Members of my ward's family advised me that from the time the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 went into effect and up to the time the lease was executed, the premises had not been rented but had been occupied by members of the family. As the lease was executed before the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 went into effect it was my understanding that it was not necessary for me to register the above housing accommodation. If I have been wrong in this assumption I should be grateful if you would advise me wherein I have been in violation. I shall hold Form D-402 pending your reply.

Sincerely yours.

A true copy of the signed original.

OFFICE OF THE HOUSING EXPEDITER,
AREA RENT OFFICE,
South Bend, Ind., January 11, 1950.

In re: 520 Cedar Street, Niles, Mich.

Mr. ROLLIN R. WINSLOW,
Attorney at Law, St. Joseph, Mich.

DEAR SIR: Acknowledgment is made of your letter of January 10, in reference to the above-captioned premises. Under the Housing and Rent Act as it existed prior to April 1, 1949, certain housing accommodations were exempt from rent control. Among these were those accommodations which were not rented to anyone, other than immediate members of the owners' family, for 24 consecutive months between February 1, 1945, and March 30, 1949. Thus, from your letter, it is obvious that the premises in question were free of rent control up to April 1, 1949.

The Housing and Rent Act of 1949, effective April 1, 1949, however, would modify and change the rent act, among other changes, eliminating the above exceptions. Thus, the premises in question reverted to rent control on April 1, 1949, and as a result, a registration statement should be filed showing the maximum ceiling rent that was charged on April 1, 1949. This Office, in turn, will process the registration and, if it deems the rent in excess of what comparable units are renting for, it will, after due notice to you, reduce the rent to that of comparability. In addition, the rent act provides that only 1 month's rental at a time may be collected.

It is appreciated that the contract was entered into during a period of time in which the premises were free of rent control. In spite of this, the premises in question are subject to rent control and the maximum rent subject to being properly fixed by the rent office. If the rent office does decrease the maximum-ceiling rent, in my opinion it does not vitiate the contract, but rent suspends any portion of that contract which is in conflict with the rent act so long as the rent act is in effect.

If you have any further questions in this matter, please feel free to call on us.

Very truly yours,

ALEXIS T. CHOLIS,
Area Rent Attorney.

A true copy of the signed original.

JANUARY 12, 1950.

Re 520 Cedar Street, Niles, Mich.
Area Rent Attorney,
South Bend, Ind.

ALEXIS T. CHOLIS, Esq.,

DEAR SIR: I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated January 11, 1950. As guardian of the little girl who owns the above property I am under the jurisdiction of the probate court here. For this reason it will be necessary for me to submit the matter to the court in the event that the sole income of the estate is affected. I should, therefore, appreciate your advising me concerning the specific retroactive provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 since it was passed ex post facto. I do not see how it can be contended that a decrease in the maximum rent ceiling *as* established by the lease and a refusal to permit me to accept rent in advance *as* provided by the contract would not in fact vitiate the contract.

My ward is the victim of a broken home and these rents represent the only income of her estate. The mother has had a very rough time of it through no fault of her own if I read the files in the divorce case correctly and any reduction in the rents would work a genuine hardship. The people who rented the property were very anxious to pay the rent demanded and were restive under the delays which were necessary in order that the probate court might approve the lease.

Sincerely yours.

A true copy of the signed original.

OFFICE OF THE HOUSING EXPEDITER,
AREA RENT OFFICE,
South Bend, Ind., January 18, 1950.

In re 520 Cedar Street, Niles, Mich.

ROLLIN R. WINSLOW,
Attorney at Law, St. Joseph, Mich.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of January 12, in reference to the above captioned premises. As yet, no rent reduction has been ordered. A request has been merely made that a registration statement be filed, showing the rent first charged on April 1, 1950, as being $60 per month. The rent office will then make a determination as to whether this amount is excessive. It will before entering an order of reduction, if any, give you an opportunity to present evidence as to whether you think the sum of $60 per month is proper. The only action which should be ceased immediately is the prepayment of rent 6 months in advance.

The Housing and Rent Act of 1949 would not operate ex post facto. It merely stated that the particular premises in question would be controlled from April 1, 1950, and thereafter. It did not effect the rental prior to April 1, 1950. I assume that since a contract had been entered into, prior to April 1, 1950, it is your contention that the setting aside of that lease is the ex post facto action. The following paragraph is indicative that the provisions of the Rent Act controlling the property from April 1, 1950, is constitutional.

It has long been established that "the operation of reasonable laws for the protection of the public cannot be headed off by making contracts reaching into the future" (Holmes, J., in *Dillingham* v. *McLaughlin* (264 U. S. 370, 374).) "Federal regulation of future action based upon rights previously acquired by the person regulated is not prohibited by the Constitution" (*Fleming* v. *Rhodes* (331 U. S. 100, 107)). There are many other decisions under the old rent act and the new rent act. Among these decisions are: *Woods* v. *Cobleigh* (75 F. Sup. 125, affirmed 175 F. (2d) 167, certiorari denied, 337 U. S. 924); *Woods* v. *Durr* (176 F. (2d) 273); *Porter* v. *Shibe* (158 F. (2d) 68).

Affirming the judgment of the *Woods* v. *Cobleigh* case, the court of appeals, speaking through Chief Judge Magruder, declared in *Cobleigh* v. *Woods* (175 F. 2d 167, certiorari denied, 337 U. S. 924 (at p. 169)):

"The constitutional power of Congress so to provide is none the less effective though it may involve prospective modification of existing agreements between landlords and tenants, valid when made" (*Fleming* v. *Rhodes* (1947, 331 U. S. 100, 107, 67 S. Ct. 1140, 91 L. Ed. 1368); *Taylor* v. *Brown* (Em. App. 1943, 137 F. 2d 654, 659, certiorari denied 1943, 320 U. S. 787, 64 S. Ct. 194, 88 L. Ed. 473)).

If there are any further questions, please feel free to call on me.

Very truly yours,

ALEXIS T. CHOLIS,
Area Rent Attorney.

A true copy of the signed original.

[Stamp of issuing office]

(Concerning 520 Cedar Street, Niles, Mich.)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, OFFICE OF THE HOUSING EXPEDITER

NOTICE OF PROCEEDINGS BY RENT DIRECTOR

OFFICE OF THE HOUSING EXPEDITER,
AREA RENT OFFICE,
South Bend, Ind.

To ROLLIN R. WINSLOW,
Guardian, 17 Shepard and Benning Building, St. Joseph, Mich.:

A preliminary investigation by the rent director indicates that the maximum rent for the above-described accommodations should be decreased.

(xx) On the grounds stated in section(s) 5 (c) 1 of the rent regulation. Therefore, the rent director proposes to decrease the maximum rent from $70 per month to $45 per month.

(xx) The rent director further proposes that the order decreasing the maximum rent shall be effective to reduce the rent from April 1, 1949, for the reason(s) stated in section(s) 4 (e) of the rent regulations.

In the event you wish to file a reply to this proposed action, such reply must be filed within 10 days from the date of this notice.

Written evidence supporting your reply must also be filed. Your statements and supporting evidence should be typed or legibly written. The address of the above housing accommodations and the docket number appearing on this notice should be placed on each document filed.

If no reply and supporting evidence are filed within the above period, the rent director may enter an order decreasing the maximum rent without further notice.

R. L. JACKSON,
Rent Director.

JANUARY 31, 1950.

A true copy of the signed original.

Washington and Lee University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last June, pursuant to a Senate joint resolution, a congressional committee, including members designated by the President of the United States, attended the bicentennial celebration of a relatively small but highly distinguished southern college. In view of the contribution of Washington and Lee University through the years to the training of men from all States in the Union for public leadership, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the account of the bicentennial of Washington and Lee written by the editor of the Iron Worker, E. A. Watson, and reprinted in the twentieth anniversary edition of Dixie Business—The Voice of Southern Progress, as its article of the year from a company magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE OF THE YEAR FROM COMPANY MAGAZINE

(By E. A. Watson, editor, the Iron Worker)

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY AND ITS BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The editor of the Iron Worker, E. A. Watson, has written for his spring 1949 issue a notable account of the bicentennial of Washington and Lee. The editors of Dixie Business have selected it as the finest feature in any company magazine published in 1949. The Iron Worker is published by the Lynchburg Foundry Co., Lynchburg, Va.)

Events marking the bicentennial observance of Washington and Lee University have focused national attention on the institution throughout the school year and will be climaxed in special programs scheduled for April, May, and June. When its first two centuries come to an official close on June 18, 1949, a celebration in keeping with its history and traditions will have ended, and plans for a future befitting the faith and ideals of its founding fathers will have been outlined and inaugurated.

An impressive opening convocation in September started the celebration, with an address by Chief Justice of the United States Fred M. Vinson. Its formal academic procession, led by the Chief Justice and the university's thirteenth president, Francis Pendleton Gaines, included regional bicentennial chairmen from all over America and the school's 1,250 male students, among whom are numbered the distinguished two sons: James and Fred M. Vinson, Jr. Each month since that time has brought additional features to the bicentennial calendar.

President Harry S. Truman, who heads the official commission established by joint congressional resolution to represent the Government and the people of the United States, has stated his expectation of participating in the grand finale of the official national bicentennial celebration. A delegation from the United States Senate and House of Representatives will be present also, and a special State commission created by the Virginia General Assembly and headed by two Washington and Lee graduates, Gov. William Tuck and Lt. Gov. Preston Collins. For the round of final events planned for June 16–18, several thousand of the university's 11,000 alumni have indicated their intention to return to the campus.

Prior to the culminating exercises will be the observance on April 12 of Washington-Cincinnati Day, and on May 10–11 the centennial celebration of the Washington and Lee School of Law. Set for the April date also is the first-day sale in Lexington of the 3-cent bicentennial stamp, the first United States postal issue honoring a college or university.

The contributions of George Washington and the Virginia Society of the Cincinnati to the school in its early days of struggle are commemorated annually by Washington and Lee, and the 1949 date has been set aside for special emphasis. President Harold Willis Dodds, of Princeton University, has been selected as the principal speaker for this occasion, in recognition of Princeton's influence on Washington and Lee's history. Other arrangements for the strictly academic program include awards of honorary degrees to Americans of scholarly endeavor, and a procession of presidents and faculty representatives of leading colleges and universities, national sponsors of the bicentennial, the university's trustees and faculty, the board of directors of Alumni Inc. and student representatives.

In the celebration of the hundredth birthday of the Washington and Lee School of Law, scheduled for May 10–11, the annual series of John Randolph Tucker lectures will be inaugurated with one of the university's most distinguished graduates, the Honorable John W. Davis, as lecturer. Mr. Davis (A. B. 1892; LL. B. 1895; LL. D. 1915), is national chairman of the bicentennial committee and a member of the university board of trustees. He is a former Solicitor General of the United States, one time Ambassador to Great Britain, and was the Democratic nominee for President of the United States in 1924.

The Tucker lectures hereafter to be offered yearly and published by the university, memorialize the contributions of the late Judge John Randolph Tucker, for many years dean of the law school. Subject of one of the initial lectures will be Dr. Tucker's foremost study, constitutional law, viewed in the light of recent trends in that field. A convocation of law students and lawyers in Lee Chapel will further signalize the founding of the Lexington Law School, a private institution started in 1849 by Judge John Brockenbrough, and incorporated into the university during Gen. Robert E. Lee's presidency of Washington College. Faculties of nearby law schools are being invited to join in the observance, which will include also the award of honorary degrees to a group of distinguished American jurists.

In all the planning for the bicentennial year and the development of its program Washington and Lee's heritage has been kept dominant, without any sign of willingness to rest on its laurels. Its noble past has been reviewed in a spirit of natural pride in its enviable traditions, but the beckoning future has been its main theme. The motto on the university's official coat of arms, "Non in cautus futuri," in free translation: "Not unmindful of the future," expresses aptly the feeling that pervades the entire bicentennial observance. When the funds sought for Washington and Lee's advancement are in hand the university may be expected to enter its third century with confident stride. In planning its future it has accepted the obligation of its past. No better pattern could guide it in the years ahead.

Little eighteenth-century Augusta Academy, named for the Virginia county in which it was founded in 1749, was the modest beginning from which has developed the present Washington and Lee University. This prospector described as "a tiny mathematical and classical school" in the Shenandoah Valley some 15 miles southwest of the town of Staunton, was established by Robert Alexander, who continued as its head for 11 years, and was followed by his close associate, the Reverend John Brown. The academy, said to have been the first of its kind west of the Blue Ridge, drew its pupils from the families of the Scotch-Irish settlers of that section, many of whose descendants have been prominent in the making of America.

John Brown, who became the second rector of Augusta Academy, was a 1749 graduate of Nassau Hall, New Jersey. He was succeeded in 1776 by another Princetonian, William Graham, who took over his duties shortly before the trustees of the school on May 6 of that year, almost 2 months before the signing of the Declaration of Independence, registered their zeal for the cause of the colonists by changing the name of the academy to Liberty Hall. Augusta Academy of the British Colony thus became Liberty Hall Academy of the new independent nation.

The Reverend William Graham, said to have been "a man of extensive acquirements, great originality of thought, warm patriotism, and indomitable energy," is credited with having made possible Liberty Hall's continuance "during the troublous times of our Revolutionary struggle." The academy, reestablished in 1776 at Timber Ridge, near the village of Fairfield, has been described as a log structure in which some 80 youths gathered from their boarding schools in the neighborhood, carrying their dinner with them, to study and recite "Latin, Greek, algebra, geometry, and such like scholastic mysteries." These were still pioneers days and instead of broadcloth coats, the students generally wore a far more graceful garment, the hunting shirt, homespun, home-woven, and home-made, by the industrious wives and daughters of the land. "In this rustic seminary a considerable number of young men began their education, who afterwards bore a distinguished part in the civil and ecclesiastical affairs of the country."

In 1782, Liberty Hall Academy, which meantime had moved to the location where its ruins now stand, received its charter from the Legislature of Virginia granting it authority "to confer literary degrees" and "to appoint professors, as well as masters and tutors." The new site was in Rockbridge County, formed in 1778 from Augusta and Botetourt, at Lexington, the county seat, so called after Lexington, Mass., where "the embattled farmers stood and fired the shot heard round the world." At its first commencement exercises, on September 14, 1785, 12 graduates received the bachelor of arts degree. It was that same year that the State of Virginia voted Gen. George Washington the stock in the James River Company that he afterwards presented to the school, giving it the stimulus that kept it alive after the Revolution and is still felt to this day.

Since his engineering days, Washington had dreamed of the project to link the Atlantic Ocean with the Ohio River by a navigable waterway. It was therefore a happy expression of appreciation for the general's service to the State and country when the Virginia Legislature awarded him stock in the newly formed canal enterprise, the James River Co. Washington was not willing to accept the gift for his own personal

benefit but agreed to hold securities valued at $50,000, until they began to show profits, and then turn them over to some worthy purpose. In 1796, when revenue began accruing to the company, President Washington, feeling uninformed on Virginia institutions because of his long absorption in national affairs, asked the legislature to designate a recipient. This it preferred not to do, but offered the suggestion that he might select a seminary in the "upper country."

Upon learning how the matter stood, Gen. Andrew Moore of Rockbridge County and Gen. Francis Preston of Washington County, Representatives in Congress from the "upper country" called to Washington's attention the merits of Liberty Hall Academy. To press its cause further, General Moore wrote the Reverend William Graham, the school's rector, suggesting that the academy apply for the gift. Mr. Graham and the board of trustees prepared an address which they forwarded to the President along with a map of the "upper country."

After giving consideration to other possible beneficiaries, Washington decided to bestow the endowment on Liberty Hall because, he said, he wanted to help a school that was helping itself. In reply to a letter from the trustees informing him that in appreciation of his donation the name of the institution had been changed to Washington Academy, he wrote on June 17, 1798, that "to promote literature in this rising empire and to encourage the arts have ever been amongst the warmest wishes of my heart, and if the donation which the generosity of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Virginia has enabled me to bestow on Liberty Hall—now by your politeness called Washington Academy—is likely to prove a means to accomplish these ends, it will contribute to the gratification of my desires."

Through reinvestment the gift is still a part of Washington and Lee's endowment, the State of Virginia having taken over the corporate powers of the James River Canal Co. in 1818, and at a later date replaced the stock with certificates of indebtedness which were in time redeemed. Additional funds came to the school in 1801 from the Virginia Society of the Cincinnati, the organization formed at the close of the Revolution by General Washington's officers in the Continental Army. Inspired by their leader's gift, the group bestowed upon Washington Academy their total holdings valued at $25,000, accumulated through the contribution by each member of a month's military pay. This donation likewise continues to bring income to the university.

The third gift in those early years was the bequest of John Robinson, native of Ireland, a soldier under Washington and afterwards a trustee of the college, who left his entire estate to the school. This brought the endowment up to a little more than a hundred thousand dollars, which was the financial foundation for its operation during most of the nineteenth century.

On Christmas eve, 1803, the stone building that housed Liberty Hall was destroyed by fire, the complete devastation of which may be judged by the masonry that has been left standing on the spot. This loss was a staggering blow, but George Baxter, who shortly before had succeeded William Graham as rector, felt that Washington's gift carried with it the obligation to continue the school regardless of setbacks. Classes were therefore held in rented buildings in Lexington until, upon the purchase of a portion of today's campus and the erection on it of another school, in 1806, Washington Academy was again ready to go forward. With the authorization of the legislature, in 1813, the name became Washington College.

Construction of Washington Hall, center building of the present colonnade known as the Washington College group, was begun in 1824, with elaborate ceremonies marking the laying of its cornerstone. The development of the college from that time to the outbreak of the War Between the States was gradual but progressive. By the time of the presidency of the Reverend Henry Ruffner, who was inaugurated in 1837, the number of students ranged from 80 to 100, which was the maximum that could be accommodated. Upon the completion of additional buildings in the 1840's the college increased its capacity to 150 students.

In Henry Howe's History of Virginia, published in 1845, is an interesting drawing of the ante bellum buildings and campus and an account of the school that includes a statement of the cost of higher learning of that day: "The bill of expenses in the college are: Treasurer's bill for tuition, room rent, deposit, and matriculation, $42 per annum; board $7½ to $8 per month; washing, fuel, candles, bed, etc., about $3 per month. Total per session."

Soon after the outbreak of the War Between the States the students of Washington College formed the Liberty Hall Volunteers, a military company which fought with distinction in the Confederate Army. So few were left in the college as the tragic conflict wore on that classes at first were curtailed and eventually had to be discontinued entirely. When the Federal forces driving down the valley under command of Gen. David Hunter entered Lexington in June 1864 and destroyed the Virginia Military Institute barracks and other buildings, Washington College also was damaged, though not so extensively as its neighbor. Local tradition has it that ladies of the town, pointing out the wooden statue of Washington atop of the college's main building and explaining its endowment from the "Father of His Country," persuaded the Northern officers to spare the property.

Although Washington College was never officially closed during the War Between the States, it was on the verge of financial collapse when hostilities ceased. Only by borrowing on their personal credit were the trustees able to reorganize the institution and begin the work of repairing the buildings and bringing about its general rehabilitation. When the matter of the presidency of the war-torn college came up for consideration, the name of Gen. Robert E. Lee was proposed. The trustees knew that the beloved leader of the Confederate forces had already refused offers carrying large salaries, but they had heard that he favored a connection with an institution of learning. Some thought it "unmingled impudence to tender to General Lee the head of an institution which had nothing then and must start at the bottom rung of the collegiate education ladder." Others reminded those who hesitated that if the college had nothing, then General Lee's acceptance would immediately correct that condition. The vote to extend him an invitation to the office was unanimous.

In a letter dated August 5, 1865, and delivered in person by Judge John W. Brockenbrough, the rector, General Lee was told that Washington College, though a great sufferer from havoc and desolation was still blessed with a vigorous vitality, and needed only the aid of his illustrious character and transcendent attainments to reanimate her drooping fortunes and restore her to more than pristine usefulness and prosperity. General Lee considered the matter thoughtfully for days and then wrote the treasured letter of August 24, 1865, in which he stated his willingness to accept, but his fear that it might draw upon the college a feeling of hostility because of his being excluded from the terms of amnesty in the proclamation of the President of the United States, and an object of censure to a portion of the country. The trustees, casting aside his objections, adopted resolutions asking him to enter upon the duties of the presidency of the college at his earliest convenience. Rejecting offers that would have paid him as much as $50,000, General Lee on October 2, 1865, was formally installed as head of Washington College at a salary of $1,500 a year.

In the biography, General Lee, by Fitzhugh Lee, his nephew and cavalry commander, it is said that one of the professors of Virginia Military Institute termed the offer that brought the idol of the South to Lexington the happy audacity. The same book describes his arrival. Traveller, the famous gray which had borne him so faithfully amid the flying bolts of battle, now carried him to peaceful pursuits. Unheralded and unattended, having ridden from Powhatan County in 4 days, he drew rein in front of the village hotel, an old soldier recognized him, gave the military salute, placed one hand upon the bridle, the other upon the stirrup, and stood, waiting for him to dismount.

Through the "happy audacity" of its trustees the college was soon back on its feet. In the academic year of 1859–60 there had been 95 students, all except 1 from the State of Virginia. In 1867–68 there were 410 students enrolled from 20 States and 1 foreign country, with 68 percent from outside Virginia. The University's present cosmopolitanism—it is one of the most cosmopolitan in America—derives from General Lee's regime as its president. General Lee was president until his death on October 12, 1870, and in his 5 years' administration of the college's affairs its growth was phenomenal.

Under General Lee came not only this greatly increased enrollment but also many changes in the curriculum. During his first year, five new departments in liberal arts were added and a limited elective system of study was introduced. In 1866, through affiliation with the Lexington Law School, a private institution founded in 1849, a department of law and equity was established. A school of civil and mining engineering was organized that same year, and the students' business school set up the following year, laid the foundations for the present School of Commerce and Business Administration. From General Lee's proposal in 1869 to establish instruction journalism, the first program of training in journalism on the collegiate level in the world, eventually came the present Lee Journalism Foundation.

The greatest development of this postwar period, however, came in "the drama of reconciliation * * * unfolded first in the heart of Lee and then on the campus of his school. From every section great benefactors joined hands with him in strengthening an institution that was to be as broad as his own inclusive loyalty: Cyrus McCormick, of Chicago; and George Peabody, of Massachusetts; and W. W. Corcoran, of Washington; and Warren Newcomb, of New Orleans; and Thomas A. Scott, of Philadelphia—he had been Mr. Lincoln's Assistant Secretary of War; and Henry Ward Beecher, of Brooklyn, even a distinguished group of English admirers, and hundreds more who wanted a part in Lee's work." Through General Lee's leadership nationalism replaced sectionalism in the school.

Upon the death of General Lee the college trustees, noting that the two most celebrated influences in their respective centuries were Washington and Lee, resolved that they be hereafter associated indissolubly as founder and restorer of the school. Gen. G. W. Curtis Lee succeeded his father as president in 1871, and that same year the name of the institution was changed to Washington and Lee University.

Through succeeding administrations, each marked by its particular adjustment to social and economic conditions and educational needs, the university has continued to press on despite occasional discouragements. William Lyne Wilson, Member of Congress and

Postmaster General under President Cleveland, became head of the school in 1897. Dr. George H. Denney, who followed him in 1901, was succeeded in 1912 by Dr. Henry Louis Smith, Dr. Francis P. Gaines has been president since 1930.

Washington and Lee University, loving both church and State, has never received from either a dollar of its support or a suggestion of its policies. Through its two centuries it has remained a small school, a personal school, a school of accepted tradition. Its students maintain manners that are apparent to even the most casual visitor, dress like gentlemen, and accustom themselves to the better conventions, as befits the memory of its founders and the columnal dignity of its academic buildings. Here they speak to each other and to strangers with courtesy and the sincerity of friendship.

Institutions of learning elect for varied motives the title they bear; tribute to a personage revered, suggestion of locality, declaration of identity with a group.

But the name of Washington and Lee is history and testimony and creed.

Farley Appeals to the People To Force Curb on Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith an article from the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News of February 11, 1950, entitled "Farley Appeals to the People To Force Curb on Spending":

FARLEY APPEALS TO THE PEOPLE TO FORCE CURB ON SPENDING

SYRACUSE, February 11.—Checking Government costs is not a political issue but an American issue and true Americans had better do something about it at once.

This was the blunt advice Friday night of James A. Farley, former national chairman of the Democratic Party, in a hard-hitting endorsement of the Hoover Commission recommendations on Government spending. Mr. Farley, board chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., addressed the convention banquet of the New York State Press Association in Hotel Syracuse.

The speaker minced no words in supporting most of the Hoover report: "It is the solemn duty of every American citizen to take this report with the utmost seriousness and to cooperate, as the years pass, in bringing about the adoption of its helpful and excellent recommendations."

SIX TIMES THE NATIONAL INCOME

If Government costs increase for the next 50 years as they did from 1900 to 1950, said Mr. Farley, the Government by the year 2000 will cost $6,000,000,000,000, or six times the whole national income. On that basis, he said, 20,000,000 employees would be on the pay roll at the time.

"The lesson of these simple figures," said the executive, "is that unless we find some way of reducing the cost of Government it will soon grow so great as to consume not only everything that we all earn, but everything that all have saved, and ultimately everything that we call property, which is owned by all of us.

"This is a very sobering situation. It is to the interest of every citizen to impress upon those whom he has elected to office the necessity that this increase in the burden of Government be checked, or we shall find ourselves living under a form of government which is utterly different from that in which we were born and under which our forefathers built a great country."

AN AMERICAN ISSUE

The problem, declared the former postmaster general, "is an American issue and every true American, regardless of party, owes it to himself to study it, understand it and do something about it."

The former Democratic chairman lauded former President Herbert Hoover and the members of his Commission for the tremendous investigative and detailed accomplishments they performed. Mr. Farley sketched several of their recommendations designed to reduce expenses and expedite services by streamlining Government functions and agencies. He continued:

"One of the most startling things in this report is the fact that it proves pretty conclusively, I believe, that Government, as now constituted, has grown so fast, so great, with such haphazard methods, that it is actually out of control of the very people conducting its affairs.

"That means that, with things as they are, Congress lacks the real means of controlling its own expenditures, and the President himself lacks the means of controlling the very departments over which he has the constitutional responsibility of direction."

ASKS ACCOUNTING OF PROPERTY

Especially needed in the Federal set-up, said Mr. Farley, are separate auditing and accounting systems as well as a "real accounting of the property" the Government owns. Such advances, he said, would place the Government in the pattern set up by modern business administration methods.

Mr. Farley emphasized that the extent to which the Federal Government, through grants-in-aid, is absorbing obligations and responsibilities of State governments is "one of the most serious tendencies in our Federal system."

"The way to stop this trend," he advised, "is to restore to the States some of the sources of taxation that the Federal Government has taken over. Here again the Hoover Commission has some very constructive and important recommendations."

It's easy to recommend things as the Hoover group did, said Mr. Farley, but it's another thing to get the recommendations accepted.

UNDER PRESSURE TO SPEND MORE

"Congress is under so many demands for the expenditure of funds that it finds it almost impossible to resist them," he declared. "What is needed is that Americans be organized to put just as much pressure on Congress to save as various pressure groups have put on it to spend.

"We must make a decision as to what should come first in the way of Government expenditures and then stop the increase."

The former Democratic chieftain told his listeners:

"We have got to have men in Congress who look to the need for a sound national economy with a balanced budget, and a little less concern for what certain communities and particular departments are demanding. This is a national cause and it requires a national point-of-view.

"We cannot, if we expect to remain a great and growing nation, indulge in an extension of the practice of deficit spending in times of great prosperity such as these. Our tax burden now is about all that we can support. An increase in our income taxes would probably yield less, rather than more revenue.

"We must reduce our cost of government, and we must reduce it even if some people get hurt in the process."

Rebuilding the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Frank A. Waring, Chairman, United States Philippine War Damage Commission, before the Women's National Democratic Club, Washington, D. C., Monday, February 13, 1950:

Madam Chairman, members of the Women's National Democratic Club, and guests, I am delighted to have this opportunity to discuss with you the Philippines and its problem of reconstruction—delighted because the United States Philippine War Damage Commission has had a part in this work since 1946, and it is a subject which lies very close to our hearts.

Recently I had the privilege of appearing before the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives in connection with the Commission's last budgetary request. To the members of that committee I was able to say, "Gentlemen, this Commission is one agency of the Government which will finish its job before Congress said it must, and for less administrative expense than the Congress authorized." Every member of the Commission's staff is proud of that record. I do not suppose that many of you realize that today, in Manila and throughout the Philippines, a staff of approximately 100 Americans and 900 Filipinos is engaged in paying the war-damage claims of the Philippine Government and of individual Filipinos and Americans. The members of that staff, involved in a great and unprecedented task, are working diligently, at the rate of 2,000 to 3,000 claims each working day, to terminate their own employment.

In 1946 the Congress passed the Philippine Rehabilitation Act which authorized the appropriation of $400,000,000 for the payment of private property claims for war damages in the Philippines. It also established the United States Philippine War Damage Commission which was assigned the task of adjudicating these claims and distributing the funds. Under the terms of the law, the Commission is required to assess the damage on the basis of prewar values less depreciation. Such values are obviously very much less than current costs. The law further provides that the Commission must pay in full all claims approved for $500 or less. On larger approved claims the Commission must pay $500, and then make a pro rata distribution insofar as its funds permit. On these larger approved claims the Commission is currently paying $500 plus 30 percent of the remainder. It expects that the funds authorized will be sufficient to permit a final liquidating payment of 15 percent. Thus, on the large approved claims, the total payment will be $500 plus 45 percent of the remainder, whereas approved claims not exceeding $500 will be paid in full.

When the statutory filing period of 12 months closed on February 29, 1948, the Commission had received 1,250,000 claims, valued by the claimants at more than $1,200,000,000 and 1,000,000 of these claims, or 80 percent, were for $500 or less in claimed amount. By January 31, 1950, 1,205,000 of these claims had been liquidated and $360,000,000 paid into the Philippine economy. Claimants had valued these processed claims at $938,000,000, and the Commission had approved them for $417,000,000. Thus, with more than 95 percent of the task completed,

the average rate of disallowances has exceeded 55 percent. On the average, therefore, the Commission has approved approximately 45 percent of the amount claimed. This does not mean that all claims were approved for 45 percent of their face value; 62,000 claims, valued at more than $107,000,000, have been disallowed in their entirety. Others, because they were well-prepared and adequately supported, were given a higher-than-average allowance.

Despite this rigorous and business-like policy of adjudication, the Philippine people appear to feel that they have received fair and equitable treatment. Under the law claimants are granted the opportunity to appeal to the Commission for reconsideration of their claims if they feel that an injustice has been done. Thus far, however, appeals have averaged less than 2 percent of the claims liquidated. We believe this to be a very real testimonial to the Commission's record of integrity and equity.

The Commission plans to conclude its work by December 31 of this year, 4 months ahead of the termination date fixed by Congress. We will finish the adjudication of all claims by June 30. Then, when the exact amount of the total authorization remaining for distribution has been determined, we will be in a position to make the final liquidating payment to those with approved claims in excess of $500. Such payments will be made to about 120,000 firms and individuals. At the rate of 2,000 payments each working day, this task alone will require 3 months. Thereafter, we will dispose of the Commission's assets, close our doors, and arrange for the return to the United States of the American members of the staff. You may be interested to know that, in this calendar year, we will pay into the Philippine economy approximately $150,000,000. And this aid comes at a time when it is sorely needed.

There is one impression which has gained some attention that I should like to dispel. It has been said that these funds, paid to small and large claimants alike, have been squandered on luxuries. The statement is simply not true. The Commission has conducted impartial surveys to ascertain the facts. As a result we know that the funds distributed by the Commission have gone where they were intended to go—to rehabilitate the Philippines. A very few exceptions there may be, but they do not constitute 1 percent of the total.

The small claimant has reconstructed or repaired his home, purchased land, or bought work animals, farm implements, tools, and essential clothing for his family. Thus he has become a more productive, and hence more useful, member of society. The large claimant has taken his war damage funds and, of necessity, added new capital to advance the rehabilitation of his business. On December 31, 1949, claimants with claims in excess of $50,000 had received $38,000,000 from the Commission, but they had invested a total of $116,000,000, or more than three times the amount received from the Commission; thus the effective aid granted by the Commission has been tripled.

The task of investigating and appraising 1,250,000 claims has not been easy. Scattered from one end of the Philippines to the other, property under claim had to be visited for on-site inspections. This travel has involved personal inconvenience and often hazard. All possible means of transportation have been employed, from planes to skin leaders. Several investigations required extended trips in dugout canoes on crocodile-infested streams. An airplane, landing on an infrequently used airstrip, narrowly missed a water buffalo. A Philippine revenue cutter was pressed into service for several weeks to visit isolated islands not connected by commercial services. One assignment necessitated a week's journey on foot, blazing a trail through tropical jungles to reach a mine site accessible before the war only by aerial tram now destroyed. The days of the pioneer are not past, or if so, they have been revived in the work of the Commission.

In addition to the $400,000,000 authorized for the payment of damaged private property, the Congress, as a gesture of good will to the Philippine people, authorized the appropriation of $120,000,000 to assist the Philippine Government in repairing the tremendous damage to its public structures and facilities. For purposes of administration these funds were allocated to four agencies of the United States Government: $57,000,000 was allotted to the War Damage Commission for the reconstruction of hospitals, schools, and Government buildings; $40,000,000 went to the Bureau of Public Roads for the reconstruction of roads and bridges; $18,000,000 to the United States Army Corps of Engineers for the rehabilitation of ports and harbors; and $5,000,000 to the Public Health Service for the restoration of that vital service. I cannot overemphasize the importance of this last activity. Disease has caused an appalling loss of manpower and, hence, production in the Philippines. Malaria is still a chief cause of illness and death, and the incidence of tuberculosis is 10 percent as compared with less than 1 percent in the United States. The Public Health Service, under the able direction of Gen. Howard Smith, has made an invaluable contribution to the welfare of the Philippine people. Filipinos owe General Smith a tremendous debt of gratitude, and the American people should be proud of his accomplishments.

Because of the importance of health, the War Damage Commission gave first priority to the construction of hospitals and municipal waterworks. Second priority was assigned to schools, and, third, to Government buildings, national, provincial, and municipal. All of the Commission's funds have now been awarded, and construction has either been completed or is in process on all approved projects. It is expected that these projects will be completed by June 30, and this phase of the Commission's work will then be terminated.

The funds available to the Commission have been inadequate to restore more than a fraction of the damaged public property. The Philippine Government presented the Commission with claims aggregating $190,000,000. It has therefore been necessary to undertake only the most urgent projects. Yet, the Commission is proud that the American people have made it possible to restore, for the benefit of our Philippine friends, hospitals with accommodations for 3,000 bed patients, schools for 3,000,000 pupils, and water facilities to care for the needs of 6,700,000 persons. Moreover, the accomplishment of these tasks has provided labor for more than 16,000 workmen. We can be proud, too, that we have restored the legislative building where the Philippine Congress meets, that we have provided a home for the supreme court, and two excellent office buildings for the executive branch of the Government. In addition, we have restored all of the provincial capitol buildings throughout the country, and the city halls of chartered cities. The supervision of this work has been arduous, but it has also been gratifying because of the essential facilities which were restored to a people whose land was laid waste in a common battle.

The extent of war damage in the Philippines defies description, and even imagination. Manila, now a city of 1,300,000 inhabitants, was more than 50 percent destroyed. General Eisenhower is quoted as saying it was "the worst damaged city in the world with the possible exception of Warsaw." But destruction was not confined to Manila. It was spread with lavish impartiality from one end of the land to the other. Other principal cities, such as Iloilo, Cebu, Zamboanga, Davao, and Baguio, the summer capital, were laid waste. Factories were bombed, burned, and looted. Major businesses were destroyed, and some of the agricultural land damaged. Many of the people were driven from their homes; farmers lost work animals and tools; thousands were practically penniless, lacking the bare essentials of food and clothing. Sources of employment vanished. The physical damage to property has been variously estimated as ranging from $800,000,000 to $1,250,000,000, the latter figure having been submitted by a reputable American engineering firm.

But despite this damage, some have said, and perhaps some of you are thinking, that other lands have also been damaged by the war. Why then should the United States take this unprecedented action for the benefit of the Philippines? The Philippine Rehabilitation Act was an effort by Congress to fulfill promises made to the Philippine people during the dark days of the occupation. It represented the generous gesture of the United States to aid in the rehabilitation of the war-torn economy of the Philippines at a time when that country was about to embark on a new course as an independent republic. It represented, also, a recognition by the United States of the valiant aid which countless Filipinos had rendered to the allied cause.

But more than that, I would call your attention to the special and peculiar relationship of the United States to the Philippines during the last half century. In that period we labored as best we could to assist the Filipinos in their education and development so that they might be able independently to sustain democratic self-government. I submit to you that our prestige in the Far East is inextricably bound in the success of the Philippine experiment. Equally important and significant is the fact that the cause of democracy in southeast Asia is directly involved in the Philippine success, for southeast Asia, today in a fluid state, has its attention focused on the Philippines and how democracy functions there. Also, I need not remind you that, with recent developments in China, the Philippines has assumed an increased strategic importance. Secretary Acheson, not long ago, referred to the line of defense stretching from Japan, through Okinawa, to the Philippines. Moreover, the Philippines has been a significant factor in the foreign trade of the United States, serving as a major market for American products and a source of essential commodities such as sugar, copra, manila hemp, and hardwoods. For all of these reasons, some more important than others, the United States, in my opinion, cannot afford a failure in the Philippines. If the investments now being made help to insure success, they are investments which will pay dividends in the future.

You may ask, "What are current economic conditions in the Philippines, and what is the outlook for the future?" First let me say that the Philippines is rich in natural resources. Fertile agricultural land combined with a tropical climate will grow many products, such as rice, corn, sugar, coconuts, fibers, fruits, and tobacco. In addition, great stands of timber, including some of the finest hardwoods in the world, are awaiting a market. Production could be doubled or trebled without exceeding the natural rate of forest growth. Although a comprehensive geological survey has never been made, known mineral resources are extensive and sources of water power abundant. Significantly, there is no pressure of population, now estimated at 20,000,000 persons, upon the land; this is not true in other major Asiatic countries. With adequate capital, efficient management, and technical skill, the Philippines could well become one of the world's favored lands, a garden spot in the Far East.

But what are conditions today? Since the war, imports of consumers' goods have been abnormally large because, for more than 3 years of enemy occupation, the Philippines was isolated and its people had exhausted completely their supplies of basic necessities. It is true that some of these imports consisted of nonessentials, such as cigarettes and cosmetics. But I suspect that you ladies realize how important these things can become, especially if they had been denied to you for 3 years. In addition, imports of building materials, machinery, and equipment have also been large because they were required in the work of reconstruction. Without them, industries could not be rebuilt and production resumed. Rehabilitation, of course, was, and is, essential to provide exports, employment, and governmental revenue for the new Republic.

The rehabilitation of agriculture and industry has been a tremendous task, necessarily time consuming. As a result exports have failed to keep pace with the demand for imports, and the Philippines has experienced sizable import balances since liberation. In 1949 the United States paid into the Philippine economy more than $200,000,000 in war-damage payments, veterans' benefits, and other disbursements. These receipts, however, were insufficient to offset a trade deficit of approximately $300,000,000 and reserves, the dollar deposits of the Philippines in the United States, declined.

To strengthen its financial and economic position, the Philippine Government, in recent months, has taken positive action. It has imposed quota controls to curtail sharply the importation of luxuries and nonessentials, and the Central Bank has followed with credit restrictions designed to accomplish the same purpose. Finally, in December, the Government, operating through the Central Bank, imposed exchange controls to provide a mechanism for the protection of its dollar reserves. Steps are also being taken to increase agricultural production, with special emphasis on sugar and manila fiber for export, and on rice to eliminate the necessity of importing it. Moreover, the Philippine administration is presenting to the Philippine Congress a balanced budget for the fiscal year 1950–51. This they propose to accomplish by the introduction of economies, the increase of certain taxes to offset the anticipated decline in customs revenue caused by import controls, and the improvement of their tax-collection procedures.

In 1946 President Manuel Roxas made a hurried trip to the United States to seek a loan so that the Philippine Government might, in those early days, have funds with which to operate. At that time I asked my old friend whether the damage and destruction could be repaired in 5 years. He shook his head sadly and said, "No, Frank, it will take at least 10." One-half of that period is now gone, and much has been accomplished. But the task remaining is very great. For this new Republic, troubled with grave economic problems, I bespeak the continued interest and sympathetic consideration of the people of the United States.

Hon. Eugene O'Sullivan, of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "O'SULLIVAN's Oratory," which appeared in the Kearney Daily Hub, of Kearney, Nebr., on Friday, February 3, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

O'SULLIVAN'S ORATORY

Nebraska's Representative EUGENE O'SULLIVAN, of Omaha, apparently is making quite a splash in Washington—particularly in the field of verbose, unnecessary, and downright silly oratory.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN, who represents the Second Congressional District, apparently has decided that a freshman in the House must be noted for something in order to get into the public eye, so he has launched into speeches on the floor of Congress, a sample of which follows:

"Political reactionaries today may advertise haughtily their venal verdure, personally and through equally venal media, spread themselves like the Biblical green bay tree—Larus Nobilis—and claim that the power of gold is supreme, but what doth it avail them; it, too, shall pass away like a drunkard's disturbing dream and be lost forever in fathomless nothingness long before their life's bad book shall have found its last resting place in oblivion's uncataloged library."

In trying times such as these, with the future of the world resting on the shoulders of America's Congress and the people who elected them their delegates, the above-quoted remarks leave one perturbed as to the ability of a nation to survive.

George Dixon, a Washington columnist, after reading the passage quoted, was moved to call Mr. O'SULLIVAN's remarks as "undiluted bilge poured forth without any apparent reason by that great reservoir of hogwash, Representative EUGENE DANIEL O'SULLIVAN, of Nebraska."

It rather makes a Nebraskan blush—even a nonresident of the Second District.

Second-Class Mail Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to correct what may have been an erroneous impression from my remarks on the postal-rate bill on the floor of the House Wednesday, February 8.

I was pointing out that the Chicago Tribune is the beneficiary of certain second-class mail subsidies which give it advantages over local newspapers in the so-called Chicagoland area. The advantages admittedly exist.

I did not mean to infer that the Tribune favored those subsidies. It is a repeated matter of record that the Tribune's editorial columns have stated the paper's willingness to give up such subsidies if and when Congress should remove them from other newspaper and magazine mailings.

In the issue of April 16, 1948, the Tribune declared editorially:

The Tribune repeatedly has stated that it does not want a free ride in the mail cars. A publisher has no more right than any other manufacturer to a Government subsidy in the distribution of his product.

The newspaper also makes the valid point on several occasions that magazines benefit more from the subsidies than do newspapers.

In June 1942 the Tribune expressed itself thus:

Consistently over the years the Tribune has argued against the use of the second-class mail privilege as a concealed subsidy. That was our position, it is our position, and it will continue to be our position.

I make special note of this situation on the floor of the House because it marks a very special occasion, the first approximate agreement between Colonel McCormick and myself that I can remember. I want to make perfectly clear that I disagree with many of the other conclusions and some of the statements made in the rest of the editorials here quoted in part.

J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I have received a great many letters from people all over the country asking that I use my utmost efforts to back Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and to oppose the traitorous efforts of those who would seek an investigation of his activities or cause his dismissal as FBI Director. Two of the letters I have received follow:

CERVE CORUR, ILL., *February 11, 1950.*

To Our CONGRESSMAN:

I am of the opinion that those who talk of firing Edgar Hoover, because of wire tapping, or any other means used in order to catch spies and traitors and Communists in our country must have a very guilty conscience. Any means used to catch these people should be used. It looks to me as if Hoover is a better patriot than those that say fire him. I think the Government and lawmakers are entirely too easy on traitors to our country. If you are a true American and loyal to our country, would you object to FBI tapping your wires, if they had any suspicion that you were doing wrong? Of course you wouldn't. I for one say, let Edgar Hoover use his own judgment, just so he catches our spies and criminals. Keep him on the FBI force. He is a wonderful man, worthy of all the respect given him. If it were not for him, Russia would still be a free man helping enemies to this country.

Respectfully,

BERTHA WITTER.

PEORIA, ILL., *February 10, 1950.*

Congressman HAROLD VELDE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VELDE: I have read in the paper that there is a move being made to get President Truman to fire John Edgar Hoover because the G-men used wire-taps on Russian agents in this country.

If this be so, I urge you to support Mr. Hoover, the most capable head of the best run Government agency we have. He has served his country loyally for 25 years and deserves every true American's support.

Sincerely,

MRS. ERNEST C. MAGNUSSON.

Falling Prices of Farm Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT SUTTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks much disgust has been expressed over our potato mess.

It must not be overlooked that potatoes are not the only sore spot, because, as of a few days ago, the Government had invested in dried eggs, $59,217,333; in butter, $59,518,797; and in dried milk, $27,398,480. In fact, the surplus-commodity purchases by the Department of Agriculture has been so extensive that it has necessitated a request by the Department to the Congress that an additional $2,000,000,000 be made available for price support.

In this connection, I commend the following editorial which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean on Friday, February 10, 1950, entitled "Eggs for Mr. Kline." Another very timely article is likewise set out below and was published in the February edition of the Southern Farmer, which, by the way, has over 1,000,000 subscribers. The article is entitled "Farmers Threatened With 1929-38 Prices."

[From the Nashville Tennessean of February 10, 1950]

EGGS FOR MR. KLINE

The latest statistics from the United States Department of Agriculture on the results of the Farm Bureau's price-support program should serve to stir even the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation. The reports show that the Department has stock piled now, and available free to public and private welfare agencies for relief distribution, enough of several foods to supply a million Americans in these quantities:

One powdered egg a day for 7 years, 2 pounds of potatoes a day for more than 2 years, and 1 quart of skim milk a day for more than 2 years.

The proportions of the agricultural program sponsored by Mr. Allen Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and Governor Dewey's secretary of agriculture if the New Yorker had made the grade, mount with each monthly report. Its absurdities and contradictions multiply. All the relief agencies in America could not consume such surpluses even if the Government would agree to add to its expenses the cost of freight haul and distribution to the relief client.

Such a program seeks to nullify the productive genius of American agriculture by making a mockery of its achievements. Such a program, deliberately plowing under the constructive effort of the American farmer, and at the same time hijacking the urban food consumer is defended by a few self-designated "realistic" farm leaders as an expression of the American way.

Secretary Brannan's program that would allow the farmers a parity price and pass on to the consumer the benefits of high production, they condemn as "a socialistic interference with the basic economic law of supply and demand." What an odd and elastic set of labels the times have brought us.

[From the Southern Farmer, Montgomery, Ala., for February 1950]

FARMERS THREATENED WITH 1920-38 PRICES

There is no longer any point in farmers refusing to face what is happening. For over a year now prices of everything farmers have to sell have been falling. During the last 12 months prices have dropped 22 percent. We are warned by the Department of Agriculture that they probably will fall 12 percent to 15 percent during 1950.

PRICES READY FOR FURTHER DROP

In some parts of the country eggs are selling as low as 15 cents; hogs as low as 13 cents; cream as low as 45 cents a hundredweight; poultry has skidded to as low as 21 cents. Dollar income of farmers has been clipped $3,000,000,000. If present prices are allowed to continue farmers will be nicked another $2,500,000,000. If the expected further drop in prices happens—and there is nothing in the present picture to stop them from falling—farmers' income will be sliced by more than one-third, or seven to eight billion dollars.

This means only one thing to thousands of farm families—it means bankruptcy and ruin. It means hunger for lack of enough food, it means sickness for lack of a doctor and medicine. It means debts, and for many it means foreclosure—loss of their farms.

Is there nothing that can be done to head off this ruin? Must farmers sit and watch all that they have labored and sweated to accumulate destroyed before their very eyes?

CORE-ANDERSON ACT CAUSES FALLING PRICES

Farmers can stop falling prices if they will act. First they will have to spot the people who have caused the drop in prices. And that is going to be a painful business for a lot of farmers. The ugly truth is that the people most responsible for the floor falling out from under farmers' prices are their own leaders. The hard truth is that the leaders of both the Farm Bureau and the Grange opposed the bills in the last session of Congress which would have put price supports under falling prices. They opposed the Pace-Brannan bill and supported the Gore-Anderson bill. The Pace-Brannan bill had price supports for hogs, poultry, fruits, beans, tomatoes, legumes of all sorts, milk, and dairy products, etc. The Gore-Anderson bill left out all of these.

Farmers must face up to the fact that present price supports only cover about 25 percent of what farmers have to sell. They must face the fact that 75 percent of what they grow and take to market is out in the cold.

ONLY 25 PERCENT OF CROPS COVERED

If farmers are going to stop their falling income they have got to demand and secure a fair price for all of their labor and not just that labor and work which they put into so-called basic crops. They are just kidding themselves or being kidded by somebody when they allow themselves to be hoodwinked by any scheme which includes only 25 percent of their labor and crops.

It is now all too clear that farmers are going to have to go around the leaders of the Farm Bureau and the Grange if they are going to get anywhere with Congress in stopping falling prices. The only national leaders who are supporting fair prices for all crops are the leaders of the Farmers Union. The leaders of the Farm Bureau and the Grange are all actively lobbying against including perishables, etc.

FARMERS SHOULD WRITE

What ought to be done now, immediately, is for every farmer to write his Congressman and the two Senators from his State and demand that price supports be revised to include all perishables. Name all that you grow and demand that each of the things you grow be put in. Congressmen pay more attention to letters from the folks back home than most people realize. They are all up for election this year. If farmers don't get action to stop falling prices, it will really be their own fault.

Now you can't fight something with nothing. The farm leaders who are responsible for the present law say they mean to stuck by their guns and not permit any changes. It is clear that the only way you can beat these fellows is by being for some other plan or bill.

PACE-BRANNAN COVERS PERISHABLES

The Pace bill of last year is the answer. This bill provided for a trial run on 10 perishable commodities along lines suggested by Secretary Charles Brannan. By this means if there are some bugs in the Brannan plan, they can be found and eliminated.

But whether you agree with us about the Brannan plan, you must agree that something should be done to include the 75 percent of what farmers grow, now left out, and that Congress is the body that must be convinced.

Coyote Valley Dam Needed To Prevent Bad Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose the following editorial from the Press-Democrat of Santa Rosa, Calif., for Tuesday, February 7, 1950:

COYOTE DAM WOULD CUT FLOOD DAMAGE ON RIVER

Nature gave an unanswerable argument last week for the earliest possible construction of Coyote Valley Dam. Flood damage, happily, wasn't great. Some basements were flooded and a relatively few homes had water lapping around their foundations.

A look back over recent years shows that flood damage could have been far worse. A little more rain, a few more feet of water added to the flood crest and it would have been a much different story.

In 1937, for instance, 40 feet of water rolled down the Russian River causing a million dollars damage in Sonoma County and a similar amount in Mendocino County.

In 1940 a 54-foot-peak crest caused damage in the two counties estimated at $3,000,000 by present values. These are figures given by the Army Corps of Engineers.

In the past 70 years there have been 11 floods on the Russian River causing appreciable damage. Thus, they have occurred more often than once every 7 years.

Future damage, according to the Army engineers, will amount to more than $600,000 per year. This means that, unless checked, floods will cost the two counties more than $30,000,000 over a 50-year period. Besides, rich topsoil will be washed to sea.

It is estimated the proposed Russian River flood-control and water-conservation project will cut flood damage by at least 60 percent.

The Coyote Valley Dam is now before Congress for authorization. Its merits warrant congressional approval and speedy allocation of funds to get it started.

Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the millions of Americans in paying tribute to the memory of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, that great Polish patriot, whose birthday we celebrate each year on February 12.

There is no need for me to recite the deeds of valor and the life of honor of this splendid patriot-soldier. The magnificent contribution he made to the cause of American freedom is indelibly etched upon the memories of all of us as well as on the pages of history and he merits the continued gratitude and undying respect of not only all Americans of all generations but of all freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

Poland was always a champion of freedom and the people of Poland in 1776 were no exception. When they heard about America's struggle, they became greatly concerned and it was the universal wish of all the people of Poland that sent Thaddeus Kosciusko to America to help us gain the freedom for which Poland on many occasions bled and died.

General Kosciusko came to America in order to help our revolutionary leaders achieve independence and he succeeded in his efforts. However, his attempt to free his own people from the Russian yoke met with defeat. He struggled in Poland for the same ideals for which he fought here, but he was defeated by an overwhelming force.

During World War II, the war which started in Poland for Poland's freedom, words of encouragement and praise were given to the Polish Nation from all quarters. Our soldiers were fighting alongside their comrades in arms of the Polish Army. Nations everywhere pledged support to the valiant Poles. As everyone knows, the Polish Nation kept on fighting and suffering. While we achieved victory in our struggle, Poland found herself still under an oppressor's heel even though she had been praised throughout the war as a most faithful member of a victorious team.

There is no difference between the ideals which America and Poland are seeking today and those for which they fought in the war of 1776.

There is no more fitting date to review our moral obligations toward the people of Poland than the anniversary of General Kosciusko's birth. That great heart would be saddened by the plight of his own country today. If he were alive at present, he would be fighting his country's cause with the same intensity of spirit with which he fought our cause and certainly we could do no less than render all possible assistance to him.

We must dedicate ourselves to Poland's cause and assure her of our full support. We must prevail upon the United Nations to exert every possible effort in her behalf. We must insist that she be liberated from the forces of totalitarianism and regain her full independence. In doing so, we shall keep faith with General Kosciusko and the other Polish patriots who gave their all so that our Nation might live. Poland must be free.

Forty-fifth Anniversary, Brooklyn Real Estate Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, while at home during a recent week end, it was my pleasure to attend the meeting of more than 1,000 members and friends of the Brooklyn Real Estate Board, who were celebrating the forty-fifth anniversary of the founding of that board. It was also my privilege to listen to an inspiring address by John A. Kervick, director of the New York field office of the Public Housing Administration.

While the speaker's address was directed primarily to the problems of Brooklyn, the explanation of the Housing Act of 1949, in its breath of scope, made it national in its application. I have, therefore, included a summary of it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I respectfully commend the reading of it by all. It follows:

The modern city of this era is far more than a mere political subdivision. It is a civic entity which has for its purpose, among other things, the furnishing of a design for good living and proper facilities for business growth. Only if it succeeds in both of these respects, will it have a chance for continued growth and development in this period of a $255,000,000,000 national income. Brooklyn must compete with the other great industrial areas and highly developed ports of this country and Europe if it is to move forward.

The tools of government, under the Housing Act of 1949, provided the necessary plans and wherewithal for pooling the powers and resources of the Federal Government with the initiative of localities and the know-how of private enterprise, to achieve the essential widespread rehabilitation and redevelopment of our cities, so drastically needed, so that they can provide those facilities for living and business expansion, without which they cannot grow and prosper.

The realtors of Brooklyn can well afford to examine closely the provisions of this Housing Act. It seems to be tailored for the use of "Brooklyns" all over the country where there is a crying need for, not only slum prevention, but slum eradication and the rebuilding of good housing and the opening of new vistas for commercial and industrial expansion in the downtown areas.

The tools are here. The Federal Government provides the funds through which the city can acquire the land and remove the blighted and substandard buildings. The Federal Government provides the funds to meet two-thirds of the write-down cost which, everyone agrees, is the only scheme through which rebuilding of vast areas can be accomplished. The city must, in turn, pay one-third of the same write-down. The city is then free to resell the land for private housing development, commercial expansion, low-rent housing use, or may utilize the land for a civic purpose or as an aid to the downtown business area, by way of the establishment of municipal parking lots. If the realtors are to take advantage of any part of the Housing Act of 1949, they must certainly recognize the advantages to them and to their city in this redevelopment provision.

The low-rent, public-housing program, which is also provided for in this act, is expected to play a vital part in the replanning and remaking of our cities. In all legislative history, no other piece of social legislation has ever been enacted with more careful attention to the protection of private enterprise from unfair competition, and with due regard for all segments of the housing and real estate field, than the public housing section of this act.

1. It respects the established American tradition of home rule in all its provisions. It is a local program with Federal assistance.

2. It is restricted to the assistance of families of low income, with veterans of World War II receiving first preference.

3. There is no outright local cash contribution, and the local taxpayers' pocketbook is hit only through the tax exemption granted this program, which is necessary to achieve the housing of low-income families.

4. Sites are acquired and developments are designed, constructed, and financed through private facilities, including, in a very generous measure, the real estate profession.

The constructive interest of the Brooklyn Real Estate Board is vitally needed for this community endeavor. I am sure that the board will have a sympathetic ear at city hall and at the New York City Housing Authority, which has done such an outstanding job under the able direction of Gen. Thomas F. Farrell. This display of leadership, in positive support of a worth-while program, will help rebuild New York City.

Campaign of Lies—Hoover Report Versus Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of February 12, 1950:

CAMPAIGN OF LIES

Thousands of jittery Federal job holders are moving swiftly and silently to sabotage, in advance of congressional debate, the efficiency recommendations of the Hoover Commission. A favorite device is misrepresentation of those recommendations to pressure groups so that Congressmen, fearing political reprisals, will vote to pigeonhole them.

An example is the current propaganda seeking to convince war veterans that the Hoover reorganization plans for the Veterans' Administration would reduce the benefits available to them. The fact is the benefits are set by law and can be changed only by separate act of Congress. This the Hoover report specifically stressed in detailing how common-sense office efficiency could save $70,000,000 a year in VA without the slightest decrease in service to veterans.

The Hoover Commission's VA task force, which incidentally included several leaders of veterans' organizations, found at least

that sum could be saved by eliminating excess VA personnel, overlapping duties, useless red tape.

It found VA employees are handling only one-fourth the policy load handled by private life-insurance companies. It found VA issues 88 different manuals, 765 varieties of technical bulletins, and 650 circulars of various kinds. It found more than 50 percent of all replies on insurance matters were delayed or improperly handled.

It found VA takes 80 days to pay a widow's claim, compared to 15 days for private insurance companies. It found VA had expanded two laws of 8½ pages into 184 pages of explanations.

It found one VA office had 24 supervisory employees for 25 persons being supervised. It found VA was letting bids for a $28,000,000 hospital almost immediately adjacent to a similar Navy hospital less than half full.

It found the per-bed construction cost for private hospitals was $16,000, and for VA hospitals $20,000 to $51,000.

This is the kind of gross waste of taxpayers' money the Commission proposed to wipe out in VA and other Government departments. But the jobholders are distorting the facts to suggest veterans will be the victims—even though most veterans themselves are well aware of VA's extravagant inefficiency.

It is a self-seeking campaign of falsehoods, and ex-servicemen should join the public in slapping them down. They have nothing to lose in benefits and everything to gain in lower tax rates.

Israeli: Arab War Looms Again Unless We Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on innumerable occasions our Government has announced that our foreign policy is dedicated to furnishing assistance to the people of all democratic nations so that they may live in peace and prosperity free from the threat of aggression by outside powers. If that truly be our aim, it is extremely difficult to account for the complete and deliberate failure by our Government to note the threat of aggression to the nation of Israel as a result of the arming by Great Britain of the Arab nations with whom Israel now has a temporary truce.

For a number of months, dispatches from the Associated Press have reported statements appearing in newspapers of the Arab countries which indicate they are looking to the next round of their war with the Israeli. They assert that the conflict temporarily concluded was but a preliminary skirmish and that there will be no doubt of the outcome of the next engagement. The receipt of vast quantities of arms from England adds fuel to their flame and gives substance to their threat.

When I was in England last December, I visited the office of the American Ambassador and called his attention to the fact that war fever was again rising with the shipment of more and more weapons, including American Sherman tanks. When I asked for an explanation, I was sought to be assured by the statement that the arms were being delivered in accordance with the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty and that at no time would the supply of arms be sufficient to permit another war. I was also informed that the Arab papers printed propaganda for internal consumption and that the stories were not to be taken seriously. I was told I was unduly disturbed.

Since then, the situation has steadily deteriorated. The arming of the Arabs has continued at a steady pace. Apparently, Egypt has made available to other Arab nations a portion of the weapons she received from Britain. In the meantime our State Department has steadfastly looked in other directions, making no protest to England and totally ignoring the alarming developments in the Middle East.

If our aim is to preserve peace, we must use our influence before it is too late. The time for action is not after the shooting has started.

The Christian Science Monitor is no scare-mongering or headline-seeking newspaper. Its reporting is characterized by fact and objectivity. That is why significance must be attached to its report on the Israeli-Arab situation, which appeared on its front page on January 31, 1950. Note the arms that are being supplied:

MIDEAST ARMS RACE BREWS AS ISRAELIS LASH "AID TO EGYPT"

(By Francis Ofner)

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL.—Through the steady shipment of British arms Egypt rapidly is becoming the center of a Middle East arms race which may have tragic consequences in this strategically important corner of the world, according to the official view of Israel.

The Egyptian efforts, as understood here, aim in three directions:

First, substantial purchases of modern war equipment for Egypt and the other Arab states; second, an increased training of new officers; and, third, the reorganization of Egypt's army based on the lessons of last year's defeat.

Israel's military command charges that since last summer Egypt's shattered ground forces are being rapidly transformed into a mechanized, mobile, and modernly equipped army, with its four combat brigades, which were heavily damaged in the war against Israel, already reequipped and modernized.

ARMORED BRIGADE REPORTED

In addition, one new armored brigade has been formed recently and equipped with British supplies, according to the Israelis, which include American-made Sherman tanks. An agreement for the purchase of 40 heavy Centurin-type tanks armed with powerful 25-pound cannon was concluded last month, it is reported.

Egypt's navy has been enriched also. Six frigates built between 1941 and 1943 have been supplied by Britain during the past 8 months. These frigates are equipped with 4-inch guns, 20-millimeter antiaircraft cannon, and torpedoes.

Egypt's air force also has undergone a very substantial change. Until last fall it had only Spitfires. Recently, however, one squadron of De Havilland Vampire jet fighters, one squadron of Venom jet fighters, and an unspecified formation of Meteor jet-propelled night fighter-bombers have been purchased in Britain by Egypt, according to the Israelis.

A part of these orders already has been delivered, the Israelis say. Negotiations are going on now for the purchase of a number of American Liberators, also to be delivered by Britain, the same sources declare.

NOT DENIED IN BRITAIN

[In London, a Foreign Office spokesman turned down the Israeli assertion that heavy sale of British arms to Arab countries will lead to a middle eastern arms race and possibly to a renewal of the Palestinian war.

[Although claiming that these sales were made in order to carry out existing treaties with the Arab nations, this spokesman did not deny that such extremely powerful weapons as destroyers, submarines, jet aircraft, heavy tanks, and heavy artillery were going to countries which are still technically at war with Israel.

[The spokesman confined himself to saying that Britain's commitments in western Europe and to the British Commonwealth of Nations limited its flow of arms to the Arabs.]

Egypt also serves as a transit area to supply Syria, which has no arms agreement with Britain. Since Syria's last governmental overthrow by Col. Adib Shishakli, Egypt has been ceding its own surplus to Syria. Twenty fighter planes supplied by Egypt have already reportedly reached an airport near Damascus.

PACT WITH RAF REPORTED

An agreement to train 2,000 Egyptians at Royal Air Force bases was reached last month. Although the place has not been fixed, it is most likely to be Cyprus or Cyrenaica.

A school for training civil pilots recently is reported to have been opened at Ambaba, near Cairo. Besides Egyptians, the pupils are said to include Syrians, Saudi Arabians, and Iranians.

The intention to send 2,000 Egyptians into the factories of France, Belgium, and Sweden was announced last month by the Egyptian Government as the first step to open an arms factory in Egypt.

Egypt seems to have learned the military lessons from its defeats between October 1948 and January 1949. Last year's lack of armored forces, mobility, and reserves is unlikely to occur again.

While most Arab countries are only now starting the reorganization of their armies, Egypt reportedly began these efforts immediately after the armistice with Israel, signed 11 months ago.

Since the Wafd Party gained power at the beginning of this year, these efforts have continued. The new War Minister, Mustafa Nuerad Bey, already has announced that Egypt is to become the strongest mideast army.

IRAQ BUILDS UP ARMS

Arms efforts are going ahead in Iraq, too. Last November, Britain concluded an unusually generous currency agreement with Iraq, releasing £1,000,000 a month to Iraq's account in hard currencies, instead of half this amount, as hitherto. The Israelis charge that this is connected with Britain's earlier decision to supply arms to Iraq.

The Arab Legion of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, which suffered only unsubstantial damage in the war with Israel, has already been reequipped by Britain. The effort is being made now to lay the foundations of Hashemite Jordan's air force. Two Arab Legion captains, Ali Abu Newar and Mohammed Bey Ruisan, were sent the end of last year to Britain's staff college.

This arms situation, coupled with the fact that no peace settlement has been concluded yet with any Arab states, makes Israel feel more isolated than ever. This is forcing Israel to increase its own defense capacity to the maximum of its ability, is officially stated here.

The Dishonest Attack on the Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Capital Times of Madison, Wis., a fearless liberal newspaper edited by a great progressive, William T. Evjue, carried an interesting article by Mr. Evjue in its issue of February 6. Mr. Evjue broadcasts over a number of Wisconsin radio stations every Sunday, and his speeches are carried the following day in the Capital Times.

His strictures on Republican leaders whom he characterizes as men who are preaching hate and distrust of government are particularly interesting. His address, The Dishonest Attack on the Welfare State, follows:

Hello, Wisconsin. During the coming week end the American people, over the radio and through the press, must go through the annual ordeal of listening to Republican spellbinders as they use Abraham Lincoln's birthday as the springboard from which to launch the current Republican propaganda at their Lincoln Day dinners. We shall be told again with great eloquence that Lincoln is the patron saint of the Republican Party and that today he is the personification of Republican ideals.

If it becomes necessary to distort some of the things that Lincoln said in order to fit the Republican ideology of today, the Republican orators will not be above taking liberties with the pronouncement of the Great Emancipator on such subjects as freedom, human welfare, and a good life for all our people. Have not some good Republicans only recently been convicted of misquoting Lincoln in order to shore up the campaign being now carried on by the Republican Party against the so-called welfare state?

Recently Representative BOLTON of Ohio introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of 10 sayings which were attributed to Lincoln. Look magazine picked up these sayings and used them in a big splash article in the Cowles publication against the welfare state. Then Time magazine challenged the authenticity of these statements and said they were never uttered by Lincoln. Here is one of the statements attributed to Lincoln and which was to be used as propaganda against the welfare state: "You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could do for themselves." When an effort was made to trace the source of the 10 statements, Representative BOLTON said that she had gotten them from a friend who had heard them on a broadcast by a radio commentator named Galen Drake. Drake in turn couldn't remember where he had picked them up, but he said he thought he had seen them in a house organ of a New Jersey machine manufacturer. These fake Lincoln sayings were traced as far back as 1942 when they were distributed in a leaflet by the Committee for Constitutional Government, the well-heeled, reactionary Washington lobby backed by Frank Gannett, the publisher of a chain of newspapers in New York.

I can't conceive that, if Lincoln were alive today, he would be joining the smug reactionary spokesmen of the Republican Party who are denouncing the welfare state. The men who are today trying to use the words "welfare state" as a term of opprobrium are men who are more concerned with property and profit than they are with human welfare. Who will deny that Lincoln was always more concerned with human beings, irrespective of race, creed, or color, than he was of dollars and cents? Isn't it always the Republican who tells the American people that what we need in Government today is the businessman's point of view; that we need the type of man who has met a pay roll and knows how to meet responsibilities? Abraham Lincoln hardly met those specifications. He was an impecunious lawyer who wouldn't have rated very high in any Dun & Bradstreet of his day. He challenged the property and economic interests of his day by branding the institution of slavery as loathesome. The property-minded Republicans of the Civil War wanted to ditch Lincoln near the end of his first term. Carl Sandburg, the Lincoln historian, said that early in 1864, near the end of his first term, not a single Member of the United States Senate and only one Member of the House would stand up and speak out in support of Lincoln. My guess is that if Lincoln were here today he would spurn the relish, big-business philosophy of the Republican Party and aline himself with the second bill of rights enunciated by President Franklin D. Roosevelt when he said in 1944 that these rights should be: "The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or mines of the Nation; the right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation; the right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living; the right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and combination by monopolies; the right of every family to a decent home; the right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health; the right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment; the right to a good education."

No; Abraham Lincoln would not be alining himself today with the men who are preaching hate and distrust of government. He believed in a government responsive to the needs and wishes of the people rather than one owned and manipulated by and for the special privileged few. Lincoln gave a pretty good definition of the "welfare state" when he said, "The legitimate object of government is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot by individual effort do at all or do so well themselves." When the Republican spellbinders mount the rostrums this week to convince the American people that modern-day Republicanism is in any way related to the humanitarianism of Lincoln they should remember another famous Lincoln quotation: "You can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all the time, but can't fool all the people all the time."

The fraudulent use of quotations attributed to Lincoln by the conservative orators is typical of the insincerity with which the whole attack against the so-called welfare state is being carried on. The men who cry loudest against the welfare state will never tell you what welfare services they would cut off if given control of the Government. Would they abolish social security, aid to agriculture, subsidies to the newspapers, shipping interests, or the air lines? Would they cut out veterans aids, the school-lunch program, rural electrification? When pressed they will never be specific. Like Governor Dewey in the 1948 campaign, they will merely say that they can do better what has already been done. This same insincerity was evident a few weeks ago when the news hit America that the labor government in New Zealand had been defeated by the conservatives. The news was hailed in the press of this Nation as repudiation of the welfare state in New Zealand. It wasn't until weeks later that we learned that the welfare state was not even an issue in the New Zealand election. The conservatives had adopted the social reforms of the Labor Party and campaigned on a platform promising no interference with the gains made by the Labor Party. The same thing happened in the Australian election where the conservatives were victorious on a platform of continuing the welfare services inaugurated by the Labor Party in that country.

We are now hearing the same refrain about the election to be held in Great Britain. The press and reactionary politicians, hoping for a defeat of the Labor government, are hailing the election as one between the welfare state and free enterprise. It is obviously anything but that, if one can judge from the manifesto issued by the British Conservative Party and the conservative British press. Commenting on the manifesto of the Conservative Party, the London Times, one of Great Britain's most noted conservative papers, said: "The so-called welfare state with food, homes, work, social security for all is to be preserved and improved. To many conservatives not very long ago, this manifesto would have seemed a socialist tract itself. Its conservatism appears in the claim to put these collective arrangements on a sounder economic foundation by better and more thrifty management." The election in Great Britain does not involve the issue of the welfare state, for British Conservatives, unlike our Republicans and Dixicrats, have come to recognize the Government's obligation to provide people with safeguards against unemployment, hunger, homelessness, and sickness. The forces of the right in Britain are demonstrating a more honest attitude. There is none of this clamor about the welfare state. They frankly accept it and promise only that they will administer it more efficiently. Our conservatives in this country, however, try to travel in both directions at once. They denounce the welfare services on the one hand and declare that they will administer them better on the other hand.

Isn't it about time that our conservatives in this country recognized that the people see through this kind of duplicity. The people are not going to condone any retreat from the welfare gains that have been made. The Republicans tried such a retreat in the Eightieth Congress and the result was the stunning upset election of 1948. For all his "me-too-ing," Governor Dewey could not convince the American people that his party was not trying to take the country back to the days of McKinley. But the dishonesty and insincerity of the attacks on the welfare state will continue even if it requires putting words in the mouth of the dead Lincoln.

Civilian Control Over Military Procurement and Related Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the legislative framework for performing efficiently the so-called housekeeping activities of the Federal Government, including procurement and other aspects of property management, is provided in Public Law 152 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

In developing this legislation we gave careful attention to the problem of the relationship between the military and civilian aspects of procurement and related functions. I believe it was the intent of Congress that, to the maximum degree possible, these activities should be under the control of the General Services Administration as the civilian agency charged with certain duties and responsibilities in Federal procurement and property management under Public Law 152. That law contained a proviso permitting the Secretary of Defense, from time to time and unless the President should otherwise direct, to exempt the military services from action taken by the General Services Administrator in the field of procurement and property management whenever he determines such exemptions to be in the best interests of national security.

I wish to stress, Mr. Speaker, that the proviso exempting the military from control by the General Services Administrator is strictly limited. The Secretary of Defense may exempt only one, from time to time; two, subject to Presidential approval; three, when a matter of national security is patently involved. The President also has authority in Public Law 152 to prescribe to the executive departments and agencies such policies and directives as he deems necessary to effectuate the provisions of the act. Pursuant to this authority, the President has issued a directive to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of General Services defining the relationship between military and civilian procurement to be presently maintained and instructing these agency heads to work out areas of understanding on what military supply activities might be appropriately exempted from or included in the jurisdiction of the civilian administrator. Until further order, the Secretary of Defense is specifically directed not to make any exemptions under the proviso mentioned above, without the prior approval of the President. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this directive of the President comports with the spirit of Public Law 152 that military exemptions from civilian control shall be held to a minimum.

Following the issuance of the Presidential directive on July 1, 1949, the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of General Services, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget signed a statement expressing certain general policies and their determination to expedite the development of areas of understanding within the framework of those policies.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that many delicate and difficult matters are involved here. The military have always been jealous of their bailiwick; they tend to operate as a self-sufficient entity unto themselves. Because national security and defense now involve the whole economy, the whole population, this kind of military self-sufficiency in the making of policy can no longer be accepted as a matter of course. For example, I am not prepared to accept the clause in the General Policy Statement signed by the heads of the three agencies which reads "while it is recognized that the great bulk of military procurement in both peacetime and wartime will continue to be handled by the military departments themselves."

That is recognizing too much, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe that it was the intent of Congress in Public Law 152 to put the "great bulk" of military property outside the purview of the Administrator of General Services and to leave only the small remainder within the "areas of understanding." It may be that in the interests of national security, dire necessity or some sudden emergency may compel us to recognize that the bulk of military procurement should be handled by the military. But let us not start with that as a general policy; let us have resort to that only if there is no alternative.

If, as the general policy statement further asserts, it is desirable to consider "all phases of Federal Government supply as a part of an over-all supply management concept," this is an argument for less and less, rather than more and more, military exemptions from civilian control. Otherwise we are forced into a degree of military control of the civilian economy, under the impact of present-day security needs, that is inimical to American traditions and dangerous to democracy.

For the information of the Members, I include with these remarks the President's directive to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of General Services, and the general policy statement signed by those officials:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 1, 1949.

To the DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET, THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, THE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES:

By virtue of the authority vested in me by section 205 (a) of the act entitled "An act to simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, to reorganize certain agencies of the Government, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1949 (the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949) it is hereby directed that:

1. Pending determinations made in the course of the studies hereinafter directed to be instituted, the several departments and agencies constituting the National Military Establishment shall continue to procure through the Administrator of General Services such supplies, materials, equipment, and other personal property, and have performed by the Administrator such related functions of the types specified in section 201 (a) (1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 as were customarily procured or performed for the departments and agencies of the National Military Establishment by the Bureau of Federal Supply prior to the taking effect of said act. Until further order of the President, the Secretary of Defense shall not, without the prior approval of the President, issue any order or directive exempting the National Military Establishment in accordance with the proviso in section 201 (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, from action taken or to be taken by the Administrator of General Services under said section.

2. The Administrator of General Services, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (1) shall forthwith undertake, and diligently pursue, studies aimed at developing areas of understanding with respect to the extent to which the National Military Establishment should be exempt from the jurisdiction of the Administrator under sections 201 and 206 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and (2) shall present any appropriate recommendations to the President.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

GENERAL POLICY STATEMENT ON DEVELOPMENT OF AREAS OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PURSUANT TO PUBLIC LAW 152, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

The President's memorandum of July 1, 1949, to the Secretary of Defense, Administrator of General Services, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, directed that areas of understanding be developed between the General Services Administration and the Department of Defense with respect to the application of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.). Considerable progress has been made in certain areas. Completion of the task will be expedited by acceptance of basic principles.

It is a necessary part of our national defense to keep appropriations within bounds. Our economy requires it, the President and the Congress rightfully expect it consistent with the fulfillment of primary missions. The preservation of our nonrenewable resources from unnecessary exploitation in our time will mean that future generations may also have the substance of defense.

Modern war is total war involving all agencies and segments of our economy—farmers, factory workers, professional groups, as well as the traditional military forces. Within the Government, many, if not all, civilian agencies have wartime functions, and a careful planning and providing for their needs is essential to a consideration of the whole problem.

The accomplishment of this task requires detailed examination of many areas of effort and assignment of tasks to both military and nonmilitary agencies. While it is recognized that the great bulk of military procurement in both peacetime and wartime will continue to be handled by the military departments themselves, nevertheless there are certain procurement areas and other areas of effort, such as certain parts of surplus property disposal, real property management, traffic management, etc., where it will be important during peace and war for the military departments to continue to depend upon the General Services Administration. Because effective military supply planning covers both current peacetime operations and wartime functions, it appears essential that if sound planning is to be done the military departments must have assurance that the General Services Administration will continue in existence in wartime and will be protected against undue inroads by selective service. To develop "areas of understanding" for peacetime use only would greatly complicate the problem.

In a war economy, especially, each item should be considered as being a scarce item. Transportation, storage, manpower, and other scarce components are involved in producing items which may be fabricated from abundant basic materials. We are a have-not nation with respect to some materials and are fast reaching that status with respect to some once-abundant materials.

All agency requirements in peace and in war should be coordinated so as to constitute a minimum impact upon the Nation's economy.

The military and nonmilitary supply systems must be coordinated at both the policy and operation levels so that the constituent agencies will not compete against each other for their requirements thus creating artificial scarcities and inflationary prices. This objective can best be attained by considering all phases of Federal Government supply as a part of an over-all supply-management concept, rather than by isolating the segments and making each the object of special administrative or statutory attention. To accomplish this end there will be required wholehearted cooperation between the military and the civilian agencies.

Every effort will be made by the undersigned to expedite the development of areas of understanding within the framework of the above policies.

LOUIS JOHNSON,
Secretary of Defense.
JESS LARSON,
Administrator, General Services.
FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Director, Bureau of the Budget.

Congress Should Act Now!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of national security, is it not imperative that less time be spent on discussing the atom bomb and H-bomb and that immediate action be taken by the Congress to protect the people from the insidious and subversive enemies located in the key positions of our Government? Is there any assurance that the infiltration of spies into Government departments is not being aided and abetted by administration officials right now?

To suffer and permit it to aid and abet in the wholesale betrayal of our Government through failure to act on available information by those clothed with constitutional power and responsibility to protect and defend the Government raises a question of duty of the first magnitude. Has the power of impeachment also gone with the wind?

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting an editorial entitled "The Spies' Best Friend," which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald under date of Tuesday, February 14, 1950:

THE SPIES' BEST FRIEND

The point of Mr. Willard Edwards' remarkable series of articles about Russian spies in this country is not that the Russians have spies here. There is nothing extraordinary about that. No doubt other countries have spies here, too, trying to get their hands on secret information.

The more important a country becomes in world affairs, the more likely that spies of foreign governments will seek to ferret out its diplomatic and military secrets.

NOT ALL TRIED TO STEAL SECRETS

To be sure, the Russian spies were not all engaged in trying to snatch our secrets. Some of them were under orders to gain control of trade-unions, especially in vital industries like transportation and communications. The purpose there was to hamper industrial production, promote discontent, and establish a fifth column to disorganize the country from within in preparation for the moment when Russia might attack it from without.

What is chiefly noteworthy about these activities is that anyone as late as 1933 should have accepted at face value Stalin's pledge not to engage in them.

What is genuinely remarkable about the Russian spying and what Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Truman, and their friends have never been able to explain is why the spies were allowed to continue at work after our Government not only had proof that hundreds of them were entrenched in Washington offices but knew who they were and what they were doing.

The information reached our highest officials from many sources. Whittaker Chambers told all he knew to Adolf Berle 10 years ago. The FBI had accumulated a great mass of damning evidence. Later the Canadian investigation revealed much more of the same sort, all of it placed at the disposal of our administration. The House Committee on un-American activities had accumulated a mass of evidence. And there was much more beside.

With all of this information at its disposal, all of it telling the same story, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman and their Attorneys General sat tight and did next to nothing.

The Department of Justice was all set to forget even about Hiss and would have done so except for the persistence of the House committee in pursuing the matter and Hiss' own foolhardiness in bringing his suit for slander against Chambers.

F. D. GAVE THEM JOBS THEY WANTED

There is no honorable explanation of the administration's conduct. The only theory which fits the facts is that Mr. Roosevelt was himself sympathetic with the aims of the Communists.

Certainly they were his stanch political allies and were immensely useful to him, especially in carrying elections in New York. In return for their help he gave them all the jobs they wanted in Washington, even in the State and Defense Departments. He knew what he was doing, and why.

He wasn't gullible. He was the willing partner in a conspiracy directed against his own country.

United States Chamber of Commerce Distorts CVA Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the United States Chamber of Commerce is opposed to the establishment of a Columbia Valley Administration. As I have pointed out many times, this attitude of opposition is not shared by those forward-looking businessmen of the Pacific Northwest who are willing to analyze the issues on their merits. As an example I cite the following letter from Mr. Lloyd B. Dysart, a member of the Centralia (Wash.) Chamber of Commerce, who points out the distorted and misleading statements made by the United States Chamber of Commerce on CVA. I also include an article from the Labor News, Seattle, Wash., of February 8, 1950, which also deals with the United States Chamber of Commerce stand on CVA.

JANUARY 23, 1950.

Mr. CLARENCE B. MILES,
Manager, Department of Government Affairs, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILES: I am a member of the Centralia Chamber of Commerce, which is affiliated with the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Your office has just mailed me a copy of Governmental Affairs Legislative Daily, being volume 7, No. 6, under date of Tuesday, January 10, 1950. This copy is subheaded Special Number, and is devoted to valley authorities, particularly to CVA.

Under the heading The Issues you state: "The Chamber of Commerce of the United States is strongly opposed to regional authorities. * * * The valley-authority idea should be rejected for the following principal reasons."

You then list six reasons for which you claim the valley-authority idea should be rejected, and I will discuss them in the order in which you have set them out.

As reason No. 1, you state, "The carefully developed and coordinated planning for resource development that has aided the Pacific Northwest over the years would be abandoned in favor of a three-man board of political appointees responsible only to the President." You then, in the same reason, state the fact that 4 years ago Federal and State agencies formed the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee to coordinate development of the area.

You do not call attention to the fact that the present existing agencies, and in particular the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee, have been severely condemned as being inadequate by the Hoover Committee. I quote briefly from its report:

"The difficulty is that no effective method has been found for reconciling conflicting opinions and programs. The Federal Interagency Basin Committee and its two field subsidiaries, the Missouri and Columbia Basin Interagency Committees, have not performed this function to any appreciable extent. * * * In virtually no instance has the Committee been able to resolve a major interagency conflict."

Your second reason is that under the valley authority "States' rights could be obliterated." You apparently have overlooked the tenth amendment to the Federal Constitution. If your statement is correct, then Congress, by the simple process of passing a valley authority act, could amend the Constitution of the United States. You surely do not expect your readers to believe this.

For reason No. 4 you say, "An authority in the form of a Federal corporation having substantial autonomy would be free of many of the legal and congressional checks and restraints.

"Projects probably could be initiated at the will of the authority directors. Their purpose could be that of the directors only."

I assume that you have read the bill, and, if you have, you must know that this statement is either untrue or badly distorted. The bill, and you must well know, is replete with provisions for congressional checks and restraints. I will not attempt to enumerate them all, but will quote from only one:

"The Administration shall not initiate construction of any major water control or electric generating projects or major transmission line into a new service area, or undertake any major new type of activity authorized by this act, unless such project or activity has been included in the annual budget program or amendment thereto approved by the Congress" (sec. 12-c, lines 18 to 24).

Since the last of the bill is so plain that "he who runs may read" you surely do not expect any of your readers to be misled by your so-called reason No. 4.

For reason No. 5 you state, "Untold new billions of dollars in taxes would have to be

raised." Now, this statement is very misleading to say the least. This surely do not mean that the bill itself provides for any such thing. Manifestly, if the development of the Columbia River is to go ahead under the authority, or otherwise, many dollars in taxes in the course of years ahead will have to be raised; but you must be fully aware of the fact that the bill itself does not require the addition of a single dollar in taxes. On the contrary, the plan, if effective at all, should greatly reduce taxes by the elimination of waste and duplication of effort which is going on under the present system.

For your sixth objection you seem to advance the conflict between flood control and power development as a reason why the plan should be rejected. You overlook the fact that the Hoover Commission has specifically pointed out this conflict as one of the strongest arguments for remedying the present situation. In this respect I quote the following from the Hoover report:

"There are glaring defects in the organization of these services of government * * *. (c) There is an inherent conflict between the most efficient operation of storage dams for the purpose of flood control and of dams used for the generation of hydroelectric power."

The above statements were made by the Hoover Commission under the general heading, "Defects in organization of water development and use." The Commission was referring, of course, to the present set-up, which you say would be abandoned as your No. 1 reason for opposing the valley authority.

Now, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has, I presume, the right to support or oppose the valley-authority idea, or the CVA bill in particular. In my opinion, as a member of an affiliated body of your organization, you have no right to circularize your membership with false, distorted, or misleading propaganda. You must feel that the grounds upon which you oppose the valley authority, or the CVA in particular, are so unstable that you must abandon cold logic and resort to the type of propaganda published in your January 10 issue.

As a member of a chamber of commerce located in the region directly affected by the CVA bill I want to place myself on record as being unalterably opposed to the tactics adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in its opposition to this bill.

Very truly yours,

LLOYD B. DYBART.

[From Seattle (Wash.) Labor News of February 8, 1950]

WESTON AND CARSTENSEN HIT UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FOR DISTORTING CVA FACTS

Leaders of Washington's two largest labor and farm organizations this week scored the United States Chamber of Commerce of a serious distortion of fact in its recent attack on the proposed Columbia Valley Administration.

The charge was made in a letter to the chamber from E. M. Weston, Washington State Federation of Labor chieftain, and Henry P. Carstensen, State Grange master.

They attacked the United States Chamber's statement that the idea for creation of a CVA had no support in the Pacific Northwest except from some locals of the CIO and from the farmer's union.

Carstensen and Weston pointed out that every organization that represents the people is on record for CVA. This includes, they said, the Washington, Oregon, and Idaho Federations of Labor; the Washington and Oregon State Granges, the CIO, the farmers' union, railway brotherhoods, International Association of Machinists, as well as many smaller chambers of commerce and civic organizations.

These groups represent more than 1,500,000 people in the Pacific Northwest.

"The idea that the people don't want CVA is a fiction that the anti-CVA lobby persists in perpetuating despite the fact that organizations representing less than 50,000 of our area's people are on record against CVA," they added.

"Sure, nobody wants CVA," Weston added. "Nobody at all—just the people."

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HIT

The two leaders also charged the United States Chamber of Commerce with ignoring the Hoover Commission's findings on the present system of resource development in the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere in the Nation.

"It is inconceivable to us," they said, "how the United States Chamber of Commerce, which recently fully endorsed the Hoover Commission recommendations, can ignore its findings on resource development which clearly point out the inefficiency of the present system, which has cost the United States taxpayer $1,250,000,000 more than it should.

Meanwhile, the league has challenged the principal anti-CVA front group, the Pacific Northwest Development Association, to make public its 1949 financial statement. The proposal was made in a letter from Joe Miller, league executive secretary to Daniel Noble, secretary-manager of the so-called development group.

PROPAGANDA

The letter declared that the development association had distributed hundreds of thousands of anti-CVA pamphlets and other material, circulated many anti-CVA speakers throughout the region and taken every possible step to block this legislation, so vital to the best interests of the Pacific Northwest.

Declaring that such a campaign obviously takes huge sums of money, the CVA league spokesman said, "We believe that the public of the Pacific Northwest is entitled to know where this money came from.

To date, Mr. Noble and the Northwest Development Association have not answered this challenge.

The Future of Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Synchroscope magazine of February 1950, written by Mr. James W. Parker, president of the Detroit Edison Co., of Detroit, Mich. This magazine is the publication of the Detroit Edison Co. The article traces free enterprise in the United States and outlines what the future means to us. Mr. Parker points out many things not evident to the general public because of his experience and knowledge in the field of free enterprise. The article follows:

THE FUTURE OF FREE ENTERPRISE

(By James W. Parker)

When I happen to be the speaker at the annual meeting of the Power Club I usually try to give something of an account of how things have been going in the last 12 months. It has all been very well reported, I think, in the articles that have appeared in Synchroscope. The annual report will soon be in your hands and I hope you will read it—there's some exceedingly cheering information.

Fellows, I think we've got a good team. I think we've got a good company, and it's giving the kind of service that people want and appreciate. I think they set us down as a good citizen although we are a corporation and a big one. After all, it's a corporation made up of a lot of individuals. We have managed to keep contact and friendship with the people in our service area. That is what makes this company a good place to work and a good company for the community.

You and I and most Americans, as we've grown up in this country, have come to take some things for granted. I think all of us have been inclined to believe ourselves forward-looking and liberal-minded. We have believed in a fair deal, a fair chance for every man. We Americans haven't attained this by a long shot, but still we've come a long way toward it.

A LOOK AT HISTORY

After the Civil War, when the country was consolidating itself, big business began to grow and get rather powerful. Some of it was corrupt. And so the people of the United States, through Congress, set themselves against this sort of thing and, about 60 years ago, passed the Sherman Antitrust Act and 10 years later the Clayton Act.

The people made up their minds that they would break these great concentrations of economic and industrial power. They feared them the way the founders of our Republic feared royalty and the old monarchy of England when it controlled us.

Down the years since the founding of the Republic there has gone that same spirit, the belief that men themselves are the best judges of their own welfare, that they want to keep things reasonably in their own hands. This is the effort, the ideal of the men I call liberal. Sometimes one political party has led the fight, sometimes another.

CENTRALIZED GERMANY

There was no antitrust legislation in Germany before the war, none in Europe nor, for that matter, in England. It was in 1848 that liberal thought failed in Germany. From then on the idea of running the show from the top, controlling every last move that every man made, prevailed and went on growing. It ended in terrible disaster for that nation and for the world.

Do we have a free competitive system in America? I've asked and looked around and the answer, by and large, is yes. I don't mean everywhere in every industry. We have a competitive economy because for 60 years, with antitrust legislation, the American people have been determined to have it. They haven't always succeeded, and so it's been necessary to bring suit after suit to break up some of the practices that keep cropping up.

I don't approve of the methods that the Antitrust Division in Washington has employed. I think they have done it unfairly. But it has never hurt my feelings when they made some big corporation stop a monopolistic practice. I hope that every time unfairness shows its head they'll crack it. We should stick to our principle.

Americans are now faced by two new growths of power. I don't think anyone of us is very happy about the manifestation of centralized power that has developed in the United Mine Workers under John Lewis. The men who mine coal need unions, but I don't think it is to their advantage, any more than it is to the advantage of the people of the United States, to have a czar with the power that Lewis has.

Fortunately, all this is being aired very well in the newspapers and in people's discussions. I have enough confidence in the

American people and in the fact that they still have the political power to tell their Congress what they want, to believe that in the long run this problem is going to be straightened out.

But I want to talk in more detail about the growth of another great centralized industrial power. This is the tendency to concentrate power in the Federal Government.

Let's talk about it in terms of our own industry. We who have made it our business to see what is going on, to talk to the heads of other companies, can see things that aren't evident to the general public or to most businessmen. The story appears in patches in the newspapers, but until you put it all together you don't realize how far this thing is going.

HOW ABOUT REA?

The idea of subsidizing the building of electric power lines to farmers where companies couldn't economically serve them was, in principle I suppose, all right. Of course, the Rural Electrification Administration was, say, levying taxes in Michigan to build lines in Arkansas. If, in the wisdom of Congress, that was a good thing to do, I can find no fault with it. But here's what happened:

The report (from Statistical Bulletin, Electric Light and Power Industry) is just out that 97½ percent of the occupied dwellings in the United States now have electricity available to them. That includes cities, villages, and agricultural areas alike. In our service area electricity is available to 100 percent. We don't serve every house because some folks haven't wired them. But it wouldn't cost any of them one penny for extensions to have Detroit Edison bring the current to them and put a meter on the house and start serving them.

The Rural Electrification Administration did its part in many sections of the country. It helped do the job, and with that I have no quarrel.

But with the farm job well over 85 percent accomplished, can anybody tell me why on earth the Rural Electrification Administration should still have unexpended appropriations of $1,250,000,000 at their disposal? Money like that never goes back unspent into the Treasury; it gets spent for something.

And I'll tell you what they are trying to spend it on. They are going into the transmission business and coming up with the super co-op. It's cropping up in two places in Michigan right now. This is just plain competing with money that is already invested, with lines that are already in existence.

I remember very well when Harry Snow, our one-time controller who has since passed away, gave us, at the luncheon table, his analysis of the Rural Electrification Cooperative in our own territory at Ubly. You will recall that this got started at just about the time we began serving the Thumb and building lines up there.

Harry Snow said, "There's a million dollars of Government money that need never have been expended. Detroit Edison would have spread its service to that area at its own expense—that is, at its own investors' expense, using money voluntarily put into the business, not taken by the tax collector from the public in the form of forced investment."

Has this been a good investment for the United States of America? Has this even been a profitable thing for the people in that rural cooperative? We know that they pay higher rates than Detroit Edison would charge them—and they don't get Detroit Edison service.

Why it's good for the people of Ubly and that area to have a cooperative is more than I can tell you. Why it's good for the people in western Michigan to build a super co-op I can't say either. But I do know there is $1,250,000,000 of unexpended appropriation and that the REA is out to spend it. And they'll spend it for purposes that weren't contemplated when the thing was started. Once these things get started they keep growing.

An ambitious scheme was put before Congress to create valley authorities practically all over the United States, dividing the whole country into districts. Congress hasn't swallowed it. But Congress did appropriate for the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Southwestern Power Administration, and a lot of others.

WHAT IT COSTS

Although the Tennessee Valley Authority estimated that the annual damage caused by Tennessee River floods amounted to $12,500,000 a year, they have admittedly spent $149,000,000 on flood control projects charged to that account. Yet even this won't control all the floods, they admit, and Chattanooga and nearby towns will have to put up another $20,000,000 for their own flood-control works. And of course there's going to be maintenance cost on all these projects, too.

Figure out what it has cost to save that $12,500,000 flood loss and you'll find the Nation's taxpayers are spending several times that every year * * * just to save that estimated loss in the first place.

And if you talk about the flood lands that are now usable, the joker there is that they have permanently flooded with their dams just about as much rich bottom land as used to be flooded once in a while. And by their own estimate, that "once in a while" is once in 500 years.

The plan to extend these valley authorities is being pushed steadily. They are persistent—and do you know who "they" are? Not Cabinet members. It wasn't Cap Krug, Secretary of the Interior. Rather, it's the staff in behind—obscure people the public has never heard of, men who are bent on making this thing grow.

LOCAL OPPOSITION

They are now proposing a Columbia Valley Authority and running into the solid opposition of local boards of commerce and all the business associations of the Northwest. They say, "We don't want it. This isn't a backward, undeveloped part of the country. We don't want the Federal Government in here telling us how to plant and reap. We've done a good job developing this great and lovely country, and we think we local folks can continue to do it well."

But the staffers in the departments at Washington don't want it that way. So you hear a great deal about a power shortage in the Northwest. The Federal Government itself has caused that shortage by insisting on making aluminum, in peacetime, with underpriced power subsidized at public expense.

The Government fellows just made up their mind that it would be a good thing for the Northwest to have an aluminum industry there. The people didn't want it because aluminum plants don't employ very many. This jumble of power project, aluminum, shortage, and local dismay is just a sample of what happens when you centralize industrial power in Washington.

You can't run the industry of the United States from Washington. Nevertheless, that's what these men whom no one elects are trying to do. And that's why a number of us in the light and power industry are trying to tell the story. I honestly believe that if the real facts get understood there will be no question about the outcome.

When the affairs of a private business enterprise go wrong, the company gets a new management or goes out of business, letting other sound enterprises carry on the work of the Nation. But what happens when a Government project goes wrong? A deficit doesn't put them out of business; they just go back to Congress for a larger appropriation next time.

I think a nation's enterprise must be based on making ends meet. Its industrial life should seek money in the open market, where people entrust capital to enterprises that are well managed and can pay a reasonable interest or dividend on investment.

That is what makes Detroit Edison sound. And when the light and power industry of our whole country is made up of a lot of Detroit Edisons, all of them sound, then that much of the Nation's economy is sound.

FUNDAMENTAL DANGER

But once you put half of that industry into the hands of Government—and that is what some departments are planning—once half of the industry doesn't have to meet budgets and stay sound, then that much of the American economy has an unsound basis. Something very much like that threatens our country.

I'm not at all downhearted about this. It's good having a hand in trying to see to it that the public gets wise, and that's what we are out to do. I think we and other freedom-loving Americans are going to win.

Can We Preserve Our American Free Enterprise System?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Electrical Engineers Association at Baltimore, Md., February 14, 1950:

Fellow Americans, I am glad to speak here in your great city of Baltimore tonight. It has been almost 86 years ago that Abraham Lincoln spoke in this city at the Sanitary Fair on April 8, 1864, to be exact, at which time Lincoln said, "The world has never had a good definition of the word 'liberty.' We all declare for liberty; but in using the same word we do not all mean the same thing. With some the word liberty may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself and the products of his labor; while with others the same word may mean for some men to do as they please with other men and the products of other men's labor."

I am sure if "Honest Abe" could talk here tonight he would say, "I have the definition for the word liberty now." But in his absence you and I must define the word and shout it from the house tops. Liberty means the exact opposite of Nazi or Communist tyranny, and British socialism, all of which most any American school child can define today. Of course, in Lincoln's time that type of tyranny had not yet raised its ugly head. Today, this very hour, most of the people in this world have taken a stand for liberty or tyranny. The fight is on, my friends, and make no mistake about it. Yes, the fight is on right here in your America this very minute, and the hour is late to enlist, a lot later than some folks think.

Can we save our liberties?

Can we preserve free private enterprise for America, the keystone of our liberties? That is the question we face today.

My answer is yes, if we are worthy of it in your sight and it be the will of God to save us from our own folly at this late hour. Where do we start, you ask? First, we must take stock of our debits and credits in order to ascertain about where America now stands as a going concern, and what is most needed to keep America in business. As you know,

there are three sure roads to national suicide—bankruptcy, dictatorship, and starvation. Is it necessary to remind the American people that every nation in the wide world that has traveled the full length of the wasteful, reckless spending road we are now traveling at breakneck speed has come to utter ruin and tyranny. Look at old Germany. A great people who enjoyed their best times when the wage earner made 50 marks a week, but they, too, followed the siren call of Utopia of a wasteful, national spending program, which finally brought a bogus high national income and unenviable inflation. Then the wage earner received as many of marks each week, but it took almost all of it to buy bread. Sure, we can have a $300,000,000,000 national income. Germany had a billion billion mark income, just as Red China has today, and just as America will have unless we stop this mad rush to financial national suicide.

Think this one over for a minute and please remember it. If everyone in the United States cashed in all their life-insurance policies, the total would amount to about $44,000,000,000, which is less than it will take to run your Government just for the year 1950. Or if every farmer in America sold all his farm land, all his farming equipment, and all his livestock, the total would amount to around $49,000,000,000. Again this would not run your Government a full year. Do those figures mean anything to you? I'm sure they do, but not to a lot of fellows in Washington who I could name. Facts are those fellows simply don't care so long as they get theirs. Now you may say, How can we stop it? The answer is, When America thinks and speaks up America is safe. So speak up, Americans.

Since it is a known fact, and these are figures which cannot be disputed, the white-collar workers, of which you engineers are a part, plus the blue-denim workers, plus our retired elderly folks, represent about 60 percent of our consuming public; our farmers, who consume 1½ times more on an average than the rest of us, represent about 20 percent of our consuming public; and the employers in business and industry, and a few more of us, make up the balance of around 10 percent. The consumer pays all taxes in the final analysis, so I'll leave it to you as to just who is paying our tax bill, and should be most vociferously opposing wasteful spending. You folks are paying your share in income taxes, withholding taxes, and hidden taxes. Maybe you can stand it now, but the end is not in sight.

I presume that most of you engineers are now employed by private industry, tax-paying industry, which is the whipping boy among the great economic planners headquartered in Washington. And they are honeycombing throughout our country, planning and scheming ways to drive free, private, tax-paying industry to the wall. I know what I am talking about, for I have been fighting that gang ever since coming to Congress, and have really been in the thick of the fighting for the past 8 years.

As a member of the House Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations, one of those who hear and pass on all requests for funds for the Bureau of Reclamation. That Bureau is in the Federal electric power producing and distributing business up to their necks. There is no end it seems to the length they want to go to finally get control of all the electric energy and distribution of power in our Nation. They have well-developed plans to cover our native country with hydroelectric power and steam plants and a complete network of distribution systems, such as they now have in operation in the TVA, and Bonneville dreams in Washington and Oregon, where the private utilities are already on their knees. This is especially true in the State of Washington where a State law permits private utility facilities to be taken over by public utility districts by condemnation proceedings, and many private electric utility distribution lines have already been condemned and taken over by the public utility districts, which works hand and glove with the Bonneville power officials and the Socialists in the Interior Department.

Time will not permit me to tell you even a small part of the story, but I will give you an inkling of how this scheme is worked. There is a promoter running loose in the Northwest by the name of Myers. He went there after doing a job on the people of the great State of Nebraska, which is now a 100-percent public power State, to the peoples' sorrow, as it is today one of the darkest States in the Union so far as electric lighting is concerned. But Myers walked away with a pocket full of money. Now he is really going to town in the State of Washington with the help of a group of Wall Street money brokers. Myers will say to the folks in a certain area, "You are paying too much for your electric energy. I will help you take over under public utility district State laws with the blessing of the officials in the Department of Interior, and with money from Wall Street, this section of the private power companies' facilities. The minute you take it over you will have no Federal income tax to pay, hence we can pay the company a good price for it. The Wall Street boys will be happy for the business, and you will get cheap power." So, the deal is made and carried out. Myers gets a nice fat drag, the Wall Street money barons get a nice money take over a long period of years, the Socialists have cut the heart out of taxpaying free enterprise, and thus another mighty blow has been struck for socialism and national suicide at the expense of every American taxpayer, the people of the State of Washington included. How do you like it?

Now about the same kind of business is being carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation, with White House blessing, all over the 17 Western States, and spreading fast to other sections of our Nation. Folks, I have not $1 invested in any private utility company, but I cannot sit idly by and see this kind of business going on in America without speaking up and telling the truth so that all may hear.

Dictatorship. I am sure it is not necessary for us to look behind Stalin's iron curtain to know the sad story of follow the leader and his promises of security. All people who have done that now have neither liberty nor security. That we do know, at least.

Starvation. Thank God the farmers of America are solving that problem for all of us by good soil-conservation practices and crop rotation and other scientific farming methods. But there is yet much to be done. Let us never forget that every nation in this world that neglected to take proper care of their priceless top soil are now at our doors crying for bread.

Also, do not forget that our national income is always about seven times our farm income, and that for every dollar of farm income, the businessman sells $4.20 worth of goods and labor collects over $4 in wages for each dollar of farm income. All wealth springs from mother earth, she is our only economic generating plant. We must never again turn off that kind of power in America. Remember also that we have never had a depression with good farm prices, but have always had a depression with poor farm prices.

"If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be the author and finisher," Abe Lincoln said that almost 90 years ago. I believe that admonition to be just as weighty and true today as then.

It was Lincoln who said, "The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of free society." Jefferson also expounded a preachment of millions of Americans today when he said, "When all government, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will become oppressive."

Today, millions of us are fighting the battles to preserve our American concept of life as laid down in the principles of both those great Americans, Lincoln and Jefferson. We are fighting for the economic system of America, which is as much a part of America as is our tradition of Bunker Hill and Valley Forge—as much as is our industry, our people and our countryside.

The paramount over-all issue that confronts us is: Do we believe in the principles of our Republic as it has been operated for 170 years? Do we believe in our American way of life, the private enterprise system, as opposed to socialism?

On this question, there can be no compromise. One stands for the dignity of the individual, his inalienable rights and freedoms, and his sovereignty over public servants. The other, socialism, stands for an all-power state, directing the lives, the activities, and the affairs of the people. The preservation of our American way of life and our private enterprise system depends entirely on how well you and I discharge our duties as Americans. Americanism and socialism do not mix. One or the other will be destroyed. America cannot survive half free.

A true American is one who believes in the right of every American to work and prosper—to establish his own security by industry and thrift—to make a better life for himself and his children through his own initiative and energy. Lincoln said, "You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

Let me quote a few more pertinent words of Abraham Lincoln. He said, "You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift; you cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong; you cannot help strong men by tearing down big men; you cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer; you cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred; you cannot help the poor by destroying the rich; you cannot establish sound security on borrowed money; you cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn."

Do any of these precepts have a familiar sound today?

In recent years, we have seen the extent to which Government has interfered in the lives of its citizens. We have been led into a time of great danger by oppressive taxation, extravagant and wasteful spending by Government, deficit financing and a staggering national debt. And the end is not yet in sight.

Whose fault is it? We have allowed the cost of Government to grow and grow, year by year, until we are consuming nearly one-third of our income just to govern ourselves.

What is the reason? Have the American people lost their capacity for self-government? Must the cost of Government be so great as to endanger our national existence? Lenin, the great Communist leader, said shortly before he died just a few years ago, "We will force America into bankruptcy then we will take her over."

Must peacetime taxation placed upon our people be so burdensome as to destroy all incentive for industrial growth and economic progress?

Must the people give up to Government such a large share of their earnings that they are deprived of all opportunity to get ahead? Will Lenin's prediction come true?

The greatness of America was not built by Government spending. It was not created in legislative halls. It was not produced by the enactment of laws which led people to believe that they were getting something for nothing.

The greatness of America is ours because of the toil and sweat, and the inventive genius of generations of courageous, industrious, self-reliant Americans. They were willing to work and sacrifice and save to build economic security for themselves, for their families, for their communities, and for their country.

And they did not export jobs as we are doing today under a system of tariff reductions that permit the importation of cheap foreign goods through a so-called reciprocal-trade agreement at the discretion of one man which has caused whole industries in our country to be shut down and our workers thrown out of work. We now have not only a national socialist philosophy at work in our country, but a global concept of this system. This, in spite of the fact that those governments which have tried socialism over a period of years have turned their backs on it.

How else can we recognize the Trojan horse of socialism which is being offered to the American people? We have been told that we can produce a $300,000,000 economy, providing jobs for everyone without any large increase in taxes. It sounds good, doesn't it? And it is good, provided our liberties, as we know them, are not sacrificed in its achievement.

But we are presented a 5-year plan. Where have we heard of 5-year plans before? Russia had a series of them. Germany had them. Italy had them. They all ended the same way—starvation, misery, dictatorship, and inflation. Yes; they had a high national income, but it was a bogus income. Their currency was not worth the paper it was written on. A basketful of bills was needed to buy bread. That was not so good. Sure those folks were all promised utopia. All that was required was for them to bow to wasteful spending by the leaders. Does that song sound familiar to you?

What else did these three dictatorships have in common? They are all socialistic states. Socialism and communism are sisters under the skin. Remember the official name of Russia is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

How did all of this start? Let's take a brief look at how the Trojan horse of socialism took over in England and then show the deadly peril here. First they took over all banking, then all electric power—the people were then told to be good or you get neither money nor electric power—the rest was easy. Remember this, few Socialists of modern times will admit that they are a Socialist. The large majority of American Socialists abhor the name while doing the deed. They call themselves economic planners and other high-sounding titles. But their objectives are all the same—the regimentation of the people into robots to obey the commands of the big brains fastened onto the pay rolls of the Government.

In England the Socialists masking under the name of the Labor Party were a small group at first. They fastened themselves onto the larger Liberal Party and bored from within. They worked slowly and began to take more and more power over the Liberal Party until in the last election several years ago the Liberal Party was practically out of existence. They came into power with catch slogans such as "jobs for all," "security from the cradle to the grave," and other vote bait. Then the real planners of the so-called welfare state got to work. I need not go into any details as to what has happened to once mighty England. You know she is bankrupt and living off the dole of the United States, the last and most powerful free-enterprise country in the world. How long can we take it? But you say it couldn't happen here. Listen to this: There is a bill called the Spence bill, H. R. 2756, called the Economic Stability Act of 1949. It is part of the 5-year American Socialist plan. It sounds good, doesn't it? Everyone wants economic stability. But this bill gives the President the right to go into any business with Government funds to compete with any private business. Last year they wanted to put the Government into the steel business. Under this Spence bill, the President can also channel scarce materials and facilities into what he may deem essential production and uses. If the Socialist planners feel that your business is not essential, they can put you out of business by simply refusing you materials or plant facilities. You could also be subpenaed in person with your records and books and, if you refused, be in contempt of court and suffer the penalty. This bill permits the President to fix prices. I have not time to go into all phases of this Spence bill, but these are a few examples to show you how far down the road to socialism a powerful, well-organized clique are determined to take America.

The Brannan farm bill is another example. High prices to farmers and low prices to consumers also sounds good. But even the author himself or his experts either cannot or dare not estimate the cost to the taxpayers of this one. And my advice to all young men planning to be farmers is to learn accountancy good to keep the numerous records and reports which are necessary if this plan ever went through, in order to keep himself out of jail—for there is a jail penalty in the 15 pages of penalties written in this bill which would regiment farmers beyond anything Americans ever dreamed would happen here. Farming is the greatest private enterprise in our land. I am happy to report to you that only a very small percent of our farmers are falling for the Brannan scheme.

The time has come when we must abandon our easy-going attitude toward regimentation and needless and wasteful Government spending. We have been presented this year with the largest peacetime budget in our history, plus the fact that we will have a 1950 fiscal deficit of at least $6,000,000,000, according to my figures.

What are we going to do about it?

We must give the people a clear-cut choice of the issues confronting us today. Let those who are for a Socialist state get into their corner. Those who are for our free-enterprise competitive system get over in our corner. Let's fight it out on clear-cut issues. Anyone who can think and read and who has followed the goings on in Washington for a long, long time, can have no doubt as to where the road ahead will lead.

We must stand for a republic in which the elected representatives and public officials are servants of the people and not their masters.

Public opinion, when aroused, is yet the strongest force in this land. It is your job to see to it that the people understand the truth; understand that eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

We must stand up fearlessly against the folly of a domestic program that teaches people to depend upon Government for all good things in life remembering that Lincoln said: "You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence."

We must constantly warn against the dangers of a Federal policy that deceives the sane of mind and strong of body into thinking that they get something for nothing. But we must ever remember our duty and responsibility as Americans to the aged and infirm, to the widows and orphans, and our disabled veterans who are paying the greatest price for our wars. This we must do and can do unless we spend all America into bankruptcy needlessly.

We must place where it properly belongs, full responsibility for secret agreements which betrayed free governments into socialistic and communistic enslavement.

And we must fight here against the drift into a socialistic pattern of government because that system has brought death and destruction to every country where it has been attempted.

Let us plan courageously and well. And let us work diligently. Let us carry the truth to the people.

Let us again dedicate ourselves to the proposition "that this country, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

A Tribute to Susan B. Anthony, a Woman of Consecrated Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today is the birthday of Susan B. Anthony. Although 130 years have elapsed since her birth and nearly half a century since her death, her influence is still a powerful force in the promotion of an improved status for women and of enlightened government.

Miss Anthony was a zealous and valiant campaigner for any cause to which she devoted her unusual talents. Halfway measures she spurned. She is best remembered, of course, for her pioneer work in obtaining suffrage for women, which, unfortunately, did not become a reality until 14 years after her death. But her activities in furthering the advancement of women and in other worthwhile causes were by no means limited to this single field.

I am proud the women of the party which gained the allegiance and loyalty of this distinguished woman have formed in my community a flourishing organization known as the Susan B. Anthony Republican Club, thus perpetuating the memory of a great woman leader and furthering those principles of government which she espoused. This daughter of Rochester belongs to the ages. Let us who follow profit by her example through clinging steadfastly and, if necessary, militantly to the ideals and principles which conscience, rather than expediency, dictates.

Recommendations of the Hoover Commission Report on Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter from Mr. Joe H. Tonahill, a division commander of the American Legion in the State of Texas. It seems to me to be a very fine statement, and the million other veterans of his State stand on that part of the Hoover Commission report concerning veterans' affairs.

The letter follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF TEXAS,
Jasper, Tex., February 3, 1950.

Hon. M. G. BURNSIDE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURNSIDE: The purpose of this letter is to commend you for the very intelligent and patriotic stand you are taking relative to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission Report on Veterans' Affairs. I refer to your speech in the House February 1, 1950, which is printed on page 1350 of the Congressional Record.

Your statement that any change in the Veterans' Administration program of hospitalization must be viewed from the standpoint of better service to our disabled, and that the Hoover Commission proposal of the consolidation of hospital care for veterans with all other hospital programs of the Government is a complete reversal of our national policy of special treatment for veterans, meets squarely with the consensus and considered belief, in my earnest opinion, of the 1,000,000 veterans of Texas, their families, as well as their leaders, the 100,049 paid-up members of the American Legion, Department of Texas.

We Legionnaires are for real economy in the Government's discharge of the Nation's obligations to its 19,000,000 veterans. As a matter of fact, the American Legion has always advocated wastes in Government effort. We likewise recognize that improvements can be achieved in the operations of the Veterans' Administration. However, we of the Legion believe very strongly that such improvements in services and savings in costs can best be made within the existing framework of the Veterans' Administration.

In considering the Hoover Commission report one must naturally look to the nature and character of the research and investigation that was conducted by the Hoover task forces. It, of course, is no absolute disqualification of that report in connection with veterans' affairs that Hoover himself in 1929 told the Nation that efficiency, economy, and more uniform administration required consolidation of the three separate agencies then handling veterans' affairs, for instance, (a) Veterans' Bureau, (b) Pensions Bureau, and (c) National Homes for Volunteer Soldiers, and that Congress responded by placing these three agencies under the Veterans' Administration; yet now, though 20 years later, statesman Hoover tells us that for the same reasons of economy and efficiency the Veterans' Administration must be carved up into not just three agencies but five agencies. We are wondering whether Mr. Hoover was wrong in 1929 or whether his Commission is wrong now.

Nor is it an absolute disqualification of the report that there is an existing defect that cannot and should not be corrected within the four walls of the Veterans' Administration. Neither is the report disqualified by virtue of the fact that the Hoover task forces completely ignored the American Legion in reaching its findings, originated, conducted, and prepared and discussed their investigations for 2 years into the matter from offices located just four doors removed from the American Legion headquarters in Washington, D. C.; nor either for the fact that the American Legion asked to be heard to present the side of the veteran on four occasions and that their request went unheeded; and likewise neither is it a disqualification that Chairman JOHN RANKIN, Veterans' Affairs Committee, were not consulted.

Though these observations do not vitiate the structure and credibility of the Commission's recommendations, yet one cannot ignore the unmistakable fact that had the Commission sought the benefit of the experience, the lessons gleaned from a long period of trial and error of those more familiar with the veterans', their dependents', widows', and orphans' problems, that virtually that report would have contained an entirely different approach to the economy aspect of administering veterans' affairs and the problems in connection therewith. Failing to consider the valuable information at its disposal, the unbiased mind cannot consider that the Hoover task forces went about their business with open minds.

You, of course, know that the American Legion contends that the cost of rehabilitating the human wreckage of war is as much a part of the cost of waging war as is the building of battleships, tanks, planes, and guns. Those weapons are paid for in cash on the barrel head. The Government leans over backward to see that every wartime contractor gets a square deal. But the human costs of war are put on the cuff. They constitute a sacred obligation of the Nation. This debt cannot be honorably discounted or evaded by simply writing it off as a so-called economy measure.

We want you to know, Congressman BURNSIDE, that we down here in Texas truly hope and feel that your veteran population there in West Virginia, your home State, will not let the intelligent and patriotic stand you are taking on this highly important matter go unnoticed when you ask for retention in office. Our hats are off to you and to your concluding statement, "I am opposed to transferring from the Veterans' Administration any of its duties or responsibilities to our disabled."

With best wishes for your continued success, and as one of millions who has asked for no benefits and as one of the 100,049 legionnaires of Texas who are receiving no benefits, and ask none for themselves, my highest compliments and great admiration are to you extended.

Very respectfully yours,
JOE H. TONAHILL,
Second Division Commander.

Traffic Management in the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government expends approximately $1,000,000,000 a year for the transportation of public property. A task force of the Hoover Commission and other investigators have called attention to the huge potential savings to be derived from improving the traffic management functions of the Government. The Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, of which I am chairman, is considering the need for legislation in this field.

On January 10 the Washington Chapter of the Society for the Advancement of Management held an important meeting to discuss traffic management problems in the Federal Government. This was one of a series of round-table discussions on Federal property management under the able direction of Mr. Ray Ward, chief, Property Management Group of the Bureau of the Budget. It was my privilege to attend and participate in this discussion as did Congressman BURNSIDE, of West Virginia, a member of the subcommittee, and Congressman MACK, of Illinois. The magazine Traffic World in its issue of January 14 carried a very full account of the traffic management meeting. I believe the Members will find this article of interest in view of legislation about to be proposed:

UNPROGRAMED CALL FOR REDUCED FARES FOR CIVILIANS IN GOVERNMENT SPEEDS MEETING—MANAGEMENT GROUP HEARS SUGGESTIONS THAT REDUCED FARES FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL APPLY TO CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—CALL FOR WIDER APPLICATION OF REDUCED RATES ON PROPERTY ALSO VOICED

There were two developments at a meeting of the Washington chapter of the Society for Advancement of Management round table on property management, the evening of January 10, that were not on the official program.

Maj. Gen. William O. Reeder, deputy director of the logistics division of the Army, General Staff, drew a round of applause when he responded to a request for comment on what had been said about centralization of traffic-management functions in the Federal Government and a current program of the General Services Administration for coordinated Federal traffic management. Said the general:

"When you have everyone with a good traffic manager, and you have the rates all down, and your purpose has been achieved, it seems to me the rates would have to go up to keep the carriers going."

The other development came when Stanley Crosthwaite, of the Division of Supply, Bureau of Reclamation, asked Col. E. B. Gray, of the Office of the Chief of Transportation, Department of the Army, how the Army had obtained a 10-percent reduction in passenger fares for military personnel from the railroads and the air lines, and a 5-percent reduction from the bus lines. The resulting discussion brought a suggestion that civilian employees of the Government ought to enjoy the same reductions and eventually the subject broadened out into expressions of opinion that the property of Government departments moving in transportation should be considered the property of Uncle Sam and special rates made to one department of the Government should apply to the movement of all similar Government property.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AS A PROFESSION

Dr. John H. Frederick, professor of transportation, University of Maryland, was the first speaker of the evening. His subject was Professional Aspects of Traffic Management.

"No one who has observed the development of business in this country can avoid being impressed with the fact that, gradually and over a period of years, the various vocations or subdivisions of industry have tended to become professionalized," said Dr. Frederick. "This has been true not only in the fields of law, medicine, and insurance, which are not directly connected, but in the fields of industry, management, purchasing, accounting, and other activities which at one time were considered to be but part of the day-to-day work of any businessman.

"The word 'professional' is one that is very easily misunderstood. It does not mean that a smug group considers the work it does as something better or more difficult than the work other people do. But it does mean that certain criteria of judgment have been applied to a vocation. It means (a) there is a reasonable compensation paid to those who work in the field; (b) there is a reasonable opportunity for advancement based upon professional efficiency, commensurate with talent and devotion to the work; (c) there is a high degree of attraction to the work; (d) there are high ethical standards applied, and (e) there is a firm belief that the work is related to public service.

"Professionalization may be brought about in several ways. One is to prevent, by law, anyone from practicing a profession until certain educational and ethical standards have been complied with. This is the case with physicians, lawyers, pharmacists, and other professional men who render such a personal service to their clients that they must meet certain standards before being permitted to practice. Another way is followed by engineers, architects, and the like who serve the public in a semi-personal way and practice their professions without having complied with such rigid standards but still with general rules prescribed by professional societies or even by law.

"All of the numerous reasons which have influenced any group to organize for professional, promotional, and educational work are present in the field of traffic management. However, the basic reason why professionalization is needed in traffic management is that it will establish and then maintain essential and uniform standards of practice. It will be another important step toward better standards and more efficient and economical transportation.

"If the profession of traffic management is ever to amount to anything several things must be done by individuals and groups. (1) The public must be told of the importance of traffic management. (2) Employers must be sold more and more on traffic management. (3) Traffic managers must broaden their horizons and extend their knowledge of transport practice, the economics of transportation and general management in order to prepare themselves for larger fields of service. (4) A high standard of ethics must be established and maintained.

"Traffic management has already developed a group consciousness which facilitates further and stronger organization. A number of able men have achieved positions of prominence in the field through their efforts and opportunities they have grasped, and many of these men are willing and eager to assist others for the good of the profession. Much has been done, but not enough. The foundation has been laid, now the building must be erected.

"If professional status is to be brought about it will be necessary for someone or some group to suggest what the professional standards should be. This is a delicate point. No one has yet done this with any exactness. Perhaps no one is ready to do it, but it merits early attention.

"No one can deny the fact that traffic management is not and cannot ever be a profession such as medicine, law, and the like. It does, however, have much in common with what might be termed professions such as engineering, architecture, accounting, and the others, and it is certainly affected with the public interest. It is time that steps toward professionalization be taken."

TRAFFIC CONSULTANT SPEAKS

E. B. Ussery, a traffic consultant of the firm of Bell & Ussery, Washington, D. C., in his talk on the increasing need for centralization of traffic management functions in the government, after reviewing studies of alleged payment of excess rates on Government traffic in the two world wars, and an investigation his firm made for the Committee on the Reorganization of the Government, headed by former President Hoover, asserted that the problem of rates on Government shipments could not be solved unless there was centralization of the top-flight functions of traffic management. He observed that Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, gave the new General Services Administration centralized authority insofar as civilian agencies of the Government were concerned, with provision for the Administrator to perform the function of negotiating rates for the military unless his decision was vetoed by the Secretary of Defense.

There was now a clear-cut line of authority, power, and duty, he said, and that, when the agency could obtain the necessary personnel, it must first perform the basic task necessary to obtain information on whether or not charges were reasonable or unreasonable. He said it was now very easy to determine what traffic of the Government moved on class rates, on exceptions rates, or on commodity rates.

Among other things, Mr. Ussery asserted that, if the basic scale prescribed by the Commission in its class-rate case was prescribed in the light of costs in the various territories, it could not be assumed that the redistribution of the burden among commodities now moving under exceptions would not, under the uniform classification and the elimination of exceptions, move under rates also to be made in relation to the cost of rendering the service.

Col. E. B. Gray, Chief of the Movements Division, Office of the Chief of Transportation of the Army, described the Department of Defense land traffic program. After reviewing the development of military traffic management during and after the war, Colonel Gray said recently a central military land traffic office was established in the Department of Defense by an order of the Munitions Board. He said the order stated that the Munitions Board would establish policies of traffic management and would assure compliance with those policies with a view to developing the most efficient and economic operation of those functions in the Department of Defense. He listed 10 duties of the central military land traffic office, which he said was being shaped up in the Office of the Chief of Transportation. Those duties were, he said: Negotiation of certain rates and charges, including classifications and exceptions ratings; negotiation of fares and charges for passenger traffic; issuance of billing guides; negotiation of weight and average demurrage agreements; negotiations incident to loss and damage claims and related investigations, including technical review and recommendations concerning the prevention of damage; issuance of export rules for war or emergency only; promotion of maximum use of service-owned equipment; operation of freight consolidating and distributing stations if established; development of proposed regulations pertaining to traffic management; administration of centralized statistics. Colonel Gray then gave a brief explanation of each of the duties.

GSA PROGRAM

William E. Hayghe, Acting Chief, Division of Traffic and Utilities, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration, read a paper on "The current program for coordinated Federal traffic management." Under the act setting up GSA, he said, the function of traffic management was created as an integral phase of personal-property management, the GSA Administrator having been given the duty of prescribing policies and methods relating to transportation and traffic management. He said GSA, because of the ineffectiveness of previous attempts at traffic management, found itself without any reliable index of the nature, volume, and channels of freight moving for Government agencies. He asserted that those best fitted to analyze the Government's transportation policy knew that from 2 percent to 10 percent of the amounts paid annually for the transportation of property represented excessive charges. The object of GSA's plan, he said, was centralization of policy establishment and decentralization of operations.

Mr. Hayghe said GSA had developed a plan for attacking the Government's freight traffic management problem on four broad fronts: Establishment of policies and methods of shipping to insure that the fullest advantage is taken of benefits available under published tariffs; examination and study of existing and proposed rates, classifications, rules, and regulations to determine to what extent they may be, or become for the future, unreasonable or unlawful on movements of public property; attempt by direct negotiation to effect voluntary adjustment of rates, following up as to items that cannot be so adjusted by petition or complaint to Federal or State regulatory bodies; and establishment of direct personal contact with Government shipping personnel throughout the country, to insure compliance with policies and methods centrally developed, and to improve such policies and measures.

Mr. Hayghe developed each of the proposed measures in a brief way. In the course of his remarks he said, in developing the described plans, no facility of government that was functioning efficiently and effectively to reduce costs of transportation would be destroyed simply for the purpose of substituting something else, but that the purpose would be to develop such a facility so that it would function for the future on a more comprehensive basis than in the past. He said that, underlying the whole structure of the system of traffic management covered by the plan, would be the object of furnishing all agencies the maximum of service at the minimum of cost, to the end that payments by Federal agencies of excessive transportation costs will be eventually eliminated or reduced to a negligible quantity.

QUESTION PERIOD

Ray Ward, Chief, property-management group, Bureau of the Budget, who is chairman of the property management round table, and who conducted the meeting, called for questions.

Carleton Shugg, Deputy General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission, asked Mr. Ussery what part of the excessive charges for transportation to which the latter had referred came about because of an unusual demand put on a transportation agency, and in clarifying his question indicated he meant the charges on shipments that did not move when they should have moved, but before or after that time. Mr. Ussery spoke of two areas of rates—those that could be adjusted because the proper rate was published in tariff form or subject to section 22 quotations; lower rates quoted the Government under section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act—and those that were legal rates but unlawful under the act. Mr. Hayghe said the Government must first determine what was moving, how much was moving, and where it was moving, because, he repeated, no one in government had a reliable index of those facts.

Col. Frank H. Dryden, Assistant Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, said 87.3 percent of that agency's traffic moved in carload or truckload lots, which, he said, showed the agency was planning its shipments, which he said moved to several major depots out of which between seven and eight hundred installations were served.

SPECIAL RATES TO GOVERNMENT

It was here that Mr. Crosthwaite, of the Reclamation Bureau, asked Colonel Gray how the reduction in fares for military personnel was obtained when "we can't get it for the rest of Uncle Sam's employees." Colonel Gray said it was "because we went after it, I presume." He observed that reductions had been in effect for a long time, going back to land-grant days, with the present reductions negotiated since the Land-Grant Act was repealed. He said the railroads and busses had agreed to the reductions in fares for travel on transportation requests if the

military services would distribute traffic on an equal basis among the individual carriers.

Mr. Usery said Mr. Crosthwaite had "put his finger on an evil I think is abominable." He asked why one agency of the Government should have preferred treatment, adding he thought all the transportation contracts should be made in the name of the United States Government. He said that if contracts had been negotiated for the Government it could have used the bargaining power of the military services for the benefit of all departments of the Government. Mr. Crosthwaite expressed the view that the civilian agencies were using transportation, in the aggregate, to a greater extent than the military agencies, and said he thought the civilian agencies should "take whatever action we can to get in on this gravy train." Mr. Hayghe said that there had been a movement about 2 years ago for the other Government agencies to obtain the same agreements as the military, but that it was felt then that if all the agencies of Government followed that course it might jeopardize the advantages the military had gained, and the matter was dropped. He said he thought it perfectly proper for the railroads to give to an agency having volume movement, such as troop movements, rates comparable to those for carload movements.

CENTRALIZATION OF PLANNING

After General Reeder had made his remark concerning the ultimate effect of rate reductions, Mr. Crosthwaite said it was not believed that the entire determination of Government transportation policy could be consummated in Washington because, he said, "it's too big." He said there were transportation management problems "down at the level where you are doing the ordering and receiving of your supplies," and that "if we are going to accomplish the maximum benefit," it would be necessary to "push down to those levels" the principles and doctrines established in Washington.

Representative HOLIFIELD, of California, a member of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments which handled the bill that became the Administrative Services Act, asked if the things planned by GSA could be done without further legislation to give GSA power to go into the matter a little more thoroughly. He said he looked on the act as a basic act on which could be developed several facets of Government economy and efficiency.

Representative BURNSIDE, of West Virginia, also a member of the aforementioned subcommittee, called on by Mr. Ward for comment, said he was sorry the newspapers throughout the country did not carry stories that Government employees gave their evenings to such conferences without overtime pay.

SPECIAL RATES TO GOVERNMENT

Russell Forbes, Deputy Administrator of the GSA, said the Government should be getting around to the point of view of considering Uncle Sam as a shipper of property and get away from the idea that departmental property transportation was a separate proposition. In the past, he said, special rates granted under section 22 had, in a great many cases, been considered a secret within one agency that secured that rate. He said he thought the Administrative Services Act opened the field for that type of consideration, that all Government property is viewed as owned by the taxpayer and the shipper is the United States Government. If the civilian shipping requirements were combined with those of the military, he said, he did not see how it could help benefiting all around and that the ultimate beneficiary would be the taxpayer.

He continued by saying that although GSA did not contemplate in its set-up going into the matter of passenger rates, he thought it would be proper to accept the challenge Mr. Crosthwaite has thrown out and see what could be done through GSA to make available to the employees of civilian agencies the same rate or a comparable rate to that given the Military Establishment. He said travel of Government servants was at the expense of the taxpayer and should be subject to discount. He said he did not think the effort to obtain reduced fares for civilian employees would jeopardize the arrangement the military group had made.

DECENTRALIZATION IN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Jack Somers, of the Department of Agriculture, said the Commodity Credit Corporation had had an opportunity in the past few years to compare experience under two methods of operation, that is, with shipments moving on Government bills of lading on a centralized basis, and with those moving on commercial bills of lading on a decentralized basis. He said experience, as far as efficiency was concerned, showed that the decentralized operation on commercial bills of lading, shipping wheat and other products, with the settlement of transportation bills at regional area levels, was far more satisfactory than under the centralized operation, where all the bills of lading came into Washington. He said one of the reasons for overpayment was that Government bills of lading were not audited before they were paid. Under decentralization, he said, the bills were audited before they were paid.

He agreed that the negotiation of rates was centralized in Washington, and that procedures and rules were also set up in Washington.

SECTION 22 DISCRIMINATION

At this point Mr. Hayghe expressed the view that a section 22 quotation for one agency of the Government was in violation of section 3 of the Interstate Commerce Act, because it was a discrimination against other agencies. However, he added, "the lawyers do not agree with that." He said the same rate should apply for all departments for the same transportation services. In answer to a written question sent up to Mr. Ward, Mr. Hayghe said there would be bulletins, circulars, and other educational matter sent to clerks in the field offices until such time as GSA had personnel sufficient to maintain direct contact with such employees.

Homer S. Paul, of the Office of the Chief of Transportation, Department of the Army, described the work of a voluntary interdepartmental committee formed about 3 years ago. He said rate information had been exchanged between its members so that, when a rate had been obtained by negotiation for one department, the others would request that the rate be made to cover their transportation, with the assurance that the agency that had obtained the rate in the first place would assist other agencies to obtain it.

Mr. Ward, in closing the meeting, said the subject of the next conference would be records management.

Prepaid Health Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a self-explanatory communication and enclosures from the California Physicians' Service. In my opinion it is a program like this that answers the continual cry for socialized medicine in this country:

CALIFORNIA PHYSICIANS' SERVICE,
San Francisco, February 9, 1950.

Hon. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
United States Representative, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. ANDERSON: California Physicians' Service—one of the largest of the many voluntary blue shield health plans established in the United States by the medical profession—is announcing today another major improvement in its system of prepaid health care for the public.

California Physicians' Service is aware of the great financial shock of many of the prolonged illnesses and in an endeavor to protect the public against the shock of such illnesses it is now making available catastrophic coverage which offers protection against the heavy and prolonged costs connected with some of mankind's most feared diseases. The list includes 23 illnesses such as cancer, infantile paralysis, tuberculosis, etc., and for these it offers complete medical care.

The cost of this extremely valuable protection is quite modest. It will range from 70 cents per month per individual to a maximum of $2.20 per family no matter how large.

We are sure, Mr. ANDERSON, that you are giving very serious consideration to public discussions regarding the Nation's health and the various types of health insurance which may protect it. We feel that the announcement of our catastrophic-coverage plan has an important bearing upon this whole problem and we are sure that you will wish to refer to the enclosed material which contain rather full information about catastrophic coverage.

Sincerely yours,
LOWELL S. GOIN, M. D.,
President, Board of Trustees.

The following concise account of the founding and growth of California Physicians' Service may be useful as background material to supplement the accompanying news release, regarding the offering of catastrophic coverage by CPS. It may also be useful for editorial writers who may wish to comment editorially on the CPS record of service and achievement since 1939.

WHY IS THERE A CPS?

The objective of CPS is to provide Californians with a prepaid membership plan by which they can budget for serious illness and injury, thereby removing as much as possible the financial burden of health care. In addition, the basic philosophy behind CPS is to provide this plan on a cooperative, voluntary, and nonprofit basis under sponsorship of the medical profession. In this way it is possible to maintain the vital, personal relationship between doctor and patient—as well as to uphold the high standards of American medical practice.

HOW DID CPS GET STARTED?

For many years prior to the beginning of CPS, the medical profession had recognized that the amazing discoveries in medical science had raised the costs of providing modern medical care to the public. In 1927 a national committee on the costs of medical care was formed with the late Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur as chairman. The committee's 5-year study, published in 1932, included among its specific recommendations the establishment by the medical profession of a voluntary health security plan on a group, prepayment basis.

In December 1938 the California Medical Association took a great pioneering step when it decided to sponsor the formation of California Physicians' Service. Shortly after, on February 2, 1939, CPS opened its doors—the first State-wide, medically sponsored health plan in the United States. Now 11 years old, CPS has had the added distinction of being a model for similar plans organized throughout the country. It has also been instrumental in causing health insurance to be offered by commercial carriers.

HOW DOES CPS OPERATE?

CPS functions under the direction of a 15-man board of trustees—11 doctors and 4 laymen—all of whom serve voluntarily and without remuneration. The late Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, who also played a leading role in the founding of CPS, served as president of the board of trustees from 1939 to 1945. He was succeeded by the current president, Dr. Lowell S. Goin.

CPS is a nonprofit corporation, and its funds are received in the form of dues paid by beneficiary members. Approximately 85 percent of the money thus received is paid out for claims made by the beneficiary members. The remaining 15 percent is used for administrative expense and for building a reserve fund.

HOW LARGE IS CPS?

CPS has had a remarkable growth which reflects the wisdom that was responsible for its founding. Today, approximately 900,000 Californians are beneficiary members and 10,300 of the State's leading physicians and surgeons are physician members. Approximately 27,000 new beneficiaries enroll monthly, and approximately 50,000 claims are paid each month.

WHAT HAS CPS ACCOMPLISHED?

As the pioneer in the previously uncharted field of prepaid, voluntary health plans on a State-wide basis, CPS had no precedent or previous experience to guide it. The early formative years were difficult; as a nonprofit organization, CPS had to adjust dues to cover actual costs for services rendered to beneficiaries; there was no yardstick to indicate the rate of utilization by beneficiaries of their prepaid health protection.

Necessarily, therefore, there were frequent adjustments through hard experience. However, there was also the determination of California doctors to evolve a workable solution to voluntary, prepaid medical care on a large scale, even at their own expense. Almost from the start, doctors have willingly accepted reduced fees in order to assure the ultimate success of the program. For the same reason, CPS doctors are still accepting less-than-normal fees for services rendered. In this spirit, most problems have been successfully overcome—a fact which is largely attributable to the flexibility of CPS and its administration by those best qualified to serve the health needs of the public, the doctors themselves.

Not only did CPS work out its problems; it also constantly enlarged the scope of its coverage and benefits.

1942: Membership extended to dependents of employees.

1943: CPS the first health plan in the Nation to cover conditions existing at the time of joining.

1944: Diagnostic and hospital care increased to provide additional services not formerly covered.

1945: Employed persons over 65 eligible for group membership.

1946: First complete rural health program established in cooperation with California State Grange.

1946: Veterans' program for home-town medical care of veterans with service-connected disabilities established in cooperation with Federal Government.

1948: All age limits withdrawn throughout California for dependents as well as employee members of group enrollment.

1949: CPS individual memberships, designed for persons not able to join through group enrollments, available throughout northern California. (Soon to be offered in southern California.)

1949: New plan inaugurated to provide equal medical services in the hospital for all family members, plus hospital and surgical benefits.

1949: Greater protection for lower- and middle-income groups provided by raising of income ceiling to $3,600 annually.

1950: Vast extension in coverage for more than a score of catastrophic ailments, including cancer and tuberculosis.

California Physicians' Service led in the formation of the Associated Medical Care Plans in 1947, a national organization of medically sponsored, voluntary, prepayment health plans in the United States. While each plan is independent, all carry the same emblem of the blue shield and each is known as a Blue Shield Plan. Altogether there are 64 Blue Shield Plans, in virtually every part of the country, and total membership is approximately 11,000,000.

NOTE.—In northern California CPS writes complete membership contracts—for medical, surgical, and hospital benefits. In southern California the Hospital Service of Southern California Blue Cross provides the hospitalization in a joint offer with CPS.

Oconomowoc Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a unique scholarship plan whereby an entire community can assist the education of some of its young people who otherwise might be denied a chance to attend a college or university has attracted much attention to the city of Oconomowoc, in my district of Wisconsin.

Some time ago, in order that I might call this Oconomowoc idea to the attention of my colleagues and to other sections of the country where similar plans might be established, I sought to obtain details of the plan's operation from Editor C. W. Brown, of the Oconomowoc Enterprise. I fear he has been too modest about his accomplishments to supply that information. While the fine generosity of the people of Oconomowoc has made this plan an annual success, it took the initiative and directing enthusiasm of Editor Brown to make it possible. I am glad to note that the current issue of Publishers' Auxiliary, a newspaper trade journal, pays deserved credit to Editor Brown and the Oconomowoc Scholarship Fund, Inc.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include that story from Publishers Auxiliary:

SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM SCORES FOR WISCONSIN WEEKLY EDITOR

OCONOMOWOC, WIS.—With seven students attending universities and colleges as the result of the successful operation of the Oconomowoc Scholarship Fund, Inc., the past 3 years, the Oconomowoc Enterprise which originated and sponsors the scholarship project, now is raising funds for the third year of scholarships with the hope that the amount of money subscribed the past 2 years will be equaled or surpassed.

The fund is an example of community service which can be adopted by any newspaper in the United States.

Speaking before editors of the State at a press conference at the University of Wisconsin at Madison last fall, E. B. Fred, president of the school, said, "It is my belief that nowhere in the country is there a finer example of public service than this educational plan sponsored by the Oconomowoc Enterprise."

The fund grants $1,000 in 4-year scholarships or $250 per year. The scholarships are outright gifts, not loans.

The Enterprise itself raises the money each year for the scholarships through its news columns by asking for voluntary donations from residents of the city and area. There is no direct solicitation. The first year more than $3,000 was raised; last year a total of more than $3,400 was contributed. Raising of funds for the 1950 scholarships, which will be granted at the end of the school year in June, was started December 15. A total of $1,150.50 was in by January 10, showing the raising of funds running ahead of the other 2 years for the same period of time. To start the fund-raising campaign each year, the Enterprise donates $250.

The student must make application for the scholarship. Once having been granted a scholarship he may attend any accredited school—university, college, technical, or trade school. He may also be attending one of these schools when he applies for scholarship which may be granted for the number of years remaining in his university or college studies. The awards are based on scholastic standing, character, desire of the student to continue his or her education and the benefit to society in general.

Once having been granted a 4-year scholarship, the student's work is reviewed each year by the board to determine whether the grant should be continued.

When the Oconomowoc Scholarship Fund, Inc., a nonprofit organization, was organized, the Enterprise sought the aid of prominent local people, a cross section of the area, to launch the program. The corporation has 21 members, elected for 3 years. It is operated by an executive committee of five.

"Newspapers have the instrument with which to do a job such as this," declares C. W. Brown, publisher of the Enterprise. "The good accomplished, which affects the entire life of the student, is so much greater than the effort required by the sponsoring newspaper, that we urge other newspapers to inaugurate such projects for the benefit of their own communities.

"We are really amazed at the amount of interest shown in this project throughout the State and Nation," Brown emphasizes.

More on the Shubert Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the attorney for the Shuberts, Mr. Milton Weir, has said that I do not know about conditions as they exist in the theater. I do not care to enter into an alley-cat fight with Mr. Weir, who is a good lawyer,

and naturally wants to protect his clients, but even the most uninitiated in the ways of the theater knows that unwholesome practices abound therein.

Perhaps Mr. Weir, or his principals, would be able to tell us something about the following:

First. In productions like South Pacific, the Shuberts insist on taking, and receive, 50 tickets a performance—the best seats in the first rows. This totals 400 tickets a week for 8 performances, for 52 weeks a year, making a total of 20,800 tickets for that one smash hit. These tickets are presumably for the friends of the Shuberts. The public is clamoring to see this play, but it does not have any opportunity to buy these 20,800 tickets at the regular box office.

Who gets these tickets? Do favored brokers procure them? Is there any accounting of them? What is paid for most of them? Who gets the proceeds? Is the admission tax paid? Is the income tax paid on the profits from their sale? What do the favored brokers pay for the privilege of disposing of these tickets? What are the kick-backs?

Second. For Kiss Me Kate, the Shuberts demand, and receive, 40 choice tickets a performance, or 320 per week, totaling 16,640 per year.

Third. For Happy Time, another hit show, the Shuberts take 25 tickets a performance, or 200 tickets a week, totaling 10,400 tickets per year.

Fourth. This practice is in operation in every theater under Shubert control. I make a rough guess that the gains taken in by these tickets run into millions of dollars a year. How long must an abused public continue to suffer?

I am sending this information to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, whose duty it is to insure proper collection of the revenues in the United States, and to bring to book evaders of the revenue laws. I am asking him, furthermore, to check carefully all the records of the disposal of these so-called free tickets.

Fifth. Mr. Weir, in addition to being the attorney for the Shuberts is also the attorney for the League of New York Theatres, which in turn is dominated by the Shuberts, who own and control 60 percent of all New York theaters. The League of New York Theatres insists that 75 percent of the remaining orchestra tickets for each performance go to brokers.

The league was organized to protect the interests of the theater owners, and also to enhance the public's interest in the art of the theater. Apparently, the league has merely become the fulcrum to hoist the interests of the Shuberts.

Sixth. Mr. Weir, aside from acting as attorney for the Shuberts and the League of New York Theatres, was, by some mysterious maneuvering, appointed to the committee created by the municipal authorities, to investigate the theater ticket scandal. Thus the investigated became the investigator. Shubert investigates Shubert.

What a hoax. Perhaps Mr. Weir will make answer.

Taxes With Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

TAXES WITH TROUBLE

(By Hugh Park)

Not many seasons back, the financially elect of every community were a distinguished crowd, made known by the posting of their names on the billboard in the local postoffice.

How time has changed the things of life. No longer does Uncle Sam rent an ordinary building at some $50 per month and therein house the custodian of mails. Now Uncle Sam owns the best building, right in the best part of town, and if it's any kind of a postoffice at all, there are almost as many caretakers as there are rural mail carriers. And we all like it—and point to it with pride—while cussing the Government for raising rates and losing money handling the mails.

No longer does the postmaster solemnly walk out each spring and proclaim to the community the payers of Federal income taxes by posting their names on the bulletin board. Today the lobby is decorated with pictures of gangsters wanted by the FBI and signs advertising air-mail stamps and savings bonds. The list of taxpayers then could be printed in big type on a postcard; now it would take a whole ream of paper to publish the names. For it's a pretty poor citizen, or a pretty prolific papa, who doesn't pay an income tax these days. It would take much less room and time to just post the names of those who are exempt from the tax.

Far be it from me to vilify the collection of taxes. We people here in America have asked for it, and if we didn't ask for it, we let it be pounded upon us, piece by piece. While we decry the continued rise in taxes on the one hand, we yelp louder and louder for more assistance on the other. We shake our heads in fearful disdain against communism in Russia, against socialism in England, and we hold up the merits of our own democracy. And all of us know that we are simply whistling in the dark, for the road we are traveling is nothing less than government autocracy under another name.

If that is what the people of America want, we have no complaint to make. But do we want it? Are we being led, bit by bit, into some kind of a situation which we all despise? Can we be happy in a state where every person is told what to do, when to do, and how to do it? Do farmers want to be regimented, like miners under John L. Lewis, and have no freedom to use their own ingenuity?

The last week has been taxpaying time around the Argus office. And it's had us in a nervous frenzy—for it is time for us to make our annual report as an unofficial but real, nevertheless, tax collector for Uncle Sam. They don't get any pay for it, but every businessman in America today is a tax collector. And the chances for error are so great, and the whole set-up is so complicated, and the penalty in fine and imprisonment so fearful, that no businessman will venture to hire more than one or two helpers until he has one trained person to take care of the tax racket.

The power to tax is the power to destroy. Business labors under the tax burden. On Monday, our own little county newspaper turned over to the Federal Government nearly $500 ($499.87 to be exact) as taxes it had collected from employees and customers during the last 3 months of 1949. Our business didn't pay those taxes, we collected it from our employees and our customers. Out of every pay check there came a tax. Onto the price of every bit of paper there went a tax!

Like most manufacturing business firms, we have had during the last year an undesirable but yet stupendous turn-over in personnel. Labor itself is restless under the yoke. Our bookkeeper made a report on 14 different employees during the year. A strict personal record is kept on each one—as to their Government number (social security), the size of their family, the hours they worked at straight time, the hours they worked at overtime, their rate of pay, the amount they earned in each category of time, the deductions the Government allowed them for having a family, the amount we took out of their check as they paid for old-age assistance, the amount we took out of their check each week for the Government income tax, and the balance that was their due. Then at the end of the year a detailed report on each item must be made.

Our normal staff is eight employees. You can see, then, the necessity of having one trained employee to look after all these items. That is her first and major responsibility. And several hours each week of her time is donated to Government tax collection. Last week when year-end reports were made, she gave the Government a lot of time, including some night work of overtime and a half. Last week she gave the Government more than she gave the business which maintains her salary.

It's not to fuss, or to find fault, that we discuss this situation. We really believe that few people know just how many tax collectors we do have in this country; few people stop to think how far we are drifting. For instance, we doubt very much, if the key employees in our own little publishing business know that last year all but one man, father of five children, practically tithed for the Government. Several chipped into the Federal Treasury more than $1 out of every $10 they were due in pay for their work.

It slipped by them, because their tax was hidden from them. They never handled it at all—it was taken from them by the girl tax collector at the bookkeeper's desk, before they ever saw it. She gave them a report on it, of course; but you don't miss a dollar until you have to reach down and pull it out of your own pocket, where you had been keeping it to spend it on something you wanted.

No, labor has no idea just how much it does pay in hidden taxes that go into a higher cost for homes, cars, and washing machines. There's a tax on everything from cradles to coffins. And, above all, the entire structure is so complicated that it is actually nerve-wrecking. We had such an example this week right here in our own office.

There is a tax the Government levies on a man who hires more than seven persons to help him in a business. In 1948 our bookkeeper figured that the Press-Argus had to pay $73.24 for having that honor. This year a new bookkeeper, confronted with that tax for the first time, turned in a report that we owed the Government $193.21 for excise tax on eight employees. It was a blow to us, chiefly because we had notes at the bank which demanded our immediate attention. We didn't have $193.21 to spare. We thought something surely was wrong, so we began to dig into the demand.

We turned to "Instructions for form 940, United States annual return of excise tax on employers of eight or more individuals under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act." Four big solid pages of small type flashed an ominous warning to us to be cautious, and go careful. And we did.

Sentence by sentence, and section by section, we went through the small type. We noted on page 1 that if the return was not filed on time, there was a penalty of interest at 6 percent, plus a delinquency assessment of 5 percent to 25 percent of the tax. We had no time to lose. In detail we read every sentence, every paragraph. We went through page 1, we went through page 2, we went through page 3.

Down in the lower one-half of page 4 we found what we were looking for:

"How to prepare schedule D—computation of credit."

We are tempted to reprint that section just to show you how complicated these tax reports can become. But you wouldn't read it unless, like us, you were forced to.

It took us a whole day to find the error, but it was worth it. Our bookkeeper, tired and confused, had passed over a sentence following the word "Important." It so happened that our experience rate for taxes on employees during the year was changed from 1.5 percent in the first quarter to 0.5 percent for the other three quarters. Our bookkeeper had lumped the whole pay roll together for the year, and had not taken credit for our experience rate. We did what the "Important" said, and divided the pay roll up by quarters. Our tax was not $193.21 for the year; it was $54.99 paid by us for the privilege of giving employment to eight instead of seven employees.

And now we repeat—it's not to fuss or find fault; it's a sincere desire to help our country that we write. We know taxes are always necessary to preserve our Government. High taxes are necessary right now. There is no way to get around them. We pay them willingly and cheerfully. We hope we never get to the point that we growl about the privilege of paying a reasonable tax to build our Nation.

But we do say this: The people who levy the taxes these days don't have to collect them. They force a businessman to do that. It is an onerous task; an expensive item; and most unpopular system. It's especially hard on little firms such as this small group of people who print your county newspaper here every week.

I sincerely believe that the whole thing can be simplified, and much expense saved. Think of the printing bill, for instance, on the set of instructions that goes with that excise tax. Think of the loss in time and money that our own little business had in trying to figure out that tax.

Today every person is allowed by the Government to make a certain amount of money before he pays an income tax. If you are single, it's $50 a month; if you're married the Government allows you another $50 a month to support your wife; and then you also are allowed another $50 for each child. Well, when you earn more than your allowance, the tax collector takes out 20 percent of the balance—or one out of every $5 goes to the Government. That's simple—and efficient—but the Government doesn't stop at that—as I have told you—and there isn't a small-business man in America who isn't confused, angry, and disheartened over the details that he has to study and interpret to do his part as a citizen.

The small-business man is the forgotten man in America today—he is actually harassed on every side. If you don't believe it, ask one, any one, of them.

Depletion and Oil for National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, because of the great importance of adequate petroleum reserves for national defense, because of its importance to our national economy and for continuing development of national resources, I am unalterably opposed to the Treasury's proposals of reducing the 27½ percent depletion allowance for oil and gas production.

Yesterday I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee to give my views, and also those of our distinguished Oklahoma Governor, Hon. Roy J. Turner.

Because of the importance of this issue to all groups, producers, laborers, and farmers in the 22 oil-producing States, as well as to the Nation to have a dependable supply of oil, for peace and war alike, I would like to insert here the testimony presented at the hearings:

STATEMENT OF HON. ROY J. TURNER, GOVERNOR OF OKLAHOMA

We are unalterably opposed to any change of policy in connection with oil and gas depletion allowance, and I wish to submit to you the following information in support of our stand:

Oklahoma, as an oil-producing State, depends heavily upon the taxation of that industry to support its State government. Depending entirely upon special and excise taxes, a reduction from this source of revenue would seriously affect the entire State financial structure.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the total received from all State taxes, exclusive of the unemployment-compensation taxes, was approximately $138,000,000. Approximately 60 percent of this total was from either a direct tax on the oil industry or on services depending upon the products of that industry. A loss in this revenue would place a direct burden on the individual taxpayer, either in the form of income or sales taxes, or upon the local ad valorem taxpayer, to replace that loss.

Ad valorem taxation in this State is for local purposes only.

For the year 1949, the total assessed property of personal and public utility properties was $725,000,000, of which approximately 20 percent was on the properties of the oil industry. Local units of government share in the taxes collected on this industry by the State. Of the total 60 percent thereof was returned to the local units of government to help pay the costs of those governments. I repeat, it would mean a complete breakdown of the tax structure that supports Oklahoma government, and I am of the opinion that all other oil-producing States would be likewise affected.

The depletion allowance has been of basic consideration of operators from its inception. Also States and local governments have given consideration to this allowance in determining equitable taxation.

This allowance is now a basic factor that any change made at this time would materially affect consumer prices, employment by thousands of independent operators, suppliers of materials used in the oil industry, and State and local government revenues to the point of jeopardy in many States. But of the greatest importance of all, the reserves needed for national defense. Such an action would have greater and more far-reaching effect than first meets the eye.

I can think of no congressional action that would do more to cripple the economy and safety of the Nation as a whole.

STATEMENT OF HON. MIKE MONRONEY BEFORE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 14, 1950

Mr. Chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you on the matter of reduction of the 27½-percent depletion allowance which has been a vital part of the development of our oil industry for more than 25 years.

Four points seem to me to be vital in your consideration of the Treasury's recommendation for such a revolutionary change as the cutting almost in half of this historic pattern of allowance for exhaustion of capital wealth in natural resources.

These four points are:

1. The misleading and prejudicial claim that this depletion allowance, investigated, studied, and written into law by this committee many times, is a tax loophole.

2. The fallacious claim that this change will result in more revenue to the Treasury. By crippling the exploration for oil, the Treasury will have far fewer new oil fortunes to tax and will lose far more in the course of years than it can gain by this ill-advised action. State revenues, geared to gross production and excise taxes on oil and its products also will suffer.

3. The oversimplification by inexperienced Treasury experts that only big corporations and the very wealthy benefit from depletion. Actually, it is the one feature that keeps the wildcatter, the small-lease man, the farmer and the small royalty owner investing in the hazardous search for more production.

4. The completely misleading claim that oil exploration enjoys tax advantages not available to other segments of our economy. Many far safer fields, such as stock-market profits, business-property development, and even industrials enjoy long-range tax advantages far superior to the uncertain investments in oil developments.

(1) The misleading label of tax loophole is not borne out by facts. Since 1918 this committee has recognized the equity of discovery depletion. In 1926, this committee enacted percentage depleton and I am sure knew what it was doing. Countless times it has been studied and each time the Congress has sustained it intentionally, not accidentally, on the basis of facts. This committee and Congress are not in the habit of approving any loopholes over a period of 25 years.

If the Treasury wants to make one single industry make up the major share of the $700,000,000 loss of excise-tax revenues, they should be honest enough to advocate singling out petroleum as their sacrificial lamb instead of using this fallacious loophole claim.

As further evidence of shifting this burden to oil, even the Treasury experts advocate and endorse the percentage depletion allowance and intangible drilling costs in principal, but want to cut it about in half and place it at 15 percent, an arbitrary figure picked out of thin air without relation as to its effect on whether it will cripple our present development of domestic oil resources.

The present rate of 27½ percent was the result of careful study and determination by the House and Senate. Its soundness has proven itself by the large amount of taxes it has raised and the steady, expanding discoveries of petroleum that it has helped to encourage. It has proven itself by test and is in no way an arbitrary figure but a foundation on which the industry rests.

(2) The second point that the Treasury needs the revenue and that this would add $200,000,000 of these needed dollars to the bill is equally fallacious. If you don't make money—you don't pay taxes. If oil exploration is crippled—or even drastically curtailed—less money in the long run will come into the Treasury.

Your big tax take comes in the discovery and development of new oil fields and the creation of new wealth. If you are satisfied to tax only the fields you now have—it won't be long until you will find one-half of your big revenue gone—then two-thirds gone. Without new fields, new tax sources, you'll be in a stripper operation yourself before long—as you'll learn the real meaning of depletion.

If you have a good cow that gives lots of milk, you can't get production without adequate feed. Cut her feed in half and your milk supply dwindles. You can butcher the cow and put her in a deep freezer and live on steaks for a while, but in the long run you're depleting your assets.

But if you are a prudent operator you'll see that the cow produces the maximum amount of income—enough feed to produce more milk. Then you'll probably get more cows and more milk and more income.

The same rule applies. Government revenue depends on American business, all of it, being a going and expanding concern, and any tax policy that restricts expansion means revenue losses in the long run.

By the same token, the decline of development of new oil sources—and consequently new taxable wealth—will strike a severe blow at State revenues. Big portions of State budgets in our oil-producing States are dependent not on a static but on an expanding oil industry. If exploration were stopped—or drastically curtailed—my own State would suffer tremendously—as would every other oil-producing State, all of which tax oil heavily.

(3) The third point betrays the naive assumption by the Treasury experts that each segment of the widespread oil industry operates in a carefully cataloged, hermetically sealed specialty. I know the oil industry and know of no operators who fit into the neat little packages the statisticians have worked out in their testimony.

All of them are producers, lease buyers, royalty owners—most are wildcatters or work on submarginal lands—and even the big refiners lease, wildcat, produce and even operate stripper wells. It is completely fallacious to think that you can divide the industry up into individual segments, for it isn't that kind of a divisible business.

For example, the statistically minded experts assume that all operators of "stripper wells" operate only wells of extremely small production. Actually, most all oil men and all big operating companies, producing and refining as well, have much stripper production. The 27½-percent depletion keeps them working the submarginal fields and recovering millions of barrels of oil that would otherwise be lost forever.

The 27½-percent depletion makes it possible for them, big and little, to go in for expensive "secondary recovery programs" which will result in the production of at least 4,000,000,000—I repeat 4,000,000,000 barrels more oil from these depleted fields than we would otherwise recover. Secondary recovery is expensive and hazardous—as expensive and hazardous in many instances as original drilling—and without the 27½-percent depletion allowance, I fear it will be largely discontinued.

Further, the Treasury claimed major oil companies get the lion's share of the benefits of depletion allowances. This is again over-simplification. Most of the fields, it is true, are found and developed by individuals or smaller companies. But it is the reward for taking the big risk that keeps them drilling. Their price for a proven acreage—in other words, the value of their discovery—is dependent upon the present tax structure. To drastically change it now would lower these values of the small operator and the independent producer tremendously.

The financing of independent oil operations in every bank and in every oil State is based on the 27½-percent depletion allowance. Directors calculate the engineering of an oil field or lease, its probable production, and estimate its worth for drilling loans. Without the 27½-percent depletion allowance, I know of few banks which would continue this financing of drilling operations. With it reduced by half, credit for independent operators would be frozen.

Already in my State, and I have just returned for these hearings, drilling has been stopped to see whether Congress takes this ill-advised step or not. If the incentive to small business is not there—there'll be little new exploration or development of new "pimple" fields where the risk of striking oil is tremendously great.

If the depletion allowance is taken by the big integrated corporations, it's only on the exhaustion of the production some independent operator has found and sold to them. And the high sales value of the production is based on the 27½ percent depletion allowance. Cut this allowance in half and the major companies will drastically cut their purchase prices to the independent wildcatters and producers.

Tens of thousands of small farmers and small investors today draw royalty checks. Standard royalty payments to the owner of the subsurface oil equals one-eighth of the value of the oil produced from that property. Cutting depletion in half will collapse the value of their properties by about one-half. The farmer and the royalty owner would find that not only their income would be severely reduced, but the sales value of the owner's rights to the soil would go down to a depression level. Far more than the $200,000,000 in revenue would be lost immediately on the value of these owners' oil rights.

The claim that oil enjoys special or unusual tax advantages is completely fallacious. Compared with the risk taken—four dry holes to every five wells drilled—the advantages are far smaller than that accorded stock-market gains where only a 25 percent capital gains tax is paid on securities held for 6 months.

The single individual who makes a million net on the stock market pays only a 25 percent capital gains tax, or $250,000. If he makes a million net operating revenue in oil, he'll pay $755,570. He would have used up $275,000 of his capital worth and his actual profit would be only $67,320 out of a million net operating income.

This committee and Congress passed that stock-market law to get more revenue on the theory that a more rapid turn-over of stocks would result in more revenue. By the same token of more business and more taxes, greater revenue results from oil.

It is fallacious to compare depletion with depreciation. Tens of thousands of business buildings today, almost fully depreciated over the years, are bringing in from 10 to 100 times more revenue because of their advantageous location on Main Street than they did when built in 1905 or 1910.

Yet everyone knows that an oil well, after its first few years of production is almost a dead duck. It will never again produce as much oil as it did the first year and is on a rapid and steady downgrade from that time on.

Much has been made of the charge-offs for development costs by the Treasury experts. Yet in the same breath, they admit frankly that four out of every five wells drilled are dry and nonproductive. Some way, somehow, the inference is left that the oil industry is avoiding taxes because of these exploration losses and that there is some special advantage in drilling dry holes.

Holes in the ground have little value—you can't pull them up and sell them for post holes—yet from the Treasury testimony you would think these losses had some special value: Almost any building, railroad, factory, utility, or machinery has some value once the development is completed. Dry holes have none.

That one out of five is a producer furnished income, which after depletion is taxable at our present high rates during its few years of flush production. After that it is a stripper well and the capital wealth from its discovery has been fully dissipated.

In closing let me say that I think it would be foolhardy to sabotage a system that has given us an abundance of essential oil under free, competitive enterprise in two world wars. Oil is an absolute essential in today's mechanized warfare, and without an expanding and abundant domestic supply our entire defense effort would collapse.

The major targets of bombing both in Germany and in Japan were their oil and when they had been knocked out, their war machines on land, sea, and in the air were unable to move.

While the Treasury has supplied your committee with ample tables on alleged excessive depletion and development costs, they have failed to furnish you with the amount that the industry does pay. The corporate tax total, your Joint Committee on Revenue and Taxation advises, came to $512,000,000 in 1947. Add to this the hundreds of millions (the total amount not available from the Treasury) from individual stockholders of these corporations. Add also the tens of millions from individual oil operators, the farmers who own the oil lands, the oil-machinery men and you have a staggering amount of Federal revenue produced by this industry.

Obviously, the purpose of this drastic change is to make up a part of the loss of $700,000,000 in excise taxes on furs, jewelry, transportation, light bulbs, etc. May I respectfully call your attention to the fact that the oil industry has long paid heavy excise taxes, and is not here asking that these be removed or reduced.

The best estimate I can get shows that more than $2,000,000,000 is paid by oil products in excise taxes—$1,453,000,000 in State gasoline-excise taxes; $500,000,000 in Federal gasoline taxes, and $83,000,000 in lubricating-oil taxes. In many States, these excise taxes on gasoline will run as high as 35 percent or 7 cents per gallon.

The total taxes paid other than Federal will run between two and a half billion and three billion dollars. I ask leave to insert here the list of taxes and their estimated amounts. It is by no means complete as it does not and cannot reflect the hundreds of millions paid by individuals.

I sincerely hope that this committee, in the light of all the dangers for such a drastic change will not single out this already heavily taxed industry to make it the goat in the removal of small excise taxes from other items.

Petroleum tax bill

	1948	[1] 1949
State gasoline tax	$1,342,975,000	$1,453,000,000
Federal gasoline tax	498,362,000	500,000,000
Real and personal property	317,000,000	200,000,000
Federal and State income tax	882,000,000	800,000,000
Severance taxes and drilling permits	164,000,000	164,000,000
Lubricating-oil taxes	81,383,000	83,000,000
Pipe-line taxes	19,643,000	20,000,000
Import taxes	15,000,000	15,000,000
State inspection fees	8,350,000	9,000,000
Local gasoline taxes	7,884,000	8,000,000
Other taxes	76,000,000	78,000,000
Total	3,363,304,000	3,100,000,000

[1] APIC estimates.

The Late Francis W. Durbin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN McSWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by the Allen County (Ohio) Bar Association on the life and services of Francis W. Durbin, late of Lima, Ohio:

Francis W. Durbin of Lima, Ohio, died of pneumonia on December 10.

He was born in Kenton, Ohio, on December 8, 1891. He entered Notre Dame University from which he was graduated in 1913 with the degree of LL. B.

In 1913 he was admitted to the bar of Ohio and immediately embarked upon the practice of his profession in Lima.

He is survived by his widow, three daughters, his mother, and a brother.

William W. Durbin, father of Francis, was examiner of claims in the Treasury Department from 1866 to 1890, and for several years thereafter was law partner with Phil M. Crow at Kenton. William W. Durbin showed unwearied devotion to the Democratic Party, beginning in that long period when that party was seldom victorious in local or State elections. He held the chairmanship of the Ohio State Democratic Committee longer than any other man, his first work as chairman being in the Bryan campaign of 1896. He went to more Democratic National Conventions than any of his contemporaries either as district delegate or delegate at large, attending those of 1900, 1912, 1920, 1924, 1928, 1932, and 1936. He became register of the United States Treasury in 1933.

Francis W. Durbin was a powerful and colorful figure in the councils of his party for 40 years. During that period not a campaign in the county or State was conducted without his active participation. Yet, strange to say, he was never elected to public office. In fact, he tried only on one or two occasions. However, he received many appointments during his career to boards and commissions, among which were the Civil Service Commission and the Allen County Board of Elections.

In politics Francis was possessed of that indispensable trait found in all great political leaders—a remarkable memory. It was said of him that he knew, and could call by name, as many prominent Democrats not only in Ohio but in the Nation as any one with the exception of James Farley.

One of the outstanding achievements of his career which many have forgotten was his leadership in the fight for the adoption of the Ohio old-age-pension plan when he was president of the Ohio State Association of Eagles.

Francis W. Durbin was a devout Catholic, being a member of St. John's Church.

Fraternal affiliations were Elks Lodge, Knights of Columbus, and the Eagles, of which he was past president.

Francis loved his home and was a loving, faithful husband and a kind and exemplary father.

As a lawyer he was able, faithful, honest, dependable, and diligent.

Both as a lawyer and in politics he was fair, honorable, courteous, respectful, and gentlemanly.

Perhaps the trait we loved the best about our brother was his affability and his inability to hold a grudge. He was quick to forgive and after the heat of a courtroom battle or a political campaign he was the first to insist that "bygones be bygones."

Serving on the memorial committee were Leslie Reid, John L. Cable, Howard Everett, Paul T. Landis, Melvin C. Light, E. T. Lippincott, L. E. Ludwig, Harry R. Meredith, and B. F. Welty.

Resolutions Adopted by the American Coalition and Remarks of Its Retiring President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, the American Coalition is a vigorous and patriotic group of fraternal, civic, and similar societies, with a joint membership of some 3,000,000 men and women in the United States. It was founded 25 years ago, in New York, by Capt. John B. Trevor, who has been its president from that time until the 26th of last month when, of his own desire, he relinquished that office, and was succeeded by Mr. John W. Finger, a businessman of New York and Georgia, and president-general of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.

Among the constituent members of the American Coalition are the Sons of the American Revolution, National Society; the Daughters of the Revolution, National Society; the Military Order of the World Wars; American War Mothers; General Society of the War of 1812; National Society, Sons and Daughters of the Pilgrims; National Society of New England Women; Society of Old Plymouth Colony Descendants; the Federation of Huguenot Societies in America; Congress of State Societies in America; Grand Army of the Republic; Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commander in Chief; National Constitution Day Committee; National Society for Constitutional Security; Regular Veterans Association; Sons and Daughters of Liberty, National Council; the Wheel of Progress; and the Women of Army and Navy Legion of Valor, United States of America.

It is a particular pleasure to me, as a member of one of these constituent organizations, to include in this extension of my remarks, the pertinent and timely address of the retiring president and founder, Captain Trevor, and the resolution adopted at the January meeting. The address and resolutions follow:

ADDRESS OF JOHN B. TREVOR AT ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN COALITION, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 26, 1950

Ladies and gentlemen, this is my farewell speech as President of the American Coalition. Today I retire. I understand that the nominating committee is going to present for your consideration the name of a man for whom I have the greatest admiration—admiration not only for his patriotism, his business ability, and his gift of speech, but above all, for his aggressive courage in defense of our traditional institutions.

I cannot, however, leave the position which I have occupied for so many years without thanking my old friends, and my new friends, representing the societies which make up the American Coalition, for their loyalty and helpfulness in the performance of my duties. I am inclined to think such loyalty must be unique; certainly, it has been outstanding.

As for the American Coalition itself, I believe that it has potentialities which are of transcendent importance in this time of crisis. They should be developed. I, therefore, am particularly glad that the nominating committee has selected a young man as its candidate for the presidency who is able to travel, and make contact with the societies which you represent, without having to consider the difficulties which have hampered me for many years.

Our organization is dedicated to the preservation of American institutions without partisanship in any form whatsoever. I have never known, or considered, how the members of the constituent societies are politically divided. They were patriots, and that was all that mattered.

Unfortunately, it has seemed to me that President Truman's predecessor opened wide the gates of the executive branch of our Government to people who have had ideas and ideals which are the antithesis of those held by all the members of the constituent societies of the American Coalition. As a consequence, we have had the Hiss case, the Coplon scandal, the Hiss trial, and we are being pushed down the road to socialism at a terrifying speed. I need hardly to say to you that socialism is the negation of liberty. I am not original when I say to you today that the search for security and its promotion by the Federal Government can have in reality but one result—slavery.

Beveridge, in England, admitted quite frankly that his universal plan was utterly dependent upon compulsory labor. That means the complete subordination of the individual to the state.

It has always seemed to me that the founders of the Republic, and, for over a hundred years, their successors, planned the Government of the United States to be solely an agency to be operated for the benefit of the citizens of our country. Now, under the present holders of high office, we see advocated the support of Socialist regimes based on Marxian principles. These governments seem unable to remain in power unless they receive subsidies from the economic system still extant in the United States.

We were taken into a war for purposes, I venture to say, which were quite contrary to our national traditions. Do not forget that Winston Churchill called it the unnecessary war. Because of a dramatic gesture calling for unconditional surrender, probably 100,000 Americans had to die upon the battlefields of the world. What is worse, I suggest, that we thereby had to utterly destroy two great barriers against bolshevism. These barriers might have been saved in some form to fortify our present position in the appalling situation which now confronts us.

I have had left at your place at the table a reprint of a letter which I addressed to a Senator of the State of New York who sponsored a resolution advocating a constitutional convention for the purpose of integrating the United States in a federal union of all nations. I have taken the liberty on the basis of resolutions adopted by the American Coalition to oppose what seems to me a wholly fantastic and dangerous policy.

At the moment, Senator McCARRAN, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, is fighting a great battle to prevent this country being inundated by immigrants from central Europe, who cannot legitimately be classed as displaced persons actually displaced as a result of military operations during the war. Some of you have probably read what I have written about this matter, and I hope that you have read what Senator

McCARRAN has set forth in his statement about this problem. Throughout the discussion on Capitol Hill, Senator McCARRAN has been facing a majority in his committee which seems to be more sympathetic to the requirements of alien blocs and left-wingers than to the desires of the great unorganized mass of the American people. However, we are greatly indebted to the Senator for his successful effort in securing the inclusion in the amended bill of certain safeguards which have been lacking in the Celler bill. For this reason, I suggest that every member of the American coalition and their friends stand foursquare behind Senator McCARRAN in his efforts to block passage of the iniquitous measure which is now before the Senate, even though, for parliamentary reasons, the Senator may be recorded as voting for the bill reported by his committee. It seems to me that everybody present, and those of you who meet in the Women's Patriotic Conference, have a duty to perform, and, that is to go to the Capitol and call upon every Senator to defeat the amended Celler bill in whatever form it may reach the floor of the Senate.

Approximately a million dollars have been spent by our opponents to put this measure through the House, and through the Senate; and, as you know, we have never had the means to purchase the radio, to hire speakers, and to flood the country with propaganda, as has been done by the other side.

Once more, I thank you, my friends, for supporting my efforts with such extraordinary loyalty, and I want you to understand, that I deeply appreciate the wonderful friendships which have been built up between us, and between some of the splendid men on Capitol Hill, who have been and who are now carrying on our fight in their official capacity.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN COALITION AT ITS ANNUAL CONVENTION IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 26, 1950

As the fundamental purpose of the American Coalition is to keep America American, it is hoped that each participating organization will exert every effort to bring the information contained in these resolutions to its members, and through them to mobilize activity in their communities on these vitally important subjects.

GERTE L. H. FROMBERG,
Chairman, Committee on Resolutions.

IMMIGRATION

Whereas the debate in the Senate on October 12, 14, and 15, 1949, on the merits of the Celler bill (H. R. 4567) revealed deplorable facts relating to the admission of displaced persons into the United States, and a recent statement since his return from a study of conditions on the spot in Europe, by Senator McCarran, reinforces the statements therein made relating to the administration of the law: Be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, urges Congress to suspend all immigration into the United States so long as more than 1,000,000 persons in the United States are unemployed, except for the admission of husbands, wives, and minor children of citizens or aliens lawfully admitted as permanent residents in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That pending such suspension of all immigration into the United States, the Displaced Persons Commission be abolished and its functions be transferred to the Immigration and Naturalization Bureau of the Department of Justice; and be it further

Resolved, That insofar as the so-called displaced persons are to be admitted into the United States, the cut-off date established by the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, shall be maintained in force, and in addition, screening boards be established abroad, whose members shall be composed of a single delegate from the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the United States, the State Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Defense. The approval of admission of any person shall be by unanimous vote and the rejection of an applicant for admission shall be final and not subject to review; and be it further

Resolved, That the American coalition expresses its deep appreciation of the gallant efforts of Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, to uphold our immigration barriers in the face of outrageous assaults from minority groups upon his character and his motives, and be it further

Resolved, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled earnestly entreats its constituent societies and the individual members thereof to urge their State legislators to oppose this infamous and dangerous scheme to destroy the United States of America.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Whereas great pressure is being exerted on Congress to pass legislation which would place under Government control the health and medical care of the people of the United States; and

Whereas such action would destroy, or at least impair, the personal interest, initiative, and private research on the part of the medical profession, and put that profession under the control of a paternalistic bureaucracy with direct socialization as a result: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition, in annual convention assembled, expresses its emphatic opposition to the establishment of socialized medicine and thereby the expansion of a parasitical and paternalistic bureaucracy in the United States.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Whereas the American Coalition has consistently opposed over a long period of years the enactment of legislation which would place in the power of the Federal Government the right to intervene in local systems of education either directly or indirectly through the imposition of restrictions or conditions as to the expenditure of Federal appropriations: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the American Coalition, in annual convention, assembled reiterates its opposition to all legislation in whatsoever guise to place the control of education under any department or bureau of the Federal Government.

OPPOSING WORLD GOVERNMENT

Whereas there are now active organizations and individuals in our country which endeavor to establish a world government, a world federation, or any other international organization which would abrogate any of our national sovereignty; and

Whereas it has been openly admitted by advocates of such a world government, by whatever name it be called, that no secession would be permitted to any nation which joined such a world government and which later wanted to withdraw; and

Whereas the voting strength of the United States of America in any such World Government would be overwhelmingly outnumbered by the vast populations and geographical areas of Asia, and by the uncounted millions of Africa; and

Whereas world government law would be enforced directly upon individuals in our country, and world government taxing power would directly tax our citizens independently and in addition to our own national taxation, and the world government would take over the gold reserves of the United States and of all member nations, thus rendering our own currency worthless; and

Whereas the power to tax is the power to destroy, and if the United States of America should join such a world government, it would cease to be a free nation, its people would lose their precious liberties and become the slaves of a world superstate founded on the philosophy that the individual is not the master of his government but its servant: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American coalition in annual convention assembled declares itself as uncompromisingly opposed to a world government or any other international organization with supreme authority over all national governments; and be it further

Resolved, That the individual members of this convention most earnestly urge their Representatives in the Congress of the United States and their State legislatures to oppose this infamous and dangerous scheme to destroy the United States of America.

BILL OF RIGHTS DAY

Resolved, That the American Coalition, in annual convention assembled, earnestly urge: upon the Congress of the United States the adoption of a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue annually a proclamation designating December 15 as Bill of Rights Day and calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and prayers.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Whereas the American Coalition is deeply appreciative of the superb service rendered to the country by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, in exposing to public view the activities of individuals and organizations who are, or have been, engaged in efforts to bring about a change in the form of Government in the United States; and

Whereas it is all too evident from subversive literature and other propaganda emanating from innumerable agencies of varied affiliations that our free institutions and our constitutional form of government are in real peril: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the American Coalition, in annual convention assembled, urges upon the Congress to appropriate such funds as will enable the committee to function effectively; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Coalition urges upon the committee not to relax its efforts to expose the operations of all subversive activities in the country or its dependencies.

ARMED FORCES

Whereas strife and contention are still very much in existence today, and the peace of the world is in jeopardy; and

Whereas our philosophy of life and the rights of the individual as well as our productive industry are precious possessions which we must at all times be prepared to defend against invasion or subversion: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, urges Congress to provide for the maintenance of an armed force sufficient in strength and equipment to meet any attack by land, sea, or air of any aggressor, until the Reserve forces are made ready to meet the emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Coalition further supports continued research and technical development in all branches of the armed services.

OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS AND RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

Whereas, historically, the security of the United States has rested upon a strong civilian army; and

Whereas in the opinion of the patriotic leaders of the country, some form of military training is essential; and

Whereas it seems apparent that universal military training is not going to be put into effect; and

Whereas a reasonably satisfactory means of physical and military training can be effected through a system of military training in the colleges and secondary schools; and

Whereas such training could effectively be carried on by Reserve officers on inactive duty: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, earnestly requests that the Department of Defense and the Congress of the United States, in cooperation with State and local authorities, provide for training the youth of the country through establishment of a form of military training in colleges and secondary schools.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Whereas the United States Marine Corps always has been an integral part of the fighting forces of the United States and its record and inspiration to the American people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition, in annual convention assembled, urges upon Congress that the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps always be maintained at not less than 6 percent of the combined strength of the armed forces of the United States, and be it further

Resolved, That we urge that the commandant of the Marine Corps be made an ex officio member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to sit in with the staff on all matters pertaining to amphibious operations and/or the Marine Corps.

ESSENTIAL MATERIALS

Whereas the encouragement by the Government of the United States of foreign production of raw and manufactured materials, which can be found in, or manufactured in, American Territory, is a direct assault on American labor and the business institutions of the United States; and

Whereas the Soviet Government is reported to be constructing a gigantic fleet of submarines, which, in the event of war, might deprive the United States of access to foreign sources of essential materials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition, in annual convention assembled, opposes any Government policy or legislation which threatens the economic independence of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the American coalition favors any Government policy or legislation which will promote the economic independence of the United States.

WASHINGTON SESQUICENTENNIAL

Resolved, That the American coalition in annual convention assembled, endorses the celebration of the sequicentennial of the founding of Washington, D. C., as the Capital of the United States, as authorized by Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That every patriotic organization be called upon to participate in making this a national event of first importance.

ANTARCTICA

Whereas the Antarctic continent was discovered and explored in large measure by American citizens; and

Whereas extensive outcroppings of valuable mineral deposits in Antartica have been frequently reported; and

Whereas foreign nations which are in debt to us are now claiming sovereignty over large portions of this territory; and

Whereas the United Sates has gravely depleted its natural resources in coming to the rescue of present claimants to this territory: Be it, therefore

Resolved, That the American coalition, in annual convention assembled, urges Congress to make it a condition precedent to the extension of any economic aid to any nation, that that nation shall cede to the United States all claims to sovereignty in this region.

JUDGE MEDINA

Resolved, That the American coalition in annual convention assembled, desires to express its sincere appreciation of the marvelous patience and completely judicial attitude assumed by Judge Medina under great provocation occasioned by a very trying situation in the Communist trial in New York.

TRAITOROUS CITIZENS

Whereas at long last there is being made successful prosecution of some of those charged with disloyalty to the people and Government of the United States, and with service in behalf of foreign powers: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the American Coalition, in annual convention assembled, hereby commends the action of all those, in and out of Congress, who have contributed to the work of investigation and prosecution of those thus charged; and condemns and deplores the action of those who, in positions of authority, have shown themselves to be unsympathetic with, or scornful of, the efforts thus made to bring to the bar of justice those who have been engaged in such treasonable conduct; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Coalition here and now urges the Congress and the law-enforcing agencies of the Federal Government to continue, and to broaden, the scope of such investigations, and to make speedy and fearless prosecution of all such offenders, whoever they may be and wherever situated.

TRIBUTE TO MR. TREVOR

Whereas over a period of 25 years the destinies of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies have been wisely guided by Mr. John B. Trevor, as president; and

Whereas he not only founded it but has sustained and developed it into a power; and because of his ability, courageous heart, gentleness of spirit, and honesty of purpose has won the respect, affection, and complete confidence of his officers and coworkers; and

Whereas he has with great discretion done valuable work for his country and for the American Coalition in legislative matters affecting the welfare of the Nation; and

Whereas Mr. Trevor feels it necessary to relinquish his active leadership: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled signifies not only its keen regret but its appreciation of his rare ability and unselfish service by a rising vote of thanks and at the same time wishing him many years of health and happiness.

Let There Be Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the RECORD the broken-hearted plea of a young mother in my district for peace—peace in our time and in all time to come, not by surrender to totalitarian forces and aggression, but by refusing to surrender to hysteria and fear.

As you read this letter, you may say that it is theatrical and melodramatic; perhaps it is.

But the whole theme of peace and war is theatrical and melodramatic. It runs the gamut of all human hopes and emotions, and the prize to those of us in this dreary world who find the answer to the international riddle is preservation of human civilization.

This letter was written to me, Mr. Speaker, by Mrs. Ben Bernstein, of 384 Madison Street, New York. It is only one of scores that I have received in recent weeks. I hope that some of our colleagues who are ready to plunge the world into war for nothing will read it and ponder, and perhaps think of their own children who may be maimed or killed in a new holocaust.

NEW YORK, N. Y.,
Monday, February 13, 1950.

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have just tucked my three little girls into bed and kissed them good night. They are only 5 years old, 2½, and 10 months old, and I love them very much.

As far as it is within my humanly power to do so, I protect them, I feed them, I clothe them, I bathe them. When they are sick I worry over them, until, with the doctor's help, they are well again.

And, in turn, my children love me. They need me, they depend on me, they trust me.

But now a very real and terrible threat hovers over us all. My little girls are too little to understand, so their world is still safe. Happy, lucky little girls. But not so lucky am I. Not so safe is my world.

The atomic age has come and released upon the earth a fury more deadly than the mind of man could ever dream possible. And men have lost their reason.

What is man, or who is man that he dares use the mighty brain God gave him to conspire with the devil and plot chaos, fear, and impending violent death upon His beautiful, wonderful world?

I am a simple person. I was not ordained by fate to help shape the destiny of our world, nor to carve myself a niche in its hall of fame.

No, I leave the making of history to our able and honorable statesmen, financiers, and politicians. For myself, I want only to be free to fulfill my own duties as wife and mother—an old and noble profession.

But I must have peace of mind in order to build and plan a future for myself and my children. I want to see growing bodies and happy faces. I want to see graduations, weddings, and grandchildren.

My voice is a small one, but its message is mighty, for my sentiments are universal. Every mother, every father everywhere shares these hopes for a bright tomorrow.

I am not a deeply religious woman, but if it were possible I would have written this letter to God Himself.

Instead, I am writing to you, as a member of the human race, as a father, and as my elected voice in Congress.

I beseech you to rise before that body and speak as you have never spoken before, and tell them what I have said.

Perhaps as a little person I am not too well informed as to what goes on in the inner sanctums and private circles of our Government. But this I know:

There is no time for false pride. There must be active, genuine attempts made to iron out our difficulties with Russia, since she seems to be the reason for all our atomic research.

We must bend over backward, if necessary, to find a common meeting ground with her. For Russian mothers, too, love children, and they, too, have their dreams.

There can be no point of difference so great that world destruction, as an alternative, would be justified.

And, if need be, let's shout across the rooftops until our voices pierce the iron curtain, and we can make them understand that, despite our differences, we are all as brothers and that we have a common destiny.

Let there be talk of peace and work for peace and peacetime spending. Not talk of war and work on atom bombs and billions for defense.

This, then, is the sworn duty of our elected Congressmen: To secure the peace and to maintain the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

And if our Congress feels itself inadequate to cope with world affairs, then let the American people subscribe to a world government that will have the vision and the authority to set the world right again.

Surely, civilization has not emerged from the dark ages to the magnificent heights of modern times only to face annihilation at the hands of its own moulder.

People's hearts the world over are united in a prayer for permanent peace.

From this common denominator we can build new hope, slowly perhaps, but surely, and may Almighty God lead us back to a saner, safer, and happier life.

Amen.

Sincerely yours,

CORINNE BRAWNER
(Mrs. Ben Bernstein)

Gen. H. H. Arnold: "A Man To Match Our Mountains"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, at the entrance of one of our State capitol buildings in Sacramento, Calif., is an inscription that reads, "Give us men to match our mountains." Gen. Henry H. Arnold was undoubtedly the type of man that the author of this statement was thinking about. General Arnold was not a native Californian but he spent a good part of his adult life in our State. When he retired from active service, he went to California to make a home in the beautiful Sonoma Valley, christened by Jack London as "The Valley of the Moon."

Unfortunately, God called him recently and those of us who had known him were deprived of his friendship, comradeship, and leadership. He will go down in history as one of our great military leaders. In times of crisis, the Lord seems to produce the types of men that are needed to bring us the victory. General Arnold's work as head of the Air Forces during the Second World War was one of the most stupendous jobs ever performed by a military man. He built an air force, starting with practically nothing, to the greatest air armada and striking force that the world had ever known. It contributed mightily to our victory in every theater of the war. He was the last one to proclaim that his particular group deserved any more credit than the other two groups composing our armed forces, namely the Navy and the Army.

After he retired to California he took part in public affairs and at the request of Gov. Earl Warren he served as a member of the State Fish and Game Commission. He took part in the affairs of his local community and became a member of the Kiwanis Club of the little city of Sonoma. One of its members, A. R. Grinstead, wrote a poem about him when he was conferred an honorary membership of the Kiwanis Club of Sonoma. I believe that it describes General Arnold and his work very well.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the poem which reads as follows:

"A MAN TO MATCH OUR MOUNTAINS"

"Give us men to match our mountains,"
Every city, town, and State
Long has yearned for men gigantic
Who in thoughts and deeds are great
So, within our tiny valley,
We have wished for men who share
The dignity and grandeur
Which our rugged mountains bear.
And now our wish is answered
And our yearnings satisfied,
Since General Henry Arnold
Has come here to reside.

But this vale is not his measure,
Our small mountains not the test,
Nay, compare him with the grandeur
Of the nation's highest crest.
He's a match for any mountain,
Aye, more than a match is he;
He's o'ercome the highest ridges
As he's spanned the widest sea.
For the far-flung operations
Of his Air Force in its might,
O'er this world's loftiest ranges
Carried victory in its flight.

Yea, for men who match our mountains—
There's a need throughout the land,
For men of giant stature,
Who'll in war and peace command.
May that need ne'er be unanswered;
Let their strong arms e'er insure
The success of every venture,
That this nation may endure,
May there e'er be stalwart leaders,
Who'll protect in direst plights,
May there always be "Hap" Arnolds
To guarantee our rights.

—*A. R. G.*

Bad Bugs in Bed With REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

BAD BUGS IN BED WITH REA

(By the Country Editor)

If the United States Government has ever done one good thing, and it has, that thing is the rural electric program, the REA.

No newspaper in America has given more space to the REA than has the Press-Argus. The daddy of REA in this part of Arkansas has been John H. Hobbs. We freely turned over our columns to him to espouse the cause. And he has used it—hundreds of columns—more space, we suspect, than was given to the REA by all the other weekly newspapers in Arkansas, all put together.

Several times we have personally spoken a good word for REA, for we like the set-up. It's simple. The Government, through the REA congressional act, simply gives a group of rural people the privilege of forming a business corporation, and such corporation can borrow sufficient money from the Government at low, long-term rates. With this money, the farmer-owned, farmer-managed corporation can build power plants, can build electric lines, and can within its own discretion sell electricity to farmers and to all small communities that cannot be profitably served by other privately owned power companies.

It's a sensible set-up. We've said so several times. But of late we have had a feeling, a hunch, that all was not above the board in REA. We noted they had expanded their pay rolls to take in public-relations employees. We noted that money was not available for extension of lines. We had no time or inclination to dig into the situation; but we had a feeling that the fellows back home who have been on the front line fighting for better service for REA have not been told all the things that were going on in brass-hat circles.

Last week our hunch was proven true. In a sensational disclosure, our own Congressman BOYD TACKETT flushed the covey from the bushes—and there it was: the blackbirds of the SPA had gone to roost with the REA. The bureaucrats of the Southwest Power Administration, evidently in cahoots with the higher-ups in REA, had concocted a clever plan to set up a giant power empire here in the Southwest—in positive defiance of the decision of Congress.

TACKETT deserves a vote of thanks for his fearless disclosure. He did some immediate good—loans that had been held up for months upon months were immediately allowed by the REA. Many farmers can soon get the electric service they had been promised for month after month.

But it's not all thanks that he's getting. TACKETT is catching criticism for his stand in the matter. The "public relations" men supported by tax funds have sent out the word that he is "ruining REA." There's not a word of truth in it. TACKETT is the best friend REA ever had. In fact, we believe that he has saved REA as we have known and admired it.

We know that talks on Government are dull things; but, honestly, if the people don't awaken to their dangers, it is going to be too late to claim there is freedom in our democracy.

This SPA-REA combine is a fair example of what is going on right under our noses under the guise of "good government." Let's study it a minute.

The SPA is a Government bureau, created by Congress. Its task was simple. Its job was to take control and to sell electricity generated by water power at dams along the streams here in the Southwest. The SPA was to do nothing more than hook all this electricity together and to sell it—to REA first, to other companies second.

But SPA seems to be made up of a remnant of a mob of schemers once quite popular in Washington under the name of "Brain Trust." They want more than just electricity to sell. They must want to operate with tax money the same kind of "big business" which they denounce as "dangerous to democracy." Their idea is to have the Government set up a power empire to drive the privately owned companies out of business. So they asked Congress for more money. And Congress said "No." SPA was not to be a Government manufacturing business.

Well, now, the REA has money for power plants. In fact, one is to be built down here at Ozark. Congress, which has always been friendly to REA, told REA to buy their electric power from private companies such as the O. G. & E. and the Arkansas Power & Light, or to buy from SPA. And if the two agencies, one privately owned, the other owned by the Government, couldn't supply REA with electricity at a fair rate, Congress gave REA authority, and funds, to build its own power plants.

It was that last item that the SPA schemers grabbed onto. TACKETT charged, and we have heard no denials, that SPA seduced the REA in Washington to borrow the money to build the power plants. And when REA completed the plants, they were to lease them to SPA on a long-term basis. Eventually SPA, without authority by law, would acquire the plants that were owned by the farmers who borrowed the money to build them.

It was a slick scheme to circumvent the will of Congress, and might have succeeded, and may succeed yet, if folks don't wake up to the fact that some big lumps of their tax money are being used to put taxpayers out of business.

We don't like it—and we are pretty sure that farmers around here like John Hobbs and others who have put their money and time in REA don't like it either. I know these men and their ideals. They are not socialistic planners. They don't want the Government to take over private business. I know they are not in harmony with the idea of these bureaucrats who have such boldness.

Well, as one little small-town editor who has fought for REA all the way through, we say: "Thanks to BOYD TACKETT." His courage will be appreciated some day—we hope it's not too late—as it was in England, to stop the drift toward absolute slavery of all citizenship—through bureaus who are administering so-called good government.

The trouble with bureaus is that they are dictators before the people know it. Once entrenched with authority, the bureau can rule with an iron hand that subdues by the power of the purse. Those who disagree with them are punished by withholding funds, denial of projects, and other methods to beat into line those who disagree. Those are the evils of bureaucratic government. We marvel at the political fortitude of BOYD TACKETT. He has attacked a pretty big tiger.

H. P.

Anti-Semitism in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the February 1950 issue of the Jewish Layman, together with the remarks of our high commissioner, Hon. John J. McCloy:

ON THE RISE AGAIN—ANTI-SEMITISM IN GERMANY

(By Harry Greenstein)

To get an authentic account of the alarming undercurrents in postwar Germany, the Jewish Layman asked Harry Greenstein, former adviser on Jewish affairs to the United States occupation authorities, to comment on the restoration of anti-Semitism and the future of Jewish life in Germany. In reply he sent us a copy of his report to the Secretary of the Army on his observations in Germany and Austria from February to October 1949. The following article contains excerpts of that significant document. Mr. Greenstein recently returned to the United States to resume his position as executive director of the Jewish Charities and Jewish Welfare Fund of Baltimore.

During my tour of duty I found relatively little in Germany of what might be termed overt forms of anti-Semitism. In an occupied country, where basic attitudes are necessarily repressed, this fact is no gauge of the intensity of the anti-Semitism that still exists. No one can work in Germany for even a brief period without being conscious of the deep, underlying hatred and hostility against the Jews. It will take years, perhaps generations, before the virulent form of anti-Semitism will have spent itself.

All competent observers agree that militant nationalism in one form or another has been on the rise in Germany since early 1948. There is a reason to believe that with the creation of the Federal Republic of Germany, it will, in all likelihood, increase. This nationalism which expressed itself without restraint in the speeches of the political candidates of all parties in the recent German elections, is a danger signal which no one can afford to ignore. It is true that the Bonn constitution is democratic in concept and provides for many safeguards for the protection of the basic rights of man. However, constitutions are not self-executing. From the standpoint of the future, what counts is the spirit in which Germany will be governed.

It is highly significant that in the recent elections no party, competing for the votes of the German electorate, found it politically expedient to denounce Hitlerism and its vicious anti-Jewish complex. The generation which grew up during Hitler's regime has been schooled in the leader principle and unless there is decisive rejection of Hitlerism by those elected to high public office, the German masses will continue to nurture the hatreds planted in them by their former leaders.

Chancellor Adenauer and President Heuss took a step in the right direction when, in extending New Year's greetings to the Jews of western Germany and in inviting them to take part in the intellectual, social, and political reconstruction of Germany, they said, "The Jews will not forget—the loyal Germans must not—but together we must overcome our evil inheritance." While these sentiments will be appreciated by people with democratic instincts, wherever they may reside, they will remain hollow words unless the new German Republic takes positive steps to combat anti-Semitism and to dissociate itself from its evil inheritance by a concrete program of action.

On the basis of my observations and work in Germany, I have formed the following conclusions:

1. It is imperative that the occupying powers recognize in anti-Semitism the rejection of the democratic principle and as the unmistakable sign of the resurgence of German nationalism in its most vicious form.

2. It is imperative that those entrusted with authority in Germany be ever vigilant against any manifestations of anti-Semitism and that they deal with it in vigorous and militant fashion.

3. It is imperative that the powers reserved by the authorities in the occupation statute be so exercised as to guide the press and other media of communication in bringing about a genuine regeneration of the German people.

4. From a long-range point of view it is of the utmost importance to develop a positive, democratic program which will reach into the governmental circles, into the church, the family, the schools, and into the daily lives of the German people.

There is no single cure for anti-Semitism. This is true of any country where the disease thrives. It is doubly true of Germany, where, sanctioned by law and dinned into the ears of the old and the young, it had become a national fetish whose validity few people questioned, and fewer had the courage to challenge. It will take at least as much time and effort to destroy the virus of hate as it took the Nazis to implant it in the hearts of the German people. It will be a long and uphill fight, to which all the liberal and enlightened elements, in and out of Germany, will have to apply themselves if any perceptible dent is to be made in meeting this problem.

A conference on the future of the Jews in Germany, conducted at Heidelberg by Mr. Greenstein last September, brought together for the first time in 16 years the major local and international Jewish organizations operating in Germany, and laid the ground work for coordinating efforts of every element in Germany interested in the welfare of Jews.

Facts brought out included:

In 1939, there were approximately 550,000 Jews in Germany; by the end of 1949, the number had been reduced to approximately 50,000.

The remaining community of Jews is over 50 percent intermarried, and in an overwhelming majority of the cases the children of these intermarriages are being raised in the Christian faith.

Hitler and his National Socialists, especially certain SS units, killed in a very short period of time at least 5,000,000 Jews; that is, most of the Jewish people in Europe, including more than four-fifths of the Jews of Germany.

Jewish religious services and education are still carried on in Germany, but there is a shortage of rabbis and schools. In fact, in all of continental Europe today there are only a few Jewish seminaries.

From his experience, Mr. Greenstein concluded:

1. For all practical purposes, the DP chapter in Germany has come to an end.

2. There will continue to be a Jewish community in Germany. Its ultimate size will depend upon such factors as world conditions, economic stability, the duration of our armed occupation of Germany, and the extent to which the German Government makes it possible for all minority groups to feel secure in Germany.

3. Nothing must be permitted to take place which will in any way weaken the restitution law. It is impossible to restore the lives of the millions who were murdered under the Nazi regime. It is, however, possible in some measure to effect a restitution of property of which the dead and the handful of survivors were robbed. The power to render the final decision in restitution cases must rest with an American tribunal and the United States authorities must be vigilant that the restitution cases which reach the courts are expeditiously handled.

4. It is imperative that no person with a Nazi background and record be permitted to hold any position of public responsibility in Germany.

5. The Jews of the world have an important stake in what happens in Germany. In our fast shrinking world every spot on the globe is important. A land which could very well become the rallying point and a source of strength for the reactionary forces of the world is of special importance to the Jew. It is already abundantly clear that Germany will strive to regain its former status in the family of nations and will make every effort to become an important factor in world affairs. The future attitude of Germany toward its Jews, regardless of how large or how small the number may be, will have a profound effect and influence on Jews everywhere.

6. For these reasons I feel it is important that the local Jewish organizations in Germany, specifically the Kultus Gemeinde and the Central Committee of Liberated Jews develop a coordinated program in meeting common Jewish problems.

7. I feel it is equally important that the International Jewish organizations, functioning in Germany, coordinate their efforts and work closely together in safeguarding Jewish rights and in helping create a truly democratic regime in Germany.

It will take many years before we can have an atmosphere of tolerance and breadth of view in Germany. I hope those years will be fewer than some people fear. The attitude of the Jew who remains in Germany will probably have a great deal to do with it. He will be laboring under a strain and will be moving against the current. However, I cannot but believe that with the tenacity, persistence, courage, and vigor of the race and with the habit of honest and fair dealing, the Jew in Germany will be restored to a position which he occupied in the past in this community and will reach even higher levels.

JOHN J. MCCLOY,
High Commissioner,
United States Zone, Germany.

Problems of the Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members a resolution I am introducing today which would create a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on the Problems of the Aging, which would be authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the employment problems of persons who, by reason of their age, are faced with difficulties in securing suitable and adequate employment.

The United States Bureau of Employment Security found in a special survey of six cities in May 1949, that in all six areas studied employers had significant restrictions against the hiring of older workers. The proportion of employers in each city who would hire no one over 44 ranged from 32 percent in Denver, to 79 percent in Birmingham, Ala.

In all six areas older workers remained listed in the active file of the local employment offices longer than younger workers. In one city where a special study was made of a lay-off wave that hit the area at the end of 1948, it was found that workers over 40 were most sharply affected, that employers became increasingly reluctant to hire older workers as unemployment increased the supply from which they could choose, and that where opportunities were available, they were in service industries where the wages and conditions of work were not attractive to younger workers.

Prospects for the future point to an extension and deepening of this problem.

America is aging. One-third of the people of voting age in 1945 were 50 or more years of age; by the year 2000 this proportion will be over 45 percent.

People 65 and over were 4 percent of the total in 1900; today they are 7.5 percent; by 1960 they will be over 9 percent. This is the fastest-growing section of our population.

On the other hand the youngest section is declining. Children under 5 were over 12 percent of the population in 1900. Today they are less than 8 percent.

Every age group below 40 is decreasing in relative size, while every one over 40 is increasing.

The hearings on social security that are now being held by the Senate Committee on Finance have thrown a piercing light on a problem that all of us face.

It is not a new problem.

It has been with us as long as man.

In other times and other civilizations, when people grew old, they were taken to a cave or igloo and left there to die, or otherwise neatly disposed of. We have not done that, at least not quite as openly.

Where a man is a Senator or a Congressman, or even a President, we the people of America, have recognized the contribution he can make from experience. Witness the fact that one-third of our Senators are over 60 years, and almost one-fourth of our Congressmen. To put it more forcefully, more than three-fourths of our entire Congress is over 45 years—an age beyond which most workers seeking employment find the doors closed.

Where a man is a doctor, or a lawyer, or a teacher, or an entrepreneur if you will, age has been recognized as adding to his ability, his experience, his know-how. But for the vast majority of America, the workers, the prospect is indeed dark.

Several hundred years ago, a worker could count on his trade and his skill remaining substantially static. He would live and die a skilled cobbler, a tailor, or blacksmith.

But the modern industrial system is one of rapid and frequent change. No man starting out in one occupation can be certain that it will remain unchanged long enough for him to die in it. On the contrary, the likelihood is that he and it will change many times in the course of his life.

While industry changes more and more rapidly, the working population grows older and older.

There is no doubt that physical and physiological changes occur in the older worker—the worker over 45 years. His strength, his agility, his sight, his speed may be lessened. At the same time his sense of responsibility, his lack of absenteeism, his ability to supervise and train younger workers, his concentration, his stick-to-it-iveness may increase—a fact which employment of older workers during World War II so clearly showed.

As Ewan Clague, commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics so clearly pointed out in his article in the December 1947 issue of the Monthly Labor Review entitled "Employment of the Older Worker":

Under ideal conditions, the worker would be graduated at about this time into more responsible work, perhaps into some form of supervision or direction of the training of young workers, or "paper" work of some kind which capitalizes his knowledge. If this were the normal outcome, no social or economic problem would arise.

But that is not the normal outcome at the present time.

The common notion is to retire a man or woman of 65, to make them comfortable—not in a cave perhaps, but certainly apart from the steady stream of activity to which they may long to contribute and to which they are capable of contributing in good measure. A man may retire, that is, if he has been able and lucky enough to hold onto one job long enough to derive pension benefits from long employment.

But where a worker is not yet aged, where he is what we call near old—over 45 years of age, like the vast majority of Congress, and looking for a job, then what?

Remember, he is not yet eligible for old-age or retirement assistance, yet he finds employers increasingly reluctant to hire him. He is classed as too old to work. Then what?

The problem as I see it is twofold:

First. What to do with the aging worker, the worker over 65 years who is able, willing, and seeking work, who has some productive years before him, and much experience behind, and

Second. What to do with the near-old worker, the man or woman over 45, who has at least 20 or 25 years, productive years, ahead, and yet whom industry, as it is now developing, finds it increasingly difficult to use?

There is need, therefore, to know the full extent of these employment difficulties: What basis there is in fact, if any—medically, physically, psychologically—for employer opposition to the hiring of workers over 40, what may be done to prolong useful employment opportunities for such workers, and what greater measure of security can be afforded for those who are genuinely beyond working age.

Some governmental and private agencies have already begun to think and work on the problem of an increased aged population in the United States.

I feel that Congress could assist in throwing further and very much needed light on the problem. For that reason I have drawn the following resolution:

Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the problems of the aging

Whereas today many of our people are being forced to recognize that their age has become a block to their further employment; and

Whereas this is a drain upon their own and the national welfare and tends to obstruct commerce; and

Whereas prospects for the future point to an extension and deepening of this problem: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on Problems of the Aging to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the employment problems of persons who, by reason of their age, are faced with difficulties in securing suitable and adequate employment.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Freedom Versus Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the events of recent days have proved that it is possible for the Republicans to become an effective, united party of intelligent opposition to the Fair Deal if the issues are pointed up in such a way as to inspire the more thoughtful people to work for political action.

Adoption of the slogan "Socialism or freedom" is a forward step. Every American who can put two and two together and come up with four as the answer knows that these are the alternatives facing this Nation today. Ten years from now we shall be either a socialistic nation or we shall be a free nation.

It is possible that we still will have a mixed economy, of the type in which many of our people now are suffering, but the odds are against the continuance of the mixed economy. When a nation has gone as far along the road to totalitarianism as this Nation has gone, the time comes when the admixture of freedom and slavery either must become separated or the whole thing becomes slavery.

What we have had for some years is a mixture of wheat and chaff. The time has come when the wheat must be separated from the chaff, or else the whole "shebang" will become polluted.

It is easy enough for any intelligent person to sit down and understand clearly why the present policies of this Administration are leading us to socialism, which is just another name for the controlled state, totalitarianism, or communism.

As millions of our citizens become more and more dependent upon the Federal Government for hand-outs, more and more of them are afraid to speak for fear of jeopardizing the hand-outs. As millions of our citizens become tied up in labor unions dominated by racketeers and goons, there is less and less freedom of speech. A coal miner in a Pennsylvania town spoke out against John L. Lewis the other day. He shortly was run out of town, his name erased from union rolls, and he lost his right to work in that town forever. He swore that he never would go back for fear of his life.

We are losing freedom in these—and hundreds of other—ways, through the steady, unremitting growth of the Federal Government. As Federal expenditures go up, taxes rise. As taxes rise, you and I have less and less left of our income to invest as we please. The Federal Government has more money to invest. It uses the money to start power companies, to build steam plants, to go into various businesses.

Whatever else this may be called, it actually is socialism, under any definitions found in the dictionary. Also, it represents a contraction of the areas of economic freedom. If the Federal Government takes over hotels, naturally the number of privately owned and privately operated hotels shrinks. This is true in the field of electric power and in dozens of other fields possible to name.

The loss of freedom is so gradual, so subtle, that many citizens do not understand what is happening to them. The outward forms of government do not change, perceptibly, but the spirit of government becomes just the opposite of what it has been. It is like a man who is affected with a dread disease that affects his bones, or certain vital portions of his body. He looks the same, but actually his health and vitality are sapped and eaten away. That is what has been happening, is happening, and will continue to happen to our precious freedoms so long as a majority of the people vote for the Fair Deal.

Every one of us should devote all of our available time, effort, ability, and money to fighting against socialism. For, in so doing, we are fighting for nothing less than freedom itself, for ourselves, for our children, and for generations yet unborn.

The Lincoln Day box supper held in Washington was a rousing success because it brought together 12,000 persons who were united for freedom. If every such affair throughout the Nation will emphasize again this fight for freedom against tyranny of a very subtle kind, we can start building the kind of America for which all men of good will yearn.

Abraham Lincoln said that a nation could not exist half slave and half free. He proved in his day that when freedom was an issue the people would not falter, they would not fail. Let us prove it in our day.

Smoking Mice Live Normal Span

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from United States News and World Report for February 3, 1950:

SMOKING MICE LIVE NORMAL SPAN—UNITED STATES EXPERIMENTS FAIL TO PROVE CANCER RISK

Cigarette-smoking mice show this about tobacco:

Cancer—it is just as common among nonsmoking mice as it is among the smokers.

General health—mice who smoke half their lives reach the same ripe age as nonsmokers, none the worse for cigarettes.

Tests of the effect of cigarette smoking on health, conducted by the United States Public Health Service and others, result in these conclusions:

Cigarettes, so far as proof can be established, are not a cause of cancer of the lungs, lips, throat, or other parts of the "smoke tract." There is no clear evidence that smoking tends to shorten life. Digestion, however, does appear to be affected by excessive smoking. Cigarettes probably are harmful for people with some types of heart disorder. Smoking is not, so far as proof goes, a limiting factor in reproduction.

A sharp rise in the incidence of lung cancer—at a time when smoking has increased greatly—has led to the theory that cigarettes are the cause of the lung-cancer rise. To answer that theory, cancer experts of Public Health Service are reporting the results of experiments that they have conducted, using mice for men. Mice were induced to take up smoking, and kept at it for half their normal lives.

Specifically, for 4 hours daily, except Sunday, and for as long as 300 days, these mice were exposed to an automatic cigarette-smoking machine "which closely imitated human smoking habits." The mice used by Dr. Egon Lorenz, Chief of the Government's National Cancer Institute Biophysics Unit, were of the strain most susceptible to lung cancer.

Yet smokers among the mice showed no special tendency to develop lung cancer. In fact, they developed no more cancers in any part of the body than the "control" mice—the nonsmokers.

Dr. W. C. Hueper, Chief of the Institute's Cancer Studies Section, on the basis of these experiments with smoking and nonsmoking mice, makes this observation to United States News and World Report:

"No lung tumors among the mice were induced by smoking. Since other chemical agents can induce lung tumors in this strain of mice within a few months, the conclusion was reached that, under conditions simulating human smoking habits as closely as possible, tobacco smoke is not a cancer-causing agent, at least so far as the lungs of this strain of mice are concerned."

To explore further into the theory of smoke-induced cancers, the research workers repeatedly painted mice in one group with tobacco tar—supposedly a cancer-causing agent. Tobacco tar was injected under the skin of another group. Still another group had tobacco tar suspended in its drinking water. In addition, a tobacco-tar suspension was injected repeatedly into the blood stream of still another group of mice so that tar particles would be lodged in the lungs.

Results, again, were purely negative.

Still another approach was used in the effort to learn whether smoking is a cause of lung cancer. Research scientists reasoned that, if smoking is a cause of cancer, then a spectacular rise should be appearing in the incidence of lung cancer among women, who have taken up the habit in a big way in recent years. Young people, too, should be developing more lung cancers, since cigarette addicts are found more and more among the young. Also, cancer of the lip, tongue, and throat should be on the rise.

Yet there is no evidence that the rise of lung cancer among women is more noticeable than the increase among men, or that any other of these developments have occurred.

Dr. Hueper says, in this regard, "Certainly there is insufficient evidence to support the claim that the recent spectacular rise in the incidence of lung cancer is due to an increase in the smoking habit."

Cancer experts also have an answer for the physicians who report that they have found more lung cancer among smokers than among nonsmokers. Research workers point to proof that the average income of heart patients is far below that of the average person. But that doesn't prove that poverty causes heart trouble. The fact is, as has been shown, that many heart patients have low incomes because their ailment handicaps them.

As Dr. Hueper puts it, "The smoking habit may play a role in the production of human cancer, but the available evidence is in no way conclusive."

Other effects claimed for smoking arouse even more argument among physicians and scientists than the cancer claims. The research scientists, it seems, are less convinced than most physicians and writers on this subject. They are not willing to make dogmatic statements. But on the basis of their judgment, this can be said:

Digestion can be hindered by smoking, especially excessive smoking. Nicotine, in some tests, has stepped up secretion of stomach juices: acid, bile. That could be good. But, if it is overdone, it could be bad. Most experts doubt, for example, that an acid condition from smoking causes stomach ulcer. But they feel that, for the individual who already has an ulcer, smoking, at least excessive smoking, can serve to aggravate the condition. Few physicians fail to order their stomach-ulcer patients to stop smoking cigarettes.

Length of life, it appears, could be shortened by too much smoking, or by any smoking, but nobody seems to know for sure. Some sets of statistics indicate that heavy smokers tend to die at an earlier age than nonsmokers. But, say the experts, a man who is careless about his smoking habits is likely to be careless about his other health habits. Besides, who knows whether a heavy smoker dies at an earlier age from smoking or from the fact that the heavy smoker is likely to be a high-strung individual who wears himself out quickly, anyway?

The mice, again, provide a clue. The Lorenz tests showed that the normal mouse of the type used could look forward to an active life of better than a year and a half whether he took up smoking or not.

There is another clue. Some tests show that smoking increases the individual's blood-sugar level. What that indicates is that the smoker is putting a strain on his central nervous system, is producing energy unnecessarily. Logically, the individual who overdoes that sort of thing should expect to age more rapidly. Whether he actually does is something that has not been proved.

Heart troubles of various types are popularly connected with cigarette smoking. The evidence depends on the type of disorder. For the common angina pectoris, for example, most physicians play it safe and order their patients to reduce their smoking or, for more severe cases, to swear off entirely. Reason is that angina results from an insufficient flow of blood to the heart. And smoking can constrict the blood vessels and reduce that flow still further. But, again, most experts believe that smoking does not cause angina in the first place.

As for high blood pressure, the picture drawn by the experts is hazy. Individuals who are not used to smoking usually get a brief rise in blood pressure by smoking a cigarette. But there is evidence that smoking does not cause permanently high blood pressure. For example, rats subjected to much the same tests as used by Dr. Lorenz showed the same temporary rise in blood pressure. But they developed no permanent condition.

Actually, most physicians—and other scientists—are not much worried about tobacco effects on any but the most severe cases of high blood pressure where complications are present. That goes, too, for arteriosclerosis—hardening and narrowing of the arteries.

Local irritations, it is agreed, can be a result of smoking for some persons. Still, few people develop what might be called a cigarette cough, and these are not always attributable to smoking.

Reproductive processes seem unaffected by tobacco. Smokers among the mice, for example, were just as prolific as their nonsmoking friends.

What seems indicated, in sum, is that the ordinarily healthy individual can get by without serious effects if he smokes in moderation, if he stays within the limits he has established as his tolerance. But individuals who have heart pains, ulcers, or other conditions that seem affected by smoking will do well to take it easy on smoking, or to swear off.

Prospect, however, is that more and more people will take up smoking and complain about how harmful it is. Already, people spend more on smoking than they pay all physicians and dentists together. And, a Government study just out shows, people whose incomes decline cut their spending on tobacco far less than they trim spending on food and doctors.

Has America's Strength Been Sacrificed for So-Called Economies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very timely article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post and other newspapers. It is an article that I believed should be read by every Member of Congress:

HAS STRENGTH BEEN SACRIFICED FOR JOHNSON'S ECONOMIES?

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON, February 13.—It is a grave act to charge a high official with deliberately misinforming the Nation. But it is graver still for the Nation to be grossly and persistently misled about vital matters, as we are now being misled by Secretary of Defense Louis A. Johnson's many misrepresentations. The time has come to call a spade a spade. Johnson has not been telling the truth about the national defense.

Specifically, on December 7, Johnson told the National Association of Manufacturers that his savings in the defense budget were being made without any reduction in our state of preparedness. He then reiterated this claim in his official annual report, stating that we are obtaining greater national security at less expense. All precautions are being taken, he said, to increase rather than diminish the over-all combat capabilities of the armed forces. Many other similar statements of the Secretary of Defense might also be cited.

Only a few of the facts that flatly and utterly refute these claims of Johnson's can be compressed into the space of a newspaper column. Yet even these few facts are sufficient to prove that the Secretary of Defense has been practicing what amounts to a confidence trick upon the Nation.

As between the services, the Navy is, of course, the heaviest sufferer from Johnsonian "economy." Taking the 1949 strength as the base, and the new budget as the comparison, the fleets at sea are being reduced from 18 cruisers to 13; from 8 heavy carriers to 6; from 5 light and escort carriers to 3; from 155 destroyers to 140; from 79 submarines to 70; and from 439 other active ships to 414. Naval manpower is being drastically cut, and the strength of the Marine Corps, never noted for its overhead, is being reduced by nearly the equivalent of a division, down to 72,000 men.

In the air, the Navy's attack carrier groups are being cut from 14 to 9, with further weakening of the fighting strength of each group.

Nor is this the worst. Johnson has also taken his axe to the vital replacement of obsolescent and obsolete aircraft. The 1951 budget will give the Navy only about 60 percent of the new planes which are needed to keep even the shrunken naval and marine air arms continuously provided with fully modern types.

The case of the Air Force is less dramatic, but hardly less grave. As everyone knows, all competent authorities, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have established an Air Force of 70 groups as the minimum needed to provide adequate offensive striking power, reasonable air support for our ground armies, and minimum air defense. Working toward this goal, the Air Force had activated (but not equipped) more than 54 groups. Then came the cut-back to 48 groups. The 15 activated heavy-bomber groups were maintained. But tactical groups, including light bomber and fighter, were reduced from 32 to 27, and troop-carrier groups were cut from 7 to 6.

The Air Force retains as many planes as in 1949. But the Air Force, like the naval air arm, is not being permitted to keep its group continuously provided with modern aircraft. For this purpose more than $1,700,000,000 was requested when the budget was being prepared. The figure allowed under the Johnsonian "economy" program is $1,300,000,000.

This means that the Air Force replacement rate has been cut approximately 25 percent below what is thought necessary to keep the 48 authorized air groups fully ready for modern war.

In the Army alone genuine economies have been made without cuts in combat strength. By the firm insistence of Secretary of the Army Gordon Gray, the fighting units of the ground forces remain what they were. Even so, with our ground force strength stationary, and our naval and air power being continuously impaired, our net loss of strength is already very great. And the loss will be far greater still if this process goes on.

Johnson has, to be sure, succeeded in paring something from the outrageously swollen overheads of the services. He has also saved funds by eliminating such foolishly competitive enterprises as the giant carrier. Yet the facts cited above add up to only one possible conclusion—outright sacrifices of strength account for the vast bulk of Johnson's economies.

This Johnson has repeatedly denied. One must take one's choice, therefore, between two views—either the Secretary of Defense is too hopelessly incompetent to recognize a cut in combat capabilities when he makes it or he stands convicted of untruth in detail as charged.

Repeal the Wartime Excise Taxes Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, following is a statement which I submitted to the Ways and Means Committee today. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to express my thanks and appreciation to you and the members of this committee for allowing me to present my statement.

It is my earnest conviction that the wartime excise taxes very definitely constitute a case of taxation without justification. The sooner we repeal these burdensome taxes which are stifling business activity in our country, the sooner we shall help bolster the general economy and maintain our high level of employment.

Ever since I have been a Member of Congress I have advocated the repeal of all wartime excise taxes. I have introduced bills, both in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congress, calling for the termination of these wartime excise taxes, including the tax on retail sales of furs, jewelry, cosmetics, and luggage; the tax on admissions to movies, theaters, and other forms of amusement; the manufacturers' excise tax on electric, gas, and oil appliances; the manufacturers' tax on electric light bulbs and tubes; the tax on electrical energy which is sold for domestic or commercial consumption; the tax on transportation of persons and property; the tax on communications, including telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities, the tax on photographic equipment, and others.

In fact, I was so fearful of a serious setback to certain of the trades and industries affected, that last July, I initiated a petition to bring out of committee one of my bills calling for elimination of the retail excise taxes in order to obtain action on it on the floor of the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, my fears were verified by subsequent developments in several of these industries. The fur industry, for example, recorded a drop in sales last year of 30 percent as compared with 1946 and a drop in employment of 60 percent. Something similar has happened in the jewelry industry.

Today I am even more firmly convinced of how detrimental the excise taxes are on our economic life. In fact, I would urge the committee to eliminate the taxes not only on the items I mentioned above, covered by the bill referred to in my discharge petition, but to extend that list considerably to include many more items, before additional industries are just as badly affected and our whole economy seriously undermined.

In the case of transportation of persons, we have in effect a 15-percent tax. During the war the railroads were operating at full capacity and it was therefore important to discourage unnecessary travel, which the tax did. Now we hear of a reduction in travel of between 25 and 40 percent. Instead of encouraging business we are still following our wartime policy of discouragement.

The tax on theater admissions is 20 percent. We have all heard of the terrific crisis in the theater and movie industries which have been hard-hit by the admissions tax. I mean the little people, the owners of the thousands of movie houses and theaters throughout the country and the many thousands of people who depend on them for a livelihood. Relaxation is recognized by medical authorities today as a necessity not a luxury. Yet the admissions tax deprives thousands of our lowest- and middle-income earners of this vital and often only means of relaxation.

The tax on photographic equipment is one of the highest—25 percent. During the war the excise tax imposed on cameras and photographic materials was justified on the ground it helped to discourage civilian consumption of these articles in order that they might be available for wartime purposes. There is no longer any justification for this tax, particularly since the demand for these articles has been considerably reduced due to the high prices still in effect because of the tax.

Similarly high is the tax on communications: 25 percent on telegraph, cable, radio, and long-distance telephone, and 15 percent on local telephone service. In our modern system of living these services no longer constitute a luxury, but are a vital and essential part of our daily life. This tax should be entirely eliminated or drastically reduced.

Take a little item like electric-light bulbs, on which there is a 20-percent tax. Are electric-light bulbs a luxury item today? Is electrical energy for our homes and business establishments to be regarded a luxury? Or appliances for the preparation of food, whether gas, electric, or oil fueled? The tax on these items serves only to discourage homeowners and hotel and restaurant operators from purchasing necessary equipment to replace some of the obsolete equipment of prewar days.

I could go on in this fashion and cite other instances as to how excise taxes are affecting conditions in many industries. The examples cited, I believe, are sufficient to indicate the seriousness of the situation and the need for speedy action. The excise taxes, as you well know, were imposed during the war not so much for the purpose of raising revenue, but to restrict consumer purchases of these items and to preserve basic raw materials which were in short supply at the time. It was universally understood by our people that as soon as the war was over, these war measures would be repealed and the excise taxes would be removed. The Congress promised as much.

Here we are in the fifth year since the end of the war and to date we have failed to keep our promise to the American people. But while there may have been some justification for continuing these taxes in the early postwar years until the supply caught up with the the demand and while business activity remained at an all-time high, there is certainly no justification for it today.

No valid reason exists now for retaining such burdensome taxes, which are properly called nuisance taxes. To continue such taxes in normal times is to undermine the economic foundation of many important industries in this country and to destroy the confidence of the people in the legislative branch of our Government.

In the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1948, the United States Treasury obtained $470,000,000 from retail excise taxes. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the total income obtained by our Treasury from this source was $449,000,000, a decrease of $21,000,000 in one year. I am certain that at the end of the present fiscal year it will be still less. This in itself, the steady decline of revenue from these excise taxes, is the best proof of the effect it is having on our industries and how it is paralyzing economic activity in these trades. This alone justifies the repeal of the retail taxes.

Some of the raw materials used in the manufacture of these items, which we sometimes label erroneously as luxury items, is today in short supply. Supply has long ago caught up with demand, so that now these industries need incentives and inducements to consumers in order to maintain in a sufficiently high level of production and sales which will prove profitable. All of these industries are suffering from consumer resistance which is bound to increase in the coming year if restrictions on retail sales continue as heretofore.

I am also fearful of the effect this will have in the near future on the employment situation, not only in the industries affected by the excise taxes where already considerable unemployment is being reported, but even in other fields beginning with the production of basic raw materials and continuing through each successive step of manufacture and wholesaling of the component parts, as well as the retailing of the finished articles.

It is now generally conceded that the Government is losing almost as much, if not more in potential income-tax revenues as it has been collecting from luxury taxes. By the repeal of the excise taxes we shall make possible the release of some $400,000,000 annually into consumer purchases. The overall sales resulting from this release will bring increased income tax and profits tax to make up this loss.

Governor Driscoll's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune today editorializes as follows on the speech of Governor Driscoll before the National Republican Club at the annual Lincoln Day dinner in New York last Monday night:

GOVERNOR DRISCOLL'S SPEECH

The annual Lincoln Day dinner of the National Republican Club in New York found upon the platform two Republican governors who share the merit of having faced and dealt with the most pressing problems of the modern State. Governor Dewey spoke briefly, introducing Governor Driscoll as the chief executive of a State government that is clean, solvent, and progressive. Mr. Driscoll has aroused much interest since he won reelection last fall, the first New Jersey Governor to succeed himself and the only Republican to win high office in the scattered elections of that time. Not well known to his neighbors, New Yorkers had an opportunity on Monday night to hear him speak on the broadest of national problems.

The Governor revealed himself a man of prudent speech and of liberal ideas. He took his stand squarely with that wing of the party which demands something more than obstruction and negations: "Let us not divide our house against itself," he said, "by our inability to say 'Yes'." "The Republican Party," he continued, recalling the progressive tradition of Lincoln, "is committed to a government fully conscious of the needs of our industrial age, ready and willing to take care of its casualties whenever and wherever they may occur." But at the same time Mr. Driscoll warned against the extravagances, the waste, and the defeatest reliance upon big government which marks the opposition. "The real issues of today," he summed up, "are essentially of method rather than objective."

To emphasize method, to insist that the way a thing is done is no less important than the doing, takes the courage of lucidity and clear purpose. Finding that the Democrats led the country into a dissipation of its resources and a debasement of its ideals, the easy way is to condemn their goals, root, and branch. But that can be a fatal way for a great party, bent on recapturing national power. The harder, but

in the end the more hopeful course is to maintain, as Governor Driscoll did, that the goals of a stable and progressive society can be pursued by means compatible with individual judgment, initiative, and responsibility. As Governor of an industrial State, Governor Driscoll has a chance to exemplify what he teaches; and the party could scarcely do better than to search both his words and his deeds for light upon the path ahead.

Great Caution Should Be Used in Filling Vacancies on Federal Reserve Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, President Truman will soon be called upon to fill two vacancies on the Federal Reserve Board. This will be a great responsibility for the Chief Executive. The importance of his action is well stated in a press release which appeared in Washington newspapers over the week end. The release, I understand, was issued by a highly respected Member of the other body and should be available to every Member of Congress. Therefore, under permission to extend my remarks, I include this statement which I commend to all Members:

FEDERAL RESERVE VACANCIES

There are two vacancies to be filled on the present Federal Reserve Board. This Board, as you know, was set up to act as an independent regulator of the country's financial policies and was never designed to be a tool of the executive branch. It is supposed to be nonpolitical and nonpartisan. The Board is designed to serve as a traffic light in national fiscal policy.

It is important for the American people and our democratic institutions that these very fine and important positions, paying $15,000 a year for 14-year terms, should be filled by men of independence and caution. The credit of the Nation is nothing to be trifled with. We must be strong financially to stand the strains from within and without nowadays.

There has been a tendency of late on the part of the Board to move closer to the orbit of the White House. That is against the spirit of the law which created the Board. This Board could very well be packed to agree to the fiscal policies laid down by the White House and the Treasury. There are reports in Washington that this is a possibility. Let me point out that the loss of control from the White House to the Treasury to the Board could well have as its ultimate result the control of the banks through the Board's credit policies and through the banks to the industries of the country.

The Board has embarked in recent years on some radical actions which are more or less questionable. If we do not get independent men as new appointees these questionable actions might well become rules of future action. The subject of the consumer's dollar is a precious one in this country. I am sure the President will realize that a strong, independent Federal Reserve Board, acting according to the intent of Congress and not moving to the White House orbit at all, is an asset which the American people cannot well afford to lose.

Object Lesson in Race Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the New York Times magazine of February 12, 1950. It is extremely apropos as well as most enlightening. The author of the article, Gen. Thomas F. Farrell, is chairman of the New York City Housing Authority, a position which he took up after the end of the war. During the war he served with distinction as a major general in the Engineers and as Deputy Commander of the atom bomb project. His article follows:

OBJECT LESSON IN RACE RELATIONS—NEW YORK CITY'S PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS DEMONSTRATE THAT NEGROES AND WHITES CAN LIVE TOGETHER AS GOOD NEIGHBORS

(By Thomas F. Farrell)

"Therefore be at peace henceforward
And as brothers live together."

—*Longfellow.*

This week the new nondiscrimination policy of the Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration will be put into effect. There is no crystal-ball answer on how well these policies will work, but it may be helpful to look at the experience of New York City's public housing projects where Negro and white families have lived side by side as neighbors for the last 10 years.

While the results may be less than are demanded by those who want full race equality at once, in New York City there has been definite and increasing progress in the serious problem of getting people of different races to live together in peace with mutual respect and trust.

The New York City Housing Authority first adopted nonsegregated housing as a policy with the opening of Red Hook Houses in 1939, the first project in New York City completed under the Federal Housing Act of 1937. In its previous public housing projects—two built under the Public Works Administration and a small group of rehabilitated buildings—the tenants with one or two exceptions had been completely segregated, with the Negroes selected for Harlem and the whites for Brooklyn and the lower East Side. The management staff for each project was largely selected in the same way. At the start of Harlem River Houses in 1936 it was apparently assumed that all tenants would be Negroes.

It is interesting to speculate on the reasons why, only 3 years later, nonsegregation was not only possible at Red Hook Houses but was a declared policy of the people of New York State in the then new public housing law which required that no person shall, because of race, creed, color, or national origin, be subjected to any discrimination.

Perhaps widespread interest in public housing explains such a major change in public opinion, although there is no question that Negroes made gains in other fields at the time. Whatever the reasons for the law, Negro and white families were assigned to their apartments in the same building and on the same floor at Red Hook Houses, perhaps with some reservation about the outcome.

In those early days the number of Negroes was kept small—34 families out of 2,545. At that time a delegation of white women tenants visited the manager to suggest that all Negroes be moved to one all-Negro building. The manager pointed out the logical conclusion to that proposal—an all-Italian building, an all-Irish building, an all-German building, and since there were 38 nationalities and only 25 buildings, under their plan some tenants would have to get out. He then offered for their consideration another way of doing it—all-Catholic, all-Jewish, all-Lutheran buildings. They were intelligent enough to get the point.

Although there were objections to Red Hook's new Negro tenants from the neighborhood and, of course, occasional arguments between tenants, no serious trouble developed.

At stair-hall meetings, tenants and staff discussed their problems and gradually got acquainted, although, on the whole, the first tenants treated each other with considerable reserve. In the sitting areas on the grounds, white mothers grouped themselves and their baby carriages together, and Negro mothers wheeled their carriages to a place apart. After some weeks a white mother asked a Negro mother to keep an eye on her child while she went to her apartment. The Negro woman gladly agreed and the ice was broken.

Soon white women were performing the same favor. Then came a rotation plan, with each mother taking her turn in looking after all the children. Later there was some visiting of each other's apartments and shopping together. The barriers were gradually lowered within the limits of the project. But outside the project there was a difference in their relationship. On the whole, families did not go to Coney Island together, nor visit each other's friends on the outside, nor go to the movies together.

The situation remains much the same today at Red Hook Houses. The families may feel that their friendship would not be understood by outsiders; it is a project affair. Or, more likely, the relationship which develops between two families living in one building—whether they are both white, both Negro, or mixed—is merely a neighborly one, as it is in private housing, and the instance when a solid and lasting friendship ripens is unusual. Negro and white families have the same tolerance and consideration for each other as other apartment dwellers. One white woman, a grandmother baby-sitting with her two grandchildren at Amsterdam Houses, summed it up to an inquiring sidewalk sociologist: "They're no different. They mind their own business and I mind mine. When people mind their own business they get along."

Since 1939 all public housing projects have been nonsegregated, and more Negro families have moved into Red Hook Houses and into the almost all-white Williamsburg Houses as vacancies occurred.

It may be pointed out that most public housing projects were built in areas already occupied by many racial groups. There were several reasons why a project would be likely to have among its tenants the same kind of people already in the neighborhood. Families moving from the site to make way for the project were given first preference in the new apartments if they met the eligibility standards. A heavy percentage of applications came from the neighborhood families who had watched the buildings rise. People want to remain in their own neighborhood. Negroes and whites alike want to be near the stores, churches, clubs, and movies which they use and are used by people they know. Applicants were allowed to express a preference among the projects, which was honored whenever possible. As a result there have been no drastic upheavals of populations, no great moving of large numbers of Negroes into areas predominantly white, no great moving of large numbers of whites into areas predominantly Negro.

These conditions may have helped the nonsegregation policy to succeed, but the attitude of the manager and his staff, who are thoroughly "briefed" before being charged with carrying out the policy, has always been an important factor. Since staff members are assigned, like tenants, without regard to race, the tenant expects fair treatment. Although some families may feel they have the hardest-hearted landlord in the city, complaints about race discrimination are rare. Meetings with tenants whenever they ask for them, and a conscious effort to see that normal arguments do not develop into racial issues, are helpful.

When a project is built in an area where there are no Negro families, as in the case of the postwar projects built on vacant land, there is sometimes a more difficult experience with the neighborhood. Taxpayers' organizations and civic associations may object to the project because, they say, and very likely believe, it would "tend to depreciate realty values." They are often quite vocal, suggesting that the project would be filled with "undesirables." While such groups rarely become specific, they sometimes refer to the "intrusion of the Negro."

At the ground-breaking ceremony for Woodside Houses in Queens, a group of objectors picketed the ceremony with signs accusing the authority of communism. At earlier public hearings, the small group of protesting citizens warned of dire results to the neighborhood if the project was approved. Now that Woodside Houses has been completed and fully occupied, including about 8 percent Negro families, the furor has died down, and the surrounding area is being built up with business properties.

Instead of depreciating realty values, there is evidence that they have been increased, as anyone who drives around the project can see. Once a large vacant tract, the construction of new shops kept pace with the project, and when the tenants moved in, the stores were ready for business. The Negro tenants have met no hostility in the community. A Negro tenant was amazed to learn of objections from the neighborhood before Woodside houses was built. "Why, the shopkeepers are just grand to us," she insisted.

Administering this policy of nondiscrimination and nonsegregation is not left to luck and good will. We must be sure that tenants are selected on their need alone, and once a project is open its business must be conducted smoothly. Although much of the problem is one of human relations and justice, there are two objective measures used as safeguards.

In the selection of tenants, based on need, with priority for former site residents and veterans, the following things are done to assure equal treatment: Preliminary registrations, on which there is no information about race, are filed by mail. The information is translated into code numbers and the name into a serial number, and punched on International Business Machine cards. Families are called for interviews as they are sorted by machines, according to their need and priority.

The second measure is to require that all public facilities in a project, such as nursery schools and recreation programs, are operated on an interracial and interfaith basis. Many an otherwise worthy organization has been refused space because its interest is limited to the members of one faith or one race. In contrast, the Urban League has adopted an interracial program in opperating one of our nursery schools, and several Catholic and Jewish groups have adopted interfaith recreation and child-care programs in our projects.

Hewing a middle course, we often make a target for so-called public-interest groups representing both points of view on nondiscrimination. Once we got caught in a crossfire between two special interest groups, both supporting nondiscrimination wholeheartedly. One group suspected that we must be discriminating, since we kept records of the tenant's race; they had frequently asked for the statistics but thought it discriminating to keep records to provide these statistics. The other group suggested that we should maintain definite proportions of minority groups, including Negroes; they objected to calling it a "quota" system but said that a "conscious effort should be made to secure heterogeneity in occupancy"—whatever that may mean.

One group says we should have a leavening of religions as well as races. Others say we should waive the veterans' preference, required by law, in order to avoid a monotony of relatively young families in a development. Some who preach nondiscrimination urge us to check on a person's race before assignment to a particular project in a particular section of the city, so that a proper distribution can be made. To these critics our director of management answers: "There is only one way to carry out our policy of nondiscrimination, and that is not to discriminate." It's as simple as that.

Children play a big part in welding the white and Negro families together. One is reminded of the South Pacific lyric, You've Got To Be Taught To Hate. A lot of the business of living centers around the care, schooling, and play of the children. The attitude of the children toward their neighbor children is carried into the home of the parents. Our chief of community activities finds that the 2-to-5-year-olds seem completely unaware of adult racial prejudices, though they notice and point out the fact that you're black or you're white.

She tells the story of two 4-year-old girls, one Negro and one white, in a preschool center, who were fast friends. One day they had a fight which ended with each child screaming at the other. The next day the white girl came in with a bag of candy and told her friend of the day before that she couldn't have any because she was black. She then gave candy to all the other children, Negro and white, and said to the Negro teacher, "Of course, you'll have to get some because I love you."

Three years ago a staff writer from a national magazine made an investigation of Kingsborough Houses with the aim of debunking a news story reporting on how well the Negroes and whites lived together. After interviewing many people he finally found a white tenant with a bitter complaint about her Negro neighbor. She delivered a long oration, relating in all its details a housewife's argument over a borrowed tray of ice cubes, and ended with, "And it makes my blood boil when I think of the soup I used to make for that woman when she was sick!"

How do the tenants feel about nonsegregated housing? A veteran of World War II, now a policeman, summed it up this way: "Well, I was sort of worried when I came to Amsterdam, but, you know, I've learned a lot. They're just like the whites. When people are decent their color doesn't count." Or, as the manager of Amsterdam Houses reports, if some trace of prejudice remains they may say, "The Negroes in the project are O. K.; it's the ones across the street that we don't like."

The effect of housing projects on neighborhoods has been generally good. There has been no tendency for neighborhood people to move away because of the projects. The projects are well built and are well maintained. Business in the neighborhood improves. With rare exceptions the tenants are good neighbors.

Just how far has nondiscrimination gone and what does it mean? It would not be right to claim too much.

All white families in public housing have not immediately become friends of the Negro race, nor is the reverse true. Conditions vary between projects; in general, the older the projects and the longer families live together the better friends and neighbors they become.

The effects of nonsegregation are largely limited to the families within the project boundaries, although as far as the commerce of the neighborhood is concerned Negro families are generally welcome.

Racial intermarriage is not involved, nor are the problems of discrimination in employment, places of amusement, hotels, and in other activities. Human nature has not changed and some strife between persons of the same race or of different races will continue as before.

Within the projects, the results have been solid and enduring. In the business of raising families, of children playing together, of lending a hand in emergencies, of living side by side in peace, much has been done. In caring for each other's children, helping in sickness, working together in tenants' organizations and social and athletic events; in practicing tolerance in the best sense of the word, the tenants have raised a little the iron curtain between races.

Race prejudice dies hard—and often comes to life when seemingly dead. It has taken a long time and required great effort to get this far ahead and there is a long way to go. There are many to whom nondiscrimination is largely an abstract ideal to talk about, but in New York City's public housing it is a reality. It can work; it is working.

The President's Address at the Law Enforcement Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the thoughtful address delivered by President Truman in Washington on February 14 at the Law Enforcement Officers' Conference, which was called by Attorney General McGrath.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Attorney General and gentlemen of the conference, when the Attorney General told me of his plan to hold this conference, I welcomed the idea. It seemed to me that it would be most useful for Federal, State, and local officials concerned with law-enforcement problems to gather together to devise ways and means of making law enforcement better and more effective.

There has been a substantial postwar increase in crime in this country, particularly in crimes of violence. This is disturbing, but it is one of the inevitable results of war, and the dislocations which spring from war. It is one of the many reasons why we must work with other nations for a permanent peace.

I might remind you that after every war this country has ever been engaged in, we have had exactly the same problems to face. After the Revolutionary War, we had almost exactly the same problems with which we are faced now, out of which came the alien and sedition laws, which we finally had to repeal because they did not agree with the Bill of Rights.

Then, after the War Between the States, or the Civil War, we had all sorts of banditry. My State was famous for some of the great bandits of that time, if you recall. We had

the same situation after World War I. We had a terrible time then with the increase in crimes of violence. We managed to handle the situation, and I am just as sure as I stand here that we will do it again.

This postwar increase in crime has been accompanied by a resurgence of underworld forces—forces which thrive on vice and greed. This underworld has used its resources to corrupt the moral fiber of some of our citizens and some of our communities. It carries a large share of the responsibility for the general increase in crime in the last few years.

This is a problem that, in one degree or another, affects every community in the country, and every level of government. Our rural areas as well as our cities are invested in this.

MORE AIR GENTLER FORCES

It is important, therefore, that we work together in combating organized crime in all its forms. We must use our courts and our law-enforcement agencies and the moral forces of our people to put down organized crime wherever it appears.

At the same time we must add and encourage gentler forces to do their work of prevention and cure. These forces include education, religion, and home training, family and child guidance, and wholesome recreation.

The most important business in this Nation—or any nation, for that matter—is raising and training children. If these children have the proper environment at home and educationally, very, very few of them ever turn out wrong. I don't think we put enough stress on the necessity of implanting in the child's mind the moral code under which we live.

The fundamental basis of this Nation's law was given to Moses on the Mount. The fundamental basis of our Bill of Rights comes from the teachings which we get from Exodus and St. Matthew, from Isaiah and St. Paul. I don't think we emphasize that enough these days.

If we don't have the proper fundamental moral background, we will finally wind up with a totalitarian government which does not believe in rights for anybody except the state.

Above all, we must recognize that human misery breeds most of our crime. We must wipe out our slums, improve the health of our citizens, and eliminate the inequalities of opportunities which embitter men and women and turn them toward lawlessness. In the long run these programs represent the greatest of all anticrime measures.

And I want to emphasize particularly equality of opportunity. I think every child in the Nation, regardless of his race, creed, or color, should have the right to a proper education. And when he has finished that education, he ought to have the right in industry to fair treatment in employment. If he is able and willing to do the job, he ought to be given a chance to do that job, no matter what his religious connections are, or what his color is.

I am particularly anxious that we should do everything within our power to protect the minds and hearts of our children from the moral corruption that accompanies organized crime. Our children are our greatest resource, and our greatest asset—the hope of our future and the future of the world.

STRESS ON HEALTHY MINDS

We must not permit the existence of conditions which cause our children to believe that crime is inevitable and normal. We must teach them—honor, ethics, decency, the moral law. We must teach that we should do right because it is right, and not in the hope of any material reward.

That is what our moral code is based on: Do to the other fellow as you would have him do to you. If we would continue that all through our lives, we wouldn't have organized crime—if everybody would do that.

Our local, State, and Federal law-enforcement agencies have a major role to play in this whole task of crime suppression.

As law enforcement officers, you have great powers. At the same time, you must never forget that hand in hand with those powers go great responsibilities. You must make certain that these powers are not used for personal gain, or from any personal motive. Too often organized crime is made possible by corruption of law-enforcement officials.

But, far more than that, we must always remember that you are officers of the law in a great democratic Nation which owes its birth to the indignation of its citizens against the encroachment of police and governmental powers against their individual freedoms.

Now there isn't any difference, so far as I can see, in the manner in which totalitarian states treat individuals than there is in the racketeers' handling of these lawless rackets with which we are sometimes faced. And the reason that our Government is strong, and the greatest democracy in the world, is because we have a Bill of Rights.

You should be vigilant to enforce the laws which protect our citizens from violence or intimidation in the exercise of their constitutional and legal rights. The strength of our institutions depends in large measure upon the vigorous efforts to prevent mob violence and other forms of interference with basic rights—the right to a fair trial, the right to vote, and the right to exercise freedom of speech, assembly, and petition.

It is just as much your duty to protect the innocent as it is to prosecute the guilty. The friendless, the weak, the victims of prejudice and public excitement are entitled to the same quality of justice and fair play that the rich, the powerful, the well-connected, and the fellow with pull thinks he can get.

Moreover, the guilty as well as the innocent are entitled to due process of law. They are entitled to a fair trial. They are entitled to counsel. They are entitled to fair treatment from the police. The law-enforcement officer has the same duty as the citizen—indeed, he has a higher duty—to abide by the letter and spirit of our Constitution and laws. You yourselves must be careful to obey the letter of the law. You yourselves must be intellectually honest in the enforcement of the law.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF OFFICE

Now, as President of the United States, I have the most honorable and the greatest job in the world—the greatest position that can come to any man on earth. I am invested with certain great powers by the Constitution of the United States in the operation of the Government of the United States.

But, I was put into this place by the people of the United States. I am the servant of the people. And in the first place, I am a citizen of this great country. And as a citizen it is my duty as President of the United States to be exceedingly careful in obedience to the Constitution and the laws of this great Nation.

I believe that as President it is necessary for me to be more careful in obeying the laws than for any other person to be careful. I never infringe a traffic rule. I never exercise the prerogatives which I sometimes have of going through red lights. I never exercise the prerogative of taking advantage of my position as President of the United States, because I believe, first, that I am a citizen, and that as a citizen I ought to obey the laws first and foremost.

And every one of you has that same responsibility. You yourselves, as I said, must be intellectually honest in the enforcement of the Constitution and the laws of the United States. And if you are not, you are not a good public official.

I know that it would be easier to catch and jail criminals if we did not have a Bill of Rights in our Federal and State Constitutions, but I thank God every day that it is there, that that Bill of Rights is a fundamental law. That is what distinguishes us from the totalitarian powers. I am confident that you share these convictions with me, and that you will not lose sight of them in your efforts to wipe out organized crime and reduce lawlessness.

I know that your discussions here will be fruitful. I hope that you develop a sound plan by means of which the cooperative efforts of every American law-enforcement agency will be effectively brought to bear upon organized crime.

Your task does not end with today's meeting. It only begins with today's meeting. The spade work must be done in the communities where you live and work. It will be your task to mobilize local opinion and resources against organized crime and the conditions which create it.

In this task I pledge my wholehearted support.

Thank you very much.

Amendment of the Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on January 23 I introduced Senate bill 2912 to amend the antitrust laws so as to protect trade and commerce against unreasonable restraints by labor organizations. This morning I testified on behalf of that measure before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Since the issue involved is one of national importance and inasmuch as my statement before the subcommittee is not unduly long, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, for the information of Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON (DEMOCRAT OF VIRGINIA) BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE CONSIDERING HIS BILL (S. 2912) TO PROTECT TRADE AND COMMERCE AGAINST UNREASONABLE RESTRAINTS BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss with you my bill S. 2912 which is intended to protect trade and commerce against unreasonable restraint by labor organizations.

This bill was written following hearings which I conducted on behalf of the Banking and Currency Committee. The committee report, following these hearings, concluded that, "The order of the United Mine Workers imposing a 3-day workweek is the very antithesis of collective bargaining. If this usurpation and abuse of the power to control production and price is tolerated by the Congress, its unbridled use will quickly spread from union to union, from industry to industry, and the Congress will never regain its own narrowly circumscribed power to control the economy of the Nation consistently with the Constitution of the United States."

My bill was predicated upon these findings in the belief that labor leaders and labor unions have the power, and will continue to have the power until Congress acts, to unreasonably restrain trade to any extent their whims dictate, including control of production and prices by unlawful means as well as lawful means.

At this point I would like to offer for the files of your committee, the printed hearings upon the Economic Power of Labor Organizations which were held by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee from July 25 to August 26, 1949.

I also should like to offer, as part of your record, Senate Report No. 1234, Eighty-first Congress, second session, which resulted from these hearings and, as an exhibit, a topical digest of the testimony.

I might point out here that although these hearings were held, at my suggestion, because of an acute situation which existed with regard to the coal industry, our inquiry was not confined to that industry but covered the whole industrial field. At these hearings we asked witnesses to tell us whether or not labor unions were using monopolistic powers in an effort to control prices or production in a manner that was adverse to the public interest in any industry and we also asked those concurring in this view to suggest possible remedies.

Witnesses heard by the Banking and Currency Committee told us that labor monopolies exist in various stages of the process of making numerous commodities. Detailed information was given as to how this monopoly power has been exercised by the United Mine Workers Union and the direct and indirect effect of this on transportation, manufacturing and other industries, on commercial enterprises and on private individuals.

It was testified, for example, that John L. Lewis first proposed to the coal mine operators that a 3-day workweek be instituted on a voluntary basis. If the operators had consented, of course they would have been subject to action under the antitrust laws for entering into a conspiracy with the union to control production. The possibility of such prosecution was clearly shown by the action in the case of *Allen Bradley* v. *Local Union No. 3, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers* (325 U. S. 797).

But when the operators refused to join in such a conspiracy, Mr. Lewis, on June 30, 1949, addressed a letter to all of his local unions in which he advised and instructed the miners as follows: "All members in all mines heretofore under contract will return to work Tuesday, July 5, and produce coal 3 days, namely, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. Each following week thereafter, until you are further advised, the workdays will be Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, on which days coal will be produced. All other work except the production of coal may be performed without restrictions in accordance with the usual practice."

Note that statement, if you please. Here was a Nation-wide industry which is basic to our industrial system and which is essential to the health and welfare of the people of our Nation. Yet, one individual writes a letter and says that hereafter Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday are the only days on which coal will be produced.

I do not have to tell you that this order was effective and for most of the time since it was issued coal has been produced only on those 3 days in each week.

At the end of his letter Mr. Lewis said: "The cooperation of each member with this policy is requested." He did not have to remind the miners of what might happen to anyone who failed to cooperate.

But to let the coal operators know where they stood in the matter he also said in this circular letter: "Operators of all mines will be expected under this policy to maintain the same terms, wages, hours, and conditions of employment heretofore existing under the agreement expiring June 30. Local unions will immediately report to their proper district the identity of any coal company refusing to cooperate with this policy."

Here, then, in this country which boasts it is the home of free enterprise, we have a spokesman for labor, who is vested with monopolistic powers, able to use and using that power to tell the owners of the coal mines when and how they can operate their businesses and use their property.

Of course, if the union can say coal will be mined only 3 days a week it can say coal will be mined only 2 days or 1 day, and it might just as logically say that coal shall not be mined unless it is to be sold for a certain price. It is a clear-cut case of the use of union power not to increase wages or to improve working conditions but to control prices and production.

The future of small companies was jeopardized because they could not operate profitably on a 3-day-week basis or were unable to meet their commitments to fill orders. Much coal was lost permanently because of cave-ins where supports were not adequate during the lay-off periods. The coal industry as a whole lost to competitors such as gas and oil because industries were unable to get or were afraid to depend on their accustomed source of fuel.

Employment figures and pay rolls dropped sharply because 60 percent of the cost of producing coal is labor cost as compared with 8 percent for the oil to which many plants shifted. Railroad traffic and railroad employment were reduced. Communities dependent on mining operations had general business depressions.

The effects of allowing this labor organization to control the production and prices of coal were not limited to the coal industry. They spread to other allied industries and had a serious impact upon our whole economy. The country has refused to accept monopolistic dictation by industrial leaders and it should not be required to accept any such dictation by a labor leader.

It is true that Congress has given certain immunity to labor unions and the interpretation of the law by the Supreme Court has also contributed to making all labor and pseudo labor activities safe from any corrective action by any court. Rightness or wrongness, wisdom or unwisdom, selfishness or unselfishness, and the gravity of the effect on the national welfare and security have now become factors which labor unions can, if they desire, disregard.

Not only do we here have an example of monopoly by a labor leader over business but I call your attention to an editorial of the Washington Evening Star commenting upon the monopoly exercised by this same leader in suspending from the union for 6 months one of its members who spoke out in disagreement to the actions of this leader. In this connection I also call your attention to a letter printed by the Philadelphia Inquirer, February 3, in their column The Voice of the People. (Editorials offered for record.)

This monopoly power in all of its ramifications and arrogance has, since the close of our hearings and the introduction of my bill, been exercised and abused daily. I need not detail for your committee the manner in which this monopoly, accompanied with utter defiance and disregard of public needs, rights, and interests, has aroused our entire Nation to a recognition and demand for some corrective legislation. In any contest for power between the public represented by the Government and any group, large or small, there should no longer be any doubt as to which contestant must win. This country cannot afford dictators—government or private.

I shall not at this time go into the testimony offered as to the potentiality, at least, of something similar happening in other basic industries, but you will find it in the hearings. And there are numerous such instances.

The evidence at our hearings, in general, gave point to the warning of another Member of the Senate, the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, who cannot by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as biased against labor. On January 1947 this colleague aptly said: "If democracy is to survive, it must be vigilant, strong, and constantly able to defend itself against any force or organization which sets itself up to dictate to the Government. When rulers of industrial empires, when rulers of big unions, when any economic power grows so big and becomes so arrogant as to threaten the state, then indeed is the people's government in jeopardy. This has become such a time."

If then, action is required against a condition which jeopardizes the people's government, the next question is: Where shall we find the remedy?

The objective of my bill is to restore to the Sherman Act the meaning which Congress always intended it to have. In fact the Supreme Court accepted that meaning until in 1941 five members of the Court gave it a new interpretation. They then declared that the Norris-LaGuardia Act (29 U. S. C.) had modified the antimonopoly laws so as to give immunity to all labor activities. Up to that decision in 1941 the Supreme Court had previously said, time after time, that this had never been intended by Congress.

Under Justice Frankfurter's decision in the Hutcheson case of 1941 (*United States* v. *Hutcheson*, 312 U. S. 219) no injunction can be issued and nothing can be a criminal offense or the subject of a suit if it arises out of any kind of a labor dispute. This state of the law gives labor an unlimited license to do anything it chooses, by unlawful as well as lawful means, and still be safe from prosecution, injunction, or liability under the Sherman Act.

My bill would modify the ruling in the Hutcheson case (supra) to the extent that when a labor union or its members have unreasonably restrained trade in commodities or services essential to the national economy, health or safety, they cannot use the cloak of the Norris-LaGuardia Act to escape a criminal prosecution or injunction.

The public can be hurt just as badly when restraints are imposed by a labor union as it can when these restraints are imposed by business combinations. In fact, no business combination of which I have ever heard has achieved the kind of arbitrary power and control that John L. Lewis now possesses and wields.

In the case of coal, John L. Lewis has been dictating to the industry in such a way as to govern production and prices. If this continues, the whole industry will be run at the discretion of one man. That tends to drive out small business and put the remaining big business under the control of a monopolist. My interest is in the general public and the health of the national economy. I am also interested in the mine workers. They, too, have been hurt.

In the Supreme Court decision in the Allen Bradley case (supra) in 1945, Mr. Justice Black, speaking for the court, acknowledged the inconsistency of a law which allows labor unions to destroy competition provided they act alone. He said: "This, it is argued, brings about a wholly undesirable result—one which leaves labor unions free to engage in conduct which restrains trade. But the desirability of such an exemption of labor unions is a question for the determination of Congress."

Let us see, then, briefly, how labor obtained its exemption from application of the antitrust laws when it restrains trade in a manner which is prohibited to the managers of industry.

Generally speaking, until 1842, organizations of wage earners were held to be criminal conspiracies in restraint of trade. In that year, in the case of *Commonwealth* v. *Hunt* (45 Mass. (4 Metcalf) 111), Massachusetts held to the contrary and thereafter peaceful combinations of workers to better working conditions were generally recognized as lawful. As we developed more complicated processes of manufacture calling for greater capital investments than any one man could command, or any partnership could conveniently handle, we developed of economic necessity, the corporate form by which sufficient capital could be assembled to construct the large plants and acquire complicated and expensive machinery. The growth of unions followed, on the correct theory that the individual could not bargain on terms of equality with employers.

Because industrial units became larger and more powerful and some tended to engage in monopolistic practices, the Congress, in 1890 passed the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 209; 15 U. S. C.) which declared unlawful "every contract, combination, in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States." Enforcement of the Sherman Act has varied from time to time, but generally speaking, it has succeeded in preventing any single corporation or combination of capital (excluding labor organizations) from gaining a stranglehold on any section of the economy and has prevented any business group from exercising the same autocratic powers now possessed by unions.

In 1908, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Danbury Hatters case, *Loewe* v. *Lawlor* (208 U. S. 274) held that the Sherman Act applied to labor unions as well as to business organizations. The Court stated in its opinion that the act "made no distinction between classes. It provided that every contract, combination, or conspiracy in restraint of trade was illegal."

The records of Congress show that several efforts were made to exempt, by legislation, organizations of farmers and laborers from the operation of the act and that all such efforts failed.

Then, in 1914, Congress passed the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 731), and section 6 of that act stated that the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce. It goes on to say:

"Nothing contained in the antitrust laws shall be construed to forbid the existence and operation of labor, agricultural, or horticultural organizations, instituted for the purpose of mutual help, and not having capital stock or conducted for profit, or to forbid or restrain individual members of such organizations from lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof."

That act, however, did not have the effect, according to decisions of the Supreme Court, of exempting unions from the prohibitions of sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, dealing with restraints of trade and monopolies. Historically, the Supreme Court has taken the position that labor was subject to the antitrust laws as evidenced by *Loewe* v. *Lawlor* (208 U. S. 274); *Duplex Printing Press Co.* v. *Deering* (254 U. S. 443); *Coronado Coal Co.* v. *United Mine Workers of America* (268 U. S. 295); *United States* v. *Brims* (272 U. S. 549); *Bedford Cut Stone Co.* v. *Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association* (274 U. S. 37).

The jurisdiction of the Federal courts in labor-relations cases was further restricted in 1932 when Congress passed the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which was in effect an anti-injunction act.

The public generally, and I am sure most Members of Congress, regarded that law merely as a law regulating court procedure and greatly limiting the use of injunctions in labor cases. Actually, however, it has been construed as an amendment of the Sherman Act and Clayton Act and has resulted, through its interpretation, in giving unions almost complete exemption from the antitrust laws.

Reverting from a long line of decisions that labor was subject to the antitrust laws, the Supreme Court, in the Apex case (*Apex Hosiery* v. *Leader* (310 U. S. 469)), concluded that labor is not liable under the antitrust acts where its conduct did not result in controlling price and restraining competition.

The Court justified its position by holding that:

"The congressional end was the prevention of restraints of free competition in business and commercial transactions which tended to restrict production, raise prices, or otherwise control the market to the detriment of purchasers or consumers of goods and services, all of which had come to be regarded as a special form of public injury."

The Court developed the "price and competition" test from the legislative history and reviewed earlier decisions only to find that the activities "affecting interstate commerce were directed at control of the markets and were so widespread as substantially to affect it."

Shortly thereafter in the case of *United States* v. *Hutcheson* (312 U. S. 219) the court asserted the legality of a union's conduct even when directed against interstate sales and customers, so long as it is peaceful and otherwise within the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts.

Against this reasoning, Mr. Justice Roberts vigorously dissented saying:

"By a process of construction never, as I think, heretofore indulged by this court, it is now found that because Congress forbade the issuing of injunctions to restrain certain conduct, it intended to repeal the provisions of the Sherman Act authorizing actions at law and criminal prosecutions for the commission of torts and crimes defined by the antitrust laws. The doctrine now announced seems to be that an indication of a change of policy in an act as respects one specific item in a general field of law, covered by an earlier act, justifies this court in spelling out an implied repeal of the whole of the earlier statute as applied to conduct of the sort here involved. I venture to say that no court has ever undertaken so radically to legislate where Congress has refused to do so."

As Mr. Thurman Arnold put it, the Supreme Court in the Hutcheson case (supra), read the words "legitimate objects" right out of the Clayton Act and left the union free from either injunction or criminal indictment regardless of the objectives which it sought to obtain.

The Hutcheson case, as some of you may recall, grew out of a dispute between machinists and carpenters over who should install machinery for a brewing company in St. Louis. The carpenters attempted to boycott the brewery's products all over the United States, and they practically stopped all building operations in St. Louis because of their dispute with another union, yet the court refused to uphold an indictment against them under the Clayton Act.

In another case that originated in New Orleans the teamsters' union prevented a group of truckers from entering the city because the truckers were dealing with a CIO union which had been certified as the proper bargaining agent by the National Labor Relations Board but the Supreme Court refused to hear and affirmed, without opinion, a dismissal of the indictment against the teamsters (*United States* v. *Building and Construction Trades Council of New Orleans et al.* (312 U. S. 539)).

In a third case arising in Chicago, the hod carriers insisted that ready-mixed concrete should not be used; that concrete should be mixed by the old puddle method, or, if the employer chose to use these concrete mixers, then he should have enough people standing around to fill the complement which would be necessary if the puddle method had been used. That prevented the importation of concrete mixers in Chicago. It raised the cost of building and lowered the quality of building materials. Thurman Arnold thought surely that was not a legitimate union purpose. However, a dismissal of the indictment in that case was affirmed by the court without opinion and without even the opportunity of filing briefs. (*United States* v. *International Hod Carriers and Common Laborers District Council of Chicago and Vicinity* et al. (313 U. S. 539).)

Thurman Arnold then took the cue from the Court and concluded that it seemed there was no limitation whatever upon the power of a labor union to engage in any activities whatever.

Even the Anti-Racketeering Act of 1934, which makes criminal the use of force, violence, or coercion to obtain money or other valuable consideration was incapable of halting featherbedding by unions. The Supreme Court (*U. S.* v. *Local 807* (315 U. S. 521)) held that the exemption in this statute for "the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee applied to instances where members of the teamsters forced payment of wages from employers of nonunion truck drivers to members who tendered their services by riding in trucks."

The Supreme Court said this exemption may be applied to a union which uses or threatens violence to find employment for its members, though the offer to work is rejected and payment is made for protection rather than for services rendered. After that case had been decided, Congress patched the loopholes by repealing this exemption in the Hobbs bill (60 Stat. 420, 18 U. S. C. 1951 Sup. 1948).

Again, in *Hunt* v. *Crumboch* (325 U. S. 821), decided in 1945, a union refused to permit members to work for one employer and refused to permit his employees to join the union. So they completely destroyed his business in revenge for his previous hostility. The majority of the Supreme Court held that such a conspiracy to punish an employer was a legitimate exercise of the rights of concerted action with which labor organizations have been endowed by Federal law. Four Justices of the Supreme Court dissented in that case, holding that the conspiracy was within the prohibition of the Sherman Act and not within any immunity conferred by the Clayton Act. Mr. Justice Jackson, in one of the dissenting opinions, made the following trenchant observation:

"With this decision, the labor movement has come full circle."

After pointing out how the workers had struggled long for their freedom from economic oppression, he continued:

"This Court now sustains the claim of a union to the right to deny participation in the economic world to an employer simply because the union dislikes him. This Court permits to employees the same arbitrary dominance over the economic sphere which they control that labor so long, so bitterly, and so rightly asserted should belong to no man."

As a result of these decisions we find ourselves with no protection against the abuse of labor's power except the limited declaration in the Allen Bradley Co. case (supra) that the antitrust laws apply to labor unions when, and only when, they conspire with business organizations to restrain trade.

It is this inconsistency that I wish to correct through S. 2912. I wish to put an end to this unlimited license granted to the union to do anything it chooses by unlawful

as well as by lawful means, and still be safe from prosecution, injunction, or liability under the antitrust laws. I am convinced that Congress never intended such a result.

The text of the bill which I have offered is an amendment to section 1 of the Sherman Act (15 U. S. C., sec. 1), as follows:

"Section 1 of the act of July 2, 1890, entitled 'An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies,' as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 1), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: '*Provided further*, That when a labor organization or the members thereof have unreasonably restrained trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, in articles, commodities, or services essential to the maintenance of the national economy, health, or safety, or any substantial segment thereof, such conduct shall not be made lawful, and the jurisdiction of any court of the United States to issue an injunction against any such conduct shall not be restricted or removed, by the act of October 15, 1914, entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," as amended, or the act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An act to amend the judicial code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes".'"

There is a second section identical in language to what I have just read amending section 3 of the Sherman Act, which deals with trade and commerce involving the District of Columbia and the Territories of the United States, as distinguished from commerce among the several States and with foreign nations. This second section of the amendment merely conforms section 3 to section 1.

The objective of the bill is not to change the Sherman Act itself in any way, but to restore to the Sherman Act the meaning which Congress always intended it to have, and which the Supreme Court had always said it had, until five members of that Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Frankfurter in the *Hutcheson case* (312 U. S. 219), declared in 1941 that the Norris-LaGuardia Act, an act purporting to deal, and intended by Congress to deal, solely with the availability of injunctive relief, was interpreted by the Court to have modified both the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, so as to immunize all labor activities from the Sherman Act, a result which the Supreme Court had previously said, time after time, had never been intended by Congress.

The amendment I have proposed would overrule the Hutcheson case, to the extent that when a labor union or its members have unreasonably restrained trade in commodities or services essential to the maintenance of the national economy, health, or safety, they cannot use the cloak of the Norris-LaGuardia Act or the Clayton Act to escape a criminal prosecution or injunction which Congress in the Sherman Act itself declared were the appropriate and necessary methods for dealing with unlawful activity of this kind.

In the course of our subcommittee hearings, a number of other kinds of legislation were proposed for dealing with this situation. One proposed method was to outlaw union activity on a Nation-wide basis. An extreme measure of that kind cannot enlist my sympathy or support. Another method proposed was to define especially and to spell out the particular kinds of labor-union activities which are legal, and those which are illegal. Such a task has seemed to me, after studying all the proposals that were made, an almost impossible objective. The difficulty is that once a list is made of the specific activities which are declared to be unlawful, the list must always be qualified by some sort of an exemption of activities of these kinds when they are clearly pursued with the primary purpose of furthering a legitimate union objective. Once such a qualification is introduced, the whole matter of intention and purpose, i. e., whether the primary purpose is in furtherance of legitimate union objectives like bettering working conditions, or whether the primary purpose is to control production or prices, becomes controlling. Thus the final decision of whether the conduct is lawful or unlawful again comes back to a finding by the court to which the matter is submitted, and I believe that the better approach is to let the original, general language of the Sherman Act itself stand, making no attempt to spell out particular kinds of conduct which are lawful or unlawful, but merely prohibiting unreasonable restraints of trade and monopolies.

Some suggestions have been made of modifying the Sherman Act by outlawing labor monopolies rather than by attacking unreasonable restraints of trade by labor. In other words, such a proposal would amend section 2 of the Sherman Act, dealing with monopolies, rather than section 1, which deals with restraints of trade. However, although either business or labor can engage in restraints of trade which to any fair-minded court would seem to be unreasonable obstructions to the free flow of commerce and the free play of competition, the monopoly provisions of the Sherman Act cannot be said to have the same sort of application to labor unions as they have to business combinations. Every labor union is seeking to monopolize the supply of labor either on a comparatively limited scale or on a national scale. That kind of monopolization is the avowed objective of labor unions, and it has been approved as a matter of public policy by Congress not only in the Wagner Act but also in the Taft-Hartley law. I have no intention or desire of asking that Congress outlaw that type of labor monopolization, strongly as I do feel that restraints of trade by labor can be as vicious and far-reaching as any restraint of trade ever attempted by a business combination.

The original purpose of the Sherman Act was to prevent restraints of trade and monopolizations intended to restrict production, fix prices, or otherwise control the market to the detriment of the consuming public. The public can be hurt just as badly when these restraints are imposed by business combinations, and in fact no business combination of which I have ever heard has achieved the kind of arbitrary power and control that John L. Lewis now possesses and wields. My bill will not abolish, or even threaten, the existence of Nation-wide unions or their right to strike. It will not destroy industry-wide bargaining, as will be obvious to anyone who reads cases like *United Mine Workers* v. *Coronado Coal Co.* (259 U. S. 344 (1922); 268 U. S. 295 (1925)). Nor will my bill undertake to police interstate commerce or to regulate the internal affairs of unions. Under the doctrine of the Apex Hosiery Co. case (supra), decided less than a year before the Hutcheson case, the Supreme Court declared that the regulation of union affairs is not governed by the Sherman Act, but is to be controlled by the acts dealing with labor such as the Wagner Act.

My bill would overrule the Hutcheson case. It would not overrule the Apex case or any of the other cases through which, over a period of 50 years, the Supreme Court of the United States had forged the Sherman Act, pursuant to the will of Congress, into a vital and potent force in keeping our economy a free one—free not only from the unreasonable restraints imposed by business combinations but also free from the unreasonable restraints which labor had imposed and might seek to impose. The Apex case shows that buried beneath the artificial veneer with which Mr. Justice Frankfurter in the Hutcheson case had coated the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts, the Sherman Act still condemns restraints of trade, by labor as well as by business, in the same forceful language this Congress enacted in 1890. Labor unions today are immune only because of what I believe was a completely erroneous interpretation by the Supreme Court in the Hutcheson case of these two subsequent acts of Congress. The control of production and the fixing of prices by union action in commodities or services essential to the public welfare of the United States seems to me just as objectionable from the standpoint of the ultimate effect on our economy as similar action by employer groups. The bill which I have offered would in plain and simple language remove the immunizing effect of the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts from conduct which up until 1941 had been almost universally branded as illegal and against the public interest, and which had always been regarded as outlawed by the Sherman Act. It would leave the Government free to go into a court and it would leave the court free to put a stop to labor-union practices which are so detrimental to the national welfare that some remedy beyond the temporary stop-gap remedy of the Taft-Hartley Act is essential to protect the people of this country. The Sherman Act would then again serve, as it originally served, as a brake on unions which seek to put their own activities ahead of the national welfare.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me in Knoxville, Tenn., on February 12, at a dinner celebrating the one hundred and forty-first anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Republicans, we are here tonight to celebrate the one hundred and forty-first birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln. Abe was born on Sunday, February 12, 1809. I dug out the other day what the Senate was debating in February 1809. I found it was a problem of foreign relations. They were discussing with much bitterness the interference of Great Britain with our trade. That interference 3 years later led to the War of 1812. I found too that the Senate was discussing with minute care the expenditures of our Government—but how differently from today. Then the United States Government had a cash balance in the Treasury of over $13,800,000. The total appropriations proposed for the fiscal year 1809 were $13,000,000. Eight million of that $13,000,000 appropriation was to reduce the Government debt which amounted to $56,000,000. Today we know only too well our debt stands at $256,000,000,000, and we are finding difficulty in balancing our budget—let alone any reduction in our debt.

We are now commencing the second half of the twentieth century. Again, what was Congress debating when the century opened in 1900?

I found that Congress then was wondering how to distribute the surplus in the Treasury. Bankers were worried in 1900—not by inflation—but from the heavy withdrawals from the banks by the Government in distributing this surplus. Now we have only a deficit to distribute after 18 years of a Democratic administration.

On the morning of February 12, 1900, the Boston Herald had a lead, "China's New Policy"—just as today, a question of our relations with China. This article then says, "Those acquainted with Chinese affairs are supposed to regard the decree as significant of the beliefs of the Empress and her advisers that China is sufficiently prepared to resist by force of arms all further aggressions of foreign powers on Chinese territory and that future policy will be in line with this view."

Problems over the years remain very similar.

A proper determination of the Chinese problem is surely a headache today.

Government spending, government debt, taxation are very much in the news. They too are the subject of daily debate on Capitol Hill in Washington.

Today while we have the largest production this country has ever known, we live in an uncertain world. We have just fought and won the most destructive war in the world's history. We have devised weapons capable of terrific destruction. Now we are to devise one immensely more destructive. The battles are over, but no peace treaties, except for those with Italy, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria are yet signed. And the last three countries are satellites of Moscow. We have found ourselves up against many road blocks, literally and figuratively speaking, on our road to peace. We live in a period of a cold war. We live in a period where there is a fierce desire on the part of peoples in many different parts of the world to be the rulers of their own fortunes. Indonesia, Pakistan, Burma, India are countries which have set up their own governments. Germany is split. China has been overrun. Russia is governed by an ideology that is hostile to our way of life. In the last year and a half there have been many sudden changes of government among our neighbors in South America. While peoples have this fierce desire to be rulers of their own fortunes, they are still hungry, miserable, and uneducated.

Today peace and security are the No. 1 objectives of all of us. But we must remember we cannot have peace by mere wishful thinking. There is no easy road to peace. Don't ever be fooled by a quack panacea that promises it. We must never lose faith in our ability to secure peace. If we lose faith we will lose the peace. Too many people today are trying to find reasons to give up many of the things we are doing to obtain a peaceful world. Let us examine carefully their motives. Are they in every case patriotic American citizens or are they playing the game that Moscow desires? We simply cannot afford to settle back once again into a state of isolationism and happy complacency.

If Lincoln were alive today, he certainly would work for a world at peace with the greatest possible security here in our own country. We cannot go ahead to better standards of living, more happiness, greater contentment; we cannot long invent better automobiles, radios, airplanes, electrical appliances, and electronic gadgets that bring us that higher standard of life without the feeling of security that goes with a world at peace. Our Republican Party today stands for peace in the world. It also stands for the United States of America having sufficient armed strength to maintain our responsibilities throughout the world and our defense at home.

To help insure our security we must maintain our military forces adequately. President Truman has reported that today we have 1,506,000 men in uniform and 725,000 civilians in our armed services. Pay allowances, subsistence, and clothing for these men costs you and me $7,600,000,000 a year. But, pay allowances and subsistence are not enough. We must give them the best of modern equipment in order that, if they must fight, they can do so efficiently and with as much safety to themselves as possible. So, we are planning in the next 2 years the building of 5,100 airplanes of the most modern type. These planes cost money. A B-36 costs over double the amount of its predecessor, the B-29. A modern jet fighter costs many times that which a fighter plane cost during the World War. We know, too, that the weapons of another war will be far different. The atom bomb, the possibility of the H-bomb, the lengthening range and accuracy of a guided missile, the importance of a radar screen are all developments that now enter into our problem of security.

Call it bipartisan, or nonpartisan, the Republican Party is composed of patriotic American citizens who, knowing only too well the meaning of a world conflict, pray and work for a world at peace. I only wish the present administration would understand this and take greater advantage of the brains, experience, and knowledge of Republican leaders in reaching their decisions on foreign relations.

In this 1950 world that has grown so much smaller than it used to be through the use of airplanes and modern communication systems, we know that we must have friends in other countries. I have seen much of that devastation and know how they must be strengthened. We want those friends in this period of a cold war to have their economic and industrial strength built up. We want, in short, to help them to help themselves, as we need their strength. If they can trade with us and other countries they will build up their own security to a far greater degree. So, we devised the Marshall plan for economic aid. That plan is now in operation. We know that it has already cost us many billion dollars. We know it will cost us more billions. But we are spending that money for our own security. We are spending that money in order that those friendly nations in other parts of the world may be economically strong, have more confidence in their own security in this cold war and thus be a greater aid to our security.

Likewise the Republicans in Congress by a large majority have voted to consummate a military-assistance pact—within the framework of the United Nations—with 12 European nations. I know I voted for the pact because I believed it gave a better opportunity to those people in those countries to help our boys in our country to maintain peace in the world. By a great show of strength in many free countries we make any nation that wants to start trouble think and think carefully before it comes to grips with the mighty strength of our own country and her friends.

But no one of us wants to build up our strength for imperialistic purposes. Will we be considered imperialists if we send a mission to Formosa? Will we lose face in Asia because of our continued support of Chiang Kai-shek? Should we recognize the Communist government of China? These questions ultimately come before the Congress which has to appropriate the money with which the administration carries out our Government's relations with China and the other nations of Asia. Today we see the great change that has come over China. We read of the foment in Asia. The problem of Formosa has been debated at length in the present session of Congress. How to adjust these problems? How to prevent the spread of an ideology which is hostile to us requires patience, tact, diplomacy, firmness, and an everlasting vigilance on our part today. We must exercise to the best of our ability these qualities in order that our security may be maintained and the peace of the world obtained. Then and only then can we go forward with greater opportunities here at home.

Tonight when we celebrate Lincoln's Birthday and think for a few moments of the strength of his character, the soundness of his philosophy of government, and his deep understanding of the needs and problems of the individual man, we can soliloquize as to how he would think and act today on some of the questions that are so troubling us within our great country.

He was the leader of the Republican Party. His views became the principles upon which the Republican Party was built and on which it governed our country for so many years.

Let me ask you some of these questions. Let me give you my answers and see whether we agree. Many of our problems boil down to the answers that you as citizens make to these questions.

1. How much service do you people expect of your Government?

Answer. When Abraham Lincoln was asked how long should a man's legs be, he replied, "Long enough to reach the ground." The Government should be big enough to do the job you expect of it and no more. It should never be big for bigness' sake.

2. How do you want your Government to perform those services you require of it?

Answer. You want it to perform them for your benefit without dictatorship and without undue direction. You want them performed economically and without undue bureaucracy.

3. How much leadership do you people expect from your Government?

Answer. In the question of foreign affairs the Government must be the leader. In the domestic field the Government should act in behalf of the individual in order to give him opportunity and freedom and liberty. He should be independent, not the servant of government.

4. Do you want to maintain freedom, independence, and opportunity for yourself?

Answer. Of course you do.

5. How much of your earnings are you willing to have taken in the form of taxes to pay for government, local, State, and National?

Answer. The answer is, just as little as is consistent with our national security and our national welfare.

Let me discuss for a few minutes some of the problems concerned with these answers:

Since 1900 we have had a Republican President for 24 years and a Democratic one for 26 years. The total appropriations for 24 years under a Republican amounted to about $59,000,000,000. The appropriations of the Eightieth Congress, second session, and the Eighty-first Congress, first session, amounted to about $88,000,000,000. I would hate to tell you the total figure that has been spent in 26 years by Democratic Presidents. True, most of it was for war. The aftermaths of war are always expensive, but today spending is going on in many directions all at once. The Government is like a railroad train running loose on a straight track. Everything is fine until it hits the curve where the red warning light is flashing. That curve is still ahead. But, the light is on. Will we heed the lessons of the past to guide us in the future before the train goes off the track and our bubble of prosperity bursts?

The Republican Party stands for the principle of the balanced budget because we all know that if our budget in peacetime remains unbalanced over the years, then the dollar in our pockets will buy less and less. In the terminology of 100 cents in 1938 the dollar today is worth only 60 cents yet in 1900 that same dollar of 1938 would buy $1.95 worth of goods at retail. Certainly today we are paying more to run our Government in peacetime than ever before in our history. It takes over 25 cents out of every dollar you and I earn, to pay for our Government. Over $7,000,000,000 of Federal Government receipts today come from excise taxes. Many are wartime taxes. When we buy baby powder, a ticket on the railroad, or go to the movies, we pay the Federal Government a tax. These were not intended to be peacetime taxes. I believe, as does the great majority of Republicans in Congress today, that many of these taxes should be reduced this year, and some of them repealed. This means two things: First, that we must either find some more revenue to help make up for these taxes in order not to increase the deficit or else reduce expenditures. I want to see us make an honest, sincere effort to reduce expenditures before talking about new taxes. That is the No. 1 fiscal problem.

Here is one suggestion for reducing expenses. We have heard a great deal of discussion about the total number of civilian employees working for your Government. The latest figure is 2,000,000. The turn-over is around 500,000 a year, some 25 percent. At a time when we are running a deficit, the President is still asking for additional employees. If you were running a business in the red and found you could drop employees by simply adopting a policy of not replacing anybody who voluntarily leaves your service, wouldn't you do it? I certainly believe it is time—unless Government service is seriously interfered with—or unless a very specialized purpose is involved—to adopt a nonhiring policy. Let me say this however. I have heard and read a great deal of abuse about Federal employees. I do not doubt there are those, as in any other business, who do not do their fair share, but I have dealt with a great many individuals in a great many departments, and I have found them almost without exception conscientious and thoughtful citizens who are trying to do their job to the best of their ability. I believe a policy of nonhiring might save the Government as much as a billion dollars a year without sacrifice of anyone who wants to continue to work.

Another way to get economy is to do all that we can to stimulate our Government to secure more efficient operation. The Hoover Commission has made 288 recommendations. One hundred and twenty-four of these require legislation. Thirty-six of this one hundred and twenty-four are already law. I hope Congress will go forward with enacting into law more of these recommendations.

But, unless there is the will on the part of the administration to improve the business methods of our Government, Congress alone can accomplish little. I have yet to see this will.

Today we hear much talk of statism and welfare state. To me essentially they signify concentration of power in our Government in Washington. They purport bureaucracy and regimentation. Republicans are not opposed to welfare. As a matter of record Republicans started many of our social-security laws. Our Constitution calls on our Government to promote the general welfare. The essential opposition of Republicans in Congress today to the present administration of our Government is based fundamentally—not on giving service of a personal nature to our individual citizen—but on the manner and method by which that service is rendered. Our Government essentially begins at home. It begins in the fashion of the old town meeting where every citizen is able to once a year express himself. It begins there because the people at home have common problems, understand each other, and know their own individual needs. Your individual needs can never be as well understood by bureaucrats in Washington as they can be by the local administrator in your home town. I believe we can help our friends at home who need the help of our Government, more by assisting his local government to help him, than by trying to do it directly through growing bureaucracies headed by an appointive official in Washington. That, in my opinion, is the difference between the general welfare and the welfare state. That is my opposition to the constantly increasing bureaucracy under Democratic administration.

Government must give not only efficient service if it is to promote our social security, but it must give honest service. It cannot give honest service if it spends beyond its ability to pay for that service. So, essentially, we Republicans feel that we must not develop the services of government beyond our willingness to pay for those services; otherwise, we are not honest with those whom we are helping.

I am opposed, as you are, to regimentation. Let me give you two recommendations of the present administration that, in my opinion, lead to regimentation and directly to the domination by government over our individual lives—domination to such an extent that opportunity for advancement becomes essentially limited. I have in mind socialized medicine, so-called, and the regimentation of farmers—the Brannan plan. But that does not mean that government should not develop ways to help us with those problems. Today government is helping to build hospitals. It is promoting research to eliminate the scourges of cancer, tuberculosis, and the ills of the heart and mind. Today we are more conscious of our health and of the cost of staying healthy.

So we want our Government to assist us to stay healthy but that does not mean we favor the regimentation of our doctors. We want the incentives that provide for greater knowledge of scientific methods that will make us more healthy. We don't want that research for greater knowledge to become stagnant through lack of initiative. Likewise, we realize that there must be support of our farm products at proper levels, if our agricultural and industrial economy are to go forward together. But, the Brannan plan would have it that if when the farmer sells his products at a loss, the consumer—even though he may get his food cheaper—must pay other taxes to make up the farmer's loss. Ultimately that plan will put our farmers completely under regimentation by the Government. So, in determining how government is to help us be healthy, housed, or get assistance in social security, we want to remember that the average American citizen is moderate. He wants his Government to help, but he does not want his Government to regiment his life or to socialize the natural resources of this great country of ours.

Today we hear much of another "ism"—communism. That word indicates an ideology absolutely contradictory to our ideology. The best way to eliminate it from our lives is to convince our people that our opportunities for education, for advancement in life through freedom and opportunity, with a government of service to help us but not to lead us, is the best method of attack. A strong offense is always the best defense in any game of sport or experience of life. In the words of Vannevar Bush in his new book, Modern Arms and Free Men, "If we lose our liberties it will be because we abandon them."

The Republican Party today is the minority party in Congress. Its platform and principles can only be put into effect by endeavoring to incorporate them where it is wise to do so in legislative proposals of the majority party. The responsibility of a minority party is to look critically at the recommendations of the majority party. It is the duty of the minority party to make these recommendations more workable and more practical, to make sure that the ultimate composite result of the conflicting views will be for the best interests of the country as far as the strength of the minority will allow. In this connection we hear much discussion of the relation of government to the problems of industry and labor. Certainly, the Republican Party believes in collective bargaining. Certainly, the Republican Party wants to fashion our laws to be of the greatest possible assistance to those who work in industry and to those who manage industry, but always with an eye to protecting the public interest. I have always felt that the best labor-management relations come from a friendly discussion around the table. Government must set up the principles upon which these discussions are held. We want our laws to be fair to both sides and to make certain that those laws protect the public interest as well.

We are now in the second month of a new half century. Think back over the last 50 years since 1900—and many of us can easily do just that. Would you have considered building a garage in 1900? A hangar or a radio tower or an airfield? Who would then have known how to construct a concrete road or build a boat of plastic or put shatter-proof glass in a windshield? Yet today the building of a garage, a radio tower, an airfield, a concrete road, and the use of shatter-proof glass and plastic is just too common for even a news item. It is just too common because we have made conveniences out of the inventions which came from the minds of free men of science, of imagination, of courage, and of hard work. We have built up the present-day comforts in our homes through the ingenuity, the imagination, and the hard work of our women folk. Who in 1900 would have believed that this country would have to fight and win two disastrous world wars? We have won two world wars because of the same spirit of inventiveness—independence, and the fighting qualities of our young men. These are facts of our life of which we are proud. These are now part of our heritage, just as Lincoln, Jefferson, Washington, and the lives of other leaders of our country are our heritage.

So tonight when we are thinking of the greatness of Abraham Lincoln, who was called forth in a time of crisis in our national life, we must think well of the challenge that faces us today—perhaps an even greater one than was faced in Lincoln's day. We can recall the principles and traditions which have become a Lincoln legacy. We can recall with gratitude the breadth, the concept of freedom and liberty, the deep confidence that a political party must serve a useful destiny. With those thoughts that always come to us when we think of Abraham Lincoln, we must dedicate ourselves once again to the proposition that "this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom." A greater opportunity of service to our people—a rigid upholding of our responsibilities to obtain the peace in the world—and the maintenance of our security and the future of our children and their children, is what we all so fervently pray for today. Let us in the words of Lincoln "here highly resolve" to make it our job.

Wisconsin's Rank in United States Dairying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, is it surprising that a State like

Wisconsin, that produces more than one-eighth of the milk of the Nation, is worried about the economic effect of displacing butterfat with highly subsidized vegetable oils in the manufacture of oleo, filled milk, oleo ice cream, and other synthetic dairy products?

The following is from the Wisconsin official report of Mr. Milton H. Sexton, director of the State department of agriculture:

Wisconsin's rank in United States dairying

	Percent	Rank	Production
			Pounds
Milk production	13	1	14,914,000,000
Munster cheese	88	1	7,[illegible]
Brick cheese	86	1	18,725,147
Malted milk powder	77	1	23,[illegible]
Swiss cheese	62	1	43,192,053
Limburger cheese	56	1	3,527,143
American cheese	45	1	[illegible]
Powdered whey	43	1	64,965,087
Powdered whole milk	41	1	73,335,597
Italian cheese	40	1	10,492,282
Condensed whole milk (unsweetened)	28	1	[illegible]
Powdered skim milk	26	1	[illegible]
Evaporated whole milk	57	1	[illegible]
Condensed whole milk (sweetened)	24	1	63,035,542
Cream cheese	24	2	13,[illegible]
Condensed skim milk (unsweetened)	23	1	[illegible]
Condensed skim milk (sweetened)	11	1	20,949,629
Butter	9	2	99,992,300
Ice cream (gallons)	8	II	16,638,108

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a national broadcast which I delivered on February 12 over Station WMTR, at Morristown, N. J.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good afternoon. I am very happy to be able to join in this series of broadcasts. In this talk I think it may be best for me to concentrate on just two or three broad questions which have been asked of me and which appear to be especially important right now. Here is the first question: "Some people say that the program of the present administration will lead to a 'welfare state.' Just what does this mean, and how do you stand on this program?"

That's a very big question and a vitally important one. First of all, let me say as clearly as possible what I mean by the term "welfare state."

The idea of the welfare state is simply that the Federal Government, by assuming new powers and going into new programs, can solve all the perplexing problems of human welfare that we have in our American society—problems of inadequate income for some groups; problems of high prices, poor living conditions, bad health, inadequate education, and so on. In simplest terms, the people who favor the welfare state urge us to give the Federal Government more and more power to deal with all these problems.

Now, there are many of us in Congress, members of both parties, who refuse to go along with this idea. For instance, we refuse to enact a national system of compulsory health insurance which would give a Federal bureau the power to regulate all aspects of medical and hospital care, and to say what the rights and duties of both patients and doctors are throughout the country. As another example, we refuse to enact a Brannan farm plan under which the Department of Agriculture would regulate the daily activities of farmers throughout the country, telling them how much of what crop they may plant and how big an income they may aspire to.

I am one of those who oppose these measures, even though they are urged in the name of welfare. My reason is simply this. I believe that the destiny of the American people lies primarily in their own hands, and not in the bounty of an all-powerful government.

Now, this doesn't mean that the Federal Government should follow a hands-off policy in problems of human welfare. Far from it. In my own experience I have seen that Federal action in problems like the hospital shortage and the matter of public education has been not only useful but necessary if anything effective was to be done. What I am pleading for is a different kind of Federal action. Instead of trying to run the whole show, instead of trying to force a Federal program down the throats of 150,000,000 people, I want to see the Federal Government play a role of partnership in these programs. For years I have been a sponsor of a national health bill whose main principle is just that—a cooperative partnership between the Federal Government, the States, and voluntary groups.

We must put an end to the dangerous idea that Federal domination is the only way to get things done. The idea can be put into effect only at ruinous cost—not only in money and taxes, not only in efficiency, but in the individual and local freedom which we Americans cherish.

To sum up, I believe that the so-called welfare state means in reality the setting up of a centralized monopoly government. It means the abandonment of the freedom and responsibility of the individual citizen. It means the stifling of the free creative energies of the American people. So, instead of the idea of the welfare state, I propose another principle on which Government can help us attain our goals—the principle of a free and equal partnership between the Federal, State, and local governments, and the people generally, in which each does what it is best equipped to do. That, I firmly believe, is the way of progress.

Now I want to turn to a question in the foreign field. One of my constituents has asked me: "Do you think it is worth while for us to continue supporting the European recovery program?"

My answer is that I not only believe it is worth while; I believe it is of the highest importance.

Recently, as you may know, I have been very much concerned with the Communist conquest of China, and the need for a positive American policy in the Far East. But my concern in that field does not for a moment diminish my interest in carrying through our positive policy in Europe.

We embarked on this historic venture with the European nations 2 years ago, when Congress enacted on a bipartisan basis the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. At that time the free nations of Europe were literally living on a hand-to-mouth basis. The war had devastated many of their productive resources and had disrupted most of their long-established channels of trade. The peoples of Europe were exhausted by the war; they were surviving from day to day with the help of American relief; and they were losing hope for a better future. The Communist Parties, especially in France and Italy, were profiting by all this distress and were growing dangerously powerful.

It was in this situation that the United States proposed a new approach. We said, in effect, to the nations of Europe that we would help them in the gigantic task of recovery if they would get together and help themselves. Immediately this proposal raised the hopes and morale of the European Continent. Sixteen nations took up our challenge and formed an organization to plan their recovery together. After careful congressional study, we embarked on a program of aid to these 16 nations designed to run for 4 years.

We are now approaching the midpoint of that 4-year program. Tremendous problems still face us but I am convinced they are no greater than the problems which have already been overcome. Under the brilliant direction of ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman, we have enabled those nations to get away from the old basis of hand-to-mouth relief and put their energies behind a great program of reconstruction. Production levels have risen dramatically, until now western Europe is producing as much or more than before the war. The extremely difficult task of removing barriers to trade between these countries, and between them and the rest of the world, is one of the toughest problems that we are now endeavoring to cope with. And, step by step with the progress that is being made, the threat of Communist subversion and revolution in all these hard-pressed countries, especially France and Italy, has definitely been checked. I am sure this will go down in history as one of the greatest achievements of the free world in our century.

In the remaining 2 years of the program the political and economic integration of these countries of Europe will be the primary goal of our ECA operations. Let me emphasize here that the cost of this whole program has been a constantly decreasing one. We appropriated approximately $5,000,000,000 in the first year and $4,000,000,000 in the second year. For the third year we are planning about $3,000,000,000 and in the final year approximately $2,000,000,000. This is a very large total expenditure, but it is a relatively small price to pay for the economic recovery of the free nations of Europe and the definite blocking of the disintegrating forces of communism.

In that connection another very important question has been raised with me. Here it is: "Do you think there is a good chance that Germany will cooperate peacefully in a free Europe?"

I think there is an excellent chance. The three western zones of Germany were set up last year as the Federal Republic of Germany, which has since taken its place as the seventeenth member of the Marshall plan group. Recently, as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I had an opportunity to talk with Mr. John J. McCloy, our representative on the allied high commission in western Germany, who was back in this country on a short visit. His comments confirmed my belief that steady progress is being made there in both the political and the economic fields.

From the point of view of western Europe, Germany poses both a threat and a promise. The promise lies in the fact that western Germany is still the biggest single industrial unit on the European Continent, and the other countries vitally need her products. The threat lies in the old German tradition of aggressive militarism, which has led three times to an invasion of France and twice to world war.

I think the greatest hope today is that Germany—at least western Germany—can be brought more and more into the society of free European nations as a self-respecting member. If this can be done, Europe will be able to benefit from Germany's economic promise, and at the same time will be able to do away with the German militaristic threat. Fortunately, Chancellor Adenauer, the present head of the German Federal Republic seems to be entirely in accord with this idea.

We hear many reports nowadays of a revival of extreme German nationalism and military spirit. I am confident that this trend can be effectively combated if we concentrate on three goals:

First, we must be sure that Germany makes steady economic progress along with the rest of Europe, because it is economic distress that leads to these extreme political movements.

Second, we must devise some way of guaranteeing the military security of Germany, probably under the provisions of the North Atlantic Pact, so that the Germans will not be driven by fear into demanding an army of their own.

Third, we must step up our efforts, by radio broadcast and every other means of education, to teach the German people the real meaning of democracy, which most of them have never experienced and do not really understand.

This problem of Germany is an important part of the whole problem of Europe. I believe the continuance of our part in the European recovery program for the remaining 2 years is absolutely essential if we are to see this great venture through. The dollar cost to us will be less this year than it was last year, and still less in the final year. It is many times worth the cost, because it means that the free and friendly nations of Europe will once again be able to proceed on their own.

In conclusion, let me emphasize that in this cold-war period we need more than a European policy or a far-eastern policy. Our foreign policy must be world-wide if it is to make sense. As the most powerful free nation in the world, we Americans have a tremendous responsibility. If we are going to stop communism we must travel the long and difficult road of aiding to build peace, freedom, and plenty; and we must do it not only in Europe, not only in the Pacific, but everywhere in the world.

And now my time is up for today. This is Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH reporting from Washington.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at a Lincoln Day dinner sponsored by the Summit County (Ohio) Republican Central and Executive Committees, at Akron, Ohio, on February 11.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a high honor to be invited to speak here tonight.

I am indeed grateful for the privilege of joining this splendid assembly in tribute to one of the most illustrious figures in world history, the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln.

The great State of Ohio is an appropriate place to discuss real Americanism. No State of the Union has produced so many outstanding leaders in government, politics, industry, education, and the church. No State has contributed more to the advancement of American progress and human welfare.

On this birthday anniversary of one of the greatest of all Americans it is a sincere pleasure to tell you how much your Pennsylvania neighbors appreciate your distinguished United States Senators, my colleagues, ROBERT TAFT and JOHN BRICKER.

Ohio and the Nation are indeed fortunate to have in the Senate of the United States two men of such exceptional ability, unquestioned integrity, and fervent patriotism.

Of both of them it may be truthfully said they are fearless champions of liberty, courageous defenders of the Constitution, and ardent protectors of the inalienable rights of free Americans.

Their forthright Republicanism is in accord with the ideals and principles of Abraham Lincoln, whom we honor tonight as one of the founders of the Republican Party and as the first Republican President of the United States.

More than any other man in the history of our Republic, Abraham Lincoln knew the real meaning of Americanism. The story of his humble birth and early struggles are known to all. He suffered extreme poverty and the hardships of pioneer life on the rough frontier. He experienced defeat, disappointment, and discouragement.

But he never lost faith. He held firmly to faith in himself, faith in the people, and faith in God.

Perhaps the outstanding characteristic in Lincoln's make-up was his undeviating faith in the capacity of a free people to govern themselves.

He realized that the people might be led astray for a time by false hopes and deceptive promises. But he was firm in his belief that the good judgment of the American people and their love of freedom would lead them, in the end, to the right decisions.

Today, as in Lincoln's time, America's greatest need is faith in the fundamental truths of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. Under these immortal documents our people have enjoyed a greater measure of individual freedom than any other people since the world began.

Lincoln's great task was the preservation of the Union. The great duty before us is to preserve individual freedom and the God-given right of every American to live in liberty, free from the strangling dictatorship of state socialism.

The dangers that confront us are plainly manifested in the course taken by the present and the preceding administration in Washington.

The grave menace to our free American institutions is clearly indicated in programs and policies that invite national bankruptcy.

We are asked to accept the alien teaching that the concentration of all government power and authority in a gigantic Federal bureaucracy will provide security and prosperity for all the people.

We are told that the more we spend the better off we will be, even though the people are shouldered with taxes that grow more oppressive year after year, with an ever-increasing burden of debt and with inflated prices for food, clothing, housing, and all the other necessities of life.

My fellow Americans, that philosophy of government is the economic road to socialistic ruin and the destruction of American liberty. It has brought us to a time of crisis just as challenging as that in Lincoln's time.

The paramount issue before us is this: Shall we fight for the principles which have made America the last remaining hope of freedom in the world or shall we be led in a Socialist pattern of government that has brought disaster to every country where it has been attempted?

We meet tonight as Republicans, but the great issue I have outlined is so important that it is not bound by party lines.

Distinguished leaders in both parties, Democrats as well as Republicans, are fighting on the side of true Americanism against the creeping paralysis of the socialistic state.

Let me recall to you the words of a great Democratic statesman, former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, who said, and I quote:

"The Nation is going down the road to statism. Where it will wind up no one can tell, but if some of the new programs seriously proposed should be adopted there is danger that the individual—whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor—will soon be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state."

Another distinguished Democrat, the senior Senator from Virginia, HARRY F. BYRD, has been equally emphatic in his warnings against the dangers of excessive taxation and reckless squandering of the people's earnings for political purposes.

No American should ever forget the warning sounded by that great patriot, our only living ex-President, Herbert Hoover, when he said, and I quote: "Through governmental spending and taxes our Nation is blindfully driving down the back road to collectivism at high speed.

"Along this road of spending the Government takes over, which is socialism, or dictates institutional and economic life, which is fascism."

Let us turn now to the wisdom of Abraham Lincoln. Nearly 100 years ago he expounded a principle of government to which the Republican Party has adhered ever since.

He said, and I quote:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can do as well for themselves government ought not to interfere."

Lincoln recognized that interference by government in the lives of its citizens is an encroachment upon individual liberty and a barrier to opportunity.

If he were with us today and would speak out against the trend toward socialism, I have no doubt he, too, would be called a reactionary. He, too, would be ridiculed as being 150 years behind the times. His principles would be attacked as vicious, representing selfish interests, against the welfare of the people.

The attack would be led by those who call themselves liberals.

They claim Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson as their patron saints. But they pay only lip service to the principles of those American statesmen. They do not follow the teachings of Jefferson and Jackson.

Thomas Jefferson was a great prophet of the evils of government debt and government grown to monstrous size.

It was not a reactionary, not a Republican, it was Thomas Jefferson who cried out in warning:

"We are ruined if we do not overrule the principle that 'the more we owe, the more prosperous we shall be' and that 'a public debt furnishes the means of enterprise.'"

It was Thomas Jefferson again—and I hope they are listening down there in Washington—who said:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers. To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty * * * or profusion and servitude."

Yes, that was Thomas Jefferson talking.

And what of that other patron saint, Andrew Jackson? This is what he believed:

"From our past experience, it cannot be doubted that simplicity in the character of the Federal Government and a rigid economy in its administration should be regarded as fundamental and sacred."

Let me remind the socialistic-minded free spenders at Washington that these quotations express the philosophy of Jefferson and Jackson. Let me ask:

Will you brand them as reactionaries and tories because they, too, preached economy and limitations upon the growth of the central bureaucracy?

Let us step forward to the year 1893.

The great Grover Cleveland, first Democratic President after the Civil War, is being inaugurated for his second term. In his inaugural address he said:

"The lessons of paternalism ought to be unlearned and the better lesson taught that while people should patriotically and cheerfully support their government, its functions do not include support of the people."

Will they in Washington stop at Grover Cleveland and disown his great memory?

Then, in 1913, the next Democratic President occupied the White House—Woodrow Wilson. Let me quote briefly from Mr. Wilson. He said:

"The duty of economy is not debatable. It is manifest and imperative."

I turn now to the Democratic National Convention of 1932. The platform adopted contains this language:

"We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government."

May I point out that in that year, the entire cost of operating the Federal Government was less—I repeat, less—than this year's interest on the national debt alone.

Running on that platform was Franklin D. Roosevelt, who declared in a major address:

"Any government—like any family—can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse."

Ladies and gentlemen, these are magnificent words. They should be hung in every office in every department and bureau in Washington—and I include the President's own offices in the White House.

Then in 1943 a Democratic Member arises in the United States Senate. He says:

"It seems that when public funds are to be expended no one has any interest in what happens to them, no matter what his responsibilities may be under his oath of office.

"I dislike to make such a statement, but unless this body and the House of Representatives exercise their prerogatives in connection with the purse strings of the Government, much of the money appropriated will be thrown away for no good purpose whatsoever."

At that time we were engaged in total war. The Senator who made that statement was the chairman of the Special War Investigating Committee. He was Harry S. Truman, then a Senator from Missouri.

And so, when I hear them call those of us who are economy-minded, reactionaries and horse-and-buggy folks, I remember the strong stand of every Democratic President in our history, down to the time of the New Deal and the so-called Fair Deal.

Were they all wrong? Were they all reactionaries? Were they all horse-and-buggy tories?

Were all these great men fools because they feared deficit financing and growing Federal encroachment upon the liberties of the citizens?

Were Roosevelt, the candidate, and Truman, the Senator, reactionaries and tories?

We who are called tories and reactionaries because we fight for economy and solvency are struggling to preserve the greatest blessing given by God to mankind—freedom and opportunity.

Recently I ran across a quotation which impressed me greatly. It was from an English philosopher who lived 200 years ago. It was this:

"The greatest glory of a freeborn people is to transmit that freedom to their children."

Is it not right and proper for us, at this time of crisis, to demand that the great freedoms that freeborn Americans have enjoyed be preserved inviolate for our children and their children?

I say it is not only right and proper but it is our sacred duty.

If we are to retain freedom of the individual for ourselves and for posterity, we must reverse the present socialistic trend.

If America is to survive as a land of liberty and opportunity, we must return to principles of Abraham Lincoln and Thomas Jefferson.

We must preach the gospel of American patriotism—self-reliance, work, thrift, tolerance, and love of God.

We must impress upon all our people that security has no meaning if liberty must be surrendered to get it.

The freedom that was established and preserved by the blood and sacrifice of heroes in every generation is too precious to be lost through indifference or neglect of our responsibilities.

If we are to help save America, we must all interest ourselves in politics, because the kind of government we are to have is decided at the ballot box.

We need a deeper understanding of practical, patriotic politics, the kind of political activity that is based on the highest standards of morality, honesty, sincerity, and love of our country.

With those standards as our guide, with courage and vigilance, we can defeat every attempt to enslave the American people under the tyranny of socialism.

In the immortal words of Lincoln at Gettysburg, let us again dedicate ourselves to the proposition "that this country, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Cheese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the CCC advises that there is 24,000,000 pounds of cheese in storage. The following official letter indicates that there were over 32,000,000 pounds of cheese imported the last calendar year:

Cheese: United States imports for consumption, by types, 1949[1]

Type	Quantity	Value
	Pounds	
Emmentaler or Swiss, with eye formation	5,776,778	[illegible]
Gruyere process cheese	1,334,474	[illegible]
Italian-type cheeses:		
Romano, in original loaves	7,981,378	3,977,436
Pecorino, in original loaves	3,323,663	2,150,241
Reggiano, in original loaves	1,360,046	614,379
Parmesano, in original loaves	12,909	10,449
Provoloni, in original loaves	930,373	534,584
Provolette	37,656	21,084
Sbrinz, in original loaves	1,374,949	515,966
Goya, in original loaves	[illegible]	137
Total, Italian-type cheeses	15,808,938	7,824,747
Roquefort, in original loaves	1,293,982	1,017,839
Cheddar cheese, whether or not in original loaves, but not including any cheese processed otherwise than by division into pieces	3,126,301	564,494
Blue-mold cheese, in original loaves	1,301,641	570,441
Edam and Gouda cheese:		
Containing 40 percent or more of butterfat	101,147	[illegible]
Containing less than 40 percent of butterfat	4,794	1,604
Brynda cheese, in casks, barrels, or hogsheads, weighing with their contents more than 200 pounds	[illegible]	[illegible]
Other cheese and substitutes for cheese	3,115,771	1,342,646
Total	32,014,42	16,835,374

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one example showing that the products accumulated by the CCC as surplus are partially the result of imports. Is this not another indication of the need of an international agricultural agreement comparable to the International Wheat Agreement?

Minimum-Wage Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I submitted relating to the minimum-wage bill last year, which was ordered to be incorporated in the permanent RECORD. Because of the fact that the permanent RECORD is not available to anyone at this time, I ask that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On October 18 Senator PEPPER submitted a statement expressing the views of a majority of the Senate conferees as to the intentions of the conference which prepared the conference report on the minimum-wage bill. It seems to me that this report was prepared in the first instance by the attorneys for the Wage and Hour Division in an effort on their part to retain jurisdiction in various fields which the conference report clearly intended to take away from them. The Wage and Hour Division for years has been trying to extend its jurisdiction beyond the field provided by Congress and is now trying to nullify the present congressional action.

The conference committee never considered this statement, or summary, nor was there ever any meeting of the Senate conferees to consider or discuss it. My own view is that the report and the act finally adopted speaks for itself. I am quite certain that the conclusions of the report submitted by the senior Senator from Florida as to the intentions of the conferees are incorrect in many important particulars, and that the report of the House managers is much closer to their actual intentions.

Since other individual views have been submitted, however, I have prepared a partial discussion of some of the points at issue and submit it herewith.

Considered in its entirety the summary submitted by the senior Senator from Florida does not state what the amendments are intended to accomplish. Its approach is a negative one of pointing out what the amendments are not intended to accomplish. This is especially true with respect to those amendments which were introduced to limit the coverage of the act as interpreted by the Administrator and the courts. For example, the retail and service establishment exemption adopted by the overwhelming vote of the Senate was intended to prevent the Administrator and the courts from asserting coverage over those retail and service businesses on the main streets of America which were never intended to be covered when the original act was written in 1938.

Likewise the conferees agreed to a redefinition of the term "produced" intending to prevent extension of coverage to such operations as window cleaning and grass cutting on the far-fetched theory that such operations are necessary to the production of goods. We specifically authorized Belo type contracts because the Administrator, refusing to accept the decision of the Supreme Court which had held such plans to be in conformity with the act, had made a series of attempts to modify or overrule that case. The summary, prepared in the office of the Administrator, in many instances seeks to confirm those very interpretations of coverage which the conferees were seeking to prevent.

PRODUCE

The conferees in their meetings had before them a memorandum setting forth specific cases showing the extreme lengths to which the Administrator and the courts had gone in interpreting the term "produced." The conferees were in agreement that such cases should be overruled. The cases discussed and the agreement of the conferees are set forth in detail at pages 14–15 of the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

During the meetings of the conference committee the House conferees insisted that the definition of the term contained in the House bill be agreed to. They yielded only to the extent of agreeing to substitute the words "directly essential" for the word "indispensable" in the definition. It was understood by both the House and Senate conferees, however, that the definition as finally agreed to was intended to have a substantially limiting effect upon the coverage of the act as heretofore interpreted by both the Administrator and the courts. Nothing is more clear than that there would never have been any conference agreement on a minimum-wage bill, had the Senate conferees not agreed to such narrowing of the act's coverage.

The summary, however, in effect states that the redefinition of "produced" has not had the effect of cutting down the coverage of the act at all, but has merely provided a more specific guide and created more certainty as to coverage. The summary concedes only that under the redefinition coverage is not to be extended to the following activities or employees:

1. Procurement of land for a new factory.
2. Manufacture of bricks for new factory buildings.
3. Employees of a local real-estate firm renting apartments or dwelling houses to tenants, some of whom are employees of a factory producing goods for interstate commerce.

But no change in the definition was needed to assure that the act would not be extended to such activities or employees, since neither the Administrator nor the courts had ever held or even hinted that such activities or employees were covered.

The summary is chiefly concerned with pointing out that the redefinition of "produced" has done no more than to confirm all outstanding interpretations of such term, both administrative and judicial. For example, it cites *Consolidated Timber Co.* v. *Womack* (132 F. (2d) 101 (C. C. A. 9)), *Hanson* v. *Lagerstrom* (133 F. (2d) 120 (C. C. A. 8)), and *Basik* v. *General Motors Corp.* (311 Mich. 705, 19 N. W. (2d) 142) as authority for the proposition that coverage has not been withdrawn from "employees engaged in operating or maintaining living facilities for employees of a producer of goods for interstate commerce in situations where living facilities such as food and lodging are provided as a means of assuring continued and efficient production." The employees in such cases were cook-house employees in a lumber camp and cafeteria workers in an industrial plant, providing eating facilities for employees engaged in producing goods for interstate commerce. There may be situations where such services are "closely related" and "directly essential," but the conferees never intended to create such broad coverage as the quoted passage indicates.

I am in agreement with the summary that under the redefinition of "produced" the act continues to apply to office workers, plant guards, watchmen, and maintenance workers of the primary employer engaged in producing goods for commerce as well as to production employees of tool and die concerns and public utilities furnishing things without which the primary employer could not conduct his business. Many of the cases the summary cites, however, go far beyond the situations to which I have just referred. For example, it cites:

1. *Roland Electrical Co.* v. *Walling* (326 U. S. 657)—office employees of a firm which made, repaired, or maintained machinery for customers within the State who used same in producing goods for interstate commerce.

2. *Meeker Cooperative* v. *Phillips* (158 F. (2d) 698 (C. C. A. 8))—office employees of an electric power company supplying electrical energy to customers within the State for use by the latter in producing goods for interstate commerce.

3. *Borden* v. *Borella* (325 U. S. 679)—employees maintaining, servicing, and guarding an office building owned by an interstate manufacturing company and occupied primarily by its executive and administrative offices.

4. *Walling* v. *McCrady Construction Co.* (156 F. (2d) 932 (C. C. A. 3))—employees of a construction company some of whom were engaged in constructing new facilities for existing interstate manufacturing plants.

5. *Bozant* v. *Bank of New York* (156 F. (2d) 787 (C. C. A. 2))—custodial and maintenance employees of an office building occupied by lawyers, brokers, and banks. Coverage was asserted as to the custodial and maintenance employees because the banks prepare, execute, or validate bonds, shares of stock, etc., some of which move out of the State.

6. *Tormey* v. *Kiekhafer Corp.* (76 F. Supp. 557 (E. D. Wis.))—employees doing research and experimental work for an interstate manufacturer. Their work was abandoned and no new or improved products were shipped in commerce as a result of their activities.

7. *Walling* v. *Hamner* (64 F. Supp. 690 (W. D. Va.))—employees of a sawmill operator who produced and sold mine props within the State to supply companies, which in turn sold them also within the State to interstate coal companies for use in producing coal for interstate commerce. The employer also made mine props for a coal company within the State which produced coal that it transformed into coke and shipped out of the State.

RETAIL AND SERVICE ESTABLISHMENTS AMENDMENTS

The summary states that the retail and service establishment exemption provided by the amended section 13 (a) (2) is not intended to apply to establishments which are not ordinarily available to the general consuming public, citing *Boutell* v. *Walling* (327 U. S. 463), which involved a repair garage serving exclusively an affiliated interstate motor carrier. I agree that the rule of the Boutell case is not changed by the amendment made to section 13 (a) (2), because the establishment involved in that case is same as the repair department operated by the interstate motor carrier itself and its servicing would not be recognized as retail in the industry. The conferees intended, however, that the exemption should apply to any establishment meeting the tests set forth in the amended section 13 (a) (2) regardless of its location, whether in an industrial plant, an office building, a railroad depot, a Government park, etc., even though arguably establishments so located are not ordinarily available to the general consuming public. See page 25 of the House managers statement which sets forth the agreement of the conferees on this matter.

In its discussion of the 13 (a) (4) amendment the summary states:

"The goods must be made or processed at the establishment in which they are sold in order for the exemption to apply."

This statement appears susceptible of being construed to mean that although an establishment is otherwise exempt under section 13 (a) (4), it might lose its exemption unless all the goods it makes or processes are sold across the counter, dock, or platform of said establishment. Such an interpretation would be inconsistent with the intent of the conferees. Exemption is not to be denied an establishment under section 13 (a) (4) because it sells substantial quantities of goods it makes or processes through driver salesmen rather than across the counter, dock, or platform.

This is only a partial statement of my disagreement with the summary prepared by the Wage and Hour Division.

Criticism of Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a telegram addressed to President Truman under date of January 27, 1950, by Charles O. Blaisdell, president, Society of Former Special

Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Inc., 75 Pine Street, New York, N. Y., together with a copy of an answering telegram to Mr. Blaisdell, by Peyton Ford, the Assistant to the Attorney General, on behalf of the President. I make this request at the instance of this society, believing that it may be of interest to the Members of the Congress and I do so in a completely objective manner.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We have noted with alarm increased criticism in the public press of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In the very recent past the National Lawyers Guild, which many responsible persons have stated is a Communist-front organization, has requested you to order an investigation of that Bureau. We respectfully address this communication to you as a completely independent organization of over 1,600 men who formerly served as special agents of the FBI.

Our membership includes men in all walks of life. A substantial percentage of our members now active attorneys and we believe that our views might be of some interest to you.

As average Americans we have a genuine interest in the preservation of civil rights, and as former law-enforcement officers we have a keen appreciation of the constant need of protecting those sacred rights of our fellow Americans. However, we feel that our Government also has the duty of protecting the security of our country. We believe that our Government has the duty to use every moral and proper means authorized by proper authority to combat espionage, treason, and other traitorous subversive activities which imperil the present or future security of this Nation. It is of special interest to note that most of these recent attacks have centered around investigations by the FBI, in loyalty and espionage cases. There is no doubt that many of the critics of the FBI, often unfortunately misinformed, are motivated by a sincere desire to render a public service. However, there are those who, for reasons which do not include a patriotic devotion to American principles, desire to reduce the present effectiveness of the FBI in security investigations.

In recent weeks the FBI has been criticized for the use of wire taps in the conduct of espionage investigations. Many of these critics have left the erroneous impression with the general public that the FBI has been engaged in the unauthorized use of wire taps. That is not a fact. The Attorney General of the United States has very recently stated that the FBI uses wire taps in national defense and kidnaping cases and then only upon his authorization. This policy was approved by the late President Roosevelt in 1941, and has been followed consistently by the Attorneys General since that time. Under these circumstances, when the situation warranted, if the FBI failed to avail itself of this method of obtaining information in either national defense or kidnaping cases, it would be derelict in its public duty. The Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, in its report to the Congress, after pointing out that Japanese diplomatic establishments on our mainland and Hawaii, had uncensored channels of communication with Tokyo up to the time of the attacks on Pearl Harbor, stated: "The situation should never again be permitted whereby the efforts of our Government to combat forces inimical to our national security are hamstrung by restrictions of our own imposition which aid the enemy."

We heartily subscribe to these views of that committee:

We feel that recent criticism of the FBI's wire-tapping activities has led to an entirely distorted conception in some quarters as to the extent of the wire tapping done by that agency. Many persons have been led to believe that the FBI has engaged in indiscriminate wire tapping to the detriment of many innocent persons. That, also, is not a fact. As Mr. J. Edgar Hoover recently stated publicly, the FBI had less than 170 telephone taps in operation and all of these were used in internal security investigations. When it is considered that the FBI has thousands of cases under investigation at all times, that small number of wire taps is indicative of the fact that wire tapping has not been used indiscriminately by that agency.

Today the FBI stands as a symbol of integrity and efficiency in law enforcement. Interstate gangsterism and many types of vicious crimes, including kidnaping and bank robbery, have been sharply reduced as a result of the work of that agency. Through the police-training program of the FBI, police organizations at the State and local level have made unprecedented advances during the past two decades. The war record of the FBI is an excellent one. Not a single act of foreign-inspired sabotage was committed in the United States during the last war, and many espionage agents and others intent upon wrecking our security were uncovered and brought to justice.

We deem it most regrettable that unwarranted attacks are being made on one of the most efficient agencies of our Government. It is not improper to suggest that current criticism is emanating from the same individuals and groups who over many years have sought to undermine the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Such criticism only indicates a complete lack of concern for the fundamental security of this Nation. We believe there never has been a time in the history of this Republic that greater vigilance is required to insure the internal security of America. Internationally we are engaged in a titanic struggle with great totalitarian forces of aggression, and national chaos would result should we be called upon to meet this challenge with an impotent FBI and a public disunited by the influences of subversive propaganda, sabotage, and espionage.

To those of us who have lived and worked in the FBI charges of the character being impressed upon you are not merely unwarranted—they are outright lies. There is today no public servant more vitally concerned in preserving our fundamental civil rights than the Director of the FBI. Our members are proud of their past service with the FBI. We are proud of the fact that we were able to take some part in the relentless fight made against domestic lawlessness and subversive activities. We are proud that we dispatched our duties without resorting to illegal tactics, and we are proud of the genuine confidence which the great bulk of the American people reposes in the FBI.

It is for these reasons that we are constrained to write you in this instance, as well as by reason of the further consideration that the FBI, occupying the position that it does in our governmental structure, is unable to defend itself from the unwarranted and malicious attacks to which it has been repeatedly subjected. It is our sincere conviction that you will not be swayed by the attacks of those whose primary purpose it is to discredit and harass the FBI; nor will you be influenced by the criticism of sincere but misinformed individuals and groups.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES O. BLAISDELL,
President, Society of Former Special Agents of the FBI, Inc.

CHARLES O. BLAISDELL,
President, Society of Former Special Agents of the FBI, Inc., New York, N. Y.:

Re urtel to the President expressing concern over unjustified criticism of Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice. Rest assured that complete Government and public confidence in the Federal Bureau of Investigation will not be weakened in the slightest by unwarranted and malicious attacks. You may also rest assured that the Government will not be swayed adversely to the interest of either the national security or the Federal Bureau of Investigation by the attacks of those whose primary purpose is to weaken our security and discredit the FBI; nor by the criticism of sincere but misinformed individuals and groups. The interest and views of the Society of Former Special Agents of the FBI in this matter are sincerely appreciated.

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

Summary of Provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 2, Abolishing the Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief summary which I have prepared of the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 2.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 2

Senate Joint Resolution 2 is a proposed constitutional amendment which was passed by the Senate by a two-thirds vote of 64-27 and which aims to abolish the electoral college; count the electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote; and provide for a vote in the newly elected Congress between the two highest candidates in case no candidate for President receives 40 percent of the electoral vote.

This proposal completely eliminates the present possibility of an election being thrown into the House with each State having only one vote; it establishes the constitutional right of the people to direct vote; it does away with the so-called unit-rule system of counting electoral votes whereby the candidate receiving a plurality of the popular vote in any given State is credited with all the electoral votes of that State regardless of how small the plurality may be; and, finally, by making it impossible for anyone to become President of the United States who has less than 40 percent of the electoral votes, it materially reduces the power of splinter parties.

As all Members know, the present electoral college unit rule system is seriously defective and has been criticized for more than a century.

The dummy office of presidential elector is in effect an inaccurate rubber stamp since on occasion these electors actually vote against the popular will.

Under the present system, the failure of a candidate to obtain a majority of electoral votes throws the election into the House of Representatives where each State has one vote. This would have happened in January of 1949 if only a few thousand votes in Ohio and Illinois had gone differently. On the first ballot the result would have been: Truman, 21; Dewey, 20; and Thurmond, 4. And 25 would have been necessary to a choice.

The unit-rule method of crediting all other States' electoral votes to the plurality candidate in each State puts a tremendous premium on a few large States, limits the campaign to a minority of States, and restricts political preferment to a man who happens to live in one of a few so-called pivotal States.

The present system has led to the election of a President who actually had a smaller popular vote than the man whom he defeated—Adams over Jackson in 1824, Hayes over Tilden in 1876, and Harrison over Cleveland in 1888. This possibility cannot, of course, be completely eliminated without going to a straight popular election, but the pending proposal very much reduces the danger. The Brookings Institution is authority for the statement that the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 2 "will practically eliminate" such an occurrence.

Moreover, in pivotal States there are pressure groups which, under the present system, can sway the balance in those States. In the last election, for example, the candidacy of Henry A. Wallace swung all of New York's 47 votes to Dewey in spite of the fact that Truman received 45 percent of the popular vote in that State.

In this respect, Senate Joint Resolution 2 effectively reduces the power and influence of splinter parties. The provision that the newly elected Congress, voting as individuals, would choose between the two highest candidates in the event that no candidate initially received 40 percent of the electoral vote is another deterrent to splinter party growth.

The proposed amendment completely preserves the rights of the small States, who retain their allocation of two electoral votes regardless of population.

It would tend to give a more truly national character to both our major parties and would greatly enhance and invigorate the two-party system in the United States. It neither helps nor hurts either party. It is sponsored by persons from both parties representing all sections of the country. I believe that upon careful study members of both parties will conclude that it simply eliminates restraints on the two-party system as a whole and thus opens up the field for imaginative and courageous political leadership in the future, the ultimate advantage of which none of us can accurately predict.

Let us send it to the legislatures so that the people in the States may have the chance to pass on this constructive reform.

American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently in my State of New Jersey we again celebrated the anniversary of the birth of great inventor, Thomas A. Edison. In connection with that celebration I have had called to my attention the work of the Thomas Alva Edison Foundation, a nonprofit organization which is attempting to discover "new Edisons" and to sell the principles upon which our way of life was founded.

This important and significant foundation is directed by a distinguished retired naval officer, Vice Adm. Harold G. Bowen, who made an important address on the subject of American industry at a luncheon meeting of the Kiwanis Club in New York City on January 18.

I ask unanimous consent that Vice Admiral Bowen's address be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN INDUSTRY

(Address delivered by Vice Adm. Harold G. Bowen, U. S. Navy (retired), executive director, Thomas Alva Edison Foundation, before the Kiwanis Club, New York City, January 18, 1950)

We are living in the midst of that phenomenon, which let us call, the modern industrial state.

The modern industrial state depends on several fundamentals, some of which are a patent law which recognizes ownership of ideas as well as ownership of property; mass production which, of course, depends upon a large home market enjoying a sufficiently high scale of living; industrial management relying very heavily on accounting; risk capital; research and development laboratories; marketing; transportation; and inventions. The loss of any one of these fundamentals would be as bad as the loss of a strategic battle.

The grouping of nations in the future will be along industrial and economic and not political lines. The world will be divided into primary industrial states and satellite nations thereof; and the first necessity of a primary industrial state is a large enough home market with a sufficiently high scale of living to support mass production, one of the keystones of the modern industrial state.

The backward condition of England as respects modern industry was plainly apparent during the high-pressure, high-temperature steam fight in our Navy in the late 1930's. England, which had led the navies of the world in innovations and improvements for several centuries, did not follow us in the radical and extensive modernization of our machinery which preceded and was completed before Pearl Harbor. The royal navy lagged with its machinery because England was lagging in industrial research and in that complete mechanization of industry which accompanied the rise of mass production. There is a grave doubt in my mind that England, on account of insufficient home population and insufficient scale of living, can ever again become a primary industrial state, even after she has copied all of our American practices.

Russia, China, and India have sufficient populations for mass production; but whether or not their scale of living can be sufficiently increased over the years for them to become, in the future, serious competitors of our own industrial civilization is something only time can answer.

Remarkable and fascinating as they are, I find no appreciation of the rise of our present industrial civilization in Toynbee's books and articles. I find no recognition of the fact that our present industrial civilization has no parallel in history. Churchill, the glorious and the inimitable, recently ascribed America's rise to ascendency to the fact that we are a union of States. Oh, that life were as simple as that.

Prof. Harold Laski is quoted as having advised the labor unions, during his visit to this country, to organize a labor party like they have in England. He says that would fix everything. That's what I'm afraid of—that it would fix everything. But he forgets to tell us who will support England if we go socialistic.

Toynbee, Churchill, and Laski apparently haven't the faintest conception of the modern industrial state based on these fundamentals which I enumerated earlier. Why pick on Toynbee, Churchill, and Laski? I doubt if such a conception is present in the minds of either the Conservative or Socialist Party.

World War II was won because our allies, and principally ourselves, were able to apply more horsepower per man in our military operations than our enemies and more horsepower per man than had been applied in any previous war. Industry and research won the war; and, right here, let me state that the technology of any armed service cannot rise above the technological ceiling of its national industry.

National defense depends in large measure on the ability to rapidly mobilize a large proportion of industry. Industry, therefore, has the double role of putting bread into the mouths of the multitude and in defending the multitude from aggression.

That, American industry can and will do if it is not pestered to death by an omnipotent state.

Of all the fundamentals of the modern industrial state, certainly the most recent and fundamental ones are mass production, research, and development.

There is a constant battle going on in industry between rising wages, costs of raw materials, increased taxes, and reduction of production costs. Management endeavors to keep down its production costs by such well-known and orthodox methods as increased mechanization, extensive use of more and better labor-saving devices, and improved or new processes. There may come a time when management's only out will be through improved or new processes. Besides constantly improving processes or substituting more and better processes for older ones, it is also the function of research and development continuously to provide new wants and thus build up a bigger market for the concern with which the research laboratory is associated.

When we compare the equipment we had to work with 50 years ago with the equipment we have at our disposal today, we should remember that the unbelievable strides we have made in the mechanical and electrical arts are due to the amazing contributions of scientists, research workers, or development engineers. None of these improvements just naturally happened; they are results of long, hard, and generally disheartening work by many unsung heroes in research and development.

For instance, General Electric acquired the rights to manufacture the Curtis turbine when it was more of an idea than a turbine. The reliable and dependable steam turbine of today—industry's work horse—is the result of many years and millions of dollars' worth of effort.

Radio, before it reached its present efficiency, had to await the development of the vacuum tube and the amplifying circuit. These great components of radio began with Thomas A. Edison's invention of the Edison effect, which was followed by the work of Fleming, deForest, and Armstrong. Hertz, Marconi, and other early pioneers did but set in motion certain forces which development engineers, at a later period, fashioned into that which we now know as radio.

The great Michael Faraday made his discovery that a conductor carrying electricity could be made to move in a magnetic field, but his model of the first electromagnetic machine was of no earthly use as it was. His discovery was followed by the work of

brilliant research engineers, development engineers, and others, who in my opinion, made as great a contribution to technology and all knowledge as Faraday. Certainly Edison, with his invention of the electric light, the central power plant, his rapid and radical improvement of the dynamo, and his development of all the devices necessary for the mass production, installation, and metering of electrical energy—not to mention the first bulb manufacturing plant and many other details—showed in a graphic way, the contributions which research workers have made to modern industry.

The story of the invention and development of the phonograph presents, in a neat fashion, the wonderful way in which the material arts have profited by our technological progress. The phonograph could not have been invented by a scientist, nor could it have been brought to its present state of perfection by an inventor.

It has been said that, if Bell and his associates had known of the mass of technological knowledge required before telephony was really possible, they would never have attempted to invent the telephone.

The same is true of Edison and his phonograph.

Edison didn't know that his phonograph should never have worked; and not having this load on his mind, he invented it. That's what makes an inventor.

Edison was the first man in the history of the world to reproduce the voice of man; and this should rank him next to and immediately after Prometheus.

The work of development engineers, after Edison's invention of the phonograph, is fairly well known to us all; but it remained for Bell Laboratories to put the finishing touches on the phonograph. The contributions of Bell Laboratories' research workers in the phonograph development is typical of the work of industrial research laboratories, in innumerable fields, today.

It is interesting to note that the phonograph is an American invention and, further, that its wonderful perfection resulted from years of work by a telephone industry which is a free enterprise. Telephone companies in Europe, which are run by their respective governments, had the same opportunity as Bell laboratories to do this work, and they didn't do it.

There are mouths to be fed in this world—a brutal way of saying that our population must be kept employed if our economy is to succeed.

Research and invention have put more people to work than any element in our civilization, and it will forever be the glory of applied or industrial research that it represents the first time in the history of the world that an art became self supporting.

It has been my good fortune to have witnessed the rise of many industries and parts thereof, and one of the most inspiring has been the rise of the Diesel engine.

The steady advance in the reliability of the Diesel engine has been perfectly astonishing, and few today remember the trials and tribulations of the Diesel engines in the early 1900's and, as a matter of fact, until quite recently.

The Navy, prior to Pearl Harbor, became convinced that we would never have good submarines until they were powered by engines of the type being manufactured by General Motors and Fairbanks-Morse. About the time the Navy started buying General Motors' engines, as I remember it, General Motors was employing 140 men in building Diesel engines. Today, at the LaGrange plant, they are employing in excess of 14,000. I know of no better example in this day and age which indicates so forcibly the role of the research engineer in helping to feed the multitudes.

I read and hear a great deal about labor and management, collective bargaining, social security, and old-age pensions; but I don't hear enough about the work and contributions of the industrial research workers, and this I object to. I am concerned that such a large proportion of our people don't know that there is something more to industry than labor, management, financing, and marketing.

The Edison Foundation is endeavoring, in various ways, to acquaint the public with the fact that we have attained, in this country, considerable material progress and that material progress requires long and laborious work in the material arts. There is no such thing as push-button progress.

The Edison lecture series is sponsored in cooperation with the Newark Evening News every winter, and such distinguished lecturers as Charles F. Kettering, Dr. Harold G. Moulton, Dwight R. G. Palmer, and Benjamin F. Fairless present addresses on various facets of our modern industrial state. These lectures have set such a high standard in explaining industry's position that they are beginning to attract most favorable attention.

We are publishing booklets describing Mr. Edison's principal inventions. In each story, we are making the point of bringing Mr. Edison's inventions up to date so as to show the almost incredible effect of Mr. Edison's original inventions on today's industry, and also because they provide perfect examples of what happens to fairly simple inventions when they become subjected to modern technological development. The history of the incandescent light has already been published in booklet form, suitable for use in schools and shops, and the story of the invention and development of the phonograph is presently being prepared.

Not enough of our people realize the fundamental fact that American industry is a natural resource. The story of industry, if told at all, has been told by advertising and public relations people who are largely influenced in their natural desire to market a product. The significance of our industry as a fundamental factor in our economy and in our life has never been told, at least successfully.

We are living in a period which is probably best described as Toynbee describes it—the western Christian civilization—and we are all its beneficiaries.

I like to think of our civilization as a great revolving fund, from which, until we mature, we constantly make withdrawals. By the time we reach maturity, therefore, we have incurred a tremendous debt to this fund which we are duty bound to repay.

I have the greatest admiration for American industry. It is one of the pillars of our civilization. If it goes down, down goes America and, with it, western Christian civilization.

Lincoln Day Address by Mr. Talmage Wilcher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by Mr. Talmage Wilcher, State Republican committeeman from Arlington, Va., on February 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln should be a time of rededication of those general principles for which he stood, as applied to present-day problems. We are proud to honor the memory of this great man who was a father of the Republican Party, and one of America's great Presidents.

In simple terms he expressed the relationship between the people and their Government: "In all things which the people can do for themselves as well or better than the Government—the Government should never interfere." For the past 20 years we have had the opposite of this theory of government dinned into our ears from the theorists in Washington. Young people are led to expect security from the cradle to the grave—that the Government will take care of them. This is socialism—it has never been successful in any country in the world—it cannot be successful here. It is a deliberate attempt to lull our younger people into a sense of false security. The Government secures money from its citizens in the form of taxes. When money goes to Washington, where there are 1,154 bureaus, these bureaus take their toll from it—a 15-percent handling charge before any money is returned to us in unproductive charges.

The man who said "Nothing is certain but death and taxes" had something there. The Fair Deal, as do all other socialistic forms of government, appeal to the man of lesser income by appearing to soak the rich in taxes. The catch is that the poor man pays too. The rich man pays in income taxes and the poor man pays in hidden taxes. Newsweek has recently released a report on taxes which should interest every citizen since all of us pay taxes. It tells us that a tax research organization discovered 150 taxes levied on the manufacture and sale of a woman's hat, 116 taxes on a man's suit of clothes, 151 taxes on a loaf of bread, yet we find no reduction in cost of bread even though we have the largest surplus of wheat in our Nation's history—at least 100 taxes on a dozen eggs, yet we have $15,000,000 worth of eggs rotting in caves in this country.

There are 11½ cents in taxes in the cost of a pack of cigarettes, $500 on a $2,000 car, $2,000 tax on a $10,000 home. These are a few of the items used daily by almost every family. It is time we Republicans told the man of moderate income that it is not only the rich who pay taxes. All of us, rich or poor, must have food and clothes, and we must all, therefore, pay the taxes. If business and industry are taxed out of existence, as there is reason to fear they may be, what will happen to our standard of living, the highest in the world. We own more automobiles, radios, television sets, cars, telephones, and other refinements of living than all the other nations put together.

What then have we to gain by adopting state socialism? We know there are people in high places in government who would have us adopt the "lame" which have caused economic disaster wherever they have been accepted. We have the words, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of Senator HOLLAND, of Florida, a southern Democrat, who admits that "There are present on this floor of the Senate public officials representing this Nation who see state socialism as one of the objects for which they are working and to which they think we should soundly go."

The day has come when we Republicans must say, in no uncertain terms: "We are for the free and private competitive-enterprise system. We believe in the ability of people to maintain their homes, their families, their businesses and professions without Government interference. We believe in the pay-as-you-go form of government, and a tax scale that is safely within the bounds of a

democratic system as opposed to socialism. We believe that the individual 48 States are sufficiently able to maintain their governments without benefit of Federal regulation, for which we pay a frightful toll. We believe that curtailment in Government cost is an absolute necessity, in view of the mounting Federal debt—already in excess of two hundred and fifty billion.

We do not believe in national socialized medicine. We do not believe in regimentation. We do not believe in Federal control and regulation in any forms.

Lincoln's philosophy of government should be applied to present-day problems, and what I mean is we cannot ditch all of the social gains—such as grants-in-aid to States. Some of this legislation has real merit, such as care of the aged, Federal aid to education and dependent children. Social-insurance labor laws, which have proven a blessing, and such other legislation, as Federal housing insured loans, Farm Credit loans, but I reiterate that subsidies should be ditched, bureaucratic control should be ditched, and any law that tends to regulate and control large segments of our population should be repealed.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is not an easy thing to tell one's children that there is no Santa Claus; it is not an easy choice to tell the American people that its Democratic-elected Representatives in Government have not been honest in their interpretations to the people. It would be much easier for us to go along the primrose path, outpromising the Fair Dealers, but we cannot do this, we will not do this, and we must not do this. We have reached the crossroads where we must forget political expediency in favor of telling shocking truths. From here on out we are fighting to preserve a mode of life; our battle is not between two major political parties. It is a question of whether Americanism or socialism shall dominate.

The impossibility of socialism has been proven by 4,000 years of failure. The American way of life has proven itself in less than two centuries. Southern Democrats, let me ask you, "Who is kidding whom?"

You know that the Lincoln philosophy of government is the same as the Jeffersonian Democrat. Both of these political philosophies represent equal rights and State rights, freedom of action, free competition and free enterprise, decentralized governments as against centralized governments. You who call yourselves Democrats are not Democrats in the main. You are Republicans in belief, because the national administration is not Jeffersonian democracy—but Fair Dealers, fellow travelers of a socialism which is alien to Americanism. Awake, Southern Democrats and join hands, because our fight is yours also.

This is our country, if we love it, and hope to keep it, and to keep the freedom to be let alone, to pursue our way of life as we wish as individuals, the burden is on us to fight for it. That means work. We must inform ourselves, we must educate others regarding the fallacies, that are being saddled on us every day. The last Presidential election some 45,000,000 people failed to vote. We must see that they cast a vote this year and that it is an informed vote. Begin at home, with your neighbor, the families on your street, the person next to you in the grocery store. There you can mention a few of the items in his grocery basket—cigarettes, bread, and eggs. Tell him about the hidden taxes he is paying there. See that your friends and acquaintances are registered and that they vote. It is a job that must be done individually and one that we must all share—else we fail.

Many of you Virginians attended the Lincoln Day box supper last Monday night in Washington and your morale was boosted by the tremendous crowd there. It was an inspiring and wholesome thing to see. The Fair Deal Democrats say that the Republicans are the party of privilege and of the rich—yet we have a dollar box supper while they have $100-a-plate dinners for the party faithful—and they aren't going to pay a tax on the $100, badly as they need tax money—it will go into the till to elect more good Fair Dealers and fellow travelers to spend more of your money. If you don't like this flagrant insult to your intelligence—there's only one thing to do about it, and that is to join the Republican Party now.

There is a job to do and that job is to tell others over and over again just what socialism means to every man, woman, and child. Let's tell this story in every American home until the dangers of socialism are forever past. If you continue to work and to do this job sincerely and honestly, I feel certain that the future of our Republican Party and the American people will be secure.

Closing of Waltham Watch Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Say It Isn't So," published in the Waltham (Mass.) News-Tribune under date of Saturday, February 11. The editorial relates to the tragic closing of the Waltham Watch Co.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAY IT ISN'T SO

Government officials and leaders of his own party many times have had cause to be disturbed at President Truman's faculty for saying the wrong thing at the wrong time. The latest outbreak of foot-in-mouth disease on the part of the chief executive hit Waltham Watch Co. at a most inopportune moment.

Mr. Truman, it should be pointed out, has promised much to Waltham's precision industry and given less than nothing.

By less than nothing we mean that he has dismissed this vital concern without even waiting for the results of a study he himself had asked for concerning Waltham's essentiality to the national defense.

He has consistently failed to do anything in Waltham's behalf despite his oft-quoted statement that no segment of American industry would be harmed by reciprocal trade.

His off-the-cuff statement that everything possible has been done for Waltham is puzzling indeed. By everything he can't mean tariff or quota relief. Neither the State Department nor the Tariff Commission has acted despite incontrovertible proof the Swiss import flood has strangled the domestic watch industry.

By everything he can't mean RFC assistance. About all the RFC did was to pay off banking indebtedness and enable the firm to capitalize on its inventory—through a half-price sale. That was something to be grateful for, of course. But RFC advanced no reasonable amount of working capital, and is now reluctant to release part of $2,000,000 earmarked for machinery despite the fact that the concern's asset value is far in excess of its debt.

No, Mr. Truman, we don't think everything has been done for Waltham. We believe a tragic disservice is being done the country's security by your casual dismissal, which so ironically came within an hour of the time when the Munitions Board was reaffirming Waltham's vital defense role.

The President's aides say he wouldn't want to be directly responsible for barring the firm from a chance to reopen. Well, Mr. Truman, just say it isn't so. Tell us it really counts to be a 100-percent producer of timing mechanisms during wartime. Tell us that 2,300 jobs mean something.

If Waltham is expendable, won't Elgin or Hamilton be next?

Statement by Hon. Leonard W. Hall, of New York, Relating to Edward Lamb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement by Representative LEONARD W. HALL, of New York, in regard to Mr. Edward Lamb, who seems to be arranging President Truman's trip to Ohio.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. LEONARD W. HALL, OF NEW YORK

It should be of interest to the American people that within a few hours after the New York Times had printed President Truman's reaffirmation of his "red herring" stand, that the President should receive at the White House one Edward Lamb, a man whose association with Communist fronts and Communist causes is a matter of public record.

The official White House calling list issued today, February 15, reads, in part: "12:15, Mayor Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, with Publisher Edward Lamb, of Erie Dispatch."

An hour after Mr. Lamb had visited the White House, the Associated Press carried the following report on the AP wire:

"Edward Lamb, Toledo, Ohio, lawyer and publisher of the Erie (Pa.) Dispatch, told reporters after seeing the President: 'The President said he would wage as aggressive a fight to elect a Democratic Congress this fall as he did to get himself elected in 1948.'

"Another White House visitor, Mayor David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, joined Lamb in making the announcement.

"Mr. Truman is expected to go into other States in a speaking tour for Democratic nominees after the primaries are over, White House aides say.

"The President himself has said that he does not expect to participate in any Democratic primaries outside of his own State of Missouri.

"Lamb said Mr. Truman assured him and Lawrence that after the nominees have been chosen he would be 'free to campaign aggressively in Pennsylvania and Ohio for a Democratic, aggressive Congress.'

"He and Lawrence are here to attend tomorrow night's Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner."

Mr. Lamb's affinity for Red causes has been the subject of debate on the floor of the

House of Representatives on at least five occasions. The discussions are to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1, page 588; volume 94, part 4, pages 5237 and 6816; volume 96, part 7, pages 8233 and 8235; and in the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 94, part 11, page A3658.

In addition, a special House Committee To Investigate the Federal Communications Commission (80th Cong., 2d sess.), devoted 5½ pages of its final report to the House to publication of Mr. Lamb's record. This document is known as House Report No. 2479, and the pages cited are pages 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25.

I was a member of the special committee investigating the FCC and signed the final report. Congress interested itself in Mr. Lamb's record because Mr. Lamb within the space of 2 weeks in 1948 received five operating licenses from the FCC. Congress considered it a proper matter, and perhaps the President might also, to inquire into the Communist associations of a man who would control the airways of five outlets under Government license.

Here is Mr. Lamb's record in part:

Mr. Lamb was executive vice president of International Labor Defense; he was vice chairman of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born; he was a member of the executive committee of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. All three of these organizations have been cited in the Attorney General's list, and have been cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Lamb was an executive vice president of the National Lawyers' Guild, which is now seeking an investigation of the FBI; he was a member of the National Committee of the International Juridical Association; he was a sponsor of the Civil Rights Congress. All three of these organizations have been cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Lamb was the signer of a telegram addressed to the President in 1940 and sent by the Emergency Peace Mobilization condemning military conscription as un-American; he was a signer of the call for the International Action Conference for Civil Rights; he was a signer of a statement addressed to the President of the United States on March 5, 1941, defending the Communist Party; he was a signer of the open letter for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union in September 1939. Mr. Lamb was twice the author of articles appearing in the magazine of the Friends of the Soviet Union; he was a signer of a letter to President Roosevelt protesting attacks on the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and condemning the "war hysteria being whipped up by the Roosevelt Administration."

Mr. Lamb acted as counsel for Mrs. Sarah W. Montgomery when she was a witness before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, and he stated at that time that he was attorney for the American Peace Mobilization; he was an attorney for Alex Bail[illegible], a witness called before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, who was a Communist later ordered deported.

Mr. Lamb also is the author of a book called The Planned Economy in Soviet Russia.

The record cited above dates from 1934 into 1948.

Mr. Lamb has been mentioned favorably on numerous occasions by the Daily Worker and by New Masses. The records of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities list 21 citations involving Mr. Lamb's name.

This is Mr. Lamb's record, and it is appalling that President Truman should summon him to the White House to help make campaign plans for the election of Democratic Congressmen in 1950. In his interview in the New York Times today Mr. Truman asserts that his loyalty board has done much more effective screening of Communist sympathizers and fellow travelers than has Congress through the action of its committees. While this may be questioned by the American public in the light of the Alger Hiss case and numerous other cases, perhaps the American interest would be better served if the President's loyalty board moved over to the White House doorstep and screened the guest list. It is high time that somebody in this administration determined when "herring" ends and "red" begins.

Reestablishment and Maintenance of Free and Competitive Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY DARBY

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. DARBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the American National Livestock Association at its fifty-third annual convention at Miami, Fla., on January 5, 1950.

This resolution, which was brought to my attention by a prominent Kansas farmer, cattleman, and businessman, Richard W. Robbins, of Greensburg, Kans., expresses the concern of the members of the association over the present trend toward a socialized state, and deserves the attention of all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There impends today a threat to our country and the freedom of its citizens which so menacingly overshadows the future that we, American cattlemen of all shades of political belief, feel it our duty to speak out in unmistakable terms.

This threat lies in the fact that our country—without conscious choice on the part of its people—is rapidly and unmistakably drifting toward the consummation of a false concept—the socialist state.

Tokens of this danger are everywhere and undeniable. The growing power and expansion of wasteful government; the colossal public debt; the heavy burden of taxation; the malicious attempt to substitute an artificial economy for the natural economy which alone can function in freedom; the gradual assumption by the State of financial responsibility for every hazard incident to life—hazards which should be personally met and borne by every human being who has the instinctive will to survive and the inherent impulse to be free; the arraignment of economic and social groups, one against the other, and numerous other conditions and proposals similarly inspired and equally false.

Government produces nothing and has no means by which to support these false and destructive theories except by exacting from its citizens the fruits of their labors.

The course the Government is now taking, unless it is promptly reversed, must inevitably lead to natural bankruptcy. In a vain effort to prolong a specious sense of security, more similar expedients will be applied until we become mere numbers in a completely socialized state: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the American National Live Stock Association in convention assembled at Miami, Fla., January 5, 1950, reaffirm our solemn conviction that the future health, strength, and prosperity of our country depend on the reestablishment and maintenance of free and competitive enterprise and hereby pledge ourselves as individuals and as an association to diligently and actively work toward this objective and toward the defeat of the fallacious philosophies that are beguiling our country into socialism.

No Security Without National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Security Without National Security," published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO SECURITY WITHOUT NATIONAL SECURITY

The popular cry of the times is "security" and everybody is clamoring for it, egged on by political leaders who fear to urge caution.

Security is most desirable. All of us want it and we are seeking it.

It was the dream of the men who founded America. They had been oppressed by the centralized government of the British monarchs of the era or other despotic rulers of Europe.

To the founders of our Republic, freedom for the individual was the form of security most desired. They wanted to be freed from the shackles of serfdom.

Time marches on and we are now in an era in which we are turning again to the security promised by a centralized government which is being granted more and more power.

The security of freedom was sufficient for several generations of Americans. They wanted only the opportunity to work and strive for something they could call their own, secure in the conviction that it could not be taken from them by government taxes. Leaders of those generations refused to permit heavy taxation. They knew that the power to tax offered opportunities to gain power. They refused to use it because they had been closely associated with generations of peoples who had been ground down into vassals of the state through imposition of such levies.

Now, a little more than a century and a half later, we seem too far removed from our founding fathers to remember or realize the experiences which so infuriated and inspired them that they fought a bloody revolution to gain the security of freedom.

In this era, for a degree of security in the distant future, we are permitting a revival of centralized government. Home rule of the townships and municipalities is being lost to States and the rights of States are being absorbed by the Federal Government.

What good will this future security be if the Government which pledges it is not built on a firm foundation?

What is the condition of our Government today?

It has a debt of $256,000,000,000 and is entering upon a period of deficit financing to maintain itself.

An individual under such circumstances would be considered hopelessly bankrupt.

Despite this situation there is no serious effort to adopt sensible financial practices.

The Government would not permit an insurance company to collect premiums from individuals if its affairs were being conducted in such a manner because of a lack of security.

To create security for ourselves and those who follow us we should demand a return to normal and sensible financial practices.

Educational Advancement in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a news item which appeared in the February 11, 1950, issue of the Memphis Press-Scimitar. This news story clearly presents the progress which the great State of Mississippi is making in trying to solve its educational problem and also indicates the good relationship now existing between the white and colored races in our State.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UPON THIS RICH DIRT SHALL GROW A NEW COLLEGE FOR NEGROES—GOVERNOR WRIGHT AND PRESIDENT WHITE SINK SPADES INTO ITTA BENA SITE FOR VOCATIONAL SCHOOL

(By Clark Porteous)

ITTA BENA, MISS., February 11.—Last year's sere cotton stalks, brown and still flecked with bits of white, wave in the wind on 450 fertile acres of Delta dirt near here.

Come September, a college will be ready on the acres, ready to start serving Negro boys and girls of the Delta, and some day of the entire State.

Mississippi Vocational College, a State 4-year institution for Negroes, was started officially at 4:15 p. m. yesterday.

It was then that Gov. Fielding L. Wright, of Mississippi, and Dr. J. W. White, a Negro and the president of the new college, turned the first spadefuls of Delta dirt in a groundbreaking service.

THE SPADE SERVES

The new spade is destined to be kept in the archives of the college as a memento of the ceremony which drew white and Negro leaders from afar and hundreds of just plain people, both white and Negro.

The ground breaking followed more than 2 hours of speeches, music, and ceremony in the jam-packed Leflore County Training School here, a high school for Negroes. More than 1,000 were at the school, and there was standing room only. Hundreds were outside, many listening to the Governor and state officials. Inside whites and Negroes sat side by side in many cases, and no effort at segregation in seating was made. There were white officials and Negro educators on the speakers' platform.

The ground breaking was to start construction of $300,000 worth of buildings—a classroom building, a shop building and the president's home. The current Mississippi Legislature is being asked for $700,000 to build dormitories and a cafeteria.

Dr. White hopes to have these by September, but he plans to open the college whether or not he has them. He is expecting an enrollment of 500 next fall, and if there are no dormitories, trucks, and school buses will haul the students back and forth.

The long-range plan for the college calls for 40 buildings, 2 barns, and a stadium. It's a 25-year plan, but leaders hope the plans drawn by Raymond Birchett, Jackson architect, can be carried out sooner. MVC eventually will accommodate 2,000 students.

It's part of the plan to give Mississippi equal educational opportunity for Negroes, though the plan still calls for segregated education. Mississippi Vocational College will be the third State-supported 4-year college, the other two being Alcorn A. and M. in Alcorn County, northeast Mississippi, opened in 1820 and a large Negro college since 1871, and Jackson College in the State Capital, center of the State, opened in 1940. There is also one Negro junior college, Coahoma County Agricultural Junior College, which became a 2-year college this year.

Governor Wright promised the audience equal education opportunities for Negroes and equal pay for Negro teachers as soon as the State can afford it, but said he will continue to be for segregated education.

* * * * *

"We will have great advances in Negro education, but there is no use expecting them to happen tomorrow," Governor Wright said. "Insofar as I'm concerned both as a citizen and as Governor, I shall do everything I can to promote progress, development, and betterment of all citizens regardless of race, color, creed, or anything else."

"I said to the teachers in the colored Mississippi Education Association 2 years ago that as Governor of the State I recognize your right to equal facilities in education, opportunities, and advantages, and I still recognize that. I recognized that before I became Governor, or Congress began talking about FEPC or other legislation. That's not what's bringing it into Mississippi. But it's not coming overnight. Let's be realistic.

"DIDN'T GET ENOUGH

"I don't claim credit. The legislature and others are doing it. The educational appropriation was $12,000,000 for common education. You (Negroes) did not—and I have no objection to saying it—get enough. I am going to see before this session of the legislature is over that you get your proportionate share.

"There is a program in the legislature to equalize school teachers' salaries. It's not going to help if you don't like the past, to build a grudge in your heart. If you've been discriminated against—forget it. Think about what is happening today and in the future.

"I have to be careful what I say, speaking as the Governor of the State. What I say, as chief executive, I hope to do my part to carry into effect. Don't expect the great day to be tomorrow. When we turn a spade of dirt and leave, there will just be a hole. In a few months, I hope there will be buildings, in a few years I hope a campus full of buildings.

"The University of Mississippi, Alcorn, Mississippi State, Delta State, MSCI, Jackson, and the rest did not grow overnight. They have been years growing. Maybe we have been backward in furnishing education for your children. It is not altogether my fault, nor the fault of my forefathers or yours. With privileges and opportunities goes responsibility. Through the cooperation of all citizens, white and black, is the only way. If you want to cooperate with me, the men on the board and in the legislature—we will solve the education problem. It's a big one. When you do not have responsibility, it is easy to say what to do. When you have responsibility, there is a limit to what you can do.

"LOOK HERE

"I say in all seriousness to this mixed gathering, if we have that cooperation from you, we will take a long step in our program to eventually furnish equal education and equal opportunity with no discrimination."

The Fulbright Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the Fulbright program, by James W. Silver, chairman of the history department of the University of Mississippi.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger of December 20, 1949]

FULBRIGHT PROGRAM IS ONE GOOD THING THAT GREW OUT OF WAR, STATE MAN AVOWS

(By James W. Silver, chairman, history department, University of Mississippi)

ABERDEEN, SCOTLAND, December 19.—Until I saw most of the windows of the Southampton-London boat train plastered with the word "Fulbright," I was not conscious of the size of the movement with which I had become connected. Most of our contingent took up the pronunciation of the dockworker who was curious about the meaning of "Foolbright," but, regardless of how you say it, my guess is that one of these days the word will find its way into the dictionary.

For the Fulbright program is undoubtedly the most comprehensive experiment of its kind yet undertaken. It is one of the few good things that have come out of the war and should be a great force for making American democracy more completely understood by people we like to call our friends.

With his background as Rhodes scholar and as president of the University of Arkansas, it was only natural for Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT to introduce Public Law 584 which received the President's signature on August 1, 1946. This Fulbright Act, an amendment to the Surplus Property Act of 1944, set in motion the machinery which has already enabled nearly 2,000 students, teachers, and scholars to study and work in lands other than their own. Its basic purpose is an "increase of mutual understanding between the people of the United States and people of other countries."

Administrative responsibility rests with United States Department of State, whose Division of Exchange of Persons initiates with other countries executive agreements under which United States educational commissions are set up abroad. To present time, agreements have been consummated with China, Burma, Belgium, and Luxemburg, France, Greece, Italy, New Zealand, the Philippines, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Norway, and negotiations are well under way with Austria, Australia, Egypt, India, Pakistan, and Turkey.

Financing of the program comes solely from the sale of surplus property abroad which we refused to bring home after the war and which our allies were eager to buy as they were lacking in dollars. For instance, Britain's settlement of land-lease

brought the United States sterling credits of some $650,000,000. To have withdrawn these would have partially frustrated our whole plan of economic aid to non-Communist countries. In December 1947 Britain agreed to set aside $50,000,000 (in sterling) for educational purposes. Under the Fulbright program, up to one million of these dollars may be used annually for the next 50 years; similar agreement has been made with each of the other nations mentioned.

President Truman has appointed an eminent Board of Foreign Scholarships which approves policies and types of programs and selects both Americans and foreigners for Fulbright awards. Graduate student applicants are certified to the Board by the Institute of International Education, 2 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. Secondary teachers who want to swap jobs for a year with foreign pedagogs must first be O. K'd by the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C., while those interested in university instruction of advanced research must be recommended to the Board by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, 2101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington 25, D. C.

The American student lucky enough to snag a Fulbright appointment receives tuition, maintenance, and travel allowances. The teacher or research worker does still better with a stipend in addition to travel and maintenance. The foreigner who comes to the United States under the program gets only travel allowances, inasmuch as no dollars are available. Under this condition we hope to have both a professor and a graduate student from Britain at the University of Mississippi in 1950–51.

So far, 587 students, 124 teachers, 68 professors, and 113 research scholars have gone abroad with Fulbright appointments. From foreign lands to America have come: 851 students, 11 teachers, 89 professors, and 111 research scholars.

The United States Educational Commission in the United Kingdom, which looks after the Silver family with such painstaking care, was set up by an executive agreement of September 1948, signed by Ambassador Lewis Douglas and Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin. Under its administration there are over 250 Americans working in Britain and a slightly smaller number of Britons in the United States. Another year will see an increase on both sides.

My 3 months' experience in Scotland has convinced me that we would do well to examine carefully the assumption that even our close friends are informed regarding us and our way of life. I know, too, that the average well-informed American is likely to live in blissful ignorance of the real problems and feelings of millions of people abroad. War itself brought a considerable advance in mutual respect and understanding. The Fulbright program may well be another important milestone on the road to international comprehension and good will without which there is small chance of permanent world peace.

A Novel Plan To Raise Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Novel Plan To Raise Revenue," written by Arthur Krock in the New York Times of February 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—A NOVEL PLAN TO RAISE REVENUE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 9.—A suggestion that the Federal Government charge fees for special services, and thus in one move cut down costs and add to revenues, may not get serious attention from the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, but it should. They are hard at work on proposals affecting taxation, their basic problem, as always, being how to relieve burdens on the industrial economy without reducing the Government's income.

The suggestion was made in some detail by John A. Kennedy in the San Diego Journal, of which he is publisher and editor. In substance, it is to put special Government services "on a cafeteria style or pay-for-what-you-get basis."

Local governments do this regularly; they also make a charge for an automobile driver's permit or a marriage license, which are ordinary and not special services. But Mr. Kennedy gave a number of examples of the second variety which the people get free from Washington and add measurably to the cost of the central Government. Here are some:

A citizen expects to pay, and does, a pro rata share of the expense of a new road or sidewalk in front of his house. He pays gasoline taxes so that roads may be built and maintained. But he pays nothing beyond his regular taxes, or in some instances only a nominal sum, for Federal licensing and inspection of great and direct benefit to him. And as part of a corporation he gets free special services of great business value from the Federal Government.

"Why," asked Mr. Kennedy, "should Uncle Sam not exact a payment for the valuable export licenses the Department of Commerce issues to business men? Or for the certificates of operation, charters, and inspection services given gratis to interstate motor and freight carriers by the Interstate Commerce Commission? Why shouldn't the Civil Aeronautics Administration or the Maritime Commission be reimbursed, at least for the paper work involved in issuing charters to aviation and shipping companies?"

OTHER EXAMPLES

The Federal Communications Commission, he submitted, should charge for the valuable franchises it issues in the form of licenses every 3 years to more than 2,000 broadcasting stations. Some of these may have entered the business wholly as a concept of public service, but also it is "a pleasant way of earning their bread and butter."

The Departments of Agriculture and Interior furnish hundreds of free services to farm and other groups, and some of these, said the editor, "could fairly be the basis of a small charge." American Overseas Airlines and Pan American have kept a Federal staff busy for months on the application of the latter to buy the former for $17,500,000, and he thinks the buyer and the seller should pay the costs. Also, when the railroads seek increased rates they should reimburse the Interstate Commerce Commission for the expenses of the long hearings, and so should others in the same position—telephone companies, power companies seeking grants from the Federal Power Commission and corporations asking the approval of the Securities and Exchange Commission for bond and stock issues.

"Why," inquired the editor, "should the 600,000 pilots and technicians have been issued their CAA licenses for nothing; likewise the 60,000 radio 'hams' and 60,000 commercial radio operators who hold 5-year licenses from the FCC?" He cited the Government Printing Office, which distributes most of its huge output free, except for a small charge that reflects only the actual cost of printing documents prepared for individual Government agencies. "In 1947," said Mr. Kennedy, "the Public Printer sold 36,000,000 pamphlets for $3,200,000 but over twice that number—86,000,000—were distributed free by Members of Congress and others.

"I imagine [he wrote] that some skeptics will look down their noses at this suggestion as providing too little in additional Government moneys to offset the added headaches of bureaucratic bookkeeping. But this is to ignore the basic fact that multiplied throughout the whole fabric of Government, such fees could be fixed on the cost of services performed and could add up to a lot of money for the Treasury.

"I am also in the radio and television business. Why shouldn't I pay the Government for servicing my various requests which have helped make my radio business profitable?"

SOME PAY FOR OTHERS

In addition to the good sense of much of this, it has a particular appeal for the great mass of citizens who pay for these special services, few or none of which they ever request for themselves. No calculation of the cost could even be approximated, but the amount is very large. And, going beyond the Hoover Commission, Mr. Kennedy has managed to devise a plan by which public revenue is increased and the budget reduced simultaneously.

In The Great American Bandwagon, Charles Merz, the editor of this newspaper, once observed that if Government charged admission to celebrated trials and like events, and held them in stadia about the size of the Yale Bowl, the take would greatly shrink the public debt. Mr. Merz wrote that with his tongue in his cheek, though his would be a sound revenue measure if the dispensing of justice were not the matter involved. Mr. Kennedy, however, is serious and has made a serious case.

What Is Prosperity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Is Prosperity?" published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS PROSPERITY?

What is that state generally referred to as prosperity? Webster gives various meanings to the word. Prosperity is an advance or gain in anything good or desirable, according to the dictionary. It is also a general condition of industrial and commercial activity in which goods and money are comparatively plentiful, according to the same authority.

Presently goods and money are comparatively plentiful. But it can be seriously questioned whether there actually is an advance or gain in anything good or desirable. Money is plentiful, but that condition exists largely as a result of political manipulation by the Federal administration, which has scattered public funds with a lavish hand, unmindful of the mounting debt, constantly striving to put off the evil day when these obligations must be met.

True prosperity can be based entirely upon the permanent prosperity of the people and while Americans do have money to spend, they cannot be permanently prosperous so long as they are saddled with debt which is mounting daily. Present prosperity is not bringing a gain that is either good or desirable, and must be followed by readjustment.

Plight of the Baltic Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL J. LINEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. LINEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the Baltic Nations is of great concern to the United States and all liberty-loving people. The aggression of the Soviet Union against these nations on June 15–17, 1940, and the ensuing occupation put an end to a period of independence in which great strides had been made in self-government, economics, culture, and education. With other countries, the United States condemned this occupation by Soviet Russia, but unfortunately to no avail. The three nations on the Baltic have been put under the iron heel of Moscow and their recent history is a good example of the meaning of the Soviet system to the other peoples of the world. They are suffering all the hardships and cruelties to which any totalitarian tyranny subjects the people in its power. Many have been killed or tortured to death, while others have been deported to the interior of the Soviet Union or perished in concentration camps. These former independent countries are now more isolated from the west than any other countries. There are no foreign diplomatic or consular representatives there, nor can any of their inhabitants travel west.

In an appeal to the General Assembly of the United Nations in November 1947 the representatives of the Baltic states made the statement that June 1940 "also marked the beginning of a planned, systematic, and cruel genocide of these peoples." This appeal also quoted from a secret instruction from Moscow in January 1941 that "the removal of anti-Soviet elements from the Baltic Republics is a political task of great significance," which is the background for the tragedy now going on there. The policy of annihilating the Baltic nations and executing Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians is continuing to this day, despite the fact that Soviet Russia signed the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations wherein man's rights and fundamental freedoms are assured.

The Baltic people are fighting a grim battle for life against the deliberate policies of the Kremlin. It is obvious that the Kremlin intends to completely eliminate the freedom-loving Balts. Arrests, executions, and mass deportations for slave labor in Russia threaten to destroy the Baltic nations completely. Many of the national leaders and much of the intelligentsia were killed off or deported during the Russian invasion of 1940. The deportation of larger numbers, classified according to progressive degrees of untrustworthiness, began after the Russians returned in 1944. Tested Russian Communists were sent to take their places, taking over their holdings and even their names. Russian has become the official language. Recent testimony before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the proposed genocide treaty pictured the Soviet Union as systematically extirpating the Lithuanian and Ukrainian peoples to solidify the extended Soviet frontiers with safe Russians and to provide sure base areas for an onslaught on Europe and North America. However, it is reassuring that the United States and other nations have refused to recognize the status of the Baltic states resulting from Russian aggression and continue their de jure recognition of them as independent states. The declaration of the Secretary of State on July 23, 1940, condemning Russia's aggressive acts still stands.

Unemployment Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, in 1931 and 1932 I was a member of the Ohio Commission on Unemployment Insurance. I helped draft the unemployment insurance bill of Ohio, which served as a model for many States of the Union throughout the past 18 years. I believe in a strong unemployment-insurance program and introduced a bill, H. R. 7331, to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment-insurance program. This bill is designed to meet the present-day needs of workers and to extend and improve the program generally.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I report that the following is a summary of the bill providing for an extension and improvement of the unemployment-insurance law.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL FOR EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE UNEMPLOYMENT-INSURANCE LAW

In brief, title I provides for the observance by the States of certain minimum standards with respect to the eligibility of employees for unemployment compensation benefits, amounts and duration of benefits, and permissible reasons for disqualifying insured workers. In this regard the bill reflects standards which, with respect to amounts, duration, and eligibility for benefits, are already largely embodied in a substantial number of State laws. It would, moreover, stem the trend manifested in recent years in some States to extend the disqualification provisions, even to the extent of a complete denial of benefits in many situations. These provisions would thus provide greater assurance that involuntarily unemployed workers shall receive the benefits to which they are entitled. This title would also provide unemployment-compensation benefits to many workers who are presently excluded from State unemployment-compensation programs, primarily because the Federal Unemployment Tax Act is inapplicable to firms with less than eight employees.

Title II makes certain improvements with respect to financing the States' costs of administering their unemployment-compensation laws and public-employment offices. Among other matters, this title would provide for the earmarking of the proceeds of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and make such funds available for the exclusive purposes of defraying the States' and Federal Government's expenses incurred in the administration of the unemployment-compensation program and public-employment offices, and for providing reinsurance grants to States. This title would require States to incorporate into their laws certain provisions designed to assure that benefits will be paid only to persons legally entitled thereto and to assure participation by States in appropriate arrangements for the payment of interstate claims.

Title III provides for the making of nonreimbursable reinsurance grants to States, thereby assuring the continued solvency of the States' unemployment funds in the event of an unexpected diminution of State revenues. In this connection, mention may be made that the provisions for making reimbursable loans to States whose unemployment funds fall below a certain margin of safety expired on December 31, 1949.

Title IV contains provisions for extending the duration of benefits in critical unemployment areas. This title contains certain safeguards to assure that only those persons who have an attachment to such labor-market areas shall be entitled to receive benefits for an extended period. The additional cost of providing benefits for the period of acute unemployment in any labor-market area would be borne by the Federal Government.

Title V would extend the States' unemployment programs to Federal employees, including military personnel.

A brief summary of the more important provisions of the bill follows:

TITLE I, AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 9, SUBCHAPTER C, INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Section 101 would amend section 1603 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to require the States to observe, in addition to the standards presently provided for in the code, the following additional minimum standards as a condition of securing the credit-offset allowances of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act:

First. Amount of benefits: Benefit payments to unemployed insured claimants of at least an amount substantially equivalent to 50 percent of a claimant's weekly wages up to at least $30 a week for individuals with no dependents; 60

percent of a claimant's weekly wages up to at least $36 a week for individuals with one dependent; 65 percent of the claimant's weekly wages up to at least $39 a week for individuals with two dependents; 70 percent of the claimant's weekly wages up to at least $42 a week for individuals with three or more dependents.

Second. Potential duration of benefits: Benefit payments to unemployed insured claimants equivalent to at least 26 weeks of benefits in a benefit year, if a claimant remains unemployed. Cancellation of wage credits or the reduction of benefits would be permitted only in case of fraudulent claims for benefits.

Third. Eligibility for benefits: Qualification for benefits if the employee has earned in his base period in covered employment (1) as much as 30 times his basic weekly benefit amount; or (2) as much as 1½ times his high-quarter earnings; or (3) if he was employed in as many as 20 weeks in his base period. The State would decide which one of these methods it chose to apply. A State would be permitted to adopt lower eligibility requirements if it so chose.

Fourth. Disqualifications: Benefit payments to all insured claimants able and willing to work, except that a State may deny benefits for the first week of unemployment in a benefit year; it may postpone the payment of benefits for periods up to 6 weeks if the claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause, or was discharged for misconduct connected with his work, or refused suitable work without good cause. A State may deny benefits to employees participating in a strike for the duration of the strike. It may postpone or reduce the amounts of benefits potentially payable, or cancel the wage credits, of any employee who makes a false claim for benefits.

The bill provides that these standards would become effective July 1, 1952. Each State would thus be afforded ample time to amend its laws to the extent necessary to bring them into conformity with these minimum standards.

Section 102 would extend coverage by redefining the term "employer" in section 1607 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code to include any person who has one or more individuals in his employ, thus removing the present limitation on the size of employers taxable under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act.

Section 103 would redefine the term "wages" in section 1607 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code in substantially identical language as such term is defined in the Social Security Act Amendments of 1949 (H. R. 6000) passed by the House on October 5, 1949. The only substantial difference is that the bill increases the maximum wages subject to the Federal Unemployment Tax Act from $3,000 to $4,800 (cf. sec. 208 (a) of H. R. 6000). The effective date of this section would be January 1, 1952.

Section 104 (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) redefines the term "employment" in section 1607 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide with some modifications, the same coverage and exemptions as are provided by H. R. 6000 (compare with section 205 (a) of H. R. 6000).

Section 104 (f) would redefine the term "employee" in section 1607 (i) in language substantially similar to that used in H. R. 6000 in defining this term (compare with section 206 of H. R. 6000). Thus this bill, as H. R. 6000, would specifically include within the term "employee" certain classes of persons who are economically dependent upon an employer, such as outside salesmen, full-time insurance salesmen, homeworkers, contract loggers, and certain classes of licensees of space in mines. In addition, the bill sets forth certain basic principles to be applied in determining the employer-employee relationship with respect to all other classes of employees, as provided in H. R. 6000.

Section 104 (g) would redefine the term "State" in section 1607 (j) of the Internal Revenue Code to include Puerto Rico, making Puerto Rico, upon the concurrence of its legislature, eligible for participation in the Federal-State unemployment insurance program—see also section 106.

Section 104 (h) would redefine the term "agricultural labor" in section 1607 (l) of the Internal Revenue Code in language identical with that used in H. R. 6000 in defining this term—see section 205 (d) of H. R. 6000.

Section 104 (i) defines certain miscellaneous terms, including "American vessel and American aircraft," "American employer," "benefit year," "high-quarter wages," "weekly wages," and "week of unemployment."

Section 104 (j) provides that the effective date of this section would be January 1, 1952.

Section 105 amends section 1609 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to require the Secretary of Labor to consult with the States on matters of policy with respect to any rules or regulations affecting the States which he may issue to carry out the purposes of this measure.

Section 106 defers the extension of this bill to Puerto Rico until January 1 of the first calendar year which begins 90 days after the legislature of Puerto Rico by concurrent resolution resolves that it wishes its extension to Puerto Rico.

Section 107 provides that the unemployment taxes in Puerto Rico shall be collected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and that the minimum standards with respect to the amounts and duration of benefits and eligibility for benefits shall not be applicable to Puerto Rico until 4 years after the act becomes applicable to Puerto Rico.

TITLE II. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, AS AMENDED

Section 201 would amend section 301 of title III of the Social Security Act to improve the administrative financing of the States' unemployment-insurance program and public employment offices.

Subsection (a) amends section 301 to provide a permanent appropriation of the proceeds of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to the Federal Unemployment Account. It also authorizes appropriations to the Federal unemployment account of such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this bill.

Subsection (b) contains new provisions authorizing appropriations from the Federal unemployment account to the Department of Labor of such sums as are necessary to provide payments to States to finance the administrative costs of their unemployment compensation laws and their public employment offices.

Subsection (c) contains new provisions authorizing appropriations from the Federal unemployment account of the sums necessary for the Departments of Labor and of the Treasury to carry out their functions under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Wagner-Peyser Act and to provide reinsurance grants to States.

Section 202 would amend section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act so as to require States, as a condition for receiving administrative grants, to conform to the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act.

Section 203 amends section 303 (a) of the Social Security Act so as to require States to incorporate into their laws, as a condition of receiving administrative grants, provisions for, first, additional methods of administration which the Secretary of Labor finds are reasonably calculated to prevent the misuse of the unemployment-compensation program by fraudulent claimants and to assure the payment of compensation only to individuals entitled thereto; and, second, for participation in plans and methods of combining wage credits and handling interstate claims which the Secretary of Labor finds are reasonably calculated to assure the prompt and full payment of benefits to interstate claimants.

Section 204 amends section 304 of the Social Security Act by redefining the term "State" to include Puerto Rico—see, however, section 107, above, as to effective date.

TITLE III. AMENDMENTS TO TITLES IX AND XII OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, AS AMENDED

Section 301 rewrites title XII of the Social Security Act. This title, as rewritten, would provide for outright grants of funds to States, from the Federal unemployment account, whenever on the last day of any calendar quarter a State's unemployment compensation fund falls below the amount of compensation paid during the 6 months' period ending on such date. The amount of the grant would be the amount estimated by the Secretary of Labor to be equal to three-fourths of the excess of the compensation which will be payable under the provisions of the State's unemployment law during the quarter for which such grant is made, over 2 percent of the taxable pay roll for such period.

In order for a State to qualify for such reinsurance grants, it would be necessary for the State to levy a minimum contribution rate of 1.2 percent for the first and any subsequent taxable year after December 31, 1952, and prior to December 31, 1957, and for each of the five preceding taxable years beginning after December 31, 1957, whenever, on the computation date for such taxable years, the State's unemployment fund fell below an amount equal to 6 percent

of the most recent taxable pay roll, or less than the amount paid from such fund during the 2 years immediately preceding such date, whichever amount was greater.

Funds provided by reinsurance grants could be used solely for the purpose of paying unemployment benefits. Any unused funds would have to be returned to the Treasury to the credit of the Federal unemployment account when the State was no longer eligible to receive a grant.

Section 302 would amend section 904 (h) of title IX of the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to authorize the appropriation to the Federal unemployment account of the proceeds of the Federal unemployment tax collected prior to December 31, 1950, less the amount expended for administrative expenses.

TITLE IV. EXTENSION OF DURATION OF BENEFITS IN CRITICAL UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS

Title IV of the bill would add a new title to the Social Security Act—title XIV—which would provide for an extension of the duration of benefits in critical unemployment areas. The program would be administered by the States, and the Federal Government would reimburse the States for the benefits paid under this title. In brief, title XIV of the Social Security Act, as amended, would provide:

Section 1401 would define certain basic terms used in this title.

Section 1402 would authorize the Secretary of Labor on behalf of the United States, upon the request of the Governor of any State, to enter into an agreement with such State which would provide for the prolongation of benefits of insured workers up to 52 weeks in their benefit year in any labor market area—as defined by the Secretary of Labor—in which during each of the immediately preceding three calendar months unemployment exceeded 12 percent of the average monthly covered employment in the State during the preceding calendar year. Insured workers would be entitled to receive benefits for such extended period of time only if they were last employed in such area and had resided therein for at least 26 weeks. Extended benefits would terminate as soon as the Secretary found that unemployment of insured individuals had fallen below the 12 percent figure during each of the three immediately preceding calendar months.

Section 1403 would make the pertinent provisions of title XIII of the Social Security Act—reconversion unemployment benefits for seamen—applicable to the administration of this title and for reimbursing States for the additional sums expended for benefits under this title.

TITLE V. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL WORKERS

Title V of the bill would add a new title to the Social Security Act—title XV—which would provide for unemployment compensation benefits for Federal employees. In general, the program would be administered by the States, as agents of the Federal Government, pursuant to agreements entered into between the States and the Secretary of Labor. In the absence of such an agreement with any State, the program would be administered by the Secretary of Labor. Federal employees would enjoy the same rights and be subject to the same disqualifications as provided by the unemployment compensation law of the State where they last performed Federal services. The Government would either advance or reimburse the States for the sums necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. The States would be entitled to additional grants under title III of the Social Security Act for the additional administrative expenses incurred as a result of administering this program. In brief, this title contains the following sections:

Section 1501 defines the terms "Federal services," "Federal wages," "Federal employee," and "benefits." The term "Federal employee" is defined to include any individual who has performed Federal services, including military services. The term "Federal services" is defined to exclude services performed by an elective officer in the executive or legislative branches of the Government.

Section 1502 would require the various branches of the Federal Government to make available to the Secretary of Labor, or to the appropriate State agency administering this title, such information as the Secretary of Labor finds is practicable and necessary to determine a Federal employee's entitlement to benefits.

Section 1503 would authorize the Secretary of Labor to enter into agreements with any State whereby the State would act as an agent of the Federal Government in the administration of this title. A Federal employee would be entitled to receive benefits on the same terms and be subject to the same disqualifications as are provided by the State law where such employee last performed Federal services. Federal employees who last performed services outside any State would have their rights determined under the law of the State of their residence. In the absence of an agreement with any State, the Secretary of Labor would administer the payment of benefits in the same amounts, on substantially the same terms, and subject to substantially the same conditions as though such an agreement had been entered into with the State.

Section 1504 contains provisions for the adjustment of benefits in cases of employees who would qualify for benefits under this title as well as under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Section 1505 provides that Federal employees shall have the same right to have their benefit determinations reviewed by appropriate State administrative and judicial tribunals as other employees covered by the State law; that States shall be entitled to receive grants under title III of the Social Security Act for their expenses incurred in the administration of this program, and that the States shall furnish such information to the Secretary of Labor as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

Section 1506 provides for reimbursing the States, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, for the amount of benefits paid by the States under this title.

Section 1507 provides that a Federal employee would not be entitled to receive unemployment-compensation benefits until he has exhausted any accrued annual leave, whether or not paid in a lump sum.

Section 1508 authorizes an appropriation of the necessary funds to carry out the purposes of this title.

Section 1509 authorizes the Secretary of Labor to issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of titles IV and V of this bill.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED UNEMPLOYMENT-INSURANCE AMENDMENTS

In his state of the Union message, the President said with respect to unemployment insurance:

> I also urge that the Congress strengthen our unemployment-compensation law to meet present-day needs more adequately. The economic downturn of the past year was the first real test that our system of unemployment insurance has had to meet. That test has proved the wisdom of the system, but it has also made strikingly apparent the need for improving its operation and increasing its coverage and its benefits.

In his budget message, the President outlined more specifically the recommendations he would make with respect to amending the Federal unemployment-compensation legislation. This bill, although not the administration proposal, with a few exceptions, embodies the President's proposals.

The proposal provides additional minimum standards which State laws must meet as a condition for Federal approval in order that employers may receive credit against the Federal unemployment tax for their contributions under such State unemployment-insurance laws. Certain standards are already required in the Federal legislation. The additional standards proposed are designed to assure that unemployed workers will receive a minimum of protection, no matter what State unemployment-insurance law they come under. The State laws must provide at least this much protection; they will be free to provide more adequate protection. These new standards would not have to be met until July 1, 1952, in order to give the States time to make such changes in their next regular legislative sessions.

With respect to benefit amount, the States would be required to pay 50 percent of the former weekly wages up to a maximum of at least $30 a week for totally unemployed individuals without dependents, with supplementary allowances for dependents up to 70 percent of weekly wages or at least $42 a week as a maximum for individuals with three or more dependents. At present, the highest benefit paid by any State not paying dependents' allowances is $27 a week and 19 States have a maximum benefit of $30 a week or less. Ohio now pays maximum benefits of $25 a week for persons without dependents and a maximum of $30 a week for persons with dependents.

The measure would require that benefits be paid for a duration of 26 weeks to all persons who remain unemployed that long. This standard at present is

met only by the State of New York, although 14 other States pay up to a maximum of 26 weeks, depending on the amount of previous employment or wages. Ohio pays up to a maximum of 26 weeks, but duration varies from 12 to 26 weeks, depending on former earnings.

The proposal would place certain limitations on the disqualifications which the States could impose. A State could impose a maximum of 6 weeks' disqualification for voluntary quitting, discharge for misconduct, or refusal of suitable employment. Ohio disqualifies for a maximum of 4 weeks for voluntary quitting and disqualification for misconduct, but with respect to refusal of suitable employment Ohio disqualifies for the duration of the unemployment. The bill would permit postponement but not reduction nor cancellation of benefit rights by the amount of the disqualification. About a third of the States reduce or cancel benefit rights in connection with such disqualifications. Ohio reduces benefits with respect to voluntary quitting and discharge for misconduct. Ohio is therefore in some respects more lenient and in some respect more stringent than the proposed standard.

The bill would also limit disqualification in case of labor disputes to unemployment due to strikes. Ohio is one of the nine States which would conform with this limitation, since it does not disqualify for unemployment due to lock-outs.

The present restriction of coverage of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to employers of eight or more persons would be removed by the bill. At present 29 States cover smaller firms than 8 or more, Ohio covering employers of 3 or more. However, the States have held back on extending coverage to small firms until the Federal Government leads the way. Most of the States have passed provisions which would automatically extend the coverage of their laws when the coverage of the Federal tax is extended. The bill would supply the Federal leadership in covering the small firms.

The measure follows H. R. 6000, which amends Federal old-age and survivors insurance, with respect to certain other extensions of coverage, namely coverage of border-line agricultural workers and a new definition of employee. These new definitions are the result of exhaustive study by the Committee on Ways and Means and will result in a more equitable definition of who is covered by the act.

The bill also provides for unemployment benefits for unemployed Federal workers, both those who have been in civilian and military service. Benefits would be paid according to the laws of the States in which the Federal employee worked or was resident.

In title II of the act it is provided that all the proceeds from the Federal unemployment tax would be automatically appropriated to be used for unemployment-insurance purposes. The first call on these funds would be for grants to the States to defray their costs of administering unemployment insurance and the employment service, and the balance would be accumulated as a reserve to provide for reinsurance grants to those States in jeopardy of exhausting their unemployment funds.

In addition to the present requirements which States must meet in order to receive grants for administration, the bill would require the States to provide effective procedures for the prevention, detection, and adjudication of fraud and to cooperate in interstate plans for the payment of benefits to interstate workers.

Reinsurance grants would be made to States whose reserves have dropped below the previous 6 months' benefit costs. The grants would be equal to three-fourths of the benefit cost in excess of 2 percent of taxable pay rolls. In order to assure prudent financing on the part of the States, a State applying for reinsurance must have established a minimum contribution rate of 1.2 percent of taxable pay rolls when its reserve fell below 6 percent of taxable pay rolls or 2 years' benefit expenditures.

A Lesson for Truman to Learn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Lesson for Truman to Learn," published in the Williamsport Sun for February 13.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LESSON FOR TRUMAN TO LEARN

A picture of Abraham Lincoln and his son, Tad, has been distributed by the United States Savings Bonds Division of the Treasury Department. It tells its own story, and teaches its own important lesson.

It is a famous drawing of the martyred President which has become popular because it has a tone of warmth and security about it. How trustingly the lad turns to his father for explanation of the book they are reading! How much the picture seems to speak of home life and parental concern for the boy's future welfare!

The text which the Savings Bonds Division has written under the picture is important, too. It emphasizes the value of thrift. It stresses the importance of frugality, of living within one's income, of laying aside regularly a portion of one's earnings against "a rainy day." It commends private initiative and lauds both ambition and resourcefulness.

It says that comfort and security, a home and education, are "the heritage of every child." Such who have attained this heritage heretofore have done so by habits of thrift and careful living.

All this the Treasury Department applauds. Then, it adds the wise counsel that future security—a home and education—"can be attained through a regular and automatic investment in United States Savings Bonds."

That is good advice. And it would be well for more people to heed it.

But we find ourselves wondering whether, by the remotest chance, this Treasury Department sales talk on thrift and savings has come to the attention of President Truman. We believe that it contains a lesson for him, and for those around him who seem to find it so easy to spend money.

If thrift and systematic saving are so desirable for individuals, why does not the Federal Government practice it? If savings bonds are to guarantee happier and better futures for the children of this generation, then the Federal Government needs to operate on a balanced budget and in a condition of solvency which will assure the soundness of its investments.

If the people are to turn over their savings to the Federal Government through the purchase of its bonds, then the Truman administration is obligated to restrain its spendthrift inclinations and to conduct public affairs in a manner designed to win public confidence.

It is well for the Treasury Department to urge the purchase of savings bonds. But President Truman must remember that, when people invest money, they look at the balance sheet. They want evidence of solvency. Annual deficits running into billions of dollars do not encourage investors.

That is a lesson for President Truman to learn.

Greetings by Commander in Chief Lewis, Congressional Dinner, February 15, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is a pleasure for me to include a splendid, inspiring, and effective speech made by Clyde A. Lewis, national commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in the greetings extended by him at the commander in chief's congressional dinner, Hotel Statler, the evening of February 15, 1950:

Secretary of Labor Tobin, Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives, Gen. Omar Bradley, and distinguished senior officers of the armed forces of the United States, national officers, department commanders, and comrades of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I bid you welcome.

It is an honor for me, on behalf of my organization, to greet such a distinguished body of leaders of our American governmental, military, and civil life. I am impressed by the fact that yours is a trust of unbounded opportunity and great influence in our Republic.

It has been the pleasure of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for the last two decades to hold the traditional dinner—we please to call it the congressional dinner—because it is given in honor of the Members of Congress who have served in the armed forces of the United States. We think it a splendid opportunity to meet the honorable gentlemen from the Hill, most of whom were once our buddies, our comrades in arms, and our shipmates—veterans all.

I should like at the outset of our program to reaffirm our pledge that this gathering is not—I repeat not—for the purpose of talking veterans business or official "shop," but rather to break bread and, if the spirit moves us, to have a small libation together, all in the spirit of comradeship.

In my 75,000 miles of travel during the past 6 months as an official and commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I find our people intensely interested in the general aspects of our foreign affairs, our national defense, and in the state of the Union. Daily I am impressed by the keen interest of the people because, to my view, it means that democracy is functioning definitely at the "grass roots level." My observation is that our freedom-loving citizens want to know more than ever before just where they are going and what will be their status when they get there. For, as they proceed, so proceeds the Republic.

They sense that ominous political forces are loose in the world; they feel that the atomic era has brought us all to a crossroads in the history of mankind, and furthermore, the turn we are making, or should make, is a critical one for the United States, and possibly for the entire world.

There is something else I find the people are deeply sensible of and that is that the United States holds the leadership, whether we like it or not, of the so-called democratic bloc of nations. And gentlemen, your constituents believe with all their hearts that this bloc holds the greatest hope for all of humanity. The faith of the people in democracy is great.

Most of our people are truly thankful that in our native land is found the greatest abundance of the good things of life ever known to the average man in all the melancholy history of civilization—the most precious of them being liberty and the opportunity to pursue happiness and prosperity. This trust and faith of the people is an inspiring fact.

Never have our people placed such high value on competent leadership in national and international affairs. This is easily explained—because the people feel that only by the wisdom, the resoluteness, and the courage of our leaders will we be able to fulfill our destiny and thereby play our great part among the Nations of the earth.

We of the Veterans of Foreign Wars pledge ourselves to uphold those measures you leaders take for the good of the United States in general: a strong national defense and a realistic foreign policy. We believe peace may be maintained only by a strong defense and a realistic foreign policy. But a weak defense, any major loss of United States sovereignty, a flabby foreign policy and an impairment of the Constitution of the United States is, in our considered judgment, the quickest road to involvement in war. The VFW does not believe in peace at any price; it must be peace with honor.

Finally, permit me to say that because you gentlemen, our guests, are confronted with a multitudinous number of grave problems, the solution of which is of highest importance to our beloved Nation we thank you again for taking some of your valuable time to join us here at a dinner given by veterans for veterans.

Gentlemen, we are profoundly honored.

A Real Answer to "Methodism's Pink Fringe"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Herald, published by the First Methodist Church, of Peoria, Ill., entitled "Methodism's Pink Fringe":

"METHODISM'S PINK FRINGE"

What about it? The immediate and direct answer is that Methodism does not have one.

The article by Stanley High in the current issue of the Reader's Digest, bearing the above title, has provoked wide-spread discussion and has given many good Methodists a great deal of anxiety. Good Methodists do not like to have any reflection cast upon their church. They do not like to be numbered with those whose loyalty to basic American principles is subject to question. For these and many other sound reasons the publication of items like the Digest article is disturbing.

Let these Methodists who love their church cease worrying. There is, and there can be, no question of the loyalty and the sound common sense of the Methodist Church. It is probably the most thoroughly American institution in the country. It came into being as a direct result of the Revolutionary War—and from its inception has been American to the core. It always will be. Not in a narrow nationalistic sense—for it is also one of the greatest missionary agencies in the world. Sprung from the good earth of this great country, nurtured with the vigor of our American institutions—it has given back to this country an unsurpassed devotion, its purpose and prayer being best expressed in the familiar words: "America, America, God shed His grace on thee, and crown thy good with brotherhood, from sea to shining sea."

But the Methodist Church has no patent on the name, or rather the word "Methodist." It has been appropriated by many groups with various kinds of prefixes and suffixes. So, there are many organizations that somewhere in their title include the word "Methodist"; among them the Methodist Federation for Social Service. None of them should be identified with the Methodist Church, the official name of the church which was organized and established by John Wesley, and which is a duly incorporated body. What is more important, none of them, including the Methodist Federation for Social Service, has any right to speak for or in the name of the Methodist Church.

The only body that can speak for the Methodist Church is the general conference of the church, which is a delegated body whose membership is made up of delegates whose election begins with every local church in the denomination. The general conference meets every 4 years. It is to the Methodist Church what the Congress of the United States is to the Nation. It is the supreme legislative body of the church. Its actions and its pronouncements are regularly printed in a volume known as the Discipline of the Methodist Church. No other group, not even the Council of Bishops, can speak in the name of the church.

Methodism's official pronouncements upon social questions is found in paragraph 2020 of the Discipline of 1948. That pronouncement is as American as Yankee Doodle and as Christian as the Sermon on the Mount. Every intelligent Methodist should be familiar with it and will be proud of it. There is no other Methodist word and no other Methodist position upon current social matters and problems than that. There is therefore no pink fringe to Methodism.

Why did Stanley High write the article in the Digest? Only Stanley High can answer that question—but there is room for deduction. Probably Stanley High does not like some of the things that the federation has been saying; even more probable he does not like some of the spokesmen of the federation. Giving him full credit—it is likely that he does not like to see a great church suffer for some of the radical statements made by an organization that includes in its membership some of the most highly placed ministers and officers of the church. If that be true he has the support and gratitude of many thousands of the leading ministers and laymen of the church.

It is regrettable that an organization that, admittedly, deals with controversial issues, and that seeks radical changes in the economic and social life of the Nation, should appropriate the name of a great church even though its membership is made up almost entirely, if not exclusively, of members of that church. It ought to stand upon its own feet. Having said which it needs to be said that the members have every right to hold and espouse their own ideas on the problems and issues involved so long as they do so within the bounds of proper respect for law. About this there has been no question. In Voltaire's famous statement—we can differ with everything they say and yet defend their right to say it. But it ought not to be said in such a way as to convey the impression that a great church is saying it.

The conclusion of the whole matter is this: the Methodist Federation for Social Service is not the Methodist Church. It has no official connection with the Methodist Church. When it speaks it speaks only for itself.

There is no Methodism's pink fringe—and nobody knows that better than Stanley High.

W. T. S.

Faker Einstein Joins Communists in Attacking Judge Medina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on February 13 I inserted in the RECORD excerpts from the report of the Un-American Activities Committee showing a large number of Communist-front organizations that Albert Einstein, the alleged scientist, is now, or has been, mixed up with.

Now, I find that this same Albert Einstein has joined in filing a brief in the United States court of appeals, in New York, to reverse the decision of Judge Harold R. Medina for adjudging six Communist lawyers in contempt of court for their efforts to demoralize and intimidate the court and the jury during the trial of certain Communist for their treasonable efforts to overthrow this Government.

This information will probably come as a shock to the average American, for nobody ever heard of Albert Einstein being a lawyer before.

In order that no Member of Congress may be misled about this proposition, I am inserting at this point a column from page 16 of the New York Times of Tuesday, February 7, 1950, carrying the whole story, and showing that Albert Einstein is one of the signers of the petition to reverse the action of Judge Medina in punishing these communistic lawyers for their contemptible efforts to harass, disturb, and demoralize his court.

The article referred to reads as follows:

CIRCUIT COURT GETS RED LAWYERS' PLEA—DEFENSE SAYS MEDINA LACKED RIGHT TO IMPOSE CONTEMPT SENTENCES AFTER TRIAL

(By Russell Porter)

Six defense counsel at last year's Communist trial asked the United States circuit court of appeals yesterday to reverse Judge Harold R. Medina's action in convicting them of contempt of court.

After 2½ hours of defense argument, the case was adjourned until this morning, when the defense has asked for another hour and Government counsel for an hour. Pending completion of the argument, another stay of execution was granted on the 1-to-6-month prison sentences imposed by Judge Medina last October. The sentences were originally set to begin in November, but were stayed during appeal.

Eleven members of the Communist Party's American Politburo are also free on bail pending appeal from their conviction for criminal conspiracy to teach and advocate violent overthrow of the Government.

At the end of the 9-month trial Judge Medina immediately adjudged defense counsel guilty of wholesale contempt throughout the trial as part of a conspiracy to obstruct the administration of justice and sabotage the trial.

Eugene Dennis, the party's general secretary, who acted as his own counsel, was convicted in both groups. The other defense counsel held in contempt were Harry Sacher, of New York; A. J. Isserman, of Newark, N. J.; Louis F. McCabe, of Philadelphia; George W. Crockett, Jr., of Detroit; and Richard Gladstein, of San Francisco.

Paul L. Ross, of New York, Thomas D. McBride, of Philadelphia; and Charles J. Katz, of Hollywood, Calif., appeared yesterday as attorneys for defense counsel.

BAIL POWERS ARE LIMITED

They argued that Judge Medina's legal powers to impose summary punishment for contempt were restricted to immediate emergency action on contempts committed in his presence that would interfere with the administration of justice unless checked.

He had no right, they insisted, to take such action at the end of the trial, when there was no disturbance or other threat against the order of the court, or to do so because of an alleged conspiratorial agreement that obviously could not have been made in his presence.

The constitutional right of due process, they contended, required that any action at the end of the trial should have been taken after a hearing by an impartial judge.

In comments from the bench, Judge Jerome N. Frank sharply questioned defense arguments. Judge Frank pointed out that Judge Medina had repeatedly warned defense counsel during the trial that they were in contempt and that he was going to do something after the trial. It was obvious, Judge Frank added, that Judge Medina didn't mean he was merely going to write a nasty letter.

"The judge thought it would disrupt the trial if he sent them to jail during the trial," Judge Frank added.

Judge Frank raised the question whether Judge Medina's warnings were not equivalent to a judge's recognized power to impose judgments of contempt for various acts as they occurred, and to suspend sentence until after the trial.

As to the alleged conspiracy by defense counsel, Judge Frank asked if a judge who saw all the outward manifestations in his presence that such an agreement had been made, had not the right to draw inferences that it existed.

"Only after a hearing," Mr. Katz insisted.

SUFFICIENT VALUE OF HEARING

Judge Frank then asked what evidence could be adduced at such a hearing aside from defense denials of conspiracy.

"They are now getting a hearing before three judges," said Judge Frank. "If we find no reasonable judge could reach any other conclusion [than Judge Medina's] wouldn't it be foolish to send it back to another judge?"

Judge Frank asked whether any error that might have been committed in the district court wasn't a harmless one.

Mr. Katz replied that at a hearing defense counsel could explain their reasons, which did not appear in the trial record for doing and saying what they had said and done. He said they could bring evidence whether or not they had sneered at or badgered the judge as charged, and as to how loud they had argued.

Particularly in view of Judge Medina's charges that defense counsel had falsely accused him of racial discrimination and lack of integrity and had tried to impair his health, it was argued, another judge should have disposed of the case.

Mr. Ross denied there had been any conspiracy by defense counsel or that the individual instances cited by Judge Medina warranted punishment. He said defense counsel had only exercised their legal right to present their clients' case vigorously and persistently.

Several lawyers were allowed to file briefs as friends of the court. These briefs bore several hundred signatures, including those of Albert Einstein and Thomas Mann. Judge Augustus Hand, presiding, said the introduction of the briefs seemed very foolish, since they could not add anything to the legal arguments fully briefed by defense counsel.

Judge Frank raised the question whether these briefs were not intended merely to indicate a lot of people are rooting for the defendants.

Judge Charles E. Clark was the third member of the court.

Housing: The Political Football

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members, I wish to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a talk given by Clarence R. Knickman, a distinguished citizen of my district, on the subject of housing:

Many Federal, city and State officials have found that housing is a subject that the public is sympathetic with and very much confused about. The peoples' sympathies are being exploited; hence housing is fast becoming the biggest give-away program in the country.

Low-cost housing and tax exemption started under the heading of slum clearance but every conceivable subterfuge has sprouted from this and is gaining momentum, and if unchecked, will result in full-scale socialized housing.

The backbone of good American citizenship is home ownership. What incentives can a family have for home ownership when they realize that the more tax-exempt housing that is created, the larger is the home owners tax burden. What incentive will investors have to build rental housing when Government subsidises construction that is tax free in competition with and at the expense of higher taxes of private owned and operated properties.

Up to the present time there existed an emergency; that emergency is definitely over. There are plenty of vacant houses and vacant apartments. Apartment-house owners have started offering 1 and 2 months' concessions in order to try to fill their vacancies. These vacant apartments are for families earning $3,500 annually and up. Advertisements in the newspapers also offer free moving expenses for prospective tenants. That is the condition now, but in addition to these vacancies there are many thousands of additional apartments in the New York metropolitan area under construction, and many thousands more planned and approved for immediate start in the spring.

Some of our legislators and housing officials are trying to enact legislation permitting families earning up to $9,500 per year to live in tax-exempt housing; just think of such an outrage, when the average home owner and legitimate rent payer whose tax will increase because all these tax exemptions, earns only about one-half of that income.

There now exists city owned public housing, tax-exempt renting at $8 per room assisted by cash subsidies by the State and Federal Governments. Also city owned middle-income housing at $17 per room tax exempt. Tax exemption is also granted on redevelopment housing. It is also granted on limited-dividend housing both for rental and cooperative ownership. The latter is for private investors, such as organized groups, labor unions, etc. This limited-dividend housing is increasing rapidly. These groups realize the benefits their members can achieve in cooperative ownership and renting units in projects carrying tax exemption. Most of these groups who are enjoying these benefits consist of families high above the $3,500 income group.

When you stop to realize that at the present time one-fourth of the real estate in the city of New York is tax free ($6,000,000,000 is tax free). This, of course, includes city and Government-owned property within the city, institutions, churches, etc., but $216,000,000 of this is in tax-exempt public-housing redevelopment and limited dividend projects. This will increase considerably upon the development of the vast number of these projects now being planned and being voted on by the legislators.

The low-income group earning less than $3,500 is the group that needs help, and they are the only ones that should be helped.

The city of New York or any large municipality could make a very profitable investment through slum clearance by condemning slum areas or outmoded areas which now produce very little tax revenue. A good many of these sectors are very convenient to transportation. The city could readily auction this property off to private builders at low prices with a distinct agreement that low-cost rental housing be built thereon for families earning less than $3,500. The increase in taxes due to the building, plus the creation of new business areas surrounding these developments, would provide great income in additional taxes for the city.

It is a well established and proven fact that private enterprise builds cheaper than government, and private enterprise can operate and manage these properties with greater efficiency and economy. Elected and appointed Government officials should go all out to cooperate and assist private builders who are really the creators of the source from which taxes are derived.

Home purchase should be encouraged. Home ownership is the American way of life; it is the American's dream.

Reduce carrying charges on new home ownership. This will create a building boom and all talk of housing shortage will vanish. At present the city of New York assesses new homes much higher than the old ones. Why discriminate between the outs and the ins? Partial exemption on small, new one- and two-family houses would go a long way in reducing monthly carrying charges.

Further reduction in carrying charges could be made by using semiliquidating mortgages. Why make a new house prospect liquidate his entire mortgage in 15 to 20 years? A well-built house, well kept, will have great value after this period. Write a mortgage for 15 years semiliquidating. Most of these owners will have achieved enough success to pay the balance at that time. If not, this mortgage could be renewed for the balance and for a period commensurate with the condition of the house and with the owner's ability to pay. At this time if the mortgagee wants his money, the remaining mortgage would be a conservative investment for any mortgagee.

Rent control is no solution to the problem of providing low-income groups with adequate housing. Most of the controlled rental units are in old buildings where rents are very low. Many of the tenants in these controlled units have achieved great success and greater incomes, but their controlled rental unit is a protected franchise which when once surrendered can never be regained. So, no matter how inconvenient or undesirable it might be to the higher-income family, selfishness prevents his releasing it to some family who could not afford better. Rent control creates such inequities between the outs and the ins, that it cannot be justified.

I repeat again, the emergency is over—let's solve these problems with some sound, common-sense thinking.

Alternative to Atomic Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Alternative to Atomic Chaos" from the Christian Century of February 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALTERNATIVE TO ATOMIC CHAOS

CAN this atomic arms race toward universal destruction be stopped? Apparently neither Truman nor his State Department is greatly concerned whether it is stopped or not. They accept passively the stalemate in the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, which has brought atomic control negotiations to a halt. They will not even act on the silly dispute over Chinese representation on the Commission to get the negotiations started again. They are adamant against direct exchanges with Stalin. They insist on the Baruch control plan, even though the props were knocked from under that plan when the American monopoly of atomic weapons ended. But they think public fatalism has produced such widespread apathy that there will be no serious pressure for any change in official policy. So that policy is to make the most terrible bombs possible as quickly as possible, and for the rest to let things drift along and see what happens.

So far only one national leader has challenged this drift toward disaster. To be sure, Senator VANDENBERG and a dozen scientists who helped start the atomic arms race have suggested that the United Nations be assured that, after we have produced a hydrogen bomb, we will never use it except in retaliation. But that sort of assurance will never stop an arms race—especially since we did drop atomic bombs on Japan without any necessity whatever. Washington rumors hint that David E. Lilienthal may have something important to say on this atomic arms race after he gives up the chairmanship of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. At this writing, however, Mr. Lilienthal is still gagged by his official position. Only one national leader has spoken the truth as to where the atomic arms race is taking us and coupled with that truth a proposal both statesmanlike and Christian as to how to stop it. But that courageous speaker is the one Member of Congress who knows most about what is at stake.

On February 2, hard on the heels of President Truman's order to the AEC to continue work on the H-bomb, Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, made a speech in the Senate freighted with destiny for the Nation and for all mankind. Senator MCMAHON, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of both Houses of Congress, knows as much as any living man about the nature of the atomic arms race, where it has carried us thus far and where it is headed. His speech should be read word by word. It should be studied clause by clause, in every high school, college, editorial office, discussion club, public affairs group, adult Bible class, ministers' meeting, radio forum or other place where citizens consult together in the United States.[1] If the newspaper in your town has not printed the McMahon speech in full, ask it to do so, making sure that enough citizens endorse the suggestion to give it maximum weight with your newspaper publisher.

I

Every thoughtful citizen, on reading the McMahon speech, will see at once that here is the first proposal for dealing with the atomic arms race commensurate with the urgency of the crisis this race has produced. Senator MCMAHON began by agreeing that under present circumstances President Truman had no choice but to approve production of the hydrogen bomb. He went on, however, to point out that this insures that the Russians will build a similar bomb and that any military advantage we may gain by building the H-bomb first will be short-lived.

"Let me warn, with all the solemnity at my command, that building hydrogen bombs does not promise positive security for the United States; it only promises the negative result of averting, for a few months or years, well-nigh certain catastrophe."

"We are plunged into a truly terrible arms race," the Senator warned his colleagues. What can be done about it? There are only two choices. The United States can go on with the cold war, as President Truman seems content to do. But "5,000 years of history" teach that will end in another world war—this time, a hydrogen war. Moreover, maintaining the cold war is undermining liberty in this country, and if we keep it up in terms of an atomic arms race "We will find ourselves more and more compelled to imitate the totalitarian rival." Liberty, as well as human survival, is at stake.

Our only other choice is to move heaven and earth to stop the atomic armaments race. How? We must regard no suggestion as too startling or unconventional for careful consideration. And we must be guided, disciplined, and inspired by our code of ethics, and democratic peace-loving decencies. The Baruch plan, when originally proposed, was such a pioneering and morally acceptable policy. But it failed to win the concurrence of the Russians. Today, with the American monopoly of atomic weapons broken, it is obsolete. So we must try again. "It is my intense conviction," said Mr. MCMAHON, "that our decision, born of necessity, to build the hydrogen bomb, must be accompanied by the immediate initiation of a moral crusade for peace having far greater potential effect than any physical weapon, even chunks of the sun. Otherwise we would deal a severe blow both to our moral position and to our fervent hopes for a secure future."

To make this new proposal succeed where the Baruch plan failed, Senator MCMAHON pointed out, it must be made known to the Russian people and others behind the iron curtain and must be "sold" likewise to the peoples on this side of the iron curtain, our formal allies, who today are just about as afraid of where American atomic policy is heading as are the Russians. In this latter observation, the Senator was making the same point the Christian Century has tried on many past occasions to emphasize. (See, for example, Let's Change the Voice of America, December 14, 1949.) He insisted that until the American people spend more on trying to make their peace proposals known to others than they spend on advertising cosmetics, they cannot pretend even to themselves that they are seriously tackling this problem. The Connecticut Senator advanced various thought-provoking specific suggestions as to how to go about this task of penetrating other minds—particularly Russian minds.

"At almost any cost we must assure that the Russian people have opportunity to consider, side by side, the atomic proposals of their own rulers and our atomic proposals—and that the Russian people act as part of the world jury which brings in a verdict concerning this monumental issue."

Then Senator MCMAHON tackled the key question as to what the United States proposal for control of A-bombs and H-bombs should be if the atomic arms race is to be stopped. It must, he insisted, provide for "strict control of raw materials, strict control of plants, and continuous inspection." Walter Lippmann interprets this to mean that the Senator was still calling for Russian acceptance of the outdated Baruch plan. The words, to be sure, do conform to the general structure of that plan, but they do not necessarily involve adherence to its details. In the interest of good faith, however, Senator MCMAHON should, if he intends to push any plan involving continuous inspection of plants by an international body—which would include Russian representatives—ask the Senate to adopt a prior resolution affirming its readiness to ratify such an agreement. One reason the Baruch plan failed was because few believed that, if adopted by the UN, the Senate would ever have given it the two-thirds majority required by treaties.

Whatever provisions are proposed to set up effective atomic controls, Senator MCMAHON made clear his belief that these must be accompanied by certain constructive and imagination-stirring proffers on a scale of generosity sufficient to induce other nations and peoples to accept the necessary international controls. It was at that point that Senator MCMAHON sketched the idea which captured the headlines in the daily press. "Let this Nation," he said, "offer to spend for the next 5 years two-thirds of its present military outlay—that is, $10,000,000,000 a year for 5 years—on giving substance to

[1] The full text of the speech is to be found in the New York Times for February 3, or may be obtained from Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

President Truman's point 4 idea, on developing peaceful uses of atomic energy, and on giving scientific aid to all nations, including Russia.

The $50,000,000,000 would not be given without conditions. It must be matched by acceptance of the conditions for an effective UN control of the production of atomic weapons and by an undertaking on the part of the other nations that they likewise would divorce two-thirds of their present spending on armaments to the constructive ends outlined by Senator McMAHON. But with any such devotion of resources during the next 5 years to raising the living standards of all mankind—and Senator McMAHON hinted, out of the great knowledge he possesses as chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, at productive triumphs of breath-taking immensity which are now within reach—the tension and fear now harrying the nations toward disaster can be lifted. Then the atomic arms race will end. Then mankind will recover the opportunities of peace.

Senator McMAHON had no illusions as to the difficulty of winning the Russians to acceptance of such a proposal. But difficulties are something to be tackled, not bowed to in despair. He had no illusions, moreover, as to the fatalistic cynicism with which his proposal policy will be greeted by some Americans. But he asked that those who reject this plan for ending the arms race bring forward a better one. "In 1945 and 1946, when our thoughts were focused upon the Hiroshima bomb, we enjoyed an opportunity to wage atomic peace that somehow—despite the magnificence and generosity of our proposal to the United Nations—we did not fully exploit. Our present concern with the hydrogen bomb furnishes a second opportunity. I do not think a third will be given us."

II

There, for the present, Senator McMAHON left his proposal. It was as much warning as proposal—warning based on the immense knowledge he possesses. And it was as much appeal as warning. It was an appeal to his fellow Members in Congress. It was an appeal to the President of the United States and to the State Department. It was an appeal to Stalin, to the government of the Soviet Union and to the Russian people. It was an appeal to the conscience and the moral courage of all mankind. Is such an appeal to be allowed to drop into obscurity? Is it to molder in the files of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD until those files disappear in a hydrogen blast along with the other works of man? Is public apathy, murmuring at the approach of catastrophe but accepting it as inescapable, to let this appeal "echo away into silence as though it had never been"? That is the question which now confronts the American public, and particularly the American churches.

Senator McMAHON did not present his proposal as the final word by which to end the atomic arms race. He did not claim for it any such plenary inspiration as the administration has tried to impute to the Baruch plan in the meetings of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. We believe, for example, that the McMAHON plan could be strengthened at the point of immediate action if it included the proposal of the American Friends Service Committee for an interim sealing of atomic stockpiles by the United Nations pending the conclusion of permanent agreements for atomic disarmament. We see no reason why Senator McMAHON should not incorporate that Quaker suggestion in his program. Details of the policy toward which Mr. McMAHON is pointing are all to be worked out—and that is one of its signs of wisdom.

But the McMAHON speech should have important historical consequences. First, because it shows how many possibilities for ending the atomic arms race and using the new powers of atomic fission for constructive purposes are still unexplored. Second, because by showing this and by the boldness and imagination of its proposals it may arouse the people from the apathy into which they have sunk as atomic devastation has drawn ever closer. Third, because it should make it extremely difficult—in fact, well-nigh impossible—for White House and State Department to go on talking piously about the reluctance with which they are pushing the atomic arms race while they do nothing positive to stop it.

Nations, legislatures, citizens—we have had our warning and we have heard an eleventh-hour appeal. The warning and the appeal have come from the man in Congress who knows best the awful fate in store if this atomic arms race is not soon stopped. But the warning and the appeal have been pointed with a promise: "If the proposal were actually accepted, we would have concluded the cheapest monetary bargain in our history; we would have probably saved mankind from destruction by fire; and we would have paved the way toward a new era of unimagined abundance for all men, based upon atomic energy constructively harnessed." The voice of prophecy on the floor of the United States Senate. Will the churches give the prophet the irresistible support he deserves!

"He Belongs to the Ages"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Morgan, from the Boston Sunday Globe of February 12, 1950:

"HE BELONGS TO THE AGES"

LINCOLN'S MEMORY NEVER MORE ALIVE THAN TODAY WHEN OUR POLICY MAKERS NEED TO DRAW LESSONS FROM HIS AGELESS PRINCIPLES

(By James Morgan)

It is five and eighty years since Edwin M. Stanton is said to have turned from the death bed of Abraham Lincoln with the remark, "Now, he belongs to the ages." We, in our time, can bear witness to the truth of that prophecy attributed to the Secretary of War. For the memory of Lincoln never was more alive than it is on this anniversary of his birth.

Yet, the issues with which Lincoln directly dealt are dead. That human slavery ever existed in the United States is all but unbelievable to us. Secession no longer is a debatable question and southerners would not reverse the verdict of the Civil War. All Americans are Unionists now, when the Blue and the Gray, like the Red and the White in the War of the Roses, awaken only echoes of—

"* * * old, unhappy, far-off things
And battles long ago."

Nevertheless, Lincoln is no ghostly figure of a dead past, but a living presence. The reason for this needs to be understood by our policy makers today, who are too easily satisfied with expedients to serve the moment. Lincoln checked and double-checked his course at every step with an American tradition and an enduring, universal principle. He did not see the grave crisis of his time as an isolated incident but as part of the never-ending, world-wide struggle for freedom. Hence, now, when government by the people stands challenged the globe around, there is no truer spokesman among the living for liberty in all lands than this voice from the grave.

Why he belongs to the ages

Lincoln foretold the larger, enduring significance of the war for the Union in his second annual message in 1862, when he sounded the warning, "We cannot escape history * * * no personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we are passing will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation * * * we shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth."

Stanton was by no means alone among the contemporaries of Lincoln in perceiving that he belonged to the ages. Even while the corpse of the assassinated President was borne across the country, Ralph Waldo Emerson told his mourning Concord neighbors, "The weight and penetration of many passages in his letters, messages, and speeches, hidden now by the very closeness of their application to the moment, are destined hereafter to wide fame." A few weeks later in that same year, 1865, James Russell Lowell dared to predict in his commemoration ode at Harvard:

"Great captains, with their guns and drums,
Disturb our judgment for the hour,
But, at last, silence comes;
Then all are gone and, standing like a tower,
Our children shall behold his fame,
The kindly, earnest, brave, farseeing man,
Sagacious, patient, dreading praise, not blame,
New birth of our new soil the first American."

Our leaders in Washington could profit by taking thought of Lincoln's method in meeting the questions that crowded upon him. He met them with no snap judgments or impromptu answers in press conferences. He took them, one by one, into the laboratory of his deep spiritual nature, and to that sanctuary this prairie mystic admitted no man.

The still, small voice

The more momentous decisions of Lincoln's life on the national stage were made in the solitude of the secret places of his inner self. Unknown to anyone, he took his stand in the "house divided against itself" speech, which logically led him into the great debate with Douglas and, finally, to the Presidency. In a retreat within himself, he selected his Cabinet and wrote his inaugural. Against the advice of all but one of the members of his Cabinet, he determined in a sleepless night to provision Fort Sumter and thereby accept the fateful challenge to war.

When he surprised his counselors with the Emancipation Proclamation, he told them that he was not asking their opinion of the measure itself, because already he was pledged to it in a compact with God. A gnawed penholder is treasured as the only witness to the anxious care that weighed upon him while, unseen, he prepared that historic document. In the same hidden recesses, he thought out his immortal Gettysburg Address, which told in 2 minutes the greater, the timeless meaning of the war to save the Union, that "Government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

I do not wish to give the false impression that Lincoln acted without advice. No President ever listened to more of it. It was only after he had heard all sides of an argument that he retired within himself, weighed the conflicting answers in the scales of his conscience and his common sense and formed his judgment in quietude.

Few Presidents, if any, have had the patience of mind, the strength of body, and the good humor to bear with the wrangling that raged about him in the Cabinet and among the Senators, Representatives, and Governors who stormed in upon him. Throwing his door wide open to Tom, Dick, and Harry 4 days a week, he called these receptions to the unknown and unprivileged his public-opinion baths, in which he said he was renovated and reinvigorated. "No hours of my day," he insisted, "are better employed than those which bring me again within the direct contact and the atmosphere of the average of the whole people * * * they renew in me a clearer and more vivid image of that great popular assemblage out of which I sprang and to which I must return."

Two Lincolns

This seemingly most gregarious of men in the gallery of our history really went through life alone, with no chum in boyhood, no confidant in manhood. There was the outer Lincoln, the plain, simple, small-town man, who milked his cow, bedded his horse, went to market with a basket on his arm, and sat on a box at the foot of his office stairs, telling stories to a group of street loiterers. There was the circuit-riding lawyer who, tilted back in his chair, set on roar a crowd in a country tavern. Even his closest associates caught only glimpses of the poet, dreamer, idealist, prophet, who pondered within those somewhat grotesque externals.

It is this duality which has baffled the attempts to reenact on the stage the most dramatic life in our biography. These depict but the shell of the man. It is Hamlet, without the soliloquizing, soul-searching, melancholy Dane. There is yet to appear a playwright capable of dramatizing the thought, the spirit concealed within the outer Lincoln.

The key to the secret of the power in this man's memory was given by himself in his explanation of the lasting, widespread influence of the Declaration of Independence. He said of the framers of that manifesto, what may as truly be said of him, that they reached far out into the future and sought to place a stumbling block in the path of every form of tyranny everywhere in all time. They aimed, Lincoln said at Independence Hall while on his way to his inauguration, to "give liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world for all future time * * * that the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men and that all should have an equal chance."

Lincoln and the cold war

Today, we are involved in a cold war, and we can win it if we will only keep cool. Lincoln did not lose his temper when all about him were losing theirs in the bitterness of a family quarrel. Should we not be equal to holding onto ours in this controversy with an alien antagonist in another hemisphere?

His adversaries could not provoke Lincoln into recrimination or into any retort. Whenever we let the propagandists of Moscow incite us to bandy epithets with them we surrender the initiative and are thrown on the defensive. We play their game, with the inevitable result that they win and we lose a trick.

While we are talking back at Moscow, we are wasting time at Washington which should be given to thinking out what we stand for, instead of telling only what we are against. For lack of a positive policy we rely on scares to rally Congress and the country in support of negative policies. Not fear but courage should be our weapon in this war of nerves. Let us observe this birthday of the man who belongs to the ages by following his example of upholding principles that are ageless.

Migratory Farm Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the conditions under which millions of migrant farm workers and their families work and live—and travel from one part of the country to another seeking work—are a long-standing national disgrace.

On October 26, 1949, I wrote our President, Harry S. Truman, as follows:

OCTOBER 26, 1949.

THE PRESIDENT,
THE WHITE HOUSE.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Having entered politics because of my anxiety to do something in behalf of migratory farm workers, I have continued to be concerned with their welfare and that of all farm workers, throughout the period of my political activity.

We have been much concerned in recent years with maintaining and stabilizing farm income but we have done nothing to stabilize the work or income of farm labor, except the hope that some of the money at the top would trickle down—an idea that we Democrats have never felt would work.

In addition we have established, and are preparing to extend, the system of social security. But we have left the farm worker out. We have given industrial workers the benefit of the National Labor Relations Act, but exclude the farm worker from its benefits.

I believe that we should give the farm worker some of the attention he deserves, and I wish to join those who have recommended to you the appointment of a commission to investigate agricultural labor. Such a commission could perform a major service which has been left almost neglected until now.

Yours sincerely,

HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS.

On November 5 the President replied to that letter as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 5, 1949.

Hon. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: Your letter of October 26 with reference to the problems of migratory farm workers raises several questions concerning complex areas in our national economy.

The Department of Labor is currently exploring the feasibility of recommending the establishment of a Presidential commission to investigate the problems of agricultural labor, and I am sure that in case such a commission is established the problems of adequate income to which you specifically refer will be one of the basic matters for its consideration.

Please be assured that I deeply realize the fact that agricultural workers present a special problem in our economic pattern and that I shall continue my efforts to alleviate the difficulties of this important group of the American people.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

Last August I obtained from the State Department the text of the international agreement between our Nation and Mexico providing for the admission of Mexican farm workers in such amounts as the United States Employment Service certified as necessary to meet labor shortages in the various States.

On September 2, September 8, and again on October 11, 1949, I wrote Secretary of Labor Tobin, requesting that I be kept currently informed of the number of such certifications, the actual recruitment figures, and the number of workers returned to Mexico.

Since then, I have received periodic reports. The latest of these, dated December 14, 1949, covering the period August 1 through December 2, 1949, shows—

Number of Mexican workers requested and certified as needed	209,690
Cancellations	12,410
Number actually employed under contract	98,408

Of these 98,408, about 78,000 were Mexicans illegally in the country who were legalized under the international agreement; 20,625 were actually imported from Mexico under the agreement up to December 2, 1949.

These figures are derived from the following letter from Robert C. Goodwin, Director of the Bureau of Employment Security, United States Department of Labor, who administers the United States Employment Service:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1949.

Hon. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: In accordance with my letter to you of November 7, I am listing below the transactions in the importation of Mexican nationals for agricultural employment in the United States for the period ending December 2, 1949:

State	Imports of Mexican nationals as of Dec. 2, 1949		Record of contracting as of Dec. 2, 1949	
	Certifications, number of workers	Cancellations, number of workers	Number of "wetbacks" legalized	Importations from Mexico
Arizona	[illegible]	0	2,299	3,924
Arkansas	[illegible]	8,215	11,296	0
California	6,470	0	6,470	0
Colorado	2,025	0	0	134
Kentucky	[illegible]	0	57	0
Louisiana	1,915	0	1,[illegible]	0
Mississippi	9,554	4,341	1,624	0
Missouri	5,655	514	2,168	0
Montana	750	0	0	887
Nebraska	250	0		
New Mexico	15,[illegible]	1,064	8,[illegible]	8,[illegible]
Tennessee	[illegible]	0	111	0
Texas	[illegible]	[illegible]	30,[illegible]	9,363
Wyoming	[illegible]	0		

There is enclosed herewith, also, Form I-120a, issued by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which covers information of your interest, for the period ending September 30, 1949.

For other copies of this release of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, you should address Mr. Willard Kelly, Assistant Commissioner, Employment Division, United States Department of Justice, Washington 25, D. C.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. GOODWIN,
Director.

In recent months, traveling up and down and across our marvelously productive California valleys, I met people everywhere who were concerned over the

welfare of the migrant when the picking season would end. They were teachers, businessmen, farmers, doctors, welfare workers, and so forth. Everywhere one heard the refrain: "When the work in the fields comes to an end shortly, then the hunger will begin. How do we meet it? What do we do?"

The situation became so acute this winter that a conference was called in Fresno by the State department of public health. Before presenting the text of this report I insert in the RECORD an excerpt from an article in the San Francisco Chronicle of January 4, 1950:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of January 4, 1950]

THE HUNGRY WOMEN—HEALTH DIRECTOR CALLS PEOPLE'S BIG BOSS ON OUR BOW POLITIC

(By Stanton Delaplane)

The State board of health heard some plain talk about the migrant farm worker yesterday: His diseases and infant deaths, his unemployment and muddy shacks.

Bluntly, Dr. Wilton Halverson, State director of public health, declared, "This is primarily an economic problem; it had sore on our body politic. All we (the health department) are doing is applying a poultice."

Dr. Halverson believed that the boards of supervisors in the six San Joaquin Valley counties might take "a less restrictive policy" in applying public-health remedies to the 35,000 cotton pickers' families stranded in the valley by the annual season of unemployment.

In a sense, he returned the responsibility which county supervisors, welfare directors, and health officers tried to put upon the State at a 2-day meeting last week.

WARREN'S POSITION

The migrant farm picture, however, looked brighter than it has for some years as Governor Warren yesterday said the State would mobilize every agency to fight the problem of poor housing, poor health, and unemployment that is the annual hang-over of California's rich harvest.

With the huge demand for cotton pickers as California's new "4-42" cotton shot up to 1,500,000 bales, the bulk of the State migratory workers reach the end of the harvest trail in the Valley.

There they face a 3- to 4-month unemployment season until spring brings new crops to work.

Governor Warren said he would not ask emergency legislation in the March session of the legislature. But he said the situation again points up the need for including agricultural workers in the State unemployment insurance set-up. They do not have it now.

FRESNO MEETING

Last week, State agencies met with county officers at Fresno at the Governor's request to work on the migrant farm-labor problem.

The counties largely felt it was up to the State to provide funds and services for health, education, and relief.

An offer was made by the Federal Agricultural Department to distribute surplus foods in this year's emergency. At present, almost unlimited quantities of dried eggs and milk, apples, potatoes, and honey are surplus and available for a phone call.

To date, only Kern and Madera Counties have asked for surplus, both for potatoes.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT PLANS

The board of health yesterday heard department of health plans discussed by Dr. Ellis Sox who attended the joint meetings last week in Fresno.

Of prime importance, he said, was a study of the unknown infant diarrhea which accounted for 28 deaths, mainly among Mexican cotton-picker families, this year.

He thought much of this was due to lack of education and somewhat to restrictions on health services by the counties. A large number of migrants are not eligible for county medical service except in emergency because of short residence in the country.

It was recommended (if county supervisors approve) that (1) any illness in a child be classed as emergency and, therefore, admissible to county medical care; (2) pregnancy be classed as an emergency so that prenatal care can be given. At present only actual labor and delivery of the baby is classed as emergency.

Dr. Sox hit upon the economic theme again in reporting that the conference of health officers thought Federal social security should be extended to cover agricultural workers. But he said it would be a long pull to put over.

Mr. Speaker, the excellent report of the conference to which the Chronicle refers can well be a guide for the work of a Federal commission to study the problems of migratory labor. The text follows:

REPORT OF CONFERENCE ON HEALTH AND RELATED PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS, FRESNO, CALIF., DECEMBER 29, 1949

This conference was initiated by the State department of public health in order to appraise the various problems related to agricultural workers in the six southern San Joaquin Valley counties.

Included in this conference were representatives of local health departments and local official and voluntary agencies, which were present by invitation from the local health officers, as well as various State official and voluntary agencies, who were also invited to be present.

In addition to the general public health problems which face local health departments and the community generally, basic aspects such as the need of agricultural workers, their movements throughout the State, the responsibility of growers for sanitary facilities and housing, the better correlation of community activities in meeting this essentially local problem were discussed.

The conference was opened by a short general presentation of the problems to be considered and then was divided into two major sections, one on health and medical services and the other on housing and sanitation. The first major section was further divided into three subsections, one on health and medical facilities and services, the second on community organization and education, and the third on auxiliary services. These sectional reports were presented to the conference as a whole and were acted upon by the group.

The results of this conference have been discussed with Governor Warren and the State department of public health and other State agencies, as well as local agencies, have already initiated a program to meet many of these problems.

Following is the report of the sections of the conference, as acted upon by the conference as a whole, with a short résumé of progress made since December 29, 1949:

REPORT OF SUBSECTION OF HEALTH AND MEDICAL SERVICES AND FACILITIES, FREDERIC M. KREITE, M. D., CHAIRMAN

The conference made six recommendations on health problems. These recommendations were prepared by a small working committee, approved by the section on health services, and finally accepted with only one change, by the conference as a whole. The recommendations are presented as they were finally approved by the conference.

Following each recommendation there is a summary of some of the discussion which developed during the course of the meeting.

Recommendation No. 1: The six counties do not have sufficient personnel to meet the health needs of the agricultural worker and will require additional financial assistance to augment staff and facilities. The group recommended that such assistance be provided by the State government.

No one in the group felt that county governments were in a position to spend any additional money for health services to the agricultural worker. In the first place, they felt that county financial resources are already strained; in the second place, they felt that the county should not be held solely responsible for services to this group.

Furthermore, the counties vary in their financial resources and would find it difficult to provide an equal level of services. Any county which provided better services than the neighboring counties might find itself burdened with more than its share of migratory workers seeking assistance.

The type of personnel most needed in staff expansion seemed to be the nurse. This was true even in those counties which have not filled all the budgeted positions, although obviously they could not expect assistance until such positions were filled. There was no discussion in this particular section of the relative functions of registered nurses and public-health nurses. Emphasis was laid not only on the need for improvement in the quantity of care, but also in the quality of care. Mention was made of need for more participation in these programs by local physicians.

Recommendation No. 2: The high infant mortality rate indicates the need for additional and better health services for expectant mothers, infants, and children; and the group recommended that these be provided on a decentralized basis. This applied to both preventive and therapeutic services; and the planning for decentralization must include participation by the health department, the welfare department, the growers, and other community agencies.

This recommendation reflected the group's feeling that the services, to be effective, must be carried to the farm worker. This was particularly true of preventive and educational measures. No attempt was made to define the exact methods of decentralization, since this would vary from county to county. It was felt that in many places the growers would cooperate in furnishing housing facilities; and it was hoped that welfare departments might cooperate in decentralizing some of the out-patient services now available only at county hospitals. The use of trailers was mentioned by several.

One of the problems which frequently came up in this connection was the necessity for administrative flexibility in shifting personnel and program in response to the fluctuations in camp populations.

Recommendation No. 3: The group recommended that the San Joaquin Valley Supervisors Association include prenatal and postnatal care and medical and hospital services for indigent sick children in the definition of a medical emergency. The group further recommended that the problem of county residency in relation to medical services be studied by a committee appointed by the Governor.

This recommendation was made because of the difficulty in securing medical care for those expectant mothers and sick infants who are indigent but who do not meet the indigent act residence requirements of 3 years' State residence independent of assistance and 1 year county residence. It seemed to the group that it is a waste of time to teach mothers to seek medical care for their children early in sickness, only to have them turned away from the hospital until the infant is sick enough to qualify for medical care as an emergency. The original recommendation called for a relaxation of residency requirements for county medical services; this, however, involves legal complications, as medical services for the indigent are provided under terms of the indigent act,

and a change in the law would then also affect eligibility for general public assistance. The adoption of a simple definition of an emergency by the San Joaquin Valley Boards of Supervisors does not require legislative action, and can probably be secured. This would assist in getting mothers under prenatal care in county hospital clinics, rather than waiting until they go into labor to accept them for service. Since adequate prenatal care does seem to be effective in reducing both maternal and infant mortality, as well as the incidence of prematurity, this would seem most desirable.

Recommendation No. 4: The group recommended that the Federal Social Security System be broadened to include agricultural workers of all categories.

There was a great deal of discussion about the income of agricultural workers, particularly the migratory workers. Aside from the general statement that migratory workers have periods of income alternating with other periods of no income, there was no agreement on either the amount of annual earnings or the wisdom of family expenditures. Little or no factual information on this matter was available in the section, and personal opinions were freely, even emotionally, expressed. However, everyone agreed that the several social-security benefits, both Federal and State, would help to cushion the effect of unemployment.

Recommendation No. 5: The group recommended that the State department of public health arrange for fundamental epidemiological studies on the diarrheal diseases in the Central Valley.

This was felt to be an obvious need, and the recommendation was unanimously supported.

Recommendation No. 6: The group felt that the measures recommended above will help to alleviate some of the acute health problems in these counties. However, the basic problem is a chronic one, complicated by a variety of social and economic factors. The group recommended that serious and intensive study be carried on to discover some means of meeting the labor needs of this area, while simultaneously helping the migratory worker to develop into a permanent contributing member of the community.

This recommendation came out of the original committee as an indication of the great difficulty which individuals had in attempting to keep their attention focused on the matter under discussion. The committee was supposed to work out methods of improving health services to migratory agricultural workers, but the discussion kept shying off into broader areas of social and economical implication.

One of the great difficulties in rendering health services to the migratory groups is the fact that they do not stay long enough in one place to facilitate good educational and service programs. As they move from county to county, there are serious problems of sharing of health information about individuals by the different health jurisdictions. There was a good deal of wistful talk about slowing the migrant down; and it is inescapably true that the best solution to the problem of migratory labor is to have no migration. Hence this recommendation.

The committee which produced the recommendations originally consisted largely of public-health personnel. There was only one representative from a local welfare department, there were no county supervisors, and only four educators. On the other hand, all the counties concerned were represented, and toward the end of the session Mr. Don McColly of the State chamber of commerce was present and contributed to the deliberations.

REPORT OF SUBSECTION ON AUXILIARY SERVICES, HELEN E. WALKE, CHAIRMAN

A. Surplus commodities

The discussion of surplus commodities was limited to the utilization of these foods by the families, since the respective county welfare departments have worked out the details of distribution within the county.

1. The committee members expressed the opinion that limited cooking equipment and facilities and inadequate storage space are factors that would influence the acceptability of surplus commodities. In addition, the two food items—dried milk and dried eggs—present a further problem because of the lack of familiarity on the part of the recipients in handling these products.

Accordingly, it was suggested that instructions be outlined regarding the use and cooking of dried milk and dried eggs and simple recipes be compiled for distribution with these products.

Since the distribution of the surplus foods will commence immediately, the home economist from the Fresno County Welfare Department, the home advisers from the Fresno County Agricultural Extension Service, the school-lunch nutritionist from the State department of education, and the district nutritionist from the State department of public health met on Tuesday, January 3, 1950, in Fresno to develop this material. In addition to the instructions and recipes, a list of foods to supplement the surplus commodities will be prepared for use by the directors of county welfare departments in advising volunteer groups of foods to donate.

2. The committee felt that in addition to this mimeographed material there was need for cooking schools to demonstrate the use and cooking of foods. The problem of where such schools might be held was discussed. The local churches were mentioned as a possibility. It was suggested, also, that the growers might be approached regarding the provision of a demonstration kitchen in the camps. Earlier this year owners of two camps in Kings County contributed $25 each to cover the costs of a series of nutrition classes held in their camps under the auspices of the health department.

It was agreed that the home economists and nutritionists from the various agencies in the six counties would plan jointly the content and schedule for the cooking schools.

3. In connection with the discussion of cooking schools the problem of limited cooking facilities was again discussed. It was pointed out that this is one of the factors that handicap these families in providing even a minimum adequate diet. This is particularly true for the infant and small child.

(a) It was recommended that the Housing Division and the growers give attention in their study of housing to minimum food storage (shelves and coolers) and stationary cooking equipment.

(b) It was further recommended as a part of this study that the possibility of community kitchens be explored.

These community kitchens (similar to community showers, laundries, etc.) to be used either by individual families to prepare their meals, or rotating committees to prepare and serve meals to a group of families.

(c) Another suggestion that the committee felt should be studied was the possibility of a nonprofit cafeteria which might be operated by the families or the growers.

The last two recommendations to be considered as a part of a long-range program.

4. Throughout the discussion it was apparent that more information concerning the food practices of these agricultural workers was needed.

Therefore, it was recommended that a study be made which would not only point up the dietary habits but food marketing and preparation practices.

The State department of public health in cooperation with the State interagency nutrition committee would construct the questionnaire and be responsible for tabulating the data.

The local home economists and nutritionists in the counties would be responsible for collecting the data.

B. Day care of children

5. The many problems encountered in providing supervised day care of small children were enumerated. These included such problems as financing, adequate housing and play areas, isolation units, and trained personnel. The magnitude of the problem pointed up the need for assistance beyond the resources of the local area.

For this reason it was felt that the problem should be referred to the State child-care program and that the Department of Education and other concerned agencies should study the possibility of extending its program to children of agricultural workers in rural areas.

This type of program would not only provide an educational program for the parents but an adequate lunch for the children.

6. The committee felt that in addition to the day-care program a long-range educational program to teach parents proper child care is essential.

It recommended that local health departments, welfare departments, and agricultural extension assume this responsibility, which would necessitate additional public-health nurses, welfare workers, and home advisers.

C. Recreation

7. The importance of providing adequate recreational facilities for agricultural workers and their families was discussed. Several county representatives pointed out that the counties employ recreational supervisors.

It was recommended that this problem be referred to the respective counties for consideration by the boards of supervisors.

The resources at the State level were discussed, and it was recommended that these be mentioned to the local counties. Those listed were the State recreation commission, State department of education, and youth authority.

It was further suggested that the growers be advised of this need. In certain camps the management have recognized the importance of recreation and have provided recreation personnel to supervise and guide a program for the workers and their families.

REPORT OF SUBSECTION ON COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION AND EDUCATION, MRS. ASA W. HATCH, CHAIRMAN

A number of resources are available in the counties which can contribute to an educational program directed to—

1. Teaching agricultural workers more healthful ways of living.

2. Helping the community provide more opportunities for participation by agricultural workers in community life.

In both phases of the program, education should be "not something we do for people but something we do with people."

Not all agencies and groups that can be interested in participating in the program were represented in the section. The following specific resources, aside from those of health departments, were mentioned:

Local chapters of the American Red Cross: The representative of the Pacific area office stated that the Red Cross is interested in expanding its program of classes in home nursing and in infant and child care with particular emphasis on reaching agricultural workers. The Red Cross recognizes that it will be necessary to modify the course to meet the needs of this group and to be adaptable to the conditions under which they live. A training course for teachers of the two courses will be held in the valley, including nurses employed by health departments, willing to take the training.

Agricultural Extension Service: Home and farm advisers of the UC Agricultural Extension Service will be able to work more intensively with agricultural workers than has

been possible in the past. Because of the methods used by the advisers, it is believed they will be successful in discovering leaders in the agricultural-worker group. These leaders can be made available also for programs of other agencies.

Schools: The health-education programs of schools in the valley have been greatly improved during the past few years. An additional important contribution the schools can make is in provision of opportunities for agricultural workers and their children to participate in community life.

Growers: One large firm in Fresno County has indicated an interest in employing a nurse to work in the camp under the direction of the local health department.

It was felt by the section that many additional resources could be discovered by exploration at the local level.

There are serious needs and problems in all of the counties that stand in the way of community organization and education. Among those brought out by the section are:

1. Need for an over-all community organization that includes professional and lay people and reaches into small communities.

It was felt by the local people present that the councils now operating do not completely meet this need.

2. Need for personnel: (a) People trained in teaching methods of working with this particular group; (b) people trained in community organization.

Only one of the health departments employs a health educator and that position is now vacant. Vacancies exist in nursing positions in health departments. Not all departments have sufficient nursing staff to meet the normal needs.

3. Need for facilities in camps: (a) A place for group meetings; (b) provision for supervision and recreation for children while meetings are being held for adults.

4. The problem of finding a time for meetings that is possible both for the agricultural workers and teachers.

It was felt that much of the teaching might have to be done on person-to-person basis.

5. The problem of "be heterogeneity of the agricultural-worker group, the lack of organized and natural subgroups.

6. The problem of how to reach the people who are not concentrated in labor camps.

The section felt that not all needs could be met, nor all problems solved, immediately. However, they do not present insuperable difficulties and, through utilizing all resources that are available, a sound program of community organization and education can be developed in each of the six counties. As a start toward that program the section presented the following recommendations:

Recommendations

1. At an early date, the local health departments should take the leadership in bringing together in each county the people and agencies concerned with planning, developing, and coordinating the educational program.

2. A training course should be held on a county or regional basis, whichever is practical, to train the people who will work in the educational program in (a) content—so that confusion and contradictions in information given agricultural workers may be eliminated; (b) methods of working with agricultural workers.

3. Provision should be made at the State level for joint planning and coordination between all agencies concerned with the educational program.

REPORT OF SECTION ON HOUSING AND SANITATION, HILLS P. SOS, M. D., CHAIRMAN

1. The following was submitted for action by the conference as a whole:

"It is recommended that the provisions of the State labor code relating to housing be amended to include labor camps, labor supply centers, tent camps, and so-called house courts, and that authority be vested in the State board of public health to adopt regulations governing the construction, maintenance, and operation of such camps and courts, with particular reference to the sanitation facilities provided therein; it is further recommended that enforcement of these sections and of any regulations promulgated be delegated to the State and local health departments."

In view of the far-reaching implications of such proposed legislative changes upon both the State department of industrial relations and the State department of public health, and upon industrial housing throughout the State, the conference acted as follows:

It is recommended that above motion be tabled pending a later meeting to be called by the State department of public health in cooperation with the State department of industrial relations, such meeting to include representation of both official and nonofficial agencies, and other persons having an interest in the problem.

Discussion included reference to the area of the State not presently served by organized local health departments and which could not assume responsibility for enforcement if such authority were provided without budgetary provision. It was also felt that the original recommendation, with its State-wide implications, was premature and justified more extensive study.

It was suggested, although not formally adopted, that this matter might be referred to appropriate committees of the State legislature for study and action.

The basis for consideration of this matter included the following factors:

(1) Authority and responsibility for inspection of labor camps are vested in the Division of Housing of the State Department of Industrial Relations, and have so existed since 1913, at which time there were no organized county health departments.

(2) A labor camp includes housing facilities provided for five or more employees of an employer on his property. Technically speaking, therefore, when less than five of the inhabitants are employees of the owner, it ceases to be a labor camp and the responsibility for inspection and supervision by the Division of Housing ceases. The labor camp then becomes a responsibility of the local health department under the health and safety code provisions governing disposal of sewage and wastes, etc., or as provided by any pertinent local ordinances. The questions arose at this point: "When is a labor camp not a labor camp?" and "Is this shifting responsibility and authority sound and efficient administratively?"

(3) The local health authorities, with one exception, felt very strongly that the delineation of responsibility should be made more definite, and that it should be placed in the local health department. Additional personnel would be required if such a change were made, and it was suggested that State subsidy should assist in their provision.

(4) The division of housing, on the other hand, has been inadequately staffed. Assurance has been made that augmentation of that staff will be made at once.

(5) Pending action one way or another as to legislative changes, it was agreed that the division of housing would assign its personnel to cover a specific county, and that they would work in close cooperation with local health-department personnel. It was suggested that they might be housed in the local health departments, but agreed they would not be under the direction of the local health officer. This would assist in meeting the immediate problem, in that specific cases could be handled jointly by the two agencies. The details of this arrangement are to be worked out between the division of housing and the local health departments.

2. The following recommendation was adopted:

It was recommended that consideration be given to amending the Labor Code in the section pertaining to agricultural-labor housing to include the provision of a permit system as a part of the administrative procedure carried out by the Division of Housing.

It was further recommended that local health officers and boards of supervisors in the development of local ordinances pertaining to housing in the unincorporated area, or pertaining to the control of environmental sanitation include in the local ordinances the provision for the issuing of a permit prior to the construction, maintenance, or operation of such facilities, and with the privilege of revoking such permit by the health officer after a proper hearing on the matter.

Discussion on this item was concerned with the difficulties now existing in finding areas which have sprung up as part of the housing provisions for agricultural laborers, whether they be in labor camps or in facilities not included under the purview of the labor code.

It was agreed that this would place upon the grower or the operator of such a housing facility the responsibility for informing the local health department or the division of housing of his intent to establish such a facility. Further, it would facilitate enforcement of violators.

3. The following recommendation was adopted:

It was recommended that local health departments and boards of supervisors consider adoption of the principles of two ordinances adopted by the Kern County Board of Supervisors. These are:

(1) Ordinance G-53, referring to the designation of certain areas of the unincorporated area of counties as "urban" areas, the definition being as follows:

"Urban areas shall consist of those portions of the unincorporated area of the county (of Kern) which are closely built up and largely given over to business and residential use and that area adjacent to such built-up areas which is potential business or residential area, and its inclusion is reasonably necessary to preserve the character and stability of the existing built-up area, in all of which area it is feasible, practicable, and necessary to provide uniform health, sanitation, and safety ordinances, and regulations which are not adaptable to sparsely populated and rural areas."

It was felt that the adoption of this principle would permit the passage of local ordinances and regulations by the health officer which would assist in the control of conditions existing in the so-called fringe areas around incorporated cities and in other built-up areas where increased density of population is associated with accentuation of sanitation problems.

(2) Ordinance 302, which covers the construction, reconstruction, or maintenance of "house courts, apartments, camp, car and/or trailer, tent-camp space, and squatter camps, giving authority to the local health department for the enforcement thereof."

This ordinance covers a field of housing used by agricultural workers and others which are not completely covered by the provisions of the State labor code or of the health and safety code. It constitutes a stop-gap to cover the jurisdictional no man's land between the local health department and the State division of housing.

4. The following recommendation was adopted:

It was recommended that a study be made immediately looking toward the establishment of camp sites for agricultural workers, with acceptable sanitary facilities, with adequate management, operating with the approval and under the general supervision of the local health department.

There were two phases to the discussion of this item. One was whether or not such camps should be operated by counted government. There was a unanimous feeling that neither the Federal Government nor the State government should operate such facilities. There was a general feeling that county government should not operate such facilities.

There was relatively unanimous agreement that such facilities can be effectively sponsored and operated by growers' associations, as has been the case in Tulare and Kern Counties. One grower, a Mr. Thomas, of Madera County, expressed the opinion that such camps, particularly when operated after the harvest season is over, become places for organized unrest and labor difficulties. Mr. Stein, manager of the two grower-operated camps in Tulare County, with 8 years' experience in both Federal and privately operated camps, expressed the opinion that this was not the case, particularly when the camp management was strong and leadership of the inhabitants themselves was cultivated and encouraged.

It was brought out that education, for both better living habits and other aspects of public health, could be accomplished more easily under conditions where there are large groups of people in a single area for a long period of time. The provision of health services to such a group of people is easier and more effective than when the same number of people are scattered throughout the county.

5. It was recognized that with all the discussion concerning the problem there appeared to be no concise or accurate knowledge available as to the need for housing of agricultural workers in this area, particularly at the peak of labor demand, its relative adequacy, the status of sanitary facilities, etc., or any sound method of evaluating either the quality, the quantity, or the actual need. The following recommendations concerning this were adopted:

(a) It was recommended that information available from the State department of employment and the bureau of labor statistics be utilized by State and local agencies in anticipating labor needs on an area basis, in order that more effective planning for the provision of adequate housing and sanitary facilities might be developed.

(b) It was recommended that by January 31, 1950, local health departments in cooperation with the staff of the Division of Housing make a survey of existing facilities for the housing of agricultural workers, including the number and the type of housing facilities, and percent of occupancy, and some estimation of their sanitary status, utilizing the standards of the Division of Housing as the minimum requirements to be met.

(c) It was recommended that the Governor appoint a study committee to develop techniques for evaluating the need for housing of agricultural workers throughout the State, to study the flow of agricultural workers throughout the State, and that after such techniques have been developed, and if it appears necessary, an actual survey of these conditions be conducted.

(In the discussion of this latter resolution it was brought out that agricultural workers are brought into various areas of the State, particularly during the peak of demand, from urban centers.)

RESUME OF PROGRESS SINCE DECEMBER 29, 1949

The State department of public health reported on the activities of the above conference to Governor Warren at a conference in his office, attended also by representatives of other State departments.

To further implement some of the recommendations of the conference, the State department of public health has assigned Dr. Donald Davy, assistant chief of the division of local health service, to correlate the activities of the department, with headquarters temporarily in Fresno at the departmental branch office in the Rowell Building. The phone number is Fresno 4-1129. Dr. Davy in addition to integrating the activities of the department will assist local health departments and other agencies in any way possible.

The department is seeking health educators to be employed temporarily by the State and assigned to this area to assist in the community organization and general health educational program. The nutrition services of the department are active, along with the Agricultural Extension Service and the local welfare departments, in giving advice and consultation to those utilizing surplus commodities. A basic educational program is being started immediately.

The department of public health is preparing a recommended project of research in the epidemiology of the diarrheal diseases for submission to the United States Public Health Service.

The bureau of sanitary engineering is cooperating with the division of housing of the State department of industrial relations in an attempt to make more effective the program of sanitation and housing which much be carried on jointly by State and local agencies.

The bureau of vector control of the State department of public health is investigating methods whereby its services may be tied in to the general sanitation services in the control of insect vectors of communicable diseases.

In cooperation with the various welfare departments, the State department of public health and local health officers will confer with the San Joaquin Valley Supervisors Association on February 10, 1950, to discuss basic problems which are of concern to county supervisors. This includes the distribution of surplus commodities and the decentralization of both health and medical services and, possibly, the lowering the admission requirements for indigents by making prenatal and postnatal care and medical and hospital services for indigent sick children medical emergencies.

As further problems present themselves the State department of public health will cooperate with other agencies in meeting them in any way possible. Your suggestions should be presented to your local health officers or to Dr. Davy in our Fresno office for further study and action.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
DIVISION OF LOCAL HEALTH SERVICE.

Mr. Speaker, California's State director of public health, Dr. Wilon Haiverson, says this migrant farm labor problem "is primarily an economic problem."

The California conference, as its report shows, looked at this problem steadily and saw it whole, not as an isolated health problem, or school problem, or housing problem.

The economic problem is basically affected by the supply of labor in relation to the need for labor. I am convinced that there is a surplus of farm labor, not only in California, but throughout the Nation.

Of course, to provide the largest number of days worked for the labor supply that is available, we should have an up-to-date system of recruiting, transporting, placing, and housing migrant workers.

Instead, we ignore available labor here in the United States, all over the United States, and continue to make our unemployment picture worse by bringing in more Mexican workers to share the already insufficient number of jobs.

The most recent information I have received as to the situation among agricultural workers in California is in a report on the Imperial Valley dated January 30, 1950. The report was submitted by Hank Hastwar, a representative of the American Federation of Labor's National Farm Labor Union.

The union has presented this report to President Truman and Secretary of Labor Tobin with a request for an immediate investigation and action.

This report recites low wages, inhuman living conditions, and insecurity among American citizens caused by the influx of Mexican nationals under the international agreement and by thousands of Mexicans who enter in violation of our immigration laws. This report should shock the conscience of all who read it. The text follows:

NATIONAL FARM LABOR UNION, A. F. OF L.,
Bakersfield, Calif., January 30, 1950.

REPORT ON THE IMPERIAL VALLEY

PREFACE

The Imperial Valley is located in the southern most region of California, bounded on the south by the Republic of Mexico. It is a fabulously rich agricultural area whose climate conditions enable this valley to grow and harvest fruit and vegetables while the rest of the Nation is fighting blizzards and hail.

Yet in this valley American people, mainly those of Mexican descent, are slowly starving because illegal aliens from Mexico have their jobs.

To the north in the vast agricultural empire of the San Joaquin Valley, where all crops have been harvested, American people of all races and creeds are suffering hunger because there is no work. In the great Central Valley of which the San Joaquin is the major part, between fifty and sixty thousand farm workers are unemployed.

It is indeed a tragic mystery for many farm workers that in areas where work is going on, all avenues to secure employment have been closed to them by the most rapacious group of employers who operate in the American economic system.

THE IMPERIAL VALLEY

The writer of this report arrived in the Imperial Valley on January 28 to survey that area at the request of many American people of Mexican descent who were being forced against the wall of poverty by thousands of their former fellow countrymen employed illegally in the Imperial Valley by the growers in that area.

The writer found a condition that was unbelievable, hardened as he was the last 3 years by the inhuman exploitation of the farm laborers in the State of California.

He found that many Americans of Mexican descent and others legally in the United States for many years were earning wages scarcely comparable with that of an American standard by any stretch of the imagination.

Typical of such pay checks earned by energetic Mexican-Americans who are known for their ability as farm laborers were such checks as follows:

For week ending Jan. 7	$6.70
For week ending Jan. 13	5.10
For week ending Jan. 20	9.20

Another energetic Mexican-American worker, the father of seven children, earned for the—

Week ending Jan. 13	$9.90
Week ending Jan. 20	15.00

These figures are from the check stubs of a leading firm operating in the Imperial Valley—the Arena Imperial Co., located in Brawley, Calif. Further, these stubs and many others are in evidence.

Yet even these families can consider themselves fortunate, for there are many peasants of towns in the Imperial Valley, as El Centro, Brawley, Holtville, Calexico, and Calipatria, who cannot even secure employment to earn even such pittances.

Additionally, hundreds of laborers not only those of Mexican descent but colored and white Okies and Arkies have been turned back from the Imperial Valley for lack of employment and forced to return to their origins where they at least could secure a roof over their heads. Many of these ran out of gas money to drive their jalopies back and became stranded in the Imperial Valley. At the time of the organizer's visit, in Brawley alone, 200 Okies and Arkies were completely stranded and absolutely destitute.

In the Imperial Valley there is no relief program, for no direction of human concern extends from the growers to the people who make their industry possible.

In the great Central Valley of California farm workers are going hungry because there is no work. In the Imperial Valley farm workers are going hungry because illegal Mexicans have the jobs.

The illegal Mexican is commonly called a wet-back, supposedly derived from getting wet in crossing the Rio Grande. The wet-backs or wets cross from Mexicali over the border into Calexico, El Centro, and Brawley. From there many thousands work their way as far north as the State of Washington. It would be safe to estimate, although no official figures are available, that there is at least 50,000 wet-backs in the west-coast States. However, the Imperial Valley, because of its nearness to the border and because of its outright control by the corporate farm interests receives more than its fair share of the wet-backs.

In the Imperial Valley at present there is a total work force of some 18,000 farm laborers. At peak in the month of March between 23,000 and 24,000 are employed. Of this number there are 5,000 Mexican nationals working now in the valley due to a contract negotiated between the United States and Mexico for the legal importation of foreign Mexican nationals. Additionally there are 6,000 wet-backs working now who come regularly over the border or who shack up in towns within the valley or who live on the ditch banks. This makes up a work force of 11,000 citizens of the Republic of Mexico as against 7,000 citizens and legal residents of the United States.

This is the work force in agriculture which at the present is primarily engaged in harvesting carrots, lettuce, and cabbage. Additionally, numbers of wet-backs are employed in other pursuits besides those of stoop labor. The A. F. of L. Central Trades and Labor Council in El Centro has found wet-backs in the restaurant industry, the retail trades, and the building. They, too, are most concerned with this displacement, and particularly so when they discover numbers of them with social-security cards.

The supply of wet-backs seems to be a never-ending one. At the writing of this report there were 25,000 Mexicans gathered in Mexicali, all waiting for jobs in the United States. Each week 1,500 to 2,000 enter this new port of entry hoping to find their fortunes in the United States. This labor pool at first was supposedly set up to provide for the legal entree of contract Mexican nationals into the United States, but so effective has been the propaganda that from all over the interior of Mexico are arriving Mexican citizens eagerly looking forward to their long-awaited manna. Only a few of these can be used contractually, the others must find employment as wet-backs or starve. For this the Republic of Mexico deserves its full share of discredit. It is common to hear our Mexican-American citizens explain this phenomenon by saying that Aleman has sold out. Miguel Aleman is the President of the Republic of Mexico.

Separating Mexicali, Mexico, from Calexico, United States, is a 5½-mile fence. The fence has holes in it and for those who are more energetic the paths are well worn on each side. The fence is patrolled by the United States Immigration Service but twice a day, thus providing ample opportunity for any number to cross at the proper intervals.

Certainly the United States Immigration Service must be a frustrating occupation for as soon as this service does pick up illegal aliens for deportation (wet-backs), and they have picked them up at bursts of 2,000 per week, the wet-backs infallibly return, all the wiser for having been caught. It is commonly joked that when the wet-back is picked up and returned to Mexicali, he hops a cab and beats the Immigration Department back over the border.

All admit that the United States Immigration Department has a hopeless task in cleaning up the wet-backs problem. At most the border patrol can only be a source of irritation to the growers whom they raid for wets.

The composite of the employer force in the Imperial Valley typical of farming in the State of California. There are 100 grower firms that control 50 percent of the total acreage in the Imperial Valley. Approximately 5,900 other growers control the other 50 percent. Farming in the Imperial Valley is on a cash-crop basis and controlled in spirit as well as financially by the corporate farmers.

Although a curse need not necessarily be imposed on bigness nevertheless an emulation on the part of many smaller operators takes place that often results in even more abuses. It can commonly be said that wet-backs are exploited severely. Many small growers and even renters have called the Immigration Service in to clean out their wet-backs and refused to pay them wages that were due them. In one week it was reported that certain small growers and renters refused to pay 461 wet-backs for their labor. The organizer discovered from his Mexican contacts that this practice takes place among larger growers as well. It has become a most convenient custom to tell the wet-back to go back to where he came from when it is time to pay him off.

Wet-backs are again in a most unfortunate position because of their inability to get protection or redress for their grievances. They cannot complain about sleeping on irrigation ditch banks—nor can they complain about getting 30 or 35 cents per hour—which is less than half the scale of the 60 cents per hour for the contract Mexican national.

The scale of 60 cents per hour set for contract nationals has rapidly become the prevailing wage for all American workers in the Imperial Valley.

Even the contract nationals (those who are legally here for the duration of the contract) are exploited unfairly. Reports that they are inadequately housed, that they do not receive the scale of 60 cents per hour through manipulating them to lower piecework rates are common. Complaints from the nationals are so numerous that the Mexican consul finds himself inadequate to police the contracts.

It is obvious to the most superficial observer that the contract Mexican nationals and the wet-backs are being used by the growers to destroy American living and working standards for the American farm workers. It becomes further obvious that the wet-backs and the Mexican nationals are being exploited even more greatly than our own American people.

Spanish-speaking Americans will tell you that Brawley, the largest farm labor supply center in the Imperial Valley looks like Mexico in the early mornings when the growers' trucks come in to pick up the wet labor, dressed in ragged clothes, wearing a large straw sombrero and serape around their shoulders. The residents of Brawley look on while the wets are picked up and leave for work. So serious has this problem become that Mexican-American ex-GI's and the wet-backs have had small outbreaks of violence.

Living year round in the Imperial Valley are a sufficient number of workers to form a basic work force. At present the farm labor population in the leading towns are:

Brawley	3,900
El Centro	3,700
Holtville	2,000
Calexico	2,000

In surrounding areas there is an additional resident work force of 6,500. Supplementing this work force are migrants who make their regular trek to the Imperial Valley to assist in the harvesting of carrots, lettuce, melons, beets, and other vegetables. This year the trek is not as large because the wet-backs have the jobs. Additionally, the population of the main towns in the Imperial Valley have been going down because of the steady loss in job opportunities for the original resident farm population. Steadily increasing the labor pool of available illegal labor in Mexicali is the increasing number of 25,000 Mexican citizens in Mexicali, growing from 1,500 to 2,000 each week. Consequently, the San Joaquin Valley is becoming increasingly flooded with displaced Mexican-Americans from the Imperial Valley. At this writing hunger, privation, and loss of homes, combined with bewilderment and hopelessness, is the symbol of the times for the farm workers in the San Joaquin Valley.

CONCLUSIONS

It is of foremost necessity that immediate action be taken to prevent the further demoralization and impoverishment of the American farm workers in the Imperial Valley.

1. The border must be plugged against the entrance of any further "wetbacks." Those in the United States should be immediately rounded up by the United States Immigration Service and returned by the Mexican Government to the Interior of that Nation. The recently acquired pool of 25,000 laborers waiting in Mexicali must be dried up by shipping them back home under clear instructions by the Mexican Government.

2. The State of California now prevents the employment of illegal aliens on public projects. This should be extended by law into agriculture with penalties attached, otherwise the growers will violate the law as they are doing at present.

3. The State of California in conjunction with the National Farm Labor Union, A. F. of L., should begin to shift unemployed and qualified farm workers to the Imperial Valley to complete the harvest. Transportation will have to be arranged for most since they are completely penniless, having no unemployment insurance to rely on. All harvesting prior to World War II was done with American labor in the Imperial Valley thus there is no reason why it can't be done with the same now.

4. The present contract under which 5,000 Mexican nationals are employed should be immediately abrogated by the American and Mexican Governments.

If these things are done immediately, we can still save an immensely perilous situation. This is an obligation which both the Mexican and United States Governments owe their people. If these proper actions are taken we can rest assured that we will have restored faith in the people themselves as well as in their respective governments.

HAM FISHWICK,
Western Representative.

Mr. Speaker, we have a migrant farm labor problem. It is a continuing problem. It is being aggravated by the continued importation of migrant labor from Mexico and the West Indies.

My conclusion is that we ought to stop the importation of foreign migratory labor. We have a surplus of domestic farm labor. The problem is to supply these men and women with full employment at decent wages and working conditions. The problem grows worse daily. It is not a seasonal problem. It is not just a California problem. It is not a Southwest or a Mexican border problem. It extends all over America, as Mr. Goodwin's table of certifications shows.

I believe that, if the full facts about migrant farm workers' problems can be assembled and spread out for all to see, the American people and Congress will do what is right.

We have had complaints, we have had surveys, investigations, and reports for the past quarter of a century dealing with this, that, or the other phase of the migrant farm labor problem. Labor, church, civic, and welfare organizations have reported on conditions among migrant farm labor families, on the health of children of these workers, on their working conditions, on their nutrition and health, and, in at least one instance, on the extent of disease, starvation, and death in the midst of the plenty they helped to harvest for the tables and the clothes closets of America.

But we have never had a thorough Nation-wide examination of the entire problem with findings and recommendations for raising this great depressed segment of our people to an American standard of living.

Since the war, this American tragedy, once described in John Steinbeck's Grapes of Wrath but dismissed as a temporary phenomenon of the last depression, has returned. It is with us again. The most recent employment figures show that unemployment has increased, seasonally it is true, from three and one-half to four and one-half million employable persons. It is emphasized that a large proportion of this increase in unemployment is among farm workers. The hope is expressed that, as spring comes on, these workers will again find jobs.

But the most optimistic estimates of employment in 1950 say only this: that, if business holds up, the level of employment may be maintained through the end of 1950. With a net increase in the labor force of at least 800,000, composed of GI's who are finishing their education and training and other young men and women finishing school, the prospect now is for more than 4,000,000 unemployed by the end of 1950.

The effect of this upon migrant farm labor will be to make the search for work more desperate, the trips from one crop area to another more frequent. Farm wages and working conditions may be pounded down by employers facing lower farm prices on the one hand and on the other hand seeing larger pools of unemployed available.

I hope President Truman will create at the earliest possible moment a Commission to assemble the full facts about the conditions under which migrant farm workers are employed or seek to be employed and live or seek to live. Such a Commission, appointed by the President and given the cooperation of all agencies of the executive and legislative branches of the Federal and State Governments, and county and municipal agencies, can give us sound bases for intelligent action, adequate to meet the need.

If this is done and if the American people and their elected representatives respond as I believe they will respond, we can then eat our food and wear our clothes without our consciences telling us of sins of omission, economic, social, and political sins against millions of fellow Americans.

If this is done now and if we act as we should act on the basis of such findings and recommendations, our Nation will be healthier, stronger, happier, and more secure within and without.

Senator McMahon and His Proposal to Neutralize the Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. William S. White regarding the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], which article appeared in the New York Times magazine of February 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCMAHON, SENATOR AND ATOMIC SPECIALIST—THE FATHER OF CIVILIAN ATOM CONTROL PROPOSES A BOLD NEW APPROACH TO NEUTRALIZING THE BOMB

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—For the people of the earth first the atomic bomb discovery and now the urgent progress toward the infinitely more destructive hydrogen bomb have thrust into the ordinary way of life a clutching, mass fear of death not even fully understood.

Perhaps no one in all the world has been more vitally stirred than a young United States Senator from the State of Connecticut. Like everyone else, he, too, is to live or die upon the issue. But for this dreadful business BRIEN MCMAHON would be only 1 of 96 Members of what used to be a rather droning, pleasant old club called the Senate—and he most likely would be a quite obscure and junior one, speaking for the most part when spoken to, and careful not to move forward into the chairs reserved by ancient custom for the patriarchs.

Instead he has, in a single term in the Senate, accumulated a frightening responsibility, as chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, which oversees the agency that in turn controls all in this field, the Atomic Energy Commission. He did not reach that post by soft means or manners; by the polite, after-you-sir bows expected of a Senate newcomer. He fought and clawed for it with the single-minded toughness of a zealot upon whom a great and fearful urgency had fallen.

He got it, against all tradition of seniority and over the claims of men who had been in the Senate for years before him, for two reasons. If he was not the first man in Congress fully to understand the meaning for men and government of what was afoot in the grim laboratories, certainly he was the first doggedly and plainly to articulate that meaning.

He was, moreover, the leader among the congressional forces that fought fiercely, and from the beginning, to take the atom away from the military and to lodge it in civilian control. He was in short, the author of the McMahon Atomic Energy Act for which, quite naturally, there was no precedent, since the fact of the atomic bomb was quite unprecedented itself. It was against this background and in his capacity as the highest lay authority on atomic matters that Senator MCMAHON made his recent great speech—and the adjective is used to denote a tour de force—proposing bold new approaches to the Russians for neutralizing atomic weapons. He urged the United States to set aside $10,000,000,000 yearly for the next 5 years (about two-thirds of present defense expenditures) for a global Marshall plan of atomic and other developments for all countries, including Russia—provided all participants in the program, which the United Nations would administer, accept world atomic control with full inspection.

When the word was flashed in 1946 that our first A-bomb had fallen upon Hiroshima in Japan, BRIEN MCMAHON, who had been in the Senate only about long enough to know the respective locations of the Republican and Democratic lounges, was at breakfast with his brother in Vermont. He was, then, too young a chap in the Senate to be trusted with anything important, including important information. He did not know that an appropriation of $2,000,000,000 had been put through Congress mysteriously for a hush-hush thing called the Manhattan District Project. Indeed, he did not know that there was a Manhattan District project.

His instant response to what was coming in over the radio in that peaceful Yankee farmhouse was no different, in substance, from that of many intelligent men everywhere: That monstrous thing, too big for thought, had been wrought by the scientists. But he had a secondary, and quick, response that was wholly different. This thing, he thought, must first of all be understood, even by politicians—perhaps most of all by politicians.

He set out at once to try to understand and the first data to help him along the line, he says, "were the pioneer articles written by William L. Laurence, of the New York Times." Senator MCMAHON took on all that Mr. Laurence had to offer and then, a man with a legal education and not a scientific one, he began to read all the heavier stuff besides. Certainly, he would not claim today that he approached, then, the dim corridors where lay the essential secrets; all he did was keep his foot thrust into the outer door.

What he learned and heard frightened him to an exquisite degree. It put him in fear not only of the atomic engine itself, but in fear for the survival of the kind of government we have always had. He saw, as he puts it now, an ever-constricting ring of

secrecy. He based an ever-growing observation among politicians, based upon the obvious fact that leads to the wrong direction might physically destroy the United States and all it had and hoped for: "We can do nothing but leave it to the experts, the military and scientific experts."

To Mr. McMahon this concept of secrecy was a dangerously creeping thing, particularly when it implied—as it did in those days—a barrier raised even against the elected representatives of the people. Insofar as military security would permit, he has always been antisecrecy, has always sought ways to lift the curtain.

So, in what seemed to some at the time a quixotic mission of hopelessness, he began drafting the McMahon Act as a counter-attack upon a War Department proposal for continued military control. It is more or less the thing in Congress that when a man introduces a successful resolution for setting up a special committee he gets the chairmanship. In this case, though, this was no committee to investigate coal prices or to preserve wildlife. What was being created here was a group with immense power over the military and possible civilian use of the greatest force known to man.

McMahon was, in the common view of the Senate, a New Dealer, young, untried, a Johnny-come-lately and a man who at the very least, had to be much more seasoned before taking on anything so breath-taking. McMahon was a New Dealer, all right; but he also was a sophisticated product of urban politics; he knew plenty of people in the right places—and passive resistance was not his strong point. He pulled wires, he lobbied among Members, he struggled onward—and he got the job. Did personal ambition play a part here? Certainly. Was there also a sense of mission apart from self? On all of the evidence since, yes.

But when the committee to serve under Senator McMahon was appointed, the then President of the Senate, Senator Kenneth D. McKellar, of Tennessee, was filled with gloomy forebodings. His gut upon it, as junior to Mr. McMahon in this new job, the greatest, long-lived stars of the Senate—men like Connally, of Texas, Vandenberg, of Michigan, Tydings, of Maryland. It was rather the way in which Balkan countries have sometimes surrounded with a stern regency of elder statesmen a young nominal king of insufficient years and doubtful designs.

The mere presence, sitting at the table below him, of such powerful figures as Connally, and Vandenberg, and Tydings would have been well calculated to put into young Senator McMahon the greatest fear in the Senate—the fear of seniority, with its crushing disapproval of the pushing and those not mellowed by tradition and tried by debate.

But Mr. McMahon's parents had raised no softy and, by a combination of deference to his elders at some points and aggressive chairmanship at others, he has managed always to sit at the head of the table. It was helpful also that regardless of his obvious and undimmed personal ambition, he was profoundly sincere about the job at hand. The elders watched carefully and as this was slowly borne in upon them they seemed content on the whole with the arrangement.

By the observation of this correspondent and by the private word of those who would be bound to know—fellow Senators who see things proceed in camera—McMahon, in the atomic field, is in the deadliest of earnestness. Indeed, he is said by some of his colleagues to be hipped on it. He himself, in moments of reflection, sometimes falls into deep melancholy as he contemplates matters not known outside the committee room. Once, to illustrate his anxieties to a friend, he observed: "You know, this may be, literally, the apocalypse."

All this should not leave erroneous impressions about McMahon as a man. He is not by any stretch of the imagination any St. George in plume and armor. He is, when he is not "the Atomic Senator," a hard-boiled politician from a closely divided State where there are no stately minuets in the party clubrooms and where the instinct for self-preservation is profoundly developed. Whenever a good turn can be done for the Democratic Party—apart from the atomic field, which in fundamental matters he seems honestly to try to keep inviolate—McMahon is the man to do it.

In ordinary affairs he is deeply partisan, untroubled by philosophic hesitations and not at all deterred by excessive scruples from hitting a Republican, in the political sense, over the head with any odd bit of plank or masonry that happens to be lying about. He is aware every minute, in the most urgently practical sense, that he is running in this off year for reelection in a State that at such times has tended to be quite inhospitable to sitting Democrats.

When he sits with the Democratic policy committee—an extraordinary position for a first-termer which he got by virtue of the fact that he is secretary of the Senate Democratic conference, or caucus—he is what his associates there call an attack man. Among the functions of his committee (which embodies the Democratic leadership of the Senate) is to decide what bills the Senate shall take up at a given time. Rarely does Mr. McMahon find, in these meetings, anything particularly pressing or specially worthy about a bill of Republican authorship.

The more easygoing, and older, policy committee members chuckle a bit about this. When, on occasion, they suggest that such and such a Republican Senator has made an interesting legislative proposal that might just possibly be worth letting to the floor, Senator McMahon is apt to put in a vehement dissenting opinion. "Why the hell," he may demand, "can't a Democratic Senator put in a better one? And then let's take that one up."

On the floor—again one is discussing the ordinary issues—Mr. McMahon is a stalwart and faithful Truman Democrat, as regular in this sense as any good soldier in an infantry platoon when the order comes to set off on patrol. On all these matters he is careful to bow to his seniors in the party—and particularly to the salty and high-tempered Connally, of Texas, the greatly feared (and beloved) prima donna of the Senate as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. McMahon is on this committee, too, and his membership here, so early in his career, represents an upward climb of the greatest good fortune. Mr. Connally accepted him a little grudgingly at first, and it used to be, when the mood was upon him to dress down the troops, that he would absently refer to Senator McMahon on the Senate floor as "Mister Mackmohahn," thus leaving the suggestion that one really couldn't bother to know how to pronounce everybody's name. Senator McMahon, who is good enough himself at this sort of thing to appreciate a great artist in the mysteries of rank, would grin, with a kind of rueful enjoyment of the skill of the master, with the rest of the Senate.

Suddenly it became apparent that Senator Connally had now definitely put Senator McMahon on the foreign-policy first team. He is now, by the Connally appointment, chairman of a Foreign Relations Subcommittee that has the antigenocide treaty—itself a revolutionary thing in history—in its charge. It thus comes about that Senator McMahon's almost exclusive present concerns, apart from the day-to-day routine necessary to any Senator, are with two concepts of horror: The possible mass destruction of human life by atomic-hydrogen bombs and the actual murder in the recent past of millions for no other reason than their race.

While Mr. McMahon is no bundle of palpitating emotion, he is basically a sensitive man—as are a great many men in the political trade—and profound anxieties often lie upon him.

Out of these anxieties grew the Senate address in which he proposed his world-wide Marshall plan. When President Truman was considering whether to go ahead with the hydrogen bomb, while the world waited upon his words, Senator McMahon sent privately to the President a proposition in two parts: First, that by all means we should build the bomb, but, second, that we accompany this with a new and dramatic proposal intended to halt the atomic armaments race.

The President did not accept this suggestion and Mr. McMahon as a loyal Democrat did not complain. Still, haunted by what he knew and what he feared, he felt himself unable simply to stay silent. He began to prepare his address, helped along by one of the most competent professional staffs in the Senate. He told only a few outside persons what he intended to say, but these were men in the highest position of American life. He listened to their suggestions.

Finally, he went forth one morning to the Senate floor, holding, with concealed nervousness, an extraordinary manuscript. As he began to deliver it, in his rather high, breaking voice, much of the Senate, as is its custom, went on noisily about its own business. At length, however, a silence fell and at the end it persisted for a full minute until colleague after colleague began to rise in congratulation.

What Senator McMahon wants to say is this:

That this country must, of course, build every weapon possible for its defense, but that it ought not to do so without the most desperate efforts to make unnecessary the use of those weapons.

That piling secret weapon on top of secret weapon tends increasingly to exclude both public and Congress, and more and more to leave terrible decisions in fewer and fewer expert hands.

That something must be attempted, some crusade against the atomic armaments race, if only as the highest moral duty, and if only for history's sake.

To those who objected that what he was proposing was impractical and even dreamlike, the Senator retorted: First, find a better plan then, and, second, that the point had been reached where even dreams should not be too quickly tossed aside.

The speech, one gathers, was not made with thought of the rather precious little coteries of professional idealists who always come chattering about to lionize a man in such a case; neither was it made for those who think necessarily and always that there is an honorable alternative to honorable combat.

By what sort of man was it made? First, the vital statistics and the like. Brien McMahon was born in Norwalk, Conn., in 1903. He graduated from Fordham University and the Yale Law School. He served as an attorney in the Department of Justice from 1933 to 1939. In 1935, when President Roosevelt appointed him an Assistant Attorney General, he was the youngest man ever to hold that place. He was 31 at the time. He had a good record as a Government prosecutor.

Mr. McMahon was elected to the Senate in 1944. He got the Democratic nomination with powerful support from the Federal wing of the party, for he had never before held any sort of elective office in Connecticut. He reached here without having had to play the somewhat dreary game of musical chairs which most Senators have had to play—first county attorney, then State legislature, and so on up.

He is a sophisticated, reasonably party-going man in Washington; heavy shouldered,

blocky, not lacking in the light, harmless cynicisms of this city in small matters, and wearing the marks of good living upon him. He married the former Rosemary Turner, a beautiful woman by any standard, and they have a 9-year-old daughter, Patricia.

The Senator, by the private testimony of those who know best—his colleagues on the floor—is well liked there; not "in the top 2 percent of popularity," as one says, "but well up there." A criticism of him one hears is that, especially in dealing with atomic matters, where he is so well informed, he has a tendency sometimes to shrug off less intense associates and to insist too much on his own way.

It is said here and there that he has, at times, a faintly pontifical manner. This, it seems from the outside, probably is actually a reflection of the fact that he really is hipped on atomic things and cannot resist the temptation to try to instruct. It also could spring, in part, from another cause. Senator McMahon has a rather formal courtesy, dresses in the highest mode, and lacks the casual, happy-go-lucky touch that many of the old-timers have achieved through long-secure seats and through the belief, as the years go by, that all things pass.

It may be, indeed, that Mr. McMahon cannot put down the urge to pontificate against that very assumption when he looks upon the sun and reflects upon the glittering brightness—or malignance—that lies there for mankind.

Prayers for Peace Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, 1950, the Tory leader, Winston Churchill, made a statement wherein he stated that, if elected, he would do all in his power to bring about another meeting with Stalin. To my mind, his statement was purely political, because the vast majority of the people of the world are in favor of peace, yes—a lasting peace.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, it gives me sincere pleasure, particularly in these days of stress and strain, to insert two resolutions in the RECORD, one which was passed by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America at its fifty-fourth annual encampment, held in Miami Beach, Fla., October 19 to 23, 1949, and the second resolution, which was adopted at a conference of Agudath Israel of America, Inc., held during the week of November 28 to December 5 at the Manhattan Towers Hotel, New York City.

Both of these outstanding groups of citizens have lent their whole-hearted support to a rapidly growing movement in the United States very justly called "Prayers for Peace Crusade." The movement was quietly started last October 28 by the Honorable Herve J. L'Heureux, Chief of the Visa Division, Department of State, in his home town of Manchester, N. H. At that time Mr. L'Heureux stated that it would be fitting if a custom sprang up for a daily 1-minute prayer for peace in every town and city in the country. The idea, as Mr. L'Heureux presented it, was that all traffic, industry, and other activities should cease for just 1 minute at noon each day. Simultaneously every man, woman, and child would offer a prayer to God to grant the world lasting peace.

To date some 751 religious, civic, social, veteran, and industrial organizations have adopted a resolution to pause for 1 minute daily in silent prayer for peace.

I would like to add my personal stamp of approval to a truly magnificent purpose of action, born by a remarkably outstanding citizen and servant of humanity.

The resolutions afore-mentioned follow:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AT ITS FIFTY-FOURTH ANNUAL ENCAMPMENT HELD IN MIAMI BEACH, FLA., OCTOBER 19 TO 23, 1949

Whereas two dreadful wars and the present disconcerting international circumstances have left this world in confusion; and

Whereas mankind seems unable to find a basis upon which to build a happier understanding among the nations of the earth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Jewish War Veterans of the United States approve the Prayers for Peace Crusade, and that all members are urged to participate in this movement by joining in 1 minute of prayer at 12 o'clock noon each day; be it further

Resolved, That each of us, in his own way, will, at this time, ask God to reveal to mankind the way to peace on earth and good will to all men, so that man's mind shall be receptive to God's way, and that in the words of the prophet, Isaiah, "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation; neither shall they learn war any more."

JACKSON J. HOLTZ,
National Commander.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT A CONFERENCE OF AGUDATH ISRAEL OF AMERICA, INC., HELD DURING THE WEEK OF NOVEMBER 28 TO DECEMBER 5, 1949, AT THE MANHATTAN TOWERS HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY

Whereas we have seen the terrible destruction the last war has brought on the human race; and

Whereas we feel that war degenerates man's action into that of an animal whose only desire is to destroy and annihilate everything good that exists: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Agudath Israel of America, Inc., lend its wholehearted support to the Prayers for Peace Movement and urge all its members in this country to participate in the movement by joining in 1 minute of prayer for peace at 12 o'clock noon each day; be it further

Resolved, That we call upon our sister organizations throughout the world to adopt a similar resolution so that there be created a unity of action for this historic cause.

Uncle Sam Plays Santa Claus to the World, Lets Its Native Indians Starve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the neglect and inefficiency by the Federal Government of the native American Indians is a blot on mankind. For a government that dishes out billions to irresponsible governments and people the world over, the blot becomes a shame.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert a series of articles by the Milwaukee Journal on this subject:

BAD RIVER LAND PRETTY, BUT WON'T RAISE FOOD

(By Rod Van Every)

The rickety, unpainted Indian houses—"picturesque," the tourists say—that line smooth Highway 2 as you drive through Odanah contain hunger and squalor. Almost every family is sustained by some kind of public relief.

Odanah is the population center of the Bad River Reservation in Ashland County. The reservation borders Lake Superior, and there are some lovely views. But the land is bad.

There are no resorts, no white tourists. When tourists zip along Highway 2, they may look at the Chippewas' houses but they do not stop. Why should anyone stop?

JOBS RARE AT BAD RIVER

The Lac Court Oreilles people are in worse shape, but not much.

There is virtually no work at Bad River. The painters and the carpenters are jobless. Six men are section hands on the railroad, and if there is heavy snow, a half dozen more may get short-term jobs. A few work in the wood-processing plant and the paper mill at Ashland. There are three Indian service mechanics, and a few part-time employees of Odanah stores.

Some winters many men get work cutting pulpwood. But there has been no market for pulpwood in the area for almost a year. To complicate matters, men are returning to the reservation in increasing numbers. They have lost their jobs in the cities.

There are 1,275 Chippewa names on the tribal roll at Bad River, but the guess is that there are no more than 1,000 persons on the reservation. Most of them live in the North, along Highway 2 and at Odanah.

SOME HOMES CONDEMNED

Only a few homes at Odanah have electric lights. Virtually none have inside toilets. Water must be hauled from several community pumps. Although there is a serious housing shortage, with many families doubled up, there are about 10 boarded-up homes. Some have been condemned as unfit for human habitation, but others are empty because their owners are working in the large cities.

The man to see is Al Arbuckle. He is 35, chairman of the tribal council and chairman of the broke town of Sanborn. He knows everyone in the area, and as you drive along the streets he rattles off the economic condition, number of children, amount of relief and the working ability of every family. "I don't see how it could be any worse," Arbuckle says. "It is always bad, but this winter has been the worst. I don't know what we'd do if we didn't have the project."

CHRISTMAS PROJECT IS ECONOMIC CORE

"The project" is made work at an Indian cemetery, about a mile out of town. Tombstones have been straightened, brush on the graves cut down and more brush on a 40-acre adjacent tract whacked off. The by-product, fuel wood, is distributed to the needy.

"The project" is the economic core of the community.

There are 89,600 acres in the town of Sanborn. But only 11,200 are taxable. Their value with improvements and personal property amounts to $116,000. Sounds good, doesn't it? One hundred and sixteen thousand dollars. But much of the land is no good, covered with swamps and cut-over

brush and scrub. The total tax should be $7,902, Arbuckle says, but, because of the delinquencies, actual tax collections are about half that. So $4,000 is the total tax income of the town of Sanborn. Many Milwaukee wage earners make that amount for one family.

FAMILY SIZE SETS WAGE

There are various State aids to help the town of Sanborn, but they were not enough. So the town went to the State emergency board a year ago, and in 1949 special State funds spent in the town totaled $19,000. Now the average monthly expenditure is about $3,000.

With this money, the little town operates its pitiful "project."

Not everyone gets a chance to work daily on the project. A man is rated on the number of mouths he has to feed. One man with a big family gets 160 hours a month. He earns 70 cents an hour or $112 a month—about $26 a week. Other men work as few as 36 hours a month—$18.20.

No one can get on the project until he has used his last resources. The wages are paid once a week by check, and the town board has instructed the Odanah stores that they may not sell anything fancy to relief recipients—just staples, the staples.

Some surplus commodities—mostly potatoes—have come into the reservation. There was one shipment late last fall and another late in January. It has not been nearly enough to help much.

LIQUOR PURCHASE CAUSES JOBS

There also is a very firm understanding about purchase of liquor. If a relief project Indian is caught with liquor, his name comes off the hour list, Arbuckle says, but adds: "We've never seen any evidence of liquor among them."

Arbuckle himself is well off compared with most of his constituents. He draws a few dollars as town chairman, and he is the janitor for the Indian service's group of clean, white buildings at Odanah. Still, it is not easy, with six children to feed.

Arbuckle works closely with Peter Walz, 27, a district agent of the Indian service who comes to Odanah once a week. Walz also visits the Red Cliff Reservation and works in the office of the Great Lakes Consolidated Indian Service at Ashland.

SUMMERS DON'T IMPROVE ECONOMY

In most Indian communities things are easier in the summer. There are more jobs. But the summers do not bring much economic sunshine to the Odanah Chippewas. Some men sail the Great Lakes on ore and coal boats. Others work on the coal and ore docks and on railroad section crews. A few follow the harvests, especially as bean pickers.

CAN'T AFFORD CURING DIET

Let's visit some of the people.

This old woman lives on an old-age pension of $27 a month. Her son has a shaky job in Milwaukee, but he is able to send her $10 now and then. The woman has high blood pressure and rheumatism, and the doctor has told her she must drink much fruit juice. She has bought none. She can't afford it.

"Ah, this is worse than the depression," Arbuckle says. "Then, at least there was WPA, and everyone had work."

In this little house an Indian service mechanic supports his wife, two children, and an aged father on $37 a week.

This old bachelor has only himself to feed, and he is lucky. He has an old-age pension.

PENSIONS MAKE MEN MAD

"Those pensions make me mad," Arbuckle says. "Out here they aren't as much as in other places in the county. The county welfare department says you can live cheaper here, and there are free fish and deer. So they cut the amounts for old-age pensions, blind pensions, and aid to dependent children.

"Worst of it is, you can't live any cheaper here. It's the food that costs so much. And we pay rent and interest on our house loans, just like everyone else. Then there are transportation costs—getting to and from Ashland, if you're lucky enough to have a job there. That's 10 miles.

"The only solution is to leave the reservation," Arbuckle insists. "But where are you going to go? There are no jobs in the cities, and you got to have at least a little capital, $50 or so, just to go looking for a week."

LITTLE CRAFT WORK

There is almost no craft work—beads, baskets, or buckskin—on the reservation.

St. Mary's Catholic Church helps where it can, and its big school, taken over by the State several years ago, provides a warm refuge for children. That hot school lunch at noon is welcomed.

The sisters at the church also operate an orphanage in which about 20 children are cared for. County funds help.

Twenty youngsters go to Ashland high school, but many hate to go because of their poor clothing and the jibes of the white children.

CONTRACT DOCTOR KEEPS CLOSE EYE ON HEALTH

Pretty close tab is kept on Indian health at Bad River. Dr. Del Andrus, 65, of Ashland, comes out to the spic and span Indian agency clinic a couple times a week.

Dr. Andrus is one of five contract doctors in the northern part of the State. The contract doctors are paid a fee by the Indian service. Serious cases of illness go to the 45-bed, 10-bassinet Indian hospital at Hayward, with its one full-time doctor and six nurses. The Indian service also has contracts with six counties and two townships for free hospitalization and medical care of Indians.

ONE DENTIST, THREE STATES

One full-time dentist, working chiefly among Indian children at the schools, must cover all of Wisconsin, upper Michigan, and Iowa. Tooth decay, caused by inadequate diet and improper care, is a major problem on reservations and in nonreservation Indian communities. But the one dentist, Dr. Charles B. Fisher, has such a huge territory to cover that he cannot visit any area oftener than about once every 2 years. Congress has not appropriated enough money to hire more dentists and doctors.

Dr. Andrus says the health situation at Bad River is pretty fair.

The Red Cliff Reservation takes up the scenic tip of the Bayfield Peninsula, the northernmost part of Wisconsin. It is the smallest of the Wisconsin reservations, and the Chippewa tribal roll contains only 653 names. The Indian service believes that about 400 people live on the reservation; local estimates are 60 families, about 250 persons.

Conditions are better at Red Cliff than Odanah. The houses are better, neater. There is more work for the people. There is more saving of earnings. Only a few are on relief, and they are a heavy financial burden on the penniless townsof Russell.

Several Indian families operate small farms. Many men are cutting pulpwood, working for whites, who are required by the tribal council to hire Indians before they are granted timber rights. Some work in Bayfield and Ashland.

NO ONE DESTITUTE

"No one is destitute here," says George Gurnoe, Jr., 57, a member of the tribal council.

When a family gets in a tight spot the town of Russell provides relief food in return for work on town roads and other projects.

Childless Mr. and Mrs. John Buffalo have a spick-and-span house and are doing all right. John works on the ore boats during the summer and fall, and he saves his money.

The James La Ferniers are making it this winter okay, but it is a tight squeeze. Mrs. La Fernier, 46, works 9 hours a day, 6 days a week in a Bayfield restaurant. She gets $20 a week. James suffered a broken leg last September, and it didn't heal properly. He has been unable to do much work.

As everywhere with the Indians, summers are kinder. Then the men and women of Red Cliff harvest strawberries, raspberries, apples, and string beans, and work in the bean cannery. There is off-and-on work with the commercial fishing boats and the tourist trollers. Then in the fall come the terrific herring runs. Everyone works around the clock—on the boats, in the canneries, processing, cleaning, and packing the fish.

WANTED: SMALL INDUSTRY

Here, too, the Indians would like to acquire a small sawmill or box factory to use the poplar and the few stands of balsam. All the financial bumps would be ironed out smoothly by the pay roll of such an industry, they are sure.

No Indian-service doctor has visited the neat agency clinic at Red Cliff for several years, but there are plans to contract with a 75-year-old doctor from Ashland for once-a-week visits.

Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver: From Slave Cabin to Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are commemorating the birthday and honoring the memory of Abraham Lincoln—the Great Emancipator, it seems to me particularly appropriate to mention the achievements of those two great Negro leaders—Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver.

In 1946, the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, of which I was then chairman, favorably reported H. R. 6528 for the minting of 5,000,000 Booker T. Washington memorial half-dollars to honor that great Negro leader who, by devoting a lifetime of service to his people, rose from slave cabin to the hall of fame.

The bill passed the House and Senate without a dissenting vote, was signed by the President, and became Public Law 610, Seventy-ninth Congress.

These coins are being distributed by the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial, Booker Washington Birthplace, Va. This memorial is a nonprofit organization dedicated to the perpetuation of the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington, and to establish trade and industrial schools for the training of Negro youth, thereby improving the economic status of the Negro and benefiting our entire national economy.

The Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial has acquired the Virginia plantation where he was born, restored the buildings including the log cabin, established the Booker Washington Birthplace, Va., post office, and are using the land for agricultural training.

In nearby Roanoke, Va., an industrial training school has been established where 250 Negro GI's are receiving industrial training; and the memorial plans to establish similar trade schools in all parts of the United States where there is a substantial Negro population in need of such training.

Booker T. Washington early recognized the talents of the eminent Negro scientist, George Washington Carver, and induced him to come to Tuskegee to carry out his scientific agricultural experiments which have so materially benefited southern agriculture, adding millions of dollars to the revenues of the southern farmer.

Several years ago a national monument was planned by the Federal Government for the birthplace of George Washington Carver, in Diamond, Mo. In 1943 Federal legislation was passed authorizing the expenditure of $30,000 to purchase the property on which Dr. Carver was born. Last year the Federal court made an award of $79,000 to clear up claims and expenses against the property. The total court acquisitional cost amounted to approximately $80,000. The original $30,000 will be applied to this, leaving a deficit of $50,000 on the property. The indebtedness has to be cleared up before plans can be carried out to establish a national monument on this spot.

Since the lives of Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver were so clearly associated, the trustees of the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial felt that something should be done by the memorial to help make the monument possible. To this end, in their 1949 annual session, the trustees made plans to establish the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation so that the George Washington Carver National Monument might become a reality.

The entire movement was initiated because of information submitted to the memorial by a Federal agency to the effect that the award would go by default if some public-spirited organization or organizations did not take hold. Since one of the main objectives of the memorial is helpfulness toward others, the trustees decided to assume the leadership.

Attorney Paul E. Bradley, of Joplin, Mo., has informed S. J. Phillips, president of the George Washington Carver Monument Foundation, that Missouri has granted a charter to this organization, with headquarters at Diamond, Mo. The charter stated that the purposes of the newly organized foundation are as follows:

First. To work out ways and means by which the needed $50,000 will be raised;

Second. To assist other nonprofit organizations;

Third. To help underprivileged youth through opportunity scholarships;

Fourth. To establish community service clubs;

Fifth. To do research in the field of agriculture and rural leadership; and

Sixth. To promote racial understanding.

Mr. Phillips, in commenting on the activities of the foundation, said that months before the granting of the charter considerable work had been done toward making local and national plans whereby the American public might have the opportunity to help acquire the birthplace of George Washington Carver, so that the national George Washington Carver monument might be developed as planned.

To make it possible for the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the direction of Congress to acquire on behalf of the United States the 210 acres comprising the birthplace of George Washington Carver, I will introduce the following bill on Monday, February 20, 1950.

I am advised that the Director of the Budget has no objection to the proposed legislation.

A bill to amend the act of July 14, 1943, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to permit the acquisition of the necessary land for establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, section 4 of the act of July 14, 1943 (57 Stat. 563), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including an amount not to exceed $80,000 to be used in payment for land to be acquired pursuant to this act."

Who Is Responsible for the Adverse Report on FEPC Legislation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate death of our colleague Chairman BLAND will justly preclude speeches on other subjects today. Inasmuch as continuous inquiries as to the status of the civil-rights legislation pour into my office, and inasmuch as I feel that the country should know who is responsible for the bottling up of this worth-while legislation, I am inserting a copy of a statement to the press which I issued today on this subject, for the information of all concerned. The release is as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH, REPRESENTATIVE FROM ILLINOIS

Congressman ADOLPH J. SABATH, Democrat, Illinois, explained today why the highly important and controversial Federal fair-employment practice bill has continually met with unfavorable action in the Committee on Rules. Mr. SABATH is the chairman of the Committee on Rules and dean of the House.

He said: "In view of the farcical performance yesterday and in the past several weeks on the part of the Republicans aided by the Dixiecrats by forcing seven roll calls in an effort to delay action on the civil-rights legislation and other important bills, I called a meeting today of the Committee on Rules in order to put an end, once and for all, to these ridiculous and dilatory tactics."

The 84-year-old veteran said: "I place the responsibility for the failure to obtain favorable action on the FEPC bill, in a great measure, on the shoulders of the Republicans. The Republicans have consistently opposed this measure notwithstanding their party platform, which reads as follows:

"'One of the basic principles of this Republic is the equality of all individuals in their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This principle is enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Constitution of the United States; it was vindicated on the field of battle and became the cornerstone of this Republic. The right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. We favor the enactment and just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic.'"

Mr. SABATH stated that both the Democratic and Republican national conventions went on record, in no uncertain terms, in favor of civil-rights legislation. Under one pretense or another, the Republicans succeeded in obtaining delays and postponements on the consideration of FEP legislation before the Committee on Rules and, "I, as chairman, never have been able to obtain sufficient votes from the Republicans to offset those who are opposed to the measure."

Mr. SABATH pointed out the fact that the very last request our great and revered President Franklin D. Roosevelt made on the last day of his life was one wherein he "urged me to endeavor to obtain a rule establishing an FEPC. Not only that, but on the day of President Roosevelt's funeral, President Truman assured me, and has demonstrated beyond a doubt, that it is also his aim and intention to bring about favorable action on this legislation."

Mr. SABATH pointed out that again in the Eightieth Congress when the Republicans had absolute control over the Committee on Rules and had the votes, they again failed to carry out their pledge to the American people; namely, to support FEP legislation.

The dean of the House very candidly stated that the same dilatory tactics were again used during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. He said: "Though four Democratic members of the Committee on Rules tried on several occasions to obtain favorable action on a rule for the FEPC bill, due to the evasive position assumed by the Republican members of the committee in conjunction with the Dixiecrats, no favorable action has been taken and adverse action was taken today." A motion to reconsider the bill carried, and one additional Republican vote could have carried the rule.

The chairman said that "In view of the fact that other important legislation is being delayed, I finally came to the conclusion that the country should know specifically and practically where the membership of the Rules Committee stands on this important and worth-while bill. I insisted that a rule be granted today for the consideration of the civil-rights measure. As a matter of fact, I felt that the meeting and the vote therein should be held at an open hearing, but the gentlemen opposed insisted that a closed session and a closed vote be taken. All this notwithstanding the fact that the clever newspapermen at all times, and even before I leave the chair, manage to obtain complete information as to any vote considered in an executive session of the Rules Committee."

Consequently, Mr. SABATH stated, "the country should know that if one more Republican had voted for the rule today, it could

have resulted in a rule being granted and the bringing of the bill to the floor of the House for consideration and debate by the membership."

Mr. SABATH charged that the Republicans have played politics with this bill from the very beginning and they are playing politics now. He said: "Next week the Republicans will continue to play politics with FEPC. At another meeting of the Rules Committee some of the Republicans who voted against the granting of a rule contemplate making a motion to reconsider the adverse vote taken today—all for the sake of confusing the American people."

The chairman stated that "I am confident that such tactics will not inure to their benefit. Let the responsibility rest on the shoulders of the Republicans who are responsible for the bottling up of this legislation."

Stichman Program Assailed by Moses as Unfair to City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, with committees in both Houses of Congress now devoting much time to consideration of cooperative housing, I believe the following item which appeared in the New York Times of December 12, 1949, will make interesting reading:

STICHMAN PROGRAM ASSAILED BY MOSES AS UNFAIR TO CITY—LIMITED DIVIDEND HOUSING PLAN WOULD GIVE AWAY LOCAL TAX FUNDS, COORDINATOR ASSERTS—SAYS MAYOR BACKS STAND—STATE HOUSING HEAD DISPUTES THIS—TO GO AHEAD UNLESS HE HEARS FROM O'DWYER

City Construction Coordinator Robert Moses attacked yesterday State Housing Commissioner Herman T. Stichman's program for the construction of tax-exempt housing projects under the State's limited dividend housing law as a too generous waiving of city taxes without the approval of appropriate city authorities.

Saying he was speaking with the authorization of Mayor O'Dwyer, Mr. Moses declared that in future all projects of this kind involving city tax exemption, city planning, and city improvements "must be discussed and agreed upon in advance by the appropriate city officials." "This procedure," he said, would have to be followed before Mr. Stichman "make public announcements to the press that they have been consummated through his unaided efforts."

Mr. Moses said his statement was prompted by Mr. Stichman's recent announcement that he had applications for 50 more limited-dividend housing projects.

In a sharp rejoinder Mr. Stichman said he had discussed the State's program for nonpromotion cooperative housing with the mayor at the outset, and that the latter had endorsed it. He added that until the mayor "personally advises" him of the withdrawing of such support he will continue with the program.

MOSES REPROACHES STICHMAN

Mr. Moses reproached Mr. Stichman for seeking to give the impression that he had the authority to establish such projects "subject to perfunctory approval by the city." Mr. Stichman, Mr. Moses said, also implied that these developments would largely eliminate the need for any intermediate type of public housing such as the city's nonsubsidized projects.

Mr. Stichman was accused of constantly criticizing such city projects while failing to indicate that all he offered the limited-dividend corporations under his program was city tax exemptions of the entire improvement. The developers pay full taxes on the land.

"Commissioner Stichman has no right to give away huge sums of city taxes for many years to come without the city's approval nor has he the right to charter and locate city-housing projects until after full investigation by the appropriate city officials, including the city planning commission and board of estimate," Mr. Moses said.

"Commissioner Stichman has some very foggy ideas as to the incidental problems and costs, all of which fall on the city, for drainage, sewerage, schools, streets, transportation, playgrounds, neighborhood zoning, and other purposes," Mr. Moses declared.

"All the projects announced by Commissioner Stichman appear to be on vacant land. They do not involve genuine slum clearance, which is the best justification for partial tax exemption. In most cases, also, the builders and developers have very little if any real equity. At most they have a small investment representing part of the cost of land and promotional expenses. They usually get an FHA guaranty nominally representing 90 to 95 percent of the full value and actually often representing more than 100 percent. This guaranty enables them to borrow all the money needed for the enterprise."

Nearby speculative builders with FHA guaranties, he added, could not compete against the limited dividend companies sponsored by the State official, which would enjoy a huge amount of city tax exemption.

Mr. Stichman, declaring that he could not recognize Mr. Moses' right to speak for the mayor "in this vital matter," said:

"I plan to go ahead trying to help lower middle-income families acquire mutual home ownership and rental housing at costs within their means. Let the city try to block this and tell the homeless its reasons. I don't think Mayor O'Dwyer or Commissioner Moses will do so.

"The mayor has told labor leaders and others who have discussed our program with him that he would cooperate with us, stating that I had always cooperated with him in housing matters. Unless and until Mayor O'Dwyer personally advises me that he is withdrawing that support from our efforts to help lower-middle-income families obtain mutual home ownership at costs within their means with State and city aid, I must continue to believe that he will keep his word with respect to cooperation from the city."

During Mr. Moses' absence in South America, Mr. Stichman said, his assistant, Harry Taylor, was kept fully informed of the State's plans. On Mr. Moses' return recently, Mr. Stichman said, the former advised him he would go along with more projects under the State program.

While the State projects are being built on vacant land Mr. Stichman said that also was true of the approximately $250,000,000 worth of the so-called nonsubsidized city projects. Speculative builders, he said, were dropping their rentals 35 percent to meet competition in sections where the State was erecting dwelling units.

He said tax exemption was only part of the program. Builders, he explained, were limiting their profits under the State program to 5½ to 7½ percent, or less than half that on city projects. Labor also was more productive on State developments, he continued, because workers knew that under the cooperative program they "will benefit themselves and other wage earners who need housing."

The Government Can't Do It All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest of pleasure that under an extension heretofore granted, I am inserting an article by Mr. Herbert Hoover, our former great President, which article appears in the American Economic Security, volume VII, 1950.

This article really comes from the heart of our greatest living humanitarian, and should cause people to reflect and act through every means at their command to preserve our own form of government from the devastating disease of socialism:

THE GOVERNMENT CAN'T DO IT ALL

(By Herbert Hoover)

We have seen a steady expansion of Government into welfare activities. I am not criticising the expansion of Government aid to public welfare. It has a place in American life—provided the cloak of welfare is not used as a disguise for Karl Marx. But parallel with this expansion, we have stupendous taxation to support the hot and cold war. That makes it difficult for the citizens to support voluntary welfare agencies. It requires more personal sacrifice than ever before.

From all this, many citizens ask themselves: For what reasons must we continue to support the voluntary agencies? Why not let the Government do it all?

The first short answer to this question is that you cannot retire from the voluntary field if you wish our American civilization to survive. The essence of our self-government lies outside of political government. Ours is a voluntary society. The fabric of American life is woven around our tens of thousands of voluntary associations. That is, around our churches, our professional societies, our women's organizations, our businesses, our labor and farmers' associations—and not least, our charitable institutions. That is the very nature of American life. The inspirations of progress spring from these voluntary agencies, not from bureaucracy. If these voluntary activities were to be absorbed by Government bureaus, this civilization would be over. Something neither free nor noble would take its place.

MORALS ARE PRIVATE PROPERTY

The second answer to this question is that it is our privately supported and managed hospitals and educational institutions that establish the standards for similar governmental agencies. It is the voluntary institutions which are the spur to official progress. Without them our governmental healing and educational agencies would lag and degenerate.

The third answer to this question is that morals do not come from Government. No Government agency can create and sustain a system of morals. Even when private charities are not working specifically in the religious field, their works confirm religious faith and morals.

There is a fourth answer. Governments and bureaucracies cannot build character in our youth. With the brutalization which results inevitably from war, character building has never been as necessary as it is today. Many private welfare organizations are, directly or indirectly, helping build character. Some, for example, support the development of sports in our youth. The ethics of good sportsmanship are second only to religious ethics.

There is a fifth answer. The greatest and, in fact, the only impulse to social progress is the spark of altruism in the individual human being. "But the greatest of these is charity" has been a religious precept from which no civilized people can depart without losing its soul. Governments practice charity solely because it rises from that spark in the hearts of the people. The day when altruism in the individual dies from lack of opportunity for expression, it will die in the Government. At best, charity by government must be formal, statistical, and mechanistic. We need charity in its real sense—from the heart.

There is a sixth reason. The world is in the grip of a death struggle between the philosophy of Christ and that of Hegel and Marx. The philosophy of Christ is a philosophy of compassion. The outstanding spiritual distinction of our civilization from all others is compassion. With us, it is the noblest expression of men. Those who serve receive an untold spiritual benefit.

THE GOOD SAMARITAN'S SOLUTION

The day we decide that the Government is our brother's keeper, that day the spirit of compassion will have been lost. If we abandon private charity, we will have lost something vital to America's material, moral, and spiritual welfare.

But a simpler answer than all this lies in the parable of the good Samaritan. He did not enter into governmental or philosophic discussion. It is said that when he saw the helpless man "he had compassion on him; * * * he bound his wounds * * * and took care of him."

Genocide in Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, 1950, marks the thirty-second anniversary of Lithuania's independence. Americans of Lithuanian extraction throughout the country will observe this day fittingly. We are well aware of conditions in Lithuania at the present time and we know that the voice of her people is mute with the heel of the Soviet tyrant on the throat of a nation and a race.

So it is that I am proud to give my voice to the cause of this brave little nation and let it resound in behalf of their liberty and freedom in this Chamber, the "home of the free and the land of the brave." Before God these people are our brothers—in thought, word, and deed.

Evil begets evil. Spawned and sired by the modern antichrist, perfected and refined in all its subtleties by these dictators who would make a god of the omnipotent state. A new and terrible crime against humanity is being perpetrated on what remains of the Lithuanian people in their beloved Baltic homeland. The purpose of Russia is to erase them as a nation and a people—right off the map.

This new horror is called genocide.

God save Lithuania from this inhumanity of man against man.

THE TOLL OF GENOCIDE IN LITHUANIA

In a memorandum dated October 3, 1949, the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation informed the United Nations of the series of major waves of genocide operations carried out by the Russians since their reoccupation of Lithuania. These operations were in addition to the systematic detention and exiling of from 2,000 to 3,000 persons monthly. The toll of Lithuanians murdered and exiled during the years 1941–48 was: 300,000 victims of the Nazi occupation and 520,000 victims of the second Russian occupation. The net manpower losses since 1940 amounted to 30 percent of the indigenous population. For a small nation of 3,000,000 people this is an irretrievable injury inflicted by a foreign state with which excellent relations had been maintained prior to the surprise invasion. The memorandum pointed out that forcible collectivization of agriculture constitutes a refined method of genocide which deprives the Lithuanians remaining in the homeland of their churches, of all personal freedom and property, of all contact with national culture, religious instruction, independent thinking. The opposition to collectivization cost 100,000 deportees in 1948 and 120,000 in the first half of 1949.

In addition to outright killings, deportations, suppression of national culture, and separation of families, the nation is deprived of all normal family life and the continuity of the nation is stopped. Young men of Lithuania are drafted into Soviet armed forces to serve in Russia. Other young men and women are drafted into "volunteer" labor battalions for service in Russia. Children are forcibly taken away from their parents and sent to specialized training schools to be reared as Russian heathens.

Lithuanian youths are waging an armed struggle as guerrillas and are dying fast. Prisoners are tortured in an unbelievable manner. Female prisoners are deliberately raped and infected with venereal diseases, and men's sexual organs are mutilated. Masses of Russians and Asiatics are brought in and settled in Lithuania.

The picture of Russian misrule and oppression is too horrible to relate in detail.

NEED FOR INTERNATIONAL ACTION

Genocide is being perpetrated in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, East Prussia, Eastern Poland, the Ukraine, and so-forth. It is perpetrated by the political organs of Soviet Russia, by Russian armed forces in occupation of these countries and areas, and under the direction of the supreme state organ of the Soviet Union—The Politburo. Collateral genocidal operations at the same time are effected against prisoners of war of other innumerable nationalities. All told, it is multiple genocide, under all five heads of the definition of genocide, affecting many peoples and many races. It is international in its operations.

International cooperation is necessary to stop international crimes. Genocide is a more horrible crime than slave trade of the former ages, or piracy, or opium trade or other crimes which are international in scope and are being suppressed by concerted international efforts.

International law is, after all, but a set of usages accepted by nations. The first step in developing new international standards is to accept the definition of certain acts and to denounce such acts as international crimes. When most members, or major members of the international community of nations accept these standards, they become established international law.

The United States is a major member of the international family of nations bound to observe the principles of the United Nations Charter. Other countries are accustomed to look to us for moral leadership, and action by the United States is reflected in all corners of the globe. Can we with honor refuse to help establish international law standards to make genocide an international crime? Our refusal to ratify the Genocide Convention would be tantamount to encouraging Serov and his ilk to expand their genocidal operations and to ignore the Ten Commandments.

It is true that, in the absence of established international machinery capable of preventing and punishing international crimes, the Genocide Convention when ratified by the required number of countries will remain ineffective against states choosing to ignore the international verdict of public opinion. Under the terms of article VI of the Genocide Convention an international penal tribunal, if and when formed could acquire jurisdiction only "with respect to such contracting parties as shall have accepted the jurisdiction of such tribunal." At this time, there is no international penal tribunal.

Had there been no Kellogg-Briand Pact, which was but a pious declaration, we would not have had an established concept of aggression, and could not have developed our notions of opposition to forms of aggression. We could not have tried the major Nazi war criminals, for conspiring against peace.

And the same with the Genocide Convention. If we ratify this treaty, it will remain for some time a set of principles with no machinery for enforcing them. However, it will have contributed to international acceptance of new standards and will carry the force of law, as part and parcel of international law. Our leadership will encourage ratification of other countries. Enforcement machinery can be discussed later. When that time comes, the United States will have ample opportunity to discuss the project on its merits. The main thing is that there will be a law against genocide. This fact alone may deter criminals.

RESOLUTIONS DULY VOTED BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN CONGRESS HELD ON THE FOURTH, FIFTH, AND SIXTH DAYS OF NOVEMBER 1949, AT HOTEL NEW YORKER IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK, UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.

I. MESSAGE TO THE PRESIDENT

(By wire, voted November 4, 1949, after the opening)

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

Delegates of 1,000,000 Americans constituted in a Lithuanian American Congress meeting at Hotel New Yorker in the city of New York, unanimously send a message of greetings to the President of the United States.

Deeply touched by the sentiments motivating your policy as expressed in your message to this Congress, the delegates in behalf of themselves and their constituencies reaffirming their undying loyalty to the principles of American democracy, pledge their loyal cooperation with your administration toward the goal of equitable domestic tranquillity and international peace founded on principles of national self-determination and Atlantic Charter, in other words on principles of freedom and justice which you invoke with God's help.

The LITHUANIAN AMERICAN CONGRESS will voice their views and aspirations in a set of resolutions after due deliberation, and copies thereof will be presented to the White House. At this time please accept our unanimous expression of gratitude for your unswerving policy of nonrecognition of the fruits of Nazi-Soviet partnership in aggression and for your continuing recognition of sovereignty of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

LEONARD SIMUTIS,
President.
Dr. PIUS GRIGAITIS,
Secretary.

II. MESSAGE TO THE APOSTOLIC DELEGATE

(By wire, voted November 4, 1949)

His Excellency Archbishop AMLETO CICOGNANI,
The Apostolic Delegate,
WASHINGTON, D. C.:

Delegates of 1,000,000 Americans constituted in a Lithuanian American Congress meeting at Hotel New Yorker in the city of New York, request Your Excellency to transmit their message of respects to His Holiness the Pope.

Gratefully recalling the increased papal intercession in behalf of the martyred people of Catholic Lithuania and their just cause of liberty, the delegates beg His Holiness to bless and invoke Divine guidance in their deliberations and their efforts seeking justice for the freedom-loving Christian people of Lithuania and other countries presently enslaved by militant Soviet communism.

LEONARD SIMUTIS,
President.
Dr. PIUS GRIGAITIS,
Secretary.

III. MESSAGE TO WASHINGTON AMERICAN CONGRESS

(By wire, voted November 4, 1949)

UKRAINIAN AMERICAN CONGRESS,
WASHINGTON, D. C.:

Delegates of 1,000,000 Americans constituted in a Lithuanian American Congress meeting at Hotel New Yorker in the city of New York send their greetings and best wishes to their fellow citizens and fellow freedom fighters of Ukrainian descent. This congress wholeheartedly supports the just cause of the Ukrainian people as that of other liberty-loving peoples presently enslaved by Russian Soviet communism.

LEONARD SIMUTIS,
President.
Dr. PIUS GRIGAITIS,
Secretary.

IV. BASIC DECLARATION

(Voted November 5, 1949)

The Lithuanian-American Congress, representing by duly elected delegates the preponderant majority of Americans of Lithuanian descent or extraction, reiterates its constituency's devotion to the principles enunciated in the American Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Wilsonian 14 points, the Atlantic Charter, the 4 freedoms, the Truman doctrine, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the objectives of the United Nations Charter, and NORTH ATLANTIC PACT.

Firmly espousing the inalienable rights of men and nations, the principle of equality of men and races, the right of all peoples capable of self-government to pursue individual happiness and to develop their creative national talents in freedom under a representative form of democratic government, the sovereign equality of states, large and small, and international cooperation under the rule of reason, of justice, and of law, the Lithuanian-American Congress carefully reviewed the events of the past decade and the deplorable state of international affairs at the close of the year 1949.

In old Europe the cradle of modern civilization, a major half of the continent lies under the sway of lawless rule by a group of conspirators established in the Kremlin of Muscovy who had extended their police-state regime over formerly independent peoples of the western Christian community of nations. The march of lawlessness and aggression initiated by Hitlerite Germany in partnership with Soviet Russia, has submerged in bondage the easternmost representatives of western civilization and democracy who had for centuries past defended Europe from barbaric onslaughts, to wit: Lithuania, Poland, Latvia, Estonia, Ukraine, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and parts of Austria and Germany. Human rights are totally extinct in all of these countries. Western Christian religions are being forcibly eradicated in the Baltic states and the Ukraine, freedom of religion is constricted in other countries, and formerly independent Christian churches are being subverted to serve the interests of the Communist Party and its political police. Living standards of the subjected peoples are lowered below the meager standards of Eurasian Russia. Millions of innocent people are being starved to death in slave-labor camps of Arctic Russia under a program of incessant genocide operations of unprecedented scale. The most formidable European races of the best fighting traditions are being molded into a mass of robots trained to destroy their own peoples and their friends of the Western World.

Resistance to Communist enslavement first exemplified by heroic Finns in a defensive open war and taken up, in underground resistance at first and in guerilla operations later, by gallant Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainians, and Poles, failed to evoke a world-wide understanding of the aspirations of these champions of the Atlantic Charter. The great democracies failed to champion the principles enunciated by themselves during World War II, and brave bands of patriots, abandoned by the signatories of the Atlantic Charter, are facing extinction in their lone fight for liberty against the armed might of Soviet Russia sustained by lend-lease. Nevertheless, underground resistance survives in the Baltic states, Poland, and the Ukraine, and is in the pangs of birth in other Communist-dominated European nations east of the Stettin-Trieste line.

In Asia, the most populous continent lies prostrate in convulsions. Militant communism is completing the subjugation of China and rearing its ugly head in other parts of the continent. The sun of freedom which had brightened the Asiatic horizon in 1945 is obscured, is setting under the hammering blows of lend-lease arms wielded by hosts directed by Moscow-trained conspirators. Unfortunately, the peoples which had recently gained their freedom at the hands of western European and American powers, evince a deplorable lack of understanding of the Communist conspiracy and its methods, and heedlessly profess their neutrality.

On other continents, the situation is more promising, even though poverty and exploitation present a dangerous contingency not to be ignored by United Nations of the non-Soviet world.

In our own country, people are recovering from their short-lived artificially fostered "love Russia" complex and are awakening to the Communist menace to American security, to American ways of life, and to international peace. The American reawakening is occasionally attended by outbursts of intemperance. Nevertheless, civil rights are imperiled nowhere in the United States, and there is every indication that Communist conspirators will be ultimately eliminated from the seats of power in the national Government and in labor unions.

The current international confusion is the heritage of the political errors and maladjustments of the fateful conferences of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Abandonment of the central-eastern European and Chinese peoples, the siege of Berlin, the veto-ridden United Nations, the huge armaments outlay and the Marshall plan—are the price for the ill-advised arrangements imposed by Stalin on gullible western statesmen, constitutional representatives and servants of the American and British peoples who posed as chiefs of state at the ill-fated conferences. These secret political decisions were never submitted for ratification, and were never ratified, by either the Senate of the United States or the Parliament of the United Kingdom. The Soviet Union itself had already violated and repudiated the letter and the spirit of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements.

Wherefore, the Lithuanian American Congress respectfully submits to the President, Secretary of State, and Members of Congress of the United States:

That the Government of the United States rescind in toto the unratified political decisions of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam conferences, which were nullified by Soviet violations;

That, having abrogated the said unratified maladjustments, the Government of the United States reaffirm its determination to reconstitute peace in conformance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter applied to the friends and former foes alike, pursuant to the declaration by original United Nations of January 2, 1942, and the Russian adherence to said principles in the international treaties signed with the United Kingdom and the United States in 1942;

That the Government of the United States insist on the sanctity of treaties, much advertised by Soviet spokesmen since 1939, by demanding that the Soviet Union honor its international treaty obligations under the peace treaties and nonaggression and friendship pacts concluded by the Soviet Union with the Republics of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland in the period of 1920–33, and withdraw the Russian occupation forces and police-party apparatus from said states;

That the Government of the United States take cognizance of the existing threat to international peace and security in consequence of the armed struggle continuing in the Russian-occupied Baltic states and in the allegedly sovereign Ukraine, a member of the United Nations, and invoke applicable provisions of the United Nations Charter as a dutiful member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council;

That the Government of the United States reaffirm its policy enunciated on July 23, 1940, regarding the devious policies and predatory activities of the Soviet Union as part of a deliberate attempt to annihilate the political independence and territorial integrity of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and, taking further cognizance of the barbarous Soviet policies applied against the Baltic peoples, invoke the aid of the United Nations in stopping the crime of genocide being perpetrated by the Government of the Soviet Union and its single ruling party.

V. THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

The Lithuanian American Congress expresses its gratification over the very active initiative of the United States Government in drafting the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

This Convention was signed by a majority of the United Nations and is ratified by several States. Its ratification is currently pending before the United States Senate.

The Lithuanian American Congress views the need to ratify the Genocide Convention as an issue second only to the problem of liberation from bondage of the Baltic states and other countries enslaved by the Soviet Union in the aftermath of the late war.

The Genocide Convention represents the first international legislation designed to effectuate at least one part of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to abolish the barbarous practices in mid-twentieth century.

Heedless massacres committed in the heat of passions by uncivilized barbarians in the ancient times, were elevated by the Soviet and Nazi regimes into a status of a planned party-state policy which added more refined methods of genocide, viz, planned starvation, sterilization, kidnaping of children, systematic disruption of family life of the allegedly inferior races and of the large segments of society at home and in occupied foreign countries, creation of conditions preventing a natural development of national cultures and religious life, and slow death by exhaustion at hard labor in the Arctic slave labor camps.

These practices did not disappear with the United Nations victory over Hitlerite Germany and the publicized transformation of the Soviet dictatorial system into an allegedly peace-loving and democratic regime. Jews and certain Slavic peoples were the primary victims of the Nazi-managed genocide, not counting the masses of the German people opposing the Nazi system. The Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainians, Volga Germans, Greeks, Crimean, and Caucasian peoples are presently the principal victims of the Russian-managed genocide, not counting the masses of the Russian people opposing the Communist totalitarianism.

Having fought two world wars in defense of the basic principles enunciated by two American Presidents and spontaneously adopted by other peoples, principally the long-suffering nationalities imprisoned within the former Russian, German and Austro-Hungarian empires, the American people are obviously determined to see these principles honored, especially by governments of the countries which were saved from destruction through American intervention in the wars and American lend-lease aid. Genocide is the most horrible crime which must not be countenanced by the civilized society and must not be encouraged by inattention, inaction, indifference and failure to ratify the Genocide Convention.

Wherefore the Lithuanian-American Congress, in behalf of one million constituents represented by the delegates voting unanimously for this resolution, respectfully urge their representatives in the United States Senate to ratify the Genocide Convention by an unanimous vote.

VI. DISPLACED-PERSONS LEGISLATION

The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 marked a significant congressional action developing out of a serious realization of the need for American contribution to the solution of the vast international problem of political refugees from the iron-curtain countries and of the persons displaced in consequence of the ravages of war. American responsibility for the creation of the problem itself was large, inasmuch as the United States Government, as a party to the unratified political maladjustments of the Tehran, Yalta and Potsdam conferences, was responsible for the presence in western Germany, Austria and Italy of the masses of people from countries which were committed at Yalta and Potsdam to the tender mercies of the Soviet Union and its cohorts of political police.

The DP legislation of 1948 represented a provisional compromise between the widely divergent views held by the respective congressional committees. The act is defective in several respects, particularly because of a comparatively small number of authorized admissions, the failure to provide for a priority to eligible persons who had spent most time in involuntary exile, acceptance of an unsatisfactory definition of displaced persons hammered out by the United Nations in the face of continuous disruptive Soviet misrepresentations and attacks, failure to provide for a fair proportional distribution of admissions among the ethnic groups, and particularly because of the unjust freezing of the small immigration quotas of the Baltic states.

The Congress failed to enact amended legislation in 1949, even though the House of Representatives had voted a Celler bill. The Celler bill contained some improvements, such as an enlarged number of admissions and a more equitable cut-off date. On the other hand, it retained the unjust provisions of freezing the immigration quotas and failed to provide for a priority to persons who had spent most time in involuntary exile. The Displaced Persons Commission pointed out other unworkable provisions, such as stiff housing guaranties, but its suggestions for amended liberalized legislation attacked principally the features which it termed "discriminatory" against Catholics and Jews. These arguments failed to convince the Senate committee which could not fail to note that the arguments of alleged discrimination were not borne out by facts and statistics.

Liberalized legislation for admission of displaced persons is needed, and the United States must share in the solution of the problem by accepting greater numbers of refugees from the iron-curtain countries. However, in solving the problem, due attention should be paid to the element of justice. The unfreezing of the immigration quotas and elimination of the restrictions not contained in the regular Immigration Act, should receive serious attention in the enactment of liberalized legislation.

Calling these reflections to the attention of Members of Congress of the United States, the Lithuanian American Congress respectfully submits that these considerations be carefully weighed and that a liberalized Displaced Persons Act be enacted early in 1950.

VII. UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The Lithuanian American Congress commends the ably rendered service of the Lithuanian American Council in educating its constituency regarding the proper mission and organization of the United Nations. Back in 1945, at the San Francisco Conference, a memorandum was submitted by this council outlining very serious observations on the plan of organization and suggesting that the veto power be entirely eliminated. At that time, spokesmen for the bipartisan foreign policy were not prepared to concede the validity of these observations fearing that the Senate of the United States would not renounce the veto power out of its regard for the extreme notions of sovereignty. By 1949, the abuse of the veto power by Soviet representatives at the UN Security Council has changed the views of a great many of our statesmen.

United Nations raised great hopes in the universe when its organization was planned and while the people firmly believed that the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" would be fulfilled. These hopes faded as American and British policies floundered over the pitfalls of the gradually revealed secret commitments of Yalta and Potsdam. Some hope is still lingering, as gallant guerrilla forces continue to fight and die with the Atlantic Charter on their lips, in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and the Ukraine. Resistance forces emerging in the satellite countries of central Europe are recalling the selfsame promise of the Atlantic Charter. But in the United Nations, the Charter is passed over in silence, inasmuch as the authors of the Atlantic Charter fail to champion it and are content with debating over harmless declarations carrying no obligation to enforce these declarations.

Nevertheless, the United Nations remains a useful organization not only as a forum for the discussion of international problems that might otherwise be settled in secret compromises as at Yalta and Potsdam. Inheriting a number of international institutions from the late League of Nations, the new international organization developed and expanded their useful functions. It brought new institutions into play to deal on a more efficient basis with vast problems of the refugees, cultural exchange and information, economic cooperation, etc. The influence of these new institutions is beneficially exercised in the countries outside the Soviet orbit—as the Soviet single-party regime brooks no interference or propaganda within the territories brought under its control in consequence of the surrender of central-eastern Europe by the American and British Governments. This influence is beneficial in spite of the fact that persons not genuinely representative of the Christian outlook of civilization serve in international councils, and that Soviet agents are permitted to terrorize anti-Communist refugees committed to IRO care in the American, British, and French zones of Germany and Austria.

United Nations would be much more effective if the veto power were eliminated entirely and if majority decisions bound all members, particularly in security matters and in the employment of force against states menacing peace.

Furthermore, any aggrieved nationality should be enabled to present its grievance and to be heard. Some excellent precedents in this respect were provided in the case of the Indonesians and Israelis—but their cases did not involve grievances against the Soviet Union. The Baltic states, the Ukraine, representatives of the true will of the nations classed as satellites, should be equally entitled and enabled to present their cases to the United Nations if that organization is to justify its existence as guardian of peace, security, and human rights.

VIII. VOICE OF AMERICA

While the facilities of the late OWI served to channel the spurious Soviet propaganda to the detriment of a number of occupied nations, the Voice of America and the United States Information Service have developed into major instruments of interpreting America, the American policy, and a genuine reporting of world events to the people of the

world, particularly to clandestine listeners among the mass multitudes enslaved by the conspirators of the Kremlin.

The standards of information have much improved within the past few years, and material broadcast were made understandable to foreign audiences for whom they are intended. The number of languages employed is likewise expanding and embracing ever larger audiences.

These developments are warmly commended by the Lithuanian American Congress. Their effectiveness is well attested by the growing Soviet attempts to jam the Voice of America broadcasts and to bar the USSR personnel from direct access to the people of the occupied countries.

The Lithuanian American Congress respectfully submits that the facilities of the Voice of America broadcasts and other information services be expanded to include transmissions in the Lithuanian language. Information should be compiled in cooperation with spokesmen of the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation and, at least occasionally, broadcast in person by personalities well known and respected in Lithuania. Similar facilities should be directed toward informing the people of Latvia and Estonia. Limited information reaches the Baltic states through the medium of German-Polish, and Russian-language broadcasts. But the masses of the population are excluded from sharing this information as long as it is not made available in the native languages understood by millions of survivors.

The Lithuanian American Council is authorized and directed to extend every cooperation to Government agencies entrusted with this service in behalf of the American people.

IX. ALL-AMERICAN COLLABORATION

The Lithuanian American Congress realizes the presence of objections to so-called "hyphenated Americans" in some sections of the country, alongside the existence of certain slavishness among the first and second generation of Americans in their eagerness to assimilate superficial "Americanism" of their own imagination. Nevertheless, "hyphenated Americans" and second and third generation Americans are second to none in their supreme devotion to the United States and to their distinguished record in the war, both on the fighting and on the home fronts. They are second to none in their sense of civic duty, and they have a superior understanding of problems associated with the countries of their ancestors and enriching their cultural contribution to America.

This superior knowledge of specific European affairs should be placed at the service of the country and should be availed of by Government agencies concerned with such affairs. In addition to local activities and keeping the neighboring communities properly informed and immunized against subversive propaganda, coordination on a national scale would be most beneficial to the country and to the cause of liberty everywhere.

The Lithuanian American Congress commends the hitherto humble efforts at collaboration made by the Lithuanian American Council, and suggests that this cooperation be made permanent, particularly with like representative organizations of fellow Americans of Latvian, Estonian, Polish, Ukrainian, Slovak, Czech, Hungarian, Rumanian, Bulgarian, Yugoslav, and Albanian descent. All of these representative organizations have at their disposal numerous newspapers, magazines, and radio programs, and a well-coordinated movement in behalf of a proper understanding of the problems of central-eastern Europe would best serve the conduct of American international relations on a well-informed and stable basis.

X. SUPREME LITHUANIAN COMMITTEE OF LIBERATION

The Lithuanian American Congress welcomed the presence at the Congress of a number of former members of the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation (the VLIK), former underground leaders and guerrilla freedom fighters, and former prisoners of the NKVD and the Gestapo.

The underground resistance of the Lithuanian people, rising spontaneously since the first day of the Russo-German partnership in aggression and the first Russian occupation of the country, became a most effective movement under a coalition of political parties and resistance combat units—the VLIK. All of the German plans of mobilization of Lithuanian manpower and economic resources failed completely, and Lithuania was one of the only two European countries which, during the Nazi occupation, failed to produce SS legions for Hitler. The passive resistance under the leadership of the VLIK and its clandestine network of information services ultimately developed into armed resistance to the German occupation and to the second Russian occupation. The experience in clandestine resistance activities gained under the VLIK leadership, enabled the Lithuanian people to continue to this very day their resistance to the most barbaric Soviet occupation.

Political collaboration between the VLIK and the diplomatic missions of the Lithuanian Republic still recognized in the capitals of the western democracies, presents another aspect of political maturity of the Lithuanian people and the unbroken unity of views and aspirations of the people surviving in the homeland and their spokesmen abroad.

The Lithuanian American Congress extends, through the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation, its greetings and expression of the most profound admiration for the gallant Lithuanian Freedom Fighters still waging battle against the dark forces of enslavement and oppression in Russian-occupied Lithuania, and for their good neighbors and friends in Latvia and Estonia.

Lithuanian Americans not only admire the fight for freedom of the Lithuanian people, and of the Latvian and Estonian peoples. They will continue to render, as they had in the past, every moral and political encouragement and assistance to the heroic forces of freedom in Lithuania and the other Baltic states until these martyred peoples shall achieve complete liberation of their homelands to resume their proper place, as masters of their own destinies, among the community of free nations.

XI. SELF-DETERMINATION AND REUNION OF ALL LITHUANIAN LANDS

The Lithuanian American Congress welcomes the activities of the Council of Lithuania Minor, spokesman for the indigenous Lithuanian population of northern East Prussia, seeking a reunion of their homeland with the sovereign Lithuanian state.

Survival of the Lithuanian speech, customs, and national orientation in northern East Prussia after nearly seven centuries of thralldom under the German rule, presents a most heartening example of the Lithuanian fitness of survival and of a Lithuanian individuality. The aspirations for a reunion with a preponderantly Roman Catholic Lithuanian state prove a genuine fraternal feeling and a great trust in the traditional Lithuanian religious tolerance which Protestant Lithuanian inhabitants of East Prussia repose in their brethren of Lithuania Major.

The Potsdam decision granting a tentative American and British support to the Russian claim to northern East Prussia violates every tenet of historic honesty, political vision, the right of self-determination, the principles of the Atlantic Charter, and the spirit of the United Nations Charter. This tentative decision, made without the advice and consent of the American people and of the population directly concerned, would condemn all of the Baltic peoples north of the Braunsberg-Goldap line in East Prussia to slavery and extinction under Russian totalitarianism. Russia has no historic, ethnic, national, economic, cultural, or security title to the Lithuanian areas of East Prussia, and a Russian or pseudo Byelorussian military-naval base at Koenigsberg could only serve as a springboard and bridgehead for further Russian aggression and expansion westward.

Wherefore, the Lithuanian American Congress respectfully submits to the President, Secretary of State, and Members of Congress of the United States that the Potsdam promise of support for Russian imperialist claims to northern Lithuanian half of East Prussia be rescinded, and that the United States espouse the legitimate aspirations of the indigenous population of that area to reunite with the sovereign and independent democratic Republic at Lithuania. Furthermore, that Lithuanian inhabitants of East Prussia, presently classed and treated as nationals of Germany, be reclassified as Lithuanian displaced persons and refugees entitled to American protection from the tentacles of Russian repatriation missions and from forcible Germanization, or cultural genocide.

XII. GRATITUDE TO RESETTLEMENT AGENCIES

The rolls of delegates to the Lithuanian American Congress were swelled with numerous new Americans who until recently had been nameless displaced persons.

Among these new Americans taking an active and intelligent part in the deliberations of this congress were former statesmen, functionaries, diplomats, scientists, professionals, teachers, army and navy officers, university students, clergymen, friars, excellent agronomists and farmers, artists, laborers, stage and opera stars, former guerrilla fighters, and victims of Russian and German concentration camps. Among them were Catholic, Protestant, and liberal men and women, former leaders and members of political parties of the Right, Center, and Left, business people and labor-union leaders. Their spirit of genuine democracy and tolerance, and high regard for human dignity and freedoms, proved that they will become, as a great many already had done, excellent American citizens with a highest sense of civic duty. Their model use of the ancient Lithuanian language coupled with their equally facile use of the English language, evoked a feeling of profound pride among the second and third generation Americans of Lithuanian descent who formed a majority at this congress.

These new Americans, the former DP's, were welcomed with warmth of feeling by the old Americans.

The new Americans have found shelter and opportunity for a resumption of normal life on the hospitable shores of America thanks to the wisdom of the executive government and of Members of Congress of the United States who made Displaced Persons Act a living reality, and thanks to the charity and selfless devotion of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and its war relief services and resettlement council, the Church World Service of the American Protestant Churches, the International Refugee Rescue Committee, the American Friends Service, Jewish volunteer agencies, and other American organizations which sponsored the program of resettlement in America of former DP's. Their combined efforts, their devotion and material contributions enriched the American community with more than 100,000 men, women, and children of finest qualities.

The Lithuanian American Congress unanimously voted to commend the executive and legislative departments of the United States Government, and the voluntary agencies

mentioned above, for their excellent contribution and humanitarian service in rehabilitating the victims of Nazi-Soviet partnership in aggression and enslavement. The National Catholic Welfare Conference is particularly gratefully commended for the great assistance rendered in aiding Lithuanian DP's, more than three-fourths of the Lithuanian refugees, of various religious affiliations, who had arrived in this country under displaced-persons program, were resettled by the Catholic agency without discriminating among Catholics, Protestants, and persons not affiliated with any Christian church.

XIII. ON CONSPIRACY OF SILENCE AND PRO-RUSSIAN DISCRIMINATION

A number of American organizations have sprung up within the past few years purporting to halt communism and save our freedom, to aid iron-curtain refugees, to present a common cause of the Soviet-enslaved peoples, etc.

As a general rule, these committees are not in any way associated with representative organizations of the American people most directly concerned with problems of the nations enslaved by Russia. Second phenomenon common to such committees is the long list of members of their boards, enumerating on their stationery persons formerly highly placed with Government departments, thus tending to create an impression of intimate association with policy-making media. At least one such organization features its endorsement by the Secretary of State.

Unfortunately, another phenomenon common to some of these committees is the pro-Russian bias and evasion of mentioning the Baltic states.

One such committee, endorsed by the Secretary of State and listing among its board of directors a former Under Secretary of State, several former Assistant Secretaries, department heads, officials of the OSS, ambassadors, the former supreme commander of the liberating allied forces in western Europe, etc. Gifts to this committee are said to be deductible for income-tax purposes. The objectives are most commendable.

However, the map printed in its informative leaflet contradicts the official policy of the United States, in effect since July 23, 1940, in that it shows the territories of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, one-half of Poland, northern East Prussia, Carpatho-Ukraine, and sections of Rumania as territories of the Soviet Union. New Poland and Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and old Bulgaria are shown in different color, to illustrate the countries meriting the interest of this committee. The Baltic states and Albania are shown outside the area. The printed text repeats the list of countries, again excluding the Baltic states and Albania, and recites that 80,000,000 sturdy people living between Germany and Russia are now in bondage. A conclusion is obvious that many other millions—in the Baltic states, Albania, Poland east of the Curzon line, the Ukraine east of Slovakia and the Pruth, as well as in Russia itself—are not now in bondage.

The Lithuanian-American Congress, taking note of the existence of such organizations misrepresenting the official policy of the United States while professing to have the endorsement of the present Secretary of State, calls the attention of the Secretary of State and of the distinguished fellow Americans serving on boards of such committees, to the misguided use of their endorsement, and respectfully suggests that they owe a duty of honor to correct the misrepresentations made ostensibly with their endorsement.

Furthermore, certain map publishers and map syndicates contribute to Soviet propaganda and to misinformation of American school students and newspaper readers, by publishing maps featuring Russia in its new frontiers, lacking any international recognition. A particularly painful impression is created by the use of such synthetic maps in the press sympathetic to the cause of liberty of the Baltic peoples and antagonistic to the predatory subversion of communism.

The Lithuanian American Congress calls on the editors and publishers of the free American press to exercise their right of calling to the attention of map-making syndicates the harm and disservice to the American people which they render by channeling Soviet imperialistic propaganda to American children and news readers. Maps shown in the official publications of the Department of State could best be utilized, and would contribute toward a better understanding of American foreign policy.

XIV. THANKS TO DISTINGUISHED STATESMEN

The Lithuanian American Congress unanimously expresses greatest appreciation and gratitude to the many distinguished statesmen who lent their moral encouragement and sympathy with the objectives of a just and stable peace which motivated this Congress.

President Harry S. Truman, of the United States, transmitted a warm message in writing. This congress found itself in unanimous agreement with the goal of freedom and justice which the President is seeking.

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of the State of New York, honored this congress by addressing it in person. His views coincided in a great many respects with the policies advocated by Lithuanian Americans.

Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR and Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD addressed the congress, and affirmed their cooperation for justice and liberation of Lithuania and the other Baltic states.

United States Senators Scott W. Lucas, Robert A. Taft, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., Millard E. Tydings, Brien McMahon, Irving M. Ives, John Foster Dulles, William F. Knowland, Homer E. Capehart, Owen Brewster, John J. Williams, Paul H. Douglas, Leverett Saltonstall, Sheridan Downey, and Edward Martin; and Representatives John W. McCormack, Philip J. Philbin, Adolph J. Sabath, John J. Rooney, John Davis Lodge, Lawrence H. Smith, Ivor D. Fenton, Ray J. Madden, James J. Murphy, Edgar A. Jonas, Harold D. Donohue, Charles A. Buckley, Lansdale G. Sasscer, Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Edward A. Garmatz, George H. Fallon, and Barratt O'Hara, transmitted their statements and declarations which greatly encouraged the delegates in their deliberations and in their hopes of ultimately achieving justice and understanding for the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and other nations enslaved by Russia.

Bishop Joseph F. Flannelly, of the Catholic archdiocese of New York, touched the delegates with his profoundly Christian sermon at St. Patrick's Basilica in New York, and his moving encouragement and blessing.

Mayor William O'Dwyer, of New York City, through Deputy Mayor John J. Bennett, welcomed the delegates to the greatest American city and voiced views which convinced the delegates that the American people are practically unanimous in supporting the administration's policy of nonrecognition of the fruits of Nazi-Soviet partnership in rapacity, and in demanding liberation of Lithuania and other freedom-loving peoples from bondage.

Their excellencies, Povilas Zadeikis, Julijs Feldmans, and Johannes Kaiv, the ministers of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia accredited to the Government of the United States, and their diplomatic and consular colleagues who addressed the Lithuanian American Congress, greatly contributed toward a most realistic understanding of the direst situation of their victimized nations. The Lithuanian American Congress found itself in full accord with their pleas for justice and demand to stop the crime of genocide being perpetrated by the Russian occupant of their countries.

The Lithuanian American Congress:
Leonard Simutis, President; Anthony A. Olis, Vice President; Pius Grigaitis, Secretary; Michael Vaidyla, Treasurer.
Resolutions Committee: Constantine R. Jurgela, Chairman; Matas Zujus, Secretary; Msgr. John Balkunas, John Januskis, Stanley Geguzis, Dr. Matas J. Vinikas, Jonas Valaitis, Vincent Rastenis, Vytautas Abraitis, Members.

Waltham Watch Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Hubert E. Howard, Chairman, Munitions Board, Washington, D. C., to Mr. Harley Hise, Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, saying "the maintenance of at least a minimum level of operation by the Waltham, Hamilton, and Elgin Watch Cos. is vital to the defense of the United States and should be preserved." I include also an editorial from the News-Tribune, Waltham, Mass., on the same subject. A recent news item quotes the mayor of Waltham as saying the city of Waltham can find other industries to take the place of the Waltham Watch Co. If Waltham does not want the Waltham Watch Co., Watertown or many other cities and towns in that vicinity would be glad to have it. Over 600 employees of the company now reside in Watertown.

MUNITIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1950.

Mr. HARLEY HISE,
Chairman, Board of Directors,
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

DEAR MR. HISE: The Munitions Board has heretofore expressed to you the position and importance of the American jewel-watch industry as a resource for national defense.

You were informed that there are approximately 8,000 highly skilled workers in the industry, and that the acquiring of the degree of skill required from 2 to 10 years of intensive training. The essentiality of the maintenance of this nucleus as a basis for expansion in times of mobilization is apparent.

The Waltham, Hamilton, and Elgin Watch Cos. employed 100 percent of their capacity in Government work from December 1941 to August 1945, manufacturing such items as aircraft instruments, chronometers, fire-control watches, time fuses, etc.

It is considered that the maintenance of at least a minimum level of operation by the Waltham, Hamilton, and Elgin Watch Cos. is vital to the defense of the United States, and should be preserved.

The above information is provided again for your consideration of the application of the Waltham Watch Co. for financial assistance.

Sincerely yours,
HUBERT E. HOWARD, *Chairman.*

[The Waltham (Mass.) News-Tribune of February 11, 1950]

SAY IT ISN'T SO

Government officials and leaders of his own party many times have had cause to be disturbed at President Truman's facility for saying the wrong thing at the wrong time. The latest outbreak of foot-in-mouth disease on the part of the Chief Executive hit Waltham Watch Co. at a most inopportune moment.

Mr. Truman, it should be pointed out, has promised much to Waltham's precision industry and given less than nothing.

By less than nothing we mean that he has dismissed this vital concern without even waiting for the results of a study he himself had asked for concerning Waltham's essentiality to the national defense.

He has consistently failed to do anything in Waltham's behalf despite his oft-quoted statement that no segment of American industry would be harmed by reciprocal trade.

His off-the-cuff statement that everything possible has been done for Waltham is puzzling indeed. By everything he can't mean tariff or quota relief. Neither the State Department nor the Tariff Commission has acted despite incontrovertible proof the Swiss import flood has strangled the domestic watch industry.

By everything he can't mean RFC assistance. About all the RFC did was to pay off banking indebtedness and enable the firm to capitalize on its inventory—through a half-price sale. That was something to be grateful for, of course. But RFC advanced no reasonable amount of working capital, and is now reluctant to release part of $3,000,000 earmarked for machinery despite the fact that the concern's asset ratio is far in excess of its debt.

No, Mr. Truman, we don't think everything has been done for Waltham. We believe a tragic disservice is being done the country's security by your casual dismissal, which so ironically came within an hour of the time when the Munitions Board was reaffirming Waltham's vital defense role.

The President's aides say he wouldn't want to be directly responsible for forcing the firm from a chance to reopen. Well, Mr. Truman, just say it isn't so. Tell us it really counts to be a 100-percent producer of timing mechanisms during wartime. Tell us that 2,200 jobs mean something.

If Waltham is expendable, won't Elgin or Hamilton be next?

Free Lithuania Shall Live Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on this thirty-second anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, I think it is fitting that we in the Congress of the United States should convey as best we can to the people of Lithuania, some message of our abiding friendship and our hope for their attainment in the near and approaching tomorrow, all of the blessings of human contentment under a government of, for, and by the people in the family of free nations in a democratic world.

The inspiring story of the part played by men and women of Lithuanian blood in building the bulwarks of civilization, and in defending the rights of man, gives us assurance that with such a people there can be no backward steps. Free Lithuania shall live again. The guaranty of that is in the quality of the character of the Lithuanian people.

In my own city of Chicago, are many fine men and women of Lithuanian birth or descent. They have made a large contribution to the great metropolis of the American melting pot. In the army of the toilers, in the professions as doctors, dentists, teachers, and lawyers, in the world of business and especially in music, where many great Lithuanian artists have excelled, the sons and daughters of Lithuania have established themselves on a proud pedestal in the city of Chicago. I am happy to number many of them among my warmest friends.

To Miss Euphrosine Mikuzis, executive secretary of the Lithuanian Council of Chicago, whom I have favorably known and admired for many years as a champion of liberty, I send this message to the large mass meeting on February 19 in Chicago, commemorating Lithuania's independence: Free Lithuania shall live again, because the quality of Lithuanian blood has never failed to prove itself when put to the test.

I feel confident that in the sentiment of this message my colleagues on the floor of this historic Chamber would join with me. In this hour it will be heartening for the people in Lithuania to know that with them is the abiding friendship of the people of the United States.

Segregation in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to clear the good name of the United States by eliminating the remains of racialism in the military forces. We just fought a war against Nazi racialism and we stand forth as world leaders of democracy and the unique right of every man to be respected, but the United States Army, perhaps the greatest of our public institutions, still retains its little citadel of racial discrimination.

The Navy and the Air Force have by now cleared themselves. During the war, the United States Navy broke the taboo under which it had labored for many years. Formerly Negro sailors could be nothing but messmen; that is, they could serve only in what was regarded as a menial capacity. There were no Negro officers. Then the Navy changed its policy, handsomely, as is the way of the Navy when it does have to make a change, and not grudgingly. It began to admit Negroes as reserve officers for wartime service, and has no complaints to make of the service rendered by these officers. Now the Navy is admitting Negroes to Annapolis and as cadets under the Holloway plan, and is commissioning Negro officers in the Regular Navy. It accepts Negro enlistments, without quota basis, and these enlistees serve on Navy ships completely integrated with white sailors. They sleep, eat, and work as individuals along with members of the majority group, without distinction, and this although it has always been customary for large numbers of the enlisted personnel of the Navy to come from the Southern States, whose inhabitants are supposed by northerners to be far more intolerant than, as individuals, they really are.

The Navy grasped the situation with courage. Authorities thought when they initiated this policy they might have a good deal of trouble. They did not have any trouble. One semiofficial writer describes the situation which ensued in these words:

> The Navy discovered that white and Negro personnel equally competent and trained, berthing, messing, and working together aboard ship and at shore establishments, and relieved of the pressures of home and family environments, and in the absence of local traditional attitudes of prejudice and discrimination, can live and work together harmoniously. It is doubtful if whites desired to make lifelong friendships of Negroes, or that Negroes themselves were desirous of future civilian associations with their white coworkers because of this experience. Nevertheless this experience tended to prove that when pressure realms are reduced, segregation and discrimination break down completely, and integration is made possible.

Since the war, the Navy has confirmed and amplified its policy of nondiscrimination, which has now been stated officially as follows:

> It is the policy of the Navy Department that no distinction be made between individuals wearing the naval uniform or the uniform of any armed service of the United States, because of race, color, or creed. All naval personnel are assigned to the various branches of the service in accordance with their mental, moral, physical, and professional qualifications. The Navy accepts no theory of racial differences in inborn ability but expects every man wearing its uniform to be trained and used in accordance with maximum individual capacity determined on the basis of individual performance.

The Air Force also, the youngest of the services, has cleared itself of its former exclusiveness based on color. This process began, rather grudgingly at first, during the war but has been, as in the case of the Navy, confirmed and amplified since, until at the present time the Air Force claims that no discrimination exists in the service.

The Army alone seems to be seeking to retain all it can of its old policies of discrimination. The Army did not have so far to advance as the other services, but it has done less advancing. There were always Negro units in the Army, at least since the Civil War, and these units have made fine records. There have been Negro officers and Negro cadets. One Negro reached the grade of brigadier general. But the Army still insists on segregating Negro soldiers in Negro units up to the company level. Until recently, while it educated Negro specialists in Army schools, it would not assign Negroes to the work for which they were specially trained, unless opportunities could be found in Negro units.

It has been the steadfast insistence of the Army that this is in the interests of military efficiency. Negroes make better soldiers, it is said, if they serve in units with other Negroes, and the Army insists that it is not an institution for social reform but for fighting.

The claim of efficiency based on segregation has never been substantiated under modern conditions. The hard core of opposition to any elimination of segregation, which has undoubtedly always existed, and still exists in the Army, has resisted even the formation of experimental unsegregated units. Why is that? It can only be inferred that the military diehards are afraid, not that the experiment will not succeed, but that it will.

There can be no doubt that eventually the military-efficiency argument would work the other way around. Other things being equal—that is, training, leadership, equipment, opportunity, and the like—every man is going to have better morale and serve more efficiently as his individual worth is recognized, his manhood conceded, and the opportunity to make good as an individual is offered to him. All our democracy is built on that, though it has yet to be recognized completely in the United States Army.

The Negro, though in our history he has been subjected to second-hand citizenship or to no citizenship at all, has played a very large and very honorable part in all the wars of the United States except that with Mexico. The first blood shed in the American Revolution was that of Crispus Attucks, a Negro, on the streets of Boston. A Negro fired the first shot at Bunker Hill, killing an English major. George Washington had between 3,000 and 4,000 Negroes in his Continental Army. About one-sixth of the whole Navy personnel in the Revolution were Negroes. There were few Negroes in the Army during the War of 1812, though some Negro irregulars saved the day for Andrew Jackson at New Orleans. The Navy enlisted Negroes in the War of 1812. Union armies in the Civil War were made up one-tenth of Negroes. There were also many Negroes in the Navy. The United States Army began the First World War with 10,000 Negroes already in service as regulars, and ended up with a total of 400,000 in military service. Among the first American soldiers to be decorated for heroism in France, were two Negroes.

Negroes participated largely in the Spanish-American War; there was even a Negro volunteer regiment made up in North Carolina, which had completely Negro officers, including the colonel. Negro Army regulars saved Colonel Roosevelt's Rough Riders from embarrassment and perhaps from destruction at San Juan Hill. In the Second World War all the services began with heavy discrimination against Negroes, which gradually broke down as the war deepened. The Army had more than 690,000 Negroes in 1945 including more than 6,500 commissioned officers. The Air Force had 563 Negro pilots and a total Negro personnel of over 80,000.

We have always asked the Negro to shed his blood for the United States, and he has done so, in spite of frequent shabby treatment. Such loyalty is one of our greatest national assets.

The present situation is far better than it ever was before in the armed services, but—at least in the Army—it is not good enough, and the present international situation points up the inconsistency between our international professions and our erring practice. All over the world, especially among the millions of Asia, communist propaganda against the United States points out to the nonwhite peoples of the world this gap between our principles and our performance. No doubt the situation is exaggerated in these reports. The question for us is, Why should there be anything for them to exaggerate?

Stock-Piling Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members a statement made by the Munitions Board in its semiannual report to the Congress, dated January 23, 1950.

The Board says:

> The probability that stock-pile procurement could not be accelerated but would rather decline during some future period of mobilization emphasizes urgency of procurement now while materials are generally available for purchase in large quantities. The unexpectedly prolonged postwar demand for materials eased somewhat during the calendar year 1949, and surpluses appeared in some commodities. Unless the stock-piling program is able to take up a sizable portion of these surpluses as they appear it is probable that production of these commodities—especially by marginal producers—will decline to new reduced levels of demand. Once this decline in output has taken place procurement for the stock pile would become more difficult. It is obviously easier to take a portion of production of a commodity in surplus than one in which the supply-demand ratio is in fair balance. This circumstance is particularly true in the case of domestically produced minerals. The Munitions Board has not taken a position as to the expediency of any action to keep domestic mines in operation. Nevertheless, the Board does realize the impact both on military strength and on stock piling of any decline in domestic minerals production. A strong, prosperous, and efficient domestic mining industry is basic to the national security. Within the limits of a balanced stock pile the procurement program, the purchase of surplus strategic and critical minerals should proceed as rapidly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I would have you note how logical and how sweetly reasonable these words are. It is, I think, the first time the policy of the Munitions Board has been stated in just this fashion. It will give great mental aid and comfort to the miners in Nevada and elsewhere whose mines are closing down by the score. Even if it pays no bills at the grocery store, we now know the Board means well and understands the problems involved.

Especially, I call to your attention the statement, "The Munitions Board has not taken a position as to the expediency of any action to keep domestic mines in operation." Mr. Speaker, if this responsible agency has not the fortitude to take a stand, I say with all earnestness that the Congress should have. We should pass an adequate mine-incentive bill without delay, save the industry from disaster, and secure this Nation from dependence on foreign sources of supply wherever possible.

Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, February 12 is the birthday of Thaddeus Kosciusko, Poland's great patriot and national leader and America's Revolutionary War general and aide to Gen. George Washington.

It is significant as well that today is the birthday of a great American patriot and hero, Abraham Lincoln. Certainly February 12 is emblazoned upon the hearts and minds of the liberty-loving people throughout the world for all time.

How better can we focus attention upon the loss of liberty superimposed upon the freedom-loving Polish people by a foreign Communist power than to bring to the attention of everyone that on the old square at Kraków, Poland, on March 23, 1794, Kosciusko took the following oath which was the signal for the Kosciusko insurrection:

> I, Thaddeus Kosciusko, swear to the Polish Nation, in the presence of God, that I will never employ the power which has been entrusted to me against any citizen, but I will exert it only to defend the integrity of my country, to recover the nation's independence, and so strengthen the general liberty of our country. So help me God.

Is it any wonder that with these sentiments in his heart the news of the outbreak of hostilities in America kindled his imagination, and he determined to go to the aid of America—a Polish knight in the cause of liberty.

It is with justified pride that Poles regard the role played by their hero, Kosciusko, in the American Revolution as a material contribution to the victory and independence of this new Nation.

Little remains of some of the great fortifications designed and built by this master of military engineering, but it is again significant that the monument erected to his memory at West Point by

American youth will remain at the citadel of American qualities of heroism and leadership a grateful tribute forever.

The hand of God must, in some way, have appeared in the selection of February 12 as the birthday of two such defenders and fighters for freedom and equality for all peoples. During the southern campaign of the Revolution, Kosciusko, with his keen susceptibility to every form of human suffering, acquired that profound sympathy for the American Negro, which 17 years later, was to dictate his parting testament to the new world, which was written as follows:

I, Thaddeus Kosciusko, being just in my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States thereby authorize my friend, Thomas Jefferson, to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own as any others and giving them liberty in my name, in giving them an education in trades and otherwise, and in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers or mothers, husbands or wives, and in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country and of the good order of society and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful, and I make the said Thomas Jefferson my executor of this.

It follows that the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, did, with his heart's blood, write forever an unforgettable memorial to the same sense of justice.

Upon returning to Poland after the American Revolution, there soon flamed under Kosciusko's leadership all through Poland once again the cause of freedom and liberty against a Russian tyrant. And today there still rings clear in the minds and hearts of all the freedom-loving Poles in the motherland the clarion call of Kosciusko when it is realized that once again, under the heel of the Russian tyrant, free Poland lies bleeding.

But it is certain to know that, as ever, with the help of Almighty God, Poland will rise again.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a short biography of Thaddeus Kosciusko, published by one of the outstanding patriotic organizations in the United States, the Polish American Congress, and may I conclude my tribute to the great Kosciusko with this quotation from the said document:

Kosciusko's body now rests in the Wawel Cathedral in Krakow, where lie Poland's kings and her most honored dead; but his heart is in the Polish conquerors. To his memory, 3 years after his death, the nation raised a monument perhaps unique of its kind. Outside of Krakow towers the Kosciusko Hill, fashioned by the hands of Polish men, women, and children, bringing earth from the battlefields where Kosciusko had fought. The act is typical. To this day the name of Thaddeus Kosciusko lives in the hearts of the Polish people, not only as the object of their profound and passionate love, but as the symbol of their deepest national aspirations. His pictures, his relics, are venerated as with the devotion paid to a patron saint. Legend and music have gathered about his name.

"His dust in Poland rests—
His proud heart a shrine!
Poland! He is thy son!
Columbia! Also thine!"

James Dempsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared currently in the Scranton Tribune, Scranton, Pa., paying tribute to my constituent, James Dempsey, 1619 North Webster Avenue, Dunmore, Pa., who received honorable mention in the science talent search for Westinghouse science scholarships.

DEMPSEY CITES IN CONTEST—GETS CHANCE AT SCHOLARSHIP

(By Gene Coleman)

How many 17-year-old high-school seniors do you know who can conduct a project delving into the mysteries of the isolation, purification and crystallization of the alpha-hemolysin of staphylococcus aureus and come up with honorable mention in the science talent search for Westinghouse science scholarships?

Well, there is one here, in fact he's the only one in this city.

His name is James Dempsey, son of Mr. and Mrs. James Dempsey, 1619 North Webster Avenue, Dunmore, and he's a member of St. Paul's High School senior class.

Jimmy was awarded honorable mention in the Nation-wide competition sponsored by Westinghouse and a chance for a possible scholarship at a college of his choice.

It all started some time ago, in fact, it was last September. He decided to enter the contest and picked his project—that scientific tongue twister above.

When the reporter regained his composure from the spelling gymnastics involved, Jimmy explained, "It's a study of the bacteria which cause such external infections as boils, carbuncles and the like. It's not really as bad as it sounds," he laughed.

He worked on this project steadily since last September and then on December 12 took the examination, which is open only to high-school seniors pursuing a science course. Of the 13,500 competing, 40 were chosen to go to Washington, D. C., where one girl and one boy will be chosen for scholarships.

There were 260 others given honorable mention—and only 11 were from Pennsylvania. These students' names will be circulated among the colleges which usually offer a scholarship to the student. However, the student has his choice of schools.

Jimmy said he never bothered with scientific pursuits until he came to St. Paul's as a freshman. However, today he has his own laboratory in the basement of his home with equipment totaling about $1,000.

"I needed a lot of special equipment which isn't usually found in school labs," he explained, "so I saved up enough money from working as a life guard at Moosic Lake and tutoring at summer school last year to buy what I needed."

He also stated that he made some of his equipment himself.

In the course of working on his project Jimmy told how he lost three rabbits through his experiments.

"They were the only casualties," he laughed, "outside of myself. I wound up in the hospital for 3 weeks after an explosion in my lab last summer."

How about fellow students' reaction to the embryonic scientist's work? They're so cooperative they even give their blood to help him out.

In the course of his research Jimmy needed human blood—and almost had himself tapped dry.

His plight was soon made known to his fellow students and after some time he had a list of donors.

"Dempsey's taking blood again" would be whispered through the halls as coatless students walked out of the lab rolling down their sleeves.

"They were swell about it—and nobody seemed to mind losing a couple drops of blood," Jimmy chuckled.

In a more serious vein, Jimmy said that his ultimate goal is to become a doctor of medicine. He would like to attend the University of Pennsylvania for his preliminary training.

The young scientist also plans to enter the State-wide competition sponsored by the same organization again this year.

From all indications it seems as if he has a head start.

Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the thirty-second anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the people of Lithuania finds that brave country and its people still enslaved by the godless Communist dictators. Another year of subjugation has passed, during which unspeakable crimes against religious tolerance, individual rights, and personal liberty have been committed by Moscow's henchmen. But these cruelties and inhumanities have not diminished in the slightest degree the fervor, the yearning, the unquenchable thirst for liberty and freedom so deeply rooted in the hearts and souls of the Lithuanian people. This passion for liberty, so basically imbedded in the very being of all oppressed peoples, cannot be, and never has been in all history, weakened or destroyed by the terrible physical outrages dictators invariably employ in their efforts to bring about complete domination and subservience to their will.

The pages of history will brilliantly portray the gallant struggle Lithuania has made and is making to rise from under the iron heel of her betrayers. The darkness and gloom behind the iron curtain cannot continue forever. Streaks of light are commencing to show through the chinks in the rusting metal, for that metal is subject to erosion and corrosion. Once the decay gains momentum, the time will be short when the free minds and the free souls of an indomitable people will again bask in the sunlight of that cherished liberty which seemed so hopeless during the darkened days of imprisonment.

That freedom will be realized when Lithuania, the Baltic states, and the other oppressed small nations now engulfed by Stalin's Communist tyrants and other dictators are again restored to their rightful places in the family of free nations. It is my fervent hope that we, as the rightful leaders in the universal struggle for democracy, will continue to lend every possible assistance to these unfortunate peoples. Lithuania will rise again to its desired place in the full light of true democracy and complete freedom and liberty.

Again, in the Second Year Since the Civil Rights Commission Reported, the South With No Federal Legislation To Force Action, Made Great Progress in Education and Other Facilities for Its Negro Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, today, on the second anniversary of the President's message on civil rights, I would like to point out that not a single one of the proposals has received congressional approval and we are still engaged in a divisive controversy. The proponents of FEPC, for example, insist that the Congress pass only the committee-sponsored bill, including its penalty and coercive provisions, with the result that a policy of promoting nondiscrimination through proper methods is not entertained.

One year ago, Mr. Speaker, I outlined a program upon which an honorable and just solution of this problem could be based. I repeat the words used at that time:

> The answer we should seek is not the conventional southern answer nor the nonsouthern answer. We * * * must find the right answer.

While my suggestions have received strong support in the South and elsewhere, the advocates of FEPC and other civil-rights bills have refused to consider anything less than the President's program.

Fortunately for the country, the political stalemate is not retarding educational progress in the States, particularly in the South. The events of the past year demonstrate that we are cooperating effectively for the advancement of both races.

Inequalities in school facilities are being rapidly corrected. North Carolina, for instance, has embarked upon a $50,000,000 construction program. In Arkansas, last November, almost every school district in the State voted to increase the tax for school districts considerably above the 18-mill limit which had previously prevailed. Much of the increase will go to finance construction of buildings for Negro students. In all other Southern States similar programs have been inaugurated. Another significant educational development in the South has been the adoption of a teacher-certification plan, under which all teachers, white and Negro, are placed on an equal competitive basis for salaries. The salary is determined by the grades teachers make on national teacher examinations and their years of educational preparation and experience. In North Carolina, as a result of this system, the salaries of Negro teachers average slightly higher than those for white teachers.

Continued strides have been made in making available to qualified Negro students an opportunity for a college education and graduate and professional study. In Arkansas, an increase in the annual appropriation for the State A. M. and N. College for Negroes from $175,000 to $450,000 was voted. In addition, the college board was authorized to issue bonds to construct many needed buildings. The number of students has increased accordingly. Most Southern States maintain a comprehensive on-the-farm training program for Negro veterans—a program that is doing much to build a strong agricultural economy through the encouragement of better farming practices and farm ownership.

I am also proud to report that in my home city of Little Rock, Ark., the citizens voted a $359,000 bond issue for a Negro park and recreational facilities. Under the urban redevelopment and slum-clearance program, the city will use that sum not only to build the facilities contemplated in the bond issue, but also 1,000 new homes for Negro residents.

Mr. Speaker, these are just random samplings of some of the things done in the South during the past year for the benefit of our Negro citizens. There is a growing awareness that much remains to be done, but we can, with the help of both races, achieve wider opportunities for all and a better understanding between the races.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of today:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

With courage that rises above despair, the Lithuanian nation today observes the thirty-second anniversary of its independence with ceremonies which will unite Lithuanians everywhere except in Lithuania itself. This sturdy people, speaking one of the oldest living languages, proclaimed their independence amid the flames of the First World War on February 16, 1918, ending generations of oppression by the Russian Czars. Today, after another world war against tyranny and in defense of freedom, Lithuania, like the neighboring Baltic countries of Latvia and Estonia, is again under the iron heel of an oppressor. Only those who have escaped from this little country can still raise their voices in its behalf.

The Soviet Government is attempting to "Russify" Lithuania by settling it with Russian Communists. According to charges submitted to the United Nations by the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation, some 600,000 Lithuanians out of a total population of less than 3,000,000 have already been deported to Russian slave-labor camps, killed, or starved to death, and the deportations are proceeding at the rate of 2,000 to 3,000 each month. A Lithuanian underground is still active, and Lithuanian independence is still recognized by the Government of the United States.

Department of Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to yesterday's action of the national legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, when it adopted a mandate calling for Cabinet status for the Veterans' Administration. For a number of years I have been advocating such a move and I am glad that this powerful veterans' organization of 1,200,000 members is lending its support to my measure.

In accordance with permission previously granted, I include the text of my bill, H. R. 1844:

A bill to establish a Department of Veterans' Affairs

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established at the seat of government an executive department to be known as the Department of Veterans' Affairs, and there shall be at the head thereof a Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The provisions of chapter 1 of title 5 of the United States Code shall be applicable to said Department, and in furtherance of such purpose, section 158 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 1), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Eleventh. The Department of Veterans' Affairs." The said Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the said Department of such device as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal.

SEC. 2. There shall be in said Department an Under Secretary and five Assistant Secretaries, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall perform such duties as shall be prescribed by the Secretary: *Provided*, That one of such Assistant Secretaries shall be the Surgeon General and another of the Assistant Secretaries shall be the General Counsel. Such Assistant Secretaries shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum each.

SEC. 3. There is hereby transferred to the Department of Veterans' Affairs all personnel, files, records, property, reservations, and facilities of the Veterans' Administration of both the central office and field stations. The balances of all appropriations and all trust funds of the Veterans' Administration shall be available for expenditure by the Department in the same manner as if originally

specified in the respective statutes authorizing or creating such appropriations or funds.

Sec. 4. All contracts and agreements entered into, and all orders, rules, regulations, delegations, permits, or other privileges issued or created by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, shall continue in effect until modified, superseded, or terminated. All laws relating to the Veterans' Administration, and those relating to veterans' benefits generally, shall remain in effect except as hereby modified and shall be administered by the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs.

An Example of Chinese Brutality and Helplessness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, there appears in the February 7 issue of the Oberlin Review, a publication of Oberlin College at Oberlin, Ohio, a shocking report of Chinese cruelty and duplicity which I insert for the information of my colleagues:

CHINA MISSIONARY TELLS OF NATIONALIST BRUTALITY

To the Editor:

Those who are interested in the situation in China, or who are concerned about United States policy there, will be interested in the following report on the liberation of Chungking. It is written by Rev. F. Olin Stockwell, a Methodist missionary who was delegated to represent the United States Government in Chungking when the American consul departed:

"The last days of November brought the news of the rapid advancement of the Communist troops, with the assurance that the government was fighting stubbornly and retreating slowly. On Saturday, November 26, Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, spoke in Chungking, assuring the leaders that the war was not lost if they but took courage and fought to the last. Three days later the last of the troops abandoned the city, and on the evening of November 30 the firing of firecrackers announced the entrance of the Red Star troops. Peace had come at last.

"The troops which came reported that they had no opposition. A few hundred troops had taken the city, without firing a shot. Some reported that in the long miles from Changsha to Chungking the Government's troops fled before them so rapidly that they had not even had a chance to use their ammunition. The rumor that the enemy was approaching sent them scurrying like frightened rabbits, throwing away their equipment and deserting into civilian clothes by the scores. The war had become a victory parade."

OVER 5,000 DIE IN ARSENAL DESTRUCTION

"Not only were men and leaders alike fearcrased, but they exhibited a brutality that is almost unbelievable. On the night of November 29, the death-like quiet of the city was punctuated with the blowing up of ammunition dumps and arsenals. Not until later did we learn that the blast had wiped out from three to five thousand people—coolies and workmen at the arsenal who were given no warning of the plans and who were blown to pieces by those for whom they had spent their lives.

"In addition to this act was the machine-gunning of between three and four hundred political prisoners at the concentration camp at Tse-chi-keo on the outskirts of Chungking. This camp was organized as a training center during the war, and American personnel assisted Chinese personnel in developing spy work against the Japanese. Since the war the secret agents of the Central Government have carried on at the same center, directing their activities against the Communists. Stories of brutality, of secret arrests and executions, have been whispered about from time to time.

"On the night that the Central Government left Chungking, from three to four hundred men, political prisoners held on the charge of being Communists, were brutally machine-gunned and burned at this one center, their bodies thrown into ditches or left to rot in the open. Several escaped to tell their story. A YMCA foreign secretary (American) visited the center 2 days and saw with his own eyes the ghastly scene. The order for this crime came straight from the top, signed by the generalissimo himself. It is a complete copy, on a smaller scale, of Nazi actions in Germany. Unfortunately, because of America's former relation to this center, the crime is accredited to America, as well as to the dying Central Government.

"In Methodist circles in America, Chiang Kai-shek is remembered as he who gave property and endowment for an orphanage at Chungking, where today there are 200 smiling children. In Chungking circles he will long be remembered as the cruel and despotic ruler who ordered the slaughter of more than 300 political prisoners as a last-minute gesture of helpless defiance."

DON WILLMOTT.

Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter from Mr. Fred Crisman, of Salem, Oreg.:

SALEM, OREG., *January 23, 1950.*

Mr. WALTER NORBLAD,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In England when the average Britisher feels put upon or has a feeling that all is not right with the "tight ill' isle" he writes a letter to the London Times. In the United States he writes his boy in Congress and tells him what he thinks. This is what I think.

You, sir, are a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I believe, as such, you, in all probability, keep your eye on what is going on overseas. As a vet you are interested in the steady threat that creeps along, both in Europe and Asia. In the past, while I didn't like the troubles in Germany and eastern Europe, I felt that our State Department was in capable hands that knew and understood the people there better than I could ever hope to. I have changed my mind. China has fallen to the Reds. I know China, and when I see what can happen there, Mr. NORBLAD, it makes me stop and think. I met Ho-Chi-Minh (Ho-Chin) in French Indochina, for my money he was wrong then, and now the French forced by the fall of Chiang must not resist. Indo-China is on the verge and will go soon. What next, Mr. NORBLAD? India? That is what has changed my mind.

The Commies are raising such a fuss in Burma that the country is in chaos, admittedly falling fast to their control. What a dirty shame. I feel this very bitterly. I was badly wounded in Burma. I was shot down in flames over My-Bon, during the small battle for Ru-Wa on the coast of Burma. I left a lot of blood out there and it makes me mad to see it all go, while people I thought were in the "know" grovel and back up before a gang of international brigands whose only difference from the Nazis is the cut of their uniforms.

I no longer think the people guiding our State Department know just what they are doing. They do not seem to rate the "loss of face" in the same manner as those who have spent some little time in the Orient. It is a matter of tremendous importance to a nation as well as to the individual.

I do not have any illusions that this small letter will rate any "big beer" in Washington, but I have it off my chest, and you are the man to tell it to, I feel. I need not tell a Member of Congress that for every single letter one of us will take the trouble to write, there are more than several people who feel the same way. I just happen to feel a bit worse about the CBI—it was "my" corner of the earth during the late ruckus out there.

Yours truly,

FRED CRISMAN.

CIO Urges Congress To Pass the Middle Income Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the executive board of the CIO today adopted a resolution urging the early passage of the Spence bill, H. R. 6818, which will provide cooperative housing to the middle-income groups. In that connection the CIO issued the following statement today, which I commend to the attention of the House:

The CIO urges the Congress to pass the middle-income housing bill.

Millions of American families, including the overwhelming majority of the membership of the CIO, now fall within an income group whose housing needs have been ignored by the Congress.

CIO's housing committee has repeatedly urged the Congress to take steps to eliminate this gap and to complete its program by providing for this no man's land in housing.

Banking and Currency Committees of both Houses are now considering the administration's proposal in this area. The proposals, known as the Maybank amendment (to S. 2246) in the Senate, and the Spence bill, H. R. 6818 in the House, provide lower costs through long-term loans of private investment capital at low rates of interest to cooperatives. This program can reduce housing costs by approximately 30 percent. With this reduction in costs most of the gap in the present housing program can be filled without additional expense to the Government.

We are heartened to see the wholehearted support which this program has been given by widely representative groups and organizations such as the American Legion, the Cooperative League of the U. S. A., the National Housing Conference, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the National Conference of Catholic Charities, the Jewish War Veterans, and many other organizations.

Major segments of the organized real-estate industry, either out of greed or shortsightedness, have continued to oppose Government action to solve our housing shortage. They seek Federal aids for themselves, they try to deny it to those who would produce more adequate housing at lower costs. Some of them seek to meet the problem by selfishly securing unto themselves, tax exemptions which would be denied the rest of the community. That way leads to the bankruptcy of America's cities.

The CIO urges the Congress to ignore the pleas of the greedy and support the program pending before it on a bipartisan basis reflecting the bipartisan nature under which the program was developed and widely supported.

We urge the Congress to permit this program to go ahead and give it as a new instrument the kind of sympathetic support and administration which will make possible the solution of the middle-income housing problem to as high a degree as the achievements of the REA which brought electricity with all its benefits to 80 percent of the farms in this country.

False Economy in the Post Office?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is much concern among many people in Chicago over the effect upon workers generally of an order of the Post Office Department assigning laborers receiving less pay to do the work now performed by the Federal postal clerks. It is felt, and I believe with some justification, that while at the present time this would affect a total of only six or seven hundred workers there is the great danger that it will set a pattern by which a general fall of wages throughout the Nation, and not only in the departments of the Government but in industry as a whole, will be effected.

I bring the matter to the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues. No one more sincerely believes in economy in Government than do I, but I do not wish those things to be projected in the name of economy that will wreck our economy. The conditions that preceded the depression of 1929 are too fresh in my memory for me to be blind to the consequences that inevitably result when high economic crimes are committed by those wearing the disguise of economy.

There is a real economy, a sound economy, an honest economy and that is the kind of economy that we in this Congress should be committed to. Merely to reduce in one group the wages of humble workers already underpaid, and thus continue the process of pilfering from the pay envelopes of other underpaid workers is the economy that destroys. It is the signpost on the road to depression. This was the kind of economy that ushered in the depression of 1929 when, to ward off a growing depression, the only remedy that was offered was to cut down wages.

No man in the public life of America is more highly esteemed than the Postmaster General, and justly so. I have confidence that when he has reviewed the immediate effect and the possible repercussions of the order we have been discussing that he will take such action as in his judgment and from his long and rich experience will seem to him proper, and which will be satisfactory to all of us who do not want another depression to start in the germ-beds of false economy.

That my colleagues may know the depth of feeling on this subject among the workers of Chicago, I am including in my remarks the following resolution adopted by the Chicago Federation of Labor on February 7, 1950:

Whereas the Post Office Department has issued orders assigning cheaper mail handler (laborers) help to work presently performed by post-office clerks; and

Whereas this order increases the assignments of the mail handlers at the expense of the post-office clerks; and

Whereas the object of the order is to employ mail handlers in great numbers at average salaries of $600 a year less than the present salaries of post-office clerks; and

Whereas the pay scales and working rules governing the employment of post-office clerks represent the energies and labors of many decades by the trade-unionists who honor their membership in the National Federation of Post Office Clerks and the American Federation of Labor; and

Whereas the many milestones of progress accomplished by the organized-labor movement in Government industry are now currently wiped out by one stroke of the Postmaster General's hand; and

Whereas the order results in a lowering of the standard of living of large masses of post-office workers, resulting in a defeat of the aims and objectives of the organized-labor movement of the United States; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Chicago Federation of Labor go on record as favoring that the anti-labor orders of the Postmaster General, issued on October 27, 1949, Change Order No. 250, be immediately rescinded and the work restored to post-office clerks; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS and Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, and the Congressmen of the Chicago area, and urge them to do all in their power to have the order by the Post Office Department of October 27, 1949, known as Change Order No. 250, rescinded.

Adopted by the Chicago Federation of Labor, February 7, 1950.

Gettysburg Address—1950 Version

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, the biographers of Abraham Lincoln tell many stories of his humor, which sometimes was delivered with the sardonic touch. Nothing in our literature compares to the immortal Gettysburg Address. Yet, somehow I am sure, that if he were alive today he would forgive generously—and perhaps with a smile—this parody which comes to me, the original author unknown:

GETTYSBURG ADDRESS—1950 VERSION

Ten score plus 7 years ago, our fakers brought forth upon this Nation a new tax, conceived in depredation and dedicated to the proposition that all men are surtaxed, unequal.

We are now engaged in a great mass of calculation, testing whether that taxpayer—or any taxpayer—so confused and impoverished, can long endure. We are met on Form 1040. We have come to dedicate a large portion of our income to a final resting place with those men who here spend their lives that they may squander the fruit of our toil.

It is altogether anguish and torture that we should do this. But in the legal sense we cannot evade—we cannot cheat—we cannot underestimate this tax. The collectors, clever and sly, who computed here, have gone far beyond our poor powers to add or to subtract. Our creditors will little note nor long remember what we pay here, but the Bureau of Internal Revenue can never forget what we report here.

It is not for us, the taxpayers, to be consulted here on the tax receipts which the Government has thus far so ignobly spent. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these vanishing dollars we take increased devotion to the few remaining; that we here highly resolve that next year will not find us in the higher income bracket; that this taxpayer, underpaid, shall figure out more deductions; and that taxation of the people, by the President, for the Government, shall not cause our solvency to perish from our hearth.

Thirty-second Anniversary of Adoption of Declaration of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the other Members of the House in paying tribute to the Americans of Lithuanian descent who today are celebrating the thirty-second anniversary of the adoption of the declaration of independence at Vilnius. This occasion is commemorated not only by our citizens of Lithuanian ancestry but by all like-minded individuals. The good and brave people of Lithuania, existing under the heel of the oppressor, do not sit by passively and accept without resistance the yoke of slavery. Despite the constant persecution and indescribable humiliations to which they have been subjected in their struggle, they have had the fortitude and courage to carry on a resistance against their oppressors. Fighting for liberty and freedom and for the belief in the church of their ancestors is the tradition of Lithuanians. They still hold high the torch of their tradition and do not break faith. They look

forward to the day when the march of communism is stopped; and on that day a new proclamation of liberty will again bring joy to the hearts of the people of Lithuania and all other freedom-loving nations of the earth.

Uncle Sam Plays Santa Claus to the World—Lets Its Native Indians Starve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the neglect and inefficiency by the Federal Government of the native American Indians is a blot on mankind. For a Government that dishes out billions to irresponsible governments and people the world over—the blot becomes a shame.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert a series of articles by the Milwaukee Journal on this subject:

UNHAPPY HUNTING GROUNDS (IX)—INDIANS FORCE TO LEAVE BECAUSE OF FAULTY DEAL

(This is the second story in a series on Indian conditions in Wisconsin.)

(By Rod Van Every)

The most stark poverty among Wisconsin Indian reservations exists the Lac Court Oreilles in Sawyer County.

But Lac Court Oreilles is not much different from other reservations.

No one has starved to death at Lac Court Oreilles (pronounced "Cooderay"), and this is taken by many to mean that things can't be too bad. But the diet is inadequate and malnutrition has laid many Indians open to diseases which have killed them. The death certificates do not list starvation as the cause.

There is almost no work in winter in the vicinity of Hayward, Stone Lake, and Couderay. A few Indian men cut pulpwood. A few work for the United States Indian Service, usually the same ones. The old ones get old-age-assistance checks. Some families that have taken in abandoned children get foster-home funds. Almost everyone is getting, or trying to get, relief.

But see for yourself. Step into the home of George Wade, 67, of Reserve, the largest Indian community at Court Oreilles.

CHIEF INCOME IS PENSION

On the outside the house looks pretty good, but inside you find its three rooms bare. There are two beds in the bedroom, one in the living room; another is in the kitchen. Here George Wade lives with his wife and six children. Two of the girls are at St. Paul looking for work. Paul, 21, recently came home after his discharge from the army. He brought with him his 19-year-old bride, a frail, frightened white girl from Missouri.

The chief income for this family is George Wade's $60 a month old-age pension. He was very glad to become 65.

Mrs. Wade sits at a table. There are saucers of beads on the table, and she is working at a small wooden frame over which threads are stretched. Most of the women at Reserve and at the poorer community of New Post, 13 miles away, are at this moment doing the same thing.

They are making strips of beads, about 1 inch wide and 20 inches long. The strips will be sewed to leather belts and sold to the summer tourists in the novelty stores in Hayward and other resort towns. Mrs. Wade sells her work to a white woman living just off the reservation, who sells the strip to a belt company. The white woman furnishes the beads and thread. The beads have been counted, and broken or defective beads must be returned so that there can be no chance of the women selling their work directly to tourists.

WORK AT HARVESTS

The pay for this, one of the main industries of the Court Oreilles Reservation? It is 25 cents a strip. As the Indians tell it, one woman, if she works hard all day and pays not too much attention to the home and children, can make three.

At the white stores the belts cost $3 and up.

In the summer the Chippewas at Court Oreilles pack up and go to the Door Peninsula to pick cherries or farther north to pick strawberries. They also follow the bean, potato, and cranberry harvests. Some guide for fishermen. Others work at summer resorts as handymen or the women as maids. There is some town road work, and some Federal blister rust-control work. Some gather wild rice.

"But you can't save enough for the winter," they say.

The fact is, many do not try. "Too many live for the day," says Father Engelhard Troesken. He has worked with Indians for 40 years, 35 with the well off Menominees at Keshena, 5 at Court Oreilles. He is pastor at the St. Francis Solanus Catholic mission and school at Reserve.

CHURCH IS DOING MUCH

The church is doing much to help the Indians, and the good-looking, 6-foot 2-inch Father Paulinus Groskopf rushes around the reservation in his 1948 Plymouth, concentrating as much on the Indian's empty belly as his soul. Father Paulinus is 36 and a dynamo of energy. Often, very often, Father Paulinus is a scratchy burr on the hide of the Indian Service.

Father Paulinus is a realist. He saw starvation in China, and he recognized the signs at Court Oreilles.

"Sure, he is a fat Indian," the priest said. "But that is potatoes. Or maybe beans or macaroni, all starch. Malnutrition is general here."

The father has many friends over the Nation. He is not bashful about asking them for financial help for the Indians. He gets it, too, but not nearly enough.

Father Paulinus' Indian parish is at New Post, 18 miles from Reserve and the worst slum of Court Oreilles. Take a look.

HELPY WAS SLEAVER

Here is Clyde Miller, 53. His wife, Violet, 34, is in a Federal tuberculosis sanitorium. He must care for the six children. He cannot get out to work. When Violet took sick last June, he applied immediately for relief. He got it in October, he said.

Mrs. Katie Martin, 67, lies in bed in a cluttered, dirty room on the second floor of her rickety house. She has been ill most of the winter.

Her two daughters and their four small children live there. There is no man. Katie's husband died 3 years ago, and her daughters' husbands are not around.

They have been getting $10 worth of relief groceries a month for 3 months, Katie said. While she lies in her bed, Katie Martin keeps working at the beads and the buckskin.

POPULATION UNKNOWN

Walter Thayer, 42, and his wife and four children live in a one-room tar-paper shack. His cupboard contains flour, a can of green beans, potatoes, raisins, one can of condensed milk, and some coffee.

Nine children live in another two-room shanty. A 17-year-old girl is in charge while the mother is having her tenth baby in the Hayward Indian Hospital. The husband left last September—not an uncommon Indian custom—and he won't be back.

There's Charlie Wolf, 49, who has one of the best and cleanest houses at New Post. He attended Oshkosh State Teachers' College and now guides and does carpenter work in the summer. Bill Conger, 31, deep in debt, lives in a one-room hut with his pregnant wife and two children. Hank Smith, 45, who wanted to start a grocery, says it took him 1½ years to get a $900 tribal loan.

No one knows exactly how many Indians are living on the Court Oreilles Reservation (or any reservation, for that matter). Father Paulinus thought there were about 1,000—perhaps 250 families. Two Indian-service sources said 900 and 700, respectively. On the tribal roll are 1,707 names, but many of the people are scattered throughout the State.

SKINNY WINTER DEER FEATHER LITTLE FOOD

Few homes at Court Oreilles have electricity. Kerosene lamps provide light. There are only a couple of telephones. Water must be brought from one of several community pumps. Toilet facilities? The privy is at the rear of the house.

Deer are not much of a source of winter food at Court Oreilles. The heavy snows drove them far into the swamps, and they have grown skinny and their meat is strong from eating bark and pine needles. When you can get through the deep snow a deer can be a good source of income. The white man will buy it, but you are a violator, and the game warden cannot be very understanding.

At Reserve, "the Farmer" says that the Indians have a way of taking care of each other, of sharing what they have. The farmer is Walter M. Bagley, district agent for the Indian service. He is liked by most of the Indians. The title derives from the old treaties which gave reservation Indians the service of "a farmer" or adviser on agriculture.

Bagley has some surplus commodities—potatoes and cans of dried eggs—in a back room, but not nearly enough. One day the newspapers had stories about how the Federal Government was going to dump 50,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes. But there are no Indian Service funds to pay for shipping them to the reservations.

Last week end the people of Rice Lake, 50 miles south of Court Oreilles, sent two truckloads of food to the reservation.

Although the Indians believe that Bagley is doing all he can to help them, they look with some suspicion on the Great Lakes Consolidated Indian Agency at Ashland. The agency oversees Indian affairs, except for the Menominees, in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Iowa. Jesse C. Cavill is the general superintendent. Many of the things the Indians complain about are the result of policies made in Washington, D. C., he says. He explains that the agency funds are strictly earmarked and he cannot spend them for such things as food, even though it may be needed badly.

Actually, the agency did provide a small relief fund by a year's end saving in other funds. Most of it went to Court Oreilles, Cavill said, but other reservations needed it, too.

CHILDREN GET LUNCHES

The amount of food on hand at Bagley's headquarters at Reserve was pitifully small.

Bagley issues it on an emergency basis, often to tide over a hungry family before it receives relief food through a joint tribal town fund.

From time to time there have been surplus commodities. Many Indians did not know until very recently that they could get surplus foods and Federal relief packages.

The school free-lunch programs are a godsend to underfed Indian children. No matter what the condition at home, they are assured of at least one substantial meal a day.

The clothing situation generally is good. Many families fit themselves out for the rugged winters with summer earnings. Others get clothing from the church, at such prices as $1 for an overcoat, 15 cents for a dress or 20 cents for long handled underwear.

CRANBERRY PROJECT DESIGNED FOR WORK

The land of the Court Oreilles Reservation, the backbone of any Indian economy is poor. It is sandy and very dry in the summer.

There is little good timber in the area. It is mostly poplar, good for pulpwood and perhaps barrel staves. Everyone thinks that the solution to the Indian poverty would be a small mill or factory of some kind, but efforts by the tribal council to bring something to the reservation have been half-hearted. And there hasn't been much help from the Indian service.

The Federal Government has financed, on a $105,000 loan, a 32-acre cranberry marsh project at Court Oreilles. The plants will be set out this spring but they will not bear for several years. The project is designed to give some Chippewas work and to build up the shaky tribal fund.

Henry Joe La Rush, 67, chairman of the tribal council, is very proud of the cranberry project. It took some doing to get a small majority of the tribe to vote for it.

LIQUOR IS PROBLEM

La Rush, one-quarter Indian, is pretty well off compared with most other Indians of the reservation. He has a 15-acre farm and three cows. He rents boats to fishermen in the summer.

One of the big problems in getting a community project going or in bringing an industry to the reservation is the varying ownership of land. Some is in heirship, some is delinquent; there is tribal land, Federal land and allotted land. To get timber rights on any large tract would require long negotiation and hundreds and hundreds of signatures. There is little reforestation because of the land title mess.

Liquor is a problem on every reservation and in every nonreservation community. Some Indian leaders minimize it, but it is always there and it is always serious. Under Federal law no Indian may be sold liquor, yet they get it easily. Some buy it openly in taverns; some have it bootlegged to them at higher prices.

Indians everywhere believe that they should be allowed to buy liquor when and where they choose. Indian servicemen and many other whites who know the ways of the Indian agree with them. They believe there will be less drinking when the law is changed.

HOSPITAL IS NEARBY

Much of the white prejudice against the Indian in communities around a reservation comes from contact with the drunken Indian who is in town on a spree and frequently is in fights. "The Indian is moral until he drinks," Father Paulinus said. Then he is very much like a white drunk, committing assaults, burglary, and petty theft.

"We don't have much Indian trouble," said a Hayward policeman. "But what trouble we got is Indian. In hard times there is less money and less trouble. There hasn't been much trouble lately."

There has not been an unusual amount of sickness at Court Oreilles this winter. The fine Indian agency hospital at Hayward, with its one doctor, is nearby. The doctor is far too busy to get to Court Oreilles, but the one ambulance is available for emergency cases. However, it is not always on hand. It also is on call for all reservations in Wisconsin, and the hauls may be 100 miles or more.

If you do not own one of the old jalopys that clank around the reservation, you must pool up with friends to pay a neighbor to drive you to Hayward. The total cost may be $5 to $7 and your share $1. The $1, even if you have one, is needed badly for food.

So you don't go to the Hayward doctor.

Statement by Lt. Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, Texas Railroad Commissioner, Before the House Ways and Means Committee

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, we have been very fortunate to have such a qualified person of the oil industry to come to Washington and explain to the House Ways and Means Committee the reasons that the depletion allowance on our oil and gas production should be maintained. Lt. Gen. Ernest O. Thompson is a member of the Texas Railroad Commission and in this capacity acts as the State's conservation agency for natural resources. He has had an outstanding military career and at present is the commanding general of the Texas National Guard.

I believe that General Thompson's explanation is a very well thought out argument to maintain the incentive plan for a progressive oil industry. I trust that the Ways and Means Committee will see fit to take favorable action on his recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement made by Gen. Ernest O. Thompson before the House Ways and Means Committee:

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, may I take a minute to introduce General Thompson, and explain how he happens to be here?

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. COMBS. On Monday I called General Thompson, who is a member of the Texas Railroad Commission, which is our conservation agency, and requested him to come here. I doubt that he has had time to prepare anything like a formal statement, but I asked him to come this morning in order that he might testify and subject himself to questioning because I regard him as one of the best informed men in public life. He is an elected official and not a representative of any particular group or company. I think he has served 17 years in this position.

General THOMPSON. My name is Ernest O. Thompson and I am and have been a member of the Texas Railroad Commission since June 1932. I might also say that I am representing Governor Allan Shivers, of Texas, who requested that I appear here on his behalf.

Among other duties of the Texas Railroad Commission, is that of conservation of oil and gas, administering our statute, waste prevention statutes, and so forth.

In addition to being a member of the railroad commission, I have long been a member of the Texas National Guard. I served in the first war as commander of a machine-gun battalion in the Ninetieth Division. I remained in the Guard all the time between the two wars and trained two regiments in this war. President Roosevelt sent me as his representative to the World Petroleum Congress in Paris in 1937. Secretary of War Robert Patterson sent me on a survey of oil and gas supplies throughout the European theater in March 1945 and then to make a survey of the oil fields in the Middle East, which I did.

My efforts have always been as a citizen-soldier. Today I am the commanding general of the Texas National Guard. We have in our State an infantry division, the Thirty-sixth Division, and an armored division, the Forty-ninth Division, an air wing and an antiaircraft battalion with 15,000 enlisted strength. I mention that because my speech today will be as a railroad commissioner and as a citizen-soldier.

My thinking, naturally, is of national defense. It is in this way that I have always approached the conservation of oil and gas. In the final analysis, oil is a munition of war. It used to be that an army traveled on its stomach. Today an army travels on gasoline and oil. Our ships, planes, tanks, trucks, and missiles depend upon oil and gasoline for their motive power.

Ten long years of strict conservation of oil and gas and proration of production in Texas, prior to Pearl Harbor, made it possible for our Nation to have all of the oil it needed for the war effort in World War II. We were never short of oil, although I must say that we were severely taxed in our producing ability many times during the war. We produced our fields to the limit. We had no extra capacity to produce and rationing of civilian needs was necessary in order to conserve the oil.

Just last week, speaking at Baylor University, one of our great colleges, a 100-year old school, Secretary Symington came down with our distinguished junior Senator, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, whom I am happy to see in attendance here this morning, to make an address and to receive a degree at Baylor University. Secretary Symington, who certainly ought to know and be in a position to know, said, among other things, "Russia has the atomic bomb. Russia has the means of delivering it. I am not so sure that we are prepared."

The late Secretary for Defense, Secretary Forrestal, who gave his life fighting for the preparedness of our Nation, is my authority that we need 2,000,000 barrels per day extra oil-producing capacity above peacetime requirements. We do not have one-half of that extra reserve capacity today.

If you gentlemen of this committee ask the Military Defense Department how much reserve oil-producing ability is enough to guarantee the security of this Nation, they will tell you, as they told Senator Johnson when inquiry was made by him at my request on this very question, they will tell you that we must have a virile, active, prosperous domestic oil-producing industry, constantly expanding to meet the ever-changing and ever-greater necessity for motor fuel.

I have kept closely in touch with the oil requirements for our defense. Only a week ago I made a personal inquiry of the Secretary of Defense and asked Secretary Johnson how much reserve daily oil-producing ability was enough. I simply wanted to know how much was enough to be ample for our national requirements in case of an emergency. The reply was again, as I have stated before, that we need an active, virile, prosperous domestic oil-producing industry for our defense. That is sound defense policy. It is not safe to do anything that would hamper or impede this prime requisite for our defense.

Oil, gentlemen, is ammunition. In defense, oil is prime mover. The proposed saving here put forward by the Treasury Department of $200,000,000 by the Government, by cutting depletion allowance from 27½ percent down to 15 percent, would, in my opinion, be poor economy. Why tamper with a system which has twice in a generation brought forth a drilling which is the only way to find oil and has made oil available in such quantities that we have been able to win two wars? Men venture in risky drilling for the reward which follows success. Remove the rewards and our domestic supply in oil will shrivel, and we will become dependent upon foreign oil. Foreign oil, of course, could be denied us.

We know that certain people are concentrating on submarines and we would be denied foreign oil. Especially is this true of the great Persian Gulf area, the Middle East, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Bahrein Islands where they have discovered more than 47,000,000,000 barrels of oil with just a few wells having been drilled. Their production in that area has already gone up to 1,400,000 barrels a day.

These great Middle East fields, gentlemen, lie under the shadow of the Russian bear right at the border. I have heard it testified in the committees of Congress by the high military officers that the Persian Gulf oil fields could not be counted upon by us if war should come. Therefore, I urge the members of this committee not to change the 27½ percent depletion lest to reduce it in any way. The system is working. It is producing the oil. It means national security. It is my considered opinion, gentlemen of the committee, that we cannot afford as a nation to tamper with a system of incentive, namely, the 27½-percent depletion allowance on our oil and gas production that is getting the job done.

We do not yet have enough ready reserve oil-producing capacity for our national security, not half enough. Reserves, however badly needed, cannot be constructed when our national security is at stake. Our very freedom is involved. Come war there will be no time to drill oil wells. To be useful for defense, gentlemen of the committee, the oil wells must have already been drilled. Reserves lying undrilled are of no value, and there would be no time to drill them, there would be no steel available for the drilling. The oil wells must have already been drilled, equipped, and ready to produce, hooked up and connected to the pipe lines and to the refineries of ample capacity, ready to make the products required in sufficient quantities and of proper quality.

Since the close of World War II the oil industry has gone faithfully forward with new drilling, new pipe-line construction, new refineries to the amount of more than 67,000,000,000, perhaps even more. I know that is a conservative figure. They have done that in order to keep up with the ever-expanding American economy and to help get ready for the national defense in time of possible emergency. I feel that we should not now imperil the progress in this field and become dependent on foreign oil.

That, gentlemen, is my statement. I have tried to stay within the time limits I gave. I shall give to the clerk of the committee, with your permission, some charts and tables and data that brings the situation up to date.

Here is a book written by a man named Wallace Pratt, one of the great authorities in this country on geology, entitled, "Oil in the Earth." I simply have two pages marked here showing how much drilling is necessary to discover an oil field through all the years from 1930 up through 1938 and 1940. I have other data here which supplements it and brings it up through 1948.

Gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you.

Mr. BOGGS. General, I know that you were here yesterday when we were questioning the representatives of the Treasury Department?

General THOMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOGGS. You probably listened to my questions which were put to the representatives of the Treasury Department in connection with the statement that depletion was the same thing as depreciation. Now, of course, I do not subscribe to that theory at all and I do not think that the Treasury Department can establish any such theory.

I should like for you to explain to the committee the difference between depreciation and depletion.

General THOMPSON. Depreciation, Congressman BOGGS, in my opinion, is a method of setting aside money to rebuild something that can be rebuilt. Depletion is a consideration which the Congress has wisely provided to take the place of an irreplaceable natural resource. You cannot replace it. Man did not make oil and man cannot make it. It is an irreplaceable natural resource, expending the capital as it comes out of the ground, never to be replaced by man.

Mr. BOGGS. And the whole theory of depletion is the replacing of capital, is it not?

General THOMPSON. So you can search for more oil: yes, sir.

Mr. BOGGS. General, in your opinion, is it fair, in view of the fact that 27½ percent depletion has been in our law since 1926 and some similar arrangement has been a part of our law since 1918, to say that the character of percentage depletion is a tax loophole?

General THOMPSON. It certainly would not be a tax loophole, Congressman BOGGS. It is the secret of the oil-producing business. The reason that oil men go out and hunt for oil is because they hope to get a reward. This depletion is the thing that has kept the oil business going. As a matter of fact, the profits in the oil business are less by statistics than 400 industries in the Nation and in my papers here, I set them out and show that the amount that they make is less than the amount made by ordinary business.

Mr. BOGGS. You have been the railroad commissioner for Texas for 17 or 18 years. I know you have had a long and distinguished career. I know you are equally familiar with the entire Southwest. What in your opinion would be the effect upon the economies of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, California, if this Congress took action which adversely affected the continued expansion of the oil business?

General THOMPSON. Congressman BOGGS, Texas has at this time 117,439 producing oil wells. We produce 2,000,000 barrels per day and we have the well shut down tight half the time because our statute says that production of oil in excess of market demand is waste. So our State is already suffering from the shut-down because of the fact that we are producing more than market demand. Now if you cut off the depletion allowance, drilling will stop and we will again be faced with a shortage of oil.

The economy of our State depends almost entirely upon revenue from oil, 56 percent of the revenue that comes into our State, the State government, comes from oil taxes. We call it a severance tax.

Mr. BOGGS. That supports your schools, welfare programs and your highway programs and 56 percent, or whatever percentage you mentioned, goes to the State government?

General THOMPSON. More than that. Fifty-six percent is from oil production, Congressman BOGGS. Then you have the oil refining, the pipe-line work, thousands of people who work for the oil companies in pipe lines are in the fields. If this oil business should drop in Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Kansas, California, and all of the 22 States that produce oil, it will stop the advancing economy of this Nation and the impact would be terrific. Other industries would topple, such as steel for example and many, many other industries.

Mr. BOGGS. How much would you estimate as the total employment directly and indirectly in Texas and in the Southwest generally is dependent upon the oil business?

General THOMPSON. I would say eight or ten million people are dependent on oil for their livelihood.

Mr. BOGGS. Directly?

General THOMPSON. Directly, sir. One hundred and seventeen thousand wells are scattered from east Texas clear out to El Paso and from the Panhandle all the way down to Corpus Christi. Three-fourths of the counties in our State produce oil.

Mr. BOGGS. General, has anything happened since 1942, when the Congress investigated this very subject quite thoroughly to justify an arbitrary reduction in percentage depletion at this time?

General THOMPSON. On the contrary, if it was good in 1918 and in 1942, when it was started and when it was reinvestigated, it should be even more so at this time, because of the fact that costs of drilling have constantly increased. We are going deeper and deeper all the time to get oil.

As you go below 8,500 feet the costs go up not only arithmetically, but geometrically. You can hardly get a contractor to go below 8,500 feet. Many of our discoveries are being made below 10,000 and 12,000 feet. Many of them are dry holes and cost as much as $500,000. I know one well which was drilled in Florida at a cost of $1,500,000, and was dry. Of all the wells drilled, 36 percent are dry. Exploratory wells, 81 percent are dry. You do not hear about the fellows who hit dry holes. You just hear about the fellows who, like the man who hit the daily double, hits oil.

Mr. BOGGS. General, do you have any figures on the approximate amount of money which has been spent by the industry in developing or attempting to develop the offshore areas in Louisiana and Texas?

General THOMPSON. Congressman BOGGS, those off-shore operations are terrific in cost. Some of the platforms where they drill cost a half million dollars, just to build the platform from which to drill, and then they have converted LST's, these ships that hauled equipment during the war, big tanks, they converted these to barges for drilling at terrific cost. I would say that off-shore drilling would certainly be $500,000 a well.

Mr. BOGGS. Yesterday in the testimony of the Treasury Department did you find in that testimony any scientific basis for the reduction of the allowance from 27½ to 15 percent?

General THOMPSON. I certainly did not see any scientific reason for it. I will say this that the conservation of oil, gentlemen, is being practiced in a most exacting manner. We allow oil to be produced all over the Nation only at that rate which will cause the greatest possible amount of oil to be produced.

Mr. BOGGS. The figures given yesterday struck me as being arbitrary figures. Did you get that impression?

General THOMPSON. Certainly they were arbitrary figures and I did not think they had a proper grasp of it, if I may be pardoned for saying so.

Mr. BOGGS. I thought so too. Thank you.

General THOMPSON. I thought your questioning yesterday was to the point and Mr. Mason put some questions right to the point too.

Mr. COMBS. I have just a few questions, General, to amplify a few points that Mr. Boggs brought out. For one thing, you brought out the point that peacetime is the time to continue your explorations and bring your wells in because in wartime, you cannot drill because you have neither the time nor the steel or other equipment and manpower needed to develop new wells in wartime in large number?

General THOMPSON. That is right.

Mr. COMBS. And to keep up production and to have potentially more production you have to keep up the drilling and exploration during peacetime?

General THOMPSON. Yes, sir; that is correct. That is the only time you can do it.

Mr. COMBS. Now when you bring in your wells under proration, your actual production is kept down to the point where the oil is needed theoretically at the time?

General THOMPSON. We do that to preserve the pressure, Congressman COMBS, so that you will not have to put the wells on pump.

Mr. COMBS. That is the conservation feature, but I say from the standpoint of having available oil, you do keep the production down, regardless of the number of wells to

the total of what is needed from time to time?

General THOMPSON. We prorate among all the wells in the State and the different fields so that each field gets its pro rata share of demand; that is a technique of conservation. Prorating is a tool of conservation and a necessary one.

Mr. COMBS. I brought that out to emphasize this point. Under that system, if you have the wells and the deposits in the wells available, you can rapidly step up production if the wells are there?

General THOMPSON. Yes, sir; you can open them up as needed and produce them at that rate which is the maximum efficient rate. The maximum efficient rate is that rate beyond which you dare not go to keep from harming the reservoir.

Mr. COMBS. In that connection then, in the interests of national defense, it is advisable to develop every possible deposit and have the wells there ready?

General THOMPSON. You must have the wells drilled and all hooked up so that you simply turn a valve. If you do not do that you will not have oil.

Mr. COMBS. That is necessary to national defense to have this oil in an emergency?

General THOMPSON. You could not fight a war without it.

Mr. COMBS. You think the proration allowance is one of the main encouraging factors that make possible that kind of development?

General THOMPSON. Judge, I can best explain that by giving you our experience in the East Texas field. There are 22,000 oil wells in that field. It is 19 years old. The expert said when that field was discovered and outlined with dry holes, when the limits were defined, that the total production would be in the nature of 1,000,000,000 barrels. By reason of conserving the pressure, we have kept those wells flowing 19 years and we have already produced and saved 2,600,000,000 barrels of oil and the pressure still stands at 1,038 pounds. If the pressure is protected in the future as it has been in the past, that field will produce another 2,500,000,000 barrels, making 5,000,000,000 barrels of oil where 1,000,000,000 was expected.

Mr. COMBS. Now General, does that type of operation put an added burden on an oil company to operate under the conservation practice?

General THOMPSON. Those wells in east Texas, Judge, as you well know, because you have tried many cases and I have been before you, we have wells at east Texas that can produce 30,000 barrels of oil today, if opened wide open but they are only allowed to produce 12½ barrels per day because the market demand is such that we can only make room for 12½ barrels from a 30,000-barrel well. That is building up an arsenal of ammunition come war. Does that answer your question?

Mr. COMBS. That answers the question. Would you explain the oil commission of which you are a member?

General THOMPSON. Through the permission of Congress in 1935, the conservation agents of the various 20 States that produce oil got permission of the Congress to enter into a treaty each with the other, the Interstate Oil Compact Commission. That gives the States the right to coordinate their police powers in waste prevention. As a result, the idea developed in one State can be quarterly transmitted to the authorities and the engineers of the other States. We meet four times a year and exchange freely technical information, one with the other. It has been a great blessing to get uniform waste prevention measures. We are grateful to the Congress for that treaty between the States where we can coordinate the powers. It has made Federal control unnecessary.

Mr. COMBS. One other question that suggests itself. You are familiar through that relationship with production problems and exploration problems, you might say, throughout the oil-producing area in the United States?

General THOMPSON. That is correct, sir.

Mr. COMBS. You have seen oil brought in in States that heretofore have not had any oil, like Mississippi?

General THOMPSON. All over the country, 22 States now produce oil.

Mr. COMBS. In most instances enormous sums were spent drilling and testing and searching for those deposits before they were found?

General THOMPSON. Millions and millions of dollars have been spent, unsuccessfully in many cases.

Mr. COMBS. I will ask you if those great reserves were not in large part made possible by the fact that the producing companies could retain a sufficiently large operating fund after payment of taxes in order to do it?

General THOMPSON. I think the 27½ percent depletion has made possible the finding of field after field after field. At the close of World War I we had 5,000,000,000 barrels reserved in this Nation. Since that time we have used tweny-seven billion out of that five billion and now we have twenty-five billion. It is working, is a fine system, and should not be tampered with.

Mr. COMBS. Do you think that an attack upon the system, on the principle of proration allowance as to each individual lease would be proper?

General THOMPSON. You could not do that, Judge.

Mr. COMBS. One particular lease might show rather large profits.

General THOMPSON. You have to take all of the properties and throw them into one pot. You could not take separate properties and proceed on that basis because you would break the little fellow, and he is the man that goes out and gets the oil.

These stripper wells could not exist. Out of 439,000 wells in this Nation, 200,000 of them produce less than 6 barrels per day, but they are the backlog of our oil supply of the Nation because every well will be a stripper by and by.

Mr. COMBS. That is all, thank you.

Mr. REED. You are a great expert in this line and I just want to ask this brief question. If they were to reduce this 27½ percent, or wipe it out, it would be absolutely devastating to the stripper wells, would it not?

General THOMPSON. It would put them out of business and make us dependent on foreign oil and would also make oil go up; it would be higher than a cat's back.

Mr. REED. General Thompson, the Treasury has testified that the benefits of percentage depletion have tripled since the original depletion provision was put into the law owing to the increase in the corporation tax and the personal income tax, is that not so?

General THOMPSON. You mean that they testified that, Congressman?

Mr. REED. Yes.

General THOMPSON. Well, I do not know whether you meant dollars or what.

Mr. REED. The corporation tax having increased so greatly since the bill was passed, the benefits to the taxpayer have tripled, dollarwise, since that time?

General THOMPSON. I would say that the cost would more than absorb any such difference. The cost of drilling has gone up so greatly, in other words. As I said awhile ago, it increases geometrically. You cannot get a contractor to work below 8,500 feet. It works against the little independent who is the fellow who finds the oil. They said yesterday that a little fellow can discover it and sell it to somebody. Why should he sell it? Why in a free nation could he not produce? All these companies were little at one time. The Texas Co. started in Texas, the Gulf Co. started in Texas and the Humble Co. started in Texas. Many big companies started there and why can we not keep an opportunity open for the little man today? Why say that he should sell out to somebody else? Let him grow and prosper to the wise and beneficent law you passed here. It is a wise law and gives a little man a chance to live.

Mr. CARROLL. I have just one question. You placed great stress upon the cost of drilling?

General THOMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CARROLL. All that you testified to applies with greater force to the Rocky Mountain area?

General THOMPSON. Your costs in the Rocky Mountain area are terrific. Getting stuff up there costs as much as it does to drill a well in a lot of places.

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, General Thompson.

Uncle Sam Plays Santa Claus to the World, Lets the Native Indians Starve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the neglect and inefficiency by the Federal Government of the native American Indians is a blot on mankind. For a Government that dishes out billions to irresponsible governments and people the world over—the blot becomes a shame.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert a series of articles by the Milwaukee Journal on this subject:

FOOD AND JOBS SCARCE FOR WISCONSIN INDIANS

(By Rod Van Every)

Most of the 14,000 Indians living in the progressive State of Wisconsin exist deep in degrading poverty.

No one has starved. Many are hungry. There is general malnutrition.

Serious illness is not apparent, but State statistics show that the Indian health record is far worse than the white's.

Most Indians are poorly but warmly clothed. The clothing comes from charities and surplus army warehouses.

Jobs are scarce. It was better in the black depression of the thirties.

LUCKY HAVE PENSIONS

The lucky ones draw an old-age pension of $30 to $50 a month.

But still the diet is potatoes and bread, macaroni and rice, spaghetti and beans, potatoes and bread, maybe with some lard on it.

We're back now after 1,200 miles over old tote roads, crisp and crackling at 30 below; icy town roads, plowed too late; fast, dry highways with frost heaves that fling you through the air.

We're back to furnaces, television sets, orange juice, and hypertension.

But we wonder about the Winnebago woman near Wisconsin Dells. Her man had left her and the six children 2 weeks before. There were potatoes and bread for breakfast; potatoes, bread and bacon grease at noon. She had 50 cents. The woodpile was gone and the temperature then was 15 below zero. She had laughed as she said she guessed her

time had come. Her labor pains had started during the night. We'll have to telephone to the Dells and find out about the baby.

THIS WINTER IS "WORST"

And what about the old Chippewa women at New Post on the Lac Court Oreilles (pronounced "Cooderay") Reservation? She had been lying ill in the shivery loft of her rickety home for many weeks. She was nearly blind, nearly deaf, and the pain hurt.

Everywhere the Indians say that this winter things are worse than in other years. Industrial conditions in the cities have tightened, and the Indian has lost his job. Right or wrong, most Indians believe they are the last to be hired by the white boss in good times and the first to be fired in bad. There is no doubt that prejudice against the Indian exists among the whites in cities and villages near Indian communities.

JOBS AND BENEFITS SCARCE IN WINTER

Except during World War II, winter economic conditions among the Indians have been bad, to one degree or another, for many, many years. There was work in the cities during the war, and many men left the reservations and Indian communities. Many more went in the Army, Navy and marines. Their departures lessened the pressure, and so did the pay checks they sent back.

Now, the Indian wage earner and his family are trekking from the cities to the reservation, back to the old folks, back to the only roof they can be sure of. Families double and triple up. It makes no difference that they are penniless now that the wonderful unemployment compensation has been used up. They are welcome, and there always is room for one more.

The summers are relatively kind to the Indians. There is work. There are the harvests to follow and the gardens to plant. Some men guide for fishermen at $10 or $12 a day. Women work at resorts. The sun is warm, and there is money. It is hard to remember that winter will come, as surely as tomorrow's sun.

HEALTH RECORD POOR

In the winter, there may be some pulpwood cutting, a little timber cutting, trapping, lawn work on roads and in woodlots to earn the relief food, odd jobs when you can find them. Depending on the locality, the women may work off and on while caring for the home and children at basket weaving, bead crafts and buckskin sewing. The white tourist will be outraged by the price, which, broken down, may have brought an Indian family a wage rate of 10 cents to 25 cents an hour.

The Indian health record in Wisconsin is far below that of whites. Indian service officials do not have readily available statistics—although Indian health is one of the service's prime functions—but they thought it was good.

"The Indians in Wisconsin have a better health service than the average white, believe it or not," said Jesse C. Cavill, general superintendent of the Great Lakes Consolidated Indian agency at Ashland, in charge of about 19,000 Indians in Wisconsin, upper Michigan, and Iowa.

Statistics of Dr. Allan Fliek, of the State board of health show a different picture. They are for 1945-47. On a comparison with whites, the figures show that the Indian birth rate is slightly higher, infant deaths are two and one-half times higher (75 of every 1,000 Indian babies die in their first year, compared with 30 for the State as a whole).

PNEUMONIA TOLL HIGH

Indian mothers die at the rate of 7.9 per 1,000 live births, compared with 1.2 for white mothers; 94 of every 100,000 Indians die of pneumonia, compared with 34 whites; the Indian death rate from tuberculosis is six times that of whites, but the Indian death rate from heart disease, cancer, and cerebral hemorrhage is lower than that of the whites.

When the average citizen thinks about Indians, he often thinks in terms of a reservation. To many whites that means security, a free home, a comfortable dole, and happy year-around hunting and fishing.

The reservations were set up in treaty agreements. The Indians signed away vast, rich lands at low prices. They reserved certain lands for themselves—the reservations. The agreements also called for cash payments and other types of payments—teachers, blacksmiths, and agricultural assistance. Those agreements still are in force.

RESERVATION DOESN'T MEAN SNUG SECURITY

There is no security on an Indian reservation. You live there and your land is not taxed. You must pay all other State and Federal taxes. You must finance your own home, make your own living. You do not have to live there, but it is the only place to return in time of stress.

There is no dole. Because of some old treaties there may be a tiny cash payment once a year. In one instance it is 52 cents.

There is no Indian service appropriation for relief of Indians in Wisconsin. But the service spends about $713,000 in the State yearly. Some is for forestry practices, construction of roads and looking after the financial and land problems of reservation Indians. But much goes to the State and counties for Indian education, health, and hospitalization and boarding dependent children.

Hunting and fishing the year around? Just step out the back door of your shack and bag a deer? Drop a line and pull up a muskie? Not quite. Fish and game are no longer on the reservations in great numbers. You must walk many miles to kill a deer, and when the big snows come and the deer go deep into the swamps, it is very tough work, even on snowshoes, to find them.

RELIEF IS PUBLIC PROBLEM

Relief is handled on the town or county system, just as it is for whites. Some towns strongly resent the financial burden placed on them by down-and-out Indians, but at the same time make no objection to giving relief to whites. But the Indian has the same citizenship status as a white man, even though he may contribute little to the economy of the community.

George M. Keith, director of the division of public assistance of the State public welfare department, estimates that fewer than half of Wisconsin's Indians need some kind of financial or medical help. Over-all that figure might be right although Keith is asking all county welfare departments for exact figures. But on a reservation basis, the figure probably is low.

If a town or county is in such a bad financial situation that it can't take care of needy Indians and whites, it can get money from a special State emergency fund, just as the town of Sanborn in Ashland county has done. Forest and Florence Counties also are getting such help. Failure to request special funds is taken to mean that everything is all right.

LAC COURT OREILLES WORST

Conditions vary a lot from reservation to reservation, from community to community.

The worst is the Lac Court Oreilles Reservation, just like old Michael Wolf told the legislative subcommittee several weeks ago. Probably 1,000 Indians live there. It is hard to tell. Families come and go. There are deaths and births, slow to be recorded.

The Red River Reservation runs a close second. The Winnebago Indians, scattered from Wisconsin Dells to Black River Falls and as far east as Wittenberg, have no reservation. They are desperately poor. The Chippewas, on the beautiful lake-dotted Lac du Flambeau Reservation, are in somewhat better straits, and the Oneidas west of Green Bay, with no reservations, are about the same.

At the northernmost tip of Wisconsin is the Red Cliff Reservation, near Bayfield. Things are not too bad there. The Indian service says the Chippewas in Burnett, Polk, and Barron Counties, the Mole Lake (Forest County) Chippewas and the Potawatomis in Forest County are having a tough time. They were not visited. They are so few.

The aristocrat of the Wisconsin Indians is the Menominee. His reservation, heavily timbered, is near Shawano. There is a lumber mill, and regular wages. The white man's ax did not get a chance to whack off the miles and miles of towering white pine and hemlock. With selective logging, the timber will last for many years, perhaps forever. The Stockbridge Indians, neighbors of the Menominees, share some of their good fortune.

Indians live in many other places in Wisconsin. There are about 300, mostly Oneidas, working in Milwaukee County.

The Security and Strength of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks an article entitled "The Security and Strength of America" appearing in the current issue of Liberty, a magazine of religious freedom, by C. S. Longacre, an associate editor of the magazine, which is a most excellent discussion of the critical problem of the security and strength of our Nation facing us today. In considering this article it is worth while to have in mind the declaration of principles of the Religious Liberty Association, the publisher of this magazine, which are:

We believe in God, in the Bible as the word of God, and in the separation of church and state as taught by Jesus Christ; namely, that the church and the state have been placed side by side, each to work in its respective sphere (Matthew 22:21; John 18:36).

We believe that the Ten Commandments are the law of God, and that they comprehend man's whole duty to God and man.

We believe that the religion of Jesus Christ is comprehended in the principle of love to God and love to our fellowman, and thus this religion needs no human power to support or enforce it. Love cannot be forced.

We believe in civil government as divinely ordained to protect men in the enjoyment of their natural rights, and to rule in civil things, and that in this realm it is entitled to the respectful and willing obedience of all.

We believe it is the right and should be the privilege of every individual to worship or not to worship, or to change or not to change his religion, according to the dictates of his own conscience, but that in the exercise of this right he should respect the equal rights of others.

We believe that all legislation which unites church and state is subversive of human rights, potentially persecuting in character, and opposed to the best interests of the church and of the state; and therefore, that it is not within the province of human government to enact such legislation.

We believe it to be our duty to use every lawful and honorable means to prevent the

enactment of legislation which tends to unite church and state, and to oppose every movement toward such union, that all may enjoy the inestimable blessings of religious liberty.

We believe in the individual's natural and inalienable right of freedom of conscience, and the right to profess, to practice, and to promulgate his religious beliefs; holding that these are the essence of religious liberty.

We believe that these liberties are embraced in the golden rule, which says, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

The following is the article to which I refer:

THE SECURITY AND STRENGTH OF AMERICA

(By C. S. Longacre)

What constitutes the real source of American security and strength? A British poet tells us in his graphic style what a state is not, and what really constitutes a state:

"What constitutes a state?
Not high-raised battlements or labored mound,
Thick walls or moated gate;
Not cities proud, with spires and turrets crowned,
Nor bays and broad-arm ports
Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride;
Not starred and spangled courts,
Where low-browed baseness wafts perfume to pride—
No! Men, high-minded men,
With powers as far above dull brutes endued,
In forest, brake, or den,
As beasts excel cold rocks and brambles rude—
Men, who their duties know,
But know their rights; and knowing, dare maintain,
Prevent the long-aimed blow,
And crush the tyrant, while they rend the chain—
These constitute a state."

—*Sir William Jones.*

Many mighty nations with walled cities and moated gates, with splendid navies and thick-walled fortresses, with unrivaled armament and numberless soldiers, have gone down into defeat and passed into oblivion. Will our American Republic, which every true and loyal patriot loves so dearly, meet the same fate as did the world powers of Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome? There are certain tendencies operating in our Government, and unless they are checked and corrected the United States is headed for a similar fate.

The one and only hope of the American Republic's maintaining its unique position of true greatness, strength, and security lies in its preserving the ideals and fundamental principles of liberty, justice, equality of rights, equality of opportunity, individual initiative, the free exercise of the conscience in religious concerns, the separation of church and state, freedom of speech and the press, and the inalienable right of the individual to propagate his religious convictions without interference from the Government so long as he respects the equal rights of his fellow beings in the exercise of his God-given prerogatives. The moral sense and character of the American people constitute the greatest asset of our Republic, and as long as the majority of the people maintain the ideals upon which our forefathers founded our constitutional form of government, our heritage of liberty will be secure.

We hear that our greatest defensive weapon is the atomic bomb or the poison-gas bomb that can wipe out all the inhabitants of a large city within a few moments. There is no one who doubts or who belittles the fantastic, destructive power of these deadly weapons. But the security and strength of America is not found in the exclusive possession of these terrible instruments of destruction which, we are told, can wipe out whole nations.

We must never forget the divine admonition that "the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong." "Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain" There is nothing more deceptive, more misleading, or more dangerous to the security of any nation than for its people to put their trust in princes or in the son of man, in whom there is no help. But, as the psalmist says, "Happy is he whose hope is in the Lord his God." The strength of a nation lies not in its superior armaments but in its superior ideals and principles of government, reflected in the lives of its rulers and its people.

George Washington and a weak, ragged, impoverished army of the American Revolution demonstrated that fact in their conflict with superior forces. It is possible for a boomerang to smite the head of its hurler. The cause of right, however inferior in numerical strength, is mightier than the cause of wrong, however superior. What has made America so strong, prosperous, and invincible is the ideals, the virtues, and the faith and character of the rulers of the people who have believed in and protected the precious heritage of liberty, and essential justice that is for all the people.

Liberties once surrendered are exceedingly difficult to regain. Eternal vigilance is the price that has to be paid for our security and our blood-bought liberties. Every citizen must view with alarm the first attempt to encroach upon our liberties and our inalienable rights. Our weakness and our danger lie in our apathy and indifference toward our American way of life. We are weak in the same proportion as we lose faith in the ideals upon which our Republic was founded and which have made us as a people a great and influential nation in a short period of time.

The greatness of America does not lie primarily in military strength, nor in American thrift and free enterprise, nor in economic soundness and reform legislation in the field of morals and religion; it lies rather in the strength and vitality of our ethical and spiritual ideals, promoted and fostered on a voluntary basis without governmental sanction and support. As long as the people of America place the conscience of the individual in all religious matters above the supremacy of the state, and safeguard the inalienable rights of the individual above the exercise of human authority in government, both the dignity and the safety of the individual and of the state will be maintained, and governmental stability will be insured. This is the only basis upon which liberty, peace, and security both for the individual and for the state can possibly be maintained.

Here the rulers are not the masters but the servants of the people. The actions of government officials may be freely criticized without reprisal. The right of dissent is sacredly guarded so long as the individual does not indulge in malicious libel or slander. Diversity of opinion, diversity of religious creed, diversity of political faith, and diversity in the practice and propagation of divergent views in religion and politics is the unique distinction between a republican and a totalitarian form of government. As long as ethical, moral, and spiritual standards function on a voluntary basis, without interference or molestation on the part of the government, religious freedom is safe.

For liberty to be secure, it must be so deeply engraved upon men's hearts that they would rather surrender their lives than to give it up. This love of liberty must be woven into the warp and woof of the fabric of the character of the people, or it will be lost—given up for promised gain or through fear of suffering.

Double Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the members of the Ways and Means Committee and also to all the other Members of the House of Representatives an article which appeared in the Mexia Daily News, Mexia, Tex., regarding double taxation. I realize that our Ways and Means Committee is studying this problem of Federal revenue revision and I hope that serious consideration will be given to this matter of taxing both the profits of a corporation and the dividends which are paid out to the stockholders. This has proved to be a considerable drain on the small corporation and on the stockholders with their small investments.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include an article written by Mr. E. C. Deane, of the Mexia Daily News:

THE WAY IT SEEMS TO ME

(By E. C. Deane, editor)

Facts of life sometimes make a bitter pill that's mighty hard to swallow.

This is true whether we're fruit growers in California, fishermen in Massachusetts, newspapermen in Texas—or farmers anywhere.

Yesterday, on invitation of my friend Barney Davis, I had the pleasure of eating lunch with about 60 stockholders of the Mexia Production Credit Association. They're farmers and ranchers from Limestone, Freestone, and Leon Counties.

After lunch came a most informative talk on PCA achievements by a man from Houston. The achievements he outlined are things that PCA stockholders—and the general citizenship of Texas as well—can take pride in.

You see, Texas production credit associations have paid off their debts to Uncle Sam, who financed PCA originally. Texas is the first State in the Nation to attain this goal.

The PCA, it should be explained, is the organization set up by Uncle Sam to provide money on credit to farmers and ranchers for various approved operations.

While PCA was in debt to Uncle Sam, the association's profits were exempt from Federal taxes.

Now that the debt is paid off—and the association is owned solely by its stockholders—the association's profits are subject to Federal taxation just the same as those of any other corporation.

That's where the bitter pill came in yesterday—when the talk got around to Federal taxation on the association's profits.

One stockholder asked this question:

"If our association makes profits on its operations, and then splits up those profits into dividends for its stockholders, can't we charge off the dividends as operating expenses—won't that lower the Federal taxes on the profits?"

No, sir; explained the man from Houston, Uncle Sam takes his share of profits before you pay any dividends. In Uncle's eyes, dividends aren't counted as operating costs.

It doesn't take any genius in mathematics to figure that if Uncle dips his big hand into the association's profit pot, the dividends the stockholders get will be smaller as a result.

Well, asked another stockholder, Uncle Sam won't charge us individuals any personal income tax on dividends we might get from our association's profits, will he?

Oh, yes, sir, Uncle certainly will do that very thing, the man from Houston said.

That's double taxation, somebody suggested.

It sure is, said the man from Houston, adding "that's what a lot of corporations have been complaining about."

I wish Mr. Truman could have seen the looks on the faces of some of the PCA stockholders when that bitter pill went down.

Everybody who gets his hopes and his money invested in a corporation these days soon learns how bitter that pill of double taxation really is.

The sooner more of our citizens, newspaper men, housewives, farmers, city slickers, politicians, rich, poor, mild, and meek, get personally acquainted with this damnable evil of double taxation, the sooner we'll be rid of it.

Let nobody mistake me, please.

I feel just as concerned about the matter personally as those good farmers and ranchers did at that meeting yesterday.

I don't think stockholders of the PCA, who are anxious for their corporation to prosper and to pay them a return on their investments, are being treated right when they are hit by double taxation.

And I don't think we fellows who publish newspapers, or make peanut sacks, or sweat blood over any other little business, are being treated right, either. I wish I knew what to do about it, besides complain and pay.

If any of my New- and/or Fair-Deal friends think I'm taking a Republican or Dixiecrat attitude on this, I ask 'em to think again.

I consider myself a good Democrat, and a danged sight better one than a lot of jokers who are parading under its banner these days, promising everything to everybody and let the devil take the hindmost.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this thirty-second anniversary of Lithuanian independence finds those who love the cause of liberty for this proud land cloaked in sorrow and anxiety. Lithuania, once a great kingdom extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea, now suffers the oppression of a foreign power.

The history of Lithuania for over 900 years has been the story of a nation fighting for freedom. Struggling against centuries of Polish and German and Russian rule, throughout the years the yearning grew ever stronger for a land of their own in which they could live in their own traditions and mold the future with their own hands.

In 1918, when the great nations of the world were exhausting themselves in a world war, the chance came; and their leaders seized the moment to declare their land a free and independent nation.

The two decades of independence that followed are as splendid as any period in Lithuania's rich history. She established a government based on the will of the people. She created an independent state as progressive and enlightened as any in the family of nations. International trade increased. A program of agrarian reform was inaugurated. Education and cultural pursuits multiplied in a free and prosperous land.

But just as its people were receiving the benefits of liberty, the Second World War broke out and almost at once Lithuania was overrun by first one invader and then another. At the close of hostilities and after a series of violations of national integrity seldom equalled since Napoleonic times Lithuania found itself annexed to the Soviet Union. In 1944 the iron curtain closed around her and the nation was cut off from the rest of the world.

However a passion of liberty as deep and vigorous as theirs is not to be crushed so easily. In the past 6 years we have received word of an almost superhuman struggle being fought to maintain their freedom under the smothering oppression of communism. Guerrilla warfare, stubborn civil resistance, and a determined refusal of the people to accept Russification has thwarted the Soviets at every turn. Few nations have fought so valiantly to resist the Communist power as have the Lithuanian people.

But in the past year we have also heard of the savage methods invoked by the conquerors to stamp out this attempt at freedom and individuality. Mass deportations to the interior have drained the population away. Punishment and retaliation are imposed on those who resist the collectivization programs. The most brutal methods of the dictatorial state are being invoked to bring about conformity and submission.

And yet it is right that we are commemorating this anniversary of independence today. Thirty-two years ago, the people of Lithuania did more than establish a new government. In their declaration of independence, they set forth a solemn dedication of a courageous people to the principles of liberty. And it is this spirit, so sorely tried today, which we honor.

Lithuania has been conquered before but never for good. Today she lives only in the hearts of her sons and daughters, and with the freedom-loving people of the world, but we must look forward to the day when her representatives will again join us as equals around the world's conference tables.

For the present we have certain responsibilities. We must keep her name alive and we must strengthen her people's faith in a future of freedom ahead. We must continue America's refusal to recognize the Soviet claims to this land; and we must extend our sympathy and support to the Free-Lithuanian legations in this country.

Above, all we must do everything within our power to strengthen the United Nations until it becomes a world agency of such influence that such brutal subjugation of small nations will not be tolerated, and the rights and traditions of the Lithuanian people will again be recognized and respected in the family of nations.

Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address which I delivered at the anniversary of Lithuania's independence, St. Francis Church Parish Hall, Lawrence, Mass., Sunday, February 12, 1950. This annual affair sponsored by Rev. Father Francis M. Juran, pastor, was very well attended and many enlightening and educational addresses were delivered by the able and capable speakers on the program.

The address follows:

Friends of freedom, we meet, not in celebration, but to recall the days when your homeland belonged to you and not to strangers, when men and women were happy at their work, and fear did not walk in the night.

From these recollections of better times, we fortify our determination to rescue this world from the evil which threatens it, so that no man or nation shall be the downtrodden slave of another.

It is fitting that this anniversary should begin with religious ceremonies for the great struggle going on in this world is between those who believe in God and the dignity of man, and those who would destroy the last best hope in human life.

The only effective resistance to the red terror in Lithuania and other countries behind the iron curtain is centered in the clergy and the faithful. We are pained when we think of the sufferings endured by Archbishop Stepinac and Cardinal Mindzenty and a host of lesser martyrs. We grieve for the millions of your countrymen who sacrificed their lives rather than yield to the Fascist and Communist barbarians.

But this terrible price is a warning to us, telling us that we must wake up before it is too late. Communism is the anti-Christ that will not be satisfied until it has the whole world in chains to satisfy the power lust of a few men. It is clever, it is without conscience, and it is working at its diabolical conspiracy night and day.

And the pity is that some otherwise good people are deceived by its sugar-coated falsehoods.

This is the supreme danger.

This is what we must guard against with unceasing vigilance.

If the tide of communism is to be stopped and rolled back, it must be done with superior faith and intelligence.

Already it has a large part of the world in its grip. It has economic and military power, but these things we can see and measure and offset by security provisions of our own making.

We know, also, that we must work to improve our own society; to encourage production and full employment; to provide security for the individual in time of sickness, disability, and old age; to open up greater opportunities for all so that, by example, we prove that freedom offers the highest material advantages.

But man does not live by bread alone.

He has a mind and a soul.

If these can be enslaved all is lost.

The Communists understand this. If they can first confuse a man by causing him to

lose faith in himself and in his God, the rest is easy.

This is one of the prime objectives of their propaganda.

This is what they are trying to do within the United States. By spreading false rumors they try to arouse antagonism among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. They try to set race against race, knowing that if they can break down our tolerance and our unity, and get us to fight among ourselves, they can seize control in the resulting chaos.

They even tried to disrupt our economy by working their way into key posts among a few labor unions, but American labor leaders exposed this conspiracy and quickly eliminated these treasonable elements.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, estimates that there are close to half a million Communists in this country. Of course, they are not so proud as to identify themselves, but I can assure you that the FBI is not asleep on the job. Once they transgress the law the Communists find themselves in trouble.

But there is no law against what appears to be harmless gossip, and that is where you and I have a job to do. Stop any rumor in its tracks, refrain from criticizing any race or creed, and we will be helping to stall the "divide-and-conquer" strategy of the Reds before it gets started.

Remember that the day-to-day practice of democracy is the way to strengthen it.

Perhaps most of us had the good fortune to be born in the United States. We are apt to take our blessings for granted because we do not know what it is to be deprived of them. If we did know the dark side of the picture we would be more earnest in our devotion to the Christian-democratic standards of our society because we would really appreciate them.

In this audience today, there are some displaced persons who have escaped from the Red terror. With their own eyes they have seen churches despoiled and homes violated, freedom of conscience and freedom of thought crushed by a brutal power that knows no law but that of its own appetite.

These victims have escaped to a land where, in spite of minor imperfections, the state is the servant and not the master of human life. Where men deal with one another as men and not as animals. Where men have faith in God and in one another and are encouraged to develop their talents without fear.

I have talked with some of these displaced persons and I have seen how difficult it is for them to believe that the freedoms we enjoy are a fact, and not some trap to ensnare them. So vivid is their recollection of oppression that they had almost lost all hope.

I have been humbled as I listened to them and watched the pathos in their eyes as they seemed to plead for reassurance that this freedom of ours is not a bubble that might burst.

It will not, if we listen to them and learn from their experience that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

I am sure that, as they become citizens, they will become better than those who never had to earn it. In so doing they will help to rouse many from the complacency which unintentionally allowed communism to undermine so many other countries.

Thirty-two years ago, the people of Lithuania declared their independence. For the next 22 years, the young republic surged with joyous effort, and the liberated people accomplished more during that time than at any other generation in their history.

Then the darkness came, first from one side and then from the other, until Lithuania was forcibly taken over by the Soviet Union. Since then, more than 30 percent of the Catholic clergy has been annihilated by the ruthless conquerors. In 1948 alone, more than 200,000 civilians were sent as slave laborers to Siberia.

The United States Government has never recognized the annexation of Lithuania and its incorporation into the Soviet Union. And I am sure that it never will.

There are holes in the iron curtain, tiny though they may be. Even if Russia had 50,000,000 troops, they could not stifle the religious zeal and sturdy independence of the Lithuanian people. They have outlived other tyrannies and their spirit will finally prevail over those who now oppress them.

The news that leaks through to us tells of brave resistance. The one thing that the Communists fear above all else is the truth. They realize that if people get to know each other as fellow human beings, the fabric of lies upon which communism is built will topple like a house of cards.

The hydrogen bomb could kill millions of people, but it is the truth that will finally win. And the truth put to work now could immobilize this hideous weapon of destruction and all others like it.

Eventually, the free peoples of the world will get their message through the iron curtain, even to the people of Russia, and then they too will rise up against those who keep them in bondage.

The light is dim in Lithuania, but it has not been extinguished.

It glows in every Lithuanian heart where the Communists cannot reach it. It glows in their resistance. It glows as they think of the United States and its fine Lithuanian citizens who have not forgotten their homeland.

It is prophetic that Lithuanians and non-Lithuanians assemble on this day to share in our mutual dedication to the cause of freedom. For this is the birthday of the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln.

He led the fight to free the slaves just as we must exert ourselves to keep the light of freedom burning brightly until it illuminates the whole world. Then Lithuania will be herself once more and we will meet again to celebrate the rebirth of her independence with hearts overflowing with joy.

February 16, 1918, is a date whose anniversary will be celebrated in festival and song throughout Lithuania, when black fear is lifted from the earth.

That happy time may be nearer than we dare to think.

Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Sunday Star includes the following sentence:

But the nutritionists don't like the milk situation. They said less whole milk and cream were being used for the fifth consecutive year and this was reducing the amount of calcium in the American diet.

Calcium is a mineral people need for teeth, bone, and other body equipment.

With constantly less milk produced per capita for year after year it is not surprising that the nutritionists are worried. The subsidizing of vegetable oil substitutes that have infiltrated into the dairy-products business is constantly making this situation more serious.

Good News From RFC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this morning's papers announce that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has ordered foreclosure on the $37,500,000 loans to the Lustron Corp., of Columbus, Ohio.

The RFC is to be commended for this action. No matter what will be lost through foreclosure proceeding, one rat hole down which the taxpayers' money has been slipping will be plugged. On January 14, I received a letter from Mr. Carl G. Strandlund, enclosing certain "Facts About Lustron."

An analysis of the facts, shows that on each Lustron home built up to December 1949, the loss, which was the cause of the foreclosure, amounted to $9,403.85 per home. The analysis of Lustron's operating losses follows:

LUSTRON CORP.'S LATEST ALIBI

Lustron Corp., of Columbus, Ohio, borrowed $37,500,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The loans were made over a period of 2½ years, starting from June 30, 1947.

As of October 29, 1949, principal in the amount of $22,000,000 was in default, and with but a small amount of cash on hand the corporation was unable to meet its obligations to RFC as agreed.

MR. STRANDLUND'S LETTER

Under date of January 14, 1950, Mr. Carl G. Strandlund, president of Lustron Corp., addressed a letter to each Member of Congress, stating:

"In order to help clarify the conflicting stories about Lustron and its operations, I am glad to attach a summary statement outlining the financial status of Lustron Corp. at the present time."

Analysis of the financial data accompanying Mr. Strandlund's letter reveals that the financial status of Lustron, as of November 30, 1949, was as follows:

Assets:	
Cash	$1,603,356.43
Accounts receivable	916,950.25
Inventories, material, etc.	3,039,043.96
Machinery and equipment	14,360,361.62
Cash deposits, etc.	471,787.90
Total	20,391,518.86
Liabilities:	
RFC loan	37,500,000.00
Current accounts payable	538,480.59
Capital stock	[1] 841,000.00
Total	38,879,480.59
Apparent deficit	18,487,961.74

[1] Represents income from stock sales. Mr. Strandlund reportedly received 86,000 shares, par value, of the capital stock for himself and wife, on an original cash investment of $1,000.

In the Facts About Lustron it is stated that shipments of houses to 35 States, Alaska, and Venezuela totaled 1,952, and that 14 completed houses were in inventory. Since when have the American taxpayers been financing the production of houses for

Venezuela? No explanation was included in the facts.

Receipts from customers shown as $11,206,-[illegible] indicates that the houses produced were sold for an average of $5,740 each.

The deficit from operation, distributed on the basis of houses produced indicates an average loss on each house of $9,[illegible].

A former chief accountant for the Government, in reading the Strandlund letter and accompanying facts, said:

"This appears to be a compilation intended to confuse and deceive the Members of Congress."

Lustron is being operated with less than 3 percent private capital and more than 97 percent of Federal funds. The plant leased by the corporation was built during the war at a cost of over $[illegible],500,000.

Here is a chance to trim operation fat by denying more Federal funds to Lustron.

A Community Sorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a eulogy delivered by Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of the archdiocese of Boston, Mass., at the solemn high funeral requiem mass for Mrs. Mary Curley Donnelly and Leo Curley, daughter and son of our former colleague, the Honorable James M. Curley, who also served as mayor of the city of Boston on several occasions, and Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I know that each and every one of us share the feelings expressed by Archbishop Cushing in his expression of sympathy on this occasion.

A tragedy such as that which has befallen James Michael Curley transcends any political, personal, or other private considerations. It immediately becomes a community sorrow and the hearts of all, without any possible exception, go out to this devoted father of a family so suddenly, so overwhelmingly visited by the angel of death.

I am conscious that I speak for all our citizens, for every class and condition of persons in the community, when I pause for these few minutes before the final elections of the church are given to speak a word of Christian comfort to the bereaved father of Mary and Leo Curley, to their relatives and their friends.

Chosen by our city as its mayor on numerous occasions throughout his long life, chosen by the people of the commonwealth as their governor, elected to other offices in both local and national political life, the chief mourner in the tragedy of the Curley family has more than once demonstrated personal qualities which have endeared him to millions in moments of good fortune and which have enabled him manfully to bear adversity in moments less propitious.

Never has Jim Curley more genuinely won the hearts of his neighbors, however, than in those hours, recent and remote, when death has visited his family. On these occasions, past and present, he has inspired us all with the firmness of his personal faith in the promise of our Blessed Lord that with those who die in Him life is only changed, it is not taken away; for with the dissolution of the earthly body of our mortality, a new and eternal dwelling place is opened up to the souls of all who love God and believe in His Christ.

That conviction, guaranteed by Christian faith, argued by sound reason, confirmed by the experience of the devout heart, must be the consolation of Mayor Curley as he gives back to God two more of the children to whom he has been so affectionate a father.

I want to say to him this morning that everyone, everyone whose mind believes in divinity and whose heart beats with humanity, is grateful to him for the example of faith and fortitude which he has given in the face of death. In this he has taught a truly inspiring lesson to a generation so often feeble in that faith or too selfish, too ungenerous to accept death in its proper perspective.

More than one person has said to me in the last 2 days that Mayor Curley had spoken in the spirit of Holy Job himself in the public pronouncements which he made when it must have been so difficult for him to speak for public ears out of the heart of his private, personal grief.

I want him to know that we are all grateful for his demonstration, under difficult circumstances, of the truth that the Christian, confronted with tragedy, must not languish in fruitless and unavailing grief, nor sorrow as those who have no hope. Rather, he must take the loss of his loved ones as itself a passing thing, a necessary condition of their own salvation in God and of his eternal reunion with them in the land where sin and sorrow have no part.

Meanwhile, the firm believer, even through his tears, will look meekly up to God, the God of all consolation. He will not be ashamed of his tears of human grief, but he will know how to transmute these tears into something much more precious, into prayers to almighty God that God may grant these children, their souls, and all the souls of the faithful departed, eternal pardon, peace, and life. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Triangular Margarine Tangle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this news item from the Washington News indicates that our oleo friends do not wish to sell their product as oleo. The reason they give for their dislike of the triangle is just as phony as was their experiments that didn't prove what they claimed to be proven. The claim of costs of a triangle cutting machine is ridiculous. Why should a machine cost more to make triangles than squares?

The following is the article:

TRIANGULAR MARGARINE TANGLE

House-Senate conferees are deadlocked on margarine tax repeal bill. Majority of Senate group—TAFT, MILLIKIN, BYRD—is holding out for amendment which would force all yellow margarine to be made triangular before sale. Majority of House group opposes this. Next conference is scheduled for February 20, more than a month after Senate passage of the bill.

Some margarine people say they'd rather have Federal law as it is, tax and all, than have to buy new machinery to make triangular margarine.

Our oleo friends evidently show their hand. They do not want any law or any regulation that would disturb the process of passing off oleo as butter.

Asia's Challenge to Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in the New York Times magazine for last Sunday there appeared an article by Raymond B. Fosdick, containing some very sage observations in regard to why things have gone so wrong for us in China. In the article Mr. Fosdick makes some interesting and, I think, well-considered recommendations as to the future. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASIA'S CHALLENGE TO US—IDEAS, NOT GUNS

(By Raymond B. Fosdick)

No one can begin to understand what is happening in the Far East today without an appreciation of the vast revolutionary forces that are on the march in Asia. From Manchuria to Indonesia, from the Mediterranean basin eastward to the south Pacific, explosive ideas have awakened millions of people from an age-old fatalism. For these millions a new faith has been born that poverty and misery are not the unavoidable attributes of human life, and that disease, flood, and famine can be controlled. A rice bowl that is never full enough, an intolerable system of land tenure, illiteracy and ignorance, a life expectancy of 25 or 30 years—it is against these conditions that the floods have risen.

In this upheaval which is long overdue, the old lethargy and acceptance of the inevitable on the part of the masses has been supplanted by a belief that an era of wider justice and greater abundance lies ahead, and by a determination to follow those leaders who promise to guide them there.

This revolutionary movement is not only an economic awakening; it is a social and political awakening as well. It is rooted in rebellion against colonialism; it is linked to a passionate nationalism, to an ambition for freedom and independence and sovereignty that will not be denied. This is the tide that proved to the British the wisdom of withdrawing from India and Burma, and that led to the separation of Indonesia from Dutch control. This is the tide, too, that threatens the half-measures with which the French have tried to stem it in Indochina.

These revolutionary forces which have been unleashed in Asia go back at least to the opening of the century. They precede the bid by Russia for the political hegemony of the continent. In China they were beginning to stir before Sun Yat-sen vitalized them into overt rebellion. In India they were moving under the surface before Gandhi whipped them into flame. Slowly and irresistibly they have been growing over the years, occasionally smothered by military force, sometimes betrayed by their own leaders, often thwarted by the inexperience and ineptitude of the people themselves, but in the end rising in a flood of protest and demand which has inundated the continent.

It is a tragic misconception to think of this mighty movement as inspired solely by communism, and thus to try to write it off as a tactic in the cold war. What has happened is that the Communists have captured the revolution, or are in danger of capturing it; but the revolution itself, and all that it stands for, stem far back to ideas and principles which we here in the United States helped launch in the world. For our Nation was born in revolution, and the echo of our trumpet, sounding around the globe, has brought the walls of kingdoms crashing down.

The concept of liberty, equality, and fraternity of the French Revolution was forwarded by our example, and for 175 years governments and charters have been patterned from our design. Resistance to tyranny is in our blood, and the right of people to throw off alien yokes and build themselves up into sovereign nationhood is the tradition we live by.

Always in our thinking and often in our action we have identified ourselves with the sufferings and aspirations of our neighbors overseas. Our sympathies instinctively and ineradicably are with the underdog. We do not like to see big people push little people around. When the Latin-American countries revolted against Spain we erected a Monroe Doctrine as a shield against other European attempt to reassert them. When Napoleon III was overthrown in 1870 we recognized the Third French Republic within 48 hours. When the Spanish monarchy was upset by revolt 2 years later our minister at Madrid, on instructions from the State Department, paid his respects to the new republic the day after its proclamation.

We gave asylum to Kossuth and Carl Schurz and to the leaders of revolution in foreign lands, including those from Imperial Russia. The Chinese revolution of 1911 under Sun Yat-sen stirred the imagination of America, and although we resented the anti-American features of the second revolution of 1926, China's attempts to become a modern state had our complete sympathy.

This is not solely our tradition; it is, of course, the tradition of the western world, but our example and precept have helped mightily in its building and shaping. Over decades our missionaries and teachers in the Far East, Protestant and Catholic alike, have been telling the story of Lincoln and Washington and the faith that sustained them. Our textbooks and our courses of instruction in scores of schools throughout the area have spelled out the inalienable privileges of liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and the right of people to govern themselves. It is not without significance that when the Allied troops took over the area in September 1945, they found the streets of cities like Saigon and Batavia plastered with mottoes taken from the Declaration of Independence and the writings of Jefferson and Lincoln.

In brief, the revolution in Asia is rooted in western traditions. In a real sense, it is our revolution with which American sympathies and creative capacity ought now to be actively identified. Instead of that, communism has moved in to take the initiative away from us. It has appropriated both the economic and the political goals of the revolution, so that when we attempt—as we should—to discover workable methods by which the imperialistic designs of Russian communism can be contained, we find ourselves in the unhappy position of seeming to oppose some of the objects of the revolution which, because they are flesh of our flesh, should have our complete understanding and support.

This is the bitter aspect of our dilemma, and it comes to a tragic climax in China. Here is a great and sturdy people to whom over the years we have felt ourselves intimately bound, and whose struggles with internal and external handicaps and foes have compelled our admiration and often our assistance. From the days of John Hay, and even before, we have felt it a duty and a privilege to serve as a friend and a protector of China's welfare and integrity. Today we are regarded by the new regime and millions of its followers as their enemy No. 1, and we are execrated over large areas of the country. Even Great Britain, whose occupation of Hong Kong has long symbolized to the Chinese all that was evil and sinister in imperialism, now appears in almost friendly guise in comparison with the United States.

It is easy to say that the Communists did it with their propaganda, and certainly the Communists have had their fair share in producing the result. But it is an oversimplification to pin the responsibility on the cleverness of Mao Tse-tung and his associates alone. America has herself played a part in forfeiting her own position in China, because she has not understood the desperate character of the economic situation and the mounting determination of influential segments of the Chinese to get on with the revolution.

For example, we have lost our hold on a large part of the intellectual class and practically the whole of the student population, people who were brought up on our ideas in institutions which we supported. They have gone over to communism because it, rather than the Western democracy, appears to them to be the more promising vehicle for accomplishing the objectives of the revolution. Many of them do not like communism, particularly its freedom-curbing, thought-control aspects, but for the moment at least, in their minds, it offers the most effective means of ridding the nation of its colonial backwardness, and making it strong and self-reliant.

We are shutting our eyes to the realities of the complete picture when we think of China as another Czechoslovakia, or talk about "acquiescence by rifle butt." There is undoubtedly an element of truth in this characterization, but it is based on inadequate perspective. From many unimpeachable sources in China—business, missionary, and governmental—the reports are coming that in the desperate thinking of millions of people communism represents a new hope, a chance for escape from incredible poverty, a promise of dignity and independence for the nation. We cannot shrug off this development, and if in our perplexity we turn our backs on it, we do so at our peril.

But how did we lose our position in China? Why do we seem to be so hated by large elements in a nation which we still admire and still desire earnestly to help? The question has no single or simple answer, and the situation is streaked with controversy. The vast war-weariness of the Chinese people undoubtedly reacted against what seemed to be the efforts of the United States to keep the war going. As has been indicated, Communist propaganda, probably inspired from Moscow, also played its insidious role. But a gross error of judgment on our part, based on an ignorance of the forces that were moving in China, gave the Communists an opening which they have been quick to exploit.

That error of judgment was our continued support of Chiang Kai-shek long after he had lost the confidence of all classes of the people of China, Communists and non-Communists alike. Chiang is undoubtedly a perplexing character to understand. Ambassador Leighton Stuart, who is his friend, describes him as "a completely sincere and completely mistaken man." Our own difficulties with him have been thoroughly documented in the white paper issued by the State Department last July.

It is not, however, what we think of Chiang that counts, but rather what the Chinese think of him. To them, or to most of them, he has betrayed the revolution. He has forgotten all about its objectives—the economic and social reforms involved in the platform of Sun Yat-sen: the correction of the odious land-tenure system, the agricultural rehabilitation, the schools that were to be built, the clinics that were to be established. Whether the judgment is just or unjust, Chiang and his government have become a symbol of reaction and moral bankruptcy.

It is this disillusionment which has been one of the potent influences in driving the progressive elements of the country into the Communist ranks. There has been no other alternative; and between Chiang and the Communists the latter, in spite of their ties with the unpopular Russians, seemed to promise far more for the future of China. In brief, to use the phrase of the Chinese, Chiang has "lost the mandate of Heaven." Expressed in our idiom, Chiang is through. Indeed, in the opinion of the Chinese, as it has come to us from many creditable and objective sources, he has been through for 4 years or more.

But we here in the United States refused to admit it, and we went ahead with the business of trying to restore the sovereignty of a discredited regime to an obviously reluctant nation. Our persistent military assistance to Chiang, of which the chief item was the $125,000,000 voted against General Marshall's advice by the Eightieth Congress, was worse than futile. To the legions of Chinese who were our friends and wanted to remain our friends, it seemed to be the final and conclusive proof of the Communist assertion that by standing behind this reactionary regime, America was herself betraying the revolution.

The British, far wiser in this matter than we were, stayed aloof from this ill-starred attempt to bolster Chiang's tottering rule—and so did all the other powers. Our unilateral action not only cost us the support of a substantial fraction of liberal opinion in China but has had unfortunate repercussions in southeast Asia as well. It has alined us in popular opinion with the maintenance of the status quo rather than with the forces making for a new Asia. It has awakened suspicions that we regard the people of Asia as pawns in a chess game with Russia, and that their advancement and welfare are secondary to our considerations of strategic interest.

No program in Asia today has meaning or promise which does not integrate itself with the struggle of the common people for a better life. As far as American relations with Asia are concerned, one, and only one, door is open to the future: we must identify ourselves with the just and humane purposes of this revolution, and make them our own. They are part of the heritage which the democratic West has given to the East, and they do not belong in the hands of those who would use them for devious purposes.

Our task is clearly defined, although the techniques to be employed are not yet wholly in hand. That task is to make sure, as far as we can, that the aspirations of the people of Asia for freedom and justice and more abundant living have a fair chance. We must prove to the East our traditional concern for the deprived people of the world and the sincerity of our desire to be of help. We have the skills and technology, the cultural values and ideals, to make us the friend and counselor of revolutionary Asia. What we must now demonstrate is that we have the determination and vision to use them.

That is why point 4—an unemasculated point 4—is of such vital significance to our far-eastern policy. It is a positive declaration of our faith in mankind and a practical application of that faith to underdeveloped

areas. It clears the way for a new approach. It gives us our most effective weapon in halting the spread of communism. For communism grows in tissues made gangrenous by disease, poverty, and exploitation, and the cause of the malady does not readily respond to a therapy of guns and tanks.

Of course, the United States by itself cannot underwrite the ambitions of Asia for a better life. In a sense, no outside nation or group of nations can underwrite them. The initiative and leadership must come from the Asians themselves. As Secretary Acheson said, we can help only where we are wanted and only where the conditions of help are sensible and possible. But acting on this principle, the Commonwealth nations at the Colombo conference have already taken a realistic step in relation to Burma, and we have demonstrated through the ECA how effective and revolutionary rural reconstruction work can be in China. These various efforts must be coordinated; this is a conception which requires team play and the pooling of resources in terms both of money and of men. Many nations and agencies will collaborate in the undertaking—particularly the United Nations with its world-wide contacts—and private capital will share in the enterprise.

The idea behind point 4 is to prime the pump, to get people into a position where they can help themselves. There are pilot plants to be developed, rural areas to be built up, an agricultural economy to be modernized, schools to be built, hospitals and medical care to be established, local personnel to be trained in the creation of adequate governmental civil services. Let us not minimize the quality of patience required in the undertaking, or the paucity of tested methods for dealing with it. The concept is daring and bold, and it requires imagination and courage to back up our belief that men are capable of planning and achieving a better life.

But what has all this to do with China? Probably very little at the moment, except as our example in the countries of southeast Asia, and in Korea, Japan, and the Philippines starts a genuine rehabilitation in the people's interest which reverberates through the entire continent. If we can help to demonstrate in countries like Siam and Indonesia and Korea that we are alive to the dangers of a world half prosperous and half slum, the news of what we do there will flow back into China like a refreshing tide.

As far as the Chinese Government is concerned, difficult days undoubtedly face us, and no one can foresee the pattern of events. It is to the advantage of the Communist regime to maintain the specter of American hostility in order to keep popular sentiment at white heat against capitalist imperialism. This gives them the opportunity to charge us with the responsibility for their mistakes and failures, as well as for the hardships which will undoubtedly harass the Chinese people in the months ahead. To the extent that we blindly accept this role of hostility we play into the hands of the Communists. Whether there is among the Chinese people a reservoir of good-will toward America which can outlast the attempts of their Government to drain it, remains to be seen. But no provocative acts on our part should help them drain it.

Certainly through missions and schools, through commercial and cultural exchange, through the United Nations, we should keep open the channels of idea and influence, to the extent that the Communist regime will permit and we themselves consider desirable.

And there is one other service we can render. Because of our long historic relationship in which we have consistently championed the territorial integrity of China—and no one knows this better than the Chinese themselves—we are in an excellent position to point out to her the danger she runs in involving herself in the ambitious design of the U. S. S. R.

That design, cloaked in the beguiling promises of Marxism, stems directly from the old Czarist policy of territorial aggrandizement. It is a type of imperialism far more lethal to national hopes than anything which the people of Asia have thus far suffered. It is the kiss of death to the political and economic independence and freedom to which the Chinese aspire. What is happening in Manchuria and Outer Mongolia is a palpable example of Russian intentions. The relationship between China and the U. S. S. R. is in its honeymoon stage, but it does not take a prophet to foretell the disillusionment which lies ahead.

This we can bring home to China as an old and loyal friend who wishes her well, and whose hopes for her future are genuine and deep, even though we believe that her present alliance is for her, and for the free world to which she belongs, a tragic mistake.

What confronts us is a war not with armaments but with ideas. It is a war to determine which of two systems is really dedicated to the people's welfare, and which of the two, in terms of concrete results, is better adapted to promote it. We must prove to the nations of Asia that in their struggle for freedom and for a fairer share of the rewards of labor and the good things of life, western democracy can offer them far more in the way of understanding and championship than can communism. Only as we carry this demonstration to a successful conclusion, and make these hopes come alive, can we recapture the initiative which communism has gained.

Those who talk of arms and a display of power as the principal counters in the game misunderstand what the game is about. Arms undoubtedly have their place, but we are up against a set of ideas, and ideas cannot be stopped with bombs or battleships. The only way to beat an idea is with a better idea, and that better idea has got to be an idea that works.

It is our high faith here in America that we have that better idea. Over long years we have proved it to ourselves. We now have the chance to prove it to Asia.

Is the A & P Suit in the Public Interest?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD the very timely and interesting discussion entitled "Is the A & P Suit in the Public Interest," which was recently presented on the American Forum of the Air by Theodore Granik, founder and moderator. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] ably presented the question in the affirmative and the negative side of the issue was equally well taken by Carl Byoir, public relations counsel for the A & P Co.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator O'MAHONEY. Bigness itself is not a crime, Mr. Granik. I would not pretend to say when business is too big. The description of the difference between bigness in business which is good for the public and bigness which is bad was best made by the only man in the history of the United States who ever served both as President of the United States and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. I quote from William Howard Taft.

"If they use no other inducement than the constant low price of their product and its quality to attract custom, and their business is a profitable one, they violate no law. But if they attempt by a use of their preponderating capital and by a sale of their goods temporarily at unduly low prices to drive out of business their competitors, or if they attempt by exclusive contracts with their patrons and threats of nondealing except upon such contracts or by other methods of a similar character to use the largeness of their resources and the extent of their output compared with the total output as a means of compelling custom and frightening off competition, then they disclose a purpose to restrain trade, and to establish a monopoly and violate the act."

That is what William Howard Taft said to the Congress of the United States. It is the basis of this suit.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Byoir, do you want to answer Mr. TAFT or Mr. O'MAHONEY?

Mr. BYOIR. I think I would rather answer Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because I can see that the Senator, who in my book has been one of the great liberals in the United States over a long period of years, has been listening to the Antitrust Division, because the Senator through all those years has never made any bones of the fact that he thinks that big business is too big. He hasn't maintained it was criminal, but he has maintained that it was too big and that something ought to be done about it.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You have not listened to me. I have never said it was too big.

Mr. BYOIR. I will quote you for 2 hours and 40 minutes——

Chairman GRANIK. Not today; we are not in the United States Senate.

Mr. BYOIR. About big business being too big and the concentration of assets and 7 percent of the companies, and how many they employed.

Senator O'MAHONEY. But that is a very different matter.

Mr. BYOIR. I don't want to get away from this. I am perfectly in accord with the idea that no American business should be allowed to grow big by the violation of any law—State, Federal, or local.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Why not accept the injunction in which the Department of Justice seeks merely to restrain you from doing the things again of which your company was convicted?

Mr. BYOIR. Let's look at that. The antitrust laws are very vague laws. They don't tell you, like the automobile law, that you must not pass a stop light or that you mustn't go 40 miles an hour. They say, in effect, you must not drive an automobile in an improper manner. So you don't know whether you are violating the antitrust laws in many cases—and you can ask all the lawyers in the United States—until some court has told you what the law is. The Antitrust Division——

Senator O'MAHONEY. The court of appeals has told you what the law is.

Mr. BYOIR. That is right.

Senator O'MAHONEY. It has found you guilty of coercion. It has found you guilty of blacklisting. It has found you guilty of unduly low prices to drive out competition, and then fixing prices after you have driven it out.

Chairman GRANIK. You don't agree with the charge that the real basis of the attack on the A & P is the Government's theory that it has been able to undersell competitors?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Not at all, not at all. If A & P will abandon these practices and

undersell competitors only by efficient methods, believe me the Department of Justice wouldn't have a leg to stand on, and no attorney general would bring a suit, but that is not the case. In this Danville case in which the A & P was found guilty, and which it appealed to the circuit court of appeals, there was a unanimous decision rendered by that court of appeals, a fine of $175,000 was assessed, the A & P paid the fine, and now the Department of Justice says, "Let's not have any more offenses of this kind." Why doesn't the A & P accept that injunction?

Mr. BYOIR. Wait a minute, Joe. Let's get the story straight and the record straight. The story of the Danville trial is not the whole story of the A & P and the Antitrust Division.

Senator O'MAHONEY. How about——

Chairman GRANIK. Let him finish.

Mr. BYOIR. The identical case that was tried at Danville was brought on originally in Dallas, Tex., and in the sworn statement of the representatives of the Antitrust Division it was identically the same case. In that case the judge said that even if they proved everything they alleged, there was no violation of the law. So the Government appealed to the circuit court, and two circuit court judges said, "This is vague, it is inflammatory, but you can go back to Dallas. There is enough to have a trial about."

One circuit judge said, "It is no good. There ought not even to be a trial. There is nothing here that violates the law." So we went back to Dallas, Joe. I think we ought to obey the circuit court. The court said, "In conformity with what the circuit court has decided, we are striking out this inflammatory matter and we are asking the Government to tell the defendants what they are charged with."

The court gave them 75 days to bring in that bill of particulars, and it hasn't been delivered yet. They went into court and dismissed their own suit.

Chairman GRANIK. Maybe you will get it now.

Mr. BYOIR. This time they said all the judges are wrong, the three circuit judges and the district judge.

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I ask a question?

Mr. BYOIR. Let me tell you one more thing.

Senator O'MAHONEY. All right.

Mr. BYOIR. The peculiar advantage that these people have. With all the power of all the people of the United States, which ought to be used carefully against American citizens, they could lock all over the United States for any judge that they thought agreed with their theories about what the Congress meant when it said you must not restrain trade. They went up to Dallas, and there was a judge who didn't throw it out, but, Joe, he didn't bring in any such decision as you say.

Chairman GRANIK. Let's ask the Senator what Congress meant.

Mr. BYOIR. Yes, let's see what the judge said. I have it right here.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Here is your story, sir. Assuming that everything that you have said about Dallas is absolutely correct, you must acknowledge that what I have said about Danville, Ill., and the circuit court of appeals' decision is correct.

Mr. BYOIR. No.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Why did you then not take that case to the Supreme Court of the United States instead of paying your fine? If you were not guilty there, what about those 23 cases in the District of Columbia, in the police court, in which the A & P was found guilty of short weight, weighing the butcher's thumb when selling the steak? How about that?

Mr. BYOIR. In the first place, I sat through the Danville case and Judge Lindley made no such decision. Judge Lindley said the A & P did one thing which, if they had not done, probably everything else they did would have been legal. He said there was one thing that tainted the operation of the A & P, and that one thing was that our subsidiary dealing in fresh fruits and vegetables accounted as both a buyer and a seller. He said that was wrong. He said that was a violation of the law. I am not prepared to say to you that Judge Lindley wasn't right, but all I can say to you is that under the Perishable Commodities Act which was passed by the Congress of the United States, nobody can engage in trading in fresh fruits and vegetables without a license from the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture had not only issued such a license, had not only never made a single complaint that there was any violation of properly trading under that license, but they even issue licenses so people can engage as dealers, as brokers, and as commission merchants. I think they know something about the agricultural business.

But, Joe, let me answer your question about the circuit court. I admit that Judge Minton adopted a good deal of language of the Government and said we did some things that were pretty bad. You say why didn't we appeal to the Supreme Court. We read the decision of the court and we said, "The best thing to do here—and this will be all over and we won't be in court and won't be spending millions in legal fees—is to assume that the judge is right even though we think he is wrong, and to do everything that he says we ought to do and to discontinue every practice that he thinks we ought not to indulge in." We did that and paid the fine.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Is that the reason why in Massachusetts, in another case in Connecticut, in another case in Rhode Island, in another case in the State of Maine, when you were charged with fixing prices, you pleaded nolo contendere and paid the fines? Is that the reason why——

Mr. BYOIR. Wait a minute.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You pleaded nolo contendere in the southern district of New York and why you also acknowledged the correctness of the Government's case in the District of Connecticut? There is case after case, including the case of the Federal Trade Commission which ordered A & P to cease and desist from its violations of the Robinson-Patman Act; and while this Danville case was being tried and that cease-and-desist order was outstanding against you, you were rebating, taking rebates from the Borden Dairy Co. and from the Bowman Dairy Co. in Chicago to the tune of a million two hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. BYOIR. We are not even a defendant in that case. The Department is suing those companies, and if they thought we had done something wrong, they could have sued us.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The grand jury found that that was the fact.

Mr. BYOIR. No. There hasn't been any decision in that case. You know as a lawyer—

Senator O'MAHONEY. You and I could spend the whole 15 minutes saying, "You did," and "you didn't."

Chairman GRANIK. That is right. Let's get to the public interest.

Senator O'MAHONEY. My first statement to you is, you ought to accept the injunction and say, "We won't do these things any more." If you didn't do them, the injunction does you no harm. If you don't intend to do them, the injunction does you no harm. Now what are the other—

Mr. BYOIR. Now let's debate that.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Are you willing?

Mr. BYOIR. A & P has never had an opportunity to say whether it would accept the injunction. The boys down there said what you must do.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You have the opportunity to say it now. Are you willing to do it now?

Mr. BYOIR. I am sure that the A. & P. will accept a consent decree in which they undertake not to violate ever any law of the United States, and they don't believe they ever have.

Senator O'MAHONEY. And that will be specific? You will accept such an injunction?

Mr. BYOIR. I am sure they will. I am neither their legal counsel nor the trustee of the company.

Senator O'MAHONEY. It will include the Federal Trade Commission, will it, sir?

Mr. BYOIR. Do you want me to tell you about the Federal Trade Commission?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Will the injunction include the Federal Trade Commission?

Mr. BYOIR. Did you vote for the Robinson-Patman bill, Senator?

Senator O'MAHONEY. I did.

Mr. BYOIR. And you don't know that it cost the American people 6 or 7 or 12 billion dollars in the food and clothing and the drugs that they do not get?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Oh, nonsense. That is perfect nonsense.

Mr. BYOIR. I am not against the Brannan bill for the small retailer. I am for the small retailer.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You are talking about something very different now.

Mr. BYOIR. No, I am not. I am just keeping you on the beam, you see, because you and the rest of the Congress, and it is within your power——

Senator O'MAHONEY. If the courts could keep A. & P. on the beam, it would be a great benefit for the consumers of the United States.

Mr. BYOIR. We say we are on the beam. We paid the fine, and we have discontinued all those practices. We say this is like a case where you fine a man $10 for passing a red light in the traffic district, and then you say, "And now we must cut off the man's arms and legs and prohibit him from ever being able to drive an automobile again."

Senator O'MAHONEY. All right, now, Mr. Byoir.

Mr. BYOIR. That is what they ask for in this complaint, not an injunction, Mr. O'MAHONEY.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You come here defending an organization which has been found guilty in the Federal courts, in the trial court, in the Court of Appeals—you haven't appealed to the Supreme Court—in the Federal Trade Commission, and in the police court of the District of Columbia. Now you talk as though this were an organization, just a beneficent organization, created for the purpose of distributing food to the housewives of the Nation. You are representing, sir, an organization of holding companies, piled one upon the other, an operation under 17 or 18 different aliases, manufacturing, distributing, warehousing, brokerage, and tea companies, operating in 39 different States, with sales totaling about $3,000,000,000.

Mr. BYOIR. The figure is $2,700,000,000.

Senator O'MAHONEY. $2,700,000,000?

Mr. BYOIR. Eight hundred million.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Isn't it wonderful. In the trail which has been followed, you have been crushing competition, you have been operating at a loss in New England and in the eastern district, operating at a great profit in other States. I have your exhibit here——

Mr. BYOIR. I gave them to you.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The exhibit which your company filed in the trial. In the case this is defendant's exhibit 499, at page 1, showing that you planned in 1938 to operate in New England throughout the year 1939 at a loss.

Mr. BYOIR. At an operating loss?

Senator O'MAHONEY. At a loss, and that in the Central Western States, where you were doing exactly the same number of sales—123,000,000 sales—you were planning to operate at a profit.

Chairman GRANIK. Let Mr. Byoir answer that. Go ahead, Mr. Byoir. It will take a long answer.

Mr. BYOIR. I think you get reduced here to de minimis. Here is a company that has ten to twelve million, fifteen million individual sales transactions a week, with ten or twelve million women. In one instance it was found that in 29 sales out of the total of all the billions of sales a weight inspector said somebody was shorted.

Senator O'MAHONEY. In the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYOIR. In the District of Columbia; and in the District of Columbia the same people said we conspired to reduce the price of bread, and Judge Alan Goldsborough said, "This is the worst case I have heard in 40 years. Any good trial lawyer would have told you there is no evidence at all." They accused us of conspiring to reduce the price of potatoes in Carolina, and the judge said, "You can't make a case without facts."

Senator O'MAHONEY. Of course, all the $2,000,000,000 worth of sales weren't wrong. I will acknowledge that.

Mr. BYOIR. I want to ask you, Joe, if we are putting all the retailers out of business with these unfair methods, how is it that there are 400,000 of them in the United States and that they are rushing forward literally by the hundreds to tell the Antitrust Division that they don't need any help, that we are the best friend they ever had?

Chairman GRANIK. And advertising to that effect.

Mr. BYOIR. And advertising in the newspapers.

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I answer you?

Mr. BYOIR. Just a minute. The farm organizations that we are supposed to hurt, including the Farm Bureau Federation, are passing resolutions representing millions of farmers, that this case is no good. The consumers have increased our business $2,000,000 a week. So, evidently they don't think we are a lot of crooks. I want to tell you that if any lawyer or any political leader or anybody else thinks that 50,000,000 American women don't know whether they are getting the right weight or fresh fruit or spoiled meat or good meat, they just don't know the American woman. She gets her money's worth, and she has made the A. & P. the greatest retail company in the history of the world.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Why not try it in the courts?

Chairman GRANIK. Gentlemen, how about letting the consumer ask some questions? Go ahead, Miss Frenzel. You have a question there.

QUESTION. Mr. Byoir, do you believe that the fine paid by the Atlantic & Pacific Co. is a sufficient deterrent to prevent a recurrence of the violation of the antitrust laws?

Mr. BYOIR. No, I don't but I don't think the people who run the A. & P. need that kind of deterrent, although they paid the fine. In the first place, I know they went to the Department and said, "You tell us what to do, and we will do it to obey this law," and the Department said, "There isn't anything you can do. It is so terrible, you have to break this company up and quit manufacturing and have seven different companies. Nobody who ever had anything to do with the company before can be in the new company."

Let me answer your question about the $175,000. As the courts have said over and over again, and the antitrust lawyers have said over and over again, there is only one motive to violate this law, and that motive is greed. You want to make more than I. You get together with your competitor and try to raise the price. The whole history of the A. & P. negates greed. I just want to show you something here. What kind of people are the people who run the A. & P.? John Hartford, 77 years old, works 5 days a week. George Hartford, 85 years old, works 5 days a week. Rich beyond the dreams of avarice because the American people have made them rich.

What have they done for the American people? I think the best test of an employer of a big business is how he treats his people. Does he try to make his profit out of the sweat of the brow of the people who work for him? Just take a look at these charts for a minute. There is the picture of A. & P. employment. I showed these to Senator O'MAHONEY. He is familiar with them. In 1933 this company had 67,000 employees. Today it has 112,000, or the number has increased 29 percent. The cost of living for the American people in that period has gone up 82 percent. Do the Hartfords just try to keep a little ahead of the cost of living? No. Their pay roll has gone up 195 percent over that period of years, and they are paying an average in the grocery business, which was the worst paid business in America a generation ago, $60.50 a week to all employees, not including any executive employees.

Chairman GRANIK. Go ahead, Senator. Do you want to comment on that chart?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Let me say this, Theodore. The Standard Oil of New Jersey had just such a monopoly as this. The Supreme Court of the United States decreed that it should be broken up. The result of it was more business and lower prices to the consumers, more profit to the operators. Instead of one gigantic company, out of the Standard Oil trust we had almost a dozen new companies.

The Congress of the United States when President Harding was in the White House passed a law compelling the packers to give up their ownership of the stockyards. It was signed by Mr. Harding. It was unanimously passed by the Congress. The result was cheaper prices for meat to the consumer and better prices to the producers of cattle.

The same thing will happen if the A. & P. were compelled to separate manufacturing from retail, if it were compelled to divide into its seven divisions so that it could not throw its losses into one area of the country to sell temporarily at a low price and make profits in an another area of the country so as to suppress competition and work over the consumer.

Chairman GRANIK. Let's see what another consumer has to say. Go ahead sir.

QUESTION. Senator O'MAHONEY, if A. & P. is hurting competition, why are so many small independent grocers rallying to its aid?

Senator O'MAHONEY. I have no evidence that so many are. Of course, I might say to you that the Department of Justice has been following A. & P. for 10 years, and that has been very helpful to little business in competing.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to comment on the Senator's point of view?

Mr. BYOIR. The fact is that competitors all over the country, at their own expense, have run advertising in newspapers stating that they don't need any help from Uncle Sam or from the antitrust lawyers. There is a typical advertisement from farmers. Down on the Jersey coast more than 1,200 Atlantic County farmers protest Government action against A. & P. and strangely enough, they say they rise to the defense of the best friend the farmer ever had. The fact is that the A. & P. has benefited its competitors in the retail field, and not hurt them.

Senator O'MAHONEY. What bothers me about this, Carl, is that if your company is such a perfectionist as you describe, if it is so beneficient, so kind, so concerned in the interest of the public, what have you got to fear in going to court? Why do you have to spend $5,000,000 in advertising in the newspapers and here in the city of Washington the newspapers into which you place the advertisements decline to receive the advertisements of the little business people?

Mr. BYOIR. No, they have run them.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Are you trying to do anything about getting the trial in the papers instead of in the courts?

Mr. BYOIR. What a minute. We are not afraid of the trial in the courts, but we have 10, 12, or 15 million women dealing with us every week. I don't think the American women are the kind of people who would want to deal with that kind of company. Suppose we had waited a year in Washington, where they said we were raising the price of bread, that we were the kind of people who would take bread out of the mouths of poor people. It took a year for that to come to trial. What would have happened to our business in Washington, when Judge Goldsborough said at the end that the evidence showed that we sold bread cheaper than anybody else in Washington, not higher. What would have happened to our relations with the farmer?

I don't think we have to sit silent under these, plus the fact that we are not spending $5,000,000, Joe. We are running stories about this in the regular space that we would use if we were running our price ads; and, strangely enough, the public is so interested in it and believes us against our adversaries, that business gets better every day.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Now will you prepare an ad—you are a skilled public relations man.

Mr. BYOIR. Thank you, Senator.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Prepare an ad tomorrow or next week on the southern New York case where you pleaded guilty, a story on the Massachusetts case, on the Rhode Island case——

Mr. BYOIR. Keep the record straight. We didn't plead guilty in any of these cases.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You filed a nolo contendere. You said, "No, we don't contest it." On the short weighting in the District of Columbia you had a trial, and you were found guilty in the police court.

Mr. BYOIR. That is right.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Well, put an ad about that in the papers, won't you?

Mr. BYOIR. That is right.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to answer, or do you want to go into the summary period? You each have a minute. Senator O'MAHONEY, do you want to sum up?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Let me say just that we are struggling here with the great question of centralization. The United States is either going to have decentralization, self-government in the regions and in the States, or it is going on the road to big government. The A. & P. a typical national organization operated from a central office in such a manner that little competitors can't keep pace with it, is leading down the road to socialism. That is why I am for competition and for little business and for restraints upon predatory big business.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you very much, Senator. Mr. Byoir?

Mr. BYOIR. I say to you with all the sincerity of which I am capable, I have represented many American companies, and I have never known a company that tried as hard to obey every facet of every law, local, State, and Federal, as the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. I say to you with all the sincerity of which I am capable that no little retailer has been hurt. The little retailer who used to work 7 days a week and who worked 5 and 6 nights a week, today has a big supermarket and makes $250 or $500 a week. Due to this competition he gets his groceries cheaper, and the wholesaler gives him a better and cheaper service.

I would just add that the proof of all this, that we have not restrained competition, that the charge emanates against us because we are too competitive, is that in all things you buy your wife takes a dollar to any store—clothing, household utensils, anything for the children or the husband—and she gets 62 cents worth of goods and gets 38 cents worth of the cost of distribution. She can go into any grocery store in the United States and, due to the competitive pressures of the A. & P.—everybody in the grocery business will tell you it is so—she will get 85 cents worth of food and she will pay only 15 cents for all the costs of distribution. She can do it in a thousand grocery stores that are not A. & P. grocery stores.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

You have been listening to a discussion on the A. & P. case. Our speakers have been Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, and Carl Byoir, the noted public relations counsel.

Resolutions Adopted by the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most highly respected and greatest patriotic organizations of our country is the Grand Army of the Republic. There are only a few members of that great organization still left. The Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic is a great organization that will carry on the work of the Grand Army of the Republic long after the last member of that organization has passed away.

On January 21, 1950, the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic in regular convention assembled here in Washington adopted a set of resolutions which are well drawn and which are firm in their defense of the United States of America and its institutions.

I am glad to have these resolutions printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks. These resolutions were offered by Mrs. Margaret Hopkins Worrell, chairman of the resolutions committee of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic. Mrs. Worrell is a resident of the district which I have the honor to represent and also of my home city of Ironton, Ohio. The resolutions are as follows:

Whereas for several years there has been moving throughout these United States of America a very stealthy scheme for a "one world" government, which if put into effect would abolish the United States of America; and

Whereas the principal leaders of this scheme are the World United Federalists, Inc., and Union Now, propagandizing for a world government in which they have been so successful that the legislatures of 31 States have favored resolutions to repeal the Declaration of Independence; and

Whereas the legislatures of six States—California, Connecticut, Florida, Maine, New Jersey, and North Carolina—have approved a resolution which "calls for a constitutional convention to amend the Constitution to expedite and insure the participation of the United States in a world federal government, open to all nations"; and

Whereas approval by 33 States would compel Congress to call a convention for that purpose; furthermore, action favoring world government has been suddenly instituted in our Congress itself, with 91 Members of the House of Representatives (64 Democrats and 27 Republicans) introducing a concurrent resolution whereby Congress would declare that world government is the fundamental objective of American foreign policy"; and

Whereas the United World Federalists says: "World law shall be enforceable directly upon individuals—that means we give up the right to make our own laws, but would obey laws made by foreign politicians, tried by a foreign court with no enforceable appeal by our United States, which would have but one vote against hundreds of foreign votes—it means said world government would direct and decide how much taxes we Americans should pay without consulting our own Government (we would be taxed to support the world)—it means that our Nation could not possess armament or forces unless approved by world government and that we would strip ourselves of all power for self-defense and be at the mercy of well-armed international, mercenary forces, under the heel of some political clique, possibly Communist—it means that world government would take our gold hoard at Fort Knox and spend it for the enrichment of their own countries and themselves—it means that they would cancel any debts owing to the United States. In consequence of the above proposals, the United States would cease to exist as a free Nation—our Constitution destroyed—our liberties destroyed, and that we become slaves of a world superstate government founded by the socialist totalitarian philosophy that the individual is the servant of the government and not its master; and

Whereas our elected members of the United States Congress took an oath to defend the American Constitution, therefore the loyal citizens of the United States cannot sit silent while they listen to such outrageous proposals for the destruction of our Nation: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic in regular convention assembled this 21st day of January 1950, and in the name of our forefathers who saved the Union of these United States, That we call upon each and every patriotic organization, every loyal supporter of our Constitution and Bill of Rights to inform their Senators and Representatives that they are absolutely against any form of world government or superstate, that we have prospered and grown rich under our system of government and will not tolerate any change; and be it further

Resolved, That we hold each and every Member of our elected body to cast their vote in the interests of the United States and not on international foreign policy.

Whereas for the last 2½ years a Senate committee has been investigating our entire immigration and naturalization system; and

Whereas their report shows that the floodgates of our Nation are opened for the entrance of millions of aliens from all over the world who are coming in as displaced persons; and

Whereas certain pressure groups have been lobbying in the Congress for the repeal of all our safeguards on immigration and are spending millions of dollars for the dissemination of propaganda for that purpose; and

Whereas our country operates under an immigration quota system, whereby approximately 154,000 quota immigrants may be admitted every year for permanent residence, also United States citizens may bring in their relatives on a nonimmigration quota; and

Whereas certain pressure groups are trying to drive the Celler bill (H. R. 4567) through the Senate, which provides the admission of some 15,000 persons from behind the iron curtain who have not yet been displaced; and

Whereas an official of our principal intelligence agency (operating abroad), expressed his opinion that this provision of the Celler bill would constitute a dangerous threat to the security of the United States, and would be another loophole for the infiltration of Communist agents; and

Whereas upon uncontested evidence of a complete break-down in the administration of the immigration law which has opened the gates to persons who will not become good citizens, but will become ready recruits in subversive organizations to tear down the democracy of the United States; and

Whereas during the first 6 months of 1949, illegal entries over the Mexican border were at a rate of 25,000 a month, and a former American consul on the Canadian border estimated the number of illegal aliens in the United States to be from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000: Therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of the Potomac, in regular convention assembled this 21st day of January 1950, That we will oppose with all our strength and will immediately inform our Members of the United States Senate that they must protect our immigration system and promptly provide funds for the detection and deportation of these thousands upon thousands of aliens who have illegally entered our borders; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Senator PAT MCCARRAN, with the request that he place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Coercive Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as of today, February 8, 1950, some unions are following a practice directly contrary to their pronouncement. Some union labor officials insist, and rightly, that no man can be forced to work at a particular job.

Then they go to the other extreme and insist that a man shall not be permitted to work at a job where the wages and the working conditions are satisfactory to him, unless he belongs to the union, pays the union initiation fees, union dues, and special assessments levied by the union.

Unions claim and exercise the right to ban a union man from membership in the union if he violates a union rule or if he exercises his right to free speech. They may be correct in insisting upon the right to expel a member who does not comply with their rules, but under no circumstances should they have the right, nor should they be permitted to exercise the right to expel a man or prevent his employment when he honestly expresses his own opinion.

The public is rapidly approaching the conclusion that if unions insist upon the right to clog the telephone service, to refuse to dig coal, to cut off transportation, the citizen's supply of light, heat,

water, food or clothing, by the calling of a strike, as a union might well do by calling out the teamsters, we will shortly get a law curbing that union power—a law which will provide that when a man goes on strike and that strike results in injury to the public health, welfare, or safety, that man on strike, if he persists in refusing to work, shall have his status as employer-employee taken from him.

Stating it in different words—the proposition is this—an employee shall have the right to refuse to work at any time, at any job, but he shall not have the right, by picket line, show of force, abuse, or in any other manner, to prevent another man from taking that particular job.

Union officers will best serve their organizations when they discover, as they ultimately will, that they have no right and will not be permitted to exercise power to drive any man from his job.

Answering a union official, who is a good citizen but just does not understand the term "democracy," an editorial from the Allegan Gazette, published in my home town of Allegan, Mich., reads:

DEMOCRACY NOT MAJORITY RULE IN IT UNLATER INDUSTRIAL RIGHTS

In a recent letter to the Gazette, published in the January 19 issue, Robert Gibson, president of local 709 UAW-CIO Allegan, took exception to our criticism of certain union activities and stated that we have been kicking the wrong dog.

A review of our editorials reveals that we have never found any fault with the fundamental principles of unionism in general, but that the Gazette has repeatedly and consistently criticized the illegal and oppressive actions of the large vertical unions, the methods that they have used to extort money from industry, the public, and their members, the dictatorial actions of their leaders, their destruction of property and assaults upon individuals in connection with their strike activities, their usurpation of the rights of individuals and of the functions of our courts, their interference with the political freedom of their members, their own disregard of contracts with their employers, their wildcat strikes, and their blind assumption that their first and only loyalty is to their union.

We do not believe for one moment that Mr. Gibson approves, for instance, the raid by union members, on the Shakespeare plant, in Kalamazoo, and the personal attacks upon individual workers at that plant by members of the goon squad. We do not think for one moment that if we had trouble in Allegan, Mr. Gibson would himself consent assault and battery upon anyone or that he would willfully destroy property. But why, if he doesn't believe in such illegal union activity, doesn't he come out and condemn it and why should he criticize us because we do condemn such practices?

Frankly we think the reason is that the unions are not democratic, that he is afraid to engage in any criticism of the activities of the CIO or of their policy because he feels that he would be jeopardizing his standing with the CIO.

In his letter Gibson writes of the high profits realized by many of our large corporations and the effect those profits have in increasing our standard of living. It is significant that Gibson does not mention that these profits are subjected to a very high rate of double taxation, and that if he and other employees of these large concerns are to remain employed, some money must be retained by these concerns for expansion, for replacement costs, for experimental purposes, in general to not only keep the industry operating but to improve its product and its methods of production. If all the profit of any year was paid out in salaries, wages, and in dividends to its stockholders, how long could these concerns continue to employ the union members, continue to produce the best and the cheapest goods of any country on earth?

If Gibson has any complaint against the present high cost of living he should take it up with Harry Truman and his Fair Deal; the Government is responsible for the high cost of living, not the large corporations.

Did you know, Mr. Gibson, that the people of the United States are paying out more money for interest on our indebtedness today than it took to operate our Government in 1932? Reduce our governmental expenditures, balance our budget, quit kidding ourselves that the Fair Deal will work, reduce our national debt while we still have a chance and you will discover that the cost of living will go down and that the working man will be a lot better off than he is now.

Mr. Gibson also speaks of having been discharged from some position that he held because of a difference of opinion regarding politics. Of that, of course, we have no knowledge but we do know that in unions there are many members afraid to express their opinions because of union coercion and the power of some union official to blacklist them. We know of instances where union officials have sat in judgment upon the individual members and fined them just as a court would fine an individual for disobeying some law.

The unions today have acquired power because of the pressure that they exert. Fear is one of their weapons. Men must join unions in order to obtain employment, they have no choice. Men often go out on strikes not because they want to, but because they have to. Many persons stay away from work because they are afraid they will be beaten up by some union thug. Many newspapers refrain from voicing an honest opinion of unions because of union pressure. National unions today are guilty of the same kind of treatment that you complain of when you say that you lost your job on one occasion because you expressed a political opinion, and on a scale such as never witnessed in this country before.

In your letter you indicate that you are not familiar with the meaning of the word "democracy" as practiced in this country. You assume that the "majority rule." You disregard one of the main principles of our country as established by our Constitution and that is that the individual has certain rights and privileges which if the law is enforced cannot be violated by the majority.

In fact you belong to an organization, that would, if it could, take over complete control of the Government and rule the people for the benefit of the unions and their members.

We remain of the opinion that some of present-day vertical unions as now operating are detrimental to the general welfare of the country. They have assumed too much power, they have become too large, they no longer respect the rights of individuals and of the minority within their ranks, they disregard the law, commit acts of violence, they have, and in some instances still do, harbor Communists working for the destruction of our Nation, in some instances their leaders are known criminals.

No, Mr. Gibson, we don't believe that these unions you defend are the underdogs of today, and we are firmly convinced that the average workingman would be better off if unionism was limited to that particular plant where he was employed.

Thirty-second Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today as the forces that would destroy freedom move in an attempt to enslave the world I would like to pause and notice a special anniversary of freedom. Thirty-two years ago today the Council of Lithuania signed their declaration of independence. I would like to join with all free Lithuanians, and invite all free people throughout the world to recall this declaration. I would like to join the enslaved, liberty-loving people of Lithuania in their hope for future freedom. In establishing an independent state, Lithuania received her chief external support from United States and today people of America solemnly hope that Lithuania will soon enjoy the cherished independence she seeks.

Lithuanian history is clear during the last 700 years. It is a history of war and a constant fight for freedom. During the Middle Ages Lithuania established a powerful state and successfully defended her independence against the Germans, the Mongols, and the Tartars. They knew and appreciated the fruits of freedom and governed themselves by the philosophy of freedom. They fought and died to preserve their freedom. In 1795 Lithuania lost her freedom under the occupation of Czarist Russia. From 1795 to February 16, 1918, Lithuania was at constant war with Russia and Germany in an attempt to recover her lost liberty.

On February 16, 1918, Russia and Germany, as did the United States and other nations, recognized the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. Russia gave up all claim to Lithuania and Lithuania was seen to grow and progress with remarkable achievement until Russia enslaved her again in 1940.

During the years of true independence Lithuania contributed much culture and industry to civilization. Her people were truly happy, self-supporting, and justly proud of their independence.

Since the Soviet occupation Lithuania has seen her soil abused and her forests wasted. Families have been separated, deportation has reached appalling heights. The personal freedom, the inherent rights of all people are denied the people of Lithuania. But the spirit of freedom is not dead, it is enlivened and activated by the very denial of actual freedom.

In view of the splendid record and generous contribution to humanity given by this small country we cannot but recognize her plight and hope for her quick recovery.

We extend best wishes to Lithuania on this anniversary. We hope that Lithuania who has suffered for the cause of freedom will soon enjoy what she deserves and be delivered from her present plight which she does not deserve. We hope that Lithuania will soon take her seat among the family of democracies and contribute freely to her own internal peace and to the peace of the world.

The Mindszenty Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, prior to my election, a year ago today, and within a matter of hours after Cardinal Spellman delivered his crusade sermon, I publicly called upon our distinguished President, requesting that he direct our Secretary of State to release to the world all the facts our Government must have in the Mindszenty case, feeling confident that such disclosure would completely exonerate the cardinal. I also urged that the entire matter be referred to the United Nations, with a view of obtaining the cardinal's liberation.

I have closely followed the events in this case, and commend to the reading of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the New York World-Telegram on February 4, 1950, entitled "The Mindszenty Trial: A Chapter in Infamy," which justifies my stand and continued protest against Soviet religious intolerance:

THE MINDSZENTY TRIAL: A CHAPTER IN INFAMY—PROSECUTION OF CARDINAL CONVICTED RED JUDGES IN EYES OF FREE WORLD

(By Gabriel Pressman)

A year ago today, I saw brought to trial a brave man who acted like a coward. I saw a people's court from which the people were barred. I saw an ex-Nazi sitting as a Communist chief judge. I saw a defense attorney outprosecute a prosecutor.

On February 4, 1949, second day of the trial, I was admitted to a dimly lit courtroom in Budapest, where Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty and six co-defendants sat before the bar of Communist justice. Edward Korry of the United Press and I were the only American correspondents representing American publications admitted to the trial.

There was one catch: I could not choose an interpreter, I was told by Ivan Boldizar, pudgy, nervous-eyed government press chief. The government would supply a bright, young Communist to translate for me.

GUSS GUARD COURT

The courtroom was two flights up—with six checkpoints of submachine gunners from the door of the dirty, red-brick courthouse on Marko Street to the door of the trial room itself.

It was a small, dark room. Not much light pierced the huge windows. On the dais sat the people's court president and four associate judges. On the first bench beneath were the seven defendants, charged with a royalist conspiracy to overthrow the government.

Their faces were drawn. Their attitudes ranged from indifference to resignation. Alongside each sat a militiaman. Throughout the courtroom, militiamen stood or sat among the carefully screened spectators. Only seven relatives of defendants were present.

FROM NAZI TO RED JUDGE

Through an American's eyes, it was a trial of paradoxes. There was Vilmos Olti, before and during the war one of Hungary's foremost Nazis, now playing Communist chief judge.

Olti fired an endless stream of questions at the defendants, methodically building up the case against them with "yes" and "no" answers. He allowed seven prosecution witnesses, no defense witnesses. As he carried the case through in a lightning 3 days, the hard-faced prosecutor-juror seldom looked up from the papers he read.

The "trial" seemed a little academic. The defendants had confessed everything days before at the headquarters of the dread secret police, 60 Andrassy Street. And the government had the confessions bound neatly into a "yellow book" for the convenience of Red propagandists.

EAGER TO CONFESS

The defendants vied constantly to confess. Once it was even too much for the court. The Cardinal tried to read a repudiation of his prearrest warning against any future "confession," but Olti silenced him: "You don't want to read that now." So the Cardinal sat down and read it when directed.

Young Andress Zakar, the Cardinal's secretary, was once his stubborn, good right arm. Now he stood, weak and timid, most pathetically trying to follow wherever Olti led. And the judge coached him benignly, like a teacher with a backward child.

Zakar used the word "democratic" in the Western sense. "Liberal, bourgeois democratic or people's democratic?" Olti demanded.

Zakar (searchingly): "Er * * * liberal."

Olti (with fatherly severity): "That means against progress."

Zakar: "Yes, sir."

ROLE FOR CARDINAL

The Cardinal, an excellent orator before his arrest, spoke monotonously, reading from prepared papers. Under prodding from the rasp-voiced director, the Cardinal said: "I'm very sorry" about everything—the book he had written, letters, money manipulations.

The script called for a Mindszenty of repudiation, confession, and apology. And this, the Communists wanted the world to believe, was the same man who in a last interview said staunchly: "I will never take back anything I have said against the Communist government * * * Hungary has degenerated into a gigantic chamber of horrors, a den of robbers and thieves."

Crudest of the crudities was the attitude of the so-called defense attorneys. They spent most of the trial twiddling their mustaches or gazing into space. I didn't see them take a single note, nor consult each other once.

Kalman Kicsko, a Communist of 30 years' standing, "defended" the cardinal. Joseph Groh, prominent Catholic lawyer, had been jailed for offering to serve.

Kicsko pleaded well * * * for Kicsko. Most of his final speech told how much he, Kicsko, loved the people's democracy.

Then, removing his spectacles, he denounced western newspapers: "The foreign press has written numerous calumnies against Hungary." He disputed that the trial was unfair: "Nobody either at home or abroad can accuse us of restricting freedom." He cringingly thanked the prosecution for bringing up the charges against his client. And, when he sat down, even Olti smiled.

A year has passed and the world still wonders what made the defendants act as they did? Was the cardinal tortured, drugged, or hypnotized?

Pro-Communist correspondents reported the cardinal seemed perfectly normal in every respect. It was hard to agree when you saw a man weak and cowardly, whose actions for 4 years had spoken strength and courage.

CHANGED MAN AT TRIAL

Was he in his right mind when he offered to resign if the charges against him were dropped? Only the Pope could accept such a resignation. Before his arrest, he could deliver a perfect sermon from a few notes. At the trial he forgot frequently and—the interpreters did not hide it—had to be prodded by the court.

The key to what happened is, of course, the 38 days the cardinal spent with the secret police before the trial. I did not speak to the cardinal—the Government forbade it—but I have spoken to others educated to confess at 60 Andrassy Street. The Communists have a standard curriculum: questioning for days on end under bright lights, standing with arms overhead until faint, repeated blows with blunt instruments on the kidney, electric shock treatments.

It is possible that all the standard methods and perhaps more were used on the defendants. Perhaps Zakar was tortured to arouse the cardinal's pity. Zakar's white face and trembling impatience to please marked him a likely graduate of the torture chamber.

Not all the clues were outside the court. In the cardinal's final speech, he spoke with some feeling for the first time:

"I stand here with half a century of basic principles * * * principles that guide us as railway tracks guide trains. * * * I was not and am not an enemy of the Hungarian people * * * worker or peasant."

Perhaps the cardinal here revealed his true thoughts—that he believed as he always did, that he still loved the people but not the Communist government.

REFUSE TO BOW TO RED

Significantly, the Hungarian press and radio did not carry the statement. For weeks before the trial, these government-controlled media trumpeted the cardinal's guilt. "A pitiable worm, a scared scoundrel, a bloodthirsty beast of prey," they called him.

Meanwhile the government had nightly press briefings to tell correspondents what to write. Boldizar, the press czar, said: "Tell your readers that the cardinal is not a brave hero of freedom, but a weakling and a coward." The second night Mr. Korry and I refused to sign a Communist-sponsored resolution, signed by the others, affirming there was no censorship and translations were accurate.

A Hungarian journalist secretly applauded our stand: "There are two kinds of censorship: one where the censor's pencil scratches out the words, the other where the fear in your heart scratches them out." He told me how every Hungarian-speaking person in that courtroom had been intimidated.

After my refusal to sign, the government pretended I did not exist, withdrew even its slanted help. I had to scrape together at least the official version of what was happening—and that was damning enough.

FINAL COURT SCENE

Time will never dim that last, sad scene of February 8. The defendants stood for more than an hour while Olti issued an anti-western political tirade and their sentences.

The cardinal's head was slightly bowed, his hands clasped before him. As he was sentenced to life imprisonment, his cheek twitched. Princess Esterhazy knelt in prayer. A Government camera's flash bulb exploded.

There was a weird moment when Laszlo Toth, almost deaf Catholic editor, stepped forward to hear Olti shout his fate—10 years.

Then it was over. The heavily guarded defendants filed out. In the corridor I stopped gray-haired Hildegarde Enkar, the defendant's sister. Glancing nervously at detectives, her eyes moist, she said in French:

"My brother is a good boy. He has always served God. If God wills it, then this must be."

The reaction of the people in the streets and coffee houses was bitter. Through a Hungarian-speaking American, they told me: "They were afraid to give him the death sentence because they know his hold on the people is too great."

HAS PLACE IN HISTORY

The cardinal, says the Hungarian underground, languishes today in Gyujtofoghas jail, 10 miles north of Budapest.

Whatever happens, Cardinal Mindszenty's place in history is assured. A Hungarian student friend expressed it well that last night in Budapest as we strolled along the banks of the Danube. I had just come from a final press conference at which Boldizsar said: "The trial is over, but the trial of you correspondents has just begun. You must tell the world the truth about this trial."

My friend looked up at the sky. "You know, for once Boldizsar is right," he said. "This was more than the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. In the court of world public opinion, a cardinal has convicted his judges and communism stands condemned."

One World a Fantasy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I am glad to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "One World a Fantasy," which appeared in the Oil, Paint, and Drug Reporter, on February 6, 1950.

This editorial was written by the editor, Mr. Craig, and it appealed to me as being a penetrating and thought-provoking article which I thought would be of interest to the Members of the House.

ONE WORLD A FANTASY

Altogether too much is being said by tongue and typewriter about how we can't get along with Moscow. It is time that consideration was given to getting along without those for whom that name popularly stands.

It should be clear to everyone that the high-minded, optimistic idea of melting all the peoples, or merging all the countries, of the man-inhabited globe into one world has faded into fantastic nothingness. The United Nations should recognize that it has a much better purpose in enabling friendly folk to live as they would.

It is unquestionable that there is going to be, while man exists, various numbers of worlds, depending on the characteristic on which group divisions are based. All sorts of characteristics, race, color, creed, for example, will be the dividing lines among worlds, even as they are now within existing countries. But, the characteristic which falls most loudly for consideration—and disposition—is that of political ideology. It is beyond all question that there is going to be a red world. That is no reason why the other main division of the inhabitants of the globe should be blue.

United Nations and individual governments—at least the human instruments thereof—are greatly bothered over what will be the result of the childish refusal of the reds to participate in an increasing number and variety of UN deliberations. Much solemn pondering is being directed to the discovery of ways and means of getting their participation. It would be far better for those who believe in the UN purposes to proceed in the pursuit thereof as though there never had been any reds in the organization.

It may be argued that decisions made and actions taken without the participation of the uncooperative Reds would not be accepted by the latter. What of it? That acceptance at best is wholly a matter of expediency. It must be admitted that, if they were not in on any program, it would be clear where they stood. When they are in, there is no such clarity.

The world can get along without being red if it will but not be blue. But, it must be ready. It also must be realistic in facing the fact that not all who now are averse to being red are white. Expediency, as a road to advantage, has not lost any of its popularity. There must be also a clear recognition of the extent to which the profit motive transcends all color lines, whether dermal or political.

The peoples of this globe are not ready for world singleness. They are going to continue to be divided politically into at least two entities. There is a deal of substantiation for the belief that the group which aspires to a world brotherhood cannot get along with the other. There is much reason to feel that it is largely, if not wholly, a waste of time to endeavor to remedy that condition. So, the white world should quit being blue, carry on in pursuit of its ideals—and be ready, able, and willing to kick out those who may try to block its progress. It can get along without them, politically, socially, and commercially. And it wisely should quit moaning and begin to demonstrate its independence.

James Patrick McGovern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md., on February 13, 1950:

POET, LAWYER CELEBRATES SEVENTY-FIRST BIRTHDAY HERE

Friends, fellow patients, corpsmen, and nurses gathered for a party recently up on Tower 11, to help James Patrick McGovern celebrate his seventy-first birthday. Mr. McGovern is a well-known person in the hospital. His bombastic nature and Celtic conviviality are always rife.

Here is a fighting man from way back. During the First World War he became a captain in the Army.

He is a poet, a lawyer, a crusader, and an ardent Irishman; his poems have been included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for many years. His first poem attacked Wall Street interests, and found him expelled from school for promoting the spirit of anarchy. Unabated he went forward to become a brilliant lawyer and the originator and founder of the Coconino Sun, a paper that is a collector's item today.

When asked to recite a poem, he chose Too Old, a piece written when he was refused entrance into the service for World War II:

"The surge of battle rises everywhere,
From cap and field to office, home, and street;
The soldiers' vibrant step, the drum's deep beat,
Stir the blood even as they fill the air.
But who are they that, chafing, stand and wait,
Though speed is victory and men's the need?
Why must they press, while none will pay them heed,
To serve at any cost, in scorn of fate?
Scarred veterans whose valor shone before,
They have stepped forth to take their posts again;
'Too old, too old,' they hear in a refrain,
As their steeled honor urges them the more.
Faith with their past, which knew no compromise,
Calls them to fight until their life tide dies."

The Need To Combat Interstate Crime and Rackets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to offer for inclusion in the RECORD a statement of Mayor deLesseps S. Morrison, of the city of New Orleans, which was made on February 15, 1950, before the Attorney General's conference to combat crime and rackets. Mayor Morrison's discussion of the growing menace of organized Nation-wide gambling syndicates is very timely. It is forthright action such as Mayor Morrison suggests that will do much to aid in our fight against widespread crime and gambling.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MAYOR DE LESSEPS S. MORRISON BEFORE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S CONFERENCE TO COMBAT INTERSTATE CRIME AND RACKETS

My name is deLesseps S. Morrison. I am the mayor of the city of New Orleans and the immediate past president of the American Municipal Association, whose viewpoint and recommendations I have been asked to present here today. The AMA speaks directly and indirectly for 10,152 towns and cities of America.

On September 20, 1949, our association addressed to Attorney General McGrath a letter expressing concern over the growing menace of organized Nation-wide gambling syndicates. We proposed Federal Government coordination and cooperation with local agencies in coping with this problem.

This conference is a most significant milestone in the history of crime fighting in the United States. Certainly it marks the first coordinated step to be taken by the Federal Government in recognition of the growing power of organized crime syndicates in our country.

On behalf of the American Municipal Association, I should like to express our genuine

appreciation to Attorney General McGrath for his interest and initiative in calling this meeting. And to President Truman, certainly, for his presence. Both the conference and the stature of the participants offer the greatest encouragement to public officials and civic-minded citizens who are sincerely concerned with the problem and who believe that an immediate, strong, and effective plan of coordinated action is necessary.

Before going further I would like to make plain and clear two important points. We of the AMA recognize fully the responsibilities and duties of local officials for local law enforcement. We do not ask the Federal Government to take over this task—nor do we condone the failure of indifferent or inefficient local officials to work for enforcement in their communities.

But we do say, however, that when local officials wage war on nationally organized underworld elements whose supply lines, communications, and general operations cut across municipal, county, State, and even national lines—then this problem is no longer a local one to be handled solely by local officials whose jurisdiction and information is so limited.

Secondly, I would like to say that we do not pretend to be experts on this subject. There are many gaps in the information available to us and to the other municipal officials present—gaps which we hope will be corrected to some extent by this conference.

For instance, the Federal Government agencies have an extensive data on Nation-wide operations of racing-wire services, the slot-machine syndicates, and allied activities. Yet much of this is not available to municipal officials, and some not even available to other United States departments.

A few days ago we learned of an extensive report on racing wire services compiled several years ago by the FBI. Yet, when our police superintendent asked for a copy he was told that none was available in New Orleans. And, even if there were, the FBI said, it could not permit us to see such a confidential document. (Mr. Morrison explained that the FBI did not have jurisdiction to do so; that the FBI had cooperated in every way possible.)

There is an urgent need now of central coordination for such information among Federal departments, making same available to law-enforcement agencies of the cities and States.

We do not have the whole picture, but each of us present—and hundreds of other mayors, public officials, and crime commissions in various States—have seen small segments of this national scene of organized interstate crime. These pieces fit together in a pattern of mounting evidence concerning several highly organized gambling and racketeering syndicates whose wealth, power, scope of operations, and influence has recently grown to gigantic and alarming proportions. It is an ugly, vicious, un-American picture of systematic law violation, huge profits, corruption of public officials who can be bought—and operations outside the jurisdiction of those who cannot be purchased.

According to our information, there are two major criminal syndicates operating in America today. One controls the large slot machine industry and engages in allied gambling rackets; the other dominates the racing wire service. On the basis of checkable information, these activities are the largest steady sources of income in the underworld.

Their shrewd and efficient overlords have adopted the techniques and methods of business. They operate in a loose confederation of mutual respect, cooperation, allocated territories, and huge profits.

Here are the most conservative figures on these operations:

The annual slot-machine take in the United States is estimated by the best authorities from $1,000,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 a year. This figure is based on the fact that 105,000 gaming machines, mostly one-armed bandits, were registered in 1949 with the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The total number operating is considered double or triple that figure. The average net take of each machine is $10 to $15 a day.

The principal racing wire service in the country is Continental Press Service, which is the key to the multi-billion-dollar-betting business. Its 16,000 miles of leased wire service over 300 key handbook areas. It is difficult to pin down the annual take of this industry but the best estimates put it at double or treble the volume of pari-mutuel betting at legalized race tracks—or from $3,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 per year.

There is an abundant fund of facts which point to control of this wire service by the old Capone gang. Although the wire service has been domiciled in Cleveland since its late operator James M. Ragan was killed, the Chicago Crime Commission and other sources believe that Continental is dominated by the Chicago and underworld interests.

We have good reasons to believe that the slot-machine syndicate is controlled by Frank Costello. The shy and retiring czar of the slot-machine racket always understates his interest in rackets and governments in his public denials of the facts about his potency and influence.

The numerous case records of his interstate operations could take our entire day. For the record I will briefly sketch a well-documented case and the one with which I am most familiar—the Costello syndicate operations in Louisiana.

According to his own Federal grand jury testimony some years ago, Costello moved his New York slot machine operations to New Orleans in 1936. He said that he sent down Dandy Phil Kastel, exconvict and one time associate of Arnold Rothstein, to incorporate and run the business. Today he lives and operates in Jefferson Parish above New Orleans beyond our jurisdiction.

Kastel first formed the Bayou Novelty Co. which later became the Pelican Novelty Co., and which today is the Louisiana Mint Co., to handle the distribution of slot machines and other coin devices.

From 1936 until 1946 the Costello-Kastel interests operated in New Orleans under an exclusive monopoly.

Some idea of their profits may be seen in the figures revealed during the income-tax evasion trial of Costello, Kastel and five associates in the New Orleans Federal court in 1939. The Government charged that they had conspired to evade payment of about $500,000 taxes on income approaching $9,000,000 from their New Orleans slot machine business in 1936–37. That was before they installed their maximum amount of 5,500 slot machines in New Orleans. We have no figures on their take between 1937 and 1946, but at $10 to $15 a day per machine it must have been enormous.

With the election of the present city administration in 1946 the syndicate retreated across the parish line. No slot machines have operated in New Orleans since that time.

One day in 1947 our police superintendent learned of a cache of new slot machines stored in New Orleans for shipment to nearby distribution points. Police raided the place and destroyed 390. Kastel, as an owner of Louisiana Mint Co., promptly filed a suit against us for $117,000. Listed in the suit as company manager was Dudley Geigerman, brother-in-law of Frank Costello.

Their suit was dismissed, but the Louisiana Mint Co. continues to thrive and prosper outside of New Orleans. They own most of the 8,000 gambling devices for which the Bureau of Internal Revenue issued $100 tax stamps in Louisiana last year.

Meanwhile, Kastel was following another of the syndicate's recognized techniques—that of entering into allied businesses. This syndicate built the Beverly Club in Jefferson Parish, La., a luxury gambling house. Its charter, copy of which is attached, shows its registered agents to be Phil Kastel and Carlos Marcello. The latter is a local ex-convict and syndicate man. In addition to operating the Beverly Club, this group finances bar and tavern proprietors at lower interest rates than the banks charge—with the understanding, of course, that these places must install their machines.

The Continental Wire Service, as already noted, does not come into New Orleans. Its leased Western Union wires do service their Louisiana distributor at several points just above and below our city. Through batteries of telephone relays they service handbooks below and above our city limits. Despite the continuing enforcement efforts of our police there are still sporadic bookie operations in our city. But the lack of direct wire service and our insistence that the telephone company pull out telephone lines of all raided establishments has held these operations down to a minimum.

To our knowledge, the Costello syndicate and the wire-service heads today are not personally violating any municipal or State law in New Orleans. But they are doing it all around us. And they are causing the law to be violated in our city.

Mayor Bowron, of Los Angeles, and the California Crime Commission, headed by Admiral Standley, have called attention to similar situations in the far West. The Citizens Crime Commissions of Chicago and Greater Miami have compiled almost identical facts. So has the Massachusetts Crime Commission. Others present, including Mayor Darst, of St. Louis, and Mayor Cobo, of Detroit have similar corroboration.

Mayor Dorothy Lee of Portland, Oreg., has publicly stated:

"Seven weeks after my election, slot-machine operators sought to organize in Portland and at the same time get me out of office."

Municipal officials everywhere will tell you that in investigations of local criminals we continually run into frustrating blind alleys and dead ends—and the trail often winds out of the local jurisdiction over a city, county, or State line.

Does all this not point up the very vital fact that the great need is not to get at the small fry, but the absentee syndicate bosses who direct the financing, supplying, strategy, and rapid movement of law breakers back and forth across the country? All States and cities are not yet infected, but no State or community is immune from invasion.

It should also be made a part of this record that for several years the United States Immigration and Naturalization Department has had complaints in its files that Costello committed perjury in swearing to his final citizenship papers in 1926. When he swore that he was not in violation of any United States laws, it is our understanding that he was at that time the Nation's top-ranking rum runner.

The American Municipal Association proposes to attack the problem on three levels: at home, within the States, and through joint efforts of city, State, and Federal Governments. In presenting our recommendations, I wish to make three preliminary comments.

The first goal of the AMA is to assure the basic honesty and integrity of municipal officials, so they will deserve the respect of the people. One of our major efforts will be to strengthen the backs of those municipal officials who have the courage to uphold the law.

Here questions of State laws arise—laws designated to protect individuals and free

enterprise from undue governmental interference—but laws whose loopholes have been exploited for years by high-priced legal talent defending illegal operators. The attorneys general are the most competent authorities to go into this point. Then there are Federal-city problems.

I should like here to express the admiration and implicit confidence of municipal officials in the law enforcement agencies of the Federal Government. We believe that they are doing the best possible job under conditions laid down by Congress and within the limits of their budgets.

Insofar as permissable, there exists today excellent teamwork between local and Federal enforcement agencies. Many of the best city police are graduates of the FBI academy, or have served actively with the Bureau—and this suggests a further expansion of this type of training.

Wise legislation in the recent past has extended the jurisdiction of the Federal authorities so that they may assist local police in combatting crime. For example, kidnaping, bank holdups, interstate transportation of stolen cars. No responsible persons would consider this a usurpation of local power.

If the Federal Government can invoke its power against those who use its mails to defraud, does it not follow logically that similar powers should be invoked against those who use interstate shipments and communications against the public interests.

Today it is a Federal offense to traffic in prostitution across State lines, but responsibility for suppressing prostitution remains local. Similarly, unauthorized possession of narcotics is a Federal offense, but the local war against the dope traffic goes on strong as ever.

This all adds up to the fact that the last major area of big profits from illegal enterprise in which the jurisdiction of the Federal Government has not been extended is that of interstate gambling operations that violate the laws of 48 States.

Here is where Federal action truly seems to be indicated—not to invade home rule, nor to centralize police power—but to move into a field that needs its help.

We must conclude that for the world's best investigators to materially help us in this problem there must be new legislation to extend their jurisdiction and fill in the gap that now exists.

We know, too, the political power of the underworld lies primarily in its financial strength. And its financial strength stems largely from the syndicate operation of slot machines and the control of racing and sports pool news.

The key objective before us is an attack on the supply lines and income of organized gambling as a Nation-wide industry.

Today the records of any collector of internal revenue will tell you who has bought gaming tax stamps and where the business is situated. We believe that it would be equally valuable to know who owns the machines as well as those in whose place of business they are installed.

Finally, if we can deport those who have fraudulently obtained their priceless American citizenship, we will rid the country of undesirable elements who are a menace to American democracy and our way of life.

The American Municipal Association endorses and will actively support these concrete recommendations:

1. Development of a coordinated master plan of action on the whole system of Nation-wide rackets by Federal, State, local governments and citizens' groups. The Attorney General for the United States should be coordinator for the entire effort.

In that connection, it would be of tremendous help if we could receive a confidential quarterly or semiannual report from the Attorney General, correlating all available data—giving municipal officials a continuing, complete picture which cities do not have the facilities or jurisdiction to obtain ourselves.

2. Support of the Kefauver bill to investigate the entire problem of interstate gambling rackets and allied operations. A Senate investigation that can call witnesses and make them tell the truth under threat of perjury indictments is the only way some of these dead ends can be routed out.

3. Legislation to outlaw dissemination of race results across State lines by telegraph, telephone, or radio for illegal gambling purposes. Such a law would not be designed to prohibit dissemination of sports information through the generally accepted press associations and newspapers.

4. Legislation to prohibit the interstate shipment of slot machines, other gambling devices, and their parts; requiring Federal registration of all such machines sold within States, and prohibiting foreign export of such devices. The Preston bill to prohibit shipment of gambling devices in interstate or foreign commerce has been endorsed in principle by FBI Director Hoover.

5. Amending the Bureau of Internal Revenue tax regulations on gaming devices to require registration of owners of devices on which tax stamps are purchased, as well as the user of such gaming devices. Penalties for failure to register gaming devices should be stiffened.

6. Legislation to extend the jurisdiction of the FBI to permit that agency to lend needed assistance and information to State and local officials.

7. Amending the immigration and naturalization laws providing that aliens obtaining citizenship by fraud or perjury may have that citizenship revoked at any time after discovery of said fraud or perjury.

8. Complete and continuing tax investigations of the head bosses of the rackets syndicates.

9. Amending Bureau of Internal Revenue regulations to provide that the now closed income tax records of known police characters and ex-convicts may be inspected by law enforcement agencies of the Federal, State, and local governments.

10. Inter-city cooperation, exchange of information and action. This was begun some months ago through the AMA by Mayor Bowron, myself, and the Chicago Crime Commission, Mayor Lee, of Portland, and several others. We will work to strengthen and improve the facilities for exchange of information among local police departments, through AMA as a coordinating agency.

11. While all the recommendations above are important, if we are to accomplish all of our joint objectives, there needs to be a thoroughly coordinated Federal effort or agency through which the cities and States can work.

To sum up—I wish to acknowledge the interest and assistance of numerous mayors and the crime commissions of Chicago, Greater Miami, and of Massachusetts.

The American Municipal Association believes that the flourishing existence of these nationally operated gambling-racketeering syndicates presents one of the greatest threats to society and to good government. At the very least, the alliances between the wealthy organized criminal element and local gamblers make more complex and difficult the problem of law enforcement at the local level. At the very worst, these underworld czars, through entrenched special privileges in a community, can wield tremendous influence over its government. From profits and power in one locality they go on to another. That is a danger and threat to our democratic way of life hardly less real than the Communist menace. Indeed, nothing could please the Russians more than the crumbling corruption of democratic government from within and consequent loss of faith in democracy by large segments of the American people.

I do not believe that the combined resources of the organized underworld rackets are greater than those of the Federal, State, and municipal governments of the United States.

It is our firm conviction that if everyone in this room determines to do something about the problem it can and will be conquered. Our cooperative action must not end when this meeting adjourns.

In this objective we pledge you the full and active cooperation of the American Municipal Association.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 11, 1950, before the Queens Village Republican Club, at Queens, N. Y., my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], made the annual Lincoln Day address. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the adress was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure to meet with you tonight in this Republican stronghold of the sovereign State of New York.

We gather together for a dual purpose; first to honor the name of the greatest American of all time, the founder of our Republican Party, who was born 141 years ago tomorrow and, second, to commemorate another important birthday.

Certainly this magnificent audience before me is aware that 1950 marks the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Queens Village Republican Club, the oldest club of its kind in the Nation in continuous existence.

I am honored more than I can say in having been asked to speak to you on such an auspicious occasion.

And that isn't all—I consider myself fortunate in sharing this rostrum with Bill Groat, your very able district leader.

My respect for Bill began when I first met him; it grew in 1948 when he invaded New Jersey to preach the gospel of Dewey and Warren and Hendrickson to the voters of my State, and is even greater now that I have watched him serve as an outstandingly capable administrative assistant to a Senator for whom I have the greatest admiration and affection, your own Irving Ives.

I wish to speak to you tonight about Abraham Lincoln as viewed from two different vantage points: First, President Lincoln, the wartime leader who brought this Nation successfully through its most crucial test, and secondly, as the leader of a new and struggling political party which became the most potent force ever known for the welfare of a great people and the development of our now great constitutional Republic.

To review Lincoln's humble origin, his struggles for mere existence and for an education, and his rise to fame would be "carrying coals to Newcastle," for I realize that this audience knows as well as I that stirring and inspiring story.

But I do want to impress upon you, my good friends and neighbors of Queens, that his devotion to the cause of common honesty and simple decency, his unimpeachable integrity, and his love for his fellow man were the traits of character which have enshrined him in our hearts and in the souls of free men everywhere—it was these humane qualities, not the power that he wielded as a wartime President or the authority he exercised as the Chief Executive of the Nation.

On the other hand, it was these very virtues which gave birth to our party and which saved the Union; it is these virtues alone which can be our salvation today as we struggle for domestic fortitude and strength and international peace and prosperity.

The Republican Party was born to make men free. It was conceived in a period in our Nation's history when vested interests were in complete control—when property rights were absolute.

When Lincoln was a boy, a man was only as important and powerful as the wealth he possessed, and, of course, a part of that wealth was often the possession of other human beings, of slaves or chattels.

The Republican Party, therefore, originated as the Liberal Party; its lofty purposes and high ideals gave it victories at the polls for almost a half century with very few interruptions and it was the hope of progressive forces in the United States and throughput the world during that entire period.

Under Republican leadership, all men were made free and welcomed into the company of American citizens; public land in our Western States was given to all who would care for it and live on it; the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor were established; the Sherman Antitrust Act was passed to meet the challenge of big business to free government—all of these were Republican achievements which led the United States from its position of a divided second-rate world power to a unified, powerful Nation whose natural wealth and industrial might combined with its concern for individual dignity and freedom, made it the beacon light for all the people of the world who desired the better things of this world.

As has happened often in the past, however, the dominant faction for good in a country sometimes goes off the beam and ignores the well-charted course it has so carefully plotted.

This happened to our own party shortly after the beginning of this century and, as we lost our vision, we lost our momentum.

Then the desire for unqualified services to mankind at all levels, was greatly impaired.

We became smug and lazy and content to enjoy our sense of superiority and invincibility. Our leaders forgot that the Republican Party was established to serve all people and that the GOP was only as strong as the place it occupied in the hearts and minds of the voters of the Nation.

We lost the confidence of the people; we overlooked some of their just demands for betterment in their working or living conditions, and we fell under that axiom uttered by the Great Emancipator himself "* * * you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

As the Republican Party became overconfident and less observant, a second political party held us on downs, took the initiative, and became first in the hearts of our citizenry and first at the ballot boxes.

But now we find that that party itself is less vigilant and virile and that our great party has another opportunity to prove to the Nation that we are competent to serve all the people without regard to race, creed, or color.

That our party can meet the challenge of an industrial society in an uncertain world; that it can give honest and intelligent government to millions of people, that it can effectively guarantee civil liberties to all citizens regardless of their origin is demonstrated beyond doubt in the neighboring States of New York and New Jersey.

Your Governor, Thomas E. Dewey, and my Governor, Alfred E. Driscoll, have functioned most effectively as chief executives of two of the most important and diversified States in the Union.

They have been able to operate on a sound financial basis; they have been able to provide clean government, administered by men of integrity; they have been able to cooperate with other governmental units in planning, constructing, and operating jointly-used facilities without Federal aid or contributing to the ever-growing trend which is fast reducing State and local governments to mere fictions.

I refer, of course, to the present very dangerous and parasitical system of Federal grants-in-aid on a hand-out basis.

Above all, Governors Dewey and Driscoll exemplify the sort of leadership that the revivified Republican Party can provide for a Nation which demands statesmen of great stature as never before in its history.

Incidentally, speaking of New York, as I was, and of Democrats, as I was not, brings to mind a little story Representative Abraham Lincoln told the Congress in 1848:

"I have heard some things from New York, and if they are true, one might well say of your party there, as a drunken fellow once said when he heard the reading of an indictment for hog stealing. The clerk read on till he got to and through the words 'did steal, take, and carry away 10 boars, 10 sows, 10 shoats, and 10 pigs,' at which he exclaimed, 'Well, by golly, that is the most equally divided gang of hogs I ever did hear of.' If there is any gang of hogs more equally divided than the Democrats of New York are about this time, I have not heard of it."

One of the greatest shortcomings of the fat and incompetent Democratic administrations down in Washington is their policy in treading with those who would betray their Nation.

Lincoln, as a wartime President in a divided Nation, found that there were those in his immediate circle who wished him ill and who gave aid and comfort to their country's enemies.

But President Lincoln never reacted as has our present national leadership to the threat of treason and disunity.

After some 10 or 11 years of hiding behind his benefactors' official skirts and his White House entree, the high New Deal and Fair Deal officer, Alger Hiss, who would sell his own country down a Volga River, has been brought to justice.

This conviction was made against the wishes of the administration and despite the efforts of those men who have sworn to serve their Nation faithfully and to protect it against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

They have protected Hiss; they have secreted vital and damning evidence; they have procrastinated; they have lied. What faith can we have in such leaders?

We Republicans reject the soft and kid-glove treatment of communism—or of any foreign ism.

We repudiate the Democratic Party's handling of this specific case and their entire philosophy in this regard.

We condemn this record.

In 1858, when he was asked to define his position, Lincoln said, "I hope to 'stand firm' enough not to go backward, and yet not go forward fast enough to wreck the country's cause."

I feel that this could very well be the GOP's watchword for the 1950 and 1952 elections.

We cannot hope to prevail if we are content to look complacently back at our past record of achievements, but we reject a rapid rise to socialism and un-American schemes engineered by the Democratic Dealers.

Those now in power would give their programs a trace of respectability by allowing it to bask in the sunshine of Lincoln's progressive ideals, but it is too deeply pocked with the scars of intolerance, reckless and extravagant spending, hypocrisy, and the rankest demagogic appeals to the selfish instincts in man to be able to breathe that exalted air.

Its extreme efforts to maintain itself in control are marked with such atrocious examples of summary dismissals from high military posts as Admiral Denfeld's removal which can only demoralize young and efficient officers who want to serve their country with honor and distinction.

The administration's hypocrisy is nowhere better indicated than in the President's recent message to the Congress on taxes which is a masterpiece of double-talk and plain simple untruths.

You may remember that he said "we must continue to exert rigid economy" at the very time that his extravagance was bringing about a record peace-time deficit of some five or six billion dollars. This despite the fact that there is a high level of employment and a near-record national income.

These practices must end and in lieu thereof, we must have a positive and vigorous course of action based upon sound and staple principles. Such a program was ably "spelled out" by our great party at its convention in Philadelphia in 1948.

That platform was and is a masterpiece.

It is a progressive document which minces no words in its treatment of the problems of the day. It uses as its central motif, a quotation from Lincoln, and I quote: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so must we think anew and act anew."

Clearly any mind which can conceive such a forward-looking philosophy in respect to a nation's purposes and objectives according to the standards of our times, is a great liberal.

What, I ask, did Mr. Lincoln mean by this statement?

How, I ask, would he apply this terminology today?

Would he use its broad and noble meaning to usurp the legislative and judicial powers of his Government?

Would he permit its generality to be a guise to allow foreign ideologies to seep into and destroy the basic principles of his great charter of constitutional government for which he gave his life?

Would he allow such a noble utterance to be the means of wasting our great natural resources for the advancement of nations who would one day destroy us for their own ends?

Would he permit an interpretation of such eloquence to advance and establish a program which could only lead us to national bankruptcy and internal collapse?

Would he so use his own utterances to entrench himself and his party in power so firmly that he and his successors might one day dominate his people as the Roman emperors of old in complete disregard of his constitutional powers and prerogatives?

Would he, I ask you, as men and women who have enjoyed the blessings of Lincoln's mold and greatness, have ever done any of these things because of the high and lofty vision which inspired him to say and repeat:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so must we think anew and act anew." The answer is "No."

Then, my dear friends, what did he mean when he said it?

Your great party in convention assembled in Philadelphia not only interpreted the meaning of this now historic utterance, but they also applied it.

One has but to read these solemn pledges made by our party to the people of America to realize that this pronouncement of Mr. Lincoln was the inspiration for the enlightened approach and the course of action promised by the delegates to that gathering.

Let me say that our failure then was not due to our aim, but to our methods.

We will again prevail if we are only as courageous in deed as we were in words.

I can assure you that there is no tendency in our ranks in Washington to ignore the present through gazing at the past.

We reject the trend toward socialism, toward Government control of every aspect of our lives, and toward statism.

I feel that Abraham Lincoln expressed these ideals well 96 years ago, when he said:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

And—

"I think a definition of 'popular sovereignty' in the abstract would be about this: That each man shall do precisely as he pleases with himself, and with all those things that exclusively concern him. * * * That a general government shall do all those things which pertain to it, and all the local governments shall do precisely as they please in respect to those matters which exclusively concern them."

Of course, these are not definite answers, and there are other questions which must be answered, but I feel that they do mark out a course of action and a basic philosophy of the role of government.

On some things, there can be no compromising.

The record of civil-rights legislation in New York and New Jersey has won praise for our party throughout the Nation, and must be supported with equal vigor at the Federal level.

Sound fiscal policies based on a "pay-as-you-go" premise are a "must" if the United States is to remain strong and vigorous. The excessive spending, the tremendously high level of taxation, and the roll-ruin of deficit financing are unconscionable.

America is the hope of free men throughout the world and we cannot escape our responsibilities all over the globe.

To meet these needs, our foreign policy must be nonpartisan and above-board.

Up to date, it has been neither and we propose to make it a truly bipartisan and cooperative undertaking.

I have given you what I feel to be the proper stand for the Republican Party to take on a few of the momentous issues of the day.

In a large part, I feel that our party is fostering these ideals and striving diligently for these ends.

We are back on the right road; we are the truly progressive and liberal party—certainly no statist or centralist supporter of economic and social bondage can claim that creeping socialism is either progressive or liberal.

Lincoln said: "In this age, and in this country, public sentiment is everything. With it, nothing can fail; against it, nothing can succeed."

Our task, then, for 1950 and for 1952, is to convince the people of this Nation that our purpose is as steadfast as our aims are worthy.

It is to this end that all of us must work; it is to this end that we must all give more of ourselves and our precious time than we have ever given before.

There is no more important mission left to us than that of saving our way of life for the generations yet unborn.

Let us then here highly resolve that through our party, the spirit of Abraham Lincoln shall live on in this land of ours; that "it is for us the living, to be dedicated to the unfinished work" which he "so nobly advanced"; that from his life we shall take "increased devotion" to those things for which he "gave his last full measure of devotion" that his party of the people "shall not perish from the earth" but shall have a "new birth" of vigor, courage, and vision with which to meet the challenges of the day.

Lincoln Day Addresses by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two addresses delivered by me.

There being no objection, the two addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT A LINCOLN DAY DINNER SPONSORED BY THE WARD COUNTY REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AT PARKERSBURG, W. VA., FRIDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 10, 1950

It is most appropriate to pay tribute to the greatness of Abraham Lincoln in the State whose whole history has been one of loyalty to our Republic.

In the tragic days of crisis, when the fate of the Union hung in the balance, West Virginia took its stand with Abraham Lincoln.

True to the tradition of its sturdy and courageous pioneers the Mountain State severed relations with the Old Dominion. The gallant sons of West Virginia rallied to the Stars and Stripes. They fought and died to preserve the ideals of freedom—one nation and one flag.

We are assembled tonight as true Americans and loyal Republicans. We meet to honor the memory of a plain, humble, God-fearing man of the people who rose from a life of poverty and hardship to become one of the outstanding figures of world history.

We celebrate the birthday anniversary of one of the greatest of Americans, one of the founders of the Republican Party and first Republican of the United States.

The principles of Abraham Lincoln's Americanism were firmly rooted in profound and abiding faith. In the face of disappointments, defeat, and discouragement he never lost faith in the common sense and wholesome instincts of the people. He held firmly to faith in God, faith in himself, and faith in the future of America.

As a young lawyer, less than a year after he was admitted to practice, he summed up his philosophy in a speech at Springfield, Ill. He declared that the future support and defense of the Nation depended upon general intelligence, sound morality, and, in particular, reverence for the Constitution and the law.

Those principles were given further expression in the first resolution ever adopted by the Republican Party in national convention.

That resolution is one that can be adopted without reservation by every good American today. It touches upon the vital issues of our own time. It was as follows, and I quote:

"*Resolved*, That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution are essential to the preservation of our republican institutions; and that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the union of the States must be preserved."

The delegates to that history-making first convention, held in the city of Philadelphia 94 years ago, were summoned by a call which could be echoed today.

It was addressed, and again I quote: "To all the people of the United States, without regard to past political differences or divisions, who are opposed * * * to the policies of the present administration * * * and in favor of restoring the action of the Federal Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson."

The words of that Republican platform are just as timely and just as inspiring today as they were in the crisis of Lincoln's time.

Republican devotion to individual freedom, to the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights has never faltered or diminished.

Republican programs and policies are those of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. The platforms of the Republican Party have charted all the expansion and all the prosperity which this Nation has enjoyed in the half-century of its greatest progress.

The prosperity of that period was produced by the inventive genius, the resourcefulness, initiative, hard work, and thrift of the American people.

It was encouraged and stimulated by government through economical administration, sound fiscal policies, a stable currency, and national solvency.

Freedom of the individual was the door to opportunity for every American, no matter how humble his birth or origin.

Slavery was the great question that inflamed the passions of men in Lincoln's day.

Today, another form of slavery threatens the future of America and all its people.

The creeping paralysis of socialism is spreading through our country. If allowed to run its course, it means slavery to the Government. It means the destruction of individual freedom and the loss of all liberty.

And the great tragedy of it all is that we are being bribed with our own money into the bondage of the socialistic state.

You will note that the first Republican convention was organized under a call to all the people of the United States who were opposed to the policies of the Democratic administration then in power.

Let us examine briefly the policies of the Democratic administration now in control at Washington.

Let us consider its plans and proposals and see what awaits us at the end of the road over which we are being driven.

Recently we have had three messages from the President dealing with the state of the Union, the economic plans of his administration, and its fiscal program. In none of them was there a mention of socialism, but all the elements of the socialistic state were outlined in unmistakable terms. Mr. Truman advocated and demanded increased taxation, unlimited spending, deficit financing, and the piling up of more billions on top of our staggering national debt.

He submitted a budget of $42,500,000,000—the largest peacetime budget in the history of the world. Then he told the American taxpayers they would have to go in the red $5,100,000,000 more, just to pay the expenses of the Federal Government.

But that's not all. He proposes that Congress enact laws and appropriate funds to place education under Federal control, to socialize the practice of medicine, and for political dictatorship of agriculture through the Brannan plan.

No one, in the administration or out of it, has been able to estimate how much these dangerous proposals would cost. But we do know that they would add billions of dollars to the already swollen cost of Government. They would place an additional back-breaking burden upon the worker, the farmer and every other taxpayer.

These are just some of the schemes that spell socialism under the cruel and discredited theory that an all-powerful central government can manage the people's lives better than they can for themselves.

What are the American people offered in return for this proposed surrender to Government control and regimentation?

President Truman has given us a beautiful picture of the bright-colored, rosy prosperity and happiness that he envisions some time in the future.

A dream world of health, happiness, and security awaits us in the year 2000, he said in effect. At that time, 50 years from now, every wage earner would enjoy an income of $12,000 a year.

We were told also that this fabulous income of $12,000 a year would result from an expanded industrial plant and an expanded economy.

We were not told, however, that the whole philosophy of the proposed program would dry up investment capital and would prevent industrial and economic expansion.

We were not told that the enormous increase in the cost of government and the tremendous increase in the national debt would so greatly reduce the value of the dollar that it would have less than one-third the purchasing power of today's dollar.

The dollar buys much less today than it did 50 years ago. Expert economists have figured that 50 years from now we will have an 18-cent dollar if the Government's present spendthrift course is continued through that period.

Nevertheless, we are promised ease and security for all. No one will have to take the hard knocks that so many of us have encountered upon the road of life.

But first—and always keep this in mind—first, we must go broke. We must spend ourselves into national bankruptcy. We must forget all about economy and a balanced budget. We must not worry about taxes that become more and more oppressive every year. We must not care a rap how high the national debt climbs.

Spend, spend, spend—that is the order of the day in President Truman's program for the Nation.

My fellow Americans, I say it is a dangerous, dishonest, and immoral program.

It is stealing and squandering the savings of the people. It is destroying initiative and all incentive. It drains off savings that might be invested in job-creating productive enterprise. It is robbing youth of this and future generations of the opportunities America has held out so generously in the past.

And most important, it must result in national bankruptcy and the slavery of the socialistic state. It must place our people under the same strangling controls and regulations that have brought ruin to every nation where socialism deprived people of their freedom.

The Truman socialistic spending program, to which so many of our people have been attracted, recalls the warning of Lincoln when he said, and I quote:

"If destruction be our lot we ourselves must be its author and finisher. As a Nation of freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide."

The Truman socialistic-spending program is contrary to the teachings of Thomas Jefferson, whom those in control of the present administration pretend to follow. It is contrary to the philosophy of Lincoln who declared, and again I quote:

"The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of a free society."

When these self-styled followers of Jefferson hail him as their patron saint at their $100 dinners they neglect to recall his words of solemn warning. Jefferson said and I quote:

"I place economy among the first and most important of republican virtues and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared."

They likewise conveniently forget that it was Thomas Jefferson who said, and again I quote:

"When all government * * * in little as in great things shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power * * * it will become venal and oppressive."

Those were the definitions and axioms of a free society in which Abraham Lincoln believed. They are principles to which the Republican Party has subscribed throughout its history. They are American principles, not a socialistic pattern based on the false teachings of Marx and Lenin.

Lincoln based the critical period of his administration on a text from the Bible: A house divided against itself cannot stand.

That quotation from scripture applies with equal force to the critical situation of the present day.

We can have socialism—or we can have liberty and freedom of the individual.

We cannot have both. One or the other will be destroyed.

We are, therefore, faced with these overall questions:

Do the American people want a socialistic system of government?

Would they vote for socialism in a free election if the issue was presented under its true label?

Are they willing to be bribed with their own money into accepting socialism because it promises an easy way of life?

Are they willing to surrender the dignity and freedom of the individual in exchange for so-called free hand-outs from an all-powerful central government?

Let us pray to Almighty God that the time shall never come when these questions will be answered except by a loud and resounding "No."

And that time will never come if we take Lincoln as our guide and face the menace to American freedom with general intelligence, sound morality, and reverence for the Constitution and the law.

Prosperity has never been achieved through tricky political promises. The happiness of the people has never been advanced by the Government taking away their earnings and then giving them so-called free hand-outs.

Security has never been established for any people on earth through the demagog's deceptive offer of something for nothing.

The free spender of other people's money is always popular. But his wasteful, extravagant course always ends in financial and moral bankruptcy.

Our first line of defense must be a strong, stable, solvent America. We want a self-reliant, prosperous dynamic America.

We need as a definite policy of Government control of spending, not control over people.

America was built on a dream of liberty. Let us fight as Americans and Republicans against turning that dream into a nightmare of socialistic slavery.

Today as Republicans we are fighting to preserve the concept of life as laid down by Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln.

As an army of truth and righteousness let us go forth to battle to save America and to preserve the God-given rights of free men.

ADDRESS BY HON. EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT A LINCOLN DAY DINNER OF THE LINCOLN REPUBLICAN CLUB OF OAKLAND COUNTY, MICH., AT PONTIAC, MICH., MONDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 13, 1950

I am sincerely and highly honored by the privilege of joining with you in this Lincoln Day celebration.

Just 5 years ago tonight it was my extreme pleasure to welcome your distinguished ex-governor, the Honorable Harry F. Kelly, as the Lincoln Day speaker in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa. His eloquent and forceful presentation of Lincoln's service to America and to mankind was a real inspiration.

Later in the same year, as Governor of Pennsylvania, I attended the Conference of Governors at Mackinac Island. On that occasion I experienced the warmth and cordiality of Michigan's generous hospitality. I was thrilled by the unforgettable beauty of your great recreational areas.

Michigan holds a proud place among the States of the Union. It exemplifies the American system of free enterprise at its best.

Here you have created a vast empire of production. Your giant industrial strength was a bulwark of national defense in time of war and makes a mighty contribution to world progress in peacetime.

Most noteworthy is the fact that your unparalleled industrial growth had its beginnings in the dynamic energy of plain men of the people, skilled mechanics and craftsmen who worked with their hands.

Here the miracle of mass production was brought to its highest stage of development. Great names stand out in your industrial history, Ford, Olds, Chalmers, Durant, Willys, Chrysler, and many others.

It is important to remember that their wonderful achievements were accomplished without looking to the Government for help when difficulties were encountered.

Neither were they hampered by bureaucratic controls or regulation. They planned and worked in an atmosphere of individual freedom which has given America the highest standard of living and the highest level of opportunity the world has ever known.

Since I have been a Member of the United States Senate, nothing has given me greater satisfaction than the fine association I have enjoyed with your courageous and able Senators, ARTHUR VANDENBERG and HOMER FERGUSON.

They are not only great Senators, but they are great American patriots. They are statesmen in the tradition of Abraham Lincoln. They are imbued with the same love of liberty and devotion to American ideals.

The principles of Abraham Lincoln live on in the honorable career of your distinguished Representative in Congress, GEORGE DONDERO. He is a credit to your State and the Nation as one of the ablest Members of Congress.

A profound student of American history he has gained national recognition as an outstanding authority on the life of Abraham Lincoln. No man in America is better qualified to apply the ideals of Lincoln to the problems we face today.

Michigan's Republicanism stems from that outpouring of patriotic spirit that took place in July of 1854 at Jackson in your own State. There the name of the Republican Party was formally adopted and Michigan took her place in American political history as the first State to give the Republican Party victory at the polls.

I am proud to recall that my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shares with

Michigan the honor of participating in the founding and development of the party of Abraham Lincoln.

In February of 1856, courageous and patriotic Americans met at Pittsburgh and formulated plans for the first Republican National Convention.

That convention, dedicated to the ideals of human rights, individual freedom, the maintenance of the Constitution, and the preservation of the Union, was held, most appropriately, in the birthplace of American independence, the city of Philadelphia.

The delegates were summoned by a call that can be echoed today. It was addressed and I quote:

"To all the people of the United States, without regard to past political differences or divisions who are opposed * * * to the policies of the present administration and in favor of restoring the action of the Federal Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson."

I repeat, that call can go out today, renewed in strength and vigor by the greatness of Abraham Lincoln and the proud record of the Republican Party in three generations of American progress.

We face a crisis today just as challenging as that in Lincoln's time.

We, too, in our day, must fight to restore the action of the Federal Government to the fundamental principles that have come down to us from the founders of our Republic.

Lincoln's great task was the preservation of the Union. The great duty before us is to preserve freedom of the individual and the God-given right of every American to live in liberty, free from the enslaving dictatorship of state socialism.

We must defend our country from the destructive blight that is corrupting American morality with its false promise of something for nothing.

We must resist the ever-increasing centralization of governmental power and authority at Washington by insidious grants of so-called aid to the States.

We must awaken the American people to the dangers of deficit financing and a continued policy of taxing and spending that means bigger debt and more oppressive taxes year after year.

We must summon all the patriotic strength of an aroused people to prevent a headlong plunge into national bankruptcy.

The party of Abraham Lincoln is committed to these things and will continue the fight because we know that freedom depends upon a sound, strong financial and spiritual structure. An insolvent nation cannot be a free nation. Economic bankruptcy is the road to political and moral disaster.

My fellow Americans, that is the perilous road over which we are being driven with no thought of the price we must pay.

The paramount issue before us is whether we are to continue on the perilous path to disaster or whether we are to return to the road of constitutional government and individual freedom.

One leads to the slavery of socialistic regimentation and control. The other is the way to real progress and prosperity. It is plainly marked with the signposts of sound fiscal policies, stable currency, economical administration, and national solvency.

Let us survey briefly the program of the Truman administration and see over which road the so-called Fair Deal is taking us.

Recently we have had three messages from the President dealing with the state of the Union, the economic plans of his administration, and its fiscal program.

In none of them was there a mention of socialism—but all the elements of the socialistic state were outlined in unmistakable terms.

Mr. Truman advocated and demanded increased taxation—unlimited spending, deficit financing, and the piling up of more billions on top of our staggering national debt.

He submitted a budget of $42,500,000,000—the largest peacetime budget in the history of the world. Then he told the American taxpayers they would have to go in the red $5,100,000,000 more, just to pay the expenses of the Federal Government.

But that's not all. He proposes that Congress enact laws and appropriate funds to place education under Federal control, to socialize the practice of medicine, and for political dictatorship of agriculture through the Brannan plan.

No one, in the administration or out of it, has been able to estimate how much these dangerous proposals would cost. But we do know that they would add billions of dollars to the already swollen cost of government. They would place an additional back-breaking burden upon the worker, the farmer, and every other taxpayer.

These are just some of the schemes that spell socialism under the cruel and discredited theory that an all-powerful central government can manage the people's lives better than they can for themselves.

What are the American people offered in return for this proposed surrender to Government control and regimentation?

President Truman has given us a beautiful picture of the bright-colored, rosy prosperity and happiness that he envisions sometime in the future.

A dream world of health, happiness, and security awaits us in the year 2000, he said in effect. At that time, 50 years from now, every wage earner would enjoy an income of $12,000 a year.

We were told also that this fabulous income of $12,000 a year would result from an expanded industrial plant and an expanded economy.

We were not told, however, that the whole philosophy of the proposed program would dry up investment capital and would prevent industrial and economic expansion.

We were not told that the enormous increase in the cost of government and the tremendous increase in the national debt would so greatly reduce the value of the dollar that it would have less than one-third the purchasing power of today's dollar.

The dollar buys much less today than it did 50 years ago. Expert economists have figured that 50 years from now we will have an 18-cent dollar if the Government's present spendthrift course is continued through that period.

Nevertheless, we are promised ease and security for all. No one will have to take the hard knocks that so many of us have encountered upon the road of life.

But first—and always keep this in mind—first, we must go broke. We must spend ourselves into national bankruptcy. We must forget all about economy and a balanced budget. We must not worry about taxes that become more and more oppressive every year. We must not care a rap how high the national debt climbs.

Spend, spend, spend—that is the order of the day in President Truman's program for the Nation.

My fellow Americans, I say it is a dangerous, dishonest, and immoral program.

It is stealing and squandering the savings of the people. It is destroying initiative and all incentive. It drains off savings that might be invested in job-creating productive enterprise. It is robbing youth of this and future generations of the opportunities America has held out so generously in the past.

And most important, it must result in national bankruptcy and the slavery of the socialistic state. It must place our people under the same strangling controls and regulations that have brought ruin to every nation where socialism deprived people of their freedom.

The Truman socialistic spending program, to which so many of our people have been attracted, recalls the warning of Lincoln when he said, and I quote:

"If destruction be our lot we ourselves must be its author and finisher. As a Nation of freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide."

My fellow Americans, if we are guided by the wisdom and the example of Lincoln, America will not die by suicide but will survive as a nation of freedom and opportunity.

If we are to help save America we must all take a more active interest in politics. The kind of government we have is decided at the ballot box.

In reviewing the greatness of Abraham Lincoln we must remember his genius as a politician. He was a strong party man. He believed in party loyalty and party discipline. His statesmanship represented political action at its best. He believed in good government, honest government as the best politics because it truly advanced the welfare of his fellow Americans.

Lincoln's birthday should be celebrated wherever men rejoice in the ideals of freedom. His devotion to true Americanism guided him from a life of poverty and hardship to a place among the world's immortals.

True Americanism is just as important in our day as it was in Lincoln's time. The great issue confronting us is to drive the Reds out of the Government and to get our Government out of the red.

As Americans and as Republicans, we can pay no greater honor to the memory of Abraham Lincoln than by planning and working to preserve the Republic he so nobly served.

National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a discussion entitled "Do We Want National Health Insurance in the United States," in which the Honorable Harold Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania, and the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] participated, on Sunday, January 29, 1950. Senators will find this an illuminating discussion on the subject of adequate medical care for the people of the United States.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum of the Air, founded 21 years ago by Theodore Granik and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, coming to you today before a large crowd in the famous Continental Room of the Wardman Park Hotel in Washington, D. C.

Now here is your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. The current issue of Reader's Digest magazine carries to its 50,000,000 readers throughout the world a vital and dramatic report, the second of a series of articles on the British national health program written by Harold E. Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota, and now president of the University of Pennsylvania. Commenting on the services performed by London hospitals Governor Stassen says:

"The conclusion would be that Londoners are now getting less than they once did and at higher costs."

He quotes a British doctor as saying, and I read from the Digest:

"Please tell our friends in America, 'Never, never, never adopt such a program.'"

However, Oscar Ewing, United States Federal Security Administrator, while in London recently, heard that most of the critics tried to mislead the American people on facts about the British National Health Service. "What we have seen in England," said Mr. Ewing, "confirms my deep conviction that the national health insurance proposal will be good for America."

So today the American Forum of the Air, in cooperation with Reader's Digest, presents a discussion on this timely subject. We are privileged to have as our speakers Governor Stassen and Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida, member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and coauthor of the administration's bill proposing national health insurance for the United States.

Now, Senator PEPPER, if you met this British doctor what would be your answer to his "never, never, never"?

Senator PEPPER. Mr. Granik, in the first place, I would tell the British doctor that we do not propose to adopt the British plan in the United States. Under the British plan the Government pays about 90 percent of the cost of the medical care dispensed under the plan. In this country about eight-ninths or seven-eighths of the cost of the plan would be paid for by those who are covered, who pay the required payments periodically.

In the second place, I would say that our plan is not state medicine or socialist medicine. It is a national health insurance plan, which the British plan is not.

Then I would say to this doctor that in the United States there are about 40,000,000 people, roughly, who are part of income groups who make less than $2,000 a year, and about 60,000,000 people who are part of income groups who make less than $3,000 a year; that all our data show that these people and many more simply cannot pay, without ruinous cost to themselves, the cost of the hospital and medical care they require in this expensive age of excellent medicine.

Chairman GRANIK. Would you care to comment on that, Governor?

Senator PEPPER. Therefore, what we propose to do, in the language of Winston Churchill, who proposed the basis of the British plan in the House of Commons in 1911, to use his words, is "to bring the magic of averages to the rescue of millions," through giving an opportunity to participate in national health insurance to these people who need the care they don't now generally get.

Chairman GRANIK. Governor Stassen.

Governor STASSEN. Of course, I immediately would have to say that Senator PEPPER has misquoted Mr. Churchill. In other words, he has gone back to the Lloyd George proposal of 1911, which was something entirely different, which was private and not governmental in its nature. So I first want to clear up his misquotation.

Then I want to point out that the statement that they are not trying to copy the British program is definitely not correct. In fact, Mr. Ewing, the commissioner, has indicated that that is the program they are following.

Senator PEPPER'S statement simply was that they are going to raise the money in a different way. It doesn't change the nature of the program whether you collect the taxes one way or another.

The key point is that under the program that President Truman and Senator PEPPER have presented for adoption by the American Congress, you would bring a large sum of money, perhaps $5,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000, under the direction of a national committee appointed by the President, of different men, and you would bring all the doctors and the nurses and the hospitals and dentists under the thumb of this committee of five. All the experience in the world says when you do that you injure the health of the people rather than promote the health of the people.

Chairman GRANIK. How about that, Senator?

Senator PEPPER. In the first place, I am quoting from the Evening Star in Washington, excerpts from the text of Churchill's broadcast on war progress and postwar hopes, March 22, 1943. This is Mr. Churchill's language in 1943, when he thought what he said in 1911 was pertinent because here is what Mr. Churchill said:

"Here is a real opportunity for what I once called 'bring the magic of averages to the rescue of millions.' Therefore, you must rank me and my colleagues as partisans of national compulsory insurance for all classes, for all purposes, from the cradle to the grave."

Furthermore——

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to comment, Governor?

Senator PEPPER. Let me continue. Furthermore, this same Hon. Winston Churchill in a radio speech on January 23, 1950, said the following:

"As head of the wartime government I proclaimed the 4-year plan of social reform, education, family allowances, and the national-health scheme. Although mu''ed and twisted a bit by ministerial ineptitude, this program has now largely been carried through."

The first sentence under the title "The Health Service," in the pamphlet This Is the Road, of the Conservative and Unionists Party for the elections of this year, which is Churchill's party, reads:

"We pledge ourselves to maintain and improve the health service."

So they are not going back on their national health service.

Mr. STASSEN. The Senator is very clearly quickly shifting between talk of the health service or talk of the national compulsory insurance system. I think that when we definitely analyze what has happened under the British system, we realize that it is a system that we should never, never follow. The facts are that the death rate has increased in England under this new national health program. It went up rather sharply. The facts are that illness and sickness and absence for illness increased in the first year of the plan.

It is true that the coalition government during the war appointed the so-called Beveridge Commission, and that out of that arose in the postwar situation the adoption of the plan. It is also true that they clearly aren't going to make any major change in their plan until they have tried it out for a few years, certainly not in the first year. But there has been one significant reversal already which the coalition of both parties have already adopted, and that is when they started out to give away all medicine, they found the abuses so extensive that Mr. Attlee on October 24 reversed that policy and began to make a change.

I think in quoting specific Britishers we are getting a bit off the point. The point is, we want to advance the health of the American people. We want better health in America. How can we get it? The main point would be some constructive moves, but definitely we do not want to take the move that has caused so many other countries to go down in their health programs.

I have here the statistics of all the nations in the world, the point presented by the United Nations. These statistics show that the United States today has the best health record of any major country in the world; in other words, more favorable death statistics, better situations as to maternal deaths, as to illness, and all of those major factors of health. When we have the best health record in the world, why don't we improve the system we have rather than start to copy countries with records not as good as ours.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator? Go ahead, Senator.

Senator PEPPER. Let me say in the first place that we are talking in respect to Mr. Churchill and the British health scheme which the Governor had so severely criticized in his two articles in Reader's Digest. We are both talking about the same thing.

In the second place, the governor, in his Reader's Digest article, has attributed to the health insurance service of Great Britain greater sickness and more deaths. The distinguished Governor pointed dramatically at the conclusion of his first article to 72,000 more tombstones in the cemeteries of Britain, which he clearly inferred, if he didn't charge, were attributable to this national health service. The Governor and I are in politics, or we have been. He may still be—both of us. I would like to ask my distinguished friend if it is likely that Winston Churchill, slashing as he is at the Labor Government, if he believes and if the British people believe that a national health scheme in effect was causing more tombstones in the cemeteries and more illness, if the British Conservative Party which Churchill leads would have said "We propose to maintain and improve the national health service," and if Dr. Charles Hill, who is to the British medical profession what Dr. Fishbein used to be to the American, before the American Medical Association let him out, if Dr. Charles Hill would say that no political party dares to propose the repeal of the national health service.

Mr. STASSEN. Senator, may I point out when you quoted Mr. Churchill, he said, "We will improve the health service to the British people." He did not say "We will hold onto this complete compulsory system that was put in." The manner in which the British will proceed, in my judgment, will be that after they have had 2 or 3 or 4 years' experience, they will again appoint a coalition commission, which is the way the British do things, and on a bipartisan basis they will review and study what has happened, and then you will begin to see the major change in the British approach. They never have and they do not make issues in their campaigns of things of this kind. They study them. Then they move together and then if they find they are mistaken they will study them again under a bipartisan commission and move again.

Let me point out that it was the Churchill government that received the Beveridge Commission report. Obviously, as I say in those articles in the Reader's Digest, you shouldn't expect a conclusive judgment in 1 year's time, but when President Truman and yourself are proposing that we should copy the British, then I say let's look at the 1-year record, and when the 1-year record shows more deaths than the year before, shows more illness than the year before, shows this discontent among the doctors and hospitals and nurses, then I say that means, let us not do it. Let's continue to watch the British, but let's move on some of the problems that definitely need action in America and upon which we can all agree and upon which we can cooperate with the American doctors.

Senator PEPPER. The Governor means that the British political parties don't raise issues when they don't think it would be politically wise to raise those issues.

Mr. STASSEN. That isn't what I mean, Senator, and you know it.

Senator PEPPER. You as Governor know that the British Conservative Party issued this statement on the health service, and then we will pass on.

Mr. STASSEN. Let's get to our own pattern here. Do we want it here?

Senator PEPPER. Let's get one fact. Do you say that the British Conservative Party proposes to repeal the compulsory health service in existence at the present time?

Mr. STASSEN. Of course not. Neither party proposes it now. I merely say——

Senator PEPPER. Having settled that, now let's go——

Mr. STASSEN. There are other important issues in this British election that is coming up. They will reexamine their health plan in a few years by a commission similar to the Beveridge Commission.

Senator PEPPER. We are reexamining ours, and having examined it, we are discovering the deficiencies we are trying to correct by national health insurance. That is where we are today. As I said a while ago, ours is a national health-insurance program. It is not State medicine; it is not charity. The individual covered under our proposal would simply pay, as he does under social-security coverage at the present time a percentage of his income up to a maximum amount. For example, it is proposed now that a covered worker would pay when the program is in operation 1½ percent of his income, not to exceed $450 a month. The maximum he would pay would be $6 a month, if he made $400 a month income. If he made $100 a month in income, he would pay $1.50, 1½ percent of the $100. His employer would pay the same amount. That fund would go into the health fund, as it were, out of which hospital and medical costs would be paid, with the distinct and the very clear reservation that the covered individual, the patient, would have the free choice of his doctor, and the doctor would have the free choice of determining whether he would accept a given patient or not.

I ask the question, if it is found important and no political party proposes to repeal it, to establish social security, where in order to provide retired people something like an annuity at 65, we require them to make a periodic deduction from their income, then surely the importance of life and health to these people would justify the extension of that social-security principle so that they would always be assured of adequate hospital and medical care.

Chairman GRANIK. Governor Stassen.

Mr. STASSEN. Senator, you present, of course, President Truman's and your own proposal in a very appealing way, and it sounds good on the surface. But this is what actually happens. When you provide a central fund which is billions of dollars, and you say you are going to pay all the hospital and medical bills out of that fund, the experience in every country in the world has been that then abuses arise; in other words, that a small percentage of the people who are malingerers or hypochondriacs, call up the hospitals, call up the doctors' offices, and the doctors cannot perform as good service as they did before. The result of these abuses is that rather than having better health service, you have a depreciating health service, and, as I said, a higher death rate and more illness. So the people who think they are going to get something better and cheaper find that actually they are paying through taxes a higher cost for something available in greater quantity but of lower quality, and that that has been the result throughout the world. That is the sort of your compulsory health service.

The other thing is that you bring all the doctors under the politicians. You bring the political situation into the patient-doctor relationship. I say that clearly under such a system it would become more important for a doctor in Florida to know Senator PEPPER or for a doctor in Missouri to know the Democratic leaders there, than it would be for him to make progress in his own profession and do a better job. When that political situation comes about, when you bring the political aspect into medicine, then the health of the people suffers.

Senator PEPPER. I think the quality of medical service that we get out at Walter Reed and at the Naval Hospital at Bethesda and generally the quality of medical service being given in the Veterans' Administration hospitals over the country and in the Public Health hospitals, it might be called political in that it is provided by the Government, but it is of a quality that I think commends itself to the people.

The Governor has stated the assumption that the quality of British medical service was impaired by this plan. I have here a letter dated the 20th of January 1950, from the secretary of the British Medical Association. When I quoted to him the governor's statement about "more medical care, lower quality for more people at higher cost," here is what Dr. Hill, who, as I said, corresponds to what Dr. Fishbein was in this country, said:

"Lower quality. We do not admit this."

The gist of the whole matter is that we have all readily admitted that there would be many administrative problems to be overcome. I have here what the British Conservative Party proposes to do. It proposes to improve the administration of this bill, but not to change its basic essentials, so that all the British people will get the medical and hospital care they require. But surely it is easier to overcome that than the people to be denied service they need and can't pay for.

Chairman GRANIK. Let's take some questions from our audience. Miss Penuel has a gentleman there with a question.

Question. Senator PEPPER, basically isn't the shortage of hospitals, clinics, nurses, and doctors the fundamental problem facing us today, and not the need for compulsory national health insurance, in your opinion?

Senator PEPPER. No; that is not the exclusive problem. However, the Senate passed a bill—and I was the principal author of the bill and handled it in the Senate, which is now awaiting passage by the House—under which for the first time the Federal Government gives aid in the establishment of medical schools, and I hope Florida will get one from it, and I hope some Florida people are listening in. It provides a Federal assistance fund to aid in the operation of medical schools so as to train more personnel and other aid to train more dentists and nurses and hospital administrators and technologists. However, even when we have more professional people and more hospitals—and the Federal Government is now contributing $150,000,000 a year to do that, and I am one of the authors of that bill, and that is in effect—we are also expanding vastly our research programs, and I have been identified with nearly every one of them. But when we get the doctors and professional people, the hospitals, and these expensive drugs, I say to you that the simple income facts of the people of this country show that the major part of our people simply cannot pay the cost without being ruined or without having to accept charity.

Chairman GRANIK. Governor Stassen?

Mr. STASSEN. The facts of the matter are that the greatest deficiency in medical service now is for the Negro population of the South. Those are the people who are most being denied health services, and that rests directly with the discrimination on the part of the leaders of the Senator's party in the South. That is one of the problems that we ought to move on to correct.

In this matter of providing facilities for them, the facts are that the great advance that has been made is under the Hill-Burton Act. The Hill-Burton Act was a bipartisan act passed some 5 years ago and, of course, when Senator Burton, now a Justice of the Supreme Court, was in the Senate. That was a bipartisan measure upon which everybody agreed, and 1,000 local hospitals and facilities have been increased through it. That is the kind of constructive American type of action I want to see.

Likewise we have this measure to assist in medical education, and yet it doesn't get passed. Why don't the President and Senator PEPPER, instead of asking for something which all the doctors and all the experience of the world say is bad, bring through some of these constructive measures for improvement of medical education, for more medical education, and opportunities in hospitals for the Negroes of the South, and for an advance in the sound medical program in mental health which we all agree is a governmental problem, instead of trying to upset the whole medical profession and the whole, great, magnificent health service in this country?

Senator PEPPER. The Governor is certainly overlooking the obvious non sequitur which must appear in my distinguished friend's argument. We are not trying to upset anything, unless it upsets the doctors a little bit to have to agree to a reasonable schedule of fees if they perform services for this health-insurance fund. They are performing services already for the Veterans' Administration. They are working on salary at Walter Reed and at the Naval Hospital. I find Senators and Congressmen who speak very loudly against national health insurance are quite ready to go out and take the services of a salaried doctor at Walter Reed.

Chairman GRANIK. A question from a lady over there.

Question. Governor Stassen, can there be an effective alternative to a national health insurance program?

Mr. STASSEN. Yes; definitely. We can move on a constructive program, and it could be worked out on a bipartisan basis and with the doctors. In fact, the third and fourth articles in the Reader's Digest will come forward strong on the constructive side. The important thing is first to conclude that we don't want to go into a program which causes all these other countries to have bad health statistics. We want, rather, to work out an American type program. When Senator PEPPER speaks as if the veterans' medicine program is an example for it, he knows that that is not a correct example. In the first place, you are talking about a service limited in a total free profession, and the voluntary deans committees and things of that kind that have helped in the veterans' medical program have built it up. But the facts of the matter are that the great advances in medicine in the United States have not come under Government medicine. They have been made by the free medical profession and by the great universities of the country, such as Harvard Medical School, Chicago Medical School, and our own University of Pennsylvania Medical School, which was the first one established in this country. We will give due credit for a fairly good job in the veterans' hospitals, but that is certainly not any argument for taking over the whole of the medical profession and putting them under the thumb of a group of politicians appointed by the President.

Senator PEPPER. Nobody proposes to take over any part of the medical profession or any hospital in the country. Contrasting our proposals with that of Britain, they have taken over practically all the hospitals, but we do not propose to take over a single hospital. We only give Federal assistance in the establishment and in the construction or in the enlargement of hospitals. So, if doctors didn't wish to come under the other plan by accepting a reasonable schedule of fees, they could stay out from under it.

Mr. STASSEN. Senator, may I pick you up on that?

Senator PEPPER. Just one minute. You made a statement or two, Governor. Allow me to speak of one other fact.

The Governor has mentioned the question, why do we fly in the face of experience. I am prepared to show here that even Sweden who, like most other countries, started off with the ordinary private fee for service system, finally moved along to the next step, the voluntary system, as England did for a while, found those were inadequate because the people who needed to be in it didn't join and they dropped out before they should have. Then they moved on to the compulsory, and that is exactly the evolution here. Now we are up to the voluntary stage, and we are seeing the necessity, as the American Medical Association did in 1932, of moving on to the compulsory to protect the masses of the people.

Chairman GRANIK. I am sorry, gentlemen, we just have time for summaries. I understand you want to comment. Will you comment in your summary, Governor?

Mr. STASSEN. Yes. First of all, your reference to Sweden. The facts of the matter are that under the semisocialist medical program in Sweden, they are not making as good a record as they are in a similar place in the United States. Let me put it this way so you understand it: A Swede in Minnesota lives longer and is healthier than a Swede in Sweden. That is an extreme way of putting it, but it is true. In other words, an American of Swedish background in Minnesota has a better health record under the American system than do the Swedes in Sweden under the semisocialist system which doesn't even go as far as the Senator's proposal.

Now on your statement that you were not taking over the professions, let me quote you section 717 of the bill which you and President Truman are proposing. This says that every doctor, every nurse, every individual, every hospital that comes under this act shall enter an agreement "which shall contain an undertaking to comply with this title and with regulations prescribed by the National Health Board thereunder."

In other words, everybody in all these professions would have to comply with all the regulations and rulings of this five-man board appointed by the President. If that wouldn't bring them under the thumb of the politicians, I don't know what would.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Governor. Your summary, Senator.

Senator PEPPER. Governor, it has been made very clear in the hearings and in the discussion of this measure that the administration of this measure will be in local hands, not only the State levels but down at the local level, and affecting all professional matters that every local committee which has decisive authority shall be composed of a majority of professional people.

Mr. STASSEN. The bill does not so provide.

Senator PEPPER. There is a sentence in there that would allow any other effect? All your Republican member has to propose is to amend it, and he will have a sympathetic hearing. On the subject of Sweden, the Governor evidently didn't recall that the Swedish system, the voluntary plan, goes into effect in 1951, so he is not talking about the same thing that they are going to have over there a little bit later.

Mr. STASSEN. Semisocialist system, I said.

Chairman GRANIK. I am sorry, gentlemen, the time is up.

Our speakers have been Gov. Harold E. Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania, and Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida, who have been discussing the question, "Do we want national-health insurance in the United States?"

Thank you gentlemen.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by me on February 13.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 18)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

As you know, in these broadcasts I have always tried to discuss matters in which the people of our State have indicated they are vitally interested.

In recent weeks my mail has been unusually heavy on the subject of communism and the Alger Hiss case. I have had dozens of letters from all parts of Pennsylvania condemning the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, for his statement following the conviction of Hiss.

Certainly this whole matter is timely and important. It must be given prompt, serious, and sober attention.

Certainly Americans are wise to ask whether our Government has been properly purged of seditious elements. Certainly they are right in insisting that nothing be done or said in high circles that would give encouragement to those who conspire to destroy this Nation or surrender it to foreign ideologies.

My own stand on communism is well known to you. For years—for many years—I have fought communism and I have warned our people to be on guard against it.

I was in the forefront of this fight at a time when it was decidedly unpopular to take a stand against communism. Not so many years ago, you will recall, those who were trying to explain to Americans that communism was a cancerous growth, a deadly menace to American freedom, were sneeringly called red-baiters. We were ridiculed. We were laughed at. Some were even smeared as Fascists.

Today, I am happy to say, we have come a long way toward winning that fight. Today I believe most Americans are alert to the danger. Not many are fooled by claims that communism is a better system of government than our own plan of individual freedom in a self-governing republic.

Today most Americans understand that communism is another form of ruthless dictatorship which denies God and destroys liberty. Today a man can say these things without being called a black-hearted Fascist.

There is no doubt that the disclosures of the Alger Hiss trial have been tremendously important. Now no one can fail to be convinced—despite official denials—that Communists had worked their way into high places in our Government and were coloring our foreign and domestic policies.

I don't know whether these men have all been rooted out yet. I do know that much of their influence remains.

I do know that some of the policies which the Administration has been following at home and abroad are policies which Communists, or fellow travelers, or their innocent dupes, would set in motion and support.

Think that over. I'll come back to it later.

I want to talk briefly about Dean Acheson, the Secretary of State. In the press and in my mail there have been many demands for his impeachment.

First of all, I am sure he is not a Communist. But I do believe he made a bad and indecent blunder when, after the conviction of Alger Hiss, Mr. Acheson said in effect that this traitor was his friend, and that even if the Supreme Court should uphold the conviction, he, Acheson, would not desert his friend.

Had Dean Acheson first resigned as Secretary of State, and then made that statement, it might have been a courageous and noble thing. He, as a private individual, would be standing by a friend. But Dean Acheson did not resign. He is not merely a private citizen.

Dean Acheson stands at the head of the department which makes, directs, and carries out the foreign policy for this Nation of 150,000,000 men, women, and children. Dean Acheson speaks not only for that department, but to the rest of the world he is the official spokesman for the United States.

Alger Hiss was formerly a high official of the State Department. Alger Hiss betrayed his country by stealing secrets of the State Department and transmitting them to a foreign dictatorship whose sole aim is to enslave the world by climbing over a prostrate America.

Thus we have the head of our State Department endorsing and supporting a man in his own department who resorted to perjury and hide his part in a disloyal conspiracy.

And, as I said earlier, Dean Acheson's policies regarding China and other places strongly indicate that he is the victim of policies laid down by Communists and Communist sympathizers, like Alger Hiss.

Now, my fellow Pennsylvanians, it seems to me that this entire Administration is tarred with the same brush in this case.

Let me remind you that 1,236 Federal employees resigned while being investigated, rather than face questioning by a loyalty board, and another 848 quit their jobs before the board could issue rulings in their cases. Only 123 were fired for disloyalty in the weeding-out process which began in 1947.

Not only has the administration been riddled with Communists but at the very top it adopted a policy of evasion and concealment, scoffing at protests and denying that Communist infiltration in the Government was a serious matter.

Up to the very top, this administration joined in the smears against those who tried to arouse the Nation to what was going on. It ridiculed those who warned America that Communists had wormed their way into high places.

I don't imply that the administration leaders realized they were aiding a foreign conspiracy. I am certain they had no realization of it.

But I point this out because they are the people who ask you to trust their judgment, their good sense, and their inside information to run your country and to protect you.

Let me remind you of just a few incidents of the many that happened.

As Pennsylvanians you will remember that George H. Earle, a former Democratic Governor of our State and a former diplomat under President Roosevelt attempted, early in 1947, to warn Mr. Truman against the Communist dangers at home.

But President Truman did not accept the warning. In his reply to George Earle he said—and I quote—"People are wrought up about the Communist bugaboo, but I am of the opinion that the country is perfectly safe as far as communism is concerned."

At that time, back in February 1947, the administration was liberally sprinkled with

Communists and fellow travelers. At that time domestic and foreign policies were being formulated under the influence of these people.

At that time, every Government department was under orders from the White House to withhold its files from a congressional committee seeking to ferret out communism.

Mr. Truman was certain it was nothing but a "bugaboo." Let me remind you that more than a year later, when public clamor had risen to a high pitch, the President reluctantly, and for the first time, ordered the FBI to check the loyalty of Federal employees.

In 1948, you will remember, when the House investigating committee asked cooperation in its probe which led to uncovering the disgraceful Alger Hiss case, the President only ordered his departments to lock up their files, but he said in a public statement—and I quote:

"The public hearings now under way are serving no useful purpose. On the contrary, they are doing irreparable harm to certain persons, seriously impairing the morale of Federal employees, and undermining confidence in the Government."

That was what Mr. Truman said. One of the persons who was being done "irreparable harm," I might advise you, was Alger Hiss.

Then Mr. Truman went on to make another charge. He declared that these investigations into a spy system working right here in Washington, in Government agencies, was—and I quote—"a red herring."

Surely you all remember that. It was the considered judgment of an administration which asks you to trust it to make foreign and domestic policy in your best interests.

There was still another Presidential statement in June 1948, when Mr. Truman was pooh-poohing what he called a red herring. He said—and I quote:

"I went to Potsdam in 1945 * * * with the kindliest feelings toward Russia and we made certain agreements, specific agreements. I got very well acquainted with Joe Stalin and I like old Joe. He's a decent fellow." End of quote.

Do you folks all remember that?

My fellow Pennsylvanians, I have a confession to make.

I like old Harry. I believe that deep down he's a decent fellow.

But let me add this. I'd like old Harry a lot better if he would just confess error once in a while.

I'd like him a lot better if he'd admit to the country that he was wrong about the red herring and wrong about Joe Stalin.

I'd like him a lot better if he'd clamp down on his high officials so they would not go around extending the hand of friendship to traitors to our country.

I'd like him a lot better if he'd admit that a terrible blunder was made at Yalta—that a sick Franklin Roosevelt, influenced by Communist Alger Hiss, sold out anti-Communist China to Joe Stalin and the Soviet Union.

I'd like him a lot better if he would admit that he, Harry Truman, blundered terribly when, fooled by his pro-Communist advisers, he made a deal which gave us a zone of Berlin but without a highway leading to it, so that we had to use the airlift, and are having more trouble even now.

I'd like old Harry better if he'd admit error in the Chinese policy which caused us to sell out the Nationalists to the Communists.

But I guess he won't.

The disclosures of the Hiss case and the more recent revelation that atomic secrets have been betrayed to Soviet Russia make it imperative for every American to be on his guard.

From all parts of our country indignant and aroused citizens and organizations have demanded a full investigation.

I shall support that demand.

You have a right to know the full story of Communist infiltration into places of trust and importance in our Government.

You should know what hidden influence made it possible for disloyal conspirators against America to gain access to secret security information and to deal with Communist agents and spies.

Let us demand a thorough search to determine whether the Hiss influence still prevails among those who guide national policy in domestic and foreign affairs.

Let us open the files of the State Department and the records of the Department of Justice and let the FBI bring out the evidence it has to support the statement of J. Edgar Hoover, which I now quote:

"Communism, in reality, is not a political party. It is a way of life—an evil and malignant way of life."

As free Americans let us proclaim our loyalty to the American way of life.

This is Ed Martin, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Law-Enforcement Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an address by Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States, on law-enforcement problems. General McGrath delivered this very excellent speech at the Attorney General's conference on February 15, 1950, which was attended by State law-enforcement representatives. I think General McGrath's approach to this pressing problem is one that should be widely discussed and seriously considered.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Civic leaders as well as lawyers are accustomed to look for and benefit from precedents. In arranging this conference of municipal, State, and Federal law-enforcement officials, we observed that in recent years, since the First World War, this country has had a number of challenging crime problems, Nation-wide in scope, which have lent themselves to the technique of cooperative conference, study, and action, by cross-section of the country's enforcement agencies.

Beginning in 1929, the lawlessness precipitated by war and prohibition was examined into by the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement. In 1934, the fast-moving, violent gangster and racketeer, successor of the bootlegger, was the cause for concern, and resulted in the calling of a conference on crime. In 1940, enforcement problems relating to national defense caused the summoning of the Federal-State Conference on Law Enforcement Problems of National Defense. In 1946, Attorney General Clark summoned the National Conference on Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency. All of these conferences resulted in notable developments in law enforcement.

Today, a new phase of the old problem is upon us, requiring the concentration of the combined efforts of all our law-enforcing agencies. The mobsters of the 1930's have not been entirely eliminated. But their leadership is being supplanted. The modern version combines the worst features of big-business manipulations with violence and corruption to clamp a monopoly or monopolies on the illegal businesses of bookmaking, slot machines, policy, or the numbers game, and other forms of commercialized gambling. These operations of the American public cost billions of dollars and threaten to make a mockery of respectable local self-government. There is reason to believe that such operations are tied in with prostitution and narcotics, and the more violent forms of underworld criminal activity.

Bookmaking, slot machines, numbers games, and the like are illegal in almost every State. It is, therefore, an inescapable conclusion, evidenced by the surveys of a number of local crime commissions and a few successful prosecutions, that in this modern society gambling as a private business cannot operate on its present gigantic scale without corrupting what it touches.

In organized gambling, we are dealing with the biggest illicit traffic since prohibition. Everywhere the pattern is the same—struggling and double-crossing, to eliminate competitors for the right to cheat the public. The racket produces nothing. It contributes nothing to society but trouble.

As an example, the modern numbers racket has been built upon the nickel and dime bets of hundreds of thousands of our poorest people. In more recent years it has moved into offices, shops, and factories where the money wagered makes it a business estimated by investigators to yield $2,000,000,000 dollars annually. Employee absorption in the play has so affected production in plants in some localities as to cause company and union investigations, and combined action to drive out those employees acting as numbers runners.

Businessmen's associations are concerned, not only with the numbers racket, but with bookmaking, slot machines, punch boards, and all forms of lotteries. They find that in communities where the business of gambling openly flourishes the clientele of the legitimate businesses are not paying bills and are dissipating their earnings.

I need not dwell on the demoralizing effect upon our children, who are everywhere bombarded, by sight and by hearing, with the temptations of gaming and lotteries. Benjamin Franklin wisely said, "Keep flax from fire, youth from gaming."

The people of this country, State by State, painfully and painstakingly evolved a public policy against the gambling business. At one time public gambling in lotteries was an accepted means of raising funds for public use. The State legislatures, and even Congress, authorized lotteries and chartered private companies to conduct them. The corruption that flowed from lotteries, marked by the bribery of public officials, and the mere trickle of funds into the public treasuries as compared to the huge sums raised, led gradually to the prohibition by the State of lotteries and other forms of gambling. This policy was capped by congressional legislation in 1890 forbidding the sending of lottery tickets in the mails, and supplemented 8 years later by legislation forbidding the transportation of lottery tickets in interstate commerce.

Still later, in 1934, Congress forbade radio broadcasting of advertising and information concerning lotteries.

This basic Nation-wide public policy against the gambling business, which grew from local roots, has remained steadfast. The only substantial deviation has occurred in the situation where, by judicial decision or direct legislative action, approximately half the States have made an exception for betting at the track on horse or dog races, usually in connection with the so-called pari-mutuel system. This has not been accompanied by validation of the professional off-the-track betting, generally described as bookmaking. And, except for a very few States which have allowed local option in permitting the licensing of certain kinds of gambling, I believe we are justified in taking the view that throughout the United States there is, and has existed for many years, a public policy that condemns organized gambling and makes its activities criminal.

Are we then to allow that policy to be set at naught?

The President has expressed his grave concern with the increase of crime. We know that there are many sources and causes from which this condition arises. From information that has been coming to me, from your letters, and from the resolutions of your organizations forwarded to me, I believe we are in agreement that if there is a single most prolific source, constituting one of our greatest dangers, it is the continued flourishing of organized gambling, about which, as the most lucrative of the illegitimate enterprises, revolves many nefarious activities of the underworld. Out of this conviction, and in order not to dissipate our energies in a 1-day session devoted to exploration, I have felt constrained to focus attention without delay upon this major problem.

This is your meeting, called principally at your request. It is your views that will be most important. You are free to discuss all phases of organized crime. Our interdependence in matters of law enforcement, our need and determination to cooperate and help in our mutual problem will carry us forward.

I believe the agenda will develop clearly what are the fundamental problems, and from the discussion we will perceive the means for studying their solution. As part of our thinking upon solutions, we cannot avoid being acutely aware of the division of governmental responsibilities in dealing with crime. Let it be stated at once on behalf of the Federal agencies that it will not be the purpose of the Federal Government to usurp the functions of the State and local police, or to conduct activities that extend beyond constitutional limitations or the usages of our people. We must never lose sight of the fundamental principle that local responsibility, fully realized, makes for sound government and healthy law enforcement. That is the true meaning of "States rights" and "home rule." Conditions which breed contempt for law can only become worse if we allow ourselves to be lured away from sound principle by the temptation to pass off State and municipal responsibilities to the Federal Government. Nevertheless, adherence to this view will not detract from the common purpose to assist and complement the law-enforcing agencies charged with primary responsibility, and to devise means of aiding each other, within the limits of law, however responsibility is vested. In this connection, I draw your attention to the presence here, not only of representatives of the United States attorneys and the various divisions and bureaus of the Department of Justice, but of the several specialists in particular kinds of law enforcement representing, among others, six units of the Treasury Department, the Post Office Department, and the Federal Communications Commission. The enforcement programs of these Federal agencies and their programs of cooperation with local authorities are known to you; but their representatives have promised to be available to inform you further, and to consult on means of advancing the purposes of this meeting.

It may be that the discussions today will reveal the need for new legislation of a municipal or State or Federal character. I believe that there is much that can be done by way of reexamining and modernizing local codes which the pressure of the past war and related absorptions have caused us to neglect. In fields where cooperation among the States is required it may be useful to review and strengthen what has been done in the field of interstate compacts pursuant to the blanket congressional consent given in advance to all compacts entered into by any two or more States for the prevention of crime or the enforcement of criminal laws and policies. There should also be a complete review by both Federal and State authorities of the present so-called Fugitive Felon Act. If it is found that Federal legislation is needed we must take care that we do not recommend laws which will bring back the prohibition era. We must at all times be conscious of the need to present a program acceptable to our people and capable of effective enforcement. And certainly, I think we would all prefer to see that the methods adopted represent a direct approach to the problems requiring solution rather than any indirect or disguised method of prosecution. I would judge that the detailed study and continuing efforts necessary for the development of the various phases of a program of work can best be handled by committees, or a similar form of continuing machinery, to be provided by this conference. It may be that a further and broader conference will be required, when the detailed preparatory work is ready, in order to consolidate these efforts.

But whatever be the methods or techniques propounded in this fight against crime, we must not lose sight of the big, vital factor—the need of public support. I have already mentioned the insidious and clever propaganda activities of the organized gambling fraternity to legalize some of their operations. The American Municipal Association and others have informed me of well-organized and financed drives, now under way and conducted by the same fraternity, to oust mayors and other public officials who have had the temerity to stand for enforcement of the law. These activities and this kind of attempted intimidation indicate powerful opposition, which is being unwittingly aided by perhaps well-meaning but misguided appeasers, who believe that since the desire to gamble is found in many persons it must be a virtue which should be legalized and permitted to flourish commercially. It will take fertile minds and strong backs to plan and disseminate a campaign of persuasive education, which will interpret for the public the work you public officials are undertaking to do. Until the psychology of our people is so affected with an abhorrence of the kind of crime we are seeking to eliminate, high-minded public officials will continually be fighting an uphill battle.

I think the time is ripe for the drive for public support through press, radio, motion pictures, civic clubs, business leaders, churches, schools, labor unions, and every form of decent organization. The stage is set for you to capture the popular imagination in a stirring campaign to crush organized crime in your communities. I want you to know that in this effort I stand ready to give you every possible assistance.

Labor-Management Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, today labor-management disputes are once again front-page news. This would seem an appropriate occasion to consider the basis of labor-management cooperation. On November 1, 1949, a resident of my State discussed this subject in a speech that has attracted wide attention and much favorable comment. The address by Millard Cass, assistant to the Under Secretary of Labor, on the Basis of Labor-Management Cooperation is still being reproduced almost 4 months after it was delivered. Numerous labor and industry magazines and newspapers have carried it. I believe that my colleagues in the Congress will find Mr. Cass' address both interesting and challenging. I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BASIS FOR LABOR-MANAGEMENT COOPERATION

One hundred and one years ago MARX and Engels declared that society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other—the class of modern capitalists and the class of modern wage-laborers. They asserted that property in its present form, is based on the antagonism of capital and wage-labor. Their one sentence cure was the abolition of private property.

Since 1848 crackpots all over the world have been attempting to divide and alienate management and labor. Occasionally dictators have managed to take advantage of this and to subjugate both management and labor to serve their undemocratic and barbaric purposes.

Yet in over 100 years Communists have been unable to prove their charge that management and labor have antagonistic and irreconcilable interests. They have been unable to prove their point because it is just plain false. In the United States we have built the greatest industrial machine and the highest standard of living the world has ever known. We have produced more than any other nation in history and have distributed it more widely among our people than has any other nation. This dramatic record was achieved by labor-management cooperation. It would have been impossible had there been a class struggle such as Marx and Engels declared was inevitable. In America the whole people, not a class, is the tree on which the fruit is to be borne.

Recently a businessman wrote Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin that as a result of the industrial revolution there has developed in this country a division into definite classes, namely the employer and the employee. This ever-increasing struggle has in the past few years gained tremendous momentum. If the tempo of this conflict is not reduced, we will eventually end up with a caste system of society.

Secretary Tobin's reply reflected his deep faith in our system. He said: "I should like to express my own strong belief that American society is not crystallizing into a caste system. Actually, un-American, totalitarian forces have based their hopes largely on such a division. It seems to me that the cleavages they have attempted to create do not exist, and that we have an extremely fluid and mobile society."

Promoting labor-management cooperation is a cardinal objective of the Labor Department. It is for that reason that Secretary Tobin asked me to speak to you.

It is a pleasure to meet with you tonight to discuss human relations in industry. You are to be commended for your constructive attitude toward this problem. When important business groups like the Rotary Club and the chamber of commerce seek means

of promoting industrial peace, they make a valuable contribution to our economy. I am always happy to speak to any group sincerely interested in labor-management cooperation. This voluntary cooperation of free partners in our industrial democracy is our strength. It is an enlightened capitalistic society's answer to the totalitarian philosophy of force, restriction, and abolition of freedom. The record speaks for itself. We find no need to hide behind an iron curtain. Let any honest observer judge which system provides greater benefits for the people.

Incidentally, I feel confident that we can cope with the threat of communism both domestically and internationally. The continued strengthening of democracy and democratic economies at home and abroad is the most effective blow we can deal to communism. We have already taken a number of important steps to strengthen and assist democratic governments. The foresight and courage which President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson have demonstrated in the conduct of our foreign policy is assurance that it is in good hands. Secretary Acheson is now an adopted son of Maryland. His farm home near Sandy Spring gives the Free State first claim to him, and I know all Marylanders are proud that he is a resident of this State.

During recent weeks big strikes have made front-page headlines. The issues involved have been tried in advertisements and on the editorial pages. This publicizing of labor disputes is nothing new. From such publicity, however, many Americans have over the years gathered the impression that there is no such thing as industrial peace and that labor-management cooperation is a contradiction in terms. Nothing could be further from the truth.

There is a high degree of labor-management cooperation in our country. Every year about 100,000 collective-bargaining agreements between management and labor are peacefully negotiated. Tens of thousands of disputes and grievances are settled annually without a strike or lock-out. Hundreds of joint labor-management committees are still operating effectively. There are, under the auspices of the United States Department of Labor, 6,500 local joint apprenticeship committees. The 32,000 members of these committees, representing management and labor, work together to promote apprenticeship. Hundreds of persons from the ranks of management and labor are working together to promote industrial safety through the President's Conference on Industrial Safety. This is a continuing program sponsored by Secretary Tobin at the request of President Truman. In all of these fields workers and employers are working together to develop good human relations.

These instances of labor-management cooperation do not even get newspaper publicity, much less front-page billing. Disagreements get better coverage than agreements—and the more violent the disagreement, the more widely it is publicized. It is no wonder that we sometimes get a distorted impression of ourselves.

In the international field the same situation exists. There too we have a high degree of labor-management cooperation that receives extremely limited publicity. The United States has been a member of the International Labor Organization for 15 years and spends more than a million dollars a year on this account. Yet I should be surprised if many of you ever heard of this Organization. How many of you know that it is not a labor organization at all, but a specialized agency of the United Nations? How many of you know that management and labor are voting partners with governments in this Organization?

Outstanding Americans have been associated with ILO. Samuel Gompers helped found it. John Winant was once director general, and former Under Secretary of Labor David A. Morse is its present head. American Government, management, and labor have sent capable and conscientious representatives to the ILO. On the business side has been J. D. Zellerbach, president of the Crown Zellerbach Corp., and now chief of the United States special mission to Italy of the ECA. Your own fellow businessman and Marylander, Charles McCormick, president of McCormick & Co., of Baltimore, is the present representative of American employers. At the 1949 conference the junior Senator from Maryland, Hon. HERBERT R. O'CONOR, was United States Government delegate.

Over the years American employers and workers have found a large area for agreement in ILO deliberations. Yet these achievements have received comparatively little attention.

It is axiomatic that it takes two to make a bargain. It takes only one to start a fight, but it takes two to make a contract. There can be no industrial peace without the cooperation of both management and labor.

While we seek industrial peace, we recognize that the right to strike is important in a democracy. It is a badge of freedom. Only in totalitarian countries is the right to strike denied to workers in private industry. We are anxious for industrial peace, but recognize that there are instances when free people will disagree. At such times non-Government employees must be free to walk out. Compulsory arbitration is equally opposed by management and labor.

The basis for labor-management cooperation would appear to be threefold: the desire to have industrial peace; mutual understanding; and a community of interest.

The desire to have industrial peace is shared by management and labor generally. There are very few persons on either side who will not make sacrifices to achieve this end. Employers and workers are both well aware of the cost of strikes and lock-outs. The public suffers from labor disputes, but it is the parties who suffer first and most. Consequently, it is their own needs, rather than public pressure, that will in the first instance drive the parties to seek agreement.

Workers do not like to see wives and children hungry, to incur debts, and generally to imperil their economic security. A man does not treat lightly the stopping of his income, with all its attendant consequences. Employers also can seldom afford the luxury of strikes and lock-outs. They too may find themselves without income but with continuing responsibilities and expenses. Stockholders expect profits. Markets for products can be lost during a prolonged cessation of operations. Economic necessity requires that both management and labor seek industrial peace. It creates the desire for good human relations which is a basic element in their cooperation.

Mutual understanding is clearly a prerequisite to labor-management cooperation. It has been stated that: "Industrial warfare will plague America until leaders of labor and management understand and respect the survival needs of each other." That need for understanding is a fertile ground for all who are really interested in industrial peace. There is still much to be done to bring the story of labor to management and the story of management to labor. Let's consider it both ways.

Many employers have spent much time and energy and huge sums of money fighting unions. Yet some of them know little about the unions they condemn. For example, how many employers have attended union meetings before they became experts on democracy in unions? I need not tell you how wrong some of these experts have been. The Christian Science Monitor stated in an editorial published January 17, 1949:

"A lot of water has rolled under the bridge since the wave of big strikes and the framing of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1946 and 1947. A few widely held assumptions have been swept down the stream of experience. It ought to be clear by now that American workers, by and large, want to join unions and do so of their own free will; that, by and large, the rank and file dictate the acts of their leaders and back them up, and that, with very few exceptions, American labor doesn't like political strikes or Communist machinations any more than do Americans in general."

The accuracy of this statement was underscored by the votes of workers in National Labor Relations Board union-shop elections under the Taft-Hartley Act. In more than 94 percent of these elections the employees voted for a union shop.

Mutual understanding must be based on facts. Many workers think the boss coins money and gets an inordinately high return on his investment. What do employers have to fear from giving the true facts to their employees? How many employers attempt to explain to their workers pertinent facts about the company's financial position? There is, after all, a close relation between the company's economics and the worker's personal economics.

There are some serious omissions on the other side too. When workers talk of the company's ability to pay, how often do they first try to ascertain the facts? Some workers fail to consider the employer's investment. Thousands of employers have worked their way up from the bottom. Many risked their life's savings and put in long, hard hours to build the business. Yet some workers believe that employers are concerned only with their own self-interest. How many realize their own job is dependent upon the soundness of the company's economic position?

Workers need food, clothing, housing, and recreation, and look forward to saving something for old age or illness. How many employers know whether their workers can feed their families and live decently and healthfully on their wages? Some employers opposed raising the Federal minimum wage above the obsolete 40-cents-an-hour figure. Can you imagine raising a family today on $16 a week? Actually the higher minimum wage will help businessmen and farmers as well as workers because it will increase purchasing power and provide a strong, broad base of consumer demand.

While some employers are overlooking the needs of their employees, some workers are overlooking the needs of the business. Thus, in some instances workers do not feel any pride in the accomplishments of their company. A recent survey demonstrated that some workers do not even know the company's products, the location of other company plants, the name of the top officer, or the operations which precede and follow their own.

Employers are, without exception, proud of their products. They constantly advertise the merits of the things they sell or produce. I wonder how many employers are equally proud of their human relations. How many have such good employee relations that they are willing to advertise their human-relations programs?

Mutual understanding must be based upon knowledge as opposed to ignorance—facts as opposed to fiction. I have mentioned some of the areas in which additional facts are needed by management and labor. It is up to employers and workers to supply each other with the information necessary to an understanding of their respective problems and needs.

The third prerequisite to labor-management cooperation is a community of interest. There can be no doubt that employers and workers have a common interest in the economic well-being of each other. There is

a tendency in some quarters to forget that from time to time. Nevertheless, wages, purchasing power, sales, and profits are all interrelated. Both management and labor benefit from high levels of income. High wages create heavy consumer demand. Strong demand for goods and services supports high wages. There can be no prosperity for workers if there is none for employers. On the other hand, depressed wages mean reduced sales and lower income for business. The depression was rough on management and labor alike, while in 1948, for example, was good to both. The prosperity of both employers and workers is a matter of their mutual concern.

To be sure, the economic interests of workers and employers are not entirely the same. While both have a common interest in maximum production, there are conflicting interests in how the income from that production will be divided. There are only so many slices of the pie, and both management and labor cannot have all of them. At that point, their economic interests do conflict—since each wants as large a share as possible. If the pie is large enough, however—that is, if the gross national product is great enough—it would appear that both groups can get all they need. Consequently, instead of merely fighting over the division of a small pie, management and labor should be primarily concerned with producing a larger one.

I am not a Pollyanna. I cannot share the philosophy of Voltaire's Dr. Pangloss that "all is for the best in this best of all possible worlds." Nevertheless, I do believe that industrial peace is clearly within our grasp. It is required by the mutual interest of management and labor. It awaits only more widespread mutual understanding.

Naturally, in a democracy there will always be some labor disputes. From time to time economic tensions and adjustments may temporarily upset the delicate balance upon which successful bargaining depends. Moreover, human frailties may cause transitory disturbances based on irritations, bad judgment, personal ambition, or greed. In the main, of course, labor disputes will continue to reflect honest disagreement in spite of all good faith efforts to come to terms. Nevertheless, men of good will usually can find a way to make and keep agreements.

Two recent examples of industrial statesmanship will demonstrate what can be done. A union bargaining committee did not feel satisfied with the employer's offer. Nevertheless, they felt that the offer was made in good faith. They invited the employer to come to the union meeting to explain to the workers his side of the case. This is not an area for compulsion or legislation. It is, however, an area for statesmanship. How much better off we would be if more employers were invited to union meetings and union leaders were invited to stockholders' and board of directors' meetings.

In another instance, after a strike over a different issue, a company's board of directors continued the plans to institute pensions for the workers. You can imagine the surprise of union leaders who returned from a strike to be asked to bargain concerning a pension plan. This refusal to be deterred from high humanitarian purposes is most commendable. It could well be emulated by employers and workers generally. It is a practical application of the Golden Rule.

In a democracy employees of private enterprise must retain the right to strike. It is up to both workers and employers, however, to eliminate the need for exercise of this right in as many cases as possible. We do not want to sacrifice or curtail the democratic freedoms of management and labor in order to obtain industrial peace. Peace at any price is too high a price. An honorable peace fair to both sides is, however, fully consistent with democratic freedoms.

It has often been said that it is harder to wage peace than to wage war. This is as true in the field of labor relations as it is in the field of international relations. The fruits of peace are infinitely more satisfying than the spoils of war. Consequently, it behooves all of us to continue to seek the road to industrial peace.

The Coal Shortage in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, as an indication of the seriousness of the coal shortage in New York, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a message to the legislature by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, under date of February 14, 1950, certifying to the necessity of an immediate vote on a bill before the legislature entitled "An act providing emergency measures for the controlling of coal supplies."

This bill was passed by the legislature and approved by Governor Dewey on the 14th of February, and is now chapter 15 of the laws of 1950 of the State of New York. As soon as a copy of chapter 15 is received by me, I shall request that it be inserted in the RECORD, believing that it may be of interest to the Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, February 14, 1950.

To the Legislature:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 14 of article III of the Constitution and by virtue of the authority conferred upon me, I do hereby certify to the necessity of an immediate vote on assembly bill, introductory No. 2050, print No. 2151, entitled "An act providing emergency measures for the control of coal supplies."

The facts necessitating an immediate vote on this bill are as follows:

The long-continued partial strike of miners in the present Nation-wide strike in the production of coal has reduced the supplies in this State to the point of grave peril. There is generally on hand in the State less than 10 days' supply. In some communities, the supply will last only 3 or 4 days.

If coal mining should resume tomorrow, it would take some 8 to 12 days for coal to reach our consumers. There is presently a small amount of coal moving into the State from strip mines in Pennsylvania but this source is dwindling rapidly.

Many hospitals in the State have no coal reserves and depend upon dealers for daily deliveries. In many communities dealers no longer have sufficient coal on hand even to meet the needs of hospitals and vital public services.

In Jamestown, electricity is now being rationed. In Buffalo and other cities night schools have been canceled. In the southern tier counties, a number of milk-processing plants are finding it extremely difficult to get enough coal to operate their pasteurizing facilities.

Further reduction in the coal supply would cause many schools to close. It would also threaten the continued operation of water and sewerage systems, as well as other services essential to the welfare of the health of the people of the State of New York.

Industry has already curtailed production in many cities and a number of plants have been forced to close down.

If we knew that coal mining would be resumed within 2 or 3 days and that coal would be delivered within the State in 12 to 14 days, we could meet the existing emergencies by voluntary plans of rationing and sharing.

We have no means of knowing whether coal mining will be resumed in 2 days, 2 weeks, or 2 months. If the present strike should continue longer than a few days more, our State would face a catastrophe. Industry would be forced to close down widely and unemployment would spread rapidly. Rail transportation of food and its processing would be gravely imperiled, and many of the services essential to the maintenance of life would be curtailed or terminated.

Fortunately, most of the public utilities of the State have been farsighted in their accumulation of coal reserves, but if the strike should continue even these reserves might not be sufficient and it might be necessary for the State to profit by their foresight and take from them coal essential to the maintenance of the milk supply and other food processing, and the operation of hospitals, water and sewerage systems.

Since we presently face an immediate and serious danger to the health and welfare of our people which will become a grave emergency if the coal strike is not immediately brought to an end, I ask that your honorable bodies establish the office of solid fuels administrator.

I ask that you confer upon this office the power to regulate the distribution of coal still remaining in the possession of coal dealers in the State and to establish a system of priorities for the use of that coal. I further ask that you give the administrator authority to restrict the use of electric power, manufactured gas, and other products of coal, to the extent that he deems necessary.

I do not at this time seek power to appropriate coal in private hands and I hope the emergency will not require it. In the event that it becomes that grave, I shall not hesitate to return to you for all authority which may be needed to cope with whatever problems arise.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 14th day of February in the year of our Lord 1950.

By the Governor:

THOMAS E. DEWEY.
B. BOMWELL BURKE,
Assistant Secretary to the Governor.

Lights Stop Truman; He's Law-Abiding Man—Truman Flits Past 20 Red Lights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article

entitled "Lights Stop Truman; He's Law-Abiding Man," appearing in the Thursday, February 16, 1950, issue of the Washington Post.

I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted, immediately following it an article entitled "Truman Flits Past 20 Red Lights," appearing in the next day's issue, February 17, 1950 of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of February 16, 1950]

LIGHTS STOP TRUMAN; HE'S LAW-ABIDING MAN

President Truman told some of the Nation's law-enforcement officers yesterday that he was a law-abiding man.

"I never infringe a traffic rule," Mr. Truman said, bringing smiles. "I never exercise the prerogatives which I sometimes have of going through red lights. * * * I believe, first, that I am a citizen, and that, as a citizen, I ought to obey the laws."

Reporters who traveled behind the President on his way to the Department of Justice building for his address noticed that his new Lincoln stopped for all red lights.

[From the Washington Post of February 17, 1950]

EXPLAINS GO GREEN AS TRUMAN FLITS PAST 20 RED LIGHTS

President Truman, who told a crime conference Wednesday he never exercised the prerogatives of his office to crash red lights, went through 20 of them yesterday.

It was all perfectly legal though. It occurred while the President was en route from Blair House to the Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day shindig at the local armory under a police and secret service escort.

As other motorists waited enviously for the green, Mr. Truman's escort hit 20 traffic lights. Twenty were red.

Reply by Fact-Finding Mission on Jerusalem to Article by Dorothy Thompson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, recently a fact-finding mission on Jerusalem, under the auspices of the American Christian Palestine Committee, made an extensive visit to Israel and reported on the situation with regard to the Holy places in Jerusalem.

Some days ago, Miss Dorothy Thompson, an eminent and distinguished columnist, wrote an article about the findings of this mission. I have at hand a statement written by this mission, composed of six outstanding American Christian ministers and scholars, in reply to Miss Thompson's column. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert this statement in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ANSWERING DOROTHY THOMPSON

As the members of the Fact-Finding Mission on Jerusalem which made an extensive visit to Israel in January under the auspices of the American Christian Palestine Committee, we wish to record our protest against the statements regarding our mission made by Miss Dorothy Thompson in a recent syndicated column. Miss Thompson states correctly enough that we have "reported against UN internationalization of Jerusalem as dangerous and unnecessary," and that we are not in agreement even with the less inclusive Garreau scheme to internationalize a smaller area of Jerusalem. Then, Miss Thompson proceeds completely to ignore the positive recommendation made by us for international supervision and safeguarding of religious interest in Jerusalem. She categorically states: "In short, it would appear that the mission wishes to keep the United Nations out of Palestine altogether." This is a dangerously untrue statement of our position. Our report cautions against the drafting of a Jerusalem statute by the United Nations that would interfere with the just territorial sovereignty of any nation, in this case the territory of Israel and Jordan. Both of these nations properly object to the UN plan on this ground. Freedom of access and protection of the holy places can easily be secured without the internationalization of territory or people. Though we so clearly opposed international administration of territory or people in Palestine, we quite as clearly proposed the setting up of a United Nations commission, with no territorial sovereignty, but with full right to seek the removal of existing limitations of access to the old city of Jerusalem and the holy places, all of which are in Arab territory. We went on to add the guaranties should be given to such a commission by both Jordan and Israel assuring the freedom and sanctity of the sacred places within their territories. It is difficult for us to understand how this proposal can be interpreted by Miss Thompson as indicating a desire to keep the United Nations out of Palestine altogether. The basic distinction we made between international control of the city and people of Jerusalem and international supervision of the sacred places, was quite clear to editorial writers in a great number of American newspapers, all of whom viewed our proposal with sympathy. It should have been quite as clear to Miss Thompson, particularly since in a column of hers printed in the latter half of December 1949, she herself set forth a similar approach to the problem of international control of Jerusalem: "It would, it seems to me, have been wiser (however unsatisfactory)," she said, "to have confined United Nations supervision and protection to the holy places of all religions and to have left the secular and political solution to negotiations between Israel and Transjordan." The passage of time and continued reflection upon the issue have merely reinforced our conviction that the true interests of Christianity and the progress of peace in the Middle East would best be served by United Nations adoption of a plan guaranteeing the sanctity of the holy places without infringing upon the territorial sovereignty of the nations occupying Jerusalem. Christian spokesmen in Israel with whom we spoke are, we found, in substantial accord with this point of view.

Signed by Dr. John W. Bradbury, editor, the Watchman-Examiner, national Baptist magazine; Dr. Samuel Guy Inman, former adviser on Latin-American Affairs to the State Department, and member of the Federal Council of Churches Commission of International Good Will; Dr. Victor Obenhaus, of the University of Chicago, Department Church in Agricultural and Industrial Life, and national chairman of Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Church of America; Dr. Ralph W. Riley, president of American Baptist Theological Seminary; Mrs. M. E. Tilly, member of President Truman's Commission on Civil Rights, and field representative of the Southern Regional Council; Dr. Charles J. Turck, president of Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.; members of Fact-Finding Mission on Jerusalem.

The Patriotism of a Catholic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in these times when there are current divergent ideas as to what constitutes patriotism in the truest sense, a significant contribution to the discussion is made in an address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley, before the Calvert Province, fourth degree Knights of Columbus jubilee banquet in New York on February 12.

Never have I seen the topic discussed in a more forthright and convincing manner. It so well deserves to be given widest attention that I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PATRIOTISM OF A CATHOLIC

If the American Philosophical Association had asked me to address one of its sessions on the works of Aristotle, I should feel about the same as I feel addressing fourth degree Knights of Columbus on the subject of patriotism of a Catholic. Who would know more about the topic than the listeners themselves? Who could enlighten them further, except possibly some renowned scholar out of their own ranks, full of years and learning?

In any gathering of fourth degree Knights of Columbus the whole atmosphere is charged with the spirit of patriotism in its high and historic sense. Your first three degrees pledge you to universal qualities—to charity, which seeks the good of all—to unity, which makes you stand shoulder to shoulder in defense of the one truth—to fraternity, the spirit of the brotherhood of all men under one Father. Your fourth degree, patriotism, gives a local direction to these universals, applying them first to the land in which you live.

The very name of this province—Calvert Province—summons up memories of the great Catholic Lord Baltimore, who founded the State of Maryland and left it a patriotic tradition celebrated ever since throughout the Republic. The names of assemblies gathered here commemorate patriotic laymen like Dr. John G. Coyle; Thomas Dongan, first Catholic Governor of this State; Joyce Kilmer, convert, poet, and war hero; and Charles Carroll of Carrollton who pledged the greatest fortune in the Colonies to the cause of the American Revolution. They also commemorate patriotic members of the hierarchy, such as Father Duffy, Archbishops Corrigan and Hughes, and Cardinal Farley.

Who am I to hope to enrich the tradition of Catholic patriotism typified by those illustrious names?

Yet perhaps I can make some simple offering. The university of practical politics bestows no degrees, but it does contribute a certain rough erudition of its own. I have been exposed to that rude learning, and I hope it is not immodest to say that some of it has been rubbed into me. If I speak to you as the representative of that university, I cannot be sure whether I come as faculty member, alumnus, or student. There are those who would say that I am a professor emeritus. I should not like to think that is so. There are, I think, really no alumni of the university of practical politics. I regard myself as one who is and always will be a student.

Many years of faithful attendance in the classroom of government have taught me some things about practical politics. As all students should, I reflect on what I have learned. One of the things I have learned is that you can find among the citizens of this country all degrees of patriotism, ranging from complete and true devotion to the Nation and its welfare, through indecision, indifference, and disrespect, down to concealed and even open contempt and hostility. I have also learned something about why that is so. Lastly, I have learned that the reasons for it are the very reasons why a high and pure degree of patriotism is and always will be found among our true practicing Catholic citizens—why, in particular, the public order in America has no more vigilant and militant defenders than the Knights of Columbus themselves.

This fact itself needs no proving. The time is past and gone when there was any organized belief among non-Catholic Americans that Catholics are alien in sympathy or aim. It may be that in a few perverse and stubborn souls there is still a conviction that the first allegiance of American Catholics is to a foreign sovereign plotting on a Roman hill. It may be, though I doubt it. We still hear these things said from time to time but they have all the flavor of hate and conscious falsehood. They have no flavor of honest conviction. It is certainly true that when some one like Commander John J. Shea, of the United States Navy, writes from abroad to his small son, "Be a good Catholic and you cannot help being a good American," and the admonition is broadcast after the commander's untimely death, the emotional response throughout the entire Nation is that it rings profoundly true.

But I would not think that I had said anything of great value if I cited only the recognized quality of Catholic patriotism and its proof by common consent. Inquiring minds are always asking the reasons for things. When you know the reason why a thing is what it is, you feel that you have an intelligent and satisfying knowledge of the thing itself. When someone says, "It isn't so," you can answer not only that it is so, but that you know why. If the reason is good, you have won the argument.

Why is it that the patriotism of a Catholic is intense? Why is it firm? Why is it immune to the infections that have played such havoc with the old-fashioned love of country in the hearts of so many citizens not of our faith? As I have seen it, the basic cause is the sound sense of values which every Catholic youngster absorbs with his catechism and which never leaves him so long as he remains true to his faith. The basic fact on which every Catholic orders his whole life down to the smallest detail is that the supreme and absolute value—the value on which all other values are built and to which they are all referred—is the will of God. To the secular society of the twentieth century, as to the pagan Greeks, man is the measure of all things. To the Catholic, God is the measure of all things. The will of God, revealed to us through Christ, puts everything in its proper place. Man is a creature of body and soul. Man has certain direct relations with God. A spiritual organization—that church—was established for the purpose of regulating man's spiritual activity in relation to God. Man also has relations with other men. A political organization—the state—was established to regulate those relationships, so that each man can satisfy his needs and be free of undue interference by others.

The Catholic knows that both organizations were established by God and that each is given its specific function and authority. His keen sense of the divinely established order in all things impresses on him that the authority of the state in temporal affairs is as much a part of the order of creation as the cycles of the planets. The natural reason which shows to the Catholic the hand of God in all his intimate personal affairs, also makes him feel the hand of God in the laws imposed by the state, and tells him that his moral obligation to give respectful obedience and devotion to the state in matters relating to its proper field of action is no different in substance from his moral obligation to accept the injunctions of the church in spiritual matters.

Natural reason might well be enough to make the Catholic a dutiful and patriotic citizen. But he has more. He has a positive edict from Christ himself, probably the most celebrated and dramatic edict in all Scripture, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's." This was no mere ironic reprimand. The Eternal Light never spoke an idle word. He was giving a vivid reminder of where the temporal and eternal authorities stand with reference to each other, and He was making clear that though the temporal authority stands infinitely below the eternal authority, it has a legitimate claim upon the conscience of its subjects. As I have said, all this, in one way or another, is in the catechism. Is it surprising, then, that Catholics hold themselves bound, as a matter of lifelong habit, to a standard of proper behavior as members of the temporal society, just as they hold themselves bound to a proper observance of their spiritual duties? No one would say that exceptions cannot be found, yet, in the main, the reverence and love of our Catholic citizens toward the temporal authority and society, symbolized in the Nation, is a natural and characteristic expression of their reverent submission to the will of God in all things.

Where in the world will you find a clearer perception of the whole order of creation and the place which temporal authority plays in that order? Where in the world will you find a more lively sense of moral obligation strictly binding in conscience?

And one thing more—where else will you find a more constant and keener realization that the same moral law governs temporal and spiritual affairs—that the same moral standards which the Catholic knows he must maintain for his own soul's salvation, are also the standards that the state must maintain in order to secure a peaceful and orderly life for its citizens? The Catholic is as loyal and faithful a supporter as the state has. He is, in the main, a supporter with the integrity and courage to profess publicly that just as he must serve the state, so the state must serve God, and that if the state acts immorally it will destroy itself.

Make no mistake about it, the state is in grave danger of destroying itself. As Professor Toynbee's celebrated works on history clearly prove, every civilization that has perished in the history of the world, has destroyed itself in very much the same way that we see our own society beginning to cut itself to pieces. We don't even have to take it from Toynbee. There are other forceful witnesses. In the university of practical politics we do hear of ancient happenings and classical authorities. We have heard of the disintegration of Rome and we have heard what the Roman historian Tacitus had to say about it. He said:

"We are entering upon the history of a period rich in disasters, gloomy with wars, rent with seditions and savage in its very hours of peace—there was defilement of sacred rites, adulteries in high places, the sea was crowded with exiles, island rocks drenched with murder * * * all was one delirium of hate and terror; slaves were bribed to betray their masters, freedmen their patrons. He who had no enemy was destroyed by his friends."

Who was to stop it? Not the Christians, for they were yet no moral force in that society. Who is to stop it now? Who cares about the defilement of sacred rites? Who protests adulteries in high places? Who pleads against the barbarous contempt for the dignity of the human soul which makes the seas and the air tragic roads for displaced persons? Who is horrified at murder, and especially at the new and polite kinds of murder like euthanasia and abortion? You know the answer. The voices of the Catholic clergy and laity—of the Holy Father—of the hierarchy of America—of the Knights of Columbus—cry out above all in the name of Christ against this coming darkness which a pagan society is bringing down on itself.

That is true patriotism, the patriotism which yearns with religious fervor for the truth and morals in our society, for integrity in government and for the happiness and prosperity of our beloved America.

Balance the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, our national debt, today, is $257,000,000,000. Despite that staggering debt load, our Federal Government is spending at the rate of $5,000,000,000 a year or $15,000,000 a day more than its total income from all taxes. These taxes, this year, are several times those of any prewar peacetime year.

A family that is heavily in debt and which, despite its debt, continues year after year living beyond its income, inevitably will become bankrupt. Similarly, a government that is heavily in debt, which continues spending beyond its income, piling deficit upon deficit, is headed, as all history will reveal, for devaluation of its currency and inflation.

There is only one way to avoid the ruinous disaster to which our present fiscal policies inevitably will lead. That is by balancing the Federal budget. We can balance the budget in only two ways. Either we must raise taxes by $5,000,000,000 annually to make our income equal our outgo or we must reduce our Federal spending to bring it into balance with our tax income.

Local, State, and National taxes even now confiscate 30 percent, or almost one-third, of the national income. Can we

increase these taxes higher without undermining the incentive and thrift of our people? I think not.

Demagogs say that we will take the additional taxes from the rich and the rich alone. We cannot do that for taxes on the rich are already so high that if we took all of what they now have left after paying taxes, we would not get enough, at the present rate of spending, to balance the budget.

The latest year for which income-tax figures are available is 1947. In 1947, according to the Treasury Department, there were 126,675 individuals in this country who had incomes of $25,000 a year or more. After paying their personal income taxes these 126,675 individuals had $2,037,000,000 left. If the Government confiscated all of the income above $25,000 of all of these people, the Federal Government, at the present rate of spending, still would have a deficit of $3,000,000,000.

Obviously, if we attempt to balance the budget by increased taxes the little fellow, as well as the big one, will have to dig up more money. The little fellows would have less to spend on themselves and their families. If they have less to spend on their own needs and those of their families, buying will decrease. When buying decreases unemployment increases.

The surest way to throw business and employment of this Nation into a tail spin would be by raising taxes.

But we can and should balance the budget of this Nation by reducing wasteful and extravagant spending.

This year, we paid out $100,000,000 of taxpayers money to buy up potatoes, and then we destroyed these potatoes while at the same time importing 10,000 carloads of spuds from Canada.

The Hoover Commission Report says that the Post Office Department by spending $18,000,000 to modernize its equipment and methods would effect savings of $170,000,000 a year. Yet nothing is done to bring about those savings.

Of the Nation's postmasters, 22,000 of them never had a day's experience in a post office prior to their appointment to the highest salaried job in their home town post office. Meanwhile regular postal employees, with years of experience in post office work, were denied consideration for promotion to the position of postmaster. The Hoover Commission has recommended that the post office be taken out of politics for the efficiency and good of the service, but nothing is done about that, either.

Twenty years ago there were 570,000 civilian employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government. Today there are almost 2,000,000 or about four times as many as in 1930. In 1930 the pay roll of the civilian Federal employees was about $1,000,000,000 a year. Now it is nearly $7,000,000,000 a year. Is the service of the Federal Government to the average citizen seven times what it was in 1930?

Most of the recommendations in the Hoover report are good. Most of them should be adopted as quickly as possible. But it will require more even than the Hoover report recommendations to bring economy and efficiency to our Federal Government. There must be a will for economy and a will for efficiency in the executive branch of the Government before the great goals of efficiency and economy can be accomplished. That will for efficiency and economy is not there now.

Manistee County Reports Real Soil Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of the annual report of the Manistee County Soil Conservation District for 1949, and to make a few comments on it.

I am extremely proud of the progress that has been made in my district in recent years in soil-conservation work. Ours was one of the areas that needed such a program badly, for much of our area has suffered from wind and water erosion and from that type of one-way farming which took everything from the soil, put nothing back, and forgot that our young people had a right to just as glorious a future for themselves as their forefathers before them.

The Manistee district is only 5 years old. But I think no district any place within that short period has had such practical results. Today the soil conservation district there is one of the liveliest organizations in the area. It cannot begin to keep up with the demands being made on it. The present directors are: Ro. S. Anderson, chairman; Forrest Chrestenson, treasurer; Wayne I. Crompton, secretary; Floyd Beers, Harry Taylor, and Edward Swanson, Jr.

I have fortunately been with these men on several of their inspection tours. I admire the program they have created and to point it up I offer the following brief quotations from their 1949 report, just published:

Since its organization in the late summer of 1945 the Manistee County Soil Conservation District has been working aggressively to halt erosion and depletion of the soils of its farm lands and forest areas. The actual work on the land has been done through the assistance of soil-conservation technicians loaned to the district by the United States Soil Conservation Service. These men have worked with many of the farmers of the county helping them in the understanding and application of conservation practice. It is this down-on-the-land work which is the real purpose of the district. However, in order to facilitate the work of these technicians, the board of directors of the district have been working steadily at the task of acquainting the people of the district with soil conservation, its purpose, and its benefits. This report is the record of 1 year's work by the Manistee County Soil Conservation District. It has been prepared by your board of directors with able assistance from Wayne Crampton, county agent and secretary to the board; D. E. Balog, unit conservationist, United States Conservation Service assigned to the Manistee district; and Lindo Bartelli, district conservationist, Soil Conservation Service, who supervises technicians in this region. The several sections of this report have been prepared by the several directors as shown.

Of particular interest to the directors has been the way the farmers have turned to better land-use practices. During the past year more time has been spent on development of natural resources than the healing of old scars or gullies.

Our cooperators seem to have learned which of the two ways of farming is best. The conservation way, which requires the farmer to keep putting something back into the soil instead of mining it for all it's worth. Thus managed, the soil's earning capacity can be maintained indefinitely at a high level. They seem to find that most class 7 land can be put to a better use than the growing of row crops. As an example, one cooperator, Richard Linke, with considerable acreage, asked for a woodland-management plan and plans for fish ponds instead of clearing the land.

We also have five irrigation ponds built during the past year. These have furnished water to irrigate both row crops and pastures.

The Ashcraft irrigation outfit saved a crop of strawberries that would have otherwise been frozen. Also in a few cases the pond lowered the water level a few inches and made it possible to develop some muck acreage. About 3 miles of open drains were constructed on cooperator's farms.

The interest in sod waterways seems to continue. Almost 4 miles of waterways were constructed during the year. It seems that farmers like to drive across a strip of sod better than across a gully.

There have been nearly 4 miles of terraces built. Most of them with regular farm equipment, a few with an old road grader, and a few with a grader attached to the tractor. Of interest was the group enterprise that tackled building terraces on the Ed Lingg farm. When the day was done, almost a mile of terraces was finished. Also about one and a third miles of diversion terraces were constructed to prevent gullies and eliminate wet spots in fields.

In the past, orchard practices have consisted mostly of heavy cultivation; the spreading of barynard manure, if available; some nitrogen and lime; very little phosphorus and potash. As a result, considerable topsoil has been lost and soil fertility has gradually been decreasing.

This year, cooperating fruit growers of the district have made a definite step forward in orchard practices through the use of more complete fertilizer, lime, and better soil management. They have been able to hold or build soil fertility and produce a good quality of fruit, along with good terminal growth. The district has furnished technical assistance in laying out 50 acres of contour cherry orchards. The contour rows were 26 feet apart and the trees in the rows were spaced 23 feet apart.

We are able to report this year that we have had some encouraging results from planting cherry trees on a site that had been laid out and mulched 2 years previously.

Approximately 325 acres of orchard and strawberry beds have received mulching material in the past year. The materials used were sawdust, shavings, and straw.

Orchard covers of various types were again used by cooperators. Rye, rye and vetch, or rye and oats were used for annual covers. Some permanent covers are being used and old sod covers were trashy cultivated in the early growing season and then allowed to come back in late July or early August. A complete fertilizer is used on the covers.

Some very good frost prevention was carried out on strawberries by the use of irrigation systems. One grower was able to produce over 900 crates to the acre on a frost protected patch.

In 1949, the Manistee County Soil Conservation District cooperators have planted 159,000 pine trees or approximately 159 acres. These plantings were on class 6 and 7 lands, consisting of about 50 percent red pine, 25 percent jack, and 25 percent white pine.

The district's aim is to promote the planting of about a million trees per year as soon as the trees are available. The Manistee district has about 36,000 acres of class 6 and 7 land which will take about 36 years to complete or area that is definitely marked for reforesting.

At the present time we have about 1,150 acres under woodland management, such as thinning, selective cutting, and restriction from grazing. There are approximately 60,000 more acres that can be put under this same kind of management.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the above there was a year-around educational program sponsored by the district, including articles in the newspapers and broadcasts over the radio, programs in the schools and various demonstrations and public meetings throughout the year. In the way of planning, during the year 12 study clubs were formed which were attended by 72 farmers. These farmers have applied their knowledge of conservation and land-use fundamentals to the development of 61 farm conservation plans designed to stop erosion and depletion on 8,643 acres of land within their district.

The real barometer of success for this Manistee district lies in the fact that 1950 will see a snowballing of its work load. Success likes company and the farmers in that area are really climbing aboard the soil conservation band wagon so much so that the directors are now warning their people that there is bound to be a backlog all through 1950 in the demands for technical assistance. I want to say again that I am proud of this Federal service which is making such progress and doing such constructive work in my district.

Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Friday night, February 17, I had the privilege of speaking before an interdenominational brotherhood meeting, attended by citizens of all faiths, at the synagogue of the Congregation B'nai Israel, of Elizabeth, N. J. The subject of my address was Brotherhood, and I endeavored to relate the principle of human brotherhood to world conditions today and to American responsibilities both at home and abroad.

I ask unanimous consent that my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an inspiring experience for me to be a part of this gathering of Americans of all faiths, joined together here to rededicate ourselves to our ideal of human brotherhood. Brotherhood Week symbolizes the fundamental moral principle on which our Nation was founded—a principle which all of us, in our churches and our synagogues, hold in common. This principle was stated in our Declaration of Independence in words which changed the course of human history for all time: "All men are created equal."

I want to examine those simple and profound words for a moment, because in this secular age we are inclined to think of them as nothing more than a political principle. Actually, what gives these words their power is that they state a basic moral and religious principle.

I call your attention to one word in that famous sentence: the word "created." The self-evident truth which our American forefathers proclaimed was not simply that all men are equal, but that they are created equal. They are equal because they are all equally creatures of one Creator—God—a just and loving God who commands them to be just to one another and to love one another. And so, by that one word, "created," this principle is elevated above the idea of mere equality to the idea of brotherhood. There is a world of difference.

Let me restate this thought. Human brotherhood is more than mere human equality. Human brotherhood flows from the belief that we are all equally the creatures of one God. I think it is appropriate today to stress this point, because, to my mind, it sums up the vital, fundamental difference between the faith we hold in common and the other great movement at large in the world today, which is called communism.

The presence of communism in the world faces us with an entirely different set of problems from those with which our Revolutionary forefathers had to contend. We were the revolutionaries of those days, and because our ideas were powerful we carried the world before us. Today the dynamic revolutionary movement is in the hands of others, and it is sweeping many countries with its ruthless force. It is up to us to oppose it, not only because it threatens our safety but also because it is fundamentally evil.

I think it is vital for us to understand what the essential evil of the Communist movement is, and why it has become so powerful. We are all aware of its ruthless violence, the setting of class against class, its suppression of freedom, its distortion of truth, its mad drive for power. With all these ugly features, it is astonishing to us to see how this doctrine has managed to command the allegiance of various misguided idealistic souls who somehow hoped that communism was the road to social justice.

I think we can clarify our understanding of this amazing movement if we remember that communism as a doctrine does preach the idea of human equality. It appeals to the oppressed and hungry peoples of all lands who think they see in it a promise that they will no longer be oppressed and will receive under communism the same equal treatment as everybody else. To those submerged classes of the world who have experienced this oppression, the appeal of communism to class warfare seems the only way out of their difficulties. In their misery and despair, the Communist doctrine spreads before them a vision which is the very reverse of their unhappy experience—the vision of a so-called classless society in which all men are equal.

Now, obviously, the evils of communism do not stem from this idea of equality itself. In my mind, they stem from the fact that the equality which communism preaches entirely omits the proposition that all men are creatures of God. In other words, communism is completely materialistic and atheistic. It denies God altogether. And in denying God it also denies the moral basis of equality.

Without that moral basis, the idea of equality is bound to be empty and vain and frightfully destructive. Communism perfectly illustrates this fact. The equality it preaches leads to strife and hatred, envy and malice. It denounces justice, mercy, and love as fatal weaknesses. It ignores the priceless value of the individual soul and looks upon man as a mere instrument of the state. It denies brotherhood and all the noble motives of the mind, and in the end it brings on the very antithesis of brotherhood—the ruthless domination of man by man.

Yet it is not enough for us to condemn this evil atheistic force of communism. Our condemnations do not change the fact that it is on the march in the world today, and I believe it is our duty to assume our share of responsibility for that terrible fact. If we can understand why we of the Western World share the responsibility for this tragic state of affairs, then we may gain some insight into the question of how to stop it.

The successes of communism, I think, directly represent the shortcomings of the free, democratic world. We of the West, in our concept of human equality and brotherhood, with its profoundly moral and religious basis, have evolved an idea of incalculable power—an idea which could have become the moral basis for the ordering of human society all over the world. Our failure was that we did not manage to apply that idea throughout the world. Even in our own countries, in western Europe and America, we have shown certain weaknesses, we have tolerated injustice in various ways, and as a result we have seen the growth of extreme and ruthless movements under the banners of both fascism and communism. And even more, in the colonial areas of the world, the principles of brotherhood which we professed at home have often been totally ignored.

Today the most urgent crisis in the struggle with communism is in the Far East. That should not surprise us too much—for it is in the Far East that the western nations for centuries past have failed most tragically to carry out their own principles of human brotherhood. This has been the great area of the supposed supremacy of the white man, the great area of colonial subjection, and the great area of economic exploitation. We are challenged today to show the peoples of the Far East that we represent not racialism, colonialism, and exploitation, but their very opposites: Individual human dignity, national independence, and free economic development for the benefit of the people.

In my travels in the Far East last fall, I was profoundly impressed with the power of these ideals in the minds of all Asiatic peoples. Everywhere I went I found a yearning for nationalism and freedom.

But the problem I am discussing is not confined to the Far East or to any one region. It is world-wide. The fact is that nowhere in the world can we Americans afford to ignore or condone human misery. This is not only because misery is a breeding ground for communism—that is one reason, and a very vital one, but it is the negative reason. We have a higher and more positive reason for being concerned with human misery, and that reason is our fundamental belief in the brotherhood of man. We are our brothers' keepers. We are interested in them for their own sakes, simply because we view them as human beings, creatures of the same God who created us.

It is vitally important that we succeed in bringing the peoples of the world to an understanding of this moral attitude of ours. No nation is likely to welcome an American policy if they think that policy is a mere

defensive more designed to strengthen America against communism. No nation will be happy over the idea of being used as an American shield. Therefore we must show that we seek the development and freedom and prosperity of these nations for their own sakes, in order to carry out our ideal of human brotherhood. If we proceed on that basis, then I feel sure we will have the strongest alliance against Communist tyranny that it is possible to have—an alliance based not on fear but on mutual understanding, and on hope for the future of mankind.

But if it is vital for us to make clear our ideals and our motives, it is equally vital that we keep our actions in line with those ideals, both at home and abroad. America is being carefully watched all over the world, and especially the Communists are eager to seize on our shortcomings for propaganda purposes. I would like to mention two or three areas in which I think it especially vital that we in the United States live up to our professed ideals of brotherhood.

The first of these areas is the matter of our program for European displaced persons. In the welter of world events this may seem a very small question, but in reality it is of the highest moral significance. In 1948 Congress passed an act by which the United States assumed a share in the job of resettling these unfortunate victims of Nazi aggression. It was clear from the beginning that the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 was very inadequate both in the numbers of displaced persons to be admitted and in the unfortunate restrictions and hidden discriminations which were placed in their way. Many of us in Congress have been urgently trying since that time to amend the act so as to make it more adequate and more just. It seemed most unfortunate to us that a program inspired by feelings of brotherhood and compassion should be hedged about with all these intimations of distrust and unfriendliness.

The time for action to improve the displaced-persons program is at hand in Congress. I believe there is an excellent chance of amending the bill on the Senate floor in order to bring it more into line with the original purposes of the program. For my part, I shall do all in my power to bring about this result, because I believe this program is a moral imperative for the United States. Our solution of the displaced-persons question will be watched by all those in the world who want to see whether the United States is willing to live up to its high ideal of human brotherhood.

A second area in which our American ideals are on trial is the area of civil rights. This is a dramatic test of whether or not we in the United States are ready to practice in our own homeland the ideal of brotherhood which we seek to promote in the world. From the standpoint of our fundamental morality I can see only one solution to this question, and that is a solution based on our common belief that we are all equally the creatures of one God.

But perhaps we can gain an added sense of the importance of this question if we remember once again that the whole world is watching us. Especially in Asia and Africa, where the peoples of vast former colonial areas have known the humiliation of being treated as inferior races, the way in which the United States acts to implement the rights of its own Negro citizens is of the highest significance. I know of no other field in which the quality of our own actions at home so directly affects our moral power in the world.

Enlightened men may differ in detail as to the best way for us to proceed, but I think none of us can deny the importance of acting quickly and vigorously. This is a question on which there should be no conflict between our political parties. Naturally, I am most anxious to see that my own Republican Party continues to maintain its historic advanced position on this question.

In this connection I cannot conceal my disappointment that the recent Republican statement of principles and objectives, issued on February 6, did not speak out decisively and clearly on civil rights. For my part—and in this I think I speak for many Republicans in Congress—in my attitude and voting on civil rights I shall continue to feel bound by the words of the Republican platform of 1948:

"Lynching or any other form of mob violence anywhere is a disgrace to any civilized state, and we favor the prompt enactment of legislation to end this infamy.

"One of the basic principles of this Republic is the equality of all individuals in their rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This principle is enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Constitution of the United States; it was vindicated on the field of battle and became the cornerstone of this Republic. The right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color or country of origin. We favor the enactment and just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic.

"We favor the abolition of the poll tax as a requisite to voting.

"We are opposed to the idea of racial segregation in the armed forces of the United States."

That is a strong statement, and I still support it in its entirety. As many of my friends know, in the field of fair employment practices I believe that the primary emphasis should be on education and conciliation. But I am extremely anxious that we get ahead with Federal fair employment legislation, and I myself plan to work and vote for the very best law that we can possibly achieve in this field. I earnestly hope that we will get a good and workable law in this session of Congress. I am keenly aware that the eyes of the world are upon us in this matter.

Lastly, I want to mention briefly a third area of American action in which I think our ideal of brotherhood is involved. I refer to that whole complex of our domestic affairs which comes under the heading of welfare. I believe that we cannot stand effectively as champions of social and economic progress in the world unless we are prepared to grapple with the problems of social and economic progress in our own country. This is not the place for me to outline my ideas on the proper role of government in promoting our objectives in this field. But I do want to make it clear that in my judgment government—on the Federal, State, and local levels—cannot ignore the demands of the people for economic security and opportunity, for better health and housing and education. These are the concerns of all of us, and it is right and proper that all levels of government in this country should take a hand in solving these problems.

Yet it is of the highest importance that the actions we take be compatible with the principle of freedom for the individual. I cannot for a moment subscribe to the proposition that the salvation of the American people lies in the erection of a monumental, centralized, monopolistic government machine. On the contrary, it seems to me that our way of progress lies primarily in the enlightened creative efforts of the people themselves, aided and encouraged by a government which acts not as a master but as a servant—and perhaps as a partner.

The United States stands before the world as a living proof that economic and spiritual welfare for the people can best be attained in an atmosphere of freedom—an atmosphere where the free inventive capacities of every individual citizen are allowed the fullest possible play. In this atmosphere we have maintained a society which has no sharp class divisions and which spurns the Marxian idea of class warfare.

I think this is a tremendously hopeful fact for the peoples of the world to contemplate. In the United States we are all middle class. Our system is far from perfect, but the fact remains that we are committed to a system of equal opportunity, equal justice, and social progress for all the people. We have managed to make that system work, not by the dominant power of government but by the moral power of our faith in the principle that all men are brothers.

We must have the courage to maintain and continuously perfect this system of ours in an atmosphere of individual freedom. The peoples of half the world are being courted today by the insidious appeal of communism. It is not enough for us to show them that the Communist doctrine of so-called equality is vain and frightfully destructive. We must show them also that there is an alternative way of life. The fundamental principles of this alternative of human freedom have been established by the blood, sweat, and tears of generations of our forebears. These fundamental principles will work for all humanity as they have worked for us here in America. We must persuade these people, who earnestly aspire to be free, that the way to freedom lies not through hatred and conflict but through the practice of human brotherhood. We must show them, as clearly as we know how, the true meaning of the words in our Declaration of Independence: "All men are created equal."

Flood Threat in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

FLOOD THREAT IN LOUISIANA

The flood menace is growing more acute in those Louisiana areas in the watersheds of the Mississippi, Ouachita, Black, and Red Rivers. On the Atchafalaya also there is an increasing threat.

There has been no loss of life so far and a great measure of credit for this can be given those governmental agencies charged with early warning of oncoming high waters and with construction and maintenance of our levee systems.

But more than 1,500 families have been routed from their homes and countless head of livestock have been endangered or lost to the flood waters.

The National Guard has thrown amphibious military vehicles into the struggle to remove residents of low-lying areas. Refugees are being taken to 10 camps on high ground in the stricken sections. The Red Cross is aiding them with warm clothing and food.

The rivers are still brimfull and forecasters are eyeing the Midwest for rainfall which would further increase the danger in the lower Mississippi Valley. It is felt that river stages of the Mississippi, the principal controlling factor, will continue to be near or at flood stage for most of the month of March.

The crisis then is real in all flooded areas, is imminent in others now threatened, and will be continuous for some weeks ahead.

No workable method of reducing these high levels can now be used. Opening of the Bonnet Carre spillway near New Orleans will afford a measure of protection to that city which in years past has been under recurrent threat of flood. The city of Alexandria is on high ground, protected by levees and will probably not suffer any more than in past years. Monroe too lies under the protection of a system of levees that extends up into Morehouse Parish. Baton Rouge is also free of threat.

Our chief cities in the flood area seem able therefore to escape any serious damage. But in many other parts of the State bordering the swollen rivers, residents are hourly awaiting the warning to flee.

If the rains continue upstream, flood stages exceeding the disastrous overflow of 1927 have been predicted. If this forecast actually materializes, it would represent a real calamity to our State.

Apparently the only possible plan to prevent further flood-water damage would be opening of the Morganza floodway. This would turn the waters of the Black and Mississippi Rivers into a leveed channel to the Atchafalaya River and thus to the Gulf. By providing an alternate route for the flood to follow, pressure would be relieved in New Orleans and a quicker, more direct route for the water to follow would be provided.

There is one hitch to this. The Morganza floodway is not yet completed. The giant levees and other structures are finished as far south as Morgan City. Below that, the Morganza spillway does not exist or exists in only partially complete form. Engineers say that if the spillway is opened now to relieve the flood threat of the Black and Mississippi, a seven-parish area south of Morgan City would be inundated.

If further evidence were needed, the present flood situation surely is proof that completion of the Morganza spillway should be rushed with a minimum of delay and red tape. It is, of course, too late to do anything about the present flood, or so the engineers say, but residents of the State should take such action as seems necessary to obtain quick completion of the spillway. This could easily be the chief factor in effecting a practical solution to the high-water problem in the Red and Black Rivers and the areas affected by their juncture with the Mississippi.

International Conference on Control of Atomic Energy, World Disarmament, and Revision of United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are all agreed that the most critical single problem in the world today concerns our relations with the Soviet Union, particularly now that she possesses the secrets of the hydrogen and atomic bombs. In this connection I released on Sunday a statement urging the Department of State to request a poll of the members of the United Nations on their reactions to the idea of a new international conference which would consider control of atomic energy, world disarmament, and revision of the United Nations Charter. The hunger of the world is for peace, and this hunger must be met by constructive action—realistic, yet imaginative.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement I issued, together with a copy of a letter I wrote to Secretary of State Acheson, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY SUGGESTS UNITED NATIONS POLL COUNTRIES REGARDING WORLD CONFERENCE TO REVISE CHARTER, DISARM

A poll of members of the United Nations to determine their reactions to world federation, atom control, and disarmament proposals has been suggested by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican of Wisconsin.

The Wisconsin Senator, second ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, made public a letter which he has written to the Secretary of State suggesting the United States ask United Nations Secretary General Lie to make such a poll.

Senator WILEY stated that the United States should make this request, rather than "proceed unilaterally and suggest outright, without any preliminary consultation with anyone else, an international conference. We must determine whether the nations believe a new conference would accomplish anything that the United Nations could not of itself right now accomplish."

The full text of Senator WILEY's letter reads as follows:

"The Honorable DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you both in my capacity as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and as a member of the special subcommittee which has been evaluating World Government, Atlantic Union, and other resolutions and informal proposals designed to meet the current critical situation throughout the world.

"It is agreed among all thinking men that the present course of events, if left unchecked, can potentially lead to disaster for the entire world because of the specter of the hydrogen and even worse bombs to come.

"I feel that there are two major shortcomings of the various proposals thus far presented to the subcommittee:

"WE CANNOT ACHIEVE MILLENNIUM BY A MERE ORGANIZATION

"1. All of them may lead to a sense of false security on the part of the American people; may lead to the creation of an illusion that by simply setting up the framework of another international organization, or calling another international conference, we would automatically be accomplishing the millennium and resolving all differences between ourselves and the Soviet Union.

"I have consistently questioned all witnesses to this effect; assuming that some form of new international structure were set up, suppose the Russians continued to refuse to cooperate—would we not be then in the very same situation, and, in fact, far worse a position than we are now?

"WE CANNOT ASSUME WE AUTOMATICALLY KNOW WORLD OPINION

"2. A second shortcoming is that all of the proposals would have the United States in effect drag the rest of the world behind it, without first ascertaining what the other nations think about these ideas. While we are a leader among nations, we cannot presume on so important a subject as this that we automatically know the opinion of the member nations without even asking them as to whether or not they feel any of these proposals are at all feasible and desirable.

"MY TWO SUGGESTIONS

"May I respectfully suggest, therefore, that as Secretary of State you—

"1. Instruct the United States delegate to the United Nations General Assembly to contact the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Trygve Lie, and Mr. Lie proceed to poll the member states to determine whether or not they believe it would be both desirable and feasible for a new international conference to be called at which the member states, represented on the highest possible level, would discuss (a) proposals for revision of the United Nations Charter or setting up some new form of international organization; and (b) in connection therewith to consider ways and means of ironclad international inspection of atomic energy and other weapons and possible disarmament, so as to halt the armaments race now existing.

"2. I believe that simultaneously the Department of State through its own embassies, ministries, and missions abroad should contact foreign governments to learn directly what the opinion of those governments are in relation to an internation conference and the other proposals which have been made. By determining at the outset Russia's position, we would avoid building up any false illusions.

"I OPPOSE WORLD GOVERNMENT RESOLUTION

"May I indicate at the present time that I for one believe that it would be premature and foolhardy for the United States to consider abandoning its constitutional prerogatives and sovereignty and to enter into a world government at the present time. I do, however, believe that further cooperation and coordination between our country and other lands is necessary and that is why I submit the above suggestions.

"THESE ACTIONS WOULD BE A PART OF OUR PEACE OFFENSIVE

"I believe that in taking these actions the United States would be demonstrating its good faith in consulting with foreign powers and that this demonstration should be communicated by the Voice of America to the peoples of Russia and those countries behind the iron curtain, as well as to the rest of the world. This would be a part of an over-all peace offensive designed to mobilize the spiritual power of the peoples of the earth for constructive actions leading toward peace. Years ago, I introduced legislation to establish a cabinet department of peace for this very objective.

"WE NEED A PEACE BOMB

"It has been well stated that we possess an A-bomb, are working toward an H-bomb, and what we now need is a peace-bomb which will create rather than destroy and scatter blessings rather than havoc.

"I know that you will agree that every American parent feels a deep anxiety over the future of our children and our children's children in this atomic age and that any step we may take to relieve that fear is that much to the good.

"Sincerely yours,

"ALEXANDER WILEY."

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. John Davis Lodge, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on Monday, February 13, 1950, before the New Haven Republican organization's

annual Lincoln Day dinner, held in New Haven, Conn., the distinguished Congressman from the Fourth District of Connecticut, Mr. LODGE, made a stirring Lincoln Day address.

Because of its enlightened approach to many of the pressing problems of the day, it merits careful study by every Member of the Congress. To this end, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege to have been asked to address such a distinguished gathering. And it is a pleasure to meet with you here to celebrate the great Republican principles of which Abraham Lincoln was the founder and is the living and inspiring symbol.

It is particularly appropriate that we should celebrate this occasion in the historic city of New Haven, the city of elms, the city of industry, the site of Yale University, the city which recently reelected as their Republican mayor, our good friend and able administrator, William Celentano.

Surely as Abraham Lincoln looks over the battlements of Heaven and watches the Republican Party in its efforts to preserve intact the two-party system on which our freedoms depend, he must be particularly interested in what we say and do in celebration of his birth 141 years ago. And assuredly at this stirring and challenging time in the story of man it is not sufficient for us simply to commemorate Lincoln's birth. Rather, it seems to me this banquet should be an occasion for solemn rededication to the timeless truths for which he fought and worked and died. This is no time for doubt, defeatism, and despair. We are confronted with great issues. And we must meet these issues with vigor, with imagination, and with courage.

In Lincoln's own words, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new so must we think anew and act anew." Indeed, the sayings of Abraham Lincoln constitute a veritable bible for the present-day guidance of the Republican Party. It is altogether fitting that we should be reminded of his wisdom and understanding at this difficult and dangerous time.

Now it has been the fashion in some quarters to think that our party is on the horns of the dilemma of choosing between a philosophy which some have called me-toolsm and a point of view which others have labeled as reactionary. But this is not our choice. Certainly we must not follow and imitate while others lead and create. But neither must we be obstructionists. We must not disagree for the sake of disagreement. We must not come out against the Ten Commandments just because they are favored by the Democrats.

In its policies and in its actions our party must reflect the fundamental divisions of thought among the American people.

That does not mean that we must be horse-and-buggy die-hards. It does not mean that we should advocate the doctrine of laissez-faire. Nor does it mean that we must follow in the recent tradition of a small segment of the Republican Party who classify themselves as isolationists rather than in the older and more widespread Republican tradition that what goes on outside our borders is of great concern to us. It does mean that we must produce feasible alternatives to the schemes of the Democrats which, if they were adopted, would destroy the very welfare of which the Democrats are the self-styled champions. It does mean encouraging the large number of independent voters to express themselves politically through the medium of the Republican Party. It does mean that our party must convince a majority of the people who vote that it has a constructive plan of action which will respond more effectively to the needs and aspirations of all this people than the tired clichés, the reckless promises, and the special-interest appeals with which the Democrats have in recent years preyed upon the fears and apprehensions of the voters.

As a matter of fact, if one could believe Democratic oratory, the Democratic Party would be the me-too party. A curious example of this attempt to be all things to all men is found in the President's recent message on the state of the Union which, I may say, contained a minimum amount of comment on the state of the Union and a maximum quantity of cynical political bait strangely reminiscent of the promise to reduce prices for the Connecticut housewife made by our present Governor during the campaign of 1948. The speech is interesting because the President, wishing to reassume a growing body of aroused Americans, resorted to the very me-too philosophy which he has often attacked on those occasions when certain Republicans have agreed with him. In an effort to attract the support of those who are alarmed by the increasing cost of Government, by deficit spending at a time of high national income, and by the growing might of the Washington bureaucrats, the President stated that "businessmen must continue to have the incentives necessary for investment and for the development of new lines of enterprise."

Yet in the same breath he recommended a program which would go far toward eliminating these incentives, preclude the development of new enterprises, and concentrate more power in Washington.

In his message on the state of the Union, the President also reiterated his desire for the repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley law which he used last week in connection with the coal strike. He advocated repeal in spite of the fact that this law was favored by a large majority of the Democrats in the Eightieth Congress, and in spite of the further fact that the overwhelming majority of the Democrats in the Eighty-first Congress are opposed to repeal. Indeed, when repeal of the Taft-Hartley law came before the first session of the Democrat-controlled Eighty-first Congress, out of 263 Democrats only 30, none of whom were from Connecticut, voted in favor of repeal. In spite of the President's request for repeal, the Democrat leadership has apparently decided to keep this issue for the 1950 campaign. I believe that this is a grave disservice to labor. I believe that labor is entitled to be influential in both parties. I believe that the welfare of the working men and women of America is entitled to the same bipartisan consideration as that which is accorded to the welfare of the Europeans.

Let us see what Lincoln has to say about this question: "Capital is only the fruit of labor—could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves the much higher consideration." And he went on to say: "That men who are industrious and sober and honest in the pursuit of their own interest should after awhile accumulate property, and after that should be allowed to enjoy it in peace is right. The prudent penniless beginner in the world labors for wages a while, saves his surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account for another while, and at length hires another to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all, gives hope to all, and consequently an improvement of condition to all."

Lincoln said: "I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruit of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other man's rights."

Labor and capital are component parts of what is essentially a cooperative effort. It should be the mission of the Reupblican Party to take labor legislation out of politics.

Furthermore, in order to provide more jobs and higher wages, in order to raise our standard of living, we must increase and improve our tools of production. This we cannot do if incentives are stifled, if risk investments are made so risky that people won't take a chance. This is the paramount interest of all of our citizens, and in particular of labor. It has been estimated that the average job in America requires a $6,000 investment. It is a disservice to labor to discourage such investments.

The Republican Party should also point out to what degree the working men and women of our country are weighted down with taxes. Our Federal Government annually costs the average American between $275 and $300. It now owes the average American family of four somewhere between seven and eight thousand dollars. The average American citizen is plagued by dozens of invisible taxes. Yet the President talks of substantial tax increases.

And at this very moment while the people of our country are carrying this great tax burden the Democratic administration is in possession of 65,000,000 bushels of potatoes, 219,000,000 dozen eggs, and 96,000,000 pounds of butter. This food was bought with the taxpayers' money in order to keep prices up.

A notable omission from the President's message is that it contains no reference to the Hoover Commission reports and recommendations which hitherto had been thought to have substantial bipartisan support. This is sad indeed particularly in view of the budgetary deficit because I believe that the overwhelming majority of the American people, including those who want the Government to do so much, want it done without waste, and with efficiency.

And while the Hoover Commission reports and recommendations are not a partisan matter; while they are supported by many citizens in both parties and by independent voters, certainly there is a tendency in some administration bureaucrats to prevent a proper streamlining of our Government. The Republicans should assert themselves to the utmost in order that the President and the Democrat-controlled Eighty-first Congress should with such adjustments as may seem desirable proceed with dispatch to the implementation of these recommendations.

With regard to what is often referred to as social legislation, there is no need to embrace the solutions offered by the Democrats. However, neither should we ignore these problems where they exist. It is up to us to demonstrate our imagination and our intellectual vigor by coming out with better solutions. Principally, however, the difference between our point of view and the view of those who are in power is that for us it should be an effort to respond to a human need while for them it is usually part of a plot to concentrate additional power in Washington. Such centralization is, of course, pleasing to the Communists since it enables them more easily to undermine the morale of our people and to destroy the political fabric of our country.

Because the Government must be the servant of the people it must also be strong enough and wise enough to respond effectively to the problems of the day. While we provide incentives for the creation of new wealth, we must also intercede on behalf of those for whom lief is particularly difficult in order that the people should retain their enthusiasm for the private property system. While, in order to raise our standard of living and buttress our economy, we should reduce the national debt, effect large-scale economies in government, and return to sound fiscal policies, we must also assist those who have no more than a substandard on which to eke out a meager existence.

Abraham Lincoln said: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

But we should burn into our brains the incontrovertible truth that the ultimate, the essential welfare of the American people depends upon the continuation and increase of the vital opportunities inherent in our free society. Aid to the needy, to the unfortunate in our society, is right and just and feasible. But if every family receives housing, food, clothing, medical care, and education from Washington, we shall have embarked upon a course which will cause a break-down not only in the American economy but also in the American character. And when a government attempts to redistribute to the citizens more than the citizens can produce, inflation and dictatorship are the inevitable result.

Acting in the clear and vigorous tradition of Abraham Lincoln, we Republicans should take a forthright stand on the question of civil rights. This is in keeping with our platform. It is in accordance with the first article of the constitution of Connecticut, which declares "that all men, when they form a social compact, are equal in rights." It is in furtherance of the Constitution of the United States. And it is in keeping with the enlightened principles and vigorous leadership shown by our late great Gov. James McConaughy, when, on March 14, 1917, he signed the Connecticut Fair Employment Practices Act.

On this matter the Democrats have been arguing among themselves while the Republicans have been acting—not only in Connecticut but in seven other States—New York, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Indiana, Oregon, Washington, and Massachusetts.

With regard to this issue, the Democrats are hesitant, apologetic, and ineffective. We can and must be united and strong. We should carry the banner on the civil-rights program. This is not only right and just and in the best Republican—Lincolnian—tradition, but it will also be of great help to us in the battle for men's minds which we are waging throughout the world with the godless forces of Communist aggression.

And this brings me to the primary issue which faces our Nation—the issue of war and peace. For it is relentlessly true that any social gains we make will melt like snow in the sun if we have war. Concerning our intercourse with other nations, Abraham Lincoln said: "* * * in the case of a long and threatening misunderstanding let us prepare for the worst and work for the best." It can hardly be said that we are preparing for the worst when we reduce our national defense establishment and use these unwise savings not to give tax relief to the American people but on further Government extravagance during an election year. And while we have reduced our forces to a mere fraction of the Soviet military strength, the Russians have improved and modernized their striking power so that today they have a more effective fighting force than they had during the war against Germany.

The possibility of large-scale destruction and loss of life by terrible new weapons does not change the fundamental issue. It does underscore the urgency of the problem of peace. We must not allow ourselves to be stampeded into ill-advised actions and panic-stricken statements by these new engines of destruction. The road to a less precarious peace is hard and long and requires steady nerves and firm resolve. All right-thinking people agree as to the desirability of peace. It is my conviction that in the world of today peace is a product of strength and war is a derivative of weakness. Certainly World Wars I and II bolster that conviction. Statements by members of the administration party which attempt to bait and bribe the Russian people to disarm do not reach the Russian people but may well convince the Kremlin that we are leading from weakness.

It is well to recall that at the end of the war we offered Russia a loan of some $10,000,000,000 for rehabilitation. There were no strings attached to this loan. All we desired was continued collaboration in the cause of peace. All we wanted was a reduction in armaments. The offer was not accepted. And in 1947 the Soviet Union was invited to share in the Marshall plan. Molotov, who was asked to participate, tried to wreck the plan. This has been established Russian policy ever since.

In 1948 Henry Wallace proposed before the Foreign Affairs Committee the creation of a global Marshall plan to include Soviet Russia and involving an expenditure of $50,000,000,000 over a period of 10 years. Now, after the Communist forces have overrun huge territories in Asia involving the subjugation of 450,000,000 people, there is another $50,000,000,000 proposal to include the Russian Communists. Although the suggestion is no longer original, intervening events have not endowed it with greater validity.

The fact is that there is no easy solution to the great dilemma with which we are faced. There are no pat answers to these problems. There is no open sesame by which we can suddenly emerge from the dark clouds of oppression which are crowding down upon us into the bright sunlight of a secure freedom. There is no sudden deed of excellence which will guarantee for us overnight the peace for which we recently sacrificed so much. We are inextricably involved in a conflict of titanic proportions, and it will take all the energies, all the stern resolve, all the balanced judgment and all the spiritual fervor and spirit of sacrifice of which we are capable to surmount our difficulties. We cannot afford to grow tired at this time.

In addition we must recognize that the world crisis cannot be solved solely in terms of dollars and commodities, military equipment and personnel, plans and agreements. It is also most emphatically a question of moral leadership. In fulfilling this exacting role we must bear in mind that while men and women the world over yearn for safety from war and from want they are also interested in how and why they are living. We who take sharp issue with the Marxian theory that man lives by bread alone must realize that the problem is not simply one of matériel. It is not just a battle of industrial potential, of things. It is also a battle of ideas.

And while this overriding issue of war and peace should be met without regard to party advantage, it is more important to be right than to be bipartisan. And it must be increasingly clear to the people of America that it will be to their advantage to have in Washington a Government which devotes its time not to a justification of its errors in the Far East but to correcting them; not to covering up mistakes but to policies which will safeguard the peace. We have a right to demand of our officials that they place loyalty to America ahead of loyalty to their friends and cronies.

In the words of Abraham Lincoln, "Revolutionize through the ballot box, and restore the Government once more to the affections and hearts of men by making it express, as it was intended to do, the highest spirit of justice and liberty."

This is the Republican Party's opportunity for distinguished service. This is the challenge to us in Connecticut. This is the challenge to America.

Government Spud Muddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an excellent statement by Mr. George B. Buck, a Maine potato grower, in a letter written to the Belfast Maine Republican Journal, and published in that newspaper on February 2, 1950.

His observations of the "spud muddle," I believe, accurately reflect a growing sentiment among Maine potato farmers. I invite the attention of all Members of this Congress to his statement.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HITS AT GOVERNMENT SPUD MUDDLE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following letter, addressed to the editor of the Republican, is written so clearly by George B. Buck that we commend it to the attention of our readers. So many with whom we have talked—while trying to blaze a mental trail out of the wilderness of the potato muddle—have voiced quite similar opinions, but we didn't take down their words.)

This is the first time I ever undertook to write anything other than an advertisement for your paper, and there isn't much doubt in my mind but it will be the last.

There is so much discussion about the potato situation, perhaps a better word would be a mix-up. And having raised potatoes for over 60 years, and shipped both hay and potatoes for 40, I can truthfully say I was never any more discouraged. But, perhaps I will feel a little better when I get this pill off my stomach.

We do not seem to know where we are at. Personally, I would rather sell cheaper and not be bothered with the Government. I do not like this dictatorship.

It seems too bad, after years of such hard work here in this county and State to build up a market and then give it to the Canadians. And we cannot blame them. We would do just as they are doing if we had a chance. When you let the bars down the cattle are going to come out and seek better food. That is the law of nature.

Many times, both last year and this year, when we wire any of our old customers they reply, "Sorry, Mr. Buck, but we can do better in Canada." For example, I am going to quote what a chain-store manager in Derry, N. H., replied when I wrote about hay. Just a few years ago we shipped them around 165 cars. Read what they say now:

"The writer found your letter of January 16 on his desk, and in reply I wish I could tell you something definite about hay. Our sales are still slow, with the bulk being on real good quality out of Canada. The market on other quality is very mixed, with quotations spreading $4 per ton on comparable lots. The low figure is quoted by truckers out of the Maritimes who will sell to dealers when they can, and deal directly with consumers if they have to."

This is a good sample of letters and telegrams we have had during the last 2 or 3 years. We cannot compete with them because, for instance, they can press their hay for five or six dollars per ton where it costs us nine and ten dollars per ton. Then, too,

there is the 19 percent discount in the exchange of money. That in itself is quite a profit.

As it is, our Government is cutting our quota while the Canadians are planting more and more to put on our market. I call this real tough medicine. And it isn't only potatoes and hay, but other things. At present they are even bringing over eggs. And they bring over meat, dairy products, whatever it may be. All these things have a tendency to hurt the farmers here.

As I see it, the high ceiling has cost us a lot of money. It has made some people all around us wealthy, but it hasn't helped the small fellow raising 25 or 30 acres. Only just recently I heard a young farmer say in our store that he didn't know what he was going to do. He has been raising 25 acres. They are cutting him down, and he has quite a large family. He has a daughter who wants to go to college, and he wants her to go, but he can't see how in the world, in planting so few acres, he is going to do it. This is only one case in many.

And then another thing about this high ceiling. It has taught some States that you might say are right in the market, to go into potatoes. They, too, are hurting us. They have no such advantage, about $1 difference per barrel in freight. We are way up north here with a heavy freight—but we can raise the potatoes.

I personally feel confident that after World War II every producer should have been allowed to go right back the old-fashioned way, on his own risk, planting as much as he wanted to. It was all right when they gave us a goal to encourage production when we were feeding the world. There was no cut limit.

I would just like to try it—to go back the old-fashioned way, every producer taking his own chances and I say to you, in all fairness, I sincerely believe that the law of supply and demand will fix it better, fairer, than any man or men. That is the way this great Nation was built up.

GEORGE B. BUCK.

Basing-Point Legislation Directed Against the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1950, Dr. George Stocking, head of the department of economics of Vanderbilt University, met with a group of Senators and Congressmen for the purpose of discussing informally the effects which the basing-point system would have, if restored by S. 1008, upon the South. He was invited to give us the benefit of his views by Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, who felt that unless we knew what the effects of this proposed bill would be on our region we would be more or less in the position of legislating in the dark.

At the end of the discussion I asked Dr. Stocking whether he would be good enough to put his remarks in the form of a statement. This he has been good enough to do, and it is this statement which I now wish to include in the RECORD.

Briefly his statement shows, in cold figures, that the steel mills of Birmingham, Ala., although constituting probably the lowest-cost mills in the entire country have been able to secure only a relatively small share of their own home market. Under the basing-point system it makes no difference to the ultimate buyer located in the South or anywhere else which mill he buys from since all mills offer him the same delivered price. Consequently the Birmingham mills have not received the benefit of their natural location, and they have been forced to sit idly by while orders which should have been theirs have gone to distant northern mills. Since the Birmingham mills have thus not been able to gain the benefit of their natural market, their expansion has been held down. Similarly, since the steel users in the South have been unable to obtain the benefits of the Birmingham mills' natural location and cost advantages, their expansion has also been retarded.

I think the figures set forth in Dr. Stocking's statement should make it clear to every southern Senator and Congressman that S. 1008 is a bill aimed directly at the South and should be opposed with all the resources at our command.

The statement follows:

EFFECTS OF BASING-POINT PRICING ON THE SOUTH'S IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY

The following analysis was made by Dr. George W. Stocking, of Vanderbilt University, as part of a study of the significance of basing-point pricing to the South, which he is making for the Committee of the South. The basic data were compiled by the Temporary National Economic Committee from questionnaires covering shipments of major iron and steel products for the month of February 1939. TNEC hearings, part 27, give a description of the questionnaire and a statement of its coverage at page 14133 and following pages, and 14350.

STRUCTURAL SHAPES

This analysis shows that during February 1939 nine Alabama counties surrounding Birmingham received from all sources included in the TNEC study, 1,623 tons of heavy structural shapes. Birmingham mills supplied only 1,017 tons of this or 62.6 percent of the total. Far away Chicago supplied 453 tons or 27.9 percent; the Pittsburgh-Johnstown district supplied 122 tons or 7.5 percent; eastern Pennsylvania supplied 31 tons or 1.9 percent. Average freight charges on shipments by Birmingham mills to buyers in that area were 94 cents a ton; on shipments from Chicago, $11.62 a ton; on shipments from Pittsburgh-Johnstown district, $12.82 a ton; on shipments from eastern Pennsylvania, $15.16 a ton.

All other Alabama counties bought only 52.5 percent of their heavy structural shapes from Birmingham. They got the remaining 47.5 percent from Chicago, Pittsburgh-Johnstown, Buffalo, and eastern Pennsylvania districts. Freight charges on the Birmingham shipments averaged only $6.55 a ton; on the shipments from northern mills they ranged from an average of $11.91 to $16.67 a ton.

Mississippians bought only 27.9 percent of their heavy structural shapes from Birmingham. Average freight charges on these purchases were only $6.83 a ton. This compared with $12.17 and $14.86 freight charges on shipments from Chicago and Buffalo. Despite higher freight charges, Mississippians got 72.1 percent of their requirements from these remote production centers.

Georgians got 66.5 percent of their heavy structural shapes from Birmingham on which freight charges averaged only $6.29 a ton; they bought the balance from Buffalo, Chicago, and Pittsburgh-Johnstown districts which average freight charges ranged from $13.20 to $14.59 a ton.

Birmingham's second best market for heavy structural shapes during February 1939 was Tennessee. Tennesseans bought a total of 502 tons from Birmingham on which average freight charges were only $5.40 a ton. They bought the balance of their requirements—45.6 percent of the total—from the Chicago, Pittsburgh-Johnstown, northern Ohio, and Buffalo districts on which average freight charges ranged from $9.44 to $11.70 a ton.

Sharing their nearby markets with far distant suppliers under a basing-point pricing system that robbed them of their advantages of location, Birmingham mills reached out for more distant markets. Other southern markets took a part of their surplus but these, too, had to share with less advantageously located mills. Florida bought 63.4 percent of its requirements of structural shapes from Birmingham on which freight charges averaged only $10.03. It bought the remainder of its requirements from Chicago, eastern Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh-Johnstown, and Buffalo districts on which average freight charges ranged from $12.64 to $20.33 a ton. South Carolina bought only 36.7 percent of its requirements from Birmingham, although average freight charges were only $9.70 a ton. This compared with $12.01 and $13.30 a ton on shipments from eastern Pennsylvania and Pittsburgh. Despite the higher freight charges, these two districts supplied most of South Carolina's requirements.

Birmingham supplied only 8.6 percent of North Carolina's requirements of heavy structural shapes, although average freight charges on shipments from Birmingham were $8.53 a ton as compared with average freight charges ranging from $9.19 to $11.43 on shipments from eastern Pennsylvania, the Pittsburgh-Johnstown and northern Ohio districts whose mills supplied the bulk of North Carolina's requirements.

Birmingham's sales in Kentucky were negligible—24 tons, or 5.32 percent of Kentucky's total requirements. Average freight charges on Birmingham shipments to Kentucky were only $2.25 (apparently water shipments) as compared with average freight charges ranging from $5.71 to $12.44 on shipments from the St. Louis, Chicago, Buffalo, Pittsburgh-Johnstown, and eastern Pennsylvania districts.

On shipments to the Texas market—more than twice as large as that of any other Southern State—Birmingham had the lowest average freight charges on structural shapes of any supplying area. Yet it supplied only 12 percent of Texas requirements. The eastern Pennsylvania, mountain, St. Louis, Chicago, Pittsburgh-Johnstown, and Buffalo districts shared the other 88 percent.

Unable to dispose of its output in nearby markets under the share-the-market program of a basing-point system, Birmingham shipped 223 tons, or 5.3 percent out of its total, to northern California. Freight charges on these shipments averaged $21.99 a ton. The Birmingham mills absorbed $21.49 of this amount.

STEEL PLATES

Mills of the Birmingham district shipped 12,836 tons of steel plates in February 1939. These shipments exceeded total purchases of all consuming districts in which Birmingham mills had a clear freight advantage. Birmingham mills supplied most of the southern market, but not all of it. Georgia shared 29 percent of its market with the eastern Pennsylvania, the Pittsburgh-Johnstown, and Baltimore districts. Yet average freight charges on shipments from the Birmingham district were only $4.75 a ton compared with average freight charges ranging from $10 a ton to $12.87 a ton on shipments from the northern mills. While sharing the Georgia market, in which it had a freight advantage, Birmingham mills were forced to go far afield to dispose of their surplus. They sold 486 tons of steel plates in northern California on which they absorbed an average of $16.21 freight a ton.

PLAIN DRAWN WIRE

Birmingham mills shipped only 321 tons of plain drawn wire during February 1939. Freightwise their best markets were Alabama, Tennessee, and Georgia. Although they had a sharp freight advantage in both the latter States, they supplied only 27 percent of Georgia's requirements, at an average freight charge of $6.45 a ton and 28 percent of Tennessee's requirements at an average freight charge of $4.21 a ton. Georgia got the balance of its requirements from the Baltimore, Pittsburgh-Johnstown, Indiana, Illinois, and New England districts. The average freight charges on shipments from these mills ranged from $12.52 to $16.50 a ton. Tennessee got the balance of its requirements from St. Louis, Indiana, Illinois, and Pittsburgh-Johnstown district mills, with average freight charges ranging from $9.40 to $11.73 a ton. Birmingham supplied none of the big Texas market, although most Texas shipments were priced on a Birmingham base; that is, they were destined for points in Texas, freightwise nearer to Birmingham than to any other mill. Neither did South Carolina buy any plain drawn wire from Birmingham, although it was freightwise nearer to Birmingham than to the mills that supplied it.

Apparently Birmingham output was kept below that necessary to supply its natural markets.

HOT-ROLLED STRIP

Birmingham mills shipped 528 tons of hot-rolled strip during February 1939. Freightwise their best markets were the Alabama, Birmingham, Georgia, South Carolina, and Tennessee consuming districts. Yet the Youngstown district supplied 81 percent of shipments into nine counties constituting the Birmingham district, 31 percent of the shipments into Georgia, and 65.9 percent of the shipments into Tennessee. On shipments into Georgia average freight charges from the Birmingham district were $1.93 a ton; from the Youngstown district, $13.31 a ton. On shipments into Tennessee average freight charges from Birmingham were $6.67 a ton; from Youngstown $10.97 a ton.

Sharing its nearby markets with distant producers, forced Birmingham mills to go farther afield for business. They supplied 84 percent of North Carolina's requirements at an average freight charge of $8.21 a ton. The Pittsburgh-Johnstown area and Youngstown supplied the balance with freight charges of $10.75 and $12.60 a ton respectively. Birmingham mills absorbed an average of $6.76 a ton freight to ship 55 tons, representing 10.4 percent of their total shipments to Ohio. They absorbed an average of $3.09 a ton freight to ship 98 tons, representing 18.6 percent of their total shipments into Kentucky.

HOT-ROLLED SHEETS

Birmingham mills shipped 6,572 tons of hot-rolled sheets in February 1939. These shipments went to 19 different States—small shipments being made to both the Pacific coast and northern Atlantic coast States. Had Birmingham supplied only the six States (Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, and portions of Texas) on which freight charges from Birmingham were lower than shipments elsewhere and in supplying which Birmingham had a freight advantage over all other mills, it would have had to expand its output.

Assembly cost of raw materials for production of 1 long ton of basic pig iron and 1 long ton of finished steel at different centers, 1939 [1]

[Dollars]

	Pig iron				Finished steel			
	Iron ore	Coking coal	Limestone	Total cost	Iron ore	Coal	Limestone	Total cost
Pittsburgh	5.38	0.28	0.33	5.99	6.26	0.50	0.62	7.38
Chicago-Gary	3.55	3.56	.20	7.31	4.12	3.79	.37	10.28
Duluth	1.53	3.13	.20	4.86	1.77	5.54	.27	7.58
Detroit	3.55	2.91	.17	6.73	4.12	3.18	.31	9.59
Cleveland	3.08	2.32	.24	5.64	3.57	4.11	.45	8.13
Buffalo	3.08	2.78	.24	6.02	3.57	4.78	.45	8.80
Youngstown	4.84	1.53	.19	6.56	5.61	2.71	.34	8.66
Weirton-Steubenville	5.12	.67	.37	6.16	5.94	1.19	.68	7.81
Hamilton	5.40	2.31	.33	8.04	6.20	4.00	.61	[2] 10.90
Ashland	5.36	1.03	.33	6.72	6.22	1.82	.61	8.65
Bethlehem	1.56	3.35	.28	5.19	1.81	5.93	.51	8.23
Sparrows Point	6.17	3.19	.57	9.93	7.16	5.65	1.05	13.86
Birmingham	1.26	1.35	.08	2.69	1.46	2.39	.15	4.00
St. Louis	4.90	1.20	.14	6.24	5.68	2.12	.27	8.07
Pueblo	3.85	1.79	.43	6.07	4.47	3.06	.79	8.32
Provo	3.06	2.18	.14	5.38	3.55	3.86	.26	7.67
San Bernardino	3.35	6.60	(3)	9.95	3.89	11.68	(3)	15.57

[1] In deriving these assembly costs, blast-furnace practice shown in table 26 for Youngstown were used for Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Buffalo, Weirton-Steubenville, Ashland, Hamilton, and St. Louis; those for Chicago-Gary were used for Detroit and Duluth; those for eastern New York were used for Bethlehem and Sparrows Point and those for Provo were used for Pueblo and San Bernardino.

Following are the proportions of iron ore and coal from the different sources which were used. They are those used by Marion Worthing in Pittsburgh Business Review, Jan. 31, 1938, p. 22, and they are also found in Beaver and Mahoning Rivers, Pa. and Ohio, hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, 77th Cong., 1st sess., 1941, pp. 47–48:

Iron ore: 75 percent Minnesota, 25 percent Michigan (101 percent direct ore at points on Lakes: at inland points, 89 percent direct ore and 20 percent dock ore).

Coal: Pittsburgh and Weirton-Steubenville, 100 percent western Pennsylvania by barge. Chicago, 70 percent eastern Kentucky and West Virginia, 30 percent Pocahontas—20 percent rail-lake; 50 percent all-rail for coking; southern Illinois for other coal. Cleveland, 80 percent Pittsburgh field by barge-rail, 20 percent Pocahontas, all-rail. Detroit, 80 percent eastern Kentucky and West Virginia, 20 percent Pocahontas—60 percent rail-water, 20 percent all-rail. Buffalo, 60 percent Pittsburgh and central Pennsylvania, rail-water; 30 percent Pittsburgh field, all-rail; 20 percent Pocahontas, rail-water; Youngstown, 85 percent western Pennsylvania, barge-rail, 15 percent Pocahontas, all-rail. Duluth, same as Chicago, except none from southern Illinois. Other points obtained materials from the cheapest available source.

[2] This figure applies at Middletown, which is 12 miles from Hamilton. Hamilton does not make steel and Middletown does not make pig iron.

[3] Negligible.

Source: BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation. S. Doc. 80, 79th Cong., 1st sess., p. 124.

Transportation charges for supplying Houston with 1 ton of finished steel from selected producing centers

[Assembly cost and freight charges in dollars per long ton]

Producing center	Freight rate in cents per 100 pounds	Assembly cost, 1 ton of steel	Freight charge on steel	Total
Birmingham	[1] 33-½	4.00	8.79	12.79
Pittsburgh	[2] 35	7.36	7.87	15.23
Sparrows Point	[2] 29	13.86	4.48	18.34
St. Louis	[4] 51-½	8.07	11.45	19.52
Pueblo	55	8.32	12.12	20.44
Chicago-Gary	[5] 38-½	10.28	13.03	23.31

[1] Rail charge, 19 cents per 100 pounds to Mobile and ocean charge of $2.86 a net ton, 500 tons minimum, Mobile to Houston.

[2] Barge charge of $7 per net ton, 500 tons minimum.

[3] Ocean contract-carrier rate of $4 per net ton, effective Mar. 20, 1942.

[4] Barge rate to New Orleans of $6.40 a net ton and ocean charge of $1.83 a net ton, 500 tons minimum, New Orleans to Houston.

[5] Barge rate to New Orleans, of $9.80 a net ton and ocean charge of $1.83 a net ton, 500 tons minimum, New Orleans to Houston.

Source: BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 125.

Transportation charges for supplying Seattle with 1 ton of finished steel from selected production centers

[Assembly cost and freight charges are in dollars per long ton]

Producing center	Freight rate in cents per 100 pounds	Assembly cost, 1 ton of steel	Freight charge on steel	Total
Birmingham	[1] 60	8.00	15.46	23.46
Provo	72½	7.67	16.24	23.91
San Bernardino	[2] 42	15.57	9.41	24.98
Sparrows Point	56	13.86	11.36	25.22
Pueblo	85	8.32	19.04	27.36

[1] Includes rail charge of 19 cents per 100 pounds to Mobile.

[2] Includes rail charge of 9 cents per 100 pounds to San Pedro Harbor.

Source: BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 126.

Comparative value and cost ratios for blast furnaces, 1939 [1]

	Value of blast-furnace products per ton of pig iron	Value added by blast furnaces per ton of pig iron	Wages per ton of pig iron	Fuel cost per ton of pig iron	Cost of material and supplies per ton of pig iron	Fuel and power cost per ton of pig iron	Total, columns 3, 4, and 6
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Pennsylvania	$17.29	$2.84	$0.78	$2.71	$10.72	$2.72	$15.23
Ohio	16.57	2.40	.88	4.13	9.42	4.17	14.47
New York	15.81	3.91	.87	4.35	7.42	4.48	12.77
Illinois	15.97	2.98	.74	5.65	8.99	5.72	14.36
Indiana	14.01	1.50	.73	4.83	9.66	4.85	15.24
Alabama	13.48	3.65	.90	3.14	8.32	3.18	12.39
Average [2]	15.27	2.65	.89	4.30	8.37	4.36	13.44

[1] Blast furnaces produce byproducts including gas, slag, and ferro-alloys. The importance of byproducts is relatively small compared with pig iron, its value representing more than 90 percent of total output value in 1939. In computing the ratios for each State, the pig iron tonnage reported by the census for that State was utilized.

[2] Represents an arithmetic average for the 6 major producing States shown here.

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census: Sixteenth Census, 1939; Manufactures. BIR, Economics of Iron and Stee Transportation, p. 127.

Pig-iron, steel-ingot, and finished hot-rolled capacity, by States, 1925, 1929, and 1938

[Capacity is in long tons]

	Pig iron		
	1938	1929	1925
United States	51,159,000	58,340,400	51,401,490
Percent of total:			
Pennsylvania	37.9	35.2	32.4
Ohio	23.1	21.5	21.7
Indiana	6.8	8.6	10.5
Illinois	9.1	9.7	11.0
New York	7.8	7.6	7.0
Alabama	7.1	6.3	6.3
Maryland	1.9	2.7	3.7
West Virginia	1.1	1.3	1.6
Michigan	1.6	1.3	2.5
All others	3.6	5.7	3.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

	Steel ingots		
	1925	1929	1938
United States	61,147,000	88,735,471	73,067,892
Percent of total:			
Pennsylvania	37.0	34.3	32.1
Ohio	23.1	23.7	23.4
Indiana	9.3	11.4	12.5
Illinois	8.1	8.8	8.6
New York	4.4	4.2	5.9
Alabama	2.9	3.1	3.2
Maryland	1.8	2.7	4.1
West Virginia	1.8	2.3	3.1
Michigan	.1	1.7	4.1
All others	10.7	7.5	6.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

***Pig-iron, steel-ingot, and finished hot-rolled capacity, by States, 1935, 1929, and 1938*—Con.**

[Capacity in long tons]

	Finished hot-rolled products		
	1935	[illegible]	1938
United States	46,185,300	55,972,200	[illegible]
Percent of total:			
Pennsylvania	40.5	38.6	32.7
Ohio	19.1	20.9	20.3
Indiana	12.6	10.5	11.9
Illinois	7.6	8.6	7.8
New York	6.5	6.7	4.7
Alabama	2.7	2.9	3.3
Maryland	1.6	2.1	3.6
West Virginia	2.2	2.1	3.5
Michigan	.7	1.1	5.1
All others	9.7	7.1	7.2
Total	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[1] This figure was calculated from these for production and average percent of capacity operated during the year.

Source: Figures for 1935 were compiled from the Iron and Steel Works Directory of the United States and Canada for 1936; those for 1929 are from the Iron and Steel Works Directory of the United States and Canada for 1930, and are taken from a table compiled by Daugherty, de Chazeau, and Stratton, Economics of the Iron and Steel Industry, p. 28; for those for 1938 were compiled from the Iron and Steel Works Directory of the United States and Canada for 1938.

BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation p. 163

Estimated per ton assembly costs in production of basic pig iron, 1934

[In dollars per long ton]

	Material			Total
	Iron ore	Coke	Flux	
Birmingham	[illegible]	[illegible]	None	2.885
Buffalo	3.257	2.607	0.370	[illegible]
Cleveland	[illegible]	3.050	.370	[illegible]
Pittsburgh	3.771	[illegible]	.37	[illegible]
Detroit	3.257	[illegible]	.370	[illegible]
Chicago	3.248	3.340	.370	[illegible]
Wheeling	3.771	[illegible]	.373	[illegible]
Youngstown	3.131	[illegible]	.39	[illegible]
St. Louis	[illegible]	[illegible]	.190	7.417
Ashland	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	7.436

NOTES: Material ratios used:

1.94 gross tons of ore per gross ton of pig iron, except for Birmingham for which a ratio of 2.5 gross tons was used.

1.54 net tons of coal (producing 1 ton net coke, i. e., 65 percent yield from coal) per gross ton of pig iron, except for Birmingham for which a ratio of [illegible] was used.

0.45 gross ton of limestone per gross ton of pig iron, except for Birmingham for which no limestone ratio was used (Birmingham was generally self-fluxing).

Source: Special computations made for Bureau of Business research, University of Pittsburgh, by H. R. Moorhouse, of Arthur G. McKee & Co., Cleveland, Ohio. Based on rail, rail-water, and water transportation according to typical routes over which the materials are transported to their districts. Costs are based on a 100-percent ore burden of 51.5 percent iron content.

Table is from C. R. Daugherty, M. G. de Chazeau, and S. S. Stratton, The Economics of the Iron and Steel Industry (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1937), vol. I, p. 378.

BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 116.

Relative cost (in dollars) of transporting raw materials for the production of 1 ton of basic pig iron in various districts, 1939

	Material			Total
	Iron ore	Coking coal	Limestone	
Cleveland	5.502	5.130	[illegible]	8.912
Buffalo	5.502	[illegible]	[illegible]	8.737
Detroit	5.502	[illegible]	[illegible]	7.171
Pittsburgh	[illegible]	.734	[illegible]	[illegible]
Youngstown	[illegible]	[illegible]	.207	[illegible]

***Relative cost (in dollars) of transporting raw materials for the production of 1 ton of basic pig iron in various districts, 1939*—Continued**

	Material			Total
	Iron ore	Coking coal	Limestone	
Wheeling	6.150	0.887	.414	7.451
Ashland	6.344	1.340	.414	8.098
Chicago	3.415	[illegible]	.270	7.170
Birmingham	1.375	1.760	None	3.135

NOTE.—Assumptions: (a) 1.94 gross tons (2,240 pounds) of ore per gross ton of pig iron, except for Birmingham, for which a ratio of 2.50 gross tons of ore per gross ton of pig iron was used.

(b) 1.54 net tons (2,000 pounds) of coal, 65 percent yield of furnace coke from coal, per gross ton of pig iron, except for Birmingham, for which a ratio of 2.07 net tons of coal per gross ton of pig iron was used.

(c) 0.45 gross ton of limestone per gross ton of pig iron, except for Birmingham, for which no limestone ratio was used (Birmingham ores are generally self-fluxing).

(d) The computations are based on 100 percent ore burden of 50 percent iron content and on rail, rail-water and water transportation according to routes over which materials are usually transported to the several districts.

(e) No scrap used in burden except that produced at mill works.

Source: William A. Haven, The Manufacture of Pig Iron in America, p. 22. BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 117.

***Estimated per ton assembly costs in the production of basic pig iron*[1]**

[In dollars per long ton]

	Material			Total
	Iron ore	Coal	Flux	
Birmingham	1.25	1.64	[illegible]	[illegible]
Gary	3.52	[illegible]	.26	7.77
Pittsburgh	5.88	.31	.37	[illegible]
Provo	2.87	2.30	.14	5.31
Pueblo	4.16	1.49	.43	[illegible]
San Bernardino	3.35	6.60	(3)	[illegible]

[1] No data was given in the source, but the data have been compiled recently and were said by the source to be an approximation to typical conditions in each district.

[2] Negligible.

Source: J. R. Mahoney, Basic Factors Affecting the Economic Soundness of the Developing Iron and Steel Industry of Utah and the West, Utah Economic and Business Review, June 1942, p. 5. The column on San Bernardino has been estimated by the author of this report.

BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 117.

***Ton-miles required to assemble raw materials for 1 long ton of pig iron*[1]**

Producing center	Iron ore		Coal		Limestone		Total		Total rail equivalent[2]
	Rail	Water	Rail	Water	Rail	Water	Rail	Water	
Pittsburgh	338	1,366	0	70	[illegible]	0	359	1,445	832
Chicago-Gary	142	1,550	[illegible]	[illegible]	0	[illegible]	377	2,304	[illegible]
Youngstown	[illegible]	1,366	127	0	5	0	562	1,366	507

[1] Railway mileages were obtained from Handy Railroad Maps of the United States (Chicago, Rand McNally & Co., 1942) and the Official Guide of the Railways and Steam Navigation Lines of the United States, Puerto Rico, Canada, Mexico, and Cuba (New York, National Railway Publication Co., January 1942). Mileages for the Great Lakes were obtained from Transportation of the Great Lakes, Transportation Series No. 1, 1937, Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army. Mileages for rivers were obtained from Light List: Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, 1942, U. S. Coast Guard.

[2] In reducing miles by water to their cost equivalent in rail miles the following ratios were used: Lakes, 9.43; rivers, 3.2:1; ocean, 18.81. The ratios for lakes and rivers are those used by J. R. Mahoney, Utah Economic and Business Review, June 1942, p. 5. In normal times the rate from Chile to Sparrows Point varied from $4.50 to $4.70 a ton, compared with a rate of 60 cents a ton on the Lakes. Thus, a given sum of money would carry iron ore twice as far on the ocean as on the Lakes.

***Ton-miles required to assemble raw materials for 1 long ton of pig iron*—Continued**

Producing center	Iron ore		Coal		Limestone		Total		Total rail equivalent[2]
	Rail	Water	Rail	Water	Rail	Water	Rail	Water	
Cleveland	123	1,366	194	0	0	122	317	1,488	475
Detroit	142	1,372	204	118	0	69	346	1,559	512
Buffalo	123	1,620	194	183	0	177	317	1,980	528
Bethlehem	110	0	225	0	4	0	339	0	339
Sparrow's Point	15	7,709	136	0	21	[illegible]	172	7,709	582
Hamilton	426	1,281	110	153	16	[illegible]	552	1,434	735
St. Louis	456	1,345	104	0	5	0	555	1,345	708
Birmingham	22	0	[1] 24	0	[1] 3	[illegible]	[1] 49	0	49
Duluth	142	0	435	851	0	141	577	992	673
Ashland	530	1,366	86	0	28	0	643	1,366	788
Weirton-Steubenville	303	1,366	0	153	28	0	331	1,519	522
Pueblo	640	0	126	0	[2] 42	[illegible]	808	0	808
Provo	392	0	154	0	[2] 10	[illegible]	556	0	556
San Bernardino	230	0	1,051	0	[2] 1	[illegible]	1,302	0	1,302

[1] Figures used by J. R. Mahoney, the same.

[2] In this and the following tables nautical miles have been converted to statute miles.

Source: BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 120.

***Number of ton-miles necessary to assemble the materials for 1 long ton of pig iron and to transport 1 long ton of steel to Chicago, at selected producing centers*[1]**

Producing center	Ton-miles per ton of steel			Ton-miles per ton of pig iron, rail equivalent[2]	Total ton-miles, rail equivalent
	Rail	Water	Total, rail equivalent		
Chicago-Gary	0	[illegible]	0	832	832
Birmingham	85	896	365	49	414
Detroit	0	633	122	512	634
Cleveland	0	740	142	475	617
Buffalo	0	893	172	528	700
Youngstown	63	740	207	507	714
Weirton-Steubenville	110	740	252	522	774
Pittsburgh	131	740	273	528	801
St. Louis	0	868	155	673	828
Duluth	0	365	114	708	822
Middletown	295	0	295	747	1,042
Ashland	[illegible]	1,201	375	788	1,163

[1] In this and the similar tables which follow, the water mileages have been reduced to their cost equivalent in rail mileages. The following ratios were used: Lake, 9.43; rivers, 3.2:1. These ratios were obtained by averaging the rates of tables 55 and 56. The ratio for rivers is the average of rates for a 500-ton minimum; the ratio for cargoes of 200-tons minimum is 2.1:1.

[2] The figures on pig iron for Middletown were obtained by taking the figure for Hamilton and adding 12 ton-miles, the distance between the 2 places being 12 miles. Hamilton, which does not make steel, supplies pig iron to Middletown, which does not have blast furnaces.

Source: BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 121.

Number of ton-miles necessary to assemble the materials for 1 long ton of pig iron and to transport 1 long ton of steel to Memphis, at selected producing centers

Producing center	Ton-miles per ton of steel			Ton-miles per ton of pig iron, rail equivalent	Total ton-miles rail equivalent
	Rail	Water	Total, rail equivalent		
Birmingham	252	[illegible]	252	49	301
St. Louis	0	405	127	[illegible]	835
Weirton-Steubenville	0	1,140	356	[illegible]	878
Pittsburgh	0	1,208	378	528	906
Ashland	0	885	277	673	950
Chicago-Gary	0	770	241	832	1,073

Source: BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 121.

Number of ton-miles necessary to assemble the materials for 1 long ton of pig iron and to transport 1 long ton of steel to Houston, at selected producing centers

Producing center	Ton-miles per ton of steel		Ton-miles per ton of pig iron, rail equivalent	Total ton-miles, rail equivalent
	Water	Total, rail equivalent		
Birmingham	968	[1] 328	49	377
St. Louis	1,673	523	708	1,231
Weirton-Steubenville	2,408	753	522	1,275
Pittsburgh	2,746	774	[illegible]	1,302
Ashland	2,153	[illegible]	[illegible]	1,461
Chicago	[illegible]	637	[illegible]	1,469

[1] Rail haul of 19 miles to Port Birmingham.

Source: BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 122.

Number of ton-miles necessary to assemble the materials for 1 long ton of pig iron and to transport 1 long ton of steel to Dallas, at selected producing centers

Producing center	Ton-miles per ton of steel		Ton-miles per ton of pig iron, rail equivalent	Total ton-miles, rail equivalent
	Water	Total, rail equivalent		
Birmingham	847	287	49	[illegible]
St. Louis	687	687	708	1,385
Pueblo	748	748	808	1,556

Source: BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 122.

Louisiana Leads in Welfare Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

LOUISIANA LEADS IN WELFARE AID—HIGGINS CITES REASONS FOR NATIONAL HIGH

Louisiana has the highest number of old-age pensioners in the Nation because she has gone to the trouble to investigate the need and try to fill it, State Commissioner of Public Welfare Lawrence E. Higgins said here Thursday.

Addressing the annual meeting of the Orleans Parish Department of Public Welfare at the Hutchinson Memorial Building, 1430 Tulane, Higgins said the dependency of large numbers of adults in this State harks back to the days following the War Between the States when the South's whole economy was upset.

Few opportunities and low wages in the intervening years, lack of medical care and proper diet have all contributed to a tremendous backlog of adult dependency, he said.

He foresaw a lowering of the adult case loads in future years provided child welfare and other programs are carried on adequately now.

Meantime, the mounting number of cases is neither "alarming nor surprising," he said.

In Orleans Parish in 1949, total assistance paid to needy people was $17,746,080.97. This was an increase of $8,421,781.33 over 1948.

Number of applications for aid decreased in 1949 by 6,229 to 13,497.

Despite the fewer applications, more money was spent because bigger payments are being made to applicants, said Miss Lillie H. Nairne, Orleans Parish welfare director. She said "more adequate care is being afforded."

Higgins called upon employees in the department to interpret the needs of assistance to the taxpaying public. He said taxpayers will gladly maintain the welfare services when they understand the need.

He said the Louisiana Department of Public Welfare is pushing for an expanded old-age and survivors insurance plan under social security, so that all wage earners in their years of productivity may provide for their periods of old age.

A break-down in last year's $17,000,000 expenditure is $11,369,490 for old-age assistance; $226,192 for aid to blind; $3,760,959 for aid to dependent children, and $2,389,438 for assistance to incapacitated adults from 18 to 65 years of age.

Average amount of money paid during the month of December was $47.28 to old-age beneficiaries; $49.12 to blind; $52.98 to dependent children, $42.90 to incapacitated adults.

William J. Guste, chairman of the Orleans Parish Board, said the 1949 operations of the department were "very successful and creditable." The department's functions, methods, and integrity have never been questioned because of the high type of sincere personnel employed, said Guste.

Expenditures for institutional care for 1949 were $110,640 for indigent men and women patients at Touro-Shakespeare Home; $53,092 for temporary care of uprooted children at Sophie Gumble Home, and $160,604 for delinquent boys and at the Milne Boys' Home.

Fifty-second Anniversary of the Sinking of the "Maine"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the fifty-second anniversary of a naval tragedy that more profoundly affected the fate of mankind and the history of the world than any other loss of ship or any destruction of an entire fleet in the records available for modern scrutiny.

February 15 of 1898 is a date the significance of which will grow with the centuries. We are still too close in proximity properly to give appraisement. The fact is clear, however, that with the sinking of the *Maine* in Habana harbor on February 15, 1898, was started a chain of events, tremendous in their impact, that brought to the high responsibility of world leadership the Nation of freedom-loving men and women that had grown from 13 straggling colonies on the Atlantic seaboard.

The period from the sinking of the *Maine* to the end of hostilities in World War II covered a half century during which three wars were fought and won and from which the United States of America emerged the first power of the world. Between each two of these wars was an intermission of peace, when muscles were being flexed, but the common circumstances that surrounded them and the inescapable consistency of the purposes of destiny that was revealed would justify the future historian, viewing at long range and writing when cause and effect had become a matter of recorded fact, to group the three separate wars—Spanish-American, World War I, and World War II—as one war, the 50-year war starting with the sinking of the *Maine* and ending with the bombing of Hiroshima, the 50-year war that ushered in the golden age of American influence as the first power of the earth.

It is immaterial at this time upon whom should be fixed the guilt of the *Maine's* destruction while anchored peacefully in a friendly harbor. Suffice that on the morning of February 16, 1898, when in the newspapers of an outraged Nation men and women of good will read of the death of 260 of their countrymen, sailors on the *Maine*, a hot wave of indignation swept into every crevice of the Nation and from the cities, the hamlets and the farms the cry "Remember the *Maine*" swelled into an irresistible chorus of demand.

Time has tempered the passions of the period, and today there is nowhere in the United States any desire to convict, without the positive evidence which never has been forthcoming, the then Government of Spain of a crime which if perpetrated was the most dastardly of any in all history. For the Spanish Government of the time, and the officers who served in its army and its navy, I can say only that after the opening of hostilities they fought honorably and cleanly a war which they lost.

But the sinking of the *Maine* was a large contributing influence in disrupting our relations with Spain, already strained. The Honorable William E. Mason, Senator from Illinois and father of the Honorable Lowell Mason, presently serving on the Federal Trade Commission, was one of the dynamic forces in the debates in the Congress which preceded the war. On April 12, 1898, almost 2 months after the *Maine* was destroyed, he said in the Senate:

> I am for war, and have been since the hour our flag was lowered in Habana Harbor and the lives of our citizens taken by the Government of Spain. * * * I have no desire to destroy the Spanish Nation, but her flag must be dishonored by surrendering her sovereignty over Cuban territory as an stonement for lowering our flag, sinking our ship, and murdering our men.

The war with Spain was fought and won in 101 days, her Pacific and her Atlantic fleet completely annihilated and in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines the flower of her once proud all-powerful armies crushed by the greatest all-volunteer army in the history of warfare.

Because the victory of the American arms was so quick and so devastating the legend, properly resented by Spanish war veterans, has grown with the years that Spain was a set-up.

To get the picture straight, as it was seen by the people who lived in that period just before the sinking of the

Maine, permit me to quote from an editorial in the London Globe of June 1897:

> The American Navy is absolutely unfit to protect the islands of Hawaii, which lie at the mercy of any Spanish ships appearing at Honolulu, while Japan's sea power is so immeasurably superior to that of the United States that a Japanese naval demonstration would place President McKinley in a difficult and perilous position.

If I here may be permitted for the moment a personal note, and only for the purpose of giving a better understanding to a younger generation of the "spirit of 1898," born in the heat of wrath over the destruction of the *Maine* and which was destined to continue for half a century of warfare, with intermittent periods of peace, to permeate the hearts and minds of Americans: When the news came of the tragedy in Havana Harbor, I was 15 years of age, a sophomore in the high school at Benton, Harbor, Mich. With seven other boys in that high school in Michigan I forthwith enlisted for the period of hostilities and until the *Maine* had been remembered so that nowhere ever again would American lives be endangered by the treachery of professing friends.

A little over 4 months after the sinking of the *Maine* those eight high-school boys from Benton Harbor, wearing winter clothing in the heat of the tropics and armed with smoking Springfields to face the modern smokeless Mausers of the Spanish defenders, were splashing through the waters of the Carribbean from the small boats from the transport toward the Spanish earthworks at Siboney defending Santiago.

On July 1, 1898, when the first general assault was made on Santiago, with Teddy Roosevelt and the Rough Riders storming San Juan Hill, it was the Thirty-third Michigan Volunteer Infantry, mostly high-school boys with antiquated smoking Springfields and wearing on the hottest day they had ever known an issue of heavy winter clothing, that held Shafter's attacking line on the coast of the Carribbean at Fort Aquadores. It was M Company that suffered the first casualties, M Company every soldier of which was the son of a veteran of Grant's army from the North, and when I in I Company, stationed immediately ahead of M Company, heard of the deaths among those sons of veterans the thought ran through my mind that in the grief of their parents would be mingled the pride of blood running true to blood.

Although my pride and my heart ever have been with that old Thirty-third Michigan Volunteer Infantry that went largely from the high schools of Michigan to the battlefield at Santiago, a sense of the proprieties on this occasion would have commanded my silence on the subject of any specific regiment, and certainly of my own regiment.

But yesterday I learned for the first time that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] also was a soldier in the Thirty-third Michigan Volunteer Infantry, a private in Company H, from Owosso, and I thought it noteworthy that after these 52 years, of the four veterans of the Spanish-American War in the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, two, or 50 percent of the whole, were from the old Thirty-third Michigan Volunteer Infantry.

Under the circumstances, and in justice to the memory of young Shanks, about my age, who, after the Santiago campaign, went to the Philippines and fell in action over half a century ago; of Charlie Loeffler, and so many others who fell in action or who died of fever, including the brother of my beloved friend, Arthur Evans, of the Chicago Tribune, I could not remain silent about the regiment of high-school boys, and the boys from the towns and farms, that was the first volunteer outfit after the Rough Riders to land in Cuba and which, 52 years after that landing, had two survivors serving in the Congress of the United States dedicating themselves to the task of saving our country from another and more devastating war.

Four of the Members of this House are veterans of the Spanish-American War which followed the sinking of the *Maine*. Another of my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], was a soldier in the Thirty-fifth Michigan Volunteer Infantry, of which the then Secretary of War, Russell A. Alger, had been colonel. I trust the State of my adoption, Illinois—where I have spent all my adult life, where my children were born, and which, to the best of my ability and with devotion I have served—will not hold me as one giving preference to the State of my nativity when I direct the attention which I think due, to the fact that of the four Members of this body who served in the Spanish-American War, three served in Michigan regiments.

The fourth veteran of this war of 52 years ago who is a Member of this body is the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], whose long and honorable service in this body has been a sequel to that service to country, to justice, and to humanity which he rendered as a young soldier in the American Army which landed in 1898 in Puerto Rico and took the oppressed people of that island under the folds of the American flag.

Only four of us. It has been a long time since the cry "Remember the *Maine*" stirred America as perhaps never before it had been stirred. But from that cry has followed a sequence of events which only the historian of the future properly can evaluate. The spirit of 1898 was the spirit of American idealism. To Spain, defeated, we gave the hand of friendship, exacting none of the tribute of the conqueror. To the peoples of Cuba and Puerto Rico we gave bountifully of our means to save them from threatened starvation and to aid in their rehabilitation. To the Philippines we sent our doctors, our nurses, and our school teachers, pouring out our wealth with no expectation of return, other than the satisfaction of adding another self-respecting, self-governing, independent nation to the family of the world. That was the spirit of 1898, which has not faltered and which will continue to prevail despite the threat of dictatorship, atomic bombs, and the destruction of civilization through biological warfare and hydrogen bombs.

It is not reasonably to be expected that the number of Spanish-American veterans on the floor of this historic Chamber ever will be increased. Another decade, more or less, and no one in this House will represent that war of 52 years ago that started the United States of America on the way to world leadership.

It is our hope that in our absence this anniversary of February 15 will be observed annually in this Chamber during all the years to come, when in the spirit of 1898 and idealism that is its embodiment, our country, with large responsibility for human contentment, shall lead mankind from the fog of strife and friction to the heights of brotherhood.

Do not underwrite the Spanish-American War. Do not minimize the significance of the February 15 memorial anniversary which today and tonight every Spanish-American War veteran is joining with the representatives of all patriotic orders in observing with fitting ceremonies.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot close without mentioning a letter which I received from a good woman in Columbia, S. C., and which brought vividly back to mind the yellow-fever experiment in Cuba many, many years ago when soldiers of the Spanish-American War permitted themselves to be inoculated with deadly yellow-fever germs that medicine might score another great triumph in the eradication of this dread disease. The letter is from Mrs. May Jernegan, box 97, Columbia, S. C., and reads:

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA:

I am very much interested in (the House memorial service) having lived in Cuba during the Spanish-American War, with my husband until our Government troops left the island.

I am 74 years old, the widow of Warren G. Jernegan, who during his Spanish War service, rendered extra service to science, humanity, and our Government. He took more yellow-fever experiments than any of that group of men at Camp Lazear, Quemados, Mariano, Cuba, under the yellow-fever board of which Walter Reed was the head. Walter Reed's memory lives in the great Walter Reed Hospital in Washington. My husband's memory lives only in the heart of his wife and only child—for he has slept in a lonely grave in Spartanburg, S. C., for he was still in the Government employ * * * at the date of his death in 1919. He died during the flu epidemic.

My husband was the only man to take four different experiments and the only man to take the inoculation of human yellow-fever blood from the Spaniard, Jose Martinez. In this experiment they took the syringe of yellow-fever blood from the Spaniard and my husband permitted them to inject this Spaniard's yellow-fever blood into his own system, from which my husband became desperately ill—thus proving the yellow-fever theory.

I have an 8-ounce gold congressional medal of his for this service, and congressional pension of $125 per month for this service. This pension has never been increased. Other widows have had their pensions increased, but my congressional pension was not increased 20 percent like theirs.

I also have a Panama Medal given my husband for his Panama service during the building of the Panama Canal where my son and I lived with him for many years. This medal was given him by Teddy Roosevelt. * * *

I thank you.

Very truly,

Mrs. MAY JERNEGAN.

It was 21 years ago this month of February that the Congress gave recognition to the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever. One name was omitted from that list of heroes, and for 21 years Gustaf E. Lambert has fought in the "spirit of 1898" for that recognition of his magnificent service which cruelly and without adequate reason has been denied him. He is now an old man, his health is frail, and his days are numbered, and he hopes, and I pray, that before he has passed to the final rendezvous of all heroes, the Congress of his country at long last will have added his name to those of the others recognized for high public service in the yellow-fever experiments of the Spanish-American War.

Our distinguished and beloved former colleague, the Honorable Raymond McKeough, who for years represented brilliantly the district which now I have the honor to represent, introduced a bill to give this recognition to Gustaf E. Lambert, but for reasons difficult to fathom the opposition blocked the way to this doing of simple justice.

At the request of many comrades of the Spanish-American War, and responding to the resolutions passed by the United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Illinois, and posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I introduced the same bill in the Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 2257. I think it is fitting that on this occasion, when we are observing the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*, attention should be called to the case of the one hero of the yellow fever experiments in Cuba who so far has been left shivering in the cold of his country's ingratitude.

It is said by some who stubbornly stand in opposition that Lambert was only an army nurse as though being a nurse should deprive a hero of a hero's recognition.

I bespeak for my comrade, Gustaf E. Lambert, and in behalf of all surviving veterans of the war of 52 years ago, the sympathetic consideration of H. R. 2257. That my colleagues may know the facts from a first-hand source I read the following letter dated March 3, 1949, from Paul L. Tate, 1530 Tyler Street, Berkeley, Calif., to the Honorable JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., a copy of which has been furnished me:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing this to ask your support of House bill No. 2257, asking recognition of the work of Dr. Roger Post Ames and Nurse Gust. E. Lambert for their work during the yellow-fever experiments conducted by the Walter Reed Board in Cuba during 1900–1901.

I was the clerk of the Hospital Corps at Columbia Barracks, Cuba, during the time of these experiments and have some familiarity with the subject.

I kept the post hospital records and knew personally all the doctors there, including the members of the board and their various duties. I also knew personally all the members of the Hospital Corps who volunteered for the yellow-fever experiments, and saw most of them daily before and after the experiments.

There is one thing that is not generally known: After these men were inoculated with the fever virus by infected mosquitoes and/or blood transfusion, they were then treated by one doctor only, and that one was Dr. Roger Post Ames. That all of them were cared for by one nurse only, Gust. E. Lambert, of the Hospital Corps. And that every one of these cases was cured.

Not only that, but Dr. Ames and Nurse Lambert treated and cured (including all the experimental cases) about 67 cases of yellow fever. Many other cases of Army personnel and officers treated by other doctors and nurses during this same period died of the disease.

I well remember the horror we all had of yellow fever—its mystery, and swift, awful, death. So I know for a certainty that if only one of these experimental cases had died, there would have been no more volunteers to conduct the experiments with, and it would have ended in failure.

But the wonderful success of Dr. Ames and Nurse Lambert in curing each case as it developed encouraged more volunteers to take the risk.

Another fact not generally known is that neither Ames nor Lambert were immune to the disease. They were both as vulnerable to it as anyone else, and, in fact, Dr. Ames did contract yellow fever during the final phase of the experiments, and yet through the aid of Lambert saved another patient from death while he himself was sick.

Dr. Ames, besides being the only physician to treat these cases, personally made transfers of infected blood and applied disease-bearing mosquitoes to experimental cases at various times. So he performed practically every duty that any member of the board did and more.

As for the Hospital Corps men who bravely volunteered for these experiments, without detracting one iota from the courage of any one of them, I still think that, all facts considered, Gust. E. Lambert was their equal or better in heroism. During the contagion tests each volunteer went through his siege, but Lambert, equally vulnerable, worked and slept constantly in these quarters, never leaving day or night through all these tests. He took more chances of becoming infected than all of them combined.

No one has solicited me to write this and I have no special interest in the case, but I wish only to add my testimony in the hope that it will aid long-delayed justice to two of the key figures in that great medical experiment that conquered one of the most terrible scourges, yellow fever. At least I was there, and present briefly here just a few of the facts known to me.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL L. TATE.

Potatoes, Politicians, and Atom Bombs: Aroostook County Has Done Its Job Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Potatoes, Politicians, and Atom Bombs: Aroostook County Has Done Its Job Well," published in the Bangor (Maine) Commercial of February 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POTATOES, POLITICIANS, AND ATOM BOMBS: AROOSTOOK COUNTY HAS DONE ITS JOB WELL

Today our editorial, which is rather longer than most, deals with potatoes, politicians, and atom bombs:

Potatoes, because we are pro-Aroostook, for reasons which we think are sound.

Politicians, because we think too many of them are too willing to play politics with Aroostook County's future.

Atom bombs, because we suspect that too few people are looking at the problem of our food surpluses in its true light. A clearer view may reveal that everyone with a stake in civilization has a vital interest in what happens to Aroostook's potatoes.

The price-support crisis that is making headlines out of potatoes has brought plenty of resounding statements from Washington. As yet it hasn't brought anything that is very constructive.

Congressmen, like other people, aren't fond of solving difficult problems. It's easier to blame somebody when the going gets rough.

As soon as it became known that many of 1949's spuds would be returned to rot on the fields that bore them, the name calling started. Some of our lawmakers began lambasting the growers.

Representative THOMAS J. LANE, Democrat, of Massachusetts, whose constituents live by Government-protected manufactures, called the potato farmers a parasite group. Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida, whose State is at the early end of the potato-growing cycle, piously described Maine growers as "principal sinners" in the price-support crisis.

SCOTT W. LUCAS, Democrat, of Illinois, the Senate majority leader, got even more sanctimonious this past week. He talked of "those potato farmers who are taking advantage of the pocketbook of Uncle Sam." A "scandalous situation," he said.

The whole performance was absurd. What is needed is less oratory and fault-finding—and more common sense.

First of all, Congress makes the laws. If there has been something grievously wrong with the law affecting potato prices, then it would seem that Congressmen, rather than farmers, are at fault.

We suggest, too, that the veil is going to have to be ripped away from a lot of economic hypocrisy before Congress gets to first base with any proper remedial measures.

Hoisting the standard of free enterprise, a lot of professional banner waivers are pretending that it would be quite all right to turn potatoes over to the tender mercies of the law of supply and demand. They talk as though there is something inherently wicked in supporting the price of potatoes.

But in our book Aroostook County has no need to apologize for the fact that its principal crop is price-supported.

Have you heard the steel industry apologize for the governmental protective wall that has safeguarded the prices of its products for so many generations?

Do you hear Representative LANE and his home town (Lawrence, Mass.) apologizing for the tariff protection given to the textile mills?

Are any apologies made by the spokesmen of many other industries that have enjoyed governmental largess in one form or another since Alexander Hamilton and other sound men introduced the protective tariff? Or

by the growers of other price-supported farm crops?

And, if supply and demand are supposed to rule supreme, how about labor? Is it bad to support the price of potatoes but good to support the price of labor with a minimum-wage law? Mr. Lucas seems to see no inconsistency in his loudly proclaimed position. But we do.

One man's free enterprise, it seems, is another man's parasite.

Further economic hypocrisy is involved, we believe, in what looks like a definite effort to whittle down Aroostook's earned share of the Nation's annual potato output.

By the most orthodox teachings of traditional economics, men and regions are entitled to produce the things they produce most economically. It simply doesn't make sense that Aroostook, which produces potatoes more efficiently than anybody else, should suffer production curtailments for the sake of others who can't produce them as efficiently.

If the price-support plan is to be readjusted, why readjust it in a way that puts a penalty on being up to date and knowing how? Neither sound economics nor national interest is going to be served by shackling Aroostook just because it has done the world's best job of raising potatoes.

Now let's go a step farther. Let's see what is sinful or scandalous about producing food in a hungry world.

Unless all the ancient virtues are dead, and they aren't, the ethics of potato raising require that a man do the best job he can. If he can raise more on an acre, it's not only his privilege but his ethical obligation—his social responsibility—to do so. It's his equivalent of industry's honest day's work.

One may well talk of sin and scandal in connection with the destruction of potatoes in a world in which many people lack food. But the sin cannot be laid at the door of the man who raised the potatoes. He did his part.

We are pro-Aroostook because we like Aroostook's way of doing things. In its particular branch of agriculture, the county is modern civilization's advance guard. It has been showing the world how food can be produced in the twentieth-century way. It has been showing the world how to have a better future.

Aroostook's potato crop is just as much a product of modern science as the atom bomb. They have another affinity in that wars are fought, in large measure, over food. Rake the ashes of the last two wars and you will find the bones of people who could be led to destruction because they wanted more to eat.

In time of war we are a bold and imaginative people. We marshal our best brains, unleashed our resources, and take huge problems in our stride.

In time of peace, apparently, the too successful cultivation of potatoes can throw us for a loss.

Face enough facts, and you collide with this plain truth: Potatoes are going to be destroyed—in a world that still needs potatoes—simply because the American people as a whole haven't been ingenious enough, industrious enough, or even interested enough to find out what else to do with them.

The American taxpayer who feels that he can't feed the world may do well to start counting the comparative costs of potatoes and atom bombs.

As we see it, Aroostook points up the epic challenge of our times.

It is a challenge that calls for our best brains and our most earnest effort.

If Congress, for instance, could just do its job as well as Aroostook has been doing its job of raising potatoes, we suspect that things would be a lot different. And if all the rest of us—taxpayers, voters, and civil leaders—could rise to the same standard of performance, we would have solved much more than a marketing problem.

We'd be well on our way toward learning how to live in the twentieth century.

Economic and Military Problems in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on February 16, 1950, Gen. William J. Donovan delivered a very important address on the occasion of the presentation to him by Columbia University of the Alexander Hamilton award. His address deals with the very important economic and military problems in the Pacific. I think General Donovan is probably one of the best informed Americans on the situation in Asia, and I think the Members of this body will be very much interested in reading the address. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Soviet Union has completed the conquest of China and this has been given formal approval by the 30-year peace treaty.

Throughout the Far East this marks a defeat for the United States.

This victory now makes Russia the dominant power in Asia as well as in Europe.

There may be disagreement whether this breach of the former balance of power in Asia has already gone so far that it threatens our security. "But there can be no difference of opinion that the balance of power on which formal peace depends will be hopelessly upset if the Russians carry out their projected extension of the Chinese conquest to Indochina, Hong Hong, the Philippines, Siam, Malaya, Indonesia and Burma. This was the path by which the Japanese before them got all the way to India.

I visited all these countries, except Burma and Korea, and also visited Japan. During my trip the Russians boldly announced that they were going to try for just such an extension of their continental conquest. They made that announcement by recognizing the Communist revolutionary parties as the Government of French Indochina. Within a week the Western Powers had to accept the challenge. The British, the French and ourselves recognized the opposition government of Bao Dai. In Asia it is completely appreciated that the Russians have declared a subversive war on the rest of non-Communist Asia and ourselves. I wonder if the significance of that choosing up of sides has really come home to us here in the United States.

In the face of this Russian declaration of further conquest beyond China, with the Russians having demonstrated that they do know how to wage this kind of war, the non-Communist Asiatics wonder if the poet Shelley does describe us, if we indeed are "An ineffectual angel beating in the void his luminous wings in vain."

They want to be on our side if we're safe to be with—if we can be relied upon to stick with them when the going gets bad.

What is there we can do to justify their reliance upon us? What are the elements in that area that we can pull together for the sake of the people there as well as for our peace and security? As a line of departure I accept the statement of the Secretary of State that "It is hardly necessary for me to say that an attack on the Philippines could not and would not be tolerated by the United States but I hasten to add that no one perceives the imminence of any such attack." Let us see how, even at this late day, this defense could be accomplished.

Southeast Asia stretches from the subcontinent of India to the Australia subcontinent. In the center of this great south Asian triangle lies the spreading culture of Southeast Asia—on the Indochinese Peninsula, on Burma, Siam, and Malaya; on the island at its base are the archipelagoes of Indonesia and the Philippines.

Within this triangle live almost 600,000,000 people or about 25 percent of humanity.

The first thing we have to do is to recognize that the theater is one theater—Burma, India, Siam, Indochina, Manila, Malaya, Formosa, Korea, Japan.

That it is all one in spite of the differences that lie between. That it is one in which victories won, time gained, or material salvaged, in Indochina or Formosa, may greatly help in an intelligent defense of the Philippines or in the reconstruction of Burma or Indonesia.

When we look at our map and wipe out of our minds the wartime artificial separation into theaters of operation, we see that the Western Pacific is a strategic unit of which the Philippines are an integral part.

There is disorder to the point of chaos in Burma. Yet it is the bulwark before India and only speedy political and economic reform can save it from Soviet exploitation. In Indochina the Soviet has picked Ho Chi-Minh, to do there what they used Mao to do in China proper. In Malaya the British are contending against a campaign of ambush and assassination by the Malayan Communist Party.

Japan and its associated islands 1,600 miles from the Philippines give it protection from the north and Formosa almost halfway between must be denied to enemy occupation by Nationalist China until next June at least.

Indonesia is the master key for the defense of the Philippines because with Malaya it forms a protective shield against the south and that shield is given depth by Australia only 300 miles south of it. Strategically, Southeast Asia is of more than local interest. Whoever controls the Strait of Malacca and Singapore dominates a sea route comparable in importance with the Panama Canal. Indonesia is an island gate between the Pacific and the Indian Ocean. In 1942 Japan took the islands and broke out of the Pacific to extend its operations as far west as Ceylon. The Indian Ocean may well be the warm water target that Russia has always sought.

The American naval and air bases in the Philippines are only a thousand miles from Saigon in French Indochina.

Indonesia is the most important of the southeast Asian countries that have emerged from colonial status into nationhood. An archipelago stretching nearly 4,000 miles, or one-seventh of the way around the earth, and and having some 750,000 square miles of land area, and a population of 75,000,000.

It is probably the most westernized of the far-eastern countries. Its economic, financial, and even its transport system are based upon Western models. It is even by modern standards rich in resources and is fully able

to repay any loans advanced to it for reconstruction and capital expenditures.

Its top leadership is anti-Communist by conviction. Although on lower levels there is needed experience in organization and administration, the government in control is about the best that could be obtained. The four or five leading men are competent and honest. They seek United States technical advice both of an industrial and military nature. If we could meet this request for aid as well as counsel, our position would gain strength from the fact that for the last 2 years we have carried out a policy there, consistent, definite, and to a degree successful.

In addition, our Ambassadors in the vital countries of India, Siam, and Indonesia are men of training, experience, and understanding. They already have the respect and friendship of those countries to which they are accredited.

There is general agreement among those whose opinion should be given weight that Russia has a program in southeast Asia and that the timetable for that program has been stepped up in an endeavor to take full advantage of the momentum from their speedy victories in China.

The urgency requires leadership now. It requires a leader—whether you call him a supreme commander or a high commissioner with the authority, the experience, and the ability to deal with political as well as military problems. He should be vested with the discretion to deal with those problems on the spot and should be located in the theater close enough to see it at first hand, yet not so close as to lose his perspective.

The cooperation of the British, the French, and the Dutch would be eagerly given, and they know our leadership is needed. The establishment of such leadership would be welcomed by the people of the countries concerned and would allay their present fear that we would abandon them.

We must make clear to them that having picked our friends we will stay with them to the finish whatever the consequence.

We have a precedent for this action.

In June 1948 Russia, in the Berlin blockade, employed a menacing and dangerous tactic to test the will of the Western Allies and to stop the European recovery program at the outset.

General Clay met the challenge with boldness and resolution. The dramatic success of operation "vittles," which maintained Berlin's food supply despite the seizure of the city, caught the Soviets flatfooted with surprise.

General Clay saw that if the Soviets intended war, war could not be avoided by a retreat from Berlin. On the contrary, it would mean that we would be driven progressively to weaker positions. He saw, too, that if Russia was bluffing, that the moment had come to call the bluff or to surrender the initiative he had won.

The courageous and common-sense action of General Clay in that crisis is a guide and an example for us all.

We have shown our great desire for peace with Russia and our willingness to settle differences. But we have learned that up to now at least agreement with the Russians is a hopeless illusion.

We now see that what happens in Berlin or in Peking has its repercussions in every area of the world where our country and the Soviet Union face each other. It is a war of subversion on a global scale in which Russia is trying to whipsaw us from one side of the world to the other.

We must win now the war in which we find ourselves. It is a war which on many fronts Russia has been waging and winning. A war that we can lose without a shot being fired. A war that, if we win, may make impossible a shooting war. We can neither buy our way out nor appease our way out. Our strength must be found in ourselves—in our decision and in our resolution.

Leadership in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, immediately following the printing of the address delivered on February 16 by General Donovan, a very valuable editorial entitled "Leadership in Asia," published in the New York Herald Tribune of last Saturday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEADERSHIP IN ASIA

The revolutionary changes that have swept over eastern Asia during the last few years in an accelerating tempo of change have found the United States, in great measure, unprepared. Successive missions by individuals and groups, conferences of ministers and ambassadors such as that which recently ended in Bangkok, long and futile exchanges of recriminations in Congress and the press, have all testified to a basic lack of organization and intelligence (in the military sense) in respect to a vast and complex continent. It was toward that situation, no less than toward the spreading danger of Communist expansion in Asia, that Gen. William J. Donovan directed his address on Thursday night.

General Donovan proposes effective leadership, the appointment of an official representative of the United States, "with the authority, the experience, and the ability to deal with political as well as military problems" in Asia. His theater of operations would be vast, territorially, but it is so closely linked strategically that no confusion or cross-purposes should be permitted to divorce policy in the Philippines, for instance, from policy in Indonesia. He would need discretionary powers for an emergency, but the over-all program would have to be laid down clearly in advance, and close liaison with Washington is essential. Such an individual, backed with a suitable organization, would be evidence of America's intention to form a core of resistance to communism; it would also provide the information and the operative facilities needed to enlist the support of the peoples of the area and provide channels through which to strengthen the native forces of freedom.

A high commissioner for southeast Asia would not, needless to say, be the whole answer to the multiplying problems of that continent. The creation of such an office would not absolve the State Department, the Defense Establishment, Congress, or the American people from the hard thinking and strong action which the Asiatic dilemma demands. Rather, it would be a tool, a very useful tool if filled competently and used imaginatively, to implement American purposes in a region full of peril. General Donovan's suggestion is well worth consideration—in some form or other what he proposes must be done, and done speedily.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, on the occasion of Brotherhood Week, now being celebrated throughout the United States, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very incisive address by a citizen of Connecticut, Mr. Joseph J. Morrow, personnel manager of Pitney-Bowes, Inc., of Stamford, Conn., before the Catholic Interracial Council of New York on November 20, 1949, entitled "Prejudice—A Moral Problem."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREJUDICE—A MORAL PROBLEM

We've heard a lot about prejudice in the past few years, associated mainly with the problems of American minorities. Not many people nowadays would be caught admitting they were prejudiced about anything. There are a few exceptions, of course, such as the rather notable southern gentleman who earlier this month offered to devote a breathtaking sum of money to the cause of segregation, with a lack of success that was equally notable. To us, he seems a perfect example of extreme prejudice; but when we stop and think, a good many of our own daily actions are guided by prejudices which take the form of likes and dislikes about a variety of things—feelings which have no sensible basis. Localized in our own lives, they harm few people, if any. Still, their existence can help us understand how easily prejudices are formed, and how, spread out as race attitudes, they can defeat Christian purposes more readily than conscious scheming ever could.

We all recognize now that negative feelings about people who belong to certain racial or religious groups are an extremely disturbing factor in our country, and one of utmost importance to us right now. After all, every American, at some point in this world, is a member of a minority—one of less than a 150,000,000, among a world population counted in billions. The American is set apart by his thinking and his ideals from a very great part of the world; and is different in ways which have lined him up willy-nilly, on one side of an ideological struggle with an aggressive and powerful opponent. We must not forget for a moment that American Negroes, or Jews, are not the only Red Riding Hoods in this world; on that there is more than one kind of wolf in the forest. Justice and self-protection have become inseparable for us; and Americans of all races and all beliefs must cling together for their common salvation as they never have before.

Just not to be prejudiced against a minority group isn't enough. Passive tolerance is certainly a more valuable attribute than intolerance, of course, but its value is limited to the tolerator himself. On the other hand, tolerance combined with action develops a chain reaction which increases daily. I think that's the kind of tolerance we are beginning to have in much larger quantities than before. The evidence is in the press; in the growing number of State fair employment practice laws; in organized promotion of unrestricted job opportunities for Negroes in many cities; and even in the

movies. Most everyone reads the papers and goes to the movies; and both have tremendous influence on public thinking. Continued increase in the number of fair employment practice laws, and in local fair employment efforts, means that more and more people will eventually either be working with Negroes, or will at least know someone who does. At the same time, they'll be learning first-hand that a Negro is a normal human being, with a personality as separate and distinct as any white man's—that he is someone who certainly doesn't look or act like a social or economic menace.

These are some of the results we can get, and are getting, from the growth of aggressive tolerance. If I have made them sound like cure-alls, I haven't meant to. Naturally, these weapons have little effect yet in those parts of the Nation where the causes of prejudice are deep-rooted and complex, and often expressed with violence. Nor can they be immediately effective with those whose prejudice stems from strong personal insecurity. There are many kinds of insecure people. You all know the fellow who becomes angry and feels frustrated when he sees a Negro driving a new car; who is resentful when a Negro takes over the shop bench next to his and gets an identical wage for his work. There is the salesgirl, too, who waits on the Negro woman with coldness and barely humiliation, and the mother who first teaches her child about bias when she tells him his dark-skinned playmate doesn't belong.

The people with only a little of those feelings are the most receptive to education in tolerance when they are exposed to it. As a group, they are also the people who live in a reassuring, well-established home and community atmosphere, free from physical need. They are quite different from the group in the hand-to-mouth economic bracket, whose lower living and social standards paradoxically increase their estrangement from the even more underprivileged Negro. They are different from this group because the idea of advancement for the Negro is no real threat to their own firm and well-defined position in our social structure. They can afford to be generous.

What bridge, or link, then, can be provided for those people whose precarious spot in our class structure prevents their accepting the idea of equal job rights and fair personal treatment for Negroes? Obviously the link must provide an incentive toward sympathy which is stronger than fear-bred race hatred and compelling enough to overcome the compensating belief in the righteousness of their hatred.

In each man's life there is only one influence which can meet these requirements. It is his church. The Christian and Jewish religions are the strongholds of the philosophic idea of brotherhood among men—not the destructively leveling brotherhood of collectivism, but the kinship in love and hope of those who worship God. All arguments against discrimination must have their roots in religion if they are to furnish convincing answers to the "why?" of the biased.

I do not in any sense believe that the amount of prejudice in the United States is a sign that the faith of American Christians is weakening. If all Christians were automatically infallible, there would be no need for the spiritual leadership which heavenly wisdom has provided through our church. And when Christian souls are plagued by unchristian resentments, the church need only raise its voice enough to reach beyond these statistics.

At this point I want to fall back on my own experience in the city where I live and work, to make a statement which I am sure must hold true in many other parts of our country. Prejudice in our city of Stamford is no greater than that in any other northern industrial city, but the prejudice I have found does not come from our old Yankee stock, but from some of the comparative newcomers—the first or second generation Americans who come to the United States from Italy, Poland, Ireland, or any other country you might mention. The country isn't important; but it is important that some of these people are not yet secure and settled enough in their jobs and community relationships to be ready for the idea of equal working opportunities for Negroes in industry and commerce. They are good citizens otherwise; and they can respond to the kind of guidance which will stir their consciences. For these people, help should and will come from the church, particularly our own Catholic Church—because a majority of such newly transplanted citizens are Catholics, from Catholic countries. This is not more a reflection upon catholicism than the bigotry of some southerners should be considered a reflection upon protestantism. But to me it is a sign that the church's voice ought to be raised especially for these people, to give them understanding of true tolerance, how it may be applied within their own lives, and to what end. Along with the immense satisfaction of practicing their Catholic faith as it is meant to be practiced, those who listen to the church's voice will find a good measure of the security in community existence which has been lost somewhere along the way. For what can add more to a man's self-respect and spiritual fulfillment than knowing he is capable of replacing his fear with compassion; his hatred with friendship; and his self-seeking with charity?

The subject of race attitudes in foreign-born Americans produced an interesting by-product when I was discussing it a few weeks ago with a young Negro employee at Pitney-Bowes. He spoke of the excellent treatment given the Negro GI's in the western countries of Europe during the war, and the cordiality and friendship they found nearly every place they went. He told me that many Negroes, received warmly in the churches, homes, and public places of Italy, have actually returned there to live. They have found complete freedom to work at any job for which their abilities have qualified them, or to continue their education in any of Italy's universities.

While the welcome they were offered in Europe was undoubtedly extended, in part, because of their status as United States soldiers, I believe it was due mainly to the generally recognized absence in Europe of anything which could be called class feeling against Negroes. This doesn't prove that Europeans are basically more generous than we; or even that they have learned to be. Race tolerance isn't something human beings are born with, to be unlearned later; it simply does not exist unless a set of unnatural conditions have produced it. The Negro was never a slave in Europe, or an economic problem; and he has no history of social ostracism there to frustrate his attempts to live as others do. How ironical it seems to hear American Negroes, even a few, finding their free home in Europe, while western Europeans look to the United States, with hope and longing, as the land of the free.

Class patterns in the United States explain easily why the Negro has been so often labelled "inferior," in spite of proof that, all things being equal, his mentality and spirit are identical with the white man's. Class levels are chiefly levels of material worth, and the Negro, as a whole, still exists on the fringe of the very lowest economic bracket—the spot into which he immediately fell upon his release from slavery, and where prejudice has kept him ever since. Many brilliant Negroes, of course, have carved out places for themselves which are in true proportion to their worth; but still mor have fallen by the wayside trying—college men working as janitors, college women working as domestics; intelligent high-school graduates often not working at all. Industry and commerce, in many States, are already beginning to recognize their personal responsibility to do something about this tragically wasteful aspect of prejudice, and to accept it by employing Negroes in capacities which are equal to their skills.

Well-paying jobs are the only practical answer to the question of how to remove the Negro from the "inferior" class into which poverty has forced him. We are doing our best at Pitney-Bowes to meet our own responsibility; and we know that not one of our Negro employees is "inferior" in any sense. We have chosen them carefully for the skilled jobs in which most have been placed; but we have not gone beyond our own locality to find them. We will employ more Negroes, as we have an opportunity to do so, and as they come to us—just as we do qualified whites. If we started our program with a little feeling of self-conscious philanthropy, and some doubt of our success, these have long since left us. The Negroes in our company have proven themselves almost without exception to be responsible, loyal employees, not charity patients; and they are accepted on that basis now by our entire plant.

With the complete support and encouragement of our top management, we started an active program of employing skilled Negroes in our shop about 5 years ago, and placed our first Negro office worker on the pay roll in the summer of 1946. We had some anxious moments trying to anticipate as best we could the type of problems which might arise from employee resentment at working with Negroes. We had always worked for a healthy relationship with our people, and believed that this record would make our job easier—which it did. When we began to employ a few skilled Negroes to fill shop jobs as machinists and assemblers, no objections reached us except those of a very few who though the company might be planning to flood the plant with poorly paid Negroes at the expense of our white personnel. This, incidentally, is a good example of the sort of irrational reaction produced by a feeling of economic insecurity. The story got little attention, and died a quick death, apparently because the great majority of our employees had found within our plant a measure of the security and sense of personal identification with the company's aims which we had tried to give them.

We knew our real problem would come in placing Negro girls within our office departments. The first young woman we hired was assigned to our personnel department, among employees who understood what we were trying to do and who had assured us of their cooperation. At first, some negative comment did come from girls in other departments whose work was related to hers; but her ability and pleasant manner later earned her the friendship and support of everyone who had become acquainted with her. She has worked hard to improve her value to the company during the 3 years she has been with us, and I think she is deeply happy in her job.

We have employed a number of young Negro women for office work since then, and have encountered very little opposition of a really serious type. What we did find seemed to be completely checked when we made it plain that our employment policy would definitely be continued, and that we would insist upon cooperation from everyone in helping to make the program work.

We have found frank discussions of the prejudice problem with our white and Negro

personnel to be a real help. Through such discussions we have prepared our new Negro employees for possible rebuffs, and at the same time emphasized the importance of their behavior as missionaries for their race. Through similar talks with the white employees among whom the newcomers will work, we have explained the purpose of our program and tried—successfully, I think—to enlist them on our side by bringing the subject of prejudice into the open ourselves, not waiting until trouble puts us on the defensive.

Whatever factor weighs most heavily in the success we have had, our employees, white and Negro, have found the secret of working together with harmony and forbearance. Our own company is not the only industry where this has been done, by any means. Some of our largest corporations, both northern and southern, have taken the leadership in destroying race barriers inside their own gates. Some job opportunities are opening up for Negroes in stores and public utilities, too. Still, "some" is not most, or anything like it. A lot of education and guidance will be needed all over the Nation before we can really say that industry is taking its share of responsibility for the Negro's economic betterment.

I know, as we all do, that complete equality for Negro citizens in all the segments of our national life is a long way off. The revolution in thinking which will bring it about won't be the product of a brief, white heat of inspiration. It will need a lifetime—or two—of steady consecration from those who carry Christian principles closest to their hearts. When the job is done, American democracy will be its own triumphant answer to the haters and the doubters who are challenging the strength of our faith, and the truth of our ideal.

Brotherhood in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial from the New York Times of yesterday, February 19, 1950, entitled "Brotherhood in America." Confronted as we are in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress by major issues affecting the brotherhood of mankind, this editorial, during the current week has been designated as Brotherhood Week should be a forceful reminder to us of our clear and unmistakable course of duty.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD IN AMERICA

The week of Washington's Birthday has been set aside, appropriately enough, as Brotherhood Week. Its spirit is well expressed in Washington's prayer following his inauguration, that "Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens * * * to entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large." It is the week, conceived by a Catholic priest in Denver and observed every year since 1934 under sponsorship of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, that recalls to all the inhabitants of our land the basic principles of human fellowship on which our democratic society is founded.

A respect for the dignity of man is one of the distinguishing characteristics of our western civilization. It is not an empty phrase. While it is of course true that this country of ours is not yet entirely rid of racial conflicts and religious prejudices, it is also true that all that is best in America stands with increasing strength in firm opposition to such forces of retrogression and despair. The dignity of man requires firm adherence to the principle and practice of civil and political liberty, of racial and religious tolerance. Those who belong in the free world understand this. Brotherhood Week is a good time to think about it.

History of the Military Order of the Carabao

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from the history of the Military Order of the Carabao, written by Commander Arthur Stanley Riggs, United States Naval Reserve, for the 1939 Wallow, and published in the Army and Navy Journal of February 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY ORDER OF THE CARABAO

The Military Order of the Carabao was organized in Manila, P. I., in November 1900, for the purpose of fostering a high standard of military and social duty and to perpetuate the memories and associations of military service in the Philippines during the early days of American occupation.

In the closing days of the great Boxer campaign in China, when the fighting was all over, the officers of the allied armies met in the Temple of the Dragon in Peking and decided to perpetuate their comradeship in arms with a military order of their own. That was the origin of the famous Order of the Dragon, limited to officers of the American, British, Russian, French, German, and Japanese armies who had served together during those hectic days. The officers of the Sixth United States Cavalry in particular had had a wonderful time in China, and when some of them arrived in Manila, sporting the yellow ribbon and gold badge of the new order, some officers of the Philippine Expeditionary Force—it wasn't called that in the days of the empire—among them Col. John Biddle Porter, United States Army, and Maj. George L. Byram, United States Army, at a dinner in the old Army and Navy Club in the Walled City, decided to form a joke society to offset the Chinese organization.

To spoof the proud wearers of the dragon, something ridiculous was necessary as a badge of the new society. Major Byram promptly suggested the most lowly, despised, cursed-at, and best-loved animal the forces knew, the patient water buffalo, or carabao. The name caught instantly, and the Military Order of the Carabao came into being with a cheer. The carabao, as anybody who ever had to work with him knows, is a beast of cow-like demeanor and docility—so long as he stays wet. He is the donkey, the mule, the elephant, the abused and inevitable drudge of the Filipino and of all who live in the islands. When our troops reached the islands they had no mules. The roads were bad, the bush impenetrable, all the conditions such that the guns could not go up without reliable motive power that would not bog down in the rains or wilt under the torrid heat. The answer was God's gift to the little brown brother, the most faithful of all beasts of burden, so long as he can have his daily supply of something wet. Deprive this docile creature of his right to water in unimaginable quantities, and the time to wallow in the muddy shallows, and he becomes a very different and a very formidable beast indeed. This characteristic made the carabao the butt of infinite jest in the Army. Even the fact that the first field artillery used in the islands got into action only by grace of the humble carabao, did not save him from the ribald joking the troops enjoyed so much. As a name for a derisive organization, also, carabao was priceless, and wallow as a name for the dinner meetings when Carabaos gathered from far and wide to gambol and swap reminiscences of the fighting days, had something more than a poetic significance.

With the gradual development of the order into an organization of Nation-wide significance, and the transfer of the main corral from Manila to Washington, the annual wallows or dinners have become affairs of the greatest interest and importance. Carabaos come from remote sections of the country to attend. The President of the United States is always invited, as are the members of his Cabinet. Invitations to these hilarious affairs are eagerly sought, and legend has it that a Marine will fight anybody for one at any time.

Ex-President William Howard Taft, who was delighted at his election to the order, enjoyed the fun and satire at the wallows with great heartiness and always requested the singing of the song, He May Be a Brother of William H. Taft, But He Ain't No Friend of Mine. Sometimes these festivities included very trenchant comment upon national affairs. The press was quick to realize the tonic effect of such outspoken criticism from men who were themselves a part of the Nation's administration, and gave the wallows the widest publicity. One of these famous dinners gave rise to perhaps as curious an incident as ever marked the lives of any public officials in the United States.

During his first term as President, Woodrow Wilson was invited to become an honorary member of the Carabao Order by Maj. William E. Horton, Grand Lead & Wheel Carabao. Writing from the White House on November 22, 1913, President Wilson replied:

"MY DEAR MAJOR HORTON: Allow me to thank you for your very kind letter of November 19, and to say that it affords me much pleasure to accept your tender of honorary membership in the Military Order of the Carabao.

"With assurance of my appreciation of this compliment, believe me,

"Sincerely yours,

"WOODROW WILSON."

On December 11, 1913, came the annual wallow with the familiar, somewhat boisterous good time. Included in the program of stunts was a satire upon the policies of the President, of the Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels, and Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan. The whole thing summed up into a good-humored poking at

fun at our Philippine policy and the peacefulness of Secretary Bryan—subjects hardly to be expected to excite the admiration of sturdy fighting men sworn to maintain, uphold and defend the Government. During the festivities an army officer who was not on the official program got to his feet and began to sing the famous Insurrecto song. With a wild shout of applause, the diners responded and the chorus nearly unroofed the ballroom of the Willard Hotel. After one verse, the chairman of the program committee pulled the speaker down.

Then, mounted upon the shoulders of stout lads from the Navy and the Marine Band playing "Columbia, the Gem of the Ocean," three battleships hove into sight: U. S. S. *Friendship*, U. S. S. *Fellowship*, and the U. S. S. *Fife*. The last-named was rigged up with newspaper, grape-juice bottles, lecture platform, and other gadgets thrusting scornfully at the policy of the State Department.

The applause was uproarious. Secretary Daniels chuckled over it as heartily as anybody. The next day he wrote the following letter officially:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
December 12, 1913.

Rear Admiral THOMAS B. HOWARD,
United States Navy, Navy Yard,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ADMIRAL: I wish to congratulate the patriarch of the herd for the brilliant entertainment given by the Carabao last evening and to tell you how much I enjoyed the steady stream of wit and wisdom that flowed around the festal board.

I assure you, my dear Admiral, that I shall always have a happy memory of the dinner and beg to thank you most cordially for giving me that pleasure.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

President Wilson, however, was not only not at the dinner, but he was not at all pleased with the ridicule his policies had drawn. A day or so later he directed Secretaries Daniels and Garrison to investigate and report to him. When he received their reports, he ordered one of the sharpest reprimands on record for the officers who had arranged the program.

The difficulty of the affair was remedied when, still smarting with irritation, the President wrote as follows to Major Horton:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 17, 1913.

MY DEAR MAJOR HORTON: Some time ago I had the pleasure of accepting honorary membership in the Military Order of the Carabao. I now beg to be permitted to withdraw my acceptance. I am constrained to make this request because of circumstances which I am sure the society will understand.

Sincerely yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Both President Wilson's letters and all the documents covering this amazing outburst are in the official archives of the order. There was some talk of court martial for the officers concerned, but naturally nothing came of it. The reprimand was more than enough. Secretary Daniels suggested to Admiral Howard that he relinquish his office as patriarch of the herd. Asking a naval officer to be a quitter had the result to be expected. The society backed him up steadfastly, and the only civilian among the officers, former Col. Joseph M. Heller, Medical Corps, assumed the entire responsibility for the entire incident and made a public apology. The order also officially apologized, and the incident was closed. Though the amends honorable had been made, not a Carabao retreated an inch from the ground taken. The years that quickly followed demonstrated that whatever President Wilson thought of the patriotism and intelligence of the officers he had censured as caustically, they were straining at their moorings when the call came in 1917 that scattered them over the seven seas and throughout a war-torn world from the icy steppes of Siberia to the south of France, spread them over the man-killing cold and storm of the North Sea and the Channel and into the hell of the Argonne. The World War added fresh laurels to the order, and sounded taps for many a devoted Carabao who, when the moment came, joked with death as cheerily as he had with the herd when the lights blazed and the wine sparkled at the wallow that brought him into disfavor.

Since then two more decades have gone by, and wallow has followed wallow without any repetition of the incident, though the herd remains as always ready on the instant for frolic or fight, with the leaders of all the services and hundreds of eager civilian guests gathering each year on the date closest to the day when the Philippine Insurrection broke out, February 4, 1899.

Today the order is centered in Washington, where many of the officers of all three services are quartered, and in Manila, in a newer, more comfortable Army and Navy Club. All the other branch corrals are gone, but the inextinguishable spirit that won the Philippines, first from Spain and then from some seventy thousand Filipino irregulars as elusive and hard to catch as tropical fleas, lives on and burns as brightly through the years as when the first shot fired in the Islands lighted it.

WALLOW MARKS CARABAO'S FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY

Its members bonded and blended together in historic camaraderie, the famed Military Order of the Carabao, conceived in the tropical brain of a socially and spiritually inclined officer, and named to honor an animal of distinction so constitutionally created that frequent libations are necessary to his very existence, tonight celebrates its fiftieth anniversary.

At this historic wallow, old grandads of pre-World War I Philippine service will thrill alike with youthful Virginia gentlemen who sailed or flew across the Pacific to liberation action in World War II to the lofty words of the bountiful bombinero.

Sober pedants may insist petulantly that the celebration should be delayed until November, for it was in that month of the year 1900 that the Military Order of the Carabao was founded in Manila.

But neither Carabao nor hombre need tip his hat or his glass either to such a scholar, for no search of archeological ruins or examination of nonexisting archives ever will disclose the actual date of the first meeting.

And there is a reason for this. It is not, as some might suspect, because members were too Scotch to provide proper record books. As Col. Herbert A. White, United States Army, the bombinero of the epic 1913 wallow, revealed the true story, it went as follows:

"The paramount Carabao was found to be in such a high state of exhilaration over the future of the order that he was unable to put a motion, and the secretary was in such a similar state of exhilaration that he was unable to record a motion that had been put."

As a hang-over from that first meeting, each successive wallow has been characterized by great exhilaration. At times, notably in 1913, the effervescent spirit of the order's annual wallow has bubbled over into unprecedented situations of corking national interest.

Thus it was in the unlucky year of thirteen that President Wilson, not present at the wallow but disturbed at traditional Carabao satire which his policies evoked, ordered a very serious reprimand for officers responsible for the program.

Of this reprimand, the New York Sun commented editorially: "Let us quote the classic rebuke; it is a model for any pedagogue who may ever have occasion in the course of stern duty to administer verbal chastisement of men of war."

Official apology was made by former Col. Joseph M. Heller, Medical Corps, United States Army—the only civilian among the order's officers and the incident was closed. Not ended, however, was the unwavering adherence to the creed which keeps the herd, as tonight, "always ready on the instant for frolic or fight."

Among the 270 persons present at the 1913 wallow, described in detail in the history reprinted herewith, was Assistant Secretary of the Navy Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Records do not reveal his reaction to the evening of mirth, but the undisputed belief is that his famous smile was much in evidence at the wallow, symbolized by many refills and only that solitary one but straight reprimand.

At the 1939 wallow Assistant Secretary of War Louis Johnson told the Order of the Carabao that "you are the romantic old guard of the services and your achievements in song and battle have been perpetuated in the traditions of the Army and Navy."

Then, in Sybilline words, Secretary Johnson made this wry observation: "The reactionary and the conservative are not of the same type. A reactionary resents change merely because it is change. A conservative comes from Missouri.

"He is slow to change. Once convinced that the change is for the better, he becomes eager and ready to turn to the new. The old guard is properly conservative. It could never become reactionary."

Just as the 1939 wallow saw the inauguration of a Marine Corps officer, Maj. Gen. James C. Breckinridge, as grand paramount carabao, so tonight, Gen. Clifton B. Cates, Commandant of the Marine Corps, takes over the reins of Carabaos, an organization eager to demonstrate that there will be no watering-down of the order's richly deserved reputation, and exhilarated at the prospect of another evening devoted to "a temperate amount of prudence and a prudent amount of temperance."

"Housing" Is a Misnomer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "'Housing' Is a Misnomer," published in the New York Times of February 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING IS A MISNOMER

Thomas B. McCabe, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, speaking for that body, has gone on record as opposed to the administration's $2,000,000,000 so-called middle-income home-financing bill, as now set up. The Board's position is hardly surprising. Nobody charged as the Reserve Board is with responsibility for stabilizing the Nation's credit system could conscientiously or logically support a measure so economically irresponsible.

This newspaper has consistently favored public-housing programs where they could be justified on legitimate humanitarian or

social grounds. But to describe this proposed bill as a housing program in that sense of the term is a complete misnomer. The plan is not restricted to families with substandard incomes. The Internal Revenue Bureau classes persons in brackets up to $6,000 as in the middle-income group. Actually, this bill doesn't even include that limitation. The nearest it comes to it is to provide that the particular residential project contemplated should meet the need of moderate-income families in the locality.

Specifically, the bill calls for the creation of another Government lending agency, this one to be known as the National Mortgage Corporation of Housing Cooperatives. The new institution would be authorized to make long-term low-interest rate loans to housing cooperatives and other nonprofit organizations for housing purposes. The proposed terms for such loans are so fantastically liberal that they come close to being merely thinly disguised subsidies. Lending rates would be only slightly higher than those at which the United States Government itself can borrow. In fact, the bill provides that the two should be tied together. The loans would be amortizable over a period of 50 years—half a century. Nor is that all. An extension of another 10 years would be obtainable by the borrower; also, the Corporation would be authorized to defer payment on both principal and interest for as long as 3 years during the life of the loan. No wonder that Mr. McCabe observed that "we know of no mortgage credit currently available in this country on amortization terms of 50 to 60 years or at interest rates such as are contemplated here."

Surveying the provisions of this bill, we find ourselves tempted to repeat an observation we made after going through the Brannan farm bill—namely, that no measure which rested on a sound economic basis would have to be made so thoroughly delectable as this one politically.

The New Grand Paramount Carabao

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The New Grand Paramount Carabao," written by Carabao Robert Sherrod, and published in the Army and Navy Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW GRAND PARAMOUNT CARABAO

(By Carabao Robert Sherrod)

Clifton Bledsoe Cates, who becomes tonight the forty-sixth grand paramount of the Military Order of the Carabao, took office as the nineteenth commandant of the Marine Corps on January 1, 1948.

It is not difficult to discover why there have been more Grand Paramounts in 50 years than there have been commandants in 175 years. In the early years of the Republic—and of the Marine Corps—commandants served unconscionably long terms. Of the late, great Archibald Henderson it is said that after 37 years in the office he forgot and willed the commandant's quarters to his son.

General Cates' son is a naval officer.

As a colonel the new Grand Paramount commanded the First Marines at Guadalcanal. There he gained a distinction among his gyrenes which stuck with him throughout the war; he always looked as if he had just stepped out of a bandbox. Let it rain, let the mud get shin-deep, let Pistol Pete fire until his guns melt—Cliff Cates' pants were still pressed.

The legend persisted throughout the Tinian battle in 1944, the still immaculate General Cates commanded the Fourth Marine Division in what was probably the corps' smoothest amphibious operation of World War II. During that beachhead in hell which was called Iwo Jima, General Cates had his division CP in what had been a Japanese underground ammunition dump. Despite an almost total lack of sleep, despite the gore and brimstone, despite the dank quarters, General Cates nontheless managed to turn up each morning clean-shaven and neatly pressed. His only concession to the surroundings was his failure to wear a necktie.

Outside this CP one of General Cates' staff planted a street sign, "Maui Blvd." The Fourth Marine Division always returned to the Hawaiian island of Maui between battles, and the people of the island referred to the outfit as the "Maui Marines." Probably nowhere on the globe was there a closer affinity between the local population and the military visitors. Whenever the marines came back, almost every man, woman, and child among the island's 45,000 population turned out to greet the transports, and Cliff Cates became by common consent No. 1 citizen of the island. General Cates still has a petition signed by 1,191 citizens, beseeching Admiral Nimitz to send the division back to Maui "when it has finished its current battle." Nearly every inhabitant of Maui made friends with someone in the division, which was stationed there well over a year. Greatest of all the homecoming welcomes was after Iwo Jima. The local citizens outdid themselves when the transports docked this time—there were coffee, doughnuts, cakes, and flowers, and huge street signs welcoming the Fourth Division. But after the ships docked a great wave of sadness swept over the crowd. Half the Fourth Division failed this time to come back. Nearly two thousand of the "Maui Marines" were dead; six thousand others lay in hospitals from Saipan to San Diego. As long as he lives, Cliff Cates will probably remember above all else the return to Maui after Iwo.

In World War II General Cates was awarded two DSM's and a Legion of Merit. His record in the First World War, in which he served as a platoon commander and company commander of the Sixth Marines, was equally distinguished: two DSC's, a Navy Cross, two Silver Stars, two Purple Hearts, and a Croix de Guerre with two Palms and a Gold Star. He was wounded and gassed at Chateau Thierry, and wounded again at Soissons. He acquired the nickname "Lucky" during an assault on the village of Bourescheo, which he survived with ten of his men after being knocked cold by a bullet which bashed in his helmet. A week later, only Cates and Private Levine were left of his entire company. The nickname and the trait stayed with him throughout World War II, which he escaped without a scratch, although at Iwo a warrant officer standing next to him was decapitated by a Japanese mortar fragment.

Concerning his nickname Cliff Cates has one standard answer: "Better born lucky than good looking."

General Cates was born in Tiptonville, Tenn., 56 years ago. He started out to be a lawyer, and graduated in law from the University of Tennessee. He enlisted in the Marine Corps June 13, 1917, and has not shown any disposition to return to law since then.

America's Role in the Chinese Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio commentary entitled "America's Role in the Chinese Tragedy" by W. Earl Hall, managing editor of the Mason City Globe-Gazette, of Mason City, Iowa, and appearing in the February 6 issue of that publication.

There being no objection, the commentary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MAN'S OPINION—AMERICA'S ROLE IN THE CHINESE TRAGEDY

(A radio commentary by W. Earl Hall, managing editor)

There may be such a person but I have yet to meet an American who is proud of the role our country has played in China these past 10 years. In my opinion we should be hanging our head in shame rather than throwing out our chest in pride.

Actually the policy pursued by our State Department almost from the time of Pearl Harbor could have had no other result than the one which we now behold in China—complete domination by the Communists.

The Communists are in control of China for the plain and simple reason that those at the helm in the shaping of our foreign policy considered them better than Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalists.

LIKE A BIRD ON A PLATTER

Joseph Alsop in his recent series of articles on why we lost China in the Saturday Evening Post didn't overstate matters when he wrote:

"Throughout the fateful years in China, the American representatives there actively favored the Chinese Communists. They also contributed to the weakness, both political and military, of the national government (under Chiang Kai-shek).

"And in the end, they came close to offering China up to the Communists, like a trussed bird on a platter, more than 4 years before the eventual Communist triumph."

Mr. Alsop in his articles reviews the whole sordid mess, going back to the time shortly after the war broke out when Gen. Joseph ("Vinegar Joe") Stilwell was placed in charge of America's interests in China. Qualified to lead an army in the field, Stilwell was as ill-equipped for a post calling for diplomacy as anybody who could have been named.

"IDIOT" AND "RATTLESNAKE"

The general from the start had an abiding contempt for the Chinese generalissimo. "Idiot" and "rattlesnake" were two of the endearing terms applied by the crusty old general to Chiang.

It was probably because of his unreasoning loathing of the generalissimo rather than because of any affinity for communism that Stilwell cultivated and propagated the idea that China's Communists weren't Communists at all in the real sense of the term. They were merely agrarian reformers.

From the day of his arrival on the assignment, General Stilwell was obsessed with two ideas. One was opening up the Burma road; the other was sinking a stiletto into Chiang Kai-shek. No cost was too great for bringing embarrassment to the generalissimo.

In Stilwell all of this can be explained as a manifestation of senility in a venerable man attempting to fill an assignment for which he wouldn't have been qualified even in his better days. It's regrettable that this had to be the closing chapter of a life story which otherwise was instrucit.

USED BY OUR FOREIGN

But the wholly unfortunate part in the situation was that the Stilwell skillsh prejudices geared into the philosophy of those in the State Department who had the loudest voice in determining American policy toward China.

In June, 1944, Henry Wallace, then Vice President stopped off in China, accompanied by three left-wing advisers. Most of his 2 weeks there was spent trying to persuade Chiang Kai-shek that he should take the Communists into his family.

Chiang knew, as Wallace could have learned if he had been interested, that the Communist troops in those days weren't much interested in fighting the Japanese invader. Their interest was in setting the stage for taking over China after the war.

THE SAME HENRY WALLACE

On his return to America, the Vice President reported to President Roosevelt in these words:

"Chiang, at best, is a short-term investment. It is not believed that he has the intelligence or political strength to run postwar China. The leaders of postwar China will be brought forward by evolution, or revolution, and it now seems more likely the latter."

Yes, this is the same Henry Wallace who a few short months ago sought the Presidency on a platform which found nothing to criticize the Communist ideology. He helped shape our policy toward China in the critical war years.

At Cairo, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill pledged undying loyalty to China and the nationalist cause for which Chiang Kai-shek spoke. Without reservations they promised him a larger measure of assistance in a military way.

WE WERE "INDIAN GIVERS"

Josef Stalin wasn't in on that Cairo conference. A diplomatic nicety had to be observed. China's war was with Japan and Russia hadn't come into that war as yet. Whether she ever did is debatable—but that's another matter.

Anyway, a few days after the Cairo meeting Churchill and Roosevelt met with Stalin at Teheran. On Russian demand all available landing craft—including those promised to Chiang Kai-shek—were promptly reallocated to the European theater.

"Thus," as Mr. Alsop points out, "a major promise to Chiang Kai-shek was broken almost as soon as it was made."

And so it went month after month as China, already weary from years of war against the Japanese, sought to protect its homeland from an invader. The people of America thought they were allied with the government under Chiang, but State Department policy was all slanted at building up the Communists.

FORT A GLAMOUR CHINA

In the closing months of the war Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer replaced General Stilwell in the Chinese theater. Like many another, he had been told what a "monstrous crook" Chiang Kai-shek was. But he never was told what crooked things Chiang had done. It was just a blanket charge.

As recently as last November General Wedemeyer had this to say about the Chinese Generalissimo:

"My faith in the Chinese people remains unshaken. Personally, I have never questioned Chiang Kai-shek's sincerity of purpose and I am convinced of his desire to establish true democracy in China. He has already been a symbol of China's consistent opposition to forces of aggression."

With the war ended, those with a Communist leaning in the State Department—including one Alger Hiss—were free to step up their program designed to help the forces of Mao Tse-tung and throw the harpoon into Chiang. That's exactly what they did.

YES; ALGER HISS WAS THERE

It's not to be forgotten, or minimized, that at Yalta the President's aide was Alger Hiss. Could that have had something to do with the secret agreement giving Russia Outer Mongolia, Sakhalin, the Kurile Islands, Dairen, Port Arthur, and vast railroad properties in China and Manchuria?

One of the commonest charges laid at Chiang's door is that much of the arms and ammunition intended for Chiang's Nationalist forces fell into Communists' hands. Are you naive enough to believe that just happened?

At the conclusion of the war in Europe it was decided that some of the surrendered German arms and ammunition should go to China. The order was dispatched to General Eisenhower and compliance set under way. At least one ship was started toward Asia.

Then something happened. A countermanding order on White House stationery was dispatched to Eisenhower. It was signed by Lauchlin Currie, administrative assistant. No further German arms went to China. Where have you seen that name, Lauchlin Currie? In the testimony of both Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley, former workers in the Communist fold.

CONFERENCE WAS IGNORED

In 1948 Congress wrote into law an affirmative policy of resisting communism. This was long before the Reds even reached the Yellow River. But nothing much happened. There was delay and dawdling in the State Department. The clear-cut intent of Congress to aid Chiang was aborted.

More recently a white paper covering the Chinese situation has been issued by the State Department. Mostly it's an apology for our policy of do-nothing in the face of the constant extension of the Communist grip on all of continental China.

In September 1947, General Wedemeyer at the conclusion of his second mission to China turned in a report which gathered dust for more than 2 years in some Washington office. It outlined a plan of supervised military aid to the nationalists to halt the march of the Communists.

WHERE ACHESON STOOD

In the line-up within the State Department of pro-Communists and anti-Communists, Dean Acheson in his days in subordinate position usually could be found alongside those highly critical of Chiang Kai-shek—and not so critical of the Communists.

In 1947—at just about the time General Wedemayer was recommending military aid to Chiang—Mr. Acheson, as acting Secretary of State, made this report to the House Foreign Affairs Committee:

"The Chinese Government is not in the position at the present time that the Greek Government is in. It is not approaching collapse. It is not threatened by defeat by Communists. The war with the Communists is going on much as it has for the last 20 years."

This point of view is in quite violent contrast with the one expressed by Mr. Acheson, now as Secretary of State, in that white paper of last year:

"The unfortunate, but inescapable, fact is that the ominous result of the civil war in China was beyond the control of the Government of the United States. Nothing that this country did or could have done within the reasonable limits of its capabilities could have changed that result; nothing that was left undone by this country has contributed to it."

ALL RESPECT FOR UR GONE

Well, that's the story in sketchy outline form. That brings us down to where we are now—with the Chinese Communists tossing our officials into jail without fear of appropriate reprisals. In India and elsewhere in the Orient, American prestige has taken a terrific wallcping.

The question of whether Chinese Reds are true Communists has been answered, at least in part. Mao Tse-tung, the man about whom the Communist forces have centered their efforts in China, has been a guest of the Kremlin. Later his first assistant joined him for the conferences.

According to some dispatches out of China, which may or may not be wishful thinking, Moscow is making some unreasonable demands on China. One writer mentions insistence on a half-dozen ports for Russian use. Another talks of demands for large shipments of food from underfed China.

WE ASKED FOR IT

By the nature of the policy we've pursued in China—buddying up to the Communists when we ought to have been giving full support to the forces seeking to halt the Communist march—we're getting exactly what we asked for.

The time is past when we can give effective aid to Chiang Kai-shek or the cause which he represents. The hazards involved in trying to protect Formosa are all out of line with any possible benefits to be derived from what would have to be a military operation.

History tells us that no conqueror of China ever prospered. Always the invader has been swallowed up. We can only hope that history will repeat itself and help us out of the hole which we deliberately dug for ourselves.

Expensive "Wildcats"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Expensive 'Wildcats'," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of February 14, 1950. The article should be of great interest to the Members of the Senate because of the study now being given to depletion charges for income-tax purposes.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPENSIVE WILDCATS

Last year, the American Petroleum Institute announces, the oil industry drilled about 7,250 wildcat wells—the greatest number in any one year since the discovery of oil in 1859.

Wildcat wells are test wells which the oil men drill in the course of exploring new or unproved territories. Through them new pools are discovered and new fields brought into production. Our proved oil reserves have now reached the enormous figure of nearly 27,000,000,000 barrels—and the wildcats are largely responsible for that.

A wildcat, however, is not a safe, sure, and conservative piece of business. It involves great financial risks since four out of five of them turn out to be dry holes. The science of geology has made great progress, but it isn't foolproof by a long shot. The only sure way to prove that there is oil in any given place is to go down and look.

Last year's wildcats cost the oil industry more than $350,000,000 in drilling expense.

Since only one out of five was a producer, the average cost of finding a worth-while well was about $250,000. And that doesn't include the huge sums paid to landowners for leases, the cost of geological and geophysical exploration, and other heavy and necessary costs. In 1949 the total cost of exploring for oil and gas within this country was over $1,000,000,000.

In a free-enterprise economy, men will take these risks for the possible rewards for success—thus bringing progress and a better life for millions of people. What is true of oil is true of all the rest of our basic enterprises.

Portrait of a Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there recently appeared in the Montgomery Examiner a very excellent article entitled "Portrait of a Statesman," under the pen name of "Rev. A. S. Turnipseed." I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PULPIT ECHOES—PORTRAIT OF A STATESMAN

(By the Reverend A. S. Turnipseed)

Week before last I happened to have been on the campus of the University of Alabama talking with the Reverend William Graham Echols, director of the Wesley Foundation at the Capstone. Dr. Echols told me the story of the spring elections of 1913 at the university when LISTER HILL made a successful race for president of the student body. Echols was then a student from Russell County and managed HILL's campaign.

Echols was the campus champion of the "little man" and had well organized the nonfraternity element of the university. Echols led the nonfraternity men in choosing HILL as their candidate.

HILL was a member of Deke. It must be remembered that Deke is often referred to, whether rightly or not, as the "snob club." Thus it was quite a tribute to HILL for the nonfraternity men to choose him as their candidate against the organized opposition of the whole fraternity system at Alabama. According to Echols, HILL lost friends in his own fraternity, to say nothing of the other fraternities, because of this move. It was a bitterly contested election but HILL won.

Cynics may say that even at this early date HILL was simply the demogague going the way of the most votes. Surely the selfish element was in it but that is not a full explanation.

BIG ARISTOCRAT

This incident out of HILL's student days is indicative of the man himself. I always am a little confused when people refer to HILL as an aristocrat. I do not venture in this column a definition of the term "aristocrat." But to my mind HILL is not an aristocrat in the usually accepted sense of the word.

This man's grandfather, the Reverend L. L. Hill, was one of the leaders in Methodism during the last half of the last century who fought for democracy in the church. He was ordained in the Methodist Protestant Church which was a protest movement against some of the autocratic practices of the main Methodist body. Today the things for which the Methodist Protestants stood, such as lay rights, have long been accepted by the main body of Methodists. (The Methodist Protestant Church has gone out of existence because of the unification of all Methodist churches in 1939.) The Methodist Protestant movement was to the Methodist Church what the Populist movement was to the Democratic Party. A lot of that old grandfather was showing up in young LISTER when he was the candidate of the nonfraternity element at the university.

Now that LISTER HILL is up for reelection he should be reexamined in the light of his contemporary setting. Representing a deep south State his liberalism is far more to his credit than the liberalism of representatives in the Congress of large industrialized and urban constituencies. It takes time and circumstances to develop a statesman. Maybe for the first 14 or 15 years HILL's performance in Washington indicated no deeply worked out social philosophy. It remained for the New Deal really to develop this man. His stands on such things as labor legislation, TVA, hospital legislation, social security, and agriculture during the last 12 or more years have been so consistently liberal as to indicate that his politics is motivated by a basic social philosophy.

I asked Dr. Echols if HILL were a good student at the university and he enthusiastically answered in the affirmative. When he first went to the United States Senate it was not uncommon to hear people say that HILL was an opportunist and intellectually superficial. His consistent liberal record in the Senate would confirm Dr. Echols' opinion rather than that of his detractors of some dozen years ago. In November 1939 I heard Senator HILL address the Alabama conference on the application of Christianity to social problems. It was a scholarly address which led many of us to conclude that religion was central in the motivation of the Senator. This speech caused some of the older ministers in the conference to recall that HILL made a profession of faith and joined the church in a revival meeting here in Montgomery when he was a young man just starting the practice of law.

It is remarkable that in a State that elected a very reactionary governor not more than 12 years ago, LISTER HILL stands today as the almost unchallenged leader. (I believe one or two have indicated they might run against HILL but at the present I cannot think of their names.) Two years ago the lamentations of modern Jeremiahs were heard everywhere to the effect that HILL was a "dead duck." In the midst of the terrible storm over civil rights, which everybody knew was used in Alabama as a blind for reactionary rights, HILL emerged to lead the ticket of those elected to the Democratic conventions.

PROPERTY VERSUS PEOPLE

Books have been written around the thesis that the Negro is the determining factor in southern history. To me this is a thin thesis. The real fight in the South, since the days of Thomas Jefferson on down to the days of LISTER HILL, is property versus people. This is what makes southern politics so precarious for any man with any independent proclivities. All the reactionaries have to do is use the Negro issue against him to discredit everything else for which he stands.

HILL has vigorously opposed the imposition of civil rights by the Federal Government and has contended that the South must work out its problems within the Democratic Party. This in effect puts the Negro question where it ought to be put—off to the side and out of the center of southern politics. This seems to be the tact taken by all liberal men who are effective in southern public life.

The great burden of this region is to rid ourselves of all forms of exploitation—whether it be the exploitation of our natural resources, such as erosion of the land, or the exploitation of our human resources, such as the economic exploitation of poor whites and Negroes. We can save ourselves from an economy dominated by economic monopolists by preserving free enterprise for little operators. But how can there be any free enterprise for little people who have diseases, ignorance, and superstitious religion directly derived from abject poverty? What makes HILL a statesman is his consistent advocacy of Government policy that strikes at this abject southern poverty.

RACE ISSUE INJECTED

The political fortunes of LISTER HILL sank the lowest in 1944 when he was returned to the United States Senate by a close margin. The issue of property versus people was smoke screened in that race by the skillful injection of the Negro issue by the monopolies. In large part HILL won that fight because the majority of the people of Alabama believe that property should be held by a constantly increasing number with a corresponding lessening of control of property by monopolies. But the balance of power in that election was tipped by a large element in this State that abhors another form of exploitation—that perpetrated by the liquor traffic.

When Col. Oscar Tompkins, of Dothan, Ala., wrote letters to the church periodicals of this State pointing out the record of James Simpson in the legislature on the alcohol issue thousands of people began to veer toward HILL. Protestant preachers became indignant and a wave of resentment went over the State large enough to sweep into the HILL fold enough additional votes to get him over the hump.

I know political prophecy is precarious but I venture the prediction that LISTER HILL will stay in the United States Senate as long as he wants to.

Youth Rally Attracts 2,000 White and Negro Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, voluntary attendance of some 2,000 white and Negro students in the public, private, and parochial schools of Baltimore made possible an interracial meeting for better understanding and tolerance in Baltimore's Polytechnic Institute last week.

As reported in the Baltimore Morning Sun of Saturday, February 18, the principals in this most laudible effort, held in connection with the silver anniversary week program of the Urban League of Baltimore, were James J. Lacy, Jr., former Loyola College student and basketball star, and Levi Jackson, Negro

captain of the Yale University football team. Judge Herman M. Moser, of the supreme bench of Baltimore, was the adult speaker for the occasion.

Because of its widespread favorable implication, I ask unanimous consent that the report of this meeting be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH RALLY ATTRACTS 2,000 WHITE AND NEGRO STUDENTS

More than 1,000 white and Negro students in the city's public, private, and parochial schools joined yesterday in a youth rally in the auditorium of the Polytechnic Institute, which was a feature of the silver anniversary week program of the Urban League of Baltimore.

The large interracial attendance, which was by invitation to all students and not obligatory, was particularly gratifying to the sponsors of the meeting, some of whom said it was, in their opinion, the largest outpouring of white and Negro youths to attend an interracial event held here under private auspices.

The interracial theme was carried to the stage where James J. Lacy, Jr., former Loyola College student and a basketball player of national reputation, and Levi Jackson, Negro captain of Yale's football team, were the principal speakers with Judge Herman M. Moser, of the supreme bench of Baltimore.

BAND, CHOIR PROVIDE MUSIC

The music was provided by the Baltimore City College Band under the baton of Donald B. Norton, and the Frederick Douglass High School choir directed by Mrs. Georgianna Chester.

Without directly mentioning discrimination or integration, the speakers, who were introduced by Nick Campofreda, used sports to show how teamwork can produce results both on the playing field and in other spheres of life.

Judge Moser emphasized that the United States must not give aid and comfort to enemies by disunity. America, he insisted, must be united at all times.

Mr. Lacy said that boys and girls must apply to their lives the same rules that apply to sports, a determination to do a good job, play as a team, train for it and be a good sport, "playing the game to the hilt."

Mr. Jackson said each boy and girl must take advantage of every opportunity offered them, especially opportunities of going to college. He insisted that "schools can't aid you unless you desire that aid." Sports, he said, are a "wonderful adjunct to education."

Edgar M. Ewing, president of the Urban League, presented Mr. Lacy and Mr. Jackson with citations pointing out their successes not only as leaders in sports, but as citizens looking toward the advancement of all persons.

SUMMER SLATED SUMMIT

The anniversary week program will end Monday night with a dinner at Morgan State College.

Alexander J. Allen, executive secretary of the league, will make his annual report.

Addresses will be made by Dr. Paul G. Douglass, president of American University, Washington; Dr. Martin D. Jenkins, president of Morgan College; and Dr. Broadus Mitchell, first president of the Urban League of Baltimore, a former member of the Johns Hopkins University faculty, and currently professor of economics at Rutgers University.

Miss Anne Raedenkopf will present the local league an original oil painting. There will be a business meeting and election of officers.

Prohibition of Interstate Liquor Advertisements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from the Honorable Harlan M. Calhoun, judge of the twenty-second judicial circuit in Moorefield, W. Va., who expresses his opinions on S. 1847, which is the bill proposing to prohibit interstate liquor advertisements.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOOREFIELD, W. VA., *February 7, 1950.*

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: I am writing to you to express my very great interest in the enactment of Senate bill No. 1847, prohibiting interstate liquor advertisement. I trust you will pardon a rather extended expression of my views.

Definitely this is not a mere wet and dry issue. I am not a dry in the sense of being an abstainer myself, nor in the sense of favoring a return to prohibition. I was prosecuting attorney of my county during prohibition days and in that capacity I learned the futility of such a law. I am confident, however, that just as many wets as drys are keenly conscious of the need of a law such as this.

Perhaps the Democratic Party, of which I have the honor of being an ardent member, was the political party most directly responsible for repeal. However that may be, I feel that all those individuals or groups who were in any way responsible for repeal owe to the American public a responsibility for keeping faith. There can be no denial of the fact that the theory back of repeal was that liquor was a necessary evil; that a great portion of our people were determined to have it, lawfully or unlawfully; and therefore advocates of repeal had the very plausible argument that intoxicants should merely be made available to meet this insistent demand. Reasonable regulation was to follow repeal.

But the most ardent advocates of repeal never once asserted that prohibition should be repealed because liquor represented a public good. They never once, in urging repeal, asserted that there should be a greater consumption of liquor for the good of the country. They never once urged that any individual consumer should consume more, nor that the number of drinkers should be increased. Most certainly they never urged that our youth should be urged to consider drinking a social necessity nor to believe that all men of distinction are necessarily drinkers.

On the contrary, the very logical, plausible argument for repeal was that liquor, as a necessary evil, should merely be made available for those who insist upon having it, and that it should be reasonably regulated. In that, I feel, we must keep faith.

As an argument against this proposal, it is urged that it represents one step toward a return to prohibition. On the contrary, the best insurance against a return to prohibition, the best assurance against a further extension of the dry areas of the country, is for the liquor and beer industries to submit to reasonable regulation. A prominent official of this State, during the recent Christmas season, told me how his small children had been hurt and disillusioned by an advertisement showing Santa Claus consuming a popular brand of beer. From a purely selfish standpoint the liquor and beer industries must submit to a reasonable restraint upon such avaricious inclinations or else suffer the public reaction.

In connection with the hearing before the Senate committee, I noted the effort to characterize as "drys" all advocates of this legislation. One could be guilty of no greater error than to assume that there is reasonable truth in such a position. It happens that, for years, I have keenly felt a need of such legislation. Meantime, I have discussed the matter with perhaps hundreds of people. I am quite certain that the vast majority of these people drank to some extent, some to a most unfortunate degree. I have not yet encountered one single individual, wet or dry, but who favored such a law. Opponents of this bill are hard-pressed to find any semblance of a logical argument to support their position. I urge you, in your own mind, to consider what sound argument may be advanced against the proposal.

If we admit that a greater consumption of liquor should not be encouraged among a greater number of people, particularly youth, then there can be no logical basis of opposition to this bill.

I have no way of knowing the number of millions of dollars spent annually on such advertisements. Let the "wet" opponents of this bill bear in mind that this cost is paid by the "wet" consuming public for whom they assume to speak. Or, if this immense cost of advertisement remains the same, let us consider the field for public revenue which will be created thereby.

I have endeavored in this letter to disabuse your mind of any impression you may have that this legislation is favored only by a lot of long-faced prudish cranks under the general characterization of "drys." I am not an advocate of prohibition, nor a "dry."

Nevertheless, perhaps I am in a better position than the average citizen to note the havoc which is being wrought by liquor on an America which owes it to the world to be strong. Other judges of my acquaintance agree with me that at least 80 percent of criminal law violations in our courts of record relate in some way to liquor or its use. I cannot estimate the cost in divorce, broken homes, juvenile delinquency, public welfare grants, poverty, loss of health, or loss of mind. Any impartial observer, wet or dry, must agree that liquor probably constitutes the greatest curse of civilization next to the institution of war. Why, then, permit a systematic, immensely-financed program to extend its evil tendencies?

The motive of gain will doubtless drive to great lengths both the liquor interests and portions of the press. Excluding these two groups, I venture the assertion that 90 percent of the American people who know of the proposal favor its enactment into law. I urge further investigation on your part to determine whether or not my estimate is correct.

I am the father of two teen-age children. There is a very sordid side to liquor and beer not portrayed in the enticing advertisements in expensive magazines. I believe American parents may reasonably expect the cooperation of Congress in their efforts to shape the thinking of their teen-age youngsters along lines you and I know to be sound.

Very respectfully yours,

HARLAN M. CALHOUN.

It's Fun To "Speak Your Piece," Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, sometime ago I had the distinction and pleasure of participating in a program at Manistee, Mich., which was a part of a plan for spreading in that community the ideals of good citizenship under a slogan, "It's Fun To Live in America." One of the leaders in that movement has been Judge Max Hamlin. He has sent me a copy of a piece of literature, which is one of several that go into the homes of Manistee citizens each month. It is in the form of a letter to a Member of Congress and is headed "It's fun to 'speak your piece,' too." This particular piece reflects Judge Hamlin's ideas and my own with respect to the objectives of the Hoover Commission, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the folder was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

" IT'S FUN TO "SPEAK YOUR PIECE" TOO

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR AND CONGRESSMAN: I am writing you about this business of Federal spending. I am what you call one of the little guys. I am single, make 50 bucks a week and own a second-hand car. It may sound corny, but I want to save enough to buy that little white cottage.

Out of my 50 bucks, my boss has to withhold $5.45 for Federal income tax. That's $283.40 a year, and brother, that ain't hay. That means I work about 34 days out of every year just to pay income tax.

Now, I don't mind spending for good Government. I think our defenses should be strong and that we ought to pay for such things as the Postal Department, FBI, and other necessary services. But I don't believe in waste. My grandpop used to say, "A penny saved is a penny earned." As I look back on it now, grandpop was a pretty smart old duck. He saved his money, bought a horse here and a mule there, and finally had a livery stable. Automobiles came along, so he sold his stock and started a garage. He didn't ask nobody for nothing, just saved his money, worked hard and wound up with a pretty good stake. When he got old he was able to sell his business and take it easy.

Well, to get back to this business of Federal spending. As I said, I don't mind spending for good Government, but it burns me up when a lot of bureaus up there in Washington come along and put the heat on you fellows to give them more and more money to keep adding people to their departments.

The other day I got hold of one of these reports by the Hoover Commission, the group appointed by the President to look into the cost of Federal Government. Believe me, some of the facts I read made my blood boil.

For instance:

That approximately one-half the several million purchase orders issued by the Government each year are for items totaling less than $10, yet the paper work done on every purchase transaction costs more than $10.

That Government records fill a space of 18,000,000 square feet at a cost of $20,000,000 a year and the filing equipment alone is worth $154,000,000.

That in one county in Georgia, 47 Government employees attached to seven separate field services of the Agriculture Department have been working with only 1,500 farmers.

That the Government worker handling my GI insurance policy carries a work load of only 450 policies, whereas the worker in a private insurance company handles 1,762 policies.

These are just a few of the facts that this report gave. All this talk in millions and billions is mighty confusing, but I have enough common horse sense to know that a lot of this money has been wasted just like pouring sand down a rat hole.

Now, Mr. Senator and Congressman, and I don't care what your politics are, I am writing you to ask you point blank to get behind some of these ideas recommended by the Hoover Commission. We little guys have heard this business about soak the other guy quite a while. Now we realize that every dollar we pay in taxes is just as hard on us as it is on the other fellow. So, we want you to do something and do it quick.

Respectfully yours,

JOE DOAKES
(Just an Average Joe.)

The Buchanan Committee's Task in the Light of Some Lessons From Past Congressional Investigations of Lobbying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the Public Opinion Quarterly early next month will publish an article by Dr. Edgar Lane, instructor in politics at Princeton University, entitled "Some Lessons From Past Congressional Investigations of Lobbying." I have been fortunate enough to read an advance proof of this article, and I am deeply impressed by the scholarly job performed by Dr. Lane in analyzing the three previous investigations of lobbying activities conducted by committees of the Congress during this century. Out of his research into those previous inquiries, the author reaches some interesting conclusions as to the fields in which he believes the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of this Congress can perform the most worth-while public service.

Although it is not scheduled to appear for several weeks in the Public Opinion Quarterly, I have obtained the permission of Dr. Lane and of his publishers to have this article appear now in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have requested that permission because I believe this article, with its careful review of the background of our present investigation, can serve as a useful subject of discussion within the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities and among those Members of Congress, the press and the general public who are demonstrating a deep interest in the subject matter of our investigation.

I have called an executive session of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, which includes, in addition to myself as chairman, Representatives LANHAM, ALBERT, DOYLE, HALLECK, BROWN, and O'HARA of Minnesota, for Tuesday afternoon, February 21, at 3 p. m. At that meeting, we may decide on a priority list for intensive investigation and for hearings.

As a prelude to that meeting, I think it would be most helpful if we could have this article before us for study and review and I know other Members would also find it exceedingly interesting. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, Dr. Lane's article, Some Lessons From Past Congressional Investigations of Lobbying, as prepared for the Public Opinion Quarterly, is inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

SOME LESSONS FROM PAST CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS OF LOBBYING

(By Edgar Lane, Ph. D., instructor of politics, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.)

(Congress has conducted three major investigations of lobbying activities since 1900. None of these has been completely successful, and it is to be hoped that the House lobbying investigation of 1950 will profit by the experience of its predecessors. Such an inquiry is most likely to serve the public interest if it adheres to a predetermined agenda, is based on careful research, does not bog down in colorful detail, submits periodic reports, and avoids partisan division. The present committee could make a major contribution by concentrating its attention on the improvement of legislation governing lobbyists, a subject which has been too much neglected in the past.)

Congress has decided to take another long look at the lobbying problem.

Under the terms of a resolution passed in August 1949 by the House of Representatives, a select committee of seven Members, headed by Representative FRANK BUCHANAN, has been empowered to study all lobbying activities, both private and governmental, which are "intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation."[1] Only an end-of-session jam of business prevented the Senate from becoming a partner in the enterprise. The primary purpose of the investigation, at least according to published reports, is to disclose the inadequacies and loopholes of the Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 and to seek means of correcting them.[2]

If the Buchanan committee does nothing more than find correctives for the internal contradictions of the Lobbying Act, it will have performed a valuable even though somewhat limited service. The present act stands very much in need of careful revision, and an investigation which looks in this direction is thoroughly opportune.

The committee has not yet indicated, however, whether or not it intends to tie itself to proposals based on the present system of regulation by registration. Even if it does not recommend a radical change of approach,

[1] 81st Cong., 1st sess., H. Res. 298. The President made an early session pledge that there would be a full-dress lobbying investigation, but expressed a preference for the joint investigating committee envisaged in S. Res. 23. The Senate failed to act on this resolution, however. New York Times, October 9, 1949.

[2] Ibid. See also Washington Post, October 7, 1949.

the group will be obliged to face during its investigation more complex problems than the mere clarification of conflicting statutory language. Primary among these is the necessity of agreement on purposes. What end is the investigation intended to serve? Is it conceived of as a means of informing congressional and public opinion on the scope and meaning of pressure-group activity? Or is it designed to serve primarily as a medium for the development of a more satisfactory system of pressure-group regulation?

Assuming that the Buchanan committee clearly accepts one or the other of these alternatives—and this in itself is unlikely—there immediately arise corollary questions of investigation procedure. Is it more productive to investigate extensively or intensively? Should the approach be spectacular or scholarly, carping or gentle? The manner in which these questions are resolved cannot help but materially affect the Buchanan committee's contribution to the effective management of the sprawling complex of modern pressure politics.

In attempting to meet these problems of purpose, scope, and method, the committee can profitably turn for guidance to the experience of past congressional lobbying investigations, although more often than not this guidance is negative in character. The investigations of 1913, 1929, and 1935 yielded valuable information on pressure operations, but at the same time they were in most cases models of confused purposes, inadequate planning, poor procedure, and wasted opportunity. Their primary value is that they demonstrate graphically the errors of omission and commission which can so easily blunt the impact of any congressional effort in this area. They suggest pitfalls to be avoided rather than guidelines to be followed.

We do not imply that the record of these earlier inquiries is necessarily predictive of the success or failure of the present effort, for the context in which the Buchanan committee works is somewhat unique. The purpose of this paper are rather to indicate the ends which earlier investigations have best served, to suggest the approaches which have yielded the most useful results, and to show how this experience can be particularly relevant to the new undertaking.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS OF LOBBYING

The investigations of 1913

Congress did not suddenly awaken to the existence of lobbying in 1913. The history of the latter half of the nineteenth century is dotted with frequent cases of corrupt lobbying and subsequent congressional investigations.[1] Outright bribery was not uncommon in the 1870's and 80's, and to buy Congressmen for the smallest possible sum was all too often "the acme of ambition to the successful lobbyist."[2] But by 1913 both the methods and practitioners of lobbying had changed, and the investigations of that year represent the first congressional recognition of lobbying in its newer forms. Persuasion and promotional activities had supplanted overt corruption. Pressure group representatives and public relations experts had largely replaced the brokers of entree and influence of an earlier era.

The impetus to the investigations of 1913 came primarily from President Wilson's statement to the press on May 27. Referring to the tariff lobby, which had been particularly active in opposing the administration's Underwood tariff, the President charged:

"Washington has seldom seen so numerous, so industrious, so able an lobby. The newspapers are being filled with adver-

[1] See Spofford, A. R., Lobby, Labor's Cyclopedia of Political Science (New York, 1933), pp. 778–781, for a spry account of events in this period.

[2] Reinsch, P. S., American Legislatures and Legislative Methods (New York, 1907), p. 231.

tisements calculated to mislead the judgment not only of public men, but also the public opinion of the country itself. There is every evidence that money without limit is being spent to sustain this lobby and to create an appearance of a pressure of public opinion antagonistic to some of the chief items of the tariff. * * * It is thoroughly worth the while of the people of this country to take knowledge of the matter. Only public opinion can check and destroy it."[3]

Within 2 days, the Senate authorized its Judiciary Committee to "investigate the charge that a lobby is being maintained at Washington, or elsewhere, to influence proposed legislation now pending before the Senate."[4]

In the House, approval of a resolution providing for a parallel investigation lagged. It was not until the appearance of a series of articles in the Chicago Tribune and the New York World, beginning on June 29, 1913, that the House was provoked to action. These articles, which have since become known as the "Mulhall Revelations," charged a number of past and present Members of both Houses of Congress with having entered into various improper dealings with the National Association of Manufacturers through the agency of one Martin Mulhall, a former representative of the association. The House, apparently fearful of another Credit Mobilier, quickly authorized its own select investigating committee to inquire into these charges and to report whether the NAM or its agents had actually influenced "any officer or employee in this or any former House of Representatives in or about the discharge of their official duties."[5] Thus began the two investigations which gave the first thorough airing to lobbying in the Nation's Capital.

SENATE INQUIRY WANDERS

What did these inquiries accomplish, and what can be learned from them? In the case of the Senate investigation the record of accomplishment was highly uneven. The committee's hearings were both brief and diffuse, and the entire investigation suffered from a failure to focus on any central theme.[6] President Wilson's charge had been made with particular reference to extensive lobbying by beet-sugar interests, and the investigation at first centered on these activities. But within 2 weeks, the committee's attention had wandered to charges made by President Lovett, of the Union Pacific Railroad, to the effect that David Lamar, an alleged "Wall Street scavenger," had impersonated two Congressmen over the telephone in seeking to aid one Edward Lauterback in securing employment in the then-pending Union Pacific dissolution case.[7] Nor was this the end. Before its hearings were concluded, the Senate Committee had plunged exuberantly into the Mulhall affair, which was ostensibly the province of the House investigation.

This lack of concentration, although understandable, was unfortunate. Even more unfortunate from the tactical point of view was the committee's failure to present to the Senate any interim or final report of its findings. President Wilson's angry indictment had at first been dismissed as the exaggerated statement of a newcomer in the National Capital. When the Senate investigation was completed, there was little doubt that his charges had been more than substantiated.[8] The committee found that the Beet Sugar Growers Associations had each raised and spent over $500,000 in their efforts to influence the passage of the Underwood tariff. One million five hundred and twenty-five thousand pieces of literature, pro and con, had been mailed under the frank of friendly Members of Congress. Recalcitrant Members had been threatened with political reprisals, and deliberately falsified statistics had been righteously submitted to congressional committees.[9] The evidence of diverse and powerful pressures was both abundant and disquieting, and had the Senate committee submitted a report recommending the enactment of regulatory legislation, Congress might well have acted on its recommendations.

House report outlines pattern of lobbying

The House investigation undoubtedly rendered a more valuable service than did the more discursive Senate inquiry in two respects: the scope of the committee's hearings was successfully confined to the Mulhall charges and to the even-then multifarious legislative activities of the NAM;[10] and when these hearings were ended, the House committee submitted a report which is still notable for its balance and prophetic insight. The committee found that the NAM was—

"An organization having purposes and aspirations along industrial, commercial, political, educational, and other lines, so vast and far reaching as to excite at once admiration and fear—admiration for the genius which conceived them and fear for the effects which the successful accomplishment of all these ambitions might have in a government such as ours."[11]

This statement of the broader problem implicit in organized group activity is as modern as tomorrow.

The most tangible contribution of the report, however, consisted in the light which it threw on the methods by which the NAM had sought to obtain its objectives. The committee found occasional instances in which NAM representatives had attempted to prevent legislation by striving to induce Congressmen to remain away from the Chamber when a vote was being taken.[12] It found, too, that the chief page of the House had been in the employ of the NAM, and that at least one Congressman mentioned in the Mulhall papers, James E. McDermott, of Illinois, was guilty of acts of grave impropriety, unbecoming the dignity of the distinguished position he occupies.[13]

But these activities were trivial, except for the moral turpitude involved;[14] the NAM placed far heavier reliance on more subtle and tangential avenues of approach. The committee found that the association con-

[3] Reprinted in Herring, E. P., Group Representation Before Congress (Baltimore, 1929), p. 44.

[4] 63d Cong., 1st sess., S. Res. 92.

[5] 63d Cong., 1st sess., H. Res. 198. Although he did not accuse them of impropriety, Mulhall named ex-President Taft, ex-Vice President Sherman, and Senator Lodge, inter alia, as being very tractable.

[6] U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Maintenance of a Lobby To Influence Legislation, hearings, 63d Cong., 1st sess. (Washington, 1913), 4 vols.

[7] For comment, see Inquiries About Lobbyists, Independent, vol. 75 (July 10, 1913), p. 69.

[8] The Lobby Exposed, Current Opinion, vol. 55 (August, 1913), p. 75.

[9] O'Laughlin, J. C., Invisible Government Under Searchlight, Review and Reviews, vol. 48 (September 1913), p. 337; Hunting the Insidious Lobbyist, Literary Digest, vol. 47 (July 5, 1913), pp. 3–5.

[10] U. S. Congress, House, Select Committee on Lobby Investigation, hearings, 63d Cong., 1st sess. (Washington, 1913), 4 vols.

[11] 63d Cong., 1st sess., H. Rept. 113, printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 51, pp. 565–574.

[12] Ibid., p. 571.

[13] Ibid., p. 582. No action of censure was recommended by the committee majority, however, nor was such action taken by the House.

[14] "Mulhall Lobby Charges Upheld," Literary Digest, vol. 48 (Apr. 4, 1914), p. 743.

tributed through its agents to the election campaigns of properly disposed congressional candidates; that it carried on a disguised propaganda campaign through newspapers, publicists, speakers, and literature in schools, colleges, and civic organizations throughout the country; and that it had promoted employee alliances for use in opposing prolabor congressional candidates.[17]

These activities may have been less than forthright; they were certainly concealed as carefully as possible. But, withal, there was a notable absence of the widespread and systematic bribery which had disgraced Congresses in the past. If the report proved only that outright corruption was no longer a principal instrument of the lobby, it had served an important purpose.[18]

Beyond demonstrating the new modus operandi, the report was significant as the first official congressional expression concerning the status of the lobby. It clarified that status and suggested a new code of practice for the future.[19]

Equally, the report gave unmistakable notice that Congress would not tolerate indefinitely a continuation of the devious means of special pleading which it had found were employed by the NAM. The committee agreed that:

"To place the Congressman in a cloister to legislate, rendering him immune to extraneous influences, would be impossible, and, if possible, it would be exceedingly ridiculous."[20]

But, at the same time, the committee warned that the NAM and its agents had gone beyond the limits of legitimate effort and that they deserved "the severest censure as well as a pointed invitation and suggestion that they completely reform their methods or else remain away in the future."[21]

The report recognized, however, that these secretive, reprehensible, and disreputable methods were largely vestigial aberrations, and that the deliberate creation of a charged public opinion and a consequent coercion through propaganda were the important means by which the new lobby operated.[22] Although it never submitted a formal statement, the Senate investigating committee had been led to a similar conclusion. Senator Overman, chairman of the Senate group, declared that lobbying consisted less of personal appeals to Congressmen than it did of "the newer form of organized activity to mold public sentiment and to influence Senators by means of public pressure from various sources."[23]

The recognition and at least partial documentation of this changed approach were probably the most useful contributions made by the investigations of 1913. They had the further effect of indirectly stimulating the introduction during the Sixty-third Congress of 12 bills calling for various kinds of congressional regulation of lobbying.[24] No one one these bills was ever reported from committee. It seems reasonable to conclude that they might have been differently received had they been actively sponsored by the two investigating committees.

Near-regulation and investigation, 1927–29

The investigations of 1913 had injured several reputations and forced a number of notorious lobbyists to leave town, but pressure group activity did not diminish as a consequence. Lobbying activity, in fact, became steadily more intense. The world war prompted a greater vertical mobilization of industry, which in turn resulted in a substantial increase of economic groups and associations.[25] This increase in interest alinements combined with the war-spurred development of propaganda techniques to heighten pressure activities during the 1920's.

Apart from the occasional introduction of proposals for registration of lobbyists, Congress gave relatively little consideration to the problem during this period. It was not until 1927 that lobbying again came to the forefront of congressional and public attention. Interest was first provoked by the dubious character of many of the witnesses and organizations who had opposed the Federal estate tax before congressional committees during the Sixty-ninth Congress.[26] Congressional suspicions were aroused, and when the new Congress met in December 1927, a number of regulatory bills, resolutions of inquiry, and proposed rules amendments were immediately introduced in both Houses. One of these bills, a registration and reporting measure sponsored by Senator Caraway, was actually passed by the Senate in March 1928, but was pigeonholed in the House Judiciary Committee until the end of the Congress.[27]

Lobbying and the tariff

The big storm still lay ahead, however. On April 22, 1929, Senator Caraway reintroduced the resolution of inquiry which he had unsuccessfully offered in 1927.[28] The resolution was referred, and during the long summer nothing was heard of it. Meanwhile, the Senate Finance Committee was conducting hearings on the Smoot-Hawley Tariff bill. These two seemingly disparate matters were dramatically joined in the Senate on September 25, when Senator Harrison, following extended debate on tariff increases proposed by the Finance Committee, charged that:

"The rates upon which such increases may be based are determined by such methods as should cause the American people to revolt against them."[29]

Senator Harrison then read the following newspaper statement into the record:

"An executive of one of the country's most important lobbying organizations sat in the secret sessions of the Senate Finance Committee's tariff meetings, investigation by the Hearst newspapers disclosed today. * * *

"Charles L. Eyanson, assistant to the president of the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut, is that man.

"He admits he helped draft some of the provisions of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill.

"He acted as tariff 'expert' for Senator Hiram Bingham, Republican, of Connecticut, during June, July, and August when the Senate Committee was revising the bill's various schedules."[30]

"Here is what this paper said," asserted Senator Harrison; "It calls for a reply." Senator Bingham attempted to justify his action on the ground of needing expert information in order to properly serve his constituents' best interests. The Senate does not appear to have been satisfied with the explanation, however, for 6 days later the Caraway resolution was passed and a Judiciary Subcommittee headed by Senator Caraway was authorized to investigate not only the Eyanson affair, but also the activities of all other "lobbying associations and lobbyists," their revenues and expenditures, and "the effort they put forth to affect legislation." How far did this authorization extend? Senator Caraway had very decided loose on the matter. When asked if the resolution were broad enough to allow investigation of the "social lobby," he replied, "Yes, sir; it is broad enough to investigate anything in which one might feel interested."[31]

Investigating trees rather than the forest

During the course of its investigation, the committee heard from some 92 witnesses whose testimony filled over 5,500 pages. The hearings, which began on October 18, 1929, were not finally terminated until November 24, 1931.[32] What did this lengthy and detailed investigation accomplish? In the first instance, it brought forth massive proof of the charges which had been made against Senator Bingham. The Senate had sought expert aid on tariff questions, and the president of the Connecticut Manufacturers Association had supplied Mr. Eyanson to provide it. Eyanson continued to draw his private salary but at the same time accepted employment as a clerk to Senator Bingham. He returned his Government salary to the the Senator, who, in turn, forwarded the money to the permanent clerk who had been dismissed to make room for Eyanson's appointment.

If nothing else, the Caraway committee report on the affair showed that Senator Bingham had used bad judgment and that Eyanson has pursued his employment as clerk with conspicuous success.[33] These disclosures alone, however, were hardly enough to warrant an investigation which extended for almost 2 years. As had been the case with certain of the more disreputable NAM activities in 1913, the offenses exposed were trivial in importance. But while the House committee of 1913 had placed the whole pattern of NAM pressure operations in a broad and thoughtful framework, the Caraway committee seemed content to take its data where it found it and to present this data without attempting to organize it or to evaluate its significance.

This apparent lack of basic orientation was revealed in the subsequent reports which the Caraway committee submitted to the Senate.[34] Each of these reports dealt only with

[17] H. Rept. 113, loc. cit., p. 574.

[18] Herring, op. cit., p. 46.

[19] Ibid., p. 45.

[20] H. Rept. 113, loc. cit., p. 574.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Herring, op. cit., p. 46. Herring suggests that these investigations were the government actions which had the most direct effect on "the reform of lobbies in the National Capital." (p. 43). One might equally well conclude that these investigations reflected reform more than they stimulated it.

[23] "The Lobby Exposed," loc. cit., p. 75.

[24] These bills called for either prohibition of various lobbying methods, or for registration of lobbyists.

[25] Herring, op. cit., p. 51.

[26] Ibid., pp. 253–254.

[27] 70th Cong., 1st sess., S. 1095. For editorial comment on the bill, see "To Tame the Lobbyist," Literary Digest, vol. 96 (Mar. 17, 1928), p. 11.

[28] 71st Cong., 1st sess., S. Res. 20.

[29] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 71 (Sept. 25, 1929), p. 3948.

[30] Ibid., p. 3949. E. E. Schattschneider's Politics, Pressures, and the Tariff (New York, 1935).

[31] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 71 (Sept. 25, 1929), p. 4115.

[32] U. S. Congress, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Lobby Investigation, Hearings, before a subcommittee, 71st Cong., 1st, 2d, and 3d sessions; 72d Cong., 1st sess. (Washington, 1930, 1931, 1932).

[33] 71st Cong., 1st sess., S. Rept. 43, pt. 1, in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 71 (October 26, 1929), p. 4922. See also Lobby Investigation, Hearings, pp. 149–296. Senator Walsh, of Montana, alleged that Eyanson's advice had resulted in increases in 44 of 53 commodities of interest to Connecticut manufacturers. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 71 (October 16, 1929), p. 4925.

[34] S. Rept. 43, pt. 2, in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 71, p. 5393; pts. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 72, pp. 352, 993, 1568, 3069, 3071, 9268, 9350, and 11151, respectively.

a single individual or a single pressure organization. There was, for example, a separate report on Mr. Joseph R. Grundy by reason of the "extraordinary and commanding place he holds among the lobbyists in this National Capital." There was no suggestion that Mr. Grundy had acted illegally, the committee merely concluded that "the government does not figure at all in Mr. Grundy's views in respect to tariff legislation." This information was no more novel than was the committee's irresistible inference that Mr. Grundy believed that his campaign-fund raising services would enable him to influence his party associates in Congress.[a]

There were other reports in similar vein, each of which drew attention to some particularly notorious or free-spending lobbyist or pressure group.[a] These reports detailed the money spent and received, the methods employed, and the legislation in which the individual or organization was interested. They did not, however, suggest means by which the situation could be improved. The committee never proposed the enactment of a lobbying law, a surprising omission in view of Senator Caraway's earlier efforts in this direction. The committee did not, in fact, submit a final or general report of any kind. It neither summarized its activities nor proposed any correctives for the abuses which it had found.

Another factor which sapped the initial promise of the investigation was the development of political antagonisms among the members of the committee. The first six reports were submitted unanimously, but with the seventh, Senator Robinson, of Indiana, the only administration Republican in the group, felt obliged to leave his colleagues and submit a minority report. Senator Robinson charged that the majority report was purely political condemnation of Mr. C. H. Huston, who happened to be chairman of the Republican National Committee.[a] Senator Robinson dissented from the eighth report on similar grounds and presented his separate views.[a] Thereafter there was considerable discord within the committee as regards both its purposes and its jurisdiction.

The very time for which the investigation extended was also a factor which limited its utility. When the investigation began in 1929, there was reason to believe that it could serve as the motive force behind congressional adoption of a system of pressure-group regulation. Particularly after the Nyanson disclosures, a substantial body of editorial opinion definitely the adoption of a regulatory law, or a code of practice, or an enforced code of ethics.[a] But the Caraway committee proposed nothing: it merely reported. The iron cooled very rapidly after October 1929 and the Caraway Committee never succeeded in reheating it.

Finally, Senator Caraway's attitude toward lobbying undoubtedly contributed to the practical failure of the investigation. He did not treat political pressure as an inevitable concomitant of economic development, nor did he recognize that this pressure was effecting vast changes in the representative system. Rather he believed that lobbyists were greedy and dishonest and that 90 percent of the associations in Washington were what he called fake organizations.[a] Thus the Senator's incessant badgering of witnesses, noticeable in the most cursory examination of the committee hearings, may well have sprung from his determination to buttress his existing convictions about the dishonesty of lobbyists as a group. Whatever the cause, the results were frequently more tasteless and time-consuming than they were informative.

These factors, then, combined to make the investigation a rather sharp disappointment. It threw some light on the development of pressure group methods, particularly in electoral campaigns, and it indirectly reaffirmed the major conclusions of the investigations of 1913; namely, that overt corruption was infrequent and that group pressures had to a very great extent replaced personal solicitation. But given the broad scope of the enabling resolution and the initial receptiveness of congressional and editorial opinion to regulatory proposals, the drawn-out and uncoordinated reports submitted by the Caraway committee were less than might reasonably have been expected.

Congressional action in 1935–36

For the 4 years following the Caraway investigation Congress was quiescent concerning lobbying. Occasional proposals to regulate or investigate lobbying were introduced without success. But with the seating of the Seventy-fourth Congress, there began a period of lobby-busting which was ultimately more significant than either of its predecessors. As in 1913 and 1929, the impetus to congressional action was provided by the particularly extensive pressure exerted in connection with a single piece of legislation. In 1913 and 1929, lobbying on tariff bills led to investigations; in 1935 the legislation at issue was the Wheeler-Rayburn bill to regulate public utility holding companies.

Even prior to 1935 the series of monthly Federal Trade Commission reports on public utility corporations, submitted over the period from March 1923 to December 1935, had amassed impressively detailed information on the pressure and promotional activities of these companies.[a] The methods by which they opposed the Wheeler-Rayburn bill were not wholly new ones, but because they were excessively used they attracted Nation-wide attention.

Congress was well aware of the utilities' efforts to escape regulation. As the House Rules Committee reported subsequent to the passage of the Holding Company Act, the campaign waged in opposition to the measure was probably as "comprehensive, as well-managed, as persistent, and as well-financed as any in the history of the country."[a]

Nor was the congressional recognition of extreme pressure wholly retrospective. Before the Wheeler-Rayburn bill ever came to a vote the Senate had acted favorably on a lobbyist registration measure sponsored by Senator Black.[a] The House took no action on the bill during the remainder of the session, but shortly after the passage of the Holding Company Act both Houses took steps to investigate the pressure which had been exerted for and against the measure. The Senate authorized a special committee of five Senators, headed by Senator Black, to investigate all efforts to promote or retard the passage of the Holding Company Act "or any other matter or proposal affecting legislation." The committee was charged with reporting to the Senate as soon as possible the results of its investigation together with its recommendations.[a]

The utility-lobby investigation

In the House the investigation was authorized with respect only to attempts to influence legislation affecting holding companies during the Seventy-fourth Congress.[a] While the Senate investigation was to be conducted by a special committee, the House investigation was made the responsibility of the already overtaxed Rules Committee. There was, in addition, a hard core of opposition to the House investigation on the ground that Congress already knew that every big utility company had had lobbyists in Washing to keep the Wheeler-Rayburn bill from passing. As Representative Blanton put it: "No new facts will be developed that will be worth 5 cents to the people."[a]

This prophecy partially matured, at least with respect to the House investigation. The Rules Committee held hearings only between July 9 and August 28. A large part of these hearings, furthermore, were dedicated to an examination of charges by Representative BREWSTER, of Maine, that Thomas G. Corcoran, a key administration strategist, had attempted to coerce him into supporting the Wheeler-Rayburn bill by threatening to block clearance of the Passamaquoddy project, in which BREWSTER was particularly interested.[a] The case was colorful, even brazen, but it was trifling when compared to the enormous pressures brought to bear by the private utilities.

When the Rules Committee did turn to an investigation of these pressures, it became embroiled with the Black committee over the custody of a witness, Mr. H. C. Hopson of the Associated Gas & Electric Co. It is perhaps significant that the only response of the House to its Rules Committee's request for authority to arrest Mr. Hopson was the introduction of a resolution to return the committee's unexpended funds to the General Treasury.[a]

The Rules Committee submitted one six-page report on its investigation to the House, and this almost 6 months after hearings had ended.[a] This report, inaccurately labeled "preliminary," agreed that there had been a widespread and well-organized campaign in opposition to the Holding Company Act. The report did not condemn the campaign per se, but rather decried it because it appeared to have been excessive. Thus it scored as "arrogant" Mr. Hopson's candid admission that his company had spent $900,000 in an effort to defeat the "death sentence" for utilities. No question was raised as to the ethics of this particular use of investors' money.

The excessiveness of the campaign notwithstanding, the committee seemed to have little faith in its own investigation. The report moodily concluded:

"The truth is that coming (as the investigations do) after the legislation in question has been disposed of, they are too much like closing the stable door after the horse has departed, usually leaving a very dim and uncertain trail."[a]

The Senate investigation had its limitations, but self-doubt was not one of them. The Black committee fought a lively skirmish with the House Rules Committee over

[a] S. Rept. 48, pt. 2, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 72 (December 10, 1929), p. 362.

[a] E. g., the American Taxpayers' League (pt. 4), the Million-Dollar Sugar Lobby (pt. 5), the Minute Steaks Lobby (pt. 7).

[a] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 72 (May 21, 1931), p. 9269.

[a] Ibid., p. 9441.

[a] "A Show-Down on Lobbying," Christian Century, vol. 46 (October 16, 1929), p. 1269; Fifth Estate, World's Work, vol. 58 (December 1929), pp. 34–35; W. F. Ford, Consider the Ethics of Lobbying, Eaton's Business, vol. 17 (October 1929), pp. 50–51.

[a] Herring, op. cit., p. 350.

[a] "Utility corporations, 70th Cong., 1st sess., S. Doc. 92, pts. 7a (Efforts by Associations and Agencies of Electric and Gas Utilities To Influence Public Opinion, 1934), and 8a (Publicity and Propaganda Activities by Utility Groups and Companies, 1935).

[a] 74th Cong., 2d sess., H. Rept. 2081, p. 3.

[a] 74th Cong., 1st sess., S. 2512.

[a] 74th Cong., 1st sess., S. Res. 165.

[a] 74th Cong., 1st sess., H. Res. 289.

[a] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 79 (July 5, 1935), p. 10717.

[a] U. S. Congress, House, Committee on Rules, Investigation of Lobbying on Utility Holding Company Bills, Hearings, 74th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington, 1935), pp. 1–162.

[a] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 79 (August 15, 1935), p. 13292.

[a] 74th Cong., 2d sess., H. Rept. 2081.

[a] Ibid., p. 3.

the custody of Mr. Hopson. It later became involved with Mr. William Randolph Hearst over the seizure of certain telegrams which Hearst had sent to his employees concerning the Wheeler-Rayburn bill. This dispute was finally settled in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals in a manner which cast the committee's procedures in a distinctly unfavorable light.[a] Both the Hopson and Hearst episodes did considerable damage to the good public relations which the committee needed to bring its investigation to a fully successful conclusion.[a]

The Black committee further failed to submit either a final report or the recommendations which it had been charged with submitting as soon as practicable. It reported to the Senate only once, and this report was confined to a discussion of Mr. Hopson's failure to respond to the committee's summons.[a]

On the positive side, the Black investigation had at least one tangible consequence. The committee's carefully documented evidence on the utilities' campaign to defeat the Wheeler-Rayburn bill was certainly an important factor in the approval by the House on August 22, 1935, of the death sentence clause in only slightly modified form.[a]

The Black investigation was also significant from the purely procedural point of view. The committee's staff was painstakingly attentive to details, and this careful spadework contributed significantly to the nature and conduct of the investigation. To give but one example, Senator Black submitted sworn statements from telegraph office managers in 20 towns which indicated that of 31,580 telegrams sent to Washington regarding the Holding Company Act, all but 13 were filed and paid for by utility company agents, almost invariably without the consent of the person whose name was used.[a] Nor is this example an isolated one. Throughout the committee's hearings an abundance of comparable evidence was introduced on other facets of the utilities' campaign. This documentation both speeded up the committee's hearings and gave substance to its findings.

But beyond its contribution to the passage of the Wheeler-Rayburn bill and its demonstration of the possibilities of the documentary approach, it is doubtful whether the Black investigation had any other lasting value. The committee developed a fairly full picture of a particularly intensive pressure campaign, but it left untapped a great part of the broad investigatory power which it had been granted. It failed to give any essentially new insight into either the methods or significance of organized group action. And, finally, if it is presumed that an investigation means little unless it stimulates congressional action, one would have to concede that even this relatively well-conducted investigation was a failure.

CONCLUSION: APPLYING THE PAST TO THE PRESENT

It would be extravagant to predict that the new investigation will succeed only insofar as it transcends limitations which have marred earlier investigations. Certainly the subject matter involved is too broad, too complex, and too fluid to be dealt with purely in terms of methods which have succeeded or failed in the past. Every investigation has been addressed to a specific situation which can have no exact counterpart. These reservations notwithstanding, past experience strongly suggests a few general conclusions as to the most viable means of conducting a lobbying investigation. Let it be noted that these conclusions are offered only as rules of thumb; no stronger term is possible.

First, considerable research should precede the actual hearings. It seems safe to say that this has never been done in the past, and that the investigations have suffered as a consequence. This research should begin with an analysis of past investigations and a survey of the literature on both pressure groups and pressure-group regulation. Assuming that the Buchanan committee is particularly concerned with improving the present Lobbying Act, this research should also include a careful examination of the act's operation over the past 3 years and a parallel examination of the content and efficiency of State regulation of lobbying laws.

Second, an agenda for hearings should be established and adhered to. Here the Buchanan committee is in a particularly favorable position. Past investigations have come in immediate response to charges of heavy pressure on specific matters. The committees have usually probed these charges with great initial energy, but when this source has been thoroughly mined the investigations have usually petered out in planless confusion, the House inquiry of 1913 being the one notable exception. The present investigation is addressed to a general situation rather than to specific cases, and this fact should enable the Buchanan committee to plan its work more carefully than did any of its predecessors.

Third, the committee should make every effort not to let its hearings bog down into a welter of interesting but trivial detail. Here again the example of the House investigation of 1913 is worth following, while the Black committee's hyperscrupulous attention to the utilities' telegram campaign in 1935 is an obvious case of the extreme to be avoided.

Fourth, the committee should strive to avoid an overly caustic treatment of witnesses or an excessive use of its subpena power. The experience of the Caraway and Black committees on these points is persuasive. The temptation may be overwhelming, but untoward grilling or unnecessary seizure of evidence tends to turn the public against such an investigating committee.

Fifth, the provocation and maintenance of congressional and public interest in the investigation is essential. To this end, the committee should submit interim progress reports on its work as did the Caraway committee in 1929 and 1930. A final report embodying the committee's recommendations for revision of the Lobbying Act is even more important, particularly since the hope that the committee can find means of strengthening the present act is a central reason for its existence.

Sixth, the committee should take steps to avoid the development of the internal political cleavages which so seriously handicapped the latter part of the Caraway investigation. The present committee's authority to study the Government lobby is potential political dynamite and is, therefore, liable to become a serious divisive factor. One can only hope that the Buchanan committee will approach this problem cautiously, with full awareness that the publicity activities of Government agencies are not strictly comparable to those of private interest groups and require different techniques for both investigation and regulation.

These suggestions relate primarily to procedure. It is somewhat more difficult to indicate the proper scope of the investigation since this is so largely a function of the substantive purposes which the investigation is designed to serve. On this point, the Buchanan committee has not yet clearly declared itself.

What purposes can an investigation of this kind serve? There would appear to be two primary alternatives, both of which may be present at once: the investigation can be a means for the development of an improved system of regulation, or it can be a medium for the development of information. Every previous investigation has centered on this second alternative to the exclusion of the first, and it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that this choice has usually been unfortunate. This past experience, buttressed by the general limitations of the congressional investigatory process, suggests that the Buchanan committee is unlikely to make a comprehensive, meaningful, or informative analysis of group pressures on Government. It is highly doubtful for example, that the committee could add much more than recent detail to the broad coverage, the basic and penetrating orientation of Donald Blaisdell's TNEC monograph, Economic Power and Political Pressure.

It would appear, therefore, that the present investigation can be of greatest service in fulfillment of the first purpose, i. e., the development of improved regulation. This is not to suggest that the Buchanan committee could or should rewrite the Lobbying Act without a fairly broad investigation into the whole pattern of pressure group activities, particularly into those parts of the pattern such as institutional and editorial advertising, or other indirect pressure practices whose standing under the present act is uncertain. Information and regulation cannot be wholly divorced; it is, rather, a question of emphasis. Effective regulation should be the first consideration, not because further information in unnecessary but rather because a congressional committee is simply not equipped to provide this information in a complete or well-integrated way. The Buchanan committee should do that which is most urgent and that which it can do best. On either score, its primary task is to find democratic solutions for the problem of political pressure.

[a] Judge Groner held that the seizure had been unlawful, but that complaint had been made too late to affect the committee's use of the material. *Hearst* v. *Black* (87 Fed. (2d) 68 (1936)).

[a] See, as examples of critical comment, Black Booty, Time, vol. 2 (March 16, 1935), pp. 17–18; New York Times, March 15, 1936, sec. IV, p. 10.

[a] 74th Cong., 1st sess., S. Rept. 1272.

[a] McGeary, M. N., the Development of Congressional Investigative Power (New York, 1940), p. 40.

[a] U. S. Congress, Senate, Special Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities, hearings, 74th Cong., 1st and 2d sess., 75th Cong., 3d sess. (Washington, 1935–38), pp. 1014–15.

Control of Coal Supplies in the State of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in line with my remarks of February 17 and my insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A1179, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, chapter 15 of the Laws of 1950, State of New York, which is the text of "An act providing emergency measures for the control of coal supplies" approved by Governor Dewey on February 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An act providing emergency measures for the control of coal supplies

The people of the State of New York, represented in the Senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Legislative finding: The legislature hereby finds that in the State of New

York the exhaustion and scarcity of coal constitute a public emergency directly affecting the health, safety, and welfare of the residents of the people of the State. At the present time such a scarcity exists. Coal supplies in important cities are so reduced that industrial establishments have been forced to stop work and there is danger of widespread further stoppages. Unless coal mining is resumed immediately, existing and anticipated supplies of solid fuels will be insufficient to assure the continued operation of hospitals, water systems, sewage systems, food processing plants, schools, and other facilities essential to the health, welfare, and safety of the people. It is therefore necessary that the distribution and use of solid fuels be regulated in order to ensure the continuance, as long as may be possible of services, activities, and functions essential to the people of the State.

Sec. 2. Solid fuels administrator: There is established in the Department of Public Works, the office of solid fuels administrator. The head of the office shall be the solid fuels administrator who shall be appointed by the Governor and serve during his pleasure. In the event that he should not be a public officer or employee, he may receive compensation to be fixed by the Governor within the amount made available by appropriation therefore. He shall be reimbursed for his actual expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of his duties. With the approval of the Governor, he may employ such assistants as he deems necessary and fix their compensation within the amounts made available by appropriation therefor.

Sec. 3. Definitions: (a) The term "solid fuels" as used herein shall be termed to mean and include all forms of anthracite, bituminous, subbituminous, and lignite coals. (b) The term "dealer" as used herein shall include any person employed or engaged in the business of selling, transporting, or distributing solid fuels at wholesale or retail.

Sec. 4. Powers of the administrator: The administrator shall have the following powers and duties: (a) To establish a system of preferences in the use of solid fuels.

(b) To ration and allocate supplies of solid fuels in the possession of or subject to the control of a dealer and assign priorities with respect thereto.

(c) To limit, regulate, or prohibit the sale, transportation, delivery, or transfer of solid fuels in the possession or subject to the control of a dealer.

(d) To restrict the use of solid fuels by ordering the full-time, part-time, or intermittent closing of any building, facility, or plant in connection with which solid fuel is used for any purpose and to restrict the use of electric power, gas, steam, and other products requiring solid fuels in their manufacture.

(e) To adopt, promulgate, and make effective plans, regulations, rules, and orders to implement and carry out the purposes of this act.

(f) To make such investigations and surveys as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act and to inspect the premises or property, books, records, and other writings of any person, partnership, company, or corporation. Except in accordance with proper judicial order or as otherwise provided by law, it shall be unlawful for the administrator or for any person who is permitted to inspect any book, record, or writing which has been produced in accordance with this paragraph, or to whom any information contained in any report or record as a result of the production thereof pursuant to this paragraph, to divulge or make known in any manner any of the particulars set forth or disclosed in any book, record, or writing hereunder. Any violation of the provisions of this paragraph shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both, at the discretion of the court.

Sec. 5. Standards: In establishing the preferences, rationing, allocations, and priorities provided for in the preceding section and in performing his other duties under this act, the administrator shall with respect to each use of solid fuels under consideration take into account:

1. The relationship of such use to the preservation of the health, welfare, and safety of the people of the State.

2. The consequences with respect to the health, welfare, and safety of the people of the State of the cessation or curtailment of such use.

3. The amount of solid fuels which such use requires.

4. The degree to which fuels other than solid fuels may be substituted with respect to such use.

5. The degree to which the public benefits of such use may be otherwise obtained.

Sec. 6. Prohibitions: No person shall sell, deliver, transfer, or otherwise distribute coal in violation of the rules, regulations, or orders of the administrator.

Sec. 7. Utilization of State and local agencies: The administrator is hereby empowered to direct or authorize any department, agency, or officer of the State or any political subdivision thereof to provide such facilities, personnel, assistance, and data as will enable him to carry out the purposes of this act.

Sec. 8. Exercise of powers through State and local agencies: The administrator may exercise any power, authority, or discretion conferred upon him by this act through any department, agency, or officer of the State or any political subdivision thereof in conformity with any rules or regulations which he may prescribe.

Sec. 9. Inconsistent laws: Superseded. All laws, general, special, or local, or parts thereof, which may be inconsistent with the provisions of this act shall be superseded and suspended in their operation to the extent that they are inconsistent with the provisions hereof or any rule, regulation, or order issued hereunder.

Sec. 10. Injunctions: Whenever in the judgment of the administrator any person is engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this act or of any rule, regulation, or order issued hereunder, the administrator, through the attorney general, may make application to the supreme court for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, rule, regulation, or order, and upon a showing by the administrator that such person is engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices, a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

Sec. 11. Penalties: Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited or willfully fails to perform any act required by any provision hereof or of any rule, regulation, or order issued hereunder, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any public officer who willfully violates any such provision, rule, regulation, or order shall be subject to removal from office by the governor in the manner provided by law for the removal of sheriffs.

Sec. 12. Contract liabilities: No person shall be held liable for damages or penalties for any default under any contract or order which shall result directly or indirectly from compliance with this act or any rule, regulation, or order issued hereunder, notwithstanding that this act or any such rule, regulation, or order shall thereafter be declared by judicial or other competent authority to be invalid.

Sec. 13. Expiration date: The provisions of this act shall take effect immediately and shall continue in effect for 90 days.

Judicial Legislation: A Threat to Constitutional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, one of the fundamental problems in the Government of the United States today is a blurring of the lines which mark the separation of powers between the three coordinate branches of legislature, executive, and judiciary. The distinctions are basic in the Constitution. Encroachments, particularly on the functions and powers of the legislature, are serious threats to representative government. On February 11 Senator BRICKER delivered a penetrating and scholarly address before the State of Illinois Bar Association at Peoria on one phase of this matter. The subject of his address was "Judicial Legislation: A Threat to Constitutional Government. His remarks are so significant that I feel they deserve permanent reference and I therefore ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDICIAL LEGISLATION: A THREAT TO CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

(An address by Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER)

The paramount political issue of the day is that of liberty versus the planned economy of a socialist state. There are some, of course, who do not agree with Herbert Hoover that we are now on the last mile to collectivism. There are others who feel that the promised economic security is worth a substantial price in terms of individual freedom. It is not my intention this evening to restate my opposition to the so-called welfare state. That issue should be resolved by the Congress after the people have spoken in the elections of 1950 and 1952.

Unnoticed by the general public, however, is the increasing amount of judicial legislation which tends to make the votes of the people and the deliberations of Congress academic. In spite of the political beliefs which individual lawyers may hold, usurpation of legislative powers by the Supreme Court should lead to vigorous opposition on the part of all the members of the American bar.

First, let me emphasize that there is a vast amount of so-called judicial legislation which does not undermine the constitutional separation of legislative and judicial powers. One common type of legitimate judicial legislation arises out of the interpretation of statutes couched in such vague language that Congress has by implication delegated legislative power to the Court. Also, the Court frequently applies a statute to a specific situation never contemplated by Congress and where a decision either way would not contravene the intent of Congress as disclosed either in the statute or its legislative history. Judicial legislation of the type described does not upset the constitutional division of labor between the Court and Congress, however unwise some of it may seem.

By virtue of its power to determine the constitutionality of laws passed by the Congress, the Supreme Court also exercises what can be described as a legitimate legislative

function. Since 1937 the Court has refrained from junking legislation on constitutional grounds, and, to this extent, has increased the power and responsibility of Congress.

In the past 10 years, there has been increasing evidence of another type of judicial legislation which conflicts with article I, section 1 of the Constitution providing:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

It is this illegitimate judicial legislation to which my remarks this evening are directed. This judicial legislation springs from the insistence of a group of justices to establish, under the guise of statutory interpretation, their own preconceived notions of wise social and economic policy. Justices Black, Douglas, Murphy, and Rutledge comprised this group. They frequently succeeded in having one or more of the other Justices join them in resorting to some process of illegitimate statutory interpretation to reach a result coinciding with their own left-wing attitudes and opinions. In general, the political philosophy underlying judicial lawmaking is strikingly similar to that involved in State socialism. That philosophy consists of: (1) a desire that State regulation be superseded by Federal regulation; (2) hostility toward business in general and big business in particular; (3) an irrepressible sympathy for the under dog in both economic and political activities; (4) suspicion of the rich; (5) the conviction that labor organizations can do no wrong; and (6) the belief that administrative action should not be hampered by judicial review.

A collectivist society requires virtually complete centralization of all governmental powers. Because the draftsmen of the Constitution feared a strong central government, they not only divided authority at the national level, but reserved the bulk of political power to the States. That constitutional plan has been thwarted, of course, by decisions construing the welfare clause as conferring substantive powers on the Congress and by imaginative expansion of the interstate commerce clause. Nevertheless, Congress has generally been unwilling to supersede State regulation to the full extent permitted under recent constitutional doctrine. The Supreme Court, however, has been eager to centralize authority through the unwarranted expansion of existing legislation.

An example of this type of judicial legislation is the East Ohio Gas case,[1] decided on January 9 of this year, where the Court held that the Federal Power Commission's authority extended to a distributor of natural gas operating solely within the boundaries of a single State and selling gas only at retail. In spite of the clearly expressed desire of Congress not to intrude upon the area of effective State regulation, the East Ohio case sanctions overlapping regulation, nullifies an uncertain amount of State regulation, and, unless Congress acts, will lead to complete Federal regulation of the natural-gas industry. Other decisions by the Supreme Court involving electric power companies reveal a similar type of judicial legislation. Similarly, in the Southeastern Underwriters case[2] the Court cast aside prior judicial decisions accepted by numerous Congresses over a period of 75 years for the purpose of federalizing insurance regulation.

The centralizing influence of the Supreme Court's legislation is not confined to insurance and public-utility regulation. By now most lawyers are thoroughly familiar with the manner in which the Fair Labor Standards Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and other Federal laws have been thrust upon businesses as far removed from the stream of interstate commerce as the corner drug store and grocery store. In each case an unbiased examination of legislative history would have disclosed that Congress never intended its statutory definition of interstate commerce to be determined by any ingenious "house that Jack built chain of causation."[3]

There is a peculiar quirk in the mind of every socialist planner that employers who provide gainful employment to several hundred men and who compete for the consumer's favor are exploiters, but that the bureaucrat who fixes prices, allocates markets, and limits competition is a public benefactor. This curious thinking is reflected in much of the judicial legislation affecting business.

In the famous Cement case,[4] for example, the Court approved the fantastic theory of competition advanced by the Federal Trade Commission that manufacturers discriminate unless they net the same price from each customer. This mill-net theory, of course, is sufficient to outlaw all delivered pricing and freight absorption. Congress certainly never intended any such result because language having that result was deleted from the Robinson-Patman Act, and specific antibasing-point legislation was rejected. The Cement case apparently requires many manufacturers to sell only on an f. o. b. mill basis. As a result many industries are threatened with balkanization; each company selling only within its freight-advantage territory. When the Department of Justice notes the rise of a series of local monopolies sponsored by the Federal Trade Commission, it may then invoke the Sherman Act. Unless Congress reverses the Cement-case legislation, lawyers will be placed in the unhappy position of offering their business clients a Robson's choice.

Hostility toward business is also reflected in the Supreme Court's patent cases. Time does not permit me to delve into the intricacies of patent law. However, since the first patent law of 1790, Congress has tried to perform its constitutional duty of encouraging invention by granting to inventors an exclusive right to work their invention for a limited period. The extent to which the Court's legislation has been substituted for that of Congress is revealed in a recent dissent by Mr. Justice Jackson. Summarizing the effect of the Court's decisions on patent law during the past 10 years, Mr. Justice Jackson said: "The only patent that is valid is one which this Court has not been able to get its hands on."[5]

Evidence of the Court's hostility toward business is clearly evident in its expansion of the Sherman Act far beyond what the Congress of 1890 and subsequent Congresses intended. Quite appropriately, this law is now commonly referred to as the new Sherman Act, but it was amended not by Congress but by the Supreme Court. As a result, no lawyer can advise a company with any confidence that it is not a monopoly and not engaged in restraint of trade. Intent to monopolize or to restrain trade is now immaterial. Competition which hurts competitors is suspect. Patent uses held valid under numerous Court decisions, and accepted by the Congress, are now invalid.[6] Meeting the price of competitors has become per se proof of conspiracy. In short, the Supreme Court has given the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice blanket authority to harass business at will.

For many years Socialists have been preoccupied with the plight of the economic and political under dog. Unfortunately, the sometimes sincere desire to help the less fortunate means that rules of law must be twisted and bent beyond all recognition. The Supreme Court has been motivated by the same compassionate instincts, sometimes laudable, but generally doing violence to the principle of equal justice under the law.

In the Federal Employers Liability Act, Congress established negligence as the rule of liability. By the simple process of never reversing a judgment in favor of the worker and never failing to reverse a directed verdict for the carrier, the Court has transformed that act into one of absolute liability.[7] It has done the same thing in many cases for the benefit of injured seamen.[8] In fact, its sympathy for injured railroad employees was so great that it permitted them to shop for the most liberal forum regardless of established rules relating to the convenience of the carrier and of the Court.[9] It may be true that the Federal Employers Liability Act is outmoded, but the Supreme Court has no constitutional right to act as a legislative reformer by making the act a workmen's compensation statute.

There has always been a close affinity between socialism and communism. This is only natural since both have the same ends, the only difference being in the method and speed of attainment. In at least three cases, Communists or Communist sympathizers have been the beneficiaries of judicial legislation.

In the case involving Harry Bridges,[10] the Attorney General and two lower courts found substantial evidence of Bridges' membership in the Communist Party and ordered his deportation. The statute provided that the decision of the Attorney General should be final. Nevertheless, the Supreme Court reviewed the proceeding de novo and reversed on the ground that some hearsay evidence had been introduced. With much more tenuous support in the evidence, the Supreme Court has affirmed findings of the Labor Board and most other administrative agencies. It should be obvious that Congress did not intend to give Communists a broader type of judicial review than that available to American citizens of unquestioned loyalty.

In the Schneiderman case,[11] an avowed and ardent disciple of communism escaped denaturalization through the Court's rationalization that a spreader of communism can be attached to the principles of the United States Constitution within the meaning of the naturalization laws. It should be unnecessary to add that no Congress has ever believed that a man can be genuinely attached to both the Communist manifesto and the United States Constitution.

In a case decided last year, the Court set aside the conviction of Harold Christoffel for perjury before the congressional committee, because there was some evidence that only 11 Congressmen, 2 short of a quorum, heard the lie that he was not a Communist.[12] The Court disregarded prior decisions, established parliamentary authority, and the custom and practice of Congress for over 150 years that a quorum is presumed to continue unless a point of no quorum is raised.

A common delusion under which all Socialists and planners labor is that the wealthy have an inexhaustible pool of money which can be tapped at will for what they conceive

[1] *Federal Power Commission* v. *East Ohio Gas Co.*, 18 U. S. Law Week 4080.

[2] *United States*, v. *Southeastern Underwriters Association*, 322 U. S. 533 (1944).

[3] *See Borden Co.* v. *Borella*, 325 U. S. 679 (1945).

[4] *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Cement Institute*, 333 U. S. 683 (1948).

[5] *Jungersen* v. *Baden*, 335 U. S. 560 (1948).

[6] E. g., *United States* v. *Line Material Co.*, 333 U. S. 287 (1948); *Scott Paper Co.* v. *Marcalus Manufacturing Co.*, 326 U. S. 249 (1945).

[7] See concurring opinion of Frankfurter, J., in *Wilkerson* v. *McCarthy*, 336 U. S. 53, 64 (1949), for a review of the Court's decisions over the past 10 years.

[8] *Johnson* v. *United States*, 333 U. S. 46 (1948).

[9] *Miles* v. *Illinois Central Railroad Co.*, 315 U. S. 698 (1942).

[10] *Bridges* v. *Wixon*, 326 U. S. 135 (1945).

[11] *Schneiderman* v. *United States*, 320 U. S. 118 (1943).

[12] *Christoffel* v. *United States*, 336 U. S. 94 (1949).

to be the common good. It has been discovered in England, and it is rapidly being found out here, that persons of modest means pay the cost of social and economic experimentation. The Supreme Court's ability to redistribute wealth has been necessarily limited. However, those of you who deal with tax questions can appreciate that the Court has made some progress in that direction.

In the famous Clifford case[*] the Court plugged a sizable loophole in the income-tax law. However, it was a loophole which the Congress, in providing for a different method of taxation for trusts and individuals, had expressly refused to close. In common with most judicial legislation, the Court's Clifford rule proved so vague and confusing both to tax lawyers and the lower courts that the Treasury was forced to implement it with a body of administrative legislation. What has been said with reference to the Clifford case applies also to the Court's family-partnership cases.[*]

The Court has been no less ingenious in milking large estates. In the Spiegel case,[*] for example, the Court sustained a $450,000 tax on the estate of a decedent because of a possibility of reverter, which, if it existed, was never worth more than $1,000. Speaking for the Court, Mr. Justice Black refused to consider the future-interest law of Illinois to see if the tenuous possibility on which the tax rested did in fact exist.

It is indeed ironic that workers who suffer most under a totalitarian regime have, through their labor organizations, supplied the springboard to power. Much of the Supreme Court's legislation reflects the attitude that labor organizations, in spite of their economic power, should not be hampered by any legal restrictions.

The outstanding example of judicial legislation in this field is the famous Hutcheson case.[*] Although Congress in the Norris-LaGuardia Act had banned the injunctive remedy for certain acts of labor unions outlawed under the Sherman law, the Court proceeded to repeal all other remedies for labor union antitrust violations. The work of removing labor unions from the reach of the Sherman Act was completed in the Carpenters case,[*] where the Court immunized labor unions from liability for the unlawful acts of their duly authorized agents. Other decisions of the Court have sanctioned labor union violence,[*] forbidden by Congress in the Antirackteering Act, and kickbacks of wages to dishonest union officials,[*] clearly outlawed by the Kickback Act of 1934.

In Dr. Friederich Hayek's brilliant work, the Road to Serfdom, chapter 6 is devoted to planning and the rule of law. The first two sentences of that chapter are:

"Nothing distinguishes more clearly conditions in a free country from those in a country under arbitrary government than the observance in the former of the great principles known as the rule of law. Stripped of all technicalities, this means that government in all its actions is bound by rules fixed and announced beforehand—rules which make it possible to foresee with fair certainty how the authority will use its coercive powers in given circumstances and to plan one's individual affairs on the basis of this knowledge." (P. 72.)

If you fully understand the meaning of those sentences, you will appreciate why the symbol of justice wears a blindfold. It simply means that justice is based on standards which are both rational and communicable, and above all else impersonal. In other words, in a free society justice is dispensed in accordance with definite rules which in themselves prevent arbitrary action for or against particular individuals. In a collectivist society, those who plan the details of the lives of the people necessarily require power of such magnitude that it cannot be tested by any definite act of the legislature. The authority granted to the OPA, for example, meant that whatever action it might take in controlling prices would be legal. The growing trend toward what Dean Pound has described as administrative authoritarianism is due in part to legislation by the Supreme Court.

In the Dobson case,[*] the Supreme Court completely nullified the law providing that decisions of the Tax Court not in accordance with law should be reversible on appeal. The Court, on behalf of itself and the circuit courts, abdicated authority to review Tax Court decisions not showing at first blush a serious legal error.

In numerous cases involving the definition of employee, the Court, contrary to the intent of Congress, has relinquished the burden of interpretation to the administrative agency involved. Until the decisions of the Court were reversed by Congress, the Labor Board, and the Treasury Department under the Social Security Act, were empowered to define employee under vague standards of the broad social purpose of the legislation, instead of the usual common law test intended by Congress.[*]

By abdicating powers of judicial review, the Supreme Court has granted to many administrative agencies arbitrary power over the businesses they regulate. In cases involving, for example, the Federal Power Commission,[*] the Federal Trade Commission,[*] and the Securities and Exchange Commission,[*] the Court held, in effect, that Congress intended the courts to give rubber-stamp approval to the actions of those agencies because of their presumed expertness.

What are the dangers involved in judicial legislation inasmuch as Congress has already corrected many of the examples already discussed?

First. The desire of Congress to reestablish its original intent can be thwarted by a Presidential veto.

Second. Considerable time is required for Congress to correct judicial legislation as shown by the aftermath of the Cement case. This increased work has been thrust upon Congress at a time when its responsibilities with relation to foreign affairs and national security have been greatly increased.

Third. Correction of some judicial legislation subjects the Congress to unwarranted, but perfectly natural, criticism. The general public still assumes, almost instinctively, that the Supreme Court should be immune from criticism, because, unlike Congress, it is emotionally unconcerned about the desirability or undesirability of particular legislation. In 1947, for example, the Congress wiped out retroactively the effect of the Court's portal-to-portal legislation imposing a multi-billion-dollar liability on business and the Government. It is only natural that many wage earners would be bitter about the action of Congress in taking away the money so generously promised by the Court.

Fourth. Some judicial legislation is virtually beyond the power of correction because the Court has blinded itself to socially desirable practices and equitable principles, universally recognized but difficult to express in legislative form.

Fifth. Judicial legislation, because it is generally retroactive and incomplete, befuddles the lower courts and lawyers until such time as Congress makes the necessary correction.

Sixth. Judicial legislation, sooner or later, must lock the Supreme Court and Congress in another open struggle for power in which the reputation of both may be damaged.

There is no more important work which members of the bar can undertake than to devote their exceptional talents to a study of judicial legislation. The separation of legislative and judicial power is one worthy of eternal vigilance, because the judiciary owes no responsibility to the electorate. The impending struggle between the Court and Congress concerns the right of the people, through their elected representatives, to make the laws under which they choose to live. Lawyers, whatever their political affiliation, should be willing to work together toward seeing that the right of the people to rule shall never be impaired.

[*] *Helvering* v. *Clifford*, 309 U. S. 331 (1940).

[*] *Commissioner* v. *Tower*, 327 U. S. 280 (1945).

[*] *Spiegel* v. *Commissioner*, 335 U. S. 701 (1949).

[*] *United States* v. *Hutcheson*, 312 U. S. 219 (1941).

[*] *United Brotherhood of Carpenters* v. *United States*, 330 U. S. 395 (1947).

[*] *United States* v. *Local 807*, 315 U. S. 521 (1942).

[*] *Carbone* v. *United States*, 327 U. S. 633 (1945).

[*] *Dobson* v. *Commissioner*, 320 U. S. 489 (1943).

[*] *Labor Board* v. *Hearst Publications, Inc.*, 322 U. S. 11 (1944); *Silk* v. *United States*, 331 U. S. 704 (1947).

[*] *Federal Power Commission* v. *Hope Natural Gas Co.*, 320 U. S. 591 (1944).

[*] *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Morton Salt Co.*, 334 U. S. 37 (1948).

[*] *Securities and Exchange Commission* v. *Chenery Corp.*, 332 U. S. 194 (1947).

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Address by the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner speech of the President of the United States is included herewith under the unanimous consent granted me. In this speech, delivered on February 16 to more than 5,000 Democrats at the dinner and to a radio audience of millions, President Harry S. Truman outlined clearly the forward-looking goals of the Democratic Party, and the means of achieving those goals. The President made clear the contrast between the two major parties. The Democratic Party looks forward to the future with faith and confidence, while the Republican Party yearns for the past predicting a gloomy future.

Fellow Democrats, this is a most remarkable dinner.

This dinner and others like it throughout the land are evidence of the growing strength of the Democratic Party. They show that our party is determined, more than ever before, to carry its message to the voters of this country.

It is very significant that such great interest and enthusiasm are being shown in a congressional election year. We know that congressional elections are as important as Presidential elections. We found out in

1946 how much harm can be done to our country when a congressional election goes wrong. We are not going to let that happen again. We don't want another do-nothing Eightieth Congress.

These dinners carry forward a great tradition. The original Jefferson-Jackson dinner was held in this city in 1830, 120 years ago. It was given in memory of Thomas Jefferson, and its guest of honor was President Jackson. At that first Jefferson-Jackson dinner President Jackson gave his famous toast: "Our Federal Union, it must be preserved."

Tonight we meet again to think of our Federal Union, to be thankful that it has been preserved, and that it has grown in strength and in service to the people. As in Jackson's time we meet to discuss some of the problems that our country faces.

We have some very serious problems today. We are living in a troubled period of the world's history. Our responsibilities as a Nation have never been so great, and the decisions we face have never been more difficult. We confront serious questions of foreign policy. We have the problem of maintaining an adequate national defense. We have the task of maintaining prosperity and protecting our economy from depression. We have the question of handling the Nation's finances and the national debt.

These are grave issues. And the Democratic Party is meeting them squarely. We do not believe in trifling with the people about these issues. We do not offer to solve them with vague generalities or worn-out slogans. We know that the solution of these problems requires all the wisdom and energy we possess as a Nation. We know that their solution requires heavy expenditures. The Democratic Party does not propose to deceive the people either about the problems we face or the cost of solving them.

The Democratic Party has confidence that the United States will meet these great responsibilities. It knows that the United States is a dynamic, growing Nation. We believe that this country will make as much progress in the next 50 years as it has made in the last 50 years.

But we cannot meet the responsibilities of today or the challenge of the future by following the outmoded concepts of 50 years ago. The promise of the twentieth century cannot be fulfilled by those who would like to return to the days of McKinley.

We must go forward with our programs for peace through defense and foreign aid. We must proceed with our domestic programs for health, education, social security, and economic stability. Both our foreign programs and our domestic programs are necessary to answer the demands which this critical period of history makes upon us. We cannot have prosperity at home unless we play our full part in the defense and the revival of other free nations. We cannot have peace abroad unless we increase the strength, the freedom, and the well-being of our people at home.

There are some who would like to see us turn our backs upon the rest of the world and drop our efforts to strengthen our domestic economy. At the present time they are spreading the mistaken idea that we can save money by going backward. They advocate slashing our expenditures for peace and for our domestic programs. These people are blind to the problems that confront us. They can see that a tax cut would help their own pocketbooks temporarily. They fail to see that in the long run false economy would endanger not only their pocketbooks but their lives and the continuation of civilization itself.

It is true that our present expenditures are large. But the Democratic administration is working toward a balance in the Federal budget. I wish we could balance the budget immediately by the simple expedient of cutting expenses. But that is out of the question. More than 70 percent of our Federal budget goes to pay for past wars and to work for peace in the future. Anyone who says that these expenditures are extravagant does not understand the kind of world we live in. Our other expenditures are less than one-third of the budget, and less in proportion to the national income than they were 10 years ago.

I would like to cut expenditures further, and I intend to do so at every opportunity. But I do not propose to weaken the strength and security of this country. I do not propose to place the peace of the world in jeopardy to satisfy the advocates of false economy.

In this difficult world situation some people are talking about general tax reductions. I regard this as political hypocrisy. We had one recent experience with an ill-timed, irresponsible tax cut. Much of our present financial difficulty is the result of the sweeping tax reduction which was enacted in 1948 over my veto—at a time when expenditures for defense and foreign policy were inevitably rising. We must not make the same mistake again.

In this election year the Democratic Party will not play politics with the Federal budget. We will state the honest truth about the budget, just as we will about all other issues. We believe that the people are entitled to the plain facts about every issue, so that they can make up their own minds.

The Democratic Party can afford to be frank and truthful, because it is working for the general welfare of all our citizens. It does not serve any narrow group or clique. This makes it easy for the Democratic Party to put its program before the country openly and completely. We have nothing to hide from the people. Our strength lies in explaining our program and our policies to the people. And the more thoroughly we explain to them what the Democratic Party is trying to do, the more certain we can be of their continued support.

There are many differences between the Democratic and the Republican Parties. But I think the greatest difference is that the Democratic Party is the party of affirmative action—it is for measures to achieve prosperity and progress. The Republican Party is the party of negative inaction—it is always against things.

The principal thing that Republicans are against, of course, is the Democratic Party. But they can't win on that plank alone. They must try to find reasons for being against the Democratic Party. They must persuade people to vote against the Democratic Party. And that is getting harder and harder to do.

One reason it is hard to do is that the Republican Party has no affirmative program of its own. It refuses to face the problems of our economy. It refuses to take thought and make plans for the future. Instead of presenting a positive program of their own, the Republicans sit around waiting for us to make a proposal. Then they react with an outburst of scare words. They are like a cuttlefish that squirts out a cloud of black ink whenever its slumber is disturbed.

Right now, the main problem of the Republican leaders seems to be to find some new scare words. They have not had much luck along that line lately. They tried using the phrase "welfare state" as a scare word for a while, but they discovered that the people are in favor of a Government that promotes their welfare. So they dropped that scare word. Then they tried "statism." But my good friend Governor Lehman took care of that one in the New York election—so they had to drop it, too.

Now, the Republican leaders have had to go back to an old stand-by. Frankly, I don't think it's as good as some of the others, but it appears to be the best they can think of. Their current scare word is "socialism."

It's perfectly safe to be against "socialism." The difficult thing is to make the country believe that the Democratic Party stands for socialism. How in the world can the Republicans persuade people that all you Democrats at all these dinners are socialists?

It can't be done. But the Republicans will try it just the same. That's what they've been trying to do ever since 1933. For the last 17 years they have called every new Democratic measure "socialism" or "communism," and they have made constant predictions of doom and disaster. The plans and proposals that we have advanced for improving the condition of the people of this country have been greeted with these same old scare tactics during all these years.

And I'm going to prove that to you.

Let us take it step by step.

In 1933, this country faced some of the greatest problems in its history—the problems of providing food and work for millions of jobless persons and their families, of saving millions of farms and homes from foreclosure, of restoring a banking system that had collapsed, of placing the entire economy on the way to recovery.

The Democratic Party rolled up its sleeves and went to work. It took steps to provide relief and jobs, to save farms and homes, to restore banks and businesses. Bit by bit the economy responded to those vigorous measures. Income began to grow, confidence returned, business activity mounted. This was the response of the economy to our farm and labor and business programs—our programs for resource development and public works and the building of homes.

As this miracle of recovery unfolded, what was the attitude of the Republican Party?

In 1934, the Republican National Committee issued a policy statement. And in that statement they said:

"American institutions and American civilization are in greater danger today than at any time since the foundation of the Republic."

That sort of talk may have frightened the members of the Union League Club. But it didn't frighten the people who had been saved by the New Deal from bread lines and bankruptcy.

In 1936, the Republicans thought the danger was worse. In that year, the Republican platform cried out:

"America is in peril. The welfare of American men and women and the future of our youth are at stake * * *. The New Deal administration"—this is from the 1936 Republican platform—"has bred fear and hesitation in commerce and industry, thus discouraging new enterprises, preventing employment, and prolonging the depression."

People weren't scared by that one either. They knew it just didn't make sense, because the national income had risen more than 50 percent in the previous 4 years, and it was still rising.

In 1940, the Republicans tried to scare us again. This time their platform said:

"The administration has imposed upon us a regime of regimentation which has deprived the individual of his freedom and has made of America a shackled giant. * * * The New Deal administration has failed America."

That's what the Republicans said, but the America that the New Deal had saved—the economy that the New Deal had freed and made productive again—became the arsenal of democracy that overwhelmed the forces of totalitarian aggression.

But that still didn't teach the Republicans anything. In 1944, when we stood at the peak of our wartime production—the economic marvel of the free world—the Republican Party platform proclaimed: "The fact remains that under the New Deal, American economic life is being destroyed." That's what they said in 1944—"American economic life is being destroyed."

Apparently, they never learn anything. Today, when we have a national output of over $250,000,000,000 a year, and a higher standard of living than ever before, the Republican Party still cannot see anything good about the situation. In their policy statement issued 10 days ago, the Republican National Committee declared: "The major domestic issue today is liberty against socialism: * * * Basic American principles," they said, "are threatened by the administration's program. * * *"

It's the same old story—the same old words and attitude—the same empty and futile attempt to scare the American people—in complete contradiction of the plain facts that are visible to every citizen in his daily life.

For the past 17 years, the same outcry has greeted every proposal advanced by the Democratic Party—whether it was for better housing, social security, rural electrification, farm price supports, minimum wages, or any other program for the general welfare.

In 1944 Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., summarized the Republican attitude toward all these progressive steps in one brief paragraph when he said:

"For 11 years we have been steadily drifting into a regimented nation, with absolute control vested in a power-mad group of bureaucrats and social planners. Unless there is a change in government this year"—that was in 1944—"we can be reconciled to some kind of totalitarian, socialistic government."

That is what the Republicans said about our programs in 1944. That is the way they talked about them in 1948. That is what they are saying about them now.

Today, we are proposing further development of our resources, further strengthening of our economy, new measures for the welfare of the people. And what do we hear? The same old story. It is all repeated in that latest statement of the Republican National Committee:

"This program"—they said, and they were talking about the program of the Democratic Party—"This program is dictated by a small but powerful group of persons who believe in socialism, who have no concept of the true foundation of American progress, and whose proposals are wholly out of accord with the true interests and real wishes of the workers, farmers, and businessmen."

Well, let's look at the record. What is our program? Where did it come from? Our program is the platform adopted by the Democratic Party in its convention of 1948. And it has been voted on by the people of this country, including the workers, farmers, and businessmen.

If our program was dictated, as the Republicans say, it was dictated at the polls in November 1948. It was dictated by a small but powerful group of 24,000,000 voters.

And I think they knew more than the Republican National Committee about the real wishes of the workers, farmers, and businessmen.

Of course, this program is not socialism. It is based upon a firm faith in the strength of free enterprise. It is designed to strengthen the markets of free enterprise and to expand the investments of free enterprise. It will make our citizens economically secure, well-educated, and confident of the future. Only in a nation of such citizens can free enterprise grow and expand and reach its full possibilities.

The program of the Democratic Party is aimed to promote the prosperity and welfare of the American people. It is aimed to increase the freedom of the American people.

Freedom is not an abstraction. Freedom is a reality in our daily lives. The programs of our party have freed workers from economic subjection to their employers. They have freed farmers from the fear of bankruptcy. They have released farm wives from the bondage of ceaseless drudgery. They have freed older people from the fear of a dependent old age.

Our programs look forward to the day when our people will be freed from the fear of inadequate medical care and crushing medical expenses. They are aimed at freeing our young people from ignorance and poor education. And on these foundations for greater freedom for all our people, we are going forward to break down the barriers to economic opportunity and political liberty that have been created by prejudice and discrimination.

This is the record and the promise of the Democratic Party in expanding the freedom of the American people. And when the Republican Party proclaims that we are engaged in restricting freedom—that we are the enemies of freedom—I ask, "Whose freedom?" Let the American people look into their own lives and ask themselves whether they enjoy greater freedom or less than they did 18 years ago.

About the only freedom we have limited is the freedom of Republicans to run the country. Maybe that is what they are complaining about.

For the Republicans to drag out the same old moth-eaten scarecrow of socialism again in 1950—after having used it, or something very like it, in opposition to every progressive step the Nation has taken since 1933—is an insult to the intelligence of the American people. Out of the great progress of this country, out of our great advances in achieving a better life for all, out of our rise to world leadership, the Republican leaders have learned nothing. Confronted by the great record of this country, and the tremendous promise of its future, all they do is to croak, "socialism."

The Democratic Party is going right ahead to meet the needs and carry out the aspirations of the American people.

Our objective is to advance in freedom—to create a system of society that is ever more responsive to the needs of the people—to establish democratic principles so firmly in the hearts of the people that they can never be uprooted.

In the present anxieties and troubles of the world, the real strength of our country lies not in arms and weapons, important as they may be, but in the freedom of our citizens and their faith in a democratic society. Among the nations of the world, we stand as an example of what free men can do when they are in control of their own affairs and dedicated to the concept of a better life for all.

To work for the prosperity, the welfare, and the freedom of the American people is to work for the vindication of democratic institutions everywhere. And it is only through the growth of democratic institutions that a just and lasting peace can finally be achieved.

In this troubled world, it is more than ever important that the Democratic Party remain steadfast in its devotion to these ideals. It is more than ever important this year that the Democratic Party present its program to the people so plainly that it cannot be misunderstood. If we do that, I am confident that the people will again voice their approval of the principles which lead to increased prosperity, welfare, and freedom—not only for this country, but for free nations everywhere.

Macaulay's Prophecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD a very interesting article entitled "Macaulay's Prophecy," which appeared in the February issue of Partners:

MACAULAY'S PROPHECY

(By George Peck, executive editor of Partners)

On May 23, 1857, Thomas Babington (Lord) Macaulay wrote from London, England, to his American friend, Congressman H. E. Randall, of New York. In this letter he predicted that in the twentieth century America would experience a severe period of depression when "Hundreds of artisans will be fairly brought to the test. Distress everywhere makes the laborer mutinous and discontented and inclines him to listen with eagerness to agitators who tell him it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should have a million, while another one cannot get a full meal."

Space does not permit reproducing here the entire letter, but I would like to quote one significant paragraph from it: "I seriously apprehend that you will, in come season of adversity, as I have described, do things which will prevent prosperity from returning, that you will act like people in a year of scarcity, devour all the seed corn, and thus make the next year not of scarcity, but of absolute distress. The distress will produce fresh spoilage. There is nothing to stay you. Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. As I said before, when society has entered on this downward progress, either civilization or liberty must perish. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth century; with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and your Huns and vandals will have been engendered within your country by your own institutions."

Macaulay died long before the term "Fair Dealers" had been coined, else he probably would have used it instead of the word "barbarians." But the terminology makes no difference. Shakespeare wrote: "What's in a name? That which we call a rose by any other name would smell as sweet." Macaulay was keen enough to foresee that here in America we would sow the seeds for our own eventual destruction by nursing vipers in our bosom.

I TOLD YOU SO

Macaulay died in 1850. Were he alive today, he would have ample justification for saying, "I told you so." Here he would see the sickening spectacle of the American people abandoning the right to govern themselves, delegating more and more power to the Central Government, and looking to that Government for their very need; forsaking the spirit of initiative, thrift, and enterprise which was responsible for making America the great country that she is.

He would listen to soap-box orators haranguing on street corners and to demagogs over his radio advocating various and sundry crackpot economies to replace the splendid one we now have. In certain newspapers and magazines, Macaulay would read ridiculous charges against the American system of free competitive enterprise—accusations so false, so utterly lacking in factual evidence to back them up, that even he, in spite of his skepticism, would wonder what could have happened to a formerly sane people to cause them to give heed to such drivel.

He would witness the alarming spectacle of National, State, and local governments piling up debts, spending and borrowing with no thought of the morrow, while Americans apathetically look on, making little or no protest about the profligate waste of money and resources.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY YEARS OF PROGRESS

Our founding fathers set up a beautiful thing here in this country. For 150 years we closely followed the pattern they designed for us. We became the envy of the entire world. What has happened to us? Are we going to let the barbarians within our gates destroy us? My fervent prayer is that, before it is too late, America will awaken to its senses, get back on the pathway that led it to unprecedented heights and which, if followed again, will carry it to a new record high in civilizations.

During those first 150 years, the American people established an economy that gave more wealth to more people than has ever been achieved by any nation at any time in world history. It is true that the millenium was not reached; there still existed inequalities, but the gaps between these inequalities were slowly but surely being narrowed. Now we have turned our backs on the tried and proven formula for creating wealth. Barbarians within are propelling us into the welfare state, which more properly should be called the farewell state.

LESSON FORGOTTEN

We have forgotten the lesson learned that the wealth of any nation consists of those things which its people are able to have over their bare needs for existence. It is the surplus of food, clothing, etc., plus luxuries and semiluxuries which people are able to accumulate. Part of this excess must be used as seed corn, to be plowed back in order to insure necessities and luxuries for future years. Just as long as this seed corn is taken from surplus, a nation is progressing in the right direction—the green lights are showing. But when a nation is forced to take seed corn from food supplies really essential to proper subsistence of its people, it is on a dangerous road with red lights showing against it.

All wealth formerly was created by human labor, but today an ever-increasing proportion is created by human imagination. With the advent and development of the machine, labor has become mostly mechanical and now is of value chiefly for carrying out the ideas of human imagination.

For instance, stop to consider the amount of labor that goes into the making of a book. An author writes a book, a best seller. While his imagination was at work, men were laboring months and years ahead of the book coming off the presses. Men in the forest had been cutting down trees; other men in paper mills took those trees, made them into pulp and then into paper. Other men transported the paper from mill to printing plant. While this was being done, other workers were digging in the ground, mining the lead for the type; still others were making the ink.

Finally linotype operators set the type on machines made by other men, and pressmen ran the books off presses that were made by still other mechanics. All of these men were put to work through the imagination of but one man, the author of the book. Even then the author was not finished putting people to work. Men had to transport the books from the printing plant to the bookstores of the Nation, where sales clerks were employed in the selling of the book.

IMAGINATION REQUIRED

It takes far more imagination to build up and conduct a successful business than to write a best seller. As in the case of the book, most of the work which enters into any manufactured product is planned months, sometimes years, ahead of the day the finished article rolls off the assembly line. Since it costs about $6,000 for plant and machinery to put a man to work, new wealth must be created constantly, else there can be no new jobs, no rising standard of living. In recent years there has been an artificial temporary creation of new jobs in America. It has happened because we have made and are still making use of some of the stored-up wealth, or of the credit arising therefrom, to create new jobs. This means, in essence, that we have been eating our seed-corn. This can only end in disaster if long continued. The red lights are up.

One of the functions of business is to create new wealth (more seed-corn), by increasing production (increasing the yield per acre), by building new plants (planting additional acres). That and that alone gives more new permanent jobs and an increasingly higher standard of living.

CAPITAL MUST BE ENCOURAGED

If we continue to eat our seed-corn as we are presently doing, inevitably the day will come when we shall not have enough left to plant the acres already under cultivation, and with fewer acres planted, our standard of living will take a severe tumble. So it is with capital and industry. The flow of new capital into industry must be increased; the using up of present capital must be discouraged, else we shall live to see unhappy time when there will not be sufficient capital to keep the wheels of industry moving. Only by giving capital an opportunity to make a profit commensurate with the risk taken, can new venture money be lured into taking the chance of backing new enterprises and expanding old ones—the two ways, the only two ways—by which new wealth can be created.

The hour is late—very late—but we can still save ourselves. The barbarians within can be defeated and our Republic saved if we demand a halt to wasteful governmental spending and insist on decentralization of bureaucratic power at Washington. If we have the will, the courage, the unselfishness, we can still save America from the sad fate which Lord Macaulay predicted for us—and thereby make him a poor prophet.

The Future of the Republican Party

REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion recently about the future of the Republican Party. The subject is of interest to Democrats and Republicans alike, because, strange as it may seem to some, most Democrats are sincerely interested in preserving the two-party system in American politics. And most Democrats believe that the best chance of preserving that system is that drastic action be taken to keep the Republican Party from fading from the political scene.

I do not believe that the Republicans can chart a course for the future without understanding their mistakes of the past. For this reason, in a spirit of sincere effort to aid my distinguished and respected Republican colleagues in the Congress, I am inserting into the RECORD as a part of my remarks a scholarly and thoroughly documented article by Dr. Walter Prescott Webb, of the University of Texas, entitled "How the Republican Party Lost Its Future," as carried in the autumn issue of Southwest Review.

This thought-provoking article, written, of course, without political bias, discloses how the Republican Party has successively turned its back on great segments of our society—on the farmer, on the small-business man, on the workingman. As Dr. Webb so forcefully phrases it, the Republican Party quit the people long before the people quit the Republican Party. I hope that my patriotic Republican colleagues who share my concern over the current threat to the traditional two-party system of our Nation will digest this historical study of their party and profit from its lessons.

HOW THE REPUBLICAN PARTY LOST ITS FUTURE

(By Walter Prescott Webb)

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr. published in the Saturday Evening Post of January 29, 1949, an article entitled "Does the Republican Party Have a Future?" Though he spoke with objectivity, the fact that he could ask the question indicates that he realizes the dilemma of the party of which he is a distinguished member. It is probably the first time in the history of the party that the question has been asked in such seriousness. Senator LODGE believes the party has a future, but he suggests that it can be realized only on condition that the Republicans clean house, discard old concepts, and adopt a program more in conformity with the will and the aspirations of the American people. In short he implies that the house is in disorder, that the party's present concepts are archaic, and that its program does not mesh with popular spirit and desires.

Many thoughtful persons have tried to explain the recent surprising defeat of the Republican Party, but most of them have been content to do so by analyzing the current situation in terms of such factors as the labor vote, the farm vote, or the Roosevelt vote. At least I have read no account that viewed the present state of the Republican Party down the long gun-barrel of history. I believe that history throws a strong clear light on the problem and makes the eclipse of a once very powerful institution understandable.

It must be remembered that the Republican Party set out as a great crusader bent on emancipating those Americans who were not yet free to enjoy the benefits of democratic life. The cause was one that made a tremendous appeal to the idealist and to the common man. The cause gathered that strength known as moral force. The party that espoused the cause became the champion of suffering humanity, of freedom, of real democracy extended to all men, even the most humble slave. There was something here of unselfishness, of humanitarianism, of philanthropy, and the appeal of it reached in some measure every man whose pecuniary interests did not outweigh his idealism. The party first appeared in 1852, and by 1860 it had enough strength to capture the National Government.

As a result of its first success in the election of Lincoln, the Southern States withdrew from the Union, giving the Republican party its second and its greatest opportunity, that of saving the Union. In saving the Union the party proved itself able to win the hardest war the Nation has yet fought,

and to add to the moral prestige it had exhibited in the election of Lincoln the prestige of physical force sufficient to hold the Nation together in the gravest crisis. Here was the deed that stirred the patriotism and fervor of people everywhere, cementing their allegiance to the party with something approaching blind devotion. If you believed in freedom of men, you were a Republican, or should be; and if you believed in the Union and in loyalty to the flag, you could be nothing else. Thus it happened that the Republican party emerged from the 4 years of civil war triumphant in the shining armor of high moral purpose and armed with the keen sword of patriotic devotion. No political party ever set out on the path of peace—to last for more than three decades—under more favorable auspices. It had found in the shortest time the political holy grail.

But there was a structural weakness in the young party, a weakness which had considerable effect on policy for 10 years after the war, and indirectly for a much longer period. The party was not geographically in the beginning a national party, and this despite the fact that it had kept the Nation from dividing, had saved the Union. It originated as a sectional party, drew its total initial strength from the North, gained its first national election from northern votes, and had relatively little following elsewhere. Had its leaders inherited Lincoln's wisdom as they did his power, the party might in time have become truly national, but it never did. It has in essence always been sectional.

Because the South became so Democratic as to be known as the Solid South, it has been assumed in some quarters that the Democratic Party was sectional. On the contrary it was a national party before the Civil War, through reconstruction, and remains so today. Its members were distributed over the whole Nation, though for long they formed a minority in the more populous region. It was the sectional nature of the Republican Party that led directly to the harsh reconstruction measures. The Republican leaders in Congress knew that they had no Members in the South to speak of, and that if the Southern States were permitted to return Members to Congress, the Democrats would have a majority in the House of Representatives. The only safe thing they could do was to keep the southern Democrats out until the victorious Republicans could be assured of a majority in both Houses of Congress. This political party maneuver, or gerrymander, was carried out under the guise of reconstruction with the result that no Southern State really was represented in the National Congress for nearly a decade after the war closed.

In this decade the Western States were not represented either. They were not represented because 12 of them had not yet been admitted to the Union. They existed as Territories, and these Territories were governed and administered by the National Government, in this case the Republican Party. When time came for the admission of new States, every step was taken to guarantee that they came into the Republican fold. By eliminating the South and conciliating the West, the Republicans built up their strength to a point where they could safely permit the Southern States to send Democrats back to the Congress. But for a period of 10 years the Republican Party, operating from the Northern States, held undisputed political control in theory and in fact over the entire Nation—over the South because it was being reconstructed, over the West because it was largely unoccupied and still Territorial in status.

The Republican Party, having gained a breathing spell by disfranchising southern Democrats, set itself to the task of consolidating its strength and binding its membership to it before memory of its original high idealism and its patriotic achievement in saving the Union had faded into the background. It is perhaps a good political maxim that a party cannot live by its past alone. It must make good every day, at least every administration. This the party succeeded in doing.

Its position after Appomattox is probably unique in political history: unique in that within 5 years from the time it came to power it had completed its program. It would be a mistake to assert that the Republican Party of 1860 or 1864 had but one plank in its platform, but it is no mistake to say that it had only one that was important. The others were window dressing. By 1865 it had carried out the reform that gave it its birth and its original strength. As a reformer it had completed its mission and should have been ready to die, but the Republican Party was not ready to die—as what party is? It was confronted with the necessity of finding another plank, evolving another program that would justify its existence and assure its growth. Fortunately its unlimited power and prestige at this juncture were matched by an unequaled opportunity, and that opportunity was seized with the unerring instinct which comes when the cards of success are falling right.

The whole Nation lay at the feet of the Republican Party for development and exploitation. The South was no longer a rival or even an obstructionist and the West was a fallow field with untouched and all but limitless resources. The Nation was founded on agriculture, the farm, and the plantation, but this old force was not the thing to build a program on. The South had tried that. The new force—with all its dynamic future before it—was the one for the new party to champion. The new force consisted of wheels, pulleys, belts, blades, gears, driven by water, steam, and electricity in the fabrication and distribution of goods and commodities. The North had made a considerable start in the development of technology before the Civil War, and in the war it had knocked out completely any competition that the South might have developed. It was in supreme command of the dynamic power generated by the industrial revolution.

The Republican Party, in complete political control of the North, the South, and the West, was free to choose what it would go in for. It chose well. It embraced the new and most dynamic force, not the old agriculture which was mature and comparatively static, but rather that combination known as business, meaning manufacturing, transportation, and distribution. Here was an alliance of a sectional economic power with a coterminous political power, a partnership for great achievement.

The program followed by the Republican Party was designed, whether wittingly or not, to foster with loving care the economic power and smooth the way for its eager and powerful partner to seize the material resources of the Nation and concentrate control in the North, and thus to make both economic and politics sectional. The policy of the Republican Party was to make the North prosperous, and as long as the North prospered, the North would give its allegiance to the party and keep it in control. "The party of prosperity" was a good slogan to soothe a whole Nation, but those inside knew that the real policy was Republican prosperity.

The assets of the party after the Civil War were staggering in their immensity, so enormous that they could not help but bring relative prosperity to all sections. The business interests had in hand the technology and skill to manufacture unlimited quantities of goods, enough for the entire Nation. What business needed was protection from competition, domestic and foreign, and a system of transportation that would assure distribution. Government, in control of the Republican Party, could protect against domestic competition by granting patents and against foreign competition by levying tariffs. Patents cannot be considered a party measure, but as luck would have it, they turned the chief benefits to the North where patentable articles were being devised and used. The Republican Party made the protective tariff a broad plank in all its platforms, and throughout the Republican era the curve of the tariff was constantly upward, higher and higher. This tariff funneled the wealth of the Nation into the Republican section and built up a surplus in the National Treasury which was also dispensed for Republican and northern benefit.

Business needed railroads, in order to transport the goods it manufactured to all parts of the Nation, but the task of building them into the West was too great for business to undertake on its own hook. It did not need to. It called on Government to finance the venture. The road to the Pacific—across the plains—was projected before the Civil War but was not built because the two sections could not agree on a route. The South wanted it; the North wanted it. Neither would yield, and so nothing was done. In 1862, with the South out of the Union, the Republican Congress authorized the building of the Union Pacific from the West into the northern region. From 1862 until building ceased, the whole railroad system was designed to feed into the northern section. And much of the building was done at Government expense.

The Government had in its possession after the Civil War two enormous tangible assets which the Republican Party disposed of largely to its own benefit. The first asset and the larger one was the public lands comprising approximately one-half the continental area of the United States. Until 1862 the policy had been to sell the public lands to individuals, but in that year of fateful and far-reaching Republican legislation the Homestead Act was passed and the lands were given away. It was not difficult to convince any recipient of a homestead ranging from 160 to 640 acres that the Republican Party was beneficent and worthy of support. Though small areas were given to individuals, much larger ones were given to corporations. The railroads received western lands equal to the area of France. This lavish distribution of the greatest relief fund in history to individuals and corporations took nothing away from the popularity of the Republican Party, but it relieved the Government of its landed estate and national resources and prepared the way for another and less popular form of relief.

The second asset in the hands of the Government during this era was cash in the Treasury, cash accumulated from the tariff imposed by the Republican Party for the benefit of the infant industries of business. The question was not one of how this surplus cash could be returned to all the people, but rather how it could be placed safely in the hands of the chosen section and in the hands of good loyal Republicans. The solution was easy, the answer almost obvious. Give it to the Union soldiers of the Civil War in the form of pensions. Thus would it reward loyalty and strengthen business—and the Republican Party. The pension rolls were set up during the war and increased constantly until 1923, nearly 60 years after the war ended. Here was a safety valve that would relieve the Treasury of its surplus.

In any attempt to account for the deterioration of the Republican Party the declining influence of these pensions cannot be ignored. Not only did the receipt of a pension check each month hold the members of the GAR to the Republican Party, but it likewise held all his kith and kin, especially those on whom he might otherwise have been dependent, and friends whom he might influence. That this pension money, gathered from the pockets of the entire Nation, flowed mainly into the pockets of one small section, the records in Washington will abundantly prove. Of each $100 paid in pensions, about $85 went North and $15 was distributed to scattered Republicans in the South and West. Here was one of the most dependable blocs of votes that any party could hope to have.

It should not be difficult, then, to understand the loyalty of business to its political partner. Business had never known such opportunities, and nowhere in the world had it made more of the possibilities that lay before it. An increasing population in an expanding frontier lapped up all the commodities that could be produced and each year called for more. The resources were so great that there was something for all, enough to hide many inequalities. The Republican Party rode this dynamic wave and won election after election. A part of its advantage was the fact that its position was positive; it was doing things, and much was being done in its name. The opposition had to content itself with blocking, interfering, and protesting. What could you do with a party that had emancipated the slave, saved the Union, given everybody a bounty in land or tariff, assured businessmen of prosperity and poor men of a full dinner pail?

The answer, as the opposition found out, was nothing—nothing but wait. The waiting was long. The South, sitting disconsolately outside the warmth of the charmed circle, sans tariff, sans pensions, was always in protest, but could be ignored. In the seventies and eighties the farmers of the West—though Republican by inheritance—raised their voices against monopolies more than against the party that had fostered them. The Populists got nowhere. But the campaign of 1896—foreshadowing that of 1932—gave the Republicans a great scare and caused them to adopt, under the leadership of the able Mark Hanna, tactics as effective as they were reprehensible in order to win. This should have been a warning.

Despite the party's splendid record of achievement, keen observers might have detected by the turn of the century the deterioration that had set in, a deterioration in position. No party can live on its memories or expect to live on gratitude for past favors. By 1900 people were a little tired of hearing that Lincoln, the only great President the party has produced, had freed the slaves. By then the Union was so well saved that even the bloody shirt no longer evoked patriotic emotions. These things lay far in the past. The giving away of the public domain lay largely in the past too, and some were saying that the policy had been carried too far. The pensioners were dying rapidly, and the political loyalty of the GAR was becoming less important. The one vital force left to the Republican Party was business.

Between the close of the Civil War and the eclipse of the Republican Party in 1932, business made spectacular progress. As everyone knows, it got very big and more powerful than any other factor in American life. We emphasize this in books and politics by the use of capitals: Big Business. It has already been pointed out that business was the principal ally of the Republican Party, the only one that survived the passage of years and retained its vitality. Its crystallized around the corporations which the Republicans got the Supreme Court to define as individuals in order to override the will of the States and other protestants. The party did everything that could be done to clear the track and give cannon-ball right-of-way to the business special. The Republican boast, so effective in many campaigns, of being the party of business was sound and true.

This alliance between business and the dominant political party made an unbeatable combination as long as they could deliver prosperity and keep the factory wheels turning and the people employed. With the passage of time, subtle changes began to take place in the relationship between the two partners and also within the domain of each partner.

In the beginning both partners were young, each with its special vigor, but of the two the political partner was dominant. It was the Republican Party that had the political power to grant the land to the railroads, to give a tariff bonus to manufacturers, and to grant pensions to the GAR. In the process of doing this it transferred the Government's wealth—which theoretically belongs to all the people—into the hands of the party section, party members, and party supporters, that is, into the hands of business. The result was that business grew very powerful and became dominant. In the beginning the party had political power and economic assets; in the end it had only political power, the assets having been transferred. Therefore when it needed economic assets it became a supplicant before a power it had formerly controlled and helped to make.

Time brought changes in business and these changes compelled the Republican Party to make two hard choices, neither of which was politically wise. Shortly after the Civil War the original numerous small businesses began to merge into fewer bigger businesses, forming trusts and approaching monopolies in one field after another. In the struggle that ensued the Republican Party had to choose its destiny: would it champion the cause of small business or would it go where the power and money were, with big business? It is doubtful whether, given the background, the Republican Party could have made any choice but the one it did. The choice in favor of big business was natural, logical, and under the circumstances inevitable, for, as a matter of fact, the men who were operating big business were by that time the prime movers of the Republican Party. They were on the board of directors of the corporation and of the party.

Another division in business compelled the Republican Party to make a second choice. With the rise of the great industries, there was a sharp division between the owners or managers and the employees who did the work; there was capital on the one hand and labor on the other. The Republican Party could not champion the cause of both. Its whole history of opposition in greater or less degree to the demands of organized labor indicates its decision in favor of capital.

The important thing to notice in both these decisions is that the Republican Party threw its support to the minority as against the majority. There were more small businesses than big businesses, and there were far more laborers than there were managements or managers. Slowly but surely the Republican Party was narrowing the base of popular support upon which any party in a free democratic country must in the long run depend.

After it ran out of homesteads, the Republican Party had no place at all for the farmer. It may have given him lip service, but it never could accept the poignant plea of 1896 that the farmer too was a businessman. He was something else, a farmer. Even if it had granted him the status of a businessman, the party would have classed him as a small-business man, and his interests would still have been made secondary to those of big business. Throughout it compelled him to buy in a protected market and permitted him to sell in a free market with all the world as his competitor. For the farmer's mule or cow or cotton or tobacco there was neither tariff nor patent.

It is difficult to explain the long record of loyalty of middle western farmers to the Republican Party, why they clung to it for three-quarters of a century to the detriment of their own welfare. The most reasonable explanation is that they inherited their Republicanism. The fact that their fathers received free homesteads and pensions brought them into the party and a loyal inertia held them there for a very long time—but not forever. They woke up at last to the fact that the party had done nothing for them lately.

Thus the Republican Party successively turned its back on one great segment of society after another, on the farmer, on small business, on labor. The party quit the people long before the people quit it. Finding big business a jealous god, it gave it complete and undivided devotion, sacrificing its Lincolnian idealism and its early patriotic fervor for the downtrodden man, and thus cutting from under itself the foundation on which popular support could with any reason stand. It is not surprising that the Republican Party eventually went down in defeat known to no other major party in history; the surprising fact, the one that needs explanation, is that its defeat was so long delayed. The explanation of the delay must be sought in the unbroken success of business.

The party was never really defeated in the sense that it lost prestige, until its main partner—and we might almost say its only one—collapsed. Since business near the end was the only ally of strength the party had, the condition for the continued dominance of the party hinged on the ability of business to provide prosperity. It was business that had to make and distribute the goods, maintain employment and provide hope for the future. As long as business did this, the voters went along voting the Republicans into power with only an occasional interlude by protesters and reformers.

The union of business and the Republican Party was never more felicitous than in the years following World War I. It is quite true that one President was not quite up to the standard expected, but the two that followed were well-nigh perfect. President Hoover, the engineer and humanitarian, was the ideal man for the party of business. And business was so good during the early part of his administration that the Republicans promised to make prosperity permanent and to put two cars in every garage. It would be hard to beat a party that does either.

Then it happened, overnight. The bottom fell out, not of the Republican Party, but of business. From 1929 to 1933 the administration—representing the Republican Party—moved around in a daze, completely stunned by the disaster that had come to its partner and main support. Though there was some vague talk about turning a corner, the Republicans were never able to make the turn. Their policy had been to let business take its course, and it was perhaps too much to expect a sudden reversal of a time-honored and well-established system.

In the next election the Republican Party had nothing on which to base a campaign. Born on a platform of one plank, slavery, it died on a platform of one plank because that plank, business, had decomposed and fallen from under it. It began as a sectional party, carrying only Northern States; it died as a sectional party carrying six States, all of them in the region of its original strength. Four years later it carried Maine and Vermont. Gone from it were the farmers of the Middle West, gone the votes of the laboring men, now jobless, around the silent factories of the industrial North. Gone also the tradition of invincibility and the belief that the Republican Party alone knew the magic formula of prosperity and success.

The collapse of business in 1929 and of the Republican Party in 1932 gave the opposition the first opportunity it had had since long before the Civil War to seize the initiative and launch a constructive program. It is true that in a period of 72 years, from 1860 to 1932, the Democrats won 4 elections, serving 16 years to 56 for the Republicans. But none of these victories gave the Democrats a broad initiative. They were due in Cleveland's case to protests against Republican rule, and in Wilson's case to disaffection in the Republican Party and to war. The foundation under the Republicans in each case remained strong and sound, and as soon as the reformers had failed in their reforms, control slipped back into safe Republican hands. The party still stood for the constructive force, the development of business, and not for the complainers, obstructionists, and amorphous dissident elements which have always been a plague to the out party.

The entry of the Democratic Party in 1932 was a triumphant entry such as it had not known before. Not only had the opposition been defeated, but its all sources of strength lay in complete ruins about it. The task was to build from the ground up on another principle. Twice before the Democrats had had the ball but had not known what to do with it. This time they had the ball and, as it turned out, they knew how to keep it and what to do with it.

What the Democrats did after 1932 was to launch a bold program much greater than but comparable to the one undertaken by Lincoln. And that program was based on an entirely new principle. The forces of government were directed, not to the restoration of business alone, but toward the rehabilitation of the suffering and destitute of the entire Nation. It was in the words of Roosevelt himself a "crusade to restore America to its own people." That was a long-range program. In the short range it would give bread to the hungry, clothes to the naked, fuel to the freezing, jobs to the jobless, security to the aged, and insurance to the bankrupt, and, having no public domain to give away and no other Government assets, it would pay for all this by taking money away from those who had it, mainly from Republicans and big business, and giving . . . to those who needed it. It was the taking and not the giving that stirred the bitterness and acrimony, just as Lincoln's taking away property in slaves had stirred its three-quarters of a century earlier.

In this analysis we are not concerned with the merits of the program, its constitutionality, or its rightness or wrongness. We are concerned with its political effectiveness, with the broad appeal it had for the majority and its seemingly utter disregard for the powerful minority. This program gave the Democrats an initiative based on a new principle which for the time being the Republican Party cannot possibly take from it and remain the Republican Party. The Republican Party for the first time in its history is now definitely on the outside. It can only complain, criticize, claim it can do this job better and more efficiently. It has as yet nothing constructive to offer, and under present conditions it seems doubtful whether it can find anything to offer that its members would accept or the American voters would take at face value. The Republican Party worked out to the last grain the vein of success and for the present it is through. It carried to a logical conclusion the policy of taking from the many—either the Government or the people—and giving to the few, taking from the three sections and giving to the favored one. Here was a principle that was good as long as it lasted, but it was not an eternal principle. Senator Lodge refers to archaic concepts of the party, but I would like to suggest to him that the great principle of the party is archaic and that therefore practically everything about it is now out of date. The old place may be tidied up a bit, but it will still be a Victorian palace with its gingerbread and gewgaws showing.

By way of being specific let us examine some of the cherished details of the establishment—relics of a dead past—that have no place save in a political antique shop. The first of these is the front porch. Now in its day that was quite an institution. It was a comfortable place for the Presidential candidate who was sure of election to reside in dignity while the opposition beat its brains out trying to gain the attention of spellbound voters. It was a good place from which to make no mistakes, commit no errors. The front porch is one antique that the Republicans will have to give up until they get a house to go with it.

Another outworn formula has to do with the off-year elections. This formula held that if in the rare Democratic innings the Republicans gained control of Congress in the off-year election, that was a sure sign that the Democratic President was on his way out, come next election. In 1946 the Congress became Republican and it was taken for granted that the formula would work. The White House was as good as won.

So eager was the Eightieth Congress to please its favored constitutents that it jumped the gun and began the work of destroying the principle which the Democrats had adopted and practiced for 16 years. The result was that this Congress frightened the farmers, resolved labor's doubts, and lost the election of 1948. The formula did not work.

In the last election we did not hear much about the full-dinner pail and sound money, the first a bauble for the workingman and the second a booby trap for small-business men. For 3 years the workingman looked into the pail and found it always empty. And as for sound money, the Republican Party ran out of money of any kind as did most of the voters. It appears that the dinner pail has been lost now and sound money, if not forgotten, is never mentioned.

It is customary for losers to quarrel among themselves in trying to apportion the blame for their defeat. According to news reports this jowering is going on now in the party high command. It seems that Mr. Dewey, who would have been so great if he had won, is taking the brunt of the attack. It may be pointed out that Mr. Dewey's whole campaign was in the very last Republican tradition. He conducted himself with the utmost propriety, said very little, and might even have remained on the front porch so far as results go. He was careful not to be specific or forthright but to depend on his supporters to make the commitments. He could not be expected to go over to the left of the Democrats, and his own party would not have followed him had he done so. His position was to the right of Mr. Truman's, and Mr. Truman's position was anchored firmly in the middle of the new principle of government. Actually Mr. Dewey had no principle. He was simply trying to get the voters to shoulder Mr. Truman out of his position, and the stubborn voters flatly refused to do it.

Nor can the Republicans find an alibi for their last defeat in the personality of the opposition. The two candidates were just about a hoss and a hoss in personality, though the man from New York is a little slicker than the man from Missouri. Certainly Mr. Truman's personality is not such as to give the opposition an inferiority complex. The people voted on the issues and not on the men.

President Truman's victory was so spectacular as to obscure important aspects of the last election. Had Mr. Truman been elected on personality, he might have found himself faced with a Republican Congress and with Republican governors in control of a majority of the States. The inarticulate but interested voters admired his courage and the desperate fight he made with practically nobody in his corner, but they did not vote for him through sympathy. They had simply had enough of the other party as it exhibited its program in the Eightieth Congress to know that they wanted no more of it. Wanting a modern Government that will deal with modern problems and not an antiquity, they went to the polls and swept the little champ back to the White House, and with him they sent Democrats to Congress and into the governors' offices across the Nation.

Of course we need two parties to debate the issues of the Nation. It seems from our own political history that the debate swings around a principle. One party thinks the principle is right and the other is equally convinced that it is in great part wrong. The party that originates the principle and establishes it, does so in a national crisis. If the Nation comes out of the crisis, the principle is accepted and the people go on supporting it for a long time, say until it runs into a crisis. This is what happened to the Republican Party after the Civil War; it is what happened to the Democratic Party in the great depression. During the time of trust and confidence in the principle, the party that originated it and put it into effect has a tremendous advantage, such an advantage that it may get away with almost anything. As long as the principle being acted upon works, it is almost impossible to dislodge the party that discovered it. This the Republicans need to bear in mind. They are going to have thin pickings until the present principle of developing a social state has failed. They are going to beat their brains out trying to get the attention of voters. They are going to quarrel, divide, complain, and criticize.

Their plight is like that of the man who had spent his life preparing for the future. It was his obsession. He awoke one morning on his birthday and began to appraise himself, his age which was considerable, his hair which had grown thin, his muscles a little flabby now, and his bones which seemed to have sand grains in the joints. After some contemplation, he struck his hand to his head and exclaimed, "Heavens! This is my future!" And so it may be for a considerable period with the Republican Party.

This Is Your Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States is closer to the people today than ever before. Each year hundreds of thousands of people visit the Capitol and observe Congress at work. High school students throughout the country read and study about all phases of Government, including the Congress. The newspapers and magazines, the radio and television bring Congress increasingly closer to the people.

Senior Scholastic, a magazine with a large circulation among high school students, devoted a special section of its February 1, 1950 issue to the Congress, under the title of "Congress at Work." The articles in Congress at Work are factual and instructive. They were collected, edited, and for the most part written by Mr. Herbert L. Marx, Jr., associate editor of Scholastic Magazine.

I include as a part of my remarks the article "This Is Your Congress":

THIS IS YOUR CONGRESS

Under the dome of the Capitol in Washington, D. C., beats the heart of America.

Here our Congress—our Senators and Representatives—speak for America. They decide and shape our country's future. They do so for us and in behalf of us, as our chosen representatives.

No matter where you live—the Pacific coast, the prairies of the Middle West, the Cotton Belt of the South, the villages or industrial towns of New England—you have your spokesman in Congress.

If you feel he does not speak your mind, it is your privilege and duty not to support him in the next election. This is a basic principle of a representative democracy.

Our Congress is no youngster as national parliaments go. It is now more than 160 years old. But it is showing no signs of age. It is still as youthful and vigorous as any legislative body in the democratic world.

The present Congress is the eighty-first in number. The First Congress, which assembled after the Constitution was ratified, served from 1789 to 1791. The Second Congress served from 1791 to 1793, and so on for every 2-year period.

The Congress that met in January 1950 is the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

The President has the right to summon Congress for a special session. This is usually done in the event of a national emergency or crisis, as in September 1939, following the outbreak of war in Europe.

However, the last special session of Congress, called by President Truman in the summer of 1948, was for the purpose of enacting bills dealing with our national economy.

A Congress lasts for 2 years because all Members of the House of Representatives and one-third of the Senate are elected every 2 years. All unfinished legislation "dies" at the end of each 2-year Congress.

The Congress which meets on January 3 after the regular general election every other November is called the new Congress although many of its Members may have served in the old Congress.

Let us now go inside the Capitol. We notice that there are two wings on the building. These include the Chambers of the House and the Senate. According to tradition, they may not be used for any purpose except for congressional sessions.

The next thing you notice is the surprisingly small attendance most of the time in both the House and Senate Chambers. This often baffles visitors. Where are our national legislators? The answer is there is much more to Congress' work than meets the eye of a visitor to the House or Senate Chamber.

Actually, almost 90 percent of the work of Congress is done not in the House and Senate Chambers but in congressional committee rooms. These congressional committees have been called, and with justification, our little legislatures. As former President Woodrow Wilson once remarked, "Congress in its committee rooms is Congress at work."

What is the difference between the two Houses of Congress? Let's start with the Senate.

In Roman times, the Senate meant a council of old men. Its members were regarded as persons of high rank and wisdom.

The same attitude is retained to a large extent in our Nation today. The United States Senate, called the upper House, was intended to serve as a check on the sometimes hasty actions of the lower House (the House of Representatives). George Washington explained that "the Senate is the saucer in which the House tea is cooled."

Senators were not even elected directly by the voters of each State until the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution was adopted in 1913. Before that Senators were chosen by the State legislatures.

The United States Senate consists of 96 Members—2 from each State, regardless of the population or size of the State. Thus Nevada (with a population of only 174,000) and New York (with a population of more than 14,000,000) have the same number of Senators.

A Senator is elected for a term of 6 years. One-third of the Senators are elected every 2 years. Thus the Senate has been a continuing body since 1789, because it never changes its entire membership at any one time.

Article I, section 3, of the Constitution says, "No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained the age of 30 years, and been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

The Vice President of the United States is automatically the President of the Senate. He may vote in the Senate only in case of a tie. In other words, only when the Senate is evenly divided on some issue may the Vice President cast a vote to break the tie.

In addition, the Senate elects a President pro tempore (for the time), to preside when the Vice President is absent.

Now let us cross to the southern wing of the Capitol, to the House of Representatives. This "lower House" consists of 435 Representatives apportioned among the 48 States according to population.

All Representatives are elected every 2 years for terms of 2 years. A Representative (according to art. I, sec. 2, of the Constitution) must be 25 years of age; a citizen of the United States for 7 years; and a resident of the State in which he is elected. He is customarily a resident of the district from which he is elected, but this is not required by the Constitution.

Critics of this custom say it forces a Representative to ignore national interests and concentrate on local problems in order to get reelected. They add that it also has a tendency to make the Representative take orders from the local political bosses, because defeat in his own district may mean the end of his career in Congress. In Britain, a candidate for Parliament is free both by law and custom to run for election in any district selected for him by his party.

On the other hand supporters of this custom contend that the Representative should be a resident of the district he represents so that he will be more familiar with the needs of the voters who elected him. It is also pointed out that this tradition keeps us as close as possible to pure democracy, in which every citizen has a direct voice in the conduct of his government.

States entitled to only one Member in the House have a Representative at Large, elected by the entire State. At certain times other States have Representatives at Large, too.

Under changes made by Congress in recent years the total number of Representatives is fixed at 435. The quotas among the 48 States are reapportioned every 10 years, following the regular census of population. The next reapportionment will take place after the 1950 census.

However, each State, no matter how small its population, is entitled to at least one Representative. On the average a Representative is elected by a district inhabited by a little more than 300,000 people. But this is not always true. Nevada's one Representative is elected to represent its population of only 174,000. Thus election districts differ in size of population.

They also differ in area. For example, one of New York City's heavily populated districts, which is only three square miles in area, contains as many people as the 26 counties which make up one of the districts in Texas.

POWER OF THE SPEAKER

The Presiding Officer of the House is the Speaker. He is elected every 2 years by the House.

The Speaker is entitled to all the privileges of an ordinary Member, but usually votes only in case of a tie. He presides over sessions of the House or appoints a Speaker pro tempore to replace him. He announces the order of business, and sees to it that Members stick to that order.

When the House meets as a Committee of the Whole (which includes all Members), the Speaker appoints the Chairman. The Speaker also picks the chairmen of temporary committees. He may give the floor to Representatives in any order he wishes, and directs his party lieutenants to guide the debate as he sees fit.

Because the Speaker has the power to control debate on the floor of the House, and to push bills favored by his party, he is the most influential Member of the House, if not of the entire Congress.

OTHER THE 48 STATES

The organized Territories of Alaska and Hawaii are each entitled to a Delegate in the House of Representatives. Puerto Rico, as a dependency, is represented in the House by a Resident Commissioner.

These three men have all but one of the privileges accorded Representatives. They receive the same salary and have the same rights to speak on the floor of the House and to serve on House committees. The one vital exception is that they have no vote in Congress.

There are 870,000 American citizens who have no Representatives or Senators of their own in Congress. These people are the residents of the District of Columbia. Washingtonians may not vote in Presidential elections, either. The District of Columbia, seat of all branches of our Federal Government, has always been treated as an exception to the rule of representative government.

How Taft-Hartley Costs Every Worker Cents Per Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to a very timely article which appears on pages 29, 30, and 31 in the February 1950 issue of the magazine published by the International Union of the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW–CIO). I feel that this magazine article more adequately explains the position of labor with reference to the Taft-Hartley law than any other article which I have read upon the subject. It is written in common, everyday, understandable language, which the average voter, I am sure, will appreciate.

This article is as follows:

HOW TAFT-HARTLEY COSTS EVERY WORKER CENTS PER HOUR

THE PROPAGANDA PROGRAM

June 23, 1947, the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted into law over the veto of the President of the United States.

Bought and paid for

The law was passed as the climax to a supercharged propaganda campaign in which the National Association of Manufacturers, according to Senator AIKEN of Vermont, spent $2,000,000 for advertisements on the Taft-Hartley Act alone.

Altogether, Senator AIKEN estimated the corporations spent $100,000,000 on propaganda to procure the passage of the law.

Newspapers and radios repeated over and over again (this was what the $100,000,000 paid for) that the public was demanding the Taft-Hartley law.

Public-opinion polls were fixed to give the impression the people wanted Taft-Hartley.

Bought and paid for surveys pretended to show the workers in the plant wanted the Taft-Hartley law.

With the possible exception of the artificial clamor produced to secure the repeal of the OPA, the propaganda campaign on behalf of the Taft-Hartley law was the noisiest, the most deafening ever purchased through the collective efforts of monopolies and corporations in the history of mankind.

The vote on Taft-Hartley

After Taft-Hartley was passed, the law itself provided for elections which were, in effect, a test of some of the claims made by the corporations.

The union-shop elections, for example, were a fair test of whether or not workers did or did not believe in the "right not to belong to a union."

Actually, in 35,120 elections, 3,200,000 persons out of 3,400,000 voted in favor of the union shop. That is about 15 to 1.

Every honest poll shows the country opposes Taft-Hartley Act. Union-shop vote is 19 to 1 for the union. Truman was elected.

Gallup Polls, Inc., polls on any anti-labor subject.

The November 1948 national election was decided largely on the issue of Taft-Hartley. Fred Hartley, a sponsor of the bill, did not run again, but his seat was won by Peter Wallace Rodino, the son of a UAW member, who campaigned on a specific promise to vote for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

Nationally, the reelection of President Truman was an approval by a majority of the voters of his stand for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

Wherever people had a chance to be counted, they stood up to be counted in majorities opposed to Taft-Hartley.

The people, the radios, the newspapers, and the magazines who said they were for Taft-Hartley turned out to be obliging gremlins who lived in the minds of the propagandists hired by the National Association of Manufacturers.

MAKING UP THE COST OF TAFT-HARTLEY

Is Taft-Hartley a slave-labor law?

Taft-Hartley has been called a slave-labor law.

Some people have said slave labor was too strong. Where, they ask, are some of the workers who have been enslaved under Taft-Hartley?

Under the Taft-Hartley law, people who go on strike for better wages, or hours, or working conditions may be discharged by their employer.

The employer may hire other workers to replace them.

Then the scabs may petition for a collective-bargaining election.

If the scabs vote nonunion, the employer may get a Taft-Hartley injunction forbidding the people on strike from picketing.

How to destroy job security under Taft-Hartley:

Employer forces a strike—hires scabs.

In NLRB election only scabs vote.

Injunction forbids workers to strike.

Seniority abolished; wage cuts follows.

If they persist in picketing, they may be sent to jail.

The Taft-Hartley thus provides companies with a 1-2-3 formula for taking away your union protection.

Being a free worker depends in part on your freedom to enjoy the working conditions your union has won for you.

In the printing trades these working conditions have been won over a period of 75 years and are part of the union's conditions of employment.

Under Taft-Hartley, the National Labor Relations Board and the courts have ruled that the union's insistence on these established working conditions is a refusal to bargain by the union and an unfair labor practice.

To defend its working conditions the Typographical Union has spent more than $15,000,000 in the last 2 years. Taft-Hartley has cost union printers millions of dollars in assessments.

Just as important, the fight to defend working conditions from the Taft-Hartley attack has made it impossible to give full time to bargaining for better wages. There is no way to estimate how much printers have lost because they failed to win wage increases they might have otherwise gotten.

This is the cost of Taft-Hartley to the printers' union—more than $15,000,000.

One of the major purposes of the Taft-Hartley law was to destroy the United Mine Workers and to outlaw the industry-wide contracts which provide basic union standards for all mine workers.

Partly as the result of the Taft-Hartley injunction procedure, the hard-won pensions of the miners are not being paid today. The health and welfare program is providing enormous bounties to the lawyers in the courts, but no health or welfare to the miners. For the first time in many years the miners are working in violation of their own no-contract-no-work principle.

Taft-Hartley means wage cuts

Obviously these penalties provided in the Taft-Hartley law could be applied against you.

But there is another, more insidious, way the Taft-Hartley injures wage earners.

As everyone knows, there is a persistent movement by the companies from union-standard communities to unorganized, low-wage areas.

Companies that don't run away are subjected to unfair competition from low-wage runaway companies.

Workers with standard wages are losing out in competition for jobs to runaway nonunion shops.

The Taft-Hartley, by permitting employers to ask for representation elections, by facilitating sweetheart agreements between phony unions and the company, and by preventing workers from organizing boycotts of sweatshop employers, actually manufactures the antiunion acid which is corroding the wage and working-condition standards of all workers.

Even unorganized workers have a tremendous stake in the repeal of the Taft-Hartley. For unorganized workers benefit from the wage-increase patterns won by union workers.

GM office workers, for example, get wage increases after the UAW wins increases for the production workers. If the production workers are prevented by Taft-Hartley from winning improvements, the office workers stand still or go back.

THE SECRET AUTHORS OF TAFT-HARTLEY

Double-standard legislation

The Taft-Hartley law is special-interest legislation.

Despite its name, the Taft-Hartley law was not written by Senator ROBERT TAFT or ex-Congressman Fred Hartley. Senator TAFT himself has admitted that clauses got into the bill that he regards as a mistake. (P. 1916, Senate hearings on S. 249, pt. 4.)

Who wrote the law

Here are quotations from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 16, 1947:

Representative O'TOOLE: "It was written, sentence by sentence, paragraph by paragraph, and page by page, by the National Association of Manufacturers."

Representative POWELL: "This bill was written on the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building, written by over a score of corporation lawyers, paid, not by the Government of the United States, not even by small business, but by big business, monopoly business."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 15, 1947:

Representative KLEIN: "The new House labor bill was not written with the help of the Democratic members of the committee. In fact, they were not consulted and no full committee meetings were held to discuss it. The bill was actually written with the help of several industry representatives from the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce. Some of the most valuable assistance came from William Ingles, who reports a $24,000 annual salary as a lobbyist."

Representative BUCHANAN: "The program of labor legislation drafted by the National Association of Manufacturers last December and published in full-page advertisements in the New York Times and scores of other papers on January 8 of this year is embodied in its entirety in the proposed bill. * * * Sections of this NAM program are written into the bill word for word."

PLUSH JUSTICE FOR THE BOSS—IRON TALONS FOR WAGE EARNERS

Taft-Hartley is exactly the kind of law you would expect once you are told who wrote the law. Imagine, for example, how a labor law would read if it were written by the lawyer for your company. That is the kind of law Taft-Hartley is—a law with double-standard justice. One standard of justice for employers—easy, gentle, courteous, apologetic. Another standard of justice applies to workers—tough, aggressive, punitive, bristling with penalties and jail sentences.

Here are examples:

Plush justice for the employer: Taft-Hartley provides that nothing an employer says or prints can be used against him in a Taft-Hartley hearing (unless his expression contains threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit). Under cover of a free speech, an employer is given a blanket license of irresponsibility for anything he says.

The iron talon for the worker: In any court hearing, criminal or civil, involving you, anything you say can be quoted against you, provided it is relevant under court rules.

Plush justice for the employer: If an employer is shut down because of a strike, he can call on another employer to help him out by taking over his work (and requiring the workers of the second employer to scab).

The iron talon for the workers: But workers who are locked out by an employer may not ask brother union members in another shop to help them out by refusing to scab.

Plush justice for the employer: A voluntary association of employers may engage in politics in any way it chooses (and the American Medical Association may assess its members $25 each to go into politics).

The iron talon for workers: But the workers in a voluntary association (a union) may not spend one cent to support candidates in Federal elections.

Plush justice for the employer: Any employer can use the NLRB and put it to work for his purposes, whether he files financial statements, is a Communist, a Fascist, or a criminal violator of the antimonopoly laws.

The iron talon for workers: But no group of workers can use the National Labor Relations Board until their union officers file affidavits swearing they are not Communists, along with a copy of the union's financial statement (plus other things).

Plush justice for employers: The NLRB may ask for injunctions against employers only when it chooses to. The courts cannot issue these injunctions until after a court hearing is held.

Iron talon for workers: But the NLRB must apply for an injunction against workers and their union in some situations, and these injunctions can be issued without any hearing for the workers involved.

Plush justice for employers: Certain employers' charges of unfair labor practices against workers and their unions must get priority under Taft-Hartley.

Iron talon for workers: But a worker's charge of an unfair labor practice against an employer gets no priority. Certain day-old complaints by an employer must take precedence over a worker's complaint that has been on the books for 2 years.

Plush justice for the employer: Workers may not require employers, through their unions, to employ more workers than they need.

Iron talon for workers: Nothing prevents an employer (except the union) from speeding workers up and giving them more work than they can do without hardship.

Formosa Could Be Saved—If

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of February 19, 1950. It should be instructive to note that Walter Bosshard, a seasoned observer in the Far East, believes that despite all the unfavorable factors in the Formosa picture—and I do not believe some of them are quite as bad as he portrays them—we should extend effective assistance to the defenders of the island. The prospects of success are still good, and the stakes are so great as to justify the effort.

FORMOSA COULD BE SAVED—IF

(By Walter Bosshard)

TAIPEH, FORMOSA.—"With a minimum of foreign aid," said an American officer to me on my arrival in Taiwan, or Formosa, "this island could be saved, if * * *."

The same day, the English edition of China News published an article under the headline, "Save Taiwan—Save China." It was an emotional appeal to eradicate inefficiency and corruption in government offices. It continued:

"We have been the victims of international power politics and intrigues. We have been petted. We have been idolized and we have been double-crossed. The Nationalists having lost practically all of the mainland; Taiwan is the last ditch to hold. This is the last chance left for the freedom-loving Chinese people to save themselves. We cannot and we must not fail. There is only the sea left for our retreat. There is only one way open for us—to live or to die."

Chinese and foreigners alike fully approved this remarkably frank statement, adding, however, "if only * * *," followed by a number of reservations which are constantly made, whether people are discussing the political, military, or economic aspects and prospects of Taiwan.

TWO MAJOR CLIQUES

To start with the biggest problem, there is dissension among the ranking officials which makes any concerted action very difficult. This conflict has its roots in the history of the Kuomintang when individual members or entire groups who ventured to disagree with Chiang Kai-shek were severely censured, if not punished. Several of the smaller factions disappeared or joined the Communists, but suspicion and open conflict continues between the two major cliques, despite the danger knocking at the very gates of this island.

In this fight, the reactionary C-C clique, led by the two Chen brothers, Chen Li-fu and Chen Kuo-fu, seems to have the upper hand. The Kwangsi clique, with Acting President Li Tsung-jen, now in the United States, and Gen. Pai Chung-hsi as prominent members, is fast losing ground.

The C-C clique is the watchdog in Chiang Kai-shek's headquarters. He remains chairman of the Kuomintang, but otherwise holds no official position in the government. He is still considered the strong man in this last bastion of Nationalist China, however, pulling the wires from his sumptuous retreat in the hills above Taipeh. He will not tolerate any man in a responsible position who has not been approved by his inner circle, a sort of private supercabinet.

According to the Chinese Constitution, Gen. Li Tsung-jen is the actual head of the National Government. When he left for the United States in December, he delegated his power to the Prime Minister, 70-year-old Gen. Yen Hsi-shan, who has frequently been at loggerheads with Chiang but is now too old and weak to make a determined stand against the constant pressure brought upon him by the generalissimo and the powerful C-C clique.

Yen Hsi-shan takes his orders from Chiang Kai-shek and his ministers rubber-stamp the decisions of Chiang's private cabinet. If General Li should ever return to this island, his only choice would be either to fall in line with the inner circle or be ousted through all sorts of intrigues and accusations already in the offing.

YOUNG MEN DISCOURAGED

Thus it is not surprising to see numerous politicians and defeated generals, who escaped with their loads of gold bars to Formosa, seeking favors with the powerful group and getting lucrative appointments, while any outsider, however meritorious his achievements, is cold-shouldered as long as he refuses to join this mutual admiration society.

There is a number of younger, very able officers in Taiwan, ardently patriotic and willing to fight, but getting discouraged by the prevailing favoritism. The tragedy of the present situation is that the ruling class consists of tired, worn-out members of the old Kuomintang, who continue to think in terms of "face-saving" and are unable to inspire any confidence or enthusiasm among the young generation.

The return of Madame Chiang Kai-shek from the United States will further aggravate the tension. She has never been known as a peacemaker, and her overbearing likes and dislikes will hardly encourage amity outside her own circle.

There is also disunity among the native population. Different groups are clamoring for a share in the island administration. None, however, represents the majority of the Formosan people, and it is even questionable whether popular opinion has yet crystallized on what is the best political future for Formosa.

The native inhabitants are generally anti-Communist. But they are also strongly antagonistic toward the Nationalist administration, whose past excesses and exploitations are difficult to forget. And the presence of the refugee government on the island stirs fears of an early Communist invasion.

The newly appointed governor of Taiwan, Dr. K. C. Wu, former mayor of Shanghai and one of the ablest administrators in China, is trying by justice and fair play to bring the different parties together and to create a common front. The lack of trained and able native leaders whom he can trust makes it difficult for him to combat the creeping defeatism, which centers around the argument that any resistance is useless if no immediate help can be expected from the United States.

A WILLING ARMY

There is one bright spot in this rather gloomy picture. The new army, trained by Gen. Sun Li-jen at Pengshan in the southern part of Taiwan, is exceptionally good. Despite many handicaps, this general and his very able staff of partly American-trained officers has built up a defense force which not only is ready to fight, but which knows the stakes.

Its equipment, however, is not too good. Most of the material supplied earlier by the United States was lost in the fighting on the mainland and is now in Communist hands. There is an urgent need for transport vehicles for the mechanized army, for spare parts and ammunition for the artillery, and also for smaller weapons.

It is a surprising fact that there is no over-all command for the coordination of the army, navy, and air force. Each of these branches has its own program and works independently of the other two. Each is under direct orders of the Ministry of National Defense, which takes orders from Chiang.

An inborn mistrust prevents him from appointing any officer to the over-all command. He wants to keep all the power in his own hands. In spite of the disastrous results of his past strategy and policy, he stubbornly considers himself the only man in China capable of defeating the Communists.

Under such circumstances, is it possible to save Formosa and would it be wise to extend any more help to the Nationalist government? The answer to both questions is, in my opinion, yes. As my American officer friend said, with comparatively little help the present defense forces can be made strong enough to prevent a Communist invasion, provided, of course, that Russia did not actively take part in any such operation.

ECA CAN SHOW HOW

Should any material help be given to the Nationalist Army, it would need strict supervision to prevent further abuse. That such control can be made effective has been demonstrated in Formosa by the ECA and JCRR. If a similar pattern were followed on military aid, the morale of the defense forces and the native population alike would be tremendously encouraged, so that Formosa could well become the turning point in the battle against communism in the Far East.

It would be the best solution, of course, if Chiang Kai-shek and his entourage could be persuaded to let other, better-equipped men decide the future strategy. This being beyond any hope of realization, the only course is a clear-cut policy with no loopholes for compromise.

Formosa well defended would inspire the opposed people on the mainland. It would encourage the nations of southeast Asia to join forces against their common enemy. And it would dispel that feeling of fear and weakness which now paralyzes life in this part of the world.

Yes, Formosa is well worth saving despite the many if's. But time is running short, and the Red typhoon may devastate this beautiful island before statesmen and ambassadors, now discussing the problem from many angles, can make up their minds.

Biography of Susan B. Anthony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, last Wednesday was the anniversary of the birthday of Susan B. Anthony, one of the great women in American history. I think it fitting to remember her, and I ask unanimous consent that a short biography of her be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Susan B. Anthony—one of the great women of our country—stands in the doorway of the house where she made her home for 40 years. This brick house was one of the early ones built in the Rush and King Tract. After the death of Daniel Anthony his wife, Lucy Read Anthony, bought the house in 1866 and lived here with her two daughters until her death April 3, 1880, in her eighty-seventh year. Then Mary became the owner and every year when she paid her taxes she added to her bill—"Paid under protest," since she believed that taxation without representation was tyranny.

THE HOUSE A MEMORIAL

Through voluntary gifts the house was bought December 31, 1945. It has been restored in keeping with the time in which Miss Anthony lived. Furniture, books, pictures, and many objects have been returned. There is a great deal of source material here about the woman suffrage movement. Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, who was one of Miss Anthony's able, younger associates and who followed Miss Anthony and Anna Howard Shaw as president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, sent her valuable collection of framed photos of noted women who believed in rights for women. By bequest there came also her mahogany desk on which she drafted her strategic plans for the nineteenth amendment. The house is a unique center which commemorates Miss Anthony and also "the neighbourly woman's crusade the world has ever known, led by as great generals as ever headed armies and finished fights for victory."

INCIDENTS CONNECTED WITH THE HOUSE

November 1, 1872, the two sisters went out with some other women and registered for voting. Then on November 5 they voted—thus testing the right of women to vote under the Constitution. Miss Anthony was arrested here by the United States deputy marshal for voting illegally. She was tried at Canandaigua and fined $100 which she told the judge she would never pay.

In 1894 when New York had a constitutional convention Miss Anthony started a great campaign to secure an amendment allowing women to vote in this State. This house became the headquarters and many worked here all summer, sending out literature and petitions. Miss Anthony at the age of 74 went forth every week to speak in the 50 counties.

Here plans were made to persuade the University of Rochester to open its doors to women. Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton was present at one evening meeting and answered every objection. Miss Anthony was the leading person in raising the necessary funds.

Miss Anthony and her sister were very hospitable and many workers for woman suffrage and many noted people were their guests. Some of the meetings of her suffrage board were held here.

Here with the help of Miss Anthony who recognized the need of recording women's history, Ida Husted Harper wrote the Life and Work of Susan B. Anthony and volume IV of the History of Woman Suffrage.

LIFE OF MISS ANTHONY

She was born at Adams, Mass., February 15, 1820; and passed on at 17 Madison Street, March 13, 1906, in her eighty-sixth year. In her early youth she taught school. She was teaching in Canajoharie, N. Y., at the time of the first woman's rights convention in Seneca Falls, N. Y., July 19 and 20, 1848, and also when the adjourned convention was held in Rochester August 2, 1848. Her interest at the time was in organizing Daughters of Temperance, and it was not until 1851, after she had met and talked with Elizabeth Cady Stanton, that she saw the need for woman suffrage and joined her in a life-long crusade for the rights of women. Soon Miss Anthony became the driving force of the woman's rights movement, assuming the responsibility of its conventions and of building up a strong woman's rights organization. On May 15, 1869, she organized the National Woman Suffrage Association with Mrs. Stanton as president.

HER WORK

Susan B. Anthony gave 45 years of devotion with singleness of purpose and unbelievable persistence for the enfranchisement of women. Through her efforts and that of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, woman suffrage was debated on the floor of Senate in 1866 and a resolution was introduced in 1868 in both Houses of Congress providing that citizenship be the basis of suffrage. In the "Life of Miss Anthony" she says: "I have addressed the committees of every Congress since 1869, and our New York Legislature scores of times." Senator Sargent introduced in the Senate the first woman suffrage amendment in 1876. This amendment was reintroduced year after year through the tireless efforts of Miss Anthony. It was finally adopted in 1920, 14 years after her death.

Because she believed that the movement for woman's rights and woman suffrage should be world-wide, she organized in Washington, D. C., in 1888, the International Council of Women.

In 1890, the National Woman Suffrage Association and the American Woman Suffrage Association united, forming the National American Woman Suffrage Association, with Mrs. Stanton as its first president. Miss Anthony succeeded her in 1891 and for 9 years until 1900, she served as its president.

Her interests were wide and in addition to directing State and National campaigns for woman suffrage and attending hearings, she never lost an opportunity to speak, write and work for the advancement of women in education, in the professions, in business, and to win for them full civil rights. Her scrapbooks kept for 50 years are now in the Rare Books Section of the Congressional Library. They give a record of her life work.

HONORS

The nineteenth amendment which became the law of the land August 26, 1920, was the goal to which Susan B. Anthony dedicated and devoted her life. A commemorative 3-cent stamp bearing her profile was issued August 26, 1936, on the sixteenth anniversary of the nineteenth amendment.

The governors of many States issue proclamations, commemorating her birthday—February 15—and calling attention to her and her work.

In the Capitol at Washington is the Woman's Monument by Adelaide Johnson. Rising out of an 8-ton base of Italian marble are the heads and shoulders of Mrs. Stanton, Mrs. Mott, and Miss Anthony—who were known as the Great Triumvirate in the work for woman suffrage. In the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City was the bust of Miss Anthony by Adelaide Johnson. It has been loaned to the Anthony House. There is a bronze tablet to Miss Anthony along the grand staircase of the capitol at Albany.

Rochester memorials: Anthony Hall of the Women's College of the University of Rochester; Anthony Room in Cutler Union of College for Women; bronze tablet to the sisters in the Unitarian Church which they attended; bronze tablet in chapter house of Irondequoit Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of which she was a life member; tree in Genesee Park—near Dr. Moore's monument—dedicated by department of parks, 1935; School No. 27 is called the Susan B. Anthony School; exhibits in Rochester Museum and in Rochester Historical Society headquarters; Susan B. Anthony House.

California memorials: Susan B. Anthony Memorial Collection in Los Angeles Public Library; Susan B. Anthony Tree in Sequoia National Park; Susan B. Anthony Day in public schools; mementos of Miss Anthony in Mission Inn, Riverside, Calif.; Susan B. Anthony Memorial Committee.

TRIBUTE

At Miss Anthony's funeral Mrs. Catt gave this tribute: "This woman for a large part of half a century was the chief inspiration, counselor, and guide of our movement. There were women associated with her from time to time, women of wonderful intellect, of superb power, of grand character, yet she was clearly the greatest of them all, the greatest woman of our century, perhaps the greatest of all time. We shall never see her like again."

Sound Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1950, the East Atlanta Post, No. 159, the American Legion, Atlanta, Ga., adopted a resolution regarding the gold standard.

Under leave previously granted, I insert this resolution herewith:

SOUND MONEY

Whereas we are fighting a global war of terrific intensity, but it will be easier to win the war of arms than to overcome the forces of financial evil which will not even hesitate to throw the entire world into economic chaos before they will willingly relinquish the power to manipulate and control money; and

Whereas formally silver and gold were used as money by weight being the unit of value in ancient transactions. Abraham gave, in weight; 400 shekels of silver for the cave of Machpelah. He was rich in flocks and herds and also silver and gold. David, King of Israel, paid 50 shekels of silver for a threshing floor; and later, 600 shekles of gold for the entire field in which the threshing floor was located; and

Whereas silver and gold were thus used as a medium of exchange, having an inherent value by weight and thus representing the value of goods, services and property in all business transactions. Nebuchadnessar, King of Babylon, in the first great economic conference (of which we have record) there he instituted gold as the standard of value, pronouncing the death sentence for anyone

who would refuse to abide by the ruling (Daniel 3: 1-6); and

Whereas by setting up gold alone as money there was instituted a rigid, inflexible monetary system, placing those in charge of gold to manipulate price levels and bring about periods of depression, thus they continually dominate the purchasing power of money, the price level, regardless of the actual value of things purchased: Therefore be it

Resolved, That East Atlanta Post, 159, the American Legion, Department of Georgia, memorialize the Executive Department of the National American Legion to petition the United States Congress to take steps necessary to assume its constitutional authority to coin money and regulate its value. Making gold and silver to function together making standard its value, like lineal measure which does not vary in length—the yardstick; and a standard of weight that is constant—the pound; as well as the measure of, capacity the gallon thus creating a ratio between demand and supply, further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished our Representatives in Washington, D. C.

Unanimously adopted by East Atlanta Post, 159, the American Legion, Department of Georgia, February 16, 1950.

B. L. HARBERT,
Commander.

W. B. JONES,
Service Officer.

Beware of a Loafer's Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James P. Lynch from the Exeter (N. H.) News-Letter of February 16, 1950, commenting on a Lincoln Day address by Harold E. Stassen, now president of the University of Pennsylvania:

BEWARE OF A LOAFER'S PARADISE

(By James P. Lynch)

Considerable advice on how to redeem the Republican defeat of 1948 has been given but we believe the greatest contribution to the Republican cause was made the other evening by a man who played a prominent part in the last presidential race.

Cautioning the people of America to beware of the establishment of a loafer's paradise, Harold E. Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania and former Governor of the State of Minnesota, declared: "Let us always have in mind that every attempt in the history of the world to establish a loafer's paradise has wound up in a dictator's hell-hole.

Typical of the fighting spirit of this great Republican leader, the speech was a sincere plea to Republicans throughout the Nation to step forward and meet the challenge of the exceptional task that confronts the party of the Great Emancipator.

This phrase "Beware of a loafer's paradise" should definitely be adopted as the fighting words of the Republican Party. It is much more defining, much more critical of the wasteful administration in Washington than the present ammunition of words.

Stassen paid tribute to Abraham Lincoln as one of those few men in all history who deeply understood the nature of man and one who had the unshakable courage to act in accordance with his convictions.

In his opening remarks the university prexy stated: "Lincoln believed he knew what man was meant to be free, and in moving addresses he declared that this Nation could not endure permanently half-slave and half-free.

"Standing fast upon this principle, Lincoln welded together a powerful and victorious political party, he took the leadership of the Nation and brought it through the hour of grim trial as one undivided United States of America."

Unlike some other orators that we heard during Lincoln Day dinners, Stassen did not dwell on the historic events of Lincoln which we are all so familiar with. He chose to discuss the more important issues of the day which we believe is the way Lincoln would prefer.

He pointed out that through the vigilance of the Republican Party and through some key decisions by the Supreme Court, the people of this country, thus far, in the main, have retained our economic freedom.

He stressed how we are being challenged by a new set of proposals that are weakening our independent structure. The advocates of these ideas have adopted the slogan, "Let the Government do it."

The methods of this school of thought, as the majority of us realize, call for nationalization, Government ownership, blanket controls, price fixing, heavy taxes, governmental distribution of goods, and governmental operation of all or a major part of the economy.

Cautioning the people against following such a course, Stassen declared: "If a man becomes subservient to the men in authority in his government for what he may eat and what he may wear, for where he may work, and what he may earn, for what he may produce and how he shall profit, for what he may build and where he may live, then he cannot truly be free in what he may say or write, or how he may worship, or how he may live."

"A man must either have complete freedom or he will not for long be truly free at all. A man cannot permanently be half a slave and half a freeman."

These are really threats to the future freedom of America although many probably are willing to accept them as a new trend. The Republican Party certainly can alter the direction of this freedom-losing road if it is willing to take a firm and definite position, not in words but in action. Republican Party leaders must make certain that those who are willing to participate in the give-away programs should be exposed and defeated at the polls. This includes the Truman Republicans. If the Republican Party is willing to take such clear-cut action the people will rally around such a fighting program.

Stassen's advice against increasing the power and bigness of Government is quite sound. Government is like a fire. If it is kept within bounds and under the control of the people, then it contributes to the welfare of all. But, and that word is very big, if it gets out of its place, gets too big and out of control, it destroys the happiness and even the lives of the people.

As the university president pointed out: One of the lessons of America's unparalleled progress is that Government's principal role is to protect men and to prevent crushing burdens from being laid upon them, to leave them free—truly free and completely free.

Stassen's suggestions certainly demonstrate that the Republicans made a drastic mistake in not appreciating his capabilities as the presidential nominee in the last campaign. We feel certain that if the people had been given the opportunity to select the candidate acceptance of the me-too nominee would not have been.

The former chief executive of Minnesota has not lost any of his political stature, in fact he has become increasingly strong. The people realize that he talks with them and not down to them. They know he wants to work with them and not be their caretaker. They see in men of his caliber a great Republican Party.

Stassen called for the adoption of the following basic objectives: "Let us rebuild the Republican Party as a dynamic, fighting party with the issue of the true freedom of man as our central rallying point.

"Let us make it clear that if people are looking for a political party that will promise to everyone ever larger hand-outs from the Public Treasury, they should look elsewhere, that we hold that the Public Treasury is in reality the people's pockets and that we will not seek to win votes by false promises nor by leading the country down that road that inevitably ends in a cheapened dollar and ultimate misery and suffering for all when resources are drained.

"Let us make it clear that if the people want a political party that will take over and politically dominate the medical professions in exchange for promises which the experience of Britain show cannot be fulfilled, they should look elsewhere.

"Let us make it clear that if they want a political party that will try to delude them into thinking that someone else is going to pay the tax burdens, they should look elsewhere.

"Let us make it clear we seek to build a political party that is frank and forthright with the people—a party that promises above all that it will not weaken or destroy any of the freedom of the people, that it will seek ever to maintain an incentive for every man and woman to use his hands and brains and capital in worth-while and productive accomplishment and service, and that it will steadfastly refuse to maintain or to operate any system of governmental hand-out, to provide soft cushions for loafers and chiselers or dishonest 5-percenters.

"Let us also declare with deep sincerity that man cannot truly be free if discrimination against him because of his race or religion or ancestry shuts doors to him of education or of employment or of shelter or of justice. Thus we shall make clear that having adopted this great principle, our party cannot contemplate and shall not consummate a fusion with those forces in our country affiliated by name with the opposition party who seek to join with us partially to protect economic freedom for themselves, but even more to deny freedom to others in their midst."

The humanitarian approach offered by Stassen makes certain that we should provide for the aged, infirm, or unemployed, but there is no room for the loafer. It also called for the curbing of the dictators within the unions. He emphasized that it is necessary to have a sound, strong union, directed by the freely made decisions of its own members. His plan denounced monopolies and called for real competitive production and distribution.

The Republican Party would do well to follow the advice given by this great statesman. It would lead to the road of victory for the GOP—a mighty important road, especially after being off it for so many years.

Taking From All of Us To Give to Some of Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the coal strike, the scarcity of coal, the resulting unemployment and

suffering should bring home to us the fact long known, but consistently ignored by too many, that all of us are being penalized through higher costs for the benefit of first one group, then another.

Coal miners, steel workers, motor employees have from time to time received increases in wages, special benefits given them through contracts requiring primarily the employer, ultimately the consumer, to pay for those benefits.

Periodically, organized labor asks for an increase in wages or, like the miners, an increase in the tax levied upon production, for the benefit of their particular group.

Each time a group receives an increase in wages or payments for unemployment, sickness or pensions, obtains a shorter work week, or a subsidy, the cost falls upon everyone.

Everyone who thinks knows this to be true: that it cannot forever continue without giving us uncontrollable inflation.

To date, no effective action has been taken.

To bring home to the average citizen the procedure followed and to emphasize the danger in such a procedure, by permission granted, I am reprinting a leaflet put out by the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, New York, entitled "Exploitation by the Privileged Versus Equality Before the Law." It reads as follows:

EXPLOITATION BY THE PRIVILEGED VERSUS EQUALITY BEFORE THE LAW—WHICH DO YOU FAVOR?

Being a good American, you will probably answer without hesitation, "Equality before the law." But wait a minute. Is this your real attitude, or is equality before the law merely a shibboleth? Are you consistent? Do you advocate equal economic rights for everyone, all the time, or only for some people in special cases? Do you always object to exploitation?

Before you answer these questions definitely, it may be wise to consider certain specific instances.

You have a good job and a steady income. Suppose that you move to a new locality and start buying groceries from Mr. Brown who has a store near your home. If you continue to patronize him for a month, do you feel that you thereafter have a right to quit buying from him if you find that you can get equally good groceries cheaper elsewhere? You will probably say, "Of course."

IS BROWN'S CLAIM VALID?

But suppose that you discover that Mr. Brown has a wife and seven children to support, and that his net annual income is far smaller than yours. He insists that, under such circumstances, he has a right to compel you to patronize his store indefinitely. He also says that it is your duty to provide him and his family with adequate insurance against sickness and death, and to arrange to give him an old-age pension when he retires.

You will probably say that you never heard of such a preposterous proposition. Why should the fact that you have bought some groceries from Mr. Brown obligate you to support him and his family? Aren't you free to stop trading with him any day you please? What are his family's affairs to you? When you paid for your groceries you had fulfilled all of your obligations to him—and that's that.

Next, let us suppose that the grocers in the neighborhood discover that too many stores have opened there and that none of them are making decent profits. Is it legitimate for them to get together and agree to double all the prices charged for their goods? Under such circumstances, do you have a right to buy groceries from some store in the next town, and bring them home with you?

HOW WOULD YOU ANSWER?

You will probably say that it is not only your right—it is your duty to oppose any such high-handed attempt to rob you. The grocers ought to be prosecuted under the Sherman Act.

Now, let us go further and assume that all the grocers in the whole region unite in an association, and then inform you that, hereafter, you will have the option of either buying groceries from members of the association, or going without groceries and starving. They also warn you grimly that, if you order groceries from anyone else—for example from a mail order house—it will be your own fault if your car is wrecked, your house burned, or you are beaten up.

However, they tell you that they intend to be very reasonable about the whole matter, and that, if you and the other customers will appoint a committee to represent you, they will be willing to discuss calmly the question of whether grocery prices are to be trebled or merely doubled.

You will doubtless say that any group of merchants making such outrageous demands would promptly be sent to prison for long terms, and that they would richly deserve such punishment.

APPLY IT IMPARTIALLY

Now, we come to the vital issue. Is your antipathy for persons making such demands confined to merchants, or does it apply equally to all other persons guilty of the same offense? At first thought, you will say that your sentiment is general—you will see no reason for discriminating in favor of or against any particular class. But will you stick to this point of view when this test is applied to a specific case? Let us consider that of Mr. Green.

Unlike Mr. Brown, who sells groceries, Mr. Green sells his services as a coal miner. He also has a wife and seven children. For some months, he has been selling his services to Mr. Smith who owns a small coal mine. Mr. Green belongs to the United Mine Workers. He insists that, since Mr. Smith has been purchasing his services for several months, it is now Mr. Smith's duty to continue indefinitely to buy his services, and under no circumstances to patronize Mr. Black—a "scab" who is ready to sell as good or better services at a lower rate.

Do you still stick to your guns and say that Mine Owner Smith, as an American citizen, must have freedom to buy where he can buy cheapest; or do you feel that Mr. Green has a vested interest in his job?

YOUR OBLIGATIONS PILE UP

Mr. Green also insists that it is the duty of Customer Smith to see that Mr. Green and his family receive adequate care in case of accident or sickness, and that Mr. Smith provide Mr. Green with an old-age pension when the latter retires. Do you still consider this demand preposterous? Do you still hold that, when Smith pays for Green's services to date, Green has no right to ask Smith for anything additional?

Mr. Green says further that the United Mine Workers' demand that Mr. Smith buy coal-mining services solely from union members, at double prewar rates of pay, or else stop buying such services from anyone, and that, if he does buy services from others, he alone is to blame if his car is wrecked, his plant is burned, and he is beaten up. However, Mr. Green generously informs Mr. Smith that he may join with other coal-mine owners and appoint a committee to bargain with Mr. Green and his colleagues as to whether pay for coal mining shall be two and one-half times or only double prewar rates.

If Mr. Smith and his fellow mine owners are unreasonable and refuse to discuss the proposed rates of pay, they are free to close the mines and let coal users shut down their plants and allow their homes to remain unheated.

Incidentally, of course, at the time that Mr. Green is making this demand for the coal miners, Mr. White is making a similar demand for the trainmen, and Mr. Blue is joining in for the telephone operators. Mr. White and Mr. Blue state bluntly that, if their people cannot market their services at greatly advanced rates, the Nation can go without transportation.

IT'S COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Are you still ready to denounce such demands as outrageous, and urge that those making them be sent to prison for long terms? Before you so decide, remember that Mr. Green, Mr. White, and Mr. Blue are merely talking about collective bargaining—an institution which most reformers insist marks a great social advance. Remember also that, even under the Taft-Hartley law, the "slave labor act," industry-wide collective bargaining is permitted. Remember further that no coal miners, no railway workers, no telephone employees, have been sent to prison for making the just-mentioned demands on their employers.

"But," you will say, "the point overlooked is that Mr. Brown is selling commodities—groceries—while Mr. Green and Mr. White and Mr. Blue are selling personal services." However, is this difference real or merely fancied? Is it not true that Mr. Brown, like Mr. Green, Mr. White, and Mr. Blue, is engaged in selling his own services? Of course, grocers must pass along to you the costs to them of the goods at wholesale, clerk hire, rent, etc. But what they net is mostly pay for their own efforts in supervising the buying and selling of their merchandise.

YOU ARE BEING EXPLOITED

There seems, then, to be no escape from the fact that, if you wish to be logical, you must condemn equally Mr. Brown, Mr. Green, Mr. White, and Mr. Blue for engaging in most reprehensible conspiracies to injure their customers and the public in general. All alike are trying to exploit those who do not belong to their organization. If Mr. Brown ought to be sent to prison, so ought the others.

The only logical way to avoid this conclusion is to assume that members of labor unions are a privileged class who are entitled to plunder the underprivileged nonunionists. This is, indeed, the purport of such statutes as the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the Wagner Act. If, after thinking matters over, you feel that, after all, most of us voters are so dumb that we deserve to be exploited, and that it is only fair to give to those keen enough to organize unions the special privilege of exploiting the rest of us, you will urge that the status quo be maintained. If, however, you should happen to decide in favor of equality before the law for all of us, you will demand the repeal of the just-mentioned statutes. It's up to you. What are you going to do about the whole matter?

The Spiritual Base of American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Under permission to extend my remarks, I include a thinking, a penetrating, and a powerful address made by the Honorable John E. Peurifoy, Deputy Under Secretary of State, before the International Christian Leadership, Inc., in Washington, D. C., on February 3, 1950:

I welcome the opportunity to talk with you tonight. As members of the Christian fellowship groups, you are primarily concerned with the advance of spiritual values. I believe that the most certain legacy that we, as fathers, can leave our children is one of the spirit. Our hope for future generations of Americans must be based on bequeathing them an inheritance of spiritual and moral leadership. The enduring thing we can pass on to them is a living tradition.

The great nations of this world, those that have exerted most marked influence for good on the history of man, are those nations whose leaders were men of vision with great spiritual qualities. The dictators, the tyrants have their brief innings, fall, and are remembered only for the evil they worked. The work of moral leadership lives on. Ancient Greece, constricted in size and arid in soil, gave the standards of truth, beauty, and liberty as we know them today. From tiny Palestine came a philosophy which has influenced the moral code of the Christian world for nearly 2,000 years. The might and wealth of greater nations have vanished but the vision of the prophets of Judah and the teachings of Christ are a potent influence in the world today.

Our United States, the richest country in the world in physical wealth and material resources, must be great in spiritual leadership if we are to play our great role in the destiny of nations. We must have a living spiritual philosophy to fight the material forces of communism. Communism is a philosophy of materialism and refuses to acknowledge the existence of God. Even more, communism is an avowed nonrecognition of God. Mark how many thousands of priests and churchmen have been arrested in Communist-dominated countries. The Communist action against the clergy in Czechoslovakia is the most recent example of their campaign against the spiritual leaders of a society.

This is evidence of Communist recognition and Communist fear of the strength and durability of spiritual leadership and their acknowledgment that the churches are spiritual strongholds that stand against efforts to enslave mankind.

In taking control of a nation, the Communists have followed a consistent pattern. Their first move is the seizure of governmental powers. Their next move is always the same, either to liquidate the spiritual leaders or to make these leaders subject to them. Once these two steps have been accomplished, a Communist minority as small as 2 percent can control a country.

We must face this fact at the outset. The forces of communism are on the march. We must recognize that this is not alone a fight between the Catholic Church and communism, but a fight between communism and all faiths—Catholics, Jews, and Protestants.

In this battle, the various religious faiths have at hand effective weapons, and the major weapon in the religious arsenal is that of the Christian principle. The moral force of that weapon is immeasurable.

The programs that the United States has launched since 1945, and the projects in which we have participated, individually and collectively, conform to the Christian ideal. As far as America is concerned, the elements of these principles have long been an integral part of this democracy. It is only to be expected that we should project them into our dealings with other nations.

Since VJ-day, American policy in dealing with other nations has involved a number of important steps. We took a leading role in UNRRA and contributed substantial amounts of food, clothing, and other necessities to peoples made destitute by the war. Subsequently, we provided huge quantities of food, materials, and equipment to stricken nations in western Europe to help them get back on their feet. This was under the Marshall plan and I call to your attention that much of these goods and equipment were grants-in-aid. In other words, they were gifts from the American people.

Of course, we did these things partly out of self-interest. We were aware that American welfare depended on the welfare of our neighbors.

Some of our programs have been in effect long enough to show what strength, resolution, and moral force can accomplish.

A freely elected Greek Government is still in office, and with a determined assist from us, has routed the forces of Communist guerrillas which threatened its survival. Internal conditions, in the economic sphere, have improved considerably. With our aid, the Turkish Government fended off a threat of encroachment and is measurably more solidly established. An American mediator, as an official of the United Nations with the power of that organization behind him, succeeded in resolving a dispute between the Arab states and the Israeli which had flared into open conflict.

The United Nations, in which we take an active part, must be given a large share of the credit for the establishment of the free nations of Indonesia and of the Republic of South Korea. The Marshall plan has been, and is still, instrumental in an inspiring revival of the economies of the states of western Europe. Conditions in those nations, in comparison with the state of affairs that obtained immediately after the war, are enormously better. Food is far more abundant than it was—although some shortages still persist. In most nations the rate of production, which is economic lifeblood, is moving steadily upward and has passed the 1938 levels.

Furthermore, the North Atlantic Treaty and the mutual defense assistance program have done much to allay the fears of invasion and have provided a sense of security that is essential to political stability and to further economic recovery.

This is only a partial and certainly a cursory review of what has been achieved. Even as such, I submit that it is an impressive record.

In western Europe and in the Middle East, and even in certain segments of the Far East where it seemed to be making sweeping progress, communism has received a series of set-backs from which I hope it may never recover. This I am sure provides a practical and convincing answer to the question about the power of Christian principles intelligently applied.

Nonofficial organizations, such as the Christian fellowship groups, can be of real service in turning back the tide of communism. They can help in extending the application of the Christian principles we have been discussing. Earlier I pointed out that the spiritual leaders of a society are regarded by the Communists as major threats to Communist power.

It is conceivable that vigorous promotion of human rights will compel the Communist leaders to alter their course and to deal with the rest of the world in a more Christian manner. They might be forced to live up to their international commitments and to begin to cooperate with free nations in establishing a world system of law and reason.

Of this you can be sure: news of each gain in human rights will penetrate the iron curtain. The fact that men outside the curtain are successfully working out the pattern of living together in which the individual is free of oppression, can come and go as he pleases, and is guaranteed certain basic rights—which are enforced by law—will make itself felt among the masses of Russia. It may take a generation but once that fact gains acceptance, we can look for a more tractable Soviet policy. We can expect a Soviet Government which will discharge its obligations to other nations.

When that happens we will have established the basis for an enduring peace—an achievement to which you may justly claim a considerable contribution. You will have helped to assure an increase of spiritual values in the world of tomorrow.

Basing-Point System: Its Catastrophic Effects on Growth of Various Regions of the Country as Attested to by Leading Economists—Excerpts From Statements by Dr. Walter A. Adams, Dr. Fritz Machlup, and Dr. Vernon A. Mund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important aspects of the basing-point system is its effect upon the growth of the various regions of this country. This question has been examined at some length by economists appearing before the House Small Business Committee. Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to include a few excerpts from the testimony of Dr. Walter A. Adams, professor of economics, Michigan State College; Dr. Fritz Machlup, professor of political economy, Johns Hopkins University; and Dr. Vernon A. Mund, professor of economics, University of Washington, bearing on this point. These excerpts make it abundantly clear that, in view of the experts who have carefully studied the basing-point problem, the restoration of the basing-point system will have exceedingly injurious effects upon the regional development.

EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT OF WALTER ADAMS, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE, EAST LANSING, MICH., BEFORE THE HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, JULY 5, 1949

The fourth objection to the basing-point system (and to the pricing system which this bill would authorize) is that it results in an uneconomic location of both producers and consumers. As far as producers are

concerned, they experience no particular pressure to respond to changing locational factors. They tend to maintain their investment in locationally anachronistic areas, because "under the umbrella of a controlled-price system the test of profitable plant location ceases to be essentially a matter of cost of production and distribution. * * * Plants thereby may be established at uneconomic points in terms of production costs."

Why, it may be asked, should Detroit have only 5 percent of the Nation's steel capacity, when Detroit industries consume more than 18 percent of the total steel output? This question becomes especially embarrassing when it is considered that Detroit has a more favorable location in respect to scrap, iron ore, and a substantial portion of the market than Pittsburgh, for example. It is indeed strange that Pittsburgh, with the decreasing locational pull of coal resources and the increasing locational attraction of steel markets,[1] should be able to retain 40 percent of national steel capacity, when the industries in that area consume only about half that amount, thus necessitating an exportation of the rest. This anomalous situation can be attributed largely to the basing-point system which tends to neutralize geographic advantages and disadvantages between steel producers by allowing every steel mill to compete on a substantially equal footing for any piece of business anywhere in the country, a criticism which applies (although to a lesser degree) to any system of pricing involving freight absorption.

In addition to this uneconomic location of producing plants, the basing-point system tends to encourage the location of steel-consuming plants in areas which, under other pricing systems, would not have been selected. The reason for this is that, under the basing-point system, the lowest price for steel is not necessarily obtained by locating close to a steel mill, but rather by locating in the proximity of a basing point. Thus a steel consumer who, under f. o. b. mill system, might have located in Detroit would instead establish his plant at Pittsburgh or Chicago or some other basing point, in spite of the fact that the latter location results in higher social costs.

Such distortion in the location of both producing and consuming points tends to favor a geographical concentration of industry, a phenomenon which might prove very hazardous for national security in case another total war materialized. Aside from economic considerations, it would seem unwise public policy to encourage a pricing system which tends to stimulate a geographical concentration of industry by allowing freight absorption. Indeed, our interest in national defense should constitute a compelling reason for advocating such pricing systems as will favor a progressive locational diversification and decentralization of industrial establishments.

Finally, we should recognize that, in spite of the official opposition to the f. o. b. mill system emanating from steel circles, some companies are in no danger of loss as a result of the basing-point system's abandonment. Bethlehem Steel, for example, is favorably situated for the eastern seaboard and export market; Inland Steel has the vast Chicago market at its plant gate; National Steel operates in steel-starved Detroit; Republic Steel is favorably situated in Cleveland. That these companies have not, to date, suffered adversity under the f. o. b. mill system is best seen in their recent profit figures. Other companies, to be sure—notably United States Steel—with substantial capacity in the less advantageous Pittsburgh-Youngstown area are not so fortunate. They will have to look for new markets when steel demand slackens. With systematic freight absorption illegal, United States Steel and others like it will eventually have to move part of their capacity to better locations, that is, closer to markets and scrap sources. Such moves are entirely in accord with sound economic development and should not be discouraged by a reimposition of basing-point pricing.

[1] D. Lynch, The Concentration of Economic Power, New York, Columbia University Press, 1946, p. 191.

EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT OF DR. FRITZ MACHLUP, PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL ECONOMY, THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, SUBMITTED TO HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, JULY 6, 1949

The basing-point system of pricing enables each member of an industry to calculate the exact prices that he may expect every one of his cooperating competitors to quote for the product delivered to any of the 60,000 or more destinations in the United States. The system thus permits the competitors to eliminate price competition and without prior consultation to quote to any one buyer exactly identical prices despite the different freight costs from the various production places to the destination. One of the great advantages of the basing-point system to the industries in which it is employed is that it permits price fixing, without traceable communication among the cooperators and, hence, with less direct evidence of conspiracy than can possibly be discovered in other forms of combinations in restraint of competition. If the cooperators are careful, they can maintain such a price-fixing scheme indefinitely without being caught unless the very adherence to the system is accepted as prima facie evidence of collusion. Section 1 of S. 1008 in its present form immunizes the inherently collusive practice unless the existence of the combination, conspiracy, or collusive agreement is proved.

An advantage of the basing-point system to the largest corporations in the industries in which it is employed is that it permits those firms to dominate and oppress the smaller firms in the industry without leaving any direct evidence of the oppressiveness of the discriminatory policy. These large corporations can restrict the operations and prevent the growth of the small businesses by using the discriminatory pricing practice of the basing-point system and professing that they are merely "meeting the equally low price of a competitor." The oppressive effects are discernible only by subtle methods of economic analysis. It is uncertain whether the results of such an analysis would be admitted as the "substantial and probative evidence" which is required by section 4 of S. 1008.

The collusive-monopolistic and oppressive-discriminatory nature of the basing-point system was exposed in chapters 4 and 5 of my book, The Basing-Point System (published in March 1949 by the Blakiston Co., of Philadelphia). This book incorporates the results of years of painstaking and impartial study of the established facts in several court cases as well as to the economic analyses presented by opponents and defenders of the controversial pricing system. The contentions denying the monopolistic and discriminatory nature of the basing-point system proved to be absolutely untenable and sometimes deliberate falsehoods. The case against the basing-point system and against similar "freight-equalization systems," as they are sometimes called, proved to be so strong that a condemnation of these systems in the strongest terms became inescapable.

The 1948 decision of the Supreme Court in the Cement case, holding that the basing-point system was illegal under existing law, was a late but incontrovertible recognition of the monopolistic effects of the system. In a thorough analysis of the economic consequences of the operation of the basing-point system—in chapters 6 and 7 of my book—I came to the conclusions that "the system—

"(1) reduces the degree of competition in the sale of the products concerned;

"(2) causes wastes in transportation by encouraging shipments over unnecessarily long distances and by unnecessarily expensive means;

"(3) raises the level, reduces the flexibility, and distorts the structure of prices;

"(4) facilitates the increase or maintenance of concentration of control in the industry;

"(5) reduces the utilization of productive capacity in the industry;

"(6) severs the price connection between expansion of capacity and growth of demand;

"(7) distorts the location of productive capacity in the industry by retarding its decentralization; and

"(8) distorts the location of fabricating industries by fostering undue centralization."

EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT OF DR. VERNON A. MUND, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SEATTLE, SUBMITTED TO HOUSE SMALL-BUSINESS COMMITTEE, JULY 8, 1949

From a public point of view, various economists have pointed out, the practice of sporadic discrimination is an undesirable method of competition (1) because it forces some customers to pay excessive local prices, and (2) because it subjects small competitors in distant areas to the fear and hazard of anarchic price cutting. The large producer may honestly not intend to kill off a distant competitor, but the fact remains that no seller likes to see a competitor grow bigger and more powerful if he can prevent it. Thus, sporadic discrimination, used by a dominant firm to meet competition, may be exercised to hold prices at an unremunerative level at distant points, so that rival sellers fail to grow, wither on the vine, or eventually drop out of production. Since the discrimination is exercised in accordance with no principle except that of meeting competition, a small producer can never be sure about the prices which he is likely to find in his area. The resulting uncertainty and the fear of retaliation thereupon frequently become important factors in inducing the small firm to follow the leader in a policy of cooperative, systematic price discrimination.

Basing-point and zone-delivered pricing systems force buyers to purchase two commodities—the manufactured goods and freight—on terms and conditions determined solely by the producers. In charging phantom or fictitious freight, a mill forces a buyer to purchase transportation service which he doesn't want and which he doesn't get. This gives a particular mill net prices higher than the base price by the amount of the fictitious freight. On the other hand, in the case of absorbed freight, the railroad is paid the actual freight cost, and the mill secures net prices which are lower than the base price of the amount of the absorbed freight.

Buyers (fabricators) located at or near a nonbase mill do not want to pay phantom freight, for such a charge places them at a competitive disadvantage with fabricators located at or near a base mill. Likewise, buyers located near a base mill which is engaged in freight absorption, find that they are denied the advantage of their location and are forced to pay high local prices which help to defray the delivery cost to other buyers.

The Pacific Northwest is now producing approximately 50 percent of the total aluminum ingot production in the United States. However, we are doing very little in manufacture of finished aluminum products. The situation has led many to question the advantages of the aluminum industry to the region in view of the fact that it is a heavy power consumer, but a relatively small employer. The question is frequently asked why with all of our aluminum production we

don't have more fabricating facilities. The fact is that insofar as basic commodities—such as aluminum—are produced locally and sold freight allowed, with an average freight item included, local prices are high, as high as elsewhere in the country, and fabricators find no cost advantage in locating in the Pacific Northwest.

Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to a splendid article which appears on pages 3 and 4 of the February 1950 issue of the Progressive, a magazine published monthly by The Progressive, Inc., 408 West Gorham Street, Madison 3, Wis.

This article presents the most readable break-down of what President Truman's $42,000,000,000 1950–51 budget request is to be spent for and dispels many of the wild claims of some people and silences many of the untrue claims and spurious arguments heretofore made by persons against this present-day budget request.

The article which I refer to is as follows:

The President's 1950–51 budget, second highest in the Nation's peacetime history, drew howls of protest from the conservative press and politicians. The $42,000,000,000 budget, and its $5,000,000,000 deficit, were blasted as "the bankrupting cost of the welfare state" and as "laying the bricks on the socialist road to economic ruin."

Analysis of the budget shows how weirdly inaccurate such charges are. Nearly three-quarters of the budget's forty-two billions—72.4 percent, to be exact—is earmarked for war, whether for past wars, the present cold war, or preparation for future wars.

Item-by-item break-down of the recommended expenditures reveals that of every dollar of expenditure provided in the budget:

Thirty-one and nine-tenths cents will go directly for national defense.

Thirteen and two-tenths cents will pay interest on the national debt, most of it incurred in the two World Wars.

Fourteen and three-tenths cents will be disbursed in the form of veterans' benefits.

Eleven and one-tenth cents will be paid in international security grants to foreign nations.

One and nine-tenths cents are earmarked for atomic-energy development.

The total of these war and defense appropriations is 72.4 cents out of every dollar of Federal spending.

Conversely, the total of all Government activities which could be classified as welfare or social-service programs comes to 18.8 cents, of which aid to the aged, the blind, and the otherwise handicapped comes to 3.6 cents; other social welfare and health services, 2.8 cents; purchase of housing mortgages, 2.3 cents; housing and slum clearance, 1 cent; aid to agriculture, 3.6 cents; rural electrification and rural housing, 1.6 cents; and subsidies to business, 3.9 cents.

Significantly, the last item is the largest but, of course, provokes the least outcry. These subsidies go to newspapers and magazines, the merchant marine, and air lines, all privately owned and operated for private profit.

We shall be watching with great interest when the economy bloc goes into action. We have no doubt that there is waste in the Federal establishment, and that sound economies can be made without disturbing vital functions of the Government. But we're convinced that any genuine effort at economy must be made with the understanding that the budget finances a warfare state, not a welfare state."

A Fact We Sometimes Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, religion is on the defensive in many parts of the world today. This is a time which calls for utmost cooperation among the great faiths of the world in spreading religious tolerance of our fellow men. Better understanding among the people of all groups would, in these days of moral crisis, contribute most effectively toward better relationship in the political and socio-economic spheres which have so rent the world asunder.

One of the most constructive methods toward interfaith understanding is the annual observance of Brotherhood Week, which occurs this year during the week of February 19–26. In connection with that observance, I am placing in the RECORD an editorial written by the Rev. Richard Ginder, editor of the publication the Priest, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD WEEK, FEBRUARY 19–26, 1950

It will come as a distinct surprise to many a Christian when, on the last day, he confronts, as his judge, a young man, exceedingly handsome, and with a face that is unmistakably Jewish. It's only natural, especially in these latter centuries, to identify Christianity with the non-Jewish element in the world, that to say a man is a Christian is practically, by that very word, to spot him as a Gentile, or a non-Jew.

We tend to forget that when the Wise Men came to Jerusalem they inquired, "Where is He that is born King of the Jews?" And Herod sent them to Bethlehem, the ancient city of David, where they found Jesus.

And when the Messiah began His public life, He surrounded Himself with 12 Jews—the Apostles. It was a Jew, St. Paul, who first carried the Gospel to the Gentiles. It is through him that the rest of us have been made sharers in God's revelation.

That Blessed Virgin Mary, who was His mother and to whom Christianity has had such a tender devotion throughout the ages, was a Jewess, the daughter of St. Anne and St. Joachim.

Catholics venerate a Jew, St. Peter, as their first pope, and another Jew as his successor.

It was the children of Abraham who, through generation after generation, handed down God's truth in a world that else would have lost it. Moses, David, Solomon, Isaiah—Jews, all of them—were God's instruments in penning the most sublime pages of our literature. They were His people, chosen above all others, to preserve orthodox dogma, the concept of an invisible Creator of all things. It was their mission to school the world in a religion of sacrifice and atonement, to sensitize the human conscience and educate it to ideas of justice, truth, and purity.

And they fulfilled their mission admirably. They had their lapses, it's true, but always somehow they managed to get back on the track. So that when Our Lord did come, finally, He could speak to a people that understood His language, a people well versed in things of the altar.

Protestant or Catholic, our spiritual ancestry is Jewish. It is a fact we should never forget.

REV. RICHARD GINDER,
Editor, the Priest.

Torture in Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article, by Mr. Lawrence R. Goldberg, appearing in the January 8, 1950, edition of the Boston Sunday Post, which graphically describes the terrible conditions in Lithuania today as the result of Soviet tyranny. It is a poignant reminder that the tremendous sacrifices in two World Wars will have been in vain if Lithuania, and the other small democratic nations, are not liberated from ruthless imperialism. Let us hope that the new phase of our foreign policy will include a stern demand that Russia relinquish her strangle-hold upon Lithuania and permit a peace loving people to rule themselves as they have a right to do under God's law as well as international law.

The article by Mr. Goldberg follows:

BARE TORTURE IN LITHUANIA—UNDERGROUND LEADERS SEND GRAPHIC STORY AND PICTURES TO SHOW WHAT RUSSIANS ARE DOING

(By Lawrence R. Goldberg)

A series of photographs brought to the United States from the underground resistance movement in Lithuania—accompanied by sworn-to facts and figures—poignantly depict what is going on behind the iron curtain enveloping that country.

They show conditions there under Soviet rule growing steadily worse in all phases of life—moral, social, political, economical, cultural, and military—and pose a dramatic plea to the free part of the world for aid.

"Our nation is being crucified," writes one of the underground leaders in a letter accompanying the photographs. "Our blood-stained hands reach out to you. It is our own blood. It flows in streams. Our burning homesteads light up the sky, nothing but blood and suffering everywhere. The summer sun does not dry up the blood, nor do winter colds congeal it. This blood is only washed away by the tears of our mothers, wives, sweethearts, and children as they embrace us."

CRIES FORTH

"As we look around at the desolation of our homes; as we see the hideous crimes of violence; we forget our exhaustion and a calm, cold fury gives up strength to fight on.

"The bodies of our men, robbed, bared, and mutilated lie in piles in town market places for weeks; by such display our oppressors attempt to intimidate us. Our people are spied on through the windows to discover any sorrow on the part of families for

their deed. Occasionally a mother, a sweetheart or a sister breaks down and embraces the corpse of her beloved. Then hundreds of Russians, like a pack of bloodthirsty wolves, pounce upon the relatives—new victims for Siberia."

TERRIBLE TRAGEDY

"There is no place, no school, nor factory job for the relatives of the fallen. There is not a single village nor a house which has not experienced the horrible tragedy of reprisal.

"We shall fight for our homeland to the last. Our lives we shall sell dearly on our own ancestral soil rather than waste away in Siberia. Our bodies will fertilize our beloved soil and succeeding generations will be imbued with a greater love for this—our motherland. We pass into eternity with a mouthful of the sacred soil.

"During the past 3 years of fighting we have lost hundreds of thousands of lives—some fallen in battle in the homeland, others suffering in Siberia. But the 3,000,000 of us keep on fighting against the 200,000,000 strong occupants armed with most modern weapons. And we shall win.

SPRING WILL COME

"Spring will come. Nothing can change the tide of our Resistance, father of our rivers. All praise to our gallant people—there were 1,000 here in 1943, 600 have died or are in Siberia or are with us in the forests. All praise to our students. Born free men in a free homeland, they refuse to become enslaved. Some 16-year-olds, with fettered hands and feet, defiantly march to die in Siberia—with heads held high. Inhuman torture has brought about no instance of betrayal; he who has tasted freedom will never become a slave.

"The occupants fear us. The doors are never left unlatched. Our people have produced few traitors—our oppressors bear foreign names. Our own striking squads eventually take care of those few who betray our people.

"We are not cruel, but we are dealing with rapacious beasts. Not one Russian died without first being warned to leave our soil. But when they victimize our people without any conscience—we simply defend ourselves.

"For 3 years we have listened to ravings regarding the paradise which would follow the 5-year plan. Yet the situation gets worse every month. Selling our last overcoat, we buy food for our children. We work long hours to earn one-tenth of what is needed to fight hunger."

SCANT FOOD

"Our children no longer know what sugar, butter or meat look like. After a hard day's work we must go to the agitators to listen to what Stalin had said regarding life after 5 years. We go home at night with clubs in hand lest militiamen or soldiers should attack and disrobe us. A great many lives have been lost because of a well-worn overcoat.

"The silhouette of an approaching human figure causes us to make a wide detour. The militia check our papers at night—in other words, we are robbed by the representatives of law and order. If one complains, he is accused of being a counter-revolutionary by drunken militiamen.

"There is very little electricity. Fences, window sills, and partitions were burned for fuel. Roofs are holed. Only 10 percent of our production remains in the country, the rest is moved to Russia—to the paradise where father and teacher Stalin feeds everyone with milk and honey, where orange factories are producing in three shifts."

5-YEAR PLAN

"The Communists now tell us that our beautiful structures erected in 1945 and earlier were built by the working people as part of the 5-year plan. Should this evince the slightest doubt, he is exiled to Siberia for 10 or 15 years. Lavishly furnished shops for Communists sell at black market prices.

"These are not for us: our 1 month's earnings are not enough to buy 1 day's needed supplies. Officially, we are all equal, but Communists live extravagantly in sumptuous apartments while in the grace of their masters. They eat in separate restaurants and buy in special stores. Those who earn their bread in sweat are hungry and ragged.

"Under armed guard we are forced to march in the demonstrations of joy. The bayonet troops prod us to hail when passing the reviewing stand. Nevertheless, our heads sag or turn away. * * *

"We are very much surprised at the timidity of the Vatican broadcasts. Why be afraid? We are not afraid to die for our faith, for our homeland and for civilization. Fear not to lift your voice in loud protest. Harbor no fears for us—nothing could possibly be worse. We are dying, but in dying we want to know that there are people in the free part of the world who do not fear to raise their voice in behalf of the oppressed. Do not be afraid to drop the atomic bomb which our oppressors fear so greatly. We are prepared to pay this price for freedom."

LATEST STATISTICS

Latest available statistics divide the country's 3,250,000 population as follows:

	Percent
Lithuanians	80.60
Jews	7.15
Germans	4.10
Poles	3.04
Russians	2.35
Latvians	0.69
Whiteruthenes	0.21
Others	1.86

Before the Russians came this population distribution by religion was:

	Percent
Roman Catholics	80.48
Protestants	9.54
Israelites	7.26
Greek Orthodox	2.54
Other Christians	0.09
Other non-Christians	0.09

The following show what has happened to Catholics since June 1940, when the Soviets occupied the country:

	1940	1948
Archbishops and bishops	14	1
Clergy	1,646	400
Monastic order members	1,566	0
Churches	1,202	60
Parishioners	2,776,422	0
Theological seminaries	4	0
Catholic faculty in universities	7	0
State assistance	Li.383,278	0
Church taxation	0	0
Divinity students	470	0
Killed or exiled clergymen (percent)	0	75
Catholic press 1935:		
Number	52	0
Circulation	7,000,000	0
Religious-philosophy books	[illegible]	0
Sodality-fraternity members	800,000	0

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

The underground data does not disclose clandestine cathechetic instruction by clergymen and laymen, and the secret religious press. Religious books and articles bring highest prices in the black market. All of the Catholic scientific, educational, social, athletic, labor, economic, publishing and charitable institutions, academies, schools, libraries, kindergartens, associations, sodalities, et cetera, have been closed and their property confiscated by the Russians.

No religious literature—no catechism, missals, discourses, etc.—is printed; no paper is alloted by the government—and all printing places are state-operated. No priests are permitted to enter hospitals, schools, barracks, and prisons to administer the sacraments. The priests enter jails only as prisoners.

Since 1947, the Russians have attacked the church from another angle—clamoring against the Vatican and demanding creation of a "national Catholic Church."

Priests are repeatedly summoned and urged to break with "the fascist Vatican"—or be imprisoned for "espionage" and contact with "the Vatican intelligence." In several parishes pastors have been arrested and apostate priests installed, without the Bishop's blessing. Bishop's representatives were barred. Local Communist officials became ardent and regular "church-goers"—but no one else goes there.

SEARCHING PARTIES

Persons exhibiting religious icons and crucifixes in their homes come under persecution. Religious pictures and statuettes found in homes by armed searching parties infuriate the Russians and their stooges. Religious objects are smashed, bayoneted, spat upon, and trampled.

The "boss" of the country is a satrap of the Kremlin—comrade Shcherbakov, titled All-Union Communists party's Bolshevik Plenipotentiary for Lithuania.

Of the so-called "Luthuanian Units," only one survives—the 16th Infantry Division stationed in Vilnius. The enlisted and non-commissioned officers personnel is roughly 80 percent Lithuanian, but the officer cadres are predominantly Russian on all levels. Orders are given in Russian. Colonel Motieka is the divisional commander, and political "General" Macijauskas is deputy commanding officer. All other mobilized Lithuanians are dispersed throughout Russian units.

MAJOR NAVAL BASE

Klaipeda (Memel) is converted into a major submarine and naval base.

During the first half of 1948, regular Soviet army forces (exclusive of the navy and spy units) stationed in Lithuania numbered about 80,000 men of infantry, artillery, aviation, armored, and tank units. The artillery is concentrated along the seacoast.

Preparations for war are in evidence everywhere. New airfields are constructed, old fields are expanded and modernized. Armored units, air squadrons, and artillery are constantly in transit. Closely guarded military trains travel by night. The populace is kept in a state of nervous war tension.

Mobilization exercises are periodically staged. Speakers addressing mass meetings denounce American and British "imperialists" and "warmongering aggressors." War morale permeates the administrative apparatus, the party and army circles. Workers are urged to strain every effort for the "defense of the Soviet motherland" and to increase the output.

The United States and Rearming of the Arabs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, from all sides reports have been coming in about the current rearmament program of the Arab countries. Fears have been expressed by various well-informed people in this country and abroad that the British rearmament of the Arabs will lead to a general armaments race in the Near East and to an inevitable renewal of warfare in that part of the world which will result in the most dire consequences: Instead of peace, we shall witness bloodshed; instead of economic development and upbuilding of underdeveloped areas, we shall have widespread destruction; instead of security and tranquillity for the people of the Near East and the safeguarding of American interests and American policy, the entire region will be thrown into chaos.

This very day a delegation of responsible Jewish leaders in the United States submitted a memorandum on the subject of rearmament of the Arab states to the Department of State. This delegation was headed by Mr. Louis Lipsky, chairman of the American-Zionist Council which comprises all Zionist groups and organizations in this country. In addition to Mr. Lipsky, the delegation included Mrs. Moses P. Epstein, Dr. Pinchus Churgin, Mr. Louis Segal, Mr. Elihu David Stone, of Boston, and Rabbi Jerome Unger, executive director of the council.

In their memorandum, the delegation presented the facts and urged our Government to use its great influence to avert the dangers to the peace of Palestine involved in the situation which is being created, and to request Great Britain to discontinue the shipment of arms to the Arab countries. I think the overwhelming majority of Members of this House will desire to read the memorandum in order to get acquainted with the facts.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to forestall bloodshed and to put an end to plans for revenge and for a second round against Israel. Tomorrow may be too late. Here is ample warning that a dangerous situation is developing in the Near East which is reaching explosive stages. It will be a very sad day for the world if we suddenly discover that we failed to heed this warning.

The full text of the memorandum submitted by the American Zionist Council to the Department of State, as well as the statement by Mr. Lipsky following the conference at the Department of State, are as follows:

THE REARMAMENT OF THE ARAB STATES—MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED TO THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE BY THE AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL, FEBRUARY 20, 1950

1. We have the honor to address you, on behalf of the American Zionist Council, to express to you the deep concern felt by American Zionist bodies over American policy with respect to the rearmament of Egypt and other Arab states. We refer, in particular, to your recent letter to Congressman JACOB K. JAVITS.

2. It is a matter of public knowledge that the Jews of Israel have engaged in the most difficult resettlement program in the history of our times. They have absorbed into the economic life of Israel in a period of 18 months 354,109 Jews who have made their way to the homeland under great difficulties from many lands of persecution. The Jews of the United States have been active partners in this work of reconstruction and rehabilitation. They have given of their means with unparalleled generosity to enable the struggling state to integrate the returning settlers in the economic and cultural life of the community.

3. The threat to the peace of Israel implicit in the rearming of the Arab states has evoked apprehension and uneasiness on the part of all American Jews, as well as large segments of American public opinion on the whole. We are greatly concerned lest the constructive work of the State of Israel and its program of absorbing the tens of thousands of refugees may have to be curtailed and the community forced by the growing menace of a renewal of warfare to take up the heavy task of preparing to defend their lives and the communities they have established. We are greatly disturbed lest the hard-won truce with a number of Arab states may be broken by the incitements of the forces of aggression who are being stimulated by the fact that their governments are assembling large quantities of formidable destructive weapons available for immediate use.

4. It has been a source of pride to us that the Government of the United States played a memorable role in the United Nations in the rise of the people of Israel to independence and statehood, that our Government was the first to recognize the State of Israel and that it has cooperated with the new state in the solution of many of the problems confronting it.

5. Moreover the Government of the United States participated constructively in the deliberations at the United Nations to end the conflict in the Near East and actively supported those steps which led to the signing of armistice agreements between Israel and her four Arab neighbors.

6. It is our sincere belief that our Government maintains the policy of continuing helpfulness to the State of Israel, and, indeed, to all the states of the Near East, but we are constrained to admit our inability to reconcile your recent letter with that policy.

7. It will be recalled that when the Security Council voted to lift the arms embargo on August 4, 1949, there was widespread concern lest an armament race develop in the Near East. Israel's representative to the Security Council, Mr. Aubrey S. Eban, expressed doubt that the newly won peace could survive the strains of that competition and urged a moral directive by the Security Council to exert influence on the arms-supplying states in order to insulate the Near East against the worst dangers of an armaments race.

8. Members of the Security Council shared Mr. Eban's apprehension and there was general agreement that care and restraint must be exercised in the Near East to prevent large-scale rearmament. Thus, Sir Terrence Shone, the representative of the United Kingdom, declared that any supplies of arms which his Government might send would be for the internal security and defense requirements of the States concerned. But he said the United Kingdom was opposed to the Middle Eastern states acquiring war material in excess of their legitimate defense requirements, and, he said, "We believe the states themselves would not wish to exceed such limitations." Dr. Ralph Bunche, the former acting mediator, observed that in the absence of a firm injunction, coupled with observation machinery, "the burden really seems to rest upon the states in a position to ship arms."

9. And, as you note in your letter to Congressman JAVITS, former Senator Austin, on behalf of the United States, told the Council that export of arms to the area should be "strictly limited to such arms as are within the scope of legitimate security requirements."

10. Events since the lifting of the arms embargo challenge the assurances that were given during the Security Council's deliberations. The Arab countries are now acquiring heavy arms which far exceed those necessary for the purpose of maintaining internal law and order by the governments concerned in the legitimate exercise of constituted authority and for the purpose of providing for reasonable requirements of self-defense.

11. The facts are well known. The 1949-50 budget approved by the Egyptian parliament was fixed at 87,457,290 Egyptian pounds (before devaluation), and of this fully one-third—the extraordinary sum of 62,000,000 Egyptian pounds—was allocated for rearmament. Since that time, newspaper dispatches have fully reported Egypt's purchase of jet planes and heavy bombers, destroyers, frigates and corvettes, hundreds of heavy tanks and heavy artillery of all calibers. In addition, there have been authoritative reports of the establishment of armored formations both by Egypt and Syria, the establishment of an arms industry in Egypt, and the acquisition of hundreds of armored cars by Egypt, Syria, and Hashemite Jordan.

12. Manifestly, equipment of such range and striking power is intended for purposes other than internal order and security. While it is conceded that there may be internal unrest in Egypt—the inevitable consequence of poverty—the people are unarmed and jet planes, tanks, and destroyers are not needed to subdue them. Economic unrest is not quieted by the diversion of a huge proportion of a country's substance to the nonproductive weapons of war.

13. In our judgment, there is every ground for fear that these arms will eventually be used for a renewal of Egypt's aggression against Israel, if not immediately, within the foreseeable future. Apart from this, we hold the view that this huge-scale armament program prejudices the prospect of a peace settlement between Israel and Egypt.

14. It has been the hope of all friends of both the Jewish and Arab peoples that Israel and the Arab states would soon find it possible to transform their armistice agreements into final and lasting peace treaties. It is the conviction of most observers—based on the successful negotiations of the armistice accords—that such treaties can be consummated if Israel and the Arab states can engage in direct negotiations.

15. But it is clear that such negotiations will be retarded rather than accelerated if the balance is upset in the Near East, if one side is rearmed and if the interests of the people are diverted to military channels. In Egypt and in every other Arab state, there are war parties which are eager for a second round in which they hope to recoup their losses and remove the stigma, and exculpate themselves from the responsibility of their last defeat. They oppose a peace settlement. To put arms into the hands of their governments strengthens their intransigeance. They have announced their intentions, repeatedly, in the press, on the radio, and on the public platform. Now they are being given the tools to turn their words into missiles. They have no other identifiable enemy in sight. What basis is there for the belief that the second round which they so eagerly advocate is not, in fact, in preparation? What guaranty is there in the circumstances of the Near East's endemic political instability that these forces may not succeed to power and make use of the weapons in accord with their avowed program?

16. If it is not the purpose of the Arab countries to use these arms for a second assault against Israel, then one must ask why are they being rearmed at such fantastic cost? Is it the belief of the proponents of this rearmament program that the Arab states can be regarded as worthy and reliable allies of the democratic countries in the event of another world conflict?

17. Past experience answers these questions. In the Second World War, Egypt remained a nonbelligerent, and although the country was occupied by General Rommel's forces, the Egyptian army remained passive and the defense of Egypt was left to the British army, including thousands of recruits from the Jewish population of Palestine. It is an ironic commentary that British arms are now going to Egypt and may be used against those who were the sole allies of the democratic forces in the Near East in the last war.

18. In Iraq in 1941, Nazi forces seized control of the government and were finally eliminated only after a show-down with the British army. Palestine Jews took part in that action and they were active also in removing Nazi influence from Syria and Lebanon. Throughout the entire war, the Arab world remained aloof from democracy's banner, while many of its leaders, like the former Mufti of Jerusalem, were actively on the side of the Axis and made their headquarters in Berlin.

19. Can the democratic forces regard Egypt or Iraq, or any other Arab country, as a shield of substance in the light of the past record, and particularly in the light of Arab weakness in the war in Palestine? Although their forces and their arms far exceeded those of the nascent state of Israel, they were quickly overwhelmed in battle. Does this type of alliance fit into the mosaic of democracy's defense?

20. Quite apart from our natural feeling of sympathy for our Jewish kinsmen in Israel, we deem it our duty as Americans vitally concerned about American policy in the Near East and American defenses throughout the world to express the strongest misgivings on the military support of a dubious ally. The fact that it is Britain which is extending this generous aid should not obscure the fact of indirect American participation, for it is surplus American Army equipment that is being used in many cases, and it is the United States which is today providing arms for these same countries which divert their stocks to the Near East.

21. The paramount need of the entire Near East is the development of resources to lift standards of living for millions of depressed people. In the context of this urgent need, the extravagant expenditure of interest, energy, and funds on armament and mobilization is a disservice to humanity.

22. This view was eloquently put forth by the representative of the United States, Mr. Austin, in the Security Council debate on the armistice agreement. He said:

23. "It is essential that the resources of that area be used for peaceful purposes, for economic development, for the resettlement of refugees, and for the achievement of higher standards of living for the populations of the area. It would be tragic and wholly wrong if the resources of the area were to be dissipated in an unproductive arms race."

24. In this connection, the limits of the obligation of the Arab states to their Arab brethren who, victims of Arab aggression against Israel, were forced to leave Palestine and who today are homeless refugees. If the Arab governments were disposed to expend their funds for resettlement projects, as Senator Austin suggested, they would make a constructive contribution, not only toward the regeneration of a people for whose misery they are primarily responsible, but in the development of their own underdeveloped countries.

25. Precise figures on the cost of resettling the Arab refugees are not available; but in a recent survey published by the Royal Institute of International Affairs, it was suggested that the cost of resettling an estimated 711,000 would be £56,871,000 (before devaluation). The Chatham House experts estimate an average of £75 for settling a refugee on the land in the Near East. It is startling to reflect that Egypt's budget for armaments in 1 year actually exceeds the total estimated cost of resettling all the Arab refugees. No one would dare to compare the moral validity of two projects like refugee resettlement and military armament. Nor would one debate which enterprise more effectively promotes the cause of internal order and security as well as the stability of democratic institutions in the Near East.

26. For its part, relieved of the threat of a renewal of hostilities, the Government of Israel would be enabled to continue its dedication to the resettlement of Jewish refugees who have come to Israel after a decade of wandering and helplessness—an undertaking to which the American Jewish community has proudly contributed substantial sums. It would be a sad day if the Government of Israel were compelled to reduce or halt its resettlement program because it felt obliged to spend large sums for armaments to keep pace with its neighbors.

27. The people of the Near East must have peace. It is for the Governments of the United States, United Kingdom, and other great powers to use their best efforts to ensure peace and tranquillity in the Near East so that its peoples may work together to raise the living standards of the entire area. To plunge these people into an armaments race is to serve the cause of their impoverishment, debasement, and destruction.

28. We respectfully urge our Government to reconsider the problem in the light of the facts herein set forth. We ask that it use its great influence to avert the dangers to the peace of Palestine involved in the situation which is being created; and that the United Kingdom be requested to discontinue the shipment of arms to the Arab states.

Respectfully submitted.

AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL.

(Representing: Hadassah, Women's Zionist Organization of America, Hashomer Hatzair, Labor Zionist Organization of America—Poale Zion, Mizrachi Organization of America, United Zionist Labor Party (Achdut Avodah—Poale Zion), Zionist Organization of America, Zionists-Revisionists of America.)

STATEMENT BY MR. LOUIS LIPSKY, CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL

We repeat that we regret the position taken by the State Department. We are convinced that American public opinion will not share the complacency of Mr. Acheson toward the rearming of the Arab states. The danger we refer to is not far off; it is right around the corner. The state of Israel is now engaged in negotiating for peace agreements to take the place of the armistice arrangements with the Arab states. Sending them large quantities of arms at this time inevitably disturbs all talks of peace with them. It is like handing a revolver to a potential assailant, who has once been disarmed. It is no rational defense of the act to say that the supplier of the deadly weapon will wait to see what he will do with it, and is prepared to take action if necessary. We will be too late then. British assurances as to the kind and quantity of arms she is sending to the Arab states cannot be taken seriously in the light of past performances.

We solemnly declare that the approval of England's sending of new planes and heavy artillery and submarines to any Arab state at this time is a direct encouragement of Arab aggression. We deplore that the state of Israel will have to use a larger part of its hard-pressed budget not for the restoration and rehabilitation of the tens of thousands of new settlers, but for the mobilization and equipment of its armed forces.

Biweekly Broadcasts by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain biweekly broadcasts which I made over certain radio stations in Pennsylvania in the month of February 1950.

There being no objection, the broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF TRANSCRIPTION BY HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, OVER PENNSYLVANIA RADIO STATIONS, WEEK END OF FEBRUARY 3–5, INCLUSIVE

(No. 19 in biweekly series)

As this second session of the Eighty-first Congress rounds out its first month, I think we could characterize our accomplishments most accurately by saying that the largest part of our efforts have gone into what we might term "spade work"—in other words, we've spent most of our time on those preliminaries that are necessary to get legislation in final shape for passage.

When the first session ended the middle of last October, we had managed, by and large, to clean up most of the major legislation then on the calendars of the Senate and the House, and as a result, our initial task when we returned early last month was primarily directed at completing committee work on a number of bills which we hadn't found time to finish during the last session.

As I explained in my last radio report 2 weeks ago, when I talked about the steps necessary to pass a law, some of you may recall that each Member of the Senate serves on two of the 15 legislative committees. Now actually, the situation is somewhat more complicated than it would first appear, because, as I also explained at that time, the legislative committees are, in turn, broken down into a number of subcommittees which consider specific bills. So, while it's true that each Member of the Senate is assigned to only two legislative committees, the practical effect of this is that we serve on six or eight subcommittees.

In my particular case, there are several other complications as well, because in addition to my legislative assignments on the Finance Committee and the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I am also a Member of the Joint Senate-House Committee on the Economic Report, a committee established to advise the Congress in matters of national economic importance. Over and above this, I am one of the 8 Democratic members of the majority policy committee, which meets for an hour or so each Tuesday to schedule the sequence of legislation in the Senate, and I also serve on the majority steering committee, which meets periodically to consider such matters as assigning Senators to membership on various legislative committees. And finally, I have other duties and obligations as the majority whip.

Now my purpose in explaining this to you is to point out that every Member of the Senate frequently finds himself confronted with the difficulty of having two or three committee or subcommittee meetings going on at the same time. Up to now none of us has worked out a suitable means for being in several different places at once. About the best that we are able to do when we are confronted with three simultaneous meetings is to select one of them, attend that meeting, and then somehow, in the next day or so, manage to get our hands on the written transcription of what took place in the two meetings we missed.

This obviously isn't an altogether satisfactory solution, because frequently, in reading over the transcriptions of the committee meetings we missed, we think of questions we would have asked the various witnesses had we been present to do so.

I think I can illustrate this pretty well by an example. The Senate Finance Committee opened its hearing on the new social-security amendments shortly after the middle of January. Now those hearings are of tremendous importance for a number of reasons. For one, the social-security bill, in the form in which it passed the House of Representatives late last year, contains more than 200 pages. This alone is some measure of the tremendous complexity and comprehensiveness of that legislation. It is perfectly understandable that the Senate intends to examine every aspect of that bill with great care. Furthermore, hundreds of people, most of them expert in particular phases of the bill, have asked to testify in opposition or support of certain provisions. These people should be heard, and the committee intends to hear them.

I have wanted to attend every one of those hearings, but it has been simply impossible for me to do so. As a general rule, the Finance Committee has scheduled hearings all day long, 6 days a week, and I have been present whenever it has been possible for me to do so. I think this may also be said of the other 12 Senators who serve on the Finance Committee, because they, too, are keenly aware that virtually every American will feel the impact of the changes the Congress will make in our social-security laws this year.

I won't take time now to develop any of the details of the social-security bill for you, but at the present time, I am preparing a News Letter which summarizes the major social-security proposals that are now being considered by the Senate. In all honesty, I think every American should know the basic provisions of the social-security law, whether he is presently paying social-security premiums or not, and if you are not already receiving my News Letter regularly, I invite you to write for a copy of the one which describes the social-security proposals. I believe you will find it helpful in understanding the provisions of the bill now before the Senate Finance Committee.

If you'd like a copy, address me, Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

At the start of this broadcast, I remarked that we had been busy at our "spade work," and the social-security bill is only one example of this. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee spent almost the entire month of January putting finishing touches on the middle-income housing bill, in order that we could get it ready for Senate action.

The Senate Judiciary Committee completed its work on the displaced-persons bill January 24, just 1 day ahead of the schedule ordered by the Senate last fall when the DP bill was returned to committee for further consideration. I might add, in connection with the DP bill, that I believe the Senate itself will wish to make a number of changes in the committee bill before it is ultimately passed. The newspapers, when the DP bill was first reported from the committee, noted that a number of liberalizing changes had been included in the committee bill, but later editorial comments on the bill have changed quite a bit as editors have had an opportunity to study the measure further. I certainly go along with many of the papers in criticizing the shortcomings of the Senate bill as it now stands, and I believe that the DP bill, as it passed the House last year, is much fairer and far more nearly in line with what I would regard as a decent and suitable law.

A couple of weeks ago there was a bit of spade work going on over in the House of Representatives. I refer in these terms to what happened because the issue there did not result in legislation, and merely represented a struggle for power. I have in mind, of course, the fight over the so-called discharge rule. The whole issue in that fight in the House boiled down to deciding whether the 12 members of the House Rules Committee had the exclusive power to block the passage of legislation. The majority of the Rules Committee contended that it had such authority. When we consider for a moment that there are 435 Members in the United States House of Representatives, it is hard to go along with the argument that 12 men should be permitted to speak for all of them.

The background of the Rules Committee fight developed more or less in this fashion: The House has never been troubled with filibusters, simply because it has long been recognized that if 435 Representatives were permitted to talk without limit, the result would be pandemonium and absolutely no legislative accomplishment whatsoever. As a consequence, the House operates under the strictest kind of rules to limit floor debate in order that it may get its work done. Naturally, this means that legislation can't be talked to death in the House as it can be in the Senate through the tactic of filibustering.

Thus, minority groups who have opposed passage of certain classes of legislation have been forced to resort to other strategems which would accomplish the same result as the filibuster. Until the Eighty-first Congress, the blocking tactic of these House minorities has been accomplished through the operation of the House Rules Committee, a body, as I've already indicated, composed of 12 members. These 12 men had the sole power of deciding what measures the House would consider. Needless to say, if 7 of the 12 Rules Committee members objected personally to a bill, they could kill it completely by refusing to report it out to the House for a vote. Bill after bill has been killed in this fashion.

Early in 1949, Democratic Congressman EDERMAN EBERHARTER, of Pittsburgh, came up with an idea which made it possible for a majority of the House to bypass the Rules Committee when it sought to bottle up a bill. The technique Mr. EBERHARTER suggested was cumbersome, it is true, but for the first time the House had found a way for the majority to express its will in those cases where a stubborn handful of Representatives refused to go along with the measure supported by an overwhelming number of our people.

So, early in the Eighty-first Congress, the House adopted the Eberharter proposal, and without question, the Eberharter discharge plan broke the power of the House Rules Committee. Early in this present session of Congress, the Rules Committee of the House sought to regain its old dictatorial powers, and for several weeks the battle raged. The move by the Rules Committee to get back in the saddle was vigorously attacked by everyone who believes in the democratic process, because, as I've said, the opinions of 7 men, or for that matter, 12 men, cannot substitute for the full expression of the 435 men and women who represent the American people in the House of Representatives. For some days the fate of the Eberharter rule hung in balance. No one was really sure of what the outcome would be.

Finally, on Friday, January 20, 1950, the matter came to a vote in the House. The outcome represented a smashing victory for the democratic process. The House voted 256 to 163 to reject the Rules Committee's demands that its old power be restored. The Eberharter discharge rule remains in force, and henceforth, the House will have the unqualified opportunity to consider every issue on its merits and bring it to a vote in a democratic fashion.

I notice that my time is about to run out, but I want to mention one other extremely important bit of spade work that is going on in both Houses. The Congress has adopted this year a new method for handling the appropriation of funds for the Federal budget. In the past, we have considered the budget in a series of packages, that is to say, that we have drawn up separate appropriation bills for particular agencies and functions. For example, we'd have one bill for our military budget, another bill for flood control and rivers and harbors, and an agriculture appropriation bill—all told, a dozen or more separate measures, which taken together, furnished the total moneys which the Government spent in any one year.

This year we are seeking to wrap the budget up in a single appropriation bill, and as a result, largely of recommendations made by the Hoover Commission, a number of changes have been made in the form in which the President's budget was submitted to the Congress. The one-package approach to the budget was adopted because it was felt that by handling the matter in this fashion the Congress would have a better perspective of the whole budget picture. The old system of considering each appropriation measure separately was criticized on the grounds that not enough attention was devoted to the over-all budget picture. The Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate have worked steadily for almost a month on their budget hearings, and remarkable progress has been made thus far. If the balance of the appropriation job is completed as speedily as work has progressed this month, we should be able to avoid completely the kind of log jam that developed last year in the Senate when we were faced with the task of handling billions of dollars' worth of legislation in the tired and harassed closing weeks of the session. This year we should be able to take on the budget in an orderly fashion and give it the time and studied consideration it deserves.

Thank you for joining me. I hope you will listen in again when I return to the air in 2 weeks.

TEXT OF TRANSCRIPTION BY HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, OVER PENNSYLVANIA RADIO STATIONS, WEEK END OF FEBRUARY 17–19, INCLUSIVE

(No. 20 in biweekly series)

When President Truman announced 2 weeks or so ago that America would go forward with the development of the hydrogen superbomb, there was a reluctant, though overwhelming, public endorsement of the decision.

This is certainly understandable. Such a decision as this is a dreadful one to have to make. I believe America had no other choice than to make the decision that was made. I believe the American people overwhelmingly agree that in the light of the world conditions existing at this moment, we cannot risk the security of the free, democratic nations by failing now to follow where science is leading us. I say this because it is impossible for me to believe that America could remain free if the Russians had the hydrogen bomb, and we did not.

It is this single reason—that is, that the Russians might some day have the hydrogen bomb—which has compelled us to make this decision.

I want to make it clear, however, that there is much more behind the story of the atom than this fact alone. I intend on this broadcast to point out some of the historic landmarks of the Atomic age in an effort to indicate where we stand now, and what I regard as our prospects for the future.

On August 6, 1945, a shocked world learned for the first time that a single bomb had virtually obliterated a city in which almost a third of a million people lived. That bomb, as all of us know, was dropped from an American Air Force B-29 on the city of Hiroshima in Japan. The bomb killed 71,000 people. Four days later a bomb composed of an element—plutonium—previously unknown to science, was dropped on the city of Nagasaki. In less than a week the war with Japan was ended.

President Truman, in announcing that the atomic bomb had been used, said that this had been done to save the lives of hundreds of thousands who would otherwise have been lost in the conquest of the Japanese homeland. The grave decision to use the bomb at that time was not lightly made. It was done in recognition of the fact that at Guadalcanal, Saipan, and Guam, in the Philippines, at Iwo Jima, and in Okinawa the Japanese had resisted to the last man. Even when fully possessed with this knowledge, the decision to use the atomic bomb was not one easily made. We could not justify such an act by the cold thought that the Germans or the Japanese would have used the bomb on us if they had got it first. The American decision rested on a most careful weighing of all the considerations that are the consequence of war.

From the day that the first atomic explosion occurred to this day, it has been the unqualified policy of the Government of the United States to bring the atom under a workable system of international control. The American people have not been alone in insisting that the atom should forever be removed from the arsenal of war. Peace-loving people the world over are fearfully aware that the atom, if misused, is capable of destroying man and his civilization.

In stopping to consider the atomic developments which have occurred since the end of World War II in 1945, I think we must consider first the condition of the world as it emerged from the war. The United Nations Organization had been born at San Francisco in the spring of 1945. Those who dreamed of lasting world peace in those days had great expectations for the UN.

Twenty-five years earlier it had been hoped that the League of Nations would provide for a framework of world government in which war would forever be impossible. America, following a policy of isolation, had not joined the League of Nations, and it was commonly said that the League failed because America had refused to participate in it.

With the UN, it was hoped things would be different. The victorious wartime Allies had all agreed to join this adventure in world cooperation to promote lasting peace. The Russians were there, the British were there, the French were there, the Americans were there, and for that matter, there were at the start, all of the nations which had not participated with the Axis in the Second World War. It was planned that the defeated Axis nations would ultimately join the United Nations after they had established democratic governments of their own.

The year 1946 was a year of enthusiasm and hope for the future of a world at peace. The world had survived the worst war in history, and that war had ended in a thunderous climax brought about by the explosions which ushered in the atomic age. People all over the world believed that we had seen enough of war, that the atom had introduced a new and compelling reason for never going to war again, and people believed that the United Nations would provide us with the necessary machinery with which to construct a world that would remain at peace.

For the next few years, though they didn't know it at the time, those who dreamed of peace were in for some bitter disappointments.

The atomic bomb, of course, had been developed in America. Through our intelligence sources we knew that the Germans had been working on a similar project throughout the war, but finally the production of the first atomic bombs had actually taken place in America. The Government of the United States was clearly aware of the huge responsibility that placed upon us.

Very shortly after the close of World War II, a group of distinguished Americans drawn from public and private life, were asked by the President to work out a method for harnessing the atom. No group of men has ever been assigned a more important job, and they undertook it with all the seriousness that it deserved.

The primary responsibility for doing the job was assigned to Mr. Dean Acheson, who at that time was Under Secretary of State. Mr. Acheson called upon David E. Lilienthal, then Director of the vast Tennessee Valley Authority, to act as chairman of a committee which was to work out the basic proposals for international control of the atom. There were four other members of the Lilienthal committee—Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, certainly one of the outstanding scientists of our time—and three great industrialists—Mr. Chester Barnard, then president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co., Mr. Charles Thomas of the Monsanto Chemical Co., and Mr. Harry Winne of the General Electric Co.

The Lilienthal committee was given the unlimited authority to learn everything there was to know about the atom. For weeks members of the committee sat day and night listening and learning as the top atomic scientists explained to them, chapter and verse, the theory and the application of atomic energy. This was their first job, and the committee stayed with it until every member understood every point. Thereafter they visited all of the laboratories and all of the plants in which the giant atomic program was being conducted. They looked into every step—the research programs and the production itself, starting with the crude, raw materials, and finally with the bomb itself.

Everywhere the committee went it sought after, and listened to, the many proposals advanced for international control of the atom. By this time each of the five committee members had some ideas of his own as to what should be done to make control effective.

The big task still lay ahead, that of working out the details of the proposals which they later recommended. Mr. Lilienthal and the members of the committee decided from the first that they would stay with each controversy that arose between them until a way had been worked out upon which all five men could agree completely. In this way there was no unfinished business left aside to the last. If a particular dispute became serious among them, they would frequently get on a train or plane and revisit the plants in which that particular phase of the work was being conducted. Thus, they acquired additional facts and were able to iron out every disagreement.

The finished report of the Lilienthal committee was submitted with the unanimous approval of all five members. That report today is an outstanding monument to clear-headed thinking and statesmanship.

The report proposed an International Atomic Authority. This authority would conduct all of the research. It would control all the raw-material sources of the explosive elements. It would own and operate all of the facilities for producing atomic materials. And because this Authority would be operated by all of the 2,000,000,000 people on earth, the Authority would possess the power to inspect every part of the world to guarantee that no nation could develop atomic weapons in secret.

The Acheson-Lilienthal report became the basis of the proposal submitted to the United Nations by that great American, Bernard M. Baruch, in the fall of 1946.

Nineteen hundred and forty-six, you will remember, was the year that the Russian delegate on the Security Council began throwing around the Russian veto whenever he was outnumbered on a proposal that did not meet with the fancy of the Kremlin. Along in that time the Russian delegates introduced the now-familiar practice of walking out on the UN every time they felt their feathers were ruffled. They weren't willing to give an inch. Proposal after proposal that came before the UN was submitted, not once, but many times, and in different forms in an effort to obtain Soviet cooperation. And the Soviets sat, unwilling to budge, insisting on doing things their way, or not at all. They made countless impossible demands. The true intentions of the Communists to dominate the world were daily becoming more clear.

The Soviet delegates, and the delegates from the satellites they controlled, rejected the Baruch proposal. They did so on the ground that they would not permit unlimited inspection, saying they were willing to take the inspectors to their atomic plants, show them what they had, and that thereafter, the International Atomic Authority would have to take their word that there were no other projects elsewhere in Russia, or otherwise under their control. This counter demand would have made adequate inspection impossible, and the Russians knew it.

In the 3 years and a half that have elapsed since the Baruch proposal, a special committee of the General Assembly of the UN has stayed busy trying to work out the dilemma, thus far without success. In the meanwhile Russia has developed and exploded an atomic bomb of her own, and America has moved steadily forward in her own developments in the atomic field, producing more bombs, and more efficient bombs. Now that it appears practically possible to do so, America is going ahead with plans for the superbomb, which it is expected may be a thousand times more devastating than its uranium and plutonium parents. There's where we stand * * * busy at work on more efficient means of destruction, while efforts for international control appear to be stalemated.

Since the announcement of the superbomb, a number of new proposals have been put forward. One Senator has suggested that a giant fund could be established in the United Nations that could be put to work for economic development of the entire world, if every nation of the world would agree to international control of the atom along the general lines of the Baruch proposal. This fund, he went on to explain, could be created by having each nation contribute to the UN two-thirds of what it now spends for armaments.

Another Senator has suggested a new move for world disarmament.

Secretary of State Acheson and President Truman have stated that it is their intention to stick by the Baruch plan, because it represents, as they see it, the only effective way that the atom may be harnessed and put to work for man's use instead of for his destruction.

We cannot let fear immobilize us. Many world problems which troubled us a year, or 2, or 3 years ago, no longer bother us today. Solutions to them were found through constructive thinking. For the moment there are a number of suggestions for solving the atomic problem, and there will be more. We must examine and reexamine all the possibilities of every one of these. We must bend every energy to this problem upon which the fate of mankind depends. I am convinced that the 2,000,000,000 people on earth have sufficient intelligence to find a workable answer. By ridding ourselves of fear, by continuing to think constructively, by a continued willingness to cooperate, and by promoting world understanding, we will succeed. The need is compelling and the will is there.

Should Utah-Idaho Potato Grower Be Farm Support "Whipping Boy"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Should Utah-Idaho Potato Grower Be Farm Support 'Whipping Boy'?" published in the Deseret (Utah) News of February 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD UTAH-IDAHO POTATO GROWER BE FARM SUPPORT "WHIPPING BOY"?

Isn't it about time somebody said something on behalf of the Utah-Idaho potato grower, who is being made out a villain's accomplice by all the criticism of the Federal potato-support program?

Certainly, there is plenty wrong with a program that costs the taxpayers $50,000,000 for a foodstuff that has to be dumped or burned. Constructive criticism of such a program is welcome and deserved. But the innuendo that the growers of either Utah or Idaho are responsible for this great economic waste, or are opposing proper correction, is hereby resented on our own, and on their behalf.

Potato growers in this section have taken drastic acreage reduction whenever and wherever they have been requested. So far as they are concerned, all this talk of producers blocking acreage curtailment to eliminate the surplus is just so much idle chatter.

There is an earnest question, too, as to just how much this section is contributing to the 50,000,000 bushel tuber surplus. Idaho State agricultural department reports indicate that very few Idaho potatoes have been sold to the Government, and so far as we can learn, the same situation exists in Utah where potato production is not a very big item. Even now the best grade of Idaho russet potatoes are bringing around $3 per 100 pounds, compared with a Government support price of $2.05. Of course, the situation in Maine might be something else again, but that is not our particular problem.

It does seem unfair, also, to make the potato grower the whipping boy for the whole support program. While they are talking about potatoes, they shouldn't forget that eggs and poultry, cotton, wheat and other grains, milk, and butter are not in too greatly different positions. The Government holds vast surpluses of all these products. For instance, the Government now holds about 2,700,000,000 surplus eggs, for which it paid $100,000,000. Despite the fact that it doesn't know what it is going to do with them, it already has agreed to buy more. And, unfortunately, if egg support is not continued for a time at least, there will be a great many poultrymen who will be broke or badly bent.

But why make the potato grower the whipping boy? There are no growers, in this region, at least, who have been taking the taxpayers for a $50,000 to $500,000 support ride. Nor are they making a killing on spuds at present prices. Just figure it out for yourself. One substantial Idaho russet grower comes up with these figures on the cost of growing and sacking 100 pounds of marketable tubers—seed, 40 cents; sack, 21 cents; picking up off the ground, 12 cents; loading on truck and hauling from field to warehouse, 5 cents; sorting, 30 cents; inspection and miscellaneous, 10 cents. That adds up to $1.18 in just harvest and preparation labor costs. It leaves only 87 cents of the $2.05 support price to take care of the 25-percent culls and rotten potatoes, and for all the other costs of plowing, planting, irrigating, and growing, with all the taxes, water assessments, fertilizer, and general overhead thrown in. "In a nutshell," said our informant, "it boils down to this: If you are a good grower with an efficient spud operation, and have some good luck with the weather, you can make a little money; otherwise not."

So perhaps we had all better think twice before villainizing the Utah-Idaho potato grower for a shocking situation that is being dramatized, partly, no doubt, by Brannan to aid the Brannan consumer subsidy program.

Control of Imports and Exports of Agricultural Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report from the solicitor of the Department of Agriculture dealing with the authority of the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and other officials of the executive branch to control imports and exports of agricultural commodities.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, D. C., December 29, 1949.

In accordance with your request of December 1, 1949, there is transmitted herewith a list of the authorities which can be invoked by the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, or other executive branch official to control imports and exports of agricultural commodities.

Title III of the Second War Powers Act, as amended and extended (50 U. S. C., 1946 ed. and Supp. II, sec. 633, and Public Law 155, 81st Cong.) authorizes the President to impose import controls with respect to fats and oils and rice and rice products. Such authority is exercised by the Secretary of Agriculture under delegation from the President.

The Export Control Act of 1949 (Public Law 11, 71st Cong.) authorizes the President, for the purposes of protecting the domestic economy and national security and carrying out the foreign policy and the international responsibilities of the United States, to prohibit or curtail the exportation of any articles, materials, or supplies, except under such regulations as may be prescribed. The President has delegated this authority to the Secretary of Commerce. The act provides that such authority shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity during any period for which the Secretary of Agriculture makes certain determinations concerning the supply of such commodity, subject to certain exceptions.

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended (7 U. S. C., 1946 ed., Supp. II, 624) authorizes the President to impose restrictions on the importation of articles when they threaten programs undertaken by the Department of Agriculture with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof. However, such action may not be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is a party.

Section 402 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to determine whether agricultural commodities which are sold abroad by executive agencies of the Government as excess property may be imported into the United States.

The International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (Public Law 421, 81st Cong.) authorizes the President to impose such controls on the importation and exportation of wheat and wheat flour as may be necessary to implement the International Wheat Agreement.

Section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 1351 and Public Law 307, 81st Cong.) authorizes the President to modify and impose import restrictions as required or appropriate to carry out any foreign-trade agreement entered into under the act. The Secretary of Agriculture has advisory functions under the act.

The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. supp. II, 135–135k), for the purpose of preventing the importation and exportation of adulterated and misbranded products and for related purposes, restricts the importation and exportation of insecticides, fungicides, rodenticides, herbicides, and certain devices and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to issue regulations to carry out the act.

The Federal Seed Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 1551–1610) restricts the importation of seeds for the purpose of preventing the importation of adulterated or misbranded seeds and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make regulations to carry out the act.

The Plant Quarantine Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. and supp. II, 151–167), for the purpose of preventing the introduction of insect pests and plant diseases, restricts the importation of nursery stock and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to apply such restrictions to other plants and plant products, to prohibit importation of nursery stock and other plants and plant products, and to make regulations to carry out the act.

The act of January 31, 1942 (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 149) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the entry into the United States from Mexico of vehicles and freight and other materials and to require cleaning and disinfection thereof to prevent the introduction of insect pests and plant diseases.

The Meat Inspection Act, as amended and extended (21 U. S. C., 1946 ed. and Supp. II, 71–98), for the purposes of assuring that exported meats are wholesome and fit for human use and exported animals are free from disease, requires Federal inspection for cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and horses, and the meats and meat-food products thereof,

which are exported, and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make regulations to carry out the act. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to apply, under such regulations as he may prescribe, the inspection and certification provisions of this act to dairy products for export. He may also extend inspection pursuant to this act to meatpacking.

The Tariff Act of 1930, § 306 (19 U. S. C., 1946 ed. 1306) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the countries where certain animal diseases exist, and after publication of his determination the importation of certain animals and meats from such countries is prohibited. The section prohibits importation of meats unfit for human food. It also authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make regulations to carry out the section.

The Tariff Act of 1930, § 601, paragraph 1605, as amended (19 U. S. C., 1946 ed. and Supp. II, 1201, par. 1605) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe regulations for determining the purity of breeding of animals offered for duty-free importation.

The act of March 3, 1891, as amended (46 U. S. C., 1946 ed. 466a–b) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe, by regulation, accommodations for exported animals.

The act of August 30, 1890, as amended (21 U. S. C., 1946 ed. 101–105), for the purpose of preventing the spread of animal diseases, authorizes the President to suspend the importation of all or any class of animals when necessary to protect animals in the United States, and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to designate ports through which certain kinds of animals must be imported, to quarantine and inspect such imported animals, and to prescribe regulations and take other actions relating to imported and exported animals.

The act of May 29, 1884, as amended, and the act of February 2, 1903, as amended (21 U. S. C. 1946 ed. and Supp. II, 111–122) authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make regulations and take measures to prevent the introduction of contagious diseases of animals into the United States, to seize, quarantine, and dispose of certain materials and products coming into this country from infected foreign countries, and to make regulations and take measures concerning the exportation of livestock and live poultry to prevent the spread of animal diseases.

The United States Grain Standards Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 71–87) generally requires that grain which is shipped in foreign commerce and is sold by grade be officially inspected and graded and the grade by which it is sold be a grade fixed in the official standards which the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish. The Secretary is authorized to issue regulations to carry out the act.

The Naval Stores Act (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 91–99) establishes certain standards for spirits of turpentine and rosin, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish further standards, and requires the use of such standards for such naval stores when sold in foreign commerce. The Secretary is authorized to issue regulations to carry out the act.

The Virus-Serum-Toxin Act (21 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 151–158) prohibits the importation of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product without a permit from the Secretary of Agriculture who is authorized to make regulations to carry out the act.

The Sugar Act of 1948 (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. Supp. II, 1100–1160) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to fix quotas for importation of sugar from foreign countries.

The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. and Supp. II, 601–611) authorizes handlers of certain agricultural commodities to enter into marketing agreements with the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary to issue orders, limiting the amount of such agricultural commodities that may be purchased, handled, or shipped in foreign commerce, for the purpose of stabilizing farmers' purchasing power.

The Anti-Hog-Cholera Serum and Hog-Cholera Virus Act (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 851–855), to insure the maintenance of an adequate supply of serum and virus and for related objectives, authorizes handlers of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-cholera virus to enter agreements with the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary to issue orders, imposing restrictions on the handling of such serum and virus for or in foreign commerce.

The Tobacco Seed and Plant Exportation Act (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 516–517) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to issue permits for exportation of tobacco seeds and plants for experimental purposes only and prohibits exportation of such seeds and plants without a permit.

The Tobacco Inspection Act (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 511–511a–511q) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish standards for tobacco and generally requires inspection according to such standards of all tobacco sold at auction at previously designated markets where tobacco moves in foreign commerce. The Secretary is authorized to make regulations to carry out the act.

The Export Apple and Pear Act (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 581–589) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe certain requirements which apples and pears for export must meet and to issue certificates showing that such commodities comply with such requirements and with the standards of the country of destination, and to make regulations to carry out the act.

The Process or Renovated Butter Act (26 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 2320–2322, 2324–2327) imposes inspection and other requirements for process or renovated butter prepared for shipment to foreign countries. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make regulations to carry out certain provisions of the act. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue may make certain other regulations, as authorized.

The Honeybee Act (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 281–282) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the countries in which no honeybee diseases exist and from which honeybees may be imported for experimental or scientific purposes under regulations of the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Treasury.

The United States Cotton Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 51–65) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish standards for cotton and generally prohibits the use of unofficial standards in connection with transactions in cotton in foreign commerce. The Secretary is authorized to issue regulations to carry out the act.

Under the act of April 12, 1926 (16 U. S. C., 1946 ed. 616), timber lawfully cut on any national forest or on the public lands in Alaska may be exported from the State or Territory where grown if, in the judgment of the Secretary, the supply of timber for local use will not be endangered. The regulation under this act is found in 36 CFR 221.3 and permits the free movement from the national forests except those in Alaska where the prior approval of the regional forester is required.

Many of the statutes listed contain other provisions than those mentioned in the list, but reference has been made only to those provisions which appear relevant to your inquiry. Pursuant to the telephone conversation of December 14, 1949, between your office and Associate Solicitor C. W. Bucy, the list of authorities is limited to those authorities in the administration of which this Department participates. The list is limited, moreover, to those authorities which provide for the exercise of control over the importation or exportation of agricultural commodities. It does not include those statutes such as the Packers and Stockyards Act, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1946 ed. 181–231), which merely provide for regulation of trade practices with respect to foreign commerce, since we understand from your request that you are not interested in this type of authorities. If you do desire information concerning such trade-practice authorities or further information on the authorities listed, we shall be pleased to furnish it to you at your request.

Sincerely yours,

W. CARROLL HUNTER,
Solicitor.

S. 1008

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1950, at the request of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, Dr. George Stocking, head of the department of economics at Vanderbilt University, appeared before a group of Senators and Congressmen interested in basing-point legislation. He discussed explicitly the effects the basing-point system, if reimposed as the result of the passage of S. 1008, would have on the future growth and development of the South. He showed rather clearly that these effects would be extremely harmful.

A number of us from the West were interested to know whether or not a reimposition of the basing-point system would have similar adverse effects upon the West. In order to obtain an authoritative view on this matter, I requested Dr. Vernon Mund, professor of economics at the University of Washington in Seattle, to prepare a statement describing the effects of basing-point pricing upon the future growth and expansion of the West.

Under permission to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the statement prepared by Dr. Mund:

The purpose of this analysis is to explain the injurious effects of S. 1008 on the West, the South, and the entire Nation. Upon the basis of the national interest—rather than of the narrow, selfish, commercial interests of variously located organized producer groups—it is submitted that the principles of S. 1008 should not be enacted into law.

Significant reasons (a) for continuing the legal ban on systematic freight absorption whenever the effect is substantially to lessen competition and (b) for giving all needed legislative support to the Staley, Corn Products, Cement, Rigid Steel Conduit, Malt, Milk Can, Crepe Paper, Pittsburgh-Plus, and Standard Oil of Indiana decisions are as follows:

1. To give buyers and fabricating industries (a) the advantage of their location by eliminating an overcharge for freight and (b) the privilege of arranging for the purchase of their own transportation: Basing-point and zone-delivered pricing systems force buyers to purchase two commodities—the manufactured goods and freight—on terms and conditions determined solely by the producers. In charging phantom or fictitious freight, a mill forces a buyer to purchase transportation service which he does not want and which he does not get. This gives a particular mill net prices higher than the base price by the amount of the fictitious freight. On the other hand, in the case of absorbed freight, the railroad is paid the actual freight cost, and the mill secures net prices which are lower than the base price by the amount of the absorbed freight.

Buyers (fabricators) located at or near a nonbase mill do not want to pay phantom freight, for such a charge places them at a competitive disadvantage with fabricators located at or near a base mill. Likewise, buyers located near a base mill which is engaging in freight absorption find that they are denied the advantage of their location and are forced to pay high local prices which help to defray the delivery costs of other buyers.

Sellers using zone-delivered pricing systems typically include in their prices the freight costs which are charged for less-than-carload shipments. A fabricating mill, however, frequently is in a position to make up a consolidated shipment of supplies (such as paint, copper products, aluminum sheets, and pneumatic machinery) and secure a lower carload rate. It is denied this opportunity under the zone-delivered pricing systems. Under basing-point systems, moreover, buyers are typically charged the rail freight even though cheaper forms of transportation are available (or actually used).

2. To prohibit the device of local price cutting by which dominant firms injure geographically separate independents: The principal objective which Congress had in mind in drafting section 2 of the Clayton Act was to prohibit geographic price discrimination which substantially lessens competition. The term "substantially" apparently was inserted on the ground that the law is not concerned with trifles. According to the House committee, section 2 of the Clayton Act "is expressly designed with the view of correcting and forbidding a common and widespread unfair trade practice whereby certain great corporations and also certain smaller concerns which seek to secure a monopoly in trade and commerce by aping the methods of the great corporations, have heretofore endeavored to destroy competition and render unprofitable the business of competitors by selling their goods, wares, and merchandise at a less price in the particular communities where their rivals are engaged in business than at other places throughout the country."[1]

Various lawyers and some Congressmen now appear to be reluctant to curb local price discrimination, thinking that the action of a seller in cutting prices in one area while maintaining them elsewhere is a wholesome act of competition or a meeting of competition. This view contains economic error. The making of discriminatory lower prices is only a limited kind of competition which experience has shown works always to the advantage of the larger and financially stronger concerns. It is not the kind of competition found in real market or contemplated by the antitrust laws.[2]

The practice of geographic price discrimination is an undesirable method of competition (1) because it forces some customers to pay excessive local prices and (2) because it subjects small competitors in distant areas to the fear and hazard of anarchic price cutting. A large producer may honestly not intend to kill a distant competitor, but the fact remains that no seller likes to see a competitor grow bigger and more powerful if he can prevent it. Geographic price discrimination, used by a dominant firm to match or undercut prices in a distant area may be exercised to hold prices in that area at an unremunerative level, so that rival sellers fail to grow, wither on the vine, or eventually drop out of production. Since the discrimination is exercised in accordance with no principle except that of meeting competition, a small producer can never be sure about the prices which he is likely to find in his area. He is not free, moreover, to expand and develop upon the basis of his productive efficiency.

When a small business firm is getting established in a particular area, it frequently finds that it must offer its goods at prices somewhat below those of a large rival. Its prestige and reputation are not firmly established, and some inducement must be offered to secure customers. If a large distant mill is permitted to meet the local prices by reducing its mill net prices on sales in that area, the small rival has little opportunity of ever developing his business.[3] A prohibition of geographic price discrimination would do much to enable small business firms to develop in the local areas in which they have a freight advantage. A decentralization of industry would tend to develop, and the efforts of local firms to extend their sales areas would also exert a constant pressure on distant rivals to reduce their base prices.

3. To promote a decentralization of industry: Industrial pricing systems which employ eastern base prices (such as Pittsburgh or East St. Louis) plus rail freight make for high-cost prices in the West and South and discourage the development of local fabricating industries. Local fabricators which to develop, moreover, are unable to ship their products eastward to any appreciable extent in competition with fabricators situated near an eastern basing point, for the delivered costs of their basic supplies are higher.

Insofar as basic commodities (such as aluminum) are produced in the West and South and sold freight allowed, local prices are high, as high as elsewhere in the country, and fabricators find no cost advantage in building plants near the sources of supply. The sale of fabricated products (such as copper wire, sheets, and tubing) by eastern mills at zone-delivered prices (by including an average freight item) also serves to discourage the development of distant fabricators, for the established mills, in effect, are able to dump into the distant areas by absorbing some or all of the freight, at the expense of their nearby customers.

4. To provide locally separate mills with a genuine motive to reduce their base prices: The requirement of f. o. b. mill pricing will undoubtedly result in a reduction in prices at locally separate mills, for a given seller cannot get distant business by quoting a high base price plus freight. Locally separate mills will thus be given a genuine motive to reduce their mill prices, even though local competition is lacking. Consumers living adjacent to a producer will also get the advantage of their location, as they do under conditions of effective price competition. With the collective use of basing-point and zone-delivered pricing systems, sellers do not have a motive, a competitive pressure or compulsion, to reduce prices to all buyers in order to provide a selling outlet for their capacity.

A principal reason that some businessmen in the Pacific Northwest support S. 1008 grows out of the fact that the governing base price for a number of steel products used in our area is Sparrows Point, Md. Our delivered price is this base plus water freight to Seattle. Steel mills in Chicago (prior to the cement decision) matched this delivered price in Seattle instead of charging Chicago plus rail freight, for the latter combination would be higher. This practice involved freight absorption (systematic) by the Chicago mills. Now, insofar as the Chicago mills do not absorb freight on sales to Seattle, they quote a higher delivered price or they do not enter our area. Thus, some Pacific Northwest buyers believe that the ban on systematic freight absorption denies them the benefit of competition.

Like all error, this view contains an element of truth. With the use of systematic freight absorption, some Seattle buyers may have the advantage of sales competition as identical prices. With rare exceptions, however, they never enjoy price competition under the basing-point plan. The Chicago and Sparrows Point mills have identical base prices, and the basing-point practice is to charge the base and freight which gives the lowest combination price. This is price matching, not price competition. The type of competition upon which American industry must stand or fall is price competition. Price competition, moreover, is the type of competition called for by the antitrust laws.

At present, some Chicago and Pittsburgh mills appear to be content to quote a high delivered price in the West (their identical base prices plus rail freight) and forego some or all of this business, for they can sell all they can produce in their nearby areas. Sooner or later, however, the Chicago and Pittsburgh mills may eagerly want to sell in the West and South, in order to expand their sales volume. To do so—with the present ban on systematic freight absorption—they will have to cut local base prices in Chicago and Pittsburgh. This would be real competition and just what the Nation needs. Fabricators and consumers in the Middle West would thereupon be benefited by the desire of the Chicago and Pittsburgh mills to ship westward and southward. First-hand producers in the West and South would also be encouraged to build new mills, for they would know that the eastern mills could not dump into their areas while making up their freight absorptions on sales in the East.

A ban on systematic or sporadic freight absorption which substantially lessens competition, it may be noted, does not preclude the quotation of uniform, national retail prices. Some manufacturers, for example, provide for a national, uniform retail price—such as $8.80 for a pair of Regal shoes—and at the same time quote f. o. b. factory prices, uniform to all dealers. This method of pricing results in a slightly lower mark-up for dealers at distant destination points. The ban on injurious price discrimination, moreover, would not necessarily preclude the charging of local, zone-delivered prices for newspapers, milk, groceries, and other consumer merchandise. In the absence of established freight stations, published tariffs, or significant freight differentials, it would be possible for an administrative agency to accept local, zone-delivered prices based upon an average delivery cost. The resulting discrimination would be a trifle. A legal maxim developed in ancient Rome declares that "the law does not concern itself with trifles."

THE POLICY OF CONGRESS TOWARD SECRETIVE PRICE SYSTEMS

The Clayton Act, as amended, and the recent court cases on price discrimination provide rules with respect to monopoly and unfair competition which have a high degree

---

[1] Committee on the Judiciary, Antitrust Legislation, 63d Cong., 2d sess., H. Rept. No. 627, May 6, 1914, pp. 8–9. For recent data on the use of geographic price discrimination to injure small business, see *U. S. v. N. Y. Great A & P Tea Co.* ((Criminal case) 67 F. Supp. 626, 666–667, 1946.)

[2] See also the statement by Senator HOAR, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 8, 1890, p. 3152.

[3] In 1948 a midwestern manufacturer of vegetable oils wrote to a Senate committee investigating basing point delivered price systems, stating "We have long felt that the practice of many of the larger companies in quoting delivered prices and absorbing the freight was a serious threat to our business, as they have been making deliveries of competitive products from remote parts of the country to customers in our area at prices we have been unable to meet." Senate Trade Policies Committee, release No. 15, November 7, 1948, page 2.

of clarity and certainty. In the great majority of cases the problem is not that the law is uncertain, but rather that it requires a significant change to be made in present-day pricing methods—namely, the creation of fair-price competition analogous to that found in open markets.

What course should Congress now take? The recommendation made by the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1941, under the able leadership of Senator O'MAHONEY, provides a sound approach upon which the preservation of the American competitive system will depend. According to the TNEC—

"We therefore recommend that the Congress enact legislation declaring such pricing systems to be illegal.

"Because such systems have resulted in uneconomic and often wasteful location of plant equipment it is recognized by this committee that the abolition of basing-point systems should provide for a brief period of time for industries to divest themselves of this monopolistic practice.

"The committee is not impressed with the argument that a legislative outlawing of basing-point systems will cause disturbances in the rearrangement of business through a restoration of competitive conditions in industries now employing basing-point systems. Such disturbances may be costly to those who have been practicing monopoly. But the long-term gain to the public interest by a restoration of competition in many important industries is clearly more advantageous."[4]

Mr. Speaker, in view of the very complex nature of this whole matter and also in view of the fact that no regular hearings on this particular bill were ever held by either the House or Senate Judiciary Committees, I believe that every Senator and Congressman, particularly those from the South and West, should study the effects of this proposed legislation on their home States and districts.

In making their statements on the South and the West, Dr. Stocking and Dr. Mund have rendered us a great service in outlining the probable consequences of this legislation. These two men, I might add, are generally considered to be among the Nation's leading authorities in the field of antitrust law and basing-point pricing.

Keep Flood Control Under the United States Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include therein an editorial from the Vicksburg Evening Post, Thursday, February 9, 1950, one of the leading newspapers of the State of Mississippi and the lower Mississippi Valley, I include the following:

[4] Final report and recommendations of the Temporary National Economic Committee, 77th Cong., 1st sess., S. Doc. No. 35, 1941, p. 33.

KEEP FLOOD CONTROL UNDER THE UNITED STATES ENGINEERS

Under a recommendation made by the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of Federal Departments, there is a grave possibility that the civil activities of the United States Engineers will be transferred to the Department of the Interior. This possibility should bring the people of the Mississippi Valley and particularly the people of Vicksburg into united action to keep flood control under the Corps of Engineers.

The record of the United States Engineers in the combat of floods and in their prevention is a record of magnificent accomplishment, a record of devotion to duty, a record of outstanding engineering feats, a record which has given new hope and security to the people along the great river. Under the administration of the Engineers there has never been one instance of scandal or graft, though there have been projects which in total reached into billions of dollars. The Engineers have the know-how and they have the efficiency and precision to put into action this know-how. They have lived with the river—they are a part of the river, and it would be next to criminal to take away from this wonderful Corps of Engineers, their greatest avenue for peacetime service.

The people of the Mississippi Valley have a great stake in this proposed change. The Mississippi Valley has the greatest confidence in the Engineers. The lives and property of the people of the Mississippi Valley have been safe in the custody of the Engineers through their flood-control work. The Mississippi Valley people will thoroughly resent a change from an efficient, smooth-working organization. And good business practice dictates no change where such an outstanding job is being done.

There are some who think no exceptions should be made in the Hoover reorganization plans, feeling that the former President has performed a great service to the country in his study and recommendations. While we believe Mr. Hoover has made some very beneficial suggestions, which we think should be adopted, we cannot follow him in his suggestion to transfer flood control to the Department of the Interior. First of all, and most important, it would place flood control in politics. Political expediency or just plain politics have never been a part of United States Engineer operations, but under the Department of the Interior one can readily understand how politics could be injected. Behind the great river, our people want none of this. The lives and property of the people of the valley are sacred and should be held thus, as they have been held these many years by the Engineers. Secondly, we believe flood-control work by the Engineers is the greatest training facility for combat engineers. The record of the men who fought the big Mississippi, is proof of that. Some of the greatest Engineer officers of the last war were men who carried on their peacetime activities on the Mississippi River. Many top-flight commanders of our armies in the war were men who were here in the Vicksburg district office at one time or another. Many of the techniques used by the Engineers in the late war, were developed in work on the river. Many technical features of the engineer work in the war were initiated here at our United States Waterways Experiment Station. Why should we take away from the corps this opportunity for training?

We cannot adequately express our deep appreciation for the work of the Corps of Engineers. And we admit to great apprehension that the guardians of the great river might be relieved of their present assignment. We call upon Senators EASTLAND and STENNIS and our entire delegation in the House of Representatives to spearhead the fight to keep flood-control activities with the Corps of Engineers. And we call upon all of the States along the river to join in this protest. There is little time to lose in the matter. We must not be content to sit back—we must go into action at once. And the fight is ours, not that of the Engineers. Regulations prevent them from taking a stand in the matter.

We trust our people will realize the seriousness of the matter. A change in flood control would affect every man, woman, and child in the Mississippi Valley. We cannot afford to jeopardize our lives and fortunes. We must keep flood control under the United States Engineers.

Summary of Report Introduced at Request of Representative Porter Hardy, of Virginia, Written by James Baylor Blackford, School of Geography, University of Virginia, Before Joint Senate-House Committee on Economic Report, January 27, 1950—A Virginia Location for a Steel Mill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a study introduced at the request of Representative PORTER HARDY, of Virginia, James Baylor Blackford, School of Geography, University of Virginia, pointed out that steel interests were planning to spend much over a billion dollars on erection of taconite beneficiating plants to enrich Lake Superior low-grade iron ore as the high-grade ore there is fast becoming depleted. He pointed out that the cost of the erection of a steel plant in Virginia would be a fraction of that amount and that steel products would cost the consumers much less if steel were produced where the high-grade ores from Venezuela, Brazil, and Labrador would meet the coal and limestone at the nearest deep water point which would be in the vicinity of Tidewater, Va. He pointed out that the end of the basing-point system and the need for dispersion of strategic plants for defense purposes made it imperative that steel plants be scattered out. The study told of the shortage of adequate water resources throughout the heavily industrialized sections of the country did not apply to parts of Virginia where the necessary 50 to 100 million gallons of water per day required for operations of a steel mill could be found.

The study brought out the fact that there was a shortage of job opportunities for men there and Virginia was losing its high school and college graduates to other States whose steel mills attracted other industries which paid better wages. Ships now carrying coal to South America could pick up iron ore from Brazil or Venezuela all 12 months of the year. For cheaper steel prices and a less vulnerability from concentration the Blackford study recommended a plant be erected in Virginia where there was adequate supply of labor and water supply and where the raw materials could be brought together most cheaply.

Let's Keep the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting an article by George Sokolsky, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on February 6, 1950:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Oh! that my son should never write a book!

Franklin D. Roosevelt might have spoken these words. For now that the foreign policy of the United States, which he had conducted from 1933 to 1945, has proved such a failure, Elliott Roosevelt's book, As He Saw It, comes to plague the record.

On page 249 of that book, Elliott Roosevelt, discussing the Cairo Conference attended by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek, says:

"At Cairo, Franklin Roosevelt wrung a promise from the feudal warlord who happened also to be the de facto war leader of China. The promise was that before the cessation of hostilities a truly representative government of China's national unity would be formed, and that under the aegis of this new and more democratic government there would then * * * as promptly as possible * * * be held national elections."

1. Chiang Kai-shek was not a feudal warlord; he was then head of the state—as much head of the state of China as Roosevelt was of the United States. Each was in his position in accordance with the basic law of his country.

2. Chiang Kai-shek was not a de facto anything. He had been at the head of the Government of China, under one title or another, since 1927. His government had been recognized by every other government involved in Chinese affairs. So far as the United States is concerned, such recognition was complete (de jure, the diplomats call it), the two countries having exchanged ambassadors for nearly two decades.

3. It is utter nonsense to speak of a national election prior to the cessation of hostilities. Much of China was then in the hands of the Japanese. How could an election be held until the country was freed from the Japanese?

In a word, Elliott's statement is nonsense and if that is what his father told him, it is evidence that his father had no understanding of the situation.

Now, let us proceed. Elliott Roosevelt continues to say: "* * * True, it was a conditional promise. Chiang's conditions were two: First, that father should obtain from the Soviet Government full assurance that Manchuria would be returned to Chinese sovereignty and full assurance that the future Chinese boundary would be respected, this commitment to include an understanding that the Soviets would not interfere in China's internal political problems; second, that the United States should back the Chinese in their postwar refusal of extraterritorial rights to the British in Hong Kong, Canton, and Shanghai * * *."

(Extraterritoriality had long been abolished in Shanghai and Canton and never existed in Hong Kong.)

Let's get at dates. The Cairo Conference was held a few days prior to the Tehran Conference in 1943. Chiang, who had flown from Chungking to Cairo, with his wife, wanted to attend the Tehran Conference. Stalin objected.

Obviously it was a bit surprising to discover that the fourth ally, Stalin, refused to attend the Cairo Conference, and objected to the presence of Chiang Kai-shek at Tehran.

This is what was agreed to at Cairo:

"It is their purpose that Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the First World War in 1914, and that all the territories that Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China."

But at Tehran a few days later, this agreement was nullified. Chiang was not notified of the nullification. In the official pronouncement on Tehran, nothing was said on the subject. This pious wish was expressed:

"From these friendly conferences we look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives untouched by tyranny and according to their varying desires and their own consciences."

Yet at Tehran, in December 1943, the double-cross was in. At Yalta, in February 1945, it was implemented by an agreement. Elliott Roosevelt seems shocked in his book that the December 1943 platitudes did not work out and blames the State Department.

But it was his father, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who personally attended the Cairo, Tehran, and Yalta Conferences, and who personally affixed his signature to all the documents, as did Winston Churchill.

At Yalta Roosevelt was advised by Alger Hiss.

Russian Canned Crab Is Now Flooding American Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday 15,000 cases of Russian canned crab, valued at half a million dollars, were unloaded in Seattle. This crab was caught by Russian fishermen, in Russian waters, and canned by Russian cannery workers.

This was the first shipment since the war of Russian crab meat into the United States. If these shipments continued, and there is every reason to believe they will continue under our present free-trade policies, our Pacific coast canned-crab industry soon will be knocked into a cocked hat. Our American crab fishermen cannot compete with the low wages and low living standards of the Russians.

It is interesting to note that prior to Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, 85 percent of all canned crab sold on the American market was imported from Japan and only 15 percent of it supplied by our American fishermen.

Pearl Harbor blew the Japanese out of the American market. Americans then built thousands of crab-fishing boats and scores of crab canneries, investing millions in developing a prosperous crab-fishing industry in this country.

The Russians, under our treaties with them, have now largely taken over the fisheries previously operated by the Japanese. Last week's Russian crab import seems to indicate that Russia now has opened a drive to take over the American crab market and thereby drive our American crab-fishing fleet from the seas and to force our American crab fishermen and crab-cannery workers into unemployment.

We are today spending billions to prevent Russia from engulfing Europe. At the same time we pursue a policy of admitting Russian canned crab into United States markets in order that the Russians may be made more prosperous. The two policies are absurdly inconsistent.

The State Department ought to take immediate steps to stop further imports of these Russian crabs into the United States. If we do not, our Pacific coast fishing industry and its thousands of workers will be irreparably injured.

New England Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Carroll County Independent, published in Center Ossipee, N. H., of February 10, 1950:

NEW ENGLAND TRAGEDY

The closing down of the Waltham Watch plant is tragic. Nothing can be done to cushion or to soften the blow to that community in particular and to New England in general. Some 1,200 people were involved when the final notices were given.

When a shoe plant, a textile mill, or a canning factory folds up through any one of a number of causes, the help can sometimes find places in similar plants. Many hardships are involved, but quite often work can be found for which the freshly unemployed man or woman is trained.

But when a watch factory closes, there are just no other watch factories to which the help may migrate. There are such plants in this country, but they simply cannot absorb all the help. Anyone who works in a watch plant has a very high degree of manual skill and should be able to adapt himself to other precision work. But the retraining process may be long and costly.

Much more is involved than the closing of a factory and the throwing out of work of about a thousand people. Looking at our national economy as a whole, the opening or the closing of one such a plant means very little.

But from the viewpoint of national security, the loss is absolutely irreparable. In time of war there is a tremendous demand for chronometers for the Navy, for absolutely accurate watches for pilots, airplane navigators and for Army officers.

In the manufacture and assembly of certain types of bomb and shell fuses, airplane navigation instruments and optical equipment, extremely high standards of precision are demanded.

A watch plant is a great center of know-how, skill and teaching ability to help meet such demands.

During the last war we amazed both ourselves and the world in our ability to teach people to do precision work in mass production. But certain skills cannot be taught in an intensive learning course.

They come only the hard way, by years of both schooling and bench work.

Oftentimes it is a question of finding the highly skilled man who knows how to make the tool, to make the tool, that makes the final tool with which the semiskilled worker does his precision work. Often it is a question of finding an old shop foreman who knows both theory and actual practice and who carries in his head information that is just not found in any shop manual or text book.

When a plant such as Waltham Watch closes down the precision machinery either depreciates, is lost, sold or stolen. The great pool of irreplaceable skill is broken up and can never be replaced or reorganized.

If we as a Nation can afford to subsidize the growing of potatoes, cotton and tobacco, if we can engage in economic and social experiments of highly debatable value, we can most certainly afford to subsidize factories that may easily be of vital importance to our national safety a few short years from now.

Today's Dollar Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include one of the most thoughtful and factual statements I have yet seen regarding the necessity for instituting some semblance of fiscal sanity in our national and international affairs. Because of its value, I have secured permission from Mr. Frank Lilly to print his address on this subject.

TODAY'S DOLLAR TOMORROW

(Address by Frank Lilly at the Spokane Valley Kiwanis Club, February 6, 1950)

Today's dollar, like the old gray mare, is not what it used to be.

The 75 cents that I paid for a good shirt, according to the diary which I kept while a student at the University of Missouri, would not today buy the shirt tail of the same quality shirt. The $2.50 that I paid for shoes would today barely pay for the rubber heels, soles, and shoelaces of similar shoes. The $15 that I paid for a good suit would today pay for little more than one leg of a pair of pants of the same quality suit. The $1.50 a week that I paid for board at the Union Boarding Club would not today buy a good meal at a first-class hotel. Today I pay the barber $1 for trying to find some hair to cut as compared with the 25 cents I paid at that time for a real haircut. The 5-cent loaf of bread of that day has become a 16-cent loaf and the 5-cent Saturday Evening Post of that day is now 15 cents.

When I recently received payment on a small loan made in 1923, my elation over the unexpected reimbursement passed quickly when I realized that I was actually receiving back in today's dollars only about 25 cents of the value of each of the dollars that I had loaned.

In this connection, my attention was recently called to the fact that even if one now has a third more funds on deposit in the bank than he had in 1945, he will still actually have about 5 percent less in purchasing value than he had 5 years ago. In other words, the figures on your $20 bill and the figures in your bankbook do not mean what they say; their true meaning lies only in terms of what their value is in purchasing power.

YESTERDAY'S DOLLAR GOLD BACKED

The value of the dollar was relatively stable from the time of resumption of specie payment in 1879 up to 1934 because the dollar of that period was a different kind of dollar than we have had for the last 15 years. It was either a gold dollar or a gold-backed dollar, and I shall refer to that type of dollar as "yesterday's dollar." You will recall in this connection that the old gold certificates, national bank notes, and the Federal Reserve notes were redeemable in gold coin.

Yesterday's dollar was money; today's dollar is merely paper currency, with the exception of silver certificates and silver dollars. It is important to distinguish between currency and money. Currency performs only two of the functions of money, namely; it serves (1) as a medium of exchange and (2) as a measure of value. Money's most important and necessary function, especially from the standpoint of the man who is earning and saving his money, is as a storage of value. This "storage of value" is best provided by gold and/or silver.

From the banker's standpoint, interest is the most important consideration and as long as he can get interest on currency, notes, or what-not, he places little or no emphasis upon "storage of value." The Government's chief objective seems to be spending, and it, therefore, overlooks the "storage of value" which is of so much importance to the man who is endeavoring to establish a competence through savings.

TODAY'S DOLLARS MOSTLY NOTES

Nearly two-thirds of today's paper currency is in the form of Federal Reserve notes. Now a note is a promise to pay, and you will find on the Federal Reserve note the provisions that it "is redeemable in lawful money at the United States Treasury or at any Federal Reserve bank." If you should send a $10 Federal Reserve note to the United States Treasury with a request that it be redeemed in lawful money, you would probably receive two $5 United States notes which you would find are also "redeemable in lawful money." And that would be as far as you could go unless you demanded silver dollars or a silver certificate which calls for payment in silver dollars that actually contain only about 70 cents worth of silver on the basis of the price of 90½ cents an ounce that the United States Treasury pays the miner for his silver.

The silver dollar in China, by the way, will buy three times as much as our paper dollar, because, in every nation, people have more confidence in hard money than in paper. Although lack of confidence in paper currency may not be an important factor in the lower value of today's dollar, no one could successfully contend that redeemability in gold would not inspire greater confidence in its value.

The contention that our currency is backed by gold in the vaults at Fort Knox is, at best, an academic distinction and not a practical fact. Cream in the icebox that the waitress will not serve you is not cream in your coffee.

The best evidence that gold is of major importance in a monetary system lies in the fact that our Government seized and nationalized gold in order to keep it from flowing out of the country and into the hands of foreign governments and their citizens. Incidentally, it was the devalued English pound which resulted from Great Britain's abandonment of the gold standard in September 1931 that precipitated the flow of gold out of this country and, in January 1934, resulted in our Government's raising the price of gold to $35 an ounce. If we had not then increased the price of gold to offset the devaluation of foreign currencies, we would, in time, have lost this all-important gold.

GOLD GOING ABROAD AGAIN

This Nation is today again faced with the same situation as in 1933 and 1934, except that this time it is on a greater scale, as a result of Great Britain's recent devaluation of the pound sterling which was followed by devaluation in over 40 other countries. For the first time in 15 years, gold is now flowing out of this country and we will soon be forced either to increase the price of gold or we will continue to lose our gold in ever-increasing quantities. In other words, the price of gold in terms of foreign currencies is now higher than in the United States in every other country except Switzerland (whose money is 100 percent gold backed) and it goes without saying, that other nations, including our own, will send their gold to whatever place they can get the best value for it in goods.

NOT ENOUGH GOLD

There is still a rather general impression that we have a large amount of gold, and it is true that we have the greater part of the world's gold—more than any other nation. But in relation to our national debt, the amount is only about 11 percent as compared with nearly 50 percent in 1940; and in relation to our total money supply, including bank deposits, our gold holdings are only about 12 percent of the total. Actually, therefore, we now have less gold in proportion to our national debt and our monetary supply than we had before our money was converted into irredeemable currency, and our gold holdings are far smaller than they should be for the safety of our money and Government bonds.

In this connection, it is of interest to note that during the 124 years from 1784 to 1910 the entire cost of the United States Government was $8,000,000,000 (and this includes the entire cost of the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and the Panama Canal). Since 1910, the cost has reached $360,000,000,000 and the expense involved in running our Federal Government is now close to $45,000,000,000 a year. On the basis of $35 an ounce for gold, it would take more gold than there is in the entire world to meet the expenses of our Federal Government for 1 year.

DEBT-BASED DOLLARS DANGEROUS

The importance of maintaining the current value of today's dollar, and increasing its value, if possible, cannot be overestimated. If the value of today's dollar should continue to decline as it has during the past 15 years, insurance policies, annuities, pensions, and savings of every kind will be practically destroyed.

This has happened in other countries—take France as one of several examples that could be cited—and it can happen here unless we put our financial house in order and establish a sound monetary system. A nation cannot, any more than an individual, get out of debt by going further into debt. A currency that is based upon debt cannot endure.

In emphasizing the foregoing danger, I am not questioning the intent of our Government officials, for the matter does not involve a question of intent but of fact. Lenin is quoted as having said that Germany would arm itself out of existence, Great Britain expand itself out of existence, and the United States lend itself out of existence. The first has happened; the second, practically so; and the third could happen. The fact that a large amount of the loans have been made to ourselves does not alter the situation, for debts are debts—they must sometime either be paid or repudiated.

NO BUSINESS CAN BE BETTER THAN MONETARY SYSTEM

No business or bank, no insurance system, can be any better than the monetary system of the nation in which it operates. No plan for old-age security can work unless the nation has a monetary system with which to maintain a sound and stable value for its money. Calling paper currency money does not make it money, nor does good intent put value into paper currency.

It is too much to hope that tomorrow's dollar will again have the value of yesterday's dollar, because we have probably gone too far down the road of debt and inflation. I do believe, however, that we can restore to tomorrow's dollar some of the value that yesterday's dollar had.

TOMORROW'S DOLLAR VALUE CAN BE INCREASED

There are two ways in which the value of tomorrow's dollar can be increased. One way would be to bring about a lowering of prices, which involves a decrease in labor and material costs. This may sound like heresy to many people, but even the laborer and supplier should prefer lower wages and prices to continued debt and an inflation that could end in repudiation.

The other way to meet the situation is to utilize the power that is inherent in gold. Incidentally, we are not doing this when we sterilize gold and render it inactive by withdrawing it from use and burying it in underground vaults as we have done in this country. There is neither life nor growth in sterility and stagnant inactivity.

HIGHER GOLD VALUE ABROAD

A legal recognition of the higher value for gold which now prevails in every country in the world except the United States, and even indirectly here (in "natural gold"), is merely facing the facts of the situation. To establish a higher price for gold and permit citizen ownership of it would not involve more inflation and a further decrease in the value of today's dollar, but would merely be a realistic adjustment to the current value of today's dollar.

Everyone knows that the price of practically everything except gold has increased since 1934. It follows, therefore, that the price of gold must be increased correspondingly; otherwise, the price of all other things must soon be decreased proportionately.

An increase in the price of gold is a proven method of meeting financial crises that has been used a number of times in the past. Great Britain, for example, has, in one way or another, increased the price of gold seven times in the last six centuries.

GOLD BEST CURE AND PROTECTION

It is not by chance that, from the beginning of history, gold has been the only sure cure for inflation and the best protection against deflation. Time and time again nations have tried to get along without gold in their monetary systems, but such attempts have invariably failed and in every instance, when these nations have returned to a gold standard, gold has been given a higher monetary value than it had before.

British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin acknowledged the major importance of gold when in a speech to the British Trade Union he said, "If you find another gold mine (district) in the world it would assist you, it would be a great advantage."

DEVALUATION MADE TO GET GOLD

Great Britain's recent devaluation of its currency was, by the way, made not just for the purpose of getting dollars as is so generally believed in this country, but primarily for the purpose of getting gold because, in many instances, Great Britain can use other currencies to better advantage than she can dollars; and with gold she can obtain all currencies, including dollars. There is no gainsaying the fact that there is not a nation in the world, including Russia, that would not prefer to be on a gold standard, for an ample supply of gold is a big advantage in world trade. Why, then, should the United States, like an ostrich, bury its head in the sands of paper currency?

MONEY LIFEBLOOD OF COMMERCE

Because money is the lifeblood of commerce, and because commerce is an essential phase of modern civilization, the monetary blood stream must be kept pure and vital. You can pump several things into the human blood stream and the substitute will function for a little while, but the individual will not live long unless he gets real blood—either by transfusion or the creative forces of his own body.

Fortunately, this country is in a position to obtain the gold and silver needed to maintain the monetary blood for a healthy economic body, both from the mines in its own body and also by transfusion, so to speak, from abroad. As matters stand, however, efforts to produce gold from our own mines are being discouraged by forcing our producers to sell only to the Government, and at a lower price than they could obtain in foreign countries. Also, due to our failure to recognize in trade a higher value for gold, we are not obtaining the gold we were formerly getting through trade with foreign countries—exports are declining and imports that take our gold abroad are increasing.

Governments have ever been slow to act. It is freely admitted in well-informed financial circles that the disastrous depression of the early thirties could probably have been avoided, or at least ameliorated, if our Government had taken quicker action in raising the price of gold. There are, I think, good grounds for believing that this fact is now well recognized by a large number of Congressmen and other Government officials, and that constructive action can reasonably be expected within the near future.

GOLD BEST FOR PROFITS

Meanwhile, is there anything an individual can do to protect himself against a possible further decrease in the value of the dollar and/or profit by or through the situation? If, as has been said, one can best judge the future by what has happened in the past, gold and stocks in gold-mining companies offer the best protection and the largest profit possibilities.

Consider what happened in France during the last decade when the price level increased seventeen-fold, so that it now takes 17 francs to buy what 1 franc bought in 1939. During this period of currency management, the French investor could put his money into government bonds, food and services, industrial stock equities, real estate, stocks of gold-mining companies, and gold itself, the last-named being a privilege now denied to citizens of the United States.

The man who put his francs in government bonds suffered a loss, both in the franc value of his investment and its buying power. Those who converted into food and services showed a 98 percent loss in real value. The equity investor lost 40 percent, although stock prices advanced ten-fold. Those who bought farm lands realized a big increase in franc value but in real value they gained less than 20 percent. However, those who bought stocks of gold-mining companies and/or gold itself, wound up with a tremendous increase in franc value and a real net of over 50 percent.

British citizens who purchased stocks of gold-mining companies before the recent devaluation of the pound saw their stocks advance over 300 percent within a few days following the devaluation of the pound by 30⅓ percent. Sir Stafford Cripps had repeatedly declared that he would not devalue but he did.

In our own country, those who purchased stocks of the leading gold producers in the thirties during the depression realized enormous profits in market appreciation which, without exception, have more than offset the decrease in the purchasing power of today's dollar.

INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE AND ACTION NECESSARY

There has in recent years been a general tendency to leave everything up to the Government, but this leads to socialism and communism. Individual initiative and action are necessary if this Nation is to maintain and preserve a free enterprise system.

Unless the decline in the value of the dollar is at least stopped, people will find that what they have saved and are saving to live on tomorrow when their productive days are over will have little value; the security they have been attempting to provide will have vanished.

A return to the hard-money system as it was set forth in the United States Constitution is a primary need—other necessary reforms can then be established on a firm and lasting foundation.

Inflation of paper currencies throughout Europe set the stage for World War II, a shooting war; conflict over paper currencies in the Berlin area has been the real issue in the cold war; devaluation of the paper currencies of Great Britain and its some 30-odd satellite nations has precipitated a gold war. This we must win. We can do so by (1) recognizing the world-wide higher value of gold which these devaluations involve and, (2) reestablishing our monetary system on realistic and honest monetary values for both gold and silver. Quick action should be taken; delay is dangerous.

In the meantime, every individual owes it to himself to endeavor to protect himself and his loved ones against a decreasing dollar value by putting his today's dollars at work in equities of companies whose assets are in natural resources, for these will roll along with, or even move a little faster than, the spiraling inflation which has so greatly reduced the value of the dollars that he has been saving for tomorrow.

Fifty-second Anniversary of the Passing of Frances Willard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered in Statuary Hall on Friday, February 17, 1950, under the auspices of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the District of Columbia, observing the fifty-second anniversary of the passing of Frances Willard:

Madam President, officers, members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and friends, on this fifty-second anniversary of the passing of Frances Willard, it is quite appropriate that we hold this observance here in Statuary Hall, this hallowed Chamber of our Nation's Capitol, at the feet of the statue of one of history's most remarkable and influential women. As evidence of the unusual and outstanding character and service of Frances Willard, her statue is the only one representing our women in this chamber. All around us are impressive figures of stalwart sons, brave soldiers, great statesmen, leaders in industry, education, business, and politics. In their midst stands this statue of imperishable granite of a frail little woman. Since the dawn of history women have contributed more than their share in

the advancement of Christian civilization. Someone has said that God could not be everywhere all the time so he gave us our saintly mothers.

We have just observed the birthday of President Lincoln who, like other great leaders, attributed his finer qualities to his mother. Mr. Lincoln said, "Whatever I am I owe to my mother."

Frances Elizabeth Caroline Willard was the daughter of teacher parents. Education, next to religion, played the most important part in their ideals in life. Circumstances made it necessary for the Willard family to leave their native State of New York, and journey westward through Ohio, Illinois, and Wisconsin.

Early in life Miss Willard displayed talents of leadership and for many years taught in schools and colleges. Her record as an educator is outstanding but is overshadowed by her work in the cause of temperance.

Although considered by some as an impractical dreamer, Miss Willard fought hard for political enfranchisement of women. She was a pioneer in the crusade for equal opportunities, equal pay, equal rights, equal responsibilities in the home, in the professions, in industry, and affairs of state, for women. She insisted upon provisions for vocational guidance for girls, upon education for citizenship, upon physical education, and sports. She advocated the 8-hour day, a minimum-wage law, and many other ideals which in her day were considered the ravings of an impractical dreamer.

When those of us who still fight for temperance and decency become discouraged, we see heartened to learn of the untiring efforts for a better world in which to live as sought by Miss Willard.

She believed that intoxicating beverage was God's worst enemy and the devil's best friend. As we contemplate the example of this good woman, we shamefully confess the fact that so many still clamor for beer even if there is no bread. The selfish, greedy attitude of those who transform food into strong drink has so recently been revealed by their opposition to any restrictions in the use of grain for the distillation of liquor. In like manner, the selfish, wicked influences vigorously oppose any restriction of advertising the falsehood that alcoholic beverages are good and wholesome food. They would teach the children that drinking is the proper thing to do.

By reason of her devotion and zeal in the cause of temperance, our subject advanced from a subordinate position to that of president of the World's Women's Christian Temperance Union.

This guiding genius of the national temperance cause early recognized the importance of the printed page. She wrote six books, and edited the Union Signal. She believed in temperance education, and promoted this cause for schools, colleges, and churches. She agitated for legislation, and participated in securing constitutional prohibition amendments in various States.

Not only was Miss Willard interested in the cause of temperance and justice in our own country but her theater of operations covered the entire world.

A half century has gone since this stately woman was called to her reward. In spite of the present chaotic plight of this troubled world and in spite of the destructive wars through which we have passed, her marvelous influence is still with us.

This is not the only statue or memorial to Frances Willard. Throughout the world there are hospitals, educational institutions, and other agencies of mercy and culture bespeaking the fine qualities of this good woman. In Willard Hall at Northwestern University on a marble bust of Miss Willard are chiseled these lines from the pen of the poet Whittier:

"She knew the power of banded ill,
But felt that love was stronger still,
And organized for doing good
The world's united womanhood."

Soon after the passing of Miss Willard, the great State of Illinois placed this marble statue of her likeness here. The Congress passed that day to mark the eventful occasion. Many impressive eulogies were delivered. Inscribed on the pedestal of this statue here are these words from the lips of Miss Willard:

"Ah, it is our women who have given the costliest hostages to fortune. Out into the battle of life they have sent their best beloved with fearful odds against them. Oh, by the dangers they have dared, by the hours of patient watching over beds where helpless children lay, by the incense of 10,000 prayers wafted from their gentle lips to heaven, I charge you give them power to protect along life's treacherous highway those whom they have loved."

Our Nation, our churches, our people do well to remember the life and service of so noble, so self-giving, so loving a soul.

She was a brave true soldier, a great commander, and finally and best of all, a kind and gentle woman who loved her fellow beings with such an unstinted devotion that she has been christened the mother of all mothers.

When called by that Master with whom she walked so closely all through life, she answered with tones of utmost content: "How beautiful it is to be with God."

May the memory of this good woman, who did so much for the cause of humanity, be forever preserved, perpetuated, and transmitted to the generations yet unborn.

Presentation of Bust of Abraham Lincoln by Eloy Alfaro International Foundation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, February 12, 1950, I had the pleasure, at the Ford Theater in the very room where Abraham Lincoln was shot, of presiding at a memorial service in memory of the birthday of that great American who became a citizen of the ages. This annual memorial program is conducted under the joint auspices of the Lincoln Group, of Washington, D. C., and of the National Park Service.

One of the features of the program was the gift of a bust of Abraham Lincoln to the Lincoln Museum at 511 Tenth Street by the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation. The Eloy Alfaro International Foundation is devoted to perpetuate the memory of Eloy Alfaro, martyred ex-President of Ecuador, and to encourage the propagation of the liberal ideals and principles for which this great South American patriot and statesman fought for more than half a century. Its headquarters are located in the city of Panama, but its membership extends throughout the North and South American Continents.

The memorandum given to me as chairman for the basis of my remarks about the bust of Abraham Lincoln being presented by the foundation was as follows:

That the people of many nations have paid tribute to the memory of Abraham Lincoln is not surprising. His contribution was not to the welfare of his countrymen, alone, but to all humankind. That he should be revered by the common people and the oppressed is easily understood. But Lincoln did more than that. He inspired the chiefs of other nations to look upon their own downtrodden peoples with compassion and the effects of his humanitarianism were widespread, offering new hope and opportunity for the people of many lands.

This afternoon, Dr. Emeterio S. Santovena of Habana, Cuba, author of the best work on Abraham Lincoln ever written in the Spanish language, has sent a bust of Abraham Lincoln to this museum to be presented in the name of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of which he is President. This is being done as a token of respect for the memory of Abraham Lincoln and gratitude for the blessings which he helped to bring to the peoples of all of the American nations.

Eloy Alfaro was born in Ecuador in 1842. As a young man, he followed closely the career of Abraham Lincoln and was deeply moved by Lincoln's championship of the rights and dignity of the common people and his principles of freedom and democracy. When he became President of Ecuador, he devoted his efforts to free the native Indians, who had been held in virtual slavery by tyrannical dicators, from exploitation and inhuman treatment. The measures which he adopted in bettering the conditions of the masses in Ecuador and his humanitarianism have had so widespread an influence that he is commonly called the Abraham Lincoln of South America. Like Lincoln, he too had many enemies. But he was willing to sacrifice his great personal wealth, banishment from his native land, and finally his life to further the ideals of democracy. Again, like Abraham Lincoln, he met death at the hand of a cowardly assassin.

But his death was not in vain. Today he is not only heralded as the father of Ecuadoran democracy and the apostle of Pan-Americanism, but he has gained the accolade of history. In almost every South and Central American Republic his name is synonymous with freedom and his memory has been perpetuated by many monuments and memorial institutions.

I now have the honor to present Mrs. Karna Wilgus, whose husband, A. Curtis Wilgus, is professor of Latin-American history at George Washington University, a founder of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation and of the Inter-American center of Florida. Mrs. Wilgus will present the bust of Abraham Lincoln to the United States, in the name of the Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, and, then, in a most gracious manner, Mrs. Wilgus presented the magnificent bronze bust to the Museum within the walls of which we hold these annual memorials to the memory of President Lincoln.

I also had the pleasure of introducing to the audience Mr. Colon Eloy Alfaro, youngest son of the martyred Ecuadorian president—and himself a great Ecuadoran patriot and friend of the United States. "Captain" Alfaro, as his friends like to call him, has served his country both as Ambassador to the United States and Ambassador to the Pan-American Union. He is a graduate of West Point

and the father of three sons who also have graduated from the United States Military Academy.

A further memorandum handed me by the distinguished son of this martyred President of Ecuador said, and I quote:

[From the Star and Herald, Panama City, of September 10, 1949]

To perpetuate the memory of Eloy Alfaro, martyred ex-President of Ecuador, a movement has been started which will be devoted to the task of encouraging the study and propagation of the liberal ideals and principles for which this Ecuadoran statesman and leader fought during more than a half century of his existence.

The headquarters or seat of this organization to be known as the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation will be established in the city of Panama, because it was in this city that Eloy Alfaro, in the early nineties organized his liberating action to free his country from the backwardness in which it was held by a reactionary conservative regime and to bless his fellow countrymen with progress of liberalism.

Writing in Informacion, of Habana, Cuba, Dr. Emeterio S. Santovenia, president of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, explains the aims and purposes of the organization in an extensive article which is translated as follows:

"With its permanent headquarters established in the city of Panama; with Sic Itur ad astra as its motto; and, by the will of citizens of North, Central, and South America, there exists today the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation.

"This denomination is very expressive both because of the ecumenical meaning of the high purpose it covers and, also, because of the significance of the name of the great Ecuadoran patrician.

"The selection of Panama as the headquarters of the FIEA obeys the scope of fundemental facts in the life of him who presented the complete delineations of a liberator of the people.

"The motto Sic Itur ad astra, is closely related to the trajectory of the extraordinary existence of Eloy Alfaro: It can well be said, on appraising his progress forward and upward, that it is thus that the stars are reached.

"The FIEA, has neither political nor lucrative purposes. Its finality is to tribute the memory of Eloy Alfaro and make available all knowledge of his life and his works as a statesman and liberator. What Alfaro undertook and did throughout half a century, constitute the essential, transformation norms of men and people.

"Against ignorance, backwardness, and despotism in Ecuador he fought ceaselessly. For the realization of the maximum ideals of a common welfare he sacrificed his belongings and his prosperity, his peace and tranquility, and the immediate happiness of his family.

"To the yearnings for improvement and dignity of his country he added those redeeming undertakings which had achieved success in other far regions of America.

"The magnificent lessons from so many noble undertakings are worthy of being transmitted from generation to generation for the honor and benefits of an entire community of nations.

"The statutes of the FIEA, includes the bestowal of a high decoration by its Council of Dignitaries. The FIEA's Cross exists to reward eminent services. These must have been rendered in two ways: (a) To the memory of the patrician, (b) to the ideals and causes for which he struggled, suffered, and sacrificed his life.

"There is thus a close relation between the greatness of the remarkable transformer and the virtuous aptitude of the believers in the value of historic continuity.

"The FIEA can confer a medal. This is particularly destined as a means to recognize journalistic, scholastic, and analogous merit resulting from activities devoted to exalting the virtues of Eloy Alfaro. This medal will serve as an ostensible bond between the past, the glorious past, represented by Alfaro and the present, the promising present, administered by those who understand and can develop the principles of which he was a champion.

"The details of the FIEA's Cross are also symbolic. The extremes of the jewel represent the singular points of human fraternity and the 5th of June, 1895, the date which marks the beginning of the great social and political transformation in Ecuador launched by Alfaro. The circular figure superimposed on the points, signifies the wheel of progress. Its red color is that of Ecuadoran liberalism; the blue, red, and gold are the colors of the present flag of the country of Alfaro; the colors of the ribbon specially devised to serve as the collar of the Cross are also the colors of the Ecuadoran flag; corresponding to each point of the star, the crown of unity. In the background, sustaining the Cross are the laurel and olive branches symbolic of victory and peace. The motto Sic Itur ad astra, is the inscription which accompanies the bust of the great fighter in the center of the beautiful jewel.

"The FIEA, gathers and encourages the permanent political and moral values of America. Eloy Alfaro is the most outstanding Ecuadoran in the Western Hemisphere. The action and thought which he placed at the service of his country were instrument and agency of the highest aspirations of half the globe. He worked for a broad land and for a long time when he strove to raise the social level of the Indian, to spread education among his countrymen, to banish the exploitation of man by man, to act for the defense of liberty regardless of frontiers, to create American public law, and to free the flesh and the spirit from its chains."

Mr. Speaker, and, then the beautiful booklet, published about Eloy Alfaro, as president of Ecuador, in part, said:

Eloy Alfaro, soldier, patriot, statesman, and martyr, the centenary of whose birth was celebrated on June 25, 1942, was a citizen not only of his native Ecuador, he was a citizen of America. The personal integrity, the unwavering defense of the principles of truth, justice, and friendship among nations, the self-control and self-sacrifice that marked his 70 years of unflagging service to his country and to America extended his sphere beyond the confines of his own country, awakened unbounded admiration in distant lands, and brought him unsought but richly deserved fame and honor in far places as well as at home. He was a rebel, a conspirator, but his rebellion and conspiracy were directed against hatred, injustice, discord, and tyranny. He was the leader of a generation fired with the hope and desire for political action for the welfare of their country.

Born in Montecristi in the Province of Manabi, Ecuador, on June 25, 1842, Eloy Alfaro was the son of Manuel Alfaro, a native of Rioja, Spain, and of Dona Natividad Delgado. His childhood and youth were spent under the parental roof in an atmosphere that inspired in him the love of liberty, the sense of honor, the diligence, and the clear-sightedness that were to be his guide throughout his life.

In all the history of Pan American relations there is no name more distinguished, yet lesser known to North Americans, than that of Ecuador's greatest contemporary hero, Gen. Eloy Alfaro.

The student of inter-American affairs is cognisant of Alfaro's contributions toward hemispheric cooperation. The amateur in American relations has yet to know his greatness. This pamphlet is presented as a humble contribution to these latter.

In the writer's mind, two important phases of General Alfaro's life stand out above all others. A study of his thoughts, as expressed in his writings and his acts, clearly demonstrates the steadfastness of purpose which kept before Alfaro the wide and far-seeing aim of inter-American unity in action. During those years he held the supreme power in Ecuador he accomplished miracles in social changes for his fellow countrymen. Yet, and observe from his acts, he never once lost an opportunity to advance the cause of the Americas as an entity. While yet a loyal Ecuadoran, thinking of the welfare of his people and their advancement, he saw always before him the ultimate goal of inter-American unity of action and thought—Pan Americanism.

The other salient feature in this great American's life is found in his ability to translate his thoughts and ideals into solid concrete facts. Through the strength of his character and the fame of his name, he was able to preserve peace in Central America when war seemed the only solution to a boundary dispute involving three of the nations which had once formed the Republic of Central America. His ideal of Pan Americanism was put to the test and found not lacking.

Again, when the people of Cuba were the object of as cruel a despotic terror as any land has seen, and when political forces both in the Americas and abroad were using the struggle of those gallant Americans as a means to an ignoble end, Alfaro's ideal gave him the strength of character to intervene publicly on behalf of his fellow Americans. No other American of like standing found within himself the moral courage to do this.

Following in the footsteps of every great American from Bolivar to Blaine, General Alfaro was inspired to call the American nations to a hemispheric conference at Mexico City. The reader shall see that this conference, as measured by the usual standards, was as stated by Ignacio Mariscal, Secretary of State of Mexico, a failure analogous to that of the Congress of Panama, notwithstanding the powerful influences of the liberator (Simón Bolivar), yet it is significant that the Central American countries which had seen Pan Americanism at work found merit in the general's call, and were represented at the conference.

Mr. Speaker, upon the adjournment of the very largely attended meeting, and before leaving the hall, hundreds of those in attendance went forward to more closely observe the bust and to personally meet Mrs. Wilgus who had presented it on behalf of the foundation, and also to meet the distinguished son of this former President of Ecuador, Capt. Colon Eloy Alfaro.

"They Reap Every One His Corn in the Field; and They Gather the Vintage of the Wicked"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my desk an article from Aufbau—Reconstruction, an American weekly printed in German and English, written by Manfred George, the editor, which does an excellent job of rationalizing the difficult position maintained by

those of us who believe that the United States was engaged in a crusade for justice and democracy in World War II, and that the Nazi leaders cannot be quickly forgiven for their crimes against humanity.

This article attempts to discuss dispassionately, and as a moral issue, the case of Kirsten Flagstad, and, by obvious analogy, similar cases such as those of Wilhelm Furtwaengler and Walter Gieseking. Mr. George comes to the conclusion that basically these are problems involving the honor of the United States.

As you can readily imagine, I have been severely criticized for almost everything I have done in public office; most people in public life have that experience. In particular, I have been accused of inconsistency, because on the one hand, I was, at least in part, responsible for the expulsion of Walter Gieseking, and I have opposed the entrance into the United States of others who were conspicuous for their adherence to nazism, yet hardly culpable to the point of being called war criminals; on the other hand, I have tended to intervene in behalf of minor and harmless people who were, almost by accident, members of the Nazi Party for varying periods.

Mr. George supplies the moral content of my position, and it is with pleasure that I insert his article in the RECORD under leave:

THE FLAGSTAD CASE

(By Matthew George)

This article deals with timely ethics and politics. The fact that a Wagnerian soprano by the name of Kirsten Flagstad may again appear at the Metropolitan Opera House in New York does not interest us from an artistic point of view. Kirsten Flagstad is a first-rate singer. We have no way of judging whether or not Miss Helen Traubel is on a par with her presumptive successor as far as box-office appeal and artistic qualifications go; some critics who apply only the highest standards, are inclined to give preference to Mme. Flagstad. This, however, does not concern us here. What concerns us are the moral aspects of the matter; this case is but one in the lengthy discussion about art and politics which, in themselves, are meaningless unless contrasted with human beings and humanity.

Here are the facts: Mme. Kirsten Flagstad's husband, Henry Johansen, made a fortune by treacherous collaboration with the Nazis and the Norwegian quisling regime. Disregarding the pleas of her loyal countrymen in the United States, disregarding the requests of the Norwegian Legation here, Mme. Flagstad returned to occupied Norway. In contrast to other artists of Allied nationality, she never helped the war effort in any way. Fate punished her husband for his treachery: he died in a prison hospital shortly before he was to go on trial. In view of the incriminating evidence, the Norwegian Government confiscated his property—which was also Mme. Flagstad's property.

After the war, Mme. Flagstad was not permitted to make concert or operatic appearances in Norway, Copenhagen, and Stockholm. An attempt of hers to sing in Stockholm resulted in a public scandal. As far as the United States is concerned, the Americans of Scandinavian descent made it impossible for her to tour the Middle West as she had planned. In San Francisco, however, she enjoyed a carefully prepared triumph. If she is now to appear at the Metropolitan Opera House, she will be able to laugh at the fools who attempted to oppose her reappearance.

What is the real issue behind the matter?

The issue is not to perpetuate the concept of the enemy as it was held during World War II. Hate and enmity can never be constructive. We can understand those who say with conscious indifference: "We don't care about the past. Kirsten Flagstad is a great singer. This is the only thing which matters."

Yet they have not thought it over completely. True enough, one cannot pin down for years on end the countless little and not so little enemies who made life hard for us during the war and who are responsible for the death of many an American soldier. Relations between peoples change from one day to the other; one cannot sit down with a notebook and keep track of millions of insignificant Nazi fellow travelers in Allied countries. It is impossible, and in many instances where decisive changes have taken place, it is also unjust. But this attitude cannot apply to internationally known celebrities.

This is where we have to draw the line between forgiveness and recollection. A great name means great responsibility, because those who bear it are a symbol as well as an example. The Americans of Scandinavian descent doubtlessly have forgiven many a traitor among their former nationals. There is a deep meaning in their reluctance to forgive Kirsten Flagstad, an attitude, incidentally, which is shared by the Norwegian Government. Knut Hamsun, who definitely was a great writer, has not been forgiven either.

Anyone who has identified himself with our enemies to such an extent—in a way which, although it might be called passive, speaks for itself very actively—has forfeited the right to appear in this country, even if he or she is as great a singer as Mme. Flagstad, except for the exclusive benefit of wounded war veterans.

To those who say: "We don't care about these things; we cannot afford to forego such outstanding art," may we reply that there is no art outstanding enough to justify an insult to our national honor.

We realize that these lines will not achieve anything. Who are we to compete with the mighty ones who organized Kirsten Flagstad's triumph over decency and ethics? We are doing our duty anyway. And although, with Beethoven's Choral Symphony, we would like to embrace all the world—diesen kuss der ganzen welt—our friendship for all the world compels us to see to it that this kiss is not turned into a kiss of Judas.

The Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include articles 14, 15, and 16 in the series on the Columbia River region by Mr. Leon Starmont:

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 4, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 14)

(By Leon Starmont)

About $450,000,000 of the $2,250,000,000 asked in the comprehensive plan for Columbia Basin development is intended for use in Idaho. That includes half of the $334,000,000 Hells Canyon Dam on Snake River, and all the $81,070,000 cost of Albeni Falls Dam on the Pend Oreille, which is just above the Washington line.

The biggest single item entirely in Idaho was slashed by the Budget Bureau, as forecast in article 12 of this series. It called for $253,234,000 to irrigate 192,000 acres, develop 180,000 kilowatts and store 1,225,000 acre-feet in Payette and Boise Rivers east of Boise. Parts of the Mountain Home project were retained, however.

HOME OF EARLY IRRIGATION

This part of Idaho saw the first large-scale irrigation in the Northwest. A right was granted in 1865 for diversion from Boise River for irrigation of a tract now included in the Boise city limits.

Age of the settlement, and the varied nature of early projects, create a problem not faced elsewhere. With the Weiser and Owyhee, six different rivers, including the Snake, flow through the region. The irrigable area extends roughly from Mountain Home, Idaho, to the Oregon side of the Snake above Huntington.

Contiguous areas are divided into numerous districts and Federal projects, and much of the ground can be served with almost equal efficiency from more than one source.

The Owyhee now irrigates about 150,000 acres in three States, the Bruneau 21,000 acres in two States, the Boise 340,000 acres, the Payette 160,000 acres, and the Weiser some 40,000 acres, the last three items being all in Idaho. These streams provide more than 700,000 irrigated acres.

MANY OTHERS AUTHORIZED

Now authorized and under construction in this area, which the Bureau of Reclamation at Boise calls the Middle Snake, are Payette division of the Boise project, for 52,760 new acres, and the Anderson ranch dam, to be completed in 1951, which will send supplemental water to 300,000 acres. The dam will generate 27,000 kilowatts.

Also nearing completion is the Owyhee project, extending into Oregon, to add 103,000 acres. These plus the new project would total about 1,060,000 acres.

Above this area is the upper Snake country, extending into Wyoming. It now has more than 1,500,000 acres irrigated, or about three times the area now qualified in central Washington's Big Bend.

The Minidoka project, nearing completion, will add 318,700 acres of new land. The Minidoka and Palisades projects, the latter somewhat delayed, will add supplemental water to 1,350,000 acres where the present supply is insufficient.

The total is approximately 3,000,000 acres for Idaho, southern Idaho, exclusive of the Salmon, Clearwater, and Lost River drainage systems, but including portions of Wyoming, Nevada, and Oregon which are tied to it economically.

TWO ITEMS ATTACHED

Strong efforts have been made to have two of the Idaho items, the two largest, deleted from the list of 93 projects for immediate authorization.

One is Hells Canyon, which is a power project with no irrigation angle. The contention is that a series of low dams with locks on Snake River, between Lewiston and Weiser, would develop approximately the same amount of power at a much earlier date, and would make up-river navigation possible. The principal loss would be the proposed storage capacity of 3,080,000 acre-feet.

It got by the Budget Bureau, however, with removal of $120,000,000 for transmission facilities, which the message said might better be constructed by another Federal agency.

Efforts to change budget recommendations and to add items may still be made in Congress.

The Bureau of Reclamation "blue book," which covers all future projects, specifies 17 possible power development, totaling 1,665,000 kilowatts, and 32 irrigation schemes, to cover more than 1,000,000 acres. They would in time bring the region's irrigation acreage to 4,500,000, and its power, including the items now being debated, to nearly 3,250,000 kilowatts.

That is roughly half the irrigable acreage and one-tenth of the power potential of the entire basin.

WOULD BAR BONNEVILLE

Most of the open debate in southern Idaho centers around proposals for a large Bonneville power administration transmission line through the State.

Idaho Power Co. serves the territory now. Its recent expansion has exceeded that of any other private member of the Northwest power pool. Many chambers of commerce and State commercial organizations have backed its position that no BPA line is needed, that left to its own devices, and its own financing, Idaho Power will deliver all the energy needed in the region, including much of eastern Oregon.

Presently installed capacity on the Snake and its tributaries above Weiser is approximately 350,000 kilowatts. Some of the installations would be reduced in capacity by diversion of water for other purposes. For that reason figures from different sources disagree.

Summarizing, it appears that:

1. Idaho lags behind the downriver States in power development, but much of the opposition to projects in the original Army-Interior agreement comes from within the State. This applies also to Albeni Falls Dam on Pend Oreille River, which got by the budget without change.

2. Idaho is far ahead of the downriver States in irrigation acreage, and there is no indication that either Oregon or Washington will ever catch up.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 5, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 15)

(By Leon Starmont)

Ten water-short States are making eyes at Columbia River. California's plea has been most publicized. The others interested and potentially benefitted are Nevada, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas.

They would not all get water directly by ditch along the Wasatch and the Continental Divide. Only California would receive water through the suggested big pipe taking off below Bonneville Dam.

What Interior Department planners really are studying is a mammoth project for water-sharing by displacement. It would work somewhat as does the existing Northwest power pool, by which an emergency in Seattle can be met by juice poured into the Utah Power and Light lines by a copper company plant at Bingham Canyon, Utah—or somewhere else.

INTERCONNECT SEVEN VALLEYS

Participants in this great interconnected system of water diversion gates would be:

1. Columbia river, which enters the Pacific between Oregon and Washington at Astoria.

2. California's Central Valley project, whose Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers reach salt water at San Francisco bay.

3. Colorado River, which rises in Wyoming and Colorado and flows into the Gulf of California between the Mexican States of Baja California and Sonora.

4. The Salt Lake Basin and adjacent Nevada areas which have no direct outlet to the sea.

5. Rio Grande, which rises in Colorado, and below El Paso forms the boundary between Texas and several Mexican States.

6. Arkansas River, which rises in central Colorado and flows into the Mississippi south of Memphis, Tenn.

7. Platte River, which starts just over a hill from the Arkansas, with another branch out of Wyoming, and enters the Missouri south of Omaha, Neb.

ONE TUNNEL BUILT

Already built and delivering Colorado River water to the Platte is the Alva B. Adams tunnel of the Colorado-Big Thompson project. If you wondered several months back why Bureau of Reclamation officials held an all-western conference at Grand Lake, Colo., that's the reason.

Grand Lake is where the 13-mile tunnel starts under Rocky Mountain National Park to deliver 550 second feet of water to Big Thompson River above the town of Estes Park. This water serves farmers all the way to Julesberg, on the Nebraska State line.

The man in the street is likely to ask: "If California needs water so badly, and the Colorado flows past its eastern border, why do they divert Colorado River water for irrigation as far east as Nebraska?"

And his wife may chip in: "If Colorado water is diverted to Nebraska, why talk about taking water out of Snake River, in Idaho or Wyoming, for delivery to the Colorado?"

The answer, says, the Bureau of Reclamation, is "exchange."

That's where the similarity to the Northwest power grid comes in. The principal difference is that the power grid was organized by private companies, and the water grid is being planned by engineers of a Federal bureau, acting under authority contained, or at least implied, in an act of Congress.

These studies, started last year, are to be completed in 1953. They are being handled in a special division at Salt Lake City, entitled "United Western Investigation." S. P. McCasland is engineer in charge. Assisting the planning office are four regional offices of the Bureau at Salt Lake City, Boise, Boulder City, Nev., and Sacramento.

The present task is estimating the water that may be available in the Columbia and its tributaries, also the Klamath and other streams of northern California, after all the needs of the Pacific Northwest have been reserved.

Investigations now going on, McCasland explains, form a preliminary reconnaissance to ascertain the justification for a more detailed investigation.

The reconnaissance was initiated because of the badly unbalanced distribution of supply and demand throughout the West. McCasland points out, for example, that the entire supply afforded by the Colorado River is estimated at less than 5 percent of the water which now flows to the ocean in north coastal streams.

In keeping with congressional policy, all States affected by the study will be invited to review the Bureau's reconnaissance report and make comments on it. These comments, together with those of other Federal agencies, will be transmitted to Congress.

A summary is being made of all the lands that might ever be irrigated under future conditions, McCasland said. A similar estimate is being made for industrial, municipal, and all other foreseeable water uses which might arise. Considered as available for export are only the waters which would remain after a supply had been reserved for present and potential local demands.

VARIOUS MEANS SUGGESTED

The study also will include making cost estimates of the various ways in which any surplus water in the Northwest might be transported to the areas where it would be used, and such costs will be compared with the benefits.

Investigation will be made of the means by which the plan could compensate for any disadvantage to existing or future power production. Exploration will be made of the possibility of using steam power for such means.

McCasland said that municipal, industrial, and agricultural use for water in large areas, particularly in the southwestern United States, is growing at a rate which will in the near future exceed the supply. As local surface supplies are fully exploited and ground-water reserves exhausted, expansion or even maintenance of the accomplished development will depend upon imported water.

The feasibility of exchange which might permit greater upstream utilization of the Colorado and of other rivers is an important phase of the study. An example is a possible multiple exchange of water whereby imported water would replace or expand present uses in southern California, thereby releasing some Colorado River water now used in that area.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 6, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 16)

(By Leon Starmont)

Backers of irrigation from Chief Joseph Dam at Bridgeport, Wash., are not at all discouraged by failure of the Budget Bureau and President Truman to include in the pending Columbia Basin legislation the $17,920,000 item which appears in the Army-Interior deferred list.

The bill does set up the so-called basin account, into which Chief Joseph's power revenues would be paid, and provides that a subsidy from the interest component may be applied to future new irrigation projects only by specific authorization. This is a complex situation, on which experts decline to express opinions until they have had a chance to study the budget letter as printed in Friday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STUDIES STILL GOING ON

The Bureau of Reclamation has not yet finished the studies necessary, either for the Greater Wenatchee project or the proposed Douglas-Okanogan project. Much more land than first thought possible may yet be irrigated both by gravity and pumping from the pool behind Chief Joseph Dam.

Meanwhile, preparations are being made to step up construction of the Okanogan River bridge and preparation of housing facilities at Bridgeport and the dam site as soon as weather conditions permit.

Col. E. C. Itschner, district engineer at Seattle for the Corps of Engineers, recently gave assurances that the preliminary designs, as now approved, permit later installation of irrigation works. He also revealed that a working model of Chief Joseph Dam has been built and is now being used in the Army's hydraulic laboratory at Bonneville Dam, which it built and still operates at the lower end of Columbia Gorge.

A complete account of Chief Joseph and Brewster, with 18 photographs and 2 maps, was published in the Spokesman-Review's Inland Empire magazine on January 8.

LONG CONSIDERED AS SITE

Foster Creek dam site is one of those recommended in the first "308" report of the Army engineers, undertaken as a result of congressional direction in 1927, and finished 5 years later. It was mentioned, however, in many earlier reconnaissances, including that of Lt. Thomas W. Symons prepared in 1881.

It was also mentioned in the Federal Power Commission's report on uses of the upper Columbia River, undertaken by a commission appointed in 1921, which made its report in 1923. At that time the site, known as Foster Creek, was being considered as a possible location of a pumping project for some of the land now about to be irrigated from the Grand Coulee Reservoir.

It is interesting to note also that the 1886 report by Lieutenant Symons mentions the course of Foster Creek, entering the Columbia from the south of Bridgeport, as the only route that might be followed by a railroad designed to cross the Columbia to connect Spokane Falls, W. T., with the Okanogan country.

BUILDER A CHELAN RESIDENT

Colonel Hatcher, under whose office the dam is to be built, is a property owner and legal resident of the Lake Chelan area, and expects to make that part of the State his home when his Army service is concluded.

Describing the model installed at Bonneville, he said:

"Extensive model studies were conducted to determine how well the contemplated design would function and how it could be improved.

"The over-all model was constructed to one-eightieth scale, and was in itself quite a project.

"Every detail of the river for some distance above and over a mile below the dam was reproduced carefully, and the major parts of the dam were duplicated in plastic.

"For instance, the spillway section of the dam was about 20 feet wide. By finding where the flaws lie, we have been able to experiment with corrective measures in order to improve the theoretical design. Splendid results have been obtained, and the savings in construction costs have amounted to many times the cost of the model."

FUTURE PROBLEMS

There are many problems connected with the design and construction of a project such as Chief Joseph. One of these, somewhat unique, arises from the nature of the various deposits on the north bank of the river at the dam site.

A porous gravel formation, generally about 100 feet thick, through which water flows at a rather high rate, 100 miles a year, lies on the bedrock. On top of the gravel and extending almost to the ground surface is a dense watertight formation of glacial till about 150 feet thick.

To prevent excessive leakage of water from the reservoir, something had to be done to prevent flow through the lower stratum of gravel.

Two alternate solutions were considered.

The first was to place a watertight blanket of glacial till, consisting of nothing but soil thoroughly compacted, on the bank above the dam.

The second was to tunnel back one-half mile through the top of the gravel stratum, and to excavate from this tunnel down to rock; then to fill the holes with concrete to form a continuous wall 5 feet thick resting on rock, extending up into the impervious layer, and back so far that water would be greatly retarded in seeping around it.

Since the soil blanket probably will be satisfactory, and it can be placed for considerably less cost than the cut-off wall, Colonel Hatcher elected to use the blanket.

Resolution Creating a Commission To Establish an Alternate Capital of the United States

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the heart of Washington, D. C., can be destroyed and a large percentage of its inhabitants killed or injured by one atomic bomb strategically exploded by an enemy power.

In that eventuality the nerve center of our Nation would be paralyzed.

Within the square miles of destruction accredited to one atomic bomb—not a hydrogen bomb—the White House, the defense establishments, the legislative offices and chambers, the Supreme Court, and the central offices of practically every vital department of Government are presently concentrated.

I have just introduced a joint resolution for the establishment of an alternate Capitol of the United States.

I have taken this step after sober consideration of the need for such action. My decision that an alternate Capitol should be established came as the result of an accumulation of knowledge during my service for the past 4 years on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. That knowledge imposes on me, as a matter of conscience, this proposal in the hope that a thorough study will be made of the subject. The continuity of Government functions in a period of national emergency created by atomic or hydrogen bomb disaster must be guaranteed. Such guaranty does not exist at the present time. It is the duty of Congress to proceed to reevaluate the importance of this facet of our national security in the light of present potential danger. Congress should make this study now, while there is time to make security plans with calmness and without any semblance of hysteria.

Joint resolution creating a commission to investigate the measures which can be taken to insure the continuous operation of the Government of the United States in the event of attack by a foreign power

Whereas the development of atomic weapons has reached the point where large cities and their inhabitants could be destroyed by a single explosion; and

Whereas an atomic explosion in or near the city of Washington could paralyze the functioning of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government of the United States; and

Whereas it is appropriate that timely measures be taken to protect the people of the United States, and to insure the continuity of their Government in the event of an atomic attack by a foreign power: Now therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby created a commission to be composed of seven members, as follows:

(1) One appointed from the Senate by the President of the Senate;

(2) One appointed from the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House;

(3) One appointed from the Supreme Court of the United States by the Chief Justice of the United States;

(4) Three appointed by the President of the United States, one from the National Security Council, one from the National Security Resources Board, and one from the Atomic Energy Commission; and

(5) The Secretary of Defense, who shall serve as chairman of the Commission.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall investigate and study the feasibility of establishing an alternate seat for the Government of the United States, to be used in the event of attack by a foreign power. The Commission shall consider particularly (1) possible sites for such alternate seat of government which would be secure against attack by a foreign power, (2) the buildings which would have to be constructed on or under any such site, and the facilities which would be required in connection therewith, to insure the efficient and continuous operation of the Government, and (3) the extent to which duplicate copies of documents and records would have to be made available at any such site to ensure the efficient and continuous operation of the Government.

(b) The Commission shall also investigate and study the various procedures which might be followed in selecting the successor or any President, Vice President, or Member of Congress who becomes unable to perform his duties as the result of attack by a foreign power.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall report its findings and recommendations to the President and to the Congress, together with such proposals for amendments to the Constitution of the United States as may be required by such findings and recommendations, on or before January 31, 1951.

SEC. 4. The Commission, or any member designated by the Commission, may, in carrying out the purpose of this resolution, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member.

SEC. 5. The Commission may, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

SEC. 6. Each department and agency of the United States shall, upon request made by the Chairman of the Commission, furnish to the Commission such services, information, facilities, and personnel as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

SEC. 7. Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in carrying out the functions of the Commission.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

Economy and Our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop in the Washington Post of February 20 gives us clear warning of the effect that economies are having in our defense structure.

Important economies should be made in other sections of our appropriations, because upon the degree of strength in our armed services rests our survival.

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

JOHNSON AND THE CHIEFS

The hardest question to answer about Louis A. Johnson's concealed disarmament program is why the Joint Chiefs of Staff have stood for it so long. The answer would seem to fall into several parts. The first part is the new atmosphere of blended favoritism that now pervades the Defense Department.

A pretty good symbol of the favoritism is to be found in the Secretary of Defense's outer office. Brig. Gen. Louis Renfrow, a plump relic of Johnson's American Legion machine, now presides there as his patron's special assistant. For a far from brilliant reserve officer serving as Johnson's appointments secretary, Renfrow has received remarkably high promotion. But that is not all. He was once a dentist. He is also drawing $100 a month supplementary pay under a rule designed to attract young dentists into the services.

The sum is not large. The arrangement is at least technically legal. But the symbol remains: the crony gets his perquisites while Johnson's economies bite deep into the sinew of American strength.

As for the intimidation, there is plenty of evidence concerning the Secretary of Defense's special methods of getting his way. One authenticated incident involved one of the two or three ablest senior officers in the Army, whose unpopularity with Johnson may probably be traced to his serious approach to defense problems.

Mere threats would of course not frighten the Joint Chiefs themselves. Yet it must be remembered that Bradley and Collins, Vandenberg and Sherman were all trained in an earlier period, as members of the defense services of a country that had no defense.

This prewar psychology has quite visibly survived, for example, in Gen. J. Lawton Collins, who is fond of repeating that his ground forces are in better shape than ever. It is true, and has been recorded in this space, that the Army alone has maintained its fighting units under the impact of Johnsonian economy. It is also true that these fighting units are in a fine state of training.

At least in his public statements, this seems to satisfy General Collins, yet he is making do with Second World War weapons which are in many cases obsolescent or actually obsolete. He has no tank force worth speaking of. He has in prospect only the smallest trickle of the new antitank weapons. Above all, because of Air Force economies, he cannot count on the slightest effective close air support, without which modern armies literally cannot take the field.

Finally, the Joint Chiefs must be well aware that in this matter of defense economy, the Secretary of Defense only differs from the President in wishing to go further and faster. The President made the original decision, in 1948, to forget the requirements of a serious defense, and to sacrifice defense planning to budgetary convenience.

Meanwhile, however, Soviet strength has grown visibly, and the world situation has worsened appallingly. Meanwhile, the defense planning of the Atlantic Pact nations, which is under the personal charge of the incorruptible General Omar Bradley, has begun to show how enormous are the gaps in our security. Meanwhile, Congress has been waking up, as is shown by Senator MILLARD TYDINGS' fine speech last week.

Thus far, Secretary Johnson has been able to count upon the Joint Chiefs' acquiescence, and to take advantage of it. But that acquiescence may not endure forever.

The Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of confused talk here in Washington about the Brannan plan. I have ample proof every day that the farmers are not confused about it. They understand it and they want it. And so do the consumers. Both groups realize that it would be the best way to keep the farmer solvent, cut food prices, and eliminate the terrible waste which is a by-product of our present plan.

Under leave, I insert in the RECORD a column written by Miles McMillin in the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis., reporting on sentiment on this vital program:

Democratic candidates for Congress in 1950 campaign will undoubtedly take a firm stand for the Brannan farm plan. But where will Republicans stand?

So far most of the Wisconsin Republicans in Congress have been doing a soft-shoe dance all around the question. Not long ago Representative Frank Keefe was put on the spot at a university forum when he was asked to state his position. He first tried to talk around the question, but when pressed for an answer he spoke favorably of the production-payment provisions of the plan, then launched into a denunciation of it and finally wound up by saying that he hadn't made up his mind.

Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, however, seems to have set the pitch for the GOP delegation from this State. He spent some time the other day in the Senate heckling Senator LANGER, North Dakota Republican who is an ardent supporter of the Brannan plan. MCCARTHY opened his remarks by saying: "I very heartily disagree with the Senator [LANGER] that the enactment of the Brannan plan will be of any benefit either to the farmer or the consumer."

MCCARTHY may change his tune when he finds that a lot of Wisconsin farmers, particularly those who have had an opportunity to hear the plan explained, don't share his views. There doesn't seem to be any doubt that the dairy farmers of this State are safe leaning more and more toward the Brannan plan because of the recognition it gives to perishables.

Farm Bureau people in Wisconsin will tell you that the intransigent opposition of the American Farm Bureau Federation to the plan has caused local Farm Bureau leaders a great deal of embarrassment. The opposition of the national leadership is not being followed by the rank-and-file member in this State, and the local Farm Bureau leaders know it.

A significant meeting was held down in Crawford County the other night at which the Brannan plan was debated. Crawford is a strong farm-bureau county, and the local there sponsored the debate. More than 300 farmers attended.

Herman Brandt, a farm-bureau man who owns a large farm outside of Oshkosh, spoke for the Brannan proposal, and another farm-bureau member opposed it. Ballots were passed around among the farmers who attended.

The farmers were asked to indicate on the ballots whether they were members of the farm bureau. They were asked to indicate their views on the plan before the meeting started and after. The results of the poll are quite significant.

Of the farm-bureau members who voted, 45 were for the Brannan plan before the meeting and 61 voted in favor of it after the discussion. Thirty-six were against it before the meeting and forty-six against after the meeting. Fifty-eight were neutral or undecided before and thirty-two after. This indicates that of 26 farmers who were undecided before they heard the plan explained, 16 voted for it and 10 against it.

Of the nonfarm-bureau members who voted, 30 were for the plan before the meeting and 42 after. Nine were against it before the meeting and sixteen after. Thirty-four were undecided before and fifteen after. The discussion convinced 12 of the soundness of the plan as against 7 who decided against it.

Equally as significant as the poll was the attitude of some of the farm-bureau members in the audience toward the national farm bureau. The speaker who was present to uphold the position of the national organization heard farm-bureau members stand up and quote recent Capital Times articles showing the tie-up of the national organization with big business.

It was obvious from the meeting, which lasted past 11 o'clock, the Brannan plan is certainly going to be one of the biggest and hottest issues in the 1950 campaign. Republican Congressmen are going to have a hard time ducking it.

What Can Be Done To Bring About Peace and Dispel the Clouds of War?

REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in my own mind I can see danger ahead for the security of the United States, and being of this opinion I ought not sit here and do nothing about it. We are today further from peace than we have been at any time since the actual fighting in World War II ended.

The United Nations organization was a good gesture, but nothing has been done by that organization and nothing can be done to stop a war between the United States and Russia if both countries pursue the course followed for 5 years.

I am certain the people of the United States and Russia do not want any war, and the question is: Are the people of the United States and the people of Russia powerless to prevent such a disaster? Is the fate of both countries tied up with what action the leaders take?

At the present moment both countries are feverishly arming and in five short years we find the United States and Russia, allies in the late war, hating each other and arming themselves to the teeth. I think nothing can be gained by not talking frankly. Russia is mortally afraid the United States will, with others, seek to subjugate the Russian country and we are mortally afraid that Russia seeks world dominion and will eventually destroy our system of government. When two such powerful nations are afraid of each other, naturally they arm; naturally they get ready to defend themselves.

And so the armament race is on and it will drain the substance of the people of both countries to keep it up, and if history repeats itself there will be a war to justify this unprecedented preparation. We were the first to have the atomic bomb, and we thought that would protect us, but since science cannot be bottled up, since minds still function, there is no monopoly on ideas and brain power. We must admit that, because Russia has the atom bomb. We are building a much

more powerful bomb, one that will destroy millions in 1 day. Instead of keeping that to ourselves, we publish what we are doing in the newspapers, evidently to scare out Russia. Evidence comes right back to us that we have no monopoly on that devastating bomb and there is little doubt but what the Russians have it now.

The threats of what each country has done and can do is not going to settle anything. In this state of mind we will not be bluffed and neither will the Russians. These new destructive weapons will only increase the possibility of war and will not prevent war.

Our North Atlantic Pact was another mistake and I so expressed myself on the floor of Congress. That only added proof to Russia that there was a movement being formed to crush Russia. It did not contribute to peace and the only effect was to foment war.

We financed the Marshall Plan which we boldly stated was for the purpose of stopping the spread of communism. There was nothing said about facism or any other isms detrimental to the welfare of the people of the world. Russia has not invaded any country for any purpose since the fighting stopped. Their ideas of government may have spread, but we have not money or resources enough in the United States to stop the spread of any idea.

We here in the United States quite overlook the fact that a great change is taking place all over the world. The day of exploitation is doomed and many countries that have lived on exploitation will be doomed. Does Great Britain, for instance, housed on an island two-thirds the size of North Dakota and one-fifth the size of Texas, expect to continue to maintain 47,000,000 people? She has succeeded because she was the manufacturing center of the world. She brought in raw materials from India and Africa and other points all over the globe and manufactured in England. These great fields of exploitation like India and Africa are fast disappearing. England used to buy a great deal of raw materials from us, but today we manufacture our own merchandise. Factories in America are moving to the fields of production too, and even New England will feel the loss in this new adventure of moving manufacturing plants to the places where the raw materials are produced.

It will make no difference whether there is a Socialist government in England or a conservative one. It will make no difference how much money we give away to England; it is becoming apparent that this British Empire will crumble and people will have to move out of England and settle elsewhere.

Our pouring of money into these foreign countries does not have the effect of bringing peace, but, rather the opposite effect.

What specific things should be done to stop this armament race between Russia and the United States? No other countries seem to be involved—or if they are, their ability to fight with effect has been pretty well reduced in the last two wars. President Truman in October 1948—or a short time before—proposed sending some new envoys to Russia to talk matters over. I think for one, he suggested Chief Justice Vinson. Our would-be leaders on foreign affairs blew up and the Secretary of State threatened to resign if that were done. Others said this move would offend the United Nations. In face of this bluster, the President did not take action. The United Nations have sputtered for 5 years and have not accomplished peace, our State Department has failed and all the representatives we have sent to Europe have accomplished very little that makes for peace, but have recommended action that in my opinion will prevent a peaceful solution of our differences with Russia. Do not the American people think it is time to send some other representatives? Send those who have not already created so much prejudice that they would be worthless in a mutual discussion with the Russians.

The President should again try to discuss matters with Russia and his so-called advisers should let him alone. They have all had their day in court and have not brought about peace.

Regardless of what the Russians do or how they may respond to the President's move for a discussion of peace, we should put our cards on the table and express a desire for a discussion and send representatives who have not lambasted the Russians from Dan to Beersheba. If we do that, it is more likely that Russia will keep the Vishinsky's, the Molotov's, and the Gromyko's out of such a discussion. In the hands of the United States and Russia rests the fate of the world, the fate of civilization, and I do not think either country wants to be a contributor to this complete destruction. If the United States and Russia can understand together what course to take, never mind other countries, never mind the United Nations, never mind the Atlantic Pact, but get right in and determine that this world shall not be destroyed and that there is room enough in it for both the Russian theory of government and the theory of free enterprise and individual freedom, which is our philosophy of government. It can be a peace with honor to the United States, a peace with honor to Russia, and a peace with honor to all countries and all peoples. These destructive bombs can be laid aside and an agreement reached to use this new scientific knowledge for peaceful progress and not for the extermination of all living things on this earth.

We do not have any monopoly on this destructive agency; neither has Russia, and neither side can be threatened. But neither side should use such a weapon, and if we can have this common understanding with Russia, we can go a step further and ask each other, "Why have any war at all?"

Above all we must convince the Russians that we seek no territory that belongs to Russia; we seek no new territories anywhere; all we want is peace in the world. That is the only aim of the President, as everyone knows, but our approach to the greatly desired end has bogged down by the action we have taken in Europe and Asia.

A new approach must be tried, even if it fails, and if the President again wants to try some new representatives to accomplish this purpose, he should not be harassed with threats of resignations or potshots from Congress.

Workers in Rubber Footwear Industry Imperiled by Proposed Tariff Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, evidence accumulates that organized labor is becoming more and more alarmed at the tendency of the administration to overlook the threat to industrial workers in the failure of our Government to stop the flow into this country of foreign products manufactured at a cost with which we cannot compete without lowering our standard of living. The peril to the century-old Massachusetts rubber footwear industry and to the 20,000 men and women workers in the industry is well shown in the following letter and statement which I have received today from the president of a local located in my district:

RUBBER WORKERS F. L. UNION,
LOCAL NO. 22763,
Malden, Mass., February 16, 1950.

Mr. ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GOODWIN: I am writing to you in my capacity as president of Rubber Workers F. L. Union, American Federation of Labor, Local No. 22763, and also in behalf of those rubber workers in our plant who are not union members.

We are authoritatively informed that a still further reduction in the tariff on waterproof and canvas rubber footwear is contemplated. Rubber footwear coming from Japan with its oriental standard of living and from Czechoslovakia with its nationalized industry which is within the Soviet orbit are produced with a labor cost with which we Americans cannot compete.

The threat, represented by tariff reduction, to an old New England industry concentrated chiefly in Massachusetts imperils not only our standard of living but our jobs as well.

I am enclosing a paper which sets forth the facts of the case.

I hope that you will use your influence to protect our jobs and our standard of living.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS MULCAHY,
President.

FEBRUARY 14, 1950.

Members of the rubber-footwear industry are greatly concerned and disturbed over the possibility that the administration may put into effect further tariff reductions on imports of waterproof and canvas rubber footwear. This concern is based upon information which is considered authoritative.

Any further reductions in the tariffs on these items would produce an effect upon the American rubber-footwear industry little short of disastrous. It would be impossible for the domestic industry to produce articles which could compete in price with the products of the nationalized industry of Czechoslovakia or with those of Japan with its debased oriental standard of living. These are the ocuntries of origin of the rubber footwear which would be sold here.

The rubber-footwear industry is an American enterprise about 100 years old, and at one time it supplied most of the world. But since the early thirties the American industry has been confined to the domestic market because of its inability to meet foreign low-wage competition. This domestic market the American industry is amply equipped to supply.

At present imports from these countries are priced at from 20 to 40 percent under the usual American prices. One must understand that the presence of even a small amount of low-priced goods in an industry as seasonable as rubber footwear can be a most upsetting influence on the market.

In the decade of the thirties, the threat to the American industry by the influx of rubber-footwear imports was so great that both President Hoover and President Roosevelt issued proclamations making duties on these products applicable on the American selling-price basis. That is to say, the rates of duty which were 25 percent on waterproof and 35 percent on canvas remained unchanged, but they applied to the domestic selling price of American-made footwear similar to the imported articles rather than to the selling price of the foreign product. In 1937, when the Czechoslovakian trade treaty was under consideration, this policy was sustained by President Roosevelt. In 1947, at the reciprocal-trade conference in Geneva, the American delegation granted concessions to Czechoslovakia on waterproof-rubber footwear which, in effect, cut the American duty in half, which means that the duty on Czechoslovakian footwear was reduced to 12½ percent.

This industry is one in which the labor cost in proportion to the total cost of the product is very high, namely, 47 percent. An attack upon the price structure becomes therefore an attack upon the wage structure of the American worker in this field and is also a direct threat to his job.

The industry at present is doing a business of about $62,000,000 annually, and it employs more than 20,000 men and women. These may not be, in relation to the total annual income, and to the vast army of employed workers in this country, imposing figures. However, this is of vital importance to New England and especially Massachusetts. Over 75 percent of this industry is located in southern New England, a small area already hard pressed economically, struggling to maintain its position in the American scene. A very substantial portion of this 75 percent, much more than half, is located in Massachusetts. This becomes, therefore, a matter of vital significance for this area, and some particular communities in it would suffer extreme hardship were this industry to become blighted.

Here is an example of how this thing works out with respect to a canvas oxford coming from Japan at an invoice price when landed here of $0.49. This shoe can be compared to an American canvas shoe that sells at $1.80. Now the tariff at the present rate of 35 percent of the American selling price is $0.62, which makes the total price of this shoe $1.11. The American shoe, you remember is $1.80. Now, with the tariff reduced by 50 percent, it would become 17½ percent of the American selling price. This is $0.31, making a total price of the Japanese shoe $0.80. With the tariff remaining at 35 percent but applied to the Japanese price, the tariff becomes $0.17 which makes the price of the Japanese shoe $0.66.

Precisely the same situation prevails in the field of waterproof footwear which comes from Czechoslovakia and on which the tariff rate is 25 percent.

These are the facts, a vital New England industry with a long history is faced with a situation which would make sheer survival difficult and certainly make any prosperity impossible.

Fallacy of Sea Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, during recent months the Nation suddenly has become aware of a painful fact—that we cannot be sure forever of getting enough water for our growing cities, industries, farms, and other water-consuming needs.

The West has been up against the problem for generations. Congress has approved projects that would help provide better distribution of what scant supplies we have out in the area that has become known as the reclamation States. During the past couple of years, the East has started to realize—in painful fashion, as evident from stories about shaveless and bathless days in New York, as indicated by burned up lawns and family gardens in New England communities last summer.

Whenever some of the people from California have pointed that water is essential to growth, remarks have been made that it can be obtained from the sea. There are suggestions about dropping dry ice on clouds or firing chemicals into the sky to bring about precipitation. Many sincere suggestions have been made about changing the course of rivers—killing two birds with one stone by ending flood damage while at the same time supplying areas without enough water.

Science has proved that rivers can be changed, clouds can be made to drop rain or snow, and salt water can be turned into fresh. Yet, I have not seen any explanation of who would pay the terrific costs involved in applying these methods to solve New York's present water shortage—that has been on the front page for several weeks. If the Federal Government is going to subsidize all the rainmakers and water distillers, to take care of New England and the Middle West in summer, California and Arizona the year round, we are going to have to get ready for a wallop at our pocketbooks.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to warn my colleagues that this is no simple problem. It is going to cost large amounts of money to perfect methods of distilling salt water and making it available at reasonable cost. Perhaps when the scientists have found out how to use atomic energy for peaceful means the cost will be much less. So far, though, they have not cleared that hurdle.

Everybody admits the problem is complex from a scientific standpoint. The financial difficulties have been clearly stated in a recent letter to the Los Angeles Times from Samuel B. Morris, general manager of the Los Angeles department of water and power. His department serves a large part of a fast-growing metropolis and is always on the alert to meet future demands. Mr. Morris says it will take a dozen Hoover Dam power plants to provide enough electric energy to run the stills and other apparatus required to provide Los Angeles with water from the ocean. If oil is used, the requirement is 40,000,000 barrels, which cannot be spared according to experts who say the United States is running out of petroleum and could not fight another war with its own supplies.

The problem is pointed up by the letter which follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times of February 6, 1950]

COST OF FRESH WATER FROM SEA

Recent letters from Times readers indicate a great interest in the subject of producing fresh water from sea water.

It is encouraging to see such evidence of community thinking on the very serious problem of water supply and we of the Los Angeles City Department of Water and Power appreciate the spirit that prompts the readers' comments.

However, we believe it is our duty to point out the matter of high cost entailed in the best known present methods of converting sea water. An authoritative article in Engineering and Science Monthly, published by the California Institute of Technology Alumni Association, shows that costs are almost prohibitive.

For example, water produced by a vapor-compression or thermal-compression distillation unit would be 13 to 17 times the present cost of Colorado River water. It would require 40,000,000 barrels of Diesel oil per year to provide the 1,000,000 acre-feet we expect ultimately to use from the Colorado River source of supply.

The electrolytic process is even more expensive. It would take 12 power plants as large as the Hoover Dam plant to generate power needed to furnish the equal of our full share of Colorado River water.

This statement is not intended to discourage research, but to show the great cost problems that will have to be overcome. In our enthusiasm for scientific progress we must not overlook the practical fact that our share of Colorado River water will enable cities in the southern California area to serve at least 5,000,000 persons, with a corresponding increase in industrial and commercial activity, in addition to the millions served by local and Sierra supplies.

The Colorado River supply is under attack now by Arizona, through legislation pending in Congress. If we are successful in defending the Colorado River water that is legally ours, and for the delivery of which we have constructed works, we will have added time in which to search for a sea water conversion process that is within the ability of our homeowners and our industries to pay.

Present known methods are completely out of reach financially.

The department of water and power always has endeavored to furnish water (and electric) service to its citizen owners at low rates. I therefore feel strongly that it is my obligation to bring this practical money matter to the attention of Times readers and the public generally.

SAMUEL B. MORRIS,
General Manager and Chief Engineer.
LOS ANGELES.

The Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include articles 11, 12, and 13 in the series by Mr. Leon Starmont, entitled "Let's Explore the Basin." Today's episodes indicate some of the problems in settling the huge Columbia Basin project.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 1, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 11)

(By Leon Starmont)

Spokane will get a taste of the Big Bend highway fight next Monday, when a victorious Warden group will lay before the Columbia Basin committee of the Chamber of commerce the case for the easternmost north-south highway, preferred by a 10-to-11 vote at Monday's Ephrata session.

Meanwhile, the Columbia Basin Commission will study a plan submitted by James H. Dodson, Grant County engineer at Ephrata, for a series of county primary roads and arterials to be financed by the State or Federal Governments, construction of which can parallel settlement of the newly irrigated lands as now projected for the next 5 years. The Ephrata gathering of 125 persons proposed that State funds be distributed on county roads until settlement is complete, running State highway construction to be deferred until later years.

WAHLUKE SLOPE BASIN

James E. Travis, assistant manager of the Hanford plutonium works for the Atomic Energy Commission, said the AEC would have to turn down all of three proposals advanced by the Yakima Chamber of Commerce for an east-west highway through the Wahluke Slope. More than 200,000 acres have been withdrawn for security purposes, of which 164,000 acres are classed as irrigable.

Turned down were:

1. A right-of-way for the Yakima-Connell cut-off via either the Wahluke ferry or a bridge to be constructed there.

2. Guarded gates at the east and west ends of the routes, that could be closed in case of danger from the plutonium plant.

3. A convoy system that would permit highway travel in groups with AEC guards preceding and following the cars so nobody could stop.

No objection would be raised to a new State road from Priest Rapids via Beverly, Smyrna, Corfu, and Othello, little longer than the Wahluke route, said Travis.

SECRETARIES CONFERENCE

Jack Rogers, chairman of the State Columbia Basin commission, and W. A. Bugge, State director of highways, agreed the Bitterroots exhibited by delegations favoring specific highways was regrettable, but that in a free country every man and group is entitled to speak its piece.

Most of those present refrained from voting on the question of the Warden route over the Othello route, 8 miles west, for a north-south State highway through the basin.

The Warden route already exists as a county highway, while the plan proposed by the county engineer would provide an east-west county highway along Crab Creek from Beverly and connecting at the county line with an extension into Othello. This is the same route suggested by the AEC executive for a State highway connecting Yakima with the Land area.

A delegation interested in the easterly north-south route, scheduled for next Monday's luncheon of the Columbia Basin committee here, will be headed by Al Wedmer, president of the Warden Chamber of Commerce, and Fred Radach, chairman of its road committee.

DODSON'S PLAN IN DETAIL

County Engineer Dodson submitted several alternate plans, but sentiment at Ephrata apparently favored his No. 1, which covers some roads in Adams and Franklin Counties as well as Grant

Dodson presented a map with the land to be irrigated by 1952 in orange, the 1953 tracts in green, the 1954 in pink, and the 1955 in yellow.

For 1951 construction he proposes a road straight north from Moses Lake to Stratford, crossing the Northern Pacific branch at Gloyd. The distance is 20 miles. He also plans 27 miles of county arterials in the area east of the main road and below the east low canal. He also plans about 32 miles of highway in the second largest of the first-year irrigation blocks, generally southeast of Quincy and south of the State highway.

For 1952 construction he plans some north-south feeders in the Quincy and Winchester areas, north of the State highway, and about 18 miles of arterials south of U S 10 and east of Potholes Reservoir, surrounding on three sides the Barkan dunes.

Dodson's third-year road-building program would call for new roads in the Warden area, extending into Adams County, and some additional construction south and west of Quincy and southeast of Trinidad.

That would leave for the fourth year an extensive area west of Warden and another lying generally east and southeast of Burke, between U S 10 and the almost forgotten Lowgap, where a tunnel is to pierce a low spot in the Frenchman hills for ultimate irrigation of their south slope north of Crab Creek.

Dodson figures that 25 percent of the roads will be arterial and will cost $15,000 per mile to construct. The other 75 percent can be constructed at $8,000 per mile or a total cost of $12,300,000.

Grant County's share of new roads is 870 miles, to cost $6,500,000.

SEVEN YEARS TO FINISH

The total cost of $12,300,000 for Grant, Adams, and Franklin Counties, over 7 years, Dodson said, will mean an expenditure of $1,850,000 per year.

"The counties do not have the money. It will have to come from some outside source in the form of a grant, loan, or bond issue," he added.

PARKER FOR 1950 START

H. A. Parker, supervising engineer for the irrigation project, made it quite clear that if the roads are not built in time for the settlers, the Bureau might as well show up in its efforts to get water on the land. He said work could be started this spring on roads leading to the farm units that will receive water in 1952.

"It can be done in 1951, after the legislature meets, but it will be a big job," Parker said.

By a resolution presented by the Quincy Chamber of Commerce, the Governor was asked to declare an emergency for roads in the Columbia Basin, and State funds allocated for building new State highways in the area, would be used for county roads.

Jack Rogers, chairman of the Columbia Basin Commission, and presiding officer at the meeting, pointed out that the law would have to be changed to reallocate State road funds. He thought this would be hard to do.

"An adequate system of highways must be provided," Rogers declared. "It is the State's responsibility."

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 2, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 12)

(By Leon Starmont)

Spring'll be along soon, but deep snow and clogged roads have halted work at most Columbia Basin construction points. So, while waiting for chinooks and snow plows, let's take a quick look at current basin projects in Oregon. Montana and southern Idaho, finishing Sunday with the present status of interbasin shifts such as moving Columbia River water to California.

Oregon, of course, shares Bonneville and McNary Dams with Washington and will share the major dams also proposed at The Dalles and John Day River's mouth, to provide 980,000 and 1,105,000 kilowatts respectively in their power installations, and to irrigate 286,000 and 380,000 acres.

ALSO SHARES HELLS CANYON

Another major project, Hells Canyon Dam on Snake River, to generate 900,000 kilowatts, will have its east end in Idaho and its west end in Oregon.

These dams are all included in the list of 93 projects placed before Congress and the Buget Bureau, with request for authorization, by the Army's Corps of Engineers and the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation.

Omitting, for the time being, the other 312 projects slated for ultimate development, the must list for Oregon alone includes four Bureau projects to irrigate 22,000 acres, and nine Army power projects to develop 323,000 kilowatts. Largest of the power projects asked is Meridian Dam, on the Middle Fork of the Willamette, 115,000 kilowatts.

The figures mean little unless coupled with data on projects already authorized or already constructed.

Also in the Willamette, under construction, is Detroit Dam, on the North Santiam, which with added facilities will develop 84,000 kilowatts and store 432,000 acre-feet of water for downstream use.

And on the Willamette's Coast Fork, south of Eugene, Dorena Dam is going up. Its principal purpose is storage, plus flood control.

Also authorized are three major storage projects—Sweet Home on the South Santiam, 315,000 acre-feet; Lookout Point on the Middle Fork, 600,000 acre-feet, and Quartz Creek on the McKenzie, 785,000 acre-feet, with 128,000 kilowatts of power.

STANDS BY ITSELF

Willamette River, rising in the Calapooyas and running northward between the Cascades and the Coast range, generally has more of a flood than an irrigation problem.

Yet the Army engineers, who have done cost of the planning there, figure on watering 514,000 acres, or roughly as much as is now left, with the Wahluke and wheatland withdrawals, in the Big Bend project in central Washington.

More than any other tributary of the Columbia, the Willamette stands self-sufficient by itself. There are 24 power sites in the valley, according to the latest information on the comprehensive plan. The Army plans ultimate power development at three of the seven sites originally marked for flood-control storage only.

There are already 24 power plants operating in Willamette, with 135,000 kilowatts capacity. It is the most thickly settled of the Columbia's valleys.

While these waters, entering the Columbia below Portland, play no part in inland empire irrigation projects, they nevertheless contribute to the Northwest power pool.

SCARCE IN EAST OF OREGON

There are enough votes in the valley to make sure that the middle Columbia, upper

Columbia, and Snake are not going to permit upstream projects to outstrip the first-settled section of Oregon.

Insiders say a fight is already being made to eliminate one central Oregon bureau project, the Crooked River part of the Deschutes irrigation set-up, from the comprehensive plan now before the Budget Bureau in Washington. It would irrigate about 10,000 new acres northeast of Bend and send supplemental water to 10,000 more. Its cost is estimated at $5,278,000.

This would leave only the 4,000-acre Bully Creek extension of the Vale project, and the 4,500-acre western Dalles project, for eastern and northern Oregon. The power projects in the present list, outside the major dams, are all in the Willamette Valley. Largest, aside from Meridian, is the Green Peter, in the middle Santiam, 81,000 kilowatts and 322,000 acre-feet storage.

FLOOD-CONTROL ESTIMATES

The budget request calls for some $130,000,000 for minor lower Columbia and Willamette Valley projects, including $20,000,000 for a fishery plan and most of the rest for channel improvements, levees, snag clearing, and betterments to navigation.

Bank protection is proposed at 66 locations, levee modification at 28.

For comparison, there is $15,227,000 asked for upper-stream flood control, including projects at Bonners Ferry and Clark Fork, Idaho; Missoula and St. Regis, Mont., and the Okanogan, Wenatchee, Yakima, Entiat, Methow, Crab Creek, and Wilson Creek, Walla Walla, Touchet, and Mill Creek channels in Washington.

The total cost of the 93 projects, as indicated earlier, is $2,250,000,000, at current price levels. With efforts going on to remove some of the Oregon and Idaho projects, observers indicated addition of any central Washington irrigation item would face an uphill fight.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 3, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 13)

(By Leon Starmont)

Montana has only one major power project and two minor irrigation projects among the 93 for which authorization is asked in the comprehensive plan of the Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation, now before the Budget Bureau at Washington, D. C.

Montana's share of the $2,252,664,000 program is $248,200,000, or a little more than 10 percent. That doesn't mean much for most of Montana is in the Missouri rather than the Columbia Basin. The Missouri "comprehensive" involves $6,125,000,000 or almost three times the Columbia. That is one fact emphasized by those who believe the Pacific Northwest should stick to the custom of going to Congress every session for appropriations.

LIBBY DAM AT JENNINGS

Libby dam, on Kootenay River at Jennings, is the one big project left in the current Montana picture. Glacier View Dam on the Flathead having been eliminated because of the protests of sportsmen and dude ranchers, backed up by the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior.

Hungry Horse, on the Flathead's south fork, a Bureau of Reclamation project, is already under construction. It will regulate water for Montana Power Co. plants at Polson and Thompson Falls, and for all the other plants down the Pend Oreille and Columbia, including Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, McNary, and Bonneville.

Libby Dam will cost $239,077,000, develop 588,000 kilowatts, and store 4,250,000 acre-feet for the dams down the Kootenay. It is second only to Grand Coulee (9,700,000 acre-feet) among the projects now built or authorized, or for which authorization is sought. It will back water far into British Columbia, which will receive compensating benefits. Another Kootenay River dam at Katka has been deferred.

BITTERROOT IRRIGATION

A Bitterroot Valley project in the comprehensive plan will cost $8,979,000, store 88,700 acre-feet above Missoula, irrigate 1,700 new acres, and supplement the water supply of 48,300 acres now irrigated.

There is also a 1,200-acre addition to the Missoula irrigation district, at a cost of only $156,000.

Channel improvements are also proposed on Libby and Flower Creeks in the Kootenay drainage. Marked for later development, but not present authorization, are reservoirs on Yaak and Moyie rivers to store 435,000 and 322,000 acre-feet, respectively, the outlet of the latter being in Idaho. Also scheduled for later consideration is a 25,000-kilowatt power project on Yaak River.

On the tributaries of the Pend Oreille a much more extensive power development is contemplated, much of which has been delayed by objections of several localities to valley flooding.

In Montana, 23 potential power projects in the Pend Oreille Basin, not including those already developed, total 1,797,000 kilowatts. To others down river in Idaho total 175,000 kilowatts.

FLATHEAD IRRIGATION

In the Flathead, major tributary of the Pend Oreille, about 85,000 acres are now irrigated. This is to be much enlarged by projects in which the Indian Service has a hand. Because of the more complex picture caused by Indian projects and private ventures, estimates of irrigable land in the Flathead lack the exactness now charted for other Columbia Basin areas.

Irrigation development in the lower Flathead and Little Bitterroot Valleys was initiated by the Reclamation Service in 1907 and was turned over to the Office of Indian Affairs for completion and operation in 1924. All of the irrigated land is within the Flathead Indian Reservation, much of which was opened to non-Indian settlers under the act of April 23, 1904, and virtually all of the irrigated area is within the Flathead Indian project.

The Flathead Indian project, with a designated ultimate area of 138,195 acres, is made up of three units or divisions: Mission Valley, 111,660 acres; Camas, 13,170 acres, and Jocko, 13,365 acres. Of the ultimate project area, nearly 107,000 acres are now under constructed works.

NON-INDIAN DISTRICTS

The non-Indian lands of the project have been organized into three irrigation districts under Montana law and each has entered into a repayment contract with the United States. The district lands aggregate 99,405 acres. Indian-owned lands within the project total about 28,500 acres, and the remaining 10,290 acres of the ultimate project area are State and county lands.

The Camas division, in the valley of Little Bitterroot River, is irrigated by gravity diversion from that stream, supplemented by storage. The water supply currently available is inadequate for the 13,170 acres of the designated ultimate area of the division with the result that not more than 5,000 to 10,000 acres are usually irrigated each year.

The Mission Valley division is irrigated by gravity diversions from tributaries of Flathead River, supplemented by storage and by pumping from Flathead Lake.

The Jocko division is supplied by gravity diversions from Jocko River and Finley Creek. Both the Mission Valley and Jocko divisions occasionally experience moderate water shortages.

Storage for the entire project is provided in 14 reservoirs with a combined capacity of 142,725 acre-feet. The Flathead River pumping lift is approximately 330 feet.

The Cost of Mr. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to call the attention of the House to an article entitled "The Cost of Mr. Johnson" written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop and appearing in the Washington Post for Friday last.

Secretary Johnson is very boastful about the preparedness of our armed forces and emits from time to time utterances that are alarmingly jingoistic. I am very much afraid that the estimate of the situation by the Alsop brothers is entirely correct.

The article follows:

THE COST OF MR. JOHNSON

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

There should be no mistake about it. Behind the false front of Louis A. Johnson's defense "economies," there lurks something even more unpleasant than petty domestic politics. There lurks, in fact, the specter of our eventual defeat in the world struggle with the Soviet Union.

The reason why this is so can be very simply stated. The Soviet Union is in mid-phase of a program of rearmament considerably surpassing Adolf Hitler's. Meanwhile, because of Louis Johnson's policies, the United States, the leader of the Western World, is patently failing to give solid strength to the western confederation against Soviet aggression. This is happening in several different ways, and on several different levels.

It is obvious, for example, that the divided and mutually suspicious nations of the Atlantic Pact can never organize efficient defense unless this country takes the lead in the hard, day-to-day planning. Almost all the regional defense groupings in Europe wish us to do so. The biggest and infinitely the most important grouping, the western union, has actually asked for an American officer to replace Field Marshal Montgomery in command at Fontainebleau.

Both the British Field Marshal, who would be supplanted, and General de Lattre de Tassigny, who rearely agrees with Montgomery, are at least in accord on this point. Western union can accomplish little without an American to serve as umpire. Yet "my Joint Chiefs of Staff," as Johnson sometimes calls the JCS, have refused to take part in the European planning process in this responsibility-creating manner. Atlantic Pact planning has thus been limited to the vague and cloudy top-level.

The motive is plain. If we assumed serious responsibility for western defense planning, we should immediately be pressed to make western defense a real thing. Johnson's economy policy forbids this sort of effort. The military-aid program for Europe has some psychological value, but on balance the Atlantic Pact is degenerating into

a mask for weakness. Here again we are being misled by Johnson, as his annual report discloses.

Despite the power of the Red army, despite the Soviet atomic bomb, a serious defense of the west can be organized, at reasonable cost, by our allies and ourselves. It is not being organized simply because we are not making our necessary contribution, and because this, in turn, demoralizes the European effort. The plainest case in point is that of Europe's air defense.

The Soviet heavy bomber force is relatively small, and comprises only obsolescent aircraft of B-29 type. These aircraft can be rather easily stopped by a modern air defense, combining first-rate fighters and the powerful antiaircraft guided missiles that are now proven. Thus an effective European air defense, which would neutralize the Soviet atomic bomb, is now entirely possible.

However, the western Europeans lack the resources to build this sort of air defense themselves. Meanwhile our own fighter groups, already shockingly reduced, are being further weakened by the low aircraft replacement rate that is one of Johnson's major economies. Our guided-missile programs are also being held back to their inexpensive early phase. In short, the job is not being done. The growing Soviet atomic stockpile will therefore be available to terrify the Europeans into submission.

The truth is that the strength of the United States must be the very backbone of the strength of the west. That backbone is being chipped away at, if not broken, by Johnson. Previous reports have disclosed the progressive, still continuing impairment of our capability to guard the sea lanes across the oceans. Yet who can expect determined European resistance to Soviet aggression if the Atlantic sea lanes are even temporarily interrupted?

Equally, it has been shown that we may not be able to press home strategic air attacks against Russia's vital centers in 2 or 3 years' time. Yet a promise to destroy the Soviet vital centers, very shortly after the outbreak of any war, was the chief contribution of our representatives to the Atlantic Pact staff talks. If our allies see that we probably cannot keep our major promise, who can suppose that the western confederation would hold together? Indeed, certain signs of disintegration are already appearing.

These are the reasons why the specter of defeat now looms before us. It does not so much matter as yet that this continent is also totally devoid of air defense, and that Alaska, the natural Soviet bridgehead, is quite unguarded. In the new era of intercontinental struggle it is unlikely that we shall suffer the first attack. The Kremlin's first goal will be control of the Eurasiatic land mass and the decisive isolation of the United States.

Because of Soviet rearmament and American disarmament, the Kremlin already has this goal in sight. Because our allies will feel deserted by us, the western confederation will most probably crumble under Soviet menaces, whenever Soviet rearmament is complete. In that event, we shall experience the equivalent of a gigantic defeat in war, without, perhaps, a shot being fired.

Let no one suppose, either, that after our expulsion from Europe and Asia, the situation can be restored by warfare between continents, carried on by us alone. It is unthinkable that we should try to force our way back across the oceans behind a barrage of guided missiles carrying hydrogen bombs, germs to produce pandemics, and the like. If these events we are inviting are allowed to come to pass, we shall have only two alternatives.

One alternative will be to surrender in our turn. The other will be to abandon all that is good in our society, and to transform this continent into one vast, bristling, wholly militarized, permanently alerted armed camp. Such is quite possibly the cost of Mr. Johnson's policy.

The Federal Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert an article by David Lawrence, published in the Washington Evening Star of February 17, in the RECORD:

TRUMAN FINDS HIMSELF ON DEFENSIVE OVER BIG FEDERAL DEFICIT—JACKSON DINNER SPEECH INDICATES HE REALIZES EXTENT OF VULNERABILITY

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman seems to have found himself on the defensive in the political arena. His speech at the Jackson-Jefferson dinner reveals for the first time that, while the leader of the Democratic Party doesn't like to admit it, he realizes how vulnerable his administration is on the big Federal deficit.

The President implied that it would be easy to dispose of the new cry of "socialism" by a simple denial that any Democrats are Socialists. He pointed to the prosperous-looking diners, intimating that those who pay $100 a plate for dinner aren't believers in socialism but rather the exponents of a firm faith in the strength of free enterprise.

What the President omitted to mention was that the diners were, for the most part, job holders on the big Federal pay roll or persons directly or indirectly benefiting by the largess of the Democratic administration.

REPUBLICAN "SCARE WORDS"

Mr. Truman revealed that he felt somewhat the sting of the recent Republican platform with its "liberty or socialism" slogan, which he referred to as "scare words." He went back to 1933, as all Democratic stump speakers do nowadays, to remind his hearers about the unemployment of those days and the reconstruction job done by the New Deal in the thirties. Unfortunately, the unemployment figures have just reached a new postwar high and the deficit is the largest in any peacetime year.

Mr. Truman devoted a large part of his speech to explanations as to why expenses couldn't be cut and accused the economizers of being willing to weaken the security as well as the domestic economy of the Nation. The group in Congress which is demanding economy includes many Democrats. So, in that sense, Mr. Truman was perhaps more nonpartisan than he realizes.

The speech undoubtedly will be regarded as a keynote. It will, unless circumstances change before the autumn elections, furnish the main line of political campaigning.

Mr. Truman's words, which were directed at the status of the deficit, sound as if he knows already the attack that is coming from the Republicans. He says:

"At the present time, they are spreading the mistaken idea that we can save money by going backward. They advocate slashing our expenditures for peace and for our domestic programs. These people are blind to the problems that confront us."

WORKING TO BALANCE BUDGET

"It is true that our present expenditures are large. But the Democratic administration is working toward a balance in the Federal budget. I wish we could balance the budget immediately by the simple expedient of cutting expenses. But that is out of the question."

Mr. Truman then repeats the old wheeze about 70 percent of the expenses being for past wars and for peace in the future. He says: "I would like to cut expenditures further, and I intend to do so at every opportunity."

But the answer to this is that the administration has recommended increases in spending nearly every year since the war and, notwithstanding a severe decline in receipts due to a business recession, the expenses for this year and next are scheduled at a high level.

The Republicans have a real chance to influence the whole course of Government policy by fighting it out on the economy issue, showing the proposed cuts that the Hoover Commission recommended and economy proposals that Democrats like Senator BYRD, of Virginia, have offered.

Maybe the Republicans hope to blend the word "socialism" with something akin to communism, but isms are rather abstract things to understand, whereas a government running in the red by billions is something everybody can understand. Much more descriptive than a welfare state or a socialistic state is the bankrupt state which develops when political spending becomes a habit.

How Far Dare We Let the Government Go?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Democrat of January 19, 1950:

HOW FAR DARE WE LET THE GOVERNMENT GO?

Arkansas Representative BOYD TACKETT has taken a hot shot at the Federal Interior Department and its Southwestern Power Administration. His target is a loan asked of the Rural Electrification Administration by six big rural electric co-ops in Missouri, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Texas, to build steam generating facilities and transmission lines.

Mr. TACKETT charged that the SPA would have control over the co-ops, under its contracts with them, and is using this method as a back door to an expansion which goes beyond the authority given it by Congress.

He said the SPA is thus seeking to use the good name of Mr. Claude Wickard and the fine rural-electrification program to foster a grandiose scheme of dominating electric power in the Southwest. He declared that the REA's funds should go to provide more electric service to farm people, and not to advance what he charges is the Interior Department's aim of socializing electric power in the United States.

Mr. TACKETT has introduced a bill to require congressional approval of REA loans for electric facilities which would be used by any other group or agency—like the SPA. Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma has introduced a similar bill in the upper House.

This is another case which brings home to Arkansas the menacing growth of Federal authority. If we countenance it, and support it when we think we have something to gain, how can we, without hypocrisy, denounce the extension of that authority to serve the interests of other groups elsewhere?

You will recall that the TVA, as urged by President Roosevelt, was to be primarily for flood control and navigation work. The power generated was to be a yardstick of costs for regulating private utilities.

But look at the yardstick now. The Federal Government will soon be producing 15 to 20 percent of the Nation's power—with many other huge projects being pushed. If the Government takes up the distributing of this power, building stand-by steam plants and lines competing with private lines, what will happen to private enterprise in this field?

Let the Government sell the power generated at its flood and navigation dams to private concerns. It has ample authority to regulate them. If we help to cripple, maybe kill, one private enterprise, be sure that others will be the next victims.

Vigilance and Effective Opposition Can Save the Medical Profession From Socialistic Control

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my candid opinion that the apathy which has prevailed for the past number of weeks in pushing a program relating to the welfare state and socialistic legislation, is only the lull before the storm.

The proponents of legislation dealing with such a program may be sitting out and awaiting the February 23 election in England. If they succeed in duping the people into voting them back into office, such occurrence may have certain repercussions in our own country. The success of the Socialists in England may be hailed by certain segments of society in this country as a great victory for the welfare state. That may prompt the present administration to make socialized medicine and public-health insurance the first order of business on the welfare program.

To date, all polls, investigations and personal surveys indicate that the medical profession is decidedly opposed to socialized medicine; but what is more encouraging, the people of America are evidencing their mistrust in the plan and their dislike for it. Decided opposition has cropped up, and is presently manifesting itself in terms of protests from many individuals and organizations who are not affiliated with the medical profession or interested in activities that are incidental thereto.

Aggressive opposition to the plan should not be relaxed for a single minute.

A recent poll, published in the Washington Post, discloses that throughout the Nation people who understand the administration's over-all socialized medical plan and compulsory health-insurance plan, were opposed to it in the ratio of 3 to 2.

Only 54 percent of the adults questioned were able to present arguments for or against the Truman proposal—the opening wedge for his welfare state, which is bound to lead us down the road to socialism just as surely as it did in England.

The principal argument which the proponents of the plan rely on is that it would provide medical aid to those sick and indigent who are not financially able to meet the cost, all of which, they maintain, is tantamount to assisting the impoverished and thereby improving the Nation's health.

The argument interposed against the compulsory medical plan deals chiefly with prohibitive costs—the encroachment upon the private rights now enjoyed by the individual practitioner by Government functionaries, and the inescapable fact that it would lower the standards now prevailing in the practice of medicine and mitigate against the patient in need of medical care and attention.

One person in three, or 30 percent, could give the correct answers when asked how the plan would be paid for; saying "pay-roll deductions," "taxes," or "like social security." When informed that both pay-roll deductions and additional taxes were necessary to meet the bill for the national health program to be administered and controlled by the Government, 10 percent voted in favor; 17 percent, against; while 3 percent reserved decision.

It is my contention that the information broadcast by the administration has not only been confusing—with an idea of creating an aura around its head—but that the tabulations dealing with costs, method of operation, and just how far the plan would apply to individuals who are nonwage earners, Government employees, or those on public-assistance rolls have been distorted deliberately. Under the proposed plan more people would be omitted than under the social-security plan, now being administered by the Government. Nonprofit health plans and that of commercial insurance would be destroyed, and medical attention would be geared to quantity—not quality.

Unless an educational program is undertaken by the medical profession, supported by States, counties, cities, and communities, our people will discover—just as did the people of England—that governmental control will reach not only every life in America, but deeper into every purse, and that Federal control means the kind of compulsion which Americans like no better than Englishmen.

We are gradually being drawn into a socialistic pattern. The insidiousness with which it is done works on the same principle as creeping paralysis. A popular definition of socialism is that it is a disease which fastens itself upon a weakened society. The depression years from 1921, war, and the loss of export trade, which meant England's lifeblood, are all partially to blame for the British allowing themselves to be insinuated into statism, with welfare and security as the bait.

Many well meaning and thinking Americans contend that we are being victimized by similar tactics.

At the time the National Health Service was foisted upon the British there were few, if any, private plans available for medical insurance which was within the means of the average wage earner or heads of families.

That is not true in this country, where numerous forms of insurance, such as Blue Cross plans, Blue Shield, commercial insurance, and so forth, are within the reach of 70 percent to 80 percent of our population. The rapid growth and development of the various methods of voluntary health protection during the past decade is a clear indication that the American people prefer to pay for their medical, surgical, hospital, and all types of incidentals thereto as they see fit, and to whom they choose.

During 1948, the number covered against loss of income increased by more than 2,000,000, while the number covered against the cost of hospital and surgical care increased by approximately 8,000,000.

I quote from a survey made by the survey committee of the Health Insurance Council, in which you will see that the total number of persons covered, for hospital benefits is 60,995,000; for surgery, 34,060,000; and for medical coverage apart from surgery, 12,895,000. These figures show an increase of 93 percent in the past 10 years, without the cooperation of the Government for its employees.

The following statistical tables reflect the progress of health protection through private enterprise:

Number of persons protected

Type of protection	Dec. 31, 1948	Dec. 31, 1947	Increase in 1948 (number)	Percent
Loss of income	33,410,000	31,224,000	2,186,000	7
Hospital expense	60,995,000	52,584,000	8,411,000	16
Surgical expense	34,060,000	28,247,000	7,813,000	20
Medical expense	12,895,000	8,898,000	3,997,000	45

Comparisons over a longer period are not available in every case, but the following figures serve to illustrate the growth in protection during the past decade:

Number of individuals covered at end of indicated year

Coverage	1939	1943	1945	Increase during last 5 years	Increase during last 10 years
Hospital expense: Group insurance and Blue Cross plans combined	8,200,000	19,400,000	47,200,000	27,800,000	[illegible]
Surgical expense: Group insurance and plans sponsored by medical societies or affiliated with Blue Cross	100,000	8,900,000	24,400,000	15,500,000	24,300,000
Medical expense: Group insurance and plans sponsored by medical societies or affiliated with Blue Cross	----------	800,000	5,400,000	4,600,000	5,300,000

It will be noted that these comparisons are noted only to show the rapid rate of growth. Because of the inadequacy of statistical sources prior to 1947, the preceding table omits the very impressive record of coverage provided through individual insurance policies, consumer-sponsored prepayment plans and other important methods of voluntary protection.

SUMMARY OF SERVICE

1. Insurance against loss of income due to disability

A. Insurance companies and fraternal societies	16,643,000
B. Paid sick leave:	
In private industry	4,509,000
In civilian Government service	2,750,000
C. Employee mutual benefit associations	1,408,000
D. Union plans and other employer-employee methods	2,000,000
Grand total	33,410,000

2. Hospital, surgical, and medical coverage

	Hospital	Surgical	Medical
A. Insurance companies and fraternal societies:[1]			
Personal	13,689,000	11,203,000	2,442,000
Dependents	12,295,000	8,423,000	902,000
Total	25,984,000	19,626,000	3,344,000
B. Blue Cross plans sponsored by medical societies:[1]			
Personal	13,626,000	4,771,000	2,711,000
Dependents	17,630,000	5,625,000	2,001,000
Total	31,246,000	[illegible]	4,712,000
C. Other organizations:			
1. Bituminous coal industry:			
Personal	220,000	200,000	[illegible]
Dependents	300,000	300,000	350,000
2. Consumer sponsored	1,000,000	1,000,000	[illegible]
3. Industrial, excluding coal mining	1,200,000	1,220,000	[illegible]
4. Private group clinics	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
5. University health plans	100,000	[illegible]	[illegible]
	3,763,000	3,520,000	3,520,000
Grand total	60,995,000	34,000,000	12,986,000

[1] This does not include individuals covered solely by Government under compulsory plans.

With these figures in mind, let us look at England, which more nearly resembles the administration's prospective plans than any other. Their experiment in socialized medicine—instead of being the blessing they anticipated—has proven to be a tragedy. That Britain sorely needed more medical care is not open to challenge. On the other hand the indisputable fact is that she has not obtained it. What actually took place was that care made available was spread so thin that it is now inadequate for everyone.

In England, the National Health Service, which came into being on July 5, 1948, has cost twice the original estimate—and for many of their patients seeking examinations or medication in one form or another, it has meant endless hours of waiting; overcrowded conditions; and in most instances, indefinite appointments for hospitalization; and that those seeking medical attention must "queue" up in a fashion resembling a depression bread line.

Mr. Aneurin Bevan, Minister of Health, said in a press conference at the end of the service's first fiscal year—October 6, 1949, that—"the total cost of the service was not to be regarded as an additional burden on the community—but in the main as a vast transfer from the private to the public purse."

The public purse, as everyone knows, is fed by individual contributions made from private purses—in England, just as it is here. Those contributions are measured only by one yardstick—taxes. The British felt the bite and the decreased efficiency in their medical service, and they do not like it. We, too, will feel the bite of taxes, and deplore the inferiority of professional service and care, in the field of medicine, if we are gullible enough to accept in full the administration's socialized medical plan.

Payments from the national insurance fund—pay-roll deductions—to the National Health Service in England, were $112,000,000. The cost to the end of the first year was $840,000,000. The balance of $738,000,000 was paid by additional local and national taxation. This meant more taxes for overburdened industries, and yet another load added to a people who were already the heaviest taxed in the world.

The service as administered by the Socialists has become a vast, calloused, inhumane, and cold-blooded machine, which only adds sorrow to the suffering, and deepens their misery. This system has conclusively demonstrated, in addition to its unworkability—that it leads to a rationing of doctors; the destruction of initiative and professional independence. It has redounded to the benefit of only 2,000 out of some 18,000 who "joined" the National Health Service, by their own admission.

According to the pattern followed in England under state medicine, the pharmacist is circumscribed by his share of red tape comparable to the rationing days in the United States.

The preparation and sale of prescriptions is not managed in terms of convenience—or choice; but governed by zoning areas measured in distances of miles. For instance, if a patient lives 1 mile or less he gets his drugs from the store nearest the doctor. If he lives 2 miles or more from a store he gets his drugs from his doctor, who is supplied by the government. If he lives between a mile and 2 miles it is optional whether drugs are supplied by his doctor or not.

This makes the druggist subject to the personal likes or dislikes of the zone physician. The natural consequences are that the druggist stands to lose both financially and in patronage. Clearly, under such a system it is quite impossible to build up good will.

As an example of the meagerness of the entire service we might point to their slogan, which is, "security from the cradle to the grave"—yet the evaluation of this security is $16 for the cradle, and $80 for a Christian burial.

The United States has always been known to have the highest medical standards in the world, and the lowest mortality rates. Supporting this proof is the difference in the medical facilities for care and hospitalization in England, as weighed against ours.

I quote from The National Health Service of Great Britain, page 8, by Willard C. Rappleye, M. D., published by the Josiah Macy, Jr., Foundation, New York:

> On the appointed day (July 5, 1948) 3,426 hospitals, convalescent homes, and clinics passed from the control of their own boards to that of governmental agencies, which had been created during the tooling-up period, a transaction of major dimensions.

No other country in the world has a network of hospital facilities that are comparable with ours. This network represents $45 per capita or $108 per employed person. In terms of assets each bed represents an investment of $4 598.

The Federal Government owns only 372 hospitals which have a capacity of 185,000 beds for the armed forces, United States Public Health, Veterans' Administration, Indian Affairs, Penal, and Narcotic.

State, county, city and city-county operate 1,528 hospitals, with bed capacities as follows: State, 648,386; county, 101,327; city, 73,797; city-county, 11,159.

Total governmental, including Federal, amounts to 1,900 hospitals, with 1,019,767-bed capacity and 15,757 bassinets.

In the nongovernmental classification, there are 4,435 hospitals which fall into the following categories:

Church, 1,068; nonprofit organizations, 2,016, with a total bed capacity of 352,972, and a bassinet capacity of 62,635, according to a table published by the American Medical Association, May 7, 1949. This classification is rather confusing since the Catholic Welfare Council lists 725 hospitals in the United States, which are run by 184 different religious orders or units. The Protestant Hospital Association, lists more than 550 hospitals which are directly connected with Protestant churches, with a possibility that there are 500 more interdenominationals, which are directly or indirectly connected with church groups.

To permit the Government to take these over, as President Truman proposes, would, in the instance of those of the Catholic faith, regiment 184 orders which are dedicated to the care of the indigent and ill. Those of the Protestant faith provide facilities of the same nature and would be similarly affected. That also can be said of the great Jewish hospitals in the country. Aside from the humanitarian aspect of a hospital, religious, fraternal, and racial contacts not infrequently come into play in the conduct of the institutions.

I personally believe it not out of place to assume that removing or interfering with impressions and the comfort derived from the respective faiths they cling to, would deny to the sick the unimpeded opportunity to give full expression to their spiritual beliefs, and by indirection would interfere with individual religious commitments.

In addition, there are 973 individual and partnership-owned hospitals, which have a bed capacity of 27,567, and a bassinet capacity of 5,668. Those run by corporations or on an unrestricted profit basis total 378, with a bed capacity of 23,214 beds and 3,536 bassinets.

In 1946, the last figure available showed 496 unregistered—either AMA or AHA—hospitals with a bed capacity of 16,172—or an average of 50 beds per unit. These hospitals are usually owned by group doctors and surgeons, who have pooled together to supply the needs of their communities and their patients in rural or local areas. There is no reason to believe that this number has not increased since the lifting of building restrictions due to wartime priorities.

I would like to point out here that there are more than 10,000 bills and resolutions presented—all on problems relating to public health, during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. Some of these are duplicates, but 291 bills are now pending, along with a large number in the Senate.

The Hill-Burton building plan, Hospital and Construction Act, which became Public Law 725 in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and was amended by laws 830 and 380 in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, reached an early stage of operation in 1948, with its matching of Federal, State, and local funds; while leaving control in the communities and localities in which the hospitals are built as needed, and according to the requirements of the population seeking benefits from this plan. There are 1,019 projects. Of this number 662 have been finally approved. More than 139 general hospitals, health centers, clinics, and laboratories have already been completed.

A great many hospitals are also being built without Hill-Burton plan funds which will help round out the country's hospital facilities. The Hill-Burton program was painstakingly planned to produce a balance of facilities for all communities.

When the FSA propaganda campaign began setting forth the great need for the compulsory health-insurance program in 1948, it is significant to note that despite all the danger signals—we had the lowest death rate ever recorded in our history. Specific attention was called to the fact in the FSA statements that 1,241,185 citizens per day were receiving hospital care—but there were factors involved which offset the alarm. The first of the following is, of course, the most important. The last, is the obvious reasons for Nos. 2 and 3.

First. Admissions went down.

Second. Percentage of occupancy went up.

Third. Daily census went up.

Fourth. Length of stay went up.

It is also important to note that 1948 brought a sharp downward trend in admissions after many years in which this figure climbed steadily. And, lest the figure for the number of the population daily hospitalized startle you—let me emphatically point out that while there might have been 1,241,185 citizens in hospital beds—99 percent of our population were ambulatory and active.

It is my contention that it is not only dangerous to allow bureaucratic laymen to dabble in the sciences of which they know nothing—but that it would disorganize and impede the splendid progress the medical profession has made in this country. Under free enterprise and competition, commercial, philanthropic, and religious organizations are being constantly urged forward by the pressure of public demand for expanding research and scientific exploitation in the medical arts.

Assuming the Government becomes the sole overlord in the management and operation of hospital and health services, it is quite probable that the advantages gained in the medical profession would be slowed down and unnecessarily impaired. This would tend to restrict a profession that constitutes one of the most vital segments of our democracy.

The foundation of our country was laid—and depends upon the sense of personal responsibility which exists in the hearts of its citizens. Compulsory insurance—this opening wedge of statism, with the same promises of welfare and security which duped the people of Britain should be militantly opposed. Why? Because it would abrogate not only the responsibility of the individual—but do great and irrevocable harm to the inhabitants of the community and the state as well.

Let us keep in mind the many facets of the issue when we are again called upon to face this cunning internal revolution—this insidious approach to the eventual completion of the plans for a welfare state, as was so aptly presented in the February 4 issue of Collier's article, Mr. Welfare State Himself, which clearly outlines the plans afoot, as well as the ambitions of the satellites who head up the FSA. In the February 11 issue, Collier's presents the story of Dr. Ralph Jocelyn Gampell, The Doctor Who Brushed off "Utopia."

We are in the danger zone, make no mistake about that, when our United States Supreme Court has ruled: "The State has a perfect right to control and administer whatever it subsidizes."

With the obvious draw-backs provoked by socialized-medicine experiments, with their attendant deteriorations of standards, there is no excuse for our allowing the lives of our ill and indigent to be turned into nightmares of neglect—offering them additional distress and indifferent and stereotyped attention.

I quote Mr. Truman:

> I depend upon our peculiar genius for combining governmental and voluntary activity to expand and maintain our hospital system.

Candidly speaking, this is being done to a limited extent, with the aid of such acts as Voluntary Health Insurance Act (S. 1456); the National Health Insurance Act (S. 1581), and the National Health and Public Health Act (S. 1679) in conjunction with the Hill-Burton legislation and others, which is designed to aid the individual communities to fulfill their needs—whether it be for assistance in building hospitals, or in the interest of educating and training specialized personnel to staff them, or providing needed equipment.

In all of these, particular emphasis has been directed to giving special consideration to rural, local, or sparsely populated areas where the greatest needs are for more available doctors, and proper equipment for treatment and diagnosis.

Legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act of 1946, and known as H. R. 5940, is now pending in the House, and was drafted with a view of lessening the tension related to some of the apparent grievances with which the medical profession has to contend. In this bill provision is made because of the shortage of physicians, optometrists, dentists, dental-hygienists, nurses, and other health personnel, including hospital administrators, for the education and training of such personnel, and the expanding of facilities and opportunities through Government aid and financial grants.

Practical nurses are also included in the vocational-education section of the bill. They are to be trained for subacute, convalescent, and chronic patients under the direction of a licensed physician or a registered professional nurse.

H. R. 5940, and others which have preceded it, nor the legislation which may follow, may not prove to be a complete cure-all or panacea tending to alleviate the conditions with which we are confronted. However, it must be conceded that there are not now enough doctors and nurses to meet the ever-present demand for such personnel. The legislation herein noted is designed to improve upon the present situation and to make immediately available opportunities and facilities for those who wish to have a share in protecting and guarding the health of the people of our country.

Basically, the bill proposes not to regiment personnel or socialize medicine. The fundamental objective of Federal aid as contemplated, and through legislation outlined in H. R. 5940, is to financially aid students who aspire to become doctors, dentists, nurses, and so forth.

The legislation also has for its objective that of providing funds for building health centers and modern hospitals and providing means for securing proper and modern equipment to operate them.

In the final analysis, the bill places the management as well as the allocation of funds not exclusively in the hands of inexperienced or untrained Government appointees, but the management and supervision of what H. R. 5940 hopes to accomplish, is with conditions attached delegated to the United States Surgeon General and his council.

Bills like H. R. 5940 are worthy of study and consideration. If they are intended to prevent regimentation of personnel and institutions or the administration thereof, and restrict interference with the curriculum of medical schools in general, we are on safe ground—provided that there is no radical deviation from maintaining the present high professional standards, ethics, and scholastic requirements.

Continuing forward in the science of medicine, under those circumstances, may show a swift, steady, and healthy growth, without destroying anything that has made it what it is today. The objective which transcends all others involved in this timely subject is that we will not relinquish in any degree our basic probity nor the trust and confidence which has obtained through practical and traditional achievements

and experience in the great profession of medicine.

The connotation of the word "compulsory" itself instinctively stirs up in the consciences of men and women accustomed to independent thinking an impulse toward rebellion.

Laws which are venal and obnoxious of their very nature have always been frowned upon and treated as incompatible with the fundamental principles of liberty and justice.

Therefore, it may be assumed that the medical profession, and any or all activities that are kindred or incidental thereto, will not readily lend themselves to the enactment of any legislation which is inherently destructive in character, and objectively despotic, and is obviously partial to a socialistic philosophy.

Controlled and socialized medicine unquestionably requires additional revenue, that can only be secured through one source; that is, higher and more taxes. In place of helping the poor and the needy, is it not logical to assume that such a course would exact from them contributions they could ill afford? It is axiomatic that the moneys they part with must be withheld from expending them for other needs or comforts.

Would not then the whole plan militate against the poor man in that he has to skimp and save and forego buying clothing, food, and those commodities which constitute his daily sustenance in order to get the tax load off his back?

All of which might militate against improved conditions in public health in place of contributing to the objective of advancing sciences where it is sought to prolong life in place of lessening the opportunities to live.

Economy and Self-Reliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SANBORN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter I received from an Idaho housewife, Mrs. Lester M. Johnson. Her letter is well stated, to the point, and constructive. I believe it should be made available to others.

DEAR MR. SANBORN: May I express the hope that, as Representative from Idaho, you will take a leading role in directing the country back into the path of economy and self-reliance?

My husband is a veteran, a member of the Reserves, and in the moderate-income group, yet we feel very strongly that any favors done to any of these groups will, in the end, cost us far more, as taxpayers, than the price we would have to pay for them if we were able to save and achieve them for ourselves.

We believe that people should be encouraged to provide for their own medical care, housing, retirement, etc., except in cases of extreme poverty. I am also in favor of the Taft-Hartley law as a very necessary control over the labor monopolies and feel that it might have been invoked more often.

I should like to see CVA shelved—at least until sincere public demand from this area and a surplus of Government funds make it more advisable to consider it. The present Government hardly has a record for efficiency, honesty, or plain common sense that would lead anyone to want to confide any greater powers to it.

I feel that the thinking voters of the country would prefer a little belt-tightening to the present hopeless spiral of increasing taxes, national debt, and expensive projects. You can hardly expect us to welcome a tax increase if we believe that; instead of paying for past and present debts, it will go into some crack-brained scheme for a Government-owned Utopia.

We can still "cut our coats to fit our cloth"—why can't the Government do the same?

MRS. LESTER M. JOHNSON.

BOISE, IDAHO.

Cooperation, Not Competition, Will Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by C. F. Byrns from the Southwest American:

COOPERATION, NOT COMPETITION, WILL PAY

(By C. F. Byrns)

A good way to cut Federal Government expenses is to use private enterprises instead of competing with them. That is exactly what will happen in Arkansas, Oklahoma, and other States in this area if pending contracts governing Federal electric power sale are approved by the Interior Department.

Douglas Wright, director of the Southwestern Power Administration, is responsible for the sale and distribution of electric power generated at federally owned dams on the Red, White, and other streams in this section of America. Lately, he negotiated contracts with the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. and Public Service Co. of Oklahoma for distribution of Federal power through the privately owned electric utilities. Similar negotiations are under way with other power companies in the same area, including Arkansas Power & Light Co., Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., Arkansas-Missouri Power Co., and Missouri Utilities Co.

This week, Wright told the House committee considering his budget requests that he will cut $5,000,000 off the expense for the year beginning next July 1 if these contracts for finally approved. The reason is this: He is asking for $5,000,000 in that 1 year, with more to follow, for construction by the Federal Government with Federal money of facilities for distribution of Federal power. Those facilities will not be needed if the contracts are approved for distribution by the private companies.

The proposed contracts make the best possible use of the electric power being generated and planned in the Southwest.

They provide a way to use the hydro power for peaking purposes—that is, for carrying the excess load of demand at the peak hours, while steam plants owned by the private companies carry the normal around-the-clock demand.

Everybody in the power business, both Federal and private, recognizes that peaking power is the most profitable use of hydroelectric energy in this part of the Nation. The stream flows in this area are widely variant. Continuous power from hydro plants requires continuous flows of the streams in large quantities. We do not have that. But we do have many opportunities for developing hydro power as an incident to flood control, silt control, navigation, and other water uses. That power should be put to use in the public interest, on the most economical basis possible.

Under the proposed contracts with the private companies, Federal power will be sold to them at the Federal power plants and at existing interchange points between federally owned and private lines. The private companies will deliver power for the Federal Government to customers now on their lines or hereafter put under contract for use of Federal power.

This arrangement removes the necessity for spending large sums of public money to build power plants.

No Government Will Work in a Land Where Everyone Tries To Work the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a very great pleasure for me to take advantage of the opportunity afforded for permission to extend my remarks to include a statement recently made by the Honorable W. Arthur Simpson, commissioner of social welfare of the State of Vermont.

He has reduced to six paragraphs all worth while which has been said in volumes. Every Member of Congress ought to cut this extension out of the RECORD and carry it with him or else learn it as he would the Ten Commandments. It is the complete and perfect answer to all those who insist that this is a good Government to live in so long as they may live off it. With these people, unfortunately, every State is filled to overflowing today.

He well says that security is not the product of political power. He might well also have said you cannot legislate to make men honest, tolerant, or civic-minded.

This comprehensive yet compact statement of the issue which confronts the American people of today should have wide distribution and greater comprehension:

If this Nation is to survive we must learn that security is not the product of political power.

Government can wave no magic wands, issue no decrees, make no laws which will provide things for a people who do not produce.

The only riches which enable us to eat and drink, to clothe, shelter, and educate ourselves and our families, to provide a measure of security in old age and to enable us to aid the less fortunate are the riches that are created through the skills of men in industry and business or grown through the efforts of men on farms.

The moral basis of society is being destroyed by the incessant scramble for higher wages, higher profits, higher pensions, more leisure and rigid prices for agriculture.

It is easy to forget how to plow when everyone wants to be a harvester.

No government will work in a land where everyone tries to work the government. When you take away the incentive to produce and the penalty for loafing, you are on the slippery road to ruin. We can take out of our economic system only what we put into it.

W. ARTHUR SIMPSON.

Rural Electric Co-Ops in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by C. F. Byrns from the Southwest American for February 14, 1950:

OFF THE RECORD

(By C. F. Byrns)

Representatives BOYD TACKETT and JIM TRIMBLE have lately disagreed in House speeches on a proposed plan for rural electric co-ops in Arkansas to build a steam-generating plant and electric transmission lines and lease them to the Southwestern Power Administration for a long period. Gordon Brown, Associated Press Washington writer, said in a Sunday column their disagreement is holding up REA approval of the local asked by the Arkansas co-ops.

A disagreement between these two men which reaches the point of House speeches is rare enough to provoke interest. Both are ardent supporters of rural electric cooperatives. Both are accustomed to speaking their frank opinions. I imagine a good many people in the Fourth and Third Congressional Districts would like to know what the disagreement is about. I wanted to know, too, so I asked each of them to tell me.

After reading the speeches of both of them on the floor, it is clear to me that both are strong for the rural electric co-ops, as they always have been. They have a different view of the effect of a proposed contract between the rural co-ops and the Southwestern Power Administration.

This proposed contract would provide for the newly formed group of Arkansas electric co-ops to borrow money from the Rural Electrification Administration to build a large steam plant to generate electricity and transmission lines to distribute its product, and then lease it to the Southwestern Power Administration for operation. The contract with the SPA is the point at issue between the two western Arkansas Congressmen.

Representative TACKETT interprets it to mean that SPA would own the steam plants and transmission lines built with REA money at the end of the proposed contract period. He points out that Congress has refused to appropriate money at SPA's request to build steam plants and transmission lines. He urges that SPA is trying to do indirectly what Congress has refused it permission to do directly. In addition, he charges SPA is using the good name of the rural electric co-ops and the REA to accomplish its purpose of building duplicate facilities to compete with privately owned electric utilities in the area. He believes the contract would give SPA eventual control of the policies of the rural electric co-ops.

Representative TRIMBLE does not agree with Representative TACKETT's interpretation of the contract nor his conclusions as to its effect. Representative TRIMBLE says the proposed steam plant and transmission lines would remain the property of the rural electric co-ops and would not pass to SPA at any time. Neither, in his opinion, would SPA be able to dominate the policies of the rural co-ops. Representative TRIMBLE points that the rural electric co-ops are private enterprises, owned by their members, buying electric energy wherever they can get it at the best price, from either privately operated utilities or the SPA which sells power from Federal power projects in the Southwest. He thinks the proposed contract with SPA is a proper exercise of the co-ops' right to make the best arrangement possible for purchase of power. He sees no danger of SPA domination of the co-ops operations.

Representative TACKETT has introduced a bill to require congressional approval of any REA loan to build any facility to be leased to any other agency for operation. Representative TRIMBLE thinks such a bill would be a serious restriction on the freedom of the co-ops to manage their affairs efficiently.

The two Congressmen agree on their support of the co-ops. They disagree up to now on the meaning of the proposed contract. Everybody concerned will likely have a clearer idea of what it's all about as a result of the controversy.

Resolution of Council of Lithuanian Societies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my many American Lithuanian friends, I include a resolution passed on the occasion of the banquet held under the auspices of the Council of Lithuanian Societies in commemoration of the Thirty-second Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the people of Lithuania, held at the Lithuanian Hall on the sixteenth day of February 1950, in Baltimore, Md.:

"Whereas by overwhelming military forces Soviet Russia occupied Lithuania in 1940 and now arbitrarily deprives Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia of their independent political life; and

"Whereas since the said occupation of Lithuania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics pursues a ruthless policy of planned liquidation, deportation, and dispersion of the Lithuanian people in order to destroy the Lithuanian national entity, and

"Whereas the crime of genocide, which the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is perpetrating upon the defenseless Lithuanian nation violates all principles of human rights and has been outlawed by the convention of the United Nations General Assembly; and

"Whereas the afore-stated genocide pact will be presented for action before the United States Senate: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That our representatives at the United Nations request that steps be taken by the General Assembly to impel the withdrawal of all Russian organizations from Lithuania; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the United States Government enter into no peace settlement without the restoration of the freedom and independence of Lithuania and similar nations; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we urge our esteemed members of the United States Senate to ratify the genocide convention."

The foregoing resolutions were adopted by unanimous vote at the Thirty-second Anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania Day, under the sponsorship of the Council of Lithuanian Societies held this sixteenth day of February 1950, in the Lithuanian Hall, Baltimore, Md.

ANTHONY J. MEYERS, President.

MARTIN BAILA, Secretary.

Truman and the Press—Once-Humble President Tells Off Reporters at Heated Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article by Doris Fleeson, published in the Washington Evening Star of February 17. The article speaks for itself, and would apply to a President of either party after he becomes power hungry:

(By Doris Fleeson)

"Pray for me," the new President of the United States begged Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt on April 12, 1945.

February 16, 1950, the same President of the United States told the Washington press corps in so many words that the king can do no wrong.

Harry Truman's brush with the press is an amusing story. The President is a very human and transparent man with a touchy temper. Reporters tend to be creative and imaginative, else they would not be reporters, and while they are usually congenial as individuals, they can be hard to handle collectively.

But superseding questions of public interest stem from the unprecedented press conference yesterday where a cocky President baited the press and the press stood its ground.

What is eating the President?

Does the secrecy which is the order of the day regarding paths to peace hide some dreadful revelation that is still to come?

Or it is that power has tended to corrupt the once humble man who closed his first message to Congress April 15, 1945, with a prayer for "an understanding heart * * * for who is able to judge this Thy so great people? I ask only to be a good and faithful servant of my Lord and my people."

NOT BATTLING OWNERS

It is important to the understanding of why Washington asks these questions to realize that President Truman this time was not battling and belittling newspaper owners. Many of them, perhaps a majority of the most important ones, prefer the Republican Party.

President Roosevelt, this being so, skillfully created the illusion of a deathless feud between himself and newspapers in which reporters secretly sided with him but were helpless to interfere. President Truman has retouched this pretty picture along the same lines. At this two hundredth press conference recently he said he liked the conferences and reporters as distinct from their bosses.

But the President first rubbed, then sought to bulldoze: (1) He real friends among the press and the with whom he was more popular than any President since T. R.; (2) by-line writers who can take Harry Truman or leave him alone but who support his aims and keep them in perspective before the public.

What the President did was to break a White House rule by giving an exclusive interview to Arthur Krock, head of the Washington Bureau of the New York Times. Like everything Mr. Krock writes, it was a lucid, beautifully written story, and it explored the state of the President's mind with respect to our present cruel dilemmas.

Mr. Krock concluded it with a bread-and-butter letter in the form of a tribute to the President which is one of the very good notices that the Democratic Party, the Fair Deal or New Deal, or the last two Presidents have got under his signature in years. What Mr. Krock's favorite statesman, Senator Byrd, of Virginia, said when he read it is, unfortunately, not on record.

GREAT JOURNALISTIC FEAT

It was a great journalistic feat and reporters who are not still too speechless with rage are begging Mr. Krock for lessons on how to batter a man so gracefully that he will beg you to accept the Kohinoor diamond.

When the story broke Wednesday irate reporters pounded Charles Ross, the President's press secretary, regarding it. Mr. Ross, who never permits a syllable of news to pass his lips until it has first been printed in the World Almanac, fended them off as best he could. At the same time, puzzled Democratic politicians were asking how come.

At this point versions vary. Some reporters profess to know that Mr. Krock had the idea of synthesizing what he had heard the President say at social gatherings, that Mr. Ross helped fix up the interview, that the President saw Mr. Krock Monday and approved it.

A politician who saw the President is authority for the statement that the President did not authorize the interview as printed, that he had consented to have his views expressed socially printed without direct attribution but that calling it an interview and the Q. and A. form employed were unfair to him.

In any case, the President was spoiling for a fight when the press entered the oval study the next morning.

It is not permitted to quote him directly—it's a White House rule—which is a pity because only the abruptness of the Q. and A. conveys the President's attitude fully.

ALL IN GOOD HUMOR

The scene would have had its comic side for a disinterested observer. But the angry, emotional participants were in dead earnest.

The President had the advantage of respect for the presidency. Mad as they were, the reporters sensed their peril and their voices fairly throbbed with objectivity.

The first to take the gloves off, the President said yes, he had authorized the interview. Then he pitched in.

The reporters, he said, seemed to be in kind of a disgruntled mood. The President is his own free agent, he continued, he will see whom he pleases, when he pleases, and say what he pleases to anybody he pleases, and he is not censored by reporters or anybody else. He said he had tried his best to be polite and courteous but he didn't like the reporters' attitude that morning, so they should just cool off.

Being the aggrieved party, the reporters who are allergic to being lectured, too, paused for breath and one of their elder statesmen, Earl Godwin, radio commentator, sought to pour oil on the troubled waters. Every bureau chief and reporter in Washington considered the story a reflection on them, he said soothingly.

The President replied that it was nothing of the kind. He said he didn't intend for anybody to edit his actions, he was a free agent.

After some skirmishing in which the President again exclaimed that he was a free agent, the question was put whether or not interviews would now go by favor with the no-interview rule disarmed.

WILL DO AS HE PLEASES

The President replied that there was a custom and that they would continue that custom and that he would do as he pleased in regard to interviews.

Asked if this somewhat contradictory statement were his answer, he said it was. He added impatiently that he would like to answer some questions that had a bearing on the present situation.

"Some of us think our business is very important, sir," a reporter said.

The President replied that sometimes he was not so sure.

A really ominous pause ensued. Some reporters weighed giving the signal for the end of a press interview—"Thank you, Mr. President." How many then would have walked out is a question. Probably the President would have retaliated by ending the press conferences for good.

But other questioning began, none of it very fruitful.

The President remains the President. He has lost personal ground, however, that he cannot regain.

PREVIOUS EXCLUSIVE RECALLED

Many people are convinced he means to run again. The operations of his temperament are such that incidents like these will make him want to do just that. It is probable, for example, that he really didn't intend to put the rest of the press in the hole, exactly as he told his political visitors, but that when he got pounded he could not refrain from telling them where to go. That is Mr. Truman.

Mr. Krock also got an exclusive interview with President Roosevelt on the Supreme Court packing plan. Mr. Roosevelt always claimed he was betrayed by Mr. Krock; nobody who knew him well took that seriously. Mr. Roosevelt thought a New York Times interview would help him, so he connived at it but bruited his alibi about.

Mr. Truman has no such guile in his makeup. He probably did not realize that such a storm would ensue or that his pals would turn on him. And Mr. Krock is a very plausible reporter. If this is the situation, Mr. Ross is the one to blame.

It is probably good for the Washington reporters to have "put not your trust in princes" driven home to them again. In this city reporters have social standing, they are sought after and catered to. Many Democrats now in power are singularly beguiling people. But reporters need to write on their hearts Lord Acton's dictum, "Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

Use of Rural Electrification Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Texarkana Gazette for January 26, 1950:

TACKETT ON GUARD

Congressmen these days must be eternally alert to prevent an ever-expanding bureaucracy from usurping the powers of Congress and pushing forward projects which not only have not been approved by the Congress but have been disapproved by that body.

A case in point is the program dreamed up by the Southwestern Power Administration to use rural electrification funds to build a $4,835,000 steam-generating plant and $4,740,000 to build transmission lines.

Congressman BOYD TACKETT of the Fourth Arkansas Congressional District caught on to the scheme in short order and is doing everything in his power to block it.

TACKETT charged that the arrangement was a scheme to gobble up electric coooperatives and eventually to federalize electric power. In doing so, he said, the SPA has, in effect, gone deliberately contrary to a refusal by Congress to give it such funds.

Congressman TACKETT deserves the commendation of his constituents for bringing this matter to the attention of the Nation. He has introduced a bill which would effectively curb such schemes.

Jeffersonianism Is South's Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, being a friend of Mr. Charles Coburn, distinguished actor and movie star, I take pleasure in asking that his article, Jeffersonianism Is South's Need, and also the editorial on this subject by the Savannah Morning News, be inserted in the RECORD. Mr. Coburn, in addition to being a great actor, is also a realist and is deeply concerned about the welfare of his country.

The matter referred to is as follows:

JEFFERSONIANISM IS SOUTH'S NEED

(By Charles Coburn)

We often hear the expression, "I am a Jeffersonian Democrat." Why not say, "I am a Jeffersonian Republican." The original name of Jefferson's Party was the Republican Party. And, according to the Encyclopedia Britannica, "the day of its birth has been definitely fixed as May 13, 1792, that being the date of a letter from Jefferson to Washington in which is made the first authoritative claim of a name for the party of which Jefferson had become the recognized head. Actually, the seeds were sown in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 when the first battles were fought between those who wanted a strong centralized Federal Government, and those who wanted the least possible Federal Government consistent with national security. In the debates of that convention can be located the democratic germ plasm, the ultimate growth of which, under Jefferson's genius, was the establishment of a party whose theory aimed at direct popular control over the Government; which championed the rights of the masses and was really democratic in theory and in fact; which was based on the fundamental belief that the people are capable of governing themselves * * * equal rights for all, special privilege for none, and stood militantly for religious liberty, free speech, and a free press."

Later Jefferson's party became known as the Republican-Democrats, and it wasn't until after Andrew Jackson's election in 1827 that the party name really changed from Republican to Democratic.

Therefore, it would seem to me that an intelligent political point of view would be one that is influenced only by the principles of a party, regardless of its name.

Thus we find that Jefferson's Republican principles grew out of the anti-Fascist principles, and the principles of the original Democratic Party grew out of the Jeffersonian Republican Party. So, while the principles remained the same, the name of the party changed three times. Those principles were strongly for States' rights, and for a government to serve the people and to protect them in the pursuit of happiness which included the principles of free enterprise, free speech, free press, and freedom of religion.

The Republican Party of today embraces all of the foregoing political principles of Jefferson. Now let us look at the picture from the other side. The present Democratic Party, after the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and now, of Harry S. Truman, has completely abandoned the democratic principles of Jefferson, through the centralization of governmental power in Washington—by gradually robbing the individual States of local self-government; by impoverishing the individual citizen through abusive use of the power to tax; by a fantastic increase in the number of Government employees; by unnecessarily spending more and more money for the purpose of drawing more and more votes to its political banner; by shackling our system of free enterprise; and strongly advocating the principles of socialism under the alluring titles of "welfare state," "planned economy," "socialized medicine," and "security for all."

If this Government continues at its present rate of taxation and spending, in a very short while the United States will be in a worse position economically than is England today, for in a helpless world we will have no one to help us, and that is exactly what Stalin wants.

If you believe in the political principles of Thomas Jefferson, but because of a prejudice against the name "Republican" you vote to keep the present Democratic administration in power, then you are subscribing to principles contrary to Jefferson's; you are a traitor to your own political belief; and you are as guilty of establishing a dictatorship as if you believed in a dictatorship.

A SOUTHERNER SPEAKS OUT

In his article on this page today entitled "Jeffersonianism Is the South's Need," Charles Coburn, the distinguished actor, advances some thoughts regarding the Republican Party as differentiated from the New Deal Party which the Morning News believes it would be well for all voters in this region to consider seriously and carefully.

Mr. Coburn, an internationally known figure in the movie and stage world, is a native of Macon, Ga., and spent his boyhood and youth in Savannah. Starting as an usher in the old Savannah Theater he has risen to fame in the amusement world and is considered one of America's outstanding actors. Throughout his career he has been an ardent supporter of the finest traditions of the Old and the New South. He has adhered to the customs and manners of this region and has been a loyal adherent of the principles for which the hosts of Lee and Jackson fought during the fateful days of 1861 and 1865.

He has been one who views the political scene in the South realistically. He believes in the two-party system as being the only means by which the States of this region can ever hope to establish their rightful place in the national political sun. He is a conservative who recognizes the solemn truth that the Government cannot continue its wild orgy of spending beyond its income without running into disaster.

His article on this page today sketches the evolution of the Democratic Party as Mr. Jefferson conceived it, first as the Republican-Democratic Party and then as the Democratic Party. Mr. Coburn emphasizes the historical truth that Mr. Jefferson's Republican principles grew out of the anti-Federalist principles and that the principles of the original Democratic Party grew out of the Jeffersonian-Republican Party. "Those principles," he points out, "were strongly for States' rights and for a government to serve the people and to protect them in the pursuit of happiness which included the principles of free enterprise, free speech, free press, and freedom of religion."

The Morning News believes it is important for our leaders to consider what this distinguished son of the South has to say, because we believe he puts a finger on the real truth as to what southerners should do in the future if they wish to vote intelligently in national elections. Our men and women for too many years have been disposed to follow blindly the idea that because their fathers and grandfathers supported the so-called Democratic Party they should support what today is the New Deal party.

The Roosevelt New Deal and the Truman Fair Deal, as Mr. Coburn convincingly points out, have completely abandoned the democratic principles of Jefferson through the centralization of governmental power in Washington. To which he adds that these two regimes have robbed the individual States of local government, brought about a fantastic increase of the Government employees, abused the power to tax, and challenged our system of free enterprise.

Mr. Coburn thus bespeaks the argument that The Morning News, for many months, has advanced that southerners should cease their ill-advised loyalty to the New Deal and Fair Deal and return to the kind of republicanism and democracy for which Thomas Jefferson stood. The challenge is obvious. It is summed up in Mr. Coburn's stern view that if this Government continues its present rate of taxation and spending, in a very short while the United States will be in a worse position economically than is England today. For, in a helpless world we will have no one to help us, and that is exactly what Stalin wants.

The actor's arguments, in the opinion of this newspaper, are sound and convincing and, therefore, are among the most challenging we have seen for a long time. It should be remembered that they come, not from a citizen of the North who knows nothing about the traditions, customs, and manners of the South, but from a man who was born and bred here, one who loves the South and all it has stood for in the past, one who is as anxious as any southerner alive to see this section become an important political segment of these United States of America.

Taxpayers Carry Bogus GI Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from New Orleans States of February 15, 1950:

TAXPAYERS CARRY BOGUS GI SCHOOLS

Probably hundreds of thousands of GI's, possibly several millions of them, dipped into the education and job-training program without any appreciable benefit to themselves outside of the money collected, but with tremendous cost to taxpayers. Abuses of the Bill of Rights benefits have been enormous because Congress in drafting the legislation left the doors wide open for slick promoters to organize weird schemes having the color of legality but little else.

The large-scale hatching of gyp schools to milk the Government and milk the vets was described in a series of articles printed in this newspaper several weeks ago. They were written by Benjamin Fine, education editor of the New York Times. The majority of the schools was asserted to have been organized to reap the fat fees Uncle Sam paid, in good faith, to school and train his fighting men. Irregularities and inadequacies in 1,287 of these institutions were reported to the Veterans' Administration.

President Truman now presents a catalog of abuses to Congress and asks remedial action. The vocational and trade schools having real merit and offering sound instruction and training are not to be confused with the gyps that are clearly substandard and offer merely makeshift training. The VA admits that enough poor-quality training is in evidence to warrant serious concern.

The annual cost of GI education and job training is still running about $2,500,000,000 nearly 5 years after the end of the war. Huge gobs of this money are wasted. Representative TABER says a billion could be lapped off the annual outlay without harm to a sound GI program. Here is a compelling invitation for Congress to get economy-minded.

Farm-Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am asking permission to insert in the RECORD a letter which I consider to be a fine analysis of the farm problem, especially as it looks to us who are from the city. Mr. Blank, as you will note in the letter, has had considerable experience along this line. I certainly concur in his sentiments.

The letter follows:

MARTIN H. BLANK & ASSOCIATES,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 2, 1950.

Congressman NORRIS POULSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POULSON: My purpose in writing to you is to convey my thoughts in regard to farm-support programs, not only as a taxpayer and consumer but as an experienced agricultural economist. I am not only experienced in paying taxes for farm-support programs, paying food bills for six members of our household, but I have made a successful living from services rendered to clients in the marketing of agricultural products over the past 17 years. Many years ago, I worked in Washington as a junior economic expert for the Federal Farm Board. Therefore, I feel properly qualified to discuss the matter of legislation covering farm-support programs.

I have no quarrel with the basic concept of Government supports and assistance to our farmers and to our agricultural industries. I realize that in a great democracy, such as our own, a free play of economic forces can prove disastrous to our farmers and undermine the basic stability of our country. I further recognize we were obligated to our farmers to assist them in adjusting from peak war-production levels. However, we have already given this assistance and discharged this obligation. What is disturbing to me is the fact that our farm-support legislation is rapidly veering away from the original point of justification and of economic soundness. Too often, it appears, support levels for various agricultural commodities are established in response to the pressure of groups only interested in getting a larger share of the Government's purse.

In considering the basis for aiding agriculture, we seem to have lost sight of the fact that farming is a mode of living, as well as a means of livelihood. The life of a farmer has always had certain advantages to offset its disadvantages, compared to working and living in a city. We have now reached a point where we consider farming purely on a dollars-and-cents basis, in comparison with the income received from industrial enterprises.

Agricultural production has always responded to prices, except when hindered by such uncontrollable factors as the weather. It is difficult to accept as necessary the high support level of prices being established for agricultural products, in view of the output of agricultural commodities during the last few years. On the basis of Government support prices, much new agricultural land has been developed, and production has been increased for only one reason—the operations have been highly profitable on the basis of the returns received with the aid of Government supports.

As a taxpayer, I do not believe it is my obligation to help keep millions of individual farmers in a highly profitable position. I do believe it is my obligation to help prevent disastrous conditions from arising among our farmers. I am now convinced the farm-support legislation, generally, has been carried to a point where my Government is obligating me to provide a level of profits for one group of our population, beyond anything warranted by sound democratic procedure.

I have often wondered how long taxpayers can be expected to support the production of cotton in amounts so far in excess of the quantity which can be marketed domestically and in foreign countries on any reasonable price basis. Is it sound, in a democracy, to take the position that, because some citizens choose to continually produce a certain commodity, or engage in a certain enterprise beyond the needs of the country, the taxpayers should be obligated to provide enough income to absorb the production from such citizens? I can only come to the conclusion that any programs that thrust such an obligation upon the taxpayer will eventually bring dissension and ruin to our country.

I have mentioned cotton, specifically, in my previous remarks. However, my conclusions apply to any of our agricultural industries which are continuously producing commodities far in excess of the quantities that can be marketed soundly in domestic and foreign channels. An examination of the statistical data on stocks, production, consumption, and export requirements of a large number of our agricultural products will quickly show that Government-support programs have been a stimulus to the building up of surpluses far in excess of normal reserve requirement.

In conclusion, I urge you to keep the following factors in mind in your deliberations on farm-support legislation:

1. The use of public funds to assist any group of citizens should be limited to amounts necessary to maintain stability.

2. In judging necessary support levels, consideration should be given to recent records of production in relation to farmers' returns.

3. Support programs which result in the necessity of the Government constantly making hand-outs to agriculture because of excessive production cannot be justified.

4. Support programs increase the consumers' cost of living both in direct taxes and in the higher levels paid for food commodities.

5. Unduly high-support prices will, eventually harm all agriculture by creating disastrous surpluses and maintaining marginal production, while, at the same time, curtailing consumption.

Thank you for any consideration you may choose to give to the opinions and remarks expressed above.

Very truly yours,

MARTIN H. BLANK.

Volunteer Fire Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced two bills for the relief of the volunteer fire companies throughout the United States.

H. R. 6964 would exempt all fire fighting equipment purchased by volunteer fire companies from the 5-percent excise tax. The other bill, H. R. 6955, provides that contributions and gifts to volunteer fire companies shall be deductible for income-tax purposes.

Everyone knows that these splendid groups of men are organized in the communities where they cannot afford a paid fire-fighting force. They are ready day or night, in fair weather or foul, to speed to the homes of their neighbors to fight fires. They are dependent upon contributions for the barest necessities in the way of fire-fighting equipment. They are the unsung heroes of thousands of rural counties throughout the United States today. It seems to me little enough for us to exempt from excise tax equipment they have such a difficult time buying, and I believe that if the average citizen could deduct from his or her income tax any contributions made to volunteer fire companies, these men would not have such a difficult time getting the equipment they need, and our volunteer companies would be able to purchase more adequate equipment.

I should like to say that I am very proud of the volunteer fire companies in my district. They own the most modern type of fire-fighting equipment and the personnel is composed of the most outstanding citizens in the community in which they are located. I know of no group who are more worthy of our help, a group of men who are willing to serve any time, and some even give their lives, to protect the property of their neighbors. Some of these companies even furnish free ambulance service in the communities in which they serve. I bespeak the approval of the Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 6964 and H. R. 6955 and will appreciate the support of the House membership when these bills are presented to the House for a vote, which I hope may be in the near future.

Waltham Watch Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the Boston Post of February 4, 1950, and one appearing in the Boston Traveler of the same date relating to the action of the RFC in failing to take action to assure the continuance of the Waltham Watch Co., of Waltham, Mass.

Of the $6,000,000 heretofore advanced to this company by the RFC, $2,000,000 was set aside or "frozen" to buy new machinery and equipment over a period of from 3 to 4 years. At the most, $500,000, and probably considerably less could be used this year to purchase new machinery and equipment. The final proposition made to the members of the RFC board was that $1,500,000 of this $2,000,000 be released so that it could be used as new working capital. If adopted, this would not have increased the original overall commitment of the RFC.

This suggestion was made at a time when the reorganized company was in the best shape possible to operate with fine prospects of success.

I think it most unfortunate that the members of the RFC board rejected this proposition.

We must bear in mind that we only have in the United States three American watch companies, of which Waltham Watch is one.

We must bear also in mind that in case of emergency or war—particularly as shown by World War II—that an American watch industry is a very important part of our national defense.

It is my opinion every effort should be made to keep this company a going concern. It is vitally important for many reasons, and in particular from the angle of national defense.

I hope the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will reconsider its previous action and take steps to extend reasonable and justifiable loan assistance to this company.

It seems to me that the RFC has the responsibility, if necessary, to negotiate with any interested person or persons to keep this company and its plant in existence as a part of the already small but very important American watch industry, to keep it in operation by American interests for the benefit of our country in case of another emergency.

If the present law relating to the powers of the RFC does not permit national defense to be considered as a factor in the making of a loan, it is my opinion that the RFC should either propose such legislation or cooperate in its enactment.

Our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE] has introduced such a bill. It could be the basis of consideration by the RFC and the Committee on Banking and Currency.

In any event, if the important plant of this company—as well as its employees—is to be preserved, action of an effective nature must be taken immediately.

The officials of the RFC have the burden of preserving this company in the interest of our national defense. Every effort should be made by them to ascertain from the Department of Defense and from the Munitions Board the value of this company as a part of our national defense, the Munitions Board having already recognized its importance, and between them some kind of proper action should be taken to assure the continuance of this company. If this is done the future prospects of this company will be good. It can, with the use of sound judgment on the part of our officials, and with good management, be made a proper risk for the loan already made by the RFC, and for the release of the $1,500,000 of the $2,000,000 of the original loan that was frozen for the purchase of new machinery and equipment.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the Boston Post of February 4, 1950]

THE WATCH COMPANY CLOSING

The news that the Waltham Watch Co. closed its doors yesterday afternoon, perhaps for all time, comes as a numbing shock, not only to the city in which it is located, but to all New England. Certainly it is the worst industrial set-back this section has had to take in a decade or more, not only in the number of employees that must lose jobs—well over the 1,000 mark—but in the prestige of a plant that had become world famed for its product.

The very suddenness of the closing cannot help but leave the impression that a bad blunder has been committed in allowing this fine 100-year-old concern to go by the boards so casually. There had been no inkling of the action, except for a stray rumor or two within the plant, yet yesterday workers were told not to return, the management moved to put the company into bankruptcy, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation took over physical possession, to dispose of the assets as it sees fit.

Not a great amount of money was involved, as Government loans go. The refusal of the RFC to allow $1,500,000 of the last $2,000,000 of a loan already approved to be used by the company as working capital was the final straw that precipitated the shut-down. This money, in the original $6,000,000 loan, had been earmarked for new machinery. It seems hard to believe that the company, regarded as meriting a loan of $6,000,000 a few months ago, had its outlook so drastically altered since then that it now must be cut off needing only a quarter of that sum.

For the fact remains that the company had been doing well of late. Its new 1950 line of watches had been nicely received by the trade. Orders had been coming in at a good pace and the short-handed personnel had found it hard keeping up with the work at hand. In view of these facts, this is a tragic time indeed to have the roof fall in on such a promising start.

Aside from the cold profit-and-loss angle, it is a crime to deny a helping hand at this critical period to one of the last firms in the Nation employing precision workers so badly needed in our defense set-up. Why, you can't set off an A-bomb or an H-bomb unless you have precision workers to make fuses, as one of the former trustees of the company has so aptly pointed out. It doesn't make sense to give the hoot to some of the most experienced and best precision men in the country at just the moment we are embarking on our great H-bomb project.

These workers showed their value during the war, when their services were badly needed. Now they find themselves out of jobs because the Government allows Swiss imports to flood our watch market and harms loyal citizens who have proved their worth and patriotism. This doesn't look much like gratitude.

We appreciate the fact that our representatives in Congress and influential State officials did all they could to prevent this closing. Their efforts were in vain, yet they must not give up now, as long as there is a possibility that the RFC may reconsider its decision. When we look at all the millions it has thrown away needlessly, on loans that have no vital bearing on our defense, as the precision trade has, we find it hard to believe that it will continue its adamant attitude when presented the full facts in the right light.

[From the Boston Traveler of February 4, 1950]

THE WALTHAM MIRACLE

From beginning to end, the sorry story of the Waltham failure should serve as a glaring object lesson on how not to manage something.

Waltham Watch had a proud old tradition. But through the years it did not modernize, nor did it maintain the quality of its product. The inevitable result was that Waltham lost its markets. When that happens only two courses are—or should be—possible. One is to fold up; the other is to reorganize thoroughly both as to management and machinery.

Unfortunately a third, faltering middle course was followed in Waltham Watch. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was called in last fall and put up a loan which hauled Waltham off the rocks but didn't provide enough to really float it. The money was used to pay old debts and set the ship in order, but there wasn't enough to put in a new engine and speed it up. Without a real engineering overhaul, Waltham just couldn't get back in the race. So although we really can't blame the RFC this time for not putting the money up, we can blame it for doing a half job last fall.

And we have no patience whatever for the brutal abruptness with which notice of this second failure was sprung upon the world. Almost overnight the 1,200 workers were given terminal notice. In this day and age that seems a shockingly callous procedure. Why, for instance, couldn't the RFC have bestirred itself to see whether another business group would take over the factory space, or whether some other product could have been made profitably, using part of the equipment available? If Waltham failure was inevitable, wouldn't it have been possible nonetheless to carry on for another 30 or 60 days until terminal notices could have been accompanied by news of a new project?

There are two other suggestions which seem to us worth considering. Should not liquidating companies when financially able to do so be required to pay a high terminal wage to enable employees to look around without being immediately forced on relief? Secondly, why shouldn't State and Federal employment agencies expand training facilities so that workers who suddenly found themselves stranded might have a means of adapting themselves to a new trade? Both of those proposals would cushion the rank-and-filer against a disaster which was certainly none of his making.

We are profoundly sorry for all concerned with the Waltham fiasco. We only hope that something can be done to salvage the working force before serious economic depression assails the city of Waltham.

Fred Othman's Column

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, last week Mr. Fred Othman, who in my mind is one of the most clever columnists in Washington, clearly demonstrated in his column titled "Don't Jump Yet, James!" how Government agencies can work at cross purposes with John Q. Public squeezed in the middle.

Mr. Othman's article of February 16, which appeared in the Washington Daily News, is quoted below:

DON'T JUMP YET, JAMES!

(By Fred Othman)

The man with 1950's toughest problem so far seems to be James B. Bender, the Somerset, Pa., shoe manufacturer, whose Government insists that he raise his own salary—and which says also that if he does he's going to be in serious trouble.

This sorry tale comes from Bender himself. His facts I have checked with appropriate governmental sources, which agree, red-eared, that he is in trouble. Pending passage of still another law by Congress to get him out of the soup, they agree (off the record, of course) that his best bet simply is to drown himself.

In the hope that he does not find such a drastic solution necessary and that maybe somewhere there is a Federal lawyer who can find him a way out alive, I'm reporting his predicament here in full.

Bender, his father, brother, four uncles and 87 stockholders organized the Bender Shoe Co., in July 1948, to manufacture good, solid shoes for small boys. The elder Bender became president and treasurer; his son, James, became secretary and superintendent.

They decided that until such time as the corporation got into the black they, as the only salaried officers, would pay themselves $60 a week apiece. But they needed more working capital.

So they applied to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a $40,000 5-year loan. This was granted. It tied up the company's funds, the personal assets of father and son, and froze their salaries until either the firm shows a profit or pays off the entire loan.

This, young Bender reported regretfully, is unlikely to be soon. But everybody was happy making shoes. Until day before yesterday, that is.

At 10 o'clock that fateful morning a brisk young man dropped into the Bender Shoe Co., identified himself as a representative of the Labor Department and wanted to look over the pay roll to see whether it adhered to the wages and hours bill. He noticed that the superintendent earned only $60 a week.

"You've got to pay him $75," he said.

"He's me," replied young Bender, sounding a little flustered.

"Well, he's responsible for purchasing and * * *."

"Me," interrupted Bender.

"And that makes him an administrative employee," the man said.

Bender learned that as a company officer he was required to pay all administrative employees; namely, himself, a minimum of $75 a week. Ah, well, if he had to, he had to.

"Oh, no, you don't," said the RFC. "You raise your own salary and you violate the loan agreement; under the law we will be forced to foreclose."

"Hm-m-m-m," Bender said to himself. He drew up a list of questions which he wanted answered: "(1) Are the consequences of defying the RFC more serious than disregarding orders from the Labor Department? (2) How do I go about suing myself for back wages? (3) What is the proper method of running a factory without making purchases? (4) Are the marines giving out bids to Reserve officers for immediate active duty in Pago Pago?"

There you are, lawgivers. You answer Shoemaker Bender. And kindly don't tell him to go jump.

Lincoln Was a Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered at a Lincoln Day banquet on February 13, 1950, at Defiance, Ohio:

Mr. Chairman, I have had the good fortune of passing through your beautiful city several times, and I also have enjoyed the privilege of knowing a number of the residents of your county, and I feel proud of the opportunity to meet with you today.

When your Congressman, Mr. CLEVENGER, invited me to come to visit with you, I felt that I could not refuse to come because he has, ever since his coming to Washington been one of the stalwart Republican Members in the Ohio delegation and has never failed to cooperate with me and others in any program that we had for the advancement of our party and of the country generally.

In my somewhat extended service in Congress, I have had occasion to observe the work of many Congressmen. I have often thought that the best Congressman for his district and for the country is not the one who talks the most or the loudest. I THINK that the best characteristic of a good Congressman is that he should be a man of good judgment. A man may be ever so brilliant and highly educated but if he is flighty and uncertain in his judgments he would not be well qualified to consider the very difficult and important matters which confront the Congress nearly every day.

To be successful, a Congressman must be a man of good character. He must be able to say "yes," and "no," and to stand by his decisions. A man of unstable character will soon be discovered and his colleagues will treat him accordingly. And again a man to be a good Congressman must be industrious. If he is not industrious he will never get his work done. The work of a Congressman is oftentimes very exacting and demands upon him are great. Of course, if he is a man of poor judgment and poor character, people will not depend upon him and consequently will not communicate with him very frequently. But, on the other hand if he has the qualifications of a good Congressman the people of his district will have confidence in him and will communicate with him frequently with the result that his mail will be heavy and his tasks will be numerous.

And again a Congressman should represent the interests of his district. Sometimes we hear it said that a Congressman looks after his own district and does not have the interest of the country at heart. Under our theory of Government a Congressman is expected to represent the interests of his district. If he comes from a cotton district he should look after the best interests of the cotton industry. If he comes from a big city district he should look after the interests of his constituents. If he should come from an agricultural district, such as your district, he should know the problems of agriculture and the problems of rural life and should stand up for the interests of rural people.

When Mr. CLEVENGER first went to Congress I was the Ohio Representative of the Committee on Committees which had to do with the placing of the Members on the various committees. It was not long until Mr. CLEVENGER was placed on the Agriculture Committee which is one of the top committees of Congress. Agriculture is the biggest industry in the country. More people are employed in tilling the soil and making their living from the soil than are employed in any other industry. Mr. CLEVENGER conducted his work on the Agriculture Committee in such a way as to make him a recognized leader on questions of agriculture. The Agriculture Committee is the food committee of Congress. Frequently alert members of this committee have done much for the relief of the people by demanding strict adherence to the law. This was demonstrated conspicuously by Mr. CLEVENGER and Mr. ANDRESEN when they forced the removal of sugar rationing with the result that the people immediately got sufficient sugar.

A Congressman cannot be well posted on all subjects. He learns the subjects that have been assigned to him and then he seeks the opinion of other Congressmen who are recognized authorities on different subjects. Mr. CLEVENGER'S work on the Agriculture Committee convinced the leaders in Congress that he was a man who could be depended upon and he was promoted to a place on the Committee on Appropriations. His Scotch blood had manifested itself early in that he always voted against extravagance and it was thought that he would be a safe man to look after the spending of the finances of the Government. He has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations now for several years and his work has been very satisfactory. For the last 17 years I have been a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

As you know this committee has the responsibility of raising the money to meet the expenses of government. This is not an easy task especially in these days of extravagance. Before Mr. Roosevelt came into power we were spending only about $6,000,000,000 a year to run the Government. Under the management of Roosevelt and Truman, $6,000,000,000 will not pay the interest on the national debt for a year. I hope to have more to say about this matter later.

All over the land these days, we Republicans are celebrating Lincoln's birthday. We have a perfect right to do this because he and Washington are generally considered the two greatest Americans of all time. And again we Republicans are entitled to carry on these celebrations because Abraham Lincoln in 1856 laid the foundations of the Republican Party. When the Whig Party went out of existence, Lincoln and those who believed as he did established a new party. This party was truly and surely established for the preservation of liberty and freedom both personally and nationally. In those days the motto was "liberty and union now and forever, one and inseparable." Thousands of Lincoln Day banquets are being carried on all over the United States. This great movement for this year was started in Washington last Monday. By way of encouragement I want to say to you that I have seen and participated in many political rallies, but the rally in Washington last Monday night was the most enthusiastic and most promising that I have ever seen. It was really beyond description. From the standpoint of crowds we had secured the largest auditorium in Washington which seats about 12,000 people. Every seat was taken and that part of the auditorium given over to parades was filled by three or four thousand people who sat on the floor and three or four thousand people were turned away. That audience was made up altogether of grown people and there was no foolishness about it in any way. Those who took part in the program were outstanding men and women including Senators, Congressmen, governors, and the highest officials in the Republican ranks.

Every shade of Republicanism was given recognition. Every section of the country was recognized; all races and creeds were recognized and the meeting was a gigantic success in every respect. It was spontaneous, and no pressuring or duress was applied by anyone to get a crowd.

Washington has long been known as a very poor place to have enthusiastic political meetings because it is the seat of the Government and political strife naturally is more tense here than anywhere else, but in spite of this, the Republicans put on the most successful rally that was ever put on in Washington and they did this for only $1 a ticket. I think this will shame those who have been putting on the $100 dinners. It is a well-known fact that many persons who attend these $100 banquets consider that that is the price they are paying for the Government job which they hold, or for their opportunity to claim that they are on friendly terms with the White House and with those who have favors to dispense.

H. G. Wells, one of the world's greatest historians, on one occasion named the six men whom he thought were the world's greatest. He named Jesus as the greatest, and in this list he included the name of Lincoln. His reason for choosing Lincoln was that he thought Lincoln typified the great movement for liberty, freedom, and justice which the Pilgrim fathers and their followers had established on this North American Continent. He considered that America was the symbol of human liberty and that Lincoln was its greatest expositor.

It was Lincoln who said in his Gettysburg Address that we were then engaged in a great conflict which would determine whether our Nation should continue or should perish from the earth. In other words Lincoln saved America. All over the world where people strive for human freedom they revere and respect the name of Lincoln. I once heard a great world traveler say that he had visited the homes of humble people in all parts of the world and in many, many places he had seen the picture of Lincoln, which of course indicated that human liberty was their great hope.

Lincoln was not only a great person but his writings were very extensive and are widely read in all parts of the world today. Who will ever forget his "with malice toward none; with charity for all" and his timely words that we cannot live "half slave and half free."

How applicable are his words in these days of political and economic unrest. He said, "You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift; you cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong; you cannot help strong men by tearing down big men; you cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer; you cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred; you cannot help the poor by destroying the rich; you cannot establish sound security on borrowed money; you cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn."

Lincoln was seldom in error in his conclusions. His prophecies generally came true. In only one instance in his writings have I found that he missed his guess. Progress in the manufacturing of destructive implements of warfare has come faster than he had been able to foresee. He was not so imaginative as his contemporary Alfred Tennyson was when he wrote—

"Heard the Heavens filled with shouting
And there rained a ghastly dew
From the Nations' airy navies,
Grappling in the central blue."

The quotation with reference to whom Lincoln missed his guess was as follows:

"At what point shall we expect the approach of danger. By what means shall we fortify against it. Shall we expect some transAtlantic military giant to step the ocean and crush us at a blow. Never. All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth—our own excepted—in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years."

How glad we would be if the conditions at present were what Lincoln thought they would be. Let us hope that we will be able by peace agreement to prevent a test of this prophecy made by Lincoln.

Now, my friends, no Republican speech would be complete today without some reference being made to the conditions in Washington. I am afraid that nobody can tell anybody else just what is going on except that in a general way the conditions in Washington are terribly confused.

I think it would be a fair statement to say that the chaotic conditions in Washington are the result of the maladministration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. I think that when the impartial historians write the history of America they will be forced to say that Mr. Roosevelt is directly responsible for the plight in which we find ourselves. With perfidy and deceit he sowed the seeds of distrust and destruction and we are now reaping the harvest. Woodrow Wilson refused to recognize Russia because she was a Communist state; Mr. Harding also refused. Mr. Coolidge did the same thing. Mr. Hoover also took the same position. It was Franklin D. Roosevelt, the so-called great humanitarian, who loved most all of the rest of the world apparently better than he did America, who gave recognition to the unchristian, unholy, arrogant, tyrannical, and in many instances inhuman Russia. It was he who opened the doors to the crooks, commies, and criminals of all the world to come to this country, strictly in violation of our laws and distinctly contrary to every principle of government and decency that typifies America. In order to guarantee that this class of people would have free movement in our country, he had as his right hand advisers such men as Alger Hiss and many others that I could name. In addition to flooding our country with the scum of the earth he elevated to high positions many people, both men and women, who could not pass the ordinary test of Americanism. He permitted the Government itself, especially the State Department, to be honeycombed with men whom he must have known were anti-American in their philosophies and in their sympathies. Many of these are holding high positions in the Government today. A sample of the inefficiency of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations is shown by the recent arrest of this man Fuchs whose very countenance would indicate his instability of character. It is a terrific travesty on justice to have permitted this man with such a background of communistic associations to roam at will in the factories where we were carrying on scientific research work which was supposed to be of the highest military value and to be secret from everybody.

Mr. Truman with his Pendergast training has never been courageous enough to clean out these nests of slimy spies and traitors. But on the other hand, a few months ago dismissed the whole subject with a wave of his hand and with the statement that it was all simply a "red herring." He was either very inept and ignorant for not knowing what was going on or else he purposely held back the facts which are now shocking the whole civilized world. The Hiss case and the Fuchs case have shown to the world that the United States has the poorest defense against espionage and foreign intrigue of any country in the world. A year ago we boasted proudly that we had the atom bomb and that nobody could take it away from us. We used it as a balance of power on many occasions. At last we woke up and found that Russia, which we look upon as benighted nation of barbarians, had our secret. Only a month ago we Americans heard of the hydrogen bomb which is a thousand times more destructive then the atom bomb. Today we hear that Russia also has this secret.

I should like to give you an illustration of Mr. Roosevelt's inclinations to admit these foreigners. It developed when he was trying to have passed a bill designated as the fourth-Presidential-powers bill. This was a bill that sought to give to the President the arbitrary power to admit any persons into the United States that he wished. The bill would also give him power to move people now in the country from place to place as he might see fit. I am proud of the fact that it was largely due to my efforts that that bill was defeated in the Ways and Means Committee. In connection with it there is a long story which I will not have time to delineate at this time. Suffice it to say that the fact and the information by which I was able to defeat this terrible proposal was given to me by someone in one of the branches of the Government who did not want to openly oppose the President but whose patriotism was such that he felt it his duty to let me know what the real condition was.

Ladies and gentlemen, I think I should also talk to you briefly about some of the economic conditions in the country. As you know, Mr. Truman has in peacetimes spent more money than all of the rest of the Presidents who served in peacetimes. He ran behind last year $5,500,000,000 and he will run behind again next year at least that much. At no time since Roosevelt came into power has the Government lived within its means except during the 2 years when the Republicans had control of the Eightieth Congress. The President is still demanding an increase in taxes and is still refusing to reduce excise taxes as should be done. He knows that Mr. Roosevelt was able to elect and elect by spending and spending.

He proposes to do the same thing. The country is clamoring for a reduction of excise taxes on many commodities. These taxes were put on as war taxes and should have been taken off a long time ago. If the Republican Party had been elected to power in Congress in 1948 we would have reduced these taxes last year. Mr. Truman has recommended the reduction of a few excise taxes this year because he knows that will be a popular thing to do. He is not in favor of a general reduction because he will not have the money to spend and spend so that his party can elect and elect. How long can we continue to spend $15,000,000 a day more than we take in? How long can we continue to pay $17,000,000 a day for interest on the national debt and still continue to run the debt up at the rate of $15,000,000 a day.

Ladies and gentlemen, I say with all of the emphasis at my command that the greatest need in America today is the election of a Republican President.

What is the duty of we Republicans in Ohio? It means more to be a Republican in Ohio than to be a Republican in any other State. Ohio Republicans have more responsibility than Republicans in any other State. Let me prove this to you in a very factual and convincing way. As I have already stated, the Republican Party started with Abraham Lincoln. From Abraham Lincoln down to Franklin D. Roosevelt there were only two Democrat Presidents. These were Grover Cleveland and Woodrow Wilson. During all of that time every President that was elected through the grueling contest of a national convention in that time, came from Ohio except Herbert Hoover. You may think that I am wrong but let me explain. Chester A. Arthur, Theodore Roosevelt, and Calvin Coolidge all came into the Presidency by virtue of their having been Vice Presidents. So I repeat that all of the Presidents elected from Lincoln to Roosevelt who went through the grueling vicissitudes of a national convention for his first election to the Presidency came from Ohio, except Mr. Hoover. Ohio is the mother of Presidents and from all indications old lady Ohio may give birth to another President if we can elect Senator Taft by a big majority next November.

Now my friends in summation, let me say that the country is in a bad way. Just a few days ago I heard two very prominent men discussing how long our country will last. One fixed the date at 15 years and another doubted that we would last that long. I definitely disagree with them both because I firmly believe that we will survive the storm. We must do so and the best way to do this is to strive to elect a Republican Congress in 1950 and a Republican President in 1952 and thereby clean out from the Government all the Reds and pinkos and again put the Nation on a basis of liberty and justice for all.

Prosperity by Lowering Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by Robert Montgomery on excise-tax repeal:

This is about a country that has increased the prosperity of its citizens by an unusual plan that would shock most of our politicians. This country brought prosperity by lowering its taxes.

Some distant, small country? Not at all. This is our friendly, sturdy, next-door neighbor, Canada. A country very much like our own—great farm lands—mines—growing industries.

As they used to say in the Navy, Now hear this.

Since the end of the war, Canada has five times reduced its taxes. By these five reductions Canada has cut its citizen's tax bill almost in half.

While making these sweeping reductions, Canada also balanced her budget.

After the last drastic tax cuts, unemployment in Canada dropped to less than 3 percent. At a time when the jobless in our country, where there has been no tax reductions, rose to triple that percentage.

Sounds like a miracle, doesn't it? But it isn't. It's just proof of what can be done through ability and imagination.

Ability, on the part of Canadian leaders, to realize that the prosperity of a country does not lie in the money taken out of the pockets of its citizens, but in how much money is left in their pockets.

Canadian Finance Minister Douglas Abbott is one economist I can understand.

Taxes, he said, should cause as little harm and irritation as possible. Amen. He said he wanted his people, the taxpayers, to have more money to spend, so that they would be able to buy more of the goods raised by the farmers, made by the manufacturers. Makes a great amount of sense to me.

But stop a minute and recall what another leader said recently about taxes. Just the reverse as I remember it. I quote now from President Truman. He argued:

"Events of the last few years have proved that our economy can grow and prosper * * * at the same time that individuals and businesses are paying taxes high by prewar standards."

But what about our budget? It's not balanced.

What about our deficit spending—to the tune of some five billion?

Is that a prosperous economy?

Canada is putting her money back to work. She's on a mounting spiral of increased national income. Less taxes; more money to spend. More spending; more production.

The more I found out about what our good neighbor is doing the more I wondered if anybody in Washington was thinking along these lines. So I made a few phone calls. I had two particularly interesting conversations.

One was with Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, from Nevada, CHAIRMAN of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and a high-ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. I thought you might like to hear what he had to say so we made a recording. Here he is now. Come in, Senator MCCARRAN.

"Well, Mr. Montgomery, I am certainly for any sound program for reducing all taxes, income and excise. Since before World War II, the Federal budget has been pyramiding and the burden on the American taxpayer has been increasing to the point where this burden can no longer be borne. As more services are performed for the people, a greater share of the people's income goes for taxes and they are less able to perform these services for themselves. If the economy is to grow, it must be encouraged, and what better way than to leave the people enough money so they will be able to buy the goods they make.

"The figures you mention, Mr. Montgomery, indicate that the Canadian people have prospered as a result of the sweeping tax-reduction program."

Thank you very much, Senator.

Now, what about those excise-tax cuts we've been hearing about? Cuts already made by Canada. What's Congress going to do about them? Let's hear a word from Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican, House minority leader, as recorded during my talk with him. Come in, Congressman MARTIN.

"Bob, I believe Canada is on the right track. The history of previous tax reductions is that every tax cut is followed by an increase in revenues. However, our immediate problem is the elimination of the wartime "discouragement" taxes—the taxes that discourage you from buying, from traveling, from telephoning, and actually take your jobs away. Those taxes were enumerated in the American Weekly articles.

"The wartime taxes should be repealed now. There is a feeling throughout the country that long overdue action to reduce these excessive rates is coming in this session of Congress. Consequently, buyers are adopting a "wait and see" attitude. We must not wait for tax revision 6 months hence."

Thank you. I hope we don't have to wait much longer. President Truman has talked of a trillion-dollar national income by the year 2000. I'll swap my share of the Truman trillions for sound, honest tax cuts tomorrow morning.

A $50,000,000,000 Bubble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, here we have further evidence that our American foreign policy is the American dollar. We are trying to buy our way all over the world and without appreciable success.

Mr. Henry Hazlitt, writing in Newsweek for February 20, 1950, calls the turn on Senator MCMAHON's proposal of last week. He suggests that it is a wholly absurd proposition and millions of Americans agree. At this point I include a copy of Mr. Hazlitt's article:

FIFTY BILLIONS FOR TRIBUTE?

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Senator BRIEN MCMAHON's proposal that our Government contribute $50,000,000,000 over 5 years for a global Marshall plan is the culmination, the reductio ad absurdum, of the befuddlement on foreign economic policy in which Washington has wandered for the last 5 years.

Senator MCMAHON's proposal is, to put it baldly, a proposal to pay unparalleled tribute. No other word fits. "Tribute" is defined in the dictionary as "a stated sum * * * paid by one sovereign or state to another in acknowledgment of submission or as the price of peace, security, protection, or the like."

When we were small and considered weak, our minister Charles Pinckney, on being told by Talleyrand that a gift to the directory might avert war with France, made his famous reply: "Millions for defense, sir, but not 1 cent for tribute." Yet today Senator MCMAHON, at a time when we are by far the strongest Nation in the world, proposes that we pay up to $50,000,000,000 as the price of Stalin's promise to stop threatening us with atomic or hydrogen bombs.

This mere proposal, by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, is certain to be taken by the leaders behind the iron curtain as a sign of fear and weakness. The leaders of the iron-curtain countries have already found that they can with impunity plant spies in our midst, blockade us at Berlin, beat or imprison our envoys, and insult and vilify us every day. What further move may they not be encouraged to take by this timorous offer of ransom? Even Secretary Acheson's emphatic rejection cannot fully offset this blow to our prestige.

The McMahon proposal obviously lacks sense. Would we make ourselves safer by pouring billions of our dollars into Russia, by reducing our economic and military strength to increase hers, by intensifying the problems of our free-enterprise system to mitigate the problems of her Communist system? And if for 4 years Stalin has unswervingly refused to call off the atomic-bomb race, even when we were far ahead of him, and even at the risk of the annihilation of millions of Russians and of his own regime, does it make sense to suppose that he will reverse his stand now for a mere monetary bribe?

It is time we asked ourselves frankly, in fact, whether an atom-bomb agreement might not actually be more dangerous than the present known lack of agreement, by binding us and not the leaders of Russia. These are the same leaders who have broken promise after promise, who believe that the end justifies any means, who live by systematic perfidy. The proposals for international inspection of the vast depths of a totalitarian Russia are not realistic. Even if our inspectors finally did catch up with a plant in Russia that had been working on the bomb—after we had poured in our $50,000,000,000 to help finance it—what recourse then?

But the real point of this article is economic. Senator MCMAHON himself calls his proposal a "global Marshall plan," and casually drops point 4 inside it. It is a super-give-away program. It is not only politically preposterous, but it rests on the same fundamentally false economic assumptions as the Marshall plan and point 4. It wrongly assumes that the American capital thrown into such schemes is a net addition to the world's capital. It is in fact a mere diversion of such capital. And it is a diversion, in the main, from productive private enterprises into far less productive collectivist projects.

Such schemes do not encourage private lending abroad; they discourage such lending. They do not speed up recovery and development of world resources; they retard that recovery and development. For as long as foreign countries can get easy money, seized from our taxpayers, out of the United States Government, they will neither give the assurances nor make the economic reforms that they would have to make to attract private investment.

It is time we called a halt to the give-away mania.

Two From St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it gives me real pleasure to include under unanimous consent an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Tuesday, February 14, 1950, which gives well-deserved recognition to two of my distinguished colleagues from Missouri:

TWO FROM ST. LOUIS

A perfect attendance record may not be the supreme test of a Representative's devotion to duty. There are times when he may be of much greater service at a congressional committee meeting than by being on the floor to answer a relatively unimportant roll call.

Still, it was something of an achievement to have been on hand each of the 121 times during the 1949 session that the House of Representatives was asked to vote "yea" or "nay." Only 16 of the 435 Members managed to achieve this record. And two of the 16 were from St. Louis.

For this, a bow to Representative JOHN B. SULLIVAN and Representative FRANK M. KARSTEN.

Bountiful Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sure that all my colleagues agree that our Nation has a magnificent future provided we take certain actions to maintain this as a land of opportunity. Yes; one of the conditions for achieving an ever higher standard of living for our people is an equitable system of taxation which will encourage rather than penalize private enterprise and will promote the widest possible production and consumption of consumer items.

In this connection, Mr. President, there was carried in Sunday's issue of the American Weekly, the national periodical published by the Hearst newspapers and distributed throughout the Nation among many independent journals also, a very fine article by Mr. David Cameion.

This article analyzes the future of our American people, the prospects for an even more prosperous America in which the infants of today will enjoy even greater blessings some day than we do now.

The article emphasizes the importance of a sound system of taxation, a system for which I personally have fought, for example, by trying to overhaul the obsolete excise tax structure and repeal many nuisance tax burdens. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Cameion's article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOUNTIFUL FUTURE

(By David Cameion)

"What chance have my babies got?" The nice young mother was worried and confused.

She'd heard calamity howlers say America is through. Its natural resources are exhausted. Opportunity is dead. The courage that made America has vanished—and there is no future.

"I don't really believe it," she said. "But I want so much for my babies—and sometimes I'm scared."

You don't have to be, mother. The calamity howlers are wrong.

The future belongs to your babies—and to you. The coming century is theirs—and it can be the finest, richest century America has ever known. Our country is not exhausted—we are only beginning to realize its possibilities.

You can take the word of such outstanding men as Dr. Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution, and one of the world's leading economists, for that.

There are some "ifs," of course. There are some things you'll have to fight against—such things as repressive taxes. But you're a good fighter. Baby's future is in your hands.

First, what is this America you brought your baby into?

It has put more money into the hands of more people than any other country in the world—and it is progressively giving more and more to those the Communists like to call the masses or the little people.

Dr. Moulton gives the facts in his latest book, Controlling Factors in Economic Development, published by the Brookings Institution.

Twenty years ago, only about 10,000,000 families—28 percent of all the families in America—had incomes in the $2,000–$5,000 range. But by 1946, half of all the families in the country—23,000,000—were in this group.

Twenty years ago, the families in the $2,000–$5,000 range got only one-third of the total individual income. But by 1946 more than half of America's income—55 percent—went to families in that group.

The picture is even more striking if you lump together all of the moderate-income groups—those families whose incomes ranged from $2,000 to $7,500 a year. In 1929, they received only $38,000,000,000—but in 1946, they shared $111,000,000,000—65 percent of America's income.

Does that look as though America were dying—as though opportunity were dead?

Every year there are fewer really poor people in our country. In 1929, Dr. Moulton's figures show, 65 percent of the families in America had incomes of less than $2,000. By 1946 only 40 percent were in that group, and the number is going down all the time.

It's folks like you, mother—folks in the great American middle class—who are getting a constantly greater chunk of our country's wealth. Meanwhile, the people in the higher brackets are getting less. Those earning more than $7,500 received 30 percent of the country's income in 1929. In 1946 they got only 20 percent.

Dr. Moulton describes what's happening in this way:

"Prior to 1929, and especially in the decade of the twenties, the distribution of income in the United States was becoming increasingly concentrated. Since 1929, the situation has been strikingly reversed."

Meanwhile, figures provided by Dr. Moulton showed that, despite the inflated dollar, wages were rising far more swiftly than prices. By 1946, hourly wage rates were seven times as high as they had been in 1900—while wholesale prices were only two and one-half times as high.

That meant that more people could buy more things. And those who talked of America being through, Dr. Moulton said, didn't see the big market that existed in the unfulfilled desires of the existing population—desires that could increasingly be attained as incomes rose.

So that part of it is all right, mother. Never before has a baby been born with such a good chance to earn a comfortable income.

But the calamity howlers say our country is running down. They used to contend, for instance, that our population was leveling off—they went so far, Dr. Moulton said, as to predict that America's population would become stationary by 1980—with births balancing deaths.

You made them look silly on that prediction, mother—you and all the other mothers of America. In the last 10 years, Dr. Moulton said, the records show an astounding and progressive increase in births.

During the depressed thirties, births ranged from 2,074,042 in 1932 to 2,296,962 in 1936. The insecurity of the depression years kept the birth rate down.

It was to be expected, Dr. Moulton continued, that the rate would increase during the war—as it did. In 1940 there were 2,400,000 births, and the wartime peak was reached in 1943, when 2,900,000 were born. There were 2,700,000 babies born in 1945.

But the amazing thing, Dr. Moulton said, is the way babies kept increasing after the war. From 1946 through 1949, births averaged 3,600,000 a year. There were 20,000,000 babies born in America from 1940 to 1950. Subtracting deaths during those years, that meant our population increased by 18,000,000.

That completely confounded the gloomy experts. The more optimistic had predicted a population of 141,000,000 by 1950. The fact is that the population reached 150,000,000 last October.

That doesn't sound like a dying country, does it?

Those youngsters—your babies and the others—will be grown up in the 1960's and the early seventies. They'll be getting jobs, marrying, establishing their own homes. They'll want automobiles, and refrigerators, and all the other things that go with homes.

They'll form a new market in the sixties and seventies—a market that will help keep America going.

What is responsible for that sharp increase in births?

You've got the answer to that, mother—you know it far better than the economists. In part it's undoubtedly your own courage, your own confidence in your country and yourself.

Girls are marrying earlier. It used to be assumed at girls' colleges, Dr. Moulton said, that only 20 percent of a graduating class would be married in the first year after leaving school.

Now, however, large numbers of girls—and young men—are married before they graduate. The figures show, too, that they want larger families. Higher incomes, and the fact that there are jobs for all, encourage them.

But whatever the reason, you mothers were smarter than the gloomy experts. Your instincts told you America was sound—and you were right.

But what good is all this—what good is higher incomes, and increasing markets, if America can't support those new babies? You've heard that America's natural resources are exhausted—that there isn't enough left to go around. You've heard that we'll have to lower our standard of living.

Mother—that just isn't true.

Dr. Moulton looked ahead for 100 years, and asked:

"So far as natural resources and productive capacity are concerned, might the United States a century hence support a population double that of the present day on a plane of living eight times as high as that now prevailing?"

The answer was "Yes."

"There can be little doubt," he wrote, "that the onward sweep of science and technology as a whole is such that in one way or another scientific advancement as applied to the processes of production could yield results of (this) magnitude."

Dr. Moulton did not predict that we would have twice the present population, with a standard of living eight times as high, in another 100 years. What he said was that we can have it—and that American resources can support it.

How so?

He found that five things go to make up the basic parts of a high standard of living: Food and nutrition, for which, in 1946, we spent $55,000,000,000; shelter and home maintenance, for which we spent $31,000,000,000; attire and personal care, $34,000,000,000; education and health, $12,500,000,000; and recreation and travel, $21,500,000,000.

First, then, could we feed 300,000,000 people—with a higher standard of living?

Yes. Dr. Moulton estimates that we would need to triple our present food supply to do it. But by bringing new land under cultivation through reclaiming swampland and irrigating deserts; by controlling soil erosion to protect existing land; and through the use of scientific discoveries to increase the crop yield, we can feed your children, and their children's children.

America need not go hungry.

Can we shelter 300,000,000 people?

Yes. Dr. Moulton estimates that we'd need eight times the amount of building materials we're now using, and he continues:

"Residential construction materials are entirely adequate. They are of many kinds, of which the most important are wood, brick and tile, cement, stone, cinders, glass, aluminum and steel. In the case of stone, brick, glass, cement and cinders raw materials are virtually unlimited."

Systematic reforestation can preserve our supply of wood. Plastics and other synthetic materials will be used increasingly. Steel and other metals, he found, will not be exhausted.

"It seems clear," he said, "that there is no danger of running short of materials."

Our needs for attire and personal care, he estimated, would be increased 20 times. But there, he found, the supply of natural—and synthetic—materials is virtually inexhaustible.

The fields of education and health, he said, make little demand on material resources. America can meet the requirements.

The largest rate of increase, he found, would be in recreation and travel; which make heavy drafts on mineral resources. You've heard, perhaps, that we're coming to the end of our iron ore—that the great Mesabi ranges in Minnesota hold only 40 years' supply of high grade ore at the rate of wartime consumption.

But Dr. Moulton showed that newly discovered Canadian ores, modern methods of using low grade ores, and the use of substitute metals for many purposes, assure adequate supplies for hundreds of years.

Coal is virtually unlimited. The sources of electric power are superabundant. And the potential supplies of natural and synthetic oils, he found are adequate. "Abundant supplies of oil and gasoline seem assured," he continued, "for many generations to come." So great is the progress in making synthetic oils, he continued, that much of our reserve of natural petroleum may be left in the ground.

Yes, mother, your babies have a future—a great one. What can you do to make sure that they achieve it?

Protection and conservation of our natural resources is necessary. You can help fight for that.

We've got to produce more—every one of us. For if you double the population, and raise the standard of living you far more than double the things people want to buy. We can't sell—or use—things we don't make. We can help achieve that.

Too high taxes can injure your babies' chances. Beyond a certain point, Dr. Moulton said, taxes "dull incentives, and may destroy the principal source of funds for new enterprises." He explained:

"To state the matter in extreme terms, there can scarcely be any question that the private enterprise system would function more vigorously with a tax system that absorbs, say 10 to 15 percent of the national income rather than under one that absorbs 25 or 30 percent."

You can fight for lower taxes.

But most of all, you can have the future back—confidence—for yourself and your babies.

America is not exhausted. The future is alive and strong.

Tribute to Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, From the Northwest Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I was glad to note in the January 1950 issue of the newspaper the Northwest Republican, a very fine and well-deserved tribute to our colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. This independent Republican newspaper, published monthly for Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, and Wisconsin, has presented some deeply interesting facts regarding Senator WILEY's outstanding record of service in Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this tribute be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS LETTER

November 1950 will see many crucial battles for positions in the United States Senate. Upon the outcome of those battles will, in large part, depend the future of the American economy—of the free-enterprise system and of our constitutional Republic. When the voters go to the polls in Ohio, in Indiana, in Missouri, in Wisconsin, in Iowa, in Colorado, as well as elsewhere in our country, they will have a vital opportunity to reelect Republicans of integrity and achievement now in the Senate.

In this connection, the Northwest Republican invites the attention of all Wisconsin voters to the outstanding qualifications of their senior Senator, ALEXANDER WILEY.

Few Senators in recent American history have won for themselves so warm a niche in the hearts of their countrymen, and in particular, in the hearts of their constituents as has ALEX WILEY. Possessed of a broad background in farming, law, business, fraternal organizations, public service, he has brought to the Senate folksy, human qualities of friendship, good nature, and humility as well as the statesmanship necessary for so high a position.

WILEY'S SENIORITY IS CRUCIAL

Wisconsin voters should bear in mind that Senator WILEY stands among the third highest ranking Republicans of the entire United States Senate. He is the first Wisconsinite in history ever to serve as chairman of the influential Senate Judiciary Committee and is now its highest ranking Republican. He is second highest ranking Republican of the powerful Foreign Relations Committee which will in considerable measure help shape the future peace of the world. Senator WILEY has won these positions by virtue, in part, of his continuous, unbroken record in the Senate. Wisconsin voters note the fact that, at long last, they have in Senator WILEY a man representing Wisconsin who has the necessary seniority to do an effective job for Senators from other States who have no seniority and who rank them, in contrast to freshman low in the party councils, thus being relatively unable to help shape national policy.

PUBLICATIONS APPLAUD WILEY

Ample commendations of Senator WILEY can be found in many of the magazines and newspapers of State and Nation. The Northwest Republican is privileged at this time to devote space in listing some of the fine expressions of commendation of him. In so doing, we feel that we are helping to inform the citizens of Wisconsin of the outstanding caliber of their devoted public servant.

Read what a newspaper columnist close to the Washington scene and writing in the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette said about the Senator:

"Senator WILEY conceives more original ideas than anyone I know in Congress."

Here is what a Washington, D. C., newspaper said about him:

"He works hard. As chairman of the important Judiciary Committee, which handles a third of all Senate legislation, he personally reported out 205 bills last session, more than any other man in the House or Senate."

A Young Republican newspaper commented:

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY has compiled one of the most enviable records of service and achievement for State and Nation * * * an energetic campaigner—he presents the strongest possible Republican opponent (in 1950 Wisconsin race) * * * Senator WILEY deserves bipartisan support on the basis of his middle-of-the-road record of conservative, but forward-looking achievement."

That is what the Reserve Officer magazine said last year about him:

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY has scored a long list of legislative firsts in his career in the United States Senate, including his warnings long before the advent of World War II, of the danger of an attack on Pearl Harbor, the potential danger of critical shortages of wartime materials, the dangers of overcentralization of government and industry. His pioneering suggestion for a permanent liaison group between the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Department of State was acclaimed during the war by the Christian Science Monitor as 'The most important, constructive, and forward-looking suggestion on behalf of the future peace which has come from Congress since the United States formally entered the war.'"

WILEY'S FIGHT AGAINST DEMO BLACKJACK

A long list of commendations in the Wisconsin press could be added to this summary. Most recently, many Badger newspapers applauded Senator WILEY'S blast against Democratic finance headquarters in Milwaukee for its "outrageous tactics in seeking to blackjack humble service employees into making financial contributions to the Democratic Party."

Wherever there has been an issue of importance to Wisconsin—to Badger white-collar workers, farmers, merchants, housewives—WILEY has been in the front lines battling for Badger interests. What could be more important to the leading dairy State of the Nation than a Senator who won this commendation from the world-famous magazine, Hoard's Dairyman:

"Although burdened with many pressing administrative responsibilities, Senator WILEY * * * has been one of the United States Senate's most vigorous defenders of the dairy farmer. His work in the Eightieth Congress last year was primarily responsible for the failure of (antidairy) legislation to pass prior to adjournment."

Since Wisconsin is half-industrial and half-agricultural, the Senator has devoted equal yeoman work to the problems of Wisconsin business, in particular to the needs of the little fellow. WILEY has been among the Senate's hardest hitters for tax relief, balancing the budget, Federal economy, and application of business horse-sense to Government.

The Northwest Republican is proud to point out these facts to the people of Wisconsin and the Nation as its contribution to continuation in high office of a real Republican statesman and a fine human being—ALEX WILEY.

Displaced Persons Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Minority Report," from the New York Times of February 19, 1950, with respect to the displaced persons bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY REPORT

The impressive minority report on the Senate Judiciary Committee's displaced persons bill is very nearly a majority report. Of the committee's 13 members, 8 have signed the minority report, 2 more said they "now subscribe" to it, and another 2 stated that they favor "further liberalization" of the committee draft. With so much support from among the Judiciary Committee's own members, it should not be too hard to convince the rest of the Senate next week that the DP bill, as it emerged from committee with Senator McCARRAN'S blessing, needs drastic overhauling.

The way to do this is indicated in the minority report, which bears the signatures of Senators KILGORE, GRAHAM and FERGUSON. They propose revising the bill generally along the lines of the measure passed by the House of Representatives last June, which is now all but unrecognizable as a result of Mr. McCARRAN'S hacking and mangling job in committee. The exposé of Mr. McCARRAN'S efforts to defeat the original purpose of the law by opening its provisions to the 8,000,000 German expellees, or Volksdeutsche, who, however sad their plight, are not DP's in the internationally accepted use of the word. To confuse the issue by mingling German expellees with DP's would, as the report points out, bring about hopeless complications in the administrative machinery of the entire program and leave the DP question unsolved.

The minority report rightly attacks the restrictions in present legislation requiring that 40 percent of the DP's be from Baltic countries and that 30 percent be agricultural laborers. The agricultural provision has forced the DP Commission to cut shipments down from 18,000 to less than 6,000 a month and to hold back some 10,000 otherwise eligible DP's until the 30-percent quota can be filled.

The minority statement repeats the observation made in the recent report submitted by Representative WALTER of the House Judiciary Committee that the DP Commission has performed its function "in a diligent and satisfactory manner." This comment is particularly noteworthy in view of the loose and unwarranted charges that Mr. McCARRAN has been in the habit of flinging around whenever the word "DP" is mentioned. But by this time the Senate doubtless knows how to evaluate Mr. McCARRAN'S rash and reckless words.

William P. Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, an editorial in the Washington Post of this morning pays tribute to the manner in which the Senate investigating committee and its retiring chief counsel, William P. Rogers, have conducted the investigations which have engaged the committee's attention.

As a member of the investigating committee who feels, as does the Washington Post, that Mr. Rogers has performed his difficult duties with tact and with due care for the rights of all who appeared before the committee, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MODERN INVESTIGATOR

The investigator who knows how to bring to light all the facts about scandal, corruption, or wastefulness in Government without unfairly maligning any individual is rare enough to deserve a special type of recognition. Such a man is William P. Rogers, who has resigned as chief counsel for the Senate investigation committee. Following the tradition of the Truman committee, which it succeeded, this investigative arm of the Senate has given us a good demonstration of the restraint, judgment, and persistence that constitute the investigative art. The appointment of Francis D. Flanagan, former assistant counsel, to the head of the investigative staff is a further tribute to the quality of the work the staff has done under Mr. Rogers' direction.

The departing counsel has served the committee under both Republican and Democratic chairmen. Apparently the change in the chairmanship when the Eighty-first Congress assembled made no appreciable difference because the committee's investigations were being conducted on a level above partisanship. Conscious of the necessity of respecting the rights of citizens, the committee formally adopted rules of fair procedure to guide its activities. Witnesses were given a right to be accompanied by counsel, to defend themselves against accusations and to cross-examine other witnesses through questions submitted to the chairman. Investigations were undertaken only with unanimous approval of the subcommittee or majority approval in the full committee, and reports had to have the unanimous approval of the subcommittee.

The care exercised by Mr. Rogers to avoid smearing any citizen unfairly was well illustrated last August when he stopped a witness after he had brought Major General Vaughan's name into the deep-freeze scandal. There was not a trace of whitewash in this action, as the committee subsequently gave us the full story of the five-percenters and their friends. The chief investigator was simply taking precautions against the careless listing of names until the background facts could be carefully checked by his staff. That this method is effective against corruptionists (as well as protective in the case of innocent citizens) is indicated by the part Mr. Rogers played in exposing such scandals as those involving Maj. Gen. Bennett Meyers, Representative Andrew May and the Garsons. Probably far more important are the changes brought about in governmental machinery as a result of the committee's efforts to prevent the development of fraud and waste in the future. Mr. Rogers has helped to set standards that should long be a potent influence in investigations on the Hill.

Why Not Investigate OHE, FHA, and VA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include a letter recently received from Mr. David P. Weaver, Des Moines, Iowa, relative to houses bought by 100 GI's in the Franklin Park project at Des Moines, Iowa:

DES MOINES, IOWA, *February 18, 1950.*

DEAR SIR: Please read this letter. It is an urgent appeal for justice long overdue. It is mimeographed only because of necessity and is being sent to every Member of the Congress—both the House and Senate—and to the President as well, and to many newspapers and news writers and commentators throughout the country. It is because of desperation that such action as this is being taken.

I need help from some red-blooded, honest Americans who will not hold still and let a group of veterans be sold down the river, almost a hundred veterans who have been defrauded in the purchase of their homes—homes that were built under a veteran's priority and to specifications that were given to our Government in order to obtain that priority.

Over 100 homes built and sold in violation of a law of the United States in a housing program known as Franklin Park, in Des Moines, Iowa, built in 1946 and 1947.

Housing Expediter Tighe Woods knows of this scandal, and so does the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Attorney General of the United States knows of it, as well as the Veterans' Administration—and none of them will do anything about it.

The Housing Expediter ordered an investigation made of Franklin Park and the result was that he placed a claim against the contractor in the amount of from $50,000 to $60,000, but for some mysterious reason it has been shelved. The Franklin Park Co., headed by one Samuel Rosoff, of the Rosoff Construction Co., New York, N. Y., built these homes, and it is common knowledge that for political reasons Mr. Rosoff has been able to bring about enough pressure to cause this scandal to die a natural death. Five percenter Tighe Woods, and also the members of his Chicago office, won't even talk about this matter with we victims, and we are pushed aside wherever we turn for assistance. Our last dealing with his office was in August 1949, when he sent a Mr. Evans, of the OHE Chicago office, to Des Moines, along with a couple other men from the Washington OHE office, and at that time they gathered here in a Des Moines hotel room with some of us who had filed claims with the OHE. Mr. Evans and his cohorts brought us greetings from Mr. Tighe Woods in the form of a settlement offer, one being an offer to pay us $14 for an omitted row of concrete blocks which was left out of our basement foundation by the contractor, and another offer of something like $10 for the

felt composition left off of the roof, and then they offered us another few dollars because of the contractor's failure to give us a dry basement. And the fact that our basement is substandard in height makes no difference as far as they were concerned even though the Federal priority granted to the builder called for a full 7-foot basement—and this in spite of the fact that the OHE claim against the builder asked $500 damages for that alone. That is the solution Tighe Woods offered a few of us veterans who gathered in a Des Moines hotel room with his henchman. Not all of these veteran home buyers were invited to that meeting—just those whom he thought were the hell raisers asking justice.

How did they arrive at the ridiculous figure of $14 for an omitted course of concrete blocks? They told us that the FHA gave them that figure. The total settlement offered us was around $40, and naturally we turned it down and because of it we are being persecuted. All of this happened after the OHE had placed a claim against the contractor for something like $60,000 for his omissions and deficiencies in our homes at the time of construction. Certainly we won't sign a release for $40, who would?

We paid almost $10,000 for our homes but with the "shenanegan" pulled on us regarding trees, curb, and gutter, to be paid for by us over and above the purchase price, these homes are costing us nearly $11,000, and get this, gentlemen, the priority granted for the building of these homes placed a maximum selling price on them at $10,000 including curb, gutter, and paving. With the interest piled on top of all of this, and over a 30-year period, we will be paying nearly $16,000 for these homes.

One hundred families here in Franklin Park have been treated miserably by the representatives of several Government agencies involved in this deal, all of them covering up for the contractor because of his political connections. The Iowa Federal Housing Administration flagrantly double-crossed these veterans with the false report they turned into Franklin Richards, Commissioner of FHA in Washington, back me for the proof, I have it, and the office of the Iowa Chief of the Loan Guaranty Division of the Veterans' Administration here in Des Moines is no less a violator and party to this fraud.

Where is the justice of the Department of Justice; they know of this mess? Where is the integrity of the office of Tighe Woods and his expediters, and why hasn't he turned this case over to the Justice Department for prosecution? Why don't the sleuths of the Federal Bureau of Investigation give their report if they have one—the Omaha office does. How can Tighe Woods and his gang place a claim against the contractor for almost $60,000 and then decide these veterans in Franklin Park don't even have a case, if that's what it is?

Our local newspapers, the Des Moines Register and Tribune, have printed many thousand words of this case in many stories over many months' time, and the record is clear that somewhere along the line these veterans have been washed out of the picture because of a mere handful of shameful politicians.

We carried the flag when you needed us, and it looks as though you may need us again in this troubled world, but how are we going to cope that with the victims and flagrant violations that is allowed to exist in the buying of our $10,000 dream house purchased when we came back from the wars? How can false reports be turned in by Government agencies to conceal this swindle, and why did the office of the chief of the loan guaranty division of the VA here in Des Moines minimize the fact that there is forged paper in this case when he was told about it? They won't give us these answers, nor will they tell us what happened to the progress of this case which has now covered 2 years. I believe, gentlemen, that they will talk with you about the matter if you ask them.

Iowa's Lilienthal investigator, Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, knows all about this Franklin Park case but apparently his hands are tied also, at least that is what he has led his constituents to believe. Even the American Legion and the AMVETS ran for shelter because of the pressure they ran into, and their promise of assistance melted away with the heat of their burning inability to right this vast wrong. Only the Veterans of Foreign Wars stood their ground and they to this day are being fought off by 8-percenter Tighe Woods whom you all have heard gloat over the success he has had in getting refunds for cheated and defrauded veterans.

You men in Washington, and elsewhere, can come to our aid, and my earnest plea is that you do so. Let's have a little investigation at the OHE, FHA, and VA, and find out who shelved this Franklin Park fraud and why.

For 2 years now we have tried in vain to get justice, and for 2 years men in high places in Government have kept the facts buried. May I ask that some of you true Americans come to the front for us?

Sincerely yours,

DAVID P. WEAVER.

Brazen Illegality Seen in Interior-REA Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ray Tucker, from the Shreveport (La.) Times of February 18, 1950:

BRAZEN ILLEGALITY SEEN IN INTERIOR-REA PLAN

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON, February 16.—Resorting to strategy that has been assailed as a brazen defiance of the law and expressed will of Congress, public-power officials in the Department of Interior and Rural Electrification Administration have concocted a scheme that will eventually bring a vast section of the Nation's electric generating plants and transmission lines under Federal control.

The device, which represents a greater bid for power by Interior than even Harold L. Ickes ever dared to dream of, obviates the need for the series of power authorities proposed by President Truman—Missouri, Arkansas, Columbia River, St. Lawrence, etc. Under the method already in effect a power system gridironing the country will fall into Federal hands by indirection.

Oddly enough, the first experiment has been made in the home State of President Truman and in the district represented by CLARENCE CANNON, the czaristic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. He forced approval of grants totaling $44,000,000 over the objections of Representative JAMES L. WHITTEN, of Mississippi, who heads the subcommittee handling these matters.

Representative BOYD TACKETT, of Arkansas, seeks to block the scheme through a measure that will prevent use of Federal funds for this purpose, especially as the Flood Control Act of 1944 specifically denies Interior the right to build steam generating plants.

Other attempts to break up the plan will be made when the measure providing money for these two agencies reach the floor of the House and Senate.

Besides Missouri, other States where these loans have been made or are now under consideration are Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. But these are only the beginning, according to REA-Interior officials, the Cannon group, and the public-power lobby headed by former Representative Clyde Ellis, of Arkansas. As well-paid president, he heads an organization here known as the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

The device for funneling Federal funds into allegedly illegal channels is simplicity itself. It is described by Members of the House as one of the neatest schemes for "bypassing" and "defying" plainly written prohibitions of law that has been seen around Washington in many years.

Under the intent of Congress and its original management, REA loaned money to cooperatives to build steam generating plants where they were required and to transmit electricity to their rural customers. When the property had been paid for by liquidation of the Government loan the generating and distribution system was turned over to the farmers.

Now, however, three or four of these farm groups form what is known as a super-cooperative, with their operations covering a fairly large area. As in the past, they obtain money from REA for construction of electric power plants and lines.

But now their applications and contracts contain a new provision under which they merely lease the property, with Interior becoming the actual owner at the end of 40 years with only a $10 payment by the Government.

By building these systems in various sections of the country, and then tying them into into the great power dams and plants already operating or under construction—Randall in South Dakota, Fort Peck in Montana, Big Thompson in Colorado, Bonneville in Washington, Boulder in Nevada, and the lower Colorado network—the Government will be in a position to nationalize power. Private utilities would not be able to hold their own against such a rival.

In view of President Truman's demand for extending the TVA technique to the Northeastern States, especially Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and New England, that area would also become part of the network.

The taxpayers who must ultimately finance this Federal industry may find themselves holding an empty bag at the end of the 40-year period. In view of prospective changes in the generation and transmission of power, based on development of atomic energy for commercial use, these plants and transmission lines may be obsolete after four decades.

Congressional friends of the rural electrification movement, including Senator ELMER THOMAS, of Oklahoma, contend that the REA-Interior tie-up will mean less rather than more power for farmers and rural communities. Incidentally, it is estimated that there are still 1,000,000 farmers without these necessary and convenient facilities.

It is their contention that money to be spent in building generating plants should go into construction of transmission lines, with the firm power coming from private utilities, wherever that is possible. They argue that construction money will also be eaten up to pay salaries of an even larger number of Federal agents and administrators.

Save for the areas directly affected in the Southwest, the diversion of REA funds and

cooperatives' property into the hands of Interior has commanded scant notice on Capitol Hill. But it will get excited attention when appropriation measures for these two agencies come up for debate and vote.

Even proponents of the scheme do not know how they will reconcile Interior's gamble in generating power with several specific declarations by Congress against such activities. Moreover, only last year, Congress instructed Interior to negotiate with private utilities for construction of transmission lines under the Texas formula negotiated by Speaker SAM RAYBURN on behalf of his Texas utility friends.

Questions and Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following questions and answers from the News-Bulletin of February 21, 1950:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question. Can a government which spends more than it takes in be a prosperous and solvent government?

Answer. Manifestly, the answer is "No." A government, like an individual, must live within its income and means in order to remain solvent.

Question. Why is that true, since the Government, after all, is merely "we, the people?"

Answer. That is true because the Government has nothing to spend except what it takes from the people, either by borrowing or by direct and hidden taxes.

Question. If the Government borrows money from the people, do not the people merely owe themselves the amount borrowed by the Government?

Answer. If the people loan the Government money, and the Government does not have the money to repay the loan when it becomes due, then the Government must either borrow more money from the people or tax them to pay what it owes. Such a course of action sets in motion an endless chain of borrowing that may never be broken short of national bankruptcy. It is even worse than an individual loaning money to another to purchase an automobile, the purchase price of which cannot be paid by the borrower when the loan falls due. Manifestly the lender-seller must lose.

Question. Is government spending inflationary?

Answer. Certainly; because, when the Government spends money usually nothing of substance or wealth is produced to take the place of the money spent—but whatever is added to the economy to take the place of the amount spent, usually costs more than if private capital operating under the free enterprise system did the spending. President Truman on August 1, 1946, admitted that Government spending was inflationary and urged the deferment of public works, except such as were absolutely essential to the Nation's business.

Question. What of the welfare state? If it comes, will it add to inflationary pressures?

Answer. Of course it is, and it will. The more the Government spends, both of what it has and what it borrows, the greater will become the inflationary pressure on the national economy.

Increases in wages, passed on to consumers, are inflationary; and all payments for old-age, survivors, unemployment benefits, and the like are likewise inflationary, though they do all add to the cost of goods and services to the consumers, since they are passed on in increased prices.

Question. Will the Government be able to meet promised payments of $30, $50, or $100 a month as welfare benefits, when such payments become due?

Answer. Manifestly such payments cannot, and will not continuously be met, because taxes to produce funds for such payments have almost reached the saturation point. It has been estimated that, if carried to its logical and proposed end and conclusions, such welfare plans will cost in the first 50 years a total of $1,250,000,000,000. This would mean that every worker would have 15 cents of each dollar in wages deducted.

Question. If such payments are promised and undertaken, what will the money in which payments are made be worth?

Answer. It has been estimated that, if the national income reaches $1,000,000,000,000—one trillion dollars—that the dollar will be worth only 18 cents in purchasing power.

Question. Have welfare and social benefit systems succeeded in other countries?

Answer. No. They have failed wherever they have been tried.

Question. Is there a chance that the welfare state will bring destruction to our national economy and our republican form of government?

Answer. Yes, there is such chance. For the welfare state to be successful, there must be absolute governmental control. In short an oligarchy would be set up not materially different from the absolute dictatorships the whole world apparently abhors but sometimes puts up with as in Soviet Russia and her satellite countries.

"Commerce is the equalizer of the wealth of nations."—Gladstone.

Porcupine Jr., says: "The time has come for Uncle Sam to close up his international gift shop."

Steel Age for New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith an editorial from the Boston Herald for August 28, 1949:

STEEL AGE FOR NEW ENGLAND

A group of unrelated events offer New England an opportunity for prosperity such as we have not enjoyed since the days of the clipper ships. We have almost, but not quite, been handed a great industrial and commercial expansion. So far the fates seemed to have worked in our favor without any effort on our part; from now on it is up to us.

The story, as it is being told by W. E. Playfair elsewhere in the Herald, is an astonishing picture of jigsaw pieces falling as if by themselves in place. A little while ago New England's hope for an iron and steel industry was dashed by the findings of the Econometric Institute that an integrated plant, producing finished steel shapes from iron ore, was economically impossible here. Today another kind of steel industry, but one of even greater potentiality is virtually within reach.

These are the unrelated circumstances that have so strongly worked together for us:

1. The decision of the Supreme Court sustaining the Government's power to prohibit the basing-point system.

Under this system, the steel companies have set prices, including freight charges, as if the steel had been shipped from certain basing points which usually were not the actual shipping points. Abandonment of the system means either that industries using steel must move nearer existing steel plants or new steel plants must be built in areas of large consumption. Up until recently the high cost of new plants would weigh heavily in favor of the former alternative, a sad blow to New England's growing hard goods industry. But the picture is reversed by—

2. New technological developments in steel production.

These new discoveries include the oxygenation system, by which the output of a given steel mill can be increased 25 percent, and the continous casting method, which permits the efficient use of compact and less costly equipment. Not only do these make steel production possible in smaller units, but they make the present big producing units out-of-date and inefficient. Decentralization of the industry, with plants in New England, is made almost inevitable.

3. The discovery that the Labrador-Quebec iron deposits outstrip the mighty Mesabi mines.

The possible limitless deposits, almost at New England's back door, are ready to take the place of the Mesabi mines, in the Lake Superior district, which have been the source of 85 percent of America's iron ore, but which are running out. There are now no known reserves in North America to compare with the Labrador-Quebec deposits. But though relatively near to New England, there is the difficulty that ships bringing the ore here would have to return empty. This difficulty has been greatly eased by—

4. The decision to use the abundant water power available to reduce the Labrador-Quebec ore by electricity to sponge iron.

This means that New England would import not ore but iron, which can be shipped at a great saving in cargo space. New England is better fitted for the secondary manufacturing processes, any how, and the production of steel especially fitted for our uses would serve us better than an integrated steel industry. The difficulty here, however, is that it will be at least 5 years before Labrador-Quebec can be in production. But there may be iron to tide us over in—

5. Production of iron as a byproduct of the titanium smelter soon to be built by Kennecott Copper at Sorel, Quebec.

This, too, may be a matter of several years, but it offers an earlier, or at least a supplementary source, of 800 tons daily. (The Mystic furnace has been producing 500 tons daily.)

6. A number of minor factors, such as the expected piping of natural gas to this region and the world dollar shortage which will impel Canada to export as much as possible to this country.

All these factors do not assure a big steel industry to New England. They make such an industry a natural for us, but it will not come by itself against the inertia of the country's present industrial set-up. There is already on foot a powerful move to have Congress restore the basing-point system, which, if successful, would tend to freeze the present steel concentration of the country. We need to combat that.

This present iron famine should be exploited to bring home to the steel companies the urgency of our requirements and the

growing demands of our hard-goods manufacture, now New England's most rapidly growing industry. We need to bring out that this is the center of an enormous market.

This can be, as we have said, the greatest thing for New England since the clipper ships—if we do not muff the opportunity.

Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, may I include a statement on legislation now pending in the Eighty-first Congress pertaining to the expansion of services to the physically and mentally handicapped, by Mr. W. F. Paulkes, chief of the rehabilitation division of the Wisconsin State Board of Vocational and Adult Education. Mr. Paulkes is one of the Nation's outstanding authorities on the subject, having specialized in the field of rehabilitation in an official capacity since 1920, and on a voluntary basis prior thereto:

STATEMENT ON LEGISLATION NOW PENDING IN THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS PERTAINING TO THE EXPANSION OF SERVICES TO THE PHYSICALLY AND MENTALLY HANDICAPPED

It is my understanding that there have been presented to the Eighty-first Congress two bills for the purpose of expanding the services to the physically and mentally handicapped. These two bills are H. R. 3095 and H. R. 5577. The latter bill, H. R. 5577, is based upon the Federal-State cooperative relationship that has obtained since June 2, 1920. It is my further understanding that a committee has been appointed for compromising the various items involved in these two bills. It would seem that careful consideration should be given before making such a drastic change in administration as is predicated in H. R. 3095. The latter bill, in my opinion, is based entirely upon hypothetic and presumptuous data, while H. R. 5577 is based upon more than a quarter of a century of rather successful experience, especially when for nearly 20 years the Federal allotment did not exceed $1,500,000 per annum.

In this statement, it will not be my purpose to indulge in any acrimonious or sarcastic statements about anyone, assuming that a discussion of such an important subject should divest itself of all personalities and prejudicial statements. Our purpose and aim should be the setting up of an adequate program that is vested with sufficient authority and the necessary funds to carry on a program of rehabilitation that will adequately serve all physically and mentally handicapped, and even those who are severely disabled and those who are blind.

Bill H. R. 5577 provides for rehabilitation centers where the severely disabled, such as those who are suffering from multiple sclerosis, hemiplegics, paraplegics, and those with other severe disablements may be remedied and rehabilitated to the end that they may again function both vocationally and socially. On the other hand, I do not believe that the rehabilitation service should be the agency for the granting of pensions. In my opinion, that properly belongs to the agency in charge of public assistance; but I do think that a proper liaison should be provided between the rehabilitation service and the public assistance agency in regard to pensions which may be arranged for on an individual case basis, as many severely disabled persons may be feasible for at least partial rehabilitation. In my opinion, if proper rehabilitation facilities are provided, such pensions will be few in number. These rehabilitation centers should be supplemented by training centers and sheltered workshops, where those persons who are home-bound and cannot be recommended for competitive employment can be trained for suitable craft or other work that can be carried on in the home as well as elsewhere. Such training centers are now being set up in Wisconsin, but the number has necessarily been limited to the funds that are now available. There should be instituted, also, a more liberal policy for setting up individual business enterprises for both the severely disabled and the blind. All of these items for expansion are provided for in bill H. R. 5577.

The close relationship of rehabilitation to health and education predicates that these services should be in close relation to each other. Such relationship now obtains in the Federal Security Agency. Anyone who has had any experience in rehabilitating disabled persons realizes that physical therapy and education play a major part in such service to the disabled person in procuring suitable and successful employment. My experience of over 30 years has demonstrated that the employment service providing counsel and guidance alone can never solve the myriad of problems that are involved in a program of complete rehabilitation. In Wisconsin, a rehabilitation service was set up in the office of the State employment service back in 1918. The supervisor in the employment office stated that in most cases the disabled person should have some training, and even some physical restoration, before being recommended to a job. The writer was requested to take charge of the program even before the Federal Rehabilitation act was approved in June 1920.

After a disabled person has had the necessary therapy and preparation for a particular suitable job he can be effectively placed, and usually, when placed after such careful preparation, his turn-over on that job is reduced to the minimum. I am in thorough agreement that there should be a very close liaison between the rehabilitation service and the employment service, and that is more easily accomplished after the preparation has been completed than to arrange for such liaison in the midst of the program of preparation.

The writer's interest in the physically handicapped extends back to 1914, when he had an extended conversation with Senator Page, of Vermont (now deceased). I had at that time been appointed a member of a Commission to go to Europe for the purpose of studying vocational education. About that time I had conversations with several State commissioners of workmen's compensation relative to providing amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Acts, to the end of granting lump-sum settlements for injuries sustained, for the purpose of preparing such injured employees to become adjusted to some other job that would be more suitable to the injured client. Since 1920 the writer has had charge of the rehabilitation program, and organized the present rehabilitation service that obtains in Wisconsin. In other words, the writer's interest in the physically handicapped has extended over a period of 36 years, being actively in charge of the program for a period of 30 years.

The original Wisconsin Act was probably in 1920, the most comprehensive act on the statute books of any State, inasmuch as it provided for physical restoration, prosthesis and maintenance, as well as vocational preparation for a suitable employment. It is my firm opinion that bill H. R. 5577 will provide for an adequate service for all the disabled, providing adequate funds are provided by the State and Federal Governments.

Again, the present management of the rehabilitation service is in the right hands, and the program should be retained in the Federal Security Agency. I have worked with this service since its inception, when it was under the Federal Board for Vocational Education; when it was under the Department of the Interior; and now, under the Federal Security Agency, and I have no hesitancy in stating that more progress has been made since the last transfer, 1944, than in all of the previous years. The subcommittee on Aid to the Physically Handicapped of the House Committee on Labor, after a careful study of this problem, made, in part, the following statement in its report in 1946: "It is important that the administration of health, rehabilitation, and education services should be kept closely related because a high degree of coordination is necessary if the services are to be fully effective."

I am convinced that the present administration of the rehabilitation service on a national level through the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is being effectively carried on, and that the Federal-State relationship has been built upon a very friendly and sound cooperative basis.

I am confident that the approval of H. R. 5577 will make possible an even more adequate service for all the handicapped, and enable many more disabled to make their potential contribution to our society, to which they are entitled as their birthright.

Resolution of Atchafalaya Basin Levee Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present a telegram which I have received from Mr. A. B. Smith, Sr., president of the Atchafalaya Basin Levee Board, Baton Rouge, La., which reads as follows:

BATON ROUGE, LA., *February 13, 1950.*

Congressman OVERTON BROOKS,

Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution was unanimously adopted by the Atchafalaya Basin Levee Board on February 13, 1950:

"Whereas due to the present existing conditions of flood water stages in the lower Mississippi Valley and its tributaries, there is considerable agitation from some quarters for the Morganza spillway to be put into operation by the United States engineers; and

"Whereas the Morganza spillway has not been completed, and due to its incomplete condition, opening it would cause untold damage in the Atchafalaya Basin and adjacent territory if said spillway should be opened before it is completed: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Atchafalaya Basin Levee Board in special session assembled this 18th day of February 1950, hereby goes on record as being unalterably opposed to the opening of this spillway under the present existing conditions of incompletement and in view of the present predicted stage at Red River Landing, nor should it be opened under any other circumstances in its present incomplete condition, unless deemed imperative by the United States engineers and the engineers of the Louisiana Department of Public Works; be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be sent to the Louisiana Department of Public Works, Gen. P. A. Feringa, Col. Charles G. Holle, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Gov. Earl K. Long, Senators Ellender and Long, and all Louisiana Congressmen."

A. B. SMITH, Sr.,
President, Atchafalaya Basin Levee Board.

Playing Politics With Your Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Booneville Democrat of February 17, 1950:

PLAYING POLITICS WITH YOUR MONEY

What would you do if someone came to you and asked you to contribute several dollars to the building of a grocery store, a print shop, or other business in a town in eastern Tennessee—not only to contribute, but to add another contribution each year to keep it operating—and you not get any profit out of it? You'd say no, of course, and you might be tempted to add a short, four-letter word that some folks say is naughty. And you'd be right—dead right. Yet that is exactly what you are being asked to do to build a steam electric-generating plant in New Johnsonville, Tenn.

Congress is being asked to appropriate over $30,000,000 for a steam electric-generating plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., to be operated by the TVA (officially known as Tennessee Valley Authority).

Some years ago Tennessee Valley Authority was established as a flood-control project with hydroelectric power as a byproduct. The Government has put almost a billion dollars into it, your tax money, mine, and other citizens, and now they have decided they want to built a steam plant—with the taxpayers' money. The plant will serve a million population, we are told, and will be a good thing for Tennessee—but what about Arkansas?—when we are doing all we can to locate industries in the State?

Why should the people of Arkansas, or Oklahoma, or any other State pay for an electric plant for TVA, so they can sell electricity below cost to people in business in that area? And how does TVA sell electricity so dirt cheap? It sells it that way because TVA pays no Federal taxes, no interest, borrows their money from the Government, and has many other advantages that privately owned companies do not have. What it really amounts to is that it is selling electricity below cost and you, and me, and other citizens are making up the difference. How can we attract more business to Arkansas and at the same time subsidize through our taxes business for TVA?

Another thing, if the Government can build an electric plant in Tennessee with our tax money, it can build another one anywhere else. And building plants everywhere means putting tax-paying electric companies out of business. No one can compete with tax-free, interest-free, Government-babied businesses. And remember, too, if Government can go into the electric business it can also go into the grocery, or hardware, or other business. Ridiculous, you say—maybe, but it has been in the printing business since before this writer was born.

We know our electric companies, privately owned, have done a good job—the way they hooked their different companies together during the war so that power could be delivered where it was most badly needed shows their attitude toward America when America needs them most—and they have kept prices down, given good service and made living a pleasure. Rates are cheaper now than they were during the late war. Their rates are regulated by State commissions, they are allowed a certain percent profit on their investment and they couldn't go above that if they wanted to.

Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., that serves this area is now engaged in a $35,000,000 expansion and building program. Other companies are doing likewise, keeping pace with the rapid growth of their State. They have the machinery either in service or on order to serve all electrical needs. They pay their full share of local, State and Federal taxes.

Government in business is what we are cussing communism for—but it is time we understood what is going on. Let's insist that Congress call a halt to this useless expense of our tax money to put the Government in business. We don't want any part of it in this country—but we may wake up some morning and find a new Government store on Main Street—and wonder how it got there. Think it over.

A Citizen Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a resident of my congressional district so typical of the feelings of a steadily growing body of our citizenship that I believe it merits the attention of every Member of the Congress. The writer is an informed citizen properly concerned over the tragic situation resulting from continued administration delay in the coal crisis. His letter follows:

OLNEY, ILL., *February 11, 1950.*

Hon. EDWARD H. JENISON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JENISON: With coal stocks at a new low, and getting shorter, schools closing, trains being cut off because of a coal shortage, it seems to me that it is high time that Congress passed a law which will restrain one man, or a small group of men, from tying up the economy of the country. It seems ridiculous to me that we permit a John L. Lewis or a Phil Murray to throw their weight around and stop the wheels of this country.

In all the strike settlements that have been made, it is we, the consumers, who ultimately pay the cost of the settlement because it is reflected in our higher coal bills and other things we purchase.

Now do not misunderstand me. I am not opposed to labor unions, and believe that in the right kind of responsible leadership, they have and can accomplish considerable good for the welfare of the laboring man. But the immense powers vested in the labor leaders that we have in this day and age, is not being wisely handled. The cause of labor is being injured rather than aided.

This coal shortage could be seen by everyone a month and a half ago, except by the man from Missouri, who for political reasons, did not want to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act. Now that he has had to proceed under it, it is too late to put coal above the ground. In the event of more rough winter weather there will be immense suffering among the people of this Nation.

Mr. Representative, the time has arrived for you and your colleagues to do something for the good of this country, and that is to curb the powers of these labor leaders, just as your predecessors in office curbed the powers of the corporations, so that in the future the people will not be harassed by the whims and fancies of John L. Lewis, Phil Murray, and all the other power-drunk labor leaders who like to throw their weight around and show just what they can do.

Very truly,

DONOVAN D. MCCARTY.

The Time Is Here for the Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Batesville (Ark.) News:

THE TIME IS HERE FOR THE TEST

Members of Congress never overlook an opportunity to promise reduced taxes if they can find a way to reduce them. It was to this end that a commission was appointed, headed by former President Hoover, to make a study to determine what overlapping agencies could be eliminated and what streamlining could be done to cut expenses of government and thereby reduce taxes.

Several highly important recommendations have already been made by this Commission. Reports by Mr. Hoover's group indicate that tremendous cuts can be made in the personnel of tax-financed bureaus.

One of the groups of experts working for the Hoover Commission has made a thorough investigation into the question of Government electric-power projects. It was made by independent engineers and accountants. And it has made the startling report that electric power developed at tax-financed dams in the country is actually not cheap power as has been claimed. Rates would have to be drastically increased if the Government recovers even a major portion of the huge tax outlays it has made on these projects, according to the Hoover report.

The report points out that public-power bureaus do not charge themselves with nearly all of the things that are necessary for sound business operations; they pay no taxes; they enjoy special low-interest rates; and have many other subsidies that the taxpayers must pay out of their pockets. The report even recommends that one useless public-power bureau, the Southwestern Power Administration, be dissolved, and that the Army engineers sell power generated at Federal hydroelectric dams in the Southwest.

Here is a definite and concrete proposal for reducing taxes. It is going to be interesting to see just what our Congressmen, who say they want to reduce our taxes, do about this plan. The time for their true test is at hand.

Every American Must Do What He Can

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this morning I made an announcement that I would be a candidate for the Republican nomination for United States Senator in the South Dakota primaries, June 6. Petitions are being prepared and will be sent to the State immediately.

I am led to this decision as the most effective way to say to every corner of South Dakota that our national life is in peril from the power-drunk, color-blind, inept and spendthrift leadership. As of today, for me the best place to combat that is in the United States Senate. The President in his appointments and Secretary Acheson in his administration of foreign affairs act with the advice and consent of the Senate.

No one bears the responsibility for this decision but myself. It is not easy to give up a seat in the House which many say I could keep with little campaign effort or personal expense. I do it, however, in the belief that many others could well carry on there and that I can render a greater service to South Dakota and the country by making this effort regardless of its cost to me.

Friends of South Dakota development familiar with my work in behalf of the people and district I have had the honor to represent will know that if I am elected to the Senate, every person and section of the State will receive the best representation that my 14 years of experience in Washington can bring. And those who know of my personal interest in farming will be sure that every day I will be doing something for our basic industry. In effect, we are all farmers in South Dakota; without farm prosperity there is none.

Whether my name is selected to be at the head of the Republican column on the South Dakota ballot next fall or not, my time and energy will be at the command of the Republican Party next fall.

Our life as a nation is at stake in a fearful world of shadow boxing with domestic problems like John L. Lewis and of bluffing with unmade H-bombs at a literal-minded Red Russia. It is a time when every American must live up to the best light he has and do what he can.

Imports Versus Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, business in surplus foods is very, very good, particularly if you are an exporter in a foreign country and want to sell in the United States.

Recently I reported the imports of some surplus foods July through November 1949. Today I have the figures from July 1 to December 31, 1949, and there has been, as I had previously indicated, a sharp increase, during the month of December. I am advised the Secretary of Agriculture remains unconcerned, despite seeming surplus problems and the outcry resulting from the waste of food and taxpayers' money.

It would appear that it is about time the administration, the State Department, and ECA and Secretary Brannan face facts and reconcile the conflict between our one-sided foreign-trade policy and the welfare of our domestic economy. The simple facts are that tariffs on most food and agricultural products have either been eliminated entirely or reduced so low that they no longer afford American agriculture the protection it needs. Meantime, the American farmer is being held up to scorn, and it is forgotten that we must maintain our farm income, so essential to our entire economy. Secretary Brannan apparently is now attempting to sell his impractical plan by using foreign imports as a club, that will result in further production cuts for the American farmer.

The imports of some surplus food commodities, as covered in my statement of February 7, 1950, totaled approximately $45,000,000, for July 1 to November 30, 1949. The new total for the July through December figure is approximately $57,000,000. These are commodities that the Commodity Credit Corporation owns and are in surplus supply or are under price-support programs or in danger of being soon. Given proper tariff protection, the cost of our agricultural price-support program could have been reduced by over $55,000,000 during the past 6 months.

From July through December, we imported 19,435,000 pounds of cheese—Government holdings on December 31 were nearly 24,000,000 pounds.

From July through December, we imported 795,000 bushels of wheat, not counting wheat in bond—Government stocks on December 31 were over 475,000,000 bushels.

From July through December, we imported 359,000 bushels of corn—Government stocks on December 31 were over 180,000,000 bushels.

From July through December, we imported 8,260,000 bushels of barley—Government stocks on December 31 were over 53,000,000 bushels.

From July through December, we imported 9,478,000 bushels of oats—Government stocks on December 31 were nearly 42,000,000 bushels.

From July through December, we imported 7,436,000 bushels of rye—Government stocks on December 31 were nearly 760,000 bushels.

From July through December, we imported over 48,940 bags of dried beans—Government stocks on December 31 were 10,850,000 bags.

From July through December, we imported 701,000 bushels of apples, while we were paying an export subsidy on over 1,500,000 bushels.

From July through December, we imported 86,000 pounds of raisins, with the surplus under marketing agreement orders estimated at 100,000,000 pounds.

From July through December, we imported 2,202,000 pounds of pork and pork products, while hog prices declined sharply.

From July through December, we imported 1,587,000 dozen eggs from Canada.

From July through December, we imported over 1,746,000 pounds of dried eggs, mostly from Communist China. We also imported 283,000 pounds of frozen eggs. The Government stock pile of eggs on December 31 consisted of over 73,500,000 pounds of dried eggs, and they are still buying at the rate of over 2,000,000 pounds a week.

Again I wish to ask the questions: How long can this foreign give-away last? When is the Secretary of Agriculture going to act to protect our farm markets?

The REA Versus SPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Waurika (Okla.) News-Democrat of June 10, 1949:

THE REA VERSUS SPA

Nobody, so far as we are able to learn, is in any way opposed to the REA, which has already brought electric light and power into much of the rural area of the United States. It has done much to improve living conditions in these areas and the move has the backing of practically all the people. But what a lot of people do object to is the Government going into the business of generating electricity in competition with private industry.

Private industry could not extend lines into the sparsely settled districts. This is a project that had to be subsidized by the Government. But some of the power-mad Government-ownership crowd want to dub everybody who oppose their schemes as being against REA.

There is a lot of talk now about increasing taxes in order to balance the budget, yet the Government continues to invest in private industry, using up a lot of Uncle Sam's revenue and at the same time putting out of business many of those concerns that supply that revenue.

The House of Representatives has passed a bill approving an appropriation of $12,625,530 for SPA.

The significant part of this bill is that it is all in southeastern Oklahoma. Of the lines that are proposed to be built none are less than 66,000 volts, and the line from Lulu to Anadarko is 132,000 volts. It covers the southeastern part of the State completely, extending into 26 counties and reaching every county seat in those 28 counties.

The program calls for the building of 33 substations where the current may be taken from the line and stepped down for use at lower voltages. For instance, the lines go to McAlester, where private companies already have three large lines running into Hugo now—no shortage of power at all. Yet one of these 66,000-volt lines extends to Hugo and a substation will also be built at Hugo.

The SPA claims it intends to serve the REA's, some public bodies, and the rest will be new business. But they are building lines and substations sufficient to take over the entire electric load in this area just as completely as it has been taken over in Nebraska and in Tennessee.

Then, after they get this area entirely cleaned up, they plan on some other areas. Just which ones, we do not know.

They are doing this in the face of the fact that up until today this area has had all the current it wants and still has plenty, for some time in the future, and before any great need would arise, the private companies will have installed an abundance of power.

This is just a scheme of the public-power advocates to go into the general electric business, and what alarms us is that the people, generally speaking, seem to think that we are in no danger at all of being swamped into socialism. Just take a look at what has happened in the last 10 years in England and then picture Uncle Sam still further in before another 10 years has passed.

Free enterprise has made America great and will, properly safeguarded, continue to make her great. Well, just write your Congressman and United States Senator and tell him how you feel about things.

We defy anybody to be any stronger for REA than we are, but, on the other hand, we take a back seat to nobody in being against the Government going into business against her own taxpaying citizens.

Rent Decontrol and New Housing Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, in the near future, the Congress will begin consideration of a proposal to extend rent controls. The decision of Congress in this regard will have an immediate effect on virtually all of the Nation's renters, builders, and property owners.

Recently, Mr. Tighe E. Woods, Housing Expediter, directed a communication on this subject to the Washington Post. Mr. Wood, clearly analyzes and discusses the current problem in his communication which follows:

A COMMUNICATION—RENT DECONTROL AND NEW HOUSING NEED

(By Tighe E. Woods, Housing Expediter)

In the Washington Post of February 12, there appeared an article by Ysabel and Robert Rennie entitled "Rent Control Distorts Housing." The authors of the article say that the purpose of decontrol was to increase building, and that this objective was attained. In support of their statement they cite the increase in the total number of nonfarm units started from 1947 through 1949.

Since there never have been ceilings on the sales prices of new homes, the decontrol of rents for new construction was obviously not intended to stimulate construction for sale. It was intended to spur the building of rental property. The real estate industry had repeatedly asserted that if rent ceilings were removed from new construction enough rental housing would be built to wipe out both the housing shortage and the need for rent control. On July 1, 1947, when the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 went into effect, rent control was removed from all new construction, including houses completed on or after February 1, 1947. The decontrol of new rental housing now gave them their chance.

What happened after decontrol? The authors admit that most of the new houses were for sale, not for rent. Between July 1947 and October 1949, 431,400 rental-type units were started in nonfarm areas.

Rental-type housing since July 1947 constituted only 19 percent of all new nonfarm construction, and represented an addition of less than 3 percent to the number of occupied nonfarm rental units in the United States reported by the Census Bureau in April 1947.

Thus, decontrol did not result in any great outpouring of new rental housing as the real estate industry had predicted that it would. On the contrary, it fell far short of our previous achievements in this field. During 1925 and 1926 a total of 723,000 rental-type units were started in nonfarm areas. In other words, in those 2 years we produced 68 percent more rental-type housing than in the 28-month period after July 1, 1947, when new construction was decontrolled.

Obviously, we are paying a premium in high rents for new housing and, as the authors point out, there are two levels of rents—a high one for uncontrolled new construction, and a lower one for controlled housing. The authors state that when rent controls go off the differential will disappear—rents for new construction will fall, and the formerly controlled rents will rise. In a general sense that is true, although there will probably always be some differential between new and old housing. People are willing to pay something more for the latest equipment in a new house, for lower initial costs of maintenance, and for the general feeling of comfort in a new home. Nevertheless, the two groups of rents will tend to move toward each other.

The real question, which has been left unanswered, is "At what point will they tend to be equalized?" All evidence points to the conclusion that the high rents will drop very little and the presently controlled rents will rise a great deal. In other words, the more than 11,000,000 families now paying controlled rents will pay considerably more; the few hundred thousand families now paying uncontrolled rents for new housing will pay a little less. For new houses, high construction costs will act as a brake on rent reductions.

For controlled housing, a survey recently made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in Dallas, Tex., where rents were decontrolled in June 1949, shows the probable effect of decontrol. Let us see what happened to the rents of the units in Dallas which were under rent control at the time the city council voted decontrol, excluding those units which were under lease and could not have their rents increased. The survey showed that by November 1949, only a few months later, 67 percent of these units had rent increases averaging 35.4 percent. If we throw in the 33 percent of the units which had no increase, the general rise in rents is 20.5 percent, but this figure does not measure the actual burden on the majority of the tenants who had to pay rent increases. To use a combined average including the units which had no increase is like saying that a millionaire and a pauper have average assets of $500,000, and just as unrealistic. The significant fact is that two out of every three tenants had to pay an average rent increase of 35 percent.

The authors imply that all controlled units have been held frozen at low levels. I should like to correct this false implication. Rent increases have been granted through individual adjustments to more than 2,000,000 units under rent control, and to more than 430,000 units through area-wide increases. Over 2,250,000 units have had rent increases through voluntary 15-percent leases signed in 1947 and 1948. Finally, almost 3,000,000 units have been decontrolled since April 1, 1949. This certainly does not add up to any picture of a rigid freezing of rents.

The authors say that the high premium on new rental housing encouraged builders to bid up costs, that prices for homes for sale were consequently inflated because they are a mirror of inflated rentals, and that if rent controls go off builders will have to cut costs and lower profit margins if they want to tap the great new potential market for homes at lower prices that will be created by decontrol.

This is really putting the cart before the horse. In the first place, the premium on new rental housing was, in itself, in part a recognition that construction costs had already risen to such an extent as to require a rent differential between new and old housing. In fact, during the period when new housing was subject to rent control, we recognized this need and established higher maximum rents for new construction to compensate for higher construction costs. What the authors are saying, in effect, is that the builders of new housing for sale—and this new sales housing was 81 percent of the total since July 1947—went ahead merrily bidding up their costs because rents were decontrolled for the remaining 19 percent of the new construction which was of the rental type. That makes no sense whatsoever.

If the authors' reasoning had any foundation in fact, we should find that the big rise in building costs had taken place since the decontrol of new construction in July 1947. Exactly the opposite happened. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that by June 1947 its index of wholesale building material prices had increased 58 percent above the 1943 average. After June 1947 the index increased only 17.2 percent to its peak in September 1948, and it has declined since that date so that in December 1949 it was only 9.3 percent above June 1947.

The biggest factor in the rise of construction costs was the premature lifting of price ceilings in November 1946. The building material price index jumped 20 percent in the short period from October 1946 to June 1947. Average hourly earnings of building-construction labor show a similar big rise before July 1947 and a much smaller increase since that date. Since most of the increase in building costs took place before July 1947, attributing the rise in building costs to decontrol of new construction (which did not take place until July 1947) is a distortion of the facts.

The great new potential market that the authors talk about is not something that will magically come into being the day rent controls are lifted. That great potential market is here today. Our real need today is for low-priced and low-rent housing within the means of the vast majority of our people—for homes to sell for less than $8,000 and to rent for less than $75 a month. Builders don't have to wait for the end of rent control to tap this market. They can do it right now, if they will cut costs and lower profit margins.

The end of rent control will not create that market. That is the cart before the horse all over again. But if builders will build for that market now, and build enough homes, the need for rent control will be ended. That is something I should like to see happen as soon as possible. However, premature decontrol will mean great suffering and hardship for the American people; and until most men can house their families decently at a rent or price within their income, decontrol would be premature and foolhardy.

Incorporating Girl Scouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to vote for H. R. 6670, to incorporate the Girl Scouts of the United States with domicile in the District of Columbia.

The Girl Scouts were organized to promote the qualities of truth, loyalty, helpfulness, friendliness, courtesy, purity, kindness, obedience, cheerfulness, thriftiness, and kindred virtues among girls as a preparation for their responsibilities in the home and for service to the community. No higher ideals could be taught to the future womanhood of America. These young women will, in large measure, guide the future destiny of this great Nation, because it is the hand that rocks the cradle that rules the world. Together with the Boy Scouts, these young women will be the future leaders of our country. They are doing a splendid job to preserve democracy in America and in teaching the youth of other countries who attend their conventions, what we mean by democracy. Would that we had more Girl and Boy Scouts in America to make their Scout promise, as follows:

On my honor, I will try to do my duty to God and my country; to help other people at all times; and to obey the Scout laws.

What of the Night?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have just come upon a copy of the December 1949, issue of the Ohioan Post, published by Ohio University at Athens, Ohio. One of the contributors to that issue was our distinguished colleague, Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON, of the Twenty-second District of Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON's article, What of the Night?, is so replete with political, economic, social, financial, agricultural and labor facts and economics, that it merits the reading of every Member of this House.

Her pictorialization of the news of the day, of changes that have taken place in these last 20 years of congressional activities; of the days when annual appropriations by the Congress were still in the millions instead of billions of dollars; of the waste, inefficiency and extravagances that have characterized the maladministration of Federal affairs in recent years; her discourse on bureaucracy; so-called Federal aid; of a Government that is today spending more than $4,000,000 an hour every day of the year; make it worth while to all to read this article by FRANCES BOLTON, What of the Night?

WHAT OF THE NIGHT?

(By Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON)

As the outline of this article is being written, the telegraph wires, the radio, the television, and the cables are carrying the happenings of today to the people of the world.

Over the radio comes word that "the weatherman advises that a blanket of snow is being laid over the Midwest"; "there is no further news about the steel strike, affecting not alone the steelworkers, but hundreds of thousands in other industries"; "that settlement of the coal strike is further away than ever"; "schools are closed in Indiana for lack of coal," says the Governor of Indiana; "the Governor of Illinois stated today that coal will be rationed in that State if the strike continues 10 days longer"; "the Government opened negotiations with eight foreign nations to provide them with arms under the military-assistance program"; "Dictator Tito of Yugoslavia will be permitted to buy several civilian, but no military planes"; "Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, upon his return from Europe, states that 'the Russian Army is many times larger than our own, but the United States Air Force is about equal to Russia's.'" Now comes word that "the Governor of Minnesota has just stated that with snow falling, the small towns of Minnesota are in a pathetic condition for want of coal."

"Within a few hours President Truman will address the Nation. The title of his speech has not yet been announced, but the President says it will be 'bipartisan and nonpolitical.'" The country is awaiting the President's address.

To quote a Nation-wide popular radio commentator, "That is the top of the news as it looks from here."

Many in Congress feel with me that each day brings not alone a new challenge but a new crisis to the people in America. These challenges have to do not alone with the lives and fortunes of individuals, both young and old, but seemingly have to do with every spiritual and material interest to which all studious and contemplative minds address themselves in this modern civilization.

Tremendous and epochal changes have taken place in America in these last 20 years. They first appeared as the backwash of the great world-wide economic depression which engulfed this Nation in the late twenties and the early thirties. They continued insofar as our domestic front was concerned until the lush boom times which struck our country with the beginning of World War II.

A veritable catalog of changes have occurred. Changes with respect to industry and agriculture, in production, marketing and in the pricing systems. Changes with respect to bank deposits and banking controls affecting deposits and loans and reserves. Changes having to do with labor and management in their relations with wages and with hours. In the field of social security, changes have taken place as to the care of the aged and the indigent. Then there are questions of taxation * * * extended bureaucratic controls * * * management of the public debt * * * the extent of financial support that is being rendered not alone to the veterans of all wars but for the support of foreign nationals across the seas. The foregoing are all problems to which the youth of America will some day have to address themselves and solve in their own time and in the national interest.

My personal knowledge of congressional activities goes back before the days of billion-dollar Federal appropriations, when Government expenses were still in the millions. The Eighty-first Congress, in its first session, appropriated roughly $37,000,000,000 in cash, but pledged another additional four and a half billion in contract authorizations. These figures do not include six billion for interest on the public debt * * * half a billion for statutory public debt retirement * * * and another billion for annual indefinite appropriations. It all adds up to the staggering total of almost $50,000,000,000 which we, the taxpayers, must meet.

How well I recall the occasion and the clamor provoked by the first year of deficit spending by the Congress. Yet during the past 16 years I have seen billions annually appropriated and expended in excess of Federal income. The exception to this current practice was the two memorable years when the Republican Party controlled both Houses of the Eightieth Congress of these United States.

The waste, the inefficiency, the extravagances which have characterized the maladministration of Federal affairs in recent years were most vividly disclosed by the talk recently made in Cleveland by the Honorable Louis B. Johnson, Secretary of Defense. In discussing the economy drive which he recently launched, Secretary Johnson said he was convinced he could save hundreds of millions and even billions of dollars without reducing the fighting efficiency of our armed services, and even a billion dollars, my friends, is a saving of one thousand million of the taxpayers' dollars effected in but one department of Government alone.

It is my conviction, reached after careful study, that a saving of more than $5,000,000,000 could be effected in Federal expenditures in the next fiscal year alone if equally sound business principles were made applicable to expenditures in all other departments.

Second only to the proper management of the national debt comes a factual and long-delayed revision of the tax structure of the Federal Government, which has not been basically altered in the last three quarters of a century.

Up until 1939 all the new revenue measures that have been written were amendments and additions to, or extensions of, the basic tax structure, which dates back to the year 1874.

To have even a meager idea of the tax laws of these United States one must make practically a lifelong study of tens of thousands of pages of small print comprehended in hundreds of volumes of tax digests.

In addition to the laws themselves as enacted by Congress and signed by the President, are hundreds upon hundreds of amendments thereto, administrative rulings, regulations, interpretations, which cover the collection of taxes and which by virtue of usage alone are now part and parcel of the law of this land.

Because of congressional delegation of power to executive departments in order to execute loosely drawn legislation, and because of rulings pertinent to legislative enforcement, the day is not far distant when the Congress of these United States will be called upon * * * actually to repeal laws which as a Congress they never enacted.

The number of these instances are legion. The rulings, orders, and so forth, are applicable to farmers, to manufacturers, to common carriers, to those who come under the provision of the Federal Trade Commission, the Pure Food and Drug Administration, the Federal Power and Security and Exchange Commissions * * * and a host of other agencies who have now issued hundreds of administrative rulings which because of usage courts have held * * * to have the full force and power of law.

The last two decades have seen deep and penetrating incursions made into the field of States' rights. The adjustment of the rights of sovereign States to a highly centralized form of government is a matter which is going to invoke the greatest intellects that will develop in those who now constitute the American youth.

For years past I have argued with my colleagues that there is in fact no such thing as extending Federal or financial aid to the States.

Political aid, Yes. Financial aid, No.

On innumerable occasions I have advanced argument that every last dollar that is covered into the Federal Treasury at Washington must first be collected either by direct or hidden taxes from the people in the 48 States, our insular possessions, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, or the District of Columbia itself.

So-called Federal aid to States whether for highways, bridges, roads, schools, or any other purpose whatever, must first be collected from the States—by the tax gatherers of the Federal Government. Then, by congressional action, and by another group of Federal agents it is returned in part only to the States from which it was collected.

Experience has taught me that the dollar which citizen taxpayers in the States send to the Federal Treasury in Washington is not as big a dollar when it gets back home, because bureaucracy imposes a heavy "brokerage fee" for first making the collection and then the refund.

It is both significant and startling that for the year 1948 the total of all grants and aids returned to the State of Ohio (which grants total 45 in number for various activities) but exclusive of the $157,000,000 paid for veteran benefits, the Federal Government paid back to the State of Ohio a bare $80,000,000 as contrasted with the total of $2,665,000,000 that it took out of the State.

PART II

I have just listened with deep interest to all that the President had to say in the memorable broadcast on this the last day that marks the 100th anniversary of the Louisiana purchase and the establishment of the territory of Minnesota.

In no one sentence did the President address himself to a single one of the many issues which confront this country.

He characterized as reactionaries each and every one who gives any thought to the future or to the administrative tasks which lie ahead!

He totally ignored what Governor Thye of Minnesota, who sat on the platform with him, had stated earlier in the evening about the pathetic condition of the small towns of Minnesota suffering for want of coal.

Neither did the President make mention of the fact that one person out of every nine in these United States is now on the pay rolls of Government, Federal, State, and local, drawing all or a part of his income from the taxpayers of the United States.

He made no mention of the fact that there is one Government payroller for every three families in the United States. Neither did he mention the impending deficit of nearly $6,000,000,000 which the Government is at present facing in this the first fiscal year since his reelection to office.

What the President stated in fact was that his personal program was not alone to continue, but that he intended to extend the peculiar brand of national socialism which has been slowly engulfing America.

The President did say in his talk that this was a day of change—but what a change. From a balanced economy to reckless bureaucracy, and still more reckless spending.

He did not tell the people that he is spending more than $4,000,000 an hour of the taxpayers' money, or nearly a million dollars more every hour of the day and year than is collected in taxes.

Yes; it is a different day—it is a day of change—a day when it would seem that our National Government no longer believes it must pay as it goes.

It is because of the President's unwillingness to face these facts that I put the question to you, my readers: What of the night?

Platform of American Veterans' Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me, I include that portion of the platform of the American Veterans' Committee which deals with veterans' affairs:

VETERANS' AFFAIRS PLATFORM

PREAMBLE

We believe that military service in time of war is an obligation of citizenship in defense of our families, our homes, our security, and our freedom.

We further believe that to each man or woman, physically disabled by such service, and to the immediate families of those men and women who suffered death in such service, our country should provide adequate medical, financial, and other benefits and assistance. We are opposed, however, to Treasury raids and grab-bag legislation and believe that rehabilitation and reintegration into the community is the scope and purpose of a veterans program.

We maintain that it is the veterans' basic need and right that he be properly restored to the economic and social status which he would normally have achieved as a civilian had he not entered the service, without regard to his race, color, creed, or political belief.

The achievement of economic security for veterans through sound economic planning as citizens rather than through special grant or favor as veterans is basic AVC philosophy. To effect these ends, we urge:

CARE OF THE DISABLED AND DEPENDENTS

Adequate care of veterans disabled in military service and of the immediate families of those who suffered death in such service requires:

(a) Comprehensive, careful review of the adequacy and fairness of the existing compensation rates, and of the rating system employed by the VA;

(b) Provision for adjusting compensation rates periodically in accordance with movement of the BLS Consumers' Price Index;

(c) That the VA should raise its compensation schedule for disabled veterans with dependents;

(d) That the VA conduct a continuing active program to aid disabled veterans in securing gainful employment;

(e) Ironclad preference in Federal, State, and local governments for veterans who by reason of their war service are amputees, paraplegics, hemiplegics, blind, or otherwise disabled to a degree of 50 percent or more;

(f) Comprehensive, careful review of the adequacy and fairness of the existing medical facilities for treatment of veterans with a view to extending the service provided by the VA in this respect.

(g) Provision for increasing Government appropriations to the VA to carry out the extension of medical service to veterans.

(h) Provision for developing a training program to adequately staff VA hospitals.

(i) An equalization of the benefits of hemiplegics and paraplegics.

(j) Extension of the GI bill of rights benefits to widows and orphans of the men and women who died in the service.

EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND REHABILITATION

We affirm that use of Federal funds to speed full adjustment of the veteran to civilian life not only constitutes simple justice, but represents a worth-while investment in increasing the productivity and enhancing the culture of our Nation. Therefore, we support:

(a) The reversal of the apparent trend by the Veterans' Administration denying educational and vocational rehabilitation benefits through cutting the essential staff for these services and through unreasonably stringent requirements of veterans who need these services.

(b) Increasing the base-subsistence allowances from their present figure to such figure as is justified by increases in the cost of living as measured by the BLS consumers' price index.

(c) Legislation assuring veterans in the employ of the Government of the right to educational leave at the earliest possible date and in no case later than 1954.

(d) We call for the raising of the present limit of $500 for books and tuition to $600, and that the maximum total allowance for the purpose be raised from $2,000 to $2,400. Ceilings on earnings should be raised proportionately.

HOME-LOAN GUARANTEES

Increases in building costs and in the cost of living have rendered the home-loan-guaranty program, ostensibly guaranteed by the GI bill of rights, relatively meaningless. To accomplish the purpose of the original act, we believe that it is to the best interest of the veteran that the present rate of interest on loans be decreased and to this end we urge that the Government establish a Veterans Home Owners' Loan Corporation, providing for 100-percent financing of GI loans at a rate of interest lower than the current 4 percent.

DISCRIMINATION

We call upon the VA and all State agencies administering veterans benefits to discharge their duties without any discrimination whatever based upon race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, or political belief, and we urge these agencies to exert every effort to induce employers, loan agencies, and education institutions to make veterans benefits available to all veterans without such discrimination.

We urge the elimination of Jim Crow practices within all branches and departments of the armed forces. Furthermore, we call for a review of all blue discharges by an interracial civilian examining board.

We call for the initiation by the Veterans' Administration of machinery to investigate reports of unpaid terminal-leave benefits and the denial of the 52-20 payments to Negroes in the South, and for provision of machinery to aid in the collection of these benefits and to insure the collection of the pending NSLI refunds.

EXPLOITEERS

In addition to the assistance we urge for disabled veterans, and within the context of AVC's long-standing support of the Full Employment Act of 1946 and the various improvements in that act which we urge elsewhere in the platform, we ask that the Congress revive the benefits of the Readjustment Allowance Act, otherwise known as 52-20, and extend these benefits, increasing the benefits therein in accordance with the movement of the BLS Consumers' Price Index since the amount of benefits was set.

We urge elimination of superpreference in the civil service except as mentioned above in the case of disabled veterans. Veterans, whether in public or private employment, should be given seniority credit for the time spent in military service and in vocational rehabilitation after release from such service. The present 5- and 10-point preference in civil-service examinations should be continued, but a passing grade should be required before the preference is given.

Until Congress acts to remove the absolute preference given veterans in civil service, reductions in force in the appropriate Government agencies should give consideration to measures alleviating the hardship imposed upon career employees by such preference policy. These measures should include:

(a) Where reductions in force are ordered the workweek of all employees be shortened to minimize the number of lay-offs.

(b) Reducing the retirement age for those involuntarily separated from service.

(c) Maintaining an overall Federal seniority list so that those laid off by one agency may be transferred to another agency.

BONUSES AND PENSIONS

As citizens first and veterans second, we stand opposed to bonuses and general pensions, the right to which rests solely upon service in the armed forces of the United States. We regard such bonuses and pensions as economically unsound political hand-outs, for which the veteran himself would ultimately pay. We propose, instead, as benefiting veteran and nonveteran alike, the AVC program of social legislation.

RESOLUTIONS

Employment

Resolved, That the chapter of the AVC should encourage local organizations to assist in the economic rehabilitation of the disabled veterans by buying their employment by local employers and by assisting in the merchandising of their products.

Insurance

Resolved, That we call for making renewable term insurance a permanent program on a convertible and automatically renewable basis.

Because of large overpayments, veterans are now going to receive a large refund on payments made. We ask the VA, therefore, to immediately reduce the amount of premiums on GI insurance, and to make available to veterans any additional amounts of insurance they desire.

We ask that AVC take definite steps toward insuring that all veterans in the South are made aware of this refund, and that some plans be devised through southern AVC chapters and the Veterans' Administration to get the necessary forms for refunds to all who are entitled to them.

Arthur Krock's Interview With President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, considerable comment has appeared in the press recently in connection with an interview with President Truman published by the New York Times over the byline of Arthur Krock.

Mr. Krock, who usually expresses the Republican viewpoint in his column on political and governmental affairs, can scarcely be regarded as an admirer of the Democratic Party or of its program.

For this reason it is especially interesting that Mr. Krock finds, despite the Republican sloganeering concerning socialism, that our President is sincere in his efforts to preserve our great free-enterprise economy and our Democratic form of government.

For the convenience of the Members who may not have read this article, I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AN INTERVIEW WITH TRUMAN: HE SEES MAN'S BETTER NATURE BRINGING PEACE TO ILL WORLD—COVERS WIDE FIELD—HE SEES NORMAL DEALING WITH SOVIET HOPELESS—BROKEN PACTS CITED—DEFICIT SPENDING DECRIED—GOP TAX SLASH IS BLAMED—"RED HERRING" HELD TO APPLY TO SPY HUNTERS' METHODS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 14.—In the age of atomic energy, transmuted into a weapon which can destroy great cities and the best works of civilization, and in the shadow of a hydrogen detonant which could multiply many times that agent of destruction, a serene President of the United States sits in the White House with undiminished confidence in the triumph of humanity's better nature and the progress of his own efforts to achieve abiding peace.

This President, Harry S. Truman, is a controversial figure in the world and in domestic politics. But to those who talk with him intimately about the problem of global life and death, his faith that these good things will happen, and probably in his time, shines out with a luminous and simple quality which no event or misadventure of policy can diminish.

The following is an account of the President's current views on the international and domestic issues of his time which I can vouch for as to accuracy. It may serve further to reveal to doubters and critics what manner of man he really is; and crystallize in the minds of those who instinctively supported him in the campaign of 1948 what were the personal qualities they sensed but did not always comprehend.

UNDAUNTED BY WAR CLOUDS

He sits in the center of the troubled and frightened world, not a world he ever made; but the penumbra of doubt and fear in which the American Nation pursues its greatest and most perilous adventure—the mission to gain world peace and security while preserving the strength of the native experiment in democracy—stops short of him. Visitors find him undaunted and sure that, whether in his time or thereafter, a way will be discovered to preserve the world from the destruction which to many seems unavoidable, as moral force is steadily weakened by the conflict of two great rival systems and by new skills in forging weapons of destruction that make the discovery of gunpowder seem like the first ignition of the parlor match.

His reasons for this serenity and this sureness emerge from current conversations with the President on the issues of the time. For Mr. Truman is the kind of American who must be observed at first-hand, free to speak with the candor and natural piety of his make-up, to be wholly understood.

In such meetings he answers questions that bear directly on the problems before him. And these questions and his answers that follow (the latter put mostly in the indirect discourse which is due to a President for his own protection and that of the country) reveal the man and what he conceives to be his mission and his methods of accomplishing it better than the formal record can do.

CHANGE OF SOVIET EXPLAINED

Question. You recall the hopeful prospect of peace that surrounded you, and you expressed, at San Francisco in 1945 when the United Nations was organized. What has happened since to bring about deterioration to the point where a member of your Cabinet can say of it: "The cold fact is that we are still in a hot war?" When did you conclude that normal negotiation with the Kremlin was hopeless?

Answer. The President said he remembered that time well, and with what good-will toward the Russian people and their rulers he went to Potsdam shortly thereafter. There he explained to offer help for reconstruction, of Russia as well as the rest of the world, on a very large scale. He remembered with pride and sympathy how Russians had smashed the German armies in the East, and he believed their assistance was necessary to win the war against Japan. But he found that all Stalin wanted to talk about was the abrupt cessation of lend-lease; hence the atmosphere was unfavorable to what Mr. Truman had in mind.

"To abolish lend-lease at the time was a mistake." But he was new then; the papers had been prepared for Roosevelt, and represented a Government decision. He felt there was nothing else he could do but sign. He had no staff and no Cabinet of his own. Now he has both.

The agreement the Russians made at Yalta to enter the war against Japan was the only one they ever kept out of nearly forty. He has no hope they will keep any which now it would be good policy to seek. But he remains hopeful of the outcome.

When the Russians, after the Potsdam agreements, blocked East-West trade he began to lose the last vestige of hope that what seemed so good a peace prospect at San Francisco had survived. Gen. George C. Marshall, he recalls, came back from Moscow deeply discouraged. And when Ambassador Bedell Smith reported to the President from Moscow that the Russians were carefully concealing from the people all facts about the war assistance we had given them, and what our proposals had been for joint reconstruction of the world, that last vestige disappeared.

BARRED DIVISION OF JAPAN

It would have been the same in Japan as in Germany if the President had not demanded an American as the allied generalissimo there at the signing of the surrender on the *Missouri*. Otherwise the Russians would have divided that country as they have Germany; and the situation in the Far East would have been so much worse than it is that one can take comfort from it.

The real trouble with the Russians is that they are still suffering from a complex of fear and inferiority where we are concerned. If a campaign had not been in progress in 1948 he would have sent Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson to try to straighten out Stalin and the other Russians leaders on this and on our real intentions. Maybe that will be the thing to do some time. But in nothing must we show any sign of weakness, because there is none in our attitude. To appreciate some of the importance of this read "Berlin Command" (a book by former Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, published by Putnam's, New York).

He is reliably informed that the Russians have 16,000,000 people in concentration camps. This is the way of the police state, which he finds utterly abhorrent.

Question. In view of your background, training and dislike of debt, how do you reconcile these with your toleration of deficit spending and your advocacy of new spending programs? Critics of the Fair Deal program say it proposes permanently to burden the more able, diligent and successful with the cost of "insuring all others against the results of their own improvidence, ill-luck or defective behavior"; that this is very nearly the Marxian doctrine, "to each according to his need, from each according to his ability."

Answer. In no sense does the President tolerate deficit spending. There wouldn't be any now if the Republicans had not cut the income taxes in the Eightieth Congress. Tax changes should not have been made piecemeal at any time, but conformed to a general and revised plan. This was equally

true when he approved the repeal of the excess profits tax. He wishes he had not done this, because it was piecemeal also. But then again he was new at the job.

AIMS AT EXPANDED ECONOMY

His object is steadily to expand the economy so as to provide jobs and careers for the million and a half young people who come annually into the stream of commerce. This cannot be done without the measures outlined in the Fair Deal. From a peak of 59,600,000 of persons employed in civilian activities last September, the number has gone down to 56,000,000, with 4,800,000 unemployed. A certain amount of unemployment, say from three to five millions, is supportable. It is a good thing that job seeking should go on at all times; this is healthy for the economic body. But the main thing is to keep the economy rising to absorb the new entrants into the stream of commerce. There are now 62,000,000 employed in the labor force in the United States, including the military. Ten years ago whoever had suggested that this could happen would have been written down a fool or a dreamer.

Senators GEORGE and BYRD call for a reduction of $6,000,000,000 in the budget. They know very well it can't be done. The President has cut the defense requisitions this time from $22,000,000,000 to less than $14,000,000,000 and paid for the military-aid program for the North Atlantic Treaty nations out of it also. He is an old hand at budget making, and at the last session he sent a tight one to the Capitol and they sent it back with increased totals. He feels he has cut this one as much as can be done in consideration of the basic needs of the foreign program and of the dynamic domestic economy he seeks to create and maintain. This in itself will bring an end to deficit spending, which represents exactly the amount the tax cut of the Eightieth Congress cost the revenues. He hates deficit spending as much as HARRY BYRD ever could, and it is only a temporary condition, brought on by necessities which could not be removed by any genius of statecraft known or available to him.

A reduction of more than $8,000,000,000 in the defense bill, with $1,000,000,000 for the military-assistance program (MAP) found extra, compares rather well with the blueprint of the economizers.

He has no policy which contemplates permanently burdening the more able, diligent and successful with the cost of insuring all others against the results of their own improvidence, ill luck, or defective behavior. This charge—also that the Fair Deal approximates the Marxian doctrine—is absolutely untrue. The President's aim is to preserve life and property and expand opportunity and the standards of living. There isn't a drop of Marxist or Socialist blood in him.

The globe shows vast areas inhabited by hundreds of millions of people who want to improve their lot, and this can be done with our American surpluses and with a moderate amount of our assistance, financial and technical. When that is done the chief threat of international communism will pass, and this is the primary objective of his policy.

Question. Your views on party obligation: that all elected as Democrats must abide by platform pledges. Suppose (1) you construe a pledge in detail differently from a Member of Congress; or (2) he has made a commitment to the contrary prior to the adoption of the platform. Is he recreant as a party man?

Answer. The President does not expect 100 percent support from those elected to Congress on the same platform with him. He recognizes that local situations may require some Members to refuse to follow a President on certain matters. As a Senator, he reserved the right of independence at times for himself. But he does not believe that, after a platform has been duly adopted by a convention, all those who have participated or run on that platform should generally abide by its detailed construction by the national candidate.

Only that national candidate, the President, can translate a platform into actionable terms. There are few chairmen of congressional committees who follow the platform and the President's construction of it more than 50 percent of the time, and this is very bad. These chairmen should be the right arm of the administration in orderly government by party. If there is any other way to have a responsible Government, he does not know what it is.

STIRS HIS STAND ON FEPC

Question. You favor the Fair Employment Practice Commission legislation providing Federal police powers in the States to correct employment discriminations, some of which are implicit in the present condition of racial minorities. You know intimately the condition of the Negro race and the limitations of its capacity to fill certain kinds of employment. Many believe that education will be required before an FEPC could operate even on a voluntary basis. Why then is it desirable in mandatory form, requiring that the burden of proof be on the employer?

Answer. The President would not support or continue to support any legislation which deprived a citizen of the right to run his own business, for which that citizen was responsible, as he thought best. The President does not agree that the administration's FEPC legislation would have any such result. If he thought so, he would not be for it, and under him it will not be so administered.

But opportunities to get jobs for which applicants are fitted by every fair test must not be denied in this country on grounds of race, color, or any similar discrimination. The value of the FEPC bill will be to give this position the dignity, strength, and clarity of a national policy, not just political, but social and economic as well. For that reason he wants the bill passed, even if it were only to serve as a club in the closet.

EARLY "INADEQUACY" DESCRIBED

Question. When you became President you expressed a sense of inadequacy which many thought was far too humble for your abilities. Now and for some time you seem to have dropped that feeling overboard, where it belongs. How did this change come about?

Answer. When Mr. Truman became President he did not intend to convey the sense of inadequacy which many people thought he did. He came into office without a single member of the Cabinet who was devoted to him personally, without having been briefed on the processes or current problems of government, without knowing who the people were to whom he should apply for the counsel and facts a President must have to serve the best interests of the country. Often some member of that Cabinet tried to see him privately to complain about another one. He stopped that: first, by recounting the incident at the Cabinet meeting and asking the two or three involved to work it out; second, by getting his own Cabinet. Now he is served by the best personal staff he could find and by a loyal and able Cabinet. The problem remains how to find the very best qualified persons outside for counsel and for collecting the facts in special matters. That is an unending task, as well as a vital one. But the inadequacy of the position he was in to do that has disappeared, and that was all he meant at the time.

Question. It is true that chairmen in Congress get these places through senority, and it is a bad system. Have you any idea of a better one, or any other that would be operable?

Answer. The seniority system by which chairmen of committees in Congress are selected is a defective one because the best qualified men do not always get the jobs. But any substitute that has been proposed is unworkable, and the present system has the merit of keeping order in the legislative process. If the Administration were allowed to pick the chairmen, which is one substitute that has been proposed, the Executive would dominate Congress and this is not only undesirable but contrary to the intent of the Constitution.

Question. Will you explain your use of "red herring" and "hysteria" in the context of the spy trials and hunts since you are charged (1) with not comprehending the gravity of this situation or (2) playing for votes of groups under suspicion?

Answer. When Mr. Truman on several occasions spoke of "hysteria" and "red herrings" in connection with revelations about espionage, and so forth, he was criticizing the methods employed by the Un-American Activities Committee and by individuals in Congress and out of it. The objective of having only loyal citizens in Government service and in positions of importance and responsibility has been his fundamentally, too.

His loyalty board (Chairman Seth W. Richardson) has done much more effective screening of this kind without headlines and personal publicity than the congressional spy hunts, which have been animated chiefly by quests for headlines and personal publicity. These produced the hysteria he was talking about, reminding him of the public excitement in the days of the Alien and Sedition Acts, the Know-Nothing Movement, the Ku Klux Klan, and the red scares of 1920. And he has never changed his opinion that the way the Un-American Activities Committee handled the Hiss and other cases was a red herring to distract public attention from the blunders and crimes of the Eightieth Congress.

When the President was chairman of the special Senate committee during the war, he followed a method which he sought to endorse by contrast when he made the above comments about hysteria and red herrings. Whenever he found something wrong or some indication of potential wrong in the war program, he privately communicated the facts to the departments concerned, and usually it was corrected or averted without the kind of publicity that unfairly shakes public confidence, and spreads through the more than two millions in Government employ a feeling of insecurity in their jobs which hampers and damages their work.

The result was that no major scandal occurred in the war. This is the responsible method which, because it was not followed in these other matters, impelled him to say what he did. The Government service is 99 percent plus loyal and secure.

If the facts about a Government employee show the contrary, out the man will go at no expense to public stability—though, it is true, without a headline for a politician who has that chiefly in his mind.

Such are the President's statements on his views.

Those who have the privilege, necessarily a limited one, of searching in this way the mind and purpose of Harry S. Truman usually come away with faith in his honesty and courage. They usually come away also with the conviction that, whether or not he has the greatness which the times require—a question that must be left to the verdict of history—he means to preserve the basic system by which this Nation attained its greatness, and to achieve and maintain that peace which has been the highest aspiration since 1783.

Commemorative Stamp Issues

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have been pursuing the matter of special and commemorative issues of stamps with only confused information from the Post Office Department.

I have received a most clarifying letter from the Third Assistant Postmaster General in whom rests the departmental responsibility for these issues. Certain that many other Members have sought information in this field I am inserting General Lawler's letter in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1950.

Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. BOLTON: This will acknowledge your letter of January 5 and other correspondence relative to commemorative stamps.

In the Postmaster General's letter of February 9, 1949, it was explained that under section 351, title 39 of the United States Code, he has the authority to issue new stamps of both the ordinary and commemorative variety. Prior to 1948 all postage stamps were issued under this authority, the ordinary stamps being determined by the various postal rates in force and the public convenience. Commemorative stamps are issued to recognize important historical anniversaries of events of national importance, or of famous persons. The Postmaster General, under the authority cited above, determines the number of new stamps to be issued.

There is a limit to the number of commemorative stamps that may be issued each year, as they must be manufactured and distributed in addition to approximately 20,000,000,000 stamps of the ordinary variety. It has been found from experience that not more than 10 or 12 commemoratives can be issued each year without disrupting normal functions or being accused of exploiting the collecting public. After a program of this extent had been approved for 1948, the Eightieth Congress enacted legislation requiring 14 additional stamps to be issued in a period of 6 months. This greatly augmented program had many unfavorable results, one of which was the delay in filling orders by the Philatelic Agency, as was brought to the attention of this office in your letter of February 1, 1949.

Philately is a hobby enjoyed by millions, among whom are many school children and people in modest financial circumstances who can ill afford more than a few pennies at a time for stamps. To issue a large number of commemoratives each year makes the cost of collecting prohibitive to these people, who then protest vigorously to the Department. A problem is also presented by our Philatelic Agency when stamps are issued in such profusion. Additional personnel, working quarters, and equipment are not immediately obtainable, and new clerks must be trained in the technicalities of philately if patrons are to receive the service they demand.

You will note in the attached table showing the issues in 1948 that the number of each stamp printed was reduced from 115,000,000 to 80,000,000 or 90,000,000, beginning with the Salute to Youth issue. This action was necessary in order to keep pace of the numerous issues being released. Such reduction results in a higher philatelic value being placed on the stamps, which is undesirable from the small collector's point of view, as he is then required to pay higher prices to dealers for the stamps he was unable to obtain from the post office. The Philatelic Agency could not keep space with such a program as that of 1948, which also seriously retarded the distribution of operating supplies of ordinary stamps to postmasters.

There is attached a statement showing the commemorative stamps issued during 1948 and 1949, together with the number of each sent to postmasters, and their total manufacturing cost. Also given is a statement showing the sales, salaries, etc., of the Philatelic Agency. To determine the total cost of providing commemorative stamps it would be necessary to add to the manufacturing cost and philatelic salaries not only that part of the cost of transportation, heat, light, power, and storage involved, but to apportion the time and salary of every clerk in the 41,000 post offices who handled them. While it is possible to determine this cost, the Department has not undertaken the task, as the final result would be of no value. The profit derived from the sales of commemorative stamps cannot be found by deducting this cost from the receipts. The profit depends rather on the number of commemorative stamps sold that are never used for postage purposes. It is impossible to even accurately estimate this, as a great many collectors buy sheets of 50 or 100 stamps and select only a few for their collections, the balance being used for postage. Then again there are those who have been collecting for years that unfortunately meet financial reverses and are forced to use their collections for postage purposes. In order to ascertain with any degree of accuracy the profit derived from the sale of commemorative stamps, it would be necessary to know the number of stamps used strictly for collecting purposes and those affixed to mail. It is of course impossible to obtain this information.

It is hoped that this will clarify the situation sufficiently to enable you to furnish satisfactory answers to your constituent's inquiries.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH J. LAWLER,
Assistant Postmaster General.

Commemorative stamps issued to postmasters in 1948

Date issued	Name of stamp	Number issued
Jan. 5	George Washington Carver	121,540,000
Jan. 24	California Gold Centential	120,709,500
Apr. 7	Mississippi Territory	[1] 117,000,000
May 28	Four Chaplains	[1] 115,000,000
May 29	Wisconsin Statehood	[1] 115,000,000
June 4	Swedish Pioneer	64,108,500
July 19	Progress of Women	[1] 115,000,000
July 31	Golden Anniversary, City of New York	28,140,100*
July 31	William Allen White	77,064,600*
Aug. 2	United States-Canada Friendship	[1] 115,000,000
Aug. 9	Francis Scott Key	[1] 115,000,000
Aug. 11	Salute to Youth	[1] 75,000,000
Aug. 14	Oregon Territory	52,214,000
Aug. 25	Harlan Fiske Stone	33,900,100
Aug. 26	Palomar, Mount, Observatory	[1] 50,000,000*
Sept. 7	Clara Barton	[1] 50,000,000
Sept. 9	Poultry Industry	52,975,000*
Sept. 27	Gold Star Mothers	[1] 75,000,000*
Sept. 29	Fort Kearny	[1] 50,000,000*
Oct. 4	Volunteer Firemen	[1] 80,000,000*
Oct. 12	Indian Centennial	[1] 50,000,000*
Oct. 27	Rough Riders	63,575,000*
Oct. 29	Juliette Low	[1] 60,000,000*
Nov. 4	Will Rogers	[1] 60,000,000
Nov. 5	Fort Bliss	87,490,000
Nov. 8	Maine Method	[1] 50,000,000*
Nov. 19	Lincoln's Gettysburg Address	[1] 60,000,000*
Nov. 20	American Turners Society	[1] 60,000,000*
Dec. 9	Joel Chandler Harris	[1] 60,000,000

[1] Number of stamps ordered printed rather than the number issued. This is given where the issue is not yet complete.

*The asterisks mark the stamps that were required by congressional action. The others were approved by the Postmaster General.

Total number of new stamps issued in 1948 was 2,009,115,000 at a manufacturing cost of $442,123.

Commemorative stamps issued to postmasters in 1949

Date issued	Name of stamp	Number printed
Mar. 3	Minnesota Territory	100,000,000*
Apr. 12	Washington and Lee University	110,000,000
May 11	Alexandria Bicentennial	70,000,000*
May 25	Annapolis Tercentenary	100,000,000*
Aug. 29	Grand Army of the Republic	110,000,000
Oct. 7	Edgar Allan Poe	112,000,000
	Universal Postal Union:	
Oct. 7	5-cent	35,000,000
Nov. 18	10-cent	20,000,000
Nov. 30	25-cent	15,000,000
Dec. 17	Wright Brothers Air Mail	75,000,000

*The asterisks mark the stamps that were required by congressional action. The others were approved by the Postmaster General.

The total number of commemorative stamps issued to postmasters in 1949 was 1,144,456,709, at a manufacturing cost of $264,036.

Work load and cost of clerks

Fiscal year	Average number of employees	Policies	Orders	Amount of business
1947	47	$124,767	161,251	$3,331,261.00
1948	46	117,643	124,203	2,490,735.00
1949	58	168,782	194,660	4,136,122.01

Veterans' Organizations Disagree With Part of the Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, about 2 years ago Congress passed legislation providing for a Commission to study the numerous Government departments with the idea of making much needed economies in many departments of the Government. Former President Hoover, America's greatest administrator, was placed at the head of this Commission. He, with other members of the Commission and a large corps of experts in Government management selected to advise them, brought forth a few months ago a masterful document known as the Hoover Report. This report recommended certain drastic changes in the management of the medical centers and hospitals which are now under the control of the Veterans' Administration.

The national commanders of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans and the American Veterans of World War II protested vigorously that it was not for the best interests of the disabled veterans of the country to have the recommendation of the Hoover Commission carried out. These veterans' organizations made a thorough study of the problem and published their recommendations in well-written briefs. I have read these briefs and feel that these organizations have made a good case. I feel that the views of these organizations can be carried out without seriously affecting the usefulness of the Hoover Report.

I expressed my views on this subject in a short speech that I made in the House of Representatives in Congress on February 2, 1950. This speech is as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION WITH REFERENCE TO VETERANS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the various veterans' organizations in the country are objecting to one of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. They assert that this recommendation if carried into effect will work a severe hardship on disabled veterans and those needing hospitalization.

I want to commend the leaders of these organizations for the thorough study they have given to the subject before they announced their opposition to this one section of the Hoover report. I have read the statements made by the American Legion and other veterans' organizations on this subject and I feel they made a good case. It shall be my purpose to assist them in their efforts.

The people are strong for the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission and, likewise, they want to do justice to the veterans, especially those who are disabled and those who are in need of medical care and hospitalization.

I think Congress can work out a plan that will meet the wishes of the veterans and not seriously disturb the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

The high officials in several of the veterans' organizations approved my speech and complimented me for making it. At a meeting of American Legion leaders from Ohio recently held in Washington the viewpoint expressed by me was in good part the viewpoint of most of those present.

The First World War affected the United States and the whole world tremendously and in many ways. It brought many difficult national problems. One of these problems was what to do for the disabled veterans and the widows and orphans of veterans who had given their lives for their country. Millions of our young men participated in this war and many thousands gave up their lives and many more thousands returned as permanent cripples.

Lincoln said after the Civil War that it was the obligation of the Government to care for him who bore the brunt of the battle in the heat of the day and for his widow and orphans. To the everlasting credit of our country the Government through the actions of Congress has always done this.

Soon after the First World War, Congress passed legislation setting up what is known as the Veterans' Administration. In this new department of the Government was reposed the authority and the responsibility of administering the laws providing for pensions and compensations and also the laws providing for the management of medical centers and hospitals for the care of disabled veterans.

The Veterans' Administration has become a very important Government department and employs many thousands of office employees and physicians. These employees have the responsibility of caring for many thousands who are receiving assistance and medical care of different kinds.

The Second World War brought many of the same problems with many hundreds of thousands of additional disabled to be cared for.

The burden on the Veterans' Administration came to be tremendous in volume and tremendous in expense. It was only natural that there would be many complaints made against this organization and while many of these complaints may not have been justified, it is only natural that many of them would be well founded. In fact, the work of this great organization became heavier and heavier by reason of the increased load that came with the passage of new legislation giving to veterans many new privileges for training and education, all of which called for the expenditure of great amounts of additional funds.

In my somewhat extended service in Congress, I have had occasion to serve many thousands of disabled veterans in their efforts to secure pensions and other assistance. Likewise I have assisted in securing pensions for thousands of widows of war veterans. Back in the period following the First World War when the veterans of that war were claiming pensions and compensation for injuries and the effects of gas, I think the records will show that I had for two separate years gotten more pensions than any other Congressman. My experience as a lawyer and with the help of efficient office assistants, enabled me to secure material assistance for many worthy veterans.

The GI bill of rights which passed Congress following the Second World War, and for which I voted, brought to Members of Congress a great deal of additional work. By reason of this law thousands of deserving veterans have been able to equip themselves to fill responsible positions in the professions and in every form of social activity.

I feel confident that this Congress will give favorable consideration to the expressed wishes of the several great veterans' organizations with reference to the maintenance of the medical centers and hospitals now under the control of the Veterans' Administration and that this will be done without weakening the power and influence of the Hoover Commission whose recommendations have quite generally met with the most hearty approval of the American people.

The veterans' organizations are to be commended for their efforts in securing for the sick and disabled veterans what they are entitled to. If the Veterans' Administration has been inefficient in its handling of the medical centers and hospitals, it will, I am sure, immediately endeavor to correct its faulty methods.

I hope that the veterans' organizations will in the future encourage the Veterans' Administration in its management of the medical centers and hospitals to which the disabled veterans are sent. If these agencies are properly and economically operated by the Veterans' Administration, the veterans will be benefitted and the general public will be satisfied.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an eloquent address by the Honorable Joseph Mruk, mayor of Buffalo, N. Y., together with introductory remarks by Hon. Chester T. Skibinski, chairman of the Massachusetts Board of Arbitration and Conciliation, recently delivered over the radio under the auspices of the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish American Congress, Inc.:

JUSTICE FOR POLAND

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY CHESTER T. SKIBINSKI, CHAIRMAN OF THE MASSACHUSETTS BOARD OF ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION

Poles came to America before the Pilgrim fathers arrived on the Mayflower and even before Henry Hudson sailed into what is known today as the port of New York. The first Poles landed in 1608 and helped to establish the oldest American colony at Jamestown, Va.

During the next two and one-half centuries, the immigration consisted mostly of Polish intellectuals who left an indelible stamp on the progress and development of the United States, which is too lengthy to narrate in this brief introduction. The massive influx of Poles, however, began in the middle of the nineteenth century and was comprised chiefly of people engaged in agricultural pursuits. Today there are some 6,000,000 Americans of Polish ancestry in the United States.

Since one of the characteristics of Poles is an intense love of freedom, it was not surprising that during our war for independence, the noble Polish military leaders volunteered their services to General Washington. The address you are about to hear is devoted to the evaluation of accomplishments of one of them.

Our speaker was born in Buffalo, N. Y., in 1903, the son of Polish immigrants. In 1937 he became a member of the Buffalo city council and in 1943 a Congressman from the Forty-first New York District. In 1949 he was elected mayor of the city of Buffalo, a city of 600,000 inhabitants, on the Republican ticket. I feel proud and honored to present to you, the recorded address of the Honorable Joseph Mruk, mayor of Buffalo.

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH MRUK, MAYOR OF BUFFALO, N. Y.

When a famous French writer met Thaddeus Kosciusko at a banquet, and asked him bluntly, "General, please tell us all about your revolution," Kosciusko answered, "I have been a soldier, and I fought."

This little story gives us a more convincing picture of the man, whose birthday we commemorate today, than lengthy biographies. For, modesty is an attribute of greatness, and Kosciusko was a great man. There are no doubts about it. But he was so modest that he probably never realized that his birthday would be celebrated in speech and writing for many, many years to come, not only in his native Poland, but also in the United States, which became his beloved country of adoption. He never guessed that after 204 years his name would be heard by millions of listeners, in the privacy of their homes, thanks to an invention called the radio.

I wish that not only his compatriots, but that all Americans could join today in a tribute, paid the man who was justly called the Polish Washington.

Strangely enough we are facing almost the same problems that worried Kosciusko and stirred his heart to action. In his times Poland was victimized by three rapacious neighbors. The country was partitioned, and overrun, by Russian and German armies. Nowadays, Poland is again a victim of a ruthless occupation, but many other countries are suffering the same hardships. If only the world would have more men of the stature of Kosciusko, who never hesitated to risk his life defending a just cause, we would not have to worry.

The life of that political refugee, who later became a general of the young American Army, should be taught in every school as an inspiring example. He came to the United States of America as a heartbroken, disgraced Polish soldier, a refugee from a defeated country, and a few years later he was planning the defense of Billingsport and of Saratoga, he was constructing fortifications of our first Military Academy at West Point, where we may now admire his monument. He joined the army of Washington, and had the privilege of firing the last shot in the American Revolution.

Even in Charleston, deep in the South, the name of Kosciusko sounds familiar to all inhabitants, because it is connected with the memorable day of December 14, 1782, when victorious armies marched into the city, and a young American colonel, of Polish origin, was cited by General Greene for his extraordinary zeal, vigilance, and brains.

Kosciusko arrived in America in 1775 as a political exile after the first partition of Poland, because the noble words of the American Declaration of Independence prompted many enthusiasts to leave their countries and help the heroic American soldiers in their strive for liberty.

The American war for independence became thus his personal problem. Kosciusko embraced the ideal of democracy and became its promoter in his own country, where he returned 10 years later as an American general to lead a fabulous insurrection against three powerful occupants. Before his departure from America, where his promotion was recommended by Washington, as an individual proclamation, he was bestowed another honor by a city where he lived for a long time. The exclusive Society of Cincinnati, with only three foreigners in its midst, offered Kosciusko a perpetual membership. Washington gave him his own sword, which he used during the battle of Saratoga. That token of a lasting friendship between a statesman and a soldier was for many years one of the greatest treasures of the Polish National Museum, because of its symbolic meaning, namely, that of the friendly relations that existed from the very beginning between the United States of America and Poland. A friendship cemented with the blood of Polish heroes, Kosciusko, Pulaski, and many others.

After his departure from America in 1784, "he took with him," as a biographer states, "besides ideas of political and military nature which had, up to then, been less effective in the Old World, also the treasures of experience, of endurance, and of authority which were to prove so invaluable to Poland." His liberal manifesto, assuring Polish peasants of their rights, was an echo of the American Declaration of Independence.

Almost single-handed he waged a war against Russia, and its allies. He dared to challenge not only Catherine of Russia, but also the German and Austrian rifles. Guided by a truly American democratic spirit, he mobilized men of all social classes.

For the first time, members of the Polish nobility and peasants joined their hands, and formed a powerful living chain. Unfortunately, it did not prove strong enough to withstand the joint onslaught of three well armed enemies. The hero of both the American Revolution and Polish Civil War, was critically wounded and thrown in a dungeon in St. Petersburg. But such was his prestige that the newly elected czar paid him a visit and set him free.

Kosciusko never surrendered. He remained faithful to his principles. Even the magnetic charm of Napoleon would not make him collaborate with the French Army, because the Emperor refused to promise complete independence to Poland. "Everything or nothing" was the motto of Kosciusko. Heartbroken over the plight of his native land he went into voluntary exile, and returned to his beloved United States of America, for the independence of which he fought with such unselfish zeal and devotion. Americans freed from a foreign rule were gladly building the future of the New World. They greeted Kosciusko in 1797 like the best of friends. They forgot their shops and labors, their troubles and quarrels, and—as his biographers state—they poured en masse on the wharf of Philadelphia to celebrate the return of the "illustrious defender of the rights of mankind." The citizens of Philadelphia, in their ardor, unharnessed the horses from Kosciusko's carriage, and dragged it to his lodgings.

The popularity of Kosciusko in this country grew even more after the publication of his last will, addressed to his dear friend President Jefferson. In that testament the noble Pole asked that all his meager funds be used for the freeing and educating of Negroes. And though his intentions have never been carried out, he nevertheless, deserves the title of a pioneer of their emancipation. The last words of his will "each citizen must defend his country against foreign as well as internal enemies," sound nowadays more timely than ever.

Kosciusko is a symbol of all the values that make a good citizen. And today again, his inspiring example appeals to all those who suffer persecution and who strive for freedom. He is also a shining example for all Americans of foreign birth who came to this blessed country of ours from their native lands, as war victims or political refugees, and instead of becoming a burden to America are her real asset. He is a symbol of the indomitable Polish spirit.

Once more Poland lost its independence through no fault of her own, but solely through the fault of greedy, imperialistic-minded neighbors, and through the short-sightedness of the modern world which did not realize that not only Poland but the entire civilization is threatened by an impending danger of a totalitarian enslavement. Once more the lovely country which in 1918 regained its independence, dreamed of by Kosciusko, and accomplished many striking achievements, only to be overrun in 1939 by German and Russian Armies, joined again in an unholy alliance, became in our times a target of despicable political bargaining which caused her enslavement by Soviet Russia. And once more Thaddeus Kosciusko seems to rally young and old, men and women around the historic Polish flag, which bears the memorable motto: For your freedom and ours.

Poland, the country of Kosciusko, Pulaski, and so many other heroes, will never die.

Why I Had To Step Aside

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, who recently resigned as Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers because he could not twist economic facts to suit political purposes.

The article should be of interest to every American citizen, since it sheds light upon the policy of the Administration and how political and personal bias sway official decisions and warp their thinking on economics. The article is entitled "Why I Had To Step Aside," and it appeared in Collier's magazine for February 18, 1950.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make approximately three pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $246.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I HAD TO STEP ASIDE

(By Dr. Edwin G. Nourse)

(In 18 years of Democratic rule in Washington, no one man's break with the White House has had deeper meaning than the resignation of Dr. Edwin G. Nourse as chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Past rifts between presidential righ-hand men and their boss have stirred up louder tempests and juicier gossip. But Dr. Nourse is no mere disgruntled politician or disaffected crony. At 65 an economist of the highest distinction, formerly vice president of the Brookings Institution, head of the American Economic Association, and United States delegate to international economic conferences, he quit his council post as an act of intellectual protest against the things he saw done and the attitudes he met behind the top-level Washington scene. This is Dr. Nourse's own story of why he quit. He tells it with characteristic dignity, restraint, and lack of sensationalism. But in it he raises one of the most important questions of our time: How far do we want to let political and personal bias go in swaying the official decisions which daily affect our economic lives?—The Editor.)

It made live newspaper copy to say I fired a blast at the administration and that this act cost me my job as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. But such an explanation does not square with the facts, and it fails to shed any light for my fellow citizens on some developments in our system of free government which I believe important for our future.

The mere addition of one individual—technically past retirement age—to the ranks of the unemployed would in itself have no importance or general interest. But in this particular case the individual was connected with a highly important innovation in the United States effort to make free enterprise work splendidly within a system of free government. Thus my departure has significance for the businessman, the worker, the taxpayer, the voter, and the reasons should be frankly told.

I did not resign because of any doubts or disillusionment about the Employment Act of 1946 itself, which set up the Council of Economic Advisers. I still firmly believe in the declaration of national policy with which the act begins. It states a purpose which is practical, sound, and deeply held in the hearts of most Americans. It registers an intention of ending, or at least lessening, the periodic depressions which have plagued us in the past.

The act proposes no panacea. But it seeks to mobilize our economic brains, inside Government and outside, to improve our public and private economic practices, and to coordinate the economic thinking and policy making of business executives, labor leaders, farm organization officials, and Government people. It promises unprecedented recognition to the scientifically trained economist as a practical aid in public affairs.

Nor did I resign because I felt that the Council of Economic Advisers itself was either inadequate or ill-designed to promote the purposes of the Employment Act. It was set up as a small advisory agency, with no administrative powers or responsibilities. It was not to gather its own facts or rely exclusively on its own interpretations, but to

synthesize data from many agencies in Government and in private business. Its task was to bring this data into focus for use by a greatly overworked and heavily pressured President.

This exacting job was to be done by three men who, as a result of training, experience, and attainments were especially qualified to analyze and interpret economic developments, appraise Government programs and activities, and formulate and recommend national economic policy.

A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

When Mr. Truman asked me to become Chairman of the newly established Council of Economic Advisers, I first tried to see what kind of a council was expected or desired. After our initial discussion I wrote to the President, outlining my view of the Council's role. I said I saw no need for it to become in any way involved in the rival beliefs and struggles of different political and economic factions. I added that, if this statement correctly interpreted the act and reflected his hopes and purposes for the Council, the position offered me was one of unparalleled opportunity as well as responsibility, and one to which I would give my most loyal service. Mr. Truman at that time expressed agreement with my interpretation.

In my more than 3 years on the Council, my troubles stemmed entirely from the interpretation placed on qualifications for Council membership and from the way Council members interpreted the general instructions laid down in the act. In the end, I felt I had to step aside because I had become convinced that the Council of Economic Advisers could not, under present circumstances, be operated as the professional and nonpolitical agency I had supposed was called for by the Employment Act of 1946.

The impasse which led me to feel that I had to step aside began to develop early. When I accepted the post of chairman, I was entirely unacquainted with either Mr. Leon H. Keyserling or Dr. John D. Clark, the other members. As we got down to work, it became evident that both my colleagues conceived the role of the Council as one of much more active participation in the political process by which policies are carried out than I did.

I had stated my idea of our duties in a paper read before the American Economic Association in late January 1947, under the title Economics in the Public Service. I disavowed the idea that we were the three wise men of economics standing at the President's elbow to give him pontifical answers to every economic problem as it arose.

Instead, I said, we should undertake to show him the agreements and disagreements among qualified economists and experienced business, labor, and agricultural leaders and the grounds on which these disagreements arise. We should tell him briefly and simply which courses of action we, individually or collectively, believe promised best results for the national welfare. My paper concluded: "When we have brought this sort of material to the President's desk, we shall have discharged our responsibilities under the act as I conceive it."

That paper was called to the President's attention, with this passage specifically pointed out. He later said he had read it with approval. But our Council discussions soon made it clear that neither of the other members would have stated our role in any such terms. Instead of marshaling pros and cons for the President's consideration and analyzing probable consequences of alternative policies or actions, they were emphatic that the Council should come to the President with a single definite policy recommendation and do our best to "sell" him on it. After he had bought it—or taken a different policy line—they thought the Council should be prepared to testify on the President's policy if asked to do so by the Congress.

One member insisted strongly, and the other more or less acquiesced, that a three-man Council must follow a majority rule, certainly as to operational matters such as the Council's role and scope or activities and, hopefully, even as to economic views. I did not feel that the Council could or should be expected always to come to agreement. Since actual agreement was impossible and formal agreement was demanded, both omission and verbal subterfuges were resorted to in order to produce documents to meet deadlines. Subsequently, a member could claim that his pet idea was still there by implication.

It was also argued that it was fruitless, if not improper, for us to draft analyses and expositions whose conclusions varied with the President's known and publicly stated beliefs and intentions. My answer was: "We are not here to take our economics from the President. We are here to bring him the best thinking that economic training and enlightened business experience (including labor and agriculture) have to offer. If any one of us believes the course he is following or proposing is harmful to the best interests of the economy, it is his duty to keep saying so (privately to the President) and to make as clear as possible to him the reasons for our concern."

In the first 2 years of the council, our difficulties were somewhat minimized by the fact that the reports published were explicitly Economic Reports of the President and appeared in his name. No separate statement appeared over the signatures of the council. Even so, there were gentlemanly brawls around our council table in which I was accused of running out on the President because I insisted on holding to reservation or dissents I had originally expressed, but which had been removed or stultified in the devious literary process ending under the editorial pencil of the White House staff.

In the first 2 years, there was considerable criticism of the President's Economic Reports as being infused with politics. Presumably this infusion occurred after documents of pure economics had been given him by the council. The President was peculiarly sensitive to this charge as the campaign of 1948 got under way.

He urged me very strongly, therefore, to have the council present a report of its own in conjunction with the Midyear Economic Report of the President.

SEARCHING POSSIBILITIES

My colleagues were delighted at this proposal. I finally acquiesced, although with great misgivings. I felt that either the document signed by the council would be so written as to support the President's program, whatever that might be, or that the public would note real or alleged discrepancies between the council's analysis and his recommendations and thus embarrass the whole relationship between the council and the President.

The midyear report of 1948 contained a separate Review of the Economic Situation over the signatures of the Council. I tried to have it limited to a factual statement and an objective analysis, with no policy recommendations, thus preserving the principle that the Council is not itself a policy-making agency. By dint of what I called persistence and others called stubbornness and overreaching the Chairman's prerogatives, I had the Review's concluding section limited to an examination of the issue between inflation and stabilization rather than devoted to the argument that inflationary dangers demanded the reimposition of price and other economic controls. The situation was made somewhat delicate by the fact that presentation of the midyear report had been postponed until after the Democratic National Convention so that it would not seem a political document designed to influence the country and the delegates.

But when Mr. Truman made his acceptance speech to the convention at 2 o'clock on the morning of July 15, he announced that he would call a special session of Congress to enact a rather specific program of controls. Thus he scooped himself on his forthcoming Economic Report. When that report appeared, on July 26, the President's statement was limited to five pages of general policy on the theme "A time for action," followed by a page and a half excerpt from his message to the special session on July 27. This presented an eight-point program, which ran from an excess-profits tax to price control for scarce commodities.

General public comment was that the Council's Review, presented separately in the report, was factual and objective. But it was also commented that the President's program for the special session did not logically follow from our analysis. Thus the division of the document into two parts with separate responsibilities did not allay the charge of politics, but sharpened it.

It was at this time that I definitely broke with the practice of trying to arrive at single, unified statements of the Council's views in private documents prepared for the President's guidance. Sometimes I would merely append a dissenting opinion. Sometimes, if my views basically differed from my colleagues', I would submit a separate document with my own evaluation of the available facts, or if the facts were agreed on, indicating the logic by which I had arrived at a different recommendation.

Developments in connection with the third annual Economic Report of the President, on January 7, 1949, caused the Council's position to deteriorate still further. The special session had not enacted the President's eight-point program, and there was every indication it would be reintroduced in the new Congress. There was a strong move to add to this program specific proposals that the Federal Government take steps to enlarge industrial capacity, notably steel, on the theory that inflationary danger stemmed from a persistent shortage of industrial output.

The Council's Review at this time limited itself to observing that "attention should be given to the possibility" that allocation controls might be needed and that "selective price controls also call for consideration" as well as "special measures (that) may be needed to stimulate the increase of capacity and production."

But the legislative recommendations in the President's report went somewhat further than mere consideration. He asked for selective price-control authority and for measures which would "remedy shortages of supply in certain critical areas so serious as to impede maximum production in an expanding economy and to limit programs related to national security."

PROVISION FOR FUTURE NEEDS

He concluded that "immediate legislation * * * should impose upon the Government specific responsibility and provide the funds to make careful surveys of future supply needs and productive capacity * * * at maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. To the extent that facts reveal the need, it should provide additional authority to deal more adequately and effectively with inadequacy of capacity and supply."

Out of these recommendations there promptly came the Spence bill. That bill provided for promotion of production and supply, priorities and allocations, price control and decontrol, and the adjustment of wages, salaries or other benefits through collective bargaining. It was widely hailed by those who believed in it as a new action

program by Government to carry the Employment Act into effect. Those who feared this bill branded it as the opening wedge to nationalization of industry and eventual state socialism.

Certain members of the Council and its staff lent their support to the Spence bill. They not only helped draft it, but gave assurance that it was in line with the Council's findings of fact and its private recommendations to the President. Such a course was not justified by any Council understanding, but this could not be made clear in view of the peculiar circumstances. It might be all very well in the political game of a party administration to have a bill of uncertain parentage go to the Congress without specific Presidential sponsorship, be used as a trial balloon and abandoned when that seemed expedient (as was done). But for members of the Council, unofficially and somewhat surreptitiously, to give such a measure a cloak of Council approval created an impossible situation for the chairman of the Council.

February 1949 saw the first real show-down between the political and the economic interpretations of the Council's role. The President had several times told us, "You bring me the economics of the question. I'll take responsibility for making the political judgments and final decisions." I was content to obey this directive, but other members of the Council were not willing to terminate their activities at this point. They were not content to wait for the Council to win prestige and usefulness based solely on professional competence, mature judgment, practical realism, and a stubborn refusal to let economic judgment be warped by political considerations. They wanted to advance philosophies or causes for which they had a personal enthusiasm.

One said, "People who were interested in seeing me attain a place on the Council are chiding me for my ineffectiveness, now I am here."

The most direct and dramatic means of gaining such personal influence was, of course, to go before a congressional committee in active support of the President's program.

This question had not arisen sharply when the first economic report of the President went to the Congress in January 1947. But in January 1948 it was proposed that I appear on Capitol Hill to argue in support of the President's economic program. When I demurred, several members of the Council agreed with me that this was not appropriate for the chairman of a professional and nonpolitical body. They recognized that the Council has a unique role within our frame of government, which calls for a detachment from active political affairs comparable, in its way, to that of the Supreme Court.

The Employment Act of 1946 made this nonpolitical role of the Council as clear as possible without actually forbidding legislative activities by Council members. At the same time it set up in the Congress an entirely distinct machinery for carrying the purpose of the act into legislation. This is a Joint Committee on the Economic Report, composed of seven Senators and seven Representatives, instructed to make its own continuing study of matters relating to the economic report. For this purpose it has both committee funds and the extensive Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Thus it is entirely unnecessary for the committee to draw the Council over into the inevitably political atmosphere of the Congress.

Such a course is also mischievous and fatal to the Council's unique character as a staff arm on which the President could rely for politically disinterested or colorless analysis and advice. If a member of the Council exposes himself to merciless questioning in the political and partisan atmosphere of Capitol Hill, he faces a dilemma of a sort intolerable to an economist of professional training and scruples. Shall he accept the role of economic attorney and, by rhetorical agility, make the most plausible case he can for someone he serves as mouthpiece? Such following of the party line would be not only repugnant to professional standards, but also self-defeating in the case of anyone who had previously contributed to serious economic literature.

It is quite unthinkable that the President would always follow the economic philosophy of such a Council member; and, in supporting the President, the Council member would be liable at an awkward moment to be trapped by some well-read Congressman who would confront him with contrary views he had expressed in private life.

On the other hand, if a Council member stated his honest conviction that a policy espoused by the President was, in his judgment, economically unsound, this would be exploited by political opponents as evidence of stupidity or of willingness by the President to subordinate economic soundness to political advantage. Such an episode or series of episodes would embarrass and strain future relations between Council and President.

I, for one, have been unwilling to stultify myself and my profession by arguing for positions I could not honestly support. I have been equally unwilling to appear debating, criticizing, and in effect tearing down the policies espoused by my chief—for whatever reasons. The moment such a situation was allowed to arise, my usefulness and that of the Council itself would be seriously impaired, if not destroyed.

My colleagues kept insisting that I took much too restricted a view of the Council's function, and that I was hampering its usefulness and lowering its place in public esteem. I was told that we should not merely contribute material for the President's use in formulating his economic policies, but that we should go on to play an important part in effectuating those policies in the Congress and through the public, on the cheerful assumption that the President always followed our (not unanimous) advice or that we were prepared to accept his decision, whatever it might be.

This view was also shared by some, though not all, members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. When Senator TAFT was chairman of this committee I explained my view to him and he refrained from requesting either my appearance or that of other Council members. The President had said that he would not urge me to appear, since I felt such activity improper. Nor would he dissuade the other members if they wished to appear.

SENATOR PRESIDENT WORRIED

Senator O'MAHONEY became chairman of this commitee in January 1949 with the change of party control in the Congress. On February 4, he wired me the first formal request for the Council to appear before the committee. The message was worded with notable precision. He asked us to appear to develop and amplify those major analyses and findings in the Annual Economic Review of current problems and prospective trends and developments which accompanied the President's report. However, anyone of normal political sophistication would realize in advance that the question of whether our analyses justified the President's recommendation would arise at every stage of the discussion.

The Senator's telegram arrived after I had left Washington for a long-standing speaking engagement in New York. On my return I at once wrote him:

"I understand that Mr. Keyserling and Mr. Clark freely and gladly accepted your invitation to appear before the committee. If I had been here, I would have had, in good conscience, to ask that I be excused.

"I think you are aware * * * of my belief that this agency cannot, over the years, discharge its functions effectively and without embarrassment either to the Chief Executive or to Council members if it is drawn out of the Executive Office into the political atmosphere of Capitol Hill. * * * I would strongly regret being put in a position where my testimony could be used to embarrass or weaken the position of the President."

The presentation before the joint committee, chiefly by the vice chairman of the Council, stressed the imminence of inflationary dangers. This made the Council not a little ridiculous, since, by that time the problem to be faced was the onset of recession. The President's program had been framed in the latter part of 1948, when it was still possible to be worried about inflation. But even then, there had been evidences of a reversal of trend; this was clearly noted in the Council's review, but was underplayed in the preparation of the President's program.

Instead of appearing publicly in support of a Presidential policy already made obsolete by the march of events, all members of the Council should have been diligently weighing the significance of the latest recessionary developments and privately advising the President as to revisions of policy that would square with the new facts.

This episode is a striking example of how active participation in the process of political persuasion will corrupt the Council's performance of its duties in the sphere of economic analysis.

During the time of the joint committee hearings I was on the Pacific coast, fulfilling speaking engagements, business and academic, arranged long before. There, and after my return, I began to hear rumors that I had resigned or was about to do so. Reporters inquiring at the White House were told: "Just the routine resignations such as many officials submitted at the opening of the new Presidential term."

My resignation had been handed to the President on December 14, 1948, and was intended to be taken seriously, not as a mere gesture to protocol. As I pondered the meaning of the November election returns and noted the reaction of my fellow members, I became convinced that my departure from the council was only a matter of time—a very short time. In my letter to the President, I reiterated my deep concern that the council become established on a high professional plane, with its members not subject to the vicissitudes of politics but retained or replaced solely on the grounds of their qualifications as objective economists."

The fact that this interpretation had not been accepted and observed had made my work as chairman so difficult, and the internal tensions so great that I expressed a wish to be relieved at a not too distant date. I would defer my going until I had completed any duties or responsibilities in connection with your forthcoming Economic Report.

The President responded, neither orally nor in writing, to my December resignation. I discussed the difficulties of my situation with Dr. John R. Steelman, Assistant to the President, on two or three occasions but did not press the matter for some 8 months. Circumstances made it apparent that this was no time for anyone in the executive office to rock the boat.

The program of anti-inflation controls included in the President's Economic Report in January of last year, his call for $4,000,000,000 of new taxes, and the alarm caused by the section of the Spence bill providing for Government action to enlarge steel and other industrial plant capacity had now to be considered against a background of rising unemployment, falling production and lower prices. It was obvious that everyone

concerned for our economic welfare should stand by to give all the aid he could.

For the council this meant having the best possible council review and midyear economic report of the President.

THREE HURDLES IN REPORT

I therefore did all I could to quiet the talk of my resignation and to prepare a council evaluation of trends which would have greatest guidance value for the President. When the midyear report appeared, the reactions of informed persons made me feel that this end was measurably accomplished.

One other task remained. On July 1, at a meeting of various major department heads in the Cabinet room, the President handed me a letter requesting a Council critique of the economic impact of budget ceilings being considered for the fiscal year 1951. As the Council undertook the drafting of this document, it became glaringly evident that no common ground for evaluation of fiscal policy existed between us. Hence, I set about drafting my own independent analysis. Without waiting to complete this task, I decided that the time had arrived for me to seek early acceptance of my resignation.

August 9, 1949, third anniversary of our swearing-in ceremony, seemed a fitting date for raising the matter again with the President. Referring to my letter of resignation of December 1948, I urged as much speed as possible in the selection of my successor.

On September 9 I renewed my request.

"I have not had any direct response from you to my letter (of August 9), but Mr. Steelman informed me on August 11 that the only question which would be involved was that of timing of the announcement of my retirement. He said you desired to name my successor at the same time that you announced my resignation. You could thus avoid pressure on behalf of persons whom you would not care to consider for appointment. In accordance with this suggestion, I have not mentioned my pending retirement even to my colleagues on the Council. This has caused delay in organizing our program of work and our staff arrangements between now and the Economic Report in January. My relations are rendered ambiguous also with reference to Mr. Pace and budget discussions. If the work of the Council is to be kept from serious demoralization (these men should know) that I shall be leaving not later than November 1."

This matter proved one of the best-kept secrets of recent Washington experience. It was not until the morning of October 17 that the story appeared in print and then obliquely, through a commentator's column, rather than directly, as a news release.

By coincidence, I was addressing a trade association group at the Mayflower Hotel the following day on a program that had as its theme the March of Progress. Speaking from the economic side, I reviewed the enormous potentialities for progress within our grasp and then expressed concern lest policies and practices being followed in private and in public areas might seriously impede that progress. My speech had been written some days in advance, and I was completely surprised when the belated story of my resignation broke the day before this meeting. The fact that the news was out did not infuse any added feeling into what I said on this occasion. Nor did it occur to me that I should withhold or modify my prepared paper. The press, however, seized upon my speech as either a parting shot to relieve my mind after I was out, or as an indiscreet utterance which caused prompt acceptance of a resignation which otherwise I might have been urged to withdraw. The facts as here cited make it clear that neither interpretation was correct.

In fairness to the job, I had felt I could not press for acceptance of my resignation during the first half of 1949. But, in fairness to myself, I could not defer it longer than the autumn. After the age of 66, this sort of thing takes a heavy toll. While the midyear report was in preparation I hung on at my office till nearly midnight on both Saturday and Sunday nights of one of the hottest, most humid bouts of Washington summer. On several occasions over the preceding 2 years I had seen the physical and nervous breaking point too close ahead for me to feel that I could, under existing conditions of work, risk the strain of another annual report.

I would gladly have taken that risk if it had appeared that such a gamble on my part would be offset by a reasonably good prospect of being able to make any really effective contribution to sounder economic policy. I felt deeply that this is a serious juncture in the history of our country—looked to now as the bulwark of a free world. But I knew that the chance of effectiveness had gradually fallen near zero.

At various times, one of them as late as the summer of 1949, the President had expressed a courteous regard for the labors of the Council. When we handed our final draft of analyses and suggestions to Mr. Truman his almost unvarying formula was: "I'll take this home with me—or on the Williamsburg—and read it with great care. Then we can discuss it further." But never—from the first annual report of January 1947 to the third midyear report of 1949—did such a discussion materialize.

To be sure, the President's course often substantially paralleled our recommendations. We could beguile ourselves with the thought that our labors had borne fruit. But on no occasion did the Council have so much as a single hour's time in which we could sit down with the President to answer any question that arose in his mind, clarify data, or examine alternative courses and probable consequences. We learned of his final policy decisions through an assistant or an assistant to an assistant on the White House staff. "Arm's-length bargaining" has become a phrase of frustration in the business world. Our position might be called "arm's-length economic advising."

On the last council assignment in which I took part—a memorandum on the economic impact of the budget ceilings proposed for 1951—differences of view were so basic that I submitted a separate analysis. In handing these memoranda to the President, I suggested that the majority view be stated first. I then commented that I felt that that memorandum gave an unduly complacent view of moderate deficits, soon to be followed by comfortable surplus.

I said I could not derive any such easy confidence from a reading of the discernible facts and foreseeable trends. I thought the President was being encouraged into taking inflationary short cuts, which give us a superficial short-term prosperity but which seemed to me to carry unwarranted risks for the longer, but not very distant, future.

DEFICIT SPENDING DEPICTED

The President said he would read both memoranda with care. But we never heard anything further from him. However, when I read his Pittsburgh address of last September 5th, it seemed to me a very clear reply not alone on the fiscal issue but on almost the whole of national economic policy. Deficit spending was depicted as only a "scare word" to "turn the American people against the programs which the people want and need." I quote:

"The selfish interests [a phrase repeated 22 times in the speech] say we can't afford these programs during a boom because that would be inflationary. They say we can't afford them during a recession because that would be deflationary. They say we can't afford them during a war because we are too busy with defense, and we can't afford them in time of peace because that would discourage business. So according to the selfish interests, we never can afford them. But the truth is—we can't afford not to put these programs into effect. We can afford them, we ought to have them, and we will have them."

It seemed to me a casting to the winds of any economic analysis of the intricate process by which the several segments of a total economy can be helped into workable balance and sustained high production. In its place I seemed to discern a highly political and dangerously inflationary economic program.

I view this as a menace to our American hope of making free competitive enterprise produce continuing abundance within a framework of free government. And since my position as chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers gave me no opportunity to do anything effective to bring economic analysis honestly to bear on the merits of these pressing issues, I was glad that the day of my retirement had already been set.

I left the council deeply disappointed over a purpose not fully accomplished, but stubbornly hopeful for the future. It will take time for successive Presidents to learn how to use a nonpolitical advisory staff agency effectively. It will take time for successive council members to learn how to bring the most competent and realistic analysis of economic problems simply and effectively to the President's aid.

A position on the Council of Economic Advisers should come to be regarded as the highest recognition to which any economist can aspire after he has risen to mature stature in the profession. Choice should not fall so much upon the most brilliant theorists, as upon men wise in the realities of current business organization and behavior, capable of recruiting and directing an able staff and of drawing effectively upon the wisdom and cooperation of businessmen and administrative officials. Most of all, council members must be above and beyond the temptation to make economic rationalization serve any predetermined conclusion or policy.

Problem of National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMAN C. CROOK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition given inception by Hon. Charles C. Price, head of the chemistry department, University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Ind., and his local chapter for world federation, in support of House Concurrent Resolution 64 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, the world federation resolutions.

The petition embraces the names of many prominent citizens of the Third District, Indiana; and, to date, the names of 1,250 citizens of various sections of Indiana in favor of said resolutions are on file in my office for inspection.

FEBRUARY 6, 1950.

A PETITION TO THE UNITED STATES SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN FROM INDIANA

We, the undersigned citizens of Indiana, believe the following to be true:

1. The atom bomb and other weapons of swift, long-distance mass destruction have

revolutionized the problem of national security.

2. Armies, navies, and air forces cannot protect civilians from atomic attack. Their power to retaliate may deter an aggressor, but they cannot insure us against the possible annihilation of vast numbers of our people and a large portion of our capital assets.

3. Achievement of security in the atomic age, security for our own people as well as those millions throughout the world who look to this country for the leadership we alone can give, is therefore the most important challenge which you as our representatives in Government must meet.

4. We believe that the prestige and system of security through the control of armaments by sovereign nations must give way in the atomic era to a system of security based on enforceable world law—in short, a world federal government endowed with those powers necessary to settle international disputes without recourse to war.

5. We cannot state with certainty that the endorsement of this policy by the United States will break the chainlike reaction of events now leading to a third world war. However, should the United States advocate such a system of world security based on law, and yet fail, we believe that our country would be strengthened morally and politically by the stand which we had taken, and thus be in a better position to fight, if fight we must.

In view of the above, and in view of the moral and economic benefits which would inevitably follow the substitution of world law for the present international anarchy, we request that you use your position as our national representatives to insure that our Government undertake every possible action toward this goal while there is still time.

House Concurrent Resolution 64 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 54, the world federation resolutions, have been sponsored by 105 Members of the House of Representatives and 23 Senators. These resolutions read as follows:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

We ask full support of this resolution in the belief that it will be an essential first step in the establishment of a just and enduring peace through world law.

Listed below are some of the leaders among some 1,200 signers of the above petition. The positions or occupations are listed solely for the purpose of identification:

L. M. Hammerschmidt, attorney, South Bend, Ind.

Sherman L. Egan, M. D., South Bend, Ind.

Rev. Philip S. Moore, C. S. C., dean, Graduate school, Notre Dame, Ind.

Loyal B. Wilson, insurance, South Bend, Ind.

Sig Welber, president, Rubenstein's Department Store, South Bend, Ind.

Paul A. Gilbert, clothier, South Bend, Ind.

Lincoln B. Hale, president, Evansville College, Evansville, Ind.

I. Lynd Esch, president, Indianapolis Central College, Indianapolis, Ind.

Otto A. Pfaff, president, American Wheelabrator Corp., Mishawaka, Ind.

Frederick L. Hovde, president, Purdue University, W. Lafayette, Ind.

V. F. Schwalm, president, Manchester College, North Manchester, Ind.

Frank Leahy, coach, Notre Dame University, Notre Dame, Ind.

J. H. Quam, Bendix Products, South Bend, Ind.

Richey W. Whitesell, Bendix Products, South Bend, Ind.

Violet Conner, Star City, Ind.

Milo K. Miller, M. D., South Bend, Ind.

B. I. Lingeman, M. D., Crawfordsville, Ind.

E. H. Clauser, M. D., Muncie, Ind.

Prince G. Huston, Salem Realty Co., Salem, Ind.

D. Logan Dunlap, M. D., South Bend, Ind.

A. E. Kemmer, contractor, Lafayette, Ind.

Frank E. Allen, superintendent of schools, South Bend, Ind.

Courtney Johnson, Studebaker Corp., South Bend, Ind.

George W. Blair, United States Rubber Co., Mishawaka, Ind.

E. A. Lurenberger, United States Rubber Co., Mishawaka, Ind.

R. V. Cleary, United States Rubber Co., Mishawaka, Ind.

William Mayo, CIO regional director, South Bend, Ind.

Edward F. Dose, secretary, St. Joseph Building Trade Council, South Bend, Ind.

Irma Collmer, Tuberculosis League, South Bend, Ind.

Richard C. Kaczmarek, attorney, South Bend, Ind.

W. F. Gaunitz, Associates Investment Co., South Bend, Ind.

Andrew Petrasa, M. M., South Bend, Ind.

Elizabeth Alexander, South Bend, Ind.

Stephen C. Grzeskowiak, trustee, Portage Township, South Bend, Ind.

Eleonore Ciesielski, South Bend, Ind.

A. J. Goes, Goes Motors, South Bend, Ind.

James E. Mark, farmer, Mishawaka, Ind.

A. Santford Durham, farmer, Tipton, Ind.

John E. Will, jeweler, Mishawaka, Ind.

Harry Castleman, coal merchant, Mishawaka, Ind.

William R. Ogle, manufacturer, Goshen, Ind.

E. R. Dykstra, coach, Mishawaka High School, Mishawaka, Ind.

John M. Obenchain, Bell Telephone Co., Mishawaka, Ind.

Morris N. Tomlinson, school principal, Mishawaka, Ind.

Lester Roberts, foreman, Bendix Aviation, South Bend, Ind.

LaNola Cross, director Limebloat Camps, Fort Wayne, Ind.

J. C. Milnor, newspaperman, Fort Wayne, Ind.

J. M. Murphy, M. D., South Bend, Ind.

Eli Rubens, M. D., South Bend.

N. D. Altman, auto dealer, South Bend, Ind.

C. J. Donovan, attorney, Bedford, Ind.

J. Robert Edwards, Bedford, Ind.

J. B. Farmer, insurance, Bedford, Ind.

Nick Kattis, restaurateur, Bedford, Ind.

Ruby Perkins, teacher, Mishawaka High School (and 600 signatures collected by her students), Mishawaka, Ind.

Sanford M. Reece, South Bend, Ind.

Charles E. Crozall, minister, South Bend, Ind.

F. K. Baer, attorney, South Bend, Ind.

John Ewbank, patent attorney, Lafayette, Ind.

Paul R. Laughlin, Lumbermen's Wholesale Supply Corp., Indianapolis, Ind.

Lyle L. Mabe, State Board of Accountants, Indianapolis, Ind.

Clark L. Jones, mayor, Crawfordsville (and 41 other members of Crawfordsville Kiwanis), Crawfordsville, Ind.

Alfred L. Scanlan, professor of law, Notre Dame, Ind.

Robert J. Mahoney, attorney, South Bend, Ind.

J. E. Otis, Jr., president, Dodge Manufacturing Co., Mishawaka, Ind.

Thurman C. Crook, Member of Congress, Third District, Indiana.

Charles C. Price, Department of Chemistry, Notre Dame University, South Bend, Ind.

A Congressman's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of Scholastic magazine, our colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, the Honorable CARL ELLIOTT, is featured in an article called, A Congressman's Day. This is a most interesting article, and depicts clearly the busy life of a Member of Congress. Scholastic magazine could not have chosen a more outstanding Member to be featured than CARL ELLIOTT. His colleagues here in the House of Representatives, and especially those from Alabama, share with his constituents, deep pride in his accomplishments.

The article follows:

A CONGRESSMAN'S DAY

(By Herbert L. MARX, Jr., associate editor, Scholastic magazines)

"I tied 'em by myself," said 8-year-old Martha Elliott, as she pointed to her neatly tied shoelaces. It was 7:30 a. m. Thursday, January 19, and this was one of my first glimpses into the life of Representative CARL ELLIOTT and his family.

I had come to Washington to spend a day with Congressman ELLIOTT, a freshman Representative from the Seventh District of Alabama. From the railroad station the taxi driver had taken me to 3623 Alton Place, the Elliotts' new brick home in northwest Washington. At the door to meet me were Carl Elliott, Jr., eight (who was soon very busy again reading about Indians), and Mrs. Elliott. Inside were Lenora, toddling around at 15 months, and the Congressman himself—a tall, serious-looking man of 36. It was at this point that Martha came proudly down the stairs to display her tied shoelaces, and in a few minutes 2-year-old John followed—to complete the Elliott family.

Representative ELLIOTT's day had begun at 6:30 a. m. He was downstairs before his children, to read the previous day's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the daily newspaper. At 7:20 his assistant called him from home, to check on a detail of the day's schedule. At 7:30 the four children were downstairs and Mrs. Elliott was in the kitchen. The Congressman took these few moments to play with his children. Except for week ends, he has almost no time to be with them.

At 7:45 the Elliotts sat down to breakfast. After breakfast, Carl, Jr., was packed off to school, and the Congressman and I, with Mrs. Elliott and Martha, drove in the family car to the Old House Office Building. There Mrs. Elliott and Martha took over the front seat, and Mr. ELLIOTT and I headed for his third-floor office. Now, here's a minute-by-minute account of Representative ELLIOTT's day.

8:45 a. m.: We arrive at room 140. The Congressman's staff has not yet arrived, so he picks up the first of eight daily mail deliveries already outside the door. He unlocks the door and leads me into one large room where his assistant, Hershell McNutt, and his three secretaries work. To the right is another room of the same size. This is Mr. ELLIOTT's own room. His large desk stands under a window and is flanked by United States and Alabama flags. To either side are deep easy chairs for visitors, and along one wall is a long couch. Sitting on that couch most of the day, I watched the Congressman at work.

9:10 a. m. (Sorting out some of the mail and handing it to his assistant): "Tell these folks I appreciate the expression of their views, but I don't agree with them." "Make me a couple of copies of this letter." "Keep sending this boy the information he wants. He's ———'s brother, a mighty fine boy." "Let me see an Alabama road map. I can't tell just what road this fellow's talking about." "And get me the county agent of Cullman County on the telephone."

9:40 a. m.: The Congressman pushes a signal button, and two secretaries come in. Now begins the morning attack on the mail. During this day I was to learn how very important these letters are to the Congressman. Just listening to them being answered gave some idea of the breadth of interests and demands of his constituents. For this morning session of answering letters, the Congressman moves from his desk to a long table in the center of the room. The Congressman dictates his replies standing up, pacing back and forth. Here is the gist of some of the 37 letters which Mr. ELLIOTT answers in the next hour and a half.

"I am enclosing an Alabama road map. Please sketch in the exact road you are talking about, and I will take up the matter with the Bureau of Public Roads."

"In answer to your request to be a census taker, may I suggest that you write the district supervisor. I am enclosing a paper listing the necessary qualifications." This was only one of dozens of similar letters the Congressman answered. These short-lived jobs for the 1950 census are made by appointment of district supervisers, who are, in turn, recommended to their jobs by Congressmen.

COTTON, OLEO, LOANS

10 a. m.: Interruption to speak to the Cullman County farm agent on the telephone. Cullman County is a heavy cotton producer in Mr. ELLIOTT's district. The Congressman is worried about effects of a 1949 cotton acreage allotment law, which Congress may revise. The agent tells Mr. ELLIOTT that there have been only a few complaints and the law ought to be left as it is.

10:10 a. m.: More letters. "The House has already passed a bill to repeal taxes on oleomargine, and I join you in hoping that the Senate will do likewise."

"I shall be happy to place a copy of your editorial, which I have read and reread in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

"Please be advised that the Post Office Department informs me today that it has authorized a new rural route in our district."

10:25 a. m.: Assistant announces that Mr. Howard Hopkins, Assistant Chief of the United States Forest Service, wants to see the Congressman. Mr. ELLIOTT tells his assistant to have Mr. Hopkins wait.

10:27 a. m.: Telephone call from Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH, of Texas, about a bill before the House.

10:29 a. m.: (More letters.) "The Birmingham office of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may make loans up to $100,000. Please send me more details on your proposed project, and I will submit them to RFC headquarters here and get their expression of views on it."

"There is no possibility of changing the law to raise minimum wages from 75 cents to 61 at this time.

"I am interested to learn of your plan to run for Lieutenant Governor of Alabama, and am a firm believer in cooperation between the State officials and the congressional delegation."

11 a. m.: Assistant reminds the Congressman that Mr. Hopkins is waiting.

11:01 a. m.: More letters, more about census taking, a number about possible post office jobs, one thanking the Congressman for his part in getting a local housing project started, and others urging him to vote for certain bills before Congress. At this point, Mr. ELLIOTT sends out the two secretaries who have been alternating in taking dictation.

11:15 a. m.: Mr. Hopkins of the Forest Service comes in. This was the first time the two men—one a freshman legislator and the other a career employee of the Government—had met. But it took only a moment for them to find common interests.

Within Mr. ELLIOTT's district there is a national forest, owned by the Government and operated by the Forest Service. Mr. Hopkins commented on the fine timberland in the forest. The Congressman told him about a 70-year-old bridge which needs repairing. Then the two men talked about making greater use of the forest to create new jobs and new recreational facilities for the people of Alabama. Mr. Hopkins pointed out the necessity of the Government's buying up little parcels of land to "fill out" the forest and make it a larger unit.

Behind Mr. Hopkins' visit, at least in part, was the hope that Mr. ELLIOTT would support the Forest Service's request for funds when they were voted on in the House. And Mr. ELLIOTT, in his turn, was looking for more activity by the Service in the national forest in his district.

11:38 a. m.: A young lady from Mr. ELLIOTT's district telephones. She is in Washington, looking for a job. Can he help? He makes a few suggestions, and tells her to call again if she has no luck.

11:45 a. m.: As Mr. Hopkins leaves, Representative JOHN RANKIN, chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee (of which Mr. ELLIOTT is a member) comes in. They discuss details of the committee's work, scheduled to start again in a few days.

A TRIO FROM ALABAMA

11:55 a. m.: Representative RANKIN leaves, and Representatives ROBERT E. JONES, Jr., and ALBERT RAINS, both from Alabama, come in. Representative ELLIOTT has asked them to come in to discuss the President's budget proposals as they affect Alabama districts. Congressmen JONES and ELLIOTT were classmates at the University of Alabama. (They and Congressman RAINS are shown in photo above.) Their talk today soon turns from the budget to more general topics—of how the Southeast can best make use of its resources. They agree that the southeastern States must join together in asking for river development and other projects, rather than simply requesting them piecemeal, each man for his own district.

12:10 p. m.: Congressman ELLIOTT looks at his watch and reminds his two colleagues of the session of the House now beginning. We all get up and leave the office. Congressman ELLIOTT and I go through the long passageway which connects the Old and New House Office Buildings with the Capitol.

12:20 p. m.: The House is just marking time this week, waiting for legislation to be cleared to the floor. The brief session is devoted to routine business. Mr. ELLIOTT carried out his promise to place an editorial into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

12:41 p. m.: The House adjourns, and the Congressman goes to a special room reserved for the Alabama delegation. Once a week the nine Alabama Representatives (and occasionally the two Senators) meet together for lunch. Other State delegations have similar arrangements, to permit the Congressmen to discuss problems of their State. At today's luncheon Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN is host. Among the guests are several officials of the Mobile, Ala., real-estate board, who are friends of Mr. BOYKIN. To meet these men Mr. BOYKIN has also arranged for Tighe E. Woods, the Federal Housing Expediter, to be present. Seated at an adjoining table is Majority Floor Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. He is asked to say a few words to the delegation. Lunch includes servings of freshly baked southern corn pone, made at the special request of the Alabama delegation.

2 p. m.: Luncheon is over, and the Congressmen return to their offices. Mr. JONES returns with Mr. ELLIOTT to discuss the cotton-acreage law. They exchange views and tell each other what they've been writing to the folks at home about it.

2:25 p. m.: Congressman JONES leaves, and Mr. ELLIOTT returns to his mail, still stacked high.

2:40 p. m.: The secretaries reappear, and there's more dictation.

2:47 p. m.: The Congressman talks by telephone to one of the experts who works for the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Mr. ELLIOTT wants to find out what would be necessary to extend the GI bill of rights so that veterans could continue to qualify for medical school with Government financial aid.

3:15 p. m.: Now the Congressman turns to me, and for the first time during the day, he has a few moments to relax. I asked him about this double job of his—being a member of a lawmaking body and also doing favors for his constituents. "To be an A-1 legislator," he told me, "you would have to spend all your time at it. But then you'd be living in a vacuum, out of touch with the folks whom you represent. Yet the way it is now, it's always a fight to preserve enough time for legislative matters between running errands for the people at home."

I asked the Congressman if there were any bills in which he had a particular interest. "I've introduced a bill," he replied, "to permit the Federal Government to lend money to needy boys and girls on a long-term basis so that they can get a college education. Our greatest resource is the boys and girls who read your Scholastic magazines. I started college at 16 with $2.30 in my pocket. I had to work 8 to 10 hours every day—for 20 cents an hour back in those depression days—to pay my way. I don't regret any of that, because it's given me strength for hardships which were to come. But not everyone can work it out that way, and young folks deserve a chance for a full education."

4 p. m.: A lobbyist for a Mississippi Valley association telephones to discuss his hopes for new laws with the Congressman.

4:10 p. m.: More letters, more dictation. But by now the Congressman is sitting slumped in a chair at the table. He's had a long day since he was pacing up and down the floor so energetically this morning.

5 p. m.: An army colonel drops in to say hello.

5:15 p. m.: Representatives JONES puts his head in the door to arrange to leave with Mr. ELLIOTT for the President's party in half an hour.

5:45 p. m.: The Congressman calls his wife, telling her when to expect him at home. He ends his dictation—leaving about 80 letters to be answered tomorrow.

6:50 p. m. (By now the Congressman has his hat and coat on): A telephone call comes from the Alabama Governor's representative in Washington. They discuss plans for the forthcoming Democratic State Committee meeting in Montgomery, which the Congressman plans to attend.

5:55 p. m.: The Congressman leaves the building with Mr. JONES. They take a taxicab to the Shoreham Hotel, where President Truman is host at his annual buffet supper for all Democratic Senators and Representatives.

7:45 p. m.: The Congressman leaves the party and takes a taxicab home.

8:15 p. m.: Home again. There's time to see the children for a few moments, and then, in his little workroom in the cellar, the Congressman spends the evening working, undisturbed. These hours he uses every evening to work on bills he is going to propose and studying other bills before his committee or the full House.

12 midnight: And so to bed.

While this is a typical day in a Congressman's life, it is by no means the same as all others. For instance, the House often meets from noon until 6 p. m., and Representative ELLIOTT makes a point of attending every session. Often there are committee meetings in the mornings. Sometimes he is called upon to testify before other committees, and must often make visits to Government agencies downtown.

But, as long as Congress is in session, the pace never slackens, although Saturdays and Sundays are less crowded. Does this portrait of a Congressman seem a little different than the speech-making, hand-shaking, fellow-well-met you may have had in mind? We hope so. It would be difficult to find a group anywhere more hard working and more conscientious than our 435 Congressmen.

Soil Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, February 10, 1950:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am most grateful for the opportunity to appear before this committee in support of the budget item of $52,255,000 for the soil-conservation program. In fact, I hope, in the wisdom of this committee, that an increase can be justified over the amount recommended by the budget.

I have stated on other occasions and should like to state at this time that I realize the very great importance of keeping Government expenditures to a minimum, and as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I expect to be a party to keeping Government expenditures at a minimum. May I further state that, in my opinion, with the high degree of prosperity we are now enjoying, deficit financing is undesirable and unsound. However, I am convinced that certain budget recommendations should not be reduced, and, in some instances, should be increased. In my opinion, soil conservation is one program that may suffer unless the budget's recommendations are increased. Almost all the money appropriated to the Soil Conservation Service is used to provide soil-conservation districts with technical assistance needed to carry on a high-quality program of soil and water conservation. The money now available to this Service barely provides for a minimum assistance to the districts now organized in the 48 States of the Nation, and the Territories. It is encouraging to note that farmers are organizing new districts, and if these districts are to receive the vital technical assistance they expect and need, some provision must be made for them in the appropriation we are considering for the Soil Conservation Service.

It has been directed to my attention that the budget's recommendation for fiscal year 1951 is approximately only $400,000 over the amount appropriated for fiscal 1950. In effect, this is a decrease inasmuch as the recommended increase is more than offset by public laws passed during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress which, of course, include salary increases authorized by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, a sound soil-conservation program would be one of the best investments that the Congress could make. There is a published table which I consider accurate and dependable, disclosing that for each dollar spent in the field of soil conservation, the wealth of the Nation is increased by $2.25. Certainly if these figures are accurate, then soil conservation is a good investment.

I have been furnished on what I believe to be good authority, information that every year enough top soil is being washed or blown from American fields by erosion to fill a train of freight cars long enough to reach around the earth 19 times at the Equator. This would make a train of freight cars almost half a million miles long. A conservative estimate on the value of top soil lost annually by erosion is in excess of $1,000,000,000.

Today our standard of living requires 3 acres of cultivatable soil to provide food for each person. It has been well established that soil erosion has now reduced our cultivatable soil to the point where we only have 3¼ acres of cultivatable soil for each person in the United States. With our population increasing and soil erosion running rampant, in another 12 to 15 years we will be on the border line. In 25 years, unless this evil is checked, we could very easily be importing part of our food supply.

The Soil Conservation Service cooperated with 2,078 districts during the current fiscal year. This is an increase of 154 districts over the previous year. These districts cover more than 1,100,000,000 acres.

Mr. Chairman, by July of this year there will be 150 new soil-conservation districts organized. They will expect, and are entitled, to receive needed technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service. Unless the amount recommended by the budget is increased, these new soil-conservation districts will have to go without funds or the standard of service afforded the active districts which is already at a very minimum must be lowered.

I am sure that this committee has in its possession all technical data and statistics dealing with the soil-conservation program. Therefore, I shall not incur added expenses to the Government by filing for the record additional statistics and technical data. However, I should like to reemphasize the need for an increase in the budget's recommendations because certainly it can be established that funds expended in the field of conservation are a wise and profitable investment.

Our Federal Government Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an interesting and informative article from the February 1, 1950, Congress at Work section of Senior Scholastic magazine, styled Our Federal Government Team. This article was prepared by Herbert L. Marx, Jr., associate editor, and Mary Jane Dunton, art director, Scholastic magazines.

OUR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TEAM

Do you sometimes find yourself expressing thoughts without knowing the precise meaning behind them?

Try yourself on this 30-second test: You have learned that the United States is a Federal Republic which operates under a system of separation of powers with checks and balances. But, if you are challenged, can you give real meaning to each of the phrases used above? If you can, score 100 and turn to the next page. If you're a little doubtful, let's take a look at each of them.

I. A FEDERAL REPUBLIC

The word "Federal" tells us that the United States is a union of individual States, each of which reserves certain powers to itself. The national (or Federal) Government has broad—yet limited—powers.

By contrast Britain is not a federal government. Her counties (geographically equivalent to our States) have few powers of their own. However, our Canadian neighbors do live under a federal form of government, with certain powers retained by the provinces within the national dominion. Several of the Latin American nations are also federal republics.

"Republic" comes from the Latin words res (thing, affair) and publicus (public)—in other words, a public affair, or matter concerning the people at large. The United States is a republic because qualified voters select the President, Senators, and Representatives by direct vote.

The Constitution of the United States was written and signed more than 160 years ago. Since the adoption of the first 10 amendments (the Bill of Rights in 1791) the Constitution has been amended only 11 times. Yet it remains a living thing, guiding our democratic form of government through every kind of trial and strife.

The Constitution is proclaimed (in Article VI) as our permanent guide in government: "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land."

II. SEPARATION OF POWERS

In earlier sections the Constitution provides for the separation of powers among three branches:

Article I: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress."

Article II: "The executive power shall be vested in a President."

Article III: "The judicial power * * * shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

The founding fathers were breaking new ground when the Constitution was written. Never before had the theory of the separation of powers within a national government been put into practice. Since our early days other nations have patterned their systems of government on ours. The Philippines, Liberia, and many of the Latin American countries are examples.

The British Commonwealth nations and most European countries follow the parliamentary system. Under this system the prime minister and his cabinet (the executives) are members of the legislature, and the courts have much more limited power than in the United States.

But the men who wrote the Constitution went still further. They felt that each branch of the Government should have certain checks over the other two—in order to balance the power and prevent any one branch from becoming too strong. Thus we come to our system of:

III. CHECKS AND BALANCES

Congress has these checks (or restraints) on the President and the courts:

1. The Senate must approve the men whom the President appoints as Cabinet members, other high officers of the executive branch, Ambassadors, and Ministers, and as Federal court judges.

2. The Senate must ratify (approve)—by a two-thirds vote—all treaties which the President works out with foreign countries.

3. The Congress may remove a President or a Federal judge from office for serious misconduct ("high crime and misdemeanor"). In these circumstances the House impeaches (accuses) the official, and the Senate sits as judge and jury in a trial to convict or clear him.

4. Congress also holds a check over the lower Federal courts, through its power to create or eliminate these courts.

5. Through its "power of the purse" Congress exercises a very effective control over the President's activities. By refusing to approve funds Congress can prevent the President from carrying out certain activities—even if he has the authority for them.

6. Finally, Congress is a check on itself. The House and Senate must agree on the exact terms of each bill before it becomes law. Every session hundreds of bills are passed by one House, and are either rejected or ignored by the other. Most important bills are modified in conference, so that the varying opinions of the House and Senate can be brought closer together.

The President has these checks on the legislative and judicial branches:

1. His most powerful check is the veto. He may disapprove any bill passed by Congress by returning it to Congress with his veto (which, in Latin, means "I forbid"). However, if both Houses of Congress repass the vetoed bill by a two-thirds majority it becomes law without the President's signature.

2. The President acts as a check on the Supreme Court and other Federal courts by his power to appoint new justices when vacancies exist.

The judicial branch—and the Supreme Court in particular—holds one all-important check over the other two branches:

The Supreme Court may set aside any law passed by Congress and approved by the President if it finds that the law conflicts with the Constitution. We know that the Constitution is the "supreme law of the land." When a person or State challenges a law, claiming that it conflicts with rights granted in the Constitution, the Supreme Court makes a decision. If it finds the law unconstitutional, it is declared null and void and is no longer a law. However, the Supreme Court does not examine Federal laws unless a case is brought before it by a citizen or a State.

IV. CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION

It is true that our Constitution has served us well throughout the years, with only a few changes. But the people of the United States may alter the Constitution. It may be amended in a variety of ways.

One Hundred Taxes Hidden in an Egg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by Robert Montgomery on hidden taxes:

There's been a lot of talk about taxes this week. Some of the talk about reductions reminded me of a magician's patter when he tells you to watch his left hand so you won't notice what his right hand is doing.

Before I comment on the President's tax message, I want to take a look at what we really pay in taxes—the ones we don't realize we're paying—hidden taxes.

We'd do a lot more thinking about hidden taxes, if for just one day, every time we made a purchase, we were told how many taxes were tucked away in the price we pay.

Let's try the experiment right now. Let's start with something just as simple as buying an egg. It seems we haven't just bought an egg, we've also paid a hundred hidden taxes.

One hundred, hidden in an egg.

What are they? Well, for example the grocer. He paid 14 Federal, State, and local taxes. Among them Federal income, Federal transportation, Federal safe-deposit box, and Federal social-security tax.

In an excellent article in the American Weekly, reporter Dave Cameron tells how the Tax Foundation discoverd 116 taxes woven into a man's suit of clothes—150 on your Easter bonnet.

Now you say, most of these hidden taxes are pretty small, fractions of a cent. What do they really amount to in the course of a year?

Listen carefully. If you are an average American family, hidden taxes cost you more in 1 year than your income tax.

For what really happened is that the President agreed to reduce certain luxury taxes provided * * * Congress will increase the taxes on necessities.

On necessities? How so? Because increased corporation taxes will, in fact, increase your hidden taxes. The tax burden on corporations is so great today that further increases can mean only one thing—that these increases are passed on to you in the form of higher prices.

In other words, you the consumer, will be no better off. You may pay less for your wife's handbag, less for a trip to the country, but more for your necessities—more for your eggs.

No party, Republican or Democratic, can wipe away overnight the staggering debt we accumulated to win the war. We owe this money. We owe it to the future prosperity of ourselves and our children. But it's high time responsible leaders in Washington cut our expenditures so that we can have a real reduction in our tax burden * * * start reducing our national debt. So that we, as a Nation, can risk more, make more, and so buy more.

Next week I'll have something to say on how we can begin to reach that goal * * * a lower tax plan that has proved it brings prosperity.

Reduction of Government Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a communication from a management-labor committee of the Denver, Colo., Chamber of Commerce urging the adoption of legislation recommended by the Hoover Commission "as a possible means of reducing governmental expenditures and promoting efficiency."

JANUARY 24, 1950.

To the Certain Members of Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: This communication is from a management-labor committee initiated during the early days of World War II. It is composed of the active heads of the major labor organizations of the State of Colorado and the city of Denver, and a number of business leaders of the community, all meeting under the auspices of the Denver Chamber of Commerce. The purpose of this committee has been to perpetuate the friendships formed at a time when the common defense was paramount and factional disputes were subordinated in the all-out effort to win the war.

The committee holds regular meetings about twice a month to explore in a friendly fashion the many areas in which such widely diverse groups can think and act in concert for the common good of all.

This committee has been much concerned over the failure of the Congress to take action on more than a small part of the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government. They feel very deeply that the present situation of an outgo of money exceeding by billions the income is deplorable. They believe that obvious waste in many quarters, overlapping of functions in Government, excessive red tape, unnecessary expenditures, and unwarranted extension of bureaus should be eliminated at the earliest possible moment.

The committee therefore urges the Congress, and specifically the representatives from this territory in both branches of Congress, not to forget the principles expressed in the Hoover Commission report, but to constantly keep these principles in mind as a possible means of reducing governmental expenditures and promoting efficiency. Bills for this purpose should be introduced, kept free from entangling riders, and be constantly pushed forward to the end that some reasonable economy in Government will be attained.

It is the intention of this committee to make detailed study of the various recommendations contained in the Hoover report, and from time to time to express the views of this committee to the Members of Congress with respect to the items so studied.

O. H. Knight, President, Oil Workers International Union, CIO; Michael Livoda, Regional Director, CIO; A. R. Kinstley, Vice President, Oil Workers International Union, CIO; George A. Cavender, President, Colorado State Federation of Labor; Charles O. Voigt, President, Stearns-Roger Manufacturing Co., President, General Iron Works Co.; Roger B. Mead, Secretary-Treasurer, Mead & Mount Construction Co.; B. Vissig, Vice President, Gardner-Denver Co.; Paul Ducey, President, Local Union 111, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; J. Cline Evans, President, the Denver Fire Clay Co.; Fred Lusk, Business Representative, Denver Building and Construction Trades Council; John A. Ferguson, Jr., Vice President and Secretary, Morey Mercantile Co.; R. S. McIlwaine, President, Rainbo Bread Co.

Communists in China Demand Hostages for Release of American Citizens—American Prestige in Far East Is at a New Low

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have in my possession reliable

information to the effect that the Chinese Communist Government refuses to permit American citizens to leave that country unless a Chinese guarantor or hostage is provided. If this is true, then President Truman and Secretary Acheson should resign forthwith as they are derelict in their responsibilities to citizens of the United States who are abroad.

The information, Mr. Speaker, comes to me from Mr. Alfred Kohlberg, one of the vice presidents of the American China Policy Association, Inc. I include as part of my remarks a telegram addressed to Dean Acheson, a letter of February 9, 1950, from Troy L. Perkins, Department of State, and a letter in reply thereto from American China Policy Association by Alfred Kohlberg:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 15, 1950.*

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.:

We have received reports from China that each of the employees of the American State Department in that country now ordered to return home will have to provide a Chinese guarantor or hostage before being granted exit permit. Is this accurate and is the State Department permitting its employees to accede to this demand?

AMERICAN CHINA POLICY ASSOCIATION, INC.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 9, 1950.

AMERICAN CHINA POLICY ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIRS: Reference is made to your telegram of January 16, 1950, addressed to the Secretary, concerning reports you have received that Department of State personnel returning from China "will have to provide a Chinese guarantor or hostage before being granted exit permits."

These reports undoubtedly refer to the regulations enforced in recent months by the Chinese Communist authorities that foreign nationals must provide shop guaranties as a prerequisite to the issuance of exit permits. It should be noted that this requirement is not limited to official American personnel, and that, so far as is known, there has been no general stipulation that the guarantor must be Chinese. It is our understanding that officials of other nonrecognizing countries have also been subject to this requirement. Furthermore, it is believed that the word "hostage" is misleading in this context. As you are probably aware, the shop guaranty, although not a standard requirement under previous governments for persons wishing to leave China, is widely used in China, and is generally equivalent to the type of bond which is required in this country of persons in positions of financial responsibility.

Prior to the departure some months ago of certain official American personnel from Nanking, protests were made by our Embassy in Nanking to the Chinese Communist authorities on the basis that diplomatic and consular officials are exempt from such requirements. These protests were disregarded by those authorities for the stated reason that our Government personnel in China were considered by the Communists to have no official standing. To enable these persons to return to the United States as instructed, the Embassy was authorized to comply with this demand, and at the same time was instructed to emphasize to the Chinese Communist authorities that this treatment of United States Government representatives was considered contrary to international usage and usage and that the Embassy action did not constitute a waiver of any rights under such diplomatic usage.

Recent reports indicate that the shop-guaranty procedure may be changed somewhat by the substitution therefor of advertisements in newspapers of the intention to leave China.

The Department is giving its attention to this problem and will take all those steps to protect its prerogatives under existing treaties and diplomatic usage as are consonant with this Government's policy of withdrawing all official personnel from China.

Sincerely yours,

TROY L. PERKINS,
Officer in Charge, Political Affairs,
Office of Chinese Affairs.

AMERICAN CHINA POLICY ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., February 15, 1950.

Mr. TROY L. PERKINS,
Officer in Charge, Political Affairs,
Office of Chinese Affairs,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of February 9 in reply to my telegram of January 15 confirms my understanding of the system of so-called shop guaranties required of Americans, both official and unofficial, seeking to leave Red China. You are, I believe, mistaken in referring to such shop guaranties as widely used in China insofar as Americans are concerned. In my 34 years in business in that country, I had never heard of it, except as a bond or guaranty for Chinese holding positions of financial responsibility.

I think you are also mistaken in assuming that "advertisement in the newspaper of the intention to leave China" will be a substitute therefor. This advertisement has been a requirement in Shanghai in addition to the shop guaranty since the Reds took over, and is not a substitute therefor.

In writing "that the word 'hostage' is misleading in this context," I fear you may not be familiar with the actual working of this Communist requirement. For example, a certain American, one of those who was able to get out on the *President Gordon*, September 22, 1949, talked to the press when the *Gordon* arrived at Hong Kong. A few days later, at sea from Hong Kong en route for San Francisco, he received a radio from the man you call his guarantor and whom I call his hostage, reading approximately: "Please make no statements of any character about China because authorities will hold me responsible."

Feeling grateful to his Chinese friend, without whose guarantee he could not have escaped, he has since remained silent. You may not consider this American's guarantor a "hostage" for his satisfactory behavior. I do.

The man I refer to was not an official. This same system applies to our officials and your Department's authorization of their compliance with this demand must lead either to the public gagging of Americans leaving China, or the punishment of their "hostages." This latter would result in refusal by responsible Chinese to further guarantee their American friends and thus make it impossible for the Americans remaining there to leave.

If this is the best that the State Department can do for Americans, both official and unofficial, stationed abroad, I do not believe that I will be the only American who will wonder whose interests the State Department serves.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED KOHLBERG, *Chairman.*

Proposed West Point of the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter addressed to the Congress of the United States from a Mr. Ted Essex, of Douglas, Ariz., which is in district 2.

Mr. Essex' letter is brief and to the point and sets forth the voice of many of my constituents as well as other citizens in the State of Arizona. You will find his letter timely and certainly brings forth to us in this, the second half of the twentieth century, the great possibilities that are available to our Nation in the West.

As an ordinary citizen of our great country, Mr. Essex is asking that his voice be heard.

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *December 16, 1949.*
An Open Letter to the Congress of the United States.

GENTLEMEN: I am a native Arizonian, born and reared in the baby State, and I feel that my State is not receiving due consideration in your search for a favorable site for your proposed air academy. Arizona has been neglected so many times and in so many instances that I made up my mind to speak out in defense of our young but virile State. There is no better locale in the Nation than ours, but because we have a small population and so few millionaires, you continue to give us the run-around. We have two able Congressmen and we are proud of their efforts in our behalf, but they are not enough so it seems, and I feel that there must be some sort of bloc against our efforts to get the recognition accorded other States with much less to offer than politics.

I know that for such a venture as the proposed West Point of the Air, you naturally seek an ideal location, and we have that in every sense of the world. We have the best all around climate in the country, and no State has a greater safety record in aviation. We have all the facilities necessary for such a venture, and our geographical position cannot be surpassed. Above all, our people are loyal and would support it to the hilt. We have never had to submit to a so-called loyalty check, and never will. We are proud of our country, and our record in every crisis is unblemished and unsullied. We need such a program as is being proposed to build up our prestige and earn the respect so readily given to the more populated sections of the Nation. Of course, I know that the lobbyists are fighting for the project on every hand, and of course they will be given priority, being heavy on cash but light on the stuff called patriotism to gain their ends. We, being westerners, are not of the ilk that uses this sort of procedure. We merely operate on merit. It could mean much to us, but we would not want it any other way than the right way. We are the most discriminated-against State in the Union and if it were not for our hardiness and indomitable will to survive we would still be a Territory plagued by Indians, and our deserts would still be barren wastes instead of the great agricultural praradise we have become. We are also proud of our strides in the fields of culture and business, and all we need to really become a State on equal terms with the others is to be given something such as

the proposed air academy to prove we are qualified and ready for recognition. We are not asking too much and neither are we beggars, because we will become prosperous regardless. But you could help us to achieve our goal at a faster pace by giving us the consideration due us.

I am just a mere citizen asking for a break for my State of Arizona. No one has prompted me to make this request, as I hold no office of any kind. But being an Arizonian, I feel it my duty to further the ambitions of my State. I am not a lobbyist as they have money behind them and I have not. But I feel that you gentlemen of such high position can help if you will. Leaving this plea in your hands and hoping you will give it some thought, I am,

Very truly yours,

TED ESSEX.

Thank you.

Dr. Paul S. Heath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last, an event of interest took place in my home town of Buffalo, N. Y., which was indeed a fitting preview to the official opening of Brotherhood Week, which we are celebrating this week.

Dr. Paul S. Heath was installed as general presbyter of the Buffalo-Niagara Presbytery to succeed Dr. Frank L. Janeway, who is retiring.

The fact that this auspicious event was attended by Protestant leaders of many denominations represented in the western New York area is, indeed, significant of the spirit of unity and brotherhood which exists in Buffalo among the various church groups.

Our need for brotherhood is even greater today than it was when our great Republic was first proclaimed, and certainly the expression of cooperation such as was evidenced at this impressive ceremony is a splendid example of the efforts of all religious groups in Buffalo to implement the Christian concept of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God at a time when all such proposals are under such violent attack by the forces of totalitarianism.

I join the citizens of Buffalo in extending to Dr. Heath a cordial welcome and my very best wishes for a long and happy stay in my native city. To Dr. Janeway I extend my felicitations and warm personal regards. The affection with which he is held in the hearts of the people of Buffalo is proof of the splendid spiritual influence he has generated and nurtured among so many thousands and he has spent many years of fruitful endeavor for his Church and our community.

It is indeed fitting that all of us, at the beginning of Brotherhood Week reaffirm our faith in God and rededicate ourselves to brotherhood under God through all the peoples of the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith articles from the Buffalo Evening News and the Buffalo Courier-Express relating the details of this happy occasion.

[From the Buffalo Evening News of February 15, 1950]

DR. PAUL S. HEATH FORMALLY SEATED AS GENERAL PRESBYTER

In a ceremony significant for its interdenominational spirit of unity, Dr. Paul Silas Heath was installed Tuesday evening as general presbyter of the Buffalo-Niagara Presbytery.

Protestant leaders representing a score of denominations heard the former minister of First Presbyterian Church, Kalamazoo, Mich., receive the charge in spacious Lafayette Avenue Church from his predecessor, Dr. Frank L. Janeway, who is retiring.

Dr. Heath was congratulated by the Rev. Harlan M. Frost, executive secretary of the Council of Churches of Buffalo and Erie County, "on behalf of a Christian community * * * of 270 (Protestant) churches."

Then, on the flower-decked altar, the Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Western New York, told an audience of 300 that there is "a need in these days * * * for a united Christian witness." He added: "There is a growing cooperation among most bodies of Christians."

URGES RETURN TO LOVE OF GOD

The number of denominations present, he said, was a token of cooperation in praying together and seeking together the truth.

The problem of life today "is really the problem of Cain and Abel," Dr. Harold E. Nicely of Rochester, moderator of the Presbyterian Synod of New York, declared. The answer, he noted, lies in a return to love of God.

"Sooner or later Cain and Abel will come together," Dr. Nicely observed. "And how they come together will determine our future. Will one say, 'I have an adversary; he wants to destroy me, so I'll destroy him first'?"

A fair question, the Rochester clergyman added, is "What have we in this power-driven, industrialized age to do with the Galilean carpenter?"

"Yet, if we look for * * * peace only in science, or in apparent progress, we are likely to be guided into a false complacency which can be turned overnight into despair."

COMMISSIONERS ELECTED

The Rev. William Thomas Heath, rector of Trinity Episcopal Church and brother of the new general presbyter, read from the Scriptures. The invocation was by the Rev. David S. MacInnes, minister of the host church, and the constitutional questions of the ceremony were administered to Dr. Heath by Dr. James W. Laurie, Presbytery moderator.

The installation prayer was given by the Rev. Murray S. Howland, former minister of the Lafayette Avenue Church, who officiated at Dr. Heath's ordination in 1921.

Earlier, the Presbytery elected these commissioners to the General Assembly in Cincinnati in May:

The Reverend Richard W. Firth, Fredonia; the Reverend Clair S. Emerick, Ellicottville; the Reverend Ray K. Hallin, Niagara Falls, and these elders: Harold Rich and Edward P. Lupfer, of Buffalo, and Edward H. Cartwright, Tonawanda.

[From the Buffalo Courier Express of February 15, 1950]

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH SEATS NEW PRESBYTER

Dr. Paul Silas Heath was installed last night as general presbyter of the Buffalo-Niagara Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church, United States of America, at the Lafayette Avenue Presbyterian Church.

Dr. Heath, former president of Auburn Theological Seminary and minister of First Presbyterian Church, Kalamazoo, Mich., was praised for his accomplishments and devotion as an educator and pastor by Dr. Harold E. Nicely of Rochester, moderator of the Presbyterian Synod of New York, and by Dr. Frank L. Janeway, stated clerk and retired general presbyter.

During the month that Dr. Heath has served unofficially as general presbyter, Dr. Janeway said, he has demonstrated a calm spirit, judicial mind, and deep sincerity.

In giving the charge to Dr. Heath, the retiring presbytery leader urged him to get to know intimately all the 80 ministers and 32,300 members of the presbytery's 62 churches. He further admonished him to be a patient and willing listener and to free pastors of organizational details in order that they can devote their full efforts to curing souls and preaching the word of God.

The presence of clergy and laity of other communions at the installation ceremonies was cited by the Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Western New York, as an evidence of a growing spirit of cooperation in the Christian church.

"In these days there is need for a united Christian witness as the forces of godlessness wax strong among us," Bishop Scaife declared. "There are those who impatiently call for an immediate uniting of all Christians into a single church in order to combat this godlessness.

"That is not possible, but what is possible is the churches themselves working together, praying together, thinking together, sharing a faith greater than we have yet grasped and deeper than we have ever fathomed, seeking together the truth which none may know in its fullness alone."

Greetings on behalf of other churches were extended to Dr. and Mrs. Heath by the Reverend Harlan M. Frost, executive secretary of the Council of Churches of Buffalo and Erie County.

The Reverend William Thomas Heath, rector of Trinity Episcopal Church and brother of the new general presbyter, gave the Scripture reading. A processional of clergy of Protestant denominations and elders of the Presbyterian Church was led by Dr. Ralph B. Hindman, minister of the First Church.

Dr. Murray S. Howland, a retired minister who officiated at Dr. Heath's ordination at the Lafayette Avenue Church in 1921, gave the prayer of installation. Dr. James W. Laurie, moderator of the presbytery, presided and asked the constitutional questions.

Rogers Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith a short editorial from the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune commending my colleague, Congressman DWIGHT ROGERS, for his resolution proposing an amendment to the rules which will provide that no appropriations shall be passed without a yea-and-nay vote:

ROGERS IS RIGHT

Representative DWIGHT L. ROGERS, of Florida, has a level head, containing a sound

mind. Concerned about the tendency to vote millions and billions of the people's money without due process or consideration, Mr. Rogers has introduced a resolution, in these wise words:

"Resolved, That rule XXI of the rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'5. No bill or joint resolution of a public character making an appropriation shall be finally passed, and no amendment of the Senate to, or report of a committee of conference on, such a bill or resolution shall be agreed to, unless the vote of the House is determined by yeas and nays.'

Mr. Rogers briefly stated the reason for his resolution. He said: "I do this for the purpose of letting us become appropriation conscious. I have seen in this House not millions but billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money appropriated without even having a majority of the Members of the House present. I think we owe it to the taxpayers of this Nation, our constituents, to let them know how we stand on the appropriation of their money. I hope you will give consideration to this resolution."

The Rogers resolution, intended to make it harder to "railroad" appropriations, thus promoting governmental economy, may not get through, but the Floridian is thoroughly right in his plan and purpose. Members of Congress should at least be required to go on record on vast expenditures of Federal funds. Voting billions by a minority of the lawmakers is the worst kind of bad business.

Ancient Ferry May Escape Scrap Heap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. Frank O. Braynard which appeared in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, when I read this article, which had with it a picture of the old *Brinckerhoff* ferryboat, which we who lived on the west bank of the Hudson River used so many years to cross the river in order to go to Poughkeepsie, it brought back very pleasant memories. I think that it is no more than fitting that this article about the *Brinckerhoff* be inserted in the COMMERCIAL RECORD for the benefit of my many constituents who, like me, must still have a very soft spot in their hearts for this old ferry. I hope that it will be possible to give it a permanent location for those interested in the history of the Hudson River Valley.

In the old days I used to use this ferry when driving to Poughkeepsie with a good team of horses and a buggy and again occasionally in the winter with that same team and a cutter. Sometimes the ferry would be unable to make the trip because of the thick ice in the river. Then the great thrill was to drive across the river in a sleigh back of a good snappy pair of horses and very often you could pick up quite an exciting race. Most of the time, however, the old *Brinckerhoff* kept the channel open and you wondered how it stood the wear-and-tear banging away and dashing against the floating cakes of ice.

This article speaks of the *Brinckerhoff* in connection with the annual intercollegiate rowing races held on the Hudson River. What a service it did for thousands of people in those days. It was quite an event to be one of the passengers on the old boat to view the race from that vantage point.

When the Mid-Hudson Bridge was built, of course the old *Brinckerhoff* could not withstand that competition. It did its best, however, to keep going and very often we would use the old ferry, during those trying days for its existence, just for old-times' sage.

The article follows:

ANCIENT FERRY MAY ESCAPE SCRAP HEAP—MUSEUM BERTH OPEN IF VETERAN CAN MAKE HELP

(By Frank O. Braynard)

The historic ferryboat *Brinckerhoff* may yet escape the scrapper's blow torch. Eastern members of the Steamship Historical Society of America hope to find ways and means to sail or tow the 51-year-old craft from Kingston, N. Y., to a permanent location at the Marine Historical Association's Mystic, Conn., Museum.

The *Brinckerhoff* is the last of dozens of small sidewheel ferries that criss-crossed the bays and rivers of the Northeast a generation ago. She has been described as a choice specimen of nineteenth century ferryboat architecture—from her quaint pilot houses—topped by huge, old-fashioned range lights, each with its gilded ball—to her two horse-and-buggy-size vehicle gangways.

If successful, the society will deliver the boat to the Mystic museum to be "enshrined" alongside such famous relics as the square-rigged *Joseph Conrad*, the whaler *Charles Morgan*, and the original clubhouse of the New York Yacht Club, towed last year from Glen Cove, L. I.

There will be no lack of a good crew to man the ancient craft if it is found feasible to move her under her own steam to Mystic. A good percentage of those attending a recent New York chapter meeting of the society volunteered to help. Capt. Karl C. Palmer, vice president of the society and an executive of Moran Towing & Transportation Co., has offered to skipper the 140-foot craft to her final resting place.

The *Brinckerhoff's* former captain and chief engineer also have offered their services for the voyage, according to William Hopkins Ewen, society president and assistant advertising manager for the Borden Co. Ashby O. Reardon, a society member and secretary of the Mutual Ice Co., Alexandria, Va., has volunteered to provide a ton of coal and to shovel it himself.

Capt. Elwell B. Thomas, proprietor of the Thomas Boat Yard at Stonington, Conn., has offered to bring a crew of workers to Mystic to paint or otherwise put the *Brinckerhoff* into exhibition trim. If the society succeeds in bringing the boat to Mystic, a joint society-museum committee will be set up to determine what work is necessary for her upkeep and to get volunteers for it.

But many problems beset the society in its efforts to save the *Brinckerhoff*. Built in 1899 for the Poughkeepsie Highland (New Paltz Landing) Line, she ran faithfully until 1941 lowered tolls on the mid-Hudson bridge forced the company to close after continuous operation since 1798. From 1942 to May 1948, the ferry served Bridgeport, Conn., as a pedestrian link between the city and nearby Pleasure Beach. She made an occasional moonlight cruise on Long Island Sound.

The *Brinckerhoff's* years on the Hudson were fairly uneventful, except for the annual intercollegiate rowing races. On these occasions she carried hundreds of spectators and her crew once saved eight boys when their canoe capsized.

The *Brinckerhoff's* engine, built by the W. & A. Fletcher Co., Hoboken, N. J., still operates with flawless smoothness. It is one of the few of Fletcher's 200-odd beam engines to survive. More recent such engines are in the Hudson River steamboats *Robert Fulton* and *Bear Mountain*, and in the Lake Champlain steamer *Ticonderoga*.

Last May the *Brinckerhoff* was sent to her regular lay-up spot at Roundout Creek, Kingston, and it was found that her outboard paddle-wheel braces would have to be replaced. The cost of restoration led Bridgeport to decide not to return her to service. It is hoped that her general condition will permit a temporary certificate from the Coast Guard for her projected trip. Mr. Ewen estimated that it will cost $1,500 to reconnect pipe lines and tow or steam the *Brinckerhoff* to Mystic.

The historical society entered the picture last fall when its former president, Freeman R. Hathaway, passed through Bridgeport. Inquiring about the old ferry, he was led promptly into Mayor Jasper McLevy's office. He explained why the society was interested and was told the case would be taken up in due course. Last December the Bridgeport City Council turned the ferry over to the Mystic Museum.

The society has been designated as the intermediary in the transaction, and is conducting complex negotiations. Towing is being investigated if the more romantic way of sailing her under her own power is ruled out. Coast Guard certification also is being investigated and insurance coverage, particularly if society members run the boat, is being studied. Permission from the various maritime unions for such a voyage has been requested.

The matter has been discussed with the National Maritime Union and the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, CIO, affiliates, and the AFL Masters, Mates and Pilots of America. All three unions are considering the project and representatives have indicated that no objection probably would be made to the 200-mile voyage of a 51-year-old vessel manned by a volunteer crew.

A general appeal for funds for the project will be launched tomorrow by Mr. Ewen for the society. He will ask that interested persons send checks or money orders to the Marine Historical Association, Inc., Mystic, Conn. Checks should be made out to the association and not to the Steamship Historical Society, he said.

Donations will be recorded, and in the event the required $1,500 total is not reached all gifts will be refunded, according to Charles A. Brooks, association business manager.

Freight Trains on the Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Hammond (Ind.) Times sets out some factual information regarding the rapid deterioration of the Nation's highways. A complete survey should be made as to the vast number of trucks that have been added to the various truck fleets throughout the country in recent years. One has only to drive his automobile on any single-lane main highway to find that his progress is blocked by great numbers of trucks driving bumper to bumper and refusing to allow passenger cars to pass.

Unless the truck interests of the country do something regarding their heavy trucks from taking over the highways, Congress must take the necessary steps.

FREIGHT TRAINS ON THE HIGHWAYS

One of the most important questions affecting the taxpayers of the Nation is this: Are the huge modern commercial trucks paying their way—or are the vast sums needed to build and maintain highways suitable for this kind of traffic being paid by the rest of us?

Various authorities have spoken on the subject. And here is what some of them say.

The chief engineer of highways, State of California, said: "Big trucks in this State are responsible for 55 percent of the total cost of new highway construction."

The highway-traffic problems commission of Illinois said: "Private automobiles in this State are paying three times more tax per ton-mile than the largest-type truck."

The United States Commissioner of Public Roads said: "The chief destructive factor of highways is overloading (of heavy trucks)."

The Cincinnati Post said: "What * * * every State is up against is an effort to put freight trains on the highways, with the taxpayers providing the right-of-way—not the railroads, as happens when freight cars are kept on rails."

The American Automobile Association said: "Billions of dollars worth of the Nation's finest highways are being pounded to pieces by overweight and overloaded commercial vehicles."

It's no wonder that more and more highway officials—to say nothing of the people who pay the bills—are looking anxiously for ways to solve the critical highway-destruction problem.

The Drift Toward Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a special resolution adopted by the American National Livestock Association at their convention in Miami, Fla., January 5, 1950.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States and the Democratic administration, at the Jefferson Day powwow, chided the Republicans about their charge that this administration was leading us down the road of socialism. Apparently the consciences of the Democrats are being troubled. They protest too much.

Mr. Speaker, your party should be called the Labor-Socialist Party. It is nothing more nor less. If socialized medicine, socialized housing, the Brannan farm program, and a host of other pending legislation does not lead us down the road of socialism, then it is hard to understand just where such proposals will lead the American people.

The resolution passed by the American National Livestock Association on January 5 reaffirms the thinking of this large group as to the direction the legislative program of this administration is leading the country.

The livestock association is worried about becoming mere numbers in a completely socialized state. They further state that "our country is rapidly and unmistakably drifting toward the consummation of a false concept—the socialized state."

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that your party heed the warning of the livestock industry. They speak the truth in their resolution. Your party will find it hard to throw off the yoke and charge that you are sponsoring socialistic legislation. The resolution follows:

There impends today a threat to our country and the freedom of its citizens which so menacingly overshadows the future that we, American cattlemen of all shades of political belief, feel it our duty to speak out in unmistakable terms.

This threat lies in the fact that our country—without conscious choice on the part of its people—is rapidly and unmistakably drifting toward the consummation of a false concept—the socialized state.

Tokens of this danger are everywhere and undeniable. The growing power and expansion of wasteful government; the colossal public debt; the heavy burden of taxation; the malicious attempt to substitute an artificial economy for the natural economy which alone can function in freedom; the gradual assumption by the state of financial responsibility for every hazard incident to life—hazards which should be personally met and borne by every human being who has the instinctive will to survive and the inherent impulse to be free; the arraignment of economic and social groups, one against the other, and numerous other conditions and proposals similarly inspired and equally false.

Government produces nothing and has no means by which to support these false and destructive theories except by exacting from its citizens the fruits of their labors.

The course the Government is now taking, unless it is promptly reversed, must inevitably lead to national bankruptcy. In a vain effort to prolong a specious sense of security, more similar expedients will be applied until we become mere numbers in a completely socialized state: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the American National Live Stock Association in convention assembled at Miami, Fla., January 5, 1950, reaffirm our solemn conviction that the future health, strength, and prosperity of our country depends on the re-establishment and maintenance of free and competitive enterprise and hereby pledge ourselves as individuals and as an association to work diligently and actively toward this objective and toward the defeat of the falacious philosophies that are beguiling our country into socialism.

Iowa People and Their State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the story is told of four European statesmen who were conducted on a tour of the United States last year. They saw the skyscrapers of New York, they visited Niagara Falls, they descended into the Grand Canyon, they flew over the snow-capped Rockies, and they were entertained in Hollywood. But when someone asked them to name the most impressive sight they had seen, they all agreed that it was the tremendous expanse of rich farmland in the upper Mississippi Valley.

This story is a striking reminder of the fact that we Americans sometimes forget that we possess, in our great heart land, one of the largest areas of fertile land on the globe. In a world in which food for hungry millions is a major problem, the importance of this area cannot be overemphasized.

Anyone who has taken a morning plane west out of Chicago on a clear autumn day has seen below him the ocean of patchwork grain fields stretching for miles in every direction. To use the psalmist's phrase, these prairies "stand so thick with corn that they laugh and sing."

The State of Iowa is the food-producing core of this great valley. We are situated almost in the Nation's center with the great Mississippi River on the east and the great Missouri River on the west. Our State contains a quarter of all the Nation's grade A farmland and 97 percent of our soil is under cultivation. Those of us who live in Iowa—who have literally heard the corn grow on hot summer nights—love that deep black soil. We love it because we know it and can work with it. Each spring it challenges us; each autumn it rewards us with abundant crops.

Iowans are proud of their 36,000,000-acre garden spot between two great rivers. We are proud of our children and our churches, our schools and our industries. We rejoice that we have no really showy mansions and no really sordid slums. We brag that Anton Dvorak found inspiration for his New World Symphony in our own Spillville, but we are just as proud of the fact that we conduct a music festival each year in which over 5,000 high-school boys and girls participate.

Most of all, perhaps, we rejoice in the role of creating food for this great Nation and for the world. Our food-production statistics are almost unbelievable to some people. Iowa normally leads all other States in the Union in cash farm income—over $1,808,000,000 in 1949; in the value of our market cattle; and in the production and marketing of corn, hogs, eggs, poultry, and oats. During the past year, Iowa produced for the homes of America a total of 3,750,000,000 pounds of pork, 156,000,000 pounds of butterfat, and 332,000,000 dozen eggs. Translated into breakfasts, that is bacon and eggs every morning for over a tenth of the population in this country.

Last fall, 11,303,000 acres of corn in Iowa produced a total of 554,000,000 bushels. This year's corn crop, is in its own way proof of the fact that corn can be raised in the Hawkeye State under almost any circumstances, since especially adverse conditions prevailed. No million-dollar rain appeared for weeks during the critical period of July and

August. In addition, the worst cornborer manifestation in the history of the State appeared. Still Iowa produced a record crop of corn and, in addition, raised the largest number of pigs ever produced in peacetime.

For the most part, as many of you know, our grain crops reach the tables of the Nation through corn-fed hogs and cattle. Iowa produces and markets more hogs than any other two States in the Nation combined—and has enough corn left over to fatten about a million head of cattle imported each year from the western ranges.

We are proud of last year's record in Iowa. We look forward to the future even as we are proud of our past. But even with mechanization which has revolutionized farming in the last decade—even with improved strains of grains and livestock which have added so much to our productivity—we know that the crops have been raised and the livestock has been fed in spite of storm or snowdrifts and at the cost of sore muscles and weary bones. In this sense we are close to those stanch pioneers who built our State and we are aware of the kind of courage and self-reliance which they possessed.

The history of Iowa, like its present, is more a story of slow achievement than of spectacular but fleeting glory. We can offer to our visitors neither historic battle sites nor elaborate shrines which preserve a golden antiquity. But in a very real way, the name of every village and every county in our State speaks of our own history and of the story of our country. The eighteenth century French period gave us such names as Dubuque and Des Moines. The roll call of our counties is studded with Indian names—Winnebago, Pocahontas, Wapello, Mahaska, Winneshiek, and Pottawattamie—which remind us of the days of the buffalo and the tall grass. Interspersed between the musical Indian names in the county roll call are other more familiar names which are part of American history. Fort Madison, named for the fourth President, was first built in 1808 and was burned and evacuated during the War of 1812. As more and more settlers began to cross the Mississippi at Davenport and Dubuque and Keokuk, the names of other Presidents—Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Monroe, and Jackson—began to appear on county maps. The Mexican War added the Spanish names—Cerro Gordo, Buena Vista, and Palo Alto—to the county roll call. Webster and Calhoun Counties, standing side by side, suggest the debates in Congress which were echoed on the frontier as settlers from the North and the South continued the argument around log-cabin fires. Lee County is said to take its name from the surveying trip which brought the young Gen. Robert E. Lee to Iowa.

Some of the names chosen for our cities and towns reflect the delight of the first settlers in the beautiful country they found—names such as Iowa Falls, Spirit Lake, Cedar Rapids, and Greenfield. Outstanding men of the pioneer period are remembered in such names as Grinnell, Fort Dodge, and Grimes. The European migrations to Iowa beginning in the 1840's brought the Germans and Hollanders, the Irish, Scots, and Swedes. But from the beginning, Iowans, regardless of their origin, have joined together to harvest crops, to establish schools and churches, and to maintain law and order.

By December 28, 1846, when James K. Polk signed the bill admitting Iowa into the Union as the twenty-ninth State, its residents had already discovered that corn grew taller than any other place in the world. Many of the early towns grew up around mills established for the purpose of grinding the grist. At the end of its second decade of statehood, Iowa had sent 48 regiments of its young men to the battlefront in the Civil War, had subdued Indian raids from the north, and had extended its farmlands to the Missouri River.

A special chapter of Iowa history in the 1860's records the story of the mad race of the railroads across the State to be the first to connect with the Union Pacific at Council Bluffs. This race was won by the North Western on January 22, 1867, but the Rock Island and Burlington lines continued to build, and today all three roadbeds serve major transcontinental railroad lines and take the food we raise to market.

Iowa's first century brought tremendous changes. During this period the canoe, the barge, the steamboat and the stagecoach have been replaced by trains, streamlined cars, busses, and planes. It is interesting to note that the river traffic on the Mississippi, which was the major means of transportation in the early period, is showing a marked revival. With the outbreak of World War II especially, traffic on the upper Mississippi grew to giant proportions. A striking fact is that three modern towboats can push as much freight upstream in one trip as four steamboats could carry in a year in the period from 1900 to 1910.

In 1846 there were 102,553 people in the new State of Iowa. A century later there were over 2,500,000—a growth equal to that of the Thirteen Original Colonies between the settlement of Jamestown and the outbreak of the Revolution.

Iowa is proud of the fact that our factory pay rolls are increasing to the point where the State's manufacturing has recently passed the billion dollar mark in valuation. When William H. Voss invented a washing machine at Davenport in 1877 he built the basis for a famous Iowa industry. In 1873 George W. Douglas and Robert Stuart brought to Cedar Rapids the Scotch process for making oatmeal which is now produced in one of the largest factories in the world. In 1878 John H. Morrell, of Ottumwa, founded the packing company which bears his name. In 1913 W. A. Shaeffer, of Fort Madison, established in a back-room workshop the world-famous Shaeffer Pen Co., which is now one of the largest fountain-pen factories in the world.

Already Iowa has an industrial income virtually equal to its agricultural income, from its packing plants, its farm implement and tractor factories, its canneries, and its food processing plants. Today Iowa and Nebraska, together, produce nearly a fourth of the country's serums, vaccines, toxins, and other biological products. Des Moines ranks second only to Hartford, Conn., as an insurance capital. Department store sales increased 201 percent from 1939 to 1948 and bank deposits went up during the same period from 1 to 1½ percent of the national total. We are glad that this industrial growth is integrated into our economy instead of dominating it. About 160,000 Iowans are working in packing houses, tire factories, machine shops, mining and other industries. Unions are well organized and many of the workers are exfarm boys who retain close ties with the farm. Many of them, indeed, are hoping to save enough money to buy a farm.

Iowa is equally proud of the sustained interest in education and cultural pursuits which has kept our State close to the top in literacy since 1870. The first public-school law was passed in Iowa in 1839—7 years before the State entered the Union. Within the year after we became a State, the State University of Iowa was organized. Today more than 50 buildings are scattered on the 386-acre campus which is cut in two by the Iowa River, and dominated by the old stone Capitol so dear to all Iowa hearts. Over 10,000 students are enrolled in courses including the liberal arts, medicine, law, dentistry, pharmacy, engineering, education, commerce, journalism, religion, and the fine arts. In a very real sense, the university reflects the rich cultural tradition, the fine family environment, and the splendid education facilities throughout the State. Walter Damrosch first called Nation-wide attention to Iowa's love of music when he noted that he received more letters from there than from any other State. The annual musical festival and the fine concert and symphony programs at the university draw a State-wide audience. Iowa's graduate school of art, which was inspired by a group of Iowa artists is the largest in the country. The list of famous Iowa writers includes many well known names. Since its first newspaper, the Dubuque Visitor, appeared in 1836, the press in Iowa has grown to produce prize-winning country weeklies, as well as the famous newspapers and widely read magazines.

The Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts at Ames, established in 1858, not only serves as the home of Iowa agriculture but has become internationally famous in its field. Early in its history Iowa State became a pioneer in the establishment of a cooperative extension service between farm and college. Today the county agricultural agent pattern has extended throughout the country. Radio broadcasts, home demonstration agents and printed matter spread the knowledge gained in laboratory and experimental farms operated by the college to all of our farmers and to their sons and daughters. Most Iowa farm boys and girls have participated in the 4-H Club livestock and homemaking demonstrations at Iowa State before they enter high school. In addition to these State institutions, 29 denominational colleges, 4 universities, and 23 junior colleges make their own contribution to Iowa sons and daughters. This year the school budget in Iowa reached $101,500,000—an increase of $7,000,000 in 1 year. In addition, a capital outlay of $15,000,000 is anticipated. In the rural districts, approximately 400 consolidated school districts have been established to supplement the little white schoolhouses which dot the landscape.

It is a privilege for me to bring you a part of the story of Iowa—of its history, its people, its industries, and its farms. As the Iowa farmer and laborer work today, they know that their State is important not only to the Nation but to the world. It is endowed by nature and by its citizens with the capacity to respond to the world's plea for food. It is geographically situated to distribute that food to the Nation's markets and the Nation's ports. And with its paved roads, its extensive railroad mileage, and its broad rivers, it has the transportation facilities to get the food moving to the consumer.

Today the young men and women of Iowa are seeing visions just as their grandfathers dreamed dreams as they sat on the hard seats of covered wagons. As farm markets have become a part of the great complexity of world trade and world politics—and as they themselves have participated in a war which took them to so many parts of the globe—they have gained at once a new perspective and a new appreciation for their home State. Their radios and newspapers bring the football games, the fashions, and the symphonies of the world into their homes; their automobiles and their airplanes make the whole country more accessible. They have seen the bitter fruits of concentrated living. And they believe that only as our country fuses the vigor and might of the cities with the peace and security of our farms, will we achieve a new beauty, and harmony, and completeness which will be our own.

Yalta Agreement—Roosevelt and Churchill Sell China Down the River—Congress Stands Supinely By

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when President Roosevelt returned after his conference with Stalin and Churchill at Yalta, he addressed a joint session of the Congress early in March 1945. At that time he was obviously a very sick man but nevertheless he tried to appear jovial and happy. I shall never forget his statement to us that "there were no secret agreements at Yalta."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the sordid details of the agreement consummated at Yalta are in the open. Many Members have asked to see such a copy as they did not believe that President Roosevelt could be a party to the sell-out of a loyal and trusted ally.

The people of this country will not forget, Mr. Speaker, that Alger Hiss, the convicted Communist sympathizer was Mr. Roosevelt's adviser at Yalta. The agreement placed Russia in a strategic position to take over all of China which is an accomplished fact today.

As part of my remarks, I am including a copy of the famous Yalta agreement:

AGREEMENT REGARDING JAPAN

The leaders of the three great powers—the Soviet Union, the United States of America, and Great Britain—have agreed that in 2 or 3 months after Germany has surrendered and the war in Europe has terminated the Soviet Union shall enter into the war against Japan on the side of the Allies on condition that:

1. The status quo in Outer Mongolia (the Mongolian People's Republic) shall be preserved.

2. The former rights of Russia violated by the treacherous attack of Japan in 1904 shall be restored, viz:

(a) The southern part of Sakhalin, as well as all the islands adjacent to it, shall be returned to the Soviet Union.

(b) The commercial port of Dairen shall be internationalized, the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union in this port being safeguarded and the lease of Port Arthur as a naval base of the U. S. S. R. restored.

(c) The Chinese-Eastern Railroad and the South Manchurian Railroad, which provides an outlet to Dairen, shall be jointly operated by the establishment of a joint Soviet-Chinese company, it being understood that the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union shall be safeguarded and that China shall retain full sovereignty in Manchuria.

3. The Kurile Islands shall be handed over to the Soviet Union.

It is understood that the agreement concerning Outer Mongolia and the ports and railroads referred to above will require concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The President will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin.

The heads of the three great powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated.

For its part the Soviet Union expresses its readiness to conclude with the National Government of China a pact of friendship and alliance between the USSR and China in order to render assistance to China with its armed forces for the purpose of liberating China from the Japanese yoke.

JOSEPH V. STALIN.
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

FEBRUARY 11, 1945.

One Big Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News of Monday, February 20, entitled "One Big Bill."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE BIG BILL

This year, for the first time, Congress is trying to combine all its annual appropriations of money into one big omnibus bill.

That's a fine idea—if it works.

In previous years a dozen or so appropriation bills reached the House and the Senate, one at a time, over a period of months. Until the last of them was passed nobody could know what the total amount appropriated would be.

With a single big bill Congress can know its total, and, if so minded, can reduce that total to bring it within the Government's anticipated revenues. Or, at least, Congress can make a much more intelligent effort to economize. That's the theory.

But there's one danger in the plan. If Senators and Representatives start logrolling, the one big bill can become much too big. And, because President Truman has no authority to veto items in an appropriation bill, he may be forced to approve even more spending than he proposed in his $42,500,000,000 budget.

Congress should give the President power to veto items.

Whether it does that or not, Congress most certainly should shun all temptation to swell the size of the one big bill by logrolling and back scratching. Otherwise, the fine one-big-bill plan will either have to be abandoned or all the economy talk by Members of Congress may turn out to be a costly bad joke.

As to the future, another good idea comes from Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas: Establish a joint House-Senate committee on the budget, with an adequate, capable, full-time technical staff.

At present, some 500 people in the spending branch of the Government work all year preparing the President's budget.

Congress needs a well-staffed committee on the job all year, every year, studying the budget while it is being prepared and equipping Congress with the accurate information it needs—and does not now get—to do properly its duty of controlling the public purse strings.

Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this is Brotherhood Week throughout the country. Whether by coincidence or by Divine impulse, most significantly, in every synagogue and temple in the world—Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform—the portion of the Torah, the Old Testament, that will be read this week deals with the Divine revelation on Mount Sinai, through which Moses received the laws for dispensing justice to mankind.

These laws covered every imaginable classification. For the purpose of emphasis of brotherhood it suffices to remind you here of a few of those statutes, to wit: the laws establishing the principle of majority rule and of equal justice for all, forbidding oppression of foreigners, and prohibiting malicious gossip,

The last rule of neighborly living is observed too often in these Halls by its breach.

With pointed reference to that rule, permit me to call your attention to the following editorial by Dr. HARRY HALPERN, which appeared in the current issue of the Bulletin of the East Midwood Jewish Center:

FROM WHERE I STAND

I have just read one of the periodic reports issued by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and I found it to be a very interesting document. What interested me particularly was a report on race riots in Chicago and a discussion of what was involved in them.

Let it be made clear from the outset that B'nai B'rith cannot be accused of Communist tendencies by anyone in his right mind. The record of service to our country which the organization has achieved is an imposing one. Its efforts in behalf of the men and women in our armed forces during the war and its contributions to the work of rehabilitation after the war have earned for it a place among the great patriotic agencies in our land.

The aforementioned report points out that the Chicago riots started out with an anti-Negro slogan which, in turn, became anti-Communist and finally as anti-Jewish. This metamorphosis of a hatred is worthy of note because it follows a pattern which is becoming alarmingly too familiar.

That relations between Russia and our country are strained is clear to all; that ideologically, religious people are opposed to the antireligious crusade of Russia is obvious; that there have been clear-cut cases of espionage, particularly in the matter of atomic-energy experimentation, no one will gainsay. And yet, knowing of all this, we must be on our guard lest the struggle against communism becomes a smoke screen for all anti-Semitic and reactionary forces in our country. For, under the impact of war, many subversive groups found it the wisest policy to suspend operations or, at least, to keep out of the glare of publicity. But now the lunatic fringe sees an opportunity for attacking Jews under the guise of fighting communism.

The method of accomplishing this is really very simple. First, you label something "communistic." Then you show that many Jews are in favor of the thing you've so labeled. Finally you attack Jews, not because you're anti-Semitic but because you want to protect America.

It is true that many Jews are progressive. They believe in social security, in old-age pensions, in unemployment insurance, in proper schooling for children, and adequate housing for families. They believe that the Government should intervene to make these things possible. Does this mean that they are taking dictation from Moscow or are trying to overthrow the Government? Oscar Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator, who is a Wall Street lawyer, has been attacked as a Socialist by those who oppose what they call the welfare state.

All of us should clearly understand that dealers in prejudice hate first and then find slogans to rationalize their hatred and to justify the protection of some selfish interest. The struggle against communism must not be permitted to become a weapon in the hands of Jew-baiters or Negro haters. We should recall the rabbinic statement that Satan, the evil inclination, and the angel of death are merely different names for the same unholy and dangerous character.

FEPC Legislation—White Americans Betrayed

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if George Washington could come back tomorrow and see the communistic FEPC program that is being proposed on his birthday, and especially if he could look up and see that hideous distortion of the United States seal, and the American eagle, right over our heads, he would be shocked beyond measure.

The FEPC bill which is to come before the House tomorrow is the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation with which this country has ever been threatened.

If it should become a law, it would do more to drive industry out of this country than anything else that has ever been done by the Congress of the United States.

CALIFORNIA

Remember that it was referred to the people of California for a popular vote, and was defeated by a clear majority in every single individual county in the State.

Are you Members from California now going to vote to impose this hideous monstrosity on your people who have said by their votes, by more than a million majority, and by a clear majority in every single individual county in the State, that they do not want it?

PENNSYLVANIA

Are your Members from Pennsylvania going to vote to impose this monstrosity on your people after the legislature of your great State has killed it twice?

Do you want to drive industries out of Pennsylvania by harassing them with a program of this kind that could not pass the Legislature of Pennsylvania?

OHIO

Do you Members from Ohio want to force this monstrosity on your people after the legislature of your State has killed it twice?

Do you want to drive your industries to Canada, or to some other foreign country by harassing them with this monstrosity?

Remember that this is going to be an issue in every congressional district in the United States in the primaries this year.

MICHIGAN

Do you Members from Michigan want to drive your industries out of the country by imposing this monstrosity on your people, after your legislature refused to pass it?

If you were to place it on the ballot in the State of Michigan, Pennsylvania, Ohio, or any other State in the Union, and let the people vote on it, they would kill it in every county just as they did in California.

ILLINOIS

Do you Members from Illinois want to impose it on your people after your legislature has killed it as dead as Hector?

Do you want to run industries out of Illinois and across the border into Canada, or to some other foreign country?

You know, and I know, that it would not carry in a single county in Illinois, if left to a popular vote and explained to the people who would do the voting on it.

MINNESOTA

They tried to pass it through the Legislature of Minnesota last year, but when the members of the legislature of that State found out what it meant they refused to pass it.

Are you Members from Minnesota now going to impose it on your people and drive your industries across the line into a foreign country?

It would not pass in a single county in Minnesota if left to a popular vote.

COLORADO

Take the State of Colorado. They tried to pass it through the Legislature of Colorado last year and failed.

Are you Members from Colorado now going to vote to impose it on your people, when the legislature has said they do not want it, and when you know it would not pass in a single county in Colorado by a popular vote?

The same thing applies to every other State from Iowa to Maine, from North Dakota to Florida.

You cannot pass this thing in a single county in a single State in this country if left to a popular vote of the people if they are told what it means.

NEW YORK

They rammed this measure through the Legislature of New York and appointed a commission to enforce it, with the result that they have tantalized and annoyed the business people of New York beyond measure. The best thing the Legislature of New York could do would be to repeal it.

If they had left it to a vote of the people of New York, it would have been buried worse than it was in California.

And the same thing would have happened in Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Rhode Island.

I am inserting at this point excerpts from a speech which I made on this FEPC in New York in 1947, and am setting out 18 different questions that you cannot ask a person seeking employment in that State.

I want every Member to read them and see whether or not he would like to have these restrictions, these paralyzing restrictions, imposed upon the people of his own State.

Here are some of the things you cannot do under the law of New York:

"Unlawful employment practices before hiring anybody."

Those words are written in capitals, and here is the first unlawful practice:

First:

"Inquiry into the original name of the applicant for employment, whose name has been changed by court proceedings or otherwise."

If you inquire as to his name or what his name used to be you violate the law. You commit an unlawful practice. For instance, take this man who writes for PM, who calls himself I. F. Stone. His name was Isadore Feinstein, as Cordell Hull once pointed out. Suppose he comes to you asking for employment and you ask him that question. Then you will have committed an unlawful act.

Second. Here is the next one:

It would be unlawful practice to make "inquiry into the birthplace of the applicant for employment, the birthplace of his parents, spouse, or other close relative."

How would you like that in Iowa, Illinois, Texas, or Nebraska? In California I know you do not like it, because you have just voted on it.

Third. Here is the next unlawful practice:

"Requirement that the applicant for employment produce a birth certificate or baptismal certificate."

That would be an unlawful practice under this FEPC Act in New York.

I was surprised to see Governor Dewey get his mustache in the wringer on this proposition. I do not see how he is ever going to get loose from it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. What about this requirement during the war that every person employed in certain industries had to prove that he was born here before he could get a job?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. If we had had this law all over the country then, the Japs would have had a spy at the elbow of every man in a key position; so would the Germans, and so would every other enemy country.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his timely suggestion.

Fourth. It is an unlawful practice in New York, under this law, to make "inquiry into the religious denomination of an applicant for employment, his religious affiliations, his church, parish pastor, or religious holidays observed. Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist."

Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist is forbidden, although you may be publishing literature for the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, or any other denomination.

Fifth. Another thing, an applicant for employment—and I am reading from the rules laid down by this Commission:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that this is a Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish organization."

In other words, if you are in the business of publishing religious literature you cannot even give him that information under this law which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] now proposes for the whole country, including Illinois.

Sixth. Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that the following holidays will be observed by the firm and no others, naming the holidays; e. g., Decoration Day and July the Fourth, etc."

You cannot tell them under the laws, rulings, and regulations of the State of New York that they may observe the Fourth of July.

Seventh. Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that employees are required to work Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur."

Frankly, I did not know there were any such days until the last few years.

Eighth. Another thing, it is an unlawful practice under this New York law to make "inquiry into the complexion of an applicant for employment."

Inquire into his complexion and you are likely to get yourself tangled up with the law of the State of New York.

Ninth. Here is another unlawful practice:

"Requirement that an applicant for employment annex a photograph."

That would be an unlawful employment practice. You are not supposed to know how he looks.

Remember, this is not in Russia, but in New York.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. And yet the State Department, in order to grant a visa, requires a photograph of the person to be presented with his application.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly, and they ought to do so. Much as I respect the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], I certainly would not want to employ him unless I knew how he looked. If I had never seen him, I would certainly want to see his picture.

Tenth. Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry whether an applicant for employment is a naturalized or native-born citizen; the date when the applicant acquired citizenship; whether the applicant's parents or spouse are naturalized or native-born citizens of the United States; the date when such parents or spouse acquired citizenship."

You cannot inquire into those questions under this FEPC law in New York.

Eleventh. Here is another unlawful practice:

"Requirement that an applicant for employment produce his naturalization papers or first papers."

He may lie to you and tell you that he is a naturalized citizen, but you cannot ask to see his papers.

Twelfth. Another unlawful practice in New York is to "inquire into the lineage of an applicant for employment, his ancestry, or national origin."

You remember a few years ago the Dallas News inserted an advertisement for a colored janitor, and this FEPC outfit down the street, ordered them to take it out, said it was an unlawful practice.

One member of this FEPC outfit here in Washington went into the office of Swift & Co. in Chicago. This FEPC man asked them: "How many Negroes do you have on your board of directors?"

The answer was "None."

Then the FEPC man asked him: "Why haven't you?"

That was the FEPC down here in Washington a few years ago before it died because a few radicals could not browbeat Congress into perpetuating it.

But it is now in force in the State of New York.

Thirteenth. Here is another unlawful practice under the New York law:

"Inquiry into the location of places of business of relatives of an applicant for employment."

Fourteenth. It is an unlawful practice to make "inquiry into the place of residence of the parents, spouse, or other close relatives of an applicant for employment."

I am reading from the records at Albany.

Fifteenth. Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the maiden name of the wife of a male applicant for employment and/or inquiry into the maiden name of the mother of a male or female applicant for employment."

The other day we had the Eislers down here. One of them has been shown to be representing the Comintern, according to his sister's testimony. He has a brother out in California, who seems to be poisoning the public mind through the moving-picture industry. He tries to defend his brother and refers to this woman as "my former sister." If you wanted to employ any of them and check the name of at least one of them as given here, you could not inquire into those names at all—if you are trying to do business in the State of New York—even though one of them has a half dozen aliases. You could not even ask where they came from or when they got here or when they changed their names.

Sixteenth. Here is another unlawful practice, in New York:

"Inquiry into the general military experience of an applicant for employment."

Seventeenth. I wish every ex-serviceman could read that, and the next one.

Here it is: It is an unlawful practice to make "inquiry into the whereabouts of an applicant for employment during the First World War, i. e., during the period from 1914 to 1919."

In other words, inquiry as to his whereabouts in the period from 1914 to 1919 is forbidden as an unlawful practice in the State of New York.

Is that what you want in Colorado? Is that what you want in Massachusetts?

Mr. GIFFORD. We have it.

Mr. RANKIN. Get rid of it, and we will help you.

Is that what you want in Kansas, in Ohio, and in other States?

Let your States vote on it. Michigan is going to vote on it right away. If you will tell the people of Michigan the whole truth, let them know the whole truth about this monstrosity, I will guarantee you they will beat it worse than they did in California.

Eighteenth. Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the organizations of which an applicant for employment is a member, including organizations the name or character of which indicates the religion, race, or national origin of its members."

I presume, if they should ask me if I am a member of the Masonic lodge, I could have them jerked up and brought before this inquisition board or probably prosecuted at various places throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am not criticising the people of New York. I have long since learned in going from one State to another that real Americans are about the same everywhere. I believe if they had a vote on it the people of New York would beat it, just as they did in California.

They are having a vote on it in Michigan because a little minority group has been attempting to browbeat the Legislature of Michigan into passing it. I dare say when it goes on the ballot in Michigan and the people of Michigan understand what it means they will defeat it more thoroughly than they did in California. The same thing would happen in probably every other State in the Union.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman tell us what the penalties are in New York?

Mr. RANKIN. In addition to being harassed to death with orders and directives to cease, desist, rehire, and so forth, there is a punishment provided of "imprisonment in a penitentiary or county jail for not more than 1 year or by fine of not more than $500, or by both."

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to remind the gentleman that we have that law in Massachusetts.

Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that.

Mr. GIFFORD. I was thoroughly amazed when I looked into it; I had not learned what the rules were. But, perhaps we carried it too far. I am so sorry, and I have been, and I am not in favor of this, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I know the gentleman is not, and I am sure the people of Massachusetts would not favor it if they had a vote on it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Employers always inquire and must know whether you come from a respectable family or not. They are so careful. Perhaps they overdid it. But I think a man ought to be able to find out whether he came from a respectable family.

Mr. RANKIN. There are a great many questions that should be asked, which are forbidden under this law.

FEPC IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Speaker, in order to give the new Members an idea of what a mess this FEPC was here in Washington during its existence under Executive order, I insert a speech I made on this subject in 1945.

IT READS AS FOLLOWS:

"FEPC A BETRAYAL OF WHITE AMERICANS

"(Speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, July 12, 1945)

"Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of a law at this time legalizing this so-called FEPC would be a betrayal of the white people of the country. If every individual in the United States could understand just what it means, there would be such a roar of protest coming from every State in this Union that it would never see the light of day.

"If every Member of Congress would 'screw his courage to the sticking place' and vote his convictions on this so-called FEPC, it would not get 30 votes out of the entire membership of 435.

"It is a most dangerous and brazen attempt to fasten upon the white people of America the worst system of control by alien or minority racial groups that has been known since the crucifixion.

"When I read the names of the personnel of this outfit you will understand what I mean.

"To sanctify this organization by law would give the lie to everything we have told our American boys they were fighting for. Instead of coming back to liberty, freedom, and democracy, they would find themselves sold into this bondage, herded, humiliated, and regimented by alien influences directed by a foreign committee representing the deadly doctrine of Karl Marx that is based upon hatred for Christianity and for everything that is based on Christian principles.

"It is a manifestation in legislative form of that infidelity that has closed thousands of Christian churches in Europe and been responsible for the murder of untold millions of Christian human beings.

"This measure is not directed altogether at the white people of the South. If it were, you folks in the North would not have so much ground for alarm. We in the South know how to combat subversive elements. As Henry Grady once said, 'We wrested the South from such domination' when Federal drum beats rolled nearer and Federal bayonets hedged closer to the ballot box of the South than it ever will again in this Republic.'

"But you people in the North have not had that training, and this FEPC is likely to bring grief, strife, hatred, race riots, and chaos in your northern cities if this vicious agency is perpetuated and sanctioned by your votes.

"Do not forget that the returning servicemen know what this thing means, and they are going to call you to account next year—beginning with the primary. They are not going to wait until the general election.

"Do not forget that every businessman, every farmer, every professional man, and every other independent individual whose blood glows with the instinct of American liberty, is going to join these men, and these other patriotic forces that are fighting to have American institutions for which these boys have been fighting and dying upon every battlefield in the world.

"If every man and every woman in the United States could just read the list of individuals that compose the personnel of this crazy FEPC, and its subdivisions throughout the country, I dare say there would not be enough of you left who vote for it, even if nominated in the primaries next year, to form a corporal's guard.

"For your information, and for the information of the American people generally, I am going to read you the official personnel as it exists today. Remember, this list is taken from the official record. This is the group that wants to nose into and control every business in the United States. Remember, they can search the files and records of every business establishment in America where some disgruntled individual is willing to trump up a charge of discrimination. They can drag them all over the country and try them, and in that way destroy any ordinary business concern.

"The next thing they are going to try to do is get control of your schools and force their communistic henchmen into the schools and teach your children their subversive doctrines.

"Read these lists carefully, which, as I said, are taken from the official records here in Washington, and you will see that not 1 out of 10 on these rolls is a white gentile American.

"Here is the official list:

"Committee on Fair Employment Practice, Washington, D. C., office of the chairman

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ross, Malcolm	Chairman	White	$8,000
Johnson, George M.	Deputy Chairman.	Colored	8,000
Hubbard, Maceo	Hearings examiner.	do	5,600
Bloch, Emanuel	do	White	5,600
Copper, Evelyn	do	do	5,600
Berking, Max	Assistant to Chairman.	do	3,800
Alexander, Dorothy	Secretary to Chairman.	Colored	2,600
Clifton, J. Jeanne	Secretary to Deputy.	do	2,000
Brooks, Mary	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Barting, Myra	do	White	1,800

"You will note that in this office of the chairman, consisting of 10 people, there are 5 Negroes and 5 white people, most of whom have foreign names. One of the whites is a stenographer who receives the smallest salary of anyone on the list.

"Remember that the members of this group preside over the destiny of every business enterprise in America, and are using their assumed powers to harass white Americans out of business.

"This is the organization Members of Congress are being asked to perpetuate by the passage of this bill.

"FIELD OPERATIONS

"Here is the Division of Field Operations:

"Field operations

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Maslow, Will	Chief	White	[illegible]
Mitchel, Clarence	Principal fair-practice examiner.	Colored	5,600
Davidson, Eugene	do	do	5,600
Beall, W. Hayes	Senior fair-practice examiner.	White	4,600
Mercer, Inez	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Rogers, Eleanor	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Saito, Otome	do	Japanese-American.	1,800
Thompson, Mildred	do	Colored	1,800
Cornick, Emma	do	do	1,620

"You will note that it consists of nine people—five Negroes, one Japanese, and three others—two of whom have records of affiliations with Communist-front organizations, according to the reports of the Dies committee.

"Imagine this group going about over the country riding herd on the white American businessmen of the Nation, telling them whom they shall employ, whom they shall promote, and with whom they may associate.

"It would be interesting, and probably enlightening, to check up on these people and see how many of them are native-born Americans.

"Members of Congress had better do this now, before they get caught in this trap, because this question of un-American activities is going to be an issue in every congressional district next year, beginning with the primaries.

"The people are not going to wait until the general election for someone who holds a commission as a result of the pernicious activities of Sidney Hillman and his gang to wrap the party cloak about him and shout to the people of his district that 'I am a Republican' or 'I am a Democrat.'

"More than 2,000,000 young men have already been discharged in this war, and they are organizing now to try to save America for Americans. They are going to read your records, and they are likely to ask you some very embarrassing questions when you get home.

"REVIEW AND ANALYSIS DIVISION

"Now look at this list and see who reviews all these records of racial discrimination when they come to Washington, and you will understand how the editor of the Dallas News felt and how other white gentiles feel, including Cecil B. DeMille, the great American movie producer, when they are harassed out of business.

"Here is the list:

"Review and analysis division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Davis, John A	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Lawson, Marjorie	Research analyst.	do	3,800
Colightly, Cornelius.	Compliance analyst.	do	3,200
Hemphill, India	do	do	2,600
Coan, Carol	do	White	2,600
Davis, Joy P	do	Colored	2,600
Hoffman, Celia	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Spaulding, Joan	do	Colored	1,800

"You will note that it consists of six Negroes and two white people, one of whom is named Carol Coan and the other Celia Hoffman, a white stenographer receiving the lowest salary on the list.

"Now, if you sign the petition to bring out this bill or vote for this monstrosity, do not forget that when you get home those white American businessmen who help to sustain this Nation in time of peace and whose sons are fighting its battles in time of war are going to want to ask you some questions that you may not be able to answer.

"LEGAL DIVISION

"But if you want a real laugh, look at this legal division.

"Legal Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Reeves, Frank D	Attorney	Colored	$4,600
Stickgold, Simon	do	White	4,600
Gordon, Jernevive	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800

"You will note that this so-called Legal Division consists of two Negroes and a Simon Stickgold.

"INFORMATION DIVISION

"Now we come to the Information Division. If you want information about this outfit, write to this Division:

"Information Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Bourne, St. Clair	Information specialist.	Colored	[illegible]
Whiting, Margaret	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

"You will note that it consists of two Negroes, one registered as an information specialist and the other as a clerk-stenographer.

"BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

"Now we come to the Budget and Administration Division. This Division not only makes up the budget but administers the regulations. Here is the list:

"Budget and Administration

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Jones, Theodore	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Jeter, Sinclair	Assistant administrative officer.	do	3,200
Baker, Vivian D	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Jackson, Rosales A	Clerk-typist	do	1,620
Paynter, Minnie A	do	do	1,620
Hollomon, Irving	Clerk	do	1,440
Selby, Ralph E	Chief, fiscal	do	2,600
Ross, Sylvia B	Voucher auditor	do	2,000
Nelson, Otelia	Accounting clerk	do	1,620
Carpenter, Elizabeth.	do	do	1,620
Brent, Pearl T	do	do	1,620

"This outfit, which is composed of 11 Negroes, and no whites at all, not only makes up the budget for financing this aggregation, but it seems to have the power of administration. I hope you will read this list to your white businessmen, farmers, and ex-servicemen at home when you get back and ask for renomination in the primaries next year.

"MAIL AND FILES DIVISION

"Now, here are the ones that have control of the mails and filing system:

"Mail and Files

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Douglas, Lela	Chief, Mail and Files.	Colored	[illegible]
Welch, Selena	Docket clerk	do	1,800
Gamble, Jessie	File clerk	do	1,620
Phillips, Rose	do	do	1,440
Reed, Charles	Messenger	do	1,380
Mitchell, Regina	File clerk	do	1,440

"You will note that this division is composed entirely of Negroes—six Negroes, and no whites at all. I wonder why they discriminated against the white race in setting up these two powerful branches of this most dangerous agency?

"REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW YORK

"Now, let us turn to the regional offices and see who is going to harass the business people back in the States. Here is the list for the State of New York:

"Regional office, New York

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Lawson, Edward H.	Regional director.	Colored	[illegible]
Jones, Madison S	Fair-practice examiner.	do	[illegible]
Jones, Robert G	do	do	[illegible]
Donovan, Daniel R.	do	White	[illegible]
Irish, Miriam	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	[illegible]
Asepha, Tillie	do	White	1,620
Schwartz, Sonia	do	do	1,620

"This is the list that is going to help Governor Dewey harass the white American businessmen of the Empire State. You will note that it is composed of four Negroes and three white people. Please read the names of the three white people and see if you can figure out their antecedents.

"Businessmen of New York are going to have a hard time after this war without having all this communistic conglomeration to deal with, to say nothing of the one which Governor Dewey and his political henchmen have now heaped upon them.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, PHILADELPHIA

"Now, let us turn to Philadelphia, the birthplace of the Constitution—the City of Brotherly Love. At the risk of causing glorious old Benjamin Franklin to turn over in his grave, I read you the list:

"Regional office, Philadelphia

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Fleming, G. James	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Greenblatt, Mildred.	Fair-practice examiner.	White	[illegible]
Manly, Milo A	do	Colored	[illegible]
Risk, Samuel R	do	White	[illegible]
Grinnage, Willard	do	Colored	3,200
Gorgas, Helen	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Klincer, Karyl	do	White	1,800
Brown, Grayce	do	Colored	1,440

"You will note that it is composed of eight individuals—five Negroes and three whites, Mildred Greenblatt, Samuel R. Risk, and Karyl Klinger.

"Don't you know there will be some brotherly love when that crowd gets going on the businessmen of the Philadelphia area?

"REGIONAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

"Now, here is the regional office in Washington, D. C., the Nation's Capital, where there has been so much persecution of white gentiles in the last few years. Here is the list:

"Regional office, Washington, D. C.

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Evans, Joseph	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Houston, Theophilus.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,200
Kahn, Alice	do	White	2,600
Chisolm, Ruby	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Urback, Dorothy	do	do	[illegible]

"You will note it consists of four Negroes and Alice Kahn. Just what chance a white gentile will have with this group is entirely problematical, to say the least of it.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, CLEVELAND

"Now, let us move out where the West begins and take a look. Here is the list in the Cleveland regional office:

"Regional office, Cleveland

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
McKnight, Willistu	Regional director.	Colored	$4,600
Abbott, Olcott R	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,600
Glore, Lethia	do	Colored	3,200
Kelley, Bernice	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,620
Wasem, Edna	do	White	[illegible]

"You will note that this group is composed of three Negroes and two whites, Olcott R. Abbott and Edna Wasem.

"Don't you know the white people of Cleveland will enjoy being dominated by them?

"CINCINNATI REGIONAL OFFICE

"Cincinnati seems to be largely under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland office since it only has two people:

"Cincinnati

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
James, Harold	Fair-practice examiner.	White	[illegible]
	Clerk-stenographer.		[illegible]

"DETROIT REGIONAL OFFICE

"Now let us move on to Detroit, Mich. Here is the regional office for Detroit:

"Detroit

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Swan, Edward	Examiner in charge.	Colored	[illegible]
Sese, Doris K	Clerk-stenographer.	Japanese-American.	[illegible]

"You will note that it is composed of one Negro and one Japanese. I know the businessmen of Detroit are grateful for this consideration.

"I should like to hear some of the comments they will make to you gentlemen from Detroit when you get home next summer, if you support this vicious measure.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, CHICAGO

"Here is the list of the regional office in the Windy City:

"Regional office, Chicago

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Henderson, Elmer	Regional director.	Colored	[illegible]
Gibson, Harry H. C.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	[illegible]
Schultz, Joy	do	White	[illegible]
Williams, Le Roy	do	Colored	3,200
Zeidman, Penny	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Ingram, Marguerite S.	do	Colored	[illegible]

"You will note it is composed of four Negroes, Joy Shultz, and Penny Zeidman. I am told that a representative of this group went into the office of Swift & Co. and asked how many Negro members they had on their board of directors. The answer was, 'We have no Negro members on our board of directors.' Then the question came back, 'Why haven't you?' This just shows what this supergovernmental set-up is driving at. They want to communize America and destroy everything which our glorious ancestors have left us and for which our boys are now fighting and dying all over the world.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, ATLANTA

"Here is a list of the Atlanta office:

"Regional office, Atlanta

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Dodge, Witherspoon.	Regional director.	White	[illegible]
Hope, John	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	[illegible]
McKay, George D	do	White	[illegible]
Chubb, Sally	do	do	[illegible]
Ingram, Thelma	do	Colored	[illegible]

"You will note that it consists of two Negroes and three whites; the most important post in this office, that of examiner, is held by a Negro. I wonder how

the people of Georgia enjoy the domination of this group. I may have more to say about them later.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, KANSAS CITY

"Here is the list of the Kansas City office:

"Regional office, Kansas City

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hegland, Roy A.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Ormsbee, Eugene	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Mildred	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620
Schlun, Helene G.	do	White	1,620

"You will note that this office force consists of three whites and one Negro. You can read the list of whites yourself and then judge how many of them really represent the people of that area.

"ST. LOUIS REGIONAL OFFICE

"Here is the list of the regional office at St. Louis:

St. Louis

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Theodore Brown	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$3,800
Morris Levine	Examiner	White	3,200
Arnetta [illegible]	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620

"You will notice that it consists of two Negroes and Morris Levine. Just how they came to select these particular individuals to preside over the destiny of the white businessmen of the great State of Missouri I cannot understand.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, DALLAS, TEX.

"The members of the regional office at Dallas are as follows:

"Regional office, Dallas

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Castenada, Carlos	Regional director.	White	$4,600
(Vacancy)	Fair-practice examiner.		3,200
Gutleben, Willetta	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

"You will note there is one vacancy. Last year that position was held by a Negro, namely, Roy V. Williams. The other two members, Carlos Castenada, the regional director, and Willetta Gutleben seem to be in charge of the office at the present time. This is the regional office that attacked the Dallas News last year for carrying an advertisement for a Negro janitor. This fellow Castenada, the director, held the same position that he holds now. If this set-up is made permanent, then I presume the rest of the white American businessmen in Texas may expect to be harassed just as the Dallas News was.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW ORLEANS

"The regional office at New Orleans consists of the following members:

"Regional office, New Orleans

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ellinger, W. Don	Regional director.	White	[illegible]
Morton, James H.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,200
Bonsing, Evelyn	Clerk-stenographer	White	1,800

"You will note that there are two whites and one Negro in this office. As the Negro is the fair-practice examiner, just what the decent people of Louisiana may expect at the hands of this outfit is something to contemplate.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, SAN FRANCISCO

"The San Francisco office consists of the following individuals:

"Regional office, San Francisco

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Kingman, Harry L.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Rutledge, Edward	Fair-practice examiner.	do	4,600
Ross, Bernard	do	do	3,800
Seymour, Virginia	Administrative assistant.	do	2,000
Mazen, Jewel	Clerk-stenographer	do	1,800

"This is the only office we have found yet that consists entirely of white (?) people. Just what the background of each one of them is I am unable to say.

"LOS ANGELES REGIONAL OFFICE

"The Los Angeles regional office consists of the following:

"Los Angeles

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hunt, A. Bruce	Hearings examiner.	White	$5,600
Brown, Robert E.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,600
Lopez, Ignacio	do	White	3,800
Vetter, Vera G.	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Lerna, Marie	do	do	1,620

"You will note that there are four whites and one Negro in this office, the Negro being the fair-practice examiner. I do not know what consideration the white businessmen of the Los Angeles area are receiving at the hands of this group, but from what I can hear there is considerable gnashing of teeth over the situation.

"Mr. Chairman, this FEPC is a supergovernment of commissars, with more power for evil than any other agency that has ever been created in this country. If Congress should ratify it and make it the law of the land, then we will have sacrificed and destroyed that sacred freedom for which our brave men are now fighting and dying on every battle front in the world.

"We have no right to pass such a drastic revolutionary measure that literally changes our way of life, as well as our form of government, while these boys are away from home in uniform, fighting to sustain American institutions.

"As I said before, we are going to carry this battle against such un-American activities into every congressional district in the United States next year, in the primary, so that no one can crawl behind the party cloak and claim immunity at the hands of any segment of our people.

"This is a battle for the survival of free constitutional government, for the survival of the American way of life, for the survival of free enterprise, for the survival of American liberty itself.

"It is a battle to save America for Americans."

The New McCloy Spanks Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues, as well as I, have, from time to time, called the attention of this House to what appeared to be a deterioration of democratic thinking in Germany.

Today I desire to call your attention to what I believe will cause a great improvement thereof.

The following article by Don Cook in the New York Herald Tribune of February 19, 1950, is worthy of your perusal:

THE NEW M'CLOY SPANKS GERMANY—VAST CHANGE FOR BETTER FORECAST IN FIRM POLICY

(By Don Cook)

FRANKFURT.—Decisive pronouncements of foreign policy or political policy generally are well-marked historical events, such as the Monroe Doctrine, the Truman doctrine, the Harvard speech of Secretary of State George C. Marshall, or the British decision to get out of India.

But at least as decisive, though less well marked, can be a change in the application of a policy or doctrine already laid down—the mood or attitude of the responsible official whose objectives remain the same but whose method of approach suddenly takes a radical alteration almost as if he had been handed a new directive.

This, it appears, has happened suddenly in western Germany, and in the opinion of a good many Allied officials it has happened none too soon. The basic Allied objective of restoring a free and independent government to the western European community of nations is unchanged, but since the Stuttgart speech of United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy the whole atmosphere of the German situation has altered.

From a defensive position Mr. McCloy has suddenly carried the Allied High Commission over to a new high point of psychological authority in western Germany. No longer is everybody wondering what Chancellor Konrad Adenauer will do next: The question now is what the High Commission will do.

This Mr. McCloy has achieved by the simple act of telling the German people clearly, concisely, and unmistakably that they are still committing a lot of their old traditional political mistakes, and that before the world will trust the new Germany she must humble herself and learn the lesson that "humility leads to strength and not to weakness * * * that the highest form of self-respect is to admit mistakes and to make amends for them."

To understand the impact of such relatively obvious and elementary remarks one must first understand the instinctive fashion in which Germans respond to the voice of authority. Mr. McCloy has that authority by virtue of his position and the power which the United States represents here in the heart of Europe.

But the voice of authority must be clear and unmistakable and it must be heard continuously if it is to be kept effective. It need not threaten to get results, but certainly it must speak strongly enough and judicially enough to demonstrate a constant sympathetic interest in the future of this somewhat autocratic democracy.

Last November 30, for example, Mr. McCloy was confronted here with a request for comment on a directive which the German cabinet had issued to government civil servants, forbidding them from talking to the press. He remarked very carefully: "Free comment on the acts of government leaders must always be encouraged, and if any errors are committed in that respect they should be on the side of liberal rather than restrictive policy."

This comment was barely even reported by the German press, but when Mr. McCloy arrived in Stuttgart and was asked for comment on the efforts to suppress news of the Wurttemberg-Baden denazification scandal, he got strong results from this statement:

"I cannot too strongly indorse the right of freedom of the press and the principle that public officials must exercise their responsibilities under the bright light of public discussion. Any thought of suppression of the news is intolerable and I commend the German press for its demands for the facts and the punishment of the guilty."

In the contrasting wordings of these two statements, each involving the same principle, lies the difference between strong psychological authority here in Germany and ineffective comment. What has produced the change in Mr. McCloy's attitude?

"A man can't go on being patient with the Germans forever," one of his high advisors remarked in discussing the matter. In 6 months here Mr. McCloy gave in tremendously to Chancellor Adenauer and the west German government—gave in at what many felt was an alarming rate in the hope that demands would cease, but only to be confronted with other demands from other quarters.

"I remember a remark Ernie Bevin made in a discussion about Germany," a British official said, talking about the McCloy speech. "Some one at the foreign office asked him at a conference one day if we weren't trying to make Germany a democracy. He hit the table with his fist and said, 'Of course, I want them to be a democracy. I want them to think what they like and do what I tell them'."

A chief factor in Mr. McCloy's new approach was the mood of American opinion he found on his last trip home—concern, he felt, at the growth of the old German autocratic temperament instead of the humility and pan-European spirit of which he spoke in Stuttgart.

The high commissioner had set a new pace for his mission here in Germany and the favorite topic of conversation now is the question: "Is this the new McCloy?" Germans being the people they are and the politicians they are, he should not have to wait long to prove whether his speech is backed with policy.

Petition To Reject World-Government Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a petition signed by women of 35 patriotic organizations which met in conference in the city of Washington in the last week of January. These 35 patriotic groups represent 3,000,000 women in the United States. As part of my remarks I am including the petition together with the signatures and a copy of the resolution adopted by the twenty-fourth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense held in the city of Washington, January 6, 7, and 8, 1950:

A PETITION TO REJECT WORLD GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS PENDING BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

A petition to reject the world government resolutions now pending or which may be presented; a petition to hold strictly to the liberty with which we are endowed by the Constitution of the United States and to ask Congress to vote against any efforts to supplant or overthrow the Constitution of the United States and place in the hands of a world government authority, necessarily dominated by the totalitarian world, the rights, freedoms, and liberties of we, the sovereign people of the United States.

Kathryn M. New, Buffalo, N. Y.; Mrs. Carl O. Oyleo, Fostoria, Ohio; Mrs. William B. Shelton, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Mrs. Josephine Jarvis, Hartford, Conn.; Mrs. Irene E. Wangel, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Emma Johnston, New York City, N. Y.; Mrs. Earl Atkinson, Forest Hills, N. Y.; Josephine W. Ottman, New York City, N. Y.; Mrs. Alice B. Huntington, Maplewood, N. J.; Edna H. Brown, Washington, D. C.; Gladys Thomas, Lafayette, Ind.; Mary E. Porter, Eloise E. Whitmer, Mrs. Anna Hansman, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Lillian Nugent, Rutherford, N. J.; Mrs. Leonard J. Bradley; Mrs. W. Graydon Painter, Lewisburg, Pa.; Pauline Walker, Waverly, Va.; Mrs. H. Klyspeel, Providence, R. I.; Mrs. Anne H. Drysdale, Warren, R. I.; Mrs. Ola D. Lee, Washington, D. C.

Ruth B. Niece, Chagrin Falls, Ohio; Gertrude I. Stone, Biddeford, Maine; Myrtle H. Knox, Hartford, Conn.; Mary E. Shields, Collingdale, Pa.; Loretta C. McGill, Philadelphia, Pa.; Harriet Eaton Hughes, New York, N. Y.; Grace A. Hartley, Cambridge, Mass.; Mrs. M. Russell Kelley, Washington, D. C.; Miss Alice D. Butterfield, New York City, N. Y.; Mrs. T. W. Ballard, LaGrange, Ill.; Mrs. Frances Cordaro, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Mrs. Bernice Weiss, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Mrs. Florence W. Braum, Irvington, N. Y.; Mrs. J. E. Cauklin, Hubbell, Nebr.; Mrs. Alberta S. Tucker, Bloomfield, N. J.; Imogene Philibert, Arlington, Va.; Dous Patch, Townsend, Mass.; Mrs. David D. Good, Osceola Mills, Pa.; Mrs. Ralph Ord, Dravosburg, Pa.; Mrs. Mildred Sterem, Mrs. Amelia Thiele, Mrs. W. M. Thomas, Kansas City, Mo.

Madalin Dingley Leetch, Mrs. Ethel E. Fuin, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Lou Ella Allen, Ennis, Tex.; Mrs. L. H. Breuer, Rolla, Mo., Mrs. Wm. Hilgert, Duquesne, Pa.; Mrs. W. W. Stearns, Willoughby, Ohio; Mrs. J. B. O'Brien, Bronxville, N. Y.; Mrs. Eleanor Carty, Yeadon, Pa.; Frances B. Cox, Mrs. Marion Alterrus, Silver Spring, Md.; Mrs. Doris Hohn, Chicago, Ill.; Mrs. Milton W. Davis, Atlanta, Ga.; Mrs. Harrison Smith, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. Calvin F. Shugg, Rutherford, N. J.; Mrs. E. S. Alvord, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. C. J. Keller, Wauseon, Mrs. Lee E. Moore, Zanesville, Ohio; Mrs. J. A. MacGalloway, Arlington, Mass.; Mary F. Barclay, Uniontown, Pa.

Mrs. Harry C. Hassinger, Northumberland, Pa.; Mrs. Rola Wright, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Ruth E. Martin, Brentwood, Md.; Mrs. Gertrude Harris, Pearl Heagerty, Washington, D. C.; Margaret M. Locke, Myra Judd, Miss Theodore Reed, Helen C. Miller, Mary B. Hartman, Miss A. Clare Tosmer, Mrs. C. H. Garret, Mrs. L. Coats, Mrs. Edward H. Dolle, B. Dorothy Fulton, Mrs. Lowell F. Hobart, Sr., Cincinnati, Ohio.

Dorothea G. Norman; Mrs. Ramsay Peugnet, Bronxville, N. Y.; Mrs. D. A. William, Washington Court House, Ohio; Mrs. A. J. Dexter, St. Paul, Minn.; Grace L. H. Brosseau, Greenwich, Conn.; Elizabeth B. Coddington, Douglaston, N. Y.; Mary Ruggiero, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Myra Hacker, West Englewood, N. J.; Mrs. Ethyl M. West, Ketchikan, Mrs. Nena Ellis, Anchorage, Alaska; Mrs. Harry G. O'Connor, Drexel Hill, Pa.; Mrs. D. C. M. Hart, Kansas City, Mo.; Nagene C. Bethune, Washington, D. C.; Gladys B. Coffin, Helen Welch, Cincinnati, Ohio; Mrs. John P. Lustenberger, Mt. Aub, Mrs. Lyall Lipscomb, Mitchell, Fort Mitchell, Ky.; Mrs. Ruth Martin, Mrs. L. B. Crawford, Cincinnati, Ohio; Ida McMillan, Covington, Ky.; Helen Mullen, Nina Beyerlein, Frieda Rossel, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Resolution No. 12

Subject: Oppose surrender of national sovereignty, world government

(Presented by National Society of New England Women and assembled on floor of conference)

Whereas various schemes are advocated to bring about world government, world federation, or world union under world law of unknown character, which would supersede the Constitution of the United States or, indirectly, by international treaty, to establish an international central council planning group which would control the lives, work, investment, and genius of free Americans and thus abrogate the national sovereignty of the free people of the United States;

Whereas the United States has 7 percent of the world's population and, as one of the few solvent nations, would be outnumbered and outvoted in any scheme for world government;

Whereas United States gold reserves, currency, taxes, and immigration would be regulated by the world government, with world courts to try and sentence Americans;

Whereas the Army, Navy, and Air Forces would be abolished for an international police force maintained at the level approved by the world government;

Whereas the destruction of the United States Government would be accomplished by the stroke of a pen, thus serving the aims of the Communists: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-fourth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense oppose membership in any international organization which would inevitably have powers and rights over the United States, including Atlantic Union, and its sovereign people and supersede the Constitution of the United States.

Christian Leaders Term Jerusalem Plan Dangerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the hopelessness of attempting to internationalize Jerusalem in contradistinction to the internationalization of the holy places within Jerusalem is now established beyond contradiction. In support of that statement I am pleased to submit the following item which appeared in the February 1950 edition of the New Palestine:

CHRISTIAN LEADERS TERM JERUSALEM PLAN DANGEROUS

A fact-finding mission of Christian leaders and spokesmen, sent to Israel to investigate the feasibility of the internationalization plan for Jerusalem, concluded in a report that "the United Nations plan to internationalize the Jerusalem area is dangerous and unnecessary." Having rejected the internationalization plan, it recommended that a United Nations commission "with no territorial sovereignty" be established in order to insure the free accessibility of the Christian world to the holy places of Jerusalem.

"Guarantees should be given to such a commission by both Jordan and Israel assuring the freedom and sanctity of the sacred places within their territories. This is all that the Christian world has a right to require of two sovereign states, which we believe will in time compose their differences. This making of the peace will be accomplished all the more speedily if Israel and Jordan are encouraged in their negotiations by the western powers," the report emphasized.

Members of the investigation commission, who occupy leading positions in the Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist and Congregational denominations, included: Dr. Samuel Guy Inman, former adviser on Latin-American Affairs to the State Department and member of the Federal Council of Churches Commission of International Goodwill; Dr. Charles J. Turck, president of Macalester College in St. Paul and president of the National Council of Presbyterian Laymen; Mrs. H. E. Tilly, member of President Truman's Commission on Civil Rights and field representative of the Southern Regional Council; Dr. John W. Bradbury, editor of the national Baptist magazine, the Watchman-Examiner; Dr. Ralph W. Riley, president of the American Baptist Theological Seminary; and Prof. Victor Obenhaus of the University of Chicago, national chairman of the Council of Social Action, Congregational Christian Church of America.

The Jerusalem investigation group disclosed that while it was in Israel and the Holy City, it had discussed the problem of internationalization with representatives of the Coptic Church, the Greek Catholic Church, the Copt Catholic Church, the Roman Catholic Church, ministers of Protestant groups, and with Jews and Arabs. From these discussions, the fact-finding mission was able to conclude, according to its report, that the UN plan was unworkable.

SUPERS PEACE

"The overwhelming majority of leaders of religious groups we interviewed expressed the belief it would not work. Many held it was impractical and certain to add confusion and impede peace negotiations now in progress," the report stated.

The mission called upon the United States Government to press for a reconsideration of the United Nations Assembly decision. It asserted that a reconsideration by the United Nations of its internationalization plan was within the prerogatives of the international organization, and that the formulation of a just and workable plan for guaranteeing the sanctity of the holy places would enhance its prestige and power.

At the same time, Louis Lipsky, chairman of the American Zionist Council, threw up a charge of inconsistency at the State Department for its statement that the United States would participate constructively in the Trusteeship Council's consideration of the Jerusalem issue.

Mr. Lipsky made direct reference, in his statement, to the State Department's failure to amplify its meaning of the term: "participate constructively."

The Zionist leader stated: "To 'participate constructively' in the Trusteeship Council—a principle by which our Government has always been guided—should not mean that the United States has yielded its strong feelings of opposition to an impotent and impossible regime for Jerusalem which, according to the views conveyed by the United States delegation on December 5, 'does not in any way express the wishes of the people of that city.'"

Mr. Lipsky went on to quote from statements made at Lake Success by John C. Ross, United States representative to the United Nations, pointing out the impracticability of the Jerusalem plan.

In that conection it is well to set forth the following excerpt from an address delivered by the Israel Ambassador to the United States before a Jewish National Fund gathering in San Francisco:

WE WILL NOT FORGET OUR RESPONSIBILITY FOR JERUSALEM

(By Eliahu Elath, Israel Ambassador to the United States)

Our efforts for lasting peace and security for Israel and its population were seriously hurt by the ill-starred plan which the United Nations has just adopted for Jerusalem. This plan ignores experience and reality and violates fundamental principle, for the United Nations was established to defend the right of a people to govern themselves. The United Nations is seeking to annul Israel's authority in Jerusalem and has no means by which to assert its own. By passing this resolution, which is foredoomed to futility, the United Nations has fallen victim to incredible light-mindedness. Those who sponsored the resolution have charged themselves with grave moral responsibility for the moral authority of the United Nations.

Let me state with full clarity that Jerusalem is an integral part of Israel and cannot be severed, neutralized or separated in any way from the state. The failure to implement an internationalization plan in 1947 is tragically marked in Jerusalem's cemeteries by the graves of 1,490 Jews who fell in Jerusalem's defense.

Jerusalem, throughout the ages, meant to the Jews the embodiment of everything Jewish. Today, Jerusalem, in addition to being a symbol, is a reality. The new city of Jerusalem is as much a part of Israel as Tel Aviv, because it was built up by Israelites, is inhabited by Israelites, and draws its livelihood from Israel. But for our successful stand against aggressors, Jewish Jerusalem would have been signed off the face of the earth.

The government of Israel does not believe that there has ever been any fundamental clash of interests between the Christian world and Israel as to the safeguarding of the holy places. Only about 5 percent of the holy places in Jerusalem are located in the Israeli-held part of the town. Approximately 95 percent are in the Old City, which is controlled by Jordanian forces.

It must be stressed that the Arab authority in control of almost all the holy places refuses to concede any title or function whatsoever to the United Nations.

My government has solemnly declared its determination to honor the rights of every faith and religion in Israel, to protect the shrines and holy places in its territory and to guarantee free access to them. My government is equally determined to protect, with all its means and power, the security and well-being of the Jewish community in Jerusalem and its sovereign rights in its historic capital. We will protect Jewish Jerusalem with the same vigor and, if necessary, self-sacrifice as in our defense of Haifa, Safed and Negba.

We in Israel are fully aware of our sacred responsibility to the Jewish people for justice to Jerusalem. We will not forget and not betray that responsibility.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to displaced persons, by William A. Millen, from the Washington Evening Star of yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DP'S ARE APT TO LEAVE SUDDENLY, FARMERS IN NEARBY STATES FIND

(By William A. Millen)

An up-to-date version of "How you gonna keep 'em down on the farm?" is plaguing Maryland and Virginia farmers who have employed displaced persons.

A tendency of the recently arrived Europeans to move out without warning was cited by area farmers as probably their greatest fault.

L. M. Walker, Jr., Virginia commissioner of agriculture and State DP committee chairman, put it this way:

"The biggest all-round objection is that the DP's leave suddenly, and the farmers are left high and dry. The farmer provides a house and some furniture. But he still is worried whether the DP will be there next week, or will move to the big cities—Chicago, Philadelphia, Baltimore or Washington.

He blamed the screening of DP applicants in Europe—an apparent failure to select farm people for farm work.

Virginia has about 120 DP families now. About 40 percent of these originally employed on farms have switched to other occupations. More than half the Virginia DP's are Ukrainians, with Lithuanians and Poles making up most of the others.

Dr. T. B. Symons, dean of the School of Agriculture at the University of Maryland, figures Maryland has between 400 and 500 DP's.

In addition to a need for screening, Dr. Symons believes the DP program would be improved by a follow-up check on performances, a requirement that DP farmers remain on farms for a reasonable time, and that they be registered for a reasonable period.

Anne Arundel County's members resigned recently from the Governor's Committee for the Resettlement of Displaced Persons. They charged the DP program has been "haphazard."

Anne Arundel County Agent Stanley E. Day said that often "farmers" turn out to be tailors, beekeepers, or florists.

To illustrate, he told how one DP family, given a chicken by a farmer, had to ask him to kill it for them.

Other difficulties arise from the difference in languages. Some farmers, believing they were more than generous in wages and living quarters, were amazed to find DP's walking out on them at a minute's notice, Mr. Day said.

At Joyce Lane, Md., Dr. Charles E. Iliff, a Baltimore eye specialist, invited a young Ukrainian family to work on his farm last May. The DP's were given a third-floor apartment in the large farmhouse, with their own bath, radio, and a large fan to keep cool in the summer.

The Ukrainian woman did not know how to cook, so Mrs. Iliff patiently coached her.

The immigrant often talked about how nice things were back home and said that some day, when the Russians left, they would move back. Almost without warning last month, the Ukrainians left the Iliff farm.

On the Arnold (Md.) Angus cattle farm of Charles B. Lynch, there's an empty house. It was prepared for another Ukrainian family last April. Last month the tenants shoved off for parts unknown.

In Montgomery County, where some of the first DP's landed, there has not been a request for a DP farm family in 10 months.

S. Gilbert Brown, manager of the Silver Spring office of the Maryland Employment Security Department, said, "They went sour on us and the word spread like wildfire."

"Now, instead of the 14 DP families in the county, there are 4 such groups, all Lithuanians," he said.

Montgomery County Agent O. W. Anderson said, "The DP's showed they were interested only in getting into this country and then going their own way."

Dissatisfaction also was expressed by Agent P. E. Clark, of Prince Georges County, where 30 foreign families still reside on farms.

"They should be called in many cases misplaced persons instead of DP's," he said. "They are chosen like picking a pig out of a bag. They land in Baltimore and the farmer is told to meet them there. The DP's have pictured to them that this is a land of milk and honey, and somebody will take care of them."

But not all the criticism of DP farm families is derogatory. Many hard-working groups have proved satisfactory, as tomorrow's concluding article will describe.

FEPC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, this is a statement by eight Republican Members of the House on the FEPC bill coming up Wednesday:

The 1948 platform of the Republican Party contained these ringing words:

"This right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. We favor the enactment and just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic."

In line with our party platform we shall oppose any attempt to remove from the FEPC bill adequate provisions for its enforcement. Specifically, we shall oppose any amendment or substitute which would have that effect.

We realize that an FEPC law must be administered with wisdom, understanding and restraint. We shall insist that it will be so administered. All the experience under State FEPC legislation amply justifies our confidence that this can be done.

But if the FEPC law is to have any effect it also must be administered with firmness and to this end it must contain adequate machinery for its enforcement. A law without sanctions is no law at all.

We recognize that the various State FEPC commissions have been making great progress in the elimination of discrimination in employment and that they have not found it necessary to resort to the penalty provisions which their laws contain. But the evidence is overwhelming that it has been the very existence of such penalty provisions which has made resort to them unnecessary. The testimony of State FEPC commissioners is conclusive on this point. And the hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor are replete with evidence of the failure of voluntary efforts at the elimination of discrimination and the quick success of such efforts when backed by adequate legal sanctions.

We agree completely with the 18 prominent businessmen, including William L. Batt, president of S. K. F. Industries; Henry R. Luce, editor of Time, Life, and Fortune magazines; Beardsley Ruml, chairman of the board of R. H. Macy & Co.; and Spyros P. Skouras, president of Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp. who declared to the committee:

"We like the reliance which the bill puts upon education and conciliation. On the other hand, we recognize the necessity of governmental sanctions when conciliation breaks down."

The existence of discrimination in employment is recognized by everyone. The need for a Federal law to eliminate such discrimination is generally conceded. That need cannot be met unless we enact a law with real enforcement provisions and not the mere statement of a lofty principle and the expression of a pious hope for voluntary conformity.

CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Republican, Sixth District, New Jersey.
JOHN W. HESELTON,
Republican, First District, Massachusetts.
JACOB K. JAVITS,
Republican, Twenty-first District, New York.
KENNETH B. KEATING,
Republican, Fortieth District, New York.
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Republican, Twenty-sixth District, Pennsylvania.
HARDIE SCOTT,
Republican, Third District, Pennsylvania.
HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.,
Republican, Sixth District, Pennsylvania.
THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
Republican, Sixth District, Washington.

The Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include articles 17, 18, and 19 in the series on the Columbia River region.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 7, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 17)

(By Leon Starmont)

Warden brought its highway battle to Spokane yesterday, and will stage another demonstration at a special highway meeting at Coulee City, Wash., next Sunday.

Warden is trying to have its north-south paved county road designated as part of the State highway that will connect Pasco at Coulee Dam. This route, once approved, the Warden spokesmen maintain, is threatened with abandonment in favor of a more westerly road through Othello, Moses Lake, and Ephrata.

Twenty-one chambers of commerce, from Vancouver, Wash., to Oroville, on the Canadian border, have been invited to a special highway meeting at Coulee City next Sunday. A special strategy meeting has also been called at Soap Lake tonight.

JUST SCENIC, SAYS ROGERS

The State highway commission will decide where the highway goes, according to Jack Rogers, ex-officio chairman of the State Columbia Basin Commission, who poured a little oil on the troubled waters at yesterday's luncheon of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce's Columbia Basin Committee.

"I believe the surveys now being made of the westerly route are merely in line with the expressed desire to determine the least expensive right-of-way as well as one that will best serve the greatest permanent population," said Rogers, who had presided at a road meeting in Ephrata just a week before.

"W. A. Bugge, State highway director, is new in office, and doubtless wants to canvass all possibilities before his office commits itself to any definite route for the road.

"But action must come soon. The irrigation districts and the Bureau of Reclamation should know where the State highways will be before they start laying out irrigable units in that part of the area that will get the first flow of water."

The Bureau of Reclamation, he said, can pay for crossings of canals on county roads designated but not yet improved, but cannot do that on State highways not yet located.

WARDEN DELEGATION

The basin commission, said Rogers, expects to meet early this summer with the interim State highway committee. He doubted whether it is practical to delay selection of the highway route until the 1951 legislature acts on a proposal to establish a seven-man State highway commission.

Warden's delegation yesterday comprised Millard Steele, president of its chamber of commerce; Finley Imbert, city councilman and treasurer of the chamber; Albert Widman, past president of the chamber, and Fred Radach, chairman of its road committee, who acted as spokesman.

Maps on the wall showed the routes in dispute. Radach answered many questions. More than a dozen stayed after adjournment to bring out more facts about the roads and the necessity of determining soon where the State arterial will be built.

The present paved road through Warden follows a 60-foot right of way and is 18 miles long, said Radach. It is oiled from the junction on U S 10, straight south, to another junction 6 miles east of Othello. It is graveled 4 miles more, almost to the Franklin County line. From the present south end, a 9-mile extension would connect with State secondary highway 11—about 4 miles north of Mesa.

EPHRATA "TRICK" SEEN

"We thought this road route was all settled until we discovered State-highway surveys were being made of the Othello route," said Widmer. "We suspect Frank T. Bell, an Ephrata political power and member of the State Columbia Basin commission.

"Of course we don't blame Ephrata for trying to have all roads directed toward the county seat. But the fact we can't get definite answers from the Bureau of Reclamation and the State highway department arouses our suspicions.

"Ephrata also tried to put over the so-called Burke cut-off, bypassing Quincy. They were stopped on that, and we think they can be stopped on this."

Adams County commissioners, the Warden spokesman said, favor the Warden road, despite the fact Othello is the only Adams County town on either route. They said they also had support from Pasco, Connell, Soap Lake, Coulee City, Grand Coulee, Coulee

Dam, and Okanogan County views as far north as Oroville.

"We believe this road will ultimately be part of the proposed U S 197 running from Omak to Pasco via Coulee Dam, Sun Lakes State Park, and Soap Lake," said Hasela.

ANOTHER GROUND HERE

Spokane Chamber of Commerce should come out definitely for the Warden route, Radach maintained.

J. E. Cheadle, chairman of the chamber's Columbia Basin committee, said more information must be developed before the group can take any part in the argument.

"We don't know what facts may be brought out by the State highway department in its study of the Orthello-Ephrata route," he explained.

"This group, organized in 1918, is the oldest in years of any of the several official and volunteer groups which are cooperating in bringing the hopes of many years to fruition.

"We will not take any part in any controversies among local groups until it is clearly demonstrated that one of several alternatives is the best plan for the basin project as a whole."

Several maps brought by the Warden group were left for study by the Spokane committee, which also was invited to participate in Sunday's Coulee City meeting.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 9, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 18)

(By Leon Starmont)

One of the forgotten men in the colorful history of the Columbia Basin project and Grand Coulee Dam is E. W. Southard, Ephrata (Wash.) attorney. He was talking about a dam at the head of Grand Coulee nearly 30 years ago. He is generally credited with being first to get the dam proposal onto newspaper front pages in Spokane, after 1914, when the State irrigation bond issue was voted down.

Potholes Dam, west of Warden, having been renamed for James O'Sullivan, the proposal is now being made in the district that South Dam, at Coulee City, be named for Ed Southard, one of the small group who made O'Sullivan's early labors possible.

NICHOLLS IDEA ALIVE?

Incidentally, Southard maintains that the ideas of Ralph Nicholls, former Seattle State senator, about reviving the original gravity project, to reclaim high land in Spokane, Whitman, and Adams Counties, should be taken seriously.

Southard reports—and this is verified by ex-Senator C. C. Dill—that Nicholls was working on this project many years ago, but even then included a river diversion plan at Grand Coulee.

"In 1913 I took a party to the present site of Coulee Dam, and Senator Nicholls suggested construction of a dam so high it would run water through Grand Coulee," the pioneer attorney recalls. "I considered the idea wholly impractical, as it would have drowned out all the railroad crossings of the Columbia in Canada."

This was essentially the same idea that had been advanced by Laughlin McLean in 1892, and revived periodically. It was later suggested by William E. Clapp, another Ephrata attorney, in 1917.

FILED DESERT CLAIM IN 1902

Southard recalls that he filed a desert claim a mile below the present dam site in 1902, when the Brookfield family controlled the Columbia's west bank at the coulee head.

"Bill Brookfield and I talked about the wonderful dam site even then," Southard reminisces, "but nobody thought it possible to get the development money."

James O'Sullivan became interested in 1919, as Southard now recalls, the gravity plan having been suggested at a Spokane meeting by E. F. Blaine in 1918.

"It was James O'Sullivan who interested Arthur Powell Davis, of the Reclamation Service, in the possibilities of the Coulee Dam site," according to Southard. Evolution of the dam idea was gradual, but neither the highest dam suggested in 1892 and 1913 nor the low power dam originally envisioned by the Army engineers had much resemblance to the structures that now stands.

Southard's own scheme, for a dam to divert water into a tunnel emerging below Dry Falls in the lower coulee, was revived as late as 1943 by a Seattle engineer.

SOME UNTOLD HISTORY

Here is some other previously unrelated history, as now recalled by Ed Southard:

"In early 1929 the idea of a dam that would irrigate by pumping was being developed by the Army engineers under Maj. John S. Butler, Seattle District engineer. But they had not yet given up the idea of a power dam at Kettle Falls. That spring I wrote a protest to the Federal Power Commission as Washington Water Power Co. for the Kettle Falls site, which could later be condemned if the high dam at Grand Coulee ever were adopted.

"That alarmed me, so I wrote Senator Wesley L. Jones, and he visited the Power Commission and obtained assurance that the Kettle Falls permit would be held up pending further study of the high dam at Grand Coulee.

"By 1934, when President Roosevelt scheduled his visit to the project, quite a fight was going on between O'Sullivan and some of the State Columbia Basin commissioners. By that time Jim was all for the higher dam, and we in Ephrata backed him to the limit.

DAWS AND GOSS AID

"Some of those concerned with the President's visit wanted the matter of the higher dam kept out of it while he was here. I sought a way to sell Jim O'Sullivan to the President and the Secretary of the Interior. So I wrote Bob Kipp, of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, to try to get me a conference with Marshall Dana, who had been making speeches for the Columbia Basin project since the early 1920's. I impressed Dana, a former president of the National Reclamation Association, with Jim O'Sullivan's qualities and asked him to intercede with A. S. Goss, head of the National Grange. That he did.

"When the President reached Portland, Dana got his ear, and when the President reached Ephrata on his inspection trip, Secretary Ickes astonished a lot of the natives by getting off the train and asking for Jim O'Sullivan.

"I have always been proud of the little trick I played to get O'Sullivan the needed audience. From that time on his going was easy."

Southard might have added that he was among those who financed O'Sullivan's early efforts in the Columbia River Development League—which fought for the pumping plan when the gravity system was still the official choice of both State and Nation—and that he also drove possibly 50,000 miles over early unpaved roads to get O'Sullivan wherever his arguments could do the greatest good.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 9, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 19)

(By Leon Starmont)

Unique among State agencies is the Columbia Basin Commission. It has no power, but lots of influence. It is sitting right now in an important spot as principal spokesman for the State in dealing with the Federal Government and the other States through the interagency committee, and in dealing with Canada through the international joint commission.

Chairman of the Columbia Basin Commission, by virtue of his office, is Jack Rogers, State director of conservation and development, who also acts as Gov. Arthur B. Langlie's delegate on the Columbia Basin interagency committee. Rogers, former mayor of Wenatchee, succeeded Frank A. Stewart, who succeeded Art Garton, of Chelan. Neither Stewart nor Garton participated officially in CBIAC activities, because former Gov. Monrad C. Wallgren refused to recognize that body as a proper instrument for advancing Columbia Basin plans.

MILLER, HAMBLEN, WOODS

Appointed by the Governor on the basin commission, as provided by statute, are three men:

H. Lloyd Miller, of Sunnyside, as mentioned in an earlier article, was with E. F. Blaine in 1918 when that noted irrigationist revived the Columbia Basin project, then dormant 4 years, and started the chain of events that led to construction of Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and other dams, and creation of today's comprehensive plan.

Herbert M. Hamblen, of Spokane, former speaker of the House of Representatives, is the youngster of the basin group, but W. S. Gilbert, his father's law partner, was one of the earliest advocates of the project.

Rufus Woods, Wenatchee publisher, began to take a serious interest in Columbia basin affairs about 1922. He opposed the gravity system of irrigation and argued for substitution of the Grand Coulee pumping plan.

The State Grange also officially opposed the Columbia Basin project until 1931, and according to A. S. Goss, State master, approved it then only on condition it be consolidated with the Grand Coulee power project.

THREE STREAMS UNITED

The so-called industrial membership of the State commission, therefore, is made up of spokesmen for three groups which approached the subject from different angles from 28 to 32 years ago.

Hamblen may be said to carry on the work started in 1918 by the hastily formed Columbia Basin committee of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce.

Miller represents the slightly older element which gathered around E. F. Blaine, and which became regionally vocal after organization of the Columbia Basin Irrigation League at Pasco in 1922.

Woods was for some years president of the Columbia River Development League, organized several years later, whose principal objective was power rather than irrigation.

By law the three irrigation districts in the Columbia Basin (Big Bend) project elect the other three members of the State commission—Leon L. Baille, of Mesa; Don Damon, of Cunningham; and Frank T. Bell, of Ephrata as representative of J. A. Weber, of the Quincy-Columbia district. Other irrigation districts of the State are not represented.

These district men have generally acted with a State-wide outlook, says Hamblen. There is no present movement to have the law changed.

THREE EARLIER COMMISSIONS

There were three earlier Columbia Basin commissions. The first was a State board authorized by the 1919 legislature to resume surveys for the project. The second was a Federal group appointed by the Bureau of Reclamation. The third was a five-man State group authorized in 1933, after the pumping plan had been adopted.

The 1933 chairman was E. F. Benker, now deceased, of Winthrop. Other members were A. S. Goss and Rufus Woods, already mentioned; James E. McGovern, of Spokane; and Harvey Smith, now deceased, of Reppel (Moses Lake).

The 1933 board also had an advisory board, including State Senator Horace E. Smith, of Omak; W. C. Morse, of Seattle; D. C. Henny, of Portland, author of one of the 1920's reports on the basin project; and A. F. Darland, of Tacoma, who later became assistant to Frank A. Banks, chief engineer in charge of the construction of Grand Coulee Dam.

For several years both the irrigation league and development league carried on their programs, one based mainly on irrigation and one mainly on power. Both leagues had members in both Spokane and Wenatchee. The irrigation league, however, drew its support from all over the Northwest States, and became in effect after 1925 a spokesman for a comprehensive basin program. The development league was concentrated in Chelan, Grant, Okanogan, Douglas, Lincoln, and Kittitas Counties.

He's Still Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the fact that J. Edgar Hoover has asked for 700 more men to assist the FBI in running down spies and to protect the Government from the subversive elements working to undermine our representative form of government, I for one favor full cooperation with his request. It has been my opinion for a long time that he has been one of the greatest sources of security this Nation has had not only in war but in peace. There should be no interference with the work of this outstanding public servant, and if given the cooperation which he deserves every law-abiding person can feel more secure in life, liberty, and property.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of February 21, 1950:

HE'S STILL HERE

On May 4, 1949, the Times-Herald in an editorial entitled "Who Is the Man?" urged an all-out hunt for the big brain behind Russia's spies planted throughout our Government agencies.

It was pointed out that the machinations of this spy system are so cleverly directed that the master mind must be a top man in the Government. He must be a person of authority. He must be trusted in the inner circles. He must be an American traitor. Else he would not be so diabolically clever in placing his agents in our Government agencies where they milk so many secrets for the Kremlin.

Since that editorial was published the United States Civil Service Commission has reported that 123 Government employees have been fired for disloyalty, 848 have quit while under investigation, and 6,076 cases have been handled by the special loyalty board.

The disclosures of Elizabeth Bentley, Whittaker Chambers and Henry J. Wadleigh have resulted in the conviction of Alger Hiss as a perjurer in swearing to a Federal grand jury that he had not stolen important documents from the State Department for the Communist conspiracy.

Judith Coplon has been convicted of stealing documents for Russia from the Department of Justice.

NOT GOOD ENOUGH

All that is to the good. It proves the point of the May editorial beyond a doubt. But it's not cause for going back to sleep. In that May editorial we said:

"Actually there isn't much to be proud of in the fact that we have combed out a few of these agents. We can't go around patting ourselves on the back and say 'Look, 94.8 percent of the Government employees are loyal, law-abiding citizens.'

"Because we've caught only a few bunglers. The really efficient spies are still operating and the biggest fish is still at large."

The same goes today. FBI Director Hoover reported recently that 99.6 percent of the employees investigated have proven loyal. But what good does it do us to have 2,000,000 loyal employees and one or two thousand spies?

Did you ever hear a bank president boast that all of the bank's employees were honest except two tellers, the cashier and a vice president?

Hoover also has reported there are 45,000 card-holding Communists in this country and about 10 times that number of fellow travelers or Communist sympathizers. They prey on our Government night and day. They must be thwarted in their espionage attempts or the security of this country won't be worth one thin dime.

Hoover has asked for 700 more men to help the FBI do the job. He should have them. And he should be encouraged in his efforts to find the Soviet master spy who still is hidden in the works of the Truman administration.

Who is that man?

Advice to the CAB

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful article appearing in the American Aviation magazine on February 15, 1950. I ask my colleagues who are interested in aviation to give it their attention, if possible.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVICE TO THE CAB

In a speech the other day CAB Member Russell Adams indicated quite clearly that the Board would continue to pursue its policy of ordering investigations of air lines which it considers to be uneconomic in route structure and of route segments which it thinks have excessive competition.

The purpose of these investigations, the Board has said, is to correct deficiencies in the air-route pattern and to reduce the dependency on mail pay of the entire air-line network. To this end there can be little disagreement. Everyone wants the most efficient and the most economical air-line system possible under our present system of private enterprise.

In his strong feeling that something must be done, Mr. Adams proposes that industry itself assume the obligation of initiating corrective measures. He admits quite frankly, as other Board members have admitted, that the Board does not have the powers under the law to force mergers and radical route adjustments. He hints that unless industry does take the initiative, the Board ultimately will have to seek the necessary powers from Congress to remake the air transport system.

It was on September 28, 1948, that the Board instituted its first investigation order, against National Airlines. The hearing on the expanded proceeding resulting from this 1948 order is now scheduled to start March 6. A year ago the Board ordered investigations of Western, Northeast and Colonial, but no hearing dates have ever been set. Mr. Adams in his recent speech indicated there may be one or two other air lines needing similar inquiries.

We would like to give the CAB a little friendly counsel in its current efforts to correct the deficiencies which it believes to exist in the air-route pattern.

1. MAY IMPERIL THE ACT

First and foremost, we are certain the CAB, as well as the industry itself, does not want to upset the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. It is as fine an act as any industry could ever expect to obtain from Congress. If there is anything wrong, it is with the manner in which the act has been administered. No legislative move now would bring any advantages. The act as it stands must be retained.

We are not sure, however, that the CAB fully understands that it imperils the act every time it shocks the industry and air-line stockholders with new and broad investigation orders—orders which it admits that it cannot back up with enforcement powers. We are not sure the CAB fully realizes that each investigation is in reality an investigation of itself. In seeking to correct existing deficiencies the CAB is actually seeking to correct its own mistakes.

We say this not to belabor the Board again for past errors of judgment. Perfect forecasting and perfect planning in aviation is a goal impossible to attain. Industry's judgment has often been just as far amiss as the CAB's. Yet for this very reason the burden for corrections cannot be placed in toto on industry when it is the CAB that is the regulatory and the deciding agency. The Board's own record has been all too noteworthy for its whims and inconsistencies.

What we do say is that Congress currently has the impression that something is wrong with the air lines, due in part at least to the financial troubles of early 1949 which were directly traceable to the Board's delay in adjusting mail pay to reasonable levels. And due in part to the shocks which the CAB issues in the form of investigation orders. By making enough fuss over current deficiencies, the CAB might well lead itself and the industry into a full-scale investigation by Congress. And in any such inquiry the CAB is apt to come out considerably blackened, to say nothing of the repercussions on the air lines. This is no time to imperil the Civil Aeronautics Act. No matter how many accessories to the crime a congressional inquiry may line up, the biggest sentence after conviction will go to the CAB because CAB made all of the decisions.

2. SET HOUSE IN ORDER

Another bit of friendly counsel is for the Board to get its own house in order. By moving ahead more rapidly on the raft of pending proceedings, the Board might well find many deficiencies corrected if the proceedings are acted upon promptly and wisely.

Embarking on broad investigations without expediting pending matters is like an industrial firm calling in high-priced efficiency experts before the company straightens out defects and inefficiencies which are obvious and known. Investigations are conducted, and efficiency experts called in, to discover what is not known and what is not obvious.

In his speech Mr. Adams was frank to admit that there isn't too much wrong with the existing air-line network. A few relatively minor operations are all that are needed, he says. But how many of these corrections are already involved in pending proceedings? We suspect quite a few.

3. A BETTER APPROACH

A third suggestion is a changed approach by the Board in its relations with the industry it regulates. The CAB has issued a general invitation to the air lines to come forth with corrective proposals but it makes no guaranty that it will approve them when made.

Why not a more specific invitation, formally issued to each air line with a time limit on replies, to submit in a few pages the specific, concrete suggestions which each air line thinks would bring about greater efficiency and economy, and which can be acted on expeditiously by the Board with its existing powers. Hundreds of small, quickly made corrections, saving in the aggregate large sums of mail pay, might well be the result of this more specific approach.

Industry today has a feeling of futility about making proposals. Time lapses between filing of applications and decisions are much too long. CAB must give a better indication of good faith. If all airlines submitted proposals at the same time, CAB might not find a complete pattern, but it might find many of its wishes answered.

4. A FEEDER POLICY

As a final bit of counsel, the Board must clarify its feeder policy. One of the greatest steps toward moving trunk lines into the self-sufficient category could be the transfer of small towns to the feeders, or the entire elimination of costly small stops in the absence of feeder service. The Board seems to be reaching the idea that feeders can give better and more economical service to small towns. We believe this is a sound trend.

But trunk lines are reluctant to apply for suspension of service without having some assurance from CAB that this is in line with a firm policy. No trunk line wants to abandon a stop which a competitive trunk line might grab up. Without a lot of hullabaloo and scarehead investigations, CAB has within its powers the means of clarifying a situation which is, today, inexcusably confused.

A recent test case was Chicago and Southern Air Lines which applied for suspension at Peoria, Ill., an unprofitable stop. CAB approved. Just lately Northwest Airlines has filed for suspension of three local stops in Wisconsin, towns served now by Wisconsin Central, the certificated feeder. Approval of suspension means removal of losses for Northwest and means net gains for the feeder. All major trunk lines have been discussing the elimination of unprofitable stops, but the answer is up to CAB. Industry is waiting for the cue from headquarters.

In conclusion it seems to us that CAB is doing some fairly straight thinking—or at least exploration—of the major economic and air-route problems. But in trying to find solutions it may be making things difficult both for itself and industry. It has alarmed unduly the Congress, the companies, and the stockholders. It is thinking too much about a new house which will never be built and not enough about making repairs quickly to keep the house livable.

CAB really needs no more powers and no more staff. It merely needs to bring itself closer to the industry and its own proceedings files and get caught up with what's in the mill. Every time it has had a chance to take a crack at a big problem, it has compromised and backed away. This will happen with all big investigations. Meantime, there is much corrective action that can be taken without more staff and more legislation.

WALTER W. FERRIER.

The Business Outlook Is What We Make It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting address by the Hon. Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce, delivered before the economic conference on the business outlook, at the Read Hotel, Chattanooga, Tenn., on February 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have had the privilege of listening this morning to Dr. Marcus Nadler. Although I have not been privileged as you have to hear Dr. Nadler's address, I know him and I know his abilities, and I know there is no necessity for me to repeat the kind of statement which he can give you so much better than I. My comments with regard to the business outlook and what the banker can do about it will be more general than Dr. Nadler's. But they will be specific enough, I hope, to be helpful.

The business outlook is not like the weather. Mark Twain's famous statement that everybody talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it is definitely not applicable to business. In fact, just the opposite is true about business. Not only does everybody talk about it, but everybody does something about it, so that when we try to predict, we are trying to predict what everybody is going to do. This is no small task.

Each of the owners and managers of our 4,000,000 business firms makes decisions every day that affect the business outlook. The businessman decides to expand his business, or to contract it. He decides to do something, or to do nothing. In any case, he does something which automatically affects the business situation. But it is not only the businessman who affects the business situation. All the rest of us—as customers in stores, as buyers of houses, as workers who are happy or unhappy about our wages, as Government officials making decisions about regulations, controls, taxes, and Government purchases—all of us affect the volume and the kind of business that is transacted. The important question, then, is why do people do what they do? And all our study of business developments is fundamentally a study of why people act as they do. Considering the state and complexity of this mass of decisions being made every day, it is small wonder that the science of predicting business conditions is not yet perfect.

Before looking ahead, let us look back—not too far but far enough to just get a little perspective and, if you don't mind, far enough so we can do a little boasting. The Southeast has been going through a period of development which has rarely been duplicated, and the results of this period of development are evident on every side. They represent the achievement of a period of great vigor in American life.

In 1929 we saw the beginning of the great depression. For a time we literally did not know what had hit us. Only gradually did we realize we had to take concerted action, but finally the combined intelligence of the people responded to the challenge to put this country back on the road to vigorous growth and development. You will recall that during those years some people were saying that America's great period of expansion had passed. There was a certain amount of truth in this statement, since expansion in certain directions had stopped. It was true, if we were convinced that we had taken full advantage of all the material and human resources with which we had been endowed. Actually, of course, it became clear that there were new frontiers and that the use of free land and the wasteful exploitation of nature's gifts of forest and field and underground were not the only ways by which people achieved the good life. We learned—I hope for all time—that our real wealth lies in our minds and hearts and hands—that knowledge and strength and vision create the material things which we ordinarily think of as wealth.

This knowledge is so broad that it includes all the skills of our community. It is the self-respect and the broad back of manual labor. It is the skilled hands of the craftsman. It is the directing power of a manager of a plant. It is the organizing skill of a corporate executive. It is the far-seeing eye of the investor and developer. It is the understanding of people and the arts of governing of the mayor and the municipal council. It is the engineer's measuring of stresses and strains and his power to build. It is the school teacher's instilling of ideals and handicrafts in the children. It is the banker's ability to sit down with the businessman and work out his line of credit or think through the industrial development which can come from a new investment, and recognize the needs of the growing community in which he lives. All these together, and many more, are what determine our ability to grow.

But if they are to be used they call for an understanding of the way these human and material parts fit together and make us into a going concern, whether as a business organization, a city, a great government agency such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, or a corporation like du Pont or United States Steel.

What has this new concept of our capacities meant to the Southeast? If we compare the peaks of achievement in 1929 and today, we can be amazed at our growth and development as a nation; but we can be even more amazed that the proportionate growth here in the Southeast has been even greater than for the Nation as a whole. This is for the good of the Nation as well as for the good of the South. Only a decade ago there were areas of the South in which individual productivity was too low to permit the people to contribute much to the economic life of the Nation. When we look at the facts about the rapid growth of the South in recent years, we all take pride in knowing that the inherent human resources of this great region have been used by the people to make their own lives more worth living.

One does not need to have figures to be convinced of the truth of what I have been saying. Anyone who has traveled through the Piedmont, or through the Coastal Plain, or down the rivers, or over the length and breadth of the area in a plane can see with his own eyes what it means when a whole community moves ahead as rapidly as this area has. But since you are all more or less acquainted with figures and handle them easily, it is not out of place if we throw in a few statistics. Since 1929, the South's share of the Nation's total income has increased from 10.5 percent to 14 percent. This relative increase of a third is matched by only one other area in the United States, namely the Far West. This growth was not limited to any one of the States in the South; it was shared by all.

If we turn to the income of individuals, the per capita income of the Southeast, computed simply by dividing the region's total income by the total population, expanded 175 percent from 1929 to 1948. This was three-fourths again as large as that occurring on Nation-wide scale, and in every one of the 11 Southeastern States the relative growth of income per person during this period substantially exceeded that of the country as a whole.

There were many people who said that the wartime expansion of industry in the Southeast was a temporary phenomenon. This has been proven not to be true. The progress during the war was a clear extension of prewar trends. Since the war, the South has retained the relative gains achieved during the war, and extended them. Even under the unusually severe impact of the postwar readjustment, the steady trend of the growth which was taking place was clear.

The opportunity which lies ahead is indicated by the fact that the per capita income is still below the national average. And this fact points to the necessity for further growth and further use of the great resources and opportunities which are here.

I can remember very well, and I am sure many of you will remember, the campaigns undertaken by chambers of commerce, by newspapers, and by business communities throughout the Southeast for diversification of the economy of this area. This movement showed foresight. The dependence on King Cotton, the overemphasis on crop agriculture, had not been healthy. Now we can measure the results of the campaigns of those farsighted men who worked to bring more industry to the South. Industrialization has moved forward with great strides and added its contribution to the income advance. From 1929 to 1948, the increase in manufacturing pay rolls was fourfold in the Southeast; nationally it was less than threefold. The expansion was shared by nearly every State in this area, and in most of them exceeded the rate of development in other parts of the country.

The South can still use more industry and there are numerous opportunities for further industrial development; but this does not mean that agriculture is not an important part of the economy. Agriculture is more productive now than it was 10 years ago; and it is in better balance with industry. The proportion of agriculture to the total income of the area has declined somewhat. It was one-fifth of the region's income in 1929; one-sixth in 1948.

The important point is that southern land now produces a different range of agricultural products. All of you recall the time when the farmer's income from cotton and cotton byproducts made up the greater part of the farm income. Actually, between 1929 and 1948, the gross cash income from cotton and its products to farmers declined from 43 to 28 percent of the gross cash income. At the same time, livestock and livestock products advanced from less than a quarter to a third of the total.

This refers to money income, but I am sure that you will recognize what I mean when I say there have been some other gains from this shift. I can still fly over these plains and these rivers and see the great yellow floods held back by the dams or rushing down to the sea, but the program of livestock farming and the cultivation associated with the planting of kudzu and the other soil-building legumes have had a real influence on the landscape. Contour ploughing is saving soil as the practice becomes more and more prevalent. We are learning not only to create wealth, but also to conserve some of that which a kind providence has given us.

This is what we have done. We have worked together. Private development has produced new and better products in our factories and on our farms. Private business has increased the range of services we enjoy and has built new utilities for better transportation, power, and communication. Government has developed new sources of power, built new utilities to meet the needs of our growing population, and carried on its program for conserving our water, soil, and other natural resources.

For the last 3 years we have maintained high levels of business activity, high levels of employment, high levels of investment as well as high levels of consumption. As a Nation, our living standards have been rising steadily. In fact, they are so far superior to anything we have had heretofore that we are the envy of the world.

As a matter of fact, the most potent weapon in our whole international arsenal is not some new-fangled engine of destruction, but the envy of other peoples for what we have achieved in a material way. The desire of people to come to our shores and share this good life is the finest compliment we can have. The fear on the part of those who control the Soviet bloc that the peoples behind the iron curtain will learn of the good life which we have built is powerful testimony to the strength of our best weapon. We hear much talk of fifth columns and boring from within by Communists in a capitalist society. Let us not forget that we too can bore from within. Our secret weapon is the weapon of a good life so superior to anything which can be produced in a nonfree society that those who wage the cold war against us do their best to prevent the knowledge of what we have done from reaching their people.

The last few years have indeed been years of high activity. We must, however, look forward, and the forward look calls for imagination if we are to continue our high achievements.

This conviction that we must continue to maintain our high levels of business and employment we have expressed, not only in our actions but in laws passed by the Congress. We have said that, as a matter of national policy, we intend to maintain full employment. This is the same thing as saying the Government has certain responsibilities which it cannot sidestep. Furthermore, it says that private industry and private business must continue to carry out their part of the productive process, for our Government alone cannot supply full employment.

We believe in growth and in full employment because our kind of society is designed for growth and cannot remain healthy unless it grows. But a more immediate fact dictates the absolute necessity for growth. I refer to our rapidly increasing population. Each year 700,000 workers are added to our labor force. This means more hands to work and more need for the growth of production which those hands make possible. To provide the new jobs and new business opportunities, the initiative must be taken by business with relation to its phase of our activities, and by Government with relation to the phases for which it has responsibility.

Just to be sure I am not misunderstood, I should like to remind you of what takes place in a growing community. Wherever there is a real estate development, when lots are sold and houses are built, there have to be streets, there have to be water mains, sewers, gas mains, industrial power and lighting developments. All these call for government responsibility and initiative. When Government does not carry out the work, Government lays down the terms on which private activity goes ahead.

In a growing community there is always a danger that the attempt to restrict Government activities can go too far. The people must speak clearly to their respresentatives so that the development of the community facilities and community services are provided. This means schools; it means hospitals and many other of the services which we now call on our Government institutions—either local or State or Federal—to carry out.

The second important factor in the business outlook is the business population. Immediately following the war, there was a remarkable growth in the number of business enterprises. In the normal course of things, there are many new businesses formed and there are many business disappearances. This is part of our way of doing things. But during the past year, the rate of growth in the number of businesses has declined. This need not be a long-time development. I mention it, however, because the growth of healthy new businesses is important if we are to maintain the kind of competitive society that we want, and if we are to maintain the rate of increase in our population which is essential to higher living standards. We cannot allow our business structure to stagnate, either in terms of the number of businesses or in terms of their total volume of production. The stability of the business community must be the stability of the gyroscope, which depends upon the rate at which the wheels turn over. Business is stable only as it is active. The other kind of stability is the stability of stagnation, in which we are not interested.

The expansion of population, the expansion of business firms must be paced by the expansion of capital investment. We have learned to increase production by harnessing the energy of the earth to the strength of man. We have done it, however, only by using many machines in complex organization. The intangible is as important as, if not more important than, the tangible.

The guaranties of property ownership, which are preserved by nothing more than contract, are more stable, and must be more stable, than the material things which they represent. After all, you can destroy a building, but the ownership of the building and the knowledge of how to rebuild it and the insurance against its destruction can make possible its replacement. These various agreements between people are more permanent than the building itself. They can be valued just as material things can be valued, and so we say that there must be a growth of capital investment in these productive arrangements of our society.

We are interested in investment abroad as well as at home. We have found with this growing society of ours that we have a place in the world which we did not seek. This fact is unpleasant to many of us. But our good life depends on our relationships with other peoples. We export and we import in great volume. They have things we want; we have things they want. The richness of the cultures of the world can be shared without loss. This growing place which we must have for ourselves provides not only opportunities, but it imposes responsibilities which are difficult to assume and to carry out.

The banking community holds an unusually crucial and strategic position in all this development. It is no accident that banks play such an important role in our community. In the first place, they share with the Federal Government that most essential function: coining money. Credit advances are our primary monetary medium today. Without the invention of this device for carrying on trade, we would still be somewhere in the Dark Ages. This joint monetary function is carried out, of course, through the Federal Reserve System and its relationship to the Federal Treasury. This linkage between the banking system and the Treasury is critical to our business system. The problems involved here have been clearly described in a recently published report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Those of you who have not seen it will be interested in this document.

In the hands of the banking community rest the fundamental judgments on whether

business as a whole moves ahead or moves back. The implementation of fiscal policy through the banking community is of first importance. Next is the bank's role as lender of short-time funds and as middleman for long-time funds. Productive capacity must be created, and it can be created only by these new investments. The banking community's part in this process is apparent once one becomes aware of the process.

In our society, where the responsibility for most of our activities rests with private business, finding the key to community responsibility in private business is one of the major tasks before us today. The outlook is good if we look at potentialities. The outlook is good if we look at our capabilities. If we can maintain our objective of moving forward in concert, we can keep business good.

I should like to illustrate the point that the level of business activity will be what we make it. During the war, normal civilian productive activities were reduced to about half of our total activity. When the war was over, business had to redirect its energies to peacetime pursuits. Everyone who studied the size of this reconversion job was staggered by the difficulties which presented themselves. This was true of every business in the land which was engaged in war activity.

The Committee for Economic Development, a farsighted organization of businessmen, sensed this problem, and worked out a method for dealing with it. In essence, the committee said to businessmen, "Plan the way you will reconvert when the time comes. As far as possible know the next moves, how you will engineer them, how you will finance them, how you will reorganize production lines." This program was carried to meetings of businessmen throughout the country, and I would be surprised if some of the people here today had not been active participants in those meetings.

One of the results of this program was that thousands of businesses all over the land knew what their developmental programs, their capital investments, and their plans for new business were going to be, before the war was over. The minute the fighting stopped they were ready to move ahead, and did. Thus, the people who predicted heavy unemployment and large-scale dislocation were proven wrong.

The important thing to note is that when the problem was seen clearly and when the business community moved in the same direction at the same time, the results in terms of productivity astounded not only the rest of the world, but even surprised us.

I am not suggesting that this planning was the only factor which was involved. One of the related factors was the speed with which Government contracts were settled when the war was over. Many of those settlements might have been made better had more time been spent on them, but from the standpoint of the national economy speed was more important than detailed correctness. This process released credit which otherwise would have been frozen.

If we are to continue to use this kind of approach, we must be in agreement on the fundamentals. As long as total population is growing, there must be a growth of production and investment. As long as we are improving our knowledge, we can improve our living standards. Knowing these two fundamental facts, we can look forward with great confidence, for they tell us that potential markets exist to be explored and developed.

I think it is clear why I have spoken to you of these fundamentals behind the outlook. Focusing on details to the exclusion of fundamentals can lead anyone astray.

I feel confident that the banking community which deals with these details will operate in the light of the major possibilities which lie ahead rather than the detailed difficulties which must be overcome.

Samuel Gompers, a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, due to my absence on account of illness on January 27, 1950, the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Samuel Gompers, I was unable to carry out my intention to pay tribute to the memory of this great leader of labor, outstanding citizen, and loyal and patriotic American.

It was my great privilege to have known Mr. Gompers intimately and to have worked with him in many of his accomplishments for the improvement of labor conditions in this country.

Under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks in the RECORD on the life and work of Mr. Samuel Gompers.

On January 29, 1950, all American workers and industrialists alike did honor and paid their respects to Samuel Gompers on the occasion of the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of this distinguished American whose works and efforts gave substance and life to the destiny of a great and powerful America. This centennial observance should continue after January 29.

I had the happy privilege of knowing intimately and well Sam Gompers, who, during his lifetime in an era of grim foreboding and discouragement for the success of the labor movement and the welfare of the worker and the toiler, had to arm himself with patience, breadth of understanding, vigor, and patriotic leadership in order to realize his goal of betterment of conditions for the working class.

Here, in the life and works of Samuel Gompers, is an outstanding example of one who becomes a distinguished American, rising from humble beginnings to high and exalted position in American industrial, political, and social life.

Here, in the career of Samuel Gompers, born in London of Dutch-Jewish stock, is found a striking example of what millions of immigrants before and after him have accomplished, namely, infusing into American life the energy and spirit of industry, honesty, and thrift which have made America the most formidable Nation in power and prestige in the world.

I like to dwell on this point because there exists too strongly in many quarters and sections of our country, a tense feeling and prejudice against our newcomers, immigrants who, like Gompers—little schooled, dissatisfied with conditions in their homeland, seeing no future there for themselves or their offspring—seek liberty and freedom in our country, and at the same time advance the interests of their adopted country. Like Gompers, they worked 6 days a week from 12 to 14 hours daily at their trade or employment, plodded their weary way home and in recent years read their paper or listen to their favorite programs, and except for one night out either on Saturday or Sunday, retire to their rest to be prepared for the next day and next week's battles extending into the years. Thus do they build up a backlog of simple but firm, honest endeavor and accomplishment which goes into the sinews and lifeblood of the Nation which gave them succor and aid. And if these contributions were not enough, they and their children further acted to repay the debt of asylum given them, when in large and overwhelming numbers, they rushed to the aid of the Nation in time of two devastating wars and write distinguished feats of valor and sacrifice in illustrious pages of history, for Americans of posterity to emulate and revere.

My friend Sam Gompers came from a so-called minority group. As a true American, he would not and did not permit wholesale or mass mistreatment of the human race. He fought with all his might the totalitarian way of life exemplified by Kaiser Wilhelm who sought to make slaves and serfs of freemen and women. Gompers labored in the vineyard of human rights and freedom. He fought to protect the minorities regardless of race, religion, or class.

In America we find many minorities so-called, which make us the greatest melting pot of all races, creeds, and colors on the face of the globe. America is great because the virtues of patriotism, liberty, and justice abide with resolute heart among her people. There are, however, though fortunately small in number but nevertheless vocally strong, those who sound notes of hate and discord against these minority groups, attempting to set minorities against each other.

This hate mongering which begets prejudice, bigotry, and discrimination must be met and overcome by means of education and by law.

Samuel Gompers did just that. He built up a sound and enduring trade unionism first as a hard working official in his Cigarmakers International Union, composed of all sorts and conditions of men. Later he organized the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, which, together with the printers, the iron and steel workers, the granite cutters and other lesser craft unions, united about 1881 to sow the seed which later brought forth the American Federation of Labor.

I am aware of the organization called the Knights of Labor which, although, it claimed at one time over 700,000 members, moved like a meteor along the sky and fell just as quickly to earth leaving practically no concrete or beneficial results from its existence.

Neither time nor space permit me to set forth in detail the complete record of the activities of Samuel Gompers. To do so would fill volumes. It is sufficient to point out a few which demonstrate that he was a pioneer in a field which called for sound, constructive, and forward-looking leadership. The labor movement in the eighties was in a critical period. The Knights of Labor had failed because of inefficient leadership.

Slowly, but the organizer, leading exponent of craft unionism, Gompers welded together an organization with his

small group of trade-unionists as a nuclei and then moved forward and pressed ahead regardless of the great obstacles confronting him on all sides which big business set up. He succeeded in keeping his organization intact, whether in time of adversity or good fortune. Gradually he became the spokesman of labor and oftentimes the spokesman of the large army of unorganized labor.

HIS PHILOSOPHY

I believe that it can be correctly stated that as president of the American Federation of Labor Mr. Gompers had no special or particular philosophy as to the aims of the labor movement. In the years before World War I his program did call for better wages, shorter hours, healthier, and safer working conditions.

These aims, he felt, could be furthered by pursuing or following business-union procedures and working within the framework of the existing order which he always upheld, supported, and protected. For a time he took the position that labor did not aspire to share with the employer or take over control of the industry.

EXPANSION OF LABOR UNION AIMS

After the war, however, Mr. Gompers was forced to adopt a different or expanded position, namely, that viewing wages and hours as its only concern and collective bargaining as its sole aim was not only the program of the American Federation of Labor; that included also was "the bidding for a progressive share in the proceeds of industry and a voice in industrial management." The union he urged would become responsible for the workers in industry. Along with this new statement of principles, he held strongly to the laissez-faire doctrine of individualism—voluntarism, he called it.

He was strongly insistent that industry "organize itself to govern itself, to impose tasks and rules and bring order into its own house." Thus it came about that in 1923 the American Federation of Labor recorded itself against the antitrust laws.

I remember in my friendly and close association with this sublime spirit whom we now honor, many instances of greatness. One, however, has always stood forth in my mind, namely, the deep and profound patriotism of my friend. The period was that of the First World War. America and Americans were debating the issues of participation by our country in the great war then being waged abroad. The country and our people were in the throes of a great debate. Indecision and vacillation were riding the crest when firm action and resolution should have been in command. The workers, like other groups, were uncertain as to whether our participation was necessary or justified. Many of the union locals opposed our entry into the war.

GOMPERS LEADS THE A. F. OF L. TO A GREAT TRIUMPH

It was at this psychological moment that Samuel Gompers as president of that great labor organization, the American Federation of Labor took hold. Here again the exceptional qualities of leadership asserted themselves. He readily realized the dangers of isolationism, its dangers not only to his own group but most important of all its danger to his adopted and beloved country. To work he went. No man ever waged a more relentless and soul-stirring fight against Kaiser Wilhelm and his type of totalitarianism than did Sam Gompers. Although ill, almost 70 years old, he traveled from one end of the country to the other, addressing meeting after meeting and exhorting the union members and the unorganized workers to action. Then biding his time, he prepared the course of the American Federation of Labor and at its convention in November 1917, at Buffalo, N. Y., he invited President Wilson to address the convention. As Mr. Wilson entered the hall, every delegate stood up and gave support and approval to the President's position, "to make the world safe for democracy." This was one of the greatest triumphs in the life of Gompers and the American Federation of Labor. The force and influence of this great body of American workers did much to dissipate and scatter the power and influence of the pacifists and isolationists. It had the effect of clearing the atmosphere of doubt and indecision for those deluded but sincere Americans, as well as casting aside the specious and untenable arguments of the Germanophiles and traitors. Gompers had more than established himself as a labor statesman.

PRESIDENT WILSON'S CONFIDENCE IN GOMPERS

Wilson showed his confidence in Samuel Gompers in October 1915 when he named him one of the five members on the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense. His was the job to make ready the forces of labor for the battle to be fought. His colleagues on the board were Daniel Willard, Julius Rosenwald, Bernard M. Baruch, Dr. Hollis Godfrey, and Dr. Franklin Martin. How well he did his part is best demonstrated by the great part labor played in producing the implements and matériel of war in 1917–18, just as in 1941–45 the laboring groups did the same spectacular job a second time.

President Wilson again called on him when he appointed Mr. Gompers on the Commission of International Labor Legislation in 1919. This Commission, composed of two representatives from each of the five Great Powers at the Peace Conference, were to act on matters affecting labor and work within the League of Nations for common action on conditions of employment. Although not fully satisfied with the work of the Draft Convention, he accepted it, as did the American Federation of Labor.

OPPOSITION TO COMMUNISM AND SOCIALISM

His opposition to communism and socialism manifested itself in strong, unmistakable language. He warned that "communism can only be successful if it succeeds in tying itself to the masses by directing its appeals in language of jingoistic sentiment, by aggravating and exploiting every manifestation or display of discord or discontent." Note, for example, in our day, the Communist parades and pickets for civil rights, better housing, and so forth. He knew that communism profits from the political mistakes of political parties, since these errors permit the Communists to proclaim themselves as the sole and only defenders of the national welfare and the country's traditions. Gompers kept the Communists in the labor movement on the defensive and never permitted them to take the initiative.

COMMUNISM, A THREAT TO UNION AUTONOMY

He fought communism because it constituted a distinct threat to union autonomy. To him, it meant absorption of the union by the totalitarian state and thus becomes a mere cog within the framework and machinery of politics.

He knew and recognized early in life as a union leader that when Communists win control of a union, not only do they change the personnel but also the objectives and functions of the union. In addition they form and organize opposition to the parent body. It becomes a tool, an ally of the Communist regime and loses its character as a trade-union.

His New York was a maelstrom of revolutionary groups and many different national extractions. He saw in these formative years, the actions of the extremists and the anarchists and soon came to the conclusion, how little organized labor would gain if it joined or cooperated with these groups.

Hence he was attacked by the leaders of Bolshevism, Lenin, and Trotsky who called him an enemy of the proletariat. Communists accused him of being a "bourgeois and labor faker." Lenin spoke in glowing terms of Daniel De Leon often referred to as the "Pope of the Socialist Party." De Leon was an arch enemy of Gompers in the labor movement.

It was at this time that Communists had infiltrated into a few trade-unions such as the Needle Trades in the State of New York and New England, into textile, miners, and steel workers unions. There developed consequently an aggressive left wing movement in the American Federation of Labor which constantly attacked the conservative program of Gompers, continually demanding the immediate recognition of Soviet Russia.

OPPOSITION TO SOCIALISM

Mr. Gompers had studied the principles of socialism in his youth. He soon learned to oppose it. Socialism to him meant the overthrow of free enterprise and the existing order to be replaced by socialism. Then, too, the Socialists were pacifists and opposed the war. He was viciously attacked by them because he stood for and promoted private enterprise which was and is today anathema to Socialists whose program is that of nationalization of industry. Led by Gompers, the American labor movement accepted the concept of "private property as a necessary agency for securing opportunity for individual independence and resourcefulness."

FEUDAL BARONS OF WEALTH DENY RECOGNITION TO LABOR

The enemies of labor and trade-unions with whom Samuel Gompers had to contend in the early days of their development and growth were powerful indeed. One look at the imposing list of those who opposed and fought incessantly and with every unfair weapon at their command, serves only in increasing my

admiration and regard for the man we honor:

John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who had acquired his wealth, as did some of the others I name, at the expense of low wages paid the workers. He refused to recognize the union miners of Colorado.

Andrew Carnegie, who with Henry Frick in 1892 opposed better conditions for labor and fought the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers in the homestead strike with Pinkertons and help from unconscionable quarters, thereby almost crushing the cause of labor.

George Pullman of the Pullman Palace Car Co., at Pullman, Ill., who advocated wage reduction and whose action resulted in the Pullman strike, producing hard and heavy burdens on the laboring man and his family.

Jay Gould, an industrial tycoon of his day, a ruthless individualist, who, drunk with financial and economic power, believed that progress meant accumulation of great private fortune at the expense of the worker paid starvation wages.

James Fisk, who used his resources to beat down labor, ably seconded and abetted by another arch foe of labor, Judge Elbert H. Gary, of the United States Steel Corp., whose sense of economic justice set a new low even in those early days of high-handed action against labor unionism.

John P. Morgan, along with Carnegie, Rockefeller, and E. J. Harriman, were among those who at the beginning of the twentieth century built up and developed powerful systems of high finance, great monopolies in trade and railroad industries—all by the sweat of labor, but denying the laborer just compensation.

Take the case of miners forced always to strike for a living wage to keep out of peonage. Never given the opportunity to work the number of days of other industries, the miners were forced to put up with seasonable fluctuation in production.

Forced to trade for their food supplies in the company stores owned by the coal barons because of lack of funds, unable to obtain or afford decent housing for their families, the miners lived in squalid surroundings near the mines. Always in debt to the coal barons who held them in servitude, with no safety appliances and working hundreds of feet below the ground under perilous conditions the plight of these workers has always been a desperate one.

However, they found a champion in Gompers, encouraged by men such as William Green who fought successfully to improve these disgraceful conditions in slave wages and galley slave working situations imposed by the autocrats of the coal industry. Truly does history repeat itself.

Strange to say, these men have their exact counterparts today—ruthless men in their self-same positions in the trusts, monopolies, holding companies, who vote themselves large pensions upon retirement notwithstanding the high salaries they receive as an official of the corporation for many years. Yet these self-same men deny pensions and security to those who made possible their millions, who as they are about to complete their span of life, seek in a manner of attempted appeasement to their complaining conscience, to distribute small sums proportionately to their wealth, to worth-while purposes such as endowments for educational institutions, libraries, medical, and economic research.

But I say to them—too little and too late for they have robbed the worker and his family of the just and equitable share of the fruits of his honest and productive labor. Well did the apostle of a new era, another of my admired friends, William Jennings Bryan, phrase it in his Cross of Gold speech which I had the high privilege to hear at the Democratic National Convention in 1896 at Chicago:

> You shall not press down upon the head of labor this crown of thorns,
> You shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold!

GOMPERS WAGES GIGANTIC FIGHT FOR LABOR'S LEGAL RIGHTS

The Sherman Act passed in 1890. Labor unions' activities were not included in the act. But the Supreme Court in the *Danbury Hatters case* (308 U. S. 774) declared the act did apply to labor unions. Then came the Clayton Act of 1914, for which I had the honor of voting, signed by President Wilson, declaring that "the labor of a human being was not a commodity or article of commerce." This act was called by Gompers the Magna Carta of labor, and made lawful the existence of labor organizations which feared that the Government might start dissolution suits against labor unions such as those successfully prosecuted by the Government in 1911 against the Standard Oil Co. and Tobacco Trusts.

Another provision of the Clayton Act prohibited the granting of injunctions by Federal courts against certain specific labor activities such as peaceful picketing. But the interests keep up their opposition to the Clayton Act and the Supreme Court in the *Duplex Printing Co. case* (254 U. S. 443) stated that the Clayton Act did not give any blanket immunity to labor. In this and other decisions the Supreme Court read into the work unreasonable restraint of trade and commerce, the so-called rule of reason into the Sherman Act passed by the Supreme Court in 1911.

Another act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932, which I also supported, made it an absolute prohibition for any Federal court to issue an injunction in almost any case involving a labor controversy. Labor held that this act which was interpreted by Justice Frankfurter in the *Hutcheson case* (312 U. S. 219) in 1941 makes labor injunctions forbidden.

Today we find efforts made by the enemies of labor to overrule these protections and safeguards properly given to labor on the ground they say, and without authority and reason, that labor unions are seeking to monopolize the supply of labor either on a large or limited scale in restraint of trade. These opponents of labor falsely charge and urge today that labor controls of production and the fixed prices by union action in commodities or services essential to the public welfare require that labor unions come under the restraint of trade provisions of the Sherman Act. In Gompers' day, he met up with William Howard Taft whom he fought step by step as an injunction judge, and later as a presidential candidate; as President and later as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Gompers opposed him. Taft contended that labor sought class legislation of the most vicious sort. Gompers replied that all legislation is class legislation and that organization of labor having their origin in human need should be exempted from the provisions of the Sherman antitrust law. President Wilson accepted this viewpoint of labor notwithstanding the fact that Gompers had opposed him in 1912 as against my friend Champ Clark, Speaker of the House in 1910, whom Gompers called "a more intrepid friend of labor never occupied that position."

POLITICAL ACTION FORCED UPON LABOR

From 1906 to 1912 Gompers took up political action through necessity of self preservation of the labor movement. He had always believed that the courts under the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 had gone far beyond the use of their equitable jurisdiction and had rendered strikes ineffectual by unfair restrictions on picketing, free press.

These injunctive measures destroyed the rights of the union members because the working man when deprived of his most effective means of protection namely the right to refuse to work unless justly rewarded for his labor, is placed under a serious handicap. Thus, faced with injunctions obtained by employers based on flimsy evidence untrue and false testimony, Gompers and his organization had no other alternative and determined to "reward our friends and punish our enemies. Elect those who support anti-injunction bills in legislative halls." He made it clear, however, that this action did not mean the formation of a labor party. Gompers always fought those who advocated a labor party. In fact he feared it.

After World War I we find Mr. Gompers changing and modifying his views on political action. He was forced to the conclusion that economic action and non-partisan political activity could not obtain the benefits union labor was now seeking. For labor now insisted on a share in the control of industry. A great struggle was raging between labor and capital. I saw that struggle in progress here in the House. The United States Steel Corp. and all big business, making use of the injunction, also either controlled or had great influence in the Republican Party. A few members of the Democratic Party were at times too much influenced by these predatory business groups. Something had to be done. Hence much against his former views, Gompers took labor out into the political arena. The National Association of Manufacturers was already there. Big business had been there for many years.

The opposition was firmly entrenched in politics. It had men like Penrose, Root in the Senate and others in the House who placed every obstacle in the

path of labor's progress. Here is an illustration of this.

If you will pardon the personal allusion, I remember well that in the first session of the Sixtieth Congress, I introduced the first bill in the House—H. R. 21962—which embodied the principles of workmen's compensation. The Republican majority influenced by the large railroad interests refused to consider it. They said it was unconstitutional and too costly, that it would seriously impair the financial structure of the railroad industry. History records otherwise.

For 10 years we had endeavored to pass the Employers' Liability Act abolishing the barbaric doctrines of assumed risk, contributory negligence, and the doctrine of fellow servant. No sooner had we passed this act, than the railroad interests began to agitate for repeal. And on March 1, 1913, in the closing hours of the session the Republican-controlled House railroaded through the House with only 40 minutes of debate and over 100 amendments to be acted upon, a measure—S. 5382—which practically repealed the small benefits in the then existing law. This legislation favored the great railroads and corporations of the country, was a railroad measure to the *n*th degree and against the laboring men of the Nation.

On this eventful occasion, my thoughts and my memories revert to those memorable days in my early career, as a Member of Congress when labor was fighting for its very life and for a rightful place in our social and political and economic life. Its champion was Gompers and a braver, a more spirited and able fighter and leader never lived. His opposition came both from within and without. He traded blow for blow and he fought his way to the top amid a morass of confused thinking with no compass to chart the course, and dissension to quell in his own ranks.

The enemies of labor saw in him a distinct threat to their stranglehold and control of the worker—control to time, wages status, and general welfare of their workers whom they kept in serfdom. He raised their status to that of free men. He protected the rights of the union, forced the employer to collective bargaining and bettered the working conditions of the laboring men and women. Samuel Gompers represented a dynamic force in American life and left a record of rectitude, sincerity, and altruism which brought about a labor movement in America which is strong, more inclusive, and more united and compact than in any other nation in the world.

Today the American Federation of Labor reflects the aims, hopes, and aspirations of Samuel Gompers for the welfare of the worker and the Nation of which that worthy organization is an integral and necessary part.

Although departed from our midst almost a quarter of a century ago, the spirit of Samuel Gompers lives in that great organization whose objects he furthered and in whose behalf he dedicated and consecrated his entire life.

One of his admirers aptly summed up his place in American history:

> America was his world. * * * Every spot and every country outside of his American horizon was merely subsidiary and suburban. As a matter of fact, Samuel Gompers was the American American, although born in Whitechapel, of his time. What he lacked in greatness of soul or brain, he made up in loyalty of untarnished rectitude.

The whole world respects and reveres the memory of Samuel Gompers and the exalted Americanism of a great American whose last words were so typical of a patriot: "God bless our American institutions. May they grow better day by day."

Haste Makes Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Morning Herald, Hagerstown, Md., February 18, 1950, entitled "Lustron Fiasco Proves Again That Haste Makes Waste":

LUSTRON FIASCO PROVES AGAIN THAT HASTE MAKES WASTE

The country's costliest experiment in mass-producing prefabricated homes apparently is doomed to failure. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has decided to start foreclosure proceedings against the Lustron Corp., maker of all-steel dwellings.

The RFC has loaned the Columbus, Ohio, firm $375,500,000 in an effort to get it well launched on big-scale housing operations. Both the company and the agency figure foreclosure may cost the Government $30,000,000 of that sum.

The Lustron case is a sad history of dreams never realized. It is made all the more dismal by the fact that the project seems to have had the blessing of high Government officials, probably, including President Truman, from the beginning.

Why were these men so interested in Lustron? From the days of Wilson Wyatt, former Federal Housing Expediter, there's been a notion in Washington that a well-developed prefabricated housing industry would go far toward bringing the cost of a decent home down to the average man's level.

At the same time it was felt this goal couldn't be achieved simply by waiting for the tiny prefabricated-housing output of established companies to swell into the desired heavy production. Government interest centered on initiating a bold effort to telescope this growth process.

The way to do it, Wyatt and others decided, was to help ambitious firms get quickly into automobile-style mass production of houses. The Lustron Co. turned out to be the prize guinea pig in this plan. It gained control of former aviation-plant space in Columbus. The RFC lent it money for machinery and operating expenses. Big things were in the wind, but the promises were lavish.

But somehow the dream always remained just out of reach. Many problems arose. It was hard to find the necessary skilled labor force, to set up a sensible selling organization. Continued rising costs wrecked hopes of a really cheap sales price.

Several times Lustron came back for more money to keep going until it could get over the hump. The story was always about the same: "Just let us have a few more millions and we'll really be rolling." So much Government money had been put into the experiment it looked unwise to let Lustron sink while there was still any hope at all. But, inevitably, there had to be an end to doling out funds without results.

The Government has decided that moment has arrived. This doesn't mean the prefabricated housing industry has failed. There are numerous small companies doing well in the field, with a few showing impressive growth. But the evident collapse of the Government's bright dream does seem to mean there'll be no spectacular catapulting of the industry onto a level with the motor makers. Progress henceforth will likely be slower than hoped for—but surer.

Weekly Newspaper Editor Points Up Difficulty in Reducing Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 60 weekly newspapers and 4 daily newspapers published in the ninth district of Minnesota. I make an effort to read every one of them, and in this way I keep in touch with the activities of my congressional district, which comprises 15 counties in northwestern Minnesota.

Several of the weekly newspapers have personalized special columns written by the editor himself or a member of his staff. These columns usually are very interesting and I make it a point to read them every week.

One which attracted by attention last week was entitled "Letter to My Congressman." It appeared in the Warren (Minn.) Sheaf for February 8 under the heading "Chips off the block." It was written by Neil Mattson of the editorial staff of the Warren Sheaf.

The column points out the fact that groups and individuals desire appropriations for their own needs but are opposed to all other appropriations. The article points up the difficulty of trying to cut appropriations in Congress.

I recommend the reading of the article to my colleagues. It follows:

CHIPS OFF THE BLOCK

(By Vic Boo)

A LETTER TO MY CONGRESSMAN

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I see by the papers where Congress wants more economy in government. I see they hope to put a lot of the Hoover Commission's report into action to save the taxpayers' money. I just want to tell you that it is about time Congress thought about cutting down on spending money. You can bet, I'm all for this economy. Our taxes are high enough, let's start cutting costs so we can cut taxes.

I see the Hoover Commission recommended some changes in the Post Office Department. I'm all for cutting down the cost, you understand, but I think the Post Office has been doing a good job so far and if we were to

make any changes there. It might mean service wouldn't be as good, and if their efficiency went up too much, it would mean a lot of people would be out of work. I'm in favor of cutting costs but maybe we better leave the Post Office Department alone. After all, it is nice to have a job to offer the political precinct workers.

This economy program has been long overdue and there are perhaps a lot of changes that could be made in the Department of the Interior, but one better tread pretty lightly there. What if there are only 32 Indians for each employee of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. After all didn't we take this land away from them? To see that they have plenty of people to look out for their welfare now is the least thing we can do. Economy is a good thing, but the Interior Department is such a small part of the Government that what it spends don't amount to much anyway.

You maybe don't know me, Mr. Congressman, but I was in the Navy during World War II and I belong to the veterans' organizations. You know us veterans' organizations hate to see waste in the Government. We are 100 percent for economizing. Naturally, we feel it would be false economy to see any changes in the military set-up. We won the wars didn't we? The Army-Navy Departments must be pretty O. K. the way they are. Then there is the other agencies that serve the veterans. You know we can't do enough for the veterans. Why shoot, we shouldn't mind paying out the money that goes to the veterans' departments in the Government. We want you to know us veterans' organizations back up this economy program to the hilt as long as you don't cut the appropriations to the veterans' agencies.

Up in this neck of the woods we make our living by farming primarily so I would not recommend any cut in the appropriations to the Agriculture Department. Our folks get a lot of help from this Department.

My brother-in-law writes me he works in the Government Printing Office) that he backs up this economy program, too, but he says they better not cut appropriations to that department otherwise there would be a lot of disappointed people when they quit printing booklets like Mist-Netting of Birds in Japan.

I want you to know our whole family is behind this cutting down on Government waste. My brother (works for the Department of Reclamation) says pretty near every time they figure out some dam or something the Army engineers do, too, and he thinks the Army should cut down. Course it's like I said before, too, the Army does a lot of good so it wouldn't be wise to cut them out.

There are many other departments to the Government, too, that do wonderful things, but I wouldn't just start cutting their appropriations. First, I would find out if there were any objections to cutting the appropriations to these other departments and then if there were some that didn't think they should be cut I would look into other departments and cut down on the departments that didn't have any objections or that said they could get along on less. That's what I'd do if I were a Congressman.

Well so long for now. I just thought you would like to know that I am all for economizing and cutting down in Government.

By the way, my hobby is to read up on all sort of insects and birds and things, and I wrote in once about a book on Hypentalinia nigricans. They told me the Government didn't print this booklet so I was wondering if you couldn't see about getting them to put one out on this subject. In case you are not familiar with this scientific term, Mr. Congressman, it means a stink-poler or hard-hear-head bug.

Yours for cutting down Government expense.

Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following copy of my address at the annual observance of Lithuanian Independence Day, Lithuanian Citizens' Club, 41 Berkeley Street, Lawrence, Mass., Sunday, February 19, 1950:

The President of the United States and the Secretary of State have recently announced that it is almost useless to negotiate with Russia, because its word means nothing.

From now on the free peoples of the world must build up their strength because power is the one and only factor which tyrants understand and pay attention to.

The Lithuanian people have known the brutal truth of this for centuries. In recent years they have been caught between the twin tyrannies of nazism and communism. One has been defeated, but the other is triumphant. The war is over. The shells and the bombs no longer ravage your homeland. It is supposed to be a time of peace, but there is no peace. Unseen terror clutches at every heart, for the Communists are putting into operation a plan to destroy the Lithuanians as a people.

No wonder they have drawn an iron curtain between themselves and the world to hide the shameless crimes they are committing. By keeping us in ignorance they hope to accomplish their devilish purpose, and then it will be too late for us to wake up.

But we have ways of knowing even now what the Russians are doing, and it is not a pretty story.

We meet on occasions such as this to consider the most recent evidence, to put ourselves on guard against the red terror, and to pledge ourselves anew to the struggle for those human rights which will banish tyranny in any form from the earth.

The United States has its Independence Day, and the Lithuanian people have theirs. Ours is open, complete; but that of your countrymen can be celebrated only in the underground. Americans and Lithuanians are brothers because they believe in the dignity of man and will bow the knee to no one but God. As we in America learn of the sufferings endured by your friends and relatives overseas, we cannot rest content. Freedom is universal. It cannot exist one-half in light and the other half in darkness. When it is stamped out in one country tyranny is on the march again; and that constitutes a threat to us here in the United States. For we can never be truly free until the whole world is liberated from slavery.

Today we face an enemy who looks like a civilized person. He even talks about democracy. But what is he doing behind the false front he shows to the world?

With the lie and the club he is trying to destroy people who never harmed him. In this we see the criminal viciousness of the Soviet regime. Russia has more land than any other country in the world. Russia may have more natural resources. But Russia is not satisfied with these.

Russia wants all.

By torture and murder, the Communists destroy many bodies but they cannot conquer the soul. In their plan for a world governed only by materialism they left no room for God. But they are discovering that all the force at their command cannot crush the faith in a man's heart. Instinctively they realize that the human spirit will not surrender, and so they are doing everything they can to crush it.

Lithuania was a free nation, asking only to live in peace with her neighbors. But Russian armies have blacked out her independence, have forced a puppet government upon the people, have robbed them of their liberties, seized their properties, gagged their newspapers, enslaved their schools, persecuted their clergy, torn people from their homes, and have made murder the rule of the land.

This we know in spite of every Russian effort to conceal or excuse her crimes against humanity.

Three hundred thousand Lithuanians perished during the Nazi occupation. That was hideous. It occurred during a time of war. In time of so-called peace, however, the Soviets have exterminated 520,000. More than 60 percent of the priests have been liquidated.

My friends, these facts strike us with horror. If applied to the United States they would mean that 40,000,000 of our people here would be wiped out if we had been conquered by the Communists. Not as soldiers in the line of battle but as innocent civilians who fell before the fury of godless hate.

We need to know of these tragic happenings so that we shall be armed against them not alone in military might but in the spiritual strength to recognize and resist this evil before it extends its brutal power.

Tear parents from their children, scatter them in the icy wastes of Siberia, break up homes and you break up the Nation, that is the Soviet technique in your homeland.

Even some who have been bedridden for years have been deported. At Birstonas a dying person was arrested but died in the motor truck some minutes later. The wife of an organist was compelled to carry her two babies in her arms for 2 miles while the Red soldiers beat her with the butt ends of their guns.

Attempts at escape are made even if there is no chance of success. Whoever has been arrested by the MVD will always prefer death to falling into their hands once more. Despite the fact that it rained hard on May 22, 1948, the forests were full of men, women, and children who had gone into hiding.

Those picked up for deportation are loaded into freight cars like cattle, and the cars are then boarded up. Strangely enough, the trucks used to carry the victims to assembly centers are of American manufacture, which we gave to them during the war under lend-lease. The Reds boast of the fact that American transportation is carrying Lithuanians to their doom—as if to kill off all hope in the hearts of the deportees.

This is the power-thirsty dictatorship which has fooled so many people with its promise to provide heaven on earth and gave them hell instead.

A power that is without conscience or mercy.

Remember after the war when the United States had a monopoly on the atom bomb? If we were evil, we could have used this fearful weapon to destroy Russia. We didn't, because our statesmen and scientists believe in God and in the sanctity of human life. We had no quarrel with the Russian people, and we would not use this tremendous weapon for aggressive purposes.

On the other hand, do you suppose the men in the Kremlin, if they were in our position, would have been deterred by any moral considerations for the rights of other people? Let us thank God that they did not find this secret first.

On this day dedicated to the memory and the hope of Lithuanian Independence, I say that the United Nations should call upon Russia to give up her occupation and control of Lithuania and the other Baltic nations.

The Soviet Union has violated the political decisions made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Unless restitution is made, the Government of the United States should not be bound by these unratified agreements. It should use its moral leadership in the United Nations to speak up for the rights of subjugated nations so that they will not be forgotten.

Just as you who have escaped, you who live in a free country beyond the dread reach of the secret police—proclaim Lithuania's irrevocable right to independence.

As long as your voice is heard in protest at meetings like this, Lithuania's cause will not die.

For yours is the voice of truth and justice, appealing to the world conscious for recognition of Lithuania's right to live.

This is a spark that appeals to all decent men and women, and there are tens of millions of them; and there are some even in Russia for they too are enslaved and bear a heavy cross.

Not even an iron curtain can keep the peoples of this world apart. When they get together, as they surely will, we shall see the dawn of a new age where mankind will be free. Lithuania will rise again to enjoy true independence, this time forever more.

The Late Lloyd Noble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I advise the House of the untimely death of a great son of Oklahoma, Lloyd Noble. Born and reared in Ardmore, in my congressional district, he kept his home in that city until his death. Though he became a giant in the oil industry, he never left the people and things he had known and loved as a boy.

Mr. Noble's total contributions to his native community and State will probably never be known. Certainly it can be said that he played a major role in bringing our State university to its present status as one of the great institutions of higher learning in our country. As an active alumnus and member of the board of regents, he gave unstintingly of his time and money to the development of his alma mater. Dr. George L. Cross, president of the University of Oklahoma, said of him:

His many years of service to institutions and his great generosity with respect to gifts, which he would not permit to be published, indicate his very great interest in higher education.

Lloyd Noble was a lover of the land. Through the establishment of the Samuel Noble Foundation, he began during his lifetime the job of rehabilitating and improving the soil in his own part of our State. His job did not stop there. His soil-improvement work was not only an end but also a vehicle by which he sought to show others that the elimination of fear through knowledge would lead mankind to a better life.

His primary interest was in people—an interest that he maintained until the very last. Only a few days before his death he had accepted the chairmanship of the fund drive of the Oklahoma Heart Association.

Those who knew him best loved him most. A Republican in politics, he was elected to the Oklahoma Legislature as a very young man from one of the strongest Democratic counties in the country.

Lloyd Noble's death is a great loss to Oklahoma and the Nation.

In Defense of the Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article has been called to my attention by a former colleague of ours, the Honorable Edward J. Devitt, of St. Paul, Minn. Mr. Devitt is now judge of the probate court of Ramsey County in St. Paul.

The article he submitted to me for reading was entitled "In Defense of the Congressman" and was published in Plain Talk magazine for January 1950. The editorial comment on the article was as follows:

The Members of Congress will hardly overlook Oscar H. West's In Defense of the Congressman * * * it seems to us that such a plea has long been needed in the interest of representative government, especially in view of the indiscriminate and ignorant criticism to which the Congress is so often subjected.

I thought it would be interesting to Members of the Congress and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so I am glad to include it herewith with my remarks.

The article follows:

IN DEFENSE OF THE CONGRESSMAN

(By Oscar H. West)

Every year some American cities name a schoolboy to be "mayor for a day." A similar custom might well be tried out in Washington, by nominating Mr. Average Citizen to step briefly into his Congressman's shoes. After a single hectic day in the Capitol, I am sure, Mr. Citizen would breathe a sigh of relief and place a much higher value on the services of his representative.

We hear a good deal these days about what's wrong with our Congressmen, but too few of us have a real idea of what their job entails. Yes, $15,000 may be a lot of money, but the pay check is garnished with headaches. Do we employ our Congressmen to be errand boys or statesmen?

What's that guy representing me in Washington for, anyway? is the attitude of many constituents who flood their Congressman with inquiries about trivial matters and requests for personal favors. They expect his never-failing interest in everything from getting tickets for the world series to getting a job for some ne'er-do-well relative or friend of a friend; from helping to name the new baby to pursuing a petty personal complaint against Uncle Sam.

One constituent swamped his Congressman with letters concerning a $6.20 claim against the Government, plus two taxi fares, a hotel bill, and meals. The file was voluminous. The man-hours and clerical time consumed were astounding. Finally the constituent wrote: "You are just not doing any good down there in Washington."

A Senator put it this way, "I came to Washington to represent my State in the United States Senate. Instead of devoting my thought, time, and energy to subjects before the Congress which affect our economy, our way of life, the future of our country and its people—subjects that determine our place among world powers—I have to give more of my efforts to demands from my constituents about wholly unimportant matters."

Then there are the constant calls on him for speeches. Whether it is a church social, political rally, county fair, civic club luncheon, or crowning a festival queen, the Congressman has to respond. Asked about vacation plans, one Senator replied: "I can't go home. I'd be hounded to death about speeches and give most of my time listening to personal problems. Don't misunderstand—my people are well-meaning. But after a man has been in the Capitol for 7 months wrestling with problems before Congress, he should be entitled to a rest at home. I'll have to take my family and go somewhere else."

I believe that most Senators and Representatives are sincerely trying to do a good job. Yet few ever get any thanks from their constituencies. Too often Mr. Average Citizen takes no interest in decisions to be made by his Congressman, makes no effort to inform himself on proposed legislation, yet cries to high heaven when the vote is cast if it doesn't suit him.

Notwithstanding the barrage of criticism heaped upon every Congress—charges of blundering, waste, undue influence from Government bureaus, and accusations from disgruntled pressure groups employing caustic adjectives—the record of Congress down through the years is one of which we can be justly proud. When we consider the myriad complexities of problems with which our national legislative body has to deal, the personalities and individual viewpoints of its 531 Members, plus conflicting views of their constituents, it is indeed noteworthy that the vast majority of laws are enacted with reason rather than with passion. True, accumulated pressure and frayed nerves blow the lid off sometimes. Unfortunately, such episodes are played up by the press and radio. We get only a smattering report of the conscientious hours of honest endeavor put in by our lawmakers. The long, detailed, powder-dry committee hearings, requiring both patience and eagerness to get at the facts concerning proposed legislation, are seldom recounted unless colored by a spectacular witness.

For the way he handles irritating situations, the average Congressman measures rather high in terms of human behavior, I believe. But such situations are a deterrent to his efficiency. There is little he can do about it, but we can do something if only we will. All too many citizens, especially businessmen both big and small, overlook the fact that what goes on in Washington controls the hopes and heartaches of millions of Americans like themselves.

With our freedom and security and our free-enterprise system at stake; with the tidal wave of a new philosophy washing at the dikes of democracy, we are defeating our own best interests by harassing and shackling the Congressman with insignificant matters when his mind should be left unencumbered to weigh and resolve matters of national and international importance. Consider the difference between the Atlantic Pact or the ECA and the $6.20 claim.

This country has had thrust upon it the leadership of a world bogged down with the after-effects of war, beset with sinister forces,

With the Congress of the United States, which underwrites policy and sets the pace, rests the hope and security of mankind. We the people must see to it that the right men are sent to Washington—and after they get there, support and help them.

Resolutions at Lincoln Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Republicans of Wright County, Iowa:

RESOLUTIONS BY THE REPUBLICANS ASSEMBLED AT LINCOLN DAY DINNER

We, the Republicans of Wright County, Iowa, gathered to honor the memory of the great emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, adopt the following resolutions:

The United States are threatened by dangers both from within and from without, in a degree unparalleled in our history. As citizens, we feel it incumbent upon us to point out these dangers and to state our convictions.

FREEDOM

The historic mission of the Republican Party always has been and is today the preservation of human freedom. The freedom of millions of people in eastern Europe and in Asia has been sacrificed because of the tragic blundering of the Democratic Party. The lives, the property, and the freedom of every American citizen is being jeopardized by certain of the policies of the current Democratic administration. We assert that human freedom is the divine right of every person, the first obligation of every Christian government, to protect. It is the sacred obligation and the high honor and privilege of the Republican Party to forever oppose tyranny, and to forever champion and defend freedom here and throughout the world.

SOCIALISM, COMMUNISM, AND CAPITALISM

Every Socialist is a potential Communist. Every Communist is a radical Socialist. Socialist and Communist governments always destroy freedom, because they are monopolies and therefore exercise tyrannical power.

Socialism has been tried, unhampered and beside capitalism, here in Iowa, and it has failed as it has failed throughout the world to provide as high a standard of living as has been provided by the American capitalistic system. We denounce socialism and communism as delusions and snares. They promise a land of plenty, they create a land of scarcities. We assert that the present administration is controlled by men who believe in socialist principles and are opposed to the principles of American capitalism. We assert our faith in the American capitalistic system, properly regulated by law, as being the best system to bring the highest standard of living to the greatest number of people which has ever been devised by man. We believe in its continuance and its improvement.

MONOPOLY

Every monopoly tends to oppression and tyranny, and therefore is opposed to freedom. The basic principle of our Constitution upon which our Government is founded is opposition to monopoly and the restraint of power. We therefore divided the political power into three equal branches of Government. We placed restraints upon the exercise of judicial or military power. We provided guaranties for freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of assemblage, and freedom of the press, which monopolistic governments have always suppressed. The monopolistic economic power now in the hands of the administration at Washington is a thousand times more dangerous to our freedom than a monopoly of economic power in the hands of Wall Street. We denounce monopolistic power in the hands of a political party of Government, of industry, of labor, or of any other group as a threat to freedom. We denounce Socialist and Communist governments as monopolies.

SECURITY

The security of the family from want and the security of the Nation from invasion depend upon maintaining the solvency of our National Government. We denounce the reckless deficit spending of the administration in time of full employment as jeopardizing our national security. Its continuance will lead to the devaluation of insurance policies, of Government bonds, and our American currency. It will injure our charitable institutions, such as hospitals, colleges, and libraries. It will lower the American standard of living for everyone.

SPIES

The shocking revelations of the Fuchs case prove the truth of our own Senator HICKENLOOPER's indictment of the handling of atomic affairs.

We assert that the action of Justices Felix Frankfurter and Stanley Reed in testifying as to the good character of Alger Hiss and the statements of Secretary of State Acheson render them unfit for public service. We denounce their conduct and demand their removal from public office. The statement of President Truman that the Hiss case was a "red herring," together with the conduct of Acheson, Frankfurter, and Reed show conclusively that the security of this Nation cannot be entrusted to the Democratic Party, that a new administration is necessary if we are to rid ourselves of spies from without and the disloyal from within our National Government.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Day by day, we are losing the cold war with Russia. We denounce the abandonment of eastern Europe and of China to the Communists. We point out that the traitor, Alger Hiss, was a high official in the Department of State in the Division of Far Eastern Affairs, that he was a personal adviser to the President at Yalta, where the dismemberment of Poland was agreed to, where Russia was awarded three votes in the United Nations, and the power of veto was agreed to.

We denounce secret agreements with foreign powers and the failure to inform Congress and the public of these agreements.

We favor the support of the United Nations and the adoption of a foreign policy which will insure peace, justice, and freedom at home and throughout the world.

TAXATION

The heavy burden of Federal taxes is oppressing the individual. It is inflating the cost of State and local government, destroying their independence and making them subservient to the National Government. It is destroying initiative and lowering our standard of living. It is handicapping our youth in their efforts to build their homes and their careers.

We declare that:

1. Federal taxes must be reduced.
2. Deficit spending must be ended.
3. Federal spending must be substantially reduced.
4. Efficiency and economy along the line recommended by the Hoover committee report should be adopted.
5. There must be a new division of sources of revenues between the Federal Government and the State and local governments.
6. The responsibilities of the Federal Government and those of the State and local governments should be redefined.
7. Because the power to tax is the power to destroy freedom, a limitation upon the percent of the national income which is spent by taxation must be fixed by Congress.

We have too long traveled the road to bankruptcy and ruin.

AGRICULTURE

Agricultural prosperity is essential to national prosperity. We point out the fact that the income of the farmer is steadily decreasing at a time when his taxes and his cost of operation is steadily increasing.

The farmers of the Nation must not become dependent upon the National Government for their income. They must not become a pawn of political bickering.

We must continue to work with farmers and all friends of agriculture, to bring about a sound solution of the problems confronting the farmers of the Nation.

Farm policies must be developed which are in the interests of all, the farmer, the consumer, and the national economy.

LOYALTY

One of the cornerstones of free government is loyalty, disloyalty, greed, and irresponsibility by individual citizens or organized groups within the Nation can become a greater threat to our national security than the force of arms from without. The spirit of freedom must be reborn. There must be a new and a deeper understanding of our American way of life. We must acquire a deeper understanding of the meaning and the threat of communism to Christian institutions and to human freedom not only to the people of Russia and of China, but to the people of the United States.

CONCLUSION

Freedom is not just a heritage which men hand down to their children. It is a glorious blessing and achievement which each generation must achieve for itself, the right to worship God in our own way, to choose our own vocations, to speak our minds freely, without the fear of reprisal or even death, and to live our lives and run our business free from the dictates of an all-powerful government.

The issue of a free government and a human freedom with equal opportunity for all, under the law, as opposed to socialism and communism within security and fear for all is the issue before the people of this State, this Nation, and of the world which transcends all other issues in importance.

What shall it profit our children, to gain security for them if we lose them their freedom?

Too Much Government in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial from the Middletown Times-Herald, a daily newspaper in my district:

TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT IN AGRICULTURE

A generation ago farmers complained they were getting too little help from the Government. There was widespread agrarian demand for farm relief, as it was then termed.

Today by all the signs the farmers is getting too much help. It has been proposed to guarantee him everything through a program that is running into deep trouble. Mountainous surpluses have already blotted up billions of tax dollars.

There is a current request in Congress for $2,000,000,000 more to augment the previous authorization of $4,750,000,000 to support prices. The program has not only grown financially unwieldy to the point that a crash is in sight but is hurting the small farmer by restricting his acreage.

In fact, the mockery of the current philosophy seems to be always to injure the little man the high priests of the temple have promised to help.

Now as in the 1920's the need of agriculture is markets. Now, as then, the markets are lacking. Consumption in fact is curtailed by prices held artificially high.

The farmer himself is reported to be getting impatient. He doesn't want to drift on until the tentacles of the Government completely enfold him, leaving him no decision of his own to make. More and more farmers are beginning to see that they can do better for themselves than by waiting for handouts from bureaucrats.

If there is a prospect that there will be a diminution of Government in agriculture, it is all to the good.

Carl Elliott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, there is no more diligent Member of Congress than my colleague from Alabama, CARL ELLIOTT. I have noted with interest that the newspapers of Mr. ELLIOTT's district are appreciative of his efforts. I include herewith an editorial from his home-town paper, the Mountain Eagle, of Jasper, Ala., entitled "Reelect CARL ELLIOTT," and an editorial from the Franklin County Times, of Russellville, Ala., entitled "Let's Keep ELLIOTT," and another editorial from the Sulligent News, Sulligent, Ala., entitled "ELLIOTT Making Good":

[From the Mountain Eagle, Jasper, Ala.]

REELECT CARL ELLIOTT

When CARL ELLIOTT defeated Carter Manasco for Congress in the Seventh Alabama District in 1948, Mr. Manasco had the magnanimity to say that he hoped ELLIOTT would not have any opposition for the office in 1950, because it is exceedingly hard on a Congressman to have to run for reelection every 2 years. That should be the sentiment of a majority of the people of the Seventh District.

The Mountain Eagle is in favor of the retention of Mr. ELLIOTT in Congress during the next 2 years, not for any sentimental reason, but because he has proven during his first term of office that he is a legislator of unquestioned ability and efficiency and has gained a strong following not only in the Seventh District but in the Halls of Congress, and he is able to compete with the best minds of the Nation in Congress. He has made a thorough canvass of the seventh district and is familiar with the needs and aspirations of the people of this district.

In a speech at Russellville, Ala., recently, Congressman JONES stated that in order to make a good Congressman one must have three requisites, good character, intelligence, and hard work, and CARL ELLIOTT has all three, he said. He said Representative ELLIOTT is the hardest worker he has ever seen in Congress.

Congressman ELLIOTT can be depended on to stand firm in his opposition to the spread of communism in any part of the world. It is the greatest menace today to the freedom and independence of the United States.

[From the Franklin County Times, Russellville, Ala.]

LET'S KEEP ELLIOTT

On more than one occasion and in various sections of his congressional districts, have we heard people say that they hoped CARL ELLIOTT, our Franklin County boy, now a Congressman, would have no opposition this year—and many years without opposition as long as he continues to do as good a job as he is now doing.

This newspaper, on more than one occasion, has suggested that Congressman CARL ELLIOTT have no opposition this time—and none for many years to come.

No young Congressman has ever done a better job than Mr. ELLIOTT is doing now in Washington.

Now comes the Mountain Eagle at Jasper, h. the home town of Mr. ELLIOTT, favoring the retention of Mr. ELLIOTT as Congressman. The editorial of this newspaper under the date of January 26, follows:

When CARL ELLIOTT defeated Carter Manasco for Congress in the Seventh Alabama District in 1948, Mr. Manasco had the magnanimity to say that he hoped ELLIOTT would not have any opposition for the office in 1950, because it is exceedingly hard on a Congressman to have to run for reelection every 2 years. That should be the sentiment of a majority of the people of the Seventh District.

The Mountain Eagle is in favor of the retention of Mr. ELLIOTT in Congress during the next 2 years, not for any sentimental reason, but because he has proven during his first term of office that he is a legislator of unquestioned ability and efficiency and has gained a strong following not only in the Seventh District but in the Halls of Congress and he is able to compete with the best minds of the Nation in Congress. He has made a thorough canvass of the Seventh District and is familiar with the needs and aspirations of the people of this district.

In a speech at Russellville, Ala., recently, Congressman JONES stated that in order to make a good Congressman one must have three requisites, good character, intelligence, and hard work, and CARL ELLIOTT has all three, he said. He said Representative ELLIOTT is the hardest worker he has ever seen in Congress.

Congressman ELLIOTT can be depended on to stand firm in his opposition to the spread of communism in any part of the world. It is the greatest menace today to the freedom and independence of the United States.

[From the Sulligent (Ala.) News]

ELLIOTT MAKING GOOD

Congressman CARL ELLIOTT representing us in our Seventh District in Washington has been rapidly making a name for Alabama in the Halls of Congress. Congressman ELLIOTT has done this through hard work and intelligent thinking.

Former Congressman Carter Manasco stated that he hoped ELLIOTT would not have any opposition in 1950 because it is difficult for a Congressman to have to run for reelection every 2 years, having gone through the same hardship for several terms. This newspaper agrees with him.

CARL ELLIOTT has kept in touch with his constituents and is familiar with their needs and those of his district. We have found him dependable and to stand firm on his convictions when he is right.

When we have able and efficient representation in Congress we believe we should keep it there.

Italian-American World War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following address of National Commander Henry Selvitella, Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., in Washington, D. C., February 20, 1950, at dinner concluding three national conferences:

Fellow Americans, we are signally honored to have with us this evening in the Capital City of the Nation, the distinguished Secretary of Labor, Hon. Maurice J. Tobin, his excellency, the Ambassador to the United States from Italy, Albert Tarchiani, majority leader of the House, Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, United States Senator Irving H. Ives, of New York, Congressmen William T. Byrne, of New York, Angier L. Goodwin, of Massachusetts, R. Walter Riehlman, of New York, Aime J. Forand, of Rhode Island, Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts, John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, Foster Furcolo, of Massachusetts, and many other distinguished guests.

As national commander, I welcome these outstanding leaders of our National Government and grateful to all of them for honoring us this evening with their presence. We have successfully concluded a 3-day conference of policymaking for our organization, and you members of the national executive committee, State commanders, and post commanders, and officers of the auxiliary, who have come from all parts of the United States, are to be congratulated on your fervency of devotion and attachment to your duties and obligations.

May I reiterate at the outset, some of the things that you know, and I am sure our guests this evening will want to know about our organization. That is perfectly natural.

The Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States was founded in Hartford, Conn., on November 11, 1931, and represents more than 1,700,000 Americans of Italian heritage who served under the American flag in both World Wars.

In the American way of life, there is a place for all organizations established in good faith and which have a designated sphere of activity. The problems faced by all are such that together they could never do too much work. The Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States makes a constructive and positive contribution as an organization in the community and Nation.

Here is the preamble to our constitution:

"To aid and maintain the honor, integrity, and supremacy of our country.

"To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America.

"To hold aloft the torch of true patriotism.

"To strive for a better understanding between nations.

"That peace and good will may prevail.

"To cherish and preserve the memories of our military association, and records of patriotic services performed.

"To aid and assist veterans, their widows and orphans."

There are more than 300 IAWWV posts throughout the country with about 100,000 Americans of Italian extraction enrolled as active members and a ladies' auxiliary of many thousands. The numbers are growing daily. There is no conflict whatsoever between joining any other organization, nor should there be any confusion as to the choice between them. Ninety-five percent of the IAWWV members belong to other veteran organizations.

The Italian-American World War Veterans specializes and is actively engaged in:

1. Veterans' welfare: Hospital visitations, inviting individual gifts to veterans of all creeds; entertainments; presentation of facilities at hospitals and convalescent centers.

2. Servicemen's service on all problems: Veteran rehabilitation, claim filing, educational vocation training employment, personal assistance.

3. Flag education: Cooperation with parent-teacher associations and other welfare groups fostering Americanism. Cooperation with public and religious schools. Citizenship classes and group interrelationship activities.

4. Organization activity: Ladies' auxiliary, membership work, band and drum corps, and athletic clubs.

The Italian-American World War Veterans have regularly adopted annual resolutions advocating legislation to provide this Nation with a military and civil defense of sufficient strength and training to cope with any possible emergency. To speed the economic rehabilitation of all war veterans; they have repeatedly appealed for national conferences of business, labor and governmental representatives so that a constructive program might be formulated to absorb the disabled and jobless into the national productive economy. They have consistently supported programs that would extend humane and judicious assistance to those deserving nationals overseas whose struggle to establish free governments have been handicapped by hunger and illness, by inadequate shelter and lack of productive machinery. And from the very beginning of their existence as an organized group, they have vigorously affirmed their opposition to totalitarianism of any kind by closing the doors of members to believers in or servants of, political extremism, whether of the left or right.

Because America was the world's first great haven of refuge from tyranny, oppression, and liberty, the Italian people of this country have since been privileged to defend freedom as every man who is given such a privilege should defend it—in the uniform of his country.

In America, a man may serve his God and his country by no other dictate than those of his own religious convictions and a set of laws he himself helps to establish. That is why Americans of Italian extraction have served equally and proudly in every war of the Republic. They have served as Americans and they know only one allegiance. That loyalty was to our country, because America asked only if they wanted freedom; if they wanted freedom enough to do battle for it. The answer in every war has been in the affirmative. That is why the Italian-American World War Veterans is in existence.

The men who organized the Italian-American World War Veterans thought to insure that their descendants would carry on, in years to come, the ideals that made our country the freest in the world. The Italian-American World War Veterans is an organization of men who have met the first responsibility of good citizenship. We have defended our country and her way of life in time of war. But our obligations did not cease when we exchanged a soldier's uniform for civilian clothes. Our primary responsibility has not changed. Our first duty has been, and must always be, to work for the security of our country and her free institutions both at home and abroad.

Our organization brings together men and women of one racial group to use their combined influence for the purpose of making this a better America for all minority groups. We bind ourselves together to dedicate ourselves to a special job that non-Italian veteran organizations are not especially interested in, and an example of this special work can be best illustrated by our active participation to defeat communism in the general election held in Italy on April 18, 1948. We in the United States were fearful and apprehensive that the people of Italy would not defeat communism and pass this supreme and historic hour with a victory for the Catholic Party.

Our fathers and forefathers, who immigrated to the United States, carried with them the ideals and heritage of a country that gave so much to world civilization. These ideals, we feared, would be swept aside if Italy became a prey of the giant octopus that slowly was engulfing Europe with its tentacles of communism.

Early in January 1948 a campaign of letter writing was started by our organization, the first of its kind in the United States, and as part of this campaign booths were set up in our large cities where volunteer workers of our organization asked and secured Italo-Americans in the United States to write a letter to some kin or relative living in Italy and urged them to ally themselves against communism and reminding them that a victory for communism would subjugate Italy to the tenets of Stalinism and would mean the end of free election and disfranchisement of civil rights in Italy and above all the loss of world prestige as a nation.

As a result of this campaign more than 10,000 letters were sent to Italy and on Easter Sunday of April 1948, a special plane was chartered and christened by the Franciscan Fathers of Boston and named the "Freedom Plane," and on board of this plane bound for Rome were thousands of letters to supplement the work already accomplished by our organization. We did not expect this special and peculiar work to be done by any other veteran organization. We feel supremely proud of the small part played by this organization in this campaign in Italy.

Premier Alcide de Gasperi and His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, commended our participation by letters to our organization.

In the glorious history of the last war, no page more glamorous could be written than that of the story of the contribution made by individuals of Italian blood, who have so distinguished themselves in battle that they have won the plaudits of this Nation and been the recipients of the highest awards for valor. The Congressional Medal of Honor is the highest award for gallantry within the power of any nation to bestow upon its heroes, and 18 of these Congressional Medals of Honor were received by Americans of Italian heritage, and the foremost of these that comes to our minds is that of Gunnery Sgt. John Basilone, United States Marine Corps, where on July 25, 1949, in my home city of Boston, I was present when a new destroyer was commissioned and named in his honor. What a halo of proud glory surrounds these valiants of a peaceful race who have upheld the banner of gallantry on the bloody fields of battle. More than 35,000 of these Americans of Italian extraction died in battle and more than 100,000 were wounded in battle. Over 150,000 awards of various types were received by our members of our race.

Therefore, as a matter of patriotic pride and the militant contributions rendered by our boys, the Italian-American World War Veterans' Organization is an essential part of the American way of life, as any other veteran organization.

American Legion Endorses Prayers-for-Peace Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel it only proper, that during these times of great unrest throughout the world, that all Americans would do well to heed and follow the action which was taken by the American Legion in calling upon its members to pause for 1 minute at noon each day to pray for enduring peace. Herewith is submitted the resolution approved by the American Legion and other national organizations:

AMERICAN LEGION ENDORSES PRAYERS-FOR-PEACE MOVEMENT

The American Legion, through its national executive committee, meeting in annual session at Indianapolis, November 4–6, 1949, called on its 3,000,000 members to pause for 1 minute at noon each day to pray for enduring peace.

The national executive committee adopted, unanimously, a resolution submitted by its national chaplain, Edward J. Carney, O. S. A., who informed the committee that the movement for the daily prayer at noon for peace was started by American Legionnaires at Manchester, N. H., October 26, 1948, as a result of an inspiring address by Hervé J. L'Heureux, a career officer of the American Foreign Service, who is presently assigned to the Department of State as Chief of its Visa Division. Mr. L'Heureux is a founder of the American Legion.

Father Carney's resolution, as adopted by the national executive committee, follows:

"Whereas at this moment of confusion, doubt and uncertainty in the affairs of our country and of the world, all free men lift up their hope for continued peace and security; and

"Whereas in times of travail and trouble freemen turn to their faith in Almighty God for solace and strength; and

"Whereas the American Legion by its first declaration in its constitution has asserted its belief in God and constantly seeks divine aid in all its official acts: Now, therefore, be it and it is hereby

"*Resolved by the national executive committee in regular meeting assembled in Indianapolis, Ind., November 4 to 6, 1949*, That having complete confidence in the ability of our fellowmen with the aid of Almighty God to establish a just and enduring peace in the world, does hereby recommend to all Legionnaires everywhere that they pause for 1 minute in each day in their employments of whatever kind at noontime to raise their hearts and minds to God asking that He help us to so adjust our differences among men so as to enable the nations of this world to secure an equitable and abiding peace; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That all departments of the American Legion, through their officers and agents, seek to have this moment of daily prayer observed by Legionnaires as an example and an encouragement to all citizens in furtherance of a common aspiration."

According to Mr. L'Heureux, at least 809 organizations and other groups in the United States have endorsed the movement as of February 15, 1950. The nature of these groups are indicated as follows:

Veterans' organizations (individual posts)	513
Veterans' auxiliary groups	18
Service clubs (Rotary, Lions, etc.)	9
Fraternal societies, clubs and sororities	67
Student bodies (schools, academies, universities)	53
Alumnae groups	11
Church groups	22
Business firms, including professional offices	106
Groups of Federal employees	9
Total	809

The following national organizations, included in the foregoing categories, have adopted resolutions, urging their members to pause at noon each day to pray for peace:

1. The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States—annual convention, Cleveland, July 13, 1949;

2. Greek-American Progressive Association—annual convention, Milwaukee, Wis., August 5, 1949;

3. The Order of AHEPA—annual convention, Miami, August 19, 1949;

4. The Society of American Legion Founders—annual meeting, Philadelphia, August 27, 1949;

5. The Delta Theta Phi Law Fraternity—annual convention, Detroit, Mich., August 31, 1949;

6. Jewish War Veterans of the United States—annual convention, Miami, October 19–23, 1949;

7. The American Legion—annual meeting National Executive Committee, Indianapolis, November 6, 1949.

The Case of Mr. Robert Vogeler, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. VINCENT QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEBRUARY 20, 1950.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
The Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: According to the latest press reports Mr. Robert Vogeler, Jr., of Jackson Heights, N. Y., the eastern European representative of the International Telephone & Telegraph Co., who is imprisoned in Hungary and held incommunicado since November 18, 1949, has confessed as follows:

1. That he had received special training in espionage at a Federal Bureau of Investigation school in 1942.

2. After the war he was assigned to Hungary to collect military, economic, political, and technical data for United States Army Intelligence authorities.

3. That in 1948 in a Budapest hotel, "Colonel" Sosthenes Behn, president of International Telephone & Telegraph Co., instructed him in the methods to be employed to sabotage the Hungarian economy.

4. That he gave his reports to the United States Military Attaché while in Budapest, to be forwarded to the United States Counter-Intelligence Corps in Vienna.

The truth or falsity of these statements can be readily ascertained from the following:

(a) The Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(b) Rear Adm. B. H. Hillenkoetter, Director of Central Intelligence Agency.

(c) Mr. Sosthenes Behn, president, International Telephone & Telegraph Co.

If the answers to these inquiries are in the negative then it is conclusively proved that the purported confession of guilt was induced by threats, fear, the use of drugs, or by other unlawful means.

It is significant to note that this alleged confession follows that of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, who was tried before the same judge, Dr. Vilmos Olthy, in the same courtroom, and by the same prosecutor, Gyula Alap.

As I wrote you in my letter of February 10, 1950, to permit this outrage to continue will be interpreted as an admission of weakness on our part. We will in effect tell the world we are unable to protect the life and liberty of an American citizen from Communist tyranny. What is our answer to Robert Vogeler's children when they ask "When is daddy coming home"? Or what answer shall we give to his wife and father when they ask "Why can't something be done"? What answer shall we give to the American people who will wonder what would happen to their loved ones if they found themselves in a similar position to that of Robert Vogeler? Shall we hang our heads in shame and say that we are powerless?

The people of my congressional district would like to know the answers to these questions, Mr. Secretary, and although they appreciate everything that has been done thus far they feel that something further should and must be done.

Sincerely yours,

T. VINCENT QUINN,
Member of Congress.

Legislative Program of Italian-American World War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following national legislative program of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., subject to the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and adopted at the national conference of the organization, held in Washington, D. C., on February 18, 19, and 20, 1950:

In the years that have intervened since the last war, the economic and social progress of this Nation has not been compatible with our democratic ideals, our unparalleled productive resources and our wartime victory. We have not moved ahead on the domestic front toward the effective implementation of the ideals for which war was fought and won. Today, an impoverished world looks to America as its sole source of economic assistance. The success or failure of our domestic economy is the difference between starvation and survival for the people of the world. We must fight the forces which are inconsistent with our fundamental freedoms whenever and wherever they arise.

VETERANS' UNEMPLOYMENT

Inasmuch as there is a consistently increasing and abnormally high rate of unemployment among veterans, we urge appropriate Federal agencies to inquire into the cause of such unemployment and take prompt and effective corrective action to arrest this trend.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Our country is a nation of many races and creeds, and no particular nationality, religious or ethnic group can take full credit for its achievements. When Congress enacted barriers to immigration and naturalization based upon race and color, it turned its back upon the lessons of our history. We call upon the Eighty-first Congress to remove all barriers presently existing to the immigration and naturalization laws.

REPATRIATION OF AMERICAN-BORN ITALIANS

We urge the enactment into law of H. R. 6616, sponsored by Congressman WALTER, of Pennsylvania. This bill has already passed the House and would allow 3,000 or more native-born Americans who lost their citizenship to become repatriated to their American citizenship. These 3,000 or more Americans of Italian extraction were in Italy and voted in the elections held in 1946 and 1948 when the fight against communism was the chief issue. Many injustices have been done these good people who rendered such valiant service to Italy and, incidentally, to all liberty-loving people in America and throughout the world. These people have no way of returning to the United States except by special act of Congress.

We urge the favorable consideration and enactment of the following proposals that have been introduced in the Eighty-first Congress and subject to the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1. We favor the extension for 2 years the period during which World War II veterans may receive readjustment allowances under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. H. R. 1374 by Mr. HUNTER.

2. We strongly oppose any legislation that would reduce the hospital benefits now available to veterans suffering from non-service-connected disabilities.

3. We urge the enactment of legislation increasing compensation by 20 percent for those having combat-incurred disabilities and diseases. H. R. 903 by Mr. RANKIN.

4. To amend Veterans Regulation 2676 (B) (4) so as to permit acceptance of lay testimony in determining service connection for malaria.

5. We favor the enactment of H. R. 4234 by Mr. RANKIN for legislation to enable veterans rated totally disabled service-connected to reinstate Government insurance.

6. We urge the passage of H. R. 5331 by Mr. RANKIN, which authorizes an equitable adjustment of certain NSLI policies by applying contemplated dividends to unpaid premiums so as to revive lapsed policies.

7. The speedy passage of H. R. 908 by Mr. RANKIN, which will increase disability compensation and pensions for World War I and World War II veterans and widows and orphans.

8. We favor the passage of H. R. 4617 by Mr. RANKIN, entitled "Veterans' Pension Bill," and now pending before the Senate Finance Committee.

9. We urge the enactment into law of H. R. 921 by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, to increase the income limitations governing eligibility for widows' and veterans' non-service-connected death pension to $2,000 for those with no children, and $3,000 for those with children.

10. We urge the President of the United States, (a) to rescind his orders for the cutback of the 16,000 beds, and (b) to issue orders for the prompt construction of these and such other beds as may be required for adequate care of America's disabled veterans. H. R. 5965 by Mr. RANKIN.

11. To support the liberalization of existing law relating to the granting of automobiles to disabled veterans so that the Government contribution will be $2,000 instead of $1,600.

12. The enactment of H. R. 5569, by Mr. RANKIN, which will provide a statutory seniority equal to the time spent in the armed forces during World War II for those veterans employed in an industry governed by the seniority system.

13. To amend Public Law 469, Seventy-eighth Congress, so that widows of World War II veterans would be eligible for pensions on the same basis as now provided widows of World War I veterans.

VETERANS' BONUS

Federal legislation for a bonus or adjusted compensation for World War II veterans is presently in the minds of all veterans in the country. This issue must be faced sooner or later, and somehow steps must be taken to speak in loud tones instead of the hush-hush manner in which this subject is now being discussed.

Undoubtedly this will be a No. 1 resolution in all future conventions of veteran organizations, and the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., and representing more than 1,700,000 American veterans of Italian heritage in America, favor legislation authorizing $2 for each day of domestic service and $4 a day for overseas service; and said bonus to be paid in 10 years with interest-bearing bonds. Any benefits received by a veteran under the GI bill of rights would be deducted from the bonus.

Potatoes in the Soup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Tuesday, February 21, 1950:

POTATOES IN THE SOUP

Congressman Dawson Ryan, of New York, draws some remarkably misleading conclusions about the potato glut in his letter appearing elsewhere on this page. Mr. Ryan implies that it is not high support prices for potatoes, but imports from Canada that are primarily responsible for the present mess. This is ridiculous in light of the fact that imports from Canada will be at most 12,000,000 bushels for the 1949 crop, whereas the domestic crop will run around 412,000,000 bushels, and the Government probably will be forced to buy 70,000,000 bushels. Actually imports are a small factor in the surplus.

Where Mr. Ryan goes astray, it seems to us, is in his comparison of present prices of $1.26 a bushel with the 1943 price of $1.31 and only slightly lower prewar prices as evidence that farmers now are getting a fair price. In determining a fair price he apparently takes no account of the effects of mechanization and increased use of fertilizer in lowering costs to producers. The significant fact is that under the stimulus of high supports more potatoes have been grown on progressively less acreage. In Maine alone, for example, the 1935-44 yield per acre was 275; in 1948 it was 370 and in 1949 it was 450.

The tariff on Canadian potatoes is 37½ cents per 100 pounds on shipments up to one million bushels of table stock and 2,500,000 bushels of seed potatoes, and 75 cents a bushel on all above that. Out of the 12,000,000-bushel import figure quoted by Mr. Ryan must come the Canadian seed potatoes which have been used in the Canadian for years. The United States, of course, exports seed potatoes to Canada from the West, and there is no Canadian tariff. The real point, however, is that Canada imports large quantities of other fruits and vegetables from the United States. If this country raised the tariff on potatoes, Canada could reciprocate on other commodities with harmful effect.

The potato problem cannot be treated in isolation. It is a part of the whole price support issue, and it is a graphic illustration of the disastrous consequences of past rigid supports unrelated to supply. The 1949 Anderson law, to be sure, adhered to the principle of variable supports, and this is a distinct gain. But it is apparent that even the 60 percent of parity floor provided by the Anderson law is too high for potatoes—and the Department of Agriculture has repeatedly called the potato problem to Congressional attention. The Brannan plan formula of production payments to farmers and removal of price supports would be preferable to the present system. Here, however, the difficulty would be that farmers who have no business growing potatoes would be kept producing. The production payments and strict marketing quotas which are being mentioned in Congress will be no solution unless there are concurrent efforts to direct potato farmers into more useful production.

Amendment of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, when the Railroad Retirement Act was first set up in 1937, the tax rates and scale of benefits were based on the average rail worker's earnings. Since 1937 wages have increased over 100 percent. There is an inequality existing that should be corrected, and the benefits due the railroad workers will be justly taken care of in a bill I am introducing to provide full annuities at half salary or wages, based on the five highest years of earnings, for individuals who shall have completed 30 years of service or have attained the age of 60.

This legislation can be enacted, and the Railroad Retirement Act can be amended in this manner, without bankrupting the retirement fund or increasing pay-roll deductions.

The money now in the unused reserve, approximately $2,061,690,640, is the present reserve as taken from the figures of the Railroad Retirement Board published in the November 1949 Monthly Review. This leaves ample for the railroad workers to receive improved retirement benefits for which they are paying and are entitled to.

From figures cited in the November Review the reserve increased from an amount on June 30, 1937, of $60,741,671 to the present reserve figures as stated above.

An interesting fact to be considered when judging the results of the legislation contained in this bill, is that there is more money in the unused reserve than the whole amount paid out in all forms of retirement benefits since the retirement fund has been in operation, and is an honest justification for asking that the railroad workers be given improved retirement benefits.

For the year 1948–49, 45 percent of the annual income of the Railroad Retirement Board was paid out in benefits. Fifty-four percent was placed in the unused reserve. One percent was used for administrative purposes. These figures taken from the November Review show the unused reserve increasing at the rate of about $400,000,000 a year.

The passage of this legislation would not mean an appreciable reduction in the reserve of the retirement fund, it would not mean an increase in pay-roll taxes. The increased benefits can be financed without jeopardizing the soundness of the retirement system.

The Late Amadeo Peter Giannini

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a memoriam on behalf of Amadeo Peter Giannini. I knew this gentleman for many years during his lifetime. He was highly respected by the citizens of California and did very much to bring the State of California into its present state of economy. He was always sympathetic to the interests of the people whom his institution served, and his passing is deeply regretted by all.

The memoriam follows:

IN MEMORIAM: AMADEO PETER GIANNINI

Whereas on the morning of the 3d day of June 1949 the Almighty Father summoned from our midst Amadeo Peter Giannini, our beloved "A. P.," fellow director and founder of Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association; and

Whereas "A. P." was born of strong immigrant stock in San Jose, Calif., on May 6, 1870; and throughout his career exhibited the pioneer spirit inherited from his Italian parents, his fixed purpose and ceaseless energy carrying him forward from the humble circumstances of his youth to a position of preeminence in the financial world; and

Whereas endowed with extraordinary mental and physical qualities and dominated by an unbounded faith in the destiny of California and neighboring Western States, he created a great and unparalleled financial organization designed to serve and develop the West; and

Whereas Bank of America, the largest unit of that organization and the world's foremost bank, is the outstanding product of its founder's genius and dynamic personality, and the embodiment of his will to create a public-service institution capable of supplying, within its sphere, the financial needs of worthy people in every walk of life; and

Whereas A. P. was a living symbol of the American system of free enterprise, and with herculean strength fought many a battle with powers in and out of government to preserve this system and the financial organization which he had builded within its bounds; and

Whereas at the time of his demise this seemingly indestructible warrior was leading his forces in what was destined to be his last battle for the cause of free enterprise and the preservation of his life's work; and

Whereas A. P. has left behind him a battle force fully capable of carrying on in his tradition under the able leadership of his illustrious son, Lawrence Mario Giannini, president of Bank of America for the past 13 years, and who, blessed with the fighting spirit and genius of his father, has long demonstrated his ability to preserve and further develop this great institution of service; and

Whereas A. P. was a public-spirited citizen and a powerful influence in the determination of the social order of his native State, and through the medium of his financial organization contributed more to the economic development of California in his time than any other man, thus earning for himself the fitting appellation, "Colossus of the West"; and

Whereas ever mindful of the fact that financial circumstances had denied him opportunities for advanced education in his youth, he made or caused to be made generous contributions for educational purposes, important among which were a gift to the University of California to further the agricultural interests of the State, and the establishment of the Bank of America-Giannini Foundation to assist worthy members of organizations with which he had been associated in obtaining higher practical and cultural education than their means or circumstances would permit, to advance medical research, and to accomplish other charitable purposes; and

Whereas A. P.'s frankness and warm personality won for him the esteem and affection of his thousands of business associates and a host of other friends, and his indomitable spirit was a source of inspiration that carried his organization forward to incomparable achievements; and

Whereas in his demise his children have lost a loving and devoted father, this association, the State of California, and the entire West have lost a fearless champion, and the Nation has lost a great American: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this board of directors of Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association in regular meeting assembled, That the loss of our beloved fellow director and founder, A. P. Giannini, is the source of deepest sorrow to us, and that when we adjourn today we do so in respect to his memory; and be it further

Resolved, That we tender to his sorrowing family our deepest sympathy in their bereavement; and be it further

Resolved, That we dedicate ourselves to the task of perpetuating the ideals and principles of our founder as expressed in the fruit of his labor—Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association—and that we stand in solid phalanx to preserve this glorious work as a monument to the memory of its creator and as an institution of public service to the West; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting held on the 14th day of June 1949, and that a suitably engrossed copy thereof be sent to the surviving son and daughter of our beloved "A. P."

A. J. GOCK,
Chairman of the Board.

Farmers Want 100 Percent Parity and Less Bureaucratic Meddling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the Ninth District of Minnesota are seriously concerned about many farm problems which are confronting the country at this time.

During recent months, both the Farmers' Union and the Farm Bureau county organizations have held their annual county-wide meeting in most of the 15 counties of the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota, which I have the honor to represent in the United States Congress.

One of the most thorough and comprehensive sets of resolutions adopted was sent to me in the mail late last week from the West Otter Tail County Farm Bureau. Its secretary, Mr. Theodore Hegseth of Fergus Falls, Minn., mailed me a copy of the resolutions adopted at the last annual Farm Bureau meeting.

I believe the resolutions will be of interest to the Members of the House and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I am glad to attach them to these brief remarks.

The resolutions are as follows:

I. FARM PROGRAM

In past years Farm Bureau thinking on a farm program has centered around the theory that it is in the interest of all groups that the prices farmers receive for their products should be such that they are on a fair level compared to things that farmers have to buy—in other words, at a parity level. We believe, first of all, that to achieve that end, farmers themselves must do everything they can and only in times of emergency should they call on their Government to use its aid in trying to restore that economic balance between groups. We have always opposed vigorously any direct subsidy program in food products as unsound and unfair and will continue to do so. We believe farmers themselves should decide the kind of program they want for agriculture and that the leaders in that department should confine themselves to administering such a program in a manner sympathetic to the way in which it was written. We agree with a farm leader in a neighboring State that Farm Bureau wants 100 percent of parity but we don't want it in checks from the Government. We believe that the flexible price-support program should be given a fair trial before it is discarded as being of no value.

II. GAS-TAX AMENDMENT

We again go on record in favor of the amendment on the division of gasoline-tax money to be submitted at the next election whereby gas taxes are to be divided 50 percent to the State, 44 percent to the county, and 6 percent to the metropolitan cities.

III. SOIL TESTING

We urge Farm Bureau members to take advantage of the new soil-testing laboratory and make soil tests on fields to be fertilized before buying large amounts of commercial fertilizer.

IV. RECOMMENDED GRAIN VARIETIES

Since many farmers in recent years have been victimized by smooth talking seed and fertilizer salesmen, we urge Farm Bureau members to buy only varieties recommended by the State experiment stations and at prices set up as fair by the Crop Improvement Associations.

V. FARM SAFETY

We commend the county agent for his efforts on farm safety as carried out in 4-H Clubs and by special meetings for that purpose. We urge that farm safety again be stressed in 1950 and should feel repaid if such a program saved only one life.

VI. BANG'S TEST AND CALFHOOD VACCINATION

We again urge that continued study be made on Bang's disease testing in combination with calfhood vaccination as a means of controlling Bang's disease.

VII. NEW USES FOR AGRICULTURAL CROPS

Since we have again reached the point where certain crops appear to be in overproduction in this country and unless a worldwide distribution plan can be worked out to relieve the situation, we urge that research be carried out to find new uses for surplus crops, new and cheaper methods of production and handling so lower prices could be accepted without seriously affecting the normal margin of profit in producing such crops. We also urge that an advertising campaign be inaugurated on sale of surplus farm products and that producers themselves stand the cost of such a campaign.

VIII. POLIO RETURNS

We urge that every effort be made to combine the March of Dimes and Sister Kenny campaign for funds so as to conserve effort in raising money for this worthy cause. We would urge people without protection to consider taking out a polio insurance policy with a reliable company and through a local representative. In like manner we urge Farm Bureau families without hospital and medical protection to make use of the Blue Cross hospital plan and the Blue Shield medical plan. We would offer these plans as being better and less expensive than any compulsory health plan advocated by the Government.

IX. OCCUPATIONAL DISEASES

We again urge that some definite action be taken to help eliminate such occupational diseases as undulant fever, strep throat infection, and erysipelas.

X. RADIO PROGRAMS AND COMIC NEWSPAPER SECTIONS

Since parents everywhere are finding increasing objection to crime programs on the radio and comic sections of the newspapers that are not either comic nor educational, we, therefore, urge as a means of combating these objectionable features that a campaign be started by the Farm Bureau people of the county to get churches, parent-teachers' associations, mothers' clubs, and other interested groups to systematically object to the sponsors of these programs and to the owners of the newspapers as a means of doing away with them.

XI. SOIL CONSERVATION

Besides new uses for crops in surplus production, we urge the use of soil-conserving crops such as grasses, especially legumes, and that steep slopes or poor land be taken out of production and planted to trees and in so doing conserve the soil and help to reduce surplus production.

XII

We again urge support of the Farm Credit Administration, Farmers Home Administration, Soil Conservation Service, REA, and Production and Marketing Administration.

XIII

We urge farmers to take advantage of the new telephone program to be offered by the REA.

XIV

We believe that manufacturers of cars, trucks, tractors, and machinery use too many different sizes and types of ball and roller bearings, some of which vary as little as one-sixty-fourth of an inch. We believe the bearings could be made much more interchangeable, which would greatly simplify obtaining repairs.

XV

We wish to extend a word of thanks to the newspapers and radio stations of the county

for generously giving space to items of interest to farm people, to the board of county commissioners for their sympathetic interest in the agricultural extension program and especially to County Agent Gustafson and Home Agent Judith Nord for carrying out the extension program so vital to all people in the county, both farmers and city folks.

Water for Irrigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a poem by a pioneer woman in my State that emphasizes again that water for irrigation is of paramount importance to the people who live in the semiarid West.

When the Mormon pioneers, led by Brigham Young, settled in the great dry valley that was to become the center of Utah, many felt it would be impossible to grow any crop but sagebrush.

But on July 23, 1847, William Carter broke the bank of a small creek and brought water on to the parched earth, which he afterward plowed and planted. This was the first irrigation by an Anglo-Saxon in North America.

William Carter's daughter, Annie Carter Johnsen, who now lives in St. George, Utah, has watched the waste land being transformed through the power of irrigation, and she well knows what miracles water can perform in our western lands. I am proud to insert in the RECORD the poem she has written:

GIVE US WATER, UNCLE SAM

What we want out here is water,
  Just plain water, Uncle Sam;
And we think you ought to bring it
  From a governmental dam.

We've just learned that you've decided,
  After many years delay,
To supply the West with water—
  If you find the scheme will pay.

We've been praying hard for moisture,
  Through the hot and arid years,
But our cry for "water" * * * "water"
  Has just lately reached your ears.

We have other kinds of liquids,
  From the best brands to the worst,
And they're all quite efficacious
  When it comes to quenching thirst.

We maintain out here that water
  Its great function best fulfills
When it irrigates our ranches
  And brings power to our mills.

If you can't resist the impulse
  That impels you to expand,
You can find room for expansion
  On our western arid lands.

As we furnished you with silver,
  When you wanted to resume
Now that you've espoused expansion,
  We'll provide the bridal-room.

Come out West and help us fulfill
  What God left about half done,
When he turned this desert over
  To the lizards and the sun.

You can go up in the canyons
  And construct a reservoir
For a tenth of what you squandered
  In your recent foreign war.

You can go down in the valley
  And produce a flowing well,
And won't have to run your auger
  More than half-way down to hell.

With the differential duties
  Which you pay the Sugar Trust,
You can pump sufficient water
  To forever lay our dust.

You can dig a hundred ditches
  From the Platte to Tonopah
For much less than you have taxed us
  For your ditch at Panama.

If you'll only bring us water
  To our arid lands out West,
We will ask no further favors
  And we'll quickly do the rest.

We will make this desert blossom
  Like the fertile Philippines,
Where you're educating natives
  While we furnish you the means.

We will show you what strong muscles,
  When engaged in honest toil,
Can produce on barren uplands
  From a dry and sandy soil.

We will fill your empty coffers
  With the stuff you like so well,
Then the bankers can't control you,
  For you'll have gold bricks to sell.

When this prayer of ours you answer,
  And our arid lands redeem,
You will see the full fruition
  Of our hydrographic dream.

Then you'll see our verdant valleys
  Smiling 'neath our azure skies,
Circled round by purple mountains,
  Like the vales of Paradise.

What we want out here is water,
  Just plain water, Uncle Sam,
And we think you ought to bring it
  From a governmental dam.

—*Annie C. Johnsen.*

Eat High on Hog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT A. MEYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Daily Reporter, Independence, Kans., relative to the recent $100-gold-plate "break bread with your Government" dinner of the Democratic Party on which no tax was paid:

EAT HIGH ON HOG

Thomas Jefferson may have been, but we doubt if Andrew Jackson would have been, able to read the menu of the $100-a-plate Jefferson-Jackson dinner held in Washington last night. Items such as pommes risoles, petits fours, and filet mignon bordelaise probably would have meant nothing to old Rough-and-Ready any more than they mean to ordinary Republicans of the present day, who go in for $1-a-head box suppers, featuring good old American fried chicken, held in the hand and gnawed at.

The party which boasts of its affection for the common people doesn't have room at such parties for many common people—not at $100 a plate.

Nowadays the Democratic chieftains are eating mighty high on the hog, when they condescend to eat from such a common critter as a hog. Maybe some of that French on the menu means some part of a hog, you couldn't prove it by a Kansas Republican not educated to such fancy gorging.

The $100-a-plate eaters talk a great love for the "peepul" and do a lot of bragging about what they do for the common herd. That is exactly the same line of talk put out by Stalin and Hitler, the British Socialists, and the like.

But none of these great humanitarians loves the people enough to give them the kind of government Thomas Jefferson always said was the best government—the one that governs least. None of them trust the people to spend their own money either. They tax it way from them and spend it for them on their great humanitarian projects.

On the way they deduct enough from the money passing through their hands to pay salaries to an immense number of jobholders. They're the boys who attend the $100-a-plate dinners.

The Farmer and the Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, last Tuesday night the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] delivered an address regarding the relations of the farmer and the chamber of commerce at the Association of Commerce banquet held in Bloomington, Ill. I ask unanimous consent that this illuminating address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, when Walter Meers called me, requesting me to come here for this address, I naturally assumed it was a farmers' meeting. He described what a nice auditorium you would have, what a distinguished group of people would be here, and how much I would enjoy another visit to Bloomington. I accepted his invitation, but awakened a few days later to discover that I had committed myself to address the Bloomington Association of Commerce.

Perhaps it is just as well. Surely this community, tied as closely as it is to rural America, united as it has to be with the welfare of agriculture throughout this Nation, is one where a farmers' meeting or one held by the Association of Commerce should have pretty much the same subject and definitely an identical point of view.

I want to talk tonight for a few moments about the farmer and the chamber of commerce, but before I do I must admit to you that I have first-hand information about Bloomington. My good friend and close associate is the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, SCOTT W. LUCAS. When it is an election year, he may fall into the habit of public servants and travel over the State recalling how much time he has spent in every county courthouse and how well he is acquainted with the people of every village where there are votes. But it just so happens that he has the goods on Bloomington. This is, according to SCOTT, his second home because he came here, attended the Illinois Wesleyan School of Law, lived among you for many years, and seems to have a perfectly valid right to say that part of his roots are in this community.

I have a frightful time trying to keep up with speaking engagements. I try not to leave Washington when the Senate is in session, and when I do I seek to pack several appearances into one trip. At 8 o'clock tomorrow morning, God willing and the weather not too bad, I will fly into San Francisco to talk to western meat packers. We are going to explore the question as to whether the West can feed itself. Not too many hours later I will be in Boise, Idaho, where faithful Democrats will be permitted to pay $50 a head for the purpose of learning more about the virtues of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. Soon I will be in Houston, Tex., to talk about cotton. Those subjects are too diversified to permit the use of the same speech. So I had trouble with this one.

Down in my heart I want to discuss some of the things that farmers must do to keep intact their program of price supports. We have been wrestling, you know, with the question of potato supports and have before us the unpleasant prospect of dumping many millions of bushels of good Irish spuds. I wanted to discuss the implications of that and hoped that I could lay down as a central theme a paraphrase of Wendell Phillips' famous statement that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. I feel that eternal vigilance is the price of the farm-support program, and my talk ought to be punctuated with that sentiment.

But steadily there was a theme that kept bothering me. People have been coming to Washington in droves these past few weeks outlining what they thought the Government should do for one particular commodity. The cotton people want us to increase greatly the acreage permitted to be planted in 1950. The peanut growers do not seem to care how big the increase in acreage is that they receive as long as it's substantial and everlasting. The potato growers don't feel that we should change the rules in the middle of the game, regardless of how they have been playing the game.

Through it all, no one seems ready to remember that the Government can give you nothing it has not first taken away.

Most of the reading matter that comes out of Washington is of a high order but there is a recent pamphlet to which I want to call your attention. It is entitled "The Federal Budget in Brief." It covers the fiscal year 1951 and was issued by the Bureau of the Budget. When you read that pamphlet you understand from charts and from language clear and concise why taxes now are high, why present high levels will pretty largely be maintained for some time to come and why, if relief is not shortly obtained, the burden of taxation will continue to grind down the availability of venture capital, will continue to make it more attractive to go into the stock market and purchase a seasoned security that at current prices will yield 6 to 10 percent rather than to put money into a new venture that may have only a 50-50 chance for success.

We have been living at a rapid pace these last 10 years. We have changed our Government substantially and we have altered its activities greatly. That is why you cannot view an agricultural program solely from the standpoint of its individual desirability. The Senate of the United States today has been voting on the central Arizona project, a great reclamation undertaking that would dam up and divert the waters of the Colorado River far into central reaches of the great State of Arizona. Its total cost will probably exceed a billion dollars but in the initial stages will involve the expenditure of slightly more than $700,000,000. Now you and I can argue whether it is or is not a desirable project. I personally feel that it is but you may disagree with me. Regardless of our discussions of its validity, if it were to be constructed in this fiscal year, we would come up against the problem of our national budget and we might rule that it could be profitably postponed until there might evolve a more favorable financial atmosphere. Fortunately, the bill contemplates that.

The same thing may be said of many of our agricultural programs. It may be right to say that every agricultural product ought to be supported and the day may come when all of them can be supported. But any proposal to support them all immediately and simultaneously runs squarely into the question of whether or not it can be accomplished within the framework of the present budget and, if not, what is to be dropped out to make room for the new program. Therefore we look at all these proposals not only from the effect of the individual suggestion but against the background of the whole financial structure and current need of our National Government.

When we make that over-all examination, we discover that our Government has been moving forward rapidly in fields that we scarcely thought of cultivating a dozen years ago, but we find as well that some of the older and well-established functions of Government have mushroomed to an expanded importance out of all relationship to their earlier importance. I know it's an old story, but it may be worth telling again that for the current year we face a deficit of possibly $5,000,000,000 in contrast to a deficit that ran under $2,000,000,000 last year; that if our legislation remains as it is, if we live on under present economic circumstances, and leave our tax levels about where they are, the outlook for the coming fiscal year is not black balances but more red ink and another very substantial deficit.

Possibly as I proceed both of these themes may be integrated and woven together. Possibly if we remember that the Government can give us nothing which is not first taken away, we may be a little more cautious in our demands for price-support programs that would further distort our budget, and, finally, if we are more cautious and more modest in our demands, we may then look for some method to handle these agricultural problems without immediate recourse to the Federal Treasury, as in the case of voluntary marketing agreements or learn that the mechanism by which it can be accomplished is the same mechanism which makes those business enterprises whose membership constitutes the association of commerce function and succeed, the old-fashioned idea that it takes salesmanship to move a product. In other words, I like to sell agricultural products to the trade and not to the Treasury.

Now, after that introduction if there is anyone here who has a clear idea of what I'm going to talk about, he has my sincere congratulations. If his services could be available to me the next time I start to write a talk, I'd be better off than I am now.

For my launching point I take a brief glance at the calendar and realize that we are approaching the ominous date of March 15. I am reasonably sure that income-tax Form 1040 is now in the mails and from the magazine section of the New York Times, I take these soulful lines:

"Naughty be our deeds or pure,
  Rough or calm the seas we sail,
Toil, our life, or sinecure,
  Death and taxes will prevail"—

Death and taxes will prevail. I could just as well have used that as the launching platform for my Jefferson-Jackson Day rocket because income taxes are about equally unpopular with labor, businessmen, and professional people. In fact, higher personal income taxes have about as much appeal to these groups as the prospect of socialized medicine has to the doctor.

Somewhere in the Government, I have heard, a determined group plans to do something about our health and when the program is adopted and in full swing, death will be swallowed up in victory and the span of life may be stretched from three score and ten to four score and five. Those of us in Washington who are well into our fifties and fairly well along toward our sixties are much more jubilant today than we were a year ago because the new toast of the town is the Vice President and his bride. One can get along fairly well at a large reception in Washington until the Vice President and Mrs. Barkley arrive and then you must be careful not to be bowled over in the rush. Love is sweeping the country and the greatest argument for improved health facilities and extra medical attention is the youthful vigor of the Vice President as he rides past three score and ten and heads toward the century mark. He has about persuaded us that death will not prevail and thereby he has doubled our conviction that increasing old-age benefits and pensions make it certain that taxes surely will.

When I have discussed the budget difficulty with friends and neighbors, they inevitably ask, "Why don't you simply balance the budget?" It's a good question. Why does the Government spend four times as much this year as it spent 10 years ago?

You have your answer principally in the fact that 72 percent of the money spent by the Federal Government pays for the cost of past wars or for insurance against future wars. May I run quickly through the figures: $41,800,000,000 or 30 cents out of every tax dollar for national defense; $6,300,000,000 or 14 cents for present commitments in the international field, for ERA, for occupied areas in Japan and Germany; $5,700,000,000 or 13 cents of every tax dollar for interest payments of the national debt; $3,500,000,000 or 15 cents for veterans' services and benefits. There you have it—$31,400,000,000 or 72 cents out of every dollar the Government will spend in 1950 is chargeable either to past wars or to the prevention of future wars.

Now I think it will be conceded that we're not going to change those figures much. If anything, the interest on the national debt may move up. There may be some slight saving in veteran affairs but it will be small. The pressure is on always for greater rather than less expenditures in the field of national defense, and we're not yet at the point where we can anticipate the complete elimination of our activities in the international field even though we hope to see them taper off rapidly in the next 2 years.

So out of the remaining 28 cents of the taxpayer's dollar you must pay the normal running expenses of the Government, the carrying of the mail, the enforcement of laws, the collection of taxes, the assistance that must every day be given to industry, to agriculture, to our working classes in the mediation of their difficulties. Along with that must go the great programs of the Department of Interior in the conservation, preservation, and final development of our resources. We must maintain our public-health service, our transportation-communication facilities, our contribution to the advancement of the science of aviation. New and better public roads must be engineered and constructed. You will find that in all these fields economies are possible but they are small compared to the total expenditures.

One of the experts of the Bureau of the Budget put it in what to me was a clearer and more understandable form. Let me use his simplification of the budget:

"The Government spent $3 for national defense in 1949 for each man, woman, and

child in the country; this year it is spending $66. The Government spent 16 cents for international affairs 11 years ago; today the cost is $42. The Government spent $4 for veterans' programs in 1939; in this fiscal year, the cost to each person will be $44. To service the debt cost $7 per person before the war; it costs $38 this year. For all other activities of Government in 1939, the cost per person was $49. Today, in sharp contrast to other increases, that cost has been only to $50 per person."

When we examine those figures and see how tight the present budget is, how difficult it is within the framework of that budget to find funds for the most worth-while activities, then we recognize how true it is that when we ask for new services, when we ask for new price supports when we suggest new aviation schedules and new airport construction, we come back to the fundamental proposition that the Government can give us nothing it has not first taken away.

Here in Bloomington you have a new soybean-processing plant. You should be very proud of it. It is a fine contribution to your community. You want to see it succeed and expand its usefulness. But you and I know that there could come a time when soybeans might be in price difficulty again as other crops have been before. If that happens, I can hear welling up from many areas a demand that soybeans be protected by support prices to help not only the planter, but the processor as well. When that day comes, you people know that I will be on the side of those who try to give protection to the soybean grower through a price-support program, but if it's a new program and a costly program, you and I will remember that we can't do it unless we can find the spot to pick up that cost within the framework of the then current budget. We can't take that money out of thin air. We have to take it from taxpayers. We can't give the farmers of this country something that the Government has not first taken away, and taken either from the farmer, the laborer, the businessman, or a combination of all. So this new business and the soybean producer realize that their programs must be worked out with an eye on the welfare of each group and with consideration by each for the other. If the cost becomes so excessive that the present budget cannot accommodate it and we have to find new sources of income that we can tap, then we might raise corporate taxes and thereby so discourage the free flow of investment capital into the expanding enterprises of this country that there will be no new soybean processing plants. We must be sure that in the long run the soybean-processing plant is not more important to the farmer than is the temporary price-support program.

I am trying to say to you that I want farm supports at reasonable levels. I prefer them at flexible levels so that the consumer shares in some degree the unexpected good fortune of a large outturn. I want to be sure at all times that the sciences of growing, harvesting, processing, and manufacturing the food and fiber of this country move ahead under a program of research that never slows down.

While I was Secretary of Agriculture, the Congress of the United States passed a Research and Marketing Act. I urged that more millions than had been appropriated be poured into the fund to implement that act, that we would shortly be facing surpluses and that it was of extreme importance that we begin then to find ways of utilizing those surpluses. I felt it was urgent that we begin to learn if there were new uses for cotton, corn, and wheat and that we learned to be ready with new processes, whatever they were, at the earliest possible moment because it seemed apparent that the day of surpluses would soon be upon us.

We have not gone far enough in that field. We ought to compare what industry does in the field of research. If a great industrial firm like du Pont spends a portion of its revenue from rayon on continued research projects seeking to reduce the cost of production and broaden the field of utilization of their product, then the American farmer might be justified in having a proportionately equal amount spent to improve the growing of cotton and the utilization of the cotton crop. I don't know how much money that would involve but I know it would be well beyond what is now being spent for research in the Department of Agriculture, our land-grant colleges, and the experiment stations and farm-product laboratories over the United States. That's the cheapest money we will spend and it will lighten the burden of future surpluses.

Which brings me again to the suggestion that eternal vigilance is the price of farm supports.

Yesterday the Senate of the United States wrestled with a proposal that no price support of any kind should be available to Irish potatoes unless marketing quotas were in effect on those potatoes. That's different treatment from what is given to other commodities. Generally speaking, the basics are supported at 90 percent or near that figure. Some nonbasic commodities may receive from 75 percent to 90 percent; others from 60 percent to 90 percent; all the rest at the discretion of the Secretary, from zero to 90 percent. But by the rider which Senator Lucas offered and which the Senate Agriculture Committee felt it should attach to the cotton-acreage law, the Secretary of Agriculture cannot support potato prices at any figure unless marketing quotas are in effect.

Why such drastic and discriminatory treatment? The answer is, of course, that some potato farmers dipped greedy hands into the Federal Treasury. They went beyond the necessity of supplying potatoes for the domestic market of the United States. They grew potatoes to receive price support and when they did that, they jeopardized every other price-support program existing in the United States.

Let me give you some figures: In 1920 (and I quote these figures from miscellaneous publication No. 707 of the United States Department of Agriculture, p. 44) the average production of potatoes in the United States was under 100 bushels per acre. In 1949 it was 220 bushels per acre. That exceeds the normal progress of American agriculture over a 30-year period. In 1940 the average production was just over 130 bushels per acre. By 1945 it had reached the 160-bushel level. Suddenly it zoomed upward to 220 bushels and the end is not yet in sight. No one knows how much further the application of fertilizer, the development of better seed, the use of improved insecticides, the practice of narrowing the spaces between hills, can jump the per acre production.

The Congress believed there was power in marketing agreements to control this upward trend and wrote legislation into the Agriculture Acts of 1948 and 1949 to accomplish that, but the experience of 1949 was disappointing. Maine, Idaho, and California produce about one-third of all the potatoes grown in the United States. California, in 1920, produced less than 140 bushels per acre; in 1949, 380 bushels. Maine started in 1920 with a production of 235 bushels to the acre, stayed at the level of 290 bushels till 1935, but in 1949 its average was more than 450 bushels per acre.

The Senate Agriculture Committee felt that it just could not stand that sort of a performance. The potato growers are suggesting to the Congress that we kiss and make up, that we let them try the same program again in 1950. This time, they say, it will work. We learned from the cotton-planting experience in 1949 that they might recognize this as the last big chance to make a killing from the Federal Treasury and we have no way of knowing to what length they would go. Therefore, Senator LUCAS proposed his potato amendment to the cotton-acreage bill prohibiting any support to potato growers unless and until legislation could be passed providing for a system of marketing quotas and such marketing quotas could be applied to an oncoming crop. I think that will save the Federal Government $50,000,000 in 1950 alone. Eternal vigilance is the price of a continued farm-support program.

You may be thinking, "So what? It's a little bad with potatoes. We'll get that straightened out. Is there anything else in the farm price-support program that looks dangerous?"

Possibly. Take peanuts, for example. In 1948 there were 3,312,200 acres of peanuts harvested, so the 1949 acreage allotment was reduced to 2,628,970 acres. In Public Law 272 there was a new formula adopted which permitted the Secretary of Agriculture drastically to reduce peanut acreages but provided that in the year 1950 he could not drop the acreage below 2,100,000 acres. Nearly half of the 1949 crop of peanuts must be crushed for oil or exported to the Army and ECA. Losses under the shelling program or amounts charged to section 32 funds of the Department of Agriculture are going to be terrific, perhaps $35,000,000 on the 1949 crop. If an effort is made to drop the 1951 allotment down where it belongs, under 1,500,000 acres and probably as low as a million acres, there'll be a terrific outcry. If the allotted acreage is not greatly dropped, the legislative history on potatoes may be repeated on peanuts. Right now we are also having some trouble with cotton acreage.

That brings me to my final suggestion: Salesmanship. Perhaps the farmer and the chamber of commerce ought to work much closer together. The farmers primarily are producers. Every large industry needs a good sales manager. The farmer should join forces with the chamber of commerce or the Association of Commerce and try to take advantage of the sales experience of the men in these organizations. Let me illustrate what I mean.

We're running into a little trouble with dairy products. Right now it looks as if the per capita consumption of all dairy products on a fat solids-milk equivalent basis may remain considerable below wartime levels and slightly below prewar levels. I may not be up-to-date on my figures but I believe that cheese and evaporated milk are moving at record high levels. The continued low consumption of butter is chiefly responsible for the over-all drop in the consumption of dairy products. Ice cream is being sold at a rate substantially below the peak reached during the war, but it's still above the prewar rate. The consumption of fluid milk and cream and other whole-milk products is above prewar consumption, but butter is down or at least in 1948 was down 40 percent below the prewar average. Just prior to the war in the period 1935–39 the average commercial consumption of butter was 17 pounds but last year it was about 10 pounds per person. That much of a drop in the consumption of butter between prewar and last year represents a loss to the dairy industry of the equivalent of about 13,000,000 pounds of milk. Oh, I know a lot of that loss was compensated for by the increased percapita consumption of whole-milk products such as fluid milk, evaporated milk and cheese, but the fact remains that a great deal of the market of the dairy farmer of the United States has been lost in the slump of the sale of butter and I doubt if he has gone out to find himself a new market for the products that he produces.

In the free-enterprise system the answer to that is salesmanship. Too often in the present circumstance the answer seems to be price support. I still think farmers can sell.

The population of this country is moving upward rapidly. New demands ought to be steadily developing for the products of the farm. If we depend upon Government programs to utilize these products, as we have been doing with dried skim milk powder and dried eggs, then the day will come when the farmer of this country will be in trouble and bad trouble because overnight these programs can be wiped out. But if he has built up his list of customers, if he has built up a trade for his commodity in normal trade channels, then he has a market where he can solicit and sell and which he can steadily expand as the population of the country increases and there are more mouths to feed.

Salesmanship does not always mean expanding markets for the old product. Sometimes we need new products. The drop in butter consumption from 17 pounds to 10 pounds may be only an indication of future reductions in butter consumption. What would the dairy farmer do if the drop was to five pounds per person? That could happen in the next 5 or 10 years. The world changes fast and we ought to change with it. Maybe we won't be eating fats in the same degree that we now eat them.

A few weeks ago my doctor gave me a cholesterol test, found that I was carrying a little fat in my blood stream, knew that it might lead to deposits that could be the forerunner of a coronary if not watched, and so he tells me that I must eat no more butter. Salesmanship won't sell it to me. I may buy a new product that research will help the dairy farmers develop. If we approach our problem on any other basis we may finish by building up burdensome surpluses of butter with consequent great losses to the Treasury and a new demand for the elimination of another price-support program.

So there you have my story.

The Government can give you nothing it has not first taken away. The more the Government gives to farmers, the more it must first take away in taxes—with the usual collection costs added to the take or deducted from the gift.

Similarly, if farmers want adequate returns from potatoes, if they want to receive from price-support programs, the Government must first take away from the grower the liberty of planting as many acres as he would like and of marketing what he does grow as he pleases. He must plant only what the Government permits and market only those grades and quantities that the Government decides are needed. That, to be sure, is regimentation.

The bigger and better the returns the farmer expects from the Government through price support, the greater the regimentation and the tighter the controls.

To illustrate: There is intensified pressure for additional and extra cotton acreage to be still allotted for 1950 planting. That is because the support price will be relatively high—over 27 cents. If the lowest permissible levels of the Agricultural Act of 1948 had become effective this past January, the support level would have been about 6 cents less, and the demand for extra acreage would have been less. Cotton farmers want a bigger part of a better deal.

From which it would appear that marketing agreements would work better. Under them, the farmers receive little from the Government and surrender little to the Government. The farmers run their own show with the Government as referee—as is the case in Federal milk-marketing agreements—and operate without financial aid from the Government by getting their money in the market place—as citrus growers largely do.

Notice the difference in public acceptance. The citrus growers pile up unwanted quantities and qualities of oranges, spray them with oil, and burn them to sustain grower returns—and not one soul utters a protest. The Government piles up unwanted quantities and qualities of potatoes, sprays them with oil and burns them to fulfill price-support obligations—and a cry goes up all over the Nation. There may be a lesson in that.

How much better off the potato people would be today if they would seize upon the marketing-agreement provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and make them work instead of producing and showing to the Government endless quantities of unwanted potatoes. Control could have been achieved through marketing agreement—but like any other agreement, success only comes when both parties to it proceed in good faith. The Government must desire the agreement to work and the grower must want to live up to its provisions. We do not have that possibility in the present situation.

That is why I have proposed that your association of commerce, established in a community whose ties are strong with the rural life around it, needs to study what the farmer gives and what he gets.

For farmer and businessman are not of different classes. "Men," said Confucius, "are near one another by nature, but practice sets them apart."

May it be the purpose and practice of your community to bring them together.

Missouri Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by W. G. Sloan, chairman, Missouri Basin field committee, delivered before the thirty-first annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., February 7, 1950.

The address exceeds in length that which is permitted to be printed without an accompanying estimate of cost. Therefore, I attach an estimate by the Public Printer of 3¼ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $266.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This morning I am taking the opportunity to discuss with you the role of the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee in the Missouri Basin resources development and to answer, in part, some of the criticisms which have been published concerning the conception of the plan of development and the manner in which it is being executed.

I expect to give you some of the details of the workings of the interagency committee so that you may have a better insight, not only of its accomplishments but, of its limitations.

There is a popular idea that the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee was set up to accomplish the same thing as a board of directors for a corporation and because it does not take upon itself some of those duties which would ordinarily fall to such a board, there has been a studied effort on the part of some people to create the impression that it has many shortcomings. The interagency committee is a unique organization. Nothing like it has existed in the world of internal resource development and for that reason, it has been critically examined and studied by students of political economy and well-intentioned planners for the purpose of searching out its flaws and in seeking a conclusion as to its workability in other sections of the United States. Having been a member of the committee for about 4 years and its chairman for the past year, I believe I can speak with some assurance concerning the workings of the committee and I will not attempt to inflict my personal convictions upon you as to its competence. That you must decide for yourselves after hearing both sides of the question.

Early in the year 1943 a voluntary Federal interagency committee was formed in Washington for the purpose of bringing about better cooperation among the various Federal departments in Washington having to do with resource development in the United States. On March 29, 1943, this Federal Inter-Agency Committee passed a resolution which states in part as follows:

"In order to facilitate progress on the multiple-purpose development program authorized by the Congress for the Missouri River Basin, there is established a Missouri Basin Interagency Committee. The purpose of this committee is to implement the policies and purposes of the Federal Interagency River Basin Committee established under the Federal Interagency Agreement dated December 29, 1943, by providing a means through which the field representatives of the participating Federal agencies may effectively interchange information and coordinate their activities among themselves and with those of the States in the preparation of reports and in the planning and execution of works for the control and use of the waters of the Missouri River Basin. The establishment of this committee should not be interpreted as related to or in any way affecting the consideration now being given by the President and the Congress to the possible creation of a Missouri Valley Authority, or any other administrative device."

Note that the principal purpose for which the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee was established was to provide a means through which field representatives of Federal agencies may interchange information and coordinate activities among themselves and with the States in preparation of reports and planning and execution of works.

The committee has no authority in the administration of the public works within the Missouri Basin nor has it responsibility for execution of the works. It is simply a voluntary coordinating body.

Committee membership: At the time the committee was activated there were designated one member from each of the four Federal departments and four Governors from the basin States to represent all of the States in the basin. In May 1947 Federal participation was increased by one member who represents the Department of Commerce. State representatives then were increased by one member to keep pace with the Federal representation. The Federal members are named by the heads of the respective Federal departments. State representatives are selected by a committee known as the Missouri States Committee which was organized in 1943 for the purpose of coordinating State activities in the basin toward promotion of the development of the entire basin. The Missouri States Committee is composed of the governor of each of the States and two other representatives of each State selected by the respective governors. The committee meets only once or twice a year or, at the call of the chairman. It is quite informal but important in that it has the responsibility of selecting the governors who will become members of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee and thus represent all of the States in the basin.

Each of the Federal departments has functions distinct from the other. Therefore, the representative of each department

functions for his department in different ways.

The Corps of Engineers is organized in such manner that all of the activities in connection with the civil functions of the Department of the Army, of which it is a part, are centered in the Division Office of the Division Engineer at Omaha, Nebr. This division covers the entire Missouri River Basin. Therefore, the division engineer is the top-ranking official for the Department of the Army in the entire basin and can speak for all the civil functions of his Department in the basin.

The Department of the Interior, however, is not thus organized. Its activities are much more diversified than those of the Corps of Engineers. These activities are divided among seven Bureaus of the Department, each of the Bureaus having special functions in its particular field. These Interior agencies are as follows: Bureau of Reclamation, Fish and Wildlife Service, Geological Survey, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Mines and National Park Service.

For the purpose of coordinating the wide variety of activities of these agencies, the Secretary of the Interior has set up the Interior Missouri Basin Field Committee. The field committee meets once a month to coordinate all the activities of Interior in the Missouri Basin, formulate programs and recommend allocation of annual funds for the purpose of producing a balanced coordination of all of the work assigned to the Department of the Interior in the Missouri Basin development. The chairman of the field committee is appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and is the present representative of the Interior Department on the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee.

Likewise, the Department of Agriculture has many varied activities within the basin, but to date there has been little acceleration of its activities toward the sole purpose of matching the intensified activities of other departments in the Missouri Basin development. In order, however, to coordinate the activities of numerous of its agencies so that it can be adequately represented on the interagency committee the Secretary of Agriculture has appointed on his staff a field representative. His responsibility, like that of the chairman of the Interior field committee, is to coordinate and program the activities of Agriculture agencies to the end that Agriculture may serve to implement the purposes of Missouri Basin development to the greatest extent.

These three Departments, Army, Interior, and Agriculture, carry the bulk of action work in the Missouri Basin development, but as necessary complement to the work of these agencies, the Department of Commerce is represented on the committee for the purpose of channeling the vast amount of statistical information which it gathers and its knowledge of business enterprises and opportunities to the over-all study of basin development being pursued by the interagency committee. The Weather Bureau and Coast and Geodetic Survey are important agencies of Commerce with active participation in the basin work. The present representative of Commerce on the committee is the regional director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

The development and distribution of power is one of the important purposes of basin development. Therefore, the regulatory powers and market forecasts of the Federal Power Commission are necessarily involved. Consequently, their representative, who is the regional director for the Chicago regional office, represents that phase of development on the committee.

During the history of the interagency committee a total of 20 persons have been members, which represents about one complete turn-over in membership. Changes in membership have come about through transfers of Federal personnel or election of new governors in the Missouri Basin States. The present representative of the Federal Power Commission is the only member, Federal or State, who has held office as a member continuously since the committee was activated.

Finances: Since the committee is a voluntary organization it receives no appropriations as an entity of the Federal Government, nor does it receive any contributions from any of the States involved. The salary and expenses of each of the Federal members are paid by the respective departments of the Government. The expenses of State personnel are provided by the respective States. Expenses of the monthly meetings are usually provided by the community in which the meeting is held. The duty of preparing, mimeographing and distributing the minutes and agenda of the meetings usually falls upon the Federal member who happens to be chairman of the committee. The secretary of the committee is appointed by the chairman from his own staff and it is his duty to prepare and distribute the minutes of the meeting. When the committee decides to issue a pamphlet or publication, the expense of such work is usually prorated among the committee agencies.

Method of operation: The first meeting of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee was held on July 19, 1945, in the office of the Division Engineer of the Corps of Engineers at Omaha, Nebr. Prior to the general meeting, the four Federal members of the committee met for the purpose of electing a presiding officer. He, in turn, selected his secretary.

At the August 1945 meeting it was agreed that meetings would be held monthly so far as practicable, that they would be rotated from State to State and that all questions, resolutions, or motions should be carried only by unanimous approval. If unanimous approval was not obtained the subject should be referred to the Federal interagency committee for disposition. In compliance with the instructions of the Federal interagency committee the Federal members only were considered as having a vote on the committee but, as the meetings proceeded, this requirement has been waived and the votes of State members have been recognized as having equal validity with those of the Federal members. It never has been necessary to refer any questions to the parent committee.

All meetings are open to the public and the press. It is the usual procedure at each of the meetings to devote at least the first half of the day to a report by agency representatives of the progress and plans of those agencies within the State where the meeting is being held. The afternoon session is usually devoted to a discussion of general and specific problems in the basin. Quite often papers are delivered to the committee by specialists on some specific problem in the basin. A custom has grown up and is generally being followed, of having a general civic meeting in the evening which is sponsored by the local citizens and at which some member of the committee is called upon to discuss the over-all development of the basin and the progress which is being made. In this manner businessmen and local citizens who have no opportunity to attend the routine sessions of the committee, may learn about basin development.

As construction work progressed, opportunities to view the work in progress have been taken by making a field trip on the second day of the meeting whenever the weather and location of the meeting place would permit. Thirteen of these all-day tours have been made to date.

When problems of coordination arise they usually involve only one or two of the agencies. It has been the practice of the committee to advise these agencies to work out their problems among themselves and bring the matter before the full committee only if they have been unable to reach an agreement.

The need for an over-all coordinating body: In the development of the Missouri River Basin the plan envisions development of all of the natural resources of the basin. In the beginning, major emphasis was placed upon control and use of the water resources but, in authorizing the development, the Congress stated the principle of broad development of all of its resources and thus enlarged to a great extent upon the original conception. Consequently, any interpretation of the concept of broad resource development involved many other things besides the use of the water flowing in the streams. Thus minerals, fish and wildlife, recreation, industrial, and all the activities which make up the basic, natural, renewable, and processed resources of the basin were brought into the picture. No single agency of the Federal Government has been functioning or has jurisdiction over all of such activities. It became of paramount importance, therefore, that there should be a central body to view the basin development as a whole and to coordinate all of the individual activities for the purpose of achieving the final goal in resource development. Each of the Government agencies is expert along particular lines. Each of them has built up organizations to fulfill its specific functions and each of them receives annual appropriations for the purpose of carrying out the mandates of Congress. The voluntary interagency committee is endeavoring to bring about this coordination without compulsion, without authority and with only the will and desire to work together toward a common end.

Achievement: No committee can be effective unless there is continued interest and attendance at regular meetings by each of its members. One measure of the effectiveness of the committee is the attendance record of those members. The committee has now held 36 meetings during the 3½ years of its existence. The attendance by Federal members of the committee has been approximately 98 percent. This percentage holds true of personal attendance by Federal members. An alternate appearing for a Federal representative is a rare occurence. As for the Governors who represent the 10 States in the basin, they have registered an average percentage of personal attendance of 62 percent throughout the period of the committee's existence. When it is realized that eight to nine meetings are held each year and that the Governors, who are especially busy people within their own States, are called upon to travel long distances and that each loses from 2 to 4 days from his own office to give his attention to the over-all basin affairs, such high attendance by the Governors is indicative of their sincere desire to be effective on the committee. It is only on rare occasions that the States represented on the committee do not have an official alternate, even though the Governor may be absent.

The first step in coordination of the program of the agencies was taken at the very first meeting of the committee. Each agency representative presented a statement of the interests of his department in the program. Soon thereafter a compilation was made of all of these programs for the information and guidance of the committee. From that date to the present there has been a studied effort by the committee to thoroughly inform not only the members of the comittee but also the attending press and public, of the myriad details of the program, progress which is being made and the problems which are continually arising in coordination and accomplishment.

In the beginning there appeared to be a reluctance on the part of State members to voice in public, questions concerning the advisability of constructing this part or that part of the project, its effect upon conditions in their own State or the need for some of the work which had been programed. But as time went on and a better understanding and better acquaintance was acquired this reluctance changed to an eagerness and willingness to lay their cards on the table and work the problems out in public. The mere presentation of the programs of the various agencies has tended to make them conscious of the need of coordinating their work and producing effective results which will stand up in the spotlight of a public meeting.

Responsible administrators of the various agencies have become acquainted with each other. The break-down of a specialist's viewpoint to that of a broader, more civic-minded attitude has become increasingly apparent as the meetings have followed one after the other. It is in this educational aspect of the committee's work that the most effective results can be seen.

The average attendance by those registered at the meetings throughout the years has been as follows: 1945, 44; 1946, 61; 1947, 57; 1948, 69, and, 1949, 83.

At the present time agenda and minutes of the meetings are distributed to approximately 450 individuals and Government agencies.

All members of the committee take back to their own agencies and to their States an understanding of the over-all problems and progress which could be obtained in no other way. Early activities of the committee were toward probing the interrelated activities of the agencies and a groping to understand the relationship of each of the program with others.

As of today most of the important or key structures in the development plan are either contracted for or have been initiated. A new stage is approaching wherein the attention of the committee is being devoted more and more to operational programs, the conflicts between State and Federal jurisdiction, and the methods and means of continuing harmonious cooperation beyond the construction stage into the operational stage.

In addition to the activities of the Federal Government in a broad program such as this, each of the individual States is carrying on many activities complementary to or related to and affected by the activities of the Federal agencies. The interagency committee offers and accepts the opportunities to enable each of the State agencies to understand and realize the relationship of the individual States to the Federal program. Thus there is brought about a meeting of the minds of those in charge of State activities with those in charge of Federal activities.

The more important actions taken by the committee are described in the following list:

(a) Unanimous agreement was obtained on the height to which Garrison Dam should be built.

(b) At the request of Governor Donnelly, of Missouri, the Corps of Engineers agreed to restudy their flood-control plans of the Osage Basin in cooperation with the State of Missouri and other agencies. A similar cooperative study is now being taken on the Grand River in Missouri.

(c) A controversy over jurisdiction of the construction of Baldhill Reservoir in North Dakota was resolved through meetings between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers and State officials of North Dakota.

(d) A controversy over the construction of Glendo Reservoir in Wyoming is being worked out between the States of Colorado, Wyoming, and Nebraska with the Bureau of Reclamation. Reports on progress are being made at each meeting of the committee.

(e) A controversy over the construction of Moorhead Reservoir in Montana and Wyoming was discussed and agreement reached to postpone action until Montana, Wyoming, and the Bureau of Reclamation had reached an agreement.

(f) Repeated urging by the committee resulted in the production of a comprehensive agricultural program for the entire basin by the Department of Agriculture. This program awaits further action by Congress.

(g) Controversies over the sale and distribution of power from plants being constructed in the Missouri Basin have been discussed at several meetings of the committee, all of the known facts have been presented, and steps are being taken by the various States and the Bureau of Reclamation to bring about a harmonious agreement.

(h) Discussions on methods of future operation of the entire project are under active discussion at this time.

So much for the make-up and workings of the interagency committee.

There appears to be a growing recognition of its role in this great development. Its effectiveness must be measured by the unanimity of the support it receives from the people in the basin.

There are some honest critics of the Missouri Basin program but, in the main, no adverse criticism stems from the well-informed. Therein lies the strength of the interagency committee—to inform the people—critics and supporters alike. To be well-informed on the many complex facets of the program is to support the development. There has always been opposition to the program since it was first proposed and authorized, but this opposition originates largely from interests outside the Missouri River Basin. Charges have been made that the Government bureaus operating under the program are wasting Federal funds, that they are torn by rivalry and have refused to work together. Panaceas have been proposed to demolish the straw men they have constructed. Lately there has been a new rush of criticism and some of it has come from within the Missouri Basin itself. Perhaps the criticism which has been made has received its greatest impetus from a document which was incorporated in the task-force report of the Hoover Commission on natural resources. This task-force report has often been erroneously referred to as a part of the Hoover report. It is not. Apparently the Commission felt that a case study of the Missouri Basin development would yield basic information to assist their Commission in formulating recommendations as to reorganization of the Federal Government for greater efficiency. They, therefore, employed a young professor of geography from the University of Chicago to make such a case study for them. He had never before had any experience in resource-development planning, nor had he ever visited the Missouri River Basin. His case study was based upon such reports, newspaper articles, etc., as he was able to find in libraries and with the aid of conversations with various executives in Washington. Neither the findings nor the recommendations of this case study were quoted by the Commission in its final report. The prestige given to his report is a natural result of its incorporation within the task-force report on natural resources and, therefore, deserves serious consideration in any study of the advantages or disadvantages in carrying out a basin-wide development on such a big scale as is proceeding in the Missouri Basin.

The report occupies some 20 printed pages and is accompanied by a bibliography setting forth the publications used as a basis for the study. The author apparently did not realize that the development has now been proceeding for 5 years and that there is already under way at least 40 percent of the work contemplated in the development. Such a conclusion can be drawn from the opening statement of his report which is as follows:

"For many years Missouri River Basin development has been the subject of an intermittent but fierce struggle between seemingly irreconcilable groups in the United States."

Such a statement might have been true 5 years ago. It certainly has not been true at any time since the development program was authorized by the Congress in December of 1944. Whatever differences of opinion there might have been prior to that time and however bitter the controversies might have been, all were resolved upon the passage of the authorizing act, and from that day to this opponents have been searching in vain for evidences of noncooperation, competition, and waste—without success.

You people in the lower part of the Missouri Basin are well aware of the struggles in the basin and in the Congress over the plans of development before the whole problem was aired within the committees of Congress. You are also aware that since that time there has been such a unanimity of opinion in all parts of the basin that the Congress has appropriated increasing amounts from year to year to carry out the work with very little argument or controversy.

In the summary of the case study to which I am referring there is a prelude to those findings. The statement is made that while the Missouri Basin will benefit greatly from the works to be constructed and other Federal activities in the area, the procedure is not recommended as a pattern for similar development in other areas. Seven conclusions are listed to support this statement. Let me make it clear that those of us who are engaged in this development program do not consider ourselves missionaries to other parts of the United States nor do we contend categorically that what is being accomplished here can be used again in other parts of the country. Each area of the United States has its own peculiar problems, and in outlining a program for other basins the problems peculiar to each should dictate the nature of administration required and the manner in which the work should be executed. We do contend, however, that within the Missouri Basin the job is being accomplished as expeditiously as the funds made available will permit, with a minimum of friction and with a greater degree of cooperation by the various Federal agencies than has ever been attained in the history of the country.

Now, to get back to the seven conclusions in the case study.

1. In referring to the plan, "It has not been sufficiently evaluated in terms of national interest."—It may be the opinion of the author of the report that such evaluation has not been made. Could it be that he is oblivious to the fact that voluminous documents were submitted to the Congress basic to the plan; that extensive public hearings were held all over the basin and within the committees of Congress, and that debate was frequent and furious during the time it was under consideration? When the program was finally authorized it was done by voice vote of Congress. Surely, a great deal of attention had been given to evaluating the project in the national interest, perhaps not by a board of political economists but by the Representatives of the people themselves.

2. "Planning was not undertaken in the proper order, especially because of a lack of basic data * * * Operations have been commenced in the face of uncertainties." There are three clauses in this statement. Let us consider them one by one:

(1) "Planning was not undertaken in the proper order." This is a vague generality.

Who is to determine the proper order, the author of this report? The engineers who did the planning? Or, the Congress, who authorized it? It could not ordinarily be stated that a single person without experience in planning resource development should be the sole judge of the "proper order" in which it should be planned. The Missouri Basin development was planned by qualified engineers and approved by the Congress. There is no clue in the report as to what that proper order should have been, nor has 5 years of experience in carrying out the work disclosed any upside down undertaking to date.

(2) "Especially because of a lack of basic data." I doubt if there ever was a large undertaking commenced of any type in the United States with all so-called required basic data at hand. Indeed, if all development were to await the time when a board of experts had concluded that all basic data necessary were on hand nothing would ever be accomplished. The problem we always face is to accomplish a purpose with available data. If you want 50 additional years of records you must wait another 50 years. The people chose not to wait. We have records of the discharge of the streams for periods from 10 to 50 years on more than 400 individual stations on the streams of the Missouri Basin. We had preliminary surveys of all of the proposed projects. We had preliminary soil classifications of all the land proposed to be irrigated, a background of more than 40 years of experience along these particular lines, and over 70 volumes of basic data gathered in the course of the previous 5 years of intensive study. That the basic data were sufficient and that the planning was sound is evidenced by the fact that after 5 years of intensive and detailed study of the program the over-all changes now in sight amount to less than 10 percent of the plan as first proposed. We are continuing to obtain basic data and we will not have such complete data within the course of the next 40 years, in fact, at no time will there be all the data available that we would like to have.

(3) "Operations have been commenced in the face of uncertainties." The plan was authorized near the close of the greatest war in history. It was started at a time when materials were scarce, there was a distinct undersupply of both labor and skilled personnel, and no one could foresee what the future would bring forth. But, was there ever a time in the history of the United States when an undertaking that may require from 20 to 30 years to complete could be started without uncertainty? Such a time has not occurred nor will it ever in the future. On the other hand, we were dealing with an area with perhaps the least internal development in the country; an area ravaged by drought and flood; an area losing population. It was high time something was to be done about it and the time to begin was when the people agreed that it should begin.

5. "Organization for the administration of the program lacks flexibility." Again, a search of the text fails to reveal why there is inflexibility. By voluntary agreement the work of each of the agencies was laid out for them within their particular expert field. Adjustments are being constantly made in programs to fit the changing conditions from time to time. Flexibility is one of the greatest features in the present procedure as is well illustrated by the fact that the vast agricultural program now proposed in Congress can be fitted into the program as complementary to it and without interference with any of the work now going on. There is flexibility to the highest degree.

4. "Congress and the President are the only effective coordinating authorities." I have taken some considerable time to explain to you the workings of the interagency committee, which is a coordinating body. It was specifically agreed at the inception of the committee's existence that if agreement could not be reached on any problem it would be referred to higher officials in Washington or to the Congress. To date not a single problem has been thus referred. As for furnishing funds to carry on the work the Congress itself always has been and always will be the final coordinating authority as it should be in any democracy.

5. "There is no complete program for the valley as a whole." Again, who is to judge what is a complete program? The author of this case study? The Congress? The officials of the various agencies? Or, the people themselves? Consideration has been given to every facet of natural-resource development in the basin so far as its features could be recognized, not only by the different departments but by the interagency committee. If there is lacking any part essential to a complete program none of us is aware of it and we would certainly be glad to be informed of such a weakness. The study, however, discloses no part of the text which points out wherein the program is incomplete.

6. "The procedure leaves causes for future sectionalism." In an area as big as the Missouri Basin comprising one-sixth of the area of the United States and, with parts of 10 States involved, sectionalism is inevitable in any over-all program development.

The people in Missouri will worry as to whether they are going to receive too much or too little water; the people in Montana in the other end of the basin will have the same worries. The people in Nebraska will be content if they receive the lion's share of the power in the basin, while the people of South Dakota will worry about their proper share of the power since much of it is developed within their own State. The people in Nebraska may worry because a reservoir in Wyoming on a stream flowing through their State may interfere with some of their water rights. Such worries and fears and evidence of sectionalism could not be avoided under any type of plan or administration and the interagency committee and all other departments and agencies are continually striving to smooth out such worries and apprehensions. But none of these quarrels or arguments have become of any great consequence, nor have they interfered in any way with progress in the development plan. In fact, the wonder is that the States are working together so well and so harmoniously. Could it be because they feel that they are a part of the development themselves, are kept continually advised and are given opportunities to express their feelings before a body which does not meet behind closed doors? Any community or group which is alive to its opportunity under the plan can be heard.

7. "The system of accounting is complex and difficult to understand." With this conclusion I can fully agree, but such a conclusion was drawn by the Hoover Commission on practically every department of the Federal Government. It has always been so and probably always will be so, as long as we are working in a Nation so huge and with such a complex Government organization.

I have dealt at some length on the findings in this particular study simply because it has probably had wide circulation and has been dignified by its association with the Hoover Commission reports, but since I personally have had such a prominent part in the unfolding of this plan and since it has hit directly at the fundamental concepts which motivated the plan, I feel that I am justified in standing up to its defense. There is no intention on my part to be critical of the findings of the Hoover Commission in general. I am treating this study by itself and I hope you will interpret my comments as a contribution to the increase of your knowledge of what is going on and how it is being carried out in the Missouri River Basin.

Let's Beware of a 1950 Munich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under the caption "Let's beware of a 1950 Munich," the Morning Call of Paterson, N. J., editorially contends that history will show that the good will and friendship of a hostile conquest-bound nation cannot be bought, and the proposal for our country to spend $50,000,000,000 as economic aid to Communist Russia to obtain peace would be the writing of another Munich. This editorial was written by the Call's editor, Henry A. Williams, who was an aviator in World War I. The editorial follows:

LET'S BEWARE OF A 1950 MUNICH

Through all the pages of history there is no recorded instance, to our recollection, of successfully buying the good will and friendship of a hostile, conquest-bound nation. It was tried in the ancient days of glorious Greece and later of the mighty Roman Empire. It was tried in the more recent era of the diabolic Hitler 20 centuries later. It was tried in the case of militaristic Japan, only to have our own scrap iron and oil rain down death upon our fellow citizens from Jap planes at Pearl Harbor.

It is hard, therefore, to believe that the majority of our Congressmen in the Senate and House of Representatives, who profess to be solicitous of the taxpaying citizens of America, will be so gullible as to fall in with last week's proposal of Senator McMahon of Connecticut. This contemplates the spending of fifty billions of United States dollars (none of any of our allies, mind you) on a peace crusade involving economic aid to Communist Russia, which now has billions of its own to spend on atomic weapons, as well as to our more friendly associates in the United Nations. * * * Where could one find a better way, from the Moscow viewpoint, for us to play into the hands of Russia's Communist conspirators who have pledged their lives to the destruction of our constitutional democracy.

Every international event since Japan's surrender adds proof to the Call's long-held conviction that the present crop of fanatical Soviet leaders will never abandon their Marxian dream of world conquest until forced to. Before our statesmen's eyes they have been allowed to acquire new territory and subject millions of people to the status of serfdom, and to seize spoils of war, much of which belonged by the rules of war to the United States rather than to Russia. Instead of showing appreciation to our Government for acceding to their demands, they have taken these concessions as a sign of American weakness and an invitation to go a step further in defying us and all their former allies.

Russia still owes our country millions upon millions in lend-lease and her wealth-laden leaders show not the slightest desire to live up to her agreement and pay it back. How then can we for a moment expect them to live up to an agreement to stop making atomic weapons and scrap those already made if we lower ourselves in their eyes by seeking to buy Stalin's signature with a billion or more dollars? Honor from people of dishonor can never be purchased by dollar bills. That kind of attempted appeasement might prove to be Munich all over again, but on an even more calamitous scale.

Religious and Racial Bigotry in George Washington University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, on this two hundred and eighteenth anniversary of the birth of George Washington, I am sickened by learning of the recent outburst of religious and racial bigotry in the head of the university which was founded by Washington, which bears his name in the city which is his namesake, and which was chartered by Congress over a century ago with a specific prohibition of discrimination.

Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin has in recent weeks, and to my intense sorrow and disappointment, conducted himself in a pattern reminiscent of the late and unlamented Herr Dr. Goebbels. The disgraceful situation at George Washington University, the only Jim Crow institution of higher learning in the District of Columbia, has come to a head in this most completely incongruous time, the week in which we celebrate the memory of the founder of his country; the period proclaimed Brotherhood Week; the week in which the District of Columbia has discovered that its un-American pattern of discrimination and segregation is illegal.

It was not many weeks ago that the George Washington Hatchet, student weekly, ran an editorial declaring it was time for GWU to rejoin the United States by abandoning its anti-Negro policy. George Washington left 50 shares of C. & O. Canal Co. stock to found a college "to teach democracy to the people." James Monroe and John Quincy Adams supported and patronized Columbian College, out of which GWU grew.

The Newman Club, the Hillel Foundation of B'nai B'rith, and a number of Protestant and secular student groups endorsed the editorial.

There was no reaction from the president of the university until the Jewish press widely reprinted a brief story sent out of Washington by Milton Friedman, JTA correspondent here.

Immediately the wrath of Olympus descended on Hillel Director Irwin Glatstein. According to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Dr. B. H. Jarman called on Glatstein. Not satisfied with Glatstein's assertion that he could not confirm or disavow the statements in the JTA story except as to the resolution, Jarman haled Glatstein before the great man himself for a 1½-hour stormy interview.

JTA says that Dr. Marvin threatened to have Glatstein fired, and later tried to carry out the threat; that he also threatened to ban Hillel from the campus; that he talked wildly of a Jewish plot against the university and demanded that Glatstein sign a letter dictated by Marvin saying the JTA story was untrue. Rabbi Arthur Lelyveld, national director of Hillel Foundations, was forced to come to Washington in an effort to smooth out the row, in cooperation with the Anti-Defamation League.

The Jewish community of Washington is up in arms.

During depression days, Abram Lisner and other Jewish philanthropists bailed out George Washington University when the going was tough. Lisner Auditorium was built by funds bequeathed by Abram Lisner. By his direction the Bill of Rights is inscribed on the walls. His direct command that no discrimination be practiced is openly flouted by barring Negro citizens from the hall. At various times Protestant churches and private philanthropists have helped George Washington University. Yet so far as I am aware there is not a single Negro student in the university, and the medical school follows the infamous AMA quota system.

For the benefit of Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin I want to quote from the famous Washington letter to the Hebrew congregation at Newport:

The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy. * * * All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens in giving it on all occasions effectual support.

Gen. U. S. Grant III, grandson of the great American who helped free the slaves and the man who tried to impose a permanent pattern of segregation on the District of Columbia, is vice president of George Washington University.

The Lincoln Philosophy of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Lincoln Day address entitled "The Lincoln Philosophy of Government," delivered by me at Tuscon, Ariz., on February 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After I received the invitation to join you here at this celebration of Lincoln's birthday, I spent some little time in thought and study about what to talk about. I got hold of a biography of Lincoln. Although I have read Lincoln's life before rather carefully, I got a great deal of pleasure out of glancing through those volumes again. I also secured a collection of quotations from Lincoln's speeches, letters, and other statements.

As I read this material, I could not help but becoming enthusiastic about joining you here today for your Lincoln Day celebration. I got this feeling because as I read over some of the things that Lincoln had said, it struck me so forcibly how directly they applied to the problems we face today. It almost seemed that I was reading the work of some great statesman who was commenting on the problems of 1950.

For example, listen to these words of Lincoln: "Coming expenditures must be met, and the present debt must be paid; and money cannot always be borrowed for these objects. The system of loans is but temporary in its nature, and must soon explode. It is a system not only ruinous while it lasts, but one that must soon fail and leave us destitute. As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest, and next no one left to borrow from, so must it be with a government."

How could any comment be more to the point of our present problem? This administration would have you believe that some new formula has been found that makes deficit financing or borrowing money a good idea. This quotation from Abraham Lincoln shows us clearly that there is nothing new about Government financial problems. There is nothing progressive or modern about going into debt. Then, as now, there was a tendency for demagogic governments to promise more than they could perform. That is as old as the hills.

Lincoln faced that issue frankly and boldly. He knew that excessive spending and borrowing would destroy the national prosperity, and particularly, the prosperity of the average man. That is why he was so firmly against it—because he knew that the chief burden would fall on the average man.

There is one thing he probably did not know. I doubt if he ever could have imagined any national administration throwing around such gigantic sums of money as Harry Truman's $42,000,000,000 budget. Do you know how much it cost President Lincoln to run his administration during the entire Civil War? In 4 years his administration spent just $3,250,000,000. That was the entire cost of the Civil War and all the other Federal expenses during those 4 years. That $3,250,000,000 would be enough to last this administration not quite 1 month.

In fact, it is hard to get any realization of what a tremendous money-spending machine our Federal Government has become. During the nearly 5 years since Truman became President, he has spent more than all the 32 Presidents spent before him in the 156 years up to the beginning of the Second World War. The war has been over for almost 5 years now, and yet the Government is still spending at a rate five times as great as President Roosevelt's average rate of peacetime spending. Before the war we used to think that F. D. R. was a fairly expensive President.

Of course, when I talk about President Truman's spending, I am talking about just those programs that are already in effect. I don't include those spending programs that Congress has refused to authorize, such as the Brannan plan for agriculture and the socialized medical proposal. If Congress gave the President everything he asked for, we would hit some new high records on spending. That is why it is all-important to send some more Republican Congressmen and Senators to Washington.

Lincoln stood for sound finance. He also stood for another ideal which is even more important, and that is human freedom. We meet today at a critical time in the history of our Nation and the world. While vast areas of the earth are being covered with tyranny, we meet to honor a man who not only believed in freedom but fought for freedom. Much of the world seems to have retreated into a new kind of dark ages. It is particularly fitting at such a time that we turn our eyes once more to a man who stood

out as a symbol of light and hope at another time when darkness seemed to be moving over the face of the earth.

We meet to honor a man about whom numberless eulogies have been written and speeches have been made. Nothing ever has affected the American people so greatly and so unanimously as the assassination of Abraham Lincoln in 1865.

A tree is best measured when it is down. Men who had never considered Lincoln great while he was alive suddenly went into deep mourning for one whose works they suddenly understood.

Why did Lincoln's death bring so many men—North and South—to their knees in prayer? Why have we not been able to forget him although he has been dead for almost 85 years? I think I can tell you why.

Abraham Lincoln lived by great principles. He built his life on those principles. He developed, step by step, a philosophy of government based on the finest of the American tradition he inherited. He could give more life and meaning to those principles of government because he himself had gone through a hard life on a harsh frontier.

He had been handed an ax when but a lad and told to start cutting. He had hewn rails by the thousands. He had felt the cutting chill of a prairie wind against his worn clothing. He had tried a variety of occupations and had struggled to establish himself as a prairie lawyer. In political life he had known both success and failure, but until his election to the Presidency, more failure than success. Even during his term as President, he was subjected to the most unjust and unworthy criticism and ridicule.

In short, by the time of his death Abraham Lincoln symbolized America as no other man could. He bore in his heart and his mind the spirit of the honest toil that has created America. He revealed, by his speech, the pride of living in a free land under a free government. None before him and none after him was able to state so well as he the principles by which he lived and to stir the people as he could. His supremacy in leading the people by those principles was due to the fact that he expressed those principles in his personal life.

What are some of those principles that Lincoln lived by? Before I answer that, let me say this. Times change. The appliances that we use change. Circumstances and problems change. But principles never change. Lincoln's principles were sound because they have stood the test of time. Those principles are still sound today.

I have mentioned the fact that Lincoln did not believe in phony finance that swindled the people out of half of their savings and their earnings by cutting the buying power of their money in half. One of his principles was simple honesty, and that quality is something we need badly in public life today.

I have also mentioned his love of freedom. He sought to free the slaves but he also sought to maintain the freedoms of the average man against Government regimentation and Government confiscation. He said on one occasion, and I quote: "We see it and to us it appears like principle, and the best sort of principle at that—the principle of allowing the people to do as they please with their own business." On another occasion he said: "Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

He believed that every man was entitled to the fruits of his own labor and that the Government had no right to take them from him.

He was a practical statesman as well as an idealist. He knew that once the process of Government regimentation and of confiscating wealth began, it would be very difficult to stop. He said, and I quote: "A house divided cannot stand. I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free." He referred, of course, to the immediate challenge before him—the issue of Negro slavery. But in a broader sense the words ring true when applied to our economic problems today. We cannot long maintain a free political system if our economic system is not free. We cannot have socialism and capitalism at the same time, no matter what President Truman may say. The systems are the very opposite of each other. If we have socialized medicine, socialized farming, socialized banking, socialized housing, how can we have a free economic system?

The entry of government into new fields always has meant a gradual strangling and elimination of free economic forces in that field. The Germans tried it and got war instead of security. The British have a poor house. The Russians have a police state. It is the lesson of experience that if the government goes into the housing business to any extent it drives out those who want to construct private homes. If it goes into the railroad business, privately owned railroads cannot long stand against subsidized competition. It is the same in every field. The government cannot afford, once it is engaged in any economic operation, to have competition. To allow competition is to allow the people to see the inefficiency of government operation. For free men working freely are able to do a better, more resourceful job than men who are working for a top-heavy centralized government, tied up in every step by red tape and excessive supervision from top to bottom.

That is the central issue we must face today. Shall we move toward a greater and greater concentration of power in Washington? If we adopt the President's program, control of something like half our economic system will be in the hands of the Federal Government. If we reach that point can we remain half controlled and half free? Or will the growing power of the Federal Government be able to pull us the rest of the way toward socialism until every man's daily life and activities are completely controlled. Remember that socialism, practically speaking, is nothing more nor less than an extreme concentration of power in the hands of the central government.

The trend toward totalitarianism of some sort has been running pretty strong over a good part of the world, but perhaps you don't realize that all of these various types of centralized government are merely varieties of socialism. We used to call the Hitler doctrines fascism, but Hitler himself called it national socialism. We usually call the British Government a labor government, but it calls itself a socialist government. And don't forget the correct name for the Government of Russia is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

We have our own brand of Socialists in this country too, only here they don't generally call themselves Socialists. There is a Socialist Party and a Communist Party, but most of the Socialists in America don't belong to those parties. They have found it more expedient to join up with the Democratic Party, gain control of its party machinery, wrap themselves in its traditions of Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson, and pretend to espouse its time-honored principles. They refer to themselves as believers in economic planning or perhaps in a controlled economy. They never use the ugly word "Socialist." In practical effect if they succeed in their aims, they will have changed our form of government.

There are several roads to socialism and the Socialists in this country have been smart enough to choose those roads that arouse the least opposition. For example, this administration does not generally talk much about Government ownership of our major industries. That might arouse too much public opposition and criticism. They believe they can achieve the same results through controls over business and industry and through confiscation of a major portion of the people's income through taxation. If they can concentrate all power in Washington, they can run the country just as if it were a fully socialist state.

Observe how closely the proposals of the President follow the path that has already been laid down in socialist England. The Ewing proposal for socialized medicine is almost an exact duplicate of the British health program which has failed so miserably. In fact, Mr. Ewing, during his visit to England, pointed out the similarity and openly said that his program would draw directly on the experience of the British.

Take a look at the Brannan plan for agriculture. Under this proposal farmers would be subsidized to produce and overproduce so that the market would be flooded with farm surpluses, and farm prices would fall to unbelievably low levels. Then Mr. Brannan promises he would pay the farmer directly with a Government check enough to give him a living income. The result, according to Mr. Brannan, would be low prices to consumers and high incomes to farmers. I don't need to point out the obvious catch in this plan. Anything you saved on your grocery bill you would have to pay on your tax bill. That stands to reason. That is the way it works in England where they have the same system.

There is another point to this Brannan plan which is more subtle. Once the farmer's market has been destroyed, he will be completely dependent on his Government check for a living. The income he gets from the sale of his produce at the market place will be too small to live on. He will be so dependent on that Government check that he won't dare to argue with the Government official about the program or about his rights.

I can imagine one year they will pay him for producing. Perhaps the next year they will pay him for not producing. The third year maybe they will run out of money and not pay him at all. He wouldn't be in a position to argue or complain if he gets a raw deal. He will just be a pawn in a vast system of regimentation. He will have to do what the Government bureau tells him to do, regardless of how impractical it may be.

Take another example—the Federal housing program or programs, because there are so many that I can hardly keep them straight. Last year Congress passed a bill to subsidize housing for the low-income groups. The subsidy for this limited program alone will be vast and extremely burdensome. I can't tell you just how large the subsidy will be because it will spread over a 40- or 50-year period, divided between Federal, State and local governments and mixed up with tax exemptions and fancy financing.

This year we have up in Congress another bill which is supposed to take care of housing for the middle-income groups. It is another vast subsidy program, but it is not called that. The subsidies are cloaked under a system of low-interest-rate loans, tax exemptions and maturities running far beyond sound lending practices. I am certain that this program also, if enacted, will run into heavy expense to the taxpayer but no one can say just how much it will amount to. If this bill is enacted to go along with the public housing law of last year, we will then have the Federal Government in the field of both lower income and middle-income housing, and that makes up about two-thirds of the entire housing field.

Altogether, the Ewing proposal for socialized medical care, the Brannan plan for socialized agriculture, and the new program for socialized housing would put the real basic needs of the average man—food, shelter, and

health—on a substantially subsidized basis. And once you subsidize all these basic needs, you can control both their production and their use.

There is another road to socialism which our economic planners are also following, and that is the road of excessive spending and taxation. I mentioned the President's $42,000,000,000 budget. The taxes to support this program will not only break the back of American industry; they will also confiscate the surplus of the average workingman.

When we talk about destroying the incentive to produce, we mean the incentive of the average man on a salary or a wage just as much as the incentive of the businessman who is working for profit. In England today, a working man is not interested in overtime work even at time and a half. Too little of what he makes on that extra pay is left to him after the Government income tax. He has no hope of bettering himself by working an extra day or by trying for a job with better pay. He has resigned himself to a life of poverty.

The excessive concentration of power in Washington has been brought about to a material extent through these gigantic spending programs. The kind of budget that the President proposed is a long step on the road to socialism. We have to fight against excessive spending, just as we have to fight against direct regulations and controls from Washington.

And in that connection, I can't resist quoting another great American, Thomas Jefferson. Of course, the Democrats claim Jefferson and sometimes they hold celebrations in his honor, but they never quote him. They never quote him because they can't find anything he ever said that backs up what they are doing. On one occasion, Jefferson said: "I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest dangers to be feared. * * * To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. * * * If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. * * * If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

Thomas Jefferson was speaking of the New Dealers, Fair Dealers, demagogues of his day. Political demogogy is not a new invention. Jefferson knew about it and Lincoln had plenty of demagogues to deal with in his time. There have been plenty of men in every age who have promised that every problem would be taken care of if only they were given more and more power. Lincoln knew how to handle such men. He faced the issues boldly and courageously. He did not try to fool the people. Instead, he told them frankly what the problem was, how it could be handled and what he proposed to do about it if elected to office. He did not always win, but when he did win he was in a position to perform the supreme service for our country.

He knew two and two always make four—and he could give that moral a homely application that made it clear to the average man of his day. One story is told by a Mr. Roland Diller, one of his neighbors in Springfield, that illustrates his practical wisdom. Mr. Diller tells us that one day he heard the cries of children in the street. When he looked, he saw Lincoln striding by with two of his boys, both of them wailing at the top of their lungs. "Why, Mr. Lincoln, what's the matter with the boys?" Diller asked. "Just what's the matter with the whole world," Lincoln replied. "I've got three walnuts and each boy wants two."

That's what's the matter with so many of the New Deal and Fair Deal promises. They promise you a great deal more than they can perform. They tell you that they are going to give you this or that, but when the time comes to make good on the promises, they pay you off in 50-cent dollars.

Whenever any of us have criticized any of these peculiar New Deal and Fair Deal programs, it has been customary for them to call us all sorts of names, and say that we are reactionaries and against all progress. You know that is not true. Of course I believe in progress and I am willing to work for it and to fight for it in Congress and elsewhere. For example, most Republicans believe we should expand our present system of Government security until it provides real security, not phony security, to everyone. All of us are in favor of making real progress. We want to build up our land. We want to see the desert bloom. We want to see public improvements and we want to see the number of happy people increased day by day. That is not the real question we are arguing. The real point is, What kind of progress; and progress toward what? If we are going to progress toward a police state, I am against it. But if we are going to progress toward more production, more security, a fair distribution of the world's goods, better living for all, I am for it.

Can we make progress by wasting billions of dollars? Of course not. Can we make real progress by promising people more money for less work, something for nothing, when it is impossible to deliver on those promises? Of course not. Is it progress to pay off social-security obligations to our old people with a 50-cent dollar? Of course it isn't. If we are going to make real progress, we had better think about setting up a sound system that will really work. If you measure progress as I do—by the number of happy homes with well-fed, well-clothed children—you will agree that we have made very little progress under the New Deal and under the Fair Deal. When Lincoln spoke of progress, he did not mean a booby-trap type of progress that offers you a benefit with one hand and picks your tax pocket with the other.

There are plenty of other issues I would like to talk about but I haven't time for all of them. There is one that I want to mention particularly. It is one that Lincoln had to deal with, also. Abraham Lincoln believed in reserving the American market for the American producer. He is the real father of the Republican system of protective tariffs; the system under which America made more and faster progress than it ever has before or since.

Ever since 1934 when the Trade Agreements Act was first passed, the State Department has been promising us everything from peace to prosperity as a result of those trade agreements. We know that the trade agreements did not give us peace, and we have not achieved real peace even yet. As for prosperity, I don't think we will ever get that by importing goods and exporting jobs.

Before I came out here, I stopped to look up what had happened to some of the industries of Arizona as a result of this trade-agreements program. I can tell you that the facts I obtained really shocked me.

Arizona is a leading copper-producing State. The prosperity of the copper mines is highly important to the prosperity of Arizona. Under trade agreements negotiated by the State Department, your protective tax has been cut from 4 cents to 2 cents per pound and for a temporary period suspended entirely. As a result of that reduction, imports in 1948 for domestic consumption amounted to 466,000 tons of copper content. And for only the first 9 months of 1949, it amounted to 417,000 tons, an even faster rate of imports. That imported copper threw American miners out of jobs. American mine production has run about 100,000 tons less than it did last year, and about 300,000 tons less than it did during the peak war years.

The story on lead is about the same. The tariff on lead has been about cut in half. Lead imports for consumption last year amounted to 218,000 tons, and in the first 9 months of this year, ran over 223,000 tons. Before the war, there were no imports to speak of. Meanwhile our domestic production has been declining steadily. In 1937—which was not a terribly prosperous year—domestic mines produced 465,000 tons. In 1948 American production had fallen to only 390,000 tons. I don't know how many displaced jobs those imports represent. I am sure it is substantial.

Zinc is another good example. The tariff on zinc has been cut in half. Zinc imports before the war didn't amount to anything but in 1948 they were over 236,000 tons, and during the first 9 months of 1949 they were 167,000. Meanwhile American production of zinc ore in terms of zinc content was only 630,000 short tons last year, a decline of over 100,000 tons from the peak figure reached a few years ago. The trade-agreements policy has just simply exported to foreign countries the jobs of the miners who used to produce that 100,000 tons of zinc.

That is one of the most important problems we have to face. We are going to have to install a flexible import-tariff policy to replace the so-called reciprocal trade policy of the New Dealers, which is not reciprocal in the least. Under it, import rates have been reduced on more than 1,500 items and there has been not one single rate increased. Under it, factories have become idle and men have lost lifetime jobs. In some States the unemployment-insurance fund has been exhausted. Unless we change these socialized deals in Washington, there will be many million of idle men in America.

We Republicans have a terrific job to do. First of all, we will have to work and organize more effectively than we have ever done before. We will have to show the people where these policies are leading us. We will have to show how false the New Deal and the Fair Deal policies are. We will have to show how real progress can be made. We will have to organize effectively at the grass roots, at the precinct level, if we expect to win elections.

Lincoln had his election problems, too. After serving as a Congressman, he was defeated for reelection, and then in 1858 he was defeated again. During his Presidency, his wise, far-seeing policies were threatened time and time again by the dangers of a political overturn. Lincoln maintained a calm faith in the face of these obstacles. He did not give up his principles and he never stopped fighting. If we Republicans expect to carry on his tradition, we will have to be just as firm in our faith as he was.

Then when we come into power, we will have the biggest job of all. We will have to clear up the evil results of years and years of misrule. There are a lot of things we will have to do. First and foremost, we have got to put a stop to this movement in disguise toward socialism. That means we have got to stop spending ourselves into socialism. Modern Socialists figure on carrying us into socialism by one or the other of those two means. If they can tax private industry to death, they can make us all dependent on the Federal Government for jobs. Maybe that is what the President had in mind when he proposed a few days ago that the income-tax allowance for mineral depletion be taken away from the mining and oil companies.

Another thing we will have to do is to clean the administration out thoroughly of all the Red sympathisers and fellow travelers. I won't speak of Alger Hiss because even the administration now admits that he is a bad one. It would be impossible to say how much damage he did to our security on such occasions as the Yalta Conference. But, at least, he is out of the Government now. I am thinking more of those with the

same cast of mind as Hiss, who are still in the Government. It is an extraordinary thing when the Secretary of State, the man who holds the threads of peace and war in his hands, publicly announces his faith and sympathy in a convicted spy. It is still more extraordinary when it is the same man who has been telling us for months past that the best thing to do with China is to let the Communists have it. When the clean-up finally comes in Washington. I certainly hope it starts with the State Department.

There are a lot of other things we will have to do, too—too many for me to mention today. It will be a big job, but I believe we can do it if we all work together. In the meantime, the important thing is to go to work and elect Republicans to office.

We must give the people a definite choice between our system and the system of those who propose to overturn it. We must meet the danger boldly and firmly, not by compromise and half measures. We must know what we stand for and be unafraid in defending that stand. We have the best system in the world in this country, and we should have no hesitancy in saying so.

Lincoln fought for what he believed in. When the Republican Party has dared to fight, it has won. Lincoln said: "Let us have faith that right makes might; and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it." That was Lincoln's way. I hope it is still the way of the Republican Party.

Is This a Government Under Law or Is It a Government of Men?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, is this a government under law or is it a government of men? Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting the following article by David Lawrence, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 21, 1950:

GETTING MINERS TO WORK IS CALLED RESPONSIBILITY OF TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION, NOT COURTS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 21.—This week has witnessed a serious break-down of democracy—a sacrifice of the prestige of the Government itself on the altar of political expediency and group selfishness.

The failure of the coal miners to obey the Federal Court injunction is not just an incident in a labor dispute. It has nothing to do with the merits of any wage or labor controversy as such. It has everything to do with the fact that tens of thousands of American citizens have decided to disobey their Government's judicial decrees.

This amounts to open insurrection. The only saving grace about it is that the rank and file of the miners probably do not know that they cannot lawfully defy an injunction. They do not know that they cannot even hold a union meeting and vote to refrain from work when there is a court order telling the union not to exercise such influence.

SITUATION MISCONSTRUED

The union leaders, on the other hand, have counsel. They have education. They know what it means to ignore a court order as a group. It is amazing, moreover, to note how many persons of education outside the coal industry have also misconstrued the situation, weekly commenting that there is nothing anybody can do to get coal mined—that no injunction can get the coal mined.

This is tantamount to saying that an insurrection in the United States cannot be coped with by the Government itself and that the majesty of the judicial authority has vanished. The idea that the right to strike in concert as a union is inviolate and supersedes the rights of a court of the United States is one that has been mistakenly nurtured for a long time by the radical groups in America. The present administration is culpable because it has sabotaged both the spirit and the letter of the present labor-management law through a prolonged period of inaction.

Today the Nation is suffering a tremendous economic loss apart from the inconvenience arising from the shortage of coal. The Truman administration refused to apply for an injunction until the crisis reached a danger point. Now, in the face of determined opposition by rebels against judicial authority, the administration is content with the filing of a contempt charge against the union and a 4-day lapse before any hearing is held on the charges.

All last week the court's order was flouted. No contempt charges were filed. The evidence was published in the press. The miners held meetings and, in effect, voted to violate the injunction. News of these acts has been broadcast. Judicial notice apparently could not be taken of such violations until the Department of Justice was ready to present evidence to the court. Had an act of contempt been committed before the court, the judge would have been empowered to act immediately, but, since the incidents occur far and wide, it is necessary for the evidence to be presented by the Department of Justice as petitioner.

WASTE OF TIME SEEN

Seemingly the refusal of the miners to go back to work and the apparent unwillingness of the locals to obey the instructions given them by the miners' chief officer were not adequate to impress the administration here that quicker action could be taken. As a consequence of this slowness, more time is wasted and more economic loss is inflicted.

Judge Keech, before whom the contempt charges will be tried, is a former executive assistant to President Truman but there is no indication that he is to blame.

The responsibility for pressing the court to act on the contempt charges and to mete out fines or other punishment to those violating the injunction rests squarely on the administration rather than the court.

What's Wrong With the American Lawyer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject, What's Wrong With the American Lawyer, delivered by Luther L. Hill, publisher of the Des Moines Register Tribune, before the Harvard Law School Forum, at Cambridge, Mass., on February 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Dean Griswold, members of the faculty, students of the law, and friends, when your program chairman asked me to be with you tonight, I, frankly, was pleased. "The halls of history," it is said, "are constantly filled with the sound of wooden shoes going up the stairs and patent leather ones coming down." Your law school and its graduates are a refreshing exception to that observation. Perhaps because here is practiced the admonition of "that which thy fathers hath bequeathed to thee, thou must earn again, if thou wouldst possess it."

The title "What's Wrong With the American Lawyer" has a belligerent ring and reminds me of my friend Pat Murphy who was very sick and the padre was sent for. The padre, looking down at Pat, said, "You are a very sick man, you may not be with us much longer, you must at once embrace the Lord and renounce the devil." Pat looked up at the padre and said, "As sick as I am and the life I have led, I am in no position to renounce anyone." So let's change a few words and say the subject is A Layman Looks at the Lawyer.

Speaking with you in this historic building of rare grace and dignity, I cannot but reflect that except for the untimely interference of a certain William Hohenzollern, one time King of Prussia and Emperor of Germany, I would be a member of your chosen profession.

Yet, I have not lived isolated from the atmosphere of the law. My brother, three uncles, one of whom is a graduate of your law school, and innumerable first cousins are lawyers—not to mention a hostage to the future—my son. From all these, I gather that the law is a jealous mistress and demands your close attention. The potency of your reputation was brought home to me when I mentioned to a friend about being here tonight and he said, "You are like the chap who entered a mule in the Kentucky Derby—he knew he couldn't win but thought he would benefit by the association."

As members of the legal profession, you profess to have acquired special knowledge to be used by way of either instructing, guiding, or advising others in a way that promotes their interest or happiness. For perspective, let me say there are 180,000 lawyers in this country compared with 22,000 architects; 78,000 authors, editors, and reporters; 140,000 clergymen; 76,000 college presidents, professors, and instructors; 71,000 dentists; 152,000 doctors; 100,000 civil engineers; 1,100,000 teachers; 5,300,000 farmers; and 250,000 insurance agents and brokers.

There are two aspects in which I wish to consider the 180,000 lawyers. First, as professional men, qualified to advise and act for private clients in regard to their legal affairs. The other as citizens learned in the laws of the land, familiar with the Government of the country, and peculiarly competent to assist in the conduct of the community and the State.

As to the first aspect, I say that today the lawyer's place in trade, in finance, in business affairs, is unique—stronger and more entrenched than ever before. The whole fabric of the business world is permeated by the law—the lawyer's influence is far greater than other serving professions: engineers, economists, statisticians, analysts, accountants, advertising, public-relation experts, etc. In short, if the businessman sometimes finds it difficult to live with the lawyer, he finds it impossible to live without him.

This strategic position now occupied by the lawyer is due primarily to the growth and the presence of the corporate era, together with the legal and political conditions arising therefrom. The sprawl of Government

controls, perhaps as an inevitable result of the problems so created, over most fields of business activity has enormously increased the need for legal services. One businessman expressed his feelings by saying that "what started as a government of laws not of men, has ended as a government of lawyers and not of men."

What do I, as an individual or as an officer of a corporation, expect of my lawyer? I agree with George Shattuck, law partner of Oliver Wendell Holmes, "the business of a lawyer is to know law,"—he must keep abreast of changes. In other words, be prepared and that means constant study. Now, I realize that to ask for unqualified opinions on most legal problems is absurd. Mr. Justice Brandeis aptly described the lawyer's position thusly: "I can tell you where the edge of the cliff is, but I cannot tell you how hard or in what direction the wind will be blowing when you pass it."

Second, my lawyer must study and know not only the law but be equipped to advise and counsel with me on economics, politics, and the related social sciences. I ask him to adjust law to life. To remember and to remind me that we are dealing with human beings, and not just things.

I want advice before wrong action is taken and thus prevent trouble. I ask him to accept the responsibility of seeing that his client is legally fit and well. Legal planning is essential to a successful business operation.

I need to feel that confidential information may be given him without any fear of disclosure.

I ask for the skill in negotiations which comes from an innate sense of fairness and honesty combined with the will to win.

Yes; the law is referred to as the calling of thinkers. I believe that the specifications of my lawyer are in keeping with that definition and I trust you would not have it otherwise. Parenthetically, may I say that our general counsel, a graduate of your school, fully meets, in my judgment, every requisite I have just enumerated.

Let us now observe the lawyer in a broader sense as a specially equipped citizen. We are privileged to live in one of the decisive periods of history. Our country urgently needs the services which you are being prepared to give. Such a role is your heritage.

The judgment of history as of today says America was a colony—not her own master. Under the leadership of lawyers we became free, have grown, prospered, and, better still, preserved freedom and opportunity, the like of which the world has never before seen. It is unnecessary to tell of the faith this Nation has placed in her lawyers—as, for instance, the one simple fact that for the 160 years of selection of their Presidents the people of the United States have chosen a lawyer three times out of four. Approximately 1 person out of 800 of our population is a lawyer, yet this small minority has held, roughly, 70 percent of the positions of Government trust and authority.

No tradition of your profession is more cherished than that of leadership in public affairs. As Fowler Hamilton recently wrote, "The political traditions and the gifts for government that have enabled the United States to maintain dynamic balance find expression in laws and the task of reconciling the concentration of business power and labor power with our characteristic democratic dispersal of political power can be performed only by the legal processes, of which the lawyer is an essential part"; and, I might add, the most essential part.

The great figures of the law inspire our reverence, as they have used their special gifts for the advancement of public interest. Yet, candor would force the admission that today the bar does not occupy its traditional position of public influence and leadership. The changes have come by almost imperceptible stages and are only now beginning to be recognized. I mention these changes, not to condemn, but to describe. The changed character of the lawyer's work has made it difficult for him to see himself and his profession in proper perspective. No longer does his list of clients represent a cross-section of society. The demands of practice are more exacting. He is more a man of action and less a student of history and government. Big business, big labor, and big government have produced inevitable specializations of the bar. The successful lawyer is today very often the general manager of a mass production factory of legal products.

More and more the amount of his income is a measure of his professional success. These conditions have given us a bar whose leaders, like its rank and file, are on the whole, less likely to be well rounded professional men than their predecessors. The energy and talent for public service and for bringing the law into harmony with present conditions have been largely absorbed in the advancement of the interests of clients. The changed system has, at best, given the commercial world a superior proficiency and technical skill, but at its worst, it has made the learned legal profession the servant of the market place and tainted it with like morals and manners. I am not unaware that criticism of lawyers and law administration is no new thing. Much of it is merely a reflection of dissatisfaction with the prevailing political and social order.

To me, as a layman, the license which you will obtain to practice law is not a right, but a privilege to be granted, or withheld, or withdrawn by the court. The bar has been properly called a "democratic aristocracy," democratic in that its ranks are open to all who meet the requirements prescribed by law and aristocratic in the true sense, being a body of selected citizens qualified by learning and character to advise upon the laws of the land.

What are the standards which a layman has a right to expect of you as citizen lawyers?

1. The making of money shall be secondary. It must not be the sole standard of success or measure of service rendered. Here I would like to interpose and say, as a businessman, that lawyers, as a group are poorly paid, mind you, I did not say underpaid. According to available figures for the year 1948, the median income for all lawyers was $6,336.

2. Your sense of public service shall be at least equal to that of a minister or a doctor. The lawyer must be conscious of a feeling of trusteeship for he is a necessary part of the State's function of administering justice—in the part he plays, he is just as essential as the judge.

3. The practice of law represents the applied science of law just as medicine represents the applied sense of biology and chemistry.

Thus, set apart as a profession, you must practice your legal ethics which limit, yet uplift your means of livelihood. This philosophy of conduct is something that a lawyer must practice in his day-to-day dealings with his individual clients and the public.

What does a representative cross section of men and women think about the legal profession? Through the research department of the Register & Tribune Co. of Des Moines, using the accepted techniques of public opinion research, I can give you some of the answers from the people of Iowa. For the benefit of those not so fortunate as to live in Iowa or to be familiar with it, may I say that the State ranks in the top 5 percent of all the States in literacy and that its economy is evenly balanced between agriculture and industry. In Iowa we have a thrifty, homogeneous population with a high general level of well-being. You may be skeptical of such a survey. I don't claim it is 100 percent or 95 percent accurate, but the pattern is there.

One of the questions which the trained interviewers asked was: "Which one of the following do you regard as the most important in protecting your personal rights—the President of the United States—the courts—Congress. Forty-seven percent said the courts, 25 percent said all three equally, 17 percent Congress, 5 percent the President, and 6 percent had no opinion.

Have you ever hired a lawyer to handle something for you? Forty-nine percent said "Yes" and 51 percent replied "No."

Incidentally, one out of five believed they were charged too much for the legal services they obtained.

If you had a legal claim for damages, do you think you would settle out of court for one-half or less of what you felt you had coming to you rather than go into court and maybe recover the full amount? Forty-three percent would settle for one-half or less, 34 percent would go to court, and 23 percent were undecided.

A great many of our Senators, Congressmen, legislators, and other elected governmental officials are lawyers. In general, do you think having lawyers elected to these offices has been good or bad for our country? A strong majority considered that this had been a good thing for the country. It is interesting to note that the favorable majority is stronger among women than it is among men.

How does the public rate your profession along with other professions and businesses? The research people took a list of seven groups: doctors, bankers, teachers, businessmen, lawyers, farmers, and dentists. The list was presented in alphabetical order and the question was asked which group the people thought did the best job of leading and participating in worth while community affairs. The businessmen were at the head of the list; teachers second; farmers third; bankers fourth; doctors fifth; lawyers sixth; with dentists bringing up the rear.

What do our people consider the best life work for their sons if they plan to go to college? Engineering was at the head of the list, which is not surprising, since this is widely publicized as a scientific age. There is food for thought in the fact that over seven times as many named engineering as the legal profession and over four times as many thought young men going to college would do better by preparing for the medical profession than the law. Twice as many named business, and the teaching profession came in a little ahead of the legal profession. Only dentistry and ministry trailed the number naming the profession of law.

The question was asked, which one of six groups they trusted the most. The medical profession headed the list, bankers were second, teachers third, businessmen fourth, lawyers fifth, and dentists at the bottom.

I know that neither you nor I are satisfied with these answers. One may not simply shrug his shoulders or easily explain away the results of this survey. For the moment, I am not concerned with the truth or falsity of the beliefs. I am concerned with the fact that the beliefs exist. If the beliefs continue to exist even though they be false, you and I will see action predicated upon them. For that reason, it is vital to the future of the legal profession that it have available to its use the facts concerning the profession and its services to the public and that it tell its story clearly and understandably.

I offer one simple suggestion; there would be greater trust if the public knew that the unworthy member of the profession was promptly and effectively punished. The public may very likely believe that the unpunished practices of the few are condoned by the many. The dishonesty of Samuel Insull was harmful to the whole private utilities industry. So may the conduct of a few lawyers injure the public confidence of the

entire profession. The bar should itself be the first line of defense against sharp or dishonest practice. This distrust can be remedied. To do it is your job. To accomplish it will be a great public service of which you will be the direct beneficiary.

May I suggest that one function of the organized bar should pertain to the selection of judges? For example, in the selection of municipal judges in my city of Des Moines there were 11 candidates, of whom 8 were to be nominated and 4 ultimately to be elected. The average voter had no knowledge or ready means of knowledge as to their training, ability, or desirability for a position where liberty, property, and reputation are directly involved. It seems to me the bar should know who is or is not qualified. Does not the organized bar, directly related as it is to the administration of justice, have an obligation to give the public the benefit of its appraisal? Naturally, the weight of the bar's recommendation will be in direct ratio to the voters' confidence in the organized bar and their belief that such recommendations are entitled to respect as being solely in the public interest.

Listen to these words of the Honorable Learned Hand: "The profession of the law has its fate in its own hands; it may continue to represent a larger, more varied social will by broader, more comprehensive interpretation. The change must come from within. The profession must satisfy its community by becoming itself satisfied with the community. It must assimilate society before society will assimilate it: it must become organic to remain a living organ. The lawyer must learn to live more capaciously or become content to find himself continuously less trusted, more circumscribed until he becomes hardly more important than a minor administrator, confined to a monotonous round of record and routine, without dignity, inspiration, or respect. There can be no ambiguity in the answer of those who are worthy of the traditions and the power of a noble calling."

Gentlemen, one thing more: Our Nation began as a brave experiment based on the conception of the rights and dignity of the individual. Today an imperialistic, totalitarian state, under the rule of atheistic communism, seeks to destroy the hard-won freedom of man. We want, above all else, to hold on to freedom in our half of the world, at least.

In America, through the expansion of suffrage, the enormous increase in popular education and the perfection of techniques of modern mass communications, unprecedented power is today in the hands of the plain people. So really, the future of freedom is in the custody of the ordinary man. Therefore, the man in the street must know, as you do, the full connotations of the phrase "constitutional guarantees"—he must know that only in a government by law—not men—are these guarantees safe, and their maintenance depends on the independence and integrity of the court. Yes, let every American realize the writ of habeas corpus in his defense against a concentration camp.

Our people must be aware of the requisites of popular rule and stable self-government—they must understand how justice is administered and the importance of maintaining law and order.

Yet, even assuming these things were all understood, then I say knowledge alone is not sufficient. Free men must learn and practice self-discipline or freedom cannot be preserved even in an educated United States. The present world conflict is essentially a struggle of fundamentally opposed social disciplines. The discipline of the totalitarian is forced, regimented, ruthless, and built on fear. Ours is self-imposed and is built on hope and aspiration—on the promise of greater happiness and well-being. Freedom is secure only when it marches hand in hand with responsibility and again I repeat, self-discipline.

I ask you, the straight-thinking lawyer, to take the lead. Our case, our future, must rest upon the foundation of justice and you have decided to enter into the priesthood of justice. If you accept the challenge of leadership, you shall find in your work great and rewarding satisfaction.

Resolution of the Executive Committee of Young Republican League of Minnesota Opposing Construction of the Hydrogen Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Young Republican League of Minnesota, on January 29, 1950. I feel that the resolution adopted by the Young Republican League of Minnesota is not only thought provoking, but most timely.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE YOUNG REPUBLICAN LEAGUE OF MINNESOTA, JANUARY 29, 1950

There was a time not many months ago when it could be argued that any attempt to compromise with the Russians would be interpreted as a sign of weakness on our part. Many of us could not see that the risk of a cold war was as great as the risk of a partnership with tyranny.

Nothing has occurred to alter our opinion of the Russians. They are today as dangerous, as enigmatic, and as antidemocratic as they were a year ago. Their system of government and their system of economics are equally incompatible with our own.

But the risk of the cold war has multiplied itself beyond belief and almost beyond comprehension. Somehow or other, we must put a stop to it—must welcome or wheedle or bully the Soviets into the society of free nations. Hateful or not, we must work out a way of living with them, or face the alternative of universal suicide.

The reason is the hydrogen bomb. The uranium and plutonium bombs dropped in Japan were primitive little gadgets equivalent to only 20,000 tons of TNT and with a destructive radius of only 2 or 3 miles. There was a merciful limit to their size. Above the critical mass these bombs fizzle and are scarcely more lethal than an earthquake.

But the hydrogen bomb now contemplated by our Government, and by the Russians, is something else. It suffers from no limitations. It threatens not only our big cities but the earth itself. The first one would be a thousand times as powerful as the atomic bomb; the last might blow the earth out of its orbit.

It must not be built. Not by us, not by them, not by anyone else during this generation or ever in the future. There is no possible justification for its existence. It is totally and solely an instrument of destruction. Unlike the uranium bomb, it could not be used for the peacetime production of energy. It is fiery death and Armageddon.

If the democracies cannot now avoid the building of the bomb for fear of Russia, it is criminally naive to assume that we can build it, let the Russians build it, and then prevent it from being used. When, and by whom, matters hardly at all. When the first hydrogen bomb is dropped civilization will have ended.

President Truman is considering a final authorization to the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with the development of the hydrogen bomb. David Lilienthal's resignation as head of the Commission was intended as a protest against any move toward the fatal decision before all possible negotiations with the Russians had been exhausted.

There still remains some hope that Russia may agree to UN control of atomic energy. Although the U. S. S. R. has rejected the Baruch plan for unlimited inspection of atomic plants, Vishinsky has submitted a plan for limited plant inspection, which, with all its weaknesses, would open a door in the iron curtain. If it did not break down, such a plan would lead eventually, we believe, to the development of a plan of fool-proof inspection. At the moment, the only alternative to the acceptance of a limited inspection plan is the development of the hydrogen bomb.

The choice should not be hard to make. There will be no hope for a world dominated by the hydrogen bomb. The Russians may someday be brought to see reason; the bomb will never be tamed. Once this monstrous power has been unleased, the problem of maintaining our democratic institutions against the Communist threat will disappear into thin air and we along with it: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Young Republican League of Minnesota opposes the construction of the hydrogen bomb until all possible means of international control of atomic energy through cooperation with the U. S. S. R. have been exhausted and that we specifically recommend consideration of the proposal made in the United Nations for limited inspection of atomic plants in the belief that such a plan would lead eventually to a foolproof unlimited inspection plan. Acceptance of such a plan would hinge upon the inclusion of adequate safeguards and would allow construction of the hydrogen bomb only in the event that such an inspection plan should fail to prove effective.

Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Washington Post of February 18, 1950, published a very thoughtful editorial setting forth the next logical step in our foreign policy. I hope the State Department will consider further the desirability of this proposal. In any event, Congress is demanding and the people are expecting the Department of State to move on from the present sit-tight program.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTIC UNION

To give men's thoughts a direction is the highest mark of statesmanship. If the new direction points to closer ties for living and working together in amity, then the statesman is insuring his immortal soul. Moreover, such a direction inspires a drive in behalf of the good and the true which otherwise would remain potential. On this subject we have in the past quoted the great nineteenth century historian, Lord Acton. Lord Acton out of his erudition and wisdom observed that "the pursuit of a remote and ideal object which captivates the imagination by its splendor and the reason by its simplicity evokes an energy which would not be inspired by a rational, possible end, limited by many antagonistic claims, and confined to what is reasonable, practicable, and just." This is the reason we have backed the resolution calling for a convention of the free world to discuss a union of the Atlantic community.

Now the State Department, playing Mr. Obstinate to this Pilgrim's Progress, thinks the pilgrimage is a will-o'-the-wisp. As the administrative unit of our foreign affairs, perhaps this was inevitable, though a better attitude might have been one of neutrality. It is hardly wise to include the illusion of the brotherhood of man in the current slaughter of illusions. The opposition, the Department may be sure, will be no deterrent to this growing movement, nor to the friendliness exhibited toward it by so many of the legislators. Since the H-bomb decision, Members of Congress have been searching for a parallel line to pursue along with that of what may at any time be a provocative and a frightening line of militarization. The line on which the State Department was asked to comment has as its goal freedom and union. Surely that is the hope of the world.

Even the President shares the vision that the (more or less) world government or federation advocates are working to achieve. At any rate, on June 28, 1945, he said, "I am anxious to bring it home to you that the world is no longer county size, no longer State size, no longer Nation size—it is one world, as Willkie said. It is a world in which we must all get along. And it is my opinion that this great Republic ought to lead the way. It will be just as easy for nations to get along in a republic of the world as it is for you to get along in the Republic of the United States."

The way is more difficult than the President then seemed to envisage—a way that he seems himself to think is too full of road blocks to venture further. But some of the road blocks are imaginary. For instance, there seems to be an idea that if there were a union, Europeans would throng their ports immediately and make for America. Not the slightest reason exists for this fear. Are any of the immigration quotas, except that of Italy, filled? Not at all. A State Department spokesman objected that few Americans would allow foreigners to outnumber them in a union parliament. This was a misstatement of the aims of the union movement. The fields of activity of an over-all body would be as limited as the constituents cared to make it, and the voting could be weighted—and might well be—instead of numerical.

However, the advocates of one form or other of union would welcome the ventilation of real as well as imaginary difficulties. That is the reason for this resolution. It simply calls for a convention. Such a convention would clearly put men's thoughts in the direction of ways and means of living together better, and togetherness is the only means of survival. Presumably the convention would dissolve into working committees which would seek agreement on details for further discussion. The process itself would be of great service in furthering existing American policy of cooperation, as, for instance, in making the Atlantic Pact a reality. In sum: The unionists have a goal, and they serve a purpose to the rest of us in showing us the end of the route toward which we are, presumably, walking. The trouble is that time is not on the side of the pedestrian.

Coal: The Eleventh Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of February 22 which concludes with this significant sentence:

If the administration is not now convinced of the necessity for such a course (namely, more adequate law than is now available for the protection of the public in the current coal crisis) the Congress should and, in our opinion, must shoulder that responsibility without further delay.

Senate bill 2912, to make what John L. Lewis has done in denying coal to the consuming public subject to the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act, is my answer to the responsibility of Congress in the premises. Hearings on that bill are now being conducted by a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COAL: THE ELEVENTH HOUR

President Truman issued an Executive order on February 6 which set in motion the machinery provided in the emergency sections of the Taft-Hartley Act. Theoretically, this offered two approaches to the problem of restoring normal coal production. First, it provided for the enforced resumption of negotiations between Mr. Lewis and the coal operators; second, it paved the way for the issuance of an injunction which would compel the miners either to return to work or face penalties for contempt of court.

A Presidential fact-finding board named under this same machinery reported to the White House on February 11. In this report it said:

The Bureau of Mines reported to this board of inquiry on February 9 that over-all stocks (of coal) have declined to approximately 22,100,000 tons. Based on an estimated daily consumption of 1,385,000 tons, this represents a 16-day supply in the hands of consumers.

Twelve of those sixteen days have now passed. Meanwhile, on the evidence available to date, the two approaches opened up by the President's reluctant invocation of the Labor-Management Act have proved for all practical purposes dead end roads. Cyrus S. Ching, Director of the Federal Mediation Service, who has been sitting in on the so-called negotiations between Mr. Lewis and the operators, says he can see no signs of progress in that direction. Meanwhile, not only have the miners flouted the Government's court order directing them to return to work, but they have indicated a similarly defiant attitude toward a citation by Federal Judge Keech for contempt of court.

In theory, the stalemate on either or both of these fronts could be broken any day and at any hour. In theory, Mr. Lewis, who was reported yesterday to be "jaunty and unconcerned" and "smiling broadly" at the way things were going, could suddenly abandon his 9-month-old strategy and agree to a reasonable settlement of the contract dispute. And, in theory, the rebellious mood of the miners could miraculously disappear overnight. But the time for dealing with the coal emergency in terms of theory and wishful thinking has passed. There is little, if any, reason to believe that we are moving toward a solution along either of the two routes now being followed. But even if there were a reasonable basis for hope in these directions, the country is no longer in a position to proceed on such an assumption. We are now at the point where, if we are to guard against a national catastrophe, we must assume the worst—namely, that both negotiations and the injunction process have failed. If the administration is not now convinced of the necessity for such a course, then Congress should, and, in our opinion, must shoulder that responsibility without further delay.

Cooperative Action Against Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on previous occasions in the Senate I have pointed out the critical problem of water pollution existing throughout our Nation. I have pointed out the tremendous interest of the conservationists of Wisconsin—members of the Isaak Walton League and other fine conservation groups—in preserving our water heritage clean and unpolluted.

As an aid, I personally have introduced legislation providing for rapid tax depreciation benefits to industries developing waste treatment facilities. In the House of Representatives there is companion legislation for this objective.

So far the action that Congress has been taking is in the too-little-and-too-late category, but I trust that even at this late hour, while the waters of Wisconsin and of Ohio and of New York are becoming increasingly befouled and diseased, we in the Congress will help conservation organizations, municipalities, States, and private industries working on this tremendous challenge.

In the February 1 issue of the Conservation News published by the National Wild Life Federation here in Washington there is a fine write-up of the efforts of the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board which was set up in accordance with the act which we passed. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement, as published by Mr. Carl D. Schoemaker, the able Washington correspondent of the federation, be printed in

the RECORD. I know that his comments will be of deep interest to Waltonians and other conservationists in my own State and elsewhere.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD TAKES ACTION

There are not many problems facing the American people that are more important and vital to their health and well-being than those which center in cleaning up the pollution, both domestic and industrial, which is hourly dumped into our rivers and lakes, the National Wildlife Federation reminds us. Increasing populations, the creation of new and the expansion of old industries, aggravate the nuisance and add to the burdens of solution. People must have clean water to use and drink. Industry likewise penalizes itself when the waters so essential to its working are loaded with filth. It requires a crisis or an epidemic to bring home the urgent need for action.

The Ohio River watershed or drainage basin covers the whole or parts of 14 States. A tip of southwestern New York, the western third of Pennsylvania, the whole of West Virginia, the southwestern portion of Virginia, nearly all of Indiana and Kentucky, about three-fourths of Ohio, and the eastern fringe of Illinois are embraced in the area, and total 154,850 square miles. Pittsburgh, Wheeling, Columbus, Cincinnati, Louisville, Indianapolis, and some 1,100 other cities and towns drain their sewage and waste, either directly or indirectly, into the Ohio River. North Carolina, Tennessee, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, likewise, in lesser degree make use of the Ohio for drainage purposes.

It was at the turn of this century that the people of Ohio began to notice a change in the great river that bears its name. They were conscious of a stench that reached them from the deposits of pollution coming from as far upstream as Pittsburgh and augmented by the rapidly growing industrial communities in West Virginia, Kentucky, and Ohio itself. These people, who were looking ahead, decided to take the matter to their State officials. Contrary to their expectations the State in 1908 declared that no Ohio River city need install sewage treatment facilities until the communities on the banks of the river in other States did likewise. Here was the germ of an interstate compact. Nothing, however, was done about it until 20 years later when the States mentioned above entered into an informal agreement to control taste-producing phenol discharges coming from coke plants.

The droughts of 1930 and 1934 made it extremely difficult to produce safe drinking water from the polluted streams in the area. The Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce screamed its protests just as New York City is now battling the means to increase its safe water supply. In 1936 the United States Congress passed an enabling act which gave permission to the Ohio River States to enter into a compact or agreement to fight this menace to the health and prosperity of their people. This act of Congress was merely the push button that started the campaign. It took another 12 years to get the States—eight of them were needed—to sign on the dotted line. On June 30, 1948, at a gala ceremonial the compact became effective and plans were immediately set in motion to tackle the job and clean up the rubbish in the waters. There are well over 16,000,000 people within the watershed of these eight States which have signed the agreement, officially known as the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission. Each State contributes a share of the annual budget in proportion to its area and population in the basin. Joseph L. Quinn, of Terre Haute, Ind., is chairman of the board which is made up of three members from each State appointed by the Governor. Edward J. Clearly, of Cincinnati, is executive director and chief engineer.

THE TAFT-BARKLEY ACT

On the same day that the Ohio River compact was signed, President Truman affixed his signature to the Taft-Barkley Water Pollution Control Act which brought to a successful conclusion the long and bitter fight in Congress for a measure of Federal control over the increasing horrors of pollution. The act provides for the establishment of a Water Pollution Control Advisory Board upon which are representatives of the interested Federal agencies and others who represent industry, States, and municipalities, and wildlife.

This board last month held its quarterly meeting in Cincinnati and for 1 day met in joint session with the Ohio River Valley Commission. It was brought out with remarkable clearness that the main burden, as well as the responsibility for water pollution control, belongs to the States, their cities and towns and their private industry. The part that the Federal Government plays is to give a large measure of assistance and encouragement to local governments and their industries. The Water Pollution Control Advisory Board is required to develop comprehensive plans covering all the major watersheds in the Nation. This board did not get under way until over a year after the law was passed—Congress did not provide appropriations—but since it did get the green light, it has moved fast and much has been accomplished to cover the preliminary phases which are so essential to later smooth working of the machinery. Ten regional offices have been set up and staffed with sanitary engineers and water biologists; $800,375 have been approved as grants to the States for industrial waste studies; $67,508 have been allocated for special studies such as citrus wastes, treating wool-scouring wastes, the effect of industrial wastes, including paper and pulp mills, on aquatic life and the treatment of wastes from beet-sugar refineries and intensive research into State sanitary laws for pollution control. There is room for much improvement in this latter category.

NO LOAN MONEY IN BUDGET

While the Taft-Barkley Act authorizes $22,500,000 annually for 5 years for loans to municipalities for construction of treatment plants, no money for this purpose was appropriated last year and the President's budget sent to Congress early last month carries no recommendation for such loans.

The law further provides that such loans shall not exceed $250,000, or one-third of the construction cost, whichever is the lesser amount. Assuming that the maximum loan would be made to every applicant, the $22,500,000 authorized by Congress would be available only to 90 communities in the United States. New treatment plants, expansion of present facilities or replacement of obsolete equipment to the number of 13,952 are required throughout the Nation, according to an official survey made in 1948. Should all these take the maximum loan, it would take appropriations totalling $3,487,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury to do the job. To depend upon the Federal loan feature of this bill would prolong the day when such treatment works would be installed throughout the country. For instance, one Congressman says that in his small district there are eight towns which want immediate loans. There are 435 congressional districts in the United States. Inasmuch as these are loans and not grants, the amount involved must be repaid to the United States. Therefore, it seems to be a better philosophy for the municipalities to finance these plants through bond issues sold to private financing concerns.

The present plight of New York City, through its shortage of water and the need for extensive increases in the supply, has brought forth the suggestion that the waters of the Hudson River be used for this purpose. These waters are, of course, thoroughly polluted, unfit for drinking, unfit for recreational use. Pumping the waters from the river into the present reservoirs or into newly constructed ones would call for treatment before it could be used domestically. Senator LEHMAN, who only recently took his seat in the United States Senate from New York, introduced Senate bill 2823 2 weeks ago. This bill seeks to liberalize the loan provisions of the Water Pollution Control Act. He wants to increase the annual authorization from $22,500,000 to $50,000,000 a year. Furthermore, he seeks to raise the amount that may be loaned for any one project from $250,000 to $5,000,000. This bill is aimed directly to aid and assist New York in its water crisis. Should it pass and the limits raised as proposed, and assuming that other large cities would want to avail themselves of the loan feature, only 10 such projects could be undertaken each year. The Water Pollution Board, at its Cincinnati meeting, reaffirmed its position that States, municipalities, and private industry accelerate their respective efforts at once and provide the needed revenues from their own resources. This matter of financing these local activities for pollution control should be under such terms and conditions as will encourage private investors to extend private credit and money into this field.

The Board recommended to the Surgeon General the establishment of a National Technical Task Committee on Industrial Waste. The proposal was made by L. F. Warrick, a senior sanitary engineer for the State of Wisconsin. The proposal calls for a committee to be composed of industry's representatives of 150 to 200 of the best minds in the country. Its functions would include inventorying, appraising, coordinating, and promoting research and development work on treatment and control of industrial wastes; stimulating close working relations on technical phases with industry and Federal, State, and local governmental agencies; and would aid in the establishment of Federal grants-in-aid for industrial-waste problems in water-pollution control where major needs exist.

The Board tentatively agreed to holding three more meetings this year, one on the west coast, one at Boston to study the extremely hazardous pollution problem in the Merrimack River Valley, and another in Washington, D. C.

Relations of the United States With International Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Where the 'One World' Effort Runs a Little Wild," by Arthur Krock, which appeared in the New York Times of February 21, 1950.

This article is a summary and analysis of Senate Report 1274, prepared by the Subcommittee on Relations With International Organizations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which it is my privilege to be chairman. Because it deals with the tremendous rise in this Government's international-organization expenditures during the past fiscal year and emphasizes the need for economy and efficiency in this important field, I feel that the Members of this body will be interested in examining it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—WHERE THE ONE WORLD EFFORT RUNS A LITTLE WILD

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 20.—A Senate subcommittee, dealing with the costs of executive departments, has made some recommendations which appear to possess the rare virtue of pointing the way to lower costs and greater efficiency in government. This virtue the reports of the Hoover Commission revealed on a much larger scale, but the Senate document was dealing only with the expense of United States participation in international organizations.

The subcommittee chairman is HERBERT R. O'CONOR, of Maryland, with Eli E. Nobleman as counsel, and these were in charge of the survey. Its stated purpose was to examine "United States policy with respect to the Government's relation with international organizations * * * to determine the extent of the benefits which accrue * * * the need for careful analysis of any increased participation, the advisability of continued membership * * * and the possibility of reducing the financial burdens." In the fiscal year, which ended June 30, 1949, these burdens amounted to $144,600,000 plus.

SOME STATISTICS

Of this sum the Government contributed about $129,000,000 to permanent and temporary world organizations, spent above $3,300,000 on missions and other conferences, advanced $11,500,000 to the United Nations toward its $65,000,000 building loan and otherwise disposed of the remainder. In fiscal 1948 the total was about $127,500,000.

Of the 1949 amount, the bulk, $104,100,000, was expended on emergency agencies and projects—$70,600,000 to the International Refugee Organization, $25,500,000 to the United Nations' children's emergency fund and $8,000,000 to the Palestine-Arab refugee relief fund of the United Nations. The money was spent in connection with 258 conferences involving about 6,000 meetings, 8,000 documents printed in five languages, and travel over the spaces between New York and Shanghai.

THE EAGLE'S SHARE

The subcommittee found that the average United States contribution to the cost of all these activities was 47.2 percent, ranging from 2 percent to 70 percent, and from $50 per year per organization to $70,000,000. It found also that these contributions are higher to postwar than to prewar organizations and highest to inter-American agencies, where membership is limited and disparities in financial capacity are greatest.

The Senators and their counsel also discovered a lack of coordination among Government agencies and departments represented in this international field serious enough to suggest waste and duplication that may impair the effective presentation of this Government's policies and position in the conferences and meetings on global subjects. Thirty-three interdepartmental committees have been set up, dealing with politics, economics, health, labor, education, transportation, communication, and finance. But, said the report, they are not properly coordinated.

Since February 1948, however, the report noted, the State Department has headed off the creation of 10 new agencies—5 in new world-wide organizations and 5 in the pan-American area. Proposed were a study of conservation, a control committee of the issuance of identity cards to foreign correspondents, an irrigation and high-dams committee, an international rice organization, and a court of honor to deal with cases involving journalists and foreign correspondents. On the other hand the Department is supporting the creation of four new specialized agencies—the International Trade Organization, the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the World Meteorological Organization, and a Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Commission.

IMPROVEMENTS RECOMMENDED

Much good work is done by the global and hemispheric groups on which the United States is spending these millions and underwriting their costs at an average of 47 percent. But some of these have been used by officials to provide agreeable junkets at the taxpayer's expense for personal friends of good human intent and influential outsiders. So the Senate subcommittee came to the following conclusions:

1. These activities should be recognized as a cornerstone of our foreign policy and contributory factors of peace. But in 3 years the cost of the United Nations and related agencies has expanded from $43,000,000 during 1947 to $220,000,000 during 1949.

2. The United States can no longer afford to sit by and await the advent of improved economic conditions in * * * other nations * * * before seeking to reduce these expenses. No new agencies should be created. Where duplication or overlapping exists, and it is frequent, there should be liquidation. Better budgeting and auditing should be required. And pressure should continue toward reduction of the assessments these organizations levy against the United States.

3. The President by Executive order should establish guiding principles for all in this Government concerned; also an over-all interdepartmental committee with Cabinet and sub-Cabinet membership and a permanent secretariat. The personnel now constituting the scattered groups should be required to conduct this business without any additional expense and at a saving.

These proposals, if carried out, ought to get more and better results for less out of this important segment of foreign policy.

Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I include in my remarks the following editorial appearing in the Washington News on Wednesday, February 22:

This is Brotherhood Week.

The fact that men are brothers and should live as such has been recognized in the religions of many lands and many ages.

Selwyn Gurney Champion, an English physician, has recorded a study of the world's major faiths in a book, The Eleven Religions, published by E. P. Dutton & Co. It contains 4,890 quotations.

We cite just 10 of the quotations which show that the golden rule is a teaching of 10 of the 11 religions. Here they are, in the alphabetical order of the religions:

1. Buddhism: "Hurt not others with that which pains yourself."

2. Christianity: "All things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets."

3. Confucianism: "Is there any one maxim that ought to be acted upon throughout one's whole life? Surely the maxim of loving kindness is such—do not unto others what you would not they should do unto you."

4. Hebraism (the Jewish religion): "What is hurtful to yourself do not to your fellowman. That is the whole of the Torah and the remainder is but commentary."

5. Hinduism: "This is the sum of duty: Do naught to others which if done to thee would cause thee pain."

6. Islam (Mohammedanism): "No one of you is a believer until he loves for his brother what he loves for himself."

7. Jainism: "In happiness and suffering, in joy and grief, we should regard all creatures as we regard our own self, and therefore should refrain from inflicting upon others such injury as would appear undesirable to us if inflicted upon our selves."

8. Sikhism: "As thou deemest thyself, so deem others."

9. Taoism: "Regard your neighbor's gain as your gain; and regard your neighbor's loss as your own loss."

10. Zoroastrianism: "That nature is good only when it shall not do to another what is not good for its own self."

The eleventh religion, missing from that list, is Shinto, the religion of imperial Japan. Shinto has no Golden Rule.

Mr. Speaker, most of us regard the Golden Rule as the chief, at least the most practical part of our religion. It gives us respect for the other fellow's religion to know that he, too, has the Golden Rule.

The fact that the Golden Rule has been taught by many religions, in many ages, shows that the mind of man has always seen that, by the very nature of humanity, we are bound to live together.

Brotherhood, then, is not something we may choose or not choose, if we would live. Inescapably, we are brothers and must live as such or suffer the consequences.

General Pulaski's Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the American Legion Pulaski Post, No. 562, of the city of Los Angeles, Calif., on January 20, 1950, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Day resolution now pending in Congress:

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the

present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Hampshire, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment, designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1940, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion Pulaski Post, No. 562, of the city of Los Angeles and State of California—

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from California.

PHILIP A. FINIE,
Commander.
FRANK A. HARDICK,
Americanism Chairman.
JOHN KULCZYK,
Post Adjutant.

Racism at George Washington University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been brought to my attention a situation in the District of Columbia, at George Washington University, which I feel under obligation to bring to light and to do what I can toward correction.

A statement which I issued to the press today contains the essence of this unsavory story, and I am including that release as a part of my remarks. Since this morning I have been informed by a former GWU student that when he enrolled in a course in the economic history of Europe at George Washington summer school in the second summer term of 1948, he was shocked by the initial lecture by a Professor Ragatz, which outlined and advocated a theory of racial superiority.

It has also been brought to my attention that George Washington University has been the beneficiary of Federal funds from many sources, and that its substantive legislation governing some, at least, of these grants contains specific prohibitions of discrimination. I am taking appropriate steps to ascertain the closest possible estimate of such funds, with a view to insisting that all discriminatory practices cease before any further Federal funds are made available to the university.

The text of my release follows:

In a prepared statement Representative ARTHUR G. KLEIN, Democrat, of New York, today made a slashing attack on bigotry at George Washington University. Congressman KLEIN said:

"On this two hundred and eighteenth anniversary of the birth of George Washington, I am sickened by learning of the recent outburst of religious and racial bigotry in the head of the university which was founded by Washington, which bears his name in the city which is his namesake, and which was chartered by Congress over a century ago with a specific prohibition of discrimination.

"Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin has in recent weeks, and to my intense sorrow and disappointment, conducted himself in a pattern reminiscent of the late and unlamented Herr Dr. Goebbels. The disgraceful situation at George Washington University, the only Jim Crow institution of higher learning in the District of Columbia, has come to a head in this most completely incongruous time: the week in which we celebrate the memory of the founder of his country; the period proclaimed Brotherhood Week; the week in which the District of Columbia has discovered that its un-American pattern of discrimination and segregation is illegal.

"It was not many weeks ago that the George Washington Hatchet, student weekly, ran an editorial declaring it was time for GWU to rejoin the United States by abandoning its anti-Negro policy. George Washington left 50 shares of Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Co. stock to found a college 'to teach democracy to the people.' James Monroe and John Quincy Adams supported and patronized Columbian College, out of which GWU grew.

"The Newman Club, the Hillel Foundation of B'nai B'rith, and a number of Protestant and secular student groups endorsed the editorial.

"There was no reaction from the president of the university until the Jewish press widely reprinted a brief story sent out of Washington by Milton Friedman, JTA correspondent here.

"Immediately the wrath of Olympus descended on Hillel director Irwin Glatstein. According to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Dr. B. H. Jarman called on Glatstein. Not satisfied with Glatstein's assertion that he could not confirm or disavow the statements in the JTA story except as to the resolution, Jarman haled Glatstein before the great man himself for a 1½ hour stormy interview.

"JTA says that Dr. Marvin threatened to have Glatstein fired, and later tried to carry out the threat; that he also threatened to ban Hillel from the campus; that he talked wildly of a Jewish plot against the university and demanded that Glatstein sign a letter dictated by Marvin saying the JTA story was untrue. Rabbi Arthur Lelyveld, national director of Hillel Foundations, was forced to come to Washington in an effort to smooth out the row, in cooperation with the Anti-Defamation League.

"The Jewish community of Washington is up in arms.

"During depression days, Abram Lisner and other Jewish philanthropists bailed out George Washington University when the going was tough. Lisner Auditorium was built by funds bequeathed by Abram Lisner. By his direction the Bill of Rights is inscribed on the walls. His direct command that no discrimination be practiced is openly flouted by barring Negro citizens from the hall. At various times Protestant churches and private philanthropists have helped GWU. Yet so far as I am aware there is not a single Negro student in the university, and the medical school follows the infamous AMA quota system.

"For the benefit of Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin I want to quote from the famous Washington letter to the Hebrew Congregation at Newport:

" 'The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy. * * * All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens in giving it on all occasions effectual support.'

"Gen. U. S. Grant III, grandson of the great American who helped free the slaves, and the man who tried to impose a permanent pattern of segregation on the District of Columbia, is vice president of GWU."

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED IN 1947

In connection with this situation, Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind you and the House that on January 13, 1947, I introduced in the Eightieth Congress H. R. 867, a bill to prevent certain payments by the Veterans' Administrator to any educational or training institution which consistently pursues a policy of discrimination.

The bill was adversely reported by all agencies to which it was referred; and I deferred reintroduction in the belief that I would be able to find time to reword the bill to meet the valid objections made on administrative grounds; and of course there can be no valid objections on ethical and moral grounds.

Under leave, I am including the text of the press release I issued at that time and also the text of the bill:

An amendment to the GI bill of rights to forbid any payments to schools which purport to be nonsectarian but actually discriminate against veterans belonging to minority races or religions was offered today by Representative ARTHUR G. KLEIN, Democrat, of New York. The bill is based on studies of discrimination against GI's in schools of higher education made by the Jewish War Veterans and the American Jewish Congress jointly which reveal that numerous veterans are unable to take advantage of their rights under the GI bill because of the fact that many schools have adopted a quota system limiting the number of Jews, Negroes, Catholics, and persons of Italian descent who may be admitted.

The proposed law would empower the Veterans' Administrator to hold hearings wherever a school is charged with discriminating against veterans. The Administrator would first attempt to eliminate the discrimination by means of conciliation and mediation, but if the school refuses to discontinue the practice the Administrator is empowered to stop all further payments to the offender. Students already enrolled in such a school will continue to receive regular payments. In proposing the bill today, Mr. KLEIN said:

"A GI who was not excluded from the hedge rows of Normandy or the beaches of Okinawa should not be excluded from the so-called educational institutions of our country. Discrimination by an educational institution against a veteran because of his color or religion strikes at the very heart of the democracy for which he fought. This bill may not eliminate this un-American practice but will at least stop these institutions from feeding at the public trough. There is no reason why the Treasury should subsidize un-American practices."

H. R. 867

A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to prevent certain payments by the Veterans' Administrator to any educational or training institution which consistently pursues a policy of discrimination, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 5 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) be amended to read as follows:

"5. (a) The Administrator shall pay to the educational or training institution, for each person enrolled in full-time or part-time course of education or training, the customary cost of tuition, and such laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and other similar fees as are customarily charged, and may pay for books, supplies, equipment, and other necessary expenses, exclusive of board, lodging, other living expenses, and travel, as are generally required for the successful pursuit and completion of the course by other students in the institution: *Provided*, That in no event shall such payments, with respect to any person, exceed $500 for an ordinary school year unless the veteran elects to have such customary charges paid in excess of such limitation, in which event there shall be charged against his period of eligibility the proportion of an ordinary school year which such excess bears to $500: *Provided further*, That no payments shall be made to institutions, business or other establishments furnishing apprentice training on the job: *Provided further*, That any institution may apply to the Administrator for an adjustment of tuition, and the Administrator, if he finds that the customary tuition charges are insufficient to permit the institution to furnish education or training to eligible veterans, or inadequate compensation therefor, may provide for the payment of such fair and reasonable compensation as will not exceed the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction; and may in like manner readjust such payments from time to time: *And provided further*, That no payments shall be made to any educational or training institution holding itself out to the public to be nonsectarian which engages in a practice or pursues a policy of discrimination in the admission of, or in providing the full use of its facilities to any such eligible persons, otherwise qualified, by reason of the race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry of such person or persons.

"(b) Whenever it is charged by a person aggrieved or by an association or organization formed or organized to protect the rights of veterans or the Administrator has reason to believe that any educational or training institution has engaged in the practices of discrimination or exclusion set forth in subparagraph (a), the Administrator shall cause a preliminary investigation to be made, and if such investigation establishes a prima facie case of the existence of any discriminatory practice or policy, he or his representative shall attempt to eliminate the same by conference, conciliation or otherwise. In the event of failure to eliminate such practice or policy, the Administrator or his representative shall hold and conduct one or more hearings, invite or subpena and compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, records, and other documents, administer oaths, take the testimony and evidence of the witnesses and reduce the same to writing. The transcript of the minutes of such hearings shall be deemed a public record and a copy thereof shall be given to any person or organization interested therein and requesting same. If after such hearing or hearings, the Administrator or his representative is satisfied that the educational or training institution has engaged in such practices of discrimination or exclusion, the Administrator shall cause such educational or training institution to be placed upon a list of disapproved institutions. No payments shall be made under this part with respect to any eligible person who shall register or enroll therein after the publication of such list of disapproved institutions, but payments shall be continued to be made as provided in this part with respect to eligible persons who theretofore registered or enrolled in such institution.

"(c) Any institution or any person claiming to be aggrieved by a determination of the Administrator pursuant to this paragraph or any association or organization formed or organized to protect the rights of veterans may obtain a review of such order in the circuit court of appeals for the circuit wherein the institution affected is situated or within the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia by filing in such court a written petition within 60 days after the publication of such determinations, praying that the determination be modified or set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such petition shall forthwith be served upon the Administrator, and thereupon the Administrator shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the record. Upon the review by the court, the findings of fact by the Administrator when supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certification or certiorari as provided in section 239 and section 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 28, secs. 346 and 347).

"(d) Any educational or training institution placed upon a list of disapproved institutions may petition the Administrator for removal therefrom. If the Administrator shall be satisfied that the discriminatory practice or policy has been eliminated, he shall cause the institution to be removed from the list of disapproved institutions and it shall thereafter be eligible to receive payments under this act."

Repeal of Excise Taxes on Entertainment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include petitions that have come to my office in recent days from patrons of the movies in my district urging that the Federal excise tax on movie admissions be repealed.

One petition from the United Artists Theater contained over 2,000 names affixed over one week end. Another, from the Town Theater, contained almost a 1,000 names, all willingly and gladly listed. A third from the Bill Robinson Theater also contained almost a 1,000 names.

The petitions state that a tax of 1 cent on each 5 cents of movie admission discriminates against that form of entertainment and unfairly taxes those who seek and need relaxation and entertainment at moderate cost. It states futher that movies have become so much a part of the American way of life, that such a continuing tax upon them imposes an unjust and discriminatory burden.

The House will remember that in the past I have urged the repeal of various excise taxes: First, because many of them were discriminatory; second, because they fell upon those who often could least afford to bear them; and, third, that their emergency need during the war had long since passed.

I feel that excise taxes on movie admissions fall into the same category as excise taxes on telephone, telegraph, and transportatiotn, whose repeal I have urged since 1947. My most recent bill, H. R. 6151, introduced August 26, 1949, would repeal all Federal excise taxes except those of a regulatory character. That would include taxes on telephone, telegraph, transportation, entertainment, and so forth.

As additional petitions are received, I will ask permission that they be recorded.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, recently 15 United States editors made a 3 weeks' journey in Europe studying the operations of the Marshall plan in England, Germany, Italy, and France. One of these distinguished editors was Mr. Edward Lindsay, editor of the Herald and Review of Decatur, Ill. Mr. Lindsay has written a most interesting article about his trip and his convictions and conclusions with respect to the ECA, published in the Herald and Review, and an editorial for the same newspaper entitled "Vital Marshall Plan." I ask unanimous consent that the article and editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES IS WINNING COLD WAR, BUT RUSSIA IS BETTING WE WON'T FINISH THE JOB—EDITORS SEE ECA GAINS—STAKE RESTS WITH FUTURE

(By Edward Lindsay, editor of the Herald and Review)

The United States is winning the cold war in Europe—with dollars and know-how—but Soviet Russia is betting that we can't or we won't finish the job.

The people of the 19 Marshall plan nations of Europe are grateful for what we have done but turn white at the thought of a United States depression of even modest proportions and regret that we have hesitated to take our own advice of full economic cooperation in Europe for ourselves.

This is a brief summary of the findings of 15 American editors—of whom I was one—just returned from a 3 weeks' visit with political, business and labor leaders of all complexions in England, Germany, Italy and France.

Since the beginning of our program for rebuilding Europe we have spent $8,250,000,000. Large as this sum is, it seems relatively small when compared with the cost

of a hot war. Our economists have not been able to estimate within $40,000,000,000 the cost of World War II. The total figure is somewhere between 340 and 380 billion dollars.

In the forefront of the American cold war leadership are American industrialists, businessmen and labor leaders. Their mission is to help European countries make a success of free-enterprise economies in the United States pattern.

WHO IS RUNNING THE SHOW?

Our top man in ECA is Paul Hoffman, president of the Studebaker Corp. He spends most of his time in Washington, but makes frequent trips to Europe.

W. Averell Harriman, financier, chairman of the board of the Union Pacific until 1946, is the United States special representative located in Paris. He has over-all responsibility for dealing with the representatives of the cooperating countries.

Our labor mission, also located in Paris, is headed by Boris Shishkin, economist for the American Federation of Labor. His job, among other things, is to wean European labor—especially in France and Italy—away from Communist leadership.

The heads of our missions in individual countries include such men as Barry Bingham for France, W. John Kenney for England, and James D. Zellerbach for Italy. Bingham is the publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal; Kenney is an attorney; Zellerbach is chairman of the board of Fibreboard Products, president of Crown Zellerbach Corp., paper manufacturers, and director of numerous companies and the California State Chamber of Commerce.

It will be recalled that A. E. Staley, Jr., chairman of the board of the A. E. Staley Mfg. Co. of Decatur, has just returned from a year's tour of duty as head of the ECA mission in Norway.

One of the architects of the ECA approach to European recovery was Roy W. Gifford, chairman of the board of Borg-Warner International Corp. A year ago he was making speeches around Illinois and elsewhere urging that we show European industry how to be self-supporting so we would not have to continue to think in terms of relief.

These topflight business executives and labor leaders are working in close cooperation with our State Department representatives on the ground. They are putting hard-headed business judgment behind the United States position as it is discussed by our diplomats and diplomatic advisers.

WHAT HAVE WE ACCOMPLISHED?

The strictly relief stage of European recovery was passed a year ago.

All of the editors felt that genuine recovery, apparent on all sides in Europe in January 1950, had progressed much further than we had heard about through the news accounts that have been published in American newspapers.

Statistically, industrial production is 125 percent of the prewar figure (1938). Agricultural production, on the average, equals prewar production.

The shops are full of goods of all kinds. There is no unemployment in England or France, and the unemployment in Italy and Germany has been sensationally reduced.

These figures do not mean that life is easy for the average European workman—industrial or white collar. All European countries still are operating under wartime wage controls and prices in relation to wages are higher than in the United States and, in many instances, higher than in prewar Europe.

A Paris architect told me that the average Frenchman pays as much as 80 percent of his income for food, but only 5 percent for housing. This last because rents have been frozen at prewar levels.

Our impression was that the architect's statement was an exaggeration but that it is true that food takes a disproportionate share of the European's income.

Inflation, that was running rampant when the Marshall plan started, has slowed to a walk with every indication that it will be stopped entirely. The pound, the D-mark, the franc, and the lira have relatively stable values since devaluation. While there is a black market in money, it now is a relatively furtive and unprofitable business.

In France, for instance, the official rate is 350 francs to the dollar and the black market rate is 380. We heard no black-market quotations for pounds or lire but we were warned in Italy to deal with only reliable people in cashing traveler's checks because of the possibility that we would get counterfeit money.

The reconstruction of buildings destroyed by war in England, Germany, and Italy was so far advanced as to be sensational to the visitor who saw these countries 4 years ago. We did not see the invasion coast of France.

All of the countries of Europe are working hard to develop export business. All of them have plans for getting into the dollar market (the United States, Canada, and some South American countries), but so far they have done the best selling job in the sterling countries.

WHAT IS HAPPENING POLITICALLY?

The European recovery that we saw is reflected in a marked swing to the right in political thinking in all countries.

Prominent members of the Labor Party in England think the party will return to power on February 23, but with a reduced majority. Both the Conservatives and Liberals have real enthusiasm in this campaign.

We got the impression that if the question of nationalizing more industries were put to a vote that a good many people who would vote for the Labor Party would vote against further nationalization. In fact, a minor labor official said that was his opinion.

In Italy about 30 percent of the population voted for Communist deputies in April of 1948 and 70 percent voted for non-Communist parties.

A majority of the deputies were elected as Christian Democrats, the party of Alcide de Gasperi.

This was a remarkable turn around for Italy in response to American aid. All of the Americans we talked with who were in Italy during 1947 thought the Communists could have taken over the Government at any time, but that they deliberately chose to wait for the April 1948 elections so that they could go in legally and without risk.

De Gasperi is regarded by American observers as the finest, most dependable and sincere leader that Italy has ever had. He deserves the characterization of statesman.

For 15 years he was in hiding in the Vatican because of his opposition to Mussolini. When he returned to politics, he had the financial backing of Italian industrialists and the Vatican and yeoman support throughout Italy from Catholic laymen.

He could have formed a Christian Democrat Government, but insisted on bringing in as many of the non-Communist parties as possible. He realized that the vote of 1948 was not a genuine Christian Democrat vote but the result of rallying of the non-Communist voters from all parties.

After the election De Gasperi established a system of collecting dues from party members so he would not need to rely upon industrialists and Vatican financing of party activities.

Since the recovery in Italy the Liberal Party (rightist), which ran the country for 40 years before Mussolini, is gaining in strength.

Most American observers believe that a new election in Italy would see a further loss of Communist deputies and a loss of Christian Democrat votes to the Liberals and Moderate Socialists.

In France the Communists have been the strongest single party and have about 30 percent of the deputies. The second party, the MRP, which is made up essentially of the Catholics of liberal thought, is expected to lose a good many of its followers in the next election to the Radical Socialists (rightists despite the name) and even to De Gaulle's Rally of the French People.

Like Illinois, France has a reapportionment problem. In France this has resulted in too many deputies from some of the districts in which the Communists are strong. An effort is being made to get a reapportionment bill through the Chamber of Deputies. Even if it fails, most observers think that the Communists will lose some seats in the next election.

Of equal significance is the weakening of the Communists' grip on the trade-union movement in Italy and France. In Italy the non-Communist unions are growing rapidly. In France the big Communist union, CGT, is losing membership more rapidly than the non-Communist unions are gaining.

It is becoming increasingly difficult for Communist leaders to deliver their members in nuisance strikes for political effect. The big-shot Communist leaders can send word to a port, for example, suggesting a strike against the unloading of military equipment from the United States. The strike will not come off unless one of the well-known Communist leaders appears in person to demand it. If the French Government sends troops to unload the ships, as it has been doing, there is no violence and no real resistance from the unionists, most of whom did not wish to strike anyway.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Nineteen hundred and fifty is the critical year in nailing down the gains we have made among the 270,000,000 people of western Europe. (This is an increase of 20,000,000 since prewar.)

The word "integration" appears early in every discussion of Marshall-aid plans. By this is meant the reduction of tariff barriers and particularly the elimination of the quantitative quotas on the movement of goods between countries. We also mean simplifying the exchange of money and permitting the freer movement of peoples.

We have been insisting on sound fiscal policies within European countries and the balancing of budgets.

(On this last point, one of the editors asked a American leader if it wasn't embarrassing to demand that European governments balance their budgets in view of our own in the United States. He replied, off the record, that if we would take two-thirds of the good advice we are giving Europe what a wonderful country we would have. He did point out that our savings and reserves made it possible for us to do deficit financing for a little while, but that we could not keep it up indefinitely.)

We already have gotten quantitative restrictions taken off of 50 percent of the import items in each of the countries of Europe. At the recent meeting of the council of European leaders who administer the Marshall plan (OEEC), France took the lead in proposing that restrictions be taken off an additional 10 percent of the import items.

It should be understood that there has been no genuinely free movement of goods in Europe since before World War I. The wave of nationalization that swept through Europe like a plague was the incentive for each nation to try to be economically self-sufficient.

The result of this was that Italy, which has neither coal nor iron ore, attempted to maintain a steel industry.

France, which is not as far advanced as either Italy or England in the textile trade, attempted to create an artificial market for French textile makers within France by erecting not only tariff walls but actually

to set a limit on the quantities of textiles that could be imported regardless of price.

We are at the point now where we are beginning to make actual accomplishments in easing the flow of goods, money, and people throughout Europe and the world on a multilateral basis. The success of this program is the best hope of giving permanence to the European recovery that has been primed with Marshall plan money.

If we stop now, with the program half accomplished, we not only risk losing the gains we have made but laying ourselves open to later greater expenses for a military preparedness budget and for a return to emergency relief grants.

The leaders of ECA planning for European countries have agreed with our officials that they can stand a reduction of a billion dollars in the United States appropriations for the coming year to a total of $3,100,000,000. They have agreed to a further reduction to $1,700,000,000 for the following year, and to an end to the program in the middle of 1952.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN TO UNITED STATES?

About 75 percent of the Marshall plan money we are putting into Europe returns to the United States. Basically it is a plan to underwrite for Europe purchases in the dollar area. The second largest salesman of goods for delivery to Europe with Marshall plan dollars is Canada, which in turn does a good deal of business with the United States.

While Marshall plan appropriations underwrite European recovery to a considerable extent, they also are a means of underwriting the American economy. We saw United States corn, wheat, and machine tools in all the countries we visited.

A part of the difficulty in the United States coal fields today is the loss of the European market. Coal cannot be economically exported, but we had to export it anyway until British, German, and French mines got their production up and until the electrical generating industry in Europe could be stepped up to an all-time peak.

We will not lose the European market for agricultural and some manufactured goods if the present phase of the Marshall plan succeeds.

Of the countries we visited, only France can feed herself. England, Germany, and Italy must continue to import foodstuffs in large quantities. There is no possibility (because of the available acreage per thousand people) that England, Germany, and Italy can increase agricultural production sufficiently to support their populations.

There is no possibility that Italy, for example, can produce steel in quantities that will satisfy her needs. Fiat automobiles are now being made with steel ingots and bars purchased from Bethlehem and Republic steel companies in the United States. It is not immediately likely that Germany, England, and France can produce steel in sufficient quantities to supply their own needs and Italy's.

WE SHOULD GET IN SHAPE

The real problem in economic and political integration in Europe is the absence of European leadership.

We are attempting to get Europe's 270,000,000 people under 19 governments to work out their own salvation economically with advice and financial aid from the United States but without our actual participation as a party to the decisions.

Historically, England, the banker for the sterling area, has been the only leader Europe ever had. Most European countries feel, and with some justification, that England's only interest in the continent has been to exploit it.

Today, England puts economic integration in Europe in second place to her plans and obligations in reference to the commonwealth. A part of this commonwealth thinking in England is based on her fear of competition from a revitalized Germany. This fear of German vitality and productivity is shared in greater or lesser degree by all the countries of Europe.

It is apparent everywhere in Europe that our plans for integration would move quickly to realization if they were extended to include the Atlantic Pact countries, especially the United States.

It is difficult for us fully to realize the extent to which we are the bellwether in world affairs. We are the leading nation in the world by every measure. It is for us to decide not only the economic and political future of Europe's 270,000,000 people, but the future of our own economy which now is so productive that it cannot operate within the confines of our own borders, a market of 150,000,000 people.

As we decide, we must be aware of the fact that the future world will be slave or free, depending entirely upon which way the people of Europe drift. These people, next to the United States, are the people with the resources and the skills to win a war or win a peace.

If we should permit them to be enslaved by Russia, there is grave doubt if our civilization could stand in anything like its present form 9 hours away by air.

VITAL MARSHALL PLAN

Hearings in Congress will begin February 21 on appropriations for Marshall plan aid to Europe for the next 2 years.

We are now at the half-way point in this program that has a definitely scheduled end on June 30, 1952.

This is not a give-away program as Paul Hoffman says. It is a planned program for making the economy of Europe sound and self-supporting. We do not get into the details of the use of Marshall plan money except to approve the items that the representatives of European countries decide upon.

We get each country to agree upon its minimum needs, then in meetings with representatives of all of the countries to pare these figures down to an over-all total that we think is reasonable.

Each manufacturer or farm organization needing American equipment or commodities, must pay for them in the money of their own countries. The governments of the individual countries make the necessary dollar exchange available to the would-be purchaser out of Marshall plan funds.

The European governments then have what we call counterpart funds. In the case of England these funds are used for debt retirement. In the other European countries they are used for public-works projects such as drainage, irrigation, roads, public housing.

Last year this cost us roughly $4,000,000,000. The total to June 30, 1950 will be about eight and a quarter billions.

Our ECA officials and the representatives of European countries have agreed upon a reduction of a billion dollars for the next fiscal year—June 30, 1950 to June 30, 1951. This makes the appropriation request $3,100,000,000.

The plans for the final year—June 30, 1951 to June 30, 1952—call for an additional appropriation of one billion seven hundred million.

The Marshall plan program, administered by some of the best business brains of this country on a nonpartisan basis, has been accomplishing more than we had a right to expect from it in so short a time. (See Edward Lindsay's report on a recent visit to Marshall plan countries.)

The year 1950 is a critical time in the Marshall-aid program. It is this year that we expect the recovery that has taken place in western Europe to be given permanence through a program of economic integration—a reduction of quantitative quotas, a reduction in tariffs, a stepping-up of the interchangeability of moneys, and the freer movement of peoples.

It would be a mistake for the United States to permit its need for a reduction in the Federal budget—which is real enough—to jeopardize the success of the Marshall program. This program is our best hope not only of continuing to win the cold war, but stabilizing and making sound the foreign markets for American goods so necessary to the success of our own economy.

We should not only finish the Marshall-aid job, but should agree to a further revision of our tariffs to permit a freer interchange of goods between the United States and western Europe, actually between the United States and the rest of the free world.

We cannot afford the consequences of a weak or unstable Europe.

Settlement of Alaska a National Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, the Alaska settlement bill, H. R. 4424, will come up on the floor before very long. This bill is necessary for our national defense. It is also necessary for the development of Alaska. The Territory of Alaska belongs to this Nation as a whole, not to a few monopolistic corporations, nor to the stooges of these corporations. The rank and file of the Alaskan people want Alaska settled. They know that their future prosperity depends upon that. A few despoilers do not want it settled.

This bill provides for the settlement of Alaska by giving to the homesteaders an enlarged homestead. It permits the Secretary of Interior to designate the lands that will be first surveyed and offered to homesteaders for settlement. These homesteads will be laid out in lots large enough to sustain an American family on the American level. It provides for the sustained yield on a timber claim.

It gives the veterans a 1-year preference whenever an area is opened for homesteading. If we want to get Alaska settled, we must give them more than 160 acres. When our Midwest and West was settled, we gave to settlers a homestead, a tree claim and a preemption, consisting of 480 acres. Later we increased it to the so-called dry farming or desert claims.

That is how the Midwest and West was settled. It was settled by adventurers and pioneers. Tenderfeet are not proper people to settle Alaska, any more than they were fitted for the settlement of the West. It is mere nonsense to think that prospective homesteaders will go to Alaska for 160 acres unless they are given special inducements by the Government as was done at Matanuska Valley.

We are told that Russia has over a million settlers right across the strait. The time has come that we wake up and get Alaska settled. This for our national defense as well as for the development of Alaska for Alaskans and not monopolies.

With my remarks I enclose herewith a letter from the Veterans' Alaska Cooperative Co.; also a letter from a veteran in Oregon:

VETERANS' ALASKA COOPERATIVE CO.,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1947.

Re Settlement of Alaska by war veterans.

Hon. WILLIAM LEMKE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After many hours of study and investigation in regard to your proposed bill for the settlement of Alaska by war veterans, I am more firmly convinced of the need for assistance by the Government and a public purpose corporation such as would be the position of the Alaska Rural Rehabilitation Corp.

The thousands of requests for information that have been received by Government agencies, as well as our company, is proof that veterans want to settle Alaska. The Canadian Government reports hundreds of requests daily to drive the ALCAN highway. The largest percentage of the inquiries to our company have been made by veterans who want to settle in Alaska and who are married with an average of three and one-half members per family. The average age of these people is approximately 28 years old. This age is important, as it shows a person in the prime physical condition of his life, as well as a balanced mental attitude. These people are not speculators but desire to become good, solid Alaska citizens. Veterans who take their families, and the majority of them will, cannot afford to be gold seekers and adventurers for the sake of adventure.

My investigations show that the contents of this bill are apparently misunderstood by many people. Several remarks have been made that this bill will void present homestead, home-site, and business-site regulations. If this be so, the bill will certainly discriminate and discourage thousands of veterans who wish to make their living in the small-business basis. It is extremely necessary that any veteran should receive the benefits of this bill regardless of the size tract he requests.

Past records show that certain lands have been denied a settler on the ground that it was not properly classified as suitable. It is important that a method such as is proposed in this bill be used to insure the settler absolute minimum of delay due to administrative procedure. The experiences of this company is such that it has cost the individual members much of their private capital that should have been used to make their home in Alaska.

It is unbelievable that any so-called resistance should be stopping the development of Alaska. I have talked with members of the War Department and they agree with us that the industrialization of Alaska with the small "unit-veteran-settler" to expand the hinterlands will be the true defense of Alaska more than the millions being spent to make another Maginot Line. An uncontrolled settlement of Alaska is dangerous, and this is going on right now and will continue. It is therefore important that this bill be put into effect as soon as possible. Should this method be but 20 percent effective, I am sure that it will be beneficial to the settler and Alaska more than the haphazard individual action that is now going on.

History shows that it is always the pioneer who struggles and battles his way through the wilderness and eventually goes bankrupt or dies of the hardship. To let this happen to hundreds of veterans who are once again voluntarily accepting many hardships to improve our country, would be the individual responsibility of all Members of Congress.

A continued delay of any help to Alaska discourages the veteran-settler to such an extent that he is forced to take other work. This has been our sad experience. Veterans who are just out of the armed forces are enthusiastic about such an experiment as the settlement of Alaska. After a year's delay, they will lose this spirit. This bill can be adjusted as problems develop and can be a true aid to the veteran-settler.

Should any member of this committee make a trip to Alaska, our veterans' settlement at Port Chilkoot at Haines, Alaska, will be extremely glad to offer them accommodations as we are sure there are none to compare with it in Alaska. You will get the opportunity of seeing what veterans have done without this bill and can judge for yourselves the great possibilities that are there, with this bill. We again hope to have you as our guests.

Sincerely,

CARL W. HEINMILLER,
Executive Vice President.

RIDDLE, OREG., *January 8, 1950.*

GENTLEMEN OF CONGRESS: Every week I read something in the newspapers pertaining to settlement of Alaska. Seems to me someone wants to get our main line of defense built up so as to defend the greater portion of North America and the population of the United States. A small front like Alaska would be easier and cheaper to defend than the great plains across Canada if our northern line of defense was walked through as Hitler walked through the European countries. Who has control of building up this line of defense? The Army or Navy or Marines don't. Congress does. What does Congress do about it? Nothing but talk. You've been talking 2 years I know about two bills that a Mr. LEMKE has introduced. While you're talking, Russia is rumored to be killing off thousands of slaves by working them to death building up an army and stocking up war supplies not far from Alaska. In other words concentrating on our northern line of defense. Are you going to sit and talk through this session of Congress and let Russia get another year of preparation ahead of us and have another catastrophe like Pearl Harbor except on a larger scale? Russia is acting every hour you talk.

The homestead law (H. R. 4424) introduced by Mr. LEMKE in 1949 should be dusted off and passed. The sooner the better. The Department of Agriculture says wheat, potatoes, all vegetables, some fruit, meat, milk, eggs and many other foodstuffs can be raised in Alaska. In fact it can produce enough for Alaska and its Army with possibilities of some for export. The big drawback that is curtailing this production is transportation. No roads or railroads. Also people who went up to Alaska to fight these odds against making a living couldn't get needed assistance and some couldn't get a title to the land. There are, to my understanding, too many restrictions to the present homestead law. If you will modernize the homestead law or pass H. R. 4424 which provides land and assistance that is all you need to get Alaska settled. The assistance is for the man who will go because the man that has a bank account necessary to put him through a year in Alaska starting a homestead isn't walking off his job, comfortable home, and security to go up there. He isn't the pioneer type. Which of you gentlemen will give up your job for a homestead in Alaska? This assistance is to be paid back but even if you didn't get a cent back it would be as some gentleman said in one of your hearings last year if you want airplanes you pay a subsidy; what for? Nothing. If you want butter you pay a subsidy; what for? Still nothing. But if you pay a pioneer a subsidy to stay on his homestead, what do you get? More pioneers and a stronger home front or line of defense.

A pioneer will need equipment to clear lands, tools to build with, tools and machinery to produce, trucks for transportation, the market is already available and will increase with each family that comes to Alaska. Each homestead will decrease the unemployment roll of 5,000,000 of today. Each timber homestead claimed and worked will start competition which will bring prices of lumber down so that the lower-income people can afford to buy lumber which in turn will give another man a job further decreasing the unemployment roll.

Under this homestead bill, H. R. 4424, if I were to go and stake a claim I probably would have a neighbor or two soon after I got started building a house. Soon there would be enough people to start a school, have a church, need a store and post office and other business and community establishments.

If you want Alaska settled pass H. R. 4424, or one similar, include a subsidy clause, which I say is to be paid back by 95 percent of total assistance loaned. (Check your veteran-loan figures.) Pass it by April 1, 1950, and I'll be in Alaska on April 30, 1950. All I need is assistance after I get there and I know two more families that will drive alongside me.

I am sure I wouldn't get lonesome going or be lonesome after I got settled. These two men are good, hard-working men who would be the makings of a good settler. I have a truck and a semitrailer and also a portable sawmill. Plenty of hand tools and enough furniture. I could get to Alaska and carry another family's furniture but I couldn't eat very long with my small cash outlay. I couldn't work at public works and build a home and clear land. I personally would need a loan to buy food and some building materials as nails, windows, and roofing and equipment to get my homestead to produce a living and repay the loan.

I would like to ask you to remember the VFW Resolution No. 5 pertaining to veteran settlement for Alaska when you pass this bill. Or are you going to pass up the opportunity to get Alaska settled and let Russia walk in our back door and ram a bayonet down our throat and make us like it?

It is up to you gentlemen of Congress to do something besides talk. Talk is all right sometimes but not right now. Action is needed. I would fight a bear (Russia) with a gun until I dropped but I would run if I were barehanded. Are we going to be caught barehanded again?

Thank you.

RALPH L. MEALER, Jr.

Japanese Naturalization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of this distinguished body the fate of House Joint Resolution 238, a resolution to remove the racial restrictions which prevent the naturalization of some 90,000 resident aliens of Japanese and Korean descent in this country.

This joint resolution was adopted by the House unanimously last year and was unanimously approved by the Judiciary Committee of the other body last fall.

When it came up on the floor of the other body under unanimous consent on February 1 of this year, objection was raised and the resolution was passed over.

Fear has been expressed in certain quarters that if this resolution is adopted all sorts of aliens at present in this country because of special status—students, treaty merchants, and so forth—would be blanketed in and naturalized.

Not only is that not true, but both the House and Senate reports expressly state that this resolution does not affect the status of any but long-time permanent residents. Therefore, it does not, and cannot, affect any persons who have come in under special arrangements, whether by treaty or otherwise, with other countries.

Injustice and racial prejudice in our naturalization laws must not be permitted to continue. These persons of Japanese and Korean descent have been residents of this country for more than 25 years. They have demonstrated their loyalty and devotion to their adopted country these many years. Almost all of them had sons and daughters who served the armed services during World War II, and many with distinction.

In all fairness to this minority in our midst, we should hasten to correct this all-too-long injustice and inequity by removing race restrictions from our naturalization procedure, and granting to these people the recognition and dignity which is justly theirs.

I sincerely hope when this resolution comes up again in the Senate it will be unanimously approved, as the House has long since done.

In the Shadow of the Sun and Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I recently received from the editor and publisher of the Wynnefield Forum, Mr. S. Bakove, a copy of a poem entitled "In the Shadow of the Sun and Death," of which he is the author, and which was published in the February 11 edition of his paper. I ask unanimous consent that the poem be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE SHADOW OF THE SUN AND DEATH

(By S. Bakove)

Hush and rush: a ghastly mission—
Fission, fusion, and then perdition.
Ah! S-U-N is the clue:
A strong UN is overdue.
Foreboding stuns the world.
An H-bomb hurled
May doom to incandescence
And gradual evanescence
The very earth we tread.
The havoc we so dread
As to induce delirium
When pondering the chaos deuterium
Wed to helium may beget,
That cataclysm may be averted yet.
Renounce all war: that's the quintessence,
Or be adjudged supreme assassins.
Hasten, lest a chunk of Sun
Blast us to oblivion.

Morganza Floodway Funds Badly Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an article by Mr. George W. Healy, staff writer of the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, published on February 19, 1950, as follows:

MORGANZA FLOODWAY FUNDS BADLY NEEDED—PROJECT IN PROGRESS 12 YEARS STILL NOT FINISHED

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

The Morganza floodway has been in the talking and planning stage for 22 years.

It has been a-building for 12 years.

But today, with backwater forcing thousands of families from their homes just upstream from the point where the floodway would relieve the Mississippi of thousands of cubic feet of water each second, the Morganza floodway is not ready for operation.

Louisianians are asking "Why?"

The only thing the United States engineers need to complete the floodway is money.

This is the statement of Brig. Gen. Peter A. Feringa, president of the Mississippi River Commission, who recently told a congressional Appropriations Committee that completion of the floodway is a vital need.

TWENTY MILLION DOLLARS SPENT

The United States has spent about $20,000,000 in work on the floodway. Actual allocations have been $20,811,597, including $1,781,000 for a combined control structure and rail and highway crossings at the point where the floodway touches the Mississippi River.

The engineers estimate that $18,899,000 more will be required to complete the project.

First legal step toward building of a spillway from a point near Old River, north of Baton Rouge, to the Gulf of Mexico was taken in 1928, when Congress adopted the Flood Control Act.

That first act contemplated a floodway along the right bank of the Atchafalaya River from its source to the Gulf. The Atchafalaya runs out of Old River, near the point where the Red River runs into Old River—the stream which connects the Old and the Mississippi Rivers.

SUBSTITUTE PROJECT

In 1936, Congress amended the Flood Control Act of 1928 to substitute the Morganza floodway for the so-called East Atchafalaya floodway. Morganza floodway would take water direct from the Mississippi below Old River and drain it into the Gulf over a route partially the same as that planned earlier for the East Atchafalaya floodway. The latter project would have taken water from Old River, instead of from the Mississippi.

In 1938, a modification in design for the project was adopted, and work on the Morganza floodway, as such, was started. This work was interrupted by World War II and was resumed in 1946.

In reply to an inquiry from the Times-Picayune, General Feringa reported Saturday that by June 1950 all parts of the floodway with the exception of the control structure will be essentially complete. This means that the guide levees will stretch from the Mississippi River to a point near the Gulf, that rail and highway bridges over the spillway will be operating, and that incidental works, such as canal locks, will be installed.

DAM FOR CONTROL

The control structure, for which only $1,781,000 had been allocated, will be a dam, or weir, over which will be a railroad and highway crossing.

This dam will be used, when it is complete, to permit water from the Mississippi to flow into the floodway or to stop it from flowing into the floodway—as conditions dictate. It will be operated just as the United States engineers operate the Bonnet Carre spillway, opening or closing it at will.

Demand for completion of the Morganza floodway was loud in north Louisiana in 1945, when backwater covered large acreage in Concordia and Catahoula Parishes—just above Old River. The demand, as expected, died down when the waters subsided. Now, with about 7,000 families evacuated from backwater areas, the demand is louder than ever.

Completion of 17 cut-offs in the Mississippi River between Memphis and Old River has aggravated the backwater problem in the Concordia-Catahoula area. By shortening the big river, these cut-offs have speeded the flow of water in the stretches where they have eliminated bends in the stream. As a result, water flows from Memphis to Old River faster than it did before the cut-offs were made. However, the Mississippi River channel below Old River is no larger than it was before the cut-offs were dredged or blasted. A greater proportion of water is reaching the Gulf by way of the Atchafalaya than was the case before the cut-offs, but the Atchafalaya's carrying capacity is limited by the size of its channel, which is enlarging.

FOUR HUNDRED MILES

From Old River to the Gulf by way of the Mississippi River is 322 miles. From Old River to the Gulf by way of the Atchafalaya River is 159 miles. Naturally, the water seeks to follow the shorter route, but it can't flow to the Gulf any faster than available channels can carry it.

The Morganza floodway would be an added channel, speeding the flow of water from a point where it is being "piled up" by the new channels, or cut-offs in the river, upstream.

The "piling up" of water in the Old River area is blamed by Concordia and Catahoula Parish citizens for the flooding of towns and farms which formerly had no difficulty with backwater. They believe that opening of the Morganza floodway would stop the backing of water up the Red and Black Rivers.

But, Morganza floodway isn't ready for operation—yet. It's only half finished—measured in dollars and cents.

Given adequate appropriations, General Feringa says the engineers will have the floodway finished before high-water time in 1953.

"The rate of engineering progress," said the general, "is entirely dependent upon congressional appropriations."

FHA Discriminates Against Indians Under Housing Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a most unfortunate ruling has been made by the solicitor in the Department of Agriculture. It makes a mockery of all this talk that the Truman

administration is opposed to racial discrimination.

Under permission given by the House, I include herewith a letter from the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to Felix S. Cohen, attorney for a number of Indian tribes, and Mr. Cohen's reply thereto. They tell the story:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1950.

Mr. FELIX S. COHEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COHEN: In your letter of December 22, 1949, you raised a number of questions regarding the eligibility of certain Indian tribes for the benefits of the financial assistance authorized under title V of Public Law 171 (81st Cong.). We referred your letter to the Office of the Solicitor of the United States Department of Agriculture, and in reply we received the following comments:

"1. TRIBAL PROPERTY

"According to Mr. Cohen's letter most of the land in the reservations of the Blackfeet Tribe, the Omaha Tribe, and the Ogiala Sioux Tribe has been allotted to individual Indians in severalty under trust patents as provided by the act of February 8, 1887 (24 Stat. 388). The trust patents in effect provide that the holders thereof are only entitled to the use and possession of the land, legal title being retained by the United States, and that the land cannot be alienated while the United States holds legal title thereto. The act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984 (25 U. S. C. 462)) extended the trust period and the restraints against alienation indefinitely.

"Section 1 of the act of February 8, 1887, as amended (25 U. S. C. 348), provides that any conveyance of, or any contract made touching, allotted lands prior to the expiration of the trust period shall be null and void and, as stated above, the trust period and the restraints on alienation have been extended until otherwise directed by Congress. The holders of trust patents will not be entitled to fee patents to their lands until it is determined that they are competent to handle their own affairs. The act of May 14, 1948, 62 Stat. 236 (25 U. S. C. 483) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior in his discretion and upon application by Indians holding land under trust patents to remove the restrictions against alienation and issue fee patents.

"One of the requirements of eligibility set forth in section 501 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is that the applicant must be the owner of a farm. Since section 502 (b) of said act requires that each farm housing loan be secured by the equity of the borrower in his farm, it is our view that the term 'owner of a farm' as used in the act contemplates that the applicant have such an interest in his farm that he can alienate or encumber it. Inasmuch as Indians holding land under trust patents cannot alienate their land or their interests therein, it is our opinion that they would not qualify as being 'owners of farms' and for that reason would be ineligible for Farm Housing assistance.

"II. FEE PATENTS

"On the reservations of the Blackfeet, Omaha, and Ogiala Sioux tribes part of the land is held in severalty by individual Indians under fee patents. It is our opinion that these Indians would qualify as being owners of farms, providing the land falls within the definition of a farm as set forth in section 501 (b) of the Housing Act of 1949, since the issuance of a fee patent removes the restraints against alienation and enables the Indians to deal with their property the same as any non-Indian. See Larkin v. Waugh (276 U. S. 431 (1928)); *Marks* v. *Brooks* (32 F. Supp. 422 (1940)); section 6 of the act of February 8, 1887, as amended (25 U. S. C. 349).

"III. TRIBAL LAND

"As stated in Mr. Cohen's letter, part of the land comprising the reservations of the Blackfeet and Omaha tribes is unallotted, held in tribal ownership, and occupied by tenants of the tribe for grazing and agricultural purposes. These tribes have been incorporated under a Federal charter issued by the Secretary of the Interior under section 17 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 988, 25 U. S. C. 477), and exercise the usual powers of a municipal corporation. On the reservations of the San Carlos Apache and Hualapai tribes, all the land is tribally owned and is occupied by Indians as tenants of the tribe for grazing and agricultural purposes. These tribes also have been incorporated pursuant to the authority cited above. Likewise on the reservations of the Pueblos all the land is held by the tribes, the tribes having been incorporated under an act passed by the New Mexico Territorial Legislature in 1847, and is assigned by the tribe to its members for occupation and agricultural purposes. On the reservation of the Ogiala Sioux tribe, an unincorporated association, certain lands are held by the tribe and occupied by tenants of the tribe for agricultural purposes.

"Land held by the tribe constitutes the public property of the tribe and the individual members of the tribes do not have a vested interest in any specific part of such land, although they may have a perpetual right of occupancy in the lands occupied by them under the laws of the tribe. See *Tuttle* v. *Moore* (3 Ind. T. 712, 64 S. W. 585); *Crowell* v. *Young* (4 Ind. T. 148, 64 S. W. 607); *Sizemore* v. *Brady* (235 U. S. 441 (1914)); *Franklin* v. *Lynch* (233 U. S. 269 (1914)). A member of a tribe cannot alienate or encumber tribal lands occupied by him because tribal lands can only be disposed of by treaty or convention as provided in H. S. 2116 (25 U. S. C. 177). Inasmuch as members of a tribe do not have an alienable interest in the land they occupy, it is apparent that they would not qualify as being the owners of farms for the reasons hereinbefore set forth in our consideration of Indians holding trust patents.

"Until 1871 Indian tribes were recognized by the United States as being nations for treaty purposes. However, the act of March 3, 1871 (25 U. S. C. 71), made all Indian tribes subject to the legislative power of Congress. Nevertheless, Indian tribes are distinct political communities as long as the tribal relation is maintained and possess powers of local self-government. The internal affairs of Indian tribes are controlled and directed by a tribal council which is established pursuant to the tribal charter or constitution. The council so established can enact whatever laws and regulations which are deemed necessary for the government of the tribe and the control and use of tribal property, providing such legislative action is not inconsistent with the laws and Constitution of the United States. See 27 American Jurisprudence—Indians, sections 6, 7, and 9. Since Indian tribes may properly be classified as being corporate or quasi corporate bodies politic, we are of the opinion that farm-housing loans cannot be made to Indian tribes as such in view of our previous determination that farm-housing assistance could only be extended to natural persons.

"In conclusion, it is our opinion that only those Indians occupying land under fee patents can be considered as owners of farms and as eligible in this respect for farm housing assistance.

"In view of our determination that Indians holding land under trust patents cannot be considered owners of farms for the purposes of the Housing Act of 1949, and that Indian tribes are ineligible for farm-housing assistance because the act limits assistance to natural persons, it is not necessary to consider the instruments used by the Department of the Interior to pledge income from trust property as security for loans made pursuant to the lending programs carried on by that department."

The comments of the Office of the Solicitor explain the position of the Farmers Home Administration with respect to the eligibility of Indians for farm housing loans and grants. If you have further questions on this subject we shall be glad to discuss them with you.

Sincerely yours,
DILLARD B. LASSITER,
Administrator.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 6, 1950.*

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The decision of the Farmers Home Administration on January 31, 1950 (copy attached), declaring about 400,000 American Indians ineligible for farm housing loans, will shock all consistent supporters of the civil-rights program to which you have given such courageous leadership.

As attorney for the Blackfeet Tribe of Montana, the Omaha Tribe of Nebraska, the Ogiala Sioux Tribe of South Dakota, the Hualapai and San Carlos Apache Tribes of Arizona, and the All-Pueblo Council of New Mexico, comprising some 40,000 of our first Americans, I appeal to you to end this executive discrimination.

Of all the racial strains that make up our America, our Indian fellow-citizens are probably most in need of Federal housing aid. They do not ask for any special favor to them as Indians. All they ask for is fair treatment as American citizens.

There is no excuse in law or in public policy for denying to Indians the aid that is now given to home owners of every other race.

Your own humane concern for Indian welfare is beyond question. I had the best possible evidences of that concern when I served as Associate Solicitor under your first two Secretaries of the Interior. Equally clear is your consistent backing of housing aid for the ill-housed rural population of our country. Your concern for the principle of equal rights to all, regardless of race or ancestry, is clear to all of us, and is particularly clear to me. When I called upon you at the White House 3 weeks ago you made it perfectly plain that the executive branch of the Government was fully and wholeheartedly committed to the principle of nondiscrimination. Unfortunately, as we both have reason to know, the executive branch of the Government contains a good many otherwise decent Americans fiven whom the principle of nondiscrimination receives only lip-service.

Lip-service to the principle of nondiscrimination in the Farmers Home Administration begins and ends with the Administrator's first regulation on applicants:

"In considering the qualifications of applicants to receive farm housing assistance, no discrimination shall be made on the basis of race" (sec. 302.1, 14 Federal Register 6546).

The decision of Farm Housing Administration to exclude Indians (except for the 1 percent or so of Indians who hold lands under unrestricted fee patents) from the scope of the Federal rural housing program is not based on the existence of any other special fund for Indian housing. There is no special housing fund for Indians in any other department or agency. Until now Indians have been led to assume that their applications for farm housing loans or grants would receive impartial consideration.

The decision of the Farmers Home Administration is inconsistent with the settled policy of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government to treat Indian land owners on a par with other land owners in the allocation of Federal assistance.

The only grounds given for the decision are technicalities more specious than any "grandfather clause" technicality ever invented to justify discrimination against an outcast minority without using racial terms.

The first argument advanced is the senseless contention that Indian land owners have no equity in their lands. The Supreme Court has consistently held that the entire equitable estate in Indian lands is vested in the Indian owners. *United States* v. *Paine Lumber Co.* (206 U. S. 467); *Shoshone Tribe of Indians* v. *United States* (299 U. S. 476).

The second of the solicitor's arguments is that Indian land owners are not owners of land because their lands are protected by acts of Congress from alienation. These acts of Congress were passed in all good faith to protect, and not to deny, the land-ownership rights of Indians. Their land "is not the land of the United States" (*United States* v. *Paine Lumber Co.* (206 U. S. 467, 473)). Your Secretaries of the Interior for many years have encouraged Indians to hold their lands under these congressionally authorized protections. Under that form of tenure, Federal loans based upon Indian land as security have been repaid with a delinquency rate of only one-half of 1 percent.

The Farm Home Administration appears to be in fundamental conflict with Interior Department Indian policy in suggesting that any Indian, to qualify for housing loans from his agency, must give up his right to Federal protection.

The final argument of the Farmers Home Administration is that individual Indians are not entitled to loans as farmers because Indian tribes are really corporations. It would make just as much sense to say that workers who are members of incorporated labor unions are not employees entitled to the protection of labor laws.

No other department or agency of the Government has found any difficulty in recognizing that Indians are human beings.

Even the Department of Agriculture made Farm Security loans to Indians. The ridiculous character of this argument is shown up by the fact that it is applied even to the Ogiala Sioux Tribe, which never has incorporated. It assumes that these Indians are a quasi corporation. So, I suppose, are all of us who are members of any cooperative, trade association, labor union, or other organization.

Obviously, an agency that will invoke such legal cobwebs to disqualify an entire race from the beneficent protection of your rural housing policy will not be influenced by legislative or judicial authorities, and I therefore refrain from citing here the statutes and the decisions which establish the invalidity of each of these arguments. In any event, the authorities are collected in the Handbook of Federal Indian Law which I wrote for the Government some years ago.

There are two things that you can do, as President, to right this latest injustice to our Indian fellow citizens. You can instruct your Farmers Home Administrator to reverse his decision. Or you can ask the Budget Bureau to arrange for, or recommend to the Congress, the allocation of a reasonable portion of Federal farm housing funds in current and future appropriations to some agency that will be willing to consider the housing needs of our first Americans, our own original displaced persons. I would estimate that of the 700,000 or so farm homes most in need of Federal loans or grants for improvement, approximately 70,000, or 10 percent, are owned by Indians. I suppose the Commissioner of Indian Affairs can give you a more precise figure on this.

Here is a situation in which two Departments of our Government, Agriculture and Interior, are at odds on Indian policy and Indian law, and the result is Indian suffering, disease, and everything that goes with bad housing and racial discrimination.

In such a dispute between Departments only the President of the United States can set right the injustice that is being done. The 40,000 Indians that I represent appeal to you to set right this injustice. I think that millions of my white fellow Americans will join in that plea. What is at stake here is basically the issue of Executive respect for civil rights.

Indeed, the Farmers Home Administration is attacking the most basic and most widely supported of all civil rights when it attacks the principle that the Federal Government, in its public services, is equally the servant of all its citizens.

Respectfully yours,
FELIX S. COHEN.

Mankind at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK P. GRAHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] at the Young Democrats' rally in Greensboro, N. C., February 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great honor which you have shown me to invite me to address this large and enthusiastic meeting of the Young Democrats of North Carolina. I am glad to have the opportunity of speaking in the home district of my friend, CARL DURHAM, who is a conscientious Member of the House of Representatives and with whom I enjoyed serving for many years. Also I note that present here tonight is Congressman HAMILTON JONES of Charlotte, with whom I have served in the House of Representatives and whom I call my friend.

I am delighted to be here with Senator FRANK GRAHAM, who I think is one of the great statesmen of our times. As a matter of fact, I have much admiration for both of your United States Senators. Senator HOEY is a very conscientious, hard-working statesman, and of course FRANK GRAHAM has already made a remarkable impression for the good in the United States Senate.

It should be noted that North Carolina in recent years has been furnishing many most capable men and women to the national scene. Such people as Mrs. Gladys Tillett, Gordon Gray, Kenneth Royall, Jim Webb, Jonathan Daniels, Lindsay Warren, Lamar Caudle, and many others whom I could name, have brought much credit to this great State and to the Democratic Party.

The newspaper headlines of the past 2 weeks have dramatically spelled out for us again the brutal fact that mankind stands at the crossroads.

By direction of the President, the United States is moving ahead with production of the hydrogen bomb—a weapon supposedly 1,000 times more destructive than that which wiped out Hiroshima.

The ink was hardly dry on the front pages carrying this announcement when we were confronted by another, equally shocking—that our plans for this bomb may lie, even now, in the hands of a potential enemy.

We cannot help but feel a certain sense of futility at a time of such developments as these.

It must seem to most of us that the individual is powerless to halt this headlong race toward chaos—that the individual is hopelessly victimized by forces over which he has no control.

Inevitably we ask ourselves—what can I do? What possible influence can we, who are gathered here in Greensboro, N. C., bear upon a future decision of peace or war to be made halfway around the globe—particularly when that decision rests with men to whom an appeal to reason, or an appeal made in the name of humanity itself, would probably be fruitless.

We shall find our answer, I think, if we reexamine the over-all strategy with which the United States attempts to insure a lasting peace among nations and if we seek to relate our individual thinking and action to that strategy.

We Americans are motivated, first, by the faith that a world in which men enjoy the full fruits of freedom will be a world at peace; a world in which the orderly processes of popular, representative government can function effectively will be a world at peace. Nations where there is a true expression of popular will do not provoke wars. Free nations do not promote those economic and social conditions which drive men to fight through desperation, greed, fear, or hatred.

In support of this principle we are providing economic assistance, to the limit of our present capacity, to Europe—where the two great wars of this century began where free men today are waging a mighty effort to stem the tide of Communist tyranny. The aid we have offered so far was given just in time to rescue a continent from the jaws of oppression and slavery.

We are studying a program of economic aid on an even broader scale under the proposed point-4 program. Through this policy, we envision the use of American capital to provide higher standards of living for other areas where modern industrialization and democratic government are still a novelty.

A second principle which guides our planning for peace is that cooperation among nations is essential to world order. This lesson we neglected to learn a generation ago, and we paid for our oversight with 300,000 American lives.

Formation of the United Nations, even before the end of World War II, gave us high hopes that through international cooperation the many grave problems of the postwar era would be solved. These hopes faded fast with the realization that the Soviet Union felt no genuine desire to approach such issues in a cooperative spirit.

Hence we felt the necessity to draw ourselves closer into the fellowship of other free nations. The signing of the North Atlantic Pact exemplifies this third principle of our strategy for peace—that those nations which earnestly seek a free and peaceful world must work in closest harmony, utilizing their collective moral force to challenge the ambitions of any aggressor. The Atlantic Union Resolution, now before the United States Congress, providing for a limited federation of the Atlantic democracies, is a logical successor to the Atlantic Pact—and is, indeed, a forward step along the path toward effective world government.

The fourth principle is another which the democracies failed to grasp in the aftermath of World War I—that an aggressor nation knows no language but that of force, that military weakness invites armed attack.

We in the United States have built the strongest, most efficient peacetime Military Establishment in world history. We are providing arms for our friends abroad.

We do not intend to be caught asleep at the switch.

We do not intend to give anyone the idea that the democracies will be a push-over.

And if there is some consolation that we may derive from development of the hydrogen bomb, we can assure aggressive powers that we will strike back with as devastating a blow as any that may be loosed against us.

Economic assistance to Europe—full support to the United Nations—Atlantic cooperation—strengthened military defenses: These are the tangible weapons in the arsenal of peace which we are forging today.

These tangible weapons are costly.

They consume nearly three-fourths of our tremendous Federal budget.

They are investments we cannot afford not to make, even though years may pass before they yield the dividends for which we fervently hope.

But the intangible weapon we possess provides the key to our salvation.

Our intangible weapon controls the destiny of civilization itself.

That intangible weapon is the vitality, the creative energy, of the free democratic system we have fashioned here in America.

It is clear that the free economy of the United States must be, for at least a generation, the foundation of world order and peace.

If we permit our economy to remain static, or if we revert to the old cycle of boom-and-bust, we cannot possibly meet the cost of those economic and military aids which help to preserve an uneasy peace.

However, the necessity that America remain strong and secure is not merely a matter of dollars and cents.

The people of the world who yearn for freedom and peace need our dollars, our arms; but they need something more.

They need a living example of a fundamental truth—that freemen, and freemen only, can enjoy the abundant life on this earth.

It is this faith which will sustain them when all else fails.

If we cannot continue to make democracy work here; if we cannot maintain a productive, ever-expanding economy within the framework of free enterprise; if all Americans cannot share the liberty, justice, and opportunity which is our birthright, all will be lost. Where else, but America, can mankind find that faith and hope without which it cannot survive?

Our contribution, as individuals, to the cause of world peace can only be made in the forging of this intangible weapon—the vitality of a free America.

We cannot enter the walls of the Kremlin—nor the halls of the United Nations—to alter the deliberations and the policies which evolve there.

But in our homes, our towns and cities, we have the opportunity to work actively for peace—by seeking to assure for all our people the full realization of the democratic ideal.

We have the opportunity to keep alive the hopes of a despairing world by proving, in our own communities, the lasting worth of the free society.

We have in our country today an unparalleled opportunity for economic advance if we have the courage to take advantage of it. We have relatively full employment and a high rate of national income. A tremendous demand for consumer goods and services remains unfilled. American technology almost daily is developing new products which contribute to more comfortable living for all. Perhaps most significant, we have brought under control many of the destructive forces which lead to depressions. We understand, more clearly than ever before, the nature of those upheavals which gnaw at the foundations of free enterprise—which, uncontrolled, would destroy it. We have legislation which enables industry and the individual to weather periods of minor decline and uncertainty.

President Truman, in his recent state of the Union message, pointed to the phenomenal growth of the American economy in the past 50 years.

Our national production has risen in value from $50,000,000,000 a year to $255,000,000,000.

The income of the average family, in terms of buying power, has doubled.

The average hours of work have declined from 60 to 40 hours per week, while the hourly production of the average worker has tripled.

Average wages have increased from 45 cents an hour to $1.40 an hour.

The President predicted even more remarkable expansion in the next 50 years. He estimated that our total national production in the year 2000 will be nearly four times as much as it is today, and that family income will be about three times as great as in 1950.

You who may still justifiably regard yourselves as young must experience a keen sense of expectancy as you stand on the threshold of this half-century—as you consider the richness of our Nation's promise which our President outlined for us.

With such expectancy there should come an evaluation of the responsibility you have to see that promise fulfilled.

It is gratifying that you indicate, through your membership in the Young Democratic organization, your willingness to accept a share of that responsibility.

Let us think for a while of the particular sphere in which you will work to mold a stronger, more free, more democratic nation in the years ahead.

Your first sphere of action will be one of geography.

Most, if not all of you will live out your span of years here in the South—and I have no hesitancy in asserting that the South can take its place in the very front rank of the tremendous economic advance we anticipate. Today we may accurately describe the South as the Nation's No. 1 economic opportunity. A new spirit is stirring here which has startled the Nation. While we conquered the last geographical frontiers of the Nation many years ago, the South is one economic frontier whose possibilities have never been fully explored.

Your responsibility is all the more challenging, and its acceptance will be all the more exciting, because the South has a potential more vast than any other section of the Nation.

We southerners frequently have cause to wonder why we attract so much attention from writers, scholars, journalists, and political leaders outside the region.

It seems that there are thousands of experts and would-be experts on the southern problem—but we never hear about a northern problem, an eastern problem, or a western problem.

One might think we in the South have a monopoly of all the problems on the American scene.

I believe we may well regard these commentaries as compliments, whether they are intended to be such or not.

The fact is that the South today is the most interesting, the most significant, region of our Nation.

The South is interesting because our pattern of living is more complex than that of any other part of the country. The fact that we manage to live harmoniously and fruitfully despite these complexities is something of a tribute to the character of our people.

The South is significant today because of its very diversity—because, in some ways, we southerners live, think and act differently from our fellow Americans.

Those qualities of mind and heart which distinguish us as southerners are rightfully the subject of national comment. Our way of life is of concern to all the American people. The South can no longer isolate itself from the rest of the Union. At a time when national unity in the common cause of peace and freedom is essential, it is imperative that we minimize the effects of that diversity.

These distinctive characteristics of the South do, indeed, merit the attention of other Americans.

But they deserve our attention more. It is we—and we alone—who must determine the South's course in national affairs.

Let us not deny that we have problems, merely because an outsider happens to mention them.

Let us freely admit that we do have complex problems—let us talk about them frankly—and move courageously ahead to seek their solution.

No one has ever condemned the South for refusing to stand still.

Volume upon volume have been written by southerners and others who have sought to dig deep to the root of the South's problems. Perhaps I risk gross understatement and repetition in outlining a few of those problems here.

No discussion of the South today would be accurate if it did not point to our unique political system as a matter for our concern.

The one-party system which is deeply rooted in our tradition undoubtedly works to our advantage as Democrats.

However, if we look beyond partisan considerations, we see that this archaic structure is neither normal nor desirable because it saps the vitality of our political institutions here, and has widespread effects on national policy.

In many of our Southern States, absence of an opposition party destroys the incentive of the Democratic Party to provide sound, serviceable government—and to attack vigorously those conditions which are properly the concern of government.

The absence of an opposition party has too often contributed to the development of corrupt, entrenched machines.

It has permitted the rise of demagogs who do not pretend to voice the genuine opinions, nor to execute the will of the majority of the southern people.

Because it has destroyed political competition and interest in government matters, the one-party system is largely responsible for the failure of southern citizens to exercise regularly their privilege to vote. The South lags far behind the Nation in the percentage of registered voters who participate in primaries and elections. The State of Ohio outranked my own State of Tennessee about 3 to 1, in this respect. In elections for governor from 1920 to 1946. About 58 percent of the eligible voters of Ohio went to the polls in these elections, while we in Tennessee had a turn-out of 18 percent in the Democratic primaries over the same period.

This pattern extends to too many States other than my own.

Surely none of us can take pride in a political system where the majority of potential voters, either through artificial methods designed to hold down the vote, or through lack of interest, do not participate in the affairs of their government.

The suggested amendment to alter the electoral college offers great promise that we may some day have a two-party system in the South. However, until we have Republican leaders in the South who are more interested in principles than in patronage, our improvement will be retarded.

We must remember that as long as we have one-party domination, the South will not receive from either major party the consideration to which it is entitled in the determination of policy.

Many commentators have suggested that the basic trouble of the South was for many years an impoverished economy—that economic development is the answer to all our problems.

Not so many years ago, Franklin Roosevelt described the South as the Nation's No. 1 economic problem.

We did not like to be labeled that—but there was considerable justification for it.

For nearly three-quarters of a century the South had trailed the Nation in almost every measure of economic progress.

Our farmers were shackled to a one-crop agriculture.

Our soil was being rapidly depleted.

Our industrial development was retarded by a lack of wealth for capital investment.

Our State governments and municipalities were too poor to provide the people adequate educational and medical services.

Millions of our people lived in abject poverty.

We have witnessed dramatic changes in the past 15 years.

We are overcoming the blight of poverty. The average income of the people here has risen more and faster in recent years than that in any other part of the United States.

Our industrial facilities have expanded rapidly. We are taking advantage of our great natural resources, our stable labor supply, our favorable climate—and we are pointing out these advantages to industrialists elsewhere who are coming to join us in building a new South.

We have learned that the absolute reign of "king cotton" is at an end, and we are beginning to achieve a well-balanced agriculture.

We are able to spend more and more money for our schools and for the health of our citizens.

These are encouraging developments. They show us that we have come far along the way to economic maturity. But we have further to go yet before the South will realize its potential effectiveness in the expanding national economy, so necessary to world stability.

A very real problem of the South is our social structure, the pattern developed here whereby two races live side by side in relative harmony.

It should be obvious to everyone that our customs are traditional, that they will continue to exist until southerners themselves decide to change them.

No social custom can ever be altered or changed immediately by law or by force.

This truth should be obvious to those outside the South who demand that we change overnight a system under which we have lived in peace for generations.

This truth should be equally obvious to those within the South who resist every effort to better the lot of the minority race—on the false notion that these efforts will disrupt our way of life.

The problem imposed by our pattern of living is that it provides a convenient weapon to oppose any program, however mild, which seeks to benefit the minority race. The fear that we may lose this pattern is a useful instrument for the demagog who plays upon the passions and prejudices of the people. By a strange coincidence, this fear is an instrument used largely by those southerners who oppose economic and social improvement for the average man of either race.

Most of us realize that to accord the minority race a full measure of legal justice, and its share of economic, educational, and political opportunity is the only sound basis for the progress of both races.

Most of us realize that such goals can be achieved without disrupting, in any manner, the accepted pattern of social relations.

These principles have won general acceptance among the people of North Carolina, which is the major reason North Carolina has won true leadership among the States of the South.

You in North Carolina are well aware that the heavens have not fallen as a result of your determination to raise the living standards of the minority group.

The South has paid a great price in regional vitality because some of its people will not follow the example you have set in North Carolina.

We have seen that your contribution to a stronger America, and hence to a peaceful world, will be made here in the South, your home and mine. The South is your first sphere of action.

We acknowledge that the South is beset with complex problems, each inter-acting upon the other. Our political system influences the growth of our economy—our economy in turn may help relieve the poverty and ignorance which create a faulty political pattern—the delicate nature of our human relations will be held in balance as we attain broader political and economic development—psychological factors may determine whether we shall take positive action on these matters, or whether our prejudices, fears, and resentments will distort us.

There is no one concrete procedure by which we can emerge immediately from these complex patterns, which are peculiarly southern, and play the dynamic role in national life which is within our power.

I do wish to suggest one underlying principle without which we cannot hope to solve any problem in human affairs on a world basis—on the national scale—or here in the South.

That principle is one which, if it were enshrined in the hearts of men everywhere, would wipe out the hatred, the greed and the lust for power which today foster man's inhumanity to man.

That principle lies at the very foundation of our Christian civilization and of our democratic faith.

I refer to the principle that every man—regardless of his color—regardless of his creed—regardless of his name or origin—has been endowed by his Creator with a certain innate dignity. Every man has a certain value and worth by the mere fact that he is a human being.

And when the dignity, the value, the worth of any man on this planet is impaired, the dignity of all men suffers thereby.

Because we live and work in the South, we can see more immediately how this great principle can simplify our task here, if we courageously put it into practice.

We can apply that principle to our political system—and we will find that every man is entitled to have a voice in the conduct of his government—and that no individual may rightfully enjoy more influence in government than another.

We can apply that principle to our economic system—and we will find that every man is entitled, by his dignity as a man, to an education, to a decent place to live and rear his family, to the benefits of medial science, to perform useful work, and to receive just compensation for it and we will find that every man should be free to move as far up the economic ladder as his ability, initiative, and effort will carry him.

We can apply that principle to our social pattern—and nowhere, more than in the field of human relations, do we need to evaluate each individual for his individual worth—and to judge him by no other standard. There should be no other valid measurement.

The idea of the essential dignity of man is indeed a simple one.

But while we can send a message around the world in seconds, it takes years, generations sometimes, for a single idea to penetrate half an inch of human skull.

There are certain institutions of society which have as a major function the teaching of this principle—and placing it into practice.

It is the home which first is charged with implanting this idea in the mind of a man; it is the church which encourages its development throughout his life; the school and the university train the individual to utilize his talents and realize his worth, at the same time teaching him how to live in tolerance and in peace with others.

It is the duty of government to assure every individual that his basic rights will not be impaired by others—to guarantee to every individual the fullest freedom to exercise those rights. Government is the one institution in society in which all men have a share—the one medium through which the people can maintain a balance of the complex forces of modern life—

You are practitioners in the art of government—as I am privileged to be. It is your second sphere of action.

We have chosen to take part in government through the Democratic Party—the only party which, throughout its history, has consistently demonstrated its concern for the dignity of the individual—the only party which has consistently followed a policy assuring every individual a chance to realize his full worth.

The Democratic Party was founded in the South, by a great southerner—Thomas Jefferson—149 years ago.

The Democratic Party and the South have come a long way together.

The principles of the Democratic Party have not changed since the time of Jefferson.

We still believe, as Jefferson did, in equal rights for all and special privileges to none.

We still believe that government is not the master of the people, but their servant.

We still believe that the interests of the majority must not be submerged to the greed of a minority.

We still believe that the protection of property in its legitimate rights is essential, but that in any conflict between property and men, the rights of men come first.

The opponents of the Democratic Party, particularly here in the South, like to recall that Jefferson said, "That government is best which governs least." These self-styled Jeffersonian Democrats assert this quotation to oppose any government effort to improve the welfare of the people. They contend that the Democratic Party of today has changed the philosophy laid down by Jefferson.

Thomas Jefferson supplied our answer to this charge when he said: "Nothing is unchangeable but the inherent and unalienable rights of man."

Democrats—true Democrats—have always insisted that government must be adapted to the needs of the time. If bold action has been necessary to make government responsive to the will of the people, the Democratic Party has dared to take such action. If new techniques of government are essential to preserve our free enterprise system, the Democratic Party has dared to experiment. We have never repudiated imagination as a component of the art of government.

No, the Democratic Party has not left the South as its enemies charge. Nor is it going to leave the South.

The Democratic Party acknowledges its debt to the South. Three of its immortal leaders—Jefferson, Jackson, and Wilson—were men of the South. Southern delegates

nominated Franklin Roosevelt in 1932, and southern leaders in Congress charted the course of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal.

The South in turn must acknowledge its debt to the modern Democratic Party.

It was the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt which restored the income and the land of the southern farmer, which gave dignity for the first time to the southern worker, which brought southern industry from the brink of chaos.

Much of the economic progress we have made in the South in recent years can be attributed directly to the wise policies initiated during the Roosevelt administration.

The Fair Deal program of Harry S. Truman offers continued promise for constructive action to improve the welfare of the southern people.

The Fair Deal is not a revolutionary concept.

It is not a radical departure from previously accepted techniques of Government action. It seeks simply to provide what its name implies—a fair deal for every American. It was not devised in hostility to the interests of any group of our people, but to advance the prosperity and security of all.

The Fair Deal concept is that the economic interests of all our people are interdependent—that the businessman cannot sell his product unless the consumer can buy at a reasonable price, that the farmer will suffer if the workingman's wages are cut, and that the social consequences of inadequate housing, health facilities, and of failure to conserve our natural resources must be shared by all in equal measure.

Any statistical measure will clearly show that the South outstripped all other sections of the Nation in economic growth under the New Deal; we can make equally rapid strides forward under the present Democratic Party.

Undoubtedly many of you—and many other southerners—may oppose some of the methods of the administration to achieve a better life for all our people.

It is heartening indeed that so many Democrats, in North Carolina and elsewhere, are willing to work these differences out within the party. I disagree with some parts of the President's program but I'm going to try to work out these differences in the party.

If we believe that some phases of the President's program are an unwarranted invasion of the field of State government, it is our task to initiate local action which will make Federal intervention unnecessary. For a number of years we have heard a great deal in the South about States' rights; we have never heard, and do not hear now, enough about States' responsibilities.

If you, or anyone you know, believe the Fair Deal program to be socialistic—take the trouble to read the actual legislation which the program calls for. There is no phase of the President's program which does not provide a maximum amount of local responsibility, a maximum amount of freedom for private enterprise, and a minimum of Federal regulation in view of the task to be accomplished.

If you believe that the Fair Deal is an invasion of personal freedom, remember that the same charge was leveled against the New Deal 17 years ago—and you can name anyone today who does not enjoy greater personal freedom and security than he did 17 years ago?

I mention these charges because they are the same which have been used, in vain, by the enemies of the Democratic Party for 17 years.

Our enemies may circulate all the scare words, myths, hysterical attacks and gloomy predictions they desire.

But in spite of the mistakes we have made, our opponents cannot charge that the Democratic Party of Roosevelt and Truman has ever wavered in its determination to bring a more abundant life to all the people of this Nation, and to serve the cause of human dignity and brotherhood.

It has been a genuine inspiration for me to be with you this evening—to think, with you, about the grave responsibility which our Nation has accepted for preserving peace; about the role which American free enterprise must play in keeping America strong and secure; about the modern South, with its complex problems and vast potentialities, the new frontier of America; about your participation as individuals, and through the Democratic Party, in bringing the South and the Nation more fully into the service of human freedom.

You as young Democrats are heirs to a great tradition of democratic liberalism.

It is heartening to know that you are bringing to the Democratic Party the ideals, energies and enthusiasm of youth * * * that you seek to preserve in the Democratic Party those dynamic qualities which have made it great.

Through your party service you not only build a better South, you not only strengthen the free traditions of a Nation. You are quickening the hopes of men the world over for a new era of peace and justice among nations.

The H-Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to present to the Congress a letter by York Sampson, editor and publisher of the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Forum addressed to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States. Mr. Sampson is a careful and competent editor who is interested in maintaining the financial and moral integrity of this Nation. I hope that every Member of the Congress will read this communication with great care, as it contains some questions which I believe are vitally important to the future of America. The letter reads as follows:

SIOUX FALLS FORUM,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak., February 12, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You recently made the gravest decision facing mortal man in modern history.

We are stuck with the most lethal weapon man has ever conceived—the H-bomb. Perhaps we need it for self-preservation. We certainly don't for any other reason.

But why, in heaven's name, didn't you take Congress into your confidence?

Why didn't you take the United Nations into your confidence, or, at least, the friendly nations therein?

More important than all, why didn't you take us—we the people—into your confidence in making this unprecedented announcement?

Why did you pass up the chance to explain your reasons over a world-wide radio network? Why did you pass up this marvelous opportunity to explain American ideas and ideals (which would have had more telling effect than a trial H-bomb)?

The history of the world may have been changed by your decision.

If this is a free country, and we believe it still is, how can you now expect any American, or any one else in the world, to believe you haven't thus irrevocably taken away a great deal more of our liberty than we yet realize?

We believe this deserves an answer at once.

SIOUX FALLS FORUM,
YORK SAMPSON,
Editor and Publisher.

The Fair Deal and Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave given me, I desire to include for the RECORD a letter written to me by one of my constituents who is mortally sick of the antics of this administration. He says he reflects how 99.9 percent of his friends feel. He wants action taken to squelch the socialized medicine scheme, the crazy Brannan farm plan, he wants Congress to throw the traitors—Communists—out of our Government. He says what he thinks about the Taft-Hartley law and those who flaunt it, and the betrayal of China. He makes an appeal to this Congress for clear and sound thinking and certainly I want to meet his request to include his letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Here it is, as follows:

JANUARY 31, 1950.

The Honorable LEONARD W. HALL,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is an exceedingly hard letter to write, for instead of writing these few lines, I would like to write books. I have spent 20 years in civic work, so I can appreciate that no matter what you do and no matter how sincere you are in your efforts, you are criticised on all sides and especially from those who do nothing. I have such little time to write and I have put it off for months but I decided to let you know how one of your constituents feels and how 99.9 percent of my friends feel.

I am really worried about the political situation in our country today. I feel that we will have a Socialistic government in another 3 or 4 years unless someone stops the Fair Deal.

I realize that you are a mighty busy man and I sincerely admire what you stand for, because I know that you are opposed to practically every one of the Fair Deal socialistic schemes. I wish that you could find time to answer a few questions for me:

1. Who is going to stop the Fair Deal from shoving through the Federal aid-to-education bill? Forget about religion, I am a Protestant. I am opposed to paying for someone else's education. When I moved to Elmont from Philadelphia my child had to go to school one-half of a day; I was one of the ringleaders in getting a new school, our children go to school a full day now. If the people want their children educated they will see that they get it. If Truman and Ewing can put this bill through, we the people, will not have a thing to say about our children's education in a few years for the Government keeps taking over a little here and a little there until they do it all, and imagine what the cost will be, with all the thousands of additional Government employees required, and who will vote for Truman.

2. Who is going to squelch this Fair Deal socialized medicine scheme?

3. Who is going to squelch the idiotic, stupid, crazy Brannan farm plan?

4. When is Congress going to throw the traitors—Communists—out of our Government? I refer especially to our State Department (Acheson and Butterworth in particular). I realize that this is a serious accusation but I'll back it up, for actions speak louder than words.

5. When is Congress going to put the United States first and Great Britain last?

6. When is Congress going to run our country instead of know-it-all Truman? We have the Taft-Hartley law on our books but Truman has flouted it twice and our poor Congressmen, that the people had confidence in, sit meekly by. If this isn't a dictatorship, then I want to know what is.

7. Is Congress going to sit by while Nationalist China goes under? No words can describe our shameful betrayal of Nationalist China; it stinks to high heaven and Congress does nothing but talk. There's a possibility that Formosa will be deserted, just so Great Britain can keep their socialistic Government in power and so Russia can take over Asia, then Africa, then the Americas, and then set up Acheson as the dictator of the Americas.

8. How long must the American people put up with this fake ECA program? All the stuff we read about what good it is doing is plain bunk. Have you ever been in some of the mental hospitals around New York? My oldest daughter is a nurse in one and I do work in them through the American Legion and my Masonic lodge. How can I describe the crowded conditions and the need for better medical treatment in this letter? Go into New York's Harlem, go into the Bowery, go into southwest Washington, D. C., and see the need for help. Why not put our people first for once? I know that Jesus said, "Love thy neighbor as thyself" and I recognize that the Europeans are our neighbors and need help but doesn't Congress realize that Americans are our neighbors too? Why aren't the Spaniards and the Chinese Nationalists considered our neighbors too?

9. How many Congressmen realize that every decision they make will be judged by the Supreme Architect at the day of judgment? Their responsibilities are so much greater than the average man's, therefore their judgment will be more severe.

Could this letter be put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

May God give wisdom to every one of our Representatives and Senators, so that they may rule wisely, for the benefit of all mankind.

Most respectfully yours,

FREDERICK W. HILL.

ELMONT, N. Y.

Statement on Percentage Depletion by Gov. Frank Carlson, of Kansas, Before House Ways and Means Committee, February 17, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent statement recently made before the Ways and Means Committee of the House by Hon. Frank Carlson, Governor of Kansas, and a former distinguished Member of this House and of the Ways and Means Committee.

The statement follows:

The administration, through the Secretary of the Treasury, has again attacked percentage depletion as a loophole in the income-tax law through which the Treasury is losing large sums of revenue.

The Secretary has proposed to the Congress that percentage depletion on oil and gas production be reduced from 27½ percent to 15 percent of the gross revenue of the property and that the gross revenue of the property be reduced by the intangible drilling and development costs to arrive at an adjusted gross revenue subject to the 15-percent application.

Coming as I do from a State in which oil and gas production and mining operations are important activities, I feel that I have more than a passing interest in percentage depletion. When the Treasury made the proposal in 1942 to eliminate or modify this provision, I made my position clear on the subject in my statement before the Ways and Means Committee.

Those who have questioned the deduction in the past have evidently done so on the assumption that it represented the grant of a special tax privilege, or that it represented an unwarranted subsidy to a favored group at the expense of all other taxpayers.

To make such a claim is tantamount, in my opinion, to contending that Congress for a period of nearly 30 years acted either in such ignorance of the subject as to amount to gross negligence or that Congress deliberately and intentionally legislated against the best interests of the country.

Since I am unwilling to attribute such a motive or such ignorance to Congress, my studies of the history of the legislation have been made with the object of ascertaining, first, just why Congress adopted and continued the provision and, second, whether circumstances now existing warrant a change in congressional policy with respect to the subject.

Depletion is an allowable deduction from gross income which the Congress has authorized in order to arrive at taxable net income and to avoid the taxation of the return of capital values. In this respect, it is related to depreciation allowance provision for the recovery of a taxpayer's investment in plant facilities and other physical equipment or properties used in the production of income.

Depreciation is allowed because the taxpayer's plant wears out or becomes obsolete in the course of producing income. Depletion is allowed because the taxpayer's minerals or other natural resources are being exhausted. It is, therefore, obvious that, in its simplest sense, depreciation is the impairment of the quality of replaceable property, while depletion is the reduction of the quantity of an irreplaceable commodity.

Depreciation is necessary to replace machines and plant facilities when they wear out. Depletion is similarly necessary to replace mineral deposits when they are extracted from the earth and consumed.

In order to remain in business and to meet the continued and increasing demands for supplies of minerals, the producers must continually explore new areas. They must find and develop deposits which experience indicates will be deeper, more remote, harder to find, and harder to develop.

This unending search and development becomes more and more costly. Thus, while the capital recovered through depreciation provides a substantial part of the funds required to replace machinery even in high-cost periods, this is decidedly not true in the case of mineral deposits.

The cost of finding and developing new sources of mineral supply tends to be many times as great as the cost of those recently exhausted. The producer must have available for these hazardous ventures a fund far exceeding the mere recovery of his former investment.

Those characteristics of depreciation and depletion began to receive serious consideration by Congress when our participation in the First World War quickly sent the income-tax rates up to the point at which refinements in computing taxable income became a really serious matter.

Concurrently the vital importance of ample proven and developed mineral reserves, as an absolute necessity for national defense and economic security, was dramatically brought to the attention of Congress and the public.

Among the many proposals to encourage a speedy and widespread increase in the search for new mineral reserves the most effective were those aimed at mitigating the burden of the income tax on those who were willing to take the financial risks involved in the search. In the light of experience such tax measures were deemed necessary in addition to measures for making the public lands available for development and measures for intensified governmental geological surveys and research in the technique of mineral production.

One of the outstanding tax provisions was discovery depletion. It was founded upon recognition of the enormous hazards that characterized mineral prospecting and development, and is thus distinguishable from subsidy measures. Designed to modify one of the deductions in arriving at net income, it forms an appropriate part of an income-tax law. It was also remarkably successful in its other purpose, which was to stimulate a vastly increased and sustained effort to find and develop more and more mineral reserves.

Although a deduction for exhaustion or depletion was provided in earlier acts, it was in the Revenue Act of 1918 that Congress first dealt comprehensively with the subject. It provided for a deduction which, by the time the recoverable mineral content was exhausted, would amount to the value of the property within 30 days after discovery.

In other words, it put the discoverer on the same footing as one who had bought the property after its value was demonstrated by discovery. Congress thus recognized, as a fundamental principle, that the computation of an adequate depletion provision must have a broader base than the concept of recovering the historical cost of the discovery property itself.

This provision for a base other than cost, in the case of discoveries of oil and certain other minerals, was by no means unique. Congress had also provided generally, with respect to any kind of property held by a taxpayer at March 1, 1913, that the value at 1913 would be recognized in lieu of cost, as the base for computing depreciation, depletion, or gain from sale, wherever such value exceeded cost.

The discovery-depletion provision was, in effect, merely a special substitution, of the discovery date for March 1, 1913, for the purpose of the depletion allowance, in recognition of the special character of mineral reserves hidden in the earth.

In 1921, without departing from the discovery-depletion principle, Congress limited the amount of allowable depletion for any single property (tract of land) to the amount of the net income before deducting depletion. In 1924 the limit was set at half of the net income before depletion. (These limits did not apply, however, to depletion computed on a base other than discovery value.)

In 1926 there was a widespread demand for simplification of the depletion procedure, provided it could be accomplished without seriously impairing the established and highly successful policy of encouraging continued effort in petroleum exploration and development. Ascertainment and proof of discovery value was complicated and burdensome. Congress solved this problem, in the case of oil and gas, by substituting a depletion deduction computed as a specific percentage of gross income. It did so with the express intent of preserving the essential effect of the existing law and of continuing the existing policy.

In an effort to approximate roughly the average result obtained under the discovery provision one branch of Congress proposed 25 percent and the other 30 percent. They compromised at 27½ percent of gross income, and the law was enacted accordingly.

At the same time the existing limitation to 50 percent of the net operating income from the property (before depletion) was continued in force; also, the exception to such limitation where cost depletion would be greater.

Later, beginning in 1932, as the operation of the simplified procedure proved successful in administration, percentage-depletion provisions were enacted in the case of other minerals. (Possibly, if Congress had provided percentage depletion for mines at the same time it did so for oil and gas, the mining industry would have been in a stronger position to meet the requirements of World War II.) The percentage-depletion provisions are still in effect and have survived after intensive review by committees of Congress intent upon weighing revenue needs against its merits.

Depletion allowance based on a value calculated on the price of oil at the time of discovery and estimated reserves proved to be arbitrary and inaccurate. The percentage depletion allowance based on actual selling cost over the producing life of the property has resulted in an allowance reflecting actual selling value and the actual quantity of production.

In 1938 when percentage depletion was adopted by the Congress, a special Senate investigating committee, after an extensive study of the problem reported to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation that the new percentage system "distributed the depletion more uniformly among the industry without regard to price of oil on discovery" and that it "reduced valuation work in the bureau". The report also concluded that the new percentage system did not materially affect the revenue. It is my own opinion that the application of percentage depletion has materially increased the national tax revenue.

The conclusion of World War II did not terminate the very real and serious national concern over the maintenance of adequate reserves of petroleum and other minerals. This is evidenced by the fact that within the past year the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Petroleum Resources made an extended investigation of the petroleum situation, hearing many witnesses and examining evidence over a period of several months.

The testimony has been published, and I consider noteworthy the following observations taken from the testimony of Mr. Charles E. Bell:

"Obviously as new pools are discovered the number of undiscovered pools is correspondingly reduced. Because of this the producer's hazards and costs will necessarily increase. * * * Producers * * * are pledged to greater effort to replace and if possible, increase by new discoveries, the Nation's accessible reserves which were so seriously depleted by the greater-than-normal draft of wartime requirements. We believe that Congress, having adopted or approved both the intangible development cost and percentage depletion provisions as a long-range policy, will be the first to realize that their continuance is essential to the Nation's postwar petroleum program * * *. I wish to remind you that the intangible development cost provision had been in the Commissioner's regulations for 8 years before Congress adopted the percentage depletion provision. It is thus clear that Congress intended that both types of deductions remain in effect, complementary to each other."

In its final report, the Senate special committee endorsed the current congressional policy in the following language:

"Because oil, like other minerals, is a diminishing resource, and because investments incident to exploration involve unique risks with danger of large financial loss, the Congress through income-tax provisions has allowed deductions for depletion and intangible drilling costs." * * *. To take steps to guarantee a domestic petroleum supply adequate for all eventualities * * * we should enact those laws which are most conducive to stimulating additional exploration and development in the United States. * * * Encourage free competitive enterprise by tax reforms to provide incentives for the risk of private capital in new ventures. * * * Continue the provisions of the income-tax law permitting deductions for depletion and intangible drilling costs."

The special Senate committee, after its thorough review of over 60 years of oil-industry operations, presented the conclusions quoted above as major features in its recommendations for a national petroleum policy. That committee's report and recommendation are, in my opinion, of direct and conclusive significance to us, because they clearly disclose that Congress is fully and currently aware of the necessity of continuing the existing policy of taxing income derived from natural resources.

In 30 years the depletion provision has become a vital factor in the economy of our extractive industries. Although its contribution toward the widespread and highly competitive search for minerals cannot be precisely measured, we do know that these extremely hazardous ventures have continued.

The resulting discoveries of mineral reserves have contributed substantially to national welfare and to the successful conclusion of the recent world war. These discoveries likewise have benefited our peacetime economy through wide expansion of employment and increased products.

With demand for minerals at an all-time peak, and with prospects of unforeseen world-wide demand, we shall need the full and continued effort of all present and prospective producers of minerals. The hazards and costs of exploration are increasing. Petroleum industry exploration has had to follow new, expensive scientific methods, and drilling has reached greater depths.

Search for all minerals has expanded into relatively inaccessible areas. Such conditions have substantially reduced the intended effect of the depletion allowance, namely, to partially offset the cost of replacing currently produced minerals.

Reversal or modification by Congress of the policy it has consistently followed for so many years would dangerously interfere with the peacetime economy. This is certainly no time to penalize the prospector and the wildcatter.

It is the constitutional obligation of the Congress to levy taxes for the national defense and the general welfare. Our income-tax laws have been framed to the end that these objectives may be accomplished with the least possible burden upon the enterprise of our citizens.

The strength of our Nation in peace and in war is the result of a sound economic system of which the petroleum industry is an integral part. The wisdom of the national legislative program with relation to petroleum has been well justified.

Percentage depletion has been a revenue-raising measure, because it has been an important factor in developing a strong and healthy petroleum industry which has resulted in increased oil and gas production which in turn has produced greater taxable income. Increased production of oil and gas has been in the public interest because it has reduced the price of petroleum products to the consumer.

Our system has given the American public an abundance of petroleum products at costs far below the level of any other country. Under our system, the domestic industry was prepared to supply the wartime petroleum needs of our own military forces and those of our allies in two world wars.

The American oil industry has in turn produced almost scores of other industries which contribute to the national tax revenue, for example, the automobile industry, the trucking industry, the aviation industry, and the tire industry. Both Federal and State gasoline tax receipts have increased with the overexpanded consumption of this petroleum product.

It is thus evident that percentage depletion was adopted to implement a policy on the part of Congress to promote the national welfare through encouraging private industry to risk its capital in the hazardous search for new sources of supply, and that the policy was continued in force in the realization that it was accomplishing its purpose.

My conclusion is that the policy of Congress, as expressed in the past by its actions and at present by the report and recommendations of the special Senate committee, is justified both on the basis of pure merit and on the basis of results obtained. It is my recommendation that this committee go on record as being opposed to any change which would restrict the percentage depletion provisions as they now stand.

Similarly, the right to deduct intangible development costs in the year in which they are incurred is based on a regulation of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue authorized by statute. This right has become an established national policy in the taxation of income derived from crude petroleum and natural gas and has been a substantial factor in the expansion of the petroleum industry.

This just regulation was promulgated in 1917, and is today substantially in its original form. The wisdom of this regulation and its effect on the operation under the income-tax laws has been reviewed and approved by the Congress repeatedly.

The serious effect of a change in this regulation was recently demonstrated when exploration and development in the petroleum industry was greatly disrupted by a court decision reflecting on the authority of the regulation. This was quickly corrected by the Congress again reviewing and reaffirming its previous position.

It is likewise my recommendation that this committee oppose any change in the income-tax laws that would restrict the right of oil and gas producers to deduct intangible development costs as an item of expense in the year in which they are incurred.

Sesquicentennial Concert Honoring Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made by me as guest speaker at the sesquicentennial concert honoring Massachusetts:

Friends and fellow Americans, it is a genuine privilege for me to appear tonight in this very appropriate and distinguished program honoring Massachusetts.

On the birthday of the great Father of our Country, who gave so much of his life and of himself for the cause of human freedom and democracy, it is fitting that we should dedicate a portion of this program to honoring the memory of the immortal George Washington with whom the history of my own beloved Commonwealth of Massachusetts was so intimately associated. It was under an elm tree on historic Cambridge Common in Massachusetts that Washington took command of the Colonial Army and within the confines of nearby Harvard College still stands the house which served as his headquarters.

Freedom found no more fertile ground in the Nation for its early growth and development than in Massachusetts. Faneuil Hall, the cradle of American liberty, Bunker Hill, and Concord and Lexington and many other places of the Old Bay State are truly historic landmarks of the early struggle of the American people to throw off the yoke of oppression and set up free institutions and a free way of life.

Massachusetts not only contributed unselfishly of its resources in blood and treasure to the forging of a great new democracy here in the Western World. It furnished some of the strongest, ablest, and most effective leadership in guiding and directing the conflict which led ultimately to the establishment of American freedom. As Congressman from a great and patriotic district in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I am proud indeed of the services, contributions, and sacrifices of the people of my district and State in behalf of the cause of free government.

Since the time it was first achieved here in America, the ideal of freedom has survived many dangerous threats. In war and peace, our free way of life has been gravely jeopardized. The tempests of civil dissension and international conflict have beat about our temple of freedom, but no foe has been able to destroy it.

But we face today greater dangers than we have ever faced before. Freedom is under attack on a world-wide front. Powerful forces intent upon the complete destruction of the free way of life have spread over much of the earth throttling democratic government and individual liberty. These forces are possessed of great strength of arms, resources, manpower, and the secrets of the awesome atomic bomb and its even more destructive twin—the so-called H-bomb.

These very same forces threaten our own liberties at home by setting up internal conspiracy designed to destroy our individual and collective freedoms through stealth, secrecy, and subversion.

My fellow Americans, freedom still lives tonight in the minds and hearts of the people, but everywhere it is in danger. Everywhere it is assailed and attacked by resourceful and powerful enemies.

In the name of Faneuil Hall, Bunker Hill, Concord, and Lexington, and all the other imperishable shrines of America, in the name of our martyred dead who gave their all that freedom might live, in the name of every principle and virtue we cherish as a people, let us solidly unite in this perilous hour to preserve our birth right of freedom. Once we lose it, it can never be regained. Let us join together under God as our forefathers did through brotherhood, through courage, through strength, and through unbounded faith in democracy to save our precious freedom before it is too late.

Thank you and good night.

What the Republican Policy Statement Really Says About a Bipartisan Foreign Policy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "GOP Policy on Bipartisanship," taken from the Daily Plainsman, published in Huron, S. Dak., dealing with the foreign-policy section of the recent Republican policy statement, together with a few comments of my own.

There being no objection, the editorial and Mr. MUNDT's statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP POLICY ON BIPARTISANSHIP

Apparently undetected and unnoticed by the press pundits and syndicated columnists in Washington and New York is the fact that in the recent Statement of Principles and Objectives, or policy statement, by the Republican Members of Congress and the GOP National Committee, took a big step toward eliminating the tragic bipartisan foreign policy.

The bipatrtisan foreign policy has been one of the two main defects of United States foreign policy.

Primary defect, of course, has been the ineptness, lack of vision, lack of understanding of Communist influences at work, and apparent lack of intelligence on the part of Truman and his advisers.

Next to that in importance has been the bipartisan principle, whereby the Republicans agreed in advance not to criticize the administration's foreign policy, nor even debate it. That principle led to formation of foreign policy by the administration without the strengthening factor of critical debate. Many of the steps, in fact, were taken in secret and kept secret.

The most terrible consequence of that bipartisanship was that it kept the public in ignorance of what was happening, both Republicans and Democrats alike conspiring to keep the public ignorant. The result is that it has taken the public five long years to realize that the administration's policies have, step by step, literally and actually endangered the future lives of every United States citizen.

Note, therefore, what the recent GOP statement says about foreign policy:

We oppose secret commitments, and we denounce the refusal of the administration to furnish accurate and adequate information to the Congress.

"Under our indispensable two-party system, we shall be vigilant in critical exploration of administration foreign policy. We favor consultation between the Executive and Members of both major parties in the legislative branch of Government in the initiation and development of a united American foreign policy; and we deplore the tragic consequences of the administration's failure to pursue these objectives in many fields, particularly in the secret agreements of Yalta, subsequently confirmed at Potsdam, which have created new injustices and dangers throughout the world."

The statement fails to state specifically that it deplores the bipartisan foreign policy and doesn't restate its evils, as it could have done, but it does show a recognition of the fact that the safety of the public demands a restoration of vigorous two-party debate in foreign policy, as in every other field.

Note well that the statement specifies that there should be consultation on foreign policy between the Executive and Members of both major parties. This newspaper happens to be in receipt of information that the word "members" was carefully inserted by those on the policy-framing committee.

That is all-important, for it means that the Republican policy is definitely not to have a Senator VANDENBERG labeled as a spokesman for the entire party and then drawn into a secret conference.

The foreign policy is to be discussed by Members of both parties, which means debating it in Congress before the public.

That is of tremendous importance and it is a paragraph to which the Republicans themselves ought to draw more attention. For it is significant that it is one section which it would be politically unwise for Truman to criticize and he is not attacking it. He has attacked the domestic affairs section of the GOP policy and the "liberty versus socialism" phrase.

The GOP's new approach to foreign policy is its strong point and it is conversely the President's most pitifully weak and vulnerable side.

Foreign policy is literally the life-or-death issue facing the American public and it therefore ought to be the chief campaign issue.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT

Mr. President, many have read into the Republican policy statement which was recently issued an interpretation of the Republican stand on foreign policy which is not in precise conformity with the carefully worded text of that important statement. Others have permitted what they hoped the statement would contain to color their observations about what the statement in actuality did contain.

Robert D. Lusk, one of our distinguished South Dakota editors, has analyzed the Republican policy statement on foreign policy carefully and has compared it with other earlier Republican platform expressions and Republican attitudes on foreign policy. To Mr. Lusk goes credit therefore for making an accurate and discerning report of the fact that the new policy statement definitely indicates that from this point forward the Republicans in Congress expect to insist that if we are to have a bipartisan foreign policy it must be created by bipartisan action and advice as well as supported by the Members of both major political parties.

Mr. President, I call attention to Mr. Lusk's interpretative editorial on this important subject.

What Have You Learned?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have a copy of an address made by Mr. David Lawrence on February 15, 1950, at the commencement exercises of Temple University. Mr. Lawrence is one of the outstanding editors and columnists of the

Nation. His ideas are sound, his suggestions constructive, and his approach always patriotic. I consider this address of value to the Congress and to the people of the Nation, and, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED?

I appreciate personally your award to me of the honorary degree of doctor of letters, but I appreciate it impersonally even more because you have seen fit in your citation to refer to the dissemination of news about the operations of our Government as a field of service worthy of recognition.

From the pen of George Washington we have these arresting lines: "In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened."

Next October will complete my twelfth year in our National Capital. Perhaps this experience permits some observations on what are the essential prerequisites to an enlightened public opinion. But I shall sum it up with one simple axiom: Without enlightened individuals there is no enlightened nation. It is, therefore, to the individual as a citizen that these remarks are addressed.

"Commencement" can be a meaningful word in your life. It can mean the beginning of self-examination. It can mean the beginning of an adjustment to life itself—a new perspective.

It is a time to ask: "What have you learned?" There is implied in this, of course, no questioning of the nature of the curriculum. More and more in recent years educators have recognized that the textbook and lecture do not suffice—the student must be stimulated to apply the knowledge he derives from books. The question goes rather to the point: "What have you learned about life itself? What do you know about that broad field which we call human relations?"

There is no phase of education which does not, in one sense or another, touch directly upon the fundamental problems of human relations. The rules of law, or science, or economics, can be set, but what does human nature do to those rules? We meet this factor constantly in almost every applied phase of written knowledge.

Whether in the home, in the neighborhood, in one's profession or trade, in national or international affairs, the adjustment of human relations today yearns for understanding.

Human relations, of course, includes human friction. And the sources of all human friction are quite tangible. Whether on the picket lines of trade unionism, or in the intercourse of nations, friction arises out of misunderstandings due to distrust, or antipathy, or selfishness. This friction frequently produces violence. Economic war appears at times as unrestrained as military war. Indeed, if we come to understand the characteristics of individual behavior, we will understand the behavior of nations.

Naturally, because it has been for many years my responsibility to report and analyze current happenings, I have had a chance to see the seeds of controversy as they germinate, as they sprout, from time to time, in our domestic affairs. I have been able to trace, sometimes in their incipient stages, those international episodes which have led to two world wars and now threaten us with a third world war.

There is little new to discover about human relations as such. The pattern is drawn and redrawn on the pages of history. Through centuries of time men have behaved toward one another in virtually the same way; human nature is really not much different than it was, for instance, in the days of ancient Greece or Rome. The scale of human friction is more extensive today and the methods of warfare are more destructive, but the human ingredients are the same. Basically there is no novelty in the truism that when nations grow sufficiently suspicious or distrustful of one another they rationalize their fears and assert the right to kill one another in self-defense.

The main task of the modern world, therefore, is to weigh anew physical and moral force as a means of preventing war. This is not to imply a denial of the rightful part which physical force plays in obeying the law of self-preservation. But I do assert that moral force as a means of averting human friction has not played, and does not now play, its rightful part in human relations.

Moral force is relatively untried in the world. Men have proved conclusively that they can use their fists. But they have not proved that they can use their heads. All the ingenuity of mankind today is focused on the making of destructive weapons. The constructive energies of mankind have never been mobilized for peace.

The real reason, of course, is that the acquisitive instincts of the human being, the materialistic instincts, the poisons of pride and selfishness, have ruled individuals and permeated governments in a strong lust for possessions and power.

Let us not make any mistake about this—governments are the creatures of peoples. Governments are no better than their constituents' desire. If we are to have better government in the world, or if we are to have better relations between governments, we must start not just with the study of theories of government but with the practices of individuals to whom the obligations of responsible citizenship are entrusted.

But how are we to get responsible individuals? Inevitably we come back to the school as the institution from which this primary influence must radiate. But education is unjustly blamed sometimes for the misbehavior of the educated as well as the uneducated.

If prescribed courses alone could stimulate individuals to an understanding of their responsibilities this would be a different world. Yet precisely because what is written or spoken in the classroom needs interpretation by the individual in terms of his own experience, responsible individualism must be developed outside the classroom—when the individual begins to apply the lessons of life itself.

What is responsible individualism? In these days of "isms" and ideologies, we are told that rugged individualism was a ruthless exercise by the individual of his economic powers of exploitation. We are told that liberalism, on the other hand, provides a real recognition of the public interest—the greater good of the greater number.

Unfortunately, in our day there are too many people who call themselves liberals but who really believe in the mastery of the citizen by the state. Their concept of the public interest is that all rights belong to the state and that the individual must be subservient thereto. They ignore the Constitution with its clear definition of individual and state power. While the Constitution enumerates certain specific powers as belonging to the Federal Government and to the States, the tenth amendment declares explicitly that all rights not delegated to the Federal Government or to the States are reserved to the people—to you and to me as individuals.

The broad premise that those governments are best which rest upon the consent of the governed is still, to be sure, the best guaranty or assurance of human freedom for the individual. But just because we have emphasized rights and freedoms in an abstract sense, and because we have defined governmental powers in a legal sense, we may have overlooked the true meaning of individual responsibility. For the best of governments cannot function effectively if the individuals themselves fail to live up to their responsibilities.

Responsible individualism means, therefore, that there are duties and responsibilities as well as rights inherent in the enjoyment of individual freedom.

In the world today we are discussing communism, fascism, and state socialism as imposing new restraints upon the individual. We view with apprehension statism as a method whereby governments exploit peoples. But we must not deceive ourselves. These extreme forms of government have arisen largely because individuals have abdicated their responsibilities. Economic discontent and chaos have plunged peoples into a state of desperation. Out of this they have grasped at any straw, at any "ism," as a means of extricating themselves from their tragic plight.

The main objective of a responsible government is to make sure that no group or faction exploits the majority and that economic stability is made possible for the maximum number. But government in a democracy cannot legislate morals nor introduce rules of ethics for individuals. It cannot cure the excesses of materialism. Good government is dependent only upon the morality of the community and the standards which decent men and women recognize as standards.

Have you, therefore, learned your responsibility as an individual? It is time to begin. It is time to note that in an age of materialism there are spiritual values which can afford you great compensations—great happiness.

The rituals written in the various religions of mankind are not in themselves complete. It is in the everyday life of the individual that the lessons contained in those rituals must be applied.

Having been permitted to observe government over a long period of time, I do not hesitate to say that the most effective men we have had in the public service are the men in whose private lives there is no taint of dishonesty or fraud. I am referring not merely to the fraud involved in a piece of graft or bribery. I am referring rather to the integrity of men—those who give their word and keep it, who say what they mean and who do not camouflage through the phrases of expediency what their honest purpose really is. I am referring to men with a deep sense of moral values.

Politics is a euphemism which too often covers intellectual dishonesties of educated persons—those who justify expediency and openly rationalize deception.

A courageous press can expose this form of hypocrisy and assist the citizen so that he may express his disapproval of those artifices which are all too numerous in the legislative and executive bodies of our Government today.

Never underestimate the importance of a free press as a servant of democracy and good government. It is not perfect. It has flaws. But do not be misled by those who say the press in America is controlled. Controlled by whom? The criticism we sometimes hear is that the press is controlled by its advertisers. But who are the advertisers? They are the businesses of the country, large and small, which have goods to sell. Unless the public finds publications truthful and interesting to read, there will be no opportunity for the advertisements to be read. The readers—not the advertisers—are sovereign.

Some irresponsible critics have arisen to say that news is suppressed at the dictation of advertisers. What news? There have been times, no doubt, when some member of an advertiser's family has gotten himself into trouble and maybe some kindly editor here or there has kept the name out of the paper, perhaps out of a mistaken sense of reciprocity. I seriously doubt whether the infinitesimal number of such instances in our whole press has any more significance than the occasional suppression of the name of a kidnaped child while the police work on clues.

The real test is this: Can any one point to an important piece of national or international news that has been suppressed? I mean, of course, outside of the military orbit—economic news, political news, crime news, any important news touching on social welfare?

The reason why the press is so frequently attacked as being under the control of materialistic influences is that those who have a materialistic ax of their own to grind have not been able themselves to obtain control of the press.

Theoretically, the entire press might be expected to be controlled by the workers. Virtually all of its readers work for a living. But workers are tolerant citizens of the broad community. They are not a separate class. Newspapers have long since learned that the moment they become organs of classes or groups they cease to fulfill their main function in the community. That is why you will find that the statements by labor-union leaders and the statements by employers all get attention in the news columns of the American press.

Nothing like the freedom of the press which we enjoy in America can be found in the nondemocratic countries. A single group or a single man can overnight plunge those countries into war. When public opinion functions, however, as in a democracy, there is restraint and caution and the people demand that every step that can possibly be taken to avoid war be taken.

There are some defects, however, to which I would like to call your attention.

Not enough people read about their own government—what it is doing with the taxpayers' money and what it is doing or failing to do to enforce the laws of the land.

Not enough people are concerned with the basic principles of fairness in governmental operations.

Not enough people demand the information that they are entitled to receive on national and international problems.

Good citizenship requires that you be well informed. The dissemination of knowledge about our Government is increasing rapidly, but the number of persons who are actually concerned with governmental trends and who read carefully what is going on is too small a group. One would think that with a large number of college graduates the circle would be wider. It should be. The fault lies with those educated individuals who delegate this responsibility of citizenship to other citizens.

Do not be misled by the defeatist cry, "What can I do?" Do not feel that you are a helpless individual among many hundreds of millions of persons. This is the feeling that leads directly to an abdication of your responsibilities as a citizen in a democracy.

What you do in your precinct, among your friends, among your business acquaintances, in your profession, can influence others. The power of example—the power of good example—is still the greatest force that mankind has ever known.

There is happiness and satisfaction ahead for you on the day you discover the spirit of human service—when the quests of vanity and pride, the pursuit of material gain and advantage, become to you valueless if obtained at the expense of a troubled conscience. The day that you conquer yourself and learn by searching self-examination to differentiate between right and wrong, between truth and untruth, between selfishness and unselfishness—on that day you will emerge as a truly educated person—a responsible individual—in a world all too anxious to entrust you with leadership and the guidance of others who crave an understanding of that better way of life.

I venture to speak of these things only because I have felt that we depend too much on the words of written formulas, or agreements, or laws, or treaties, in order to make our institutions more effective, and too little do we search our hearts and our consciences for those motivating influences that give us character as individuals—influences which can make or unmake written formulas and the most carefully drafted laws.

I commend to you the importance of spiritual values in our modern life.

I urge you to give your attention to the sources of human friction and to pledge yourselves to try not to increase friction but actually to do your level best to diminish friction within your own individual area of activity.

Perhaps such a plea is superfluous. Perhaps the youth of today will be compelled in an atomic world to evaluate human relations with a new realism. Perhaps they see in perspective already this distraught world. Perhaps they will perceive more quickly than our generation has that communism and state socialism can thrive only when individualism throws up the sponge. Perhaps the youth of today are wiser and will not make the same mistakes because they cannot afford the risks of doing otherwise. The prayers of mankind will support that hope.

You have in the short span of years that lie ahead of you the opportunity to remake your world. It is not an unsolvable problem. What we sometimes call a new approach is as old as the ten commandments.

There is but one answer to the ills of the world—a willingness on the part of all of us as responsible individuals to listen to the guidance of God and to feel His presence as the master of conscience.

What can you do? Just remake yourself—and your example will be followed by others.

Then will nations, too, be remade. Then will real peace come to us all.

Individual character and national character are inseparable.

Nylons and Lipsticks Ruin Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Nylons and Lipsticks Ruin Marshall Plan," published in the Kansas City Star under date of February 17, 1950.

This article was sent to me by a lady in Missouri with this notation: "Is this what we pay such exorbitant taxes for? I'm tired of being taxed to death."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NYLONS AND LIPSTICKS RUIN MARSHALL PLAN

PROVIDENCE, R. I., February 17.—The Marshall plan is choking itself to death on nylon stockings, lipsticks, plastic combs, and canned tuna fish, Nicholas Farmakis, a Greek student at Bryant College here, charges.

The insistence of the United States in shipping little but finished products—and then things that are unnecessary to life in Greece—is stifling Greek economy and making the people lazy and dependent, Farmakis said.

INSTEAD LACE

Raw materials which could be converted by native labor into articles really needed by the Greeks would start up industry in Greece and make it a strong bulwark against the Communists to the north.

But the American idea that what an American thinks is right and all that foreigners think is wrong is causing the Marshall plan to backfire into an agency of dissatisfaction among the people of Europe, Farmakis thinks.

Tuna is an ideal canned product for America with its vast inland territory, Farmakis admits, but it could help make idle thousands of Greeks who fish for a living, when shipped in large quantities to Greece if only the Greeks would use it.

But they don't. They prefer the native, fresh-caught fish. The American tuna is stored in warehouses until the space is needed, then it is dumped. But it keeps coming, Farmakis said.

FEELS FOR WORTHY

Lipsticks and nylons do a lot for the American girl, said Farmakis, who is a student of more than business administration, but their use among the economic level of persons supposed to be helped by the Marshall plan is slight in Greece.

The tall, 23-year-old student, who hopes to go into politics in Greece when his studies in America are completed, feels that all aid under the Marshall plan should be stopped immediately until the nations involved can meet with the United States and set up a program by which they can get the things they need—and the things that we think they need can be left in this country.

Farmakis's father is president of the Greek Rubber Co., and he wants to import raw rubber to Greece so that it can be manufactured by Greeks into things that Greeks need. But the Greek need for these products is met by Marshall plan administrators with shipments of finished rubber goods.

These fail to benefit the people because the Greek Government imposes import taxes on them to protect the native rubber companies, so other Greeks suffer.

The Danger Facing America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I present a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Arizona Republic, of Phoenix, Ariz., the Indianapolis News, and Muncie (Ind.) Press, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITH THE WOLVES OF FIRE

The President of the United States made a speech to the Nation Thursday night. He spoke via radio to millions of Americans who may be living on borrowed time, now that an avowed enemy is building weapons of atomic

destruction aimed at America. The President spoke to a people who have been told that the even more fearful hydrogen bomb may wipe out civilization and all life on this planet in one flaming breath. At the moment he spoke, the Red tide of communism that has engulfed almost all of the continent of Asia was pressing hard against the last friendly outposts in the Pacific. In captive Berlin the noose again was being tightened by a new blockade.

On the same night the President spoke, the fires were going out in basic industries all over America. Schools were being closed, and homes and hospitals were reaching into their last reserves of coal. Men by the thousands were being laid off their jobs, trains were being canceled, and the Nation was faced with suspension of vital telephone service. Food products bought with the taxes of the people were being piled up to rot while millions throughout the world went hungry to bed. As the President spoke, citizens all over the Nation were reflecting on the treachery of those in high positions of trust who had been found guilty of betraying their country. And all over the world desperate men were shoring up the hasty defenses of freedom.

Against this background of national peril and acute drama the President of the United States made a speech.

He said the only danger to the American Nation is the Republican Party.

In the name of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln we reverently ask: How much lower can the leadership in Washington descend?

Social-Security Coverage of Police Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on February 9 I caused to be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by John J. Goff, chairman of the Committee of Associated Pension Funds of New Jersey, in opposition to the enactment of H. R. 6000.

Today I should like to supplement that statement with a communication and statement of Howard J. Devaney, president of the New Jersey State Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, Inc., which clearly indicates that the patrolmen of New Jersey have precisely the same concern about the effect of H. R. 6000 in its present form as have all other public employees at the State and local levels of government.

To the end that this correspondence and statement may be properly before the Senate, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW JERSEY STATE PATROLMEN'S BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Glen Ridge, N. J., February 22, 1950.

Hon. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Apropos your suggestion, we respectfully submit in writing our objections to H. R. 6000, insofar as police officers who are members of existing retirement systems are concerned. We would appreciate your presenting our objections to this bill and our endorsement of the amendment, before the Senate at your convenience.

I have the authority to express the deep appreciation of our organization and the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police for your interest in behalf of the policemen of the State of New Jersey. Your outstanding courtesy during our 1 hour's interview with you left an impression with our delegation that will be remembered for a long time.

Thank you very much.

Respectfully yours,
HOWARD J. DEVANEY,
President.

FEBRUARY 22, 1950.

Re H. R. 6000, social-security bill.

Hon. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENDRICKSON: The New Jersey State Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, Inc., and the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., represents an active membership of 12,000 police officers in 563 municipalities in New Jersey.

We are opposed to the extension of social-security coverage to police officers who are members of an existing retirement system because we earnestly believe such coverage would injure police officers instead of benefiting them.

The local taxpayer will not stand for supporting both systems, nor is it economical or just to expect the taxpayer to do so. Apropos this situation, social security would impose a double burden of contribution upon police officers who are underpaid in many States. The forcing of police officers under social security would inevitably lead to the destruction of their own local pension systems, regardless of the Federal-State agreement as to coverage.

Our specific objections to social-security coverage is outlined as follows:

1. Present public retirement systems in the States and subdivisions thereof are adequate to provide for their employees.

2. The benefits under the typical retirement plan for death, disability, old age, and survivorship are better adapted to the needs of the public employees than the benefits under the Social Security Act, which was set up for industrial workers.

3. Public employees have grave doubts that many States and subdivisions thereof can afford to have both, present retirement systems and social-security coverage, without affecting their salaries or impairing public services.

Now, as to H. R. 6000, all that has been said applies besides—

(a) The proposals under this bill as to contribution costs contemplates an increasing cost to the individual as the years go by; thus, imposing a real hardship on public employees who now belong to a retirement system, as two deductions must be made from his salary.

(b) The proposed higher benefits under this bill would not exceed those paid by public retirement systems—Federal or State.

(c) We recommend that public employees covered by a State or subdivision thereof retirement system should be excluded from the bill, H. R. 6000.

4. A referendum may take us into social security, but the State or State subdivision may drop us out without a referendum. If a State withdraws from social security it loses all moneys paid in. There is no provision for any return of funds.

5. Public employees do not wish to interpose any objections to the extension of social-security coverage or benefits to those not so well covered and protected as they are under public retirement systems, but they most respectfully pray and ask that they be excluded from coverage and be permitted to remain undisturbed in their present contractual rights and expectations that they now enjoy and that they may continue to look forward to an age of retirement under a protected public retirement system.

We therefore beg the Senate Finance Committee to endorse recently introduced amendments to H. R. 6000 which would definitely exclude police officers now covered by a pension system from the scope of the bill; and we respectfully urge that the Finance Committee recommend this course of action to the Senate.

Respectfully submitted.

HOWARD J. DEVANEY,
President, New Jersey State Patrolmen's Benevolent Association.
FRED A. ROFF,
Executive Secretary, New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police.

The Coal Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, like nearly every other American, I am trying to determine and understand why many of the soft-coal miners of the Nation are refusing to obey the law of the land. For the reason that it offers one point of view on the question, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on Tuesday, February 21.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MINERS' REBELLION

The Nation's soft-coal miners are engaging in a rebellion against the Government of the United States. They have refused to obey an order of the Federal court directing them to end their strike which is imperiling the health and safety of the Nation. The miners also appear to be engaging in a rebellion against John L. Lewis. But are they? Or do they have reason to believe that Lewis is secretly in sympathy with their conduct, despite the fact that twice he has ordered them to return to work?

It will be recalled that Lewis' first message to the miners, following the issuance of the injunction, was a telegram to his district presidents, couched in legalistic phraseology, in which he made it clear that it was the court's idea, not his, that the miners should go back to work. Under the circumstances, he had no alternative but to direct the miners to obey the injunction, he said.

A week went by with nothing happening, except that the union strong-arm squads, which are always responsive to Lewis' wishes, roamed the mine fields, threatening any miners who showed an inclination to return to work, and preventing any mines from reopening.

By the end of the week the strong-arm squads were in complete control of the situation. Under their influence the miners presented a solid front behind the slogan "No contract, no work."

By that time it was evident that the miners had been organized to stay out of the pits. Whereupon Lewis then sent another telegram, this time addressed to the locals, instructing them to comply with the injunction and end the strike, but the locals apparently had been well briefed as to what they were to do. They ignored the second instruction as they had the first.

Was this a prearranged, phony rebellion against Lewis? Anyone who stopped to consider how Lewis in the past ruled his union with an iron hand and how the miners responded to his slightest command would conclude that it was.

It was less than 3 weeks ago that a young miner in Library, Pa., Joseph Dickmon, was suspended from the union for 6 months for calling Lewis a dictator and saying the miners ought to work full time instead of the 3-day-a-week schedule then in effect.

Another miner, George H. Livengood, of Uniontown, Pa., was expelled from the union because he asked for an accounting of the miners' welfare and pension fund.

In the past, if any mine-union official had dared to disobey an order from Lewis, he would have been fired forthwith. Any miner who expressed the sentiment "to hell with John L. Lewis," as some of the strikers have, would have been taking his life in his hands.

We think if Lewis really wanted to end the strike, he could do so. All he would have to do would be to give the right signal. But he is now engaged in a struggle to nullify the Taft-Hartley Act, an attempt to demonstrate to other unions and to Congress that it cannot be enforced and that it need not be obeyed.

Prayer for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, Mr. James Patrick McGovern, a former captain in the AEF during the First World War, and a member of Bethesda-Chevy Chase Post, No. 105, of The American Legion, Department of Maryland, has composed a poem which reflects such a basic spiritual force as mankind must cherish if civilization is to survive—let alone to advance. He has titled it "Prayer for Peace," and has dedicated it to the national welfare. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYER FOR PEACE

Men's prayer for peace through brotherhood world-wide
Had never need so great as in this hour;
Love calls, with God's infinitude allied,
Regardless of the race, the creed, the power.
Now that both space and time, the atom's fire,
And all the secrets of the sun unfold,
The helmless mind speeds to a brink so dire,
Who can foretell what death's abyss would hold!
But none can steal, like land, another's soul,
Or any virtue in its quality;
But rather will thieves make good-will their goal
When heart finds heart in true democracy.
May strength have leaders who like Christ forgive—
Who for the spirit live and would let live.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

A Kansan's Appraisal of George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission previously granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial appraisal of George Washington which appeared in a recent issue of the Argonia (Kans.) Journal, as follows:

OUR FIRST NATIONAL HERO

All over this broad land the 22d of February—George Washington's Birthday—is celebrated.

How shall any man add aught to the praise or eulogy of George Washington? History and biography, eloquence and poetry have exhausted their combined riches upon the successful leader of the American Revolution and the founder of the American Republic—our first great national hero.

Every great crisis in the history of the world has found its man to control and guide it. Call it providence, accident, or what you will, the American Revolution was no exception. Before the first murmurs of discontent were heard in that struggle the man was being prepared for the crisis. On the banks of the Potomac and the Rappahannock, 20 years before Lexington and Bunker Hill, a truthful and manly boy was growing up, ripening into stalwart young manhood. With only the common-school education of that early day, the young man was being educated in the broader nature and experience, in the great forest, under the open heavens, with his surveyor's chain and sword, in Indian wars, defending the frontier settlements from the savage incursions.

Growing still apace the young Virginian was soon the leading spirit and military commander of all that Patomac region, and his skill, endurance, and courage in those campaigns swelled the measure of his fame. Then with peace, the young commander laid aside his sword, married, and settled down on his inherited country seat at Mount Vernon and, like his ancestors, was a rich-landed proprietor, a Virginia farmer and planter, and a country gentleman. So he might have remained to the end, had not the voice of patriotism called him to take part with his neighbors and the oppressed people of the Colonies against the tyranny of the mother country.

He was elected a delegate to the Continental Congress, and it was by that body that he was unanimously elected Commander in Chief of the American Army in 1775. After the war, when the Constitutional Convention was called in 1787, he was unanimously elected its chairman, and his influence had much to do with the framing of the Constitution and getting it accepted by the States. When this new scheme of government went into operation, he was unanimously chosen as its first President and reelected in 1793. Washington never accepted a cent for his services for his country during the Revolutionary War and his two terms as President, and was paid only his actual expenses.

At the close of his second term, he delivered his famous farewell address, which has become one of the outstanding public documents of all time, and which contained statesmanlike advice and sound counsel. One of his admonitions to the young republic is just as worthy today as it was 160 years ago: "Avoid the accumulation of debt, not only shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden of debts which we ourselves ought to bear. Bear in mind that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; and that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant." In the light of recent history, what an old fogy George Washington was.

He retired to his home in 1797 and resumed his plantation life. The following year he was again made commander in chief of the army in expectation of a war with France, but in the midst of military preparations he was stricken with a sudden illness and died December 14, 1799.

At the time of his death, one Member of Congress was Gen. Henry Lee, "Light Horse Harry," father of the famous leader of the Confederacy in the Civil War, Robert E. Lee. He was appointed to deliver the oration in a memorial service by Congress and it was in that speech that there was uttered that famous phrase, "First in war, first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen." Those words have stood the test of time, which were not only true at that time but were prophetic of an opinion which exists to this day.

F. J. G.

Reservoir of Christian Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the February 18 issue of America, National Catholic weekly, titled "Reservoir of Christian Hope." In these days when we are looking for a sedative for our nerves, I commend this article to all thoughtful Christians. In this atomic age people are becoming increasingly apprehensive because they do not know the solution to the problem of control of atomic energy. The encouragement that this article offers should be reassuring.

The article follows:

RESERVOIR OF CHRISTIAN HOPE

It is news, and it is welcome news, when scientists find it necessary to appeal to the moral sense of the Nation.

This is what happened on February 4, when Prof. Samuel K. Allison, director of the Institute for Nuclear Studies at the University of Chicago, expressed his own frank opinion. "I am appalled," said Dr. Allison, "to hear talk of the hydrogen bomb as just an improved piece of machinery. * * * After all, we are a nation with a sense of morality. This is a moral issue."

Yes; we are, by and large, a moral nation. Yet to exactly what extent? How deep, how sure are our moral resources when we are confronted by the need of making a moral decision of this magnitude?

Almost more terrifying than the bomb itself is the generally baffled air of the American public when the entire world is looking to us for our decision. It is hard to say which phase is the more disturbing: popular apathy and apparent inability to grasp what we are really up against, or the hysteria and demoralization that prevail when imaginations are finally stirred.

This sense of bafflement, this perplexity, this inability to take other than a merely emotional approach, is the direct result of the decay of religious and moral teaching, of the continual erosion that materialistic subjectivism has worked in our Nation's moral fiber. "The greatest change I find in the United States since my last visit," remarked a distinguished Japanese educator recently, "is the widespread weakening of moral standards."

Yet mere lamentation is of no avail. The present is the time for all citizens who have a clear sense of good and evil to do what they can to restore and strengthen our sanity, to stabilize our emotions, and clarify our thinking. If we must face such a crisis, let us face it as mature men, not as children.

No fear is more demoralizing than an hysterical fear of death. No conviction is more apt to restore courage and tranquillity to the soul, even when walking in death's own shadow, than the conviction that death, after all, is not the most dreadful of all evils.

In time of crisis more men and women will be found to share that conviction than we are likely to suspect in the piping days of peace. The greatest military mistake Hitler ever made was occasioned by his inability to understand how the people of Britain would prefer being bombed to death by German planes to the disgrace and slavery that would follow compliance with his demands.

If this is true for the patriot, it is doubly true for every convinced Christian. For we know, with the certainty of natural reason, with the certainty of all God's revelation and the supreme certainty of the Resurrection, that no H-bomb in creation can destroy a human soul. Strange anomaly, that we Christians who today are asserting the sanctity of human life on earth in the face of the abortionist and the mercy killer, at the same time maintain that the supreme values are those of life eternal, and that all human policies and decisions must ultimately be judged by the immutable standards of such a life. Yet that anomaly is only apparent, since it is the immortal in man that lends such significance to his temporal years.

What is true of one man's fate is true of the whole human race, even were the worst possible forebodings to be realized and all humanity exposed to destruction. In one instance as in another, the pivotal truth remains that we can afford to risk all on earth, if that is the only way by which we can save the liberty of our own souls. After all, as America said on August 18, 1945, the providence of God, not the schemes of man, will finally set the time for ending the earthly sojourn of the human race.

Much is said, and correctly said, to the effect that the Russians can better afford to face the risks of vast bomb destruction than can the Americans. Nevertheless, when it comes to the absolute choice of life or death, those of us who have retained our faith in God and His teachings possess a hope that is lacking to the boldest materialist. Let those of us who have such a hope in life everlasting make every effort to impart it to our entire country. No matter how tremendous the cause for alarm, we are not and we never will be intimidated. This quiet certainty that we can save our lives by dying is a weapon as mighty in its own way as the H-bomb itself.

Rescue of Greek Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK P. GRAHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a plea by Archbishop Michael that Greek children be rescued, which appeared in the Orthodox Observer.

There being no objection, the plea was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARCHBISHOP MICHAEL PLEADS GREEK CHILDREN BE RESCUED

My heart is full of gratitude as I take this opportunity to greet the American people and pay my respects to this wonderful democratic country.

I have just come from Greece and I want to express the warm and enduring thanks of all the Greek people for the vital aid that has been extended under the leadership of the President of the United States of America to Greece in her hour of need.

My message to you today is one, alas, of tragedy, which again hovers over the homes of Greece.

In America at this Christmastime gladness prevails in millions of homes. The mothers of America have their little ones at their own firesides and God's blessings of peace, freedom, and security are the possessions of everyone here.

It is not so in Greece. Though that nation was liberated from enemy occupation, military intervention on the part of the Communist neighbors of Greece followed that liberation and plunged the country into a long period of conflict on Greek soil. Once again Greece found herself defending freedom and Christian civilization as she so often has done through the centuries.

Under cover of this conflict the Communist guerrillas conducted one of the most unspeakable campaigns in all human history by abducting thousands of Greek children, ranging in age from 3 to 15, from the areas of guerrilla operation and transporting them behind the iron curtain.

Of these 2,000 were taken to Albania; 2,650 were taken to Bulgaria; about 3,000 were taken to Hungary; 3,800 to Rumania; 2,235 to Czechoslovakia; 11,000 to Yugoslavia; and many have since been moved to Poland and eastern Germany.

The pretext was that these children were to be given salvation from famine and that they were carried away in order to undergo a program of education in free democracy.

Some of the older ones since have actually been captured while fighting in the guerrilla bands.

I am speaking this morning from New York City, which is the headquarters of the United Nations, dedicated to peace and justice. The United Nations has condemned this violation of fundamental human rights but its resolutions asking the immediate restoration of these young people to their mothers' arms have been ignored. The continuous appeals of their heartbroken parents have fallen upon deaf ears.

There is no joy, only sorrow and heartbreak, in these Greek homes at this season of rejoicing for so many of you within the sound of my voice.

In the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ, whose eternal theme is peace on earth, good will toward men, and who is full of compassion for little children, I earnestly appeal to you to lift your voices with us on this day, December 29, in denunciation of this inhuman action.

In the name of the Christ Child, whose birthday we celebrate, I ask you to express with us—through your Christian churches, through your organizations of women, through whatever groups to which you may belong—your wish to exert all possible moral influence upon the members of the United Nations so that all civilization will demand the return of these thousands of boys and girls to their grieving and broken homes.

In the name of all decency and all religion, I ask you to pray that all the humanitarian instincts of mankind will be brought to bear against this mass outrage.

To you Americans who are so rich in spiritual gifts, as well as liberty and well-being, I address this appeal with all the fervor at my command.

May the blessings of Almighty God and our Savicur be with you.

Lincoln Republicanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the Lincoln Day address entitled "Lincoln Republicanism," delivered by me on February 11, 1950, at Schenectady, N. Y.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every year at this time the American people join in observing the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. In frank recognition of the eternal debt owed by all Americans to Lincoln, all Americans—regardless of race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, place of residence, or political party—pay sincere tribute to this man who contributed so greatly to our present well-being.

For us Republicans the anniversary of Lincoln's birth has come to be almost a sacred occasion. At these annual observances we pay tribute not only to Lincoln, the man, the statesman, the leader in crisis, but to Lincoln the first Republican President.

For Abraham Lincoln, besides having been one of the greatest of all Americans, was the greatest Republican who ever lived. He shaped the formative years of the Republican Party and established for it the high tradition of service to the American people which carried our party to greatness.

I suggest, however, that there is a way in which we can pay even higher honor to Lincoln, and at the same time do a greater favor to ourselves, than by staging annual ceremonies highlighted by effusive panegyrics of the Great Emancipator.

That way is the day-by-day practice by us of what he preached.

Even as we cannot forget that Lincoln was the greatest Republican who ever lived, so we should not forget that he was also the most successful Republican who ever lived. To try to emulate the example set by Lincoln

is to do more than to praise him; it is also to benefit ourselves as Republicans.

In March of 1832 Lincoln had just passed his twenty-third birthday. Announcing his entry into politics as a candidate from Sangamon County to the Illinois Legislature, he used these words:

"Holding it a sound maxim that it is better only sometimes to be right than at all times to be wrong, so soon as I discover my opinions to be erroneous, I shall be ready to renounce them."

Lincoln lost that election in 1832, but he never lost the habit of open-mindedness which was revealed in that early message to the voters of Sangamon County.

Thirty years later, in 1862, Lincoln, then President of the United States and approaching the peak of his magnificent career, wrote a letter to Horace Greeley which contained the following solemn promise:

"I shall try to correct errors when shown to be errors, and I shall adopt new views so fast as they appear to be true views."

Thus it is plain that from the modest beginning of Lincoln's public life to its glorious, yet tragic, conclusion, his was a steadfast rule ever to be receptive to new ideas, and never to hesitate to recast his thinking in the light of changing circumstances. Nowadays those Republicans who decry so-called "me-toolsm" would do well to reflect upon this conspicuous quality in the character of the greatest Republican of all.

As we pause in 1950 and look back through the years, we can clearly see that during the first half of the twentieth century there has occurred such a world-wide upheaval of nineteenth century institutions and traditions as to amount to no less than a gigantic social, economic, and political revolution.

World Wars I and II were the most violent explosions of this revolution. Communism in eastern Europe and China, socialism in Great Britain, and their reverberations in Asia, Africa, and South America are dramatic evidences of the new and overpowering forces which have been operating on a global scale during the last 50 years.

Here in this country—fortunately for us—this revolution has taken a milder, more moderate course. But a revolution has nonetheless, been taking place.

It is most unfortunate, for the country as well as for the Republican Party, that our party has failed too often to adjust itself to the consequences of this revolution. Too often we have not been receptive to new ideas. Too often we have not exhibited that open-mindedness which characterized Lincoln. The voters of this country have repeatedly told us so. They told us in 1932; they told us again in 1936; they repeated it in 1940, 1944, and 1948.

"If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem."

That warning comes from Lincoln and unhappily is applicable to our party's record, especially in the field of civil rights where our party's performance has failed miserably to conform to promise or tradition. Unless party platform pledges are made with the solemn conviction that they shall be kept, the party responsible for them is deserving only of the hostile public reaction which disregard for them inevitably provokes.

It seems to me that today the Republican Party can do no better than to adopt again a course based on the abiding principles and fundamental integrity of Abraham Lincoln. And never in the history of the Nation has there been more urgent needs for a reapplication of those principles and a rededication to that integrity.

As Republicans, we believe profoundly in the free competitive enterprise system. An unfortunate result of our party's traditional defense of this system has been an identification in the minds of too many Americans of the Republican Party and big business. This condition has arisen largely from the fact that through our insistence that there can be no genuine human rights without property rights we have appeared frequently to place property rights ahead of other basic individual rights and freedoms guaranteed in the Constitution.

Yet it is a fact that, while we emphasize that human rights without property rights are illusory and nonexistent, it is and always has been a fundamental principle of the Republican Party that political liberty for the individual is of greater importance than his economic security. For without political liberty, economic security constitutes no better than a condition of slavery. As Lincoln said, "Republicans are for both the man and the dollar, but in case of conflict the man before the dollar."

It is exceedingly interesting to note that at the time Lincoln was expressing this principle of Republicanism, he was criticizing the Democratic Party of his day for a complete reversal of the basic position of its founder, Thomas Jefferson, that the rights of property are secondary to other personal rights of men and women.

How equally valid is such a criticism today, as successive Democratic administrations, by glowing promises of everything for everybody everywhere, shamelessly bribe the American people to trade their political liberty for so-called economic security.

Another basic principle of the Republican Party was expressed by Lincoln in a speech made in 1854 at Peoria, Ill. During the course of this speech, an impassioned attack on the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, he made the following statement:

"If there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people to never intrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions."

Today it is imperative, if this Nation is to remain a Nation of free men, that the Republican Party most vigorously reaffirm this principle. It is not, definitely not, a case of crying "wolf, wolf" to say that through its control of the strings of the enormous Federal purse, the administration has been and is moving this country toward a highly regimented state, wherein individual freedom will have been bartered away for alleged economic security through deficits, debt, and intensified bureaucratic control.

This trend to socialism, begun in 1933, is a growing one, as witnessed by such recent administration proposals as socialized medicine and, under the name of the Brannan plan, socialized agriculture.

Through financial aids, grants, subsidies, and other forms of economic persuasion, the Federal Government is promoting the further surrender of personal liberty and jeopardizing the integrity of those free institutions of American society which are the foundation of our system of free government.

It is of transcendent importance to the American people that the Republican Party, by reviving and sustaining its Lincoln heritage, arrest, and arrest now these false concepts and the trend toward a planned economy, a socialist state.

For what has until recently been only a trend is now being accelerated to a degree at which it is becoming a mad rush.

Within the past year we have seen developing in our country dangerous theories and notions. The idea that a national debt of $255,000,000,000 or $265,000,000,000 is inconsequential; the thought that uninterrupted deficit spending is not alone justifiable, but even desirable; the growing feeling that economy in government, far from being a virtue, is actually a vice and to be shunned—these are some of the theories and notions to which I refer, and they are signposts on the road to moral bankruptcy and national decay.

Striking proof of this situation is provided by the proposed budget which the President submitted to the Congress last month.

For the fourth successive year since World War II, he has presented to the Congress a Federal budget higher in amount than the one submitted by him the year before. Each successive request has set a new all-time record for Government spending in peacetime.

By seeking authority to spend more than $5,000,000,000 in excess of anticipated revenues in 1951, the President urges the Nation to increase its staggering national debt at a time when the level of national income is such that we should be rapidly reducing the debt.

To permit ourselves to indulge in continuous deficit spending, as urged by the President, is only to yield up more economic, and therefore more political, freedom. For the excessive Federal spending envisaged in his budget is the inevitable prelude to excessive Federal control. Furthermore, the increasing concentration of influence over our lives exerted from Washington marks the imminence in this country of a regimented society similar to those social orders elsewhere in the world today, which we view with such abhorrence and alarm.

The so-called New Dealers or Fair Dealers are fond of quoting the following passage from Lincoln's writings:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities."

That is often cited by the Fair Dealers as the Lincolnian expression of approval of the Fair Deal.

These people, however, fail to complete the passage as written by Lincoln. In view of his full words, this is understandable, for they are as follows:

"In all that the people can individually do for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

There, in those few words of Lincoln, lies the essential difference between the present Democratic Party and the Republican Party, from which stem the important political issues that confront us today.

The few quotations from Lincoln which I have cited in my remarks tonight are enough to reveal a very important and very distinctive part of Lincoln's personality and character. It is, however, one that too frequently is not remembered today.

Not only was Lincoln possessed with high principles, but he was practical. Not only was he a consummate statesman, but he was a shrewd politician. Not only could he hope and plan for achieving greater goals, but he could achieve them. Not only, in short, was he a thinker, but he was a doer, as well. In the truest and best sense of the word, he was a realist.

Probably today the Republican Party has greater need for realism than for anything else. It seems to me, in fact, that a lack of realism has been one of our party's chief handicaps.

If in our opposition we blindly ignore great national problems demanding solution or if—perceiving these problems—we refuse either to provide solutions or to accept solutions offered by others, we serve neither ourselves nor our country. We then present the sorry spectacle of a party devoid of ideas

or imagination, and we fail in our obligation to the American people.

Ours is the party of opposition, yes. Ours must not, however, be the party of opposition simply for the sake of opposition.

Oppose we must. But we must propose, too.

To attract the support essential to our success, we Republicans must stand for things. And we can stand for things without being a "me-too" party.

Our great task is to combat the reckless spending, the glaring incompetence, and the socialistic programs of the Fair Deal. In doing so, we must show that we possess genuine solicitude for the welfare of all the people.

We must point the way to the maintenance of our free society while indicating the steps to be taken to improve continually the lot of the ordinary man. The mighty challenge confronting us is to provide the means for the reconciliation of the ever growing demand for security with the even more vital requirement for the preservation of freedom.

Ours is the job of convincing the majority of the American people that the way to a better society lies not through ever bigger and more powerful government which would finally destroy freedom. Ours is the job of convincing the majority of the American people that only through government's cooperation with, and not its operation of, our free institutions can those institutions be fully utilized and expanded and remain free—for the benefit of all.

So tonight, in rededicating ourselves to the ideals and principles of Lincoln, let us not forget that he was also a very real and a very practical human being.

But more important, let us not forget that with all of Lincoln's practicality and shrewdness, there stands revealed in his writings and speeches, and especially reflected in his everyday life, a rare appreciation and acceptance of the great moral and spiritual values. If Lincoln's success in his day was owing in large measure to his realism, his greatness for posterity is owing in even larger measure to his lofty idealism, his basic integrity, and above all, his abiding compassion for humanity.

And so let it be with the Republican Party today. Mindful of these things, profiting by them, we can move forward now to new goals of achievement and success and secure for ourselves the gratitude of generations to come.

America, World Leader Against Imperialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER C. HUNT

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, on the evening of February 22 the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] delivered an address on the subject America, World Leader Against Imperialism, at the Arlington Jewish Center. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA, WORLD LEADER AGAINST IMPERIALISM

We are celebrating today the two hundred and eighteenth birthday of George Washington. Most Americans think of George Washington as the Father of our Country, and that is the way our children are taught to think of him in school. Yet the name of George Washington is known throughout the world for a different reason. Before he could become Father of the Country he had first to be its liberator. George Washington, more than any other one man, was responsible for the liberation of the American Colonies from the British Empire.

Washington was the first of a long line of liberators. The United States of America was the first new country to appear on the map of the world in more than a hundred years. Its appearance was the signal for the beginning of a world-wide struggle that has continued down to this very day, and that is going to continue until every subject people on earth has finally achieved liberation and nationhood. Many great men have followed in the Washington tradition as liberators of their countries:

In South America, Simón Bolivar and José de San Martin.

In South Africa, Jan Smuts.

In Italy, Garibaldi and Mazzini.

In Czechoslovakia, Masaryk and Beneš.

In India, Gandhi and Nehru.

In Israel, Ben Gurion, Beigin, and others.

In Indonesia, Sukarno and Sjarir.

And many more whose names stand out in their countries' history.

Washington, the liberator, has been the symbol for the anticolonial struggles for freedom on every continent for the past 150 years. His words and acts have inspired such recent liberation movements as those of the Jews in Palestine and the Republicans in Indonesia. His model will be followed again and again in the struggles for freedom of all the remaining colonial peoples.

As the first great liberator, Washington started a historic movement the end of which we cannot yet see. As Father of his Country, he and the great men working with him founded a new kind of country endowed with a new kind of society. Americans who came after them have perfected the miracle—and America—a new country with a new type of society has become an example for oppressed peoples everywhere to emulate.

In recent years the deep current of national liberation has swelled to a mighty flood. The historic trend that began with Washington's liberation of America swept unchecked through the Western Hemisphere in the early nineteenth century. Then there were set-backs. Though Spanish and Portuguese colonies in America achieved independence, European empires were extending themselves over Africa and tightening their grip on Asia.

The first years of this century saw, in the Boer War in South Africa, a reversal of the trend. Since then the drive for liberation from imperialist domination has mounted with ever greater intensity. The Austro-Hungarian, German, and Turkish Empires were smashed by the First World War. Germany's overseas colonies, however, were taken by French and British mandates. The breakup of the Turkish Empire produced a series of weak states dominated by France and Britain.

There was another reversal of the trend during the period from 1931 to 1944, when the Japanese, Italian, and German totalitarians tried to establish vast empires by military force. They, too, were smashed—largely because of American efforts, it should be noted, as in 1918. In the wake of their destruction, other European empires are staggering and collapsing.

Since 1945 we have seen more than a dozen new countries appear on the map of the world.

Syria and Lebanon drove out the French, with British help.

Israel achieved her independence.

India, Pakistan and Ceylon are now partners of the Commonwealth.

Burma is wholly independent.

We have granted full independence to the Philippines.

Indonesia is liberated from the Dutch.

Libya has been declared free from Italy.

Eritrea will be free from Italy 10 years from now.

Jordan has been granted nominal independence from Britain.

Korea has a half-way, precarious freedom.

Ethiopia is again a free country.

In the past 5 years hundreds of millions of people have begun the great adventure of independent national life—and this is not yet the end.

But again the trend is not all in one direction: The Soviet Union, expanding into Europe, has transformed some nine countries into colonial dependencies. In Poland the process has gone so far as to put a Russian general in command of the Polish armies. These colonies all work for the greater glory of the Soviet Union, as India once worked for Britain. Yet even there a counteraction has set in, producing the phenomenon called Titoism—national communism that rejects Moscow's rule of Yugoslavia. And no one can predict when a similar phenomenon may arise in Communist China.

But, setting aside for the moment the onrush of Soviet imperialism, we can see that almost everywhere else in the world the current is running strong against colonialism. The shot fired at Lexington is still echoing down the corridors of history.

Regardless of what anti-American propagandists may say, this country throughout its history has, far more often than not, been actively in support of people fighting for their freedom—whether it was the Irish, the Czechs, the Greeks, the Israelis, the Boers, the Arabs or anyone else. We have granted independence to the one Asiatic colony we stumbled into: the Philippines. There are today before Congress bills seeking to transform two of our remaining territories into full-fledged States—and I am supporting statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. Americans are uncomfortable in the role of colonial imperialists.

America has always been a profoundly anti-imperialist country. Even when, from time to time, our Government has temporarily abandoned the traditional support for colonial fighters for freedom, our deep-seated feelings sooner or later have always forced the Government to return to the path. I am thinking now of the recent period when the American people insisted that their Government stand on the side of the Israelis against the British-instigated Arab invasions and on the side of the Indonesians against the brutal attempts of Dutch imperialists to crush the Republic of Indonesia. And no one forgets the unending efforts of vast numbers of our people during the whole war period to persuade the British to grant independence to India.

When we think of the origins of our country and its struggle against the totalitarian political philosophy and the mercantilist economic philosophy of the empire it fought against—why should we be surprised that America has been and still is today the world leader against imperialism? The surprising thing would be if America were not. We can't be anything else but anti-imperialist. It is in our history to be so. It is in our best interests economically to be so. It is in our blood to be so.

Compared to the American who stands against imperialism, the Communist or Socialist who preaches—but never practices—anti-imperialism is a "Johnny-come-lately"—a poor imitator of something begun long ago by the colonists strung out along the eastern seaboard of North America, under the lead of George Washington.

This is a fact of extreme importance today. We are all aware that one of the most potent propaganda weapons of the Communists is their attack on colonial imperialism in Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. With this weapon they are hitting the weakest plates in the armor of our European allies—and through those allies are hitting at us. This is producing one of the most acute dilemmas in our foreign policy today.

The embarrassment which our alliance with Europe causes us elsewhere can be seen in all its ugliness in the Indochinese crisis. Unlike Indonesia and Israel, where we had similar though lesser embarrassments, Indochina is next door to a great new Communist power—China. Unlike Indonesia and Israel, Indochina's nationalist movement is mainly controlled by Communists. We decided, when the chips were all down, to back the Israelis and the Indonesians against the British and the Dutch Empires. We were right to do this—it was in our long tradition of anti-imperialism. History is already vindicating those many Americans who worked for this policy in Israel and in Indonesia.

Our Government's policy is not yet clear on Indochina, though the indications are that we have decided to make an all-out effort—including economic and military aid—to back the French-sponsored Indochinese regime of Bao Dai, against the Communist-dominated nationalists under Ho Chi-minh. Here our decision is influenced by factors that did not exist—or that were far less important—in Indonesia and Palestine. The question in Indochina is not only one of colonial independence versus European imperialism but also of a modified European-type imperialism against a dynamic, driving Communist imperialism.

If the French win, we will at least have the possibility of effecting reforms and even one day of seeing Indochina become independent of French imperialism. If the Communists win, we will not only lose this possibility but the Indochinese will promptly be taken over by a new and more virulent form of imperialism run either from China or from Russia. Indochina is a great gamble, and the odds at present are not in our favor. We have been forced to back the French and their puppet, because the Soviet Union and Communist China recognized Ho Chi-minh.

The fact that we find ourselves in such a trap illustrates what I have been talking about. We are being forced to compromise our traditional opposition to European imperialism in order—we hope—to stop an even worse Russian Communist imperialism. We must realize why we have been driven into this trap. I hope we insist, before it is too late, that in other parts of the world where the Communist pressure is not as immediate or as powerful as in Indochina, there will be undertaken reforms and steps toward liberation that will strengthen colonial areas so that they do not later involve us in more civil wars. I am thinking of British Malaya which lies just south of Indochina, of Iran, Iraq, and other Middle East countries, of French North Africa, British Nigeria, the Gold Coast, and the rest of Africa controlled by Britain, France, Belgium, Portugal, Italy, and Spain.

There is almost no part of our foreign policy, outside our direct relations with the Soviet Union and the arms race on which we and they have entered, no aspect of our foreign affairs that calls for more attention, more deep thinking, than on the colonial question. The day is long past when we can afford to ignore what the European colonial powers are doing in their possessions and dependencies. We are tied to them by the North Atlantic alliance, by the military-assistance program, by the European recovery program, by all manner of strategic and economic interests.

It is foolish to think we do not have sufficient influence with the European colonial powers to be able to propose—and have accepted—vital and necessary improvements in their colonial policies and regimes. That doesn't mean declaring, as some rash individuals suggest, "Do what we tell you, because we're putting up the money." That is the last way to accomplish anything. Such an approach smacks of the very thing we are opposing: Dictation by a stronger power to a weaker one. But it does not mean either that we are forced to sit back, hands folded, and watch while other Indochinas and other Indonesias develop before our eyes, doing nothing to prevent the crisis, only stepping in when the policy of the European power involved has proved bankrupt.

The stakes in the colonial problem are too high to leave it to ambassadors on the spot, area desks in the State Department, or experts and specialists. Of course, what we decide to do will vary in each area according to local and particular conditions. But we can certainly develop what we do not now have: an integrated body of principles on the colonial question that will form the fundamental approach to our policymaking throughout the colonial world.

If our decision, for example, is always to go through the colonial offices of the mother countries when we want to deal with a colonial people—then the outcome of any action we take will be one thing. If, however, we make it a policy to go directly to the colonial peoples themselves—bypassing the colonial offices and their pretensions to superior standing above the "backward" peoples—we will obtain quite different results.

Take the Indo-Chinese dilemma again. If we decide to give aid to the forces fighting the Communists—as it is almost certain we are going to do—then to whom do we give this aid? To the French army which all Indochinese, Communists, and non-Communists, detest as their oppressor? To Bao Dai, the French-sponsored leader of the non-Communist Indochinese? To some other man or group less suspect in the eyes of the people we are trying to draw away from the Communists? The success of any program we may invent for Indochina will largely depend on this decision.

Take the new point 4 development for economically retarded areas—mainly for colonies and semi-colonial countries. Do we channel technical assistance and investments through colonial offices in London, Paris or Brussels? Or do we send it directly to Nigeria or French Equatorial Africa or the Belgian Congo? If we do one thing, any development that takes place will be primarily in the interest of the imperial power. If we do the other thing, the development will be for the benefit of the colonial people—their economy will grow on a broad base and their political freedom will grow on top of that.

Such decisions cannot be left to State Department officials, no matter how expert they may be. There is a crying need for a statement of general American policy on the colonial question. This means that a public body of outstanding men and women is needed to state the issues, study the alternatives, suggest the course to follow.

The colonial problem is one of relations between subject peoples and their masters. It is complicated by our alliance with the masters and by the Communist efforts among colonial peoples to identify liberation with communism. We have to think through this problem so as to attain two goals:

First. To retain our alliance with Europe, now that it exists, and to transform it, if possible, into a federal union including Canada and the United States.

Second. To prove to the colonial peoples that we favor their liberation from the very countries with which we are allied.

I doubt if a more difficult problem—involving more people and more intricate relationships among them—has ever faced this country. If we do not solve it correctly I can safely predict that we will either turn the Europeans against us as muddled meddlers in their colonial backyards, or that we will finally lose the colonial peoples to the agents of world communism. We cannot permit either of these to be the outcome.

One of the most dramatic and most fruitful ways of concentrating public attention on this problem and on its possible solution would be a national conference on the colonial question. We should have a conference called—perhaps by Presidential direction, perhaps not—to include representatives of all Government departments and agencies that deal with the colonies of other nations. Members of the House and Senate, leading representatives of business, labor, universities, professions and civil bodies, people from the United Nations, visiting witnesses from colonial areas. Such a conference would make a thorough study of the colonial issue as it affects our standing in the world, our foreign policy goals, our relations with the millions of colonial peoples. It should report its findings and recommendations to the Congress, to the executive department, to the people at large through press, radio, and other media.

I would not want to leave the impression with you that I am considering the colonial question solely in respect to its role in the cold war. Even if there were no cold war the problem would confront us. The cold war has merely accentuated it and brought it more sharply to our attention. The march toward freedom of colonial peoples began long before communism was ever heard of.

What makes me proud is that we in America began that march. The man whose birthday we are celebrating today was the first leader in that march. Millions of Americans since his time have participated in one fashion or another in the liberation of other peoples. In a very real sense our participation in both world wars had as its purpose the liberation of peoples conquered by imperialist armies. And though no one stresses it much, one of the basic issues in our present conflict with the Soviet Union is the colonization of eastern Europe by the forces of Communist imperialism.

America cannot help being an anti-imperialist country. Our Nation was born in a struggle against foreign imperialism, and our history will never let us forget it. The democratic society we have built has made it impossible for the type of feudal ruling class to develop that European nations depend on for the conquest and rule of colonial peoples. Our economic system is designed primarily to satisfy consumer wants for all the people, not to perpetuate and enrich a small ruling class of the sort that in Europe has ruled at home and ruled in the colonies.

America is never truer to herself than when she is engaged in a great liberating task. Many feel we have somehow lost the track in recent years, that we are stumbling across the world like a powerful but dizzy giant. I believe that one way to bring us back on to the path we have so long followed in the past—the true path of George Washington's America—is to make up our minds about the colonial question and to proclaim publicly and before the whole world, that one of our primary goals in foreign affairs is to help speed the process of liberation of all colonial peoples wherever they may be.

We Mustn't Flinch in the Face of Mounting Russian Threats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Connersville (Ind.) News-Examiner of February 17, 1950:

WE MUSTN'T FLINCH IN THE FACE OF MOUNTING RUSSIAN THREATS

This is a time of supreme urgency in America. Not since Russian fighters buzzed our air-lift planes over Germany have we had greater need to view the future with courage and determination.

Dr. Harold Urey, atomic scientist, tersely expresses the danger: "If the H-bomb is created, there will be no place to hide."

Another eminent scientist, Dr. Vannevar Bush, warns that the only real defense against the A-bomb or the H-bomb or any other explosive weapon is to keep it away from our shores.

Urey underlines that warning by telling us that not only Russian bombers but innocent-looking tramp steamers which slip almost unnoticed into our harbors may bear the dreaded explosive cargo.

He foresees a possible Soviet strategy before the year is out to split European Atlantic Pact nations off from us by mining their key harbors with atomic charges.

Rumors are rife that Russia may strike any time at defiant Tito in Yugoslavia or at Finland, tiniest partner in the Soviet Union's circle of compulsory friends.

Admiral Sherman, chief of naval operations, declares the Russians have a vast submarine fleet in Asiatic waters. Military experts see submarines as prime carriers of superexplosives for possible launching against our island outposts or our western shore.

A Government aviation research official reiterates an old story: Russia has a bigger air force than ours.

Air Secretary Symington goes him several points better, asserting that Soviet dictators have the world's largest armed forces and are capable of a surprise attack upon any part of America's 3,000,000 square miles.

These signals of peril have not gone unheeded. The cry for action to stave off civilization's ruin has risen everywhere. And that call has been answered, by Secretary of State Acheson, with the full support of President Truman.

Our policy for dealing with Russia in this hour is to be founded solely on strength and power. For these blunt tools of diplomacy are the only ones which impress Moscow.

Let the meaning of that decision sink in. There'll be no more big-power meetings, no peace treaties with Germany and Japan, no disarmament or atomic control talks until we and our friends among free nations are strong enough to establish conditions that Russia must accept whether it wants to or not.

We do not have that kind of strength now. Therefore it is clear we must set about getting it without delay. Otherwise our policy of power is a string of empty phrases.

As a beginning we must stop deluding ourselves that we do have such strength. Nothing is more dangerously misleading than the statement of Secretary of Defense Johnson that we're ready to "go over and lick hell out of Joe Stalin."

The truth is we plan to reduce our military budget for the coming fiscal year by some $2,000,000,000. Obviously we aren't going to get more defense for less money.

To obtain the power we need will force us to some hard choices. Expanded military strength almost certainly will mean contracted civilian comforts. We'd better find out soon where those choices lie—and start making them. We can't stand off a worldwide menace while enjoying business as usual.

Our military and scientific experts make the maddening decision as to the relative value of atomic bombs, guided missiles, long-range bombers, naval forces and land armies in a future war. We must seek balance in our strength.

We can't assume any weapon, including a hydrogen bomb, would give us decisive advantage even if we had it exclusively. And the story of Dr. Klaus Fuchs' spying is a reminder that we'd better not count on sole possession. Spies don't go out of business just when the stakes get bigger.

What Democracy Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Madam President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. MILLIKIN] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio script by Anne Pinkney, a 17-year-old Trinidad, Colo., high school senior, which was one of four national prize winners in the annual I Am an American contest. This contest was jointly sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the Radio Manufacturers Association. It was endorsed by the Office of Education of the United States Government.

The contest, now in its third year, this year had more than 1,000,000 entries, high school boys and girls from every State and Territory, writing on What Democracy Means to Me. The entries were recorded for radio and were judged by an eminent group of Americans, which included Associate Justice Tom C. Clark; Douglas Southall Freeman, noted Virginia editor and historian; J. Edgar Hoover; Morgan Beatty, NBC newsman and radio commentator; Edward R. Murrow, CBS newsman and radio commentator; Mrs. Raymond Clapper; Wayne Coy, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission; Andrew D. Holt, of the National Education Association; and James Stewart, motion picture star.

I was fortunate enough to be present yesterday when the two boys and two girls who were adjudged the winners were presented with their plaques and $500 each for college scholarships. As Assistant Secretary of State Edward Barrett, who presented the awards, observed, it was a fine example to the people behind the iron curtain of how democracy works. It was inspiring to note the enthusiasm and understanding these boys and girls have of America.

Naturally, my colleague [Mr. MILLIKIN] and I are very, very proud of Miss Pinkney, and we congratulate her parents and the faculty of Trinidad high school.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I speak for democracy.

Perhaps you're wondering who I am.

I am a symbol, existing only in the minds of men.

As a symbol I stand at the shores of our country.

As a symbol I cover the whole land. I exist elsewhere, but never so much as here.

Can it be you don't recognize me?

In one form I stand and welcome many travelers to our land. I am robed in skirts of iron, and I hold a bright torch aloft in my right hand. All peoples have thought of me in their dreams; many have defended me.

Do you recognize these words, "Give me liberty or give me death"? They were spoken by one of my defenders, Patrick Henry, and in times of stress have been echoed by millions after him.

What did I mean to Patrick Henry and those early patriots of our country? I meant enough to them that they risked their lives in order to set up a country in which I should reign supreme. They wrote our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, which today stand as models upon which many governments are founded. They conceived the truths that all men are created equal in the sight of God and man, and so wrote into the Constitution of my country these things which I stand for: freedom of religion, freedom of speech, the right to vote, trial by jury, freedom of the press, and the right to do as you wish if it doesn't harm other people.

As you see, without me none of these would have any meaning—and that is why you find my name written so many times in our Constitution.

To the men who followed these early champions of me I meant a great deal too. I was the magnet that drew millions of people from across the seas in reaching our Nation. Many of these people became pioneers, pushing our frontiers steadily westward. Many of them did not go exploring however. They settled in towns and villages across the Nation, starting businesses, using skills which they had brought with them from across the waters, thus, in time, making this one of the greatest industrial nations in the world.

You say that you know all this, that you've studied it since the first grade, that it is ancient history and you want to know what it means today.

It hasn't changed. It means more today than it did then.

Democracy, through freedom which I symbolize, is still the brightest hope of mankind.

There are three institutions which are fundamental to our democracy: the home, the school, and the church.

The home lays the foundation for democratic living, the schools continue this building in many ways, through the student councils, leadership programs and even through sports, for there the student learns fair play and if he has any totalitarian instincts he can always work them off by booing the umpire.

The church is the cornerstone in cement that holds these other two together, for it was the first democratic institution teaching the brotherhood of all men.

We have the right to choose, to vote for those whom we wish to guide us. Millions of people today would tell us how wonderful and precious this is, if they could speak without fear and with freedom.

You can. You can complain of any action, even of your Government, which seems unfair and your complaint, if just, will be printed in newspapers all over the country so all men may see and act to remove it. But in many countries your speech would not get into the newspapers. Instead, you would be arrested and taken to court, tried and judged, a traitor to your country. You would be liquidated, so that never again would you be a problem to the government.

The trial would not be such as you have known in America either. It would be short, brutal, the sentence predestined. In America your liberty is guarded by a jury of 12 of your own neighbors, a competent judge, a lawyer who believes in you and you must be proved guilty beyond a question of a doubt.

These are my fruits, and, as the Bible puts it, "by their fruits shall ye know them."

You say you have not realized in how many ways and how importantly I had entered your life. You may not see me in all these invisible ways but every day you see my greatest symbol. The flag of the United States of America. Symbols have no voices to be heard as you are hearing me now, but this, I think, would be what the symbol of freedom would say, because this is what democracy means to me.

These Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VIRGIL CHAPMAN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the major portion of an article entitled "These Days," by George Sokolsky, which appeared in today's issue of the Washington Times-Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

War is still our most serious business. War costs us more than 70 percent of our budget. War determines both our domestic and foreign policies.

Naturally, when a situation is so critical, differences of opinion develop as to the best way to handle the situation. Thus, the Navy and the Air Force differed, and that led to wild public recriminations.

The problem centers on two factors:

1. How much can this country afford to spend year after year on the national defense without wrecking the national economy?

2. After the maximum permissible amount is settled upon, how is the money to be allocated?

The responsibility for the conduct of the national defense rests upon Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense; the responsibility for determining the amount to be spent rests upon the President and the Congress.

The amount that can be spent on the national defense is limitless; the amount that will be spent is limited by the judgment of the President and the Congress as to how much the national economy will permit. For the present budget, the amount is $12,000,000,000.

Secretary Johnson has emphasized economy and has won the dislike of the following elements in our population: Contractors who live by enormous expenditures; those officers of the various services who prefer high expenditures without increased effectiveness; the pro-Russian crowd who want so much spent that it will crack our national economy; the pro-British crowd who want us to maintain as much of the British Empire as is left.

These groups take potshots at Secretary Johnson. Their latest falsehood, however, sounds true because of the previous quarrel between the Navy and the Air Force. They try to give the impression that a violent quarrel has developed between Secretary of Defense Johnson and Secretary of the Air Force Stuart Symington. The object of the story is to imply that Johnson can get along with no one.

I have thoroughly investigated this story and have confirmed that it is a lie.

The Alsop brothers, who rather fancy themselves great experts, have been calling Secretary of Defense Johnson a liar and have accused him of fooling the American people.

The gist of their complaint is that while he is practicing economy, he is impairing the efficiency of the defense forces. Emphasis is placed upon the appearance of discrepancy in public statements made by Louis Johnson and Stuart Symington.

I have examined the public statements of both these officials and there are no actual discrepancies.

The gist of the thinking of both is identical:

Johnson says:

"Our establishment of defense must be so strong—in the conception of the President and myself and the joint chiefs of staff it must be so strong that it will deter anyone who wants to start trouble in this world; and secondly, it must be so strong that if somebody does start trouble, there is no question about America being the victor in the final outcome of that discussion."

Symington says:

"America is reconciled to the necessity for a peacetime defense program greater than ever required in the past. We must remain steadfast and alert until that day—God hasten it—when we can have complete assurance that any power, or combination of powers, which threaten peace will abandon their aggressive schemes and participate effectively in the community of nations to advance, and not destroy, civilization."

But there is more than that. The President, Johnson, and Symington, and every other official associated with the national defense now have the problem of turning fat into muscle, of using economy to produce efficiency, of ending the cost of Mexican and Civil Wars installations so that the needs of 1950 can be met without wrecking our national economy.

In a word, money must be saved to be used to the best advantage. This is what the Department of Defense is trying to do. It is a difficult task under any circumstances; it is particularly hard when every plan to accomplish both economy and efficiency encounters unfair opposition.

National Health and Medical Care Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the press of New Jersey and New York City published a statement of aims and purposes comprising a national health program put forward by the Medical Society of New Jersey, as an alternative to the compulsory health insurance plan which has been advocated by Hon. Oscar Ewing, Administrator of Federal Security Agency.

The alternative plan is largely the work of Dr. James P. Norton, an eminent physician of Jersey City, president of the Medical Society of New Jersey and vice president of the medical association.

Without commenting upon the details of the program or offering any opinion as to its value, I append it herewith as part of my remarks:

PROPOSALS OF THE MEDICAL SOCIETY OF NEW JERSEY FOR A NATIONAL HEALTH AND MEDICAL-CARE PROGRAM

A 12-point cooperative health program, in which National and State Governments may participate without endangering individual initiative, personal freedom, or scientific progress was set forth on January 30, 1950, by the Medical Society of New Jersey.

The program was revealed by Dr. James P. Norton, of Jersey City, president of the State Medical Society and vice president of the American Medical Association. In introducing the medical society's proposals, Dr. Norton said:

"We believe this positive cooperative health plan constitutes a 'standard to which all men of good will can repair.' We propose to seek endorsement and active support of this program from every private and public organization in the community.

"We are convinced that people working together can solve their social problems, acting through the many voluntary organizations that already have accomplished so much in making life safe, healthier, and happier for everyone.

"Government—local, State, and National—has a part to play, but it should seek to promote and supplement the efforts of free citizens, not to supplant or supersede those efforts. We have tried in this statement, to define the proper role of government and to show how voluntary agencies, including the medical profession, can exert the leadership that the public expects of us."

Text of the society's statement follows:

"The Medical Society of New Jersey favors, and always has favored, a constructive approach to the solution of the national health problem, particularly as it applies to the citizens of New Jersey. The solution of medical and health problems should be undertaken in a realistic, scientific spirit. Moreover, since the health of the people transcends all political considerations, it must be considered on a nonpartisan basis.

"In view of the fact that the Congress of the United States and the State legislatures are considering various extensions of the health program, the medical society believes that the following statement, presented as a definite and comprehensive program of action, will be helpful at this time.

"The Medical Society of New Jersey believes there are large areas in which Government may beneficially cooperate with the citizens, individually or acting through voluntary associations, in furthering a health program—in the interest of all the people, and without jeopardy to individual liberty. It is generally recognized that voluntary cooperative effort should have priority at all times. Government should seek to promote and supplement the efforts of free citizens (not to supplant or supersede voluntary action) whenever voluntary cooperative effort can meet the need.

"Any constructive approach to solution of the health problem must take into account the several classifications of those who require medical care, namely:

"1. Those not employed, but able to sustain the full cost of providing for hospital and medical care.

"2. Those who are employed.

"3. The medically indigent, whose income does not suffice to meet the costs of catastrophic illnesses.

"4. The totally indigent, who are on public-assistance rolls.

"5. The chronically ill.

"Any adequate program to meet health needs should include medical and hospital care. Insofar as possible, such care should be so inclusive that everyone may budget in advance against the financial burden of sudden illness. In addition, the program should assure every community of basic health protection through well-organized professional public health departments.

"No matter what program is devised, it should be experimental, flexible and evolutionary in character. It should be sufficiently concrete as to be readily understood and practically adaptable everywhere.

"The Medical Society of New Jersey, therefore, offers the following proposals for a cooperative health program, in which National and State Governments may participate, without endangering individual initiative, personal freedom or scientific progress. The sequence in which this program is set forth does not necessarily indicate the relative importance of its parts.

"1. Voluntary nonprofit organizations should be used as the best means of budgeting hospital and medical service for the individual and his family.

"(a) The Blue Cross movement, providing for hospital care on a nonprofit, minimum cost basis, is recognized as the outstanding development in this direction. First established in New Jersey less than 20 years ago, Blue Cross has extended to nearly every part of the United States. There are now 96 Blue Cross organizations with a combined enrollment of more than 35,000,000 people. In New Jersey, approximately one-third of the population now enjoys this protection.

"(b) The Blue Shield movement, launched within the past decade, has made possible the prepayment of medical care on a budget basis, which in some areas means that the doctor's bill for eligible care is covered in full for 80 percent of subscribers and their dependents, of whom there are now more than 12,000,000 persons enrolled throughout the United States. Blue Shield in New Jersey has enrolled 350,000 people in only 7 years.

"2. For persons not employed, but able to meet the cost of enrollment in such voluntary nonprofit organizations, we propose that the premiums be made eligible for deduction for income-tax purposes, regardless of the financial status of the subscriber or the amount of the premium paid.

"Such deduction is equitable, inasmuch as employers who pay or contribute to the enrollment cost for their employees are already permitted to deduct these costs for income-tax purposes, in cases where the latter enters into the computation of Federal income tax.

"3. For employed groups, it is encouraging to note the growing practice of the employer contributing toward the cost of health and welfare programs for his employees and dependents. As mentioned, such payments are usually tax-deductible as part of the cost of production, and are being increasingly recognized as a legitimate part of that cost.

"4. As an immediate encouragement toward employer contribution toward the enrollment cost of hospital and medical protection, government, at every level from municipal to national, should promote the program of such protection for its own employees, by assuming either a part or all of the cost of enrollment in voluntary prepayment plans.

"5. As rapidly as possible, consistent with actuarial experience and sound administration, the services eligible under such voluntary nonprofit organizations should be extended to cover all nonchronic ailments on an inclusive basis. An encouraging step in this direction is the decision of the Blue Shield Plan in New Jersey to provide complete coverage (within the $5,000 annual income limitation) for maternity services, including delivery and pre- and post-partum care, in the hospital, the home, or the physician's office.

"6. After sufficient enrollment is attained, we recommend that consideration be given the practicability of providing medical-care protection on an inclusive basis to subscribers in voluntary, nonprofit plans, regardless of the financial status of the subscriber, and with no salary limitation for over-all inclusive service.

"7. We propose that immediate study be given the possibility of providing voluntary, nonprofit protection for those who are medically indigent though not on public-assistance rolls, through the use of State and local funds for the purchase of such protection. As a rule of thumb to determine 'medical indigency,' the criterion might be the question whether one's taxable income is such as to exempt him from payment of Federal income taxes.

"8. For the medical and hospital care of persons on public-assistance rolls, we recommend the providing of service through State-county-municipal funds, with such Federal aid as may be found necessary or may be provided from time to time, perhaps, utilizing on a cost basis the voluntary nonprofit organizations for the actual provision of the required services.

"9. There is no actuarially sound basis yet established for treating the chronically ill as an insured group. We suggest, therefore, that study be given to providing care for needy persons suffering from chronic illness, on a cost basis at State level, again with the possibility of utilizing the facilities of voluntary nonprofit organizations.

"10. The need for better local public-health service in most areas of the United States has long been recognized, but progress in providing it has been discouragingly slow. We recommend that every State government—particularly our own in New Jersey—adopt such legislation as may be needed to permit consolidation of local health jurisdictions into districts having sufficient size and resources to support at least a minimum staff and facilities for complete modern basic public-health protection.

"11. There are numerous areas in certain States where the private practice of medicine is economically or professionally impractical, because the areas will not sustain a sufficient number of capable physicians on a fee-for-service basis, or because hospital facilities are inadequate or lacking. Progress is being made under the Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act toward meeting the deficit of hospital accommodations. We suggest exploring the possibility of the United States Public Health Service providing competent physicians to such areas when requested by State or local agencies.

"12. Such a cooperative health program as is here envisaged may require a considerable increase in the number of physicians, health officers, nurses, and other medical personnel. Ideally, every qualified person desiring to enter the field of medicine and public health should be able to do so. We support a program of Government subsidy, where needed, to assist qualified individuals in obtaining professional training and to expand professional training facilities where it is found possible to expand existing schools or to establish new ones. In this connection we renew our plea for early action looking toward establishment of a medical school in New Jersey. We believe that any governmental subsidy that may be provided for these purposes should be granted unconditionally to approved institutions.

"The Medical Society of New Jersey submits that through such voluntary cooperative action the problem of attaining an adequate national health program can and will be solved. This suggested program is not intended as a nebulous proposal for the indefinite future, but might well be inaugurated within the present year."

FEPC Resolution of New York State Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the memorial passed by the Senate and Assembly of the New York State Legislature on February 21, 1950, with only seven dissenting votes in the assembly and two in the senate memorializing the Congress to enact FEPC legislation with enforcement powers in the Commission, as contained in H. R. 4453:

Senate Resolution 42

(By Mr. Scanlan)

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, a bill, H. R. 4453, known as the Fair Employment Practice Act, the purpose of which is to establish a permanent agency of the Government to eliminate discrimination in employment; and

Whereas the State of New York has been among the pioneers of the States of the Union to enact such legislation which has been successful in reducing or eradicating such discrimination in the industries of this State; and

Whereas all citizens without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin are entitled to equal opportunity to be gainfully employed and it is in the public interest that such unfair practices, which tend to engender bitterness and unrest among large segments of our population be eradicated as opposed to the principles of our form of government; and

Whereas during the last war when it was essential for our war industries to keep production at their highest level, the fair employment practice committee was highly successful in reducing or eliminating such discrimination in such industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That it is the sense of the people of the State of New York, expressed through the considered judgment of their representatives in the legislature, that the enactment of such legislation is of the greatest importance to the people and will tend to unite the country and create greater respect for our institutions among the other peoples of the world; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed H. R. 4453 or such other, similar, appropriate legislation as will accomplish the purposes of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to do all within their power to bring about the enactment of such legislation.

By order of the senate:

WILLIAM S. King,
Secretary.

In assembly, February 21, 1950, concurred in without amendments.

By order of assembly:

ASHLEY Bubkowski,
Clerk.

How Much of the World?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Livingston Hartley, which was published in the January issue of Freedom and Union. Mr. Hartley is a well-known student and writer on international affairs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MUCH OF THE WORLD?

(By Livingston Hartley)

WORLD UNION MINUS RUSSIAN BLOC WOULD CONTAIN ONLY 3.1 PERCENT MORE PEOPLE BY LOOSE UNION THAN WOULD INSTEAD KNIT ATLANTIC UNION PLUS ASSOCIATED PEOPLES

Advocates of world government make much of the quantitative difference between a government representing the world's people and an Atlantic Union including initially only a minority of them. This quantitative difference shrinks surprisingly if the comparison is made on a basis which considers political and economic relationships.

When we take account of those relationships, we have to expect that Russia and the other countries now under Communist control would not participate in a world government, a conclusion which is now accepted by some leaders in the world-government movement. We have also to expect that nations closely associated with the Atlantic democracies today would be closely associated with the Atlantic Union. If these conclusions are valid, a comparison of populations in an all-conclusive world government and in an initial Atlantic Union has little meaning. A far more pertinent and realistic comparison is that between a world government which does not include the Russian bloc and an Atlantic Union together with associated peoples.

Before proceeding further, it should be stressed that such a comparison in no way implies that these two alternatives are equally feasible. We can, if we wish, compare the size of a projected liner which is soon to sail the Atlantic with the theoretical size of an atomic rocket which some scientist calculates might some day fly around Mars, without implying that both are equally practicable.

The Atlantic Union would be based upon common institutions, common interests, a common cultural heritage, and a sense of community which has developed over many centuries. The peoples who would form it have already combined for defense in the North Atlantic Pact, and for European recovery through the Marshall plan. The union is directly in line with historic evolution and its many instances of voluntary integration based upon community and proximity.

Proposals for world government, in contrast, depart abruptly from the pattern of historic evolution, disregard the controlling factors of community and proximity which have brought about previous voluntary integration, and seek at one step to bring into one government democracies, dictatorships, and all continents, races, religions, and stages of political development.

Few objective people will challenge the conclusion that in considering any form of world government today it is more realistic to consider one without the Russian bloc than one including the Russian bloc. The Russians have established this point rather clearly by official statements, and even more clearly by their actions. The attitudes toward it of many leaders in the world government movement appears to rest less upon a belief that Russians would actually participate, than upon a desire to avoid themselves any responsibility for further dividing the world.

The conclusion that peoples now associated with the Atlantic democracies would be associated with the Atlantic Union may require more substantiation. Before going into cases, let us look at the general pattern of world trade.

The Atlantic democracies account today for the greater part of international trade. The seven sponsors of the North Atlantic Pact alone, not including their dependent territories or the British dominions, accounted for 45.4[1] percent of world trade in 1948. Most nations outside the Russian bloc are associated with the Atlantic democracies closely economically, depending upon them both for markets and for goods.

Atlantic Union would develop, not diminish, these economic ties. Because it would increase the purchasing power of its own people, it would provide a larger market for the exports of all these outside peoples. Because it would also open new opportunities for its people for mass production and specialization, it would produce goods more cheaply than the Atlantic democracies have done. Thus the union would provide outside peoples with both expanded markets and cheaper goods, strengthening and enlarging the economic bonds between them and the Atlantic peoples.

It may be objected that the Russian bloc might disrupt this progressive economic association by expanding its own trade with all peoples outside the Atlantic Union. But the Russian bloc, including China, which appears destined soon to fall completely under Communist control, has played a relatively small part in international trade. In 1938 it accounted for only 6.6[1] percent of world trade. The trade statistics of most of its people are hidden today by the iron curtain, but it seems likely that the iron curtain itself and the conditions in China and many of the satellite countries have reduced this proportion.

Russia, moreover, lacks the merchant marine to conduct an extensive overseas trade, whereas the Atlantic democracies are the preeminent maritime nations. Russia's overland trade is hindered by inadequate transport and, in parts of Asia, by mountains and deserts. Finally, most of the nations associated economically with the Atlantic democracies need industrial products and the Russian bloc has failed to produce enough industrial products to meet its own requirements.

The association of peoples all over the world with the Atlantic democracies is not only economic, but also political. These peoples, which are listed individually in the table with this article, may be divided into the following six groups:

1. The colonies or dependent territories of the seven Atlantic democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Pact. These would presumably become, for an initial stage, dependent territories of the union.

2. The democracies and dominions which were not among the sponsors of the North Atlantic Pact, but may be expected to enter the Atlantic Union either when it is established or soon afterwards. They include three parties to the North Atlantic Pact, three dominions and Switzerland, Sweden and Eire.

3. The Latin-American Republics which have long had intimate bonds with the United States. Most of them could be expected to enter the Atlantic Union soon after its creation. None of them, not even Argentina, would be likely to remain outside the union more than a few years.

4. Six Asiatic countries which were formerly dependent territories of the Atlantic democracies and have now achieved either independence or dominion status. While most of them could not be expected to join the Atlantic Union in the near future, they are today closely associated with the Atlantic democracies and would continue to be closely associated with the Atlantic Union.

The most important of them is India, which has been attempting to avoid definite involvement in the clash between Russia and the West, yet maintains special political and economic links with Britain. If Britain, as well as the United States, became part of a union dedicated to freedom and the dignity of man, these links with the West would become not weaker, but stronger. Old antagonisms towards the British would not apply to the union, while trade ties with the Atlantic area would rapidly increase.

5. Western Germany and Japan which are now occupied by the Atlantic democracies and under their control. Western Germany which would border directly upon the Atlantic Union, might soon be enabled to join the union.

6. A somewhat heterogeneous group of countries which now has close associations with the Atlantic democracies. Greece and Turkey depend upon American military aid for security. Portugal and Italy are parties to the North Atlantic Pact. Egypt, Ethiopia and Thailand have close relationships with Britain while Liberia has long had a special relationship with the United States. Spain has been included in this group because it is reasonable to believe that by the time her European neighbors and some Latin American republics had joined the union, the Spanish people would turn from Franco to freedom in order to join it themselves.

When the economic and political realities underlying the association of all these countries with the Atlantic democracies are analyzed, two conclusions concerning their relationships with the Atlantic Union become apparent.

First, more than half the countries of the world could be expected to seek to join the Atlantic Union within a few years of its creation.

Second, the association of the others with the Atlantic Union would become stronger than their association with the Atlantic democracies. All of them would look to the union not only for expanded markets and cheaper goods, but also for security against a third world war. All peoples among them who aspired to preserve what freedom they had won would see the union as the world's great bastion of freedom. Farseeing statesmen among them would seek practical means of closer association with the union and begin to work for the day when their peoples could join in.

This analysis indicates also that the nations who would be either in the Atlantic Union or closely associated with it, actually comprise most of the world outside the Russian bloc. It may be advisable, however, to

[1] Compiled from Summary of World Trade Statistics, Statistical Office of the United Nations, October 1, 1949.

omit those whose future possibilities of association with the union may be open to some doubt, however much their peoples may aspire toward it. It is usually best to understate a case.

Iran, Palestine and the Arab states of Asia have close ties with the Atlantic democracies today, but might become subject, because of their geographical situation, to powerful Russian pressure. Similar pressure might be applied to Afghanistan and Nepal. The status of both Austria and Korea is undecided. In order to be conservative, these peoples are omitted from the long list of those who would be associated with the Atlantic Union. It may be suggested, however, that not all of them would be willing to join in a "government" which the Russian bloc refused to join.

The accompanying table gives a comparison between the populations included in a world government without the Russian bloc and in the Atlantic Union and associated peoples. Population figures are from the World Almanac of 1949, taken to the nearest million for simpler presentation.

Exception may be taken to some of the specific items in the population chart, since the inclusion or omission of some countries is necessarily a matter of judgment. It might be objected, for example, that Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Jordan, and Palestine should be added, or that French Indochina should be omitted because the Chinese Communists have reached its borders.

Such adjustments may be made according to individual judgment. It is not believed, however, that any reasonably sound adjustments will materially affect the over-all figure for the Atlantic Union plus associated peoples. To illustrate, an adjustment so sweeping as to eliminate French Indochina and all of the last group, which contain countries as closely tied to the Atlantic democracies as Greece, Turkey, Italy, and Portugal, would reduce the over-all figure only to 1,209,000,000, or 53.4 percent of the world.

But to compare such radically different political entities as a world government without the Russian bloc and the Atlantic Union plus associated peoples on the basis of population alone would be misleading, just as it would be to imply that both are equally feasible.

Such a world government would be loosely constructed of widely divergent peoples, democracies, autocrats, and various shades between, who would lack common interests, common heritage, and any sense of community. Its functions would be limited to efforts to preserve peace. Since the Russian bloc would continue to maintain vast armies, air power, and atomic weapons, the world government could not preserve peace by enacting world law. Peace would then depend, just as it would in the case of the Atlantic Union, upon the creation and successful maintenance of an unquestioned world predominance of power.

The Atlantic Union, in contrast, would be founded solidly upon common interests, common heritage, and a sense of community as well as upon free institutions. Its functions would include not only preservation of peace, but also regulation of trade, currency, and communications. It would be inherently much more closely knit and efficient. Functioning as a solid nucleus surrounded and supported by associated peoples and itself possessing 50 percent of the industrial capacity of the world, it would be infinitely better equipped to create and successfully maintain an unquestioned world preeminence of power.

Both political aggregations would comprise almost the same proportion of the world's population. Both would depend upon exactly the same peoples to maintain peace, the Atlantic democracies which would form the initial Atlantic Union. In the world government without the Russian bloc, the Atlantic democracies would be only a minority, unable to apply their decisive combined power and influence effectively without the agreement of a heterogeneous majority composed of peoples far behind them in political and economic development. In the union these Atlantic democracies could operate as effectively as we Americans can in our Union, not only to preserve peace, but also to promote prosperity and to foster freedom.

Independence for Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1950 marked the thirty-second anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. On the evening of that day, the priests and members of Our Lady of Vilna parish and their guests assembled in the parish hall, Worcester, Mass., for the purpose of celebrating the event with appropriate patriotic exercises. During the exercises, those assembled unanimously adopted and passed the following resolutions:

Whereas the United States of America has ever defended the God-given right of all nations to determine for themselves the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas the United States of America with Great Britain signed the Atlantic Charter, the principles of which guarantee all nations, both large and small, this right of self-rule without interference of any kind from any outside and alien source; and

Whereas the United States of America joined with the Allies in World War II to assure for the entire world a just and lasting peace which can and shall exist only when all nations, both large and small, live as free and independent nations in accordance with recognized principles of justice and charity; and

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania, a small freedom-loving nation, which made astounding advancement and progress in all fields of endeavor during the 21 years of her independence (1918–39), has been forcibly and unjustly denied the exercise of this right by a cruel and ruthless Soviet and has been refused a place and a voice in the United Nations by the great powers who have acquiesced to the unjust and immoral demands of the Soviet; and

Whereas authoritative sources of information clearly indicate that the present policy of Soviet Russia calls for the shameless commission of the international crime of genocide upon liberty-loving Lithuania by the complete destruction and annihilation of Lithuania's Government and of her cultural, educational, economic, industrial, and agricultural systems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States of America continue to maintain and uphold its present policy of recognizing the "de jure" independence of Lithuania despite the unjust absorption of Lithuania's territories within the Russian orbit; be it further

Resolved, That the United States of America insist upon invoking the principles of the Atlantic Charter, thereby guaranteeing the immediate and positive restoration of the independence of Lithuania; be it further

Resolved, That the Republic of Lithuania be admitted and accepted as an active member of the United Nations and that her officially appointed representatives be permitted to enjoy with full privileges the status of duly elected delegates of that organization; be it further

Resolved, That the Government of the United States of America ratify the Genocide Convention, ratification of which would open up the way for Lithuania to present her case against Russia to the entire world; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency, the Honorable Harry S. Truman; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson; to the head of the United States Delegation to the United Nations, the Honorable Warren R. Austin; to the chairman of the Senate subcommittee now considering ratification of the Genocide Convention, the Honorable BRIEN MCMAHON; to the Senators of Massachusetts, the Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., and the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL; to the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts, the Honorable HAROLD D. DONOHUE, and to the press.

CONSTANTINE A. VASYS,
Chairman.
MRS. TEKLA MASKUKA,
Secretary.

Mr. Keogh's Reappointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which referred to the redesignation of my brother, J. Vincent Keogh, as United States attorney for the eastern district of New York. I am proud, indeed, to include this editorial in view of its being an objective appraisal by the outstanding newspaper of the district of the work performed in the office of the United States attorney during the last 4 years.

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of February 10, 1950]

MR. KEOGH'S REAPPOINTMENT

President Truman's redesignation of J. Vincent Keogh as United States attorney for the Brooklyn, Long Island, and Staten Island area, called the eastern district of New York, is well-merited recognition of our Federal prosecutor's excellent record. As was noted in these columns recently, the prosecutor's office, under Mr. Keogh, compiled an amazing record of approximately 98 percent convictions in cases in the Federal court.

Mr. Keogh's career has been an interesting one. A native Brooklynite, he was a public school teacher for 12 years, an assistant district attorney for 2 years, a lieutenant commander in the Navy in World War II, and has been active in many charitable and civic organizations. He was first named United States attorney 4 years ago. President Truman's decision to rename him is an excellent one.

The President's Foreign Policy Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include President Truman's foreign policy speech at the unveiling of a statue of George Washington:

It is a great privilege to dedicate this inspiring statue of George Washington.

This is the climax of many years of planning and effort. I congratulate particularly the Order of DeMolay, whose contributions have made this statue a reality. This heroic likeness of our first President makes even more impressive the entrance hall of this temple. It is altogether fitting that this work should stand in the community that Washington did so much to build, and so near his own home at Mount Vernon.

George Washington, like ourselves, lived in a period of great change—a period when new forces and new ideas were sweeping across the world. He was the leader of his people in a revolution against tyranny. He commanded an army in a long and bitter war. He was a major figure in the creation of a new kind of constitution. Finally, as the first living President of our Nation, he translated that Constitution into a living government.

Washington's efforts for freedom were twofold. He was concerned first with making the ideal of democratic government work. He was also concerned with the defense of that ideal against the forces opposed to it.

UNWAVERING IN DEVOTION

Washington was unwavering in his devotion to the democratic concept. He never yielded to those who urged him to assume extraordinary powers. Even in the darkest days of the Revolution, when his task as commander in chief of the American forces was rendered doubly difficult by the weakness of the Congress and the rivalries among the States, he always considered himself as a servant of the people. In all that he did, he strove to make democratic institutions more effective.

He knew, too, that they had to be defended; that there were times when the use of force to defend democracy could not be avoided. He not only led the armies in the Revolution but, as President, he was always alert to the necessity for a vigorous national defense.

The task of Americans today is fundamentally the same as it was in Washington's time. We, too, must make democracy work and we must defend it against its enemies.

But our task today is far greater in scope than it was in Washington's time. Not only are we concerned with increasing the freedom, welfare and opportunity of our people. We are also concerned with the right of other peoples to choose their form of government, to improve their standards of living, and to decide what kind of life they want to live.

Since Washington's time the great principles for which the American Revolution was fought have become known throughout the world and have uplifted the hearts and hopes of generations of men. At the same time, through the progress of science, the nations of the world have been drawn together into a common destiny. Our security and progress are today more closely related than ever before to the advance of freedom and self-government in other lands.

A TIME OF RESTLESSNESS

This is a time of restlessness and change. In many parts of the world men are searching for a better social order. They demand a way of life that will provide greater freedom and more widespread opportunity. They yearn to own the land they live on, and to be secure against poverty, disease, and hunger. Above all, they want to live their own lives as they see fit. This rising demand of men everywhere for independence and a better life puts the ideals of freedom and self-government to their greatest test.

At the same time, these ideals are under deadly attack from those who would destroy them. The most aggressive of these enemies today is communism. Communism seeks to induce men to surrender their freedom by false promises of a better life. But the great danger of communism does not lie in its false promises. It lies in the fact that it is an instrument of an armed imperialism which seeks to extend its influence by force.

This threat of force is a challenge to all peoples who are free or who wish to be free. The fundamental issue is whether men are to be free to choose their one way of life, or whether they must live under a system imposed upon them by force.

Just as our Thirteen Original States found that survival and progress depend on closer association and common effort, so the free nations of the world today must seek their salvation in unity and concerted action. The real strength of the free nations is not to be found in any single country or any one weapon, but in the combined moral and material strength of the free world as a whole.

As members of the United Nations, the free nations are working for peace and international security in accordance with the principles set forth in the Charter. Within the context of that larger association many of the free nations have joined together to strengthen the common defense of particular areas against aggression. That is the meaning of the North Atlantic Treaty and the mutual-defense assistance program.

FOR THE COMMON DEFENSE

We shall continue to work with the other free nations associated with us in the common defense—for our defense is theirs, and their defense is ours. The united defense of these nations is a powerful deterrent to aggression, and it will become more powerful as time goes by.

In creating a common defense we do not seek to impose a way of life on any nation. Freedom is not expanded by conquest. Democracy is not created by dictation. Freedom and democracy grow only by persuasion and example, and through the actual experience of what they mean.

At the same time, freedom cannot grow and expand unless it is protected against the armed imperialism of those who would destroy it. The free nations, therefore, must maintain military force as a defensive measure.

While the free nations stand prepared to resist aggression, they are doing their utmost to find peaceful means for settling international disputes. They know that another great war could destroy victor and vanquished alike.

Consequently, we in the United States are doing and will continue to do all that lies within our power to prevent the horror of another war. We are working for the reduction of armaments and the control of weapons of mass destruction.

We are convinced of the necessity for an international agreement to limit the use of atomic energy to peaceful purposes, and for a workable international system to assure that such an agreement is effectively carried out. We believe that the United Nations is the proper forum in which to reach such an agreement. We firmly believe that all nations would gain by such an international agreement. We shall continue to work honestly and wholeheartedly toward that end. But we must remember that the outcome is not ours alone to determine. The actions of men in other countries will help to shape the ultimate decision.

We believe that the plan for controlling atomic energy, which has been worked out in the United Nations and has been approved by the overwhelming majority of its members, would be effective. That plan, therefore, has our support. It has our support not because of its form or its words, but because we believe it would achieve effective control. The stakes are too large to let us, or any nation, stand on pride of authorship. We ask only for a plan that provides an effective, workable system—anything less would be a sham agreement. Anything less would increase, not decrease, the dangers of the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes. We shall continue to examine every avenue, every possibility of reaching real agreement for effective control.

In the long run, however, our security and the world's hopes for peace lie not in measures of defense or in the control of weapons but in the growth and expansion of freedom and self-government. As these ideals are accepted by more and more people, as they give greater meaning and richer content to the lives of millions, they become the greatest force in the world for peace.

The purpose of our participation in the United Nations and other international organizations is to strengthen this great force for peace. That is the purpose of the European recovery program and our point four program to assist underdeveloped areas. That is the purpose of our foreign trade program and our other measures to help build world prosperity.

These programs are positive measures to increase the strength of freedom and self-government by helping men to meet the needs and fulfill the aspirations of their daily lives.

Today, in many countries of the world, the concepts of freedom and self-government are merely vague phrases. They express little to people who are engaged in a desperate struggle with ignorance and poverty. They mean little to men who must work from sun-up to sun-down merely to keep alive. They are not fully understood by men who cannot read or write.

On the continent of Asia and the islands of the Far East, in Africa and in the Near East, are millions of people who live in poverty and who have never known real freedom or democratic government. In their present condition the immediate benefit of steel plowshares, or smallpox vaccinations, has more appeal than abstract ideas of democracy.

FALSITY OF COMMUNIST CLAIMS

The Communists are saying that they will bring food and clothing and health and a more secure life to these poverty-stricken peoples. We know that is not true. But it is not enough to tell such people that communism is a modern tyranny far worse than that of any ancient empire. It is not enough to tell them that communism leads only to oppression. People who have never known freedom and security themselves have little basis for judging how false are the claims of communism.

These people will turn to democracy only if it seems to them to be the best way to meet their urgent needs. The benefits of freedom and democracy must be demonstrated to them.

In many of these areas there are governments which are working to improve the conditions of their people. They know that the claims of the Communists are not made in good faith. They do not want Soviet domination. If these governments are successful in raising living standards, and in

building strong and stable democratic institutions based on popular support, their people will not go over to communism.

But these governments are struggling with titanic problems as their people attempt to climb in a few years from economic misery to better standards of living. They need help. If these nations are to grow in freedom they urgently need assistance in improving their health, their education, their productive capacity, their transportation and communication systems.

That is why I have requested the Congress to act as rapidly as possible on legislation to expand our programs for giving technical assistance to such countries as these, and to encourage American investment in those countries on a mutually beneficial basis. We are not trying to sell them automobiles and television sets. Our purpose is to help them to grow more food, to obtain better education, and to be more healthy. That is the way they can gain the physical and moral strength to be free and to maintain their own governments.

As these nations prove to the skeptics and to others the effectiveness of free institutions in meeting their people's needs, they will show as nothing else can the true value of democracy and the false claims of communism.

PROBLEMS IN EUROPE

But the problem of making free institutions work is not confined to underdeveloped areas. The highly developed nations of Europe came out of the war with serious problems of their own. They were threatened with economic chaos. Their ability to maintain freedom and democracy was challenged.

The purpose of the European recovery program was to meet this challenge in the area of the world where the preservation of free governments was of supreme importance. The results, which have been achieved so far under that program, have amply demonstrated its wisdom.

With the aid we have provided, the nations of Europe have already made great advances in their production and have improved their trading relations with the rest of the world. Much more must be done before they reach the firm basis of economic self-support, which is essential to the maintenance of free and democratic governments. Consequently, we must complete our program of assistance. It would be utter folly to lose sight of the importance of the European recovery program. It is essential to our hopes for peace.

The preservation and strengthening of free governments depends in large measure on the creation of firm economic conditions throughout the world and on an expanding world trade. Free nations can expand their trade only on the basis of mutual respect and fair dealing.

Our reciprocal trade agreements program and the International Trade Organization are the kind of international machinery which is necessary for increasing the trade of the world. We shall continue to use the procedures of the reciprocal trade agreements program to reduce trade barriers, but more than this is needed. That is why I have urged the Congress to act favorably on the creation of the International Trade Organization, through which the nations of the world can work together effectively to increase world trade.

This program and our other plans for international action are the practical way to move forward toward peace. They recognize that we must deal with the difficult world situation which actually exists. We must not be discouraged by difficulties and set-backs. We must not be misled by the vain hope of finding quick and easy solutions. We must move forward persistently and courageously along the hard path to a peace based on freedom and justice.

The progress we have made in this country since the days of George Washington is proof of the vitality and truth of the ideals he fought for. We must be no less firm, no less resolute, no less steadfast than he was. We move upon a greater stage than he did, but our problems are fundamentally the same problems that faced the first President of this Nation—to make democracy work and defend it from its enemies.

George Washington sought guidance from Almighty God as he faced these tasks in his time; let us be guided today by divine providence as we strive for lasting peace with freedom and justice for all mankind.

Congress Must Take Immediate Action on the Old-Age Pension Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress in January 1939. Then, as today, the general problem of old-age pensions has been before the Congress of the United States.

Along with other Members of Congress, I have actively supported not only by voice but also by vote all legislation designed to give the aged of this Nation the benefits to which they are entitled. During the Seventy-sixth Congress I was among the "101 immortals" designated by Dr. Francis Townsend, founder of the Townsend organization, as having the courage to vote for the Townsend bill.

Much water has flown over the dam since 1939 and Congress is still toying with old-age pension legislation. As in the past 10 years, I am still engaged in a determined effort to have Congress do something with respect to old-age pension legislation.

Since the opening of the Eighty-first Congress I have continued my activities in the field of pension legislation. Not only am I a member of the congressional steering committees for the Townsend and the American pension groups, but I have also appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee in urging immediate action on pension legislation. In addition, I have spoken on this floor and called attention to the plight of our elderly citizens. I have also signed the discharge petition now being circulated in behalf of the Townsend bill.

My statements during this session of Congress on the subject of old-age pensions are as follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, MARCH 15, 1949, IN SUPPORT OF LIBERALIZATION OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and the members of the committee to discuss the importance of broadening and liberalizing the Social Security Act.

All of you are familiar with the efforts I have been making, since I first came to Congress, to liberalize the provisions of the Social Security Act. On various occasions I have introduced amendments to the Social Security Act and made every effort to have them considered by Congress.

In addition, I have joined with groups such as the Townsend plan, American pension plan, and others in support of legislation to provide an adequate old-age pension for the benefit of millions of Americans who are in the twilight of life and dependent upon old-age assistance or other forms of social-security benefits.

Time and time again statements have been made on the floor, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been full of impassioned pleas for action by the House leadership with respect to improving benefits under the Social Security Act. The present plight of elderly citizens is a national disgrace and has existed for the past several years.

It is a known fact that social security is here to stay and that it is intended to provide elderly citizens with a means of livelihood in their declining years. Yet, we seem to forget, in viewing earned social-security benefits, that the formula used in computing them has never been changed since the law was first passed. Meanwhile, the cost of living has soared to the point where it has doubled itself. Since 1933 the cost-of-living index has increased considerably. It is common knowledge that persons gainfully employed are having a difficult time in making both ends meet.

The Congress of the United States has ignored the elderly citizens of America, who by their labor and taxes, built this great Nation. Yes, we have forgotten them in turning our attention to world problems. Hardly a day passes that we have not heard on the floor of the poor unfortunate people abroad. When you pick up your daily newspaper, it is not uncommon to find full-page advertisements directing your attention to the needs of millions of persons abroad. This week the House approved an appropriation of $16,000,000 for destitute displaced Arabs and Jews in the Middle East. But there is not one word said in defense of millions of our own American citizens who are on starvation diets and restricted in many instances to one scanty meal a day.

Let us examine, for a moment, the amount of financial assistance we have given to the peoples of the world. According to the United States Department of Commerce, from March 11, 1941, to December 31, 1946, in the form of lend-lease aid alone, the American taxpayers contributed $50,243,996,159. In addition, we have contributed toward world recovery since July 1, 1945, the sum of $25,495,052,923 which has been allocated as follows:

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation	$2,700,000,000
United Nations Organization	41,426,162
Lend-lease (postwar)	2,163,000,000
International Monetary Fund (authorization)	2,750,000,000
International Bank	635,000,000
Export-Import Bank (loans authorized)	2,258,300,000
Loans to Great Britain and the Philippines	4,390,000,000
War Department, grants for relief	1,771,926,293
Surplus property sales (credits extended)	1,148,000,000
Greek-Turkish loan (authorized amount)	400,000,000
Relief in occupied area (Army)	2,230,000,000
International Relief Organization	71,073,000
International Refugee Organization	182,327,468
European Cooperation Administration	4,754,000,000
Other appropriations for foreign or international objectives by Eightieth Congress	300,000,000
Total	25,495,052,923

With the passage of the Marshall plan by the Eightieth Congress, we have obligated ourselves to spend what may amount to more than $17,000,000,000, which no doubt will be only a starter in bailing out Europe from its financial mess.

When you add together all of these sums for foreign aid, you have the almost unbelievable total of over $90,000,000,000 being sent abroad to help foreign nations.

In other words, since this Nation was founded in 1776 until 1933—a period of 157 years—we spent, in conducting the affairs of Government, less than $90,000,000,000. Yet, in 7 years we have sent abroad over $90,000,000,000, which should not be such a bad record in the eyes of foreigners for a Nation that has been called repeatedly a race of Shylocks.

Let us recognize the fact that all groups in America have received some recognition with respect to the increased cost of living. Virtually all employees in Government and industry have received wage increases. Yet little attention has been given to the plight of our elderly citizens receiving old-age assistance, and no attention has been given to those who earned retirement benefits under the Social Security Act.

For example, in the State of Pennsylvania in 1948 the minimum figures for bare existence of an individual amounted to $20 for food, $4 for clothing, $25 for shelter and maintenance, and $4 for incidentals or a total of $53.

The cost of living in Pennsylvania is typical of conditions in the United States. Yet, in Pennsylvania in 1948 the average old-age assistance paid was $3.52 per month. At the same time, retired employees under social security received an average monthly benefit of $25, with $13 additional if married, or a total of $38 monthly.

In some States many recipients of old-age assistance receive $10 to $15 a month and are told to live on such an allowance. Yet, at the same time, Great Britain has been paying, by comparison, $33 monthly to each needy person. Our gifts to the British Socialist Government in recent years have averaged $1,500,000,000 annually; and, in dispensing money under the European recovery program, Great Britain will receive approximately one-third of the money that American taxpayers are contributing to support the so-called Marshall plan. It is a ridiculous situation to realize that American taxpayers are doling out billions of dollars to foreign nations and permitting them to pay to the needy nearly three times the amount we expend for our own elderly citizens.

Even though we approved legislation to enable States to increase old-age assistance $5 monthly, is there anyone in the United States that when he reaches age 65 can be expected to live on $12.75 monthly, $25 monthly, or $38 if married? The answer is so apparent that it is an insult to question one's intelligence to even ask such a ridiculous question. Yet, that is exactly what we have been asking the elderly citizens to do the past several years.

I feel it is needless for me to continue to describe the plight of the elderly citizens of this Nation.

You have listened to the testimony of Mr. Russell Saville of the American Pension Plan, Inc., and to Dr. Francis Townsend and his son, Robert Townsend, who explained the merits of the Townsend plan. Other pension leaders have added their voice in pleading that something be done for our aged and without further delay.

Members of Congress like myself have introduced legislation for the American pension plan and for the Townsend plan. We are serving as members of the Congressional Steering Committee for both groups. We are giving our time and devoting our efforts toward securing some relief for our elderly citizens.

Before coming to Washington for this session of Congress, I talked with honest, God-fearing Americans whom I know personally and in whose homes I have visited. I learned of their poverty and the fact that the very roof over their heads is mortgaged to the State in return for the paltry sum they receive in the form of old-age assistance.

Mr. Chairman, there are many Members of Congress who share my belief that something must be done to relieve the want and suffering of our aged.

At this very moment Congress is showing great effort to hurry through the Senate and House an appropriation of nearly $6,000,000,000 for the relief of the people of Europe. Petitions are in circulation asking relief for the people of China. As I said previously, this week we approved an appropriation of $16,000,000 for destitute Arabs and Jews.

Why not apply the same concern and attention to the plight of our own American citizens.

All I ask is action by this committee in getting to the floor of the House a bill that will bring relief to our own American people who are victims of neglect by their Government.

STATEMENT ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, TWENTY-SECOND DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, OCTOBER 5, 1949, IN CONNECTION WITH H. R. 6000, A BILL DESIGNED TO AMEND THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, during my career in Congress which began in 1939, very little has been done toward amending the Social Security Act. Every effort made since 1939 was met with the excuse "there is a war to be won."

As a result no action was taken for 10 years despite the fact that there was need for revising the existing law. Each time we tried to do something we were told that a committe or a commission was engaged in studying the structure of the Social Security Act. The inference was that if we were patient long enough, Congress would receive recommendations for streamlining the Social Security Act.

Now we are considering H. R. 6000 which we are informed represents the efforts of the House Committee on Ways and Means over a period of 6 months.

The bill is not only disappointing in its provisions but it lacks features that should have been included in such a measure. To have waited 10 long years and then be handed a tailor-made bill without the right to amend it is a blow to the great American principles of fair play and justice.

We are considering a bill that affects the lives of over 50,000,000 persons and their families. We are taking such action at a time when the pension issue has invaded every segment of American life. We witness the pension issue being discussed freely in management and labor circles where it has become the focus point of collective-bargaining conferences.

The controversy over the need for universal pensions is so pronounced that the day is not far distant when such an objective will be realized.

Today, I am in utter dismay over the fact that this Congress is being asked to approve a bill in a take-it-or-leave-it atmosphere. This is especially disheartening when we are asked by such procedure to turn a deaf ear to the plight of the elderly citizens who helped build this great Nation.

According to the Bureau of the Census there were 16,799,000 persons in the United States aged 60 years and over on July 1, 1948. A large percentage of this number includes men and women who are unable to work or support themselves. It is this great class of citizens that we have completely ignored despite the fact that it is not their fault that they toiled and paid taxes when pensions and social security were but vague dreams.

It is a national disgrace to realize the tears we shed over displaced persons overseas while we give the "cold shoulder" to deserving American citizens who in the twilight of life have not enough material assistance to keep body and soul together. We send billions of dollars overseas and plan on sending billions more to help what are called the backward nations of the world. At the same time our only concern for the aged citizens of this Nation is the shedding of a few "crocodile" tears every time a political platform is adopted.

I cannot in good conscience remain silent any longer while this bill is lauded as being for the welfare of the American people. While I approve heartily of the increased benefits for those recipients who have earned them by contributions from their pay, it is a deplorable fact that the House Ways and Means Committee after 6 months of hearings and study failed to heed the anguished cries of the millions of elderly citizens who are left with no assurance that the present Congress intends to do anything for them but to continue to promise to consider their plight. Let us search our own conscience and face the fact that we are by our actions betraying millions of God-fearing American citizens.

I shall support this bill but I do so in a spirit of reluctance and with great disgust.

STATEMENT BY JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, TWENTY-SECOND DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE WITH RESPECT TO AMENDING THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, FEBRUARY 20, 1950

Mr. Chairman, I supported H. R. 6000 when it passed the House of Representatives during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. I did so, because I felt it was a step in the right direction. Yet at the same time it was my belief that the provisions of H. R. 6000 did not truly meet the general problem of old-age pensions.

As many of you know, I have long been associated with various groups in the old-age pension field including the Townsend organization and the American pension plan. I am sure that you will agree with me that these pension groups are entitled to a lot of credit for they are pioneers in the effort to bring to the attention of the American people the general problem of old-age pensions.

Fifteen years ago the American people were faced with the problem of old-age pensions and from that day until this there has been a constant effort by pension groups and many of us in Congress to bring about a general revision of social security in all of its aspects.

You know as well as I do that when Congress approved the Social Security Act our Government accepted the responsibility of that segment of the population covered by the act. This was the beginning of a program that was designed to provide eventually for the problems of our aged.

Since the Social Security Act became effective statistical information furnished by Government agencies reveal that the number of aged persons is increasing rapidly due to the lengthening of the span of life because of the rapid strides made by the medical profession in treating human ills.

Then, too, we must recognize that the Social Security Act has resulted in many people depending upon the Government for

security in their old age. While this attitude may be subject to criticism, yet it actually exists and the condition must be faced.

We cannot escape the fact that the cost of living has aggravated the general problem of old-age pensions and that present benefits under the Social Security Act are wholly inadequate. Then, of course, we have the cost of social security which has developed to be quite a problem to the Federal and State Government, as well as to the employer and employees.

While I was not in Congress when the Social Security Act was approved, yet I felt at that time that since our Government was committed to provide benefits to the aged the program was not broad enough since it did not cover all citizens. Many of you will remember that at that time I was identified with the Veterans of Foreign Wars as commander in chief and my activities brought me in contact with not only those covered under the law but also with a large number not covered. To be frank, the glaring defects in the Social Security Act were immediately apparent.

Today we are faced with the terrific problem of old-age pensions. It is my opinion that the Congress of the United States through its failure to take positive action in this field over a period of 15 years, is responsible for the situation we are confronted with today. If Congress had kept abreast of developments in the field of old-age pensions and had taken action instead of using delaying tactics, the issue would have been met and we would have today the necessary laws to meet present day needs.

Without doubt the question of industrial pensions and the many pension plans in effect at the present time have made this general problem of old-age pensions an acute one. As I have already said, it is my opinion that if Congress had taken action, the pension problem would have been solved years ago and we would not have the conglomeration of pension plans now being offered to the American people.

It is the consensus of opinion that the Social Security Act will have to be rewritten or a substitute adopted. It is freely predicted that the cost of social security benefits in the near future will be so great to employer and employee that a Federal Government subsidy will be necessary.

Then, let us not forget, that we are talking only about earned benefits under the Social Security Act and that we have not considered the cost of old age or public assistance to persons who are not contributors to the social security fund. The cost of these old-age pensions, as you know, is shared by the Federal and State Governments.

In mentioning the total cost of the Social Security Act, it is evident that the day is not far off when the cost of taking care of our aged under all phases of the Social Security Act will become an unbearable burden to Federal and State Governments as well as to employer and employee.

In closing, I recognize that your committee has access to Government statistics that concern all phases of the general problem of old-age pensions. For that reason, I have confined my remarks to a general discussion of the subject. It is my considered judgment, however, that the only answer to the old-age pension problem is a universal pension for the aged of this Nation. It may be the Townsend or American pension plan or some similar pension proposal that will provide the answer to this problem. One thing certain, we are not on the right track at present. It is a known fact that the aged of this country are not being taken care of for many of them are hungry. Therefore, I say to you, Congress had better devise a universal pension plan in keeping with the solvency of our Government and the needs of the American people.

Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE CENTURY PRESS,
New Castle, Ind., February 17, 1950.

Hon. RALPH HARVEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARVEY: I have just been going over some figures for our business and I have come up with some things on the retail excise tax which might be of interest to you.

Taking 1946 as the norm, or as 100 percent, our business has for 4 years been as follows:

1946	100
1947	119
1948	130
1949	128

Now the excise taxes we have paid show no such consistent record. Actual figures are as follows:

1946 (December only)	$162.59
1947	220.48
1948	197.59
1949	92.25

Our excise taxes are mostly on fountain pens, billfolds, and brief cases.

Our pen sales now are mostly on those that are not taxable. Our billfold and brief case sales are way off in volume as tax records show.

Since our annual total volume is over $100,000 you can see that generally speaking our business has not been so bad though items carrying retail excise taxes are another matter.

It is our judgment that in most cases the unsettled situation with regard to the excise taxes has practically stopped the purchase of products carrying these taxes except in cases of absolute necessity.

We are aware of the fact that there are only two ways to make up for any revenue loss that may result from a law abolishing the excise taxes; one is to spend less and the other is to secure revenue from another source. Why not do both? Spend less and if the saving is not sufficient, tax those who are not now paying their fair share.

* * * * *

It was nice seeing you the other day and I hope that one of these times you can do something for small businesses along the lines suggested above.

Your truly,

HENRY L. CHESICK.

Resolutions of Society of Mayflower Descendants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, knowing the high character, intelligence and patriotism of the members of the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the resolutions of this splendid organization adopted January 31, 1950. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that I agree in every particular with these resolutions and thank the members of this society for their timely action.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE SOCIETY OF MAYFLOWER DESCENDANTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ADOPTED JANUARY 31, 1950, IN RE PROPOSED WORLD GOVERNMENT

At a meeting of the Board of Assistants, the governing authority of the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia, held in the city of Washington, on January 31, 1950, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted, to wit:

"Whereas there are pending before the Congress of the United States proposals for the establishment of a so-called world government, to embrace all nations and peoples of the earth, with the United States of America as a constituent member; and

"Whereas because of the wide divergences, prejudices, antagonisms, distrusts and misconceptions attendant upon the existing differences of race, custom, creed, religion, speech, economic aim, interest, and need, political concept, ideal, ideology and ambition; and because, also, of the inherent urge and force of self-interest and demagogic appeal everywhere to be encountered—a single government, created for all lands and tongues, functioning with power, authority and universal harmony and beneficence, is absolutely impossible and out of the question; and any reign thus set up would prove to be a veritable babel of criminal folly and confusion; and

"Whereas the joinder of our own Nation in such a tragic and colossal misadventure would surely result in the overthrow of its system of liberty and constitutional government, and the regulation of its internal and domestic affairs; the inevitable loss of its nationality and freedom; the destruction of its unexampled enterprise and progress; the ultimate depletion and pillage—for the world at large—of its vast resources; and its reduction to a condition of hopeless impotence and futility: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia absolutely opposes any and all efforts for the establishment of such world organization, and respectfully calls on the American Congress to register its prompt and overwhelming disapproval of all such schemes and proposals; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be furnished to the Congress and its appropriate committees, for their consideration."

Postmaster Goldman and H. R. 4578

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by unanimous consent to extend my remarks I take pleasure in including therein the statement made by Hon. Albert Goldman at the hearing of the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on February 9, last, in connection with H. R. 4678 and H. R. 4757.

Mr. Goldman has been postmaster of the New York post office for the past 16 years during which time the receipts of the New York post office have increased tremendously and the efficiency in the handling of the mails has been greatly bettered by reason of the high morale of our New York post office employees. No small part of the credit for this achievement is due to Mr. Goldman, who has demonstrated unusual ability as an executive.

Mr. Goldman's statement follows:

The New York post office is one of the most intensive centers of industry anywhere to be found. It is the largest mail-distributing and financial center in the postal service in the United States.

As indicative of the enormous volume of the present business, it may be said that the receipts for the calendar year 1949 amounted to $164,474,009.02. This is an increase of $15,468,347.53 over 1948.

The postmaster's salary at New York, N. Y., was fixed at $12,000 per annum as far back as July 1, 1930. Only three increases in salary were granted since then—one of $400 in 1946 under Public Law 386, another of $450 in 1948 under Public Law 900, and another of $120 in 1949 under Public Law 428. In 1945, under Public Law 134, postmasters at offices with salaries in excess of $6,000 were not considered for any increase in salary, although postmasters whose salaries were under $6,000 received the benefit of this legislation.

During my incumbency as postmaster since 1934, the postal receipts of this great city have increased from $61,162,758.97 to $164,474,009.02 for the calendar year 1949; while the personnel has increased from 16,620 to 33,081 during the same period. The volume of mail and the various activities likewise, have increased correspondingly.

At New York, N. Y., the postal area embraces all postal activities in New York and Bronx Counties, and the village of Pelham in Westchester County. This includes the main post office, 4 large annexes, viz: Morgan Station—through which is cleared the bulk of foreign mails originating in the United States; Grand Central Station; Church Street Station; and Bronx Central Station; 46 classified carrier stations, 46 finance stations, and 8 contract stations; and the Postal Concentration Center in Queens, where foreign parcels and prints and overseas APO's and naval mails are distributed.

In addition there is the responsibility for the administration, supervision, maintenance, and operation of 24 Federal buildings having 93,143,113 cubic feet, ranging from the Main Post Office with 26,305,000 cubic feet; Morgan Station with 24,000,000 cubic feet; Church Street Station, a 15-story office building with 17,423,000 cubic feet; Bronx Central Station with 3,095,000 cubic feet; to the smaller buildings with 144,000 cubic feet.

The land value of these buildings is over $17,000,000, and the construction cost of the buildings $40,000,000, or a total cost of $57,000,000, which does not include equipment, machinery, furniture, or other appurtenances that are necessary for our financial and mail handling activities.

The motor vehicle service, operating two large garages with overhauling and repair units, is required to house and maintain a local fleet of 712 Government-owned trucks, plus the periodical overhauling of trucks assigned to 131 other post offices in the States of New York and Connecticut.

The mail handling operations of the New York Post Office are of such gigantic proportions that they stagger the imagination to visualize their enormity. During the calendar year 1949, there were 67,598 solid cars of mail loaded at the railroad stations located in the metropolitan area. This tremendous stream of cars, end to end, would extend from New York, N. Y., to Louisville, Ky., a distance of 865 railroad miles. In reducing the carloads of mail to sack equivalents, there were handled and transported 54,478,400 sacks of mail. In addition to the mail dispatched on trains, our Morgan Station and Postal Concentration Center prepared and dispatched on outgoing steamers 6,031,283 sacks of foreign mail, and 804,295 sacks of mail prepared and dispatched for United States military units outside the United States. With respect to the handling of air mail, there were 12,261,983 pounds of air mail, equivalent of 613,098,150 letters, prepared and dispatched during 1949.

During 1949, the division of registered mails handled 42,378,962 articles, a large percentage of which consisted of articles and pouches containing currency, and articles containing negotiable securities of great value. The registered mail addressed to foreign destinations, including parcel post of considerable value, is also handled in the registry section. Mail for all over the world is made up to connect with steamers leaving all ports.

During 1949 this office transported and delivered over 9,600,000,000 pieces of mail. Over 3,753,000,000 pieces of mail were canceled. The above statistics give you a good idea of the huge volume of mail now being handled in the New York office.

A word about our pneumatic-tube service, an underground system for the transportation of ordinary mail, daily papers, and miscellaneous letter-sized pieces of other mail when included with letter mails. The points connected with pneumatic-tube service include the general post office and 21 stations located in New York, and the general post office in Brooklyn, and consists of 27 miles of tube lines. Approximately 6,000,000 pieces of mail are transported daily via the pneumatic tubes.

The financial transactions at this office are of a magnitude exceeded by very few of the large banking institutions in the city. There were 7,953,539 domestic money orders issued amounting to $183,558,508.33, and 20,711,878 domestic money orders were paid amounting to $291,963,355.87. In addition 110,704 international money orders were issued for payment abroad amounting to $1,799,065.89, while 20,955 international money orders received from abroad amounting to $275,980.13 were paid. The New York office is also the international exchange office, and during the year, 600,483 international money orders were certified for payment abroad amounting to $9,639,691.22, while 58,439 international money orders amounting to $509,480.66 were received from abroad for payment in the United States. There were 4,962,947 postal notes issued amounting to $28,607,277.29, and 11,025,720 postal notes were paid amounting to $58,231,526.08. Furthermore, all money orders issued by Army post offices and post offices on naval vessels outside the United States and in foreign waters are under the jurisdiction of this office, excepting those in the South Pacific islands and in the Pacific Fleet.

The number of domestic money orders processed through the electrical accounting unit of the New York post office in 1949 totaled 45,689,529, which were received from 50 tributary offices, amounting to $704,176,130.16.

Postal savings are maintained at most of the stations of this office, and there are 212,153 postal savings depositors, with a total of $117,001,704 on deposit. The operation is comparable to any similar banking organization in the city.

During the calendar year 1949, we sold 327,814 United States Savings bonds amounting to $16,219,368.75 (issue value), and United States Savings Stamps amounting to $1,165,818.35 were purchased by our patrons.

This office deposited funds to the credit of the Postmaster General during 1949 amounting to $767,773,504.65.

The office collected $2,365,814.01 in postage due money; adjusted 100,716 indemnity claims, and made payment in settlement of these claims amounting to $1,119,474.36.

In my capacity as the disbursing officer for all employees of the New York, N. Y., post office, it also embraces the personnel of the inspection service and headquarters force of the New York division; the postal transportation service, second division, and rural carriers throughout the State of New York.

New York, N. Y., is also the central accounting office for a total of 1,750 second-, third-, and fourth-class post offices in New York State, and is also the depository for certain first-class offices and all second-, third-, and fourth-class offices in New York State, a total of 1,926 post offices.

The transactions at this office are constantly increasing in volume as a result of expansion and growth of New York City, inasmuch as it is the largest business center in our country. The New York, N. Y., post office is the District Central Supply Unit filling requisitions from the Assistant Postmaster General, Division of Federal Buildings, for post offices located in Federal buildings in 15 States, having a total of 1,500 Federal buildings supplied throughout the United States, including Alaska. In addition, jurisdiction is maintained over postal supplies for all the New York, N. Y., post-office units, and for 716 third- and 667 fourth-class offices in New York State, including APO and naval units.

The foregoing indicates that the New York, N. Y., post office operates one of the country's largest businesses. It has reached such gigantic proportions with ramifications so numerous and far extending that the postmaster's salary should at least approximate those of executives in private industry. In every private enterprise throughout the United States salaries have advanced in rapid succession with the times and each succeeding advance has been equally substantial. It is fair to state that salaries paid by banks, commercial houses, and mercantile establishments to those directing such activities are larger than those paid by the Government for similar qualifications and responsibilities.

The postal service is the outstanding and largest business enterprise in the United States—if not in the entire world. The New York, N. Y., post office, in turn, is the largest in the country. It may be of interest to mention that this office not only includes practically every feature of the service conducted elsewhere, but certain additional features, such as the handling of immense volumes of foreign mail and the certifying to and from foreign countries of international money orders on behalf of the entire United States. The extensive development and use of the domestic air-mail service and the inauguration of foreign air-mail service, which will further expand with the completion of the International Airport, are added features of the service.

In fact, statistics show that approximately 10 percent of the entire postal revenues of the Nation are produced through the New York, N. Y., post office. It is evident that the offices producing the greatest postal receipts are in areas where the cost of living, rents and taxes are the highest. The question presents itself whether these offices which handle the bulk of the business are to be given the recognition and proper comparable credit for the large receipts, which are the backbone of the service.

As you are aware, the salaries of postmasters are based upon the gross postal receipts of their offices, and it is obvious that a revision of this system should be made because of its existing inequalities. To be consistent, the receipts of post offices should be readjusted to include, in all equity, those offices where the receipts far exceed the present $40,000,000 and up.

A glance at the salary chart will reveal that postmasters are graduated according to postal receipts of the office, and that there is

a finely graduated ratio of postal receipts in the lower salary brackets. The graduation in postal receipts is nonexistent above the $40,000,000 and up, consequently if the bracket system based upon postal receipts of a given office is the most desirable medium of adjusting salaries, then the policy should be followed through to a more favorable and reasonable conclusion. In its present limited form, it only serves as a penalty to postmasters where the receipts of the office double or triple and quadruple the top bracket of $40,000,000 and up.

The inconsistencies of such a situation clearly serve to emphasize the need for an upward revision of the salary structure of the postmaster, assistant postmasters, and postal supervisors.

Something should be done at this session of Congress to enact a law to adequately compensate these officials because of the tremendous volume of business involved, together with the numerous responsibilities, both financial and physical which they are required to handle and direct.

I, therefore, strongly recommend the reclassification of salaries of postmaster, assistant postmasters and postal supervisors, which I deem worthy of favorable consideration.

Coal-Supply Situation in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1950, I received the following telegram from Stanley J. Davis, the mayor of Grand Rapids, Mich. This telegram clearly indicates the seriousness of the situation facing the citizens of western Michigan. Sometime ago I introduced a resolution calling for immediate action to prevent suffering among our citizens. I trust the President's unwise delay over a period of several months will not ruin our national economy at this critical hour.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., *February 21, 1950.*

Hon. GERALD R. FORD,

United States Representative:

Coal-supply situation in Grand Rapids, Mich., critical. Every effort must be made to get coal in this area to meet our domestic-heating needs. By the week end our supply will be exhausted. Dealers have no coal in yards or in transit. We are deeply concerned from standpoint of public health and safety.

STANLEY J. DAVIS, *Mayor.*

Resolution of the South Dakota Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following concurrent resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota at a recent special session of that body and which is of great importance to the United States:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

(Introduced by Mr. Houck)

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States, His Excellency the President of the United States, to make an immediate, thorough and exhaustive study and investigation of the loyalty of the members, officers, and employees of the State Department, and to take such further appropriate action to rid the Department of State of procommunistic employees in order that the safety of our Nation will not be further endangered by men in high places who condone acts of treason which endanger the safety of the United States of America and the people

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the house concurring therein)—

Whereas through the activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Alger Hiss was twice tried in the Federal courts of the United States of America and convicted of the crime of perjury; and

Whereas members of the United States Supreme Court, Supreme Court Justices Frankfurter and Reed voluntarily testified in the first trial as character witnesses, thereby breaking all of the precedents heretofore existing in relation to our Federal courts, and creating in the minds of the American people a disregard for members of our Federal judiciary; and

Whereas, upon the conviction by a Federal jury in a Federal court of the said Alger Hiss, Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States of America, issued a prepared and considered statement in which he said, "I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss," which statement was designed to belittle the actions of an American jury in an American court and to raise in the minds of the American people a doubt as to the guilt of one of Dean Acheson's friends and former State Department employee in spite of, and in total disregard of results of a free and fair trial and a verdict rendered by a jury as provided by the Constitution and the laws of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States and His Excellency the President of the United States, to make an immediate check of the loyalties and beliefs of the men employed in the State Department of the United States from Dean Acheson on down to determine whether or not the ideas and ideals of such individuals are such that the American people can have continued faith that such Department through its representatives will safely keep and guard the secrets of the United States of America from foreign enemies and that such Department and its employees in preparing and carrying out a foreign policy in relation to Russia and other foreign countries will adopt and carry out policies which are not contrary to the ideas and ideals of the American people as expressed by the Constitution of the United States and the laws adopted thereunder; be it further

Resolved, That His Excellency the President of the United States, make immediately available to the House Un-American Activities Committee all secret files and lists and reports of investigations covering the loyalties and activities of any and all employees of the Government of the United States which in any way show or indicate disloyalty to the United States of America as expressed by Communist membership or otherwise; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency the President of the United States, to United States Senator Chan Gurney, to United States Senator Karl Mundt, to Congressman Francis E. Case, to Congressman Harold Lovre, and to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress.

REX TERRY,
Lieutenant Governor, President of Senate.

Attest:

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

A. E. MUNCK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attest:

W. J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Why a New Farm Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members to an article by my constituent, Mr. Henry Baker, president of the Oregon Wheat Growers League. It represents the viewpoint of those who are actually engaged in growing wheat and is very indicative of the fact that the wheat farmers only want a fair price for their produce and not Federal subsidies. I have introduced H. R. 7245, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a two-price plan for wheat, and the bill is intended to implement the income certificate plan for wheat which is discussed in the following article:

WHY A NEW FARM PROGRAM?

The Agricultural Act of 1949 extended the support program of 90 percent of parity for wheat to include the 1950 crop. The high Government loan support program has been continued since the war as a temporary relief in aiding the readjustment of the agricultural economy to postwar conditions. In his opening speech to Congress, the President of the United States recognized the shortcomings of present farm legislation and urged the approval of the Brannan Plan. Since it is apparent that present agriculture legislation is temporary and will be changed, the wheat producers in Oregon would like to have a voice in determining what national program is finally adopted.

Looking forward to the time when a permanent program is adopted, the wheat growers in Oregon through the Wheat Growers League have for more than 7 years, been developing in cooperation with the Pacific Northwest Farm Council the self-supporting certificate plan for wheat.

Along with other segments comprising national economy, American agriculture is faced with more complex problems than ever before. The Department of Agriculture endeavors through the establishment of a Federal farm program have been comparatively successful in the maintaining of a high farm income and a balanced economy for the Nation. This we believe essential and applaud all efforts which have this end in mind. It is recognized, as history emphatically verifies, depressions arise when farm prices reach such a low point that buying power is reduced. It is agriculture's responsibility and that of all organizations which have farming interests at heart, to develop and support programs which protect that national economy. Labor and industry are highly organized, which emphasizes that agriculture must also be strong. These three groups, labor, industry and agriculture must not be divided in their goals—they are interwoven and dependent upon each other. And there can never be a sound and healthy economic condition when any one of these three has a crippling advantage over the others. We must maintain agriculture on a par with labor and industry; if we are unable to do this, we are shirking our responsibility not only to the farmers but to all the people who make up this great Nation.

While Federal assistance to agriculture has become necessary, it must be realized that both labor and industry have had legislative assistance for a long time. Where it is essential to the national economy to provide financial assistance to agriculture, we should consider the program in the light of an insurance premium to guarantee a healthy, long-lived agriculture.

We favor the continuance of the policy of maximum production geared to economic use of the Nation's wheat lands, by the enactment of a bill providing for the income certificate plan for wheat. This plan was presented at hearings held by the Agricultural Committee of the House by a Wheat League delegation last year with favorable acceptance. They requested more detailed information and asked the Wheat League to prepare a bill which has now been drafted and is available to all growers for their analysis and comments.

Our proposed income certificate bill is a direct and simplified approach to what we believe to be a sound long-range program for wheat producers. This action by our league is consistent with action taken for several years by the wheat farmers of Oregon. Discussion of our plan with wheat organizations of other States gives assurance that support of the major part of the wheat growers of the United States may be expected. National legislation of such an important nature cannot be secured on the spur of the moment. The Wheat League has a reputation for persevering until its aims are accomplished. Genuine progress has been made in preparing the way for legislation we have consistently recommended. We urge wheat growers to take such aggressive action as will secure enactment of the wheat income certificate plan.

In view of the fact that it will not be possible to secure the enactment of such legislation immediately, we recommend that in the meantime the Oregon Wheat Growers League give support to a program providing 90 percent of parity for wheat as long as acreage allotments are in effect. This should not be construed to mean that we favor a high-support policy over a long period of time, but merely in the interim until the income certificate or other satisfactory plan for wheat is realized.

HENRY BAKER,
President, Oregon Wheat Growers League.

Fair Employment Practice Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Powell bill, H. R. 4453, embodying the establishment of a Fair Employment Practice Commission, is the heart of the civil-rights program to which the Democratic Party so vigorously and forthrightly dedicated itself in its platform adopted in 1948.

As a democratic people founded on the precept of equality for all, we must take action to guarantee that equality. There is almost no section of our country today which is entirely free from discrimination in some form. Although it is generally associated with the plight of the Negro, there is discrimination just as insidious to other racial and religious groups, and to people of foreign descent. In one place it may be directed at Jews and Catholics, another Mexicans or Japanese, and in my own part of the country I know well it is experienced many times over by our large number of people of European descent—Italians, Polish, Greeks, Slavs, and innumerable others.

That intolerance of this kind should exist in this country is a sad commentary, and I have long felt that our Government has an obligation to promote safeguards of the freedom of opportunity. Every time an individual is denied employment because of some factor which he is powerless to change, the dignity of that individual is destroyed and his faith is shaken in the principles to which we profess belief. The passage of the Powell bill would go far to restore the hopes and ideals of the many who have suffered again and again, who have been unable to find decent employment and provide for themselves and their families.

Particularly has the principle of nondiscrimination with respect to employment opportunities been a subject of great international concern during the years following the formation of the United Nations at San Francisco. Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations at San Francisco. Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations declares that one of the purposes of the United Nations is "to achieve international cooperation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

Under articles 55 and 56 of the Charter, all members of the United Nations "pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization" to achieve "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." Article 68 of the Charter of the United Nations directs the Economic and Social Council to set up a Commission for the Promotion of Human Rights. The Commission on Human Rights has manifested its concern with the problem of nondiscrimination in employment opportunities in a number of ways: First, it has set up a Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities; second, it has prepared and had approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations a Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This Declaration of Human Rights has been proclaimed by the General Assembly "as a common standard of achievement for all peoples of all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of member states themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction."

Further concern with the principle of nondiscrimination in employment opportunities was manifested in international agreements and declarations adopted by the states of the Western Hemisphere at the Bogotá Conference in 1948. The International Labor Organization expressed its adherence to this principle at its conference in Philadelphia in 1944 in a declaration which reads in part:

Believing that experience has fully demonstrated the truth of the statement in the constitution of the International Labor Organization that lasting peace can be established only if it is based on social justice, the conference affirms that (a) all human beings, irrespective of race, creed, or sex, have the right to pursue both their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity.

So, despite our vulnerability at home, we are carrying forth abroad in our foreign policy the ideals of freedom and equality of the individual. As a Nation, we play a leading part in a number of international organizations in which we work with other nations of varied race and religion on an equal basis and in which we espouse a policy of nondiscrimination. Yet these nations are aware that we do not practice a like policy in our own country; consequently, our international position is weakened. In such inconsistency we give aid to those who would happily see an end to our system of government.

I have always been an ardent supporter of an adequate fair employment practices commission, one which would do as complete a job as possible toward the elimination of discrimination in employment. The bill which passed the House today, the McConnell bill, is totally inadequate. It is nothing more than a sop to those who have looked to this Congress for enactment of this long-needed legislation. The McConnell bill is not designed to operate effectively against the evil of discrimination in employment, and I was compelled to vote against it. Knowing this, I could not in conscience support it.

Hon. L. Pascual Martinez

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, in the debate on the Navajo rehabilitation bill yesterday I called attention to the fact

that Indians desire to have the privilege of having their personal and property rights protected by the State and the privilege of having access to the State courts for the enforcement of those rights. They are wondering why they are being denied these civil rights to which they should be entitled as citizens of the State.

In a newspaper from Taos which I just received, there appears a news item concerning the announcement of a prominent Republican as candidate for the State legislature, and in which he points out that the first move toward the civil rights of the Indians is up to the Federal Government.

Because the item is also of historical interest, I insert for the RECORD portions of that news item, which appeared in El Crepusculo of February 16, 1950. It reads as follows:

The June election picture began to take even more definite shape in Taos as L. Pascual Martinez, present mayor, announced Monday that he "may seek the Republican nomination as State representative." * * *

Pascual, incidentally, is descended from Padre Martinez. And this introduces an interesting angle to the legislature race, because the Democratic nomination-seeker, Doughbelly Price, is descended from Colonel Sterling Price, who led the troops against the Taos Rebellion of 1847, generally thought to have been started by Padre Martinez. * * *

Martinez hopes that Taos Indians will exercise their new right to vote in the next election. "Indians, too, should have elective and appointive county positions, and take their full share in civic life." As for Indian improvements, he stated that the Federal Government would have to make the first moves, such as approval of the Hoover report which calls for full Indian citizenship. "After that," said Martinez, "the State can begin to help—with my full support."

Russian Expansionist Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Speaking in Palmer last night, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, declared that the expansionist policy of the Soviet Union and its refusal to cooperate with peace-seeking nations in measures to limit armament requires the United States to maintain costly and unprecedented National Defense.

The Clinton Congressman asserted that while the atomic bomb and the H-bomb present terrifying prospects for the world, the American people should not allow the present campaign of terrorism regarding these weapons to produce a national hysteria.

PHILBIN, who is a member of the House Armed Services Committee, stated that such weapons should be diverted to constructive and not destructive purposes, but that current Russian policy is making international cooperation for peace virtually impossible.

His remarks follow in part:

"Russia has spread its sphere of influence by ill-advised diplomatic maneuvers, by actual aggression and by the more subtle but equally coercive methods of infiltration. The gains of the Russian expansionist policy since the war are startling. One country after another has been swallowed up in the vortex, not only in Europe but in Asia. Reversing the situation during and immediately after the war when democratic nations exercised dominant control, communism has now spread to cover wide areas and large numbers of people until directly or indirectly Russian influence extends to almost half the population of the world.

"During this time worth-while, humane programs for world peace have been thwarted, and international cooperation for peace has been rendered virtually impossible. It has been necessary, therefore, though ironic in the light of our great wartime sacrifices, to saddle the American people with a gigantic cost of more than 20 billions of dollars to maintain adequate national defense, and try to check the wildfire spread of communism in western Europe and other parts of the world.

"The H-bomb presents another startling problem. Together with the atomic bomb, it encompasses the most terrible and destructive weapons ever known to mankind—weapons which, when implemented, might destroy overnight great cities and teeming populations. Weapons and substances of such devastating strength and ominous possibilities should be regulated and restricted by international compact. Universal disarmament should be vigorously sought and applied to this world before it destroys itself. Rigid international inspection should be established to control such lethal weapons. But all this cannot be achieved when one great power sets up continual road blocks against world peace and security.

"Under these conditions we must maintain armed services, adequate and ready for almost instantaneous action against potential enemies. But let us not be unduly aroused, disturbed, or worried by the current campaign to terrorize the American people by exploiting the potentialities of the H-bomb. While we originated and implemented atomic power and bombs, and while we have made the critical decision to develop the H-bomb because of current conditions in the world, we have actually had no choice. We will have to live with the horrifying reality of these weapons until the Soviet Union makes up its mind to join democratic nations in outlawing them and in effecting disarmament in the name of and for the sake of a just, lasting peace.

"That peace cannot be based upon aggression, upon infiltration, upon oppression, or injustice. It cannot emerge from organized movements against the security of this Nation or from internal or external conspiracies to destroy it and to spread the Marxist formula to the far corners of the earth. Peace can come only from earnest, sincere cooperative action by and between nations and by leaders of good will toward mankind, and not by men obsessed by fanatical hatred of God and every decent principle of government and life.

"I believe that our Nation is well prepared as it should be to defend our shores and way of life. Let us work together to weed out subversive elements which are working from within to bring about our destruction, because if another war should come—and God forbid it—our number one problem at the outset might well be that of our internal security due to the disloyalty and treason which has been fomented in our very midst by agents of communism and domestic traitors.

"To this end let us be vigilant lest our liberties be lost because of our own inertia and failure adequately to value and protect them. And let us be sure that the Nation will be constantly ready not only to ward off attacks but to visit swift and telling retaliation at home and abroad against those working to undermine the integrity of America."

The Tax on Life-Insurance Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that on January 26, last, the House passed House Joint Resolution 371 by which the formula for the determination of the net investment income of life-insurance companies was amended so that these companies would pay taxes on their net investment income for the years 1947, 1948, and 1949. The resolution, which had been unanimously approved by the Subcommittee on Taxation of Life Insurance Companies of the Committee on Ways and Means and had been favorably reported by a vote of 24 to 1 by the full committee passed the House with only a few scattering votes in opposition and is now before the Senate Finance Committee.

In the insurance industry there is little opposition to the bill. Whatever opposition exists is more vocal than persuasive; it is the kind of opposition that is "agin" everything and everybody in the industry. I am reliably informed that 95 percent of the industry supports this legislation.

I believe that the forthright and patriotic position of the industry is clearly revealed in an interview given to a New York Times reporter by Mr. Leroy A. Lincoln, president of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. I might say that Mr. Lincoln, by reason of his position as president of the largest life-insurance company in this country, is a dominant personality in the life-insurance industry. Furthermore, he is, in his own right, a man of outstanding ability and of wide vision, who understands the economic conditions of the country and who always has his feet solidly on the ground. Recognizing the critical need of the country for housing, he and his company have taken the lead in multiple-home construction. He is truly a great man and a great American.

Under the leave granted me by unanimous consent, I include herein the report of the interview which appeared in the New York Times of February 21, 1950:

LINCOLN DEFENDS RETROACTIVE TAX ON LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES—NINETY-THREE MILLION DOLLARS LEVY BACK TO 1947, PASSED BY HOUSE, WAS A COMPROMISE, METROPOLITAN HEAD SAYS—DENIES IT SETS PRECEDENT

The Government's proposal for an income tax levy of $93,000,000 retroactive to 1947 on life insurance companies is eminently fair, Leroy A. Lincoln, president of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., said yesterday.

In his statement, made at a press conference at which he presented the annual statement of his organization, largest life insurance company in the world, Mr. Lincoln took issue with critics in business, finance, and the life insurance industry itself who have attacked the retroactive features of the tax measure as establishing a dangerous precedent. The measure has been passed by the House.

The retroactive proposal, Mr. Lincoln said, was the result of 3 years of conferences of committees representing the House Ways and Means Committee, the Treasury Department and the life insurance companies. It was a compromise, he added, between two measures, one of which would have made the companies include the $93,000,000 assessment as part of their 1949 incomes.

"There was no way of insuring that the alternative measure which would have fixed the back taxes as current parts of the 1949 levy would have disappeared from the law books within a single year," Mr. Lincoln said. "Those who argue that the proposal which the Metropolitan along with 84 other life companies approved would set a dangerous precedent so far as retroactive Federal taxes are concerned, are in error.

"Because of the special circumstances surrounding our approval of the retroactive measure, it can hardly be argued that the special bill can be used as a precedent to apply to other industries. It is also certain that it will not force insurance companies to pay the special levy again in future years because of some legislative oversight."

Mr. Lincoln reported that his company had paid out $768,627,888 to policyholders and beneficiaries last year, the highest total in the company's 82-year history.

He added that the company closed its books for the year with $41,699,549,717 of life insurance in force, compared with $39,958,517,854 at the end of 1948. The amount of new life insurance issued was $2,778,793,267 in 1949 compared with $2,904,157,071 the year before.

The new insurance issued last year was divided into $1,656,021,996 in ordinary life insurance, $701,920,796 in industrial life, and $420,850,475 in group life.

Mr. Lincoln added that by March 1 the company will have written more group life insurance in 1950 than it did for the entire 12 months of last year. This, he said, will be due chiefly to the fact that his company has been designated as the insuror in Bethlehem Steel Corporation's new $325,000,000 group life and disability insurance program.

At the end of 1949 the company held assets of $9,707,947,682 for its 33,080,000 policyholders in the United States and Canada. The interest yield on all of the company's investments averaged 3.07 percent for the year, compared with 3.03 percent in 1948 and 2.94 percent in 1947.

Effect of Wartime Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE NEW CASTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
New Castle, Ind., January 24, 1950.

Hon. RALPH HARVEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR RALPH: In the interests of finding out just what effect the wartime excise taxes are having on local sales—and on Federal revenue—we polled a number of local retailers and asked them to give us the excise taxes paid for two comparative months.

We used the months of December 1945 and December 1949. Our replies are not yet complete because the reports for last month are not due until January 31, but since the question seems hot now in Congress we thought we'd better send along what we have as the pattern seems fairly well established.

The totals run $6,641.54 for the month of December 1945 as against $4,412.83 for the month of December 1949. This indicates a drop in revenue of approximately 33 percent.

Such taxes certainly are a deterrent to business in the affected lines. We polled only on luggage, jewelry, furs, and toilet preparations. We did not ask the stores furnishing the information to identify themselves, although several have done so.

* * * * *

So you can see the kind of survey we made, I am enclosing a returned questionnaire from a firm which has no 1945 experience and therefore could not be used in our final results. There are 10 firms represented in the above totals.

We will be glad to make any further surveys on questions upon which you would like a sample of local sentiment or thinking and are always glad to be of assistance to you, if possible, in the difficult and conscientious job you are doing for us.

Cordially,

JIM
(J. B. Clements),
Executive Secretary.

The Food-Distribution Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish now to make available for your information and ready reference certain correspondence between myself and Mr. John C. Stalker, myself and Miss Faith Clark, economist of the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, and myself and Mr. John Dittrich, in charge of the northeastern area of Food Distribution Programs Branch, Production and Marketing Administration:

FEBRUARY 17, 1950.

Mr. JOHN C. STALKER,
Director, Food Distribution Division,
Department of Public Welfare,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. STALKER: After talking with you this afternoon, I called Mr. Albin again and expressed the opinion that you and I were in accord that the allotments should be revised upward. He told me that the proper procedure would be for you to present any evidence of insufficient quantities to the New York area office and assured me the New York office had the authority to act immediately. I have not completed my study as to what any such increases should be, but will try to do this tomorrow, with the thought of having my suggestions in your hands Monday. I thought possibly you might be able to have some data assembled on the State basis and could then take the necessary action.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION, BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1950.

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HESELTON: Following my telephone conversation with Mrs. Coupe of your office, I am quoting to you from another of our technical publications, Family Food Consumption in Buffalo, N. Y., winter 1948 (now out of print). Buffalo families consume on the average more potatoes than do urban families throughout the country. Since their consumption pattern probably represents consumption in your section of the country better than the over-all national average, you may want to use the Buffalo figures in arriving at a desirable surplus distribution schedule. The average purchased quantity of potatoes used by the Buffalo families was 9.6 pounds a week. That meant an average of 2.7 pounds per person a week.

As I told Mrs. Coupe, we do not have any break-down of our recent studies by size of household. Even the national urban sample was too small to allow for such a break-down and at the same time maintain the income classification. Any tabulations that we are able to make by household size will have to be for rather broad groups of foods.

Mrs. Coupe quoted to me the following surplus commodity distribution plan for families of various sizes. I have computed averages per person from this schedule. Compared with average consumption in Buffalo in the winter of 1948, this schedule appears to me to be on the low side.

Potatoes

Number in household	Amount per household unit per month	Average amount per person per week [1]
	Pounds	*Pounds*
1	10	2.33
2	20	2.33
3	25	1.94
4		1.45
5	35	1.40
6		1.36
7		1.30
8	40	1.11
9		1.03
10	45	1.29
11 and over	65	1.27

[1] Calculated at 4.3 weeks per month.

I hope that these figures will be of use to you.

Sincerely yours,

FAITH CLARK,
Economist.

FEBRUARY 22, 1950.

Mr. JOHN C. STALKER,
Director, Department of Public Welfare,
Food Distribution Division,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. STALKER: Thank you for your telegram of February 21, in regard to the procedure which has been worked out. I hope it will be of value to communities not only in the First Congressional District but throughout the country.

Supplementing our telephone conversation of February 17, with reference to my belief that the schedule of maximum amounts per household unit, per month, should be revised, and the advice given to me that the regional office in New York has full power to revise those maximums upward, upon submission by the State director of a request with any evidence supporting it, I enclose a letter from Miss Faith Clark, economist in the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, Department of Agriculture, advising me of the result of their study in 1948 of family food consumption in Buffalo, N. Y.,

with reference to Irish potatoes. I have prepared a revised schedule in accordance with Miss Clark's report that the average consumption of potatoes by Buffalo families was 2.7 pounds per person, per week. While I believe this would still be inadequate so far as many families are concerned, at least it does offer tangible and convincing evidence of the immediate necessity of revising the existing schedule.

Realizing that you have met this situation temporarily so far as the Greenfield request is concerned by authorizing immediate delivery of a 3-month supply, may I request that you act as soon as possible to obtain a revision of the schedule so far as Massachusetts is concerned.

Sincerely yours,

FEBRUARY 22, 1950.

Mr. JOHN DITTRICH,
In Charge Northeastern Area, Food Distribution Programs Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. DITTRICH: I enclose copies of correspondence which I think will be self-explanatory. I am confident that you will act promptly upon any request made by Mr. Stalker.

Sincerely yours,

(Enclosures: Letter to Mr. Stalker of February 22, 1950, with table attached; letter from Faith Clark, economist, Department of Agriculture, of February 21, 1950, with table attached.)

Mr. Speaker, I have now submitted the following tabulation to Mr. Stalker based on Miss Clark's report and I believe it represents a far more realistic schedule of minimum quantities which should be established immediately so far as the reasonable consumption of Irish potatoes is concerned:

IRISH POTATOES

Schedule of maximum quantities issued by the Food Distribution Programs Branch, United States Department of Agriculture, effective July 1, 1949, compared with schedule of consumption in accordance with a survey made in Buffalo, N. Y., by the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, winter of 1948:

Number in household	Present maximum amount per household unit per month	Maximum based on Buffalo survey amount per household unit per month
	Pounds	*Pounds*
1 person	15	11.61
2 persons	20	23.22
3 or 4 persons	25	46.44
5 or 6 persons	35	69.66
7 or 8 persons	45	92.88
9 or 10 persons	55	116.10
11 or more persons	65	127.71

Mr. Speaker, you will note that the variation is most marked beginning with families of three or four persons upward to families of 11 or more persons.

I have in my possession photographs of the actual weight of potatoes which are now available under the schedule of maximum weights established by the Food Distribution Programs Branch. For three persons in a family this would amount to an average of 2 pounds and one-third ounce per week, per person. That is one fair-sized potato and six small potatoes. For four persons the photograph indicates an average of 1 pound and 9 ounces per week, per person, which is illustrated again by seven potatoes slightly larger. Any one familiar with potatoes as a food knows that this amount would hardly provide sufficient food for one meal. The puzzling contradictions arising from this schedule and this study should be corrected promptly. This is all the more so since while surplus potatoes are doled out in such small amounts for food, 100-pound bags, dyed blue, have been seen on trucks by friends of mine within recent days, presumably destined for dumping or feeding livestock. While we have succeeded in establishing the procedure for diverting these potatoes for consumption by needy persons, we should not relax our efforts to get them to them in maximum amounts consistent with realistic utilization of them as food.

Charles Seymour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an article which appeared in the New Haven Register on Sunday, February 19, and call attention to the retirement this June of Charles Seymour, who has been president of Yale, one of our great universities, since the year 1937.

It is earnestly hoped that President Seymour, with his outstanding background and administrative experience, can be persuaded to turn to public life. It is interesting to recall at this time when our diplomatic relations are of the greatest concern to all of us that in his early years on the Yale faculty, President Seymour wrote a book entitled "Diplomatic Background of the War (1916)," which I understand so impressed the late Woodrow Wilson that he was invited to Paris in 1919 as a member of the United States peace delegation.

The article follows:

SEYMOUR OF YALE—SOON TO RETIRE, THE HEAD OF A GREAT UNIVERSITY GIVES FRANK ANSWERS TO A REPORTER'S QUESTIONS

Into Woodbridge Hall and past the famous table on which Napoleon signed his abdication the reporter walked into a small office, clutching his note pad somewhat apprehensively and groping to see whether the three sharpened copy pencils were still in his lapel pocket. Up from his modest desk immediately rose the president of one of the world's greatest universities.

Charles Seymour of Yale smiled and shook hands warmly with the newcomer. He knew the reporter's name, offered him a chair, had a pack of cigarets ready and proffered it. Not until then did he select a corncob pipe from the six on his ash tray. Lovingly he filled the corncob, tamped the tobacco with his fingers, lighted it with obvious relish.

President Seymour is tall, slender. His blondish moustache is slight and at 65 his light-colored hair has thinned out. His most striking feature is a pair of light blue eyes, set in a kindly face which is stamped with wisdom. He is a Yale man dyed in the Blue—class of 1908, teacher from 1911 to 1937, president from 1937 to 1950. He will retire in June.

The reporter looked around the unpretentious office, noticed the old Yale prints on the walls. Mr. Seymour said they had been "borrowed" from the Mabel Brady Garvan collection at the Yale art gallery.

THE ROAD AHEAD

On a small table within arm's reach were three recent books Mr. Seymour had been reading. They were a small volume, The Road Ahead, by John T. Flynn; a middle-sized one, My Retreat From Russia, by Vladimir Petrov (a Yale instructor and a latest publication of the Yale University Press) and a big one, Human Action—A Treatise on Economics, by Ludwig Von Mises (also Yale Press).

Mr. Seymour chatted briefly about the Flynn book, mentioned that the author had been at one time on the staff of the Register. Then he thanked the reporter for sending him a copy of his questions in advance. He emphasized that he would be speaking from his experience at Yale, and that because of the limitations of the interview his answers must not be construed as all-inclusive and detailed.

He began to answer the questions in a friendly and courteous way. There was no condescension or talking down to a younger man. He even paused occasionally to ask anxiously, "Does that sound all right to you?" By now the reporter had lost his nervousness, was enjoying the interview and had the feeling he was in the presence of a man who had made courtesy and consideration for others the foundation of his philosophy of life.

The questions and answers:

Are educational standards as high as they were, say 25 years ago?

"At Yale they are very much higher and student scholarship is much better. Ever since my first contacts with Yale—I was in the class of 1908—I have noticed that standards have been consistently rising. I taught history at Yale from 1911 to 1937 and my experience during this time was particularly striking in this respect. I noticed, for instance, that in 1930 I could get three times as much reading out of the average history student as I could in 1911."

The President's commission on higher education recommends a doubled college enrollment by 1960. Do you think this desirable—or feasible?

"I think the plan is impracticable if educational standards are to be maintained. It would be materially difficult to double educational facilities by 1960 and the cost would be astronomic. If the attempt were made without adequate financial support, with an inexperienced teaching and administrative staff and with hastily planned educational equipment and service, this program would seriously injure American education as a whole. Expansion involves the serious risk of dilution.

"At Yale, we recognize our obligation to offer an education to as many young Americans as we can within the limits of our facilities. These facilities are not designed and we do not plan to use them for mass education. The implication of the report of the educational commission appointed by President Truman, that the more students given a college education the better the country, is, I think, open to serious question. Yale's service to the Nation as I have said many times, will not lie in the number of Yale graduates but in their quality."

What do you think about Federal or State subsidies to private colleges?

"Direct grants certainly imply the danger of loss of independence, and I should be strongly opposed to the acceptance of grants for general purposes. But it is a fact that

certain divisions of a university such as the medical school may not be able to survive without such aid. If this is so, the institution will have to decide between accepting the grant or giving up the service which it is contributing to the national welfare in medical education. It would seem reasonable to suppose that industry would be interested in making contributions to medical education since national health is a vital industrial asset. But there seems to be no complete answer to this particular problem without State or Federal assistance of some kind. I repeat that if private institutions accept subsidies for general educational purposes, their freedom is certainly imperiled."

In the light of financial difficulties, do you think the privately endowed university will eventually disappear?

"The privately endowed university will certainly endure so long as it meets its obligation to serve the public welfare, but it is likely that institutions of this type will be compelled to restrict and probably ought to restrict their activities to those fields in which they can give superlatively fine service. They cannot compete and they ought not to try to compete with the great State institutions in various fields in which the vast funds of the latter assure them great educational advantage. The independent institution should concentrate upon quality and avoid overextension of activities."

Do you think that State, Federal, or municipally endowed colleges can do the same job as privately endowed colleges?

"I don't suggest that privately endowed colleges are better but they do possess a certain quality that makes them different. This diversity of type in our university system is a great asset to American education. It would certainly be a great loss to the Nation if the private institution should disappear. It is not uninteresting to note the high proportion of national leaders that have graduated from the independent institutions, not merely great universities but the small liberal arts colleges."

Has the value of an unspecialised Liberal arts education decreased?

"No, in my opinion it has on the contrary greatly increased. Providing that the program is well conceived, I feel very strongly about the importance of a broad general education before a man begins to specialize. This is all the more true in these days when the tendency toward specialization and technical education is clear."

What about the role of sports in college life?

"I am enthusiastic in my belief that college sports in America form an important aspect of education. This is true for the varsity player as for the member of the intramural team. But we must be careful that the teams that represent us are truly representative of the undergraduate body. There is real danger if we lay so much stress upon the quality of our players that we import them because of their athletic ability rather than because of the leadership which they are going to give to the undergraduate body. Yale wants good athletes because we believe they will make good Yale men and leaders in their later life; but Yale gives them no privilege or help that is not open to every undergraduate. We are very fortunate in our coaching staff here—teachers of the highest ability and imbued with the highest ideals of amateurism."

Why did Yale spend millions for buildings far more lavish than the majority of its students will live in after graduation?

"This is a misconception. We accepted gifts for buildings and constructed them according to the terms of the gift of bequest. This was true of the Harkness Quadrangle and the undergraduate colleges. The Sterling Library, the Divinity Quadrangle, the law school, were provided by the Sterling bequest. I think that during the terms of President Angell and myself, no Yale money has been spent on buildings. They have all come from gifts or bequests."

What do you consider the major accomplishments of your administration?

"I like to think that perhaps I have been holding on the three-yard line, while the college has been passing through a world war and its confusing aftermath. We have maintained the morale of our faculty and improved its quality. We have accomplished an integration of the various university divisions, bringing such schools as the Sheffield Scientific, Medical, Law and Fine Arts into a unified effort in which each division knows its function and mission. We have set up the University Council in order to bring the alumni closer to the life and operations of the University."

What is Yale's greatest current problem?

"Maintenance of freedom from external influences by which we may be threatened because of inadequate resources."

What is the foreseeable future for Yale?

"Fewer students—we hit a peak of 9,400—have now dropped to 8,500 and will eventually, I think, go down to 6,000. I do not think we shall have more specialization in studies; we shall maintain a broad general basis of liberal arts education for our first two undergraduate years before the student enters upon his specialized work."

What new developments are there in the current curriculum?

"We have organized an 'American Studies' program which seems to me of the first importance in the field of American civilization and history, in order to bring into a coordinated course of study, history, literature, economics, philosophy, in fact all phases of American life. We have made a general reexamination of our curriculum and have introduced various new educational plans designed to stimulate and assist the serious student: The Directed Studies Program and the Scholars of the House Program. It would take too much detail to describe them here but they indicate that we have been actively exploring our curriculum with regard to student needs. We are also giving increased attention to the need for enlarged teaching and research in the social sciences."

Why are so many Communists seemingly associated with universities?

"We haven't any Communists on the Yale faculty as far as I know. I wouldn't appoint a Communist, for his presence here would mean the negation of academic freedom. It is not possible, of course, to know the student body so intimately, but I would say that at Yale communism is practically nonexistent."

What is the most effective way of fighting communism on the college level?

"Well, in the first place, I am sure that Communist ideas ought not to be outlawed from college teaching. Rather they should be analyzed, discussed, and deflated. We must meet the menace of communism by positive and imaginative measures. A major obligation is to train our youth in the understanding and practice of American democracy, whether in the classroom or in our campus life. That is why I am so interested in pushing forward our program of American studies which I have already mentioned. That is a positive approach. A negative defense degenerates into a rearguard action. Our purpose is to lead democratic allegiance. It is, however, important to study Karl Marx and to understand the nature of contemporary communism."

Are our public schools properly training youth for college?

"The boys we select from public schools do a very fine job. In fact, in their devotion to their work and their scholastic marks, their record is higher than that of private-school graduates. However, I must also say that it is my experience that a good many of our public schools are neglecting education in the three R's."

What are your plans after retirement?

"I plan to live in New Haven, and devote myself to the study of history. My work will be done in the house collection of the Yale Library."

Would you be available for public office after your retirement?

"In all honesty it is very hard for me to picture my future except as devoted to historical study and writing."

Who's Who lists you as a Democrat. Is this correct?

"I suppose I should call myself a Woodrow Wilson Democrat. I was brought up in the tradition of William Graham Sumner and Grover Cleveland and cannot escape its continuing influence. So you can appreciate the fact that I find it difficult to accept various aspects of the New Deal and the Fair Deal."

Looking back on 13 years as a college president, what kind of an experience has it been—Disillusioning? Exhausting?

"By no means disillusioning. On the contrary very stimulating. The college president is one of a team made up of men of the highest quality, and my chief impression is a sense of privilege in working with them. There is probably no institution in which one can find the complete devotion to a common effort that one can in a college. Differences of opinion are honest. Criticism is constructive. Methods are direct and aboveboard.

"The position is no more exhausting than that of the normal hard-working professor."

What are your hobbies?

"Unfortunately I've had small time for hobbies during the past 13 years. Golf which I used to enjoy is too time-consuming. I still like to play a little poker. My summer hobby is harmless and healthy—weeding in my wife's garden."

Speaking with a historian's perspective, are these, as some would have us believe, the worst possible times?

"How can we tell? The present, you know, is never the best time. As I look back on history I see many times as bad or worse than those in which we live; the Dark Ages, the era of the feudal peasant, the 30 Years' War in Germany. The times in which we live certainly produce a sense of insecurity but they might be worse. After all, you and I are sitting in a warm room, we slept under cover last night, we had lunch this noon, didn't we? The general physical level of the Western World is much higher than it has ever been. If you're talking of the level of manners throughout the population we compare very favorably with the past. My chief worry has to do with morals, and especially morals in the field of international relations. The disregard of treaties, the disappearance of good faith which has characterized the history of the past 30 years has numbed the conscience of the world. We must hope that it will be revived."

What individuals in your time have done the most for the world?

"The first who comes to my mind is Woodrow Wilson, who brought the principle of international association into practical politics. Among others would be Winston Churchill, who saved western Europe; Herbert Hoover, who brought the principles of international relief into practical operation; Albert Schweitzer, for his direct service to mankind as medical missionary and his indirect service as spiritual leader. I think I would also include Steve Benet (Stephen Vincent Benet, Yale '19, Pulitzer prize-winning poet). His John Brown's Body brought home to the American world a sense of destiny."

Are we educating the type of young people who can lead the world through the tremendous problems we are told lie ahead?

"Our present youth in the colleges represent a high type of humanity. If we lack for leaders it won't be for lack of material, but because we have failed to train them properly."

Suppose you were asked to give a few parting words of wisdom to a young man about to enter college, what would you say?

"I try never to give advice to young people, but the following would be running through my mind: 'You are about to enjoy a great privilege. Remember you carry a great obligation: To develop to the utmost your quality as a gentleman and a scholar; to add to the gaiety of your friends; to help those less fortunate than yourself.'"

The interview was over. Before the reporter could express his thanks, Mr. Seymour was already shaking his hand and saying: "Thank you very much. Thank you especially for making it so painless."

People's Confidence Shaken by Government Indecision Regarding American Watchmaking Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion in the past to comment on the fact that the agencies of our Government have been created for the purpose of serving and aiding, first and foremost, our own American citizens.

I have also, before, brought to the attention of the Members of this House, by editorial insertions, unhappily evidence that our own people may be on the point of losing their faith, trust, and confidence in the institutions and divisions of Government whose only reason for being in existence is to assist them. As additional information on this score, which I believe will be of pertinent interest to my colleagues, I desire to insert another editorial, reflecting community conviction, which appeared in the February 13, 1950 edition of the Lawrence (Mass.) Evening Tribune.

The editorial follows:

THE PLIGHT OF WALTHAM WATCH

Maybe President Truman doesn't know all the facts about the difficulties of the Waltham Watch Co., and maybe we don't either, but it does seem that the problem is being dismissed a little too casually. If the Waltham Watch Co. goes out of business, and there are ominous signs that it may have to, the welfare of a lot of people will be affected. And it's not something which will make this State, as a whole, especially happy. Any wallop at Massachusetts industrial strength is a serious thing. According to what has been revealed so far about the plight of the company, its assets are not sufficient to warrant letting it use $2,000,000 of a $5,000,000 RFC loan as working capital instead of for the purchase of equipment. President Truman has said there doesn't seem to be anything which can be done to save the company. It seems to us that something in the way of a try could be made without ruining our economy.

The logic of the situation is rather baffling. The RFC previously authorized a $6,000,000 loan to retool the plant, evidently figuring that the mortgage it would hold on the equipment would protect its money if things went sour. But, surely, such security as highly specialized machinery designed for the construction of watches and other chronometric devices would not be easily liquidatable and would show marked depreciation from the day of installation. What we are getting at is that there doesn't seem to be any more apparent justification for the $6,000,000 loan, which the RFC was willing to give, than for the $2,000,000 allocation, which it balks at. The RFC says the company's assets are not sufficient; a spokesman for employees of the plant says they are. A government which can cheerfully throw good dollars down a rathole to support the price of potatoes seems inconsistent when it gets virtually economical all of a sudden and shudders at the prospect of risking a mere $2,000,000.

The fact that Waltham Watch played a role in national defense in wartime, and could be called upon to do so again, is an additional reason why something should be done. The issue is not a local one, it is national in its implications. And there are human factors involved in the way of the particular skills that watchmaking, a precision trade, calls for. Skills lose their edge if they are not used. It is certain that the watchmaking industry will not be able to absorb all the Waltham workers; some of them will have to turn to other industries. This loss by evaporation of trained technicians can be shrugged off as inconsequential but it shouldn't be.

There is a feeling in the air that the Waltham trouble is being handled ineptly.

Hoover Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, there has been much propaganda in the press recently and also from certain groups throughout the Nation who are trying to create the impression with the general public that the Eighty-first Congress has not been diligent in enacting into law the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for the reorganization of our Government.

Contrary to that, I want to point out that many of these recommendations have already been enacted into law. When these reports were submitted to the Congress, they naturally had to be studied carefully and this, of course, entailed much time and study.

The work of the United States Government has grown more complex with the years. From the time of George Washington, when a few departments existed in the administering of our national needs, it has grown until there are over fifteen hundred agencies in the executive branch of the Government. Since all of these departments and agencies have some claim upon the attention of the President and the Cabinet, a good deal of their work has been taken up with administrative details, leaving less time for the more complex consideration of policy.

Mindful of these effects, in July 1947 the Congress authorized the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. This body was composed of outstanding citizens drawn from a panel of public officials and eminent private citizens. They, together with their staff or task forces as they were called, were admonished to analyze and study the areas of economy and services requiring needed improvement. This group, under the leadership of the distinguished former President, Herbert Hoover, explored the many phases of government operations and reported its findings to the Congress.

In this connection I might mention in passing that 12 of the 17 major reports embodying these recommendations have been referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I am a member. It shall be the duty and responsibility of this Congressional Committee to analyze and evaluate these recommendations. From these studies and reports must be evolved the legislative drafts which will result in the accomplishment of the objectives recommended to the Congress. The Congress set as its immediate goal for attention those spheres of Government activity where the greatest savings could be effected at once. According to Bureau of the Budget sources, these areas were: The National Military Establishment, the Civil Service Commission, Procurement and Supply Activities, and the Post Office Department.

During the last session of Congress, by reorganization plans and substantive legislation, these areas have been amply explored and vastly improved.

Congress, as a prelude to the effectuation of the Hoover Commission recommendations, passed the Reorganization Act of 1949. This act allows the President, after a survey of the needs of the executive branch, to send up to the Congress reorganization plans which will regroup, realine, and improve that branch.

This is one of the means which can be employed for reorganization for the betterment of efficiency and economy in Government. However, two other avenues are open also for the accomplishment of these recommendations. They include: administrative action by the agencies concerned, and substantive or appropriation legislation by the Congress. By these three methods, then, the field of reorganization can be covered. There are in all about 288 recommendations in the Hoover Reports. If all were to be carried into law, the greatest amount of reorganizational work would have to be done through the administrative action of the executive branch, or by reorganization plans initiated by the President. According to the Bureau of the Budget, approximately 60 percent require initiation by the executive branch, while about 38 percent require initiation by the Congress through legislation.

In order to give a more rounded-out picture, it would be well to consider what has been done up to this time. In whole or in part, about half of the Hoover reports have been acted upon favorably. Thus we have seen changes effected in the general management of the executive branch, personnel management, supply activities, Post Office Department, Department of State, Department of Defense, Department of Commerce, some regulatory commissions, certain functions of the Department of Labor.

It should be noted also that the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, a research organization founded to press for enactment of these worth-while findings of fact, has stated recently that—

> More reorganization has been accomplished than at any previous time in the Nation's history.

The first session of Congress closed on a very encouraging note, for many of the recommendations eagerly sought by interested citizenry had been accomplished within 90 days of the termination of the life of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Among others, the following public laws saw their light in this session:

Public Law 109, Reorganization Act of 1949.

Public Law 92, Travel Expense Act of 1949, raising per diem from $6 to $9 per day.

Public Law 429, the Classification Revision Act of 1949, revising the civil-service classification system.

Public Law 359, the Executive Pay Raise Act: This increased the salaries of Cabinet officers and other heads of departments as a means of attracting high caliber individuals into public service.

Public Law 180, Civil Service Retirement Act: This consolidated various Government retirement programs.

Public Law 152, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949: This established a General Services Administration, transferring the Bureau of Federal Supply, the Federal Works Agency, the National Archives and the War Assets Administration into one consolidated agency for simplification of Government procurement, buildings management, records management, transportation, and surplus property disposal and utilization.

Public Law 231, operations of the Post Office Department: This provides for a long range development program for improvements in the methods, procedures, equipment and supplies used in the postal service.

Public Law 73, reorganization of the State Department: This provides for a thoroughgoing reorganization of the administrative and operational functions of this agency.

Public Law 216, reorganization of the National Military Establishment, under a performance budget, further providing for unification of the armed services.

Public Law 110, Central Intelligence Agency: This gave CIA the necessary authority to improve its internal operations.

Six of the President's reorganization plans were put on the statute books as of August 20, 1949:

Reorganization plan No. 2 tranferred the Employment Service and the Unemployment Compensation Bureau to the Department of Labor;

Reorganization plan No. 3 increased the authority of the Postmaster General;

Reorganization plan No. 4 has the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board now residing in the Executive Office of the President;

Reorganization plan No. 5 acted to put the executive direction of the United States Civil Service Commission in the Chairman for administration;

Reorganization plan No. 6 vested the powers of the United States Maritime Commission in the Chairman; and

Reorganization plan No. 7 transferred the Public Roads Administration to the Department of Commerce.

In December 1948 Mr. Hoover stated in a press release that, if the whole of the Commission's recommendations were adopted, they would result in a savings of about $3,000,000,000 a year. Other speakers, in discussing the problems of reorganization, since that time, have placed this sum at much higher levels. Be that as it may, we must point out that the primary objective was, not so much to achieve immediate economy, as to induce greater efficiency through better rearrangement of the executive branch. This will result in improved administration and will produce long-range economies of a continuing nature. Emphasis, therefore, should be placed on increased efficiency in the Government and improvements in the Federal service in order to insure a greater return for the tax dollar expended. Thus, it remains reasonable to expect economy from quite a number of the Hoover Commission recommendations, particularly through consolidation and elimination of many functions which duplicate each other. Just what the amount will be cannot be reckoned too accurately until operations have been conducted under such rearrangements for a definite period of time.

At present our committee is making studies and has held a number of preliminary hearings in fields aimed at the reduction of Government costs. It is hoped that this implemental legislation in the fields of records management, traffic management, and related fields will be fruitful of constructive legislation.

In closing, I should like to add that we must not be impatient. Much time and money has been expended to cull these facts for the aid of Congress in the work of reorganization. A good start has been made. The enthusiasm of the House and Senate membership augurs well for its continuance. Certainly, the people of the United States have displayed keen interest in the reorganization program. It would be well to proceed slowly, taking many forwardlooking steps in view of the staggering task that his problem presents. Rome was not built in a day. Worth-while legislation cannot be enacted in haste. Reorganization should mean change; but every change should bring progress.

Contract Settlement for Mining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, the vast bulk of war contracts with the Government already have been settled. It has even been proposed that the Contract Settlement Act of 1944—Public Law 395, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session—be repealed. I believe the settlements so far have reached the colossal figure of 20 billions of dollars. Very little further business is before the Office of Contract Settlement, which has been shoved about in the process of reorganizing the Government agencies until its very location nearly has been lost sight of. I want to point out to the Members that almost no mining claims have been allowed. Application after application has been rejected on some technicality or other, until our miners have become too discouraged either to press their cases, or to bother even to file for settlements.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that such treatment of the mining industry of this country was not the intent of the framers of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, and neither was it the intent of the Congress which passed that act. It is true that at the time the act was drafted, stress naturally was laid upon the manufacturing industries. This, however, was largely due to ignorance of the special problems of mining, and was not due to any deliberate attempt to slight the mining industry. As soon as the deficiencies in the bill S. 1716, which became Public Law 395, were seen, Mr. WALTER in the House and Senator MURRAY in the Senate took immediate steps to correct the situation, and wrote language into the bill which brought mining within its purviews. Furthermore, President Roosevelt in the public announcement made through Mr. Donald Nelson in 1943, guaranteed fair treatment to each individual producer, this promise being made specifically and pointedly to the mining industry. The Congress attempted to translate this promise into law, even going so far as to make the War Production Board—the authority which stimulated most mining activities—a contracting agency under the law when, in fact, it had not been one. Along the same lines, part of the language of the act was made to read "or any other request to proceed from a contracting agency, the contracting agency shall pay such person fair compensation therefor." This was done because the sponsors well knew that most mineral and metal producers had no formal contracts with the Government. There is much other language in the act also in point, but I will not bore you by reciting it. Suffice it to say that the responsible agencies never did like the idea of compensating our mining producers and they

have ignored the intent of the Congress in some instances and in others deliberately misconstrued the act.

After the First World War, there was no law quite like the Contract Settlement Act of 1944. Realizing the plight of mining producers who were cut off from Government purchasing, sometimes with cars of minerals actually on the road, Congress passed the War Minerals Relief Act of 1919. From time to time, as experience dictated, the act was revised and the language was tested in the courts and precedents established. I mention this to show that the Congress did at that time and, I sincerely believe intends now, to see that justice is done.

As time went by after the 1944 act became law, it shortly became increasingly noticeable that mining claims were being summarily rejected, no matter on what theory they were based. Bills were introduced in both House and the Senate designed to clarify the 1944 act. In a detailed discussion of contract settlement for the critical and strategic minerals and metals industry, the Senate Small Business Committee Mining Subcommittee on May 21, 1946, said:

> Of course the mine operators entitled to fair compensation, after having exhausted their right of appeal provided in Public Law 395, may be able to enforce their claims in court, but such discrimination is not consonant with the acknowledged obligation of the American people nor with the expressed intent of Public Law 395. * * * every effort has been made to clarify, classify, delimit, and define (the clarifying bill) so that the small group affected may be paid what is due them for their work.
>
> The measure provides a separate channel for settlement for mining claims and places them in a category by themselves, where they belong.
>
> It adds no claims not already existent, nor does it create any additional commitments. It simply clears the way for the discharge of an obligation already recognized, but which has become snarled in administrative and procedural difficulty.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, after these carefully prepared bills were introduced the agencies concerned furnished the legislative committees with adverse reports, using every pretext to bolster the recommendation that the bills should not pass, the same opinions were exhumed from the same agency files each time a report was requested on these or subsequent bills, session after session, Congress after Congress.

The proponents of the measures trimmed their sails, revised the bills, and finally, after the committees dealing with the new bill found the cause was right, H. R. 834 was favorably reported in spite of agency opposition and passed by the Senate and House only to be vetoed by the President, who issued a detailed statement at the same time.

The veto message, Mr. Speaker, quite evidently was written by a novice with no knowledge of the history of mining settlements from the War Minerals Relief Act of 1919 to the present day, but armed with the same files full of adverse memoranda and reports which spawned the previous departmental attitudes. Unfortunately, Mr. Truman was induced to sign a statement full of obvious errors and flat misstatements of fact. Among other things the message by implication accused the mining industry of being grasping, with the words, "Other industries were urged to do their part in the war program, and other industries responded as splendidly to the challenge as did the mining industry. They too sustained losses in enterprises undertaken as a part of the war effort." Now I submit, if any other war industry has not been taken care of under the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, Congress certainly should look into the matter and take steps to rectify the oversight. I know of none. The message also said that S. 834 introduces a new principle—the gentleman who wrote it quite evidently never had heard of the War Mineral Relief Act of 1919.

Since the publication of the veto message on July 11, 1949, Mr. Speaker, H. R. 834 has rested in the Judiciary Committee awaiting action but it never has been reported to the floor with a recommendation to override the veto. I personally think that had the President had the time to give this bill the study and attention which it merits he not only would have signed it, but would have insisted upon expediting its passage. I cannot think he would have any serious objection to our repassing the bill over his veto, even though some minor bureaucrats were disgruntled thereby.

I understand from those who were here when the original act of 1944 was passed, that much was made of the urgent necessity for quick settlement of claims so that the funds could be reinvested promptly. Every effort to complicate the bill by a set of elaborate bookkeeping checks was resisted, on the theory that speedy action was more important than preventing a few errors of commission.

It is now 1950, Mr. Speaker, about 6 years since the Contract Settlement Act was passed. The producers of strategic and critical minerals and metals who labored so valiantly and successfully for the war effort still are unpaid. The agencies still show no inclination to pay them.

I beg the members of the Judiciary Committee to bring H. R. 834 to the floor again promptly and see if the Membership of this House, out of an innate sense of justice and fairness to our war mineral producers—the backbone of any plan for national defense—will not pass the bill with the necessary two-thirds majority, with a sense of correcting a mistake not within the President's power to rectify unless we take positive action and with a sense of certain satisfaction of a wrong righted, and a job well done.

The Federal Government and National Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio address given by me over radio station WJR, Detroit, on Friday, February 17, 1950:

The responsibility of the Federal Government for the health of the American people and the extent it should function in the field of public health has precipitated a bitter controversy in Congress and throughout the country. There are two extremes in this controversy—those who favor the President's program which would take over the medical profession and its related functions, lock, stock, and barrel, and regiment the individual citizen in matters pertaining to his health—and the other which holds the Federal Government has no business concerning itself with any of the health problems of the individual American family.

There is a middle ground between these divergent views which I shall discuss a little later.

There is a marked similarity between the President's proposals and the scheme of nationalized medicine now being practiced in England. Therefore, I would like briefly to tell you something about the British plan. In the first place, no matter how unsound a thing may be it always has its redeeming features. This is true of the British medical system. It has done at least three things which have tended to improve the health of millions of British people. Many people in England were not receiving adequate medical and dental care. This class was composed of people whose incomes were sufficient to make them ineligible for relief medicine, and yet inadequate to enable them to pay for the kind of medical aid they needed. The national scheme has helped these people considerably.

The second advantage is that it has permitted people to seek early medical and dental attention which all doctors agree is desirable. Since medical care is now free, there is no hesitation on the part of the British citizen to seek early advice and care for his ills.

The third advantage is the assistance the government has given to established institutions of medical research which for years have been handicapped because of lack of funds through private sources. This has permitted an important broadening in the fields of research.

But the disadvantages of the British system far outweigh the advantages, which I have mentioned. Here are some of the devastating disadvantages.

The system makes every doctor a government employee. With but few exceptions the private practice of medical and dental surgery in England has been completely eliminated.

Since the doctor is a government employee, he has no choice in location of his practice. He must locate in the town or city designated for him by the government. Theoretically, he may choose his own patients but actually he has no choice because his location is selected for him. Because he is a government employee, the British doctor finds himself enmeshed in an endless maze of red tape. Government reports must be made daily to a dozen different branches of the Ministry of Health, and in many instances the making of these reports consumes as much as 50 percent of the doctor's time. So he must practice his profession, not by the ordinary rules of medical practice, but by rules and regulations promulgated by a government agency. His fee schedule may be changed from day to day, or week to week; he may be moved from one community to another against his will; he may be disqualified as a practicing physician by capricious regulations of the Health Ministry. Under this system the British doctor is truly a politician. He must curry a favor of the Ministry of Health in order to do the things he wants to do. He has financial security, it is true, for as long as the British Treasury holds out, but he has lost most of the freedom to live his own life, in his own way.

What will happen to the incentive and initiative of the doctor under such a system. It is certain that both these important attributes will be partially if not completely destroyed. Because the minute you place a limit upon the amount that a man can earn to that extent, you kill his desire to excel.

What about the effect of such a system upon the people generally. In the first place, the scheme is too luxurious for the British purse. The estimate of the first year's cost was £152,000,000. The actual cost exceeded £300,000,000—more than 10 percent of the total national budget. Were it not for the financial aid that this country is extending to Britain, the plan could never have been undertaken, and certainly not sustained.

So it is not only the doctor who suffers under such a scheme, the burden falls upon the whole economy. Nor is regimentation confined to the medical profession. It affects every individual in the country. In exchange for what he believes to be free medical care, the average citizen must accept the same bureaucratic regulation and red tape, and in the end he gets what might properly be termed "assembly-line medicine." He, too, must sacrifice many of his liberties to have medical security.

There is little essential difference between the British scheme and the President's proposals for this country. Both provide for Federal control of health problems. Both provide for the same type of regimentation. The British plan covers every citizen; the President's proposal covers only the wage earner whose income does not exceed $4,200. The British scheme is financed through general taxation plus American financial aid; the President's plan provides for a specific pay-roll tax.

But other than the mechanics of the system, there is little to distinguish either plan.

The socialistic aspects of the British scheme can well be illustrated by several significant factors. These factors prove that nationalized medicine will not work under a free government but will only work as part of a pattern of complete socialism. Since the British plan was inaugurated, the Government has taken over so-called related medical and dental industries. For example, the Government has taken over the artificial appliance business—all businesses connected with the manufacture or sale of dental appliances—likewise the industry which produces eyeglasses. When our committee was in England last fall, we were reliably told that the drug industry would be next. Under that plan the Government would operate central drug dispensaries—and the corner drug store would be a thing of the past. Similarly, dietary food industries are in line for Government seizure.

All of this proves a very simple fact—once you nationalize one important economic function it immediately becomes desirable to socialize all related functions, until in the end you have a complete socialized economy

Such schemes are all based on the assumption that the individual can do nothing for himself that the Government cannot do much better for him—with his money. It assumes that a greater part of what a citizen earns should be turned over to a central Government agency, there to be spent by an army of bureaucrats to provide the things that the citizen could provide for himself if left unmolested.

I do not believe the rank-and-file citizens of our country want that type of government here. But they can only prevent it by constant vigilance, and by refusing to submit to the entering wedge of nationalization which will ultimately lead to a completely socialistic state.

While the socialization of the Nation's health is the kind of a system we must constantly guard against, it does not follow that the Federal Government should remain completely aloof in matters relating to the health of our people.

Indeed, there are many things the Government is already doing in this direction, and there are many more things it can do without getting into the realm of socialism. Strong, healthy children are of prime national concern, and Federal funds provided to improve health standards of children is, in my judgment, money wisely spent. Federal funds for medical research in order to help discover cures for serious diseases is likewise beneficial. Aids of this nature are consistent with our form of government, and can be accomplished without bureaucratic control or dictation.

There is one additional field in which the Federal Government could, in my judgment, render valuable assistance to its citizens. It lies in providing a system which will help the average family in the payment of catastrophic medical expenses. I want to give you briefly what I consider to be a worthwhile proposal to help solve this problem.

Two economic groups of our citizens are reasonably provided for from a medical standpoint. The first group consists of the well-to-do who are able to pay for all medical services they need or desire, although it is fair to say that this group is gradually becoming extinct by virtue of present tax laws. The second group consists of the poor who are given medical care on the basis of public support and private charity, supplemented by gratuitous services of the average physician.

But there is a third group made up of the average working man and his family who comprise the main element of our population. This group is not as well provided for in all respects as either of the two other classes. It is true that great progress has been made in recent years in providing adequate medical care for members of this economic group, as for example through Blue Cross and Blue Shield and through joint labor-management health care. However, none of these protective devices give satisfactory protection to the average American family against calamity illnesses. This is the type of illness which leads to catastrophic medical expenses beyond the financial ability of such families to pay.

The ordinary family budget can stand routine medical bills. It can provide for Sally when she has the measles or for Johnny when he needs a tooth filled. But this budget cannot stand for disasters. Too often it cannot meet the financial burden of serious surgery or prolonged hospitalization and medical care. Such emergencies create financial hardship which in many cases disrupts the family budget beyond repair.

I think the Federal Government can help solve this problem by acting as the insurer against calamity sickness. The Government can collect its premiums to pay for such insurance by the simple method of pay-roll deductions or direct contributions in the case of the self-employed, on an actuarial basis, with premiums geared to the risks assumed. Such a plan would be preferable to voluntary methods working toward protection against catastrophic medical expenses, which cannot be successful because the coverage is distributed among too few and the premiums necessarily prohibitive. Moreover, under such plans those who need coverage the most are least likely to have it. What is needed is broad and extensive coverage in terms of the numbers of people protected in order to diversify the risks and minimize the cost to those insured.

This plan is based on the assumption that the average American family can take care of its ordinary medical problems without Government interference or assistance. It assumes that the medical profession is doing a good job and will continue to do so without control from Washington. It recognizes, however, that the Federal Government can help protect the citizen against extraordinary medical bills. It recognizes that this can be done in a manner sound in principle and consistent with our free-enterprise system.

The standards for such calamity insurance would be specifically written in the law just as an insurance company writes its policy. There would be a minimum of administrative costs and control. There would be no need for an army of bureaucrats to harass the citizen. Finally, the plan would provide the answer to a very vital need without making every doctor a Federal bureaucrat and without putting either doctor or patient in a political strait-jacket.

Farm Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan taken from yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Mr. Sullivan is correct in assuming that the farmers are becoming aware that continuing price supports only leads to further Federal controls over the lives of our farmers. A good many of us have envied farmers because they have always enjoyed a certain amount of freedom and independence. I have always believed that the farmer should be paid well for his efforts. The farmer who has put thought and sound judgment in his planning has always enjoyed a fair living. However, he must realize there is a limit to the subsidy program and that all things being equal, he is dependent upon the consumer when subsidies bring prices to the high level where consumers refuse to buy, something is wrong. Certainly the stories on potatoes and eggs are a disgrace. We have got to find a happy medium, and this is something the "planners" have failed to do.

FARMERS ARE BECOMING AWARE PRICE SUPPORT BRINGS CONTROLS—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS THEY BEGIN TO QUESTION POLICY THAT INCREASES PRODUCTION, CUTS CONSUMPTION

(By Mark Sullivan)

If the price of food is a principal private concern of the people, then Government actions and policies which affect the price are by that fact a principal public concern. This has come to be recognized in Congress and by the administration. The very existence of price support of farm crops is subjected to questioning. Within this field as a whole a concrete proposal in Congress, at once definite, yet limited, is especially important because of its origin; it came from the Democratic leader of the Senate, Mr. SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois.

Senator LUCAS' proposal has to do only with potatoes. After the recent public outcry following spread of information about the immense cost of supporting potato prices,

the Department of Agriculture undertook to reduce the cost by reducing the quantity it would need to buy. Attempt was made to do this by requiring potato growers to reduce the number of acres planted. But it quickly became apparent that this would not be effective; potato growers, by planting rows closer together, liberal use of fertilizer, and intensified tillage, could grow more potatoes on the same acreage. So Senator LUCAS proposed that the reduction be imposed not on the number of acres planted but on the number of bushels raised and put on the market. This would enable the Government to establish a more effective check on growers.

PRICE QUESTION REFUSED

Senator LUCAS' proposal about potatoes illustrates what farmers are beginning to learn. Limitation upon the number of bushels a farmer may raise and withdrawal of price support if he raises more, is an extension of Government control. And the farmer is beginning to be aware that if he accepts the benefits of price support he must submit to regulation supporting it. Awareness of this on the part of farmers has led to an amount of questioning and discussion among them about price support comparable to the amount that goes on in Congress and among the people.

Potatoes are the example of price support that has become presently conspicuous. But the real public problem is price support as a whole, and price support covers practically every crop grown on a farm except a few minor ones. The methods of price support vary with different crops, as do the costs to the Federal Treasury and to the taxpayer, and the cost to consumers of food due to paying higher prices than they would otherwise need to. Adequate understanding on the part of the public would be facilitated by possession of as much information about all crops as the public has recently received about potatoes. An example, about which some degree of information has recently come to public attention, is eggs.

The Department of Agriculture is buying large quantities of dried eggs; in a week in February it bought 1,836,000 pounds. The fact that reports are in terms of pounds is one of many complexities that make public understanding not easy. A pound of dried eggs is the equivalent of three dozen eggs in the shell. The Department buys from processors, and these are required to certify that in buying eggs in the shell from farmers and other producers they have paid a price that the Department stipulates. The price thus stipulated varies with grades, sections of the country, and seasons. The purpose of buying the dried eggs is to support the price farmers receive for eggs, which means, of course, keep up the price consumers pay. The Department's average price-support figure this year, for all parts of the country and all the seasons, is 27 cents a dozen.

HUGE DRIED SUPPLY ON HAND

While the department goes on buying more dried eggs, at a pace which is the equivalent of over 5,000,000 dozen of shell eggs a week, it has on hand more than 78,000,000 pounds, equivalent to more than 300,000,000 dozen of eggs in the shell, some bought last year, some the year before. The dried eggs tend to deteriorate, though the department says that less than a quarter-million pounds have deteriorated to a point where they could not be used for human consumption.

As in the case of potatoes, the department would like to get rid of its dried eggs. It has offered to give them away to charitable institutions and offered to sell them abroad at prices less than half what it paid for them and is daily paying for more. As in the case of every crop the department supports, it cannot sell for consumption as food in the United States at a price less than the support price it fixes, for that would defeat the very purpose of price support.

One of the many economic vices inherent in price support, the denials of reason and common sense, is its diverse effects on production and on consumption. It increases production, the farmer knowing that the Government will take the surplus off his hands. At the same time it reduces consumption by making prices high, leading some consumers to refrain from buying. The per capita consumption of potatoes last year was the lowest in years.

Amendment of Displaced Persons Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is pending before the United States Senate several amendments to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 which would give special consideration to persons who, during World War II, were members of the armed forces of the Republic of Poland, who were honorably discharged from such services, who reside in the British Isles, and who upon the effective date of the new amendment have registered for an immigration visa with a United States consular officer in Great Britain prior to the effective date of the act, as amended.

I have been a strong and unwavering supporter of amendments to improve the present legislation on displaced persons in the many conferences which have taken place with respect to the study of various amendments now under consideration. It has been my privilege to present all the facts concerning those members of the armed forces of the Republic of Poland whose heroic deeds in the defeat of Nazi Germany are well known to everyone. Consequently, a number of different amendments to the present law have been offered in the House of Representatives and in the Senate which would carry out my urgent pleas to permit a reasonable number of these gallant fighters for the freedom of Poland to gain admission to the United States as displaced persons.

I have made a very careful study of all these amendments and have concluded that the substitute bill now pending before the Senate, presented in the names of Senators KILGORE, GRAHAM, FERGUSON, MAGNUSON, KEFAUVER, O'CONOR, and WILEY offers the most practical amendment with respect to former members of the armed forces of the Republic of Poland now residing in the British Isles. It is my intention to offer every support I possibly can for the substitute bill when it comes before the House of Representatives for final consideration.

I should like to call to the attention of all those who have relatives and friends among these Polish soldiers who are now in the British Isles that it is imperative for them to telegraph immediately to these relatives and friends urging them to register for an immigration visa to the United States with the nearest United States consular officer in Great Britain. Unless such registration is made these relatives and friends will not be able to qualify for admission to the United States under the amendment I have been advocating. It is expected that the Senate will begin to debate this bill on February 23 and it is possible that the legislation will be ready for the signature of President Truman sometime during the second week of March. Therefore, such registrations in England must be made at the earliest possible moment.

Middle-Income Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of February 22, 1950:

MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING

Although the House Banking Committee has reported out the Administration's so-called middle-income cooperative housing plan, the reluctant testimony in which Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman of the Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, last week opposed this measure is still convincing. Not wishing to appear disloyal to the President's program, Mr. McCabe emphasized that his criticisms were limited to the economic and financial implications of the measure. Yet, these are precisely the aspects to which too little attention has been paid in the course of the bill's legislative history, and which are today of the greatest importance.

The cooperative housing idea is an attractive one to many people. Over it hangs the aura of Scandinavian prestige which was felt even by a hard-headed party of Senators who visited Sweden last summer to see for themselves how the "middle way" of housing fared. It has, for us in New York the further connotation of a rather long history and a rather successful application in the hands of our present State housing commission. But the cooperative program sponsored by the administration has nothing in common with these familiar measures except in name. When unmasked, the program appears as a thinly disguised plan for federally guaranteed mortgage lending that would allow cooperatives to borrow their building money for terms of 50 to 60 years at interest rates hardly more than the Federal Government itself pays. The objections raised by the Federal Reserve Board deal with the impact of such a multi-billion dollar program on the Federal debt and on private credit. But other major questions are posed by this measure. Why should members of cooperatives get better financing terms than other home owners? Where is the line drawn separating the middle-income sheep from the upper-income goats? Once the legitimate ground of public housing is abandoned, is there any reasonable stopping point whatever?

A notable group of Republican Senators, led by CHARLES W. TOBEY and RALPH E. FLANDERS, have participated in the creation of the bipartisan housing program enacted last

summer. Their cooperation is necessary in any further comprehensive housing legislation. What position should they and other Senators not tied by party loyalties to the President's program take now? The 1949 housing program is barely under way, but already there are grave questions concerning the wisdom and capabilities of those administering it. Part of that program included substantial new aids for middle-income housing that have been instrumental in raising the output of homes to present record-breaking levels. But where is the eagerness to press down the cost of housing through the manipulation of controls largely in the hands of the Federal Housing Administration? Where is the determined effort over a longer period of time toward lower cost housing through a better integration of the building industry? We believe that the administration should be required to give its present powers a fair test in the middle-income field before any new comprehensive legislation is authorized. Congress has done what was needed. It should now oblige the administration to do its part.

The Bicentennial Celebration in Haiti

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to emphasize the importance of the good reports about the bicentennial celebration in Haiti given by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs. It was gratifying to all the Members of the Congress to know that this apostle of inter-American friendship had been invited by the Republic of Haiti to attend this international exposition as an honored guest. It is equally gratifying to know that, during his visit in Haiti, Dr. Thorning had interviews with the distinguished President of the Republic, His Excellency Dumarsais Estimé, as well as with the Foreign Minister, His Excellency Vilfort Beauvoir. Since the international exposition was the brain child of President Estimé, the latter must be happy to see that the realization of his dream has been widely appreciated in other countries, including the United States. It is also a triumph for Ambassador Joseph D. Charles, a most loyal friend of President Estimé and of the people of the Western Hemisphere. All of us have admired the work of Ambassador Charles in Washington. He, too, shares in the congratulations that rise in all quarters with respect to the success of the festivities connected with the two hundredth anniversary of the foundation of the Haitian capital, Port-au-Prince.

Dr. Thorning reports that the international exposition at Port-au-Prince is thoroughly worth while. As an eyewitness, he relates that the Haitian Pavilion contains numerous examples of national art. Furthermore, he was deeply impressed by the historical exhibit of documents and books which throw light upon the history of the people of Haiti and their long struggle for freedom and democracy. The exhibits of Cuba and France were also valuable, in the opinion of the Maryland educator, author, and lecturer. Naturally, Dr. Thorning was pleased to note that the Pavilion of the Republic of Venezuela featured the achievements of both Simón Bolivar, the Liberator, and Francisco de Miranda, the Precursor.

Enthusiastic praise was given by Dr. Thorning to the folklore music and dancing which, in the open-air theater on the exposition grounds, were a feature of many of the evening entertainments. The poetry of M. Jean de Brieur, Under Secretary of Tourism, was recited on these occasions, with universal applause. Many of these artistic events were dedicated to the honor of the President of the Republic and Madam Estimé.

It was noteworthy, Dr. Thorning stated, that the chapel of the Vatican, now on the exposition grounds, will be presented to the people of Haiti. This should indicate the good will and friendship of His Holiness Pius XII, and of the Apostolic Nuncio, Archbishop Francesco Lardone, as well as of the Papal Chargé d'Affairs, Monsignor Achille de Lupi.

In conclusion, Dr. Thorning related the beauty of the ceremonies which attended the formal presentation to the city of Port-au-Prince of a gold medal from the Forty Immortals, Paris, by M. Jacques de Lacretelle, a member of the French Academy, who came to Haiti with his charming wife for this express purpose. The response, in the name of the Haitian people, was given eloquently by M. Dantès Bellegarde, who in former times served his country as Ambassador to the United States and Ambassador to the Holy See. The mayor of Port-au-Prince, in turn, presented the gold medal, gift of the French Academy, to His Excellency Dumarsais Estimé, President of the Republic of Haiti. It is Dr. Thorning's most cordial recommendation that the international exposition at Port-au-Prince, Haiti, receive the most generous support and attendance on the part of the people in the other American Republics, including the United States of America.

Legislation Threatens the Oil Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, I am confident all Members of the House of Representatives will welcome an opportunity to read the following editorial from the Robinson (Ill.) Daily News, published in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. The editorial comments in a comprehensive manner on the adverse effect certain to be suffered should present provision for the 27½-percent depletion allowance on oil production be reduced or eliminated, as currently proposed in new tax legislation before the Eighty-first Congress.

The writer of the editorial is Kent V. Lewis, editor and publisher of the Robinson Daily News and, in addition, the Illinois State senator from his legislative district. Senator Lewis writes from a background of a lifetime in a community where oil and oil development have been a major factor in the economy of the area. His clear presentation of the harmful effects of the proposal merit close study before any action is taken by the Congress.

His editorial follows:

LEGISLATION THREATENS THE OIL BUSINESS

Proposed elimination of the 27½-percent depletion allowance on oil production would be a crippling blow to oil development in Illinois.

It would mean an end to exploration by the small, independent producer, and since independents drill nearly all the "wildcats" which open new pools and pool extensions the lone drilling rig which has brought prosperity to so many areas of the State would become a rare sight.

Only the big integrated companies with refining and marketing facilities would be able to support drilling programs, so another section of small business would disappear as present leases belonging to independents are depleted.

More, thousands of stripper wells producing a few barrels a day would have to be pulled, with consequent permanent loss of the large amount of oil which in the aggregate they would otherwise produce. For the tax saving provided by the depletion allowance makes it possible for producers to pump many a well which would otherwise be plugged.

For many areas in Illinois, including this county, elimination of the depletion allowance would be almost an economic calamity. It is to be hoped that the Illinois delegation in Congress will keep in mind that for many sections of the State of Illinois oil is an industry second only to agriculture, and that in many oil-producing areas there are practically no other industries.

Oil has brought, and is bringing, comparative prosperity to many towns in Illinois which are located in what may be described as economically depressed areas.

The attack on the depletion allowance is based upon "plugging a tax loophole." Actually, the depletion allowance is not a breach in the tax structure, but a necessary incentive for continued exploration for a natural resource the discovery of which increases the taxable wealth of the Nation.

Without the allowance, exploration would be greatly curtailed, and areas in which geological indications point to small pools or wells of very limited production would be neglected entirely.

The end result would be the substitution of oil imports for much oil which will otherwise be discovered and produced in this country.

This might not injure a few of the major companies with extensive foreign oil production, but it would certainly handicap the industry as a whole and sap the strength of the war potential which enabled us to "float to victory on a sea of oil" in World War II. Certainly the very limited increase in tax collection can hardly balance the economic gain to the Nation of the continuous exploration and production of oil fostered by the depletion allowance.

Even discounting the undesirable monopolistic tendency of destroying the future of thousands of small independent producers there can be no permanent gain to the Nation in removing the incentive to wildcat

for small pools and producing wells. Only the depletion allowance justifies that risk, as any oil producer can assure you.

The picture of the rich oilman enjoying a large tax exemption may be a pleasant one in Washington, but in the oil areas of Illinois it is clear that the depletion allowance is only the cushion which persuades the wildcatter that he can leap into new exploration without the certainty of breaking his financial back.

Resolution of Delaware State Dental Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to direct attention to a resolution adopted on February 15, 1950, by the Delaware State Dental Society in opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of medical or dental care containing the principles of federalized compulsory health insurance.

It is also appropriate, Mr. Speaker, for me to call attention at this time to the fact that both houses of the General Assembly of the State of Delaware last year passed resolutions memorializing Congress not to pass such legislation as is described in the resolution which follows:

Whereas the American people now enjoy the highest level of health, the best standards of scientific medical and dental care, and the finest medical and dental institutions ever attained by any major country in the world; and

Whereas these accomplishments of American medicine and dentistry are the results of a free people working under a system of free enterprise; and

Whereas in all countries where government has assumed control of medical and dental care the experience has been a progressive deterioration of medical and dental standards and care, to the detriment of the health of the people; and

Whereas this problem has been adjudged so serious by the people of Delaware that resolutions from its State legislature have memorialized Congress not to pass such legislation; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Delaware State Dental Society:

1. That the Congress of the United States be asked to refrain from imposing upon the citizens of this Nation any form of compulsory health insurance, or any system of medical or dental care containing the principles of federalized compulsory health insurance;

2. That the Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS, the Honorable J. ALLEN FREAR, JR., and the Honorable J. CALEB BOGGS, Members of the Congress of the United States from Delaware, be and they are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation;

3. That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives and to each Senator and Congressman from Delaware.

Report From Washington County, Benton County, Madison County, and Van Buren County Soil Conservation Districts in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington County Soil Conservation District, the Benton County Soil Conservation District, the Madison County Soil Conservation District, and the Van Buren County Soil Conservation District in Arkansas have sent copies of their annual reports to me. I had hoped to be able to insert the entire reports of these districts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but their length precludes that, under the rules of the House, without special permission. I do, however, wish to quote from each report.

The Washington County Soil Conservation District, with its office at Fayetteville, Ark., is under the excellent guidance of the following board of supervisors: Walter D. Ramey, chairman, Winslow; M. G. Lewis, secretary, Farmington; C. D. Griscom, Lincoln; J. H. Pyeatt, Cane Hill; C. E. Shafer, Farmington. These men are outstanding farmers of Washington County. This year their district has had for its program soil and moisture conservation, and has stressed orchards, vineyards, and strawberries on contour in addition to the regular long-term program of soil conservation which they are carrying out. I quote from their report as follows:

Soil and moisture should be conserved on land being set to orchards, vineyards, and strawberries by planting on the contour. This practice is being encouraged by the supervisors of the Washington County Soil Conservation District. * * *

The advantages gained by planting these crops and cultivating them on the contour outweigh immensely the disadvantages. Farmers who have kept records state that they have received higher yields than they would have expected from the same crops planted the old way. These higher yields are the direct results of the savings in soil, moisture, and fertilizers which are kept on the field by the contour rows which act as small terraces.

Erosion is found at its worst in improperly managed orchards and vineyards. This is explained by the fact that few cultivated crops, other than fruits, are grown continuously on the same land for so many years. The cultivation of orchards and vineyards year after year up and down the slope throughout the life of the trees soon erodes out the middles between the trees, leaving the trees on mounds. This condition is too prevalent in northwest Arkansas.

The Benton County Soil Conservation District, with headquarters at Bentonville, is under the direction of the following fine supervisory staff: T. S. McNeil, chairman, Rogers; Harry F. Stitt, secretary, route 2, Rogers; Mac Givens, Gentry; Elbert S. Graham, Lowell; Wayne L. Shields, route 1, Siloam Springs. This soil conservation district is one of the most active in our section and it, too, is led by outstanding men of Benton County. I quote from the letter that Tom McNeil, the chairman, forwarded with the report:

I would like to call your attention to the fact that there are more farms under active soil conservation agreements with the district than ever before (773 farms covering 71,517 acres). Also there are more applications requesting assistance which have been approved by the board of supervisors than ever before (534 farms covering 57,925 acres), desiring conservation plans on their farms. This in face of the fact there has not been any campaign or action taken in years or any attempt to create a desire for farmers to make application for assistance. This district covers the entire county and from careful study there are 4,500 ownership farms covering 457,000 acres, most of which should have district coordinated conservation programs in the near future. Northwest Arkansas' agriculture is making progress and the soil and water conservation district program is advancing.

The Madison County Soil Conservation District, with head offices at Huntsville, is under the able leadership of the following board of supervisors: James M. Parker, chairman, route 2, Huntsville; Ewell E. Boyd, secretary, Huntsville; A. H. Berry, Hindsville; Hugh Hargis, route 4, Huntsville; Ralph Buck, RFD, Combs. As an example of what soil conservation is doing in our whole section, I give you one instance from the report of the supervisors of Madison County:

CONSERVATION PASTURE BRINGS WESTERN CATTLE TO MADISON COUNTY

Mr. Floyd Truman, from the State of Arizona, sold his ranch about June 1, 1949, but retained his 341 head of Hereford cattle. After having put his cattle on some very poor range, he started out in search of better pasture for his cattle. Mr. Truman, after looking for pasture for 2 months from Arizona to Arkansas, eventually landed in Fayetteville, Ark., where he contacted Mr. J. E. Critz, district conservationist of the Soil Conservation Service. Mr. Critz, having attended the "greener pasture tour" on the Paul Smith farm at Hindsville, Ark., knew that Mr. Smith, a cooperator with the Madison County Soil Conservation District, had done an excellent job of developing his pasture in connection with his soil-conservation plan on his farm. Also, he knew that Mr. Smith was short on cattle at this time. Mr. Critz directed Mr. Truman to Hindesville to contact Mr. Smith. The contact was made, and the two men made a deal to bring the western cattle to Mr. Smith's farm.

The cattle, consisting of 184 cows, 105 calves, 22 bulls, and 30 yearlings, arrived on August 16, at the Smith farm where they were tested both for TB and Bang's.

After the long trip by rail and truck the cattle arrived very tired, hungry, and gaunt. Even though the cattle were thin from being on poor pasture, there was not a casualty in the shipping. After being tested and kept in a close lot around straw stacks about 3 days, the cattle were turned on the lush pasture of the Smith farm, and they are looking better already. We know that the well-balanced, limed, and fertilized pasture on the Smith farm will start adding pounds of beef in a hurry.

Mr. and Mrs. Truman are looking for a location in this county.

Under the inspired leadership of the following men, the Van Buren County Soil Conservation District, with headquarters at Clinton, is rapidly taking its place in the vanguard of fine districts in our section: Roy E. Tester, chairman; D. M. Baker, vice chairman; Clayton Graddy, regular member; J. O. Hill, ex officio member; J. B. Naney, secretary and treasurer. The attitude of this energetic group of supervisors can best be shown by the following paragraph from their report:

Farmers in Van Buren County have a higher standard of living today than any farmer has ever had, and we feel that the Production and Marketing Administration programs have helped them accomplish this. We have helped them by offering incentive payments for conserving soil and water on their farms. When we help the farmers, we indirectly help everyone—for the person who lives the farthest from the farm is still dependent upon the soil for his livelihood.

I am hopeful that the Congress, in this grave period of our Nation's history and in view of the absolute necessity for economy, can find ways and means to keep this great program moving forward, because wise economy dictates that we keep our soil strong and our young people on the farm.

Walter Featherly, Jr.—One of Twelve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to have the opportunity at the National Boy Scouts of America breakfast last week to join with Walter T. Featherly, Jr., of Dillon, Mont., who represented region 11 at that gathering. It was a turn-out marked by the presence of the 12 most outstanding Boy Scouts in the country and it was a pleasure and privilege for me to be with Walter on that occasion.

Walter Featherly is a credit to his school, his State, and his region, and, of course, on that basis, he must be a credit to our country as well. Walter has had an extremely interesting life, having been a Life Scout for most of his Scouting career and also having received the God and Country award. His hobbies are music, marksmanship, and minerals. He conducts his own dance band in Dillon. He is also a Life Scout Explorer. Walter typifies the fine spirit of brotherhood which prevails among the Boy Scouts not only in our country but throughout the world.

It has been well said that "Today's youth will guide tomorrow's world. The feelings which youth of one nation harbor for the youth of others will undoubtedly influence the course of relations of all nations." The Boy Scouts of America have exemplified in their service the ideal of world brotherhood. They have taken an active part in the promotion of the United Nations appeal for children; they have sent over 9,000 CARE packages to other countries to be used as food for training courses for leaders and camping experiences for boys and leaders alike; they have contributed funds to bring to the United States the national director of the Cub Scouts for the Boy Scouts of the Philippines so he might observe our methods and procedures. They have done many other things of worth-while character and the, are to be congratulated for the great amount of good they have performed in the many years of their existence. To Walter Featherly I extend my congratulations on the signal honor he has achieved; and to the Boy Scouts of America, I extend my best wishes on the fortieth anniversary of that great organization.

Your Move, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of the House an editorial entitled, "Your Move, Mr. President," which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Wednesday, February 15, 1950.

On January 10, and again on January 20, I forwarded communications to the President relative to the coal situation in western New York. I earnestly begged of him to immediately recognize the fact that an emergency does exist; and that many persons would be deprived of employment, to say nothing of going without adequate heat, unless he took action at once.

I further advised that I was fully aware of the magnitude of his duties and the demands upon his time, but I, as a Member of Congress, do believe that I am entitled to a reply to my communications. To date I have not been extended the courtesy of a reply to my letters.

The editorial follows:

YOUR MOVE, MR. PRESIDENT

The coal crisis deepens; Buffalo public schools are closed; State and city officials are forced to impose strict regulation on such thinning supplies as there are; 350,000 miners continue their outlaw strike—and the White House says President Truman plans no further action at this time.

If the children and teachers miss their Easter vacations; if homes turn cold and businesses close and jobs are lost and pipes freeze, let one and all remember that the responsibility for Lrtting affairs drift into their present critical state rests squarely with President Truman; that the responsibility for enforcing the orders of the Federal court is his alone, and that every sign of delay or irresoluteness encourages disrespect for the law, for his own office, and for the national safety he is sworn to protect.

Unless a contract should suddenly be negotiated, the next move is President Truman's. Until he makes it, we all remain the helpless pawns of a shameless game of power and politics that the United Mine Workers, the coal operators, and the President are playing at the public expense—at an expense mounting to disastrous proportions.

Practice What We Preach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of February 19, 1950:

PRACTICE WHAT WE PREACH

One hundred years ago Ireland's potato famine caused great numbers of persons to seek a new life in this country. There was a good deal of prejudice against the newcomers, who were mostly Roman Catholics. Sometimes it took the form of rioting and other crime.

A political group calling itself the Know-Nothing Party was formed. It wanted to repeal immigration laws. It wanted America for Americans. It wanted to forbid anyone except native Americans to hold public office.

In 1855 Abraham Lincoln felt called upon to deny that he was a Know-Nothing. Lincoln wrote to a friend:

"How can anyone who abhors the oppression of Negroes be in favor of degrading classes of white people? Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a Nation we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal.' We now practically read it 'all men are created equal, except Negroes.'

"When the Know-Nothings get control it will read: 'All men are created equal except Negroes, foreigners, and Catholics.' When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty—to Russia, for instance, where despotism can be taken pure, and without the base alloy of hypocrisy."

That was only one of hundreds of expressions by Lincoln on the subject of social harmony.

"Equal justice for all" means something more than equal justice in our courts. It means equal justice for neighbors in our thoughts, words, and deeds. This concept has inspired Brotherhood Week, which begins today.

It's a week in which Americans are urged to examine their consciences about their attitude toward all other Americans. It is a week to remember that the earliest settlers of the America which we ask God to bless came here to escape various kinds of intolerances practiced upon them elsewhere by people who thought they were different.

Prejudice, by dictionary definition, is "opinion or leaning adverse to anything without just grounds or before sufficient knowledge."

Listen to this description of a certain group:

"They introduce pauperism, slums, corruption, and crime. They are to blame for unemployment and panics. They deprive native Americans of jobs and they lower the wage scale. They are clannish, unassimilable, and half-witted."

It was used to describe Irish immigrants a century ago. Does it sound familiar today? Have you heard such words used recently to describe Americans whose family background is oriental, Jewish, Mexican, Polish, Italian, or Negro?

Most of the prejudice in this country is against members of minorities. But, as a reader points out in our letters column today, some members of minorities have prejudices, too. But two wrongs do not make a right. Prejudice against one group

cannot be justified by citing the fact that any of its members have prejudices, too.

The United States, considered a "white" nation, seeks the moral leadership of a globe populated largely by nonwhites. One of the greatest handicaps to our national leaders in their relations with leaders of other countries is the race discrimination practiced here at home. We are in a cold war which can't be won by construction of a hydrogen bomb, or a Marshall plan, or a point 4, alone.

To attract to the cause of democracy the millions in India, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Africa, America must live as well as preach the abolition of racial, religious, and economic discrimination.

Hon. Louis B. Heller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, February 28 marks the first anniversary in Congress of my distinguished colleague, LOUIS B. HELLER, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Mr. HELLER was elected to the Eighty-first Congress in a special election to fill a seat left vacant by the death of Congressman JOHN J. DELANEY. Well qualified for his post, Mr. HELLER already possessed legislative experience by virtue of having served in the New York State Senate. There, his sterling abilities were utilized as secretary of the temporary commission against discrimination. The splendid record he accumulated in this and other endeavors won for him the strong support of many groups and individuals and resulted in his election to the Congress of the United States.

Since coming to the House of Representatives, he has continued to serve the Nation as admirably as he did his State. Before taking his oath of office, he pledged himself to support all progressive and constructive legislation. He promised, further, to work to crush communism and to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. Few Members of Congress can equal the record made by him in the pursuit of these goals.

Mr. HELLER has vigorously attacked the antilabor Taft-Hartley Act. Demonstrating his keen interest in the problems of labor, he analyzed the act point by point, listing specific reasons why it should be repealed. With insight and understanding he showed how the law has undermined collective bargaining, provoked unnecessary strife, and stripped workers of basic rights. Strong unions, he declared—

> With effective power to bolster the real wages of their members through collective bargaining, represent the most democratic means of preventing the boom-and-bust cycles which have plagued our economy over the past 100 years.

He cited the 1948 elections and his own special election as "clear and convincing mandates from the people" and stated that "immediate repeal of this unjust, unfair, and vicious legislation" was the way to carry out the people's will. A coalition of misinformed House Members has forestalled further action on this measure this session. Under the spirited guidances of such men as LOUIS HELLER, however, the fight for repeal will be carried on and the mandate of the people will be accomplished.

Important as the labor and economic problems of our Nation are, we have a still larger concern in the affairs of the world. In his first year in Congress, LOUIS HELLER has shown a grasp of these affairs scarcely rivaled by many who have longer tenure. Equally as admirable as his stand on labor issues has been his fight against communism and Communist aggression.

When it became apparent that recognition might be granted to Communist China, Mr. HELLER sent a personal plea to President Truman to prevent this tragic error. In an eloquent statement he asked:

> How can there be recognition of a government that cannot even maintain minimum standards of decency and hospitality in its dealings with foreigners? How can there be, moreover, recognition of a government which callously flaunts the basic international responsibilities of a sovereign state? Finally, how can there be recognition of a government which acts not in the interests of its own citizens but rather at the behest of a foreign master?

He urged the President not to be indifferent to the expansion of communism in China and southeast Asia and not to be swayed by the action of other countries.

But, like all true statesmen, he believes in a positive program for the reconstruction of war-torn countries and the building up of democratic ideals throughout the world. When the Korean aid proposal was before this body, Congressman HELLER enthusiastically rose to its support.

The point 4 program ranks high in his estimation as a solution to international ills. He believes, with President Truman, that we should make our technical knowledge available to peace-loving peoples in order that they may realize their aspirations for a better life. Improvements of this type, he knows, will also advance the cause of freedom and will help to develop international understanding and good will.

These ideals have been challenged, however, by hostile actions of the Soviet Union and the knowledge that the Soviet Union possesses an atomic weapon. This knowledge has forced a reappraisal of our strategic position in the world. The United States answer to this problem has been the creation of a military assistance program. Mr. HELLER firmly believes in this program and in the necessity for augmenting it. In a strong and forthright speech he called for the strengthening of the military forces of western Europe against the atomic threat of the Soviet Union. He stated at that time:

> Increased military aid to western Europe is even more urgent because the whole timetable of international strategy has been speeded up by the Soviet Union's unexpected atomic progress. Russian discovery of the atomic bomb came years ahead of the predictions of western scientists. The period of grace permitted to the western powers to strengthen their defenses has been considerably shortened. Consequently, additional American military help must be hastened to close the time gap in North Atlantic defenses.

When he went on record in favor of amending the Displaced Persons Act, Mr. HELLER revealed again his great humanitarian character and noble qualities of statesmanship. On that occasion he called upon the United States to exert moral leadership in the settlement of the displaced persons problem. We must change them. He declared:

> From displaced into placed persons. Maybe then, as we work and pray for peace, for a better world, the Great Architect will listen, for we cannot expect to receive the blessings of life if we do not give of ourselves in service to others.

To Mr. HELLER these words are more than phrases to be used in debate. Not content merely with supporting progressive legislation, he has taken advantage of every opportunity to effectuate it in a practical manner. Through his efforts, 760 Brooklyn Navy Yard workers, who would otherwise have been forced into idleness, are still employed. They will not soon forget LOUIS HELLER'S interest in them or his pleas to the President and the Secretary of Defense, explaining why for the good of the country, their jobs should not be abolished.

But LOUIS HELLER is not satisfied with a partial victory. With redoubled energy, he is continuing his attempt to see that workers in the navy yard area have employment. In this he has the support and cooperation of all Brooklyn citizens his eight Brooklyn colleagues, and the Brooklyn press. An editorial published in the Brooklyn Eagle on January 21, 1950, stated:

> Representative LOUIS B. HELLER has made a timely appeal to the Navy high command to assign to the Brooklyn Navy Yard one of the two giant aircraft carriers slated for modernization work. As he points out, the Brooklyn yard has pioneered in the work of rebuilding carriers along the lines dictated by postwar scientific developments and atomic research. And, as he adds, the work would provide employment for hundreds of Brooklyn workers who face dismissal on completion of several current jobs. * * *
>
> The Eagle is glad to add its voice to that of Congressman HELLER in demanding assignment of one of the two carrier modernization jobs to the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

A disturbing sidelight on the Brooklyn Navy Yard reduction-in-force problem was provided by the noted news analyst, Robert S. Allen. He revealed that among the employees discharged were six disabled veterans. Mr. HELLER'S answer to this violation of veterans' rights was an immediate and thorough personal investigation. He conferred with the admiral in charge who gave Congressman HELLER definite assurances that although the six disabled veterans had previously been informed that they were being separated from their jobs, he would offer them other employment. Each man was reemployed, and is presently working at his job in the yard. Mr. HELLER went further—he personally interviewed each veteran to determine whether or not he was satisfied with his new work.

As a result of this incident, Mr. HELLER has introduced a bill—H. R. 6547—to put an end to this sort of outrage. It would prohibit the dismissal from a Government job of any veteran who has lost a limb or the use of a limb, or has a disability rating of not less than 60 percent, as a result of service in the United States armed services.

Mr. HELLER expressed his opinion that there was no need to justify this measure on the basis of need. Such legislation, he feels, should be enacted because disabled veterans are entitled to special treatment from the Government they did so much to maintain at a most critical period in its history. I am sure, however, that we would heartily agree with Mr. Allen, who, in expressing his appreciation for this prompt and vigorous action, described Mr. HELLER'S efforts as "splendid and humane."

Among other worthy measures which have earned his wholehearted support have been the repeal of the oleomargarine tax, the national health insurance bills, civil rights legislation, and pay raises for Government workers.

On the issue of civil rights, Representative HELLER has put himself firmly on record as being opposed to the poll tax. Nor has he neglected other forms of discrimination in his struggle for equal rights. I particularly admire his stand against unfair employment practices. He has stressed on many occasions his belief that the right to equality of opportunity of each individual to obtain useful employment without regard to race, color, creed, and national origin is essential to the well-being of the individual and to the progress of our society.

He abhors, particularly, the totalitarian arrogance which makes one man say he will respect another only if they agree in race, religion, and social position. From his service as a member of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, Mr. HELLER learned that this problem cannot be handled by the States themselves. With insight gained from experience, he recommends Federal action to protect States having such laws against unfair competition from States that do not.

Along with a guaranty of civil rights security, Representative HELLER believes in an expansion of the social-security program. With commendable vision he sees the growth of this program as representing not only a growth in national security, but also an aid to our national defense and to our national future. He is one of the farsighted legislators in Congress to recognize that our prosperity and our national physical well-being depend heavily upon maintaining our health at the highest level.

To give substance to this conviction he is for the passage of a national health insurance and public health bill. There is no greater duty, he believes, that we owe to the electorate of this Nation, than to secure for them a reduction in sickness and premature death, thereby promoting individual and community welfare.

The plight of the underpaid Government worker is still another of the causes that has attracted the attention of the indefatigable LOUIS HELLER. Speaking before congressional committees, civic groups, and on the air, he has promoted legislation which would correct inequities and permit these worthy employees to enjoy a higher standard of living. Edward Zeitner, foremost political writer of the New York Daily Mirror and noted charity organizer, expressed his admiration in these words:

> Battling for postal pay raises, Representative LOUIS HELLER, the fledgling Congressman from Brooklyn, turns in an appraisal of Government service that merits thought. HELLER charges that the best talent, from top echelons to the bottom, are stepping out of Federal jobs because they don't pay enough. In the case of the average Government worker, it would be cheaper to grant him a pay raise than have him quit, the Congressman contends. He points out, by way of argument, that during 1947 at one post office 3,687 employees resigned for better jobs in private industry.
>
> Figuring that it costs $15 to add or subtract each of these persons from the Federal pay roll, the cost in this one instance was $55,305. These figures projected over the Nation, show how much the Government actually loses by constant employment turnovers. HELLER is trying to show that Federal employees can't live on salaries fixed by an act passed in 1923—when applied to the 1949 cost of living.

Referring to this and other accomplishments, Zeitner also commented:

> Representative LOUIS HELLER * * * has been on his toes every minute since he parked his satchels in Congress.

Representative HELLER has indeed been on his toes. He was on his toes when a Rule Committee coalition sought to obtain the power to block legislation. He saw in this move a denial of the principle of majority rule and diagnosed it as a design "to blockade a fair deal legislative program which the Democratic Party was chosen by the people to enact." "If the resolution is adopted," he charged, "the Rules Committe will become a graveyard where the policies of both political parties and the hopes of the American people will be buried." His strong voice, along with those of other farsighted legislators spelled the defeat of this ignominious proposal and has cleared the way for constructive action.

The record of LOUIS B. HELLER'S first year in the House of Representatives speaks for itself. He has measured up fully to the ideals he has expressed and to the high expectations of his friends. When I look at the record he has achieved and the volume of work he has done, I wonder how it has been possible. I know, however, that the problems of the Nation, and particularly of his own district, are of such vital concern to LOUIS B. HELLER that no task is too great if done on their behalf.

The letters which come to his office are sufficient proof that LOUIS HELLER has, in great measure, accomplished the task he set out to accomplish. These letters are interspersed with such phases as "your whole-hearted support * * * has given our people new courage," "we wish for you * * * the blessings that must come from the knowledge of a good deed well done," "we are all fully aware that this brighter future is, to a very large degree, attributable to your efforts."

We are indeed fortunate to have in our midst such an able public servant as LOUIS HELLER. His qualities of liberalism and leadership are sorely needed in these trying times. I congratulate him on the completion of a most successful first year in the House of Representatives and express my appreciation for the inspiring work he has done.

One Was Worthy of the Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Harvard (Ill.) Herald of February 16, 1950:

ONE WAS WORTHY OF THE NAME

Public indignation, in pre-Revolution days, over treatment the American colonists were receiving at the hands of England set the stage for emergence on this continent of the great and beloved American whose birthday we celebrate next Wednesday—George Washington.

Public indignation, today, over the sorry state into which the great United States of America has been allowed to fall, merely because the man who today occupies the office of President did not regard the coal tie-up as a national emergency soon enough, will surely manifest itself through public action.

We can't believe the American people will take this tragic defect in a President's domestic conduct with nothing more than a shrug. We can't believe they will continue to regard him as a President above impeachment.

Now that the miners are defying a Government order and refusing to get coal to a desperate Nation, on the flimsy technique that they have no contract, we shudder at the immediate future of our community and our country.

Our college students are coming home from chilled school buildings. Our train service is being curtailed. The coal bins in our homes, our places of business, our hospitals are yawning. From here on in, we can expect to get colder.

Coal means too much to America's finely geared society today to let its supply be withheld from us because of a President's outrageous timidity to deal with the unions. Mr. Truman has waited too long. We, not he, will suffer. We, not he, will be fools if we don't remember this winter of 1950 and act accordingly when it comes time to vote.

George Washington showed beyond doubt his first and foremost responsibility was to all the American people—not just one class. Mr. Truman showed his first concern is for the labor vote. Let labor have him. The people should impeach him.

Story of Alexander Hamilton as Told by Hon. Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, during the present week we have celebrated the anniversary of the birth of President George Washington. The birth of Alexander Hamilton came so close to that of George Washington that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Story of Alexander Hamilton as Told by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG," published in the February 1950 issue of the magazine Sons of the American Revolution.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STORY OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON AS TOLD BY SENATOR ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

In my impetuous youth I set out to right an historical wrong. I felt that America owed a long-overdue debt to the memory of Alexander Hamilton. I determined to make a small payment on account. So I wrote a book in 1921 to prove that Hamilton was the greatest American—meaning the greatest in the widest variety of contributions to his country's welfare. He was the most constructive statesman, the profoundest constitutionalist, the greatest lawyer, author, orator, and economist, the greatest political leader of his time, and one of its greatest soldiers. His was the most brilliant mind in an era of amazing genius. He was Washington's right arm in both war and peace. He was the brains in the pilot house when the ship of state set out into its perilous sea of history.

I have lived to realize that no one patriot can be called the greatest American in a land blessed with so many leaders of sublime and heroic stature. To that extent I overshot my mark. For example, I now freely concede that young America equally needed Thomas Jefferson and his basic rivalries with Hamilton. Jefferson would have been cheated of the presidency by Aaron Burr in 1800 but for Hamilton's refusal to permit his Federalists to condone the outrage. Jefferson himself said of Hamilton, "He is really a colossus; without numbers he is an host within himself." But I have not outlived the conviction that Hamilton never has been given his historic due. Lord Bryce, in his admirable work, the American Commonwealth, said, "One cannot note the disappearance of this brilliant figure, the most interesting in the earlier history of the Republic, without the remark that his countrymen seem to have never, either in his lifetime or afterward, duly recognized his splendid gifts; equally apt for war and civil government, he stood in the forefront of a generation never surpassed in history."

We Americans love Horatio Alger heroes—brave young men who rise above adversity to win great place and fame. Well, here is the top prodigy of them all.

Hamilton was born on Nevis in the West Indies, January 11, 1757. His father was a Scottish ne'er-do-well. His devoted mother was a French Huguenot divorcee. The legitimacy of their union is still a subject of controversy. It never ceased to be a scandalizing weapon of Hamilton's enemies. It could have crushed a lesser soul.

At 14 years of age young Hamilton was successfully managing Nicholas Cruger's general store and countinghouse on neighboring St. Croix.

At 15 he emigrated to Boston—without a friend in this New World. At 16 he entered King's College, now Columbia, in New York. At 17 he was pushing his unbidden way to the rostrum at New York's famous "Meeting in the Field" to help promote the First Continental Congress. "It is the battlefield or slavery," he cried—a full year ahead of Patrick Henry.

At 19 he was captain of New York's first company of artillery, destined for 10 months of bitter combat in which his personal heroism brought him to Washington's attention. At 20 he became Washington's first aide and military secretary and in the final victory at Yorktown he led the first victorious American assault.

At 25 he qualified as a lawyer in four months of study, exciting the envy of one Aaron Burr, a fellow student, who subsequently became his lifetime foe and his dueling assassin. Shortly he was to be acknowledged as the leader of his Nation's bar.

At 30 he was in the New York Assembly struggling for full, free, public education and for easier debtors' laws. Here, too, he first enlisted in the mighty conflict which produced the Constitution. He forced his State into the Annapolis Convention from which came the call, which he wrote, for the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia. Then he sat in the Philadelphia Convention—the only New Yorker to sign the Constitution. He wrote the major portion of the Federalist Papers, the greatest exposition of the Constitution ever penned. It was, and is, the "bible" of the Constitution. Then came the terrific contest over ratification, chiefly centering in the New York convention.

At 31 he led a forlorn hope in this New York convention at Poughkeepsie, facing a hostile majority through six guerrilla weeks. At the end he won. It was little short of a miracle. "The overwhelming eloquence of Hamilton," wrote Chancelor Kent, "Was exerted to its utmost pitch and shook the most resolved in the majority." In the light of this reality I wonder if it isn't fair to say that without him there would have been no Constitution.

At 32 he was called to President Washington's first Cabinet as Secretary of the Treasury. By now he was the dominant figure in the Federalist Party, which held power for the first 12 years of the new Nation's political life. He immediately became the master craftsman of the great American adventure. Not only did he chart the basis for restoring Federal credit and for the redemption of the public debt but also, in flashing succession, he recommended navigation laws, drafted the first bill for the postal system, proposed the means for handling public lands, establishing the mint, advised the decimal system for our currency with the dollar as the unit, recommended the beginnings of the tariff system, proposed the patent system, and generally charted the Republic's structure. John Adams said he was "all the time the commander in chief of the House and Senate, of the heads of departments and of the President himself." This, mind you, is that immigrant boy on the docks of Boston only 17 years before.

At 36 he dominated America's first great decision in foreign policy. He demanded neutrality in the war between England and revolutionary France—squarely colliding with Jefferson. Washington agreed with Hamilton. In the light of this episode it is easy to trace the source of the eloquent warnings in Washington's Farewell Address—an address which Mrs. Hamilton, the lovely Betsy Schuyler, later testified came almost exclusively from her husband's incandescent pen.

At 40 he chose to strip the veils from every last detail of the only incidental scandal that ever blemished his private life, his affair with a Mrs. Reynolds, rather than leave a shred of suspicion against the integrity of his public works. He spared nothing and pleaded no palliation. His sole purpose was to put his public honesty beyond attack.

At 47, he was killed in a duel with Aaron Burr, his lifetime enemy. Burr chose a relatively inoffensive remark of Hamilton's as an excuse to invoke what was then the code of honor. Hamilton hated dueling, but honor was the touchstone of his life. He fell at the first shot. The tears of a nation followed him to Trinity churchyard.

This is the bare chronology of as great an American as ever lived. Ten thousand pages would be required to fill in the full story of his talents, his genius and his impact upon the foundation of America. He was ever the subject of white-heat controversy—in death even as in life. But for myself, summing it all up, I say that five words might be his epitaph, "The Republic Is His Monument."

The Indiana State Banner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the remarks of Mrs. Royal Eason Ingersoll, designated representative of Mrs. Roscoe C. O'Byrne, president general, Daughters of the American Revolution, at the Indiana State Society of Washington, D. C., celebration of the Sesquicentennial of Indiana Territory, 1800–1950, on February 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INDIANA STATE BANNER

At the Twenty-third Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, held in Washington, D. C., on April 20, 1914, attention was called to the fact that Indiana had no State flag. Memorial Continental Hall, in which the meetings of the congress were being held, had been appropriately decorated for the occasion. The chief, and one of the most conspicuous decorations consisted of the flags of the various States placed about the auditorium of the hall, just below the cornice. Spaces had been left for the flags of those States having no emblems, and Indiana was found to be among this number. The want of a State banner induced Mrs. Gaar of Richmond, and Mrs. John N. Carey of Indianapolis, two of the delegates attending the congress, to procure a flag, displaying the coat of arms of the State, and to place it in the space allotted to Indiana, awaiting the time when the State should adopt a distinctive flag, and in a meeting of the Indiana delegates attending the congress, Mrs. Henry Beck, the State regent, appointed Mrs. John N. Carey the chairman of the committee to secure a suitable emblem.

Upon her return to Indiana, by means of the press, Mrs. Carey offered a prize of $100 to the person who should submit the best design for a State flag. Meantime, the campaign begun in Washington was carried on at two of the State meetings of the Indiana Daughters of the American Revolution and a State banner committee, consisting of Mrs. John N. Carey, chairman; Mrs. F. F. Hutchins; Mrs. Robert McBride; Mrs. B. C. Bennett; Mrs. Henry Beck, State regent; Mrs. M. A. Potter; Mrs. Charles Thompson, and Miss Ames was appointed to develop the idea, and to secure the adoption of a State flag symbolizing the history, valor, products, and activities of the past 100 years.

A formal notice was issued by the State banner committee stating that the Daughters of the American Revolution and certain other patriotic organizations had decided that it was wholly suitable and desirable, that the Indiana centennial observance should be lasting marked by the creation and adoption of an Indiana State banner, and inviting citizens of the State to compete in the creation of a fitting emblem. The interest displayed was Statewide and the response was most gratifying to the committee. Between two and three hundred designs were submitted.

At the close of the competition on October 1, 1916, the State banner committee called together the heads of all the patriotic societies of Indiana, and 11 votes were cast for the design finally adopted and 4 votes for the next most popular design. The committee selected three designs, which were submitted to Harry B. Smith, adjutant general of the State. General Smith called the prominent military men of the State into his office and requested them to pass judgment on the proposed designs, and the same flag which was preferred by the representatives of the patriotic societies was the one chosen by the majority of the military men. The design executed and submitted by Mr. Paul Hadley was the one finally adopted.

When the design had finally been adopted, it was submitted to the general assembly of 1917 for formal and official approval and adoption. The committee succeeded in obtaining the passage of the bill through the Senate by the efforts of Senator Harry E. Negley, of Marion County, whose committee added the word "Indiana" above the Indiana star, an amendment to which the committee of the Daughters of the American Revolution advanced no objections. The bill finally passed on the last night of the session.

The field of the banner is blue with 19 stars and a flaming torch in gold or buff; 13 stars are arranged in an outer circle and 5 stars in a half circle below the torch and inside the outer circle of stars; the nineteenth star which is appreciably larger than the others, is placed above the flame of the torch; the outer circle is so arranged that one star appears directly in the middle at the top of the circle; the word "Indiana" is placed in a half circle over and above the star representing Indiana.

The reasons for the choice of the banner which was finally selected were, first its symbolic significance. The torch in the center stands for liberty and enlightenment; the rays represent their far-reaching influence. The outer circle of 13 stars stands for the original 13 States. The inner half circle of five stars represents the five States which next entered the Union. The nineteenth star, appreciably larger than the others, and placed above the torch, stands for Indiana.

The second reason for the selection of this banner was because of the simplicity of the design, because it is a contrast to the Stars and Stripes, and because military men generally admire a blue banner.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by me at Sacramento, Calif., on February 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is no place where I should rather speak at an event that commemorates the birthday of Abraham Lincoln than here in California, which, beginning a century ago, has developed into one of the greatest of our States and today is second only to the Empire State itself in the number of its citizens.

Yours is an empire, too, and one whose long history is colorful and significant. California, in a sense, is a State of States, for here, drawn together by pride in your great riches of climate and fabulous resources of nature, and no less by friendly western good will, are the sons and daughters of every State in the Union. Here, at the gateway to the Orient, you who shared so magnificently in meeting the impact of World War II are perhaps more keenly conscious than many others of our fellow Americans of the historic mission of our country in the world today. Here, too, is to be found a spirit of initiative and enterprise, of love of freedom and of faith in the American way that are typical of our country at its best.

It is not surprising that from such an environment there should come to the United States Senate to represent you a young Senator as competent, courageous, and effective as Senator KNOWLAND. It is not surprising that at the head of your State government is a man such as Gov. Earl Warren, respected and beloved by the entire Nation for his proven leadership of California. You have elected him twice as governor of this great State and once the American people chose him as a candidate for one of the highest offices in this land. I know you will again elect him governor of California.

You also have as a citizen one of the most distinguished living Americans—Herbert Hoover. He selected as the one place he wished to call home, Stanford University at Palo Alto, the college community in this State where he was educated.

And as I think of all of those statesmen—all members of the party of Lincoln—I am mindful also of another young man, Congressman NIXON, whose persistence and determination to focus attention on certain dangerous influences in our Government started a train of events which recently came to a most shocking climax. Congressman NIXON should be elected to the United States Senate in this coming election. There is a need for courageous, fearless fighters for the American way of government. Congressman NIXON and his committee members spread a net that some people scoffed at, others condemned, calling the committee findings of disloyalty of former Government employees in high Government office nothing but a political red herring. It proved to be a red fish but not a political red herring that some distinguished politicians talked about almost too glibly in the 1948 presidential campaign.

I mention this specifically because I think that the curious and devious operations that have been disclosed, and, even more, the attitude that is taken toward these matters by persons in high places in our Government in Washington, reveal a complacency that is not in keeping either with our ideals or our security as a nation.

They certainly do not bespeak the ideals and integrity in public office that Abraham Lincoln displayed. All over this land there are events such as this Lincoln Day dinner in honor of the first man to be elected President of the United States on the Republican ticket. Abraham Lincoln, in a very true sense, belongs to all Americans and to all men of good will everywhere. I would not wish to detract from the universality of the homage paid him by referring to his leadership in a partisan or narrow sense of exclusive possession. It is rather in a spirit of rededication that Republicans pay tribute to him today as the honored leader who laid down the foundations of our party.

Lincoln symbolized the power, the dignity, and the sovereignty of the people, and he put into phrases that will last as long as the English language is spoken the deep aspirations of the American people for unity as a nation, for liberty as human beings, and for the achievement of "a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Therein is the challenge to the Republican Party: To make these aspirations live—for freedom and democracy, for unity and justice, for opportunity and growth. These—and not a so-called standard of living—are truly the American way.

A Republican Party that is steadfastly true to these ideals will deserve to live—and will live.

Now, what do these ideals mean in practical reality?

What do freedom and democracy mean in an age of cold war between the philosophy they represent of a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," and the Communist ideology and philosophy of government wherein man exists for the benefit of the state, where freedom of mind, the rights of man, and individual initiative do not exist?

What do unity and justice mean when translated into the complex problems of an atomic age?

What do opportunity and growth mean in a nation that has assumed historic obligations of world leadership as the United States found it must do immediately upon the close of the war—a leadership we must exercise the world over if a permanent and a lasting peace is to be achieved?

I want to say to you, ladies and gentlemen, that the very circumstances under which those questions are phrased—cold war, atomic age, world obligations—suggest that there are no easy answers. It will require men in public office with courage, loyalty without question to the United States, who will not play party politics in the selection of leaders in responsible positions.

The Republican Party has no easy answers to the complex questions of our day or any of the many related problems of the American people. Those who seek to enroll under a political banner that affords them an escape from reality will not find it here, for the party of Lincoln, in all honesty, must say to the American people: "These are your problems. They cannot be solved unless you are willing to think about them. Your representative government, which has endured for nearly two centuries, cannot be made to function effectively unless you are willing to shoulder your share of the responsibilities of citizenship. The American way cannot be preserved except by the same forces by which it was evolved—hard work, self-reliance, individual freedom, equality of opportunity, individual initiative, thrift, and prudence."

Those who would belong to a party which is all things to all men, whose policies are based, not upon the long-range needs of the future, but the immediate requirements to win the next election, and which promises all kinds of benefits to be paid out of what would seem to be an inexhaustible Federal Treasury, will not be at home in the Republican Party. Such a policy would lead this Nation down the road to socialism and eventual dictatorship, the road of many and many a nation in the past and which today is the experience of the great British Empire. Those who wish to play such politics must line up from the start with the party of which Santa Claus is the guiding spirit.

Those who imagine the Government owes them a living, must change not only their imaginations but the course of their thoughts. The great achievement of our industries and business has been on the basis of thrift, prudence, and economy and if the United States is to survive, thrift, economy, and a balanced budget in our National Government must be the keystone of our Government policy.

Now, there are a great number of people who think the Government can do everything, that it is a substitute for brains, thrift, and individual effort on the part of the people. They propose to abolish poverty by law; they are sincere in believing we can spend ourselves rich.

There are some projects such as reclamation, flood control, harnessing the mighty powers of the water for generating hydroelectric power that individuals cannot do alone. That type of Government activity is needed. It enriches this Nation by the developing of such resources and man is better served by such developments. In fact, it is the new frontier of this era. It takes the place for the American youth of the vast undeveloped areas this Nation offered only a half century ago. We must recognize there is a need for such developments in order that we may meet our expanding population and the expansion of our industrial enterprise of this Nation.

The Republican Party has recognized these needs and has supported and worked for their achievement. The Republican Party does not propose to turn back the clock on the economic and social gains that have been made in this country.

The Republican Party has been a vigorous and vigilant minority party even in the heyday of the New Deal. We still have a strong two-party system in this country, regardless of what those who are preoccupied with election statistics may undertake to prove to the contrary. The two-party system is an absolute necessity for the survival of this democracy. One political party stands as a check against the other. We, the Republicans, shall continue to fight that the freedom of man and individual initiative may survive by holding the Government only as a servant to the people, rather than a power over the people.

Now, I have said that the Republican Party has fulfilled the historic duty of the opposition party in our representative Government. It has been critical and it has served as a brake. It has often said, "Well, now, let's examine this thing on the basis of facts." These are necessary functions of the party out of power.

Nevertheless, before we relegate the GOP to a permanent place as the minority party, let's see who is in the minority. Take the last election. Mr. Truman was reelected President with a vote of 49.5 percent—less than half of the total popular vote. Governor Dewey received 45.1 percent. The rest went to the third and fourth party candidates. It would be a wonderful thing if the winning candidate had received the approval of 49.5 percent of the qualified voters. Understand, I have said qualified voters but only 51.9 percent of the qualified voters voted. I call this to your attention because you have a responsibility as citizens to urge everyone to register and to vote in an election. Oh, if this cherished privilege of voting were actually taken away from us in the United States for a short period of time, we would then realize and appreciate what a privilege we had as free citizens—the right to go to the polls in a free election and vote for the men and women whom we want to serve us in public office.

The figure I have given you will prove conclusively that the Fair Deal cannot claim a mandate, even if it allied itself with those who did not go to the polls. We might say that those who did not go to the polls were just a little too certain in the last election that the Republicans had it "hands down." Don't let that happen in another election. Fight for the right that was given you when this country was founded. It is the only way this Nation will survive as a Nation of free people.

The prophets of doom who have relegated the Republican Party to an untimely death are facing the same disappointment as their fellow travelers who have long predicted the collapse of the American system of free enterprise and free government.

We believe that it is time the American people took stock of themselves. What other nation has created a better standard of living? What other country possesses the resources, the ingenuity, the incentive that America possesses? Where, under what political system, have as great strides been made to gain not only political but economic equality? What has been achieved in this great country has been done by the American people and it has been done under a two-party political system.

There are those who would be perfectly willing to entrust our representative Government to one party, perpetuated in power over long periods of time. One wonders sometimes whether the present occupant of the White House does not consider his leadership as the No. 1 Democrat ahead of being President of the United States. Certainly the Vice President is a Democrat first. There is no other way to explain the extravagant claims of the Vice President of the United States that credit for the progressive achievements of the American people during the first half of this century belong exclusively to the Democratic Party. That view is narrow and partisan. It puts a premium on politics. It forgets the united efforts of the American people to conquer the depression, or the costly sacrifices they made together to win two world wars. It is a claim unworthy of a Vice President of the United States. The American people have repeatedly rejected such smug claims on the part of their leaders in the past. They will do so again.

But, meanwhile, we Republicans accept the Veep's challenge that only good resides in Democratic control of the Government, and that nothing constructive can be expected from the Republicans if elected to power. Let's take a quick look at the record.

It was a Republican Congress under a Republican President, Teddy Roosevelt, which passed the Reclamation Act of 1902 under which the Government of the United States undertook to champion the cause of irrigation by providing that irrigation works, beyond the easy reach of the ordinary cooperative methods, might be constructed with Federal funds. You in California know what this has meant in these 50 years since that act was passed.

And let me just add, in passing, that the Eightieth Congress—a Republican Congress—appropriated more money for reclamation and western development than any previous Congress in that half century.

When entrusted with power Republican Congresses and Republican administrations have done a great many other things for the benefit of the people during the first half of this century.

A Republican administration first made effective antitrust legislation, which has been called the Magna Carta of labor, agriculture, and industry.

A Republican administration, in 1903, established a Department of Commerce and Labor, which was divided 10 years later into two Departments of Cabinet rank.

A Republican administration launched the Panama Canal.

A Republican administration established the Postal Savings System.

A Republican Congress submitted the woman's suffrage amendment to the States.

A Republican administration adopted the Capper-Volstead Act to authorize the association of producers of agricultural products.

A Republican administration, in 1929, set up the Agricultural Marketing Act, a forerunner of modern agricultural legislation.

A Republican President, Herbert Hoover, recommended and obtained passage of the act establishing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, one of the most important agencies used to conquer the depression, and still a vital agency of the Government in protecting savings and credit and assisting small business.

A Republican President led in the formation of the Federal system of home-loan banks and of the agricultural credit banks.

Republican governors and Republican administrations in a majority of States of the Union have made constructive, progressive, and brilliant contributions in every field of governmental activity in this half century.

The last national presidential election was won by Mr. Truman partly on the basis of a wholly unwarranted attack upon the Eightieth Congress when, as a matter of record, that Congress achieved much in spite of hostility and resistance from the entrenched administration. Let's name just a few of the achievements in that short 2-year period:

The Eightieth Congress launched the European recovery program.

The Eightieth Congress authorized unification of the armed services.

The Eightieth Congress cut six billion from the padded Truman budget.

The Eightieth Congress balanced the budget for the first time in 16 years.

The Eightieth Congress reduced wartime income taxes and gave 70 percent of the tax savings to those in lower-income groups.

The Eightieth Congress created a bipartisan Government Reorganization Commission, later known as the Hoover Commission.

When we consider politics and government, let me say that the American people, in the long run, will determine the type of government and the kind of policies they want. The Republican Party welcomes that fact because it wants the people to mold its policies and to determine its future.

There are some politicians who think that anything goes with the American people and, unfortunately, they have sometimes been correct in that unflattering analysis. Yet, these things have a way of coming out of the deep freeze, so to speak.

Take this matter of peddling influence in the high councils of the Government. A recent report of the Senate investigations subcommittee speaks of the eventual triumph for public virtue by pointing out that the fundamental reason for the success of the 5-percenter was that he was permitted to operate in secret behind the scenes. As long as this condition was allowed to exist, the 5-percenter flourished. Once the 5-percenter is exposed to the light of day, he can no longer survive.

So we are reassured, after all, that not everything goes with all the people. We find

that Lincoln was right when he said, "You can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time." I would just add the thought that if our people have access to the facts, you can't fool them for long, either on domestic matters or foreign policy.

As a matter of fact, we have recently had good reason to be concerned over commitments made in the international field without thorough understanding on the part of the American people or of Congress. Our Government participated in international conferences of great moment—at Yalta, at Potsdam, at other far places—but they were not open negotiations and some secret decisions were reached. We are still not certain what some of those agreements were, but we do know that they opened a whole world of difficult problems, on the continent of Europe, in the Near East, and most tragically of all, in the downfall or collapse of our once honored ally in war, Nationalist China.

Such conferences, in which our Government officials conferred in secrecy and inn which the American people did not participate through their Representatives in Congress, were not intended by the founding fathers. I doubt whether such an able leader as Senator VANDENBERG, had he been consulted, would have approved a situation where Berlin is permitted to sit virtually as an island, surrounded by Russian-controlled territory in Germany, where an air lift became a necessity for the allies to supply their sector in Berlin. I doubt if he or any other able congressional leaders would have tolerated the development of a similar situation in Austria where the Russians have delayed a peace treaty and where the great city of Vienna is completely surrounded by Soviet-held and Soviet-controlled territory.

Appeasement of the Soviet Government, so evident in all of these matters—in Manchuria, in China, in Germany, and Austria—is shocking enough when we realize what has taken place and how it has complicated the whole problem of world peace. It becomes even more shocking when we learn that a keyman who stood at the elbow of our President at Yalta, advising him on Russian and far eastern affair, since has been publicly convicted of being a fellow traveler of the Communists, if not worse.

We face a most critical situation with relation to China. It is obvious that we have not shown the same decisive, courageous attitude toward the problems in China that we showed in the defiance of Russia in our Berlin air lift and in our positive action in the European recovery program as well as the Atlantic Pact. I am not passing judgment on what we have done in China and what we are doing in Formosa except to say that the situation is not reassuring. We cannot desert our Government as it deals with these matters, but we have reason to be thankful, nevertheless, that we have in the Senate of the United States a vigilant Republican minority that wants to know what is going on and why.

There is need for a bipartisan foreign policy. The world problems are so perplexing, there is so much dependent upon the United States in world leadership, that we must stand united, we cannot be divided. We cannot be united unless the American people really know and understand our foreign policy. For that reason I say to the present administration, if it asks for a bipartisan attitude toward foreign relations, it must be a two-way avenue. They must be frank and honest with the minority on the foreign questions. The policy must be open to legitimate criticism. All questions must be open to intelligent debate to afford the American people an understanding of the problem. This is not an easy way, but it is the American way.

In much of the history of our representative government as it is written in the utterances of our political leaders, considerable stress is laid on such words as frugality, thrift, and economy, to say nothing of a shockingly reactionary phrase, "balanced budget." But in these days when the conservatives are in the "dog house," some new and shall we say foreign theories of fiscal policy have come into being, and with them the same cynical idea that anything goes. It reaches its climax in such slogans as "spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect."

Ten years ago Federal Government expenditures amounted to about $69 for each man, woman, and child in the country. In the fiscal year 1951 the per capita expenditure is estimated at more than four times that amount, or $278.

With this vast expenditure, amounting in total to an estimated $42,400,000,000 during the coming fiscal year, our Government has embarked on a policy of deficit financing. It is estimated that the deficit will be $5,100,000,000 next year; it is $5,500,000,000 for this year; it was $1,800,000,000 last year. Those figures, the amounts we are running behind year after year, represent a lot of money. They represent, also, a wholly unsound approach to Government fiscal policies in times of peace, and full production and plenty.

That question is one that must be weighed by everyone whether he be the man toiling in the shop, factory, or processing plant, the man classified as the white-collar worker, the executive who heads one of the great corporations of the land, or the corner merchant. Everyone must recognize that we cannot indefinitely spend more than we take in without passing on to our children financial burdens that they will not be able to carry. We cannot continue a free-enterprise system when we spend more than the revenue from sound taxation. Nor can we tax people too much and still have venture capital to create new businesses and expand present businesses, thereby creating the jobs that men and women are constantly seeking as a means of providing their own security. There would be no incentive for a man to work if he knew that it would all be taken from him in the form of taxation, either by inheritance taxes or the year-to-year taxes.

The best answer I can find to deficit financing is just to think of it in terms of a family budget. The credit of the family depends chiefly on whether the family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation.

Our own course of deficit spending is not sound and it is our children who will be asked to carry the financial burdens in the future years.

The Republican Party stands for a sound program of Government financing. This means reducing the cost of government, staying within our income, and paying off our debt.

We advocate a program for agriculture that will give the producer necessary protection with a minimum of regulation and regimentation. We urge a program for labor and management that will assure fairness and balance in their relationship, with the Government an umpire and not a punitive agent.

In the field of social security and welfare, we intend to preserve and strengthen the gains that have been achieved as we have developed enlightened and humane policies, but we are vigorously opposed to radical experiments such as socialized medicine as advocated by Oscar Ewing and his associates.

We are determined to make this a Nation economically strong and productive, a Nation where civil rights and equal opportunity are confirmed in experience and not merely promised to catch votes, a Nation where national security and internal justice are commonplace and not virtues merely to be extolled by public speakers. These things we shall try to do for all, and not for one class arrayed against another class, or one group promoted at the expense of another group.

We propose to make secure and lasting the peace which was bought by such a costly sacrifice of American youth on battlefields of a global war, and by the vast investment of the productive capacity of our people. We shall do this by sustaining the European recovery program, implementing the North Atlantic Treaty, strengthening the United Nations, and revitalizing our far eastern policy, knowing that unless we go forward with courage and determination in these matters we may find that, by waiting until the dust clears, what we have to offer has become too little and too late.

Above all, the Republican Party stands for freedom of the individual, freedom of enterprise and initiative, and freedom from the evils of too great dependence upon Government.

With this challenge and this opportunity, let us, then, in the spirit of Lincoln, dedicate ourselves and our party to the proposition "that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

"Old Order Passeth"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter entitled "Old Order Passeth," written to the editor by Ed Wimmer, of Cincinnati, and published in the Cincinnati Enquirer of January 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

READERS' VIEWS

"OLD ORDER PASSETH"

To the EDITOR OF THE ENQUIRER:

I have just read your lead editorial of December 27 entitled "The Old Order Passeth." I write to congratulate you, not only on the soundness of this one editorial, but to express my appreciation of the many other excellent declarations of faith which have preceded it.

It is too bad that more people do not turn to the editorial page instead of so often to the news and comic strips.

In this editorial you rightly criticize the present tendency of the Federal Government to "graduate income taxes so steeply as to make it impossible for an individual to withhold any sizable amount of his earnings." You deplore this tendency on the part of the tax gatherers as one which not only deprives the individual of his just earnings, but which will in the near future tend to shut off private endowments to community projects, research foundations, universities, or other institutions.

The time has come when all thinking Americans should join in such a protest as you have voiced. This leveling off idea was the beginning of the end of freedom in other nations, and if continued in this country not only the wealthy but all individuals will be paying their surplus earnings into the Federal Treasury and be dependent upon the Federal Government for everything above basic requirements.

We all know that in many instances that wealth is unduly accumulated, but the present policy is almost wholly opposed to the idea that the essence of private security is the right to earn and save more than one may actually need, and then to put such savings to productive use. Viewing the present scene one might well inquire, "Who will defend liberty and democracy when the thrifty have been wiped out with too much care of the unthrifty?"

All around us is a changing of governments due to collapsing economies, and the only reason that we have not gone down and under with the rest is our faith in the Jeffersonian principle of "proper reward for effort expended."

The only thing that will open up the Golden Age now beckoning to us is a rebirth of self-reliance, self-determination, individual, competitive enterprise, and a rededication of ourselves to the preservation of self-government.

If the "old order passeth," in which men are rewarded according to their worth, the fault will not be that of the Federal Government, but rather will it rest with those citizens who are so willingly yielding their personal liberties in exchange for the subsidies and false security which a government can promise, but which no government can continue to deliver.

ED WILMER.

CINCINNATI.

Fantastic Lustron Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fantastic Lustron Case," published in the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FANTASTIC LUSTRON CASE

Carl G. Strandlund, representing a Chicago company in the business of building filling stations, traveled to Washington in 1946.

He wanted priorities for a little steel, then so scarce that the Government officials would let him have none for filling stations.

But Government housing expediters gave him a new idea. Maybe he could mass produce prefabricated steel houses. If so, they'd get him steel.

Prefab housing was a field strange to Mr. Strandlund. He would need capital to venture into it and he could afford to risk only $1,000 of his own money. But the housing expediters had an answer for that problem—the Government's Reconstruction Finance Corporation had plenty of money.

So Mr. Strandlund organized the Lustron Corp., and leased, for $425,000 a year, a Government-owned former war plant at Columbus, Ohio. And, from the White House, Presidential Assistant John R. Steelman wrote a letter urging the RFC to make a loan to Lustron.

The first RFC loan, $15,000,000, was granted June 30, 1947. A year later Mr. Strandlund needed, and got, ten millions more. Four months later he needed and got, seven millions more. Thereafter he needed, and got, five millions more, bringing his total borrowings from the RFC to $37,500,000.

Lustron started line production of prefab houses in June 1949. Since then it has been able to produce and sell fewer than 2,000 of them. Cost to the purchaser, including a lot, has ranged from $10,000 to $14,000.

It has not been able to repay any part of the $37,500,000 owed to the RFC. Nor, in recent months, has Mr. Strandlund been able to convince the RFC that he can make a go of the venture if only the RFC will lend him some more millions.

Now the RFC has decided to foreclose on its Lustron loans, with small chance of ever recovering more than a few cents on the dollar.

Well, of course, it's only money that the RFC will lose. But part of it happens to be your money, taken from you in Federal taxes.

So perhaps you'll agree with Congressman ALBERT M. COLE, of Kansas, that here is a sorry example of what happens when the Government goes into business and makes decisions on the basis of politics, favoritism, and wire-pulling.

You will, we hope, want to add your voice to the demands for a congressional investigation of the Lustron affair and of other RFC lending activities.

And we may conclude, as we do, that Congress should call a halt on bureaucrats who risk the people's money in ventures which most of the people, if they had any say about it, would not undertake.

Segregation in the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the fight which I have been waging to eliminate all segregation from the Army, there is appended hereto a factual news report which illustrates again that given the same opportunity American troops will respond to proper training regardless of their race, creed, or color:

[From the New York Times]

ARMY FINDS NEGRO EXCELLENT PUPIL—THOUSANDS TRAINED AT SCHOOL IN GERMANY SHOW APTITUDE FOR BECOMING LEADERS

KITZINGEN, GERMANY, February 12.—The United States Army is turning thousands of Negro soldiers into top-notch fighting men at a base, once a German air force installation, on the outskirts of this old Bavarian city.

At Kitzingen Training Center, the largest Army school in the European command, a student body of about 1,900 men goes through concentrated academic, military, and character-building courses that raise educational levels and provide the students with a better understanding of military tactics and methods.

According to Col. Henry C. Newton, of Los Angeles, commandant of the center, the Negro students, whose ages range from 19 to 35, have demonstrated a remarkable talent for grasping knowledge and have shown a high potential for becoming military leaders.

Failures among the soldier students have been below 10 percent. At the end of 1949 more than 13,000 men had been graduated from the center with diplomas.

"These men will be a great asset to the Army," Colonel Newton said.

Asserting his belief in academic training for soldiers, Colonel Newton explained:

"Our Army is airborne and highly mechanized. Our men must know mechanics, understand orders, and have a thorough knowledge of maps and terrain. To an educated man these things come easier. That is why we have undertaken this program for Negroes who now comprise 10 percent of our strength in the European Command."

The training center here has a faculty of 70 instructors, both white and Negro. The curriculum is divided into three categories: General subjects, motors, and weapons. The academic instruction begins with basic education for men of less than fifth grade educations.

By means of careful screening, new testing methods and improved classroom instruction the basic-level group has been nearly eliminated.

The program also includes an 8-week development course for noncommissioned officers designed to strengthen qualities of leadership and initiative; an 8-week education instructors' training course planned to orient and instrument special personnel as teachers for the Army's regular educational program; a 1-month orientation course for new personnel; and a 4-week education refresher course to supplement and continue the training of educational instructors.

The center covers a wide area. It has rifle and pistol ranges, training fields, and 49 modern buildings including 11 dormitories, school buildings, and recreation centers. There is a well equipped library, a good gymnasium, bowling alleys, game rooms, club rooms, stores, and a moving-picture theater.

Stalin's Stooges Left Imprint on American Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Stalin's Stooges Left Imprint on American Policy," published in the February 25, 1950, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. The editorial is not only thought-provoking, but it calls to our attention things which have happened in the past, which may have a very serious imprint and effect upon our Government, not only for the present, but the future.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STALIN'S STOOGES LEFT IMPRINT ON AMERICAN POLICY

The turmoil caused by Secretary of State Acheson's citation of scriptural authority for visiting Alger Hiss in prison or even out on bail may have been a little overdone. After all, the Christian admonition does not limit such attentions to prisoners who have been acquitted. The fuss tended to obscure the main question, which is: What was the impact on American foreign and domestic policy of the presence in the Government of Alger Hiss and others who believed as he did? In the future annals of our history, it is certain that stolen documents will play a part less important than the ability of Communists and fellow travelers in Government posts to point American policy in directions favorable to Moscow. A memorandum here, a "minute" to a state paper there, perhaps slanting information necessary for decisions at the "policy-making level"—these will be seen to be the real reasons why Communists and fellow travelers were spotted in strategic positions throughout the administration.

Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, in a well-documented address to his colleagues, did something to keep current thinking on the right track. Going back over American postwar foreign policy, Senator MUNDT pointed out that Alger Hiss had received key behind-the-scenes assignments at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference; at Yalta, where we lost to Russia the war we had just won from Japan; and at San Francisco, where were laid the legalistic foundations for Soviet sabotage of the United Nations. At Yalta, Senator MUNDT points out on the authority of the late Ed Stettinius, then Secretary of State, Hiss continually expanded his functions so that at one point he was the sole United States representative on the committee which recommended giving Russia three votes in the UN Assembly to America's one. He was also called in to do the legal work on the Yalta decision on the Polish boundary dispute.

These official activities may mean much or little, but they provide fascinating material for speculation, perhaps for investigation as well. Certainly more damage to the cause of free peoples was accomplished through these conferences than by any secret papers our fellow-traveler friends managed to slip to Elizabeth Bentley or Whittaker Chambers. For example, Harry Dexter White, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who died before the House Un-American Activities Committee could go to town on him, is understood to be the real author of the so-called Morgenthau plan for the pastoralizing of Germany. White, in some mysterious fashion, acquired enormous influence on our German policy, theoretically administered by the State Department and the Army of Occupation. White's minions in Germany succeeded in postponing any constructive recovery program for Germany and are therefore in no small degree responsible for the expansion of Soviet prestige among the Germans. These characters managed to survive long after our policy toward Germany had changed. Upon being sent back home, some of them carried on their pro-Communist activities by explaining to liberals that General Clay or Commissioner McCloy or both were reviving nazism and cartels in order to promote an attack on Russia in world war III.

Who had the bright idea that Dexter White should step out from his job in the Treasury to take on the diplomatic task of forming American policy on Germany? Why wasn't his leftist attitude suspected by those who made the appointment? Or was White's point of view supposed to qualify him for such responsibilities? According to the Un-American Activities Committee, the purpose of the Red apparatus was not primarily espionage, but Communist infiltration of the American Government—the subordination of American policy to Russian purposes. Therefore, a probe of this infiltration should be as profitable as the investigation of espionage proved to be.

The justification for this curiosity is that the primary purpose of Red infiltration through innocents, fellow travelers and actual agents was largely achieved. On the vital issues presented by the war, we let Stalin write his own ticket. We consider ourselves bound by these disadvantageous agreements. If it can be shown that all or any of them were the result of the labors of Communist agents spotted among the stuffed shirts at international conferences, the world might as well know the facts.

The American Congress and people should know the facts, too, if only for use in detecting and ridding our services of remaining subversive influences. The truth about Red impact on American policy will also prove useful when and if our one-sided effort to play ball with Russia becomes impossible, and we decide to claim a foul.

Bankruptcy Results in Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bankruptcy Results in Dictatorship," written by Hassil E. Schenck, president, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., and published in the Hoosier Farmer, February 1950 edition.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANKRUPTCY RESULTS IN DICTATORSHIP

(By Hassil E. Schenck, president, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.)

With the Eighty-first Congress again in session and with a great multiplicity of issues to be considered, there are a few which stand out as of utmost importance because they indicate trends which will influence the destinies of men in this Nation and probably in the world.

One of these is the matter of deficit financing. Many sound businesses resort to deficit financing on occasions. Sound government may well do likewise. No sound business, however, can continuously go in the red and stay in business. It will eventually go into receivership and be liquidated. When receivership takes over any corporate business, democracy ends so far as that particular business is concerned and dictatorship takes over. The stockholders no longer have a voice—the trustee in receivership, under the direction of the courts, issues the ultimatums. History bears out the fact that if governments approach insolvency the roads are paved for dictatorship.

JUST TWO BALANCED BUDGETS

Our Nation went into deficit financing in the latter part of the Hoover administration. We have had, from that day to this, just 2 years in which the budget was balanced and with slight reductions in the Federal debt. Those were the fiscal years ending in 1947 and 1948, with 1949 finding us back in the red again and with 1950 indicating a deficit of some $6,000,000,000.

Bear in mind that today our Federal debt is at the $257,000,000,000 level and also remember that in the middle thirties there was a congressional limit of $30,000,000,000 beyond which it was considered economically unsound for this country to plunge into debt. Our debt is now over eight and one-half times what 15 years ago was regarded by economists as the maximum debt which this country could stand. The Eighty-first and possibly Eighty-second Congresses will determine future fiscal policies, which will affect the everyday lives of our citizens.

An aroused citizenship can make its sentiments felt through the proper organized channels. With the farmers, this is through Farm Bureau.

NO SUCH ANIMAL

We seem to be living in an age when people want something for nothing. There just "ain't no such animal." Everything the public gets from the Government not only costs somebody, but it also costs additional for administration and interest on accumulated debts. No dollar can ever get to Washington and back without considerable leakage.

This, and/or the next Congress, will determine whether the farmer's security is to be subject to Government appropriations with Government control over what a farmer plants and markets and with Government regimentation of all handlers, processors, and distributors of food products, or whether we shall have a broad program with a minimum of regimentation, a maximum of personal liberties, and a guaranty to the farmers of an equitable income with an absolute minimum of subsidization. The latter can and should be effected.

GOVERNMENT MONEY IS AN ISSUE

Still another issue that will be determined is whether or not moneys shall be raised by Government from the taxpayers of our country to pay for hospitalization and medical care of our people. England is experiencing this now, and indications are that it is much to their sorrow. Government has some definite responsibilities to see that hospitals and/or medical centers under local controls are available in sufficient numbers and size to meet the actual needs of the various areas. Available local resources should be used wherever possible and in every instance Federal appropriations should be matched with local funds.

In recent decisions by the electorates of New Zealand and Australia, socialistic trends were definitely reversed. All the world has an eye on England to see what will happen in the weeks ahead. In the meantime every citizen in America should be thinking most seriously whether or not we should break away from precedents which have made our country the most independent, the most unselfish, the most powerful, the most resourceful nation in all the world, or whether we should pattern after those countries which are right now looking to us for help to prevent their economic collapse.

Liberty in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Wednesday evening, February 22, I made an address at the thirtieth anniversary dinner of the American Civil Liberties Union in New York City. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert this speech entitled "Liberty in Crisis," which proposes a point 4 program for human rights, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERTY IN CRISIS—A POINT 4 PROGRAM FOR HUMAN RIGHTS—AN ANALYSIS OF LIBERTY'S ROLE IN THE WORLD CONFLICT

We are gathered here tonight to do honor to a great captain in the unending battle for human rights. Roger Baldwin has fought all his life, to secure for his countrymen the full exercise of those rights. But I was told beforehand that Roger Baldwin wished tonight to be honored by a discussion of civil liberty rather than of Roger Baldwin. So, it is to do him not less but more honor that I turn attention from Roger Baldwin's personal achievements of the past to the problem which confronts him and all of us today—the problem of civil liberty in its international and world aspects.

Not only civil liberty but all liberty stands in serious peril as a result of the forces which face us in the world today. If we succumb in the current struggle against these forces, the lamp of freedom may be extinguished for us and for our children, and for generations to come. But the threat is not one of aggression alone. Is it were only that simple! Liberty faces a triple threat—aggression from without, subversion from within, and finally self-destruction. In our efforts to ward off the first two dangers, we must not yield to the third. We can lose our liberties by denying them gradually to our own people, as surely as by surrendering them suddenly to an enemy.

This is the first paradox we face in a world torn by struggle and conflict. But this paradox is not as simple as it sounds. In order to uphold liberty in a world of clashing ideologies, our first concern must be to guard and maintain liberty at home. How else can we urge the blessings of liberty upon other peoples? But how can we prevent the enemies of freedom in our own country from using that very freedom to destroy it for the rest of us? In this question lies the riddle of 1950. That riddle has not yet been wholly solved. Any solution contains some elements of danger. But one fact we know from history, and that is this: Freedom is indivisible. To deny it unjustly or arbitrarily to some is to endanger it for us all.

We must bear in mind that the Kremlin is well aware of this inner paradox of democracy and is quick to remind us of it and to aggravate it. Nothing would suit the purposes of the Politburo more than the crumbling away of political freedom in America. Anything which the enemies of democracy can do to excite us into hasty and repressive action is marked as a success in Moscow.

But this is only the first problem which we face. Another, and perhaps an equally serious one, is the fact that all Americans do not have the same value in mind when they speak of liberty. We do not all mean the same thing when we speak of tyranny.

Almost a hundred years ago an American statesman said: "The world has never had a good definition of liberty. * * * We all declare for liberty, but we do not all mean the same thing. With some, the word 'liberty' may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself and the product of his labor; while with others the same word may mean for some men to do as they please with other men and with the product of other men's labor."

The man who gave this definition of the problem of his day was Abraham Lincoln in a speech at Baltimore in 1864. The problem of 1860 is still with us. But today it is even more pressing than it was a century ago. Today the belief held by some few Americans that liberty is the right to exploit, regardless of the rights of those exploited, makes it all the more difficult for America to convince other peoples that our kind of liberty is a cause worth fighting and struggling for.

And finally, we come to the third and most difficult of the problems of liberty, the denial of full equality and rights to some of our citizens because of their race, religion, or national origin. Every such denial of equality in this country, every such denial of political, economic, or social rights is being magnified abroad today as a cynical contradiction of our professed claims of freedom and justice. And honest men must admit that these denials are hard to explain to foreigners who hear us describe our country as the homeland of liberty and equality.

These inequalities and discriminations exist in our country by virtue of law in some cases, but in most cases by custom. The most obvious of these discriminations and inequalities are those against American citizens of Negro race. And I say to you tonight, as I have said again and again, that this shame, this blot upon our national honor furnishes ammunition to our enemies more deadly than bullets and shells.

Of course, we must not be discouraged by these circumstances into feeling that we have no right or duty to preach liberty to the world. The fact is that we are pressing forward, with full vigor, to eradicate the cancer of discrimination and inequality from the national body politic. The policy of our Government in this field is clear and determined.

We are holding out to the world an ideal which even some of our own people do not completely understand. But great things have been wrought in this world, and they have been wrought by imperfect men and women, and by imperfect nations. We need to be truly shamed by our failures only on the day we cease to struggle for liberty and equality at home. While we continue our efforts to expand the rights and freedoms of all our citizens, we must offer our energies in the struggle to bring rights and freedoms to all mankind.

But how is this to be done? There are 2,250,000,000 people in the world. It is true that the vast majority are not Communist. But neither are they prodemocratic. The fact is that they are uncommitted. Today they hear the siren song of the Kremlin and of other advocates of totalitarianism. Communism does not promise these people personal liberty. But communism does promise—however falsely—food, equality, and security.

Can we promise less? Or should we promise more? Of course, there are some among us who would have us stand only on the atom and hydrogen bombs, and on naked military power. Certainly it is necessary that we be militarily strong and powerful. But military power is not enough. Through single dependence on military might, we might avoid attack, but we would inevitably invite being isolated and engulfed. I believe that we must offer, in addition, a positive program to the peoples of the world.

I believe that we must acknowledge and take into account the desire of these peoples for economic security. It is a tragic fact of history that if men cannot have both freedom and economic security, they will often surrender freedom, or abandon the search for it, in the false and wistful hope of winning economic security. We must advocate both freedom and security. We must make our technology and mechanical know-how available to other peoples so that their dream of security may be truly attainable.

I believe that we must stand for food, for housing, and for the ordinary comforts of living for all men. I do not mean that we should undertake to support the rest of the world. Obviously we cannot. But we can and must engage in a cooperative undertaking with all other nations to help them raise their standard of living.

Finally, and above all, we should stand for liberty—for the right of every man and woman to think freely, to worship freely, and to live freely—free of the fear of economic as well as political and religious oppression.

This is my formula. It is, indeed, a general one. How are we to implement it? It must be implemented by more than words. It must be implemented by action.

That action can be undertaken on three separate but closely related fronts.

We have the Marshall plan. It is a good plan, and must be carried through to its completion. We have given, and are continuing to give, great amounts of food and other aid through which many millions of people have been and are being saved from starvation. We must continue that program on a sound, sensible but not extravagant basis.

More recently, we have conceived the point 4 program. This is an even more dynamic project. I have great hopes for it. Through it, we can carry on the work of helping peoples to help themselves. Through it our vast and almost unlimited store of knowledge can be shared with other nations and peoples. Through that knowledge the nations may find the tools, each people in its own way, to build a better economic life. In the wake of this program, investment will flow. In its aftermath, economic strength will develop.

And finally, liberty. It is axiomatic that peace, plenty, and security are empty values without liberty. But only exceptional individuals will continue to fight for liberty in the face of hunger and total economic insecurity. This is a fact we must face, but without discouragement. And so I propose tonight that we launch a point 4 program for human rights, in close association with our point 4 program for economic betterment. Let America lead the way in espousing freedom for oppressed peoples everywhere, and I mean everywhere, whether it be behind or in front of the iron curtain. Let America lead the way in espousing the cause of both freedom and plenty, of liberty and security. And let America show the way by strengthening and expanding democracy and equality here at home.

This is my challenge to you here tonight, and to all Americans. It is my challenge to the Roger Baldwins everywhere. I have deep faith in mankind's ultimate ability to contain the terrible forces which have been loosed among us. I shall never abandon the hope that freedom and security for all peoples is an attainable goal. It is a goal that may not be fully attained in my time, but it must come, lest we perish from the earth.

Costs of Election in the United States and Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with election expenditures and revenues in this country and in England, by Gould Lincoln, from the Evening Star of last night.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES ELECTION COSTS ARE STILL VERY HIGH—COMPARISON MADE WITH BRITISH EXPENDITURES

(By Gould Lincoln)

The high cost of elections in the United States has periodically been the subject of attack. The various corrupt practices acts, including the Hatch Act—the most recent of the statutes—may have put a check on these ever-mounting expenditures in political campaigns, but the cost of a national election is still tremendously high. Compare it, for example, to the cost of a national election campaign in England—which has just taken place.

Under the strict British election laws, one political party with a candidate for each of the 625 seats in the House of Commons is limited to $1,087,500 for campaign purposes. This is made up as follows: Each candidate in a constituency, whether county or borough may spend £450, about $1,260, plus about 1 cent for each registered voter. If 30,000,000 are registered voters, then it adds approximately $300,000 to the sum of 625 times $1,260. Treble the total and you have about $3,000,000, and probably far less was spent.

Take a look at the reported expenditures reported by 144 organizations participating in the 1948 national campaign in the United States. The total was $13,563,876. These reports came from the political committees of all parties with candidates in the field and from labor groups and other groups such as the Americans for Democratic Action. These are reports of committees. Individual expenditures, it is believed, run the total election costs much, much higher.

CHARGES LOOK SILLY

Although President Truman, like his predecessor, Franklin D. Roosevelt, has sought constantly to pin the label of "special interests"—wealthy interests—on the Republican Party, an examination of the contributions made by the so-called "fat cats" to the GOP and to the Democratic Party makes such charges look silly.

A recent and exhaustive survey of political contributions, made by Congressional Quarterly, shows that these fat cats are warming themselves in the Democratic corner. In the off year, 1949—when only a few State-wide elections and a handful of congressional elections to fill vacancies were held—contributions reported by the Democratic committees totaled $1,477,427, and by the Republican committees, $661,804.

The big contributors, too, were on the Democratic side, overwhelmingly. For contributions of $1,000 or more made up about one-sixth of the total intake of money by the Republicans and about one-third of the total intake by the Democrats. The list of these big contributors to the Democratic Party showed the names of many industrialists as well as of some of the wealthy members of the diplomatic corps. And the Democratic list made the Republican list puny by comparison.

MANY BIG CONTRIBUTIONS

Why do these people of wealth now contribute to war chests of the Democratic Party? Is it for favors they hope to receive from an administration that is doing billions of dollars worth of business? Is it because of fear of a shake-down? Or is it just for love of the Democratic Party and President Truman? There were 200 contributions by individuals ranging from $1,000 to $5,000 each, made to the Democratic National Committee.

During 1949, the expenditures by the political committees, especially the Democratic and Republican National Committees, were largely for the maintenance of their party headquarters and staff—now permanent, all the year round organizations of considerable size. With a congressional election coming up this year, the contributions and expenditures for the campaign will be tremendously increased. The labor groups have promised to spend millions to defeat Senator TAFT, of Ohio, and other Members of Congress who have incurred their wrath.

Byrd Joins GOP Attack on Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "BYRD JOINS GOP ATTACK ON TRUMAN," written by Edward T. Folliard, and published in the Washington Post of February 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BYRD JOINS GOP ATTACK ON TRUMAN—VIEWS GIVEN IN PARTY SPEECH ADD "INSULT TO INJURY," HE SAYS

(By Edward T. Folliard)

Republicans struck back yesterday at President Truman for his Jefferson-Jackson Day speech but the most vehement retort came from a member of his own party—Senator BYRD, Democrat, Virginia.

BYRD took up Mr. Truman's statement that the Republican slogan, "Liberty against socialism," was an insult to the intelligence of the American people, and said:

"If it is an insult to the intelligence of the American people to say that we are on the road to socialism, as the President 'cracked' last night, then the insult is added to the injury already done our intellect by Truman proposals and propaganda.

"We have been moving steadily down this primrose path for some time, but we shall be irrevocably committed to socialism—from which there is no retreat once it is entrenched—if Congress adopts but three more of the President's projects."

Senator BYRD, who was not one of those who paid $100 to attend the Jefferson-Jackson dinner, listed the three as follows:

"Socialized medicine (British brand)—the project assigned to Oscar Ewing, who was sent to England at public expense to get the 'low down' as a basis for his propaganda.

"Socialized agriculture—called the Brannan plan, after its propagandists of the same name—which would give the Federal Government control over the sale and distribution of food, despite fundamental opposition by the great farmers' organizations.

"Extension of socialized housing—the project long ago adopted by Propagandist Keyserling, who plugs his wares in reports of the Council of Economic Advisers."

MENACE WITH TAFT PROPOSED

"Add to these the President's public embrace of chronic deficit spending and you have a nonstop, high-speed highway to socialism, with or without an insulted intelligence."

Representative WOODRUFF, Republican, Michigan, proposed that President Truman and Senator TAFT, Republican, Ohio, debate the issues of 1950 from a platform in TAFT's home State. He was prompted to make the suggestion by Mr. Truman's announcement that he would campaign in Ohio this fall.

Said WOODRUFF:

"I would like to hear, and the people of the Nation would like to hear Senator TAFT and Mr. Truman debate publicly on the trend to socialism, the mounting costs of Federal Government, the entire lack of economy in Government, and the ever-increasing tax burden on the people. I feel sure that Senator TAFT would be delighted to meet the President on the hustings."

BROWN FOUND TRUMAN AMUSING

Representative BROWN, Republican, Ohio, had this to say about President Truman's speech:

"I was amused by Mr. Truman calling the Republican Party a cuttlefish squirting out black ink to confuse national issues. I prefer the black ink of a Republican cuttlefish to his red herring and the red ink in which it writes its deficits."

Representative CURTIS, Republican, Nebraska, said Mr. Truman once more "has proved he is a prisoner of the irresponsible, left-wing spendthrift groups—predominantly CIO—in our country."

Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, Democratic leader of the Senate, said Mr. Truman's speech was an excellent answer to the Republicans' "phony slogan, 'Liberty against socialism.'"

"It seemed to me," Lucas added, "the President gave that phrase a complete knockout. I predict that before long they will be talking about some other slogan."

Appraisal of Military Defenses of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from this week's issue of Life magazine, which every Member of Congress and every American should read.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATURE OF THE ESSAY

This week Life appraises the military defenses of the United States in the light of the military capacity of the Soviet Union. This appraisal is undertaken in a awareness that the problem of United States defense is not entirely a military problem. The American people could make no worse mistake than to assume that there is safety in military defense alone, however massive and costly the defense may become.

Then why undertake such an appraisal?

First, although there is no sure safety in military defense alone, there is sure ruin in any miscalculation or neglect of military defense.

Second, the wisdom and adequacy with which the officials who are in charge of United States policy calculate the defense necessities of the time provide a measure of the wisdom and adequacy with which they calculate the total necessities of the time.

The net showing of our report is that the defense necessities of the United States have

been avoidably underestimated by the President, by his Secretary of Defense and (to the extent that they have participated in final policy decisions) by the chiefs of the military services. Not in extenuation of these officials but to indicate the scale of the turn-about in attitudes and policy now required, this must be added:

The official estimate of United States defense necessities has on the whole been welcomed by the United States Congress, the public, and the press. The dominant device has been to let the postwar economy run its course toward full civilian abundance. Most everybody had come to realize that the United States was in something called the world conflict, that the conflict might even be called a kind of war and that a certain amount of dollars and goods had to be put up for the fight against communism, which most everybody had come to detest. But hardly anybody really thought that the United States was really in a real war, a war for survival that might cut into the civilian economy and take more out of it than the United States has as yet been willing to pony up.

Now, chunk by chunk, the walls of illusion are falling away.

COMMUNISM AND THE OFFICIAL MIND

Some of the facts confronting the United States and all mankind are terrible, adding up to the single, elemental fact that Soviet communism is committed to the destruction of the free world. This elemental fact is still not accepted, not in its entirety and not in its full meaning, by millions who think in one corner of their minds that they do perceive the innermost fact of the Communist enemy but with another corner of their minds decline to accept and act upon its full implications of the fact. This is literally true of all too many of the men who mold and execute western thought and policy.

Consider Dean Acheson, the United States Secretary of State. He recognizes more and more of the separate facts of the conflict, but he still shrinks from the final fact. On February 8 Mr. Acheson said in a carefully considered statement that the Soviet system "is incompatible with a world situation which is based on peace" and concluded that only agreements based on the facts of power mean anything. So far so good—the statement was a decided advance on anything Mr. Acheson or any other administration spokesman had said previously. Yet Mr. Acheson, speaking of the achievement of peace, seemed to assume (as he has always assumed) a point at which accommodation if not formal agreement with Soviet communism would be possible.

NOW THERE IS NO TIME FOR LEARNING

Or consider Mr. Acheson's boss and admirer, President Truman. In an authorized interview with the New York Times the President said last week that he had given up any hope of meaningful agreement with the Soviet Union some years ago (although he has been talking confidently of getting over-all agreement within the past year). He said that in 1948 he wanted to send Chief Justice Fred Vinson to Moscow to "straighten out Stalin" and would have done so if the campaign had not been on. He indicated that he still has this in mind to do "some time." He also said (as paraphrased by the Times). "The real trouble with the Russians is that they are still suffering from a complex of fear and inferiority where we are concerned." Evidently the President still does not understand the real trouble with his Soviet Communists. It is, as cannot be said too often, their fixed purpose to promote by every possible means the destruction of all non-Communist societies.

Urgent demands for one more talk with Stalin are heard on every hand. Another talk with Stalin may be in order. But not on the assumption that any deal with Soviet communism can enable the two worlds (as Winston Churchill put it last week) to live their lives in separate peace. Statements assuming that the two worlds of freedom and bondage can do so, render a twofold disservice. First, they obscure and postpone the total understanding of the enemy's purpose which is necessary if Soviet communism is to be repulsed and in the end defeated without universal disaster. Second, they unwittingly serve one of the main purposes of Soviet communism's world propaganda. Soviet propagandists are doing their utmost to cultivate in the western mind a sense of responsibility for creating a war situation, a guilty conviction that the West is somehow failing to do all that it might to achieve agreement with a foe who makes agreement impossible. However inspired they may seem, however deep the yearning they may assuage, statements which elide or overlook the dedicated enmity of Soviet communism are so much grist for the Soviet mill of guilt.

Official and public understanding of the Soviet enemy has advanced considerably since Yalta and Potsdam. It has improved appreciably in the last year or so. Statesmen learn. We all learn. But now there is no more time for learning.

Two aspects of Soviet communism deserve special attention. They suggest that even the Communist mind is not immune to the pressures of the time—and that the first duty and best hope of the free world is to gird and guard its strength. These aspects are:

1. Rigid in purpose though it is, rigid in attitude though it always seems, Soviet communism has its own peculiar doctrine of change to meet changing circumstance.

2. Soviet Communists are schooled to believe that the final assault must come only when the forces of anticommunism are so rotted and so weak, and when the forces of communism are so strong, that the outcome is calculably certain. Stalin himself has told his followers again and again that they must wait, wait, wait until the world situation is "ripe" for victory.

WATCH FOR A SHIFT, BUT NEVER COUNT ON IT

Anything that smacks of departure from the fixed doctrine of Soviet communism is justified to the faithful on the ground that the doctrine has been newly "enriched by experience." In the past this theory of enrichment has never altered the end purposes of Soviet communism. But it has cloaked many important shifts of immediate aim and attitude—from revolutionary internationalism to Soviet nationalism, and then back to the present militant internationalism, for example. No less for Soviet communism than for the free world, the age of obliteration is likely to be a most enriching experience. The fact that atomic enrichment has as yet had no discernible effect in Moscow need not mean that it will never have.

What is needed is a precise yardstick by which to measure what to hope for and not to hope for. As we see it, the proper yardstick runs something like this:

To hope for any slackening or change of Communist purpose is worse than idle. To hope for any lasting agreement, balance of force, accommodation of aim and circumstance which will enable the two worlds of freedom and communism to live side by side in permanent peace is worse than idle. But to hope that the prospect of mutual obliteration will sink in upon and affect the guiding minds of Soviet communism is not idle. To hope in turn that it will alter the enemy's calculation of what pays and does not pay—of what does and does not constitute a situation assumed to be ripe for final Communist assault—is not idle. To hope further that the prospect of mutual obliteration will seep home to the peoples of the Communist world, as it is now seeping home to the peoples of the free world, is not idle. To hope finally that the enormous pressures engendered by these processes of realization will compel a shift of Soviet communism's attitude toward the uses and control of ultimate weapons is not idle. To watch for such a shift—never to count upon it, never to mistake it for a fundamental change of purpose, but always to watch for and seize upon it if it occurs—is the task of western statesmanship.

THE SUPREME QUESTION: HOW STRONG IS FREEDOM?

We have said, the free world must know its enemy. But knowing the enemy is not enough.

The free world must know itself. It must know—it must never forget—that its freedom and its strength are one. Without freedom it cannot have strength. Without strength it cannot preserve freedom. Without the will for freedom it cannot have the strength of freedom.

At this hour of this age these are not empty words. They have a very present meaning for free men, and especially for free Americans who guard the source and center of the free world's strength.

The danger and the power of obliteration on a nuclear scale are new to mankind. Only now, 5 years after Hiroshima, is the prospect coming home in its full meaning to Americans. As it must for all men, it will affect the lives, the ways, the standards of Americans. The supreme question—and the sooner it is spelled out the better—is whether it will alter the American idea and the American love of freedom.

The national habit, the good habit, is to say as a matter of course that freedom is something to enjoy, to defend, if need be to die for (though preferably not in person). The habit and the idea of freedom have been stronger than any force yet arrayed against them. Are they stronger, will they be stronger than the prospect and power of obliteration? The accustomed "what is life without freedom?" takes on an unaccustomed meaning when there is the prospect of no life. What price the free life in the free society, free men will ask, if to defend freedom is to risk all life and all society?

These are the questions, this is the risk that Americans will be living with until further notice.

Into Stalin's Vestibule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Into Stalin's Vestibule" written by Heptisax, being a discussion of the direction in which socialism is leading the United States, published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 9, 1950.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTO STALIN'S VESTIBULE

A DISCUSSION OF DIRECTION IN WHICH SOCIALISM IS LEADING THE UNITED STATES

(By Heptisax)

The doings inside the Soviet Union have been of great interest to a limited number of persons for more than three decades. Now they interest almost everyone. The mess that Soviet foreign policy has made of

the peace has earned the Kremlin dictatorship and the administrative machinery of the police state an attention from great bodies of plain American citizens which they have never in the past given the workings of their own Government. Many features of the picture which they piece together from books by truants from utopia, from magazine articles and from news reports, are pretty horrible. Since the supreme boss of the vast Stalinist empire, and all the duly accredited apostles of Stalinism the world over, insist that a politico-economic system, to which we should not sentence those who have despitefully used us, is successfully applied socialism (Marxism-Leninism), there is not only much squirming among all sorts of Socialists, but a rank-and-file interest in radicalism which would be wholly unsympathetic if all the radicals were not so bitterly anti-Stalin.

The experiment in Russia began with an effort to implement revolutionary Marxist socialism. So, however eloquently our various Socialist friends protest that the system now clamped on Russia is not what should have come of the 1917 revolution, one damned question persists in thousands of well-informed minds—like Lady Macbeth's damned spot that would not out. The question is this: "Isn't that Mongoloid gangsterism in Russia and her neighbors the inevitable end of socialism, whether approached through an orthodox Marxist revolution, or through humanitarian reformism? That, I believe, is troubling so many different kinds of minds, bold and timid, that it accounts for the low ebb of moderate Socialist fortunes in this country. It also accounts for some interesting psychological phenomena.

Anyone who invades the circles of the tough-minded but anti-Stalinist Marxists will hear that, when one of their number has a change of heart and defects, he does not commonly retreat from the serene heights of Marxism to the lower level of the humanitarian Fabians. He makes one wild leap from extreme radicalism into the abyss of reaction. This means, of course, that he has looked over the 30-year record of the Soviet experiment and has decided that Stalinism is the unavoidable flowering of even the gentlest Christian socialism.

But the voting on socialism at the polls also reveals that a great body of reformist Socialists has shied away from guilt by association into the socialistically inclined liberal ranks of the Americans for Democratic Action, the Liberal Party, and so on. They hope to escape the stigmata which Stalinism has put upon socialism; but, at the same time, they hope to infiltrate the Democratic Party so heavily that they can turn it into an instrument of humanitarian socialism. Being persons of good will, they also hope that when the Democratic Party becomes the Social-Democratic-Labor Party, they can elect and elect by virtue of Federal largess, and herd us into a decent socialism that will bear no relation to Stalinism.

Partly they are right. They have done their infiltration; and they have President Truman functioning satisfactorily as a ventriloquist's dummy. If they can win him a lot of congressional victories in November, they will have converted poor old Jefferson's party of the horny-handed, rural individualists, who agreed on nothing so much as the cities were sores on the body politic, into a superunion of the proletarians and threadbare intellectuals (pending the arrival of Dr. Guillotine on the scene). Whether they can go on electing and electing, and can herd us into disguised socialism is another matter. That depends wholly upon the number of conservatives who have the courage to say that is what they are. If the Republican Party is not going to have the courage to say that it is the party dedicated to the conservation of American manliness, I for one shall have no interest in its bids for votes. If it is, for vote-getting reasons, going to be a party offering more efficient guidance into the vestibule of Stalinism, I shall try to compose a death song for the United States of America, based on Ecclesiastes.

Fortunately, we are not there yet. I personally do not believe that new dealism, fair dealism, welfare statism, the crypto-socialism of the ADA, skulking liberalism or the anti-Stalinist democracy of a lot of our best labor leaders, are going to fool the American people very long. I feel that the realization that these all lead into the Stalinist vestibule is very widely appreciated.

I personally feel that there is no other end to socialism. Aneurin Bevan, most popular of the British Laborites, has often been quoted on his bicycle theory. Socialism must keep going like the man on a bike, or take a tumble. Socialism must always call for more of the same, until the centralization of power is so great that the people have lost their check on it. We now have popular political power, through electoral representation, balanced against concentrations of economic power. The Socialists say that the check is not adequate. But the Socialists—the tamest of them—would put centralized political and economic power in the same hands. Upon that concentration of power, with a dozen political Al Capones fighting for it, the aroused proletarians would focus their great will—as they do in Russia through the one-ballot system.

It is just because the upshot of this welfarism is getting to be so evident that we have two marked developments. President Truman has stepped right into the vestibule of Stalinism and has asked the blessed liberals to follow him. They are swarming in. Their wang—one of the rarest of Chinese sounds, meaning the humming of insects—is all but deafening. The other development is the increasingly frequent and bold assertion of conservatism—meaning salvation of what is worth while in the United States—by top-notch persons like Dulles, Eisenhower, Hoover, Dewey, and such like.

These gentry are not against progress. As I have said many times, one can progress at high speed into a bog. (Look at Russia.)

We are all old enough to know that every extension of government service means a check on human liberty. The bigger the bureaucracy the less American we are. If we don't know it, we ought to know that every Federal school lunch to a local child has brought us just one short step into the Stalinist vestibule. No? Well, figure that out.

Communists in Government Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Post on February 19. This is a story by my good friend and equally good reporter, Jerry Kluttz, concerning the activities of the United Public Workers of America, recently expelled by the CIO for following the Communist Party line. It should be pointed out at this time that this and similar articles by Mr. Kluttz were used by the CIO to support their action in expelling this Red union. Mr. Kluttz is to be congratulated for a job well done.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL DIARY

ANONYMOUS TIP TO REPORTER SPOTLIGHTS UPW'S "RED" TACTICS

(By Jerry Kluttz)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The CIO executive board has voted to expel the United Public Workers from the CIO on charges of following the Communist Party line. Among the important pieces of evidence used to support the accusations were stories by Jerry Kluttz, the Washington Post's Government columnist. A background story follows.)

Her convincing words were spoken to me over the phone in a low and halting voice. I sensed she was scared—a thought she later confirmed. The time was late April 1948.

"You must go to the convention in Atlantic City," she urged me repeatedly. "Believe me, and I know, the Communists are all set to grab control of CIO's Government worker groups. Neither the CIO nor anyone else seems to know or care what's happening."

I hadn't planned to attend the convention as Congress was in session and making employee news at the time. Also, the main purpose of the gathering was to merge CIO's United Federal Workers with its State, county, and municipal workers union. It didn't promise to be a newsworthy event and I told my unidentified caller so. I also didn't take her Communist talk seriously.

A day or so later she was back on the phone. I thought she was using a bit of psychology on me when she said:

"So you're not going—that's swell with the Communists. You're the one reporter they're afraid of and they're hoping you don't go to Atlantic City."

By that time the convention was just about ready to get under way. But I told my caller that I would make last-minute arrangements to attend if she could convince me of her Red charges. I wanted specific details, I told her, not generalities. She asked for time to think it over and promised to call me back.

She did. She talked as though she were afraid of being shot at any moment. She then unloaded and this is the gist of it:

That certain union leaders—not all of them—had discussed in highly secret and preconvention gatherings the best way to pull an effective strike against the Federal Government—a walkout that would embarrass Uncle Sam in the eyes of the world.

This one specific thought was debated at length, she said. To launch an organizing drive among the service employees of the Government, the elevator operators, char force, and so forth, and to pull them out on a strike at the right time. Many of these jobs, she added, were held by Negroes and the leaders agreed they could be easily used for this purpose since their plight would arouse public sympathy.

She also told me that a foreign-policy resolution had been drafted that would express sympathy toward Russia while denouncing the imperialistic designs of the United States and her allies. She gave me other details of the preconvention talks.

I told her I'd change my plans and would attend the convention. There was another period of hemming and having on her part and then said she:

"Please handle this discreetly. It won't be easy. You're already suspected as being unfriendly. If you write anything they don't like you'll be smeared as antilabor, anti-Negro, anti-Jew, and a Red-baiter."

Her last words were "Good luck but be careful."

I arrived in Atlantic City after the convention had gotten under way. Union leaders reacted coldly to my appearance. I tried without success to talk with several of them about their attitude toward strikes against the Government—all of which convinced me my tipster was on the right track.

Eventually, one of the key unionists conceded to me in a begrudging sort of way that it would be possible to call a strike against the Government under a proposed constitutional provision. He and others, however, dismissed it as meaningless and they swore no strikes were planned against any government.

The strike provision was put before the convention and several Federal-worker members took the floor to demand the right to strike and to denounce the Hartage as weak and soft.

I wrote the story. The following morning, after my column had been read, I became the target of the abuse my caller had warned me about.

Next came the foreign-policy resolution. It was late one afternoon and little had happened that day in the convention in the way of a news story. I was invited to leave as nothing more would take place on the convention floor. I stuck around.

Then a strange thing happened. A reporter covering the convention for the Communist Daily Worker suggested to union leaders that they get out the foreign-policy resolution and get it passed that evening. He was also covering a meeting there of CIO's Textile Workers, and it had just adopted a strong anti-Communist foreign-policy resolution that supported United States foreign policy. He wanted the UPWA to approve its resolution to offset the Textile Workers' stand.

UPWA leaders complied meekly. They pulled out the pro-Soviet foreign-policy resolution and jammed it through the convention over a scattering of opposition.

This proved to be too much for a handful of delegates to swallow and they began belated protests. The small uprising was the signal for an old commie trick—a favorite of the left-wingers became the leader of the opposition. This person confused and misled the objectors while cursing out the "damn" Communists, but when the right moment came he "left them in the lurch," a helpless and bewildered lot.

Several honest opposition members confided to me that they had been threatened and they left the convention early. Because of my stories, very few delegates had the courage to talk with me in public.

The postconvention reaction in Washington was both swift and drastic. Congress was ready to adopt riders to force all UPWA members off the Federal pay roll because of the strike provision. The UPWA executive committee was forced to adopt a flat no-strike provision against the Federal Government to save the jobs of union members.

The foreign-policy issue was taken up and debated in heated meetings of UPWA locals. Many units here went on record censuring the anti-American convention stand. Members began to drop out in large numbers.

I continued to hear occasionally from my informant who couldn't help from reminding me: "I told you so." She gave me advanced information on many UPWA actions. Incidentally, I still don't know who she is.

By this time, however, many former enthusiastic UPWA'ers were beginning to see that they had been duped. Several met me in isolated spots to tell their stories. One of the most helpful was a key Negro member of the union.

His stories of how people tried to get him and others to join the Communist Party, to foment trouble and strife to Government, and their guarded suggestions of strikes against Uncle Sam were a shocking eye-opener. He told me frankly that he thought seriously of joining the Communist Party because he thought it might help his people.

"But the more I looked into it," he explained, "the more I became convinced the Communists were merely using the Negroes for their own devious purposes." "Communism," he told me, "isn't for my people, as we'd lose what freedom we have under it."

I was not one bit surprised to see many UPWA leaders fired on disloyalty charges after what he and others told me.

The National CIO was acutely embarrassed by its UPWA. Its responsible leaders have been convinced for several years that the union should be either expelled or cleaned of Communist influence. About 2 years ago an anti-Communist rival, the Government Workers Union, was set up with top CIO support.

GWU has won nearly every fight it has had with the UPWA and it's slated to take over UPWA's jurisdiction in the Government field.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the original script entitled "I Speak for Democracy," by Robert Shanks, of Lebanon, Ind., who was one of the four winners in the Nation-wide contest participated in by a million high-school students.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

Hello; my name is Brown—Richard Brown. Remember me? No; I don't imagine you do. It's been almost 5 years since anyone has heard about me. And it seems people have a knack for forgetting kinda' fast now-a-days. How about the Battle of the Bulge? Does that strike a familiar note? Of course, you recall it. The papers gave it quite a write-up at the time. I'm glad you do remember it because that's where I was killed. It wasn't very dramatic—my death, I mean. There I was crouched in a fox hole, shaking from the cold so much that I know it was my teeth that gave my hiding place away, when—boom! went a hand grenade and (snap finger) it was over that quick.

You wanta know something, friend—you wanta know why I was over there? No; it wasn't because some big shot drew my number out of a fish bowl either. I'd of been there regardless of that. I was there because of a thing we have in America called democracy. That's a pretty important word when you take time to think about it. It means something strong, good, and just. To men like Hitler and Tito it meant something that had to be destroyed and wiped out if men of their breed were to exist. Well, I was just one of many Richard Browns who couldn't see it their way. Just one of a thousand young kids who'd rather dig ditches than be told he couldn't.

When I was living, it's true that I thought of democracy as—well, like our history teacher used to say: "A noble inheritance left to us by far-sighted statesmen, a beacon light in a world of darkness." This thought hit me particularly on the Fourth of July. Yet, somehow, to me, the true meaning of democracy was kinda' more every day.

It was hot dogs and baseball games, chicken every Sunday, hayrides and roasted marshmallows, giggling girls, and dignified high-school seniors. It was the evening paper and even more informing neighborhood gossip. It was the gang and your girl. It was rugged mountains and broad, flat plains, and big cities, and small towns, churches, schools, institutions. It was a chance to grab the world by the tail and give it a whirl. Sometimes you got to the top; other times, you didn't, but you still had the chance to try.

I saw democracy in our movies, in big fat political rallies, in our colleges, and even in lovers' lanes. Well, in fact, I saw just about everything I did or said. Take away even one of the things I've mentioned and you've weakened democracy. Leave them, and you've given America something to be very proud of—a way of life to build toward a better future.

As an American, I didn't want to fight; as an American, I didn't want to die. I had too much to live for, but when I realized that there were men in the world who didn't want my kid brother to be a Boy Scout, or my pop to be an Elk; then, is when I was ready to fight, ready to fight for America, for democracy. You might even say I fought because I was stingy, stingy for my rights to live and breathe a freeman.

Those of you who have seen a college football game, or a harvest moon shining through the sycamores on a Midwest cornfield, or have listened to the President make his inaugural address, or have attended a county fair—then I think you know why I fought and why I am speaking to you from, well, let's say a place far distant from that war-torn field in Germany. And if you do know, then dedicate yourself to the job of making sure that never again will a Richard Brown have to fight and die to protect our democracy.

Well, I guess I really got wound up, didn't I? Almost needed a soap box. Still, call everything I said drivel, call it sentimentality, if you will. I call it America. I call it democracy. Democracy comes from the Greek, I think. "Demos," meaning "people," "kratis" meaning government—the people's government.

Yes; that's what I'd call it—democracy. The people's right to breathe, to worship, to speak, to think, to gather together, to make an honest living, and, yes, to fight a freeman. That's it; that's what is speaking; that's why I fought.

ROBERT SHANKS.

(Original script written October 1949. Judged State and National winner in third annual I Speak for Democracy Contest.)

The Defense Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with the defense budget, by David Lawrence, from the New York Herald Tribune of this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY IN WASHINGTON—PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY JOHNSON STAND FIRM AGAINST DRIVE TO INCREASE DEFENSE BUDGET

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 23.—There's a drive on to augment armament expenditures by about $4,000,000,000, which would further increase the deficit and postpone indefinitely the time for a return to a balanced budget.

President Truman and Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson are standing firmly against the drive, which apparently is coming from outside the armed services.

The basic claim being made in an effort to induce Congress to expand appropriations is that the United States is weak and not prepared for war. Much of the criticism is rather unjustly concentrated on the Secretary of Defense, who, after all, is given by the Director of the Budget the amount that the President, as the final authority, decides shall be spent by all the armed services.

The question of whether the armament which the United States now has is sufficient is one that depends for its answer on a definition of the meaning of the word "adequate." From the viewpoint purely of military theory, it would take from $25,000,000,000 to $50,000,000,000 a year to be prepared in every sense for an outbreak of war.

What a democracy, however, with a limited amount of money available out of a peacetime economy, must do is set up a defense establishment capable of immediate expansion. If that definition is applied, then the United States is ready for instant warfare and for the immediate expansion of each service in the months that ensue.

AIR FORCE HELD READY

Certainly the United States Air Force, which is the main instrument of instant retaliation, is in readiness to deliver retaliatory blows. No nation in the world with a government in its right senses will wish to invite the kind of retaliatory action of which America is capable today.

But, along with the United States Air Force, there are retaliatory blows which can be struck from the seas as well as from bases across the oceans. To follow up on such moves in succeeding weeks, it will be necessary to reactivate ships and planes now in moth balls. The manpower for such recommissioning of World War II ships and planes is available because reserves are steadily being trained for that purpose.

It is true that Russia is building ships and planes, but the United States has in reserve far more aircraft and ships than Russia is now building and enough antisubmarine strength to cope with any menace to shipping.

The key to preparedness lies in the kind of reserves trained for each of the three armed services. America has always depended on its regulars to form the nucleus of wartime operating forces. The public has been led to believe that next time there will not be time to mobilize armies and navies. There wouldn't be if the counterattack from the United States were not effective. But nothing has happened to our defense forces which in any way justifies the assumption that our retaliatory blows would not be effective. The power of the potential enemy to wage war would diminish from the day war broke out, as American strength would begin to grow.

HUGE SUM AUTHORIZED

The President has authorized approximately $13,500,000,000 for all three armed services for the current fiscal year. This is a large sum, and the armed service chiefs are well aware of the necessity of staying within their budgets. It is gratifying indeed to note the acceptance of budget limitations within all three services. The attitude toward economy and maximum use of the military dollar has undergone a remarkable improvement in recent weeks.

The Secretary of Defense has accepted the task of holding the budget to the limits set and is striving to make economies in overhead and auxiliary services. Cutting expenses in government always produces repercussions and criticism. But it is significant to note that the reductions which have been made are in line with a definite policy which assumes a continuance of peacetime conditions for the next few years at least. Even if a war arises, however, the scheme of our defense organization is such as to permit of instantaneous expansion.

The veterans of World War II are not yet too old to have lost their skills, and a refresher course of a few weeks will bring a manpower strength quite comparable to war conditions.

The drive to unbalance the budget by $4,000,000,000 in the name of national security will not succeed unless a war crisis develops. Then appropriations, of course, would naturally skyrocket far beyond any such figure. The outlook is for peace—and for the continuance of a military budget that the national economy can stand.

The Soul-Searchers Find No Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely and thoughtful article from this week's issue of Life magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOUL-SEARCHERS FIND NO ANSWER—IN THE FACE OF THE WORLD CRISIS AND THE H-BOMB THEY FORESEE ANNIHILATION BUT NOT HOW TO FORESTALL IT

The melancholy state of world affairs and President Truman's decision to make the hydrogen bomb set off 2 weeks of soul-searching on the part of American scientists and statesmen. Some considered only the moral issues, others merely the practical issues. But most wrestled with both—and with thoughts of the UN and American and Russian military potential as well. None found a real answer.

As the thinkers stood in what many deeply believed to be the shadow of death, some found comfort in groups. Thus, 12 top scientists, members of the American Physical Society, spoke in unison: "We believe that no nation has the right to use such a bomb, no matter how righteous its cause. This bomb is no longer a weapon of war, but a means of extermination of whole populations. Its use would be a betrayal of all standards of morality."

In New York another group—the most august that gathered anywhere to discuss the problem—issued no joint statement but several individual ones. This occurred on February 12, when Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt presided over the first of her series of television teas. Among the guests were Dr. Hans Bethe, physicist at Cornell; Senator Brien McMahon, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy; David Lilienthal, recently retired head of the Atomic Energy Commission; and Dr. Robert Oppenheimer, president of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton. "Naturally," said Mrs. Roosevelt, "there can be only one subject we can deal with—and that must be the hydrogen bomb and the future of the atomic-energy program and its direct effect upon our future lives."

Said Dr. Oppenheimer, "The decision * * * to make or not to make the hydrogen bomb is rooted in complex technical things, but they touch the very basis of our morality. It is a grave danger for us that these decisions are taken on the basis of facts held secret."

Then the broadcast switched to Princeton, where Dr. Albert Einstein phrased the problem and offered one solution: "Annihilation of any life on earth has been brought within the range of technical possibilities. * * * Is there any way out * * *? Solemn renunciation of violence * * * is undoubtedly necessary. Such renunciation, however, can only be effective if * * * a supranational * * * body is set up." But neither Dr. Einstein nor the others suggested how a world state can now be established. Later Dr. Bethe said, "Let us state * * * that we will never be the first to use hydrogen bombs." Senator McMahon repeated his proposal for a world-wide Marshall plan. Then the program ended with the words of Mrs. Roosevelt: "May God grant us all the wisdom to find the true path to peace through cooperation with the other nations of the world."

Elsewhere other American leaders found themselves in agreement with Dr. Robert Oppenheimer. Gen. Dwight Eisenhower said, "I can't go along with those who believe we should hide the horror of the H-bomb in ignorance. I can see no good in ignorance. From the beginning of time, every invention of mankind has been capable of two uses, good and evil. It is up to the moral fiber of mankind to decide to which use an invention is put. But certainly at this time, faced as we are with a godless opponent, I do not believe we should bury our heads in the sand." Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard, was shocked because the simple fact is that many important decisions are being made in Washington today without adequate evaluation.

But no matter what had surrounded the making of the decision, the fact remained that it had been made and reactions to it soon came from all over the world. Returning from Germany, United States Commissioner John J. McCloy said, "I am glad of President Truman's decision. If there were an oxygen bomb that would be bigger than the H-bomb, I would build it." In Rome the Vatican newspaper announced that it is to be deplored, of course, that human society should have come to such a pass, and this is a sad commentary on the world's inability to insure peace except by force, but then went on to justify American manufacture of the bomb because of the mysterious power explosions in Russia. In Washington, Senator MILLARD TYDINGS said, "Our failure to build while other nations are building the H-bomb conceivably could * * * destroy our own security as well as dismember the democratic, liberty-loving world." In Air Affairs Bernard Baruch, whose proposal for international control of atomic energy has been blocked for almost 4 years by Russia in the UN, wrote, "Every effort must be pressed to maintain our overwhelming advantage in the development of atomic weapons. Nor should any time be lost in proceeding to develop the best possible system of atomic civilian defense, as part of a general plan of mobilization readiness against the danger of possible war."

But atomic defense was no easily solved problem. Dr. Vannevar Bush told the Senate Armed Services Committee "the only way to defend yourself against any kind of bomb is to stop the airplane or carrier before it

gets to the target, or to bomb the place that is manufacturing the bomb before it gets started. I know of no way to detonate an atomic bomb—or any other kind—once it is on its way." Dr. Harold C. Urey warned that atomic bombs in the holds of ships could easily be smuggled into the harbors of the United States or friendly nations, and there exploded or employed as the instruments of international extortion. Dr. Ralph Lapp, head of the Navy's Nuclear Research Division, said, "Horrible as it may sound, we must be prepared to lose ten to fifteen million people in the first day of the superbomb. In a certain sense we are like the man who lives in a tar-paper shack and develops a flame thrower to protect himself."

Meanwhile the soul searching of the leaders did not seem to upset the plain citizens of the Nation. Gen. Lucius D. Clay said, "So long as Americans are thinking about it, they will do the right thing." But there was evidence on every hand that many Americans were by no means ready to think about it. In Chicago a lawyer summed up one widely held attitude with, "I've ceased to even think about the prospect of war. The whole thing is so overwhelmingly depressing that I am glad I'm not running the Government right now, that I can go about my own daily business." In Boston a business executive put it this way: "Maybe we're building up an immunity. The world keeps going from crisis to crisis, and they cry 'wolf' so often that we don't pay much attention to it." In Kansas City a cafe owner said, "The only people talking about war are those who stand to make some money out of it. The boys who were in the last war and the parents who lost sons don't want any part of it."

But in Los Angeles a 14-year-old schoolboy named Maitland Hardyman, called by his teacher to write a short composition as an exercise in the use of words, did so. He lacked the facility of the scientists and the statesmen, and he used one horrible word 11 times while he was writing only 49. The word he used was the one that underlay the thinking of them all. The soul searchers tidily tripped around it, but the schoolboy boldly picked it up and swung it like a sledge hammer. "The hydrogen bomb reeks with death. Death, death to thousands. A burning, searing death, a death full of horrible, lasting death. The most horrible death man has invented, the destroying, annihilating death of atomic energy. The poisoning, killing, destroying death. Death of the ages, of man. The lasting death."

The Same Old Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Same Old Answer," published in the Palladium-Item, of Richmond, Ind., on February 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SAME OLD ANSWER

Senator CAPEHART, Republican, Indiana, takes the position that the Truman administration does not know how to subtract.

He passed this judgment when he proposed a $7,000,000,000 cut in Federal spending. A balanced budget and a strong economy are more important than the things which the extra money will buy, the Senator said.

Budget Director Frank Pace, Jr., made typical New Deal reply. He said budget balance is something for the future if economic conditions remain reasonable.

Every administration official has made the same sort of evasive reply to suggestions and recommendations for cuts in Federal spending.

President Truman has sold himself on the idea of deficit spending. He proposes spending more than the Federal Treasury receives and making up the difference by borrowing.

The rapid and dangerous growth of the national debt does not disturb the President. He seems to believe that the people can carry a still greater tax load.

Whether the Federal debt will handicap future generations is of no concern to the President. He wants to spend now, and let future generations foot the bill.

Missouri River Basin Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Gov. Val Peterson, of Nebraska, on February 23, before the War Department Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. This is an enlightening statement about the conservation program being developed in the Missouri River Basin.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are engaged, in the Missouri River development program, in the greatest undertaking of its kind in the history of the world. One can, if he desires, become lost in the blueprints of the engineers and other technicians' statistics relating to the size, numbers, and costs of the dams, and other intricacies of the program. However, boiled down to fundamentals, ours is simply a program to conserve the soil and to make water work for man, rather than to permit it to destroy him and his property.

We've had a great vision and upon that vision the Congress of the United States has placed its stamp of approval. We plan to so manage our soil that the maximum amount of the moisture which falls upon it is contained in it to produce crops and to stop erosion. Recognizing that after we have utilized the best soil management practices known to man, there will still be periods of the year when there will be tremendous run-offs of water gathering momentum as they rush pell-mell toward the ocean destroying all that lies in their path, we have planned to construct 105 dams to impound these destructive waters and by controlling them make them work to the benefit of the people of our region and all America.

The problem of soil conservation, while I am certain that all members of this committee are interested in it, as must be necessarily all Americans, is not before your group for consideration today. It is a phase of our work which must be stepped up immediately. However, every one of the other multiple features of the great Pick-Sloan plan, for the development of our basin, is properly within the province of your committee. When we build great dams to control floods, we establish the basis for all of the other multiple benefits of our program. The water impounded can be released to provide power, irrigation, navigation, firm municipal water supplies, and the great lakes of blue water, with which our area will be dotted, have tremendous potentialities for recreation.

Today, as probably never before in its history, the Government of the United States needs to economize. When any individual or government, whether it be local, State, or national is not on a sound fiscal basis, it is like a house built upon sand, and from its financial failures stem many other difficulties and eventual disaster.

We, in the basin, are thoroughly cognizant of the need for economy in government. In Nebraska, the State government owes no one a penny, has $40,000,000 in cash or in bonds, holds property worth hundreds of millions of dollars, is on a pay-as-you-go basis, and for fiscal 1949 had the lowest per capita taxes in America. Prudent forefathers and the sternness of nature have forced us to learn well the valuable lessons of frugality; frugality of money and frugality of those things which are worth more than money, and, of course, there are many such, including soil and water.

So, at the out-set, let me make it clear that we have no objection to accept such a cut in our activities as the Congress sees fit to apply evenly across the entire scope of governmental activity. We do feel, however, that there must be discrimination in the cuts that are made, that first things should be put first and that in the broadest and true sense, the poorest excuse for an economy movement would be that which would strike at the conservation of our great natural resources which are basic to the wealth and well-being of America. We maintain that if we continue to neglect our soil and our water we lay the foundation for the eventual and final bankruptcy of America.

Public moneys which are invested in projects which add to the wealth of America are expended wisely. They are investments for the future and must be made if our country is to survive and be able to support an expanded population. In our judgment, we simply must not make the disastrous mistake of attempting to balance the budget largely at the expense of soil and water conservation.

One phase of the control of water in the Missouri Basin is basic to all other multiple features of the Pick-Sloan plan. That is flood control. Floods can be ended completely on the Missouri River and its major tributaries, and when they are stopped we have created the foundation for all the other benefits. The other benefits flow, in a broad sense, from flood control.

We simply cannot afford the luxury of continued floods in the Missouri Basin, or, for that matter, on any of the great river systems in America. They are rapidly destroying vast sections of the finest farm lands in our country besides damaging other valuable property and destroying life. They are costly, so constant and costly in fact that our economy cannot stand the drain which they are upon it.

Floods have taken a costly toll of lives and property in the Missouri Basin. For the 14½ years ending June 1, 1949, in which official records are available, the estimated tangible property loss stands at $493,500,000. The loss of human life for the same period was 269.

Only fragmentary records of flood damage are available prior to 1935. Several of the greatest floods of record on the Missouri River

occurred prior to 1935, notably the floods of 1844, 1881, and 1903. High floods struck also in 1903, 1908, 1909, 1918, and 1927. The 1903 floods on the Kansas and Missouri Rivers which converged upon the Kansas Citys in 1903 caused damage to that metropolitan area alone of $23,000,000, and 19 persons lost their lives.

The impact of floods on the lives and prosperity of the people of the Missouri Basin is illustrated in the following table of destruction on a year-by-year basis from 1935 to midyear in 1949:

Year:	Damage
1935	$34,000,000
1936	1,000,000
1937	3,500,000
1938	4,500,000
1939	1,500,000
1940	1,000,000
1941	8,000,000
1942	23,000,000
1943	68,000,000
1944	51,000,000
1945	46,000,000
1946	9,000,000
1947	177,000,000
1948	39,000,000
1949 [1]	42,000,000
Total	493,500,000

[1] Covers only first 5 months of 1949.

The full story of human misery and retardation of progress caused by floods in this great breadbasket region is not told in cold figures alone. Thousands of people were driven from their homes by the raging waters of the Missouri and its tributaries, dead livestock floated on the muddy crests, hundreds of thousands of acres of farm crops were washed out, industries dislocated, and highway and railroad transportation disrupted.

In the flood of 1947, 300,000 acres of land were inundated by floods on the main stream and tributaries, 26 lives were lost, and 65,000 persons displaced.

Moreover, the tangible loss figures do not include the tremendous damage to topsoil back on the farms and ranches resulting from erosion. No man is wise enough to put a value upon a ton of topsoil, but unquestionably the loss of topsoil, in terms of dollars, exceeds all other damage in floods many times over. It is an irreplaceable loss. Continued, it can mean regional and national impoverishment. They do not encompass the detrimental effect upon potential growth in natural industrial areas along the flood-menacing streams.

While the major flood damage has been on the main stem of the Missouri River, tributary basins have been hard hit by periodic floods that disrupted the economy of those areas and brought suffering and property loss to the people who live in them.

In my own State of Nebraska, for example, the Republican River Valley was ravaged by the worst flood in its history in 1935. In that flood alone which extended down into our sister State of Kansas, 105 persons, most of them Nebraskans, were swept to their deaths. And when the toll of property damage was tallied, it ran to the appalling figure of $9,000,000. Here again, topsoil losses are not calculated.

The Republican Valley has been hit again and again by destructive floods. In 1943 the loss was $1,100,000; in 1944 it was $1,700,000; in 1945, it was $2,400,000; in 1946, the toll was $1,300,000, and in 1947, it jumped to $20,000,000. On the night of June 23, 1947, 13 citizens of my State lost their lives when a flash flood on Medicine Creek, a tributary of the Republican, swept into the town of Cambridge, Nebr.

This story of suffering and waste is repeated over and over, year after year and basin by basin. In the drainage basin of the Kansas River, one of the major tributaries of the Missouri in the lower basin, the story is the same. In 1943 floods destroyed property in that basin valued at $10,000,000; in 1944, it was $4,900,000; in 1945, $13,700,000; in 1946 the loss was $2,500,000, and in 1947 property damage totalled $26,200,000 in the valley of the Kansas. In the 1947 flood, Kansas farmers saw 375,000 acres of their richest farm lands inundated and many cities and towns along the river were ravaged.

It is a story of waste, of destruction of natural resources which the Missouri Basin and the Nation cannot afford. It can and must be stopped. Under the Pick-Sloan plan, which is now out of the blueprint stage and well along the road to accomplishment, floods will be a thing of the past. Money now drained away by their destructiveness can be used to raise the level of well-being and productivity in the region and Nation. Every dollar invested by Uncle Sam in the control of floods, under our Missouri River development program, will help stop the unnecessary and disastrous destruction now caused by floods and will also help buy for us the constructive benefits that come from controlled waters.

There is no more sound program under consideration in America today. There is no major river development program which is as far along. There is no program which can bring greater benefits to a vast region or the Nation. We plead with you to provide funds in an orderly, regular manner for the development of our resources. For our selfish benefit? Yes. But more important, for your selfish benefit, for the selfish benefit of every American.

Don't force us, by your refusal to appropriate required funds, to stand along the banks of the Missouri next year, the following year, and in numberless other years, wringing our hands and exclaiming, "How long, O Lord, how long must we endure death and destruction."

I Speak for Democracy Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, it was recently my privilege to make the presentation of awards at the second annual banquet given by the Philadelphia Junior Chamber of Commerce in honor of the Philadelphia winners of the I Speak for Democracy essay contest conducted among the high-school students of that city.

I was greatly impressed with the clarity of thinking and the sincerity of these young people. In a world where adults are too often either discouraged or indifferent, it is both stimulating and challenging to find such firm conviction among our boys and girls of the need to make democracy work.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the three winning essays by Marie Jesakow, W. C. Beatly, and Lawrence J. Mellon, Jr.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Marie Jesakow)

The days pass by softly, swiftly, and happily. Each day is full of sunshine, the bright smile of heaven. Each day is another day of honest labor, another day of progress, of love and respect for every common man regardless of his religion, race, or creed, another day of peace and faith. These are the days of democracy, the endless days of justice with a new, happy tomorrow, with a future filled with love and brotherhood. I look at the faces of American people radiating joy, peace, and serenity. Everywhere a song resounds with the glorious words, "We hold these truths to be self-evident. That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This is the triumphant song of democracy which stands for the rights of a whole people to determine its own fate, democracy which has for its goal the development of each person into all that he may possibly become. Democracy dries bitter tears on the weary faces of thousands of people, giving them a sense of security and belongingness. It gives a driving faith that scales steeper heights and views farther horizons.

These are the happy days of democracy in America where every citizen is free. I was born in America with every right to liberty, but as a 9-month-old baby I was taken to Poland. There I stayed for 15 years, returning to this country over a year and a half ago. Fifteen years is a long time, long enough to learn to love freedom and to hate bondage. Those were years of terror, slavery, and death, when the roar of the bombs was deafening and stunning, when the soldier stood on the barricade looking at the burning city, and at the blood, streams and seas of blood. The piles of dead bodies with arms stretching out to heaven were whispering with dead lips words that sounded like thunder, "Vengeance, vengeance to the enemy, vengeance for blood, for burned homes, and for the dead ones that we loved." They did not want to die in slavery, nor to be burned in the concentration camps. Greater was the desire for freedom, stronger was the passion for liberty. They remembered those bright days of work in a sunny field where they lived simple lives playing their music, painting their pictures. No man had the right to destroy their happiness, to change their heaven into hell. No man had the right, but some had power, some had bombs, planes, and mortars. The sharp voice of Hitler declared, "It is a matter of course that a Pole deserves no equal rights," and "Humanism is but a mixture of stupidity and cowardice."

Then came those long, gray columns of people with angry gleams in their eyes and the burning desire for freedom in their hearts always followed by the same companion, death. "Krieg gefangener." Krieg is war, gefangener is slave. That word described everyone in those long, gray columns.

The light of that vision is painful, too bright and glaring to be borne without hurt. But the lesson that we once learned must be carried to those who live, to make them understand that democracy is the salvation of the whole world, democracy that gives us faith in which love is born, the service by which love is strengthened, and sympathy by which love is shared. Democracy has courage and wisdom to establish and maintain universal brotherhood and peace, with all nations joined in love and lawfulness to foster a life more abundant for all. Democracy gives us a belief in values, in dignity, and in the worth of every individual, and disciplines us in service to the common good. Democracy has power to make our world a

place where with fruitful industry, valiant truth, responsible freedom, creative love, and pure religion, all men may dwell in harmony.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By W. C. Beatly)

I speak for democracy, because I believe in it, live for it, and will endeavor to be worthy of it. But wait! What is democracy? We hear this term used in many newspapers, magazines, and in the press and pulpit. Webster says that democracy means the rule of the people. I say it means more than that. Yes, a great deal more than that.

Democracy is a living and breathing contribution to the life of man, for without the gift of democracy the present would be dismal and the horizon dark. Democracy is not license but liberty regulated by law. It says we are free to talk, think, write, and pray, provided our neighbors have the same privilege.

Democracy is life. It gives us the privilege to call our souls our own, and the right to pursue our individual desires, hopes, and aspirations, subject to the same gift being shared by others.

Democracy is a book, whereby we turn back the pages of history and read the minds of those whose lives and deaths made a contribution to the freedom, welfare, and happiness of mankind. Eternal truths remain the same yesterday, today, and forever. We hear today from Plato, Aristotle, Burke, Pitt, Fox, Bacon, Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, and other giants who left an imperishable foot-print in the walk toward liberty.

Democracy is a picture more beautiful and more inspiring than any artist can paint. It gives us views of the mountains of progress, the hills of success, as well as the valleys of disappointment, and failures. We can roam the plains of ambition, and the fertile fields of work, knowing that when the sun shines tomorrow opportunity will still be our heritage, and with the setting of the same we will have had an equal chance to work and play as had the giants of old who bequeathed to us the democracy for which I speak.

Democracy gives me individual freedom. It says that I may read whatever paper I choose in the morning, and learn what others think and do without being punished for my desire. It tells me that I have the inherent right to pursue any business or profession of my choice unfettered by any limitation other than I must not injure others.

Democracy is a teacher. It instructs me in the art of thinking of others and guides me to the altar of good citizenship. It points out the folly of selfishness and tells me that no man can live for himself alone. It is a way of life which when followed with humility and earnestness brings a sense of inner satisfaction, which cannot be measured in any terms other than those which come to all who endeavor to do the right.

Democracy is at my bedside when I awake each morning and gives me the light to see the day, whether the sun shines or the clouds are dark. When the day is over it is my companion when I retire. It is my ever constant friend and helper. Individuals may fail me, and I may be unworthy of friendship, or help, but my democracy is always at my side, ready to pick me up when I stumble and urge me on when the going is difficult.

Democracy gives me a pride of ownership and an interest in the greatest treasure which man can possess. Those who share democracy can call themselves rich, not in the terms of gold and silver, but in everlasting values.

Democracy is America, and America is democracy.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Lawrence J. Mellon, Jr.)

Democracy has been the principal topic of discussion in this vast world of ours for the past 300 years. Did you ever stop to imagine the power which this one word conveys? Did you ever stop to think why it makes the peoples of the world look and wait for new hope? It is small wonder that the world yearns for democracy. To the oppressed peoples of Europe and Asia, democracy is new hope, a new light, and a new promise.

In 1776 democracy was conceived in this great country of ours. Our forefathers chose the only form of government where the people determined by free elections those who would conduct the affairs of the Nation. You can readily see how the framers of our Constitution could choose no other form of government. They well knew the many hardships suffered by the subjects of the English king, and they were determined that their children in all future ages were going to live their lives, not in the dark shroud of submission and servitude, but in freedom to read what they please, to worship what they please, and to say what they please. It wasn't easy for such leaders as Jefferson, Franklin, Washington, and Adams to forget their own interests. They looked to the future. It was there and then that they knew that a democratic form of government was the only real one. How right they were we well know today.

How can any group of governing men fail to catch the magnificence of a democracy? Yes, how can they? It seems impossible doesn't it, but it has been done, and is still being done. Hitler and Mussolini and other similar tyrannical dictators scorned the democratic way of life, denouncing the voice of the people, cursing freedom of worship, freedom from want, freedom from fear, and freedom of speech. They, like all others who defied freedom, perished ignobly, cursed and hated by those they oppressed.

But what are we going to do about this democracy, we, the youth of America, who will some day direct the destinies of this great Nation? It's easy to sit back and say: "Well, it's not my problem. Why should I get excited?" Certainly it's easy to say this, but with such harmful indifference, would we be carrying on the patriotic traditions of our forefathers? We most certainly would not. We must zealously practice at all times the democracy we so glibly advocate for others.

Democracy is something that one feels. It is something that is deep down inside of him that makes him rise in anger every time he hears of the communistic freedom-haters. Democracy is something that we young Americans know is right and just, and as future leaders our stand for democracy must be sound and determined. It's not enough to talk about democracy. We must practice its teachings. In our churches, in our schools, and in our communities, we must be ever on the alert—always, at all times, thinking, acting, and speaking for democracy.

Yes; I speak for democracy. I shout aloud to the nations across the Atlantic and Pacific who denounce a democratic government that I speak for democracy. I stand and praise it. I stand and thrust its colors to the heavens and shout, without fear, that I believe in it.

Four hundred thousand other Americans also believed in it. They also spoke for democracy, only not by their tongue, but by their blood. Don't you think that they could tell you of this nine-letter word? They died for it in World War II. Yes; people have been dying for democracy for the past two centuries, and they will continue to die for it until those totalitarian nations which dot the earth correct their freedom-hating ways.

Yes; for the sake of those 400,000, let us pray God that some day the whole world will stand and with the power and majesty of an erupting volcano shout at the top of its lungs: "I speak for democracy."

Kidnaped Greek Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, further bearing on House Resolution 456, which I introduced, to condemn the abduction of Greek children by Communist guerrilla forces and seek the return of these children to their homes and parents, is the following prose poem by Harry H. Schlacht from the New York Journal-American of Tuesday, January 24, 1950:

CRIME AGAINST CIVILIZATION

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Murder, looting and cruelty, kidnaping, outrages, and brutality are still the order of the day in Communist Russia.

The abduction of 28,000 Greek children by Communist guerrillas in Greece is a crime against humanity.

The American people are stirred by this shocking outrage against mankind.

It is but a succession of savage deeds and stands unparalleled in the annals of recorded history.

It is a new and unheard-of kind of warfare.

It is a new and unheard-of kind of barbarism.

It is designed to convert these children to communism.

It is designed to imbue them with a hatred against their country and religion.

The mothers of Greece plead for the return of their children.

From the woes and sorrows of Greek homes come the wailing of fathers and mothers that will not be silenced until their children are restored to them.

This is a time to give Greece—our ally in peace and war—a helping hand.

This is a time for American greatness.

America is the light of the world.

America must take the leadership in this godly cause.

This is an appeal to the conscience of civilization.

This is an appeal to the hearts of all civilized human beings.

Let us voice our thunderous protest against this communistic iniquity.

Let us speak of it until these depraved creatures will understand.

Let us speak of it until these morally deaf will hear.

Let the monsters of Moscow know that the Greek children will never be converted to communism.

Like their ancestors, they will hold aloft God's torch of liberty to light the pathway of civilization.

They will always be God-loving children, in spirit and language, in culture and religious sentiment.

They will always be the ramparts of Christian faith against the arch enemy of the world—communism.

We, as free people, must free these children from communistic bondage.

The cry of the mothers of Greece shall and will be heard.

We must not fail them.

We shall not fail them.

Acheson Logic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column of comment entitled "Acheson Logic," by Rev. James M. Gillis, C. S. P., appearing under date of February 16, 1950, under the headline of his column entitled "What's Right With the World," published in the Witness, the official paper of the Catholic archdiocese, of Dubuque, Iowa.

There being no objection, the comment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH THE WORLD

ACHESON LOGIC

(A column of comment by James M. Gillis, C. S. P.)

We had a few words in this column not long ago about inconsistency in the dealing of our Department of State with foreign countries. The instance cited was our hostile attitude toward Spain and China in contrast with our favoring Greece and Russia. Being asked to explain, Mr. Acheson said:

"There seems to be a great interest in many quarters in trying to point out a logical inconsistency. They say if you do so and so in Greece, why don't you do so and so in China. The idea is that we must always act exactly the same way in every country in the world. That, I think, is not a helpful way of discussing foreign policy and it is a very false trend."

Since Mr. Acheson mentions logic let's stop right here to remark that in those words he has played a logical trick. Nobody had demanded that he always act exactly in the same way in every country. What he asked, at least in this column, was since you say the United States refuses to send an ambassador to Spain because Spain has no trial by jury, no habeas corpus act, and no popular elections, why doesn't the United States refuse to send an ambassador to Russia which has no trial by jury, no habeas corpus act and no popular elections? We said nothing about always acting exactly the same way in every country of the world. You indicate that you don't care too much for logic. Neither do we, Mr. Acheson, if by logic you mean the device of answering a question that wasn't asked.

The Secretary of State went on to say: "The United States acts in regard to a foreign nation strictly in regard to American interests or those wider interests which affect American interest. If it is to those interests to do one thing in one country and another thing in another country, * * * I am not in the slightest bit worried."

Not to be too critical, let's pass over the dubious morality of America's acting in regard to any foreign nation strictly in regard to American interests. According to that principle American interests seem to be the touchstone of justice and right. How about the interests of the foreign nation? Should not America act toward China in accordance with the interests of China? Toward Spain in the interests of Spain? And so on? Shouldn't America act in accordance with justice and right whether it helps America or hurts America? But, I say, let that pass, and come back to the question not of ethics but of logic.

Bert Andrews, Washington correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune, suggested in his column on January 18, that Mr. Acheson's disregard of consistency may have been inspired by Ralph Waldo Emerson's familiar dictum: "With consistency a great soul has simply nothing to do. * * * Speak what you think toward in words as hard as cannon balls, and tomorrow speak what tomorrow thinks in hard words again, though it contradicts everything you said today." That was a familiar sentiment with Woodrow Wilson who, by the way, used to add the still more familiar phrase of Emerson's "consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds."

But we must not put the Emersonian sentiment into Mr. Acheson's mouth, though Mr. Andrews seems to have reason to do so. We simply say that the present tragic condition of Europe and Asia is due largely to the fact that the United States of America under two Presidents and at least two Secretaries of State has followed an inconsistent foreign policy.

In the startling disclosure of Mr. X in Life magazine, a couple of years ago, the world was let in on the secret that our State Department's left hand didn't know what its right hand was doing. "That's a heck of a way to run a railroad," said the farmer when he saw a head-on collision on the railroad. And it's a heck of a way to run a government when one Under Secretary in the State Department puts into effect a plan diametrically opposed to that of another Under Secretary.

Nor would it add to the stability of the world if Emerson's fantastic notion of inconsistency as a virtue were taken as the basis of our foreign policy. The Yankee philosopher (or was he only a poet and an orator) had in mind chiefly the difficulty—he would have said the impossibility—of ever finding and holding abstract truth. I think he would have been surprised if he could have known that a hundred years later inconsistency was to become a guide in such a practical matter as international relationships.

In that same passage on consistency (from the essay on self-reliance) he does mention little statesmen who worry about being consistent; so I suppose we are to understand that big statesmen, like Mr. Acheson, have no such worry. If that is what Emerson really meant, he was a more dangerous visionary than most of his admirers have thought him.

Be that as it may, the attempt to run the affairs of the Nation, still more of the world, by having one thing today and another tomorrow can lead only to anarchy. That was the principle on which Hitler and Stalin worked. They swore allegiance to each other one day and were at each other's throat the next. So of Russia and Japan. They had a neutrality pact so long as it served them, but when the time came they unceremoniously ditched it.

Is that the kind of thing we Americans must now be prepared to do? In fact, we have done it twice, at least—once in Yugoslavia and once in China. Mihailovitch used to be our man. We chucked him and took over Tito who then executed the man who had been our man. One cynic in high political circles has said, "Tito, of course, is a s. o. b., but he is now our s. o. b." Has the great and glorious American Republic descended to that base amoralism?

Also Chiang Kai-shek was our man. Now we have jettisoned him because to hold to him would no longer be in accord with American interests. Is that what we are to call statesmanship? And justice? And right? How about it, Mr. Acheson?

Editorial Comment on Proposed Constitutional Amendment Abolishing Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Constitutional Amendment on Elections," published in the Chicago (Ill.) Daily Calumet of February 4, 1950, and the other entitled "Lodge's Amendment," published in the Rockford (Ill.) Star of February 4, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily Calumet of February 4, 1950]

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON ELECTIONS

An amendment to the Constitution of the United States affecting the election of President and Vice President of the United States is on the way. If enacted into organic law, no citizen will lose his vote, once he has cast a ballot.

Our own United States Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, a Democrat, teamed with United States Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts, to win this week a two-thirds majority in the Senate providing for the election of President in the electoral college on a basis of proportionate votes of the electorates of the respective States.

Under the system which has prevailed ever since the electoral college was created the candidate who gets a plurality in any State in an election receives all its electoral votes. If a Presidential candidate defeated his opponent in Illinois by 1,000 votes nay, he would be given all 28 of Illinois' votes in the electoral college. Remember, some 4,000,000 vote in Illinois.

As the law now stands, all citizens who voted for the losing candidate lose their choice in the electoral college. The proposed amendment will change that by having the State's electoral vote divided between the two candidates—or more—on a proportionate basis. For example in Illinois with 28 votes, a candidate receiving 75 percent of the popular vote would be given three-fourths of the electoral college markers. And so on, for any percentage involved.

Beyond a doubt the amendment for a fairer allocation of the electoral vote will meet with support among citizens generally. It frequently happens the popular vote of a State is divided between two candidates, with one receiving 51 percent of the ballots, and the other, 49. Yet under the present system the 2 percent plurality is enough to

give the candidate enjoying this kind of advantage all the electoral votes in the State.

Whether the amendment can succeed is another matter. It faces a long, long trial before enactment. It now must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the House. That accomplished, the amendment must be ratified by at least three-fourths of the 48 States. This may require from 5 to 7 years.

Make no mistake, this is a solid step forward for democracy because all the people have a voice right down to the wire. It would be interesting if one had the time, and inclination to statistical research, to delve back into history to see how many men missed the White House under the present system of winner take all.—H. F. W.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Star of February 5, 1950]

ELIOT'S AMENDMENT

From the time when Senator LODGE of Massachusetts introduced his plan for a proportional counting of electoral votes—a plan to take the place of the "winner-take-all" system in use today—we have looked with favor on the proposal. Nor has the argument that such proportional counting would tend to create splinter parties appeared to us to have much validity.

As for the new plan's being favorable to one party or the other, it has seemed to us that the long-distance gain would be to the Republican Party, since proportional counting would tend to make the "solid South" a ground of contest for both parties.

Yet when the resolution calling for presentation to the States of a constitutional amendment providing proportional counting, and actually doing away with the electoral college, came to a vote Wednesday, it was a bloc of 23 Republicans who offered the most opposition. The resolution was adopted, 64 to 27, with more than the required two-thirds margin. Opposing the resolution were those 23 Republicans and 4 Democrats; in favor of the resolution were 60 Democrats and 18 Republicans. Senator TAFT said he thought the amendment would work to the disadvantage of the Republican Party.

The amendment resolution must now go to the House, where a two-thirds margin is likewise required. If it passes the House, the States will take it up, and three-fourths of the States must ratify before it is proclaimed as a constitutional amendment and thus charter law.

Illinois offers an excellent example of how proportional counting would work. In 1948, Mr. Truman carried this State by a little more than 30,000 votes out of some 3,946,000 votes cast. Yet the entire electoral-college vote of Illinois had to be counted for Truman. Under the Lodge amendment, the vote would have been divided, with a margin of less than 1 percent for Mr. Truman, and with the rest credited to Mr. Dewey.

In a number of other States there was likewise a narrow edge of victory for Mr. Truman; and if the electoral vote had been divided in proportion to the popular vote, the margin would have been close, although Mr. Truman would still have had the edge.

Senator LODGE feels that, if proportional counting were used, there would develop a revived bipartisanism throughout the country, since, even in the South, a Republican could make his national vote count to the extent that it was a proportion of the total of his State's vote. A Republican in a traditionally Democratic State is disenfranchised as surely by the electoral method which we now use as he would be if he were interdicted at the polls by a poll tax.

As for splinter parties, the biggest offender has been New York State, although the South presented a Democratic State's rights splinter party in the last presidential election. The splinter vote in New York, proportionately divided, would have given only a minor place to Henry Wallace. The South's splinter actually got recognition, since the electoral votes of the split-off States went to Governor Thurmond, the State's righter.

But, to meet any real splinter threat, Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, got accepted, as part of the Lodge amendment, a provision that the winning presidential candidate must get at least 40 percent of the electoral vote. If the leading candidate lacked 40 percent, Congress would decide between the two highest candidates, with each Senator and House Member having one vote each.

It is difficult to see how this Lodge arrangement would work to the disadvantage of the Republicans, save as it might create a real Republican Party in the South which could not be manipulated as to delegates in national conventions. In fact, the disadvantage would seem to lie with the Democrats if a south hitherto solid had to yield over some electoral votes to the Republicans.

We believe, with LODGE, that proportional counting of electoral votes would revivify the two-party system for the entire country. We also believe that it would reduce the talk of mandates by showing the narrowness of party victories.

Uncertainty in Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and letter:

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of June 7, 1949]

UNCERTAINTY IN STEEL

Last week the Senate made a laudable effort toward resolving business uncertainty when it passed a bill that would permit freight absorption in industrial pricing. But while this gives promise that the controversial basing-point issue, which was left up in the air in two Supreme Court rulings, will eventually be decided for good and all, the Senate's gesture can actually have a deterrent effect on future business unless the House quickly follows suit with similar legislation.

Take steel, which traditionally absorbed freight costs to its customers. Because recent Government policy on the matter has been vague, to say the least, the steel industry was changed over last year to f. o. b. or cost-at-the-mill method of pricing in practice, the latter method has proved more expensive to the average consumer of steel. Senator O'MAHONEY, the New Deal lawmaker, who sponsored the recent Senate bill to legalize freight absorption is certainly aware of this fact, thanks no doubt to his constituents way out in Wyoming, who, under the new system, have had to pay stiff freight charges on steel shipped to them. Now, however, since the Senate has voted overwhelmingly to allow industry to quit f. o. b. pricing, steel consumers may well expect that the outlook for similar action by the House is bright. And since freight absorption will mean cheaper steel on the average, these consumers may find it prudent to hold back on present orders which are still reckoned f. o. b. This added element of uncertainty is poor news for steel makers who are already experiencing a shrinkage of their markets. Production of steel, for example, has dropped from 102 percent of capacity in mid-March to 89 percent now. While this dip is due almost wholly to the general postwar readjustment of America's economy it could also be influenced in the future by a reluctance of steel customers to buy when they think there is a chance for cheaper prices. And that chance will exist as long as the House delays on the O'Mahoney bill.

For the short term as well as the long-term business good, then, the House should now give priority to writing this measure into law.

JOY MANUFACTURING CO.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., August 10, 1949.

Hon. HARRY J. DAVENPORT,
Congressman, Twenty-ninth
District of Pennsylvania,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVENPORT: I read your speech on the basing-point bill, S. 1008, with much interest. Our company is not in the steel business, but we do have plants at different locations in the United States that will be most seriously affected in their business and their employment if we are prohibited from equalizing transportation costs to meet the prices of more favorably located competitors.

For example, our plant in New Hampshire, which manufactures rock drills, must compete in the western mining areas with competitors having plants located in California. We have no understanding or agreements with anybody respecting the prices of rock drills, but obviously we have to at least meet the prices quoted for deliveries from those west coast plants in the western mining areas. This we customarily do by paying the freight on our rock drills to our San-Francisco warehouse and distributing from that point on a delivered price basis to meet the western competition. If we are compelled to cease this sales method we will, of course, be forced out of all of the rock-drill business of that great mining territory.

The same conditions prevail with respect to shipments of coal-mining machinery from that same plant in competition with plants of competitors located in or adjacent to the coal-mining districts.

This illustrates what we face in the sale of other products from plants located in New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, and Texas, each of which makes special products for national distribution, and, in various markets, must meet more favorably located competitors.

I am glad to see you speaking from your own personal experience, endeavoring to give some practical relief to manufacturers in this country from the decisions of the courts that will be most hampering and restrictive unless they are changed by amendments to existing laws.

Very truly yours,

J. D. A. MORROW,
President.

Proposed Airplane Trip to the North Pole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Airplane Scheduled To Make Landing at North Pole Next Summer; Hubbard on Flight," published in the Daily Alaska Empire, of Juneau, Alaska, of February 20, 1950. The article deals with the proposed trip to the North Pole by plane. Father Hubbard, the famous glacier priest, will be a passenger. I am particularly desirous of having this article printed in the RECORD in view of Father Hubbard's expressed views respecting statehood for Alaska.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIRPLANE SCHEDULED TO MAKE LANDING AT NORTH POLE NEXT SUMMER—HUBBARD ON FLIGHT

SEATTLE, February 20.—Sometime this summer an airplane is scheduled to make the first recorded landing at the North Pole, and among its passengers will be the Rev. Bernard Hubbard, S. J.

It will be a thrilling climax to 23 years of Arctic exploration for the noted glacier priest.

"For years I have looked forward to conducting mass at the north pole," he said here Saturday.

Father Hubbard, who has covered thousands of miles on foot in the far north, climbing snow-covered peaks, studying volcanoes, and gathering a wide variety of scientific data, will make the forthcoming flight in a United States Air Force plane.

"The Air Force has made 400 flights over the pole," he said, "but no one has landed there—at least no United States plane.

REMAIN FULL DAY

"We plan to stay a full day. It is important to learn all we can about actual conditions on the top of the world.

"As more planes fly over the polar region we know some will be lost, but we want to save the men. It's to gain the information on survival there and to perfect the rescue program that this flight is planned."

At the North Pole the ice attains a maximum thickness of about 18 feet and the temperature rises considerably above zero, Father Hubbard said.

"In fact, it rains there sometimes," he added.

TO SOUND OCEAN

Among other things, the party will sound the ocean.

"It is reported to be 14,000 feet deep, but we want to find out for sure," he said.

Father Hubbard, who lectured and showed his latest color motion pictures of the far north at the Civic Auditorium last night, said he considers the defense of Alaska is progressing satisfactorily.

"The situation in Alaska is good," he said, "except that some places housing and recreation for the servicemen should be improved.

"Should Russia parachute troops and take some of our military fields, they could not maintain a line of supply, which would be a minimum of 1,000 miles long. And the worst handicap, the weather, works against foe as well as defender."

DECAY VERSUS INVASION

He said he feared decay from within the Territory far more than possible invasion from without.

"The vastness and impenetrability of Alaska are already strong defenses," he said. "As an offense base it has bases with runways 9 miles long—two near Fairbanks and one near Anchorage. We're ready for any kind of an air strike from Russia."

AGAINST STATEHOOD

The priest said he is opposed to statehood for the Territory because of possible exploitation of the area's rich natural resources.

"It has too few legitimate taxpayers to become a State. In the wrong hands it would make the Pendergast and Hague political machines look like peanut sellers," he said.

"I'm not nearly as afraid of penetration from without as I am of decay from within. If we ever have any real fear of the Russians coming into Alaska, we already will have been so hopelessly betrayed from within that it won't much matter."

Fight of Spain for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an article on conditions in Spain. This article, written by Patrick F. Scanlan, appeared in the Tablet on February 18, 1950. It follows:

PRAISES HEROIC FIGHT OF SPAIN FOR SURVIVAL—NATION, VICTIM OF MISFORTUNE AND WITHOUT OUTSIDE AID, AROUSES ADMIRATION—FRANCO GIVES INTERVIEW—LEADER URGES FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH UNITED STATES; NATION NEEDS FOOD

(By Patrick F. Scanlan)

MADRID, SPAIN, February 11.—The heroism and the unity of the Spanish people under most distressing and discouraging circumstances impresses the visitor to Spain. The government, facing obstacle after obstacle, has with rugged determination fought against an economic debacle from within and the pressure of boycott from without.

Spain's handicaps are as follows:

1. A fearful war of liberation from the Communist menace, which continued from 1936 to 1939, costing 1,000,000 lives, crippling thousands of others and destroying an inestimable amount of property.

2. The stealing by anti-Spanish forces of the entire gold currency of the county and transferring it to Soviet Russia.

3. Six years of drought which have proven almost catastrophic. The present government has erected 11 dams but today there is no water behind any of them. The water shortage has seriously affected crops, electric power, the water supply, and the raising of cattle. Some industrial plants have had to close down 3 days in the week and elevators in large buildings have been temporarily discontinued.

4. The boycott of the Spanish Government by many other nations has prevented trade relations and the obtaining of loans. Spain is one of the few European countries barred from obtaining aid from the United States or loans from the World Bank.

Yet Spain has courageously endeavored to make a go of it alone when almost any other country would have either abdicated or succumbed to the dictatorial power and interference of other nations.

MEETING WITH GENERAL FRANCO

Yesterday afternoon we had the opportunity of meeting Generalissimo Francisco Franco. The meeting, which lasted 30 minutes, took place in the former Palace of the Kings just outside Madrid. The approach to the building was simple and we noted only 16 guards around the ruler's headquarters, or less than the guard which usually surrounds President Truman in public appearances.

The General is a short, stoutish figure and, in a double-breasted navy blue suit with civilian tie, looks like an American businessman. He is completely unlike the ferocious type of dictator pictured by the foreign press; rather he is shy, retiring, pleasant, and friendly.

In a brief message, spoken fluently and without hesitation, he called attention to the value of the airplane in promoting concord, stating "since it has been the means of reducing space and bringing peoples of foreign nations together, so, too, should it by the mingling of distant peoples promote friendship."

The Spanish people, he added, have no differences of any kind with the American people, but, on the contrary, have many points of common interest. The General then said he welcomed visitors to Spain and added newspapermen were particularly welcome in the country and he assured them that every facility would be at their disposal.

Journalists, he continued, have a special mission to perform and by their sincere efforts can bring nations together and promote friendship among the peoples. "You have every facility to see the truth about Spain and the reality of what we are trying to do," he said.

Far from having differences, the Generalissimo pointed out, Spain, by reason of discovery, of blood and religion, has many ties with the people of America. He said he hoped the journalists would return often and that many Americans would come to visit Spain. He closed by stating truth was very important and as a part of good reporting made for understanding. He hoped this would be one of the results of the visit to Spain of journalists.

To call Spain a "police state" is completely incorrect, as any visitor will note. The members of the TWA press flight had little or no trouble getting into Spain and they traveled about as they pleased without having to show a police card or obtain a permit of any kind. Moreover, in covering several hundred miles, few soldiers were observed.

The food situation is critical. Nearly everything is rationed and bread and potatoes are particularly scarce. Many farms outside of Madrid—a fine, modern, up-to-date city, with large, clean thoroughfares and a variety of good shops—have been denuded by the lack of water and the number of cattle is alarmingly low. The people are industrious, law-abiding, and only ask for the minimum requirements to get along.

The houses, apartments, and other buildings in the city are well constructed of brick and stone and present a pleasing appearance. There is, moreover, a tremendous building program for everywhere one turns structures of all kinds are being erected.

We were particularly struck by what we saw at University City in the outskirts of Madrid. This huge educational center was practically destroyed in the war for liberation. Today, however, it has practically been rebuilt and the large, modern, well-equipped and well-lighted buildings would do credit to Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Notre Dame or any large American university.

RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS

The Spanish people are good Catholics and attend church in large numbers. The 8:30 mass on Thursday in a neighboring Capuchin church had more than 300 present—and half of them men—and the 11 o'clock mass in another nearby church on the following day had close to 100 present—and these were week-day masses. In the latter church while one priest celebrated the mass another from the pulpit recited the Latin and the congregation in unison made the responses, nearly all possessing missals.

The Irish Minister to Spain, Hon. Leo. T. Macauley, who recently served in the United

States, told us it was a great problem to get a seat at any mass in a Madrid church on Sunday unless one got there from 15 to 30 minutes in advance of the starting time. He also stated the Protestant church in the neighborhood of his house conducted services and the minister's Sunday sermons were frequently quoted by visitors to his residence. Incidentally, the attractive and most pleasant Mrs. Macauley is the former Miss Georgia Cormac, of Kinhurst, in the Brooklyn diocese and she attended St. Bartholomew's Church for many years.

OPINION OF SPANISH LEADER

At a reception in the American Embassy we, with others, were talking to a Spaniard who is a figure in public life and someone asked "is criticism of Franco permitted?" "If it isn't," he said, "just listen to me." Then he proceeded to attack the Spanish leader largely on the grounds that he had evolved no program for continuing the government once he died or went out of office.

We asked if there were many political prisoners in Spain. He answered that their number was exceedingly small, and then he proceeded to attack the government's leniency in giving a recent amnesty to prisoners who had in the war of 12 years ago committed serious offenses against people and property.

We then inquired about changing the form of government. He replied one of General Franco's strongest aids was the experience the people suffered in the war for liberation, for the horror and suffering of that period taught the people that communism and lawlessness were a far worse menace than anything that could come from the present regime—a regime headed by a man who had actually defeated both Hitler and Stalin and had restored public order.

"Do free labor unions exist?" was another query we submitted to several Spaniards. The answer was that in Spain the workers are united in syndicates and are protected by the government. In industrial disputes the government invariably rules in favor of the workers, it was told, and as an example it was stated that at present, while factories and huge industries could operate only 2 and 3 days a week due to the water famine, the government had ruled that employers must pay the employees a full week's salary. It was also observed that a government permit must be obtained for the dismissal of employees.

AMERICAN POLICY SLIPS

Most Americans we talked to in Madrid denounced the United States policy toward Spain as inhuman, stupid, contradictory, and inviting disaster.

It was called inhuman because the Spanish people today are greatly in need of food and are willing to buy it, but the United States, following the appeasement of Russian policy adopted several years back, has made Spain a pariah and prevented aid to these men and women who are our friends.

It was called stupid because a strong Spain is America's best ally in the fight against communism.

It was called contradictory because the United States has been giving aid to Tito and other nations whose form of government and leaders we dislike.

It was said to be inviting disaster, for a collapsed Spain might permit the anti-American pro-Red forces to seize power, and if they did Italy, France, Spain, and Germany would likely fall to the Reds.

We asked an American official at the embassy just how the Government of Spain, to which the United States refuses full recognition and aid, differed from that of Portugal, which the United States fully recognizes and into which millions of dollars have been poured.

He answered: "The difference is that Salazar has ruled Portugal since 1927 and Franco has ruled Spain only since 1939."

We inquired as to whether the Salazar government was fully approved; the answer was "No, but then we should not interfere in the domestic affairs of foreign countries."

Yet this rule does not direct our policy toward Spain. Of this one may be sure, the Spanish people have resented the UN policy toward their country and the Russian-inspired plan to overthrow the Franco regime has made the government stronger in the minds of the masses, for the Spaniard has pride and objects to foreigners telling him how to run his country.

Spain today needs food, modern machinery, transportation equipment, and fertilizer for the farms. The United States could make no better investment from a viewpoint of humanitarianism, insurance against communism, and the cultivation of friendship which would extend all the way through Latin American countries, than by giving Spain this modicum of help and at once.

MAYOR OF MADRID FRANK

The acting mayor of Madrid—the mayor was in Rome on a Holy Year pilgrimage—was very frank in discussing the situation in Spain. He asserted the country was endeavoring to preserve civilization against communism and revolution and had succeeded thus far. It was, he added, astounding that the Marshall plan and United States aid to so many countries—some of which hated everything American—left Spain out of consideration. He urged that Americans include Spain, particularly the needy children of the country, in the help they were so generously giving to other nations and people.

BROADCAST TO THE UNITED STATES

Just how the Americans were impressed by what they witnessed in Spain was strikingly revealed on Thursday night of last week. While at a dinner given the TWA press flight delegation in the Hotel Ritz in Madrid five, including the writer, were asked at midnight if they cared to go on the mighty Spanish broadcast to the United States. Not only did all immediately consent, but in a half-hour program each praised Spain and their commendation went all the way from voicing admiration of the orderliness and cleanliness of the city to urging that the Marshall plan include the interesting and worth-seeing country.

A BELGIAN'S VIEW

A much-traveled Belgian, a man of intelligence and discernment, gave us this apt observation on world affairs: "The only two leaders of nations who know what the world conflict is all about are Stalin and Franco. Stalin is consistent in his program aiming at world revolution and the destruction of Christian civilization. Franco is equally consistent in his opposition to communism, and all its adjuncts and fronts; he refuses to budge in his fight against the menace to Christianity and is the one leader who has, without deviation, sought to preserve the values which have made men and nations great."

Electric Power Industry in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the De Queen (Ark.) Bee for January 19, 1950:

NEWS, VIEWS, AND COMMENT

(By Ralph B. Kite)

Congressman BOYD TACKETT's stand against the proposed Federal grab of the electric power industry in Arkansas deserves the commendation of all who are becoming fed up with the creeping trend toward socialism in our country. The Southwestern Power Administration (SPA), the Interior Department's offshoot from Rural Electrification Administration (REA), would, with a flourish of a Federal pen, virtually take over the privately owned, well-managed, taxpaying electric power industry in the Southwest, and Arkansas in particular. They would ruthlessly disregard the interests of thousands of private citizens who have invested their savings in these power companies. We are happy to see BOYD TACKETT stand up on his feet and show up this power-mad tentacle of the Department of the Interior.

Sale of Federal Electric Power in Southwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by C. F. Byrns, from the Southwest American, of Fort Smith, Ark., for January 28, 1950:

OFF THE RECORD

(By C. F. Byrns)

A good way to cut Federal Government expenses is to use private enterprises instead of competing with them. That's exactly what will happen in Arkansas, Oklahoma, and other States in this area if pending contracts governing Federal electric power sale are approved by the Interior Department.

Douglas Wright, Director of the Southwestern Power Administration, is responsible for the sale and distribution of electric power generated at federally owned dams on the Red, White, and other streams in this section of America. Lately, he negotiated contracts with the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. and the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma for distribution of Federal power through the privately owned electric utilities. Similar negotiations are under way with other power companies in the same area, including Arkansas Power & Light Co., Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., Arkansas-Missouri Power Co., and Missouri Utilities Co.

This week, Wright told the House committee considering his budget requests that he will cut $5,000,000 off the expense for the year beginning next July 1 if these contracts are finally approved. The reason is this: He is asking for $5,000,000 in that 1 year, with more to follow, for construction by the Federal Government with Federal money of facilities for distribution of Federal power. Those facilities will not be needed if the contracts are approved for distribution by the private companies.

The proposed contracts make the best possible use of the electric power being generated and planned in the Southwest.

They provide a way to use the hydropower for peaking purposes; that is, for carrying the excess load of demand at the peak hours, while steam plants owned by the private companies carry the normal around-the-clock demand.

Everybody in the power business, both Federal and private, recognizes that peaking power is the most profitable use of hydroelectric energy in this part of the Nation. The stream flows in this area are widely variant. Continuous power from hydro plants requires continuous flows of the streams in large quantities. We do not have that. But we do have many opportunities for developing hydro power as an incident to flood control, silt control, navigation, and other water uses. That power should be put to use in the public interest, on the most economical basis possible.

Under the proposed contracts with the private companies, Federal power will be sold to them at the Federal power plants and at existing interchange points between federally owned and private lines. The private companies will deliver power for the Federal Government to customers now on their lines or hereafter put under contract for use of Federal power.

This arrangement removes the necessity for spending large sums of public money to build parallel and competing transmission lines. It eliminates the need for federally owned steam-power plants to firm up the hydro power. It cuts down the public investment in the river development program.

When the Southwestern Power Administration proposed in 1946 establishment of a network of transmission lines and steam plants in this area, the cost was estimated at $200,000,000 or more. It would be much more now. If that added cost were necessary, it would seriously threaten and possibly defeat the whole program of river development in the Southwest. If the proposed contracts are finally approved, these heavy Federal investments will be unnecessary, the private companies will not have to face tax-free competition, and the electric users will still have all the benefits of public power.

Useless Duplication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lawton (Okla.) Constitution for April 17, 1949:

USELESS DUPLICATION

One of the needless wastes in Government which the taxpayers must pay is the constant efforts of Federal bureaus to project the Government further into business, largely to make their own jobs more important and add to their personal power and prestige.

Probably one of the most useless duplications is the proposal, contained in the current Federal budget, to build huge power plants in various parts of the country. One of the projected plants is in southwest Oklahoma and would cost around $11,000,000.

There is no shortage of power in southwest Oklahoma that would warrant such expenditure. Existing utilities have expanded their power production to a point where they can supply ample power for any foreseeable need. To build additional plants is a waste of public money that is totally unjustified.

If Congress approves the proposed expansion of Government-owned power plants there can be only one ultimate outcome. That is the elimination of all private power production, with the resultant loss in taxes and the further expansion of big government. In most cases this will mean political manipulation of the power business and probably a loss in efficiency of operation and service to the public.

If the people want the Government to take over the power business, the logical thing is for it to take over existing systems. There is no point in duplicating existing investments where there is no need for additional facilities. We doubt that a majority of the people have become so socialistic minded that they want this to be done. The pressure for such action comes largely from the bureaucracy which thrives upon wastefulness and useless Government expenditures.

Free Enterprise Versus Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tulsa World for July 27, 1949:

FREE ENTERPRISE VERSUS WELFARE STATE

Current legislative fencing in Congress has obscured what could well be one of the most important domestic issues facing the lawmaking body—that of public power. The Federal Government is already deep in a program of power development and each session of the Congress is confronted with requests for increased funds to extend both the production and distribution of hydro and steam-produced power. The desirability and need for a national public power policy is clear.

The Government-subsidized Southwestern Power Administration is seeking a large appropriation in order to extend its facilities which will actually duplicate those of private electric companies. The tax-free SPA would then be in a position to offer a competitive rate to customers of existing private utilities lower than the companies' rates by an amount less than the total taxes now paid by the electric firms—and which taxes the politically managed system would not have to pay. Oklahoma's two Senators [ELMER THOMAS and ROBERT S. KERR] are opposing each other in this matter. Senator THOMAS takes the correct and wise position that there is no need or reason for duplication of present facilities. Senator KERR's stand is incompatible with sound economy and subscribes to a dangerous philosophy stemming from Socialistic doctrines. There is no uniformity to his stand. On the one hand he resents and vigorously fights threats of Government interference and regulation of the gas and oil industry—in which he is financially interested. And, on the other, he wants an unfair federally subsidized competition for the private power industry—in which he is interested only as a consumer.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN has also placed himself in an analogous situation. He was instrumental in furthering a contract between the SPA and private utilities in Texas whereby the latter purchased the Government-produced power, but he is opposed to a similar proposition for the Oklahoma utilities. The SPA program is of and for the welfare state. It wants $852,000,000. If that is granted it will kill 19 private utilities in the SPA domain. In nine short years these utilities will pay $737,000,000 in taxes.

Better Save This Twelve Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chickasha (Okla.) Star of June 2, 1949:

BETTER SAVE THIS TWELVE MILLIONS

The Government is asking for $12,000,000 to build high-voltage lines all over southeastern Oklahoma. No one can be found outside of the fellows whose jobs depend upon the expenditure of these funds who will claim that this expenditure of funds is needed or necessary. These lines are not needed to give any farmer in this area rural electricity. The promoters of the plan have only thought in mind to socialize the production of light and power.

They intend to completely take over the power business in southeastern Oklahoma just as they have taken it over in Nebraska and Tennessee. They do not claim that there is any dearth of power or power facilities in private hands in this section. What they want is socialized industry and the easiest group on which to start is the production and distribution of electrical power. With a mounting Federal deficit where would be a better place to start economy than by the lopping off of this twelve millions.

Mistreatment of Greek Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have today called the attention of the Senate to the shocking abduction by Communist forces of thousands of Greek children, and I desire to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD various comments regarding that subject.

The first is an editorial entitled "Crime Against Civilization," from the New York Journal-American.

I also ask to have inserted an article entitled "Children or Slaves?" published by the Greek Government Office of Information.

Next I ask to have printed an article published by the Greek Theological Institute, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Mass.

I also ask to have printed in the Appendix a statement entitled "War Against Greek Children," published by the Hellenic Boy Scouts and Girl Guides Associations.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal-American of January 26, 1950]

WAR AGAINST CIVILIZATION

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Murder, looting, and cruelty, kidnaping, outrages and brutality are still the order of the day in Communist Russia.

The abduction of 28,000 Greek children by Communist guerrillas in Greece is a crime against humanity. The American people are stirred by this shocking outrage against mankind.

It is but a succession of savage deeds and stands unparalleled in the annals of recorded history.

It is a new and unheard of kind of warfare. It is a new and unheard of kind of barbarism.

It is designed to convert these children to communism. It is designed to imbue them with a hatred against their country and religion.

The mothers of Greece plead for the return of their children. From the woes and sorrows of Greek homes come the wailing of fathers and mothers that will not be silenced until their children are restored to them.

This is a time to give Greece—our ally in peace and war—a helping hand. This is a time for American greatness.

America is the light of the world. America must take the leadership in this godly cause.

This is an appeal to the conscience of civilization. This is an appeal to the hearts of all civilized human beings.

Let us voice our thunderous protest against this communistic iniquity. Let us speak of it until these depraved creatures will understand. Let us speak of it until these morally deaf will hear.

Let the monsters of Moscow know that the Greek children will never be converted to communism. Like their ancestors, they will hold aloft God's torch of liberty to light the pathway of civilization.

They will always be God-loving children, in spirit and language, in culture and religious sentiment. They will always be the ramparts of Christian faith against the archenemy of the world—communism.

We, as free people, must free these children from communistic bondage.

The cry of the mothers of Greece shall and will be heard.

We must not fail them. We shall not fail them.

[Published by the Greek Government Office of Information, 20 Rockefeller Plaza, room 1318, May 1948]

CHILDREN OR SLAVES?

(This is a reprint from the Union Jack (No. 1014), an English paper for the British Army in Greece)

On the 29th of February this year one of the grimmest samples of Communist-inspired cruelty was thrust at the people of Greece. The news came over in a series of broadcasts from Communist-dominated state announcing that Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Albania were offering hospitality to 60,000 Greek children.

The ironical term of "hospitality" was given as a pretext that these states wished to save the children from famine and educate them in "free countries" but Greece has her own word for it—"Paidomazoma"—meaning "the stealing of the children."

FORCIBLE HOSPITALITY

On the same day from districts of northern Greece, children aged from 3 to 15 were torn from their families by armed bandits. The Communist program as usual, was well prepared in advance.

Markos and his colleagues, undoubtedly aware of the profound ties that attach Greek parents to their children, could have dealt no deadlier a blow to those thousands of mothers and fathers living in the danger zones, where his forcible hospitality would become an endless nightmare.

This unsurpassed piece of barbarism is one of which the world at large appears to be singularly unaware. The foreign press devoted little space to the kidnaping of the Greek children, nor did it seem to notice that this announcement coincided with the day on which UNO decided to form an organization for aid to children all over the world.

BLOW TO CIVILIZATION

What exactly does this deportation of children mean? How deeply does it infringe on the rights of freedom and on our conception of democracy?

Some may think that it is a purely local affair concerning Greece only, but we have seen before how totalitarian systems are aimed, not at one country, but at a whole civilization.

If the children of Greece are allowed to be abducted and to be taught the new Communist creed who can say where such methods may lead humanity?

For of course, the plan is to take those who are young and eradicate all memories of the past. To bring them up as citizens of a totalitarian regime with no thoughts in their heads other than those taught by the creed, with no feelings in their hearts other than a hatred for all people and races who do not agree with their creed.

Facts and figures, however, may convey more weight than generalizations. One of the most appalling of these facts is that up to date some 12,000 children have already been deported by the bandits.

How they were taken makes sad reading. Some were dragged from their parents who dared not protest, fearing that they would see them killed on the spot. In many cases mothers offered to go instead and were shot.

In long desperate lines these children were driven over the mountains clad in rags, shoeless and cold. Those who survived the forced marches were herded into camps in the countries where they will be taught to hate their own people.

Stories of tragedy and heroism are endless. Some of these young victims have managed to escape and have harrowing experiences to relate. From all over the threatened areas of Greece, refugees are now pouring into the main cities and most of them are children fleeing from destruction and exile.

A typical story of the courage and epic endurance of the stricken youth of Greece, is that of Eftychia Kalyva, from the village of Kalesmeno, some miles from Karpenissi.

GIRL'S HEROISM

One evening bandits entered the village to loot, and capture as many children as possible. Sixteen-year-old Eftychia was an orphan who lived with her two small brothers aged 8 and 11.

Hearing the noise of wailing and sobbing from neighboring homes, she realised what was happening, woke the children and took them away with her in the darkness. She knew that at Karpenissi there was a Greek Army outpost, but the main road would not be safe, so in spite of the heavy snows she started off on a rocky mountain path.

For hours she plowed her way ahead, digging through the snow with her bare hands while the children followed. Eftychia walked all night, her face and feet torn by thorns and rock, her hands and breast bleeding.

REACHED SAFETY

She reached the first military roadblock by dawn and when the sentry sprang forward to cry "Halt" it was one of the children who begged "Don't shoot."

Eftychia only had the strength to murmur "the children," before she fell in a heap at the sentry's feet and died. Today the two small boys for whom she gave her life are at a Red Cross convalescent home.

To save these children of Greece, the Government is now organizing a large-scale evacuation from the bandit-infested provinces. Queen Frederika of Greece has been largely responsible for collecting the funds through which these youngsters are housed in camps all over the country, fed, and given proper care.

One of the Queen's ideas is to send evacuees to the Dodecanese Islands, especially to the island of Leros where available barracks can be transformed into suitable quarters.

The Greek Red Cross assisted mainly by voluntary nurses, takes care of the evacuation of the children and of looking after them in the camps. Last week a ship came into Piraeus carrying 1,200 young passengers from Macedonia and Thrace, who have been accommodated in the Athens area.

Many families, rich and poor alike, have offered to take refugees into their homes, but for the time being the Greek Government is keeping them together in camps where they can be cared for by welfare organizations.

Now that the United Nations Aid to Children has come into being, help will surely be forthcoming for these innocent victims of planned terror, but meanwhile their upkeep is a heavy burden to the war-stricken economy of Greece.

AMONG OWN PEOPLE

For the parents, separation from their sons and daughters is a long-drawn-out sorrow, but the consolation of knowing that they are safe and among their own people, makes it more acceptable. It is the parents whose children have already been carried away by the bandits, whose suffering is beyond words.

Our twentieth century has seen many crimes and much sorrow; most of the misery has been caused by attacks on that very freedom and tolerance which, from the earliest days of civilization, man has learned to cherish.

It was in ancient Greece that these principles of individual freedom reached their highest aspirations. Can we sit back today and remain unmoved when the youth, the future manhood of a free world, is being taken into slavery?

[From the Greek Theological Institute, Brookline, Mass.]

MORE THAN 28,000 GREEK CHILDREN ARE SUFFERING BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN—WON'T YOU PLEASE RAISE YOUR VOICE AND FREE THESE YOUNGSTERS?

To All Fellow Christians:

Our Theological Institute, which has as its main purpose the ethical and religious training of our young Greek-American generations, in addition to the preparation and education of our present and future priests who endeavor to propagate our faith and ideals, considers it its duty and privilege to raise loud her voice in protest to the great wrong which is taking place in Greece and to 28,000 (a very moderate figure) Greek children.

The Communists and the guerrillas have seized these innocent children, have callously and heartlessly torn them from the arms of their mothers, and deported them far from our beloved Greece—to Albania, to Yugoslavia, to Bulgaria, to Hungary, to Poland, to Czechoslovakia, to Rumania. There they are kept forcibly under the false pretense that better provisions and accommodations are being made for their health and general welfare.

Actually, however, these children are being detained in these foreign countries for the main purpose of poisoning their hearts and consciences with the be-clouded, be-fogged, and utterly destructive communistic ideas and theories which are, even at this moment, being spread insidiously throughout the noncommunistic world. In other words, they wish to make murderers and janissaries of these children, so that in the future when they are released to return to their mother country they may put to the sword not only their beloved ones, by now long-forgotten, but their country, too.

The opposition which is being offered by the Greek people against the latest communistic attempts to enslave the whole of Greece is being countered by these barbarians in this evil, inhuman, ruthless, and barbaric manner.

For this dastardly crime, we protest from the depths of our hearts, and we earnestly plead with every man, woman, and child of Greek descent in America to do the same.

WIRE PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND STATE DEPARTMENT

Write to your State Senators and Representatives. Entreat them to make possible that which seems impossible—to set free from this communistic slavery these 28,000 children.

Request your newspapers and radio stations to raise their protesting voices in an appeal to the generous American public to become actively interested and sympathetic in this just and worthy cause.

Continue to discuss this intolerable situation with your friends, both Greek and American, old and young, so that we may see these unfortunate victims of aggression speedily returned to their native country and to their loved ones.

Consider this your duty as a member of a great democracy and your obligation as a Christian.

WAR AGAINST GREEK CHILDREN

Our children are being carried away.

On the 29th February, 1948, broadcasts from Communist-dominated states announced that Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Albania offered "hospitality" to 60,000 Greek children. The pretext given was to save them from famine and to educate them in a free country.

On the same day from districts of northern Greece children aged from 3 to 15 years were torn from their families by armed bandits. They were dragged from the warmth of their homes. Mothers offered to go in their places. Some were shot for trying to save their children.

In long desperate lines the children were driven over the snow-covered mountains. Severed from home, parents and country they were forced across the frontier.

Since then other children have suffered the same fate. Every day more are being abducted. The threat hovers over every home in northern Greece. The children who survive the forced marches and hardships will be herded into camps across the frontier. They will be taught to hate their country and kill their brothers. The planned degradation of these children is a crime against humanity. Their abduction is an attempt to exterminate the Greek people.

We appeal to the civilized world to join in unanimous protest against this barbarous uprooting of children and to defend the ideals of the United Nations.

THE HELLENIC BOY SCOUTS AND GIRL GUIDES ASSOCIATIONS.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Congress has a real concern with the question of what ought to be done with Federal rent conrtol. The Washington Post of today offers its reasons for supporting the decontrol of rents. I think the observations are logical, sensible, and fashioned from common sense. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "End of Rent Control" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

END OF RENT CONTROL

The action of the Senate Appropriations Committee in refusing the Housing Expediter's request for additional operating funds is equivalent to a vote to end Federal rent control. We hope the Senate will sustain the committee's action, since the extension of control can no longer be justified on the ground that housing shortages are so acute and so widespread as to create a national emergency. It is nearly 5 years since the end of the war. Most wartime controls have long since been dropped. Housing congestion has been alleviated by population shifts and by the recent rapid expansion of new residential housing, although rental housing construction has lagged far behind construction of houses for sale.

To be sure, there are a number of areas where rent control is still needed to protect tenants against profiteering landlords. But if the Federal Government waited until every community in the land could safely dispense with rent controls, there would be no foreseeable end to the Federal control system. Housing shortages have, as shown by the evidence, ceased to be a concern of the Nation and have become a local problem that should be the responsibility of State and local governments. The local authorities are acquainted with conditions in their communities, indeed Federal officials have to depend on their knowledge and enlist their cooperation in administering control legislation.

The risks of decontrol are negligible compared with the advantages of relinquishing a discriminatory form of Federal regulation that denies to landlords the right accorded other property owners to sell their goods and service in the market for what they will bring. The patent inequity of the system is evident from the fact that rent increases in controlled areas have lagged far behind the rise in prices of other goods and increases in the wages and salaries of their tenants. It is further demonstrated by the gap between the rentals charged for occupancy of new properties not subject to control and rental of older controlled properties. Moreover, if Federal rent control were to be continued indefinitely, the construction of new rental housing would be discouraged. For even though the new structures are uncontrolled, rental charges cannot diverge too widely from those paid by occupants of comparable controlled properties.

Of course, removal of control will result in some rent increases that will be resented, and the transitional period of adjustment will bring hardships to some people. This is the price that has to be paid for the return to a system of free enterprise which will provide incentives for the construction of more housing accommodations in still congested centers of population. Meantime, State and local governments are in a position to ease transitional hardships by taking steps to prevent excessive increases in rentals. It is up to them to show the Federal Government that they are capable of handling their own affairs without being subject to its direction.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] at a Lincoln Day dinner in the city of Des Moines, Iowa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Governor Beardsley, and fellow Republicans, it is a pleasure to once again be in the city of Des Moines and in the State of Iowa, and to participate with you in this meeting honoring Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday was 141 years ago. His party and ours has contributed much to our Nation's progress. I bring you a hands-across-the-continent greeting from the Republicans of California to the Republicans of Iowa.

There are several reasons why I was pleased to accept the invitation of your Republican State committee. One reason is that this is the home State of my friend and colleague Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER. Senator HICKENLOOPER is a member of two standing committees of great importance to the people of the Nation as well as to the people of Iowa. These are Agriculture and Foreign Relations. In addition to that he is a member and former chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I have served on the latter committee with him since its organization 4 years ago.

The recent case of Dr. Fuchs in England underscores the fact that Senator HICKENLOOPER was right in stressing the importance of security in matters dealing with atomic policy. The lack of adequate investigation by the British not only endangered the security of their country but endangers our own as well.

While President Truman, who has the primary responsibility for keeping men like Alger Hiss out of our Government, was calling congressional concern over espionage a

red herring. Senator BRICKER was fighting for the safeguarding of our atomic secrets. You are entitled to know the cold, hard facts of the situation. The breach of security which has taken place is of the most serious character, and I underscore the word serious. It perhaps helps to explain why the Soviet Government was able to develop an atomic explosion at least a year or two in advance of when it had been estimated they would be able to do so.

Another reason I am glad to be here is that I always feel at home in the heartland of America. This may be due in part to the fact that so many of the citizens of my State have come from Iowa and it may be partly due to the fact that my mother and her family came from Clarinda.

Tonight I wish to discuss with you some of the important problems facing us in our domestic life and in international affairs.

It is my strong belief that only with an informed citizenry can we solve these problems that confront us.

Within the last 4 months two catastrophic events have taken place. These are the Soviet success in atomic development (as announced by the President of the United States on September 23, 1949) and the establishment of a Soviet-recognized Communist regime in China. Only in retrospect will we be able to finally determine which event will have the most far-reaching influence. Both have set off "chain reactions" that have not yet run their full course.

These events separately are sufficient to cause everyone who believes we should have a free world of free men to examine his own conduct to determine if he is making his greatest contribution toward freedom. The combined events make it mandatory that we do it.

Our economic system is tied with Siamese-twin attachments to our Constitutional form of Government. If one is destroyed they both perish. There is no need for either catastrophe to happen if we get off the perpetual defensive and take the offensive.

There are too many people who have had our hospitality or advantages joining forces with Moscow and her satellites in spreading their views on "what's wrong with America".

Those who believe in our system should start a crusade to tell "what is right with America."

We, of course, will not close our eyes to the liability side of the ledger, but as citizens with our feet on the ground and common sense gained from experience and observation we know that America's assets in freedom of religion, speech and press and in agricultural, educational, fiscal, industrial, and governmental categories to mention but a few, greatly exceed our liabilities.

Seventy-eight million life insurance policyholders own policies with a face value of over $200,000,000,000.

Individuals who still believe that thrift is a virtue also own directly or through institutions for their account some $87,000,000,000 in savings institutions and $3,000,000,000 in the postal-savings system. A substantial part of the $85,800,000,000 of time deposits in commercial banks is theirs. They also have a stake in annuities and pension funds amounting to an estimated $5,000,000,000 and a direct stake in the social-security system (Federal, State, and local) of $20,000,000,000.

We have more stockholders and home owners than any other nation in the world.

To permit this solvent, going concern of ours to be liquidated by the strong-armed action of international communism or to consent to the voluntary bankruptcy proceedings of state socialism are both unthinkable and unnecessary. We need an alert and determined citizenry if the battle is not to be lost by default.

We must not let complacency destroy the spirit that has developed a great world power out of a small colony in less than 175 years. We must not build or depend upon military or economic Maginot lines.

This Nation has never been wedded to the status quo or ruled by the dead hand of the past. Our economic as well as our political system broke away from Old World patterns.

Shortsighted European-style capitalism built the gallows for its own execution by allowing and encouraging monopolies, cartels, low wages, and great aggregations of capital narrowly held.

The lifeblood of our system to the contrary is competition, productivity, good wages, and widespread ownership of our economic structure.

We must continue to demonstrate to the world that here in America we have political and economic freedom. Here our people, since the founding of the Republic, have looked forward to leaving to their children a better land than they themselves found.

The challenge we face is to meet the economic, social, and political needs of the twentieth century while we maintain free institutions under a constitutional government.

Certainly security alone is not the whole answer. The most secure man is the one who has his clothing, food, medical care, and housing guaranteed for life—as an inmate of a State prison.

The basis for an expanding standard of living for our people rests upon labor and management pulling together and not apart. It also depends upon a square deal for the farmer as well as for the urban dweller. It requires a full realization that when any part of our economy is in distress the chain reaction that takes place will soon react on all other segments. The American farmer must not be so regimented that he becomes primarily a statistic in a Washington bureaucrat's office.

The time has come, I believe, when labor and management, with the help of government, must get down to the nugget of what is really needed in America.

The sustained stability and progress of our American system of capitalistic free enterprise requires high real wages, sustained buying power for abundant markets, and maximum production at low unit costs. American agriculture, labor, and industry must not be undermined by the dumping of goods produced by low-paid labor abroad while outside markets are closed to our products.

In meeting the growing challenge of socialism and communism the dynamic American system must continue to demonstrate that labor, management, and investors all have a vital interest in maintaining our way of life.

High productivity and widespread distribution of that which our Nation can produce is more sound than the doctrine of scarcity brought about by stoppages of production or by governmental action.

Controls tend to multiply like rabbits. In the end they will destroy both the American economic and political system.

A free economy can better bring about a higher standard of living for our people than any permanent regimented economy of domestic origin or foreign import.

In the growth of our economy there have developed powerful groups in business and in labor. Not all of them have recognized that with power must go responsibility. No man or group of men in the ranks of labor or business have the right to strangle the economic life of 140,000,000 Americans and by so doing endanger the entire free world.

The Government of the United States established economic traffic laws many years ago to protect our businessmen and consumers against unregulated monopolies. These were the antitrust statutes.

More recently, first through the Labor Relations Act of 1935 and later through the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, the Government has sought to establish a national labor policy that would be fair and equitable, not alone to labor and management, but to the general public as well.

While some well thought out amendments are in order, they should be weighed in the light of their effect upon the entire population, and not just one part.

Our entire national economy must not be at the mercy of one man or small group who can give an order that will cause a creeping paralysis to close down our mines, factories, and transportation systems and work a hardship on countless people. This is far too much power for any responsible man to want and any irresponsible man to have.

Our Federal Government is now so large that prudent officials and citizens must examine new proposals which would increase costs to see if they will endanger its functioning or impair its solvency. We must find ways of eliminating duplication and waste, so that we may better meet essential needs. Recommendations of the bipartisan Hoover Commission should get a high priority on the legislative calendar.

There are some in Government who apparently believe that if an individual spends his own money it is inflationary whereas if the Government takes it from him and spends it such is not the case. This is economic nonsense and squirrel-cage thinking. Government spending has been, and is, a major inflationary factor.

I make no claim that we can "unscramble the eggs" of Government finance, but I do maintain that we should no longer ignore the warning lights that have led to disaster when ignored elsewhere in the world.

We should balance our Federal budget and pay something each year to reduce the national debt, which now amounts to over $250,000,000,000. This should be done by prudent economy rather than by disruptive new taxes.

For the last 17 years the Democratic administration has had control of the executive branch of the Government, and during 15 of those years has had a majority in both Houses of Congress. It is significant, I believe, that during that entire period of time the Federal budget has been balanced only during the 2-year period of the Eightieth Congress, wherein the Republicans had a majority in both the House and the Senate.

In a period of 20 years the number of civilian employees of the Federal Government increased from 570,000 to 2,100,000. Federal expenditures have increased from $9,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1939 to over $43,000,000,000 for the current fiscal year.

For the next fiscal year, at the present rate of spending, there is another $5,000,000,000 deficit in prospect. Any business management that ran 16 out of 18 years in the red should be permanently retired. Nineteen hundred and fifty and 1952 are the years to eliminate the red ink and red herrings.

The problems facing us on the home front cannot be solved by Government alone. They cannot be solved by labor, management, or the farmer alone.

Here in America, as Lincoln put it, we have "this last best hope of earth." Each of us has an individual and collective responsibility for its preservation. We are interdependent one on the other. An American economic collapse would bring despair everywhere except in Soviet Russia.

There have never been so many people in the entire history of the world who have had as large a stake, as much to gain or as much to lose, as the people of the United States of America.

Nor does history record a people who have been as unselfish in their possession of their power, their resources, and their good will.

In this century which is not yet half over they have sacrificed blood and treasure in two world wars to prevent the destruction

of free institutions on the continent of Europe. Few dispute the fact that all of western Europe and perhaps even Britain would today be behind the Communist "iron curtain" if it had not been for the firm stand taken by this Republic and a considerable contribution of our resources to prevent the complete economic collapse of those war-torn nations.

Communism thrives on chaos. A rehabilitated Europe was the only chance for survival had by free institutions in that area of the world. While communism has been at least temporarily stopped in western Europe, it has made great gains in the Far East. At the end of the war communism ruled less than 200,000,000 people. Today 800,000,000 are within the "iron curtain."

Four factors relating to the ability of the Western World to defend itself against Communist aggression are:

1. Industrial capacity.
2. Population.
3. Raw materials.
4. Territory.

Except for the first, international communism now has the edge on all the others.

Fifty years of friendly interest on the part of our people and our Government in a free and independent China and the overwhelming contribution made by our Army, Navy, and Air Force in the Pacific during World War II, gave us the power, the prestige, and the opportunity for constructive action no western nation had ever before possessed. We could have pioneered in exporting the ideals that inspired men who loved freedom everywhere following our own break away from colonial status.

All this opportunity has been frittered away by a small group of willful men in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department who had the backing of their superiors.

In Europe where the record of Soviet aims was clearly outlined in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, we finally stood up to communism in Greece, Turkey, Iran, Berlin, and western Germany.

Knowing that communism thrives on economic and political chaos we gave economic aid through the ECA. With the North Atlantic Pact and the arms implementation legislation, we have given moral and material support for the protection of western Europe and the Middle East from overt aggression. In that area we have given hope and support to those advancing the cause of a free world of free men.

Munich certainly should have taught us that appeasement of aggression, then as now, is but surrender on the installment plan. Mr. Chamberlain, Prime Minister of Great Britain 10 years ago, may have sincerely thought that he was gaining peace in our time by consenting to the destruction of a free and independent Czechoslovakia by Nazi Germany. We know now that paying such international blackmail only increased later demands that made World War II inevitable.

The men in the Kremlin are as power hungry as the Nazis and their system is as destructive of human liberty as was Hitlerism with which they were bedfellows while Poland was being dismembered in 1939. They have, however, learned some new techniques.

Communism is destructive of human liberty everywhere in the world. It is no less destructive in China or Korea than it is in Poland. Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Hungary, Rumania, or Bulgaria. The pattern may differ slightly.

In Poland the opposition leader, Mikolajczayk, was forced to flee; in Bulgaria Petkov was hanged; in Rumania the King was given a 2-hour ultimatum to change the Government regardless of the Constitution; in Czechoslovakia Masaryk's life was forfeited when it became apparent that coalition with communism would not work.

A Chinese official put it clearly by saying to me recently: "There can be no real coalition with a tiger unless you are inside the tiger."

In Europe we have had a foreign policy in which the Republicans and the Democrats have contributed to the initiation and formulation of doctrines that are understandable. In the Far East there has been no bipartisan foreign policy. The Republicans in Congress have not been consulted in the moves leading up to the bankrupt policy which now stands revealed in all its sorry detail. The administration, and it alone, has the full responsibility for the debacle which has taken place on the Continent of Asia and which day by day and hour by hour is endangering the future peace of the world and the security of this country.

We stood up to communism in Europe and took substantial risks in doing so in Greece, Turkey, and Berlin. Certainly for the faint-hearted the putting into operation of the Berlin airlift presented much greater risks than giving aid to the legal Government of China to enable it to hold the islands of Formosa and Hainan. During the airlift we were flying our planes across territory controlled by one of the great military powers of the world. This Government supported the Berlin airlift at a cost of $154,568,800. This was not the only cost, for accidents took the lives of 31 of our men. Nevertheless, had we backed down in Berlin, the Soviet Union today would have that city firmly within its grasp and might even have western Germany, if not all of western Europe. Certainly the yielding to international blackmail then would have increased the demands and made more arrogant the men in the Kremlin as an earlier yielding to Hitler at Munich increased his demands.

Our China policy has taken us to such a low point that prior to his return to the United States our Ambassador, Leighton Stuart, was confined to the Embassy compound for weeks by the Communists. A consular official was beaten by the Red police in Shanghai; our consul general, Angus Ward, was restricted to the compound in Mukden for a year, and more recently thrown into a common jail; our military attaché at Nanking, General Soule, has been trying for over 4 months to get out of the Communist area and has not had any success to date.

William C. Smith, chief electrician's mate, United States Navy, of Long Beach, Calif., and Elmer C. Bender, sergeant, United States Marine Corps, of Cincinnati, Ohio, have been held captive for over 15 months. Yes; we have waited for the dust to settle, and the American people can now see the wreckage of the position once held by this great nation in the Far East.

Our long-standing far-eastern policy was first compromised at Yalta. We gave to the Soviet Union vital rights in Manchuria which were not ours to give and it was done without prior consultation with the Government of China. It was done without the consent or approval of the American Congress or the American people. It was done in violation of the open-door policy of John Hays and of Woodrow Wilson's concept of open covenants, openly arrived at.

The Yalta agreement made Soviet domination of Manchuria and other border provinces inevitable. It made possible Chinese Communist domination of the balance of continental China. It also has opened the door to bringing the entire continent of Asia, with more than a billion people and vast resources, into the orbit of international communism. Sitting with our American delegation at Yalta and playing an important part was Alger Hiss, adviser to the Secretary of State.

The representatives of our Department of State persistently tried to get the Government of the Republic of China to form a coalition with the Communists. When they refused, we placed an embargo against the shipment of any arms or ammunition to the legal government of the country while during those same months the Soviet army of occupation, in Manchuria as the result of the Yalta agreement, was turning over to the Communist forces large amounts of captured Japanese war stocks.

Like a person with a bad conscience, the State Department, on August 6, released the China white paper. All the blame was placed on the National Government, then with its back to the wall. It was apparently issued with the hope that our own part and share of responsibility might be overlooked.

That the National Government of China made mistakes, has had "Benedict Arnolds" and men who betrayed their trust, needed no underscoring from us in the way and at the time it was done. Our own history also has examples of men who have betrayed their trust from Cabinet members down to ward bosses.

We have also been plagued with racketeers, highwaymen, and five percenters at various times.

The basic objective the United States should have kept constantly in mind was to preserve a free, independent, united, non-Communist China. In the postwar illness of that nation, we prescribed that the strychnine of communism be taken. The State Department having contributed greatly to the Chinese disaster still proclaims that we must follow a hands-off policy, or that we must wait for the dust to settle, or we must investigate some more. State Department policies were directed toward a post mortem rather than a consultation.

Had China been a former enemy, like Japan and Germany, we would have been giving large amounts of supervised material help and sending many of our ablest military and civilian leaders to stabilize her currency, feed her people, and protect her from Communist aggression. But the State Department policy has been to abandon free China, our wartime ally and friend, to the vultures of international communism.

In a very well written article in the January 7 issue of the Saturday Evening Post Joseph Alsop has this to say about State Department excuses as contained in the China white paper:

"But there is also one carefully concealed defect in the State Department argument. If you have kicked a drowning friend briskly in the face as he sank for the second and third times, you cannot later explain that he was doomed anyway because he was such a bad swimmer.

"The question that must be answered is not whether the Chinese did their best to save themselves, which they most certainly did not, the question is whether we did our best to save China."

The new civilian governor of Formosa, K. C. Wu, is a graduate of Princeton. He has had an excellent record as an administrator, as mayor of Shanghai, and as wartime mayor of Chungking.

Gen. Sun Li-jen, the ground force commander on Formosa, is a graduate of the Virginia Military Institute. He is also in charge of their training centers which I visited. The morale of the men is excellent. The training program is very good. They do lack a sufficient supply of arms and ammunition for defense against the ultimate assault upon the island.

The people of Formosa are ably represented by a provincial legislature. Governor Wu has broadened his administration and consults with the representatives of the people of the island.

Like Mr. Chamberlain at Munich, there are some in this country and in Great Britain who believe that by appeasing the Communists they may change their way of life. This is naive and such a viewpoint is dangerous to the peace of the world and the security of this country.

First, the Communists will not be satisfied with mere de facto recognition. That will merely be the opening wedge for full de jure approval. When that happens, China's seat in the United Nations and on the security Council becomes a Communist one. Every Chinese embassy and consulate in this and other western nations will become centers of Communist espionage and fifth-column activity as in the case of similar Soviet establishments. At the peace conference with Japan, the Soviet bloc will have another voice and vote to help destroy the job General Douglas MacArthur has done in that country.

If the United States gives them full recognition the Chinese Communists will then consider it unfriendly unless their economic rehabilitation is financed. Such action would, of course, also increase their war potential, for power development, railroads, mines, ports, and factories are important in both peace and war. The United States is the only nation capable of such financing.

Are we to be called upon to pay out substantial sums to help stop communism in Europe while financing communism in Asia and with serious budget problems of our own? Are we to give arms and guarantees to western Europe to save that area from going behind the "iron curtain" while we or they accelerate the spread of communism in Asia?

It is my judgment that history will record the recognition of Communist China as being as great a betrayal of human freedom as was the pact of Munich. If other nations want to take that responsibility, let them do it with their eyes open. They can't for long play both sides of the street.

The signing of the Soviet-Chinese pact on February 14 is a Communist alliance. The secret sections have not yet been revealed. We may recall, however, that the secret provisions of the Nazi-Soviet pact were not disclosed until after Russia stabbed Poland in the back in 1939.

There are some American and British firms that are today sending oil and other supplies to the Communist regime which strengthens it in the effort to destroy what remains of the Republic of China. I will remember, as you no doubt do also, that there were firms, with State Department approval, which supplied scrap iron and oil to Japan in 1939, 1940, and 1941. It was used against our friends in China and ultimately against the American battle fleet at Pearl Harbor. While at Pearl Harbor 4 years after December 7, 1941, I visited the wreck of the Arizona. In her hull there are still 900 American sailors. Commercial transactions paid in "blood" money, should not set our foreign policy.

The question is asked: Can anything be done at this late date? I believe that it can. While desperate, the situation is not more desperate than it was at the time of Valley Forge or at Dunkirk.

First, of course, we need a foreign policy in the Far East. We have none there today. As a basis for such a foreign policy, I suggest the following:

1. That we make clear that we have no intention of recognizing the Communist regime in China.

2. That we have a major shake-up in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department. We cannot expect to get inspired leadership for a new policy in the Far East from those who have been receivers of the bankrupt policy we have been following. Also the people of the United States and the Congress should be informed how many persons recommended by Alger Hiss are still in the State Department?

Our policy itself, of course, will have to be set by our constitutional officers, the President, his advisers, and the Congress. Once we have a foreign policy there is great need for it to be coordinated in both its economic and defense phases. In that area of the world, so that the right hand will know what the left hand is doing, there should be selected as coordinator of American policies our outstanding soldier-statesman, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

4. We should give supervised aid to the legal government of China in the same way we give it to the legal governments of Greece and Korea which have also been threatened by communism. I have never favored giving unsupervised assistance. A mission headed by a man of the caliber of General Wedemeyer could supervise the requests for aid, be sure that the Chinese Government was properly training the troops in the use of equipment, and make certain from a logistical point of view that the supplies were received at the points where they were needed.

5. Strengthen the American Navy in the Far East. The addition of at least two carriers and possibly three would do much to restore confidence in that part of the world just as the visit of American vessels to Greece and Turkey, while the war of nerves was at its height, restored confidence in that area of the world 2 years ago. Even the executive department now realizes there has been an overdraft in our Pacific defenses.

6. Make it clear that this Government will not sit back for more than a year and do nothing but send a series of notes when officials and service personnel representing this Government are illegally held by the Communist regime in China. They should be informed that until all Americans who want to get out have done so that an American naval blockade will prevent any ships from delivering cargoes to strengthen the Chinese Communist regime.

Yes, America has come of age. We can no more return to a policy of isolation than an adult can return to childhood. We must assume our responsibilities as a great world power without whose active support there can be no adequate international system of law and order.

We need a dynamic American foreign policy. Liberty is still a greater force than slavery. Our own fight for freedom electrified the world. Let us rekindle the torch. We must assume a moral leadership that we lost at Yalta.

Let us make it clear to freedom-loving Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Latvians, Estonians, Lithuanians, Koreans, and Chinese that their desire for liberty is understandable to us.

The Voice of America should become the voice of freedom. Each program beamed to iron-curtain countries should start with the ringing notes of the Liberty Bell from Independence Hall, Philadelphia.

We need new techniques to contend with communism's weapons.

Let us first make clear to the Soviet Union and her satellites that starting forthwith we and they are on a diplomatic quid pro quo basis.

The United States Government should serve notice that we will no longer tolerate our Ambassador and diplomatic officials being restricted to Moscow and occasional outside trips while theirs are free to roam from Massachusetts to California and from Michigan to Texas.

We should make it clear that we will no longer permit five times the number of visas to be issued for Soviet citizens to visit this country as are issued to our citizens to visit Russia.

It should be made clear to all the Soviet satellites that they will treat our diplomatic representatives and our citizens with respect and international law, or we will break off diplomatic relations and tell their people why it is being done. If the State Department is correct that American recognition of Bao Dai in Vietnam strengthens that new government, why will not our withdrawing recognition from the satellites weaken them?

Neither friendship nor respect can be bought by individuals or by nations. An offer of $50,000,000,000 for an atomic truce may appease today's Barbary pirates for a time. It will not change their determination to destroy human freedom in Europe, Asia, or on the Western Hemisphere. To a blackmailer the offer of a gratuity today becomes the minimum basis for increased tribute tomorrow.

Of course, we should seek a just and lasting settlement of the cold war, but not by another Munich or another Yalta. Any settlement to be worthwhile must include freedom from the tyranny under which millions of people suffer, in part at least, as a result of our past mistakes.

No nation or its leader had the moral right to barter the lives of millions of men, women, and children into the Godless hands of international communism. The Soviet Union has long since violated various parts of their wartime agreements with the west. To Polish and Chinese patriots a public denouncement of the Yalta Executive Agreement would clear the atmosphere and give them renewed hope and courage.

It was Lincoln who said: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history * * * the fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation * * * we, even we here have the power and bear the responsibility * * * in giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. * * * we shall nobly save or we shall meanly lose this last best hope of earth."

If we use the same courage and common sense that motivated the men who sat in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, there is no foreign foe we need fear, there is no domestic problem we cannot solve.

Soil Conservation Service Watershed Treatment Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the supplemental statement to the 1950 report of the Soil Conservation Service to the Subcommittee on Wildlife Conservation of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments with reference to the watershed treatment program of that Service in the interest of flood control.

There being no objection, the supplemental statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT

The watershed-treatment program of the Soil Conservation Service, in the interest of flood control, reduces flood damages principally in three ways:

1. It retards run-off so that there is less flooding of bottom land along the small creeks and tributaries. This is effective primarily for the smaller floods of frequent occurrence;

2. It prevents erosion to upland areas, thereby reducing land damage and soil wastage; and

3. It makes substantial reductions in the amount of sediment which otherwise is transported into stream channels, harbors, and reservoirs.

The effect of such watershed treatment may be illustrated by the following few examples taken from survey reports submitted by the Department of Agriculture and approved by the Congress in the 1944 Flood Control Act:

1. In the Buffalo Creek watershed in New York, it was estimated that the treatment on farm lands would reduce the sediment that is filling Buffalo Harbor by about 12 percent. Stabilization of stream banks would reduce the total annual accumulation of sediment in the harbor by 135,000 cubic yards, or 72 percent, making a total reduction of sediment from the upstream program of about 84 percent.

2. In the Little Sioux River watershed in Iowa, the treatment program is estimated to effectively halt the advance of major gullies and thereby prevent further land damage from this cause. It also results in substantial reduction in filling of drainage ditches in the Missouri River alluvial flood plain. The program, likewise, would reduce the flood run-off on the tributaries from about 25 percent to less than 5 percent, depending upon the intensity of storm and the size of drainage area.

3. In the Trinity River watershed in Texas, the program will be particularly effective in reducing the damages from the smaller floods which, in the past, have caused as much total damage as the upper limit floods. The program is expected to reduce the aggregate total of acres inundated over a 15-year period by about 25 percent.

4. In the Yazoo River watershed in Mississippi, the annual contribution of sediment to the stream systems is estimated at 89,000,000 tons. In 20 years this is estimated to attain a total of 137,000,000 tons annually, if treatment is not applied. With the application of watershed treatments this total would be reduced by more than 75 percent.

Let's Explore Your Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, one derives solid satisfaction from being able to compliment the sovereign State which he represents. In a recent column, Let's Explore Your Mind, Albert Edward Wiggan answers three questions, one of which refers to the citizens of Washington State. The two other questions and responses are interesting. I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S EXPLORE YOUR MIND

(By Albert Edward Wiggam, D. Sc.)

1. Are the chief effects of quack medical cures psychological rather than physical?

2. Will more playgrounds and recreation centers solve the juvenile delinquency problems?

3. Are there smarter people in some States in the United States than in others?

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 1

Yes. Quack medical scoundrels use the psychological principle that people believe what they wish to believe. George Mann relates in Science Digest that at the trial of "Dr." Chadiali, 112 people swore his spectro-chrome light (merely gaudy colored lights) had cured them of everything from worry to bald-headedness. One excited witness testified it had cured him of epilepsy and instantly fell into a fit. Mr. Mann says a number of prominent businessmen and politicos wear a cigarette sized gimcrack attached to their underwear. An essential element in the device is used by veterinarians as a remedy for sick horses. Getting rid of medical quacks is largely a problem in social psychology and public education.

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 2

No, asserts Dr. Paul W. Tappan, sociologist at New York University. He shows the astonishing fact that juvenile delinquents have more group affiliations and are more often leaders in the groups than non-delinquents. Even church and school can have little effect except as they can cooperate with the home, according to Dr. Tappan. Other studies show the home outranks church, school, laws, and everything else combined in building character and preventing juvenile delinquency.

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 3

Yes. After World War I psychologists made an index of culture (indicating mental ability) for every State as shown by the following tests: (1) Number of soldiers who made A and B grades on the Army mental tests; (2) number of readers of both high- and low-brow magazines; (3) number of leaders in Who's Who in America; (4) number of illiterates; (5) number of mistakes made in making out census reports. This index shows there was more culture per square citizen in Washington State than in any other, Oregon, second; Massachusetts, third; California, fourth. My home State, Indiana, ranked twenty-ninth—probably because Mrs. Wiggam and I were then living in New York. For self-addressed postal I'll tell you where your State stands.

The H-Bomb: Humanity's New Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The H-Bomb: Humanity's New Peril," written by Clarence Poe, president and editor, the Progressive Farmer, and published in the March 1950 issue of that publication.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE H-BOMB: HUMANITY'S NEW PERIL

(By Clarence Poe, president and editor, the Progressive Farmer)

A new crisis, a new challenge, and a new opportunity come to America as a result of America's decision to make the hydrogen bomb. From 10 to 1,000 times more powerful than the atom bomb, it carries the greatest possibilities for destroying human life and happiness of anything ever developed on this earth.

Atomic power has amazing possibilities for peacetime uses—uses which might bring the whole human race to new levels of well-being and prosperity. But the hydrogen bomb has no such uses. It can be used only for destruction, and not only destruction, but indiscriminate, wholesale destruction. All the men, women, infants, children, the strong and the weak, and the industries in an entire State might be destroyed almost in a moment of time—and there is no known defense against it. Ralph E. Lapp says, "A hydrogen bomb blitz could wipe out this country's major cities and kill 10 to 15 million Americans in a single day." The Federation of American Scientists made similar predictions and a group of America's foremost atomic scientists declared: "This bomb is no longer a weapon of war, but a means of extermination of whole populations. Its use would be a betrayal of all standards of morality and of Christian civilization itself."

Nevertheless President Truman decided that America should build the hydrogen bomb. He felt that if we do not build it, Russia might build one and decide to use one and so have us at a hopeless disadvantage.

With this decision itself we have no quarrel. But with the way he made it and his course of action, or inaction, since he made it we believe that all America is shockingly disappointed and appalled. Only God Almighty has ever had the power to let loose on humanity such destruction, and all humanity as represented in the United Nations should have been warned of its consequences and asked to join in plans for its control. Suppose Mr. Truman had gone before the United Nations and had first quoted what Bernard Baruch said when his plans for control of the atom bomb were presented:

"Behind the black portent of the new atomic age lies a hope which, seized upon with faith, can work our salvation. If we fail, then we have damned every man to be the slave of fear. Let us not deceive ourselves: We must elect world peace or world destruction."

And suppose Mr. Truman, in words heard round the world, had said: "Today an even greater danger and opportunity confronts us. Scientists in the United States of America can now make the hydrogen bomb. Scientists in other nations will soon know how to do so. For self-protection and under present circumstances we in the United States have no choice but to make it. But I pray God and pray you to so change circumstances that we may never have to use it. I summon all nations to join the United States in taking some gigantic steps that will prevent any nation from ever using it. * * * When God Almighty said, 'Thou shalt not kill,' He spoke not merely to persons, but to nations. America does not seek peace merely to save our own sons from being killed, their children orphaned, and their wives widowed, but equally because we do not wish to kill the sons even of our enemies. * * * This new crisis for all nations demands a new and heroic effort to save humanity from that crisis and to make the wonders of the atomic age serve humanity rather than destroy it."

All over the world—in Europe, Asia, and South America—Communists are telling these nations that the United States wants not peace, but war. By some new and convincing program for world peace we can now win these hesitant nations to our side.

WHAT MUST AMERICA ANSWER?

While President Truman and Secretary Acheson disappointed and appalled America by offering only a continuation of the cold war as an answer to the hydrogen bomb, we rejoice to say that, fortunately, there were

yelow in the United States Senate and elsewhere which did summon humanity to do something majestic and far-reaching about this world-shaking peril. Senator BRIEN McMAHON, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, proposed that the United States and all nations (1) forego the making and use of atomic or hydrogen bombs and instead (2) agree to use two-thirds of their present military expenditures for developing the backward and underprivileged peoples of the earth and other forms of peaceful progress. Senator TAFT proposed inviting all nations to a new disarmament conference. Senators CHAPMAN and FERGUSON presented plans for strengthening the United Nations and Senators VANDENBERG and CONNALLY spoke constructively. Especially eloquent and historic was Senator McMAHON's appeal which we wish every American could read in full. In part he said:

"We now spend about $15,000,000,000 annually for armaments. Why not offer to take two-thirds of this sum, or $10,000,000,000, and, instead of amassing sterile weapons, use it to foster peace throughout the world for a 5-year period? Why not offer to spend the annual $10,000,000,000 over three programs: President Truman's point 4 proposal, development of atomic energy everywhere for peace, and general economic aid and help to all countries, including Russia?

"Such a global Marshall plan might combine with the marvelous power of peacetime atomic energy to generate universal material progress and a universal cooperative spirit.

"In exchange for our own contribution of $10,000,000,000 annually, we would ask: (1) general acceptance of an effective program for international control of atomic energy, and (2) an agreement by all countries, enforced through inspection, that two-thirds of their present spending upon armaments be devoted toward constructive ends. Administration of the annual $10,000,000,000 which we offered to make available would be carried out through the United Nations.

"If the proposal were actually accepted, we would have concluded the greatest monetary bargain in our history; we would have probably saved mankind from destruction by fire; and we would have paved the way toward a new era of unimagined abundance for all men, based upon atomic energy constructively harnessed."

Maybe Senator McMAHON's plan is not the final answer. But to those who say it is not practicable, must we not answer: "If it is not practicable to spend $10,000,000,000 a year for world peace and progress, how practicable is it to spend ten to possibly fifty billion dollars a year for an armament race when, as Senator McMAHON reminds us, '5,000 years of recorded history teach us again and again and again that armament races end in war'?" Of all plans so far proposed, Senator McMAHON's seems the most worthy of a nation that calls itself Christian and the one that seems surest to bring other nations to our side in a program to preserve world peace and prevent a hydrogen war.

As has been well said, "Every crisis is an opportunity." As we have frequently said, "Always thank God when a bad situation gets worse, for then something will be done about it." The very terribleness of our new situation may well drive us into some effective plan for strengthening the United Nations and setting up an effective program for world peace. But there must first be a driving force greater than any selfish desire to save our own skins and our own wealth. Only Christianity, we believe, can supply such a driving force. There must be a program which not merely talks of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men, but proposes to act on this basic Christian principle. We must let Russia and all humanity know that we are just as anxious not to kill other human beings and their children as not to have other human beings kill us and our children. We must have not merely the negative, despairing program of a continuing and bankrupting armament race ending in war. Rather we must have the inspiration of a great, challenging, constructive, hopeful program of building a better world for all men—some such objective as Senator McMAHON envisioned in his great address.

To all the Christian men in Congress, to the leaders in all churches, our Christian periodicals, to every Christian man or woman, and to all who believe in Christian ideals, whether or not they belong to any religious denomination, comes the challenge to work as individuals and through their organizations. Christianity must lead America and the world to that "peace on earth, good will toward men" which the very seriousness of the hydrogen bomb may now make the nations of the world bring to reality.

Repeal Telephone Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Repeal Telephone Excise Taxes," prepared by Mr. T. H. Sanderson, of Portage, Wis., director of the Wisconsin State Telephone Association, of Madison, Wis.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPEAL TELEPHONE EXCISE TAXES

(By T. H. Sanderson, of Portage, Wis., director, Wisconsin State Telephone Association, Madison, Wis.; also president People's Telephone Co., main office, Rio, Wis.)

The United States Government, during World War II, placed an excise tax on telephone usage to deter the public from demanding telephone service, except where absolutely necessary, at a time when materials, such as steel, copper, lead, zinc, etc., used in communication systems, were sorely needed for war purposes. Similar excise taxes were placed on certain so-called luxuries transportation, etc., but the Government, recognizing telephone communications as of prime importance to the success of the Nation's war effort, placed higher taxes as a curb, on the telephone user-public than were placed on other taxable commodities and services.

What Government considered as an effective wartime deterrent against greater usage of telephone communications, has become a more effective deterrent during postwar times, resulting in loss of business to the telephone industry and an unjustifiable tax on telephone users throughout the United States.

What the annual excise-tax dollar value amounts to in Wisconsin, is shown by the following table, which sets forth the amounts of excise taxes paid by the various classes of telephone companies, ranging from large to small, during the year 1948.

Class of company	Number of companies	Exchange revenues	Excise tax paid on exchange revenues	Toll revenues	Excise tax paid on toll revenues
Class A	11	$32,563,510	$4,884,526	$15,264,533	$3,052,907
Class B	8	382,198	57,330	184,576	36,915
Class C	64	1,155,302	173,295	547,015	109,403
Class D	111	616,141	92,421	213,848	42,770
Class E	87	150,625	22,594	40,081	8,016
Total	279	34,867,976	5,230,196	16,240,053	3,248,011

Recap of excise taxes paid in 1948 by telephone users in Wisconsin

On exchange revenues	$5,230,196
On toll revenues	3,248,011
Total excise taxes paid in 1948	8,478,207

In 1949 it is estimated the telephone excise taxes paid in Wisconsin were over $9,274,000.

The excise tax, as stated above, was imposed by the Government as a war measure. The war is over. It ended in 1945 and 5 years later, in 1950, this wartime tax is still saddled on the general public. It affects every breadwinner in the Nation for the reason that the telephone excise taxes paid by large or small manufacturers and service companies, along with their other overhead expenses, are considered as part of the cost of production or operation and included in the basis for price fixing. Therefore, the consumer not only pays the tax on his personal telephone usage but, in addition, pays the telephone excise tax on every commodity or service he buys. Canada discontinued a similar war tax a long time ago and it's discontinuance in the United States is long overdue.

In Wisconsin, the telephone companies pay up to 41.6 percent of their total net revenue to the Federal and State Governments for income taxes alone. In addition, telephone users must pay 15 percent on all local exchange service plus 15 percent on toll calls costing less than 25 cents and 25 percent on toll calls costing 25 cents and over.

This tax is becoming a serious problem to our State regulatory commissions. General Solicitor McDonald for the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners testified before the House committee that State commissions are compelled to provide $1.61 in net revenue before Federal income taxes in order to enable the utility to receive $1 after such taxes.

In the telephone industry, with the excise taxes of from 15 to 25 percent added, the tax situation is even worse. It thus appears that most subscribers pay over $2, before income and excise taxes, to net the telephone company $1.

From 50 to 60 cents of every telephone revenue dollar is required for wages, as compared with 20 to 25 cents for electric utilities, due to the large operating personnel required. In other words, about 46 percent of the subscriber's dollar for local service goes to employees as wages, social security, etc. The starting and maximum rates of pay have more than doubled since 1939, while at the same time the period required to go from the starting rate to the maximum wage rate has been shortened.

Under the 1949 Federal Fair Labor Standards Act the increase from 40 to 75 cents in the minimum hourly wage rate has made it necessary for many small telephone companies to raise their subscribers' rates in order to survive and by raising the subscribers' rates the Federal excise tax was automatically increased so that now, 5 years after the end of the war, paradoxically, telephone subscribers are paying higher war taxes on telephones than they paid when the war was on.

Further, the collection of this tax by telephone companies is very expensive. It takes a great deal of book work and accounting to collect and account for the tax on each telephone message and on each service charge. Many of the toll costs are 25 cents or less and the amount of clerical help necessary and the expense thereof is in many instances all out of proportion with the revenues received. For this service, the telephone companies receive nothing. Not only the tax but the expense of collection and remittance must in the end be paid by the subscribers and those who use the telephone service.

The removal of the Federal excise tax on telephone service will affect a direct saving to users of over 937,000 telephones in Wisconsin and, on their behalf, your valued support toward that end is earnestly solicited.

Notes Off the Record by Gertrude Pierson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the State of Washington produces many good things, including normal, intelligent, and curious people, among whom are found an occasional philosopher and Gertrude Pierson is one of them. Her column, Notes Off the Record which appears from time to time in the Cashmere Record is read by many and I ask unanimous consent that one of Mrs. Pierson's recent articles be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD for the enjoyment of others.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTES OFF THE RECORD

(By Gertrude Pierson)

MIND YOUR P'S AND Q'S

Joe and I are not especially concerned with the "Q's." It's the "P's" that are our pet peeve, namely, potatoes, politicians, pockets and purses.

We know little of politics and less of economics, with the exception of the kind of economics that keeps us busy chewing up pencils. Luckily pencils can still be obtained at two for a nickel. We wish we could say the same for eggs and potatoes; they'd make much better chewing.

But at 5 cents a pound potatoes have become almost a luxury; apples definitely so, and eggs to be rationed carefully. Of course, we are aware that we are not as important as the cattle being fed surplus (?) potatoes at the rate of 1 cent per hundredweight, but we do wonder why we cannot buy them at $1.25 a bushel, the price paid to the farmer by the Government. We wonder also why eggs are buried underground while children go hungry.

Speaking entirely from our own personal experience, because we cannot then be accused of not knowing what we are talking about, we feel sure the problem is a shortage of consumers' dollars, not a surplus of produce.

In our case, after we have paid for rent, clothing, fuel, insurance and so forth, not to mention taxes, we have exactly $15 a week to spend at the grocery store—no more. This amount divided by 21 meals per week for 4 people comes out at about 15 cents per meal per person, about 12 cents in reality because some inedible items such as soap are included in the grocery orders.

Our budget is completely inflexible, ironclad. There's no way for us to pile up a debt in the manner our Government does, we are forced to live within our resources. And we do not think we are less than representative of a large number of families in or near our income group.

The only solution in sight, since we cannot influence the kind of reasoning that allows malnutrition to exist because of a surplus of foods, to add to the surplus and remove ourselves from the consumers' list by planting our own "tater" patch, and let the cattle eat the farmers' surplus while we pay taxes to support the price and sweat while hoeing our own rows.

Maybe we'll get a few hens and a hog too, then work for wages to support the "critters."

All because petty, paltering politicians pick the pockets and the purses of the population to produce false price levels for the Nation's products.

Passingly peculiar, wouldn't you say? Just to get the "Q" in, too, we'll say we think it's also a little queer. No, we don't understand politics.

McCarthy's Creaking Limb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washington Daily News of today, written by Peter Edson. The article is entitled "McCARTHY's Creaking Limb."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCCARTHY'S CREAKING LIMB

(By Peter Edson)

First one of Wisconsin Republican Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY'S 81 security risk cases to be identified by name is David Demarest Lloyd. He is now employed as an assistant to Charles V. Murphy, who recently succeeded Clark Clifford as President Truman's counsel.

In Senator MCCARTHY'S 6-hour speech David Lloyd was identified only as Case No. 9. Here is what Senator MCCARTHY had to say about him:

"This individual, after investigation, was not given security clearance by the State Department. After failing to obtain clearance by the State Department he secured a job in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. And where do Senators think that man is today? He is now a speech writer in the White House. That is Case No. 9.

"So that there may be no question about this, we will refer directly to the investigative file. I think I am doing Mr. Truman a favor by telling him this. I do not think he knows it. I do not think he would have this individual there writing speeches for him if he knew it.

"Both the individual referred to and his wife—this is in the file of the investigative agency—are members of Communist-front organizations. He has a relative who has a financial interest in the Daily Worker. But in any event the State Department used good judgment not to clear this individual."

That's the end of what Senator MCCARTHY had to say about Case No. 9. Senator MCCARTHY may have a lot of stuff in his 80 other cases. But even Senator MCCARTHY admits today that he is not going to push this case. The record of David Lloyd's life may indicate why.

David Demarest Lloyd is 38. He is married and the father of two children. The family for the past 10 years has lived at 2501 Ridge Road Drive, Alexandria, Va. He was born in New York. His own father and mother were Democrats, but most of his relatives were Republicans. He had one great-aunt who died about 10 years ago who was considered something of an eccentric. She was one of three wealthy women who "angeled" and fronted as publishers for the Daily Worker in its early days.

Young Lloyd himself is medium-build, light-haired, and wears glasses. He is the quiet, serious, scholarly type. He is an Episcopalian. His hobby is painting water colors. He was graduated from Harvard in 1931 and Harvard law in 1935. He got into Government service through Department of Agriculture's Resettlement Administration.

In this period he joined the Washington Co-Operative Bookshop, along with a lot of other Washingtonians who thought they were joining to get discounts on books. Later on most of them found they had been sucked in on a Commie front organization and got out. Mr. Lloyd also joined the National Lawyer's Guild, in the days when Supreme Court Justice Jackson, Judge Ferdinand Pecora, and other prominent attorneys joined. When the guild revealed itself as way over to the left, Mr. Lloyd and all the other anti-Communists got out.

In 1945 Lloyd went to Europe with the Harriman economic mission. While there he says it became clear to him that communism was trying to destroy European recovery. When he came back to the United States in 1945 he looked around to see what could be done about it.

Americans for Democratic Action was being formed. Mr. Lloyd helped in its founding, joined its staff, and helped draft the anti-Communist planks in the ADA constitution.

About this time Mr. Lloyd made application for a job in the State Department. While he was being investigated, he got a job in the National Defense Establishment. But he asked the State Department to keep his file pending, because he might want to transfer to State.

In 1947, Representative KARL STEFAN (Republican, of Nebraska) asked the State Department for an abstract of its files on employees and applicants for jobs under investigation. Lloyd's file was sent to Representative STEFAN. It became his Case No. 99 in hearings of the House Appropriations Committee in January, 1948.

When these hearings were published Mr. Lloyd recognized his case, though he wasn't mentioned by name. He protested to the State Department, and he went to see Mr. STEFAN.

From the State Department's John Peurifoy, now Deputy Under Secretary of State in charge of administration and security, Lloyd

got an abject apology. It included an admission there were no questions of security risk in connection with his case, and an explanation that his file should not have been sent to the House Appropriations Committee.

From Representative SYKES, Mr. Lloyd got assurances that a statement on his protest would be filed with his record. Mr. Lloyd thought the matter closed. Nevertheless, 2 years later he was to find that Senator McCARTHY had picked up the old Stefan file and publicized it without any qualifications as Case No. 9.

Senator McCARTHY's reference to Mr. Lloyd as "a White House speech writer" is hardly correct. He works under Presidential Counsel Murphy, principally on legislative matters.

Mr. Murphy and Presidential Press Secretary Charles G. Ross describe Mr. Lloyd as a man of all work, one of a team of able young men on the White House staff. His salary is about $10,000 a year.

Mr. Ross says Mr. Lloyd has been thoroughly investigated by the FBI and cleared by the White House Loyalty Review Board. Everyone in the White House is convinced of his absolutely reliability. The President himself is said to have reviewed the Lloyd record and to have every confidence in his complete loyalty.

His record in the White House is that he has fought communism at every opportunity.

Our Foreign Policy at Midcentury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Harold E. Stassen at a Lincoln Day dinner:

Chairman TOPP, Congressman Ford, Mrs. Loomis, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it has been almost 5 years since that 16th day of April, 1945, when President Truman spoke to a joint session of the Congress and began his administration of our country.

We gather tonight in the home city of the outstanding Republican statesman and patriot of those 5 years, the Honorable ARTHUR VANDENBERG, your United States Senator. It is thus fitting and highly desirable that we should here and now review those 5 years in terms of foreign policy, and think together of the actions that should be taken by our country in the current state of world affairs.

On that 16th day of April in 1945, the armed forces of the United States and of her western Allies, under the superb command of General Eisenhower, were sweeping forward to complete victories on all fronts throughout the world. On that day the American Ninth Army crossed the Elbe River, last water barrier before Berlin. It was ranged along that river for a stretch of 120 miles, and at its nearest point it was only 75 miles from the German capital. On that day, the United States Third Army was only 7 miles from the Czechoslovakian border, and, at Chemnitz, was only 90 miles northwest of Prague. On that day, the American Fifth Army had moved forward through the last Apennine barrier and was only a mile from Argenta, the key to the Po River gap in Italy. On that day, the German Air Force had been destroyed, the German Navy had been sunk, and the German Army was rapidly retreating on all fronts before the American forces.

On that April 16, in the Pacific, the American armed forces, under the brilliant command of General MacArthur, Admiral Halsey, Admiral Nimitz, and General Kenny, had completed the recapture of the Philippines and had landed on Okinawa. Tokyo was 50 percent in ruins from air attack; the Japanese Navy was sunk; and the Japanese Air Force was largely destroyed.

On that 16th day of April 1945, the United States of America had in the field the most powerful armies in the world; we had in the air the most effective air force in the world; we had at sea the greatest fighting fleet in the world. Our homeland was undamaged by war; our industrial production was at an all-time high; our agriculture had favored us with bountiful crops.

Never, in all of history, had one nation put forth the tremendous fighting effort, or had achieved such vast production, or had exhibited the exceptional teamwork and courage and precision of execution, with which this Nation astonished the world in that war.

Never, in all of history, was the prestige of any nation as high or its position as strong as was that of our country on that day.

But today: In Poland, where Hitler's attack caused the beginning of the major war; in Czechoslovakia, object of the last desperate bid for peace at Munich; in Bulgaria; in Rumania; in Hungary; we find dictatorships which arrest American citizens, insult and attack leaders of the Christian church, trample on the human rights in which we believe, and mouth wild accusations against the Stars and Stripes.

Today, nearly all of China and its 450,000,000 people—the nation which we refused to permit Japan to subjugate and thereby suffered Pearl Harbor—is under the domination of a group of men who publicly attack us, call us imperialists and war mongers, arrest and insult our official consuls, mistreat our missionaries, and cruelly oppress their own peoples.

Today, in Berlin, our representatives find themselves in a precarious position, harried by recurring blockades of their railroads and highways and by other disruptions to the fulfillment of their rights and responsibilities in the capital of the German nation.

With your permission I should like to review concisely the major events of the 5 years intervening as a prelude to some specific suggestions for the future. I review them not with a spirit of rancor, nor of bitterness, nor of narrow partisanship. I review them because I believe that we have reached the point where a frank facing of hard facts will give us a better chance to evolve a sound program for the future.

It must be said, as we think back to April 16, 1945, and then look about the world today, that never before in the history of the world has a major nation, in 5 years' time, lost so many of its objectives through the executive conduct of its foreign affairs as has this Nation in these past 5 years.

How was it possible to lose so much in so short a time? How did it happen? Was it inevitable?

What prevented it from being even worse?

A review of the record shows these following facts, and I recite them now quietly and carefully with an invitation to be corrected if they are inaccurate in any detail. Of course, the aggressive and coldly calculated deceptiveness of the leaders in the Kremlin has been a major cause for what has happened. But what of this country's contribution to the unhappy record?

On April 17, 1945, the day after the President began his administration, the drive of the American Army to Berlin was halted. Our Army stood still and did not move, and it was not until the 2d of May that Berlin fell to the Red Army. Then on May 6 United States troops began to withdraw from the Elbe River to a line more than 50 miles to the rear which is now the zone boundary to western Germany. That withdrawal took place without any written agreement for a corridor or line of communications to Berlin.

In Czechoslovakia the Third Army had moved forward until General Patton's patrols were only 7 miles from Prague, the capital city, and there they stopped—under orders—virtually within sight of Hradcany Hill and the spirals of its ancient cathedral, even though the Czech patriots in Prague had temporarily seized part of the city and sent out radio calls for American aid. When that aid was not forthcoming, many of those patriot leaders of Czechoslovakia were captured and executed by the Germans. Not until May 9 did the Red Army arrive in Prague.

In Austria, the American Army reached Steyr on the Enns River on May 6 and then waited there 3 days for the Russians to arrive.

I do not attempt to evaluate the varied accounts of the behind-the-scenes conflicts that are alleged to be responsible for these disheartening facts. I simply recite that which no one can deny and state the further fact that these armies would have obeyed the orders of their Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

On July 17, 1945, the Potsdam Conference of the major powers was held. There was no Republican representation whatsoever at that conference. There was no Republican consultation in advance of that conference. The agreement there made contained many ambiguous and conflicting statements. On one hand it declared that Germany was to be treated as a single economic unit and, on the other, that the individual zone commanders would be supreme in their respective zone.

The Potsdam agreement was one of the most unfortunate ever entered into by a major nation. It made large and very definite concessions to the Russians, and it contained ambiguities concerning those things in which we had a vital interest.

The Potsdam agreement also provided for a Council of Foreign Ministers. It the midst of a series of their meetings, the Big Three Foreign Secretaries gathered in Moscow in December 1945—again without any Republican representation. It was at this December 1945 Moscow meeting that so-called agreements were made concerning eastern Europe. Actually they were concessions to the Russians. For instance, it was agreed to accept a token broadening of the Rumanian and Bulgarian Governments in exchange for United States recognition, even though the Ethridge Report had clearly shown that the Groza government in Rumania and the Georgiev government in Bulgaria were not broadly representative of the unhappy peoples of those nations.

Another similar development is noted in the European Advisory Commission's actions—without Republican participation, it rearranged the zones in Austria in such a manner that the entire northern border of Austria was placed in the Russian zone, thereby sealing off the southern border of Czechoslovakia and giving control of the Danube River to the Red army.

In December 1945 the able and distinguished General Marshall was sent to China. He was sent with specific instructions from the President which were drawn up without any Republican participation and without adequate opportunity for General Marshall to evaluate them. According to these instructions, his mission in China was specifically that of working out a coalition between the Nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek and the Communist forces of Mao Tse-tung. The net result of these efforts clearly was to give to the Communist armies of the north time to build their strength, to move into Manchuria, and to arm; to further weaken, by delay, the already weak and corrupt government of the Nationalist Party;

and to contribute immeasurably to the subsequent Communist domination of China.

This entire series of facts has had very sad results for our country and for freedom. The result could have been even more disastrous if it had not been for other moves that were constructive. It is well for us briefly to consider them also.

The United Nations Charter was successfully completed and adopted. But in this instance there was Republican participation, carried through in accordance with appointments made by the late President Franklin Roosevelt. Under that Charter, Israel has arisen, a new and promising nation in the Near East; the Dutch Indies have emerged as a new commonwealth; French Indochina is gaining an increased measure of independence; an Atlantic Pact has been formed to bring closer together the North Atlantic nations in the face of the Communist threat. The official minutes of the American delegation at the United Nations Conference will show that not only was the American effort bipartisan in nature, but, that many of the key constructive provisions—provisions for peaceful adjustment of dispute regardless of origin for individual and collective self-defense, and for an amending convention—were all originated by Republican members of the delegation, and none of them were in the original Dumbarton Oaks draft. These provisions have been the basis of the Atlantic Pact. They have also been important in the work of Ralph Bunche in Palestine and of the committees that went to the Dutch Indies.

The aid to Greece and Turkey, which has implemented the Truman doctrine, was planned on a bipartisan basis and was constructively revised on a bipartisan basis in the Senate.

The second major constructive accomplishment in these 5 years has been the Marshall plan. This also was developed and passed on a bipartisan basis, and its success has in large measure been due to the insistence of Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, your fellow citizen, that it be administered by an able executive independent of the State Department and approved by the Senate. That executive is Paul Hoffman.

The negotiation of the Italian peace treaty was concluded through a definitely bipartisan effort in which Senator VANDENBERG and John Foster Dulles played a large part. That accomplishment was of vast importance in saving Italy from communism and in moving her forward toward successful rebuilding.

One other constructive accomplishment has been the Inter-American Defense Treaty, which was negotiated at Rio in August 1947. This again was a bipartisan measure. It was stimulated by the Republicans, and was ratified by the Senate by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 72 to 1.

The Vandenberg resolution was the forerunner and spark for the Atlantic Pact, and the Republican-originated articles 51 and 52 of the Charter made the Atlantic Pact legally possible.

In emphasizing these facts tonight, I speak not so much to Republicans as to all those impartial and fair-minded citizens who are deeply concerned for their country's future. I ask that this review be analyzed. I ask this: Is it not true that in this 5-year period the sad failures in American foreign policy have occurred when the administration has moved alone, when it has not sought Republican participation in making decisions? Is it not also true that those instances in which there has been a measure of success have been those in which there has been Republican participation?

I say sincerely that I do not wish by this review to claim disproportionate credit for the Republicans. It is natural that two groups of men, each with different backgrounds and different points of view, should together reach better solutions to grave long-term problems than either group alone. This is especially true when one of the groups is not handicapped by an urgent need to excuse or confirm past administrative actions. Furthermore, when thus addressing themselves together to far-reaching questions, they are likely to be lifted above petty considerations of political advantage.

Undeniably Republican participation has been beneficial, and I emphasize this point, not for the purpose of assessing blame or credit for what has taken place, but rather for the more urgent purpose of asking that the people of our country do now insist that their President and their administration from this date forward move in foreign policy with, and only with, Republican participation.

As one of the first steps to prevent a recurrence of past mistakes, the administration should make amends for the gratuitous slap which it took at Senator VANDENBERG when, in the organization of the Eighty-first Congress, it reduced the Republican representation on the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate to only 5 out of 13 members. This was done even though the Republicans, when in the majority in the preceding session, had granted six seats to the Democrats to seven for the Republicans, and then had cooperated wholeheartedly with the administration.

Having corrected that unwise and purely partisan error the administration should then invite the leadership of both political parties to meet with it in major conferences on the vital key questions of foreign policy before us today. Clearly these are:

First, what shall we do in Asia? When Ambassador Jessup returns from his Asiatic trip, a bipartisan conference, including Senator Vandenberg and Senator Taft, Senator Knowland, Congressman Walter Judd, and former President Hoover, should be held. From such a conference I believe an economic-aid program can be evolved which would convincingly demonstrate that the United States is interested in the future of the people of Asia and which would prove false the Communist propaganda that we are deserting all of Asia. Agreement should be sought on some able individual to become the administrator of the American aid-to-Asia program. That person would have powers and duties parallel to those of Paul Hoffman in Europe.

We cannot expect sound and favorable results until American Asiatic policy is brought together under one able man and geared in with the economic efforts of the other free nations.

It is not too soon to begin to look ahead to the end of the Marshall plan and to begin to discuss such proposals as that our separate policies for Asia and Europe should be brought together into a world-wide economic policy, which would be tailored so that its total demands upon the American economy will not be too heavy, and so directed as to give the maximum boost to the convertibility of currencies and the redevelopment of multilateral trade throughout the world.

The other major urgent question of foreign policy involves the hydrogen bomb. Clearly the decision to proceed to develop this bomb is right, for it comes at a time when there is every indication that the Soviet Union is proceeding to build its war strength in every way. But this decision, by itself, is not sufficient. Even though the chances of success may be only one in a thousand, this Nation owes it to its children, and to all mankind, to make every possible additional effort to bring about a basic change of policy in the Soviet Union and to obtain free and open United Nations inspections of atomic developments and joint world disarmament.

The President of the United States should therefore request a major midcentury conference with the leaders of the Soviet Union. American participation in the conference must be bipartisan. Its delegates must specifically include not only the President, Dean Acheson, Louis Johnson, and General Bradley but also Senator Vandenberg, Senator Taft, Bernard Baruch, and General Eisenhower. The conference should be held in a neutral location such as Stockholm, Helsinki, or Vienna. The Russians who participate must include the key men of the Politburo. In addition to Stalin, Malenkov, Molotov, Beria, and Voroshilov should be present.

To make my position very clear, I would be opposed to a conference with the leaders of Russia if it did not include Republican representation. Furthermore, the American participants must have preliminary conferences of their own to clarify their thinking in advance. In addition the President of the United Nations General Assembly and appropriate representation of Great Britain and France should be invited to sit in. A complete record should be kept of this midcentury conference, and be published in all languages and distributed throughout the world. I do not propose the midcentury conference with any view that agreements in words should be looked upon as success. Only the definite actions to carry out those agreements will indicate success.

I do not, in fact, propose this midcentury conference with any belief that it has bright prospects of success. But I do most earnestly believe that however small the chance of success the grim tragedy that would come to all mankind from a third world war, absolutely requires that a nation with our moral foundation exhaust every possibility and do so repeatedly, in an attempt to end the terrible threat of war, that lies in the race to increase atomic armament. Furthermore, even though such a conference fails, or if the invitation is rebuffed, our moral leadership in the world will be strengthened, and ultimately moral force will decide the future of mankind.

On a similar bipartisan basis, we should also formulate, and rapidly put into effect, a program of moderate economic aid to the underprivileged and less developed areas of the world.

And as we proceed, we must remain strong and alert. No matter what our individual views may be, everyone must clearly recognize that in the world situation that now confronts us we will not prove that we want peace, and we will not get peace, by permitting ourselves to become weak. But let me emphasize that it is never a sign of weakness to seek an honorable lasting peace. In fact the seeking itself adds to moral standing and ethical position which are sources of great strength.

It is my belief that if we do develop our foreign policy on a bipartisan basis, with Republican participation, and if beyond that we talk that policy through with the whole of the American people and do so frankly and sincerely, we will evolve policies that are consistent; that take a long-term view in accord with our fundamental moral and ethical principles; and that will hold the best prospect of contributing to the future peace and progress of ourselves and of all nations.

There have been those who have insisted that our foreign policy cannot be discussed openly with our people because that would involve disclosing too much of secret information. But recent court decisions and official investigations, which have revealed the presence of foreign spies in our Department of Justice, in our Department of State, and in our atomic energy program clearly indicate that the Communist leaders in the Kremlin have in fact known more about our policies and our secrets than have the American people themselves. I say, let us tighten up the American security against Communist activity, and let us open up increased information to the American people.

On this foundation, with participation by both political parties, this Nation will place

its foreign policy on a positive instead of a negative base. Even if the conference with the Russian leaders fails, America can then proceed, by employing every possible means—not only the radio but also literature distributed by balloons and high-flying airplanes—to send information over the iron curtain to the Russian people. By doing this we may well regain the ground lost for the freedom of mankind without the holocaust of war and notwithstanding the leaders of Russia.

My fellow citizens, with deep and earnest conviction I submit to you that this is the manner in which our America must give effective moral leadership to the world. This is the road that leads to the best prospect for peace and progress for the men and women and children of this Nation and of all nations.

Labor and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I append hereto a most important and interesting editorial from the New York Times of February 10 on this subject:

LABOR AND POLITICS

An interesting problem has been placed by David Dubinsky before the executive council of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Dubinsky was one of the few important labor leaders in this city to support Newbold Morris for mayor last fall in the face of combined A. F. of L.-CIO backing for Mr. O'Dwyer. Presumably as a result of the position taken by Mr. Dubinsky and his union, the ILGWU representative was asked to resign from New York City's central A. F. of L. group. It is acceptance of this resignation by the Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York that Mr. Dubinsky is now asking the A. F. of L.'s highest executive body to reverse.

The problem raised by Mr. Dubinsky to the topmost Federation level is this: Should a labor organization following one political line require its officials—or, for that matter, its members—to conform to that line under pain of expulsion? This question becomes of increasing importance as labor unions as such tend more and more to take political positions. In the present case Mr. Dubinsky asks "whether a central labor union * * * has the power or the right to compel uniformity of political thought and action by all * * * members."

It seems to us in the interest both of labor and of democracy not to discourage independence of thought and action inside (as well as outside) the ranks of labor. Obviously, any labor organization, from local to top executive board, may participate in political activity if it wants to. But to enforce conformity under pain of expulsion (which is a very serious sanction indeed) would be to blanket the minds of union members. That is hardly a democratic procedure.

The CIO, to be sure, is now ridding itself of Communist domination. But there is a very real distinction, so far as labor is concerned, between political dissent as expressed within the framework of the democratic system and the tactics of distortion and disruption employed by the Communists inside the labor movement to further their own ends. The Communists use unions primarily as weapons in an ideological battle. To root out Communist influence is one thing; it is quite another for a labor group, whether A. F. of L., CIO, or independent, to require that all its members subscribed to whatever political line it may be following at the moment.

Where To Apply for Surplus Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the list published in the RECORD by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] of agencies authorized to handle surplus potatoes and other commodities, I include the following names and addresses of officials of certain Southern States with such authority:

Arkansas: J. H. Carter, State purchasing agent, 1817 Spring Street, Post Office Box 2940, Little Rock, Ark.

Kentucky: H. E. Walters, Department of Agriculture, New Capitol Building, Frankfort, Ky.

Louisiana: T. B. Kirklin, State Board of Education, Baton Rouge, La.

Mississippi: J. M. Tubbs, Department of Education, Old Capitol, Jackson, Miss.; W. D. Hilton, State Board of Trustees of Mental Institutions, 2550 North State Street, Jackson, Miss.

The distributing agents for the State of Texas are as follows:

Texas distributing agents, commodity distribution program

District	Name of distributing agent	Title	Address	Counties
Amarillo	Charles M. Rogers	Superintendent, Amarillo independent school district.	Senior high school, Polk St., Amarillo, Tex.	Armstrong, Briscoe, Carson, Childress, Castro, Collingsworth, Dallam, Deaf Smith, Donley, Gray, Hall, Hansford, Hartley, Hemphill, Hutchinson, Lipscomb, Moore, Oldham, Ochiltree, Parmer, Potter, Randall, Roberts, Sherman, Swisher, Wheeler.
Austin	T. K. Taylor	Business manager, Austin public schools.	701 East 11th St., Austin, Tex.	Bastrop, Blanco, Burnet, Coma., Caldwell, Dewitt, Fayette, Gillespie, Gonzales, Guadalupe, Hays, Lavaca, Llano, Kendall, Travis.
Beaumont	Only Gore	County superintendent, Jefferson County School Board.	Courthouse, Beaumont, Tex.	Chambers, Hardin, Jasper, Jefferson, Liberty, Newton, Orange.
Brownwood	Harley H. Black	County superintendent, Brown County School Board.	Courthouse, Brownwood, Tex.	Brown, Callahan, Coleman, Comanche, Concho, Eastland, Jones, Mason, Monard, McCulloch, Mills, Stephens, Shackelford, San Saba, Taylor.
Corpus Christi	Dustin D. Snow	County superintendent, Nueces County School Board.	Courthouse, Corpus Christi, Tex.	Nueces, Aransas, Bee, Brooks, Calhoun, Duval, Cameron, Goliad, Hidalgo, Jim Hogg, Jim Wells, Kenedy, Kleberg, Live Oak, Refugio, San Patricio, Starr, Webb, Willacy, Victoria, Zapata.
Cameron	Charles Elder	County superintendent, Milam County School Board.	Courthouse, Cameron, Tex.	Bell, Brazos, Burleson, Grimes, Lee, Leon, Madison, Milam, Robertson, Washington, Williams.
Corsicana	J. C. Watson	County superintendent, Navarro County School Board.	Courthouse, Corsicana, Tex.	Dallas, Kaufman, Van Zandt, Ellis, Navarro, Henderson.
El Paso	Lynn R. Davis	Business manager, El Paso public schools	109 W. Rio Grande El Paso, Tex.	Brewster, Culberson, El Paso, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis, Loving, Pecos, Presidio, Reeves, Terrell.
Fort Worth	O. R. Snow	County superintendent, Tarrant County School Board.	Courthouse, Fort Worth, Tex.	Denton, Erath, Hood, Johnson, Palo Pinto, Parker, Somervell, Tarrant, Wise.
Houston	J. Hall Sheppard	County superintendent, Harris County School Board.	1225 Elder St., Houston, Tex.	Austin, Brazoria, Colorado City, Ft. Bend, Galveston, Harris, Jackson, Matagorda, Montgomery, Waller, Wharton.
Lubbock	Ray Boyd	County superintendent, Lubbock County School Board.	Courthouse, Lubbock, Tex.	Andrews, Bailey, Borden, Cochran, Cottle, Crosby, Dawson, Dickens, Ector, Floyd, Foard, Gaines, Garza, Hale, Hardeman, Hartley, Haskell, Kent, King, Knox, Lamb, Lubbock, Lynn, Martin, Midland, Motley, Stonewall, Terry, Winkler, Yoakum.
Lufkin	T. J. Wilsey	County superintendent, Angelina County School Board.	Courthouse, Lufkin, Tex.	Angelina, Anderson, Cherokee, Gregg, Harrison, Houston, Nacogdoches, Panola, Polk, Rusk, Sabine, San Augustine, Shelby, Smith, Trinity, Tyler, Walker, San Jacinto.
Paris	William Wallace	County superintendent, Lamar County School Board.	Courthouse, Paris, Tex.	Bowie, Camp, Cass, Collin, Delta, Fannin, Franklin, Grayson, Hopkins, Hunt, Lamar, Marion, Morris, Rains, Red River, Rockwall, Titus, Upshur, Wood.
San Angelo	Bryan Dickson	Superintendent, San Angelo independent school district.	344 Magdalen St., San Angelo, Tex.	Coke, Crane, Crockett, Fisher, Glasscock, Howard, Irion, Mitchell, Nolan, Reagan, Runnels, Schleicher, Scurry, Sterling, Tom Green, Upton, Ward.

Texas distributing agents, commodity distribution program—Continued

District	Name of distributing agent	Title	Address	Counties
San Antonio	W. B. Connell	Superintendent, Hot Wells independent school district.	400 Hot Wells Blvd., San Antonio, Tex.	Atascosa, Bandera, Bexar, Dimmit, Edwards, Frio, Karnes, Kerr, Kimble, Kinney, La Salle, Maverick, McMullen, Medina, Real, Sutton Uvalde, Val Verde, Wilson, Zavala.
Waco	J. E. Batson	County superintendent, McLennan County School Board.	Courthouse, Waco, Tex.	Bosque, Coryell, Falls, Freestone, Hill, Hamilton, Limestone, Lampasas, McLennan.
Wichita Falls	B. H. Dinsmore	County superintendent, Wichita County School Board.	Courthouse, Wichita Falls, Tex.	Archer, Baylor, Clay, Cooke, Jack, Montague, Throckmorton, Wichita, Wilbarger, Young
State board of control [1]	Alice L. Miller	Assistant purchasing agent	State Capitol Bldg., Austin, Tex.	Taylor, Travis, Howard, McCulloch, Cooke, Coryell, Kerr, Limestone, Cherokee, Bexar, Navarro, Travis, Tom Green, Kaufman, McLennan, Wichita.
State board of hospitals and special schools.	Mayme Kelly	Director	Austin State Hospital, Austin, Tex.	Serving State institutions located in the above counties.

[1] To be changed to "Division of hospitals and special schools" as soon as the new board is organized.

Where Pioneer Strength of Character Still Prevails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in these times of myriad modern conveniences we often lose sight of the sturdy character of the strong and faithful American who still carries on in true pioneering style in many of the more or less remote areas of our great Nation.

It is to preserve in the archives of our Capital a vivid portrayal of such scenes still persisting in the broad scope of our national life that I offer herewith two revealing articles from recent pages of the Sandpoint (Idaho) Bulletin:

ODEN-SUNNYSIDE

(Mrs. Oliver Long, reporter)

WINTER SCENE AROUND LAKE PEND OREILLE, IDAHO

January 5 was the last issue of Oden-Sunnyside news. Since then much may have and did happen, but your reporter knows little about it. The snows came down and the wind whipped it about to fill driveways, roads, and fields. In some yards drifts came to the eaves of houses. Snowplows came and threw high walls, over which sometimes only a high truck top can be seen along the highway.

Along the Sunnyside roads the snow plow came through from the north on January 17. They opened on Sunnyside to near the Meeker place, where the lead plow nosed a bank and stopped. Two days later the road toward the east was plowed. That part from the mail boxes west could not be opened by the plows, and on January 28 the Dunn brothers, with their bulldozer, plowed it open. Up to this time we had missed 11 days' mail. The milk producers had to sled the milk to truckers on opened roads. On January 19 Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Earle and Faith Ellen walked in to visit the Longs. Mr. Earle kindly helped shovel the buildings clear of snow, and on January 23 Mr. and Mrs. D. A. Lange also walked in, and they, too, took dinner with the Longs.

The Oden school opened that week, but the Sunnyside bus was unable to take the children that week because of road conditions.

The Extension Club called a meeting for February 6 at Mrs. Ralph Earle's. No report on that.

The Busy Bee Club met last Thursday with Mrs. Max Eluver, with 11 people present.

Last week many white fishermen passed on the way to Sunnyside. No reports on the catches.

Mr. and Mrs. Dick Stockdale and children, of Sandpoint, were seen walking past to visit the Alva McNutt family. That part of the road to the Davis and McNutt homes is open only to teams and sleds.

WINTER FISHING ON LAKE PEND OREILLE

Whitefishing shacks on the ice of Lake Pend Oreille dot the entire area from Sandpoint to Sunnyside, but some fishermen report that the cutthroat trout have driven the whitefish closer to shore.

One fisherman told Dr. C. C. Wendle Sunday that in the Fisherman's Island area near Sunnyside he had to move his location inshore as too many trout were biting out in deeper water.

A plane flew low over the whitefishing shack town Sunday and created a disturbance among fishermen who were seen to toss out fish on the ice which could or could not have been trout, an observer said.

A good many trout have been hooked fishing through the ice for whitefish in the Ellisport Bay district, along with whitefish, reported one Hope resident, who said that more were being returned to the water than were released last year when a reportedly sizable number of cutthroat were retained in catches made in the area.

A Program for Occupation of Western Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended hereto a statement of the Committee on National Affairs on this subject signed by many distinguished Americans and spelling out in detail a positive program by which we may achieve the aims of our German occupation:

We recently emerged victorious from the second of two great wars fought within a single generation to defend democracy. We are still imperiled by German anti-democratic elements as well as by Russian Communist aggression—these threats are not unrelated.

A major failure to date in the fight against totalitarianism by the democracies has been the lack of success in developing a democratic Germany essential to the security of the democratic world. While the Russians are building a totalitarianism of the left in eastern Germany, there is danger of the rebirth of a totalitarianism of the right in western Germany. Both are antidemocratic. An undemocratic Germany, potentially an ally of the forces of Communist aggression, is now and will remain a continuing threat to the peaceful world free men seek.

The minimum objectives proclaimed necessary to assure a democratic Germany have not yet been attained.

1. The German economic war potential has not been brought under effective international control;

2. German industry has not been decartelized;

3. The German federal and state governments have not been effectively denazified as they include many former Nazis and Nazi supporters in key positions, and the all-important civil service has not been liberalized to permit greater employment of existing democratic elements.

4. German educational and cultural institutions have not been democratized.

We seek no Carthaginian peace. We believe that the natural, industrial, and human resources of Germany are necessary to the development of a balanced European prosperity and are therefore essential to the maintenance of international security. But we also firmly believe that these resources threaten world peace unless they are brought within the framework of international control and direction.

We therefore call upon the Government of the United States to take the following measures:

1. Forbid the creation of a national army or national police force in western Germany in accordance with the requirements of the Occupation Statute and the Bonn Accord.

2. Declare that it will continue to maintain occupation forces in western Germany until minimum democratic objectives have been attained and until our withdrawal would clearly not hazard the peace.

3. Insist upon continued and effective international control of the Ruhr and Rhine industries to insure their peaceful utilization, and provide for the decartelized integration of the German economy into that of western Europe.

4. Proceed vigorously to support and assist the democratic elements in Germany in the long-term task of democratizing the economic, political, and cultural institutions of that country.

5. Seek the restoration of German participation in nonmilitary international organizations at the earliest practicable time as

one means of integrating Germany so that it becomes a member in good standing of the family of democratic nations.

Samuel Hopkins Adams, New York; Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, New York; Roger N. Baldwin, New York; William H. Baldwin, New York; Courtenay Barber, Jr., Illinois; G. M. Bellanca, Delaware; Russell G. Bellamy, Maryland; Alfred M. Bingham, Connecticut; Dr. L. M. Birkhead, New York; Jacob Blaustein, Maryland; Raymond B. Bowen, New York; Mrs. Alda Breckinridge, New York; Percy S. Brown, New Hampshire; Struthers Burt, Wyoming; H. H. Butler, New York; Henry B. Cabot, Massachusetts; Samuel Cabot, Massachusetts; A. G. Cameron, Ohio; Dean Harry J. Carman, New York; Carl Carmer, New York; Delbert Clark, New York; Rufus E. Clement, Georgia; William T. Cobb, New York; William F. Cochran, Maryland; Morris L. Cooke, Pennsylvania; Albert S. Coolidge, Massachusetts; Emmett Corrigan, New York; Frank R. Crosswaith, New York; C. Suydam Cutting, New York; J. Clarence Davies, Jr., New York; A. Powell Davies, District of Columbia; J. Lionberger Davis, Missouri; Joseph M. Dawson, District of Columbia; Dr. Stephen Duggan, Connecticut; Charles P. Eisenhauer, Ohio; Thomas H. Eliot, Massachusetts; John Ellis, New York; Irving M. Engel, New York; Hugo Ernst, Ohio; George Field, New York; Prof. D. F. Fleming, Tennessee; Hugh L. Gaddis, Ohio; Truman K. Gibson, Jr., Illinois; Arthur J. Goldsmith, New York; Sylvan Gotshal, New York; D. Samuel Gottesman, New York; Herman A. Gray, New York; William Green, District of Columbia; Frederick P. Gruenberg, Pennsylvania; Edward O. Hascall, Jr., Michigan; August Heckscher, New York; William H. Hessler, Ohio; Tracy Higgins, New York; Melvin C. Hildreth, District of Columbia; Gen. John Hilldring, District of Columbia; Rt. Rev. Henry W. Hobson, Ohio; Dr. Bryn J. Hovde, New York; B. W. Huebsch, New York; Miss Alice W. Hunt, Rhode Island; Dr. Horace M. Kallen, New York; Dorothy Kenyon, New York; Prof. Hans Kohn, New York; Charles M. LaFollette, District of Columbia; Andrew M. Law, South Carolina; Goodhue Livingston, Jr., New York; Mrs. Burnett Mahon, New York; Frederick O. McKee, Pennsylvania; J. A. Migel, Rhode Island; Newbold Morris, New York; Edgar A. Mowrer, District of Columbia; Lewis Mumford, New York; P. G. Mumford, New York; William C. Murray, New York; Charlton Ogburn, New York; Harry A. Overstreet, California; Rt. Rev. G. Bromley Oxnam, New York; E. W. Palmer, Tennessee; James G. Patton, Colorado; Lewis Perry, Massachusetts; Prof. Ralph Barton Perry, Massachusetts; Henry V. Poor, New York; Arthur Upham Pope, New York; Richard de Rochemont, New York; Mrs. Tobe D. Rosenblum, New York; Richard H. Scandrett, Jr., New York; Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Massachusetts; F. E. Schuchman, Pennsylvania; Aaron Scherr, New York; Mrs. William Marston Seabury, New York; Eric Severeid, District of Columbia; Henry Noble Sherwood, Indiana; Mrs. William Dick Sporborg, New York; Admiral William H. Standley, California; Mark Starr, New York; Meier Steinbrink, New York; A. G. Stieglitz, New York; Rex Stout, New York; Clarence Streit, District of Columbia; Herbert Bayard Swope, New York; Telford Taylor, New York; Barent Ten Eyck, New York; F. B. Von Windegger, Missouri; Westmore Willcox, New York; Justice James H. Wolfe, Utah; Max Zaritsky, New York; Committee on National Affairs, New York, N. Y.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, all over our Nation this past week, there has been an outstanding thought, which is appropriately labeled "Brotherhood Week." And we do well to celebrate it simultaneously as we do with the birthday of our first President, George Washington. For it was the brotherliness of George Washington that did so much to knit the dissident and discontended soldiery of the thirteen independent colonies, into a united fighting force that finally triumphed over Britain's ablest soldiery. And it was Washington's own sense of brotherhood and neighborliness that did so much to unite those thirteen independent and contentious colonies into one nation, indivisible, and powerful enough to prevail against all separative forces.

If anyone will scan the pages of all human history and note carefully the noblest expressions of the wisest of men, he will quickly discover that the Brotherhood of Man has been the greatest ideal, the most desired object of all our human strivings and fightings and inventions and travail. Brotherhood under the common fatherhood of Almighty God was the essence of the religion taught and practiced by Jesus Christ, the head of all Christian churches. Brotherhood was the constantly reiterated lesson which Moses and Aaron and their successors sought to impose upon all Jews.

Especially I commend the National Conference of Christians and Jews for having thus launched this great ideal into the common everyday life of our 150,000,000 citizens, and given it a full week's treatment, in 15,000 pulpits, 10,000 different newspapers and thousands of theaters.

A great many people are spreading the idea that Americans are not as religious and kindly and neighborly a people as they once were, and that things were infinitely better in the good old days.

As to religion, expressed in the factual terms of actual church membership, the statistics are reassuring. Today church membership is nearing the 80,000,000 mark, which is an all-time high. One may quibble or argue as much as he likes but these 80,000,000 members are voluntary church members. They are members by their own active choice and action.

The percentage of population figure confirms this analysis for the percentage of population whch was only 4 to 5 percent in early colonial decades, has steadily grown to 22½ percent in 1890, to 52 percent in 1944, and runs today around 53 or 54 percent of our total population. And that is also an all-time high. It shows how steadily and strong has been the influence of our churches, cathedrals, and synagogues. It proves that year after year the cause of human brotherhood has progressed and will continue to progress. And that very substantial fact should give us all much encouragement against the disappointments and setbacks of which we often complain.

So let us not lose heart at any temporary reversals in the slow but substantial advance we are making. Let us continue in faith and hope and human charity to make the dream come true.

Salute to Gananoque

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Richard M. McKeon from America for December 24, 1949. Rev. Richard McKeon, S. J., is director of the school of industrial relations at Le Moyne College, Syracuse, N. Y. While dean of St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, 1935 to 1942, he founded its school of social sciences, a pioneer undertaking in the United States in free adult education in the Christian social program. Father McKeon is a charter member of the Industrial Relations Research Association.

The article follows:

SALUTE TO GANANOQUE

(By Richard M. McKeon)

On November 18, 1949, a modest gentleman journeyed from the little Canadian town of Gananoque, Ontario, to the busy industrial city of Syracuse, N. Y. The gentleman's name was Thomas J. Delaney. He is president of Parmenter & Bulloch Co., Ltd. Rightfully does this company boast to the entire world that it is 100 percent employee owned. Under the title "Every Worker a Capitalist," Mr. Delaney had come to tell the forum of the Le Moyne College School of Industrial Relations the fascinating story of this company, which is successfully putting into practice the principles of the Christian social order. A very large audience of high management officials, labor leaders, professional people, rank and file workers, and students pursuing their degree course in industrial relations showed their appreciation of his address by questioning him for more than an hour. It was a fitting climax to the fourth year of Le Moyne's endeavor to contribute to the industrial welfare of the community.

In a simple, expository style, devoid of any reference to the important part which he had played in the reorganization of the company, Mr. Delaney told the magnetic story of Gananoque. He mentioned that Parmenter and

Bulloch was established 66 years ago. The company produces rivets of all types, riveting machines, and various small metal items, including knitting needles and rings for bulls' noses. In 1946 the Bulloch family decided to sell and started negotiations with prospective buyers. One of these was a large corporation having several plants engaged in the same competitive field. There was grave danger that the Bulloch plant and its operations might be moved to another area. This would have meant loss of work for 200 employees and dismay for their families and gloom for the little town.

Here is where Mr. Delaney enters the picture, though he kept himself in the background as he spoke. He had come to Gananoque many years before, as a member of a Toronto rowing team. Because he liked the town, which is beautifully situated on the St. Lawrence River at the gateway to the Thousand Islands, he decided to remain. Entering the company, he worked himself up to the position of general manager about 10 years ago. His executive ability, together with his pleasing personality, won for him the respect not only of the entire firm but also of the community.

Realizing what the loss of the company would mean to his many friends, he recalled an idea which had made the Graybar Electric Co. a very successful concern. For Graybar, a national distributor of electrical equipment, is owned by its workers. Could he sell this idea of employee-ownership to his fellow workers? The emergency called for quick action. Rallying some leaders around him, he finally convinced the workers, and together they began a campaign to raise the necessary money. The owners were approached and a 30-day option was secured, with the purchasing price set at $300,000.

At this point in his address Mr. Delaney betrayed intense emotion for a moment. For here was the trying challenge. How could a group of 70 women and 140 men in ordinary circumstances raise this amount in a few weeks? What happened? A wonderful act of faith. Homes were mortgaged, war bonds were turned in, loans were secured, merchants fearful of their own welfare contributed. The amount raised was $253,000. No wonder the voice of Mr. Delaney thrilled when he said: "I will always admire and be grateful to my associates for their supreme efforts in raising such a substantial amount of money in a short space of time."

But the goal was far away and the cynics were sniping. Then the owners, hearing about the plan and the efforts of their employees, reduced the price to $525,000. With the ready cooperative help of Goulding & Rose, Ltd., investment brokers of Toronto, a bond issue of $275,000 was floated at very low rates. A plan to redeem these bonds over a 10-year period by means of pay roll deductions were drawn up. One may imagine the joy of Gananoque, after facing many obstacles, with hope often at low ebb, to learn that, when the bonds were offered for sale, the issue was oversubscribed before the certificates could be printed.

To protect the new company, a lengthy trust deed was drawn up by a prominent firm of corporation lawyers. There were many intricate legal details to clarify, for the idea of 100-percent employee-ownership was without precedent in Canada.

One special feature was the establishment of a voting trust. This important suggestion came from the Graybar Electric Co., with its experience of 29 years of successful operation as an employee-owned institution. The investment brokers also insisted on the voting trust before they floated the bond issue. This trust insures continuity of key management. It removes the possibility of an irresponsible group gaining control. Top management decides the policy of the company, but the workers are always kept fully informed about the more important matters.

Having thus explained the formation of the new company, Mr. Delaney now spoke of the results obtained under employee ownership. With justifiable pride he said that the plan had worked far better than they had ever hoped. The company has a happy cooperative spirit, with the result that tremendous gains have been made financially. Although during the past 3 years the number of workers has decreased, productivity has increased. The workers have a sense not only of belonging to but of actually owning the business. They do not waste time and material. They tolerate no careless work, for their own money is involved. They know that their combined efforts will determine the amount of dividends they will receive at the end of the business year. Mr. Delaney smiled when he told how a Toronto industrialist, on visiting the plant and examining the financial statement, exclaimed: "Every other manufacturer I know these days is getting only 3 days' work for 5 days' pay. Man, you're getting 6 for 5."

Every employee is a shareholder. Shares may be purchased through pay-roll deduction. If an employee leaves the company, his shares must be sold to the employees' pool and held for further distribution. An agreement is signed by all to this effect. No one outside the company can own shares in it.

When the company was reorganized, there seemed to be no hope of dividends for at least 2 years; none had been paid by the old company for many years. After only 6 months of operation, however, the improved status warranted the payment of a dividend. Thus far six dividends have been paid, representing an annual yield of 5 percent. At the same time, a fair amount of earnings is set aside for reserves.

Mr. Delaney continued: "We have redeemed $77,000 of our bond issue. Our last annual statement showed a ratio of current assets to current liabilities of over 7 to 1. Bankers think that the ratio of 3 to 1 is a good risk. When we bought the company we inherited a bank loan of $130,000, which has since been entirely wiped out. Our company is now in its strongest financial condition. Don't you think this proves the workability and success of employee ownership?"

What about wages and working conditions? The wages are the highest in the industry. The work week is now 40 hours instead of 44. Yet production, even with the present lower work force, shows an increase of 14 percent. There are 2 weeks vacation with pay, with extra time for older workers. A complete renovation of the plant has taken place along lines of greater efficiency and safety. Many of the ideas for improvement have come from the workers. Smoking is allowed on the job and canteen service is available.

The company has an excellent pension plan, to which both employees and company contribute. There is full sick pay and a bonus at Christmas. The company pays the whole cost of a hospitalization plan covering employees and their families.

The workers have a firm faith in the new set-up. They recognize that management must function as in other companies. Accordingly there are a board of directors, officers, and department heads who have the power to hire and fire. Three directors are from the main office, and two are from the shop. These directors keep a close scrutiny over the distribution of shares.

In the question period, which went for a full hour after Mr. Delaney's talk, the keen mind and sincere heart of the speaker captivated his hearers. Here are a few of the questions and answers:

"We understand that the United Steel Workers has a union in your plant. In view of your remarks, what is its main function?

"Its main function seems to be an effort to keep alive. We find it useful for grievance procedures. Thus far no grievance has reached our office.

"What would happen to your company if an industry-wide strike was called? Where would you be?

"We would be sitting pretty. We foresaw such a difficulty, and in our agreement the union is freed from participating in such a strike.

"What if the union should demand a wage increase?

"That is possible but not probable. Our workers know that a wage increase would mean less dividends.

"What is the difference between your policy and that of ordinary profit-sharing firms?

"In other firms, profit-sharing depends upon the decision of management, who frequently are not the owners. Have their workers a strict right to share in such profits, presuming they are receiving fair basic pay? Because we are the owners, we have that right and we pride ourselves that increased efficiency has made this possible. We are not unmindful of our customers in the form of lower prices.

"Have other companies shown an interest in your plan?

"Very many inquiries come to our office. We understand that two companies have set up similar programs but we have no report on their success.

"Do you workers use the time clock?

"Yes and no. All employees with 15 years of service, nearly half the force, do not punch the clock. Personally, I am in favor of tossing time clocks out completely.

"What is outstanding in the attitude of your workers?

"I would say that their most characteristic attitude is a supreme faith in the principle of employee ownership."

Mr. Delaney in his concluding remarks told how the early cynics predicted that the new company would not last 6 months, that it would be a socialistic mess, that the workers would lose everything. Some are still skeptical. Paraphrasing Scripture, he added, "Can any good come out of Gananoque?" and then he gave a smiling invitation to "Come and see."

The last question was, "What would happen in the event of a depression?"

"Well, what would happen to any company in a depression? To us it would mean retrenchment, cutting down budgets, reducing expenses wherever possible. We believe that we could weather a depression better than the average firm because we have a more understanding spirit among our associates."

In 1931 in his masterly encyclical, On the Reconstruction of the Social Order, Pius XI wrote:

"In the present state of human society, however, we deem it advisable that the wage contract should, when possible, be modified somewhat by a contract of partnership, as is already being tried in various ways to the no small gain of the wage earners and of the employers. In this way wage earners are made sharers in some sort in the ownership, or the management, or the profits."

In 1949 at Gananoque, Canada, this sound advice is now being successfully put into practice at the Parmenter & Bulloch plant.

Canada has many famous historical and religious shrines. But with all due respect to tradition and religion, we believe that she may boast about a special industrial shrine to which, we trust, many American representatives of labor and management will make a pilgrimage. On the way they will see the beauty and the peace of the Thousand Islands. For that shrine is at Gananoque, and there they will appreciate the conviction of mind and the contentment of heart reflected in the lives of its capitalist workers.

China Reds To Grab Chennault Planes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following ominous news story of a strange event in Hong Kong where Great Britain, a supposed ally in the war of survival against Communist aggression, decides to hand over a vast air fleet to our common enemy. The story is from the Washington News of February 24, 1950:

CHINA REDS TO GRAB CHENNAULT PLANES

(By Oland D. Russell)

The Chinese Communists were expected today to lose no time in flying out of Hong Kong the seventy-odd transport planes which have in effect been handed over to them by the supreme court in the British crown colony.

The planes, including communications and maintenance equipment, belong to an American corporation, headed by Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault of Flying Tiger fame.

They make up the biggest air fleet in China and for months have been sought by the Chinese Communists. They can be used to ferry military supplies to China from Russia, for dropping parachutists into Indochina, or for an amphibious assault on Formosa.

The Hong Kong court invoked "sovereign immunity" in deciding it could not take the planes under its protection by appointing a receiver for them. The court took the view that since the British had recognized the Communists, the Peiping regime was the legal and sovereign ruler of China and could not be disturbed from its possession of the planes.

SECRET, BIG PLANS

Though the American owners and representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Authority have been denied the access to the planes, pro-Communist employees of the two former Nationalist airlines have been permitted to board them at Kaitak Airfield where they are impounded. Anticipating a court decision in favor of the Communists, these former employees already have painted red flags on the ships and have been overhauling the motors in preparation for a quick getaway.

British authorities in Hong Kong have been trying for 3 months—even before London recognized the Red regime—to find a legal way of turning over these two completely equipped air lines to the Chinese Communists.

Communist pressure on the local British authorities has been great and the British themselves have not been unmindful of the trade benefits and good will that might accrue to them if they handed over the planes to the Communists.

Still other pressures have been exerted on the Hong Kong British by the London foreign office and the United States State Department for recognition of General Chennault's legal title to the planes.

"GODOWN" SURROUNDED

This showdown came this week. According to word received here, the Communists got word to the Hong Kong court that for every plane denied them, one British business establishment in Communist-occupied Shanghai would be taken over. "A godown (warehouse) for every plane," as the Reds tersely put it.

Facing this situation realistically, the Hong Kong court yielded to the Communists, taking advantage, according to observers here, of the British election following Washington's Birthday when communications with London and Washington would be at a minimum effectiveness.

The court in effect washed its hands of the whole affair, dumping a ticklish question on the London foreign office, but by choosing the holiday and election-day period, it gave some time leeway to the Communists to get the planes away from Hong Kong.

If any restraint is now to be used, it will have to be done on orders from London for some sort of executive action.

AMERICAN REPRISALS

At stake now is whether American diplomatic power can be used effectively to prod London into measures which still might save some or all of the planes from falling into Communist hands. The State Department has, through representations and notes, backed the Chennault claim to title of the planes and has insisted that the Hong Kong court conduct a trial to establish legality of this title.

But Washington consistently has refused to get tough about it, with the result that the Communists have slugged it out, and apparently have won, in the Hong Kong courts.

Some demands were heard here yesterday for American reprisals against the British through the ECA. It was pointed out that the British by letting planes and equipment valued at $20,000,000 be grabbed off by the Communists in effect have given an American air fleet to the Reds topping in value what the British will get in air equipment from the ECA.

The Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include here the last three articles in the series by Mr. Leon Starmont on the Columbia River region, entitled "Let's Explore the Basin." There has been widespread interest in this series, both out in the Pacific Northwest and among readers of the RECORD who have followed it here in the Capital.

Again, I want to state that I have had these articles inserted here because they represent one of the most complete attempts yet made to trace the high-spots of development of the Columbia River, and the controversies which have raged and still go on in the Northwest regarding the many conflicting ideas which have been advanced. The statements made are Mr. Starmont's own interpretation of a series of events which are subject to many interpretations. They should serve to indicate, if nothing more, that no one man or three men can ever hope to speak on behalf of all the residents of the great Pacific Northwest—nor should any such group ever be empowered to make decisions regarding development of the Columbia unless they are the direct representatives of those people.

The series also demonstrates what some of our Federal planners are prone to forget—that development of the Columbia region is not something new; it has evolved in thought and planning and action over a period of 60 years. I submit that the same people who have carried that development to date are fully capable of determining what future development should be and of taking the necessary steps to attain it.

For the benefit of all interested, here is an index of the complete series, as they appear in the Appendix of the RECORD:

	Date	Page
Article No.—		
1	Jan. 31	A[illegible]
2, 3	Feb. 2	A[illegible]
4, 5	Feb. 7	A897
6, 7, 8	Feb. 8	A[illegible]
9, 10	Feb. 9	A[illegible]
11, 12, 13	Feb. 20	A1246
14, 15, 16	do	A1249
17, 18, 19	Feb. 21	A1297
20, 21, 22	Feb. 27	A1412

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 20)

(By Leon Starmont)

Big Bend residents have started a drive to restore 300,000 acres of high wheat-farming country to the Columbia Basin irrigation project in central Washington.

This would make the qualified area under the Grand Coulee reservoir 800,000 acres. If the Wahluke slope or part of it is later released by the Atomic Energy Commission it would again become a million-acre project, as described by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Frank T. Bell, member of the State Columbia Basin Commission representing the Quincy-Columbia district, reports the directors of that district got behind the endeavor this week and will push it at next week's meeting at Lind, Wash., when directors for all three irrigation districts hold a joint session.

REOPEN TIME FOR CONTRACTS

Quincy-Columbia directors, besides Bell, are J. A. Weber, president; Charles E. Kennedy, E. E. Huffman, and Albert E. Jones.

Concurrence of the State commission and the other districts is taken for granted, Bell said. But Congress will have to amend the law to permit the Bureau of Reclamation to extend or reopen the time for signing recordable contracts.

The Bureau at the same time will be requested to permit veterans to exercise their priorities and pick the tracts they want before the water starts to flow in 1952.

The basin commission will finance these efforts out of its $80,000 appropriation for the biennium, which has been cut to $72,000 at the governor's request.

"That sets no precedent," said Bell. The commission also financed the campaign for recordable contracts started in 1943 and culminating in the contract elections at 15 polling places on July 21, 1945.

The 300,000 acres involved are mostly in the east Columbia district and in Adams County. They include some land in all three districts.

MEANS 22,000 PEOPLE

"We realize the importance of getting this land back into the irrigation districts," said Bell. "It means 3,000 small farms in an area where present holdings are concentrated in a few hands.

"With five persons to a farm, and half as many more in the towns that will serve them, this means a population of maybe 22,000 that will or will not be added to these three counties (Grant, Adams, and Franklin)."

Bell, an astute politician, has always represented the State basin commission at Washington when appropriation bills were before Congress. He knows his way around the Capital through long service as secretary to former Senator C. C. Dill and later as Federal Commissioner of Fisheries.

"Just to keep the record straight," he said, "I was not in the East on basin business this winter. My trip was on private business. When the last meeting of the commission was called at Spokane January 6, I notified Chairman Jack Rogers I could not attend because I would be in the East. My letter apparently was misunderstood."

HISTORY PROJECTED

Two other topics will be before the basin commission at its next meeting.

One is possible storage on Columbia and Kootenay Rivers in British Columbia for downriver dams. Regional planning is dependent on knowledge of what Canada will do, and results of its studies have not been presented to the international joint commission, it was indicated by Commissioners Bell and Herbert M. Hamblen.

Preparation of an authentic history of the Columbia Basin (Big Bend) project is also to be discussed. So many contradictory versions of past events have been circulated that many believe the facts should be separated from the fables.

A historical outline prepared by E. E. Vande Vere is now in the files of the University of Washington. There are also said to be historical theses in the files of Washington State College.

These documents may be compared with material in the files of Spokane, Wenatchee, Pasco, and Ephrata newspapers, and records of several State and Federal agencies, irrigation districts, chambers of commerce, and other civic groups.

INFORMATION CENTER NEEDED

This suggestion grew from a plan for a Columbia Basin information center made at the basin commission meeting in Spokane on January 6 by Chester C. Kimm, secretary of the Wenatchee Chamber of Commerce.

"It's about time we all started telling the same story," said Kimm yesterday.

Agreement on the facts is preliminary to agreement on policies, he indicated.

Albert Widmer, past president of the Warden Chamber of Commerce, drove to Ephrata Wednesday to assure Frank T. Bell that he had not accused Bell of promoting the Othello-Ephrata route for a north-south State highway, as indicated by this reporter in Tuesday's Spokesman-Review.

"The statement was made, but I am not sure it was by a member of the Warden delegation," said Widmer, referring to last Monday's luncheon of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce's Columbia Basin committee.

Bell says he has taken no part in the controversy over location of the north-south highway.

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 21)

(By Leon Starmont)

Many men spent many millions to put the Columbia basin where it is today. At least $2,000,000 was expended in preliminary promotion and surveys between 1900 and 1930. The big power dams, boat locks and irrigation works are monuments to thousands who poured their time and dollars into efforts that many times seemed hopeless.

No record has been located in the area of expenditures by the War Department from 1880 to 1900 above the mouth of the Snake River. Navigation improvements on the Columbia below the Snake had been started in the 1860's, and by 1880 had reached several millions.

FIRST PALOUSE PROJECT

The Federal Government, after passage of the National Reclamation Act in 1902, spent $76,409 in surveys of what was then called the Palouse project, for Big Bend irrigation, but which included the first surveys of ditch lines from Spokane and Pend Oreille Rivers to Grand Coulee and to the Crab Creek area.

Next appears the Spokane chamber of commerce, raising $3,000 in 1910 for surveys of the original Quincy project. Lake Wenatchee was the reservoir then proposed.

Between 1913 and 1915 the State put up $10,000 and the Federal Government $10,200 for two more surveys.

There the matter rested until 1918, when E. F. Blaine of Yakima Valley, after viewing the Pend Oreille with H. Lyold Miller, returned from the National Capital, scheduled to make a talk on apple marketing, and instead gave the address before the Spokane Chamber of Commerce that electrified the whole Northwest.

In the next few years citizens of Spokane raised and spent $38,256 to sell the idea to the rest of the inland empire, not including the personal expenditures of parties that went by special train or car to organize support for the Big Bend project in Kalispell, Mont.; Sandpoint, Idaho; Portland, Oreg.; and Seattle, Tacoma, Yakima, Wenatchee, and Pasco, Wash.

STATE HELPS AGAIN

In 1919, after Gov. Ernest Lister had come to Spokane to check on the reports of enthusiasm he had received from Blaine and Miller, the State legislature appropriated the first $100,000 for what was then called the Columbia Basin project. Lister did not live to sign the bill.

Then came creation at Pasco in 1922 of the Columbia Basin Irrigation League, which in the next 10 years raised and expended in round numbers $250,000. Spokane put up about half this money. Seattle citizens put up about $43,000, Tacoma $11,700, Portland $6,500, Walla Walla and Pasco about $10,400. Northern transcontinental railroads, naturally interested in settling the Big Bend, provided $52,000.

The Federal Government spent $4,043 in 1922 on the Henny report. In 1923 and 1924 there were other Agriculture and Interior Departments expenditures of $105,000. In 1925, $10,648 was spent by the Federal Government. Washington State appropriations in 1926 and 1927 totaled $37,500, and a 1929 fund of $18,000 still had $5,000 in it when the Army engineers' $150,000 survey was completed in 1931. There was then a $50,000 Federal appropriation for a special Columbia Basin project survey.

VARIOUS OTHER AGENCIES

All this money went directly toward creation of what has become the comprehensive plan.

Numerous organizations promoted special or local phases, such as Columbia River Development League at Wenatchee and Ephrata, Inland Empire Waterways Association at Walla Walla, the Montana groups that eventually became the Flathead Citizens' League at Kalispell, and other associations in at least half the counties of the upper basin.

Several chambers of commerce that did not directly finance the Columbia Basin Irrigation League had bureaus or committees working along similar lines.

E. F. Blaine, who started the stalled wheels with his 1918 Spokane speech, became chairman of the State development committee of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce.

Secretary of that committee was Thomas B. Hill, who later became secretary of the State chamber of commerce, then went with the State department of conservation and development at Olympia, still later was secretary of the Washington State Reclamation Association at Olympia, and now is assistant secretary of the Washington State Development Association.

OLD-TIMERS STILL ACTIVE

Four Spokane men active in the early days of the campaign, 22 years ago, are still residing and active in Spokane.

Charles Hebberd was made chairman of the board when the irrigation league was organized. He induced Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, to visit the Columbia Basin in 1926.

"We stopped in St. Louis," he recalled yesterday, "where Mr. Hoover addressed the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. He made another talk in Spokane. Then at the league's fifth annual meeting in Seattle he delivered the address that roughly outlined his conception of all-purpose river development."

"Can you," this reporter asked Charles Hebberd, "identify any among the Hoover advisers that might be the actual author of the comprehensive plan?"

"He must have been anonymous," said the veteran reclamationist, with a twinkle. "The plan evolved gradually. It was a process of evolution—not revolution."

NEWSPAPERMEN TOOK PART

James A. Ford, secretary of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce in 1922 as now, became first secretary of the irrigation league.

Ben H. Rice, became assistant secretary, and later served the old basin commission. He now manufactures breakfast foods in Spokane.

W. S. Gilbert, now wintering in the South, was a speaker at the organization meeting at Pasco.

Ford and Rice are former newspapermen.

The late W. H. Cowles, Sr., of the Spokesman-Review was, of course, intensely interested in the Columbia Basin. He assigned several staff members at various times to assist quietly and anonymously in the basin program.

The late Nelson W. Durham, who had been editor of the old Review before it was merged with the Daily Spokesman, back in the early 1890's when Grand Coulee Dam was first suggested, became chairman of the Spokane chamber's Columbia Basin committee. He was also a first-class orator.

DURHAM AND DANA, ORATORS

Speeches by Durham and by Marshall Dana, associate editor of the (Portland) Oregon Journal, featured many a basin-promotion meeting. Dana was again a speaker at an Ephrata meeting last summer, and later at Boise.

Among other newsmen still living who did yeoman service on special phases of the Columbia Basin program are J. G. Parsons of the Priest River (Idaho) Times, now running a paper at Delano, in California's San Joaquin Valley; Harry J. (Hungry Horse) Kelley of the Flathead Monitor at Kalispell, Mont.; J. O. Kelly of the Walla Walla Union-Bulletin; E. B. Aldrich of the Pendleton East Oregonian, and Ole H. Olson, of the Pasco Herald, later State printer, now a State representative from Franklin County.

The Pasco meeting of 1922 was called to order by C. P. Stinson, who now divides his time between Pasco and Spokane. Chairman was the late John A. Gellatly of Wenatchee.

Hundreds of others might be mentioned. Not least among them would be Roy S. Gill, a former president of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce, and chairman of the executive committee of the irrigation league after 1928. He now resides in San Francisco.

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 22)

(By Leon Starmont)

These articles started with a story about an 1860 wagon train en route to the Columbia Basin. They have attempted to answer three of the questions asked around that hypothetical campfire:

"Where are we going? Where are we now? How did we get here?"

No job for this reporter is the answer to the fourth and possibly the most important question:

"Which is the right road in the basin objective?"

The opening article said there are six roads ahead. Amendment: There may be seven.

THE NOW MAPS CHAOS

The road to Columbia Basin's goal, half a dozen years ago, seemed to be filled with ruts and bumps.

Too many people were getting in each other's way. Some seemed to be working at cross purposes. Some programs overlapped in one spot and left unoccupied voids in another. Certain interests and localities were yelping that they didn't want some other things done at all.

Out of the confusion then existing has come, by what political experts call democratic processes, the CBIAC. Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee is a voluntary association of four Federal departments, the Federal Power Commission, Bonneville Power Administration, and the governments of seven basin States—Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Nevada, and Utah.

Chairmanship is rotated among the Federal officials represented. Present chairman is Herbert M. Poet, a former Great Falls and Everett, Wash., editor, employed for several years by the Washington State publicity commission, now with the Department of Agriculture at Portland.

HOOVER'S PLANS AGAIN

CBIAC has been functioning 5 years. Most people in the Columbia Basin seem to believe great progress has been made since 1945.

There is, for the first time, a generally accepted program.

Nobody considers it perfect. But it has been reached by residents of the basin, after thorough discussion in open meetings, and in the full light of publicity. If the press coverage has been distorted in a few spots, it certainly is not the fault of the CBIAC idea or the CBIAC personnel.

Under CBIAC auspices, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers—which means the Interior and Army Departments—arrived by compromise at the present comprehensive plan.

Herbert Hoover gave a rough outline of such a plan in 1926. A quarter century later, under the second President to follow him in the White House, he heads a commission to propose certain improvements in the Federal Government. The Hoover changes, if approved, would automatically streamline and simplify CBIAC.

CVA REMAINS HEARTY CHEER

The principal drawback of the present procedure is the necessity of going to Congress every year for appropriations. Of the four plans offered as "better roads" into the future, the one currently in the limelight still leaves that pitfall.

It is CVA.

A lot of people are getting mad about CVA. In fact, the very initials are being used as epithets—much as "bolshevik" back in the 1920's.

It might be a good idea for the next year for public spokesmen to define the 95 percent of the things on which they agree rather than the 5 percent on which they disagree.

That approach has been tried by the Portland office of the Bureau of Land Management, with the result that age-old enemies discovered areas of friendship.

This reporter so far has found in the Columbia Basin only two men long identified with the basin project who are now friendly toward CVA, and one of them has his fingers crossed.

E. B. Aldrich, publisher of the Pendleton East Oregonian, has published some pro-CVA editorials. He is now on a southern motor tour and could not be reached for comment or explanation.

POOR BILL, SAYS DILL

Ex-Senator C. C. Dill is the other. But he admits the bill now being debated is poorly drawn. He says it doesn't mean what it seems to mean. He sees no reason why the number of proposed directors should not be five or seven rather than three, and why some of them should not be selected by the governors of the basin States rather than by the President.

Most CVA support comes from outside the Columbia Basin.

Officials of the Grange in Washington and Oregon have come out for a CVA. The Grange opposed the Columbia Basin irrigation project until 1931.

Spokesmen for AFL and CIO unions have also come out for a CVA. Organized labor supported the Columbia Basin irrigation project from the start.

The public-power movement is split on a CVA. Some PUD and REA executives are for it, others against it.

There may be similar splits in the Grange and labor movements, but this reporter has not been able to detect them.

Most industrial and commercial executives, reading the CVA bill, are afraid it gives the agency powers to take over all sorts of private business—power, mining, transportation, merchandising and possibly even farming.

They frankly suspect the motives of some CVA supporters. They are not convinced by assurances from ex-Senator Dill and others that "it doesn't mean what it seems to say."

If the fears of businessmen are groundless, they want to be convinced. That is why the demand grows for a series of open hearings in the basin, out of which the bill may be either amended to meet the region's desire for home rule, or abandoned.

There might emerge something called a CVA, either an administration or an authority, that the majority in the basin could accept. The future will tell.

WHY GO TO CONGRESS?

There are also elements, not yet organized, "fed up" with the constant necessity of going to Congress for appropriations.

Former Governor Monrad C. Wallgren long maintained that the State should buy Grand Coulee Dam from the Federal Government, and undertake on its own the rest of the river's development.

Representative WALT HORAN (R. Wash.) has an idea for a regional compact among the Northwest States. Subject to change, it would have a chairman appointed by the President, and four directors, to be selected from a dozen names submitted by the governors of Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Oregon.

An earlier proposal was for an independent Federal corporation, Congress to appropriate the original capital. Several ideas for local control of such a concept have been advanced.

More recent is the notion of an interstate authority, voting its own finances, independent of the Federal Government. Possible models are the New York Port of Authority, covering parts of New York and New Jersey, and "Incodel," a device by which Delaware River waters are allocated among New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware.

They might be worth studying.

Let's Go to the Roots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I call attention to an editorial which appeared in the March edition of the Farm Journal. It was written by one of our great editors, Wheeler McMillen, and it proposes a new agricultural program for this Nation. It seems to me that the content of this editorial is deserving of the most serious consideration of every Member of Congress.

The editorial follows:

LET'S GO TO THE ROOTS

Twenty years ago the big farm problem was surpluses.

Today, 1950, the big farm problem is the fear of surpluses.

During these 20 years huge efforts have been made. The best minds in agriculture, in government, and in business have been applied to the task. No one, not even the Federal Treasury, can say exactly how much tax money has been spent during these 20 years to try to do something about surpluses. But the amount ranges somewhere from $12,000,000,000 to $15,000,000,000, a tremendous sum.

No permanent solution has been achieved. After two decades of well-meant spending, agriculture still operates under programs that are obviously temporary expedients. No farmer will maintain that a sound future for his business has been assured.

What about agriculture's next 20 years? Shall we go on passing a new temporary farm bill in each Congress, spending another fifteen or twenty billions, and then wind up in 1970 still at sea what to do?

Shall we confess that we can proceed only by taxation, spending, restriction, and giving away? Shall we have to surrender freedom to all-powerful government?

Distribution? Millions of dollars have been spent to study that. There is still room for improvement. But no one has yet found out how to get farm products through to consumers without incurring considerable cost. Cooperative efforts, while helpful, have performed no miracles with surpluses.

Meantime, while 20 years have gone by and nearly as many billions have been spent, a variety of permanent advances have been achieved. Among them are hybrid corn, improved crop varieties, better fertilizing and spraying techniques, artificial insemination, DDT 2, 2.4D, quick freezing, improved power and machinery, and chemurgic markets that now total more than a billion two hundred and fifty million dollars a year.

Such permanent advances as these possess one notable common characteristic—they have been won by scientific research. Both public and private research have shared in these accomplishments.

The Federal Government now spends less than $50,000,000 a year to seek new facts about soils, plants, and animals. One chemical company spends more than that for its research. Compare the piddling fifty millions for farm research with the two hundred millions to support the 1948 potato crop.

Then note that the Government spent more than $2,000,000,000 in research to develop the atomic bomb. It now spends $600,000,000 a year on further atomic research—12 times all the expenditure for agricultural research. More will go for the hydrogen bomb. The original two billions was probably more than all peoples in all time had ever spent for all scientific research.

Experience through half a century with scientific research in agriculture has proved over and over that the benefits invariably repay the costs many times.

The more we learn, the better we realize that present agricultural knowledge is painfully scanty and inadequate. We know too little about soils, too little about improving fertility, too little about plants, too little about controlling pests and diseases, too little about what plants are good for.

We do not know how plants grow. We do not yet know the molecular structure of starch—if we did, hundred of new markets might be found for corn and potatoes. We know how to use only about one-half of 1 percent of the plant kingdom for any purpose at all.

We do know that surpluses in wheat, cotton, and other crops could be prevented if research were to develop from wild plants a few new, more profitable crops to grow on the acres where now we keep on producing too much wheat and cotton.

We know that chemurgic laboratories already have paid for themselves many times by finding new ways, now in commercial production, to use farm products.

We know, too, that scientific research constantly cuts the true costs of farm production.

That is tremendously important. When the costs are cut, farmers can make as much or more profit with any fair price. And if the price is not too high, more people can buy the products they want. And if more people can buy the products, not so much is going to be surplus.

That's why Farm Journal has been publishing articles on how to cut costs of livestock production. If we could sell livestock cheap enough—and still make money—livestock could eat up, or displace, all of our surpluses.

Farm Journal believes that the time has come for bold thinking.

We believe it would be cheaper for taxpayers, more profitable for farmers, and more beneficial for consumers, to tackle the surplus problems with the atomic bomb approach.

Farm Journal proposes that instead of niggling over research funds, and merely nibbling at agricultural scientific opportunities, the Federal Government should make available the largest sums of research money that science could use.

Let us search the whole world thoroughly and fast for new crops—new crops to prevent surplus production, and to provide new goods for human use.

Let us plunge deeply into the search for new uses for all the crops we now grow.

Let us hunt harder for ways to utilize the huge farm wastes and residues.

Let us seek as never before for new knowledge that will cut deeper into the cost of production, and make our agricultural abundance available to more and more people.

We may need to bridge over the immediate future with support prices and similar devices, but let's quit fiddling with nothing but temporary expedients. Let's quit compromising with the surplus problems. Let's put all the power of modern science to work.

If we will do that, less than another 20 years will be needed to establish American agriculture on a permanently sound footing, to be rid of the fear of surpluses, and to relieve agriculture from being propped up with public funds. And unless we do it, we may be puttering around with stop-gap makeshifts 20 years hence.

Not only agriculture benefits from the permanent advances of science. Everybody benefits.

Here is a national farm policy truly in the interest of all the people.

Lobbies Spent Nearly $8,000,000 in 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include the lobby report for 1949, compiled by the staff of the Congressional Quarterly News Features, 732 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., for the week ending February 24, 1950, volume VIII. No. 8, pages 209–230:

LOBBIES SPENT NEARLY $8,000,000 IN 1949—BUSINESS, PROFESSIONALS LED ALL OTHERS IN SPENDING

Led by American Medical Association, 256 organizations reported to the House that they had spend $7,969,710 in 1949 in Capitol actions.

Biggest spenders include:

1. American Medical Association	$1,522,633
2. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.	620,632
3. National Association of Electric Companies	338,833
4. United World Federation, Inc.	291,672
5. Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons	222,800
6. Association of American Railroads	194,159
7. National Small Businessmen's Association	192,070
8. National Milk Producers Federation (formerly the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation)	178,161
9. National Association of Real Estate Boards	158,600
10. Colorado River Association	115,120
11. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers	101,637

EXPENDITURES BY CATEGORIES

Business groups led all others in total spending reported, though a professional association, the American Medical Association, was the largest single disburser of funds. An organization classified in "general citizens," Committee for Constitutional Government, was second.

Expenditures by categories

1. Business (total)	$3,280,278
General	571,968
Building products, real estate	346,484
Financial	199,485
Food and agricultural products	591,069
Oil, gas, and mining	227,767
Power and communications	553,405
Retail and service	156,631
Transportation (total)	427,959
General	———
Air	29,276
Highway	17,536
Rail	220,702
Water	160,439
Miscellaneous companies	17,579
Miscellaneous trade groups	188,097
2. Citizens groups (total)	1,015,073
General, civic, civil rights	803,990
Welfare, religious	176,382
Women's groups	34,701
3. Employee groups (total)	257,301
AFL (excluding rail)	138,314
CIO (excluding rail)	42,085
Rail	38,473
Other	38,479
4. Farm groups	$391,595
5. Foreign policy groups	718,556
6. Professional groups	1,672,043
7. Reclamation, rivers and harbors	374,174
8. Tax groups	154,067
9. Veterans, military affairs	105,728
1949 total, all groups	7,969,710

(Congressional Quarterly News Features, Washington, D. C.)

LOBBIES SPENT NEARLY $8,000,000 IN 1949—BUSINESS, PROFESSIONALS LED 256 GROUPS IN SPENDING ON BILLS

DOCTORS TOP ALL

Two hundred and fifty-six organizations—associations, unions, firms—reported to the Congress under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act that they spent $7,969,710 in 1949, an exclusive Congressional Quarterly Log survey revealed.

The American Medical Association led all others in the amount reported spent, $1,522,633, but business groups as a whole led all other categories with $3,280,278.

The round-up, which does not include expenditures of any group which had not made a year-end organizational financial report by the close of business February 10, even if they had previously filed statements for part of 1949, showed that the tempo of lobby spending, or of lobby reporting, continued to increase.

Congressional Quarterly Log's round-ups for roughly comparable dates in 1948 and 1947 showed that a steady advance occurred. Two hundred and six organizations reported spending $6,191,838 during 1948, and 149 organizations reported spending $5,058,557 in 1947. The previous round-ups were done February 4, 1949, and January 28, 1948, respectively, but because the reports are required to be filed with the Clerk of the House between the 1st and 10th of January, the vast bulk of the reports, both numerically and in dollar weight, is on file or being processed by the end of January.

However, it should be remembered that some reporting organizations struggle in with their reports for a period of months, and in some cases, years after they are due. This takes place both out of reluctance to file (with frequent disagreement with the Department of Justice over whether filing is required) and because of bookkeeping or other reporting difficulties. Disagreement with the Justice Department, but with a temporary bowing to its interpretation of the lobby law until clarification by the courts, marked many groups' reports—and doubtlessly only fear of possible prosecution led many to contribute to the swelling report total.

(For previous expenditures round-ups, for 1949 reports see 1949 Logs, pp. 569, 893, 1291, 1426, 1450, 1474, and 1545, and the 1949 Log Index, and 1950 Log, p. 14. For 1948 year reports, see 1949 Logs, pp. 131, 208, 275, and 304. For 1947 year figures, see 1948 Logs, pp. 51, 73, 86, 116, 130, 155, 167, 189, 197, and 214.)

BIG FIGURES—BIG FIGHTS

The expenditure figures reflect some of the biggest legislative scraps of 1949—some of which are continuing in the Eighty-first Congress. The issues of national, pay-roll-tax paid health insurance versus voluntary prepaid plans; private versus public power; foreign policy matters including world affiliation, displaced persons, tariff policy, etc.; taxation, including excise tax repeal, oleo tax repeal, and additional taxation of the cooperatives; housing and rent control; reclamation, river and harbor work, and division of the waters of the Colorado River; labor relations and minimum wage bills; social security; agricultural program—and many others—find echoes in the reports.

BIGGEST SPENDERS

Eleven organizations, of those which have made final reports, reported expenditures in 1949 of more than $100,000 each. They were led by the American Medical Association's $1,522,083. (The Townsend Plan, Inc., and Townsend National Weekly, Inc., which had a combined expenditures figure for 9 months of $285,371, do not appear in this list, as they had not filed a financial report by Feb. 8.) The big spenders' list:

American Medical Association (AMA said, however, that probably half of this amount could be charged against legislation. All money was from $25 assessments.)	$1,522,083
Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc	620,612
Natl. Assn. of Electric Companies	585,893
United World Federalists, Inc	291,672
Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons	222,879
Assn. of American Railroads	194,158
Natl. Small Business Men's Assn.	182,000
Natl. Milk Producers Fedn. (formerly Natl. Cooperative Milk Producers Fedn.)	178,161
Natl. Assn. of Real Estate Boards	154,600
Colorado River Assn	113,120
Natl. Assn. of Margarine Manufacturers	101,027

(Note: Some of above figures are not as reported in fourth quarter report of the group, but rather as totaled by Congressional Quarterly from the four reports of the year.)

In comparing magnitude of expenditures among the leaders, it is important to note first the medical, railroad, real estate, and margarine figures are definitely not the total expenditures of the organizations but rather are allocations to legislative activity on varying bases. The electric companies, World Federalists, displaced persons, small businesses, milk producers and Colorado River groups appear to have listed total expenditures for all, including legislative, purposes. It is not clear from the report of the Committee for Constitutional Government whether all expenditures of the Committee and its subsidiaries are counted.

Another factor affecting evaluation of the big spenders list is that not all reporting groups with total expenditures in excess of $100,000 are on it. Senates some have made allocations of less than $100,000 to legislative activities from their total budgets, which may have been well over those of the listed leaders.

At least one group not on the list, National Tax Equality Association, said it spent $74,028 on what it called "fringe items"—consisting mainly of the cost of producing and distributing printed matter—which may have prompted others to write to Congress, but did not count in that total the salaries, traveling expenses and other costs of its registered lobbyists nor of various state "tax equality" and "associated businessmen" groups, the expenses of whose lobbyists it paid.

Another group not on the list, Transportation Association of America, may very well have spent enough to be mentioned—it received $171,085 during the year and is working mainly on formulating and popularizing a new national transportation policy—but because of the way in which it files unassimilated ledger sheets, Congressional Quarterly Log has been unable to ascertain its expenditures from the reports.

Finally, it should be remembered that not all organizations and others seeking to influence legislation have filed reports for the full year—in fact some have not filed at all for any part of the year 1949.

OTHER BIG SPENDERS

Other big-spending organizations, either on an all-purpose or on a legislative allocation basis (it is sometimes hard to determine from the form which basis the organization uses), or on a compromise between the two bases, were:

Between $50,000 and $100,000

National Coal Association (allocation)	$99,560
Central Arizona Project Association, Phoenix	97,301
The Producers' Council	96,007
National Council of Farmer Cooperatives	95,459
Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville	94,873
Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans	93,746
Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America (allocation)	90,945
Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc	86,175
National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. (allocation)	84,196
National Association of Stevedores, N. Y. C	75,069
American Hotel Association, N. Y. C. (allocation)	74,966
American Federation of Labor (allocation)	74,300
National Tax Equality Association, Chicago ("fringe items")	74,028
National Association of Home Builders (allocation)	71,942
The American Legion, Indianapolis (allocation)	71,769
National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (allocation)	65,014
American Farm Bureau Federation (Washington expenses)	60,124
American Civil Liberties Union, N. Y. C. (9 months)	56,618
Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Indianapolis	56,300
National Grain Trade Council	55,867
American Tariff League, N. Y. C. (total, of which 10 percent is maximum allocable)	55,775
United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago (allocation)	54,824
National Postal Committee for Books, N. Y. C	54,598
American Hospital Association, Chicago (allocation)	53,726

SPENT NOTHING

At the other end of the reported spending spectrum were 29 forms reporting no expenditures or leaving blank the 1949 total expenditures column. At least two of the cases appeared to be new organizations which collected money in 1949, but did not begin spending until 1950. In other cases, the contention is made that the lobbying law or the form does not apply. In some cases, no reason for filing a report appears.

The organizations:

American Council of Style and Design, New York City: None.

Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, Washington Committee (gave average of three previous years as $52,239): Blank.

Chase National Bank of New York: None.

Committee for Promotion of Tramp Shipping Under American Flag in Foreign Commerce, New York City (New; spent $12,000 in January 1950; showed 1949 receipts): None.

Communications Workers of America (CIO): None.

M. J. Galvin, for 12 Minnesota railroads: None.

Henry Hoyt Morse (registered for Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers): None.

International Telephone and Telegraph Corp., and its subsidiary, American Cable & Radio Corp., New York City: Blank.

Peder Kristian Kristensen (a deportation case): None.

D. D. Richards (registered for Mail Order Association of America): None.

Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., Lansing: None.

Harry Mopsick, Linden, N. J., for self and several tenants' councils: Blank.

George P. Meredith (executive director of National Alliance of Independent Business): None.

National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, Inc.: None.

National Committee for Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes (New; showed 1949 receipts): None.

National Committee on Resources: None.

National Electrical Contractors Association, by Paul M. Geary: None.

National Farmers Union, Denver: None.

National Fisheries Institute, Inc.: None.

National Home Study Council, by J. S. Noffsinger, director: None.

National League of District Postmasters, by E. A. Meeks, secretary: None.

National Society of Professional Engineers: None.

New York Stock Exchange: None.

Regional Committee for an MVA, Denver: None.

Transportation Association of America, Chicago (file ledger sheet photostats but no total expenditures).

Alan T. Rains (registered for United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association): None.

Washington (D. C.) Real Estate Board: None.

Hilliard Schulberg (registered for Washington, D. C. Retail Liquor Dealers' Association, Inc.): None.

EXPENDITURES BY CATEGORIES

Business groups led all others in total spending reported, though a professional association, the doctors' AMA, was the largest single disburser of funds. An organization classified in the "general citizens" section, Committee for Constitutional Government, was second.

The classification of an organization is based on what appears to be the main nature of the group—based largely on their names, rather than on the specific legislative objectives they may pursue. Therefore, there would be considerable overlap between categories, with nearly every classification having some groups which have some interest in other categories. In almost every category there are groups interested in tax questions; for example, though only groups with "tax" in their names were set into that category. The groups categorized by objective—tax, foreign policy, and reclamation, rivers and harbors—and the citizens groups, frequently have substantial contributions and direction from groups in economic categories, like business, employee, or farm.

Expenditures, by categories:

Business (total)	$3,280,278
General	571,868
Building products, real estate	346,484
Financial	199,485
Food and agricultural products	591,009
Oil, gas, and mining	227,767
Power and communications	553,405
Retail and service	156,631
Transportation (total)	427,953
General	Blank
Air	29,276
Highway	17,536
Rail	220,702
Water	160,439
Miscellaneous companies	17,579
Miscellaneous trade groups	188,097
Citizens groups (total)	1,015,073
General, civic, civil rights	803,990
Welfare, religious	178,382
Women's groups	34,701

Employee groups (total)	$257,301
AFL (excluding rail)	138,314
CIO (excluding rail)	43,895
Rail	32,475
Other	42,479
Farm groups	891,525
Foreign policy groups	718,556
Professional groups	1,572,043
Reclamation, rivers and harbors	274,174
Tax groups	154,967
Veterans, military affairs	105,729
Total, all groups	7,968,710

Methods of allocation

The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act does not spell out whether total budget or the portion of expenses judged allocable to legislative efforts shall be reported, nor has there been a decision on which is to be used. There is no clear and universally accepted method of determining how to allocate. The reported expenditure figures, therefore, vary widely as to what they cover.

Some groups which allocate simply report the expenses of their Washington office. Others, like the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, report the whole expenses of various departments and allocate a percentage of publication expense of other departments. Others take a flat percentage of the total as lobbying expense. Some, like the CIO, report the salaries of their lobbyists on individual lobbyist expense forms and other legislative allocations on the organization expense sheet (in which case the figure carried here does not include salaries).

Some organizations report that fraction of their publication costs which the legislative contents bear to the whole content (AFL and United States Savings and Loan League). Others, which have carried many legislative stands in their house organs which are sent to Congressmen and to their members, do not count their publication costs.

Still other organizations do not explain their allocation formula, but give total expenses and the amount allocated to lobbying. The National Association of Home Builders adopted this procedure.

WHAT IS EXPENDED?

The totals, in a number of instances, do not include salaries of lobbyists. Some groups, like CIO, report only expenses other than lobbyists' salaries since under another section of the lobby law, registered lobbyists are required to report their receipts and expenses.

The grand total, moreover, by no means includes all the expenditures of all organizations seeking to influence legislation. Records of the Secretary of the Senate show more than 1,700 individuals and organizations registered under the lobby law since its effective date, August 2, 1946. No tabulation has ever been made of exactly how many organizations have registered lobbyists currently working for them. However, it is apparent from comparison of organization expense statements and individual lobbyists' reports that many organizations do not directly report expenses although their lobbyists report their receipts from them.

Thus for a truly complete picture of lobby spending both the statements of organizations and the reports of lobbyists should be analyzed and those salaries of lobbyists not included in the organization statement should be added to the grand total.

One effect of the situation in which the organization leaves it to the lobbyist to report his salary and expense receipts is that the source of the organization's funds is not revealed. Another effect is that organization expenditures, as for literature, local efforts, etc., which were not incurred by the lobbyist are therefore not reported.

In contrast with these omissions, there are undoubtedly some duplications within the grand total. When both a national organization and a local subsidiary branch report, there is obviously some duplication in spending reports caused by contributions to the parent group. One example of this is National Associated Businessmen, Inc., and its local groups.

Reporting errors

In addition to the variety of systems of reporting totals; there also lurks in the path of the surveyor of expenditures the reporting errors of many of the organizations. These are not errors of judgment as to what to report—Congressional Quarterly Log does not presume to guess how the courts will ultimately hold. These are errors introduced by faulty arithmetic—as the addition of 21 and 11 to make 22—or by apparent error in carrying forward previously reported totals, or in failure to carry forward all totals reported for the calendar year, or in carrying forward totals reported for quarters or other periods in years previous to the calendar year under report, or by similar mistakes.

Congressional Quarterly Log has attempted to correct for such errors, where possible in order to arrive at comparable data, and has indicated in the following lists where the figures used are Congressional Quarterly cumulation and not the last figure entered by the organization. Of the 258 reporting organizations in this round-up, at least 51, or one-fifth, appeared to have made reports which contained such mistakes.

DOCTORS' CAMPAIGN

The American Medical Association, Chicago, recorded the biggest expenditures, as it campaigned for voluntary prepaid medical care and against the administration plan for compulsory national prepaid medical care. The AMA, which also took stands on other medical issues before the Congress, collected $2,202,045 in $25-per-member assessments.

AMA spent $1,522,083 in 1949. This figure includes certain salaries, other Washington office items, and the entire $100,000 fee to, and $1,349,451 expenses of, the public relations firm of Whitaker & Baxter for the AMA's national education campaign from January 13 to December 31, 1949. AMA said that expenditures for lobbying probably will not exceed 50 percent of the total spent in any quarter, but reported the million-and-a-half-dollar figure. The figure does not include the research, publishing, and other activities of AMA which are the regular work of the organization.

Whitaker & Baxter also submitted an organizational financial report in behalf of the national education campaign. The expenditures listed in this report are divided into two categories: Those which are considered allocable to Federal legislative activity, and those which are not. The allocable figure for 1949 is $405,032. (In a report to the AMA house of delegates in December, Whitaker & Baxter reported campaign expenses of $1,594,152.)

The campaign report figures are based on the assumption that the principal purpose is not to influence Federal legislation but to acquaint people with the desirability of voluntary prepaid medical care, its advantages over compulsory types, and (flowing from the latter) to secure a lessened public demand for, and a greater public objection to, compulsory systems. Therefore, expenditure figures given are presumed to reflect the legislative part of the purpose.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

The Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., New York City, which listed the second highest expenditure total of all reporting groups, $620,612 in 1949, has been an active foe of New Deal and Fair Deal legislation since the battle over President Roosevelt's attempt to alter the philosophy and decisions of the Supreme Court by appointments in 1937.

The committee said it received $195,568 in contributions, of which $34,470 were in fourth quarter. But total receipts were $379,231 (Congressional Quarterly cumulation) which included both contributions and income from book sales, rental of lists, etc. (said latter income not re lobbying). The committee had no contributions of $495 or over; it does not solicit them. (Five hundred dollar contributions or over are reportable as to source.) There was no mention, by name, of a CCG affiliate, Fighters for Freedom, which collects money.

Expenditures listed do not include any by name to Features for America's Future, syndicate whose literature the committee frequently sent to Congress, nor to Representative RALPH W. GWINN (Republican, New York), who writes a regular column for committee and syndicate, which is sent to Congress, nor to Fighters for Freedom.

Listed fourth quarter expenditures do include salaries and expenses, advertising, rent, and other office costs, books and other literature, printing and mailing, royalties of $850 to ex-Representative Samuel H. Pettengill, (Democrat of Indiana) and items marked "dinners" to Economic Club, New York City; National Economic Council, New York City; Public Relations Society, New York City; New York Chapter SAM.

Also included in fourth quarter was $180 membership to National Industrial Conference Board, New York City, and $36 membership to Direct Mail Advertising Association.

The fourth quarter list also noted costs of memberships in National Industrial Conference Board, $150; in Direct Mail Advertising Association, $36; and in National Register Publishing Co., $25, all of New York City.

COTTON FUNDS

National Cotton Council of America, Memphis, which received $1,594,563, explained how six segments of the industry support the council. Each segment has its own trade association, but each chips into the council on the following basis:

Assessments, on voluntary basis, come from: Producer-ginner, 10 cents per bale, with ginner collecting for council and paying when producer is delinquent; warehousemen, one-half cent per bale; merchants, 2 cents per bale on merchandised basis; one-half cent per bale on brokerage basis; cottonseed crushers, 5 cents per ton; cotton spinning mills, 5 cents per bale for combined program, of which council's share is normally 3 cents; consumers of raw cotton fibers (other than spinners), 5 cents per bale.

The Council reported spending $26,728 for those Washington office expenses reflecting legislative work.

American Cotton Shippers Association, Memphis, which does not keep its books on a calendar year basis, reported receiving $29,605 during the fourth quarter from four affiliates. Receipts are forwarded by affiliate members on the basis of $25 annual dues from individual members, three-fourths of a cent per bale purchase fees, and 2 cents per bale export fees (Canada not being considered an export country).

The affiliates of ACSA are: Arkansas Cotton Trade Association, Little Rock; Atlantic Cotton Association, Atlanta; California-Arizona Cotton Association, Los Angeles; Oklahoma State Cotton Exchange, Oklahoma City; Southern Cotton Shippers Association, Memphis; and Texas Cotton Association, Waco.

American Cotton Shippers Assn. and affiliates spent $2,469 in the 15-month period from October 1, 1948, to December 31, 1949, on an allocated basis.

National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, Memphis and Washington, is a federation of regional associations: American Pima Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association; South Atlantic Cotton Warehouse Association; Southwestern Compress & Warehouse Association; and special members in Arizona and California.

The compress and warehouse group said its maximum allocable expenses totaled $7,319, but did not think itself required to file.

Western Cotton Growers Association of California, of Fresno and Bakersfield, filed two reports, differing by a few cents, which showed expenditures via Ralph B. Bunje amounting to $9,647.

For more details on these cotton groups, see pages 219–20 this Log, and 1949 Log index.

CO-OP TAXES

Two national groups and a number of their State affiliates reported spending a total of $175,851, including intergroup transfers, in their campaign to persuade Congress further to tax the cooperatives. These organizations argue that cooperatives should pay taxes on that part of income which the co-ops claim should not be taxed because it is not profit but an overcharge and is returned to the consumers of goods or services bought cooperatively.

One of the national groups, National Associated Businessmen, Inc., reported spending $37,361 and receiving $36,115, with contributions of $500 or more each from the following: Iowa Associated Businessmen, Inc., Ames; Oklahoma Associated Businessmen, Inc., Oklahoma City; New York Associated Businessmen, Inc., Sherburne; Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., St. Paul; Maryland Associated Businessmen, Inc., Baltimore; Ohio Associated Businessmen, Inc., Columbus; Pennsylvania Associated Businessmen, Inc., Harrisburg; Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.; Nebraska Associated Businessmen, Lincoln; Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Indianapolis; Virginia Associated Businessmen, Inc., Richmond; Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, Inc., Milwaukee; Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., Denver; and North Dakota Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Fargo.

National Tax Equality Association, Inc., reported receiving $536,132 in 1949 and spending for "fringe items" only, $74,024.

The fringe items were mainly for production and distribution of literature and advertisements "which may have suggested or inspired letters to the Congress or which may possibly have been sent to the Congress by members of our association or others." Salaries, rent, etc., are not included in the expenditures reported, though they do appear in the photostatic copy of the ledger sheets which accompany NTEA reports.

Expenditures shown in the photostats included $12,000 retainer fees to Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler in the fourth quarter, and other sums for expenses and/or salaries to various individuals, some of whom are registered for or working for State tax equality or other groups.

Fourth quarter contributions of $500 or more came from 26 firms and one association: Mr. P. W. Anderson, president, Farwell, Ozmun Kirk & Co., St. Paul; Mr. A. G. Scrabeck, president, George Worthington Co., Cleveland; Mr. E. B. Morley, Morley Bros., Saginaw, Mich.; Ben C. McCabe, president, International Elevator Co., Minneapolis; Mr. E. K. Tryon, Edward K. Tryon Co., Philadelphia; Edward F. Pritzlaff, secretary, John Pritzlaff Hardware Co., Milwaukee; Weyer Dobson, J. F. Anderson Lumber Co., Minneapolis; Mr. L. D. Nuchols, Charlotte, N. C.; Globe Elevators, division of F. H. Peavey & Co., Duluth; Mr. H. H. Hill, Janney-Semple-Hill & Co., Minneapolis; Mr. A. Wessell Shapleigh, Shapleigh Hardware Co., St. Louis; Mr. E. B. Martindale, president, Van Camp Hardware & Iron Co., Indianapolis; Mr. H. D. Cram, president, the W. Bingham Co., Cleveland; Edwin R. Masback, Jr., Masback Hardware Co., New York City; Mr. C. H. Buhl, Buhl Sons Co., Detroit; Henry J. Allison, president, Allison-Erwin Co., Charlotte, N. C.; Mr. H. G. Dickey, president, Van Dusen Harrington Co., Minneapolis; Leonard Lampert, Jr., president, Lampert Lumber Co., St. Paul; Ray Grisham, Western Cottonoil Co., Abilene, Tex.; Mr. W. F. Stephenson, vice president, Stratton-Warren Hardware Co., Memphis; William Steitz, president, Supplee-Biddle-Steitz Co., Philadelphia; Mr. R. C. Dickerson, secretary, American Cotton Shippers Association, Memphis; Mr. M. J. Claussen, treasurer, Hibbard Spencer, Bartlett & Co., Evanston, Ill.; Mr. W. L. Taylor, president, Wilcox Lumber Co., Detroit Lakes, Minn.; Col. Robert Baker, Fones Bros. Hardware Co., Little Rock; Western Paint & Varnish Co., Duluth; and Mr. H. K. Nilssen, vice president, George A. Clark & Son, Minneapolis.

SHOE CHAINS

The National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., in its first financial report (page 222), showed receipts of $23,150 from various chains for services having nothing to do with lobbying. Those giving $500 or more in 1949 were: A. S. Beck Shoe Corp., New York City, $1,875; The Berland Shoe Stores, Inc., St. Louis, $750; Brasley-Cole Shoe Co., Ltd., Los Angeles, $562; Butler's Inc., Atlanta, $562; Edison Bros. Stores, Inc., St. Louis, $2,000; Karl's Shoe Stores, Ltd., Los Angeles, $750; Gallenkamp's Stores Co., Los Angeles, $750; Miles Shoes, Inc., New York City, $1,125; Sears, Roebuck & Co., Chicago, $2,000; Siegel & Fried, Inc., New York City, $562; Endicott Johnson Corp, Endicott, N. Y., $1,500; G. R. Kinney Co., Inc., New York City, $1,875; Shoe Corp. of America, Columbus, $1,500.

MILK INDUSTRY FOUNDATION

Milk Industry Foundation made its first report under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. According to the Foundation statement, it believes the lobbying law is inapplicable to itself, or, if applicable, then is unconstitutional. Principal purpose of Foundation is not legislative but to improve business methods and sponsor technical and scientific research in milk industry. It enclosed an interchange of letters between Justice Department and self in 1948, when Justice Department asked whether Foundation had filed and Foundation replied that it did not think it was required to and then solicited Justice Department advice if the Department had contrary views. The Foundation said in current statement that it never received a reply from Justice Department. (The Justice letter was dated May 25, 1948, and signed by Irving R. Kaufman; the Foundation reply June 9, 1948, signed Benjamin F. Castle, executive director.)

Castle, in the current statement, said the Foundation has "recently" learned Justice Department position now is that "every person or organization receiving any contributions or expending any money" to influence legislation must file organizational financial reports. Such construction might make lobbying law apply to the Foundation and to everyone else who is concerned about matters of national importance. On this basis, Foundation filed, under protest, but is of opinion that, no matter how lobbying law is construed, and especially as Justice Department construes it, it is unconstitutional, violating first, fifth, and eighth amendments.

Foundation has 1,088 members, whose dues averaged $171 and totaled $186,377 in 1949. Dues are not earmarked for any specific purpose, and no contributions of $500 or more for influencing legislation have been made since effective date of lobbying law. Allocated expenses (see page 219) were $6,038.

TRAMP SHIPPING INDUSTRY

The Committee for Promotion of Tramp Shipping under American Flag in Foreign Commerce, a new group seeking Federal construction and operational subsidies for nonscheduled ocean freight vessels, reported receipts of $18,500 in December, 1949 and $3,500 in January, 1950, from 21 firms in amounts ranging from $500 to $3,500 (see pp. 63, 223). The contributors (in New York City unless stated): American Foreign Steamship Corp., $3,000; Dichmann, Wright & Pugh, Inc., Norfolk, $500; Fribourg Steamship Co., Inc., $1,500; Polarus Steamship Co., $2,000; Wessel, Duval & Co., Inc., $500; Marine Transport Lines, Inc., $2,500; Bildberg-Rothchild Co., Inc., $500; Eastport Steamship Corp., $500; Stockard Steamship Corp., $500; Prudential Steamship Corp., $1,000; W. W. Battle & Co., Inc., $500; Harvey N. Bryant & Co., $500; Walter A. DeLappe Co., $500; T. J. Stevenson & Co., $2,000; J. H. Winchester & Co., Inc., $500; Eagle Ocean Transportation Corp., $500; Seatraders, Inc., $500; Drytrans, Inc., $1,000; Transtuel Corp., $500; Shipping Enterprises, $500; and in Jan. 1950, Orion Shipping & Trading Co., Inc., $3,500.

ATLANTIC UNION BACKERS

Fourth quarter contributors of $500 or more to the Atlantic Union Committee included former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts and former Secretary of Commerce and Under Secretary of State Will L. Clayton, the cotton business leader. Total receipts are not given by the Committee, which spent $45,410 during the year (see page 227).

Other contributors during the quarter included: Hugh Moore, Craig Moore and Mrs. Berenice Moore, of Easton, Pa., Hugh Moore is founder and board chairman of the Dixie Cup Co., treasurer of the Committee for the Marshall Plan and one-time chairman of the executive committee of Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies (1940) and consultant in 1945 at the UN San Francisco conference. He is also an official of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, of American Association for United Nations, and of Americans United for World Organization. Craig Moore is one of the sons of Hugh and Berenice Moore;

Edward Burnham Burling, former law partner of Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and onetime general counsel of the United States Shipping Board (1917–19); and Spencer T. Olin, of the Olin Industries family.

(For list of previous big contributors, see 1949 Log, pp. 1395–96).

The fourth quarter contributors: Former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, Philadelphia, $3,000;; former Under Secretary of State Will L. Clayton, of Anderson, Clayton Co., Houston, $2,000; Sydnor Oden, of same firm, $500; Mrs. Bernice Moore, in care of Dixie Cup Corp., Easton, Pa., $1,000; Craig Moore and Hugh Moore, same address, $500 each (Hugh Moore is treasurer of Committee for the Marshall Plan to Aid European Recovery, see p. 228); Mrs. St. John Garwood, Austin, Tex., $1,500; $1,000 each from: Mrs. Jean de Menil, Houston; Edward B. Burling; Mrs. Benjamin M. Baker, Jr., Baltimore; Mrs. S. V. McAshan, Jr., Houston; and Edgar E. Rand, St. Louis.

Five hundred dollars each from Thomas S. Nichols, Mathieson Chemical Corp., New York, N. Y.; Mrs. T. W. Hardy, in care of Hardy Salt Co., St. Louis; Mrs. Robert S. Brookings, Washington; Spencer T. Olin, St. Louis; and R. Fairfax Funsten, St. Louis.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT ADVISORS

Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., which operates in the social security field,

reported receipts of $102,415, of which $50,400 was in contributions each over $499. During the fourth quarter, over $499 receipts came from: General Motors Corp., Detroit, $3,500; Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co., Milwaukee; Atlantic Refining Co., Philadelphia; Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee; the J. L. Hudson Co., Detroit; Marshall Field Co., Chicago; American Cyanamid Co., New York City, and American Can Co., New York City, each $1,000; Briggs & Stratton, Milwaukee, $800; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Pittsburgh, $750; and $500 each from: F. W. Woolworth Co., New York City; Gulf Oil Co., Pittsburgh; Johns-Manville Corp., New York City; Weirton Steel Co., Weirton, W. Va.; Wheeling Steel Corp., Wheeling, W. Va.; B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron; United States Rubber Co., New York City; Maytag Co., Newton, Iowa; W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa; G. C. Murphy Co., McKeesport, Pa.; Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co., Detroit; Retail Merchants Association, Pittsburgh; John Morrell & Co., Ottumwa, Iowa; and Pittsburgh Consolidated Coal, Pittsburgh.

(For previous big contributors, see 1949 Logs, pp. 996, 1403.)

CIO SUPPORT

The Congress of Industrial Organizations reported $42,035 (see page 226) spent on legislative activities, exclusive of salaries and expenses shown in reports filed by its registered lobbyists. To find how much any one affiliated union gave of that amount, it took that affiliate's proportionate share of CIO total income and prorated the $42,035 on the assumption that each affiliate gave a uniform percentage of its money to CIO for legislative work. On that basis, receipts in excess of $500 each came from: auto workers, $9,556; steelworkers, $8,984; electrical workers, $3,518 (9 months; before expulsion); textile workers, $3,207; clothing workers, $1,239; rubber workers, $1,455; communications workers, $1,239 (last 9 months of year); packinghouse workers, $946; oil workers, $713; woodworkers, $618; transport workers, $589; fur and leather workers, $530; gas, coke and chemical workers, $516; shoe workers, $510; utility workers, $509.

RAILROAD LABOR AFFILIATES

Railway Labor Executives' Association, which spent $8,220 on legislative work (see page 226), speaks for all of organized railway labor which is affiliated with 15 A. F. of L. unions, the railroad membership of CIO marine engineers, and four independent unions' rail membership. (The trainmen and locomotive engineers are not in the RLEA.) The four independents in RLEA are the locomotive firemen and enginemen, conductors, train dispatchers, and machinists (the latter are negotiating reaffiliation with A. F. of L.). In addition, the railway employees' department of A. F. of L. is represented.

The twenty unions whose railway employee membership is covered by RLEA, and which contributed to it, are: Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Cleveland; Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, Kansas City, Mo.; Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Cincinnati; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, Detroit; the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, St. Louis; International Association of Machinists, Washington; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Switchmen's Union of North America, Buffalo; American Train Dispatchers Association, Chicago; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Kansas City, Kans.; International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Chicago; Sheet Metal Workers International Association, Washington; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Chicago; International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, Chicago; Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, Cincinnati; International Longshoremen's Association, New York City; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, Chicago; National Organization of Masters, Mates and Pilots of America, New York City; National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, Washington; and Railroad Yardmasters of America, Chicago.

RAILROADS' ASSOCIATION REPORT

The Association of American Railroads' report showed allocated expenditures of $194,159 in 1949. The Association of American Railroads, to figure receipts for the report, allocated receipts, equal to allocated expenditures, and then prorated among member roads on basis of total contributions, included receipts of $500 or more on that basis from 55 railroads.

Allocation of expenditures included: $21,000 given to National St. Lawrence Project Conference (against seaway); $5,000 dues to Transportation Association of America; $2,227 of total paid to E. Hofer & Sons, Portland, for preparing and distributing newspaper items re railroads; salaries, rent, communications and supplies, traveling, printing, and so forth. Fourth quarter printing item included $2,640 for 165,000 copies of This Isn't the Way To Run the Railroads, and other items, in whole or in part.

AAR also regularly lists, in financial reports, the bills it supported or expects to support, those it opposed or expects to oppose, and those it took action on without determination of whether it is for or against. There were 43 bills in the first category, 51 in second, and 88 in third (in some cases bills were duplicates or overlapped in intent, as in those to repeal excise taxes). This is a unique reporting habit, though other groups often mention a few bills acted on; it is not required in organizational report form.

WATER FIGHT

One of the most acrid regional battles in Congress came to a temporary climax February 7 and 8, this year, when the Senate postponed action on the bill to construct the proposed central Arizona reclamation project until February 21.

The financial reports for 1949 of several groups show that the California side seems to have spent more money than the Arizona group in this educational competition, though both sides got their licks in. Arizonians have used movies as a visual method. Californians have countered with such devices as distribution of a one-sentence attack on the project, written on a 7-foot ticker tape and wrapped up in a capsule. Both sides have used colorful pamphlets; one that the Californians used was made up of individual placards which had been sent to Congressmen in 1949, each signed by a different Member of the California congressional delegation.

The Central Arizona Project Association, Phoenix, which backs the project, reported spending $97,301 in 1949. Two California water groups, interested in California's share of the Colorado River's water, spent a combined $135,463, according to their statements. The latter two are the Colorado River Association, Los Angeles, with $115,120, and the Six Agency Committee, also of Los Angeles, with $20,343. The Six Agency group is composed of six California water agencies.

AMERICAN COALITION MEMBERS

Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, Republican of California, himself a member of one of the constituent organizations of the American Coalition, read into the Appendix of the RECORD on February 18, 1950, page A1091, a list of the constituent organizations of the coalition, together with a speech by its retiring president, John B. Trevor, and the resolutions adopted at its January convention.

The coalition, which reported spending $9,395 in 1949, contains the following: Sons of the American Revolution, National Society; Daughters of the American Revolution, National Society; Military Orders of the World Wars; American War Mothers; General Society of the War of 1812; National Society, Sons and Daughters of the Pilgrims; National Society of New England Women; Society of Plymouth Colony Descendants; Federation of Huguenot Societies in America; Congress of State Societies in America; Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, commander in chief; Grand Army of the Republic; National Constitution Day Committee; National Society for Constitutional Security; Regular Veterans Association; Sons and Daughters of Liberty, National Council; Wheel of Progress; Women of Army and Navy Legion of Valor, United States of America.

The American coalition resolutions called for suspension of all immigration into the United States when there are a million unemployed, sharp reduction of the displaced-persons-admission program; opposition to socialized medicine, Federal control of education, and world government; adequate appropriation for the House Un-American Activities Committee, and for the armed forces. It supported military training in the schools and colleges, in lieu of universal military training which it felt would not pass Congress, and urged more recognition of the Marine Corps.

TRANSPORT GROUP REPORTS

Transportation Association of America, in answer to a congressional quarterly log inquiry as to how much it had spent in 1949 and its reason for reporting expenditures as it does, sent a comparative statement of income and expenses for fiscal years ending October 31, 1948, and October 31, 1949.

TAA statement showed total 1949 receipts of $320,383 and expenditures of $309,017. Comparable figures for fiscal year 1948 were $304,602 income and $273,194 outlay. Donald D. Conn, executive vice president, told CQ TAA files total expenditures for all purposes, less than 5 percent of which is "actually spent in our relations to Congress in Washington." Conn said TAA's "acts, income and expenditures should be available to the Congress in complete detail. * * * In no way does the association consider itself as a lobbying organization in the commonly accepted meaning of that term * * * but, we have no objections whatever to complying with this law."

CAMPAIGN FUNDS FOR MORSE

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican of Oregon, was given $500 for his campaign by the Committee on National Affairs December 20, 1949, according to the committee's year-end report (see p. 225). The committee also reported receipt of $500 December 19 from Frank Altschul, New York banker, National Planning Association international committee chairman, Council on Foreign Affairs director and Woodrow Wilson Foundation president. The committee, which is headed by Pittsburgh industrialist Frederick C. McKee, has reported other campaign contributions in the past (see Almanac, vol. IV, 1948, p. 445 and 4th page of Lobby Addendum, following index. Also 1949 Log, p. 137) to Senators Matthew M. Neely, Democrat, West Virginia; Estes Kefauver, Democrat, Tennessee; Paul H. Douglas, Democrat, Illinois; and James E. Murray, Democrat, Montana; ex-Senator John Sherman Cooper, Republican, Kentucky; to Representative Jacob K. Javits, Republican, New York, and James G. Fulton, Republican, Pennsylvania; and to candidates running against Representatives Vito Marcantonio, American Labor, New York; Katharine St. George, Republican, New York, and E. E. Cox, Democrat, Georgia.

LOBBY SPENDING—JANUARY 1 TO DECEMBER 31, 1949

Congressional Quarterly's organization expense reports are arranged by type of organization. Where no city is given, organization filed from a Washington, D. C. address.

All expenditures listed are total expenditures reported, except where "allocation" to legislative work or similar qualification is noted.

In all but a few cases, which are specifically noted, expenditure totals are for the entire 12 months of the year.

Business

General

Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America: Received for all purposes, $2,585,154. Expenditures reported are the salary and expenses of F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, manager of construction and civic development department, expenditures of department of governmental affairs, and an allocation by possible legislative aim of part of cost of chamber publications other than those put out by Government-affairs department [illegible].

Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Indianapolis: Received from state chambers, $54,779. Spent, $56,300.

American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Mexico City, Federal District: Congressional Quarterly cumulation, $1,507.

Conference of American Small Business Organizations, Inc., Chicago: Received $51,357. Spent for salaries, office expenses, and traveling costs (no itemization of to whom, amounts, date, and purpose), $49,599.

Illinois Manufacturers' Association, Chicago, by James L. Donnelly, executive vice president, Chicago: Said not over $5,000 of his annual salary can reasonably be allocated to Federal lobbying. His expenses (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $1,555.

Interstate Manufacturers Association, Winona, Minn.: Received $16,200. Allocable expenses, exclusive of $6,000 retainer of lawyer, J. M. George, 2 percent of whose time is maximum spent on reportable work, $553.

George F. Meredith (executive director of National Alliance of Independent Business), none.

National Associated Businessmen, Inc.: Received $36,115. Expenditures included rent and office supplies, printing and communications, advertising (Meneough, Martin & Seymour, Inc., Des Moines, $2,000), insurance and legal services, travel costs, salaries (including Leo Cullinane, registered lobbyist, for publicity, $7,367), and $9,999.83 retainer fees to Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, organization counselors, $17,25[illegible].

Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., Denver: Reported payments of $158 to NTEA, of which $150 was for making up and printing 5,000 booklets entitled "Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc.," and $1,333 to NAB as one-half of local group's collection of subscriptions. Other costs for stenographic services, communications, and miscellaneous. No salaries listed. Reported spent, $2,232.

Illinois Associated Businessmen, Inc., Chicago: Received $2,060. Spent for stenographic typing, supplies, postage, "dinner for Mr. English and guest" ($18) and $25 in $5 gift certificates for five volunteer workers, $436.

Kansas Independent Businessmen's Association, Wichita: Spent, for travel, rent, and communications, but no salaries (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $1,932.

Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., Lansing; none.

Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., St. Paul: Received $10,312, including a $1,000 fourth-quarter contribution from Peavey Elevator Co., Minneapolis. Expenditures included $4,[illegible] for Minnesota newspaper advertising; $3,677 for services and $1,221 to NAB for "support;" $333 to NTEA for printing and postage, and miscellaneous travel, office, and communications expenses, $[illegible].

Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., Jackson: Received $4,[illegible]. Expenditures included dues, typing, and printing items to NTEA; salaries, traveling expenses, rent, communications, and advertising, $3,[illegible].

Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.: Received $1,[illegible] (Association fourth-quarter report corrected cumulation error of second and third quarter reports, which had not been adjusted for by Congressional Quarterly Log, either and showed 9-month expenditure of $1,960. Congressional Quarterly cumulation for that period on basis of reports would be $1,909 instead of the $4,252 previously reported.) Expenditures included $951.25 at National Associated Businessmen for printing and mailing, and other items for steno, travel, communications, no salaries. Corrected total (M-KBA figure), $3,291.

New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc., Jersey City: Received $1,265. Spent, including dues to National Associated Businessmen, Inc., and postage and stationery items to National Tax Equality Association, $1,823.

New York Associated Businessmen, Inc., Sherburne, N. Y., filed under protest; does not lobby. Received: $7,835. Expenditures included Austin W. Carpenter's salary, traveling costs, communications and $2,682 to NAB for research and bulletin service. Spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $6,035.

Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, Inc., Milwaukee: Received $2,765. Spent, including $1,355 to NTEA and $50 for membership in Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, travel and communication expenses, and no salaries except stenographic, $3,010.

(NOTE.—There is considerable transfer of funds between National Associated Businessmen, National Tax Equality Association, and their State affiliates.)

National Small Business Men's Association, Akron: Received, $184,123. Listed expenditures for all purposes, including publicity; salaries; dues to Akron City Club; Executive Club of Chicago; National Press Club; membership service from Small Business Economic Foundation, Chicago ($1,700); rent and office services, supplies, etc.; $119.95 to Representative CLARENCE CANNON (Democrat, Missouri) for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprints of insertions of letters from businessmen demanding Government economy. Spent, $192,070.

Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville: Received, $94,430. Spent, $94,873.

Washington (D. C.) Board of Trade: First report. Receives $15 per member from membership of about 8,000. Spent, estimated maximum attributable, $5,000.

Building Products, Real Estate

The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc.: Estimated allocation for entire year, including $5,000 salary of Burt L. Knowles, $19,500.

Building Products Institute: Filed by Douglas Whitlock, chairman, in view of uncertainty of coverage of lobbying law. Expenditures, mainly general counsel fees and legal representative fees to firm of Sanders, Gravelle, Whitlock & Howrey, and to Douglas Whitlock of the firm, of which ex-Representative Everett Sanders (Republican, Indiana) is senior partner, $19,385.

Harnischfeger Corp., Milwaukee: First report. Spent for services of registered lobbyist, Donald M. Counihan, Washington, $1,650.

National Association of Home Builders: Receipts arise from two types of dues and four other sources. Receipts from sustaining membership dues totaled $10,965. NAHB reports total expenditures for all purposes and then makes estimated allocation for expenditures believed reportable under lobbying law, but files under protest because of ambiguous and conflicting provisions of lobbying law. Total expenditure (except for separately kept convention and exposition account) was $319,699 (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), of which estimated allocation was $71,942.

National Association of Real Estate Boards, its Realtors' Washington Committee and its Public Relations Department, Chicago and Washington: Received $106,463. Allocation of expenses includes travel, printing, tape recording, luncheons, etc., and apportioned part of rent, mailing room costs and parts of salaries based on time spent on legislation (ranging from 12½ percent to 100 percent). The cost of NAREB's publication Headlines, does not appear to be reflected in the statement. Spent (CQ cumulation), $138,600.

National Electrical Contractors Association, by Paul M. Geary, executive vice president: None.

The Producers' Council, Inc.: Received $87,450 in 1949, of which eight contributions, of $150 each, came in the fourth quarter from California Redwood Association, San Francisco; Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute, Chicago; National Terrazzo & Mosaic Association, Washington; Marble Institute of America, Inc., New York City; National Woodwork Manufacturers Association, Chicago; National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Washington; Portland Cement Association, Chicago; and Vermiculite Institute, Chicago. Filing in view of "uncertain" coverage of the lobbying law. Spent $96,007. Washington (D. C.) Real Estate Board: None.

Financial

American Life Convention, Chicago: Allocated part of salary and expenses of ex-Representative Robert L. Hogg (Republican, West Virginia) for trips to Washington, and so forth, plus 1 percent of regular office expenses to cover allocable activities re Federal legislation, $5,914.

Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, New York City.: Makes quarterly reports on basis of estimated allocations using budget allotment for immediately preceding period and actual expenditures for prior quarters. Thus, each quarter small adjustments are made to correct for differences between estimated budget and estimated actual costs. On this basis, using estimated actual first 9 month costs and estimated October-December budget, spent $5,811.

The Chase National Bank of the City of New York, New York City: Does not believe required to file. Retains firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, of New York City and Washington, for various services, including consideration of Federal tax bills. Expenditures none.

Credit Union National Association, Inc., Madison, Wis.: Reported annual salary of $6,350 to Hubert M. Rhodes for various services; no special pay for lobbying. Phone calls and trips to Congressmen plus cost of notarizing lobbying reports cost $21.

The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, New York City: First filing. Does not believe self subject to lobbying law. Retains law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, New York City, for various legal services performed by various members of that firm. Small part of that service is by Weston Vernon, Jr., of that firm, re Federal tax matters, and he has registered but disclaimed being covered by lobbying law. If any of his activities are covered, portion of fee to Milbank firm attributable to such activities was $487 of fee and $80 expenses in fourth quarter, $567.

Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, Portland, Oreg.: Received $29,738. Expenditures in November included $181.53 to the Palace Hotel for Senator HARRY P. CAIN (Republican, Washington) re an IBA breakfast in San Francisco, $339.25 to United Air Lines for CAIN's fare in connection with his speaking engagement at the breakfast, $897.82 to the hotel, and various other expenses for the breakfast. IBA backs a bill to regulate bank holding companies; CAIN spoke sympathetically of the IBA viewpoint behind the drafting of the bill. Expenditures of 1949 totaled $12,349.

Life Insurance Association of America, New York City: Allocation based on prorated salaries and expenses of Bruce E. Shepherd, Eugene M. Thore, and Albert Pike, Jr., and of general overhead of New York office, $4,687.

Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, New York City: Received $40,081, including $1,000 from Lammot du Pont. Spent, including considerable traveling costs over entire country (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $37,392.

The Morris Plan Corp. of America, New York City: Travel costs to Washington, at invitation of Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System to discuss bank holding company legislation, $83.

National Association of Insurance Agents, New York City: Reserves question of necessity of filing because does not believe expenditures listed fall within purview of lobbying law. "Full disclosure is made as a matter of cooperative good faith," Richard E. Farrer, treasurer, added. No expenditures since those of May 1949 report; those totaled $1,[illegible].

National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, New York City: Does not believe required to file. Received $179,778. Legislative work, besides that on bills previously reported (see 1949 Log, p. 1298), also was re housing bill, S. 2246. Spent, figuring traveling expenses, phone calls, etc., and 15 percent of $34,500-a-year average counsel fee (was $33,000 in first half, $36,000 in last half), $6,755.

National Savings and Loan League: Received $120,577; spent, all purposes, $118,161. Allocation, which included part of salary of Executive Manager Oscar R. Kreutz and national letter (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $6,063.

New York Stock Exchange, New York City: Does not believe required to file. Retains law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, of New York City and Washington, for various legal services, including consideration of Federal tax bills. Expenditures, none.

The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J.: Allocation based chiefly on salaries and expenses of Milo J. Warner, Toledo, and Charles J. Milton, Jersey City, $32,857.

United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago: Filed without admitting required to do so, but "has discovered that the Attorney General * * * has taken the position that it is subject to the (lobbying) act." League, which won dismissal of indictment lodged against it by Justice Department under lobbying law, reports allocation of spending. Allocation for fourth quarter is based on portions (ranging from 5 to 60 percent) of salaries and fees, expenses of registered lobbyists, communications, cost of that part of confidential bulletin dealing with legislation, percentage of Washington office expenditures, etc. Spent, 1949 allocation, $54,824.

Food and Agricultural Products

American Butter Institute, Chicago: Said impossible to report contributions for lobbying, as funds are collected for all functions. Reported allocated expenditures, including in fourth quarter, $9,285 to public-relations firm of Hill & Knowlton. Allocated in 1949, $46,252.

Harry Hunter (registered for American Corn Millers' Federation, Chicago): For traveling expenses on Washington trips, legal fees, communications, etc., $994.

American Cotton Shippers Association and affiliated members, Memphis: Has not collected money, nor had principal purpose to influence legislation. Filed report in deference to Justice Department view which is believed erroneous. Books are not kept on calendar-year basis, so receipts and expenditures for calendar year are not available as such. Affiliates and receipts expenditures: Allocated retainer from October 1, 1948 to March 31, 1949 was $550. Spent, from April 1 through September 30, 1949, on basis of one-fifth of attorney's fees and expenses, $650. In fourth quarter, gave $1,000 to National Tax Equality Association and allocated one-fifth ($250) of lawyer's retainer. Spent, October 1, 1948 through end of 1949 (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), allocated, $1,459.

Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, Washington Committee: Report merely referred to letter of March 4, 1943, filed with Clerk of the House. Letter said did not believe required to file, but that average expense per year for past 3 years had been $52,959: Blank.

The Best Foods, Inc., New York City: Paid allocable expenses ($1,368) and regular retainer, for all services including legislative ($35,000) of law firm of Davis & Gilbert, New York City (acted on margarine bills), $36,368.

Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Lexington, Ky.: Received $18,458, from Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia tobacco growers, dealers, and warehouse associations. Spent, $21,770.

The Ethanol Committee: Spent, including retainer and expenses of ex-Representative Robert A. Grant (Republican, Indiana), $5,117.

Milk Industry Foundation: First report. Believes not required to report (see p. 312). Total receipts, for all purposes, in 1949 were $186,277. Expenditures reported included part of cost of a March and a May 1949 news letter to members, and $6,000 dues to Dairy Industry Committee, of which the Foundation is part. DIC has filed reports, under protest, so Foundation reports entire $6,000, although not all was for lobbying. Total allocated spending, $6,038.

Millers' National Federation, Chicago: Washington expenses, exclusive of salary, of Herman Pakler, vice president, and A. H. Krueger, Washington representative, $1,177.

Francis X. La France, Esq., of law firm of Swan, Keeney & Smith, Providence, R. I. (registered for Narragansett Brewing Co., Cranston, R. I.): Final report, according to statement on his individual form; was employed re S. 257, now a public law, which limits recovery on under- and over-charges. Individual report said he received $300 in full for services in 1949; organization form said he spent nothing, $300.

National Association of Margarine Manufacturers: Listed some expenditures for 1949, including: Expenses but not salaries of registered lobbyists Paul T. Truitt, Siert F. Riepma and Modane Marchbanks; $10,497 to Leo Burnett Co., Inc., Chicago, for advertising; $43,337 for expenses and $24,000 retainer to public relations firm of Selvage & Lee, N. Y. C. and $250 expenses to Samuel Bledsoe of that firm; $5,000 to American Soybean Association, Hudson, Iowa, for educational activities, and various communications, printing and other miscellaneous costs. Total reported, $101,037.

National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, Inc.: None.

National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, Missouri Valley Chapter, St. Louis: $5,[illegible].

National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, Memphis and Washington: Group is federation of regional associations. Filed, though convinced not required to, as lobbying is sporadic, infrequent, and incidental to major purposes. Maximum allocable expenses, $7,319.

National Cotton Council of America, Memphis and Washington—received $1,304,563. Federal legislative work done in Washington office only, except for mimeo, stamping and mailing work. Allocation of Washington office expenses reflecting legislative work, $[illegible].

National Fisheries Institute, Inc.: None.

National Food Brokers Association: Filed in organization name on organization form, saying counsel, Williams, Myers & Quiggle has advised and it believes self not required to file. During 1949 informed members about S. 2190 and S. 1008, which it opposed. Said some persons might construe that as being lobbying. Said report shows "that part of allocated expenses which might be deemed by some persons to have been incurred for the purpose of influencing legislation." Report said spent nothing. Reports on individual form show expenditures allocation based on part of salary, other items for legislative work (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $261.

National Grain Trade Council: Said only minor and unallocable part of expense total given was for lobbying but did not list by amounts, to whom given and for what purpose. Spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $55,807.

National Lumber Manufacturers Association: Estimated, in 9- and 12-month reports, that 5 percent of budget expenditures was for lobbying and therefore 5 percent of income was for that purpose (previously listed estimate of 4 percent). Reported receipts were $14,622. Spent for salaries and expenses of George M. Fuller and Robert E. Dougherty and for office expenses (allocated), $18,454.

National Reorderers Association: Filed under protest. Fourth quarter receipts included $2,000 from Pacific Coast Reorderers Association, San Francisco, and $1,500 from Denver, Utah, and Des Moines plants, for 1948-49 dues. Year's receipts, $28,050. Spent, 1949, $26,706.

St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $13,006.

Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans: Received, $96,321. Expenditures in fourth quarter included $50 to Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., for "publicity," $50. Total expenditures, 1949, all purposes, $93,746.

Alan T. Rains (registered for United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association): None.

United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, Washington and New York City: "No money has been expended so far this year on legislative activity." Annual salaries of association attorney ex-Representative H. M. Baldridge (Republican, Nebraska), $24,000, and of Harold Burke, New York office, $8,500, total, $32,500.

U. S. Cuban Sugar Council, New York City: Doubted applicability of lobbying law. Received (total), $70,473. Spent, for items which might be directly or indirectly connected with pending bills, including council's Bulletin, printing and chart costs, and services and expenses of public relations firm of Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, New York City (including council secretary's salary, paid by Lee-Ross firm), $34,951.

Hilliard Schulberg (registered for Washington, D. C., Retail Liquor Dealers' Association, Inc.): None.

Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., San Francisco: Previous report noted only $978, allocated part of a July expense of E. F. Forbes, president and general manager. Fourth quarter report added four quarterly expenses of L. B. Liljenquist, Washington, for mimeo, taxis, secretarial services, and miscellaneous re backing or opposing legislation, bringing total reported spent to $1,623.

Oil, Gas, and Mining

American Petroleum Institute, New York City: Does not believe required to file, but, as Justice Department has expressed contrary view, files pending court construction of act. Allocation of expenses is based on full salaries and expenses of John E. Kane and J. L. Dwyer, Washington employees, 1 percent of salary of Baird H. Markham, then director of American Petroleum Industries Committee of API, a sum listed as $161.11 (his annual salary had been $50,000, but changed during the quarter), and one-half of 1 percent of $75,000 salary of the then president of API, William R. Boyd, Jr., for year

up to November 9. Total allocated expenditures (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $33,728.

District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee. Listed salary and expenses of John E. Kane, $1,972.

American Retail Coal Association, Chicago: Allocation of salary and expenses of Bernard K. Orbeim, $4,500.

Coal Exporters Association of the United States, Inc.: Does not admit required to file but did so because of Justice Department views. CEA composed of National Coal Association and about 30 exporters of coal and coke and byproducts. Received $48,000. Spent, with no explanation of basis of allocation, $655.

Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Tulsa: Received for all purposes, $44,767. Spent, for Washington and other expenses, including home legislative, $38,165.

Fuel Research Council, Inc.: Received $74,208. Did not report names of contributors, as no funds earmarked for lobbying. Composed of about 22 members. Allocated $100 of counsel's time, which was spent discussing with other interested parties proposed Amendments to Natural Gas Act, and $321 for total cost of preparing and printing statement against proposed switch to natural gas from bituminous coal at Oak Ridge AEC gas diffusion plant. Senate statement to Congressmen "without intent or expectation of influencing the passage or defeat of legislation." Total allocation, $421.

Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., New York City: Allocated fee and expenses of James H. Lee, Washington ($4,300), contribution toward New York Times ad August 9, 1949, for repeal of wartime excise taxes ($500; via Bulova Watch Co., New York City), and to National Committee for the Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes, New York City ($5,000). $9,800.

Independent Natural Gas Association of America: Reported total receipts of $43,625. Allocation of expenditures included portions of salaries, based on allocation of time. These were $3,333 to ex-Representative Wesley E. Disney (Democrat, Oklahoma), general counsel; $8,320 to John A. Ferguson, executive director; and $1,933 to Louis E. Whyte, news director. Total allocated spent, $17,547.

National Association of Attorneys General Submerged Lands Committee, Maryland State Attorney General Hall Hammond, chairman: Received $31,838, including $14,000 from State of California; $9,000 from State of Louisiana; $7,000 from State of Texas, and $1,000 from State of Maryland. Expenses included $1,500 monthly salary of Walter E. Johnson, ex-attorney general of Nebraska. Spent $31,187.

National Coal Association: Does not admit required to file. Names of contributing firms not given as funds received were not earmarked for lobbying. Total received $1,-973,606. Allocated expenditures based on percentages of costs of various departments, ranging from zero to 100 percent, with general, and administrative, public relations, law, and legislative departments responsible for allocable expenses. Ex-Representative Carter Manasco's (Democrat, Alabama) $200 weekly part-time salary was 100 percent related to law-making. Spent, allocated, $99,-560.

Union Producing Co. and United Gas Pipe Line Co., Shreveport, La.: Action in third quarter in behalf of Union Producing Co. re Natural Gas Act. Allocated fee and travel expense of C. Huffman Lewis, of Wilkinson, Lewis and Wilkinson, $841.

Power and Communications

International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., New York City, by Kenneth E. Stockton, president of American Cable and Radio, above. See above for legislative interest. Stockton's salary is $46,000, no part of which is specifically for lobbying. Doubted lobbying law applicable. Expenditures blank.

American Cable and Radio Corp., New York City, by James A. Kennedy, vice president. Firm is subsidiary of International Telephone & Telegraph, above, and is owner of the Commercial Cable Co., All America Cables and Radio, Inc., and Mackay Radio and Telegraph Co., all engaged in international telegraph business. Firm seeks legislation permitting merger of such firms, including cables of Western Union Telegraph Co. Kennedy's salary, no part of which is allocable, is $22,500. Said lobbying law would "appear inapplicable." Blank.

Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), by Harold Hough, treasurer, care of Radio Station WBAP, Fort Worth. Received $55,168. Expenditures reported is part of total spent; part of the reported figure is allocable to lobbying, $26,149.

Commercial Pacific Cable Co., New York City, by Edward K. Wheeler, of Wheeler and Wheeler, law firm. Cable firm retained Wheeler in war damage claim case. Wheeler received $6,000, spent $21. Cost to client (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $4,021.

National Association of Electric Companies: Received $358,236. Listed all expenses, including legislative. These included fees and expenses of law firm of ex-Representative, ex-Senator Prentiss M. Brown (former OPA head), Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald; $65,000 salary of President Purcell L. Smith and his expenses; fees and expenses of N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc., Philadelphia, for public relations, etc. Spent, $388,883.

National Business Publications, Inc.: Group of publishers of trade, technical, scientific, and professional periodicals. Expenses listed included fees paid to ex-Representative Carter Manasco, Democrat, of Alabama, re postal bills affecting rates on controlled circulation periodicals ($2,400 per quarter) and out-of-pocket expenses of Robert E. Harper, managing director, $8,241.

National Electrical Manufacturers Association, New York City: Received $4,690 (presumably means allocable portion of total receipts). Spent, allocation, $4,459.

National Postal Committee for Books, New York City: Received $51,025, including unstated fourth quarter amount for American Book Publishers Council, Inc., New York City. Filed by Curtis W. McGraw, treasurer. Spent, $54,595.

National Rural Electric Cooperative Association: Received $253,989 membership fees and dues from REA co-ops and power districts, based on 10 cents per connected consumer per year. Reported all expenses, without giving dates and purposes of the amounts to the various payees and without totaling them. Then, in what it said was in accordance with conference of NRECA general counsel with Federal Judge Irving R. Kaufman, who at time of conference had been special assistant to the Attorney General in charge of lobbying law, it allocated from the expenses a figure for cost of trying to influence legislation. Allocation, $65,014.

Retail and Service Groups

(Other than food and agricultural product retail. Formerly under miscellaneous trade groups)

American Hotel Association, New York City: Does not believe self subject to lobbying law. Received $533,669. Total expenses of Washington office $45,049, but only part of that sum is included in total reported under lobbying law, and only part of that part was for lobbying. Washington office deals with about 30 Government agencies. Reported expenditures of Washington office, $29,999, for two salaries and expense. Other expenditures listed were related directly to legislation. They were: $17,500 to James Langan, Boston; $5,000 to Edward H. Miller, Washington; $10,000 to law firm of Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross; $3,000 to William Ingles re Taft-Hartley amendments; and $9,467 to governmental affairs committee of the hotel organization. Total reported, $74,966.

American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill.: Received $39,195. Spent, largely re wage-hour legislation, $17,198.

American Retail Federation: Filed 1949 second and fourth quarter statements January 10, 1949. First and third quarter statements had been filed April 8 and October 10, respectively. Received, from various leading department stores, $126,833. Spent, for four salaries and expenses, travel and meeting, communications and bulletins, $12,111.

Institute of Industrial Launderers, Chicago: Listed $6,000 legal fees and $4,435 disbursements of Stanley I. Posner, and noted disclaimer of applicability of lobbying law. Spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $10,435.

Linen Supply Association of American, Inc., Chicago: Listed fees and expenses of counsel, Stanley I. Posner, but said his legislative work was incidental to his other services, and consisted mainly of testifying at hearings. Does not believe required to file. The fees and expenses for Posner, $7,114.

National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., New York City: First report. Received $23,150 for services having nothing to do with lobbying law requirements. Said purpose of filing statement was to enable association representative to present views on pending and proposed bills. Under expenditures, listed estimates of $500 of salary of employee, Edward Atkins, "to be attributable to legislative activities," and $500 of mimeographing and mailing letters and sending telegrams "to be sent" to members of shoe group re pending bills. Thus, though report form is for 1949, expenditures appear to be future (1950) ones. Expenditures, $1,000.

National Institute of Diaper Services, Inc., New York City: Reported fees and expenses of Stanley I. Posner, attorney. Only first, third, and fourth quarter statements of NIDS are on file, with items totaling $4,509. (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), but Posner's own second quarter report figures plus NIDS three reports add up to total given in NIDS fourth quarter cumulation for the year, $5,860.

National Retail Dry Goods Association, New York City: Received $4,350, of which part was not dues but contributions from those persons interested in LIFO. Spent for fees and expenses of two Washington men, John C. Hazen and William Donald McAdams, and $8,128 expenses re booklet. This is LIFO, $27,947.

Transportation—General

Transportation Association of America, Chicago: Received $371,085 (Congressional Quarterly cumulation). Instead of expenditure statement showing expenditure total for the year, or for any quarter, has been submitting photostatic copies of the daily expenditure journals, which total various items by the month, but give no other total. Congressional Quarterly Log is unable to arrive at total expenditures, partly through not knowing which of many column totals to count.

Air

Aeronautical Training Society, by Wayne Weishaar, secretary: Believes self and society not required to file. AST received $11,116. Spent for Weishaar's salary, $11,163; for taxies, entertainment, lobby reports (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $15.

Aircraft Industries Association: Does not believe activities fall within scope of lobbying law. Received $684,891 for all purposes. Contributors included aircraft and other firms. Expenditures for purposes which may be attributable to lobbying included $12,-666 to Hill & Knowlton, Inc., for salary of Bert C. Goss, association public relations director, $13,647.

Air Transport Association of America: Filed under protest; does not believe required to file, as lobbying is minor part of its functions. But Justice Department has advised ATAA it will enforce lobbying law against anyone, "any significant part of whose activities" is lobbying, so ATAA files. To report receipts, allocated from total receipts an amount equal to expenditures allocated to lobbying, then prorated among the 36 contributing air lines an allocated contribution to ATAA proportionate to each air line's total contribution. On this basis, 29 air lines gave less than $500 each, and 7 gave a total of $12,588. The seven were: American Air Lines, Inc.; Capital Airlines, Inc.; Eastern Air Lines, Inc.; Northwest Airlines, Inc.; Pan American Airways, Inc.; Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc.; and United Air Lines, Inc. Expenditures indicated allocated salaries (of persons unnamed), taxies, communications, and, in fourth quarter, $1,250 to National Committee for the Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes. Spent, allocated, $15,584.

Highway

American Trucking Associations, Inc.: Allocated expenses plus unstated percent of salaries of three employees, communications, etc., $15,824.

Judge Joseph M. Wyatt, Baltimore, for a group of District of Columbia cab companies, proposing bills to limit number of District of Columbia taxis (for list see 1949 Log, pp. 477–478): He received $1,500, spent $212. Apparent cost to clients (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $1,712.

Rail

The American Short Line Railroad Association: Received, for all purposes, $185,815. Spent, allocated, $4,591.

Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., and 22 other Texas railroad clients of Walter F. Woodul, Houston (see 1949 Log, p. 172 for list): Woodul's salary and expenses, $16,526.

Association of American Railroads (see p. 215 for detail on report): Spent, allocated, $104,159.

The Association of Western Railways, Western Association of Railway Executives, Chicago: Received $1,315. Spent, for Federal legislative purposes, for salary and expenses of Frank E. Haas, $1,315.

The Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, Denver, $120.

M. J. Galvin, St. Paul (registered for Great Northern Railway and 11 other Minnesota railroad clients (for list see Congressional Quarterly Almanac, vol. IV, p. 429): None.

Illinois Legislative Committee (class I Illinois railroads), Chicago, $271.

Nevada Railroad Association, Reno: NRA is composed of Southern Pacific Co. and the Western Pacific Railroad Co., both of San Francisco, and Union Pacific Railroad Co., of Los Angeles.: Allocated portion of salary and expenses of Raymond E. Marks, secretary-manager for Federal legislative work, $534.

Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc., New York City: Does not believe required to file. Group is maintained by institutional investors in railroad securities. Appears before congressional committees, never has private conferences with Congressmen. Total receipts, $17,460. Spent, allocation, $1,228.

Railway Business Association, Chicago: for transportation tax repeal (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $1,663.

Water

Carden-Herd claimants: Anderson T. Herd, West Palm Beach Fla.; S. A. Markel, care of Markel Services, Richmond, Va.; Mrs. Rose Porter Carden and George A. Carden, Jr., administrators of Estate of George A. Carden, Sr., deceased, care of O. M. Ruebhausen, New York City: Ex-Representative C. Jasper Bell (Democrat, of Missouri) received $5,000 from Markel and spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation) $5,080.

Committee for Promotion of Tramp Shipping under American Flag in Foreign Commerce, New York City: First report (see Log, pp. 63,214). Received $18,500 in December, and $3,500 in January, 1950. Paid Ingoldsby, Coles & Wright $12,000 in January 1950 for legal representation. Expenditures listed for 1949: None.

Lake Carriers' Association, Cleveland: Does not believe self subject to lobbying law, nor is report form A suitable to association case. Allocated, for first half and fourth quarter 1949 (no 3d quarter statement filed) (Congressional Quarterly cumulation) $3,622.

The National Association of Stevedores, New York City: Received $122,975 from 90-odd steamship lines, stevedoring firms and others. Expenditures reports in past did not include legal fees and expenses to legal counsel, King & Lynch, New York City, as counsel advised this was not required. However, to avoid problems, this report includes such items and lists them for period since October 1947. Fees and expenses for counsel were $718 for the last quarter; full year 1948 fees and expenses were $3,054. These items are over and above previous totals for 1947 and 1948 (Spent $3,034 in 1948). 1949 expenditures included $37,400 fees and $1,433 expenses to King & Lynch, and $45,000 to Burns, Currie, Walker & Rich for account of National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. This, plus $2,056 previously reported, is 1949 total reported expenditures of $75,059.

National Federation of American Shipping, Inc.: Received membership funds from American Merchant Marine Institute, New York City, and Pacific American Steamship Association, and Shipowners' Association of the Pacific Coast, both of San Francisco, for general purposes, and contributions from National Association of Stevedores, New York for work on "overtime-on-overtime" bills. Total receipts not reported. Allocated expenses included parts of salaries, and a $45,-000 fee to law firm of Burns, Currie, Walker & Rich, New York City, etc. Spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation) $84,196.

Pacific Maritime Association, San Francisco: Final report, "as we are no longer expending any money for the purposes for which we have previously been sending in reports." Does not believe ever was subject to lobbying law but had been advised that Justice Department has taken position similar groups should file financial reports. Association is new group consolidating Waterfront Employers Association of the Pacific Coast and two other associations, and expenditures reported include $28,195 reported earlier in 1949 by waterfront group. Allocation of expenditures re legislation before Congress or to persons "that we are informed have registered" under lobbying law included $250-a-month legislative fees to William Radner, ex-counsel of the United States Maritime Commission, ex-general counsel of War Shipping Administration. Allocation, $37,-452.

Miscellaneous Companies

George B. Burnham (registered for Burnham Chemical Co. re proposed tightening of antitrust law): Allocation $4,666.

Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., New York City (see Congressional Quarterly 1949 logs, pp. 995, 1401 for detail): Received $37,000 in 1949 and total of $111,000 in 1947–49 from 11 other copper-using firms. Paid ex-Senator John A. Danaher (Republican, Connecticut) in 1949, for work re extension of copper import duty suspension, $9,000.

Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.: Allocation, fees and expenses of Henry H. Buckman, consulting engineer, $3,913.

Miscellaneous Trade Groups

American Council of Style and Design, New York City: None.

Associated Third Class Mail Users: Received $28,070.44. Spent, for salaries and professional fees, $28,430.

Bureau of Education on Fair Trade, by Baldwin & Mermey, public relations counsel, New York City: First report. Reported $12,000 retainer and $22,695 expenses, for total cost to Bureau of $34,695.

Consumer Mail Order Association of America, Joplin, Mo.—Spent, including fees to law firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter (Congressional Quarterly cumulation): $16,318.

The Council for Clarification of Pricing Practices, Chicago: Received $15,630. Spent, including $6,000 fee and $5,039 expenses of William Simon, former counsel of the Senate Commerce Trade Practices Subcommittee, Eightieth Congress (see 1949 Log, p. 931): $14 896.

Henry Hoyt Morse, Gardner, Mass. (registered for Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers): None.

D. D. Richards (registered for Mail Order Association of America): None.

National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc.: Estimated that $4,500 of executive secretary's salary, $85 of his expenses were allocable to lobbying. Mailing costs brought total (Congressional Quarterly cumulation) to $4,913.

National Association of Direct Selling Companies, Winona, Minn.: Total receipts, all purposes, $41,175. Allocable expenses, exclusive of $12,000 annual retainer of lawyer, J. M. George (very little of retainer is attributable to Federal legislation), $3,004.

National Council on Business Mail, Inc., Chicago: Received $26,650. Expenditures for fourth quarter included $100 fee to Louis Marks, Chicago, for preparation lobbying report and $3,316 to Sam O'Neal, former director of publicity for the Democratic National Committee, for his fees ($2,400) and expenses. Total spent, 1949, $35,540.

National Foundry Association, Chicago: Annual salary of Executive Vice President L. E. Roark is $10,000. His expenses (none for second half) were $989.

National Paint, Varnish, and Lacquer Association, Inc.: Allocated, $6.

Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute: Does not believe lobbying law is applicable. Allocable expenditures included $1,250 advance to national committee for the repeal of wartime excise taxes, unprovided for in OEMI budget and to be covered by membership contributions, for total of $2,195.

The Proprietary Association: Receipts, for all purposes, $164,153. Spent for all purposes, $213,140, of which $8,485 was for legislative reference service. Annual cost of informing membership of current events, $21,-657, of which fourth quarter proportionated space of these bulletins devoted to commenting or influencing passage or defeat of Federal legislation (11.8 percent) was $614. Adding $614 to previously reported sum, which is listed at $1,841, though composed of figures totaling $1,891, the association arrived at $2,455.

The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., New York City: Interested in Government controls over rubber. Allocation, based on part of employee's time spent and prorated supporting office expenses and other Washington costs (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $3,746.

Silver Users Association: Received $53,400, including $1,000 in fourth quarter from American National Retail Jewelers Association, New York City, for 1949 dues. Spent for Washington office salaries and expenses (Congressional Quarterly correction), $40,915.

Citizens' Groups

Civic, Civil Rights, General

American Civil Liberties Union, New York City: Submitted first, second, and third quarter 1949 reports on January 6, 1950. Received $101,962 in 9 months, including: $47,600 from Betsy B. Davis estate, care of Kurzman & Frank, New York City; $2,000 from Robert Marshall, Civil Liberties Trust, New York City, $1,000 from Trautman Bequest, care of Charles E. Beardsley, Los Angeles; $815 from Anonymous ("an American citizen" whose name "will be released if requested"); and $500 each from: Anne D. Geller estate, care of City Bank Farmers Trust Co., New York City; Mrs. Gertrude Boone, Princeton, N. J.; and Mrs. Jane A. Pratt, Bridgewater, Conn. Spent, 9 months, with no indication of to whom or for what purposes, $56,618.

American Coalition: Received $7,524, including $1,500 from John B. Trevor, New York City, ex-Coalition president and one-time Senate Foreign Relations Committee subcommittee associate counsel (1920), and $1,000 from Miss Helen Frick, New York City. Spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $6,395.

Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., New York City: Reported spent, $620,-552.

Committee on National Affairs, New York City: Received $500 from Frank Altschul, New York City on December 19 and gave $500 to Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican of Oregon, December 20, for his campaign. Total receipts for year $1,147. Spent $1,[illegible]

Home Rule Headquarters, Washington, D. C.: First report. Received $9[illegible] and spent, chiefly for telegrams, $65.

Washington, D. C., Home Rule Committee: Same address and treasurer as Home Rule Headquarters, above. Received $678. Spent $[illegible]

Japanese-American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., Salt Lake City: Received $41,198 including fourth quarter sums of $500 or more from Spokane ADC and from Kikaken Kiser Domei of Northern California, San Francisco. Washington expenses, $6,070.

National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education: Received $13,122. Spent $12,971.

National Committee for Strengthening the Congress: Miscellaneous office, printing, mimeo expenses 1949 through January 6, 1950, $516.

National Consumers League, Cleveland: Received $7,508, including $500 from Textile Workers Union of America (CIO) and $1,000 from UAW-CIO. Spent $1,907.

National Council Junior Order United American Mechanics, Philadelphia: Annual expenses of Charles E. Babcock, Vienna, Va., for which no accounting is required by the order, $1,000.

National Economic Council, Inc., New York City: Fourth quarter receipts were $15,-369 from literature sales, etc., and $12,734 from contributions. Contributors of $500 or over in that quarter, for total of $3,734 were:

Empire State, Inc., New York City: Charles S. Payson, New York City; Ralph F. Mershon, Miami; Crompton & Knowles Loom Works, J. F. Tinsley, Worcester, Mass.; E. G. Howes, Boston; W. H. Regnery, Illinois Western Mills Co., Chicago. (For previous contributors, see 1949 Logs, pp. [illegible], 1402.) Total receipts for 1949 $139,815 (Congressional Quarterly cumulation). Expenditure listed "include all that are properly allocable to lobbying activities. In fact, much of the expense listed is not for lobbying at all. We haven't time to separate them out." Spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $41,967.

Harry Mopsick, Linden, N. J. (registered in own behalf, and in interest of National Tenants' Council and other tenant councils): First financial report. Said had no contributions, does not believe required to file, and does so to avoid penalties. Spent, blank.

People's Lobby, Inc. (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), spent, $5,992.

Special Committee on Liquor Advertising Bills, by Elizabeth A. Smart, secretary: Received and spent (for paper and stamps), $53.

Tool Owners Union, Inc., Lexington, Mass., and Washington, D. C.: Received $34,970 as follows: $19,285 in membership contribution; $3,324 gifts; $88 income from locals; $3,241 in sales of printed materials, newsletter subscriptions and research services; and $1,042 miscellaneous. Spent, including $5,667 expense advance and $13,333 salary to ex-Representative Fred A. Hartley, Jr. (Republican, New Jersey), president, $43,906.

Welfare, Religious

American Association for Health, Physical Education & Recreation: Operates on $82,935 annual budget for all purposes. Allocated 5 percent of annual salary at rate of $7,000 during January–June; $7,250 July–December of Carl A. Troester, Jr., $356.

American Parents Committee: Received $18,518, including fourth quarter sum of $2,000 from National Committee on the Observance of Mother's Day, New York City, spent, $18,033.

The Christian Amendment Movement, Topeka: Reported contributions from congregations of Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America. Total receipts, from the contributions and other items, $12,669. Spent $88 January 1–9, 1950. Spent, 1949 Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $17,043.

Friends Committee on National Legislation: Received $36,145. Expenditures included printing items paid for to Council for Social Action, National Council Against Conscription, both of Washington, and James P. Warburg, New York City; annual dues to National Peace Conference, New York City; contributions to Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Philadelphia for services; salaries, expenses, rent, communications and supplies, travel, and so forth, totaling, $38,969.

National Catholic Welfare Conference: Salary and expenses of Washington agent, Eugene J. Butler, Esq., $15,252.

Spokesmen for Children, Inc., New York City: Received $3,860, including $3,500 from Adele Rosenwald Levy, New York City. Spent, including conference tickets from Physicians Forum, New York City ($12) and expenses of Mrs. Theodore Oxholm for Washington trip replanning of 1950 White House conference ($40) in fourth quarter, $554.

Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.: Received $102,415, mostly from nationally known firms. (See 1949 Logs, pp. 996, 1403.) Expenditures included a salary and expenses each for Milwaukee and Columbus, Ohio; Washington office expenses, printing, salaries, calendars, transportation and communications, and so forth, $86,175.

Women's groups

American Association of University Women: AAUW information materials to members contains stand on Federal aid to education: support of principle of Federal aid, State control, and no public funds to non-public schools—therefore complete support for Barden bill and only partial support for Taft bill. Expenditures listed are salary of Miss Marjorie L. Temple, legislative program associate, $4,100, and information materials to members, $32 (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $4,132.

General Federation of Women's Clubs: Expenses of Mrs. J. L. Blair Buck, nonsalaried president; Mrs. Leslie B. Wright, nonsalaried chairman of legislation, telegrams, etc. Mrs. Buck's expense not principally for lobbying. Total reported, $8,166.

League of Women Voters of the United States: Salary and expenses of Muriel Ferris, congressional secretary, and other expenses, $6,505.

National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association, New York City: Miss Elsie Dorothey Harper's salary and secretarial help, $3,060.

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., New York City: Funds derived from dues from 2,327 clubs and sale of publications. Washington representative's salary and expenses, $5,806.

National-Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Evanston, Ill.: Received $9,043. Expenditures include expense items for Elizabeth A. Smart, but do not appear to duplicate items listed for her in report of Special Committee on Liquor Advertising (see above). Total spent, $5,898.

National Woman's Party: Received $6,624. No expenditures in second half of 1949. Total spent for year, $1,134.

Employee groups

AFL (exclusive of railway labor)

American Federation of Labor: Received on basis of proration of all receipts of per capita tax payments as related to expenditures, $115,306. Expenditures included salaries; estimated portion of portion of material in publication "American Federationist," which might be regarded as falling within lobbying law; communications, supplies, etc. Spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $74,300.

International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffers, Warehousemen and Helpers of America (AFL), Indianapolis: Previous quarters gave only salary of Fred A. Tobin, Washington, which had totaled $11,250 for first 9 months (Congressional Quarterly cumulation). Fourth quarter report carried his name and address and nothing else. Tobin told Congressional Quarterly total should be $15,000.

National Federation of Post Office Clerks (AFL): Received $3,129 in voluntary contributions from members and locals for legislative and publicity purposes, of which $96 came from a $1-per-member "voluntary assessment." There is also a per capita membership tax. Spent $48,709.

Matthew Dushane (registered for Seafarers International Union of North America, AFL): This report shows no expenditures; previous reports showed (Congressional Quarterly cumulation) $305.

CIO (exclusive of railway labor)

Congress of Industrial Organizations: Allocated expenditures included such items as salaries of three clerks (but not those of registered lobbyists, who filed separate reports), multigraphing and printing costs (but with no item for the CIO News), rent and supplies, pamphlets and releases, and $10,000 given to CIO Housing Committee. Total reported, $42,035.

Communications Workers of America (CIO); None.

Railway labor

Grand International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Cleveland: Salary and expenses of John T. Corbett (who has both legislative and industrial relations duties), salary of Miss Helen Corbett, his assistant, and Washington office rent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $17,946.

Railway Labor Executives' Association: Listed prorated contributions equal to total allocated expenditures. Contributions were from member railway labor groups. Estimated allocated expenditures included portions of salaries, fees and expenses, postage and supplies, documents, furniture, etc. Said a bill may be studied by lawyers, distributed to member unions, and "infrequently be the subject of pamphlet comment." Allocated (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $8,220.

Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa: No salary and expense for C. W. Vance, legislative representative. On separate form, salary of vice president and legislative representative W. D. Johnson and expense of national legislative bureau, $12,307

Other employees

Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees' Association, South Portland, Maine (formerly filed as Retired Lighthouse Service Employees' Association): Expenses connected with legislation in first half of 1949, $431, according to report filed in August. January 1950 report referred to a previous statement (not in clerk's files) showing expenditures of $661, and cumulated year's expenditures as $1,114.

International Association of Machinists, salary and expenses of grand lodge representative, $2,700.

National Association of Federal Carrier Employees, by John Stanton Bartlett, president: Expenses for taxi, postage, phone and telegram in informing member chapters on pending bills, approximately $250.

National Association of Retired Civil Employees: Salary and expenses of Lewis H. Fisher, general counsel, and Elmer Johnson, president (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $5,499.

National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers: For services of Robert E. McLaughlin and Francis M. Sullivan, $2,000.

National League of District Postmasters, by E. A. Meeks, secretary: None.

Railroad Pension Conference, New Haven, Conn.: Received $5,639. Spent $5,592.

Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government: Received contributions from branches and members at naval shipyards, gun factories, air stations and other installations totaling $24,806. Spent $21,324.

Farm groups

American Farm Bureau Federation, Washington office: Reported Washington expenses, which included salaries, rent, communications but not cost of printed publications, subscriptions, and miscellaneous farm program lobbying expenses. Spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $60,134.

American National Live Stock Association, Denver: Total receipts, all purposes, $72,795. Allocation based on reportable expense and total salary of F. E. Mollin ($14,048.90) plus other items, $14,837.

Food Producers Council, Inc., by Philip C. Turner, president, Baltimore: Received $3,-636 on basis of assumption that only 50 percent of receipts and expenditures are allocable to lobbying. On some basis, cutting expense items in half gives total reported, $1,896.

Forest Farmers Association, by Paul W. Schoen, executive secretary, Valdosta, Ga.: Received $989. Nothing spent in fourth quarter, previous quarters' expenditures for Schoen, $4,289.

National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Morgan, Utah, by Joseph H. Francis, executive secretary: Did not lobby in fourth quarter. Previous quarters' total, $14,666.

National Council of Farmer Cooperatives: Does not believe required to file. Received $109,243, including $500 or more from each of 45 farm co-ops, some identifiable by name as dealing with cranberries, apples, avocados, almonds, peaches, prunes and apricots, walnuts, dairy products, citrus fruit, eggs, potatoes, tobacco, wool, grain, poultry, raisins, cotton, livestock, rice, wine, and peas. Expenditures are listed by purpose, without giving names of those to whom disbursed. Spent, for all purposes including legislative, $95,489.

National Farmers Union (Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America), Denver: None.

National Milk Producers Federation (formerly National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation): Because of uncertainty of meaning of lobbying law provision, full receipts and expenditures are listed regardless of purpose without admitting that law is applicable. Received $224,315.04. Expenditures included those to Hill & Knowlton for public relations work and to the General Federation of Women's Clubs for an advertisement in its publication during fourth quarter. Spent $17,161.

National Wool Growers Association Salt Lake City: Said received no contributions for legislative work. Quotas paid by various State wool growers groups are not specifically collected for above purpose. No receipts figure given. Washington expenses of J. B. Wilson and J. M. Jones, $7,053.

Wyoming Wool Growers Association: First 1949 report. Washington expenses of J. B. Wilson who receives $6,000 annual salary and whose Washington time is devoted to work before executive departments as well as lobbying, $3,424.

Western Cotton Growers Association of California, Fresno, by Ralph B. Bunje: $9,6[illegible]6.

Foreign policy

The American Tariff League, Inc., New York City: Said unfair to attribute to members and contributors intention to pay for lobbying so listed full receipts to avoid designation of part as designed for lobbying. Total receipts, $57,032, of which $52,700 were dues. Total expenditures, of which estimated 10 percent maximum is allocable, included $6,-424 to John Lee Coulter for retainer and expenses; $12,500 salary of Richard H. Anthony, secretary, $325 to Felix Morley and $300 to Walter E. Spahr for speech honoraria; $10 dues each to National Federation of Independent Business, San Mateo, Calif., and Trade Association Executives of New York, $55,775.

Atlantic Union Committee, New York City: No total given for receipts. Spent, for salaries, expenses, travel, office costs, communications, etc. (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $45,410.

Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, New York City: Received $317,525. Spent, $222,533.

Committee to Defend America by Aiding Anti-Communist China, New York City: First report. Received $1,886, of which said $500 from AFL, in care of Jay Lovestone, Intl. Ladies Garment Workers Union, $300 each from ex-Navy Secretary and ex-New Jersey Governor Charles Edison and from Frederick C. McKee, Pittsburgh industrialist (see 1949 Log, pp. 505, 512 and 1950 Log, p. 11). Spent for printing, rent, and office costs, Carnegie Hall rent, no salaries or fees except for fund raising ($800), $1,838.

Committee for Equality in Naturalization: Received $3,703, including $1,500 in last half of 1949 from Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Washington. Spent, for salary and expenses of Robert M. Cullum and printing, $4,722.

Committee for the Intl. Trade Organization: Received $25,000, in amounts of $500 or more, of which the only 4th quarter item was $3,500 from Matthew Fox, New York City (Fox is president of American-Indonesian Corp., partly owned by the Indonesian Government; see 1949 Logs, page 140). Previous quarters contributors included Sen. WILLIAM BENTON (D. Connecticut), who was not a Senator then; he gave an unstated sum, at least $500. Spent, $27,926.

Committee for the Marshall plan to aid European recovery, care of Hugh Moore, treasurer, Easton, Pa.: Spent nothing in second half year. Total for 1949, $1,500.

Peder Kristian Kristensen, by law firm of Spencer & Louisell: Firm received unreported fees and expenses re deportation case which was decided by Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia December 19, 1949. Court held in favor of Kristensen, that he is not ineligible for citizenship and hence deportable solely on ground he had claimed ineligibility in the draft when he was on temporary visa. These receipts and disbursements had nothing to do with lobbying law, said the law firm. Firm was also engaged to support H. R. 3410, a bill for his relief, but no expenditures or fees were had in this connection.

National Council for Prevention of War: Received $37,989 in 1949, including fourth quarter $1,000 contributions from Metals & Controls Corp., Attleboro, Mass., and from Mrs. S. Emlen Stokes, Moorestown, N. J. Expenditures included fourth quarter $70 contribution to National Council Against Conscription, salaries, rent, printing, and communications, and other expenses, $44,195.

Jacob Neubauer by ex-Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Democrat of Montana, of Wheeler & Wheeler law firm: Immigration case. Wheeler received $1,000, spent $9. Cost to Neubauer (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $1,009.

Philippine-American Committee: Spent since committee was formed March 25, including part of salary of Mary Higgins, $5,574.

Republic of Finland, by Emil Hurja: First report. Hurja was paid $10,000 and spent, for travel, and office expense and to Miss Bertha Kruss, $2,500. Total (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $12,500.

United States Committee for a United Nations Genocide convention, New York City: Received $3,750. Spent for printing, communications, travel, no salaries, $2,626.

United World Federalists, Inc., New York City: Said counsel advised it is not required to file, but does so "voluntarily since it has nothing to conceal." Cannot determine whether lobbying law requires report of only relatively small amounts spent re Federal legislation or total expenses for all national, State, and local activities, but, in interest of safety, reports total expenditures. If a segregation were made of expenses within the coverage of the law, it would be less than 15 percent. Did not report total receipts for 1949 or for last quarter. Total fourth quarter receipts of amounts each in excess of $490 totaled $22,329 of which $4,000 was anonymous, $1,000 from Clifton Fadiman, and other amounts, ranging from $500 to $2,000, from 23 individuals or couples. Expenditures during the fourth quarter included $47.28 to William Sims, care of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY (Democrat, Minnesota), for printing; $27 to Representative BROOKS HAYS (Democrat, Arkansas), for travel expenses; $168.72 to AMVETS for travel expenses; dues and contributions to various State UWF branches, etc. Total spent, all purposes, 1949 (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $291,673.

Professional organizations

American Dental Association, Chicago: Appropriated from general funds $31,[illegible]65 for 1949 expenses of Council on Legislation,

which works on Federal and State legislation. Members' annual dues, for all purposes, $12 each. Spent, for Federal legislative work, $15,407.

American Hospital Association, Chicago: Appropriation from membership dues for maintenance of Washington Service Bureau (which is not maintained principally for lobbying) equals expenses. Expenses, for salaries, travel, and Washington office costs, $50,725.

The American Institute of Architects, by Edmund R. Purves: Spent, including $33 for reprints for distribution of article on H. R. 7214, "Earned Income Tax Adjustment Act," $292.

American Library Association, Chicago: National Relations office in Washington has some lobbying duties; Falls Church, Va., office, headed by Mrs. Aubry Lee Graham, now in charge of lobbying. Difficult to break down expenditures between lobbying and other, so listed total, which appears to be total Washington area figure. Paid Representative WRIGHT PATMAN (Democrat, Texas), $52.96 for reprints of library construction bill. Spent $17,790.

American Medical Association, Chicago: Allocated, $1,522,463.

James E. Bryan, as agent for Medical Society of New Jersey, Trenton, N. J.: First report. Spent, for pamphlets, printing, and communications, $291.

The American Optometric Association, Inc., development fund, care of Dr. Samuel L. Brown, O. D., Fostoria, Ohio, $7,064.

American Osteopathic Association, Chicago: Allocated expenditures included $14,125 retainer to Lawrence L. Gourley, legal counsel to public relations department; and costs of notices to osteopathic physicians re medical education bill, H. R. 5940, and medical aspects of social security bill, H. R. 6000, $14,098.

Judge Advocates Association: Received $6,531. Spent, $7,429.

National Council of Business Schools, by Dr. J. S. Noffsinger, executive secretary: Fees and expenses of Stanley I. Posner (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $6,722.

National Council of Technical Schools by J. S. Noffsinger, director: Fees and expenses of Stanley I. Posner (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $4,480.

National Education Association of the United States, Legislative-Federal Relations Division: Division operates on annual budget of $57,800 covering both legislative and other work. Legislative expenditure estimated allocation (based on partial salaries and full expenses pertinent), $17,188.

National Federation of Private Schools Associations, by J. F. Noffsinger, director: Listed contributors: Pennsylvania Association of Private Vocational Schools, Pittsburgh, $3,090; National Council of Technical Schools, $725; Central Schools Association, Chicago, $2,500; National Home Study Council, $1,000; New Jersey Association of Technical Schools, Newark, $500; and McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., New York City, $500. Did not state total receipts.

Expenditures included Stanley I. Posner's fees and expenses ($1,865), printing, mailing, etc. Total for quarter and for year not given. Congressional Quarterly cumulation, assuming no duplication between third and fourth quarter expenses, $4,325.

National Home Study Council, by J. S. Noffsinger, director: None.

National Society of Professional Engineers: None.

Reclamation, rivers and harbors

Central Arizona Project Association, by Howard J. Smith, Phoenix: Received $97,943, including $12,000 from Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, Phoenix; $9,700 from the County of Maricopa and other smaller sums from various irrigation districts; $5,000 from Central Arizona Light & Power Co.; $5,000 from Vegetable Growers' Association, Phoenix; other smaller sums from farm and business associations and firms, including Arizona Farm Bureau Federation, and Arizona Wool Growers Association. Spent, including trips to various conventions (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $97,301.

Colorado River Association, Los Angeles: Received $84,364. Spent $115,120.

Florida Inland Navigation District, Bunnell, Fla.: Fees and expenses of Henry Holland Buckman, consulting engineer, $5,856.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association (for the seaway): Received, in fourth quarter, $2,250, including $1,000 each from State of Minnesota and Nordberg Manufacturing Co. This association is successor to National St. Lawrence Association, which reported first quarter expenditures of $6,751. Expenditures reported for two groups during year would be $21,639. The group's expenditures, $14,578.

National Committee on Resources: None.

National Reclamation Association: Figures for this group are based on reports which duplicate April receipts and expenditures so that there may be excessive statement of items covered in first two reports. Receipts were reported as $41,723; (see 1949 Logs, pp. 996, 1405 for previous contributors), fourth quarter items in excess of $499 each included those from: State of California, Department of Public Works, $1,350; Water Development of Southeastern Colorado, $500; Denver Chamber of Commerce, $700; Oklahoma Water Resources Association, $1,432. Other contributions came from State, county, city, and irrigation and conservancy district agencies of Government, and from associations, chambers of commerce, firms, and individuals. Washington office expenditures in first 9 months, by Congressional Quarterly addition of totals as reported was $23,992. NRA own cumulation for that period was $28,939. Fourth quarter total Washington office expenditures was $10,948, for NRA total, $39,887.

National Rivers and Harbors Congress: Received $18,077. Congressional Quarterly cumulation, $19,163.

National St. Lawrence Project Conference (against the seaway): Received $36,427 during year, of which $21,000 was from Association of American Railroads, $5,100 from National Coal Association, $3,435 from Maritime Association of the Port of New York, $2,016 from Anthracite Institute, Wilkes-Barre, and $500 from C. F. Hood, Cleveland. Spent $35,866.

Regional Committee for an MVA, Denver, first report: None.

Six Agency Committee (six California water agencies), Los Angeles: Received $30,000 from Metropolitan Water District of Southern California; Imperial Irrigation District; Department of Water and Power, City of Los Angeles; Palo Verde Irrigation District; San Diego County Water Authority; and Coachella Valley County Water District. Spent for services of Northcutt Ely, former executive assistant to Interior Secretary and now Washington representative of committee, $20,343.

Texas Water Conservation Association, Austin: Received $18,182 in 1949, including $600 in fourth quarter from Texas Power & Light Co., Dallas. Spent, for publicity work by George Kirksey & Associates, Houston, and for salaries, traveling expenses, and office costs, $19,319.

Taxes

National Committee for Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes, New York City: First report. Received $23,750 (see p. 180 for contributors). Expenditures for influencing legislation, none.

National Live Stock Tax Committee, Denver (composed of representatives from several livestock groups including American National Livestock Association, National Wool Growers Association, American Hereford Association, American Shorthorn Association, American Aberdeen-Angus Breeders Association, and about 30 other organizations). Received $674. Paid Stephen H. Hart, tax counsel, for work on amendment of tax laws on capital gains on sale of breeding livestock and deductions of ranch expenses (but think none of his activities were lobbying). Signed by F. E. Mollin, who is executive secretary of American National Live Stock Association. Hart's fees ($3,080) and expenses ($578), $3,658.

National Tax Equality Association, Inc., Chicago. Received $536,132. Said does not employ lobbyists, and that expenses were those of "fringe items," the "reporting of which depends upon whether or not they influenced third parties to make their views known to Congress." The "fringe items" are mainly for production and distribution of literature and advertisements "which may have suggested or inspired letters to Congress or which may possibly have been sent to the Congress by members of our Association or others." Salaries, rent, and so forth, are not included in the figures reported, though the fourth quarter figures do appear in the photostatic copy of the ledger sheets which accompanied the report. Spent, for "fringe items," $74,028.

Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Indianapolis: Received $2,328. Expenditures included items to Indiana State Chamber of Commerce for legislative action calendar service, rent, phone, and secretarial service, $5 dues and $527 quarterly assessment and postage items to NTEA; a $529 third quarter assessment to NAB, and so forth, $2,139.

Allen L. Smith (registered for Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc.): Spent, for travel, communications, expenses, including $5 to VFW and $5 to NTEA in November, $824.

Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Lincoln: Received $2,572. Reported, paid $650 to National Associated Businessmen for pamphlets and bulletins for 6 months (previous report said for dues) and $3 to NTEA for postage. Other costs were for communications. No salaries listed. Reported spent $2,603.

B. E. Groom, secretary, North Dakota Tax Equality Committee, Fargo: Received $12,570. Expenditures in fourth quarter included $1,000 supplies from "National Association Businessmen," $300 traveling expenses for Groom (no salary), $1,061 salary and $385 expenses of F. W. Grawe, rent, office expenses, advertising and communications. Year 1949 total, $11,067.

Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, Louisville: Received $6,853. Spent $5,113.

Tax Equality League of Utah, E. L. Schoenhals, Salt Lake City, $779.

(NOTE.—There is considerable transfer of funds between National Tax Equality Association, National Associated Businessmen and their State affiliates.)

National Tax Relief Coalition, Greensboro, N. C.: Received $2,900; spent $2,945.

State Tax Association, Houston: Congressional Quarterly cumulation, $35,367.

Twenty Percent Cabaret Tax Committee, Chicago: Received $11,900 (for detail see 1949 Log, p. 1405). Spent, including $10,250 for expenses of Samuel P. Haines, Washington, $12,276.

Washington (D. C.) Taxpayers Association: Received $4,002. Expenditures total includes full fee of Rufus S. Lusk, president, though only 10 percent of fee is applicable to Federal legislative activities, $4,028.

Veterans, military affairs

The American Legion, national headquarters, Indianapolis: Legion neither solicits nor accepts donations for purpose of furthering legislative aims. Total receipts and expenditures are reported annually to Congress under 1919 incorporation law, and not stated in lobbying reports. Allocation of Washington and legislative salaries and expenses, $71,769.

Disabled American Veterans, for Francis M. Sullivan and Charles E. Foster: Salaries (after taxes and social security) and expenses of the two men, $16,139.

Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars: Salary of L. S. Ray for first 10 months of 1949, $2,500.

National Council Against Conscription: Received $7,978, including an anonymous $1,000 during the fourth quarter, sent via Provident Trust Co. of Philadelphia. Expenditures, including fourth quarter payments to National Council for Prevention of War, for rent and supplies, $119; to Fellowship of Reconciliation, New York City, for literature and communications, and other expenditures for clerical salaries, travel, and expenses, etc., total for 1949, $9,002.

Reserve Officers Association of the United States: Received $127,716. Spent for one salary and expenses (no specific part of salary for lobbying), $6,313.

Washington and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. TOWE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I gave at the fifteenth annual George Washington's Birthday breakfast, Everyman's Club, First Presbyterian Church, Passaic, N. J., February 22, 1950:

Celebrating the two hundred and eighteenth anniversary of the birth of the Father of our County, we should pause briefly to speculate on the achievements of George Washington and examine his virtues and his accomplishments.

We may ask what dominated and what effused from this, the greatest of all American heroes. Was it his courageous tenacity, his valiant integrity, his sublime faith? Answering ourselves, we know that Washington had all these attributes and that it was the combination making up his character which made him great. Washington accomplished much. He was the leader and driving force in carrying out the successful Revolution, the only completely successful revolution in history in that it accomplished its purpose of creating a free republic. Revolutions in other parts of the globe have been failures, when measured by this standard.

In France the people threw off the tyranny of the monarch, which resulted in a reign of terror, followed by Napoleon, more blood, more terror, with the result that the Government of France is still weak, subject to immediate change, and fearful of another reign of terror.

In China, the revolt against the throne and the Manchu dynasty was never a success. The country became weak, and has now succumbed to the hordes of communism.

In Russia, the revolutionaries seized power in 1917, and eventually the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was born. Its founders promised a new freedom. Today in Russia the people, instead of freedom have misery, tyranny, a complete loss of the little dignity they enjoyed under the czars, and a loss of the right to worship their God as they choose, and in addition they face the daily fear of death.

"AT ALL TIMES THE SERVANTS"

In contrast to all of these attempts to bring complete freedom in all phases of life to the people, Washington's was the only one that succeeded.

Washington led the people in war and led them in peace, led them in framing a Constitution which is the greatest document of its kind in the world's history, and then went on to found the Republic of the United States of America. It was a great thing for Washington to have served in the Revolution and to have achieved independence for the United States. It was great, too, for him willingly to surrender his military power and to become again a private citizen. But it was even greater to construct the framework of a new Nation and in 8 years to clothe the words of its Constitution with reality.

Washington and the other founding fathers were at all times the servants of the people of the new-founded Republic. It may be some time since you have reflected on your concept of just what a republic is. Let me remind you and I will take this sentence from the dictionary: "A republic is a state in which the sovereign power rests in a certain body of the people—the electorate—and is exercised by representatives elected by, and responsible to, them."

The cornerstone which makes our country strong is the Republic's guarantee to all of its citizens of the inherent right of freedom and liberty—freedom to think as you will, work as you will, play as you will, so long as you do not intrude upon the rights of others. Above all, it guarantees the blessed right of freedom to worship according to your own conscience.

AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

Freedom then—the American way of life—is the force that has made the United States the most productive nation in the history of the world. Because men have been free, their minds have had free play. Their intellects have been stimulated and their inventive genius enriched. The telephone, the radio, the television, the phonograph, the automobile, the laundry machine, the air conditioning, the motion picture, and all the other great inventions conceived and developed in America—all of these things have been the direct products of free men, free to let their inventive genius and their ingenuity have full play.

One of the tragic facts of our era is that more and more people fail to understand this great force of freedom. Champions of philosophies completely alien to American liberty and American success have been peddling their false bills of goods in all quarters of the globe. In Russia, they are called Communists; in Germany, they were Nazis; in Italy, they were Fascists; and in England, they are Socialists.

Already a fourth of the world has become enslaved under communism. Already another fourth of the world is sampling other forms of socialism, all at the expense of human freedom and human rights.

These alien philosophies have a cornerstone, too. It is materialism, materialistic security. The formula to obtain materialistic security is the same in every case. The individual must surrender his freedom for guarantees that he will be clothed and fed. There is no guarantee of how well he will be clothed and fed, yet once he has surrendered his freedom, there is nothing he can do about it. He is trapped forever.

Politicians and governments have been trading on the materialistic desires of the people. It has been the politicians of Europe who have produced communism, socialism, fascism, and nazism.

In this country today, we have a group of fuzzy-minded thinkers who are determined to change our way of life. They are the weak-brained theorists who have been labeled socialistic planners. They are a force in Washington today. They have a formula. Their formula is that if it is necessary for the Government to do a few basic services for the people, there is no reason why the Government should not take over all of the affairs of the people and let the state manage personal lives from the time of birth until the time of death. With complete disregard for the future safety of the country, these socialistic planners have so influenced the present administration that it is unequivocally committed to change the form of government established by Washington and his fellow founders of freedom. It is plain to all clear-thinking men that we are definitely embarked on a program which deviates from our republican system of government, which has made this Nation the greatest in the history of man.

We are adopting the methods that spelled failure for the European nations. Daily we approach the stage where the dignity of the individual, his inherent rights and freedoms, and his sovereignty over his public servants, is being engulfed by the growth of government. This government expansion and control is a sharp challenge to our liberty and freedom.

The Constitution plainly says that the will and desires of the people are sovereign. The Constitution further guarantees that those persons who are elected or appointed to any public office, no matter how exalted are the people's servants and not their masters. It was clearly set forth that the people were going to be the masters, and not the few who served them. During recent years, however, the power of the few has become so great that it is questionable how long our Nation can remain free, as contemplated by Washington and his associates.

WHAT THE GOVERNMENT IS DOING

The growth of Government and Government controls has placed handcuffs on the American businessman, is taxing away his profits, and is endangering the future of his enterprise. In addition to shackling the American businessman, the Government has entered into open competition with him. The Government operates light and power plants; it builds homes and apartments and rents them. The Government is in the insurance business. The Government comes close to fixing wages, pensions, prices, interest and dividends. The Government definitely is in the banking business. The Government is in the food business—the Government buys up millions of dozens of eggs and millions of pounds of potatoes and stores them away until they rot or become poisonous. The fields in which the Government competes with American business and interferes with the private enterprise system is growing daily. Federal bureaucracy is threatening the steel industry, it is threatening the transportation industry, it is endangering the future of the professions, particularly medicine and education.

All these new formulas concocted by the socialistic-planners are put before us in the guise of new government services, something the state is going to do for us, a handout to Utopia. But like the thinking of these planners, this is a false and dishonest line of salesmanship. They don't tell all the story. They don't mention the cost, they don't tell us how much these services are going to increase our tax bill—a tax bill that is today the highest in the peacetime history of our country and increasing every twenty-four hours. They don't tell us that their objective is to make every man, woman and child

a complete ward of the state, as happened in Italy, Germany, Russia, and as is going on in Great Britain today.

TWENTY-SEVEN PERCENT OF INCOME TO TAXES

Everyone of these preposterous schemes of these planners cost money. And spending of Government money means that you must pay more taxes. High taxes is one of the main weapons of the socialistic-planners, and is the principal means they are using in their determination to change the American way of life.

Figures are dull, but I want to use a few to prove this statement. It has long been held by competent students of political science and by economists that when taxes amount to more than 20 percent of your total income, you are no longer wholly able to provide for yourself. When you are taxed more than 20 percent, you must rely on the Government for the difference. Today, the American taxpayer is paying 27 percent of his income to Federal, State, and local governments simply for the privilege of being governed. We are already at least 7 percentage points over the deadline. From the time of Washington down to 1941, 32 Presidents spent $179,620,113,645. In less than 5 years, the present administration has spent $191,081,394,191, and the budget for the coming fiscal year calls for the spending of more than $50,000,000,000, in one way or another. The planners in the present administration ran the country nearly $5,500,000,000 into the red last year, and the deficit spending this year will be approximately another $5,000,000,000.

Under the present deficit-spending policy, last year we daily spent $15,000,000 which we did not have. This is at the rate of $625,000 an hour, and $10,416 a minute.

Just a few other statistics: Twenty years ago, the average American family paid less than $200 a year in taxes. The same family today pays more than $1,300 a year.

Twenty years ago, there was 1 Government employee for every 40 of population. Today there is 1 for every 22.

ONE OF EVERY SEVEN SEEKS EXTRA FUNDS

Twenty years ago, the number of people directly or indirectly receiving money from the Government was 1 out of 40. Today, one out of seven regularly receives Government money.

The public debt today is approximately $257,000,000,000.

With taxation the cornerstone of the movement to change our form of government, and make the people the slaves of the state, instead of its masters, you can see that these planners have made great progress in this means of attack. The higher the tax, the greater danger to our liberty.

Another danger we face is the possibility of a complete surrender to materialism and amorality. This happened in Italy, Germany, it is in full force in Russia and its iron curtain satellites, it is in control in England, and it has invaded our shores. Many of our political leaders have abandoned all sense of true liberalism and morality. They still proclaim themselves to be liberals, but they are trying to sell the American people on the idea that if you have the physical necessities of life, you will be secure and happy. Yet, the fact is that the American people today are not feeling secure, nor feeling happy. The fact is that the British people feel neither secure nor feel happy. Materialism has reached its inevitable goal in Russia, and the people of that vast land have found that the price of physical security is fear.

Many of the world's great leaders understand the fatal weakness in the godless materialism now being sold to the peoples of the earth. Many religious leaders have repeatedly called for a rebirth of morality and a proper understanding of materialism. In public addresses decrying materialism, these leaders point out that the advocates of socialism are destroying the fundamental moral force of the world, the home.

Former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, also understands the fatal weakness of materialism and the threat of materialism to our Nation. Twice he has warned that "we are going down the road to statism." Mr. Byrnes declares that if these socialistic planners' programs now being concocted in Washington should be adopted, there is danger that the individual—the farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor—will soon be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state.

Former President Herbert Hoover also sees the menace of materialism. The former President said a short time ago, and I quote:

"There is a considerable group of fuzzy-minded people who are engineering a compromise with all these European infections. They fail to realize that our own American system has grown away from the systems of Europe for 250 years. They have a false notion that a collectivist economy can at the same time preserve personal liberty and constitutional government."

There can be no doubt that these planners, determined to change our form of government, have their feet across the threshold of our doors. However, I firmly believe that an overwhelming majority of thinking Americans, real patriotic Americans, want to reverse the trend toward the Socialist state in America. I believe that an overwhelming majority of the American people recognize the moral and spiritual necessity to preserve freedom. I believe that an overwhelming majority of the American people are against materialism and amorality. I believe that an overwhelming majority of the American people want to save our Nation and continue our form of government, as established by George Washington and his associates 161 years ago.

Now is the time for each of us to call on our reserves of moral strength. You should withstand the blandishments of those politicians who hold out promises of material security in one hand and hide the other hand containing the shackles of taxation and loss of freedom which are the necessary instruments of such a program. And we the elected servants of the voters must withstand the present trend to be all things to all people in order to secure votes. For as George Washington so aptly stated during the arguments accompanying the framing of the Constitution—"If, to please the public, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work?"

And, gentlemen, how can we?

The Keating Health Insurance Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, my native State of Maryland has always held an honorable and advanced position with respect to medical science and its practical application. There is little support for socialized medicine in the Maryland Free State, but the manner in which it has striven to meet the problem of medical care for the needy and indigent on the local level has won general approbation from those familiar with this activity. It is significant, therefore, that the Sun of Baltimore has shown editorial interest in the plan for expanding the program of national health insurance proposed in H. R. 6819 by my friend and colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I, too, advocate a voluntary program and, like the Sun, I hope the bill will not be squelched in committee.

The editorial in question, from the issue of February 18, last, reads as follows:

THE INCOME TAX AND THE COST OF HEALTH INSURANCE

A bill has been introduced in the United States House of Representatives that proposes an interesting approach to the problem of a national health program. Its sponsor is Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York.

What Mr. KEATING suggests is an income-tax-allowance plan. That is to say, a taxpayer would be permitted to deduct from his Federal income tax—not his taxable income but the tax itself—a proportion of any premium he has paid for approved health insurance, whether for hospital or medical care.

As the bill is written a taxpayer with an adjusted gross income of $2,000 would be allowed to deduct 90 percent of the annual premium paid. Deductions would be scaled according to income to the point where a taxpayer with an adjusted gross income of $10,001 and over, would receive credit for only 60 percent of the premium paid.

It is estimated that there already are 52,000,000 persons carrying some form of voluntary health insurance. Mr. KEATING's plan would substitute incentive for compulsion. It would serve as a stimulus for a popular movement that already has made astonishing progress.

The significance of the proposal is that part of the money now paid by an individual to the Government in the form of a Federal income tax would, instead, go to the payment of a health-insurance premium. It is probable that some of the people in the lower-income brackets who now pay a Federal tax would, because of the allowance plan, be relieved of paying any income tax at all.

On the other hand, under President Truman's compulsory insurance plan the premium would be deducted from the pay envelope. It has been estimated that the cost to the wage earners alone would be in the neighborhood of $6,000,000,000 a year. There would be also the tremendous administrative costs of setting up a huge medical bureaucracy run from Washington.

The author of the bill recognizes that there will be objection on the ground that his plan would result in great loss of tax revenue. He admits it, but points out that, on the other hand, it would relieve the Federal Government of the stupendous burden involved in taking over the Nation's whole medical establishment.

Possibly there are circumstances that would make the income-tax-allowance plan impractical. Certainly no judgment should be passed on it until exact figures have been presented and examined. But the bill should not be allowed to be squelched in committee. Voluntary health insurance is one principle preferable to a scheme involving compulsion. Any scheme which promises to encourage the growth of voluntary plans deserves full debate.

St. Lawrence Seaway Will Seriously Affect the Economy of Central Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the boards of governors of the Chamber of Commerce, Clearfield, Pa., are opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway project because of its effect on the economy of Pennsylvania.

We who reside in Pennsylvania depend largely upon the coal and railroad industries, and should the St. Lawrence seaway project become a reality, it would wreck our economy and throw thousands of people out of work.

The following resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce, Clearfield, Pa., is self-explanatary, and I hope that my colleagues will realize the devastating effects that will follow approval of the St. Lawrence seaway project:

The board of governors of the Chamber of Commerce of Clearfield, at its regular monthly meeting held on Thursday, February 16, unanimously adopted a resolution opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project.

"Our chamber believes that it would require a great expenditure of public funds which cannot be justified at this time; that it would seriously affect the economy of central Pennsylvania and further impair the market of Pennsylvania coal, the basic industry of this area; militate against the establishment of new industry and create unfair sources of competition, by lower transportation costs on foreign-made products."

The St. Lawrence project has been discussed for more than half a century. It has never been found to be an economic development either as a waterway or power scheme. Advocated now as a national defense need it has no basis for justification whatsoever.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF CLEARFIELD,
GEORGE W. GAYLOR, *Secretary*.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Hon. Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor, at a meeting sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress:

I am glad to appear on the justice-for-Poland program and to discuss, as requested, labor conditions behind the iron curtain, with special reference to Poland.

At the very outset, let me say that the pattern of Soviet domination of labor unions is more or less advanced in all the satellite countries. If, in other words, we wish to understand what is happening to the worker in countries like Poland, Rumania, Hungary, we must first realize what communism has done in Russia to the trade-union.

Trade-unions have no trace of independence in the U. S. S. R. They are an instrument of government. They have no right to strike for any purpose. They can merely make representations to a higher authority. They are controlled by a higher authority which does not spring from the union and is not responsible to the union. Unions simply function as part of a one-party state.

In such a situation the individual member, as well as the organization, is a rubber stamp. Opposition to union leadership, which is imposed from above, is opposition to the state and punished as such. Every hint of democracy has been rooted out. Russian unionists are like all other Russians who have not attained official power in the party or the government—just dumb, driven cattle. The only reason for retaining the form of union organization is apparently to increase production. In short, in the Soviet Union the organized worker has the right to be more of a beast of burden than he has been all along.

It is on that account that workers are forced to join unions. If they stay out, they can have no vacations, they are left out in the cold with respect to housing, they are deprived of all the little privileges which are held out as bait to Russian labor. That is why there is a large union membership. In effect, you have to join to avoid being suspected of counter-revolution, and you get nothing for joining except the right to carry out orders.

That is true in Russia. It is also true in Poland. Though the country and the population were reduced during the war, the trade-union membership is four times what it was before the war. You have to belong to the union, though when you belong your position is not improved in any respect. Your wages, hours, conditions of work are set not as a result of the kind of collective bargaining we know, but a collective bargaining which consists largely of a political boss saying "you must" and your saying "I will."

Over 80 percent of more than a thousand key trade-union officials belong to the Polish United Labor Party, which is, of course, Communist controlled, and which in any case runs the state. That can mean but one thing. The worker is a helpless creature of the state. He is regarded as having no interest outside the program of the state. That, at least, is the theory which is being hammered into a fact. The Polish union is not allowed a life of its own. The will of its members counts for nothing. Communism recognizes no right outside the authority of the government to carry out its ruthless purpose.

In such circumstances, where the objective of more and more production, whatever the cost, is paramount, it is not surprising that safeguards against injury and death, which we take for granted, and which even the Communists have put down on paper, do not prove effective. Human life means little under a Communist regime. Man's inhumanity to man is an old story, but it takes on a special brutality when it occurs for the profound purpose of keeping the proletariat on top.

The trade-unionist, unless he happens to be an important Communist official, has no standing, no influence, no part in shaping government policy, no opportunity to improve his lot. The well-being of the ordinary Russia or Polish worker is altogether outside his hands or the hands of his union. He remains ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-paid, for the sake of a future he will never enjoy. His not to reason why, his but to do and die. And if he does not do as required, he dies in a concentration camp. That is the fate of the Polish worker or any worker under a Communist Government.

The living conditions of workers in the Russian trade-unions are bad enough, but they must seem like paradise to those who are not in the unions. I am speaking of the millions in compulsory or slave-labor camps. How many millions we do not know, but the estimate runs from 5 to 20 million. From the reports of former inmates, we learn that the death rate among slave laborers is appalling by reason of the subhuman conditions forced upon them. This is what it means to be a workingman in a Communist country.

It is such conditions which prevail in what we are told are "people's democracies." They are conditions which differ only in degree in the several Soviet-dominated states. Their existence in Poland is accentuated by the fact that communism is not a Polish ideology but is something which has come with Russian conquest. This is not the first time the Poles have suffered from Russian imperialism, but the bitterness of being militarily conquered is made even more unbearable by the way in which Moscow has gone about converting Poland to communism.

The Poles have always been devout Catholics. But religion is poison to the Communists. So in Poland, as in all the satellite countries, the comfort which religion might have brought to oppressed men and women is at best suspect and at worst denied. Religion is a drug, Lenin declared. What he meant was that those who worship God, those who are moved by moral values, cannot be converted to communism, which is antimoral, antispiritual, so committed to materialism that it must root out the heartfelt things of faith.

There is no balm in Gilead for the masses of eastern Europe. They are not working or living except for mere survival. They have been robbed of every freedom. They cannot call their souls their own. Their masters talk about democracy, then profane it by removing every trace of self-government. Is it democracy to say to workers, you may band together, but only to serve the government, never to have a voice in it, never even to have a voice in protesting against wrongs, or in making demands, or in doing anything which is not strictly according to the party line?

The workers of the Western World have become a powerful force for social, economic, and political advancement. In the western democracies, unions are an expression of freedom. In the "people's democracies", unions are an expression of tyranny. Behind the iron curtain, the worker is condemned to a double misery. Politically, he is a cipher. Economically, he is so much raw material. He is being sacrificed on the altar of a deity crueler than any monster worshipped in the early pagan world.

What then is to be said about labor conditions behind the iron curtain? Nothing to gladden the heart of any civilized person. And the worst of it is that we can expect no improvement until this cold war is over. We can pray that this will happen soon, but we must be prepared for a long stretch of international confusion during which there can be little justice for Poland or for any other country in the grip of the Kremlin. For that, or for worse, the United States must be ready, militarily and in every other way.

But I do not doubt that, ultimately, this shadow will be lifted, the iron curtain dissolved, and mankind permitted again to march in peace and security toward a goal now hidden from us. Then there will be justice and freedom for all the children of men. Then Poland, which fought so bravely during the war against totalitarianism, will receive its reward. Then justice will be done for the benefit of the peoples behind the iron curtain, for the benefit of all the countries which are now shut off from the sun of liberty.

Forest Resources in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the statement of Mr. Anton J. Tomasek, State forestry chairman, Illinois Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Tomasek's statement follows:

I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to present a statement and on behalf of the organization that sent me I wish to thank you.

I represent the Illinois Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs which has a membership of approximately 100,000 members belonging to some 460 county chapters. Our members are farmers, laborers, small-business men and individuals from all walks of life interested in the conservation of our natural resources. Through their officers and directors they have given approval of the statements to be presented.

I myself am a small-business man in a business not related in any way to forestry. I receive no salary from any public agency. Until 3 years ago I was head of the Illinois State Forestry Division for a period of 11 years. Recently I was appointed a member of our Illinois Department of Conservation Advisory Board by our Governor Stevenson.

My statement is confined to forestry problems of Illinois but no doubt other States are affected equally. I traveled through your great State of Mississippi two weeks ago, Mr. Chairman, and saw this; although as in our State one could readily see that great strides have been made in recent years in the development of the forest resources.

We must remember that money spent on forest resource development is one of the best investments in this country today and I base that upon the fact of what that investment will bring back in the form of dollar dividends in the future. Therefore, these appropriations that you will grant are strictly a loan which will return dividends equivalent to the finest investment and eventually the loan or appropriation, as we call it here, will be paid off. Forest lands under good management will do this. It has already been proven on some of our national forest lands and more recently on private land ownerships.

We in Illinois want to place our almost four million acres of timberland of which 95 percent is owned by farmers under the best forest management practices possible. Showing our 304,000 farmers each of whom owns an average of 20 acres of forest land how to do it is a tremendous problem. Our educational program has gone far enough along in Illinois that the average farmer is convinced that good forestry on his land will pay him good dividends in return. Now the problem is to show him how to do it. We have nine foresters in the State now doing as much as they can who are so far behind on requests for their assistance it is embarrassing. Is it not good business to appropriate more money for farm forestry so that more men can be hired to give the farmers the technical assistance they need to manage their farm woodlands properly so that those lands bring in the dividends that they should?

A farmer in Washington County, Ill., provides a typical example of the services a farm forester can provide. This farmer possessed 100 acres of bottomland and upland timber which he never considered too important. The land was too rough and inaccessible for farming or good pasture, so he never considered it as a real paying part of the farm.

When a large mill operator commenced cutting operations in an adjacent tract, this owner thought perhaps that he, too, should cut his trees and get some financial returns while the getting was good. When a sizable offer of $2,000 was given by the millman, the farmer hesitated and wondered. It was then that he contacted the farm forester and wanted a little more information about forestry and especially his woodland of 100 acres.

The forester and the farmer walked through the woods and made a cruise or inventory study, and upon that decided to harvest only the ripe trees and save the younger trees for a future crop. The forester and farmer then marked and volume tallied such trees, made up a list of the quantity and quality of trees now available for selling, and then they contacted many different millmen.

From this action, these marked trees were sold for $2,400 and the majority of that timber tract still stood for periodic future cuts and the stand was benefited by the removal of the overmature ripe trees allowing faster growth on the remainder. The farmer benefited by actually receiving more for less timber; his woodland was left in a highly productive state and the millman benefited by harvesting large trees which brought him more high-quality timber and lumber than would be possible from harvesting small trees. The millman further benefited by being assured of future supplies of quality timber which will be produced by good forest practices. As a result the farmer now considers his woodland as valuable as the cropland and spends slack winter months in his woods doing the things the forester advocated during his visit and follows the simple management plan prepared for the farmer's guidance by the forester.

I see there is no provision for an increase of funds in the budget for farm forestry. I hope every effort will be made for an increase but if the committee feels this an impossibility would you please consider transferring to farm forestry some of the $850,000 increase for planting which I noticed on page 448 of the budget.

I would like to call your attention to the Forest Service research program in Illinois. They are studying timber management, tree planting, and management of plantings old enough to produce forest products, at their experimental forest in the hilly section of southern Illinois. The new and improved methods they are developing will be of tremendous value to timberland owners in southern Illinois and in three adjacent States. The practices developed and demonstrated will assist our farm foresters. The new methods of tree planting will help the Shawnee National Forest, the State forests, and the private-land owners do a better job of tree planting.

This research program has our wholehearted support and it needs to be strengthened. Southern Illinois has three important types of timberlands. The one experimental forest now in operation represents only the hilly oak-hickory type. The present program is not large enough to include forests on the claypan soils which contain nearly 3,000,000 acres of forest land in southern Illinois and southwestern Indiana. Nor is any forest research being done in the bottomland hardwoods along the Wabash, Ohio, Mississippi, and many other rivers and streams. Timber grows more rapidly in the bottomlands and this type is a very important part of the total forest area in southern Illinois.

New and better forestry practices must be developed and demonstrated in each major timber type if we are ever to obtain full use of the forest lands of southern Illinois. We believe the best way to do this is to establish experimental forests in the claypan and bottomland timber types, just as the Forest Service has done already in the hilly lands. In addition to providing the information needed by forest-land owners of southern Illinois, these experimental forests would serve owners in sizable parts of Indiana, Kentucky, and Missouri. Therefore, we recommend that your committee and Congress appropriate funds for the Forest Service to start these two new experimental forests in southern Illinois this year.

Present expenditures are limited to $32,000 for this research center. Needs require an additional $30,000 to expand the work to our other additional forest types. The budget for fiscal year 1951 recommends no increase for the experimental forest and range project of the Forest Service research appropriations. It is my responsibility to express the views of my organization that an increase of this amount is needed and justified by our situation in southern Illinois.

Another item we are interested in is a tree-planting program on the Shawnee National Forest that has already reforested 25,000 acres of denuded land. There remain 10,000 acres yet to be planted of which only 714 acres were completed last year. At this rate it will take nearly 15 years for the Federal Government to complete this job. That does not set a very good example to our people on how to get things done in forestry. Last year the Anderson-Mansfield Act was passed by this Congress to speed up planting on the national forests. The Budget Bureau recommends an appropriation of $889,000 for the reforestation project of the protection and management appropriation. This is certainly a justifiable and necessary activity. The Shawnee National Forest was purchased from private citizens in our State with the idea that the Federal Government could rebuild the forest resources more rapidly than private ownership. The Anderson-Mansfield Act authorized an appropriation of $3,000,000 for planting on these public lands. The fact that this appropriation is in the budget is encouraging however it is hoped that this committee can see its way clear to increase this amount to more nearly the amount of the authorization.

I know you men have a tremendous responsibility in allocating the expenditure of public funds and I have felt in the past that this committee has recommended wisely. Due to public opinion today I know it is difficult to increase appropriations, however I feel even as a conservative businessman that sometimes it is wise to do so. An example is the appropriation of forest-survey money in the past. Illinois for years had no forest survey of its timberlands, until finally 2 years ago it was granted. The survey was made and already the results of it have more than paid off its cost. There are still other States that need the survey.

Investing money, gentlemen, in our forest resources is one of the soundest investments today and I say that not as a forester but as a businessman. Returns in a comparatively few years will not only pay good dividends but also the principal.

All or Nothing Diehards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call the attention of the House to an article written by Marquis Childs in the Washington Post on the subject of the recent House action on the FEPC bill. I think Mr. Childs has made the fairest and most sensible analysis of this proposition that I have read.

It was because I shared almost an identical view in regard to the realism of the situation that I offered the Hays bill as a substitute during House debate. I still think this is the best and most worthy approach to this problem and that the national interest would have been served far better under this particular approach.

The article follows:

In the handling of the fair employment practices issue the Democratic leadership has provided an example of remarkable ineptitude. The net result was an embarrassment to Democratic Members of the House in a bill that has little relation either to reasonable compromise or a strict enforcement measure.

From the beginning it has been perfectly obvious that an FEPC bill with compulsory and penalty provisions could not be passed. If nothing else, a filibuster in the Senate would block it, the Republicans having joined with southern Democrats to make it far more difficult to close debate.

But it was also obvious that a large measure of support could be marshaled behind a fair employment law that would make a start at education and persuasion. Many southern legislators were prepared to accept such a bill. They represent a shifting opinion in the South—outside, of course, of the deep and irreconcilable South—which recognizes the inevitability of change and the need to prepare for it.

A compromise measure such as that of Representative BROOKS HAYS of Arkansas calling for investigation of discrimination in employment, coupled with education of employers and public, would have meant a good start. It would have afforded a test in both North and South of intentions and capabilities, supplementing the experiment of State FEPC commissions which have now accumulated a fair amount of experience.

Such a compromise could have been accepted on a frankly limited basis. Even the most passionate proponents of FEPC could have accepted a test for a period of 2 or 3 years. They are not likely to get as much in that time if they persist in an all-or-nothing attitude.

Then, too, honest advocates of equality of opportunity in the North had come to doubt the wisdom of a Federal law providing punishment for violators. They realized that such a law could be used in the South to inflame latent feeling against minorities.

Both the Democratic leadership and the proponents of an all-out FEPC law seemed to abandon any hope of keeping a substitute measure in bounds.

This was on the theory that whatever bill was sent to the Senate would be certain to be amended before final passage.

The substitute originally introduced by Representative SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR., Republican of Pennsylvania, became in consequence something of a monstrosity. Amendments were slapped on in the confusion of the late-night session providing that women should not be discriminated against and that the disabled should be protected from unfair employment practices. These amendments were mostly the work of Southerners who knew exactly what they were doing.

The Hays bill, if it had been given a chance by the leadership, would have won the votes of a fair number of southern Democrats. Moreover, President Truman had indicated that he would sign it if it came to his desk in anything like its original form.

It is hard to determine who is responsible for the present mess. But a great deal of the blame must rest on the diehard proponents of an all-or-nothing bill.

They can once again use the fair employment issue in the elections this fall. However, as one session of Congress after another fails to produce any legislation, the result may be disillusion and disgust rather than votes. The only real beneficiary is Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, of the fellow-traveling Labor Party, whose aim is to discredit major parties.

The McConnell substitute put administration Democrats on a bad spot. If they voted against it, then they were in the position of opposing the only bill that had a chance of passage. But since it was a Republican-sponsored measure, they could not take very much credit to themselves for going along with it.

One thing clearly demonstrated in the House is that FEPC has become a rather sordid football to be kicked back and forth between the two parties. The ineptitude of the Democrats made it possible for the Republicans to grab the ball and run for a touchdown.

I believe that if the Hays bill had been passed and sent to the Senate it would have had a good chance for passage there. The whole matter would have been taken out of the area of angry attack and counterattack. In a trial interval it could have been determined whether a law without sanctions would serve the cause of equal job opportunity.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, there was dedicated in the city of Providence, R. I., last year a new veterans' hospital which up until now is officially known as the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Davis Park, Providence, R. I.

The veterans of Rhode Island, speaking through the United Veterans' Council, which represents all the veterans' organizations in the State, have suggested that this new hospital be named the Capt. Elwood J. Euart Veterans' Memorial Hospital, and I am today introducing a bill which I hope will receive favorable consideration at an early date so that the hospital will officially bear the name of one of Rhode Island's outstanding war heroes, Capt. Elwood J. Euart, who gave his own life to save the lives of men serving under him.

The official records of the War Department reveal the true heroism of Captain Euart, as appears in a letter I received from the Adjutant General. I quote from that letter:

The records show that the United States Army transport *President Coolidge*, carrying approximately 4,000 Army personnel from the United States, was crippled by two mines while entering Espiritu Santo Harbor, New Hebrides, on the morning of October 26, 1942, and the alarm was sounded to abandon ship. Capt. Elwood J. Euart, service number O374388, intelligence officer of the One Hundred and Third Field Artillery Battalion, who had been detailed as troop mess officer for the voyage, was on duty in the enlisted men's mess hall at that time and personally checked the clearing of that area. Having safely reached his abandon-ship station, he learned of men trapped in the hold and went there. By lashing himself to the low end of a rope, he was able to hold it tight enough for men to climb up it to safety, even though the ship was badly listing. Finally, as he attempted to climb up, almost vertically by that moment, with the help of a few men at the other end of the line, the ship careened and sank very quickly. Captain Euart exhausted himself assisting many others, whose lives were thus undoubtedly spared at the expense of his own. For this extraordinary heroism he was posthumously awarded the Distinguished Service Cross.

Dangerous Kind of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial entitled "What's This, Politics?" which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal on Friday, February 24, 1950:

WHAT'S THIS, POLITICS?

Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, is still at it. He is continuing his vicious campaign against—well, what is his campaign against? He says there are Communists in the State Department, but so far he has failed to prove his charges.

Senator MCCARTHY's charges so far have been in the worst tradition of congressional demagogs. He has made charges, sensational charges, but he has not backed them up or proved them. He has been challenged time and again, but always he has refused to come forward with anything more real than his wild charges. Under the circumstances, it is impossible not to suspect his motives; if he would not be suspected, he should not act so as to arouse suspicion.

But what are Senator MCCARTHY's motives?

Is he honestly concerned about Communists being in the State Department, in the White House entourage? If he is, why does he not come forward and name the dangerous ones? If he believes they are really there and really are dangerous, he should be interested in seeing them removed at the earliest possible moment. The State Department has

promised to fire immediately any Communists that are shown to be on its staff.

But still Senator McCarthy does nothing but make more charges, confusing charges in which he bundles about different figures that started at 205, dropped to 57, then rose to 81. He is not even consistent as to the number of Communists he says are in the State Department's employ.

Could the Senator's motives be political? It is not pleasant to say, but they could be. The Senator could be more interested in trying to discredit the administration—it being Democratic and he Republican—than in anything else. In fact, if Senator McCarthy does not come forward soon with more proof than he has offered so far, the only conclusion possible will be that his charges are nothing but politics.

Sesquicentennial of Indiana Territory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by Hon. Homer E. Capehart before the Indiana Society of Washington, D. C., celebrating the sesquicentennial of Indiana Territory, 1800 to 1950. The address delivered at the Washington National Airport, February 19, 1950, is as follows:

Fellow Hoosiers, we are gathered here today to honor our native State and contemplate 150 years of events which have made Indiana one of the greatest States in this Nation.

We have just paid tribute to Paul Hadley, one of its noblest sons, a distinguished artist who gave us our beautiful banner.

It is fitting and right that we sons and daughters of Indiana, together with many friends of our beloved State, residing here in this great world capital should engage in this celebration commemorative of the 150 years during which Indiana has risen from a pioneer territory to a great State of agriculture, industry and the arts.

Those of us who because of our callings have found it necessary to reside apart from our native soil, gather frequently and exchange the typical Hoosier greeting of a heartfelt handshake and a pleasant word.

Today we are gathered to contemplate the noble history of our great State.

This is a sesquicentennial celebration marking 150 years of development of Indiana from a Territory, through statehood, to the high place of honor she now holds in the Union of States.

Indiana Territory was carved out of the vast area known as the Northwest Territory in the year 1800.

The original Indiana Territory embraced not only Indiana as we know it today, but also the land now included within the borders of our sister State—Illinois.

The territorial capitol was located at Vincennes, Ind., and William Henry Harrison—a great soldier and great citizen—was its first Governor, assuming this duty early in 1801.

He remained Indiana Territorial Governor until late in 1812, when he resigned to assume his military duties in the War of 1812.

Later this great man became the Ninth President of the United States, but unfortunately, he died in 1841 after only one month of service in that high office.

Our first Delegate from Indiana Territory, to the National Congress, was Benjamin Parke, another soldier and citizen of great distinction. He served in Congress as Territorial Delegate from 1805 to 1808, when he became Territorial Judge. In 1817 he was designated Judge of the First United States District Court for the State of Indiana, and continued in that capacity until his death at Salem, Ind., in 1835. Judge Parke had devoted 31 years of his life to the service of our great State.

Judge Parke was succeeded by Jesse B. Thomas as delegate from Indiana Territory. Delegate Thomas, headed a committee to determine whether Indiana Territory should be divided, and in his report urged this division, because the people of Illinois couldn't get across from Illinois to the court at Vincennes on account of muddy swamps.

The report also stated there were 11,000 people west of the Wabash River, and 17,000 east.

The report met violent opposition on the grounds and I quote verbatim "that the expense to the United States for this new government would be $6,950 yearly; that this proceeding might be very convenient to the men who should be appointed governors of judges but for no other good purpose."

Our third and last territorial delegate was Jonathan Jennings. When it came to selecting the third delegate the people had been granted the right of suffrage. The contest was between Jennings and Thomas Randolph and the issue was slavery. Jennings opposed Indiana becoming a slave State.

Jennings served from November 27, 1809 until Indiana became a State. He made the strong fight for statehood and his efforts were crowned with victory when on December 6, 1816, William Henry Harrison, who had been governor of the Territory for 12 years and who was then a Representative from Ohio, moved a final resolution of statehood, which was adopted. This resolution was passed by the Senate and signed by President James Madison on December 11, 1816.

Delegate Jennings returned to Indiana, became the first governor and later returned to Washington to serve four successive terms to Congress.

Our first Representative in Congress was William Hendricks. He served from December 2, 1816, until his resignation to become Indiana's third governor. At the close of his term as governor he was elected United States Senator for Indiana and served from 1825 to 1837.

Our first two Senators were James Noble and Waller Taylor. The annals of Congress do not indicate Taylor took an active part in debates, but Senator Noble was a strong and effective debater. Senator Noble served in the Senate until his death here in Washington in 1831.

Impressive ceremonies were held in the Capitol, attended by the President and the Cabinet, and Indiana's first Senator was laid to rest in the Eastern Branch Burial Ground (now known as the Congressional Cemetery) here in Washington.

Yesterday, Mr. Hadley and I had the honor to visit the grave of this great man and place a wreath on his grave on behalf of the Indiana Society of Washington.

With Indiana taking her place among the States of the Union in 1816, she embarked on her great career. In public life she not only supplied the early leadership of such men as Parke, Jennings, Hendricks, and Noble, but as the years rolled along, her sons—William Henry Harrison and Benjamin Harrison—served as Presidents of the United States.

Colfax, Hendricks, Fairbanks, and Marshall were elected Vice Presidents and many distinguished sons have served her faithfully and well as Members of Congress and Government officials.

One son, Senator Dan Voorhees, served from 1877 to 1897, became popularly known as the "Tall Sycamore of the Wabash." While in Congress, he planted a tall sycamore at the foot of the Capitol and while the original tree died a few years ago, another sycamore was planted to replace the original tree.

This tree stands today a monument, not only to the memory of the man who introduced the resolution to establish the beautiful building which houses the Library of Congress, but to our State through whose sycamores the candlelights gleam along the Wabash.

Not only have Indiana's sons contributed to the affairs of government, but I need hardly remind you in the field of literature some of the Nation's greatest names are Hoosier—Riley, Wallace, Ade, Tarkington, Dreiser, Nicholson—and in music—Cole Porter, Hoagy Carmichael, Paul Dresser.

Many great sons and daughters throughout 150 years of history.

As Indiana grew, her great resources of coal, oil, gas, limestone, clay were developed by her people. Her fertile fields yield crops of the finest agricultural products—apples, tomatoes, onions, corn, wheat, hogs, turkeys, and again sons and daughters of Indiana took leadership.

The first automobile was built by Elwood Haynes at Kokomo in 1894.

Canals, railroads, wide paved highways, and air lines were established.

While the great wealth and resources of her lands were developing, Indiana took leadership in education as well.

The first State university west of the Appalachian Mountains was established as a State university in Bloomington.

Later, Indiana State Teachers' College was started at Terre Haute in 1870 and Ball State Teachers' College was opened at Muncie in 1917. Purdue University was organized in 1874 and is today one of the leading agriculture and engineering schools of the country.

Religious groups of all faiths founded colleges and today Indiana has the finest educational opportunities for her young sons and daughters.

Soon you will see a picture entitled "Indiana has Almost Everything."

Indiana today, as you will see from this fine picture, is a State in which we can all be justly proud—and in the words of another Hoosier, John McGee—as given to the Indiana Society of Chicago last Saturday night, I close—

"Where springs are sweetest and autumns gayest,
Small towns with Indian names,
The Wabash sparkling white under the summer moon,
Green fields of slowly waving corn,
Autumns full of the smell of burning leaves,
And buesome harvest fields stretching away into a saffron setting sun,
Bittersweet and basketball, pawpaws and pumpkins,
Country church crowds on sunlit Sunday mornings,
Courthouses with worn down front steps,
And trotting races at the county fair,
Land of Lincoln-like lawyers,
Brown County and Turkey Run,
State that remembers canals and covered bridges,
Thomas R. Marshall, Albert J. Beveridge, Benjamin and William Henry Harrison.
Literary land of poets and writers,
James Whitcomb Riley, George Ade, Booth Tarkington,
Theodore Dreiser, Meredith Nicholson and Abe Martin,
Land haunted by red men whose canoes seem to drift down blue green curving rivers,
Land of the Speedway, sycamores, and friendly conversational folk,
'On the Banks of the Wabash'—Hoosierdom and Home."

Eightieth Anniversary of Richmond Avenue Church, Buffalo, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, recently the Richmond Avenue Church of Christ, of Buffalo, N. Y., my home town, celebrated its eightieth anniversary, and I want to join with my fellow Buffalonians in extending felicitations and all best wishes to its pastor, the Reverend W. L. Burner, and to its parishioners on this happy occasion.

This church has had a splendid history of four decades of service to its country, its community, and its parishioners. It occupies a respected place in Buffalo, for it has achieved an enviable record in religious, educational, and community matters and in bringing about cooperation and mutual understanding among the churches of various denominations in western New York.

To the pastor and the parishioners of this church I offer my heartiest congratulations and my sincerest wishes for many more years of good work for God and community.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following article from the Buffalo Courier-Express in connection with the celebration of this anniversary:

MATERIALISM IN WORLD ASSAILED BY THE REVEREND LANKLER

The hydrogen bomb makes a war of extermination possible because most of the world, even the United States, is gripped by a materialistic philosophy and people are more interested in what they will eat and wear than in seeking the kingdom of God, the Reverend Ralph C. Lankler, of Cortland, said here yesterday.

The Reverend Dr. Lankler spoke at the eightieth anniversary service of the Richmond Avenue Church of Christ, where he was ordained into the ministry 25 years ago. For the last 7 years he has been minister of the First Presbyterian Church in Cortland.

The Reverend Dr. Lankler began his sermon by emphasizing that there is a "great ferment of social upheaval" in the modern word and now "there is the hydrogen bomb hanging like the sword of Damocles over our heads."

"It is inconceivable that human beings as civilized as we are in the United States would ever use a mass killer of civilian population such as the atom bomb, but we did—and we can be assured that if another war comes anything and everything will be used to win it," he said.

The Cortland minister stated that three things have been tried to cure "the sick souls of society and correct the ills of our social order." He listed these as social welfare and justice, psychology and psychiatry, and science and education.

But, he said, although tremendous strides have been made in all these fields, "let us ask ourselves if our Nation is any better morally or spiritually than it was 25 years before many of these improvements for social betterment took place."

"Every economic system should be judged in the light of what it does for the individual and would we say that we are developing individuals of a higher character or more noble character?" he asked.

"On the contrary," he added, "just the opposite is indicated by the vast number of broken homes and delinquent children, the general immorality that seems to have control of our Nation."

Psychology as a means of curing mankind's ill has proven to be a false hope, said the Reverend Dr. Lankler, because, although psychologists can take the mind and emotions apart, they are unable to put the human personality together as a spiritual whole.

Pointing out that humans are fundamentally spiritual creatures, the Reverend Dr. Lankler said "the peace of mind or soul that the troubled souls of our day desire will not be found in books filled with psychological admonitions, but may be established through a right relationship between ourselves and our Creator."

"Peace is not something that we find or earn—it is a gift of God," he said.

Turning to education as a hope, the minister pointed out that Germany and Japan were two of the most literate nations on earth when they started World War II.

"Have we noticed any improvement in the character of our Nation comparable to the growth and development of our educational institutions?" he asked. "Educating a person with evil thoughts or the wrong motives is like putting a stick of dynamite into the hands of a child."

Returning to the theme of his sermon—Christianity is the Answer—the Reverend Dr. Lankler declared:

"Someone has said that the mind that can create the hydrogen bomb can control the hydrogen bomb so that it will not be used for our destruction. I would agree with this statement if it were changed to say 'the human mind controlled by the spirit of God.' We all know that the human mind can be controlled by evil as well as good."

"Christianity is the answer to the sick souls in our troubled world because it has the gospel for that purpose," he concluded. "It teaches us that we cannot be saved without the help of God as revealed through Jesus Christ."

Observances of the Richmond Avenue institution's eightieth anniversary were concluded last night with a pageant depicting the high lights in the church's history. Entitled "The Light of the World," it was written by the Reverend W. L. Burner, pastor, and produced by Mrs. Ralph E. Theobald.

Bank Deposits Safe Because of New Deal FDIC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article from the Denver Post of November 2, 1949:

FDIC GUARDS YOUR CASH—BUT OLD GUARD SNATCHES AT NEW DEAL LAURELS

(By Roscoe Fleming)

An engaging aspect of the new deal—now the welfair deal—is the wistful way some of its opponents lay claim to such crumbs of credit for it as they can.

When a movie nowadays shows a run on a bank, with all its ruin and heart-break, most viewers are too young to feel anything but detached historical interest. They can no more imagine it in their own lives than they can a slave auction.

They can't remember when you debated whether your $3.87 would be safer in this bank or in that—and when many folks preferred to stash their savings instead under a mattress or a hearthside brick.

A mighty small rumor could start a mighty big run. Bankers' occupational disease was bankers' nerves, for we were too unsophisticated to know about ulcers.

Nowadays everyone sleeps sweeter, for behind bankers and depositors alike stands the solid safeguarding reality of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, keeping your funds safe.

It has more than $1,000,000,000 stashed away to guard your $3.87, and has paid back all the money Uncle lent it, so it's on its own feet. Yet you may notice that banks in advertising their membership still refer to it as "a Federal agency." They know what folks think is safe.

Recently the people of a midwestern village discovered that a bank official had handed the stuff out to his friends until there was little left but the furniture.

A generation ago that would have meant community panic, and tragedy for every home. Now FDIC stands solid as a rock. There's surprise and regret, but no panic.

Senator Homer Capehart of Indiana, the bawlbox king, hardly lets a day go by without denouncing the New Deal. But this was different. He told the Senate proudly that Senator Vandenberg of Michigan was the real father of FDIC, and in Senator Capehart's elegant quote, "stuffed it down F. D. R.'s throat."

Senator Vandenberg deserves the tribute, the more so since he has often cracked the impermeable shell against reality which the Capeharts exude around themselves like oysters.

But bank failures averaged several hundred yearly throughout the era of wonderful nonsense, rising to several thousand at its catastrophic close, yet succeeding administrations of Senator Capehart's party did nothing effective about it. That was left for F. D. R.'s party to do.

We shouldn't begrudge the crumbs of credit that the Capeharts may be able to snatch from under the overflowing New Deal table.

But isn't it likely that a decade from now some newer Capehart may be wistfully claiming a little of the credit for something they're snarling at now?

Gen. William Booth Taliaferro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address prepared for delivery by the late Hon. Schuyler Otis Bland:

I feel most highly favored, far beyond my ability to express, for the honor which has been conferred upon me in permitting me to participate on this occasion which commemorates the achievements of Gen. William Booth Taliaferro, Confederate States of America.

As a boy and as a young man, it was my privilege and good fortune to know General Taliaferro personally. He was born and reared in my native county of Gloucester.

Among my most beloved friends was his son, William C. L. Taliaferro, who was a student with me at the Gloucester Academy and later at the College of William and Mary. As lawyers, he and I practiced before the bar in Hampton, Elizabeth City, and Newport News, and the devoted friendship we formed as children continued until his death. I can say with all the truth of which I am capable that it lives with me to this solemn hour.

So while I revere General Taliaferro's memory as one of the great men that our State has produced, there is also a sense of personal kinship. His unfailing courtesy to everyone, young and old alike, was at all times so outstanding that every person who met him felt that he was meeting a personal friend. He could even bestow that great gift to the young lad that was I.

General Taliaferro's distinguished career as a soldier in both the Mexican and Civil Wars is well known to all of us here but it is to General Taliaferro, the scholar and the devoted friend of education in Virginia that we pay tribute today.

When his daughter, Nina Taliaferro Sanders, so graciously asked me to make a few remarks on this important occasion, I turned to one of the most highly valued publications in my private library, a small volume entitled "The Seven Wise Men" written by Howard W. Wiseman of the College of William and Mary. "The Seven Wise Men" composed the faculty of William and Mary at the time of its reorganization in 1888 and it was my good fortune to have studied under these gentlemen. They were Dr. Lyon Gardner Tyler, John Leslie Hall, Dr. Thomas Jefferson Stubbs, Lyman Brown Powell Wharton (known to his old students as "Lima Bean"), Hugh Stockdale Bird, Dr. Charles Edward Bishop and Dr. Van Garrett. These were able, patriotic, loyal and hard-working men. I wish that time would permit a more complete discussion of the worth of each of these gentlemen because it was with this faculty that General Taliaferro worked as a member of the board of visitors of the College of William and Mary during that trying time. I remember now, even as though it were yesterday, seeing the board of visitors come into the chapel to greet the faculty and students and how proud I was that I knew personally one of those august gentlemen, General Taliaferro. I can see him now, tall and gracious as he entered, bearing a marked resemblance to Gen. Robert E. Lee, who was to most of us little short of the divine.

To have been a student of the College of William and Mary during the time of these great men was an inspiration and honor that I cherish to this day. A word or a wish from General Taliaferro or any of his coworkers constituted a command to me. There is a temptation to one as he grows old to dwell too long upon the past. I plead guilty and offer as my only excuse the magnificent work done by these men. Their glorious labors I remember and I wish devoutly that all of us could follow in their footsteps.

History has well taken care of the memory of "the Seven Wise Men" and the honorable gentlemen that composed the Board of Visitors but it is one of my warmest possessions that I knew at first hand the splendid contribution these men made to the success and to the honor and glory of William and Mary. To General Taliaferro and each of his colleagues, it was sacred work and a labor of love to make the college an instrument of good government built upon the design and plan of Thomas Jefferson, whom we all regarded as an elder brother. All of them labored for her and sought to make her what she finally became. To each she was and still is a mother. This was the lesson of General Taliaferro and the men like him and that lesson lives with each of us yet.

The general graduated from William and Mary in 1841 and then studied law at Harvard. There he knew as a friend and classmate a young man, George F. Hoar, who was later to represent the State of Massachusetts in the Senate of the United States. When the Civil War was over and the South deep in its poverty of reconstruction, General Taliaferro went to Washington to contact his old friend. As a result of the friendship and respect that Senator Hoar had for the general, his influence was used to secure passage of a bill which reimbursed the College of William and Mary for the damage done to the Wren Building during the Civil War.

Another achievement of General Taliaferro's will be forever recalled. With Colonel Lamb of Norfolk, he reorganized the Alpha chapter of Phi Beta Kappa here at the College of William and Mary. It is interesting to note that General Taliaferro was a member of this society, as were his four sons, James, Warner, William and Edward.

The general served as a loyal and active member of the board of visitors from 1870 until his death in 1898, but he did not confine his interest in matters of education to William and Mary. He was also a member of the board of visitors of the Virginia Military Institute and was one of the founding fathers of the State Female College at Farmville (now known as Longwood College). In his own county of Gloucester he established many public schools for white children and the first free school for Negroes.

On the mace of the College of William and Mary are engraved the names of 29 men, graduates of the college, who made outstanding contributions to education. Here in this distinguished company, which includes Thomas Jefferson, is to be found the name of William B. Taliaferro. This is the tribute—this is the memorial that will forever endure.

I know the warm pride that General Taliaferro's descendants are feeling today. To his daughter, Mrs. Sanders, to his nephew, Dr. Wellford, and to his many grandchildren and great-grandchildren, I extend my affection and my assurance that on this day my pride is equally deep.

I congratulate the College of William and Mary for having had General Taliaferro as a student and as an inspired and tireless worker on its behalf throughout his entire life. To commemorate him today and to hang his portrait in this library is to recognize the enduring achievements of one of the South's great gentlemen and scholars.

Thirty-second Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution adopted at a recent meeting of the Knights of Lithuania in commemoration of the thirty-second anniversary of the independence of Lithuania:

RESOLUTION OF KNIGHTS OF LITHUANIA, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY DISTRICT

Whereas man has been endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights which no human power or authority can wrest from him; and

Whereas chief among these inalienable right is the sovereign right of all peoples to choose for themselves the form of government under which they wish to live; and

Whereas the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which our Government signed, respect and guarantee this right to all nations, both large and small, to govern themselves without interference from any outside source; and

Whereas the allied nations among these our own United States fought World War II presumably for the assurance of peace which cannot be if large nations are allowed against all principles of justice and charity to subject small nations to tyrannical rule; and

Whereas Lithuania, a neutral and liberty-loving nation, has proven by her 21 years (1918–39) of advancement in all fields of endeavor that she is capable of self-rule and has ever respected this right of self-government of all peoples; and

Whereas Soviet Russia has ruthlessly and shamelessly deprived Lithuania of her freedom and is now following a policy of the complete annihilation of her people through merciless deportation into Siberia, through the relentless destruction of her government, industry, culture, and educational system, and through the cruel plunder of her population by wholesale murder and imprisonment; and

Whereas this policy followed by Soviet Russia against Lithuania is openly and defiantly against the principles of the Atlantic Charter and against the democratic policy of our own United States; and

Whereas Soviet Russia is continuing to perpetuate the heinous crime of genocide against the Baltic people: Be it

Resolved, That the Government of the United States firmly evoke the principles of the Atlantic Charter and effectively use its influence upon the United Nations to apply these principles to all nations, both large and small; be it further

Resolved, That the Government of the United States maintain and uphold its present policy of nonrecognition of Russian absorption of the Baltic states and ever use its influence to bring about the immediate and positive restoration of the independence of Lithuania and the other Baltic nations; be it further

Resolved, That our Government insist upon the immediate cessation of atrocities and inhumane treatment now being inflicted upon Lithuanian and the other Baltic peoples by Soviet Russia; be it further

Resolved, That proper provision be made to have protests and grievances addressed by small nonmember countries to the United Nations, be officially acknowledged by the Secretary General, and taken before the Little Assembly; be it further

Resolved, That Lithuania be admitted as a member of the United Nations, and that her official representatives be permitted to enjoy the status of duly elected delegates to that organization; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Harry S. Truman; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson; to the Senators and Representatives of the States of New Jersey and New York.

Respectfully submitted.

ALEXANDER WERSY,
Chairman.
ANNE M. KLEM,
Secretary.

Celler Offers Resolution To Investigate Denazification Program in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have this day offered a resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all matters relating to the conduct and status of the denazification program in the zone of Germany under occupation by the United States.

Recent events in Germany indicate that dangerous trends are seriously at work, which if allowed to continue, would undermine the whole import of the denazification program. The acquittal of Wolfgang Hedler, who publicly stated that the extermination of the Jews might have been wrong but there were other ways of getting rid of them, is a flagrant example of this trend. Hedler was tried on charges of spreading anti-Semitism, and was freed by a national court of judges. Our High Commissioner John J. McCloy, protested this acquittal, and has evidenced his desire to put a curb on the growth of nationalism in Germany. But statements and protests in the face of such defiance is not enough. In his Progress Report on Germany, Mr. McCloy states:

There is nationalism in Germany. There is a nationalist fringe on the extreme right which is more active than it has been. There is a Communist fringe that plays the Soviet game, and there is the persistent tendency of both these fringes to work together.

It has been said that it is difficult to undo the 12-year rule of Hitler in 5 years, but pressing signs of the recurrence of nazism and all its attendant evils show a pattern of regression which must be stopped. Otherwise, we will be faced with the spectre of a third world war with Germany. First the Huns, then the Nazis, and then again the devil reincarnate.

From some quarters we hear that we must use the Nazis to offset the Russians. Such comfort can only be imaginary. We could never rely on the Nazis to fight the Russians. Those who believe this myth might well remember the Hitler-Stalin pact. It is time to question the resurgence of evil forces.

The text of the resolution follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all matters relating to the conduct and status of the denazification program in the zone of Germany under occupation by the United States, especially as concerns (a) the result of transferring responsibility for denazification to the German authorities; (b) whether or not there is infiltration of former Nazis, Nazi supporters, and other antidemocratic elements into denazification tribunals; (c) whether or not former Nazis and other antidemocratic elements have been eliminated from high position in public office and the economic life of Germany; (d) whether or not there has been reinstatement of thousands of Nazi teachers to former or higher positions in the Bavarian and other public school systems; (e) whether or not there is resurgence of intensive anti-Semitism and militant nationalism in the United States zone; (f) whether or not there is a rise of strong new political parties based on Nazi doctrine and militarism; (g) whether or not there has been reappearance of Nazi-type propaganda in the German press; (h) whether or not there is development in the German youth of appreciation of and devotion to democratic institutions; and to report with expedition its findings, together with such recommendations as it deems proper, to the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The committee is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the service, information, and facilities of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Proposed Legislation Regarding Traffic Management in the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide for an adequate traffic management service in the Federal Government. The proposed legislation is to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 by defining the duties and functions of the Administrator of General Services with respect to transportation and traffic management. A Federal Traffic Service is to be created as a constituent unit of the General Services Administration, for the purpose of coordinating the transportation activities of the various departments and agencies and performing central management services that will reduce costs and increase efficiency in the movement of Government traffic.

Uncle Sam spends approximately $1,000,000,000 to move public property as an incident to carrying on the business of Government. By dollar volume of expenditure, Government traffic is big business, and it is high time that it be handled on a businesslike basis. Private corporations have learned the value of efficient traffic management. In proportion the large corporations invest substantially more than the Federal Government for traffic management and they make this investment because it pays off in dollar savings.

What savings can be expected if the Federal Government establishes an adequate traffic-management service? A Hoover Commission task force which gave careful study to this problem, estimated that within the next few years 20 to 25 percent of the Government's transportation bill could be saved. Since this transportation bill approximates $1,000,000,000 a year, possible savings would be $200,000,000 to $250,000,000 yearly.

These savings would result from vigorous action by the Federal Traffic Service, not only to obtain more advantageous rates in the shipping of public property, but also to get the full benefit of existing rates by improved practices and procedures in the traffic field. The Hoover Commission task force noted that the Government is paying the carriers between $50,000,000 and $100,000,000 per year in excess of their legal rates and charges. In other words, even aside from the problem of unreasonable rates, Uncle Sam is overpaying huge sums each year because he lacks the kind of traffic-management organization that can do a job for him. The task force reasons in this connection:

It must be realized that the loss by the Government of the use of this money, measured not only in terms of the interest value represented but also in terms of the reduction in the activities of those Departments and Agencies whose appropriations have thereby been depleted, is contrary to the best interests of the Government.

The legislation I propose was developed on the basis of the Hoover Commission task-force recommendations with respect to traffic management in the Federal Government. It should be noted that this is not a proposal for a completely new agency or service. The general framework of organization was provided by Public Law 152 of this Congress, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. That law opens the door to the development of a traffic-management organization by giving statutory recognition to traffic management as one of the Federal supply functions. However, it was generally understood by the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, which was responsible for Public Law 152, that further legislation clearly defining the intent of Congress would be necessary in this field and several related fields.

During the Eightieth Congress the Procurement and Buildings Subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments held hearings on the problems of traffic management and the feasibility of a central traffic bureau in the Federal Government. The committee unanimously recomended that this matter be further investigated, particularly as to the appropriate form of legislation.

My proposed legislation takes account of the legislative developments in the fields of procurement and property management, as well as of the findings of the Hoover Commission task force which reported on the Federal Supply System.

It is designed to fit into Public Law 152 as a new title.

I believe that the provisions of this bill are in accord with the principles of good management as practiced by large business and industrial organizations. It will register the intent of Congress in a field which has long suffered statutory neglect and it will provide the administrative means for effecting substantial savings.

Missoula Labor Observes Double Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to bring to the attention of the House an article which appeared in the Sunday Missoulian of Missoula, Mont., and dated February 19, 1950.

I am proud of the record made by organized labor in western Montana. It is not a new idea out there but it is something which has grown up with our State.

Montana labor has always endeavored to work out solutions of its difficulties on an equitable and fair basis and always with the public interest in mind. I am especially pleased with the creation of the Missoula Labor-Management Board under the chairmanship of the distinguished president of Montana State University, Dr. James A. McCain, and composed of representatives of labor and management. This board has done an outstanding job and its worth has been vindicated on more than one occasion.

Not only is Missoula labor to be commended on its fortieth anniversary but the oldest continuous member of the Trades Council, Oscar Helding, an old friend of mine is also to be congratulated.

To the members of organized labor in Missoula County my congratulations for a job well done over the past 40 years; to the members of the labor-management council, my hope that success will continue to mark your efforts; and to the membership of both organizations—many of them my close personal friends—my prayers that the next half-century will be as fruitful as the years just passed. You all typify the America we love and all of you have contributed to the welfare and betterment of our country.

The article follows:

LABOR IN MISSOULA WILL OBSERVE DOUBLE ANNIVERSARY THIS WEEK

Celebrating the fortieth anniversary of its affiliation with the American Federation of Labor this week, and the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Samuel Gompers, long-time president of the A. F. of L., the Missoula County Central Trades and Labor Council will move into new quarters in the remodeled ground floor of the union hall. Space has been provided for new offices for unions, and the back part of the ground floor has been made into a clubroom for union members of Missoula County.

The council affiliated with the American Federation of Labor in 1910. The charter, signed by Samuel Gompers, was granted January 11 of that year, and the first meeting after the charter was received was held in February.

Early records of the council were destroyed in 1911 when the building in which the council had its offices burned, but sufficient history of the labor movement in Missoula has been preserved by old-time members to present a picture of the early days of organized labor in Missoula.

COMPLETED IN 1916

The present union hall was completed in 1916, when the Union Hall Co. was organized and local unions subscribed for the stock. The lots on which the building stands were donated by the late Marcus Daly to the Western Labor Union, parent of the present organization.

The ground floor front of the building has been rebuilt with brick and glass blocks, and the offices are air conditioned and soundproofed. The council and unions have occupied cramped quarters on the second floor of the building, but a spokesman said the new offices "will be the finest occupied by any labor organization in Montana."

Thursday night the public will have opportunity to inspect the new quarters.

HELDING'S ANNIVERSARY

Not only is this the birthday party for the council, but also for the delegate with the longest continuous membership in the council. Oscar Helding, delegate from Barbers Union, No. 585, will be a guest of honor. His birthday is Thursday, and he was first seated in the council as a delegate in March 1910. He was president of the council in 1914.

The presidents have been: 1910, James R. Froman, A. W. Williams; 1911, Cuthbert Peat; 1912, D. W. Fitzpatrick; 1913, Charles E. Dodge; 1914, Mr. Helding, J. Brown; 1915, C. A. English; 1916, T. E. Arnoldy; 1917–19, H. B. Cain; 1920, H. C. Johnson; 1921–22, C. H. Cook, H. K. Powell; 1923, T. P. Wilburn, E. P. Klett, John Oberly; 1924, E. E. Bestor; 1925, James M. Gregg; 1926, H. E. Fullerton, T. P. Wright; 1927, N. I. Keator; 1928, Grant Dean, E. F. Klett; 1929, V. E. Crimmins; 1930, L. H. Daly, C. H. Christenson; 1931, Frank Roedl; 1932, Samuel Barrett, 1933–34, S. H. Rivin; 1935–36–37, Ryland Walford, S. A. Barrett; 1938–39, E. A. Atkinson, R. W. Stratton; 1940–41, R. W. Stratton; 1942–43, Pete Baron; 1944, S. H. Rivin; 1945, Laverne Hamilton; 1946–47, Sherman Brock; 1948–49–50, James S. Umber.

There are more than 4,000 union members affiliated with the Missoula County Central Trades and Labor Council at the present time. Largest unions in Missoula County are Hotel and Restaurant Workers local No. 427, while running so close as to almost equal is Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 3038 of Bonner, paying per capita to the council on approximately 400 members each. Lathers Union No. 312, with only seven members, is the smallest union in the county.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT BOARD

Following World War II an epidemic of strikes occurred over most of the country and Missoula had some. Labor and civic leaders realized that some better method of settling labor disputes must be found and early in 1948 committees from the central council and the chamber of commerce met and formed the labor-management board of Missoula.

The board consists of 14 members and an impartial chairman. Seven members are appointed from the central labor council and seven from the chamber of commerce, these electing an impartial chairman of the board. Present chairman is Dr. James A. McCain, president of Montana State University, who has held the position for 2 years and was reelected for a third term this month. Representing management on the board are Oakley Coffee, vice chairman, L. A. Colby, E. R. Dix, John E. Hightower, S. J. Howard, Otis J. Mudd, board secretary, and William Steinbrenner. Labor members are Edgar Cozad, vice chairman Herbert T. Bartron, Jr., Donald Chatfield, Frank Matthews, Dene Pfeiffer, James S. Umber, and Reva Walterskirchen.

While not able to head off all work stoppages in the past 2 years, the board has been successful in settling many disputes that might have resulted in stoppages.

Meetings are held in the university school of journalism building, where once each month, oftener if necessary, members of the board sit down to try to iron out those disagreements which have arisen during the month. Often disputes are cleared up in one meeting, sometimes they are referred to subcommittees for a final settlement. One contract took 5 months to settle to the satisfaction of both parties, another one with a different union needed an emergency meeting to settle a dispute which would have resulted in a strike the following morning. In both cases the board's efforts were successful, and these contracts now have clauses specifying that any dispute must be referred to the labor-management board for settlement.

The story of the Missoula County central labor bodies is the story of labor itself in Missoula. Organized over 50 years ago, the first group was originally known as the Western Montana Trades and Labor Council and was affiliated with the Montana State Labor Council. In 1905, the Missoula group became affiliated with the Montana State Federation of Labor, and assumed the name of Missoula County Central Trades and Labor Council.

Because of the fire that destroyed the union hall in 1911, there is no record of the exact date when the first trades and labor council was organized in Missoula. However, the Knights of Labor had a labor assembly in Missoula in 1894 which may have functioned as a central council, but there are no records to prove that a trades and labor council existed in Missoula that year. Mixed assemblies of the Knights of Labor took in all workers who were not eligible for membership in an existing union.

MANY CHANGES

The Western Federation of Miners was organized in 1894 by Ed Boyce and affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. In 1896 the Western Federation of Miners withdrew from the American Federation of Labor and organized the Western Labor Union. Loggers and sawmill workers of western Montana affiliated with this union.

The Federal Labor Union, local No. 43, date of organization unknown, was the mother of most of the building trades before they were organized into separate crafts. Federal Labor Union No. 43 was an affiliate of the Western Labor Union. The local membership consisted of carpenters, laborers, laundry workers, barbers, and other crafts.

Late in 1896 or early in 1897, the Western Labor Union issued a charter to the Western Montana Trades and Labor Council of Missoula—at that time Flathead and Missoula Counties extended to the Idaho border. The jurisdiction of the Western Montana Trades and Labor Council extended from Bonner westward to Idaho and from Idaho on the south to British Columbia on the north.

A convention of the Western Labor Union changed the name of that organization to American Labor Union and new charters were issued to all the affiliated unions bearing the name American Labor Union, without any reorganization taking place.

Late in the year 1904, the general offices of the American Labor Union in Denver closed up for reasons unknown to the membership of that organization. However, the local unions of those organizations functioned as independent unions, while retaining a central labor council.

The Montana State Federation of Labor was chartering unions in 1904 and when the American Labor Union went out of business the unions in western Montana, including the Missoula Trades and Labor Council, that were affiliated with the American Labor Union applied for charters from the Montana State Federation of Labor.

An old cash book of the Missoula Trades and Labor Council indicates that R. A. Fuller was the 1904–05 secretary and that 15 unions were affiliated with the early council. These unions were the stationary engineers, Federal Labor Union No. 43, printers, carpenters, woodworkers, cooks and waiters, plumbers, lumber workers, farmers, barbers, electricians, retail clerks, lathers, painters, and bricklayers.

The Missoula Trades and Labor Council held its charter from the State federation of labor until that organization ceased to issue charters, then the council was chartered by the American Federation of Labor in 1910. While the Missoula Trades and Labor Council has operated under four different charters, it has been in continual existence and functioned continually from the time it first organized regardless from what organization it held a charter.

The American Federation of Labor granted the Missoula council a charter as a direct affiliate on January 11, 1910. At that time the council had increased its membership to 26 unions. At the present time there are 34 unions affiliated with the central council.

The first American Federation of Labor union chartered in Missoula of which there is record is local No. 277 of the International Typographical Union, chartered on February 2, 1891, and still operating under the same charter. The next oldest charter in Missoula is Carpenters and Joiners Local No. 23, organized in 1895. James Umber, of local No. 28, is now president of the central trades council and Frank Matthews, president of local No. 277, is secretary-treasurer of the council. Another early-day charter still active is the bricklayers and masons, organized in 1897. The cigar-makers union was one of the earliest in Missoula, but that charter has been surrendered and the date of its issue is uncertain. The pioneer unions of Missoula, however, are the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen. Later a lodge of the Order of Railroad Conductors was organized. But the Big Four railroad brotherhoods were never affiliated with the American Federation of Labor or Missoula central labor bodies.

Bombs Over Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Washington Times-Herald contained an editorial entitled "Bombs Over Washington." It was of unusual interest to me because of its very kindly reference to the people of my home town of Galveston, Tex.

It points to Galvestonians as people who have learned to conquer the elements and who have developed the type of intestinal fortitude which prompts them to remain at home among their friends and kindred spirits whenever there is disaster, or threat of disaster.

Possibly the author of the editorial overdrew the picture slightly. I do not hesitate to recognize people who leave when the hurricane threatens. However, the real old-timers, the ones who built the city and who now maintain it, have learned that there is nothing in a hurricane to cause fear provided you prepare for it.

The spirit of Galveston may well be commended to the people of Washington, or to the people of any other city, as an example of how to behave in time of trouble.

The editorial is appended hereto with appreciation to the Times-Herald:

BOMBS OVER WASHINGTON

How do you think you will behave if the day actually comes that the Russians are over the Capitol dome with the H-bomb?

IT CAN HAPPEN

Thanks to American and British traitors, that's a question we must now ask ourselves. These traitors have armed the Russians with bomb know-how. And incompetents in the White House, State Department, and elsewhere have armed the Russians with the idea that the United States of America will be a soft touch.

As a result here we are, less than 5 years away from the biggest and most terrible war in all human experience, with the President of the United States of America blustering about how tough he is going to be with Stalin hereafter, and the rest of us wondering when and how an even worse war than ever will crash down.

It is obvious that in any such war this beautiful and pleasant city of Washington will be on the front line. And if what the scientists say is true, just one H-bomb will toss the whole town into the trash heap of history.

That is why, every now and then, somebody up on Capitol Hill brings up the subject of an alternate capital of the Republic, and that is why everybody in town knows the ill-kept secret that the Department of Defense is working on just such a proposition.

In the event of war, plain common sense dictates that our military forces must be able to carry on, no matter what happens, and to do that they must have secret and secure places from which to run the fighting.

But as for the President, Congress, and all the rest of us, things are a little different. All of us have to stay here, bombs or no bombs.

For Washington is not only a city. It is a symbol.

WHAT IF YOU RUN?

If this city and all of us in it were wiped out by an H-bomb, what of it? The Republic could still win its war and put together another Federal city wherever, however, and whenever it might choose. The destruction of Washington would be a curable disaster, and no doubt the tears would be dried quicker than we in our vanity might now think.

Every now and then something comes along to remind that man does not live by bread alone, and that when he tries to, he doesn't even get to keep the bread for very long.

It may be unpleasant to think about, but just the same, let's face it. We all die at least once. And nothing rings with more truth than the old saying that a coward dies a thousand times.

Just think how many times you would die if, in the event of war, you really had left Washington to hide in the Ozarks as some so lightly say now they will.

This country wasn't built by people of such a stripe, nor will it survive its present troubles if people of such a stripe set its fashion of thought and behavior. And for better or worse, Washington sets the fashion when a war is on, because the Nation cannot help but watch this city night and day for news of the struggle. So let's face it. In the event of Russian bombers over the Capitol, nobody can leave this town.

For the instinct of survival, we offer you the real American case of Galveston, Tex.

THE INSTINCT OF SURVIVAL

Galveston is right out on an exposed flat point at the edge of the Gulf of Mexico. It is low on the water and cut off from the mainland except by a causeway system. And nature has done all it could to run the Galvestonians away.

On September 8, 1900, a hurricane and tidal wave killed 6,000 of them and devastated the property of nearly all. On August 17, 1914, another hurricane killed 275 more, with heavy property loss.

Hardly a year goes by that Galveston escapes threats of some kind of natural disaster. Every time there is a storm, high water backs up in the channel and reminds the whole town how easily another two-foot lift in the sea could make an end to everything.

What do they do about it? They work hard and build seawalls. But that is not all.

In Galveston there is a rule: You can cross that causeway to the mainland anytime, unless the weather bureau has run up a storm warning. If you cross the causeway then, just keep on going.

For if you come back to town after the danger has passed, you are dead so far as Galveston is concerned. Nobody will do business with you or even speak. They won't even let their children marry your children. They are not talky tough about it. They just forget you or any of your family have ever lived. Consequently, cowardice is seldom seen in Galveston and the city continues to survive the sea.

That's a true story and it is one Americans can understand. We'd better have the Galveston spirit here in these times or it won't matter whether the Russians bother to drop an H-bomb on us.

On the other hand, with the Galveston spirit we can't lose. The place to beat the Russians is in Washington. And that goes all ways at once in cold war or hot.

Address of Hon. John J. Foley on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include excerpts from a stirring and thrilling address delivered recently by Attorney John J. Foley, former justice of one of the district courts of Massachusetts, before the officers, members, and friends of the William P. Connery, Jr., Post, No. 6, the American Legion, of his home city at their annual banquet. The speaker stressed the dangers of communism and urged his audience to combat this spreading ideology.

The excerpts follow:

CONFIDENCE IN KNOWHOW

Tomorrow the Nation celebrates the birthday of a man termed, "The Father of Our Country"—born in 1732 and who passed

away 151 years ago. His home in Mount Vernon is virtually a shrine and visited by thousands each year. The messages he left for the world were filled with the hope of peace, but the moving of events has left this hope unfulfilled.

It was only 26 years after the conclusion of the Revolutionary War that we were engaged in the War of 1812. Fifty-nine years later this Nation was nearly torn asunder by the War Between the States. Thirty-three years later we were engaged in the Spanish-American War. After that, only 19 years elapsed when we found ourselves in the First World War, sometimes called the war to end all wars; yet 23 years later we were engaged in the Second World War.

Certainly the record of so-called civilization is pretty poor. Wars don't just happen. They result from the ideas of men, and history proves that it is the ideas of a small group of men that result in such turmoil and bring such horror to millions. It requires no argument to prove to you that there has been something wrong with the thinking and philosophy of the so-called leaders which results in such a black record as that which I have outlined above.

The thinking and philosophy that caused these wars were known. Yet, despite this knowledge of such philosophies, the people themselves did nothing to prevent the trouble which resulted. There seemed to be an inertia among the people—a laziness. Probably it resulted from their desire for rest and quiet after each conflict, and as a result it left those with the dangerous philosophies free to bring about their harmful things.

At the conclusion of World War I, some men and women of noble purpose tried to construct a strong organization that would avert future wars. The League of Nations was organized by men who saw the ravages of war—men who were willing to devote the rest of their lives on this earth to making that League strong and workable. Woodrow Wilson, President and Commander in Chief, a man possessed of a great and pure mind and with a vision of the future, literally worked himself into his grave in an attempt to breathe life into the League.

DISLOYALTY MUST GO

But because of narrow, picayunish and personal reasons on the part of a powerful group in this country, who were uttering catch phrases, Wilson's great attempt at peace died a-borning. Although our country was then and is now very young, it was extremely powerful, and the League had no chance to live without the cooperation of America. Time moved on and with it came the changes in transportation which meant that our protection of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans amounted to almost nothing.

Not too many years before World War II, a man named Hitler began to make great strides in the German nation, a nation whose susceptability to war-mongering is perhaps the weakest link in its nature. Long before the war began, Hitler indicated that he was a bold and immoral man. He published his famous book, "Mein Kampf," wherein he boasted of the super-race and preaching the gospel of the destruction of men who were not wanted and telling the world that the way to accomplish the results that he and his group wanted was to tell lies and that when those lies failed to tell bigger lies and to keep on lying.

The book became a best seller. People laughed and didn't take it seriously. But when the youth of the recent war were taken from their homes, schools, shops, factories, and stores to be sent overseas to fight, people didn't laugh. The toll in blood and tears and heartaches never can be sufficiently described.

The shooting stopped in 1945. Service men and women and civilians were weary of war and they wanted peace and rest and contentment. The young sought and found temporary surcease in rounds of pleasure. Nearly all were seeking some sort of a soothing sirup for frayed nerves and tired minds and bodies. Five years have now elapsed and most of the people have returned into the grooves of regular living and attempts have been made to return to normalcy.

All these attempts have failed and the condition of the country and the entire world is so bad that it has been described as that of developing into a cold war. There has never existed since the shooting stopped any feeling of warmth and neighborliness or good will between our Nation and that of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has vetoed in the United Nations every measure sought to bring about world peace.

They have refused to enter into a workable plan for the control of atomic weapons, such as the Baruch plan; they tried to starve the people of Germany into communism; they have seized countries and butchered and murdered those who tried to thwart their plans. Why has all this happened? It is not merely coincidental. There's a reason back of all this. The reason is an idea—an ideology, a philosophy.

AMERICANS MUST UNITE

Is it another dangerous philosophy? Were the other philosophies that we paid little attention to the kind that led us into dangerous wars? What are we going to do about it? Is it near our own homes? Is it right here in Lynn? Can we afford to ignore it or must we root it out and choke it to death? What is its source? Is it new?

It gained its origin from the brain of a German named Karl Marx, whose father was a lawyer, but who descended from a long line of rabbis. He was born in Germany, 132 years ago. He became a member of the Christian sects, but admittedly not for religious but for political and business. He studied at the University of Berlin and was greatly attracted to the philosophy of a man named Hegel. He turned to others such as Ludwig Feuerbach, whose philosophy was to destroy Christianity by creating in its place a full-fledged materialistic philosophy.

It is this Marx that the present-day communistic leaders deify. Marx issued a paper that you all have heard of and probably very few have read. It is entitled the "Communist Manifesto"—the bible of communism. In it he said: "It may be taken for granted that bloody conflicts are coming." He and other Communist leaders have preached the gospel that in order to attain their means there must never be any limit to chicanery, duplicity, and deviltry.

Another leader of their cause was known as Lenin who said: "It is necessary to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of the truth." Later Stalin added to this by writing: "Dictatorship means nothing more or less than the power which directly rests on violence, which is not limited by any laws or restricted by any absolute rules." These men admittedly believe in no Supreme Being, and Marx has written, "Man is the supreme being for man."

They, the same as Hitler, have told the world that they have no morals; that they consider no duties or responsibilities nor anything else, except that they will go to any lengths to attain the supremacy of communism. In a recent book by Mr. C. L. Sulzberger called Moscow Again Talks Peace But Fails To Act, he describes Lenin as the pope of bolshevism and he quotes Lenin as saying: "There is no alternative left. Either the Soviet Government triumphs in every advanced country in the world or else."

TO CURB A KNOWN EVIL

He also quotes Lenin as saying "America is strong, everybody is now in debt to her, she is being more and more hated, she is robbing everybody, she cannot come to terms with Europe." That comes from Lenin, whose mummified body is now in a shrine in Soviet Russia. Certainly Lenin had a real hatred for our own country. In his book Mr. Sulzberger also gave the opinion that Soviet Russia believes it is winning the cold war and that its whole purpose is to undermine western civilization and to weaken it until the time is right for them to attempt to attain their ends which would mean the end of America.

Do you recall back 15 or 20 years ago when the so-called intelligentsia would meet in fashionable homes and clubs, earning for themselves the descriptive phrase, "parlor pinks"? Most of them were educated fools. No proper description can be given in detail how they became attracted to such an ungodly philosophy. But we do know they were going about the country with an air of superiority, spilling words and phrases all of which were critical to our form of government and life. They and the Communists of today were and are rather smiled at in the same manner as Hitler was smiled at in the 1930's.

There are individuals, some of whom are leaders in our national life, who today are fomenting the same unrest within our own borders. Recent disclosure of the conviction of Mr. Hiss by a jury's verdict; the new trial of Judith Coplon for another offense after one conviction; the exposure of Dr. Klaus Fuchs, who has been active with atomic hydrogen weapons; the communistic leanings of the leaders of a great electrical union in our own city as well as the traces of disloyalty by irresponsible citizens has become quite disturbing. These people have openly criticized our form of government—the one that twice had come to the rescue of the world during the two world wars.

Disloyalty within our land must not be tolerated. Fortunately, the high percentage of our men in public life are fine and loyal—willing to give their all for our country. We must have confidence in them. The American Legion with its tremendous influence can do much. Your duty is great. Made up of persons who have served, you cannot feel your work is complete. It never will be.

We of World War I did our best for the younger generation for whom we fought. But that generation was let in for much sadness, sorrow, and heartache. You'll do much better. For the sake of your children, your country, and for all creation, strike down the menace of communism wherever it stalks. Marx, Engels, Stalin, Molotov, and their kind promised the conquest and the revolution. These personalities wear no labels. They will be smooth and sleek, but in their fanatical minds and merciless hearts there will only be one desire—to take from you and yours the liberties of man and his dignity. In return they will clothe you with the sickle and scythe of slavery and serfdom. This country was built on and has lived on the sublime belief of trust in God. Ask His assistance to the end that a true peace may be had.

National Science Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, no one knows what the best possible airplane and the best possible use of atomic energy would mean to civilization.

A better source of energy and a cheaper, faster means of communication could

enlarge immeasurably world understanding and enhance world prosperity.

Coming from a State which has given much to both atomic and aviation development, perhaps I am more conscious than some of the vital need for basic research in science. Only basic research made possible the plutonium plant at Richland and the XB-52, the heavy jet bomber of the future, being built by Boeing in Seattle.

In this intensified scientific age only full utilization of potential scientific brains can keep us as a nation at the head of the scientific parade.

But, as contrasted with this need, basic research in the sciences is extremely inadequate. We have been prone to take for granted the benefits of science and technology. We do not realize that every important benefit has been preceded by long years of research in varied fields of scientific endeavor.

Atomic energy, which figures so prominently in our discussions of national security and welfare, is based upon successive scientific developments stretching back through the last century. Many of the outstanding contributions to scientific research which we exploit in our laboratories and in our industrial establishments today were made by persons who lived in distant lands. The world community of science has been blasted to pieces by war. In discharging the new responsibilities thrust upon this Nation for world leadership and for domestic security and welfare it behooves us to take forthright steps to build up our resources in basic scientific research.

Neither our universities nor many of the young people who attend them can afford to carry on in these fields without some assistance from the Federal Government. Modern research is costly and complex. Its results are not often immediately visible for immediate practical application. The reservoir of scientific talent among the Nation's youth will never be sufficiently tapped unless a scholarship program is put into effect.

The National Science Foundation bill provides for wide geographic application of contracts and scholarships. Representing the largest district in the State of Washington, which contains one of the finest State universities in the country, I believe it is important to register our congressional intent that the principle of geographic distribution be fully observed by the administrators who will be responsible for carrying out the terms of this legislation. Too often in the past there has been an undue concentration of scientific research in a few large universities.

As the Members well know, the question of including social sciences within the terms of this legislation has been the subject of considerable discussion. The present bill does not identify the social sciences as such, but it does not expressly eliminate them. I believe we should also register clearly our congressional intent that the social sciences are entitled to due consideration along with the physical sciences. To some this may be a rather touchy affair, but to me it seems evident that we have a lot to learn in ordering our affairs so that people can live wisely and enjoy the fruits of the physical sciences made possible by basic research.

From the information submitted to the committee by the Budget Bureau, as noted in the committee report, it strikes me that the sums probably required for initiating the program and for conducting it through the next 5 years are extremely modest. I believe the National Science Foundation, under the terms of this bill, will provide a valuable instrument for coordinating and integrating the research programs now carried on in rather a haphazard fashion by various Government agencies.

Mr. Speaker, the National Science Foundation bill, H. R. 4846, should be enacted without further delay. This legislation is long overdue. It has been the subject of considerable study in the Seventy-ninth, Eightieth, and Eighty-first Congresses. Hundreds of well-qualified witnesses have testified as to its urgency.

The failure to establish a National Science Foundation heretofore has reflected sharp differences as to certain of its provisions.

It is my understanding that the committee studying this legislation has attempted to resolve these differences in a way reasonably satisfactory to all parties concerned. Although I have some doubts as to the form of administrative organization proposed in H. R. 4846, I firmly believe that we can no longer afford the luxury of leisurely debate.

The important consideration is that this bill will provide a means for establishing and executing a comprehensive national policy in basic scientific research. It is significant that the Hoover Commission specifically recommended the establishment of the National Science Foundation.

This legislation grows out of the vision of the late President Roosevelt who requested Dr. Vannevar Bush to prepare a report on the subject. This report, submitted in July 1945, was appropriately termed "Science—the Endless Frontier." Science is an endless frontier for advancing human welfare and the security of the Nation. Let us pioneer further advances by passing this bil. for a National Science Foundation.

Dangerous Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the danger of foreign agents within our land is one of the most serious threats to our national security. These traitors boring from within must be ferreted out and dealt with as criminals and enemies of the United States before they have an opportunity to further damage our security.

The arrest of Dr. Karl Fuchs revealed the shocking extent to which foreign espionage agents have succeeded in stealing information from our most secret and confidential files.

Certainly it is now evident that there can be no further delay in the enactment of needed legislation to enable the Federal Bureau of Investigation to move against these foreign agents and protect our national security effectively.

An editorial in the Hollywood Citizen News of February 4 adequately summed up the situation, and I am including that editorial here now for the serious consideration of the Members of Congress:

SUPERSECRET EXPOSES

J. Edgar Hoover, FBI chief, is reported to have told Senators yesterday that Dr. Karl Fuchs, British scientist, has confessed giving Russia vital information on the assembly of the atomic bomb and some data on the super-secret hydrogen bomb.

Dr. Fuchs was arrested in England yesterday by Scotland Yard agents on information supplied by the American FBI. He was charged with giving "unknown" persons information on the atomic bomb on which he had worked in the United States as a member of a British group.

From Dr. Fuchs is believed to have gone to Russia the information that enabled that country to surprise the United States by developing the atomic bomb a year or two ahead of schedule.

The leaks through Dr. Fuchs are presumed to have been far more dangerous to the security of this country than has been the information given by Canadian and American spies.

The distressing information should cause all loyal Americans to do a little thinking and self-questioning.

Are we going to join with Communists who are enemies of this country in opposition to the Mundt-Nixon bill to require that all Communists in this country register as agents of a foreign country?

Are we going to join with Communists in condemning the FBI for obtaining information on treasonable activities through the tapping of telephone lines?

Are we going to work for the Communists in opposing loyalty tests and in opposing the strengthening of our defenses so that we can meet the attacks of the most powerful, the most vicious, the most dishonorable, and the most treacherous dictatorship in the world's history?

Hasn't the time arrived when we should stop being tolerant of Communists who seek to destroy our liberties?

If a war arises between the Stalin dictatorship and the United States we are going to expect the FBI to have such definite information on all Communists in this country that they can quickly be put behind barbed wire before their sabotage does great damage.

Yet the FBI cannot compile accurate lists without resort to every technique of spying.

If Communists are compelled to register, only those will be put on record who openly admit their membership in the Communist Party. This will be worth while but the FBI needs to know every traitor though he does not join the Communist Party.

Surely the time has come for the Eleanor Roosevelts and the Dean Achesons to stop defending the Alger Hisses after they have been convicted of being traitors to this country.

Americans have a priceless liberty to defend. The kind of life the Russian slaves live is less desirable than death to Americans.

Only death awaits one in Russia who dares whisper that he doesn't like the way the dictators runs his country.

In this country we give everyone a fair trial. Communists on trial cost the country millions of dollars annually. Their funds to employ attorneys to take the time of our courts seem inexhaustible. Some would change our conception of fair trials. But we should insist that traitors be treated as criminals.

We should insist that the work of the congressional and legislative committees on un-American activities be pushed. We should insist that all the Government support called for by the FBI be granted.

We don't want war. Let none of the Communist shouters for peace deceive us. But if to do our best to defend our liberties we have to take on war we must accept it. The chances are that if we are constantly alert to safeguard our liberties we shall be able to avoid war.

Certainly we cannot avoid war by refusing to recognize the fifth column that is among us.

Live and Let Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert a worthy article in the RECORD as it appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times under date of February 27, 1950.

As President Truman stated in his Washington's Birthday speech on foreign policy, "free nations must be prepared to defend themselves, but they know that another great war could destroy victor and vanquished alike."

I suggest that the entire membership read this editorial on a most timely subject, and heed the contents thereof.

The editorial follows:

IN DISARMAMENT FORMULA

In his Washington's Birthday speech on foreign policy President Truman struck a moderate note, evidently intended to cool off public opinion excited by the hydrogen bomb.

Free nations must be prepared to defend themselves, Mr. Truman said, but they know that another great war could destroy victor and vanquished alike.

"Consequently we in the United States are doing and will continue to do all that lies within our power to prevent the horror of another war. We are working for the reduction of armaments and the control of weapons of mass destruction."

Applying this thought to the problems of atomic disarmament, Mr. Truman steered clear of dogmatic insistence upon the Baruch plan. "We ask only for a plan that provides an effective, workable system" of control, he said.

When it comes to methods of "working for the reduction of armaments," the President apparently is not thinking of a direct approach to Russia looking toward negotiation that might make disarmament possible. The State Department this week reiterated its determination not to seek such negotiation, on the ground that if it failed public opinion might be led to think of "a more desperate alternative."

The assumption that negotiation would inevitably fail may perhaps be worth reexamination.

Some people regard the structure and ideology of the Soviet Union as inherently opposed to the kind of international inspection that is needed to make a disarmament pact workable.

The Soviet Union, however, has the same government today which it had in the twenties and thirties. It is worth remembering that, prior to the rise of Hitler, the two leading advocates of effective disarmament were the United States and the Soviet Union.

For about 10 years between the two wars, serious efforts were made, inside and outside the League of Nations, to bring about general disarmament. Hitler, not Russia, torpedoed these efforts in the end. One American participant in those efforts was Allen W. Dulles, brother of the Republican leader, John Foster Dulles. Allen Dulles wrote, in Foreign Affairs for January 1947:

"On every possible occasion, from the Genoa conference in 1922 to the Geneva conference in 1932-34, the Soviet Union energetically pressed for total disarmament; and when she found that no states were prepared to follow her in such a radical step, she advocated a proportionate reduction of armaments."

Russia's proposal, Dulles reminds us, included provision for an international commission of control which would be "entitled to carry out investigations on the spot in the event of reasonable suspicion of a breach of the present convention."

Russia wanted the disarmament commission to be represented by local subcommissions stationed in every signatory state. Decisions were to be reached by majority vote (i. e., no veto), and were to be binding on all signatories.

These proposals, says Dulles, "were among the most far reaching in respect of the limitation of sovereign authority that any country has ever suggested."

It does not follow, of course, that what Russia was willing to do in 1932 she would be ready to do today. Her expansionist record since 1945 and her breach of numerous agreements have created fear and distrust which the mere signing of a pact would not of itself dispel.

But the full record of Soviet policy since 1917 suggests that there is nothing inherent in the ideology or structure of the Soviet state which makes impossible a disarmament pact that could be checked and supervised by effective international inspection.

The Communist ideology holds that there is something inherent in the ideology and structure of capitalist states which makes disarmament impossible. This is nonsense. It also may be nonsense to assume that the Soviet state is indissolubly wedded to military power and nationalist secrecy.

If both systems can arrive at the basic decision that they had better live and let live—just for the sake of mankind's survival on this planet—then atomic disarmament and general disarmament may become possible.

An effort of true statesmanship in this direction would surely be preferable to the prospect of prolonged cold war constantly moving toward hot war.

How Can We Win Against Communism in Asia When England Gives American-Owned Air Fleet to Chinese Reds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of February 24, 1950:

HOW CAN WE WIN?

Now that the United States and Britain have recognized the French-sponsored Bao Dai regime in Indochina, French military circles are asking for a common western policy in the Far East, as well as immediate military aid.

A list of the equipment wanted, including light tanks, jeeps, reconnaissance cars, and small-arms ammunition, has been given to our Government, with an additional request for a $100,000,000 economic-rehabilitation loan.

Since we are here being asked to buy into a war, it will be well to get all the facts on the table. We ought to know what we're getting into, and just what chance, if any, we have to win. From this distance, the chance looks dim.

The French, having had an army of 160,000 men in the field for 3 years, have inflicted no serious injury to Ho Chi-minh's Communist forces. Now, according to a Paris report to the New York Times, "an effective blockade of Communist China" is regarded as one of the essentials if victory is to be achieved.

The idea of a blockade of Communist China can be discarded, now that the British court in Hong Kong has awarded the Red government at Peiping 70 transport and passenger planes which Major General Chennault had purchased from the Chinese Nationalists. That decision probably spells the doom of Formosa, as well as killing any prospect of saving Indochina from the Reds.

Some heads should be examined in the State Department and the British foreign office. Britain recognized the Chinese Reds, and now has given them the planes they need to continue their campaign of aggression. The United States has recognized the Bao Dai forces in Indochina, and now is asked to put up the money and the arms to defeat the forces of Ho Chin-minh, which are said to have the active support of the Chinese Reds. Russia, of course, is backing both Red forces.

How can the West hope to win under this kind of leadership?

More Gold Diggers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, few people realize the extent to which the American people are taxed for gifts to foreign nations. We are again about to appropriate several billions for foreign sponging nations under the Marshall plan. This in order to further deplete our natural resources at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Great Britain has become the most persistent gold digger, and our poor old Uncle Sam will have his leg pulled for billions more under the European recovery camouflage. The fact is we have made bums out of some European people and debauched their nations through our stupid foreign policy.

The time has come that we look after our own Nation—not foreign nations. Let us get rid of the foreign ideologies in the executive branch of our Government. Let us give Dean Acheson and Paul Hoffman a permanent passport to the European nations that they are more interested in than their own.

Take the profits out of the Marshall plan, and there would be no Marshall plan, and there would be no Bill Claytons, no Rockefellers, and no Harrimans for the Marshall plan.

As part of my remarks, I enclose herewith a letter I have received from Mr. James M. Witherow, a resident of Moorhead, Minn.:

MOORHEAD, MINN., *February 13, 1950.*

Hon. WILLIAM LEMKE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEMKE: We in the Northwest appreciate the efforts of you and some of your associates to keep the expenses of the Federal Government within the taxpaying ability of the people as a whole.

But when we consider the unreasonable number of individuals with which the different departments are staffed, and the extravagant practices in buying with percentages paid to the friends of the administration, we are very much hurt.

This is particularly true with reference to foreign aids to European countries, whose representatives spend a great deal of money and time entertaining friendly Congressmen and Senators, who then vote recklessly for the money requested under the Marshall plan, without paying the slightest attention to the reports of observers sent to Europe for that purpose. From these reporters, we learn that the officeholders of France have been doubled at greatly advanced salaries, with large sums paid out in entertainments and dissipation, while the American Government is asked to spend the money for the military defenses of France, with Belgium, Austria, Poland, and Italy it is the same story. In England, the people have gone wild with drinking and gambling on dogs and ponies. H. J. Taylor reports these gambling expenditures as being from two and a half to four billion dollars per year, and about three hundred Englishmen spend their time as touts selling gambling tickets on the streets of the cities, yet not a single Congressman who went over to Europe to investigate was able to report a single instance although no one in England has denied the allegation. Even Sir Stafford Cripps admits it in bringing in a 25-cent tax on the winnings. Just why the interests of the taxpayers of the United States are neglected in this important matter is something which no one yet has endeavored to explain.

There are many honest industrious Englishman who are entitled to friendly assistance, but the present policy of sending the money of the taxpayers of the United States to be dissipated by the vicious is imposing a greater financial burden upon them and their posterity than the results of the war, because it is undermining their moral habits and depriving them of many of the necessities of daily life.

This is one of the issues which the American people feel justified in placing before the people regardless of party affiliations: Just who are these Congressmen really representing, the taxpayers of the United States or the drunkards and gamblers of Europe? Kindly see how many of them can truly answer this serious question, the correctness of which we must ultimately determine from the votes which they cast when the appropriations were before the House on roll call.

Very truly yours,

JAMES M. WITHEROW.

American Bankers Association To Fight Increase in United States Lending Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an article from yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I think the president of the American Bankers Association has done a great service to the people by bringing to their attention the dangers in the centralization of credit in the hands of Federal Government. The examples of this type of financing which we find in Europe should be a sufficient lesson to us who talk of preserving private enterprise. Certainly, Mr. Peterson, the president of American Bankers Association, was very fair in his criticism in that he likewise takes a crack at the banks in their willingness to evade their full share of the risks taken by becoming involved in Government guaranteed loans. Bankers should take the same full share of risks which the businessman must take.

Certainly the tendency to extend Government financing is increasing. I do not believe the average person realizes to what a degree the new housing bill for middle-income families will seriously injure our private loaning institutions. This legislation, if passed, provides for direct Federal loans to a special class—cooperative and nonprofit companies. The cooperative feature is merely a cloak to cover the primary purpose which is the formation of giant nonprofit corporations featuring nonowner occupancy of housing at the expense of all the taxpayers and especially those who own their own homes. To my way of thinking, the $2,000,000,000 involved is simply putting us $2,000,000,000 nearer socialization. This legislation is a severe blow to the veterans and all other Americans who have already invested in housing. The veterans have received over 1,600,000 guaranteed loans under the GI bill and at least that number of loans under the FHA-insured mortgage plan. They are paying interest at the rate of 4 percent or 4½ percent depending upon the type of mortgage. The proposed bill lowers the interest rate to 3 percent. This is unfair to the veterans and home owners and will only promote further confusion.

The article follows:

AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION TO FIGHT INCREASE IN UNITED STATES LENDING POWER—PETERSON ASSAILS DRIFT TO NATIONALIZATION OF CREDIT

Asserting that a host of legislation providing for more Government loans and credit guaranties is now before Congress, F. Raymond Peterson, chairman of the board of First National Bank & Trust Co., of Paterson, N. J., announced last night that the American Bankers Association, of which he is president, would "oppose these unwarranted uses of taxpayers' money and credit."

In an address at the annual dinner meeting of the Hudson County chapter of the American Institute of Banking in the Plaza Hotel, Jersey City, Mr. Peterson declared: "We are treading perhaps unwittingly on dangerous social and economic ground if the administration of credit is centralized in the hands of the Federal Government.

"Centralization of credit administration in the hands of any government is one of the trappings of the socialism and communism abroad, against which we in this country are spending billions of dollars for defense."

The banker asserted that in recent years the Nation has been confronted with an ever increasing trend toward nationalization of credit.

He pointed out that loans, loan guaranties, and credit commitments of more than 20 Government lending agencies now exceed $26,000,000,000.

"I think no one will dispute the point that loans made directly to borrowers by agencies of the Federal Government are in effect socialized credit," Mr. Peterson said.

"Many of them are uneconomic loans. There is little chance of their ever being repaid. Some of them have been outstanding on the books of some Government agencies for more than 15 years and are still unpaid. Loans by Government agencies to sustain insolvent, dying business are a dissipation of public funds."

Mr. Peterson stated, however, that far more subtle than direct socialization of credit was the influence of Government guaranty of loans made by private lending institutions.

"The fundamental purpose of banking is to take credit risks," the ABA head maintained. "It is not to evade the risk or to attempt to share it with the Government. Government-guaranteed loans are loans in which the lender seeks to divest himself of the risk. Banking alone must either accept or reject that risk. It ought not to be shared with the taxpayers."

Winthrop's Brotherhood Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address I delivered at Winthrop, Mass., at the National Brotherhood Observance on Thursday, February 23, 1950:

I wish that I could extend my personal greetings to each one of the 65 organizations participating in Winthrop Brotherhood Week.

Sixty-five cooperating agencies in one township is eloquent proof that your community means what it says, in its dedication to the goal of human fellowship.

In the larger cities of the United States there are racial and religious ghettos into which people withdraw after their day's work is done. Wherever people congregate to earn their daily bread, however, whether in stores, factories, or on the farms, they learn to respect and to depend upon one another in the teamwork necessary to carry out a common assignment.

This was clearly revealed to us during the recent war. Men and women of different

backgrounds and different beliefs learned to serve together, and that was an illuminating experience for all. In time of common peril, there is no place for affectations of superiority. People need each other as much before and the hair-splitting differences of dogma and ritual melt away as they face danger and suffering and death together.

The cherished memory of any person who went through the ordeal of war is the intimate comradeship he found with men of all races and creeds. The pity of it is that so many people experience the fellowship of humanity only under the pressure of stern emergencies. And then they withdrew into the ghettos where all are of the same race or go to the same church. This social and spiritual inbreeding limits a person's outlook. It builds up invisible walls, made up of ignorance and fear and misunderstanding, which are nothing but the ghostly creations of neurotic minds.

Democracy had its beginnings in the small towns of the United States where it is possible for most people to come together at town meeting. Just as we assemble here tonight in a larger sense to affirm our belief in racial and religious tolerance. Democracy and religion are basic to the American faith. Our society contradicts itself when it exalts one and rejects the other. For both teach and must practice the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God. It is not enough for a man to be devout in prayer at church services or in works of charity if he discriminates against others at his work or when he exercises his franchise of the vote, because they choose to worship God in a different manner. Likewise, our democracy is failing itself when it denies political or social equality to any man because of his racial origin.

In our century we have seen clever but unscrupulous men try to turn the clock back to the days of ignorance and savagery. They have used the great communication facilities to preach fear and hate, to set people against each other in order to further their own power-mad ambitions.

After the First World War, a few Americans, concerned by this dangerous trend, organized a movement to offset this destructive program of hate by one of constructive understanding and good will. They created the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Its purpose is to dispel the fog of prejudice with the sunlight of truth. Their task is one of heroic proportions, but their success might well be the one factor which can save the world. For today the problem is not how to overcome the forces of nature, but how to overcome the weaknesses in man himself.

One of the organization's chief weapons is the trio teams of minister-priest-rabbi, or of laymen of the three faiths who appear before audiences from coast to coast. The first pilgrimage tour was made in 1933 by Father John Ross, Rabbi Morris Lazaron, and Dr. Everett Clinchy who was president of the council at that time. Advocating justice, amity, and understanding among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, this team was on the road for 6 weeks, traveling 9,000 miles. Three years later, 25 such traveling teams covered a total of 81,000 miles. Today, the NCCJ is operating from hundreds of American communities and its work is becoming increasingly effective.

During Brotherhood Week, which is observed each year at this time, we see visible evidence of the program that has been made, and we are reminded of the part each one of us can play in removing bigotry and intolerance from that greater society of which we are all fellow members.

Happily, this week embraces the birthday of George Washington, the Father of our Country, who did so much by his example to show us that we must live for others as well as for ourselves.

Neighborliness was the one factor which enabled the first settlers to survive and make progress as they faced the harsh wilderness of the New World. Even before governments were instituted it was the friendly and cooperative help extended from neighbor to neighbor that served as a support and protection for one another.

As the pioneers moved westward, mutual dependence was imperative. At barn raisings and quilting bees people pitched in to help. The greatest virtue of that period was that a man was judged by his acts and not by his race or his creed.

The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are documents unique in human history. They not only set forth the aspirations and the forms of government, they express the rich and rewarding experience of humble men and women who were creating a society born of mutual effort and mutual confidence. The oppressed of all lands came here to make a new beginning, not at the sacrifice of their particular faith or culture but in a heart-warming recognition that there is a place for all. And so our conception of liberty has come to mean freedom of expression as long as it does not take freedom from others.

There is no state religion in our country, favored over all others. There is no special race or class. And there never will be if we expose at every turn those who spread false stories about our neighbors.

It all begins in a harmless way, with a choice bit of gossip, perhaps. And the person to whom it is told cannot resist the temptation to add something to it to make it more interesting before he passes it on to another. Before the false rumor has completed its devious course grave harm is done to the character of a person, a race, or a creed.

And then, when confronted with the wrong they have helped to propagate, people try to pretend that they did not assist in the slander. Or they try to excuse themselves by saying that they meant no harm. But injustice has been done beyond correction.

This is all the more amazing when one considers that millions of our people have had the advantage of a college education which deals in facts and teaches them to separate the true from the false. But how many spike a rumor at the beginning by demanding to know the basis of any allegation?

I am reminded of the unfortunate beating of a young Jewish boy recently, the orphaned son of a man who gave his life for his country in World War II. He was assaulted by some of his young non-Jewish neighbors, which compounds the tragedy. For it reflects the poisonous atmosphere in the homes from which they come. Children are innocent. It is not in their nature to be cruel to their playmates because of differences in race or creed. When they develop unsocial attitudes the blame can be placed squarely on their delinquent parents. This should be a caution to all of us. Youngsters are impressionable, they absorb unthinkingly. Even words spoken lightly between father and mother in the presence of a child concerning a religion or a race may distort that child's viewpoint.

As it did in the case of the youngsters who beat the little Jewish boy. With a tender understanding of the victim's plight and the effect this injustice might have on him as he grew up, Oscar J. Toye, Massachusetts Department Commander of the Jewish War Veterans wrote him an exceptional letter which should be taken to heart by all of us because it is a major contribution to the goal of tolerance in our confused and wayward times. Mr. Toye wrote in part, and I quote: "Your job and mine is to see to it that the few people who do not understand America, do not get hold of it and spoil it. I am very much afraid that because of these boys who beat you and called you 'Jew' you might be led to believe that you were assaulted by Christians. I want you to say to yourself that these boys were not Christians. Christians do not hate others or beat them. The Christian religion, like the Jewish religion, teaches love for one another. I do not care of what parentage these boys are, or to what church they go. When they did what they did to you, they took themselves out of the Christian faith and out of any other religion, and they have no further right to call themselves Christian."

These are plain and humble words, spoken with the simplicity that is truth itself. They strike home to conscience. If, in the secret recesses of our hearts we confess to ourselves that we, too, at some time or another, have been guilty of prejudice, let us pledge this day forth to clean ourselves of such corruption. For the harm we do to others may also be done unto ourselves in payment of the evil we set in motion.

Catholics and Protestants, and people from the multitude of races which compose our Nation, have, in their turn, suffered from intolerance.

It is not my purpose to dwell on these negative aspects, except that they should warn us to control those careless remarks which do injury to others.

Tonight we are paying homage to the ideal of brotherhood. This is a positive and uplifting thought not simply one that refrains from intolerance but one that inspires us to build a confident fellowship in its place.

For the unity of our own Nation, and as an example to others who look to us for hope and guidance, I like to think of that sublime example among many, that took place during World War II.

It was on the United States transport *Dorchester*, sinking fast after suffering a mortal wound. The ship was crowded and there were not enough life preservers to go around. The loaded lifeboats were pulling away from the ship but four men still remained on the sloping deck. They were chaplains—two Protestant, one Catholic, and one Jew. They had given away their own life belts so that others might be saved. And these four chaplains stood on the deck, serene and unafraid as they joined in prayer before they went down to a watery grave together.

The prayers that they said were different in wording, but they were directed to the one God of all. Not for the four clergymen who were going to their deaths, but for the men in the boats who might be saved. There was no time on that slanting deck for smallness of mind or spirit.

The United States is the Nation most representative of humanity in the whole of recorded history. We have opened our arms to the oppressed from all over the world. Wherever you travel in this broad land of ours stop in the main square and look at the names of those who gave up their young lives to preserve and extend the belief that we have in one another. Men of all religions and men of no religion, men whose ancestors emigrated from every nation to find freedom of conscience here.

They offered up their lives not only to win a war but to win the opportunity for us, the living, to build a better world, beginning in our own homes and our own communities.

We cannot repay their sacrifices by cultivating the rank weeds of discrimination for that is the poor husbandry that leads to moral bankruptcy.

That is the way the Communists in Moscow hope we follow to our own undoing. But they do not rely on this alone. Their agents in this country are actively engaged in promoting dissension at every opportunity. They plant lies and rumors about religions and racial groups, trusting that we will pick them up and spread them about others, not knowing that some are directed against ourselves. This is the technique that is calculated to splinter American faith and unity, and make us the unwitting instruments of our own destruction.

Unfortunately, there are some people who bite at the bait. Our job is to enlighten them with the knowledge that they are only playing into the hands of communism.

Maybe this will teach them to hold their tongues and not be the carriers of every vicious rumor.

If not, you and I and the overwhelming majority of fair-minded Americans must make it our business to nail every lie at its source.

We are a moral people. I think most of us try to observe the Golden Rule. And we are the only nation capable of rallying the decent elements in this world to resist and overcome the spreading vice of communism. Already the cynics of the Kremlin wield great power. By alternating falsehoods with force, they first enslave their own people. And they have practiced this divide-and-conquer method in every country they have taken over. Do not underestimate these peddlers of hate. Even more than the Nazis, they have perfected the black art of propaganda, both in the open and undercover. They are constantly at work undermining the intelligence and character of people by feeding the fires of passion and prejudice.

We may expect that this subversive campaign will be stepped up within our own country. How are we prepared to offset it?

Not by shifting the burden of individual responsibility to others. Democracy is not built that way. Totalitarianism is. The high resolve to which we pledge ourselves this night will mean nothing if it is not translated into effective action 365 days a year.

There is a cold war going on in the world of today, and the first objective of the aggressors is to win control of the minds of men. If they succeed, all else will fall in line easily and completely.

The Communist high command is using every psychological trick to deceive and ensnare us. If we are not alert to this danger and are not prepared to stop unfounded rumors in their tracks then we shall be taken in.

At the same time we cannot afford to put ourselves into the strait-jacket of totalitarianism at home in order to mobilize against the encroachment of aggression from abroad, for that would be self-defeating.

The only answer to communism is a dynamic democracy. That is a value not manufactured by our Government. It is made up of the actions and attitudes of tens of millions of Americans, not only preached but practiced in their daily lives.

The Government must depend on you to show respect and understanding of your fellow citizens before it can hope to carry the Voice of America to other peoples. Our one great hope is to reach the people who are quarantined from truth behind the iron curtain and convince them that we want brotherhood among nations. But first we must prove to them that we have achieved it here—in the United States.

Unity at home does not require uniformity. We want a diversity of religious and cultural expression, for out of this richness and variety have come our inspiring development as a Nation.

We are free because we are tolerant.

And because we know that all races are members of the one human family who will someday meet in eternal brotherhood before the Creator of all.

Never before have we felt the need for one another as in this age. Scientific progress has taken the lead over man's ability to achieve that harmony in human relationships which must govern the terrifying instruments of material power.

The race is on.

Which will win?

Unbridled power in the hands of evil men or power employed for the benefit of all?

The choice lies with us the people of the world. As each individual contributes to the cause of human understanding, he adds a part of his spirit to the voice of mankind calling for an end to war and cruelty and exploitation. This is the vital force which can dissolve any injustice.

Strangely enough, intolerance is found more often in large cities than in small communities. Where people are crowded together they seem to know less of each other. Take a big apartment house where people may live next door to each other, but only meet in the elevator or pass by in the hall. They may do this for years without any spirit of neighborliness developing. There is no lonelier feeling than that of a stranger in a big city.

President Truman has stated that only a moral and spiritual awakening can save the world from disaster. In his words, and I quote: "The Protestant church, the Catholic church, and the Jewish synagogue, bound together in the American unity of brotherhood, must provide the shock forces to accomplish this moral and spiritual awakening. No other agency can do it. Unless it is done we are headed for the disaster we deserve."

The paradox of modern society is that it possesses more materials and tools and technical know-how than any other age in history. It has the things with which to produce a better life for all men, free from poverty and the worries which attend it.

What then is holding us back from stepping over the threshold to a new era of peace and prosperity?

There are willful men who make a practice of sowing the seeds of discontent but they alone could not prevail if we, the people, put our hearts and souls to work, for a change, instead of limiting them to a 1-hour exercise on Sunday with those of our own kind.

It is not enough to accept the principle of brotherhood during 1 week of the year. Only as we put it into action at home, in the office, in industrial contacts, in social and political life, in national and international relations, can it become a movement that will cleanse the world of its tensions and its fears.

I do not share the hysterical opinion that all Russians, for instance, are bent on destroying us. They, in turn, have a distorted outlook on the rest of the world because they are not allowed to communicate with other people. When the day comes that their leaders can no longer isolate them, we and they will discover that we have very much in common as fellow human beings.

To hasten that day you and I must make the beginning by lifting the iron curtain of intolerance from our own hearts.

This night marks that beginning for some.

Toward the goal of personal happiness in the society of others and a world at peace.

Counting for the Census

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the taking of the great American census is about to begin and the Bureau of the Census has a vast organization throughout the United States. There is included herewith an editorial from Spencer Canary, editor of the Daily Sentinel-Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio, covering the manner of taking the census. Surely a city of 8,000 permanent residents should not be set up as a city with a population of 13,000 because of the fact that there are some 5,000 students temporarily in the community. Such a system would be counting the students in the colleges and universities twice in the American census. It has been the understanding of Congress that the effort is to get the actual population and not an inflated one. I believe that the Bureau of the Census should make known to Congress the method by which it is taking the census for if this double counting is part of the pattern, of what actual good is such a census for any purpose? This census authorized by Congress should be of sufficient importance that the Secretary of Commerce, the Bureau of the Census, and everyone concerned should do it on a common-sense basis and not be a process of counting people as domiciled in two communities at the same time where it is actually known that they are temporarily there as students.

MISCOUNTING OUR POPULATION

Speaking before the Rotary Club here Thursday night, William H. Williams, district supervisor in charge of the census taking in this Thirteenth Congressional District, stated that all the students at Bowling Green State University would be counted as residents of our city.

This method, which the Bureau of the Census has decreed, will not give a real census of Bowling Green's population. Instead of probably being over 8,000, it will make it about 13,000, as those students whose homes are elsewhere will be included as permanent residents. Of course, many have no other home than this and should be counted.

This method of counting the city's population will be not only inaccurate, but is liable to be unfair to it. For one thing, when these students graduate and move away, a business survey later might show a seemingly less population despite the fact that the city was really increasing in actual residents. That would give a black eye to the town. Various State laws and population polls for business might adversely affect it.

This inexact method of counting, of course, is to be Nation-wide; and communities would illegitimately lose or gain population. For instance, Ann Arbor, through its big University of Michigan, and New York, through its great Columbia University, would gain population which should be accredited to other States.

We hope Congressman ALVIN F. WEICHEL and other Congressmen will call on the Bureau of Census to change this erroneous method. Charles Sawyer, as a businessman of Cincinnati and now Secretary of Commerce, under which is the Census Bureau, will recognize that the proposed method is bad.

Our Unsound, Dishonest, Inequitable Social Security Set-Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me to the Senate Finance Committee on the bill H. R. 6000:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate Finance Committee, I am one of the three members of the Ways and Means Committee that voted against H. R. 6000 when it was approved in committee. I was also one of the 14 Members in the House that voted "No" when the bill was up for final passage in the House. I feel, therefore, that it is my duty and responsibility to make a statement before the distinguished members of this committee giving very briefly my reasons for opposing the bill.

In my opinion the weight of the testimony during the 3½ months of open hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on our present social-security set-up was to the effect that it was unsound and dishonest, a Ponzi-type shell game that has been sold to the American taxpayer as a plan to provide security in his old age. It is a program which if practiced by a private insurance company would land every director and every officer of that company in jail for misappropriation and misuse of trust funds. The program is characterized by the Brookings Institute report on our present social-security set-up as a plan whereby "We (the present generation) do the promising; you (all future generations) do the paying."

The future burden of H. R. 6000 is described on pages 168 and 169 of this same report as an enlarged old-age insurance system that would ease the cash position of the Federal Government today, because the excess of revenues collected today through the social-security tax goes to meet the ordinary expense of the Government, and that means that a substantial part of future social-security costs will have to be met out of future tax revenues. The report estimates that the cost of H. R. 6000 plus the veterans' program will be between $19,000,000,000 and $25,000,000,000 by the year 1970.

Gentlemen, can our economy carry this tremendous additional burden?

Perhaps at this point a concrete illustration to demonstrate how unsound and dishonest our present social-security program is would be in order, therefore I offer the following hypothetical case:

John Smith decides to establish his own social-security program, so he meticulously deducts a certain percent of each pay check he receives and places the cash regularly in his safety deposit box. After doing this for several years and having thus set aside, say $6,000, to insure security in his old age, John Smith starts to spend each month more than he earns—as Uncle Sam does now. Then John Smith hits upon the plan of taking so much cash out of his locker to spend each month and placing in the box, in lieu of the cash extracted, promissory notes to himself. If John Smith keeps this up, when he retires he will have only promissory notes to himself to live on—which he has no way of changing into cash for groceries.

That, gentlemen, is exactly what Uncle Sam is doing with the social-security receipts—the only difference being that Uncle Sam has the taxing power to invoke in order to change his I O U's into cash to meet his future social-security obligations. But that involves new taxes, additional taxes, to meet obligations that are supposed to have been paid for already by the taxes collected. I wonder if that scheme of taxing again the children and grandchildren of the social-security beneficiary for something he and his employer are supposed to have paid for—but Uncle Sam has spent the receipts from the social-security tax for other things—can be called anything but dishonest and immoral, a Ponzi-type shell game that has been sold to the American taxpayer as a plan to provide security in his old age.

On page 176 of the Brookings Institution report the authors recommend that the present social-security set-up be abandoned entirely and a genuine pay-as-you-go system be established in its place. This would do away with all need for reserves, all need for level premiums, all need for costly and elaborate bookkeeping systems, etc. This would mean, as the authors of the report point out, "Our generation would care for its own and trust future generations to do likewise." A very sensible, practical, and wise conclusion for them to reach, it seems to me.

In discussing this social-security problem on the floor of the House, I said:

"Mr. Speaker, the action of the House on H. R. 6000, the social-security bill, has impelled me to do something that I have steadfastly refused to do for over 12 years; namely, to sign the Townsend plan petition now at the Speaker's desk. I signed that petition because when I compare the two programs for social security—the one contained in H. R. 6000 and the one contained in the Townsend plan—I am convinced that the Townsend plan is to be preferred to H. R. 6000.

"In my opinion, after careful consideration, the Townsend plan is more equitable, more practical, more just, much easier and cheaper to administer, and less costly in the long run.

"The social-security plan contained in H. R. 6000 when fully matured will require the payment of something like $1,000,000,000 per year in interest alone, in addition to the hundreds of millions of dollars each year for administrative costs. The Townsend plan will do away with both the interest on the social-security fund and the heavy administrative costs.

"The social-security plan contained in H. R. 6000 proposes that the Federal Government shall collect up to 8 or 10 billions of dollars per year and spend the same for current Government expenses. The Townsend plan proposes that the Federal Government shall collect 6 or 8 billions of dollars per year and hand it out immediately on a monthly basis to the old people of the Nation for them to spend for the necessities of life. I ask, which is the better plan? Which will bring more happiness to more people? Which can spend the money to a better advantage, the Federal Government or our worthy old people?

"In my opinion the social-security program as set up and amended in H. R. 6000 is both unsound and dishonest. I shall do what I can hereafter to substitute the Townsend plan, or some modification of it, for the administration's social-security program."

Which Political Party Is for the Common People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is important that the membership of the House should have the record of the New Deal Administration and its domination by the large financial interests both here and abroad. We hear much about the New Deal or Democrat Party being the champion of small business and the underprivileged people of this country. I am inserting in the RECORD, under leave heretofore granted, a particular record of the New Deal with reference to the influence of foreign financiers as well as our own in forcing this country to spend itself into insolvency. The record referred to appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, Sunday, February 26, 1950:

NEW DEAL OUT BUT WALL STREET REMAINS IN—FINANCIERS LINGER ON IN TRUMAN REGIME

(By Walter Trohan)

The New Deal is gone but the power of Wall Street still lingers on in the Truman administration. In 1933 the New Deal was launched by a small band of men who raised the Blue Eagle of the national recovery administration, killed millions of little pigs, transplanted families, inaugurated leaf raking, promoted boondoggling and plowed under crops.

Almost 2 years ago the last of the original band, Benjamin V. Cohen, left the Government. He was counselor of the State Department. His departure marked the passing of an era, but long before his going the Wall Streeters were edging out New Dealers in Washington influence.

TIES WITH LONDON

The most important programs in the Government came into the hands of men who came from the Nation's financial center and had social and blood ties with London counting houses and British nobility. New Dealers had been losing influence for 10 years before Cohen left. Today, although a few of them remain in the Government, they have less influence than the Wall Streeters. And President Truman is changing the very name New Deal to Fair Deal.

For many years Franklin D. Roosevelt was regarded as the fountainhead of American policy. Since his death the so-called American bipartisan foreign policy has continued uninterrupted. The long arm of Wall Street has been seen as molding the internationalist policy, and fusing varied groups and varied interests.

At one time Wall Streeters hobnobbed with Communists of Union Square as well as Park Avenue social circles, to bring profits from internationalist spending. In this period Wall Streeters were invited into the New Deal and took it over.

WALL STREETERS SUMMONED

In the earliest days of the New Deal, Wall Streeters were reputedly on the outs with the administration. President Roosevelt had called for driving the money changers out of the temple. However, J. P. Morgan himself was invited to the White House for at least one secret conference. He was discovered leaving the White House late one night.

In 1937, when the New Deal found itself face to face with a depression, President Roosevelt began summoning Wall Streeters to the White House for secret meetings. It was at this time the late Thomas Lamont, who succeeded Morgan as head of J. P. Morgan & Co., began to be a White House visitor.

Morgan was surprised leaving the White House with Myron Taylor, then head of United States Steel, which the Morgan interests controlled. The two smilingly acknowledged a 45-minute visit, which the White House had not announced. When asked about the visit the White House said it was purely social.

"You know I cannot tell you what I talked about with the President in his home," Morgan said.

THE NOBLES ARRIVE

At this time Roosevelt shifted his attention from domestic to international affairs. He was persuaded domestic recovery would come through international stabilization.

British financial interests exerted heavy influence on their American brethren. The doors of Britain's best homes were thrown open to American financiers. Britain knighted leading financiers so that whenever she encountered financial difficulties she could send over the magic of titles to help get desired aid.

For years Viscount Walter Runciman, Sir Josiah Stamp, Lord John Maynard Keynes, and Sir Arthur Salter raced to this country every time British finances became shaky. They were able to return home with relief.

The British showered decorations on American military figures and civilians. Hundreds of decorations went to persons for supporting the British cause in Bundles for Britain and in getting America into the war. Winthrop Aldrich, chairman of the Chase National Bank and leading supporter of British causes, was given the only King's medal ever to be conferred on an American.

General Eisenhower is the only American to receive the British Order of Merit, which is limited to 24 regular members and foreign honorary members. Eisenhower, like General Marshall, wartime Chief of Staff and former State Secretary, holds British decorations which would be knighthoods for Britishers. Both hold honorary degrees from British universities.

KNIGHT OF THE BATH

Alan G. Kirk, ambassador to the Soviet Union, is Knight Commander of the Bath, knighthood organization. Lieutenant General Smith, protege of Marshall, has a similar decoration. American ambassadors to Britain receive British university degrees. The Wall Streeters are able to have internationalist-minded American universities confer honorary degrees on friends and supporters.

Titles were employed in other fields of activity. King George and Queen Elizabeth came to Canada to tie the dominion to the mother country and to woo the United States. Lord Mountbatten, the Duke of Kent, the Duke of Windsor, the Earl of Athlone and a host of lesser British figures came to this country to curry good will.

In 1938 and 1939 Wall Streeters were crowding into the Capital. By 1940 Wall Street, which had opposed the New Deal in 1932 and 1936, was working for the third term. Roosevelt and Wall Street have been widely credited with the strategy which won the Republican nomination for Wendell Willkie, a former Socialist and a former Tammany Hall Democrat, who also was a Wall Street lawyer. Willkie was known to Wall Street secretly as an interventionist although he campaigned as an isolationinst. After his defeat Willkie told a Senate committee his isolationist speeches were just so much campaign oratory. He joined with F. D. R. in pumping for war.

While the Republicans were gathering in Philadelphia for the 1940 nomination, President Roosevelt named Henry L. Stimson, Wall Street lawyer and former Republican Secretary of State, to the post of Secretary of War, and the late Frank Knox, Chicago publisher and 1936 GOP candidate for Vice President, Secretary of the Navy. Both advocated American entry into the war.

Robert P. Patterson, Republican Federal judge and a former Wall Street lawyer, was made Under-Secretary of War. Patterson was a leading interventionist.

James V. Forrestal, head of Dillon, Reed & Co., Wall Street investment house, was named Under-Secretary of Navy. Forrestal came into the New Deal a little before Knox and Stimson, as a White House executive assistant.

Forrestal succeeded Knox on the latter's death and became the first Defense Secretary under President Truman. He leaped to his death a year ago a few weeks after he was eased out of the Cabinet by Mr. Truman for Louis Johnson, Truman campaign fund collector.

MANY SUDDEN DEATHS

Forrestal's death was one of many sudden deaths marking the late days of the New Deal and early days of the Fair Deal. Knox did not survive the war. Roosevelt died suddenly at Warm Springs. Edward R. Stettinius, son of a former Wall Street partner, who joined the New Deal at the time of Wall Street influx, died at the age of 49 last October 31.

Stettinius became Secretary of State in the critical Soviet appeasement days of Yalta and Potsdam, which conferences turned over large sections of Europe and Asia to Russian influence. He represented the United States at the UN founding conference, which spread Soviet influence further, and was American UN representative.

John G. Winant, American Ambassador to Britain, who negotiated the agreement which left the United States without a corridor to Berlin, died by his own hand late in 1948. O. Max Gardner, named to succeed Winant, died before he could take over the post.

A pattern of mysterious deaths surrounded the Alger Hiss spy case. Laurence Duggan, former State Department adviser, died in a still unexplained plunge from the window of his New York office. Insurance investigation ruled out suicide, which strengthened suspicion of murder. Duggan was believed to have knowledge of the inside workings of the pro-Soviet bloc in the State Department.

Harry Dexter White, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who helped draft the Morgenthau harsh peace plan for Germany, died reportedly of an overdose of digitalis after he had been questioned by a House committee on Communist affiliations. Whittaker Chambers, chief witness against Hiss, identified White as a Red spy.

Digitalis is not often employed as a poison. It is prescribed for some heart ailments. Doctors say that an overdose would have to be taken deliberately.

WALL STREETERS RUN WAR

Walter Marvin Smith, Department of Justice attorney, who fell or plunged five stories down a stairwell in the Justice Department on October 28, 1948, and was killed, had notarized the transfer of a 1939 Ford automobile from Hiss to William Rosen, alleged Communist organizer. Sumner Welles, who had examined the stolen Hiss documents and recommended some be suppressed as still of vital import, collapsed of a heart attack during a midnight walk on his Maryland estate. His hands and feet were severely frostbitten. Welles was Undersecretary of State when Hiss and Duggan were in the Department.

Hiss has a Wall Street lawyer handling his appeal from the perjury conviction. He is Robert M. Benjamin. In his first trial, which ended in disagreement, Hiss was defended by Lloyd Paul Stryker, another Wall Street lawyer.

With the third term election Wall Streeters began pouring into the administration by the thousands. Other top posts went to the Street's brokers, lawyers and clients. Lesser street figures poured into legal and administrative posts, many of which kept the holders bomb and battle proof throughout the war.

Wall Streeters ran the war and foreign policy. In the latter effort they had the powerful support of five internationalist organizations. More than 100 directors of the organizations are woven into an interlocking mesh of Wall Street lawyers and Wall Street bankers, insurance and industrial directors.

The five groups are the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Foreign Policy Association, the Rockefeller Foundation, the English Speaking Union and the Council on Foreign Relations. The convicted perjurer-spy, Hiss was named president of the Carnegie Foundation through an alliance of Wall Street and the New Deal.

Gen. Eisenhower, wartime allied supreme commander in Western Europe, was made president of Columbia University, through the influence of directors of this group. Political observers believe members of the group are seeking to capture the 1952 G. O. P. nomination for Eisenhower in the interests of promoting internationalism.

About half the directors worked for the Government at one time or another, largely in the State Department. They have common cultural backgrounds, chiefly at Harvard and Columbia. All have been working to promote the bipartisan program which is collapsing in Europe and around the world.

When the Marshall plan was proposed, a Wall Street group raised a propaganda fund. Stimson was national chairman. Contributions came from men who expected to share in the dollars given to Europe.

"RICHEST BABY IN THE WORLD"

One of the heaviest sharers in the Marshall plan funds is Will Clayton, former State Under Secretary for Economic Affairs. Clayton is the former head of Anderson, Clayton Co., world's largest cotton brokers. He has close ties with New York banks. In the State Department he promoted the British 3.75 billion dollar gift-loan and the Marshall plan. ECA records show that in one month his company handled 28 million dollars of cotton under the plan. He and his family own 40 percent of the stock of the company. Reports of the company show that the family's share of the profits runs into tens of millions annually.

Papers and publishers who supported the Marshall plan were rewarded with subsidies which are at the 3 million dollar mark. Sharers include the New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Time, Inc., Readers Digest, Curtis Publishing Co., Crowell-Collier and more than a dozen others.

Of the thousands of Wall Streeters formerly with the New Deal the most prominent are:

Robert Lovett, Wall Street banker, who was Assistant War Secretary and former Under Secretary of State. He returned to Brown Brothers Harriman & Co., of which he is a partner.

John Nicholas Brown, president of Counting House Corp., Assistant Navy Secretary. Brown was once known as "the richest baby in the world."

William H. Draper, former vice president of Dillon, Read & Co., Under Secretary of the Army.

Philips Hawkins, son-in-law of Draper, Chief of the Property Division of the American Government in Germany.

Arthur M. Hill, president of the Atlantic Greyhound Corp., head of the Army and Navy Munitions Board.

Ferdinand Eberstadt, head of the Wall Street firm bearing his name, served as a member of the Army-Navy Munitions Board.

Bernard M. Baruch, capitalist, served as adviser without portfolio and on the United Nations Atomic Commission.

Herman Baruch, brother of the capitalist, served as Ambassador to the Netherlands.

BANKERS AND LAWYERS

Charles E. Saltzman, former vice president of the New York Stock Exchange, Assistant Secretary of State.

Lewis Strauss, partner in the New York banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., a member until recently of the Atomic Energy Commission.

H. Struve Hensel, Wall Street lawyer, Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

A. L. M. Wiggins, former president of the American Bankers Association and now an Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Howard C. Peterson, Wall Street lawyer, Assistant War Secretary.

James Paul Warburg, Wall Street banker, Office of War Information.

Nelson Rockefeller, grandson of John D. Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and Assistant Secretary of State. Although of military age he came to the Government in 1940 and remained throughout the war.

Myron Taylor, former head U. S. Steel Corp., special envoy to Vatican.

Paul Felix Warburg, member of the banking family, special assistant at London embassy.

Thomas J. Hargrave, president of Eastman Kodak Corp. and Chairman of the Munitions Board.

In 1944 the Wall Streeters worked to get a second nomination for the me-too candidate Willkie. When Willkie came a cropper in the Wisconsin primary, they switched to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey in New York, a former nationalist who switched to the internationalist tinge considered proper by Wall Street. In 1948 the same group won a second nomination for Dewey.

TAFTERITES SWITCHED

In the Dewey campaigns, John Foster Dulles, Wall Street lawyer and former attorney for America First, turned up as an internationalist. He was built up as a great foreign affairs expert. The New Deal gave him a UN post and Dewey named him to the Senate. Dulles succeeded in placing Hiss in the Carnegie post. He and Hiss were associated at the UN founding conference. Dulles was defeated last spring in a race for the Senate vacancy to which he had been appointed, losing to former Gov. Herbert Lehman.

Internationalists and the New Deal took over Senator VANDENBERG, former nationalist who became an internationalist in 1943. VANDENBERG was rewarded by an appointment to the UN founding conference, having an unknown named to oppose him for the Senate, having his nephew, Lt. Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg named commander of the Air Force, and having his son Arthur, Jr., get a high salaried post with Nelson Rockefeller interests in South America. The senator is hoping to maneuver politically so that his son will succeed him in the Senate in 1953.

During the Presidential campaign Mr. Truman belabored Wall Street. He railed against "Wall Street gluttons of privilege." He took the offensive as the best defense against a charge of Wall Streetism which he expected would be made against his Administration.

BITTER BY ADMINISTRATION

The attack was made, but it came from Henry Wallace, darling of the Reds, and failed to influence voters. Wallace charged that of 125 men appointed to key civilian posts by Mr. Truman 97 were big money or big brass.

The administration still has a heavy sprinkling of Wall Streeters, although the majority have returned to the financial center to reap foreign aid dollars.

Those still in the administration include State Secretary Dean Acheson, Wall Street lawyer. Acheson's father was born in England and ordained an Episcopal minister in that country. His mother was Canadian born. The father became an Episcopal bishop in Connecticut.

John J. McCloy, Wall Street attorney, now high commissioner to Germany.

Benjamin J. Buttenwieser, of the banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., assistant high commissioner to Germany.

Lewis Douglas, insurance executive, Ambassador to Britain.

W. Averell Harriman, Wall Street banker, roving ECA ambassador.

Cornelius V. Whitney, president Whitney Enterprises, Under Secretary of Commerce.

Paul H. Nitze, vice president Dillon Read & Co., State Department.

Willard L. Thorp, former director and chairman of the board, General Utilities Corp., Assistant Secretary of State.

David K. E. Bruce, member of Maryland family associated with Wall Street interests, Ambassador to France.

Charles U. Ray, Wall Street broker, Ambassador to Norway.

Laurence Steinhardt, corporation lawyer, Ambassador to Canada.

William McChesney Martin, former president of New York Stock Exchange, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Wayne Chatfield Taylor, Chicago investment banker with New York ties, ECA Administration.

Sumner Pike, Wall Street mining and oil firm, Atomic Energy Commission.

Eugene R. Black, New York banker, president of World Bank.

Paul Hoffman, head of Studebaker Corp., which was reorganized by Wall Street, head of ECA.

William C. Foster, New York industrialist, deputy ECA director.

C. Tyler Wood, investment banker, ECA.

Edward T. Dickinson, formerly with United States Steel, ECA.

Hundreds of lesser Wall Streeters, still hold Government posts.

Facts You Should Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the information which I am inserting as a part of my remarks under leave to extend, heretofore granted, came from a pamphlet entitled "Coal Crisis":

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS LEADING TO CURRENT COAL CRISIS

1948

March 14–28: Memorial period called by Lewis; 2 weeks lost production.

May 25: Southern wage conference convened at Bluefield, W. Va.

June 13–20: Stabilization period of mine suspension called by Lewis. One week of lost production.

June 22: Northern and western wage conference convened at White Sulphur Springs.

June 30: Termination date of 1948 wage contracts.

July 5: Lewis' order effective, limiting mines to 3-day week.

September 19: Complete suspension of mining on order of Lewis.

October 3: Western and anthracite mines resume operation at Lewis' order.

October 8: Cyrus Ching asks mine workers and operators to continue negotiations.

October 21: Committee terminates negotiations at White Sulphur Springs.

November 2: Southern conferences suspended when union spokesman fails to appear.

November 9: National committee meets with Cyrus Ching.

November 10: Lewis fails to show up at conference called by Ching.

November 10: Mines resume full operation until November 30 at Lewis' order.

November 26: Southern group requests renewal of negotiations; no reply.

December 5: Three-day week again imposed by Lewis.

December 6: Mine workers announce signing small mines on new contract.

December 28: Southern Coal Producers Association files unfair labor practice charges.

December 30: Similar charges filed by northern and western groups.

1949

January 9: Wildcat strikes begin in Ohio, western Pennsylvania, and northern West Virginia.

January 13: Lewis suggests strikers in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia return to work.

January 19: Mine workers in these districts vote not to return to work.

January 25: Dr. James S. Boyd advised President of seriousness of coal supply.

January 26: Northern and western committee invites Lewis to resume negotiations.

January 31: President offers Lewis, Love, Moody, and Moses fact finding.

February 1–2: Northern and western committee meets mine workers in fruitless conference.

February 2–4: All operator groups accept and Lewis rejects President's offer of fact finding.

February 6: Mine workers on complete strike at all mines of these groups.

February 8–9: Public hearing by Presidential Coal Board, Cole presiding.

February 9: Negotiations of all groups with mine workers under Presidential Coal Board supervision.

February 10: Judge R. B. Keech enjoined UMWA from making illegal demands.

February 11: Judge R. B. Keech issues Taft-Hartley restraining order, requiring miners to return to work, mines to be kept in operation, and negotiations to proceed.

February 11: Lewis states he is ordering men back to work.

February 13: No miners working, complete suspension continuous thereafter.

February 15: Wage conferences between UMWA and all groups convened.

February 17: Lewis again orders miners to return, without result.

February 24: Miners have not yet returned to work.

Address by Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, at the National Brotherhood Week Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, everyone will agree that among the problems which challenge our best efforts is that of a better understanding between and among our citizens of different religions and races. Great strides have been made toward the desired goal which culminated in the designation of National Brotherhood Week. In Baltimore this important observance was held on Washington's Birthday, February 22, and the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] was selected to deliver the principal address.

The able Senator from Massachusetts, highly respected for his breadth of vision, his broad understanding of human relations, and his devotion to the welfare of all sects and creeds, made a profound

impression upon our citizens by his timely message.

Realizing the benefits which would be derived from a wide reading of the splendid address of the Senator from Massachusetts, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As we start the second half of the twentieth century and the emotions of fear of the future, dread of the H-bomb and the atom, are only too common emotions, it is wise for us to meet together to think for a few minutes of the great opportunities that are ours. I am proud to be one of those asked to speak to you during this, our National Brotherhood Week. I am happy to have the chance to tell you of my deep, abiding faith in the great need for a better understanding of one another at home, of our friends abroad, and of the common cause that is our United States.

On such an occasion as this, it seems fitting for us to keep in mind a statement by the author of the Declaration of Independence. Thomas Jefferson, who was a devoted Christian, wrote that "our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions." We may add that even if they did, the ethics of a Protestant, a Roman Catholic, a Jew, or a Buddhist have more similarities than differences, and certainly enough to make it possible for them to live together in peace and good will. How appropriate that thought is this week.

In 1940 at the annual dinner of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in Boston, I said, and I repeat now what I said then because it is still my strong and abiding feeling: "All of us—Catholic, Protestant, and Jew; Irishman, Latin, or Anglo-Saxon—came to this country and to this Commonwealth for the same reason—because America spelled religious liberty, equal opportunity for all, respect for the dignity of man, and the right of the pursuit of happiness. Today, as these rights are being threatened in many lands, we in America must take every step to preserve our heritage, our decency, our belief in the sanctity of man and of his right to worship his God in his own way. The National Conference of Christians and Jews does this very thing, does it with splendid dignity and high purpose."

If anything, the need for our rededication to these principles is even more imperative today when we see the dignity of man and his religion under such constant attack in different sections of the world. As Archbishop Cushing of Boston so well put it just a few days ago, the age of reverence for God and deference to religion has undergone a radical change "within the last few decades since the atheists of the Kremlin started their murderous march to the west." I have been greatly concerned in recent weeks with the increasing number of letters I have received pressing for intolerant action against this or that group among us, on religious or racial grounds. The purpose of such efforts is to open up the cracks of our misunderstandings and to pour salt into the wounds of our religious differences.

It will require the vigilance of all of us to resist them, but they can and will be resisted and defeated, if there is understanding among the rest of us and a clear view of what they are trying to do. Let me register here my life-long conviction that progress for America and peace for the world are never spelled in letters of hatred nor in words or acts of contempt for other religious and racial groups. America is a land of many colors and creeds. No color—especially communistic Red—and no creed based upon hatred can ever be good for America.

I know that we can live together in unity. We are doing so today. Consider my own State of Massachusetts. We have, I believe, perhaps a greater diversity of population in Massachusetts than in any other State of the Union. The last census showed that we had just over 4,300,000 people. Of those 2,400,000 were born in another country or are the sons and daughters of parents born in another country. Yet our racial problems have been few. They are few. They are few because basically the people want to live together and to understand each other.

In 1938 I was the chairman of our Greater Boston Community Fund. It had just been established. The biggest problem was to get all our citizens to understand what the fund meant to them. In that year we had approximately 10,000 workers and contributions from over 150,000 people. Now there are over 15,000 workers and contributions from over 300,000 people. That means as a practical matter that we are closer together, more cooperative, more understanding of each other in our common cause.

Think of my feelings, therefore, when I was in the governor's office several years later and read a New York newspaper which had printed some stories about racial discrimination and unrest in the city of Boston—stories of blows being struck because of differences in racial and religious feeling. It made me madder than any one other event in the 6 years that I was in that office. But I quickly realized when I quieted down that if there was any cause for social unrest I should find out what was causing it and how it could be eliminated.

I asked the police to investigate and at the same time I called upon a group of very distinguished citizens—three Protestants, three Jews, and three Catholics—to serve as a committee. It made me very happy that everyone whom I asked accepted. They did study the situation. They made a very thorough and complete report. Summed up, that report pointed out clearly that while there had been some youthful destruction of property, there was certainly no organized effort to discredit any segment of our society.

But what pleases me most is that two governors who are Democrats and one Republican governor have continued that committee. Its purpose is a continuing job. Its goal represents an ideal toward which we must continually be striving. I have always felt that the establishment of that committee was one act of which I will ever be proud because it went to the very heart of what we are and want to be in the United States. That committee stresses, as it has from the beginning, that education must be the principal weapon in any struggle for greater understanding in the fight against intolerance. We can pass legislation that may affect our civil rights, but unless we couple with those laws the understanding that comes with education such laws will prove to be mere words and signify little.

That education in brotherhood must begin in the home and in the grammar schools. It must be a part of the everyday routine of our boys and girls. It must reach into the family where the parents discuss the daily doings at the supper table. It must be very constant and continuing because always, we know, there are forces at work to magnify to the greatest possible proportions even the slightest forms of intolerance. It is a part of their plan to divide and conquer. Even if there is no evidence, or such slight evidence as in the case to which I have just referred, it can be manufactured and built into a mountain of trouble.

If we are to settle these formidable questions of 1950 in the best interests of all our people, then all of us, through ever-improved education, must understand them as clearly as we possibly can. We want improved health for all. We need proper education for all. Are we giving the best possible consideration to these two basic desires of every American? Are we building as best we can, in body and mind, our children of today that they may be the intelligent men and women of tomorrow? These men and women of tomorrow will be responsible for the country we are building today. Are we telling them—clearly, often and eloquently—of the great blessings of liberty and freedom? Are we telling them in our schools, on our playgrounds, in our churches, and, above all, in our homes? In all of these places people meet—young and old. They have things to talk about. They want one another's point of view. Much good can come from well-informed conversation at the breakfast table, over the lunch box, and during dinner at home.

Are we telling our people, young and old, that there are still many places in the world where people cannot meet freely, cannot freely discuss what they wish—are being told, in fact, what they must do and say and even think? In those countries they cannot do what they want to do. They do only what their government tells them to do. They are denied free speech; they are denied a free press; they are even denied their dreams.

Are we explaining to our children in school that the United States is an amazingly big country, that in large sections of it we have the farms that provide us with food and fibers and in other places we have wonderful natural resources, the rivers and the mountains, that provide us with abundant power, with fuel, with all those basic materials from which our great industries are built and which make good jobs possible?

We are now in the second month of a new half-century. Think back over the last 50 years since 1900, and many of us can easily do just that. Would you have considered building a garage in 1900, a hangar, or a radio tower, or an airfield? Who would then have known how to construct a concrete road or build a boat of plastic or put shatterproof glass in a windshield? Yet today the building of a garage, a radio tower, an airfield, a concrete road, and the use of shatterproof glass and plastic is just too common for even a news item. It is just too common because we have made conveniences out of the inventions which came from the minds of free men of science, of imagination, of courage, and of willingness to work. We have built up the present-day comforts in our homes through the ingenuity, the imagination, and the hard work of our womenfolk. Who in 1900 would have believed that this country would have to fight and win two disastrous world wars? We have won two world wars because of the same spirit of inventiveness, independence, and the fighting qualities of our young men. These are facts of our national life of which we are proud. These are now part of our heritage.

Do we make it clearly known to our young people that it takes all types of people with these qualities to make up this country of ours and even to make up the social and business community in which each of us lives? Are we telling them, every day and with all our hearts, that all these things are but part of a common cause and a common goal, the better living and greater opportunity for 150,000,000 Americans?

How true it is that we are only young once. Our children only grow up once. Can we ever neglect for a moment that one opportunity to give them as good an education as we can? The boy who grows up today on the tenant farm may become the industrial leader and even the political leader in the city where we work and live 1,500 miles away. If he is to become a good leader, or even if he is to have an opportunity to get ahead in the city where we live, we want him to be as well educated and to have as great an understanding of our problems as it is possible to have. If he has he will be a

better and more understanding leader in our community. His children will have a better understanding of our children because their father and mother understand us.

In the past 6 years, my experiences as a United States Senator have enlarged me way beyond the realization I had when I came to Washington. I had no understanding of how little I really knew about our country. I had lived all my life in Massachusetts. I had worked in the legislature and in the Governor's office in my home State. I felt I knew its problems. When a question arose, I had had long enough experience to be able to have a reasonable understanding of what the proper answer should be.

But, since I came to Washington, the scene has been much enlarged. During the past 5 years I have been to Bikini Lagoon, New Zealand and Australia in the far Pacific, and twice to Europe across the Atlantic. I have made four trips around this great country of ours to speak to Lincoln Day gatherings.

On one of these occasions, I spoke in Denver, Colo. There I addressed men and women who earned their livelihood from wool and others who earned their livelihood from mining silver. As a Massachusetts Senator I had tried to get lower prices for raw wool so that our mills at home might continue to be occupied—so that our workers would have jobs—and so that our consumers might have lower-priced clothing. I had worked for lower prices for bar silver, because we in Massachusetts have silver industries.

Yet here we were in Denver, citizens of the same country, diametrically opposed in our thoughts on these two subjects, so important to the welfare of each group. Yet our common goal was the same: greater opportunity for all in the United States. Those people in Colorado were just as good citizens of the United States as those whom I represented at home. It helped me to discuss their problems with them in their homes and at their meetings.

So, in National Brotherhood Week, we must think not only in terms of religion, in terms of national origin, race, creed, and color—we must try equally to overcome misunderstandings of any kind between sections of this country. We in Maryland or in Massachusetts want to know—we must know—what our fellow citizens in New Mexico, North Dakota or Mississippi are thinking.

We meet here in Baltimore, Md., as the century reaches its turning point. We are working this minute, in this meeting, for a better understanding of each other. But if we leave tonight without also thinking of how we may best do our part for a better understanding among peoples of the world, we are falling far short of our goal.

It is only through peace that we can realize the ultimate security. Only if the world is at peace can there be any freedom and opportunity. Now as the months roll by we are learning that this security and peace do not come easily and are not alone the result of victory in war. The science and the skill that won our victory have produced in doing so a bomb of terrible destructive power. It is clear that men's hearts must hold the answer to peace, if these are the products of men's minds.

If we reflect for a moment, we remember that it took 13 years from the signing of the Declaration of Independence to establish a working government under Constitution and its Bill of Rights. So I say to you tonight that no matter how bitter our disappointments may be, we must never give up the principle upon which we have established the United Nations. To give up that principle means defeat and disaster.

I want the United Nations to work. So do you. And it is working. If, however, it is to be the success we pray for, we ourselves must work with it and for it even harder. The will to peace is the vital element in any peace effort, such a will to peace represents itself in resolutions such as were submitted last week in Washington for extension of the structure of the United Nations and in proposals just a few days ago for consideration of disarmament, of international inspection, and of direct peace talks. Whether or not we agree with details of such proposals is not important. They represent essentially that will to peace that is not so clearly apparent among all world leaders but which must exist if we are to live with each other in this world of ours. Likewise the will to peace may require us to be as strongly armed as we may be, firm in the positions we take, and resolute in our determination; still that will to peace must be ever clear.

In order, then, for you and me to give this will to peace real strength, we must try to open every door to better understanding among the peoples of all nations. This is our fundamental task. Whatever may be the tendencies of some around us, you and I must dedicate ourselves continually to the policy of the open mind and the open door of good will to those citizens of all nations who really want peace.

Former Secretary of State Marshall, in a speech before the General Assembly of the United Nations several years ago, stated:

"Systematic and deliberate denials of basic human rights lie at the root of most of our troubles and threaten the work of the United Nations. It is not only fundamentally wrong that millions of men and women live in daily terror of secret police, subject to seizure, imprisonment, or forced labor without just cause and without fair trial, but these wrongs have repercussions in the community of nations. Governments which systematically disregard the rights of their own people are not likely to respect the rights of other nations and other people and are likely to seek their objectives by coercion and force in the international field."

What General Marshall stated so well is the unexpressed thought in the minds of us all. That is why we are here tonight. That is why in these few moments we want to rededicate our thoughts to the principles which underlie our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and its peerless Bill of Rights.

We must all be ever vigilant to expose dangers which threaten our American unity. We who believe in the American ideal must endeavor to unhold this form of government that makes that ideal live. For this is the government and the land of equal liberties, equal freedom in religion, in the press and in assembly. Cooperation of Jews, of Catholics, and of Protestants in the defense of American democracy, when it is active in our homes, in our schools, in our churches, and in every part of our land, is the living basis of good will and understanding.

Five years ago this week, a handful of American boys raised our flag on Mount Surabachi on Iwo Jima. I have talked with some of those boys. The six men who participated in that heroic deed were Pfc Ira H. Hayes, of Arizona, a full-blooded Pima Indian; Pfc Rene A. Gagnon, of New Hampshire; Navy Ph. M. John H. Bradley, of Wisconsin; Pfc Franklin R. Sousley, of Kentucky; Sgt. Michel Strank, of Pennsylvania; and Sgt. Henry O. Hansen, of Massachusetts. You all know that picture. We all know in our hearts what it represents.

That incident will always remain the symbol of American courage and hardihood, the symbol of what is possible when we work together with a common understanding in a common cause. It is the symbol of our constant fight to maintain liberty and freedom. It is the symbol which we must foster and hold before us in our fight for a greater unity and a better understanding among young and old Americans throughout this country. Then, and only then, can we bring to its finest flower this common cause that is our United States.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 96—PART 14

FEBRUARY 28, 1950, TO APRIL 20, 1950

(PAGES A1449 TO A2862)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1950

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

Pricing Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, looking at the history of the investigations and orders of the Federal Trade Commission in reference to basing point practices, it is easy to feel that our real trouble is with a faulty interpretation of the antitrust laws by our administrative bodies and the courts. It is true that the philosophy and theory of economic practice held by some of the lawyers in the Department of Justice and by representatives of the Federal Trade Commission do not seem to square with what industry generally regards as good economic practice, which will be referred to later.

However, it is plain that the trouble goes deeper than that. The trouble comes, I think, from basically unsound provisions in our antitrust laws. These provisions lead to confusing interpretations which have produced serious results.

The present antitrust law incorporates the amendments of the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936. When that legislation was pending in the House of Representatives, a member of the conference committee handling the bill stated: "You might as well know that this bill contains many inconsistencies and the courts will have the devil's own job to unravel the tangle." That has proven to be the case. We have had such a welter of decisions, both by the Federal Trade Commission and the courts, that lawyers scarcely know how to advise their clients.

The law as it now stands provides, in part, as follows:

United States Code, section 13 (a): It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce * * * to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality * * * where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly—or to injure or destroy or prevent competition. * * *

Section 13 (b): Upon proof being made * * * that there has been discrimination * * * the burden of rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section * * * provided, however, that nothing contained in * * * this title shall prevent a seller rebutting a prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor.

In the first Cement case, the Federal Trade Commission entered an order against the multiple basing point delivered price of cement. The court of appeals set it aside on September 20, 1946. In that case the court of appeals said:

Numerous bills have been introduced in Congress, seeking to outlaw the basing-price price system. Countless time has been spent in hearings by congressional committees before whom it has been assailed and defended. The pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD bear mute but indisputable proof of the fact that Congress has repeatedly refused to declare its use illegal. * * * Notwithstanding this congressional attitude * * * this court is now urged to hold that this system is illegal per se * * * and to require that cement be sold on an f. o. b. basis. In our judgment, the question of whether the basing-point price system should be declared illegal rests clearly within the legislative domain.

However, the Supreme Court of the United States in the last Cement case held that the basing-point price system followed by the cement industry resulted in unlawful discriminations which substantially lessened competition and tended to create a monopoly in commerce. The Supreme Court did not agree with the court of appeals in the first Cement case that the question of illegality was one solely for Congress.

There were elements in the Cement case bearing on the point of conspiracy in restraint of trade which might not be found present in the pricing situation in other industries. These elements certainly contributed heavily to the final decision of the Supreme Court. Perhaps the basing point price systems of other industries would not be found to be unlawfully discriminatory. Basic industry, however, cannot be left in a state of uncertainty dependent upon what the Federal Trade Commission and the courts might declare in the future as to past practices.

Therefore, it seems clear that the problem should be attacked at its source and a good look taken at the provisions of the antitrust laws. Unfortunately, as long as any degree of uncertainty exists, the various schools of economic thinking move farther and farther apart. Since one school is represented by the present official attitude of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice, supported by the language of the Supreme Court in the Cement case, it will be profitable to take a look at their philosophy on the basing point price question.

At a symposium under the Robinson-Patman Act held in New York on January 22, 1947, the associate general counsel of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Walter B. Woodin, was asked the following question:

If (a manufacturer) ships into territory where he has to absorb some kind of freight in order to sell at all, is it your view that his action reduces competition and is inherently collusive?

Answer:

I would say that setting up a system in which not merely two but all members of the industry indulge in that systematic form of freight absorption, there is ground for the inference that it is the purpose to accomplish * * * indentity of delivered price, and, that being so, it raises a serious question under the statute whether that is good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor.

Mr. Woodin further stated:

They (manufacturers) are not at liberty under the law, as I see it, to go into distant markets and take less for their commodity than they get at home if the result be adverse to the interests of competition.

Whereupon, he was asked this question:

Would not the inevitable result of that theory be to destroy this country as a national economic unit and to break it up into a series of little "Balkan" principalities, each one of which would be dominated by local competitors—which would have definite boundary lines determined by freight, so that other people living outside any of those areas could not ship into an area which, freightwise, is nearer some mill other than their own?

Mr. Woodin answered:

A mill which cannot profitably absorb freight into a certain market by rail could profitably absorb it and could sell into that market and deliver into that market if they adopt a cheaper form of transportation.

He said further:

I personally have no enthusiasm about making a price level high enough to permit

everybody to sell everywhere * * * the question is whether we must have a national market for all of our products, or should have a national market for all of our products. Why not a series of sectional markets into which the people who can deliver there at the lowest cost because of their proximity to the delivery point? Why shouldn't they have a monopoly there, since you want to call it that, but it will consist only and result only from the fact that they are able to make a lower price that would keep other people out.

He was then asked:

If you had the country divided into separate economic units or little "Balkan" principalities, what motive would there be for any one inhabitant of any one of those "Balkan" countries to invade the territory of another? Would you not have in the end a far more rigid structure than you have at the present time because there would be no incentive to break that down?

Mr. Woodin answered:

I don't see how it can be any more rigid than we had it at the time when the cement base price went through the depression and for 5 years afterward without a change of 1 cent.

He was then asked:

But if the Commission * * * put every one of those cement mills in straitjackets so that they could not lawfully ship into territory where they did not have the advantage in freight rates, do you think there would be any greater flexibility in cement prices?

Mr. Woodin answered:

I certainly do, and, in addition to flexibility, there would be a lower level. This whole delivered price philosophy makes the freight advantage the sole determinant * * * and that means that all the other advantages, consisting of differences in efficiency and manufacture and things of that kind, are simply swallowed up. They are not given the effect that they would have under a real competitive system.

Mr. Woodin further stated:

There is no way I know of in economics or law, and it probably isn't desirable anyway, to prevent the manufacturer that has the advantage in delivered cost from using it to make a lower price and keep his competitor across the country out of his market. I think it might be very desirable that he do so.

I have set forth these questions and answers at some length because I have not found any place a better statement of the underlying thinking of some of the representatives of our Government agencies on this particular point.

The question is whether or not, as a matter of economic development, Balkanizing the country from a business standpoint will produce lower prices than we now have under our basing-point systems. In some instances, there is no question but that it will increase prices. For example, take a basic commodity manufacturer who has no competition within a fairly large area. He will certainly raise his prices to the point where they will be just under a competitor's f. o. b. mill price plus freight.

But, in addition to the higher prices resulting from the Balkanization of the country, is the further fact that, for instance, a fabricator of steel will not know what his price is. If he is located in Youngstown, Ohio, his delivered steel price from Sharon and Youngstown will be less than his delivered steel price from Pittsburgh.

The development of the basing-point system of distributing basic commodities answered just that objection. The entire American economic system is based upon the historic patterns of distribution which have grown up over the years in American industry. I think it can be fairly said that the delivered-price system is a thoroughly American way of handling the distribution of basic commodities over large continental areas. No other nation has such widely dispersed production like we have. In no other country is the influence of a large continental area a real factor. Basing-point or delivery pricing is a system which industry and the public generally have considered good from an economic standpoint.

Thus, we have before us a first-class conflict between what people like us regard as sound business practice and what our administrative bodies and the United States Supreme Court regard as practice contrary to public policy.

We are never going to get the question settled until this conflict is reconciled. It seems to me it could be reconciled by amending the antitrust laws to provide that absorption of delivery costs will not be discrimination within the meaning of the first part of section 13 (a) and will not be prima facie evidence of a conspiracy in restraint of trade.

Perhaps nothing more would be required than an amendment to section 13 (a) or 13 (b), as follows:

Provided further, That nothing contained in this title shall prevent a seller from absorbing delivery costs in good faith to meet or better the price of a competitor.

This follows language of section 13 (b) except that it reads "to meet or better" rather than "to meet." We have some court decisions which hold that the language of the present law means only "to meet" and not "to better."

In suggesting the above amendment to the present law, I have not overlooked other serious questions involved. From time to time, it has been proven that reduced prices, freight absorption, and the granting of services or facilities, have been used by sellers to lessen competition by driving out competitors; and this practice has contributed to the growth of monopoly. Therefore, the law must express a public policy against this and similar practices.

The amendment only makes it possible for a seller to absorb delivery costs in good faith to meet or better the price competition. The seller, under the suggested amendment, would still have to get as much for his product at a distant point as he gets at the mill location. He could, however, absorb delivery costs in every market in the country, to meet competition.

It seems to me further that this type of amendment would meet a good portion of the objection of the opposing school of thought, which is, in Mr. Woodin's words:

This whole delivered-price philosophy makes the freight advantage the sole determinant * * * and that means that all the other advantages, consisting of differences in efficiency and manufacture and things of that kind are simply swallowed up.

Permitting a seller to absorb freight in good faith to meet or better the price of a competitor would not make freight advantage the sole determinant.

The Coal Situation

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to once again remind the leadership of the Congress of the very serious situation confronting the Nation today because of the existing coal strike. I full well realize that this subject must be on the minds of many other Members of this body at this very moment. I am certain that I speak for a great many of them, and further I am very certain that I speak for the minority membership.

On January 6, 1950, I went to the White House to urge that the President recognize the serious situation existing and that he use his offices to prevent further human as well as economic suffering. This plea fell on deaf ears. On the following Monday, January 9, in company with many of my colleagues, I attended a meeting of the Members of the Congress from the Middle West to study what steps should be taken to remedy the situation. I am constrained to state that the attendance at that meeting was made up almost entirely of Members of the Republican Party.

On January 12, 1950, I introduced a concurrent resolution, along with several other Members of the Congress, directing the President that it was the sense of the Congress that he should take necessary remedial action.

On that same date I asked that the House consider these resolutions.

On January 26 I took the floor of this House and asked the Speaker to join with the leadership of the Senate in requesting the President of the United States to take the necessary action which would bring relief to the Nation. I explained then and in the past that the Congress had given the President the authority to act.

Now again today I make the plea to recognize the situation we have allowed the Nation to be placed in.

I believe that the people of this Nation are entitled to know the facts concerning the efforts we of the minority have made to forestall the crisis we have today:

First. We have asked the President to act. He has refused to do so until such a late date that the situation is completely out of hand and the health, safety, and welfare of the people have been seriously jeopardized.

Second. The leadership of this House as well as the leadership of the United States Senate are in that position because they have large working majorities in both of the Houses of Congress. This leadership enjoys a personal conference with the President at least once each week. They either have failed to discuss this question with the President or they have failed to convince the President, who is of the same political faith as they, that he should act.

Third. Failing this, this same Democratic leadership has failed to take any action in the Congress. We must all know that they, and they alone, can take such action for they are the leaders of the majority party. We of the minority cannot even have our pleas considered because we are lacking in voting strength.

I have pointed out the above situation so as to make clear where the blame rests in this crisis and who must bear the responsibility for it. There is only one answer and that is the administration and the administration's leadership in the Congress.

I am certain that many, many Members will join with me in stating clearly that we have not in the past nor will we be guilty in the future of sacrificing the prestige of the Government on the political altar to gain political favor with group selfishness.

I state once and for all that I, as well as many Members of the Congress have taken every action possible to have obviated this coal situation, but our hands have thus far been tied, and they have been tied by the President and the Democratic leadership of the House and Senate of the Congress of the United States.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Happenings in Washington," delivered by me on February 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 19)

My fellow Pennsylvanians, this is ED MARTIN speaking to you from the Nation's Capital and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

Congress has begun work on a new tax bill—a matter which affects every home and every individual in the United States.

There has been a great deal of misunderstanding about Federal taxes because they are divided into two main classifications—direct taxes, such as the income tax, and hidden taxes, which are included in the price of everything we buy.

Even those in the low-income brackets who pay no Federal income tax at all are not tax exempt. Many others who are subject to income taxes are not aware of how much more the Government is taking from their pockets through concealed taxation.

If our people realized that all of them, even those on the relief rolls, are paying heavy Federal taxes—then taxes all around would be lower today. Because, then, our people would rise up unanimously and would demand less spending and less waste in government.

You all know where I stand. I am a member of the Senate Finance Committee, which handles all tax legislation. On that committee I have been fighting consistently for lower taxes and government at lower cost. On the Senate floor and in public and private meetings I have been trying to make our people understand that taxes can be reduced only if the Government spending is cut down.

I think you will remember that during my term as Governor of Pennsylvania, we were able to reduce State taxes by $322,900,000. This was done despite increased appropriations for health, education, welfare, conservation, stream clearance, and mental and penal institutions.

At present, the Ways and Means Committee of the House is conducting hearings on the new tax bill which will include reduction of some of the Federal excise taxes. I have been fighting to reduce those taxes since I came to Washington. And I have been fighting to reduce and to disclose to the public the hidden taxes they pay, the ones they are not even aware of.

These excises and hidden taxes are not soak-the-rich taxes. They are poor man's taxes. They hit the poor harder than they hit the rich. I'll prove that to you in a moment.

Let us consider first the excise situation which affects every one of you. You pay it when you buy a radio set, when you go to the movies, when you buy an electric refrigerator, when you buy a wedding ring, an alarm clock, or an electric-light bulb.

You pay it when you buy a lipstick, or talcum powder, or even the oils and creams to soothe the chafed skin of a young baby.

You pay it on your monthly telephone bill, your gas and electric bill, your railroad or bus ticket, and when you send a telegram. You pay taxes on a thousand other things used in your daily living. This Government calls them luxuries.

They are unfair. They are discriminatory. All too often they are without rhyme or reason. And they hit the little fellow harder than the man with money.

I could go on indefinitely with these things. Now how is the little man hit? Well, it doesn't matter if you earned a million dollars or only a thousand dollars in 1949, you've got to pay the same tax for shaving lotion and baby oil, and telephone bills, and many other necessities of daily living.

These taxes have no relation to what you earn. They fall far more heavily on the poor man than on the man with a high income.

I want to assure you that I shall work without let-up in the Senate Finance Committee toward getting rid of these taxes. And I suggest that you write to your Congressmen and make your views known, too. Now is the time to do it.

Some of the excises are hidden taxes. By that I mean you do not pay them directly as tax, the way you do when you buy a woman's handbag, a wrist watch, or a can of talcum powder.

These excises are paid by the manufacturer but are concealed in the total purchase price you pay. You are not told that a part of the price is made up of taxes. All you know is that prices are high. You blame it on the manufacturer, and the dealer, without realizing how much is tax.

There are other concealed taxes, in addition to the excises.

I want to call attention particularly at this time to all these hidden taxes. They are part of the price of everything you buy: food, clothing, shelter, fuel and light, insurance, amusements, and even streetcar transportation.

I think that our people should make clear to Congress that they want as many as possible of the hidden taxes eliminated and that they want to know what taxes they pay. They don't want to be fooled.

Let me point out the huge amount of taxes which are concealed but which you pay just the same.

A recent survey disclosed that the cost of a pair of shoes includes no less than 502 hidden or indirect taxes. Can you imagine that?

That should give the mother who buys shoes for three or four children something to think about. She pays the taxes on the shoe factory, the machinery, the leather, the canvas lining of the shoes, the rubber heels, and everything else that entered into the making of the shoes. Can you imagine how much cheaper the shoes would be without those hidden taxes?

And let me remind you that shoes used to be cheaper back in the days before all the taxes were loaded on by the Federal, State, and local governments.

In the cost of a loaf of bread there are 151 different, distinct and separate taxes. In a quart of milk, 78 taxes. In a plow, 142 taxes. In a woman's cotton dress, 125 taxes. In a cake of soap, 154 different taxes. In a woman's hat, 150 taxes.

And in an egg—one of those surplus eggs that the Government buys up and stores in caves in the ground—100 different hidden taxes.

Do you know that about 25 percent of the rent you pay is hidden taxes?

All of these things were cheaper when taxes were lower and fewer. They will be cheaper again, if the public insists that the Government tax less and spend less.

Consider a new automobile. It has 208 hidden taxes. Suppose you buy a new car for about $1,600. Well, your taxes on that car—most of them hidden and indirect—come to about $350. Without those taxes you could buy the same automobile for $1,250.

Recently a research group made a study of how these hundreds of hidden taxes affect the little man.

It found a family of four whose only income was $80 a month. Imagine trying to live on that, without any taxes at all.

That family spent every penny trying to live. And of the $80 which it spent each month, $10.29 was taken away in hidden taxes. That poor family was paying out in taxes $123.48 a year.

Another survey was made of a family of four making $300 a month. That family paid out $36.23 each month in hidden taxes on food, clothing, shelter, and so on. It paid concealed taxes of $314.76 a year.

Here is an interesting angle. Neither of the wage earners were required to pay a penny in income taxes. Apparently they were tax exempt, but did not realize how much of their small income was actually being taken away by these painless, hidden taxes.

They thought the Government was not taxing them at all. They were unaware that 13 cents out of every dollar was quietly taken away from them by these hidden taxes.

In the same manner so many of our people are being fooled today.

Let us trace one of these items and see what is meant by hidden taxes. Take the cotton dress which has 125 different taxes by the time your wife buys it in the store.

You must start back with the bale of cotton. There are taxes on the land, on the farming implements, for the school district,

etc. These are included as part of the cost of raising the cotton and are passed along in the price of the bale.

Then at the cotton gin many other taxes are added and passed on to the plant where the cotton is spun and woven.

Then there is the factory where the dress is made which adds its taxes and passes them along to the wholesaler in the coat. And, of course, the accessories—the buttons and the trimmings—all came up from raw material and gathered taxes on the way.

The wholesaler has his taxes and the retailer has his. In order for them to make a profit and stay in business, these taxes must be added to the cost of the dress. Your wife pays.

It has been figured out that a simple cotton dress, costing $7.65 has no less than $2.20 worth of hidden taxes included in the price.

Why do we have all these hidden taxes? Why must they be piled up on top of the excise taxes, direct and indirect, and the heavy Federal income tax?

The answer is simple. We have them because of the high cost of Government.

We have them because the Federal Government is spending the people's earnings at the rate of more than $42,000,000,000 a year while State and local governments add more than twenty billion to the total.

We have them because we are burdened with a national debt that now stands at more than $258,000,000,000, and is climbing higher.

We have them because the administration had abandoned all thought of a balanced budget and is committed to a program of sustained deficit financing.

And finally we have them because the administration does not dare let the people realize how heavily they are being taxed to meet the reckless spending.

So they conceal part of the taxes. And when taxes are hidden, they can be pushed on to more people. They can be—and are—foisted on to low-income people as well as those with higher incomes. And the low-income groups don't realize how much they are being taxed.

That is shrewd political trickery. It has been figured out very cleverly. Tax the rich man where it shows—on his corporation and his large income. It makes the people who aren't rich, and that's most of us, feel they are being favored.

Tax the poor man where it doesn't show, with hidden taxes that he doesn't realize he is being forced to pay.

There you have the formula which has emerged from this administration. Tax the rich where it shows and the poor where it doesn't show.

These things are something for you to think about.

And, if you ever want to get out from under this tax burden, they are something for you to shout about and act about.

Just as long as you fool yourselves that the Government is giving you a lot of things free, you are going to continue to pay these taxes.

This is Ed Martin, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

United States Headed for Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial which appeared in the American Press in the February 1950 issue. This emphatically indicates that an overwhelming majority, 78 percent of the weekly newspaper editors of the Nation, fear that the United States is headed for socialism. This is another danger signal which should be heeded, so that this disastrous trend may be reversed.

The editorial follows:

SEVENTY-EIGHT PERCENT OF COUNTRY EDITORS FEAR UNITED STATES IS HEADED FOR SOCIALISM

This startling fact was unearthed by the American Press magazine as the result of a poll which it has been conducting for the primary purpose of finding out what the weekly newspaper editors of the United States think it is most important for Congress to accomplish at the present session.

The 3-page questionnaire, which was answered by over 500 editors representing every State in the Union, concluded with the question, "Do you fear that our Nation is headed toward socialism?" All but 22 percent answered "Yes."

The fear seems to be based on what many of the editors refer to as welfare-state measures, as well as on the size of the national debt, huge Government costs and an unbalanced budget. Many believe that Congress' action on compulsory health-insurance legislation will determine whether or not we are going socialistic. Eighty-nine percent of the editors expressed opposition to this measure.

GOVERNMENT FINANCES

But of greatest immediate concern is Government finances. In answer to the question: "What do you consider to be the two most important things for Congress to accomplish at the new session?" 70 percent demanded a balanced budget, reduction of Government costs, or cuts in Federal pay rolls.

Although tax reforms were considered second most important need, only 21 percent asked for immediate tax reductions, regardless of whether or not the budget is balanced. Many of those felt that if taxes were reduced reduction in Government costs would thus be forced.

Thirty-nine percent said they favored tax reductions only if the budget can be balanced and another 36 percent advised leaving taxes as high as they are and create a surplus, if possible, to pay off the debt; 3 percent of the editors favored increasing taxes to meet the debt. But 85 percent would like to see the tax laws rewritten and simplified.

In addition to Government costs and finances, the five next most important things for Congress to do, in the opinion of the editors are:

Enact reforms proposed by Hoover Commission.

Curb welfare-state bills.

Strengthen and clarify foreign policy.

Strengthen and streamline defense; take action to restore the confidence of business in the future.

Sentiments of many of the editors were expressed by 359 who commented, "Unless our Government ceases to be the world's worst businessman, our burdens will continue to increase until a breaking point is reached. Why can't our so-called elected Representatives stop playing politics long enough to see the danger signs and get some sensible laws enacted to encourage free enterprise? What does a young man starting out have to look forward to under the present set-up? They, the lawmakers, seem to have forgotten the basic principles which have made this country as great and strong as it is to date."

Among the country editors, whose combined newspapers have a readership of around 70,000,000 people, only a handful of those replying to the questionnaire indicated general approval of the administration's domestic programs, but many felt that Congress was too steeped in politics to do anything about it. Fourteen of those replying to the question about the most important thing for Congress to do gave the facetious answer, "Go home" or "Adjourn," and many said, "Forget politics."

Remarks by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, on the Signing of the Niagara Diversion Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I issued yesterday in connection with the signing, on February 27, 1950, of the Niagara Diversion Treaty between the United States and Canada.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to learn of the signature of the long-awaited treaty between Canada and the United States covering the added diversions from the Niagara River. This treaty has been signed as a supplement to the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 and as such carries out the promise given in that treaty for the use of the waters of the Niagara for the benefit of the peoples of the United States and Canada.

Under the terms of Executive agreements entered into during the course of the war, Canada has already been receiving the benefits of more water diversions than the United States. This was necessary at the time in order to permit Canada to make her great contribution to the common war effort.

Now we in the United States have the opportunity to make use of the great potential riches with which nature endowed us in the from of the Niagara. The drop of the Niagara waters from the level of Lake Erie to the level of Lake Ontario provides us with potentials for power as great or greater than the greatest hydro-power works in all of the United States. We can expect to be able to develop from these waters an increase of 1,132,000 kilowatts or 7,900,000,000 kilowatt-hours above the amount which we are already deriving from the Niagara. All this will be done, according to the terms of the treaty, without diminishing in any way the great scenic beauties of the Niagara Falls which have been the pride of New York State and of the United States for more than a century.

This development promises to the people of New York State a great new source of cheap power—power for farms, for homes, and for factories. New sources of electric energy and new comforts may be provided for tens of thousands of our farm dwellers and new employment to hundreds of thousands of our city workers.

I and all of us who have been working and studying the Niagara water-power development envison this development as a source of power in association with that other great source of power potential in the same river basin, the St. Lawrence. If these two great projects are progressively and speedily brought into actual operation, not only New York State but all of the Northeast will be direct beneficiaries of this vast new source of man-saving energy. Of course New York State will receive the most immediate and the greatest direct benefit, but through these power projects there can be a new flowering of this entire area and a new dynamic growth in the entire region. No mere compilation of kilowatt-hours can describe the great additions to our national riches which are now in sight.

For many years I have been hoping for the day when these vast benefits for the people could begin to be derived from the Niagara. Many of the pioneers in hydroelectric development have been working for long years on this project. Many men have dreamed great dreams of what the Niagara could do for the people. Now these hopes, this work, and these dreams are one step closer to realization.

I shall press for the speedy ratification of this treaty when it is submitted to the Senate. The people of New York have reason to hail this day as a great day. The people of the Nation should likewise take note.

Relations Between Ireland and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock, published in the New York Times of February 28, 1950, commenting on a dinner in honor of Sean Nunan, retiring Minister of Eire.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—GILDING AN ANCIENT LINK BETWEEN TWO CAPITALS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—There was a stag dinner party tonight in honor of Sean Nunan, the retiring Minister of Eire, and certain recent developments suffused the occasion with an unusual degree of the wit and sentiment that always prevail when those of Irish stock foregather. This highly respected envoy was returning to Dublin, to the No. 2 post in the Foreign Office; his legation here and ours in Eire had been raised to embassies; the present United States Minister, George A. Garrett, was to be our first Ambassador to the Republic; and everyone was saying good things about Ireland's first Ambassador to Washington, John J. Hearne.

What more could possibly have been needed to make a warm-hearted occasion, further considering that Irishmen, transplanted or growing native, were those principally concerned?

The American politicians who attended must have come with a special glow under their shirt fronts. For long has it been known that the most popular thing an American politician can do, whatever his origin, unless his constituents are all descendants of the invading breed at Boyne Water and still embattled with King James, is to praise the Irish. Even in heavily Anglo-Saxon Mississippi the late Senator Byron Patton Harrison was the more beloved because he signed himself and was known only as Pat.

This sentimental warmth of feeling in the United States toward the Irish has been notably displayed once more by the welcome Washington gave to the news that the legation of Eire has been raised to an embassy. Except for the Vatican, where for 2 years there has been an Ambassador of Eire, the only major diplomatic post created by Dublin is the new one here.

DE VALERA'S VIEW

It is not the fault of the United States that the elevation was not made some years ago. But Eamon de Valera throughout the days of his primacy was, by the Washington test, the most unpopular type of administrator—he believed a nation should live within its income and also be frugal in spending the public revenues. Apparently on that same policy the Swiss maintain only a ministry here. An embassy costs more to operate than a legation, particularly in this Capital. And, though doubtless Mr. de Valera had other reasons for keeping only a Minister here when nearly every other small country in the world was substituting Ambassadors, his fiscal policy was always understood to be important among them.

Whatever his reasons, the envoy of Eire continued for a long time to follow in the protocols, and sit at dinner tables below the envoys of countries which were savage-infested wildernesses when St. Patrick was writing Fold Flada, "The Cry of the Deer"; still were when Pierce Ferriter, last hold-out against Cromwell, who hanged him in 1653, was writing his poems; and were not much more when Owen Roe O'Sullivan's Jacobite verses were the vogue in 1790. Now, with the elevation of the Eire legate, there are to be 14 out of 52 in the diplomatic corps with the rank of Minister whom he will outrank in the capital of a nation which has so many links with his own.

In the protocols Ambassador Hearne will take his place just after the Ambassador of Guatemala and 10 files below the Ambassador of Israel, whose advent to Washington from the nation that reemerged from the rubble of history was the most romantic experience of the diplomatic corps here until the creation of an Irish Ambassador. Incidentally, both events touch on the statement by George William Russell that "after the spiritual powers there is nothing in the world more unconquerable than the spirit of nationality [which] * * * in Ireland will persist even though the mightiest of material powers be its neighbor."

CAREFULLY NEGOTIATED

There is no reason to believe that the pleasure in Washington over the new accord with Eire exceeds that in Dublin, or that Mr. Garrett's promotion is less popular there than here. He earned it on his official record of cooperation and accomplishment in the common interest of the two countries, and the new Ambassadress has won as many golden opinions as he has.

As dispatches to this newspaper have noted, an Irish heroine figures in the proceedings, which is traditional in the history of the land where, in County Roscommon, she was born. An enthusiastic Washington dispatch and the headline over it last Saturday related how Miss Mary Cummings, manager of the 1925 F Street Club, had made a one-woman campaign with high personages in Washington to elevate the two legations and to assure Mr. Garrett got the recognition he deserved.

But, despite the soft and gallant impeachment, it would be a mistake to assume that such matters are determined in clubs—either here or in Dublin—or that the President, acting somewhat like a kindly oriental despot, decides on Ambassadors because of such zeal as Miss Cummings displayed in this instance.

The transition of the legations to embassies was carefully negotiated for some time by the Department of State and the Department for External Affairs in Dublin, and then officially recommended to the President and the Prime Minister. Mr. Garrett was not only promoted on his record; he had many powerful endorsements from Democratic leaders in Congress.

What Miss Cummings did was to make sure that nobody forgot to see both things through. Including, by the way, the President.

Jaycee Distinguished Service Award to Alfred James Dickinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement in connection with the Jaycee distinguished service award to Alfred James Dickinson, of Richmond, Va., who was named the outstanding young man of Virginia for 1949 by the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce.

This is a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Dickinson and is a very high compliment, as this annual award by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Virginia is made only after the most exhaustive investigation and consideration to see that it is based upon merit, and is fully deserved.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANVILLE, February 26.—Alfred James Dickinson, 33, of Richmond, tonight was named the outstanding young man of Virginia for 1949 by the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce. Announcement of the recipient was made by Atty. Gen. J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., at a banquet in Hotel Danville for directors and members of the Virginia junior chamber.

Attorney General Almond served with Dr. Dabney S. Lancaster, president of Longwood College, and Russell B. Newton, president of Dan River Mills, as judges in the selection of Mr. Dickinson to receive the Jaycee distinguished service award. Mr. Dickinson was nominated by Walter B. Gillette. Robert L. Stone, of Richmond, was Jaycee chairman of the distinguished service award committee.

Mr. Dickinson, who last month was named Richmond's outstanding young man of 1949, has actively encouraged young men to take an interest in community and civic affairs. As president of the general alumni association of the University of Richmond, he urged the younger alumni to become active in alumni affairs. And as a member of the Richmond central committee of the American Legion, he emphasized the need for veterans to maintain unselfish motives. He has also given much time to obtaining financial aid for young men seeking higher education.

A native of Eufaula, Ala., Mr. Dickinson attended high school in Newport News. He was graduated from the University of Richmond in 1937 and from the Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration in 1939.

He became personal assistant to the comptroller of the Virginia-Carolina Chemical

Corp. in 1939. Following service with the FBI and the Marine Corps, Air Combat Intelligence, he returned to the purchasing department of the Virginia-Carolina Chemical Corp. where he was named acting manager in May 1947, and manager in July 1948.

His civic associations include: President, Richmond Junior Chamber of Commerce; past commander, American Legion Post 210, Richmond; and a member of American Red Cross, Richmond Tuberculosis Association, Public Relations Club of Richmond, Harvard Club of Virginia, Country Club of Virginia, Phi Beta Kappa, Omicron Delta Kappa, and Phi Gamma Delta. He is also a worker in the Richmond area community chest.

Mr. Dickinson is married and has two children.

Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, there appeared in the February 27 edition of the Evening Star an editorial entitled "A Valuable Publicity Medium," which points out one of the fine services rendered by the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as it is of value to the Congress and the people of the Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VALUABLE PUBLICITY MEDIUM

Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, wants to abolish the Byrd Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures on the ground that it is used only as a publicity medium. But a lot of people who are more worried about Federal spending than Senator HUMPHREY seems to be will contend that the committee's publicity activities are a very good reason for continuing it in existence.

It is true that Senator BYRD and his colleagues of the joint group have publicized freely and often the inefficiencies and extravagances of the Government. The committee has kept the spotlight focused on the growing size of the executive establishment, a trend that is all the more disturbing in view of the fact that the war emergency ended nearly 5 years ago. It is hard to measure the benefits of this publicity in specific terms. There is good cause to believe, however, that the watchdog role of the Byrd committee has had a restraining effect not only on the departments and independent agencies but on Congress as well.

To those who regard governmental retrenchment and thrift as old-fashioned and unnecessary, the joint committee's frequent reports on Federal expansion and spending are understandably irritating. That, in itself, is as good an argument as any for making certain that the committee keeps up the good work. The relatively small cost of maintaining this congressional publicity medium is a profitable investment, the returns on which in terms of administrative savings can be large indeed.

Displaced Persons Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to displaced persons legislation, from the Labor Record, of Joliet, Ill., for February 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFL AND CIO REAFFIRM SUPPORT OF LIBERALIZED DP LEGISLATION

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations have recently reaffirmed their stand in favor of liberalizing the Displaced Persons Act.

The CIO voiced its approval of a DP bill submitted by Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, Democrat, of West Virginia, as substitute legislation for the bill previously reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee by its chairman, Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada.

Both AFL and CIO reiterated their support of H. R. 4567, which is the liberalizing legislation enacted by the House of Representatives last session. In addition, they stated their opposition to amendments which seeks to prohibit further admissions of displaced persons whenever unemployment in the United States reaches 4,000,000 or whenever the number of married couples living in doubled-up dwelling units exceeds 2,000,000.

CIO Legislative Director Nathan Cowan declared: "We call upon the Senate to carry forward in the American tradition of equity, justice, and recognition of human dignity by passing at the earliest possible moment the substitute displaced persons bill offered by Senator KILGORE and his colleagues."

The AFL executive council issued a statement pointing out that the AFL would be the first to protest against legislation which actually undermines the job security of American workers or which really restricts their housing opportunities.

"But we know from experience," the AFL statement read, "that the admission of displaced persons at a limited rate, widely dispersed throughout the country and in practice dispatched to areas of labor shortage, does not in any way jeopardize employment opportunities of American workers nor seriously aggravate housing shortages."

KILGORE submitted his substitute bill with a minority report on the Judiciary Committee's displaced-persons bill. The report indicated that a majority of the committee members now favor amendments to the present DP law which are more liberal than those contained in the committee bill. Senators FRANK P. GRAHAM, Democrat, of North Carolina, and HOMER FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, joined with Senator KILGORE in signing the minority report. In addition, Senators WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, and ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, signed a supplemental statement associating themselves with the views of the minority report, and two other Senators, HERBERT R. O'CONOR, Democrat, of Maryland, and ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, filed a separate statement in which they advocated liberalizing the committee bill.

The substitute bill provides for the admission of 339,000 displaced persons, as in the House bill; retention of the International Refugee Organization definition of displaced person, which does not include German expellees; removal of the 40 percent—so-called Baltic—preference, the 30-percent agricultural requirement, and the in-camp priority; a more economic administration of the law; and a bar against the issuance of any visa to any person who has or does adhere to, advocate, and follow "the principles of any political and economic system or philosophy directed toward the destruction of free competitive enterprise and the revolutionary overthrow of representative governments."

Organized Gambling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from a very fine west Texas newspaper, the San Angelo Standard-Times, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial, entitled "Gambling Problem," points up a growing national problem which Congress and the Nation must meet and solve in the near future.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GAMBLING PROBLEM

The situation with respect to organized gambling, to which Mr. Truman recently called attention, is not a new one. It is, rather, a new phase of an old trouble, gangsterism.

When Federal prohibition was enacted, the opportunities in bootlegging tempted many members of the underworld and the powerful and unscrupulous bootleg gangs became such a stench in the country's nostrils that the eighteenth amendment was presently repealed. This forced the outlaw element to seek new fields for its activities. It turned for a while to "protection" racketeering, which in due time was largely broken up. It engaged in racketeering that involved many labor unions, and while this evil has not been wholly eliminated, by any means, it is less noisome than it formerly was.

Gambling in its various forms, from slot machines and policy games on up to racetrack betting, sumptuous poker-palaces and the field of sports in general offered a natural and inviting field for underworld figures. They have moved into it and it has become a highly organized activity, with many ramifications and with many devices for catering to the ever-present gambling spirit.

Probably it can be broken up, by united action on the part of law enforcement agencies, before it becomes too hateful. The public conscience, however, must be more fully aroused on the subject before anything effective can be done.

Addresses at Testimonial Dinner to Hon. Albert W. Hawkes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, on October 27, 1949, a testimonial dinner was given to one of our former distinguished colleagues, Hon. Albert W. Hawkes, by the New Jersey Chapter of Pro America, at the Hotel Surburban, in East Orange, N. J. Mrs. George E. Stringfellow, president of the New Jersey Chapter of Pro America, presided and introduced the various speakers. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks made by Mrs. Stringfellow be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with the address by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and remarks by Dr. CHARLES A. EATON, dean of the New Jersey congressional delegation, in introducing our colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who made the principal address of the evening. I also ask that the address delivered by the Senator from Virginia be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. STRINGFELLOW. Pro America is composed of a group of citizens who place the welfare of their country above sectional and personal interest. Its purpose is to fight the destructive influences that imperil the sacred heritage bequeathed to us by our forefathers. There is gathered in this huge audience tonight to do honor to the Honorable Albert W. Hawkes, who served New Jersey and the Nation as United States Senator, citizens from as far west as Chicago and from as far south as Tennessee. We regret that the limitation of space prevented many of Senator Hawkes' friends and admirers from being here tonight to share in honoring this truly great American. Pro America is citing him as a good citizen because he has had the courage, character and tenacity of purpose to defend and support the ideals and principles which made this a great Nation.

One of, if not the most acute deficit in the world today, is intellectual integrity, an ingredient with which Senator Albert W. Hawkes is so richly endowed, and it is this priceless ingredient which attracts the members of Pro America to Senator Hawkes and others like him. Unfortunately, however, there are too few.

Dr. CHARLES A. EATON, dean of the New Jersey congressional delegation, a statesman who has rendered remarkable service to the people of this State and Nation, has graciously accepted our invitation to act as toastmaster of this great dinner given in honor of his friend, Senator Albert W. Hawkes.

Hon. JAMES F. KEM. Dr. Eaton, Senator and Mrs. Hawkes, Mrs. Stringfellow, ladies and gentlemen. After listening to Dr. EATON's delicious shafts of humor, I am reminded that a young and aspiring author once asked Will Rogers if the field of humor was crowded. Will Rogers replied: "No; it isn't crowded, except when Congress is in session."

It is a privilege to be here tonight to join the friends and neighbors of the Hawkes in doing them honor. It was my good fortune to serve with Al Hawkes for 2 years in the United States Senate. I had the opportunity to observe, at close range, his courage and his forthrightness, his ability to think clearly, and to express himself so cogently that no man could misunderstand.

He believes in the American way of life, the American system of free enterprise and personal initiative. He believes in a solvent America; he opposes the doctrines of Karl Marx, whether they are paraded under the banner of communism or under the banner of socialism.

But from these principles he never bends a single inch before any wind or political expediency.

As all of you know, Senator Hawkes' career has been characterized by good judgment, but never was his good judgment shown quite so well as when he wooed and won the belle of Missouri, the prettiest girl in Warrensburg.

I am glad to be here tonight. I am not going to detain you because I know you are anxious to hear the great Senator from Virginia, Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, the principal speaker of the evening.

I do want to say, though, that we Missourians, Senator BYRD, claim a proprietary interest in the Hawkes. We extend them our best wishes and wish them many years of happiness.

Dr. EATON. It is with profound pleasure that I introduce the next speaker, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia. I do not believe that we have in public life in this country a greater interpreter of the issues confronting the American people than Senator BYRD. His life is a great story. He was a member of the Virginia State Senate. He was Governor of Virginia. He has been since 1934 United States Senator from Virginia. And I have often said, knowing the representatives of that great State in both Houses of Congress for a long time that if we turned the Government of the United States to them—in spite of the fact that they bear the name Democrats—we would have an American Government of the highest possible type.

Senator BYRD, we welcome you as a true friend of our friend Senator Hawkes, as a great American, and as a Member of the House of Representatives I am happy to have the privilege of presenting a Senator.

Senator BYRD, we welcome you to New Jersey, and if ever you feel constrained to change your place of residence, you cannot find a finer place for raising apples, raising a disturbance, or raising anything you please, than in New Jersey.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD. Mr. Toastmaster, friends of Al Hawkes, I first want to thank my very dear friend, Congressman EATON, for the all-too-gracious introduction he has given me. He has the confidence and respect of the entire Congress of the United States, Republicans, Constitutional Democrats, and New Deal Democrats.

I bring to you the greetings of the old Commonwealth of Virginia, and I know there are thousands of Virginians who would like to be here tonight to pay tribute to our distinguished guest of honor, because they think as he does, and as you do.

I see by the pamphlet that was put at my table that this organization welcomes Republicans, Constitutional Democrats, and Independents. I see that nothing is said about New Deal Democrats or Fair Deal Democrats. I do not know whether that was an intentional omission or not. I assume that I can join under the title of Constitutional Democrats.

From time to time I am accused, in the Senate of the United States, of voting with the Republicans. In my last campaign for the Senate, I was accused by my opponent of voting with the Republicans 86 percent, and he said, in fact, that I voted with the Republicans more than they voted with themselves.

My reply to that was not to debate the issues, but merely to say that my name began with a "B," I stood at the front of the list and voted first, and the Republicans voted with me.

I am proud of the fact that I was one of 18 southern Democrats to stand shoulder to shoulder with Senator Taft when the President of the United States endeavored to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. And had it not been for these southern Democrats who left their party on this issue, the Taft-Hartley Act would have been repealed, and that would have been a great and colossal catastrophe, let me say, ladies and gentlemen, to this great country of ours. [Great applause.]

I want to pay a simple tribute to a simple man—to one who is a great citizen; to one who symbolizes the true American spirit to as great a degree, I think, as any man I know. After all, simplicity of thought and action without subterfuge or evasion is one of the greatest of human attributes. Such simplicity has been the base of the lasting fame of one of the greatest of all Americans—Abraham Lincoln. To my mind, if there ever was a man who personified the ideal public servant, it is my friend, and your friend—Al Hawkes.

I have often thought that, while some men may accomplish great deeds and thereby advance the progress of the world, yet one of the greatest services any man can render is to become a symbol of a great cause for the public good.

Al Hawkes was one of the first to see our march to socialistic Government when he said in the Senate:

"Unless the people redeem their morals, rebuild their character, and recognize the mandates of their God differently than they are doing, they will not have the fiber and the courage to do the things necessary to pay for the preservation of individual freedom in its true sense.

"So long," said Senator Hawkes, "as the majority of our people seek to give less for a dollar, they will get less for a dollar, and if they are going to be led astray by the philosophy that you can get something for nothing, or that the world owes a living to the indolent, the shiftless, and the sluggards—there is no hope for the redemption of America.

"Honest people should beget honesty in their representatives, and intelligence in the selection of representatives is vital to the preservation of representative democracy."

For this program he began an unyielding campaign which he carried to the people and fought for on the floor of the Senate—to preserve the fundamental principles of Government that have made America great, and which present to us today our only hope for future progress. Thus, his prodigious efforts for soundness in Government made him, in the minds and hearts of millions of Americans, a symbol of truth and courage.

His great success as a businessman; his service as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce gave him a clearer sight than most of us could have of the imperative necessity of the continuation of the free enterprise system as the foundation stone of our democratic institutions.

He labored for the kind of Government which stimulates individual initiative, through a private enterprise system operating in the fullest freedom of democracy, to develop and produce more of what people need at a cost they can afford.

He fought the kind of Government which, through excessive spending, debt, and oppressive taxes, stifles individual initiative to the point that state subsidy and restriction,

and dole and regimentation are required to maintain a sham in the name of free enterprise and democracy.

He knew that without American solvency our constitutional freedoms will disappear at home and there will be no deterrent to communism abroad.

It was in this situation that vast new expenditures for federalized activities were proposed at home and vast new expenditures for economic, social, and military programs were proposed for nations abroad.

He said over and over again that our friends overseas who seek American aid and comfort must realize their only hope lies in our continued solvency. And, by the same token, those at home, who, through membership in pressure groups or otherwise, continue to wring more and more political pap from the Federal Treasury through extension of federalized programs, should not contend that they are not consciously promoting an economy to be planned and directed by the National Government at the expense of the free-enterprise system operating in the full freedom of democracy.

If increasing taxes or deficits to meet continuously higher Federal expenditures is to be our course, he argued, it is obvious that neither our system nor our form of government can endure. He emphasized that if this is to be our fate, there remain two all-important questions, and he asked: How long can what remains of our private enterprise system and our democratic form of government endure our folly? What will we contrive as a substitute for the doctrines which have made us great?

As to the answer to the first question, he said time and time again that red lights of danger are flashing now.

As to the answer to the second question, he said that he knew of no one who regards the British mess as something more desirable. It is probable though, he predicted, that whatever mechanism our pressure groups at home concoct will be worse.

What Al Hawkes stands for has been called capitalism, reaction, conservatism, feudalism, etc. What he has opposed has been called socialism, welfare state, statism, collectivism, etc. What these words mean, despite recent newspaper controversy, will make little difference in terms of freedom for individual initiative if we throw over our well-tried system and form of government.

I know of no man of my acquaintance—and I say this without flattery but with all the sincerity of my heart—I know of no person of my acquaintance who has given to his fellow citizens an example of unselfishness and selflessness in public service such as Al Hawkes has done for so many years and in so many ways. He numbers among his friends the rich and the poor, and it can be said of him that he is one of the most respected and beloved men from a very large circle of acquaintances.

He is a master of self-judgment and self-control. He possesses special qualities of mind and heart—qualities that are both natural and acquired.

My own devotion for Al Hawkes comes from two sources: One is my pure admiration for the man—for his ability and highly governed mind which has found pleasure in nothing but the true and the just. The other is his friendship for me, which he has shown in so many ways. I have never known a sweeter character or a friend I love more. I shall always treasure the numerous letters he has written me and his thoughtful kindness. To me, his character is carved out of the granite of true loyalty and sincerity. He has a private life and a public career which we may proudly hold up for emulation and tribute. I am sure that today the source of his greatest satisfaction comes from a gathering of his friends such as are here tonight and in their love and confidence.

To review his career is to pay tribute to the opportunities made possible to every man and woman in America today under a system of government which gives to every citizen an equal opportunity for success, depending upon their own ability and their own spirit. Here is a man beloved and honored as few men are. Why? Because, in this free country, he began his career at the bottom and, with an invincible spirit, he overcame all obstacles, and, as he climbed the ladder of business and political success, he kept his touch with those less fortunate than himself.

So, we, his friends, gather here tonight in this testimonial to a great character. We do so in the elation of a devoted admiration for Al Hawkes, the man; Al Hawkes, the devoted friend and admired public servant—the man whom every person in this room would be proud to emulate.

His real wealth is not in stocks, bonds, or buildings, but he has a wealth greater and more imperishable—a wealth of a myriad of life-long friends; the wealth of the consciousness that his life has been guided by the desire to lend a helping hand to those in distress and in need; to give comfort to the unhappy; to make living better for his friends and associates, and the consciousness on his part that he has met in the fullest measure every single responsibility that has come to him, both in his public and private life. I verily believe that his greatest pleasure is the opportunity to do a kindness; to give happiness and to help the under-privileged.

In my service in the United States Senate, I do not believe I have served with a Senator more fearless or more conscious of the necessity of preserving this great Nation from the inroads of state socialism, statism, collectivism, or whatever you may call it. He sacrificed his political career for his principles. As his close friend and intimate, I observed him in many trying situations and never once did he falter in doing the right thing, no matter how unpopular, for the moment, that action was.

When the Fair Employment Practices legislation was before the Senate, by general agreement of all Senators, Senator Hawkes made the most impressive and ablest argument against the passage of that legislation. I have no doubt he suffered for it among certain groups of the electorate of his State.

I feel tonight that perhaps the greatest compliment I can pay to Al Hawkes is to say that he stood foresquare on these great principles during his service in the Senate, just as did my distinguished colleague, the late Senator Carter Glass. If I were asked to name the two men who were willing, from my personal knowledge, to risk, without hesitation, their political fortunes in support of great principles, these are the two I would name. Knowing both men intimately, as I did, they had many characteristics in common.

On June 19, 1948, Al Hawkes delivered his valedictory address. On page 9060 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 19, 1948, there is this line following the ending of his speech:

"Applause, Senators rising."

In my 17 years of service in the Senate, I have seen this occur only two or three times. To those who are not familiar with the rules and customs of the Senate, it is difficult to appreciate the real significance of this ovation. The rules prohibit applause in the Senate. The rules prohibit the Senators from making a demonstration by rising as a body. Yet, as a tribute to the sincerity and indomitable spirit of this great public servant who had served in the Senate a much shorter time than most of his colleagues, he was accorded this unusual honor by the greatest deliberative body in the world. No man who ever served in the United States Senate could fail to be intensely proud of these three very uncommon words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—"Applause, Senators rising."

From this great speech of his, I will quote several sentences only. All of you should read it in full. He said, on that June day just before adjournment of the Senate:

"I have known for a great many years that the label Republican or Democrat is not the vital thing in the preservation of the United States of America. The great question is this: Does a citizen or representative of the people believe in the American system and wish to preserve and improve it, or is he one of those who wish to exchange a success for a failure, by following what I call un-American activities?

"My experience here will enable me to continue making a contribution toward the preservation of our form of government and our institutions.

"From the standpoint of service to his country, no man could fail to have sorrow and regret at leaving the Senate. No personal gratification in looking forward to more ease and comfort could possibly compensate for the loss of opportunity to continue in this great deliberative body as a servant of the people.

"There was nothing here I wanted for myself when I arrived, except the opportunity to serve the people and help preserve in our mutual interest the rights and opportunities which developed under our American system of freemen."

Al Hawkes is a shining example of that rare product of our public life—a statesman without fear and without reproach. Here is a man who is honored everywhere. He is known because his name means the conception of the highest type of public official—a gentleman unafraid; a statesman whose life and character provide an inspiration to the rest of us.

Samuel Butler said a long time ago that "every man's work is always a picture of himself." If this be true, then in the long perspective of the work of Albert W. Hawkes, his countrymen will find an enlightened vision that has enabled him to find the way of right service and a strong honesty that has kept him steadfastly on that way; a character that has been proof alike against the trials of dark times and the temptations of happier times; a life governed by convictions that constitute a compass by which he guides his ship of life and so keeps the ship true to the course of high honor and good conscience, wnether the weather be fair or foul.

Of my own association with him and his many kind and considerate acts toward me, I can only speak with feeling of deep emotion. Our friendship has been close and intimate. One of the greatest privileges of my life—and one for which I shall be eternally grateful—is that of being his colleague, and, still better, of being a friend of Al Hawkes in our joint service in the Senate of the United States. I admire and love him with a deep devotion.

I like to think of Al Hawkes as a symbol of what the American citizen should desire to be, so as to preserve those things that have made America great, and standing for those things necessary to protect and fortify this great representative democracy bequeathed to us as a sacred heritage by the blood and labor of those who have gone before.

And so he stands, always for the things that are good in life; and for the things that will continue to make his country better. He has applied his rugged individual experiences to the benefit of all his fellow men.

He asks no quarter with justice. His forthrightness not infrequently brings criticism down upon him, but I have never known him to go long without vindication.

Like Benjamin Hill, he believes that:

"He who saves his country
Saves all things
And all things saved
Shall bless him.
But he who lets his country die
Lets all things die
And all things dying
Shall curse him."

A man who really made a great President, but who was never fully appreciated—John Tyler, of Virginia—when he resigned from the United States Senate because the Legislature of Virginia instructed him to take action contrary to his convictions, said:

"I shall carry with me into retirement the principles which I brought with me into public office and, by the surrender of the high station to which I was called by the voice of the people of Virginia, I shall set an example to my children which shall teach them to regard as nothing place and office when either is to be attained or held at the sacrifice of honor."

Al Hawkes, in a similar situation, would have done exactly as Senator Tyler—later President Tyler—because his devotion to principle outweighs every other consideration.

Tonight, the best that you and I can say to Al Hawkes is that he has kept the faith. He can live with his conscience, and his work as a leader has only just begun, because, if this Nation is to be saved, it can be done only by the courage and indomitable will, and the patriotism of such men as Al Hawkes.

I know I voice the hope of his many friends here tonight, and the many thousands elsewhere, in saying to him: May the Lord bless you and give you the happiness you so richly deserve in this life and, ultimately, the peace eternal for which all of us pray in the life to come. May you prosper in all you do, and we, your friends, want you to know of the depth of our love and appreciation for you; of our respect and affection for you and all of yours. I propose a toast to all of the Hawkeses: May their shadow never grow less. In the words of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I say: "Applause, Senators rising."

The Employment Assistance Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include my statement and analysis of a bill I have introduced today entitled "The Employment Assistance Act of 1950."

In July 1949 I joined with many other Members of the House and Senate in sponsoring the economic expansion bill, a measure that should already have become the law of the land.

If the economic expansion bill had become law, we would now have in effect a broad and balanced program to achieve the President's objective of a $300,000,000,000 economy within the next 4 or 5 years. We would not be in the position that we are in today of being unable to deal decisively with present areas of serious unemployment. We would not be in the position that we are in today of being insufficiently prepared for any possible failure of the economy to expand in the future.

It is high time that public hearings be held on the economic expansion bill by the Committees on Banking and Currency in both Houses of Congress. These hearings should start without delay.

But the unemployed men and women in California—and the unemployed men and women in other States throughout the country—are today in no position to wait upon the outcome of protracted hearings on a complex program. Many of them by this time have exhausted their unemployment-insurance benefits. They need immediate action.

For the last 2 years unemployment in California has been much more serious than unemployment in the United States as a whole. In 1948, unemployment in California averaged almost 300,000 persons—or 6.8 percent of the California labor force. This was twice the percentage of unemployment for the Nation as a whole. In 1949, the number of men and women out of work in California increased to an average of about 417,000—or close to 9.4 percent of the California labor force. If the number of unemployed in the United States had risen throughout the country to the same high level in 1949 as it did in California, we would have had in 1949 an army of unemployed made up of more than 5,800,000 people.

This unemployment situation in California is not concentrated in any one spot. It is distributed throughout the State. In November 1949, for example, all of the important labor-market areas were classified by the Labor Department as D areas—that is, areas having a labor surplus of 7 to 12 percent of the labor force. The only exception to this statement is San Diego—and San Diego was in the E classification, which means that more than 12 percent of the labor force in San Diego was unemployed.

These facts, in my judgment, call for immediate action.

I am, therefore, introducing today a bill to provide for immediate action.

This bill is entitled "The Employment Assistance Act of 1950." Its purpose is dual. First, it provides a program for direct and prompt handling of serious unemployment wherever and whenever it arises. Second, it provides for the development of a long-range program for resources development and public works, the kind of long-range program which is indispensable if we are to be equipped to deal with local problems if and when they arise. Let me briefly summarize these provisions.

Title I sets forth the program for handling areas of serious unemployment.

Under section 101, the Secretary of Labor would make a detailed study of employment and unemployment, and certify to the President any area or industry in which special action is needed.

Under section 102, steps would be taken to channel government contracts or government loans to areas or industries that have been certified as serious unemployment areas. This would provide a statutory strengthening of the present operations along this line that are being handled in Mr. John Steelman's office in the White House.

Under section 103, there would be established a $2,200,000,000 emergency reserve fund for urban and rural unemployment. These funds would only be used for areas or industries certified under section 101 and where other Federal, State, or local funds would not be available in sufficient amounts. The money could be used to augment existing Federal works programs, to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a rural conservation program, and for grants to States and cities on a matching basis for both construction and nonconstruction projects. Part of this fund would also be available for increasing the funds available to the various Federal agencies for procurement and stock piling.

Under section 104, provision would be made to help unemployed workers obtain vocational education or training for positions that could thereby be obtained. The Labor Department would also be authorized to assist unemployed workers to move to other areas of the country where the local employment office certifies that jobs are available.

Title II sets forth a long-range program for resources development and public works.

Under section 201, the President would transmit to Congress in his annual Economic Report an appraisal of the long-range needs for resources development and public-works projects, both on a national and regional basis. Regional surveys of needs would be made through the appropriate Government agencies and with the assistance of State, local, and regional development agencies and of universities and colleges.

Section 202 provides for developing and maintaining at all times a large-scale shelf of plans for rural and urban projects. The objective would be to have at all times a shelf of projects. To promote a large-scale shelf of this type, a State and local advance planning fund would be established. From this fund non-interest-bearing loans would be made to cities and States for both the development of blueprints and the acquisition of sites. In addition, a Federal advance planning fund for $100,000,000 would be set up to assist Federal agencies in developing blueprints and acquiring sites.

Section 203 provides for direct credit assistance to city and State governments for the financing of work on resources development and public-works projects. Under this section, RFC loans up to a total limitation of $1,000,000,000 could be made at low-interest rates for periods of up to 60 years.

Title III contains the administrative provisions of the act. This title recognizes that the administration of the act must be vested in the President. The Council of Economic Advisers would assist the President by providing for the

preparation and maintenance of a national inventory of State, local, and Federal plans and operations with respect to resources development and public works. It would also advise him on the need for accelerating or decelerating the programs provided for under the act.

I should like at this point to quote from the lucid and enlightening economic analysis which was given to the President at the beginning of this year by the distinguished economists who comprise his Council of Economic Advisers. I quote from the section entitled "Economic Trouble Spots" in the Council's Annual Economic Review, which was transmitted to the Congress on January 6, 1950, together with the Economic Report of the President:

Despite the high levels of employment throughout the Nation, there are some areas with quite heavy unemployment, and with far less than maximum levels of production and business activity. This presents a challenge, because there cannot be maximum employment and production throughout the Nation so long as some areas are relatively depressed; and there is always danger that economic dislocations in spot areas may spread if they are not remedied.

The words of the President's economic advisers provide a warning that should not fall on deaf ears. The situation they describe provides a challenge that must not be dodged. It must be met; and if the economic trouble spots of today are not to drag the country down into a Nation-wide depression, it must be met promptly.

The Economic Assistance Act of 1950 which I am introducing today is the first concrete proposal that has yet been submitted to the Congress for meeting this challenge. I urge that committee hearings be initiated on this measure at once.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I wish to include a letter which I have written to Representative EDWARD J. HART, vice chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, on February 25, 1950, requesting that his committee sponsor a study of the Pacific Coast States:

DEAR MR. HART: The joint committee's print, the Economy of the South, has been of great interest to me. Your recent subcommittee report on unemployment stressed the need for further regional studies. It is my understanding that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has asked the National Planning Association to sponsor a study of New England, and that a study may be suggested for the Intermountain area.

I am writing you to inquire if it would be possible for the joint committee to request the National Planning Association to sponsor a study of the Pacific Coast States. The impact of Federal programs on this region has been and will in the future be tremendously significant in the development of this great region. I can assure you of a real interest on the part of labor, business, agriculture, educational institutions, private research organizations, foundations, and individuals in such an undertaking.

Your committee is in a unique position to study the regional problems and is to be commended for initiating the studies that you now have under way. I hope that something can be worked out for the far West.

Sincerely yours,

HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS.

New Districts for Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the seventeenth decennial census to be taken beginning April 1, 1950, will reveal among other things the steady growth of our country—a gain of some twenty millions of people in the past 10 years. Some sections of the country have grown more rapidly than others. Some States will lose representation in the United States House of Representatives; others will gain. I include as a part of my remarks, a very interesting and instructive article styled, "How Reapportionment Works: New Districts for Old" from the Congress at Work section of Senior Scholastic Magazine for February 1950:

HOW REAPPORTIONMENT WORKS—NEW DISTRICTS FOR OLD

Do you live in one of the west coast States—California, Washington, or Oregon? Then it's a sure thing that your home State will soon have more seats in the House of Representatives than it now has. But if you're a New Yorker, a Pennsylvanian, or a Missourian your State will take a cut in its number of Congressmen.

Each State's number (or quota) of Representatives is based on its population. The quotas are reapportioned every 10 years, following Uncle Sam's regular census. The total number of Representatives is now fixed at 435. Therefore one State's gain—resulting from an increased share of our population—must be a sister State's loss. And the Pacific States, which have been on the receiving end of a huge westward migration in the past 10 years, are sure to be the biggest gainers after the 1950 census.

The Constitution provides (art. I, sec. 2) that "the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States." At first the States were allowed to select their Representatives by several different methods. But in 1842 Congress passed a law requiring that all States entitled to more than one Representative be divided into districts. Each Representative was to be elected by the voters of a district.

Later this law was amended to allow for the election of Representatives at Large for any additional Members which a State might be allotted after a new census. These Representatives at Large are elected by all the people of the State. Once a State is redistricted Representatives at Large are eliminated. (Redistricting may take years. Ohio and Connecticut still elect a Representative at Large on the basis of the 1940 reapportionment.)

Similarly, when a State's congressional quota is reduced, the State may elect all of its Representatives at Large, until new districts are set up.

When the First Congress met in 1789 there were 65 Members in the House of Representatives. Membership in the House increased steadily as the Nation's population grew and as new States were admitted. By 1840 there were 232 Members; by 1900 the House numbered 386. After the 1910 census the figure reached 435, and there it was pegged. Congress decided that this was the largest number of Congressmen which could work efficiently together.

Thus in 1920 Congress first faced the problem of reapportioning within the limit of 435 Members, rather than simply increasing the number of its Members. But Representatives from States which had lost population were reluctant to legislate their States—and perhaps themselves—out of House seats. Congress failed to act, and no change was made on the basis of the 1920 census.

In 1929 Congress passed a law to prevent this from happening again. The law stated that reapportionment must automatically follow each 10-year census, based on mathematical procedures. Reapportionment was carried out after the 1930 and 1940 censuses. The chart below predicts what will happen in 1950.

If a State loses one of its Representatives, this does not necessarily mean that the State's population has declined. It may simply mean that its population increase has not kept pace with the national rate. New York, for instance, has increased its population since 1940 by more than 6 percent. But the national gain since 1940 has been about 13 percent.

Those States which lose or gain Representatives are faced with the problem of redistricting their States. Redistricting is carried out by the State legislatures. Under ideal conditions here is how this is done: Let's take Oregon as an example. Oregon's 1,736,000 citizens will probably be entitled to five Representatives. The State's present four districts would be altered to make room for a fifth district, so that each Representative would have a district with about 347,200 people.

But attempts are sometimes made by the majority party in the State legislature to underplay the voting strength of its opponents. It does this by trying to crowd voters of the opposition parties into a few districts, and put its own voting strength into a larger number of smaller districts.

This practice often creates districts of odd shapes, and from this fact it gets its name—gerrymandering. Back in 1812 one of these oddly shaped districts was created in Massachusetts, when Elbridge Gerry was governor. A cartoonist discovered that this district could be made to look like a strange lizard, merely by adding claws, teeth, and wings. According to the story the cartoonist asked, "How's that for a salamander?" A bystander, who blamed the governor for the unfair redistricting, answered, "Better call it a gerrymander."

Congress tried to curtail gerrymandering in 1842 by ruling that congressional districts were to be of "contiguous and compact territory, and of approximately equal population. By now most State constitutions contain these same provisions, but they are not always strictly observed. In some cases legal action may be brought against the party creating gerrymandered districts. Some States make it possible to put the question up to the voters.

Will your State's representation change?

State	Population	A	B	C
Alabama	2,920,000	9	9	------
Arizona	745,000	2	2	------
Arkansas	1,964,000	7	6	------
California	10,665,000	23	31	------
Colorado	1,215,000	4	4	------
Connecticut	2,019,000	8	8	------
Delaware	311,000	1	1	------
Florida	2,494,000	6	7	------
Georgia	3,190,000	10	9	------
Idaho	862,000	2	1	------
Illinois	8,443,000	26	25	------
Indiana	3,994,000	11	12	------
Iowa	2,643,000	8	8	------
Kansas	1,947,000	6	8	------
Kentucky	2,893,000	9	8	------
Louisiana	2,686,000	8	8	------
Maine	909,000	3	3	------
Maryland	2,175,000	6	6	------
Massachusetts	4,713,000	14	14	------
Michigan	6,332,000	17	18	------
Minnesota	2,977,000	9	8	------
Mississippi	2,130,000	7	6	------
Missouri	3,935,000	13	12	------

Will your State's representation change?—Continued

State	Population	A	B	C
Montana	591,000	2	2	------
Nebraska	1,285,000	4	4	------
Nevada	174,000	1	1	------
New Hampshire	588,000	2	2	------
New Jersey	4,875,000	14	14	------
New Mexico	589,000	2	2	------
New York	14,392,000	45	43	------
North Carolina	3,954,000	12	11	------
North Dakota	605,000	2	2	------
Ohio	7,980,000	22	22	------
Oklahoma	2,302,000	8	7	------
Oregon	1,736,000	4	5	------
Pennsylvania	10,633,000	33	31	------
Rhode Island	743,000	2	2	------
South Carolina	2,001,000	6	6	------
South Dakota	649,000	2	2	------
Tennessee	3,234,000	10	9	------
Texas	7,632,000	21	22	------
Utah	662,000	2	2	------
Vermont	368,000	1	1	------
Virginia	3,102,000	9	9	------
Washington	2,582,000	6	7	------
West Virginia	1,941,000	6	6	------
Wisconsin	3,355,000	10	10	------
Wyoming	294,000	1	1	------

NOTE.—Populations are 1949 Census Bureau estimates. Column A: Present representation in the House. Column B: "Best guess" on new distribution after the 1950 census. Column C: For you to fill in after the new reapportionment is made.

Mr. Speaker, I also include an article from part I of the same magazine headed "Counting 150,000,000 noses" which gives something of the history of the census in this country and discusses the plans presently being laid by the Bureau of the Census for the 1950 census.

COUNTING 150,000,000 NOSES

Mark Saturday, April 1, 1950, as a red-letter day on your calendar. It's not because we want you to start preparing April Fool's Day jokes for your friends now. But that is the day that Uncle Sam asks his 150,000,000 nieces and nephews to stand up and be counted.

Once every 10 years April 1 becomes C-day—the date chosen for the Decennial Census of Population of the United States. Every man, woman, and child is counted. This year more than 140,000 census takers (called enumerators) will visit every home in the land. In cities and towns it will take them as long as 2 weeks to reach everyone in their districts. In farming areas and remote regions like snow-swept plateaus of the Rockies, nose counting will not be completed until the end of April. In Alaska (for our Territories are included in the census), enumerators are already on their way to isolated Eskimo villages above the Arctic Circle.

While the census taker may not reach your home on April 1, he will be asking about you and your family and your home as of that date. The next-door neighbor's baby, born on March 31, will be counted as part of the family. But the television set your family buys on April 3 will not be counted as part of your family's household equipment, since it won't be in your living room on C-day.

The United States was the first nation to provide for a regular census of its population. Of course, we didn't take the first census. That goes back to Biblical days, when King David took a census of all men in Israel. But the United States was the first to arrange in advance for a census to be taken at certain intervals (in our case, every 10 years).

It came about as an almost accidental byproduct of that famous series of meetings in Philadelphia in 1787—when the United States Constitution was written in near-secrecy throughout a sweltering summer. After long argument the Constitution makers decided that the States should be equally represented in the United States Senate, but that they should be represented in proportion to their population in the House of Representatives. But how would the representation of each State be determined? Article I, section 2, of the Constitution answered the question: A fixed number of Representatives were chosen for the first meeting of Congress. Thereafter, Congress was to direct a census-taking every 10 years to determine population.

The first census was taken by United States marshals in 1790. As the decades rolled on new population censuses were taken, marking the growth and development of our Nation, and changing the representation of the States within the House of Representatives.

PAGING MR. JEFFERSON

From the very beginning our Nation's leaders decided that it would be valuable to learn more from the census than simply the total number of people. The 1790 census—the first one—determined how many men were over and under 16. This was intended to measure the possible military strength of the Nation. That first census was performed in a crude, fairly inaccurate manner. The census taker in Philadelphia, for instance, accidentally skipped Thomas Jefferson. The statesman had to pen his famous signature to a list posted in a public square for such overlooked citizens.

Each decade the census took on more importance and was performed more carefully and thoroughly. Congress decided, too, that the Government could make good use of additional facts, so new questions were added to the census—about schooling, jobs, age, and place of birth.

Soon it was decided that there should be other censuses beside the population count every 10 years. A census of manufacturing was started in 1810. Agriculture was added in 1840. But it was not until 1902 that a permanent Census Bureau of the Government was established. The Bureau, under the Department of Commerce, is now the year-around fact finder of the Nation.

Besides the population census, the Bureau makes censuses of manufacturing, business, and agriculture at 5-year intervals. The Bureau also makes monthly surveys on current population and business trends. For these surveys only a small sampling is taken, scientifically chosen to present an accurate picture of the Nation as a whole.

The mountainous stacks of statistics do not simply gather dust in Government storage space. Tabulations based on them are used, for instance, by manufacturers of diapers who want to learn about future increase in the number of their customers; by airlines plotting out new routes in areas of increased population; by labor and business groups to judge past, present, and future economic conditions; by social scientists studying how we live; and by Government agencies which must have a guide for their activities.

Individual Census Bureau figures (like your maiden aunt's age) are strictly confidential. But totals or averages of figures (like the number of unmarried women) are available to all, through books, pamphlets, and reports published by the Census Bureau.

Now, let's take a look at the 1950 census. What will the census enumerator ask you and your family?

On his giant-size chart the enumerator will make a record of these facts for every one of our 150,000,000 people: Name, relationship to the head of the family, race, sex, age, whether married or single, State or country of birth, whether the person is a citizen, whether he is working or not, and what kind of work he does.

The enumerator will ask additional questions of every fifth person: Where the person lived a year ago, where his parents were born, how far he has gone in school, whether or not he is a war veteran, and the income he received in 1949 from all sources, as well as the income received by his relatives in the same household.

The proposed question on income has met with some objection from a group of Republican Congressmen. They believe that it is unnecessary prying to ask a person exactly how much money he makes, particularly since he may have to reveal the information to an enumerator who may be his next-door neighbor.

However, the Census Bureau points out that this information, when assembled in totals and averages, will be useful to industries seeking markets for their goods, and for other purposes. In addition, the enumerator is sworn, under penalty, not to reveal the information to anyone.

But suppose a person does not wish to reveal his income to the enumerator. In this case he has the privilege of sending this information directly to the Census Bureau in an envelope supplied him by the enumerator. In this way the information will be known only to the Census Bureau in Washington. It cannot be used for any other purpose, such as taxation.

The 1950 census of housing will be taken at the same time as the population census. Your parents will be asked detailed questions about your apartment or house. The newest question on this housing census will be whether your family has a television set. Other standard questions refer to the number of rooms in the housing unit, the kind of plumbing, heating, and kitchen equipment, and the rent paid or value of the property.

For the Nation's 6,300,000 farm families the 1950 census means a little extra "paper work." For this year, too, the agriculture census will be taken. If you live on a farm, your family can expect to receive a questionnaire from the Government by mail. This is to be filled out by individual farmers. When the enumerator comes in April, he will pick up these completed forms, or help farmers complete them.

The 1950 census will have an international aspect. Plans have been worked out so that all Latin-American nations will be counting noses in 1950. (The only exception is Argentina, which took a census in 1947.) Many government workers from Latin America are in the United States now, being trained in modern methods of census taking. For a number of nations this will be the first complete population census. Population experts hope that eventually a world-wide census can be taken simultaneously in every nation.

With new electric machinery and thousands of extra workers, the Census Bureau will get to work on its gigantic counting job as soon as the census-takers have turned in their reports. By December 1, 1950, the Bureau must give President Truman the final population tally, so that reapportionment of the House of Representatives may take place promptly. Preliminary estimates of State and local populations will be available by early next summer.

WHAT WE WILL LEARN

Census experts already know some of the things which are certain to be revealed. These predictions are based on preliminary surveys of sample areas which are going on all the time. Some of these results will show:

1. Our total population will be slightly above 150,000,000—a gain of 19,000,000 over 1940. When congressional districts are rearranged to meet this increase, our Congressmen will each be representing an average of about 330,000 people, a 10 percent gain over 1940.

2. For the first time in our history, women will outnumber men. In 1940, men had the edge by half a million. Reason for the change is that immigration, which used to be in the millions every year, has declined sharply over the past several decades. The great majority of immigrants are men.

3. There will be an average of about 50 Americans to every square mile. In 1790

there were less than five people to every square mile.

4. The move from the farm to the city has continued. Statistics will probably show, too, that 9 out of 10 of those who left farms since 1940 are under 25 years of age. This is a serious problem for the future of American agriculture.

Nearly everyone realizes that it is only good citizenship to cooperate with the census-taking. We will all benefit from the information gained, and we're more than a little curious to know how much our State or community has gained in population over the past eventful decade. Answering questions for the census enumerator courteously and accurately, is as much a civic duty as voting. The law provides a penalty for those who refuse to answer census questions or who make deliberately false answers. These penalties almost never have to be used, for citizens are eager to cooperate voluntarily.

Country Editors Fear Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks this date, I am pleased to include the following article from the current issue of the American Press, February 1950, entitled "Seventy-eight Percent of Country Editors Fear United States Is Headed for Socialism":

SEVENTY-EIGHT PERCENT OF COUNTRY EDITORS FEAR UNITED STATES IS HEADED FOR SOCIALISM

Over 500 editors, in reply to the American Press poll, tell what act'on they think Congress should take on leading issue of 1950.

A total of 78 percent of the country editors of America fear that our Nation is headed toward socialism.

This startling fact was unearthed by the American Press magazine as the result of a poll which it has been conducting for the primary purpose of finding out what the weekly newspaper editors of the United States think it is most important for Congress to accomplish at the present session.

The three-page questionnaire, which was answered by over 500 editors representing every State in the Union, concluded with the question, "Do you fear that our Nation is headed toward socialism?" All but 22 percent answered "Yes."

The fear seems to be based on what many of the editors refer to as welfare-state measures, as well as on the size of the national debt, huge Government costs, and an unbalanced budget. Many believe that Congress' action on compulsory health insurance legislation will determine whether or not we are going socialistic. Eighty-nine percent of the editors expressed opposition to this measure.

GOVERNMENT FINANCES

Not of greatest immediate concern is Government finances. In answer to the question: "What do you consider to be the two most important things for Congress to accomplish at the new session?" Seventy-nine percent demanded a balanced budget, reduction of Governmental costs or cuts in Federal pay rolls.

Although tax reform were considered second most important need, only 21 percent asked for immediate tax reductions, regardless of whether or not the budget is balanced. Many of those felt that if taxes were reduced reduction in Government costs would thus be forced.

Thirty-nine percent said they favored tax reductions only if the budget can be balanced, and another 36 percent advised leaving taxes as high as they are and create a surplus, if possible, to pay off the debt. Three percent of the editors favored increasing taxes to meet the debt. But 85 percent would like to see the tax laws rewritten and simplified.

In addition to Government costs and finances, the five next most important things for Congress to do, in the opinion of the editors, are:

Enact reforms proposed by Hoover Commission.

Curb welfare-state bills.

Strengthen and clarify foreign policy.

Strengthen and streamline defense.

Take action to restore the confidence of business in the future.

Sentiments of many of the editors were expressed by (359) who commented: "Unless our Government ceases to be the world's worst businessman, our burdens will continue to increase until a breaking point is reached. Why can't our so-called elected representatives stop playing politics long enough to see the danger signs and get some sensible laws enacted to encourage free enterprise? What does a young man starting out have to look forward to under the present set-up? They, the lawmakers, seem to have forgotten the basic principles which have made this country as great and strong as it is to date."

Among the country editors, whose combined newspapers have a readership of around 70,000,000 people, only a handful of those replying to the questionnaire indicated general approval of the administration's domestic programs, but many felt that Congress was too steeped in politics to do anything about it. Fourteen of those replying to the question about the most important thing for Congress to do gave the facetious answer, "Go home" or "Adjourn," and many said, "Forget politics."

A summary of the questions and answers follows, with typical comments:

LABOR LAWS

Question. What do you think should be done about the Taft-Hartley law?

Answer. Repealed, 5 percent; made less stringent, 11 percent; left as it is, 57 percent; made more stringent, 26 percent; no answer, 1 percent.

GOVERNMENT COSTS

Question. Assuming that everyone would like to see Government costs cut, check each of the following proposals which you think would be practical and advisable.

Answer (in order of mentions).

Major reduction in number of Federal employees, 90 percent.

Reduction of farm subsidies, 64 percent.

Across-the-board cut in funds provided for all Government departments, 62 percent.

Reduction of Federal expenditures for social services, 53 percent.

Reduction of funds for aiding foreign countries, 54 percent.

Reduction of Federal funds for housing, 37 percent.

Reduction of funds for veterans, 31 percent.

Reduction of Federal expenditures for schools, hospitals, and institutions, 21 percent.

Reduction in appropriations for armed forces, 20 percent.

INCOME TAXES

Question. Which of the following come closest to your views on what should be done about income taxes?

Answer (according to popularity).

Reduce taxes only if the budget can be balanced, 39 percent.

Leave taxes as they are to balance the budget and create a surplus if possible, 36 percent.

Reduce taxes by 20 percent immediately, regardless of whether the budget will or will not be balanced, 21 percent.

Increase taxes in order to help reduce the national debt, 3 percent.

No answer, 1 percent.

LUXURY TAXES

Question. Do you favor repeal of the so-called luxury taxes on cosmetics, furs, jewelry, etc.?

Answer. Yes, 62 percent; no, 37 percent; no answer, 1 percent.

LIQUOR AND CIGARETTE TAX

Question. Do you favor repeal, reduction, or increase of taxes on liquor and cigarettes?

Answer. Repeal, 3 percent; reduction, 21 percent; increase, 36 percent; no change, 30 percent; no answer, 10 percent.

INCOME-TAX LAW

Question: Would you like Congress to rewrite and simplify the income-tax law?

Answer: Yes, 85 percent; no, 11 percent; no answer, 4 percent.

EXEMPTIONS

Question. If income-tax law is simplified, would you favor elimination of all exemptions for contributions, medical expenses, etc., everything except deductions for dependents, to be offset by a lower over-all tax rate?

Answer. Yes, 55 percent; no, 37 percent; no answer, 8 percent.

PROPORTION OF TAX

Question. If income-tax law is rewritten, would you like to see a change in the proportion paid by various groups? If so, do you think reduction should be given to lower-income group, middle-income group, or high-income group?

Answer: No change, 34 percent; lower, 26 percent; middle, 33 percent; high, 7 percent.

SOCIAL-SECURITY EXPANSION

Question. Do you favor expansion of social security to include those not now covered by it?

Answer. Yes, 49 percent; no, 46 percent; no answer, 5 percent.

SOCIAL-SECURITY INCREASES

Question. Do you approve of increases in benefits from social security?

Answer. Yes, 36 percent; no, 59 percent; no answer, 5 percent.

COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE

Question. Do you favor a Federal system of compulsory health insurance, to be paid by an additional pay-roll tax on employers and employees, plus funds from the Federal Treasury?

Answer. Yes, 8 percent; no, 89 percent; no answer, 3 percent.

LIQUOR-AD BAN

Question. Are you for or against the bill which would prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages?

Answer. For, 20 percent; against, 79 percent; no answer, 1 percent.

PROHIBITION

Question. Would you like to see the prohibition of the sale of alcoholic beverages reenacted?

Answer. Yes, 14 percent; no, 86 percent.

MILITARY TRAINING

Question. Do you favor compulsory military training?

Answer. Yes, 57 percent; no, 41 percent; no answer, 2 percent.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Question. Do you agree with those who charge that the Department of Justice is discriminating against big business?

Answer. Yes, 55 percent; no, 38 percent; no answer, 7 percent.

CENTRALIZATION

Question. Do you think more governmental authority, and the expense it entails should be turned over to the States by the Federal Government?

Answer. Yes, 71 percent; no, 22 percent; no answer, 6 percent.

SOCIALISM

Question. Do you fear that our Nation is headed toward socialism?

Answer. Yes, 78 percent; no, 21 percent; no answer, 1 percent.

Electrical Roll-Call Conduit

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. NOLAND

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a resolution which would direct the Committee on Reconstruction and Remodeling of the House Chamber to install electrical conduits in the floor of the House in the event that some future Congress should adopt an electrical roll-call system for the House of Representatives. On the last two Calendar Wednesdays the House of Representatives must have been a very foolish spectacle indeed to those persons sitting in the galleries on either day.

On Wednesday, February 15, dilatory motions by various Members resulted in eight roll calls, which consumed slightly more than 4 hours. After sitting from 12 noon until 4:10 p. m., the House finally spent about 40 minutes considering legislation and then adjourned.

Wednesday last the House indulged in 11 roll calls, which consumed approximately 5½ hours, and which kept the House in session until 3:20 a. m. With an electrical roll-call system, not only would most of this time have been saved but dilatory motions would probably never have been made, because their effectiveness would have been reduced to a minimum. Therefore, the House of Representatives could have adjourned at 11 o'clock and still have had more time for actual debate and consideration.

The temper of the House was such at 3 a. m. that considered judgment was reduced to a minimum. The amendments adopted to the FEPC legislation were of such a nature that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] was impelled to remark facetiously, "Mr. Chairman, in view of the number of amendments that have been adopted, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder be adopted en masse."

These senseless maneuvers of the last 2 weeks merely emphasize the great amount of time lost in each session of Congress, going through the antiquated motions of roll and quorum calls, name by name.

Last session, when the Congress labored long and hard until October 19, some 25 or 30 legislative days were consumed entirely by this slow-motion roll call.

I do not say that an electrical system would reduce the time of the Congress spent in session, but it is a fact that such a system would allow more time for debate and consideration, or it would allow more time for a Member to spend in his office carrying on important work that necessitates his presence there.

I know that the proposal for an electrical roll-call system has not met with overwhelming support from some Members of the House. Therefore, the question arises, What are some of the disadvantages which would arise from the use of an electrical roll-call system?

Since the procedure would move much more rapidly, and there would only be 12 or 15 minutes for Members to assemble, it is very likely that some Members would miss more quorum calls than at present. On the other hand, with such a system, Members of Congress would not be encouraged to take advantage of the delay which now occurs when a quorum call or a roll call is under way.

Another objection which has been heard is that such a system would call for more recorded votes. This would not necessarily be the case, but would depend upon the adaptation of the electrical system to the rules of the House. However, for my part, I believe that the people are entitled to know how their Congressmen voted on every issue, and when I came to Congress, I never suspected that there would be so many times that we could act without being recorded for the people back home to read about it in the RECORD.

Probably another objection to an electrical system is that when the time came for voting, the results of the voting would be accomplished much more rapidly. In other words, the leadership on both sides of the House would have to do their work off the floor, rather than waiting for the confusion which ensues in a call by voice. I think that most of us would agree that party machinery would work with better oiled precision if more information was distributed before a Member actually came to the floor of the House.

I believe that the advantages of the electrical roll call system far outweigh the disadvantages. It has already been stated that approximately 25 legislative days would be saved per session by an electrical system. Surely, this in itself would warrant adoption because it would give much more time for consideration or debate, or for time spent in the Member's office.

With this system there would be much less confusion on the floor of the House. Each Member would have his own seat from which he would cast his vote. Surely this would present a much more orderly legislative picture to persons sitting in the gallery than the one we have now.

It was suggested by one Member that television be installed in the House Chamber to provide the people of America with a picture of their Congress at work. It seems evident to me that with the present system we could never afford to have a television picture of the workings of this body go out on radio and television waves to the people of America.

I think the automatic roll call system would call for better organized leadership in both parties which, in turn, would make for more orderly legislative procedure on the floor of the House.

It seems to me that the advantages of an electrical roll call system far outweigh the disadvantages, and the disadvantages that are present could be surmounted by better organization and a little more work.

The thing which should be of great concern to the House at this time is the necessity for laying electrical conduits in the floor at the time renovation of the lower part of the Chamber takes place at the end of this session of Congress. After spending millions of dollars to improve the Chamber future Congresses would greatly hesitate to tear up the floor, at great cost, to install a new system of recording the votes of the House. The decision to be made at this time is not whether we are going to adopt the electrical roll call system, but whether we are going to spend twenty-five or thirty thousand dollars, and make it possible for a future Congress to adopt the system if it sees fit.

It would seem a grave error to me to fail to lay the electrical conduits in the floor when the Chamber renovation is undertaken at the end of this session.

Democracy is a developing thing. Legislative procedure should not be allowed to stand still. To repeat a statement I made last year, In the days of the jet plane, the atomic and hydrogen bombs, and the strato-rockets, is there any reason why we should cling to the antiquated roll call of 1789?

The Real Issue on Co-Op Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include my statement before the House Ways and Means Committee on February 23, at the hearings on tax revision under the subject of tax treatment of cooperatives:

Grover Cleveland once said that to "understand a problem one must first understand how it got to be a problem."

The current hearings on the tax status of cooperatives did not happen by accident. They have been forced upon the Ways and Means Committee as part of a concerted and very well-financed campaign against the cooperatives.

The campaign or attack is directed less against the cooperatives and their tax status than against the cooperatives as democratic, nonprofit business enterprises.

The Ways and Means Committee of this House of Congress held extensive and exhaustive hearings on this same subject a couple of years ago, and, with all of the evidence in, found no reason to change the current tax situation. Why, then are we forced

to these hearings today? Primarily because of the work of two organizations—the National Tax Equality Association and its parallel organization, the National Associated Businessmen, both of whom are under the guidance and direction of a team of highly skilled public relations counsels, Loring A. Schuler and Vernon Scott.

The National Tax Equality Association, according to the quarterly lobby reports No. A-1954-213-2541-2805 filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, collected more than $500,000 ($586,132.29) in 1949 which was devoted primarily to a running attack on the cooperatives.

We have no information as to the amount of money collected by the National Associated Businessmen. Their financial status would be of interest to this committee and to the Lobby Investigation Committee.

The National Tax Equality Association reported 138 contributors of $500 or more in 1949 of which 43 are power companies. The other large contributors are petroleum companies, grain dealers, and hardware dealers, all of whom have been upset because the farmers and consumers of America have taken advantage of their right to go into business for themselves.

You may ask why the power companies should be interested in the question of taxation of cooperatives. Their chief concern is with the rural electric cooperatives which have brought electric light and power to more than 2,500,000 American farm homes. The power companies were reluctant to provide power in America's rural areas until the cooperatives took the initiative under the Rural Electrification Administration. America has no finer institutions than these rural electric cooperatives as the continued active support of that program on Capitol Hill indicates.

The grain operators were the first to organize against the cooperatives. They took the initiative in forming first the League for the Protection of Private Enterprise which was then changed to become the Central Coordinating Group, Inc. and finally to become the National Tax Equality Association. The president of the National Tax Equality Association until very recently was Ben C. McCabe, Minneapolis grain man who was also president of the International Elevator Co. of that city. The grain dealers became exasperated when the farmers who grow the grain felt that they were not getting their fair share of the sales price of their product and decided to establish their own elevators and grain terminals.

The smoothest of the participants in the National Tax Equality Association are the oil companies which hit upon a rather effective formula for participating in this attack against cooperatives without subjecting themselves to unpleasant publicity. The only major oil company listed as a contributor to the National Tax Equality Association is the Standard Oil Co., Chicago (Standard of Indiana). The other oil companies have contributed in substantial quantities, but at the suggestions of the solicitor have made their contributions less than $500 a year. They are therefore not subject to listing when the lobby reports are filed with the Clerk of the House. The fact that they are contributing is indicated by a letter signed by T. A. Helling, president of the Eldorado Refining Co.; J. E. Champlin, president of the Champlin Refining Co., and H. E. Zoller, president of the Derby Oil Co. The letter was addressed to oil companies and followed the usual NTEA line by claiming quite falsely that the loss to the Treasury Department from Federal income tax over the next 5 years will be considerably in excess of $1,000,000,000.

The letter accuses the cooperatives of growing at a tremendous rate "out of money that you and I and other taxpayers must pay to support our Government." They accuse the cooperatives of constituting a political as well as a subsidized competitive threat.

Then to give the oil companies a quiet tip as to the amount of their contribution Messrs. Helling, Champlin, and Zoller conclude: "Our own contribution to aid in the fight has averaged from $200 to $300 this year. We would appreciate your consideration of a substantial contribution to help insure that the fight is successful. Any one of us will be glad to transmit your check to the National Tax Equality Association if you would like to send it in our care."

This pleasant little letter dated January 16, 1950, was followed by a letter from the National Tax Equality Association January 19, 1950, pointing out that the recipients have received letters from Messrs. Helling, Champlin, and Zoller and declaring: "We hope that your company will see fit to align itself with the many others in the industry who are supporting the fight, and I venture to suggest that a subscription to National Tax Equality Association of $100 would be in line with the support of other concerns of a size approximately equal to yours. Sincerely, Garner M. Lester, president."

This National Tax Equality Association has resorted to all of the familiar pressure gadgets typical in a lobbying organization. They printed several million "phony bucks" attacking the cooperatives. The bills were so nearly identical to United States currency that the Secret Service of the Treasury Department asked the National Tax Equality Association to stop circulating the propaganda throw-aways. Undoubtedly most, if not all, of the members of the Ways and Means Committee have had hundreds if not thousands of these sent to their desks during the last few months.

The most insidious trick of all was a "phony" Christmas card which the NTEA circulated in huge quantities with the request that they be mailed to Senators and Congressmen. One of my colleagues from a western State got 5,000 of these Christmas cards himself.

The latest device—as you might well suspect—is a chain letter urging that businessmen write the Members of the Congress and tie this campaign against the cooperatives into repeal of the wartime excise taxes. In this letter the National Tax Equality Association again says, "The Congress can raise $1,000,000,000 without increasing taxes by taxing the untaxed corporations." You will undoubtedly be subject soon to another deluge, for the letter calls for action saying, "If this is done millions of letters will reach the Congress this session and definite action will result." The authors of the letter fail to state what action they expect your committee to take. But they concluded with this pleasant little ditty:

"If you break this chain
Please don't complain
When excise taxes give you a pain
And income tax goes up again."

The chain letter carefully says, "Address Congressmen, care of the House Office Building; Senators, care of the Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C."

Now, what is the fighting all about?

Congressman NOAH MASON has before this body a bill which would do two things. The first would repeal section 101 (12) of the Internal Revenue Code, which provides tax exemption for agricultural cooperatives which choose to qualify for it.

The second part of Congressman MASON's bill would put a direct, and I believe unconstitutional, tax on patronage savings which are returned to the members of the cooperative associations. By a great stretch of the imagination the Congressman has come to the conclusion that these repayments—which are in essence a return to the user of part of the price he paid for a commodity or service which he received—are the same as profits and are therefore income. The courts of the United States have consistently ruled that these are not profits and therefore are not subject to income tax.

Section 101 (12) of the Internal Revenue Code, adopted in 1916, was not a measure to confer a favor on cooperatives. It was part of the agricultural policy of the United States. It was an attempt to encourage the farmers to do things for themselves and to help bring America a more prosperous agriculture. It is very difficult for an organization to qualify under this provision; as a result less than half (only 5,000 of more than 10,000 eligible) of the cooperatives who might be eligible for it choose not to take advantage of it. This exemption from Federal income-tax payments is the only tax advantage extended to cooperatives of any kind. The cooperatives pay all other State, local, and Federal taxes. More than half of the farmers cooperatives pay Federal income taxes, and all of the city consumer cooperatives pay them since they have no possible exemption under the law.

The slogan "Tax the untaxed first" is designed to confuse and malign. It accuses the cooperatives of being tax-dodgers. I am surprised that the cooperatives have not filed libel suits against the National Tax Equality Association and the National Associated Businessmen for this frankly libelous slogan.

I believe that it will continue to be the agricultural policy of the United States to continue to encourage the agricultural cooperatives. If, however, that policy is to be changed, it should be changed only in the light of and after careful reexamination of our entire agricultural policy.

The real intent of the National Tax Equality Association and the National Associated Businessmen, however, is revealed in the final section of the Mason bill which would tax, in the hands of the cooperatives, the repayments which by law they are obligated to pay out to their members and which in no sense of the word can be interpreted as profits. This second section of the Mason bill would obviously penalize the cooperatives by placing on them a tax which is not placed on any other form of business enterprise. As you know, it is the right of any businessman at any time to pay a share of his earnings back to his customers and not pay tax on those refunds.

The cooperatives have, over the years, proved themselves to be business enterprises of which America may well be proud.

It would be a tragedy for this Congress to take action under pressures of the kinds which have been demonstrated before this committee in the last few months and the last few days.

Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes

REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I must once again urge immediate repeal of wartime excise taxes. These taxes were enacted during the war and there is no justification for their continuance. I rejoice that the House Ways and Means Committee has initiated action to eliminate them from the tax structure. I have requested the Committee to include electric and gas cooking appliances and water heaters in the list of commodities to be relieved of wartime taxation.

On numerous occasions I have stated my opposition to these unwarranted taxes. It is most encouraging to note that President Truman, high Cabinet officers, and many colleagues in the Congress have taken the position that these onerous levies should be largely eliminated.

Many of these taxes strike at necessities, nonluxuries. Women's handbags for example are clearly articles of everyday use. How such an essential as baby oil ever was included in these taxable items is a mystery but obviously such a tax is entirely indefensible. In a degree the same is true of taxes on transportation, admissions, communications, and stoves and cooking appliances as well as other articles. The sole argument for such levies is that they are necessary in order to secure essential revenue for the Federal Government. There are many good economists in business and who believe that if these taxes were lifted the Treasury would greatly benefit by the increased income that would result to manufacturers, distributors, and retailers.

I fully recognize that it may be desirable or necessary to make up any financial deficiency which might result from the elimination of these taxes, yet it well may be that readjustment in current expenditures and new revenue from the industries affected by wartime excise taxes would enable the Congress to avoid the imposition of burdensome new taxes.

It is reassuring to note that the Ways and Means Committee is now working on repeal measures. Our financial and tax problems are extremely serious and undoubtedly complex and the sooner we move toward simplification of the tax structure and sound readjustment of our fiscal condition, the better assurance we will have of full employment, high wages, continued prosperity as security for the American people.

This Government and the incomparable economic system which supports it can be weakened and shattered and brought to a condition of stalemate and collapse by the evils of high taxes and regimentation. This is not theory. This is a fact which we have vividly before us in the experience and example of certain European countries which have wrecked their economy by overtaxing, overspending, overregulating business and social institutions. This is in truth the road to serfdom. If we would avoid similar experience the Congress must take action now to preserve the vitality and strength of the American productive machinery and thus secure, not for any class or group but for the average American citizen the fundamental God-given right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness under a sound, progressive, healthy, and humane democracy.

Obviously it is the duty of Congress under the Constitution to promote the welfare of the American people. This can best be achieved by securing our freedoms to think, to speak, to believe and to work as unfettered Americans. Free initiative and enterprise is one of the strongest weapons the Nation possesses to insure prosperity and the national welfare and we must not permit these invaluable attributes to be stultified by excessive taxation and ultimately obliterated by regimented Government.

Seattle Voters Will Vote for Program of Decent Homes in Good Environment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, in a few weeks a local municipal election will take place in my home city of Seattle, Wash., which has Nation-wide importance. On March 14 the people of Seattle will vote to use or not to use Federal funds for low-rent public housing in Seattle.

Seattle, in these last few weeks, has become the battleground where the national real-estate lobby and its local adherents have taken up the selfish fight which they lost decisively in the Congress last year.

I need not remind the Members of this House of the vindictive boast with which the vanquished real-estate lobbyists retired from the congressional battlefield last summer. They then declared that having lost the issue in Washington they would take it up again in the local communities.

LOBBY CONTINUES FIGHT

Now they are trying to make good on that threat. They have turned their attention from Washington, D. C., to Seattle, Wash. There perhaps they thought their old and empty slogans would find a fertile field. Perhaps they believed Seattle was an easy place to start a national comeback. Evidently they thought that the citizens of Seattle were so uninformed as not to see through the falsification and name calling so as to find the real issue and the real answer.

I believe that they have misjudged our citizens. They have made the fatal error of thinking that the voter cannot understand the fundamental fact that a decent home and living environment are the rightful heritage of every American family and every American child. I believe that on March 14 the citizens of Seattle will vote overwhelmingly to bring public low-rent housing to Seattle for the benefit of low-income families now living in overcrowded, indecent, and insanitary places.

Last September in carrying out its responsibilities to the citizens of Seattle under State and Federal law, the Seattle Housing Authority recommended to the city council and the mayor that they join in an application to the Public Housing Administration for 1,221 additional units of low-rent public housing pursuant to the Housing Act of 1949. The city council after full public hearings endorsed the Housing Authority's application by a 7 to 2 majority.

Using the technique which the national real-estate lobby has recommended, and is using in numbers of smaller places throughout the Nation such as St. Petersburg, Fla., and Waco, Tex., the local adherents of that lobby decided to use referendum procedure to put the ordinance on the ballot in a municipal election. In a well-financed campaign, the necessary signatures were obtained on a referendum petition, and the issue went on the ballot.

DELAYING TACTICS USED

Why has this technique been used? First, because it delays the public low-rent housing program, and, secondly, because the lobbyists are hopeful that in an election with a small turn-out of voters they can hoodwink and frighten a sufficient minority to win. They would like to be able to point to Seattle as the first large city that had the opportunity to vote on the low-rent public housing program and to say the people turned it down.

My belief is that the real-estate lobby will be disappointed. Seattle civic leaders, Democrats, Republicans, church people, veterans' groups, and every segment of organized labor have joined together to support the principles of low-rent public housing. They have formed a Citizens' Housing Committee which is answering the real-estate lobby blow by blow and word for word. They are bringing the facts to the people and the facts speak for themselves.

On Sunday, February 19, the Seattle Times, a leading daily in my home city, called for the voters of Seattle to answer three questions before voting on the public-housing issue in the municipal election.

As a voter in Seattle, I want to answer these questions and state the reasons for my answers. If my responsibilities in Congress were not demanding my attention here, I should be answering these questions at home where I vote. As it is I shall cast an absentee ballot and vote to go forward with the low-rent public housing program in Seattle.

PRINCIPLE OF PUBLIC HOUSING HAS APPROVAL

First, the Seattle Times asks, "Do I approve the principle of public housing in general?" If the Seattle Times means the housing proposal on which Seattle votes March 14, my answer is clearly "Yes." By public housing I mean the low-rent public housing proposed by the Seattle Housing Authority and ratified by a forward-looking city council which was made possible by the program of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and expanded by the Housing Act of 1949.

This program provides homes only for families of low income who are unable to afford private, safe, and sanitary housing. I approve of such a program. That program assures a decent neighborhood environment to Seattle families not now being properly served by private housing. It assures these low-rent tenants a fair rent so that funds remain in order that they can feed and clothe their families adequately with the remainder of their incomes.

Yes, I believe wholeheartedly in a principle and a program which provides homes in a decent environment as the center of family life, rather than the sorry substitute of the street corner, the filthy alley, and the doorway of the crowded slum. I approve the principle of low-rent public housing for families which cannot afford decent private housing. In this, the only field where public housing is suggested, I agree with a well-known Seattle home builder who wrote me, "It has been utterly impossible for builders to cover this field."

SEATTLE NEEDS LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

Secondly, the Seattle Times asks me as a voter whether Seattle genuinely needs additional low-rent public housing now. Again my answer is an emphatic "Yes."

The 1949 census found 25,600 substandard dwelling units in Seattle. The Seattle Housing Authority found in September 1949 that there were 18,500 low-income families who would be eligible for low-rent public housing of which 7,500 families were in great housing need. These statistics speak for themselves. They are bulwarked and underlined by my own personal knowledge of the hundreds of Seattle families now living in hotels and rooming houses not designed for family occupancy. They are highlighted by my own visits to the areas in my city where because of race or color hundreds of families are crowded into unhealthy slums. They are made vivid by my memories of the 2,900 units of temporary war housing in Seattle which are full of low- and middle-income families who cannot find adequate homes they can afford on the private market.

Finally, the Seattle Times asks should I as voter in the city election vote "Yes" on the referendum if there is a real need for the 1,221 units even if I do not believe in public housing. This question, resultant of the first two, I also answer "Yes" for the doubters.

Our fathers and our grandfathers who settled the Pacific Northwest came to a country where they could fashion with their own hands homes for themselves with the abundant materials available. During the war, and since, thousands upon thousands of new pioneers have come to my city and my State to find homes for themselves and their families. We take pride in our mounting population and the opportunities these newcomers find among us. But we cannot take pride in the dwellings in which they must live, if they are overcrowded and forced into substandard, inadequate shelter.

We in Seattle are proud of our city and its people. We want to be proud of the homes in which they live. In voting for further low-rent housing, we must remember the lesson of our only present low-rent public housing project, Yesler Terrace, with its 663 apartments.

YESLER TERRACE A GOOD EXAMPLE

In its short 5 years of life more than 1,900 families have lived in these Yesler Terrace apartments. Yesler Terrace has a great record of taking low-income families out of the slums and broken-down walk-ups, off the streets, and out of the trailer camps. It has given them a fresh and happy start in a good home in a fine neighborhood. It has launched them on the road to an income and an outlook which lead them to buy or rent the good homes provided by the private home-building industry.

Our first low-rent project has proved its worth to Seattle again and again. On March 14 I shall vote to bring more low-rent housing to Seattle so that the job started on Yesler Terrace can be completed and no low-income family by virtue of its income, its size, or its color shall be forced to live out its life in a slum.

Mr. Speaker, I believe calling this Seattle problem to the attention of the Members is fully justified because the real-estate lobby will not limit its activities to Seattle alone. As I have pointed out, there is a concerted Nation-wide drive to nullify the housing objectives we have endorsed in this Congress. To illustrate, I ask leave to include with these remarks the following excerpts from a dispatch which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of February 23, 1950:

HOME BUILDERS PLAN DETERMINED FIGHT TO STOP PUBLIC HOUSING

CHICAGO, February 23.—The Nation's home builders today prepared to carry on a determined fight in cities and towns in an attempt to stop public housing projects "at the local level."

This decision was reached after it was learned the association would seek to raise immediately more than $100,000 for a public-relations program.

Electing a President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the Senate of the United States has recently passed Senate Joint Resolution No. 2, commonly known as the Lodge-Gossett resolution. This proposed constitutional amendment will in all probability come before the House of Representatives in the near future.

A former able and distinguished Member of this House, later a justice of the Kansas Supreme Court, the late Honorable Homer Hoch, took a great interest during his service in Congress in the questions involved in the election of the President and Vice President. The July 1944 issue of the Kansas Judicial Council Bulletin contained an article by Justice Hoch, entitled "Electing a President of the United States." I have seen no clearer or abler discussion of the question involved in the Lodge-Gossett resolution than is contained in this article by Justice Hoch. Because I believe that it should be read by every Member of the House of Representatives, I am including it herewith as a part of my remarks:

ELECTING A PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Justice Homer Hoch, Kansas Supreme Court)

Few people, apparently, regard the method provided by the Constitution for electing a President as a matter of much importance. Comment on the subject consists largely of facetious reference, every 4 years, to the electoral college. And yet, in the opinion of most students of government, this part of our constitutional machinery is not only undemocratic but has very serious defects fraught with real public dangers. To these defects and potential dangers we give little or no concern, our presidential elections having ridden along, in the main, on fairly even keel. Until some emergency arises in a time of tense public feeling which may precipitate a political crisis we just can't be bothered. It is quite like the traditional Irishman's leaky roof, which didn't need fixing while the weather was fair and couldn't be fixed when it was raining.

Briefly stated, the serious defects of the present system are: First, a President may be elected—and has been—not only without having received the most popular votes but without having received as many electoral votes as his principal opponent; second, the votes of the minority in each State are not only uncounted for the candidate for whom they are cast, but in effect are actually counted for the opposing candidate; third, the provisions for electing a President in case no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes are so defective that an impasse might easily occur, with no means provided in the Constitution for securing a President.

Debates in the Constitutional Convention related almost as much to the methods of selecting personnel as they did to the principles upon which the new Federal Government was to be established. And wisely so. Whatever the form of government, it must be administered by men, and while a government bad in substance cannot be sanctified by administration, a government good in principle may be perverted into tyranny by the men who run it. It was only natural, therefore, that having drawn the outlines of a central government of limited, delegated powers, with separate and coordinate branches for law making, law interpreting, and law enforcing, the Constitution Convention should debate at great length the methods of selecting those who were to exercise the various Federal powers.

It is, of course, out of the question to attempt, here, a review of those debates. The principal decisions which were reached as to the legislative and judicial branches are familiar to nearly all. The National Legislature was to be bicameral—with one Chamber directly representing the people, and the other representing the sovereign States. Without this major compromise between the large and small States, which gave representation in the House on the basis of population and gave each State the same representation in the Senate, the Constitution probably would not have been ratified. The principle of this compromise was carried over into the election of a President by giving to each State one electoral vote for each of its Representatives and its two Senators. Two important changes have been made as to election of Representatives and Senators. The Constitution originally provided, in effect, that in the apportionment of Representatives among the States a slave should be counted as three-fifths of a person. With the abolition of slavery this strange political and mathematical provision was formally eliminated by the fourteenth amendment. Senators were elected by the State legislatures until 1913, when the seventeenth amendment providing for their election by popular vote was adopted. As to the judiciary, one of the principal decisions of the framers of the Constitution was to fortify independence of judicial action by a life tenure for Federal judges. Whether this provision is a wise one has long been a question for debate. These and other interesting questions have more or less pertinent relation to our immediate subject but permissible length of this paper prevents their discussion here.

We come to the subject of this paper—the method provided for electing the executive head of the Federal Government. Few subjects before the Convention aroused such extended and acrimonious debate. At least four or five proposals were seriously considered. The so-called Virginia plan, the Pinkney plan, and the New Jersey plan all proposed that the President be elected by Congress. George Mason, of Virginia, one of the most active members of the Convention and a man with a distinguished record as a patriot and statesman, said that it was "as natural to refer the proper character for chief magistrate to the people as it would be to refer a trial of colors to a blind man." And because of his dissatisfaction with the Constitution as adopted he became one of three framers who refused to sign it, and together with Patrick Henry led the fight against its ratification by Virginia.

The Convention first adopted a resolution providing that Congress should name electors who in turn should select a President. Two days later the Convention reversed its action and provided for election of the electors by the State legislatures. A week later it again reversed itself and passed a resolution providing for election of the President directly by Congress, with a 7-year term. Finally the electoral-college system was adopted as we now have it, except for one important change, to be presently noted, which was made by the twelfth amendment in 1804. The plan was taken from a similar provision in the Constitution of Maryland. It was designed largely for a nonpartisan government—political parties not them having fully developed. Apparently the primary principle which the framers thought they were adopting was the selection of a President by a group of men especially fitted for the task. These electors were to select a President much as a board of directors selects a manager for a corporation. Alexander Hamilton wrote in the Federalist: "It is equally desirable that the immediate election should be made by men most capable of analyzing the qualities adapted to the station and acting under circumstances favorable to deliberation, and to a judicious combination of all the reasons and inducements that were proper to govern their choice. A small number of persons, selected by their fellow citizens from the general mass, will be most likely to possess the information and discernment requisite to so complicated an investigation." It is one of the interesting developments of our constitutional history that without any change in the law this fundamental principle soon ceased to operate. The electors became mere instruments for registering the popular vote of the States. Nevertheless, the Hamilton theory was the one upon which the electoral system was based. After Washington's two terms, when Jefferson and Adams were the leading contenders, three electors who were members of the Jefferson party voted for Adams and yet their act aroused no public resentment. But the bitter controversies and personal animosities engendered in the 4 years of John Adams' term—largely by his temper and ineptitude in dealing with those around him—brought a radical change in sentiment concerning the election of a President. This turmoil terminated in the bitter Jefferson and Burr controversy in Congress. The Constitution provided that the electors should meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for two persons. No separate vote for President and Vice President was cast. These ballots were to be sealed and transmitted to the President of the Senate and by him opened and counted in the presence of the Senate and the House. The person receiving the highest vote was to be President and the next highest to be Vice President. At the first election Washington received 69 votes and John Adams 34, the latter thus becoming Vice President. In the election of 1796 Adams became President on a margin of only 3 votes over Jefferson, who became Vice President.

The election of 1800 was an intense one with Adams and Pinckney on one ticket and Jefferson and Burr on another. Jefferson and Burr each had 73 electoral votes and Adams and Pinckney 65. The Constitution provided, as heretofore noted, that each elector should vote for two persons, and it further provided that if there should be a tie vote the election should be made by the House of Representatives from among those whose votes were tied. Jefferson and Burr were tied. While there probably was not a single elector who voted for Burr with the intention that he should be President—the understanding being that he was to be Vice President if Jefferson were elected President—the constitutional provision as it then existed made it possible for the House to select either Jefferson or Burr. The feeling against Jefferson was intense among most of the Federalists, who were in full control of the House. And so a movement sprang up to name Burr instead of Jefferson. Not that the Federalists hated Burr less but that they hated Jefferson more. It was an unconscionable proposal—to which the brilliant but unprincipled Burr gave covert consent—but it would have prevailed had it not been for the opposition of a few Federalists, the most aggressive and influential one being Jefferson's arch political enemy, Alexander Hamilton. Had it not been for Hamilton, Burr probably would have been President instead of Jefferson. Hamilton wrote to Gouverneur Morris, "I trust the Federalists will not finally be so mad as to vote for Burr. I speak with intimate and accurate knowledge of character. His elevation can only promote the purposes of the desperate and the profligate. If there be a man in the world I ought to hate it is Jefferson. With Burr I have always been personally well, but the public good must be paramount to every private consideration." This service of Hamilton became an enduring monument to his high-minded-ness.

As a result of this Jefferson-Burr incident the twelfth amendment was submitted and ratified in 1804. The electors now vote separately for President and Vice President, and in the case there is a tie vote for President, selection is made by the House from the three highest. In case there is a tie vote for Vice President, selection must be made by the Senate from the two highest on the list.

Both under the original Constitution and under the twelfth amendment the State legislatures have power to determine the method of naming electors. Originally electors were selected by the legislatures and as late as 1824 there were still six States that so selected them. South Carolina did not provide for election of the electors by the people until after the Civil War.

In 1824, at the close of the Monroe administration, there again occurred a bitter contest in the House of Representatives over the election of President, accompanied by personal charges and public scandal. That contest, which resulted from the unfortunate provisions of the Constitution, fomented strife and ill will which endured for many years. Out of a total popular vote of less than 400,000, Andrew Jackson had a majority of about 50,000 over John Quincy Adams, and had 99 electoral votes as against 84 for Adams. But Henry Clay and Crawford, of Georgia, who were also candidates, together had 87 electoral votes, which are sufficient to prevent Jackson having a majority of the total number. This threw the election into the House of Representatives, where Adams was elected by the vote of 13 States as against 7 for Jackson. Thus it came about that Jackson, with substantially more popular votes and with 15 more electoral votes than Adams, lost the Presidency and Adams won it. Had the times been just ripe for it, such a result might well have caused serious public uprising.

It would transgress the limits of this paper to narrate at length the circumstances and political upheaval incident to the Hayes-Tilden contest in 1876. The close of the election left the result in doubt. In four States contests took place with both sides claiming the electoral vote of the State. It is generally conceded that Tilden had a popular majority of approximately a quarter of a million. The 22 electoral votes in dispute were sufficient to turn the election either way. Public feeling ran high. Finally Congress—with doubtful constitutional warrant—created a commission to decide the contests from the disputed States. The commission, consisting of five Members from the House, five Members from the Senate, and five members of the Supreme Court, decided the various contests amidst the most intense excitement and bitterness, giving the election to Hayes by 1 electoral vote—185 to 184. Only wise counsel, to which Tilden patriotically contributed by his course of moderation, prevented uprising and possible civil war. All this would have been prevented by some simple changes in the constitutional provisions for election of a President.

I have not yet spoken of the most illogical and indefensible part of the present system. I refer to its disfranchisement, in every State, of the minority voters. A plurality of 1,000, of 100, even of 1 vote in a vote of 5,000,000 in New York State swings that State's 47 electoral votes. Thus, as many as two and a half million voters in that State may not only be denied representation in the electoral vote, but actually have their votes counted for the candidate they oppose. A like result does happen to all minority votes in every State every time we elect a President. I know of nothing in our constitutional system more illogical or undemocratic.

Not only is this disfranchisement of the minority voters in every State indefensible, in my opinion, but the provision for election by the House of Representatives in case of a tie is both illogical and inadequate for meeting contingencies. Although the apportionment of electoral votes among the States is based largely on population, the population factor is entirely disregarded when the election is thrown into the House. In that event each State has 1 vote. Nevada, with 1 Member and with 3 electoral votes, has the same 1 vote in a House election of a President as New York, with 45 members and 47 electoral votes. And if a State delegation in Congress happens to be tied, the State loses its vote entirely. Furthermore, the Constitution requires a majority of all the States to elect. It is surprising that a situation has not already arisen where no candidate could get a majority of the States. With three or more parties represented in the House it could easily happen that no eligible candidate could get a majority of all the States. It is true that if the House fails to elect a President the Vice President is to act as President, but a like provision obtains for election of a Vice President by the Senate and the Senate might easily be unable to elect a Vice President. If such a situation should arise the Constitution has no answer to it. Nor is there any provision for another election. What is the answer?

In itself the answer is not difficult. But unfortunately the obstacle of democratic inertia, of commanding the attention and convincing the understanding of the electorate to a point of action is very great. At various times in our history public-spirited men have sought to arouse public interest in the matter and to secure submission of a constitutional amendment, but to no avail. Senator Benton, of Missouri, agitated the subject in the eighteen twenties and thirties,

and in the seventies Senator Morton, of Indiana, made it his legislative hobby and submitted a very able and convincing committee report and recommendation. In the nineties Dearmond, of Missouri, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, submitted another and similar report. In recent years Congressman Lea, of California, able and public-spirited, has followed in their footsteps and has several times secured a favorable committee report. But always the deeply needed change gets lost in the maze of matters which carry a more immediate and material appeal to Members and to constituencies. We are waiting for the big rain before fixing the roof.

Space will not permit discussion of various proposals that have been made. I will therefore only briefly state the plan which seems to me to be the simplest, the fairest, and the most likely to be ratified if submitted as a constitutional amendment. The heart of the plan, which has been called the proportional plan, is to divide the electoral vote of each State in the same proportion as the popular vote of that State. For instance, if two-thirds of the Kansas voters vote for the Republican candidate and one-third for the Democratic candidate, the former would get two-thirds of our electoral votes and the latter would get one-third. Thus every voter, whether in the majority or in the minority, would have his vote registered and represented in the election of a President. No voter would be disfranchised, as millions of them virtually are now in every Presidential election. There are two reasons which appeal to me for favoring the submission of such an amendment rather than one which disregards the States entirely and determines the result on the popular vote of the country as a whole. The first reason is that it would preserve the principle of the compromise—to which reference has been made—between the large and small States in the creation of Congress—House Members according to the State population but equal representation in the Senate. This compromise tends to lessen somewhat the comparative influence of the large and rich States—a consideration which I believe has been proved fair and wholesome from the standpoint of national unity. To make the point plainer, the plan would not disturb the electoral apportionment which gives Kansas, and every other State, one elector for each Senator as well as one for each Member of the House. Election by the whole popular vote of the Nation, computed as a unit, would disregard the historic compromise between large and small States and give undue influence to the heavy population of certain States. The second reason is that there would be little hope of securing the adoption of an amendment which discarded the present allocation of electoral votes among the States and provided for election by the popular vote of the Nation as a whole.

In dividing the electoral votes of a State under the proportional plan, small fractional numbers would be disregarded unless necessary to determine the result. The technical features are simple enough, not difficult of operation, but need not here be discussed in detail. The plan would remove uncertainty, render the election of a President by the House of Representatives—with its potentialities of scandal and bitterness already demonstrated historically—forever unnecessary and take away the serious possibility that some day we may find ourselves without a President and with no constitutional way to get one. It would wipe out the present disfranchisement of minority voters in the several States and prevent any candidate with less electoral votes than his opponent from becoming President.

Secretary Acheson and the Hiss Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the New York Herald Tribune for February 28, 1950:

TODAY IN WASHINGTON—ACHESON'S ASSERTION OF FRIENDSHIP FOR HISS CALLED EXAMPLE OF PRACTICAL CHRISTIANITY

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 28.—Secretary of State Acheson stands in the middle of a cross-fire which may unfortunately have an adverse effect on the development of world politics at a critical time in history.

The Secretary, on the one hand, is accused of expressing friendship for a man convicted of perjury in a case involving the transmission of secrets to the Communist government in Moscow while, on the other hand, he is accused of standing too firmly against renewed discussions with that same Communist government and of being opposed to a new approach in Russian-American relations. On top of this come the criticisms directed toward the Department of State for alleged leanings toward the Communist regime in China and a considerable hullabaloo in Congress about disloyal employees in the Department of State said to have Communist sympathies.

The inconsistency of these different forms of attack is apparent, for obviously Mr. Acheson couldn't be a friend of communism in the Far East and opposed to it in Europe. The truth is that he is as deeply hostile to communism as anybody inside or outside the Government. The policy being adopted now in the Far East is one originating in military expediency rather than ideology, and it was decided on long before Mr. Acheson became Secretary of State—in fact, when General Marshall was at the helm.

CRITICISM ON HISS CASE

Perhaps the most direct criticism of Mr. Acheson has come because of what he said after Alger Hiss was convicted. Many people hold that he has a right, of course, to entertain views of sympathy toward his friend and to doubt the guilt of Hiss but that, as Secretary of State, he shouldn't have commented at all. This is tantamount to saying that, when a man becomes a public official, he must cease to have human feelings and that a Secretary of State or any other public official is prohibited by political expediency from expressing himself on any moral question that arises.

Actually, when the Acheson nomination was up for confirmation, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee interjected the personal issue and asked Mr. Acheson about his friendship for Hiss, for whom he had acted for a brief interval as counsel before a House committee.

When the jury rendered its verdict of guilt, Mr. Acheson didn't attempt to dodge the inevitable recurrence of the same question when put to him by the reporters. He did not say, however, as has been misrepresented since, that he believed Hiss innocent. He expressed no view on that phase of it but simply pointed out, in effect, that, irrespective of whether Hiss went to jail or not, he would continue to give him his friendship.

CHRISTIAN SPIRIT

This is a far cry from condoning treason or any other crime. It assumed merely that Hiss, by the verdict if nothing else, had already received more punishment before his countrymen than a jail sentence could inflict. It assumed, too, that the rehabilitation of a man gone wrong is an obligation imposed on society as a whole—now recognized as an enlightened attitude in penology. It assumed also that the Christian spirit is not something to which men may pay lip service on Sundays but which they sometimes forget on week days because it might bring down upon them cynical charges of mawkishness or softness. There are many things more precious to Dean Acheson than public office, and one of them is the belief that a man must live with his conscience for years to come.

It is a sign of progress—not decadence—when public officials begin to have respect for moral values, courageously eschew hypocrisy and are ready to take the consequences of their utterances. It would be discouraging indeed if, amid all the professions of righteousness as contrasted with the atheistic world of communism, democracy which is so eloquent in its espousal of Christianity in the abstract should become critical of its concrete practice by high officials in the happenings of everyday life.

Truman Gives School Children Vacation—But in the Cold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's refusal to enforce the Taft-Hartley Act gives the school children of Flint an unwelcome vacation.

The following is what the Flint News Advertiser has to say editorially about the situation:

TRUMAN POLITICS CLOSE FLINT'S SCHOOLS

Flint today is getting a bitter taste of what Missouri politics, played to the hilt in the White House, can do to the national welfare.

Today's taste, bitter as it may be, will be nothing compared to the throat-choking pill to be administered in the next week or two as the coal strike throttles our industrial, educational, and social life.

All this because one man was so busy currying votes that he refused to recognize the emergency when it arose weeks and months ago.

Harry Truman has handled this strike as a Missouri politician, not as President of the United States—that's why 4,300 of our children are home from school today, perhaps 10,000 next week, fires dying down in homes and business places, and cities all over the country holding emergency meetings to save as much as possible out of the debacle.

Without going too far into the issues at stake in the strike—issues must become secondary when human suffering is a result—it is safe to say that John Lewis' United Mine Workers and the mine operators have been jockeying for position for months.

That, perhaps, is their privilege as long as no innocent bystanders got hurt.

Months ago, however, it became evident to anyone who could read the newspapers

that someone was going to get hurt pretty soon.

That was the time when Harry Truman, as referee, should have stepped in and blown the whistle. Harry, however, was too busy counting the house, looking for the congressional seats his party might pick up this fall and the votes he might garner himself in '52 if he could get out of the scrape without using that horrible old Taft-Hartley law.

Week after week, reporters trooped into the President's press conference and asked the same question. Did the President feel that the coal strike constituted a national emergency yet?

Week after week the answer was the same. No, the President didn't think there was an emergency. News-service reporters wrote that story so often that it grew monotonous.

A month ago, the director of the United States Bureau of Mines reported to the President that the supply of coal above ground was critically short.

Mr. Truman let another week pass even after this warning, then, instead of blowing the whistle with the Taft-Hartley law when he realized that the game was getting rough, he suggested a compromise to get the miners back in the pit.

That didn't work worth sour apples.

Finally, 2 weeks ago, the President reluctantly invoked the Taft-Hartley law.

Unfortunately, the ostrich had kept his head buried in the sand too long. The President's patience outlasted our coal piles.

Even if the coal miners should return to work now under a Taft-Hartley injunction to save their treasury from heavy fines, it will be weeks before new supplies of coal filter through to Flint.

Prompt, courageous action by our President as late as a month ago could have forestalled the inconvenience and outright suffering many persons in Flint now face. Instead, Harry Truman preferred to play it like a small-time politician.

How long must our school remain closed, our homes unheated because of these two-bit politics?

How stubborn can a Missouri mule get?

Needy Persons Compelled to Support Chrysler Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the UAW-CIO and its officers have much to say about civil rights, about discrimination.

The UAW-CIO's practices are to the contrary.

Note this letter from a union man:

Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN,

Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: For God's sake don't repeal the Taft-Hartley law, especially where the contributions to politicians is concerned. If they do, when we (the common herd, as Roosevelt used to call us) get through feeding politicians, we won't have a dime, for every time they elect a new dog catcher up to Congressman, we would have to kick in. If you can change it so they can't assess us for strikes, it would help a lot, for I and my wife have been sick most of the winter and now we are assessed $12 for the Chrysler strike.

So keep the Taft-Hartley, only put teeth in it.

Tax Incentives for the Mining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, while we are spending millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money in developing mining properties in foreign lands, I think the time has arrived when we should do something for our domestic metal-mining industry which faces very serious problems.

This is not merely the concern of the mining industry; it affects every single individual in the United States because the production of raw materials—the products from our mines, farms, and forests—form the arch which supports our entire domestic economy. The combined income of agriculture and mining is always one-fifth of our entire national income, and every billion-dollar loss to either agriculture or mining will cause a loss of $5,000,000,000 in our national income.

Mr. Paul B. Jessup, attorney, accountant, and comptroller of one of the largest mining companies in the Coeur d'Alene mining district of north Idaho has prepared the following paper relating to tax incentives for the mining industry which I trust will be read by my colleagues and all others interested in maintaining a stable domestic economy:

TAX TREATMENT FOR NEW MINING VENTURES AND PRODUCING MINES

INTRODUCTORY

Taxes are an important factor in the overall problem of incentives to mine exploration and development.

In general, three different methods have been employed to accomplish this incentive objective, namely, subsidies, income tax relief, and to a limited extent, RFC loans.

Other incentives that should be given consideration are (1) liberalization of the restrictions imposed upon mine financing by the Federal Securities Act of 1933. (2) Revision of the United States mineral laws, particularly the discovery requirements of the law.

You will note that subsidies will be discussed at other sessions of this meeting, along with the matter of the effect of the Securities Act on mine financing and the proposed revision of the mineral laws. Therefore, no time will be devoted to these matters, except to point out that they are a part of the incentive program.

TAX INCENTIVES

The topic for discussion at this session is that of tax treatment for new mining ventures and producing mines. It is obvious that the difference in the character of these activities require different tax treatment.

In general, tax relief to mining enterprises can be divided into two types, (1) relief to the enterprise itself, (2) relief to the owners of the enterprise. The latter becomes important when the enterprise is conducted under corporate form.

The tax relief that has been given by Congress has been devoted to the enterprise proper rather than to its owners.

RELIEF TO MINING ENTERPRISES

Tax relief to mining enterprises can be classified under the following headings:

1. Treatment of exploration and development costs.
2. Depletion allowances.
3. Depreciation and amortization allowances.
4. Loss carry-overs and carry-backs.
5. Outright tax reduction or tax elimination for a period of time (Canadian system).

The latter is a product of the Canadian income tax laws and has not been adopted in this country. The previous speaker on the program has adequately covered this item.

The treatment of the other items under our income tax laws presupposes the ultimate existence of a producing mine. This we all know can be an erroneous assumption. I will briefly discuss each of these items in the order enumerated.

1. Treatment of exploration and development costs: The present law permits the amortization of the cost of exploration and development over the life of the enterprise. This presupposes the existence of something valuable to extract as a basis of amortization. No special provision is made for the treatment of capital expenditures incurred in the hope of developing a valuable mine, which does not materialize, except under the general theory of abandonment.

Today most of the development and exploration activities are conducted by the larger and better financed mining corporations. Existing law requires the capitalization or exploration expenditures. If the exploration program is not successful, the only tax relief that can be secured is through abandonment, which is a stiff penalty to pay for the privilege, particularly where such activities are conducted in mineral ground owned by the concern doing the exploratory work.

In my opinion, the option given the oil industry of either capitalizing intangible drilling and development costs or charging the same off as an expense should likewise be accorded the metal-mining industry with respect to its intangible development and exploration costs. The additional privilege accorded the oil industry of charging off its capitalized intangible drilling costs as an ordinary loss during the year the well becomes completed and was nonproductive should also be given the metal-mining industry during the year its development or exploratory activities are terminated at any particular property as being fruitless.

The extension of these privileges to metal mining would be a substantial tax incentive to development and exploration. As the principle has already been established in the oil industry, Congress should have no legitimate objection to such extension.

2. Depletion allowances: Most of you are familiar with the depletion laws governing metal mines. For the benefit of those who are not, this privilege is accorded by law to producing mines either on a cost or percentage basis, whichever provides the greater allowance. The term cost is used to include March 1, 1913, value.

Percentage depletion for metal mines was adopted as a substitute for discovery depletion under the Revenue Act of 1932. The original law required the taxpayer to make an election on its first return whether or not to adopt the percentage method. If this election was not made, cost depletion was mandatory. The Revenue Act of 1942 disposed of this election requirement and provided that the deduction would be cost or percentage depletion, whichever was greater. In doing this, Congress simply accorded to the metal-mining industry the same right that had been granted the oil industry since the percentage-depletion deduction was granted the latter under the Revenue Act of 1926.

I shall not take the time to go into the pros and cons of the arguments which raged for years on the subject of percentage depletion

which now seems firmly established. I do want to point out, however, that, in spite of the contention of the Bureau of Internal Revenue to the contrary, the present depletion laws are an all-important incentive to the metal-mining industry. I know from personal experience and observation that they provided a source of funds which are being utilized in exploratory and development activities. The only question in my mind is whether or not the existing percentage-depletion rate of 15 percent of the gross income from the property shouldn't be increased to a rate commensurate with the 27½ percent rate allowed the oil industry as an additional incentive to metal mining.

3. Depreciation and amortization allowances: Depreciation is allowed upon plant and equipment. The term "amortization" is usually applied to capital expenditures which do not have any tangible worth outside of their utilization in the mining enterprise, such as shafts and cross-cuts. After a mine has reached the producing stage such amortizable outlays are in the nature of deferred mining expenses which should be amortized over the life of the ore benefited by their installation. They should not be a part of the depletion base at this stage of the mining operation. The law should be clarified so that there can be no question on this matter. GCM 13943 is a sound statement of mine accounting principles, although questioned by some judicial decisions such as the Keppler Coal Company case.

Mine depreciation is usually calculated on the basis of a unit of time or unit of production. If the estimated life of the mine is less than the economic life of the depreciable asset, the depreciation should be based on the life of the mine often on a unit of production basis. If the reverse is true it is often calculated on a straight-line basis, using the economic life of the depreciable asset as the basis for the calculation. Normally, the unit of production basis for calculating depreciation is the most equitable method. It has the advantage of providing larger depreciation allowances in years of greater production and smaller allowances in years of lesser production. It also makes it more probable that the depreciable cost of the assets will be fully recovered when the mine is exhausted.

The subject of depreciation immediately brings to mind the matter of accelerated depreciation as an exploration and development incentive. There is no doubt that this would be beneficial. My own personal opinion is that the attitude of the Bureau in cutting down depreciation reductions over the past few years has not only resulted in an economic loss in wasted time on the part of the taxing authorities and taxpayers involved, but has also resulted in the Government's losing millions of dollars in tax revenues during the recent high tax rate years. If the law would permit the taxpayer to set its own depreciation method and rate so long as it was not entirely out of reason, the Government, over a period of time, would lose nothing, and eliminate tedious arguments with taxpayers. Under these circumstances if the taxpayer made an error in depicting accelerated depreciation it would only have itself to blame.

4. Net loss carry-over and carry-back: During years of high tax rates loss carry-overs and carry-backs are of great importance from the standpoint of an equitable distribution of the tax burden. Without the allowance for losses beyond the year when they are incurred, taxpayers pay a very unequal rate of tax over a period of years. In addition, some of them lose substantially on depreciation and depletion deductions. It is unfortunate that the demands of governmental revenue require the computation of the income tax on an annual basis. Of the two, the loss carry-over is probably more important than the loss carry-back. It at least has the merit of not involving the administrative inconvenience that is occasioned by the latter. However, during high tax-rate periods, a fair and equitable distribution of the tax load should not be sacrificed for administrative convenience.

From the standpoint of an incentive for exploration and development there is a great deal to be said for the 2-year carry-back and the 5-year carry forward of losses. Under proper provisions permitting such losses in the original instance it could provide a corporate incentive to take risks on exploration and development programs. Also, wealthy individuals in high surtax brackets could well afford to risk their capital in natural-resource ventures. This is particularly true at the present time in the oil industry, where in addition to the loss deduction privileges allowed, the percentage depletion deduction rate of 27½ percent is in itself an incentive in the event the venture should prove successful. Similar treatment accorded the metal-mining industry might increase this type of risk capital.

RELIEF TO THE OWNERS OF NATURAL RESOURCES

So far our attention has been directed to the matter of incentives to the enterprise itself. As most enterprises of this character would undoubtedly be conducted in the corporate form, some consideration should be given the incentives for shareholders risking their investment in the same. This approach to the incentive problem has been conspicuous by its absence.

Generally speaking two things could be done to make natural-resource investments more attractive to corporate shareholders. They are as follows: (1) Provide for the recoupment of the shareholder's investment where the enterprise is profitable, and (2) facilitate the charge-off of stock losses where it proves unprofitable.

1. Recoupment of investment: Congress should consider the possibility of levying no tax upon dividends received from mining corporations until the shareholder's investment in the stock is entirely recouped. The shareholder in a wasting asset industry who holds his stock has received no profit until this eventuality occurs. Undoubtedly there may be some difficulties in working out such a plan, but I believe some fair plan could be developed to recognize this principle.

2. Facilitation of charge-offs: The law could certainly be improved in this respect. It is probably important from a mining-investment standpoint to retain the capital-gain provisions with respect to profits on the sale or exchange of mining stocks. However, from an investment standpoint, the allowance of ordinary losses on worthlessness, and the liberalization of the determination of the requirements for worthlessness, should merit serious consideration.

CONCLUSION

The particular points I have mentioned are not the only ones which need consideration. Nor are the remedies I have suggested the only ways in which improvement might be made. But I am convinced they would help and I am sure that we must have real improvement in our tax law if we are to foster and maintain our mining industry.

The Armament Race in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, more than a week ago, on Monday, February 20, I placed in the RECORD the text of a memorandum on the rearmament of the Arab states which had been submitted that day to the Department of State by a delegation of the American Zionist Council. On that occasion I said that the British rearmament of the Arabs will lead to a general armaments race in the Near East and to an inevitable renewal of warfare in that part of the world which will result in the most dire consequences.

I regret to note that the first half of that warning has already come true—much sooner than I anticipated. The armaments race in the Near East is now on in full swing. In view of this most rapid development, I now fear to think when the second half of my warning about the inevitable renewal of warfare and its dire consequences will come true, as it must if we proceed with our present blind policy.

We learned from yesterday's newspapers that Israel has approached our Government with a request that it be permitted to purchase arms in this country. Instead of devoting its full attention to settling its economic problems, absorb the many new immigrants who have entered Israel in the past year and a half, settle them in its rural and urban areas, and integrate them into its economy, Israel is now forced against its will to turn its attention to problems of rearmament, security of its population, and the future existence of the state.

The unfortunate part of it is that our country is, directly or indirectly, a partner to Britain's task of rearming the Arabs. American arms obtained by Britain from this country are being diverted to the Near East, where they are resold to Egypt and other Arab countries. I have always been a consistent supporter of economic aid to Britain, but, at the same time, it was always my feeling that such aid should be for specified purposes and within specific limitations of the United Nations Charter.

In fact, on January 24, 1949, I introduced a bill in this House to amend section 118 of Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress by adding the following proviso:

No money under this act shall be granted, lent, or used to or for any country which violates any provision of the Charter of the United Nations or, directly or indirectly, engages in acts of aggression so long as such acts continue.

Mr. Speaker, Britain's action in arming the Arab states is a violation in spirit, if not in letter, of the UN Charter and will most assuredly lead to acts of aggression against a long-suffering and peaceful people. By our support and approval of Britain's action we are condoning such deeds and encouraging Arab aggression. We still have time to forestall bloodshed, but time is running out fast. We may awaken some fine morning to discover that we have a full-scale war on our hands in the Near East, and this time those forces who thrive on chaos and spread their ideologies in times of disorder may beat us to the punch.

Today's New York Herald Tribune has an excellent editorial on the subject, Arms and the Near East, which I commend to the attention of all Members. It is as follows:

ARMS AND THE NEAR EAST

The latest Israeli request for permission to export arms from the United States and Great Britain illuminates the stark fact that there is no peace in the Near East. Britain, under her old treaties, has resumed the shipment of weapons to the Arab states; the United States has lifted its embargo on such exports in accordance with the United Nations decision, and has licensed some sales to Israel. An arms race is on in the wake of the Palestine war.

But, as in all similar situations, it is not the arms that constitute the real danger of war—rather it is the will to use them. Peace certainly would not be insured by continuing British military aid to the Arabs, while the Israelis were debarred from obtaining weapons from the west. It would not be forwarded if the United States and Great Britain were to enter into a competition to see which nation could supply the greatest amount of arms to the contending parties. Even a new embargo by the western powers, although it might reduce some of the tension in the Palestine region, would not necessarily remove the fundamental threat. Both sides would seek other sources of supply; and if they found them in the Communist bloc of states, the situation would be worsened all around.

The real answer to the problem does not lie in any juggling of arms shipments but in the conclusion of peace treaties among the nations involved in the Palestine embroglio. The present armistice must be replaced by a genuine agreement which will permit the necessarily slow growth of mutual trust and cooperation. A workable solution of the question of Jerusalem must be found, and the United Nations as a body, the United States and Great Britain as interested powers must exert their influence to bring the parties to terms.

The armistice agreements give a practical basis for a settlement; there have been substantial advances toward resolving disputes over boundaries, the refugees and the like. Both Israel and the Arab states have domestic problems which clamor for undivided attention, and make heavy demands upon all the resources of skill, energy, and wealth that are available. Neither side can hope to obtain more, in terms of national prosperity and stability, from war than it would achieve by peaceful methods; indeed, war promises only disaster. If peace, a real peace, were made the first objective on the agenda of Israel, the Arab states, the United States and Britain, the arms race would be relegated to a subsidiary importance, and would die away of inanition.

Income-Tax Exemption for the Disabled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation extending to the physically disabled the same $600 additional income-tax exemption now granted to the blind. By alleviating some of the Federal income-tax burden on these disabled persons who, in spite of their infirmities, have overcome great physical obstacles and have become productive citizens contributing to the welfare of their communities, we will lift some of them out of the borderline area of becoming public charges, and will encourage others to greater efforts toward becoming self-sustaining. The initial loss of actual revenue to the Federal Government as a result of this bill would be very small.

There are about 101,000 disabled in this country today who would be eligible under the bill and many of these do not have sufficient disability to be included. To qualify for the additional exemption the bill defines a "disabled individual" as—

An individual who, by reason of a medically demonstrable physical defect or infirmity (whether congenital or acquired by accident or illness), is permanently and totally incapacitated to perform normal remunerative employment or work, or has permanently lost the use of a hand or a foot, or has permanently lost his hearing or speech.

Milking the Long Cow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, one certainly grows weary of seeing bad, big business after having lost a long legal fight to then rush into Congress and try to get a law passed legalizing for the future their previous wrongdoings. That is just what is sought to be done here today.

When this same bill was before the House of Representatives on July 7, 1949, I spoke at length against this legislation, as pages 9069 and 9070 of the permanent RECORD will disclose. I voted against this bill then, as I also did today.

This bill reeks with selfishness. Even in the face of the atomic and hydrogen bomb scare which requires the dispersing of perhaps all industry throughout the Republic, selfish, big business wants to still centralize it in the future as they have done in the past. The fate of the Republic does not seem to be of any importance to them as I view it.

Some time ago in a labor magazine I saw a cartoon entitled "Milking the Long Cow" which is very applicable to this bill, S. 1008, which was under consideration by the House today. This cartoon pictured a cow with one front foot planted in the Midwest and the other front foot in the State of Texas. The cow was eating the rich forage all about her. One hind foot of the cow was in New York and the other hind foot was in Pennsylvania. On each side of the cow was a man sitting on a milk stool, with a pail between his knees, and his head pressed firmly in the cow's flank, milking as fast as he could. That cartoon well illustrates the present bill.

I have urged all of my acquaintances, who are the real friends of small business, to vote against this bad, bad bill of the big, bad, business interests. Congress should not permit selfish, greedy, and all-consuming big businesses to milk the long cow any longer.

This morning the volatile, voluble, and valuable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] seemed to think that President Truman somehow was in a hole, which was a decidedly unrealistic statement to put it mildly, but anyone who voted to let the long cow be milked any longer, will be not only in a deep political hole but will have a 5-ton tombstone on that grave to keep him in it, with an inscription, I suppose thereon, "He sacrificed his political life to bad, big business' un-American thinking."

Aid to Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times of February 26, 1950, entitled "Aid to Southeast Asia":

AID TO SOUTHEAST ASIA

The dispatch of a technical mission to Southeast Asia to study the fashion in which economic aid can be best used is a sound plan. It is earnestly to be hoped that the mission will have impressed upon it the need for prompt action. There are many things to be done and some of them will be more effective if they are done quickly.

The immediate problem throughout the area is the restoration of production. For the time being, at least, the stability of southeast Asia and its opportunity to make longer range advances in the whole balance of economy is dependent upon getting back into the world market with a specific group of raw materials. The various, and often commendable, plans for industrialization at different levels and for large-scale diversification of production will simply have to wait until the basic economy is put back on a level of paying its own way. What that boils down to is sugar, coconuts, hemp and tobacco in the Philippines, rubber, tin, kapok, pepper, pineapples and petroleum in Malaya and Indonesia, rice in Indochina and Thailand, and rice, oil and teak in Burma.

A viable economy of southeast Asia will have to be, for some years to come, an economy based on close connection with the needs of the Western World plus the production of rice for food needs in the deficit Asiatic areas. This is not economic "colonialism"; it is just plain common sense. It is not a matter of proving or disproving any group of economic and political theories; it is a matter of seeing to it that a large number of persons have enough to eat and that the sufficiency be provided as quickly as possible.

This economy cannot be restored, however, in a power vacuum. There must be some degree of political stability if products are to be grown and marketed. We have already seen what terrorism can do in Malaya and what civil unrest can do in Burma. Political insecurity can be quickly translated into economic stagnation.

The United States, therefore, must give some assurances in policy that will contribute to the desired and indeed imperative

political stability. A mission to study needs and how they can be met is a good thing. But we already face the accusation of "all talk and no deeds" in the Far East. The study of needs must be coupled with the firm resolve to meet those needs, not through some hopeful planning for the distant future but through assistance here and now.

The Purchasing Power of Our Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a very distinguished constituent, Charles G. Cady, of Weston's Mills, New York, dealing with some history on currency which is very pertinent to our present fiscal situation.

We are traveling rapidly towards currency depreciation, which means, of course, a form of national bankruptcy that leads to the reduction of the purchasing power of our dollar.

This, of course, will have a devastating effect upon the security of those who in years past purchased insurance policies paid for retirement, and put their hard-earned money into annuities. Even now there are those who are proposing to cover up our deficit until after this year's campaign by putting in a plan of anticipatory tax revision on corporations. This is not a new device. In some countries reckless spenders in charge of the government resorted to this fraud to cover up deficits and keep on spending.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting Mr. Cady's letter in the RECORD:

On the chance that the following may not have come to your attention, I am venturing to submit it to you for use whenever the occasion may arise.

When the war broke out by the American Colonists against the British Crown in 1775, the total money supply in the Colonies was about $30,000,000 in gold and silver coins—"Specie."

The new Continental Congress found taxation difficult and so turned to the printing press to finance its military expenses. It printed $2,000,000 of paper, redeemable in specie, dollar for dollar. It became popular. It was all the Congress intended to print. But it was such an easy way to meet the war expenses that the people demanded more of it be printed. While that first $2,000,000 had plenty of specie back of it, it circulated practically at par. But as more was issued it steadily depreciated. Prices rose rapidly and the value of the Continental dollars in comparison with specie as rapidly fell.

The CONTINENTAL Congress issued $9,000,000 of the paper money in 1776, and larger issues each year till it had printed $140,000,000 in 1779, only 4 years later. By 1780, or in 5 years, Congress had printed so MUCH paper money that a paper dollar was worth in circulation, only 1 cent of real money. The current expression for uselessness was that "It was not worth a continental."

The Continental Congress and individual State governments tried every coercive means available to prevent the prevailing rise of prices. Price-control laws were passed. Also laws to compel creditors and merchants to accept continentals at par with specie. In 1778, Congress resolved "That if any person shall hereafter be so lost to all virtue and regard for his country as to refuse (to accept the continentals) such person shall be deemed an enemy of his country. General Putnam decreed that everyone refusing to receive continentals at par would have his goods seized and be imprisoned. The Council of Safety of Pennsylvania decreed that any violator of these control laws was a dangerous member of society, that the penalty for first offense would be the seizure of the goods and a heavy fine, and for the second offense, would be exiled from the State. Price control, particularly in Pennsylvania and New England, led to acute shortages and widespread violations. Self-appointed committees of citizens in New England looted stores at will, selling the goods from the shelves at fixed prices. The Council of Safety of Pennsylvania, learning that a cargo of salt was coming and that its price had been increased ordered it sold at a low price. From then till the end of the war, salt was almost unattainable in Pennsylvania. The Rhode Island State government decreed that if some people were in want and others were deemed to have too much, the justices of the peace might order the constables to break open the houses of the "haves" and supply the "have nots" with the goods at lawful prices (and the State was to pocket the proceeds). Connecticut decreed a rationing scheme prohibiting any person from buying more than a stipulated amount of food and other necessities. Purchases could not be made without a license from the State.

A discerning writer of that time, Peletiah Webster, summed up the experiment with the continental. "Paper money polluted the equity of our laws, turned them into engines of oppression, corrupted the justice of our public administration, destroyed the fortunes of thousands who had confidence in it." It went far to destroy the morality of our people.

Now note: In 1780 Congress repudiated its dollar for dollar promises and announced specie resumption at a rate of one specie dollar for 40 continentals. There followed a rapid fall in prices to a stable level.

Another writer of that day said: "It becomes rulers to learn from the catastrophe of our continental currency that money is upon a footing with commerce or religion. They all refuse to be the subject of law. It becomes the rulers of freemen to learn further that money is property, and that the least attempt to lessen its value in our pockets and chests is taxing us without our consent. It is the highest act of tyranny. We have tried every art and device to keep up the credit of paper money except one; we have never yet tried the effects of being honest."

Now, Mr. REED, do me one favor. Please look in your own pocketbook. You will find a $1 bill on which is printed "The United States will pay the bearer one silver dollar on demand." On your fives, tens, and twenties (I don't happen to go any higher), you will find "The United States of America will pay to the bearer on demand $5, $10, and $20." Another printed note, with nothing back of it but the promise to pay another of the same kind.

I worked hard, earned a little, saved a little, laid it away for that proverbial rainy day some 20 years ago. Then by Presidential decree my dollars were made worth only 59 cents each.

My sincere appreciation of your serious task.

RFC Pays for Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it will probably come as a surprise to some Members in this House that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is a money maker instead of a money loser. Despite the recent difficulties with the loan to the Lustron Corp.—which, incidentally, may still be saved—RFC's losses have been less than one-half of 1 percent. At the same time its net profits after payment of all expenses are reported to be about $573,000,000, more than half of which it returned to the United States Treasury in the form of dividends.

Many Members will be interested to read the brief article on the subject by Carl Levin, RFC: Money Maker, published in the New York Herald Tribune, Sunday, February 19, 1950, which is as follows:

RFC: MONEY MAKER—POSSIBLE LOSS ON LUSTRON LOAN A RARITY IN HARD-BOILED AGENCY

(By Carl Levin)

WASHINGTON.—Government lending, at least when done by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, remains a profitable and sound operation even when it becomes necessary to foreclose, as it did last week, on a borrower owing $37,500,000.

The decision to institute foreclosure proceedings against the Lustron Corp., manufacturer of all-steel prefabricated homes, with possible resulting RFC losses of $30,000,000, caused no high fevers at RFC.

A perusal of RFC's profit-and-loss statement makes clear that RFC is a hard-boiled lending outfit which, while it helps business and thus the Nation's economy, is primarily in the business of making money.

The Government-owned lending corporation was founded by Congress in 1932. At the direction of Congress it was involved in subsidy payments, stock piling, and war-plant financing during the war, which were not calculated to be profitable. Now it is engaged only in lending and investment.

Excluding intragovernment financing, it has made loans and investments in excess of $10,150,000,000. Its losses, after all operating expenses, have amounted to less than one-half of 1 percent of the amount it has disbursed. Its net profits, after paying all of its expenses, plus interest on the money which it has borrowed, are in the vicinity of $573,000,000.

Under the present Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, which contains provisions fixing the amount of profits which RFC may retain, it has paid $308,700,000 of the $573,000,000 to the Treasury in the form of dividends.

As set up 18 years ago all of RFC's capital stock, $500,000,000 worth, was purchased by the Treasury. This gave the lending agency its original working capital. All but $100,000,000 worth of this has now been retired at par.

The agency formerly borrowed money from private lenders. Now all the money it needs to continue its lending operations is borrowed from the Treasury at an interest rate fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, according to a congressionally dictated formula. The rate usually is about 2 percent, based on the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States. The rate charged borrowers usually is about twice that, 4 percent.

Currently RFC owes the Government, on notes, about $1,222,000,000, but if its past performance is any criterion this money is more than safe. It will earn well despite foreclosures such as that of the Lustron Corp., the loans to which, in the first place, were of a special nature because of the Government's interest in helping solve the critical postwar housing shortage.

And even in the case of Lustron, RFC officials point out, a reorganization may yet save RFC's investment.

British Pendulum Swings Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New Hampshire Morning Union of February 27, 1950, entitled "British Pendulum Swings Back." The Union is published in Manchester, N. H.

BRITISH PENDULUM SWINGS BACK

The result of the British election indicates a definite reversal of a totalitarian trend that has been spreading recently over the Western World. For although the Laborites won a slim majority, the reduction of their lead in the House of Commons from 180 seats to a bare 1, with 12 "ridings" still to be heard from, registers a heavy swing of popular sentiment from 5 years ago. The Laborites got less than 46 percent of the popular vote.

A party in power in Britain needs at least a majority of at least 30 to carry on, due to the number of Government officials drawn from the parliamentary membership who are not usually on hand to vote on the floor of the Commons. This means that the laborites today are faced with the alternative of forming a coalition government or of calling a new election as soon as essential legislation is out of the way. It is practically impossible for them to carry on alone. When this result is taken with the recent Socialist defeats in Australia and New Zealand, the significance is inescapable.

The drubbing given the Communists and fellow travelers in the election is another indication that a reaction against the leftist trend has set in in Britain. All Communist candidates—numbering 100 in all—together with those who expressed sympathy with Russia, were completely wiped out. Even Communist William Galacher, who had represented his district in Scotland for 15 years, was decisively defeated. For the first time in many years, the British Parliament will have no Communists or fellow travelers in its ranks.

The British people apparently are awakening to the direction in which the Labor government has been taking the country. They were beguiled for a time by the lure of the social so-called benefits the Laborites held before them, and did not realize that socialism leads inevitably to the destruction of all individual initiative and the fixing of the iron grip of statism on the people. Perhaps the nationalization of the steel industry, which the Laborites voted but held in abeyance until after the election, began to call their attention to the fact that a return of the Laborites for another 5 years would mean that the nation would be irrevocably committed to socialism.

They have drawn back from that result, and let us hope that if another general election is called soon, they will put the final veto on the issue. The British are a hard-headed people, rooted in the democratic tradition, and it is inconceivable that they would see the freedom for which they fought for centuries wiped out by a return of government regimentation in which they would once more become puppets of the state. We here in the United States will do well to study the British reaction, for the same paralysis of socialism is creeping over us under the influence of bureaucrats fascinated by the Socialist way.

Sean Nunan's Farewell Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert in the RECORD, the farewell speech of Sean Nunan, Minister of Ireland to the United States.

It was with a sense of sadness that many of us attended the testimonial dinner for Sean last night at the Carlton Hotel. We will miss his smile, his courtesy, and his indomitable courage. We will remember his refreshing humor, his understanding, and his spirit of tolerance.

We all hope that in his new position as Assistant Secretary for External Affairs he will be able to visit us often so that we may continue to work with and for one another. Sean Nunan has not only ably represented his country in Washington; he has also represented us to Ireland.

We rejoice that we have known Sean and we wish him the best of everything in the years ahead. To Mrs. Nunan and Sean we say good luck and Godspeed and we—with them—look forward to that great day when the word "partition" will be replaced by "united." Then, and only then, will Ireland really come into its own.

Mr. Speaker, the speech of the Honorable Sean Nunan, Minister of Ireland to the United States, follows:

Mr. Secretary, Mr. Chief Justice, and my distinguished and dear friends, words are completely inadequate to express the very deep sense of gratitude I have in my heart for the many expressions of warm friendship made concerning me tonight, and for the wonderful friendship evidenced by the presence of such a distinguished gathering as is here.

I feel that personally I am not worthy of the honor you have done me, but I would be less than human if I did not feel tremendous pride and gratification at the tributes paid to me. I feel that in honoring me, Ireland's Minister to the United States, you are honoring Ireland—the motherland which cradled your forefathers and, indeed, some of you who are here tonight—the land whose people have contributed so greatly to the upbuilding and preservation of this great Republic of the United States. For the honor you pay to Ireland I am deeply grateful. For the tributes paid to me personally, I return a sincere, deep, and heartfelt "Thank you."

It is a difficult task for me to speak to you tonight, for my heart is heavy at the thought that I am saying "Goodbye" to so many dear and sincere friends of mine and of Ireland. "Goodbye" is a sad word, especially when a man reaches the three-score mark, and though I have every hope that I may come back occasionally, or some of you may come to Ireland, this may well be a final goodbye between some of us.

My heart is torn by two emotions—joy in the anticipation of going home to my own country, and sadness at the thought of leaving your great country—"the greater Ireland beyond the sea"—where so many of our people found refuge from an alien tyranny in years gone by, and where the opportunity of living as free men, which was denied them in their own country, was gladly afforded them. Which of these emotions will gain mastery in the years to come, I cannot say, but at the moment sadness is the predominant one.

When I look back over the period of 30 years since I first came to your shores, and recollect how the people of America helped my country in her efforts to attain independence, I am filled with gratitude. I came here in 1919 when the world was emerging from World War I, when America speaking through her great President, Woodrow Wilson, enunciated the ideal of the right of small nations to governments of their own choosing. We in Ireland had made our choice in 1916 and confirmed it in 1918—a Republic for all Ireland; but the will of the Irish people was denied by the then ruling power.

I came here with the President of the Irish Republic—Eamon De Valera—to plead Ireland's case to the liberty loving people of America and in the course of our stay here a drive for funds was made to enable the infant republic to survive. The people of America responded splendidly to the call and a sum of about $5,000,000 was subscribed for which bond certificates of the Irish Republic were issued. Without that financial help it would have been extremely difficult for the Irish Government to function. I had the honor of being the registrar of that bond issue and I say to you that it was one of the proudest moments of my life when the Irish Government repaid those bonds to the good people of America—and at $1.25 for each $1 subscribed. Those of you who remember that, were, I am sure, equally proud that Ireland did not default on her debt.

Ireland has come a long way since that time. Every vestige of allegiance or subservience to the power which for so many long and bitter years held our country in subjection has been obliterated in 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland by successive Irish governments, and a completely free and independent state is functioning there. But freedom and independence for three-quarters of the nation is not the ideal of the Irish Government or the Irish people. Complete freedom for, and the unity of, the whole of Ireland is the aim; but while great progress toward the attainment of that ideal has been made, the Republic of All Ireland has not yet been attained—because as you all know a part of our small island has been partitioned, despite the expressed voice of the Irish people. Our efforts to abolish the infamous border which divides our nation and country have been, and are still being, immensely aided by American opinion, and

Ireland will forever be grateful for the sympathy, and active assistance of her millions of friends in America.

I hope, and I believe, that in the final drive to that goal, Ireland can count on the continued sympathy and assistance of all lovers of true democracy in America, and that includes every American worthy of the name. We in Ireland want our country to be what your children proclaim America to be, when at assembly every morning they recite the Pledge to the Flag: "One Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

On the other side of the ledger is to be found the record of the part played by Irishmen in the establishment of this great Republic of the United States. Our people are always to be found in the forefront of the fight for freedom everywhere, and particularly so in this Republic in whose successful fight for freedom from an oppressor, they played no small part. It is a matter of great pride to an Irishman to remember that, in the Revolutionary War, 50 percent of Washington's Army was born in Ireland. In the Congressional Library here in the city of Washington there is a copy of the Royal Gazette of October 27, 1779, No. 231, which reports the evidence given by Mr. Joseph Galloway, Speaker of the House of Assembly of Pennsylvania, before the English House of Commons, which was inquiring into the reason for the Revolution. In the course of the examination, Mr. Galloway was asked: "That part of the rebel army that enlisted in the service of the Congress were they chiefly composed of natives of America, or were the greatest part of them English, Scotch, and Irish?" He replied: "The names and places of their nativity being taken down, I can answer the question with precision. There were scarcely one-fourth natives of America—about one-half Irish—the other fourth were English and Scotch." We recall with pride those Irishmen who signed the Declaration of Independence; those men of Irish descent who occupied the highest offices in this Republic—men such as President Andrew Jackson, who declared that he had not one drop of blood in his veins that was not Irish. And we are proud to know that men of Irish blood are still occupying—with honor and dignity—such offices; as witness, Secretary Tobin, Secretary Matthews, and the Attorney General, to name but a few. Nor should I fail to include the Chief Justice in that honor roll for he has Irish blood in his veins, otherwise he would not be a member of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

We glory in the knowledge that our people helped to bring freedom to this country, and we glory at the part they are playing to preserve that freedom, but it is saddening to reflect that the land from which they sprang does not yet completely enjoy the true freedom which they helped to bring to this great Nation.

Yet it is indeed most heartening to see in this room men who believed in, and worked for, Ireland's right to complete independence when I came here in 1919 and who, by their presence here, give evidence that they still are of that same belief.

I recollect meeting a tall, dark, and handsome young man in the city of Butte, Mont., in the year 1919, who was the driving force behind the Irish independence movement in the State of Montana at that time. He is still tall, dark, and handsome, though 31 years older. His name was, and is, JAMES E. MURRAY, now the distinguished Senator from that great State. His recent speech in the Senate on the question of partition is evidence that his belief in Ireland's right to unity is unchanged.

I also recollect that I sat on the same platform at an Irish independence meeting in Omaha, also in 1919, with the gentleman who is now the distinguished and able Secretary of the Navy. Evidently Secretary Matthews' belief is unchanged. And, that same year, at what I believe was one of the largest and most enthusiastic meetings in support of Irish independence ever held in Boston—and Boston has had many large and enthusiastic meetings—a young man of 18 years of age was definitely present. That young man is now the distinguished Secretary of Labor and our toastmaster tonight. I see, also, Dick Dalton who, when I came to New York in 1919 was treasurer of the Friends of Irish Freedom. And Joe Scott, whose message has just been read to you was in the forefront also 31 years ago. There are many such recollections crowding my memory tonight, but those I have mentioned will suffice as examples of the enduring belief of American citizens in the righteousness of Ireland's cause.

In my many years in America I have tried to interpret Ireland and her aspirations to the American people and from the evidence I have seen, and from the generous expressions made here tonight regarding my work, I feel that my efforts have not been in vain.

Not alone am I grateful to America for what she has done for my country, I am grateful for the opportunity she gave me personally. There was, as you may have noticed from the biographical sketch which the committee prepared and included on the program, an interregnum in my official career. I shall not discuss the reasons which brought it about. Anyhow, I came back to America in 1923 as an ordinary immigrant seeking to earn a living. I tried many things. I tried to sell bonds, for instance. But either I was no salesman or the people in New York did not have the same faith in the future of the corporations whose bonds I was trying to sell as the subscribers to the bonds of the Irish Republic had in the future of that Republic, because I sold very few bonds. I then transferred from the outside of the financial world to the inside and found myself as cashier in a stock-exchange house in Wall Street. During my years there, came the crash of 1929, with which, I am sure, most of you are familiar. Maybe you got burned as I did. I saw the ruin and despair which struck so many Americans then: I saw banks closed and people's savings gone, and I wondered would America ever recover from the blight that had fallen on her. It was then that the real fiber of the people showed itself. They did not spend too much time worrying about "what might have been," but under the bold leadership of their Government they buckled down to work and built up an even greater and more stable prosperity.

These experiences brought me into close touch with the man in the street—and I don't mean Wall Street exclusively—and gave me an understanding of the real America, such as I could never have obtained in official or diplomatic circles, and thereby, I believe, enabled me better to interpret America to my Government.

Yes, America has given me much, and in return I shall do all in my power to make stronger and better—if such be possible—the sincere bonds of friendship between our two countries.

I leave America with a heart overflowing with gratitude to the great people of a great country for the friendship they have shown to my country and to me. Part of me will always be here, for Mrs. Nunan—for whose love, help, and good counsel in all the ups and downs of my life I wish to pay public tribute. She would indeed be a proud woman could she but see this gathering in my honor, and she and I are leaving our only son—Dr. Seamus Nunan—here. He has chosen to be an American citizen—a good choice may I say—and to make his home in America. So to some slight degree I am giving something to America for all she has given me. I pray that Almighty God will continue to shower His blessings on your country and that peace and prosperity will be the lot of your people for all days.

I leave you, my dear friends, with a heavy heart, but I shall cherish always the memory of the wonderful friendship you have extended to me.

The memory of this evening will always remain with me as evidence of that friendship and this beautiful token which you have presented to me will be a constant reminder of it.

Again Mr. Secretary, Mr. Chief Justice, and my dear friends, thank you, and may God bless America.

Control of Congress Means Control of Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, for months the big labor bosses from Washington have brazenly published through the press that they are raising millions of dollars they will spend to defeat all of us Congressmen who refused to take their dictation, and who voted for the Taft-Hartley law.

They claim that if they can defeat seventeen to twenty of us in the House, and six in the Senate, they can control the Congress. The danger in this statement is, that they are stating a fact, which should alarm every citizen.

Control of the Congress means control of the Nation. Control of the Congress by these dictatorial labor leaders would give them the power to put over their entire legislative program, such as the repeal of any labor legislation now on the statute books, the enactment of the Brannan farm plan, socialized medicine, socialized housing, and any legislation they choose. It would bring a one-sided socialistic labor government into power that could regiment and control every activity of the American people. Their grab for this power should awaken everyone.

I am opposed to the big labor leaders, or any other group taking over control of this government. I know the farmers and businessmen are opposed to it. It would do great damage to everyone, including the rank and file of labor.

The big labor bosses have sent out orders that I must be defeated in the coming campaign. Under such orders their hatchet men, with the high sounding names of the Southern Illinois Labor League for Political Education, opened their campaign to defeat me at Harrisburg, Ill., on Sunday, January 22.

John Marchiando, of Springfield, Ill., State president of the Progressive Mine Workers, who recently called a strike of 15,000 Progressive miners in Illinois which helped to make worse the shortage of coal for everyone, adding to the chaos of the coal strike, came down to Harrisburg as one of the chief speakers at the meeting and told them:

> Congressman VURSELL must be defeated because he is an enemy of labor.

Of course, I am not, and have never been an enemy of labor.

At this meeting my congressional opponent on the Democratic ticket addressed the meeting, composed of some 250 labor leaders, and made them this amazing promise: He said, "As far as labor is concerned, you can write your own ticket if I go to Congress."

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in becoming a rubber stamp in the Congress for any one special group. No special group has ever had a pledge from me that it can write my legislative ticket or program in the Congress, and none will ever have such a pledge.

My policy has been to support legislation that is equally fair and just to all the people, including the three great segments of our economy—agriculture, labor, and business. I know that such legislation, fair to all, will bring the greatest prosperity to all of our citizens, including labor. That will continue to be my policy.

I am glad my opponent has squarely drawn the issue so the people of my district may understand what he stands for. Shall the Congress enact only the kind of legislation the big labor bosses want? Have not the 120,000,000 other citizens some rights that should be protected? I think they have.

The coal strike which has brought so much suffering to labor, industry, and the people generally is the best evidence of the chaos that will engulf the Nation if the big labor leaders are allowed to control the Congress and write their own ticket.

Mr. Speaker, such a statement to give a free rein to any group should defeat any candidate who makes it on any ticket.

How about the farmer, his wife, and family who work long hours to produce the food for our people and the hungry people of the world? Without his farm investment and effort, all the people would go hungry and there would be no prosperity in this country. The labor leaders are demanding the passage of the Brannan farm plan and socialized medicine. Ninety percent of the farmers are against both.

What about business concerns who invest billions in capital and employ millions of workers? Are they to be neglected and cast out as are the farmers?

It is wrong and dangerous to allow any one group to write a Congressman's legislative program. All of the great groups in our economy must be given equal and fair consideration in an attempt to do equal justice to all of them.

Let us preserve representative government and run the government in the interest of all the people, as the Constitution provides.

That will continue to be my policy. I do not believe the citizens of this district want the labor bosses to write their legislative ticket in the Congress. I am willing to trust the decision of our people on this most important issue.

Taxing Chartered Veterans' Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum of the Disabled American Veterans relative to certain recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury for legislation to tax the business income of corporations exempt under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code:

The Disabled American Veterans is deeply concerned with the present hearings being conducted by the House Committee on Ways and Means insofar as they pertain to the taxing of the business income of certain exempt corporations.

The DAV is a congressionally chartered veterans' organization authorized an exemption from the payment of Federal income tax pursuant to section 101 (8) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The House Committee on Ways and Means is conducting hearings on a number of measures designed to "close the loopholes" in existing revenue laws. One proposal before the committee is H. R. 5064 introduced by Congressman NOAH MASON of Illinois, a member of the Ways and Means Committee. This measure is intended to subject the business income of corporations exempt under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code to the payment of Federal income tax.

The term "business income" is defined in H. R. 5064 to mean "the gross income derived from any activity of a kind which is recognized as an ordinary trade or business activity commonly engaged in by other persons for profit."

The principal income of the DAV is derived from two sources; (1) donations from recipients of Ident-O-Tags and (2) appropriations from the DAV Service Foundation.

The Ident-O-Tag is a small replica of a State automobile license tag. These tags are mailed to approximately 30,000,000 registered automobile owners in the United States each year. Each recipient is requested to return 25 cents or more to the DAV and a record of the name and address of each recipient of a tag is maintained by the DAV. In the event of the loss of key rings or any other article to which the Ident-O-Tag is attached, it states on the reverse side of the tag that if the article is mailed to the DAV, postage free, it will be returned by the DAV to the rightful owner.

The DAV Service Foundation is a nonprofit Ohio corporation organized by the DAV and operating under the terms of a trust agreement with the DAV. The Service Foundation undertakes various fund-raising projects and from time to time transfers money from its accumulated trust funds to the DAV to defray the costs of operating the DAV rehabilitation program.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the gross income of the DAV from its Ident-O-Tag operation was $1,757,946.81. For the same period, the DAV received a transfer of funds from the DAV Service Foundation of $750,000. This makes a total gross income from these two sources of $2,507,946.81. The expense properly chargeable to the above items of income is $323,951.33, leaving a net income of $2,183,995.48.

The DAV maintains a full-time paid staff of approximately 250 national-service officers located in practically every facility of the Veterans' Administration throughout the United States. The function of these national-service officers is to assist veterans, the dependents of veterans and the survivors of deceased veterans in the proper presentation of their claims for benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. This service is entirely free and no charge whatsoever is made to any claimant, nor is it necessary that the claimant seeking representation by the DAV service officer be a member of the organization. The annual pay roll to maintain our claims and rehabilitation service is approximately $1,600,000 annually.

Our concern with the present recommendations of the Treasury Department is that in their efforts to tax the income of certain religious, charitable, educational and nonprofit organizations from business sources unrelated to their corporate functions, the Congress might use language in drafting a tax bill that could be interpreted by the Treasury Department as subjecting the income of the DAV from the above-described sources to income tax. If this should happen, it would result in a tax, based on the above figures, of approximately $330,000. Obviously this organization could not stand such an increase in its operating costs and at the same time continue its service set-up.

ADDITIONAL INCREASE PROPOSED BY CONGRESS AFFECTING DAV

The House of Representatives on February 9, 1950, passed H. R. 2945, a bill to increase the postal rates, and this measure is now pending before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 2945 increases third-class postal rates from 1 cent to 1½ cents per piece. If enacted into law, this measure will increase the third-class postage bill to the DAV by $150,000 annually.

If the House Committee on Ways and Means should favorably consider H. R. 5064 or similar legislation and the Senate should pass the already House-approved third-class postal increase it would result in increased annual cost to the DAV as follows:

	Present	Proposed
Cost of mailing 30,000,000 Ident-O-Tags	$300,000	$450,000
Federal income tax on income from Ident-O-Tags and DAV Service Foundation	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total	[illegible]	[illegible]

If the DAV should lose its tax-exempt status as a result of the enactment of H. R. 5064, or any other similar measure, and the Senate acts favorably on the House passed postal bill H. R. 2945, it can be seen from the above that it will have disastrous effects on our excellent veterans' claims service. We feel certain that the members of this committee and the Members of Congress generally do not intend to tax out of existence organizations performing a valuable public service to America's wartime disabled. We strongly urge each and every member of the committee to carefully consider the wording of any bill they report designed to tax the business income of exempt corporations. The definition of business income in any such amendment to the internal revenue laws should be carefully worded so that no ambiguity could possibly arise in the interpretation thereof by the Treasury Department and the courts. It should be made crystal clear that congressionally chartered veteran organizations performing a public service are not to lose their exempt status or that their sources of revenue shall not be defined as business income.

Russia Indoctrinating Japanese Prisoners With Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following account of Russian tactics to indoctrinate Japanese prisoners of war with Communist ideals and advance the Red movement in Asia. These contents comprised my weekly newsletter, In Washington With HAROLD LOVRE, for the week of February 20:

A tale of the clever tactics of Russia to indoctrinate Japanese prisoners of war with Communist ideals to advance the Red movement in Asia and discredit American policy has recently unfolded. Maj. Gen. C. A. Willoughby, G-2 of General MacArthur's Tokyo occupation forces has made available to the writer an official report revealing an incredible tale of Russian brutality and cunningness which shocks the imagination. This special report from the Far East command shows unbelievable Russian tactics employed upon Japanese war prisoners, most of whom were held as slaves in Siberian labor camps.

BROUGHT HOME

While the United States in 1946 repatriated every Japanese regardless of where he was held, the Russians retained more than 2,000,000 military and civilian personnel. The Russians have fallen considerably behind the agreed 50,000 deliveries per month, although ample shipping space for the returnees has been made available by the American Far East command. In June 1949 Russia reported only 95,000 Japanese left to be repatriated. Japanese figures, however, show that there were still 469,000 prisoners in Soviet hands. The remaining 374,000 are presumably dead, because repeated requests have met with no answer.

Tales of privation, brutal treatment, overwork, and lack of medical care brought back to the homeland by the Japanese repatriates provoke little sympathy from Americans familiar with the treatment our servicemen received at the hands of the Nipponese. Yet behind the scheme lies a fiendish plot.

PW'S CONVERTED INTO COMMUNISTS

The cunning Russian policy was long range in scope. The sick and the old were either repatriated early or allowed to die. The remainder were forced to do hard manual labor without sufficient food and medical care. A team of 50 grave diggers in one Siberian labor camp could not bury the dead fast enough.

Internees were carefully segregated. High-ranking officers were put in one camp; middle-grade officers in another; enlisted men in another. An appeal was made to the latter group through condemning the so-called military caste system. American policy in the Pacific was blamed for the abject misery under which the PW's were forced to exist. Shipping space was refused by the "American capitalistic conquerors," the Russians said.

In 1946, when conditions were at their worst, there began a vast centrifugal Communist indoctrination program. The older PW's with fixed ideas had already died or been shipped back home. The "enlightenment" program was designed to foster distrust of the Japanese and hatred toward the Americans. An anti-Fascist group was thrust among the PW's, whose only hope, after seeing their companions die by the hundreds of starvation, was repatriation. A newspaper, published by specially trained Japanese, set about molding opinion along the Communist line. Living conditions for the survivors gradually improved. Even the Russian standard of living on the outside raised slowly. Imperialism, capitalism, and the military system were condemned. Gradually the intelligentsia was singled out for more comprehensive "enlightenment."

BECOME RED AGENTS

Consequently PW's arriving in Japan last year were fat and well-kept. They staged Communist demonstrations in Tokyo, singing the Nationale and waving red flags. Each returnee had been forced to sign a pledge to overthrow the Emperor system, establish a Communist government in Japan, and to join and support the Japanese Communist Party. By accomplishing the seemingly impossible task of flexing the rigid Japanese mind, an effective group of Communist agents and agitators were spread out in Japan.

Needless to say, this phase of the cold war has caused headaches for MacArthur's headquarters, who have published the accounts of Russian brutality in an attempt to discredit the Russians and the Japanese Communist Party.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Fine Arts Club of Exira, Iowa, my own home town. I wish to commend and congratulate the members of the club for expressing in this manner their opposition to compulsory Federal medical treatment for the people of America. Mr. Speaker, I take this means of letting the thousands of people all over our land who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD know that these well-informed ladies want no part of compulsory or socialized medicine imposed on the people of America.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the American family has received the finest quality of medical care available in any country in the world, developed under our system of free enterprise; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance, wherever tried, has caused a decline in national health and deterioration of medical standards, and facilities, to the detriment of family welfare; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance, wherever tried, has taken away the family's right to choosing its own family physician; and

Whereas invasion of family privacy and violation of the sanctity of the patient-physician relationship have proved to be one of the most objectionable features of compulsory health insurance, wherever tried; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would result immediately in a tax of 3 percent on the income of the American working man, rising within a few years to 6 percent and higher, creating a new tax burden which would reduce household budgets and bring down family standards of living; and

Whereas Government control of medical services, by gradually undermining free enterprise and establishing heavy new tax burdens and unprecedented national deficits, would threaten national bankruptcy and encourage the spread of socialism, which would endanger the rights of our children to the individual freedoms which have been the American heritage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Fine Arts Club of Exira, Iowa, does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator from the State of Iowa, and the Representative from our district, and that said Senators and Representative be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

MAZINE WELLS,
President.

EULA SPOO,
Secretary.

Dated this 14th day of February 1950.

Protest Against the Abduction of Greek Children During the Greek Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the Members of the House to the text of a protest which has been addressed to the President by Americans of Greek descent, in the hope of expediting the repatriation of 25,000 Greek children cruelly abducted by Communist guerrillas during the Greek civil war.

Since the text of the protest graphically describes the terrible wrong done to Greece and thousands of its innocent children, I introduce here a copy of the protest as it appeared in the National Herald, a Greek-language newspaper, published in New York.

The protest reads:

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you know, many thousands of Greek children who have been forcibly abducted from their homes in Greece, are presently being detained in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and in the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany. The two unanimous resolutions passed by the United Nations General Assembly, one on November 27, 1948, and the other on November 17, 1949, which requested the prompt repatriation of these children have proved of no avail because of the lack of cooperation by the aforementioned governments.

It is necessary to put an end to this abominable crime against humanity. It is necessary to maintain law and order and to uphold the international authority of the United Nations' resolutions. It is upon these resolutions that the policies of all peace-loving nations, such as the United States, are based. As an American citizen, I strongly protest the flagrant disregard of the United Nations' resolutions which the above named governments have shown by continuing the forcible detention of the Greek children. This is tantamount to the horrible crime of genocide.

I urge you, Mr. President, to call upon the United Nations Secretary General, the International Red Cross and the League of Red Cross Societies to continue and increase their noble efforts toward implementation of the United Nations' resolutions pertaining to the return of the Greek children. I urge you to call upon the honorable Members of the United States Congress and to direct the members of your State Department to support both morally and politically the United Nations' resolutions and to have their enforcement in mind when dealing with the aforementioned governments.

I know your special interest in this matter, Mr. President, I am certain that my protest will help to win this humanitarian battle to preserve basic human rights and freedoms in the world.

How Mr. Roosevelt Went to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Sunday Tribune on February 26:

Former Prime Minister Churchill of Great Britain finally has dealt with American entry into World War II at Pearl Harbor. His recital, as it had appeared in the New York Times and Life magazine, should remove any surviving doubts about that historic episode. From the viewpoint of Mr. Churchill, Mr. Roosevelt, and the American war party, Pearl Harbor was not a disaster. It was a Godsend.

Mr. Churchill's narrative already had revealed that for a year and a half before the Japanese attack of December 7, 1941, he had pressed Mr. Roosevelt incessantly to get into the war at Britain's side. At the Atlantic Conference in August 1941, he informed Roosevelt's circle "that I would rather have an American declaration of war now and no supplies for 6 months than double the supplies and no declaration."

Recounting this to General Smuts, Prime Minister of South Africa, Churchill said: "We must not underrate his (Roosevelt's) constitutional difficulties. He may take action as Chief Executive, but only Congress can declare war. He went so far as to say to me, 'I may never declare war; I may make war. If I were to ask Congress to declare war they might argue about it for 3 months.'"

That was what Mr. Roosevelt was doing: making war. His problem was how to force a formal state of war upon the United States without having to rely upon the power solely reserved to Congress to declare war. Economic sanctions, unyielding diplomacy with Japan, and finally the tender of a humiliating series of demands accomplished the purpose. Pearl Harbor was the culmination of a calculated policy through which Roosevelt, by making war through the Presidential office, forced Congress to acknowledge the existence of war.

It will be remembered that the attack on the fleet in Hawaii was presented to the American people, who knew nothing at the time of this secret maneuvering, as a shocking surprise—an act of treachery on "a date which will live in infamy" by a nation which professed to be "looking toward the maintenance of peace in the Pacific."

How do these professions look to Mr. Churchill? He notes that the economic embargoes imposed by Mr. Roosevelt and Britain on Japan constituted a stranglehold. He says that when Secretary of State Hull, on November 26, 1941, suddenly abandoned the project of a 3 months' standstill with Japan, embodying the hope of a general settlement of all issues, and instead presented his 10 demands to the Japanese envoys, their distress may well have been sincere. He recalls that from the end of 1940 the Americans had pierced Japan's secret ciphers and were decoding large numbers of Japan's military and diplomatic messages. He states that the congressional investigation of Pearl Harbor in 1945–46 disclosed the failure to send positive alert orders through the military departments to their fleets and garrisons in exposed situations.

"I do not intend in these pages," writes Mr. Churchill, "to attempt to pronounce judgment upon this tremendous episode in American history. We know that all the great Americans around the President and in his confidence felt, as acutely as I did, the awful danger that Japan would attack British or Dutch possessions in the Far East, and would carefully avoid the United States, and that in consequence Congress would not sanction an American declaration of war. * * *

"The President and his trusted friends had long realized the grave risks of United States neutrality in the war against Hitler and all that he stood for, and had writhed under the restraints of a Congress whose House of Representatives had a few months before passed by only a single vote the necessary renewal of compulsory military service. * * * Roosevelt, Hull, Stimson, Knox, General Marshall, Admiral Stark, and, as a link between them all, Harry Hopkins, had but one mind. * * *

"A Japanese attack upon the United States was a vast simplification of their problems and their duty. How can we wonder that they regarded the actual form of the attack, or even its scale, as incomparably less important than the fact that the whole American Nation would be united for its own safety. * * * Moreover, they knew, earlier than we in Britain could know, the full and immediate purpose of their enemy."

They "knew the full and immediate purpose of their enemy." That is, they knew that the attack was coming and that it would fall on Pearl Harbor. But they did not order an all-out alert at Pearl Harbor. They let the blow fall on the fleet and 2,326 Americans who died. How could they know? Through the intercepted and decoded Japanese secret messages in their hands pointing to these very things. Why did they let Japan strike? Because it was "a vast simplification of their problems." It solved the difficulty of a Congress which would not declare war at Mr. Roosevelt's bidding. That problem had been outlined 13 days before the attack by Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, in saying of the Japanese:

"The question was how we should maneuver them into the position of firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves."

This is what Mr. Churchill tells us of Roosevelt and his trusted friends, who did not trust Congress or the American people.

Of himself, Mr. Churchill tells us that, after the attack, he informed Mr. Roosevelt immediately by telephone, "This certainly simplifies things." He says that the two high-ranking American officials who received the news of the attack with him at his country seat, Ambassador John Winant and W. Averell Harriman, "took the shock with admirable fortitude," as if "they had been delivered from a long pain."

"No American," states Mr. Churchill, "will think it wrong of me if I proclaim that to have the United States at our side was to me the greatest joy. * * * I knew the United States was in the war, up to the neck and in to the death. So we had won after all. * * * We had won the war. England would live; Britain would live; the commonwealth of nations and the Empire would live. * * * We should not be wiped out. Our history would not come to an end. * * * I went to bed and slept the sleep of the saved and of the thankful."

It was a cry of pure exultation. Mr. Churchill's unrelenting struggle had succeeded. He had accomplished the mission of having Roosevelt pull the American people into the war to save England.

Such is the story of the date which will live in infamy.

Wartime Excise Taxes Should Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, we all realize the tremendous amount of sentiment in favor of wartime excise taxes.

On February 21 I appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee and conveyed to its membership the wishes of the majority of my constituents that wartime excise taxes be drastically reduced or repealed.

My statement before the House Ways and Means Committee is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I represent approximately 300,000 people in the Twenty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania comprised of the counties of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield. My purpose of appearing before you is to convey the wishes of the majority of my constituents that wartime excise taxes should be drastically reduced or repealed. My constituents are aware of the fact that the excise taxes were levied as a wartime measure and were supposed to be temporary.

For several year wide publicity has been given to the possibilities that Congress would repeal excise taxes. With the beginning of each session of Congress the story is renewed with the result that buyers resistance resembles a buyers strike.

In my congressional district, and I know it is the same in all other congressional districts, many firms are operating at a loss, while others have had to reduce operations and lay off employees. Without fear of contradiction I can assure you that some business firms in my congressional district have suffered a decline in business from 30 to 40 percent because of the retention of wartime excise taxes.

The losses to which I refer have by no means been confined to the so-called luxury items. Dealers in more essential products are also concerned over unfair and punitive excise taxes. For an illustration—taxes on transportation and communication were assessed solely to discourage wartime travel so that such systems would be readily available for war purposes rather than for the purpose of producing revenue.

The ordinary electric light bulb is in no sense a luxury, yet it is taxed 15 percent. On one hand we pride ourselves on the widespread use of electricity in American homes and industry. We have authorized the creation of the Rural Electrification

Administration to further the use of electricity and make it available to rural American. Then we come along and tax the electric light bulb which is an indispensable item in the use of electricity. This unfair and discriminatory excise tax on light bulbs is only one of many of these punitive taxes which should be repealed.

Another unfair and discriminatory tax is the 20 percent excise tax on the fur industry.

Since 1943 the excise tax on furs has produced revenues from $44,000,000 in 1943 to $97,000,000 in 1947. The fur industry, and especially the small furrier, has found it impossible to compete with other firms manufacturing wearing apparel that is sold tax free.

It is realized that the Federal Government needs tax revenue, but it is unfair to obtain such revenue by not only discriminating against an industry but threatening its very existence.

Let us consider the average American housewife who needs a warm winter coat, and who, by thrift and sacrifice, has saved $300 to buy a fur coat, and which she is certain to wear for at least 5 years.

When she visits her local store and selects her fur coat she finds that, instead of $300, the coat because of the excise tax, will cost her $360, or $60 more than she has to spend. Not having the extra $60 in her budget, she realizes she can purchase from another store a very fine fur trimmed cloth coat without paying any excise tax. This punitive tax drives this customer from the furrier to the store selling fur-trimmed cloth coats.

This situation is a serious one, not only for the fur industry, but especially for the small furrier.

In my congressional district furriers inform me that they have faced a buyers strike for many months. As a result they have had to reduce the number of employees 50 percent with the indication of a further reduction if the 20-percent excise tax on furs is not repealed.

Not only is the fur industry facing bankruptcy as a result of the buyers strike resulting from the 20-percent excise tax, but the importation of Russian furs is dealing a death blow to the industry.

Furriers in my congressional district employ on an average of 250 people and you all know what such employment means to the average community. I want you to know that the situation in the fur industry is desperate because of the 20-percent excise tax and I sincerely hope you intend to do something about it.

Another discriminatory tax that has lingered on since the close of World War II is the Federal amusement tax of 20 percent.

Like every congressional district I have many small movie theaters that provide the only form of recreation in many small industrial communities. We all know that a good movie furnishes needed relaxation during these trying days. Your physician will often tell you relax and forget your troubles. If you seek relaxation for your family by going to a neighborhood movie you are penalized 20 percent because the wartime excise tax is still in effect.

The excise taxes on freight, passenger travel, telegrams, telephone messages, jewelry, theater, luggage, furs, baby oil, and hundreds of other items too numerous to mention are hurting my constituents by destroying business, reducing employment and penalizing the American consumer when buying many of the necessities of life.

As I said in the beginning I am appearing before your committee on behalf of my constituents in the Twenty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania. I join them in their vigorous protest over retention of wartime excise taxes and earnestly beseech you to take positive action by drastically reducing them or repealing them in their entirety.

Proposal for a Solution of Our Agricultural Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. Fred W. Stilwell, of Sutherland, Iowa, in my congressional district. Mr. Stilwell offers a solution of our agricultural problems which is worthy of attention and study by all those who are interested in finding a solution to a most perplexing problem. I know Mr. Stilwell will welcome any comments and suggestions which Members of Congress or other interested persons may care to make.

SUTHERLAND, IOWA, *February 22, 1950.*

Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOEVEN: The following letter is not written from the viewpoint of a politician but with a desire to offer a sound solution of our agricultural problems.

During, and after the late war every farmer and stock raiser was urged to produce every pound of food he could grow. The farmer responded most generously, and the result was a volume of products that not only kept our people well fed, but supplied our Army and much of Europe as well. Every foot of land that could be cultivated was broken up and planted. Up to the past year most of these products have been sold, even above what has been termed, parity prices. But things have changed.

For the present, at least, there is no war. Europe is again producing well toward what she needs, and the amount of her production will be increasing each year. For the above reasons, we are facing a different condition and common sense dictates that we take the necessary steps to meet the situation. Europe will not buy a dollar's worth of farm products that she can raise, for two reasons: First, she hasn't the money to pay for it, and second, our prices are so high that she will not buy from us, if she can get the products from some other scource.

The result is a diminishing market for our farm products. What is the answer? There are two ways to meet this situation: First, reduce the volume of products in proportion to the reduced demand or, second, let the price drop low enough to stimulate larger purchases. The producers will resent rapidly dropping prices, so there is only one other reasonable method of meeting the situation—reduce the supply. Our farmers are intelligent, fair-minded men and if the condition is placed clearly before them they will realize its justice. It is the only way to keep the price of farm products in line with other products which the farmer buys. There are millions of acres now under cultivation that should be planted in grass and given a chance to renew its fertility. It would of course reduce the total volume of crops, but there would be less cost for production.

In any manufacturing, wholesale, or retail business, the merchant or manufacturer studies the conditions and would not consider producing or buying goods in excess of what he could sell at a profit. The farmer should do the same. In the long run he will benefit from following this plan.

The present law provides that the Government shall buy, and take off the local market a sufficient amount of the surplus products to maintain parity prices. If they cannot be sold there is only one way to get rid of them—destroy them. This method cannot go on. The Secretary says it will cost the Government above $6,000,000,000 this year to maintain parity prices. Every cent of this money must be taken from the United States Treasury and paid for by extra taxes. There is a bottom to the Treasury. We are scraping that bottom now.

In lieu of the present plan, Secretary Brannan proposes what is being called the Brannan plan. This provides for a direct subsidy to farmers and sale of the product at what the market will pay. In a statement made by Mr. Brannan on April 7, 1949, he says: "A third advantage of this system is that it would allow farm income to remain at a high-enough level to sustain abundant production while retail prices sought their supply and demand level in the market place. This level is bound to be reasonable for consumers because of the larger supplies brought out."

This is the most pernicious bid for votes that was ever proposed. It appeals to the cupidity of producers by providing high returns to the producers and to the avariciousness of the consumers through promising them cheap farm products. It is a piece of political chicanery of such magnitude that it is almost unbelievable. In addition to this he proposes that farmers be compelled to report to the Secretary a detailed report on how much they produced. Failure to do so would subject them to a fine of $500 for each offense, and if they make an error in their report they would be subject to a fine of $1,000 and a year in jail. (Comments not necessary.)

I propose the following substitute for both the above-named bills:

First, provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall notify each producer what his allotment should be for the ensuing year.

Second, provide that each producer shall be required to acknowledge the receipt of the above request and send his agreement to comply. Those who have complied shall, before marketing time, send a statement to the Secretary, sworn to before a notary, that he has complied. Those who do this will be entitled to a subsidy of from 10 to 15 percent of the selling price of each product (amount to be fixed by congressional action). The total payment not to exceed the parity price. Those who failed to comply with the requirements may sell their products on the open market, but will not be entitled to a subsidy.

Third, provide that no one except owners or tenants of the property upon which the product is grown shall be entitled to subsidy.

Fourth, provide that the Government be not allowed to loan more than 75 percent of the prevailing market price on sealed products. No one who fails to comply with restrictions on acreage, as provided for above, shall be eligible to loans.

This proposed plan takes the matter of subsidies out of the hands of the Secretary and places it in the hands of Congress. It does, however, provide that the Secretary shall make the allotments. No other department or agency in the country is in a position to know better what the future market is likely to be. It is the intention to reduce acreage as nearly as possible to what will be required to supply what is needed. The subsidy is designed to take care of any discrepancies.

Most sincerely yours,

FRED W. STILWELL.

Rural Electrification Program Is an Investment in Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on February 23 I had the privilege of attending the annual meeting of the Scott-New Madrid-Mississippi REA Co-op at Sikeston, Mo. This is one of four REA Co-ops now serving the rural areas in the Tenth Congressional District where REA has played an important part in the development of one of the richest agricultural sections of this Nation. The growth of REA in southeast Missouri has been an inspiration to the people of that section who are looking forward to further expansion through the availability of a sufficient supply of power to satisfy the ever-increasing demands. I am confident that this demand will be met within a comparatively short time with the completion of the new generating plant being built by the M & A Co-op, which should be in operation this year, and with the completion of the SPA transmission lines, which are being extended into that section from the Bull Shoals and Norfork Dams.

In the following talk which was given at the annual meeting at Sikeston, attended by a crowd estimated at nearly 4,000 enthusiastic REA members and boosters, I pointed out some of the things which have been responsible for the growth of this cooperative, which are just as applicable to the other co-ops in the district which I have the honor and privilege of representing. Because of the pride I have in the record which has been written by the REA Co-ops in southeast Missouri, and in order that others may become better acquainted with this record, I am having my talk printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Scott-New Madrid-Mississippi Co-op, and my other friends who are here today to attend the thirteenth annual meeting of this successfully operated REA co-op which is today serving more than 6,300 families throughout this area of southeast Missouri, which I have the honor and privilege of representing in the Congress of the United States.

It goes without saying that it is a pleasure for me to be here with you, else I would not have traveled the more than 1,000 miles by air, bus, and automobile in order to be with you on this occasion. However, I do want to express my appreciation to Judge Proffer and the other members of your board, and to Manager Earicor for their courtesy and thoughtfulness in inviting me to participate in this program. I also want to express my appreciation to the management of the radio stations throughout this area for permitting this portion of the program to be broadcast to their listeners. It does give me an opportunity to extend my greetings to hundreds of my friends throughout this area whom I will not be privileged to see in person on this short visit. To them as well as to the hundreds who are assembled here at the armory in Sikeston—I should have said thousands, because it is estimated that there are around 8,000 people here today—I would again express a reminder that your Congressman is always glad to hear from you, to have your views and suggestions, and to learn how I may serve you better as your Representative in Washington.

I have said that I am happy to be here, but may I also say that nothing gives me more pleasure than to address an audience such as this. This is a different type audience than many, for this is a forward-looking group, a progressive group, one that is looking ahead, striving for greater accomplishments. I learned long ago that the farm family that has once enjoyed electricity on the farm is not interested in looking back, and certainly there is no desire to return to the so-called good old days.

We have some old-timers in this audience, old-timers in the sense that they were among the first to recognize the opportunities that could come from identifying themselves with the REA movement.

While I am not so old in years, I am proud of the fact that I was permitted to have a part in the early development of the REA program here in Missouri. As a member of the Missouri State Legislature from 1935 to 1944, it was my privilege to sponsor in the Missouri State Senate some of the first REA legislation that was passed. Some of you younger people, and some of you older ones who have taken this program for granted, may need to be reminded occasionally that rural electrification was not handed to the people of this Nation on a silver platter. The rapid spread and growth of rural electrification in the 15 years since the late President Roosevelt established REA by Executive order has been due in large part to the initiative and to persistence of men and women such as you who were willing to give their time and who were willing to wage a fight to get the things they wanted.

We, who got in this fight back in 1935, 1936, and 1937, can tell you some of the opposition which was provided by the power trusts, who had their lobbyists working in every State legislature in an effort to prevent the passage of enabling legislation which permitted and authorized the establishment of REA co-ops such as we have here in southeast Missouri. And, out of fairness to them, I wish to say that the power trusts, and the privately owned utility companies were not the only ones who fought REA in the early days. Many of our very best people, friends of yours and mine, who were sincere in their actions, and who were conscientious in their beliefs, were not only unwilling to assist in bringing rural electrification to the farm homes, but were honestly opposed to REA.

Actually, some of those who are now the most enthusiastic boosters of REA were of the opinion that there was not sufficient demand for electricity on the farm to justify the building of the transmission lines. Others were conscientious in their belief that the REA was some sort of a socialistic move in that the REA co-ops would encroach upon the business and interfere with the services which they felt should be supplied by the private power companies.

True, for years, the private power trusts had preached that it was economically unsound to attempt to take electric service to the farm, except in those instances where the farm happened to be along the route of a secondary distribution system. And even then the rates were exorbitant, as many of you know. Some of you in this room know that in the middle thirties it was not uncommon for a farmer to pay for the building of his own transmission line in order to connect up with some private utility line, and the cost was such that about the only use to which electricity was put was to provide lights in the home, and possibly a family refrigerator or a small electric pump.

Under those conditions, is it any wonder that when REA was established, there were less than 18,000 farm homes in the entire State of Missouri that were receiving electric current from a central distribution system. And get this figure now, back when REA was established, only 6.4 percent of the farms in Missouri were enjoying this electric service. Yet today, more than 150,000 farms, or approximately 65 percent of all the farm homes in Missouri are enjoying electric service, thanks to the development and expansion of the REA program. I have watched the development and growth of this co-op, the Scott-New Madrid-Mississippi Co-op, just as I have watched the similar development and growth of the Ozark border, the Black River, and the Pemiscot-Dunklin, and more recently the M & A Co-op, which is building the new generating plant at Poplar Bluff—I have watched the development of these Rural Electric Co-ops which serve this district because I have had a personal interest and a personal pride in having had a part in writing the legislation which has made possible this service which had so long been needed, and which you people, my people, here in southeast Missouri could never have had except for this REA program. This, in part explains why I am so happy to be here today, to join with you in this annual meeting, and to rejoice in the good news which is contained in the reports which have been made by your president, your secretary-treasurer, and your manager.

I am sure that each of you received as I did a copy of the operating statistics, showing the comparative annual statement for the past 4 years, and I am not going to take your time by reading this statement, but I would like to comment briefly on some of the figures that were contained therein.

From small beginnings you have grown in 11 or 12 years until you now have almost 1,300 miles of line energized, serving more than 6,300 farm homes and homes in small towns throughout this area. Furthermore, you represent a $2,000,000 local business—a business comparatively new to this community which you have developed. And when I say local business I mean everything the term should mean—you take a part in community affairs, you perform a community service, you pay taxes, and you are paying back interest on the money you borrowed for your start.

I doubt very seriously if anyone would suggest today that the REA is socialistic, either in its set-up, or in its democratic operation. True, the Federal Government has supplied the capital with which it was possible to finance the operation, but, as we all know, this money is being repaid with interest. As an evidence of the soundness of the financial set-up in this particular co-op, I am sure we are all proud of the fact that the Scott-New Madrid-Mississippi Co-op has not only met its payments as they have fallen due, but has actually paid nearly $30,000 in principal even before it came due. Other REA co-ops in Missouri have similar records of repayment of money borrowed from the Rural Electrification Administration.

You have accomplished great things here—and you have demonstrated that you are going to keep on doing great things. You have translated the REA lending program into miles of line and into service for members. You people have taken an idea and have made that idea a reality.

As I said before, I am proud of you because you have done this yourselves, through the democratic organization of a rural electric cooperative. Your participation in the affairs of your cooperative—attending the annual meeting in full force—and I believe that we can say that this is a full-force meeting here today—and voicing your individual opinions on the various issues requiring decisions by your cooperative—this participation is what strengthens your co-op.

Every individual in a democracy—and every individual member of a cooperative—has a share and a responsibility in the way that democracy or that cooperative functions. Unless we exercise our rights to "say our piece," to cast our ballots, our democracy and our cooperative cannot function with complete effectiveness.

This annual meeting gives you an opportunity to exercise your rights—and that is why, again, I am glad we have such a large turn-out here today to participate in this election where you are going to elect your board of directors. Remember, that when you vote for your board of directors you are not throwing away your own responsibilities—you are merely designating certain people to act for you in certain instances. As your Representative in Congress represents responsible to you for their actions, just as your Representative in Congress represents you in Washington and appreciates the responsibility and the obligation he has in conveying your wishes, your views, and your vote into action there in Washington, and that is why I am always glad to hear from you and to have your views and your suggestions on how you would like for me to represent you in Congress.

This annual meeting gives you also an opportunity to look ahead to the job still to be done. Actually, you have two major jobs to do—individually and as a cooperative.

The first is to see that your neighbors get electricity. All farmers in this area still without electric service are looking to you to bring them electric power that will do for them what it has already done for you. As individuals you can help your cooperative by telling these people that you intend to remain loyal to them, loyal to the principle of cooperation until all are served—every farm family not only here in Missouri but throughout the Nation—that they may have the opportunity to have rural electrification which has meant so much to the development of this section and the entire United States.

The second job is to make and keep your cooperative strong and sound. This is a job your board of directors cannot do alone. It is a job which is up to each of you. Your relationship is not that of a stockholder who is interested only in net profits or net earnings. Your cooperative is not a dealer; who serves you for profit alone.

You are a member of a group organized to supply a service you all need and are unable to obtain as individuals. You got electricity because you demanded it and because your Government took an interest in having you get it. Right here I would like to pay tribute to the late Honorable Orville Zimmerman whom all of you knew and who also played a prominent part in the Congress of the United States in writing this legislation at the same time that I was in the State legislature helping write legislation to tie the Federal and State legislation together, and Orville Zimmerman should be remembered by this crowd here today. And here again I would remind you that this service was brought to you through REA after private power companies had failed to grasp the opportunity that they had. REA would never have been born if the power companies had gone out and served this rural area. Incidentally, I might add, many of these same power companies today readily admit that they "missed the boat." Some of these companies appear to be ready, and by their actions have indicated a desire to cooperate with our REA co-ops in supplying power which is so badly needed to meet the ever-increasing demand and I commend them for that action. On the other hand other companies do not show this same spirit, and REA cannot afford to place the future of its thousands of members in the hands of the private power industry. We must continue to develop new sources of power on which we can depend.

In that connection I would remind you that you do not have Government-owned power. This electric distribution system around Sikeston—the poles and wire and transformers and meters and all of that other equipment—this system does not belong to the Government. This system belongs to you. REA does not operate your system. You operate the system through your board of directors and through the personnel selected by that board of directors to represent you and to operate this co-op.

When REA was established only 17,893 farms, or 6.4 percent, in the State of Missouri were receiving central station electric service. By the end of June 1949, that figure had risen to 148,523 farms, or 61.1 percent.

REA loans in Missouri have been made to 48 borrowers, 47 of which are cooperatives. Already they are operating more than 47,800 miles of line serving more than 158,500 farms and other rural consumers.

Rural people made the year 1949 the biggest in the history of REA, just as you have made 1949 the biggest year in the history of your co-op. Even so, there is a long way to go, particularly here in Missouri. Our State falls below the national average in percentage of farms electrified. Approximately 94,400 farms in the State of Missouri are still without service.

The problems you face in seeing that the unserved farms may get electric service at the earliest possible time are to some extent the problems that all rural electric cooperatives face. It is harder to build lines—and make them pay out—when you have to reach farm homes in thinner areas, where the population is scattered, where farm income is not so high, where power supplies are inadequate, and where the land itself presents serious obstacles.

One of the toughest restricting factors to co-op expansion in Missouri has been the power shortage, and I know of no co-op in the whole country which has felt this need more keenly than you have here in southeast Missouri in this Scott-New Madrid-Mississippi Co-op. Because of the lack of generation and transmission facilities in Missouri, it has been necessary for cooperatives in Missouri to seek their own sources of electric power.

We think we now have a solution to the power shortage which has been hampering your own expansion. Through cooperation, you and some of your neighboring co-ops, have formed a power cooperative, which has received a $2,900,000 loan for a generating plant and 112 miles of transmission line. Already construction is far along on this M. & A. Co-op on its new 10,000-kw. generating plant, near Poplar Bluff.

It is estimated that the facilities of this dual-fuel generating plant will supply the power requirements of three cooperatives, one of whom you are, which are estimated at 9,350 kilowatts for 1953. M. & A. has also submitted an application for a loan to extend service to five more rural distribution systems. In addition it has entered into wholesale power contracts with Southwestern Power Administration on the assumption that it would need a supply of power for all eight distribution cooperatives. While your cooperative has been severely handicapped through its inability to secure a sufficient amount of power to meet its growing demands, and has been forced to pay in some instances nearly three times as much as is set out in the contract with Southwestern Power Administration, I can assure you that this condition is rapidly being taken care of. While it will probably be 3 years before all of the demands will be satisfied through the power which will be available over the SPA lines, the availability of power through the M. & A. generating plant will greatly alleviate the situation here in southeast Missouri during the next few months. I have just been informed that they expect to have the M. & A. plant in operation by June of this year, and we hope that some of that power will be available to this co-op to help meet some of its demands.

It took several cooperatives, working together, to obtain the loan funds to overcome the power-shortage obstacle—and the fight is not yet won. It is just as essential that we get our own house in shape and that our own members cooperate.

I understand that one of the problems hampering the completion of the transmission line authorized by the loan to the power co-op is the problem of obtaining rights-of-way and easements. This is something about which each one of you, individually, can do something. You can learn the facts—you can discover for yourselves what it means to your members in terms of lower costs to get these rights-of-way and easements as soon as possible. You can learn what it means to your members in terms of adequate and dependable power supplies to hasten the completion of these transmission lines.

Good service at the lowest cost possible is one of the keystones of a successful cooperative. This new generating plant and the proposed transmission line are essential to your continuing good service.

It is up to each one of you then to learn the facts, tell your neighbors, and do what you can to speed up your own program.

In cases where your lines must cross the property of people who are not members of your cooperative, it might be a good thing for some of you to call on this nonmember on a neighborly basis to tell him what your line means to the community, what it has done for you and your friends, and how it can help others.

Even though you have solved—or on the way of solving—your own power shortage, other co-ops are not so fortunate. Here in Missouri co-ops have faced one of the bitterest, most vicious fights in rural electrification history. Even though your own battle is won, this fight is still on, and it is up to you to lend your cooperative strength to those others within the State, and to those others across the country, who are still making every effort to get power to meet their urgent needs.

The right to generate and the right to buy direct from public power sources is your only protection from high rates and inadequate service. Whether or not you exercise this right, it does stand as a bulwark of strength for you in your negotiations with other suppliers.

This demand that has backed up on the farms, this demand that has been created here in your own cooperative, it was not created by any power company; it is a demand you, as a cooperative, helped to create. You opened up new markets. The fact that your requirements will keep on growing adds urgency to your cause. Lend your support then to the power fight anywhere in the country, for it is your fight too.

As the REA program advances rural people are placing heavier demands on REA borrowers for reliable service and for power sufficient to meet their ever-growing needs. REA estimates that co-op members who were getting service 5 years ago have about doubled their power consumption since that time. Here in your own co-op this demand has jumped from an average use of 93 kilowatt-hours per member in 1946 to 145 kilowatt-hours in 1949, with more than a 20-percent increase in the last year alone, and I know that all of you members realize how that need has grown.

Much of the future expansion of rural electrification will be in terms of use—putting electricity to work to save time, labor, and money on the farm. Efficient use of electricity by co-op members is directly related to your co-ops' financial security; the member who is getting good value for every dollar he invests in electricity and electrical equipment is the one who is not only in a better position to pay his power bill, but also has reason to be more interested in his electric co-op. That represents a dollar-and-cents value to both the member and the co-op.

However, we should also look at the program in terms of the people themselves—the women who find their household tasks made easier, the men who find their farm chores a little lighter, the children who have light for school study—all because electricity has come to the community.

Comfort, health, and other intangibles which add up to better rural living have improved vastly with the coming of power lines. Young people, who otherwise might not see a future for themselves only away from the farm, find their imagination fired by the potentialities of farming with electricity. With relief from some of the drudgery of farm work, with new opportunities for diversified farming ahead, these young people have a new incentive for staying on the land, to help build their communities, and to put to work their talents for production and leadership.

Electricity is bringing greater diversification to farming enterprise. Farmers with electricity are able to do more for themselves and with less dependence on far-away factors over which they have no control.

Rural electrification is adding to the Nation's grass roots stability by making possible the development in rural areas of new industries. These rural industries—more than 10,000 of which have sprung up across the country along rural electric lines—are offering part-time employment and greater stability of income to rural people. Our own alfalfa mills in this section are only one example.

And of course there is the contribution that rural electrification is making to our small towns and cities. As farm people are getting electricity and are putting it to work they are adding new wealth for the community—the kind of new wealth that creates more business and more prosperity.

Most all of us, whether we are members already served or whether we are only members of this community, have benefited from the coming of rural electrification. Some have benefited directly from the money spent for construction, farm and home wiring, electrical equipment, and from the pay roll of this co-op. Others have benefited indirectly through the increased farm income electricity has helped to make possible.

These benefits are neither static nor are they temporary. They will continue and become even greater as electricity is taken to other rural neighborhoods, and as it is used more intensively on the farms already electrified.

I have an idea that many of the merchants here in Sikeston could list direct benefits which they have received. REA's experience has shown that for every dollar invested in line construction the farm consumer spends $4.50 or more in wiring, plumbing, appliances, and other equipment, which depends on the installation of electric service.

This equipment they buy, however, is not limited to electrical items. With a pressure water system, using an electric motor as a power source, the farm family wants a modern bathroom with all the plumbing equipment, bathtubs and lavatories, showers and sinks.

And strangely enough—or maybe it isn't strange—when a farm house gets bright new electric lights to replace the kerosene lamps, or the old Aladdin lamps, the farm wife wants new wall paper, or new curtains. All of these purchases add to the wealth of the business community.

As you advance toward the completion of your area coverage—service to all within your reach—these effects will spread and the general welfare of all the people in this State will improve.

We have natural resources for profitable agriculture, industry, and trade all around us. With electricity available, not just here and there, but in every nook and corner, we will have the means of developing these resources to the full.

I hope that all of you, whether members of the cooperative or only members of the community, will look upon your rural electrification program as a community service. Rural electrification in the Bootheel is an investment in tomorrow.

What you have already done is visible evidence of the ability of farm people to build and operate their own businesses. You have proved it can be done.

Because of this fine record, I hope this cooperative, its members, its directors, its office personnel, its line crews, I hope that they will all look forward to the future, not content with the past.

Your rural electrification program is an investment in the future. Your accomplishments are an inspiration for all of us. With the past as a guide, then, let us look ahead to a brighter future for all of our farm people. I thank you.

Regimenting the Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport Journal of February 15, 1950:

REGIMENTING THE FARMER

Representative BOYD TACKETT, of Arkansas, has charged that the Interior Department is attempting to circumvent the will and intent of Congress at the expense of the more than 1,000,000 of the Nation's farmers who are still without the benefits of electric service. He stated that funds which should be loaned for the purpose of building distribution lines to unserved farmers are being used by the Rural Electrification Administration to construct unnecessary generating plants and transmission systems for the primary benefit of another Federal agency—the Southwestern Power Administration. He said further that the SPA is using the REA "to foster their grandiose scheme at any cost. This * * * is just another step toward complete Government regimentation of the farmers."

Representative TACKETT has introduced a bill to correct this situation.

These charges should not come as a surprise to anyone. For many years there has been a determined effort within the Federal Government to use any and all means to socialize the electric industry, and to effect a virtually unlimited expansion of the power of the Government over agriculture and all other enterprise. The Southwestern Power Administration, like all the other similar bodies, existing and proposed, is a major weapon in this effort. Huge tax sums have been wasted, at the expense of us all, on the unnecessary generating and transmission facilities of which Mr. TACKETT spoke.

Socialism comes high. No one can escape the cost—in money, in reduced opportunity, and in lost liberty. And unless the march of socialism is stopped in the United States, increasing taxes will bleed the people white.

Veterans' Education and Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in the report which the President recently submitted to the Congress he said, among other things concerning the veterans' education and training program:

The contribution which the Servicemen's Readjustment Act has made to the postwar development of the Nation's most important resource—its young men and women—is very great. * * * For the great majority of those who have made use of the education and training provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act the law has been of real and lasting service.

There have been many unjustified criticisms of this program—but notwithstanding these criticisms, there has been great and lasting and incalculable benefits from the education and training program. The President, General Gray, the VA Administrator, and others recognize this fact as do the veterans themselves.

In this connection, I desire to have included in the RECORD two editorials—one from the Disabled American Veterans publication and another from the Nashville Tennessean both of recent date.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean]

WELL SPENT

The Veterans' Administration has announced that a start is being made on the long task of closing down its veterans retraining and education program. As the curtain is lowered on this interesting demonstration of the gratitude of a democracy for the service of its young men in war, there will be discussions pro and con as to the benefits from the program.

For the expenditure of twenty-five to thirty billions of dollars by the greatest democratic nation in the world, what has it got to show?

First, according to a recent tabulation by AMVETS, World War II veterans organization, there have been nearly a million American boys and girls who have received a college education. Of this million more than 100,000 went on to graduate schools and a professional education. Not all of these veterans received their full college education at Government expense but all were well started and continued on their own after their GI benefits ran out.

Second, there were several million who received a trades education. In this field were centered some of the abuses of the Government's good intentions, which has led a minority to claim that all was wasted. A summary of the evidence would indicate that whatever their abuses may have been the benefits were sufficient to cancel them out.

The college education of a million American youths alone would appear as a long-range benefit sufficient to have justified the program. The Government has made a profitable investment playing the futures.

[From the Disabled American Veterans Semimonthly]

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Considerable furor has been created by Veterans' Administrator Carl Gray's report to Congress on education and training under the Serviceman's Readjustment Act—commonly known as the GI bill.

The country's newspapers have been carrying front page stories which emphasize the tremendous cost of this program and how a great part of the funds is being wasted.

Last week President Truman called upon Congress to enact legislation which would eliminate fraud on the part of schools where veterans are training under the GI bill. He specifically called for strict control on the part of the VA to stop the belated growth of certain types of training where the veteran is being exploited at the cost of the taxpayer.

Certainly, the time has come to call a halt to fly-by-night schools whose chief interest is to rake in tuition fees from the Government without giving the veterans honest value in return.

In fact, such action should have been taken when the GI educational program was initiated.

From the standpoint of the DAV, however, current publicity regarding these abuses is detrimental and entirely unjust. The impression given the public in these reports is that all veteran training at Government expense is poorly managed and a waste of the taxpayers' money.

No mention is made of Public Law 16, the DAV law which is restricted solely to the training and education of disabled veterans. Training under this law is closely supervised by the VA, thereby eliminating graft and corruption on the part of the schools. Veterans are given vocational advisement, thus making it reasonably certain they are suited for the type of training contemplated.

Although press reports do not exonerate the Public Law 16 program from the general abuses of the GI bill, they cite cost figures which include all veteran education and training under both laws. Certainly this is not a fair or accurate report of the vocational rehabilitation program for disabled veterans.

In his recent report, Gray stated that the cost to the Federal Government for subsistence, tuition, equipment, books, and supplies under the GI bill has already exceeded $8,715,000,000. The press has done quite a job in emphasizing this tremendous cost but have failed to mention the comparatively small cost and lack of abuses under Public Law 16 training.

The entire cost of Public Law 16 since its beginning has been $1,000,000,000. In other words, Public Law 16 has cost the Government only one-ninth as much as the GI bill training.

These are facts the American public should know before condemning the entire veteran educational program.

Fifty States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial from the New York Times, of February 26, 1950, entitled "Fifty States":

FIFTY STATES

The question of Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood is due to come before the House again this week. A bill to give statehood to Hawaii passed the House in 1947, and ever since then there has been considerable talk but no action. It seems to be indisputable that the bulk of the population of both territories wishes them to become States; the platforms of both major parties endorse the idea, differing only in degree of immediacy, and the historical development of the United States assuredly leads in this direction.

Although Alaska's population is only about 100,000 (of whom approximately two-thirds were born in the United States), there are more people in the area today than there were in at least a dozen of the continental territories at the time they became States of the Union. As for Hawaii, its 520,000 inhabitants are far more heterogeneous than those of Alaska; but even at that, almost 90 percent are American citizens, and the House report accompanying the statehood bill observes: "Certainly there is no area under United States jurisdiction where a greater complexity of races live so harmoniously."

The major objection in recent years to bringing either of these areas into the Union is the fact that they are not contiguous to the continental United States. Alaska is separated from this country by 870 miles of Canadian territory; Hawaii is 2,400 miles distant from the nearest point on the American mainland. This consideration would surely have been important in another era. But both Territories are less than 24 hours' flight from New York today, and thus they are actually far nearer in travel time than New York was to Boston when the Union was founded. With the annihilation of distance there has likewise been annihilated the argument, based on distance, against statehood for these two areas, otherwise fully qualified to be integral parts of the Union.

Little Business and Big Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Industrial News Review:

LITTLE BUSINESS AND BIG GOVERNMENT

Nation's Business recently ran an article by Henry C. Link, of the Psychological Corporation, dealing with a survey made among little business to find out what this section of our industrial economy thinks of big business.

One of the questions was: "Would you rather compete with a private company (large or small) or with a Government corporation?" Ninety-two percent replied that they would rather compete with a private company, as against a mere 4 percent favoring a Government-owned business. The remaining 4 percent didn't know.

Another question asked: "Which, if any, of the following has produced the most difficult problems for your business: large companies, labor unions, Government bureaus, other small companies?" When the answers were tabulated, it was found that 58 percent said the Government bureaus had produced the toughest problems. Large companies and labor unions followed, with but 20 percent each.

It is clear from this that the smaller businesses of the country now realize that supergovernment is the worst menace they face—and that, though competition with other business may be difficult, to compete with Government is virtually impossible. Government has every advantage. It is free from taxes, regulation, and legislation that applies to other business. It makes laws to suit itself.

The people can control big business or little business. They can't control big government. It can hamstring and dominate all business, regardless of size.

Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. POLK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written to the President of the United States by Hon. Adam Frick, of Portsmouth, Ohio:

DECEMBER 28, 1949.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT: Vacations are over. You are about to impress upon the National Congress factors which, without, will not be best for the general welfare of our Commonwealth. These, I am certain, you have in mind. This has been done annually, embracing the events written in the Nation's history.

Notwithstanding that this has been done regularly, there are practices that have grown up—maybe not intentionally—which operate to the harm of a group of our people whose contribution to our welfare has been immeasurable. I speak of our farm folk.

It would be impossible for a young man to encumber himself with an obligation such as necessary to the payment of a family-sized farm essential to finance current living standards in this era of our advanced civilization, which makes necessary the family automobile, the telephone, the refrigerator, the hot bath, electric pump, the tractor, the combine, the corn harvester, and all these delightful conveniences, arising out of countless profitable, industrial enterprises, with a profit motive as their objective, without a very substantial compensating increase from our agriculture, to finance all of these modern devices. Therefore, the migration of the rural youth from the farm to the rapidly increasing industrial centers. Of course, the propagandists of the press and radio and the bureaucrats who feed on statistics which arise out of crop juggling make believe that food supplies are overabundant, and that the huge quantities make for lower prices, while every other thing advances. That's no answer to the millions underfed in this Republic, with soil resources depleted; forcing crop yields per acre far beyond the physical resources of our less acres, at the moment, with population increasing by the millions annually.

There remains a solution to these out-of-balance conditions, so that there may be anchored at our farms, greater numbers than at the moment, that food for the starving millions may not decrease. Let that be a very important part of your annual message to the Congress. The few farmers are infinitely unable to cope with the millions off the farms, in the hope of any relief, without Government intervention. Stop gambling in farmers' commodities and there will be little need of any other kind of farm program. If supply and demand really have any value in our national welfare, we better have a larger supply of farm folk, and that real soon. Keep these factors in mind in compiling your message to the Congress on the state of the Nation. Now a happy New Year.

Very truly,

ADAM FRICK.

Sugar Production for Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced for the consideration of the Congress a resolution which would raise the annual raw-sugar-production quota for Puerto Rico from 910,000 tons to 1,150,000 tons. My purpose in introducing this measure is to alleviate unemployment in the island, to eliminate the ever-recurring annual accumulations of burdensome surplus stocks of sugar and create extra income, which is so sorely needed.

Many of my colleagues in this Chamber today have visited Puerto Rico. I am sure they shared in the same general impression there. They were struck with Puerto Rico's magnificent beauty—the green, rolling hills reaching up toward the blue, sun-filled sky, the gorgeous splendor of exotic tropical flowers and rushing surf scampering over the golden sands of the beaches which nearly surround the island.

Another spectacle of beauty in Puerto Rico are the leafy fingers of the green sugarcane, forever waving and swaying in the breezes which blow constantly from the sea. These sugar fields are in abundant evidence wherever one travels in Puerto Rico. They have much more significance than their pleasant appeal to the eye. For they represent Puerto Rico's lifeblood—its one-crop economy—upon which Puerto Rico depends for a living. Without sugar there would be no work in the island. Upon sugar, to the near exclusion of everything else, Puerto Rico stakes its economic lot.

Many have asked me why my people put all of their eggs in one basket and all their fields in sugar. I am asked why there is not more truck gardening done and a diversified crop program. As a matter of fact, we do try, insofar as is economically feasible, to raise some foodstuffs for ourselves, but we are exceedingly limited in our opportunities in this respect. First of all, Puerto Rico is just 35 miles wide and a hundred miles long. That gives us only 3,500 square miles, a large part of which is untillable—a great deal of it, mountains.

Completely dependent upon this little dot of land in the Caribbean are nearly 2,225,000 people. Puerto Rico is one of the most densely populated areas in the world. The crowded conditions there have been described this way:

If all the people in the world should come to the United States, there would be here a density of population roughly comparable to that which now prevails in Puerto Rico where there are 625 people per square mile. Since Puerto Rico's is almost entirely an agricultural economy, the burden placed upon the land in supporting so many people is great and stands in the way of efforts to raise living standards.

Since Puerto Rico's only resources are the tillable soil, the climate, and the muscle of its toiling people, it becomes urgently necessary to use every inch of land with full consideration as to what the total dollar yield of that land will be. We have found only two ways of getting a greater dollar yield from the land. One way is to plant sugar cane. The other is to industrialize.

We have planted sugar cane for hundreds of years and we are just now starting to use some of the land for factories. We hope some day to have enough factories in Puerto Rico to solve most of our economic and social ills. Meanwhile, we must depend on sugar.

The result of this situation, Mr. Speaker, is that Puerto Rico must import almost all of its food; nearly all of its clothing; and practically everything else it uses. These imports come from the United States in the form of cash purchases.

Unfortunately, Puerto Rico does not enjoy a favorable balance of trade with the mainland. Puerto Rico buys much more than it is able to sell. In 1947–1948, for example, purchases from the mainland amounted to $337,255,714, while Puerto Rico sold to the mainland goods amounting to $185,745,350. That $151,000,000 difference between these two figures has to be made up. Toward this end, some of the difference is made up by tourists traveling to Puerto Rico; some of it is made up by reason of the military forces stationed in Puerto Rico; some of it is made up by reason of various Federal services officed and operating in Puerto Rico; some of it comes from veteran benefits due our boys serving or having served under the colors, but it is an ever-present and always serious problem.

Mr. Speaker, because we live with this problem and are always keenly and consciously aware of it, we, in Puerto Rico, believe we should be permitted to more fully utilize our three natural resources of climate, muscle, and soil.

We are engaged in an all-out endeavor to help ourselves as much as we can. This we have called our Operation Bootstrap. We should like to raise and market, for domestic consumption, a quota of sugar more nearly in line with our ability to produce. This would be part of a correspondent Operation Boost from the Federal end.

When the Sugar Act of 1948 was enacted, the other domestic areas were assigned quotas for sugar production which reflected closely their ability to produce, or even better. Puerto Rico, on the other hand, was given a quota below its ability to produce.

The purpose of my resolution is to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 so as to correct this situation.

The amendment would increase Puerto Rico's quota by a net amount of 240,000 short tons annually. This would not in any way affect the quotas or production shares of other domestic areas, nor quotas agreed upon by treaty.

The present Sugar Act was adopted in 1947. During the previous year, under rationing, sugar consumption in the mainland, was under 6,000,000 tons. During 1947, when rationing was lifted, consumption was 7,448,000 tons, and for 1948, it was 7,343,000 tons. But in 1949, sugar consumption increased to 7,500,000 tons and the estimate for 1950 is again 7,500,000 tons. There is an evident tendency to increase. This fact, in itself, makes it appropriate now to reexamine and redetermine Puerto Rico's share under the domestic sugar production quotas.

This is an urgent matter to Puerto Rico. It would represent an additional income to the island of $25,000,000 per year. Twenty-five million dollars in Puerto Rico, where the only important disease comes from slow starvation, would mean 90 pounds of rice for every person in the island—rice purchased in Louisiana, Arkansas, or California. Twenty-five million dollars would represent additional purchasing power which would be exercised in the United States, thereby accruing to the economic advantage of the mainland worker, the mainland manufacturer, and the mainland farmer in Maine, New York, Illinois, California, Louisiana, Florida, and all the other States where Puerto Rico goes shopping. As it is, Puerto Rico's annual purchases from the mainland have been estimated to give permanent jobs the year around to 200,000 workers in the mainland.

Twenty-five million dollars of additional purchasing power for Puerto Rico is also a matter of direct concern to the mainland taxpayer. For Puerto Ricans would never be allowed by their fellow citizens of the mainland to starve. If we are unable or we are prevented from earning our livelihood, relief would certainly be forthcoming at the expense of the mainland taxpayer.

You see, Mr. Speaker, there is no American interest, whatsoever, which would be harmed in any way through the enactment of what I here propose. On the contrary, there are many classes of Americans who would benefit as a direct result of what I advocate. I hope that the Congress both assembled, and in the working commitees, will see fit to give this resolution prompt and favorable consideration and to speed it through the legislative machinery to early enactment.

leave to extend my remarks in the Rec- said the Government bureaus had produced farmers are infinitely unable to cope with

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial entitled "Progress on Civil Rights," which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor under date of February 27, 1950. The views expressed by this outstanding newspaper must strike a responsive note in the thinking of all those who believe that fair employment practices can be brought about by education and not by compulsion.

PROGRESS ON CIVIL RIGHTS

As we see it passage of a voluntary fair employment practices bill by the House of Representatives is a progressive step. It points the way to the kind of compromise measure which is not only most feasible politically but most likely to achieve real results in lessening discrimination.

The radicals on both sides of this question will disagree with our view. Those who believe they can establish social equality by passing a law denounce this measure as mere lip-service and toothless. Those who believe they can dam the tide of national conscience rising against discrimination denounce it as an entering wedge of Federal interference.

Fortunately neither extremist group can reasonably claim to represent the American people. Fortunately discussion of this subject promises to weaken both camps by showing how impracticable their positions are. Further debate should also help to hammer out workable legislation which will have a good chance of accomplishing progressive measures of reform.

The achievement of open debate was one of the hopeful things about the action in the House. For weeks opponents of FEPC have tried to block a vote, and in the process have blocked debate. Much of the debate on Wednesday was mere maneuver or emotion, but in the long night session and in final consideration of the McConnell bill and the various amendments tacked onto it the House came much closer to genuine study of the problem.

Another hopeful feature was that there were splits on both sides. Some of these were over strategy. One group of Dixiecrats accepted a voluntary FEPC as a means of avoiding a compulsory one. Others rejected it as a breach in the wall. For the same reasons—in reverse—the advocates of compulsion divided. Some regarded the McConnell bill as worse than nothing, others as a means of keeping the issue alive. But some of the divisions which drew from advocates and opponents of a compulsory plan enough votes to pass a voluntary plan may be credited to a growing appreciation of the merits of moderation.

Should the Senate now filibuster the McConnell bill to death, it will be clear that moderation still has a long way to go. But the House vote came on top of two other recent evidences of some softening of opinion in both parties. The new Republican policy statement retreats very definitely from the 1948 platform demand for a compulsory FEPC. And President Truman, who has been the outstanding Democratic advocate, has twice taken pains to declare that he does not want an FEPC which will deprive a citizen of the right to run his own business.

So much could be done by the methods of education, conciliation, and publicity provided in the House bill that the enemies of discrimination should be willing to try it. So much needs to be done that opponents of compulsion should welcome this better way.

World Federal Government Is the Way to National Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Stars and Stripes published in Washington had a very interesting front-page editorial in its issue of February 23 entitled "National Suicide." I commend it to all Members and especially to my colleagues who have introduced world-government resolutions:

NATIONAL SUICIDE

It has been nearly 3 months since this veterans' spokesman has commented on the several proposals being advanced to form a world government and, since, we have tried to show that its formation and American participation in it would mean the loss of our own constitutional freedoms, but the suggested monstrosity has gained startling headway, and we deem it essential to discuss it further and to issue another warning to our countrymen that the thing is an ever-present danger that must be scotched as would be a poisonous reptile.

When we last wrote about the question in December, there were known to be more than 700 chapters in this Nation composed of people who were engaged in trying to set up a superworld state in which we would lose our identity and have but 1 lone voice in shaping its conduct. There are doubtless many more such groups now, and, believe it or not, they are made up of reputable businessmen, educators, economists, and statesmen, all earnestly bent on preserving the peace, or, at least, they think they are. Over a period of years, 22 State legislatures had memorialized the Congress to express itself for a world union to supersede the United Nations, and 13 Senators and 96 Representatives had subscribed to resolutions that would mean the end of United States sovereignty.

Whether it has been because of our loss by treachery of the secret of atom bombs, or the new hydrogen bomb development, or by just plain skulduggery, we are not prepared to say, but the movement has gained momentum. Although the State of Georgia has reversed itself and the New York Legislature refused to pass upon the deal, some 40 Senators have indicated they are now for it, and a total of 111 House Members are enmeshed. Not only that, but a Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Relations has been holding hearings on the suggested world union for some time. In a sense we are glad of that, because witnesses for the proposition have been found to be so much at odds with each other over the form a world federation should take that the fallacies of the whole business are beginning to rise to the top like the fat on a mess of cold broth. Only last week it developed startlingly that well-intentioned Congressmen, who have sponsored supporting resolutions because they are greatly disturbed about unfolding world conditions and are desperately anxious to seek peaceful solutions, are riding the crest of a wave without knowing what is causing the disturbance. Therefore, we feel that they should once more be told what the Nation's veterans know about this matter and how they feel about it.

There are four principal groups and several lesser ones that advocate the one-government world that is being proposed to the Congress in one form or another. These are, foremost, the international Communists who are working skillfully all over the globe to bring about a world empire over which they can rule and in which freedom-loving peoples will have no part. With perhaps a couple of exceptions, no Congressman would knowingly support such a group, but many are doing it unwittingly. Then there is the Federal union or union-now movement, headed by a left-wing former Rhodes scholar, and it has an appreciable backing. A citizens' committee for United Nations reform would pursue similar objectives, including establishment of a world police force with exclusive possession of the atomic bomb to keep our citizenry in order. The World Government Association, Inc., composed of numerous prominent Americans, is another that is dissatisfied with our form of self-rule and believes it to be decadent, and there are more, but the largest, the most potent, and best organized is the United World Federalists, Inc., with a list of officers that reads like Who's Who and includes, among the great, United States Senators.

When sounding off to the uninitiated, and while claiming the support of those 150 or so Members of Congress who have introduced or have added their names to pending resolutions, they talk "peace" as their only objective. However, their own literature gives the lie to it. They say that their movement is the way to avoid war and preserve American independence, but their printed words spell out entirely the loss of nationalism as we know it. It admits frankly, if one will but read, that its members while endorsing the United Nations, will work to "transform it into a world federal government." That is the absolute minimum objective, its adherents say.

United World Federation, in brief—and these are their own words—is designed to replace the United States Government and all others with a single union having a common set-up for defense, a joint foreign policy, a single postal system, unified trade relations, a uniform currency and what not, but it puts the blinders on the American people by stating, "This is the only way to bring about peace." Stripped of deceptive and confusing language, every one of these schemes are naked attempts to scrap the American Constitution, bring about the surrender of our national sovereignty and our right to plot our own course in the world. They would alter our social and economic systems. Clearly, they seek the ceding of all powers of government to a superstate in which this country could have but one lone vote and would be controlled by aliens.

The UWF goes so far as to propose that once the United States of America goes into the United World Federation, it can never get out. Its objectives could not be more ruinous, if they were written by Joe Stalin himself.

It is pointed out that some of the major veterans' organizations have passed resolutions which look to a strengthening of the United Nations. They wish to have the much-abused veto power abolished and add to the effectiveness of the World Court. Some have sought control of armaments and of atomic energy, and even a world police force under proper direction. These were high-minded ideals purposed to pre-

serve American institutions and entailing no loss of sovereignty, but the One Worlders say "me too" and point out that these things are just what they desire, but without adding that they ultimately look ahead to something far more patent. These say that even the President is with them because he said, in 1945, that the world is no longer county-size, no longer State-size, no longer Nation-size. They know that Mr. Truman was speaking for support of the UN, but they are adept at twisting phrases to their own use, so they praise the vision of the Chief Executive, of the veterans' organizations and of every sucker on the long list of subscribers who have loaned their good names to a proposition that would sell down the river every cherished American institution, every freedom that is held dear by our people and every incentive this Nation has ever had, which led our youth to shed their blood and die, if need be, to protect our independence.

This is a vicious thing that faces our beloved America, all suggested in the name of peace. Already our citizens have paid dearly in money, in goods, and in blood to preserve the things in which we believe and for which we have sacrificed through the ages. The far-fetched proposals now being discussed are doubtless intended by some to save what is left of democratic processes, but they can no more work than partial communism could be successful. That is doubtless why they are supported strongly by every fuzzy-minded incompetent with head in the clouds and opposed by realists. It is the answer to the favorable propaganda of every left-wing newspaper and periodical in print, and it is why those who have faith in American concepts of freedom are found in the opposing columns. If the people of this land would preserve their present way of life, they will fight world government with all they have. If the veterans of the country do not make an issue of it, they will be breaking faith with their honored dead. Democracy and tyranny cannot yoke up and pull as a team. Every sensible person wants world peace as a reality, but seeking it by surrender of sovereign rights can mean nothing but national suicide.

New Effort To Squander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Leader and Arkansawyer, Stuttgart, Ark., for July 25, 1949:

NEW EFFORT TO SQUANDER

Another effort to squander millions of dollars in American taxpayers' money is before Congress at the present time. It is the request of the Southwest Power Administration for millions in funds to build power lines paralleling lines of privately owned, tax-paying utilities.

Down in Texas the SPA has an arrangement by which an electric company transports power generated at a Government dam to SPA customers. By using the electric company's lines, tax money is not spent for duplicating SPA lines at public expense. The contract between the electric company and SPA is a modern example of Government and business working together.

In Arkansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Louisiana, and Mississippi—States in which the SPA also plans to expand its public-power system—the electric companies have offered to enter into a contract to do the same thing the Texas company is doing, transmit SPA power over their lines for the federally supported agency.

For several years SPA held the Texas contract up as a model, saying it wanted to work out such a plan in its other States. But now it appears that SPA has changed its mind. It doesn't want to use power company lines, but asks for millions of dollars from Congress to build duplicating power lines.

A Senate committee has reported that SPA should go ahead and work out a contract with the power companies to use their lines to haul its power from Government dams to its customers, the co-ops, municipalities, and others, who are given preference for the power.

If SPA were sincere when it said that the Texas contract is a good one, it should do as the Senate committee recommends and not seek to waste millions in tax funds for duplicating lines. In fact, the Senate and Congress shouldn't let it waste funds, and it is to be hoped the Arkansas delegation will help see to it that this is the result of pending congressional action.

Fair Employment Practices Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a moral question involving the dignity of the human being is the underlying cause of the problems facing the world today. I find this same question in the major issues confronting the Eighty-first Congress.

It is apparent to me that the reason for our existence on this earth is being bypassed and forgotten. We are here to serve God and our fellowmen. Our courageous founding fathers, in establishing on this North American Continent, a new Nation, realized and gave recognition to the moral law. They founded a Government which is the only one in the world today which recognizes the dignity of the human being, his civil, his social, and his spiritual rights.

Our Declaration of Independence clearly sets forth our duties as citizens of these United States in these words:

That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

To preserve these priceless principles, as trustees for our posterity, we must strengthen and support by Government action, legislation that will enforce these principles.

In this second session of the Eighty-first Congress, we have been called on to exert our powers to insure the rights of all our people in the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness. This has been given the title of the civil-rights program. I support this program. For this reason, I voted against the McConnell amendment to the Fair Employment Practices bill. That this amendment was passed by the House by a vote of 221 to 178 is now history. I voted against the motion to recommit this bill because I knew that if such a motion carried, there would be no fair employment practices legislation enacted. When the vote on the final passage of this bill was taken, I voted for it. I did so in an effort to keep this measure alive, knowing that the bill would be referred to the Senate for action by that body. Had I voted against the final passage of this bill, it would have been a vote to kill FEPC for the session with no hope of reviving it until the next Congress. It was a poor alternative, but it was the only alternative.

Despite the coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats, I feel that great strides have been made toward the enactment of a Fair Employment Practices Act. This measure is now before the people of the United States in this congressional election year.

Carrier "Leyte" Conversion Job Belongs in Brooklyn Navy Yard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of February 23, 1950:

CARRIER "LEYTE" CONVERSION JOB BELONGS IN BROOKLYN NAVY YARD

The controversy over where the Navy's big carrier *Leyte* is to be converted—modernized and refitted to handle bigger planes—is important to Brooklyn. If the job is sent to the Norfolk Navy Yard instead of the Brooklyn Navy Yard thousands of Brooklynites face the loss of their jobs.

The work force at the Brooklyn Navy Yard has already been drastically cut as a result of last year's economy slashes. Brooklynites accepted the lay-offs at that time because they were necessary. But unnecessary dismissals, made solely because work that would normally be done in the Brooklyn yard is sent elsewhere, would be intolerable.

The Brooklyn Navy Yard should have its fair share of work. It has been described as the largest and best-equipped shipyard in the world. Its valuable equipment, worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, should not be allowed to go to waste. What remains of its skilled force of technicians should not be cast adrift to disappear into other industries and other communities. They may be badly needed some day.

Among those battling to have the *Leyte* job assigned to Brooklyn is Local 42 of the A. F. of L. Boilermakers Brotherhood. Among the cogent arguments they make is that assignment of the job to Norfolk would mean a great deal of added expense to outfit the Norfolk yard to handle the big job. On the other hand, as the union points out, the Brooklyn yard is preeminently well equipped

for the job and has had two smaller carrier conversions from which to gain all-important experience and know-how.

We are glad to support the local in its drive. We take it for granted that the full delegation of Brooklyn's Congressmen will do everything in their power to bring the *Leyte* conversion job to our local yard where it belongs.

Fearful Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial entitled "Fearful Dilemma," which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Daily News on Tuesday, February 28, 1950:

FEARFUL DILEMMA

Senator MURRAY, prolabor Montana Democrat, thinks there are only two ways to achieve lasting peace in the coal industry:

1. Nationalization: Government purchase and permanent operation of the mines.

2. Government control of coal production.

Neither way, Senator MURRAY concedes, could end the present crisis quickly. And Senator MORSE, prolabor Oregon Republican, asserts that nationalization would be a bad mistake; a step down the road to state socialism.

So it would be, and a long step. Government control of coal production would be a shorter step toward the same destination, one which most Americans do not want to reach.

But the country's need for coal is now desperate. And in and out of Congress, many are saying that if John L. Lewis and the mine owners do not agree, and if the miners continue to defy the Taft-Hartley Act injunction, the Government must seize and operate the mines.

Then what? Congress can give the Government seizure power. It cannot, under the Constitution, give the Government power to make individual miners work in involuntary servitude.

The Government might induce the miners to work by confiscating all profits from seized mines and by negotiating a contract with Mr. Lewis on his terms, as it has done before.

That, however, would make a lasting solution for the coal industry's grave problems more difficult to find. And at least some mine owners might be unwilling or unable to take back and operate their properties on Mr. Lewis' terms. So the Government could find itself in permanent possession of coal mines and traveling to state socialism.

Here, then, is a fearful dilemma, with no apparent good way out. And nobody is helping to find a way out by gloating, as some are, or by mourning, as others are, that existing law in the form of the Taft-Hartley Act has been tried and has failed to protect the country.

The Taft-Hartley Act authorizes Federal court injunctions as a method of halting or delaying strikes that imperil or threaten to imperil national health and safety—of providing time for efforts to promote peaceful settlements. In the present coal strike that method has not been fairly tried.

First, for many months, President Truman, Senator MURRAY, and others encouraged disrespect for and defiance of the Taft-Hartley Act by denouncing it in terms almost as violent and farfetched as those used by Mr. Lewis and other professional union leaders.

Then, long after the coal strike obviously menaced national health and safety, Mr. Truman refused to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act. He waited until the country was almost out of coal and the crisis was full blown.

Mr. Truman waited too long. Mr. Truman, not the Taft-Hartley Act, has failed to protect the country.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee, on behalf of Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, over the Columbia Broadcasting System, New York City, October 31, 1949:

I am happy indeed to be addressing my fellow citizens of the State of New York on behalf of HERBERT H. LEHMAN, the candidate of the Democratic Party for the unexpired term in the United States Senate which was created by the resignation of Senator Robert F. Wagner. Our party is presenting to the voters for election to the great office of Senator one of its most distinguished sons, Governor LEHMAN.

When the voters 5 years ago reelected Senator Wagner, they decided between the parties, and they elected a Democrat to serve the 6-year term for which Senator Wagner was running. In ordinary course that Senatorial place would not have been contested again until next year. However, by reason of ill health Senator Wagner lately had to give up the office he had so honored. At the moment the incumbent in his position is a Republican, appointed interim Senator by a Republican governor to fill a place for which the voters had selected a Democrat. It is now time to reaffirm that party choice the voters made when they elected Senator Wagner, and in my judgment they are going to reaffirm it when they elect HERBERT H. LEHMAN United States Senator on November 8.

People everywhere are watching this contest. Our party could have made no better choice of candidate than HERBERT LEHMAN. He stands in the front ranks of leaders of our party in this State and in this Nation. For a high office that calls for many qualities of head and heart Governor LEHMAN is ideally suited.

The people of this State know Governor LEHMAN well, for 14 years, first as lieutenant governor and then for 10 years as governor, he became known, and favorably known, to every citizen of New York. During most of that time I was State chairman of my party, and in that position I had to deal with all groups and people interested in the affairs of the State. I had a chance to learn from them the good will they had toward HERBERT LEHMAN.

I have spoken of Governor LEHMAN'S 14 years of service in high State office. There are few records that approach his, either for length of service or quality of service. First, as lieutenant governor, when he took an important part in the administration headed by Governor Roosevelt, and later, as governor, when Franklin D. Roosevelt became President, HERBERT LEHMAN got very deeply into the affairs and into the hearts of millions of people. He learned the problems of our State, which are the kind of problems that constantly must be in the mind of a United States Senator from New York.

New York is a great agricultural State, and Governor LEHMAN by zeal and hard work became a useful and effective champion of the farmers' position.

The period of Governor LEHMAN'S official term was a period of problems and of progress. The harsh realities of the great depression, and some older evils, were problems with which he was at grips daily. Thus, the HERBERT LEHMAN who will take office as United States Senator next January will be the same man who has shown us New Yorkers what he is for in the field of labor and social legislation. When he was governor these are the things he fought for:

A minimum-wage law for women and children.

An anti-injunction law in labor disputes.

Extension of the workmen's compensation law to cover all occupational diseases.

An act requiring jury trials in labor-injunction-contempt proceedings.

A law compelling payment of prevailing wage rates on public works.

A 40-hour, 5-day week for public-works contracts.

A law raising the age limit at which children could leave school and go to work.

An act to regulate industrial homework.

A law to abolish the "yellow dog" contract.

A law declaring that the labor of human beings was not a commodity.

Legislation in most of these matters is now in effect and you may be used to them. But the point I am making is that these laws were not in effect when HERBERT LEHMAN first took office. They are things for which he fought, and fought hard, against a hostile Republican legislature. Due to his persistence, and to the ratifying votes from the people of this State, the goals he set were reached.

I repeat—these things we now accept. But we must not forget that the man who was largely responsible for their acceptance in this State is the man who is now the Democratic candidate for United States Senator. His record affords impressive examples of what he is disposed to do and is able to do.

The period of the thirties was a period of improvement in the position of organized labor. In the early thirties many of the unions which are now vigorous were very weak. Some of the unions now most active in our community life did not event exist. Then came the Federal legislation sponsored by the Democratic Party, the Wagner Act. That act was the Magna Carta of labor. For the first time workers were really free to choose who should represent them in unfettered collective bargaining. At the same time the Federal act was adopted, we in New York, under the leadership of HERBERT LEHMAN, adopted the little Wagner Act, which deals with labor problems within the State. Our little Wagner Act stands on the books today practically as it was written. It is interesting to note that the men whom Governor LEHMAN appointed to the New York State Labor Relations Board managed its affairs so ably that one heard very little of the complaints and bickering that were commonly heard about the operations of the National Labor Relations Board. In other words, here in the State of New York we had under the leadership of Governor LEHMAN wise administration of far-reaching labor laws.

Sometimes when a politician interests himself as deeply as Governor LEHMAN has in labor, extension of social services, and agricultural problems, it is thought that he must necessarily be disinterested in or hostile to business. However, this unique man, who

spent the early part of his life in active business, has always found loyal supporters in the ranks of business and has never been accused of being a business baiter. He is too hard-headed and too wise to indulge in senseless sniping at the economic system which has produced great results in this country. He knows that our business system, soundly run, is the productive machine whence came the other benefits which I have just mentioned.

Governor LEHMAN is to be preferred over his opponent, therefore, by reason of much broader and sustained experience. He knows the affairs of every town and county in this State. He knows where the interests of those towns and counties mesh with the Federal Government. In the Senate he will be outstanding for his knowledge of local problems.

In the field of foreign affairs, so much the concern nowadays of the United States Senate, Governor LEHMAN is widely experienced. As Administrator of UNRRA he gained the world viewpoint. He was in many countries. He worked on countless problems. He advised and counseled with many people in many lands. His qualifications in this field are unique and distinguished. It is argued that his opponent is well qualified in this field, too, and I do not gainsay it. But competence in the foreign field is only a part of what we ask in a United States Senator. Our domestic problems need attention, too. No one can seriously dispute my statement that in the great domestic field Governor LEHMAN is infinitely better qualified than his opponent. He is closer to the people and has been closer to the people for many years than has his opponent, whose activities have been in other fields.

In my judgment over the last two decades the Democratic Party has at all times taken the lead in legislation and in administrative action leading to improvement in the life of all of us. Not everything that we have tried or have done has been perfectly done. But we have been trying, and trying hard, to promote the general welfare. We have not spent our time wringing our hands and moaning, saying "No, no, I wouldn't do this. No, no, I wouldn't do that. This is bad and that is bad."

In the 1948 election many people were surprised that President Truman was elected and that the Democratic Party was given another mandate of power. There was one factor operating that many forgot, the economic factor. At the time of the 1948 election economic conditions, while not perfect, were very good. That unquestionably had its effect on the election. In my judgment the average American decided in his own interest to make no change in the national administration because he thought it was doing a good job.

On that basis I think New York next week should elect a Democratic Senator, a supporter of the national administration which was approved last year by the voters. After all, we in New York number 10 percent of the people of the United States, and it seems inconsistent that we now have no Senator representing us who is a member of the national party which has so lately received the approval of the voters. Governor LEHMAN will immediately take a high place in the councils of our party in the Senate. His wisdom and experience, his strength and his humane attitudes, will be welcomed by his colleagues.

I have just returned from a long business trip abroad. In the few days I have had at home I have learned with satisfaction that HERBERT LEHMAN will be supported at the polls on November 8 by all the strong legions that have elected him so many times before. He deserves well of the State which he has served well. I am confident when the voters have thought things over, and have weighed the experience and character that this great New Yorker possesses, they will overwhelmingly elect him United States Senator.

Before I conclude my broadcast, may I say to those who may be listening that I am very much interested in the election of Supreme Court Justice Charles W. Froessel to the office of associate justice of the court of appeals. Justice Froessel has had a long and fine career before the bar and as a justice of the supreme court has made a most enviable record. He is well and favorably known throughout the State in fraternal and communal circles and his great host of friends, like myself, who know him intimately can testify to his worth, ability, and fitness for the high office for which he has been nominated by the Democratic Party. Let me say to those who may be listening to me that I am just as much interested in the election of Judge Froessel as I am in the election of former Gov. HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

The Politics of the Rules Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, public discussion of the operations and authority of the House of Representatives Committee on Rules has become so enmeshed among such glib phrases as "power grab" and "undemocratic" that I feel it highly worth while that some light be shed on the subject.

I doubt that any issue in recent years has been so misunderstood and misrepresented. There were two main reasons why I decided to vote to restore the rules which had been effective in the House for many years.

One. The most decisive influence on me was the question of whether we are going to make an effort to balance our national budget, or whether we would continue the "spendomania" which, I feel, will bankrupt our country unless it is halted.

Second. I had become increasingly convinced in the year that the change in rules had been in operation that the new method had not been properly thought out and had not proven successful.

To understand the importance of my first reason, we can examine the methods right in our California Legislature, where I had the honor to serve for 16 years. In Sacramento all spending bills reported out of standing committees must be sent to the ways and means committee. These measures are held up until the budget bill has been passed and signed by the governor. Then, in the wisdom of the ways and means committee, these bills are considered in light of ability to pay.

In Congress, bills authorizing expenditure of untold millions—even billions—of dollars are reported favorably by various committees. Only the Rules Committee had been set up to sift these bills, and its responsibility always has been to hold up measures which by their passage would upset the Government's financial condition.

Like the ways and means committee in Sacramento, the Rules Committee is the only body in the House which has an over-all view of the total cost of all proposed bills. No other committee can estimate accurately the effect of its legislation in relation to the total cost of all the measures reported by the other committees.

The so-called liberal rule instituted last year provided a way to bypass this check and bring out any bill some liberal-spending group wanted.

We must remember it was through watchdog tactics that the Rules Committee during the Eightieth Congress saved the taxpayers an estimated $14,000,000,000 in expenditures and balanced the budget for the first time since 1930. Funds were made available for the first time since that year to reduce our national debt.

When I voted for a return to the pre-1949 rules, I felt they must have had considerable merit. They were set up by the Democratic majority in the House in 1931, and served the purposes of the entire Roosevelt administration and Mr. Truman's first term, which included the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress. They were satisfactory for 18 years. However, the 1948 Truman victory margin did not appear enough to administration strategists to push through their entire program. To strengthen their position, Truman forces enlarged the various committees and put the balance of committee power into the hands of Fair Deal supporters.

Then they pushed through the House, without permitting debate, a rule to let any committee chairman move a bill to the floor without clearance by the Rules Committee. This action may be taken at any time 21 days after the Rules Committee had received the bill; hence the name, "21-day rule."

The controversy concerning repeal of the 21-day rule and the restoration of the pre-1949 rules unfortunately centered around the Fair Employment Practices Commission legislation. It was said that since southern Democrats had heavy representation on the Rules Committee, they would continue to block the FEPC bill. When the 21-day rule was adopted this was one of the arguments set forth by those who favored the rules change.

I am sorry to say that some outside criticism was based on a misunderstanding of the House rules. Let me give you an example of how lacking some people are in information about the methods of Congress—and, unfortunately, they have spoken the loudest.

There is an aspirant to Congress in my district in California who recently said:

SCUDDER'S vote with the Dixiecrat-Republican coalition was a vote against effective democratic government—with a small "d"—and would have given a majority of one committee of the House of Representatives the power to decide what issues would be brought before Congress for debate and vote.

That gag-rule vote might have been the means of blocking the consideration of Central Valley project measures and other bills

of interest to California as well as the President's civil-rights program, against which it ostensibly was aimed.

This is a total misstatement of fact. The truth is that no committee of Congress—the Rules Committee or any other—can keep a majority of the House from exercising its will.

There are four methods in existence which insure the consideration of any important legislation.

The first method is the discharge petition: Any time 218 Members of the House—a majority—sign a petition, the bill they seek to consider must be brought to the House floor for a vote.

The second method is Calendar Wednesday: Every Wednesday the Clerk of the House calls the Committee Calendar, and any committee chairman who gains recognition when his turn comes may call up any bill in his committee without going through the Rules Committee.

The third method is suspension of the rules: Any Member may ask for suspension of the rules on any bill, and if two-thirds of the Members present vote to suspend the rules, the bill must be considered.

The fourth method is unanimous consent: Any Member may be recognized and ask unanimous consent to consider a bill. If there is no objection, the bill then may be considered. This admittedly is the most difficult method on a controversial measure, since a single objection suffices to block consideration.

Now let us see how the rules of the House—particularly with respect to the 21-day rule, which was sponsored to save the President's civil-rights program—have operated in recent weeks.

The FEPC bill became eligible to be called up under the 21-day rule in August 1949, but although Congress stayed in session until October 19 no effort was made by the Democratic leadership to do anything about FEPC. When Congress reconvened, the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] announced that he would not recognize him and the 21-day rule proved valueless in that respect.

Now, under what method did the FEPC legislation finally pass?

Finding it impossible to get any results from the 21-day rule, the proponents of FEPC brought it up under Calendar Wednesday and the bill was passed, with amendments, on February 22 and 23.

In other words, the FEPC bill finally was considered under a method that has existed in the House for 41 years and would have continued to exist, completely intact, whether the former power of the Rules Committee had been restored or not.

Consider this: In 14 months only two bills have been called up for consideration through the 21-day method and in both cases four other methods were available to bring the bills to the floor without going through the Rules Committee.

If there was a power grab involved in the controversy over the House rules, the 21-day rule itself constitutes the grab. The 21-day rule gives the Speaker of the House a great deal more power over legislation, as evidenced by the fact that Mr. LESINSKI never did receive recognition by the Speaker under the 21-day rule to bring FEPC to the House floor.

The rules of the House are very complex and I blame no one unfamiliar with legislative procedure for failure to understand their intricacies, but it should be remembered that the House consists of 435 Members and that every Congress sees approximately 20,000 legislative measures introduced. The rules of the House have been built out of practice and experience and they have been designed to make it possible for the most important legislation to have priority.

When the rules are tampered with in order to gain certain political objectives or to promote pet measures, the American people are done a great disservice.

What is needed in Congress is more serious and better-informed students of government who will consider the welfare of the people as a whole, and not bow to pressure to upset a tested and tried system simply to gain a single objective.

I think the preservation of the financial soundness of our Government is far too important to risk in such a haphazard fashion. I shall follow the dictates of my conscience in these matters and the knowledge that I have gained in my more than 17 years as a legislator and a Congressman. I am always willing to subscribe to change when change is necessary and beneficial and I always have done so, but I shall never misrepresent, or falsify, or veil my efforts behind any method to achieve any goal.

We must remember that necessary rules on legislative procedure, many times restrictive, have been largely responsible for the success of our form of government.

Free Federal Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, at the request of Eliot Blackwelder, chairman, Palo Alto chapter, Atlantic Union Committee, I am including herewith a petition from various interested citizens in Palo Alto, Calif.:

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *February 15, 1950.*

Being convinced that a union of the free democratic nations of the world offers the best hope of maintaining peace and preserving the world from subjugation by the Communists, we, the undersigned citizens of Palo Alto and vicinity, in California, request Congress to adopt House Concurrent Resolution 107–111, introduced in July 1949, which authorizes the President to invite the nations which sponsored the North Atlantic treaty to send delegates to a convention "to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union."

Mrs. David Starr Jordan; Mrs. Jean B. Blackwelder; Dr. Karl Brandt, economist, Food Research Institute, Stanford University; Russel V. Lee, M. D., director of the Palo Alto Clinic; Tom C. Christy, president of T. C. Christy Co.; Dr. I. James Quillen, professor of education, Stanford University; Mrs. Grace Gates Mitchell; Prof. Joseph J. Graham; Prof. George E. Osborne, professor of law, Stanford University; Mrs. Ethel Smith Dalmadge; Dr. George S. Parks, professor of chemistry, Stanford University; Mr. Gerald R. Dalmadge; Mrs. Anne Parks; Mrs. A. L. Bruce; Mrs. Dorothy B. Wiggins; Dr. Arthur D. Howard, professor of geology, Stanford University; Mr. Almon W. Copley, electrical engineer (retired); Mr. Ithiel de Sola Pool, Hoover War Library; Mrs. Barbara W. Law; Dr. Gordon F. Ferris, professor of entomology, Stanford University; Dr. Eliot Blackwelder, professor of geology (retired); Dr. Robert E. Swain, professor of chemistry (retired); Dr. Ira L. Wiggins, director of the Natural History Museum, Stanford University.

Farm Bureau Group Backs Taxation of Co-op's Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I herewith request publication of the following article, appearing in the Washington Daily News, wherein it is reported that the American Farm Bureau Federation has adopted a most commendable position relative to the taxation of part of the profits of farm cooperatives:

FARM BUREAU GROUP BACKS TAXATION OF CO-OPS' PROFITS

(By James Daniel)

The American Farm Bureau Federation favors Federal taxation of part of the profits of farm cooperatives.

Breaking ranks with other farm organization, the powerful federation told the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee it believed co-ops should pay income taxes on profits which they did not return or assign to their patrons.

Such a policy would affect approximately half of the Nation's 10,000 farm cooperatives. These are the co-ops which claim full statutory tax exemption, including the privilege of building up cash reserves not treated as the property of patrons.

Donald Kirkpatrick, chief counsel for the Farm Bureau Federation, said his organization was unalterably and aggressively opposed, however, to applying the Federal corporation tax to profits which were distributed or clearly assigned to patrons. Such profits, he said, were really rebates and belonged to the patrons.

The federation's testimony caused a stir among witnesses gathered here to oppose a drive by the National Tax Equality Association to have all co-op profits taxed at the same rate as ordinary corporation earnings. This rate is 38 percent after $50,000.

Mr. Kirkpatrick told the Ways and Means Committee there was some dispute as to who represented co-op patrons, the regular farm organizations or the associations established by co-op managements. He said the Farm Bureau Federation had encouraged its members to organize hundreds of co-ops and consequently felt entitled to speak for co-op patrons as federation members.

The Farmers Union, meanwhile, sided with the co-op leadership in opposing any Federal taxation of cooperatives. A National Grange representative said that elimination of the tax exemption would yield little Federal revenue.

All co-op and farm organization witnesses contended that co-op profits paid out in cash or some form of script, such as stock or certificates of indebtedness, should not be taxed while in the possession of the co-ops.

Ordinary corporations pay Federal income taxes before dividends are paid to stockholders. Stockholders then pay an additional tax on their dividends as personal income. But farm witnesses said co-ops primarily were in competition with partnerships and single-owner businesses, which escape the so-called double taxation of corporation profits.

Representative WILBUR M. MILLS, Democrat of Arkansas, said he had heard that many farmers didn't report co-op dividends on their personal income-tax returns. He suggested co-ops might withhold 10 percent of each dividend. At the end of a year, he said, farmers could apply the tax withheld to their own income-tax payment, or claim a rebate if the amount of their income-tax liability didn't require the full credit.

Slaves of Speculation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, through the years I have protested at every opportunity against the system whereby speculators are permitted to manipulate prices of food and fiber produced by the farmers of this Nation.

Through the years, vast fortunes have been amassed by men who are known as market traders but who in reality are nothing more than glorified gamblers. As far as the farmers are concerned, these men play with loaded dice and stacked decks for they can whipsaw the markets regardless of the adversities that bear down heavily on the unprotected producer of the raw material of the farms.

It has always been rather amusing to hear the hue and cry that is raised when efforts are made to legalize various forms of gambling in the States, Nation, and local communities yet a full blast of public indignation has never been turned upon this sinister and legalized gambling as practiced on the various grain and commodity exchanges.

How long would the manufacturers of tractors, automobiles, combines, and other products which the farmer must buy continue to pile up huge profits if the selling price of these products were subject to a speculative market? As a matter of fact, how long would the manufacturers and retailers of these and other products stay in business at all if their prices were whipsawed up and down, day by day, by a bunch of gamblers?

Would not it be just as logical to establish a so-called congressional exchange here in Washington, D. C., and permit a bunch of gamblers and speculators to fix the wages of Representatives and Senators each day on the basis of alleged accomplishment in the matter of legislation?

The time is long past due for abolishment of this form of victimizing those who produce the new wealth of these United States.

Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith the following excellent article on this subject which is taken from the recent annual report of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, which maintains general offices at St. Paul, Minn.:

Far from the land and untouched by the seasons men stand in vast halls where a farmer is seldom seen and play the role of the Fates. It is nature who spins the thread, making it thick or thin. But these men draw it out and cut it off. These are the speculators on the trading floors of the grain exchanges. With a move of the hand they send the price of the farmers' grain climbing high or crashing down.

Often the farmer's grain has not been planted, very often it has not been harvested, but the prices are already made. In no other business is there a comparable situation of price-setting by men who neither produce nor use the product.

The greatest of these temples of chance which set the farmer's price is the Chicago Board of Trade. Its monument to free trading is the $25,000,000, 44-story Board of Trade building. It is topped with a giant statue of Ceres, Goddess of Grain, who looks down on the stone and brick and the milling throngs in La Salle Street. This is what the profits from the farmer's grain built, as it also helped build Chicago. There are similar markets in Minneapolis, Duluth, Kansas City, and Omaha. But the greatest of all is Chicago's. Very little actual grain is handled in Chicago, but the Chicago Board of Trade accounts for more than 80 percent of all futures trading on all markets.

When the Chicago Grain Exchange was organized in 1848, there were no grain hedges or futures trading. It did not become a general practice until 1854. And it was not until 1884 that the Supreme Court established that contracts for future delivery were valid.

That was the period, too, of frenzied speculative corners. Some of the operations of the speculators in the 1880's and 1890's seem almost unbelievable now. In May of 1887, one grain clique announced it held 10,000,000 bushels of cash wheat and had 30,000,000 more for June delivery. In one day the trading exceeded 100,000,000 bushels. Losses were more than $8,000,000. In another operation, a group of speculators reported it held 45,000,000 bushels, while another had 30,000,000. In that hectic year about 15 Board of Trade firms failed.

In 1888 the most powerful operator on the board of trade made himself famous and millions of dollars by a corner in wheat. Ten years later another Chicago millionaire dropped $10,000,000 in an unsuccessful effort to achieve the same goal. A meat packer by the name of Armour proved his nemesis. Armour sold wheat short and used icebreakers to get boatloads of grain out of Duluth and into Chicago in December in time to fulfill his contracts.

What did all these speculative frenzies have to do with the farmer? Nothing. There was no tangible evidence that the farmer had ever benefited, but plenty that he had been harmed. The public was aroused. Congress investigated.

The farmer wondered, and as he wondered his anger rose. What kind of a business was this that could buy and sell a hundred times over the actual amount of grain that is harvested in the United States? In the biggest futures trading year in its history in 1925, the Chicago Board of Trade recorded transactions on 26,900,000,000 bushels of grain. In that year the farmer harvested less than 5,000,000,000 bushels of grain. During the depression the futures trading dropped to 10,000,000,000 bushels in 1932. But that was still more than double the total of all the grain grown in the United States that year.

In 1922 the Federal Government stepped in to regulate grain trading with the establishment of the Grain Futures Administration. In 1936 Congress passed the more stringent Commodity Exchange Act, which opened the doors of the grain exchanges to the farmer and his cooperative. The futures market is, in fact, a speculative market. The grain traders say that it is the heart of existing grain trade mechanism.

But is it a necessity or a luxury? The farmer still wonders. Nearly all of the grain exchanges outside of the United States already are partly or wholly closed. The Winnipeg Grain Exchange has been operating on "half-time" for many years.

The farmer knows that speculation is only one force among many that set the price cycles. But like any form of gambling, it opens the market to hysterical panics and booms. During periods of inflation it helps to force prices up to levels which the consumer cannot afford to pay. During periods of depression it helps to force prices down to a level which bankrupts the farmer. The farmer has a right to ask, "Is this necessary?"

The size of the farmer's monthly telephone bill is not determined by the price at which American Telephone & Telegraph stock is quoted on the New York Stock Exchange. Neither is the price of a Chevrolet truck set by trading in General Motors stock.

Yet, the price of wheat that goes into bread, the wool and cotton that goes into clothes, is determined in substantial part by the futures prices on the New York and Chicago exchanges. The consumer has a right to join with the farmer and ask, "Is this necessary?"

Surplus Food Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I am including a list of names and addresses of State offices in North and South Dakota which can approve applications of welfare agencies for surplus food for distribution to needy families. This supplements the lists submitted by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERLONG], the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], the gentleman from Oregon

[Mr. ANGELL], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOFFMAN].

NORTH AND SOUTH DAKOTA

North Dakota: O. P. Beyer, area supervisor, 623 Wabash, Chicago, Ill.

South Dakota: Harold S. Freeman, State superintendent of public instruction, Pierre, S. Dak.

Country Editors Say United States Headed for Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a most informative editorial from the Livingston Manor Times, of Livingston Manor, in my district:

COUNTRY EDITORS SAY UNITED STATES HEADED FOR SOCIALISM

A total of 78 percent of the country editors of America fear that our country is headed toward socialism, according to a survey conducted by the American Press magazine. A three-page questionnaire was sent to 500 country editors all over the United States, and included the editor of the Livingston Manor Times.

The survey is interesting because editors usually reflect the opinions of the average citizen in their community. Although tax reforms were included second in importance, the editors listed five important things for Congress to do, as follows:

Enact reforms proposed by the Hoover Commission.

Curb welfare-state bills.

Strengthen and streamline defense and take action to restore confidence of business in the future.

On the present Taft-Hartley bill, 87 percent voted to leave it as it is. Your editor, with 26 percent more, advised making it more stringent. Only 5 percent wanted it repealed.

In curtailment of Government costs, we joined with 90 percent other editors in suggesting a major reduction in the number of Federal employees; went along with 62 percent in favor of repeal of military taxes; voted with 85 percent in favor of income-tax simplification; voted with 49 percent in favor of social-security expansion; voted with 59 percent against any increase in social-security benefits; voted against any ban on liquor advertising with 76 percent of the editors; and voted with 57 percent in favor of compulsory military training.

Only 14 percent of the editors voted in favor of a return to prohibition, 86 percent including your editor voted against it. Only 23 percent voted that governmental authority and the expense it entails should remain as it is. This paper with 71 percent of the other editors felt that considerable authority should be returned to the States, to take care of their individual problems.

On the question of compulsory health insurance 89 percent voted in favor.

On the vote for a reduction of aid to foreign countries, 54 percent voted in favor of a reduction. (We voted to eliminate it entirely.)

On the vote for reduction of farm subsidies, 64 percent of the editors voted in favor of reduction. We voted to eliminate all subsidies, as unfair to the average citizen and taxpayer.

One of the closest fights was on the question of income taxes, showing 39 percent in favor of reducing taxes only if the budget can be balanced; 36 percent who voted to leave taxes as they are to balance the budget and create a surplus if possible and 21 percent who voted that taxes should be reduced 20 percent immediately, whether the budget is balanced or not. We voted with the 21 percent, as we felt that with a reduction in the number of Federal employees, reduction in subsidies and elimination of Marshall fund aid, and elimination of crackpot theories there would be more than ample to balance the budget.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—We were surprised to learn that a majority of the country editors felt about the same as we do about national affairs. Even with a sharp curtailment in national expenditures it will take a lifetime of taxpaying by our children and grandchildren to take this Government out of the red. We could be a very happy Nation if we could eliminate the burden of taxation which now takes very close to 40 cents out of every dollar we earn. It is also interesting to realize that probably 50 percent of the editors who answered the questions sent out by the American Press Association were presumably democratic in policy, while they might not favor many of the theories of the New Deal or the Square or Fair Deal.

The Coal Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Not Just a Gesture," which appeared in the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star on February 25, 1950, as follows:

NOT JUST A GESTURE

Passage of a substitute for the Administration's Fair Employment Practices bill by the House was not, as an ardent Fair Dealer put it, "just a gesture." It was a solid victory both for civil rights and for common sense. The House-passed bill creates an FEPC which would work closely with State and local agencies to discourage discrimination in employment because of race or religion. It would not have police powers of enforcement, which too many departments of government are using now to harass the people. It would have tremendous influence, however, through its power to investigate to publicize its findings and to persuade employers to bar discriminatory practices.

Prejudice is not something that can be forced out of existence by fines and imprisonment. It cannot be cured by police action, but only by education and publicity and voluntary acceptance of equal rights. This country is too big, and its social structure too varied for any single Federal agency to set out a rule of thumb banning employment discrimination that will be fair, just, and effective. Each community must work out its own problems.

What a Federal FEPC can do, is to show these communities how to ease discriminations, and to bring the full light of publicity on those areas where discrimination is the most severe. One of the main reasons for the existence of discrimination is public ignorance of the problems of those minorities that are hard pressed.

We hope the Senate follows the example of the big majority of the House and passes an FEPC bill which uses the means of persuasion and education rather than force. We congratulate every member of the Hoosier delegation in the House in both parties for his vote on this FEPC bill.

The American Press Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, according to an article in the American Press, February 1950 issue, 78 percent of country editors fear United States is headed for socialism. Over 500 editors in reply to the American Press poll, tell what action they think Congress should take on leading issues of 1950.

In answer to the question, "What do you consider to be the two most important things for Congress to accomplish at the new session?" 79 percent demanded a balanced budget, reduction of Government costs or cuts in Federal pay rolls; 85 percent would like to see the tax laws rewritten and simplified.

The editors also advocate the following:

Enact reforms proposed by Hoover Commission.

Curb welfare-state bills.

Strengthen and clarify foreign policy.

Strengthen and streamline defense.

Take action to restore the confidence of business in the future.

To the question: "Assuming that everyone would like to see Government costs cut, check each of the following proposals which you think would be practical and advisable," the following answers were forthcoming:

Major reduction in number of Federal employees, 90 percent.

Reduction of farm subsidies, 64 percent.

Across-the-board cut in funds provided for all Government departments, 62 percent.

Reduction of funds for aiding foreign countries, 54 percent.

Reduction of Federal expenditures for social services, 53 percent.

Reduction of Federal funds for housing, 37 percent.

Reduction of funds for veterans, 31 percent.

Reduction of Federal expenditures for schools, hospitals, and institutions, 21 percent.

Reduction in appropriations for armed forces, 20 percent.

What editors want done about proposed legislation:

Compulsory health insurance: Yes, 8 percent; no, 89 percent; no answer, 3 percent.

Taft-Hartley law: Repeal, 5 percent; less stringent, 10 percent; no changes, 57 percent; more stringent, 26 percent; no answer, 1 percent.

Liquor and cigarette taxes: Repeal, 3 percent; reduce, 21 percent; increase, 36 percent; no change, 30 percent; no answer, 10 percent.

Luxury taxes: Repeal, 62 percent; no, 37 percent; no answer, 1 percent.

Income-tax simplification: Yes, 85 percent; no, 11 percent; no answer, 4 percent.

Social-security expansion: Yes, 49 percent; no, 46 percent; no answer, 5 percent.

Increase social-security benefits: Yes, 36 percent; no, 59 percent; no answer, 5 percent.

Ban on liquor ads: For, 20 percent; against, 79 percent; no answer, 1 percent.

Compulsory military training: For, 57 percent; against, 41 percent; no answer, 2 percent.

Last Year Out of Every Hundred Oil Wells Drilled, 85 Were Costly Failures—Only 15 Percent Resulted in Profit to the Operators—Producers Can Only Stay in Business by Discovering New Wells as Sources of Supply as Old Wells Run Dry—This Entails the Hazardous Risk of Even More Invested Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the papers on Thursday last that congressional sanction will be sought to increase the importation of oil from foreign countries in order to increase dollar credits in Great Britain.

Almost immediately I came upon another similar proposal from a high official of Government. This time it was that Congress should provide unemployment wages to such of our workers as will lose their jobs due to the planned importation in the coming year of a billion dollars worth of foreign manufactured goods to be imported into this country, in order to give the foreign nations more dollar credits.

Mr. Speaker, I am definitely against legislation looking to these ends. I am in favor of retaining American markets for all products of the soil and the toil of the peoples of our country to the American producers of those products, who work in the mines, the mills, in our factories, and on our farms.

There is still another economically unsound and fallacious proposal being considered as of this very hour by the Ways and Means Committee of this House. This, sir, has to do with changing the historic rate of depletion on our oil and gas wells in these United States. The immediate effect of that proposal, if enacted into law, would be to curtail, if not abate almost in toto, all exploratory operations looking to the development of new sources of oil and other petroleum products in our own country.

Mr. Speaker, nothing in life should be permitted to imperil the economic strength and the well-being of the people of these United States, for upon that strength, well-being, and security is dependent not alone the peace and security of our own Nation, but the peace and security of the world.

I have no conception whatever as to the mental processes that cause American public officials to even consider—much less make—such proposals.

First, we tax our people or put them under greater bonded debt to give billions of dollars in Marshall-plan aid to rehabilitate the foreign governments after we rebuild their industrial plants with that money and set them up in business to produce goods identical with those historically produced in America; next we proceed to make arrangements whereby the rehabilitated foreign industries and workers can drive our own manufacturers out of our own foreign markets with which we long served our manufactured goods.

Now the ECA wants the American consumers to buy these foreign made goods—pay them cash for what we import, shut down our own factories and tax our own people still more to pay unemployment wages to the American workers who lose their jobs as a result of the increased imports.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot conceive of this House giving serious consideration to such a proposal, regardless of the source from which it stems.

To dry up our domestic sources of oil would without question increase unemployment in these United States, decrease the availability of that highly strategic material to our armed forces and increase the cost of our national defense.

In my address to this House on the proposal to reduce the rate of depletion on oil and gas wells in order to increase the Federal revenue—and which talk I made last Wednesday, stated:

Second only to the defense of this Nation and the continuing efforts to promote peace throughout the world, is the problem of keeping our people gainfully employed.

For this Congress to upset the oil economy of our country would certainly add to the now increasing unemployment of our peoples, and certainly entail a loss to our own national economy which would outshadow any additional tax revenue that might temporarily be collected by the Federal Government in the next 12 or 24 months.

Unemployment in these United States is now markedly on the increase. The United States Bureau of the Census reported that there are now four and one-half million unemployed in these United States. Furthermore, they pointed out that this figure had risen 1,000,000 between December and January—to a new postwar high of four and one-half million persons on the rolls of the unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, at that time I further stated:

If we change the historic rate of depletion now applied, the increased cost of maintaining the armed services of the Nation—which today use directly and indirectly hundreds of millions of gallons of various types of gasoline, lubricating oils, and gaseous fuels—will have to be met by increasing the appropriation which we in this Congress make annually for the support of our Army, Navy, and our Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, there was no menace to our national defense in World War I and World War II comparable to the danger and damage inflicted by the submarine blockade established by the Germans. This is a matter about which I am fully informed with respect to World War I inasmuch as it was a shipbuilding firm which I organized that won the award for having built more ships in United States Gulf ports in World War I than all other shipyards put together. World War I saw a frenzied rush to build ships in order to offset the losses from the pack of submarines that the German Kaiser had then unleashed against American shipping.

The same kind of submarine warfare was unleashed in World War II. Billions were spent to replace the ships that were being sunk practically every hour of the day and night.

It was not generally known during World War II, submarine sinkings had become so bad that all ships were under order to return to land-locked harbors at night if they were within a certain range of shore.

It is a matter of record that persons standing on the shore actually saw the enemy submarines chasing merchant vessels around a promontory in Mobile Bay.

It is common knowledge today that the greatest strength the Russians could pit against us would be that infamous pack of schnorkel submarines which they captured from the Germans—and the additional hundreds of that type now in course of construction in shipyards behind the iron curtain.

With these facts in mind, need I point out to this House what would happen if the next war found these United States wholly dependent upon foreign sources for oil. I would have you know that they would be so dependent were this Congress to change the existing rate of depletion on our oil wells.

As I stated last Thursday, the money which the independent, the wildcats, and the major oil companies reinvest in the exploration and the development of new oil fields in order to insure the domestic needs of this Nation is money which they recaptured from the capital invested in the oil wells which are now being or have been pumped dry during more than a quarter of a century that the developers of the petroleum industry have used this historically established rate of depletion.

The depletion reserves which they establish constitute sort of a revolving fund, which is constantly being reinvested, to insure this Nation an adequate supply of petroleum and petroleum products more needful and necessary each day to the defense of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am reliably and authoritatively informed that even under the rates now applicable to the petroleum industry with respect to depletion that profits in the oil industry during the past 25 years have averaged 25 percent less

than have the profits of the average manufacturing corporations in these United States. A comparative study between the profits of the petroleum industry and the manufacturing industry disclosed that only in the year of 1933 and in the darkest days of the depression did the oil industry show a greater return than that of manufacturers, and in that year the oil companies earned a mere 1 percent on the net worth.

In still another year—that of 1925—25 years ago—they earned as much as did the manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, in the year 1949 just closed—the profits of the oil industry showed a greater marked decline than those for industrial corporations in general. While the capital investment of the petroleum industry has been rapidly increased, the result has been that the rate of return on the net worth has probably dropped substantially below that of industrial corporations.

That fact becomes evident to even the most casual observer concerned with analyzing investment returns. In the 10-year period ending in 1948, and including all the so-called prosperous war years, the dividends paid by the large oil companies averaged less than 5 percent of the net worth, while dividends paid by industrial corporations was slightly more than 7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I would have you and my colleagues who sit in this House realize that the oil companies of these United States have been compelled to sink back into exploratory and other development work more than half of all the earnings in order to replace the wells which have become depleted by pumping in order to provide the necessary expansion to keep up their operations.

Additionally thereto, they have been compelled to go into the market and borrow substantial sums of money as is evidenced by the fact that in the years 1944 to 1948, 21 of these companies secured more than a billion dollars of outside capital by borrowing and the issuance of outstanding stocks. All of these funds in addition to stockholders' earnings were retained in the business and reinvested in furthering the development of the industry.

It is highly significant that the stockholders' investment in 21 companies alone increased by nearly $5,000,000,000 between 1937 and 1938, whereas the average high and low quotations on the stocks of the companies' security values show an increase of but $3,200,000,000 in a highly inflated security market.

I am laboring this House with statistical figures because to my personal knowledge and experience they reflect a feeling on the part of investors that most of the funds invested in recent years have been made in high-cost property and which will be even less profitable properties than those which are now being pumped out and depleted.

Mr. Speaker, and it seems most appropriate that I should address you personally with respect to this question, because of the fact that your home town of Bonham, Tex., is virtually in the heart of America's greatest oil-producing area. I don't have to tell SAM RAYBURN that in exploring for oil only 15 out of every 100 wells drilled are productive of oil. Moreover, I don't have to remind the Speaker that in further development work in a discovered oil field 85 percent of all additional wells drilled are found to be dry holes.

I knew, Mr. Speaker, when I drilled Boykin Well No. 1 in Washington County, Ala., that despite the most incursive and intensive geodetic work and geology, and the use of the most modern and expensive methods of exploration, 85 percent of all wells drilled, at the loss of hundreds of millions of investment capital, were costly failures that brought in nothing but dry holes.

Mr. Speaker, so you see there is nothing new about the expenses of and the hazards faced by the oil industry as I have just recited them. It was because of these facts that the second session of the Sixty-ninth Congress, which met 25 years ago, realized that oil operators could only be expected to risk their capital if they were allowed to recover on successful ventures the costs on their unsuccessful ventures.

Because of the risks and the hazards involved in these oil operations, the operators, of a certainty, must be permitted to realize a gain on all of their successful wells in order to compensate for the loss that is made on the unsuccessful ones which they develop.

The question of the per centum rates of depletion has nothing to do with past costs. It is replacement cost which has to be counted as the capital necessary to be recovered before this Government begins to tax the oil properties if we are to encourage our operators into continuing to take the hazards of losing their capital in these financial risks.

This Congress has recognized that principle since the day that taxes were first made applicable to income by the Federal Government. In that act provision was made to permit oil and gas producers or at least those who were successful in the business to recover capital value.

It was because of the foregoing that the Sixty-ninth Congress authorized a percentage depletion allowance on the production of oil and gas. They did so because they recognized the tremendously hazardous nature of exploration by these resources and because unlike any other business transaction, oil production values and sale are the sole basic capital asset of the owners.

It was only after extended studies had been made looking to more extensive exploratory operations in developing new oil fields that the Sixty-ninth Congress gave consideration to a modification of existing laws with respect to the percentage of depletion allowance on oil and gas production.

In consideration of the peculiar financial hazards involved in oil and gas production, the Congress provided for depletion based on the discovery value in 1918.

Congress in 1926 modified the law to provide that depletion of independent producing leases would be calculated on the basis of 27.5 percent of the gross income or 50 percent of the net income on each lease, whichever was the smaller, and all experiences in the United States during the past 25 years clearly show that the national economy in general and our oil economy in particular has tremendously benefited by the foresight of that Congress.

During the quarter century that this present allowance has been in effect it has proven admirably suited to the purpose of increasing development of oil and gas resources, in promoting the national welfare and security, and by protecting the capital values of petroleum properties so that the operators are able to extend the proven reserves and thus insure replacement of the oil and gas produced and consumed.

Mr. Speaker, there are innumerable reasons, not alone for continuing existing provisions and rates, but vital economic and fundamentally sound financial reasons why this House should give due consideration to increasing rather than decreasing the existing provisions.

The principal reasons for the continuation of the existent 27½-percent rate—from the standpoint of costs—are as follows:

First. Inasmuch as the tax provisions now in effect have been a major factor in providing adequate supplies of petroleum at low prices to promote the national defense and security they have become part and parcel of the industry's cost and price structure. One cannot forget for a moment that under the beneficence of existing depletion rates the United States petroleum industry has increased the domestic production of liquid fuels more than 250 percent between the years 1926 and 1948 while at the same time, and despite ever-increasing labor, material, transportation costs and tax rates, the price of gasoline and petroleum products in general show but a percentage of increase in their selling prices as compared to all other commodities. I am authoritatively and reliably advised from wholly disinterested and unselfish sources that any downward revision in tax regulation with respect to depletion would not do otherwise than jeopardize the future domestic supplies and inevitably increase prices to the consumer.

Second. No one will gainsay the fact that an increase in taxes on petroleum products would result in increasing production costs at least to the amount of the additional taxes and thereby influence price to the consumer. More important still, is the fact that increased taxes on oil production would immediately reduce the incentive for exploratory and development work by inhibiting the more extensive use of new venture capital. Argument might be made that if the upward price adjustment of the finished product was made promptly enough the effect on incentive to develop new sources of supply might be minimized, but it would be minimized only at the expense of the consumer taxpayers in paying a higher price for the finished product.

It is always to be remembered that the United States Government itself is probably one of the largest single consumers of oil and gas in these United States. Therefore, the Federal Government

would itself be called upon to pay increased prices for all petroleum products as a direct result of congressional action in effecting a downward revision in rates applicable to the depletion on oil wells.

I am advised by one of the tax experts in the Ways and Means Committee that an increase in tax of 20 cents a barrel on oil would have to be offset by an advance in price of approximately 35 cents a barrel in order that the industry realize the same net income after paying a tax rate of 38 percent.

It is because of that fact that I have said that if prices did not immediately advance in the amount equal to the increase in cost that the incentive to develop new resources and new sources of oil and gas would be reduced and the supply of domestic oils soon decline.

Mr. Speaker, to you my colleagues who now sit on the House Ways and Means Committee, and the House Armed Services Committee, I would particularly direct your attention to the fact that a decline in supply would directly imperil the national security by reducing domestic productive capacity thus making the United States more and more dependent on foreign oil supplies.

The records of our Government clearly give evidence that the impact of any changes on petroleum prices would necessarily be sharp and prompt because current price levels only permit a moderate return on the industry's investment even under existing tax provisions. Normally, it would be expected and assumed that operations on petroleum discovery and production should return large earnings because of the enormous hazard involved. The records, however, disclose that the rate of return on investment in petroleum operations has generally been less than that for manufacturing industry as a whole. It is, therefore, inconsistent with good business practices for this Congress to expect anybody to continuing the risk of additional capital in further oil development unless prices advanced at least enough to compensate for the oil tax for the higher costs resulting in any change of regulations whatever that might effect the industry.

The fundamental need for full comprehension of the danger inherent in changing the present regulations made applicable to oil and gas production lies in the peculiar and hazardous nature of petroleum production. Unlike other business activities the production of oil and gas involves the sale of a basic asset which the operator must replace at considerable risk and steadily increasing costs in order to continue in business. The oil and gas reserves constitute the principal capital asset of all petroleum producers, be they "independent," "wildcat" or "major" producers. These assets are entirely used up in the act of production and can only be replaced by risking more new capital to locate and develop new reserves.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to encourage, or shall I say even permit, our petroleum producers to stay in business, if this Congress desires to encourage the further risk of the venture capital necessary to the expansion of our oil production, our tax laws must continue to provide for the producers to recover as capital the replacement cost of oil.

The percentage depletion as historically used and applied recognizes the fact that the income from oil and gas production includes a return of the capital value of the properties which cannot be taxed as current income. In the absence of the existing rate of percentage depletion efficient oil operators who have been successful in developing oil reserves at low costs would be discouraged by high taxes from producing from their properties and would generally make the sale by selling them to others.

Mr. Speaker, now note this well. The new owner to whom they might sell would have a cost basis for his depletion comparable with the allowance for the percentage depletion currently used and which should be permitted the original operator if he continued to produce the property.

What sense, I ask, is there, Mr. Speaker, in compelling the original producer to sell his property, that others may exploit it in order to meet the letter and the spirit of a thoroughly unsound legislative request made to alter the historic rate of 27.5 percent that has been in use for the last quarter of a century?

Mr. Speaker, time, experience, and the returns enjoyed, not alone in income to the Federal Treasury, but in the volume of petroleum products to the American people have proven to be a simple as well as equitable method of allowing producers of oil and gas to recover their replacement costs of that peculiar asset as it is produced and sold.

The percentage depletion of 27.5 percent of the gross income has operated to carry out the original intent and purpose of Congress in the Revenue Act of 1926 in order to take into account the risks which result in a high proportion of unsuccessful venture in order to encourage the operator to engage in the search for oil.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no single industry in these United States which even approximates the magnitude of the petroleum industry that is in any manner comparable to it. I speak from experience when I say that I have paid dearly for the knowledge gained of the subject upon which I am addressing my colleagues today.

There was no pot of gold at the end of the rainbow which I hit in the dry hole 7,500 feet below the surface on my property in Alabama. Needless to say, after I lost the money spent on that venturesome investment, I more or less quit the oil business the day I hit bottom, and am now one of the thousands of wildcatters who ventured their hard-earned cash and accumulated savings in the quest for oil.

Thank God, however, there still are intrepid men who have since come into my State and having both a deep knowledge of and faith in the exploratory operations, the surface and deep geology, are willing to carry on and bring in an oil field that I am as sure exists beneath the surface as I am sure that I am standing here on this floor.

The congressionally established percentage depletion allowance established by this Congress is the primary factor that will operate to stimulate the expansion and drilling necessary to provide the supply of liquid fuels required by a dynamic economy for both peace and war in our modern world.

Ponder upon one statement which I hitherto made when I pointed out that the domestic production of petroleum liquids has increased by more than two and one-half times between the years 1926 and 1948.

Mr. Speaker, that abundant supply of petroleum has revolutionized American life. It has increased the production of our farmers and our workers. It has made life more agreeable, more pleasant and of greater ease for everyone.

Because of the ample supplies of petroleum that have been generated under existing economic forces, the price of petroleum products from the lowest grade of its waxes to the highest grade of its oils made use of for medicinal purposes, the prices of petroleum products to our people here in these United States have been so low that the great mass of the people have enjoyed the benefits of its existence in our soils, its production and marketing by our industry to an extent unequaled anywhere else in all the world.

Mr. Speaker, now hear me well on this. The price of gasoline in the service stations throughout the length and breadth of the United States today, exclusive of taxes, was only 1¼ cents per gallon more in 1949 than it was in 1926. This was again a mere 7 percent increase in price, as compared with an average increase of 55 percent for all other commodities, sold in general throughout our land.

The quality of gasoline sold, however, is so greatly superior to the quality of the gasoline sold in 1926 that the motorist of today can and does operate much heavier car, and for the same or less fuel cost per mile, than he drove the lighter car of 1926.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics—Index of Petroleum and Production Prices—shows that the price level in 1949 was only a mere 12 percent higher than in 1926, a gain far smaller than is the 55 percent advanced for commodities in general.

The marked success of the prevailing tax and other circumstances attending the production of adequate supplies of liquid fuels at low costs, does more to point out to this House the foolhardiness of risking a change that would destroy the adequacy and price of a commodity than all the words that can be spoken.

Mr. Speaker, custom and use by the petroleum industry have made the congressionally established tax provision applicable to that industry for the past quarter of a century an integral part of the economy under its costs and prices.

They have influenced the amount of oil discovered, the supply of oil, the cost

of production, and consequently the price of the finished product.

Moreover, the existing tax provisions have served the national interests by promoting the discovery and the development of oil, and by making available enormous quantities at low prices.

Cheap petroleum products have proven of inestimable worth to the entire national economy, to the great automobile industry, the rubber industry, to the highway-construction industry. Fuel oil has powered the locomotives on our great transcontinental railroads, our great steamships, and now it is largely heating our homes and institutions.

The enormous production of oil in these United States has stemmed out of and is directly traceable to the rates of depletion which made constant reinvestments possible. The Federal Government itself has received more money due to the special tax provision than it would ever have realized in the absence of such provision.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me say that the percentage-depletion allowance that this Congress in its wisdom extended to oil and gas production does not now nor has it ever applied to the refining, transportation and distribution of petroleum. These the Congress classified as being phases of business similar to, if not identical, to other American business enterprise in which the normal allowances for depletion is adequate to protect against the taxation of the capital invested as it is returned in the course of operations.

There is neither anything unjust, nor is there special treatment accorded to the American petroleum industry or the oil industry in general. They neither ask nor do they receive such special treatment. It was to the benefit of the Nation's economy that the Congress in its wisdom a quarter of a century ago enacted the legislation with respect to the rates of depletion on oil and gas development. That they were wise in doing it is made evident in every automobile that is traveling the highways of the United States today. It is evident in every oil burner installed to heat our homes, in every vehicle that we use in national defense whether it flies in the air, drives on land or floats or sinks into the ocean.

The winning of World War I and World War II has proven the wisdom of that Sixty-ninth Congress and the coming generations will bless us for continuing to make use of the experience in the past and retaining the present rate of depletion.

Too Much Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following editorial from the February 16 issue of the Pratt Union, a weekly newspaper published at Pratt, Kans.

I am glad to bring the views expressed in this editorial to the attention of the Congress and the country.

The basic troubles of the world, from war to human want, can in one way or another be charged to too much government. All-powerful government is simply a reflection of the loss of individual self-reliance, initiative, pride, independence of spirit, the will to work—the qualities which made possible the founding and the growth of this Republic. We, as a people, are fortunate that we have not yet gone so far on the welfare-state road that we cannot turn back. We can still save ourselves from the final disaster that has overcome so much of the world. But we, as a people, must do it ourselves. Big government will not do it for us. We must ask ourselves this question: "Are we willing, in return for a mirage of material security, for which we pay through exhorbitant taxation, to sacrifice those liberties for which men have fought and struggled for 2,000 years?"

Rearmament of the Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, unleave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent by me to the Secretary of State, with enclosures:

FEBRUARY 17, 1950.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY ACHESON: I am enclosing a very interesting and informative letter that I have received from the Honorable Elihu D. Stone, of the American Zionist Council, 1300 Eighteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C., Mr. Stone living in Boston and being a lifelong resident of Boston. I have known Mr. Stone for the past 35 years. He and I served together as far back as 1920 in the Massachusetts Legislature. I consider him one of my closest friends and an honorable and trustworthy gentleman and a fine American. For a number of years he was Assistant United States Attorney in Massachusetts. I refer to his background as a lawyer, as an individual and as a legislator and the long years that I have known him, so you will understand the reasons for the confidence that I have in him and his opinions.

You will note the within letter relates to a very important subject. I understand that William Green, president of the A. F. of L. and Philip Murray, president of the CIO, have taken this matter up with President Truman and that the President has told them he would take it up with the State Department. As this is such a matter of far-reaching importance, I assume that the President will take it up with you.

I know that President Truman, you and I and all others who recognize history, are very happy to establish in Palestine a free and independent Jewish nation, and also that we are anxious to see a strong and stable government established in Israel.

I know that there is a tremendous amount of concern about the arms that are being furnished to the Arabs by the British Government. In view of the extreme tension in that section of the world and the threat that the giving of such arms to the Arab nations might be to the security of Israel, it seems to me to be a justifiable fear. Certainly, the United States would not directly or indirectly be a party to any situation that would result in an armament race being started now by the Israel and the Arab nations. I am sure that you are also aware that there is a tremendous interest in this situation in the United States, and it is not confined to Americans of Jewish blood.

The within letter presents the views of Mr. Stone, whose views I respect and I know that he would not set forth his views, as stated in the within letter, unless he honestly felt that the circumstances and events warranted it.

I am respectfully forwarding Mr. Stone's letter and request that it receive the serious and immediate consideration of you and the State Department. I will appreciate an early reply on this matter.

Sincerely yours.

AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL.
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1950.

Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Majority Leader,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: I beg to be allowed the privilege of soliciting the exercise of your kind offices with reference to a problem in which American Jewry is deeply concerned—a problem of maintaining peace in the Near East.

As you know, through the United Jewish Appeal, American citizens of the Jewish faith are contributing millions of dollars to the Jewish Agency in Israel for the work of immigration and rehabilitation of tens of thousands of homeless Jews from Europe, known as the DP's, and from other countries.

However, it is distressing to learn from authoritative and reliable sources that peace in that part of the world is being threatened by the unprecedented rearmament of the Arab nations, particularly Egypt and Iraq, and that the source of the supply of arms is Great Britain.

I am enclosing herewith a memorandum which recites reliable facts relative to the Arab rearmament and the part played in it by England, as well as its accompanying threat of war based on authentic information coming from official and semiofficial Arab sources.

A study of the memorandum reveals warlike intentions of the neighboring Arab states against the State of Israel. They are energetically preparing themselves for what the Arab press describes as a "second round." The tremendous military appropriations in their budgets conclusively establishes extravagant military preparations on the part of the Arabs for action, and that action is intended against Israel—a fact which the Arabs do not conceal. The volume and the kind of arms purchased by the Arabs from England and other European nations cannot be said by any stretch of the imagination to be merely for the purpose of maintaining internal domestic tranquillity.

Our own country, the United States of America, is deeply concerned in the maintenance of peace throughout the world, including the Near East. It is recognized that peace is indivisible; an aggressive military act anywhere is a disturbance of the peace everywhere.

The United States, under the Atlantic Pact, is supplying arms and ammunition to the western European nations, including England, which constitutes in effect, a replacement of the arms shipped by England to the Arab nations. In fact, we have reason to believe that a part of the surplus of American arms left in England is today in the possession of Egypt and other Arab states. Thus, in effect, the arms are being paid for by the American taxpayer and, indirectly, the United States is contributing toward the rearmament of the Arab nations. As a direct result Israel is compelled to divert a large part of its financial resources for armaments in order to meet the terrible threat of war.

I sincerely hope that, consistent with your official position, you will deem it proper to communicate with the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, to the end that this terrible armament race of the Near East, which broods no good for mankind, shall be stopped.

Indeed, the Department of State is possessed of the appropriate means for the purpose of impressing England, and the other countries in western Europe, with the evil consequences of the delivering of arms to the Arab countries whose warlike designs against Israel is a matter of public record.

I know, Congressman, of your love of peace and I am aware of your sincere friendship for the infant state of Israel, and the great service that you have rendered to the reconstitution of that state—a service which we shall always recall with deep gratitude. I am persuaded that you will not fail to see the justice of this plea and that you will act accordingly.

I believe that the views expounded by me are representative of the feelings and sentiments of American Jewry as a whole and, particularly, of the American Zionist movement with which I am affiliated.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

ELIHU D. STONE.

MEMORANDUM ON REARMAMENT OF THE ARAB STATES

I

1. The Arab countries are now acquiring heavy arms which far exceed the necessities of defense or internal order. Even before the Security Council voted to lift the arms embargo on August 4, 1949, there were reports of an extraordinary arms program in Egypt. As soon as the embargo was lifted, these reports were confirmed.

2. The 1949–50 budget approved by the Egyptian Parliament is fixed at 187,457,280 Egyptian pounds, with income estimated at 157,827,500 pounds. Part of the deficit is to be financed from funds provided in 1948 under a special unexpended allocation for the Egyptian Army.

3. One-third of this budget—the extraordinary sum of £62,000,000 ($178,560,000)—is for rearmament.

4. Thus before the lifting of the arms embargo on June 9, 1949, the United Press reported that England had decided to lift the embargo and on June 18, 1949, the Manchester Guardian commented:

"The decision of the British Government to renew her supply of arms to the Arab countries, while Lausanne talks are carried out, sounds like a threat."

5. On September 4, 1949, after the arms embargo was lifted, the Beirut Broadcasting Station announced:

"During the Palestinian war an arrangement had been made to purchase several warships. The embargo detained the sending of the ships. Now, the embargo being lifted, the ships are due in Egypt. One ship is harbored in Malta and is ready to leave for Egypt. Three other ships are still in British ports and will be leaving for Egypt soon."

6. On October 17, 1949 the London correspondent of El Misri reported:

"A British source indicates the arms purchase of Egypt in Britain to be worth the sum of £15,000,000."

7. Ten days later, October 27, 1949, the London Daily Telegraph said:

"It was announced here today that the Egyptian Government has approved the purchase from Britain of 61 military aircraft. This total is stated to comprise 40 Spitfire models, 9 Halifaxes, and 12 DH–113 night fighters, which were regarded here as a new type and hardly considered yet in the production stage. Egypt has a military mission at present in Britain. Spitfires are already in extensive use in the Egyptian Air Force, which is cooperating today with the RAF in a major exercise for the defense of the Suez Canal. The prospective purchases from Britain are part of a plan approved in May to spend about 53,000,000 pounds sterling on military equipment, including an armored division and an auxiliary air force. The Egyptian Government's intention to establish a factory in Egypt for the manufacture of 'fighter or Spitfire' planes and the agreement for this having been reached 'with a foreign government' were announced in the Senate here in July by the Minister of War and Marine, Haydar Pasha. The proportion of the cost of the aircraft from Britain that may be assigned against Egypt's sterling balances is not mentioned."

8. On October 31, 1949, the Overseas News Agency reported from London that the Egyptian airplane purchases include Vampire Mark Third fighters, which have a range of 1,080 miles, maximum speed of 590 miles, top ceiling of 37,000 feet, and equipment of four cannons. Another type of plane purchased by the Egyptians—the Venom—is still on the secret list, but is reported to be superior to the Vampire Jet.

9. This was confirmed on November 14, 1949, when the New York Times in a dispatch from London reported that an Egyptian purchasing mission had recently visited Britain and contracted with the DeHaviland Aircraft Co., Ltd., for a substantial order of jet fighter planes of the latest and swiftest model. It was unofficially reported that the mission had contracted for 5 full squadrons of Vampire Jet planes with all the necessary parts and spares—perhaps 75 or more—at a cost of about £30,000 each. These are to be developed by early 1951.

10. On November 13, 1949, the New York Post reported in a dispatch from London that the Egyptian purchasing mission was placing orders for $45,000,000 worth of artillery, jet aircraft, infantry equipment, and sea torpedo craft.

11. On November 18, 1949, the New York Compass reported in a dispatch from London that the Egyptians had signed a contract for immediate delivery of three more frigates from the British Navy, bringing Cairo's purchases up to six warships—three of which had been delivered. These ships, built between 1941 and 1943, have 2 4-inch guns and 10 antiaircraft guns, and are equipped with an antisubmarine weapon. Three ships delivered to the Royal Egyptian Navy have a displacement each of 1,470 tons, carrying 6 4-inch guns and 10 smaller guns. They have a complement of 180 men.

12. On January 25, 1950, a spokesman for the Government of Israel in Tel Aviv said that the Egyptian Government was also purchasing submarines, large quantities of tanks and artillery, as well as tens of thousands of automatic rifles, much of this in the form of American war surplus in Europe.

13. Egypt is not the only country involved in this rearmament program. On September 6, 1949, Emir Arselan, Lebanese Defense Minister, was quoted by Reuters to the effect that Lebanon had recently received from 5 to 10 training planes from England, and that another shipment was expected by the end of the month. On January 10, 1950, the Beirut Arabic radio reported that 20 aircraft had been sent from Egypt to Syria and another 20 would be sent shortly.

14. The Middle East Broadcasting Station announced on October 6, 1949:

"The Syrian Government is contacting the British aircraft manufacturers in order to buy from them airplanes. The Syrian Government also intends to send to England Syrian pilots to learn to pilot the jet airplanes."

15. On November 6, 1949, the United Press reported from Washington that middle-eastern countries—Saudi Arabia and others—had approached the United States for military aid and were seeking to participate in the $1,314,000,000 military-assistance program.

16. Manifestly, equipment of such range and striking power, as well as the armament plant recently purchased by Egypt from Germany, France, Sweden, and Italy, are intended for more than international order and security. While it is conceded that there may be internal unrest in Egypt—the inevitable consequence of poverty—the people are unarmed. Jet planes and tanks, destroyers, and submarines are not needed to subdue them.

II

17. It will be recalled that when the Security Council voted to lift the arms embargo on August 4, 1949, there was widespread concern lest an armament race develop in the Near East. Israel's representative, Aubrey S. Eban, told the Council:

"If the restraints imposed by the Security Council are entirely lifted and large-scale rearmament becomes the policy of Arab states, the Near East must become the scene of an armaments race. We ask ourselves whether the newly won peace is already so stable and so firm that it could easily survive the strains of that competition. The Security Council must take the responsibility of answering that question. For our part, we have no hesitation in saying that the most elementary prudence requires the maintenance of the Security Council's present arms policy. It is because we regard the armistice agreements as a highly notable and significant achievement that we urge the utmost caution on behalf of their preservation.

"The fact that the truce observer machinery is no longer to exist does not prevent the Security Council from affecting the arms policy of member states by a clear moral directive. Such an authoritative ruling by the Security Council would of itself, by the influence which it would exert on the arms supplying states, insulate the Near East against the worst dangers of an armaments race

"In urging the clear expression of the Security Council's mature judgment, my delegation is conscious that this policy also conforms with the general welfare of the Near East. We do not profess to understand how, in the existing social and economic conditions of that area, any government can voluntarily wish to apply the greater part of its resources to the purchase of lethal weapons. The stability of democratic institutions throughout that region can be assured not by competition in the purchase of arms, but by cooperation in the tasks of social and economic development. This is the general doctrine which Israel upholds with respect to the needs of its regional environment. If the acquisition of arms is to be the main pursuit of all governments in this area, then in all questions arising between Israel and the Arab states the security consideration is bound to assume undue weight. In these circumstances we feel that there is nothing to be lost and much to be gained by calling upon member states to maintain the existing policy of the Security Council with respect to the supply of arms."

18. Members of the Security Council shared Mr. Eban's apprehension and there was general agreement that care and restraint must be exercised in the Middle East to prevent large-scale rearmament.

19. The representative of the United Kingdom, Sir Terrence Shone, said:

"In this connection, there is one matter to which Mr. Bunche referred briefly, and to which Mr. Eban referred at greater length this morning, and on which I should like to make a brief statement. I refer to the supply of war matériel. In this connection, I would again emphasize what I believe is

well known to members of this Council: the great respect which my government has paid to the requirements of the truce resolution (S. 723), despite our treaty obligations to Arab states. We are anxious to fulfill our engagements to them. This, of course, does not mean that we wish anything in the nature of an arms race, to which Mr. Eban made allusion, to develop in the Middle East or anywhere else. Far from it. Any supplies of arms which we may send would be for the internal security and defense requirements of the states concerned. These are legitimate requirements for any state, and, insofar as the Middle East is concerned, are indeed essential to the normal conditions which we wish to see restored. We, for our part, would not be in favor of middle eastern states acquiring war material in excess of their legitimate defense requirements, and we believe the states themselves would not wish to exceed such limitations."

20. Commenting on the statements of Mr. Eban and Sir Terrence Shone, Acting Mediator Bunche said:

"Certainly, should an arms race develop in that area as a result of the lifting of the existing injunction, it would not serve the interests of permanent peace in the Near East."

21. But Mr. Bunche pointed out that it would be impossible to maintain the arms embargo without proper truce-observation machinery. Continuing, he said:

"In the absence of a firm injunction coupled with observation machinery, the burden really seems to rest upon the states in a position to ship arms. Since there is no disarmament scheme of universal application, it would seem that the states of the Near East, as all others, would now be entitled to import such war materials as may be necessary to their national security.

"There are relatively few states in a position to ship arms in large quantities. Declarations by arms-exporting states that they would refrain from shipping heavy arms to any of the parties to the Palestine dispute in quantities clearly beyond the reasonable security needs of such parties will certainly be helpful and reassuring. In this regard I have heard with great interest the statement just made by the representative of the United Kingdom on this subject."

22. The statement by Senator AUSTIN strongly affirmed American opposition to a rearmament race, and he properly called for concentration of interest and concern in economic development, resettlement of refugees, the raising of standards of living. He stated:

"So far as the United States is concerned, it does not intend to allow the export of arms which would permit a competitive arms race in the area. Export of arms to that area of the world should be strictly limited to such arms as are within the scope of legitimate security requirements, again as recommended by Mr. Bunche. We hope that prudence will prevail not only among the parties but among all nations of the world which are in a position to supply arms and that they will pursue a policy similar to that which we intend to pursue.

"It is essential that the resources of that area be used for peaceful purposes, for economic development, for the resettlement of refugees, and for the achievement of higher standards of living for the populations of the area. It would be tragic and wholly wrong if the resources of the area were to be dissipated in an unproductive arms race."

23. Mr. Chauvel, of France, said:

"I do not think that any country represented here, nor any other country, has the slightest interest in unleashing an armaments race in the Near East or anywhere else."

24. These declarations surely must remain the settled policy of the great powers who are pledged to uphold the peace. Regretfully, the confidence expressed in August can no longer be justified.

III

25. It has been the hope of all friends of both the Jewish and Arab peoples that Israel and the Arab states would soon find it possible to transform their armistice agreements into final lasting peace settlements. It is the conviction of most observers—based on the successful negotiations of the armistice accords—that such a peace settlement can be consummated if Israel and the Arab states can engage in direct negotiations.

26. But it is clear that such negotiations will be retarded rather than accelerated if the balance is upset in the Near East, if one side is rearmed and if the interests of the people are diverted to military channels. There are still war parties in every Arab state who are eager for a second round in which they can recoup their losses, remove the stigma, and exculpate themselves from the responsibility of their last defeat.

27. It may be argued that it is not the purpose of the Arab states to use their arms against Israel. What better evidence is available than the declarations of the Arabs themselves? They are being given the tools. They have announced their intentions. They have no other identifiable enemy in sight. What basis is there for the belief that "the second round" is not, in fact, in preparation?

28. Thus Egyptian journalists have written freely of a renewal of hostilities despite the conclusion of the armistice agreement, and high officials in Arab governments have made their views public.

29. On March 9, 1949, Mohammed Et'Tabi wrote in Akhar Sa'A, a Cairo weekly:

"The armistice may possibly be permanent, the Palestine problem may possibly be settled. And such a 'peace' may be lasting, but this would be but an official peace between governments, because the Arab peoples * * * will never make their peace with the Jews, but will continue to proclaim the blood feud between them, which they will recall each time the fate of the hundreds of thousands of refugees at the hands of the Jews be recalled. * * * This the Arab people will remember to the end of time * * * until Allah sends a saviour. For a second Hitler will yet arise from among the Arab peoples and then, woe to the Jews."

30. On May 14, 1949, 1 year to the day after the Egyptian forces had launched their unsuccessful invasion of Palestine, the Akhbar El Yom, a Cairo paper of standing in the court, wrote:

"The Palestine war is not yet over. Egyptian blood which drenched the soil of Palestine has laid a path along which we are in duty bound to tread to clinch the victory for which our martyrs fought."

31. A spokesman of the Egyptian foreign office was quoted on June 30, 1949, by the Near East Broadcasting Station as follows:

"We are still at war with the Jews even though the Egyptian Army has ceased firing."

32. On September 29, 1949, the Cairo weekly, Akhar Sa'A, describing life in Israel, wrote:

"This is a short account but the enemy against whom we fought but yesterday and against whom we may still fight at any minute * * * the fight is not yet over."

33. In Iraq, government leaders constantly speak the language of war. Thus, on May 1, 1949, the Iraqi Ministry of Defense assured the people that Iraqi brigades returning from the Palestine war were coming back merely to rest and to prepare for the renewal of the Holy War at some opportune moment in the future.

34. The Foreign Minister of Iraq was reported by a Cairo daily, El Ahram, on May 4, 1949, as telling parliament:

"We must all unite in strong opposition to Zionism in order utterly to destroy it."

35. On June 28, 1949, Radio Baghdad broadcast:

"The Jews are our enemies irrespective of how conciliatory they may be, and irrespective of how peaceful their intentions. We shall never cease planning for the day of revenge, for the second round, when the Jews will be driven from our soil."

36. On September 10, 1949, the same station, in its English translation, stated:

"The Arabs are determined to continue their struggle against Zionism to the very end. This small group of adventurers and thieves will regret they ever aroused the Arab people to open conflict."

37. On August 9, 1949, Dr. Fadel Jamali, Iraq's delegate to the United Nations, stated in Baghdad, according to Falastin and the Near East Broadcasting station:

"Unless the ministries of education in the various Arab countries plan now to educate a new generation of active youth who will not be satisfied with words alone there is no doubt that the Arabs will lose the second round [of the war against Israel] just as they lost the first."

38. Similar talk of a second round comes from Syria. On June 27, 1949, Radio Damascus stated:

"The Arabs have lost the first round of the Palestine war because they followed the advice of the British and the Americans. They will not be so short-sighted in the second round. * * * We must increase our military strength and build a large number of ammunition factories. Then we shall be victorious, and the Jews will be thrown into the sea."

39. Even though the Syrian-Israel armistice agreement had been concluded, Al Nazzer, a Syrian daily paper, wrote on July 23, 1949:

"We would say frankly to all the Arab states and to all the Arab people now that the curtain has finally fallen on what we hope to be the first round of the Palestine struggle—may this armistice be of short duration, during which time we may endeavor to reinforce ourselves and increase our potential in order that we may destroy the dangers which surround us before they succeed in destroying us."

40. In Lebanon, former Foreign Minister Camille Chamoun told the press on March 22, 1949:

"The war in Palestine will be renewed sooner or later. The Arabs cannot rely on the armistic agreement with the Jews."

41. And the pan-Arab newspaper, El-Khayat, wrote on June 16, 1949:

"We are at war with the Jews. * * * And this war will not end until either we destroy the Jewish state or the Jews succeed in cementing their borders from the Euphrates to the Nile and from the Red Sea to the Cedars of Lebanon."

IV

42. If it is not the purpose of the Arab countries to use these arms for a second assault against Israel, then one must ask why are they being rearmed at such fantastic cost? Is it the belief of the proponents of this rearmament program that the Arab states can be regarded as worthy and reliable allies of the democratic countries in the event of another world conflict?

43. Past experience answers these questions. In the Second World War, Egypt remained a nonbelligerent and although the country was invaded by General Rommel's forces, the Egyptian army remained passive and the defense of Egypt was left to the British Army, including thousands of recruits from the Jewish population of Palestine. It is an ironic commentary that British arms are now going to Egypt and may be used against those who were the sole allies of the democratic forces in the Near East in the last war.

44. In Iraq in 1941, Nazi forces seized control of the Government and were finally eliminated only after a show-down with the British Army. Palestine Jews took part in that action and they were active also to remove Nazi influence from Syria and Lebanon. Throughout the entire war, the Arab world remained aloof, although many of its leaders, like the former Mufti of Jerusalem, were actively on the side of the Axis and made their headquarters in Berlin.

45. Can the democratic forces regard Egypt or Iraq, or any other Arab country, as a shield of substance in the light of the past record, and in the light of Arab weakness in the war in Palestine? Although their forces and their arms far exceeded those of the nascent state of Israel, they were quickly overwhelmed in battle. Does this type of alliance fit into the mosaic of democracy's defense?

46. Quite apart from our natural feeling of sympathy for our Jewish kinsmen in Israel, we deem it our duty as Americans vitally concerned about American policy in the Near East and American defenses throughout the world to express the strongest misgivings on the military support of a dubious ally. The fact that it is Britain which is extending this generous aid should not obscure the fact of indirect American participation, for it is surplus American army equipment that is being used in many cases, and it is the United States which is today providing arms for those same countries which divert their stocks to the Near East.

47. For their part, the Arab states have an obligation to their Arab brethren who, victims of the Arab aggression against Israel, were forced to leave Palestine and who today are homeless refugees. If the Arab governments were disposed to expend their funds for resettlement projects, they would make a constructive contribution not only toward the regeneration of a people for whose misery they are primarily responsible, but in the development of their own underdeveloped countries.

48. When one considers that the Arab states are called upon by the United Nations to contribute but $6,000,000 for the relief of the Arab refugees, a tiny fraction of the money that Egypt alone is spending for rearmament, the antisocial and wasteful character of the armament program becomes tragically plain.

49. The people of the Near East must have peace. It is for the Governments of the United States, United Kingdom, and other great powers to use their best efforts to insure peace and tranquillity in the Near East so that its peoples may work together to raise the living standards of the entire area. To plunge these people into an armaments race is to serve the cause of their impoverishment, debasement, and destruction.

ELIHU D. STONE.

The Right To Compete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter written by Ben Moreell, president of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., which was sent to all employees and shareholders of Jones & Laughlin:

THE RIGHT TO COMPETE

To Our Customers:

Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. has carefully considered the recent decisions of the Federal courts in the Cement case and the Rigid Steel Conduit case and the interpretations placed upon those decisions by the Federal Trade Commission. As a result of this consideration and to avoid the possibility of violating these restrictive interpretations, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. reluctantly announces that, effective July 22, 1948, it will discontinue pricing its products on a competitive basis through freight absorption.

Prices are being announced today for all basic steel products produced at each of the corporation's plants. The cost to the customer henceforth will be, in each case, the price for the product at the producing plant plus the established charge for transportation.

In taking this action Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. wishes to emphasize that this change is not made willingly. The decisions of the courts and the Federal Trade Commission have caused this action on our part. We disagree with these decisions and their application to our business. We believe that the new system of pricing caused by these decisions is contrary to the best interests of our customers, our employees, our stockholders, and the communities in which our plants and our customers' plants are located. This new system of pricing will radically restrict Nation-wide competition.

We take no issue with the decisions of the Federal Trade Commission and the courts in enforcing the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Sherman Act, and the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act to the extent that they prohibit unfair methods of competition, price fixing, collusion, and monopolistic practices. The Commission and the courts, however, have gone far beyond these prohibitions, and in the opinion of many, including at least one member of the Federal Trade Commission, they have held that a general practice in which the seller absorbs transportation charges in order to meet competition in a distant market is itself illegal as a violation of statutory law. By these interpretations the Commission and the courts have, as a matter of plain fact, decidedly lessened, rather than promoted, competition.

We believe that an enforced continuation of this new pricing policy will promote monopolies in the areas immediately surrounding any given source of production by excluding competition from more distant sources, because of the transportation costs. In effect, a legal prohibition against meeting competition by absorbing freight will create tariff walls around each producing area. It will force the closing and relocation of mills and factories. It will restrict the sales of each company to the territory surrounding its own plant. It will curtail the development of low-cost production and distribution. It will deny to consumers a free choice of suppliers. It will lead to geographical concentration of industry, rather than dispersion which is desirable for national security. It will cost customers more money because they will pay more transportation costs when they buy from other than the nearest producer. Since costs will vary, depending upon the location of the supplier, consumers of steel will not be able to establish their costs in advance of actual purchases.

Jones & Laughlin believes that the Nation's basic industries and their customers, bound by such legal shackles, cannot continue the vigorous growth which is essential to the preservation of our country's industrial strength. We must seek relief from these bonds. We do not seek to perpetuate the basing-point system. We do not seek a rule which will permit the collection of phantom freight. All that we seek is the right to compete.

In order to restore this basic principle, we believe it is essential that the Congress amend the applicable laws. There should be no statutory prohibitions against charging lower mill prices to some customers than to others, when such lower prices are necessary to permit products to be sold in a distant market to compete with another producer more favorably located with respect to that market.

We are convinced that this position is economically sound and consistent with the meaning of the antitrust and antimonopoly laws as intended by the Congress. It is simple. It would not weaken the laws against price fixing, collusion, unfair competition, or monopolies.

A difference of opinion within the Federal Trade Commission itself and the dissenting opinions of the courts clearly indicate a need for clarifying legislation on this point.

The legislative history regarding attempts to outlaw the basing-point system by statute leaves no question that the Congress has not been willing to require uniform f. o. b. factory prices. The Supreme Court expressly recognized this in the Corn Products case in 1945. However, in the recent Cement case the Supreme Court has stated that the commonly used basing-point system is a violation of the Robinson Patman Act. In so doing, the Supreme Court has not sought to interpret the will of the Congress, but has engaged in judicial legislation.

We urge our customers and all others interested in the welfare of the country to give serious consideration to this matter. We believe that all will conclude, as we have, that prompt action by the Congress is essential if we are to continue to have the vigorous competition in this country which has been so fundamental to our national development.

Yours very truly,

BEN MOREELL,
President.

JULY 21, 1948.

General Motors Cost-of-Living Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, the Members may be interested in the following remarks as broadcast by one of the very well informed radio commentators, the Washington correspondent, Joseph McCaffrey, on his weekly commentary over the Mutual Broadcasting System:

The announcement yesterday that General Motors, under its cost-of-living contract with the auto workers, will cut workers' wages 2 cents an hour and the price of its cars from $10 to $40, focuses attention on the coming contract negotiations this spring.

How well has the cost-of-living contract worked?

Management thinks it has worked most satisfactorily.

The General Motors executives are all for continuing the present contract as it is now written, for another year or, they hope, another 2 years.

But not so the Auto Workers Union.

The union leaders say they agreed to such a contract only because it was the only method by which they could break the united industry front against further wage boosts back in 1948. The union now would like to end the cost-of-living clause for a more liberal pension provision.

And this, if certain other factors are considered, may well mean a stalemate in negotiations.

Which will, in the end, mean a strike tying up one of the biggest auto plants in the Nation.

Here might well be an excellent opportunity for the Government to see if it can head off a strike before it happens.

And by this, I don't mean standing ready with the club of a court injunction.

Too often, the Government Mediation Service is called in after both parties have become so firmly entrenched in their positions that even the combined weight of the 12 apostles couldn't move them to agreement.

The time to begin heading off a strike is before the negotiations begin, before the differences have festered.

A strike may well be coming at General Motors, some people here claim to see it in the future—even before the parties involved start discussing a new contract.

Certainly the possibility of a strike at GM exists. Why not, because of that, begin now to determine how it can be—not just headed off—but settled, as strange as this may sound, before it happens.

The coal situation is an excellent example of how relations have deteriorated so that the lines have become so drawn, the negotiators so embittered, that not even the threat of a court injunction restores peace.

The General Motors situation, however, could well serve as a proving ground.

It may be something to think about and act upon now.

Substitute FEPC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of Sunday, February 26, 1950:

FATE OF SUBSTITUTE FEPC BILL UP TO SENATE

It is a source of real regret that the House failed to pass a strong fair employment practices bill along the lines the Truman administration proposed. The southern bloc's bitter fight waged against it was unfortunately aided by reactionary Republican elements. Certainly there has been a great need for this reform and when it is considered that conventions of both parties had endorsed the plan in principle there was good reason to have expected a different attitude when it reached the floor of the House.

After the administration bill had been defeated and a weakened version of FEPC was brought forward, loyal supporters of the original measure differed in their judgment as to the proper course to follow. Many, finding the substitute so weakened and without teeth, refused to go along. Others, including the entire Brooklyn delegation, supported it as the best that was possible to achieve at the moment. The final vote was 242 to 177.

Despite a natural disappointment, it does seem to us that those who made possible the passage of the substitute used the better judgment. Certainly they were realistic. With all its lack of teeth it does put the Federal Government on record against discrimination. We hope it will win the approval of the Senate so that some important ground breaking may now be done in this difficult field. It would be at least a step in the right direction.

Bill Boyd: The Oil Industry's No. 1 Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the February 1950 issue of the Petroleum Engineer concerning Mr. William R. Boyd, Jr., retiring president of the American Petroleum Institute.

Bill Boyd, without a doubt, has had the most distinguished career in the oil industry of any living man today. He is a resident of Teague, Tex., in the Sixth Congressional District which I represent, and has returned to his home there to establish his personal law office for consulting practice only.

Bill Boyd has never lost contact with the country and small community people whom he was reared with. He served as the mayor of their city at Teague and went on to reach the most responsible and highest position in the oil industry. However, upon his recent retirement as president of the American Petroleum Institute it was no great change for him to return to the rural and small community life as he was still the same Bill Boyd.

PETROLIC PERSONALITIES

(By Dick Sneddon)

HOME IS THE HERO

Teague and Freestone County in east Texas really killed the fatted calf on Wednesday, January 18, when its favorite son, Bill Boyd, Jr., for 29 years the Pasha of the petroleum people, threw aside his mace, doffed his ermine wrap, and snuck back, not furtively, but eagerly, to the homey haunts of his boyhood. It wasn't that there was anything callous or even casual about the way he had been treated by the oil folks, for Bill is probably the best known and most universally liked person in the industry. He no doubt could have had his choice of a hundred executive positions when he decided to resign one of the top posts in American oildom, but he chose, instead, to go back to the old friends and familiar scenes of his youth. That old home-town yen grows stronger with the years, and yielding to it is as human as tears and laughter.

One of the qualities that lifted Bill Boyd to such a high altitude in the greatest industry extant is what the public-speaking experts call "audience contact." No matter what your stature businesswise, when he talks to you he has the faculty of excluding, or at least appearing to exclude, everything and everyone else. It is just you and Bill Boyd in a private discussion of a moot point or a brief, highly confidential story exchange. He has a way of unobtrusively making your interests his, which at once conveys the idea that he likes you, so, of course, you go for him in a big way. Along with this natural-born capacity to make friends and keep them, he has a fine administrative talent that has enabled him, as proxy of American Petroleum Institute, to resolve any and all differences that have arisen, and to bind a complexity of keenly competitive pet oleum people into a harmonious and distinctly effective entity.

"DEAR HEARTS AND GENTLE PEOPLE"

But returning to the celebration: It all started with an open house in Bill's new office at the entrance to his farm lodge, midway between Teague and Fairfield on United States Highway 84. Here his right hand was shaken so often and so vigorously that the arm has lengthened appreciably. We have heard, indeed, that he can now tie his shoelaces without stooping. From his office the multitude surged out onto the farm property where the Lone Star Gas Co. spudded in an oil well, Bill Boyd No. 1, so that the neophyte farmer won't feel too strange around the place. Besides you can get dry cows as well as dry wells, and even on a farm it isn't good to put all your eggs in one basket. Our Teague operative tells us that the first thing Bill did when he arrived at the farm was to check up and see how many cows were flowing and how many were on the pump.

Active in the spudding in of the new well, incidentally, were such petrolic luminaries as R. L. Wheelock, vice president of API; D. A. Hulcy, of Dallas, president of Lone Star Gas Co.; and Raymond J. Dillard, an executive of the J. K. Hughes Oil Co. Then followed a street parade, free movies and congratulatory speeches by all sorts of VIP's, including Senator Tom Connally, Congressman Olin Teague, Lt. Gov. G. C. Morris; Hines H. Baker, president of Humble Oil Co.; W. Alton Jones, president of Cities Service Oil Co., and a raft of civic dignitaries and other notables, all of whom said so many nice things about Bill Boyd, we wouldn't be a bit surprised if that other Bill Boyd they call Hopalong Cassidy is insane with jealousy. There is no need to recite the long list of Bill Boyd's accomplishments here. Every oil man in America knows him as well as we do, and every last one of them will rejoice in Teague's official recognition of his good qualities and good works. Now as he turns independent operator and gentleman farmer these same oil men will be wishing him the most of the best—and so will we.

The Pittsburgh Area and F. O. B. Mill Pricing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following paper presented to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States by Herbert Johnson, which I hope will throw some light on the basing-point issue:

THE PITTSBURGH AREA AND F. O. B. MILL PRICING

The chamber of commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., appreciates this opportunity to participate in the second 1949 economic institute of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, to discuss the interest which is at stake in the Pittsburgh area in the matter of delivered pricing. I, personally, am honored to have the privilege of presenting this problem on behalf of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce.

We believe that it was the intent of the Congress in enacting the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and other antitrust and antimonopoly statutes to protect the best interests of the entire economy. We believe that only by the administration of these laws to that end can the Nation be kept strong and free. Since all of these statutes and regulations are designed as rules and controls for business, we believe it is imperative that the rules be stated clearly and in terms comprehensible both to the interests subject to the regulation and to those who administer the controls. The present state of confusion as to the legality of any method of pricing other than straight f. o. b. mill pricing has been amply demonstrated not only in the 5 months since the decision in the Cement case became final, but also in the discussions of this institute.

It is not surprising that the Pittsburgh area should have been among the first to recognize the seriousness of the threat to competitive pricing and to attempt to appraise its impact upon the community. The cement industry and the steel industry were the first to announce their intention of abandoning former delivered-pricing practices. Had any incident been required to crystallize the problem for businessmen in the Pittsburgh district, these moves were sufficient.

The Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh has made a careful review of the entire problem in conjunction with the Smaller Manufacturers Council of Pittsburgh, sending out questionnaires to its entire membership and requesting expressions of opinion from all interested parties. Based on this survey, it is the consensus that mandatory f. o. b. mill pricing will be definitely detrimental to the best interests of Pittsburgh industry, large and small.

PITTSBURGH'S COMPETITIVE POSITION

Pittsburgh is universally known as a production center of iron and steel products. Despite the establishment and growth of steel-producing facilities in other sections of the United States, Pittsburgh is still the most important single producing location in the country. On the other hand, Pittsburgh industry has become remarkably diversified so that any consideration of the best interests of the community must take into account numerous industries in addition to iron and steel. For example, Pittsburgh is one of the principal centers of such important basic industries as aluminum, electrical equipment, glass, paint, food processing, coal chemicals, and petroleum products.

Pittsburgh is generally considered the home of giant industries. Although many large companies are located in Pittsburgh, such as United States Steel Corp., Aluminum Co. of America, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Gulf Oil Corp., H. J. Heinz Co., Koppers Co., Inc., Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co., Pittsburgh Steel Co., Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., nevertheless, there are many hundreds of small manufacturers and fabricators located in this area. The interests of these small manufacturers are a primary concern, not only of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh but of the community as a whole for its own welfare.

The Smaller Manufacturers Council, which is a part of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, has a membership of 235 firms ranging in size from companies employing 25 persons up to establishments with pay rolls of 500 people. This membership comprises approximately half of the total number of small manufacturers in the Pittsburgh district, according to a recent survey. All of these are important to the Pittsburgh area, not only in terms of their present significant contribution to the industry in the area but also because of their growth potential. In all probability, some of our large industries of tomorrow will develop from the smaller manufacturers of today.

The plight of these smaller manufacturers is a matter of great concern to the chamber of commerce. Many of these manufacturers depend upon widespread distribution of their products in order to maintain economical levels of production. By the same token, many of these manufacturers rely upon distant sources of raw materials. In a questionnaire circulated to members of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, approximately 75 percent of the companies replying stated that they were unable in normal times to secure their requirements of raw materials or to sell their normal production within a radius of 100 miles of Pittsburgh. From this, it is apparent that an important part of Pittsburgh's smaller manufacturers will be seriously affected if they or their suppliers are denied the privilege of competing outside their local areas.

The following quotations represent a few typical comments made by smaller manufacturers in response to the questionnaire on f. o. b. mill pricing:

"The f. o. b. mill-pricing system may greatly reduce our potential market when the supply exceeds the demand for our production unless new methods for protecting our competitive position are developed successfully.

"Our business is national and our customers' plants are widely scattered. As a result, where we have recently quoted f. o. b. mill, we have lost old and valued customers. We prefer a basing-point plan as the best method on which we can compete with steel companies nearer the user.

"To sell the products we manufacture on an f. o. b. plant price will curtail and limit our marketing area, reducing our volume by 60 to 70 percent. Because of the reduced volume, the cost to the consumer will increase. We are of the opinion that the volume of our products, needed for economical production will not be forthcoming from the reduced marketing area.

"Several of our customers in the Midwest are complaining bitterly about this change of delivery in the steel industry. They say it has been hard enough to stay in business with the normal steel shortage and now this new ruling has added greatly to their problems.

"We are reasonably competitive west of the Allegheny Mountains. We would lose 20 percent of our business by losing our eastern market. Our plant is too small to be involved in moving. We would probably close up in preference to moving."

POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF MANDATORY F. O. B. MILL PRICING ON THE PITTSBURGH DISTRICT

There has been a great deal of speculation about the probable effect upon the national economy of continuing restrictions against competitive selling through freight absorption. It was contended by the proponents of f. o. b. mill pricing that numerous substantial advantages would accrue to the Nation's economy. The prediction was made that manufacturing industry would be decentralized so that production centers would be located nearer to fabricators and consumers. It was also prophesied that distant steel buyers would be benefited due to the fact that steel producers, since they would no longer absorb freight, would be willing to sell in distant as well as local markets. Those who favored competitive methods of selling held opposite views. It was their position that basic industries could not be decentralized and relocated since in most cases their location is dictated by proximity to raw materials. It was further contended that steel producers would be even more reluctant to sell in distant markets on an f. o. b. mill basis because of the fact that they would normally be unable to compete on a price basis and would, therefore, secure business only in times of short supply when there was already an abundant demand near home.

In the case of the Pittsburgh district certain of these disputed effects are no longer speculative. No steel production has been relocated. Distant steel buyers are finding themselves in a worse situation than formerly. Some of these remote fabricators either have moved to the area or have announced their intentions of establishing operations in the Pittsburgh district in order to improve their steel-supply situation. This solution, however, is not available to all manufacturers. For financial or other reasons a great many of the customers of Pittsburgh's steel mills will be unable to relocate. As a result the steel producers in the Pittsburgh area will still have the problem of selling their production and the many hundreds of small manufacturers already in the Pittsburgh area will be unable to sell their normal output unless all sellers are again permitted to meet price competition in distant markets by the absorption of transportation charges.

CONCLUSION

We firmly believe that the Nation as a whole and the communities which comprise the country, together with all industry, are benefited by competition. In our opinion, competition is a matter of involving many factors. Sellers compete for customers' favor in terms of quality, service, availability, and delivery. Assuming approximate equality of these factors, cost to the customer at point of use is generally determinative. It is for this reason that competition results in substantial identity of prices, particularly in the case of raw materials or products produced to the customer's specifications. It is only by permitting the seller to exercise his own discretion in the matter of freight absorption that competitive equality at destination can be maintained. Without such competitive equality there is, in our opinion, no competition.

Since we believe that it is the intent of the antitrust laws to stimulate rather than eliminate competition, it appears obvious that the opportunity to compete in terms of price must be maintained.

There is an old adage to the effect that it is unwise to break up a winning combination. We believe that the progress of American industry has demonstrated that the factors of competition and the rules which sellers believed encouraged them to be competitive have been highly successful. Certainly in the Pittsburgh area, if one were to judge solely by results, one could not help but conclude that the system must have been, if not perfect, at least extremely conducive to industrial growth and development. We see no advantage in changing the system and substituting a disputed theory for a proved practice.

If there have been abuses in the past under competitive pricing methods, the abuses should be eradicated, and we believe the antitrust laws should be maintained to assist in the prosecution of such evils. However, we are not in agreement with a proposal which to us appears equivalent to a suggestion that we sink the ship because a few barnacles have attached themselves to the hull.

John C. Calhoun, Chairman of the State Democratic Executive Committee of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, our fellow Texans need not be reminded of the able leadership that the chairman of the State Democratic Executive Committee of Texas has demonstrated since September 1949. Many others among the

House of Representatives have experienced the warmth of his genuine friendship and his contagious humor. Mr. Calhoun is a resident of Corsicana, in the Sixth Texas District, which I am proud to represent in Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Clint Pace which appeared in the Dallas Morning News of January 22, 1950, about this leader that Texans are mighty proud of:

CALHOUN FIRES GOOD HUMOR CALMS DEMOCRATIC TEMPERS

(By Clint Pace)

CORSICANA, TEX., January 21.—Late on the evening of September 14, 1948, the telephone rang at John Calhoun's home in Corsicana.

It was a newspaper reporter calling. He asked if he was speaking to the John Calhoun who had just been elected chairman of the State Democratic Executive Committee.

"No," said Calhoun, a poly-poly man of 67. "I'm John C. Calhoun. C as in Calvin."

"That's what I thought," said the newspaper reporter. "You have just been elected State chairman at the Fort Worth convention."

"Well, I'll be ——," said Calhoun.

That was the introduction of John Calvin Calhoun, oil man, ex-mayor, domino player, part time politician and notary public to politics at the State level.

Since then, the happy Calhoun has become the laughing boy of Texas politics. Many times he has used his ready wit to stave off assorted political mayhem by members of the party's violently opposing factions. In 2 years, under Calhoun's soft-answer direction, the party's executive committee has moved from a brawling, aimless nest of trouble into a fairly well organized political unit.

Calhoun has always been a witty, humorous man, whose greatest jokes are on himself. But his quick wit has often been used to parry the thrusts of Democrats out to skin Democrats. When Calhoun took over the party leadership at the Fort Worth State convention in September 1948, he had become the referee of a continuing fight between liberals and conservatives. In many cases the differences had degenerated into personal feuds which dated back to the Austin convention in 1944.

The battle line was (and to an extent still is) drawn there. It was the Austin convention, in May, and the subsequent meeting in Dallas in September, which divided the party into New Dealers and Texas regulars and opened the first sores of a disease which threatened to ruin the party completely.

The disease was by no means cured in 1948, when Hillsboro's Bob Calvert declined to be State chairman again. The late Tom Tyson and Calvert decided that the new chairman would have to be a man acceptable to both hostile sides of the party and, therefore, must be a person who had taken a minor part in politics.

They settled on Beauford Jester's great and good friend, John Calhoun, of Corsicana, a man whom only a few delegates at the convention had ever heard of.

The vote was called on a motion to substitute Calhoun for Calvert, but the noes outrang the ayes. Tet Tyson, who later became secretary of the party, banged his gavel and announced Calhoun had been elected. There was a titter of laughter, but the delegates made no formal objection.

Calhoun might have been unacceptable to some of the liberals at the far left side, if they had known that Calhoun had committed, in 1944, the sin which the 1948 liberals found unforgivable. He had refused to bolt the May 1944 convention in Austin when the liberals marched out.

Calhoun, reviewing the bidding a few days ago, said his sympathies were with the bolting liberals.

"But my side was outvoted and I didn't think we should refuse to play simply because we couldn't pitch," he said.

The liberals, who had moved from the house to the senate chamber in the capitol, sent a message to Calhoun that he could be put on their list of delegates to the Chicago national convention. Calhoun refused the honor.

"I've never bolted a meeting yet," he told them. "I agree with your politics, but I'm a staying where I am because I believe in majority rule."

Four months later the liberals, in a riotous meeting in Dallas, recaptured control. But the big argument over Rooseveltian democracy had started and was to become the widest rift in the Texas party.

The differences had widened when the still-warring Democrats met in Fort Worth for the governors' convention in 1948. Calhoun had been left off the Navarro County list of delegates and on the night of his election to the party office was attending a rodeo. His mind was a long way from politics.

When he accepted the job with the blessing of another good friend, Beauford Jester, Calhoun knew he was starting to hoe the long row.

Part of the Calhoun political medicine was humor, liberally applied in the right places. And part was silence and soft answers which turned away wrath. Little by little he removed the cores of dissatisfaction by simply kidding them away or letting them die for want of discussion.

He believes now the party is farther away from revolt than it has been in 10 years. Part of that is because President Truman's victory in 1948 showed many Democrats that intraparty differences have little effect on the Nation's two-party system.

Calhoun is a strong advocate of the two-party system, but admits he doesn't care how small the Republican minority becomes. He is a New Dealer who believes history will make Franklin D. Roosevelt one of its all-time great men and Harry Truman one of its all-time great little men.

"I guess I wear the brass collar," he admitted. "But that doesn't mean that I believe everything the party does is exactly right.

"Little differences with the party doesn't mean anything, though. No man agrees with any other man 100 percent. No man agrees with everything in his lodge, his city council, or even his family.

"But I do believe in the broad base of the Democratic Party. It has done more for more people than any political organization in all history."

Calhoun believes agriculture is the key to the country's economy, and says only the Democrats have ever tried to improve the lot of the farmer.

"I don't care what you say," Calhoun declares. "Propped-up farm security is now our national security."

Why is he a New Dealer?

"Because you don't see old folks heading for the poor farm anymore. People trust their banks, and a workingman has a chance to be paid for what he contributes to his employer.

"You didn't have that under the old deal. It came about under the New Deal."

He believes in organized labor, but also thinks there should be a rule book by which both labor and management play, plus a referee to see that they stick to the rules.

Calhoun is not strictly the type person you would take for a liberal. He owns property, drives a new Cadillac, lives in a fine home and spends much of each day playing dominoes at the Corsicana Country Club. When he and his business partner and social pal, Joe Butler, want to spend a vacation in Florida, they just load up and go. When they get tired of loafing in the sunshine, they load up and come back.

He makes many jokes about the Democratic Party and tries to kid its members out of their differences with each other. He is interested in youngsters who give time to political thinking.

Not long ago he was addressing a group of Young Democrats in Dallas and told the story of the Arkansas farm woman who had 15 children. One day one of them fell into a barrel of tar. The mother ran to pull the sticky infant out. She looked at him a minute, then threw him back in the barrel.

"I can raise another one before I can clean you off," she said.

"That's how we feel about young Democrats," Calhoun went on. "We can train the young ones easier than we can clean up the old, party-bolting Democrats."

Calhoun was no more installed in the office of State chairman than a crisis arose. It concerned Wright Morrow, of Houston, whom the liberals wanted to throw out of the Democratic national executive committee because they felt he had not been as loyal to Truman as they were.

Calhoun remembered that Morrow had been nominated at the Brownwood convention 2 years before, had been confirmed by the national convention and the Philadelphia convention. That was majority and it was enough. Although he was on the short end of a 43-to-6 vote in the State committee, Calhoun stuck with Morrow. When the final fires died down, Morrow was retained on the national committee and serves there now.

After he was beaten in the committee meeting on the Morrow vote, Calhoun offered to resign as chairman. The committee refused his resignation. When Jester died, Calhoun—who believes the office of State chairman is the property of the governor's office—again offered to step down. Governor Allan Shivers asked him to stay on.

Calhoun served four terms as Corsicana mayor.

"This was after I had rendered the city notable service for 30 years as a notary public," Calhoun said. "I had one of the firmest notary seal squeezes in Navarro County."

Thirty-second Anniversary of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, Lithuanians all over the world celebrated Republic of Lithuania Day, to commemorate the thirty-second anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian Republic. This year again, as in the past, the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore, celebrated the occasion with a banquet, which I was privileged to attend.

The Governor of Maryland and the mayor of Baltimore issued the following proclamations:

GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION: REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Annapolis, Md., February 6, 1950.

Whereas in accordance with Joint Resolution No. 8 of the acts of the General Assembly of Maryland of 1935, the Governor is directed to proclaim February 16 of each year for the observance and commemoration of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania; and

Whereas, February 16, 1950, will mark the thirty-second anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania; and

Now, therefore, I, William Preston Lane, Jr., Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim Thursday, February 16, 1950, as Republic of Lithuania Day and request that the flag of the United States be displayed on all government buildings and urge that our people observe that day by appropriate ceremonies.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Maryland. Done at the city of Annapolis, this 8th day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fifty.

[SEAL] WILLIAM PRESTON LANE, Jr.

By the Governor:

VIVIAN V. SIMPSON, *Secretary of State.*

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR., DESIGNATING THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1950, AS REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY

Whereas February 16 of each year has, by an act of the Maryland Assembly, been designated as Republic of Lithuania Day, commemorating the founding of the Lithuanian Republic; and

Whereas with the present condition of world unrest and with a majority of continental Europe under the control of a government who denies every right to the peoples of these lands, the Republic of Lithuania has been temporarily deprived of its God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which is the rightful heritage of every nation; and

Whereas despite the fact that Lithuania only seeks to work out its destiny in accordance with the rights and privileges won in a long struggle to obtain its independence as a republic, a totalitarian government with its attendant evils has been forced upon the Republic of Lithuania by the armed might of an aggressor nation; and

Whereas as long as America and its democratic form of government survive, there will be hope in Lithuania and in all the ravaged nations of the earth, for a better day to come; and

Whereas Baltimore, along with many other cities and towns in our great Nation, sympathizes with, and is justly proud of, the many citizens of Lithuanian ancestry or birth, who have found a haven of security here in America, where they can enjoy the freedoms which are being denied them in their native land, and all citizens who love liberty join in the prayer that Lithuania will soon again be able to maintain its status as a free nation:

Now, therefore, I, Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., mayor of the city of Baltimore, by the power invested with me, do hereby proclaim Thursday, February 16, 1950, as Republic of Lithuania Day in Baltimore, and do urge all our citizens to give serious thought to the many cultural contributions made by Lithuania, and to the trials and tribulations that have befallen that country under the rule of an aggressor nation which temporarily deprives Lithuania of its rights and privileges as a free nation.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the city of Baltimore to be affixed this 8th day of February in the year of our Lord 1950.

[SEAL] THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Mayor.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, it is my great pleasure to include in the RECORD, the remarks of the Reverend Louis J. Mendelis, pastor of St. Alphonsus Church; a translation of the speech delivered by the Honorable J. Kajeckas, attaché at the Lithuanian Legation; and my own remarks:

Mr. Chairman, before returning thanks to the good God for the blessings of this evening, may I be permitted, as pastor of St. Alphonsus Church and the spiritual leader of the 5,000 Lithuanians of Baltimore, in the name of more than 400 former displaced Lithuanians who have found a new home in Baltimore, to say a most profound thank you to our Congress and especially to our President, Mr. Truman, for the passage of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Because of this act, not only more than 17,000 Lithuanians have been able to come to this country and taste some of that liberty that we Americans enjoy but make a definite contribution to our cultural and social life here in America.

I personally, in the name of these future citizens of our land and in my own name wish to thank the gentlemen present here tonight, Hon. Messrs. SASSCER, GARMATZ, FALLON, and BOLTON, for their part in helping my fellow-correligionists to come to this country. I ask them to thank the other Members of our Congress, and, if any of them have occasion to see Mr. Truman to thank him in our behalf.

My fond hope is that the Displaced Persons Act will be extended, that others may be able to enter our country to enjoy the blessings of liberty that we do. I can assure the gentlemen from Washington here tonight that none of the Lithuanian DP's are subversive or unappreciative of our way of life. I am confident that, God willing and helping, they will make excellent citizens of our land.

Moreover, before saying the prayer, I wish to add that we Americans should be conscientious in the use of our right to vote. At every election, whether it be city, State or national, we should go to the polls and cast our ballot for the candidate that we feel will best serve the interest of our country. If we ever lose our liberties, if we do not have a more efficient Government, it is because we have failed to do our duty at the polls. For several years now, I have spoken from the pulpit and urged our congregation to be faithful in the exercise of our rights as citizens of this land. God bless and save America from any "ism" that will enslave our country and its people.

Rev. LOUIS J. MENDELIS, D. D.,
Pastor of St. Alphonsus Church.

FEBRUARY 16, 1950.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE J. KAJECKAS, ATTACHÉ, LITHUANIAN LEGATION, AT THIRTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE, FEBRUARY 16, 1950, IN BALTIMORE, MD.

On this Lithuanian Day, the Lithuanian people once more celebrate in mourning. One more commemoration of the resurrection of the Lithuanian state under the sign of Golgota. On this February 16, traditionally destined to rejoicing and to the enumeration of Lithuania's achievements, we are witnessing dreadful happenings affecting the Lithuanian people.

A Lithuanian in his homeland is not the host, but a slave. He is deprived not only of his homestead, of his generations-old modest belongings, but he is also expropriated of his labor, of his profession, of his family and of all his rights and freedoms. He no longer enjoys even the right to live, especially in his native country.

In Siberia, the Lithuanian deportees, who are still alive, are subjected to terrible physical and moral suffering. They have been deprived not only of their homeland, of their beloved ones, of all religious comfort, of all human rights and the minimum standard of living, but also of hope for a better future. These helpless victims are doomed to a slow death. This land of dread and fear is scattered with the bones of Lithuanian innocent people. From this paradise, as from Dante's pictured hell, there exists no way out under existing conditions.

Lithuanian refugees in western Germany are still suffering under the burden of exile, whereas, the lot of those scattered to the four winds, and who are now living in freedom, is not an easy one. The happiness and peace of mind of the Lithuanian Americans is also disturbed, for how can they enjoy life when their relatives and their beloved ones are being humiliated, deported, and murdered, when the country of their parents is plunged into blood and tears, converted into a huge cemetery, a land of misery and suffering? This cup of sorrow of the Lithuanian people unites us with all suffering Lithuanians, whether they are living beyond the seas, behind the iron curtain, or in the Siberian tundras. Nevertheless, we dare not despair. We shall never give comfort to the tyrant. If today we cannot rejoice, we at least can work for Lithuania's liberation. Until that day arrives, as we are deeply convinced it will, let us remind the world of the wrong inflicted on the Lithuanian nation, let us unmask the enemy of Lithuania and that of mankind, let us contribute to the liberation of Lithuania. Our efforts are not hopeless. No tyrant is eternal, and Lithuanians stand not alone. From the Baltic to the Black Sea, from Manchuria to India and Indochina, even within the Soviet Union's prewar boundaries, hundreds of millions of people are living under the same thought of liberation from the liberator. The free world understands and sympathizes with us. Year after year, the proclamations of the Governor of Maryland, as well as those of the heads of other States and cities, on Lithuania Day, and the presence of distinguished statesmen throughout America at observance ceremonies on that day, are vivid proof of that sympathy and solidarity. Also, in this connection, the following splendid editorial appeared in this morning's New York Times:

"LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

"With courage that rises above despair, the Lithuanian nation today observes the thirty-second anniversary of its independence with ceremonies which will unite Lithuanians everywhere except in Lithuania itself. This sturdy people, speaking one of the oldest living languages, proclaimed their independence amid the flames of the First World War on February 16, 1918, ending generations of oppression by the Russian czars. Today, after another world war against tyranny and in defense of freedom, Lithuania, like the neighboring Baltic countries of Latvia and Estonia, is again under the iron heel of an oppressor. Only those who have escaped from this little country can still raise their voices in its behalf.

"The Soviet Government is attempting to Russify Lithuania by settling it with Russian Communists. According to charges submitted to the United Nations by the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation, some 600,000 Lithuanians out of a total population of less than 3,000,000 have already been deported to Russian slave-labor camps, killed, or starved to death, and the deportations are proceeding at the rate of 2,000 to 3,000 each month. A Lithuanian underground is still active, and Lithuanian independence is still recognized by the Government of the United States."

On this occasion I recall an episode from the Crusades for the liberation of the Holy Land. A greatly beloved commander of one of the expeditionary forces died on the way. Before his death, his only request was that his heart be taken by his soldiers and buried in the Holy Land. His wish was fulfilled. Approaching the Holy Land, a fierce battle broke out. The expeditionary force began to waiver and defeat seemed imminent. At that critical moment, the commander in

charge flung into the midst of the enemy forces the heart of the beloved commander. Like lions, the soldiers fought to recover the heart from the enemy and won the battle.

We, too, must not fail to avenge the desecration of the heart of Lithuania.

The shadow of the enemy of Lithuania and of mankind is growing longer and longer. The dawn of Lithuania's liberation and freedom is growing brighter.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt once said to a delegation of Lithuanian Americans that Lithuania will be free again. We fervently hope that the day is not far distant when another President will be able to announce the longed-for words that Lithuania is free again.

ADDRESS BY HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, OF MARYLAND

I consider it a real honor and privilege to be invited to attend this dinner commemorating the thirty-second anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania's independence.

The celebration of the anniversary of Lithuania's independence is an event which is of significance, not only to Americans of Lithuanian descent, but to all Americans.

There are those who say that she has again lost her independence, but the United States Government does not. The United States Government has never recognized the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, and continues to recognize the representative of independent Lithuania accredited to this country.

Shall the United States continue to support the rights of small nations to self-determination, the right to free and unfettered elections, the right to liberty and representative government?

Certainly, as Americans, we must call our country to uphold these principles throughout the world, for these principles are fundamental to the permanent peace and security of the United States.

No people have a stronger claim to the right of self-government than do the people of Lithuania.

From the earliest times, the Lithuanian people had developed their own language, similar to the ancient Sanskrit, their own culture and traditions, their own government, their own nation.

They are not related to the Russians or to any of the other Slavic peoples, but descended from an ancient people, of a distinct nationality.

It is, therefore, not surprising that they desire to retain independence and self-government as a means by which to preserve the ideals near and dear to them, their culture, language, in short, their way of life.

During its day of independence since the First World War, Lithuania demonstrated that it had a decent respect for the opinions of mankind.

By its progress in its economic and cultural life, it demonstrated that its people were qualified to assume and discharge the responsibilities of independence.

It is apparent that on the basis of justice and right, on the basis of principles announced in the Atlantic Charter, no one should question Lithuania's right to independence.

But let there be no mistake where the United States stands. We have never condoned the acts of aggression as perpetrated by the Soviets. We refuse to recognize the predatory destruction of Lithuanian independence as valid.

We still regard Lithuania as an independent state.

On this anniversary of Lithuania's independence, we look forward to the day when we shall see Lithuania resume here admirable progress in self-government.

The spark of liberty has burned in the breasts of Lithuanians for centuries, and despite what has appeared at times to be overwhelming obstacles, the desire to be free has overcome all opposition.

It is my good fortune to know many citizens of Lithuanian ancestry. I can truthfully say you have added much to the civic welfare of your city, State, and Nation. You can very well feel proud of your achievements.

Mr. Speaker, at that time, the assembled group adopted the following resolutions:

"Whereas by overwhelming military forces Soviet Russia occupied Lithuania in 1940 and now arbitrarily deprives Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia of their independent political life; and

"Whereas since the said occupation of Lithuania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics pursues a ruthless policy of planned liquidation, deportation and dispersion of the Lithuanian people in order to destroy the Lithuanian national entity; and

"Whereas the crime of genocide, which the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is perpetrating upon the defenseless Lithuanian nation violates all principles of human rights and has been outlawed by the convention of the United Nations General Assembly; and

"Whereas the afore-stated genocide pact will be presented for action before the United States Senate: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That our representatives at the United Nations request that steps be taken by the General Assembly to impel the withdrawal of all Russian organizations from Lithuania; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the United States Government enter into no peace settlement without the restoration of the freedom and independence of Lithuania and similar nations; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we urge our esteemed members of the United States Senate to ratify the genocide convention."

The foregoing resolutions were adopted by unanimous vote at the Thirty-second anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania Day, under the sponsorship of the Council of Lithuanian Societies held this 16th day of February 1950, in the Lithuanian Hall, Baltimore, Md.

ANTHONY J. MICKIKA,
President.
MARTIN RAILA,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, in further connection with the anniversary celebration, another meeting was held on February 19, at which time the group had the pleasure of hearing the Honorable P. Zadeikis, Lithuanian Minister to the United States. A translation of his speech follows:

ENGLISH VERSION OF A SPEECH DELIVERED BY P. ZADEIKIS, LITHUANIAN MINISTER, ON THE OCCASION OF THE THIRTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

While Lithuanians in the United States, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and in other free countries, may freely express their feelings on this occasion, the situation in their homeland, now behind the iron curtain since 1944, is simply deplorable because of the heavy hand of the Soviet regime: Forcible collectivization of farming and the continued brutal deportations of Lithuanian families have made life miserable. Instead of joyous songs and colorful processions, deadly silence prevails, and fear of Soviet police reigns supreme in every corner of the land.

There is little doubt that the Kremlin potentates by employing means of economic destruction, Sovietization, Russification, and, above all, by means of forcible deportations of the Lithuanian citizenry, and genocide in general, seek to break the will of the Lithuanian people to be free and independent. Though Mr. Stalin often appears in the role of a modern czar, nevertheless, he remains the old Ivan the Terrible. Moscow's efforts will be in vain, for the Lithuanian nation has survived many crises in the past; the Lithuanians have even coined this popular expression: "Be what may, Lithuania will always stay."

The Lithuanian people lived for 120 years under czarist enslavement. They were forbidden to print and read Lithuanian books, and even Lithuania's name had been officially buried. But what happened? For every act of Russian onslaught, the Lithuanian people had developed countermeasures. They printed Ausra (the Dawn) and other periodicals and books in a neighboring country, and even in the United States, and smuggled them into Lithuania, regardless of severe penalties, including exile to Siberia. When, on February 16, 1918, the opportunity came, Lithuanians were ready for action to regain their long-cherished independence. Independence was proclaimed in the city of Vilnius, the country's historic capital. Many Lithuanians returned from abroad to help rebuild the country. The Lithuanian people succeeded in hoisting their national flag in Vilnius, in Kaunas, and in Klaipeda by the sea. We do not doubt that Lithuania eventually will regain her freedom, though we must realize that before our people will witness the dawn of liberty, global events may yet retard the advance of liberation.

I understand that the present unhappy situation in my homeland is not an isolated problem, but it is a part of the geopolitical problem of northeastern Europe, which, at the same time, is a problem of the future united Europe. The prevailing belief that Russian expansionism can be checked by peaceful means tends toward revision as the free countries of the western world are forced to bolster their own defenses for the sake of security. The old rule, "si vis pacem, para bellum," still lives despite the existence of the United Nations. The ravaging character of imperialistic bolshevism still refuses to be localized. As far as Lithuania's future is concerned, I am inclined to believe that her liberation will spring from the universal realization that the freedom of any nation is everybody's business, that appeasement of any dictatorship is dangerous and futile; on the other hand, the regime of terror might be just a sign of weakness of the Soviet dictatorship, obsessed with mania grandiosa. But the Soviet regime inwardly is far from happy. Russian history tells us that for 1,000 years there had been no order in Russian lands, though the lands were rich. There is no order now in Soviet Russia, for stable order must rest on the free will of the people, and that is taboo in the Soviet Union.

The Lithuanians often hope that the United States would adopt a more resolute diplomatic action to aid Lithuania's liberation. In this respect, we must constantly bear in mind that the United States Government, relying on international law and moral principles, is pursuing vigorously a realistic policy of peace with justice, benefiting the chances of small nations, including Lithuania. It is not a minor matter that Lithuania is recognized as a sovereign state which maintains her legations and her consulates, though nearly 10 years have elapsed since the extortion of her freedom by the use of force and deceit which was perpetrated on June 15, 1940. The farsighted American policy of the continued recognition of our country, and of the nonrecognition of Soviet imperialistic designs, accords opportunities for our people, especially for those of us who are living in freedom, to contribute and to participate in activities which will shorten the period of eclipse and terror. The policy of self-aggrandizement, at the expense of smaller neighboring nations, must be stigmatized, and the ideals and the principles of the Atlantic Charter must be revitalized.

Lest We Forget—Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, may I bring to the attention of my colleagues that, on February 16, 1950, the people of Lithuania now living outside the orbit of the iron curtain, American citizens of Lithuanian extraction; yes, every lover of freedom, no matter in which country he resides, recalled that 32 years ago this small country of Lithuania regained her freedom and independence. Her people were happy and prosperous in their own sovereignty until they were again overrun by Russia.

Groups throughout this country assembled on February 16, 1950, and at these meetings remembered the peace and nonaggression pacts with the Baltic States, the Atlantic Charter, four freedoms, the United Nations Charter, the Yalta declaration, and the Potsdam agreement, and they wondered if these so-called solemn agreements had or have any sincere meaning to them, because they realize that this sturdy and freedom-loving country is now being destroyed as a nation and exterminated or enslaved as a people.

It is hoped that our Nation, and the other so-called democratic nations of the world will soon do a little more than acquiesce.

One of these meetings was held in my home city of Worcester, Mass., under the auspices of the Lithuanian Aid Society, and the following resolutions were enacted:

At a mass meeting held by Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., under the auspices of the Lithuanian Aid Society on February 12, 1950, at the Lithuanian Naturalization Club Hall, Worcester, Mass., the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the 16th day of February 1950 marks the thirty-second anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania as a free and independent republic, and her demonstration to the world of her ability of self-democratic government and progress;

"Whereas the unlawful-by-force-of-arms occupation of the Republic of Lithuania by Russia and the commitment of atrocities against her people, the destruction of her institutions, and her democratic form of government by Russia are continued at the present day;

"Whereas the Soviet Union has consistently and unilaterally violated all of the pacts or declarations solemnly underwritten by it, viz: Peace and nonaggression pacts with the Baltic States, the Atlantic Charter, four freedoms, United Nations Charter, Yalta declaration, and the Potsdam agreement:

"*Resolved*, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., do most vigorously condemn and protest against Russia's such unlawful force-of-arms occupation of the Republic of Lithuania and the commitment of atrocities against her people, the destruction of her institutions and her democratic form of government, the violation of pacts and peace treaties;

"*Resolved*, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., petition the Government of the United States of America to repudiate and terminate all secret pacts concluded, without the consent or knowledge of the Congress of the United States at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, already unilaterally voided by Russia, and to reassert the principals of the Atlantic Charter by demanding that all Russian military forces, Government, and agents be forthwith evacuated from Lithuania and all other European countries now behind the iron curtain, and that Lithuania and her people be liberated and that she be restored as a free and independent Republic among the nations of the world according to the principals enunciated in the Atlantic Charter.

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States of America, the Secretary of State the Honorable Dean Acheson, the Senators and Congressmen of the United States from Massachusetts, and to the press."

MICHAEL ZEMAITAITIS,
Chairman.
JULIUS P. KISKIS,
Secretary.

Thirty-second Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of this body the very fine resolution adopted by the Waterbury Lithuanian-American Council on the observance of the thirty-second anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania.

An appeal is made therein for simple justice for the now oppressed Lithuanian citizens.

The long proud adherence of the Lithuanians to democratic principles is ample evidence of their opposition to the terrifying tactics of the Russian dictatorship.

WATERBURY LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL,
Waterbury, Conn., February 25, 1950.
Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Taking cognizance of the unspeakable oppression, persecution, and systematic extermination of the people of Lithuania at the hands of the occupying Russian Soviet authorities, in violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and of the obligations of membership in the United Nations, we, citizens of Waterbury, Conn., assembled on the 12th day of February 1950, at the St. Joseph's Hall, under the auspices of the Lithuanian American Council of Societies, for the observance of the thirty-second anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania, appeal to the President, Secretary of State, and Members of Congress of the United States—

To reaffirm the adherence to the principles of the Atlantic Charter in planning the restitution of peace;

To demand the withdrawal of the Russian armed forces, police, and political authorities from the territories of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

To ratify the convention for the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide;

To take an active initiative in the United Nations in demanding liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and other countries now under the forcible enslavement by the Soviet Union;

To demand the punishment of the Russian Soviet criminals for the crimes of genocide perpetrated by them in occupied Lithuania and other countries outside the Soviet Union;

To enter into no discussions with Russia regarding the settlement of affairs pertaining to Lithuania and other countries without an active participation by representatives of the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation and representative bodies of other interested nations.

ALEXANDER J. ALEKNA,
President.
NEIL P. MESKUNAS,
Secretary.

Establishment of a Civilian Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, today I had the privilege of introducing a bill to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps as a companion to the one introduced in the other body by the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana.

Under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include my analysis of the need for this bill:

The Corps thus established would be charged with conservation of our natural resources which were of necessity so badly neglected during the war years, and the development of human resources through the training, education, and performance of useful work in conservation by the youthful citizens of this country.

The purpose of the Civilian Conservation Corps is twofold:

1. It is a long-range program—to conserve the water, soil, forest, and other natural resources of this country which have become so badly depleted.

2. It has a short term, immediate purpose—to relieve the growing unemployment of young men in this country. As of January 1950, there were over 1,000,000 young men between the ages of 16 and 24 who were out of employment and looking for it.

In the 1930's when an earlier CCC was established under President Roosevelt's farseeing eye, beginnings were made in such conservation. The Dust Bowls of Oklahoma; the perennial and drastic floods everywhere; the droughts in the Midwest; the ever-increasing gullies and arroyas, the overgrazed lands in the Southwest; the numerous roads, ditches, and canals, man-made erosion which accelerated geologic or natural erosion, all were dramatic examples of the need for constant watching, anticipating, preventing, and repairing of natural and man-made destruction of our natural resources.

The success of the earlier CCC, which was established on July 1, 1937, and liquidated by June 30, 1943, has been attested by both officials and enrollees. Many of them felt that a similar program should be organized directly after the war.

Conservation and protection of our natural resources is a problem common to all America and its citizens—particularly to those as yet unborn. A well-known eastern university recently established a department of conservation in recognition of the need for further and continuing work in this field.

Last year at this time there were 2,700,000 unemployed. This year, as of January 1950, there were 4½ million, an increase of 66 percent, and from 4.4 percent to 7.3 percent of the civilian labor force. The greatest rise in unemployment has been among men.

Coupled with the need for employment of our young citizens is the need for further education, which many of them cannot afford and the need for continuing medical care which the recent war revealed as still inadequate for a large part of our population.

All of these are provided for in the bill.

It should be made very clear that this is a regular, continuing program of conservation.

It is not emergency.

It is not military.

It is an entirely voluntary program.

It conserves natural resources.

It conserves human resources.

The Tobacco Program Has Operated at a Profit Both to the Farmers and to Uncle Sam—Why Invite the Fate of Potatoes for a Farm Program That Is Successful?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, at hearings conducted before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives during the past week, a statement was made by John M. Berry, New Castle, Ky., vice president of the Burley Tobacco Growers Cooperative Association, opposing a graduated tax on cigarettes as proposed in H. R. 2016 and companion bills. Mr. Berry pointed out that the farm-loan program to support prices on burley tobacco through loans based on 90 percent of parity price has not cost the Government a cent, but on the contrary has made a profit of $10,000,000 from sales of tobacco in this country and abroad and has collected $15,000,000 in penalties on excess tobacco, making a total of $25,000,000 paid to the United States Treasury.

The tobacco program is one element of the farm program that is working satisfactorily. Why do we want to scuttle it with a tax change and invite the fate of potatoes?

Also, bear in mind that last year cigarettes paid $1,232,727,557.02 into the Federal Treasury. Uncle Sam is going to have to pay for it in two ways if a graduated tax is substituted. He will pay for the loss of revenue and he may have to pay to support the prices of a commodity that heretofore has never been on the sick list.

Mr. Berry said:

The organization for which I speak has been in the tobacco business as a grower organization for 29 years and since 1941 has been engaged under contract with Commodity Credit Corporation in the administration of the price-support program for Burley tobacco. It serves a membership of more than 225,000 tobacco growers in the States of Kentucky, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, and Missouri. In this extensive undertaking this organization's work has been highly successful and profitable for both the producers of Burley tobacco and the United States Government. It has demonstrated that the program for tobacco is practicable. This organization has a happy, harmonious, and loyal membership, and it therefore presumes to speak on behalf of Burley tobacco growers in opposition to a graduated tax on cigarettes as proposed by H. R. 2016 and the companion bills.

The production of a crop of Burley tobacco requires skill, hard work, careful planning, much equipment and capital, and practically all of the time of an entire year. Tobacco in the States named where our membership resides is the money crop and the agricultural economy of those States rests upon the culture of Burley tobacco in proportion to the extent it is grown. In Kentucky it accounts for better than 60 percent of the farm income of the State, and for doubtless 80 percent of the income of those producing it. It is therefore, the chief business interest of hundreds of thousands of the citizens of all the States mentioned. All engaged in its culture strive from 1 year's end to the next to produce a finer quality and better product to satisfy what for years has been a constantly growing demand of the smoking public's discriminating taste for the better-blended cigarette.

On the auction market, while the manufacturers of the costlier popular brands of cigarettes, buy both the highest- and the medium-priced tobaccos, the growers see those manufacturers buy the bulk of their burley crop for the manufacture of cigarettes at those prices which make the high market averages; and they know at once that but for the use of their product in cigarettes, and in the better popular brands, the price for the bulk of their crop would be distressingly low. And the fear of low prices haunts the memory of every tobacco grower.

The so-called economy brands now represent only as variously estimated from 1 percent to 3 percent of the market and therefore account for the disappearance of only a negligible part of the burley growers' production. They know that and for that reason oppose an arbitrary classification of cigarette manufacturers for tax purposes that would burden and handicap the class that provides them the principal outlet for the product of their work and sweat and investment.

The differential proposed is 30 percent. All people and all businesses strive to achieve a lower tax bracket. And it would be the vainest waste of time to think the manufacturers of the popular and costlier brands of cigarettes would not devise every conceivable plan to accomplish the possible saving in tax. By the proposal the Government would invite their doing so. While there may be many, three such obvious plans—all costly to the growers—are that manufacturers will buy the higher quality grades of tobacco at much lower prices, or refrain from buying them at all, or substitute cheaper lower quality grades at very much lower prices to the growers; and produce cigarettes that will easily enable them to maintain their position in the competitive market.

The choice of costlier tobaccos which, in the present market principally account for the tobacco farmers' highly satisfactory income, will inevitably pile up in the hands of this and other similar organizations under loans; and the program which has proven to be so practicable and profitable to growers and Government alike will be jeopardized by the burden of these dearer and undisposable tobaccos.

While it may not be admitted that the so-called economy cigarette is an inferior product it is by these bills classed, or distinguished, because of its cheaper retail price. Tradewise the classification is unwarranted for the economy brands and the high-priced brands compete in the same market and cater to the same taste. Each would displace the other. Competitors; therefore, the Government should treat them as equals, and not subsidize the one and burden the other in violation of the true and correct conception of an excise tax, and at the expense of the hundreds of thousands of bystanding tobacco growers for whom this organization speaks.

Public Interest in Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two of the many news articles written by Bob Considine, of the International News Service. Since they have to do with alleged national syndicates of gamblers and racketeers, these articles are particularly timely in view of the fact that yesterday the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate approved Senate Resolution 202. This resolution authorizes the committee to investigate the use of the facilities of interstate commerce in furtherance of organized crime, which is in violation of the laws in the States where the crimes occur. The reports and conclusions set forth in these articles by Mr. Considine are additional evidence of the interest in ascertaining the full facts of this problem, and of having appropriate recommendations for legislation made to the Congress.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOODLUM EMPIRE

(Art. 1, February 13)

The subtle black stain of a hoodlum super-government, well protected politically, is slowly but surely spreading itself over the population centers of the United States.

Like communism, to which it has been compared by the director of the Greater Miami Crime Commission, it is superbly concealed, well-organized, and in some cases it has adopted the robes of legitimacy.

Unlike communism, it wallows in enormous profits, from gambling and other sources.

Abhoring violence as a rule, and letting cash and influence do their talking, the shrouded leaders of the hoodlum empire have expanded their influence from local police levels, to sheriffs, to mayors, to State legislatures, to governors, and either to—or toward—the Federal Government.

The national syndicate, which is operating more brazenly and with greater efficiency than ever before in the annals of crime, has its own cabinet, its own police forces, and what amounts to its own "foreign relations office"—emissaries and lobbyists planted in State capitals and apparently in Washington, D. C.

Wherever the syndicate moves, it corrupts.

William O'Dwyer, mayor of the Nation's greatest city, has publicly acknowledged that his own vast forces of law and order can no longer control one phase of the mob's operations—bookmaking. He has suggested, in effect, that the mob be legalized, in a desperate effort to stop the further pollution of New York police.

The mayors of such widely separated cities as New Orleans and Portland, Oreg., have informed their constituents that they are the targets of nationally operated mob efforts to remove them.

One branch of the national syndicate was powerful enough to make a deal with the elected officials of a certain Ohio city whereby on-the-lam hoodlums from other areas were given extra-territorial rights in that city, in exchange for the mobsters' protection of the city against lesser crimes.

In businessman roles, instead of frankly hoodlum roles, the national leaders of the syndicate have become powers in the political affairs of New York, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, Atlantic City, Cleveland, Kansas City, Los Angeles, many smaller cities, and the States of Nevada and Florida.

Through campaign contributions and outright bribery, the syndicate has managed to reap favors that run the gamut from immunity to arrest to money-saving rezoning legislation for its ever-expanding real-estate holdings.

There is no racket too small to be overlooked. An honest Miami Beach councilman, Navy veteran, and lawyer, Melvin J. Richard, has told the Dade County grand jury that he was offered a $200,000-a-year income to countenance the operation of a simple punchboard racket.

The offer was made astutely, with a proposal to show him ways and means of remaining a white knight for better government. The gamblers' consternation was mighty when Richard rejected the offer. The syndicate's annual appropriation for "ice" (its bribes, political contributions, and sometimes ostentatious gifts to charities) can be estimated only by those accustomed to astronomical figures. The California Crime Commission, for example, estimates the "ice" for slot-machine protection alone at $400,000,000 in recent years.

The syndicate's armed forces no longer go in for such gaudy slayings as the St. Valentine's Day massacre. The top men of the organization continually counsel discretion, for shootings tend to rouse the suckers. The suckers, as any good syndicate man will tell you, are the people of the United States, ranging from the bootblack who plays his daily nickel on the numbers to high pressure $10,000-a-shot bettors who do business with the bigger bookmakers.

In the end, nobody can win except the men behind the bookie or the numbers writers. They have emerged from the underworld as reformed convicts of sometimes great standing in their communities. They know they cannot lose, for the American public will never stop gambling. They strive passionately for respectability, by and large, and stoop to violence only in great emergencies.

One of these emergencies arose a few years ago when Jack Le Tendre, New England gambler, resisted the attempt of New York gangsters to muscle into the rich sucker market of Broward County, Fla., which lies just to the north of Dade County—seat of Miami.

Le Tendre had built himself a nice place named La Boheme in Broward, where certain law officers now boldly permit the important New York mobsters Joe Odonis and Jake Lansky to operate exclusively.

Le Tendre was told to split his swag from his gambling place or get out. He refused.

Then he made the mistake of returning to his native Woonsocket, R. I. He was murdered there—and thus the blood of the crime was kept off the record of the Miami men.

The others "play ball," content with the best set-up they've ever found in lives devoted almost exclusively to beating the law. They never had it better. They've found the perfect racket—gambling. And the perfect customers—an American public which refuses to take them very seriously, though these men are daily corrupting thousands of public servants.

The FBI cannot touch them because gambling, chief source of the syndicate leaders' income, is not a Federal offense.

The Treasury Department cannot touch them for, by and large, they pay their taxes almost religiously.

The Federal Communications Commission, which has power enough to put a radio-station owner out of business if he wears the wrong kind of necktie, either will not or cannot close down all the racing wire services which are the main arteries of the bookie business of the Nation.

If a man kidnaps another in this country, or transports a woman across a State line for immoral purposes, or steals a car and drives it out of the State, and is caught, the full weight of the Federal Government descends upon him, thanks to the Lindbergh, Mann and Dyer Acts.

But let him get caught operating a gambling game, which automatically means that he has spread incredible corruption in order to operate, and he pays a comparatively microscopic fine.

He has committed only a misdemeanor. The little jail sentence is usually forgotten.

Nobody in America can get very excited about the spread of gambling. The average American can see little moral difference between placing a legal bet on a horse at a track and betting on the same horse with a bookie, away from the track.

The same average American has been sold a nice bill of goods, too, on the character of the gambler with whom he does business. He thinks of him, at least when he's winning, as a fine home-loving fellow who is often the first to contribute to the bettor's favorite charity.

What he overlooks is that not one gambler of any dimension in the United States today can operate as an individual.

Everyone of any magnitude is a front man for an arm of the national syndicate composed of former and current gangsters with long records of murder, traffic in narcotics, kidnaping, extortion, prostitution, burglary, and what not.

There is absolutely no other way for a successful independent gambler to operate today.

He could set up his "book" in the middle of the Arizona Desert in the dead of night, but if he did a good business he'd shortly be working for the national syndicate, or he wouldn't be working at all.

The Nation-wide combination seems loosely knitted, for like all young empires it has its fraternal feuds, most of them based on territorial claims.

But the over-all picture shows a considerable cohesion, with a system of checks, controls, and counterbalances which makes the bawdy rule of the late Al Capone seem like a crude amateur's farce, performed for peanuts.

Like an octopus, the seemingly unrelated tentacles of the syndicate are in fact connected with a remote head.

The thing feeds voraciously on the venality of corrupt officials, the public's traditional apathy, the spew of respectability some of the top syndicate men emit, and the present inability of the American Government to combat the menace.

But jabbing at that head now are two determined United States Senators, ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, and JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, and three public-spirited crime commissions, those of California, Chicago, and Greater Miami. They have demanded support from President Truman.

The counterattack inches slowly through labyrinths of circumstantial evidence. Sometimes the evidence is even flimsier. It is discouraging work, for the syndicate leaders have covered their trails superbly.

But the job goes on, for the men who are attending to it have uncovered enough to confirm their one great and appalling fear: that mob rule one day might supersede that under which 150,000,000 Americans now live.

(Art. 6, February 18)

How much money do Americans bet annually?

A confidential survey made for the Citizens' Committee of Massachusetts, Inc., places the figure at $21,500,000,000, a figure which does not include lotteries, raffles, carnival games, and other gambling facilities.

The survey supported its contention of vast gambling activities with the observation that some $28,000,000,000 in this country is now annually unaccounted for by Government expenditure statistics. Nor does this lost fortune show up in investment or savings-bank statistics.

It is reported that gambling on baseball now has reached the $5,000,000,000 a year mark, and that racing wire services controlled by the remnants of the Capone mob now stress baseball scores, in season, almost as much as racing results.

Most of the baseball betting, the survey showed, is done in New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Chicago, and Pittsburgh.

Betting on baseball in New York, it added, is "largely dominated by the Erickson-Costello group and its associates."

Before he died of bullets shot into him by Capone mobsters who wanted his business, "race wire king" James M. Ragen told police officers that Frank Costello's income from slot machines in Louisiana alone was $1,000,000 a year.

Costello denied that he is now associated with the slot-machine racket in that State or anywhere else, though his partner Phil Kastel, who once had White House habitue John Maragon on his pay roll, continues his gambling affiliations in the State.

No one can state with any complete conviction the scope of United States gambling.

But no one can deny that it is a breathtakingly big operation, and that the suckers are harvested by an efficient Nation-wide organization which has hosts of public officials in its pocket.

In some places the organization can operate successfully for reasons other than bribery. The Dade County (Fla.) grand jury last spring complained:

"We have been made keenly aware of the division of responsibility for the enforcement of the criminal laws in our community.

"There are the sheriff's department and the different police departments. There are the county solicitor's office and the State attorney's office.

"Such division of responsibilities leads readily to excuses for avoidance of responsibilities; to a 'hands-off' policy of matters which can be claimed to be within the jurisdiction of another official; to a cynical attitude that 'it is not within the province of my office or department to investigate so and such'; to a rendering impotent of our grand jury system."

In the same area a judge has ruled that witnesses cannot come into his court to protest the presence in the community of known mobsters.

They must present their complaint to police authorities * * * which procedure tends to lead into the same blind alley of split authority mentioned by the grand jury.

In such a climate, the mobs make their progress.

In recent years it has become fashionable for top figures in the national syndicate to become associated in many legitimate businesses.

Frank Costello, for instance, is a holder of Wall Street property and other real estate in New York. He numbers among his friends an array of public servants, including judges, far removed from the arena of crime.

No one can tell how much else Costello, Erickson, Adonis, the Lansky brothers, Charles Fischetti, the Bowen mobsters, Mickey Cohen and others mentioned in this series really own.

Testimony taken during a court fight seeking to regain the Wofford Hotel of Miami Beach from the control of, among others, "Little Augie" Pisano, former Brooklyn racketeer, shows the difficulty of establishing who owns what and why.

Here are some of the bewildering questions and answers that came out of an interrogation of one of the defendants, Thomas A. Cassara. It was taken at Los Angeles on January 19, 1948:

"Did they ('Little Augie' and John Angersola, alias John King—a Cleveland gangster) ever tell you that they were the owners or were going to hold themselves out as being owners of the hotel?

"No, sir.

"Did you ever make any deal with them whereby they were to run that hotel?

"Well, if you want me to explain in detail——

"Just tell me if you made a deal with them.

"No, sir."

Then later:

"Who is Mr. King?

"This money I borrowed from him personally. He is a close personal friend of mine. His sole interest in the Wofford Hotel was to get back the return of moneys he had loaned to me.

"How much did you owe Mr. King and Mr. Kelly? (The latter is a reference to the late Jimmy Kelly, relative of "Little Augie" and former Greenwich Village night club proprietor and gambler.)

"I don't recall.

"Do you have the books to show it?

"They have."

And so it goes. Only the Federal Government, when empowered, will ever be able to unravel the mystery of deals, counter deals, links, counter links, half truths, evasions and the like which surround the operations of the syndicate. Gangsters and those on the outside.

Until the Federal Government does act, the several crime commissions will continue hammering away.

Often their accusations can be based on nothing more than the fact that this man of shady reputation is seen with that official of ostensibly good reputation—and curious things sometimes happen relating to that association.

But crime commissions have no police power. All they can do is urge the law-invoking authorities to take action. In this sometimes thankless and fruitless task, the voice of Dan Sullivan, Greater Miami's crime expert and former FBI man, is among the more eloquent.

"My own fear," he told me, "is that unless the trend toward gang government is stopped pretty soon we'll wind up with a secret hoodlum government greater than our Federal Government.

"The smooth leaders of the national syndicate, many of them now indistinguishable from reputable businessmen, are in fact so powerful that—by comparison—Al Capone was a piker * * * a stick-up kid compared to a hardened bank robber.

"They feed on a public failing which the public itself tends to condone—gambling.

"Gambling is like narcotics. The habit comes easy and is hard or impossible to stop. As a result, billions of dollars are being poured each year into a nonproductive operation, the national syndicate, and millions of it are being spent to corrode the officials who might stop the racket.

"We hear a lot to the effect that the boys have reformed; that their criminal records were compiled when they were fun-loving kids.

"That's a lot of bunk. They're still rotten, and if we can't get the Federal Government to clean them out, the very foundations of our society may collapse."

Distribution of Surplus Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the following is the list of State agencies, with addresses, authorized to approve applications for the distribution of surplus commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation to needy people within the State named.

It supplements the lists introduced into the RECORD on February 23 by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOFFEN]:

Florida: W. F. Catling, Director, Commodity District Welfare Department, 25 West Monroe Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

Alabama: A. R. Meadows, State Department of Education, 501 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.

Georgia: J. T. DePoor, Department of Education, 412 State Office Building, Atlanta, Ga.

North Carolina: J. P. Davis, Marketing Specialist, Department of Agriculture, Raleigh, N. C.

South Carolina: W. H. Garrison, State School Lunch Supervisor; Courtenay Bateman, Supervisor of Commodity District, 1230 Center Street, Room 312, Columbia, S. C.

Tennessee: T. Marshall Jones, Director, Department of Agriculture, 405 State Office Building, Nashville, Tenn.

Virginia: George Blake, Department of Agriculture, 1007½ East Main Street, Richmond, Va.

Tragic Plight of 28,000 Greek Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by the Greek-American Political Club, of Cambridge, Mass., urging use of the moral prestige of the United States to remedy the abominable crime of forcible abduction of 28,000 Greek children by the Communist forces:

Whereas Americans of Hellenic descent, and particularly those descendants from Greece, are deeply concerned that 28,000 Greek children have been forcibly abducted from their homes by the Communist forces and are presently detained in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Albania, Rumania, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet occupation zone in Germany; and

Whereas the members of the Greek-American Political Club, headquarters at 504 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Mass., at a meeting held at our headquarters the 2d day of February 1950, on motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously resolved that—

1. This abominable crime against humanity in violation of the international authority of the United Nations' resolutions should be remedied at the earliest possible moment.

2. That the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 27, 1948, and November 17, 1949, requesting the prompt repatriation of these children should be promptly enforced, in order that confidence in the United Nations shall be maintained.

3. The Secretary General of the United Nations, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and the League of Red Cross Societies are respectfully requested to continue their noble efforts toward implementation of the United Nations resolution pertaining to the return of the Greek children.

4. The President of the United States, the honorable Members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and the United States Department of State, are respectfully petitioned to support through their moral and political prestige the United Nations' resolutions heretofore mentioned and to have their execution and implementation in mind when dealing with the Governments named above.

5. All American organizations and all individuals concerned with the preservation of elementary human rights and freedoms are called upon to demonstrate through their interest in this manner that the public opinion of the world's free countries is a decisive factor in winning battles for humanity.

6. That a copy of this resolution shall be signed by the President, Treasurer, and Secretary of the Organization and sent to His Excellency Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; the Honorable Alben W. Barkley, Vice President of the United States; the Honorable, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, President of the United Nations; the Honorable Trygve Lie, General Secretary of the United Nations; the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States; Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, United States Representative to the United Nations; the Honorable Warren Austin, head of the United States Delegation to the United Nations; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House at Washington, D. C.; the director of the International Committee of the Red Cross at Geneva, Switzerland; the Honorable Leverett Saltonstall, United States Senator from Massachusetts; the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States Senator from Massachusetts; the Honorable A. Kyrou, permanent delegate of Greece to the United Nations; His Eminence Archbishop Michael of the Greek Orthodox Church; the Honorable Francis J. Myers, United States Senator from Pennsylvania; the Honorable John F. Kennedy, Member of Congress; the Honorable Christian Herter, Member of Congress; the Honorable John W. McCormack, the Honorable Philip J. Philbin, Members of Congress; and the Honorable Joseph Martin, Member of Congress and minority floor leader.

Respectfully submitted.

PETER G. PAPPADOPOULOS, *President.*
GREGORY LIACOPOULOS, *Secretary.*
PETER L. NICHOLAS, *Treasurer.*

Nixon to the Right—Douglas to the Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, important news articles in California yesterday announced that the Honorable SHERIDAN DOWNEY, Senator from that State, had withdrawn as a candidate for reelection.

It was general knowledge about 10 days ago that our colleague, the gentlewoman, Mrs. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, from California, was given an audience at the White House and there was speculation at the time as to whether or not she would be the administration's candidate in the coming senatorial election in that great State.

Since then, Eleanor Roosevelt, the surviving wife of ex-President Franklin D. Roosevelt, has written favorably of Mrs. DOUGLAS in her column and advised us of a dinner that Mrs. Roosevelt held in her honor.

We are also informed through the press that the past Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, is going to campaign for Mrs. DOUGLAS in California, and that the CIO has endorsed her in the senatorial election.

It, therefore, seems important that the conference between the Honorable SHERIDAN DOWNEY and President Truman on which Senator DOWNEY said he would predicate his final announcement of his candidacy for reelection, was canceled at the White House today.

It will also be important to the people of California who will have a real opportunity to express the attitude of the State in regard to further Government ownership of business operations and control through subsidization of the economic activities of that State.

We in the House will be privileged to see our colleague the gentlewoman from California, Mrs. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, standing on the left of that issue with the support of the administration as an opponent to the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON as the champion of the American free-enterprise system.

For the first time in several years the issues will be clearly drawn for the people of California as to whether or not they want government by understandable laws or through Executive decrees.

H-Bomb—Right Thinking Can Make H-Bomb a Deterrent to Catastrophic War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial by Fred Burdick in the eighth anniversary edition of the Gist entitled "Right Thinking Can Make H-Bomb a Deterrent to Catastrophic War":

RIGHT THINKING CAN MAKE H-BOMB A DETERRENT TO CATASTROPHIC WAR

"Nothing is right or wrong but thinking makes it so."—Shakespeare.

Right and constructive thinking regarding the H-bomb and all improved methods of destroying millions of innocent children, women, and men in a few minutes can prevent such a catastrophe from happening. The danger is from the wrong thinking—the hatreds, resentments, fears, and suspicions—the thoughts of which wars are made. Right, Christian thinking will bring the peace everybody wants.

We are experimenting, not merely with new weapons, but with forces. And some scientists contend that chain reactions may get out of control with disastrous results. And such an authority on bacteriological warfare as Secretary General Brock Chisholm, of the World Health Organization, maintains that this weapon alone endangers humanity and warns that nations must learn to live together on this planet if they want to live.

When we recall what the black plague did to populations, we can give credence to the claim that man-made epidemics—purposely scattering many billions of germs—indeed menace all people of the civilized world and that the best chance of surviving a scientific war would be amongst the savages in the jungles of Africa, etc. The more realistic we are and the more we visualize the terrible possibilities of modern warfare the more likely we are to succeed in preventing such madness and getting the world on the road to peace, progress, and prosperity.

Top military men say no nation can really win a modern war. All would lose. Said Gen. Dwight Eisenhower in the New York Times of May 28, 1947:

"War is becoming more and more a matter of fire, famine and pestilence. We can make of this earth a flowering garden or a sterile desert."

He added that the stakes in this campaign (for peace) are not only civilization but humanity.

Many thinkers have held to the theory for long that in due time warfare would become so destructive and menacing to civilization and humanity that world leaders would have no alternative than to find and use peaceful means of solving international problems. That time has come. We have the necessary machinery in the United Nations, and all that is needed is for all its members to use its machinery, not just part of the time but all of the time, and to adhere to both the letter and the spirit of the great United Nations Charter. A life preserver is of no value to a drowning man unless he uses it.

What are the immediate, practical steps that can be taken to head off world catastrophe? The answer can be found in a Gist poll taken in recent months showing that 80.2 percent of the people and nearly as large a percentage of Members of Congress favored continuous efforts in the United Nations to reach agreement on control and reduction of all deadly weapons, including atom bombs.

HOTHEADS PROLONG THE COLD WAR—COOL HEADS CAN HASTEN WORLD PEACE

When spokesmen for great countries at United Nations meetings engage in tirades and "hit high C" in vituperative utterances, impugn motives, and make unfounded charges, such tactics intensify resentments, tensions, and fears, thus prolonging the cold war and delaying the day when nations can "beat their swords in plowshares" and devote their energies, resources, and wealth to constructive instead of destructive purposes, to creating instead of blowing up property, homes, and so forth. Although vitriolic ravings may make the headlines, fortunately for humanity and civilization cooler heads are really in control.

As to charges of "war mongering" the Gist can state that not one American Congressman wants to see a catastrophic, scientific, new world war. Top officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces have told congressional committees that they desire peace. The main purpose of the State Department is to build peace. And when President Truman says "I am working for peace and shall continue to work for peace" he means every word of it. There are diversities of roads to peace but there is but one goal. But to make progress we must have peace in our own hearts, and be sure we are on the right road.

Spokesmen for all major nations at the United Nations have declared that their governments want peace, which doubtless is true, but the fundamental prerequisite for dissipating the war clouds is eradication of or minimizing of international tensions, fears, suspicions, resentments, and hatreds. And we should add misunderstandings as they frequently are the basis of wrong conclusions, thinking, and emotions.

A black-out of all war talk by radio commentators and newspaper columnists, etc., and a cessation of expressions of ill-will and resentment toward world neighbors is suggested by Representative JAMES V. BUCKLEY, of Illinois, who believes such a thing would help tremendously in insuring world peace.

In concluding a recent NBC broadcast, Senator FRANK P. GRAHAM, of North Carolina, expressed the thought that world peace can be aided by recognition and practicing of the principles of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

As we in America profess to be Christians, we should be the first to practice the Golden Rule: "And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise." It well has been said that the best sermon ever preached is setting a good example. Now may be a very propitious time to cut the vicious circle of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, and to substitute practicing Jesus' teachings.

Above all else just now, we need to have more faith in God and to know that there shall be fulfillment of, "And they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not take up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Economic Cooperation Administration

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it is appalling to me to note the flagrant manner in which public funds are being used by bureaucrats to perpetuate themselves in office.

I hold in my hand a clipping from the Times-Herald under date of Tuesday, February 21, wherein it tells that the ECA is enlarging its publicity staff in the battle for funds. To quote a paragraph from this article, it says that the ECA Information Director, Robert Mullen, revealed that he is looking for additional former newspaper and magazine writers to act as press agents for the Marshall plan.

It goes on to say that we are spending $235,000 to propagandize domestically the Marshall plan and to build support within the United States for the Marshall plan.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations might well look into this domestic-propaganda campaign on the part of these bureaucrats before voting additional funds to that agency.

I include herewith the text of the news item:

ECA ENLARGING PUBLICITY STAFF IN BATTLE FOR FUNDS

(By Philip Warden)

The Economic Cooperation Administration yesterday enlarged its publicity machine in Washington as it girded for a stiff fight for its life in Congress starting today.

On the eve of a march to the Hill by ECA Administrator Hoffman and Secretary Acheson with a request for $7,550,000,000 to finance the Marshall plan another year, ECA put five new writers and a clerk on its information staff at an annual cost of $39,450.

SEEKING MORE WRITERS

In addition, a magazine consultant has been put on call for $50-a-day advice to the information staff when needed.

The ECA information director, Robert Mullen, revealed that he is looking for additional former newspaper and magazine writers to act as press agents for the Marshall plan. Present plans call for adding $41,000 to the $234,075 yearly expenditures of ECA's information section. Mullen has been authorized to spend up to $255,000 in this country on the ECA publicity machine.

Mullen said a big expansion also is under way in the information division of ECA in Europe. Expenditures there to tell Europeans about the Marshall plan are being boosted from $250,000 a year to $8,000,000. Part of the eight million will come from foreign currencies collected from the sale of Marshall plan goods by the European governments.

LINKED WITH UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE

Mullen listed the new staff members as:

Andrew Berding, former $10,000-a-year man in ECA's information office in Rome, who will serve as Mullen's deputy and function primarily as liaison officer between ECA and the State Department's propaganda machine, United States Information Service.

Hugh Latham, new special assistant at $6,400 a year. Latham formerly worked for the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and Fortune magazine.

Harry Shimnick, former Washington newspaperman, a writer at $7,600 a year.

Willard Savoy, young Negro author of the book Allen Land. He will serve as a speech and magazine writer at $7,600 a year.

Norton Wood, picture editor of This Week magazine. He will take a leave of absence to work for ECA as an information specialist on pictures at $6,400 a year.

Thomas Mahoney, an employee of Young & Rubicam, New York advertising agency, consultant on the placement of magazine articles by ECA writers.

Mary Louise Parks, secretary to Helen Hamilton Woods, special consultant who directs ECA's propaganda to clubwomen.

The ECA press staff is expecting rough going before Congress for the next several weeks as the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate debate extension of the Marshall plan and its appropriation.

Tennessee Valley Authority Financial Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a financial statement of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Total funds made available to TVA and total investment as of June 30, 1949

1. Appropriations	$766,562,331
2. Transfer of property from other agencies	41,902,121
3. Proceeds from the sale of bonds	65,072,500
4. Net income from power operations	[1] 130,128,901
Total funds provided	1,003,665,853
5. Less following amounts:	
(a) Bond redemptions	13,572,500
(b) Payments to Treasury	33,970,333
(c) Net expense of non-income producing programs	115,299,795
Total	162,842,628
Total investment, June 30, 1949	840,823,225

[1] The net income from power operations figure of $130,128,901 is arrived at in the following manner:

Gross income from power	$366,687,585
Less following amounts:	
Depreciation	81,989,079
Interest (net)	5,180,533
Other expenses	149,489,067
Total	236,558,684
Net income from power	130,128,901

Total funds made available to TVA and total investment as of June 30, 1949—Con.

Funds paid into the Treasury:	
(1) From power proceeds	$26,059,019
(2) From activities other than power	7,911,314
Total	33,970,333
(3) Bonds retired from power proceeds	13,572,500
(4) For interest	6,325,407
Total	53,868,240

INVESTMENT IN POWER PROGRAM OF TVA

EXHIBIT I.—*TVA power program assets,*[1] *June 30, 1949*

The power investment includes the following assets:	
Completed plant in service	$510,433,479
Less reserve for depreciation	79,001,062
Net plant in service	431,432,417
Funds held for future use under sec. 26, in the form of cash and current receivables	5,174,680
Long-term receivables	17,382
Inventories	7,639,544
Total assets employed in power program	444,263,923
Construction in progress	28,483,065
Total	472,746,988

This investment was financed with capital from the following sources:

U. S. Treasury funds:	
Appropriations and transfers of property:	
Total	317,177,105
Less payments under sec. 26	26,059,019
Net outstanding	291,118,086
Bonds:	
Issued	65,072,500
Retired	13,572,500
Net outstanding	51,500,000
Total U.S. Treasury funds outstanding	342,618,086
Earnings of the power business:	
Gross earnings	136,454,309
Less interest paid	6,325,407
The remainder represents the net earnings invested in power assets, including $39,631,519 paid to the Government for retirement of bonds and as an offset to appropriations and $90,497,383 used directly in the business	130,128,902
Total	472,746,988

[1] Exclusive of general assets not segregated by programs and exclusive of construction in progress relating to multiple-use facilities at projects for which an allocation of costs to programs has not yet been made.

EXHIBIT II.—*TVA power income and expense, by years, summarized from annual financial statements*

Fiscal year	Operating revenue	Operating expenses	Depreciation provisions and amortization	Net operating revenue	Interest income	Gross earnings
1933–1938	$6,732,447	$2,876,294	$3,610,118	($754,965)	$1,184,146	($563,719)
1939	5,507,077	2,322,884	1,731,563	1,442,880	85,954	1,528,834
1940	15,285,074	7,081,735	3,615,623	4,587,716	143,595	4,731,311
1941	21,127,371	9,264,242	4,546,547	7,326,582	148,798	7,475,380
1942	25,329,454	15,819,351	5,230,350	4,280,253	136,078	4,416,331
1943	31,674,210	11,933,739	[1] 7,937,886	11,800,585	126,559	[1] 11,927,144
1944	35,429,546	13,815,808	[1] 9,876,468	[1] 11,737,270	115,045	[1] 11,852,315
1945	39,383,231	12,891,642	[1] 8,885,757	[1] 17,605,832	102,409	[1] 17,708,241
1946	35,264,545	9,875,814	8,605,731	16,783,000	78,591	16,861,591
1947	44,144,090	13,386,931	8,710,410	21,638,749	25,198	21,663,947
1948	48,766,524	22,228,522	9,264,785	17,173,448	5,299	17,181,747
1949	58,030,516	26,663,886	9,867,841	21,478,789	2,398	21,481,187
Total	366,687,585	149,489,067	[1] 82,989,079	[1] 135,208,439	1,144,870	[1] 136,454,309

[1] Reflects accelerated amortization of electric plant acquisition adjustment by write-off against accumulated earnings: 1943, $2,000,000; 1944, $3,000,000; 1945, $1,000,000.

EXHIBIT III.—*Return on the TVA power investment*

Fiscal year	Average investment [1]	Gross earnings	Annual return on investment
			Percent
1941	$190,000,000	$7,475,380	3.9
1942	220,000,000	4,416,331	2.0
1943	258,000,000	11,927,144	4.7
1944	280,000,000	14,852,315	4.1
1945	290,000,000	18,708,241	4.8
1946	400,000,000	16,861,591	4.2
1947	400,000,000	21,663,947	5.3
1948	405,000,000	17,181,747	4.2
1949	420,000,000	21,481,187	5.1

SUMMARY

Fiscal year	Average investment	Gross earnings	Annual return on investment
			Percent
1934–40, 7 years (development period)	$60,000,000	$5,686,436	1.4
1941–49, 9 years	345,000,000	[2] 130,767,883	4.2
1934–49, 16 years	226,000,000	[2] 136,454,309	3.9

[1] Average net book cost during the year of plant in service plus long-term receivables and an allowance for inventories and general plant used for the power program.

[2] Reflects accelerated amortization of electric-plant acquisition adjustments by write-off against accumulated earnings: 1943, $2,000,000; 1944, $3,000,000; 1945, $1,000,000.

EXHIBIT IV.—*Disposition of gross TVA power earnings*

Fiscal year	Gross earnings (from exhibit II)	Disposition of gross earnings: Interest	Bond retirement	Paid to U. S. Treasury (sec. 26)	Used directly in the power business
1933–39	$965,118	$60,473			$904,645
1940	4,731,311	652,062			4,299,229
1941	7,475,380	494,642			6,980,738
1942	4,416,331	742,978			3,673,353
1943	[1] 11,927,144	778,291			[1] 11,148,853
1944	[1] 11,852,315	736,634	$2,000,000		[1] 9,115,681
1945	[1] 17,708,241	729,207	2,000,000		[1] 14,979,034
1946	16,861,591	647,857	2,500,000	$2,085,741	6,628,993
1947	21,663,947	624,570	2,272,500	7,971,278	11,004,599
1948	17,181,747	563,936	2,500,000	6,000,000	6,117,811
1949	21,481,187	536,771	2,500,000	3,000,000	15,444,416
Total	136,454,309	6,325,407	13,572,500	39,970,333	[2] 76,586,069

[1] Reflects accelerated amortization of electric plant acquisition adjustments by write-off against accumulated earnings: 1943, $2,000,000; 1944, $3,000,000; 1945, $1,000,000.

[2] $5,174,680 is in the form of cash and current receivables, a share of which will be paid to the Government within the current fiscal year.

Salute to Rotary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, may I add my personal salute to Rotary International by including herein the following editorial which appeared in the Nutley Sun, Nutley, N. J., of February 24, 1950:

SALUTE TO ROTARY

Rotary International is 45 years old today. From a simple group of five or six young businessmen in Chicago who formed a habit of lunching together once a week, it has grown into a membership of 334,000 business and professional executives with 6,907 Rotary Clubs in 82 countries of this world.

There is a serious purpose behind Rotary. It sings with its meals, but it is no singing society. Rather, rotary is a world forum for men determined to promote a better understanding of all humans in the interests of world peace. Red Russia, bent on aggression, bans Rotary, and that is understandable and a wonderful tribute.

Rotary has assigned itself two missions. By monthly publications it reports the progress of the United Nations, to strengthen its prestige. Having raised $2,000,000 for an endowment fund it now selects 56 rotary fellows annually to go abroad for advanced study, thus spreading a wider knowledge of world affairs to further peace.

Both motives are excellent. By its application to its mission, Rotary fulfills its purpose to foster the ideal of service.

God, Man, and the Hydrogen Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me on the subject God, Man, and the Hydrogen Bomb, delivered at the Washington Cathedral, in Washington, D. C., on February 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOD, MAN, AND THE HYDROGEN BOMB

It is with deep feeling of humility that I address myself to the subject of the day—God, Man, and the Hydrogen Bomb. But man cannot escape coping with the harsh realities of international life. Man today spends more of the earth's resources, his wealth, and his genius on preparation for war and the ultimate destruction of human and religious values than he does on the creation of a living society based on the eternal religious principles of human brotherhood.

What the United States, for example, spends each week for military defense is what the Federal aid to education program proposes to spend for one whole year, and is as much as is being planned to spend for public health for one whole year, or for rural electrification for one whole year.

We meet here today on Ash Wednesday. We, with the millions in Christendom, today enter the lenten season. We begin the search into the recesses of our own souls; we come to grips with the facts of our own human inadequacy; we come to the ultimate realization that unless man prepares himself to commit an act of faith, he and his civilization may disintegrate.

On January 31 the President of the United States ordered the construction of the hydrogen bomb. On February 2 a noble American, Senator BRIEN McMAHON, of Connecticut, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, made vivid for the American people the significance of the President's announcement. He challenged the world to turn from a path toward war and build for peace.

On February 4 a group of 12 of the country's leading physicists warned that one hydrogen bomb could wipe out any city in the world and release such enormous masses of lethal radiation as to make the affected area forbidden to habitation of human beings for perhaps centuries to come. They pleaded: "We believe that no nation has the right to use such a bomb no matter how righteous its cause. This bomb is no longer a weapon of war, but a means of extermination of whole populations. Its use would be a betrayal of all standards of morality and of Christian civilization itself."

On February 6, another distinguished American, the chairman of the Senate Armed Forces Committee, Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, declaring that "armies are not the answer to the settlement of international disputes," urged that the United States call an international conference for the specific purpose of achieving complete world disarmament.

On February 13 the world's leading scientist, Dr. Albert Einstein, stated that "the idea of achieving security through national armament is at the present state of military techniques a disastrous illusion * * * radioactive poisoning of the atmosphere

and hence annihilation of any life on earth has been brought within the range of technical possibility."

The threat of physical destruction is obvious to all serious and informed persons. Whatever faith in inevitable progress which those of us reared in the liberal tradition may have had is seriously shaken. Not only is the threat of physical disaster a grave one for the future of mankind, but the chronic threat of war, even without its advent, must inevitably create a state of perpetual crisis and resultant loss of human freedom. Fear can result in placing the control of man's destiny in the hands of just a few. Decisions in such an atmosphere must give special weight to the advice of those who specialize in violence. Under the stress of continuing war tension, the body politic may well transform itself into a garrison-prison state.

In much of the globe this process has gone far already. If the crisis continues, the process can appear in every country. Its success may call for no revolutionary seizure of power by totalitarian forces. The process has more in common with man's struggling in a bottomless bog.

The United States stands in 1950 at a high point of power. American strength is at present supreme from the Stettin-Trieste line and from Greece and Turkey westward to southern Korea and Japan. Command of the seas and the possession of land and carrier-based bombers which extend military might into the interior of continents have created a sphere of power which no nation in the history has ever approached.

The hard truth, however, is that while America stands powerful the idea of democracy which it represents is losing strength in the world.

In 1945 the hopes of the peoples of the world were stirred when the United States put aside its traditional reluctance to play an active role in international organizations and played host to the United Nations Conference in San Francisco. The world looked to us, unscarred by the war, with our resources relatively untouched and our factories in full production, to lead in a harmonious search for lasting peace. In Europe, in Asia, in Africa—wherever men gathered—people recalled the hopes of the four freedoms and the promises of the Atlantic Charter.

What has happened? Today, in the spirit of Lent, Americans seek an explanation and yearn for a solution. The fear and mistrust within nations today is too obvious to need documentation. It is that which produces atomic and hydrogen bombs. Yet, in spite of possessing a stock pile of atomic bombs, and spending more than $15,000,000,000 a year on military preparedness, many Americans are still insecure. Here is further justification for further self-analysis and inquiry into better ways of seeking security and peace.

It is true, as our Secretary of State recently noted, that continuous self-criticism is a quality of all free people. It is an excellent quality. It comes only from freedom, and as he said, were its exercise permitted wherever men gather, the world would be much nearer peace.

How gratifying it would be were the citizens of the Soviet Union free to join with us in this lenten season to explore our consciences, criticize our governments, and join a world of free peoples in seeking a new approach toward our goal—peace, world brotherhood, and security.

Is it not our responsibility continuously and with perseverance to hold forth to the peoples of the world this dream and our hope for its fulfillment? Who can say that our voices would not reach through the barrier and give hope and inspiration where despair and hostility now rest?

Let us not ignore the deep-rooted contradictions between democracy and totalitarianism of any form, whether it be Communist or Fascist. Let us never cease expressing our indignation toward slavery, nor our vigilance in behalf of freedom. So long as there is oppression or injustice or totalitarian power in the world, there is conflict. We must, however, lift conflict out of the realm of war.

Our responsibility is to tell the peoples of the world that we, temporarily the mightiest of nations, are ready to join in an international effort to abolish war. We must resolve to take some of the imaginative daring which we have shown in the physical sciences to start a chain reaction among the peoples and governments of the world against this madness and insanity.

Here lies our strength. With a positive reaffirmation of our democratic faith, with a determination to protect freedom and resist totalitarianism, with an unequivocal declaration in behalf of an international agreement to abolish war and for universal disarmament, America would gain for itself moral supremacy in the world, and recapture, in the eyes of the world, leadership for peace.

The necessity for renewed and continuous negotiation is greater than ever before. Not only peace but our national interest impels us to make new efforts to negotiate. Once America gives up her active search for peace we lose all hope of reaching the peoples behind the iron curtain; we lose our ties with friendly peoples who hope for peace but see our bombs and fear war; and, perhaps most important, we lose the basic moral purpose which is the fabric of our democratic way of life.

History offers many examples of mortal conflicts between great movements which, with the passing of the years and the cooling of passions, have found it possible to resolve their conflicts without war. The conflict between the Moslem and the Christian worlds was finally resolved by the destruction of neither, in spite of the Moslem slogan "Face Islam or die."

Our first concrete proposal to the leaders of the Soviet Union must be to set up a conference on universal disarmament—universal not unilateral—with international guaranties of security. It is the responsibility of our heads of state to make unmistakably clear to the leaders of the Soviet Union our plans for such a positive proposal and issue an invitation that they join with us in submitting such a proposal to the United Nations.

We must also make it perfectly clear to the leaders of the Soviet Union that the alternative to peaceful negotiations and settlement could well mean turning the world into a battlefield which would make it the graveyard for the human race.

Our proposals for disarmament should include the absolute prohibition of the manufacture of weapons for mass destruction, limited not only to atomic and hydrogen bombs but to conventional armaments as well. We should stand ready to consider practical suggestions as to how necessary supervision and control can be exercised. We should stand ready to turn over our own stock piles of destruction to the United Nations as part of such an international agreement and in concert with all other nations of the world.

Significant as was the original Acheson-Lilienthal report from which the Baruch plan was devised, we must stand ready to broaden it by extending its coverage to all weapons. Now is the time to reexamine our original proposals and recognize the need for modifying them in the light of developments since 1945.

Our disarmament proposal must also include with it a plea for universal abolition of peacetime conscription. It is unnecessary to train young men and women for war in a world society dedicated to peace.

Such a program to be effective must be accompanied by provisions for a police force to maintain international security. The United Nations must be transformed into an organization capable of enforcing peace under law.

Carrying the banner of such an international program, the United States will find itself in partnership with the entire non-Soviet world. With such a program we present the leaders of the Soviet Union with a challenge. It is a challenge not only to its military power but to its very purposes, which are the ultimate roots of its power.

We would be affirming our faith that in the conflict of ideologies between democracy and Communist totalitarianism, democracy will prevail and we would be proclaiming to the leaders of the Soviet Union, "Dare you affirm less for your faith in communism?"

To strengthen our faith in democracy it must be an essential part of our international policy to enact a program for civil rights. Such a demonstration is essential if we are to convince the peoples of the world, particularly the millions in Asia and Africa, that we sincerely believe in democracy and human equality. It will be impossible for us to enlist the active support of the overwhelming numbers in the world who are colored and it will be impossible for us to gain their friendship so long as they come to equate American democracy with racial discrimination.

Our international policy must also encompass within it an economic program. President Truman's point 4 program must be the central focus of such an economic proposal. Our President said: "We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas.". It is essential that such a program be conducted through the United Nations and its specialized agencies. It must also encompass within it the vision of an interrelated world economy in which our Government, as the wealthiest in the world, makes a substantial contribution in a joint international effort against the enemies of men—hunger, misery, and despair.

With such a program we demonstrate to the Russian people, and certainly to the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Europe, our basic striving for peace, for understanding, and for international justice. Let any Government who refuses our offer then face the responsibility in the eyes of the peoples of the world for continuing the race of humanity toward destruction.

At this moment in history the helpless and teeming millions of people, citizens of the world, anxiously look for a declaration of American foreign policy which will provide them with the hope that war is not inevitable and that peace can indeed be a reality for them and their children. Having offered our willingness to join as partners in the struggle for peace and against the real enemies of mankind, hunger, and poverty, we would gain for ourselves the friendship and loyalty of all the peoples of the world.

Here is a moral alternative to world chaos.

The Rise or Sunset of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address

entitled "The Rise or Sunset of Peace," which I delivered before the American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association, at Atlantic City, N. J., on February 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RISE OR SUNSET OF PEACE

Mr. Chairman, members of the American Association of School Administrators, and guests, it is a great honor to be invited to address this convention. In these very critical days of world affairs it is a serious responsibility for a Member of the United States Senate to undertake a public discussion of any phase of American foreign policy.

I undertake that responsibility tonight because I think it is very important that the American people face up to world trends. It is particularly important that our educational institutions and the educators in charge of them marshal their forces of enlightenment behind the cause of winning the peace.

As one who taught for 20 years in various American colleges before entering political life, I know that America's educational system can be a very effective force in enlightening the American public on the facts of any great problem. Once the American people are fully informed about the facts in respect to world trends, I have complete confidence in their judgment on any proposed course of action. Each generation is called upon to face and solve at least one great crisis of its time. It is most likely that our generation will witness the sunrise or sunset of peace. The events of history written on the pages of our generation will determine the destiny of America, and for that matter of the world.

The American people—and not the American Government—will determine in the next few years whether the world will see a new birth of freedom or an autopsy of democracy—a sunrise of peace, or the dusk and darkness of war.

The Voice of America needs to be heard throughout America as well as throughout the rest of the world. Schools and colleges of our country—each and every one of them—need to throw their educational forces behind the cause of winning the peace. This is no time for a hush-hush policy on the part of school administrators when it comes to the use of school facilities for disseminating information about world affairs. The schools must help instruct the American public on the facts of the international situation. They must encourage faculty members, and students, too, to participate in public discussion on the many controversial issues that must be considered and solved in accordance with the facts if we are to win the peace. Some way, somehow, we must lead the American people to an enlightened understanding of the fact that peace does not just happen. Like war, it is the outgrowth of causes. Never was it more important that academic freedom in the sense of searching after and presenting the truth should prevail in America.

We must educate our people to an understanding that peace can result only from forging a chain of human causation. The struggle for peace, which is the major crisis of our generation, is a struggle for men's minds rather than for their emotions. It is a struggle for human decency rather than for human debauchery. It involves an appeal to reason. Peace can be won and maintained only if we can convince the American people and freedom-loving people elsewhere in the world that rules of reason, procedures of international justice, relinquishment of many selfish interests must be substituted in the thinking of people everywhere for the emotional nationalism that still dominates the world in spite of all our laudatory efforts to set up a system of international justice through law by way of the United Nations.

We need to face the fact that we will not see the sunrise of peace this year or next, but unless we see at least some of those early hour rays of a dawn of peace in the near future, mankind may awaken only to die in the pitch blackness of war.

Every institution of enlightenment in America, including the church, lodge, press, radio—every group where free men gather—and particularly the school—should join forces in the struggle for peace. We cannot win the peace by wishing for it, nor by blaming the politicians because we do not have it, nor by adopting the fatalistic attitude that war is inevitable, nor by placing all the blame on our enemies in the cold war now gripping the world.

We Americans need to ask ourselves some very blunt questions and be willing to face the realities of the answers. Are we adopting an escape from reality attitude in America toward the problems of winning the peace? Certainly, the answer is "No" if we are to be judged from the standpoint of our support of the United Nations, our spending of billions of the taxpayer's money, in the defense of Europe militarily and in the economic rehabilitation program for Europe under the Marshall plan. The answer is "No" if we are to be judged by the materialistic contributions we have made to date in many parts of the world to those people who have taken a stand for the freedom of the individual. Yet the fact remains that we have done none too well in holding our own in the cold war.

Seeking to analyze the problems which confront us in this fight to win the peace, we should not disparage or discredit the great contributions and many noble deeds which our Government and our people have performed for the cause of peace since the end of the war. It has been a glorious record—not deserving much of the criticism which has been heaped upon it. However, there is a great danger that because things do not seem to be going very well at the present moment, a feeling of hopelessness and discouragement will overcome the American people and they will acquiesce to the propaganda that is abroad in the land today that what we should do is walk out of Europe, turn our backs on Asia, build up huge armaments and defenses on our own land and try to live unto ourselves alone.

As I go across this country, I find it very reassuring that most Americans recognize that a return to isolationism would surrender most of the rest of the world to Russia and endanger our own survival as a free nation. Still we all know that the sands of public opinion frequently shift. We know that the immediate economic well-being of the American people is bound to have a very important effect on their opinion in respect to any proposal involving American foreign policy. If serious economic restrictions should come to characterize our economy within the next few years, those with an isolationist point of view would be able to exercise a much greater influence on American public opinion than they are able to do at the present moment. That is why I believe that the greatest defense weapon America has is a sound domestic economy.

The greatest answer we have to communism is to demonstrate the superiority of a capitalistic economy over the totalitarianism of a Russian state economy, or for that matter any other form of a state economy. That is why I say that a balanced budget, substantial annual payments on our national debt, a revision of our tax structure aimed at eliminating the gross equities which are now in it, the adoption of legislative policies which will carry out the constitutional intent of promoting the general welfare of our people within the framework of the checks and balances of our Constitution are just as much essential elements of a sound defense program for America as are the necessary military defenses.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, I have no hesitancy in telling you that at this critical hour there can be no let-down in America's defense program, but among the many things we must do in building that program is to take the steps necessary to stabilize our economy and demonstrate to the world that the economic freedom which characterizes our capitalistic economy can be a disciplined freedom of a united people devoted to promoting the common good. It is with kindness, but with frankness, that I say that American schools and colleges can and should do a much better job of educating the American people to a clearer understanding of the direct relationship between their political freedoms and their economic freedoms.

I'm afraid that too many people have forgotten that our economic system and our political system are inseparable. We cannot have individual rights and liberties as set out in our Constitution under any form of state economy. We cannot maintain the political freedoms guaranteed the individuals by our democratic government as we start down the road of a state economy. Political democracy and economic democracy are inseparable. They constitute what we mean by our American system of self-government.

Although the foundation principle of democratic government to which I refer appears to many people to be an abstract one, I would caution you to remember that it is an exceedingly concrete one measured in terms of your rights.

This country of ours was founded primarily upon the basic democratic principle that the spiritual value of the individual citizen is the very core of self-government. One cannot read the Constitution nor the Declaration of Independence nor the great debates out of which was born this Republic without recognizing the fact that our founding fathers believed that a society of free people must rest upon a devotion to the spiritual value of the individual person. They considered that the primary purpose of a democratic form of government was to protect the dignity of the individual. They realized that the individual human being is the creature of the Almighty and that to exploit and debase the individual person is a sacrilegious offense.

It is very difficult to reconcile in the interest of peace the political philosophies of communism and democracy, but we must try to find some basis on which the two philosophies can live in peace in the world. I say that because if we are going to avoid a war which would result in the killing of millions of human beings living under both Communist and democratic governmental systems today we must face the cold, hard fact that some mutually satisfactory understanding for peaceful relationships must be reached.

I am not one of those who believe that the Russian people are being held in complete subjugation or in involuntary servitude by the Russian leaders. The evidence is very much against such a point of view, although there are those in this country who are trying to convince us that the Russian pepole are entirely out of sympathy with the Communist regime.

It would be rather reassuring and hopeful if one could believe that the Russian people are anti-Communist. The facts, however, point to the contrary. The facts indicate that the Russian leaders have succeeded so well with a program of indoctrination and propaganda since the Russian Revolution that the Russian people generally believe the communistic form of government offers the only hope of survival for them.

We Americans need to remember that the Russian people have been convinced that we intend to make war upon them and that they must proceed as rapidly as possible to prepare for that war, no matter what the personal sacrifice and hardship may be. It appears evident that the Russian people are making tremendous sacrifices and undergoing great hardships in carrying out the propaganda dictates of the Russian politburo.

Part of the Russian strategy is a program of infiltration into the free governments of the world so that in case of another war the Communists will be in a position to do internal damage to those free governments including our own. This tactic of infiltration is characteristic of totalitarian techniques as used by Hitler as well as by the Russians. We cannot ignore the fact that a spread of the communistic philosophy in America is itself a threat to the great spiritual values of our form of government.

Although we must recognize this danger we must be careful at the same time not to become alarmists. We must be careful not to become Red-baiters in the negative sense.

But on the other hand we must not close our minds to evidence and proof of Communist infiltration into our American institutions.

Shortly, in the Senate of the United States we will be debating a proposal to appropriate funds for the extension of the Marshall plan another year. Already the ghosts of isolationism are stalking the corridors of the National Capitol—already some Senators are proposing to stop all Marshall plan appropriations and others are proposing to cut them so drastically that the plan will break down. Statesmanship calls for finding the answer to the question, "How much money is needed to complete the job of economic rehabilitation in Europe and how much of it can America make available this next year consistent with maintaining our own economic strength here at home?"

The evidence is clear that the early success of many phases of the Marshall plan will justify considerable reductions in previous estimates of the amount that will be needed this year. It is also clear that the Marshall-plan countries need to demonstrate a greater willingness to develop economic unity among themselves and eliminate the costly trade barriers within Europe which for so many decades has created a European pattern of economic Balkanism.

The schools of America have a job of informing the public in regard to the economic problems involved in operating the Marshall plan. Query—Will they do it? It is part of the job of winning the peace because unless the American people develop a better understanding of the direct relationship between the economic rehabilitation of Europe and the peace of the world, those of us in the Congress who are supporting the Marshall plan will have great difficulty in preventing a scuttling of the economic phases of America's foreign policy.

That leads me to comment upon the direct relationship between the maintaining of a nonpartisan or bipartisan foreign policy and winning the peace. We shall see in our generation the sunset of peace if the American people allow themselves to become disunited over foreign policy. If partisanship replaces nonpartisanship in American foreign policy, every Communist in America and the Russian leaders in the Kremlin in Moscow will rejoice. I am satisfied that part of the infiltration tactics of the Communists is to divide us on questions of foreign policy. Here again the schools of America can function in the front lines of the fight for peace by providing the forums and spreading the truth concerning the facts of foreign affairs.

There is considerable talk these days in Washington, and elsewhere, about having the leaders of our Government, and possibly of one or two other governments, make an approach to the Russian leaders for a settlement of the issue of the atomic bomb and now the hydrogen-bomb control by agreement between them. It would appear that there is some attempt to make a partisan issue of such a demand.

I seriously question the advisability of such an approach to the Russians. I regret the partisanship of the attempt to politically embarrass our President in case he does not agree to such an approach. The United States is a member of the United Nations. I believe that the best hope for peace is to be found through strengthening the United Nations—not circumventing it or weakening it. America's participation in the United Nations, in the first instance was the direct result of a unity of action on a bipartisan basis of the leaders of the two major political parties in this country.

It is a sad fact that there have been many instances in which the spirit of bipartisanship, which characterized the great San Francisco Conference at the time the United Nations was born, has not prevailed in some other international conferences. However, mistakes in applying the principle of bipartisanship do not justify repudiating the principle. There is a growing confusion in America as to what our foreign policy is. The American people seem to be developing feelings of fear, doubt, and almost hysteria concerning our foreign policies and the trends of world affairs.

A world full of people worried by fear, nations feverish with war psychology, national economies spending more for armaments than for human welfare, time races in competitive construction of atomic and hydrogen bombs, spell war—not peace. In my judgment, the time has come for the American people, the Russian people, and the mothers and fathers everywhere on the face of this world to recognize that present world trends, unless changed, will lead to war. We will witness a sunset not only of peace but of human happiness for generations to come unless the leaders of our generation succeed in laying the foundation, as Senator VANDENBERG has put it, of a world order based upon international justice through law.

It is my hope that you will give thoughtful consideration to the view that it is of great importance to the people of the world that the American people maintain a united front in support of a bipartisan foreign policy. That policy must seek to strengthen the forces of freedom in the world by establishing a world order capable of substituting international judicial decrees for hydrogen bombs as a means of settling international disputes.

As Nehru of India declared during his trip to this country, "There can be no doubt that a world government must come—for the only alternative is world suicide."

Yet, as we sit here tonight, we should not ignore the fact that there are forces at work in America seeking to prejudice the thinking of our people into an acceptance of a partisan approach to foreign affairs. They are appealing to the selfish motives of those who would place immediate economic gains for themselves and the Nation above the long-time security of peace. Their isolationist program is directed at the present moment at scuttling a bipartisan foreign policy. They have seised upon imperfections and mistakes in that policy as affording them an opportunity to play politics with the security of our Nation.

Recent statements by prominent Members of the Congress, highly critical of the past, present, and supposed future policy of the United States in China and Europe, raise serious questions as to America's future course in international relations.

Is the United States on the verge of another postwar era of narrow nationalism and isolationism? Is the Republican Party about to abandon the principle of a bipartisan foreign policy which Senator VANDENBERG, one of its main architects, has rightly called our best available insurance for peace?

How strong are the forces that would have America embark on an imperialistic course, characterized by dollar diplomacy and the conditioning of further Marshall-plan aid on the recipient countries adopting different policies in the conduct of their own domestic affairs?

At the Philadelphia convention in 1948, the Republican Party solidly backed the principle of bipartisanship. The platform there adopted, in anticipation of a Republican victory, pledged that the minority party would be invited to join in stopping partisan politics at the water's edge.

The Democrats likewise have repeatedly pledged a bipartisan approach to foreign-policy problems. Those who sneer at the bipartisan program need to be reminded that differences over means of implementing a united American position in international relations do not justify scuttling the principle. Rather, the shortcomings which have developed point out the need for perfecting the mechanics of cooperation.

The reasons for a bipartisan foreign policy are plain enough. Our basic objective is to achieve and maintain international peace and security in a world of free nations devoted to the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. To fulfill our obligations as a leader among free nations, we must have a foreign policy that is clear and consistent. Moreover, national security demands that our foreign commitments weather changes in the political direction of our Government.

The necessary conditions for a workable bipartisan foreign policy are not obscure, but perhaps it may be well to restate them in view of the charge that bipartisanship means me-toolism and is no more than a Republican rubber-stamp policy.

With agreement on the desirability of a bipartisan foreign policy, its successful operation necessitates that responsible party leaders achieve an understanding of common readiness to work together, that there be full access to and sharing of information, and that there be timely consultation.

Despite the strains of three election campaigns, bipartisanship has survived. At times, its workings have been far from perfect. But now is no time to stick our heads into the sand of isolationism or refuse to put forth our best efforts toward improving the machinery of bipartisanship so that America may present a united front.

A bipartisan foreign policy carries with it the obligation upon the party in the White House, be it Democratic or Republican, to consult with the leaders of the minority party in advance of entering into international understandings which commit the United States to some definite course of action. It is a two-way street between the White House and Capitol Hill.

It is true that under our Constitution the primary responsibility for determining foreign policy rests with the President of the United States, but it is also true that whenever friction develops between the White House and the Congress over foreign policy questions, our country is greatly embarrassed. This is particularly true whenever the President makes an international commitment or agreement which later requires implementation by the Congress.

Many of the strains and stresses which American foreign policy is undergoing at the present time must be attributed to the fact that in recent years Presidents and Secretaries of State have too often entered into understandings with heads of foreign governments as to which both Democratic and Republican leaders of the Congress were kept in ignorance until a misunderstanding of potentially serious proportions had developed.

It is not wise to discard entirely the use of hindsight when charting a future course of

action. The shortcomings of our bipartisan foreign policy as it has developed in recent years can be seen in a much better perspective by a realistic analysis of some of the serious mistakes which have resulted from the failure of Presidents and Secretaries of States to take into their confidence and to consult with congressional leaders of both parties upon whom the administration must lean, in the last analysis, for congressional support of any international commitments.

The Cairo understanding, the agreements reached at Yalta, the commitments made at Potsdam, the administration's policies in China, during and particularly since the war, are all examples of shortcomings in carrying out the basic spirit of a bipartisan foreign policy. Does anyone think for a moment that the understandings reached by the President with the representatives of foreign powers at Cairo and Yalta would have been acceptable, even at the time they were made, to the bipartisan leaders of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee?

The Cairo and Yalta commitments involved not only the prosecution of the war but the building of the peace as well. Historians will undoubtedly record that the international conferences of the Roosevelt administration involved in a very real sense an attempt to write peace treaties by the installment plan.

It is difficult to answer the charge, made in good faith by many critics of bipartisan foreign policy, that in those conferences the treaty-making clause of the Constitution was circumvented by the President of the United States. In any case, the conduct of the executive branch was not in keeping with the spirit and intent of a bipartisan foreign policy. Even the Potsdam agreement cannot escape its fair share of criticism on this score.

The administration's handling of our policy in China, particularly since the war, cannot be fitted into a traffic pattern of two-way cooperation between the White House and the Congress. For many months the State Department failed to discuss with the bipartisan leaders of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate its plans and policies in China, if it had any. Warning signals of dissension and criticism were raised in debate in the Senate many times during this period. On one occasion, during the Eightieth Congress, the Republican chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—and the man who is perhaps more responsible than any other living American for a willing acceptance on the part of Republicans, and for that matter Americans generally, of the need for national unity in support of a bipartisan foreign policy—admitted under questioning on the floor of the Senate that the State Department had not consulted with the Foreign Relations Committee for many months on any phase of the China problem. He admitted in the course of that debate that the contents of the Wedemeyer report had not been made known to the bipartisan leaders of the Foreign Relations Committee.

At that time, which was the fall of 1947, a serious crack developed in the seams of America's bipartisan foreign policy. It should have been cemented very quickly by a mutual exchange of points of view and information between the State Department and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Instead, the misunderstandings and criticism in respect to American policy in China became greater throughout 1947, 1948, and 1949. True, the predominant feeling in the Congress was overwhelmingly in support of any administration proposal offered in the name of a bipartisan policy. Nevertheless, those of us in the Senate who strongly supported the idea of maintaining a bipartisan foreign policy were both grieved and handicapped on many occasions over the failure of the State Department to take the bipartisan leaders of the Congress into its confidence and consultation in respect to Asia.

When the second session of the Eighty-first Congress convened on January 3, the administration faced a serious attack upon some aspects of its foreign policy, particularly those relating to China.

It is not too late to stop the trend toward partisanship in the field of American foreign policy. It is not too late to displace the distrust which some Senators have of the administration's foreign policy with a spirit of confidence and cooperation. If the administration will hasten to give not only the Congress but also the people of the United States the assurance that the leaders of both the Democratic and Republican Parties in the Congress will be taken into consultation preceding formulation of policy on any major international issue by the State Department and the White House, the breach can be healed before irreparable damage is done.

That is the test of the existence of a bipartisan foreign policy. No other course of action on the part of the administration will ever satisfy those who are questioning not only the existence but the worth of a bipartisan foreign policy. No other kind of cooperation will give the necessary strength to the hand of the great VANDENBERG by placing him in the strong position he deserves to be within the Republican Party when he is faced with laying an administration foreign policy request before the Republicans in the Senate for approval and support on a bipartisan basis.

A bipartisan foreign policy does not mean that Members of the Congress should hesitate to criticize any proposed course of action contemplated by the administration in the name of a bipartisan foreign policy. Rather it is the duty of a Member of the Congress to express criticisms. If in his honest judgment criticisms are due. However, experience shows that mutual cooperation and mutual exchanges of points of view between the administration and the leaders of Congress in advance of international commitment usually remove any basis for fair and just criticism.

What is more, the greatest assurance the administration has of maintaining a united American people behind the foreign policy of our country is to follow a truly cooperative effort in the formulation of a bipartisan foreign policy. The American people can be counted upon to respond in united support of a foreign policy which is the result of the cooperative effort of the leaders of both the Democratic and the Republican Parties. Whenever a split occurs between those leaders, then division of a serious nature is likely to develop among our people.

Rather than have the head of our Government attempt to negotiate with Stalin outside the framework of the United Nations, I would prefer to have our Government call for an extraordinary meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be participated in by the representatives of all nations, for the purpose of considering not only the international control of atomic and hydrogen bombs, but the control of all armaments as well.

I would have both parties join forces now—this year—in a world-wide appeal through the United Nations for an end to the armament race. It seems perfectly clear to me that the position taken by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished Senator from Maryland, Mr. TYDINGS, is unanswerable. He points out that unless the world agrees on some satisfactory machinery for controlling armament, the world will plunge itself into another war.

It is my opinion that the most important step the leaders of our Government could take in the interests of uniting the American people in the cause of winning the peace would be to announce a coalition of Democratic and Republican leaders charged with the responsibility of developing and administering foreign policy at the State Department level. Next, it should assure the American people that it will apply a bipartisan approach to foreign policy at the congressional level by consulting and seeking advice from Democratic and Republican congressional leaders in advance of any major international negotiation. Through such a coalition of Democratic and Republican leaders working together in a spirit of patriotic, nonpartisan statesmanship, we would be able to marshal a united American people behind any program which such a coalition of leaders might present to the United Nations for the international control of atomic and hydrogen bombs and the disarming of the arsenals of the world, whose very existence are bound to be a threat to the peace. Through such a coalition of Democrats and Republicans on the issue of winning the peace, I think our chances in our generation of seeing the sunrise of permanent peace would be greatly improved.

Each of us owes an obligation to our country, as I see it, to support a bipartisan approach to solving the crisis of our generation, which is winning the peace.

It is not going to be won without great national costs and sacrifices. It is not going to be won by making the mistake of ignoring the realities of world facts as they confront us today.

It is well for us to think in terms of the goals and ideals of a world order, based upon a system of international justice through law; but our immediate task is to cooperate with the other freedom-loving people of the world in demonstrating to Russia that we stand united in a determination to defend the peace from any Russian aggression.

However, at the same time, we must demonstrate that we stand ready to join with Russia and the other nations in an effective plan for international control of the manufacture of atomic and hydrogen bombs.

The hour of our generation may be the dusk and sunset of peace. As we close this day, let it be our prayer that through the cooperative efforts of all freedom-loving people throughout the world, our generation will see the dawn and sunrise of permanent peace.

Eisenhower Leads in Poll—Stassen Second in Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an interesting poll taken in Oregon recently and published in the Portland Oregonian. This poll is of the "scientific sampling" type, and not, as might be indicated, a newspaper clip-and-mail type. This poll is highly respected in our State for its proven accuracy over a period of years.

EISENHOWER LEADS POLL, STASSEN SECOND IN LINE—THE FRONT DOOR BALLOT BOX

(By Dan E. Clark II)

Although the next Presidential election is still far distant, Front Door Ballot Box editors felt that Oregonian readers would be interested in keeping tabs on the popularity of possible candidates in the 1952 elections.

To do this, interviewers asked a scientifically selected cross section of Oregon residents: Which of these men do you feel would

have the best chance of beating Mr. Truman in the 1952 Presidential election—Robert Taft, Dwight Eisenhower, or Harold Stassen?

The Front Door Ballot Box poll, reveals that Oregonians give Eisenhower the best chance of beating President Truman in 1952. He leads his nearest rival, Stassen, by more than a 2-to-1 margin, and Senator TAFT of Ohio, frequently mentioned as a candidate for the Republican nomination, trails Eisenhower by a 9-to-1 margin.

Here is how Oregonians rated the potential candidates on their chances of beating President Truman in 1952:

	Percent
Eisenhower	54
Stassen	22
Taft	6
None of these men	14
Undecided	4
Total	100

As one would expect, more Democrats than Republicans thought none of these men mentioned had a chance of beating President Truman.

This is how the chances of potential candidates stand with Democrats and Republicans at this time:

	Eisenhower	Stassen	Taft	None	Undecided
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Democrat	50	22	6	20	4
Republican	55	27	7	7	4

Where less than half of Portland residents pick Ike Eisenhower for first place, nearly 6 out of 10 upstaters felt Eisenhower had the best chance of beating Truman. There were also nearly three times as many Portlanders as upstaters who were pessimistic about the present chances of any of the men mentioned in opposition to Truman.

Figures below show the split in opinions between upstaters and Portlanders and veterans and nonveterans:

	Eisenhower	Stassen	Taft	None	Undecided
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Portland	50	25	6	20	3
Up-State	58	23	6	9	4
Veteran	56	22	8	11	3
Nonveteran	54	21	7	16	2

Abolition of Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on Monday I offered for the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of last Sunday. This editorial favored removing the Federal Government from the management and control of rents. I wish now to offer an editorial from the Washington Star of last night which supports the same point of view. Both of these editorials simply state the obvious when they maintain that a national emergency concerning rents is no longer present. Federal rent controls were employed and justified for the single reason that a national emergency did exist. Now that the national emergency foundation has been done away with it will best serve the welfare of the Nation to eliminate Federal rent controls.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT A FEDERAL PROBLEM

In moving to end Federal rent control by June 30, the Senate Appropriations Committee was motivated by the sound conclusion that this has ceased to be a Federal problem.

It is true that the President has asked for another year of Federal control. And it is also true that in some localities there is need for continued regulations of rents. But this need can and should be met by local action.

The 1949 rent control law set out procedures under which the States and their political subdivisions could free themselves from Federal control. Many have done so. Some 350 areas, with about 11,000,000 rental units, still are under Federal control. Some of these areas, as in the case of New York State, have stand-by controls of their own which become effective when Federal control ends. In other areas, where comparable local controls are lacking, the ending of Federal controls can be expected to work some hardship.

But this is not an argument for indefinite continuance of Federal regulation. Rent control was a wartime measure, designed to meet an emergency national need. The war has been over for nearly 5 years, and it is time for the Federal Government to step out of this picture. The yearly demand upon Congress for renewal of rent regulation shows, however, that the Federal Government will not let go of this power until Congress compels it to do so.

The True Meaning of Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a very fine article from the January 12, 1950, issue of the Wisconsin Lutheran, which is published in Madison, Wis. The subject of this article is The True Meaning of Security. It was reprinted from the National Lutheran, and it shows that security is more than material aid, such as is provided by governmental, private, and church welfare agencies. Security essentially is a thing of the spirit, and if misinterpreted, security can be a negative factor in life rather than a positive factor.

I believe that all spiritually minded Americans will be interested in this very fair article, and I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S HAVE MORE SECURITY

Slashed across the headline these days are details of the current drive for pensions, medical benefits, and higher wages. The Social Security Act and its many benefits have been an accepted part of the American way of life. Security and more security is the order of the day.

Ever since the Garden of Eden, man has been forced to struggle against the inexorable forces of nature for life itself; the present efforts toward achieving a greater security are only a part of the age-long struggle.

Welfare agencies and institutions of the church work from day to day with the problems of security in the lives of our people. Foster homes for rejected children, that they may have the feeling of being loved and wanted which is so vital to their well-being; adequate facilities for older people, where their physical, emotional, and spiritual needs may be met so that they, too, can feel loved and wanted; help for unmarried mothers; guidance and counseling in problems of marriage and the family—these are the things our welfare workers do to make more secure the lives of our people.

But what is security? What is this thing we are seeking? Webster and others say that security is "freedom from care, anxiety, or apprehension," "a confidence of safety," or "a feeling of certainty." From what cares, anxieties, and apprehensions do we want freedom? What sort of safety do we want? Of what must we be certain in order to be secure?

At the mention of "security" we almost invariably think of material things: Food, clothing, shelter, a good income, freedom from want in old age, and so on. And in an effort to achieve that security we slave and hoard, denying ourselves this and that, buying more insurance, piling up savings accounts, fearful all the time that the tides of fortune will sweep away overnight our tiny resources. Is that security? What did the Master say about such things? As I remember it, He said, "Lay not up your treasures on earth, where moth and rust do corrupt, and thieves break in and steal." Are we afraid to believe in Him?

Shakespeare, that wise student of human nature, had this to say: "As you all know, security is mortals' chiefest enemy." Security man's enemy? Yes, for security can rob life of its purpose, drain away all desire to achieve, stultify ambition and advancement. We were not made to sit back in soft security, growing fat and slothful; rather, we were made in the image of God to face life and its problems, secure in our faith in the Father and the ultimate triumph of good over evil. For security is not freedom from, but the ability to, the ability to face even with fear and trembling, the unknown of today and tomorrow, knowing all the while that our faith will carry us through.

None of us can deny that we have felt fear and anxiety. Fear and anxiety are natural reactions; they are also very corrosive, eating away at peace of mind. How are we to cope with fear and anxiety? How is the cast-off child to find a home and love and affection? How is the older person to find a safe and happy haven as the sands of life run out? Where does the family in trouble find help?

Lutheran welfare agencies and institutions supply the answer. Through them God brings care to those in need; through them we are used, by means of our contributions and volunteer efforts to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, visit the sick. And through the social security system and the other governmental efforts in the welfare field comes help to those in need. Truly we are all instruments in the hands of God for the service of our brothers and for His greater glory.

These things are not the whole answer, however. We must look to the Sermon on the Mount, where the Master laid down one of the most vital of all mental health principles when He said, "Therefore I say unto you, take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? * * * But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." (Matt. 6: 25, 33.) No government plan ever contemplated this kind of security.

There are those Christians among us who have tried out this promise of the Master, who daily live by this principle; they have found a true security far beyond anything ever contemplated by legislators or social planners. For security of the spirit transcends infinitely a security of body. Seek, then, if you will, the true security and find eternal life.—(S. Ross Pond, the National Lutheran.)

United World Federalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an encouraging letter concerning the hearings we are conducting in the Foreign Relations Committee on the resolutions having to do with amendments to the United Nations Organization and the World Organization.

I ask this, Mr. President, not because I am a sponsor of the World Federalists resolution, since as chairman of the subcommittee it is incumbent upon me that I remain neutral in regard to the various resolutions which are before us, but the educational worth of this letter from Dean Moore will be of interest to all the members of our committee, and that means practically all of them who want to see law under government and government under law extend throughout the whole earth.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME,
Notre Dame, Ind., February 23, 1950.

Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: All of us are deeply conscious that the most vitally important problem before the American people and the world generally today is the avoidance of another war and the establishing of a permanent, positive peace—a peace which is much more than the absence of a shooting war. We know that there will be no real victor in the next war—as there was not in World War II—but destruction and death everywhere beyond what most of us are able to imagine.

Recognizing this problem, the questions are, Can we solve it and how best can we solve it? In view of Russia's ideology, world foreign policy, etc., as known to us theoretically and as demonstrated by countless actions these past 4 or 5 years, I am convinced that we cannot expect any constructive cooperation from her presently and that we must try to avert disaster by a strong foreign policy and a show of strength in all directions. But I am equally convinced that peace cannot be achieved permanently through military might, power politics, pacts, and agreements, but only through law under government.

In every sphere of our present political organization—local, State, Federal—we preserve peace and order on this principle; law under government in its legislative, judiciary, and executive branches. The time has come when we must extend this principle to the world. Only in this way can we have international or world law in any strict sense of the term and, without such law under a supranational government, peace and order with justice cannot be established and maintained among nations.

I recognize that there are tremendous difficulties in the way of setting up a world federal government, especially since this government must be representative and constituted on democratic principles which recognize the sacred dignity of the human person and the inviolability of human rights. But these difficulties in my opinion do not excuse us from beginning now to work toward world federal government which alone can solve our most important problem, and perhaps save the world of men from their own destruction.

In this conviction I am a member of United World Federalists whose beliefs, purposes, and policies I endorse. I ask you to support these things, and I am sure that in doing so you will not jeopardize the national life of these United States but do the one most important thing possible to preserve this Nation both in these difficult times and for future generations.

Sincerely yours,
REV. PHILIP S. MOORE, C. S. C.,
Dean.

It's Only Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "It's Only Money" was published in the Washington News of February 28, 1950. The editorial, which is a very interesting one, discussed the absurdity of the Government's potato-buying program. I hope Senators who raise potatoes, especially my Republican friends, will take a look at that editorial.

I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S ONLY MONEY

With the absurdity of the Government's potato-buying program spelled out so clearly in the last few weeks, you'd think Congress would be eager to do something about it at the first opportunity.

It's going to cost the Government between $80,000,000 and $100,000,000 to maintain its price supports on the 1949 potato crop.

Eighty million dollars is the amount that will be taken in from the excise tax on luggage, handbags, and wallets this year. If we didn't spend it on useless potatoes, we could reduce or even eliminate this wartime levy now.

Eighty million dollars is the Government's total take from the income taxes of 394,000 married men with two children, each man earning $4,000 a year.

It's only money, of course, but it's your money the Government puts out to accumulate millions of bushels of throw-away potatoes, which you can't eat because the Government is buying them to keep them off the market and hold potato prices up.

Senator LUCAS (Democrat, Illinois) tried to do something about it for you. He's the administration leader in the Senate, but in this case he was bucking the administration and acting on his own.

Senator LUCAS proposed simply that all potato price props be dropped until strict marketing quotas were imposed to cut down those surpluses. He estimated it would save $60,000,000 to $70,000,000 of the taxpayers' money on the 1950 crop. It was one of the few times anyone in Congress has had the courage to fight on the floor for a move that actually would interrupt a farm-crop support program.

But what happened to Mr. LUCAS' proposal? It was defeated last Friday by a combination of farm-State Senators, including many members of the so-called economy bloc of Republicans. It was the old story of farm-subsidy grabbers banding together to head off a measure which might be a foot in the door against the whole costly structure of price supports.

Yesterday the Senate relented to the extent of passing a House-approved acreage bill which will drop potato price props unless marketing curbs are put into effect.

But the measure won't apply until 1951. And it won't save $60,000,000 to $70,00,0000 on the 1950 potato crop.

Appropriations for the United States Coast Guard Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Committees on Appropriations of both the Senate and the House of Representatives are presently giving consideration to a budget request from the Treasury Department for the United States Coast Guard Reserve. I am one of many in the Congress who hope that a reasonable appropriation will be agreed to because it will be impossible to establish a balanced security system for the Nation for as long as the Coast Guard Reserve remains inactive and without a training program. Because the two articles bear directly on a pressing need for approving a Coast Guard Reserve training program, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Seattle Times and an article by George Fielding Eliot be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Seattle Times of December 19, 1949]

NEGLECTING SECURITY OF NATION'S SEAPORTS

As a seaport city, Seattle is genuinely concerned over congressional neglect to provide any adequate training program for reservists of the United States Coast Guard. It is that service which is called on in an emergency to shoulder responsibility for the security of port facilities here and in every coastal city. Yet, funds have been withheld by the Eighty-first Congress to hold and train a reserve force sufficient to perform this vital function in case of trouble.

Efforts to obtain appropriations for this purpose, in fact, have failed for the past 3 years. President Truman has requested the comparatively inconsequential sum of $3,500,000 to provide a Coast Guard Reserve training program. The request has been repeatedly denied, and just before Congress adjourned, an item to supply the needed funds was stricken from the third deficiency appropriation bill.

The result is that Coast Guard reservists by the hundreds have flocked to other reserve organizations, and no program whatever has been set up to train those who remain on the reserve list in their port-security functions.

Seattle well remembers the excellent job the Coast Guard port-security detail did here all during the war. Many of its members still are available to be called to active duty in an emergency. The National Defense Establishment regards it as important to keep the reservists of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in trim and prepared for emergency service. It is no less important for the coast guardsmen to retain, and improve, their wartime skills.

It makes little difference whether this training is carried out as part of the Navy Reserve program, since the Coast Guard becomes a part of the Navy in war, or by the Coast Guard itself. The point is that an adequate training program should be set up, and the appropriations needed to put it into effect should be reconsidered when Congress reconvenes.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of February 12, 1950 (also in St. Louis Times-Dispatch)]

HARBORS CALLED OPEN TO ALIEN SHIPS WITH SMUGGLED A-BOMBS

(By George Fielding Eliot)

NEW YORK, February 11.—If the Russians wanted to send atom bombs, or H-bombs, into New York Harbor on merchant ships and explode them there, they could do it without much trouble. Atom Scientist Harold C. Urey told the Senate so on Wednesday, and he was right.

This reporter has just completed an exhaustive 2-week survey of port security in New York Harbor. Only one conclusion is possible—we're wide open to a sneak A-bomb attack. So are other United States seaports.

This is by no means the fault of the highly efficient customs, immigration, and Coast Guard men who inspect the ships entering our ports. There are simply not enough of these men to do a thorough job. Moreover, wartime port-security measures have been largely relaxed. Present efforts are directed toward preventing the illegal entry of alien persons and evasions of customs laws. The security set-up does these things quite effectively, but it wouldn't be likely to detect A-bombs before they went off.

SEEDS NOT EXAMINED

For example: Let's say a ship comes into the harbor with an A-bomb carried as a deckload. It's boxed and it's entered on the manifest as industrial machinery. At quarantine the customs boarding officer goes aboard. He finds the ship's papers in order. He doesn't examine the cargo then and there—he has neither the time nor the facilities to do so. The ship proceeds to an anchorage in the upper bay. Darkness falls. There is no customs patrol in small launches as there used to be during the war—the economy ax has abolished this patrol. The Coast Guard is supposed to patrol the harbor, but it doesn't have the cutters or the men to do a thorough job. So it's perfectly simple for the crew of the A-ship to hoist their bomb over the side and allow it to slip silently into the waters of New York Harbor with a time fuse attached.

Next day the ship unloads her regular—and innocent—cargo, complying with all usual formalities. The cargo is inspected by customs officers when it is unloaded. It is quite in accordance with the manifest. The ship sails away.

Three days later—boom! A huge column of water rises from the harbor—a deadly radioactive mist envelops the city—hundreds of thousands of people die or are incapacitated.

COULD LEAVE BOMB ABOARD

Or take another approach. The ship has the A-bomb either as a deck load, or in her hold just under a cargo hatch. She proceeds to a pier in the heart of Manhattan and ties up, late in the afternoon, too late to unload that day. The members of the crew have their papers—all correct. They go ashore and, presumably get out of town fast. That night the bomb goes off, and D-blasts a vast gaping wound into the center of New York City.

If it were desired to have bombs sent to inland cities as well, it could be done by the simple device of shipping them in bond, thus avoiding customs examination in the port of New York. The time fuze would have to allow ample margin for the period of transit from the New York pier to a railroad freight station, then to a customs warehouse to await application for entry by the consignee, who would, of course, never show up. In this way such cities as St. Louis or Chicago, Pittsburgh, or Detroit could be reached by a sneak A-bomb attack.

Probably the A-ships wouldn't be flying the Soviet flag. In fact, only one Soviet ship entered New York harbor during the whole of 1949. Arrangements would be made with the comrades of some other country to do the job. That would be a simple matter.

MORE PERSONNEL NEEDED

Guarding our seaports against this form of attack is, however, not so simple. We will need cutter patrols, manned by experienced customs and Coast Guard personnel, in every major harbor. We will need to expand the customs searching squads in 10 times their present strength, using experienced men as squad leaders, training others as fast as possible. We will have to exercise the closest watch over the entry of foreign ships and over all activities aboard them; it may be necessary to station guards on board every such ship during its entire stay in harbor. We will have to seek the close and constant cooperation of friendly governments to detect in advance the approach of a ship whose crew includes persons suspected of Communist affiliations. Ships from ports which are behind the iron curtain may have to be excluded altogether, or permitted to unload only at isolated anchorage far from any worth while atomic target.

One unhappy fact is that the reservoir of trained personnel for port security duties—the United States Coast Guard Reserve, with a wartime strength of 144,000 officers and men—exists today only on paper. The last Congress refused to pass a $3,000,000 appropriation for training this reserve. It's a deficiency which must be corrected, for it's the very foundation of security for our great seaports. But this will only be a start toward real security for the coastal cities of the United States, which today are sitting ducks for an A-bomb.

Abduction of Greek Children

REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the thousands of Greek children who have been abducted from their homes in Greece, spirited away surreptitiously and hidden behind the iron curtain is one of the most tragic, deplorable, and reprehensible crimes chargeable to the Communist regimes. It is unthinkable that such inhumanities could occur in a civilized world, and it is of utmost importance that our Government persist in its efforts, by moral and economic persuasion, to force the return to Greece of the 28,000 children.

Last Sunday afternoon more than a thousand persons attended a meeting in Cleveland sponsored by 35 societies of Americans of Greek descent urging concerted action on the part of our Government and of the United Nations to restore these children to their homes and parents. Homes must be preserved inviolate. Parents have the God-given right and obligation to rear their own children, and the children likewise should be given the opportunity to live and grow up under the guidance and influence of their own parents, rather than to be reared as abject slaves wholly subject to the atheistic philosophy of a state which considers them as chattels instead of children of God.

I urge the President and our Government to act promptly in this matter.

Under unanimous consent I include in my remarks a telegram containing a resolution adopted by the combined societies of Cleveland, which is as follows:

FOR THE REPATRIATION OF 28,000 ABDUCTED GREEK CHILDREN NOW DETAINED IN CERTAIN COUNTRIES

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *February 26, 1950.*

Whereas the general assembly of the United Nations has formally announced that 28,000 children were forcibly abducted from their homes in Greece during the recent guerrilla war and are now detained in the various iron-curtain countries of Europe; and

Whereas two resolutions unanimously passed by the United Nations General Assembly seeking the prompt repatriation of these children have proved of no avail due to lack of cooperation on the part of the iron-curtain countries; and

Whereas we believe that the relationship of mother and child is a divine natural instinct above any human control; and that, the right of mother and child to be together and to cherish the love which is inherent in this relationship has been recognized and respected by all civilized peoples throughout the ages: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That this assembly of 1,000 citizens of the city of Cleveland and surroundings with Governor Lausche and Mayor Burke, of Cleveland, partaking, raises its voice in protest for the abduction and forcible detention of these innocent children and registers its indignation for such inhuman practices; and be it further

Resolved, That this assembly respectfully urges and petitions the President of the United States, the State Department of the United States, and the Congress of the United States and the general assembly of the United Nations to use their good offices and bear pressure upon the respective governments in whose territory these Greek children are detained to the end that these 28,000 unfortunate victims be speedily returned to their motherland; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of this assembly to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the United States Congress and to the Members thereof from the State of Ohio and to the representatives of the United States to the General Assembly of the United Nations and to the general secretary thereof.

Respectfully submitted.

LOUIS B. SELTZER, *Chairman.*
JOHN KRAS, *Secretary.*

Nebraska's Eighty-third Anniversary

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, 83 years ago, on March 1, 1867, the one-time Territory of Nebraska was admitted to the Federal Union of States as a full partner in this Republic.

It has become an established custom for Members of Congress to admire and extol the wisdom, the courage, the farsightedness of the founding fathers whose combined experience wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. That custom is just and reasonable. Yet, there is a single drawback to that custom. It assumes that, after the creation of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, the statesmen of this Nation made no further contribution toward true government by the people.

I do not speak for any other State. I do speak for Nebraska. In 1867, the first legislature of the new State of Nebraska accepted a great seal for my State. The motto on that great seal is: "Equality Before the Law."

This statement, to me, was and is one of the most significant of all time.

Why?

Bitterness was rampant in Nebraska 83 years ago. Civil War guns still echoed in many ears. Spiritual wounds had not healed. Boys in blue settled next to the boys in gray. Old feuds broke out. Grievances soon found their way to the courts. To Nebraska courts these disputes were not between the blue and the gray—rather, they were between citizens of the State of Nebraska. They were decided fairly, justly, according to the evidence. There was "equality before the law."

Other antagonisms could well have made the newly established State a dark and bloody ground. The early settlers of some of our counties were of English ancestry. A great wave of Irish migration swept into these counties in the late sixties and early seventies. This could—and did—make for strife. True to Old World tradition, pioneers of German and French origin carried on their battle which began before recorded history. Swedes and Danes clashed. Yet, to Nebraska courts, there were no English nor Irish, no French nor Germans, no Swedes nor Danes. Nebraska courts recognized no national origins. Contestants before the courts were Nebraska citizens. There was "equality before the law."

Perhaps the most serious conflict of all in early Nebraska was between the old-timer and the johnny-come-lately. Nebraska was a new State in 1867, but it had had white settlers since the time of the Revolutionary War and before. The first to come resented the intrusion of the newcomers, regardless of their national origin or their Civil War sympathies. The newcomers resented the know-it-all and own-it-all attitude of the people whom they found living in their new home. Naturally, these resentments ultimately led to the courts. Nebraska courts made no distinction between the old and the new. The cases involved were decided on their legal merits alone. There was "equality before the law."

What kind of equality was this?

I like to think of it as David's kind of equality—the kind of which he sang in the Fifty-fifth Psalm:

> It was thou, a man mine equal, my guide, and mine acquaintance. We took sweet counsel together, and walked unto the house of God in company.

What kind of law was this?

I like to think of it as James' kind of law, the kind of which he spoke in his general epistle:

> But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed.

Nebraska needed its respected courts to enforce the peace. But, as David said, going to church together was perhaps the greatest single influence of equality our State could afford. German went to the same church with Frenchman. Dane and Swede sang the same hymns. Men who had shot at each other in the Civil War listened to the word of God—together—in Nebraska's new equality.

The wall between old settlers and new settlers was broken down because every Nebraskan had to be, by dire necessity, a "doer of the work." Old-timer gave of his own sparse supplies to newcomer when newcomer's worldly goods were destroyed by a swift prairie fire. Newcomer fought his way through a blinding blizzard to old-timer's sod house, risking his life that old-timer might live. Their women joined together at quiltings. Their men broke barriers at barn raisings. They helped each other bury their dead in common cemeteries after Indian raids. They celebrated together after bumper harvests. They pulled in their belts after the grasshoppers had eaten their land barren.

What began as a reluctant association in "equality before the law" was welded, by living together, into a common bond of one people, one Government, one God.

By unfailing adherence to the "law of liberty," Nebraska has prospered. This—in spite of two world wars which have taken its wealth and its youth. Nebraska has been able to recover from even these crowning catastrophes because it has been conceived in privation and has grown amidst hardship.

Ours is a producing State. Our cement, clay products, and stone are widely used in the American building industry.

In agriculture, Nebraska has made tremendous strides within the past few years. We lead in the production of wild hay over all our 47 competitor States. We are up in the front ranks of the producers of corn, oats, wheat, barley, rye, alfalfa, potatoes, sugar beets, sorghums and soybeans. We are well above other States, greater in size and in population, in producing cattle, swine, and sheep. It is natural that the chief industry of our State is that of food processing. It is natural that Omaha, principal center of the Nebraska food-processing industry, should be first city in the world in butter manufacturing.

Nebraska's progressive people of today—direct heirs of a pioneer past—have exercised a high degree of ingenuity in the development of their inheritance. Of the State's total area of 77,237 square miles, approximately a million acres have been made to produce more and better crops through irrigation. Then, too, Nebraska was one of the first North Central States to put into action a planned program of farm-to-market roads. These well-graded or hard-surfaced roads have enabled Nebraska farmers to get their crops to market, irrespective of the weather, with maximum speed and with minimum spoilage.

Nor has Nebraska's most valuable product—its human product—been neglected. No Nebraska community is without its grammar school and its high school. Many communities have their junior colleges which have been functioning over a considerable span of years. We have a State university and one municipal university. We have two denominational universities. We have 12 denominational colleges and four State teachers colleges. It can truthfully be said that every Nebraskan can receive his complete formal education—from kindergarten to doctor of medicine—without leaving his home State.

Nebraskans are individualists today, as they were 83 years ago. You cannot fence in their thoughts. Our State has seen Populists and Bull Moosers, Democrats and Republicans.

But, individualistic Nebraskans have no peace with pink-tea "liberals" who parrot social and economic phrases and shift their viewpoint with each change in party line—"liberals" who are liberal only in the sense of stealing the savings of others through taxes.

Nebraska individualists have shown themselves to be mid-twentieth century progressives. We have the only unicameral State legislature in the United States. We have an efficient preprimary system of selection of party candidates. All electric power facilities in the State are publicly owned. Yet, never have we flown in the face of the Republic. Never have we flouted the Constitution. Nebraska has the lowest per-capita tax of any State in the Union. We have no bonded indebtedness, and there is a surplus in our State treasury.

On this, the eighty-third anniversary of the admission of Nebraska as a State, I am proud to define the Nebraskan of 1867 and the Nebraskan of 1950—for they both require one and the same definition. A Nebraskan is a forward-looking American, with a long, long memory.

American Foreign Policy and the International Trade Organization (ITO)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is the address I delivered at the annual dinner of the United States Customs Examiners Association held at the Hotel Statler in New York on February 21, 1950:

The International Trade Organization Charter was adopted at Havana on March 24, 1948, by 54 nations, including the United States, bills to provide United States membership in the Organization have been pending since January 1949, and the President sent the Congress a special message on it in April 1949, yet vigorous action with respect to the approval of the Charter and the acceptance of membership by the United States in the Organization has been singularly lacking. This in spite of the fact that the reestablishment of multilateral trade among the free nations, which is its central purpose, is absolutely essential to world economic recovery and particularly to western Europe if the European recovery program is to have a chance of ending in 1952.

If the administration has been restrained in pushing for United States membership in the ITO out of fear of its opponents, it is time that the issue was faced and that the American people understood that ITO is an essential ingredient for maintaining our own prosperity and for attaining world prosperity.

European production has increased materially over what it was in 1938 and 1939, over 50 percent in an item like cement, yet Europe is still in dire need of American dollar aid, and the spectre of communism is still haunting Europe should such aid end before the dollar gap—still at about $3,000,000,000—is bridged. What is lacking is a system of trade relations among the European nations and between them and the rest of the world to assure the development of regular and continuous international markets making possible the most economical use of Europe's production resources. Europe now has done reasonably well in the battle of production, but she needs markets and it is exactly the purpose of the ITO to facilitate the opening up of markets.

The Communists count heavily on the fear of depression among the free peoples as a means for their infiltration. ITO can do more to assuage that fear for the free nations of the world than any other international measure now seriously before us. American efforts to attain economic integration in Europe and elsewhere are negated by the failure of the United States for almost 2 years to acquire membership and thereby to bring into being the ITO which has the greatest capability for establishing the conditions for integration, both in Europe and elsewhere. Charges that the ITO will deprive the United States of tariff bargaining power are baseless, in view of the express provisions in the Charter itself which provide only that members will enter into and carry out negotiations directed toward the substantial reduction of tariffs and the elimination of preferences. This is no more and no less than the United States is already doing under the reciprocal trade agreements program last year extended for an additional period of 3 years, and no more and no less than it is bound to do under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade negotiated by the United States with the 22 other signatories at Geneva on October 30, 1947, and declared in effect for the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada, and five other principal commercial nations on January 1, 1948.

Opponents of the ITO are entirely negativist in attacking a constructive world plan developed since 1945 largely at the urging of the United States to facilitate world trade, without offering anything whatever in its place except either chaos, or such trade barriers and trade restrictions as are seriously hampering world trade and world recovery, today. As early as the lend-lease agreements with Great Britain in February 1942 the United States was already insisting that negotiations should be had for the reduction of tariffs, the elimination of tariff preferences, and the removal of other barriers to the expansion of international trade. This policy was continued when the United States came out with practical proposals for this purpose in December 1945 and when these proposals were refined in several international conferences culminating in the conference at Geneva which lasted from April to August 1947 and resulted in the adoption by the 18 principal trading nations of the world, other than the U. S. S. R., of a draft charter for the ITO. This draft became the basis for the charter adopted by 54 nations at the final International Conference on Trade and Employment in Habana, from December 1947 to March 1948.

The establishment and success of ITO is, among all the nations, the most vital to the United States for the United States today is the big exporting nation of the world with much at stake in respect to its own economy in maintaining these exports. Total United States exports for 1949 are estimated at $12,000,000,000, while total imports are estimated at $6,500,000,000, leaving a net export balance of $5,500,000,000. The situation in which the United States found itself before and just after World War I when it feared a flood of cheap imports from European and other countries where lower labor costs prevailed and which resulted in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, is now completely reversed. Other trading nations of the world now fear that their markets will be flooded by our manufacturers and that their resources will be drained away by our goods as soon as they are not longer the subject of aid from us such as is afforded by the ERP. Without an ITO we may expect that these countries would erect even higher tariff barriers against our trade and engage in more discrimination and preferential arrangements than ever, and in view of the prevalence of state trading, they are in a better position than ever to do so. If we retaliated, as indeed we would have to, and so would other nations, it would defeat the effort of western Europe at recovery, would jeopardize our own domestic economy which to a growing extent is dependent on an export market and would materially improve the chances of communism infiltrating Europe.

Freer world trade must also be recognized as absolutely essential by those who contend that there must be an end to programs of American aid overseas, for this can only be achieved through greater imports into the United States and through triangular trade which are being hampered and thwarted by existing trade barriers and trade restrictions. These dangerous facts are borne out by the slipping off already taking place in United States exports, in 1949 $2,500,000,000 below their 1947 peak and estimated in 1950 to be a billion or more dollars under 1949. This export trade, though only a small percentage of our total production, is of the most critical importance to our general economic prosperity. For example, in agricultural products like wheat, cotton, and tobacco we normally export from 20 to 33 percent of the total crop. This is equally true in other merchandise and industrial fields like drugs and automobiles, where we normally export 20 percent of our production; machine tools, where we normally export 40 percent; and farm machinery, where we normally export 20 to 30 percent of our production. Yet while $12,000,000,000 of exports represents only about 6 percent of our current output and something under 10 percent of goods and commodities produced, in key items it represents the difference between profit and loss and success and failure—and the impact of these key items on our whole economic structure and on employment generally in our country is far more vital than the 6 percent figure or the 10 percent indicates. This was very clearly evidenced during the depression when the state of our economic health went down drastically right along with a drop in our import and export figures which hit a low of $1,600,000,000 and $1,300,000,000, respectively, in 1932 and 1933.

We are failing badly in our imports, too. According to our economic history and taking into consideration the over-all increase of about one-third in prices generally since prewar, we should be importing not $8,500,000,000 of goods a year but $9,500,000,000, or more. Imports from South America, from Canada, and from Central America have held up to this level but imports from Europe are about one-half of what they were prewar, and from Asia but a fraction of what they were prewar. As the greatest market in the world, there are many types of goods we ought to get from the world to improve materially our own standard of living. Linens, laces, china, glass, leather goods, and fine cutlery which enhance and beautify life could be acquired by us more plentifully from overseas. Imports of strategic raw materials which we lack, as well as raw materials in which it is advisable for us to husband our own resources, all of which are in long supply elsewhere in the world, should be of the greatest interest to us; these include oil, copper, manganese, industrial diamonds, rubber, and many other items.

The ITO charter proposes to establish rules of trade exactly such as the greatest trading nation on earth would want, and generally of a kind which only narrow nationalism or an iron-curtain ideology should oppose. The charter makes the first international effort to eliminate quantitative restrictions on imports—that is, limitations on the quantity of a certain type of goods which may be imported into a particular country; to eliminate preferential arrangements on imports between two countries which discriminate against other countries; to eliminate discriminations on imports when they enter the stream of internal commerce with regard to excise taxes or sales restrictions; and to regulate subsidization of exports by Government so that it is not used as a weapon in order to capture markets. These are the very practices which were refined into a science by the Nazis who victimized Europe with coercive barter agreements by which the foisted unneeded goods—like harmonicas and aspirins—on peoples who were breaking their backs to produce food, and the ITO charter for the first time proposes to bring under some control these dangerous foreign trade weapons. The charter also makes universal for members of the organization the most-favored-nation treatment providing for nondiscriminatory opportunity to all to trade and provides also that customs and trade regulations shall not unduly burden or discriminate against imports—as for example to provide standard procedures for determining value for customs purposes. State trading, cartels, and intergovernmental commodity agreements are brought by the charter under some measure of international review in order to see that they are not used as weapons against world trade for selfish purposes, while for the first time on a world political as well as economic level an effort is made to establish in the charter an international code of fair treatment for investors in foreign countries.

The charter, also for the first time on an international basis, seeks to establish some rules for state monopolies of import or export trade, or state trading operations so widely prevalent in the world today, requiring them to operate in accordance with commercial considerations and customary business practices and to allow adequate opportunity for competition to the enterprises of other member countries.

Admittedly the charter has many exceptions, even some exceptions which weaken the charter materially. For example, those regarding the subsidization of exports which are quite general and weak, but these are attributable to the low state of the world's economy, to the grave difficulties created by the ravages of war and to a multitude of traditional trade relationships having a tendency to hamper trade which have grown up through the centuries, and which until ITO, no major effort was made to dispel. Certain of these exceptions were requested by the United States, notably those to protect our farm price stabilization program and to protect our own essential national security. We also insisted on the fundamental exception which we have written into all our reciprocal trade negotiations that tariff concessions may be suspended or withdrawn if increased imports cause or threaten serious injury to our domestic producers. Finally, we effected a great reform in opportunities for our moving-picture industry, the greatest in the world, and as influential in teaching other peoples how Americans live as in furnishing entertainment. The ITO charter eliminates import quotas for movies and substitutes quotas of screen time making for competition instead of restriction.

The major exceptions of which other countries are likely to take advantage relate to quantitative restrictions by countries that are in balance of payments difficulties, new preferences and exceptions to the most-favored-nation rule incidental to the formation of customs unions or required for economic development, and other restrictions on imports may be utilized for the same purpose. However, for the first time in the history of international trade, each nation may not act freely in these respects as it chooses, but is circumscribed by certain criteria which it must meet to obtain either the approval of the International Monetary Fund, or of the ITO itself before engaging in these practices.

The United States, however, or any other member of ITO may withdraw from the organization on 60 days' notice if dissatisfied with a decision of the organization.

The free nations of the world are by now fairly well agreed that hunger and despair are the breeding ground for communism, yet an analysis of world income shows how far we are from decent living standards and how far we have to go to attain what we ought to consider a civilized world. A study of these figures makes us understand why such vast areas of the world and so many millions of people listen to a Communist ideology which is to us puerile, cynical, and degrading. Three-fifths of the people of the world have incomes of less than $100 a year, and living standards accordingly. Even in more highly developed countries, contrasted with United States per capita average income of $1,400 in 1948, France, the United Kingdom, and Argentina show per capita incomes of around $400 a year, and countries like Colombia, Brazil, Guatemala, and Chile show per capita incomes of about $100 a year.

Great vistas of higher standards of living and general well-being can be opened up by us for the teeming millions of the world, and the challenge of communism decisively defeated and driven back from where it has already taken hold, as in the vast area of China. It seems clear that we are most likely to attain these goals for the peoples of the world if world trade can flow fairly and easily. Our acceptance of membership in the ITO will be the signal for acceptance by the other signatories at Havana. Before then they will not sign, for the success of ITO is dependent upon us, by far the biggest trading nation of them all.

The establishment of ITO will confound the Communists who predict that on the issue of economics, the democracies will cut each other's throats. It will demonstrate the ability of the democratic nations to unite on economic principles which are essential to their success. It will decisively refute the claims of the Soviet propagandists that economic cataclysm is on the horizon for the free nations. We have already delayed much too long in organizing for the counter-offensive against communism which is inherent in the ITO. Timidity plays into Communist hands. ITO has been by now so thoroughly discussed and analyzed on record and indeed third thought that we ought to have our national debate on it and act. It will be for our world leadership a departure as vital as ERP from all previous world leadership.

Less Talk, More Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, in the Bremerton (Wash.) Sun able editor Julius Gius complains mildly of the catch-all nature of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, and asks for consideration of a "less talk" news item from Norway.

We must work for increased efficiency, but that is not always accomplished through the means suggested by the Norwegian Storting.

With a sad memory of the years when all democracy was blacked out in Norway, I recall with joy that wonderful day in 1945 when I stood with a cheering crowd on the dock at Oslo, Norway, to welcome home from England the free Norwegian Government, which had long been exiled by the totalitarian Nazi.

During all those years of German occupation there was no debate because there was no Storting, as Norway's Congress is called. Totalitarians always have feared not only free debate but all other democratic institutions.

Even with the hope engendered by the Government's return, the fact that a democratic government had not functioned for years in Norway created an atmosphere which contrasted noticeably with that in Sweden where the Riksdag, which I visited only a few days before, was democratically active.

Yes, Editor Gius, there must be a more efficient way to do things than that exemplified by our 16-hour day on the fair employment practices bill last week, but remember that the longest speech during this time was 15 minutes and the great majority of them were made under the 5-minute rule. No matter what our attitude as to this legislation, it was fairly and openly debated.

I ask unanimous consent to have the following editorial reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD so that, as the Sun requests, Members of Congress may read this debate and working-hour limitation:

LESS TALK, MORE WORK

That voluminous Washington publication, known as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains a daily Appendix which is filled with letters, speeches that never were delivered, some few that had been, reprints from hither and yon, very bad poetry, and miscellany of every sort.

We'd like to submit to said periodical one very brief paragraph that we've just run across in a Norwegian publication, with our prayer that it, too, be reprinted. Here goes:

"The Norwegian Storting has been considering how to increase its working efficiency. After 5½ hours' debate last week it was decided to limit speeches by party leaders, cabinet members, and chairmen of committees to a maximum of 1 hour, and to limit speeches by others to 20 minutes. It was also decided that the morning meeting of Parliament shall extend from 10 a. m. to 3 p. m. without the 1 hour's break at noon, which has been customary."

We'd hope that some few, at least, of our Senators and Representatives might read the item. We'd even hope that one or two might think the idea laudable and, maybe, try to do something with it.

A Profile of Hon. Jacob K. Javits, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the magazine New Yorker concerning our colleague from New York, Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS:

PROFILES—THE GENTLEMAN FROM NEW YORK

(By E. J. Kahn, Jr.)

As the Member of the House of Representatives from the Twenty-first Congressional District of New York, JACOB KOPPEL JAVITS, an energetic, informed, and ambitious lawyer generally addressed by the people whose backs he slaps as Jack, is the spokesman on the national scene for the slightly more than 300,000 inhabitants of the upper west side of Manhattan. JAVITS, who was born on the lower east side of Manhattan, has been in Congress only 9 years, but he has so rapidly adjusted to his environment that he can

now use a phrase like "warp and woof" in ordinary parlor conversation without blinking. He is a stocky man of 45, 5 feet 9 inches in height, with a gleaming bald head and gleaming white teeth. His appearance suggests an erudite version of Jack Benny, with whom, unlike some of his legislative colleagues, he has nothing occupational in common. JAVITS has always been an exceptionally serious-minded man, and he is a serious-minded legislator. He has a high regard for businesslike efficiency and is himself a sturdy example of it. When he first went to Congress, another legislator asked a mutual friend what kind of political machine the newcomer had behind him. "JAVITS doesn't need one" was the answer. "He is a machine." JAVITS has a strong social conscience, an alert and retentive mind, a fluent tongue, a courtly manner, and an air of indomitable self-assurance. He dresses expensively and carefully but without the flashiness of many politicians. During one of the two congressional campaigns in which he has been a candidate, a coworker suggested to him that he enhance his visual appeal to the voters by adopting some gay sartorial symbol. The friend mentioned Al Smith's brown derby and the success that that had enjoyed. JAVITS forthwith bought himself a black fedora, and scarcely took it off his head until election day. There is no reason to believe that it influenced a single vote.

The Twenty-first District, a politically, socially, and intellectually heterogeneous area with no particular feeling one way or another about haberdashery, hugs the bank of the Hudson River from One Hundred Fourteenth Street north through Inwood and extends as far west, here and there, as St. Nicholas Terrace and the Harlem River. It takes in Washington Heights, Marble Hill, Manhattanville, Morningside Heights, and Hamilton Grange. Its main thoroughfares are Broadway and Riverside Drive, and within its boundaries lie Columbia University, the Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center, Lewisohn Stadium, and the tombs of such antithetical celebrities as General Grant and Saint Frances Xavier Cabrini, the first American to be canonized. It is a middle-income district. Substantial blocs of Catholics and Negroes are to be found in it, but it is predominantly Jewish; since the 1930's so many refugees from Germany have sought it out as a haven that it is now occasionally called the Fourth Reich. It was traditionally regarded as a stronghold of Tammany Hall until 1946, when JAVITS, running on the Republican and Liberal Party tickets, dethroned the Democratic Party there.

A Congressman is, of course, supposed to espouse the views of his constituents, and JAVITS has tried harder than many of his colleagues to ascertain what those views are. During his 1946 campaign, he established a political precedent by engaging Elmo Roper, at a cost of $2,000, to sound out the residents of the district on how they felt about things, and he ordered a similar poll taken in 1948, when he successfully ran for reelection. On both occasions, Roper's operatives collared a thousand people of voting age (presumably a cross-section of the Twenty-first), and questioned them, for JAVITS' edification, about such issues as housing, the cost of living, atomic energy, China, public works, labor relations, the Soviet Union, and the quality of the performance of the Congress of the United States. JAVITS learned, among other things, that his potential constituents were markedly prolabor, and after being elected he dutifully voted against the Taft-Hartley Act, to the anguish of many of his Republican colleagues, who felt, as his party irregularity since then has caused them to continue to feel, that he was being grievously disloyal to their grand old cause.

Roper's 1948 survey disclosed that only 8.8 percent of the thousand constituents could correctly name their Congressman, JAVITS' predecessor; that 6.9 percent thought they could but came up with the wrong name; and that the remaining 84.3 percent, many of them well informed on atomic energy and China, found the question utterly beyond them. In 1948, when the same question was asked and the right answer was, of course, "JAVITS," 33.1 percent gave that name, and only 5.3 percent somebody else's. This was enormously pleasing to JAVITS. A few weeks ago, guided solely by a hunch, he estimated that well over half of his constituents could now, if challenged, name their representative. If that is so, he is, by big-city political standards remarkably well known in his district. His relative renown stems partly from the diligence with which he has looked out for the interests of his flock, and partly from his having demonstrated a nice flair for getting his name publicized not only within the narrow limits of the twenty-first district but also in the outside world, where he has had to compete for attention with the favorite sons of the four hundred and thirty-four other congressional districts. JAVITS works hard to this end. He almost never makes a speech or issues a statement without embodying in it expressions of sentiment that he regards as quotable and without distributing numerous mimeographed copies thereof. When Drew Pearson, who had once described him as "an effective operator," failed to mention him in an item that JAVITS thought he deserved to be counted in on, JAVITS hastily telephoned the columnist, fearful that he had somehow unwittingly hurt his feelings and eager to make amends. Such enterprise has paid off. JAVITS was, for example, the only Congressman to be honored by Forbes Magazine, a while ago, on a page headed "Thoughts on the business of life," in which one of JAVITS' thoughts (it had to do with the responsibility of the United States to the rest of the world) was quoted alongside thoughts of Abraham Lincoln, George Eliot, Irving Berlin, and an anonymous hotel proprietor in Syracuse who had put up a sign on his premises stating that business has never invented a substitute for customer satisfaction. Many of JAVITS' constituents feel that, by gaining recognition of such a high type, their congressman has brought them gratifying recognition, too. "You've put Washington Heights on the map," a pastor of that neighborhood told him a few weeks ago. JAVITS takes a more modest view of his achievements. "I've done a lot for the district," he says, "but the district has done a lot for me, too."

The mere fact of being elected a Congressman does a lot for any man. It generally means, for instance, that his State bureau of motor vehicles grants him a distinguished-looking license plate; JAVIT's current New York number is an eye-catching and cop-stopping JJ 20. Like his colleagues, he is entitled to, among other prerogatives, free medical care in Federal hospitals; Government-printed calling cards proclaiming his eminence; 68 copies of each daily printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and two bound sets of the collected issues of that massive and colorful journal; Government-made ice cubes, in the event that he should care to offer a drink to a constituent or a colleague visiting his office; Government-owned office furniture; and Government-supplied paper clips, towels, soap, brooms, and hothouse plants. The plants are lent to Congressmen to brighten their offices by the United States Botanic Garden, a couple of blocks from the Capitol. When the plants begin to wilt, the Garden obligingly sends a man around to pick them up and substitute fresh ones.

Congressmen otherwise decorate their chambers according to individual taste. One of JAVITS' closest legislative cronies is an ardent collector of ancient paintings and statuary; his office resembles an antique shop. In the realm of fine arts, JAVITS himself, like the majority of his colleagues, prefers to make do with what is readily available—calendar art bestowed upon the Nation's legislators by railroads and air lines, and framed, like any similar decoration, at the cost of the Government, provided that the users supply the glass. JAVITS has elected to deck his legislative headquarters with sparkling vistas of MacArthur Park, in Los Angeles; Old North Church, in Boston; and the lower tip of Manhattan, which is part of the Sixteenth Congressional District. An occasional visitor from the twenty-first may grumble that, geographically speaking, this gallery is hardly suitable, but without departing from his make-do policy JAVITS is powerless to remedy the situation; the travel companies have not as yet seen fit to pay pictorial tribute to Marble Hill, Manhattanville, or Hamilton Grange. JAVITS is assigned a two-room air-conditioned suite in the older of the two House Office Buildings, adjacent to the Capitol. His windows afford a view of an interior courtyard. As his seniority increases he will be entitled to better quarters, and someday, perhaps, will enjoy an outside view from the new House Office Building. On the desk in his private chamber, as befits a man in his job, are a Bible, an elephant, and pictures of his mother, his wife, and his two small children; behind the desk is an American flag, and on the floor next to the desk a spittoon, both furnished all Congressmen by a Government sensitive to legislators' needs. There are bookcases whose contents attest to the catholicity of JAVITS' interests—Science and Farming, the Veteran Comes Back, Poland Struggles Forward, and a 1947 Texas Almanac. Framed on the walls are a replica of the United Nations Charter; a Government pay check for 42 cents earned by JAVITS during part of 1941, when he was a dollar-a-year man; a photograph of the Eightieth Congress taken on January 3, 1947, his first day in office; and a copy of H. R. 3762, a piece of legislation known as the National Heart Act, that went into effect on June 16, 1948, and that is, to date, the only bill introduced by JAVITS (except for one affecting a lone constituent of his) to have become the law of the land. In the same frame with H. R. 3762, which provides for Government-sponsored research into causes of and cures for heart and cardio-vascular diseases, is the pen President Truman signed it with. JAVITS had to pay for this fancy job; the House framing service draws the line at three-dimensional objects.

JAVITS has a staff of six assistants, which is about normal for a legislator who takes his work seriously and has, or contrives to have, a good deal of work to do. His aides are evenly divided between the two poles of his political axis. In New York, he has a personal secretary and two part-time political secretaries, one representing the Republican Party and one the Liberal Party, who act as liaison men between him and his constituents. In Washington, sharing the outer office that leads into JAVITS', are another personal secretary, a press-and-legislative secretary, and a stenographer. None of the six is related to JAVITS, by blood or by marriage. All are on the Federal pay roll, and last year they collectively received $20,170. JAVITS' salary came to $12,500, and he also got a tax-free expense allowance of $2,500. Then there was $800 for stationery, $500 for telegrams and long-distance phone calls (local calls are on the House), and—since each Congressman is granted 20 cents a mile, every session, for the round trip between Washington and his home district—$89.20 for carfare.

JAVITS and the members of his staff take in, among them, more than $35,000 a year, but it costs closer to $50,000 a year to run his legislative office. He is able to make ends meet because, like many other Congressmen, he leads a perfectly honorable double life;

he devotes some time to the law firm, of which he is still a partner, that he was associated with in his pre-legislative days, and he continues to draw an income from it, though a considerably smaller one than he did when he was a single-minded man. JAVITS supplements his aides' pay out of his own pocket; he spends nearly $2,000 twice a year for printing and addressing a letter to 90,000 of his constituents, reporting on his activities; his telegrams and long-distance calls come to much more than he is allotted for them; he keeps up residences in both Washington and New York; and he has to foot a personal transportation bill that all by itself more than eats up his expense allowance. Congressmen whose districts are remote from Washington are rarely able to get back where they came from during a legislative session, but men whose districts are nearby find it not only possible but useful to make frequent trips home.

Many legislators from New York, Philadelphia, and other places reasonably close to Washington habitually attend to local affairs a couple of days a week, and are disparagingly known among their envious brethren from far away as members of the Tuesday-Wednesday-Thursday Club, a reference to the prevailing belief that they can be counted on to be present in the House only on those three midweek days, if then. Indeed, in deference to their habits, and to their numbers, the House often waits until the middle of the week to vote on important bills, and its committees hold most of their meetings then. JAVITS is an unusually conscientious legislator and can often be found in Washington on a Monday or a Friday, just as if he hailed from Oregon or Arizona, but in order to be on tap at the Capitol and also to spend what he considers a proper amount of time in New York, he has taken to commuting wildly, and expensively, between the two places. He regularly makes 2 or 3 round trips a week and has been known to make a couple in a day. When he first took office, he often used the Congressional Limited, but he has become more and more pressed for time and now generally flies. Some Thursday afternoons, as Representatives from New York City rush out of the House and wing toward home, JAVITS finds himself on a plane with half a dozen of his colleagues. On one such day last fall, he took a seat next to a stranger, and they got to talking about children. In the course of the conversation, JAVITS, referring to his year-old daughter, said carryingly, "She talks a lot but doesn't make any sense." Two other homebound Congressmen, who had evidently heard all his sentence except the introductory pronoun, turned and glared fiercely at him.

JAVITS talks a lot himself and, operating in an oratorical arena where making sense is not necessarily a qualification for admittance, he is admired by old-timers around the Capitol for the amount of it he makes. Last summer, the House was about to take its final action on a housing measure that after many weeks of wrangling had finally been approved by a joint Senate-House conference committee and was thus, as legislative procedure ordinarily goes, far beyond the stage of protracted debate. Nevertheless, when the conference report came back to the House for formal ratification, a few die-hard Representatives who disapproved of Federal housing rose to urge windily that every hod carrier working on a Government housing project be compelled to file a non-Communist affidavit, and to hint darkly that the House of Representatives itself was infested with Reds, pinks, and other heretics of allied hue. At that point, JAVITS asked for and got the floor. He said, in notably few words, that everyone present who had been against Federal housing all along would probably vote against the conference report and that everyone who had been for it all along would probably vote for it, so why didn't his distinguished colleagues just vote and get it over with? The effect of so rational a suggestion was startling. The debate halted instantly, a vote was taken, and the bill passed, at a saving to the taxpayers of heaven knows how many Congressman-hours.

During the three congressional sessions in which JAVITS has participated—two in the Eightieth Congress and one in the Eighty-first—he has been outstanding for his lack of the reticence that usually characterizes fledgling legislators. It is axiomatic in congressional circles that the best way for a freshman to get along, and to insure his reelection, is to keep his mouth shut. JAVITS was an impressively articulate courtroom lawyer prior to entering politics, and silence is foreign to his nature. He began his first session in Washington by holding himself fairly well in check, remaining officially mute until Congress had been meeting for more than 2 weeks. Then, however, he cut loose with a 20-minute speech. Before the House adjourned that fall, he had recovered so sensationally from his slow start that the index to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the session showed him to have been more active vocally, than any other Manhattan Congressman. The second session of the Eightieth Congress had been under way only 3 days when JAVITS took the floor, and when the Eighty-first Congress convened, a year ago, he gave tongue, with the confidence of an old hand, the very first day. (This current session, he was mute for a week, but possibly only because he was preoccupied by the birth of a son the day before Congress convened.) Up to now he has demonstrated his versatility on the floor of the House by holding forth on something like a hundred and fifty themes, including James G. Blaine, health conditions in Brazil, CARE packages, Indonesia, the death of Jan Masaryk, Pan-American Day, Herbert Hoover, overtime pay, immigration quotas for the British West Indies, rent control for hotels, segregation in Washington schools, the profits of the General Foods Corp., Wendell Willkie, the United States Employment Service, the United States Information Service, air-mail rates, retirement pay for Army officers, the preservation of the dairy industry, American policy toward Spain, the Russian threat to the Dardanelles, Elihu Root, the character of the German people, wheat, children, wool, the Jackson Hole National Monument, and, it goes without saying, New York City. As a fervent champion of this city JAVITS once collaborated eulogistically with Representative ARTHUR G. KLEIN, a Manhattan Democrat from the Nineteenth Congressional District, who had felt impelled to pay tribute to his home town and various of its subdivisions—Wall Street, Greenwich Village, Chinatown, Little Italy, the Bowery, and so on. JAVITS, perhaps motivated partly by the fact that KLEIN had inadvertently neglected to mention the lower East Side, where most of KLEIN's constituents live, took up the ball and not only rectified that omission but added Park Avenue and "my own Washington Heights" as a couple of other regions he felt the House, at that particular moment of history, should pause to take cognizance of. "We are really a collection of small towns," he said, "not an amorphous mass of people and masonry. There is as much good will, kindness, hospitality, and consideration per square foot in New York as in any other part of America, town or country. New York's millions of friendly citizens, its rapid transit, its restaurants of many nationalities, its magnificent shops, its unmatched theater and music, the sheer tempo of its movement, are the joy of invention, the passion for freedom, and the drive for progress which is America." Sic rapidly transit JAVITS.

The principal business of a legislator is, theoretically, at least, to legislate. While JAVITS has been in the House, around twenty-three thousand bills or resolutions have been introduced there—about 18 per Representative per session. When legislation presented to one Congress fails to get anywhere, its sponsor (if he is still there) frequently presents it to the next Congress; JAVITS has a 3-year total of 90 pieces of legislation—slightly over par for the course—including 18 that he has proffered hopefully to both the Eightieth and the Eighty-first Congresses. Some 20 of his offerings, including 4 repeaters, have been designed to assist individuals. Measures of this sort are known as private bills, and they are traditionally passed without objection once they get to the floor of Congress. The trick is to get them there. Some private bills introduced 10 years ago and reintroduced in each new Congress since then have yet to be reported out of the committees given jurisdiction over them. One of JAVITS' private bills would oblige the Government to pay $500 to a constituent of his who posted a bond in that amount with the Immigration and Naturalization Service in 1931, as a guaranty for his sister, who was allowed that year to enter the United States as an alien in transit, while on her circuitous way from Habana to Nassau. She didn't leave the country when she was supposed to, and the bond was forfeited. Nobody tried especially hard to deport her, and in 1937 the State Department, letting bygones be bygones, decreed that she might stay here indefinitely. Following that the immigration people said that they would gladly return her brother's $500 but that they would first have to be formally authorized to do so by Congress. JAVITS introduced the appropriate enabling legislation in 1948. It died with the Eightieth Congress and he hasn't got around to reintroducing it yet. JAVITS has had one private bill passed. It related to a merchant seaman who, while ashore at Leghorn, Italy, in 1946, was struck and injured by a military vehicle that he took to be a United States Army truck, and who wants damages from the Government. JAVITS' bill has granted the man the right to have his claim adjudicated by a United States District Court, where the matter may conceivably drag on for a couple more years.

The actual drafting of a bill is not the most onerous of a Congressman's chores. For one thing, the House provides a nonpartisan legislative drafting service, which, given the substance of any bill a man may have in mind, proceeds to dress it up in proper technical language. Then there is the Library of Congress, which stands ready to do whatever research a legislator may require in order to decide what he would like to put into a bill. The first public, or nonprivate bill that JAVITS offered to Congress would, if enacted, have permitted the entry into the United States, without regard to immigration quotas, of certain war orphans under 16. Having thus made his debut on the public-bill level, JAVITS went on spiritedly to propose legislation having to do with juvenile delinquency, meat rationing, public housing, multiple sclerosis, pensions for the widows of Federal justices, fair-employment practices, un-American activities, and the awarding of medals to members of the Army and Air Force Reserves. He has not been especially distressed by the lack of enthusiasm that most of these legislative proposals have evoked. A Congressman's contributions to the general welfare are not always measurable by the number of laws passed with his name on them. Carrying on in a forum where obstructive criticism is the natural order of things, JAVITS has tried to establish himself as a constructive critic of other men's bills, and several amendments he has championed have, to his immense satisfaction,

been formally, even if all but anonymously, enacted into law. Once, he got a letter from a constituent complaining about a postwar statute that allowed alien fiancees of American servicemen to enter the United States irrespective of quotas. Under the terms of this law, all such sweethearts whose romances soured after they got here and who didn't get married were liable to deportation, with the exception of German nationals, who, because the German quota had not been filled, owing to the postwar restrictions on general immigration from that country, could remain here in any event. Inevitably some Germans had been taking advantage of this loophole and, with the connivance of Americans who were willing to let themselves be called sweethearts for immigration purposes, had been crossing the Atlantic ostensibly to get married but actually just to get resettled. JAVITS was impressed by his constituent's account of this uneven state of affairs, and, noting that an immigration bill of some kind seemed on the point of being passed by the House, he tried to tack an amendment onto it requiring that German fiancés be treated the same as other fiancees. The general feeling at the time was that the matter could be dealt with administratively, rather than by new legislation, and the amendment was rejected, by the spectacular vote of 100-1, the sole vote for it being cast by Representative JAVITS (Republican-Liberal, New York). A less determined solon might have let the matter rest there, but JAVITS, nettled by the staggering proportions of his defeat, pleaded his cause earnestly to some Senatorial friends, and convinced them that a law was necessary. They inserted JAVITS amendment into the version of the immigration bill that was later approved by the Senate, and presently he had the pleasure, after this and the House version had been spliced in conference, of observing his fellow-Representatives unanimously approve a measure containing precisely the provision they had so overwhelmingly rejected not long before.

In the Senate, any number of Members may jointly sponsor a single piece of legislation. In the House, if more than one Member wants to sponsor a bill, each must present it as a separate, even if identical, legislative proposal. JAVITS, for instance, was 1 of 96 Representatives who introduced similar bills designed to strengthen the United Nations along lines recommended by the United World Federalists. This system of multiple authorship has at least one advantage; it enables whole flocks of Representatives, when reporting to their constituents, to claim credit—by implication, at any rate—for the same statesmanlike achievement. When popular indignation over the shabby treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty was at its highest, JAVITS was 1 of 13 Representatives who, moved by humanitarianism, introduced resolutions sympathizing with the cardinal's plight and berating his oppressors. So eager was JAVITS to have his views on the matter set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that, even after the House, by demonstrating its readiness to accept a colleague's resolution that was much like his own, had begun to take exactly the legislative action he had advocated, he felt it necessary to make one of those little caudal speeches that help to give the RECORD its bulging girth. "I append hereto House Resolution 65," he said, "which I offered to the same effect as the resolution now being adopted, and I am satisfied that the resolution now being adopted accomplishes the same result."

Much of Congress' legislative give-and-take is of a preliminary sort, occurring informally in restaurants, hallways, and cloakrooms, or formally at meetings of committees and subcommittees, to one or more of which every legislator is assigned. JAVITS, at the start of his first term, was tapped by his Republican colleagues for the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and he has served on it ever since. The committee's influence on the conduct of foreign affairs used to be modest compared with that of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Recently, however, the House group has been catching up fast, since the Government's foreign affairs and relations have been largely of a monetary nature—the European recovery program being a striking example—and since all appropriations bills originate in the House. JAVITS' good fortune in being assigned to this committee in the era of its ascendancy has been ERP's good fortune, too; he was one of a handful of global-minded Republican Members who, at a time when there was considerable sentiment within the committee for returning to isolationism and the Congress as a whole was dominated by the Republicans, tipped the balance in favor of distributing American largess abroad.

In 1947, JAVITS and three other Representatives concerned with foreign affairs went to Europe on one of those congressional fact-finding expeditions, and while in Warsaw one day, seeking facts about displaced persons, stopped to watch a crowd of men and women shoveling rubble into trucks. One of the legislators, aware of his position as a roving ambassador of American good will, graciously offered a cigarette to an old woman on the work gang. "Cigarette, pah," she said, and thrust a shovel into his hands. JAVITS and his two other colleagues, though a trifle weary from fact-finding at a pace that had them visiting eight countries in 6 weeks, took the hint, grabbed shovels themselves, and together they valiantly filled a whole truck with rubble, thus giving a demonstration of good will possibly never before or since matched by any itinerant delegation of American Congressmen.

The three Representatives who went abroad with JAVITS contributed, as it happened, not only to expediting American foreign relations but to expediting JAVITS' domestic relations. When the four legislators sailed from Manhattan, one of the well-wishers who came aboard to see them off was a personable young lady to whom the gentleman from New York, then unmarried, had for some time been attracted. The sailing was delayed, and so was preceded by several all-visitors-ashore warnings. Each time the bells clanged, JAVITS gave his visitor a conservative peck, and each time his colleagues, taking advantage of the prevailing atmosphere of camaraderie, gave her a resounding kiss. After the third or fourth round, JAVITS cried anxiously, "How about this, boys?" "Congressional courtesy," they explained. Before the boat cleared the harbor, JAVITS had decided that a young lady who so manifestly appealed to other men of stature was in danger of getting away from him if he didn't act fast, so he proposed to her by ship-to-shore telephone. Two months later, when JAVITS and the lady were married, his fellow-members of the Foreign Affairs Committee gave the couple a handsome silver tray with all their names inscribed on it—one of the rare instances of their taking unanimous action on anything.

When in Washington, JAVITS usually gets to his office around 9:30 in the morning. Committee meetings generally begin at 10 and last until noon, when the House convenes. It remains in session until mid- or late afternoon or, toward the end of a congressional year, when there is much unfinished business on hand, until early the following morning. Few Congressmen spend much time on the floor unless a bill in which they are vitally interested is under consideration; some hardly ever go there. To insure their being present at critical moments, as when a close vote on an important matter is imminent, they are, like firemen or young ladies seeing ships off, alerted by bells, which ring commandingly throughout the House office buildings. JAVITS keeps in fairly good shape by, among other things, spending a couple of hours a week playing paddle ball, a refinement of handball, in the House gymnasium, for the privilege of using which he pays $5 a year; when pressed, he can get from his office desk to the House chamber—roughly a quarter-mile stretch, indoors and out—in 4½ minutes without straining. This affords him a wide margin of safety, because the most important kind of vote is an alphabetical roll call, or two-bell vote, and calling the roster of the House twice (as is regularly done, to give stragglers and slowpokes a chance to record their votes) takes nearly three-quarters of an hour.

JAVITS manages to spend a few hours in his office most days when he is in Washington, but nonetheless he has to work late at night at least twice a week, and he practically never gets to any of the cocktail parties that are commonly thought to be as indispensable to the well-being of some Congressmen as paddle ball is to that of others. While JAVITS is in his office, he devotes a good deal of his time to conferring on the telephone about legislative or political matters with his colleagues (he is on a first-name basis with about a hundred of them, including quite a few Democrats); to reading and answering his mail, which rarely comes to fewer than fifty letters a day and sometimes goes well above a hundred; to greeting constituents who drop in to say hello, to ask for passes to the House or Senate gallery, or to nag at him; to preparing speeches or studying bills that are scheduled to come up (many of these are couched in such cloudy language that he has to get his legislative secretary to find out what they mean before sitting down to ponder their merits); and to editing material that is to appear in the RECORD.

When a Congressman says something on the floor it is transcribed, and if he has asked permission to revise and extend his remarks, it is sent to him so he can make any corrections he cares to before it is inserted in the RECORD, a protective device that leads to the excision of many grammatical bobbles and that once enabled a Representative from a dairy State who had absentmindedly spoken favorably of oleomargarine to change a highly embarrassing "for" to a rocklike "against." A Congressman may alter, add, or delete as much as he chooses, and a sentence like "I feel that we will continue to press for action for the middle-income families, which was also provided for in our bill"—the words JAVITS used one day in commenting on another man's housing bill—may come out something the way that one did: "I feel also that we will continue to press for action on housing for the lower middle-income families, which is not contained in his bill, but which was first provided for in the bill introduced by the 10 House Republicans, later joined in by similar bills introduced by 22 Democratic Members." Congressmen become so accustomed to editing anything they put in the RECORD that in the process of inserting an article from the Saturday Review of Literature last summer JAVITS edited that. Despite this careful preparation insertions in the RECORD are still occasionally liable to misinterpretation. During the last session JAVITS submitted for the RECORD's Appendix, in which Congressmen may insert material not spoken from the floor, an item that began with the statement, "This is an invitation to Members from our 26 most populous States to go to the theater." Some Congressmen, who knew that JAVITS had introduced a bill calling for the establishment of a national theater and who had heard through the legislative grapevine that he had just been in telegraphic communication with Oscar Hammerstein II, one of the producers of "South Pacific," read on with high anticipation, only to find that JAVITS' encouraging preamble was followed simply by a listing of the names of more than 250 summer theaters in 26 States that a theatrical acquaintance had asked him to insert as evidence of the ubiquity of the stage. JAVITS had sent a telegram to Hammerstein, all right, but merely to inquire into the possibility of buying a pair of tickets for a Saturday-night performance of "South Pacific."

JAVITS' less provocative contributions to the Appendix have included a letter from a housewife in his district lamenting her inability to find a decent apartment and a letter to the editor signed by J. K. JAVITS and published in the Herald Tribune last year when it was searching for a definition of liberalism. The Tribune has been a supporter of JAVITS, and said editorially of him, after the 1946 elections: "He promises to be a legislator of a new and different nature, and we look forward to hearing more of him." JAVITS was grateful for so warm a send-off—though probably not surprised, inasmuch as the paper's chief editorial writer was one of the men who had urged him to run in the first place.

Some Congressmen cram the Appendix with lofty words they have declaimed at cornerstone layings, barbecues, and husking bees. JAVITS has been remarkably diffident in this respect, and not for want of material, as since taking office he has made an average of two or three speeches a week at functions he has attended. If he were to accept all the invitations that come his way, he could be even more oratorically occupied, but he has chosen to confine himself, in the main, to audiences with national influence, such as the annual convention of the Grocery Manufacturers of America, and to audiences with influence in his home district, such as the Kip's Boy Scout Troop 472, Manhattan. Being one of nine Jews now in the Eighty-first Congress (he was one of seven in the Eightieth) and an outspoken friend of the State of Israel, he is considered an exceptionally attractive drawing card by most of the Jewish organizations in the country; immediately after his election to Congress he visited Israel, at his own expense, to study conditons there, and this later made him a logical choice to christen the S. S. *Haifa*, the first vessel to fly the colors of the American-Israeli Shipping Co.

During a typical 3-month period, JAVITS was invited to such varied functions as the annual strawberry ball and card party of the Republican Club of the seventh assembly district, north; a meeting of the American Association of Former European Jurists; a supper party of the Sisterhood of Congregation Ramath Orah; a dinner of the American League for an Undivided Ireland; the installation of officers of Upper Manhattan Chapter 42 of the Order of Ahepa; commencement exercises of the Western Union Messenger School of New York; a weekend cruise on an aircraft carrier, to observe naval operations; and a ball given by the Columbia University Chinese Students' Association, at which a special award of merit was to be presented to him. All these bids happened to be among the many that JAVITS was obliged to decline, except the one from the Chinese students, and, as things turned out, he might as well have declined that, too. The ball was canceled at the last minute, and he has not yet received his award.

JAVITS has learned that a politician must be patient about such personal disappointments, especially when they occur within his district. Not long ago, he was asked to an evening festival at a neighborhood synagogue, and replied that he had a terribly full schedule already set up for the evening in question but that he would try to drop in if he possibly could. When the date came around, he did have a full evening, with three or four duty calls to make, but he gamely stopped by the synagogue anyway. It was closed and dark, and after pounding respectfully on a few doors and rattling a few knobs he went away. A busy private citizen might have raised a fuss over being thus inconvenienced, but JAVITS took the whole thing with good grace. "Perhaps you had the festival on another evening and forgot to tell me," he wrote to the man who had issued the invitation, and added his expression of good wishes for the fine work he felt sure his elusive host was doing. JAVITS himself tries hard not to disappoint people who are expecting him, but he makes so many engagements that now and then he can't keep up with them. One man, who had been extremely anxious to talk to him and had had a couple of lunch and cocktail dates with him misfire, thought he had licked the problem by asking JAVITS to his home for breakfast at 9 o'clock on a Sunday morning. JAVITS accepted. That Sunday, the host and his wife arose early, got their children fed and out of the way, and sat around hungrily awaiting their honorable guest. JAVITS arrived at 10:30, panting. He was dreadfully sorry to be so late, he said, but a prebreakfast engagement had lasted longer than he had figured.

Marihuana Makes Youthful Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, an alarming number of crimes in various sections of the United States have been committed by young people who have been under the influence of marihuana. Many of these crimes have been committed by teen-age youngsters who, while under the influence of this vicious drug, have committed murder, robbery, and other equally shocking crimes.

Newspaper headlines tell the story every day. The recent hitch-hike robbery and murder of an innocent citizen involving a young 18-year-old girl and her 15-year-old companion, who admitted she was under the influence of marihuana, is but one grim example of the current tendency toward drug addiction by young people.

I am truly amazed at the public apathy which greets this shocking wave of cases. Our law-enforcement agencies are fighting this menace and trying to break up the various crime syndicates which operate these illicit narcotic rings. But the time has come for the American people to rouse themselves and to take stock of the situation.

How can a citizen join the fight? First, by learning through intelligent reading what effect marihuana has on the person. Second, by learning through discussion with local law-enforcement authorities just how unscrupulous habitual criminals circulate marihuana through highly developed crime syndicates.

In this way the citizen can become alert to the present danger of crime under the influence of drugs, and assist actively in support of our law-enforcement agencies.

Report anything that arouses your suspicions to your local police department.

Do not wait for the other fellow to do it; do it yourself and do it now.

In conclusion I would like to suggest that the vast, far-reaching medium of radio be utilized more than ever to drive home to the American public the simple truth that crime does not pay, not by simply dramatizing the activities of private detectives and criminals, but by showing the criminal in his true light—as a coward, a menace to decent citizens, a broken wreck of a human being often a marihuana addict or user of other drugs—and documentarily detailing the never ending war waged by our law-enforcement agencies to bring an end to this evil.

The Man Few People Knew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the former Governor of Nebraska, the Honorable Samuel R. McKelvie, served as a member of the Federal Farm Board under the administration of President Herbert Hoover. Each year Mr. McKelvie issues a very interesting booklet entitled "By the Way." In this year's issue, Mr. McKelvie has written an inside story about the former President and also a statement regarding surplus farm crops as they existed at that time.

Because we are now perplexed over our farm problems, I feel that the membership should have Mr. McKelvie's story, since the situation in those days regarding farm surpluses was somewhat similar as the conditions appear to be today.

By leave granted me, I include Mr. McKelvie's statement as part of my remarks:

THE MAN FEW PEOPLE KNEW

The most unusual valentine I ever received and the most appreciated was a telephone call February 14, 1929. It was from President-elect Herbert Hoover. I was in Arizona trying to recuperate from a 3-year-old X-ray burn. He was in Miami, Fla., getting in a few spare hours of fishing before taking on the immeasurable responsibilities of the highest office in the land.

He asked me to accept appointment as Secretary of Agriculture in his Cabinet. It is impossible to describe my emotions, not only because it took me so completely by surprise, but that I could not accept. After expressing my deep appreciation of the honor, the most I could say was that on account of my physical condition I could not accept then, but within a day or two would advise with an eminent surgeon from Northwestern University who was then in Phoenix, and report. This I did on February 16.

"MY DEAR SECRETARY HOOVER"—(he was still Secretary of Commerce under President Coolidge). "I have awaited giving you my final answer pending a conference with the best medical authorities. Am able to say to

you now rather definitely that I shall not be able to undertake any responsible work before the 1st of June, or possibly the 1st of July.

"The fine honor you tendered me is one that I could not decline under normal circumstances. I am in sympathy with your program for agriculture, and would welcome the opportunity to take so important a part in developing it.

"I hold myself in readiness to be of service whenever and wherever I can." (Which I did, as will be noted later.)

Fact is I had disavowed any further public office, having just begun to recover financially from my 4-year governorship bout. I was sick of politics.

That was why I wrote Mr. Hoover shortly after his election congratulating him and saying: (He was about to start on a good will voyage to South America.)

"I hasten to express good wishes on the important voyage that you are about to take.

"From copies of letters sent me I am aware that representations are being made to you in my behalf in connection with your official family. I cannot too earnestly assure you that these words of my good friends are wholly unsolicited. I seek nothing politically. My efforts in your behalf were actuated by your fitness for the place, and I would regret very much to have it considered otherwise.

"I am at your command to be helpful in promoting the success of your administration, and my services will be without thought of personal reward." (I tried to help all right, but am not very proud of the results.)

My recuperative stay in Arizona did not yield the desired results. From there I went to Johns Hopkins, had the burn excised, the wound began to heal and Martha hurried me off to our summer retreat in the Black Hills of South Dakota. That was in June. It was not long until I was wandering along the stream snaring an occasional trout, and taking a new lease on life. Then in July came another telephone call. It was from President Hoover in Washington.

The new Congress had enacted the agricultural law that he recommended. It provided for a Federal Farm Board of nine members. Secretary of Agriculture Hyde, who was a member ex officio of the Board, had felt me out from time to time about accepting a place on it. I repeatedly took refuge in my physical inability to serve. But finally the word got to the White House that I was giving them the run-around. That was why Mr. Hoover called.

He asked me to serve as a member in charge of the Grain Division. All of the other members had been appointed, and the Board was functioning. As previously indicated, I declined for reasons other than my health, but that refusal lasted only 1 day. He called again the next day and was so insistent that I accepted for 1 year only, and, on July 24, wired him:

"I will undertake service on Federal Farm Board with understanding that I may begin September 1 and retire June 1 next year. If this is agreeable to you I will arrive in Washington next Monday and spend 1 week with the Board. Also, my commitment should include conditions of my acceptance." All of which was carried out, except that when next June rolled around he prevailed upon me to stay another year.

One of these times I will have more to say about the ill-fated Farm Board and its work. Suffice to say that its acts seemed so revolutionary, and it was so shamefully opposed by private interests that it hung like a millstone around the President's neck. The squawk was made to high heaven that it would break the taxpayer and the Government. Believe it or not, the total appropriation was only $500,000,000.

"One-half billion dollars. My gawd. What was going to become of such spendthrift government. And Mr. Hoover was responsible for it all." Such incidents were the major theme of an unscrupulous opposition that set out early in his administration to misrepresent the facts and defeat him.

Small deficits were run during the last year or two of the Hoover administration. They were in fact trifling compared with what has happened since, but because it had been so long since there had been a deficit it was easy to make mountains of it. Finally, when the next campaign came on in '32 the opposition candidate speaking at Pittsburgh, said:

"We all know that our own family credit depends in large part on the stability of the credit of the United States.

"The credit of the family depends chiefly on whether that family is living within its income. And this is so of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

"But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay, and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy.

"Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors, because they are a burden on production and can be paid only by production. * * * Our workers may never see a tax bill, but they pay in deductions from wages, in increased cost of what they buy. * * *

"I regard reduction in Federal spending as one of the most important issues. * * * In my opinion, it is the most direct and effective contribution that Government can make to business."

How true. And how clearly stated.

Consider, then, what happened. Expenditures in 1932, the last year of the Hoover administration, were a little less than $5,000,000,000, and the national debt $16,801,000,000. By 1936 expenditures had increased to over $9,000,000,000, and the national debt was $33,779,000,000. More than doubled in 4 years.

Whether Franklin D. Roosevelt ever intend to live up to his promise we will never know. Suffice to say he never did, but it was red-hot campaign stuff at the time.

In my opinion, Mr. Hoover was the greatest economist and statesman of this century, and the poorest politician. One day former Gov. Henry Allen, of Kansas, and I were bemoaning the latter fact when Henry said: "The trouble with the Chief is that he always catches the ball on the second bounce." Meaning that he could not anticipate popular reactions to what he said or did. He sent out no feelers or trial balloons. If he thought a thing should be done he did it; and if he was opposed to a proposal he said so without equivocation.

I retired from the Federal Farm Board in June 1931. At that time the Government owned nearly 200,000,000 bushels of wheat and an equivalent amount of cotton acquired through stabilization purchases of the Federal Farm Board. Little, if any, of it dared be sold because just as soon as that was intimate the speculative trade made capital of it and promptly depressed prices to growers.

What was to be done about it? Well, we tried to peddle it by subterfuge. Some was sold in foreign countries in the form of flour. A few thousand bushels were traded for coffee in Brazil. Some was sold on "tick" to China, and I think never paid for. As I recall much the same was done in Germany, or other foreign countries. But all of those things made not a dent in the tremendous Government holdings.

Before leaving the Board I suggested that by some device, preferably through a charitable agency, it be given away to the needy at home. There were plenty of them. As the months wore on and the unemployed increased it seemed all the more imperative that it be done. So I went to Washington and took it up with several authoritative individuals and agency chiefs, among whom was Mr. Hoover.

The purposes appealed to him, especially on behalf of the needy—there never was a greater humanitarian; but he feared that it would again depress prices to the producer and interfere with the normal sources of distribution. I agreed but still felt that the end justified the means, and added that if he did not recommend and urge it the next Congress would and he would not get the credit. It did not budge him.

As a final clincher I pointed out that we had been giving it away in foreign countries to those far less worthy, and added "the people will appreciate it." With a good deal of vehemence he replied, "Appreciate it! They will not even remember it 6 months hence."

I recommended that 10,000,000 bushels be given away, but I believe nearer 10 times that was distributed through the Red Cross. It went into 85 percent of the counties in the United States. It was appreciated all right; that is, momentarily; but I'll wager there is not 1 in 10,000 who remembers it today. No doubt a good many were influenced by it in the next election, but Mr. Hoover did not get the credit.

Mr. Hoover believed in keeping government close to the people instead of centralizing it in Washington. He urged that the communities and States assume and discharge the responsibilities of taking care of their people. There, again, he was no politician. His successor proved that the easy way is to buy votes out of the National Treasury and let the recipients pay it back in their own money—taxes.

Fact is that in the midst of one of the worst depressions in American history Mr. Hoover could not have been reelected had he been Jesus Christ himself.

As the time for his retirement approached, Mr. Hoover offered his services and cooperation to his successor without prejudice, despite the unfair and in many respects dishonest campaign that had been made against him. His interest was in his Government and his country. To those ends he would make any sacrifice. His offers were ignored completely, and as time went on it was easy to understand why.

According to Raymond Moley, who was a part of the New Deal administration in its early stages, "Roosevelt always had a much more serious opinion of the damage to him of a Hoover come-back than he would publicly admit. I have the evidence that he (Roosevelt) made a bet with me before the 1936 campaign that Hoover would be renominated by his party." He adds, "The real gist of the Democratic appeal in four presidential campaigns has been the wonderful recovery of the country after the defeat of Hoover. The Democratic Party has been running against Hoover for 20 years."

Mr. Hoover's unselfish service to his country is measured in his every act. Never has he taken one penny from the Government in payment for his services, including the years he served as President. In that he stands alone. He never weighed his work in dollars and cents. It was a labor of love and duty. His beliefs were founded upon the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. These he sought to preserve, and his emphasis in matters of Government policy always were founded upon them.

To me it seems he was the man few people knew. The greatest economist and statesman to occupy the White House in our time, he knew and gave the answers to good government policy almost before the questions were asked. But in that time of depression and discontent, the answers were not popular. Immediate relief was the want, regardless of cost or final result.

He was a friendly man, and cordial; but not a back slapper, opportunist, or paternalist. Just a plain, hard-headed, straight-thinking businessman, he tried to get results by the short, honest route without realizing that in public life the leader must not be too far in advance of popular knowledge and thinking.

New Deal Measure, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Proves Worth to United States Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Herald-American of February 6, 1949:

FDIC ONCE MORE PROVES WORTH TO UNITED STATES ECONOMY—ONE BANK'S TROUBLES TODAY ARE NOT DISTURBING

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel)

Despite a defalcation estimated at $200,000 by its cashier, the First National Bank of Dyer, Ind., is operating as usual.

In the old days, an episode of this sort would have caused an immediate run on the bank and the chances are that very quickly it would have closed its doors. There would have followed other, more moderate runs on nearby banks and the Dyer bank would have gone through the long and costly process of receivership and liquidation.

At best, depositors' money would have been tied up for a long period and business in the whole community would have suffered. At worst, depositors would have received only a gradual and partial return of their funds over a period of years. Stockholders would have been assessed their 100-percent double liability and a substantial amount of the assets would have been eaten up with the fees of receivers, attorneys and what not.

As it was, with deposits insured up to $5,000 by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, there was no fear on the part of small customers of suffering any loss. Consequently, there was no run, no frantic efforts to liquidate under unfavorable circumstances.

LOANS WILL BE GUARANTEED

Instead, plans were made for the bank to be taken over by the Gary National Bank with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation guaranteeing loans up to $1,000,000 and agreeing to assume slow-paying loans at the end of a 6-month period.

This episode recalls the manner in which almost every banker in the country opposed Government guaranty of bank deposits prior to the bank crisis of 1933. Today the bankers recognize this insurance as the greatest blessing that has come to their business. They no longer lie awake nights fearful of runs that sometimes started from rumors that had no basis in fact.

The bankers opposed Government insurance because certain of their leaders told them it would bankrupt the Government, make for bad, reckless banking and be a first step toward complete Government control. The propaganda along this line had been so active and persistent that it was almost universally believed.

Today it would be difficult to find a banker in the country who is not wholeheartedly in favor of Government insurance.

There are other propaganda waves, however, that have swept the country which are just as false, just as injurious as the campaign against insurance of deposits prior to 1933.

ASK FOR CUT IN INSURANCE FEE

Further there is another movement now on foot in connection with the insurance of bank deposits that impresses us as completely unjustified. It is to lower the insurance charge from the present level of one-twelfth of 1 percent of deposits. Those who have been advocating this have a plausible case. Distributions as a result of failure have been very small, the FDIC has paid off completely the funds advanced by the Government for setting it up and its capital funds now exceed a billion dollars.

Superficially, certainly, a lower insurance fee would seem to be adequate. There are important factors, however, that make for an opposite conclusion.

First, deposits have soared since the creation of the FDIC. Liabilities have risen proportionately.

Second, the whole life of the FDIC has been in a period of expanding business. There have been almost no bank failures because there have been few failures of any kind and business has been excellent. What the future may hold, however, nobody knows. The test of the FDIC will come when times get tough.

Third, bank earnings have been very satisfactory. As a result, the banks do not need at this time relief from the insurance charge.

The Extra Bushel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address made by the Honorable Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, on February 18, 1950, before the National Farm Institute, at Des Moines, Iowa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am especially glad to have the opportunity of participating with you in this outstanding institute. The National Farm Institute makes an important contribution to our agricultural thinking. It is a healthy and constructive example of democracy at work, encouraging a better understanding of our Nation's farm problems and what can best be done about them.

We have before us for consideration today some serious problems of farm policy, problems which demand an early solution, not alone in the farmer's interest but for the welfare of the entire Nation.

There are, undoubtedly, a number of approaches that would be helpful to general understanding of just what is involved. But I would like to suggest we examine our subject in this way:

We have here on the table a bushel of corn.

If you will assume it is the first extra bushel beyond our assumed domestic needs, beyond export requirements, and beyond even the safe reserves required to protect the Nation against crop failure or other emergency, then it is a symbol of our major national farm problem.

It is an extra bushel. It is the bushel for which a satisfactory market must be found if the man who produced it is to get a fair price and if it is to do anybody any good. Its counterpart is to be found in many other crops.

Yet it is no different from any other bushel of corn. It requires time and effort and money to produce, and it contains the same essential feed values as all the rest of our corn.

Farmers may accidentally produce it in good faith as part of their effort to earn a living for their families and to help feed our Nation adequately and properly. They can produce many like it through more efficient use of their resources—through new and better farm practices, through better care of the soil, through new varieties developed by long and painstaking research, and through mechanization to cut down the man-hours of farm labor required.

What are we going to do with that extra bushel?

There are just two alternatives:

We must either consume it by transforming it into meat, milk, eggs, and poultry—and by getting that extra food eaten—or we'll have to lock up that extra bushel in storage and reduce the next year's production by that amount.

Of course, there are some potential industrial uses for a very small portion of this extra bushel. But the alcohol manufacturer today could not pay the farmer more than 50 cents a bushel for corn and stay in business.

That's just about all the choice we have. And that, in a way, just about sums up our farm problem today. There it is—that extra bushel.

The future course of our Government farm policies will determine what shall happen to that extra bushel—whether we use its potential nutritional values for a better diet for the American people, or whether we must stop producing it—if, indeed, it is possible to stop producing it.

Making use of it will benefit both farmers and the consumers; abandoning its production will mean a sacrifice for both.

Modern farming is geared to abundance. Our present methods of farming are founded upon the use of modern machinery, motor power, and the newest discoveries of science. Practical, far-sighted conservation practices are also aiding farmers to reach new production records.

I do not believe any of us want to call a halt to this progress.

I do not believe either farmers or the rest of the American people are willing to concede that more efficient use of our resources is a waste just because it results in that extra bushel.

I do not believe any of us would willingly give up the know-how for producing that abundance. We want to learn—and must learn—to live with our abundance. That's why I have advocated farm program measures aimed at making use of that abundance rather than shackling it.

There still appears to be some misconception and lack of understanding about these farm program recommendations, and even about my motives for making them. Some of this is the natural result of insufficient information. More of it has been intentionally manufactured by the leadership of a great farm organization.

But whatever the cause, we are here dedicated to objective study.

So, first let's get straight on some basic concepts.

I am for parity. I am for the original concept of parity—a standard of equality for agriculture, a fair share of the national income for the farmers who contribute so greatly to creating that income. I am thinking in terms of people, rather than just commodities. I want parity of opportunity for

the farmer to earn a fair return from his investment of capital, labor, skill, and management ability; not just parity for that bushel of corn. I want parity of living opportunity for the farm family.

I am against regimentation. I am against any form of controls that can be reasonably avoided and any which do not have the affirmative support of a large majority of the producers affected. I am for the widest possible freedom of choice by the farmer himself in the management of his farming enterprise. I am for farm programs that will make the maximum use of our farm production—so that we can avoid the strict controls that will be inevitable if we fail to provide a profitable and useful outlet for that extra bushel.

I am for efficiency of production and for constantly increasing our efficiency. But I do not agree with those who hold that the only path to efficient production is industrialized mass farming. I want no serfs no collectives taking over the farms of America—whether those collectives be of the Soviet design or the corporation pattern. I believe the family-sized farm can be efficient, and I believe that we should concentrate our efforts for increased efficiency upon the family-sized-farm unit because of the important human values it contributes to our society. I am for encouraging, strengthening, and preserving the family-sized farm as the backbone of American agriculture, not turning our backs upon it and destroying it in the false name of increased efficiency.

I am for Government economy. I am for economy by eliminating the uneconomic practices of present price-support methods that waste good food and penalize the consumer by making him pay the costs twice—first in his tax bill, and second in his food bill. I am for doing everything in our power now to avoid the tremendous cost to the Government of another disastrous depression and to avoid its cost in human misery to the people of our Nation.

I am against the wasteful accumulation of unmanageable surpluses beyond normal safe reserves at a time when much of the Nation's population is still ill-clothed and underfed. I want to see the Nation use that extra bushel of corn, not just lock it up and try to make farmers quit producing it. And I repeat I'm talking today about that extra bushel which is clearly beyond safe reserves, and beyond domestic and export needs. I am not talking about the reserves that we have sealed up in bins, I am talking about the extra bushel beyond prudent reserves.

Your ideas and mine cannot be far apart on these fundamentals.

But just what is our situation today? Are we making progress toward our objective or are we slipping backward? Are we on the right track?

Unfortunately, both farm prices and farm income are headed in the wrong direction. Farm prices have dropped an average of almost one-fourth in less than 2 years. They are still going down. But farmers still have to pay within 8 percent as much for what they buy as they paid 2 years ago. In 1947, farm operators had a net income of nearly $18,000,000,000. Last year, it was down to around $14,000,000,000. The forecast for 1950 is for a net income of under $12,000,000,000. That is a decline of one-third in net farm income at a time when national income is at or near its all-time peak.

Is this the way to parity?

Is this a desirable trend?

The gap between farm and nonfarm incomes is widening, instead of closing.

Even at the peak of agricultural income, total per capita income of persons on farms was only about 60 percent as high as for persons not on farms. In 1949 this income gap widened, and in 1950 is reported to widen still more.

The people on farms constitute nearly one-fifth of the total population, yet they got from their farms less than 10 percent of the national income year before last, and only 7.8 percent last year.

We are headed away, instead of toward, our real concept of parity—equality of opportunity for agriculture.

Should we not be disturbed about this trend? Should we not seek its causes and offer our best effort to retard and reverse it?

Must those in public office whose duty it is to be particularly sensitive to these trends be attacked as stupid, dishonest, or nuts because they speak out about them and seek a remedy?

One of agriculture's best friends in Congress—Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri—frankly faced the facts at a recent Appropriations subcommittee hearing by saying, and I quote:

"Our present support program is not working. It is failing notably in three ways. It is failing to support prices. Hogs are selling today at less than half the price at which they sold at a time when wages, freight rates, and dividends in this country were lower than they are today. The present system is a failure, in the first place, because it fails to bring the farmer a fair wage for his labor and a fair return on the capital he has invested, his fair share of the country's income, or his fair standard of living.

"In the second place, there is a lot of administrative machinery for embracing the system which enrages the consumer and creates sentiment all over the country, in every grocery store and every meat shop, against the farmer and the Government. It is unfair to the farmer, unfair to the Department of Agriculture, and unfair to the Congress.

"In the third place, and not the least important, it denies the American people food they need and ought to have." That is the end of the quotation.

Many people in agriculture and many friends of agriculture would agree with the Congressman. Like him, I am sure, they would defend and maintain our present farm program for the good that is in it against the enemies who would destroy it. But they would also join the realists who see the faults in the program and wish to make improvements. I am sure all of us appreciate the great strides of progress we have made since those dark days of the depression thirties when many Iowa farmers had to burn corn to heat their homes.

We have made progress, even though we are still quite a ways from our goal.

We made that progress by realistically facing our problems and the conditions of our times.

We did it in our struggle upward from the depths of depression before the war, and we did it to meet the challenge of war.

And now we're going to have to do it again, as we squarely face and appraise the great capacity of this Nation to produce food and fiber and adjust ourselves to whatever changes may be necessary to put that extra bushel of corn to use to convert it into food people need and will consume, instead of abandoning its production.

How are we going to do it?

Perhaps one answer can be found in the fact that there is not only room but need for more meat, milk, eggs, and poultry in our Nation's diet. That could mean more consumption of corn, and therefore less need to restrict corn production.

But we aren't likely to get that corn converted into more meat, milk, eggs, and poultry unless the farmer producing those foods has reasonable assurance of fair returns from his finished product. Few of them will find much inducement for converting a commodity with an assured price into one with an uncertain price. We must broaden our support program to provide the incentive the farmer now lacks to produce the foods we need, both to improve our diet and to use up that extra bushel.

But getting that extra bushel converted into protective foods is only the first step. We have to get that extra food eaten. We need adequate consumer purchasing power to encourage increased consumption, and we need to offer the consumers the opportunity to add larger quantities of such protective foods to their diets at reasonable prices.

From our past ups and downs in food consumption we know that the people, given prosperity, will gladly up-grade their diets with meat, milk, eggs, and poultry.

Adequate farm purchasing power contributes to such prosperity, and helps maintain the purchasing power of other consumers. Prosperity in the farm market always means more dollars in real wages in cities and towns.

But if we really intend to serve the Nation's best interest by maintaining the farm purchasing power needed for a full economy, we have learned from experience that we must do more than support the prices of a few commodities. It seems obvious that we must use a realistic farm income objective and extend supports to the products which create a substantial part of that income. It seems equally plain that we must do it by methods that encourage rather than hamper increased consumption.

For example, we must do it by methods that let American potatoes compete for the American market, instead of letting our own potatoes go to costly waste while consumers buy and eat Canadian potatoes because they are cheaper.

I do not think any of us should be satisfied with farm laws that create such a situation as we now have with potatoes. Yet, strangely enough, some of those objecting loudest against the administration's farm proposals appear unconcerned about the costly waste of potatoes. Despite all the fault-finding on other scores by the national leadership of the American Farm Bureau Federation, it appears satisfied with the present potato situation. Unlike the Department of Agriculture, they never objected to the present law regarding potato price supports, although it appeared in the 1948 act in precisely the same form as in the present 1949 act. On the contrary, they embraced the present law and advised the Department how it should be operated. The Farm Bureau leadership advised me as follows: "We recommend a 1949 program for potatoes at 60 percent of parity and without acreage allotments."

Why aren't we working together toward adapting our farm programs to meet the existing conditions of today? Why do some insist upon blocking any constructive action at all?

What is there that we can't agree upon?

Is the scare cry of "subsidy" the stumbling block? Let's be realistic. All aid to agriculture in any form is a subsidy, just as all Government aid to any other group is a subsidy. There is no point in blinking this fact. Rather, let us stand on principle. To the extent that the agricultural subsidy serves the public welfare, it is not only justified but necessary. By the same token, no subsidy is justified which does not serve the public welfare. And if we stand on that principle, we can be open and aboveboard about it; there is no reason for agricultural aid to be concealed or hidden.

Farmers are the trustees of our basic resource, without which this country cannot remain strong. They must be given a fair opportunity to earn sufficient funds to maintain soil fertility, care for their families, and continue to produce an ample supply for the rest of the Nation.

Is it the question of cost that is keeping some of us apart? There's been a lot of loose talk about costs. Some like to estimate the cost of one program without comparing it

with the cost of any other program. They like to forget that price declines cost somebody whether there's a program or not—and, without a program, that somebody who pays the cost is the farmer.

Let us not forget, either, that the potato program has cost the Government $500,000,000 in recent years—more than three hundred of that in the last 2 years. The administration has recommended a program that would combine for potatoes the use of acreage allotments, marketing quotas, marketing agreements, and production payments. This would most certainly reduce the overproduction of potatoes. The cost would be cut to a fraction of what the program is now costing. I have estimated before, and I say again, that the cost the first year would be less than $25,000,000.

And while we are talking about the cost of farm programs, let's not overlook the potential cost of failing to have an adequate farm program—the terrible cost of depression.

The American Farm Bureau Federation had something to say about that back in 1939, when memories of the depression were perhaps fresher in our minds. In the foreword to its resolutions embodying its farm program recommendations that year, the Farm Bureau declared, and I quote: "We believe that failure to raise agriculture's income to parity is the major cause of the unemployment which has cost the Federal Government billions of dollars in relief appropriations.

"The unsettled condition of the world makes it increasingly imperative that the United States should put its domestic affairs in order without further delay. The cost of accomplishing this by restoring agriculture to complete parity is hardly a drop in the bucket compared to the cost of neglecting to do the one thing which will solve our difficulties. We have temporized with this vital question too long. We must not delay action longer." The statement goes on to say: "It is costing the Government billions because it is not doing the one thing which will solve at once the twin problems of low farm prices and widespread unemployment."

That was written a decade ago, but it's certainly something to keep in mind when we hear the national head of the Farm Bureau repeatedly raise the cry of "cost" to prevent objective consideration of proposals to forestall another economic collapse.

But let's go back to seeing if we can find just what it is that some folks can't seem to agree upon today.

Is it the false cry about danger to free enterprise that causes some to hesitate?

How can they complain about the proposals of the administration and still defend the present system under which the Government has become a bigger and bigger operator in the food business? We want to encourage free enterprise by taking the Government out of the channels of trade just as far as possible—out of warehousing, processing, shipping, and marketing, permitting dealers and consumers alike to have the benefits of free markets on the perishable products of our farms, as long as we can still make all farmers more secure in their right to a decent and fair reward for their toil.

What about the charge of regimentation? In my opinion, we don't have regimentation as long as farmers themselves decide whether or not to use the controls that are provided by law. Some production adjustments are essential in a country with such a production potential as we are fortunate in having in the United States. But the extent to which painful adjustments have to be made will be determined in large measure by the use we find for the extra bushel. Shall we eat it in the form of livestock products? Or try to stop producing it?

I doubt whether any of these charges we hear are the real differences that have developed in our current farm policy debate. For the most part such misleading attacks are merely smoke screens intended to cloud the real issues—hampering instead of helping all of us to arrive at wise, considered decisions so vital to our future.

Actually, behind all the pros and cons over the methods of our future farm program, the underlying conflict is in the very philosophy of our farm policy itself.

You are confronted with two entirely different ways of thinking about what objectives we should seek for the American farmer.

One group, of which the present administration is a part, believes it is in the best interest of the entire Nation to use price support as a means for providing agriculture the opportunity to earn a fair income. It does not propose to guarantee that income to anyone, but it does propose assuring diligent farmers the opportunity of achieving a level of income that would bring them closer to the goal of equality with other groups.

On the other hand, there are those who preach that the only role of price supports is to protect the farmer against bankruptcy. In other words, they see no reason for stopping price and income declines until the farmer's back is against the wall.

The Farm Bureau's present national leadership is among those adopting that attitude. Its spokesmen advocate stop-loss price supports—whatever those are—sometimes using that terminology and sometimes even less exact language. Sometimes they say they are against only what they call unreasonable price declines.

What do they mean by unreasonable price declines? Farm prices have already dropped 23 percent; how much farther must they fall before they become unreasonable?

Must the farmer almost go broke before he can expect the steadying hand of Government to be extended? And where is that fine line between being almost broke and just plain broke?

The present Farm Bureau leadership has turned its back on that great organization's historic position of the past, when it so often declared, and I quote from its own former statements of policy: "The fight of organized agriculture * * * has been and is now for equal opportunity and parity position with the other great groups."

Why aren't those words still true today?

Because the gentleman now heading the American Farm Bureau is here today, I would like to take the opportunity, for just this once, of addressing him directly in the hope of reaching a better understanding of the attitude of the Farm Bureau's present national leadership.

I would like to ask the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in all seriousness: Does it aid agriculture in any way to say of the administration's proposals: "People who propose such a program to farmers are very dumb or downright dishonest?"

How will such personal attacks protect the price of hogs?

I would like to ask the gentleman: Do you actually expect to halt the decline in farm prices by calling the administration's recommendations a "statement of politico-economic philosophy, not a farm program," a "supreme delusion," or, as you have also done by saying the idea is "nuts"?

I would like to ask the gentleman: Do you think it fair to your own members to be openly favoring still lower price supports for farmers in the harsh hope of forcing some of them out of business, so that farming can be more profitable for those big-scale farmers with larger cash reserves who are able to survive?

I would also like to ask: Do you feel the Farm Bureau is fulfilling a constructive role in behalf of agriculture by having its spokesmen spend their time tearing down the recommendations of others with such abusive remarks as, and again I quote, "It shines and stinks and stinks and shines like the rotten mackerel in the moonlight"?

Let me play back the record of a few more typical comments of the Farm Bureau's spokesmen about administration efforts to improve the price-support program: "Totalitarian collectivism," "written by the CIO labor people," "ulterior motives," "socializing agriculture," "changing our form of government," and, strangest of all, "it could lead to the passage of the President's civil rights legislation."

I ask the gentleman, again in all seriousness, if he really feels such negative abuse contributes anything at all to a fair attitude and the atmosphere of serious, constructive thinking so necessary to the development of wise and practical solutions to our farm problems.

I might venture to suggest that instead of sitting in the seat of the scornful, adopting a tone of antagonism or condescension, or assuming a cocksure attitude that carries its own condemnation, the gentleman might better serve agriculture by recognizing earnest efforts for a better farm program in the making; and that in a constructive spirit he should make contributions toward wise development of its policy.

And by contributing something constructive I certainly do not mean the penny-wise, pound-foolish kind of economy that would sacrifice even the vital progress of our agricultural conservation program. Just this month the American Farm Bureau leadership has advocated a slash of $35,000,000 in the budget authorization for the agricultural conservation program—a slash not only in conservation payments but in the functioning of the farmer-elected committees so capably administering the program.

The national leadership of the Farm Bureau is apparently not even satisfied with trying to block any improvements in our price programs; it is now trying to tear down the conservation program that many of you have worked so long to build.

What aid to agriculture does the leadership of this organization offer? The press quotes the Farm Bureau president as having a twofold objective: Defeat of the administration's farm program and boosting the organization's membership by not quite 100,000.

I ask in all fairness: Are these the goals of American agriculture for which the gentleman professes to speak? Is the leadership of the Farm Bureau Federation blind to what is happening to farm prices and income in this country today?

Is it no longer of concern whether or not the farmer gets a decent and fair return for his investment and toil?

After all, the American farmer has contributed to the welfare of our Nation, after all we have learned about the interdependence of agriculture, industry, and labor, after all the progress we have made toward economic justice, must we now suddenly revert to the narrow idea of the Government keeping its hands off until after the Nation has plunged once more into the disastrous depths of depression?

I don't think so.

But that is your choice, and that is the only real basis of conflict in the current farm-policy debate.

It is the difference between those wanting to push forward, and those turning backward.

On the one hand, we have those with determination to maintain a full, expanding economy; to live in prosperity with the abundance we can produce by properly utilizing it to raise the living standards of all.

On the other hand, we have the stop-lossers, the temporizers, those who are willing to gamble on getting by themselves regardless of what happens to the other fellow. They are willing to risk the entire

Nation's welfare on their own stubborn lack of vision and foresight.

They are the advocates of sliding scale price supports that usually slide only one way—downward. They are—apparently—not much concerned over the present slide of farm income.

They are bound by the fallacious assumption that downward sliding prices provide an acceptable way to adjust production, they are willing to starve farmers into compliance if necessary to obtain that adjustment, instead of doing it the more humane way—by the incentive of fair rewards. They are willing to sacrifice small farmers under the brutal survival-of-the-fittest concept even if it means large numbers of farms and farmers forced out of business at a heavy loss. That's what they mean by so-called natural adjustments.

But are we satisfied with that harsh kind of a solution to our production adjustment problems, even if it would work?

Somehow we don't believe this is a good way. Most of us have thought we had gone beyond the dog-eat-dog law of the jungle. Yet that's what is hidden behind the concept of a downward sliding scale of prices aimed at forcing some farmers to go broke and out of business.

On which side do you want to be counted?

All that I ask—all that the present national administration asks—is constructive consideration, with open minds, of the recommendations we have made for the welfare of the farmer and the welfare of the Nation.

All that we ask is a reasonable balancing of the administration's proposals against the only alternatives before you.

Which way of thinking offers the better hope for using constructively that extra bushel of corn—that extra bushel beyond even safe reserves—instead of just locking it up and trying to quit producing it?

Which way offers the better hope of drawing nearer to the real goal of parity, nearer to a fair share of our national income for the farmer? Which offers a way to reduce our surpluses instead of piling up more? Which offers the better chance of encouraging increased consumption of the abundant food our American farms can produce? Which offers real Government economy, by doing more to avoid the costly and tragic toll of another depression?

Those are the real measuring rods for judging our farm program—weighing it in the balance of public security and public good against the only alternatives remaining.

Keep that bushel of corn in mind and I shall have no fear of your ultimate judgment.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the text of an address delivered by Prof. S. Harrison Thomson, of the University of Colorado, on the Justice for Poland radio program conducted by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish American Congress.

These weekly programs were inaugurated some time ago by Dr. Karol Smolczynski, president of the branch with headquarters in Chicopee, and have attracted a widening circle of listeners in the central Massachusetts area.

The address of Professor Thomson, who is editor of the Journal of Central European Affairs, follows:

One of the oldest areas of international friction in our modern world is that between the German and the Polish states. And because recent developments have brought the problem into more clear focus, it may be profitable to look into the background of this complex and persistent antagonism.

The primary significant fact is geography. The Poles now inhabit the broad valley of the Vistula from the Carpathian Mountains northward to the Baltic. A thousand years ago and even since then, they reached west of the Oder River and occupied a good 200 miles of the southern Baltic coast. But German so-called crusaders, merchants, and missionaries took most of this coast away from them, and German arms and the will to conquer moved eastward. It's a long and sanguinary story, and doesn't make pleasant reading. One single example will indicate the nature of the story. On a dismal November morning in the year of grace 1308, German knights and men at arms fell on the Polish population of the fishing village of Gdańsk (more commonly known as Danzig) and murdered about 10,000 of them, men, women, and babes in arms. One would be wrong to think the Poles of today do not remember the simple facts of this bit of German missionary activity. A few centuries later, when the Polish state was having some internal difficulties, the German ruler who was looked upon as the most enlightened monarch of his day, Frederick the Great, showed his greatness and his enlightenment by joining with the rulers of Russia and the Hapsburg Empire to slice off parts of the Polish Commonwealth and adding them to their own domains. The Germans took the most prosperous parts.

This partitioning of Poland was planned long ahead, and carried out in order to forestall internal reforms then in progress which would have made Poland the most democratic state in all Europe. Once the territory was in his possession Frederick and his successors proceeded to Germanize it as ruthlessly as they could, bringing in German farmers, townsmen, teachers, soldiers, pastors and priests. One has only to put oneself in the place of the Polish inhabitants of this land to realize the emotions they would experience at seeing foreigners, their sworn enemies, in all positions of power and influence over them, at being forced to use the language of their conqueror in all public places, and in sensing conscious economic and social discrimination at every turn. The term "German" came to mean a perpetual oppressor. But the Poles were then as now a vigorous people, proud and tough. The process of Germanization, carried out by all the typical Prussian efficiency and ruthlessness, wasn't quite the success it was supposed to be. Late in the last century the great Bismarck, himself a native of an area where many people still talked Polish, realized that the Poles were regaining ground and that German influence was waning in the parts of Germany that were formerly a part of the Polish Commonwealth. He raised additional vast sums to buy land and colonize Germans in the eastern parts of the Reich. But this failed too—and election and school statistics showed the Polish population of the German Reich growing and the German population and influence decreasing. By the outbreak of the First World War the handwriting on the wall was clear. In 1918 Poland was reconstituted as a free state, and her boundaries with Germany were fixed approximately according to language frontiers. East Prussia, a coastal area blocking Poland's access to the sea for a part of the Baltic, was left to Germany. Prussia was an economic liability to Germany, as it hadn't been self-supporting for well over a century. Every Pole knew how the Germans regarded East Prussia—as a military outpost which could be used against Poland or as a springboard for further German expansion eastward.

During the subsequent 20 years of uncertain peace, 1918–39, every Pole sensed that the western frontier of the country was in danger. He knew the German well enough to know that Germany would not willingly give up control of so fertile a land as western Poland and so hard-working a people as the Poles. But France and Great Britain, and to a lesser degree perhaps, America, made concessions to Germany, forgave her war debts, and loaned her vast sums of money with which she rebuilt her heavy industry, and by the Locarno Pact of 1925 left the way open for Germany to revise her frontiers with Poland. Every Pole knew that to the Germans revision meant simply taking over Polish territory. Who is now in a position to blame Poland for being cynical about the bland work of western statesmen who proclaimed that they had achieved peace by agreement and proper concessions? On at least two known occasions Polish Marshal Pilsudski told the diplomatic representatives of the western powers that Poland was willing to fight to force Germany to live up to the conditions of the Versailles Treaty. The western powers were unwilling. Germany had promised to be good. The Poles again can hardly be blamed for judging the western powers bankrupt. They were that a good 15 years before the outbreak of hostilities in 1939. The Poles knew it. The records are clear in this matter.

Came the war in 1939 and Germany and Soviet Russia again partitioned Poland. The Polish Nation underwent cold-blooded butchery by Germans which no nation of comparable size has ever undergone in recorded history. She lost from bombing, concentration camps, and before German firing squads about 6,000,000 of her people. This would correspond in the case of America to a loss of 30,000,000. Her cities were burned into rubble, her treasure stolen, her forests and national resources ravished by the Germans. The Germans were defeated finally and pushed back beyond the Oder. The territory given to Poland in the west, labeled "compensation," by the Tehran and Yalta agreements in which the United States participated, for Polish land in the east taken by Russia with American consent, had been inhabited largely by Germans for many centuries. Yet, though this new land and its industries look to be worth more than the territory they lost, the Poles know that the Germans, whether in west Germany or eastern and Soviet-controlled Germany, will never rest content until it is again in German hands. They have worked heroically to resettle this land, without regard to their feeling about the present puppet government in Warsaw, but every Pole, peasant, factory worker, or intellectual, deep in his heart dreads the day when Germany is again strong and armed and will reach out and grasp in traditional German fashion for someone else's property. At this moment the Poles are making the best they can out of their present situation. So long as it suits Soviet purposes Poland may be assured that she can keep this western land. But when Russia wants or thinks she needs German support, she will promise these former German lands to Germany as a bribe, and Poland will be partitioned again. This is an eventuality every Pole sees as almost certain. So long as territory of somebody else can be swapped around to satisfy a greedy ally, this condition of fear and hatred between neighboring peoples in Europe will persist. It is certainly nothing that an American can blandly put aside as none of his business. We are as responsible, by our dealing at Tehran and Yalta, as anybody for the grim future the people in this part of Europe face. We will do well to pay close attention to present and future relations between Poland and Germany, and remember that 10 centuries of German aggression against a weaker neighbor cannot and will not be forgotten in one or two generations. We will also have to be sure that we do not contribute to worsening these relations by heedless ignorance of deep-lying political realities.

Pass the Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent editorial by Robert Ingalls of the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette-Times on the Brannan plan:

PASS THE POTATOES

In his speech the other evening at the $100-a-plate banquet Comrade Truman endorsed the Brannan farm plan and justified the huge potato surplus. Apparently he had not read the records of the National Grange convention held recently in Sacramento, Calif. The National Grange, one of the two biggest farm organizations in the country, came out unqualifiedly against the Brannan plan, which would seek to play both ends against the middle at the expense of the taxpayer. That denunciation of the Brannan plan was most scathing and it came after a general discussion participated in by delegates from 37 States and after Secretary Brannan had appeared in person before the convention urging endorsement of his silly method of throwing away the taxpayers' money.

The resolutions adopted assail the plan as an effort of the Government at Washington to solve farm price difficulties by subsidy and characterized it as "an internal cancer that eventually would destroy our free-enterprise system," and "at best a temporary device which will serve only to postpone the time when a sound solution of the farm problem must be reached. The resolution stated that the Brannan proposal would "make farmers beggars for a fair income." Clearly under such a system that party which would promise to voters the largest bonus out of the Treasury would garner many votes not obtainable on the basis of an honest, sound platform. It would then become a race to see which party would promise most."

In addition to the Grange the officials of the American Farm Bureau, one of the two largest organized farm groups, have come out against the Brannan plan. Only the National Farmers Union, which one editor has characterized a sort of agricultural CIO has come out for the plan. This does not mean, however, that the Brannan plan will not be an important issue in the campaign next year. Some local farmer groups which have not yet been able to see beneath the surface favor the plan and in some few States even the organizations of the conservative Grange have come out in favor of the Brannan plan.

However, what assures the Brannan plan a prominent place in the campaign next year is that it is the brain child of the CIO and its Political Action Committee. And the Democratic Party and the national administration as now constituted are captives of these two organizations. The administration, of course, wants all the farm votes it can get and hopes to garner many through the Brannan plan. But it realizes, too, that if it lost the support of the CIO and the left-wing organizations in the cities and industrial districts, all the farm votes it would be able to gather would do it little good. The left-wingers have now taken over in the Democratic organization and despite all camouflage, they will continue to be in charge. Make no mistake about that. So we can expect the Brannan plan to be prominently featured next year by the New Dealers, the Fair Dealers and the Fabian Socialists of various hues.

The reason why the CIO and its PAC are pushing the Brannan plan designed to "help the farmers" is easy to understand. Workers in the city are beginning to tire of high prices, even if their wages have risen accordingly. What they naturally want is cheap meat, cheap bread, and high wages. The present system of Government loans keeps prices high. So the CIO'ers have designed a plan where prices will be allowed to reach the market level and the farmers will be paid subsidies by the Government to make up for the loss of crop loans. The workers—so the Brannan planners believe—will get cheap food and the farmers will get high prices. Only the taxpayers will suffer. At least that is what they think. Here is why the radical labor leaders favor the Brannan plan to help the farmers. They want to get off their necks the irate consumers who don't like high food prices.

Chinese Reds Seek Yanks To Fly Gift Air Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Clyde Farnsworth and also an editorial from the Washington Daily News:

[From the Pittsburgh Press]

CHINESE REDS SEEK YANKS TO FLY GIFT AIR LINE—CHENNAULT FILES APPEAL FROM HONG KONG COURT AWARD OF PLANES TO COMMUNISTS

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

HONG KONG, February 27.—Having acquired a ready-made air transport system, largely founded on the wartime bounty of American taxpayers, Red China now is shopping around for American know-how to help handle its $100,000,000 prize.

That is what it would have cost the Chinese Communists, by authoritative estimate, to amass the aviation assets to which they have now fallen heir—through bashfulness of the United States State Department and the good offices of the British in reallocating other people's property.

A reliable official source, who disapproves of last week's decision of the Hong Kong Supreme Court conferring two former Nationalist air lines on the Chinese Reds, said he believed Communist talent scouts were trying here, in Bangkok, Rangoon, and possibly the United States to hire American air technicians.

He also supposed that British concerns in Hong Kong were preparing to handle Communist requirements for spare parts and fuel; and he wondered how this would fit into the proposed $35,000,000 American aid appropriation to Britain for aircraft parts.

So far as he knew, Red agents thus far failed to sign any American pilots for the 71 planes Peiping won in the Hong Kong court. But he knew of three American technicians, and possibly three besides, who had agreed to work for the Reds.

HAS WANTED RECEIVER

Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault and Whitting Willauer, interim purchasers of the air-lines assets, wanted a receiver appointed pending a full-dress court trial for determination of title.

But the Hong Kong court ruled that as of January 6, when Britain recognized the Peiping regime, agents of that government (actually the turncoat employees of the air lines) were in physical possession of the assets and the Red government and the air-lines assets therefore enjoyed "sovereign immunity."

APPEAL FILED

Chennault has initiated an appeal to the same court and intends to go next to the British Privy Council. Lodgment of the appeal in Hong Kong requires 14 days. Meanwhile, under heavy police guard and with antiaircraft batteries ready for action at Kaitak airfield, just in case some Chinese Nationalist air fighters should take active issue with the British decision, equipment and spare parts already are being moved out by ship.

How soon the Communists will be ready to try flying the 71 planes into Red China no one could say. Flight crews are a particular problem—the Communists may need foreign pilots to ferry them out.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 24, 1950]

HOW CAN WE WIN?

Now that the United States and Britain have recognized the French-sponsored Bao Dai regime in Indochina, French military circles are asking for a common western policy in the Far East, as well as immediate military aid.

A list of the equipment wanted, including light tanks, jeeps, reconnaissance cars, and small-arms ammunition, has been given to our Government, with an additional request for a $100,000,000 economic rehabilitation loan.

Since we are here being asked to buy into a war, it will be well to get all the facts on the table. We ought to know what we're getting into, and just what chance, if any, we have to win. From this distance, the chance looks dim.

The French, having had an army of 140,000 men in the field for 3 years, have inflicted no serious injury on Ho Chi-minh's Communist forces. Now, according to a Paris report to the New York Times, an effective blockade of Communist China is regarded as one of the essentials if victory is to be achieved.

The idea of a blockade of Communist China can be discarded, now that the British court in Hong Kong has awarded the Red Government at Peiping 70 transport and passenger planes which Major General Chennault had purchased from the Chinese Nationalists. That decision probably spells the doom of Formosa, as well as killing any prospect of saving Indochina from the Reds.

Some heads should be examined in the State Department and the British foreign office. Britain recognized the Chinese Reds and now has given them the planes they need to continue their campaign of aggression. The United States has recognized the Bao Dai forces in Indochina, and now is asked to put up the money and the arms to defeat the forces of Ho Chi-minh, which are said to have the active support of the Chinese Reds. Russia, of course, is backing both Red forces.

How can the west hope to win under this kind of leadership?

Capitol Stuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John O'Donnell, from the New York News of yesterday:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 27.—Ohio's Representative CLIFF CLEVENGER—who used to run a dry-goods store before he came to Congress in 1939 and so knows the headaches of keeping a business out of the red—felt like a lot of other American taxpayers the other day when the State Department asked for $76,000,000 just to pay the salaries of the distinguished Dean Acheson and his brother diplomats for the next fiscal year.

It was one of those behind-closed-doors sessions of the House Appropriations Committee and one after another of the State Department's bigwigs had asked for additional millions. For hours Department spokesmen had droned on on the same familiar theme: We need more cash to carry on our great work in global diplomacy.

At the end of the session (this was on February 2) CLEVENGER leaned back in his chair and let fly with these off-the-cuff remarks, which we have a hunch many fellow-taxpayers have been making to themselves about the Truman-Acheson diplomatic regime:

"I've been feeling that certain numbness which also runs through the American people regarding this spending and our tax situation. I've kept quiet but I did a little arithmetic—tried to break this thing down for the people who were losing sleep because of the pressure of food and housing, taxes, etc.

"I worked it out this way: With 151,000,000 people in the United States, the cost of Government had become $6 per week per head. It was broken down in round figures to about $6 National and $2 a week State and local. This is a lot of money when it gets to $32 a week out of every average family.

"The debt that we are talking about, $258,000,000,000, simply leaves my intellect numb."

But the spenders in the State Department had not felt that numbness of the average American taxpayer shared his worries. They were now asking for $76,000,000, just for salaries for 1 year.

CLEVENGER continued:

"This amount of money, gentlemen, is just for personnel in this one Department, which has now grown so that every month you in the State Department spend more than you did in a year when I came to Congress. This is for personnel alone. It is twice the cost of the legislative operation of the United States Government. Counting the operation of the Capitol; the Printing Office—half of that at least is charged to it—the Library of Congress, which is only in a small part an agent of the Congress; and the operation of both of the office buildings and all of our staffs, that is only about half as much as these personnel sheets for the State Department's operation."

IN SECRETARY'S POSITION

With the Treasury showing a deficit of $40,000,000 a day, CLEVENGER roughly observed that the point had been reached where we had to drop something, and he was for dropping the State Department's "day-dreaming; these gigantic operations of pamphlets and books and moving pictures which (reveal) that there is no place in the world where we are not busy taking care of everybody's business. * * * We have the greatest facility for getting our nose into everybody's business that was created since time began."

He then turned his attention to the heavy tab we have to pick up to run the United Nations set-up in New York. CLEVENGER wound up with this final salvo:

"I am hoping they will provide some way to peace, but it does not seem that we are finding it. But we are finding ourselves involved in almost every domestic spat everywhere in the world. Our people are simply bombarded with endless propaganda for foreign interference.

"We have developed millions of psychopathic people in the United States, from pressure of the economic cost of living, everyday living, that is driving people out of their minds. And, so far as I am concerned, I just want to serve notice that I hope some of you will sharpen up your pencils and stand along with me to try to reduce this thing to some sensible size.

"Now, with that, I am done on the State Department, so far as I know. It is one of the greatest offenders in our Government for scattering our money, for involving us in all the difficulties of the world, and for one I am ready to try to cut it down to size and try to restore some sanity to our people and to our Government."

World War III: Is It Closer Than We Think?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Castle (Ind.) Courier-Times of Thursday, February 23, 1950:

WORLD WAR III: IS IT CLOSER THAN WE THINK?

One September not so long ago we turned in our sleep and then decided it was the telephone ringing.

"The Associated Press calling," said the operator, and then the message, "Hitler's armies have marched into Poland."

What did it mean?

War! War in Europe. With all the sword rattling that had gone on, it still didn't seem possible.

Not many months later the news of Pearl Harbor came upon us like a bolt of lightning. War! Not just for Europe but us.

Today, people who are extremely well informed believe that we may any day experience the Pearl Harbor of world war III. It is not denied that a special meeting of the Cabinet was called recently to consider the very danger of a sudden and catastrophic attack by Russia upon this country.

Certain it is that Russia has taken a new and bolder turn. She has pushed us out of Bulgaria. Her pressure upon Tito indicates that Yugoslavia may any day face actual invasion by the Russian armies. Her demands upon Finland assume unreasonable character and impossible proportions. Her swallowing of China goes unchallenged.

Let us not indulge the wishful thought that there may be an insurrection by the people of Russia. True, the Voice of America, our own short-wave radio, is being heard inside Russia and has some influence upon the people. But the Russians have never lived under a decent government; the czars were about as bad as the present dictatorship, and people don't usually rebel unless they have known something better.

Our best hope is in the practicality of the Russian mind. It is possible that they intend to go as far as they can without facing a full-scale war with the United States, but in that event it still takes complete war preparations for us to stop them.

We are obviously not prepared for a war that may come to us overnight. One thing is sure, it will come with a suddenness and devastation that will outdo Pearl Harbor.

After that impact in 1941 we were driven from the Pacific and we depended upon England to hold out for us in Europe and the Atlantic. It took us 2 years to retool our industry for war production, raise armies and train them, and get ready to fight our enemy.

This time there isn't going to be 2 years, there may not be 2 months or 2 weeks to get ready. The devastation of the atomic and hydrogen bombs, guided missiles and germ warfare, to say nothing of new devices for mass killing that are still locked up, mean that the country that has to get ready after the fighting starts is going to lose.

At the present time our railroads and industries are almost out of coal, leaving us in a weakened and vulnerable position as the result of a strike. For our national safety, that ought never to happen again.

Perhaps it is our sense of what is important that has led us to our unpreparedness, for we are unprepared both militarily and spiritually.

The nations of history who have fallen to a conqueror were almost invariably wealthy and bent on their own comfort. Rome with all its culture fell before the invading hordes of vandals and other tribes. France was serving pastries from the kitchens of the Maginot line almost up to the time the German fifth column took over.

We are now the wealthy of the world—all of us in America—for by world standards, any person who drives a car is among the wealthy. Further and worse, we have put an importance upon our comfort and well being that may be our undoing. We speak of a standard of living as though that were the goal of life. We are all the time talking about shorter hours and more pay; getting more and giving less, and it won't do; it softens and weakens us and leads to our destruction as a people. Nor need anybody get the idea that we are throwing stones at labor, all of us are guilty.

The fact is that while we meditate upon our standard of living, coyly preserve our sovereignty, and notify other countries that Marshall plan aid will soon stop and they'll be on their own, Russia overruns the world. She already has gone farther and taken more territory and more people than Germany had done when we were drawn into the war.

Czechoslovakia, China, Poland, Bulgaria, and half of Germany already have been swallowed. Yugoslavia, Malaya, Finland, and Formosa are almost within the bear's paws. How far does it go until we are next?

Our world situation overshadows every other consideration in our lives today in importance, and yet our actions are weak and inadequate. We need a bold program of action, equal to the task and up with the times:

1. We need to purge the country of Communists, not just from key positions in Government offices. The plea of freedom of speech for Communists is nonsense; they intend the overthrow of the Government, and that is treason. We might as well permit murder because the Constitution guarantees the right of people to be secure in their persons.

2. We need to double our world propaganda activities, such as Voice of America, to carry the story of freedom to all peoples. That would not approach the propaganda activities of Russia on behalf of communism.

3. We need to retool industry for war production as we would if we knew war were only a few months away.

4. We need to integrate our economy and our very lives with the other free peoples of the world. This alone can really make us and the world of free peoples strong against the world of Communist dictatorship and enslavement. There are those who smugly will say our interests are affected. Perhaps. Would it be better to preserve these interests and lose our necks?

5. We need to find other solutions to our economic problems than bickering and loss of production. It not only reduces the standard of living, but weakens us as a nation and makes us vulnerable to attack. We have got to find a way to work together.

We need a rebirth of the spirit of our fathers who founded this country: their courage, their common sense, and their concern for the common good of decent peoples.

Let us go forward together, with the conviction of free people, the courage of our fathers, and the spirit of humanity, to meet the challenge that Communist dictatorship now makes against our religion, our freedom, and our very lives.

Hog Price Supports for Next Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Des Moines Register of February 27, 1950. In this editorial Secretary of Agriculture Brannan is quoted as having said that he would continue to support the price of hogs after March 31.

HOG PRICE SUPPORTS FOR NEXT YEAR

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan departed from his prepared text at the National Farm Institute to announce: "I'll let you in on a secret," that he would continue to support the price of hogs after March 31.

Hog prices are now guaranteed at 90 percent of parity. Under the new farm price law the Secretary can support hogs at any level up to 90 percent of parity. Farmers have not been in much doubt that hog prices would be supported at some level next year. What they are eager to learn is, how high?

It is getting pretty late to alter production plans for sows which have been bred for early spring farrow. However, farmers who have sows due to farrow in late April or May could still change their plans. And hog men still have the question of summer pigs to decide. It would be enormously helpful if the Secretary would announce what level of price support could be counted upon during the next 12 months—better still, for the period up to June 1951.

The new parity calculation raises the parity price of hogs. For example, in January the old parity placed hogs at $17.50. The new parity for that month would have been $18.70. So a continuation of 90 percent supports actually would mean a substantial rise in the dollar level.

Price support in the last year was not too high to cause trouble, since the Government never had to buy pork and lard to make it effective. The margin got fairly close at a time or two last fall, however, and in January the Department of Agriculture went so far as to call for bids on sales of pork.

In a time of booming general business conditions, strong demand for meat and high farm income, it would be ridiculous for the Government to interfere in the market for hogs—no matter what the parity formula happened to show. Besides, the present law does not permit the use of direct payments as a means of implementing price support. So the Government would have to buy and store pork and lard, which would be a nuisance and run the grave danger of an unmanageable surplus, as with potatoes.

Therefore, it would seem wise for the Secretary of Agriculture to announce a new hog support level safe enough to prevent Government buying next year. Such a level would provide farmers with a minimum yardstick to shoot at—without guaranteeing them a sure profit. But it's not as simple as that.

The Secretary cannot afford to put the hog support figure so low as to discourage feeding corn to hogs next year. That would intensify the corn surplus problem. Since corn supports are mandatory at 90 percent of parity, this partly ties the Secretary's hands. And it provides an illustration of the difficulties in individual commodity price support as a means of protecting farm income.

No matter what Mr. Brannan decides, we hope he does it soon so Iowa farmers can make their plans with assurance.

Tax on Theater Admissions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, urging repeal of excise tax on theater admissions:

I am grateful to the members of the Ways and Means Committee for the opportunity to express my views on the question of exempting admissions to moving-picture theaters from the Federal tax on admissions. On February 8, 1950, I introduced a bill for this purpose, and I strongly urge that this and other wartime excise taxes be repealed at once.

The original Admissions Tax Act was passed as a war revenue measure in 1917. It was never repealed but during the interwar period some measure of relief was granted by the setting of certain minima under which the tax did not apply. During the 1920's when admission costs were somewhat lower than they are now, the minimum rate to which the tax was applicable was frankly aimed at the luxury class, for it was for some time $3. Subsequent revenue acts, particularly during the 1930's gradually lowered the minimum, until, just before the war, by an amendment of 1940, effective in 1941, it was down to 21 cents. The Revenue Act of 1943 put the effective rate at 20 percent, reaching down, with a few exceptions in favor of certain classes of persons, to levy a tax of 1 cent for each 5 cents or fraction thereof of the admission price. And, despite an express clause, covering their automatic repeal 6 months after the conclusion of the war, we have kept them at full effective war-tax rate.

It is interesting to know how they got that high in the first place. When World War II came along, we lumped all these admission tickets in with such items as luggage and jewelry. The tax on luggage was devised to prevent too great a demand for leather that was needed for war purposes; jewelry, too, was made of hard-to-get materials. But what is our excuse for admissions? Luxury taxes? Well, maybe the first-run movie houses, or the big-time legitimate theaters are a luxury, but we certainly overreached ourselves when we went beyond them. We struck at the ordinary recreation of the low-income factory worker, and deprive thousands of our lowest- and middle-income earners of this vital and often only means of relaxation and recreation.

If any luxury taxes are to be repealed, wartime excise taxes on admissions, I feel, should be given the first consideration. For so far as movies are concerned this so-called luxury tax reaches down, not only to the ordinary recreation of the lower-income class, but it also adversely affects hundreds of small businesses, in an industry that is not only competitive within itself but is just entering upon a difficult period of readjustment to the competition of tax-free television.

Insofar as the motion picture industry is concerned, let's take a look at these forms of entertainment, and the industries which produce them, and see if, after viewing the record, we are justified in continuing these admission taxes. The motion picture industry during the war, the stars, the big studios, the theaters across the Nation, small and large, the hundreds of employees who work in them, built up an enviable record of assistance in the selling of war bonds. Their efforts in this task resulted in the sale of over a billion dollars worth of E bonds. Their generosity to the Government in aiding in this work cannot be questioned. No one can accuse the motion picture industry of failing in its responsibility to the American public in our hours of greatest need. Nor have they ever shirked an effort to aid the public. We know how helpful they have been in the "march of dimes" campaign, the heart fund, community chest advertising, Damon Runyon cancer fund and others.

Let's look at the industry itself. The admissions tax brings in the fourth largest amount of revenue of all the excise taxes, surpassed only by the taxes on alcohol, tobacco, and gasoline. Last year the movie box-office take was $1,400,000,000 of which $234,000,000 represented the tax. This last constitutes 60 percent of the total admissions tax revenue of $385,000,000 for the year 1949.

A billion dollar business sounds like a lot of money, and it is difficult to be against a good revenue producer, but a break-down shows that the larger part of this money stays right in the home town for local services, and so instead of taxing a large-scale concentrated industry which can balance off deficits of one unit against profits of another, we are levying this tax on a conglomeration of units which can ill-afford to bear it.

The distribution of these receipts is as follows:

Sixty-eight percent are for local payments which cover the following items:

	Percent
(a) Salaries of theater employees	16
(b) Rent or equivalent	15
(c) Operating expenses	20
(d) Taxes	6
(e) Net profit	11

Thirty-two percent goes for film rental which covers both (a) distribution costs, 12 percent; (b) studio production costs, 20 percent.

This 32 percent which is given to the major studios is broken down in an average budget as follows:

	Percent
1. Story costs	5
2. Production and direction costs	8
3. Sets and other physical property	35
4. Stars and cast	20
5. Studio overhead	20
6. Income taxes	5
7. Net profit after taxes	10

Thus the money Hollywood takes in goes not just to the big-name stars and the stockholders of the company, but to the thousands of working people who compose the industry. If the industry fails, an important segment of low-income working people will be affected.

A survey of the motion-picture industry since the end of the war shows the same factors affecting it, as affect many another business. It no longer is in a seller's market. In its peak year in 1946, attendance rose to approximately 90,000,000 a week; in 1947, it was 90,000,000; in 1948, it was 82,000,000; and in 1949, it was approximately 65,000,000.

For years the movies have been admitted to be the greatest exponent of American culture abroad. This foreign market is dwindling alarmingly, not because of lack of desire on the part of foreign nations for the pictures, but because of international exchange difficulties. Back in 1940, not more than 4 or 5 out of 10 pictures recouped their production costs at home. The others turned to the foreign market to obtain sufficient revenues to save them from a loss on that production. Now the dwindling domestic market prevents more than 1 out of 10 from recovering production costs at home, and the movie industry is faced with a serious problem.

For despite economies, production costs as such have not decreased; it is only through the use of fewer extras, and tightening on other items of the production budget that the economies have been effected. The relief from the amortization charges will soon run out, and consumer resistance continues, and will continue if prices continue to rise, for the drop in attendance is attributed to tightened family purse strings. If increased attendance is not brought about, this great industry will be hampered if not destroyed. Domestic demand must be kept elastic, or we shall be destroying at the same time low priced American recreation, and the best voice of American life and living that foreigners ever heard.

Hardest hit, even worse than the studios which are concerned about where to get the money to produce the pictures, are the low-priced theaters that show them, the neighborhood theaters that are compelled to charge 50 cents for a show these days. It is from these little fellows that the real push for repeal is coming. They operate over 20,000 theaters with 12,000,000 seats in all the towns. And RAYBURN across the land. They state plainly that the 20 percent tax is hurting their business. The Theater Owners of America which has joined forces with the Council of Motion Picture Organizations points out that nearly 60 percent of the land's theaters gross an average of less than $600 per week, and that for small scale businesses such as these, the tax is an oppressive burden. The small time operators, united in the Council of Motion Picture Organizations, announced through the chairman of their tax committee, Abraham F. Myers, an all-out campaign to convince the American public that this Congress which represents the American public of the inequity of the tax.

"Our first job," Mr. Myers said, "is to secure repeal of the existing taxes on admissions. Then we—that is, our successors—will have to remain ever alert to see that such taxes are never again imposed. We have got to sell the Congress • • • the legislators of several States, and local authorities everywhere that it is wrong to impose special taxes on the motion picture business which are not imposed on other enterprises. • • •

"It is imperative that the public in general and public officials in particular be made to understand that the admission tax is not a tax on Hollywood—that it does not reach to those fabulous salaries which have recently been blazoned in the headlines. These salaries, I have been told are being readjusted to conform to changed economic conditions; but however that may be, the Government lays violent hands on Hollywood salaries by means of the income tax, just as it reaches into our meager purses at stated intervals. The admission tax has nothing whatever to do with those salaries."

Beyond the economic effects of the tax, there is one other major consideration to be borne in mind. The Hutchins Committee on Freedom of the Press in its study in 1943 classed the motion picture with newspapers, radio, and magazines in its obligation to live up to its responsibilities as a conduit of mass communication. Mr. Myers, speaking on behalf of the Council of Motion Picture Organizations, stated it this way:

"We cannot conceive of your advocating a special tax on newspapers, magazines, and books. As a lawyer you might ponder whether such a tax would abridge the freedom of the press; and as a statesman you would certainly say that such a tax was contrary to public policy.

"We feel, on reason and authority, that motion pictures are an important part of the communications industry and as such are entitled to the same consideration accorded by the Federal Government and the States to the press."

I believe there should be sweeping action by the Congress aimed at all excise taxes, and especially the 20-percent tax on motion-picture-theater admissions. As I have already pointed out, this popular type of recreation affects practically every family: When this movie tax was imposed as a wartime measure, it was accepted in good spirit. There were sound reasons for it and the other excise taxes. But I am convinced there is no longer any justification for continuing it, and I strongly urge the immediate repeal of the excise tax on movie admissions. Thank you very much.

Rayburn's Big Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Banner News, of Magnolia, Ark., for July 21, 1949:

RAYBURN'S BIG CHANCE

The Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended that the Southwestern Power Administration dovetail its power-delivery operations with those of the private utilities in the area. The committee also recommended that the appropriation as approved by the House be reduced. This appears to us to be sound recommendation which has as its objective the saving of millions of dollars which otherwise will be spent by the SPA in building power lines which duplicate those of the private utilities.

The Senate committee apparently took its cue from the recent agreement worked out between the SPA and the Texas Power & Light Co. It is no secret that Speaker SAM RAYBURN was in large measure responsible for bringing the private utility and the SPA together on this compromise agreement which will enable the Government to do what it seeks to do in the power field without driving the private companies out of business.

It is almost certain that the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee will be followed by the Senate as a whole when the matter comes up for consideration, probably this week. The issue will then go to a House-Senate conference committee. Surely the House committee and the House will see the wisdom of concurring with the Senate action.

It is our hope that Speaker RAYBURN will use his influence to promote the SPA-Texas Power & Light agreement as a national policy. If he does, he will have rendered a great service to his Government and to the cause of private enterprise.

It's a Long Time From Mr. Abbitt to Mr. Zablocki

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. NOLAND

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Collier's for March 4, 1950:

IT'S A LONG TIME FROM MR. ABBITT TO MR. ZABLOCKI

(By James C. Derieux)

CONGRESS WASTES A MONTH EACH SESSION TAKING ROLL CALLS, THOUGH A MACHINE WOULD TALLY ALL 435 VOTES IN SECONDS

During its last, long session, the Eighty-first Congress spent approximately 1 month of its time calling the roll, and that's about par for the chore. In the Senate there were 413 quorum calls and 226 calls for the yeas and nays, requiring from 10 to 15 minutes each. The House droned through 115 quorum calls of perhaps 20 to 25 minutes each, and 121 yeas and nays that used up about 40 minutes each.

Do a little multiplying and dividing, figure 5 days a week and 8 hours a day as normal time spent on legislative floors, and you will come up with the surprising fact that Congress could cut its sessions by 3, 4, or even 5 weeks if it did not have to go through with those slow-motion roll calls by clerks.

And it doesn't have to go through with them. It could use electric roll-call machines that would reduce minutes to seconds. It could do this without the loss of a single filibuster, without eliminating or shortening a single speech, without damage to the Constitution or to any other bulwark of freedom, without peril to this great Nation established by our fathers, and without impairment of the right of any Member to view with alarm or point with pride.

The cost of installing electric roll callers in both Houses probably would be between $300,000 and $400,000, which is not even piggy-bank change in these days of billions.

Directly, the saving of money by use of electric roll calls would not be great, because Members of Congress and their clerks are paid by the year, not by legislative piecework. But saving money is not the main point in favor of electric voting. The impression Congress makes on the public is the big consideration.

Liberty resides in representative lawmaking assemblies. Any serious disrespect for Congress is a threat to our system of liberty. The fact, therefore, imposes on the public the obligation to be intelligent in its appraisal of Congress, and on Congress the obligation to transact its business—which is your business—in the most effective and impressive manner compatible with freedom of deliberation.

A legislature cannot be efficient in the narrow sense. It should not make instantaneous decisions. It needs all the time it can get for its deliberations. There must be study and debate and consultation and, often, compromises. One way to do this is to speed the roll calls.

Tens of thousands of American citizens, including school children, visit the legislative galleries in Washington every year, and too many of them go home disappointed. To them the Congress seems a casual, dull body that drones along in nasal tones. This impression is due partly to the fact that legislative procedures are not thrilling. Even when there is political intrigue, it usually is obvious and seedy. Adventure stories are not written around the behind-the-scenes work of committees. But visible and instantaneous results in roll calls, instead of the drugging effect of oral calls, would do something to create the impression that Congress moves alertly, and lives and has its being in the twentieth century, not in the nineteenth.

Seventeen State legislatures use the electric roll call in one or in both houses. They are Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Dakota, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. The earliest of these installations was made in 1916, others were made in the 1920's and onward. The machines have been progressively improved. No State that has tried this modern technique has thrown it out, nd in none of the using States have the people, so far as is known, lost any liberty because of the device.

Here is how the device works: Each member would have a regular seat, which is true in the United States Senate now, but not in the House. At each seat there would be an electric switch box, to which the Member would have a key. When voting time came, he would insert his key—no other key would work his switch—and throw the lever to record his vote. On an illuminated roll board up front, which would display the number of the bill being voted on, a light beside his name would show how he voted—if he voted.

The result would be totaled and shown immediately on the board, and a perforated card would come out giving the printed record of who voted, and how. Corrections would be easy if errors should be made. The Presiding Officer, who faces the legislators, would have a miniature of the big board in front of him on his desk, so that he could see what happened without turning around.

In addition to this main service of taking and recording a roll call in from 10 to 20 seconds, the big board could be used to call pages. Of course, it would still be necessary, before a vote to give Members perhaps 10 minutes to get to the floor. Warning bells, as now, could do this. There are some political disadvantages to simultaneous and instantaneous voting, but they are not wholly respectable. The Member who waits to learn how the vote is going before throwing in his yea or nay would be discomfited. Also, the Member who likes to avoid putting his vote on record except on selected bills would suffer political pains for, if the machine is used on all calls, he could not count on the anonymity of the unrecorded voice vote.

Under present procedure, many bills are passed without recording the actual votes. If the machine reduced this practice, representative government would be the winner. The more recorded roll calls, the better we can judge our Representatives.

Some object to mechanical voting on the ground that it would displace worthy employees. That is not a valid argument. Everybody who knows anything about Washington knows that a public employee who loses one job generally shows up somewhere else in Government in another and perhaps better one. That is the history of Washington reforms and consolidations.

In his book, A Twentieth Century Congress, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, speaking of the oral roll call now in use, says: "Of all the antiquated procedures on Capitol Hill, this one undoubtedly pulls down the efficiency of Congress more than any other single practice."

Senator KEFAUVER, Representatives JAMES E. NOLAND, Democrat, Indiana, CHARLES E. BENNETT, Democrat, Florida, and GLENN R. DAVIS, Republican, Wisconsin, teamed up to do something about this at the last session, but without sensational results so far. However, sentiment for electric voting in the House seems to be overcoming some of the inevitable resistance to change, often strongly developed in senior public figures.

The electric voting machines would not be revolutionary in their results. In public affairs nothing is ever so beneficial as its friends claim it will be, or so damaging as its opponents predict. Even so, electric voting would help raise congressional efficiency a desirable notch or two.

The last session actually was one of tremendous actions. The North Atlantic military alliance was ratified, and more than $1,000,000,000 was appropriated to arm foreign countries. The Marshall plan and reciprocal trade agreements were extended, the military establishment was reorganized, a public housing program was started; the minimum-wage level was lifted, and there were numerous other legislative acts significantly affecting life in the United States and elsewhere. The Senate, in session 928 hours, passed 926 bills, resolutions, etc. The House passed things at an even swifter rate in the course of the 1949 session that lasted from January 3 to October 19.

Yet the session had a poor press, especially as it dragged out through the hot and humid summer; and remarks in the galleries and elsewhere suggested that the public was not satisfied. Quick, visible voting instead of the slow call from Mr. ABBITT to Mr. ZABLOCKI (first and final House names) would have done at least a little to dispel the impression that the session fumbled and stumbled and wasted time.

A Substitute for the Lodge-Gossett Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Arthur Krock entitled "A Substitute for the Lodge-Gossett Plan," which appeared in the New York Times of February 9, 1950. Mr. Krock, with his customary felicity summarizes House Joint Resolution 414, introduced by me as an alternative to the Lodge-Gossett Resolution. The alternative resolution provides for election of members of the electoral college in precisely the same manner as are elected Members of Congress, to wit, one to be elected from each congressional district and two to be elected at large from each State.

Mr. Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., a Princeton scholar advocating the district system, concluded that—

This, I repeat, is the mode which was mostly, if not exclusively, in view when the Constitution was framed and adopted. It is also the mode which was advocated after some experience with the Constitution by Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, Gallatin, James A. Bayard, J. Q. Adams, Van Buren, Benton, Webster, Story, and many others.

Mr. Krock's article is as follows:

IN THE NATION—A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE LODGE-GOSSETT PLAN

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 8.—The strength of the bipartisan support in the Senate for the Lodge-Gossett amendment to the Constitution—it prescribes dividing Presidential electors hereafter in proportion to the popular vote in each State—has been taken as assurance that the House will also yield the two-thirds majority, which the proposal requires for submission to the State legislatures. Nevertheless, Representative COUDERT, of New York City, intends to press a substitute that has much to commend it.

Mr. COUDERT's joint resolution, introduced this week, provides for reversion to the original method of choosing electors to select the President and the Vice President. This was done by districts within the States, a majority or plurality of the voters in each district being sufficient to designate one presidential elector. Each State chose two others at large.

PREFERRED BY MADISON

This method, according to Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., of Princeton, who has surveyed the whole subject, in a very able and informing article, was described by Madison as the one "mostly, if not exclusively, in view when the Constitution was framed and adopted." But it was exchanged for the system of submitting State-wide tickets of electors to the people. This became general in Jackson's time and now prevails. On the way to this present arrangement the choosing of presidential electors by legislatures was practiced and then abandoned.

Most of Mr. Wilmerding's solutions are incorporated in the Coudert proposal. It provides that each State shall have the same number of electors as the total of its Representatives in Congress plus its two Senators. The voters in each Congressional district are to choose an elector from that district and all the voters in the State are to choose the two others. If no candidate for President or Vice President shall have a majority of the whole number of electors chosen throughout the Nation, then from the three leading candidates Congress, voting as one body, with each Senator and Representative entitled to a single vote, shall make the choice. Three-fourths of Congress must be present on such an occasion, and the office will go to the candidate receiving "the greatest number of votes."

FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCES

This proposed amendment to the Constitution departs from the plan sponsored by Senator LODGE and Representative GOSSETT in three important respects. It does not provide for proportional allotment of electors on a State-wide voting basis. It requires as at present an electoral majority—not a minimum plurality of 40 percent—for popular choice of a President or Vice President. And it provides for congressional selection if a majority is not forthcoming. These differences, together with the reversion to the district voting plan, make Mr. COUDERT's resolution a very different measure.

In his memorandum Mr. Wilmerding makes these points:

1. "The intention of the Constitution was to give to each mass of persons, entitled to one elector, the power of giving that electoral vote to any candidate they preferred" (a quotation from Senator Benton, of Missouri, in 1824).

2. "The late assembly (of Virginia, which in 1800 changed from the district method to the State-wide—has separated us from our fellow-citizens of the Union and compels us

to speak the voice of Virginia only". (A quotation from the Federalist legislative minority of that year).

THE DISTRICT SYSTEM

3. The district system is preferable to proportional voting because it maintains the geographical constituencies and gives an equal voice to equal units of population rather than to equal aggregations of actual voters. This is because each district contributes an elector, no matter how many in it go to the polls. Under the proportional-representation-voting system the weight of the equal district groups would vary with the local turnout. Bad weather would retain for urban communities the same advantage over the rural they have at present. Or some acute local issue would enable one district to exercise disproportionate voting weight.

THE EXAMPLE OF 1948

4. The two extra electoral votes to which each State is entitled, and are reflected in the two Senators granted to each, might either go to the candidate who carried the State as a whole, or the State might be divided into two superdistricts for the purpose. This was done as late as 1892 in Michigan, where each congressional district also chose a presidential elector.

5. But a preferable method (to Mr. Cowen's proposal that present congressional districts, or as legislatures may rearrange them in the future, be the voting units) is to add a provision to the suggested amendment. This would require Congress to create, for national election uses only, "compact and contiguous districts containing, as nearly as practicable, an equal number of inhabitants."

With these slight deviations, Mr. Wilmerding is on Mr. Cowen's track, and his pioneer labors in this field of electoral reform plainly influenced the New York City Representative in working out his suggestions for the Lodge-Gossett amendment. Few forecasters of Capitol action would give it much of a chance when the House, in a week or so, takes up the resolution passed by the Senate. But then everyone was surprised when the Senate approved any electoral change at all.

No Partisan Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of February 26, 1950:

NO PARTISAN MATTER

The Lodge-Gossett amendment to the Constitution, under which the electoral vote in Presidential elections would proportionately reflect the popular vote by States, has passed the Senate and is now awaiting action by the House.

It is interesting that the amendment has aroused opposition both from the Taft school of Republicans and from some liberal Democrats on grounds of its partisan political effect. Mr. Taft seems to fear that the Republicans would be unable to make sufficient inroads, in the foreseeable future, on the popular vote of the Democratic South to offset the loss of electoral votes in the industrial States of the North (Ohio, for example) which under the present system have often swung en bloc into the Republican column. On the other hand, those liberal Democrats who are fighting the amendment fear that industrial Northern States would tend to lose their present political influence just because their popular (and therefore electoral) vote is so evenly divided. They fear that the South shedding its one-party character only by slow degrees, would meanwhile regain its former prestige in Democratic councils precisely because of the large blocs of electoral votes it, alone, would be able to produce. Furthermore, they fear that the Republicans, hoping to make inroads on the South, would tend to move more to the right, thus lessening still further the influence of labor and minority groups in the North.

We believe that the Lodge amendment can and should stand on its own merits as a genuine and democratic improvement in our method of electing the President and Vice President. Whether it would benefit the Republicans in the South or the Democrats in the North, whether it would give an advantage to this or that political group, is basically immaterial. It ought to be locked at not as a weapon for partisan advantage but as a proposal to bring our constitutional structure more in line with modern conditions and as a means for eventually breaking the one-party system where it exists.

Gleam of Sanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Olean (N. Y.) Times-Herald:

GLEAM OF SANITY

Emerging from the fog of the Government's potato-price-support mess comes a ray of light that should be noted.

As the result of considerable pressure exerted by Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of Rochester, the Department of Agriculture has decided to make surplus potatoes, eggs, and milk available to needy Rochester and vicinity families through the Monroe County public-welfare department.

Representative KEATING has been one of the foremost critics of the Government's price-support program, with its inevitable surpluses; and it is no secret that a storm of protest against the proposed dumping of from 25 to 50 million bushels of surplus potatoes on the farms on which they were grown, after the grower had been paid for them with the taxpayer's money, of course—had arisen in many sections of the country.

As a result, increasing pressure has been brought to bear on Secretary Brannan's Department of Agriculture to find some way by which at least a portion of the surplus foods could be utilized.

As Representative KEATING declared, "with people hungry and in need of such supplies it seems little short of criminal to follow a policy of destroying perfectly good food."

That, undoubtedly, is the sentiment of the vast majority of our people; but they are also becoming sick and tired of being stuck for the money with which the Government buys up these surplus products, only to see that Government turn around and dump them.

Potatoes, Representative KEATING announces, will be made available directly to both private and public welfare agencies in Monroe County, but dried milk and dried eggs will be handled only by the county welfare department. Private welfare organizations will be able to obtain such commodities for needy cases from this source.

Jesse B. Hannan, director of Monroe County Public Welfare Department, has been empowered to act as clearing agent for certification that particular families in Rochester and other Monroe County communities need potatoes, dried milk and dried eggs.

Transportation charges for the surplus food will be paid by the recipient welfare agency.

Presumably, if these foods can be made available for Monroe County, they can be furnished to welfare agencies in other counties; and the result may be that valuable help will be provided to families that need it, and a considerable portion of the surplus foods now on the Government's hands will be disposed of to advantage rather than destroyed.

Administration of ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from C. T. Zinsmeister:

UNITED ENGINEERING & FOUNDRY CO.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., February 22, 1950.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
Member of Congress,
Federal Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR JIM: From time to time I read of the confusion among our representatives in Congress regarding the economic and political need of ECA and, of course, I am in no position to judge the existence of ECA from this standpoint.

However, for your guidance, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to report that in regard to the administration of the affairs of ECA, we have had a large amount of dealing with the various heads of departments within ECA, and I must admit that of all the tremendous volume of dealings we have had with various agencies of our Government, our dealings with the ECA have been by far the most prompt and intelligent. We realize all Government agencies are controlled by rules and regulations, which, of course, makes it a little more complicated at times than our transactions in private industry; however, the control and administration of ECA is as close to perfect as is possible.

Our particular dealings and those with others that I know of in the Pittsburgh district have been particularly with Mr. George Knutson, chairman of the Projects Committee, and Mr. F. B. Appelbee, attached to the controller's office. We have never dealt with any persons in Washington who have performed their assigned functions and duties, and yet had some sympathy for the problems of industry, as the above-mentioned men.

In your consideration of whether or not we should have an ECA and as to the amount of ECA assistance to be given, I trust you will advise some of your friends in Congress as to my humble opinion of the above particular phase of ECA.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

C. T. ZINSMEISTER,
Secretary.

Representative Abraham A. Ribicoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Stewart Alsop that appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, February 26, 1950, concerning my colleague and friend, ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, of Connecticut:

CONNECTICUT'S ASTONISHING RIBICOFF—STEWART ALSOP APPLAUDS CANDID REPRESENTATIVE

(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—It is a rare experience these days—and, therefore, a rather moving one—to come upon honesty, intelligence, and real courage anywhere in Washington. It is perhaps particularly rare to come upon these qualities in the United States House of Representatives, on the whole not the most inspiring branch of American Government. Yet all three of these qualities are to be found in the person of a certain obscure freshman Representative, ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF.

There is no special distinction in RIBICOFF's appearance or manner. He looks like what he is—a rising young lawyer-politician, intelligent, ambitious, personable, complete with neatly tailored double-breasted blue suit and a city-bred pallor. His manner reflects the rather automatic affability which most politicians instinctively adopt early in their careers as a kind of protective coloration.

Yet, RIBICOFF has written three communications for the edification of his constituents which a well-qualified observer has called "the ablest, the most courageous, and the most literate public statements I have seen from any Member of Congress in 10 years."

RIBICOFF's personal history is a first-generation American success story in a minor key. The Jewish-Polish immigrants who settled in a small Connecticut manufacturing town; the ambitious son working his way through law school; the successful law practice in Hartford; the wife, the neat house in the suburbs, the regulation two children; a peculiarly American story so familiar it hardly needs repeating. Nor is there anything unusual about the RIBICOFF political career—a 4-year term in the Connecticut State Legislature, followed by 4 years as a police court judge, and finally by his election to the Eighty-first Congress on the Democratic ticket in a close race.

Dozens of RIBICOFF's colleagues could duplicate all this. Yet the fact remains that ABRAHAM RIBICOFF is full of surprises. For one thing, this freshman Congressman has embarked on a quite astonishing political experiment. The nature of this experiment, which began after he toured Europe this summer as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, is very simple. It is to tell the voters in his district the unpalatable truth.

On his return RIBICOFF made speeches throughout his district, and wrote numerous articles for Connecticut papers about the real position of the United States in the world. He has now written a summing-up article called Europe and Illusion, which, unlike almost anything else to emerge from Congress, deserves to be read in full. For one thing, RIBICOFF is found to write (and he employs no ghosts) a simple but remarkably effective English prose.

"There are no breathing spaces ahead," he writes, "for this country to enjoy while the balance of power serves as a buffer between us and the world's problems." He spells out the meaning of this conclusion: It is a dangerous illusion to suppose that we can withdraw from our world responsibilities in 1952, or soon thereafter, sharply reduce taxes and live happily ever after.

On the contrary, he writes, "It looks to me more like a task of 10 more years calling for an additional outlay of $25,000,000,000. * * * The present planning of foreign aid is premising a scope that is too little and an ending that is too soon. * * * We must look upon the cost of keeping Europe free as a cost of keeping ourselves in business. If we pull out at any time in the unforeseeable future, we leave a vacuum which can only be filled by the Soviet Union."

This is strong stuff in an election year. But in two other communications to the voters of his district RIBICOFF really drives the point home—that American responsibilities are neither cheap nor painless. Virtually the entire farm vote of his district consists of shade tobacco growers. At their request he has introduced an amendment to the farm bill including shade tobacco under the farm parity program. At the same time he has bluntly served notice on his farmer constituents that he will vote against the whole program, including his own amendment, simply because he considers it extravagant nonsense in these times.

He has also, astonishingly, opposed the building of a federally financed $132,000,000 dam in his own district. "We have fixed charges which must be met before we can even begin to discuss appropriations for such projects," he briskly informs the voters. "The security of our Nation, as represented in military and foreign aid commitments, is now primary."

By all the accepted rules, putting national security before the pork barrel should spell curtains for RIBICOFF. Yet there is a final surprise in his strange tale. He is now so unchallengeably strong in his district that the Republicans are talking of nominating him on their ticket.

Despite all the evidence to the contrary, the RIBICOFF story seems to suggest that to treat the voters in this democracy like adults is actually good politics. At least a good many people more powerful and conspicuous than the freshman Congressman might do well to ponder the meaning of ABRAHAM RIBICOFF's experiment.

Letter to the Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert copy of a letter which I have sent to Secretary of State Acheson. The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 28, 1950.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY ACHESON: I should appreciate it very much if you would find it possible to make me conversant with the Government's views relating to the rearmament of the Arab States by Great Britain.

My attention has been called by interested citizens of Massachusetts, whose views I respect, that the peace of the Near East is being threatened and that the war against Israel by the neighboring Arab states may be renewed as a result of the acquisition by the Arab States, particularly Egypt, of large quantities of modern arms of all kinds, including jet planes, Spitfire planes, Sherman tanks, submarines, and battleships. These arms are being supplied, as you know, by the Government of Great Britain. It is asserted that the destruction of the balance of armament, as between the State of Israel and its Arab neighbors, constitutes a source of encouragement to the Arab governments. They have, by reason thereof, assumed an intransigent attitude toward Israel's efforts to negotiate treaties of peace.

Moreover, the responsible Arab leaders, as well as the Arab press and radio, so it is said, make no secret of their intentions to renew the war against Israel. They speak constantly and publicly of a "second round." The inflammable utterances of the Arab official spokesmen, no doubt, give weight to Israel's apprehension and it may well endanger the peace in the Middle East area—"a region the security of which is of great importance to the West," as you well state in your letter of January 12, 1950, to Representative JAVITS. As a direct result of the unprecedented delivery of arms by Great Britain to Egypt, Iraq, Syria, Transjordan, and Lebanon, an armament race between Israel and its Arab neighbors is now in full swing which, in itself, is bound to create an explosive situation—the very thing which our Government is endeavoring to avoid.

Indeed, no one is in a position to guarantee that the warlike statements by the Arab leadership and the provocative pronouncements on the radio and in the press calling for a war of revenge against Israel are merely intended for domestic consumption. Should the Arabs carry out their threats and the war be resumed against Israel, then it would be too late for anyone to extinguish the conflagration, which is capable of spreading into other sections of the world. Hence Israel has reason to be jittery. Therefore it is compelled, as a matter of self-defense, to strengthen itself militarily and thus consume its financial resources for the protection of its security. These resources would otherwise have been employed for sound economic and constructive objectives for the purpose of rehabilitating the hundreds of thousands of the DP's who came to Israel in search for peace and security.

In the aforesaid letter to Representative JAVITS you state:

"Arms shipments to the Arab states and Israel should be limited to those necessary for the purpose of maintaining internal law and order by the government concerned in the legitimate exercse of constituted authority, and for the purpose of providing for reasonable requirements of self-defense."

Both the amount of arms as well as the kind of arms that are being shipped to the Arab states cannot be said to be limited to the maintenance of law and order internally. If the policy of your Department with reference to the rearmament of the Arabs is to be dictated by the security of the Middle East area, which might be attacked by a third power, then Israel, say many interested citizens of Massachusetts, is entitled to be the beneficiary of that policy and receive similar arms. By the delivery of arms to Israel in similar quantity and kind, the balance of armament between it and the neighboring Arab states would be maintained.

I am persuaded that, in the event of any aggressive act by a third power in the Middle East, Israel may well be counted as a faithful ally, and it is, therefore, worthy of no less consideration than the Arab peoples.

As you well know, American citizens of Jewish faith are contributing vast sums of money to Israel for the immigration, settlement, and rehabilitation of hundreds of thousands of the Jewish DP's of Europe and other parts of the world. They are deeply concerned about the security of Israel.

I would appreciate your reply to the contentions of my constituents.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.

A Blow at the Two-Party System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the feeling in opposition to the Lodge formula for dividing each State's electoral votes in exact proportion to the popular vote is causing great apprehension among the citizens of New York State. It is a proposal, of course, to surrender the affairs of the Nation to a one-party system. It will make a few of the large States the tax-paying slaves of a party which is now dominated by a group of reckless spenders and wastrels.

I am taking the liberty of inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, two editorials from the Buffalo Evening News, one dated February 20, 1950, and the other February 25, 1950:

[From the Buffalo Evening News of February 25, 1950]

WHY NOT A DIRECT POPULAR VOTE?

When applied to past presidential elections, the so-called Lodge formula for dividing up each State's electoral votes in exact proportion to the popular vote produces some mighty queer arithmetic.

For example, the 16 States carried by Governor Dewey in 1948 gave him a total of 189 electoral votes under the present system. But under the proposed Lodge amendment—already approved by the Senate and now pending before the House—Mr. Dewey's total margin over President Truman in all these 16 States combined would have amounted to 6.9 electoral votes. Yet the Truman margin over Dewey in Texas alone would have amounted to 8.4 electoral votes. The one-party State of Texas, in other words, was more than enough to offset the combined Dewey margin in all the States he carried.

Yet in the face of such incongruities as this, the Lodge amendment is put forth on the contention that it would practically give us a direct popular vote for President—wholly ignoring the fact that every New York vote would have about one-sixth the weight of a Nevada vote.

We agree with many of the Lodge amendment's supporters that the President of the United States, being a national officer responsible to all the people, should be elected directly by the people. But we cannot agree that the devious Lodge formula would give us such a system, or even move in that direction. The Ohio Congressman who dubbed it "a fine racket for southern Democrats" is much too close to the truth for comfort.

If a popular vote is wanted, why not provide it in a straightforward way? The only possible justification for this clumsy alternative is expediency: since the small States already have a disproportionate weight of electoral votes, it is not thought likely that they would ratify an amendment which deprived them of it.

What this overlooks, however, is that this supposed advantage of the small States is in reality a disadvantage. So long as elections depend on carrying the "key" States, the small States can be sure their favorite sons and favorite issues will get little play by either party. A direct popular vote, far from disadvantaging them, would extend Presidential "availability" in every part of the country and make one State's voters just as important as any other.

Electoral reform is long overdue. But if Congress is at last on the verge of proposing one, why not make it a real reform—a direct Nation-wide popular vote for President and Vice President? That kind of proposition could stand on its merits before every legislature, and its ratification would give us in fact the "people's choice" for President—which is much more than can be said for the Lodge amendment.

[From Buffalo Evening News of February 20, 1950]

QUIRKS IN THE LODGE FORMULA

In seeking to improve our constitutional system of electing Presidents, Congress is trying to meet at least three distinct objections to the present method. First, the electoral college is an anachronism and ought to be abolished. Second, the present system of throwing an election to the House of Representatives when no candidate has a majority of electoral votes presents the constant danger of a serious constitutional crisis. Third, the electoral vote system is not a true measure of national sentiment and ought to be modified in the direction of an out-and-out popular vote.

The so-called Lodge amendment, which recently passed the Senate and now is pending before the House, tries to meet all three objections in a single cure-all formula. We heartily concur in its objectives, but confess to serious misgivings about the formula chosen for attaining them.

As to abolishing the electoral college, the easiest way to do that is simply to abolish it, by letting everyone vote directly for President instead of indirectly for a presidential elector. Each State could still cast all its electoral votes for the successful candidates, but the Lodge plan would change this to have the electoral votes split in proportion to the popular vote.

As to the danger of a constitutional crisis under the present system, this is real and serious. If no candidate gets an electoral majority, the House (with each State delegation having a single vote) must choose from among the top three. Unless a majority of the State delegations can agree by January 20 (when the presidential term begins), the Vice President-elect (chosen by the Senate) would fill the vacancy. The whole system is an invitation to chicanery, corruption, or worse.

But that, too, could be corrected easily enough, through an afterthought clause in the Lodge amendment. It provides for congressional interference only when the leading candidate has less than 40 percent of the total electoral vote. In that case, the whole membership of Congress (House and Senate) would choose between the two highest candidates. In this respect, the Lodge amendment is a distinct improvement over the present system.

As for moving in the direction of a straight-out popular vote, however, it is hard to see how the Lodge plan offers much improvement at all. It purports to do this by splitting each State's electoral votes instead of giving them all to the candidate who carries that particular State. The reason for this cumbersome alternative to a direct popular vote is obvious, an amendment needs to be ratified by 36 States, and this one is frankly a compromise to lure the small States.

But if so, why are the big ones supporting it? That is something a number of Senators, including TAFT, of Ohio, simply couldn't understand. For the Lodge plan not only would deprive the large States of their special prominence in presidential elections, but it would greatly amplify the voice of the one-party States. New York would have no importance at all, since the two parties' normal vote here would very nearly cancel out. But a single one-party State like Georgia or Vermont might yield an electoral margin bigger than either party could hope to offset in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio combined. And since most one-party States are in the Democratic South, the Lodge system would put the Republicans at a substantial disadvantage right off the bat.

The proposed plan, in short, would not give us a direct popular vote, but would simply shift the emphasis from one extreme to the other—from the key States where the parties are in close balance, to the one-party States, mainly in the solid South. The United States News and World Report has calculated that four Republican Presidents—Hayes, Garfield, Harrison, and McKinley—would have lost out under the Lodge plan because of this factor.

Before submitting any such amendment to the States, therefore, it would seem particularly incumbent on the Congressmen from the big States—especially the Republicans—to be very sure they know what they're doing to themselves. Senator TAFT has flashed a warning that should put them on guard: "I cannot understand Republicans voting for a system which is unsound in theory and fatal to the hopes of Republican success in any close election."

Educating Poland's Youth for Russian Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech by Prof. Donald E. Super, of Columbia University, on the subject of educating Poland's youth for Russian expansion:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF ATTORNEY STEPHEN S. SOLA

Ladies and gentlemen, our speaker has chosen for his topic Educating Poland's Youth for Russian Expansion. He presents a detailed description of what is happening to Polish youth under Communist indoctrination and what it means to the future not only of Poland, but the rest of Europe and the west.

Our speaker was born in Honolulu, Hawaii, in 1910. He received his elementary education in New York, attended secondary schools in Poland and Switzerland, and was graduated from Oxford University with bachelor's and master's degrees. Columbia University bestowed upon him the degree of doctor of philosophy. During the last war he served as an aviation psychologist, leaving the Air Corps with the rank of major. He taught for 4 years at Clark University and in summer schools throughout the country including Harvard. At present he is professor of educational psychology at Columbia University. As a psychologist he is regarded as among the leaders in this country.

I consider it an honor to present to you a recorded address by Prof. Donald E. Super, of Columbia University.

EDUCATING POLAND'S YOUTH FOR RUSSIAN EXPANSION

To graduate from high school in Poland today a boy or girl must pass an examination in which his social and political views are appraised by representatives of the Government-controlled political parties and trade-unions. This means that unless he has, or skillfully makes believe that he has, accepted the Communist doctrines prescribed by the Soviet-controlled Government, he cannot graduate from high school. And it goes without saying that, if he cannot graduate from high school, most training and positions which might lead to executive or professional employment are closed to him. In one district, that of Katowice, 2 years ago 30 percent of the candidates for the matura or high school diploma were failed because of "social unpreparedness," high-sounding name for lack of sympathy with communism and Soviet Russia.

How can such things happen in Poland, with her traditions of intellectual freedom? The answer is clear, for in May 1947 Minister of Education Skrzeszewski (a Russian-trained Communist), said: "Reforms are needed to allot Marxism a more worthy place among the sciences." Accordingly a great many different steps are being taken to insure "a more worthy place," that is a monopoly, for Marxism.

For example: in the ancient Jagiellonian University of Cracow three new chairs have been established, one in Marxian economics, one in Poland and the modern world from the Marxian viewpoint, and one in the history of social movements and revolutions. While the shortage of safely indoctrinated and docile professors has made it necessary to appoint one man, a Professor Sieradzki, to two of these chairs, their creation is an indication of the Communist Party's determination to indoctrinate at every level. There is evidence, too, that the shortage of Communist and fellow-traveling professors may not last too long, as there has been an influx of academically unprepared and intellectually unqualified, but Communist-led young men and women into the universities. They have been sent there by the party in response to demands for more students willing to learn what the party feels they should learn. One bit of evidence: university enrollment in the 28 institutions of prewar Poland equalled 48,000 students per year, whereas today, with fewer students in the academic and technical secondary schools, there are twice as many students (102,000) in twice as many universities (60).

Another bit of evidence: according to the official newspaper last summer, the examinations for admission to the universities are not difficult, but it is necessary that candidates supply certificates from local authorities concerning their social background and work in Communist organizations in order that they be eligible to take the exams. To pass the examinations, one must show further evidence of "class-consciousness and economic maturity, and of understanding of the role of the Soviet Union in the fight for the liberation of nations from the capitalist yoke." This is another way of saying that in order to get into the universities one need only be a pro-Russian Communist. Thus the Soviet-controlled government insures instruction of the proper doctrines, by properly indoctrinated professors, to properly receptive students.

But these are by no means the only steps being taken to bring Polish education in line with Russian. A great variety of special events are planned and staged with great fanfare. Last November included a Pavlov Week, in which a delegation of Soviet biologists toured Poland to lecture at the universities and educational centers on the currently approved biological concepts. So-called festivals of Soviet film, plays, and the like are staged, featuring Russian productions in theaters, schools, and even in the streets, in order to carry indoctrination to the school child and to the man in the street. World Student Week provided an occasion when university and technical institute students had publicly to demonstrate their unity with the Communist students of the world, or risk dismissal from the universities because of "social unpreparedness."

The campaign for thought control has, as case of Hitlerite Germany, reached the textbooks used at all educational levels. Although 3 years ago a member of Parliament dared to protest that the textbook revision then going on was handicapping the schools by forcing them to operate without books, they underwent still another revision last year in order to bring them in line with further changes in doctrine and interpretation—this has been true especially of history and biology. Thus the 6 year plan for communizing Polish thought moves ahead.

With the universities training Communists to be future teachers, with textbooks rewritten to conform to current ideology, there are still the presently employed teachers to consider: they, too, must be Communists or, failing a sufficient supply of these, fellow travelers. Last summer several thousand school teachers, compelled to take special vacation courses in Marxian ideology, were told that they must prove their allegiance to it during the current year in order to be reappointed next year. With children trained to think that spying on elders is a praiseworthy activity, checking up on the teachers is easy.

But sole reliance is not being placed on an older generation of basically non-Communist teachers in the public schools while waiting for a new generation of teachers to be trained, the so-called Society of Children's Friends has at its disposal large sums of money which are being spent on atheistic schools and on summer camps, staffed by trusted teachers, in the apparent hope that they will produce a less-adulterated crop of young Communists than the regular schools.

This does not mean that the public schools have less pressure on them to indoctrinate. Quite the contrary. On Stalin's birthday, for example, surprisingly similar messages from Polish children were read in chorus in the public schools and at meetings, hailing Stalin as "the culture and joy of youth * * * the leader and teacher and friend of all the suffering and oppressed," like the crocodile in Kipling's Jungle Book who was flatteringly called the protector of the poor by all the weaker animals who feared he would eat them. School children were forced to write letters to Stalin, uniformly beginning with "I, a child of democratic Poland, on the day of your seventieth birthday, want to express, in my humble letter, my gratitude to you." But then the so-called spontaneous demonstration organized from Moscow is an old story in the history of communism.

The number of nursery schools and kindergartens, for example, has increased threefold, their enrollments have quadrupled, since prewar days. That figure, taken at face value, sounds splendid—until one examines what is back of it. We should remember that it is the early years which are the most formative, and that there has been a steady drive for the employment of young women in construction work: if the children are in kindergarten they can be indoctrinated and the mothers can work. Declines in enrollment in elementary schools and in high schools confirm the interpretation by showing that the Communist government is not interested in a truly educated populace. The fact that enrollment in so-called vocational schools, which are now in effect mere apprentice-training institutions, is five times the prewar level, shows that what the party wants is not thinkers but producers: modern cannon-fodder.

But education, the Communists well know, is not something that takes place solely in schools. Accordingly all youth organizations have been taken over, some primarily for indoctrination purposes, and some primarily as a means of recruiting free labor, but all partly with both of these objectives in mind. The Scouts, the YMCA, and such organizations have been taken over and merged with the so-called Association of Polish Youth (the equivalent of the Russian Komsomol) and the Service for Poland (a semimilitary organization). Political and atheistic training, anti-American indoctrination, spying on elders, and construction work are their principal activities.

The Soviet-controlled government recognises too that education is not all formal or organized. Therefore, the Christmas toys of a year ago were criticized as reactionary and capitalistic, and this Christmas was one of toys in which dwarfs worked for the 6-year plan, games came with pictures of Stalin and Bierut, and picture books dealt with subjects such as world revolution.

The rapid rate of change, and the many fronts on which it is being pushed by a country with limited resources, make it clear that Soviet Russia and her satellites consider youth the principal objective of communization; if they are adequately indoctrinated, their countries will soon be safe tools for Soviet Russia. It is in the indoctrination of youth that Russia is consolidating her territorial gains in World War II. It is only obvious, then, that if we in America do not want to stand by and see Russia turn a substantial part of the world against us, we must show an active concern for what is happening to youth in the satellite countries, and in particular to the youth of a country such as Poland, which was the first and last to resist Soviet-Russian aggression. That young Poland still reaches out to us for help despite the disillusionment of Yalta and of the wars and uprising is made amply clear by the fact that courses in English are much more popular in Poland today than are the all-but-compulsory courses in Russian; at the University of Warsaw last fall, for instance, 114 enrolled for the study of English while only 11 signed up for Russian. What a straw to grasp at, courses in English, when what is desired is normal intellectual and social intercourse with the free western world; grammar, when what is needed is a way of life; words, when their very meaning is being changed and "democracy" has become a synonym for totalitarianism.

Address of Hon. Carl T. Durham, of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of February 21, our colleague, the Honorable CARL T. DURHAM, of North Carolina, delivered a very able and timely address to the North Carolina Democratic Club, of Washington, and I take great pleasure in presenting this well-prepared speech, and I hope very much

that it will be read and appreciated fully.

From the vantage point of the vice chairmanship of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, our colleague has discussed with gravity and wise understanding the perils we face in this atomic age. He has pointed out the inevitability of an atomic warfare race in view of the adamant attitude of the Kremlin in not being willing to assume the obligations which UN control, ownership, and inspection of world atomic installations would require. Our colleague has indicated the tragedy of the possible deprivation to our people of the marvelous possibilities of peacetime utilization of our rapidly growing atomic knowledge, if we are forced to concentrate wholly on atomic weapons of war. The honorable Member frankly concludes that the only way out of the atomic dilemma is to induce the Kremlin to agree to international control, and until such agreement is reached, he realistically admits that in planning our atomic energy program we must look first to our military defenses, at the same time continuing our unitiring efforts to persuade Russia to see the light. Our colleague insists that we cannot permit a lag in development of atomic energy for peacetime applications. The program, he states, must go forward on this twofold basis.

There is no note of hysteria in our colleague's discussion, nor is there manifest any spirit of defeatism. He says, and I quote, "We must calmly but resolutely guard our ramparts and keep our powder dry."

The honorable Member warns against erecting barriers of secrecy between our people and the atomic-energy program. Rather, he believes, we should concentrate on positive achievement. We must not stifle the spirit of investigation and scientific inquiry and erect an iron curtain of our own. Our colleague is a trained scientist, and he knows the dangers of stifling scientific investigation and the free spirit of scientific research.

Throughout his calm and judicious statement runs a thread of approval of the steps taken by our President, Harry S. Truman, upon whom has devolved the stupendous task of the atomic decisions from Hiroshima to the H-bomb. Our colleague believes our President has made wise and inevitable decisions in the face of circumstances, and he describes the President's most recent responsibility in arriving at the decision to proceed with the hydrogen bomb.

In my opinion, our colleague has made an excellent and inspirational statement on a matter of the gravest import to the American people, and I know that every Member will profit by its perusal.

Mr. Chairman, speaking to you tonight as Democrats, being members of a political party that has set our policy continuously since 1933, I desire to point out to you during the first half of this twentieth century, the Democratic Party has been charged with the responsibility for more than 34 years—8 years under Woodrow Wilson, 12 years under Franklin Roosevelt, and more than 4 years under President Harry Truman. This period has produced surprise upon surprise, and now presently the atomic age. We as a party have received dose after dose of tension with monotonous repetition. So it is necessary that we guard ourselves of not becoming overexcitable. The Democratic Party has had to take over every crisis in the first half of this century. Now it becomes necessary that we make the people of the world aware of our genuineness of what we are doing. The duration of the Democratic Party has been long and honorable, but the duration is not so important as the donations that we make as a political party. We are seeking today a peaceful world, but we are not seeking peace without honor and we never will. There is no doubt that Russia is building a formidable military machine in the hands of an absolute small group of men who would destroy us if opportunity offered, and for that reason our present leader, President Truman, has deemed it imperative to build a strong defense.

The pressure which is building up for a conference of some sort with the Soviet Union, in my opinion, is dangerous. It would immediately place us in a position of despair and defeatism.

When, in mid-1945, atomic bombs fell upon Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and brought the Pacific war to an abrupt close, most Americans thought the ultimate in instruments of destruction had arrived. Men talked of the absolute weapon; it seemed that nothing could surpass the power of the atomic bomb.

Now matters appear different, and still more startling.

Four weeks ago the President gave the go-ahead signal on the hydrogen bomb. There is good reason to think that a single such bomb could destroy any city in the world. The scientists are confident that it can be built. And if we can make one, we must assume the Soviet Union can, too. The Russians broke our atomic monopoly only 4 short years after Hiroshima.

I can assure you that the President said "Yes" to the hydrogen bomb only with the greatest reluctance, and because he could not afford to say "No." Picture, if you will, the dilemma that confronted him. To say "Yes" to the super bomb was to authorize development of a weapon which, if uncontrolled, may ultimately destroy civilization. But to say "No" was to invite the possible destruction of both America and all those nations now joined with us in seeking a world of freedom and abundance. Nothing in the record of the Kremlin suggests either inability to make the hydrogen bomb, or reluctance to use it if a tempting opportunity were offered.

Therefore, the President's decision was correct—and, under today's circumstances, it was inevitable.

But why was the President faced with such a cruel choice? We must turn to Moscow for the answer. Mr. Acheson, speaking for the President, is right, in my opinion, in his theory that he must keep himself in a strong situation for future negotiations, and I point out to you press conferences where President Truman and our State Department plainly made it known that we have not closed the door as many columnists and other people would have you believe.

Over 3½ years ago, the United States offered the world a plan that would harness the atom for man's good. Bernard Baruch, as representative for our President, stood before the United Nations and announced that we were willing to give up our atomic monopoly, to share our secrets, to admit UN inspectors to our installations, to put our plants under UN ownership and control. In return, we asked only freedom from the fear of atomic attack—we asked only that the Soviet Union and every other country undertake similar obligations. All the free world agreed to our offer being generous and sound. Only Russia and her satellites opposed it—as they still do today.

President Truman, at his weekly press conference on February 16, said, with great emphasis, that this country is wide open to any peaceful overtures, including the international control of atomic energy, through all its embassies and the machinery of the United Nations. On February 13, Mr. John D. Hickerson, Assistant Secretary of State, also said the United States is willing at any time to sit down and talk with Russia in the United Nations on International control of atomic energy, and you recall that Russia has offered no control proposal since June 1947. Mr. Hickerson said in his press conference that the Soviet Government alone is blocking plans for world control of atomic energy. Mr. Jacob H. Malik, Soviet delegate to the United Nations, issued a statement on February 12, after his walk out of the six-power consultative body of the UNAEC, and gave as his excuse the unwillingness of the West to oust National China. Our State Department at that time made it known that regardless of the Chinese matter, we were prepared to continue negotiations and talks on internaitonal control of atomic energy. Mr. Hickerson said what this country wanted is an agreement on atomic energy but Russia has continued to use every excuse to block negotiations on some type of control of this dreadful weapon.

Now we find ourselves facing the prospect of an atomic armaments race.

But such a prospect represents only half of the tragedy. The other half lies in this: Moscow's refusal to accept a just control scheme deprives mankind of the untold benefits that might follow if all the genius and treasure now being expended on atomic weapons for self-defense were turned instead to harnessing the atom for man's well-being.

As you know, our Atomic Energy Commission is constantly developing the peacetime applications of atomic energy. Of course, we should not be Utopian in our hopes. The day when an "atomic pill" will heat your house for a year, or send your auto across the country is not in sight.

But much progress has been recorded, and even more is to be anticipated. In medicine, for instance, the use of radioactive "tracers" brings closer the date when cancer will be conquered. In agriculture, atomic research offers the prospect of greatly increased crop yields and resistance to plant diseases. In industry, experiments now being conducted with new types of power-generating plants hold out the possibility of driving turbines and dynamos through atomic energy. Furthermore, the time is not too far distant when the split atom will propel ocean-going ships.

Now suppose that instead of being forced, in self-defense, to build atomic and hydrogen bombs we could go all-out in developing the medical, agricultural, and industrial uses of atomic energy. Such a program might change and immeasurably improve the patterns of our existence.

That we cannot now go all-out in exploiting the atom for peace represents not only America's tragedy but the world's. The impoverished Russian people, the starving and disease-ridden millions of Asia and Africa—their loss is at least as great as ours.

What is the way out of this atomic dilemma? If we are to be frank and realistic, we must conclude that there is only one way out—inducing the men of the Kremlin to agree to an effective international control plan. Until such an agreement is reached, our very existence as a nation demands that in planning our atomic energy program we look first of all to our military defenses.

I confess that I see no easy method of persuading the Kremlin to accept a plan which it has consistently rejected for almost 4 years. Yet we must keep trying. We must continue to explore every avenue that may lead to a dependable and worth-while agreement.

It also disturbs me to read newspaper statements—some of them issued by scientists—suggesting that we retreat from realism and pin our hopes to some scheme or other that could succeed only if all men, and particularly the Communists, were completely enlightened and unselfish. The scientists have been instrumental in creating the difficult situation in which we find ourselves today. I think they should call upon the same realism and objectivity that guides them in the laboratory to help us find a workable solution to our political problems—rather than confusing the issue, as a few of them do, with impractical ideas and proposals that lead, not to a better world, but to greater danger for the free countries of the world.

While we are striving for atomic peace, along the path that our President has rightly taken ever since Hiroshima, we must calmly but resolutely guard our ramparts and keep our powder dry. We must keep our defenses in such a state of readiness that no aggressor will be offered the prospect of a quick and easy victory. We must work to maintain our lead in both the peacetime and military application of atomic energy.

This lead, of course, is not assured us merely by allotting a given number of dollars to our atomic program. We must choose between alternatives, and allocate our resources of brain power, money, and materials, so as to secure the greatest return on our investment. This often involves real problems of choice. How, for example, should we ration our scientific economy—our supply of available scientific experts—so as to press ahead not only with improved atomic bombs, not only with hydrogen bombs, but also with atom-powered ships and atom-powered industry? Can we pursue all these programs at full speed with the technical talent at hand? If not, which programs should take priority?

We must also be sure that in our understandable eagerness to reap immediate benefits we do not neglect pure research. We must not, that is, allow the well of fundamental knowledge to run dry. Here I think especially of our university students—our young biologists, chemists, and physicists. Let us remember that our real security and prosperity derive not so much from our natural resources—although for these we may be thankful—as from the skills and knowledge and imagination of free Americans.

We are in a race to develop brains as well as the race to develop bombs and reactors.

Your representatives, and all those working on atomic energy, are very much aware of these problems. They are also aware that no small group of men—no matter how diligent or how dedicated to our national welfare—can determine by itself how atomic energy can best be used to promote our twin objectives of security and prosperity. They are further aware of the imperative need for the criticism and cooperation of an informed citizenry.

That is why we must exercise the greatest caution in erecting barriers of secrecy between the people and their atomic energy program.

Of course, we cannot afford to forget about Klaus Fuchs, the British scientist now on trial for divulging atomic secrets to the Soviet Union. Of course, we want to guard against future leaks, and we want to improve our security measures if impartial examination finds them wanting. But let us not be stampeded by the Fuchs revelations into a disastrous effort to achieve security more through secrecy than through positive achievement. Not only would this imperil our democratic institutions: it would gravely jeopardize our atomic program for military purposes. The continuing success of that program depends on the greatest possible interchange of ideas and information between our scientists.

Science does not take congenially to compartments or boundaries. The iron curtain hinders Russian scientists from participating in that intellectual cross-fertilization on which the growth of scentific knowledge depends. The Soviet iron curtain is a tragedy both for the Russian people and for the world. We must not compound this tragedy by needlessly erecting curtains of our own.

Let us always keep first things first in our minds. Let us realize that the liberation of the latent power of the scientific mind awaits the end of bombs and the beginning of world cooperation through an effective control plan. Keeping our atomic defenses in order can only buy us time. We must use that time to work and struggle for the day when international control enables us to realize the true promise of the atom.

Is There Room in the Poorhouse for 149,000,000 People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsford (N. Y.) Post of February 2, 1950:

IS THERE ROOM IN THE POORHOUSE FOR 149,000,000 PEOPLE?

In 1932, Franklin D. Roosevelt, then a presidential candidate, had this to say about Government spending:

"Any Government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse."

Those words, important 17 years ago, have even greater significance today. Why? Because in every year since 1932 (with the exception of the two fiscal years immediately following the war) our Federal Government has spent more than it has collected.

In 1932, our Federal Government spent $4,500,000,000. For the fiscal year of 1950, it is estimated that our Federal Government will spend ten times that amount—$45,000,000,000.

To give you an idea of just how much money this is, consider these facts:

1. If everyone in the United States cashed in all his life-insurance policies, the total would amount to $44,000,000,000. This would not be enough money to run the Government for 1 year.

2. If every urban horse owner in this country sold his horse, the total would amount to $30,000,000,000. That's just enough to run the Government for 8 months.

3. If every farmer in this country sold his farm, farm equipment, and livestock, the total would amount to $25,000,000,000. The Government could not run for 7 months on that amount of money.

These facts put a new light on the staggering size of our Federal Government's planned $45,000,000,000 expenditure for the fiscal year of 1950. And remember, this excessive spending is in the face of a national debt of more than $250,000,000,000.

Isn't it as true today as it was in 1932 that "a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse"?

Just what are you doing to end excessive spending by our Federal Government? Have you written your Congressman? Have you discussed the problem with your business associates, your friends, your employees?

Let's make sure our Representatives in Government know how we at home feel about the continuance of a habit that means the poorhouse.

The time for action is now.

—*Automotive News.*

When Good Intentions Are Bad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Longmont (Colo.) Times-Call of Wednesday, January 11, 1950:

WHEN GOOD INTENTIONS ARE BAD

All of us have heard that the road to hell is paved with good intentions, but who ever wrote it failed to say where those go who paved it.

It would be interesting to know whether the well-meaning perverter of truth, the betrayer of those whom he loves, and the destroyer of that which he seeks to build are judged by their intentions or by the results of their actions—when the Great Judge renders his final verdict.

We need not answer that question here, but it is important to know that motives, no matter how good, cannot prevent operation of the law of cause and effect.

The doctor who mistakenly prescribes arsenic to cure heart trouble does not thereby prevent the poison from killing his patient, no matter how earnest his hopes that the patient get well.

The architect does not prevent destruction of the house he builds if he ignores the laws of physics in trying to save money for his client.

The teacher who loves his students does not thereby change the laws of psychology which wreck the boy who is mistakenly taught to rely entirely upon others.

So with the political and economic policies of a nation. We know that the Communist wants to destroy capitalism and thereby tear down the prosperous economic structure which we have built in the United States. He wants to set up government control over our lives and subjugate the individual to the state. He sees Jesus of Nazareth with his gospel of love as the mortal enemy of Karl Marx with his doctrine of class hate.

But the Communist is too wise to attack in the open with clear avowal of his real purpose. He makes the attack in the name of democracy and humanitarianism, seeking to enlist for his fell purposes the aid of the very elements he seeks to destroy.

And so, many a devout church member, or worker for good, accepts the extravagant spending and accumulation of public debt as means to foster the welfare of individuals less fortunate than himself, and to provide easy help for the projects he would serve. He does this out of love for his fellow men, to establish the reign of plenty for all men on earth.

But, whether the purpose behind the extravagant spending, subsidies, Government control and piling up of debts be to wreck the capitalistic system quickly, as is the aim of the Communist and his Socialistic pals—or whether it be in the name of democracy

to promote humanitarian purposes, as is the hope of the devout and the good—the end result is the same in either case. It brings destruction to our traditional American freedom and self-reliance, the setting up of bureaucratic controls which ultimately enslave the individual, lower his standard of living, and ultimately destroy the church itself.

So the devout church member can become fellow traveler to the Communist without realizing it, and neither the purity nor the nobility of his motives prevents him from serving as ally to the destroyers of his country and its basic freedoms. His methods defeat his purpose.

Sheer love for humanity does not save humanity when those who love it use the methods that ultimately destroy the objects of their love. It then becomes loving betrayal.

Sir Harry Lauder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor, Monday, February 28, 1950:

THE SCOTTISH MINSTREL

Sir Harry Lauder made the world hum. He led it to sing. "Singing makes you cheery," he said, and he taught the world a score of lilting songs that made it delightfully gay. The dialect was no obstacle. It came home to the dense population of Chinese as readily as to the scattered settlers of Australia. He was the first Scots comedian to capture London. The demand was so great for his appearance that he was billed in three theaters at one time.

Gifted with a rich baritone voice, Sir Harry was as happy in a sentimental song as he was in a comic number. This quality the public little knew. It was overshadowed by his irrepressible humor. He was not an imitator of the Scots. He was a caricaturist. He exaggerated types he knew, had seen on street corners, had rubbed elbows with on the Clyde. He strengthened his characterizations, and gave them dramatic values of which the originals were bereft. His catchy verses—many written by himself—caught all the romance of the Clyde in the gloaming.

Where Burns and Scott left off in literature, Sir Harry carried the torch in song. An artist to the fingertips, he gauged his audience by its response, his devoted wife always helping in the early days by relating comments made by departing patrons when the show was over.

Sir Harry knew how to get his songs across the footlights. He was meticulous in make-up, artful in dance steps, lilting in style. He worked hard, lived when possible close to the theater, and rehearsed an hour before the show. He left nothing to chance. The step that missed a beat was as carefully engineered as the wag of the kilt when he turned a corner. He had a keen sense of stage art, and capitalized on the value of taking the audience into his confidence.

Close in a while he would prompt his listeners to tell him what song they would like him to sing. When a dozen voices shouted a dozen different favorites, he would silence his hearers bluntly: "You don't know what you want, so I'll sing Keep Right On to the End of the Road." This was the favorite song of the "Scottish minstrel." It was his philosophy, too.

Hong Kong Court Gives Reds Planes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Burton Crane, from the New York Times:

HONG KONG COURT GIVES REDS PLANES—DENIES RECEIVERSHIP PLEA OF UNITED STATES CONCERN FOR 93 FORMER CHINESE NATIONALIST CRAFT—INJUNCTIONS ARE LIFTED—SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY CITED BY BENCH—ONLY REGISTRY BARS SHIPS' FLIGHT TO PEIPING

(By Burton Crane)

HONG KONG, February 23.—Under Hong Kong Supreme Court decision today, 93 planes, paid for largely by United States taxpayers, are being turned over to the Chinese Communist Government.

Despite the decision, which denied a receivership application and vacated two injunctions granted last autumn, the Chinese Communists are unable at present to fly the planes to their territory. They are not registered under Hong Kong laws. Thus, some time remains for possible action from Washington or elsewhere.

[According to the Associated Press, a spokesman for one of the air lines involved, said the planes would be flown to Peiping, seat of the Chinese Communist Government, probably within a week.]

The case concerned three corporations. The largest was the China National Aviation Corp., a prewar subsidiary of Pan American Airways. It was reincorporated in 1946, with the Chinese Nationalist Government taking 80 percent of the stock by virtue of its contribution of planes and equipment it received from the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the Economic Cooperation Administration, lend lease, and other forms of United States aid.

The second concern, the Central Air Transport Corp., was owned 100 percent by the Nationalist Government's Communications Ministry.

When the Communists began to overrun China both companies removed their planes to the Kaitak airport in Hong Kong. Eighty percent of the Chinese employees of both air lines defected to the Communists last November 9 and flew away several planes.

The two corporations asked the protection of the British Government, which then still recognized the Chinese Nationalist regime. The corporations were told they would get protection if they first applied for an injunction, according to Richard Heppner, one of the lawyers representing Nationalist and United States interests in the case. Mr. Heppner was wartime head of the Office of Strategic Services in China and a law partner of Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, retired, overall head of the OSS.

The two Nationalist Government air lines asked and got an injunction forbidding the defecting employees to touch the planes, which include four Skymasters and six Convairs. Shortly thereafter the Communists got an injunction preventing Nationalists sympathizers from going near the equipment.

Mr. Heppner declared tonight that the Americans and the Chinese Nationalists involved in the case had objected strongly because only the second injunction was ever enforced. Communists were permitted to work on the planes and service them, he said, and the British refused to withdraw the airfield passes issued to the Communists as employees even though they had announced they were no longer connected with the two concerns.

Early last November, the Nationalist Government attempted to extricate itself from this dilemma by selling all planes of both airlines to Civil Air Transport, Inc., a Delaware concern formed for that purpose by Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault and his associate, Whiting Willauer, Civil Air Transport declared in court that it had paid $3,900,000 for the planes of the first two companies.

On January 6 Britain recognized the Chinese Communist Government shortly after inspectors from the United States Civil Aeronautics Authority appeared with an announcement that the former Central Air Transport and China National Aviation planes had been registered by Civil Air Transport with the United States Government. They said they wished to inspect the planes and place United States markings on them. British authorities refused to allow them to tamper with the planes.

Civil Air Transport then filed applications with the Hong Kong courts for the appointment of receivers for both companies.

Today, Sir Leslie Gibson, Hong Kong's Chief Justice, handed down a decision declaring that the "doctrine of sovereign immunity operates to prevent the court from entertaining an application to appoint a receiver." He also declared that all proper parties were not before the court and that the plaintiff corporation had not established a sufficiently strong case.

"I have held that the assets are in possession of the Central People's Government (Communists)," he said. "If I am wrong in this then, in my opinion, they are clearly in possession of the corporation—China National Aviation. Neither the Central People's Government nor the corporation is a party to these proceedings or has consented to the appointment of a receiver."

The chief justice dismissed the American contention that the Communist Government had got possession only through infringing the November injunction and declined to admit the validity of the minutes of China National Aviation of December 31, approving the sale to Civil Air Transport. The court ordered the plaintiffs to pay $8,000 as costs.

According to the Nationalists' intelligence, possession of the planes will triple the Communist air force.

The Viewpoint of News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRISENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., Monday, February 27, 1950:

SIN IS NEWS

There are many folks who charge that newspapers print too much about crime.

From the viewpoint of the news editor's desk, anything that is unusual, out of the ordinary run of things, is news.

Good living is expected. It takes place with unexciting regularity.

Crime is news. A wrongdoing clergyman is news, just as railway accident or a plane mishap is news.

No editor would give even a paragraph to a railway journey that ended without accident.

Suppose it were not so. Suppose that sin were the usual thing and goodness the exception. Then if anybody did a good deed the reporters would rush to the scene to write up the story. We should have such headlines as these in huge type:

"Great sensation. Wild excitement. The honesty of a Chicago bank cashier found out by accident. Facts incredible. Whole city shocked."

"Startling revelations in New York City. An affectionate, faithful mother discovered. Astonishing. Report unfortunately confirmed."

"Strange reports from Philadelphia. A well-known business firm actually meets all its obligations. An investigation demanded."

"Amazing happenings in Columbus, Ohio. A married couple living happily together. No reason given. Most extraordinary. Unheard of in this region."

"A patriotic politician unmasked in St. Louis. No graft found, no chiseling; all records straight. A tough case for the FBI."

"Washington City baffled. A church full of people listening to a gospel sermon right under the nose of the Government. Entire city stirred."

Yet if we actually read such headlines, we should think that the editor had gone off his head. Love, fidelity, honesty are the rule, and the daily paper proves it. Sin is news.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ERIE COUNTY,
Buffalo, N. Y., February 24, 1950.

To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby certify that at a session of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, held in the County Hall, in the city of Buffalo, on the 14th day of February A. D., 1950, a resolution was adopted, of which the following is a true copy:

"Whereas on May 23, 1947, January 20, 1948, and on various occasions over a period of years prior thereto, this board of supervisors has recorded itself in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway; and

"Whereas the Public Works Committee of the United States Congress is preparing for a hearing on the St. Lawrence project, to be held during the month of February 1950; and

"Whereas it is still self-evident that the proposed seaway, if completed, would threaten the economy of the entire State of New York, and particularly the Niagara frontier; and

"Whereas the people of this State have invested large sums of money to provide water transportation from Lake Erie to the port of New York; and

"Whereas the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway would cause a serious diversion of transportation from the Erie Canal, and particularly the port of Buffalo, such diversion resulting in direct loss of revenues to this locality, and further resulting in the eventual loss of employment to many of our citizens; and

"Whereas the people of Erie County would be called upon through additional Federal taxation to meet the staggering cost of the contemplated project; and

"Whereas such a project is unsound, unwarranted, and unnecessary: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this board of supervisors again voice its opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Representatives in Congress and to the Public Works Committee of Congress."

Attest:

ALFORD J. FARLEY,
Deputy Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County.

Fortieth Anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. TOWE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Rev. Rowland F. Nye, rector of St. Thomas's Episcopal Church, Lyndhurst, N. J., on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America, February 12, 1950:

A man named George Orwell wrote a book last year about the strange world of 1984. It was a frightening picture of the cruel fate of man in a regimented left-wing police state which controls his mind and soul.

In the world of 1984 the true meaning of words had become so utterly distorted that they had come to mean their opposite. Every citizen had it continually dinned into him that war is peace; freedom is slavery; ignorance is strength." The appalling fact is that our world seems to be tending in that lamentable direction.

Mr. Orwell's book is available at our free public library, and I commend it to adults. It is not enjoyable reading, but we live in a world of increasing tensions between democracy and despotism, and we gain nothing by shutting out unpleasant truths which will eventually find us and force the choice of freedom or slavery.

Possibly you boys wonder what all this has to do with you in 1950, as you celebrate the fortieth anniversary of Scouting in America and the birthday anniversaries of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. It has a great deal to do with you, because your elders are making day-to-day decisions which determine the kind of world you shall inherit as adults; whether the dismal preview of Mr. Orwell will become actuality or whether the American dream of democracy with its basic and fundamental belief in the worth, dignity, and significance of each individual shall be the shape of your future.

There is a familiar word which I shall examine this morning, a word which is already so abused that it may well be added to the absurd affirmation that war is peace; freedom is slavery; ignorance is strength. I refer to the word "tolerance." If we do not understand its true meaning we may come to believe the falsity that tolerance is acceptance.

Before we recall Washington's and Lincoln's decisions to reject evils which many urged be tolerated, let us examine what tolerance truly means and how it is becoming distorted to mean something very different.

Tolerance implies both a freedom from bigotry and a liberal attitude to opinions other than one's own. It applies especially to religious and political doctrines. It forbids severity in judging others who hold such opinions or doctrines or the imposition of any restrictions upon their freedom to think as they will.

This is the 36-inch measure of tolerance and the one and only one which must measure every individual or group in society. It is the basic test for any who demand tolerance: that they grant to others what they demand for themselves. But we know that it doesn't always work like that. For the past 36 years particularly, slight-of-hand propaganda has purposely confused tolerance with acceptance, and this confusion has subtly permeated the public mind of western civilization to the extent that the good 36-inch measure of tolerance has been shortened to something less than 12.

Every totalitarian group which challenges the democratic belief in the worth, dignity, and significance of each individual demands that its program for restrictions upon freedom must be permitted in the name of tolerance. Those who challenge this travesty of tolerance are branded intolerant. Tolerance, it is told us, is the acceptance of absolute truth, the one and only system of social justice, the millennium of heaven on earth—each and all masking their plan to destroy democracy. Any society which falls for this double talk is ripe for the loss of its worth, its dignity, and its freedom.

Tolerance has also come to connote failure to resist through indifference or sometimes through a desire for peace and harmony. Tolerance thus becomes appeasement on the installment plan, whose final payment is loss of freedom.

No man in colonial America more devoutly desired peace and harmony than Col. George Washington; he possessed wealth, a magnificent estate; but he risked the hangman's noose by his intolerance of the imposition of unjust restrictions upon the colonists. He knew that ties of acquaintance and bonds of friendship would strain or break in the struggle, yet he pledged his life, his fortune and his sacred honor.

Abraham Lincoln, a man of charity and compassion, grew in political stature as he sharpened the national debate between feudalistic slavery and a Federal Union of men equal in worth, dignity and significance. Lincoln said in 1858: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy."

And so Lincoln quietly, but firmly, resisted those who urged that the erring sister States be allowed to secede in peace, "the tolerance of acceptance," and when Sumter's flag was fired upon he issued a call to arms to preserve the Union. True, Lincoln was intolerant of the southern pretension of sovereignty, but the Union was saved and we honor him today.

That Union is now in a state of cold war with a vast and ambitious totalitarian despotism whose language is double talk, a language which has misled many. It debases the word democracy until it is turned inside out and means nothing of the worth, dignity, and significance of each individual. Soviet democracy is the 1950 preview of 1984, in which war is peace; freedom is slavery; ignorance is strength, and tolerance is acceptance. The forces of subversion play upon our devotion to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and try persuasively to make them strands of the rope with which they would hang us. Pleading the protection of civil rights they seek under that same protection to engineer the destruction of all civil rights.

Can it be that we shall allow such a distorted and false tolerance to become the means of our destruction? It is time that we clarified our thinking and made it unmistakable that we shall be intolerant of any group or program which seeks to subvert the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, which would make democracy the instrument of its own death.

In conclusion: let us practice true tolerance, keeping ourselves free from the bigotry which claims exclusive copyright on all truth and grant to others the same worth, dignity, and freedom we demand for ourselves; let us beware of that false tolerance which permits freedom to destroy freedom; let us guard against the tolerance, misnamed broadmindedness, which is the refusal to face life deep and challenging conflicts of life.

It is my hope that this generation of leaders will so meet the physical dangers threatening our Nation, and so successfully debunk the insidious propaganda which would make white black and black white, that the Boy Scouts of America may inherit in their manhood free and democratic institutions enjoying the blessings of a Constitution unbreached and triumphant, and established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

It is your duty and mine to love our country; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend its against all enemies.

Name of Veterans' Hospital in Erie County, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ERIE COUNTY,
Buffalo, N. Y., February 24, 1950.

To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby certify that at a session of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, held in the County Hall, in the city of Buffalo, on the 14th day of February A. D., 1950, a resolution was adopted, of which the following is a true copy:

"Whereas this committee realizes that the veterans' hospital in Buffalo is under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and that the naming of this hospital is subject to the decision of the Veterans' Administration; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That it is the recommendation of the Erie County Board of Supervisors that the name suggested by the Joint Veterans Council of Erie County, namely, Veterans Memorial Hospital, be adopted and that wings or sections of said hospitals be named in honor of individual distinguished servicemen of this area; further

"Resolved, That certified copies of the above resolution be forwarded to the three United States Representatives from this area, the two United States Senators from New York State, and the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee."

Attest:

[SEAL] ALFORD J. FIELEY,
Deputy Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County.

Commercial Air Transportation

REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, ever since I became a Member of Congress I have had a real interest in our commercial air transportation system. I have had that interest because of its very real value to our foreign and domestic commerce and because I believed it to be—and it has proved itself to be—an essential element of our national defense. But like many of you, I have been concerned at the mounting cost in the form of mail pay which annually is paid out to the certificated scheduled air carriers. Particularly is this true when there are so many demands on each taxpayer dollar.

Commercial air transportation is no longer in the experimental or developmental stage. It has now reached a point, except perhaps in the foreign field, where it should think about becoming self-sustaining. I subscribe to the proposition set forth in the President's budget message that the subsidy element of payment for the transportation of mail should be separated from the compensation paid the air carriers for the service they perform in carrying the mail.

Last week I was pleased to note in the American Aviation Daily for February 15, 1950, that the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board appeared before the Transportation Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in support of legislation providing for separation of air-mail pay and subsidy. I also was impressed by the Board's statement of its economic program for 1949, wherein it recognized the cost of uneconomic competition on various air routes and undertook corrective action, at the same time committing itself to encourage the development of air transportation along efficient and economical lines.

Such action by the Board is constructive. It can and should stimulate and encourage those who believe in free enterprise, who believe that initiative and hard work will pay higher dividends than Government subsidy.

There is a striking example in my own district of the results of adherence to this belief. Pacific Overseas Airlines Corp. is a small company based at the International Airport in Ontario, Calif. Its employees are its stockholders. It has never received one penny of Government subsidy and it has never engaged in the subterfuge of the so-called charter operations to operate scheduled services. Nevertheless, in the 4 years since the war, when some of the certificated carriers were in the shadow of bankruptcy courts and payments for the carriage of mail were higher than ever before, Pacific Overseas, by contrast, in industriously seeking out contract business and winning the confidence of its customers, has increased its net worth 500 percent, and at the same time given a respectable living to its stockholder employees.

During the war the men who own this company flew over 30,000,000 statute miles between the west coast and points in the Pacific—the Hawaiian Islands, Australasia, and the Philippines—under contract to the Air Force. Their record for efficiency, economy, and safety was not excelled by any of the air carriers working for the Air Transport Command. Since the war this small company has flown over 15,000,000 miles in the performance of contracts to Hawaii, Japan, and China, without injury to a single passenger or crew member. They have proved their ability to operate a successful air line service.

Ever since 1940, Pan American Airways has had authority to operate between Los Angeles and Honolulu; it also has authority to fly between San Francisco and Honolulu. In 1946, United Air Lines was also authorized to operate between San Francisco and Honolulu, and by making a stop at San Francisco, it can render service between Los Angeles and Honolulu. Recently the Civil Aeronautics Board authorized two carriers to operate between Seattle-Tacoma and Portland and Hawaii. Los Angeles, the largest city in the West, a city that has a greater population than San Francisco, Oakland, Portland, Tacoma, and Seattle combined, and one of the greatest air travel centers of the world is the only city which has only one carrier offering direct service to the islands. It ought to have two carriers flying this direct service and the economy of the Hawaiian Islands demands it as a means of increasing its tourist market, so vital to the Territorial economy.

Early last summer the matter of additional air service between Los Angeles and Honolulu was heard by one of the examiners of the Board. Only two applicants sought the route, United and Pacific Overseas, opposed by Pan American which seeks to preserve its monopolistic position. United's case was predicated on the operation of a service which was an exact duplication of the luxury service now provided by Pan American; the same aircraft, the same speed, the same fares, and catering to the same deluxe market—everything the same except the name on the outside of the airplanes. And the cost to the Government of this duplicating service would be mail payments of $3,000,000 annually. Pacific Overseas, on the other hand, proposed to provide a coach or tourist type service with an emphasis on air transportation, operating at slower speeds in less comfortable seats, without multiple course hot meals and cocktails, at a fare reduction of $50; $110 instead of $160 one-way, and directed toward an entirely new travel market. But most significant, Pacific Overseas proposed to provide this service without authority to carry mail, without a dime of Government subsidy. The men who own and work for this company have said:

We do not demand $3,000,000 a year from the taxpayer to provide a duplicating service such as that proposed by United. We believe competition means more than that. It is supposed to bring some public benefit. We will provide that benefit by making air transportation available to thousands who cannot now afford it. We will do it at the risk of the dollars we have put into this company and we will show that air transportation can be made self-sustaining. All we ask is that Pacific Overseas be given an 8 by 11 sheet of paper which authorizes us to fly.

This case is now before the Board for its decision. It is an important case because in deciding it the Board must determine whether the additional service between Los Angeles and Honolulu will continue to be available only to those who can afford a 6-cents-a-mile fare with an additional charge of $3,000,000 per year from the Public Treasury, or whether the travel market will be broadened by the introduction of a 4-cents-a-mile fare without cost to the taxpayer. The Department of the Interior, charged with the responsibility for the welfare and development of our Territories, is strongly on record in favor of the tourist-class service. It knows the economic situation in Hawaii, that defense spending is down, that the sugar and pineapple markets cannot be expanded, that surface transportation has been disrupted and for prolonged periods, and it recognizes that the development of an expanded tourist market is the only means of assuring the islands' economy. The Department has made it clear that carriers who are engaged in the operation of deluxe services over extensive foreign or domestic systems cannot be expected to offer a tourist service designed primarily for the islands. Because travel between the mainland and Hawaii is largely of a local or regional character, the Department of the Interior has also said the operation should be conducted by a carrier whose primary interests are directed to this market and who can take advantage of its knowledge of local conditions.

Pacific Overseas and its partner, Trans-Pacific Airlines, which is owned by citizens of Hawaii and operates a local service between the islands, meets these standards as no other applicant can, and it has but one objective—serving the local need for transportation between Honolulu and Los Angeles. It can make a real contribution to the development of our air transportation system by penetrating the mass transportation market lying below the level of luxury air transportation.

The certification of this new carrier is also important from the standpoint of national defense. Award to United of the right to fly directly between Los Angeles and Honolulu adds nothing to our defense potential—no new ground facilities, no more trained personnel, no additional airplanes. This country receives nothing except an annual bill of $3,000,000. I have already referred to the unexcelled job which the men who own and operate Pacific Overseas did during the war. Perhaps it is not very important, but it is illustrative to tell you that they checked out United's pilots in order that they could qualify for trans-Pacific operations, and they provided the maintenance in Australia for the aircraft which United operated for the Air Transport Command. The men who constitute Pacific Overseas have stuck together for almost 8 years; they have invested their savings, and theirs only, in this enterprise; they have assembled a virile, efficient, trained organization with splendid ground facilities, located at Ontario, Calif., about 30 miles east of Los Angeles, for the maintenance and overhaul of four-engine aircraft, and they have made money. They have done all this in anticipation that some day they should be authorized to conduct regular commercial operations in the Pacific. If they are not certificated, this highly trained and qualified group of pilots and mechanics will be lost, their organization ultimately will devote itself to other activities or be dissolved, and their usefulness as a potential resource in the event of national emergency will be totally dissipated.

Authorizing them to operate this route will have a further value to the national defense. It will provide additional and new facilities in the Hawaiian Islands for the maintenance of large four-engine aircraft which could quickly be converted to military projects in an hour of need. It would provide additional qualified crews and transport-type aircraft. These very real advantages to our national defense cannot and should not be overlooked.

It is my view that the development of this new-type service proposed by Pacific Overseas Airlines is within the policy directive given the Board by this Congress when we adopted the Civil Aeronautics Act. It will contribute to our air transportation system and be a valuable adjunct to our national defense. I believe it is within the purview of the Board's own pronouncement of its economic policy for 1949—which we can hope will also be its policy for 1950. We should await its decision in this case with interest, for from it we may find signposts to guide us in matters of legislative policy with respect to commercial air transportation.

A Practical Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Banner-News of Magnolia, Ark., for July 25, 1949:

A PRACTICAL POLICY

In recommending that an appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration (SPA) be reduced to about $1,000,000 (the House had voted it $9,000,000) a Senate committee urged last week that the SPA accept an offer of electric companies that would eliminate needless waste of tax funds on duplicating power lines.

This appears to be a practical policy for Congress to adopt. In the Senate, Arkansas' JOHN MCCLELLAN has won much praise for his attempts to economize on Government spending.

If the Senate as a whole will adopt the committee report, it would be doing just what Senator MCCLELLAN is urging—economizing.

It seems utterly ridiculous for a Government bureau—whether it be SPA or any other—to waste tax money on duplicating power lines. What the electric companies offered to do was transmit power from Government dams over their lines for the SPA. When they do this there is no need for the SPA to build transmission lines.

Taxes are heavy enough now without keeping them higher with expenditures on such needless projects as unnecessary power lines.

Hydrogen Bomb Should Stir Peace Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland News:

HYDROGEN BOMB SHOULD STIR PEACE DRIVE

As President Truman says, his will be the final responsibility for decision on whether the United States shall take the fateful step of attempting to build a hydrogen bomb.

The President is getting, and will get, all sorts of advice. But when the day of decision comes he must stand alone. It is a heavier responsibility, even, than President Roosevelt met with his approval of atomic bomb research.

The potentialities of the hydrogen bomb are frightening almost beyond conception. Prof. Harold C. Urey, one of the Nation's top atomic scientists, says that it has been reported that, if such bombs were dropped off the Pacific coast, the prevailing winds would carry the radioactivity over this country and would result in the extinction of all forms of life.

Professor Urey does not vouch for the accuracy of the statement, but the fact that he quotes it is a measure of the terms in which scientists are thinking of the hydrogen bomb.

Yet Professor Urey is for development of the bomb on the single ground that if this country does not beat the Russians to it, the United States will have lost the armaments race with all the consequences that implies.

To lose the race, says Professor Urey, will be to lose our liberties, and "it is more important that this spirit of liberty continue to exist than that I or any group should continue this mortal existence for a few years more."

Surely there is no question but what the United States is in an armaments race, and that it cannot afford to fall behind. If a hydrogen bomb can be built, this is the country which ought to have it first.

But while the decision is being debated there is all the more impelling reason for a vitalizing of the hunt for new paths to insure world peace. We are thinking in terms of support for such organizations as the United World Federalists and others aiming at the same fundamental objective.

It is not necessary that one agree completely with the precise program suggested by the Federalists to give their project backing.

It is enough to know that here is a group of private citizens striving most earnestly and devotedly to promote a world order which has the strength and authority to preserve peace and prevent aggression.

We are not sure at the moment that theirs is the most practical approach, since it involves a hope that it will be possible to draw Russia back into the orbit of cooperation in good faith.

But with the hydrogen bomb looming in the future no chance to bring that about should be left untried.

A Real Chance to Economize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Phillips County (Ark.) Herald:

A REAL CHANCE TO ECONOMIZE

News items of recent weeks—items that have attracted considerable attention—have followed the headlines in reporting that Congress seems to be giving a lot of thought these days to economies in government.

That sounds almost too good to be true. Let us hope that Congress does more about it than just talk, thereby preventing a duplication of effort that is bound to cause repercussions which would throw additional burdens on an already heavily taxed taxpayer.

Arkansas' senior Senator, JOHN MCCLELLAN, is making a great fight to cut Government spending and he is getting some Senate support. Of course all economies are reflected in how much taxes we pay.

Only a few days ago a Senate committee voted to reduce an appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration (SPA) by about one and one-half million dollars.

The House had previously voted to give the Bureau (SPA) about nine million.

However, the practical Senate committee, thinking of the unnecessary payment of taxes on duplicate endeavor—in preventing the utilization of two carts for a single horse—went even further in ordering the SPA to abandon its ambitious program of duplicating power lines and to accept the offer of power companies to carry SPA power over their lines.

It is expected and hoped that the full Senate will carry out the recommendations of its committee. Here is a real opportunity for economizing. If the SPA's purpose is—as it is purported to be—to furnish the most power for the least possible cost, both to the user and the taxpayer, then it will, of its own volition, see fit to use prevailing power lines to transport its power.

It stands to reason that money not spent on needless duplicating power lines could be spent on greatly needed development of our rivers and our harbors.

Since most of the people in Arkansas, and the residents of Phillips, Lee, and Monroe Counties in their entirety are definitely interested in additional funds for rivers and harbors, it behooves them to contact their Senators and Congressmen and air their views on the matter.

The people of Arkansas will be watching with a great deal of interest how Senator FULBRIGHT votes on this plan of practical economy.

H. R. 87

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, I have always been greatly helped by the active cooperative assistance of members of all of the clerks' groups in the various post offices of the Eighteenth Congressional District of California.

Whenever I have asked them to give me facts and concrete evidence proving their claims that they were either under or not adequately paid; that they were justified in their request for increase in salary, and so forth, they have uniformly come up with prompt, helpful, and clear evidence that their representations made to me were well founded in fact.

So, in connection with my consideration of the merits of H. R. 87, I asked the Post Office Clerks Union, in my home city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif., to make and to send to me a brief analysis, based upon actual cases, of the earnings of the average veteran in the group, who was married and had a family. Under recent date I received this data, and I feel that it is so informative that every Member of Congress would be helped in understanding the worthy objectives of H. R. 87 by observing the facts as set forth in the communication to me herewith presented, to wit:

LONG BEACH POST OFFICE CLERKS UNION,
Long Beach, Calif., January 30, 1950.

Subject: Questionnaire, H. R. 87, Veterans.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: In an endeavor to furnish your office with some authentic concrete facts concerning the economic status of the World War II clerks in this office who would benefit by enactment of the veterans credit bill, a questionnaire was circulated and compiled.

It is believed that the facts presented below will show that the average veteran here is a mature, married man with a family and earning $2,870 per year postal salary. He is forced to seek other part-time employment to augment his salary. This is his third year in the postal service and he served 3 years in the military during the war. He is working alongside clerks who came into the post office at the same time he went to war and who are drawing $700 per year more in salary.

Permission is granted to use these facts and figures as you see fit.

Out of a total of 293 clerks in the office there are 120, or 40 percent, who would come under H. R. 87 and who received questionnaires.

Number of returns received, 100 out of 120, or 83 percent.

Average age, 33.

Average salary, $2,870 (includes recent raise of $120 under H. R. 4495).

Eighty-four are married with an average of three in the family.

There are 19 whose wives are working.

Thirty-one clerks have other part-time jobs.

Five hundred and ten dollars is average debt of 84 clerks who answered this one.

Seventy-seven have cars whose average model year is 1940 and 21 have no cars.

Average rent being paid, before decontrol, $44.50 per month.

Average length of military service during the war, slightly over 3 years.

The 120 veterans here are looking to Congress with hope for enactment of this meritorious legislation. It was good news to hear that the powerful House Rules Committee granted a special rule on January 27. Please press for adoption of the special rule and passage of H. R. 87 as reported by the House Post Office Committee in July 1949 which includes four additional grades upon being promoted to regular clerk.

Your efforts on behalf of the veteran are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

ADAM JASO, *President.*

The Case for ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times on February 22, 1950, entitled "The Case for ECA":

THE CASE FOR ECA

In presenting its case yesterday for continued Marshall plan aid the administration gave Congress a grim picture of the present world situation. Appearing before a joint session of the Senate and House foreign-policy committees, Secretary Acheson accused Soviet Russia not merely of blocking agreements, or even of aggressive expansion, as heretofore, but bluntly charged Moscow with pursuing, amid "signs of increasing boldness," a deliberate "design for world dominion." Economic Cooperation Administrator Hoffman was equally plain-spoken when he described the Marshall plan as an indispensable weapon for the preservation of peace and freedom.

This estimate of the present situation was submitted to Congress in support of the administration's request for new appropriations of $2,950,000,000 for the third Marshall plan year, and as an answer to those Congressmen who would use the technique of the meat ax to slash this sum by $1,000,000,000 or even $2,000,000,000. The testimony of Mr. Acheson and Mr. Hoffman is supported by the whole record of Soviet policy since the war. In fact, recent Soviet successes, which Mr. Acheson acknowledges, not only permit of no relaxation of our counter efforts but raise the question whether our present counter efforts are adequate.

As Mr. Acheson says, there are now two antithetical concepts of foreign relations. One is the concept of the Soviet world, which demands of all Communist states complete subservience to the Kremlin and denounces any act of peaceful cooperation among non-Communist states to defend their own interests and to solve their own problems as a plot of war mongers. The other concept is that of a free world, in which nations, in return for respect of their own rights, respect the rights of other states and ask only that conflicts of interest be resolved by peaceful means. Between these two concepts the best present hope is the possibility of some modus vivendi. This is a far cry from the one-world concept which we

cherished during the war, but as long as the Soviet concept prevails and is backed by Russian might, there is no other alternative.

However, as Mr. Acheson likewise points out, to attain even this limited goal the free world must first meet a threat to its existence, and that threat must be met both defensively and constructively. "The first test of any society is its ability to defend itself," he said, and we are now reorganizing both our defenses and those of our allies within the framework of the North Atlantic Pact. But defense alone is not enough. It must be matched by the creation of a successfully functioning political and economic society of free nations, which is the purpose of the Marshall plan. To cripple that plan, or even destroy it, before its goal has been attained would be not only poor economy but a direct threat to both our own security and to the whole free world.

It is from such considerations, primarily, that the administration urges approval of the third-year funds which it now seeks as the absolute minimum necessary to keep the Marshall plan going. Mr. Acheson acknowledges, of course, that Europe would have grave economic problems even without the threat of Soviet aggression, as it did after the First World War. And he puts the American Government squarely behind Mr. Hoffman's demands for both European integration (for which purpose ECA is earmarking a special fund of $600,000,000 for the European payments union) and for a readjustment of our own economy, to permit larger imports as one means of closing the remaining dollar gap. But above all economic and practical considerations or difficulties stand the primary necessities of survival of both ourselves and a sufficiently large free world to enable us to live and breathe. We are confident that after weighing the administration's arguments the American people and Congress will rally to its support.

Status of Calendar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the other day I made some remarks about the status of the calendar and the progress that the Democratic majority had been making this year. Today I am inserting this statement with reference to it.

I hold in my hand the current calendar. The back page indicates that only one bill has been passed up to date, and that an urgent deficiency bill. So that there may be no confusion about it, I checked the record of the Eightieth Congress, which the President continues to belabor. At that time they had already passed the independent offices appropriation bill, a large bill; the civil functions bill; an urgent deficiency bill; and a major bill, the income-tax reduction bill. By March 15 we had passed eight of the major appropriation bills. Now the House Appropriations Committee has not completed hearings on the one bill which we are told will be taken up by March 15. Think of it. The Congress has been in session almost 2 months and the Senate has not passed a single bill worthy of mention on the calendar. The House has only passed a deficiency appropriation bill in addition to the bill passed today. It is a disgraceful record, and proves the complete inability of the Democratic leadership to operate the Government effectively.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Address by Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner address delivered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] at Boise, Idaho, on February 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, my fellow Democrats, ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate the compliment implied in your invitation for me to address this fine gathering in Idaho and I am happy that my schedule in the West permitted me to accept it.

We rejoice that the Democrats have an annual opportunity of meeting and expressing their admiration for two great Americans who have contributed not only to the welfare of their country but have given life, purpose, and vitality to the Democratic Party—Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

Only a few nights ago I attended the great outpouring of Democrats from all over the United States gathered in Washington to pay honor to these outstanding men. It was a glamorous occasion—5,300 people assembled in the greatest dinner in the history of the world. They poured nearly a half million dollars into the treasury of the Democratic Party, which is of some importance to all of us as we look forward to the elections next November. Particularly is it important in such a State as this where two Senate seats are at stake this fall.

I don't know which annoyed the Republicans more—the mass of people there to express their loyalty and devotion to the Party and its leaders, or the dollars they dropped into the till. The Republicans saw all that money rolling in at a hundred dollars a plate and all they called us was "Socialists."

I want to talk briefly tonight about Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman. But before I do that I want to talk to you as a Westerner interested in reclamation, anxious to see the West continue its great onward sweep, determined to help you as you seek to achieve your great destiny. There may not be much politics in a great deal of what I say tonight. It may sound like a chamber of commerce speech in spots, but that may be because when I first entered the Congress of the United States I went in as a Member of the House of Representatives. There were only a handful of us from all the Rocky Mountain States and even when we added together all those from the reclamation States, we still had only a few. We found we had to bind ourselves together, both Republicans and Democrats, to achieve the development of the West. From the standpoint of politics all I need say now is that I know how alert the present administration is to the needs of the West, how anxious it is that our soil shall not be washed away, that the waters that pour down from the mountains may be held in place by great dams and mighty lakes, that multiple-purpose projects may enrich our communities, that our mines shall be encouraged to produce and our forests may be conserved. In a word, this administration by its works shows its faith in the expanding economy of the Nation and tries to guarantee that future generations may enjoy the blessings which a kind providence has showered throughout this area.

Early in February the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of which I am privileged to be a member began consideration of certain phases of the Columbia Valley program of the Department of the Interior. This arose out of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill which carried authorizations of $250,000,000 for the Columbia River Basin to be utilized by the Army Corps of Engineers. The Senate Interior Committee amendment would add another $200,000,000 for reclamation works. The matter has been tied up for weeks to permit the Interior Committee to study and express its opinion on the reclamation features of the omnibus bill. We must move cautiously on any item of a quarter billion dollars, but I could not help but think what this great program for the development of the Columbia Basin means to your State of Idaho and to all your neighboring States.

Here you will have the world's greatest single power and irrigation development. You people of Idaho remember that irrigation in this area probably started at Lapwai, near Lewiston, Idaho, in 1837. A missionary came out into these lands and while he was trying to serve his mission to the Nez Perce Indians his group constructed a ditch to irrigate fields in the river bottom to supply grain and vegetables. You know far better than I the long hard work that has followed in building the Boise, Twin Falls, Minidoka, and other projects in southern Idaho—your own Boise project just now coming into final completion by the construction of Anderson Dam at a cost over $30,000,000 of Federal funds, and how in the early days of the administration of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt he agreed to a low power dam at Grand Coulee constructed so that it might be raised at a later date but also supported the Bonneville Dam on the lower Columbia River which was actually constructed first.

In the testimony now being given before the Senate committee, engineers point to the McNary and the Hungry Horse Dams. One of the Senators casually read into the record the names of a dozen projects soon to be built all over this part of your inland empire.

I have tried to visualize what the citizens out here feel. I live in an area where we are struggling for water. Every acre of my farm has to be irrigated, but the narrow valley of the middle Rio Grande, pinched between high mesa lands, can never hope to irrigate much more than 100,000 acres. Where I farm the valley is a couple of miles in width and the supply of water which comes from the headwaters of the Rio Grande in Colorado is uncertain and sometimes rather disappointing.

I have tried to think how you must feel as you see the great Grand Coulee Dam, the Anderson, Arrowrock, Lucky Peak, and American Falls Dams pouring out their power and visualize that when all the dams and reclamation enterprises in 240,000 square miles have been authorized, engineered, and constructed, you will have 12 multiple-purpose dams, 88 major power dams which are now functioning, and hundreds more which will

come into being when all the vast resources of your area are fully utilized.

My State sought recently to acquire a project of the Army Air Corps for the construction of a giant wind tunnel. Many of us thought that geographically we presented an almost perfect location, and many technical advisers to the Air Force agreed, but we lacked water and we lacked power. I wonder what it must feel like to live here in a basin where 2,713,000 kilowatts are now being delivered by existing power plants and where new plants now under construction or authorized will add 3,867,000 kilowatts to that tremendous figure.

It is hard for me, living in a narrow valley, to broaden my horizon and think that in this whole Columbia Basin area when fully developed you will have 5,000,000 acres under irrigation.

You can protest that many of these acres and the great proportion of these dams will be in other States, but I remind you that when the Creator was laying out the Northwest, mapping the paths for its rivers and smoothing the lands for its valleys, He had very little knowledge of later-day geography and a very imperfect idea of where State lines would fall. He built you an inland empire and you people of Idaho are a part of it, a rich and potentially richer part of it as the years roll by. That is why you people are interested in the hearing which our committee has been conducting. You are interested in the discussions of a Columbia Valley authority and the proposals for the complete utilization of the water developed in the great Northwest.

Although you are producing huge quantities of potatoes, sugar beets, seeds, and dairy products, you do not depend on irrigation for all your agriculture. I was reading a short time ago the 1950 Progress edition of the Spokesman-Review, published at Spokane, and in its part 6 I saw a story of the forests of the inland empire. It caught my eye because as Secretary of Agriculture I had flown over a great deal of the forested area in the States of Washington, Oregon, and California. I had driven through great stretches of the forests of Idaho, and I know intimately thousands of acres in the forest lands of my own State. Probably the greatest cause of contention during the period that I was a member of the President's Cabinet was my admiration for and continued support of officials in the United States Forest Service. There are few people in the Congress of the United States who have a greater interest in forests or will have for them than I have. That's why I was so pleased by what I read about your forests.

I was happy to read that the period when we stripped the land and passed it by had ended, that lumbering had come of age in this part of the world, and that you had learned the value of timber cropping, both on public and private lands. I read with interest the announcement of a $12,500,000 pulp and paper mill to be built at Lewiston by people who already operate there the largest white-pine lumber mill in the world. You are proud of your white-pine belt. You are pleased, I know, in the great production of Ponderosa pine, for each year your State turns out 500,000,000 board feet of lumber. But you can be equally proud of your determination to handle this crop in such a fashion that there will not be ghost towns where once you have had active lumber camps but that you will harvest this crop on a sustained-yield basis that guarantees the long life and perpetual prosperity of these communities in your State.

As if irrigated farm lands and forests were not enough, Providence has been kind to you in the deposit of minerals within your mountains. We have been struggling in Washington with the problem of assisting the mining industry in this Nation. I don't know what will come of its final working, but we want the Couer d'Alenes to continue to have dozens of successful small mining companies and as many large ones as you can keep going. Senator O'MAHONEY, with his bill, S. 2105, as well as Senator MURRAY and Congressman ENGLE, with their bill, H. R. 976, have been trying to insure the long life of the mining industry in the United States.

Few States have more interest in the perpetuation and gradual development of that industry than has Idaho. Frankly, I don't know what the new smelter at Stibnite, Idaho, is designed to do. I hear it is going to produce antimony metal, and if the demand for that product fails, it can turn to straight gold or silver ores. Antimony sounds so much like the principal product of Nevada that most married men would leave it alone, but if it brings you money we're happy to find you prosperous because of it. Idaho has the largest phosphate reserves in the world. You already have a large fertilizer plant at Pocatello, an extremely important new basic phosphorous plant. I find it easier to understand the production of alumina from the aluminum clays of the inland empire, and I commend your State University for the work it is doing in an effort to guarantee the future of the Northwest in the production of light metals.

Recently there has been an announcement of a new atomic-energy activity in your State at Arco. When there is any announcement of atomic-energy activity it runs into huge sums, and so $20,000,000 will be the starter on your project. We, in New Mexico, have been greatly benefited from the work done in our State and we welcome you into that happy family.

I am reviewing some of these things because I am glad to find Idaho so prosperous under this Democratic administration. I mention that because I hope that all the people of Idaho when they enjoy the prosperity that will come from this great Northwest, as they see their cities grow and their businesses grow, will not turn their backs on the party that has tried to keep this an expanding economy, a progressive and prosperous Nation.

In my private life, I own an insurance business and am president of a small insurance company. On the back page of part 3 of the newspaper to which I referred a moment ago, its issue of January 22, 1950, there is a page ad dealing with an Idaho compensation insurance company. It started in 1939 with premiums of $37,000 and assets of $157,000. In 10 years it has grown to where its premiums exceed $2,000,000 and its assets exceed $2,500,000. If I have time I would like to learn if the officials of that company worry about the financial competence of the Democratic Party. That's the way business grows when the Democrats are in.

I would like to have time to visit individually with the farmers of your State. I would like to ask them how they've been coming out under Democratic administrations. I know what the story is over the country. I have made up a table that doesn't just deal with the total gross income of the American farmer. That is quite a story in itself—how the net income to persons on farms from farming rose from $2,285,000,000 in 1932 to $19,529,000,000 in 1948. I have noticed how the gross farm income went from $6,406,000,000 in 1932 to $35,299,000,000 in 1948.

But there is another yardstick which I insist should be used. Farmers have been wanting parity. They want equality in income with other parts of the population and it isn't enough just to measure how much they have because other costs may have gone up in proportion and their actual relative income be no better and so I have been interested in what they have done. I have had calculated what parity income should have been in every year from the very beginning of the period we use in calculating parity, starting with the year 1910, through and including 1948, and as figures become available, I can shortly carry my calculations through 1949. I find that in the 15 years that the Republicans were in power, namely, 1910 through 1912 and 1921 through 1932, the actual income to persons from farming was $76,619,000,000 whereas if the farmer had had parity it would have been $89,102,000,000. In other words, the net amount by which the farmer failed to attain parity in the years the Republicans were in power was $12,483,000,000.

But what is the Democratic story? In the 24 years since 1910 that the Democratic Party has been in power, namely, 1913 through 1920 and 1933 through 1948, the income has been $208,748,000,000 against an estimated parity which should have been only $160,538,000,000. In other words, under the Democrats, farmers have received $48,000,000,000 more than parity. Thank heaven the Democrats get in power once in a while to make up for the deficits that the farmer sustains when the Republicans are in power.

What is the source of this great drive within a party to bring prosperity to a land and all the people who live upon it? Why is it that the Democratic Party has fought so hard for the rights of the workingman and of the farmer and has incessantly struggled to make sure that the banks and the small businesses all over the Nation thrive and prosper?

I can sketch but briefly a few moments in the history of our party. We need to go back to that period in American life in the early nineteenth century when the United States was just a small group of States clustered along the Atlantic seaboard. We had only a tiny Republic, sneered at by much of the world, expected to collapse like a home built of cards with the first gust of wind. But there was in the White House Thomas Jefferson, a strong advocate of the Constitution, but a President who realized that the Constitution without a Bill of Rights could become a Sword of Damocles hanging over all of our people and threatening their very liberties. He proposed that we should have a government which recognized the right of the people to rule, where there was equality in the courts, where there was a free press, where there was the right of petition for redress of grievances, of religious freedom and all those fundamental rights which are guaranteed by the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. We are greatly indebted to Jefferson for the part he played in securing those rights.

But he expanded not only the spirit but the substance of the Nation. He completed the Louisiana Purchase by which the Nation acquired a huge tract stretching from the Mississippi to the Rockies and the Gulf to Canada. He laid the foundations of the Democratic Party.

After Jefferson we had Andrew Jackson to whom we owe the strengthening of our belief in human equality. With him no man was king and none was servant. He is known to history as the first people's President.

When he came into power he found a strong enemy against him—the Bank of the United States. He took on that enemy in one of the great conflicts that has characterized the Presidency of these United States. The bank fought him with every resource at its command. Jackson fought back with every weapon he could find and the result was that

the people, sensing that he was truly a people's President, swarmed from the farms and the fields and the factories and made their presence known at the polls. It was, I assume, like the outpouring of 1948 which confounded even the greatest of the political experts.

I cast my first vote for Woodrow Wilson as President of the United States. He was and has remained through the years almost an idol to me—that scholarly, gentleman who suffered as President the agony of a people whom he loved but must lead through a world war.

How suddenly political conditions can change. It was Woodrow Wilson who said to us, "The great tides in human affairs do not give notice of their intention to rise and run. They rise in their own power and irresistible might and those who stand in the way are overwhelmed."

Yes, we had been seeing great tides running in human affairs, seeing the tides that swept in Jefferson, Jackson, and Cleveland. Now we saw it in the victory of Woodrow Wilson where after these elections the progressive tide really began to flow in earnest. Let me list some of the accomplishments of his administration:

The Federal Reserve System was organized.

Labor was specifically and legally declared not a commodity.

Farm loan banks were organized to meet the need of farmers for loans at reasonable rates of interest.

Women were given the vote, Nation-wide.

The income-tax amendment was adopted.

For the first time, Members of the Senate of the United States were elected by popular vote.

Do you know anyone who today would urge repeal of any of these progressive programs? Think for a moment how large these reforms bulk in your lives—you women who vote—you men and women who can elect your Senators—you farmers who can obtain credit—you workers whose rights as human beings are safeguarded—you business and professional people who benefit from a sound banking system. Would you give these up without a fight?

And now we come to another period, an era when the tide of progressivism came in with a roar and literally swept aside all who stood in its way, just as Wilson had said it would.

The first hundred days of that era were among the most dynamic hundred days in American history. I believe historians of the future will agree that in that short period we traveled as with seven-league boots farther along the road of social progress than in all the Republican administrations since the time of Abraham Lincoln.

May I refresh your minds about those days? Think back with me. It is March 8, 1933. In Wall Street and the Loop of Chicago howling mobs surge around the pillars of closed banks while the police struggle to hold them back.

There is a sickening sensation in everyone's heart as we watch the financial life of the country come to a dead stop.

And then suddenly a day later there is hope again—hope surging through the vitals of this Nation as a great leader—though he was a man who could not even walk unaided—comes to the microphone and tells you and me that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself.

Never will the Nation forget that day. Never will it forget those first 100 days that followed.

On Sunday, the day after inauguration, the President uses a lingering power from World War I to declare a 4-day bank holiday.

On Monday a conference of governors meets at the White House.

On Thursday Congress convenes, an emergency banking bill passes both Houses, and is signed by the President.

Six days later the economy bill becomes law.

The day after this farm-relief legislation is sent to Congress.

In the next 3 months—what a stream of legislation. Sound banking act, agricultural adjustment, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Home Owners Loan Act, the Federal deposit insurance program, the Securities Act, the Wagner Employment Exchange Act—all rolled into 100 days of the most rapid legislative progress the country has ever known, 100 days in which the progressive spirit of a people rises triumphant over their fear or despair.

You have heard Republicans curse the New Deal. Well, in the Eightieth Congress they had control of both Senate and House of Representatives. Did they repeal any of the acts I have mentioned? They didn't dare. I'm not going to compete with President Truman in the job he does of lambasting the "do nothing" Eightieth Congress. He'll be at it again this fall and the people of the country will welcome him at every whistle stop. So I'll leave the record of the Eightieth Congress to him.

I hope you all heard the President in his Jefferson-Jackson Day address. He was in rare form and the great crowd roared its approval. To those of us in that immense throng, watching him and listening to his every word, it was apparent that he enjoyed picking up the old statements from the Republicans in 1933, 1934, 1936, 1940, 1944, and even in the last campaign because he could thereby remind the people of this Nation that the Republicans have tried to scare us again and again. He reminded us that their 1936 platform cried out, "America is in peril," that the New Deal has bred fear in commerce and industry, thus discouraging new enterprises. President Truman could bat that down because he knew that, instead of discouraging new enterprises, the Democratic administration had lifted us up until our national output was over $350,000,000,000 a year and until our people were enjoying the highest standard of living the world has ever known.

All over this land there are Republicans who hope that the Democrats will adopt a more cautious approach. They plead with us to join with them in some sort of bipartisan move to avoid what they think is a drive toward socialism.

The Republicans have been viewing with alarm in five straight Presidential elections and they have lost every one of them. Surely they do not expect the Democrats now to adopt the route that they have found so ruinous.

All over this land people rose up in the last days of the last campaign and turned to the support of President Truman because you still can't beat something with nothing. If the Republicans believe that the people of this country want housing, and social security, and reclamation in the West, and things for which President Truman has been contending, then they'd better tell the people of this country that they do, that they, too, have a program and that their program will give America its abundance, its comforts, its opportunities, for poor and rich alike in greater measure than the Truman program.

If, on the other hand, they believe that the people of this country are more concerned about potential threats to our economy and just where every dollar is coming from and just how high a tax burden can get before it becomes oppressive, and, therefore, if they believe that all of the good things in the Truman program must be set aside for a more propitious moment, then let them take a position of flat-footed opposition and carry that issue honestly to the people.

I say to you that there is not much hope for a Republican Party that is divided, one which stands in a sort of twilight zone, unable to determine whether it wants to face the dawn or the dusk. As a great newspaper said recently, the Republican Party "can offer something better than the President offers or it can meet him in head-on opposition. But as long as it hovers in between, Mr. Truman will continue to hold the political aces."

And so, my fellow Democrats, I bring you glad tidings from the battlefield. We Democrats in Washington are neither in doubt or in dismay. We know where we are going. We are fighting for a program which Harry Truman carried to the people of this country and which we, in our respective States, proclaimed from a hundred platforms prior to the 1948 elections. That program measures up to the great traditions of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman, and we will not fail while we fight for it.

Address of Hon. George D. Aiken, of Vermont, Before Eastern States Farmers' Exchange Annual Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, during the past few days, debate in the Senate has shown what a complete contradictory and fallacious set of policies the Democratic administration has been following in its farm program. Certainly, the staggering surpluses in potatoes, eggs, and butter are a clear indication that the vote-getting, rigid parity scheme is well on its way toward ruining the Nation's farm economy.

The administration now contends it has an answer. I refer to the so-called Brannan plan, which has been put forth as an ultimate panacea of Government planning and control.

Mr. President, I am equally opposed to the rigid set of high 90 percent parities which prevail in the country today and to the political promises implicit in the Brannan plan. On the affirmative side, I have always favored a reasonable and moderate flexible program of price supports, which has an intelligent relation to the law of supply and demand and yet protects the American farmer against depression prices.

My good friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], was the author of a flexible price support farm program in the Eightieth Congress. Unfortunately, the 1948 election intervened and this flexible program was supplanted by the law of 1949, which continued rigid high supports.

On February 28, the Senator from Vermont made as fine a speech on the general subject of American agriculture as I have ever seen. In speaking to the Eastern States Farmers' Exchange in Springfield, Mass., he said, among other things:

What rouses me and what rouses others is the promises of the Administration, which never could keep those promises, to pay farmers a satisfactory income in return for the surrender to the Government of the right to run their own farms and to improve their condition under their own initiative.

In other words, farmers are to stop thinking for themselves, stop planning their own farm work, stop raising above a certain amount per farm and in return they get what—a promise of 100 percent "income support standard," which is one way of saying parity in three words.

He further summarized the economic fallacies of the Brannan plan by saying:

But there you have the three main points of the Brannan plan—first, promises of a satisfactory income to farmers which can never be fulfilled; second, limitation of production per farm, taking away production from the efficient farmer and giving more to the submarginal or uneconomic producer; and third, compliance with soil conservation practices as approved by the Secretary.

Those are the main points of the Brannan plan which are never mentioned by administration spokesmen today.

Then he went on with his own affirmative program of moderate and flexible price supports, which would take into consideration the supply of a commodity which is being supported. On this side of the ledger, he spoke in part as follows:

We should put the support level for various commodities on an equitable basis which we cannot do so long as grain is supported at 90 percent of parity and poultry and dairy products at 75 percent, thus throwing our agricultural economy out of balance.

This should be done in the interest of the grain producers themselves, inasmuch as the greatest opportunity they have to broaden their own market is by marketing grain in the form of animal products.

Support levels should be high enough to protect the farmer and the country against economic collapse, but not so high as to destroy either the market for farm commodities or the initiative of the farmer himself in seeking new markets and new uses. Our first aim should be good prices on a free market, cushioned by Government supports only when needed.

I point out that this latter point raised by Senator AIKEN is of vital concern to New England poultry and dairy men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech of the Senator from Vermont which he delivered at Springfield, Mass., on February 28. I further point out that the flexible price support program which he advocates, and of which I am a sincere supporter, is strongly endorsed by the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a welcome relief to get away from Washington, where it seems as if everybody is trying to do something for or to the farmer, and meet with you members of the Eastern States Farmers' Exchange who still believe in the ability of the farmer to do something for himself and run his own business.

If I really thought that the American farmer is the destitute and decrepit being that some of his self-appointed spokesmen make him out to be, or if I thought that he is the greedy ogre depicted by the metropolitan press, then I would abandon all hope for the future of American agriculture.

It so happens that I know from first-hand experience that the farmer is not a slender reed leaning on the arm of the professional politician for support, nor does he desire to exact the last ounce of blood from the consumer upon whom he knows full well he depends for his income.

Farmers built our Nation. They defended it in several wars. They have sent their sons and daughters to our cities to develop the greatest economic and industrial era the world has ever known.

They have not descended from this proud position to one of dependency and subservience overnight.

For the most part, their spirit is unchanged—yet day after day all over this country the public is being conditioned, through the most elaborate propaganda system we have ever seen, to believe that the farmer should now become a ward of the Government.

Why has this all come about? Why is the American taxpayer being mulcted for an elaborate and extravagant propaganda program of this nature?

I will tell you why right now. I don't like to talk rough—but time is running out. I have done all I can to help the administration give good government but my patience has played out. We have this propaganda program because we have in Government today men who are so determined to retain and expand their powers over the United States that they would humble what George Washington called the noblest profession on earth in order to realize their ambitions.

If they control the food supply of the Nation they know full well that they will gain control over all segments of our economy.

I have confidence in the greatness of my country, but I would not minimize any danger to it from within or without.

I know that our Nation will not meet the crisis which confronts it now—an emergency greater than it was only a few years ago—as it has met crisis after crisis since it was founded.

The thing that challenges us now is nothing new.

Since history began, ambitious men have sought to control nations and people and the pattern which has been used all through the centuries is the same.

They seek to gain control through promises and then to maintain it by force if necessary.

If I were not so everlastingly proud of the record which American farmers have made, I might be more apathetic to what is going on today, but having been a farmer all my life, I do not intend that we shall now lose our independence or the pride that goes with being the greatest agricultural nation in the world, without a last-ditch stand.

Let us now consider in more detail just what these things are that have aroused so many American farmers to a fighting pitch.

It is not the proposal to maintain a farm-price-support program. It certainly is not the work of the extension service, soil-improvement agencies, or any endeavor on the part of government now, or in the past, to make farming an even more secure and profitable occupation.

What rouses me and what rouses others is the promises of the administration, which never could keep those promises, to pay farmers a satisfactory income in return for the surrender to the Government of the right to run their own farms and to improve their condition under their own initiative.

In other words, farmers are to stop thinking for themselves, stop planning their own farm work, stop raising above a certain amount per farm, and in return they get what—a promise of 100-percent income-support standard, which is one way of saying parity in three words.

What would a deal like that mean to our farmers?

Last year the average per capita farm income in America was something less than $800, while the average price received for farm commodities was a little over 100 percent of parity.

Are the farmers of America going to be fooled by a promise of an $800 annual income?

It is claimed that such a program will benefit the small farmer, the so-called family farm.

I maintain that the promise of an $800-a-year average income is not going to incite a great deal of enthusiasm when the farmers find out what it means.

A 100-percent support guaranty definitely will not assure farm prosperity, and definitely will result in lower farm incomes in the long run.

But, the administration says, "We will limit the production of the big farmers so that the small farmers can produce more."

"We will restrict production to a base of $20,000 a year per farm and adjust that figure from year to year according to the purchasing value of the farmer's dollar."

Well, that amounts to about $25,000 at the present time.

So let's go on the premise that production per farm will be restricted to a maximum of $25,000.

Where does that leave the New England dairyman who spends half his income for grain and other supplies? He gets support, not on $2,000, but only on that part produced by his own effort.

Where does it leave our orchardists and our potato growers who have to have such a huge investment in facilities and equipment before they can consider any production at all and, lastly, but not least, where does it leave our consumers?

Certainly breaking up the large farms, and I admit that many of them are too large today, could only result in higher production costs and definitely higher prices to the consuming public.

The fact is that out of 6,000,000 families living on farms today only about half of them are commercial producers and even their numbers are being reduced.

The efficient use of machinery and equipment has resulted in fewer but larger sized farms.

Most of them cannot be broken up into smaller units and operated as efficiently as they are today.

They could be taken over by Government, operated by Government, worked on by men compelled to work by Government and perhaps be handled efficiently.

I don't think the people of America want their farms run that way.

Right now there are complaints that the high cost of the potato-support program is due to the fact that farmers raised so many potatoes to the acre. There is no question but what the increased yield per acre added to the cost of a poorly handled potato program.

Potatoes were not alone in this respect, however.

Last year the peanut acreage was cut and the peanut growers increased their yield per acre approximately a percent in a single year.

Tobacco growers have increased their yield as enforcement of quota laws reduced their acreage.

I see no crime in a farmer raising the best crop possible on his land, or getting the highest possible milk production from his cows. If we accept the proposal of those who would redistribute the right to produce and limit the amount which can be produced by a single farmer, however, we will destroy that initiative which enabled the American farmer to increase his production 35 percent during the war years in spite of shortages of labor, new machinery, and other supplies.

When any nation succeeds in stifling the initiative of its people, it cannot long endure.

The next proposal of the administration is that each farmer shall be required to comply with minimum and sound soil conservation practices—not as prescribed by his State department of agriculture; not as prescribed by the soil conservation services; not as prescribed by his State PMA, but as prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

That means concentration of power over American farms in the hands of one man who can tell farmers where to plant, when to plant, how much to plant, and what part of their income must be spent on improving their farms.

My guess is that there isn't a farmer in this meeting but what knows better how to run his own farm than the Secretary of Agriculture does.

But there you have the three main points of the Brannan plan—first, promises of a satisfactory income to farmers which can never be fulfilled; second, limitation of production per farm, taking away production from the efficient farmer and giving more to the submarginal or uneconomic producer; and third, compliance with soil conservation practices as approved by the Secretary.

These are the main points of the Brannan plan which are never mentioned by administration spokesmen today.

All they talk about is the great benefits resulting to the consumer and the high prices which will be received by the farmers if they can only get a law permitting compensatory payments on the statutes.

In the mildest language which I can think of right now, I term this proposal the acme of political hypocrisy.

The terrible Eightieth Republican Congress, after 7 months of intensive study, enacted a long-range agricultural law which, if it had been permitted to take effect unamended, would have kept American agriculture out of the complete mess it is in today.

One provision of that law gave the Department of Agriculture the right to make compensatory payments in a price-support program.

This meant that in the case of certain commodities the crop could be permitted to find its own level in the market, and the farmer then reimbursed for the difference between the average selling price and the support level.

If this provision of the law were used wisely, it is possible that at times both farmer and consumer could benefit. I emphasize "if it were used wisely."

A year ago, however, we saw indications that the Secretary of Agriculture might use this provision of the law to promote a general consumer-subsidy program, costing billions of dollars annually, and charge the cost of that subsidy up to the farmers.

As an example, it is estimated by the best agricultural economists that if the Brannan plan were in effect now, the cost of the potato program would not be a possible $80,000,000 but somewhere between $250,000,000 and $400,000,000 with only a minimum of compensatory benefits to the consumer. However, we don't have that provision for compensatory payments in the law now.

The Eighty-first Congress enacted a new agricultural law and one of its provisions was the repeal of that part of the 1948 law which permitted compensatory payments.

The Secretary of Agriculture never at any time protested the repeal of this provision.

The President never protested its repeal, and on October 31, 1949, the President signed the bill which repealed the compensatory payments provision which otherwise would have taken effect on January 1, 1950.

On January 4, 1950, President Truman came before the joint session of Congress and pleaded for the compensatory payment plan which was repealed by his signature October 31 as if the life of the Nation depended on it.

Are the farmers of America pinning their faith on this type of political operating or are they going to pin some faith on themselves and those people in our State and Federal departments of agriculture and the farm organizations that have done everything that has been done during the past century to put American agriculture in such an enviable position?

I mention farm organizations particularly because at the time the 1948 law was enacted it was supported not only by the United States Department of Agriculture, but by every major farm organization in the United States. Even the Farmers Union, which has since changed its position, at that time vigorously endorsed the flexible support provisions and the revised parity formula of the so-called Aiken bill.

What is the situation today? Any farm leader, and particularly the leaders of the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange, are subject to attack by the propaganda service of the United States Government if they dare to venture an opinion contrary to that voiced by the administration.

Of all major farm organizations, only the Farmers Union supports the administration farm plan today. The others are constantly under attack through a most extensive and expensive propaganda program.

I say expensive—expensive to the taxpayers of this country because much of the material used is furnished and distributed through Department of Agriculture channels.

Every time material is sent to the 95,000 PMA directors scattered over this Nation, it is sent at public expense.

Ninety-eight percent of the material sent to these directors is factually correct, but running through it is a vein of innuendo and promotion which is either incorrect or misleading.

Fortunately throughout New England and a good share of the country our local committeemen are able to see through this.

I hope the time will come when the United States Department of Agriculture can again devote its entire services to the purpose for which it was created.

Having now expressed my opinion of the manner in which the administration and the Secretary of Agriculture are operating, I want to make some suggestions myself as to what should constitute a well-rounded program for agriculture.

There is no easy way out of our difficulties now.

We are already in some trouble and will be in worse trouble within a year or two unless steps are taken to correct existing conditions.

The continuation of the high wartime incentive prices for the crop year 1949 has resulted in the accumulation of unwanted surpluses which are depressing the market for some commodities. An example of this is eggs.

When the 90-percent support for eggs was continued through 1949, it was the signal for an increase in laying flocks all over this country, particularly through the Midwest.

Production ran far ahead of demand.

Government invested some $75,000,000 last year in supporting the price of unwanted eggs. The weight of the surplus production eventually broke the market resulting in heavy losses to thousands of poultry producers who were unable to get even the support price.

Fortunately, some of the men in the Department of Agriculture have had the foresight to reduce the support price for eggs this year to 75 percent of parity as permitted by the provisions of the 1948 law which were continued in the Anderson Act of 1949.

The egg market will probably right itself in a few months, but, in the meantime, many people are going to be hurt.

We should profit from this experience with eggs and put into effect promptly a flexible support-price program which will take into consideration the supply of the commodity which is being supported.

We should put the support level for various commodities on an equitable basis which we cannot do so long as grain is supported at 90 percent of parity and poultry and dairy products at 75 percent, thus throwing our agricultural economy out of balance.

This should be done in the interest of the grain producers themselves, inasmuch as the greatest opportunity they have to broaden their own market is by marketing grain in the form of animal products.

Support levels should be high enough to protect the farmer and the country against economic collapse, but not so high as to destroy either the market for farm commodities or the initiative of the farmer himself in seeking new markets and new uses. Our first aim should be good prices on a free market, cushioned by Government supports only when needed.

We should continue to emphasize our research work in production and marketing methods with a view to increasing efficiency and decreasing costs in both these fields.

Improvement of our soil resources which has made such remarkable progress during recent years should be continued mainly under the direction of the local soil conservation districts and local and State farmer committees.

Public participation in soil conservation programs is a good investment and entirely proper.

The welfare of all people and the security of the Nation depends upon maintenance and improvement of our soil resources.

The public participated in despoiling these resources. A moderate participation in their restoration is only fair.

I said at the beginning of this talk that the farmer realizes that he is dependent upon the American consumer for his income.

Unless the consumer has the means to purchase food and clothing, however, he cannot contribute to farm prosperity.

Therefore, let us always remember that full employment with adequate income for city people is a proper farm objective.

There are, however, many million people, possibly as many as 40,000,000, in this country who do not and cannot have an income adequate to enable them to buy the kind of food they need.

For many years I have urged a complete study of this field with a view to enacting legislation which will make it possible for our low-income people to have enough to eat.

Call it a consumer subsidy if you like, but if the result is a higher standard of living for all people and the elimination of the farm surplus problem, it will be a subsidy well spent and result in a stronger nation.

I would handle this subject more carefully, even experimentally at first, broadening it as experience proves such broadening to be advisable.

Next, we should pay more attention to the development of foreign markets for our agricultural commodities.

There is a wide opportunity in this field.

We must not approach this matter of international trade in the light of how much we can give away, but with the purpose of developing a permanent trade with every nation in the world which produces commodities that we can use in exchange.

International trade is at low ebb now and will continue to be so long as it functions on a give-away basis.

World trade between nations must be restored and failure to do so will inevitably result in war.

Finally, if our farmers are to successfully fight off economic monopolies on the one hand and political domination on the other, they must keep themselves strong—strong, not only as individuals, but strong as organizations representing the best interests of agriculture.

Our farm cooperatives must be protected and strengthened at all costs.

They stand between us and Government controls.

They stand between us and economic and business monopoly.

They stand for the right of the farmer to enjoy a standard of living comparable to that enjoyed by other groups.

Farm cooperatives are under continual attack by short-sighted business and industrial interests.

These attacks must and will be beaten back but not if we relax our guard.

Would-be monopolists don't want to just double tax cooperatives. They want to kill them.

The Eastern States Farmers' Exchange is a living and shining example of what farmers can do for themselves.

It is up to us to defend this example and show the world that self-reliance and cooperation can do for agriculture what Government control and dependency can never hope to do.

The Crusade Against Gambling in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of combatting the influence of interstate gambling and racketeering in our country. This statement has particular reference to the notorious racketeer, Frank Costello. In it, I urge the Department of Justice to report promptly on a request which has been made for a review of Costello's status as a citizen, in view of certain charges the truth of which he has admitted.

In the event that Costello's citizenship is revoked, I personally will urge that he be deported as a harmful influence in this country which gave him the privilege of citizenship, which he apparently proceeded to abuse.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN, REQUESTS DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TO REPORT PROMPTLY ON PROPOSED REVOCATION OF CITIZENSHIP OF GAMBLER FRANK COSTELLO; URGES PROMPT APPROVAL OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION RESOLUTION

Mr. President, every citizen of the United States is aware that gambling and racketeering existing throughout our country is making a mockery of Federal and State laws. On the tax angle, alone, we are all aware that literally billions of dollars in taxes are lost every year because there is illicit income from gambling, racketeering, and related activities which is never reported to the States and to Uncle Sam.

TAX EVASION

Last year, a report was submitted to the Federation of Tax Administrators in Chicago, which showed that, according to Business Week magazine, in an article of May 14, 1949:

"Commercial gambling is the only billion-dollar business in the United States that does not take a licking from the tax collector. Except for legalized parimutuel betting at race tracks, only a small part of the shill game's annual take (estimated as high as $15,000,000,000 last year) ever winds up in Government treasuries. Gambling has generally stayed immune to the rash of postwar excise taxes, in spite of its obvious luxury label and features that make it easy prey for the tax man."

GAMBLING INVESTIGATION ESSENTIAL

My colleagues on the Senate Judiciary Committee have clearly recognized the necessity for a thorough investigation of the interstate implications of crime, racketeering and gambling, and have taken prompt action on the legislation introduced by our able associate, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I earnestly trust, therefore that Senate Resolution 202 will be promptly enacted by the Senate. May I point out a quotation from an article in Collier's magazine of April 19, 1947:

"It is likely that only a full-scale congressional investigation could trace the ramifications of America's underworld empire and its relations with politicians and elected officials, or arrive at a correct estimate of the enormous sums of money involved."

THE ALLEGED KINGPIN OF RACKETEERING

Literally dozens of newspaper and magazine articles and radio statements have been read and heard by all of us to the effect that the kingpin or at least one of the kingpins of a multi-billion-dollar gambling syndicate in America is apparently Frank Costello. This notorious individual who has been publicly denounced as a racketeer and with practically every adverse adjective and noun in the books (and who has apparently not dared to file suit against anyone making such charges) is a citizen of the United States by virtue of a privilege granted to him as a former alien.

However, we have evidence by Costello's own words that for the 8-year period prior to his being granted citizenship, he was engaged in activities which by all normal standards would have rendered him unfit for citizenship rights.

Now, this whole citizenship question is being raised by Mr. Robert Montgomery in a formal request for review that he has raised with the United States Department of Justice and with an affidavit for investigation served upon the Federal district attorney for the southern district of New York. I congratulate Mr. Montgomery for his activities in bringing this whole question again before the American people. His request to the United States attorney is incidentally, I believe, the first such initiation of legal activities for revocation of Costello's citizenship.

I personally will insist that the Department of Justice respond quickly on this matter because the facts are comparatively well known and were brought to light many years ago. The only thing that is not well known is why the Justice Department has been so shy and quiet on this whole situation for so long. It is only natural that many citizens suspect political influences of Tammany Hall at work on behalf of Costello.

PREVIOUS CHARACTERIZATIONS OF COSTELLO

Let me cite the words of Mayor de Lesseps Morrison, of New Orleans, president of the American Municipal Association (which represents the governments of 9,500 cities and towns in the United States). He stated that at the head of the multi-billion-dollar crime syndicate is Frank Costello, "one of the most pernicious and dangerous influences in America today and probably one of the 10 most powerful men in the country."

According to News Week magazine of the November 21, 1949, issue, the late Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, is said to have called Frank Costello the world's biggest and most corrupt gambler.

Thomas E. Dewey says "He is a gangster."

Virgil W. Peterson, operating director of the Chicago Crime Commission, has described him as "the lord of the underworld of the entire United States."

News Week went on to say that the California commission on organized crime reported to Gov. Earl Warren that Costello was the present head of the great underworld organization with headquarters in New York which is called by its own members "the combination." The so-called "Murder, Inc.," the commission said, is the enforcement branch of this organization.

WHERE THERE IS SMOKE THERE IS FIRE

Mr. President, we are familiar with the old expression, "where there is smoke there must be fire." It is no mere accident that for many years now, newspaper columnists, editorial writers, magazine writers, and other folks have thus written up Frank Costello, calling him such names as "prime minister of the underworld," and so on. Costello's only answer has been to proclaim piously that he is being persecuted and is merely an honest, upstanding businessman.

I should like to point out, however, Mr. President, that Frank Costello, within a period of 3 months, was charged with influencing politics in New York, Kansas City, Los Angeles, and New Orleans. Official crime commissions have speculated about his connections with gambling houses, night clubs, race wires, narcotics smuggling, jewelry theft, and other assorted crimes. Undoubtedly there is some exaggeration in this guesswork.

In spite of all these charges, in spite of all the magazine write-ups, Costello has thus far had but a single accusation stick against him, and that is the charge of illegal possession of a pistol way back in 1915.

The various magazine articles to which I have referred have pointed out the fact that rackets in America today are a big business, and that the old-time trigger-happy hoodlums had largely become a thing of the past, giving way to supersharpsters developing immense cartels of interrelated rackets. Shall America's youngsters grow up with awe and admiration of these crooked big shots who escape the law?

MR. MONTGOMERY'S DOCUMENTATION

I have in my hand several of the scripts which Robert Montgomery has broadcast over the American Broadcasting Co. network in the last 3 months on Frank Costello. Mr. Montgomery cited chapter and verse of Costello's testimony in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, appellate division, first department, on October 25, 1943. At that time Costello admitted that between 1919 and 1932 he made no tax payments to the Federal Government or the State government, and that during those years he was engaged in the bootlegging business. Yet Costello was granted citizenship on September 10, 1925, and in order to obtain such citizenship, he had to state under oath and by signature that he was attached to the principles of the Constitution. The Naturalization Code of the United States states explicitly that those persons applying for citizenship must be of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States. How could Costello, who petitioned for citizenship on May 11, 1925, and who later admitted smuggling whisky during that entire period, be of good moral character, attached to the principles of our Constitution, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of our country?

These are questions which must be answered, and the person to answer them is primarily our former colleague, the able Senator from Rhode Island, the Honorable J. Howard McGrath.

WE RECOGNIZE CITIZENSHIP AS PRICELESS PRIVILEGE

Mr. President, citizenship is a priceless privilege both to our native born and to those who were formally citizens of other countries and who now receive its blessings. If the United States Government law enforcement authorities lightly allow any single individual who does not deserve the privilege of citizenship to continue to enjoy that privilege—such action or inaction makes American law a travesty.

I have no doubt that high-priced lawyers retained by Mr. Costello will fight any action which civic-minded citizens take against this racketeer. However, we in the Congress appropriate enough millions of dollars to the Department of Justice to get expert legal services, and there is no reason for dilly-dallying on this issue.

IF COSTELLO'S CITIZENSHIP IS REVOKED, I WILL SEEK DEPORTATION OF HIM

If Costello's citizenship is revoked—and that naturally could only happen after due process of law in a true American fashion—then I, for one, will insist that he be promptly deported in order that every American will note that the people of the United States are on guard to protect the morality of our citizens, particularly our young people. The proposed deportation of Frank Costello would not, of course, of itself solve or begin to solve the crime and gambling problem; however, it would make unmistakably clear to every hoodlum, every mobster, as well as to millionaire crooks living in their penthouses and sitting smugly behind the barrier of legal experts—it would make unmistakably clear to them that crime does not pay.

Mr. President, the crusade against crime must be a continuous affair. When one hoodlum is disposed of, others try to take his place. The answer to the underworld must come, as I have previously indicated in the Senate on February 20, from an aroused citizenry cooperating with local, State, and Federal enforcement officers, with our great FBI, and with all those who believe in decency and honesty in human affairs.

CONCLUSION

Too many big shots are living in the lap of luxury, because they have plucked pennies from the poor, nabbed nickels with the numbers racket, slot machines, etc.—pennies and nickels that should have gone for food, shelter, clothing, care of youngsters. We must eradicate this cancer of crime. We must put the thugs in the jug.

Excerpts From Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before Senior Class of Confluence High School

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address I delivered before the senior class of the Confluence High School, Confluence, Pa., on Monday afternoon, February 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is always a pleasure to address a high-school class. I consider it a real honor to be invited to visit with you and to discuss briefly the part you can plan in shaping the future of your community, your State and the Nation.

First let me tell you that I appreciate so much the interest you are taking in the American system of government and how it operates.

It is an important part of good citizenship to have an understanding of the three levels of government—local, State, and Federal.

Your interest is most encouraging because the kind of country we are to have in the years ahead will depend upon the kind of citizenship that is developed among the boys and girls now in high school.

Therefore I want to discuss with you the importance of the work you will soon be called upon to undertake in your communities and in your Government.

It will not be long before you young men and young women will be in the driver's seat. You will control and operate the farms, the factories, the mills, the mines and all the business establishments.

You will have the responsibility for our churches, our schools, and our Government.

That's a big job. It will be your job.

To handle it successfully will take honest, courageous and vigorous leadership. It will take intelligent cooperation and willingness to work for the common good.

It will take sincere appreciation of the American way of life and the American plan of freedom of the individual.

Above all it will take loyalty and devotion to the principles of American patriotism, placing love of country above selfish interest or personal advantage.

The Government of the United States was founded upon the proposition that freedom of the individual is the greatest blessing bestowed by God upon mankind.

The founding fathers found inspiration in the Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule, and the Sermon on the Mount. Since the world began there has never been a better guide to human conduct.

Patriotism, religion, and high moral standards are fundamental qualities without which no nation can go forward. Regardless of its form of government, regardless of the laws placed upon its books, no nation can rise above the moral and spiritual standards of its people.

In the growth and development of our country there have been many changes. But the principles upon which it was founded are fixed and unchanging. They must live forever in the hearts and minds of our people.

The real meaning of America must be taught in every classroom from the one-room country school to the greatest university.

We must tell over and over again the story of America's rise to greatness unparalleled among the nations of the earth.

Other nations had greater land area, greater population, and even richer natural resources.

What quality does America possess that enabled our country, in the short span of less than 200 years, to create more wealth, greater spiritual and cultural progress, and a higher standard of living than the world has ever known?

It is the God-given freedom of the individual. It is the right of every citizen to carve out his own destiny to work, to save, to invest, to prosper, according to his own ability, energy, and initiative.

Freedom is our most precious possession. It holds out a golden promise of opportunity for every boy and girl in America to reach a high place in business, in industry, the learned professions, the church, and in Government.

No matter what calling you may choose, I hope that everyone of you will adopt as one of your real objectives the preservation of the God-given rights that have come down to us through generations of toil, blood, and sacrifice.

In my political career and in my public life, covering more than 40 years, I have been guided by certain principles in reaching decisions on questions involving the welfare of our country.

I have always sought the answers to four questions:

First. Is it right? Nothing can be politically right if it is morally wrong.

Second. Will it work? Sometimes proposals that seem very attractive turn out to be impractical and unworkable.

Third. Is it for the good of all the people? Too often projects are advanced for selfish reasons that would benefit only a special section or group to the disadvantage of the country as a whole.

Fourth. Can we afford it? All government is paid for by taxes taken from the earnings of the people. There is grave danger in government grown too big or too expensive.

If these four questions can be answered in the affirmative with respect to legislation, I will support it. Otherwise, I will fight against the proposal.

As a United States Senator representing Pennsylvania, I have a duty to all the people of our Commonwealth. But also, I am entrusted with a part in legislating for the whole United States. I proceed on the theory that what is good for the whole country is good for Pennsylvania.

In closing, I would like to make some suggestions for your guidance growing out of my long and varied experience as a soldier and as a public official.

1. Cherish within your own heart and mind loyal and devout adherence to American ideals and principles. These ideals and principles should be your constant goal.

2. Respect and support your church. A republic cannot live without the spiritual strength of the church. There should be tolerance in religion—but everyone should strongly support his church.

3. We should all support and respect the law. If everyone would obey our laws, what a wonderful country we would have.

4. In order to become better citizens and to make better communities you should assist in public-spirited movements.

5. Let us all take an active interest in the government of our local communities, our counties, our State, and the Nation. A free republic cannot exist where there is indifference and neglect by the electorate.

6. Let us keep uppermost in our minds that America has no more precious assets than

freedom and opportunity. So long as these blessings are preserved and maintained, the youth of our land will go forward to new heights of achievement for America and the world.

7. Let us all practice the fundamentals of good citizenship, work, thrift, self-reliance, fair play, tolerance, respect for the rights of others, and the love of God.

Remember always it is your country and your government. It will be what you make it.

The share you take in community betterment, the interest you take in local, State, and national affairs, is the measure of your citizenship.

To help build a better America of the future you must always be ready to face the problems of the day, confident and unafraid, sustained by faith in American freedom and faith in God.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Charles W. Tobey, of New Hampshire, Before Women's Republican Club, Claremont, N. H.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix an address I made in commemoration of Lincoln's Birthday, at Claremont, N. H., on Monday, February 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For many years it has been the custom for Republican groups all over the Nation to gather together in observance of the anniversary of the birth of the immortal Abraham Lincoln, our first Republican President and our greatest. The purpose of these gatherings is not only to do honor to Lincoln's memory but, even more fundamental, to consider on his life and his example. It is well, therefore, for us tonight to apply introspection, to see whether our party policies today are consistent with his precepts, and then to appraise our position for the voters of our country in a heart-searching effort to determine whether we are worthy and well qualified.

So, all over the country during this week our party members are gathering together to observe the anniversary of the birth of him whom many regard as the strongest character the Nation has produced, Abraham Lincoln. The very name has become a symbol for justice and humanity.

No writer of fiction, however able, could produce a figure of more humble origin, of more remarkable growth, whose influence on his generation and those yet unborn, would be more profound, or whose death could be more tragic than that of Lincoln.

What were the attributes of this man that have so endeared him to every American born since his passing?

His great size, his kingliness, his rugged simplicity, these were obvious, but deeper than such external characteristics was the great heart that actuated him in his passion for justice, his devotion to principle, his love for his fellow men, and his profound faith in the common people.

Many of you have visited the impressive memorial to him in Washington. To me, it is always an inspiration to look upon that heroic figure and read again the quotations from his words which are carved on the walls. As I have stood there I have looked upon the faces of those who, like myself, came to pay their tribute to him. People of all types, especially plain people, those whom some refer to as the common men, many of foreign birth, but each holding Lincoln's memory in loving regard.

Today his name is revered and loved even to the uttermost parts of the world, and so long as this Nation of ours shall endure his life will be our inspiration and his name will be written on our hearts. In his love for humanity, his forebearance, his charity he followed the teachings of the Master of Men.

Of his passing, Lowell said, "Multitudes shed tears for the death of one they had never seen, as if a friendly presence had been taken from their lives. Our common manhood had lost a kinsman."

While we cannot bring him back to again lead our Nation in these days of great national crises, yet he can and will live again, if you and I and our fellow men reflect in our lives his great attributes of common sense, rugged honesty, his passion for humanity and his faith in the divine power.

We turn then to you tonight, Mr. Lincoln, for we are troubled on many sides. No generation of men ever had more complex problems to solve. In the years you led the Nation you, too, had to meet grave problems. You met these courageously, without compromise, often standing alone.

So talk with us tonight, Mr. Lincoln, on principles and problems which you faced in your days and which confront our Nation in these our days.

Since you were President, Mr. Lincoln, labor has made great progress in improving its working conditions, in wages and in a recognition of labor's dignity and worth. You expressed yourself on labor several times. How did you feel in this important matter?

"Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration.

"Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise.

"Inasmuch as most good things are produced by labor, it follows that all such things of right belong to those whose labor has produced them. But it has so happened, in all ages of the world, that some have labored, and others have without labor enjoyed a large proportion of the fruits. This is wrong, and should not continue. To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, or as nearly as possible, is a worthy subject of any good government."

Mr. Lincoln, those views of yours square with those of many men today, and our party has done much for labor's advancement and progress since you were here.

No problem we face today is more pregnant with possibilities for good or ill than the foreign problem. It constitutes a crisis of first magnitude. Certain aspects of it justify fears of the extinction of our human society, if not wisely met. Can you help our thought in this, Mr. Lincoln?

"In our intercourse with other nations, it behooves us to be at once compromising and stern. If international understanding can be perpetuated by giving a little more and taking a little less, why, then, let us give a little more and take a little less. But never must we do all the giving. Rather in the case of a long and threatening misunderstanding let us prepare for the worst and work for the best."

That is sound advice today, Mr. Lincoln, and in recent years we have joined with other nations in setting up an organization called the United Nations. It is a league of sovereign states, not a world government, and, therefore, cannot by law prevent armed conflict between nations and establish justice and security. Nevertheless, it is the greatest step yet taken by mankind toward world peace. Since the charter provides for amendments, every effort should be made to transform the United Nations into an organization with larger powers.

Science has given to the world some instruments of terror and destruction that in your day the world never dreamed of. We have used one of these, namely, the atom bomb, with terrible deadly effects on civilian people, and now this atom bomb has been superseded by a so-called hydrogen bomb, many times more powerful than the most powerful atom bomb. We are told that it could annihilate a large part of any country by explosion, and used in quantities could annihilate civilization.

We have decided to produce this dreadful weapon for self-defense.

In the aftermath of this tremendous decision, we have to think anew and act anew, as you said so truly years ago.

This United Nations, which we had a large part in bringing into being as presently constituted, is too weak to cope with the great crisis and many believe the Charter must be amended to implement the United Nations in a larger degree.

It is a trite thing to say that civilization is at the crossroads. The fate of the world is at a crossroads unprecedented in human history because the mind of man has produced weapons which stagger the imagination and could wipe out great portions of the human race, almost instantly. As the New York Times said, "The atomic bomb is here to stay." The question is, "Are we?"

Today we often hear the term "welfare state" referred to. Some men quote the constitutional phrase, "To provide for the general welfare," in attempting to justify the Government's taking over more and more of the care and sustenance of the people.

Here is an observation from Lincoln's life, which is told by a recent writer in the following words:

"The teaching of Lincoln's life which this generation needs most to take to heart is that a sheltered, easy life is not an unmixed blessing; that toil and privation are better masters than luxury and ease; that life is a drama not staged merely for our pleasure but in which we are cast for parts we must play ill or well. The doctrine seems to be very generally preached and accepted today that labor, sacrifice, and self-denial are evils to be shunned as pestilential rather than necessary means of developing capacity and character. For one to gain a livelihood or a fortune without working to pay for it more than is absolutely necessary is a desire increasingly prevalent among rich and poor. The things which made Lincoln great—toiling until it hurts, dependence for mental and spiritual growth upon self, amid commonplace surroundings and associations—these are in little favor in an age craving to be amused, to be excited, to be supported, even by the state or by society.

"The unused hand withers. The unused brain ceases to function. The unused heart hardens. Where there are no calls for courage, for sacrifice, for stoicism, the nobler qualities of human kind—these do not come forth. The chief thought even of those sincerely seeking a better social order today seems to be that of putting props under people. Altruism is good, humanitarianism is good, charity is good; but a state which becomes the universal provider, policeman, and employer necessarily becomes also the breeding ground of weaklings and of slaves. Individualism produces the sanity and strength of a Lincoln; the paternal state breeds exotic dreamers, who think humanity is dead clay for the potter rather than a

spiritual creation which 'makes and unmakes systems and system makers'."

I personally have seen no conclusive definition of the oft-heard phrase, the "welfare state," and it doubtless has varied connotations with different people.

If, however, its implications mean a state in which the citizenship looks to the state to meet all human needs, then all thoughful people should oppose it, as I do.

We should stop the centralization of all power in Washington, return the administration of much legislation enacted in Congress, to the States. That is one reason why I strongly oppose the so-called compulsory socialized medicine plan.

The Government can wisely help people to help themselves, but for the Government to direct all the movements of its citizens, and to undertake to supply all their needs is far removed from the spirit of America, as I understand it, and is a subtle threat to the real happiness and well-being of our Nation.

Therefore, I lift up my voice to warn against the dangers of a state where every possible contingency is to be cared for by the Federal Government. It would completely destroy the self-reliance of the people, and in so doing it would destroy their character.

Freedom to work, to carry out individual initiative, beyond the mere providing of sufficient food and clothing for the day is the incentive which should be the desire and the objective and the heritage of all citizens, and will maintain the ideals and standards under which our country has grown from an infant to its position of commanding leadership in the world today.

Give us your thoughts on Government aid to people, Mr. Lincoln.

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves, in their separate or individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, Government ought not to interfere."

Since you trod this earth, Mr. Lincoln, life has become more complex, and our population has grown tremendously. While these problems we are naming tonight are not on all fours with those you faced, yet they are very similar.

Today men call for free enterprise, as against too much centralized controls and regimentation. You touched upon this when you said, and I quote you, Mr. Lincoln:

"Our greatest strength lies in our ability to give a vigorous demonstration that our private property competitive incentive system of free workmen can continue to provide more benefits for more people than any system in the world."

And Mr. Lincoln, many years after you had left the earth, a great author here wrote a play called Valley Forge. It told of the campaign of Washington on the Delaware, and referring to Washington, the author said:

"There are some men, who lift the level of the age they inhabit, until all men stand on higher ground, in that lifetime."

That was true of Washington, and fully as true of your life and sacrifice for us. May we so live in these our days, that after we have passed on, men may truly say that of us.

Mr. Lincoln, in these our days, there is a lessened respect for law on many sides. We suffer from a moral let-down, manifest in disregard of law and order, even in widespread outbreak of juvenile delinquency. Give counsel to a troubled Nation on this weakness, Mr. Lincoln:

"Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap, let it be taught in the schools, in the seminaries, and in the colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in the courts of justice.

* * * * * *

"Reason—cold, calculating, unimpassioned reason—must furnish all the materials for our future support and defense. Let those materials be molded into general intelligence, sound morality, and in particular, a reverence for the Constitution and laws."

In harmony with that statement, Mr. Lincoln, we have an epigram carved over the portals of one of our great temples of justice, which reads, "Obedience to the laws is liberty."

You, Mr. Lincoln, have expressed a similar profound truth.

Fellow Republicans, one cannot make an inventory or survey of our national strength today without becoming depressed at the lack of common honesty and integrity which exist in Government.

So many of the rank and file of our citizens have lost faith in men in Government, and have come to the conclusion that many in Government care little for the people except to get their votes at election time. There is justification for that conclusion.

A disillusioned electorate is a very serious thing. It takes a long time to reestablish confidence. If some special infrared ray could be used by the people to apply to halls of government and to some of the offices of those supposed to be the people's representatives, the Nation would stand aghast at the deceit, and the chicanery that exists today.

This feeling may have been one of the main reasons why only half the registered voters across the Nation exercised their privilege of voting in the 1948 national election. It is a shocking thing when men elected to high office sell their influence for money, and when in a lust for money, men surrender their independence. Such faithless public servants should be ostracized and barred from future public service.

In the face of such faithlessness, I ask you, Mr. Lincoln, what have you to say?

"If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem. It is true that you may fool all the people some of the time, you can even fool some of the people all the time, but you can't fool all of the people all the time."

Truly said, Mr. Lincoln, and the people are aroused over this danger and the increasing degree of discernment of the American people is something to be reckoned with.

Finally, Mr. Lincoln, when you walked amongst us, and came to the high office of President, you were reviled and smeared, you suffered misrepresentations as our high purposes and aims were attacked, yet, like the Christ, when you were reviled, you reviled not again. (Some of us, Mr. Lincoln, know the tragedy of bearing such crosses.) What did you say to such?

"Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menaces of destruction to the Government, nor of dangers to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

And then I treasure your conclusive answer to all those who falsely attacked you, when you said:

"If I were to try to read, much less answer, all the attacks made on me, this shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the very best I know how—the very best I can; and I mean to keep doing so until the end. If the end brings me out alright, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference."

In truth then, fellow Republicans, Lincoln being dead, yet speaks to us, and tonight, as we have met together to consider on the life and principles of our martyred President and apply them to our days, think we cannot do better than to close our remarks by joining together in a remarkable and beautiful prayer by the late Reverend Peter Marshall, Chaplain of the Senate of the United States, made in the Senate on the anniversary of Lincoln's birth. Our Chaplain led us in this prayer, and that night he died. And Dr. Marshall prayed:

"We do pray that something of the spirit that was in Lincoln may indwell in our leaders now that they may see, as he saw clearly, that only right makes might, that only as we are on the side of God can we hope that our cause will prosper. We pray that Thou wilt raise up among us now, other men to walk as he walked, to talk as he talked, to rise above the undercurrents of politics, so that they may see the country as a whole, and not be governed by pressure from this group or that, but may seek the common good and the will of God."

Statement by Robert M. Searls in Opposition to Extension of Social Security Insurance To Cover Mine Block Leasers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting and illuminating statement by Mr. Robert M. Searls, in opposition to certain sections of House bill 6000. Mr. Searls is one of the outstanding lawyers, particularly one of the outstanding mining lawyers, in America, and his observations on this subject will be most informative and worth while for consideration by the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT M. SEARLS IN OPPOSITION TO CERTAIN SECTIONS OF H. R. 6000

My name is Robert M. Searls. I am an attorney at law, practicing in San Francisco, Calif., where I reside. I am appearing in behalf of the American Mining Congress, and particularly the California chapter of the American Mining Congress, in support of the position taken by these organizations in opposition to the extension of social-security insurance cover mine-block leasers. The opposition of the American Mining Congress was evidenced by resolution unanimously adopted at the convention held in Spokane, Wash., last September, copies of which have been furnished to each Member of Congress.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL TO WHICH EXCEPTION IS TAKEN

The mining industry, expressing its views through its industrial association, the American Mining Congress, takes specific exception to the proposals in H. R. 6000, which provide for the reclassification as employees of self-employed mine leasers, who hold independent-contract relationships with the mine owners. For reasons which will appear in this statement the industry is opposed to the imposition of social-security taxes on the mine owners covering these independent leasers as newly defined employees of mine

owners in whose properties their leases are held. By the terms of the bill mine-block leasers would be included in the latter category under the specific definition contained in sections 210 (K) (3) (F) and 206 (d) (3) (F) of the bill, pages 50, lines 4 to 7, and 151, lines 6 to 9, and they would probably be included in the category of employees under the vague and shadowy standard prescribed for the determination of employment in sections 210 (K) (4) on page 51, lines 4 to 16, and 206 (4) (2) on page 152 of the bill. This latter section classifies as employee "(4) any individual who is not an employee under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection but who, in the performance of service for any person for remuneration, has, with respect to such service, the status of an employee, as determined by the combined effect of (A) control over the individual, (B) permanency of the relationship, (C) regularity and frequency of performance of the service, (D) integration of the individual's work in the business to which he renders service, (E) lack of skill required of the individual, (F) lack of investment by the individual in facilities for work, and (G) lack of opportunities of the individual for profit or loss."

I am aware that the language just quoted is a codification of certain language used by courts in classifying workers in individual cases involving application of social-security laws, and that one main purpose of the Gearhart resolution passed by the 1948 Congress was to clarify these definitions. I am not here to either attack or defend the Gearhart resolution. The mining industry does object, however, to the legislative enactment of vague and indefinite language such as that above quoted might have the effect of reversing previous adjudications that mine leasers are independent workers and are not employees. Our objection goes both to the specific and to the general inclusion of mine-block leasers, as employees under the language of the bill above referred to, and I will submit to the committee with this statement a suggestion of the specific amendments to the bill which would overcome our objections.

It seems very significant to us that the Advisory Council to the Senate Finance Committee appointed to study needed Social Security Act revision did not recommend enactment of any of the sections of the bill to which our objections are made. (Hearings report, p. 6, item M.) The Advisory Council would have left the present law unchanged.

REASONS FOR OBJECTIONS

The reasons for the objections which the mining industry has to the bill in question are as follows:

1. Mine block leasing has been judicially determined not to be employment within the meaning of the Social Security Act by both the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and by the Supreme Court of the State of California. The former determination was in the case of *Anglim v. Empire Star Mines Company, Limited*, (129 Fed. (2) 914) involving directly the application of social security taxes to leasers; and the determination with respect to the State unemployment tax on these same leasers; was made by the Supreme Court of California in *Empire Star Mines Company, Limited* v. *California Employment Commission* (28 Cal. (2d) 33; 168 Pac. (2d) 686). Both of these cases held that block leasers at the Empire Star Mine were independent contractors not subject to social security or unemployment taxes. This determination was made some time prior to the adoption of the Gearhart resolution and has been accepted up to the present time by the Social Security Administrator as an adjudication of the leasers' independent status. His office is now seeking by congressional legislation to again saddle the mine owners and mine leasers with this tax burden.

2. Mine leasers are in fact independent contractors: I believe it will be helpful to the committee if I briefly outline the basis of this contention. Mine leasing in western United States had its origin in the customs of the old Cornish miners who came over as emigrants in the early days of California gold mines. They had been accustomed to work in the tin mines of Cornwall under a system known as "pitch and tribute" under which they mined ore and received a portion of the ore which they took out as their share of the operation, the balance going to the owner of the property. Leasing became a common method of mine operation in California, in the Cripple Creek District in Colorado, and in the Utah mines. It was also carried on in lead mines and barite mines in the tristate districts of Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. I am most familiar with the system as worked in California, and roughly summarize the sworn testimony of the witnesses in the tax cases above referred to (in which I represented the company as counsel) in order to illustrate how the system works.

3. Practice in the Empire Star properties in California: In 1929 the Empire Star Mines Co., Ltd., took over and consolidated the Empire, Pennsylvania, and North Star gold mines at Grass Valley, Calif. These three mines occupied a block of ground, approximately three miles long, two miles wide and a mile deep. They have been operated for almost a century, and there are over 300 miles of underground workings extending throughout the territory. There were large areas in the old North Star Mine, accessible only from the incline shaft, that were reputed to have good ore in them. They were at some distance from the shaft—from a half mile to a mile—and the veins, although usually quite rich, were very small. These areas were so far away from the portions of the mine where the company was conducting its mine operations that it saw no way by which its own company bosses could look after and supervise work there. It would not have been, and is not now, commercially practicable or profitable for the company to work these areas with its own crews. This is due partly to the fact that the use of its own crews involves greatly increased overhead expense for bosses, foremen, superintendents, etc., together with the burden of social security taxes which goes with employment, and partly to the fact that miners do not work with the same care or incentive when they are working for wages as they do when they are working for themselves and do not take as great pains to separate ore from waste, limit the size of working places, and, in other words, keep down cost. The company believed that there were various skilled miners in the district and in California who from long experience in prospecting and underground work in the Grass Valley District knew how to mine these narrow high-grade veins, keep the ore clean, and follow the vein with a skilled miner's nose for ore, for their own profit.

A number of these miners were glad to have the opportunity to work cubical blocks of ground, using the company's shafts and means of access, but driving their own development drifts and mining and stoping their own ore, with the privilege of keeping 50 percent of what they took out. This was the essence of the deal. Written leases were made, usually for a 6-months' period under which specifically described blocks of ground were allotted to each head leaser for his group. He selected his own partners and they made their own arrangements for division of the proceeds. The company received royalty of 50 percent of the value of the bullion and concentrates extracted, furnishing as part of the consideration for this 50 percent the use of its shaft and workings, hoisting services, fresh-air supply, and keeping the underground workings unwatered with the mine pumps. It also furnished the service of skilled mill operators to handle the leaser's ore; when it was reduced to bullion shipped it to the mint for the leaser's account; and delivered to the head leaser of each leaser group its share of the proceeds. The leasers were authorized, but not required, to buy their powder, fuze, electric exploders, and personal equipment from the company at the company's actual cost, and a further charge was made, at cost, for sharpening drill steel and milling the ore and reducing it to bullion. Milling of leaser's ore in lessor's mill was at leaser's option, and not a lease requirement, but it was to his financial advantage to have it milled there because of lower costs than he could obtain elsewhere. Each lease group's ore production was kept separate, handled separately through the chutes, hoisting cars, mill machinery, and emerged finally in the form of a bullion bar bearing the leaser group's separate number, or, as in the case of concentrates, was paid for on the basis of continuous sampling of the particular leaser's batch of concentrates being run through the mill. The company had no bosses, foremen, or superintendent supervising the leaser's operations. Each leaser worked in his own leased territory and conducted his operations in such manner as he saw fit. It was solely the leaser's profit incentive that induced him to use careful, accurate mining methods, thus obtaining the highest grade of ore for milling and avoiding the uneconomical cost of unnecessary handling of waste rock. These written leases were renewed from time to time and the practice became so popular with miners that there are now 28 leaser groups operating on the Empire property. In more recent years the Idaho Maryland Mine followed suit with its own leasing arrangements with workers, quite similar to those of the Empire. Some nine groups hold leases in Idaho Maryland properties. It is my understanding that the leasing practices in Utah and Colorado are not greatly dissimilar except that the production of nonferrous metals necessarily requires different milling and sampling practices than in the case of the California gold mines. All of these practices were commenced long prior to enactment of the social-security-tax laws.

4. The leasers' average annual income: In view of the fact that the company does not supervise the accounting of the leasers as between each other for their share of the value of concentrates or gold recovered, it does not know accurately what the leasers average. We do know, however, from occasional information that many of them have made as much as $5,000 a year. Eleven thousand is the maximum individual leaser's annual income of which the company has any information. In general they average more than a miner's day's pay would have yielded had they been employed on a wage basis; otherwise the incentive for taking leases would of course be lost.

5. Reduction of these independent workers to employee status is impracticable. In the first place, unless the method of operation is entirely changed the company would have no means of telling what the income of individual leasers was as a basis for social-security taxation. The company simply delivers each leaser group's share of mint returns from bullion produced from gold shipped to the mint for them, or the value of concentrates assayed and purchased from them, to the head leaser of the group and division is made by each group according to its own rules. Sometimes the groups themselves hire men on a day's pay basis to get certain development work done. They impose penalties on each other for failure to join in the operation or for certain classes of absences or for violation of the safety laws. There is therefore no basis on which the company could compute and return social-security taxes on the individual leasers. For all practical purposes it would have to

reduce the leasers to employee status to meet the requirements of this bill.

6. Conversion of leases to employment arrangements would wreck many companies' operations: It is undoubtedly not news to this committee that the gold mines of the United States have not been prospering under present labor costs and gold price conditions. Labor cost is a very large percentage of the total cost of underground mine operation. This is also true in nonferrous metal mines. If the leasers are made employees by the definition of this act, the companies believe that the mutual advantages of the leaser relationship, for all effective purposes, will be lost to both parties. If Congress makes the leasers employees for social security taxes, the Wage and Hour Administrator will want to call them employees. The National Labor Relations Board will want to call them employees. The companies will be faced with supervisory obligations, with labor relations problems, and worst of all, with operating problems in mining clean ore which it does not now have under the leasing system. The managements believe that the increased expenses would so far destroy the margin of profit as to render the operations in question nonremunerative. This in turn would necessitate closing down large sections of several mines and allowing them to cave or fill with water. Several hundred leasers would be deprived of their means of livelihood and the disaster to the already slender economy of these mining communities is not hard to predict.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF OUR SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS

I believe the committee will be interested in considering the other side of the picture. What will be the effect on the leasers' welfare if the amendments to the bill requested here are adopted? They will remain as they have been, independent operators. Familiar as most of them are with the traditions and practices of the prospectors and early miners who found, prospected, and developed in the initial stages the great gold mines and oil fields of California—these leasers will continue to use their skill, initiative, and ability to follow the veins in accumulating a modest competence for their retiring years. The groups carry their own compensation insurance with the State of California so that injuries are taken care of. It is obviously a matter of little concern to the owners whether or not the leasers are taxed as self-employed. Their earnings should enable them to make provision for their later years out of their savings. However, the leasers will speak for themselves on this subject. I only wish to make it clear to the committee that the position which the mine owners are taking through the American Mining Congress in this matter conforms with the position of their lessees, and that if the amendments which we ask are made, Congress will not be deciding in favor of one side or against the other. The effect on the social-security funds in the National Treasury from the loss of contributions from the few hundred leasers now engaged in mining in the United States would certainly be negligible. The situation is one which does not require the intervention of the Federal Government in the interest of security or protection for groups of individual citizens who are perfectly able to take care of themselves and their wants. On the other hand, the insertion and retention of the amendments which the industry requests will conform with present judicial decisions as to the independent status of the leasers, and it will greatly help in enabling the mining industry to meet, without expense to the Government, some of the major financial and economic problems with which it is confronted.

In behalf of the gold-mining industry and of the nonferrous metal mining industry of the United States I most respectfully urge your committee to adopt the amendments we propose which would strike out the specific classification of leasers as employees and would eliminate the generalized uncertain language from sections 206 (d) (4) and 210 (K) (4) of the act under which no operator or person holding contractual relations with him could know for certain whether that person occupied an employee's status or not.

I thank your committee for your time and attention.

EXHIBIT

SPECIFIC AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 6000 SUGGESTED TO THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE BY REPRESENTATIVES OF THE AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS AND REASONS THEREFOR

I. On page 151 amend section 206 (d) (3) by striking out clause (3) (F), page 151, lines 6 to 9, of the bill, reading as follows: "(F) as a lessee or licensee of space within a mine when substantially all of the product of such services is required to be sold or turned over to the lessor or licensor;"

II. On page 50, lines 4 to 7, strike out clause (K) (3) (F) of the bill.

The effect of these two amendments will be to automatically eliminate block leasers in mines from the definition of the term "employee" as used in the bill.

III. Strike out the parenthetical statements in lines 17 and 18, page 50, and in lines 19 and 20, page 151, reading as follows: "(other than the services described in subparagraph (F))." This language becomes unnecessary if paragraph (F) is stricken.

IV. Strike out sections 210 (K) (4) on page 51, and section 206 (d) (4) on page 152 of the bill, both sections reading as follows:

"(4) any individual who is not an employee under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection but who, in the performance of service for any person for remuneration, has, with respect to such service, the status of an employee, as determined by the combined effect of (A) control over the individual, (B) permanency of the relationship, (C) regularity and frequency of performance of the service, (D) integration of the individual's work in the business to which he renders service, (E) lack of skill required of the individual, (F) lack of investment by the individual, (F) lack of investment by the individual in facilities for work, and (G) lack of opportunities of the individual for profit or loss."

The reason for this exclusion is to prevent the classification as "employees" under the act of persons who are not and have not been considered as employees under accepted common law definitions so that mine leasers and similar classes of independent workers could not be classified as "employees" under the act merely because their leases may continue for a long period of time or they may perform the work under the leases with regularity and frequency or because the production of ore under the leases is usually an identical type of business to that in which the leaser is engaged, and because a mine block lessee does not normally have a large investment in facilities for work, most of which are owned by the lessor and furnished to the lessee either as a part of the fixtures covered by his lease or as facilities necessary to his use in operating under the same.

V. Insert in the list of exceptions from the definition of employment on page 35 of the bill, following section 210 (a) (1), and on page 137 of the bill, following section 205 (b) (1), the following:

"(2) A lessee or licensee of space within a mine where such space is held under a written lease or license for a period of not less than 6 months and where no control over lessee's operations is exercised by the mine owner; provided, that furnishing access, supplies, transportation, and ore storage and milling facilities by the lessor, as well as standard lease requirements for operation in a minerlike manner and observance of law and safety regulations, shall not be considered as an exercise of control over lessee's operations sufficient to constitute him an employee."

The purpose of this amendment is to specifically exclude mine leasers, along with agricultural labor, certain types of domestic servants and other services excluded from classification as employment under sections 210 and 205.

VI. Renumber the subsections of sections 210 (a) and 205 (b) following subsection (1) to conform with the above insertions.

Eyewitness Report on Communist-Occupied Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I believe many readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be interested and impressed by an eyewitness report which I have received from a young South Dakota GI who has recently returned to his home in Mound City, S. Dak., after spending several post-war years in Germany. I take this means of calling to the attention of Congress and the country the following report and recommendations.

At the conclusion of the letter I received from Mr. Kundert will be found an English translation of the program referred to in the letter and which was held as part of the cleverly staged Stalin birthday celebration.

I hope other Senators will share with me the conviction that the moral we Americans should draw from all of this is that we should sharply expand, step up, and make more realistic and forceful our Voice of America publicity program in Germany and in eastern Europe generally.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 10, 1950.

Senator KARL E. MUNDT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: Thank you for your very kind letter of February 1, 1950.

I am sending along the program of the Stalin birthday celebration, plus a photo of Stalin. The photos and programs and copies of the Freie Deutsche Jugent (Free German Youth—a newspaper printed in the Soviet zone of Germany) were sold at the ceremony. This is only one of the many methods employed by the Communist Party to raise funds for their activities in western Germany.

As you know, the currency reform of 1948 struck the German Communist Party in the western zones a vital blow, and they have been desperately trying to devise other methods of raising revenue in the western Deutsche mark.

For example, the Communists have set up printing firms (who, by the way, gain a lot of innocent, unsuspecting western business) which are run by agents from the Soviet zone, and which do their work with printing presses smuggled across the zonal borders.

When the zonal borders were reopened (after our counterblockade had been in effect for some time) the Soviets had built up large stores of textiles and other Soviet-zone goods which they promptly rushed across the borders to merchants in the western zones. In this manner they were able again to raise western Deutsche marks to carry on their nefarious activities in our zones of Germany. The textiles were sold to otherwise non-Communist German dealers in the west who leaped at the chance to buy their goods at prices lower than those in the western zones. Thus, by undersselling western textile manufacturers, the Communists were again able to raise funds in western marks.

I shall leave further comment on this subject for another time. I do want to give you my comments (as you requested them) on the effect of Russian propaganda and activities on the German people.

I must say quite frankly that I was shocked at the reaction of the German public at the Stalin birthday celebration. To begin with, the auditorium was jammed to the rafters. I do not know how many people were there out of curiosity as I was, but I doubt that many were because their frenetic enthusiasm at the unveiling of the Stalin portrait and their wild singing of the Internationale (the text of which appears at the back of the program) were sufficient indication to me that most of the audience were carried away by the greatness of the moment.

I had with me a cousin who was born and raised in the city of Odessa, in Russia. He knows the Red paradise from the inside, and he and my Russian teacher (a lady who was a professor at the University of Leningrad for many years and who worked in the anti-Cominform (can give you more details on this later if you like) gave me many ugly pictures of life in Utopia. The speech by Max Reimann (as you know, he is the leading German Communist in western Germany) was violent, clever, and caustic. He quoted Harry Truman by name and then proceeded to rip him to shreds. He made much of the fact that Truman once stated (during the war and while he was Vice President—believe it was a New York paper he quoted) that Germany and Russia should be permitted to bleed themselves to death and then the United States and other nations should step in and direct matters from that point on. Reimann pointed out to a cheering audience that this was the same Truman with whom they were still dealing and that the leopard hasn't changed his spots.

After Reimann's speech, the red curtains parted and a huge portrait of Stalin was revealed, whereupon the audience went stark, staring mad, leaped to its feet, and began yelling (and I do mean "yelling") the Internationale. Such a exhibition you have never heard. I must confess that the man who had painted the portrait was a genius. He had combined the loving father with the stern man of destiny and the kindly elder brother so well that I was confounded. The portrait artist could have made Gargantua look like St. Cecelia.

My cousin and I did not rise—we wanted to see what would happen if we didn't (and the day has not yet come when I am forced to rise in tribute to Stalin). Aside from a few cold—or should I say hot—stares, nothing happened. But as we drove out of the auditorium grounds, the Communist youth chorus blocked our way by forming a chain across the road (my American car was easily recognizable—in fact, it was the only American car there). I simply stepped on the gas and charged them and they scattered like South Dakota pheasants by the roadside. It might have given me great pleasure to maim a Communist, particularly since this group came from the University of Frankfurt (a university which we have helped to rebuild—obviously merely in order to furnish a breeding place for vermin).

From my conversation with hundreds of Germans from the Soviet zone and certainly thousands from the United States zone, (I have spent 4 years in Germany), I feel that that are two classes of Germans who are fertile territory for the Russian propaganda. These are:

1. Those Germans who had the Communist tendencies in them (many prior to the war), and

2. Those young Germans (and oddly enough, very old people) who are caught up by the Communist ideal (brotherhood of man, and so forth) without realizing that the present realization of communization in Russia, and the satellites, is a far cry from the Utopian one originally preached by Marx.

I personally am not worried about the effectiveness of the Russian propaganda which tries to influence Germans by promising them Utopia. I am very much worried about that section of Russian propaganda which threatens the Germans with retribution for not supporting the Communists and which tells them they had better get on the Communist bandwagon to avoid punishment when the Russians finally take over Germany and western Europe.

I know personally of many Germans who have joined the Communist party, not because they are Communists or believe in Communist ideals, but because they are insulating themselves against things to come. They feel that joining the party and giving lip service to communism will protect them when the Communists gain the upper hand. Note that I said when, because there are not too many Germans who are firmly convinced that the United States and other democracies are willing to stage a desperate, last ditch, armed fight against communism in Europe. Too many of them believe we will give up the fight in the final analysis. True, they have seen the miraculous airlift, but they consider that only the initial stage of a really bitter fight.

I do not personally know the temper of the people in Berlin, but I do know that when a 2-pfennig levy was put on each 20 pfennig of German postage, there were howls of protest from Germans in the rest of Germany. "Why should we help the Berliners—the Allies are holding Berlin, let them foot the bill"; "The Berlin situation does not concern us, and so forth."

I frankly do not think the German nation dependable enough in character to be trusted very far. As individuals they seem to me very shifty and treacherous, and I see little reason to hope that they will be a strong front against the onslaught of communism from the East. The moral degradation left by the Hitler regime is painfully in evidence in every phase of German private and political life. So, as I said, I am more concerned with the effects of Russian threats to the Germans—causing the Germans to knuckle under out of fear.

For example, while I was stationed in Augsburg, Germany, rumors began circulating about that the Germans need not, or should not, accept their new food ration cards for a period early in 1947 because the Russians would be issuing the food ration cards for Bavaria for that period (ergo, the Russians would already be established in Bavaria). True, these were only rumors, but they were so prevalent that many Germans took them almost at face value, and were certainly afraid and convinced of the possibility of such a turn of affairs.

I think, insofar as the Germans are concerned, we have the duty of letting them see our firm intent to stay in Berlin (this is the place where the whole European issue will be fought out with the Russians, and Lord knows we are in an unhappy position there) and in the rest of Germany. If we lose Berlin, we have lost Germany and Europe.

It is encouraging to note how much news of the outside world seeps into the Soviet zone of Germany, and into the satellite countries. Even the U. S. S. R. is not immune. I want to mention our propaganda to the U. S. S. R., satellite countries, and Soviet zone, though.

From many conversations with deserters from the Russian Army in the Soviet zone, and Russian civilian employees of the Soviet Army, I note that our Voice of America is eagerly heard by those Russians themselves who can hear it. But all of these sources urge that our propaganda coverage (our radio coverage—which is our only coverage) is so pitifully inadequate that it is merely a drop in the ocean.

Many of these sources told us that they believe that a really strong and vigorous and wide coverage of these areas by our Voice of America broadcasts would be our best guaranty of preventing the present cold war from becoming a hot war.

I call to mind, for example, merely our statements on Voice of America that we grant political asylum to persons fleeing the Soviet zone and satellites. The Russians tell us that if we would redouble our efforts on this one point alone, and be direct and vigorous we could prepare the ground for our psychological conquest of the Russian people (a fact which the Germans overlooked much to their painful surprise). I saw the report of the chief of German intelligence for the Russian front, and he recognized that the Germans failed in their physical conquest of the Russians because they had failed in their psychological conquest first.

I think that we had darned well better give a lot of advance thought to our psychological handling of the Russian people, because, should we ever have to fight them (and I for one am firmly convinced that we shall) we will be a lot closer to success if we have properly prepared the ground.

I know, too, that when the Germans marched into Russia, many Russians greeted them as liberators, but when the Germans committed atrocities, and treated the Russians as inferiors and animals, the battle was already lost. The Germans recognized this, and made belated efforts to organize eastern divisions (ost divisionen) but had already lost their golden opportunity by that time. I can go into much more detail on this point if you like.

Sorry, but I really went to seed on this letter. But it will give you an indication of my capacity for going on for hours on the subject. At present I am speaking to high schools, church groups, Rotary clubs, and commercial clubs and am hoping to do my bit to inform our people in the U. S. A. what kind of an enemy they are facing.

Hope the program I am sending will be of interest and help to you. I should like it returned when you are finished with it.

I am coming east sometime in March and may be able to stop and see you in Washington (have never been in that fair city).

Thanks, again, for your letter, and please let me know if I can clear up any points.

Sincerely,

OTTO KUNDERT.

MOUND CITY, S. DAK.

[Translation]

FRIENDSHIP WITH THE SOVIET UNION

(P. 1)

J. W. Stalin, the guardian of peace, the friend of the German people, will be 70 years old on December 21.

Friendship demonstration in the Frans-Althoff-Building in the zoo on Monday, December 19, at 20 o'clock. Max Reimann will speak.

Admission 1-DM.

This program entitles to admission.

PROGRAM

(Inside page)

1. Coriolan Overture (Beethoven) - Orchestra
2. Recitation — Mathilde Danegger
3. From the Soviet Union: Report in picture and sound.
4. Choir } Youth Choir
5. Speaking Choir }
6. Recitation — Mathilde Danegger
7. Egmont Overture (Beethoven) - Orchestra
8. Speech — Max Reimann
9. The Internationale - Community singing

Performers

Hessian Philharmonic Orchestra.

A youth choir.

Mathilde Danegger (formerly at the Zurich playhouse).

(P. 3)

THE INTERNATIONALE

Wake up, condemned of this earth,
Whom one still steadily forces to hunger.
Justice, like the glow in the top of a crater,
Forces with might to an eruption.
Settle accounts with the oppressors.
Army of slaves, wake up!
Being nothing is no longer to be borne,
Stream together to become everything.

People, hear the signals!
Up for the last fight!
The Internationale
Wins human right by battle.

No higher being rescues us,
No god, no emperor or court,
Saves us from misery.
Only we ourselves can do it.
Empty word: the rights of the poor!
Empty word: the duty of the rich!
We are called children and knaves.
Endure the shame no longer.

(Same chorus.)

In city and country, you working people,
We are the strongest of the parties.
Shove aside the idlers,
This world must be ours.
Our blood shall no longer be food for the
REVENS
And the powerful vultures.
When we have driven them away
Then for the first time the sun will shine
without ceasing.

(Same chorus.)

(Translated by L. M. Manross, February 23, 1950.)

Company, Seven Unions at Peace for 15 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, in these days when there is so much unrest and misunderstanding between management and organized labor, it is good to know that up in New Hampshire, the Granite State, there is a long-established, successful concern, the Nashua Gummed & Coated Paper Co., which has enjoyed peaceful labor relations for 15 years. This industrial concern has recently received recognition of its wonderful labor relationships made possible by those who work for it and the employers themselves, through a statement put out by an authority, the National Planning Association, entitled "Causes of Industrial Peace Under Collective Bargaining." I sincerely congratulate both workers and management who have made this splendid New England enterprise one of the most successful companies in the Nation. I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of February 17, 1950, entitled "Company, Seven Unions at Peace 15 Years."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPANY, SEVEN UNIONS AT PEACE 15 YEARS—NASHUA PAPER, A. F. OF L. GROUPS WEIGH GRIEVANCES TOGETHER—BOTH SIDES APPROACHABLE

WASHINGTON, February 16.—A management that encourages the expression of grievances and unions that believe the boss wants to be fair are described in a new case study released today by the National Planning Association.

This is the record of the Nashua Gummed & Coated Paper Co., of Nashua, N. H., and seven unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The study is one of a series on the causes of industrial peace under collective bargaining.

An illustration of present top management attitude was this:

"We try to encourage the expression of grievances. You always have them, and if they aren't coming out, you know there must be something wrong. The union people come into my office and raise hell, I encourage this, to get it off their chests, and see what the problem is."

Management characteristics mentioned consistently in interviews with labor leaders were these:

"NO STALLING," UNIONS REPORT

"You can always get to them without any trouble. There is no stalling. They are willing to discuss any problems. They don't just say 'No' without any reason."

The unions are the paper workers, bookbinders, pressmen, stereotypers, photoengravers, operating engineers, and firemen and oilers.

The on-the-spot investigation was made by Dr. Charles A. Myers and Dr. George P. Schultz, professor and assistant professor of industrial relations of Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Dr. Myers also is executive director of MIT's industrial relations section.

Conclusions of the authors are highlighted in a statement with the report signed by all 29 of the experts on labor relations who make up the NPA committee on the causes of industrial peace. The committee's chairman is Clinton S. Golden, who inspired the study series. The work is financed by John Hay Whitney.

RELATIONSHIP COVERS 15 YEARS

The major conclusion of the study is that this 15-year, no-strike, no-lockout relationship is based on patience rather than pressure; on hard work and good will, day in and day out, not just during annual negotiations.

The seven unions and the company look upon force as a last resort, because each party to the bargaining understands and accepts the needs of the other for security and growth, for economic gains and profits.

Neither party has argued for the inflexible application of broad principles such as management's prerogatives or union's rights.

There is no sharp distinction between making and administering contracts. When need arises, issues are negotiated and changes in the contracts are frequent. Only two arbitration cases have occurred during this history of collective bargaining.

The company produces a diversified line in a highly competitive industry. Profits, operations, and the number of employees have shown a steady growth since the company's incorporation in 1904. The expansion has continued since the first union was recognized in 1935, and employee productivity has been high.

There have been no costly interruptions of production in this company where profits depend heavily on ability to maintain a high volume of production and sales.

Ann Pamela Cunningham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present within an address prepared for delivery over the radio in my home city of Greenville, S. C., in the observance of the two hundred and seventeenth birthday of our First President, Gen. George Washington. The program was sponsored by the Nathaniel Green Chapter of the South Carolina Daughters of the American Revolution and Mrs. Jessie Reed Burnett as chairman. Since Congress was considering one of the most controversial issues on February 22, I could not leave Washington. My son, William J. Bryson, Esq., read the message for me, the text of which is as follows:

As Mrs. Burnett has so well stated, we cannot properly understand or appreciate our priceless heritage, without some knowledge of the lives and sacrifices of those who have established and maintained it for us. Hence, the members of the Nathaniel Greene Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution and of other chapters are to be commended for their ceaseless efforts toward bringing about such understanding and appreciation. They are to be especially commended for their efforts on this day to inform or remind us of the tremendous debt of gratitude which we owe to George Washington and to those persons who in some way are connected with his memory.

I have been asked to present briefly a biographical sketch of a South Carolinian, who, though she did not live during the times of our War for Independence or ever met George Washington, made of her life a challenging example for us to follow, and who is as much a benefactor of our democratic way of life as are her kinsmen and contemporaries who fought on the battlefields or in the legislative halls during the early years of our Nation's history.

That patriot and benefactor is Ann Pamela Cunningham.

On the banks of the muddy Saluda River near the community of Waterloo in Laurens County may be seen today the faint lines of what was once a skillfully cultivated ornamental garden and park. Here and there may be seen various types of roses, evergreens, and boxwoods growing wildly and intermingled with weeds. At the end of what appears to have once been an avenue of roses stands a crumbling chimney. This scene of abandonment is what remains of one of the most famous of South Carolina's upcountry plantations known as Rosemont. This was the home of Ann Pamela Cunningham.

Today on the banks of the Potomac River in the State of Virginia, not far from our Nation's Capital, may be seen in full glory

gardens and parks similar to those which once existed at Rosemont. In the center of these gardens and parks, on the river bank, where stands a mansion in all its majestic simplicity similar to that which once stood on the banks of the Saluda. That building and these gardens and parks are known to us as Mount Vernon, the home of our first President, George Washington. It stands today just as it stood during his lifetime.

Authorities estimate that today, George Washington's Birthday, some 25,000 persons will visit Mount Vernon. During the past century millions of people have visited there. Every President of this country has visited Mount Vernon at some time or another, and it may safely be assumed that none who visits Mount Vernon comes away without a keener sense of our heritage and the responsibility which rests upon us to preserve it. That historic spot is indeed a place of reverence and inspiration.

You may wonder why I have linked the desolate, decayed homestead of Ann Pamela Cunningham with the well-kept and often visited homestead of George Washington, Mount Vernon. The reason why I have done so is also the reason why the life of Ann Pamela Cunningham is important to us if we are to properly appreciate our rich heritage as American citizens. In fact, the reason is the life of Ann Pamela Cunningham.

Miss Cunningham was born on April 15, 1816, the daughter of Robert and Louisa Bird Cunningham. She was born at her father's plantation, Rosemont, which was located in what was then Known as Laurens District, S. C. Her grandfather, Patrick Cunningham, migrated to that district from Virginia and her maternal forebears came from Pennsylvania.

Miss Cunningham received her formal education through a governess and at a select school for girls near Columbia. Upon the completion of her studies she returned to Rosemont and entered into the social life of the community. The clearest picture of her at that time is found in the diary of one of Greenville's most prominent citizens, who in 1835 was a promising young bachelor lawyer, Benjamin F. Perry. Mr. Perry states that Miss Cunningham was "pretty, very intelligent, and exceeding graceful and dignified in her manner."

Shortly after Miss Cunningham returned from school she suffered an accident which changed the course of her life. She was thrown from her horse and sustained injuries from which she never recovered. This misfortune, however, is mainly responsible for the present existence of Mount Vernon, for it was upon returning from a trip to doctors in Philadelphia that Miss Cunningham's mother brought to her attention the fact that the home of our first President was lacking proper maintenance and in need of repair.

Struck by the neglect of Mount Vernon, Miss Cunningham had published in the Charleston Mercury, on December 2, 1853, a letter addressed to the women of the South calling upon them to raise funds to save Washington's homestead. As it was improper for a lady's name to appear in the press at that time, she signed her name as "a southern matron," which name followed her throughout her life.

This first appeal, which was also published by other newspapers of that day, brought little result except in her local community. There the ladies of the Liberty Springs Presbyterian Church met and established the first chapter of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association. This was on Washington's Birthday, February 22, 1854. A small amount of money was subscribed on that occasion for the purpose of preserving Mount Vernon and plans were formulated for a campaign to raise additional funds. From there support of the movement spread to Camden, Spartanburg, Hamburg, and other parts of this State.

By July 1854 the movement gained popular support throughout five Southern States and the goal of $200,000 with which to purchase Mount Vernon from John Augustine Washington was in sight. During this period, although an invalid, Miss Cunningham worked tirelessly, writing additional letters and carrying her campaign to the northern States.

Two years later in 1856 due to an increasing amount of disapproval on the part of men citizens and to the unwillingness of the owner to sell Mount Vernon, the efforts of Miss Cunningham and her associates seemed doomed to failure.

In June of that year, at the point of death, Miss Cunningham made a final attempt by visiting Mount Vernon and Mr. Washington. During that visit she secured Mr. Washington's consent to the purchase and the contract was signed on April 6, 1858. It was not, however, until 1860 that the Mount Vernon Ladies Association took possession of Mount Vernon.

The ladies of the association began at once to repair Washington's homestead and to return it to its former splendor. Since that time Miss Cunningham and her successors have maintained this national shrine for us without cost to the public. While their efforts have often faced disaster, as they did during the Civil War, Mount Vernon stands today as it did when George Washington was President.

In June 1874 Miss Cunningham resigned from her position as regent of the association and returned to her home, Rosemont, where she died on May 1, 1875.

On a headstone in the churchyard of the First Presbyterian Church in Columbia is the name of Ann Pamela Cunningham.

On the walls of the senate chamber of the State capitol in Columbia hangs a portrait of Miss Cunningham, the only woman to be so honored.

On the banks of the muddy Saluda River, as it flows through Laurens County, are the deserted, wild remains of a once well-cultivated ornamental garden and the crumbling chimney of a once lively home.

On the banks of the Potomac River are the magnificent gardens and buildings of Mount Vernon, a national shrine.

Thus, it is that a frail, invalid women from the clay slopes of Laurens County sacrificed her life and health to preserve for us the historic home of George Washington. She did so in order that we, the generations that have come after her, might be reminded by its existence of the life of the Father of our Country and thereby gain strength in our attempt to maintain and improve our heritage.

I am sure that Ann Pamela Cunningham never thought that we would also gain such strength by remembering her life and sacrifice.

Hoover Commission Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to enclose a copy of the resolutions adopted by the delegates of District 8, Essex County, Department of Massachusetts, the American Legion, at a regular monthly meeting convened at Beever-Wilmot Post, No. 309, Salisbury, Mass., on Sunday, February 19, 1950:

Whereas while we are in favor of efficiency and economy in services rendered to veterans by governmental agencies: Be it

Resolved, That we feel that the dismemberment of the Veterans' Administration Agency into several different agencies as outlined by the Hoover Commission Report recommendations will cause increased expense, great confusion, and delay in rendering service to the veterans; and

Whereas we believe that the veteran who gave of his time, at the risk of life and limb, and who in many cases has paid with the same, we feel that he is entitled to favorable consideration by a grateful Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That District 8 (Essex County), Department of Massachusetts, the American Legion, be opposed to any legislation in the future that will result in the dismemberment, or that will take away, deny, or limit the preferences, that are now received by veterans in any manner whatsoever; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Congressmen of the respective districts, and that a copy be forwarded to the Massachusetts Department, the American Legion.

Address of Dr. Dirk Uipko Stikker, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by His Excellency Dr. Dirk Uipko Stikker, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands and special representative of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation.

Dr. Stikker's address was a dinner speech at the Mayflower Hotel on Wednesday evening, March 1, 1950. The dinner was given by the Honorable Paul Hoffman, ECA Administrator, honoring Dr. Stikker.

This address is an excellent report on the progress of European integration and is historic in the fact that a representative of one European country is speaking for the 18 countries, which are members of the OEEC.

I hope my colleagues in Congress and the American people will carefully read this friendly, sincere, and sound report.

The address follows:

After this excellent dinner I have no intention of boring you with a lot of figures, statistics and details of the operation of the Marshall plan in western Europe. This, I feel, is neither the time nor the place to go into technicalities. Instead, I should like to give you a broad, general outline of the establishment of western European unity and of the main difficulties and obstacles we find on our way.

But before I embark on this subject, I should like to raise a question. How is it that right at this moment a single man can

speak in your midst on behalf of western Europe? I have not been endowed with supranational powers. In fact, I much preferred my task and powers to remain vague, because the question of supranational authority would inevitably have raised the issue of sovereignty. Still, the fact remains that, for the first time in history, all the different countries of western Europe have asked the representative of one to be spokesman for all of them. The conclusion is obvious: here is political progress of the first importance.

This brings me to my main theme. Western European Unity. The problem of Europe is neither new nor of local importance. It is the familiar question of how an advanced, very thickly populated and highly developed part of the world, having suffered the ravages of two world wars in 20 years, can regain its balance and prosperity, and thereby safeguard its all-important democratic traditions and institutions, before the evil forces of disruption, destruction, and dictatorship which thrive on postwar turbulence can get a firm grip on the situation. Nor is it a local problem, because what happens in one major part of the free world must of needs have the most far-reaching effect in another. The problem of Europe is not only Europe's problem, it is also America's.

That this was, and is, persistently realized in this country was illustrated in the first place by the approval of the lend-lease principles without which the war would have been lost, and in the second place by the acceptance of the plan voiced by a great American when he was Secretary of State, General Marshall.

Now the American people have been told on many occasions how grateful the peoples of western Europe are to them for their extensive and generous assistance on the road to recovery. I can only testify to their gratitude once more. Recently the American people have also heard that the first object of the Marshall plan has been achieved, and that from the point of view of recovery and staving off economic collapse it can already be qualified as a great success. It seems natural, therefore, that they should wonder sometimes why it proves so difficult to attain the second important objective: the integration of the western European economies and the removal of the various obstacles to free trading.

I should like to emphasize here that also in this field progress is being made all the time. There is, however, one additional difficulty here. Whereas the first objective of the Marshall plan could be reached by economic means chiefly on a national basis, the participating countries have, comparatively recently, found—not without some prodding on your side—that the more progress they make toward the economic integration of western Europe, the more likely they were to run into complications of a political nature. To the Governments of Belgium, Luxemburg and the Netherlands this did not come unexpectedly. They had had the same experience while concentrating their efforts on the establishment of the Benelux Economic Union. I should like to recall that this relatively small-scale development took fully 6 years of truly hard work to mature.

Small wonder therefore that a similar project for the whole of western Europe should run into much more formidable difficulties.

In the first place we should always bear in mind that we are dealing with an age-old historically grown system of independent states. To persuade all of them to abolish protective economic measures is not an easy job. But I feel sure that it can be done and that it will be done, just like the Benelux Union has become a living reality through the perseverance of the participants.

The second difficulty we should not underestimate is the special position of Great Britain. On the one hand Britain has strong historical, cultural, economic, and geographical ties with the continent of western Europe which makes her anxious to occupy her rightful place in the European community, but on the other hand she has equally strong affinities outside Europe which render new commitments, especially when these may have far-reaching consequences, a matter for very serious consideration. It should be remembered that Britain's currency serves approximately 40 percent of world trade. There is, however—and I should like to stress this point—no question of a deadlock here either. Certain recent statements in the press tried to convince us that western European integration had reached an impasse because of the duality I just described, but I would remind anyone who has serious fears in this respect that the absence of spectacular and rapid success by no means implies failure. I, for one, have good reason to be optimistic; a few weeks in my present capacity have shown me progress, sometimes slow progress but at the same time—and this makes it encouraging—willingness to cooperate toward an acceptable solution. I feel particularly gratified at this development, because I have a strong feeling that an overall agreement would be the only satisfactory solution. An integration of European economies without including the United Kingdom can, in my mind, not constitute our final aim.

The third difficulty we have to contend with is the problem of the German balance of payments. I realize that here I touch upon a technical aspect of our problems and that this is hardly the place to go into technicalities. But I may be permitted to draw the attention to the general importance of the position of Germany in western Europe. In my opinion it would be impossible to establish a sound European economic system if Germany were not part of it. German economy has historically played an important role in Europe. It seems unsound to me to ignore this in trying to build up an economically healthy Europe.

The fourth difficulty we encountered is the existence of various trade and payment barriers in Europe. These barriers are being maintained, not because these governments are so fond of protective measures, but simply because economic recovery in individual countries has not yet reached such a stage as to enable them to remove all these barriers without serious repercussions. I need not cite to you as legislators the extent of political pressures which come from vested interests which are opposed to the removal of protective barriers in any country, including the United States. I am sure that you experience them in the American Congress in any effort to lower your own tariffs despite the fact that from the over-all economic standpoint a more liberal policy on imports would surely appear to be in the interest of America, as a great creditor Nation, as well as in the interest of Europe.

Having pointed out four of the main factors which have recently proved to stand in the way of immediate and spectacular successes in our efforts to achieve western European unity, I should now like to turn to the other side of the question. There is in western Europe a most gratifying and promising tendency to foster European cooperation and to attain the integration we are looking forward to. Last year this tendency was crystallized in the establishment of the Council of Europe at Strasbourg. The importance of this organization and the effect it will undoubtedly have on the course of European events should not be underestimated. In the Council of Europe we see both the legislatures and the executive branches of most of the western European nations getting together to (and I quote from the Council's statute) "achieve a greater unity between its members for the purpose of safeguarding and realizing the ideals and principles which are their common heritage and facilitating their economic and social progress."

Through one of its organs the Council has already taken up contact with the OEEC. This contact is likely to become more intensive, whether it is formal or informal. What the effect of any future exchange of ideas will be I shall not venture to guess. But I feel certain that the obvious desire of both governmental and parliamentary representatives to bring about a feasible and sound form of unity cannot fail to yield beneficial results. A strong, unprecedented movement for unity as arisen in Europe—and Marshall aid has given it considerable impetus—which it would be impossible to stem.

Compared with America, Europe is an old continent, but old as it may be, Europe has not lost its vigor. Western Europe will use all its resources to achieve our common end, but in spite of the proverb which says: "Where there is a will there's a way," the will on the part of western Europe will not be enough. We need material assistance to tide us over the difficulties lying ahead in the next 2 years.

Four years ago, the present Netherlands Ambassador in Washington, Mr. van Kleffens, discussed in a speech in New York the commanding position occupied by the United States after the war and the consequences deriving from that position in the economic field. He then said that the outside world often looks with a certain apprehension toward your gigantic country, hoping and trusting that no measure will be taken there which, with the best of intentions and without any desire to harm other countries, might nevertheless result in damage to them by a certain lack of awareness of their economic position and legitimate interests.

Today, after the Marshall plan has been in operation for almost 2 years, we in western Europe know how seriously the people, the Congress and the Government of the United States have taken this responsibility. Under the inspired guidance of President Truman, former Secretary of State Marshall, eminent members of the executive branch of the Government, leaders of Congress such as Senator CONNALLY and Senator VANDENBERG, Representative KEE and Representative EATON, and many others—too many to mention—the United States, by the bold and timely action of its Congress, has shown unsurpassed generosity to those who for a number of years lacked the physical means to help themselves. We have already done much, and, with confidence in the future, we want to give expression to our gratitude and to pledge ourselves to spare no efforts to reach our goal. But I am certain that one day—and I hope it won't be long from now—we shall be able to show our American friends that their vast contributions have not been in vain.

Then Europe will show the United States and the rest of the world that investment in liberty and in democracy, liberally but judiciously made, does neither mean political subjugation, as has been contended so often in eastern Europe, nor a waste of valuable taxpayers' money, as has been feared by some here. This investment will prove to serve the cause of prosperity, of economic well-being, consequently of peace.

The part which the United States Congress is playing in this historical undertaking is a difficult one: every year during the operation of the Marshall plan the Congress has to consider and harmonize its two responsibilities, the one toward the American people as a guardian over their financial and other interests and the other toward the

democratic world as a whole from the point of view of safeguarding world peace and prosperity.

This year the United States Congress will once more be asked to appropriate a large sum of money for foreign aid. We in western Europe feel convinced that it will not be denied us, because we cannot believe that an American would help build a bridge only halfway across a stream.

We, on our part, are contributing our share toward the same goal. Western Europe realizes fully that the unity envisaged by the Marshall plan will be beneficial to all of us. We feel that America and Europe, linked together by that highway of traffic, the Atlantic Ocean, have more in common with each other than either of them with any other part of the world. The various parts they play in the Atlantic civilization demonstrate how inseparably they are united in the world of today. We gladly acknowledge the generous contribution you have made in recent years but we want to assure you that western Europe is doing and will continue to do all within its power to be a worthy partner of America in the Atlantic community of nations.

We are conscious that your aid would be wasted, if we did not create unity between democratic countries, and a free, good, and just society. These are the stakes, worthy of the supreme effort of free men.

Modern Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial by Dr. J. C. Roper, pastor of the First Methodist Church, Clover, S. C., entitled "Modern Trends," including trend in state. The editorial is from the Clover Herald of February 23, 1950:

MODERN TRENDS

(By Dr. J. C. Roper)

Some days ago the writer was in a business office and saw a calendar on the wall with a picture of a man standing on a ship looking through his glasses taking his reckoning. Underneath were these words: "It is not where you are but where you are going."

THERE IS WEAK

From the unimpressive Government over which George Washington presided to the one over which President Truman holds sway is a chasm as great as an ocean. This Nation is the last bulkwark of civilization; it is crumbling now with the weight of bureaus, lobbyists, appeasing politicians, whose chief thought in every act would seem to be with a view to reelection. Not all, to be sure, are for sale. Too many find the road of least resistance. The sequel: The new bonds to redeem some coming due will not the leader around 2 percent. Who is paying off the multibillion debt? Those who have stored up savings against old age. Taxed, on capital, on income derived interest, when will wealth give out?

DID NOT THE SOCIALIST Government of Britain declare only 250 taxpayers received more than 14,000—as against several times that number when it took over? When one gets more than $14,000—who will pay that remaining mortgage on that island that once ruled the world?

Yielding to every pressure group, the dollar has been losing its value, its purchasing power. This writer bought 2,000,000 German marks for $2.50. They are not worth a nickel. Yet, 30 minutes ago the man who used a bad word about a South Carolina statesman, according to Edward R. Murrell, is appealing for a moral battle against gambling and crime.

The moral, the educational, the religious, the national are intertwined. If these trends are not upward, where do they take us? What will the end be? England is a spot from which our planes can depart, if we are able to hold her. The treaty with China means, this once potential friend is committed to an enemy that can neither be appeased nor trusted with any promise, pledge, or treaty.

A citizen of Clover stated to this writer that his history teacher in college told his class that "taxes were the downfall of nations." Undoubtedly the debts of France aided the coming of the great French Revolution. Some have said the loss of coin by attrition, or otherwise, brought on the Dark Ages.

Gone With the Wind was the title of a fast-moving book. Going with the wind might express what is taking place under our noses and we are too blind to see it.

A horse trough for a foot-tub, a blue-back speller for a curriculum, a family altar for devotion, an intelligent minister with sense (not too much learning) but full of the Holy Ghost, and sanction from on high, enough to eat and not too much spare time, helped a lot. Punch buttons, fine soap, smelling powders, silk underclothes, lascivious literature, soft living, may add to earthly joy—at a heavenly discount.

Gravity, trends, gravity, going with the wind.

Men must be governed by God or they will be ruled by tyrants.

Oil and Gas Depletion Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the Ways and Means Committee on February 28, 1950:

The Ways and Means Committee has heard a wide range of testimony from State officials, Members of Congress, and representatives of the oil-producing industry on the proposal to reduce the oil and gas depletion allowance. I think the case for rejection of the Treasury Department's proposal was ably and honestly presented. The witnesses spoke out of earnest conviction which was based on long experience.

Over a considerable number of years I have lived in close association with a class of oil producers of whom you have heard a great deal. That is the operators of the stripper wells.

The oil industry began in my district a little more than 90 years ago. There are wells still producing in the area which are nearly that old. Yet, it is probable, according to laboratory examinations of theoretically depleted oil sands, that underlying such wells there is 75 percent or more of the original volume of oil which was there when the wells were drilled.

In that far-off time little was known about oil. Producers were dealing with a substance which they did not understand. Such fundamentals as the conservation of pressure and protection of the oil sand from water were unknowns then. Consequently, the amount of oil produced from one of the fields in Venango and other counties which were the original oil country, has been large in number of barrels but small in percentage of the total content of the sand.

The stripper well reserves of the United States are estimated to be about 8,000,000,000 barrels, recoverable by ordinary pumping and by what are known as secondary recovery methods.

These methods include the restoration of pressure to an oil sand by means of water, compressed air, and compressed gas. Others are in the experimental stage. Some form of mining may be not far off. Experiments have been made in my district and in other parts of the United States in which shafts were dug to the oil sand and tunnels extended laterally through the sand, greatly enlarging the area drained. Oil producers are constantly at work to overcome the damage done when the industry was new and technical guidance was lacking, as well as to operate newly found fields in a way that will recover through primary methods a far greater percentage of the oil in the reservoir.

How does this relate to the depletion allowance? Simply that secondary recovery work will come to an end without the allowance in at least the present percentage, according to oil producers in whom I have full confidence. Because a portion of their income is exempt from taxation some of the income is available for the improvement of producing methods. When the operator finances the large investment necessary for the application of secondary recovery methods, he counts on the depletion allowance heavily to insure his return of capital. That is so basic in the financing that without it, secondary recovery work would not be possible.

There are about 300,000 stripper wells in the United States. Without the stimulus of secondary recovery, they continue to decline in production. Their owners expect wherever the methods of restoring reservoir pressure are feasible, and when market and credit conditions warrant, to apply such methods. This work proceeds at a rate consistent with the conditions named. If such a vital factor as the depletion allowance should be reduced, it would mean the abandonment of a large portion of our known reserves within a short time.

The effects of stripper-well maintenance and secondary recovery methods on the national oil supply have been great. In the Pennsylvania oil-producing region owners of small wells have gone ahead steadily for many years learning more and more about methods of increasing the recovery of oil. To this end they have financed research work in various ways, jointly and individually. The results have been most encouraging to all who look to the United States as the primary source of petroleum supply for peaceful pursuits, as well as for national defense. The Bradford field of Pennsylvania, for example, has produced as much oil since 1920 as it had in the preceding 45 years, although in 1920 it was chiefly a stripper-well field. Operators there used the profits from secondary recovery to go into other parts of the United States—some to acquire stripper-well properties and apply the methods which had been so successful in Pennsylvania and New York fields; others to explore in untested territory and find new fields which added materially to the Nation's reserves.

I feel certain, based upon my observation of the oil industry in Pennsylvania, that none of these results would have been possible without the depletion allowance which has enabled the industry to retain sufficient income to find the new supply of oil to replace that which is consumed.

The application of secondary recovery methods is as truly a finding of new supply as is the discovery of a hitherto-unknown field by the drilling of a wildcat well.

There are several thousand stripper wells in my district. They are a part of the other thousands which account for the daily production of 50,000 to 60,000 barrels per day of the superior lubricating-base crude oil known as Pennsylvania grade. In my district there are a number of refineries which rely entirely on the production of the stripper wells and the properties which have become secondary recovery projects. The depletion allowance is of vital importance to the region, to the substantial industry located there, and to the consumers of the Nation who use the products which are made from Pennsylvania grade oil.

The term "risk capital" is used in connection with the oil industry's discovery and development operations. It must not be assumed that there is no risk in the stripper well phase of the industry. A substantial amount of drilling is carried on to keep production at the point where operations return a profit and many of the holes are dry. The Oil and Gas Journal reported that in 1949 there were 67 wildcat wells drilled in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio—three States which are wholly stripper well and secondary recovery oil regions. Of the total wildcats, only 7 found oil. In total drilling in these 3 States and in New York, of the 4,400 wells drilled last year, 526 were dry. The number includes all drilling, wildcat, development, and the 1,173 which are classed as service wells. The latter are the kind which produce no oil or gas but are used solely for the injection of water, gas, or compressed air into the sand to increase production.

This committee has much testimony before it as to the role of the depletion allowance in stimulating the discovery of new oil and gas fields. I respectfully ask that consideration be given also to the effect on approximately 300,000 stripper wells and the 2,500,000 acres which they occupy. This is, incidentally, about half the total oil-producing acreage in the United States. About 15 percent of the national daily production came from this class of wells in the year 1947, the latest figures available.

An increase in the producer's tax, as proposed by the Treasury Department in its recommendation for a reduction in the depletion allowance, will destroy a substantial part of the Nations' oil reserves. To leave the depletion allowance unchanged will be an important contribution toward the maintenance of these reserves and the continued operation of the stripper fields.

In conclusion I might say that to penalize all small independent marginal producers in the stripper fields at this time would be the most devastating blow that has ever been struck at the owners and producers in the stripper fields such as exist in Pennsylvania, New York, West Virginia, and Ohio and other parts of the country. The depletion allowance permits him to carry on research and make this effort. To take away this incentive to keep these fields alive means their abandonment and loss to the economy of the Nation.

[From the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of February 23, 1950]

DEPLETION LAW MUST REMAIN

Should anyone seek to hatch a plot to strangle the oil industry and render it impotent in any program for the Nation's future security, no quicker or surer method could be found than the proposal by the Treasury Department, backed by President Truman, to cut the present depletion allowance.

For depletion allowance is the very heart from which pulses the lifeblood of the industry, keeps it alive and virile, and provides it with the stimulus necessary to replenish the reserves so vitally needed for the health and stability of the Nation's economy and safety.

Depletion allowance is as old as the income tax law itself. When the income levy first was enacted it was recognized that special provision should be made for oil and other minerals where production income, unlike any other business, is derived solely from liquidation of capital.

The oil producer's invested capital in any particular property is represented by the amount of oil in place in that property. Every barrel of oil taken from the ground and converted into cash is a liquidation of that capital. When the supply of crude is exhausted from a particular property, the producer has nothing left and to remain in business he must constantly acquire and develop additional prospective oil acreage.

This continuing search for new reserves is an extremely costly nad hazardous venture and has stamped the oil industry as the greatest gamble of them all. Last year the industry completed 7,250 wildcat or test wells drilled in new or unproved regions and of this number 82 percent were dry. Only 15 percent found oil and 3 percent were gas wells. The industry's investment in drilling these wildcats was in excess of $350,000,000. Since only one out of five were producers, the average cost of each productive wildcat well was appoximately $250,000.

Even in territory where oil already has been found, drilling remains a big and costly gamble. In these areas last year, 25 percent of all wells drilled were dry, 66 percent produced oil, and 9 percent were gas wells.

Congress, in enacting the first income-tax law, recognized these peculiar and vital problems of the oil industry: First, that the income tax is just what the name indicates, a levy on earnings or gain, and that it would be improper to tax capital assets which would be the case if the entire proceeds from a barrel of oil, less the operating expenses in producing that oil, were subject to tax; and, secondly, the necessity of returning to the producer, tax free, the capital expended in the search for new sources of oil.

Depletion allowance was Congress' answer to the problem. At first the provision provided a 5-percent allowance on the gross value of the oil at the well. It soon was realized that this allowance, in many cases, was inadequate and inequitable and it was supplanted in 1918 by the unit per barrel allowance. This method of figuring depletion gave a much higher rate to the producer but it was found too involved and indefinite and in many instances did not fulfill the purpose for which depletion was allowed.

Finally, in order to set up a fair and simple depletion law, the Government authorized a survey of oil-production operations during the years from 1918 to 1925. This survey showed that the annual average depletion of capital invested by producers in finding and producing oil was between 32 and 33 percent of the gross income from production. Using this survey as a basis, the House in 1926 passed a bill providing a percentage depletion allowance on gross income from a producing property of 30 percent in figuring taxes. A Senate measure set the figure at 25 percent, then in conference the present depletion allowance of 27½ percent on gross income (but in no event more than 50 percent of the net income from a property) was decided upon and enacted into law.

The fairness and necessity of the present depletion allowance has been consistently recognized by Congress since that time and that enlightened body has repulsed repeated attempts by the Treasury Department to trim that percentage. Any reduction now would undoubtedly prove a death blow to the large independent segment of the industry which already is struggling for survival against enormous cost increases and lower crude prices. Ten to fifteen years ago wells of 3,000 to 4,000 feet were considered deep wells. Now drilling at 8, 10, and 12 thousand feet are the main sources of new production. And the cost of these wells is tremendous.

Producers themselves are only part of the great number of persons who would be affected by elimination of the depletion law. The oil industry, always progressive, gives employment to a very large number of persons who would be thrown out of jobs should producers be forced out of business. Farmers and merchants in all lines would suffer as the oil industry pays annually millions of dollars in oil royalties, lease rentals, and bonuses.

The Government, too, would be forced to absorb a tax loss that undoubtedly would be far greater than any revenue gain which it might hope to acquire through ending the depletion allowance. For the oil industry, in its various ramifications with other industries, shoulders a large part of Federal and State taxes.

A glance back at the performance of the oil industry in the last two great wars should provide a final clinching argument against any Government action that would imperil an industry so vital to the welfare and security of the Nation. It was largely through the herculean efforts of the oil men of America in meeting the demands of the Nation's mechanized armies that these wars were won. And this great effort was actuated by patriotic motives without the incentive of profit. For the increase in the price per barrel of crude received by producers caused by the war demand was very small in comparison with the increased price of other materials.

The depletion law has provided the incentive for the continuing search for new reserves without which the oil industry could not have attained its present vital role in the life of America. The proposal to eliminate that incentive holds a dire threat to the entire oil industry.

Congress should heed no pleas for action that would destroy, but rather should do everything within its power to foster this industry which stands as a bulwark for the future progress and security of the Nation.

That Unofficial Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the February 9, 1950, edition of the Christian Advocate entitled "That Unofficial Federation." This is in reply to an article in a recent issue of the Reader's Digest by Stanley High.

The editorial follows:

THAT UNOFFICIAL FEDERATION

In the current issue of Reader's Digest, Stanley High, who was once a probationer for a Methodist Annual Conference but was never admitted into membership, and who

ran, unsuccessfully, for the editorship of the Epworth Herald, official youth publication of the Methodist Episcopal Church, has written an article titled, "Methodism's Pink Fringe." It is clever and half-convincing—only half-convincing to careful readers because the facts are fractional facts.

Throughout the article Dr. High descends to the level of the kind of reporting we have done in the first sentence of this editorial. There we have set down two unpleasant and uncomplimentary facts about Dr. High's relationships with the Methodists, among whom his father was a distinguished minister. We might have enumerated many complimentary facts, and we hereby apologize to Dr. High for following, for the moment, the bad example he has set throughout Methodism's Pink Fringe. We would do this personally but Dr. High has just left for Australia.

That piece of writing, in which he has been so scrupulously selective in his choice of facts to support his thesis, concerns the sinning and sinned-against Methodist Federation for Social Action. The article is only the most recent of a series of attacks that began in 1947, when the organization started as the Methodist Federation for Social Service, then as now an unofficial critic of political, economic, and social ideas and actions. Because its leaders have never cared much for safety and security, it has been an embarrassment to many Methodists, and it has been attacked as persistently inside as outside the church.

"Communist" is only the last of the bad names that have been hurled against the federation. It has been called "modernist" and "pacifist" and "socialist" and much else that cannot be printed in the Christian Advocate. But name-calling, cheapest trick in the propagandist's bag, has never cowed the federation. Rightly or wrongly—and the reader ought not to judge without examining the federation's principles in their entirety, and not Dr. High's excerpt—this group has gone on, championing the rights of the workers when Stalin was still the Czar's exile in Siberia, opposing the oriental exclusion act when Chiang Kai-shek's party was still in league with the Russian Communists, calling for an embargo on scrap iron shipments to Japan before Pearl Harbor, demanding a like embargo on Russia for its attack on Finland while the men of Berlin and Moscow were still allies. The federation even opposed certain New Deal policies when Dr. High was still on the White House staff, writing publicity for the Roosevelt administration.

Understandably, Dr. High has made no effort to compile a history of the federation, which the Methodist General Conference of 1944 called a history of achievement. He has made no attempt to describe the federation's work. He has taken a few fractional facts and, after the manner of the astute debater he is, has based his argument on them. On several occasions the Christian Advocate has been at variance with the policies and programs of the federation, but we think that Dr. High is a long way from proving his case.

For instance, there is the much-debated Kansas City meeting of 1947 on the topic, "The Christian Church and Present-Day Problems." General Feng Yu-hsiang spoke there, as he had spoken a few days previously before the Methodist board of missions and as he spoke before other groups, inside and outside the churches. Jerome Davis, author of Behind Soviet Power, also spoke; and his book was sent to all Methodist ministers, but not by the federation. Carl Marzani, whom Dr. High singles out as a source of resource persons, was also present.

These are facts, but they are not the definitive facts about the meeting. The keynote address was not that of General Feng or Dr. Davis, but of Bishop Lewis O. Hartman, past president of the federation, who warned against the totalitarians—both Fascists and Communists. The opening worship message was given by a staff member of the board of evangelism. The list of invited speakers included President Lotte D. Newton of the Southern Baptist Convention; Rev. Edgar Wahlberg, whose community work was highly praised in Reader's Digest, and who served with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in China and Greece; Dr. L. N. Palar, chief of the Indonesian delegation to the United Nations; and many others.

Only a small portion of time was given to the speakers. Most of the schedule was devoted to the delegates themselves—and the list included several lawyers, an editor, a shoe manufacturer, a clothing manufacturer, and others from the commercial and industrial world—who discussed the relationship of the church to American-Soviet affairs, colonization and the Far East, Europe, labor, agriculture, community, and civil liberties. Mr. Marzani was a resource person in this last-named group, but so was Arthur Garfield Hays, counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union.

Except for Dr. Davis' statement, no speaker actually dealt with the Soviet Union, and there was no praise for its policies. Nor was there any praise of Russia in any resolution adopted, including that on Soviet-American relations. Rev. Jack McMichael, federation secretary, who receives a considerable budget of space in Dr. High's article, said at Kansas City: "The Soviet Union has not only made mistakes in its history but has committed sins. The Soviet Union is by no means a Utopia. And the United States has certainly made many and great contributions to the peoples of the world. But both of these great nations are human and sinful; both have potentialities for evil, but also for good. Neither has a monopoly of virtue and neither a monopoly of sin."

Of course, this Kansas City meeting was about as badly reported as any in recent years. The New York World-Telegram headlined: "Minority Sings Red Hymns." All were from the Methodist Hymnal and included "Faith of Our Fathers" and "In Christ There Is No East or West." But Dr. High is a responsible journalist, who ought not to be willing to take newspaper accounts of a conference which one newspaperman condemned in advance, before a speech was made or a discussion held or a report heard, as a national sounding board for Communists and fellow travelers to expound the gospel of the Communist line.

Furthermore, Dr. High ought to know Methodists well enough to realize that they have the maturity to consider other points of view besides their own. When Board of Missions officials sent out Dr. Davis' book, Behind Soviet Power, they did urge that it be read. They also sent with it opposing statements from the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America and the suggestion that these be read, too. If Methodists are to be missionaries against secularism, materialism, and militarism in communism and other false religions, they need to know what they are fighting. Dr. Davis' book is a clear, if easily challenged statement. The Christian Advocate would be interested in having Dr. High, or anyone else, cite the name of one Methodist who was converted to communism by the study mentioned.

Despite all that has been written here, and much more that might be written on the weaknesses in Dr. High's case, the Christian Advocate maintains that there should be an end to the anomalous situation in which any group, no matter what its principles or purposes, can make unofficial pronouncements and take unofficial actions that are regarded as official. Only the general conference has the right to speak for Methodism; but non-Methodists, and many Methodists, do not know that. Because many of us do not agree with the positions taken by the Methodist Federation for Social Action, that group ought, voluntarily, to drop the word "Methodist" from its name.

Furthermore, we believe that the general conference of 1952 should set up a board of social action that would be responsible for studies and activities in this area of interest that has always been close to the heart of a reforming church. We made this suggestion before the general conference of 1948. Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam made it 20 years before that, in 1928. We believe that it is an idea whose time has come.

But, whether or not Methodists have an official social-action body, with duties outlined in the discipline and officers responsible to the general conference, we hope that there will always be room in the fellowship of the church for persons and groups who disagree with most of us on political and economic, as well as ecclesiastical doctrine. No church has a more complete plan for bringing both ministers and laymen to trial, if they are guilty of conduct that is un-Methodistic. But we Methodists have never taken the position that disagreement means disunion, or dissent signifies disloyalty.

Dr. High has not proved that any Methodist is a Communist; he has not even said it. Furthermore, we doubt that he will or can.

Oil and Gas Depletion Allowances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following transcript of the testimony given by me in opposition to the reduction of the oil and gas depletion allowance before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, February 14, 1950:

Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the record my name is CHARLES W. VURSELL, from Salem, Ill.

My State ranks sixth in the production of oil, out of the 22 in the Nation.

Our situation is a little different from what we would find in the great producing oil wells of the Southwest, that is, in the fact that most of our wells, while some of them come in as very good producers, are small oil wells. This depletion allowance, if it is tampered with, would strike a terrific blow at the present production and at the possibilities of future exploration.

I might say that the Texas Co., only a few miles out of my town of Salem, brought in the heaviest production in southern Illinois, beginning in 1937, and has found that those wells have gone down in production to the point where they have decided to do a major-scale repressuring to bring out more oil.

One of the high men in the Texas Co. for the past 2 years has been giving all of his time in organizing that field and getting ready for this repressuring.

Mr. REED. That is a secondary operation?

Mr. VURSELL. That is what you call a secondary operation. Now, this big company is interested in this work. I bring out this point, which you men probably are not familiar with. They say that notwithstanding the great production that has come out of that field, that has enriched our country, that has contributed millions to the Treasury, that with this secondary recovery process at an expense of millions of dollars, they expect to

bring more oil out of this field than has heretofore been brought out of it. I raise this point because the officials of this great company who well understand financial set-ups, would not undertake nor would they go through with such an expensive repressuring effort were it not for this 27½ percent depletion allowance.

All of this valuable power-giving product would be left in the ground. The Treasury would not get the extra revenue that it will get.

That is just one phase of the effect the 27½-percent depletion allowance, if seriously reduced, will have on the economy of the oil business and on the economy of the Nation.

Repressuring is going on in different States, and it will continue to expand; and in addition, the small stripper wells, if they are left without this 27½-percent depletion, will leave billions of dollars' worth of oil in the ground that will never be brought out, and the Treasury will not get the revenue therefrom.

There are over 3,000 wells in my county. There are over 20,000 wells in Illinois. They have made a great contribution to the economy of the country, to southern Illinois, and to the Government. And the oil men tell me, 90 percent of them independents—the little wildcatter that is still going out and discovering oil in these small fields—that they will be driven out of business if this depletion allowance is reduced from 27½ percent to 15 percent. And so it will go throughout the Nation. And they will be compelled to sell to the only purchasers, the gigantic corporations that may come into being, or to the great major oil companies that already are operating in the United States. Removal of this 27½-percent depletion is a gigantic move toward monopoly in the oil business.

I want to display to this committee a map of less than one small county in my district, and show you something of the financial hazards of going out and exploring for and producing oil.

This first map represents a small part of Gallatin County and the red dots indicate the dry holes. There are a few black dots. These dry holes are 94 in number, and cost over $1,316,000 of venture capital-and-loss capital, by the little independents and wildcatters that seek to develop the resources of southern Illinois.

I have another map representing a part of Edwards County in my district, which had 78 dry holes at a cost of over $1,092,000. This is a tribute to the pioneer spirit. Yes, and it is a tribute to a people who live in a government of freedom under the free-enterprise system, that are willing to risk in order to better the welfare of themselves and their families, and in order to help make this contribution to our State and to our Nation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the question, as you members of the committee well know, this question of depletion has been before the Congress and this committee time and again in the past. After a thorough research of trial and experience, it was agreed by the Treasury Department and by this committee and the Congress, that the 27½-percent depletion allowance policy is the nearest equitable solution possible to arrive at, as between the Government and those engaged in the great oil industry.

This depletion allowance has been the constant main spring incentive for the past 25 years in the exploration and development of our great oil industry and its contribution to the entire economy of our Nation.

This depletion incentive made possible the accumulation of power that has helped us win two world wars on land, sea, and in the air. In the last World War it was absolutely vital to national defense. With the chaotic condition of the world at the present time, it is more imperative than ever that this depletion allowance be not reduced to any degree. The reduction of this depletion allowance by this Congress would be a risk and gamble against national defense that we dare not take.

The economic structure of the oil industry is built around this depletion provision. If it is seriously reduced, or if completely repealed, it will drive practically all of the little independents of the Nation out of business, because under such a condition they cannot raise the risk capita necessary to continue exploration.

Mr. Chairman, this depletion allowance is particularly necessary if we are to keep hundreds of thousands of small wells producing. Without it, they would be closed down with possibly billions of dollars worth of oil that never would be brought to the surface. It would be lost forever. The Federal Government would lose the tax revenue it would bring into the Treasury.

We have over 20,000 oil wells in Illinois—several thousand of them located in the congressional district I have the responsibility to represent. From my close contact with the operators in Illinois, and from my knowledge of the Illinois fields, I know the destruction it would bring to my section of the State, because most of the wells are small producers.

To seriously tamper with the depletion provision would largely stop further exploration and development and would close down thousands of wells that are now profitably producing and would deprive the people of my section of the State and the Federal Government of a great amount of much-needed revenue.

Mr. Chairman, the Treasury Department has testified that to reduce depletion from 27½ percent to 15 percent would gain the Government in taxes $200,000,000 a year.

A successful tax structure must be one that will encourage the expansion of business and the increase of the national income against which taxes are levied. This proposed tax legislation does not follow such a policy. It is just the reverse.

It tends to contract and reduce business. It makes the goal sought impossible. It will come nearer reducing by a half billion to a billion dollars the amount of tax money finding its way into the Federal Treasury than it will increasing the amount by $200,000,000. It is a gamble that this committee and this Congress, in my judgment, cannot afford to take.

When you consider the thousands of oil rigs that will be stacked in the yards and no longer used if this legislation is passed, with a million or more men formerly employed in the oil fields and in the oil business no longer employed, from which the Government, when employed, was checking off a high income tax, with billions of former oil income lost and no longer taxable; it is no rash statement when I say—

That the Treasury has asked this Congress to pass a bill that, on the one hand, may bring in $200,000,000 additional income in the coming fiscal year; but, on the other hand, the result of this legislation will most likely lower the national income to the point where the Treasury thereby will lose and fail to be able to collect from $500,000,000 to a billion dollars for the same fiscal year.

Worse than that, this terrific loss in tax revenue will continue in the future each year if the present depletion exemption is repealed.

Mr. Chairman, I think we all realize that the Congress and the Chief Executive has laid the heavy hand of taxation on all business almost to the limit of its endurance. We must not tax to the point of diminishing returns. We are at the point on this legislation where, in my judgment, if we pass it, we will demonstrate to the people of this Nation what Thomas Jefferson meant when he said, "The power to tax is the power to destroy."

Mr. Chairman, I know the great Jeffersonian Democrats on this committee and the great Republican Members of Congress on this committee—all of whom believe in the truth of that statement—will not want to demonstrate to the American people the logic of Jefferson's wisdom expressed over 150 years ago by becoming a party to destroying the great independent oil interests of this country through taxation.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not go further in my defense of the thousands of little oil operators in southern Illinois and throughout the Nation. I believe we have proved our case.

I understand I am to be followed by Mr. Alan K. Swann, who has followed the oil trail for a lifetime from the Texas Panhandle to southern Illinois, and who is now located in Evansville, Ind., specializing for a lifetime as an oil lawyer and in oil development.

Among the independent producers I know of no man who can bring to this committee more definite facts in discussing this prospective legislation. He will speak for the Tri-State oil group, representing Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky. I know you will hear him with interest and with profit.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the courtesy extended to me, your colleague.

Mr. REED. I just want to congratulate the gentleman on the very logical and convincing way in which he has presented this case for his constituents out in Illinois.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I heartily concur in the remarks made by my colleague.

Mr. VURSELL. Thank you very kindly, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you, Mr. VURSELL, for the information you have given the committee.

To Balance the Budget Takes Skill, Courage; but It Is Possible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Blair Moody from the Detroit News of January 15, 1950:

TO BALANCE THE BUDGET TAKES SKILL, COURAGE; BUT IT IS POSSIBLE

(By Blair Moody)

WASHINGTON, January 14.—By getting down to the real crux of the issue, Congress can balance the budget this year, vote a moderate reduction in excise or income taxes, and leave a small surplus to cut the national debt.

It will not be an easy task and cannot be done by a routine "more of the same" on Capitol Hill. It will require, if it is done, real political courage in standing up to pressure groups, the imagination and boldness needed to install a modern system of budget making based on standard corporate practice, and extensive changes in certain laws which now serve as open spigots, pouring out tax dollars.

But the opportunity is within grasp. And it can be done, as this article will attempt to demonstrate, without wrecking President Truman's international peace program—the customary target of some blunderbuss economizers on Capitol Hill—and without undermining either the activities of the Government which help to sustain prosperity, or

the military strength which is the free world's protection against aggressive communism.

BLANKET SLASHES BUT A CURE

To end the days of penceless red ink on the Potomac, a program must have these three things:

1. A vigorous will to economize intelligently.

A vague impulse against deficit spending, if not accompanied by hard-boiled analysis of hidden subsidies, usually results in political demands for impractical "blanket" slashes after Congress itself has approved a long list of appropriations, some of which are unnecessary or plain waste. Possible specific cuts are listed below.

2. Recognition of the fact that not only the budget itself but the laws lying beneath it require revision.

Some of these laws establish specifications under which money is to be paid out, but set no limit on the height to which such mandatory payments can climb.

It is under such a law that $[illegible],000,000 is being poured out in 2 years for potatoes which are being destroyed. Such a law required the Secretary of Agriculture to pay out $65,000,000 for eggs, while grocery prices were 85 cents a dozen, and bury millions in eggs in the Midwest.

BOOB LEFT OVER FOR SUCKERS

Another mandatory open-end appropriation has ballooned to $[illegible],000,000 in a single year the cost of mortgages on new homes bought for cash by a single Federal agency. The subsidy for building and operating our merchant fleet has jumped out of control from eighteen to eighty-one millions in a single year. The cost of veterans' education was $500,000,000 above estimates.

These open-end laws are one reason Congress cannot conscientiously order the President, as one group tried to do in 1949, to make enough cuts to balance the budget. The President has no legal way to check some expenditures running into billions.

Nor does it do any good for Congress to go through the motions of reducing a presidential item, like its $400,000,000 cut in the veterans' fund last year, when this merely means it now must vote a "supplemental" appropriation of $700,000,000 to carry out its own law. In 1947 Congress reduced by $600,000,000 the item for tax refunds which taxpayers had coming to them by law. Of course, this "economy" had to be canceled later, plus.

WHERE SPENDING IS CHOICE

It would be impossible for Congress to set exact amounts for some programs which are thoroughly justified, because the cost varies with economic conditions. But it is important to realize that a big segment of the budget is written, not by the appropriating committees, but by those who write the phrases into these open-end laws.

2. Remove from the list of items which are to be paid for out of taxes the cost of loans or improvements which is actually to be met by payments from a second source.

In the new budget there are about $4,000,000,000 of such items. Under the present system they are being charged to the taxpayers, cash on the barrel head.

They include such items as home mortgages being bought outright. These will be liquidated by the people paying off the mortgages. If experience serves, the losses will be small. The whole transaction will wash itself out as a huge revolving fund. But this is counted as much an expenditure as a machine gun or a clerk's salary.

They include cash loans on huge reserves of corn, wheat, and cotton, which, come a lean year, will be sold. But the taxpayer pays cash now. They include loans for installation of rural electric lines and telephones, which pay for themselves. They include well-secured foreign loans made by the Export-Import Bank, money loaned to States and cities for public works planning, and investments in the vast reclamation projects which invariably return the Government's money 100 cents on the dollar.

THE TAXPAYER PAYS

But the taxpayer is asked to put up all the money for all of those returnable items this year, and if Congress does not think such heavy taxes are good for the country, then he is told Uncle Sam is running in red ink, the country is "deficit spending," and higher taxes seem to be called for.

Would a private corporation run its affairs on such a basis? Where would General Motors get if it built and equipped a new Chevrolet plant and then charged the full cost into the selling price of its cars in a single year?

The Government is using its credit to back the buying of homes by GI's, which, if such direct Government credit is sound at all, could properly become a revolving fund in the Federal Reserve System. Instead, the taxpayers pay cash for the homes, now, and get their money back over a period of years.

OUR REAL LOSSES

There is another angle to this lack of a capital budget in Federal finance. Millions of tons of topsoil are flowing down our rivers to the sea each year. They cannot be recovered. Billions of kilowatts of potential power are flowing to waste in undeveloped rivers. Hundreds of thousands of acres are still unfertile desert for lack of irrigation projects which would pay for themselves.

Why aren't they developed? Because the money for their capital improvements would be charged this year to the taxpayers. Therefore, we can't afford it. Therefore, vast resources become a net loss. Completion of the great self-liquidating Central Valley project in California and many others will take many years longer to develop than would be possible if the Government had a corporate system of bookkeeping.

This policy would be like Chrysler deciding how much it could charge to prices each year for a new plant, and then building only that much of the plant in that year, instead of getting the benefit of the plant at once and making the charge-off over a suitable period of years.

It would be like Detroit lumping the whole cost of its new $30,000,000 sewer system on the tax rolls in 1 year—or else not building the sewers.

CLOSE CHECK NEEDED

The deficit in the budget sent to Congress by President Truman was $5,100,000,000. By cutting expenditures where they can be cut without damage to the country, and by creating a reserve revolving fund, with a proper percentage set aside against losses, within RFC or preferably Federal Reserve, to finance all loans and programs which after hard-boiled appraisal qualify as self-liquidation, a minimum of $6,000,000,000 can be cut from the tax budget.

Close check should also be kept on the total outgo and total income in relations between the people and the Government. This flow of cash represents the impact of Government activity on the economy and must be measured against current conditions to guide the President and Congress in timing the size of Government programs from the angle of inflation, deflation, prices, and employment.

But the central issue posed by the annual budget made by the President is whether taxes are sufficient to cover expenditures.

POSSIBLE ECONOMIES

Even the shift to a capital budget would not balance the tax budget. Real economy is also necessary. Here is one way to do it:

1. An average over-all cut in Federal personnel of 8 percent, as recommended by Senator DOUGLAS (Democrat), Illinois. Some smaller agencies would be crippled by such a cut, but larger ones could absorb around 10 percent providing many of them are reorganized at the same time, as recommended by the Hoover Commission. Secretary Johnson says the Defense Department will operate more efficiently after 140,000 discharges than before. Saving in this area—$550,000,000.

2. Hidden subsidies buried in the theoretically inviolable interest on the public debt account. The average cost of Government borrowing is 2.2 percent, but the Treasury pays 3 percent to the two billion trust fund of the railway retirement account, a net subsidy of $15,000,000 paid by the general taxpayers.

The veterans' insurance accounts gets 3½ percent for World War I trust and 3 percent for World War II trust, a net subsidy to this eight-billion-plus trust fund of $75,000,000. Saving—$91,000,000.

3. President Truman has frozen the contract authority for $306,000,000 worth of veterans' hospitals Congress has voted. Of the 1,800,000 veterans to be sent to school and college in the coming year at a cost of $2,400,000,000, more than half are in below-college-grade schools, some of which recruit students, collect tuition fees but do not provide adequate training, according to the President.

Budget experts estimate $500,000,000 to $700,000,000 can be saved in this area alone, with one big "if." If Congress changes the terms of the law so the Administration can get at the near racketeers.

NONSERVICE AILMENTS

Two-thirds of the veterans in hospitals have non-service-connected ailments. Their proportionate cost of hospital expenses—$314,000,000. They are admitted only if there is spare room in the VA hospitals, theoretically, but Congress authorized a building program topping $1,000,000,000.

The President says the Government should provide only for the needs arising out of military service. Experts estimate the potential saving at $200,000,000 if only those who really need the subsidy were admitted.

If administrative costs of the veterans' insurance trust funds were charged to its income, that would be another $44,000,000. Economy—roughly $1,000,000,000.

4. The budget includes $500,000,000 as subsidy to States and cities for roads. In theory, this is uncuttable, since under the hang-over system it is always authorized, and some contracts are let, before the money is voted.

However, State representatives could be called in, told Uncle Sam cannot afford so great a road subsidy this year, and asked to cooperate, always realizing that cooperation with Santa Claus pays in the long run. Potential saving—$250,000,000

PERSONNEL REDUCTION

5. Knocking down the overgenerous vacation leave from 26 days to 20. If done during the general shake-up which Hoover recommends this could reduce personnel sufficiently to save (DOUGLAS' estimate)—$100,000,000.

6. Reduction of subsidies on silver, and on potatoes and other agricultural commodities—$100,000,000. This is DOUGLAS' estimate. It is a variable because it depends on Congress changing the price-support laws.

If Congress would change the agricultural price-support scheme to a combination of the best features of the Aiken and Brannan plans, the saving could be much greater and everyone would be better off, he believes.

7. Slowing down the rate of construction in river and harbor projects. Saving (DOUGLAS' estimate), $300,000,000.

8. Reduction of maritime and other transportation subsidies; merger of Army engineers in Department of the Interior as Hoover recommended. Saving (DOUGLAS' estimate), $200,000,000.

These savings would total $2,500,000,000. They are, of course, very rough estimates. Nor do they include all savings that could be made. But they give a measure of what might be done.

CAPITAL ACCOUNT ITEMS

Now for the capital assets that could be shifted into a capital account, to be financed through a revolving fund, to be considered in their impact on the economy, but not to be charged against the tax account. They could include:

Loans

RFC loans to industry and financial institutions, $194,000,000.

Rural electrification and telephone loans, $408,000,000.

Mortgages financed by Federal National Mortgage Association, $990,000,000.

Loans to States and cities for public-works planning, to be returned to Government when projects are actually financed and built by local communities, $241,000,000.

Export-Import Bank loans to foreign nations (these considered better secured than loans granted by ECA), $98,000,000.

Commodities

Grain, cotton, and other crops held by Commodity Credit Corporation, $621,000,000.

Stock piling of scarce and strategic materials, $650,000,000.

Physical assets

Self-liquidating reclamation projects, $354,000,000.

Tennessee Valley Authority extension, $118,000,000.

In total, the taxpayers are being asked to pay in cash this year for $3,674,000,000 worth of assets which will pay out. (The President's 4,000,000,000 figure included some items that are invaluable assets, like atomic-energy plants, but are not yet surely self-liquidating. He did not favor the capital budget.)

GET MORE FOR LESS

This analysis indicates that something over $6,000,000,000 could be clipped from the tax budget without altering the President's figures for either international aid or defense or halting such social projects as the proposed Federal aid to education.

Secretary Johnson has already made savings in the Defense Department officially estimated at $1,500,000,000 a year. But the purchase of equipment, especially airplanes, previously authorized by Congress will raise military spending to a point slightly higher than a year ago, even though the request for new authority to contract is less.

We are getting more defense for less money. If the additional $500,000,000 Senator DOUGLAS believes can be clipped from defense is feasible, it should be devoted to more equipment. The Air Force still warns it does not have what it needs to defend the United States and strike back if a sneak attack comes.

There is no need to cripple the vital programs for peace and higher living standards by cutting the budget. It can be balanced without that. This analysis does not intend to imply there are not other spots at which the budget could be cut. There undoubtedly are. But here are enough to do the job.

The Crisis the President Couldn't See

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star of February 24, 1950, entitled "The Crisis the President Couldn't See":

THE CRISIS THE PRESIDENT COULDN'T SEE

As this was was written, Illinois schools were closed to more than 43,000 boys and girls. The buildings were without heat because of the coal strike.

Hospitals are keeping a watchful eye on their coal reserves. Householders who burn coal guard every lump and use it with the greatest economy. The State welfare department, with thousands of persons housed in its institutions, is scrambling in the open market for scarce coal and seeking other sources of heat, should the coal supply utterly fail. It seems likely at this time that a State-wide dim-out will be imposed in order that producers of electricity may conserve coal. The anticipated 25-percent power cut will be felt by many businesses.

Meanwhile scarcity has been producing its inevitable family of evils. Panic prices are being paid for coal. It is reported that at some small mines still operating, coal is sold to the highest bidders. Eugene A. Tetzlaff, chairman of the Peoria citizens coal committee, telegraphed to Governor Stevenson and to Illinois Congressmen Wednesday that there is virtually no coal in Peoria and that "suffering is imminent."

This is the crisis that was foreseen as inevitable 6 weeks ago. Every detail of it was predictable. We watched it fearfuly as it drew nearer, day by day.

The one man who denied it until even he could no longer refuse to face facts was President Truman.

No one can predict today how or when the coal strike will be settled. But we can say with certainty that the settlement would have come earlier if the emergency had been recognized earlier by the President.

We owe our present crisis largely to President Truman's reluctance, for political reasons, to use the Taft-Hartley law.

Amending the Tariff Act of 1930

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following text of a bill introduced by me February 27 to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, together with a brief explanation of the bill and a statement of the need therefor:

H. R. 7447

A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to sound-recording materials for use in connection with moving-picture exhibits and news reels

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 1561 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new proviso: "*Provided further*, That on photographic or magnetic film, tape, wire, or other material of any kind on which sound has been recorded abroad by photography, magnetism, or any means whatsoever, and which is suitable for use in reproducing sound in connection with moving-picture exhibits (not including any of the foregoing which is photographic film on which pictures have been recorded, or any of the foregoing which is provided for in paragraph 1726 of this act, as amended), the duty shall be 1 cent per linear foot."

SEC. 2. That paragraph 1726 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting, after the word "reel", the following: "photographic or magnetic film, tape, wire, or other material of any kind on which sound has been recorded abroad by photography, magnetism, or any means whatsoever, and which is suitable for use in reproducing sound in connection with moving-picture news reels."

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL BY SECTIONS

SECTION 1

This section extends the coverage of paragraph 1561 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to include photographic or magnetic film, tape, wire, or other material of any kind on which sound has been recorded abroad by photography, magnetism, or any other means, and which is suitable for use in reproducing sound in connection with moving-picture exhibits. It imposes a duty at the rate of 1 cent per linear foot on such materials. It excludes photographic film on which pictures have been recorded and undeveloped negative moving-picture film for use in connection with silent or sound news reels. Both of the latter are now covered by existing law. The language of this section is broad in scope and is designed to permit its application to such new materials or methods of sound recording as may be developed in the future.

SECTION 2

This section amends paragraph 1726 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, by including in the free list sound-recording film, tape, or other material on which sound has been recorded abroad and imported for use in connection with moving-picture news reels. Undeveloped negative moving-picture film exposed abroad for silent or sound news reel is now on the free list.

NEED FOR THE BILL

When the Tariff Act of 1930 was enacted, the art of producing sound moving pictures was in its infancy. With the advancement of the art and the development of improved techniques for recording sound, new problems have arisen that point up the need today for enlarging the scope of the act's coverage.

In making sound moving pictures abroad, the accepted practice for years of American motion-picture companies is to photograph the moving picture on one piece of film and the accompanying sound on a separate piece of film. The separate films are returned to the United States and duty is paid on each at the rates provided for in paragraph 1561 of the above act, as follows:

Exposed and developed negative, 8 cents per linear foot.

Exposed but not developed negative, 2 cents per linear foot.

Photographic-film positives, 1 cent per linear foot.

By virtue of the most-favored-nation clause provision in the Reciprocal Trade Agreement with Mexico, January 30, 1943, the above rates of duties were reduced to 1⅓ cents, 1 cent, and ⅓ cent, respectively. Such rates are currently in effect.

Present-day plans of American motion-picture studios making moving pictures abroad call for the original production sound recording to be done by magnetic methods, using either magnetic film or magnetic tape. Magnetic film describes a film base, having standard sprocket holes, with a red or black magnetic oxide applied to the base in much the same manner as a photographic emulsion is applied. This film is driven in exactly the same manner as photographic sound film. Uniformity of speed and accuracy of synchronism with the picture are maintained by means of the sprocket holes.

Magnetic tape describes a tapelike material having paper, acetate, or other flexible base. Applied to this base, or impregnated in it, is either a red or black magnetic oxide, which is the recording material. This tape

has no sprocket holes, is approximately one-quarter inch wide, and the equipment for using it drives the tape with some form of friction drive. Magnetic tape is essentially a nonsynchronous material.

Since neither of the foregoing methods involves the use of photographic film, the sound track produced by magnetism is held to be dutiable on an ad valorem or cost-of-production basis rather than on the linear-foot basis provided for photographic film in paragraph 1551 of the tariff act.

Determining the cost of production of the sound track by itself is a cumbersome procedure. It involves an estimate of the cost of the entire production, moving picture and sound, and an approximation of the sound cost in relation to total production cost. In some instances, a few days' or a week's sound recording will be rushed to the United States. It is difficult, if not impossible, to fix a proper valuation on such limited recordings. On the other hand, the photographic film negative on which pictures are recorded, and to which the sound relates, may be similarly shipped and entry permitted on the payment of the linear-foot duty. Except in extremely unusual cases, the sound recording would represent only a minute part of the total capital expenditure for the production. Therefore, from the viewpoint of the development of a fair and consistent customs policy, as well as simplicity of administrative enforcement, the extension of the linear-foot measurement of duty on photographic film to sound-recording film, tape, etc., offers a practical and efficient means of determining the import duty that is fair to both the Government and the producer.

The proposed duty rate of 1 cent per linear foot, provided in section 1 of the bill, is a fair and reasonable rate in respect to the major element to which it relates—the film on which the moving pictures are recorded. Such duty rate is also the same as the duty rate currently in effect on exposed, but not developed, photographic-film negatives, a category in to which the exposed sound track has some resemblance.

Excise Tax Repeal and Oil Depletion Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me to the Committee on Ways and Means February 14, 1950, on the repeal of wartime excise taxes and retention of the depletion allowance for oil as existed for almost a quarter of a century. I invite the attention of all Members of the House to this discussion.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues and members of this great and important committee, I appreciate very much the opportunity of coming before this distinguished committee on the question of percentage depletion on oil and gas.

I do not want to appear presumptuous but I have given a lot of study to this and the other problems of the oil industry for some time. As a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have been privileged to serve on the oil special committee for 8 years. I am honored and privileged to be the chairman of that important committee now. I, therefore, believe that having the opportunity during these years to study all phases of the oil industry very closely in time of war and peace, I know something about the problems of the industry and I am glad to give you the benefit of what information I can on this question of depletion.

I am fully aware of the tremendous responsibility of this committee. No one wants their taxes raised and I know you seek most sincerely to adjust certain burdensome wartime excise taxes and justifiedly so. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I say in all candidness that such wartime excise taxes should be repealed. They were adopted as a war emergency. It was understood then, I believe, that following the war such burdensome taxes would be terminated. We provided in the act imposing such taxes that they should be automatically terminated within 6 months following Presidential proclamation ending the national emergency. Such proclamation was made in 1947 but the Congress in its enthusiasm to reduce taxes in 1948 unwisely made such excise taxes permanent. It might be recalled the President at that time recommended that they be continued for only 1 year.

In view of the original intent and this history, I am quite confident this committee will report a bill that will include the repeal or adjustment of these excise taxes which will be in the interest of the public. At the same time, I recognize the difficult task of this committee in its efforts to provide additional revenues to make up the losses as well as to try to bring increased revenues in an effort to close the gap in our deficit spending.

However, Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that to follow the recommendation of the Treasury Department in reducing the depletion allowance on oil and gas would have a tremendous adverse effect on the future of this important industry. I firmly believe it would ultimately affect not only the economy of this country but the jobs of thousands and thousands of people. I firmly believe that it would ultimately and in a few years affect the available productive capacity and seriously endanger the future security of our country.

I do not want to be repetitious and I know you have heard the history and many phases of this question but I do want to give you briefly what I think are good and sound reasons supporting the statement of importance to our country and our future security. I want to present to you facts and specific instances not theoretical or assumptions, but how it actually works.

THE PURPOSE OF THE DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

In the first place, why did the Congress provide depletion allowance? What was its purpose? What was the objective?

As far back as 1918, it was recognized that the future of this country in a large measure would depend among other things on a sufficient oil supply.

Therefore, the primary purpose of Congress in adopting the depletion allowance was to enable the oil industry to provide our Nation with an adequate supply of oil in both peace and in war. Before tampering with this provision of our tax laws, it behooves the Congress to weigh most carefully the effects any changes would have upon the primary objective sought—that is, a sufficient oil supply.

The Congress, since the Revenue Act of 1913, has recognized the need for some means of returning invested capital to an industry, such as oil, of irreplaceable mineral assets. It was not until 1918, after experience under the earlier laws, that Congress recognized the need to provide further incentive so the oil industry could obtain the funds required to engage in the peculiarly hazardous and costly task of discovering and developing oil reserves.

The percentage depletion allowance, in its present form, has been in our laws since 1926. It was designed as a method of determining what part of an oil producer's gross income is properly taxable income, thereby providing him with sufficient capital to encourage him to go out and look for another oil field. It is an incentive that has worked—that has done the job Congress intended. On numerous occasions Congress has reviewed this tax provision and continued it without change.

The risk in the oil industry is great. It is a hazardous business. To find an oil field a producer may drill four or five dry holes, and sometimes more, before he finds a producing well. Even after an oil field is discovered there are many dry wells drilled in the development of that field. During the past 25 years the record shows that of all wells drilled—both exploratory and development—more than 25 percent were dry holes. This percentage of failures for the year 1949 increased to 36 percent. The tax provisions, including both the depletion allowance and the option to expense intangible drilling costs, have made this very highly risk-taking activity possible.

The Treasury Department now proposes that the Congress take action which would involve a gamble on destroying the ability of an industry, essential in a greater degree than any other to the national security, to continue an outstanding record of performance over a long period of time. It is unnecessary to speculate on what has been accomplished under these provisions. Under the present tax provisions during the past 25 years, the petroleum industry discovered and developed 43,000,000,000 barrels—more than one and a half times the quantity used by the consuming public.

DEPLETION ALLOWANCE HAS WORKED SUCCESSFULLY

Since the primary purpose of the Congress adopting the policy of depletion allowance is to provide the Nation with an adequate supply of oil, the question naturally follows—has it been successful—has it worked? That is a question you must consider and ponder well before making drastic changes as recommended by the Treasury.

In other words, through the years since World War I, has the depletion allowance provided the margin of encouragement that has meant the difference between having enough oil and in facing enemies with insufficient oil to fuel our war machines?

If so, Mr. Chairman, the Congress then cannot afford at this time to take any action that would discourage the discovery and development of domestic oil resources.

During World War II our Nation was called upon to fuel the greatest war in history by supplying six-sevenths of all the oil used by the United States and all of her allies. Had it not been for the wise course of action adopted by Congress immediately following World War I, by recognizing the need to encourage the oil industry by means of an incentive depletion allowance, the oil industry would not have been able to supply the oil we needed. Our oil supplies here at home meant the difference between victory and defeat.

Today the industry has recovered from the burdens and restrictions imposed upon it during the years of World War II and fortunately once again the domestic industry is able to provide all of our domestic demands and in addition, a reserve producing capacity above current demands. This is a reserve that we must have so as to be prepared for any emergency. In fact, our military authorities urge that this reserve capacity be increased.

The uncontradicted facts prove that it has worked and we have had a sufficient supply of oil. Even though the demands have sharply increased, the discovery of proven reserves have kept ahead of demands. We now have greater proven reserves than ever before. We have added over 1,000,000,000 barrels last year, 1949, from drilling. We drilled a total of more than 30,000 wells.

Consequently, the present tax provisions for oil and gas have proved to be effective, practical to administer, and equitable to the taxpayer. They have assured an adequate supply of oil which is essential to the Nation's prosperity on which income-tax revenues are based. This is even more vital to national security according to our military authorities.

OIL INDUSTRY PROFITS

There has been a great deal said about the profits of the oil industry and particularly with reference to the rate of income paid in dividends as compared with other industries. I am sure some erroneous impressions have been obtained from various reports singling out specific instances.

For example, the April 1949 monthly letter published by the National City Bank of New York, indicates that oil companies in 1947 and 1948 made a relatively high rate of profit as compared with other industries. The pertinent figures appearing in this publication are as follows:

Industrial group	Number of companies	Percent rate on net assets	
		1947	1948
Petroleum products:			
Integrated companies	44	15.7	22.1
Oil and gas producers	44	24.1	23.9
Total manufacturing	1,680	17.1	18.9
All industries	3,262	12.3	14.0

The above figures would seem to indicate that the oil companies, and particularly the group of oil-producing companies, made a relatively high rate of profit in 1947 and 1948. These figures are misleading and do not reflect actual conditions in the petroleum industry.

First, the above figures represent an extremely small sample of the petroleum industry. This is obvious from the fact that the 44 oil- and gas-producing corporations represent less than 1.5 percent of the 3,696 oil and gas corporations that filed income-tax returns with the Federal Government in 1946. In addition to these 3,696 corporations, there are many times that number of individual producers and partnerships for which this information is not available. The sample used by the National City Bank, therefore, cannot be considered as reflecting average conditions in the entire petroleum industry.

More important than the inadequacy of the sample, however, is the fact that the peculiarities of the oil-producing industry, as contrasted with other industries, result in a serious overstatement of real profits during 1947 and 1948. This comes about because the petroleum industry is engaged in the sale of capital assets found and developed in previous years whereas other industries in general are producing, buying, and selling goods acquired on a current basis. This means that the oil industry in 1947 and 1948 was producing and selling oil most of which was found several years ago when the cost of drilling and development was far below the 1947 and 1948 cost of replacing this oil. There is ample evidence that the cost of finding and developing oil reserves has been increasing steadily during the past decade. If the financial statements of oil-producing companies fully reflected the current cost of finding and developing, instead of the low cost in previous years, the book profits shown in the financial statements would be sharply reduced. This fact is well recognized in the oil industry and most financial statements contain an observation with reference to this situation.

A study will show that the oil industry normally has not made higher profits than other industries. For example, over the period from 1923 through 1948, 24 of the largest and presumably among the most profitable of the oil companies consistently earned an average rate of return lower than the average of manufacturing industries.

A further comment that is of interest in connection with this subject is the fact that the statistics of the Treasury Department show that the oil- and gas-producing corporations paid a larger share of their total income as Federal income taxes in 1946 (the latest year for which complete statistics are available) than the average of all industrial corporations. The 3,696 oil- and gas-producing corporations in 1946 paid 4.1 percent of their gross income as Federal taxes whereas the average of all industrial corporations was 3.1 percent.

In addition to paying its fair share of the Federal taxes, industry statistics indicate that during the past 15 years dividends paid to stockholders have reached 5 percent of net worth in only 2 years. The industry has found it necessary to devote an increasing share of its income to the discovery and development of new oil reserves. Industry figures show that a constantly declining percent of net earnings has been paid to the stockholders, or owners, in the petroleum industry.

THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT'S HYPOTHETICAL EXAMPLE OF THE EFFECT OF REDUCING DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FROM 27.5 TO 15 PERCENT

Now I want to refer to the testimony of the Treasury Department wherein a hypothetical example was given which is a complete misrepresentation of the facts. I want to give you a clear picture of an actual experience which is typical of the oil industry to show that this is not a hypothetical or theoretical problem but an actuality.

According to the Treasury Department, the hypothetical example was given as follows:

"This situation might be called the story of how to make profits in the oil business without paying an income tax. The following example illustrates the method of avoiding tax liability:

"Gross income, oil and gas sales	$1,000,000
Costs:	
Operating costs	250,000
Development costs	200,000
Total	450,000
Net income before depletion	550,000
Depletion at 27½ percent of gross income	275,000
Capital cost of drilling six additional test wells at $50,000 per well for intangible drilling costs	300,000
Net loss from total operations	25,000

"The proposed tax revision would decrease the rate of percentage depletion but would continue to allow the deduction of development costs. In the example above the result of the proposed decrease in percentage depletion would be as follows:

"Gross income, oil and gas sales	$1,000,000
Costs:	
Operating costs	250,000
Development costs	200,000
Total	450,000
Net income before depletion	550,000
Depletion 15 percent of $800,000 ($1,000,000 minus $200,000)	120,000
Net income after depletion	430,000
Capital development cost of six additional wells at $50,000	300,000
Net income from total operations	130,000"

The Treasury Department misrepresents the facts in this hypothetical case as a method of "avoiding tax liability." In doing this the Department implies that this taxpayer has evaded the payment of a proper tax. This is completely erroneous. The taxpayer has complied fully with all the laws established by Congress and the regulations of the Treasury Department. In no manner has he evaded any law or the payment of any proper tax.

Congress adopted the present tax provisions for the specific purpose of encouraging producers to spend money in the exploration for new oil fields. In this hypothetical case the producer at the end of the year was not liable for any tax only because he had spent $300,000 drilling six new wells. The fact that a decrease in percentage depletion from 27½ to 15 percent would subject this operator to paying income tax only proves that the Treasury Department's proposal would increase his taxes and thereby reduce his ability and incentive to engage in exploration development.

The ultimate effect of the change proposed can only be determined over a period of several years, not on the basis of 1 year. The tax revenue that the Treasury Department may expect to receive from the oil industry in the future, will depend upon the number of successful oil wells that the producers will drill. The income which will be subject to taxation in years to come depends upon the ability of the industry to spend money in finding and developing new oil reserves. The more exploratory efforts that are encouraged now will mean more production and more income subject to tax in future years. The proposed change shown in the above case, therefore, would merely mean a larger tax during the year shown, but less incentive for drilling and an ultimate decline in oil production and tax revenues to the Federal Government.

Now I want to refer to the testimony of the Treasury Department wherein a hypothetical example was given which is a complete misrepresentation of the facts. I want to give you a clear picture of an actual experience which is typical in the oil industry.

A FACTUAL TYPICAL OPERATION

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see how this actually works in practice as totally different from the hypothetical case.

As I have just said, it requires a number of years to determine the actual return to the Government. Let me give you a typical case and approximate figures.

A producer in the early development of his properties in 1945, had a gross income of approximately $65,000. He had extensive development costs, which with other operating costs and expenses showed a total loss for him that year of a little over $100,000.

In 1946, having fairly good success, along with his extensive development operations, he had an income of approximately $700,000. Even so, with continued development and operating costs, depletion allowance, and other expenses, he again showed a net loss of over $300,000. But in 1947, in the development of these properties, the income went up and he had a net income after all development costs, operating costs, etc., of over $600,000 on which he paid Federal income tax. His income still increased extensively in 1948, but his development costs decreased. He began to show a substantial return of the tremendous risks and after all allowances, he pays to the Federal Government on a net income-tax return of more than $2,500,000.

In 1949, it was even more in income and tax payment. He received and pays income taxes on a net income of more than $3,000,000, and substantially more than 50 percent of his gross income that year.

In other words, over the period of 5 years and the development of these leases, even though the first 2 years showed a loss, you

can rise in the 5-year period, the taxes the Government gets from this operation, and since it is being operated on a long time conservation basis, the Government will continue each year to receive a tremendous sum of taxes from these producers.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it would be safe to say, that had it not been for the incentive of the depletion provision, this operation as many other such operations, would very likely not have developed.

EFFECT OF REDUCING OIL AND GAS DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

Then what would be the result or effect of reducing oil and gas depletion allowances as proposed by the Treasury? That is the question you must consider. What would happen in the future in relation to consumer interest as well as our security? To change or reduce the long established tax provisions relating to oil and gas, I think, would certainly endanger the Nation's oil supply. Every dollar of increased taxes means one less dollar available for exploring for new oil fields. Congress cannot afford in this time of international uncertainty, to adopt a program that inevitably will result in a discouragement of the search for oil.

For some time the domestic oil industry has been facing some rather difficult and serious problems. Before this proposal by the Treasury Department there were other serious developments which were already discouraging and having its effect on our domestic industry.

It is continuously faced with the contention of shortages which have been disproved over a period of 25 years by new discoveries and increased known reserves beyond the yearly demands.

In addition to this continuing problem, imports of foreign oil have been rapidly increasing, crowding the domestic oil producer out of his own markets. Excessive imports have the same effect as would this proposal, by depressing the domestic producers' income and activities.

Last year, 1949, imports reached an all-time peak and has seriously hurt the domestic producer. The Interior Department reports that the 1949 income of the domestic oil producing industry was $200,000,000 less than in 1948. This was not all due to imports but they were cited by the Department as one of the specific causes of this reduced income.

In addition, we are faced with another serious situation, as a result of the recent British embargo, on oil shipments by American companies into sterling areas. This threatens to further depress our domestic industry by diverting large quantities of oil produced in foreign countries by American companies into the American market.

I have made a serious effort to appraise the specific results of the proposed tax increase. I have made inquiries among the oil producers in my own State of Arkansas. A typical response was the statement of one independent operator who told me that he did not know what the result of the Treasury Department's proposal might be for the entire industry but he did know the effect on his own business. He stated that he had seven drilling rigs and five of them are now shut down and inactive. In his own words: "I am not going to do any more drilling until I am sure that excessive imports and increased taxes will not make it impossible for me to take the chance of getting five or six dry holes before I get a producing well from which I can recover my investment."

In my State of Arkansas, the oil producers drilled 322 wells in 1949 of which 147, or 46 percent were dry holes and a complete loss. This is a higher rate of failure than the national average of 36 percent dry holes during 1949. By drilling these wells, producers in my State were barely able to replace the oil produced by newly discovered and developed reserves. Arkansas produced almost 30,000,000 barrels of oil last year. Under the existing tax provisions, exploration and development was encouraged so that about 30,000,000 additional barrels were found and developed to replace our production. As a result, the State still has about 300,000,000 barrels of proved reserves from which it can make its contribution toward meeting this country's oil needs of the future. There is no doubt in my mind that we would have fallen behind in our reserve position without the present tax provisions.

Only a few days ago another wild-cat discovery was made in our State. This is highly significant in connection with this program. This well was drilled to a depth of over 9,000 feet. It costs more than $120,000 but yet it is a discovery of a new pool of oil. In fact, it is a success from two depths—two formations. One of these unusual cases known as a dual producer.

The important thing is that had it not been for this depletion allowance, this important discovery would perhaps not have been made. You have got to provide this industry with the proper incentive to find oil.

Another example is the Scurry County Field in Texas, the biggest single discovery made recently.

The reason, I say, my colleagues, that these discoveries would not have been made is because these leases have been owned for years and many of them lapsed, hope was given up, yet others in the industry come in and were challenged to find oil where their competitors failed.

You are having now the greatest hunt in Colorado, all around Denver are companies conducting a wildcat campaign that stands yet to give to the Nation a lot more reserves of oil.

What is the alternative? Cut out this provision and you will see these efforts to discover oil subside. The reserves go down and you know what the result will be.

Look at our neighbor to the south. Very little discovery has been made in Mexico since the Government expropriated the private oil interests.

Furthermore you talk about revenues to the Treasury. Without a sufficient and adequate supply of oil, you will be called upon to appropriate millions and millions of dollars for synthetic fuel plants. For the last two Congresses, legislation has been presented here for the Government to provide $350,000,000 in a commercial synthetic-fuel-development program.

Yes, looking at the over-all situation from a national point of view, I am equally disturbed as to the probable results of this tax proposal. I recall the war period when the Office of Price Administration froze the price of oil at a depressed level. This denied the oil producers the necessary funds and incentive just as the proposed increase in tax would do. All of us remember the effect of this price freeze. The reserve capacity was used up in fueling World War II, and, because of the restrictions on money and materials, oil-development activities failed to keep pace with demand. By the winter of 1947–48 our oil supplies were close to the danger point and consumers in our eastern seaboard States were faced with temporary but serious shortages. That situation has been overcome but it seems to me that it provides a lesson that the Congress should not forget. The Government has already experimented in discouraging industry through price controls that limit or remove the profit incentives. The Treasury Department is now proposing the same policy through increased taxes. The Nation cannot afford another threat of shortages of oil which would inevitably result.

How Frightened Can We Get?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 1, 1950, entitled "How Frightened Can We Get?":

HOW FRIGHTENED CAN WE GET?

There is nothing essentially new in what Hans Bethe, Frederick Seitz, Harrison Brown, and Leo Szilard have just had to say in their round-table observations on the prospective hydrogen bomb. As four of the Nation's outstanding atomic scientists, they have merely confirmed, with special authority and fresh detail, a fact that has been stated many times before—namely, that it is at least theoretically conceivable that the super-super-killer, when and if it is produced, will place within the reach of man the ability to destroy all life on this bewitched and bewildered planet.

As explained by the four experts, something like 500 tons of heavy hydrogen—exploded in just the right way in combination with certain common elements—might be enough to do the job. At any rate, the theory of the thing supports the possibility that such an explosion, in addition to causing an almost unimaginable abomination of death and destruction by means of blast effect, pressure wave, and uncontrollable fire within the general target area, would let loose a vast and all-pervasive cloud of radioactive particles. These particles, in turn, would play the role of a "suicide dust" poisoning the atmosphere everywhere and inflicting total death on mankind, thus leaving the earth lifeless in space—like the moon—except possibly for a few hardy bugs.

In any case, even if the hydrogen bomb never achieves its full theoretical potential as an absolute annihilator, today's actual and prospective instruments of mass destruction are—to put it mildly—terrible enough. Thus, according to the four scientists, a war with A-weapons, or with H-weapons not quite so frightful as the one these men have in mind, would create virtually insoluble problems of civilian defense. For example, over a period of 10 years or so, in anticipation of such a catastrophe, we might disperse about half our population and decentralize our major coastal cities at a total cost of hundreds of billions of dollars. But what good would that do? How could such a program be carried out without wrecking our free-enterprise economy and destroying the political and social fabric of our democracy? And why bother to undertake it when we know that our inland urban areas would be equally vulnerable and that there could be no real hiding place against radioactive clouds?

Actually, the more one thinks about the problem, the less sense can be found in proposals to establish an alternate National Capital or to embark on elaborate projects aimed at making life safe for civilians. The truth of the matter seems to be that the large-scale pursuit of such safety—by means of decentralization, dispersal, and things like holes in the ground—would be impractical to the point of impossibility. The fact everybody must face—both here and abroad—is that in an all-out, sustained atomic war, home-front populations would share the common threat of annihilation.

This is perhaps the most important single reality of our time, and by its very nature it is an incitement to fear. Yet, even though scientists and others are talking more and more luridly about it, the average individual appears to be admirably calm. As human beings with an inborn desire to enjoy life, most of us tend to resist being forever frightened by dismal possibilities. The Cassandras, of course, may be completely right. Still, it does not seem unwholesome to be reasonably optimistic and prayerfully hopeful that the terrifying destructiveness of modern weapons will in itself help mightily to prevent war.

In the last analysis, after all, everybody has to leave this earth sooner or later, in one way or another. There is therefore much to be said for the philosophical view that even if the worst happens and suicide dust engulfs us, the experience may in fact be less painful than such commonplace forms of extinction as being hit by a streetcar. In any event, if life is to be bearable, it must be keyed to something much better than a spirit of constant fear.

The Social Security Act Under Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article appearing on the editorial page of the New York Herald Tribune on February 28, 1950, written by Elinore Morehouse Herrick entitled "The Social Security Act Under Fire":

THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT UNDER FIRE—CRITICS CALL LAW A FLOP AND A FRAUD UPON THE WORKERS

(By Elinore Morehouse Herrick)

I

A swelling chorus of criticism of the administration's old-age and survivors insurance program demonstrates the imperative need for a thorough overhauling of the system. A Senate committee is now holding hearings on H. R. 6000, which presents a modified version of the administration program. Criticism comes not from opponents of a Federal social-security system, but from proponents, including some who led the fight for adoption of such a system.

Their indictment is: (1) That it benefits too few of the workers aged 65 and over; (2) that it has become subordinate to a vast Federal relief system which is morally, socially, and individually demoralizing; (3) that the complex benefit formula presents too many hurdles to applicants and falsely portrays it as a contributory system; (4) that the administration program perpetuates the unsound and undesirable Federal relief system; (5) that it is impossible to predict the future costs and that in any event the whole plan prevents development of a sound program. It is disturbing that those in the best position to evaluate the unsound and inequitable nature of the existing program should be advocating its continuance—namely, those who are administering the program, receiving their own salaries from taxes.

Who are some of the critics and what do they have to say about the existing law and the proposed changes? Right Rev. John O'Grady of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, testifying before the Senate Committee on Finance, said: "As a pioneer in social security I now have grave questions about its future. * * * What is the picture after 13 years? About a quarter of the aged who have actually retired are receiving benefits under old age and survivors insurance, amounting to $600,000,000 a year, while almost twice that number are receiving old-age assistance involving an expenditure of approximately a billion and a quarter a year. And, not only is old-age insurance competing with old-age assistance, it is also competing with aid to dependent children. What puzzles us at the present time is that at the most critical moment in the history of social security the Federal Security Agency is recommending an enormous expansion in public assistance and aid to dependent children."

Monsignor O'Grady points out that because payments are more liberal under the assistance program than under the "insurance" program there is an invitation to fraud. He cites cases "in which mothers have entered into collusion with fathers about their disappearing from the home. Many times the husband was in the same city earning good wages, but the mother was receiving aid to dependent children funds, nevertheless, on the grounds of desertion * * * or a family in which the father was earning $100 a week * * * while the mother was getting about $150 a month under A. D. C. * * * The situation is most demoralizing to the family life of our people." No one knows how much of this sort of chiseling is going on.

William Rulon Williamson, an experienced actuary who left an insurance company to join the staff of the Social Security Board in 1936 and remained until 1947, bluntly terms old-age insurance "a flop." We have millions of unpaid beneficiaries among the aged and orphans. * * * H. R. 6000 sets out to make this system even more intolerable. Nothing could justify its passage. * * * With varied assistance administration, in lots of places old folks give away their property to their children to qualify, others are reticent about their resources, some seem to remember an earlier birthday. The attitude toward easily-come-by Federal funds on the part of State administrators is the logical development of the handout complex. * * * Three Federal recognitions of the aged exist, overlapping. Two of them, insurance and tax exemption, give more to those who have more. The third tempts the honest and thrifty to lose self-sufficiency, become dole receivers and demoralize both the recipients and the nonrecipients. * * * We should not burden today's society with 'adequacy' for all needs and fancied needs, but in simple justice we should not give $300 a year to one group for a purely token 'tax,' called a 'contribution,' to another more than $600 as charity, on the basis of needs tests that are frequently farcical, and nothing to the rest."

Dr. Marjorie Shearon, who in 1937 wrote the economic brief supporting the Social Security Act before the Supreme Court and has had 17 years of experience with Federal and State agencies in this field, reminded the Senate committee that in 1935 when the Works Progress Administration was being liquidated Harry Hopkins said the Federal Government was going out of the relief business, but it has failed to do so. It has simply changed the names of the various types of public aid. In 1932 the Federal Government spent a little over $4,000,000 on social welfare. Three years later it spent $2,000,000,000. The country was then in the depth of a depression. We thought of the expenditures as a temporary expedient. But now, 15 years later, during years of great national prosperity, years when national income is high and unemployment low, the Federal Government is spending close to $10,000,000,000 a year on health and welfare services. This is about 4 times as much as was spent in each of the depression years of 1934, 1935, and 1936 and 2,500 times as much as was spent in 1932. * * * Had it not been for the Social Security Act which crystallized and made permanent a vast system of Federal public aid, we might reasonably have expected the demand for such aid to subside as unemployment receded and national income rose. But the Social Security Act saddled the country with a more all-embracing system of public charity than we had in the depression. * * * Public charity is being accepted as a way of life by millions of our people. An artificial distinction has been drawn between social insurance and social assistance. The former is supposed to be due to certain workers and their dependents as a right; social assistance, on the other hand, is given to other persons and their dependents as pauper's aid. In reality there is small choice between the two since both forms of cash payments are made from tax funds. * * * The various public-aid programs which now cost the people of this country about $1,000,000,000 a month * * * are all similar in character * * * they are simply tax-supported benefits for favored segments of the population. * * * Social insurance is a cruel hoax. Workers are not buying insurance; they are not paying premiums; they are paying an ordinary income tax. They do not have a contractual agreement that for such and such a premium they will be entitled to a certain annuity at age 65. * * * In reality they will not get anything unless they stop work at 65. * * * What they will get, if they get it, is a small wage-loss retirement annuity which will come to them as a gift from the Government, that is, from other taxpayers. These facts should be explained to the people so that we may have an end to all this talk about benefits as rights. The fact to be borne in mind is that millions of workers are destined to be fooled.

Both Mr. Williamson and Dr. Shearon point out the impossibility of predicting the future costs of the present system. Monsignor O'Grady joins them in demanding a fundamental change-over in the present system to one of social budgeting which all three term truly a pay-as-you-go policy.

Mr. Williamson says: "We cannot find out all the facts about today. * * * Way out yonder in the year 2000 * * * we are not very clear how things will be. We do not know how many old people there will be. We do not know at what age people will seem old. We do not know what effect this dwelling on personal retirement for decades in advance will have in taking retirement. We do not know what the marriage mores will be in the year 2000. We do not know whether the costs will be $9,000,000,000, $14,000,000,000, or $30,000,000,000. * * * Social budgeting is pay-as-you go. * * * We should forget the misused words 'insurance,' 'contribution,' 'adequacy,' 'as a right,' and should think about compensation for the robbery of the aged by inflationary procedures, a social dividend for our inherited plant, of the generosity that is spelled out in imposed and paid taxes. * * * If we pay for social budgeting we must earn the funds. * * * Let us have no more tampering with an intrinsically bad law until a thorough study outlines the logic of a sound program. Such study should be conducted by competent, qualified persons. They should not be directed from the social security bureaucracy."

From a Republican Congressman, CARL T. CURTIS, comes one of the best and most thoughtful discussions of the present social security system. He, too, ends up with recommending social budgeting as the best way to meet the ever-changing problem of the

elderly and dependency. Mr. Curtis' findings and suggestions will be considered in another article. All thoughtful citizens are aware of the mounting pressure for a proper social-security system. The drive for private pension plans is a dominant factor in labor relations today and serves sharply to underline the failure of the Federal system. Private plans have the overshadowing weakness that their continuance depends upon the financial success of the particular business, not just now but for years to come. They tend to tie the worker to his job—which is individually and socially undesirable. Also, they militate against the employment of the older worker, whose unemployment will add seriously to the burden of the taxpayers. On the other hand, a Federal system will be assured of continuity as long as the Government itself lasts.

Assuredly, this is the time to make fundamental changes in a system which in 15 years has shown increasing weakness, which has worked so inequitably and which is coming so much.

The Social Security Act Under Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1950, a second article written by Elinore Morehouse Herrick entitled, "The Social Security Act Under Fire," appeared on the editorial page of the New York Herald Tribune. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include that article, as follows:

THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT UNDER FIRE—PROPOSALS FOR CHANGES INCLUDE LESS BOOKKEEPING AND PATRONIZE WITHOUT HURTING THEM

(By Elinore Morehouse Herrick)

II

The break-down of the Nation's social-security system is so clearly evident that its very break-down affords us an unparalleled opportunity to restudy the entire program and come out with a far better one. Fortunately, a growing number of people in and out of Congress recognize the need to reappraise the program. One of these critics is Representative CARL T. CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, who characterizes the old-age and survivors' insurance program as a "grossly unsound and ineffective tool." He calls for objective reexamination rather than a mere extension of its coverage or a mere numerical revision of its benefit formula, as the administration is trying. There must be a drastic overhauling of the program, even though it proves necessary to abandon completely those concepts upon which the current program rests. The discouraging factor is that those charged with administrative responsibility seemingly are unwilling to face the realities and the consequences of their program.

Mr. CURTIS criticizes the grandiose promises of the administration though relatively few of the aged can qualify for benefits under the insurance program. He points out that the old-age assistance program which makes more generous payments has led some people to conceal their assets while old people of the most deserving type have remained in need rather than face the stigma of a needs test, still others have become a burden upon their conscientious but poor children. In short, the artificiality of the line between covered and uncovered employments has put a large group of people who have worked hard all their lives to the necessity of pleading poverty in their old age.

The inequities of the present system can be seen in a few examples. A man whose salary is over $250 a month and who has been under social security since it started, and his wife, who is the same age, are drawing $67.50 a month. Yet this man paid into the trust fund a total of $390, or less than the amount he and his wife draw out in 6 months. H. R. 6000 would give a worker who has been steadily employed at an average of $250 a month $16 a month more than the benefits of a worker steadily employed at $100 a month. In short, the higher-paid man has paid for only $2.47 more in benefits but receives $16 more in benefits. This inequitable situation arises from the law's theory of compensating for the higher wage-loss suffered by the higher-paid worker upon his retirement although he has had more opportunity to save than has the lower-paid worker.

Mr. CURTIS attacks the method by which H. R. 6000 proposes to adjust the benefits of the insurance program to meet the change in living costs since the benefit formula was adopted. The remedy is not a satisfactory one, and the very problem is evidence of the program's basic unsoundness. * * * In view of the constantly changing levels of prices and wages, the revision could only be a temporary expedient. If wage and price levels fall substantially in future years, the ratio of benefits to wages could be disastrously high, both socially and economically. The more probable long-term trend, however, is upward, and not many years may elapse before this trend will give rise to a demand for further adjustment. * * * This continual need for revision of the benefit formula * * * points clearly to the absurdity of basing benefits on wage histories.

Representative CURTIS, like Dr. Marjorie Shearon, a former economic consultant to the Social Security Board, calls attention to the wastefulness of the wage-histories system. Elaborate records are kept, although the benefits paid bear no real relation to the amounts paid in—as in the case where the total sum paid would purchase a monthly benefit of $14.10 on an actuarial basis, yet the beneficiary would draw $47.95 a month under present law. "Even though the most modern labor-saving devices have been applied in the operation of the wage-record system, the cost is substantial, due to the inherent waste." Millions of wage records must be kept. For women, for example, who are only intermittently members of the labor force and who may never qualify for benefits, records nevertheless must be kept from the time they are first employed until death. "Or take the case of a man who starts to work, and works continuously, the keeping of his wage record by the Government is expensive. It is very likely that several times before he dies the cost of living and prices generally will change to the extent that the benefits he is to receive have to be changed, thereby rendering these past wage records entirely useless. We must also not forget that many fine citizens, who lead productive lives and make their contribution to society, never have a wage record. It is exceedingly difficult and in some cases almost impossible to apply the present program to these citizens."

Dr. Shearon describes in graphic detail the enormity of the wage-record system. "The Government is now paying more than $1,000,000 annually to rent IBM machines to keep the records in Baltimore. During the fiscal year 1949 wage records were posted to over 50,000,000 accounts. During the 1948 accounting year nearly 190,000,000 wage items were received. As of June 24, 1949, there were over 115,000,000 names in the employment index. Over 2,500,000 employers were annoyed with the necessity—and cost—of making out quarterly reports. As of June 30, 1949, the number of accounts which had been established was 93,356,137. The Social Security Administration is trying to persuade Congress to authorize an appropriation of $12,000,000 for a new building to house twice as many records. How many buildings do you suppose would be required during the next 50 years if the wage items kept pouring in at the rate of 190,000,000 a year? In 10 years there would be 1,900,000,000, in 50 years well over 9,500,000,000. The scheme is utterly fantastic and incredibly expensive."

Mr. CURTIS proposes that benefits be extended without a needs test to the millions of old people who cannot qualify under a wage-record insurance program on the grounds that they have worked just as faithfully as the more fortunate few who can now qualify. Broad universal coverage of the aged without the present law's restrictions upon the amount they may earn to supplement their benefits is economically feasible if we change our whole approach. Mr. CURTIS argues that "since social-security funds are necessarily limited in amount because they depend upon the amount of economic productivity in the Nation, the possibility of drawing off a portion of this productivity for social-security purposes is not too large to injure the Nation's economic health." In times of high employment the older worker would be able to continue contributing to national productivity and the amount drawn off for old-age benefits would be a relatively small portion of the national income.

A program of modest benefit amounts, one that could be borne by a present tax rate not much greater in total effect than the cost of Federal grants for public assistance plus the combined amounts of employer and employee contributions at present, is advocated by Mr. CURTIS. This tax should be in the form of an addition to the current normal income tax rates and the costly wage-record system abandoned. If the tax for social security were handled like an addition to the income tax there would be an immediate saving on the wage-history records. Approximately 8,000 of the 15,000 employees engaged in the administration of the present program are directly concerned either with the enforcement of the pay-roll tax or the processing of the quarterly employer reports and the maintenance of the many millions of wage accounts. Practically all these operations and some of the remaining operations could be dispensed with, if benefits were independent of these wage records. Administration of the old-age and survivors' insurance cost now in the neighborhood of $50,000,000 with about $45,000,000 for administration of the old-age-assistance program. The elaborate and costly network of regional offices would be unnecessary and other administrative economies would substantially reduce the present administrative costs if payments to the fund were handled as a simple income tax.

The nonpartisan, nonpolitical Brookings Institution has also studied the present law and the administration's proposed changes. They, too, recommend drastic changes: Immediate assumption of full load, payment of benefits no greater than are necessary to give full protection against need, and financing through a universal flat-rate personal income tax earmarked for social security appears the best system to use in these uncertain times. Brought face to face with full-load costs to be met annually, the people will be in a better position than they are now to determine whether individuals with personal income sufficient to protect them from need should be paid a benefit equaling that given to individuals who without the benefit would be in need. Decisions on such vital matters should be arrived at with full knowledge of the size of the true load and the real costs of the system.

"The American people and the Congress have at present an opportunity to reconsider the fundamentals of the social-insurance systems that may not come again. Because of the upward spiraling of wages and prices that has occurred since 1939 the money benefits now being paid under the most costly part of the program—old-age and survivors' insurance—are comparatively small. They are small enough so that at present the existing system could without great difficulty be converted into one designed primarily to insure against the dangers of want, and that will to a high degree preserve the freedom of the individual to determine what use he will make of his earnings. Such a system will leave a wide field open for the voluntary savings that have been a source of capital, particularly venture capital."

What too few people seem to realize is that social benefits granted by whatever formula possible must be paid for out of our national productivity. Pay-roll taxes become a part of the labor costs and hence part of the price the consumer pays—and thus are passed on both to the worker who will ultimately benefit from the social-security program and to those now excluded from that program. Thus the very basis on which we now collect the social-security funds contributes to the high prices which make the benefits shrink. Congress has a great opportunity and duty now to reexamine the entire fabric and philosophy of our Social Security Act.

The Right To Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star:

THE RIGHT TO STRIKE

"There is no right to strike against the public safety by anyone, anywhere, any time."

So telegraphed Calvin Coolidge, then Governor of Massachusetts, to Samuel Gompers on the occasion of the Boston police strike.

Public response all over the country was so favorable that Coolidge may be said to have established a national policy. It is thought that this declaration had much to do with his later elevation to the Presidency.

The Taft-Hartley law was a reaffirmation of the Coolidge declaration. It was passed after a winter of disastrous strikes had fanned smoldering public resentment to flames of anger. The Congress that was elected in 1946 was generally considered to carry a mandate from the voters that legislation be passed to prevent strikes against the public safety.

President Truman has played shameless politics, with the Taft-Hartley Act. He is now reaping the harvest of the demagoguery he sowed in the campaign of 1948. The people now suffer because there is a major strike against the public safety and the Nation's Chief Executive, reluctant for political reasons to use the law which he condemned, waited too long to do something in behalf of the people.

Labor has no weapon but the strike. That labor is entitled to this weapon is also public policy in the United States. But that labor is entitled to use it without limit is not true. The people said so emphatically in the 1946 election. They are saying so now, as schools close, transportation slows down, and householders frantically strive to make a few bushels of coal last through the emergency.

We do not know how coal may be produced, if miners will not work, even though they are commanded to under the law of the land. But we do know that the people believe today, as they did in 1919 when Calvin Coolidge was Governor of Massachusetts, and as they did in 1946 after a winter of industry-wide strikes, that no one, anywhere at any time, has the right to strike against the public safety.

President Truman has failed in this crisis. We hope that better leadership will emerge from it. The 1950 elections cannot fail to reflect the public resentment over being the victims of the current coal strike.

The people of the United States believe that the right to strike does not include the right to strike against the public safety. They have said so through their Congress. They must say so again with such emphasis that the Federal executive department will respond to their wishes.

Are Local Chambers of Commerce Abandoning Their Fight for Local Industry?—Seventy-six Economists of American Economics Association Oppose Basing-Point Bill Because Against Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable to me that over 3,000 local chambers of commerce will permit the parent organization here in Washington, the United States Chamber of Commerce, to vote them against their own interests. That is exactly what is being done in the basing-point matter. The old Pittsburgh-plus is rearing its ugly head again. This time monopolistic interests are not trying to conceal the fact that they want the power to destroy any local industry anywhere in the United States.

S. 1008 is a bill to perpetuate concentration of industry in a few areas around Pittsburgh, Pa. The Supreme Court outlawed the basing point when used for the purposes that these monopolies want to use it for now, on April 26, 1948. If the basing point is legalized, it means no decentralization of industry. Without the basing point every locality in the United States on water transportation is a potential site for a steel mill. With the basing point legalized it is not a potential site for a steel mill. If the basing point remains outlawed in every section where there is iron ore, there is a potential site for a steel mill, but if the basing point is legalized, such a site will not be considered. In practically every county in the United States there is limestone that can be used for making of cement. With the basing point outlawed there is no reason why a lot of cement plants should not be built. In fact, a large number have been built since the basing point was outlawed in 1948. If the basing point is legalized, there will be very few, if any more, cement mills constructed. The railroads strongly favor the basing point on account of the cross hauling that is caused thereby. This is very uneconomic, costing the consumers enormous amounts in excess of what should be paid, but it means dollars to the railroads.

I am inserting herewith an editorial from the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune concerning the stand of the 76 economists on the basing-point bill. It is as follows:

A TEST JUST AHEAD

Seventy-six economists of the American Economics Association have just joined in a letter to the United States Senate asking it to defeat the basing point bill.

It is a measure designed to facilitate the use of basing-point or freight-equalization systems of pricing which were knocked out in the case of cement and steel by recent decisions of the Supreme Court.

The letter is a studied argument winding up with the idea that businessmen as well as Socialists can destroy free enterprise by engaging in national planning. According to John T. Flynn, author of The Road Ahead, the test of socialism is whether or not one believes in national planning.

It may be costlier for a time to stick to the traditional American policy of maintaining a free and competitive economy, but we ought to do it, the economists declare. To approve price fixing under the guise of clarifying the law, which they say is happening in this instance, would weaken the antitrust laws and hinder their enforcement, establish two systems of pricing, since only a few industries heretofore used the basing-point method, emasculate the Robinson-Patman Act, and be a blow to freedom by restraining competition.

The letter will be an irritation to those segments of business that believe sincerely there is nothing wrong but something very fair with uniform prices arrived at through manipulation of freight charges. Admittedly it complicates affairs for the large firms in such lines as cement and steel to have to sell at dock prices plus freight. It might even force them to such uneconomic ends as opening new plants in sections they have heretofore subsidized by absorbing most of the freight rate from the central plant. It might cost the people of the undeveloped portions of the country more for their heavy goods until enterprise comes along to open plants closer to them than Pittsburgh or St. Louis. And there is no indication that Congress is going to pay any heed to the letter.

But when the history of the country is written later the letter may have a place there, among the other warnings that it was a bad action to trespass onto the field of free competitive enterprise, whether the trespasser has a pink beard or a Van Dyke.

Trading on Bomb Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in inserting into the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Arkansas Gazette on February 14, entitled "Trading on Bomb Control."

This editorial supports the movement for world government that has been spearheaded in the House by my very able colleague, BROOKS HAYS. Under his effective leadership, this movement has gathered a momentum and a degree of support that would never have been dreamed of a year ago. This editorial is one example of the way in which the opinion of this country's leaders is rapidly being brought to realize that world government offers the best ultimate solution to the troubles that presently beset the world. It follows:

TRADING ON BOMB CONTROL

On the same day that Albert Einstein in America was warning that, if the hydrogen bomb is developed, it will bring the annihilation of life on earth within the range of possibility, a dispatch from the Soviet capital reported that possibilities of achieving world-wide atomic control have been revived by Moscow's diplomatic circles. But any idea that the Kremlin leaders may have been moved by a desire to avoid a hydrogen bomb cataclysm was destroyed by the Moscow dispatch's statement that Soviet UN delegate Jacob Malik had hinted that Russia would be ready to continue atomic control talks in the United Nations if China were represented by a Communist delegation instead of a Nationalist one.

It seems likely that the question of Communist representation for China in the UN is only one of timing. Sooner or later it will come. But the Soviet Union is not contributing to progress on atomic control by putting a price tag on its willingness to cooperate. Even if Communist China were represented in the United Nations, this would not change the balance of power. The West would still have a superiority in voting strength and Russia would still have its veto.

The atomic control question cannot be settled by the obsolete methods of political horsetrading. As Professor Einstein observes, it will require the creation of new supra national governmental machinery. The Russians have shown no awareness of this necessity. And Americans, although they have demonstrated an appreciation of the need for political pioneering, have not taken positive steps in this direction. Only when we have put ourselves squarely behind a policy such as that enunciated in Congressman BROOKS HAYS' world federation resolution, can we feel that we have explored the path which Professor Einstein is talking about. Meanwhile, we can hope that the Russians will be able to realize that Einstein is speaking for them too when he warns of the possibility of annihilation.

People Eager To Hear About Ways To Preserve Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Ogden Standard Examiner, Ogden, Utah, under date of February 5, 1950.

It is a brief but timely editorial on the subject of peace. As one of the sponsors of the world federation resolution I commend it to you for your reading.

The editorial follows:

PEOPLE EAGER TO HEAR ABOUT WAYS TO PRESERVE PEACE

If any man in Congress knows the number of billions required to prepare a nation to take part in an atomic-bomb war and the size of the catastrophe to befall the combatants and innocent bystanders alike if nations begin dropping that kind of bombs on each other, it is Senator BRIEN MCMAHON (Democrat, Connecticut), for he is the chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee.

Gripped by the strong emotions his knowledge inspired, the Senator last week called upon the Nation to move heaven and earth to stop the atomic armament race. The Senator proposed the spending of as much money as a tiny war would cost to provide financial aid to Russia and other countries in the hope that economic aid would reduce the spirit of aggression.

The Senator's speech touched off lively discussion, probably to his surprise, because he confessed that his proposal would be viewed by some critics as wild and impractical, as indeed it is so viewed by some, but the general opinion is that it was time that somebody spoke up as dramatically as MCMAHON did for the good it will do in mobilizing public opinion against the defeatist notion that nothing can be done to stop the drift toward war.

Congress is even now considering in committee the famous Resolution 64, which says: *"Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring,* That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be the fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

The number of Americans, including Members of Congress, who believe that action in harmony with the foregoing will be effective in preserving peace, is far larger than the number who will go along with MCMAHON on his peace program. Yet the world federalists, despite their number and influence, never have gained the Nation's dramatic attention with their program as the Connecticut Senator has done with his.

The lesson MCMAHON taught is that the country, and probably the world, is eager to hear, for a change, some strong and emotional instructions as to how we can be switched from the war path.

Letter From Edward Francis Baker, of Mount Morris, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting for the benefit of the Members of the House of Representatives a letter from a young man from northwestern Illinois.

During my many years as a Member of Congress I have never received a more unselfish nor a more logical letter. It convinces me that as long as we have young men such as he, with such American ideals, those who desire to shoulder America with foreign ideologies are going to have trouble in saddling the American people with un-American panaceas and schemes.

The letter follows:

MOUNT MORRIS, ILL., *February 14, 1950.*

Congressman LEO E. ALLEN,
Washington, D. C

DEAR SIR: I'm a young farmer (age 29), just getting started farming. I've been farming with my father for 10 years. This is my second year on a full-share basis. I'm married, with two children—a girl 4, and a boy 3.

Just getting started on my own, I'm naturally interested in making farming a paying proposition. I've voted a Republican ticket since I became 21. I'm in almost full agreement with everything the party has done in this period.

I (being an employer) believe Congress should keep the Taft-Hartley Act. There should be some protection against the loss of free enterprise, and no union has the right to tell an employer how his business should be run and what he has to pay. I'm also against the Brannan plan. I favor the sliding parity support plan. In case of an oversupply, let the price drop a little. The consumer has a tendency to feel bitter against the farmer on this direct payment. The potato situation is just a forerunner of what will happen if we continue to keep our support prices too high. I believe in letting supply and demand be the main factors in determining the prices we receive. A little Government control on marketing protection is about all I think we need. That is against speculators and large companies or syndicates trying to regulate the market channels. I think that with our present means of getting information out to the farmers (radio, farm meetings, etc.) we should be able to pretty well figure out just what is needed in production and how we can meet certain situations. I think emphasis should be placed on conservation of our soil and the Government agencies carrying on this work should not be cut out in any way. We don't quite need all we can produce now, but in another 50 years I think we may.

Getting back to my thought on our Government. I'm certainly against the socialized state. It has helped England to reach bankruptcy at a much faster pace than I think she might ordinarily have. I think it is exactly the opposite view from what our forefathers had in mind when they came to America. Let's give each American a little incentive to work and not tax him to death, and I think our country will stay free and prosperous. If everyone is desirous of a Government job rather than one of his own, it won't be long until the people will be working for the State instead of the State for the people. I think we are at the crossroads today.

My whole thought on the matter is about like this. Let's keep every American an individual and not one of the masses. I love my work and I do it because I don't have someone telling me how to do it. I'm still my own boss, and I wouldn't trade this fact for all the promised security of some other system in the world.

Sincerely,

EDWARD FRANCIS BAKER.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD BREEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. BREEN. Mr. Speaker, statehood for Alaska is a must, both for the people of the United States and for the people of Alaska.

Full development of Alaska is of vital importance to the United States from the standpoint of national defense.

Alaska has an area of about 586,000 square miles, about one-fifth the size of the United States, a little more than twice as large as the State of Texas. Only 56 miles of water, in the Bering Strait, separates Alaska from Russia. Out in the Bering Strait are two islands, Little Diomede, on the east, belongs to the United States; Big Diomede, to the west, belongs to Russia. They are only 2½ miles apart.

Alaska was the only part of the American continent to be invaded during World War II. Alaska is on the Great Circle route to Asia; the air route from San Francisco to Japan via the Aleutians is about 1,700 miles shorter than the route via Hawaii.

Gov. Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, has recently stated that Alaska is "wholly vulnerable" and that it "could be taken tomorrow by a minor-scale air-borne invasion from Siberia, either across Bering Strait or over the Pole." In the opinion of the Governor, statehood for Alaska and adequate defenses are inseparably linked, and one is dependent upon the other. Economic development calls for defense, and statehood will bring economic development. As long as Alaska remains undeveloped and militarily weak, the national safety is imperiled.

We are forcibly reminded of Gen. Billy Mitchell's statement that "He who holds Alaska holds the world." Any and all parts of the United States could be attacked from enemy-held airfields in Alaska.

While Alaska remains economically undeveloped, and what could be very strong military defenses are neglected, there is evidence that there is considerable economic activity across the Bering Straits. We are informed that permanent farm populations are being established to support industrial, mining, and military activities; and also that all kinds of experiments in agriculture are being carried on to determine how far north and under how adverse conditions foodstuffs can be grown; and that new kinds of crops and grains have been developed which prosper in the soil and climatic conditions there. In the meantime, I have been advised that little or nothing has been done in Alaska. Large expenditures have been made in Europe and elsewhere in the interests of security and for the containment of communism, and by contrast the importance of an area so near at hand and the one point at which the United States itself impinges almost directly upon the Russian homeland, has been neglected.

It must be pointed out also that Alaska and the United States are separated only by our friendly neighbor, Canada. The Canadian and American borders are the friendliest in the world and are the result of years and years of solid and genuine friendship and cooperation.

The time to concentrate upon building up Alaska in every respect, militarily and industrially, has come, and indeed such attention is long overdue. We cannot and should not be satisfied until we have a strong Alaska until Alaska's potentialities as a bulwark of defense and a source of valuable resources are realized to the utmost. I sincerely believe that the best way to accomplish this is to take the first step in the direction of statehood, and Alaska must have statehood now.

Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter and certain tables relating to our fiscal situation, the material having been prepared by Mr. Paul O. Peters, research consultant, Washington, D. C.:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 2, 1950.*

Mr. DANIEL A. REED,
Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: A study of the economic reports issued by the President's Council of Economic Advisers indicates that the Federal Government now should embark upon a program designed to drastically cut Federal expenditures at all levels where they make no counted contribution to the gross national product.

At page 626 of the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1948, it is shown that approximately $19,700,000,000 of the $36,300,000,000 in Federal expenditures do not involve purchases of production and might well be carefully scrutinized by the Appropriations Committee of both Houses and drastically trimmed.

An economy that depends upon deficit financing in time of peace is an economy headed for disaster. The Federal spending is providing a pattern for deficit spending at State and local levels, and the only way to put the Nation's financial house in order is to start now to balance the budget and begin the liquidation of the public debt.

This can be done only by cutting down on expenditures which make no counted contribution to the gross national product and indirectly to our national income and security.

From the testimony of several of the witnesses who have so far appeared before the Ways and Means Committee I find but little attention has been given to the matter here presented.

For your information and use there is submitted herewith several compilations which show better than words in this letter how the substance of our people is being sapped for the benefit of people other than "we the people of the United States."

Also, in view of the fact that the purchasing power of our dollar has now dropped to approximately 58 cents, it is suggested that the committee review the present exemptions for single and married persons with dependents and place the exemptions on a realistic basis, say $750 for a single person and $1,500 for a married couple, with an extra $500 for each dependent. The hidden excise taxes, tied in with State and local taxes, put a heavy burden on every person's income, leaving nothing with which many are able to provide security for the hazards of life, including old age.

Respectfully,

PAUL O. PETERS.

Summary of postwar foreign credits, grants, loans, and capital investments of the United States Government for the period July 1, 1945, through Jan. 31, 1950

Capital investments:	
Paid to International bank	$635,000,000
Paid to International Monetary Fund	2,750,000,000
Grants and credits utilized:	
Lend-lease	2,553,000,000
Civilian supplies	4,211,000,044
European recovery program	6,353,693,213
UNRRA and post UNRRA	2,877,099,803
Interim aid	577,000,000
Chinese stabilization and aid	399,173,438
Greek-Turkish assistance	584,439,758
Philippine rehabilitation	246,000,000
Korean aid	11,000,000
Refugee assistance	153,000,000
International Children's Emergency Fund	65,196,904
Inter-American aid	29,000,000
American Red Cross	10,000,000
Surplus property credits	1,341,000,000
Other items	940,019,047
Export-import bank, loans and guaranties	2,455,000,000
British loan	3,750,000,000
Utilized total commitments	29,441,212,207

Compiled from Foreign Transactions of the United States Government, issued October 1949, and from Daily Treasury Statement for February 15, 1950.

This compilation does not include amounts expended for memberships in or contributions to international organizations, which costs were $144,629,262 for the fiscal year 1949, according to S. Rept. No. 1274, 81st Cong. 2d sess., issued February 14, 1950.

THE LOAN PROGRAMS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND OTHER ITEMS AFFECTING THE GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

In computing the gross national product, the Treasury Department deducts from Federal budget expenditures items not involving purchase of production. Such items include expenditures for interest, veterans' pensions and benefits, tax refunds, grants-in-aid to State and local governments, loans to foreign governments, loans by Government-owned corporations, and such items and grants to foreign nations under programs like ECA.

The annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1948, at page 626, shows that of budget expenditures of $55,300,000, items in the total amount of $19,700,000, representing expenditures not involving purchases of production were deducted leaving the contribution to the gross national product from Federal expenditures but $16,600,000,000.

The compilation following is submitted as an indication of the total of Federal expenditures for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951 which make no counted contribution to the gross national product of the United States:

[All figures are in millions]

	1950	1951
Interest on the public debt	85,725	88,625
Tax refunds	2,177	2,151
Grants-in-aid [1]	1,803	3,265
Export-Import Bank loans	71	46
Veterans' pensions, etc.:		
Pensions and compensation	2,243	2,237
Insurance	518	39
Loan guaranties	61	68
Readjustment benefits, etc.	2,871	2,542
Reconstruction Finance Corporation:		
Loans to cooperatives	10	30
Loans to prefabricators, etc.	52	45
Business loans and guaranties	153	155
Housing and Home Finance Agency:		
Loans to middle-income cooperatives		80
Agriculture:		
Loans to low-income farmers for housing	20	45
Farmers Home Administration, loans	26	26
Commodity Credit Corporation, loans	1,533	902
Rural Electrification Administration	362	436
European Cooperative Administration: Loans, grants, credits, etc.	4,040	3,230
Deductible totals	21,663	20,964

[1] Actual expenditure 1949; estimate for fiscal 1951.

The table is an indication of the trend in Government spending. Just how the Government, operating at a deficit, is able to carry on loan and other programs which make only a negligible contribution to the gross national product is the growing problem which the Congress must some day wrestle with. Eventually—why not now?

FOREIGN TRANSACTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR THE PERIOD JULY 1, 1949, TO JANUARY 31, 1950

From July 1, 1949, through June 30, 1950, the foreign transactions of the United States consisting of grants, loans, and credits to the people of other countries totaled over $25,725,000,000. For the first 7 months of fiscal 1950 additional foreign spending was as follows:

Agriculture:	
Assistance to Greece and Turkey	−$4,471.24
China Aid Act of 1948	1,275,661.00
Foreign Aid Act of 1947	−9,541.08
Relief to people of countries devastated by war	−293.00
Commerce: Bureau of Public Roads: Assistance to Greece and Turkey	138,794.00
Army:	
Military functions:	
Assistance to Greece and Turkey	$55,745,024.91
China Aid Act of 1948	88,130.27
Foreign Aid Act of 1947	28,711.20
Civil functions:	
Government and relief in occupied areas	551,600,044.68
Navy:	
Assistance to Greece and Turkey	8,949,122.79
Payments for UN relief and rehabilitation	889.90
Federal Security Agency:	
Assistance to Greece and Turkey	3,843.79
Payments for UN relief and rehabilitation	1,099.98
General Services Administration:	
Assistance to Greece and Turkey	106,949.55
China Aid Act of 1948	4,014,538.22
Foreign Aid Act of 1947	−109.46
Payments for UN relief and rehabilitation	−593.22
Maritime Commission: Payments for UN relief and rehabilitation	−1,592.80
State Department:	
Assistance to Greece and Turkey	−166,451.64
China Aid Act of 1948	446,956.99
International Children's Emergency Fund	7,196,904.05
Relief to people of countries devastated by war	−4,377.68
Economic Cooperation Administration:	
Disbursements by ECA	$1,710,144,423.18
Agriculture Department	205,451,515.84
Commerce Department	9,039,822.63
Defense Department:	
Army	38,774,272.15
Navy	−68,413.18
Export-Import Bank of Washington	71,868,285.08
Federal Security Agency	83,994.79
General Services Administration	1,091,848.77
Labor Department	15,489.07
Post Office Department	8,988,029.00
Assistance to Greece and Turkey	1,687,058.40
China Aid Act of 1948	−10,651,721.23
State Department	[illegible]
Foreign Relief Act of 1947	−580,713.07
Relief to people of countries devastated by war	−3,688.76
Other	17,351,638.46
Total, net expenditures July 1, 1949, to Jan. 31, 1950	2,707,769,295.53

Appropriations for international activities of the State Department other than the Foreign Service, for the fiscal years 1945 through 1950, both inclusive

Activity	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Participation in international organizations	$1,431,087	$9,938,156	$14,616,414	$90,961,118	$100,265,895	[illegible]
Construction loan to United Nations					[illegible]	
International contingencies	1,500,000	4,250,000	5,000,000	4,000,000	[illegible]	3,300,000
Cooperation with American Republics	3,450,000	4,098,370	5,375,000	3,900,000	4,100,000	
Salaries and expenses, Philippine rehabilitation			47,918,000	[illegible]	21,499,000	17,166,398
Mexican Boundary and Water Commission	430,000	1,626,200	10,130,000	4,969,000	2,514,428	2,020,000
Rio Grande emergency flood protection	[illegible]		100,000	[illegible]	[illegible]	15,000
Informational and educational activities				3,000,000	27,000,000	47,300,000
Expenses and salaries, international commissions	197,000	332,910	318,100	415,417	[illegible]	[illegible]
Cultural relations with China, Near East, etc.		1,390,000				
Liquidation, informational and cultural program				1,430,000		
Payment to Government of Finland						5,574,740
Payment to Government of Switzerland						14,[illegible]
Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees		4,500,000				
Other miscellaneous expenditures	135,000	955,000	90,000			[illegible]
Transfers from war agencies:						
Salaries and expenses, foreign economic functions, State		3,747,454				
Office of International Information		28,934,734				
Inter-American Affairs functions		5,819,414				
Strategic Services functions		2,500,000				
Surplus-property disposal, Army		125,000				
Salaries and expenses, War Assets Administration, special		3,516,000				
Yearly total	7,246,087	80,312,928	81,547,515	151,181,535	225,149,148	190,264,698

Taconite—The Need for Research and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, northern Minnesota is an area rich in natural resources and one which offers great opportunities for future development. In the past our great forests have been an important source of timber for the Nation—the high-grade iron ore of the Mesabi Range has been the backbone of the American steel industry for over half a century. But these resources are not unlimited. Our virgin forests are gone, and it is estimated that the high-grade iron ore of Mesabi will be depleted in another 20 years at the present rate of production. For this reason

we must give our attention to the development of other natural resources which are available in great quantities. We have enough low-grade ore and taconite to supply America's steel needs for a thousand years if such resources are developed. Northern Minnesota needs a reforestation program to restore our forests and rehabilitate the timber industry.

Northern Minnesota also has enormous deposits of peat—over half of all United States peat deposits are located in northern Minnesota—and the development of this peat offers this country a new and almost unlimited source of cheap power and fuel. For this reason it was most encouraging to note that the gentleman from Minnesota's Sixth District and my very good friend, Mr. MARSHALL, has recently introduced H. R. 7330, a bill to provide $1,000,000 in Federal funds for research in peat, and another $1,500,000 in loan authorizations to small business for peat production. This is an excellent proposal, and I want to go on record as being in full support of the measure. Congressman MARSHALL has my unqualified and active support in his efforts to secure passage of H. R. 7330.

I will now discuss briefly the question of taconite and the need for its development. Northern Minnesota is fortunate in having unlimited amounts of taconite, and this taconite contains the iron ore upon which our economy depends. For this reason it is proper that it should be discussed at this time.

A prosperous industrial economy and national security require, above almost all else, a continuous, adequate, sure, and safe flow of increasing supplies of iron ores to the country's iron- and steel-making facilities.

Without prejudice to the progress made to date, or to the sanguine hopes of the future, for the ultimate development of foreign sources of iron-ore supplies, one cannot avoid recognizing that the full success of such plans depends greatly upon an almost universal peacetime atmosphere. This condition certainly does not prevail in the cold war of today or appear on a nearby horizon.

The new set of realistic economic criteria used by Congress today in guiding it in its decisions should soon be brought to bear on this subject and be clearly passed on to industry, so that they can be applied mutually in endeavoring to assure adequate iron-ore supplies for the country. Violation of these guides, not yet fully recognized by many in industry, will surely endanger both our industrial health and security. We recognize that it has been necessary in the development of our decisions to adjust former peacetime economic criteria to the realities of our present era and responsibilities. Today we are fighting a cold war by unorthodox methods and unprecedented expenditures for national security and defense. Hence, determinations surrounding the supplies for production of and the marketing of industrial products must be kept in harmony under economic rules which realistically take into consideration the conditions of our present circumstances and the possibilities of a hot war.

Through two world wars the upper Great Lakes area has successfully supplied most of the required volume of iron ores without protective demands upon our military services. Today the same area still stands ready and capable of providing practically unlimited supplies of iron ores without the strain of military protection for its transportation routes such as are necessary in foreign fields or on open international sea lanes.

In addition to the types of iron ores supplied the country during the last two World Wars, the upper lake area has an abundant reserve of iron ores described as taconite. These are the types of ores upon which, in keeping with our American tradition of progress, we should begin to depend in larger measure. They represent a grade of ore in abundant supply within our own national boundary.

A large degree of national dependence upon foreign imported iron ores has many pitfalls adverse to both peacetime industrial health and wartime defense. It calls for a radical shift of plant location to certain coastal areas tending toward densifying population centers and increasing the strategic disadvantage of already critical target areas. Also importation of foreign iron ores tends toward delaying the necessity for an overdue advancement in iron- and steel-making techniques such as are known to be practiced on the European Continent and understood to be an important part of the Soviet program.

Sufficient progress has already been made in the beneficiation of taconite ores to point the way toward possible over-all economies by the broad utilization of these ores. These advantages are especially with regard to more efficient material-handling methods and adjustment of heat requirements. This beneficiation can be done locally near the ore bodies through the use of electric power and heat obtained from nearby reserves of heat.

These are only a few of the reasons why I have proposed that the Congress provide ways and means for prompt research and development of taconite for metallurgical purposes and heat for power and related purposes.

FEPC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. DAVIES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. DAVIES of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few comments and observations concerning the piece of legislation which passed this House last Thursday, February 23. That measure, originally called the FEPC bill, as we all know was so completely hacked to bits by the McConnell and other crippling amendments that it bore almost no kinship, either in scope or purpose, to the original bill. It was so unrecognizable, in fact, that the father of the FEPC bill, Mr. POWELL, refused to vote for the version which finally passed this House.

All of us know why the original bill had its heart cut out by the McConnell amendment. A bipartisan coalition rallied enough votes to pass the amendment. It was a foregone conclusion that no Member who represents a district below the Mason and Dixon's line would vote for the bill in its original form. But most people believed that the members of the Republican Party who sit in this body would cease playing politics as far as this measure was concerned. After all, did not the Republican platform of 1948 contain a civil rights plank?

Ah, but we who believed this, were wrong. We were hopelessly naive in the ways of politics. For even on a matter dealing with fundamental rights for millions of our citizens, many Republicans would not uphold the side of human freedom.

Our Declaration of Independence states that one of the inalienable rights with which our Creator endows us is the pursuit of happiness. Certainly, in modern society the pursuit of happiness includes the right to work in a free economy according to one's talents, regardless of religion or race.

In all justice I will admit that a few of the Members from the North who voted for the McConnell amendment did so sincerely, because they believe that racial and religious intolerance cannot be cured by legislation, but by education. In the final analysis it is true, education is the answer, but the original FEPC bill was a step toward that educational goal. It is true that we cannot legislate men's minds. But the Nation, during its tumultuous history, has been governed by many laws which, when passed, were shocking and revolutionary but within a few years were part of our national thought and philosophy.

But aside from this group, there was a much larger group of Republicans who teamed with southerners to emasculate the FEPC bill. I submit that these men voted for the McConnell amendment solely because the original FEPC bill was endorsed by the administration.

We Democrats admit that we are split wide open on the civil-rights question. But what happened to the supposed solidarity of the Republicans? For political expediency, many of them voted for the McConnell amendment so that they could cripple the administration-backed bill and get credit for the final product. Many strong civil-rights advocates voted for the final product, but only because, though it was worth while, it was better than nothing.

If those Republicans want credit for what finally passed this House, I say let them have it. It is certainly nothing to be proud of and I seriously doubt whether many citizens, regardless of their political affiliation, are proud of those Representatives who voted to cripple the original FEPC bill.

I only hope that the voters whom those men represent come to the polls next November and show them that human rights are a matter above the level of partisan politics.

A National Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the constitutional rights of the people to life, liberty, and property have been brought to a very low ebb by the failure of the President of the United States to take immediate action in the coal strike still continuing, notwithstanding the belated injunction and contempt procedure. Millions of people, old young, sick, crippled, and those who are institutionalized for one cause or another, are made to suffer because of the stubbornness of our Chief Executive. I wonder if his failure to act in this great crisis at a time when he should have acted, notwithstanding the suffering his dereliction will cause, is a result of his desire to curry political favor with John L. Lewis and his followers.

Right now in the North the weather is extremely cold and from time to time snowstorms are sweeping over my congressional district, where there is actual suffering, and unless coal is made available without further delay the consequences to human health and life will be tragic. I am in a minority in Congress; therefore, I am not in sympathy with the socialization of our coal industries by having the Government take over the mines. This would be one of the steps in the program of both the Communists and Socialists whose voices seem to be the only ones heard by the administration.

This strike in the coal mines clearly indicates that the control of only a few industries by a political-minded administration can quickly deprive the people of their rights to life, liberty, and property, which is in violation of our Federal Constitution.

With the coal mines under the control and domination of one man, aided and abetted by a political administration, a large percentage of the industries essential to life, liberty, and property, can be ruined.

I deplore that in a supposedly free country one man should be able to inflict such consequences upon millions of people.

To suffer and permit the industries of this country to be closed will obviously inflict a cruel blow upon the employees of these industries and unless relief from the coal shortage is forthcoming it will mean in many cases loss of homes, evictions, untold suffering, deaths, and consequences that are immeasurable.

I have called upon one of the many industrial cities in my district for facts pertaining to the effect of the present coal strike. I have received a telegram this day, March 2, 1950, in reply to my request, which under leave heretofore granted I am inserting as a part of my remarks. I believe that this report from the industrial city of Jamestown, N. Y., will fairly represent the perilous plight of cities and villages throughout the Forty-fifth Congressional District of New York. The wire reads as follows:

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., *March 2, 1950.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
Member of Congress:

Coal situation this industrial community desperate. Note following facts:

1. Municipal light and power plant, which also furnishes heat to city hospital, has scant 10 days' supply.
2. Fifty percent of industries facing shutdown by March 7 or 8.
3. Furniture plants burning waste consume more coal when not operating and therefore will freeze when shut down.
4. Dim-out already in effect.
5. Prices for inadequate supply of poor coal now about double pre-strike price of good coal f. o. b. mines.
6. No profiteering by coal dealers.
7. Trickle of coal mined comes from stripping (surface operations) which are uncertain due to weather and roving bands of pickets.
8. Closing of industry means heavy loss of workers even though they receive unemployment benefits, plus suffering among those who can least withstand it.

Unless mining of bituminous coal is resumed at once, permanent loss will be serious.

JAMESTOWN INDUSTRIES, INC.,
H. G. KING, *General Manager,*
Division of the Manufacturers Association of Jamestown, N. Y.

Treachery Is Protected by Statute of Limitations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD George E. Sokolsky's column of February 14, 1950, in which it is pointed out that an act of treachery against the United States is protected by the statute of limitations:

THESE DAYS

TREACHERY IS PROTECTED BY STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

A point to note is that a fellow can commit an act of treachery against the United States, wait 3 years, announce his crimes, and nothing can be done about it. The statute of limitations shall have run and he is safe. This is the open season for ex-spies announcing their crimes. There is even money in such confessions.

That is why former spies like Whittaker Chambers, Henry Julian Wadleigh, and Mrs. Hede Massing can tell their stories in safety. That is why Alger Hiss could only be held for perjury. That is why some of them are only held in contempt of a congressional committee. The statute of limitations gives them a wonderful blanket protection for the crimes they actually committed.

The Hiss case, as important as it is, must reopen the question of the statute of limitations in such crimes. Actually, there ought to be no statute of limitations in crimes involving treason, espionage, treachery. There is no statute of limitations for murder; and while a murder may involve only one person, such treacher/ as the theft of the A-bomb involves all of us.

I want to quote from A Factual Review of the Whittaker Chambers-Alger Hiss Controversy, by William Marshall Bullitt, a distinguished lawyer and a trustee of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, of which Alger Hiss was president.

"On or about August 29, 1939, Chambers and (Isaac Don) Levine dined with Mr. (A. A.) Berle at the latter's Washington residence. Chambers revealed to Berle his whole story of the Communist underground in Washington, and particularly mentioned the names of Alger Hiss, Donald Hiss, Nathan Witt, and Lee Pressman.

"Mr. Berle was both worried and disturbed, because he believed that Chambers was telling the truth as he saw it. Berle at once took the following precautionary steps: (I) Established very close relations between the State Department and the FBI; (II) organized a special section in the State Department to follow any Communist activities; (III) arranged to have a weekly liaison meeting with the FBI for the exchange of information; (IV) worked with the Department of Justice in passing needed legislation for the Government's protection; and (V) twice checked with Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, who had Alger Hiss as his executive assistant; and Acheson vouched for both the Hisses absolutely.

"Sometime later, Levine conveyed the Chambers revelations to William C. Bullitt, then Ambassador to France, and to Lloyd (he must mean Loy—G. E. S.) Henderson, in charge of the Russian section of the State Department. Since then, the State Department has removed 134 members of the State Department, for disloyalty reasons. (The pamphlet was prepared in December 1948—G. E. S.)

"In 1943, and again in 1945, Chambers reported the facts about Hiss to the FBI."

In a word, as far back as August 29, 1939, the State Department and the Department of Justice had a lead to the Harold Ware Communist cell and its members. The FBI knew about Alger Hiss and must have followed the lead as a routine matter. On August 29, 1939, Soviet Russia was not our ally; in fact, Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany were in alliance and had signed the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact to divide the world by war. The nonaggression pact, as it is formally called, was signed on August 23, 1939. Actually, the war eventuated 9 days later by the invasion of Poland simultaneously by Russia and Germany, in accordance with the Stalin-Hitler alliance.

From August 23, 1939, until June 21, 1941, Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany were in alliance and the United States was fearful of the implications of the war they had made. Actually, it took us into a disastrous war. Yet, these high officials, A. A. Berle, Dean Acheson, William C. Bullitt, Loy Henderson, to say nothing of the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, and the Attorney General, Frank Murphy, did nothing about the information which Whittaker Chambers gave them, and which now has been proved true in two trials before an American jury.

Many say today that Hiss and his associates should be forgiven because they operated in the wartime pro-Russian atmosphere. The truth is they were brought to the attention of our officials during the Stalin-Hitler alliance.

The issue raised here is one of responsibility. Who was ultimately responsible?

The Road Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a condensation of the book entitled, "The Road Ahead." This condensation of the book by John T. Flynn was published in the February 1950 issue of the Reader's Digest. I wish to say that the condensation of the book exceeds what may be printed in the RECORD without an estimate. I have received an estimate from the Public Printer of $348.50 as the cost of printing the matter in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the Senator what the matter is?

Mr. BREWSTER. It is the condensation published in the Reader's Digest of the book entitled, "The Road Ahead," by John T. Flynn.

Mr. LUCAS. Its printing will exceed the number of pages permitted to be printed in the RECORD without an estimate being furnished, and the Senator says the cost will be $348?

Mr. BREWSTER. And 50 cents. I am sure the Senator will feel it is worth that amount, if he has the opportunity to read it.

Mr. LUCAS. I have read the book and I do not agree with the Senator that it is worth it. I do not think the Reader's Digest article is worth $348 of the taxpayers' money. If the economy-minded Senator from Maine wants to spend that amount of money, I am not going to object.

Mr. BREWSTER. I very much appreciate the Senator's courtesy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROAD AHEAD—AMERICA'S CREEPING REVOLUTION

(By John T. Flynn)

Most people in this country believe that the American Communist Party and its dupes are the chief internal enemy of our economic system and our form of government. This is a serious mistake. The Communists are a traitorous bloc in our midst, but if every Communist in America were rounded up and liquidated, the greatest menace to our form of social organization would be still among us.

This most dangerous enemy is the American counterpart of the British Fabian Socialist, who denies that he is a Socialist and operates behind a mask which he calls National planning. These Socialist planners are enticing us down the dark road that has led so many European nations to their doom. Unless they are recognized for what they are, and are stopped, they will destroy this country.

Our people have been so far from the European scene that they have not observed closely the forces which in the last 30 years have been eating away the foundations of European civilization. The same forces that ruined Germany, Italy, France, and Britain are repeating their work of destruction upon our economic and political organisms.

Of the countries in Europe which have moved into the Socialist camp, the two which concern us most are Russia and Great Britain. Each adopted socialism by a different route, each organized its Socialist society upon a different model. But both are Socialist. Russia was conquered overnight by a sudden, violent revolutionary convulsion. Great Britain moved into socialism a little at a time, without bloodshed, in a journey that took almost 40 years.

We are following in the footsteps of Great Britain. We are much further along the road than we suspect. If we do not clearly recognize that fact and abandon that fatal road, we shall inevitably, perhaps in less than a decade, be in the condition the British now find themselves in.

In Great Britain we have a perfect case history of the infection and progress of the Socialist disease and, while this book is about America, we should briefly review the carefully concerted Socialist plan by which that once great country—the home of modern capitalism and modern free government—was led stealthily to her present state.

The Socialist government in Britain did not come into power by accident. In 1883 a small group of Socialists organized what they called the Fabian Society. Among its members were such eminent persons as Sidney and Beatrice Webb, George Bernard Shaw, and Ramsay MacDonald. This group realized that if socialism were to make any headway against the solid rock of British opinion it would have to proceed gradually, by political methods. They adopted the policy and the name of the Roman general, Quintus Fabius, who held that the only way to conquer his principal enemy was to lure him to battle in small sectors and defeat him bit by bit.

They began by advocating not a Socialist state but a welfare state. Deciding against state ownership of land and industry, they simply proposed state ownership of such basic sectors of the nation's economy as credit, electric power, transportation, and coal. The rest of the economic system would be left in private hands but operated under plans made by the state.

They knew they must capture the mind of the working class and must take over the apparatus of the labor unions, so they formed a political arm which later became the British Labor Party. They would begin by cooperating with the Liberal Party, which corresponded to our Democratic Party, until their own Labor Party acquired strength enough to displace it.

They agreed they must penetrate and capture the instruments and leaders of public opinion and information—writers, churchmen, and schools.

This plan's central aim was to bring on socialism without mentioning that odious word—to offer to the voters one small part of the Socialist program at a time without the Socialist label on it. Thus they would smuggle socialism into the social fabric without arousing the suspicions of the people.

The small coterie of Socialist doctrinaries, which never had more than 4,000 members, got into action about 1906. Thirteen years later their party had pushed the old Liberal party aside. In 5 more years their leader, Ramsay MacDonald, was Prime Minister of England. At that time MacDonald did not remain long in power, but the Socialists continued to push through social-welfare measures which eventually accustomed the citizens to look to the State for the correction of all their ills. The climax of this creeping revolution came in 1945.

The First World War had hit Britain a smashing blow from which she never recovered. The Second World War struck her with such epic violence that her empire withered away. Her foreign trade disappeared and her economic system lay in ruins. No capitalist government had anything to offer other than sweat and short rations for a decade at least. Only the Socialist had his radiant rainbow ready, his promises of the good life, jobs for all, security for all from the cradle to the grave. And so in the general election of 1945 the inevitable happened: the Conservatives were swept out and a Socialist government came to supreme power in Great Britain. The Fabians' plan had succeeded.

For 4 years now the Socialist prophets of abundance and security have been in power. Finally it has dawned upon the British people that the realities of the Socialist paradise does not correspond with the rosy dream. The dream has turned into a nightmare.

Socialist propagandists from Britain are fond of claiming that they have socialized only about 25 percent of the economic system and that 75 percent remains under capitalism. This is a distortion of the facts. Britain has nationalized about 25 percent of her economic processes, but she has socialized almost the entire economic system.

The government has nationalized the following: the Bank of England (credit); cables and wireless (the overseas communications system); civil aviation; railways, bus transport and inland waterways; coal mines; electricity; the gas industry; medical services.

The rest of the economy has been socialized by a method under which the state makes the plans for all forms of business—farms, factories, shops. Government bureaus decide on production quotas for an industry as a whole and in many cases for the individual units. They fix the quotas, priorities, and prices on raw materials; fix wages; determine who shall get credit at the banks and who shall not. In sum, the state generally makes the blueprints upon the basis of which all business operations are carried on and polices those operations to insure faithful obedience to the state's plans.

If the British Socialist experiment were successful one would suppose that it would have produced more goods at lower prices, and workers would be better off than under the old capitalist regime; that the security of the Nation would be advanced in every way.

But these promised benefits have not appeared. On the contrary, by every economic, physical, and moral test, socialism has been a tragic failure. It is already falling apart. The people cry out against impossible prices, against scarcities, oppressive taxation, and bureaucratic oppressors.

Britain's foreign trade—the foundation of her economic existence—is being washed away. Even with the aid of billions of dollars from capitalist America she cannot settle her foreign debts except by the gradual extinction of her gold reserves.

Her people have seen withering away those great freedoms for which Britons have fought through the centuries—freedom from seizures and searches without warrants, freedom to work where and at what they choose, freedom to engage in business and to own property, freedom to work their privately owned farms as they choose.

Let us look at the black record. The Socialist government has operated at a loss the basic industries and services which it took over. At the end of 1948 it was producing coal at the rate of 7,000,000 tons a year less than the mines under private ownership produced before the war, notwithstanding the expenditure by the Socialist government of over $170,000,000 on mechanization to increase output. The national coal board lost about $93,000,000 in 1947. By raising the price of coal it managed to cover costs in 1948, but it is still in the red about $90,000,000 since it began operations.

The miners, despite the fiction that they are now the owners of the mines, will not

produce as much for themselves as they produced before the war for private owners. Around 94,000 miners a day fail to show up for work.

The Government owns and has operated the overseas air-transport industry in the Atlantic area at a loss of $544 on every passenger carried.

The railroads have been run at a considerable deficit.

Of course, every loss sustained by the Government on its enterprises must be paid through taxes taken from the people. There are no longer enough rich individuals to soak with any appreciable results. In fact, there are only 45 persons in England whose incomes after taxes exceed £24,000 a year, and only 35,000 with incomes between $5,000 and $16,000. Hence, to pay the losses of Britain's nationalized industries, everybody must be soaked, including the workers.

We have heard a great deal about Britain's achievement in providing homes for its workers. Actually, despite the Government's free-handed spending on housing, it has provided only about 230,000 houses a year compared with 364,000 in each of the two prewar years.

Britain's exports have fallen off disastrously. She can fix the prices her own people must pay, but she cannot fix the prices to her foreign customers. In foreign markets she must meet the prices of her competitors. She cannot sell abroad goods whose prices must include the enormous taxes of the Socialist government.

This Socialist regime may be able to drag on as long as it receives free billions in aid from private-enterprise America. When that ceases—as it must—Britain will have to face the grim realities. If there is one prayer British Socialists should send up nightly it is that God will save America from drifting into socialism.

The bait held out by the Socialists to the workers was the vision of a softer and more abundant life. But poverty has not been abolished; it has simply been distributed. A small minority have been benefited a little; the great majority have been greviously brought down.

John Strachey, Minister of Food, boasted that the British people "are getting enough money to buy all the food they ought to have." Here is the permitted ration: 1 egg and a half a week, 2 ounces of butter, 6 ounces of margarine, 1 ounce of lard, 1 ounce of cheese, 1 ounce of bacon, 8 ounces of sugar, 6 ounces of meat, 2 ounces of corned beef. This is Socialist abundance 4 years after the war ended.

The Socialists' great boast concerns the social services they provide from the cradle to the grave. These begin before birth with prenatal care and cover medical care, hospitalization, old-age retirement payments, unemployment insurance, allowances for widows and for families in need. The allowances, however, are meager. But thin as they are, these social services, along with the losses on the nationalized industries and the cost of the bulging bureaucracy, are wrecking Britain's enervated economic structure.

Workers were led to believe that socialism would end wage slavery. But in fact the worker has now merely exchanged the old boss for a new one—a bureaucrat. The old boss might have been a tough fellow, but he usually was also a fairly decent human being. The boss now is a cold, impersonal, remote bureau.

No decision can be made on the job without an immense amount of paper work that begins at the local office and moves snail-like through various local boards, subcouncils, regional boards, and other bureaucratic nests up to London, and finally back through the same succession of petty bureaus.

Added to all this are the controls which are worse than they were during the war. Regulations and amended regulations pour from the presses daily so voluminously that neither shopkeeper nor housewife can keep up with them. There were 30,000 prosecutions for infractions of the regulations in a single year.

The Socialist leaders declared fervently they would never interfere with the right of British workingmen to choose their occupations. But adequate supplies of labor and full effort by workmen have not been forthcoming in the industries the government wishes to stimulate, so the government had to enact a law which says that no man between the ages of 18 and 50, or woman between the ages of 18 and 40, can change occupations at will. The Minister of Labor has the power to direct workers to the employment he considers best for the national interest. This power has been exercised upon occasion, and men have been put in jail for resisting it.

This ruthlessness extends to the farm. Over the farmer's head hangs a threat perhaps more serious than that applied to the industrial worker. Farmers are paid large subsidies to produce what the government wants them to raise, but there is a regular inspection of every farm and a record kept of its produce. If the farmer falls short of what is expected of him the government can put a price upon his property, pay him for it, and put him off the farm, which then passes into the hands of a government manager.

The British Socialist planners who have done these things are not wicked men; they simply believe they know how to run the economy of an entire nation. They have now discovered that this cannot be done without applying compulsions to labor and farmers as well as to owners of industries.

One of the curses of this system is that nothing is called by an honest name. Words are used to deceive. Hateful practices, abhorred for ages by a free people, are now identified by luminous words, while praiseworthy practices are ticketed with odious names. The man who works in a privately owned factory is a wage slave. Socialism itself is never called socialism—it is national planning. Thrift is a vice until the Government asks you to save and lend it money; then it becomes a virtue.

Socialists say that the most diabolical crime against society is profit. Private industry runs at a profit and uses that profit to expand its producing capacity. Government industry runs at a loss and taxes the substance of the people to pay for its inefficiencies. Which is the greater crime against society?

The British Socialists have been destroying freedom. This was inevitable. Years ago it was prophesied that the Socialist state, uniting the functions of political ruler, landlord and employer of the population, would result in tyranny. This is what happened in Russia.

Today the British Socialist, faced with the problem of compelling citizens to comply with his plans, has turned to compulsions. The Government has plenty of machinery for this, since it now possesses credit, electric power, transportation, and fuel—without which no man can operate a business—and can grant or withhold these.

The citizen's right to spend his income as he chooses is almost permanently abolished, since the government takes so much of it in taxes that most people have only enough left to cover the bare necessities of life.

It would be possible to fill a book with accounts, amusing and terrifying, of the blunders of men who assume that they know how to plan the economy of an entire nation. In 1947 Emanuel Shinwell, then Minister of Fuel and Power, ordered all electricity used for power shut off in the extensive industrial areas of London and the Midlands. This shut down 75 percent of British industry. The reason given was the shortage of coal. It would last, said the Minister, only 2 or 3 days. But it actually lasted 3 weeks, threw 2,000,000 people out of work and lost over $800,000,000 in desperately needed export trade.

Many predictions of the coal shortage had been made public. Why was no provision made against it by the Minister?

In 1946 Shinwell had foreseen there would be a coal shortage that year, so he suggested to Alfred Barnes, Minister of Transport, that 1,200 locomotives be converted to oil to effect a saving in coal. (Oil, being imported, is far more expensive than coal, and if 1,200 locomotives had been converted this policy would have cost about $16,000,000 a year more for fuel.)

Barnes converted 93 locomotives to oil at a cost of $6,000,000. Then he inquired about getting oil—and discovered there was none to be had for this purpose. The British Transport Commission reversed the plan. Barnes and Shinwell now had on their hands 93 locomotives for which there was no oil, so the 93 were converted back to coal.

In January 1947 the great housing plan was proclaimed: the Government would build 250,000 houses that year. Brick, cement, plumbing, nails, plaster, and other materials were ordered, and factories went to work to produce them. All this was well along when it was discovered that lumber could not be supplied for more than 60,000 houses, and that there was not nearly enough labor for the program. In the meantime, all the other materials were being furiously produced; mountains of bricks lay in brickyards, innumerable materials were piling up.

The great plan fell short by 190,000 houses.

These are just a few samples. We can match such blunders among our American planners. When they occur, the critics point to the stupidity of the planners. But the fault lies rather in the fact that no one man or small group of men, no matter how brilliant, can ever hope to comprehend the vast amount of data and the innumerable conditions which would have to be grasped in order to make effective plans for a large industrial nation. It simply cannot be done.

In taking over the railroads, the coal industry and others, the Socialists bought the properties outright from the corporations and stockholders who owned them. They paid for them with British bonds paying 3 percent interest. With each new industry it takes over, the Government adds another heavy obligation to its already crushing national debt. The folly of this lies in the fact that under the old order the stockholders had no claim for any return on their investment if the industry made no profit. But these bonds are now a fixed charge upon the Government, and it must pay interest on them whether the industry makes a profit or not.

England is being taxed to death. For instance, a clerk with an income of $2,800 a year gets one deduction of $560, an additional deduction of $720 for his wife, and $480 for his two children. Total deductions: $1,760. This leaves $1,040 of his income subject to visible taxation.

On the first $200 he pays 15 percent	$30
On the next $800 he pays 30 percent	240
On the next $40 he pays 45 percent	18
Total tax	288

A man with the same family and salary in the United States would pay $26 in visible taxes.

If a worker goes to the pub for a glass of beer to forget his troubles, he pays a tax of 16 cents on the pint. Half of the 60 cents paid for a ticket to a movie goes to the Government.

The dark realities of the condition created by this floundering Socialist regime have

brought more than one Socialist up with a jerk. Alfred Edwards, formerly a Socialist member of Parliament, declared: "I have spent years discoursing on the defects of the capitalist system. But we have seen the two systems side by side. The man who would still argue for socialism as the means of ridding our society of the defects of capitalism is blind indeed. Socialism just does not work." (Naturally he was promptly expelled from the party.)

In 1949 Lord Milverton, Labor whip in the House of Lords, renounced his party affiliation during the debate on steel. In a speech on the floor he declared, to quote the London Times, that "he had certain ideals and had thought the Labor Party could deliver the goods. He was now appalled at the type of goods which were being delivered. He thought he was participating in a crusade but found himself a camp-follower in a rake's progress. The road on which they were traveling led to a precipice at the foot of which clearly emerged the totalitarian state."

This is the system of socialism we in the United States are being asked to imitate.

We have seen what socialism means in Britain and the plan by which it was brought into effect and the consequences visited upon the British people. Do we have in America any movement comparable to the Fabian Socialist movement in Britain? And if so, what is it doing, how is it progressing and what are its chances of success here?

The answer is that we have precisely such a movement here; that it is making rapid strides; and that, unless it is soon arrested, nothing can prevent its extension here on the British model.

Do not confuse the present Socialist movement in America with what we have known for so long as the Socialist Party. This party has reached a low estate in numbers and in growth. I am referring to an entirely different movement led by entirely different men and under wholly different banners.

There are some persons who brand as socialism almost any intervention by the state into the economic system. Many imagine that socialism means confiscation by the state of the whole economic apparatus of the Nation. These concepts are incorrect.

As we have seen in Britain, modern socialism means the assumption by the state of the responsibility and authority for the control of the entire economic system. This does not mean that the state will take over every farm, mine, shop and factory. It will operate the great basic functions of credit, power, fuel, transportation and insurance. The rest of the economic system may be kept in private hands but must be operated according to plans made by the state and carried out under the supervision and compulsions of government bureaus.

This is the type of socialism with which America is now threatened. And just as it fastened itself on Britain by a movement that avoided calling itself Socialist, so it is being promoted in America by persons and organizations, that never use the word socialism. They call their system the planned economy. What that cunning label means is precisely the same thing that is now in operation in Britain.

The advocates of planning believe that the economic system must cease to be a free system and that the state, which under our system was forbidden to intervene in the management of industry, should be established as the master of industry with the power to make the plans for the whole economic system.

Who are these mysterious American Fabians? What is their organization and who are their leaders?

The crash of 1933 and the inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt brought into Washington swarms of men and women with blueprints for the reconstruction of civilization upon every conceivable model. Such a miscellaneous menagerie of social philosophers had never before been gathered together.

Because of the presence in positions of power of men like Wallace, Frankfurter, and Tugwell, streams of out-of-work or low-salaried Socialist professors and instructors, young lawyers, and economists flowed into nearly all the bureaus in Washington. As the bureaus increased in number, fresh hordes of Socialist doctrinaires, ranging from dark-red revolutionaries to mild-mannered pink reformers, multiplied in the Government. In time, the left-wingers floated to the top.

The crack-up of 1938 and the rise in unemployment created the opportunity for a new type of radical who called himself an economic planner. This new form of hooded socialism gained immense ground. A man could espouse it without confessing himself a Socialist. Actually a great many of the men who were arguing for the planned economy declared their purpose was to save capitalism.

The theory of economic planning which Stuart Chase, George Soule, and others had been preaching for years rose into respectability. This philosophy, newly equipped with glorious spending theories and magical proposals for practically endless Government borrowing, brought the school of planning into official favor.

The first attempt to provide this idea with an organized propaganda machine was the formation of the CIO Political Action Committee by labor leader Sidney Hillman in the 1944 presidential campaign. In this committee Socialists of every description—planners and Communists by the thousands—were collected together. To reach various elements outside of labor Hillman formed the National Citizens Political Action Committee. Intellectuals were formed into the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, which included professors, writers, dramatists, actors, movie stars, lawyers, doctors, and editors.

The Americans for Democratic Action was formed in January 1947. This organization has now become the spearhead and the central planning and propaganda machine of the national Socialist economic planners in this country. The basis of their program is in their statement of policy on March 2, 1948. It states that there are areas of the economy which cannot be controlled while in private hands. These may be dealt with in two ways. One is to have them taken over by cooperatives operating under one of the Government agencies—the Rural Electrification Administration, for instance. The other is complete public ownership. The rest of the economic system they will subject to national economic planning.

They propose first a vigorous use of the power to tax and spend, in order to shape and control the economic system. They advocate what they call "balanced production targets for the whole economy," and say there must be "price, allocation, inventory, and credit controls." Those and other trade phrases are actually a costume of words for socialism. What the planners intend to bring here is precisely what the Fabians brought to England.

Americans for Democratic Action have brought together many of the most powerful figures in the three great labor groups; there, too, will be found most of the old New Deal planners.

The ADA announces that it "is not a political party," that "it works through established parties," and that "its tools are education and political action." It declares its intention of "telling the people the facts and what they can do about them; working in party primaries to nominate liberal candidates; campaigning for their election." It has spread through 48 States, with over 75 full-fledged chapters and 100 student groups.

Of course, it will offer, as in England, personal benefits to various groups. At the moment it is putting its power behind a very important drive: socialized medicine. But it will never use the word socialism. That word will not emerge until the country is carried so far along the road that it can no longer be disguised from even the most ignorant.

At every stage of this subject the Communist issue arises to confuse us. The Communist Party in the United States is a political organization, but is not a party in the sense in which we understand that term. It is a secret, conspiratorial brotherhood, engaged in wrecking the American system as a prelude to making this country into a Socialist nation. (It is also the agent of a foreign power in carrying out the objectives of the Russian Government in this country, and to this extent it is organized treason.)

In a left-wing gathering it would be difficult to determine whether a given person is a Communist or a Socialist. They all believe that the capitalist system must go. They are agreed that socialism in one form or another we must have, and on this plane all of them—Communists and Socialist planners—must be grouped together as enemies of our traditional American system.

Communist Party members favor anything which will tend to wreck our private-enterprise system. For instance, they know that nothing will wreck it more quickly and more surely than extravagant spending and the accumulation of public debt. They are, therefore, for any program that will pile new tons of debt on the Nation. Our less-intelligent Socialist reformers, who know little about economics and despise its lessons, support public spending because the effects are immediately pleasant and because they have been persuaded by a new school of so-called economists that it is a sound policy.

The Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities has compiled a list of 1,180 organizations and movements brought into existence by the American Communist Party to promote all sorts of seemingly laudable social objectives. Until the war ended, you would find in these "front" organizations the names of most of those men and women who have been prominent in Socialist activities.

My point is that there is no need to make a fine point of the distinction between Communists and Socialist planners. They have been good soldiers together, marching in the cause of wrecking the American capitalist society in favor of socialism. They have penetrated labor unions, professional groups, teacher organizations, political bodies, religious bodies, racial groups. They are doing a job together upon the minds of the American people, creating in us a mood of frustration and despair about our traditional way of life. They paint a vicious picture of America which makes this country seem rotten with poverty and injustice. They proclaim that there is no prospect before us except to follow the "democracies" of Europe and throw ourselves into the arms of the planners.

Since the war ended and the terrible truth about Communist Russia has been revealed, it has become the fashion to be anti-Communist. But behind that anti-Communist label you can be a Socialist planner. As we look around for the real enemy who must be kept constantly in sight and kept ruthlessly out of positions of power where he can do his work of destruction, we need be in no doubt about that enemy. He is the Socialist planner.

In 1936 John L. Lewis, Sidney Hillman and David Dubinsky, in a deal with President Roosevelt, put their unions and the CIO

into politics and gave Roosevelt $500,000 for his campaign fund in return for certain pledges from him.[1] One of the byproducts of this deal was the delivery of the unions into the hands of the radical labor politicians, who wanted control of the officers, funds, and educational machinery of the unions. This propaganda apparatus they proceeded to use upon their own members.

They have brought to bear upon the minds of the rank and file vicious propaganda pressure for all sorts of blessings which are to come from a benevolent Government—guaranties of perpetual employment, endless prosperity, and Government responsibility for the welfare of every worker. These are what might be called the first steps in a Socialist program, after which follow such things as socialized medicine and endless Government spending to provide employment at constantly rising wages and prices.

The immense, powerful, well-financed propaganda apparatus of the unions is now at the service of the Socialist planner.

The Democratic Party is at the Socialist planners' mercy in precisely the way the British Liberal Party became the prisoner of the British Labor Party. Through third parties in New York State the Socialist planners have the margin of votes which can spell victory or defeat for the Democrats; therefore, that party must subscribe to their demands. The next problem is to crack the Democratic South, and the planners now have elaborate plans for this job. Meantime, they propagandize through the schools, the press, the theater, the movies, and strangest of all, through the churches.

I have tried to make it clear that our American system is being destroyed by groups united in the design of turning this country into a Socialist system on the British model. The Communist would like to ruin the American system by clubbing it over the head. The Socialist planner does it by slow poison. Both types of assassin are at work here now, but the latter is by far the more dangerous. And their campaign is succeeding.

Just how far have the planners advanced their program for socializing this country?

For one thing, our Government now has almost as large a control over our private banking system as England has over its banks. It has not yet the power to decide what types of loans may be made to private industry, but is geared now to assume that power with only a slight alteration in the set-up. It would then possess the power of life and death over every industry.

The Government itself has moved into the business of banking, including money lending, upon an astonishing scale, through a large number of major lending agencies whose loans and investments total $6,575,000,000, while the private banking system is at the Government's mercy because the Government is now the bank's biggest borrower and most powerful customer.

Next to credit, the most important key economic weapon is electric power. Our Federal Government's authority to engage in flood and navigation control has been seized on as a pretext for engaging in the manufacture of electrical power. The public has little conception of the extent to which our Government has penetrated that industry.

Up to now the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) has been the largest entry into that field. But President Truman has sent to Congress a demand for an extensive project on the Columbia River which would embrace river systems draining Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and western Montana. There are 16 other similar power projects. This is just the beginning of a program which is intended to cover America, take the power industry out of private hands and put it into the hands of the Government.

While Government power systems are to a great degree free of taxes and of interest charges on investment, amounting to countless millions a year, and are permitted bookkeeping practices which would land a private utility official in jail, the privately owned power companies are weighed down by every form of Government shackles. Private power systems must run at a profit or die. The Federal power systems run at losses while loudly claiming fictitious profits.

The Socialist planners believe they have the private power systems on the run. The total capacity of the private systems now is 45,000,000 kilowatts. Present Government plans call for Government plants generating 41,000,000 kilowatts. It is all being done in the name of reclamation and flood control. Little will be said about power, but the drive is to socialize the power industry.

Another project now heavily pressed by the Socialist planners is socialized medicine. It is called health insurance. The plan, which ostensibly came from Oscar R. Ewing, head of the Federal Security Agency, calls for an increase, with Federal aid, of the number of hospitals, doctors and nurses, and dentists, along with what he calls compulsory health insurance. This plan is similar to Britain's. Under it, all employers and their employees would be taxed at the pay-roll window for medical care.

The proponents of this scheme had the effrontery to call it free medical care. Of course it is not. It will be paid for by taxes from everyone's pocket.

It is important to remember that, while each of these proposals—Federal invasion of banking, Federal invasion of electrical power and socialized medicine—is promoted as if it were just a single reform unrelated to all the others, the fact is that each is intended to liquidate some sector of the private-enterprise system and expand the area of socialism.

The President has announced his wish to have authority from Congress to build additional steel mills because he believed the private steel industry was not producing enough steel. He was egged on to this by his Socialist labor-leader supporters, who are eager for the Government to get started on this course.

Congressman BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky, has proposed a law called the Spence Act which would authorize the Government to use vast powers under certain conditions. These powers are stated in such broad terms that the President can use them whenever it suits his purposes, and under the plan he is to be the sole judge of whether or not the conditions exist.

If this act becomes law the President can decide how much ought to be produced of any essential commodity, and make up a national production budget which industry will be directed to meet under Government plans and compulsions. He can order new factories constructed. He may set up priorities and allocations of materials.

Manufacturers would have to get permission to buy materials, and a bureau would decide in what order and in what quantity each would get it. Here is the power of life and death over industrial enterprise. He can establish maximum prices on materials or facilities. Here is the beginning of the end of the price system without which a private-enterprise economy cannot possibly exist. And he may make such inspection of the books, records, and premises or property of any person and make such investigations as may be necessary to the enforcement or administration of this act. Here is the power of seizure and search upon a hitherto unimagined scale.

This is the planned economy so far as industry is concerned. If this law were enacted, our country would be further along the road to the Socialist-planned economy than Britain was 3 years ago.

What appears in this Spence Act, of course, is only one part of the scheme. Another Federal administration approach to the planned economy is the Brannan plan, sponsored by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan.

The Government has been pegging prices of some crops to provide high prices for farmers, but the harassed housewife has been crying out in anguish. To meet this situation the Government has invented an incredible scheme.

There would be no more Government pegging of farm prices. The farmer is to sell his produce in the open market at whatever prices he can get. This gives the housewife the benefit of a low price. The other prong of the scheme is to give the farmer his same old high prices by a subterfuge. A price level for produce will be fixed; then the Government will pay the farmer the difference between the price at which he sells his crop and the price which the Government guarantees him.

For instance, if the guaranteed price on his crop were fixed at $2,000 and it brought in the open market only $1,500, the Government would pay him the remaining $500. The farmer would thus be paid for one part of his crop by the consumer and for the other part by the Government. But, of course, the consumer would really pay it all, and the part paid indirectly to the farmer through the Government in taxes would bear the additional charge of the salaries of bureaucrats needed to run this show.

Secretary Brannan has thus far refused to estimate the cost of his scheme, but others have indicated it might run from five to ten billion dollars a year in additional taxes.

From these Spence and Brannan proposals we may form a picture of the society into which we are being tempted by the bait of Government planning and spending. These are not schemes which may at some distant day appear as a program of government. They are the program of the present Government, and have been announced as such.

From it all emerges the spectacle of a society in which the Government makes itself responsible for the security of every citizen from the cradle to the grave, and for the operation of the entire machinery of business and farming. The ultimate aim, of course, is to control banks, transportation, power, coal, iron and steel, and the entire business of insurance. The rest of the system will be operated by private owners, following plans made by the Government under broad powers and a multitude of planning and enforcement bureaus. This corresponds in every essential respect to the system which is now wrecking Great Britain. And this is what we will have here if the men now in power in our Government are permitted to have their way.

This, then, is the road we are traveling. It is the road to socialism. And we will continue to travel it until Americans realize this and take vigorous measures to halt the journey and to reverse it.

One of the first things those opposed to this socialistic program must do is to rid themselves of the moral intimidation which

[1] In his new book, John L. Lewis, An Unauthorized Biography, Saul Alinsky quotes Mr. Lewis as saying this to him personally:

"The United Mine Workers and the CIO paid cash on the barrel for every piece of legislation we have gotten. It is common knowledge that we spent approximately three quarters of a million dollars in the 1936 campaign. And you might be interested to know that the $500,000 direct contribution wasn't my price but was the figure named by the White House, and I was given approximately 48 hours to get that money."

has been imposed on their minds. In the debate around this problem, the American system has been painted as something wicked, bungling, even brutal, while the planned new world of the future will be filled with sweetness, light, and plenty. The very word "profit" has been endowed with the most sinister implications.

But it is not a choice between a perfect system called socialism and an imperfect system called capitalism. It is a choice between two human systems both of which will inevitably have their imperfections because they are human. But the Socialist planners do not concede this. Capitalism they present to us only in terms of its defects. But socialism is painted only in terms of the wonderful things it is going to do someday.

But we do not have to rely on the promises any longer. Socialism in various forms has had plenty of trial. Russia is a Socialist country, though the Socialists would like to escape that fact. The old Socialists who first lifted the torch in Russia talked of the perfect day of the free life which they would bring. No one arraigned tyranny more vigorously than Lenin. But when they set their ideal into motion it rushed along to its inevitable end—tyranny, the most terrible tyranny in history.

The old Socialists, with their luminous dreams, got power in Germany after World War I and operated a society not greatly different from that now in effect in England—partially nationalized and partially planned. It ended in fascism and Hitler, for the line between fascism and Fabian socialism is very thin. Fabian socialism is the dream. Fascism is socialism plus the inevitable dictator.

In Italy, Socialists of various schools dominated the political life with the same results as in Germany, and that, too, ended in fascism and Mussolini.

Now Britain makes the experiment, blown-up with promises of freedom. But already she has got around to the ways of the tyrant. She asserts over the worker the right to say where he shall or shall not work. She asserts the right to throw the farmer who does not meet her directives off his farm. And this British experiment would collapse tomorrow if the strong arm of American capitalism were withdrawn from its support. Indeed it is collapsing now even with that powerful arm around it.

On the other hand, the greatest and most efficient producing machine in the world is in this country. This did not happen by accident. It is the result of the soil of freedom in which it grew.

The road we are traveling is sufficiently clear. We cannot delude ourselves with the expectation that we may go a little way further and then stop in the belief that we can combine socialism and capitalism and preserve the best features of each. The very first hard and cold fact we must face is that these two systems cannot live together in the same society.

If we keep on the way we are going, nothing can save the capitalist sector of our economy from extinction, because it will inevitably be called upon to pay the cost of operating its own sector and the greater portion, if not all, of the cost of operating the Socialist sector. In the United States the few Government-operated industries we have are operated at a loss. Private industry must produce the income out of which the losses of these Government industries are paid, and the attendant costs of Government as well.

We must arrest the course of the social disease that is destroying us and set our hands to the hard task of lifting up and revivifying our shattered system of free enterprise. If we do not, we shall go on stumbling down the path along which Europe has slipped.

It is not possible to lay down a program in detail for checking and reversing our direction. And it is not necessary. What is necessary is to see clearly the general principles which must govern our effort. These I shall now attempt to enumerate as briefly as possible.

We must put human freedom as the first of our demands. There can be no security in a nation without freedom. Let us work to make our country a more bountiful home for all to live in, but the first and indispensable test of every plan must be whether it will impair our freedom. A better life for all, yes—but not at the expense of our liberties.

We must stop apologizing for our capitalist society. It has made us strong, and has provided us the highest standard of living in world history.

Not one more step into socialism. There is, of course, much to be done to repair all the damage already done to our system by the advocates of socialistic measures, but the first militant maneuver must be to hold the line for the American way.

Get rid of compromising leaders. Let us put a mark upon every man in public life who is willing to surrender further.

We must recognize that we are in a social war, and that we must fight it as such. Our enemies have managed to capture many of the instrumentalities of the classroom, the platform, the pulpit, the movies, and the radio upon an amazing scale, and to use them not for their traditional purposes but to carry on an attack upon the minds of the American people.

We must put an end to the orgy of spending that is rapidly bankrupting the Nation. Among the most critical conditions that menace us are the fantastic commitments for spending countless billions and the crushing weight of our national debt upon our economic system. From July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949—President Truman's years in power—he spent $184,000,000,000. This is $30,000,000,000 more than was spent by this Government in all the 147 years of its existence from George Washington to the end of Franklin D. Roosevelt's first administration. We must not permit one more cent for any purpose beyond our present commitments.

We must stop planning for socialism and begin planning to make our free system of private enterprise operate at its fullest capacity. Since 1933 the Government has waged relentless war upon the capitalist system, at first ignorantly, but recently with a definite design to cripple and destroy it. The man who runs a business has been pilloried as a criminal, and the Government has taken measures to prevent him from accumulating those savings which make expansion possible. It has held him up to public scorn and hatred. It has taxed away his savings, and it has so choked the streams through which savings flow into investment that our system is wilting away.

Our system is in an appaling mess now, what with the public debt, the confiscatory taxes which draw the blood from its very veins, Government intrusions, and the threats of ultimate extinction that are taking ever more terrifying shape. The task calls for patriotism and courage; it must not be delayed another day.

We must set about rebuilding in its integrity our republican system of government. We cannot depend on any political party to save us. We must build a mass organization outside the parties so powerful that all parties will be compelled to yield to its demands. Our forefathers gave to the world the sublime example of statesmen who cast off the tyrant state and built up the sovereign people, unleashing the energies of free men. It was this historic experiment which set off the astonishing surge of human energy that created here such abundance and freedom as the world has never known.

The task before us is clear. For our principles of action we must go back to our Constitution, to our Declaration of Independence, to our history and to the example set by our national fathers. We must begin now to dismantle the tyrant state in America and to build up once again the energies of a free people.

Address of Hon. Knox T. Hutchinson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Knox T. Hutchinson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, a Tennessee farmer, made at a luncheon meeting in Minneapolis, Minn., today.

I am particularly happy to have the opportunity to submit this talk through the courtesy of Mr. Hutchinson and Representative PAT SUTTON, of Tennessee. This talk in my home city, which I am honored to represent in Congress, brings to mind that my constituency is composed partly of five rural counties made up of agriculture and agricultural communities, and Minneapolis made up largely of industrial workers.

These people are the very heart of America and it is for them that the program laid down by Mr. Hutchinson is timely.

The address is as follows:

LET'S TALK FACTS

I feel honored, indeed, to have a part in this program.

The influence of the Farm Forum has widened year by year until it is now a most valuable source of information and mutual understanding. I congratulate the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce and all the other organizations and individuals responsible for setting up this annual event and keeping it going.

It's a healthy thing when representatives of the important branches of our economy get together, talk together, and arrive at a better appreciation of the fact that the only way we can go forward is to go forward together. So I appreciate this opportunity to come out here to talk facts about agriculture.

And I'm going to do just that—talk facts.

It seems to me that this year's meeting is of special moment. Highly desirable as fact-facing is at all times, it becomes absolutely vital in such a situation as we now face.

Can anyone look with complacency upon the world today?

Was there ever greater need for world peace than now?

We have seen what block-buster bombs can do. We have had a glimpse of what primitive atom bombs can destroy. But we can only imagine the horrors that might accompany the unleashing of the H-bomb.

Was there ever greater need for national prosperity than now?

We have seen what depression can do. We have seen how depression can focus our eyes upon ourselves and make us blind to growing

dangers from abroad. But we can only imagine the cost and chaos and the threat to our very civilization that might follow from depression now.

The recent course of world history reminds me of those tube-shaped toys that one can look into and see a pattern of colored glass; and whenever you turn the tube the glass pieces at the bottom are rearranged and form a new pattern.

Throughout human history the world has been like one of those tubes. But whereas in other ages the tube of world events turned slowly, now it spins rapidly—and always more rapidly.

It took human ingenuity all the ages of man's existence until about three-quarters of a century ago to make an electric light; now there are billions of them.

It took all the ages of human existence until 57 years ago to make an auto; last year this Nation alone produced them by the millions.

It took all the ages of existence until 1903 to make and fly a mechanical airplane; now scientists make plans concerning flying by rocket to the moon.

Never have the processes of change been as breath-taking quick as now.

How long has man inhabited the earth? The most conservative estimate says thousands of years. Others say millions. Whether the answer is actually thousands or millions, in all the history of his existence until this past century the top speed at which man could travel was no faster than a horse could gallop—something less than 40 miles an hour even for a Man o' War. There was safety in distance in those days.

But in less than one century man has stepped up his speed of movement to 500, 600, 700 miles an hour—faster even than sound itself. There is no longer safety in distance. That is one reason for the emergency today.

Change! It is rapid change that creates emergencies—and the world is changing now as never before. We are more interdependent now than ever before. We are less able to live our own lives or mind our own businesses. We are all tied together by the complexity of modern life—and that is why this kind of meeting with the understanding of our mutual interdependence that it promotes is so immensely valuable.

We cannot face the future with confidence unless we understand the issues and are prepared to make the continual adjustments demanded by the fantastic pace of world change.

Other nations have looked to our democracy with faith in our ability to meet our changing international responsibilities and to solve our changing domestic problems. We dare not permit that faith to be uprooted.

The old idea that there's plenty of time to make adjustments tomorrow contains the germ of our own destruction.

Tomorrow might not be time enough to do all that needs to be done to preserve our national strength.

That is why the Secretary of Agriculture has been doing his best to impress upon the people our grave need for an improved farm program—not tomorrow but now.

That is the real reason I am here today.

To face the future we need a strong economy. But we cannot have a strong economy without a strong agriculture. Our farms supply the basic raw materials for industries that produce one-third of all our manufactured products. Roughly half the money the American people spend for commodities and services goes for products that originate on farms. And approximately two out of five working persons in the United States are employed either in agriculture, or in handling and selling agricultural products, or in producing and selling goods and services to farm people. Again and again the economic history of our Nation demonstrates the importance of farmer buying power to national prosperity.

To face the future we must be a strong people. But we shall not be a strong people without a strong agriculture. The health and vigor of any people depend largely upon an adequate well-balanced diet. In the 1930's when agriculture was weak and our whole economy was struggling out of depression, it was estimated that only one city family in four had a good diet. Many of the American people were existing on a bread and potato diet. They could not afford enough meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables. And farmers couldn't afford to produce enough of these foods.

The Nation paid for that in the number of young men rejected for military service. It paid in absenteeism and lessened efficiency in the factories and mines.

In recent years diets have improved greatly. As the people found more food money in their pockets, they could afford to buy more meat, milk, and other protective foods. And farmers could afford to produce more of these foods—and they did.

To face the future we need a strong defense. But in the long run we cannot have a stronge defense without a strong agriculture. This is more than ever true in an age wherein wars are waged and won by the nation with the better machinery.

If a strong agriculture is so vital to our economy, our defense, and the health and vigor of our people, we should be foolish indeed if we did not ask ourselves: What is the condition of our agriculture? Wherein is it strong, and wherein weak?

American agriculture is stronger than ever before in its ability to produce.

A century and a quarter ago, one person engaged in farming was able to provide for himself and three and a half other persons. Today the person engaged in agriculture provides, on the average, for himself and 13½ other persons. That's a long-range measure of our agricultural progress.

But we have ample evidence of increasing farm productivity in the short range, also. In the past 10 years, American farmers have set six new all-time production records. In 1948, despite some 9 percent fewer farm workers, our agriculture turned out about 40 percent more food and fiber than before the war. Last year, the all-time record of 1948 was equalled.

We have profited immensely by long years of research. Hybrid seed, improved varieties, electric power, and tractors and other equipment have made it possible for farmers to take advantage of a break in bad weather to put in and harvest big crops where 15 years ago crop failures would have resulted.

Pest-control chemicals—DDT and 2,4-D for example—and the increased use of fertilizer have remarkably stepped up yields of some crops.

Improved methods of breeding and feeding livestock, better soil management, and the ever-widening use of machines and electric power have given farmers a new control over production.

Many agricultural scientists say that we are only at the beginning of progress, and that, in the field of hybrid vigor, for example, we have only penetrated the fringe of things to come.

Obviously, then, so far as ability to produce for the needs of our people and our economy is concerned, agriculture is strong and healthy. I cite that as a plain fact.

In a free economy, however, ability to produce is not enough. Farmers have to be able to market what they produce, or eventually they will find themselves burning their corn for fuel as they did in 1932.

Farm capacity to produce is outrunning population. Production is up 40 percent since prewar, but population has increased approximately 15 percent.

For a time, it appeared that the gap would be made up by increased per capita consumption. In 1946 our people consumed 19 percent more food per person than they had in 1935–39. But consumption has fallen off since 1946 and last year it was only 11 percent above the prewar average.

Partly as the result of this decline in per capita consumption, farmers are running into sharp price and income difficulties. Feed grains and hay have dropped almost one-half; food grains and meat animals about a third. Prices received by farmers have dropped nearly 25 percent from their postwar peak. The prices farmers pay, however, have come down only 5 percent.

Even though agriculture is producing at a record level, farm net income has been greatly lowered by falling farm prices. In 1947, farm net income totaled nearly $18,000,000,000. This year it may fall below twelve billion—a drop of one-third in 3 years.

Economically, therefore, agriculture is extremely vulnerable. I cite that as another plain fact.

We must all realize that farming is unlike most other industries. Some people try to compare agriculture with the auto industry, or the steel industry, and they cannot see why farmers are unable to protect themselves against economic pressure as many businessmen are able to do.

But even if farmers could adjust their production and prices with their eyes on the largest possible amount of profits, would the people want them to do so? Could we, under these circumstances, depend upon abundant production of food and fiber—when the events of our economic history plainly show that farmers get a considerably better return from producing a little less than enough to meet demand than they do for producing a little more than enough?

Do we want to take a chance on too little food? Suppose farmers had been able to cut back their production to 12 percent of capacity as the steel industry did in the early thirties? Suppose farmers in 1932 had cut their output down to about one-quarter of the 1929 level—as auto manufacturers did when they reduced the number of cars produced from about 5,500,000 in 1929 to less than 1,500,000 in 1932? We can get along for quite a while on old steel and old cars—but we can't get very far without a continual supply of food.

In actual fact, the individual farmer has almost no control over the price of his products. He competes for a market against nearly six million other farmers. He cannot by himself adjust production to demand, because his production is a drop in the bucket. Moreover, once his crop is in, how big it will be depends upon the rain and the sun—so that he cannot even control his own production. He sells in the market for what he can get—unless he has the backing of some kind of national farm program to give him a little of the protection and freedom of choice that other business people are able to provide for themselves because of the control they exercise over output and prices.

If agriculture is to achieve economic stability, it requires an effective national farm program. I cite that as another fact.

In much of the agricultural legislation that has been enacted in the past two decades you will find this basic idea that programs are needed to make agriculture economically more stable.

This was a basic element in the agricultural adjustment programs of 1933 and after.

It was basic in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

It was a reason for the Steagall amendment which guaranteed price supports on many farm commodities during the war and for a period afterwards.

I believe it is fairly obvious now that the American people have accepted the philosophy that if agriculture produces abundantly for the needs of the Nation, farmers should not be left completely to the mercy of the market place.

Agriculture deserves—and the Nation needs—a farm program. Most of us agree on that. The question is: What kind of farm program will best serve farmers and all our people?

For almost a year this question has been hotly debated. The debate began when Secretary Brannan, at the request of Congress, presented to the agriculture committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, certain recommendations for improving the national farm price support structure.

Nothing in recent years that has been proposed for agriculture has created so much discussion—and I might add, so much heat.

What did the Secretary propose that caused all this furore?

Some new and radical departure from traditional American procedure? No, there is nothing new in his recommendations. They are on the contrary, the logical development of the price support programs that began in the thirties. He sought only to apply farm price supports to the needs of producers and consumers in our present postwar economy.

There are four principal points in the proposals which Secretary Brannan recommended on behalf of the administration.

1. We start from the premise that farm buying power must be maintained at a reasonable level or the entire economy will suffer. We seek as an objective such prices as will return to farmers as much buying power as they had in a recent, movable 10-year period.

2. Instead of supporting the prices of only the so-called basic commodities—cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, peanuts, and rice which bring in only about one-fourth of all farm income—we would support (besides cotton, corn, wheat, and tobacco) milk, eggs, chickens, beef cattle, hogs, and lambs. This would provide support on about three-quarters of all farm income.

3. To present methods of support, which work well for storable crops, we would add the method of direct payments to producers when supporting such nonstorable crops as milk, meat, and poultry products. Instead of keeping the prices of perishables at an artificially high level through Government purchases, we would let perishables seek a supply-and-demand price. Consumers would then have the benefit of the entire supplies of meat, milk, and poultry products—and at a market price that would encourage consumption. Instead of buying nonstorable commodities and withdrawing them from the market—instead of being forced to get rid of these nonstorables in uneconomic ways as we are now doing with potatoes—we would use this purchase money to make payments directly to producers. The amount of the payment would be the difference between the average market price and the support level.

4. Price support would be subject to certain conditions. Wherever possible, observance of good land-use and conservation practices would be required. If supplies of a commodity made marketing quotas necessary, the support program for the commodity would depend upon acceptance of the quotas.

Finally, we feel that price supports should provide financial encouragement for operators of family-size farms, but not for the continued development of extremely large-scale, industrialized farming which concentrates farm land in fewer and fewer hands. Therefore it has been proposed that supports be limited to about that amount of production which is available for sale from our largest family farms.

Those are the proposals.

There is nothing new, nothing shocking, nothing without precedent in any one of them.

For many years farm leaders and farm organizations have claimed that they stand for a fair share of the national income for farmers.

Farmers surely do not have a fair share of the national income now. In 1948 the total per capita income of people on farms was only about 60 percent as large as the per capita income of nonfarm persons. In 1949 the per capita income of persons on farms—and this includes income from all sources, mind you—was only $763 per person, compared with $1,555, more than twice as much, for nonfarm persons.

If the 1949 trend of farm and nonfarm income continues, farm people this year will have less than $40 of income for every $100 that nonfarm persons have.

When we restrict our consideration to income from farm sources alone, the picture is even worse. Farmers and their families constitute nearly one-fifth of the population. This year it is estimated that their farm income may be less than one-fourteenth of the national income.

This is not a theory. This is the hard fact of what is now taking place under present price-support legislation.

I mentioned before that farm prices have already fallen to a point one-fourth below their postwar peak—and they are still going down. Prices of feed grains and hay are down 47 percent. Farm net income this year is expected to be about one-third below the income of 3 years ago.

I repeat these facts because they show so clearly that present price-support legislation is not adequately supporting.

If we accept the objective of an equitable share of the national income for agriculture, let's be consistent when we come up against facts.

The administration takes the position that farmers are entitled to a fair return and that price supports are a positive mechanism to help them attain it. From the Secretary's viewpoint, price supports are not merely a system of protection against bankruptcy. They are not a stop-loss mechanism. We are not seeking merely to assure agriculture 60 or 75 percent of the parity price of a few commodities.

We are working toward a fair share of the national income for agriculture, because that is vital to the Nation in the emergency situation it faces today.

Let's see what kind of protection the present legislation provides. For some commodities the lower level of support is 60 percent of parity. For most commodities assured of support, the lower level would eventually become 75 percent of parity. But some of the most important commodities—meat and eggs, for example—are not assured of support at all.

Is 60 percent of parity adequate protection against unreasonable price declines? Is 75 percent adequate protection?

In 1932 all farm prices averaged 59 percent of parity, as it is figured today.

From 1930 to 1934, farm prices averaged 69 percent of parity—and as Secretary Brannan pointed out recently, three-fourths of a million farmers lost their farms. In 1939, farm prices averaged 80 percent of parity. And still every major farm organization in the country felt that 80 percent of parity was not enough.

Let's face the facts. The scale of support provided in the present legislation just does not do the job of protecting agriculture's right to a fair income.

In view of this obvious fact, why do some farm spokesmen cling so tenaciously to the present law? Why do they advance such emotional arguments against the administration's recommendations for improvement?

I want to say that it makes me more sad than angry when I see the cuttlefish approach that some of those who oppose the administration proposals are using.

It makes me wonder about their sincerity when I hear wild assertions that these proposals threaten the independence and integrity of the American farmer.

I have more confidence in the American farmer.

I know how jealous he is of his freedom, and I know also that he is far too intelligent to be fooled by this obvious smoke screen.

There is not one bit more regimentation asked or implied in the administration recommendations than is already existing in the present legislation—or than has been on the books for the past 12 years. That's another plain fact.

As for the squeamishness which some people profess about accepting a subsidy, what is this but another instance of the cuttlefish approach? Price supports under any guise are a subsidy. Let's face it. But is it wrong for the farmer to accept a price-support subsidy for producing the most essential product of all—food—and right for the manufacturer to accept the subsidy of a protective tariff—or the air-line company to accept the subsidy of a Government air-mail contract—or the publisher to accept the subsidy of postage concessions.

Let's have more honest argument and less appeal to the emotions.

We hear a great deal about the possible cost of the administration's proposals, and some critics let themselves be carried away by the fervor of their opposition. I read one estimate of costs the other day that would have the Government paying farmers some 15 percent more than the total gross income of American agriculture has ever been in its all-time peak year. According to this absurd estimate, farmers would not only give away for absolutely nothing all that they produce, but they would even pay nonfarmers for taking the agricultural produce off their hands.

But though we hear a great deal of nonsense about the possible cost of the administration's recommendations, we hear very little from the opposition about the cost of the present program. It seems to me that American citizens are paying a pretty penny now for something that satisfies neither farmers nor consumers. Our operations on 1949 potatoes alone may run to $80,000,000. The over-all cost of potato supports since the end of the war is approaching a half billion dollars. The American people have been paying artificial prices for the spuds they eat, and besides they've been paying tax dollars for the spuds fed to hogs or diverted to other uneconomic uses.

No wonder the people are getting fed up with such a senseless procedure.

The administration recommendations would actually lower the cost of supporting some commodities, and would also do a far better job of placing nonstorable commodities in the hands of consumers, where they are useful and where they belong.

On this question of cost, I should like to quote Secretary Brannan's recent statement. "By maintaining farm income at the level of average farm purchasing power in a recent 10-year period," the Secretary said, "we should be moving effectively to prevent the onset of depression. The 'stop-loss' and 'protection against unreasonable decline' theory on the other hand would leave us, I'm afraid, in the position of calling the fire department after the house had burned half way down. Which is cheaper: Fire prevention or fire-fighting?"

Although I have devoted much of my time to the price-support question, I want to make it plain that the administration's proposals are not regarded as a complete farm program. The main reason why the Secretary has hammered on this issue is that price and income considerations are the core—the heart—of an over-all program.

The reason is not obscure. The reason is that all other elements of a well-rounded

farm program inevitably are affected by, and are largely dependent on, farm income and farm prices. How can a farmer be expected to give his hand the care it requires, if he is forced to farm it to the limit to keep possession?

How can we expect a farmer to take advantage of rural power lines, unless he has income enough to pay for installation of electricity? Obviously, this is one reason why a larger proportion of farms are electrified in relatively good-income States than in low-income States.

How can we expect a farmer to take advantage of credit facilities, if lack of income makes him a bad risk?

But though we have fought long and hard for adequate price supports—and make no mistake, the fight will go on—there is no responsible Department representative who is not anxious to get on to the other elements of a sound agricultural structure.

We have made immense progress in conservation. But we still have far to go. Let us settle this price question, and get on faster with conservation.

We have made great strides in electrification—four out of five farms are now electrified, whereas only about 1 out of 10 had electricity 15 years ago. But still over a million farms are still without power lines. Let's settle this price question and get on faster with electrification.

We've made advances in the level of rural living. But millions of farm homes are wretched structures. Millions are without running water, telephones, and other necessities. Millions of farm families are still denied adequate educational opportunities, hospital care, medical and dental attention, and recreational facilities.

One-fourth of all farm families had total incomes in 1948 of less than a thousand dollars. The answer to the problems of these families is not prices so much as it is production. They need, above all, the opportunity to produce enough for a better living.

Let's settle this price question and get on with building better production opportunities and better rural communities. For it is from the rural communities that much of our future population is coming—much of our manpower—and a lot of our genius and leadership. Nearly half the Nation's children are the product of rural families.

We need to develop that potential manpower—that genius—that leadership. It is a real emergency we face today.

We need, as never before, a strong and economically secure agriculture.

The strength of our farms has served us well in peace and in war. We must not dissipate that strength—for that would be a betrayal of freedom and a great service to the enemies of democracy.

We have built well in the past 17 years. But we must not stop building now. It is our privilege to move forward for larger abundance and more complete security in the interests of the whole Nation.

It is the job not of farmers alone, nor of farm organizations, nor of Government to build that sound and secure Agriculture.

It's a job for all of us.

If we have not already learned that every right-thinking man is indeed his brother's keeper, we had better learn it fast.

If we have not already recognized that we must all seek not only our own selfish desires, but the common good of all, we had better take a long, serious look at the world we live in.

It's a changing world—a terribly fast-changing world.

No longer are empires, as in ancient times, slowly built and slow to disintegrate. Adolf Hitler rose and fell in only 12 years. In only 31 years the Comintern of Russia has achieved domination over perhaps a third of all the world's people.

We must try to keep peace among all nations—for wars between major powers can no longer be kept in quarantine. They speedily become global—and total—struggles.

We must try to maintain prosperity for all groups in our land—for depression is a communicable economic disease, and it quickly spreads, paralyzing all industries, affecting all groups.

We need a strong agriculture. We need it to maintain prosperity. We need it because it is basic to our national defense. We need it because it is the indispensable requirement of a healthy, vigorous, free people.

Let's start building the kind of agriculture we need—an agriculture of abundance—an agriculture with economic stability—by providing an adequate, realistic, and efficient program of price and income support.

Let's start now.

England's Public Medicine: The Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, everyone has an opinion on the experiment in national medicine now going on in Britain, but very few people know the facts about it. I was delighted to find an article on the subject by Dr. James Howard Means. Dr. Means who is Jackson professor of clinical medicine in the Harvard Medical School and chief of the medical services at Massachusetts General Hospital, is a recent past president of the American Association of Physicians, one of the most distinguished professional organizations which admits only outstanding doctors. He is the author of many books and over 150 articles on medical subjects.

Dr. Means article, which appears in the Atlantic Monthly for March, gives a simple factual report of his observations of the system in England. His standing in his profession gives us all complete confidence that his findings are fact, not opinion prejudiced one way or the other. Under leave to extend my remarks I insert this article in the RECORD, as follows:

ENGLAND'S PUBLIC MEDICINE: THE FACTS

(By James Howard Means, M. D.)

I

I hold no brief either for or against the British National Health Service, but I firmly believe that information about its success or failure will ultimately prove to be of great value to us in our own country. We have problems in this field to solve ourselves. We can be aided by the experience of others.

Americans either hold up the British Health Service as a horrible warning or use it as a talking point in favor of compulsory health insurance for the United States. Neither of these positions can be regarded as objective or realistic. What is needed is less recrimination and more investigation, and the first question to be put is, How is the system serving Britain? On my visit to England and Scotland last year I chatted with many people, both medical and nonmedical, I visited clinics, and I read a variety of British newspapers and journals. Some of the people I talked with were friends of many years' standing, the value of whose opinions I am sure I know accurately. Others were new, and some were chance acquaintances. Since returning home I have kept up a brisk correspondence on the subject.

I started off with the steward and stewardess aboard ship going over: both are English; both live in Liverpool. The steward was strongly in favor of the health service; the stewardess was against it. Both were working people, but one belonged to the Labor Party, the other to the Tory. This even split, it soon became evident, was no accurate indication of how the British people as a whole view the health service. There can be no doubt whatever that, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, the vast majority of the people are for it.

The attitude of the doctors, however, is very different. Among them there is undoubtedly much discontent. This runs all the way from trifling dissatisfaction to something approaching actual hostility. A very small number are enthusiastic proponents of the service. Organized medicine in Britain, represented by the British Medical Association, fought certain provisions of the National Health Service Act vigorously, but did not oppose its basic principles in any such uncompromising fashion as the American Medical Association has resisted any and all proposed legislation for a national health program here at home.

In Britain at the present time, the health service being a fait accompli, I found it to be practically the unanimous opinion of all with whom I talked, doctor and layman alike, that it is there to stay, regardless of the outcome of February's general election. The problem is how to improve it to the point where it is for everyone, fit to live with.

The actual direction which the development of Britain's National Health Service has taken was conditioned to a considerable degree by the war. When, in 1940, invasion of Britain became imminent and aerial bombardment certain, an integrated emergency medical service (EMS) for the entire realm, to take care of military and civilian wounded and sick, was rapidly set up under the wartime powers of the Government. The system devised made use of all hospital and professional services in the United Kingdom. Each individual, each unit, was assigned an area of responsibility—a particular function in relation to the whole. First aid, dispensary service, and hospitalization were systematized and services distributed so as to become universally available. Channels for the evacuation of sick and wounded were established. Though set up hurriedly, the EMS worked with great smoothness and success. Forced upon Britain by the war, it set the pattern for, and accelerated the tempo of, the socialization of medicine.

The main intent of the act which brought the national health service into existence on July 5, 1948, is to provide complete medical care for all people, to promote health, and to prevent disease. The training of professional personnel and the conduct of research are both recognized as essential to the success of the plan, and although these are primarily still in the hands of the universities, there is extensive interlocking with the health service at the level of the teaching hospitals. In a Socialist state it becomes an obligation of government to insure the production of a sufficient number of optimally trained physicians and surgeons and other professional personnel; also to see that medical knowledge is advanced to the greatest possible extent through research. In our more conservative democracy these functions have been left to a considerable degree to private enterprise. With us, the Federal or the State Governments take some, but by no means complete, responsibility for them.

Although intended to provide medical care for all people—even aliens temporarily in the country—the health service is not compulsory; any person or any doctor can remain out of it. Doctors may serve under it and also engage in private practice, if they can

find any. Medical care in Britain today is on a basis analogous to that of primary and high school education with us. All are entitled to it without direct payment but are not compelled to take it. As we may send our children to private schools, so Britons may go to private practitioners of medicine if they wish, and can afford to do so. But as we pay for education in this country through taxes, whether we send our children to private or public schools, so do British citizens pay for the health service through taxes[1] whether they use it or not. Harley Steet in London and its equivalents in provincial cities seem as full of doctors' offices as ever, and a considerable volume of private practice is going on in them. However, the doctors with whom I talked were convinced that it would slowly diminish until it might reach the vanishing point.

II

Final responsibility for the administration of the entire health service rests with the Minister of Health, a cabinet officer appointed by the Prime Minister, and therefore likely, as with us, to be replaced with each change in the government. The present Minister of Health, Aneurin Bevan—one of Winston Churchill's pet antipathies—while by no means the originator of the concept of a unified national health service, was nonetheless to a considerable extent the architect of the present act. Of it in 1946 he said, "We have just passed through Parliament the greatest single health measure of our history. We are facing, at this moment, the monumental task of putting it into operation. We are trying to secure that in future the medical and health resources of the country are available to everybody in a rational and organized way, irrespective of personal means. But the availability of the health services is not our only object: we are also aiming at their improvement and expansion. This will not be achieved in a moment; it will require a great deal of hard work, and it will require the intelligent cooperation of the public."

He might have added "and of the medical profession," but he didn't, and there, I gather, lies a considerable portion of the rub. The majority of doctors with whom I talked had the feeling that Bevan had consulted the profession inadequately in drawing up his plans. This has embittered them rather extensively. It is not health acts in general to which they are opposed, but this particular one, which they think was set up in a bungling manner.

From the Minister of Health extend three main ramifications of administrative responsibility—namely, those of hospitals, general practice, and local health authority. The classification of hospitals and doctors under the act needs elucidation. Hospitals in Britain, as with us, prior to the inauguration of the National Health Service, fell into three major categories: voluntary hospitals, municipal hospitals, and private or commercial hospitals—generally called "nursing homes." The so-called voluntary hospitals, such as Guy's or St. Bartholomew's in London, are the equivalent of our privately endowed charity hospitals, such as the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston, the Presbyterian in New York, or the Barnes Hospital in St. Louis. The voluntary hospitals are the ancient hospitals of Britain; originally run by the church, they later became secular charitable enterprises. It is in them for the most part that medical education has been conducted.

For the administration of the government-owned hospitals, England and Wales have been divided into 14 hospital regions, each based on a university medical school. In Scotland, which has an independent but similar national health service, there are six regions. The administrative control of the Scottish system lies in the Secretary of State for Scotland. Each region has a regional hospital board appointed by the minister to govern hospital affairs.

On July 5, 1948, the ownership of all voluntary and municipal hospitals was transferred to the Minister of Health. The nursing homes were left out, I have no doubt with the expectation that they will gradually wither on the vine.

It must be remembered that at the end of the war the voluntary hospitals were close to bankruptcy. Something had to be done about them, and done fast. The hospitals and the doctors at the head of them were swept along in the process of socialization then taking place in Britain.

The doctors of Britain under the Health Act are classified into four categories: (1) general practitioners, (2) a large and diverse group of hospital doctors, consultants, and specialists, (3) full-time clinical teachers, and (4) medical officers of health and their associates in the local health authorities.

In the promotion of health and the attack upon disease, the general practitioners are the front-line troops. Each general practitioner has a list of persons in his area who have joined the Health Service, who have chosen him to be their doctor. Such a practitioner is paid by the government so much a head per year for every name on his panel. He is allowed to take up to 4,000 persons. In our country this number would usually be considered excessive. To them he must render complete general practitioner service. The patients under this system are entitled to free medicine, which they can get on the doctor's prescription only.

Does the patient have any choice of physician? Yes, to a certain extent. So far as possible he is allowed to choose among the doctors in his area, but obviously in any area ultimately the total number of patients must be assigned among the available doctors in some reasonable proportion. The doctor is not obliged to receive any patient on his panel that he doesn't want, nor is the patient compelled to remain with a doctor he does not like. No troublesome obstacles are placed in the way of patients wishing to change doctors. General practitioners also are allowed to take on as private patients any persons not enrolled on their panels and charge them fees for service.

When the general practitioner encounters something he cannot handle, he transfers the patient via a hospital to one of the doctors of the class which I have numbered 2. This class includes the great group of practitioners who under the previous regime were on the staffs of voluntary or municipal hospitals. They made their living in whole or in part in private practice, chiefly of a specialist or consulting character—they were the Harley Street type of doctor. Under the National Health Service they function much as before, but they are paid by the government for everything they do for the service. They are based on hospitals and see their public patients as arranged by the hospital administration. This duty may be in ward or dispensary (out-patient department); or when necessary, arrangements can be made through the hospital for the consultant to see a patient with a general practitioner in the patient's home, and this type of domiciliary service is proving very helpful for a class of society to which it was not formerly available.

Payment of the consultant-specialist class of doctors is not on a panel system; it is on a time basis. The word "session" has been employed as the unit of work for doctors of this class. A session is half a day's work once a week per year. It may consist of any kind of professional work which this type of doctor is called upon to do—consulting, operating, or teaching.

Doctors are free to choose how many sessions they will serve, up to a total of 11, and for each they receive a flat rate per annum. A doctor taking nine and a half sessions or more is considered to have an adequate wage without the necessity of supplementing it with private practice. There are a few doctors who have stayed out of the health service altogether and still succeed in making a living on the old private-practice basis, but they are excluded from all the nationalized hospitals—which is, from the point of view of keeping educated, a great handicap. There are a larger number who fall between these extremes, and carry on some public and some private practice.

A very significant item in the over-all administration plan of the health service is that those hospitals which have been designated as teaching hospitals have been put in a special category. In England and Wales they are not directly under the regional hospital boards (in Scotland they are), but instead have their own boards of governors, which are appointed by joint action of the university concerned, the hospital staff, and the regional board.

This arrangement is to be interpreted as a consciousness on the part of the drafters of the plan of the fundamental necessity of preserving a measure of academic freedom in medical education, and of protecting it against any kind of political influence. My observations would indicate that this objective so far has been attained. It is through the teaching hospitals that the universities and the National Health Service find themselves engaged in a joint enterprise. The universities beyond this are not related to the minister of health. They as yet have not been nationalized.

Research is done chiefly in the university medical schools and the teaching hospitals as with us, although the Health Act gives every regional hospital board and every hospital management committee the power to initiate research and through a separate amenity fund to spend money on research.

It is interesting, however, that the most important research organization in the country, the Medical Research Council, is not under the minister of health at all. It is administered through the privy council, a separate department of the government. The Medical Research Council was set up in this way during the First World War, and was not changed when the Health Service came into being after the second.

III

The Health Service is working—that much is fact—but how well? Fairly well, but far from perfectly would be my judgment. Its success or lack of success, for want of an adequate frame of reference or control, cannot be measured quantitatively. One can only attempt to find out whether the British people are getting good, bad, or indifferent medical care under the National Health Service, or whether postwar Britons are getting as good service out of their medical system as prewar Britons did out of theirs. One cannot expect to discover whether, as things are now in Britain, the service provided under the National Health Act is better or worse than that which might be provided under some other type of system.

I have had opportunities occasionally to observe the work in the great British hospitals over a period extending back to 1913, and what I saw this past summer gives me the impression that there has been no important change, certainly no deterioriation in the quality of care provided. At no time in Britain, in the United States, or in any other country has the practice of medicine been as uniformly good as the medical knowledge of the time would permit it to be. There is always abundant room for improvement. To those tub thumpers of organized medicine in the United States who rant about our having the best medical service in the

[1] A small fraction of the expense of the health service is met through pay-roll deductions in the case of employed persons, and from compulsory contributions by employers.

world, I would say, "Possibly, but how many people get it?" Not many, I am sure. In both countries either now or in the past, there is, or has been, good, bad, and chiefly indifferent medicine. To evaluate a national medical system we need to know the overall standard of medical practice provided under it. I am unable to assert that the general standard is higher in Britain under the national health act than it was before that went into effect; but, on the other hand, I have encountered no convincing evidence that it is lower, and certainly more people get it.

There are many "bugs" to be gotten out of the health service—after all it has been going for only 19 months. Doubtless in time they will be gotten out, and the service will improve accordingly. Right now an amending bill is on its way through Parliament which will correct a number of the faults already found in the act. One of the most crying needs is to improve the lot of the general practitioner. He is today unquestionably overworked, underpaid, and insufficiently related to hospitals. But these abuses are correctable. One of the sorest points is that dentists are making about double what the general practitioners of medicine are. This is partly due to the fact that dentists are paid by the job, whereas general practitioners of medicine are paid on a capitation basis.

Abuse by patients of their privilege to see the doctor is another difficulty. Since it costs them nothing, they go, it is claimed, oftener than is necessary. There is reason to believe that this situation will be rectified. A token fee for each visit might be imposed, sufficient to put on a slight brake without vitiating significantly the principle of free care. Recently a charge of 1 shilling, not for visits to the doctor but for prescriptions written by him, has been imposed. Whether this will serve a useful purpose is not yet clearly discernible.

A great clamor has been made about free eyeglasses, free dentures, and even, in certain cases, free wigs, provided by the health service. Certainly there has been a colossal demand for these props to health. But is that fact a just criticism of the health service? All it would seem to mean, when viewed dispassionately, is that under the previous system there were great numbers of people who needed these prosthetic appliances and could not afford to get them. The stories of abuses of these privileges I am convinced are exaggerations, and I am assured that steps are being taken to eliminate such abuse as does exist.

One of the important elements of the program is the development throughout the country of local health centers. These will be primarily to implement and facilitate the work of general practitioners. They will even provide them in many instances with office space.

The difficulty is that the health centers have not yet really got going. The London County council's first large health center, I am told on good authority, will be in full operation in 1950, and three or four others in 1951. But for the most part the health centers are still largely in the blueprint stage.

The two most serious criticisms of this system that I encountered were that it is costing more than the country can afford, and that it is undermining the incentive to doctors to do good work.

Certainly the Health Service is costing much more than was anticipated. Whether it is more than the country can afford is a question inextricably bound up with that of the whole economy of Britain. I am a physician, not an economist, and cannot possibly throw any light on it.

The undermining of incentive to excel would be a serious defect. It is difficult to determine to what extent, if any, it actually prevails. One English prophet of doom, Lord Horder, who talked to American doctors at Atlantic City last June, can see nothing but deterioration ahead for British medicine under government control, but I did not find such a totally pessimistic view to be, by any means, universal among British doctors. It should be remembered that hardly anything but opinion is available at present. Only experience will answer the question, and 19 months' experience with the Health Service is not enough time by which to judge it accurately.

My feeling is that Britain is trying a momentous experiment in the nationalization of medicine. Since we too have great problems before us in our own country regarding the promotion of health and the provision of good medical care to all who need it in the community, it behooves us to watch closely and objectively the progress and outcome of Britain's project. Our observations will deepen our insight and may lead us to make wiser decisions concerning our own problems, which admittedly are different in many ways from those of Britain. We should be grateful to Britain for making this venture.

Letter From Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material, I include a letter I have received from a Washington State constituent who is temporarily in California.

The writer of this letter is a successful businessman, who is an authority on wildlife and who is familiar with the game problems of Alaska. His information, I am sure, is accurate and his viewpoint constructive and convincing.

His letter to me follows:

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *February 24, 1950.*

Hon. RUSSELL V. MACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MACK: I trust you will bear with me while I point out the importance of an adequate appropriation for the Alaska Game Commission. Last year $100,000 was appropriated for the purpose of securing some measure of predator control and the apprehension and punishment of game law violators in the Territory. While some good has been achieved the amount is not enough to do the job as it must be done if the once vast herds of Alaska's wild game is to be saved from complete extermination.

The amount to be devoted to this purpose should be not less than $300,000. Up to now, wild game has constituted the major source from which the natives have obtained their food, clothing, and in no small measure their shelter. If this source is destroyed or seriously depleted this burden will fall on the Federal Treasury. It will be called upon to feed, clothe, and house something over 40,000 natives in the Territory. This will also be true of perhaps 50 percent of the white population.

The seriousness of the situation can be realized when the amazing depletion of the game herds during the past 15 to 25 years is pointed out. Here are a few figures. Twenty years ago the number of reindeer in northern Alaska was estimated at 600,000. Today there are less than 50,000. Twenty-five years ago there were one and one-half to two and one-half million caribou in the Territory. Today the most reliable estimates place the numbers at not to exceed 100,000. In the late twenties there was an enormous population of the white—or Dall—sheep in the Territory. Today these animals face complete extermination. For instance, in the late twenties the number of wild sheep in McKinley Park were estimated at fifteen to twenty-five thousand. Today, by actual count, there are less than 500.

Everyone familiar with the situation agrees that the big Arctic wolf is the worst offender. The slaughter by these savage killers is devastating. While the kills for food are considerable the major damage results from kills in teaching the young to fend for themselves, kills to satisfy an insatiable lust for blood letting and deaths from starvation because of the presence of these animals on the winter feeding grounds of wild game. Because of deep snows and subzero temperatures these areas are limited. The presence of a few wolves can prevent game from obtaining the nourishing food essential to survival. As a result mass starvation ensues. These combined with the depredations of game hogs and law violators account for most of the slaughter.

It may surprise you to learn that the coyote, commonly called the prairie wolf, entered Alaska some 20 or 30 years ago and is now found throughout the Territory in considerable abundance. These in conjunction with the wolves have invaded the nesting grounds of migratory waterfowl on the vast northern tundras and are literally destroying the eggs and the young by the millions. Since these areas provide the major source for birds that traverse the Central and Pacific flyways the effect naturally drastically cuts the numbers that visit these areas. Obviously control of these two mammal predators would have the effect of increasing the waterfowl in the Western States and assure better shooting for the thousands of scatter gun addicts resident therein.

The remedy is to be found in an adequate corps of trained patrolmen. Today but 10 men are provided to patrol a rugged roadless area almost as large as the United States east of the Mississippi River. Three to five times that number are needed. Surely three or even five hundred thousand is a small price to pay for the conservation of Alaska's once abundant wildlife.

You can help mightily toward securing adequate funds for the Alaska Game Commission. The need is so vital and the amount asked for is so small compared with other appropriations. I trust you can see your way clear to give this proposition your wholehearted support.

Sincerely,

I. P. CALLISON.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, February 16, was officially designated as Republic of Lithuania Day in Pennsylvania. At this time I place in the RECORD a proclamation issued by the Honorable James H. Duff, Governor of

Pennsylvania, an editorial from the Shenandoah (Pa.) Evening Herald, and a resolution adopted by Americans of Lithuanian descent assembled on February 19 at Girardville, Pa.

The text of Governor Duff's proclamation is as follows:

In conformity with the doctrine of the right of self-determination guaranteed by democratic freedom-loving peoples, the Council of Lithuania, on February 16, 1918, formally declared Lithuania to be free and independent.

Twenty-two years later, the Republic of Lithuania was absorbed by a neighboring state, and today no longer exists as a free nation. Thus, it is that Americans of Lithuanian descent will celebrate the Republic of Lithuania Day with the hope that their homeland will some day be restored to her rightful free and independent place among the nations of the earth.

Pennsylvania is proud of its many citizens of Lithuanian ancestry, and join with them in the celebration of their anniversary of independence.

Therefore, I, James H. Duff, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do hereby proclaim Thursday, February 16, 1950, as Republic of Lithuania Day.

Furthermore, I call upon the citizens of Pennsylvania to give proper recognition to this important anniversary and to join in such exercises as may be appropriate for its observance.

JAMES H. DUFF, *Governor.*

[From the Shenandoah (Pa.) Evening Herald]

A HOLIDAY OF HOPE

Last December, on the occasion of Stalin's seventieth birthday, State-owned printing presses flooded the Soviet domain with tributes, special editions, and biographies of the dictator.

One sample: "Joseph Stalin is the leader and teacher and friend of all the suffering and oppressed."

It is not difficult to picture the grim feelings of Lithuanians as they scanned this propaganda at the time. And it requires little or no imagination to visualize the attitude of these same people today—the thirty-second anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence.

It was on February 16, 1918, after some 160 years of domination under the Russian czarist rule, that Lithuania proudly proclaimed to the world that it was free and independent. The long enduring chains of oppression were finally severed.

All of the powers recognized the Republic of Lithuania, including the United States of America. For that matter, officially we continue to recognize her independence. The Soviet Union, too, acknowledged the existence of this free state, but that gesture was not to continue for any appreciable period.

The black clouds gathered and finally broke in June 1940, when the Soviet moved in its troops—a direct violation of the treaty of 1926. The Communist octopus snaked its tentacles around the people of Lithuania and also those comprising Latvia and Estonia. The economic blood-sucking started it. It shows no signs of abatement even to this day.

Midnight descents by the secret police and constant spying no longer surprise or shock the Lithuanian people. It is a part of their daily life. Religious worship as these oppressed people once knew it simply is no more. A national culture is in the throes of plotted elimination. Education consists of an evil process to twist facts and figures to suit the nefarious purposes of the U. S. S. R.

As for the shocking toll of atrocities, the evidence is clear and unmistakable. The firing squads deal out their volleys of death to all attempting to shake off the bonds of tyranny.

But any regime built on a foundation of murder, pillage and general misery for innocent peoples cannot long endure. All of the past examples of world history prove this.

In Lithuania today, February 16 conveys a hollow ring to those who remember the era of the Republic. They know, however, they have the full sympathy of all liberty-loving Americans and many other nationalities in different parts of the globe.

Theirs is a matter of fortitude until Lithuania is once more saluted and honored as a restored free republic. Meanwhile, their courage will see them through this trying period, the end of which is not yet in sight. Time has a singular way of balancing accounts.

LITHUANIAN DAY ASSEMBLY

Americans of Lithuanian descent assembled this February 19, 1950, in St. Vincent's Hall, Girardville, Pa., to commemorate the anniversary of the independence of the Lithuanian nation, have unanimously declared that—

(a) The ethnic, cultural, linguistic individuality and political tradition of the Lithuanian people;

(b) The Ancient Lithuanian statehood dating back to the year 1200 A. D., its splendid historical record of tolerance, of individual, racial linguistic, and cultural liberty;

(c) The long unceasing, and determined struggle of the Lithuanian people against the foreign Muscovite domination and oppression;

(d) The heroic sacrifices of each succeeding generation of the Lithuanian people in the great mass insurrections of 1794–95, 1812, 1863–64, 1905, 1918–20, and the epic Lithuanian fight for basic human rights, for human dignity, for the freedom of the press and of the printed Lithuanian word during the 40-year suppression of all Lithuanian literary activities, 1864–1904;

(e) The imposition by the Soviet Union—by threat of superior force and in connivance with Nazi German war criminals—of a mutual assistance pact on October 10, 1939, whereby Lithuania granted and leased to the Soviet Union military bases in the strategic centers of Lithuania in exchange for a solemn Russian guaranty of the independence of Lithuania and of Russian noninterference in the domestic, political, social, and economic order of the country;

(f) The Soviet invasion of Lithuania, June 15, 1940, violating all treaties—the peace pact, the nonaggression pact, and the mutual-assistance pact with a guaranty of the political independence and noninterference in domestic affairs—then and now in force between the Soviet Union and the sovereign Republic of Lithuania;

(g) The Atlantic Charter declaration holding out a promise of the restoration of sovereignty to the peoples forcibly deprived of same, and the subsequent embodiment of the Atlantic Charter as a part of the declaration by the United Nations, including the Soviet Union, on January 1, 1942;

(h) The effective Lithuanian underground liberation struggle during the 3 years of German occupation and continuing to this date, directed against Soviet attempts to annihilate Lithuania as a sovereign nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, To call on the Congress of the United States to create conditions enabling—

(a) The formation of broadly representative interim governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

(b) The repatriation of Baltic deportees from Siberia and northern Russian exile, under the supervision of the United Nations;

(c) The evacuation of the Russian troops, police and Communist Party apparatus from the territories of the Republicans of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia helping the sovereign peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to restore their democratic self-governments after the harrowing experiences of three successive hostile occupations; and

(d) The initiation of a move for an immediate admission of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, still full-fledged members of the League of Nations, into the United Nations Organization; be it also

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be printed and mailed to the President, Secretary of State, to Foreign Affairs Commission and Members of both Houses of Congress.

LITHUANIAN DAY ASSEMBLY,
FRANK P. MAJUKAS, *President.*
ALBERT J. VILLINSKY, *Secretary.*

Wisconsin Spends What It Has and No More—Uncle Sam Should Do Likewise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the State of Wisconsin will not go broke nor will it pile up a huge debt for future generations to pay. Under our State law there can be no deficit spending. The money must be in the State treasury before it can be disbursed. The law thus protects the State employee and it also assures the taxpayer that he can expect economy and prudent management in fiscal affairs.

John Wyngaard, a prominent State columnist, in his daily report from Madison, tells the story and I am including it as part of my remarks:

STATE GOING BROKE? IT CAN'T; IT SPENDS ONLY WHAT IT HAS AND CANNOT BORROW FURTHER

(By John Wyngaard)

MADISON.—State administration spokesmen are scouting the impression, assiduously cultivated by the Democratic opposition that the State is going broke. A combination of high spending during the last session of the legislature, uncertainty at budget time a year ago about biennial tax trends, the habit of caution among State fiscal managers, and the campaign activities of the Democratic opposition to distract attention from the Truman deficit budget in Washington, have served to create the idea that the State is confronted with a severe financial crisis.

Actually, in the fairest analysis, it is far from a crisis or prospective crisis. The State government will be required to pull up its belt after the flush years of the war and immediate postwar period. But State employees are in no danger of raising pay days, and municipalities need not fear that their State aids will not be paid on the dates due.

THE FACTS

As other commentators have pointed out, it is inaccurate and misleading to talk about a deficit in State government terms. The State can't have a deficit. If it doesn't have the money, it can't spend it. The State cannot borrow.

In that lies an important distinction from the national budget. President Truman has

presented a budget to Congress that deliberately plans a deficit. The difference between the year's income and the year's outgo, under his program, will be made up by borrowing and an increase in the national debt. That can't happen here. The State does not borrow. It spends only as it collects.

Nor will there be a deficit in the sense that there will be a shortage of money. When the present budget was worked out last year, it was based upon a conservative estimate of receipts during the biennium, including the new revenue measures and the use of the wartime surplus that had been saved precisely for the purpose of financing postwar improvements.

Moreover, that cautious financial program was planned to have a cushion of some $7,000,000 for contingencies, as a working fund in the treasury.

A YEAR LATER

State officials now know they were unduly conservative. (They must be, because of the prohibition against borrowing.) Tax receipts have been higher than they dared to hope.

Moreover, the next State budget will very likely be smaller than the current program. The present appropriation laws contain items that will not recur, presumably. The big institutional capital authorizations are an example.

There also is the prospect of sizable lapsed balances—appropriations made and now representing claims against State revenues, but unlikely to be executed. The big veterans' housing appropriation illustrates here. Individual applications are coming in slowly, and not a single request for aid from a municipal housing authority has yet been filed. There is every indication that much of that money will remain to be available for other budget purposes in future years. Altogether, therefore, there is no chance for a State deficit in the strict meaning of the word, and the State's over-all financial situation is much better than was forecast a year ago.

In Greece There Is No Children's Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the kidnapping of 28,000 children by Communist guerrillas during the recent Greek civil warfare has understandably shocked the conscience of our civilized world. Appended is a pointed editorial on this subject from one of America's outstanding Greek-American journals, the Atlantis of New York, Solon G. Vlasto, publisher, from its issue of Sunday, February 26:

AN APPEAL TO THE WORLD

The appeal of the Greek Church to the world public opinion in behalf of Greece's abducted children is answered in the United States by a touching and wide interest of the American people in the fate of these unfortunate Greek children. It is natural that this atrocious crime is spoken generally in our country.

By the hateful and deliberate practice of the Communist forces many thousands of Greek children have been abducted from their homes, their villages, and their country, to an unknown fate. The abduction of 28,000 Greek children by the Communist-supported bandits represents one of today's greatest crimes against humanity, and if there is any conscience left in the world, some means must be found to return these children to their parents.

Cruelty reaches its depths when children are torn from their fathers and mothers leaving the parents in the agony of suspense, not only from the separation itself, but also as to how their children are being treated, or if they will ever see them again.

Representatives of the Soviet and satellite countries made a great point at the last meeting of the United Nations General Assembly of the fact that criminals were being convicted and punished through the due process of law. Yet these representatives of countries which do not even hold trials, or whose trials are travesties of justice, had bleeding hearts for those convicted in Greece for offenses against the state and their own people. How these representatives can justify the great crime of abducting 28,000 Greek children and making 18,000 additional homeless in Greece is impossible for a free man to understand.

Humanity and civilization have shown their keen interest in the fate of these tragic children. But world opinion must be aroused to the point of forcing the Communist countries to atone for this crime and return these children to their suffering parents at once. To hold these children any longer is but further proof of the criminal intent of their abductors. The appeal of the Archbishop of Athens and Primate of all Greece is an appeal to the whole civilized world and on the basis of human rights.

What Do Past Elections Disclose?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, we hear so much these days about the swing to socialism at home and abroad. England is pointed out every day as the horrible present-day example of socialism. A terribly devastating war and all of its aftermath of privation and suffering, of course, had nothing to do with England's present plight according to some present-day nonreasoning people. The doctors scream about England's socialized medicine, and every other selfish group points out that we are heading for the same fate which Britain has now arrived at. All of these comparisons are so ridiculous that it should not be necessary to discuss them at all.

Is England's Government really socialistic? If it is then socialism has surely taken on a most strange window dressing. Just imagine a dangerous socialistic government with a king, and a royal family, and all of the estates, and castles, and social tomfoolery that a king and his court and his royal retinue requires and demands. No; every person in England, after the last war was over, needed to be put under guardianship, and there being no proper guardians available they all joined hands, community style, until they could recover sufficiently from their physical and mental shock and incidentally remove the great want and privation which stalked their land. They are a limited monarchy now and most probably will continue so to be in the future. When their government recovers the old tory classes will take the helm again and liberalism will find its same old poverty hole again also.

England pulled together both before and after World War II, and at intervals pulled great aid out of us also. On the contrary we people of the United States pulled together during the war and did a great job, but after the war the selfish gougers of our Nation combined to restore to themselves again their golden empire, but unlike England, in this Republic the people will not let the days of old come back again. The extreme right-wingers had better take heed because the ballots of the thinking man and woman are theirs no longer for the asking, or the forcing, or the buying.

A lot has been said about the people of the Republic, swinging to the right again, but I think that the people are too wise to thus knock themselves out of all of their gains and advancements by their own ballot-box punch.

I wish to submit, in conclusion, the following timely article published in the Christian Science Monitor on February 28, last, which gives us food for thought:

BRITAIN SWINGS RIGHT—BUT NOT FAR

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—As in the case of the New Zealand and Australian elections, the British elections prove that the political tide can swing from a leftward to a rightward direction.

In other words, it is now well established by three postwar elections in English-speaking countries that the cause of conservatism has not been foreclosed by events of the past decade. Governments of the left can be thrown out of office, as they were in the first two countries. A government of the left can be so nearly defeated as to nullify its plans for more leftward legislation, as in Britain.

From this fact men of the right and center may take comfort, as they are.

But before they take too much comfort, or relapse into an easy confidence that because it happened in three other places it will automatically happen here, too, they had best note two aspects of the matter which have been somewhat overlooked in the original enthusiasm.

The first is that the pattern of the past lends almost no support to the theory that British and American electorates tend to follow each other. On the contrary, it would almost seem as though the two electorates were perversely determined to move as frequently as possible in opposite directions.

For example, when the United States had Herbert Hoover—a man of the political right—the British swung left to Ramsay MacDonald. Then when American voters swung left under Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the British soon turned right under Stanley Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain.

Following the war, Britain turned abruptly left under its Labor government. But the first American postwar election was a swing to the right—the Republicans capturing both Houses of Congress. There was a resumption of a leftward trend in America in the 1948 election, but now the inclination in Britain is rightward, even though not quite far enough to overthrow the government. Judging from the past, there is certainly no reason to assume that the American electorate will turn rightward just because the British have. Over the past half century the political cycles in Britain and the United States more frequently conflict than coincide.

The second aspect of the matter is that the British conservatism which did better than expected in last week's elections is a very different thing from the conservatism of the presently dominant group in the American Republican Party.

The British voter may or may not have consciously repudiated nationalization of industry by his votes. But the British voter has made it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the British Labor government to proceed with much more nationalization. However, if we judge what a Conservative government would do from its campaign record one must conclude that the British voter has most definitely not repudiated the idea of the welfare state.

The Conservative Parties which won in Australia and New Zealand, and nearly won in Britain, are all pro-welfare-state parties in the broad sense of the term. That is to say, if you are to draft a formula for a Conservative platform from the experiences of the three British Commonwealth elections your formula would be built on accepting the welfare state just as firmly as on rejecting the nationalized state. That has been the winning combination twice, and the nearly winning combination once.

It remains possible, of course, that a Conservative Party can win someday by being against both nationalization and the welfare state. But there is no basis in any of the three British elections for such an assumption. Those elections prove only one thing—that the combination of the welfare state with private capitalism is appealing to the voters of New Zealand, Australia, and Britain. It does not prove that any other combination will be appealing to voters anywhere. Nor, of course, does it disprove it.

Representative Lovre's Long-Range Plan for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE] has spent a good deal of time working on a long-range plan for agriculture. Recently he announced the objectives of his plan, which drew Nation-wide comment, most of it favorable. I would not attempt to comment on the merit of the proposal without a long and thorough study of its details, but, having great respect for Mr. LOVRE's knowledge of farm problems and confidence in his judgment, I believe that his suggestions deserve the careful study of Members of this body on both sides of the aisle. Our long-range farm policy is the most vital domestic problem before the American people, and our decision in regard to it may well determine whether we are to take the road to regimentation and socialism or to a free and expanding economy. Therefore, every suggestion should receive our conscientious consideration.

For this reason I ask to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Daily Republic of Wednesday, February 22, discussing Mr. LOVRE's plan. W. R. Ronald, author of the article and publisher and editor of the paper, has spent many years studying problems affecting agriculture. His observations are worthy of note.

CAN ATTAIN LOVRE FARM PLAN'S GOALS BY ONE MAJOR CHANGE IN PRESENT LAW

(By W. R. Ronald)

When Representative HAROLD LOVRE of the First South Dakota District, announced yesterday in Washington the provisions of the grass roots bill he will introduce, it was the culmination of 17 years of experience and effort by farmers administering the AAA and PMA measures.

This South Dakota Representative had already broken with the National Republican Committee because of its inane, one-sentence proposal for agriculture. He said he would present legislation to set up a farm products price support program.

He had found in 32 meetings, held after he had sent 85,000 post cards to farmers in his district to tell him what they wanted, that 90 percent, of course, asked for:

Full parity price on normal domestic consumption.

A completely self-financing program.

A two-level price system under which the surplus would be segregated.

Administration by county, State and national committees or boards made up of farmers, either nominated or elected by the farmers.

Tuesday Representative LOVRE announced the provisions of the bill he will introduce, which would:

1. Provide full parity price at all times for all normal domestic consumption of any of the farm products upon which the law would be operative.

2. Be fully self-financed, thus ending the use of taxpayers' money for subsidies for farmers.

3. By a simple device segregate surplus so that the farmer will receive only what it brings when sold.

4. By using market devices only, terminate all efforts to control production by the Government, but insuring that the farmers would themselves reduce production when the amount received by them for surplus becomes low enough.

5. By calling loans or selling surplus, make the parity price also the ceiling, thus protecting consumers.

6. Make it possible for the Government to get back probably most of the fourteen billion it now has invested in surplus foodstuffs.

7. By recovering this amount and adding at least the $2,000,000,000 of income which Secretary of Agriculture Brannan says is the amount by which farm income has already been reduced below what farmers should receive, go far toward balancing the Federal budget.

8. Providing a system under which, by adding a few cents to parity and then collecting it from farmers, it could provide insurance of crops against any and all loss, without any expense to the Government.

9. Make the application of the law voluntary, by using the same provision in present marketing laws, namely, a referendum in which two-thirds or more of the farmers must vote for its use before it goes into operation.

10. Set up a system of marketing under which the cost of depreciation of farm plants and of restoring the fertility of depleted soil, could be financed by adding the necessary amount to be the parity price, to be retained by the farmer only if used for those purposes, thus making possible the most extensive soil-conservation program ever put into operation in the United States.

11. Make it possible to control exports of surplus at less than parity within any policy established by Congress and without breaking down agriculture in other countries.

12. Establish administration of the law by farmers. This would be accomplished by the election of county committees of farmers, as under the AAA and the PMA; nomination of farmers for the State committee by the county committees, the Secretary of Agriculture making his appointments from this list; and nomination of farmers for the national committee or board by the State committees, the Secretary making his appointments from this list.

ONLY ONE MAJOR CHANGE NEEDED

All of this would be accomplished by only one major change in present law. Congress, a number of years ago, passed marketing quota laws to keep surpluses from breaking prices. Under this or any other such laws, the farmer is given a quota under which he may market only his share of the normal total domestic consumption of the commodity as to which the law is in operation.

By adding one amendment, namely, to require the farmer to purchase any additional marketing quotas for the sale of any surplus, the Federal Government would thus have the funds with which to provide food stamps for low-income families, aid new uses of food and through export to move any surplus it acquires, either by purchase or loans, always at parity.

"I was surprised by the unanimity of the farmers on the program they want to assure them decent prices," Mr. LOVRE told me about the meetings he held in October, November, and December. "I was astonished at the number who responded to my post card invitations. I would say that about 90 percent want full parity under a self-financing program, with a two-level price to them. By a two-level price, they mean full parity on their share of normal domestic consumption and whatever is realized on any surplus they may market by buying additional marketing quotas. I know this measure is what they desire and I am going to give it everything I have got."

FARMERS IN OTHER STATES WANT THIS LAW

I can say that Mr. LOVRE, through his meeting, found exactly what the Daily Republic was given, in meetings with farmers in eight States, North and South.

Politically, Mr. LOVRE has shown the way by which the Republicans can surely win the 1950 elections in the Farm Belt. If they are smart, they will get behind the LOVRE bill.

Readers should appreciate what Mr. LOVRE did by issuing his statement when he did. The policy, or program, outlined by Chairman Gabrielson of the Republican National Committee, referred to agriculture in general terms.

Mr. LOVRE, to his great credit, immediately declared that this Gabrielson statement on agriculture did not go far enough, and announced his intention to introduce the grass-roots bill. It is unusual for an officeholder to break so quickly and so frankly with the head of his party's organization. Obviously Mr. LOVRE was influenced by his knowledge of what the farmers of his district want, obtained by his 32 meetings with them. That, in turn, presages an aggressive effort by the Congressman to put over his measure.

So, by summoning all the farmers of his district to a frank, nonpartisan statement of what they want, Mr. LOVRE not only did a smart thing, but gave an exemplary example of democracy at its best.

I think I know why Mr. LOVRE found a response that surprised him. This was manifested in the number who came to his meetings.

ELECTION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION

Not only office holders and politicians, but also news writers, have failed to appreciate what it has done to the farmers to have held 17 annual elections of county AAA and PMA committees, beginning with 1933. The Secretary of Agriculture has named the State committees and has dictated what they should say and do; the county committees

have not only not been invited to make suggestions, but when they have tried it, have been rebuffed.

Anyone should imagine the resentment that has been accumulating with the farmers, as, year after year they have held their elections of county committees, only to find that there county committeemen are not permitted any voice in forming a farm program. It has been election without representation. And, since this is contrary both to the theory and practice of democracy in the United States, the farmers not only do not like it, but properly resent it. That is why they will insist on State and National committees or boards made up from lists of farmers they nominate for any permanent farm plan. Moreover, it would insure the interest and activity that would handle the details of any program correctly and with understanding and dispatch.

HOW IT WOULD WORK

How the plan would work may be illustrated by a farmer who had been given a marketing quota on corn at a time well in advance of planting. We will say this is for 5,000 bushels. But, because of unusual favorable weather, he produces 6,000 bushels of corn. He could dispose of the 5,000 bushels, either for cash or by feeding.

If under his alloted quota he should desire to market also the 1,000 bushels of surplus corn he had produced, he could do so, but only by purchasing a certificate for surplus marketing of 1,000 bushels from his county committee.

If parity on corn were $1.50, he probably would be charged at least 75 cents a bushel for this surplus certificate. He would sell at full parity, and the $750 he had paid to be allowed to market the 1,000 surplus bushels would go to the Federal Treasury.

The Federal board or committee administering the law would at any time purchase at parity, or make full parity loans, on any amount of corn necessary to maintain the parity price of $1.50 per bushel.

This national committee or board would store surplus up to the amount of carry-over desired in order to provide a reserve against a shortage through crop failure or increased demand.

But if the national board should acquire more than the amount desired for reserve, it could and would move it at whatever reduction in price is necessary. Food stamps for any such surplus would be issued to low-income families.

The national board would determine the value of the stamps, whether 15 or 20 or 30 or whatever cents per pound of foodstuffs. And it would also determine the number to be issued. In any event, they would be discontinued when the market for the commodity no longer needed support. (No doubt the board would be authorized also to sell at a discount to firms experimenting with new uses for corn; and also to export at a price below parity, as may be in keeping with the policy of Congress or any agreement such as the Marshall plan.)

The cost of moving any and all surplus in those ways would be met by the amounts paid by farmers for surplus marketing certificates.

BALANCES OUR FARMERS

At the end of the year, the national board would have a record of the average amount received for any surplus corn, for example, it had disposed of. Thus it would know the average realized per bushel. Let it be supposed that this amount was $1 per bushel. Farmers selling surplus had paid 75 cents per bushel for these surplus quotas and received $1.50 (parity), and so would have obtained a net of 75 cents per bushel. They would have 25 cents per bushel coming to them from the Federal board, because it had netted $1 per bushel on surplus. This would be collected by the farmers from the county committee by presenting the surplus marketing certificates they had purchased.

So, the two-level price system would work out this way. Each farmer would receive full parity for his share of the total normal consumption, and the amount realized on the sale of any surplus by the national committee or board administering the program.

This is the private-enterprise system. It is what every merchant does: sell the bulk of his stock at full price and then dispose of his surplus at reduced prices. The farmer must have the Federal Government act as his agent to handle his output in the same way, because he himself has nothing to say about the price he receives.

QUOTAS CORRECTED ANNUALLY

Each year the Secretary of Agriculture would estimate the normal domestic consumption, at the same time making a correction on the estimate for the preceding year or years as compared with the actual.

If farmers were to continue producing large surpluses, the national board would charge more and more for surplus marketing certificates in order to have funds to pay for a larger amount of food stamps or other discounts. So the farmer might have to pay $1 or even $1.25. (If in any year it is found the charge is too low, it could be immediately increased.) The farmer would receive less and less, net, for his surplus. And presently he would voluntarily reduce his production, on that account.

Under a one-price system, the more the price drops the more units the farmer tries to produce, to keep up his gross income. Only when he is obliged to take a lower price on the surplus, and the surplus takes all of the beating on price, so that it would pay him less and less, will he find he is money ahead if he reduces his plantings.

In order to reach the sale of any feed crop in the form of byproducts, namely, livestock, dairy and poultry products, all grains and probably soybeans and sorghums and hay and livestock, dairy and poultry products would be treated as one commodity. Thus, upon any of these products of which the national board acquires a surplus that should or must be marketed, food stamps would be issued whether it be eggs or butter or beef or pork or grains.

COST OF CONVERSION UNKNOWN

Not only the Department of Agriculture and State agricultural colleges but many farmers know how many bushels of each kind of feed is required to produce 100 pounds of meat or a gross of eggs or 100 pounds of chickens and the surplus marketing certificates bought by the farmer would be valued accordingly. That is why, if the law should be approved by this Congress, and a referendum were to be put into operation on grains and their byproducts, the Government could get its money out of any surplus of any of these products it now holds. As it is now, it cannot at the same time buy and sell on the public market without breaking the price. That's why it is destroying foodstuffs and unnecessarily losing millions, and if this practice is continued, billions.

In this respect the Government is in the very same quandary as was the Hoover farm board. It will be recalled that the more it bought of wheat the lower it went. When it began operations wheat was selling for $1.25; when it stopped wheat was bringing 40 cents.

ONLY WAY TO SAVE BILLIONS

Thus Representative LOVRE is offering the one way by which the Government can get out of the mess in which it finds itself by continued purchase of farm products to support the market, with no way to dispose of its holdings without lowering the price, to support which the purchases were made. As it is, the Department of Agriculture doesn't know what to do except to keep on buying. That is why Secretary Brannan a few days ago asked for another $2,000,000,000 for that purpose. If that were given to him, and he spent it, the Lovre bill could save six instead of four billions.

Since any addition to farm income adds seven times as much to national income, and even Secretary Brannan admits the farmers this year will get $2,000,000,000 less than they should (which is less than parity), and their returns are increased only by that amount, it would add fourteen billion to the annual income of the whole country and that in turn would increase the return from income taxes.

So the Lovre bill not only is the one and only method proposed by anyone that could balance the budget, but in all probability would do that very thing if the Eighty-first Congress passes the measure.

Hidden Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, hidden taxes have lulled the taxpayer into a fool's paradise. He does not know what his tax bill is nor does he seem interested. In some way he must be aroused. At this point I include a timely editorial that appeared in the Evansville (Wis.) Review:

In an editorial called Those Hidden Taxes, the New York Herald Tribune observes, "The citizen who grins and bears it each week when he takes note of deductions from his take-home pay, or who gulps when he makes the quarterly payment on his income tax, has perhaps mercifully been spared a consciousness of the hidden taxes which fall upon him every day. * * * The problem of tax reform, however, requires knowledge on that part of the citizens. It is to the advantage of the individual that he sees through the tax smoke screen which the experts have laid down, that he feel the pain of what has been devised to be painless."

The Herald-Tribune ran a series of factual articles, by Robert S. Bird, dealing with the impact of hidden taxes on the ordinary taxpayer. It is a sure bet that not 1 citizen in 10,000 has any accurate idea of how deep these taxes cut into his earnings. For instance, on a $10,000 house it was found that no less than 639 hidden taxes were involved in the construction, development of site, and purchase financing. These taxes, Mr. Bird says, were collected by the Federal and State governments from the architect, builder, banks, agents, insurance companies, contractor, manufacturers, jobbers, and others.

Hidden taxes are not confined to big purchases like a house. The tax foundation found that 151 taxes applied to a loaf of bread. A woman's hat carried 150 taxes. A man's suit came in for 116. A humble egg accounted for 100. Mr. Bird writes: "In none of these studies were local taxes taken into account, nor the Federal and State levies on the various steps behind the supply and manufacturing point. As an example of how complex the tax-shifting devices work, the economists found that even the length of

time an article remains in stock sometimes determines who bears the weight of a particular tax."

No one knows the actual total of hidden taxes. Estimates indicate they may run as high as $700 per family per year. And, of course, they come on top of all direct taxes. The magnitude of the latter is shown by the fact that in 1949 the average taxpayer worked 1 month for the Federal Government to pay the Federal income tax alone.

The Federal Government is the biggest tax eater by far. It takes 71 cents of each tax dollar, while the states take 15 cents and local units 14 cents. By contrast, in 1932, the Federal Government took but 22 percent and in 1939, 39 percent.

What to do about this tremendous problem is a tough question. The Herald Tribune says, "The overlapping of tax jurisdictions, the continuance of taxes which have outlived their original purpose, the crushing proportions of the tax burden as a whole, require the most careful * * *. But the first step is to know, and the second is to be aroused."

Depositors Who Remember GOP Era of Bank Failures Appreciate New Deal Protection of Their Life Savings Through FDIC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Thank God for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation," which appeared in the Daily Times-Democrat of Pryor, Okla.:

THANK GOD FOR THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

People who lived during the past depression and happened to be residing in a community where there was a bank failure, can appreciate the beneficent and glorious service the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is rendering to this community at this hour.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation started work quickly upon discovery by the bank examiners of the condition of the bank. For their promptness this community will be forever grateful.

Moreover, the people of this community should be grateful for the fact that we have living in our community men with determination and financial means to assist in building the financial structure of even a larger bank than the old one. And also we should be pleased that our community has attracted Charles H. Fawks, president of the new bank, to come here with his talents and means.

This is the hour when due credit should be acknowledged and this community will be grateful forever for the ultimate and satisfactory relief from this financial crisis.

Under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, deposits are guaranteed up to $5,000. However, in the case of the Pryor bank, a new bank having been organized, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation will make a purchase of the assets of the old bank and all depositors will be paid in full.

The National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful, analytical, and constructive speech of our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], which was delivered at the breakfast of the American Association of School Administrators at Atlantic City, N. J., on February 28, 1950. Those of us who have served both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate with the Senator from Texas know that he always thinks through the problems confronting our Nation and that he courageously stands for what he believes to be in the public interest. These characteristics are shown in the address I asked to have printed.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thirteen years ago, a majority of my neighbors and childhood friends in central Texas concluded that the State of Texas would best be served if I were sent away to Washington. Except for that, I might well be one of you this morning.

My earliest ambitions, after graduating from teachers college at San Marcos and entering the education field, were toward the work of school administration. At that time, Texas had an unusually large number of able and inspiring public-school administrators. The honor of the work was high, but the honorariums were low.

Today the honor is still high—and the honorariums are no longer so low. I hope both will increase in future years.

It was not my purpose in coming here from Washington to talk with you about school administration. You know that field—and you are doing a wonderful job.

Instead, I propose to talk with you about our national security.

My first committee assignment as a member of the House of Representatives in 1937 was the Naval Affairs Committee. From that year to the present, I have had the rare opportunity and the great responsibility for participating in a continuing study of this Nation's defense and security.

I do not pretend that this service qualifies me as any rare expert, either in matters of defense or in matters of our international relations.

I know that I do not possess any great store of startling and secret information, and I will not seek to stimulate those who may have an appetite for the sensational by pretending that I do.

From my years of service, I am sure of only one thing:

Modern politics and modern science have made it impossible for any nation to be certain that its defenses are adequate.

Remember that. We may appropriate and appropriate, build and build, plan and plan for our defense, but we can never be sure we have done enough.

This is a fundamental fact, a simple and obvious reality of our world.

We may as well accept it; we cannot escape it.

I emphasize this for a purpose.

A NEW ROLE

Within the past 6 months, two events have forced upon us a new role in the defense of freedom.

First, well ahead of schedule, communism has come into possession of the atomic bomb.

Second, communism has sealed the back entrance to Soviet Russia through the conquest of China.

What do these events mean?

For one thing, international communism has, for practical purposes, accomplished many of its major goals nearly everywhere except in the United States and in those nations allied with the United States through the Atlantic Pact.

Whatever advantages we may have held because of the Kremlin's diversion to other interests are now dissolving.

Furthermore, the Soviet atomic bomb changes the balance of the physical strength of communism and freedom.

We know that we no longer possess an explosive force mightier than the Soviet; we can only hope ours is not weaker.

Stated bluntly, this may be alarming.

Certainly it is disturbing.

What we have lost, thus far, is time.

Worse, however, we are losing both time and our relative strength every day.

In 1945, year one of the atomic age, scientists told us that we might have 10 years of monopoly on the atomic bomb.

The predictions were too optimistic.

Instead of 10 years we had barely 3 or 4 years.

The world of 1955 has now arrived ahead of schedule, and free men have found themselves running late.

OUR POLICY OF CONTAINMENT

For a few years we had a policy of appeasement, and then we adhered to a policy of containment. With our military resources and with our money we have attempted to hold in check the imperialism of communism. As a legislator, I have supported the policy and I have looked forward to its successes.

In those places where the policy has succeeded, it has succeeded, as Churchill pointed out, only because we held the advantage of the atomic bomb. In other places, it has not succeeded at all.

Force can only be countered by superior force.

We no longer possess a superior force. In addition to the world's largest underseas fleet, the largest land army, and one of the largest air forces, Russia has an atomic bomb. We are building an H-bomb—there was no choice other than to build it. But only the naive, only the hopelessly innocent or ignorant, would bother to contend that the H-bomb is an American monopoly.

We should now admit to ourselves that peace does not come in bombs.

Whatever bomb free men build, slave men can build also.

If slave men ever use their bombs, free men must use theirs also—that is, of course, if the first attack of the aggressor is not fatal.

Because of Russia's bomb, and because of our bomb, I believe our people need to look thoroughly into our whole policy of containment for Communist imperialism.

If all of us adhere stubbornly to a policy born in a different day and age, we may easily succeed only in containing ourselves. In other words, we may find we have fenced ourselves in, instead of fencing in communism.

What results such a review might produce I do not know. I do not think there is profit or worthy purpose in proposing retires merely to announce what the outcome should be.

This I do sincerely hope: That not all suggestions for review or reexamination of our policies will be dismissed by any free people with the reply to that change—or suggestion of change—would be interpreted by the Communists as a sign of weakness.

We should not freeze our vision or destroy the strength that hope gives by accepting this answer.

CHANGE IS OUR STRENGTH

It has long been my belief that the greatest strength of free peoples in the struggle with communism is their unique ability and their traditional willingness to change, to adapt themselves to changing situations, to find new answers to old problems.

That is what distinguishes democratic systems from totalitarian systems.

Our freedom, of which we speak so much, is actually the right and the ability to change.

If we want to lose our freedom and lose our strength, we can do so by permitting communism to frighten us away from change.

I am not one who agrees that the active quest for peace is indicative of weakness. Only those who are strong, and who are confident of their strength, can effectively seek peace. Peacemaking should not be only the business of the week.

I believe this Nation must remain sufficiently strong to sit at the conference table with Russian representatives and seek the answer to the survival of two worlds.

In our foreign policy, we must have the combination of hardheaded realism and dynamic imagination of our forefathers—and, perhaps, more of the audacity of such bold strokes as the Monroe Doctrine, the Louisiana Purchase, and the purchase of Alaska. Those ventures kept democracy's enemies on the defensive.

We must not leave today's problem—our greatest problem—to be answered by a static, negative policy of containment.

My point is this:

So long as we held a monopoly on the bomb, our policy was successful. Now, the monopoly has ended, and our policy's continued success may be ending.

What we seek is a policy that will continue to be successful. We can—and we will—shape such a policy. That is the reason for the present public discussion of our policy, we are not attempting to find a graceful way to surrender, as some seem to believe; we are attempting to find a policy that will be even stronger and more effective.

MOSCOW MUST UNDERSTAND

I believe it is as imperative that Moscow understand our policy and our purposes as it is for us to develop and maintain effective policy and determined purpose.

Twice before, once in 1917 and again in 1939, foreign dictators failed to comprehend the depths of our determination. The Kaiser misunderstood us, Hitler misunderstood us.

The cause of peace will be served now, I believe, if our President or our Secretary of State will make clear our willingness to outline American intentions frankly and openly to the Soviet. Men such as President Truman, Chief Justice Vinson, General Eisenhower, General Clay or General Bedell Smith could, I am sure, impress upon the Soviet leaders the firmness of our purpose and the clear outlines of our policy.

Free men do not desire to dictate the course of allied governments or to attempt to overthrow the chosen governments of other independent nations.

Free men cannot easily guard the secrets of their strength from the eyes of enemy powers, unless they prize the secrets more highly than their freedom.

Finally, free men cannot keep their freedom—nor guarantee their security—if they attempt to keep pace in an armaments race with a totalitarian nation.

We may be entering the final stages of the cold war. Indian summer is over.

We know that we are not bluffing. We can presume no longer that Russia is bluffing.

FACTS OF OUR STRENGTH

The facts are these:

In terms of superexplosives, we are ahead in production, which may not last long, but we now know we have no monopoly on any type of superbomb.

In the air, Russia is considerably stronger today than is the United States.

On the sea, Russia is much stronger in effective submarine strength.

On land, Russia is the strongest nation in the world.

What does this mean? What should be our reaction to these facts?

Shall we pretend to equalize these odds by ignoring them? Shall we attempt to intimidate the Soviet by displaying 160,000,000 stiff upper lips?

Shall we take another course some suggest and arm ourselves more heavily than the Soviet?

Again, I say no.

If we should enter an armaments race with Russia, we would very likely destroy ourselves attempting to win. A nation cannot dedicate its full resources to munitions production and still retain freedom for its citizens.

We do not have the population to compete with Russia in an arms race.

We do not have the fiscal resources to compete.

We do not have the time to compete.

THE MINDS OF FREE MEN

What shall our course be?

If communism and freedom are to be equal in terms of superbombs and explosive power, we must find salvation for our world in the greater achievements of the minds of free men.

Freedom's great basic advantage over communism is that free men have the opportunity to think.

We must—and we can—out think the Communists in the field of foreign policy.

I am convinced that we can—and must—out think the Communists in the field of our military defense.

For 5 years, since the end of the war in Europe and in the Pacific, we have—perhaps unwittingly—fallen into the routine of a sort of false-front armaments race with the Soviet. Instead of holding our own, we have lost ground.

At the first hint of Russian aggression, we nervously lowered our vision from the distant future to the immediate present. We began to assemble our armed forces on a day-to-day, hour-to-hour basis of urgency and need.

Our purpose has not been realized. Russia has greatly increased the size of its forces in relation to ours. And we have suffered the casualty of lost imagination, lost invention, lost planning.

A look at the defense budget will explain what I mean. This year we are spending $14,000,000,000 on our National Military Establishment. We are asked to spend $13,000,000,000 in the next fiscal year.

This is the largest item in our Federal budget—it will take 32 percent of your taxes.

THE DIVISION OF DEFENSE FUNDS

What interests me and what I hope challenges you is the division of funds and division of emphasis which we are making.

Of our total defense budget for 1951, less than 5 percent will be devoted to research and development of new weapons for future wars.

Less than 5 percent for the future.

What we have in our arsenal is impressive and it is tested; but, we know that much of it will be outmoded at the time any future war starts.

I say that helpfully, not critically, I believe it is true.

Recently, I had opportunity to look into one specific phase of our defense development—the field of guided missiles.

It was disturbing to me to find that, to the best of our knowledge, Russia probably is 2 years ahead of us in some missile research.

Our services are conducting research—on a limited scale and on a limited budget. Less than 1 percent of the total defense budget is going for these weapons which may be vital to our defense in any future conflict.

Despite this limited operation and despite the great need to acquire workable weapons in this field, there is duplication, triplication, and, in one instance, quintuplication of effort.

We do not have the time—and we do not have the brains—to condone such a squandering of talent and effort.

Imagine the chaos if, for example, there had been three Eisenhowers trying to invade the Continent of Europe. We might have been working till yet if our brain power had been misused so flagrantly.

The time has come for free men to recognize their greatest resource—free minds—and put those minds to use.

MAKE UNIFICATION WORK

For the armed forces, unification was originally conceived to economize on talent and time. It was meant to make all three services richer in terms of effectiveness, not poorer in terms of money.

The time has come to make unification work toward greater effectiveness.

Research, new methods, new inventions—that is the area in which free men can win and hold supremacy over the dead hand of totalitarian systems.

I believe we can defend ourselves with a $13,000,000,000 budget. We can do it if the services work as one, not as three. We can do it if we make sure that no brain power, no talent is being wasted.

There is fat in the Defense Establishment—physical fat and mental fat. I am most anxious that we fry out the mental fat.

SEEK FULL USE OF OUR TALENTS

With statements and counter statements now appearing in the press regarding the condition of this country's strength, I believe the time is near when the proper authorities must determine the facts concerning the strength of our Military Establishment. This should be done, not in a spirit of bias or a spirit of petty revenge, but in the hope of making full use of this Nation's scientific and technological resources.

In addition, I think we should look into our stock-piling program, so that we can avoid the great hazard of being caught short in essential strategic materials.

Also, we must look thoroughly into the conditions of our military housing and other factors relating to personnel so that the morale of our forces will not be lowered and their efficiency reduced at this period when the utmost is demanded from all of us, individually and as a team.

We have the advantage of a long history of free public education, which has given us the world's greatest reservoir of enlightened manpower. We have the further advantage of freedom, which permits the full use of the minds and learning of our citizens.

This is our great source of strength. We must put that strength to use in the military as in all other areas of our Government.

For 5 years, we Americans perhaps have to some extent isolated ourselves behind the security of an atomic monopoly. We did not extend ourselves mentally or physically. We were tired from the exertion of war, weary of crisis. We concentrated our national energy and our national talent on our own comfort more than on our security.

This is true in the formulation of our foreign policy, true in the formulation of our domestic policies, and true of the broad conduct of our Military Establishment.

That isolation is ended.

CHALLENGE OURSELVES

We can no longer indulge laziness or sluggishness.

We must challenge ourselves—and in that challenge we will find the salvation of the world.

I have spoken of these things to you because I think it important that you, as leaders in your community, carry back to Texas the realization that these times demand the best in us—and pray that the best in us is adequate for the challenge.

We will profit nothing if we succumb to hysteria, to panic, or to demands that we try to match Russia plane for plane, submarine for submarine, bomb for bomb.

We will profit nothing if we mistake change for weakness. When we talk of new policies, new ideas, new approaches, we mean more effective policies, better ideas, more successful approaches—we are talking of strength, not surrender.

You can serve a most valuable purpose if you will admonish your neighbors and friends against hysteria and panic, against fear that this Nation is to be overwhelmed by the military forces of communism.

The facts are grim, but we must face them. Only by facing facts squarely we can and will find the answers to our problem of survival.

This is not the darkest hour in our national history. If the challenge of the moment stirs our imagination and our capacity for invention, we may see the brightest hour of civilization.

There is hope for us and for the world—so long as we keep hope alive.

Lincoln Day Address By Hon. Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address by my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH), before the Portland Lincoln Club, in Portland, Maine, February 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last year at the Lincoln Day dinner in Washington, I addressed the attending Republicans as "fellow mourners." That dinner was more like a wake at which we were making post mortems on why we had lost the Presidency for the fifth straight time. We talked about the mistakes that the Republican Party had made.

But this year is different. This year I address you as "fellow fighters" because something happened in Washington this week that convinces me that the underdog Republican Party has started on the comeback trail and has started fighting.

Monday in Washington we had the kick-off Lincoln Day dinner. It was a dollar box-lunch affair—a common man's affair, not a $100-a-plate rich man's affair like the Democrats have in building up their campaign war chest. There were those who said it would be a flop—that it was fantastic to try to get a crowd of any size in the Democratic jobholder city of Washington.

But it wasn't a flop. A record, roaring crowd of 12,000 cheering people jammed the Uline Arena. There was hardly breathing space and there were 3,000 people outside who couldn't get in because there just wasn't room for them. I have never seen so much enthusiasm in a crowd.

Yes, I think the Republican Party was resurrected this past Monday night.

Monday, the Republicans issued a 2,500-word restatement of principles. Eloquent as it might be, I think that it could have been stated in less than 100 words—and in common, everyday words of the average man in the street—the man whose vote we have to get to win in 1950 and 1952. My boiled-down version of the Republican restatement of principles is not only a mere 80 words of Republican Party position but also an indictment of the Democratic Party on 10 counts for the Democratic Party has not only failed miserably on each of these points but also has made it clear that it opposes each of these points. My concept of what the Republican Party stands for and what the Democratic Party is against is: (1) Reducing taxes; (2) balancing the budget; (3) fighting deficit spending and Government waste; (4) fighting communism here instead of complacently condoning it; (5) making foreign policy truly bi-partisan instead of merely rubber-stamped; (6) fighting and exposing something-for-nothing deception, whether it be socialized medicine, socialized farming, or hidden taxes; (7) preventing either management or labor from getting too much power at the expense of the public; (8) maintaining an adequate social-security system that does not limit opportunity nor discourage initiative and saving; (9) opposing any curtailment of veterans' benefits; (10) smashing the filibuster on civil rights.

No other political party can make that statement—much less the Democratic Party. Only 80 simple words to show the basic issues between the Republicans and the Democrats—to tell the difference between the two parties.

I was elected to the Senate in 1948 on the slogan of "Don't Trade a Record for a Promise." That is equally applicable for 1950 and 1952. The Republicans promise changes if they are put into power. The voters can rightfully ask, "Do you have a record to back up your promises?" And the Republican Party can confidently say, "I'm glad you asked that question. The answer is unqualifiedly 'Yes.' Here is the record."

1. The only tax reduction that has been given to the American people in a generation was by the Republican Eightieth Congress, the only Republican controlled Congress in the last 20 years;

2. The only time that the budget has been balanced during the last 20 years was in 1947 and 1948 by the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress;

3. The only real fight that has been made against deficit spending and Government waste is the fight made by the Republicans;

4. The only real fight to expose and purge Communists and their fellow travelers from key posts in our Government so that they could not send our vital secrets to Russia has been that made by the Republicans in Congress;

5. Republicans have made our foreign policy bipartisan. But the Democratic administration is now excluding Republicans from a voice on policy formulation. The Democratic administration has turned what was once a cooperative two-way street into their own secretive, one-way back alley where only the Democrats make the decisions and then try diplomatic blackmail under the guise of unity to make Republicans mere spineless, rubber stamps.

6. The only effective efforts to expose the something for nothing fraud and deception practiced upon the American people by the Democratic administration under the policies of socialized medicine, socialized farming and hidden taxes, have been the efforts of the Republican Party to warn the people that they were in danger of trading away their individual freedom without realizing it for the mental opiate of a false sense of security;

7. It was the Republican Eightieth Congress that passed the Taft-Hartley Act to prevent either management or labor from getting too much power at the expense of the public. Republicans created the Department of Labor. One of labor's greatest champions, Senator George Norris, was a Republican;

8. As far as social security is concerned, it was Republicans that first adopted a valid old-age assistance program in Montana 12 years before the Federal Social Security Act;

9. As far as veterans are concerned, the Republican Eightieth Congress was the champion of them all, passing more favorable legislation for veterans and reservists than any other Congress in history;

10. As far as the opposition to civil rights is concerned, everyone knows that it is the Democrats who are blocking it with filibusters. The Republicans are constantly trying to break those filibusters. And does anyone dare deny that Abraham Lincoln, greatest of all Republicans, was the father of civil rights?

If any of you are still unconvinced, try this for size. The Republican Party created the Department of Agriculture. It is the original trust-busting, antimonopoly party that gave us the Sherman Antitrust Act. The Republican Party is the party that gave women the right to vote—the party that got Alaska from Russia for only $7,000,000, the party in power when we acquired Hawaii, Guam, Puerto Rico, Midway, and the Panama Canal.

The Republican Party is the party that stopped a Democratic President from packing the Supreme Court and from destroying the independence of our judicial branch. It is the party that discarded the spoils system and set up the civil-service system on Government jobs by merit and qualification instead of by the political patronage standard of whether you voted for the winning party.

Now what has the Democratic Party given the American people? Time permits me to mention only one thing—and I have chosen that which you are most aware of now—taxes. The Democrats have given you the highest taxes in the history of the country and the Democratic administration has asked that those heavy taxes be made even higher and heavier. You realize that now by merely looking at your income-tax return. But what most of us don't realize is what we pay that doesn't meet the eye—in hidden taxes. Were it not for hidden taxes, the quart of milk you pay 21 cents for you could get for 14 cents because now you pay 7 cents in hidden taxes on that 21-cent quart of

milk—were it not for hidden taxes, you could get that 47-cent can of baby powder for only 20 cents, that $2,100 car for only $1,650, that $19,000 house for only $7,000, that 10-cent candy bar for only 7 cents (look back in Republican days, full-size candy bars were only 5 cents), that 15-cent loaf of bread for only 10 cents, that 25-cent gallon of gas for only 14 cents, that 50-cent movie for only 30 cents.

Our Democratic President campaigned successfully in 1948 on the slogan of "Telling the people the facts of life." We Republicans can well take a cue from the opposition and start "Telling the people the tax facts of life." I could go on for hours talking about the tax facts of life on examples of hidden taxes on specific products and services that most of us don't realize, but let me conclude with one of the best of all examples on hidden taxes—you even pay a tax on the air in the tires of your car.

These are the facts that the party of Abraham Lincoln—the most human, the greatest representative of the common man ever to be President—must bring home to the American people if our free way of life is to be recaptured and preserved, if we are to remain loyal to the principles of Lincoln.

The Republican Party now has the fighting spirit of the under dog. It has the most admirable of causes to fight for. It has the ammunition to fight with—a past record of positive accomplishments—and the stumbling, fumbling errors and deliberate deceptions of the Democratic administrations for the past 18 years.

We can and we will win with our undeniable cause and record, if we just keep fighting to tell the people the facts of life that the Democratic administration is trying to keep from them. Let's lift the iron curtain set up here in America by the Democratic administration between the people and the Government. In that way, we can return the American people to the most basic of all freedoms—the freedom to be let alone.

The Home Owner and Honest Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on Washington's Birthday, February 22, 1950, the junior Senator from Washington enjoyed fulfilling an invitation to address the annual convention of the National Association of Home Builders in Chicago. The address which was offered under the subject of The Home Owner and Honest Money has aroused considerable interest and some controversy. In order to satisfy requests for copies I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOME OWNER AND HONEST MONEY

Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans, I feel deeply that I would rather be in your company this afternoon than in that of any other group in all of America. Many among your membership are close and personal friends of mine. I respect what you stand for and I have willingly enjoyed fighting for what I conceive to be your rights as American citizens and as the home building industry of the United States. In a word I respect what you have accomplished for the good of our Nation and have high hopes for the contributions you will make to all men and women in the future.

It has been a long time since I have read a written speech. I now intend to read a statement in order that I may adhere to your time schedule and because I want to think that what I want to say will be reprinted and read by other Americans everywhere.

In very simple but positive language I want to tell you a story which is typical, which you can uncover for yourselves by looking in any direction you will and which is deeply tragic. This story characterizes the road on which most American families find themselves these days. After this story has been related, I wish to offer a recommendation for your consideration and whatever action you think it proper to give.

No group in this country has a better interest in the future of America than you men and women. You are gathered here to consider the problems of home construction, home financing, and home ownership. The happiness, the pride, the future of the family, depend in a special sense upon its ability to acquire and own a home. It is your business and professional task to promote this deep-seated instinct of the human race. I do not claim originality when I say that a nation of home owners is a nation with stable institutions and a bright prospect.

Home ownership, however, serves a much deeper purpose than the immediate happiness of the family group. I do not mean to disparage that happiness. The individual is the focal point of community interest. Those of us who have not been swept off our feet by the nostrums and gold brick promises of the welfare state appreciate this.

Every schoolboy has been taught that this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. This means individuals. It means families. It does not mean some vague abstraction. It does not mean a blank check for dictatorial power. It does not mean paternalism and spoon-fed pap for those who do not have the energy, the courage, and the self-respect to struggle for their own rewards.

While the happiness of its citizens is the proper goal of every government, this does not mean, in my opinion, a bib and a bottle for every citizen. It means, on the contrary, the maintenance of conditions under which each American can work for his own living with the right and the duty to provide for his own needs. Let us reserve charity for those unfortunates who need help and not force it on all, under the guise of social welfare.

I spoke a moment ago of home ownership and its deeper meaning. It is a meaning which must be defined in economic, in political, and in social terms. Economically, a high ratio of home owners means stable local business. Politically, it means a greater interest in local government. The government of a home-owning community is much less susceptible to machine politics. Socially, a community of home owners assures a healthy atmosphere with a minimum of agitators and crackpots.

Last year we added more than a million units to our total of homes. It was a good year for construction generally and for residential building in particular. A fair estimate at the end of 1949 shows that this country has 47,000,000 homes. More than half of these were owned by the occupants. Among the nations of the world America ranks high as a nation of home owners.

This means much more than a desire on the part of people to live under their own roofs. It means that those who struggle and save and work for the right to call their homes their own have faith in themselves. Still more important—it means that they have faith in their Government.

When a young couple assumes the grave responsibility of owning a home, with the heavy financial obligations which such ownership entails, it means that they have not only confidence in their own future but also faith in Uncle Sam. Faith that he will not change the rules of the game. Faith that he will maintain the terms of financial contracts so that in the future those terms will not become burdensome to the owner on the one hand or defraud the lender on the other.

The ownership of a home, with its usual lien on the future earning power of the owner, is a tangible, concrete pledge of confidence in the Government. It strongly implies a conviction on the part of that owner that Uncle Sam will not tamper with the currency, that he will not limit the freedom of the owner to find the best job he can fill; that Government will not tax him so heavily that he cannot meet his obligations. If the commitment to buy a home is a personal hostage for industry and thrift on the part of the home owner, it is also—and I wish to emphasize this in the most solemn terms—an unmistakable mandate to Government to keep faith with the individual.

Let me be more specific. G. I. Jones is a typical American. He is a war veteran, married, has one youngster and hopes to have more. He is a garage mechanic in a medium-sized city in the Middle West and earns $75 a week. He works for an intelligent and successful employer who helps him set up a personal old-age pension system. It will enable Jones at the age of 65 to retire with a monthly income, counting social security, of $125. The boss pays half the cost.

By the time Jones has paid his income taxes and met the charges for social security and old-age pension, his weekly pay envelope has shrunk to $66. I am using approximate dollar figures.

Being a prudent family man, he carries a modest life-insurance policy which nicks his weekly pay for another $3. As a practical person, Jones knows that illness and accident might touch him or his family. It would be well to carry a personal reserve for contingencies in the form of a savings account. This takes another $3 a week. By the time all these charges, prudent and necessary in the mind of Jones, are made against his pay he has $60 left from his week's earnings.

This man and his wife now decide to buy a home. He has saved his veteran's bonus, some bonds he bought out of his Army pay as a sergeant, and his insurance refund. This adds up to a tidy down payment on the home and leaves a mortgage of $6,000. Its amortization over a 20-year period, plus taxes and insurance, involves a further charge of $13 against his weekly earnings. This leaves approximately $47 for all other living expenses.

Now Jones realizes that he is taking a risk. However, this is constructive risk-taking. It is a form of personal venture which is characteristic of all Americans. It is a kind of risk which millions of Americans have cheerfully assumed in the past. The willingness to take such risks has made this country outstanding among the nations of the world.

Jones and his wife did not make this commitment for a home without a great deal of careful thinking. Both are high school graduates. They read the local paper, a weekly magazine of current events, and listen to the radio. Jones is not an economist. He is not a financial expert. He uses plain, homespun common sense in getting at conclusions.

He knows that the future on which he is now wagering, with so many claims against his income, is subject to two major risks.

The first deals with his job. This does not worry him too much. He is a good mechanic and knows it. He is willing to work hard, and as long as people drive cars they will have to use him.

The second major risk involves the kind of money in which he will be paid and which, in turn, he will have to use to meet his own obligations. Will he continue to be paid in the same kind of dollars that he is getting today, or will they be different dollars? How will this affect his position as a wage earner, a home owner, a bank depositor, an insurance policyholder?

Jones sometimes reads the speeches of the President. He recently read a speech in which Mr. Truman predicted a total national production of one thousand billion dollars by the year 2000. What this meant was quite beyond Jones. It is indeed beyond a lot of people who have advantages of education which Jones does not have. Was the President discussing the future or discoursing upon the hereafter? Jones hasn't the slightest idea what the President really meant, and I share his bewilderment.

The President also spoke of an average family income of $12,000 a year. Here was a figure that was down to earth. It sounded more like personal income than astronomy. Jones knew some men who were already making that much. Yet it was about three times as much as Jones was now making and he wondered how anything the Government could do could raise his pay 300 percent.

To be sure, with all the faith that he had in himself he knew that someday he might become foreman of the shop or have his own garage. This might give him a higher income; maybe as much as the $12,000 in question.

What bothered Jones was his failure to find anything in the President's speech which dealt with the kind of money in which this future $12,000-a-year family income was to be paid. He knew that the dollars which he received for pay today were only about half as good as the dollars which he earned before the war. Could it be that the President had in mind some other kind of a dollar—a dollar which was worth only a third as much as the present dollar?

Jones had seen the result of inflation in France. He had been told by some older Frenchmen that it now took a hundred francs to buy as much as 1 franc bought in 1914. After his outfit had crossed the Rhine he had a chance to talk to some Germans. They described the great inflation in Germany after the First World War.

One German told him that his father had bought a 30-year insurance policy in 1892 with a maturity value of 50,000 marks. He explained that this was roughly the equivalent of $12,500 in American money. When the policy came due in 1922, after 30 years of frugal savings, the insurance company sent his father a single postage stamp. That was all the 50,000 marks would buy.

Jones had just read a newspaper story about Formosa. The correspondent had paid a taxi driver $7,000,000 and given him a tip of a million dollars. Did the President, in promising a future family income of $12,000 a year, have this kind of goldbricking in mind? What was being done to protect him, G. I. Jones and his family, from this kind of chiseling and cheating.

Although he was no Ph. D. in economics, he knew that inflation was the result of financial monkey business and that the Government was usually responsible for it. He could find nothing in the President's speech which assured him that the value of the dollar would be protected.

Jones tried in his limited way to get at the bottom of this problem. He tried to find out what caused money to go on the skids as it did in France, in Germany, and in China. He thought he made two discoveries.

Money becomes worth less and less when the Government issues more and more of it. It's like wheat. When there is too much of it, it drops in value. "Now," Jones asked, "what causes too much money to be around?"

One cause, it seemed to him, was the failure of the Government to live within its income. When he, a garage mechanic, spent more than he earned, he quickly got into a jam. Uncle Sam, he found, could do something which he, a worker, could not do. Uncle Sam could print money and pay his bills.

To be sure, this meant that the dollars which other people had, dollars which were honestly acquired as the result of work, would lose their value. It meant, in other words, that Uncle Sam could go on a financial spree while the people who had honestly earned dollars would pay the cost by losing some of the value stored in their money. It was a form of subtle filching.

It was odd that he could find no mention of this in the President's speech. In fact, what disturbed him most was to find in the President's speech a statement which seemed to say that the Government should spend more than its income, that this was a good thing.

Could it be that the President had in mind phony dollars when he was talking about a thousand billion national product and a $12,000 family income? Did he mean a $12,000 income in dollars that had lost so much of their value through inflation that the $12,000 was actually worth less than the amount he was now making? The ugly thought occurred to Jones that the rosy future painted by the President was paved with Chinese dollars. The same thought has occurred to many other citizens.

In his inexpert and nonprofessional probing for the truth in this problem, Jones made his second discovery. As long as money could be printed there was no limit to the total amount which the Government could get to pay its bills. If this continued long enough, the dollar would be worth no more than the paper on which it was printed. It could reach the point where it would be cheaper to light a cigarette with a dollar bill than to scratch a match.

Since this was the case, the only way to limit the supply of money, the only way to be sure that its value would not go the way of the German mark or the Chinese dollar, was to use something for money which could not be multiplied by a printing press.

It suddenly dawned on our mechanic that gold was the answer. He knew that the total amount of gold in the world was limited, that the amount added each year was a small percentage of the existing supply.

If the number of dollars in the country was limited by the supply of gold, then Uncle Sam could not spend more money each year than he collected in taxes. He would have to live within his income in precisely the same way as Jones himself had to live within his income.

If Uncle Sam had to live within his income, he might be less likely to buy potatoes at $16 a ton to be sold at a penny a ton. Uncle Sam might be less interested in raising the living standards of Zulus or building dams on the Euphrates. With the supply of money limited by gold, Uncle Sam might pay a little more attention to his problems at home and a little less attention to Fair Deals in other parts of the world.

This horse-sense thinking of our ex-G. I. is down to earth. We have explored his reasoning and weighed his position. While some of the responsibility for the failure to protect the buying power of the dollar properly falls upon the Government, I do not wish to leave the impression that all the blame should be placed there.

If the Government has operated in the red for 17 of the last 19 years, if it has disregarded the solemn duty to preserve the integrity of our money, the blame for this must be shared by the public.

In particular, it must be shared by those institutions which solicit confidence of the citizen and assume obligations toward that citizen payable in the future. I refer particularly to our banks and great insurance companies.

There are more than 14,000 banks in this country. They have more than 104,000,000 individual deposit accounts. These banks are the debtors and the depositors are the creditors. The depositors give the banks money today which must be paid back at some time in the future. In legal terms the banks discharge their legal responsibility if they return to their depositors the same number of dollars which they originally accepted.

However, if, in the interval, the buying power, or the real value of the dollar is cut in half, the depositor in the end of the period finds himself the loser. This is obviously not fraud in any premeditated sense but the effect is unfortunately though precisely the same. Too many of our Nation's banks, in their preoccupation with the narrow terms of the agreement between themselves and their depositors, have had an eye almost solely for the legal discharge of their obligations. They have been, too many of them, completely indifferent to the real substance of their obligations.

I say "completely indifferent" advisedly and only after carefully weighing my words. Ten years of my life were spent in the private American banking system when I was employed by an outstanding commercial and trust institution. This experience provided me with respect for what our banking system has contributed to the growth and development of America, and a real hope for what its leadership can contribute to the stability and health of our future. I am, therefore, not an enemy but a friend of our banking fraternity. I simply want it to live up to its potential rather than to continue to drag its feet and remain quiet when the prevailing national need for its leadership and council is so imperatively pressing. I have now been a Member of the upper House in your Congress for several months more than 3 years. In that time, and bear in mind what has happened in that period to the real value of our currency, I state as a simple fact that not a single banker has ever come to me and urged the need for protecting the integrity of the dollar because he, the banker, feels any deep sense of responsibility for the depositor.

I know of no State banking association which has appealed to Congress to protect the dollar in order that its members might, in real terms, discharge fairly and fully the obligations to their depositors.

Probably the primary responsibility for urging honest money rests upon the American Bankers Association. This body has consistently, so far as I know, remained silent on the great issue of currency. I have never seen the association become indignant or express any articulate opposition to what is happening to our American dollar. In my view their silence implies a bypassing of their moral responsibility to the millions of Americans who are their average depositors.

Here is a body whose members presumably understand money. They know full well what the ultimate, inevitable effect of paper currency with no bond to gold must be.

The American Bankers Association has besieged Congress with appeals to reduce their FDIC assessments. It has urged us in the House and in the Senate to restrain and curtail the competition of Government credit agencies.

These requests are legitimate and possessed of merit. But the point I make is that a great association is callously indifferent over the discharge of their own obligations to depositors. All banks, it seems to me, have a moral duty to insure the value constant of the dollars they repay. This they have strikingly failed to recognize and in their failure they reveal a disappointing lack of stature which fortunately they can regain if they only will and must do.

Actually, the American Bankers Association at its last annual meeting at San Francisco extended the courtesy of its platform and the great prestige of the occasion to a noted guest who lectured them on the virtues of a managed currency. This is the kind of currency that England has today. It is the kind that France has and China, and Russia.

Instead of coming to the Congress and urging us to restore gold on some practical basis the American Bankers Association entertains and flatters a planner who would leave the currency to the loose limitations of the printing press and the discretion of so-called "competent and responsible men." As an American, as a Senator, and as one who learned about thrift and honesty and consumer purchasing power from his years in the banking system, I can only say that I have been looking for greater perception and more courageous leadership among bankers of this day. I am sorely grieved to say that I have been sadly disappointed.

What I have said sincerely and consideredly about the bankers goes with equal force and conviction for the great life-insurance companies of America. They carry $91,000,000 insurance policies aggregating more than $213,000,000,000. They collect money today in the form of premiums at the annual rate of $6,800,000,000. This they will return to their policyholders at some time in the future.

Again, as in the case of the bankers, there is a narrow concern over the details of dollar obligations and a disquieting complacence regarding the substance of the ultimate payments to their policyholders. The managers of these great aggregates of capital are concerned too much with the literal letter of their obligations and consistently, flagrantly ignore the meat.

It is small wonder that capitalism is under furious assault by the forces of chaos and disorder. The men who should be fighting to preserve all that is good and useful in capitalism are silent in the face of mortal danger. Every well-trained Communist, getting his instructions from the Kremlin, knows that the easiest way to destroy and wreck and undermine capitalism is to debauch the currency. In the face of this truism I want you to point out to me the prominent or leading bankers or insurance presidents who have publicly urged your Congress to return our currency to gold.

If we in the Congress are to take any constructive action on this most fundamental and vital issue, it is necessary for us to have substantial support—particularly from men and institutions dealing with money.

Rightly or wrongly, the public presumption is that the leadership of our banking and insurance fields understand the subject. Their failure to speak up implies approval of a paper currency completely unhinged from gold. I can understand their reluctance to stand up and be counted but I can't condone it. They are doing only what their counterparts did in Italy and Germany in the decades of the 1920's. In a big way all of them grew to be frightened of their Government. They didn't and don't want to rock the boat. They lulled themselves into a sense of false security by assuming that everything will somehow come out all right in the end. They are afraid that if they speak their minds, reprisals or higher tax rates will be imposed or taken against them. They want to avoid being made a "whipping boy" of the administration. As their reluctance to be themselves, within the confines of their vast accumulation of knowledge, brought gigantic ruin to Germany and Italy the present-day disposition of the banking and insurance fraternities of our Nation to let the administration have its own way in money matters will bring the same sort of tragedy and ruin to all of us in due time.

Leadership is a demanding taskmaster. It calls for conviction and self-sacrifice and placing the future good of the country above self. A leader must take some risks. He must expect some abuse and even venomous attack and criticism. The country looks for leadership to those who are authorities in different fields of endeavor. America has a right to expect that the acknowledged authorities about money, the banking and life-insurance leaders, will publicly present and offer their views about sound money and fight for their adoption.

If our Nation continues down the foolhardy and evil path of inflation, the responsibility must be laid partly on the doorstep of the administration but partly on the consciences of our financial leaders who are guilty too because they remain mute while the cause of honest money cries out of the pain of agony for American defenders.

There are men and women in Congress willing and able to take up the cudgels for real money. I am among those who believe that the return to a gold standard is a reasonable, early, and practicable possibility.

There are three approaches.

The first is a return to the fictitious base established by Treasury regulations under authority of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. They call for a dollar defined as one thirty-fifth of an ounce of pure gold. This base has been a monetary fiction and has never been tested.

There is much evidence, persuasive to me, that any return to gold on the basis of an ounce of gold for $35 would result in a run on our gold stocks and invite their early dissipation. This might prove a fatal blow to gold as a standard.

A price for gold must be established which, in the light of prevailing conditions, constitutes a fair, a tenable equation between gold and goods. That price must be set at a level which will not expose our gold reserve to the danger of dissipation.

What is such a price for gold? How can it be determined?

The technicians within our official monetary and financial agencies—I mean the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board, and the International Monetary Fund—hold that any change in the price of gold must be made by Executive decision. In other words, they want the right to change the base for our currency. They mean well. They have the faith in their own infallibility which is the hallmark of all planners and all dictators. Without in any sense reflecting on their capacity or probity, I do not trust them.

There is a better way. We have passed through the ordeal of a great war. Our economy has suffered unprecedented distortions. Not the least of these is the great increase in the public debt and the prodigious growth in our money supply. These cannot be restored to prewar levels without deflationary pressures so rigorous as to undermine our economy. The operation could be successful but the patient in the process might also die. It is not necessary to run this risk.

Let gold for a period of time be traded freely in an open market. Let buyers and sellers from all parts of the world match values. Over a period of time a price for gold will emerge which has stood the test of market action. Let Congress take such a price for gold and use it to reestablish the dollar on a firm base of gold.

We must keep faith with GI Jones. He represents America. He is the real strength and hope of America. His home-building instinct, his industry, his willingness to take a calculated risk, his wary concern for the future—these are qualities that have made this country great.

If his financial leaders, both in and out of government, and by their silence, have defaulted on their solemn, moral obligations, it is by no means too late to compensate for this failure. The Congress, I am sure, with or without White House cooperation, is ready and willing to play its part. But I must, and want to, warn you that the high lord of monetary justice and economic stability will help only those who help themselves. Your Congress is an instrument through which our American way can be restored and preserved or dissipated and destroyed. Your Congress looks to America for advice and assistance concerning what you want done. If you want money which is hard, reliable, and honest I would urge you to give your very lives if necessary to attain it. If you are satisfied to let things and dollars drift and slide aimlessly as they have done for years, there is nothing my kind of people can do about it.

Sound American homes and sound American dollars are inseparable. If you lose one you are certain to lose the other. I came along this afternoon in hopes that together we might work and fight a little harder to save them both.

Polish Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] which was recently delivered on the Justice for Poland program, a program which is sponsored by the Polish-American Congress, western Massachusetts branch, the president of which is Dr. Karol Smolczynski, of Chicopee, Mass.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLISH FREEDOM

Much has been written and much has been said of the Polish people's long and glorious struggle to establish and preserve an independent Polish nation. Perhaps, however, insufficient credit has been given to an equally lustrous aspect of Polish history—the age-old and honorable fight waged by the Polish people for the recognition of the dignity of the individual and his God-given right to live and work and die a free man.

The record of the Poles' passionate attachment to the human freedoms is an ancient and enviable one. Long before our forefathers founded the United States of America and dedicated it to the proposition that all men are created equal, there was flourishing in Poland a strong tradition of democracy and social justice.

This democratic tradition found early and eloquent expression in 1543, when Frye-Modrzewski, protesting the general practice of forbidding the peasant to move from the soil he tilled, dared to voice the radical thought that before God all men are equal.

Far ahead of their time, the words of Frye-Modrzewski went largely unheeded in his day. But his cry echoed down through the decades of Polish history to be raised again and again, in different forms, by other great Polish liberals. The pages of Polish history are bright with the famous names of these pioneers of political democracy who demanded social and economic reforms and compassion for the exploited masses of Poland.

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries this early Polish tradition of liberalism and democracy was inspired largely by religious motives. What had been primarily a religious and humanitarian movement was transformed into a political force by the impact of the revolutionary ideas of liberty, equality, and fraternity which in the eighteenth century swept the breadth of the continent of Europe and shook society to its very core.

Spearheading this force in Poland was the redoubtable Stanislas Staszic, the great Polish patriot who has been called the patriarch of Polish democracy. Staszic tirelessly and selflessly devoted his life to the service of the Polish people and the cause of Polish democracy. For 40 years he strove ceaselessly and magnificently to abolish serfdom, to secure private rights, and to establish the principle of the freedom of movement for the peasant.

The writing and preachings of Staszic, and other renovators of Polish political thought were shortly translated into concrete political action designed to advance the democratization of Poland.

Aroused by the tragedy of the first partition in 1772, the Polish people launched a 20-year program of sweeping social and political reforms which culminated in 1791, in the constitution of the 3d of May—that great, independent product of Polish democracy-in-action which evoked the spontaneous acclaim of humanitarians everywhere.

Ranked among such peerless documents in the history of human progress as the Magna Carta and the American Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the 3d of May nevertheless precipitated the extinction of Poland as a political entity. For this magnificent milestone in the march of democracy raised so high the torch of human liberty and enlightened liberalism that the tyrannical monarchs of Poland's neighbors, alarmed at this latest menace to the perpetuation of their own despotic rule, were impelled to dismember Poland in the partitions of 1793 and 1795. It is, however, to the everlasting glory of the Poles that Poland fell, not because she could not live, but because, inspired and strengthened by her democratic ideals, she chose to live only as a nation in which her citizens would be free.

Although Poland was no longer to be found on the map of Europe by 1800, the flames of democracy and liberalism which had consumed her political independence continued to burn brightly in the hearts of her people. Events in Poland's history from the last decade of the eighteenth century to the restoration of Poland as an independent European state after World War I provide ample evidence that, far from losing their faith in democracy, the Polish people cherished and were sustained by that faith in the long years of the fearful ordeal of foreign rule.

The nineteenth century witnessed many heroic attempts by the Polish people to win their liberation—the insurrection of 1830, the rebellions of 1846 and 1848, the rising of 1863, and others. All of these failed and were cruelly disappointing. But out of the bitterness of defeat two facts emerged with crystal clarity.

The first of these was that, in the debates in the Diet, in the columns of the press, in the thousands of political pamphlets which were flooding the country, there was reflected a new and invincible force in Poland life—general and genuine concern for the destiny of the common man. The Poles knew by now what human rights were; they were prepared to defend these rights with their lives, if necessary.

The other fact now apparent was that, in the defense of these basic human rights, the Polish people for the first time were acting together. Irrespective of class interests, they were working in partnership in a common cause—the essence of democracy at its best.

The result was inevitable. When World War I ended and the long-awaited restoration of an independent Poland was finally achieved, it was as a democracy that the Polish state was reconstituted. And, although soon surrounded by the totalitarian ideologies of communism and nazism, it was as a democracy—a free and proud and resolute democracy—that Poland lived until the infamous Stalin-Hitler aggression of 1939.

The years since 1939 have been a tragic and trying period for Poland. But it is one of the strongest characteristics of the Polish people that they are at their noblest in times of adversity. The great Stanislas Staszic once uttered these challenging and immortal words: "Even a great nation may fall, but only a worthless one can perish." Poland, as a free nation, has fallen now. But, recalling these words of Staszic, I am supremely confident that a free Polish nation will rise again.

And when that happy time comes, Poland, true to her time-honored tradition of honoring the inviolability of the freedom of the individual, once more will be a democracy, a free and proud and resolute democracy.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before Dinner of Somerset County Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me before the annual dinner of the Somerset County Chamber of Commerce at Somerset, Pa., on February 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I shall always have the highest admiration for the fine people of Somerset County. Here in your beautiful hills and valleys, you have built a solid structure of real Americanism.

You are the inheritors of a rich and historic tradition. The story of Somerset is an inspiring record of courage, self-reliance, patriotism, and love of liberty.

Across the soil of Somerset passed the first pioneer and military trails to the West.

George Washington, Gen. John Forbes, and Col. Henry Bouquet are outstanding among the leaders who made history in the wilderness of Somerset.

Their heroic exploits pushed forward the western frontier for peaceful settlement and advancing civilization.

The memory of Somerset's first permanent settler, Harmon Husband, is honored as a pioneer of America's struggle for independence.

He and others who followed him came here in order that they might enjoy political and religious liberty. They had a great part in the building of America.

With its magnificent historic background and its splendid progress, Somerset is an appropriate place to discuss Americanism and the problems confronting our Nation.

The course taken by government in recent years has brought us to a time when we must take our bearings as a Nation and as a people.

We have reached a time when we must again evaluate the principles which have guided our Nation to greatness in the past.

We have reached a time when we must ask ourselves whether we are to adhere to those time-honored and time-tested principles or whether we are to follow the socialistic philosophy to which so many of our people have been attracted.

The decisions we reach and the direction we take—now—will shape the course of the United States and the world for generations to come.

I do not hesitate to say that the survival of America as a land of liberty and opportunity depends upon how we meet the grave problems now confronting us.

The paramount issue before us is this:

Shall we fight for the principles which have made America the last remaining hope of freedom in the world or shall we be led into a socialistic pattern of government which has brought disaster to every nation where it gained control?

That issue has been forced upon us by policies and programs of the administration at Washington. They invite national bankruptcy.

The most powerful business corporation in the United States would go broke within a year if it were so wretchedly managed as our Federal Government is being managed today.

We are asked to accept the alien teaching that the concentration of all government power and authority in a gigantic Federal bureaucracy will provide security and prosperity for all the people.

We are told that the more we spend the better off we will be, even though the people are shouldered with taxes that grow more oppressive year after year, with an ever-increasing burden of debt and with inflated prices for food, clothing, housing, and all the other necessities of life.

We are told by President Truman that he must have a budget for the next fiscal year of forty-two and a half billion dollars and that we must go $5,100,000,000 in the red just to pay the cost of government.

When we consider that we are burdened with a national debt in excess of a quarter of a trillion dollars it is not surprising that more and more people are becoming alarmed.

It is not surprising that more and more people are asking how long can we keep it up and retain our solvency as a Nation.

But that's not all. President Truman proposes that we place education under Federal control; that we socialize the practice of medicine and place agriculture under political dictatorship through the Brannan plan.

No one has been able to estimate how much these dangerous proposals would cost. But we do know that they would add billions of dollars to the already swollen cost of government. They would place an additional back-breaking burden upon every home, every worker, every farmer, every businessman, and every other taxpayer.

My fellow Americans, that philosophy of government is the economic road to socialistic ruin and the destruction of American liberty.

To be free we must be solvent. To remain solvent we must be free.

To me it is immoral and dishonest for a President of the United States to assure the people of this country that it is perfectly all right for the National Government to go into debt year after year, even in the years of record-breaking national income.

And how did the President justify his action? Well, he said that, if we followed his policy of bigger spending and bigger debt, the Nation would become so prosperous some time in the future that the Government would then be able to balance its books.

But I would like to make a suggestion for the solvency of our Nation. It is this: Instead of gambling upon the unpredictable events of the future, I suggest that we start balancing our budget now—today.

I suggest that the only way to balance the budget is to cut down the high cost of government. By spending less than we take in there would be a surplus to be applied to the reduction of the national debt.

That may not be as romantic and colorful as waiting to see what the year 2000 will bring.

But, my friends, we know that this old-fashioned, traditionally American formula will work.

Down in Washington the administration defends its actions by declaring that 70 percent of the spending goes for wars of the past, national defense, interest on the public debt, foreign aid, and care of the veterans.

The administration says these items cannot be cut by an inflationary nickel, and that anyone who says otherwise is unpatriotic and a reactionary.

Well, I don't have to defend my patriotism. I'll let the record speak for itself. If a firm belief that my country will be stronger to face the perils of communism by living within its means is a sign of reaction, then I must plead guilty.

But the same charge could be made against George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln and a host of other Americans whose words and deeds and principles I have faithfully tried to follow.

It is not true that the 70 percent of the budget cannot be cut. National defense spending has already been cut sharply and many are of the opinion that it can be cut again without danger to the national security.

Foreign aid can be cut through more economical administration. I voted for this aid to get the nations of western Europe back to a stable economy. But I want to see it used the way we were promised it would be used. I want the countries of western Europe to keep their promise to work together and to help each other.

Let's turn to something else in the budget—public works. There is another big item of expense the administration makes no effort to cut.

Public works should be expanded when there is deflation and unemployment. They should be curtailed when business and agriculture are enjoying good times. No public works projects should be undertaken now except those that add to the national wealth.

Nevertheless, last year recorded an all-time high for public works, despite the peak business. This year the administration went out and broke last year's record.

Might I suggest that in a sincere program of economy this is one place where deep cuts can be made.

And I assure you there are many other places where the knife of economy can cut expenses without in any way impairing the efficiency of the Government to serve the people.

I cannot take your time to discuss the extent to which spending taxes and debt have been increased by the other levels of Government. But the figures show that the infection has spread from the Federal level to State and local governments.

We've seen some tragic examples in Europe of the fool's gold that waits at the end of the false rainbow we have been following.

In Germany, the philosophy called itself national socialism. The all-powerful super-government grew into Nazi tyranny. It forced the whole world into the hell fire of war and ended by dragging its own country down to disastrous defeat.

In Russia, there is another kind of socialism—Red socialism. This government calls itself a dictatorship of the proletariat, the common people. But it enslaves the poor and humble just as it does everyone else in the country. In fact, Soviet communism has dragged all the Russian people down to the poverty level.

And in Britain today there is a third kind of socialism. It is a kind of middle-class socialism. At least it started out that way, but gradually it is becoming a socialism of the poor, because it is making all the English people poor.

One thing they all have in common. The people have lost their independence. They have lost initiative and all incentive. They lean on their government. Their lives are controlled by the bureaucrats.

My friends, I don't want to see those things happen in the United States. I want our country to follow the path which carried it upward in a little over 150 years from a newly born nation on the edge of a wilderness to the greatest, richest, most powerful Nation in world history.

I want us to follow the path of independence, not the path of dependence.

In our own country dependence upon the Government has spread to an alarming degree.

At a meeting in New York in December of last year, I made the statement that 19,000,000 Americans are now receiving regular checks from government of some kind.

A short time later the distinguished Senator from Virginia, HARRY F. BYRD, declared that there were 23,000,000 receiving such checks. This caused us to compare our figures and we now feel that almost 25,000,000 Americans are receiving checks of some kind from government.

This includes, of course, all the employees of local and State governments in addition to the Federal Government. It also includes those getting retirement payments and those getting checks for subsidies of various kinds.

There are 37,000,000 families in the United States. Of course, there may be some families in which two people are receiving checks, or one person may receive more than one check. It does mean, however, that more than half of the families of America are receiving regular payments from government.

This cannot continue much longer or there will be no one on the paying side of the fence. We then must become a completely socialized government.

Now, let me turn to another great issue, that of loyalty, undivided loyalty, from all on the Federal pay roll.

All of you remember how the President sneered "red herring" back in 1948 when we tried to tell the people that the administration was riddled with Communists—that disloyal men entrusted with our country's innermost secrets were traitors and spies for a foreign country—Red Russia.

Across the Nation, in thousands of villages and towns, clean, decent Americans found those charges hard to believe. Because the administration sneered at our warnings many people felt that it just could not be true.

But unless the administration leaders were deaf, dumb, and blind, they could not help knowing what so many in Washington knew. The stories of Communists in many departments and agencies were no secret in official Washington circles. They were talked about freely. Information was turned over to the departments. The facts were there, but they were locked up in secret files and the President issued an order refusing to open the records to congressional investigating committees. The administration ignored Congress and the American people completely and answered, "red herring."

Finally the President was forced by public clamor to order a security probe by the FBI. The people who supported the battle against communism at that time forced the administration to order an investigation.

You know what happened. Scores of Federal workers quit rather than have their records looked into. Most of them were Communists. Some others were quietly forced out. To have made too much fuss about it would have discredited the "red herring" cries which still came from the administration.

And then, thanks to the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the Republican Eightieth Congress, the story of Alger Hiss and of many other Reds in high places became known. Those disclosures have been fully confirmed in the Federal court. I believe that most of the Reds have been ousted.

But when I study some of our foreign policies, including the tragic failure in China, I wonder whether they are all gone. I wonder whether some of these men or their fellow-travelers are not still in key places, influencing the thinking and decisions of our top officials.

And I think it is the duty of every American to make his voice heard on the issue of loyalty. We must let the Government know that we want policy made and directed by men with a single loyalty—loyalty to this land, our free institutions, and to the political system that made our country the mighty power it is today.

We hear a great deal about the cold war in which we are now engaged. But here on the home front another great conflict is in progress. The outcome will decide whether we are to continue as a Nation of individual freedom and self-reliance or whether American liberty is to be destroyed by the evils of socialism.

The opposing forces in this struggle represent two widely separated philosophies. One proclaims that America can achieve greater progress through an all-powerful Government supported by high taxes and the unlimited expenditure of public funds.

The other army is composed of those who advocate prudent and economical government within the framework of the Constitution.

The battlefield is the political arena.

As Americans and as leaders in your community, your place is in the front line. Your manifest duty is to protect and safeguard freedom of the individual and all that has been built up through generations of toil, thrift, and sacrifice.

The United States was established on a dream of liberty. Let us fight against turning that dream into a nightmare of socialistic slavery.

Cooperative Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on February 3, 1950, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], referred to a public statement made by Herman T. Stichman, the New York State Commissioner of Housing, in which Mr. Stichman criticized certain provisions of S. 2246.

The junior Senator from New York then inserted in the RECORD a communication addressed by him to the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, commenting upon the New York State Housing Commissioner's remarks.

In view of the foregoing facts, I believe it might be of interest to the Members of the Congress to have before them a release from the Division of Housing, State of New York, by Commissioner Herman T. Stichman, dated March 2, 1950, commenting upon the criticism of the junior Senator from New York of the commissioner's address at the meeting of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor at Miami Beach, Fla.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement of Commissioner Stichman to which I refer.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, March 2, 1950.—New York State Housing Commissioner Herman T. Stichman asserted today that United States Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN's criticisms of the commissioner's recent address at the meeting of the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor at Miami Beach, in which Commissioner Stichman pointed out deficiencies in the Maybank-Sparkman cooperative housing bills pending in Congress, must have been music to the ears of speculative builders.

"These Federal bills will milk cooperators out of almost a double amount of interest and prove to be a $2,000,000,000 boon to some speculative builders who have been responsible for the $25 to $35 per room and more monthly rentals demanded in new housing, rather than a benefit to lower middle income families. They are the forgotten families with incomes just too high for public housing and too low to be able to afford the demands of speculative builders current since the end of hostilities. Any Federal cooperative housing program should be made into an open laboratory to determine true building costs, with inefficiencies and the excessive demands of speculative builders eliminated and profits held to a fair and reasonable amount, just as the State of New York has done in its nonpromotion cooperative housing program," Commissioner Stichman stated.

Commissioner Stichman said the Maybank-Sparkman cooperative housing bills have no effective provisions for determining what true building costs should be and for limiting excessive speculative demands, in contrast with the cooperative housing program of the State of New York, which requires efficient building methods and limits builders' profits to a fair amount, 5½ percent to 7½ percent. New York State's program, the Commissioner stated, is providing cooperative home ownership with carrying charges of a little over $14 per room monthly, and down payments of about $240 per room, and will provide rental housing at less than $15 per room monthly. This will help to stabilize the home building economy, since the people can afford housing at such costs even in so-called lean times.

"Instead of following our leadership in eliminating inefficiency and waste in building methods, and preventing excessive demands," Commissioner Stichman pointed out, "the Federal bills seek to reduce carrying charges by providing for the lending of mortgage money by the Federal Government through the device of a Federal guarantee, with an anual interest rate which it appears may be 2½ or 3 percent, and lengthening the mortgage period to 50 years, or in the event of refinancing, to 60 years, with provisions for extending these periods three more years. This will not cut total actual costs; it will make them still higher so far as the man paying the bill is concerned.

"Increasing the mortgage period from 34½ years to 60 years, which would undoubtedly be availed of under the refinancing provisions of the Maybank-Sparkman bills, would increase total interest payments by 90.9 percent, almost double; i. e., by $5,510.62 on a loan in the principal amount of $10,000 at a 3 percent interest rate, and would effect only a 22.8 percent reduction in the amount of carrying charges. Total interest payments over a 60-year period on such a loan would amount to $11,574.21, so that the borrower would be paying $21,574.21 to pay off a $10,000 loan. Whom would that help? Is that cutting costs? Increasing the mortgage period to 50 years would increase the aggregate of interest payments by 53.7 percent, i. e., by $3,255.07 on a similar loan, and reduce monthly carrying charges only 17 percent.

"There is room for Federal aid in this essential field of cooperative housing and reducing home buildings costs, but the present Federal bills give no real help; they do not cut costs. Instead, they would increase the aggregate of carrying charges and merely spread the heavier burden over a longer period of years. So far as supposed savings are concerned, there is shadow through the device of a Government guarantee, which would bring a lower annual interest rate but would carry with it greater aggregate outlay, and obvious inflationary possibilities today. But there is no substance. There is no effort to cut real costs by spurring technological advances, encouraging efficient building practices and definitely and specifically limiting builders' profits, in return for the benefits, which would aid builders, of the low interest rate and Government guarantee. This would eliminate a continuation of the unfair and excessive speculative builders' demands which we have witnessed in the FHA and VA housing programs.

"It is as though the clothing or the radio, television, or automobile industries, instead of introducing efficient mass-production methods to lower true costs and meet competition, had asked that the Government provide purchasers with direct long-term Government loans or long-term Government-guaranteed loans at a similarly devised lower interest rate to enable such consumers to buy their products, and then offered the result as an example of cost savings. The price would not be cut; the monthly payments would be lowered, but the purchaser would be paying more in the long run because of the higher aggregate of interest over a longer period of years. That would be a subsidization of inefficient methods, just as the present Federal bills would subsidize present-day builders' inefficiencies and excessive demands. They are equally fallacious.

"The Federal bills would demonstrate nothing to the country at large; the only people who would receive the 'benefits,' questionable as they are in view of the increase in total carrying charges, would be those living in housing built under the Federal program. What we need instead is an open laboratory, just as we have in New York, to demonstrate how all building costs can be reduced—whether built with Federal financing or private financing, unless it is proposed to have the Federal Government finance all the housing needed now and in the future.

"New York State's cooperative housing program does demonstrate how efficient building methods can reduce building costs; it proves that the responsibility for present-day high costs has been that of certain speculative builders and not that of labor, because at Bell Park Gardens, our first pilot project for 800 veterans' families now completed in the Borough of Queens, we have used the same workingmen, the same materials, paid the same prices for land, and used the same private lenders, but we have been watchful and efficient and limited the profits to a reasonable amount.

"The bankers have been so enthusiastic about our laboratory housing program and the hope it offers of stabilizing the home-building economy that they reduced the interest rate to 3¼ percent. So productive was labor at Bell Park Gardens, and so efficient the contractors, that there will be a dividend of about $400,000, which we have provided will go to the cooperators, in connection with building construction of about $7,500,000. This is equivalent to a reduction of about $100 in individual down payments per room, reducing them to about $140 per room, or to an appreciable reduction in monthly carrying charges. Those monthly carrying charges leading to mutual home ownership are now only a little over $14 per room, including amortization of the mortgage, interest, heat, repairs, and maintenance. That is housing that the forgotten family can really afford. The contractors are making a good but reasonable profit, and are sufficiently satisfied that they are looking for more business.

"Under the Maybank-Sparkman bills, which Senator LEHMAN approves, the contractors would get the additional $400,000 which has been saved under our plan, instead of the cooperators, and the cooperators would have the privilege of paying almost double the amount of interest for 60 years, the remainder of their lives, that is, if they came from long-lived families.

"We have found that most builders are willing to accept limitations of their profits to reasonable figures, under our program, because of the hope it offers of stabilizing the home-building industry and eliminating booms and busts. They are anxious to participate.

"Senator LEHMAN would do well to espouse a program similar to that of New York. We would then have a true laboratory of home-building costs in every State of the Union."

Under the State's plan the new housing, but not the land, is exempt from municipal taxes for about 30 years. Commissioner Stichman said that such tax exemption will be sought only for a limited number of pilot projects in the State's program to demonstrate true building costs, and that all those who need homes would benefit by proof that rentals and prices for new housing demanded since the end of hostilities have been excessive.

Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Middle Income Group Housing Help Decried," written by George Ericson, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDDLE-INCOME GROUP HOUSING HELP DECLARED

(By George Brieson, editor of the financial pages of the Christian Science Monitor)

Are more laws needed to bring adequate housing to the American people? The administration thinks so. Two weeks ago it introduced the Maybank and Spence bills, designed to provide new aids to cooperative housing and to extend the FHA mortgage loan insurance authority. This week the Senate Banking Committee reported out the middle-income bill, setting up a new Federal lending agency with authority to use $1,000,000,000 in low interest rate loans to housing cooperatives. With an obeisance toward moderation, the Senators cut the $2,000,000,000 sought by President Truman in half and reduced the $2,750,000,000 requested by the administration for additional lending power of the Federal Housing Administration to $1,750,000,000.

It is not surprising that various features of this proposed legislation have excited controversy. There is considerable basis for the charge that it is another rather thinly disguised subsidy, calculated to elicit support from that large portion of the electorate which is held to be the backbone of the economy, the middle-income group. The question naturally arises why this group, which may be presumed to earn between $4,000 and $8,000 a year, and which pays such a heavy proportion of the taxes, should get what amounts to a subsidy paid for largely by themselves.

MEASURE SEEN AS CARRYING SPECIAL BENEFITS

Let us see what is the basis for the charge that the administration is offering another subsidy. First of all, it is not a public-housing program in the true meaning of the word. It is not aimed to remedy a serious shortage of housing, or to aid those incapable of providing their own housing, or to do away with slums. Rather, it lays itself open to the characterization of this legislation as offering special favors to the veteran groups and labor organizations which are supporting the bill.

No one probably is better qualified to evaluate the financial implications of this measure than Thomas B. McCabe, Federal Reserve Board Chairman, who condemned the cheap-money provisions of the bill. His criticism is all the more pertinent since he has long been an administration supporter.

That advancing loans to various nonprofit groups at extremely low rates would have a marked effect on private credit is hardly to be denied. The new agency would float its own bonds to get the capital at 3 to 3½ percent, with the loans to run for half a century or more. "We know of no mortgage credit currently available in this country on amortization terms of 50 to 60 years or at interest rates such as are contemplated here," Mr. McCabe told the Senate committee.

MCCABE OFFERS FOUR REMEDIES FOR OPPOSITION

The Reserve Board Chairman criticized the bill as inflationary, as a factor in boosting the volume of public debt, as a measure that would add to the Federal budget deficit and as a likely overstimulus to building which might contribute later to deflation in the housing industry. Mr. McCabe held strictly to the economic factors involved but he might also have asked why cooperatives should get terms so much better than other home owners. These groups would not only get money at rates only slightly above those paid by the Federal Government on its borrowings and would be able to get a 10-year extension beyond the original 50-year loan, but would be allowed to put off payment for 8 years during the life of the loan on both principal and interest.

FHA loans by contrast cost 4½ percent over a 30-year period.

The only limitation on the help to be offered by this National Mortgage Corporation of Housing Cooperatives (NMCHC) is that it is to go to moderate-income families. The general interpretation of the foregoing phrase or that of a middle-class group gives it an earning power of from $4,000 to $8,000. The middle-income group comprises persons earning up to $6,000 a year, according to the Internal Revenue Bureau. This looks to private building organizations like a step toward socialism. A free-enterprise system, they assert, has no obligation to house its citizens.

Opponents of the legislation are asking whether there is now a housing shortage which demands further participation of Government in this field. The building industry in 1949 broke all records in the erection of new houses, making available over 1,000,000 additional homes—houses and flats—compared with the previous peak of 937,000 in 1925. This high pace is continuing in 1950 with January starts 60 percent above the 1949 month.

IS THE HOUSING SHORTAGE ENDED?

The builders are concentrating on low-price homes, largely below the $8,000 figure and embodying many cost-saving features.

The fact that apartments-to-let signs are to be seen in some new developments, that the Federal Housing Expediter has decontrolled a number of areas, that many rent increases have been permitted raises the thought that the housing shortage is coming to an end. Those who doubt the necessity for calling forth a flood of cheap money may, therefore, be forgiven if they question the wisdom of the program and see in it the fostering of a political issue useful in the coming presidential campaign.

It is evident that though building is steadily catching up with minimum demand, the administration is unwilling to let the competitive element determine what is fair and reasonable in prices and rents. The sponsors of cheap money and other privileges for cooperatives say that lack of experience with housing co-ops makes lenders reluctant to put up capital. However, it should be noted that such co-ops, which are generally heavily mortgaged, have their troubles in bad times. Private builders point out that more than 75 percent of these co-ops in New York and Chicago went insolvent in the 1930's. The Senate committee reporting the Sparkman bill last year nevertheless said the Federal Government should advance the funds needed where private financing is not available.

Of course, the new bill would be a help to the private building of rental housing, which is to lose one prop when section 608 of the National Housing Act expires on March 1. That section allowed a mortgage up to 90 percent of estimated cost. The new bill would raise insurance limits to 90 percent of value on projects costing $7,000 or less per apartment, after which insurance would be 60 percent of the next $3,000. But as Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, says: Why give loans to a middle-class cooperative at 3 percent when GI programs must pay 4 to 4½ percent?

Surplus Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Bigger Hole," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, February 28, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BIGGER HOLE

Senator THOMAS, who is chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, has remarked that "the Republicans have got us Democrats in a hole on this surplus-potato mess."

Now politics being what it is, there's no surprise in the fact that a Democrat should be worried that the spectacle of rotting spuds in Government storage might prove a painful political weapon. Nor will we be surprised if the Republicans—the brighter ones, anyway—make use of this weapon.

But it does seem to us that Senator THOMAS doesn't realize how big this hole is. It isn't just the Democratic politicians who are in it. The taxpayers who foot the bill for this mess are in it much deeper. And that includes just about everybody.

Douglass Burnett, of Sparks, Baltimore County, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in the Towson (Md.) Jeffersonian of February 24, 1950, there appeared an article about a very fine and well-known citizen of Maryland who has recently been elected president of the Edison Pioneers. I refer to Mr. Douglass Burnett, of Sparks, Md., whose interesting career is outlined in the article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FATHER OF OUTSIDE ILLUMINATED CHRISTMAS TREE CHOSEN PRESIDENT OF EDISON PIONEERS—SPARKS MAN CREDITED WITH TAKING ELECTRIC LIGHT FROM LUXURY BRACKET

Members of one of the Nation's most exclusive organizations, the men who knew Thomas Alva Edison intimately and were associated with him in his scientific work, have elected Douglass Burnett, a Baltimore countian, as their president for the coming year.

There are only a handful left of these original Edison Pioneers, as the group is called. Thomas A. Edison would have been more than 100 if alive today and his son, Charles Edison, former Governor of New Jersey, is in his sixties.

Mr. Burnett retired in 1939 after some 45 years of utilities work during which he became recognized as one of the country's leading engineers in the fields of gas and electricity.

He is also known as the father of a Christmas practice now almost as familiar as the carols and holly, lighting Christmas trees on lawns. Mr. Burnett has lived about 7 years in Sparks and earlier lived more than 20 years at Cockeysville and Riderwood.

Probably more than anyone in Maryland, Mr. Burnett is responsible for the general household use of electricity today. Much of his long career was spent in work to take electricity out of the luxury bracket and

make electric lights a convenience now taken for granted by nearly everyone.

A native of Brooklyn, N. Y., where his father, Samuel Oliver Burnett, was in the hardware and household furnishings business, Mr. Burnett obtained his bachelor of science degree at the Brooklyn Polytechnic and Collegiate Institute in 1899.

After some postgraduate work and teaching at the same institution, he taught for 5 years at Brooklyn's Pratt Institute as professor of applied physics. When not teaching in the daytime, he was busy at night making apparatus to be used in the classroom.

Through his scientific studies he became interested in Edison's work, which was beginning to receive wider attention, and about 1895 he convinced New York Edison Co. officials they should give him a job.

One of his first assignments was to sell electric lights to the New York Times, which didn't have them and didn't much want them. Mr. Burnett used some of his most persuasive argument.

"You've got to take them," he told the business managers of the Nation's best-known newspaper. "If you do, everyone will, because they say the Times is never wrong." He got the contract.

He also was given the job of reorganizing the New York Edison Co.'s applications for electric service. These records he later described as confusion, confounded by confusion. Many of the largest users of electric power had no meters, and many of the meters in use weren't working.

He began restoring order to the system, and eventually had seen to it that meters were installed everywhere and that every meter in the system had been carefully inspected.

Mr. Burnett superintended the annual surveys for the New York Edison Co. He was responsible for so much of the extension of the system that a great deal of the present system in the Borough of Manhattan was originally established under his supervision.

His work also resulted in the development of electric elevator service which speeded the construction of New York's skyscrapers instead of the four- or five-story buildings previously in use.

As new business came in, Mr. Burnett's salary and prestige increased, but he felt there was much yet to be done. Electricity still was a rare service, used mainly by the wealthy, and he believed it could be within the reach of all.

He started a house-to-house canvass, explaining electrical benefits, and then went to work on the New York Electric Show held about the turn of the century, where tens of thousands of persons for the first time became aware of what electricity was doing to revolutionize living.

One of the most convincing exhibits, Mr. Burnett has said, was demonstrated by a young woman named Miss Jane Elting Young, who went to the show and, using an electric stove, baked thousands of cookies which were distributed free to the public.

In 1903 Miss Young became Mrs. Burnett.

For the 1914 Christmas holiday, 10 years after they had come from New York to Maryland, Mrs. Burnett got her husband to decorate two trees in front of their home on Falls Road Terrace with electric lights.

The idea was such a quick and great success that the old United Railways ran three special cars each night just to take people on a sightseeing trip past the Burnett home. Mrs. Burnett died in 1939, a few weeks after her husband's retirement as manager of rate structures for the gas and electric company, where he had served 35 years.

When Mr. Burnett came to Baltimore to take an executive position with the firm then named the United Electric & Power Co., he found conditions in many ways the same as when he had started out with the New York firm.

Along Charles Street the only lights in business establishments were the small bulbs hanging over the safe. "A good way to show a burglar how to get in," Mr. Burnett used to say.

He had only time to get an impression of the volume of work ahead when the downtown section of the city was wiped out by the great fire of 1904. Mr. Burnett had been in town about a week.

Immediately, he directed the printing and mailing of penny postcards to all customers announcing the company would be ready to serve them at 8 a. m. the following day at new offices on South Eutaw Street.

As the city began to rebuild, Mr. Burnett helped install many reforms in the power set-up, and in the field of customer relations began to convince businessmen of the advertising value of the electric light. Lights came into the windows of the establishments along Charles Street and nighttime window shopping began and has never stopped.

The electric company merged with the Consolidated Gas Co. and Mr. Burnett helped establish the differentials in rates for domestic and industrial services, another phase of utilities management in which he pioneered.

Because of his early work with household gas heating, it was possible to pipe manufactured gas into many homes in this area years before it was done in many other parts of the country.

One of his principal contributions was made soon after he came to Maryland. He brought about the national standardization of lamp voltage at 3 instead of the previous 32. This made possible, among other things, the manufacture and sale of a higher quality incandescent lamp.

The rapid extension of electric service in rural areas of Baltimore County and the nearby county areas was one of the main factors that led to the establishment of the national rural electrification project. Mr. Burnett served as chairman for Maryland.

He was always interested in young men who wanted a better education and was greatly disturbed by the fact that many had no chance here for advanced technical study.

He happened one day to meet Dr. Frank J. Goodnow, who had been elected president of the Johns Hopkins University, and thought here was the chance he had been waiting for. He broached the subject of night engineering and technical courses to Dr. Goodnow. The latter was favorable to the project but said it would have to be underwritten for about $10,000.

Fortunately, a businessman friend of Mr. Burnett believed in the idea strongly. He pledged he would guarantee the $10,000 and the school was going within a few months. Later, Mr. Burnett is glad to say, the underwriters only needed to contribute $237. That was all they ever had to pay.

Mr. Burnett also was instrumental in moving the Baltimore Manual Training School from the old Carroll Mansion on Lombard Street to Howard and Centre Streets, former location of the Baltimore City College, where it became the city's first real vocational school.

For many years Mr. Burnett has been active in civic affairs. In New York he was vice president of the New York Electrical Society. Since becoming a Marylander he has served as chairman of the Baltimore section of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers and as president of the Engineers Club of Baltimore, the St. Andrews Society, and the Rotary Club of Baltimore. He has also been an active supporter of the Maryland Academy of Sciences and the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra.

He has three sons, Douglass Burnett, Jr., of Philadelphia; Robert Elting Burnett, of Schenectady, N. Y., and Thomas Douglass Burnett, the eldest, with whom he lives at Sparks. There are four grandchildren. All are grandsons except 11-year-old Happy Burnett, of Sparks, who is Mr. Burnett's shadow and, in his opinion, can do little wrong. Happy is the only girl born in the immediate family in three generations.

Mr. Burnett has been an enthusiastic motorist since the early days of automobiles and was one of the first persons in the East known to have taken his family on a vacation trip by car. It was a 2-week junket to Long Island, played up by newspapers of several States with both stories and pictures.

For about 50 years now Mr. Burnett has spent his summer vacations in New England—at Nantucket, where he is among the oldest summer residents and, in fact, is pictured on a resort souvenir postcard.

Since he retired in 1939 he has adopted a gentle masquerade that is peculiarly appropriate to the Nantucket background. He grew a set of white chin whiskers and acquired a sou'wester cap which together give him the appearance of a typical New England sea captain who might have just stepped off a whaling ship. His whiskers and cap were at first vacation items, and mostly a joke, but he had so much fun about them he decided to make them permanent. He gets a big kick when an old acquaintance sees him in the new guise and doesn't even recognize him.

It's not a 100-percent joke, however. The sea is in the Burnett family blood. His grandfather and other members of the family followed it.

Except for the summer vacations, Mr. Burnett spends most of his time quietly in the country, reading scientific books and amusing and instructing his granddaughter. But he always makes at least one expedition of some distance a year.

The Job Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address at the annual dinner, National Small Businessmen's Association, March 2, 1950, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., by Franklyn B. Snyder, president emeritus, Northwestern University, and president, the Presbyterian Hospital of city of Chicago:

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure and an honor for me to be here this evening. This association, completely nonpolitical, national in its scope, and concerned with the welfare of the country, has already accomplished much of which it can be proud. The future will see it doing even more to bring happiness to the citizens of the United States, and through them to the people of many lands. It is an association which anyone should be proud to join. I thank you for letting me be with you on this occasion.

I have never been a businessman, but I have spent my life enjoying the fruits of that freedom of opportunity and action in which you as businessmen believe. I have lived many years on the campus of a privately endowed and controlled university. I am today happily busy in a great American hospital, also privately controlled and endowed. These two notable products of our American way of life, the private university and the voluntary hospital, are dedicated to public service, to the welfare of men and women without regard to race,

creed, or color. They receive generous support from those who realize that freedom has its obligations as well as its privileges. They give back to the public many times the value of what they receive, and illustrate perhaps the finest flowering of the free-enterprise system operating in the service of humanity.

You, as businessmen, believe in what we call the profit motive, but you know well enough that your fellow citizens, as well as your stockholders, must profit from your activities. You know too that only under a political and economic system which recognizes the validity of this motive can you find happiness for yourselves or extend it to others. The private university and the voluntary hospital, though they never operate for profit, also believe in the profit motive as a stimulus to intelligent and successful business activity. Hence we have much in common—you of the business world, and we of the educational and philanthropic world.

I have read with care your four legislative recommendations for the Eighty-first Congress, and wish they might be laid before all the voters in the land. I join you in the hope that the Congress will act promptly and vigorously to check the rising tide of national debt. I hope the Congress will institute drastic economies here at home, and will sharply reduce the amount of money being given to foreign countries. I have no fear that slavery can ever be imposed upon this Nation by outside force; but I am not at all sure we may not enslave ourselves in the shackles of an ever-mounting national debt. To check this tendency, to balance the Federal budget, and to retire some billions of our outstanding bonds—what a tonic effect such action would have upon our national life.

Apropos of debt, I am glad to recognize the debt which private universities and voluntary hospitals owe to American business. Businessmen have founded many of our most distinguished universities, investing their capital in the future welfare of young Americans. They have given generously to support our hospitals and our universities, for they know that these privately controlled institutions make larger contributions to human welfare per dollar received than Government institutions have yet been able to make. Businessmen serve as trustees and curators of private institutions and foundations dedicated to public welfare. For all these services we of the universities and hospitals are grateful—sincerely grateful—to you of the business world.

There are many things, ladies and gentlemen, which American business and American education have done together in the past, and which I hope they will continue to do together in the future. And just at present they have one great task in common; a task so important and so difficult that all minor obligations are insignificant. That task is to combat the insidious but steady encroachments of socialism upon our national life. That is the job ahead; to preserve freedom in the United States.

Socialism is like old age: it creeps upon one unawares. Old age never overtook a man overnight. Quite the contrary, his powers fail, but only little by little, and painlessly at first. Slowly his arteries harden, his eyesight grows dim, his hearing is impaired. If he recognizes the symptoms and consults his physician early enough a good deal can be done to postpone the final decay. But if he waits too long his case is hopeless, for no physician can cure old age, once it has really taken hold of a man.

Socialism lays its chilling hand on a nation the way old age overtakes an human beings. No nation, so far as I know, ever said "Go to now; after next Thursday we will all be Socialists." No, the affliction comes gradually, and usually without discomfort in the early stages. But the ultimate result is unhappiness, national destitution, and slavery. The only way to fend it off is to be alert to the symptoms, and take proper measures to eliminate them. In this way socialism can be kept at bay, for though old age is inevitable, socialism is not.

I say socialism works slowly, and by doing so lulls its victims into apathy. It took two or three centuries for the poison to destroy Rome. At first the citizens merely allowed their rulers to keep themselves in power through gifts of cheap food and of treasure. Then the vicious idea that "the government will do it" gradually poisoned the thinking of the hardiest race that Europe had yet produced. Little by little integrity and thrift and industry gave place to corruption and waste and indolence. Before long, and probably without realizing it, the people had bartered their ancient heritage of freedom for the specious ease and false security offered them by politicians. And then Rome fell, not because it was beaten down by superior physical force, but because it had collapsed spiritually. The Roman new deal, which was to have made every man happy, sold the nation into slavery.

Many centuries later another nation was to have a similar experience. It was suffering from the aftermath of war, with all that that implies, and came under the leadership of a self-confident idealist. He was intolerant of criticism, willing to manipulate facts to suit his own purposes, but smart enough to limit his early activities to combatting a financial depression. He regulated business, established new rules to govern commerce and finance, and dismissed from the government men who did not approve of the new ideas.

The new leader saw that under the old system of free enterprise merchants and landlords could make money. So he levied new taxes to take away their profits and destroy what he called the monopoly of capital. To please the laborers, he controlled prices but not wages. To win the favor of the farmers he gave them loans and subsidies, which worked first to their advantage, but ultimately to their ruin. And when the national debt mounted alarmingly, he pooh-poohed his critics by saying that earlier leaders had not understood government finance.

That is the story of China under Su Tungpo in the eleventh century as told by the distinguished present-day historian Lin Yutang. Ultimately, of course, this experiment collapsed miserably and brought the nation to financial ruin—with the loss of the rich northern provinces. The attempt to establish state socialism, though made by a very clever man, all but ruined the country.

If eleventh-century China seems too far away to be significant, look at contemporary England. When the British, too worn by their sacrifices during the war to be able even to think clearly, turned the government over to the Socialists, they took a long step toward disaster. The nationalization of one industry after another, with the resulting inefficiency of management and steady increase in costs, was bad enough, in all conscience. But far worse was the concentration of power in a central government which blundered more often than it succeeded.

Fortunately for England, and for the cause of freedom everywhere, the recent election proved that there is still hope of a change—yes, there is now the certainty of a change. Despite their disheartenment, their regimentation, their willingness to stand patiently in queues, the English have not lost their belief that liberty is worth all that it costs, or their willingness to fight for that in which they believe. Before long they will be free again.

Anthony Eden put the case against socialism well when he said last summer, "The Socialist Party is far too much given to control for the love of control. * * * In restricting liberty in small matters, they are playing into the hands of those who would suppress liberty in the greater things of life. The more we are conditioned to control, the weaker becomes that sense of personal responsibility that in the past has been our strength as a nation."

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the real tragedy of socialism, of the all-powerful state, no matter what you call it or where you find it: that is the real reason we should oppose it. Not that it is wasteful and stupid and inefficient; not that it attracts third-rate men to its councils; not that it blunders tragically in its attempts to plan your lives and mine; but that it undermines the sense of personal responsibility and destroys normal, laudable, human ambition. Of course it attacks my pocketbook; but—far worse—it also poisons my soul. Ultimately its victims cease struggling. "Why worry" they say, "we can't do anything about it. The government controls us—we no longer control the government—to hell with it."

"But," you say, "this is the United States; we are still free; let's not worry about what happened in England." I agree that worry is of no use whatever. But I add that unless we resolutely and promptly do something vigorous about it, we may well find ourselves where England was before the election. And that, as I said not long ago, is the job ahead—to check the development here in the United States of the socialized state.

Already too many Americans are working to bring it into being. Honest but stupid visionaries, undercover friends of communism, and some who merely lust for power for its own sake, are actively busy promoting the destruction of free enterprise. Certain religious and political groups are openly advocating the elimination of the profit-motive from our national life, and the establishment in its place of a total planned economy.

No one can object when these radicals air their opinions. They are merely exercising the right of free speech. But I wish that intelligent conservatives would exercise the same right. I wish they would proclaim from the housetops that a program of Nation-wide planned economy, carried to its logical conclusion, is really a program of national slavery. We of the center and the right, ladies and gentlemen, are far too complacent, too lethargic. Our opponents never sleep.

A second indication of the trend of the times is the alarming growth of the administrative departments of the Federal Government, in size and in power. Well intrenched Federal bureaucracies are dictating the rules of the game in many phases of our national life, and are ceaselessly alert for more worlds to conquer. Even if the bureaucrats were skillful managers and planners, their increasing numbers and authority would be a menace to our national freedom. But they are not skillful; they are bunglers. See what they have done with potatoes and eggs, or think for a moment about that monstrous thing called the Brannan plan.

Few people who advocate—or acquiesce in—increasing the power of the Federal Government realize that in doing so they are working for socialism. But they are. For the submergence of the individual in the state is the very heart and soul of socialism. So long as we are free to protest, to assert our own independence, to enjoy our liberties as Americans, there will be no Socialist state. But once we are shackled by debt and taxes and hemmed in by administrative regulations we lose the power of effective resistance; ultimately we lose the will to resist. And then the whole battle is lost.

As we all know, the Constitution provides for a tripartite Government: executive, legislative and judicial branches all performing their proper functions, and acting as checks and balances on one another. During the past 20 years we have seen the executive department usurp many of the powers of the legislative, and attempt, through a "packing" process, to bring the judicial to heel. From this situation it is no long step to government by a single party, a single bureau, or perhaps by a single individual. The bare mention of such a possibility is repulsive. But that is no reason for burying our heads in the sand.

The bait offered us by those who favor an all-powerful socialistic state is attractive. For example, we are all interested in the education of our children and in their health. When either of these matters is mentioned, we become sentimental. Of course we want better schools, better hospitals, better medical service in small towns. And since we are already taxed to exhaustion we agree to "let the Government do it"—forgetting that the Government can pay the bills only out of our own depleted pocketbooks. We also forget that as soon as it is paying the bills it will inevitably control, no matter what safeguards may be attempted.

What about Federal aid to education; do we really think that in the long run it would be good for the country? I for one do not. Our American educational system, imperfect, but still the best in the world, has been built on the basic principles of local autonomy and local responsibility. There is no emergency which can possibly justify abandoning these time-tested principles. If my State of Illinois really wants better schools it can have better schools, by eliminating waste in the administration, or by increasing State taxes on liquor and cosmetics. We will gain nothing by sending our money to Washington to have half of it returned to us for our educational budget.

But, you say, not all States are as wealthy as Illinois. Should not the Federal Government help those who cannot help themselves? Mr. Frank Holman, president of the American Bar Association in 1949, recently discussed this question. He pointed out that the State most commonly cited as in need of such aid had increased teachers' salaries 156 percent in 8 years, had a surplus in its treasury greater than its total debt, and through the process of investing this surplus in United States bonds was actually lending money to the Federal Government. The same situation would probably be found in other places, if the real facts were brought to light. I say again no educational emergency exists which can justify abandoning our well-established principles of local autonomy and local responsibility, and allowing our schools, through subsidization, to come under the control of the Federal Government.

An even more attractive lure dangled before us is the promise of free medical and hospital care through a system of compulsory health insurance paid for out of Federal money.

It is commonly stated that millions of low-income families are without competent medical care; that the profession is unable or unwilling to give them this care; that hospital and nursing costs are prohibitive, and that the only way to solve this problem is to turn it over to the Federal Government.

No intelligent person doubts that illness sometimes lays a heavy burden on persons with middle-range incomes, that the United States needs more physicians than it has, or that the distribution of these physicians leaves many areas inadequately cared for. The war interrupted the work of our medical schools, stripped them of their youngest and most vigorous teachers, filled their classrooms with poorly prepared students, and sent into uniform hurriedly graduated medical officers who had had about half the training we expect our physicians to receive. Our medical schools and teaching hospitals are only now slowly recovering from this devastating experience.

But even so American medicine is doing a notable job in the cause of private and public health. There are few cities in America where virtually free medical care is not available to anyone who really requires it; few hospitals which ever close their doors to charity patients. In the city I know best no one is ever more than an hour's ride by streetcar from a clinic where the highest type of medical aid is available without cost to the patient. And for the middle-income group voluntary hospital and health insurance—the Blue Cross, Blue Shield plans, and many offered by insurance companies—spreads the cost of any illness over some 60,000,000 participants, and greatly lessens the danger that illness will have catastrophic financial results.

That I believe to be the American way and the best way of solving this problem—by voluntary cooperation between the medical profession and the people that profession serves; by voluntary and local support of hospitals and clinics; by efficient administration of these institutions; by generous private assistance to medical schools.

I am glad this Congress has laid aside the bills for compulsory health insurance; I hope they will not be resurrected. I say this, not because they would give the country socialized medicine, but because they would almost certainly give it poor medicine; not because they would be costly—the voluntary system we all believe in is costly—but because they would inevitably be inefficient; not because they would put the physician on the Federal pay roll, but because sooner or later they would enslave him.

Even more alluring than the proposal for compulsory health insurance is the administration's recommendation of a greatly extended social-security program. House Resolution 2893, and its somewhat more moderate substitute, House Resolution 6000, are intended to establish such a system of old-age, survivor, and disability payments as will give generous aid to virtually everyone over age 65, and to many younger persons.

The complexity of the program is so bewildering that I do not pretend to understand it in detail. But, of three things I am sure: First, the program would be a powerful deterrent to any gainful activity by a person over 65, and would make drones out of many who are now happily employed. Second, the cost, as estimated by the Social Security Administration itself, would be fantastic; not less than $4,500,000,000 in 1960, and rising in 4 decades to a possible $20,500,000,000. Third, a vast new army of Government employees would be required to administer the program. Their salaries have not been included in the figures I have just quoted; nor can their possible political influence be estimated.

In each of these three respects the program seems to many people to be contrary to good public policy.

These objectors to the administration's proposals believe that we should encourage our older citizens to work instead of to loaf, and point out that medical science has made retirement at 65 a luxury and not in any sense a necessity. They believe that we should reduce and not increase Federal expenditure, and should fight shy of any plan which promises to become increasingly costly as the years pass. They believe we should lessen and not increase the number of Federal employees, and I add that if either of these resolutions should become law, this country would at one step have gone far towards a completely socialized State. I hope this proposal, like that of compulsory health insurance, will be definitely laid aside by the Congress.

I said a few minutes ago that, unlike old age, socialism is not inevitable. Whether or not it is to overwhelm us depends in large measure on people like ourselves, who believe that freedom is essential to the happiness of the individual as well as of the Nation. The battle has just been joined, ladies and gentlemen, and if you and I and all the other right-thinking Americans do our part, the victory will be ours.

What can we do? First—and I cannot say this too emphatically—educate young America; tell the students in high schools and colleges what this capitalistic system of ours really does to keep the national standard of living higher than that of any other nation; to make America the land to which the unfortunate of every other nation would gladly come if they could. These young people are alert, intelligent, trustworthy. They will be in control of things before long. It is important that they know the truth before they take over the driver's seat. The radical, who would overthrow the present order of things, is constantly busy on college campuses. The conservative should be busy, too.

Second, can we not make it quite clear to our Representatives in Congress that the needless harassment of business, big or little, can do only harm to the country; that thrift is a national as well as a personal virtue; that the organizing and administrative skill which distinguishes American industry should be used to make our Federal Government more efficient and less costly; that the States are quite competent to handle their own educational and medical problems; and, above all, that we wish less rather than more power in the hands of the Federal Government.

Is there anything hopelessly reactionary about these suggestions? I think not. I am merely asking Congress to preserve for our children the basic freedoms and opportunities which we have enjoyed. Is there anything narrowly partisan? I think not. Neither Democrat nor Republican wishes the individual to be submerged in the State, or hopes by his action to bring socialism into power. Is there anything in these suggestions to which you as businessmen should object? Again, I think not. You have already advocated them, directly or by implication, in your published platform. If you and your friends will really work to implement your own proposals, we of the educational world will gladly help, as we can, and between us we shall banish the spectre of socialism from our land.

Heroes of Iwo Jima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is so eloquent that any words by me can only spoil it. I give it to you exactly as it appeared on February 23, 1950, in newspapers throughout the country and in the Journal American in New York City:

HEROES OF IWO JIMA

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

It was 5 years ago today that United States Marines stormed Mount Suribachi on the tiny Pacific island of Iwo Jima, during which five of their number planted the American flag in its volcanic dust.

What a soul-stirring spectacle. What a soul-stirring story.

Like rolling billows it swept across the pulsating heart of the Nation.

The marines who raised our flag symbolized the unsurpassed gallantry of all our fighting

men. The marines who raised our flag epitomized the sacrifice of all our fighting forces.

Yes, she's up there—Old Glory. How bright the stars beam. And the stripes like red signals of liberty gleam.

We have stormed the darkness of night. We have set in the darkness a light.

It is the flag of Trenton, Gettysburg, Chateau Thierry, and Iwo Jima.

They hold deeds that shine like stars above our blessed shrines.

Behold our flag—it was born of the sun, the stars, and the sky.

It was baptized by American patriots. It was dedicated in freedom's holy light.

Its stripes are as red as a patriot's blood could paint them; as white as a mother's tears could wash them. Its field of heaven's own arch that bends o'er us and set with a galaxy of 48 brilliant stars glittering together for the glory of God's country.

It is the flag of our Nation. It is the flag of liberation. It is the flag of humanity. It is the flag of destiny.

Wherever it has been unfurled to the breeze, its noble and inspiring message has been: Here men shall be free.

On this day dedicated to the glory of Iwo Jima—let us honor those who died under the flag to keep it free. Let us weave a wreath of prayers. Let us weave a bouquet of spiritual flowers, whose sweet fragrance will be carried to the throne of God in memory of our heroic souls.

Because of them our lives are free. Because of them our Nation lives. Because of them our civilization is blessed.

Let us pause today in tribute to the heroes of Iwo Jima. All is quiet on the hill—but in the distance we can see the snow-white crosses covering the ground like morning dew, for there sleeps the flower of our American youth.

The Stars and Stripes flutter securely. Not a sound is heard—except a silent sentinel keeping vigil on the sacred soil.

Yet One walks there among the crosses. He lifts His holy voice in benevolent benediction: "My peace I give unto you. Well done, good and faithful servants."

So shall they rest in peace.

The Chinese Situation

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of Newsweek says that Mr. Trygve Lie, Director-General of the United Nations, is carrying on secret maneuverings and negotiations designed to get the majority of the members of that organization to withdraw recognition from the legitimate government of China, thus opening the way for installing in its place in the United Nations the Communist regime now established in Peiping which calls itself by the attractive name, Peoples Republic, but officially describes itself as a "peoples democratic dictatorship."

Mr. Speaker, I hope this report is not true and that Mr. Trygve Lie will disavow it. The United Nations is badly shaken already as far as public confidence is concerned and if it turns out that it is being used or can be used as an agency for carrying on maneuverings and manipulations on behalf of the Soviet Union and its satellites, that would be almost a fatal blow to the United Nations, and perhaps to man's best hope for peace.

Veterans' Administration

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the papers carried a story this morning and the service organizations have been talking with me about the Veterans' Administration dismissal of 7,800 employees because they do not have enough money to pay them. Approximately 3,000 employees in hospitals and 4,800 other employees are included, the Veterans' Administration says. Hospital beds will be taken away as a result. Already there is a shortage of 1,600 beds for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that with the closing of the Army and the Navy hospitals, and the Veterans' Administration hospitals, this administration is not mindful of illness or disability, particularly of our disabled veterans. It seems to be there is more interest in potatoes and things like that than there is in disabled men. It is like the old Japan that drowned weak people they did not want, or let suffer and die.

That should not be the American way. It is not America.

The following article by Jerry Kluttz appeared in the Washington Post today:

VA TO LAY OFF 7,500 BY APRIL 10

(By Jerry Kluttz)

The Veterans' Administration is rushing plans to fire between 7,500 and 8,000 of its employees by April 10, the Washington Post learned last night.

Several hundred VA employees here and nearby will get the ax in the major shake-up.

VA Administrator Carl Gray disclosed plans for the big reduction in messages sent yesterday to key agency employees here and in the field. He instructed them to give out 30-day discharge notices a week from today to become effective on April 10.

VA's department of medicine and surgery will be hard hit by the pending lay-off, the first it has had to take. It has been ordered to fire 3,000 hospital employees, from attendants to doctors, and 1,800 employees from the medical sections in the regional offices.

A total of 4,800 employees would have to be fired from the medical program. But the program has 117,000 of the 187,000 VA employees, and percentagewise the claims, insurance, and other administrative sections would suffer.

ADMINISTRATIVE FORCE HIT

Approximately 3,000 employees would be laid off from the 70,000-man administrative force.

Among the employees here to be fired will be most of the remaining temporary staff that was recruited to pay the GI insurance dividends as well as cute "here and there" among the regular employees at headquarters, the regional office, and Mount Alto Hospital. Officials explained it would be another week before the exact number to be cut here would be known.

The reduction was ordered, officials pointed out, for a combination of reasons but it all added up to lack of funds to maintain the present staff.

"We must get in line now," an official explained, "with our 1951 budget. The longer we wait the more people we must fire."

MISCALCULATION IS HINTED

There was also a hint that VA officials had miscalculated 1950 operating costs a year ago in preparing the budget. It was recalled that Congress, the day before it adjourned last fall, okayed a deficiency appropriation for VA—money which was intended to prevent the firing of about 8,000 employees at that time.

Although no definite decision has been made, officials confided that they expected the sharp cutback to result in the closing of from 300 to 400 contact offices throughout the country, and the closing and merger of half a dozen regional offices.

In addition, the eventual closing of some hospital beds is a clear possibility. A VA spokesman explained that additional hospitals were being constructed and several thousand additional beds would become available within the next year.

The Case for Home Rule for Washington

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD today a memorandum on "the case for home rule for Washington." It begins with a quote from James Madison that appeared in the Federalist paper:

The inhabitants of the Federal District will have had their voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them.

And he assured them that—

A municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrage, will, of course, be allowed them.

The memorandum traces the history of local self-government in the District. I urge you to read it.

The petition to discharge the Kefauver bill from the Committee on the District of Columbia now has over 165 signatures. We need more. I hope that those Members who have not yet taken action on the petition will sign it.

The memorandum follows:

THE CASE FOR HOME RULE FOR WASHINGTON

1. The founding fathers promised local self-government.

(a) In one of his Federalist essays, James Madison wrote that "the inhabitants of the Federal district will have had their voice in the election of the Government which is to exercise authority over them," and he assured them that "a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will, of course, be allowed them."

2. Washington had local self-government from 1802 to 1874.

(a) Elected mayors and town councils from 1802 to 1871.

(b) Elected House of Delegates (25) and Delegate in Congress from 1871 to 1874.

3. The people of Washington are capable of local self-government.

(a) They have an occupational acquaintance with public affairs.

(b) District residents are the best educated of any American city.

4. Taxation without representation is incompatible with our traditions.

(a) District residents pay local income, property, and sales taxes amounting to almost $100,000,000 a year, but they have no control over how their tax money is spent.

5. The people of Washington want home rule.

(a) They voted 8 to 1 for local suffrage in 1938.

(b) They voted 7 to 3 for it in 1946.

(c) Seventy percent favored home rule in Washington Post poll in May 1948.

6. The Nation wants the District to have home rule.

(a) A Gallup poll in 1948 showed that 77 percent of the country favored it.

(b) Many leading American newspapers have supported it editorially.

7. President Truman endorsed the Kefauver bill and urged its passage in a letter to the Speaker of the House on July 25, 1949.

8. Home rule would relieve Congress of an onerous councilmanic burden.

(a) All District legislation must now pass through both Houses of Congress.

(b) There are 28 stages in the passage of a bill through Congress.

(c) Elsewhere local policies are made by single act of city council.

(d) It takes an act of Congress to change street names, establish daylight-saving time, destroy starlings, cut weeds, etc., in Washington.

(e) It isn't fair to Congress; it isn't fair to Washington; our needs are neglected.

9. Both political parties have promised suffrage rights to the people of the District of Columbia.

(a) Since 1892 Democratic platforms have contained District of Columbia home rule planks.

(b) The 1948 Democratic platform states: "We favor the extension of the right of suffrage to the people of the District of Columbia."

(c) The 1948 Republican platform contained a similar plank.

10. The constitutionality of home rule has been upheld by the Attorney General of the United States; House and Senate Legislative Counsel; several eminent constitutional lawyers.

(a) Exercise of rights of local self-government from 1802 to 1874 was a practical construction of the Constitution.

11. All other cities in the United States enjoy local self-government.

12. All other capital cities in the world outside of the iron curtain have it except Canberra.

13. Lack of local self-government in capital city of world's greatest democracy embarrasses conduct of our foreign relations.

(a) Washington should have a model system of self-government.

14. Under present form of government here, we have no control over acts of city officials.

(a) If school facilities are inadequate—if crime rate is high—if municipal services are unsatisfactory—we cannot dismiss the responsible officials.

15. Lack of home rule dulls the edge of democracy—weakens the citizen's sense of civic responsibility—atrophies our political faculties for sheer lack of expression.

16. With home rule, the administrative structure of our local government would long since have been modernized.

(a) It has just growed like Topsy since 1878 and is a tangled jungle of overlapping, duplicating, and uncoordinated agencies set up through years in piecemeal response to local needs.

17. Under present system, Washington has nine bosses: District Commissioners; Bureau of the Budget; House Appropriations Committee, 45 members; Senate Appropriations Committee, 21 members; House District Committee, 25 members; Senate District Committee, 13 members; conference committees on District of Columbia appropriation bills; Congress; President of the United States.

18. Under the Auchincloss-Kefauver bill, it would have one boss—a city manager—who would be responsible to an elected District Council which would be the governing body of the city.

19. Federal interests would be safeguarded under home rule:

(a) Via constant oversight of District affairs by the District committees.

(b) Via the power of Congress to disapprove District legislation.

(c) Via the power of the President to veto District legislation.

(d) Via the right of Congress to amend or annul the charter at any time.

20. The home-rule charter would become effective only after approval by a majority of District voters in a popular referendum.

21. Voting rights of District residents in their native States would not be jeopardized—100,000 local residents maintain legal domicile in the States.

22. The proposed qualifications for voting in District elections are the same as those which prevail throughout the country: citizenship, age, residence.

23. Nonpartisan local elections will prevent any national political organization from capturing control of the local government.

24. Home rule will restore local self-government here after lapse of 75 years.

25. The Auchincloss-Kefauver bill is not perfect, but it grants as much home rule as the Constitution permits.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The overwhelming majority of the people of the District of Columbia do not want this so-called home rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has expired.

Resolution on Genocide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of the House to the following resolution on genocide, adopted by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, on February 3, 1950, at its Miami, Fla., session. I sincerely hope that our colleagues in the other body of this Congress will lose no time in ratifying the Genocide Convention of the United Nations.

RESOLUTION ON GENOCIDE ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE A. F. OF L.

The crime of genocide, which is the intentional destruction of national, racial, and religious groups, is a blot on our civilization and a serious threat to social security and international peace. It not only destroys life, but it also prevents life. Further toleration of this crime is a grave threat to our civilization.

The American Federation of Labor realizes that because of the required two-thirds majority in the United Nations Assembly it was impossible to include the destruction of political groups in the convention. However, the text of the convention as it now stands does not limit the scope of motivations on the part of the offender and, even if the crime were committed for political or economic reasons, it would be punishable under the convention.

International treaties are a result of negotiations, and, therefore, this treaty can be considered as a necessary instrument for establishing standards of human decency in the world. Article II of the convention, which speaks of the creation of conditions of life calculated to destroy national, racial, and religious groups, covers the problems of enslavement of members of these groups in concentration and slave-labor camps. In these camps labor has been transformed into an instrumentality of death. The American Federation of Labor, which took the initiative in placing the slave-labor problem before the United Nations, considers this convention as an important first step toward providing international sanctions against the destruction of life through slave labor.

Though the crime of genocide has in recent years been most gruesomely perpetrated by the Nazis, it is not limited to any particular country or nation. It is a criminal menace of world-wide implications. It has been committed in the mountains of Greece, in the Balkans, in Siberia, and in the Baltic lands. More recently mankind has witnessed a new form of this monstrous crime. We are now face to face with tragic extension and a frightening innovation in this crime of mass murder. This development only puts into painful relief the growing menace to humanity and the extreme urgency to take effective action against it.

Behind the iron curtain—and particularly in Soviet Russia—governmental authorities have developed a fiendish plan based on cultural grounds and have launched a terrific compaign to wipe out entire groups of their population. The new drive to make impossible the continued existence of Jews in Russia and in its satellite areas is going on under the flag of a savage war against so-called cosmopolitanism. Their crime is that they have, or might develop, a culture different from the ultranationalist and imperialist brand supported by the ruling party, by the totalitarian dictatorship, in Russia.

A vicious campaign is afoot to chase out all Jews from employment in occupations entailing contact with the mass of people in the U. S. S. R. or with the people of other countries. All citizens of Jewish origin have been eliminated from the Soviet occupation administration in Austria and Germany. Jews are no longer permitted to be members of Soviet delegations and foreign missions or to undergo training for diplomatic service. The door to employment in the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade has been slammed hard in the face of Russia's Jews—on cultural grounds. The same process of elimination of Jews continues ruthlessly in the ranks of the ruling Communist Party and its government apparatus.

We must keep in mind that in countries where one party has a monopoly of all political power and where the government dictatorship is the sole employer, such cultural pogroms against intellectuals and their followers mean virtually the sentencing of these individual human beings to death—by enforcing conditions which make life impossible, by ostracizing them and depriving them of all means of livelihood.

Here is terrifying confirmation of the fact that prompt international action to check the spread and stop the perpetration of this heinous crime is most urgent. Otherwise, humanity is likely to be confronted by still

more new manifestations and variants of genocide in various parts of the world.

In the light of the above tragic developments and urgent considerations, the American Federation of Labor appeals to the United States Senate to ratify promptly the Genocide Convention.

The Congress and the Nation's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered at the legislative conference of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party in Minneapolis, Minn., on February 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONGRESS AND THE NATION'S HEALTH—HEALTH LEGISLATION IN THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

I should like to take this opportunity to tell you about what's going on in Washington with respect to the one thing that is more important to you than anything else in the world—your health and that of your family, of your neighbors, and of your community.

It's a subject as big as it is important. But, fortunately for your patience and my very well known dislike of speaking at length, there are a few short cuts we can take.

For one thing, I know I need not spend much time talking about why the Federal Government is active in the field of health. Some 20 years ago, perhaps, there would have been people insisting that it was entirely the business of the States and of local communities. Today, Republicans as well as Democrats—even Dixiecrats—are agreed that the Nation's health is very much the business of our National Government.

We have learned that we Americans are a highly mobile people. With no iron curtains or immigration bars between the States, our people by the hundreds of thousands move from place to place throughout the country each year finding better jobs, seeking greater opportunity, carrying on their business or just looking for rest and relaxation.

We have learned, too, that just as our people move about freely and in great numbers, so too, does disease fling aside community borders and State boundaries. We know that the great cities of the country draw their people from the farms and rural areas of the Nation. We know that the health of city workers in large measure determines their ability to earn enough to buy the products of our farms. We know that the Nation's wealth depends on its people's health—that, in fact, our health is the basic source of all our wealth.

We know these things and we've learned, that while the job of protecting our health must be carried out at the local level—in the States and in the local community—the States and their local governments cannot themselves finance necessary health measures. Their taxing powers are far too limited. Not even in the case of very wealthy States, can they effectively carry on separate and uncoordinated programs.

We know, that just as disease recognizes no boundaries, recognizes neither State lines nor differences between rich and poor, so too must the battle against illness and disease and against the wrecked hopes and broken homes they leave in their wake, be national in scope. Our country's strength is in the health of our people.

We are all agreed that the Congress should concern itself with health problems. The fact that today such conservative Republican stalwarts as TAFT, of Ohio, and DONNELL, of Missouri, as well as the so-called liberal Republicans like MORSE, of Oregon, and AIKEN, of Vermont, all sponsor national health bills proves the point. It's true that, as usual, they were some 10 years behind the Democrats in learning about the country's needs. But I'm glad they have learned, glad that now we have bipartisan recognition of the fact that we have health problems, that these problems are national in scope, that they call for action on the national level.

To a great extent, we are also agreed as to what those problems are. Briefly put, they involve problems of preventing disease as well as curing it. Problems of getting enough doctors and dentists and nurses and other health personnel to meet the needs of our people. Problems of having the hospitals and clinics in the places where they're needed. And, given enough doctors, nurses, hospitals, and clinics, the great big problem of seeing to it that people are able to use them—are able to afford their services. Those are the problems. Throughout the Nation and in the Congress there's pretty general agreement on them.

But after we've stated the problems, we've got to agree on solutions for them; we've got to do something about them. And it's at this point that you'd expect to find the Congress torn by conflict and argument—much talk and very little action.

Well—let me surprise you—and I'm sure I will surprise you: insofar as I've seen newspapers and magazines writing about the Eighty-first Congress and health legislation, it's been in terms of conflict. There have been headlines and full-page spreads telling about how Republicans have damned the Truman health program as socialized medicine. There have been others about how Democrats label the Taft health bill, charity medical care, and state medicine on the Russian model. And those headlines have been true.

But have you seen any headlines telling you that the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress has worked a miracle when it comes to health legislation? Do you know that four parts of the seven-point Truman health program have already passed the Senate? Have you been told that in one session of this Democratic Eighty-first Congress we have passed not one but five major health bills?

I'm sure you haven't. In earlier Congresses, any one of these bills would have meant impassioned argument and much oratory. Its passage would have been looked upon as a major accomplishment. In the Eighty-first Congress not only did we pass five bills of major importance to the health of the Nation, but each one passed the Senate unanimously, without a single dissenting vote.

That's what should have been in the headlines. Those bills, if they pass the House of Representatives, are going to mean the difference between life and death to tens of thousands of Americans. Because they are important in themselves; because the manner in which we reached agreement on them has an important bearing on the argument over health insurance, and because I am very proud of the fact that I had something to do with the passage by the Senate of those five bills, I want to tell you about them—about what they are, what they can mean to America, and about what they will cost.

One of these bills—the school health services bill—will make it possible for every State to assure all needed health services to its school children. A second bill—the Public Health Units Act—makes possible public health services everywhere in the Nation. The third bill extends the Hospital Construction Act for 5 years and doubles its funds so that every community in need of hospital facilities can have them built if it can support them. The fourth bill creates two great institutes of research into the causes of and cures for arthritis and rheumatism, blindness, multiple sclerosis, palsy, and epilepsy. It is based on the fact that spending millions year after year to halt the spread of disease, to care for its victims and to provide relief for stricken families, without at the same time trying to find out what causes these diseases and how they can be cured, is completely illogical. Yet that is just what we as a Nation have been doing. Arthritis and rheumatism alone cost our people $100,000,000 a year for medical care, $120,000,000 a year for relief, and about $500,000,000 a year in wages lost. Yet we have been spending less than 3 cents per case of illness to find its cause and cure. That's why we want to add these institutes of research to those now operating in the fields of polio and cancer and mental illness.

The fifth bill we passed—and again I remind you that each of them passed the Senate without a single dissenting vote—was for urgently needed financial aid to medical, dental, public health, and nursing schools. A bill which, after the most thorough investigation, the Senate found was essential if we are to keep in existence the schools on which the entire Nation relies to provide us with the skilled men and women to whom we turn for aid in times of illness.

What do these five bills already passed by the Senate in the Democratically controlled Eighty-first Congress mean? Taken together and assuming that they will be passed by the House of Representatives, these bills can mean an America none of whose children need grow into adult life with physical or mental defects which could have been prevented or corrected. They can mean that every community in the land can have those protective and preventive public health services which have wiped out some diseases, halted the spread of others, and added years to the span of life. They can mean that people in rural areas and people living in the less wealthy sections of the country can have available that same network of related hospital services which in wealthier places has often meant the difference between life and death. These bills can mean an end to the financial disaster now threatening to overtake many of the schools on which we rely to turn out physicians and surgeons, dentists and nurses for the country—a danger which is nonetheless real even though few people now know about it. Finally, these bills can mean the establishment by the Congress of a definite and badly needed policy in the field of health; a policy under which we shall no longer think our work done when we provide relief and medical care and makeshift jobs for the millions maimed by blindness and palsy, by sclerosis, epilepsy, arthritis, rheumatism and other diseases; a policy under which, while we continue to care for those struck down, we shall also do that which is much more important—we shall mobilize the best brains in the country, provide them with the laboratories and the clinics they need, and put them to work to find the causes and cures for these dread diseases.

WHAT WILL THEY COST?

Those are the things the five major health bills we've passed in the Senate can mean to you and me and this country of ours.

But what will they cost? That's not a question which will be asked by anyone suffering from the diseases I've mentioned. It won't be asked by a mother whose child has died because there wasn't an adequate hospital nearby. Nor will it be asked by a young husband whose wife has been taken from him and from their children because doctors didn't know what caused her disease or how to cure it. Those people won't ask what this kind of legislation costs—and don't forget that sooner or later you and you and you and I will be one of those who will want the hospital, need the doctors, and pray that they have the answers. We won't worry about the cost either then.

But right now some people want to know—particularly one of our Minnesota editors who gets great pleasure out of adding up the total costs of the bills HUBERT HUMPHREY sponsors and implying that I'm out to bankrupt the country.

Well, in all seriousness, it's a good question. It's an honest one and one that calls for an answer. What will it cost to provide the health services in these five bills which the Senate has unanimously decided the Nation needs and can afford?

As a serious answer to a serious question I'm going to give you an answer that may sound contradictory at first. But it's not. And you'll see why. Those five bills will call for an expenditure of slightly over $300,000,000 a year, but I'm convinced that they won't cost us a penny.

Our editor friend would say they will cost $300,000,000 a year. In his terms he's right and $300,000,000 is a figure not to be taken lightly—even though it breaks down to $2 for each of us.

But these are millions we cannot afford not to spend. We have spent and we are planning to spend billions—billions not millions—to create one single instrument of death and destruction to be used in a war which we hope will not come. These health millions—millions not billions—are needed to fight a war which is already upon us—a war against disease and illness which is regularly killing and maiming millions of our people.

Now let's talk about costs in my terms rather than the editor's. When I put out a dollar and get back two—which doesn't happen very often—I don't say the transaction costs me a dollar. I say I've made a dollar. Similarly I say that these health bills won't cost us a cent—that if we spend two dollars apiece on them we'll be making money.

The spread of hospital services and of preventive medicine, the presence of doctors and nurses when and where they are needed, the emphasis on prevention rather than treatment of illness means lives saved. And that means greater productivity. It means we can cut down some of the 600,000,000 man-days lost to industry every year through illness. And that means greater wealth. It means thousands and thousands of families remaining sturdy, productive, wealth-making units of our economy instead of becoming relief-receiving burdens on local taxpayers for many years. It means saving, Mr. Editor, not spending—saving dollars if that's your concern—but saving lives and families and human happiness as well—and that's my concern. After all that's what this Government was set up for, "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," Mr. Editor—not the pursuit of the almighty dollar.

Well, now you've heard what we've done about health legislation in the Eighty-first Congress. And I know you're interested in what's been left undone—in the unfinished business before the Senate—particularly in what's supposed to be the great battle over national health insurance. Certainly the doctors of Minnesota are interested. But there really isn't any great battle. Republicans and Democrats aren't really at each other's throats. They're not really spending all their time in the Senate shouting socialized medicine at one another. Let me tell you how the Senate passed these other important health bills unanimously; how it happened that Senators TAFT of Ohio and HUMPHREY of Minnesota who disagree completely on so many other things were both able to put their names on these five bills along with such other political enemies as Republican Senators DONNELL, SMITH, MORSE, and AIKEN and Democratic Senators THOMAS of Utah, MURRAY, PEPPER, HILL, WITHERS, and DOUGLAS. Those are the Senators all of whose names appear as joint sponsors of the five health bills. That is the entire membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate—the committee which handles health legislation.

You've all been taught that when the lion and the lamb lie down together the millenium will have arrived. Well, let me tell you, that when Senator TAFT is found lying down in the same legislative bed as Senator HUMPHREY and Senator MURRAY, it is not one whit less significant.

In effect what this means is that health legislation which used to be highly controversial in every aspect has in large measure been lifted out of the realm of politics. Credit for this achievement belongs for the most part to the voters of America. They have made it very clear that they regard health as a very important subject and they have in no uncertain terms insisted that something be done about it. Even the Republican elephant with one ear tuned to Wall Street and the other to Colonel McCormick and the Chicago Tribune could not remain deaf. And when that happens in a particular field, statesmanship eventually replaces politics. But the American people must give a great deal of credit for expediting the process to Senator THOMAS of Utah, chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to Senator MURRAY of Montana, chairman of its subcommittee on health, and to all those older members of the committee who laid aside their profound differences of opinion on other matters when they took up health legislation. These men devoted long hours, day after day for many months to working out the details of these bills even though they knew that by working together on a bipartisan basis, their work would lack the glamor and spice which means headlines and political prominence. After they had heard representatives of the public and of the professions, they closed the doors to newspapermen, called in professional and technical experts and buckled down to work. By keeping at it and by keeping their initial differences of opinion out of the papers, they found that those differences represented either misunderstandings which disappeared of themselves or minor differences which in an atmosphere of mutual respect could easily be compromised. The result was that each of these health bills was brought out on the floor of the Senate and when it was seen that they were sponsored by every member of the committee, Senators knew that each bill represented a real need for action, that it was soundly drawn and economically planned, and that it would work well in action. Consequently, each bill passed the Senate without a single dissenting vote.

That's the way your Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has worked in the last year. That's the way it's working now, and that is the way we intend to keep on working on the problems of the Nation's health. It doesn't make for headlines but it does mean lives.

Now I've said all those fine things about that particular committee even though I'm a member of it myself and it could be embarrassing. I said it partly because you and I know that I'm a new member and that, while I'm proud to be on that team and to have helped write and pass those bills, the credit goes primarily to those Senators who, because of their seniority, made the decisions as to how it would work. I said it mostly because when we talk about the big unsolved problems of medical care it's very important that the doctors of Minnesota and of the Nation realize how far along we've come and the atmosphere in which we're working. Now let's turn our attention to those unsolved problems.

When the Eighty-first Congress got under way there were eight fields of health which presented serious problems. In five of these the Senate can consider its work done and done well. But there are three other fields in which action should be taken if we are to round out our program for the Nation's health. One of these is in the field of rural health. It's true, of course, that the bills we've already talked about are going to mean a great deal to farming communities. But conditions in rural areas are such that special action must be taken to make it possible for doctors to make a good living in isolated areas and for farming communities to afford the kinds of medical centers and laboratory facilities that modern medicine demands. That's another one of the seven points in the Truman health program—one of the seven titles in the administration's health bill and one on which I've introduced a separate bill worked out with our Minnesota cooperatives and designed to help them create the farmer's health cooperatives which we think may solve the problem. Since in this field, too, members of the committee are working in harmony, there is an excellent chance that we will have worked out and sent to the Senate before the close of this session a rural health bill on which we can all agree.

Another field on which we anticipate action involves special programs for maternal and child care. We don't like the fact that three times as many mothers die in childbirth in some States as in others. We don't like the fact that 60 percent of the doctors specially trained to take care of infants and children live in places where only 4 percent of the children are found. We don't think the American people like these things either and we hope to find a way to do something about them.

PAYING FOR MEDICAL CARE

The last and the greatest of the problems in health legislation on which the Senate has still to act is the one that is probably of greatest interest to everyone here—the problem of paying for medical care. It is around this point that all the sound and fury has centered—around this question that the argument over health insurance has raged for years. But as I said before and as I now repeat, in Washington the great battle over national health insurance is all over. The battle has been won. The American people have won. The Democratic Party has won. There is no longer any question as to whether or not we're going to have a national health insurance program in these United States. We are going to. The only questions that remain involve details as to how far we should go, how fast we shall go, and along what lines we shall proceed.

Let me explain by briefly reviewing the history of the battle which I insist is now over.

To all intents and purposes the battle began when the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care brought out its report back in the early 1930's. That committee composed of distinguished leaders in American life and headed by Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur—a former president of the American Medical Association and Secretary of Commerce in President Hoover's Cabinet—studied the problem for some 5 years. It found that while American medical care was among the best in the world, most Americans could not afford it. It found that doctors quite naturally concentrated in areas of greatest wealth while sick people naturally were somewhere else. It found that whereas the wealthy got the greatest amount of medical care, the middle classes and the poor needed it most. It found that the root of the problem lay in the facts that with each advance

in the science of medicine medical care grew more expensive and that since sickness was unpredictable none but the wealthiest families could budget the cost of illness. And having proved what the average family had always known, it recommended health insurance as the answer. Not compulsory health insurance, not national health insurance. Just local voluntary health insurance plans.

The storm broke immediately. Dr. Fishbein, speaking for the American Medical Association, denounced the idea. He insisted that it would lower the quality of medical care, that it would regiment the doctors, and he proclaimed that advocacy of voluntary health insurance was—I quote—"communistic, socialistic, and leading to revolution."

The AMA's Bureau of Medical Economics actually studied the problem instead of frothing at the mouth. It concluded that it did not want either voluntary or compulsory health insurance. Even it said that if we were to have either we might as well avoid the mistakes European countries had made in trying voluntary plans and establish a compulsory system immediately. Here's what the AMA's Bureau said of voluntary plans—again I quote—"without some sort of compulsion, voluntary insurance fails of its objective. The young and healthy will not join and the aged and sickly, if accepted, will raise the cost to a prohibitive point and, if rejected, remains protection from those most in need"—unquote.

Well, despite the AMA, facts were facts. With hospital beds going empty and hospital treasuries going broke while lots of people needed their services, the hospitals risked inciting to revolution and set up the Blue Cross system.

The results proved that the AMA was mostly wrong and partly right. Dr. Fishbein was completely wrong. The quality of hospital care was improved rather than lessened. Instead of being regimented, doctors had greater freedom than before—for any patient who had Blue Cross insurance the doctor was free to prescribe hospitalization when it was needed instead of having his treatment regimented by the size of the patient's pocketbook. And I don't think even Dr. Fishbein any longer believes that the men who run our Blue Cross plans are Communists or Socialists.

But the AMA's bureau of economics was partly right. In order to stay on a sound financial basis, to keep from being swamped with poor risks the voluntary plans had to protect themselves. The old and the sick could join—if at all—only if they were members of large and healthy groups, contracts had to be limited and charges had to be high enough to pay the bills. Perhaps the greatest drawback was and is the fact that they have to charge all members at the same rate. If it costs a $100 a year for a family to belong to a fairly comprehensive voluntary plan that means that a family with $5,000 pays 2 percent of its income, but a family with only $1,000 has to pay 10 percent; just the opposite of what the doctors, the hospitals and the people want.

As a result of all these factors our voluntary hospital plans while they have done an excellent job within their limitations, cost too much and can give too little. Our Blue Cross plans which are excellently managed and run still reach only 40,000,000 people—over a 100,000,000 Americans do not have or cannot afford Blue Cross protection even though it is sold at cost and only covers about 20 percent of the average family's medical care bill. And the great bulk of these members are concentrated in a few industrial States. The Blue Shield plans for physicians' care set up by medical societies after they got religion, are far more limited both in the services they offer and in the number of people they reach. In fact all the figures available in Washington show that no more than 3,500,000 of our people are enrolled in the kind of comprehensive health insurance plans that pay for almost all of their care and that includes the preventive medical care which aims at keeping people well instead of treating them only after they are seriously ill. In this connection I wonder how many of my doctor friends have ever asked themselves why it is that the plans which are run by lay, cooperative groups like Group Health in Washington or by industrialists like Henry Kaiser give really comprehensive care and keep a check on the quality of service rendered while the plans run by medical societies offer very limited service and no controls whatever of the quality of the care rendered?

In our own State of Minnesota which is far from being one of the poorer States of the Nation, our Blue Cross plan is one of the best in the country—both in terms of the service it offers and in terms of efficient operation. Even here, however, while it does not pay the entire bill for hospital services and does not permit people over 65 to enroll it costs a family $48 a year for its best coverage and according to the latest figures I have available hasn't yet enrolled 35 percent of our people.

Those are the highlights of the health-insurance picture as it has developed here in America. You'll notice that somewhere along the line the big fight by the AMA against voluntary health-insurance plans disappeared. The AMA suddenly decided that they were not communistic, but were fine things—so long as they were completely controlled by the medical societies, of course. You won't be surprised when I tell you that the AMA's change of heart coincided with the introduction of a national health bill in the Congress in 1939.

It was Senator Wagner who took the lead. Strangely enough his first bill was very similar to the one now being urged by Senator TAFT—but then the Republican elephant usually lurches along more than 10 years behind the times. In 1943, the first Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill calling for a national health-insurance plan was introduced and the fight really grew hot. The AMA and the Republican Party insisted that everything was fine; that all Americans could get all they needed; that if anything at all should be done it should be done by the States. But the American people recognized that stalling tactic. It's 40 years since workmen's compensation got under way in this country and we still don't have it in all 48 States. Year after year public hearings on national health insurance were held and testimony taken from people in all walks of life. The AMA continued its opposition, refused to cooperate in framing acceptable legislation, and persuaded doctors to contribute millions to a viciously un-American outfit called the National Physicians' Committee, run by a couple of high-powered press agents whose tactics were so low that the AMA itself was finally forced to repudiate them. But the people whose health and whose money was at stake, made themselves heard. Bill Green, speaking for the AFL's 7,000,000 members, insisted on national health insurance as the answer and suggested improvements in the bill. Jim Carey spoke for the CIO's more than 6,000,000 and their 18,000,000 dependents. Great capitalists like Lasker—one of America's richest men and a director of many corporations argued for it is the democratic way and as a barrier against communism. So too did the president of the Radio Corporation of America and Gerald Swope of General Electric Co.

Jim Patton argued for the Farmers Union and our own Cooperative Health Federation of America testified.

After each set of hearings, the bill was improved and the tide of public support swelled even further. Then when Senator TAFT, in the Republican Eightieth Congress, introduced his own National Health Act—even though it was a sorry substitute and was opposed by every single lay citizen's organization testifying—it became obvious that the fight was all but won. Even Senator TAFT and his colleagues, Republican Senators DONNELL and SMITH, had finally agreed that as regards paying for medical care (1) it is a real problem; (2) it is national in scope; and, (3) it demands action by the Federal Government.

Finally, when Harry Truman was reelected and the Eighty-first Congress met, the rush to put national health bills into the hopper proved that the fight was all over—the battle has been won.

(Incidentally, even the AMA now favors compulsory insurance, something which it always claimed was un-American. The AMA has agreed with us that when a group believes something is necessary for its welfare but that something is too expensive for one member to bear the burden and voluntary participation doesn't bring in enough funds, participation should be made compulsory. Therefore the AMA has made it compulsory that all members pay a premium of $35 a year into an insurance fund out of which it will pay $100,000 a year to two high-pressure salesmen and give them $3,000,000 to spend in fighting these health bills. The AMA advocates compulsory insurance to fight compulsory health insurance. And I want it understood that I think they have a perfect right to do so. I suggest though that if the principle is all right for the AMA, it's O. K. for the American people too, and I don't expect to hear the AMA ever again say that it isn't.)

We now have five national health bills before us in the Senate; there are still others in the House. All five of the Republican members of the committee which is responsible for health legislation are sponsors of one or another bill. Two other Republicans—FLANDERS of Vermont and IVES of New York—are sponsoring a bill. Seven of the eight Democrats on the committee are sponsoring national health bills and the eighth is busy drafting his own. Moreover, just within the last few weeks Senator HUNT, of Wyoming, a conservative Democrat and a dentist himself, has publicly stated that the Federal Government must do something to enable the American people to cope with the costs of medical care and has introduced his own national health insurance bill.

To all but the willfully blind these developments mean but one thing, we are—and in a very short time—going to have a national health program. And since every one of these bills looks upon health insurance as the answer to the problem, we are going to have a national health insurance program of one sort or another. That's not prophecy, it's fact, and it's a very important fact to my many friends in the medical profession who are here today.

What sort of program? That does call for prophecy. We have five bills before us in the Senate. At one end of the line there's the Taft bill. Very briefly put, it would give grants from the Federal Treasury to the States to provide care for all who cannot themselves pay in full for their care. I find it completely unacceptable and so did all the representatives of the public. First, because it pretends to solve a problem affecting 80 percent of our people but provides only enough for about 10 percent. Secondly, because it depends entirely on funds from the Treasury and permits the exclusive use of State employed doctors in State clinics.

I could give many other objections, but my third is conclusive enough for me—the Taft bill would help solve the problems only of those American families so desperate that they would be willing to publicly ask for charity. Charity is one of the heavenly virtues, it is true, but to ask 80 percent of the American people to depend on public charity as a solution to their problems is as repugnant to them as it is to me.

A second bill—S. 1456—is sponsored by three Republicans and three Democrats. It is much better than the first but follows the same lines and puts no limit on the amount of tax funds which might be used. Moreover, it would turn public funds over to private, professionally controlled, monopolistic groups to the exclusion of other groups.

A third bill—the so-called Flanders-Ives bill—represents a long step forward. It would use voluntary plans and supplement them by using Federal funds to make up the difference between what they cost and what participants can afford to pay. It rejects the charity principle and accepts the insurance principle of the President's plan. It rightly insists that no local plan would be eligible unless control was vested in the hands of the public. But while this bill does represent a long step forward, I do not believe it goes far enough to solve the problem, and; in addition, it contains several very serious flaws which, if unchanged, would make its operation very risky.

The fourth bill—Senator HUNT's—has been introduced too recently for extended comment. All I can say about it now is that it is the only one of the five which seems to make no provision for the continuance of voluntary plans and that it is written in such general terms that I am not at all clear on how it is supposed to work.

The fifth bill is, of course, the administration's national health insurance bill. It is, as you know, S. 1679, and it contains seven titles, four of which have already passed the Senate. Since to my mind it goes much further toward meeting our national problem and does it in such a way as to advance the interests of all concerned, I am proud to have had the opportunity to join in sponsoring it. I am sure that most of you here know its provisions at least in general terms, and since it is not my purpose tonight to debate these bills I shall not attempt to review it.

What I want to do is to ask your help—particularly that of the professional people who are here—and if the rest of my friends still bear with me, I should like for the next few minutes to talk directly to the physicians and the dentists and the nurses of Minnesota.

I want to say again that the Congress of the United States is going to pass a national health plan in the near future. We have five bills before us now and I've tried to explain what that means. I've told you how the members of our committee have worked together on other bills and I want you to know that we are now working in the same way on these bills. We know the people want an answer and we are determined to make it as sound an answer as possible. Right now in Washington, our staff is studying all the voluntary health plans in the Nation. We want to find out if they should play a role in a national health program; and if so, what kind of plans and to what extent. We want the answers to this and a host of other problems in order that we may draft a bill which means as much to you as to the people who seek your services. We've had the advice and assistance of farm organizations, of cooperatives, of labor groups of social workers, statisticians, and public-health people. They've consulted with us and we know they will again. But from the organizations of professional people who have so much at stake in this legislation we have received nothing constructive at all—nothing but opposition. I learned in Washington that early in 1948 Senator MURRAY had written the AMA—had asked its representatives to come to Washington, to go over his bill, and to point out anything in it that could possibly do damage to you, either professionally, politically, or economically. He had not asked support—only for constructive criticism. I cannot tell you how shocked I was to learn that your officers did not even have the courtesy to reply. They waited until the election of 1948 showed a Republican Congress elected and decided that the medical-care problems of the American people had disappeared and that even courtesy was no longer necessary.

I want to tell you that the time for that sort of blindness is past. The American people need and want, and are going to have, a national health program. If when that program goes into effect there is anything in it which hurts you in any way, it will be because of criminal negligence on the part of your organizations. It will not be the fault of the American people or of the men who draft the law. We do not believe we can have a sound health program unless it is as sound for you as it is for us.

I believe the American people want a plan that will enable them to purchase health care on a decent, self-respecting, pay-as-you-go basis. They want a plan that will enable them to use your services when and as needed—at your discretion. They want to pay in proportion to their incomes and they want the Government to add enough so that you get paid well and with plenty of incentive. They're thinking of you as well as of themselves because they and we, your representatives in Congress, know that we want the best medical care possible and that we can get it only from people who are free and happy in their professions.

Without your help we have tried painstakingly to protect your interests in drafting the administration's bill. We've not only guaranteed the patient complete freedom to choose or change his doctor but we've guaranteed you complete freedom too. It's spelled out in the bill. You are free to enter the plan or not, or to enter it on a part-time basis if you so choose. If you do enter you are free to accept or reject patients just as now. In each community doctors can decide for themselves on what basis they would like to be paid. You can engage in group or solo practice as you will. You are represented on all local plans and at the State and National level by men of your own choosing. And the bill guarantees that professional matters shall be decided upon only by professional men.

Without your assistance we have tried to give you every just and equitable assurance. But we should have your help. I don't mean the sponsors of S. 1679 alone and I don't mean help in passing a bill. I do mean that since one of the bills before us or a variation of one is going to pass, your officers owe an obligation to you and to the Nation to see to it that should a bill pass even over their objections, it protects your interests as well as is humanly possible.

I am asking you—pleading with you—to recognize your obligations to the future of your professions and of the Nation of which you are citizens. As individuals I know you do, but when your organizations speak for you, they do not—and they are your organizations.

The American people have granted you your licenses to practice.

The American people have said that no one shall compete with you.

The American people have invested $40,000 of their money for every one of you doctors in order that you might have hospitals in which to work without cost to you.

The American people have invested thousands more in the professional training each of you receive.

Having done these things and more, the American people with all their respect for you as men and women of science and as friends, are not going to permit your organizations to tell them that they have nothing to say about the manner in which they shall pay your bills.

That's why I am asking that before it's too late you stop listening to those venal men who make their fortunes by urging you to fight every proposal and charging you for the privilege of carrying on the fight. Forget the scare words like "socialism" and "welfare state." Use the same scientific approach to economic and political problems as you would in investigating a purportedly new remedy for disease. This Government which the firm of Whitaker & Baxter and the AMA want you always to fight—which they want you to fear—is your Government. It belongs to and is run by you and your neighbors. It's the Government of the United States of America and of its people. That's the Government the Journal of the AMA is talking about when it says the Government wants to regiment you, to destroy your livelihood, to ruin your profession. That sort of talk is nonsense and right now for you it's dangerous nonsense.

Those of us who serve your Government in the Congress are not ogres. We're elected by you and your neighbors. We want to work for and with you—not against you. And in the field of health this is particularly true. The people tell us what their needs are—we should have your help in getting it for them.

Read the health bills in the Congress. Don't let anyone tell you glibly what they would mean or do to you. Read them. Put your finger on any line or lines you think bad or harmful. Call them to our attention. Either we can explain why they are there and how they are good, rather than bad, or we'll change them. No one of the sponsors of the national health insurance bill thinks he has a perfect bill. Not a single Senator sponsoring any of the other bills thinks his is perfect—I know I can speak for them all.

We do think that American medical care is among the best in the world. But we know that too many Americans can't afford it under our present system of payment. We want to change not the practice of medicine, but only the way in which we pay for it. The people of this country are demanding a change and, with or without your help, we're going to give it to them. Without your help we won't do as well and you may inadvertently and unnecessarily suffer. With your help we should have no problem reaching a solution satisfactory to all.

For myself, for the Congress, and for the people of your country, I ask that help. I can pledge you our good faith—completely. Will you extend to us a little?

Unification of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of a resolution endorsing House Resolution 463, to encourage a peaceful, prosperous, and united Ireland, but without imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people, which I have introduced and which is receiving widespread support from many Americans.

NEW YORK SOCIETY FOR THE
CITY OF NEW YORK, INC.,
New York, February 24, 1950.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: At a duly organized regular meeting of the New York Society for the

City of New York, Inc., held at the Hotel Astor, Floral Room, on February 14, 1950, a short business session was held to provide time for our featured guest speaker, Hon. John J. Flanagan, chairman of our board of governors, who gave to the body a minute description of his recent trip to Ireland, which must have left on his memory a lasting impression, since no notes were in evidence.

Also read to the body was a copy of the resolution, House Resolution 463, Eighty-first Congress, second session, as presented in the House of Representatives by Congressman Javits, February 7, 1950, and referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs, a resolution to encourage a peaceful, prosperous and united Ireland, but without imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people.

On motion duly seconded the body resolved to adopt unanimously, and endorse said resolution as part of its minutes and incorporate same therein. Further resolved that a copy of this endorsement be filed with the Congress of the United States.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN J. FLANAGAN, *Secretary.*

Blind Legal Stupidity Rides to a Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as the days pass by many reports are being made of acute coal shortages in different parts of the Nation. One segment of reactionaries seek to blame President Truman because the miners and mine owners cannot agree upon a settlement of their wage disputes, while another segment of the same political brood put the blame upon John L. Lewis and the United Mine Workers Union. Never once have I heard the mine owners and operators and their organizations and other hand and glove cohorts of this type of big business blamed in the slightest for the present shortage of coal.

Those who speak out so boldly in the Congress against our President and his administration, and John L. Lewis and the coal miners, in their loud and demanding way, for the putting into execution of the Taft-Hartley law, whether that law can be presently applied or not, have reached almost the fanatical stage.

Today a United States district court judge, Richmond B. Keech, in Washington, by his decision brought forth a very self-evident legal truth known to everyone but these reactionaries, that the fact that you have the Taft-Hartley law is not all that you need to get the desired results, but you also need evidence to support the charge brought under that law. To start either a civil or a criminal action without sufficient evidence is about as unavailing as the irresponsible conversation of these clamorers reduced to writing and presented to a court to take action upon.

As soon as the decision of this court became known today a stunning silence came over these lusty critics, but they were quick on the recovery and in an effort to save face blamed the Department of Justice for not getting the necessary evidence, and presenting it to the court. May I ask these men what evidence do they know of which was not presented? Their perplexed ingenuity may prompt them to furnish an answer to the question which neither they nor anyone else could or should believe.

President Truman was right that this was a case which required that the Government should proceed with caution, and be sure of its ground and not go off prematurely or half-cocked like these men always seem to me to do. Nothing hurts a cause worse than to end up on the losing side, and that generally is what always happens when you have the short end of the stick.

When you shoot at a mark and miss it, do not blame the mark but blame yourself. My father stated it correctly when he said that he never heard of a poor shoveler having a good shovel. These poor shovelers think that the public will believe their ill-conceived excuse, but the public just is not that gullible yet.

What kind of a case could the prosecution present? Just a case based solely on circumstantial evidence. The high lights of that proof were these: The men who refused to work belonged to a union. John L. Lewis was the head of that union. Heretofore these men had always refused to work without a contract, but for months in an effort to settle their differences they did work without a contract. When all of their efforts to secure a contract seemed to be futile they worked 3 days a week for quite a long time. The individual tempers of John L. Lewis and his United Mine Workers became so aroused that they ceased all work. The squeeze was upon the public. The President was forced to consent to court action and two restraining orders issued. John L. Lewis gave the greatest circulation to two telegrams and one letter urging the men for their sake and the sake of their union to obey the restraining orders and go back to work. These individually infuriated men refused to obey their leader and their union. A grave legal question arises as to whether or not men acting spontaneously and individually can be forced into involuntary servitude in the light of our Constitution and its pertinent amendments, and the legal law of the land, but there was no need of a court to decide that question if the evidence presented was insufficient.

It is a very well established rule of law in our country and that rule of law applies to civil as well as criminal cases, that proof made by circumstantial evidence alone in order to be legally sufficient must be so strong, clear and convincing as to exclude every reasonable hypothesis other than guilt. In a proper case circumstantial evidence may be just as good evidence as direct testimony but it must be so strong, clear, and convincing that every reasonable theory other than that sought to be proved by the prosecution must have been eliminated.

No the case was dangerously weak and its trial has done much harm. It will encourage rather than discourage the miners to stop digging coal. The blame for the situation with which we are confronted today rests squarely upon the legally awkward shoulders of men who can make loud noisy demands for action when a working brain would bide the time until a case could be proved legally in court.

The only thing left for the Congress to do now is to pass legislation to seize the coal mines, and to repeal the Taft-Hartley law, and put in its place a law which will be fair to both labor and management—a law which will make today's cruel and smug management bargain in good faith again collectively with labor. I know of no greater way to drive this country into communism than to have these selfish, cruel, extreme right wingers sit ala Taft-Hartley-like across the table from the real producers of the Nation. They have had their day, and their day is over, and they had better realize it now before it is too late for them, and for all of us who believe in the Golden Rule instead of the Rule of Gold.

Everyone I am sure is anxious to know the real condition over the United States as far as coal shortage is concerned. As to conditions in Nebraska I submit the following United Press news item which appeared in the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal, on Tuesday, February 28, last:

NO REAL COAL EMERGENCY YET IN STATE

Nebraska scraped the bottom of the coal bin Monday, but a survey of principal cities showed no real emergency yet.

State officials said the situation was critical. They urged Nebraskans to economize on use of coal.

Spot checks around the State Monday morning indicated many cities and towns had only a few days' supply on hand.

Dealers, city and State officials believe the State will "get by" if the weather continues mild and nonunion coal mines in the South and West maintain the present "trickle of coal."

Substitution of gas and oil during the last few years for heating and industrial purposes staved off emergencies in many communities.

At Norfolk, the fuel dealers association secretary, Clarence Isaacson, reported dealers "don't know what they are going to do." He said conditions there were "critical."

At Alliance, city officials said they had just over a 2-week supply on hand and were considering a "brown-out" to relieve the critical situation at industrial plants.

Numerous cites reported a "hand-to-mouth" situation with dealers trading coal and consumers buying in basket quantities.

Here is a city-by-city report at 10 a. m. Monday:

Lincoln: Situation getting "rougher by the day" but no emergency. Stoker coal nonexistent. Some coal coming in from Oklahoma and Missouri mines.

Omaha: Dealer supplies very low but still adequate to take care of demand on limited scale. With favorable weather, city can get by if small shipments continue.

McCook: Coal almost gone; schools and other large buildings have converted to gas. Dealers report only small nut-type coal for small stoves in stock. Sustained cold weather would cause residence hardships.

Grand Island: Half city schools use coal and report enough for few days' operation. Cold snap could deplete school supply as well as many home supplies. Industries switching to gas.

Norfolk: School officials report 2 weeks' supply on hand if weather mild. Few cars of coal arrive every week from western mines but only a drop in the bucket compared to need.

Hastings: Dealer supply ranges from few days to few weeks; many businesses and residents converted to gas past year. Most schools using gas.

Nebraska City: Not serious; most homes heat with gas. One dealer completely out of coal, others' small supplies believed sufficient for winter. The State blind school has a 2-week supply, public schools 1-month supply.

Falls City: "A week of cold weather and there's going to be some real suffering in Falls City," said the City Fuel Co. owner, Jake Morris. "If I let people have all they wanted, supply would go out in 3 or 4 days." Situation very serious, with school supply about 1 week, city generally, week or two.

Kearney: Serious, but heavy shift to gas since 1947 keeps major industries from being affected seriously. City schools and Kearney State College using gas; dealers cracking lump coal by hand for stoker use. Best estimate of city supply, 1 week.

Fairbury: Dealers able to supply emergency demand, but stocks running low and using stand-by supplies of stoker coal at city power plant.

Broken Bow: Natural and bottled gas available keeping situation from becoming serious. Two-week supply coal reported on hand by one dealer, others very short.

Alliance: City officials report 15-day supply on hand, "much shorter than our supply should be." One more week of shortage might force brown-out. City schools have less than week supply.

York: A York College spokesman said the school had only 3 or 4 days' supply of coal on hand with no immediate prospects of further deliveries.

Beatrice: Dealers report stocks 50 percent normal, stoker coal unavailable but otherwise city in pretty good shape, if mild weather continues. Schools use stoker coal and have little bit on hand.

Columbus: Situation not serious here. City schools received carload Friday and mild weather preserving school and community stocks.

Fremont: Utility officials estimate enough coal to last about 20 days if mild weather continues. The power company has turned over 250 tons to local dealers. One dealer has been bringing coal from Omaha, but reports he can get no more there. He reported Fremont could carry on normally about week or 10 days.

RFC Mining Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, prior to the Eightieth Congress there was in the RFC Act the so-called Mine Loan Section. In their haste to shrink the RFC and cover large amounts of its funds into the Treasury a number of changes were made in the act. One of the most ill-advised, to my way of thinking, was the repeal of section 14 which was done, I am sorry to say, with the collusion and consent of Mr. John Goodloe, then Chairman of the RFC.

Prior to 1940, section 14 covered only loans to producers of gold, silver, and tin. Realizing the trend of the times, Congress in 1940 expanded the loaning authority of all strategic and critical minerals and metals and this bit of foresight, Mr. Speaker, proved to be of incalculable value to the war effort. Millions of pounds of vital metals and minerals were made available to our country because of these mine loans and some important mines are still working which would never otherwise have been developed. Even though some of these loans could not be entirely repayed, the over-all net gain to the country must show a substantial profit from the operations so financed. This was realized by former Senator Charles B. Henderson, who for a long time headed the RFC. A Nevadan with a true feeling for mining, and especially for the small miner, he encouraged his mine loan divison to extend every possible help under the law and even resorted to the general wartime loan authority to expand the mine-loan activities.

Since the chairmanship of Mr. Henderson, the Corporation has looked with disfavor upon mine loans and curtailed its activities in every possible way. After successfully getting section 14 repealed on the assurance of RFC officials that mine loans could just as readily be granted under the regular business loan authority—that is, since 1948, mining men have found that assurance to have been a snare and a delusion. A few loans to coal mines have been granted, and two or three to metal mines where hundreds used to be in process all the time. Practically no applications are received as mining men have found it a waste of time even to fill out the forms.

Before section 14 was repealed, there were several bills introduced to amend the language to liberalize the law and make the section more workable for postwar loans. I am reliably informed that strong representations were made by several Democratic Senators to the Republican chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that was handling RFC legislation in an attempt to get section 14 strengthened rather than repealed. In the face of hostile—perhaps the word is too strong, Mr. Speaker, and I should say in the face of an unsympathetic atmosphere in the RFC itself, the committee left out section 14 or any substitute therefor when it reported the committee bill and the mining industry has suffered ever since.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take the time to tabulate here all the metals and minerals produced under RFC loans, but I do want to mention a few, covering the period from January 1, 1942, to March 31, 1949. Copper produced by development loan and general mining loan borrowers during the stated period reached the incredible figure of approximately 83,000,000 pounds, of which a million and a half pounds was produced in my State of Nevada. Lead amounted to nearly 83,000,000 pounds of which 2,500,000 pounds was produced in Nevada and zinc production under these loans was 150,500,000 pounds of which about 6,000,000 pounds came from Nevada. A score of other minerals participated in the program.

Mr. Speaker, much of this metal never would have seen the light of day had Congress not been foresighted enough to provide this program and had the RFC not been under a Chairman wise enough to see that it was properly implemented. Under the present set-up there still is a remnant of the old Mine Loan Section personnel supervising the liquidation of past loans and waiting hopefully for a new application to study. I understand that the gentlemen who service the RFC business loans confer with these mining men when there is occasion to do so, but the final decision is now in the hands of those who make the usual business loans under the general loan authority of the RFC.

Mining is a highly specialized business. It is too much to expect that the average man will be sympathetically inclined to mining loans, as the men who are used to examining the ordinary business-loan application simply do not understand and fit the miner into a straitjacket of impossible terms and demands. That is why special legislation was necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the administration continually is voicing the necessity for expanding our mineral resources, although it frowns upon every attempt of the Congress to aid private enterprise to do this very thing. As a western Democrat from a natural resource State, this, I must admit, puzzles me no end. I cannot understand why, for example, the RFC is not enthusiastic about the several mine-loan bills such as S. 497, which rest in the Banking and Currency Committees and gather dust there along with the adverse reports from the RFC, written by lawyers who know nothing about the problems involved, and signed by a chairman who has been beguiled into blindly following the precedent set by Goodloe. I would introduce a bill to amend the RFC Act to authorize mining loans, Mr. Speaker, but for two things—the bill would fall into the hands of the Banking and Currency Committee and be clipped to those already moldering there and it might put the Corporation to the trouble of thinking up still another excuse to recommend no action when I gather from the daily press their excuse is their department is already overworked in other directions.

I may, before long, ask the Mining Subcommittee of Public Lands, of which I have the honor to be a member, to look into this RFC mine-loan situation in some detail. At the very least I can request any committee which we may empower to investigate the RFC to make this one of their points of investigation. My mining people need encouragement, Mr. Speaker, as do miners all over this country. The Eighty-first Congress should repair the damage done by the Republican Eightieth Congress when it revised the RFC Act, and the chairman of that Corporation should make himself personally familiar with the situation instead of blindly following advisers who still are tainted with the prejudices of departed, but not forgotten predecessors.

Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being repetitious, I will persist in driving home

to my esteemed colleagues here that the national security, as well as the preservation of the economic balance of our country, demands that steps be taken to preserve, expand, and reinvigorate our domestic mining industry. The resumption of RFC loans to strategic and critical metal and mineral producers should be one of these steps.

Loan Value on Gum Naval Stores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. M. (DON) WHEELER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a resolution passed by the Senate of the State of Georgia in which it is asked that the loan value on gum naval stores be raised to 90 percent of parity.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible under existing law for the Commodity Credit Corporation to support naval stores at 90 percent of parity. It is possible, however, for the support to be raised from its present 60-percent figure to 71 percent. A large group of Members of the House and Senate has met with the Secretary of Agriculture and other members of the Commodity Credit Corporation and asked that 71 percent of parity be announced as the loan-guaranty figure. As yet we have been unsuccessful in getting this done.

The following resolution accurately describes the situation existing in the naval stores belt:

Whereas the State of Georgia produces 55 percent of all gum naval-stores products of the entire world; and

Whereas the gum naval-stores workers and farmers of Georgia are facing bankruptcy and ruin because of action of the United States Department of Agriculture, which has set Government support of gum naval stores at 60 percent of parity for the year 1950; and

Whereas such action is unreasonable and arbitrary for the reason that in 1947 and 1948 Government support of gum naval stores was set at 90 percent of parity and during 1949 the same was set at 80 percent of parity; and

Whereas during the year 1950 the cost of production of gum naval stores will be from 20 to 35 percent higher than during the years 1947, 1948, and 1949; and

Whereas the Members of the Georgia delegation in Congress, and Congressmen from the naval-stores belt arranged a meeting some weeks ago with the Honorable Charles Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, for the purpose of protesting the action of the United States Department of Agriculture, which set the Government's support of gum naval stores at 60 percent of parity, and to urge upon him the grave necessity for overruling this disastrous decision, and to fix the percentage of parity at 90 where it rightfully belongs; and

Whereas the turpentine farmers of this State and of the naval-stores belt will be unable to operate their business at the 55 percent of parity and compete with the increase in minimum wages recently put into effect, and continue to produce gum naval stores, which is vital to the defense of this country, and such a condition will cause hundreds of thousands of workers in this grave and vital industry to be thrown out of employment; and

Whereas such condition will seriously reduce the value of timberlands in this State and in the naval-stores belt and bring chaos to general business throughout this area, from which it will take years to recover; and

Whereas the continued well being of the gum naval-stores business is vital, not only to the workers and property owners of our own great State, but to the people and government of the entire world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Georgia, That the Honorable Charles Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, is hereby urgently requested to take such action as will alleviate an intolerable condition now faced by a large percentage of the people of Georgia and the naval-stores belt, and that he exercise the discretionary powers granted him by the Congress of the United States and fix Government support of gum naval stores at 90 percent of parity for the year 1950; be it further

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Georgia, That the Honorable Charles Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, is hereby urgently requested to immediately fix this percentage of parity for gum naval stores, so as to save the taxpayers of the United States approximately $3,000,000, and at the same time build up the stock pile of vital and strategic war materials for any emergency which may face this country, and which will save the turpentine farmers of Georgia and the naval-stores belt from releasing hundreds of thousands of workers and suffering great loss in the value of timberlands; and be it further

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Georgia, That the Members of the Georgia delegation in Congress immediately exert their utmost efforts in bringing this pending condition to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and urging his immediate acceptance and approval of this matter which is of such grave importance to the people of this State, and other States in the naval-stores belt; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the President of the United States and to each Member of the Georgia delegation in Congress, and to Hon. Charles Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

S. MARVIN GRIFFIN,
President of the Senate.
GEORGE D. STEWART,
Secretary of the Senate.

John C. Calhoun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article on John C. Calhoun, which was written by Miss Margaret L. Coit, West Newbury, Mass., and reviewed by Claude M. Fuess, retired headmaster of Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. This article appeared in the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on Tuesday, February 28, 1950.

JOHN C. CALHOUN—SLAVERY WAS HIS CONTRADICTION

Miss Margaret L. Coit, now resident in West Newbury, has written what is certain to be one of the outstanding biographies of 1950—John C. Calhoun, American Portrait, published today by Houghton Mifflin Co.

Almost exactly 100 years ago Senator John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, worn out by "that long diseases, my life," died at the age of 68 in a pitifully bare room in Hill's boarding house, on the site of the present Supreme Court Building, in Washington. On March 4, 1850, he had dragged himself across the park to the Capitol and taken his place in the Senate Chamber while Senator Mason, of Virginia, read Calhoun's carefully prepared valedictory, described by Miss Coit as "the most powerful warning delivered by a southern leader before the Civil War." He was carried to his seat 3 days later to listen to Webster's magnificent Seventh of March Speech, which probably postponed the conflict by 10 years, thus ensuring the success of the North. Calhoun felt that the effect of Webster's words would be only temporary, and with this conviction he died early on the morning of Sunday, March 31, 1850, his eyes retaining their brightness till his last breath.

Miss Coit's biography is thus a very timely book, culminating in the debate over the omnibus bill of just a century ago. Furthermore, she has accomplished an amazing feat of revivification by presenting Calhoun as a human being. The earlier lives of the South Carolina statesman had treated him almost as an abstraction, a political philosopher without blood or vital organs, the embodiment of an idea to which everything else was sacrificed. Von Holst, writing in 1882, said of Calhoun: "We hear that he was a just and kind master to his slaves, that he was possessed of an uncommon conversational talent, and that he exercised an especial fascination upon young men. This is about all." Miss Coit, who is a literary artist, has removed this misconception. Now at last we feel that he was not a mummy but a man, as full of vitality and perversity as Andrew Jackson or Daniel Webster.

Calhoun married at 29 his cousin, Floride, 10 years younger, who brought him a modest fortune. "From almost her wedding night," says Miss Coit, "she was pregnant," and she bore her husband nine children. Unfortunately he was often away from home; indeed, of their 39 years of marriage he spent nearly 15 separated from his wife. While he was in Monroe's Cabinet, from 1817 to 1824, and later as Vice President he lived with her in Washington on the famous estate of Dumbarton Oaks, entertaining on a lavish scale. Later, however, he found himself in financial difficulties and was obliged to leave Floride on their plantation, Fort Hill, where she was lonely and dissatisfied.

Says Miss Coit, "with the one exception of Mary Todd Lincoln, there is no more baffling or stormy figure among all the historical American wives than Floride Calhoun." With a woman's perception and intuition, Miss Coit has explained how the rift widened between husband and wife. The reader will enjoy her analysis of Floride Calhoun and her feminine psychology.

When we have finished this book, we know the little things which help to elucidate a man's personality—what he ate, how he dressed, his habits of work, his moods and vanities, the obscure motives which often actuated his changes of opinion. Introspective, repressed, self-disciplined, living in a state of intellectual solitude, he was very different from the southern plantation owner of tradition. He was really a Puritan in temperament, just as Webster, the Yankee, was in many respects a cavalier.

The volume is a fine example of the best modern biographical technique. So far as I can see, Miss Coit has explored every available source of information. She has consulted the important private papers preserved at Clemson College; she has studied the proceedings of the State legislature; she has talked with members of the Calhoun family, including the last grandson. She has used newspapers effectively by excerpting brief, salient passages for quotation. She has neglected none of the existing diaries and journals, and has even found little known manuscript reminiscences, like those of Grallé and Anna Maria Clemson. But she has been the mistress, not the slave, of her material. She has known how to separate the essential from the irrelevant, the picturesque from the commonplace. For this reason alone her book is far superior to any previous biography of Calhoun, and it is unlikely that it will be superseded.

With all its readability, this is no fictionized biography, padded with imaginary conversations of the type which has been the bane of seekers for historical truth. Miss Coit is a genuine scholar, as thorough as Nevins or Schlesinger, with a passion for accuracy; but she has not thought it necessary to be dull in order to be authoritative. Moreover she has not been content with uncritical eulogy. Although she has given Calhoun fair play, she has not attempted to extenuate his blunders or to use him to support a thesis, as some other writers on the period have done. Calhoun has been, and will always be, a highly controversial subject, but Miss Coit has appraised him without malice or prejudice. I have seldom read a book dealing with political issues which is so free from partisanship.

Calhoun's career as Congressman, Secretary of War, Vice President, United States Senator, Secretary of State, and then Senator again is familiar to students of American history. He entered national politics in 1811 as one of the Warhawks, who followed Henry Clay and has been described as "the young Hercules who carried the war with England on his shoulders." He was then a Unionist and was soon to be a supporter of the protective tariff. As the efficient Secretary of War in Monroe's Cabinet, he gained influence rapidly, and in 1824, only a little over 40 years old, he was the young men's candidate for the Presidency, supported by the great Daniel Webster, who was his exact contemporary. During this campaign he was the victim of scurrilous attacks and when he failed to gain the support of Pennsylvania, he left the field. The election was thrown into the House of Representatives, where John Quincy Adams was chosen President, with Calhoun as Vice President. In 1828, he espoused the cause of Jackson and was again elected Vice President, with every expectation that he would be Old Hickory's successor in the White House after the latter had served his two terms. So far his rise had been quick and not too much obstructed.

It was Andrew Jackson, the turbulent, obstinate, and unforgiving autocrat, who was Calhoun's nemesis. At the inaugural ball in 1829 the aristocratic Floride Calhoun ignored "Peggy" O'Neil Eaton, the former barmaid who had married Secretary of War Eaton and whose social ostracism had evoked all Jackson's frontier chivalry. According to Calhoun family tradition, the President told the South Carolina Senator that his wife must return Mrs. Eaton's call. When Calhoun refused to intervene, Jackson called on Mrs. Calhoun and laid down the law. Floride listened to his tongue lashing and then, calling the butler said, "Show this gentleman to the door."

Whether or not this incident really happened, Martin Van Buren, the bachelor in the Cabinet, had no scruples about calling on "Peggy," thus earning Jackson's gratitude. The President's resentment against Calhoun was aggravated when William H. Crawford betrayed the fact that, as Secretary of War in 1818, Calhoun had censured Jackson's seizure of Florida territory. The testy old general, who made every issue personal, turned against Calhoun. Meanwhile the latter had made himself politically vulnerable by opposing "the tariff abominations" and writing for the South Carolina Legislature his notorious exposition, outlining the doctrine which was to become known as nullification.

At the Jefferson Day dinner in 1830, President Jackson repudiated nullification in his toast. "Our Union—it must be preserved." The Vice President, in a scene which nobody has described more vividly than Miss Coit, slowly drank his wine and then white-faced, his eyes blazing, rose and uttered the words, "The Union. Next to our liberties, most dear." "That night," comments Miss Coit, "in that room the lines of Appomattox had been drawn."

The breach was now complete, and from that moment Calhoun was a tortured man, his ambition thwarted. It is unnecessary to tell again here how South Carolina in 1832, under Calhoun's leadership, passed a formal ordinance of nullification, how the administration responded with the force bill, and how Henry Clay, the Great Compromiser, finally succeeded in modifying the tariff measure, thus averting disaster. The crisis was over for the moment, but Calhoun was no longer a Nationalist but the spokesman for the isolated South. He resigned as Vice President to become Senator, and from his seat reiterated his protests against the rising dominance of the North. For the remainder of his career he was a tragic figure, disappointed and disillusioned.

As the years went on, Calhoun became the symbol of a lost cause—a cause which was lost almost from the beginning. All the finespun logic of his speeches could not alter the inexorable course of events. Northern industry flourished; southern agriculture languished. Immigrants poured in at northern ports from Ireland and Germany. The discrepancy in population and wealth between the two sections widened, and Calhoun could do nothing to stop the trend. He was driven finally to the point where he became the bigot who defended human slavery. As Miss Coit puts it, "To rest the cause of the South upon the crumbling foundation of human slavery was the tragic contradiction of Calhoun's career." His error brought ruin to his political aspirations and disaster to the South.

For a brief period Calhoun was again in a position of power, as Secretary of State under President Tyler. He accepted the office primarily to secure the annexation of Texas; and when a treaty for that purpose failed to get the necessary two-thirds vote in the Senate, he resorted to the device of a congressional joint resolution. A day before the Tyler administration ended, he sent off a dispatch inviting Texas to enter the Union. It was his last triumph as a statesman. He had hoped to be the Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1844 and even was the principal author of a campaign autobiography of himself, published anonymously. But his views were too radical for all except southern extremists and the dark horse, James K. Polk, was preferred.

Miss Coit reproduces the daguerreotype of Calhoun taken by Matthew Brady in 1849, showing him with all the appearance of great age but proud, defiant, unbroken, his cloak swept dramatically about him, the shaggy hair hanging loose about his bent shoulders, a tortured prophet, who sees nothing in the future but the defeat of all he fights for and holds dear. When Clay and Webster, the other two of the great triumvirate in the Senate, tried to save the Union in 1850 through the omnibus bill, Calhoun was too feeble to help very much. He was buried in the cemetery of St. Philip's church in Charleston, under a huge slab of white marble on which is cut the one word, Calhoun. Miss Coit tells the story of the bitter Yankee soldier, standing triumphantly in the churchyard in April 1865, in the midst of Charleston's shattered ruins, and saying, "The whole South is the grave of Calhoun."

Through her enthusiasm and skill Miss Coit has made John C. Calhoun seem almost a contemporary personage, as real as if he belonged in a present-day news magazine. Swept along by her narrative, we live ourselves through the controversy over nullification, the quarrels over abolitionist petitions, the disputes over Texas and Oregon, and the drama of the Compromise of 1850. She has written a first-rate book, one which holds the attention and provokes thought. In my judgment it will stand comparison with any political biography of recent years.

Pope Pius XII, Living Symbol of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by the House, I include with these remarks the following editorial entitled "Pope Pius XII, Living Symbol of Peace," by Harry H. Schlacht, which was published in the New York Journal-American of March 2, 1950:

POPE PIUS XII, LIVING SYMBOL OF PEACE

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

O, Father, grant us the blessings of Thy peace.

Today America salutes Pope Pius XII on the anniversary of his seventy-fourth birthday.

Many, many happy returns of this blessed day.

Today pilgrims are welcomed to Rome to worship at the shrine of the Catholic Church.

It is a true incentive to piety.

It is a spiritual banquet.

The pilgrims will unite in commemoration of the three glorious and blessed celebrations.

His Holiness' fiftieth year as priest. His Holiness' twentieth year as cardinal. His Holiness' tenth year as Pope.

He is the vicar of the church of Christ. He is the apostle of peace. He is the living symbol of peace.

He is a simple man of God.

He is praying that God will come to the world's salvation, will quicken men with charity and faith, will inspire men with truth and justice.

He is armed with God's grace and a martyr's will. He is standing at the ramparts of man's battle for liberty.

His armaments are the weapons of wisdom. His armies are God's loving people everywhere.

His Holiness stands ready to shed his heart's blood to become the seed for the rebirth of enslaved nations.

Pope Pius XII is one of the great statesmen of our times. He is the best equipped personage in the world to lead us in the blessed cause of peace.

He is a man of his time.

No nation is strong except in the strength of God.

No power on earth can equal the power of God's truth. No dictator on earth can control man's thought.

God's truths have their roots in the policy of humble folks whose minds no tyrant can reach, and whose hearts no bond of servitude can fetter.

The arm of the Lord is gloriously made bare for the overthrow of communism, for the upbuilding of righteousness.

God's truths will pierce the iron curtain.

Before His power the forces of tyranny must tremble. Their mortal coils will be shaken off. Their governments will collapse. Their empires will dissolve. Their despotisms will sink into dust.

The church came forth from the dark catacombs, and upon the ruins of paganism there arose the glory that is the Roman Catholic Church.

It has endured through every persecution. It has endured through every revolution. It has endured through every century.

It is immortal in its nature. It is standing firm. It will endure forever.

So on this blessed day of his holiness' birthday, let God-loving people everywhere unite in this heavenly prayer.

May the Holy Father ever stand forth as a champion of oppressed humanity.

May the Holy Father ever stand forth as a protector of the godly in mankind.

May he persevere for many years in the faith of goodness, in the faith of justice, in the faith of peace.

God grant us this prayer.

Abraham Lincoln, Great Friend of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio talk by R. K. Blizz:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN—GREAT FRIEND OF AGRICULTURE

On Sunday, February 12, we commemorate the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. As the years pass the stature of Lincoln grows on us. He is now with common accord considered the greatest exponent of individual liberty and democracy of the nineteenth century.

We think of him as the leader who preserved the Union of the States that Washington and his associates created. We think of him as the great statesman, the emancipator of the slaves, the friend of humanity, and the foe of intolerance.

These were the great achievements of his career with which all are familiar. But there was another side of Lincoln's services that is not so well known and understood. It is of this other side that I wish to speak of principally today.

During the stress of the Civil War Lincoln signed three legislative acts into law, two of which have had a tremendous influence on the internal development of the United States. One of these was the Land Grant College Act providing for a Federal- and State-supported institution of higher learning in each State.

Prior to this time higher education had been principally for doctors, lawyers, and clergymen. It reached only a few people. Henceforth higher education was also to be for those who made their living principally, through manual labor, management, and the sciences.

The passage of the Land Grant College Act was one of the results of a long continued effort to raise the status of agriculture and give greater opportunity to farm people. The Federal law as passed, however, also provided for the mechanic arts and laid the basis for our great colleges in engineering.

A somewhat similar land grant bill had been passed by the Congress preceding Lincoln's administration, but was vetoed by President Buchanan. One of the principal advocates of the Land Grant Act was Professor Turner, of Illinois. Turner was a friend of Lincoln's and Lincoln was certainly familiar with his arguments for the land grant bill. He and Lincoln were discussing the Buchanan veto at the time Lincoln was a candidate for President when Lincoln remarked, "Turner, get me elected President. Then put your bill through Congress and I will sign it."

The passage of the Land Grant College Act virtually democratized higher education. Almost anyone with grit and determination can go to college. Out of it has come as a new feature of education our Statewide cooperative extension services, designed to carry the immediately usable phases of higher education and experimentation to all farmers. This special effort to make agricultural science available to all is the distinguishing difference between agricultural colleges in this and other countries, and accounts in no small degree for the agricultural progress made in the United States.

Lincoln also signed the bill creating the United States Department of Agriculture, which now reaches into every community and farm home in the country. The Department of Agriculture also safeguards the quality of the food supply, and thus serves city homes as well. The two laws creating the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges, which also included the development of engineering and science, have had a profound constructive influence on the agricultural and industrial development of this country.

Another act signed by Lincoln was the Homestead Act. The purpose of this act was to divide the public domain into homesteads large enough to support a farm family. The purpose of the act, too, was to remove public land from speculation. It opened the land to actual farmers. Lincoln's name is, therefore, associated with important fundamental steps in the internal development of this country. These acts alone raise his administration to a high place in our industrial and agricultural development. No other President has his name attached to more important and constructive internal legislation.

Abraham Lincoln was truly a pioneer, both in his creative thinking, and in his upbringing. He was truly a product of the American pioneer tradition and environment. Because of this fact, the life of Lincoln is a fascinating story. Born of pioneer parents in poverty, on what we would call a subsistence farm, Lincoln's opportunities in the world were anything but bright. His father was, according to all accounts, a good man but not much interested in progress, who took life easy and was something of a ne'er-do-well. He complained about his son, Abe, trying to get so much book "larnin" and considered it a waste of time.

But, if Lincoln's father was something of a failure as a provider for the family, he at least showed remarkably good judgment in selecting Lincoln's mother and stepmother. Nancy Hanks, the mother of Lincoln, must have been a very intelligent person. Brought up in a community without schools, she nevertheless learned to read. She was religious, and read much to Abe out of the Bible. She encouraged him to go to school. He had to walk 4 miles to his first school, and 9 miles to school in southern Indiana. Lincoln's mother died when he was 8 years old, in an epidemic that swept southern Indiana. Lincoln always had a profound reverence and respect for his mother, and once said "All that I am and all that I ever hope to be I owe to my angel mother."

Lincoln's father's second wife brought love, affection, help, and encouragement to young Lincoln. There could scarcely have been a better choice for him. She championed his efforts to get an education and gave him encouragement when his father objected and grumbled. To the credit of his father it must be recorded that he gave in to his wife on this point.

There was one thing in Lincoln's upbringing that seems perfectly clear. He had the help, love, sympathy, and support of two unschooled but remarkably intelligent women. A home of poverty with one or two rooms and no conveniences where love and intelligent understanding holds sway is better for child development, I am convinced, than a palace where indifference prevails.

It would seem that Abraham Lincoln's physical comforts were pretty well cared for, too. He must have had plenty to eat for he had a wide reputation as a rail splitter and wrestling champion, both of which require great strength.

He must have been highly thought of. While still a boy of 19 he was sent in charge of a raft loaded with produce down the Mississippi to New Orleans. This was no small undertaking. It was on this trip that he got his first impressions of slavery. Some years later he made a second trip. These were great opportunities for an observing and reflective youth. He undoubtedly had much more travel and responsibility than other boys of that day.

Lincoln had an insatiable desire for knowledge and information. He would walk miles to get a book and read it, if necessary, by the light of a pine knot after the day's work was done.

Lincoln was unschooled but not uneducated. Without formal training in grammar, rhetoric, and literature he came to use some of the best English and sentence construction that can be found in the English language. Much of his writings and sayings are immortal in the sense that they will never grow old. They will last as long as men cherish freedom and individual liberty.

A good way to commemorate Lincoln's birthday would be to again read some of his addresses. I suggest the Gettysburg Address as one of the best on democracy of any literature in any country. In this address he expresses the hope that "government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth." These words are especially important in the light of present world events.

The second inaugural was a masterly objective statement made in the midst of war which concludes with the admonition that "with malice toward none, with charity toward all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us finish the work we are in." In view of the name calling and bickering that goes on in high places between nations these days, it would be refreshing to have someone now express such noble sentiments.

If you want to study magnificent logic, reasoning and good use of the English language read Lincoln's Cooper Union speech in New York where the unschooled but not uneducated frontier lawyer from Illinois spoke to the highly trained intelligentsia of that great intellectual center and won them over to his way of thinking. This speech helped to make him President.

Or if you want to read a perfect letter of compassion and sympathy, read the one to Mrs. Bixby who had lost five sons on the field of battle.

Lincoln's sayings were unique, interesting, and easily remembered. He is credited as saying, "You can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

Lincoln's logical mind was evident in a conversation with a group of ministers who came to see him during the war. As they were leaving they expressed the hope that the Lord was on his side. Lincoln surprised them by saying he was not so much concerned about whether the Lord was on his side but he was deeply concerned that he should always be on the Lord's side.

The work and teachings of Abraham Lincoln have special significance and value in these present days when dictatorship with its attendant slavery of thought and mind threatens democracy and the freedom of the individual. All who value freedom can draw much inspiration and courage from the life and acts of the great commoner.

Records Management Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide for a Records Management Service in the Federal Government. The proposed legislation is to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 by inserting a new title therein, for the purpose of defining the duties and functions of the Administrator of General Services and the Archivist of the United States with respect to records management.

A Federal Records Service is to be established and implemented by law as a constituent unit of the General Services Administration to serve the twofold purpose of planning and developing, in cooperation with the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government, a records-management program, and of exercising custody and care of the existing records of the Federal Government, its several branches, departments, and agencies.

The Hoover Commission report made clear, perhaps, for the first time, the enormous proportions of the records management job in the Federal Government. The task-force report showed that—

With regard to staff and salaries:

In 1940, an estimate was made of 340,000 employees, with annual salaries of 600,000,000, engaged in handling records then accumulated or being created at that time. A much greater figure would apply were employees engaged primarily in record making added to those in record keeping. No actual count being available, an estimate of over $1,000,000,000 is justifiable. Salaries of no other housekeeping or service function including Government accounting or personnel management remotely approaches this figure.

With regard to space requirements:

Approximately 18,500,000 cubic feet of Federal records occupy more than 18,000,000 square feet of Federal space. This is equivalent to six Pentagons. Space costs are not less than $27,000,000 annually. Actual surveys and official estimates carry this volume of records up to 17,000,000; 18,500,000 cubic feet is a weighted current estimate for the purposes of the task-force study.

With regard to operation and maintenance:

Space occupied by records is operated and maintained consistently at a cost close to the actual rental paid. Annual expenditures for this purpose are not less than $20,000,000.

With regard to equipment:

Records in such a quantity are equivalent to 3,080,000 standard four-drawer filing cabinets costing $154,000,000 at current prices.

The major problems involved in the area are both economic and administrative. The economic problem is obviously one of costs; which, in view of the size of the record-keeping operations of the Government, is considerable. Exactly how much can be saved, it is difficult to estimate with any degree of accuracy, but the amount should be sizable. By exercising some restraining influence over the creation of new records, by encouraging proper disposition of records no longer needed, and by the use of the most suitable and economical methods with regard to those records which are to be retained on a more or less permanent basis, it is obvious that substantial amounts that would otherwise be spent can be saved.

Administratively, the present situation is chaotic. The National Archives has fairly clearly defined duties with regard to the custody of records, their preservation and use by the public, but little else. It is important that there be developed under competent professional leadership, Government-wide policies with regard to the size of records, methods of filing and storage, the creation of records centers, and many other problems in this field.

The legislation which is now proposed has been drafted with very great care and in close cooperation with the executive agencies concerned. Its provisions represent a sincere attempt to carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission; they are submitted at this time, not only in response to a vital need for some action by the Congress in this important field, but also in accord with the previously expressed intentions of the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization to proceed at an early date to round out the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 by the inclusion of new titles on this and other related subjects. I hasten to add that the size of this bill is due not to a great quantity of new statutory provisions but to the assembling under this title of all existing and scattered pieces of legislation relating to this subject. All of these earlier enactments would be repealed to be superseded by the provisions of this act, which, when enacted, will in effect provide a code in the field of records management.

In short, I believe that the provisions of this bill are in accord with the principles of good management as practiced in many large private organizations, and as recommended in the report of the Hoover Commission. It will register the intent of the Congress in a field which has suffered from the lack of any clearly defined over-all policy, and from a multiplicity of scattered bits of legislation relating to portions of the field. Its enactment will do much to clarify and unify legislation on records management to make possible improved administration, and to effect substantial savings.

Industrial Development in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under date of January 16, this year, I spoke at length to the House on the subject, The South Attracts Industry. Some unbelievable facts were revealed at that time regarding unprecedented industrial development all through the South; particularly in South Carolina and more especially in the Fourth Congressional District.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert herewith two articles from the Christian Science Monitor, Monday, February 27, 1950, pointing out further facts regarding industrial, agricultural, and livestock development in the South:

WAVE OF INDUSTRIALIZATION SWEEPS SOUTH—LIVESTOCK SHOWS NEW PROMISE—NEW ERA HAILED

(By Henry Lesesne)

COLUMBIA, S. C.—Probably no other period in the South's history compares with 1945–49 for industrialization—not even the 1880's, when so many little towns in the Piedmont with available water power began organizing cotton mills as community affairs, the shares being paid for by the people on the installment plan.

At present, there seems no end to the trend in sight. The industrial expansion in the South has been a part of the general industrial expansion which has been going on all over the country. Economists say the new factories in the South largely represent a net addition to the Nation's industrial system.

With the industrial change and expansion have come, too, great changes in the region's agricultural economy. Through the Cotton Belt it is much the same story—smaller cotton fields, more grain, more hogs, more cattle, more poultry. Many areas of the South are concentrating on quality production of cotton.

COTTON MOVES WESTWARD

The culture of cotton has been moving westward to an extent not generally realized. Counting Texas as the West, production has so increased in the stretch from Louisiana to the Pacific coast that, this year, almost half the cotton crop is claimed by that area.

Mechanization has been a great factor in enabling California cotton planters to pick the biggest income crop in the State in the last 3 years. Of course, great cotton-growing areas of the South like the Mississippi Delta

are mechanizing on a large scale, too; but for much of the hilly South, mechanization is hardly adaptable as yet, if ever.

Thanks to research, the South in the last two decades has been able to produce almost the same amount of cotton on half the acreage as formerly. At the same time, some parts of the South have turned dramatically to a new type of agriculture, or industry, putting cotton into the background.

PEACHES IN SPARTANBURG

For instance, Spartanburg County, S. C., is a great textile manufacturing county. Twenty years ago, cotton was the main—and might say the only—cash crop. But in the short time since, the county has become the Nation's biggest peach producer. Peach growing is the foremost agricultural pursuit.

Nearly every part of the South has its own dramatic story to tell, whether it be agricultural or industrial. Peculiar to a rather small area in north Georgia, for instance, is the chenille bedspread industry, which began as the hobby of a Georgia farm girl and soon developed into a $120,000,000-a-year business.

In about the same time, a great pulp and paper industry has arisen in the coastal plains, until southern production now accounts for about half the national total. A number of large new pulp and paper mills have gone up in the South in recent years. The region, too, is becoming more conscious of developing and conserving its woodlands, a serious problem.

NEW PURCHASING POWER

But the main thing is that industry, generally, has expanded and become more diversified in the South. The explanation, according to Dr. B. U. Ratchford, professor of economics at Duke University, lies in growing purchasing power, an ample labor supply, plus vast material resources.

Dr. Ratchford is a former Marshall plan adviser and was another with Dr. C. B. Hoover, also of Duke, of the recent report by the National Planning Association's committee on the South, which analyzed the southern economy from the standpoint of the impact of Federal policies.

According to Dr. Ratchford, the rapid rise in southern purchasing power has created an expanding southern market, especially in the purchase of manufactured goods. And, as sales have risen, manufacturers have established plants or factories to make such goods in the South to supply the demands of the region.

INCOME INCREASES

Per capita income in the South has jumped 236 percent since 1930, compared with an increase of 163 percent for the rest of the country. Industry has raised income. So have high farm prices and a shift to a more diversified agriculture. Fifteen percent of southern income today comes from manufacturing, compared with 12½ percent in 1929.

Another factor is that the South pays less than 20 percent of all Federal taxes, and gets back nearly 20 percent of all Federal disbursements. Dr. Ratchford considers abundance of southern resources, especially an abundant supply of water, as second only to the South's increased purchasing power as a cause of the southern industrial boom.

The third most important factor, he says, is that the labor supply is being increased by a growing population and the greatly accelerated mechanization of farms. He says that inducements, such as land gifts and tax exemptions have had little influence upon location of industry in the South.

RURAL POPULATION

North Carolina, probably the most industrial of all southern States, has never had tax exemptions for new industry. Though relatively highly industrialized, North Carolina, like the rest of the South, is a State of many small towns and few cities. Nearly 70 percent of its population is rural. As elsewhere in the South, many families combine the advantages of industrial employment with the security of small farm ownership.

In the postwar years there has been a great expansion and modernization of the textile industry, which has brought supplier industries, such as the synthetic fiber industry. The South's textile industry in recent years has also become greatly diversified, with expansion in finer yarns, in finishing, and in the woolen and worsted branches. Scores of new mills and finishing plants have been built, and others are in the blueprint stage.

MILLS MODERNIZED

These plants are windowless, air-conditioned, and architecturally stimulating to the southern scene. While they may not appear as much out of this world as the new multimillion-dollar plants going up, the existing southern mills have modernized, both in building and equipment, to an extent which was hardly considered within the realm of possibility a decade ago. The mills, often termed a "prince or pauper industry," have plowed back a large part of postwar earnings into equipment and machinery to improve their competitive position.

Some of the most spectacular postwar industrialization in the South has occurred in South Carolina. A new $40,000,000 Celanese Corporation of America plant near Rock Hill has revitalized that college town. The historic resort town of Camden is booming because du Pont is building a big plant near there to make the new synthetic fiber, orlon.

PENDLETON EXPERIMENT WATCHED

PENDLETON, S. C.—Volumes could be written to tell of the amazing changes in the South's economy, industry, and agriculture in the postwar period. The National Planning Association's Committee on the South has dug up a barrel of facts and studies which tend to show many things, not the least of which is that the great number of industrial plants the region has gained represents a net addition to the country's industrial system rather than capacity which has been taken from other regions.

Essentially, the southern story today is one of industrial and agricultural growth, and of industrial and agricultural diversification. The New South—a term more significant today than ever before—is full of exciting scenes, and each part of the region has its own story to tell. But one might look a long time and never find a picture more symbolic of the changing South than can be seen near this little South Carolina up-country town.

Pendleton is a comparatively old town at the foothills of the Blue Ridge, and it hadn't changed a great deal until recent years. It is a historic town; a farmer's society organized in 1815 is still in existence, and the town boasts the oldest farmer's hall in the United States.

NEW PENDLETON VISITOR

Today you can take a main highway out of Pendleton and, on the edge of town, even if it's a bleak winter day, see something like 160 white-faced Hereford steers grazing in the lush front yard of an ultramodern, windowless, air-conditioned rayon twisting and weaving mill. The grass on that immense lawn or pasture, green the year-round, which is amazingly high in protein content and reseeds itself, is all that the steers eat and grow fat upon.

This is a relatively new scene in the South even agriculturally; but it's not nearly all of the farm part of the story. But let's consider the industrial side. The mill in the center of the many acres of meadow, the Gerrish-Milliken rayon plant, is one of the scores of new textile mills and finishing plants which have been, and are being, built in the textile South in the postwar period. They are windowless, totally enclosed, air-conditioned buildings of the most modern design, glazed tile interiors, and newest machinery with straight-line continuous production.

PROMISING EXPERIMENT

The project, known as the Deering-Milliken farm operation, is in the nature of an experiment, an experiment which agronomists believe will make a great contribution to the livestock industry of the rolling Piedmont, a part of the Old South that is hardly adaptable to the mechanized culture of cotton. The great green lawn, kept "mowed" by the steers, is a contribution of alta fescue grass, providing year-round grazing, and Ladino clover, which provides grazing plus legumes.

This combination, developed by the Department of Agriculture, has been tried out in other parts of the country—in Oregon and in Pennsylvania—but nowhere has it seemed to thrive better than in the rolling hills of the Carolina Piedmont.

ECONOMICAL CROPS

The South is undoing the damage of generations of a one-crop system. Thousands of acres are being planted in winter pasturage. Kudzu, a deep-rooted, leguminous vine from Japan which has a prodigious summer growth, not only checks erosion but furnishes pasture and forage. In much of the South, agronomists say, year-round pasturage would eliminate the investment in barns and equipment to house livestock and store forage.

Let's Mine Some Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of March 1, 1950:

THE COAL EMERGENCY—AN IMPASSE

Detroit's plight in the current coal emergency is no worse than that of many other communities in the United States, but it will serve as an example of how close to catastrophe we are approaching.

Public resentment is high, as indeed it should be, at the callous disregard for the general welfare which the coal miners and the operators are showing.

The thought of cold, heatless homes has gone beyond the scare stage and become reality. Schools in this city are to be closed unless relief, not now anticipated, is forthcoming within the next few hours.

Conditions have progressed by now to such a point that no relief can be expected for 2 or 3 weeks, even if the dispute were to be settled as this is written.

It is no exaggeration to say that the full responsibility for this deplorable and inexcusable situation lies full on the doorstep of President Harry S. Truman.

He played politics with the individual health and security of the people of the United States until matters deteriorated beyond his powers to control them.

Seldom if ever in the history of this Nation have we witnessed as callous and stubborn disregard for the rights of the people by a Chief Executive.

Ample warning was given him, and the means of averting disaster were in his hands.

He refused to use them, because Congress failed to give him his way and abolish the Taft-Hartley law so that he could win votes as the champion of labor.

Had he acted when the impending crisis became apparent, it is more than possible that the coal dispute would have been settled by this time.

Now it is too late for him to apply either his legal powers, or the implied powers which he so blithely claimed as one of his prerogatives.

The outcome of the legal action against the United Mine Workers holds no promise that the union members will go back to work.

If they choose to remain idle in the face of a Federal court order, who is to force them, as individuals, to comply?

There are nearly 400,000 strikers, and not enough jail cells to hold them all.

What if the Government seizes the mines? Who will dig the coal if the miners refuse to do so? Neither the Army, the Navy, nor the Marine Corps can do it.

The only thing now is an appeal to the patriotism and conscience of the miners.

Speaking in Atlantic City, Walter P. Reuther, president of the UAW (CIO) declared that both labor and management have a responsibility to the public that is above the interests of their special economic groups.

Those words ought to be shown to both the miners and the mine operators.

Only by an acceptance of that precept, based on the understanding that by their actions they are forcing millions of Americans toward cruel hardships, possible disease and economic distress, can the coal emergency quickly be resolved.

Whether the coal miners and the operators are beyond an appeal to patriotic duty remains to be seen.

But Mr. Truman at least should make the gesture of trying.

There is no other discernible immediate hope.

Representative John B. Sullivan and Federal Gas Rates Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 24, 1950, which calls attention to a small but important part of the fine work my colleague from Missouri, the Honorable JOHN B. SULLIVAN, has been doing to protect the interests of his constituents:

KERR'S HELPING HAND

When a special-interest group sets out through Congress to relieve the consumer of some of his money, it's customary to offer a high-sounding explanation. Senator KERR, wealthy Oklahoma oil man, has done this for a bill which passed the House and is before the Senate. He explains that his bill would help the independent natural-gas producer.

The Kerr bill would help independent producers, all right. It would help them to millions of dollars by exempting them from rate regulation by the Federal Power Commission. As for their independence, all that means is that these producers don't own gas pipe lines. Most of them are big oil companies and they represent about 70 percent of the gas industry.

For years the gas lobby has been busy in Congress. They have made a case at least for clarification of Federal powers. But if the Federal Power Commission were forbidden to figure gas production prices into a rate formula, the producers would have utilities and consumers virtually at their mercy.

Representative SULLIVAN has pointed out what Federal rate supervision means to St. Louis. Before the Commission stepped in, a southwestern company that indirectly supplied gas for this city charged $8.31 per 1,000 cubic feet. Rate regulation brought that down to $4.66. This benefited local consumers and still left the producer with a good profit.

Supporters of the Kerr bill offer one other happy thought for hilking consumers. That is States' rights. They say the States should regulate gas prices. But when gas is produced in Texas and sold in Missouri, how would regulation by Texas help St. Louis?

The gas industry has grown to the position of an interstate utility, whatever its component parts may be. Millions of Americans and much of their industry depend on it now, and more are turning to gas because of the coal situation. If the Kerr bill passes, these millions will have to pay for it.

Eat, Drink, and Be American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial of the Washington Times-Herald of March 2, 1950, which bears the above title.

The article accurately points out that in the United States we now make some very excellent wine. It happens that I represent a district that contains two very famous wine districts—the Napa Valley and the Lodi District. There are many other areas in California which also manufacture good wine. For some reason, some people have the impression that to obtain good wine one must buy wine which has been made abroad. I do not criticize the wine from foreign countries. But I do say emphatically that if one knows how to select the proper brands and types of wine made in the United States he can be assured that it will be equal to the quality of any similar types made in foreign countries. In California we have been engaged in the making of wines for almost a century. During that time, through scientific research, both public and private, and by the combined efforts of the wine industry represented by the Wine Institute, we are continually and have continually improved the quality of our wine. When one realizes that the production of wine in the United States is 140,000,000 gallons annually one can realize that the wine industry is no small industry. Furthermore, in California we produce 2,857,000 tons of grapes per year. There are probably over a hundred different varieties of these grapes. This insures that we have a great diversity in the type and taste of our wine. California manufactures approximately 90 percent of the total wine production of the United States.

I commend to the reading of my colleagues the article referred to which reads as follows:

EAT, DRINK, AND BE AMERICAN

Maj. Philip Harrison, who supervised management of wine cellars in occupied Rome and who is an expert on matters wine-y, made a good little speech in Baltimore the other day. Harrison said we should all drink more wine—which seems sensible; the Bible says "Use a little wine for thy stomach's sake"—and he further said that we should all drink more American wine.

HOME PRODUCT JUST AS GOOD

"I am sick and tired," said the good major, "of the poseurs and pretenders who delude people on the subject of wine * * * label-snobs who buy wines for the sake of the names on the bottles. Good wines are made in the United States as well as abroad," he said.

How right you are, Major? Our American wines, particularly those California and New York varieties, are every bit as good as the average bit of juice you can get from the sunny slopes of France, and they are improving all the time.

A man isn't only kidding himself when he spends $6.95 for a reed-wrapped cobwebby jug of Old d'Artagnan S'il Vous Plait Extraordinaire from A Bas Le Tourniquet just so he can murmur, "Aaaah—1928—the only good French vintage, y'know," to his friends—he is also wasteful. For that $6.95 he can get a jug and a half of much better American champagne and a box of crackers to boot.

An Honest Deal To Replace the "Raw Deal" on Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, during the last 2 weeks I have received from an aroused constituency in my home district roughly 15,000 signed statements of protest against the 20-percent Federal amusement tax. The larger part of these protests have come from the average American citizen—the fellow who after pay deductions of income tax, social security tax, insurance, and union dues, has very little left for entertainment. Yes, and these protests bring to mind the numerous cases of those average people who must cut corners and save all week in order to take their wives and families to the movies on Saturday night.

The unfortunate thing about these cases is not so much the fact that the average person has to scrimp and save in order to have enough for a little entertainment, but rather the cold, hard fact that the Federal Government, while purporting to give the low-wage earner a break, taxes him to the extent of 20 percent on every amusement admission ticket he buys whether it be the movies, the circus, a rodeo, or sporting event. And these are only a few of the "open taxes" masquerading under the name of "luxury taxes." We still have a 20-percent excise or luxury tax on light

bulbs, jewelry, cosmetics, toilet preparations, luggage, fur coats, and even certain baby necessities.

Figures available for the last complete fiscal year show that the American people paid in excise taxes alone a total of $7,500,000,000. On the basis of 150,000,000 population this breaks down to around $50 per person or $200 for a family of four.

According to the January report of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Federal Government in the coming fiscal year will extract from the American taxpayer in the form of excise taxes approximately $6,600,000,000. Besides paying the various tobacco, liquor, stamp, and miscellaneous excise taxes included in the foregoing figures, the consumer will eventually be required to pay more than $1,500,000,000 in manufacturer's excise taxes, passed along to him on any number of household goods he buys during the course of the year.

There is no way to escape paying these taxes either, for, when you try to get away, you pay a 15 percent tax on train, plane, and steamship fares, an average of 6 cents on every gallon of gas consumed by your automobile and another 15 to 25 percent tax on any telegrams sent or phone calls made.

There seems to be no end to the taxes we are required to pay. The darkness below the surface of American economic life is alive with hidden taxes too. They teem and multiply. They mean increased costs for virtually every item of living.

The American people today have every right in the world to grumble and express their anger over the excessive tax burden they are asked to bear. The average American is becoming more and more tax conscious and is fast learning to realize the full implications of the Federal Government's present chronic tax program based on the ill-conceived New Deal and Fair Deal theories of deficit financing.

I firmly believe that the majority of the American people at this point are fed up with the "raw deals" foisted upon them by the New Deal and Fair Deal and want simply an honest deal.

This "honest deal" can be given to the people, in part, by repealing excise taxes outright, lowering taxes generally, and then operating the Federal Government within the confines of a "pared down" budget geared to a peacetime economy.

"How," you may ask, "can we do this and still live up to the obligations to which we have already committed ourselves?"

This question can best be answered by comparing the records of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress and this Democratic-controlled Eighty-first Congress.

In the fiscal year 1948, during the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress, total expenditures amounted to $33,800,000,000 and the Treasury's balance sheet showed a surplus of revenues over expenditures in excess of $8,000,000,000.

In the fiscal year 1949, during the first session of this Democratic-controlled Congress, total expenditures amounted to more than $40,000,000,000 and the Treasury's balance sheet showed a deficit of nearly $2,000,000,000.

One need only compare these two figures of total expenditures and ask himself this question: "What additional services or benefits have I received from this $6,300,000,000 increase in Government expenditures?" I dare say the average citizen hasn't received one thing more than was given him by the Eightieth Congress for $6,300,000,000 less money. In fact it took that Republican-controlled Congress to lower everybody's individual income tax from the confiscatory wartime rate to the one presently in effect.

This year the President has asked for expenditures totaling some $42,000,000,000 and latest figures indicate that a deficit of $5,000,000,000 will be written in red come June 30.

The Republican Party has proved that it can set a peacetime budget, live within it, give the Treasury a surplus, and still give the people all the services ordinarily expected of a government that claims to be one "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

The Democratic Party, on the other hand, has during every 1 of its last 16 years in power operated in the red.

With that record in mind, I am becoming more firmly convinced that as long as the present administration is in power the only way we can ever cut the gigantic cost of government is to cut the taxes first and then see to it that the Federal Government lives within its income, just as you and I must do.

Repeal of all excise taxes at this time would be a boon to the little fellow who could enrich his living with the many items now taxed beyond his reach. The removal of all these taxes would certainly give business a "shot in the arm." While their removal would cost the Treasury a loss of an estimated $6,000,000,000 in revenue for the next fiscal year, many believe more than half this loss would be made up in an increase of corporation-tax revenue resulting from a greatly increased volume of business.

There is no reason why we, as representatives of the people, should not start the ball rolling now on a tax-reduction program as I have outlined. These more than 15,000 signed protests received from the Eighteenth District of Illinois clearly indicate to me that the American public is fed up with the administration's grandiose schemes that purport to give them something for nothing. These clear-thinking individuals are not interested in "fandangled" legislation that in the end will take even more money out of their pockets than is now being taken in every conceivable kind of tax.

They want simply relief from the excessive tax burden which they have had to bear for the last 10 years. The entire Congress would do well to take note of this public opinion poll which I feel certain will make itself felt this coming November.

Omnibus Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, has written an interesting article for the Tax Review on the purposes of the omnibus appropriation bill, which this body will consider after the middle of April. I think this excellent article is of great importance to Members of Congress and the general public, and, under leave to extend my remarks I include the article here:

A UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY—IMPROVED FISCAL CONTROL THROUGH OMNIBUS APPROPRIATION BILL

(By Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States House of Representatives)

For the first time since the early days of the Republic, the Congress of the United States and the tax-paying public this year will be offered a unique opportunity to understand the entire financial program of the Federal Government.

With the demands of a cold war falling upon a Government whose fiscal situation is worse than ever before in its peacetime history—with Federal spending totaling almost 20 percent of the Nation's entire national product and exerting a tremendous influence on the operation of the national economy—with the war-created deficit at hitherto unbelievable heights—now more than ever it is necessary for the Congress to exercise its important power of the purse with care and wisdom.

The opportunity that is being afforded this year for effective and intelligent fiscal management lies in the consolidated appropriation bill procedure, a technique that is new to the Congress although it has been tried and proven in France, England, Sweden, and other countries from the inception of parliamentary government. The objective of the new procedure is simple; instead of nine or more appropriation bills being considered individually over a period of 6 or more months, without relation to each other, to the total of appropriations, or to the total of Government receipts from which the obligations must be met, the House Appropriations Committee will consolidate all appropriations into one omnibus bill and will report the consolidated bill to the House, together with an estimate of Government receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year to which the appropriations apply.

This simple technique is the culmination of many years of legislative efforts to keep pace with the increasingly large and complicated Federal fiscal structure. Starting in 1796, when a Committee on Ways and Means was first appointed in the House of Representatives, the need for effective congressional fiscal control has become more apparent and more urgent as the size and scope of Federal programs has mushroomed through the years. In the last three decades particularly, the history of fiscal legislation has been marked by an insistent demand from the country, and by a consistent effort on the part of the Congress, to perfect a more efficient and effective system of handling the annual appropriation bills.

In the years preceding 1920 the appropriating functions of Congress were exercised by many committees, which at various times reported appropriations with little or no relation to any definite centralized plan or system. For some years Congress worked intermittently but assiduously in an effort to devise a plan under which we could consolidate and coordinate the appropriation functions, thereby achieving a more scientific and economical handling of national finances.

Finally, in 1921, Congress enacted the Budget and Accounting Act, under which for the first time we were able to segregate the funds for each department and agency of the Government in one place, in the same bill. It was a decided step forward.

NEED FOR EXPENDITURE CEILING

However, it became immediately apparent that there was a further defect in the system in the lack of a ceiling or other means of correlating expenditure with revenues—of adjusting outgo to income. Many men in these intervening years, including Swagar Shirley, of Kentucky, John Fitzgerald, of New York, and Martin B. Madden, of Illinois, with the able cooperation of talented career men like Marc Shield and John Pugh, have sought the philosophers' stone in a correlated consolidated budget submitted to the Congress simultaneously with authoritative estimates on the national income, but were thwarted largely by an obsolete and antiquated organization of the subcommittees.

Eventually, after long study, the Congress passed the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, including section 138, which provided for a legislative budget under which a joint committee of the two Houses was required to submit not later than February 15 of each year a legislative budget, including a ceiling of expenditure and estimated over-all Federal receipts for the next year. It was hoped at that time that this provision would solve the problem, that it would bring into such strong relief the outgo and the income of the Federal Government as to retrench the amount of money appropriated and bring it into a reasonable relation with the national income.

But from the beginning the plan was singularly unsuccessful. The requirement that a ceiling of expenditure be fixed before hearings could be held rendered it wholly impracticable. It was in effect a requirement for a court verdict before witnesses could be examined and testimony submitted. On the other hand, if desired until after hearings had been completed and bills reported, its application came too late to affect the totals.

Section 138 of the Reorganization Act of 1946 is now a dead letter. But the need which it sought to serve, the problem which gave rise to its enactment are still with us and growing more insistent with the increasing size and complexity of national finance. Some practical method had to be found of presenting in one proposal the entire expenditure program for the fiscal year in connection with an authoritative forecast of the national income for that period.

We believe we have now developed such a method. Through a reorganization of its subcommittees, restricting each member to one subcommittee and each subcommittee to one annual supply bill, and through a corresponding readjustment of our committee staff and reporting system, permitting all subcommittees to sit simultaneously, the House Committee on Appropriations during the first session of this Congress reported to the House and sent to the Senate for the first time in the history of the Congress all annual appropriation bills within approximately 10 weeks from the beginning of the hearings. This was the first step. We had to wait until its practicability could be demonstrated.

During the present second session of the Eighty-first Congress the Committee on Appropriations will discontinue the practice which has been in effect since the earliest days of the Congress of reporting appropriations piecemeal in separate, unconnected and uncorrelated individual bills, and will submit the annual appropriations in one consolidated omnibus appropriation bill.

EFFECT OF CONSOLIDATED BILL

The bill will be reported not later than April 15 of each year. By that time an authoritative forecast of the national income will be available. The prime question before the House when the appropriation bill comes to a vote will be whether to hold expenditures within the national income or vote to exceed the national income and increase the already stupendous national debt.

In the fierce light of publicity which will be concentrated on that final vote there will be no escape from responsibility. A clear unequivocal record must be made. And public opinion will do the rest. The embodiment of all annual expenditures in one compact bill, with all duplications and conflicts eliminated and with its impact on national credit clearly outlined, will serve to offset the pleas of pressure groups and high-powered lobbies and should save vast sums of money and reduce waste and prodigality to a minimum.

The advantages of the one-package bill are obvious. Appropriations will be more carefully processed; duplications, overlapping and conflicts will be reconciled; legislative items will be eliminated; logrolling will be impracticable as all the cards will be on the table at one time and any attempted trades will be too apparent to withstand the light of publicity; the entire expenditures for the year will be submitted in one figure simultaneously with an authoritative estimate of the national income; deficit financing will be discouraged, as a last opportunity will be afforded for reconsideration in the subcommittees of the entire bill with a view of bringing annual expenditures within the annual revenues of the Government; the bill will have been passed and all annual appropriations enacted before the end of the fiscal year, obviating the need for the usual continuing resolutions and permitting adjournment of Congress much earlier than heretofore.

HOW CONSOLIDATION WORKS

No special enactments or changes in the rules are necessary in order to provide for the consolidated budget or its consideration in either House. The House Committee on Appropriations is authorized to determine, without conference, the number and form and jurisdiction of the annual appropriation bills.

For example, at the beginning of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress two subcommittees of the House Committee on Appropriations had for many years been reporting the military appropriation bill and the naval appropriation bill respectively. Under the authority vested in the committee we combined the two subcommittees which now report out one bill, the armed services appropriation bill. Likewise at the beginning of the last session we combined the Subcommittee on Independent Offices and the Subcommittee on Government Corporations. From the consolidation of four bills into two bills it is only a step to the consolidation of all bills into one general bill.

The mechanics of drafting the omnibus appropriation bill will center on an executive committee within the House Appropriations Committee. The executive committee, whose five majority and three minority members will be rotated each session, will receive and hold the reports of the subcommittees assigned to particular chapters of the appropriation bill. If revision or amendment is deemed warranted, the chapter is returned to the subcommittee for further consideration. Each subcommittee report will be accompanied by a statement of total expenditures projected in the budget for the particular chapter, plus an itemized report of any changes in the expenditure total that would ensue from subcommittee action. When all reports have reached the executive committee and been approved, all chapters and reports will be submitted to the whole Appropriations Committee simultaneously, and will then be reported to the House in an omnibus measure.

OMNIBUS BILL NO CURE-ALL

Of course, the omnibus bill of itself will not be a panacea for all of the ills which prompt its inauguration. There is no substitute for laborious and searching inquiries for analyses and studies, by members of the Appropriation Committees of the two Houses, or for selfless interest and courage exercised by them and other members of the two bodies when the bill is before them for consideration or when legislative bills are under consideration, whether in committee or on the floor, which would impose new and additional drafts upon the Federal Treasury. These are requisites to the attainment of proper and effective congressional budgeting, and their importance cannot be too heavily stressed. We cannot have economy in Government under any system without patriotic interest and courage on the part of those charged with the duties of raising and spending revenue in providing for the support of the Government.

In this regard, it is necessary to remember that one of the many untoward effects of any war, and to an unprecedented degree in the last war, is the development in both the legislative and executive branches of the Government of an expenditure complex, a spending psychology. In the stress of war and the imminent necessity of providing for adequate national defense at all costs, we appropriate and spend with little regard for the sources of income or the possibility of securing results at less expense.

Now that the war is over it is difficult to get back to normal conditions and the exercise of prudent economy. It is hard to begin thinking again in terms of prewar expenditures and to drop from billions down to millions and from millions down to thousands—from dollars down to pennies. And in the present emergency in which we find ourselves, with a national debt which approximates a very substantial percentage of our national wealth, and with increasing budget estimates and decreasing revenues, we must begin to count even the pennies. Under present circumstances no economy is so small as to be disregarded.

INCENTIVE TO RETRENCHMENT

The consolidated bill considered in juxtaposition with the available incomes offers an incentive to retrenchment. As a matter of fact, it is the only practical method available at this time that offers hope for a reduction of appropriations to the smallest amounts consistent with sound business and good government.

Attainment of that goal will not be easy. The national defense situation is such as to require consideration of major policy matters which must be permitted—to some extent at least—to outweigh cold budgetary requirements. That is, there must be some consideration other than merely the number of dollars on hand at the particular time to determine the amount of national defense we will purchase. On the other hand there is no occasion to so close our eyes to budgetary restrictions as to purchase national defense on a basis which will in a few years result in our having nothing left to defend,

by reason of having exhausted our resources so completely in an all-out defense effort as to have destroyed our economy.

Veterans' benefits cannot be reduced by the Committee on Appropriations materially as such benefits are provided by law and whatever amounts are due must be paid. If any change is to be made in this area it will have to be made by the legislative committee.

In the foreign field we have certain commitments which must be honored in order to maintain our standing among nations. Regardless of how any member may feel about the policy or about whether we should originally have made commitments, the fact remains that we are committed and, whatever the cost, we must pay. Of course the committee will scrutinize such requests carefully to be certain no more is provided than is necessary to meet obligations incurred and to insure continuation of those programs which have so far proven effective in maintaining the peace of the world and in preventing the spread of ideologies which have for their purpose the destruction of democratic principles.

However, in view of these facts, this is no time to talk about new charges against the general revenues. Before we embark on new programs we must go back and survey the old ones and find what we can do about eliminating those which have outlived their usefulness and reducing the cost of others. Presentation of all proposed expenditures simultaneously in one bill will contribute materially to that end.

Thus, the initial use of the consolidated appropriation bill procedure during the present session of the Eighty-first Congress will achieve two major ends: First, it will provide the Congress with a new and much-needed tool to be used in the construction of the Federal fiscal structure; and second, it will magnify the responsibility of each Member of the Congress to achieve the sound national economy on which America's growth must be based.

Democracy Beats Communism Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an item in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of October 11, 1949, entitled "The Gladewater Plan—Democracy Beats Communism Week." It was introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH. It includes the statement that the idea for Democracy Beats Communism Week was originated by John Ben Shepperd, former president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, and that it was conducted at Gladewater the week of March 20 to 26, 1949.

I recall participating in Democracy Beats Communism Week in Kansas City, Mo., during the week of September 20 to 26, 1948, when it was sponsored and carried out by the Kansas City Junior Chamber of Commerce. The idea was, in fact, originated by my friend, Clint W. Kanaga, Jr., a prominent young Kansas City insurance executive, who offered the plan to the Executive Committee of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce for adoption for national action in January 1949, after it had been so successfully carried on and splendidly received the previous September in Kansas City.

The Kansas City Jaycees sent speakers before countless civic, church, labor, veterans' and other groups, as well as to almost every school in the community. The people of Kansas City were privileged to hear these men in earnest discussion of the fundamental issues between our way of life and that under the world's harshest dictatorship. The subject was not approached from the point of view of bitter denunciation on one side and flag-waving on the other. Instead, the Jaycees, who had spent many hours in study, presented hard facts of a historical, economic, social, and political nature and tried to give their audiences all the facts on both sides. It was seldom necessary to draw conclusions for the listeners. The Jaycees knew that when both sides of this question are clearly and dispassionately presented, Democracy invariably wins out. The whole community profited from this project and similar plans were subsequently undertaken in other communities.

I believe that the Kansas City Junior Chamber of Commerce deserves high credit for being the first to organize Democracy Beats Communism Week and for having one of its members as the originator of this plan.

Train Radio Might Have Helped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call attention to an editorial of the St. Louis Star-Times of February 20, 1950, entitled "Train Radio Might Have Helped," which discusses the recent shocking collision of two trains of the Long Island Railroad, resulting in a great loss of life and injuries to passengers.

While the railroad unions and some Members of Congress are supporting a bill, H. R. 378, to provide greater safety for passengers and employees, in the face of blind opposition, it is worth noting that the Long Island Railroad, after 29 or 30 passengers have been killed and more than 100 seriously injured, has announced the installation of "trippers" which would automatically halt trains on that particular section of a double track where trains running in opposite directions could not pass. The railroad announces that the "trippers" would be in operation within 24 hours, showing how easily they could have been installed. Why must the railroads delay installation of obvious and existing safety devices until disasters overtake them or legislation forces safety measures? The editorial entitled "Train Radio Might Have Helped" from the St. Louis Star-Times follows:

TRAIN RADIO MIGHT HAVE HELPED

Apparently the grisly collision of 2 trains on Long Island, in which 29 were killed and 100 hurt, was caused by a simple human failure. The tracks are normally double but were temporarily overlapped. It seems that one of the engineers, forgetting about the makeshift arrangement, was not watching the signals. He ran through a stop light. The right side of the west-bound train and the left side of the east-bound sheered each other open.

No gadgets in the world will ever erase the possibility of human error. But the techniques of science can make human error less likely. In this situation the Long Island Railroad was using old-fashioned signal equipment.

Here was a tragedy that radio communications between trains and between trains and stations might have averted. A radioed warning might have reminded the inattentive motorman of the overlapping stretch. The averting of a single tragedy such as this one would justify the relatively slight cost of installing the newest type of safety systems in the railroads that are lagging behind.

John H. Geisse Receives Deserved Award for Outstanding Contribution to Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a copy of a citation accompanying the gold medal presented by the Department of Commerce to John H. Geisse, who is a consultant with the Civil Aeronautics Administration, for his outstanding contribution to aviation in developing the cross-wind landing gear. The citation, which indicates the importance of this contribution to aviation, is as follows:

Mr. Geisse receives the Department's gold medal for his outstanding contributions to civil aviation, including the development of the famed cross-wind landing gear. Over a period of 25 years Mr. Geisse has labored constantly and tirelessly to bring the personal aircraft to the point where it would appeal to a wide segment of the American public. From his efforts to develop a personal plane have come the first nonspinning airplane, the safety airplane with tricycle undercarriage, and the proof that cheaper power plants and accessories for aircraft are possible.

His most recent success is the development of the cross-wind landing gear, which contributes materially to safety and economy in flying. Millions of dollars will be saved in airport construction on the basis of a recently announced CAA policy to build only one strip or runway on existing or improved class I airports, and to build no intersecting runways on larger airports. This policy was made possible only through the cross-wind landing gear, and Mr. Geisse was the prime mover in its development and adoption. Records already are available showing that both skilled and unskilled pilots have avoided accidents resulting in possible injury or death because their planes were equipped with the castered gear, thus indicating that it represents a major contribution to the technology of flying.

John Geisse has been a crusader in the aviation field. It is with considerable satisfaction, therefore, that the Department has awarded its exceptional service medal to him on this occasion.

Potato Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Globe of February 28, 1950:

POTATO PROBLEM

The importance of the potato problem is that it offers perfect illustration of the economic absurdity of subsidy without control. To its lesson we might pay close heed, lest we find ourselves shortly immersed in the quicksand of our own good intentions, up to our fiscal neck.

Basically the problem is simple. We grow more potatoes than we can use. In 1909 we consumed 193 pounds per year per person. Today we use only about 100 pounds. Yet farmers each year raise more potatoes; for although acreage has been cut by about 25 percent in the last 4 years, new insecticides and modern fertilizers cause 10 potatoes to grow where 1 grew previously.

Left to find their own level in an open market, potatoes today would sell at not much more than 60 cents a bushel, a price that would bankrupt producers. To avoid such a contingency, the Government has established price supports that have cost the taxpayers of this country just $495,169,000 in the last 7 years.

This price support has been available only in those areas where the farmers have agreed to voluntary acreage reduction. In Aroostook County in Maine, for instance, this reduction has cut plantings from 220,000 acres in 1946 to around 140,000 in 1949. But, obviously, a still further Nation-wide restriction is needed, and it was to this purpose that Senator LUCAS sought last week to amend a House bill with a provision that would suspend all price support for potatoes until some form of production control could be established by Congress.

The Senator's proposal was killed, however, by a coalition of 28 Republicans and 15 Democrats. In its place the Senate approved a plan which would continue price support as at present in all areas where growers agree to go along with marketing orders.

This plan admittedly will not cure the potato surplus. It was defended on the score that growers had already bought seed and fertilizer for the coming planting season under a gentleman's agreement with the Government that the price this year would be supported, which is true enough, and by the less tenable argument that in the present uncomfortable situation the growers themselves are without blame.

This is not to say that the potato farmers have been more eager of subsidy than others, or that they have not been cooperative. Indeed, it was the Maine farmers themselves who, taking the lead in efforts to cure the situation, first urged that the support price be lowered from 90 percent of parity to its present ratio of 60 percent. They have cut acreage heavily, switching to other crops, particularly dairy farming; as between 1947 and 1949, for instance, there was an increase of 10 percent in the number of farmers shipping milk to the Boston market from the State of Maine.

Furthermore, under our present agrarian policy, potato growers are entitled to protection against the ruin that awaits them in a free market under the laws of supply and demand. But they are hardly entitled to such protection through means that have already proved their inequity by saddling the taxpayers with a $500,000,000 expense in this one crop in 7 years.

No one likes Government controls such as the Lucas proposal envisaged, and the opposition of the potato farmers is understandable. Yet the fact remains that to guarantee price without at the same time controlling production, is to flirt with economic disaster by encouraging ever-increasing production.

As of today the Government has $3,609,000,000 tied up in crop surpluses. The figure might easily pass $5,000,000,000 in another year.

Under such conditions to insist that voluntary acreage reduction and marketing controls are sufficient, is like insisting on the pleasantness of the weather in the teeth of a northeast gale.

Potatoes at present occupy the news spotlight, but other crops press forward: the grain crops, cotton, pork, wool, eggs, butter, peanuts, and linseed oil. Are these products to follow in the way of the potato?

Are we to continue to give tight support to prices, while insisting on only the loosest of production controls?

If so, our entire farm program faces eventual collapse.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Fear of Semisocialism Here Factor in Concern Over Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan and an editorial, both appearing in today's New York Herald Tribune:

FEAR OF SEMISOCIALISM HERE FACTOR IN CONCERN OVER BRITAIN—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS REMEDY FOR UNEASINESS AT HOME LIES IN ELECTION NEXT NOVEMBER

(By Mark Sullivan)

The effect of the recent British election on relations between that country and ourselves will not be clear until we learn what course the Labor government is going to attempt in the light of its extremely reduced strength. The government's program is expected to become known when the House of Commons meets next week with the Labor Party's majority reduced to almost nothing. Soon thereafter one aspect of our relations with Britain will come up in our own Congress, when that body considers further aid to Britain (and other European countries) under the Marshall plan. On every occasion when aid to Britain has been discussed in Congress some Members have raised the point that our aid was helping a Socialist government remain in power.

The point is true, and the many implications of it that have been raised are trite or tenable. It is a fact that our aid to Britain has enabled the Socialist government to remain in power. In a phrase of Winston Churchill's, Britain has lived "from day to day and hand to mouth" on help from the United States: cessation of our aid would have been followed by economic collapse that would have unseated the party in power. And the existence of a Socialist government in Britain has been a detriment and threat to the United States, for if a country so important in world trade as Britain should become completely and permanently Socialist it would be difficult for us to continue as a country practicing free enterprise.

HANDICAP TO AID POLICY

These and other points raised by Americans who have questioned our aid to Britain are valid. They have been a handicap to the Truman administration's Marshall plan policy, and especially to Republicans who have supported the policy in a bi-partisan spirit. While votes in Congress for Marshall plan aid have always been overwhelming, uneasiness in that body has been larger than vocal expression of it. Members have been silent for the sake of maintaining a united front for a vital foreign policy. And feeling among the people has been more extensive than public expression of it. Spokesmen of public thought have practiced restraint, in the spirit of amity toward Britain and mutuality between the two peoples. Public feeling, however, has tended to grow, and public expression of it may be appropriate and less harmful at a time when apparently the British people are receding from socialism.

The queries raised about aid to Britain are true or tenable. But another thing is true, and is paramount absolutely. We are engaged in, and are the spearheads of, world resistance to communism. In that resistance, Britain is our partner. The British resistance to communism is as wholehearted as our own—in the recent election no Communist candidate was successful, and the total vote for all Communist candidates in the country was a minute fraction of the whole.

Britain's partnership with us in world resistance to communism has been imperatively indispensable. If at any time during the past 5 years the British Government in power should have fallen, whatever party it belonged to, or economic system it practiced, the effect on world resistance to communism would have been an extreme calamity. We have been abundantly justified in giving aid to Britain to keep its economy working and its Government stable.

What we have here is not infrequent in many situations, public and private. We are under an imperative necessity to help Britain for a purpose paramount above everything else. At the same time this necessity is accompanied by an awkward condition. If for the sake of the necessity we do not take account of the awkward condition, there is no reason for not recognizing it intellectually.

PART OF CAUSE DOMESTIC

In the present world chaos are three ideologies—communism, practiced by Russia, socialism, practiced by Britain, free enterprise and capitalism, practiced by the United States. While Socialist Britain and capitalist United States are united against Communist Russia, there is a subordinate and latent difference between them.

The uneasiness we feel about this difference may not be caused solely by the fact that Britain is Socialist; part of the cause may be domestic. It may arise obscurely from the feeling of many that the administration in power in our own country is not as wholeheartedly free enterprise and capitalist as the

British Government is wholeheartedly Socialist. Our uneasiness may arise not exclusively from socialism in England, but partly from apprehension about semi-socialism in the United States. The remedy for our own condition is not an election in Britain, but an election in the United States, such as will take place next November.

THE LAST WEAPON

Whatever the legal basis for Judge Keech's refusal to find the United Mine Workers guilty of contempt, however closely it may fit into or widely diverge from the precedents established by Judge Goldsborough and the courts which have reviewed his opinions, the hard fact remains that the miners have found a means of nullifying the injunctive proceedings established by the Taft-Hartley law—for the time being. And since time is of the essence in this national emergency, this victory for the miners, however temporary it may prove to be, has confronted the American people with extremely grave alternatives.

The union and the operators offer no hope of a settlement. The American economy is being strangled at an accelerating pace by continuance of the strike. Mr. Henry Ford has predicted that a mass shut-down of industry would be precipitated in 2 weeks unless coal supplies are forthcoming. To sit idly by while the Nation rushes toward catastrophe is unthinkable.

The last weapon remaining in the Government's hands is that of seizing and operating the mines. It is of uncertain value; in itself, it settles nothing, and may not even bring the men back to the pits. It places a heavy strain upon the American system by injecting the Government into the position of assuming the responsibility for the functioning of a vast field of private enterprise, and raises many questions, both of principle and detail. Some have advocated that the Government employ the opportunity afforded by seizure to force a contract upon the parties, or arbitration of the dispute. Others have urged that any profits from the operation of the mines be impounded during the seizure. If the Government is to act impartially under the circumstances—indeed, if it is to act at all—it will be plagued by many similar demands. The miners, the operators, the administration, the public may all regard seizure as a confession of common failure, a last resort.

Yet the prospect must be faced. The attitude of the administration toward the Taft-Hartley Act, consistently undermining its moral basis, refusing to invoke its provisions until time had nearly run out, affords almost no opportunity for further negotiation, or exploration of other legal remedies. The sole hope of averting the need for this expedient lies in a last-minute change of atmosphere around the bargaining table. Hitherto public pressure and legal pressure to that end has been unavailing; possibly the imminence of Government operation can still bring the bargainers to agreement. But the decision must come immediately, or the Government must step in.

Republican and Democratic Dinners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include a letter from a friend and constituent of mine:

GOSHEN, N. Y., *March 2, 1950.*

Hon. KATHARINE B. ST. GEORGE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: I have just read your News Letter No. 56 and see that you mentioned the Republican box supper and also the Democratic Jefferson-day dinner.

To demonstrate the ethics of the party in power in Washington, I submit that it might be mentioned in one of your news letters that the Republicans had 12,000 diners at $1 each and paid the regular Federal admission tax of 20 percent on each admission, or a total of $240. In contrast, the Jefferson Day dinner had 5,300 diners at $100 each, upon which they paid toward the unusually heavy expenses of running the Government—nothing. They evaded the regular 20-percent Federal tax of $106,000 on these admissions by adopting the subterfuge of accepting contributions and then issuing complimentary passes to that dinner. No doubt it is a state of mind, but it certainly does not inspire confidence among the people.

The source of this is Time, February 27, 1950, page 20.

Yours sincerely,

JOSEPH W. R. DALLY.

Serious Unemployment Conditions in Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter which stresses the fact that unemployment in Lawrence, Mass., is still in a very serious condition with thousands of the unemployed unable to collect benefits, due to the fact that their payments are exhausted. I sincerely hope that some relief will be accorded to these unfortunates by the Federal Government.

CITY OF LAWRENCE, MASS.,
City Clerk's Office, March 1, 1950.

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: It has come to the attention of the City Council of Lawrence that Mr. Arthur W. Brown, area director of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, recently wrote to you and to Senators LODGE and SALTONSTALL, requesting you to take such action as you could to have an immediate survey undertaken of the unemployment situation in our city with a view of providing work relief to assist our unemployed workers in their present plight. Our city council desires to give this request its strongest support and to add its voice to that of Mr. Brown to urge the necessity for positive action to relieve unemployment conditions in our city.

As Mr. Brown has told you, conditions in our city today are worse in some respects and are causing more hardship than they were a year ago when unemployment reached its peak here with more than 20,000 unemployed at that time. At present there are probably still 17,000 to 18,000 unemployed but conditions are worse because more than 13,000 have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits and are receiving no income today, while last year they were still eligible and were receiving unemployment benefits. Consequently the present plight of thousands of our workers is worse than it was a year ago.

This condition has been reflected in a most revealing manner in the demands upon our municipal welfare departments for assistance. During the month of January, 1950 our city disbursed more than $30,000 in direct welfare relief and an additional $20,000 for veterans' benefits, making a total disbursement of more than $50,000 in one month, or at the rate of more than $600,000 per year. By comparison, the total amount disbursed for public welfare and veterans' benefits in 1949 was $324,000 so that the demands for assistance have doubled in the past few months with every prospect of reaching higher levels unless employment in our mills increases or a relief program is provided.

We feel that conditions brought about by unemployment in Lawrence are more serious than ever before and that every effort should be made by the Federal Government to alleviate this situation either by channeling Government orders for textiles to our mills as we suggested a year ago, or by a direct work relief program.

The people of our city and the members of our city council believe that if only a small part of the billions of dollars being expended by our Government to rehabilitate western Europe and to subsidize farmers so as to maintain their income at the highest wartime levels were spent to purchase textiles from our mills, it would go far to relieve the distress which is so prevalent among our unemployed workers.

We know that you expressed keen interest in our unemployment problem last year and we trust that you will continue to do all in your power to have our Federal Government take effective and immediate action to relieve prevailing conditions in Lawrence and other textile centers of Massachusetts.

Most sincerely yours,

GORDON E. GAFFNEY,
City Clerk.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Has Succeeded Because of Sound Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, January 19, 1950:

DEPOSIT INSURANCE

The joint Senate-House committee which recently reported on its study of Federal credit, monetary and fiscal policies, included an informative discussion of Federal deposit insurance.

Under present law the FDIC insures bank deposits up to a maximum of $5,000. This covers 96 percent of all accounts, but 54 percent of the total volume of deposits remain uncovered.

In case of a bank failure the deposits uncovered would seriously cripple a community. The large depositors are generally those establishments which have large pay rolls which a failure would render them incapable of meeting.

However, the $5,000 limit has been almost purely academic and actually all deposits have been protected. This happens because the FDIC instead of waiting for banks to fail has anticipated matters and in case of a weak bank has brought about a merger with another institution. In doing that it has committed itself to financially supporting the merged institution to some extent but this has proved cheaper than the cumbersome process of receivership.

It is conceivable, of course, that if anything like the banking experience of the early thirties were to be repeated such operations would be beyond the capacity of the FDIC. If so, the $5,000 maximum would be the limit of the Corporation's power to pay off depositors. Then the disturbance to business life, resulting from the loss to larger depositors, would have its serious effect.

The committee suggests that Congress study thoroughly the advantages and disadvantages of increasing the coverage of deposits insurance and that no change be made in deposit insurance rates until after that study is completed. In brief the committee seems to raise the question as to whether it is better to lower the rates, a move often suggested, or raise the coverage.

We suggest that the amount covered by insurance will not be the determining factor in establishing the continued success of Federal insurance of bank deposits. That will be determined by the administration of the act.

When deposit insurance was suggested in 1933, there were many opponents, including the then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. William Woodin. That opposition was based on the disastrous experience of State experiments in insurance of deposits.

After a decade and a half none of the bad consequences that the opponents foresaw have come to pass. But the reason they have not is that FDIC was soundly administered. It has not let weak situations accumulate but has taken care of them as they arose.

The earlier State insurance schemes failed because the administrators imagined there was some magic in the word insurance; that just insuring something was a guaranty against loss. The Federal administrators have realized that you cannot make a strong situation by lumping together a lot of weak units; that the strength of the whole structure depended on cleaning up weakness or on preventing it from developing.

The continued success of deposit insurance depends on the continuance of sound management. Changing the figure for covered deposits will not do much for it either way.

Clarification of the Purpose of House Joint Resolution 419—Alternate Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, President Truman in his atomic-energy message to Congress October 3, 1945, said: "The release of atomic energy constitutes a new force too revolutionary to consider in the framework of old ideas."

It is in the spirit and meaning of the President's statement that I have tried to consider the problem of continuity of Federal leadership in the face of possible catastrophic obliteration of our National Capital by an atomic blitz.

The nerve center of Federal leadership is concentrated in Washington, D. C., or immediately adjacent to its boundaries. There is no doubt in my mind that Washington, D. C., would be target No. 1 for enemy attack. Paralysis of the nerve center for directing military and civilian movement in times of crisis is possible at the present moment on the basis of two undeniable facts:

(a) Concentration of the executive, legislative, and judicial functions of the Federal Government in one small area.

(b) Possession by a potential enemy nation of scientific weapons of mass destruction capable of destroying the Capital area.

I believe that it is imperative that Congress take cognizance of the problem which could be posed by possible enemy action. This is the problem: How can continuity of Federal leadership be guaranteed in the face of possible catastrophic obliteration of Capital facilities and key Federal personnel in the executive, legislative, and judicial departments of Government?

I am confident that calm consideration of the problem will produce a practical and workable solution.

I am also confident that the proper way to find the solution is to establish a commission composed of qualified Members to study the problem thoroughly and make suitable recommendations to the President and the Congress.

On February 20 I introduced a resolution—House Joint Resolution 419—proposing that a commission be created to investigate the measures which can be taken to insure the continuous operation of the United States Government in the event of attack by a foreign power. The commission would have two main fields of inquiry:

First. The feasibility of an alternate seat for the Government; and

Second. Appropriate procedures for selecting the successor of any President, Vice President, or Member of Congress who might become unable to perform his duties as the result of attack.

This resolution is receiving serious and careful attention by the departments and agencies of Government vested with responsibilities for the defense and security of the country. Many letters have come to me from persons who are thinking about the future of our country in the age of atomic science and the hydrogen bomb. Outstanding citizens within and outside the Government have responded favorably to the resolution. Newspaper editorial writers and radio commentators on the whole have been fair and intelligent in their analysis of the problems within the purview of the proposal I have made.

Understandably there have arisen a few misconceptions regarding this matter. Therefore, I lend my voice to those who plead for common sense and calm reasoning in these troublous times. I am not one who panders to panic. Nothing is more ill gotten than the publicity that plays on unreasoning fear.

My resolution does not contemplate removal of the Nation's Capital from its present site.

It does not advocate the relocation and dispersion of industry.

I am not suggesting that key executives and Members of Congress take flight from Washington, D. C., anymore than I am suggesting that the populace take flight from reason.

The burden of my resolution is a precautionary one. What measures are necessary to make sure that the machinery of government will not be paralyzed by a single knock-out blow? I propose that a small commission of responsible and informed citizens investigate and recommend to the President and the Congress the precautionary measures that must be taken.

An alternative seat of government to be used in the event of attack by a foreign power does not mean giving up our present Capital; it means simply that we must be prepared to carry on the operations of government from another place or other places in the event of sudden and drastic emergency.

To me it appears the essence of wisdom to take such preparatory steps. Unless we are genuinely concerned about the ways and means of maintaining continuity in the process of government, at some dark moment in the future we may be faced with complete and utter breakdown, our leaders gone, and our people panicked. Democracy then would disappear in the rubble. The greatest challenge of our times is the preservation of democratic government and institutions amid the awful and demanding pressures of the atomic age.

From a purely military standpoint, no doubt, the near-perfect defense would be the wholesale dispersion of industry and population, remaking the face of America on strategic defense lines without regard to the staggering economic costs involved or the devastating impact upon the lives and fortunes of its inhabitants. That is not the practical way, in fact, we would have to adopt the methods of dictatorship to attain this objective. For one thing is certain above all else; namely, that no foolproof defense can be devised against attack by the offensive weapons of our age. The most sensible thing we can do is to take vigorous defensive measures within the limits of our resources and our democratic institutions.

In stressing these limitations on defense, I do not for a moment imply that our case is hopeless; neither have I lost faith in the ultimate value of international organization for permanent peace.

What I do wish to convey—and this is the thought behind my resolution—is that we cannot shut our eyes to hard and dangerous facts; we must take the realistic measures for safeguarding the machinery of democratic government in the event of attack, even as we bend every effort to rendering such attack unlikely.

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Mr. Paul J. Larsen became director of the Nation's civil-defense program. In this connection, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter written by Mr. Edward I. Farley, of New York, a former naval officer, to the editor of the New York Times. Mr. Farley was at Pearl Harbor and was one of the very first Americans to fire a shot in World War II. An officer, he raced to an antiaircraft battery on his destroyer and fired at attacking Japanese bombers. There are many unsung war heroes. Mr. Farley is one of them.

The letter follows:

LACK OF CIVIL DEFENSE—EFFECTIVE PROGRAM FOR DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY CONSIDERED VITAL

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

There is a serious—perhaps critical—gap in our national defense program. It is the absence of an adequate stand-by civil defense and internal security program. It is possible that a $7,000,000,000 military expenditure combined with an effective civil-defense plan could give us greater national security than we have now with an appropriation twice that size. Tragically little is being done to organize our civilian services to meet the crisis that would result from surprise attack by Russia.

The Russians could deliver us, under the present circumstances of our civilian unpreparedness, a series of quick, paralyzing, and perhaps decisive body blows. They know that we are not prepared to meet such an attack and that it would be tremendously successful. This unnecessary exposure may not only someday induce Russian attack, but it aborts the security our national defense program is supposed to purchase.

Without proper civil defense, surprise attack would critically impair our ability to mobilize in time to help our allies. With the United States neutralized for even a few months, Russia would gain and consolidate her military objectives in Europe and Asia, with enormously enhanced chances of success. Our ability or our failure to weather successfully the initial shock of surprise attack may easily be a decisive factor in the best war.

TIME FOR ORGANIZATION

Then why do we not have an effective civil-defense program? It is apparently felt in Washington that Russia does not want war and that we are not now in danger. Therefore, it is also apparently reasoned, civil defense is not necessary. Yet it would probably take 3 years to organize a civil-defense program to meet the kind of attack that Russia is now capable of delivering.

Many of our military leaders feel that civil defense is a civilian responsibility; many of our political and civilian leaders feel that it is a military responsibility. Obviously, effective civil defense must be the shared responsibility of our military and civilian authorities. The present administrative responsibility lies in the National Security Resources Board. This Board is responsible to the President, and for political reasons has long been without a chairman. The Board has only a small civil-defense staff and has not been able to adequately provide the civil-defense leadership nor to assume the responsibility in this matter that belongs to it.

Failure to give civil defense the part it should have in the over-all defense program is clearly largely the President's fault. He has ignored the one comprehensive study made on this subject, the so-called Hopley report prepared by a staff of experts under the late Russel J. Hopley, of the Office of Civil Defense Planning in the Secretary of Defense's office in 1948. He also ignored Bernard M. Baruch's suggested stand-by civil and industrial mobilization plan. Mr. Truman's views on civil defense are probably based on the hope that our $14,000,000,000 defense program will deter Russia from attacking us, and the view that civil defense does not make good political grist.

FEDERAL LEADERSHIP

A few States, such as California, New Jersey, New York, and Maine, are taking measures to provide civil-defense programs. However, an effective program requires that leadership originate and flow from Washington because of the required uniformity, flexibility, and coordination. The actual implementation and administration of the over-all specifications can and should be accomplished by the individual States.

The larger problem is how to awaken the President and the other responsible Washington authorities to the fact that we are wide open, and inviting trouble. As we now go, we are certainly not fooling Russia. We must not take false refuge in our inflated military budget, atomic bomb, B-36, guided missile, and all. We must recognize in our thinking and planning that the civilian and his family, the factory and its workers—the Nation itself—are exposed to direct and furious attack. Therefore, to deter Russia from war, to give us a better chance of winning if war should come, to get value received for every dollar spent on national defense—these things require without further delay an effective civil defense and internal-security program. It could be much later than any of us realize.

EDWARD I. FARLEY.

NEW YORK, *January 5, 1950.*

Danger in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, a terrible danger to world peace is boiling and bubbling in the Middle East. The Arab states, particularly Egypt, spurred on by serious misjudgments by the British Government, devoted to humanity at home and to the exploitation of humanity abroad, are showing every sign of preparing to renew their war of annihilation against the Republic of Israel, while the cold war in Europe engages the attention of most Americans.

Under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD, first, an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune dated February 28, 1950, headed "Arms and the Middle East"; second, a letter addressed to me by Mr. Elihu D. Stone, national vice president, Zionist Organization of America; and third, a résumé of reports on the supply of arms by Great Britain to Arab states. In another place will be found the full text of the memorandum referred to by Mr. Stone.

I ask your particular attention, Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Stone's assertion that, indirectly, the United States is supplying arms to the Arab states.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 28, 1950]

ARMS AND THE NEAR EAST

The latest Israeli request for permission for export of arms from the United States and Great Britain illuminates the stark fact that there is no peace in the Near East. Britain, under her old treaties, has resumed the shipment of weapons to the Arab states; the United States has lifted its embargo on such exports in accordance with the UN decision, and has licensed some sales to Israel. An arms race is on in the wake of the Palestine war.

But as in all similar situations it is not the arms that constitute the real danger of war—rather it is the will to use them. Peace certainly would not be insured by continuing British military aid to the Arabs, while the Israelis were debarred from obtaining weapons from the west. It would not be forwarded if the United States and Great Britain were to enter into a competition to see which nation could supply the greatest amount of arms to the contending parties. Even a new embargo by the western powers, although it might reduce some of the tension in the Palestine region, would not necessarily remove the fundamental threat. Both sides would seek other sources of supply, and if they found them in the Communist bloc of states the situation would be worsened all around.

The real answer to the problem does not lie in any juggling of arms shipments but in the conclusion of peace treaties among the nations involved in the Palestine imbroglio. The present armistice must be replaced by a genuine agreement which will permit the necessarily slow growth of mutual trust and cooperation. A workable solution of the question of Jerusalem must be found, and the United Nations as a body, the United States and Great Britain as interested powers, must exert their influence to bring the parties to terms.

The armistice agreements give a practical basis for a settlement; there have been substantial advances toward resolving disputes over boundaries, the refugees, and the like. Both Israel and the Arab states have domestic problems which clamor for undivided attention, and make heavy demands upon all the resources of skill, energy, and wealth that are available. Neither side can hope to obtain more, in terms of national prosperity and stability, from war than it would achieve by peaceful methods; indeed, war promises only disaster. If peace, a real peace, were made the first objective on the agenda of Israel, the Arab states, the United States and Britain, the arms race would be relegated to a subsidiary importance, and would die away of inanition.

AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1950.

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KLEIN: I beg to be allowed the privilege of soliciting the exercise of your kind offices with reference to a problem in which American Jewry is deeply concerned—a problem of maintaining peace in the Near East—on behalf of the American Zionist Council, which consists of all Zionist parties and groups. The council includes the Zionist Organization of America, the Hadassah, Women's Zionist Organization of America, the Labor Zionist Organization of America, and the Mizrachi Organization of America (Orthodox).

Through the United Jewish Appeal, of which the Honorable Henry J. Morgenthau, Jr., is general chairman, American citizens of the Jewish faith are contributing millions of dollars to the Jewish Agency in Israel for the work of immigration and rehabilitation of tens of thousands of homeless Jews from Europe, known as the DP's, and from other countries.

However, it is distressing to learn from authoritative and reliable sources that peace in that part of the world is being threatened by the unprecedented rearmament of the Arab nations, particularly Egypt and Iraq, and that the source of the supply of arms is Great Britain.

I am enclosing herewith a memorandum which recites reliable facts relative to the Arab rearmament and the part played in it by England, as well as its accompanying threat of war based on authentic information coming from official and semiofficial Arab sources.

A study of the memorandum reveals warlike intentions of the neighboring Arab states against the State of Israel. They are energetically preparing themselves for what the Arab press describes as a second round. The tremendous military appropriations in their budgets conclusively establishes extravagant military preparations on the part of the Arabs for action, and that action is intended against Israel, a fact which the Arabs do not conceal. The volume and the kind of arms purchased by the Arabs from England and other European nations cannot be said by any stretch of the imagination to be merely for the purpose of maintaining internal domestic tranquillity.

Our own country, the United States of America, is deeply concerned in the maintenance of peace throughout the world, including the Near East. It is recognized that peace is indivisible; an aggressive military act anywhere is a disturbance of the peace everywhere.

The United States, under the Atlantic Pact, is supplying arms and ammunition to the western European nations, including England, which constitutes, in effect, a replacement of the arms shipped by England to the Arab nations. In fact, we have reason to believe that a part of the surplus of American arms left in England is today in the possession of Egypt and other Arab states. Thus, in effect, the arms are being paid for by the American taxpayer and, indirectly, the United States is contributing toward the rearmament of the Arab nations. As a direct result, Israel is compelled to divert a large part of its financial resources for armaments in order to meet the terrible threat of war. Thus, an armament race between Israel and the Arab countries is in full swing.

I sincerely hope that, consistent with your official position, you will deem it proper to communicate with the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, to the end that this terrible armament race of the Near East, which broods no good for mankind, shall be stopped, and that you will be good enough to insert your statement to the Secretary of State in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Indeed, the Department of State is possessed of the appropriate means for the purpose of impressing England, and the other countries in western Europe, with the evil consequences of the delivering of arms to the Arab countries whose warlike designs against Israel are a matter of public record.

If it is the policy of the Department of State, for reason of security resulting from the cold war, to rearm the countries of the Middle East, then certainly Israel should be included. Indeed, Israel may well be regarded as a faithful and cooperative ally of the west. Surely, Israel is no less worthy of confidence than its neighboring Arab countries, whose record in World War II is a rather dubious one. Israel is the bastion of democracy in the Near East. The establishment of a balance of armaments between Israel and the neighboring Arab states would eliminate fear and restlessness, and help to bring about the execution of peace treaties between Israel and its Arab neighbors, as a substitution for the present armistice treaties.

Perhaps you may be interested in a speech which Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN delivered on the subject of the rearmament of the Arab States, in the Senate, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 1950. You may also be interested to know that William Green, president of the AFL, and Philip Murray, president of the CIO, recently visited the President of the United States, protesting against the rearmament of the Arabs and requesting that Israel be supplied with arms so that it be placed on a par with the Arab States, who are being supplied with arms by England.

I respectfully suggest the advisability of making a statement on the floor of the House, in addition to the insertion of any communication that you may deem proper to forward to the Secretary of State, in accordance with your judgment.

We would be grateful to you if you will be kind enough to send us a copy of your communication to the Department of State.

I would be glad to come to see you personally if you find it necessary and if you let me hear from you.

Please accept our deep appreciation for your kind cooperation.

Respectfully,

ELIHU D. STONE,
National Vice President,
Zionist Organization of America.

REPORTS ON SUPPLY OF ARMS BY GREAT BRITAIN TO ARAB STATES

1. On June 9, 1949, a United Press dispatch stated that England had decided to lift the embargo on the supply of arms to the Arab countries.

2. Manchester Guardian wrote on June 18, 1949: "The decision of the British Government to renew her supply of arms to the Arab countries, while Lausanne talks are carried out, sounds like a threat."

3. Beirut broadcasting station (Lebanon) announced on September 4, 1949: "During the Palestinian War an arrangement had been made to purchase several warships. The embargo detained the sending of the ships. Now, the embargo being lifted, the ships are due in Egypt. One ship is harbored in Malta and is ready to leave for Egypt. Three other ships are still in British ports and will be leaving for Egypt soon."

4. Reuters quotes the Lebanese Defense Minister, Emir Arselan, as saying on September 6, 1949, that Lebanon has recently received from England 5 to 10 training planes. Another shipment is expected by the end of the month.

5. The Middle East broadcasting station announced on October 6, 1949: "The Syrian Government is contacting British aircraft manufacturers in order to buy airplanes from them. The Syrian Government also intends to send to England Syrian pilots to learn to pilot the jet airplanes."

6. El Misri (Cairo newspaper) correspondent in London wrote on October 17, 1949: "A British source indicates the arms purchase of Egypt in Britain to be worth the sum of £15,000,000."

7. The Daily Telegraph on October 27, 1949, said: "It was announced here today that the Egyptian Government has approved the purchase from Britain of 61 military aircraft. This total is stated to comprise 40 Spitfire models, 9 Halifaxes, and 12 DH-113 night fighters which were regarded here as a new type and hardly considered yet in the production stage. Egypt has a military mission at present in Britain. Spitfires are already in extensive use in the Egyptian Air Force which is cooperating today with the RAF in a major exercise for the defense of the Suez Canal. The prospective purchases from Britain are part of a plan approved in May to spend about £53,000,000 sterling on military equipment, including an armored division and an auxiliary air force. The Egyptian Government's intention to establish a factory in Egypt for the manufacture of 'fighter or Spitfire' planes and the agreement for this having been reached with a foreign government were announced in the senate here in July by the Minister of War and Marine Haydar Pasha. The proportion of the cost of the aircraft from Britain that may be assigned against Egypt's sterling balances is not mentioned."

8. The New York Times correspondent in London wrote on November 15, 1949: "The Egyptian Delegate in England has ordered a big order of jet planes of the latest types. The aircraft will be purchased from the DeHaviland Co. with the agreement of the British Government."

Retirement of Timothy W. Regan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in recent years about the problem of juvenile delinquency. So often we label a young lad delinquent because he gives the normal response to an abnormal situation. Then he is thrown into a reformatory which is probably the most abnormal of all abnormal situations in the world and, while there, he learns to perfect his technique of giving natural responses to abnormal conditions. Then we wonder why it is so difficult for him to readjust himself to a new and different society after his release.

What needs to undergo reforming is not the boy, but the social, spiritual, and physical environment in which he finds himself. In my opinion, it is the parents who oftentimes need reforming.

On March 1, in my home town of Buffalo, Timothy W. Regan retired as deputy director of the City Court Division of the Erie County Probation Department.

He has been one of Buffalo's outstanding citizens and has rendered almost 40 years of service to his community and his country. He was among the first in Buffalo to realize that the best and cheapest way to cure juvenile delinquency is not to let it happen. He knew that by providing a wide variety of proper group experiences in wholesome circumstances and under proper supervision much of the so-called "juvenile delinquency" could be prevented. He was a pioneer in establishing youth organizations to provide wholesome recreation for the youth of our town.

He knew that the cure for juvenile delinquency lay in individual diagnosis and treatment, and in the thousands of cases that passed through his hands in

his everyday work he used that individual approach, and found it highly successful. He knew that unless properly handled, a boy's natural reactions may be the forerunner of a serious behavior pattern.

It has been a real pleasure and privilege to have known and been associated with Timothy Regan, and I hope that, even though age has forced him to retire from active duty, he will be kept on an advisory basis because his knowledge and experience would indeed be a great loss to our community.

I want to take this opportunity to extend to him my heartiest congratulations on his seventieth birthday and my very best wishes for his continued success and good health.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am herewith including an article from the Buffalo Courier-Express in this connection:

REGAN RETIRING MARCH 1 FROM PROBATION POST—COUNSELOR OF 150,000 IN 36-YEAR CAREER

(By Wes Johns)

A man who has counseled an estimated 150,000 persons in their hour of need during the last 36 years will retire March 1 from public life.

He is Timothy W. Regan, deputy director of the City Court Division of the Erie County Probation Department, who reached his seventieth birthday February 12. Regan's long experience as a humanitarian and probation officer has earned him the title of "Buffalo's trouble shooter."

Casting a retrospective eye over the past during an interview yesterday, the veteran probation chief drew a comparison between the problems facing youth today and 3 decades ago. He also cited what he believed to be the four most important factors contributing to crime among the younger element today.

INFLUENCES TO CRIME

There, he asserted, are:

1. Environment: America has undergone great changes in 30 years, in many cases for the worse. Careless fathers and mothers who allow their children to roam the streets at night, broken homes and [illegible] parents contribute to crime.

2. Bad companions: This is an outside the home influence which may contribute to crime. Under bad companions may be listed both persons and books.

3. Neglect of religion: This may be followed by a total disregard for other sacred things and for the law. I have found the boy or girl who observes God's law is seldom charged with disobeying man-made law.

4. A general indifference by the community to the welfare of young persons: Members of the community will sit by and see questionable resorts spring up and not question them. Failure to wipe out vicious entertainment and failure to provide proper recreational facilities. We might better spend $5,000 for a playground than many times that sum for reform institutions.

PO CHANGE IN PREVENTIVES

In drawing a comparison between crime today and 30 years ago, Regan observed that most law breakers three decades ago were full-grown men of 21 and over.

Now conditions have changed so that it is not uncommon to see youths from 16 to 22 years old involved in felonies and serious crimes. While the age has lowered, there has been no change in the main prevailing feature in crime.

"Proper parental supervision is the arch of youthful character for which no substitute has ever been found," Regan observed.

Boys and girls today, however, are pretty much the same as several decades ago, Regan believes.

During retirement, Regan plans to live an active life, in which fishing, walking, gardening and travel will be the principal ingredients.

"I'll see America first, then Europe," he said.

One of the city's wittiest and most polished speakers, Regan also will continue to make platform appearances.

INTERESTED IN SPORTS

Regan also expects to continue his interest in sports, which began when he pulled an oar on the 1914 West Side Rowing Club crew.

Regan was appointed probation officer November 14, 1913. By the unanimous choice of ten city court judges, he was made deputy chief probation officer December 20, 1927. He was appointed chief probation officer on the death of his predecessor, William E. Wiley, March 9, 1928.

Regan was the first Italian-speaking probation officer appointed here, and for 15 years he worked with the Italian people of the city.

Regan instituted many reforms including a prevention clinic. This has now become a fixed feature and the clinic, largely through Regan's effort, has been a means of saving many young folks from crime. It has also been the means of settling family disputes and keeping homes intact.

Regan has always emphasized that unclean literature has been a great factor in wrongdoing by young persons.

SERVES MANY ASSOCIATIONS

In 1944, Regan was voted a frontiersman by the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce. He has also been an honorary citizen of Boys Town for more than 20 years, also a sponsor of the Catholic Youth Organization of the Buffalo diocese, and a member of the Buffalo Boy Scout Council and Advancement Committee and his parish committee of the Nativity, Albany and Herkimer.

During the time Regan has been the head of the City Court Probation Division, approximately 97,000 persons have passed through his department, and $10,000,000 has been collected in fines, restitution and nonsupport.

The Medical Treatment Supplied by the Veterans' Administration for Veterans of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, in these remarks, I desire to discuss the medical, dental, and hospital services presently being furnished to Alabama veterans by the Veterans' Administration. My emphasis will be on these services as they relate to veterans living in Blount, Cullman, Fayette, Franklin, Lamar, Marion, Pickens, Walker, and Winston Counties which make up the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, which I have the honor to represent here.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

There are presently three veterans' hospitals in Alabama, located at Tuscaloosa, Montgomery, and Tuskegee. A fourth Veterans' Administration hospital is under construction at Birmingham.

The hospital at Tuscaloosa, Ala., is primarily for neuropsychiatric cases but has an allotment of beds for general medical cases.

The hospital at Montgomery is for general medical cases only, but will in real emergencies accept other types of cases.

The hospital at Tuskegee, Ala., is maintained altogether for colored veterans. It accepts general medical cases and neuropsychiatric cases as well.

APPLICATIONS FOR HOSPITALIZATION

A. ROUTINE CASES

In a routine case—where an emergency does not exist—an application for hospitalization should be sent to the regional office, of the Veterans' Administration at Montgomery, Ala. There, the eligibility of the applicant for hospitalization will be determined, and his application sent to the proper one of the three hospitals. When a bed is available the hospital notifies the veteran to report.

B. EMERGENCY CASES

In an emergency case the veteran or his representative should telephone the hospital nearest to him. This may be done by the veteran himself, by his doctor, or by a service organization representative such as the representative of the State Department of Veterans' Affairs, the American Red Cross, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the AMVETS, and others. If possible, it is highly desirable that a doctor call the hospital so that he may professionally explain to the admitting officer of the hospital the nature of the emergency condition of the veteran.

OUT-PATIENT MEDICAL TREATMENT FOR VETERANS

The Veterans' Administration may authorize out-patient treatment for a veteran if:

First. The veteran has a condition which carries a service-connected rating. This condition does not have to be one that the veteran necessarily receives compensation for. The condition must be service-connected, but it may be a condition that has been rated as not disabling to a compensable degree.

Second. The veteran has a condition which may tend to aggravate a service-connected condition.

Third. The veteran is enrolled in training under the provisions of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, and has a condition that would cause his training to be interrupted.

APPLICATIONS FOR OUT-PATIENT MEDICAL TREATMENT

The Veterans' Administration through its Montgomery, Ala., regional office, maintains suboffices at Decatur, Birmingham, and Montgomery. Veterans desiring out-patient treatment should contact the chief medical officer of the office serving his area. If the veteran lives in Franklin or Cullman Counties he would contact the Decatur, Ala., office. If he lives in Pickens County, he would

contact the Montgomery, Ala., office. If he lives in Marion, Walker, Winston, Blount, Fayette, or Lamar Counties he would contact the Birmingham office.

WHO GIVES OUT-PATIENT MEDICAL OR DENTAL TREATMENT

When a veteran has been approved for out-patient treatment he will be treated by either:

First. One of the subregional offices at Decatur, Birmingham, or Montgomery, each of which has medical and administrative personnel with which to handle out-patient treatments.

Second. Fee-basis doctors or dentists. Any doctor or dentist licensed to practice in Alabama may get his or her name on the approved list of fee-basis doctors and dentists by making application to the Veterans' Administration.

Third. Other doctors. If the veteran who is approved for out-patient treatment prefers that his treatment be given him by his family or home-town physician or dentist, he should make such request to the chief medical officer of the subregional Veterans' Administration office—at Decatur, Birmingham, or Montgomery—serving his area.

I am inserting as a part of my remarks a list of the fee-basis physicians and dentists living in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama who have heretofore made application and been appointed as fee-basis physicians and dentists of the Veterans' Administration:

FEE-BASIS PHYSICIANS

Blount County: Dr. Vernon E. Whitehead, Blountsville, Ala.; Dr. J. S. Wittemeir, Cleveland, Ala.; Dr. M. Denton, Oneonta, Ala.

Cullman County: Dr. E. B. Barnes, Dr. Thomas D. Beatty, Dr. J. C. Chamblins, Dr. R. B. Dodson, Dr. C. E. Herrin, Dr. V. P. Hughes, Dr. Frank C. Stitt, Dr. Roy W. Williams, Dr. Robert F. Williford, all located in Cullman, Ala.; Dr. George T. Rowe, Hanceville, Ala.

Fayette County: Dr. B. W. McNease, Dr. J. Banks Robertson, Fayette, Ala.; Dr. J. D. Scrivner, Berry, Ala.

Franklin County: Dr. J. D. Burns, Dr. Clarence D. Prichard, Dr. J. S. Snoddy, Dr. Wm. H. Spruell, Dr. W. E. Wilson, all in Russellville, Ala.; Dr. Zadoc L. Weatherford, Red Bay, Ala.

Lamar County: Dr. Charles A. Davis, Kennedy, Ala.; Dr. John M. Robert, Vernon, Ala.

Marion County: Dr. J. O. Brooks, Hamilton, Ala.; Dr. Robert L. Hill, Dr. M. C. Hollis, Winfield, Ala.; Dr. M. S. White, Hamilton, Ala.

Pickens County: Dr. V. L. Ashcraft, Reform, Ala.; Dr. Lewis C. Davis, Gordo, Ala.; Dr. Hugh W. Hill, Carrollton, Ala.; Dr. Robert E. Wilson, Aliceville, Ala.

Walker County: Dr. James Andrew, Cordova, Ala.; Dr. Frank Blanton, Saragossa, Ala.; Dr. J. C. Gladney, Jasper, Ala.; Dr. Clarke E. Ginther, Gorgas, Ala.; Dr. A. C. Jackson, Jasper, Ala.; Dr. Bruce Johnson, Flat Creek, Ala.; Dr. Giles W. Jones, Parrish, Ala.; Dr. Giles W. Jones, Goodsprings, Ala.; Dr. Gaines W. Keith, Carbon Hill, Ala.; Dr. Karl E. Maneval, Parrish, Ala.; Dr. T. J. Payne, Jr., Jasper, Ala.; Dr. H. J. Sankey, Nauvoo, Ala.; Dr. John T. Simmons, Dr. William T. Snoddy, Dr. J. K. Taggert, Dr. L. M. Walker, Jasper, Ala.; Dr. H. S. Watkins, Oakman, Ala.

Winston County: Dr. Robert F. Blake, Dr. W. M. Godsey, Dr. R. Lee Hill, Dr. W. E. Howell, Dr. Hobson Manasco, Dr. Charles A. Olives, Dr. William E. Wilson, all in Haleyville, Ala.

FEE BASIS DENTISTS

Blount County: Dr. John P. Brittain, Dr. Robert E. Brittain, Oneonta, Ala.

Cullman County: Dr. George W. Bledsoe, Dr. Leroy C. Bledsoe, Dr. Sidney H. Morrow, Dr. Elmer G. Plunkett, all in Cullman, Ala.

Fayette County: Dr. Horace E. Berry, Fayette, Ala.

Franklin County: Dr. Julius Y. Blake, Dr. Thomas S. Jones, Jr., Dr. Alonzo L. Owens, all in Russellville, Ala.

Lamar County: Dr. John L. Davis, Sulligent, Ala.

Marion County: Dr. Franklin M. Shirey, Winfield, Ala.; Dr. Henry H. Sizemore, Guin, Ala.

Pickens County: Dr. Lon Alexander, Gordo, Ala.; Dr. William H. Comerford, Reform, Ala.; Dr. James V. Sullivan, Aliceville, Ala.

Walker County: Dr. Doyce G. Briscoe, Dr. Dan M. Christopher, Dr. Malvern B. Cooper, Dr. Thomas D. Rice, Dr. Orland L. Rice, all in Jasper, Ala.; Dr. Samuel E. Knox, Carbon Hill, Ala.

Winston County: Dr. W. Stewart Brock, Dr. Fred Robinson, Dr. John W. Robinson, all in Haleyville, Ala.

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS FOR RATING PURPOSES

All examinations for rating purposes are conducted either at a Veterans' Administration office, by a Veterans' Administration physician, or by doctors selected by the Veterans' Administration from the approved fee-basis list. The veteran is not allowed to select the doctor who examines him for rating purposes.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I insert at this point a letter from Hon. Harley A. Smith, manager, the Veterans' Administration Regional Office, Montgomery, Ala., which deals exclusively with the subject matter of these remarks:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
REGIONAL OFFICE,
Montgomery, Ala., January 26, 1950.

Hon. CARL ELLIOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: I have delayed a few days in replying to your letter of January 18, but believe that I now have the information that you want.

In this letter I shall explain first the set-up for handling out-patient treatment and examination, and in the second portion a few comments about the VA hospital set-up within the State. Under both sections of the letter I shall refer principally to your congressional district, but will also give you a picture of the organization for the entire State.

I am sending along with this letter a map that shows the location of the Montgomery regional office and three VA offices under the jurisdiction of this office. In each of these VA offic s we have a chief medical officer and other professional and administrative personnel to handle out-patient treatment and examinations for rating purposes and examinations to determine the need for hospitalization. The footnotes on this map explain the routing of requests for emergency medical treatment, as well as requests for hospitalization. I note that your congressional district falls into three different areas as far as out-patient medical service is concerned. The chief medical officers located at Decatur, Birmingham, and Montgomery will give prompt attention to requests received from any areas of the State. For purposes of administration and control, however, it is desirable to contact the chief medical officer serving counties within each subarea. For example, veterans living in Franklin and Cullman Counties will contact the Decatur office; those in Pickens County, the Montgomery office, and the remainder of the counties in your area will contact the Birmingham office.

It might be well to point out in this letter that out-patient treatment can be authorized only under certain circumstances. These circumstances are as follows:

(a) Treatment of any condition which carries a service-connected rating—whether it be a compensable rating or not.

(b) Any condition that may tend to aggravate a service-connected condition.

(c) For veterans who are enrolled in training under the provisions of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, treatment may be authorized for any condition that would cause the veteran's training to be interrupted.

The coverage for handling out-patient treatment includes fee-basis and home-town doctors as well as VA medical offices located on the map. I shall explain briefly the set-up on fee-basis doctors and treatment by hometown doctors who are not on the approved list of fee-basis physicians.

(a) Fee-basis doctors: Any doctor or dentist who is licensed to practice in the State of Alabama is approved as far as the VA is concerned. To be on the approved list of fee-basis doctors and dentists, however, it is necessary that the doctors make application to the VA and be appointed as a fee-basis doctor. I am sending along with this letter a list of fee-basis doctors and dentists located in your congressional district. This list contains only the names of doctors who have made application and been appointed on a fee-basis.

(b) Other doctors: Doctors other than those listed on the fee-basis list may render out-patient treatment on request of the veteran concerned. If a veteran is eligible for treatment he may indicate to the VA that he desires the treatments to be rendered by his family or hometown physician. These requests should be made to the chief medical officers of the respective VA offices. The chief medical officer will then authorize treatments to be rendered.

In your letter you did not refer to medical examinations for rating purposes, but I would like to point out that a veteran may not select the doctor to perform this type medical examination. All examinations for rating purposes are conducted either at a VA office, by a VA physician, or by doctors selected from the approved fee-basis list.

With regard to the hospital set-up, there are three VA hospitals in the State. They are located at Tuscaloosa, Montgomery, and Tuskegee. The hospital at Tuscaloosa is primarily for NP cases, but has a certain allotment of beds for general medical cases. The Montgomery hospital is for general medical cases only, except, in real emergencies, other types of cases will be accepted. The hospital at Tuskegee is entirely for colored veterans—both general medical and NP-type cases.

Applications for hospitalization in routine cases where an emergency does not exist, should be sent to the VA regional office in Montgomery. At the regional office eligibility is determined and the application routed to the appropriate hospital. When a bed is available, the hospital then advises the veteran to report. In cases where an emergency medical condition exists, the nearest VA hospital should be contacted. The veteran himself, local doctors, or service organization representatives may call the hospital. It is more desirable, however, that a doctor call so that the nature of the emergency condition can be professionally described to the admitting officer at the hospital.

It is a pleasure to pass this information along to you. If I have failed to mention anything in this letter that you had in mind, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

HARLEY A. SMITH,
Manager.

Revision of the Tax Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House Ways and Means Committee:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before the House Committee on Ways and Means to urge favorable consideration of the proposal that certain wartime excise taxes should be completely removed or drastically reduced.

The excise taxes on such articles as ladies' handbags, luggage, cosmetics, baby oil, electric light bulbs, electric and gas cooking appliances and water heaters, photographic equipment, furs, jewelry, and on such services as local and long distance telephone calls, telegrams, passenger travel, freight shipments and movie admission tickets were imposed as a wartime emergency measure to raise revenue and discourage sales to civilians of scarce articles and the civilian use of over-burdened public services, such as telephones, telegraph and railroads. It was not the intent of Congress at the time these war taxes were imposed that they be made permanent taxes on the American people. They were special emergency taxes for these two special purposes.

Section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code (war tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes) would have expired 6 months after the date of the termination of hostilities of the war.

I think it should be mentioned that our people would not now be burdened with these taxes had it not been for the action of the Eightieth Congress which passed H. R. 1650, a bill to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates. This bill passed the House of Representatives on January 29, 1947, as is recorded on page 727 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date.

H. R. 1650, passed by the Eightieth Congress, amended section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to war-tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes, by striking out the provision that such taxes would expire 6 months after the date of termination of hostilities, thus continuing these taxes indefinitely.

Likewise, H. R. 1650 amended section 1654, the retail tax on luggage, etc., and section 1660, relating to the tax on billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys. This bill also amended section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on transportation of persons).

Because of the action of the Eightieth Congress in continuing these wartime excise taxes on a permanent basis, it is necessary that we take action at this time to repeal them. They bear most heavily on that portion of our population least able to pay heavy taxes. These taxes have an adverse effect on retail business. They discourage sales of many important commodities and are imposed on many items that are necessities, not luxuries. I should like to point out the great injustice of levying a 20-percent tax on electric-light bulbs, on baby oil, and on movie tickets, to mention only three of the many unjust taxes that were continued by the Eightieth Congress.

There is another phase of this tax problem that I would like to discuss briefly—the tax on charity funds of fraternal orders. If you will pardon a personal reference, the Elks Lodge, of which I am a member, each year holds a charity ball to raise funds solely for the purpose of relieving distress and furnishing Christmas baskets to some of the less fortunate families of the community. I believe the present tax on charity funds is not in the public interest and should be repealed. I strongly urge your committee to relieve fraternal orders from this unjust burden of taxation.

In conclusion, I want to tell you that I shall support this committee's efforts in carrying out the President's recommendations and suggestions concerning the elimination of the tax loopholes which now permit some groups to escape their fair share of taxation. I fully agree with the President's statement that "The continued escape of privileged groups from taxation violates the fundamental democratic principle of fair treatment for all, and undermines public confidence in the tax system."

I hope you will succeed in your endeavor to plug all these loopholes.

Protect These Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, there is pending legislation before both Houses of the Congress which, if enacted into law, would continue to have the alarming effect that is stressed in an editorial from the Bridgeport, Conn., Post of February 28. I am one of those who is completely in accord with the provision of necessary protection to the industrial workers of Connecticut and New England whose jobs might be jeopardized because of the fact that our money sent abroad put into manufacture of products like those produced in our great Northeast could be sold in the United States at a much lesser price. This lesser price would be possible because the goods could be manufactured at a greatly reduced cost and imported into our markets with little limitation on the volume since our reciprocal trade agreements include no peril clauses; devalued currency in the foreign countries further lessens the cost of production as compared with our costs of manufacture.

Under leave to extend my remarks to include this editorial, I also take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to commend the Senator from Massachusetts for his stand in this matter, and I trust that he and many others will continue to be on the alert for statements of administrators and proponents of legislation in which they reveal the actual intent of the proposals which, unchallenged, would be the authorized purpose of appropriations when they became approved acts, and, as such, a detriment to jobs that presently have some semblance of security. The editorial follows:

PROTECT THOSE JOBS

Workers in New England factories have some cause to be grateful, we think, to Senator CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts—brother of Congressman JOHN DAVIS LODGE, of Fairfield County—for the prompt and decisive manner in which he challenged the statement of ECA Director Hoffman that we must import floods of European-manufactured articles into this country to enable the nations of Europe to repay us some of the millions which we are pouring across the Atlantic.

Senator LODGE pointed out at once that this meant a sharp loss of jobs in our own country. If the European articles to be imported are similar to the ones which we make ourselves, their importation means an equal decline in the sale of American-made goods with a consequent loss of jobs in American factories. We all know what has happened already to the watch industry of Waltham, Mass., because of the flood of Swiss watches pouring into this country.

Instead of being refuted, Senator LODGE's charge was practically admitted by those on the other side of the debate when they suggested that the situation might be met by special provision for unemployment insurance on jobs lost because of imports and also for a Government plan to retrain the jobless for other lines of work. The Senator from Massachusetts at once retorted that our workers want jobs not doles.

As for retraining them now, why should they alone be forced to bear this dislocation? For that matter, why should the cost of financing Europe be borne, indirectly through loss of jobs and business, by one section of the United States—the industrial section? Perhaps the agricultural South and West are not particularly concerned, but they ought to be. A loss of purchasing power in New England would mean a loss of the market for other American products from other sections of the country.

It is encouraging to note from the tone of the debate which followed Senator LODGE's declaration, that his point sank home. Members of Congress as a group are not ready to sacrifice employment here for the sake of carrying out these world-wide schemes which always seem to begin by robbing American taxpayers, to pour their money all over the globe.

A Rational Approach to a Difficult Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a communication I have received from Mr. Raymond M. Hilliard, chairman of the mayor's advisory committee on Puerto Rican affairs in New York City. I include the covering letter to me only to make clear the main part of the communication, which is a copy of a letter addressed to Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin by Mr. Hilliard. To save space, I am omitting the list of members of the mayor's committee, except that I wish to mention that Mr. Manuel Cabranes, Director of the New York Office of Government of Puerto Rico Department of Labor, Employment and Migration Bureau, 1881 Broadway, is vice chairman; the membership is widely representative of New York's responsible public leaders.

To those of us who believe in an open door immigration policy, it is profoundly disturbing to be forced to advocate any kind of restrictions; and I present this communication to the House as an example of a rational approach, devoid of hysteria and emotion, toward a most difficult problem of readjustment of underprivileged Amer.can citizens.

CITY OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE,
New York, N. Y., February 23, 1950.

The Honorable ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KLEIN: The undersigned Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs was appointed by Mayor William O'Dwyer to advise him on all matters affecting the integration of Puerto Rican immigrants in New York City.

In matters requiring Federal legislative or administrative consideration, it is our intention to inform you, from time to time, of the findings and recommendations of this committee. A list of the membership of the committee is enclosed for your information.

At the present time we wish to call your attention to the enclosed letter to Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin. In this letter we have set forth a strong representation to the Secretary on the Department of Labor's policies for the admission of migrant agricultural workers from foreign countries.

We are especially concerned that the Department's policies shall be modified to exclude workers from the British West Indies, unless it can be definitely established that no American citizens are available for this kind of employment.

We hope that you will agree with us on this matter which so vitally affects the interests of the people of New York City and Puerto Rico and that you will take appropriate action to support our position on it.

Very truly yours,
RAYMOND M. HILLIARD,
Chairman, Mayor's Advisory Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs in New York City.

CITY OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE,
New York, N. Y., February 15, 1950.

The Honorable MAURICE J. TOBIN,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY TOBIN: The undersigned committee has been appointed by Honorable William O'Dwyer, mayor of the city of New York, to look into the problems of the city occasioned by the concentration of Puerto Rican migrants, past and prospective.

In connection with our work, we have learned that large numbers of British subjects from the British West Indies have been admitted to this country for the past several years to perform seasonal agricultural work. Among the unemployed in New York are many Puerto Ricans and probably others who have had prior agricultural experience and who are readily available for the work performed by these British subjects. In addition, we are advised that unemployed agricultural workers in Puerto Rico are also available for this work. Aside from constituting a constant drain on Puerto Rico's economy, these unemployed United States citizens are the prospective migrants most of whom, if they decide to migrate, will settle in New York City.

The city of New York is not in any way attempting to discourage the free migration of American citizens. Those who desire to come will be welcome, as were their predecessors. But it is senseless to foster such migration by perpetuating a continued state of unemployment in Puerto Rico. This unemployment results from affording to foreign workers work which could be performed by capable and willing Americans.

We understand that you, as Secretary of Labor, have the ultimate determination of whether foreign workers are permitted to enter the country. You have publicly stated your position to be:

"The labor requirements of the agricultural industry are of such complex nature that it is not possible at this time to end our present arrangements for the use of foreign agricultural workers. This is not possible because it is necessary, as a part of our national economy, to have the necessary manpower available where and when it is needed to handle agricultural products."

Insofar as the above statement applies to Mexican and Canadian citizens, there may be special governing considerations. We strenuously urge that you reconsider your position concerning the British West Indians and, until it is affirmatively established that American citizens are unavailable in sufficient numbers to do the work required, we urge that British subjects be excluded.

The fact that 90 percent of migrating Puerto Ricans locate in the city of New York compels our interest in this matter.

We are communicating our point of view to all New York City Congressmen.

Very truly yours,
RAYMOND M. HILLIARD,
Chairman, Mayor's Advisory Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs in New York City.

Operators Used Taft-Hartley Club To Prolong Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial by Hon. James O. Monroe, which appeared in the Collinsville (Ill.) Herald, of which he is the publisher, on February 10, 1950:

HUNGER MAY FORCE THE MINERS BACK TO WORK, BUT THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW WILL NEVER DO IT

For the first time in the history of the infamous Taft-Hartley law, a show-down on its power to compel men to work against their will is near—and it will fail.

On Monday, after months of unsuccessful negotiations with coal mine operators for a new contract embodying new demands, more than 400,000 soft coal miners of the United Mine Workers quit work, saying they would not return until a new contract was signed. Hunger may force them back to the pits, but the Taft-Hartley law never will do it.

President Truman reluctantly invoked the hated law Monday by appointing a board of inquiry, which is to report back to him within a week. The report may afford the basis for the President to ask a court injunction as provided in the Taft-Hartley law. The law was invoked against the miners nearly two years ago, and Federal Judge Goldsborough fined both the union and its president, John L. Lewis, heavily. Lewis ordered the men back to work, and they complied with the order. I predict that Lewis will not again order the men to return to work, and should he do so, I predict they will not heed the order. The die, I repeat, is cast for a show-down as to the force of the law, and the miners, I am convinced, will not heed it so long as there is a crumb of bread in the cupboard.

While Lewis can be fined, or jailed, and while the union treasury can be stripped bare under a Federal court order, there is no penalty in the law for the men who refuse to respect either the order of the court or the order of the union officials. Therein lies its fatal weakness. The law, as I have said before, amounts only to intimidation, not to coercion. Congressmen who framed the law, being more bent on breaking the unions than in the public welfare, had not the courage to put penalties upon the men who dig the coal, and even if they had imposed penalties, no coal would have been mined. Coal miners are rugged, and, while they might endure prison, they will not be slaves.

I discussed this eventuality in some detail—and prophetically—in the statement I made to the House Labor Committee in Washington last March.

"I do not want to be taken as an inciter to strikes or to defiance of the Government," I told the committee, "but I predict that under the present law there will be strikes where the men will not follow the orders of the officials who give them under court injunction."

"And," I added, "I suggest to you that in such event you will have left the Nation helpless."

A few minutes previously, I had said to the committee:

"The practical question, it seems to me, is whether or not members of a union are under any responsibility to, and therefore will respect, the orders of the union, particularly when the union orders are in contravention of the union's policy and are, moreover, delivered under duress of a court order. Neither the union laws, nor the statute, nor the court order suggests any such eventuality. So far as I can discern any inhibition in the law, the men can strike as quickly and as long as they please. And no matter how crippling a court order may be to the union, nothing is achieved for industrial resumption unless the men go back to work. One may say that the men have some responsibility to obey the orders of the officers, but the law does not say so, and Judge Goldsborough did not say so, and even if both said so, there is no penalty on the men if they refuse—which makes the law well nigh a nullity."

When I put this proposition to Senator C. Wayland Brooks, of Illinois, a Taft-Hartley champion, at a breakfast at Alton in October 1948 he admitted that I was correct, and when I said to him that the law which he had been touting to the voters was mostly bluff he did not dissent.

The miners appear prepared to call the Taft-Hartley bluff. They called Brooks' bluff in November 1948.

I lament as much as anyone else the distress of the Nation which will be created by this strike, but I applaud the courage of the coal miners in demonstrating the futility of the vaunted Taft-Hartley law.

Coal-mine operators last Thursday walked out of a final conference with the UMWA officials in Washington, hoping that this break-down of negotiations over the contract issues would lead the President to invoke the Taft-Hartley law 80-day "waiting period." This, if the men had respected it, would have given the operators the advantage of having the men continue to work for nearly 3 months more under the conditions of the old contract which has expired. That is the fundamental wrong of the Taft-Hartley law, that it continues the status quo which suits the operators and ignores the demands of the workers.

In my address to the House Committee I made a suggestion on this score, which the Taft-Hartley law supporters did not heed, but which now may get some attention. The suggestion was this:

"If you should be so enamored of the waiting-period idea, and whether you enforce it by injunction or by explicit statute, this suggestion comes to me as being worth tendering to you: It would be extremely soothing to men who have to work under threat of a penalty against their union for refusing,

if you would provide that whatever benefits they may eventually secure, through the negotiations which may ensue during the waiting period or after it, should be retroactive to the date on which the overall period began. That matter of simple justice would appeal to the men, would allay their feeling of injustice and would, I think, facilitate settlement of disputes."

The coal miners by their strike are not likely to create any immediate sentiment for just treatment, either by the coal operators or by the Congress. Rather, they will be blamed entirely for the distress which a prolonged strike is bound to cause. Nobody now seems to think of suggesting some restraint upon the operators, who only have to stand pat and let the miners take all the blame.

But the miners are willing to endure this censure, along with their personal distress. The only question now is whether their cash in hand or their credit at the neighborhood grocery will last as long as the Nation's coal piles.

Out of all the suffering, I think, will come a realization that industrial peace cannot be achieved by court orders. At least it will be seen that the present law, harsh as it is, is no step against industrial paralysis. And the Nation then will face the choice of adopting Government controls which will encompass both employers and employees—the only controls that can be either effective or fair—or of undertaking to achieve conciliation with retroactive benefit provisions to make the settlement efforts more sincere.

Proposed Cuts in the Veterans' Administration Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandums sent out by the national rehabilitation commission of the American Legion regarding proposed cuts in the Veterans' Administration budget:

1951 VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION BUDGET

Submitted herewith is copy of a release being put out by the Veterans' Administration today announcing drastic personnel reductions throughout the VA system. This comes as a sudden blow since the VA budget request for 1951 as submitted to Congress does not reveal the necessity for such action. Apparently negotiations for additional funds have been going on which probably ended with a disapproval by the Budget Bureau. We interpret that the effect of this reduction will be the creation of examination backlogs in the regional offices and reduction in the scope of services rendered in hospitals. Another effect will be a demoralizing one upon the VA personnel; with consequent impairment of quality and output of work.

"VA today announced that a reduction in force of approximately 7,800 jobs will be made primarily in order to bring personnel within the provisions of the VA budget as submitted to the Congress for fiscal year 1951. The reduction in force also is prompted at this time to offset in part a shortage in salary funds for the balance of fiscal year 1950.

"The reduction will be Nation-wide and will include all activities of the VA. Some 3,000 employees in hospitals and homes, and 4,000 in other activities will be included.

"Managers of VA field stations Monday will be notified of their new personnel ceilings and notices of separation will be in the hands of employees by March 10, 1950, which will permit customary 30-day notice of separation. The reduction in force will be made under civil-service regulations.

"The VA explained that immediate action must be taken. Otherwise employment levels during the early months of fiscal year 1951, which begins July 1, 1950, would be above those for which funds would be available on an annual basis. Unless this step is taken now, more drastic curtailment would be necessary during fiscal year 1951.

"This reduction will not affect the VA new hospital construction program or plans for staffing these hospitals."

It will be recalled that 2 years ago a similar situation occurred which alerted the American Legion to go into action before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Later the legislative and rehabilitation directors were heard by a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. A deficiency appropriation was eventually approved which permitted a more gradual reduction and less impairment of services to veterans and less hardship in making necessary adjustments.

This office will appreciate getting full information about the effect of this drastic cut-back on the essential services to veterans in both regional offices and hospitals. The national commander has been notified and everything possible will be done to see that these essential services are maintained at a level traditionally supported by this organization.

T. O. KRAABEL,
National Director.

Here is text of statement being released by VA today with reference to personnel reduction. It is worse than we thought last night when I sent you the preliminary report:

"VA today announced that a reduction in force of approximately 7,800 jobs will be made primarily in order to bring personnel within the provisions of the VA budget as submitted to the Congress for fiscal year 1951. The reduction in force also is prompted at this time to offset in part a shortage in salary funds for the balance of fiscal year 1950.

"The reduction will be Nation-wide and will include all activities of the VA. Some 3,000 employees in hospitals and homes, and 4,000 in other activities will be included.

"Managers of VA field stations Monday will be notified of their new personnel ceilings and notices of separation will be in the hands of employees by March 10, 1950, which will permit customary 30-day notice of separation. The reduction in force will be made under civil-service regulations.

"The VA explained that immediate action must be taken. Otherwise employment levels during the early months of fiscal year 1951, which begins July 1, 1950, would be above those for which funds would be available on an annual basis. Unless this step is taken now, more drastic curtailment would be necessary during fiscal year 1951.

"This reduction will not affect the VA new hospital-construction program or plans for staffing these hospitals."

In my best judgment this should become an objective of primary importance with the American Legion, especially after we have received reports from coworkers in the field as to the effect of these reductions upon the essential services to veterans.

We are preparing a bulletin which is being sent out to our regular mailing list asking them to keep us advised of the consequences they observe in the regional offices and hospitals in their respective areas. Another factor we have to look forward to is the demoralizing effect upon the employees with a consequent lowering of both the quality and quantity of work. We can definitely look forward to mounting backlogs of examinations, claims adjudication, waiting lists and even a shrinkage in the coverage of medical and hospital care, especially in the outpatient services.

T. O. KRAABEL.

A Cry of Despair From China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a cry of despair from a desolate group of refugees from Nazi horror, now faced with Communist terror, huddled forsaken in Shanghai.

These are people who fled from central Europe, from one hell to another, hungry, bedraggled, but clinging to their faith in God and man, more than a decade ago, and still have found no haven—except for those who have found the final haven of death.

This message, presented in the quaint language of the original, was sent to the World Jewish Congress by the Migration Committee of Central European DP's in Shanghai, a last despairing cry for help.

If the undersigned committee hereby takes the liberty to approach you, it is primarily because we have learned from many a public utterance and action of yours in which high-minded way you have repeatedly taken concern in the needs and worries of your fellowmen.

We represent a group of approximately 900 central European refugees, all of which are eligible for UN-IRO assistance, that now here, due to circumstances, have gotten into severe economical as well as physical difficulties—if they are not indeed in great danger.

For years these people have had only one desire: To find a new home in the United States of America. They have so far failed in doing so, mainly on account of the quota system. For example, not a single Rumanian, Hungarian quota has been allocated to this refugee center and for the last 2 years not one person under the Czechoslovakian and Austrian quota has been processed.

During the Pacific war interned by the Japanese into a ghetto, their existences, hardly just and so painstakingly build up only, were destroyed again. Throughout this period actually the only hope that kept them up was the possibility to be given a chance at the end of the war for resettlement and rehabilitation in the land of their longing, the United States of America.

However, it was to come differently. Tragedies that can hardly be described resulted out of this quota system. Parents from their children, married couples, relatives, friends were separated or, after many years of separation, still are unable to achieve reuniting. But the law had to be abided by "Summum ius, summa iniuria."

American policy and law-making parties realized the cruelty of this system, and in a special DP bill in 1948 it was attempted

to eliminate its hardness. How abysmal was our consternation, however, when we found out that our emigration center here had not been given any consideration whatsoever by said bill.

New hope arose, when we learned that a new bill (H. R. 4567), by an amendment, was to be extended, thereby also to become applicable to us, the forgotten ones here. There hardly are words suitable enough to describe our disappointment, when we realized a few weeks ago that the Eighty-first Congress again during its last session had deferred passing of the bill and that perhaps a decision would only be met during the next one. And this just at a time, when prospects to reach the United States of America by following the already above described—so difficult a routine procedure—had become still more remote inasmuch as the United States Consulate here discontinued to consider and deal with our applications for immigration visas, except for a very few special cases.

We fail to understand, just why this our small remnant group of approximately 900 people here, should deserve so severe a fate, especially so since this group in its composition in no respect is better or worse than those more fortunate ones that already found a new home in your country. Under halfway favorable and peaceful economic conditions, they would be able to support themselves, and the more so if their relatives and friends could lend them helping hands, as only parents, children, relatives, and best friends can do, who already got firmly settled in the United States of America.

The desire of our people here, to go to the United States of America, is however not only based upon ties of kin—and friendship, but on that security which is the natural result of such ties is making emigration to the United States of America so very desirable. We already branch out into the United States of America, and only there we shall be able to deeply root again, last not least also in ideological respect.

Considering general conditions here, our problem of emigration to the United States of America has now become more urgent. As a matter of fact, conditions, under which we now have to live, should justify special treatment of our group. Our people here, on account of prevailing economic conditions, are losing ground daily.

In this desolate situation, help only can come to us, if the United States consulate here would be instructed to further resume consideration of applications for immigration and processing of immigration visa cases. However, if furthermore sufficient quota numbers according to registration requirements could be made available for us, the whole problem could be solved easily and entirely, even without the earlier quoted bill and its amendments. Should our suggestion not be feasible it would be necessary that the State Department should instruct the consulate here to process our cases most expeditiously.

It is the time factor now, which is of such great importance for us. We are much afraid that the bill in question will only be brought up again toward the end of the coming session of the Senate, whereby we would have to wait for another indefinite period; and this waiting may be deadly.

We do not know to what extent you will be kind enough to help us with the many possibilities at your disposal. Please do consider this letter, in which we have rather elaborately outlined our situation, as an outcry for help. It is indeed much like a very last S O S of a shipwrecked crew, as we cannot believe that the Coast Guard would disregard any S O S just because its sender is not lawfully eligible to the Coast Guard's help. We can and will not believe that you and the American people will be unwilling to help us to reach the goal of our hopes for so many years and therewith be saved. On the contrary, believing in the high doctrines of America and in humanity and human rights, we have dared to write to you asking you for your so influential and valuable assistance.

In anticipation permit us to express our most heartfelt gratitude and to remain,

Yours very respectfully,

MIGRATION COMMITTEE OF CENTRAL EUROPEAN DP'S IN SHANGHAI-HONGKEW,
Dr. GEORG LOWENSTEIN, *Chairman.*

The Crusade for Peace Will Achieve World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a radio address which I prepared for broadcast over radio station WCAU in Philadelphia on March 4, entitled "The Crusade for Peace Will Achieve World Government." The address follows:

The common people of the world, and of this country, today are banding together, some consciously, some unknowingly, in a crusade for peace. With every report of new and more horrible weapons of war, bigger and more devastating bombs, deadlier methods of destruction, the longing for peace grows stronger in the hearts of people everywhere. A striking indication of this was given last week in Britain, where political analysts credit a large portion of the high vote achieved by Winston Churchill's Conservatives to Mr. Churchill's proposal for new talks with the Russians, in a new bid for accord between the East and the West.

In this country Senators MCMAHON, of Connecticut, and TYDINGS, of Maryland, rejected the defeatist attitude that war is inevitable. Senator MCMAHON's proposal, which aroused a great response, was relatively simple. He suggests a world-wide Marshall plan, with Russia included, in return for an atomic disarmament agreement. The Congress of the United States has been giving serious consideration at committee level to various proposals for strengthening the United Nations and creating an effective limited world government.

It is this last phase which I want to discuss at this time. Recently 105 or more members of the House of Representatives and a proportionately large number of Senators joined in introducing to the Congress a resolution which has become known as the world government resolution and which expresses as the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law.

I joined in sponsoring this resolution because I believe world government would be a practical solution to the outstanding problems facing the world today. World government is practical because people have formed governments and federations of governments before and can do it again. To say, as opponents of the idea of world government have been saying with increasing frequency, that nations must learn to get along together before we try world government, is not practical. If peoples or nations could get along together voluntarily, there would be no need for government. Government provides the vehicle, the laws and their enforcement, that enables people to get along together. As I see it, the nations of the world are faced with the necessity of banding together or being destroyed or at least witnessing the collapse of the remains of democracy or free enterprise.

Extreme opponents of the idea of world federation contend that a world union must ultimately result in the abandonment of national sovereignty. This of course is not true, except in a very limited sense. In a world government each nation would retain complete control over its own internal institutions, governments, and policies. Only those things affecting the international relations of the federation would be subjected to international control. In other words, a little sovereignty would be sacrificed for a great deal of freedom—primarily, the freedom from fear. This would be achieved by laws to enable the world federation to deal effectively with the control of arms and aggression, and the enforcement of international law in these fields by a world court and a world police force, and no more.

Efforts have been made on the part of neo-Fascists and supernationalists to insinuate that the world government movement is composed of leftists who are bent on the destruction of the United States. The strongest rebuttal to this ridiculous charge is found in the names of the sponsors of the world government movement. Besides the Members of Congress who sponsored the world government resolution, which includes men of both parties and various degrees of conservatism and liberalism—excluding the extreme left—the theory of world government has been espoused by the American Legion, Kiwanis International, the Young Republican National Federation, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, the National Grange, and the legislatures of many States, to mention but a few.

Among the false charges which have been leveled at the world government movement are these: It would result in the reduction of American standards of living, curtailment of the liberties of our people, destruction of our free institutions, scrapping of the Constitution, abolishing the Army and the Navy, world taxation, free immigration and common currency. All of these charges are deliberately, or at best carelessly, false, with perhaps the exception of the contention that our Army and Navy would

be abolished. While they would not be abolished, they would eventually be reduced to a small force, adequate to deal with internal policing and similar problems. The prime purpose of world government is to promote international peace and harmony, and the only practical means of achieving this is by a central organization backed up by an international police force and a world court.

With the progress the world has made in the science of destruction, the peoples of the world are faced with this terrible alternative—amalgamation on a limited basis or annihilation. I, for one, favor at least a serious effort toward building the United Nations into a world federation.

Secretary Louis Johnson Reports That Without Impairing Our Defense He Has Already Reduced Civilian Employees by 151,542 Instead of the 135,000 Promised—He Now Advises That We Shall Soon See 100,000 Less Men in Uniform and Yet More in Combat Service

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, with such a record already established, the Members of this Congress—Democrats as well as Republicans—can well understand why the National Committee on President Hoover's Report on Reorganization of the Departments of Government has bestowed an award of merit and honorable citation upon Secretary Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John Steelman, assistant to the President of the United States, as well as the Honorable Lamar Caudle, United States Assistant Attorney General, both told me of a great speech made by Louis Johnson during a recent conference in the Department of Justice attended by the United States district attorneys. Both of these distinguished gentlemen were of one mind in stating that they had never witnessed an audience of lawyers more greatly impressed by any talk than was the group addressed by our great Secretary of Defense.

Lamar Caudle said Louis Johnson's talk moved him so deeply that, immediately upon returning to his desk he addressed a note of appreciation to the Secretary.

In his discussion with me he said: "Frank, please do not think me fanciful or extravagant in the use of language when I say that I shall remember that talk by Louis Johnson until the day I die."

Mr. Speaker, Lamar Caudle's remarks warmed my heart for I hold that America has no greater citizen, patriot, or public official than Louis Johnson.

Because of the esteem in which I hold him, I determined to get that talk and to read it to learn even more about my good friend and I want to tell you, the Members of this House, that it was an address that was not tongued but rather a talk that came right out of the heart of a great man.

I told my colleagues in this House about a year ago that there was no rabbit blood in Louis Johnson. I further stated that so long as the blood of life was in him he would fight for what he deemed was right and do so in the light that God gave him to see the right.

Mr. Speaker, Louis Johnson's first allegiance is to his country and then to his own conscience. Self-made, vigorous, it is inherent in him never to compromise—his opinions, yes—the principles of a life, never.

On many occasions when my good wife and myself sit alone in the evening reading of the day's happenings in the press, we have come upon things that have caused us to speak of the merits of our good friend.

More than once we have discussed the barrage of unfair criticism that has been directed at him because in his economy drive to attain a dollar's worth of value for every dollar expended it is well known to all that he has stepped upon the toes of certain self-seeking men who, without thought of the Nation's benefit, are concerned solely with their own personal preferment and well-being.

The multiplicity of caustic comments in the press has sometimes caused me to think that his critics have concluded they could obtain their objectives merely by creating a great product of repetition and of emphasis.

I often ponder on just what I would do were I to find wave after wave of attrition and vituperation hurled against me in an endeavor to turn me from what I held in my heart and conscience to be my bounden duty.

I remember only too well the manner in which Louis Johnson, as Assistant Secretary of War, fought with his back to the wall to mobilize the industries of this Nation against the day of inevitable attack from the gathering thunder of the Nazi hordes being mobilized for the conquest of Europe, if not the world.

The God in heaven alone knows how many American lives and billions of dollars were saved in World War II because of the action programs for preparedness that were launched and brought to fruition by Louis Johnson personally and unfortunately oftentimes fighting alone—for a preparedness program.

I was one among that great circle of friends the day he took his oath of office in the courtyard of that huge Pentagon. I remember that he that day pledged himself and the American people that when he assumed his office he would not alone achieve the unification of the armed services, strengthen the national defenses, but annually save a billion dollars by a more provident and judicious expenditure of the tax moneys entrusted to his spending.

Mr. Speaker, devotion to public trust and to public office will never die in these United States as long as men like Louis Johnson live and serve this Nation.

The talk that was made by the Secretary of Defense to the assembly of United States district attorneys was a great talk—homely, simple, truthful.

The world has enough men who are skilled in oratory and in rhetoric. It needs more men like Louis Johnson and his Army, Navy, and Air Force teammates—of innate character and abilities—simple men who have the courage of their convictions, the guts to do their duty as they see it, and who speak the truth.

Every promise of Louis Johnson to the American people has been more than fulfilled. Knowing of his growth in popularity among the common and the little people of this Nation, his critics in the future will not be unmindful of the fact that what Louis Johnson promises to accomplish, will be accomplished by him, and on time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to insert into the RECORD a copy of a letter sent to my good friend, the great Secretary of Defense by the Honorable Lamar Caudle on the occasion of his recent talk to the conference of United States district attorneys, together with Secretary Johnson's address on that occasion.

Secretary Johnson's speech was as follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Attorney General, distinguished guests, members of the Federal bar, and particularly you United States district attorneys, all of whom I understand are present, I am a little overcome by the kind words spoken by my friend the Attorney General. There was one thing I surely wanted to talk about today, and that was to tell you who work with him in the Department of Justice—the men who carry the burden for justice in the field—what I thought of Howard McGrath.

Won't you discount, more than just a little, the kind things he said about me because he's my friend and looks at me through rose-colored glasses? He looks at me with memory of the days from September 15 to November 2, last year, when the two of us worked closely together as men seldom ever do at what first seemed a hopeless and impossible task. But when I thought of the strength of the man in the White House and the courage of Howard McGrath, I myself acquired the courage and the strength to go ahead and do my part in that great campaign.

I know of no man for whom I have a deeper affection than for Howard McGrath. I know no man who is a better American. I thank God for what Howard McGrath accomplished as national chairman of the Democratic Party. I thank God that he now sits as the Attorney General, and I even forgive him for serving us a Republican box lunch here today instead of the meal I expected. I'm hoping that the people in the gallery weren't omitted on the box luncheons, as I understand some were at a recent one served here in Washington.

I should particularly like to talk to you lawyers about some phase of the law, but that's not what you expect of me here today.

I think I should first tell you that the defenses of the United States, as of today, are, in the opinion of the President of the United States, of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and of myself, sufficient unto the needs of the hour.

May I take a little liberty with Shakespeare, the kind of liberty the New York Times takes on a quotation and say that "Time is out of joint. Oh cursed spite, that we are untimely born to set it right." I have had that sort of a feeling at times about the job of Secretary of Defense.

As the Attorney General indicated, criticism has been rough. I think the book, all the books, not alone the lawbooks, have been thrown at me since I have had this job. If there are any charges that could have been brought, false as they all have been, that haven't been brought, I don't know what they could be.

I see a number of you I've known a long time. I think to you in this room I can say that those charges, those investigations and those trials and tribulations haven't caused us to lose a single stride in the job which we were sworn to do on March 28 of last year. They might have but for one thing: and that is my experience in the period of 1937 to 1940 when I was serving as the Assistant Secretary of War. I was then charged by statute—with responsibility for current procurement and for industrial mobilization of the Ground and Air Forces. In my efforts to create an air force, and in my efforts to prepare the country for what I then thought was inevitable war, there were some real book-throwers and some real name-callers around. I lost sleep. I worried. Time, however, showed that we were not too far wrong in trying to build an air force, and in fighting for industrial mobilization.

In that period of 1937 to 1940, Howard McGrath, John Steelman, and I got vaccinated or inoculated, or something of the sort. Criticism has therefore not interfered with our doing the job some 16 or 18 hours a day and to the best of our ability. Moreover, we propose to continue to do so regardless of charges or criticism.

I want to report to you today—and the time is limited—as I said a minute ago, that we are ready to defend America.

I stated in a speech made in New York, I believe on December 7, that the first attack by the United States would be a counterattack. Someone else would have to commit the first attack upon us. That was said because you and I as Americans feel that way, because we seek no foreign soil or acquisitions and we want to make the maximum contribution to the peace of the world.

My title is that of Secretary of Defense. When George Washington asked for the first appropriation for the militia of the United States in his message to Congress, he said he wanted to create not a War Department or Defense Department; he said he wanted to create a peace establishment. So while we of the Defense Department talk about war preparation and readiness for war and defense, through it all we seek a plan to secure the peace—the peace of this country and the peace of the world.

In this seeking we know how certain of the world's nations feel about us. They do not seem to pull any punches in what they say in their unfriendly attitude to us and our way of life. Even if such countries had the will to make war upon these United States, I feel that today they do not have the capacity to do so.

Nevertheless, it is our job in the Defense Department to be so ready to return the first possible blow, if a blow must come to America in the form of aggression, that it will serve to make him who delivers it stop and look, think twice and not move.

In other words, our establishment of defense must first be so strong—in the conception of the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and myself—that it will deter anyone who wants to start trouble in this world; and second, it must be so strong that if somebody does start trouble, there will be no question about America being the victor in the final outcome of that fracas. I want to put in the record of this distinguished gathering that the plans for the defense of America are so drawn and they have the unanimous approval of the President, the Chairman and the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretaries, and of myself.

We read in the paper that that isn't so, but it is, and as a matter of record, I declare it to be so.

Moreover, I want to say to you it is a balanced plan. It isn't a plan drawn by the Army, or a plan drawn by the Navy, or a plan drawn by the Air Force; it is a plan drawn by all three services which are ready to go at 5 o'clock in the morning.

May I say that the scale of that plan is one of defense, the defense of America, and further say to the assistant to the President of the United States, my long-time friend, you, John Steelman, that if the program of America were one of offense and conquest—we would need a larger Military Establishment than we need for defense and security.

Let us now turn to unification. I heard from about half of you, it seemed to me, in the unification fight before Congress last fall. Now let me tell you why you and I must have unification.

First, Pearl Harbor could never have happened if there had been unification. Unity of command and unity of purpose are needed for defense.

Second, we need unification to gain time. We have had months, a year and a half or two years before each of the preceding wars in which to work out our fighting plans and our joint programs. The would-be aggressor of the world would not be deterred one moment if he thought it would take America 3 months, 6 months, or a year after it struck for us to work out unification. There could be no readiness of the Defense Establishment if the three services were not united and agreed upon one plan ready for action at 5 o'clock or at 4 o'clock in the morning.

Third, we need unification to get greater value out of every defense dollar. A year ago in drawing the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the three services, after whittling each of their respective separate budgets down to what they thought was the minimum, asked for thirty billions of dollars for the defense establishment. For the fiscal year 1951 that starts July 1 the figures of the three services, when they came up to me, were for something over twenty billions of dollars. And those figures came up despite the fact that the three services were given but fifteen billion this year. Those figures had to be carefully scrutinized.

We of the defense establishment are convinced it does not do any good to have the best defense and the most efficient defense establishment in the world if in its building we use so much money as to wreck the economy and make fertile soil for the Communists to move in without fighting.

That is a basic reason why there must be unification.

Frank Pace, as Director of the Budget, knows that of about $15,000,000,000 over-all allotted to us this year, that we shall finish this year spending, I believe, in the neighborhood of a hundred million less than thirteen billion dollars, and because of that fact, for the year beginning July 1 we have asked for but $13,000,000,000.

Although we have talked extensively of economy, as I did myself but a moment ago, although the newspapers have made much reference to economy, I want to assure you that in our operations economy is of secondary import in the Defense Department. The first thing—the controlling thing—the impelling thing—is the security of the United States and the peace of the world.

Secondary to these comes economy.

When we made an announcement that we were going to let out a hundred and thirty-five thousand civilians—whom we did not need, the newspapers, some of them in your districts, said it was political—it would never be done.

As I came into the hall today, shortly after I left the White House, I received from my office the figures sent to me from the Pentagon on the number of civilians let out since this economy drive started. Instead of the 135,000 we promised, I am happy to tell you this morning that without injustice to anyone, without vacating a place where a man was needed for a job, we have, as of January 31 * * * let out 157,542 civilians, and the end has not yet been reached.

I want you to believe I hate to fire a man. I hate to see a man put out of a job. The defense of the United States is supposed to be ready and alert and those not needed for defense are of no help. We have found that in units where we have cut out 30 or 50 percent of the civilian employees, that unit now is doing more work and better work.

We have taken soldiers away from desks and put them in regiments with fighting troops where they belong.

For the fiscal year 1950–51 we plan to have 100,000 less men in uniform in our armed forces. We are able to effect such a reduction by improving our organization and our operations under unification. But here is the most significant feature. Despite these reductions we will have more men in combat units than we had before we decided we could lop off 100,000 without hurting defense.

Let me explain that to you—and while I have talked 25 minutes, may I not take 5 more?

I believe you would want me to talk frankly about this situation. Let me tell you really what the shooting is all about. The shooting doesn't worry us. We don't like it, but it doesn't worry us. We have but one potential enemy and I want to concentrate on our readiness to deal with him if we have to.

Let the newspapers say of whom they are speaking when they quote my remarks. I mention no names, but you all know of whom I speak.

Before unification each of the services would get dollars to do with what it pleased, even if they did exactly the same thing. In that way there was a surplus of some items and a shortage of others. The planning in one service was not made with reference to the other nor in reference to the potential enemy.

Long before I became the Secretary of Defense—under the wise guidance of my friend, Jim Forrestal, it was decided that we should measure the enemy, the one who might cause trouble, and then look at the defense of the United States in the light of that potential enemy and not on the basis of a scatter-gun defense everywhere against every country in the world.

In explaining what we discovered, imagine that well over there to the left divided into three panels.

Let me say, the first panel represents what you have to do at 4 o'clock in the morning if that enemy starts anything. That was something unanimously agreed upon long before I came to the Defense Establishment.

The second panel, and logically, you lawyers will agree, depicts what it would take to do it. That, too, was unanimously agreed upon, in one of the celebrated conferences, long before I came to the Defense Establishment.

Now we have two panels: (1) What you have to do; and, (2) what it takes to do it.

The thing depicted on the third panel down there was all but agreed upon when I came. Mr. Forrestal, who was to leave on May 1 instead of March 28, had hoped to stay to see that panel finished. Health, however, did not permit. That panel depicted who does it. That third panel was likewise unanimously agreed upon and signed up while Jim Forrestal was yet alive. I had the pleasure of reporting to him in the hospital that it was

agreed upon as he wanted, and I know that made it happier for him in his latter days.

That I submit to you as leaders of opinion throughout America, constitutes the intelligent defense of America. I submit to you, Mr. Budget Director, the observation that all of the money for national defense ought to go into the planning exhibited and depicted within these three panels.

We now have three panels: (1) What you have to do; (2) what it takes to do it; (3) who does it.

First General Eisenhower and then General Bradley, as acting chairman, and now chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, contributed mightily to those conclusions, and both approve of them completely.

I get into trouble when I get over on the other side of the wall to a still fourth panel. It is so big that it might be said to cover the whole side of the wall.

That fourth panel includes things like we discovered at Sandy Hook—thousands of acres of land which we will never use again, together with coastal defenses. In that panel are depicted the forts of revolutionary days now in the hearts of big cities where they contribute neither to defense nor the tax rolls of the country.

In that panel are depicted two ranges in the West, one consisting of three or four thousand acres—both off the tax books. Either one of the ranges could satisfy the needs of both services operating them, and the other range with all of its personnel, could and should be eliminated.

Panel four further discloses two or three billions of dollars a year of cost that does not contribute one nickel to the defense of America.

My fellow lawyers, before you all, I renew my pledge—bring what it will, in criticism or in health, first to tend alertly and fully to the defenses of America; and, secondly, though it takes my dying breath, we are going to whittle out this wastage, this fat, this throwing away of the taxpayer's money, so that the defense of America will be obtained with simon-pure dollars.

In doing that, I serve my country. I serve my conscience, and no man, save the President, is going to stop that work and he won't because it has his approval.

Included in that fourth panel are the 18 hospitals that we closed or shut down in part at the beginning of last week. We are told that that saves twenty-five million. Actually, it is much more. How much more, I cannot tell you, but I will tell you why parenthetically: I asked for a report when I first went into the defense establishment as to the cost of the medical services and hospitals. I have it now in writing that they cost $130,000,000 a year.

With the present performance budget, Senator McCARRAN—which with the help of Herbert Hoover and Frank Pace—we got through the Congress (as part of the unification law), we now know that that figure isn't a hundred and twenty-six million— it's nearly five hundred million. Cutting out the 18 hospitals we do not need still leaves us 50 percent more beds than we need. (We will continue taking care of veterans—and adequately.)

At the same time it relieves between 450 and 500 doctors to take care of our shortage in doctors elsewhere in the armed services. I am looking at this staff of mine ever here who are now wiggling around, and I want to say that in addition thereto, and they don't want me to say it; it lets out 11,000 more civilians, nurses, and other personnel that America needs and we don't need in the Military Establishment.

This is the sort of a job we are in and that is few illustrations of the many things we are doing in one element of this fourth panel.

Mr. Attorney General, there are those who say that America has reached its meridian. I am one of those that believe that with public servants like you and Frank Pace, and may I include myself somewhere in the rear guard of the group, that America is not at the meridian but, as Ralph Waldo Emerson said, "We are yet only at the cock-crowing and the morning star."

I think the getting rid of the wastage and the throwing away of defense dollars will long postpone our reaching that meridian.

I believe that America is but in its infancy. I believe that America, the greatest country in the world, has the responsibility which we are assuming in the Atlantic Pact, the military assistance, and what not, and for all those calculated risks we stand, but we stand also with adequate defense with simon pure defense dollars.

Please do not regard this as a speech. It is merely a talk to lawyers out of the heart of a harassed lawyer, but by one who here declares he is determined to do a good job. With the backing of the President, with the help of the Cabinet, the help of Frank Pace, the help of Congress and the support of the American people, I pledge anew that job is going to be done.

God bless you everyone.

Mr. Speaker, what follows is the letter from United States Assistant District Attorney Lamar Caudle, to the Secretary of Defense:

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. LOUIS JOHNSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR LOUIS: I cannot resist the urge to tell you how much I enjoyed the talk you finished but a few minutes ago. What the Attorney General spoke about you, I feel is reflected in the minds and hearts of a great preponderance of the American people.

Your equally splendid response clarifying so many important accomplishments already achieved in the Department of Defense—exhibits the splendid record that is being established in unifying the armed services of our country—coupled with an economy program never before equaled in Government administration.

It seems to me that the general consensus of opinion of those I have met from over the country is that President Truman could not have picked a finer, more capable, and determined citizen—to carry out the declared policies of the President and our Congress—than your own good self.

The common weal has tremendous confidence in your ability to secure the peace and security of our country.

The task now being finally nailed down has been a colossal undertaking.

I just wanted to pass these thoughts along to you. They have been in my heart for a long, long time. I do so in the belief that such things should be made known to one's friends because it adds encouragement as well as appreciation of work well done.

Good luck, and with fondest wishes always.

Sincerely and affectionately your friend,

LAMAR.

ECA Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, while we are monkeying around with socialistic schemes in this country and getting ready to vote more of the taxpayers' money for ECA spending in support of Britain's socialistic government, it is well to note what Winston Churchill said about that government just before the recent election. He stated:

They seek the dollars, they beg the dollars, they bluster for the dollars, they gobble the dollars, but in the whole of their 3,000-word manifesto (election platform) they cannot say "thank you" for the dollars. All of them said there would be anything up to 2,000,000 unemployed if it had not been for the American loan. Fancy the Socialist Government in England keeping itself alive economically and politically by those large, annual dollops of dollars from capitalistic America.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and fancy the international "do-gooders" over here still persisting that we continue these "dollops of dollars" to keep socialism going over there.

Recently a letter came to my attention which, I believe, should have the consideration of all my congressional colleagues in connection with further ECA appropriations. It was written shortly before the British election by a Conservative member of Parliament to a taxpayer in this country. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I quote an extract from the letter herewith:

LONDON, *January 23, 1950.*

I am contesting the Southampton test constituency, part of Southampton which has been divided since the election of 1945 into two constituencies; you will remember I represented the whole of Southampton in Parliament for 14 years. The chances I do not regard as being very hopeful for this reason: In spite of what Sir Stafford Cripps says, the financial position of this country is not improving. Last week he had a good deal to say about the gold and dollar reserves, but I see no chance whatsoever of these reaching what is regarded as the minimum reserve for safety between now and when Marshall aid ends—which I pray to God will not be renewed, as I blame America for financing socialism as it has done. Had it not been for this we would have had two million unemployed, and it is the opinion of many people that such a situation must arise before the country as a whole is brought to its senses.

Quite apart from the financial position, some of the principal unions—and, quite rightly so—are refusing to fall into line on the proposal for freezing wages, and I think this decision of the unions which was made this week, has been the deciding factor in having an early election. The Socialists want to get this over before the apex of the crisis comes upon them, which may not be until about June, and if the election took place then there would be no doubt that the Socialists would be heavily defeated but, coming on February 23, I am afraid the Socialists will be returned with a small majority—quite unworkable—and another election will follow in about 12 months' time. However, they can do an awful lot of damage in 12 months if they proceed with their further threats of nationalization.

America's generosity, which is unquestioned and undoubted, is going to prove to be a boomerang. I have always disapproved of American foreign policy, and it is now possible within the foreseeable future to appreciate the serious consequences of this and I cannot perceive any hope of a change or an escape from these so long as the Truman regime exists. You will remember that I said in more than one speech that it was necessary for America to take off her coat, roll up her sleeves and fight socialism now, not waiting until it had got a greater hold on the life of

the American people. Yet, little appears to have been done other than a spate of literature recently put into circulation. I would say that this anti-Socialist propaganda is at least 6 months too late.

I advised a meeting of bankers, financiers and economists that private enterprise would have to reorganize itself to meet the new world threat. Nothing seems to be being done in this connection. After all, what does the workingman want? He wants security and a decent standard of living which gives him a sufficient surplus to enjoy himself in quite a modest way, and if only private enterprise had appreciated its responsibility there was no reason why they could not have met these, what I regard as quite justifiable, demands and strengthened the capitalist free enterprise system. But no, someone is afraid of moving. Who is it? The money interests are strong, all powerful, but a united private enterprise effort I am certain could defeat this master control.

Relationships throughout the world are such that conditions now are worse than they were when Britain issued an ultimatum to Germany in September 1939—and the only reason that I attribute to there not having been several further ultimatums is providence. We are being given time to endeavor to realize our weaknesses but, instead of doing something about it, the diplomats' activities are, in my opinion, worsening conditions: Providence will not stand by us indefinitely.

Cold Wars Can Be Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Stewart Alsop:

[From the Washington Post of March 3, 1950]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

COLD WARS CAN BE WON

At this dark turning point in the cold war, a sense of defeatism and impotence is spreading like a fungus throughout the Government, the Congress, and the country. Yet this is the richest and most powerful Nation on earth, standing at the head of a confederation of free and brave peoples. We need not be impotent, if we choose to use our strength.

George Kennan, the brilliant State Department planner, has written that, as a basic requirement for peace, we must create "a situation of fact" which will cause the Kremlin to reverse its policy and abandon its dream of world domination. It is absolutely clear that this "situation of fact" is not now being created. If it is to be created, how must our strength be used? To what ends must our efforts be directed? How much of our resources must be mobilized? The answers to these questions lie in the following program, which represents in rough dollar terms a sort of crude, simplified consensus of those experts who must now remain publicly silent.

The first essential is to meet the challenge of Soviet rearmament. The defeatists would have it that the military problem is insoluble. It is not.

In November 1948 the late Secretary of Defense James V. Forrestal presented to the President a military budget of $16,900,000,000. In the judgment of Forrestal, whose wisdom becomes more apparent with every passing day of folly, this sum was sufficient to give reasonable security to the United States. A further sum will be needed to help give our Allies that "sense of their own military security" which Kennan also postulates as essential to continued resistance to Soviet pressure. Over-all, in dollar terms, what is necessary is an increase in the annual military budget of five to seven billion dollars, tapering off as our Allies are rearmed.

The doctrine that this will lead to war is demonstrable folly. What will invite Soviet aggression—what has already invited Soviet aggression wherever it has existed—is weakness. This outlay will not provide the western confederation with aggressive strength, nor will it begin to match the military effort of the Soviet Union, whose whole economy is now dedicated to preparing for war.

Yet the aggressor, by one of the oldest and best military rules, requires a ratio of strength of 3 to 1, and the proposed outlay should thus be enough decisively to deter any aggressive Soviet adventures. Less than this, surely, the wealthiest, the most populous, the most productive nations on earth, cannot do.

In the political and economic sphere, the western confederation is quite as directly threatened as in the sphere of strategy and simple power. The economic insecurity of the British Commonwealth; the resulting British reluctance to participate in the organization of Europe; the consequent impossibility of building a structure into which Germany can be safely fitted—all these are problems as acute as they are vast.

Yet again, these problems can be dealt with. In the case of Britain, for example, it will cost this country 10 to 16 billion dollars annually to fill the power vacuum that will be created, if economic crisis forces Britain to go out of business as a world power. We have not got this capability. Yet the annual deficiency which is driving Britain toward this disaster for the whole confederation of the west amounts to no more than $1,000,000,000.

The contrast speaks for itself. But the essential point is that dealing with all these problems will mean, at least temporarily, further drafts on American resources. The time for half measures is past. The whole job, of building a solid structure in the west and dealing with Soviet expansion in Asia, must now be done, even if it adds a further burden of $2,000,000,000 or a little more per year, which is about the outside figure.

These measures, both military and economic, are essentially defensive. If Kennan's situation of fact is to be created, it is also necessary for us to take the offensive in the cold war, as the Soviet Union has consistently done since before the last war ended. The way to take the offensive is by a massive propaganda effort, combined with those clandestine methods which the Soviets are already using on a gigantic scale. If we enter this field of effort with energy governed by prudence, gradual but vital changes may be confidently expected in many different and crucial situations all over the world. For this purpose, something like $500,000,000 should suffice.

Stated in rough dollar terms, such is the hard program which the wisest of the experts privately but unanimously agree is required if we are to make a serious effort to win the cold war and thus secure a dependable settlement with the Soviet Union. If economies are not made elsewhere, as they certainly should be, the total effort would increase the budgetary imbalance between 8 and 10 billion dollars. But cold wars, like hot wars, cannot be successfully waged with one eye on the budget.

During the last war, the budget was unbalanced by $50,000,000,000 annually, yet we ended the war with our national income tripled, and our wealth increased. This is the correct perspective in which to see the problem. And just to make the perspective a little clearer, it may also be remembered that the penalty for losing the cold war will be slavery or death.

Outstanding Mining Leader, Harry Sears, Speaks on Gold as a Commodity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address delivered at the annual convention of the Colorado Mining Association in Denver on February 2.

The speaker, Harry Sears, of Angels Camp, Calif., is director of the California Gold Committee and president and general manager of Calaveras Central Gold Mining Co., Ltd. He is a recognized leader among mining men and is actively working to assist the gold-mining industry which has suffered greatly at the hands of our Government.

GOLD IS A COMMODITY

In opening this discussion of gold, we should first define what gold producers talk about. Gold, to us, is a commodity, just as wheat or corn or wool are commodities.

Gold did not grow valuable because it was a currency base; it became the backing for currency because it was valuable.

Because of its former use in coinage, and its present use as a reserve behind paper currency, great confusion has arisen as to the rights and powers of the Government with regard to gold, also as to the rights and privileges of gold producers. It has been the practice of the Government to broaden such rights as they had, and through opportunism and propaganda, to build up belief in the minds of economists, bankers, the general public, and even gold producers themselves, that the price and sale of their gold was limited by the absolute power of the Government, as expressed in the gold regulations of the Treasury Department.

Many economists, sympathetic to the present Treasury viewpoint, try to forget that gold is basically a commodity, with a continuous and expanding use in private enterprise. They also forget that all gold deposits are limited in commercial content. Once exhausted, the mine is permanently out of business.

The Government jealously guards its custom to supply this gold to industry at a prewar commodity price. Statistics on this use in industry are published in the annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury.

In the 11 years 1919 to 1930 we find the industrial use of gold in the United States was 131 percent of the total United States gold production. During the years 1941 to 1949 we find that the industrial use of gold in the United States was 139 percent of the total United States gold production.

There is a statement in the report for 1930 which says:

"Gold produced from mines in the United States, unless exported or consumed in the

industrial arts, obviously adds to the gold monetary stock of the country."

Therefore, on the official admission of the Secretary of the Treasury, no gold produced in this country during these 20 years was added to the monetary stock.

There is, therefore, no question as to the status of gold as a commodity. What, then, about its price?

I attended the meetings of the International Monetary Fund, in Washington, last September, together with J. C. Kempvanee and George Nugent, of the California gold committee, we were present when Hon. N. C. Havenga, Finance Minister of South Africa, addressed his fellow governors. He stressed the importance of gold as a commodity. He was talking the same language which must be stressed by gold producers in this country. Our position is identical with his. He said:

"I do not think anybody can deny that gold is today the cheapest commodity in world trade. One searches in vain for one other commodity entering prominently into world trade which can still be purchased at prewar prices. The bulk of the world trade in gold is carried on in 1939 prices. * * * South Africa cannot continue to be the bargain basement of the world in order to maintain exchange stability for the benefit of all."

That statement reflects the position held by the gold producers in the United States.

GOLD PRODUCERS VICTIMS OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL TREASURY REGULATIONS

In an address here in Denver last January I presented some facts with regard to newly mined gold. We can better appreciate further development on the subject if I repeat several passages from that address:

"Gold producers are hampered by regulations dating back to that era when Congress was told to pass laws in spite of doubts as to their validity or constitutionality. If the law did not give the New Deal planners the desired freedom of action, this was achieved by a Department order, rule or practice, under pretense of authority.

"There is a vast legal difference between newly mined gold, a commodity, and government gold stocks for monetary use. Gold mines are held by their owners by direct grants from the government. Whether as claim location or as patented ground these grants are valid contracts, specifically conveying the gold, and they are property. Rights acquired against the United States, arising out of a contract with it, are protected by the fifth amendment of the Constitution which holds that no person—shall be deprived of property without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

GOLD IS PRIVATE PROPERTY

"All gold mines contain gold in its natural state: that is the condition in which the Government granted it to the owners, and that is the condition in which the gold producers find it. In or out of the ground it still remains the private property of the owners. Some gold may be retained in its natural state but usually gold must be processed to insure its recovery and avoid losses.

"When a producer is compelled to yield up any of this processed gold at a price fixed by the government, and is denied the right to seek another purchaser and receive a higher price, it is clearly a violation of his property rights guaranteed under the fifth amendment.

"There is now a steadily increasing market in this country for newly mined gold in its natural state. So far as the industry as a whole is concerned this is little direct help, for only a small part of the total gold production is in this form."

When gold producers are denied access to this market for their processed gold, because of arbitrary Treasury regulations, they are forced to take less money on their production. It is this loss which will now permit a gold producer to bring an action against the Government to collect and to change the gold regulations.

Consider the Gold Act of 1934 and its regulations. We are told that they are the rules under which we must operate today, but the validity of any law or statute must be determined not only from its words and phrases, but also from the intent of those who made it and likewise upon the basis of their legal power to write the law.

It, therefore, becomes important to review what happened in that period between the Presidential gold embargo, on April 20, 1933, and January 30, 1934, when the present Gold Reserve Act was approved.

When the embargo was first made there was a storm of protest from the mining industry, for here was an order to sell their product to the Mint at $20.67 an ounce when there were higher prices for gold in world markets abroad.

A BANKING, NOT A MINING ORDER

In construing the word "gold," in the first Executive order of 1933, the Attorney General held that this meant "gold coin," "gold bullion," and "gold certificates." It was, therefore, a banking and not a mining order.

On August 2 new regulations were made permitting sale and shipment abroad of "gold in its natural state."

Then on August 28 the President issued an order making it an offense with $10,000 fine or 10 years' imprisonment for exporting, hoarding, melting gold coin, bullion, or currency, all of which had to be turned into the Treasury at $20.67 an ounce.

But on August 29, the President issued an order that the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to receive gold recovered from natural deposits in the United States, on consignment for sale, and that "such sales shall be made at a price which the Secretary shall determine to be equal to the best price obtainable in the free gold markets of the world."

As this was issued after the criminal order of August 28, it clearly shows that transactions in gold from natural deposits were recognized as private property, entitling gold producers to "just compensation" and a fair price.

On October 25, the President issued another order substituting the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as buyer. There was an opinion on October 22, by the Attorney General approving this, in which he said:

"Whereas there is no free market in the United States for gold newly mined in the United States; and

"Whereas it will aid in the creation of such a market if such gold be purchased in the United States; and

"Whereas it will further aid such market if gold, whether newly mined or not, be purchased abroad; and

"Whereas the public problem arising from the absence of a free market in the United States for gold newly mined therein, warrant action."

This was the status therefore, up to January of 1934, when there was some debate on the Gold Reserve Act in the Senate, practically all of which was on the subject of the $2,000,000,000 stabilization fund and its control by Secretary Morgenthau. There was no mention of mines or newly mined gold except references made to the special and privileged position of this newly mined gold, which was then being sold at world market prices, while the Government demanded that all other gold be surrendered at $20.67 an ounce.

In view of present higher prices for gold in other parts of the world and because of the growing market here for gold in its natural state, it seemed most logical that producers could get relief from the pressure of high production costs, which prevents most of them from operating, and that the Government would act, if these facts were brought before them.

During the months since that last Denver meeting there was earnest effort on behalf of gold producers and responsible banking and business leaders, devoted to presenting the case for a free market for newly mined gold before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. These hearings developed the opposition and brought it out in to the open. It was expected that the Treasury would oppose the bills, also the State Department and the Federal Reserve Board. But there was an almost hysterical attack upon the bills and gold producers by a group of misguided economists and businessmen who are seeking to have paper money made convertible into gold at the present $35 price.

Members of this group still harp on the old threadbare formula that gold producers were granted a great gift of extra profits when the price of gold was set at $35. They have completely ignored the fact that the gold-producing industry, at that time, was in the doldrums because the old price had failed to keep pace with rising costs.

Let us examine the gold price in light of historical statistics. There seems to be little doubt that in a century the purchasing power of the dollar has dropped 77 percent. Assuming, therefore, that in 1850, its purchasing power was 100, the figure now is 23. In plain words the dollar today is worth 23 cents in terms of the 1850 dollar.

THE PRICE OF GOLD IN SHRIVELED DOLLARS

The price of gold was fixed at $20.67 in 1834. If the same dollar shrinkage existed before 1850, as afterwards, it had depreciated quite a bit by 1850, but assuming that it was 100 then, we find that gold which in terms of dollar value was $20.67 in 1350 had shrunk to $17.52 per ounce in 1870, that it was $14.37 an ounce in 1890, that in 1910 it was $11.22 and that by 1934 it had dropped to $7.47 and if the old gold price had continued it would have been $4.75 per ounce by 1950.

However, 1934 was the great year for gold producers, according to the crackpot economists. Gold went to $35 per ounce, although in purchasing power of depreciated dollars, it really only went to $12.64 and by 1950 that new price has become $8.04.

It's a strange thing that in discussing gold many people only think of its price and completely ignore its cost.

Let's go back along the line and look at some costs, gold mining labor in 1890 was $2.50 per day, for a 10-hour shift, in 1934 it was $4 to $5 for an 8-hour shift and today it is $10 to $12. Supplies now are generally 100 percent to 200 percent higher than they were in 1934, transportation costs are up almost 300 percent, necessary clerical work is up 500 percent and taxes have been raised 7,500 percent in the past 50 years.

To speak of convertibility of gold for paper money today, at $35 gold is a waste of words. A study of the basic thinking of our money masters in Government should show anyone supplied with normal intelligence, that this would be the last thing that they would consent to. They have sought to control gold for the purpose of centralizing their power and if the pressure for conversion gets too heavy it will certainly be at a higher dollar parity or a higher gold price.

GOVERNMENT DETERMINED TO HAVE MANAGED CURRENCY

At the recent convention of the American Banking Association in San Francisco, Allen Sproul, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, stood on a platform backed by a large mural depicting the early California pioneers, boasted of being a native San Franciscan and of it

being the one hundredth anniversary of the discovery of gold in California, then proceeded to castigate gold money as something inferior to the brand of managed currency now forced on the public by the Government and the Federal Reserve. Sproul put emphasis on his complete determination that the people must have managed currency and that they were not to be trusted with gold. He spoke frequently of laws without apparent realization that his conception of the gold question was completely lawless. He calmly supported confiscation of gold.

The next exhibit in our collection of horrors is a statement by Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. He recently replied to the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report and said as to gold; "Proposals have been freely forthcoming from world gold-producing interests to raise the dollar price of gold. The dollar price of gold, however, is still higher relative to the general level of commodity prices, than it was in the 1920's and gold production remains above the level of that period."

Mr. McCabe's statement is false. In the 1920's the commodity level of gold was lower than other commodities, by comparison of the time its price was fixed, it had been static since 1834. As to present gold production in the United States, it is only 72 percent of the 1920's instead of being above the level of that period.

I believe the latest pronouncement from the Government on this subject is the report of this Joint Committee on the Economic Report, issued in Washington on January 23. In this they have adopted one of Mr. McCabe's statements, swallowing it hook, line, and sinker. They definitely turn thumbs down on gold convertibility but the words used are not an evidence of strength but of weakness. I will quote them:

"An overriding reason against making gold coin freely available is that no government should make promises to its citizens and to the world which it would not be able to keep if the demand should arise. * * * Return to the gold-coin standard would clearly expose the economy to the risk of a drastic and undesirable deflation at times of high speculative demand for gold for hoarding, or else the government would have to withdraw its promise of gold convertibility."

In short, they admit that they could not face a public accounting of their money stewardship.

These points illustrate the spirit of our money managers toward gold and the interests of gold producers. It would be idle to expect any help or justice from them. They have appropriated our private property for their own use and nothing but force will dislodge their grip on gold.

Fortunately for us, gold producers have that force available, and if we will demonstrate a percentage of the old-time guts which formed the background of this industry, we should get out of this mess. Our industry has been completely socialized. We were the guinea pigs and what happened to us yesterday may happen to any other industry tomorrow.

We are producers and wholesalers of a valuable commodity, at present being forcefully taken at an inadequate price. We have the right to seek protection against the unlawful seizure of this private property.

NO BASIS FOR TREASURY POWER OVER NEWLY MINED GOLD

It is a long established legal principle that neither Congress nor any agency of Government has the right or the power to fix the price at which the Government buys. Maintenance of this principle is fundamental to our free economy.

The gold regulations are a product of the Treasury Department and express the manner in which they wish to have things done. They have no legal force or effect if they overstep the power conveyed by the Gold Reserve Act.

The regulations fix the price and they also fix the compulsion to sell to the Government. They deny gold producers the right to sell their gold, processed in its extraction, to anyone but a mint, or one of their licensed buyers which makes him merely a branch of the mint for the purposes of a compulsory sale.

The fixing of the price plus the compulsion to sell amounts to the taking of property without just compensation. A definite violation of the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

The fixing of a proper price, at which the Government may purchase, is a judicial function and cannot be legally accomplished by Congress, which is the legislative branch, or by the Treasury, which is only an administrative branch. Neither of these possesses judicial power for such price fixing.

If we compare the basic world conditions now and as they were in 1933, there are both parallels and contrasts. World currencies are again devalued ahead of ours. The price of gold abroad is higher than in this country, but the rights of gold producers to receive world prices are not now conceded by the Government. In fact they are violently denied to us and such slight freedom as we have in the markets for gold in its natural state is clouded by Treasury propaganda and threats to change these regulations at any time.

JUSTICE FOR GOLD PRODUCERS

There are two solutions to our problem.

Step 1: Proceed against the Government in the courts, with several distinct cases each having a different set of circumstances. We would thus seek a clear-cut decision defining the property rights of gold producers to mine and sell their product. The precise questions we are raising have never been before the courts. There are no legal decisions against the gold mining industry. We have accepted the power of Government without question, like a lot of sheep. How much longer will we submit to this?

Step 2: Cooperate, under a new and honest set of regulations with the Treasury Department, and sell our product to them provided they pay us the current world price. They could do this now, at any time. They have ample authority under section 3700 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. With the approval of the President the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase gold in any amounts, at home or abroad * * * at such rates and upon such terms as he may deem most advantageous to the public interest * * * any provisions of law as to parity, to the contrary, notwithstanding.

The Government did this in 1933 under the Presidential order of August 29 and their legal right to do this was confirmed by the opinion of the Attorney General which I have quoted.

The Government may not yet be ready to grant us the benefit of step 2, but they may be willing to do so if we proceed diligently under step 1.

The California Gold Committee is a group representing diverse gold producers' interests. Its functions are to coordinate the efforts of the industry so that they may be more effective through group action than by the efforts of a single producer.

We charge no fees, we are not a membership organization in competition with other groups. We seek no profits.

We have made research regarding the soundness of our program, have provided competent legal counsel in Washington and we have developed avenues for practical relief for the gold mining industry, along two lines.

The first being to get redress through court action against the Government for the loss and damages caused by the closing down of gold mines under L208, an illegal order, which was a studied crime against gold producers.

Two claims have already been filed in the Court of Claims of the United States, under this heading and others are being processed.

The committee would be glad to have inquiries and suggestions from those interested in this subject. Gold producers who have suffered money or property losses are invited to submit an outline of their cases to us. We would thus be able to give advice as to the most effective procedure.

Our address is, California Gold Committee, Auburn, Calif.

Gold mining has had a particularly raw deal but it is not the only branch of the mining industry that is in trouble. Seventy-three percent of all metal mines operating in 11 Western States in 1940, are now closed down. This shut-down is due to world and sectional politics. Much of this could have been avoided if mining people had been more alert but we have been too much engaged in the details of our own affairs and have been inclined to avoid politics.

That must be changed. Whether we like it or not, we must get into politics and the thousands of people in our communities must be enlisted to support us. Likewise, the thousands of stockholders in our enterprises, who now suffer with us, must be alerted to the end that we become articulate.

We must recognize and support our friends and root out of office those politicians in whom we trusted, but who have helped or permitted the mining industry to be brought down to the desperate level it now holds.

Education for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in behalf of the senior and junior Senators from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL and Mr. DARBY], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Education for Freedom," delivered by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president of the Pennsylvania State College, at the forty-first annual dinner meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, in Philadelphia, on February 28, 1950.

I am informed by the Public Printer that this manuscript is estimated to make approximately two and one-half pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $205. Owing to the importance of the address, it being a discussion of the objectives of a liberal arts college, I believe the Members of the Senate will be very much interested in reading it. It is for this reason that I am asking that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION FOR FREEDOM

I am deeply grateful for the honor you do me tonight, and for this demonstration of the friendly spirit of Pennsylvania. It is

more reassuring to me than perhaps you envisaged when you invited me here.

The Kansas from which I come retains many of the attitudes and characteristics of the frontier. I've grown accustomed there to a candor and a relaxed friendliness which might easily be lacking in an older society with deeply rooted traditions. If I had any misgivings about moving from Kansas to Pennsylvania they were that I might, temporarily at least, feel a stranger to the more formal atmosphere and conservative demeanor of this great Commonwealth.

You have convinced me of my error. You have done so not only by the cordiality of your welcome but by the fact that tonight, you are proving yourselves to be as casually irreverent of tradition as any western pioneer could desire.

For you are shattering one of the most cherished traditions of American higher education. A newly elected college president is supposed to slip quietly into office and spend several months in seclusion on the campus, after which he is formally inaugurated with pomp and ceremony. Only then does he announce his educational philosophy and aims. What you are doing tonight is so lacking in precedent that I'm hard put to find a name for it. Certainly this occasion is not an inaugural; that, I suppose, will occur for me a good many months hence. Perhaps it can best be characterized as a preinaugural, similar to the orientation and testing program to which we modern educators subject freshmen before we permit them to enroll.

Whatever it is or whatever, I must say that it is a pleasant experience, and I shall response to your pioneering generosity by doing a little pioneering of my own. I, too, shall ignore tradition by stating, as briefly as I can, and before I have had an opportunity to become acquainted with my forthcoming responsibilities, my views on the responsibility higher education has for preserving, developing, and spreading the blessings of democracy.

Now, education is not a cloistered enterprise, comfortably removed from the turbulent streams of our social, political, and spiritual life. It is an essential part of that life. For whatever glorious triumphs we of the United States have achieved, education must be given part of the credit, and for whatever failures we have experienced, education must be assigned part of the blame. Education deals with the life of the mind, and a free society rises or falls by the quality of thinking of all its participants.

This means that education must be adaptable to changing social conditions. Ideally, sound developments in education should precede social change. Ideally, we should, as a society, think before we act, using that rationality which education is concerned to develop as the driving force of progress. But this has not always been so. It has not been so, I think, in our own time. Most of us in American education are acutely aware that it has lagged behind social adjustments caused by an advancing technology—which is to say that these adjustments have been, quite often, irrationally made. They've been made, and are now being made, without sufficiently clear conceptions of the goals we wish to achieve, the values we wish to preserve or create. It is our awareness of this fact which has sparked the revolution now under way in most of our institutions of higher learning, from Maine to California, from Montana to Louisiana.

This is the second major revolution in American higher education.

The first occurred during the Civil War. That was a revolt against the restricted classical concept of higher learning, based on Greek and Latin and designed for the cultivation of a privileged class. We imported this type of education from Europe and maintained it here for many years despite the fact that it not only failed to contribute vitally to democratic development but actually, in many ways, hindered that development.

Our democratic system sprang directly from basic moral conceptions. Great ideals of human dignity, mutuality in human relations, and individual liberty motivated a social system in which social power was shared by all the people. The people were to employ this shared power to promote the common good as well as the individual good. It was a system requiring an intelligent, well-informed citizenry, each of whom realized that he was, in his capacity of free citizen, both governed and governer.

It was, perhaps, easier to meet this requirement in the early days of America than it is now. Our democracy began in a simple agrarian environment. There was a minimum of economic interdependence. True, there was a lower level of popular education; but social problems were also simpler, for no man's problems and outlook were greatly different from those of his neighbors. The average citizen mind could encompass most of the factors which must be considered in the determination of public action.

Yes; democracy was easier in those days—and it was Thomas Jefferson's realization that industrialization would make democracy more difficult which determined his initial hostility to the encouragement of manufactures. In 1787 he contended that popular government would survive in the United States "as long as agriculture is our principal object," a statement indicating at least a latent despair of democracy should industrialization proceed too fast and too far. Later, however, he modified his views. He came to regard increasing industrialization as a challenge which democracy could meet successfully, providing people generally achieved an ever-higher level of education and understanding. It must be, he saw, an education which encouraged a profound commitment to freedom while developing the skills of creative compromise.

Convinced that education is the greatest single guaranty of freedom, Jefferson helped establish the University of Virginia, whose charter declared that education must—

(a) Expound a sound spirit of legislation which leaves the individual free to do whatever does not violate the equal rights of another;

(b) Harmonize and promote the interests of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce;

(c) Develop the reasoning faculties of youth, enlarge their minds, and instill into them the precepts of virtue and order; and

(d) Form them to habits of reflection, rendering them examples of virtue to others, and of happiness within themselves.

Unfortunately, these goals for education were not widely adopted in Jefferson's time. Particularly were the first two goals neglected. Obviously, these goals implied widespread popular education and an education related to the vocational interests of the masses of the people. Yet higher education continued to be the prerogative of the few; it continued to be focused on Greek and Latin and pointed primarily to the learned professions of law, medicine, and theology. The masses of the people remained unenlightened, and distrusted the educated few.

Meanwhile the American environment was being vastly changed. An industrial democracy was developing. The percentage of people engaged in farming was decreasing while that engaged in manufacturing, trade, transportation, personal services, and professions was steadily increasing. Economic self-sufficiency was beginning to disappear. Men began to specialize, and to encounter wholly new physical and social problems, for which few seemed to have answers. A rapidly increasing population was not attaining the level of education and understanding which overwhelming events made essential. Certainly a purely classical education for a relative few did not suffice. Education was failing, and failing desperately, to contribute to democratic development.

It became increasingly clear that college education must be popularized; it must be placed within the reach of large numbers of men and women; it must concern itself with their vocational interests and needs; it must help find the answers to perplexing physical problems, such as that of a rapidly declining soil productivity. The price of failure to develop this kind of education seemed, to many serious thinkers, the ultimate collapse of the democratic system.

Accordingly there developed, in the administration of Abraham Lincoln, a new charter for American education. It was the Morrill Act of 1862, establishing the land-grant college system of which Kansas State College and the Pennsylvania State College are a part. Through it a major step was taken toward the realization of at least a part of Jefferson's charter. The land-grant colleges did breathe forth a spirit of democratic legislation, laying great stress on individual enterprise and individual liberty. They did strive—and with remarkable success—to promote the interest of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce. Gradually, in research, resident instruction, and extension, they helped solve vexing problems and provided the answers to vast numbers of people in all the States.

At that time, with interest focused on physical development, the other goals in Jefferson's charter did not seem as important as they do today, especially the goals of developing reflective thinking and harmonizing the interests of specialized groups. But I shall return to this point shortly.

The establishment of the land-grant colleges initiated a chain reaction. The new concept of higher education rapidly overcame the contempt of the classicists who, to begin with, had felt that science was not worthy of a place in universities and that it was not quite respectable to be, say, an engineer. The new colleges made science a partner of the farm and the industrial classes, and demonstrated that higher education could contribute directly to man's economic advancement. No longer did the college student look only to law, medicine, or the ministry as proper vocations. More than 3,000 occupations were now open to him. And from the land-grant schools, the new concepts spread to other colleges and universities and to secondary schools as well.

This was truly a successful revolution in education. The triumph of the concept of popular education is evident in the fact that today some 10,000,000 young men and women are enrolled in American high schools, colleges, and universities. The triumph of the concept of scientific and vocational education is evident in the curriculums of nearly every college in the land. Indeed, the triumph of this latter concept was so complete as seemingly to blind us for a long time to other educational values which now are recognized as being crucially important.

Let me explain why I say this:

Beginning in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and rapidly gaining momentum in this century, our colleges contributed immensely to our scientific and technological progress, not only by turning out highly skilled scientists and technicians, but also through research conducted in their own laboratories. For several thousand years, it seemed, physical progress had languished, like the quiet waters behind a great dam. Now the dam was burst, and industrialization with its concomitant specialization flowed forth like turbulent flood waters. Industrial and agricultural productivity increased phenomenally, releasing manpower for new professions and trades. Men applied their creative powers with feverish vigor to physical and biological mysteries and came forth with machines and treatment beyond the dreams of Jules Verne.

Happy with success, and responding to the need for men of greater and greater degrees of specialization, higher education now specialized with a vengeance. Whether in the basic or applied sciences, or even in the many disciplines within the social sciences and humanities, students were encouraged to probe deeper and deeper into narrower and narrower fields. Our colleges developed more and more highly specialized minds, tremendously competent within the confines of their specialties but uninformed and often dogmatic about everything else. The tendency, at least, was to train a biological chemist who was a stranger to the social world in which he lived; or a language specialist who literally feared the physical world, for he had no understanding of it; or an engineer who knew little about the economic forces determining the very field in which he worked.

This was a tragedy of monumental proportions.

Intense specialization in every avenue of life has brought about conditions and social problems profoundly different from those of our early agrarian days. One is an exacting economic interdependence. And interdependence calls constantly for broad understanding and tolerance. But a too-exclusive specialization, either in work or education, makes for intellectual narrowness. It creates partial minds, whereas interdependence desperately demands whole minds.

If a man does only one thing, day after day—whether it be research in a laboratory, or livestock production on a western ranch, or riveting in a shipyard, he naturally—unless he has trained himself to do otherwise—judges social affairs almost exclusively in terms of their effect on the business of research, or livestock raising, or riveting. Partial minds very naturally cluster around their special vocational and economic interests, and thus are created scores of human pressure streams, running head-on into each other.

Today there is greater community of interest among similar specialists of Seattle, San Francisco, and New York, than there is between different specialists in a single geographic locality. Each interest group, each vertical part of our society, experiencing only a fraction of the whole, thinks primarily of its own welfare. These pressure streams bear upon State capitols and the National Capitol so constantly and relentlessly that if legislation promotes the general welfare it is almost coincidental.

Specialization and interdependence have induced social changes of such bewildering speed that the citizen mind can scarcely comprehend. Hence we frequently devise social action within an obsolete factual framework. When such action doesn't get good results, we become confused and frustrated, grow critical, and look for a whipping boy.

For example, our change from a debtor to a creditor status brought wholly new economic situations which, even after more than 30 years, seem not to be generally understood, especially in the Midwest, and it is not surprising, therefore, that appropriate corrective action is difficult to take. But by far the most awesome example of cultural lag is our complete ignorance of the proposed hydrogen bomb—itself a climax of research and social organization which can literally destroy the very developments that brought it into being. To scramble my examples, I may say that we should not be arguing the economics of our debtor years at a time when a single agency of destruction could well make all argument fruitless or impossible. One of the foremost problems for all the people is to gain at least a minimal understanding of today's forces and circumstances that may determine our destiny. The facts of 25, or 5, or even 2 years ago will not do. Action devised within an obsolete factual framework is a guaranty of dismal failure.

Still other far-reaching consequences flow from extreme specialization. The complexity created by it, and the tempo of working and living that accompanies it, seemingly cause us to subordinate those very spiritual values, those very ethical concepts, which are at once the foundation and the binding cement of our free society. All life is competitive, and there is great virtue in that, provided we retain a unifying compulsion which, at all critical times, is more important to us than our individual or group interests and differences. That unifying compulsion is made up of devotion to human dignity, fairness in human relations, and the protection of interdependent freedoms—political freedom, personal freedom, economic freedom. It seems to me that in this postwar period, with foreign dangers keeping our nerves taut, and with internal problems fraying our minds, we tend not only to forget unifying spiritual values but also to accentuate philosophic differences. These differences today are deeper than ever before, save in the Civil War period. Certainly they grow daily more bitter.

Now, if our modern situation requires anything from the educated man and woman, it requires a mind that is broad, trained in critical thinking, tolerant in judgment, skilled in creative compromise, and dedicated to democratic principles.

Others may state the problem differently, but what I have just said is, I think, a self-evident truth. It is the cardinal fact that is now causing the second revolution in American higher education. Everywhere, teachers, trustees, educational administrators, and students are struggling with the problem of developing and maintaining an educational experience that will help build minds capable of contributing constructively to the solution of problems caused by modern interdependence.

Success in this task requires, I think, that we focus our attention on all the goals of Jefferson's charter for higher education—not on just some of them.

You will forgive me, I trust, if in recounting specifically how education is trying to meet its new task, I become somewhat more personal. I can, you will realize, speak with authority only about Kansas State College—about how we there during the past 7 years have tried to meet these new obligations, as we see them.

We've sought to keep always before us the obvious but important fact that most students spend only 4 years or less in college. Whatever values are to be gained from college must be gained in that brief period. It is a critical period. Most students are in college at a time when they are maturing—physically, intellectually, spiritually—and we've learned that no one of these phases of maturity can be neglected without badly affecting the other two.

We have had to remind ourselves almost daily that all the values of a college experience cannot be obtained exclusively in the classroom or laboratory. How a student lives, how he participates in constructive extra-curricular activities, whether he is given opportunity to learn through experience the democratic lessons of discussion and decision—these and dozens of other circumstances have a direct bearing upon the maturing process of a student.

Specifically, we at Kansas State College have been gradually adjusting our educational program in ways which will help each student achieve five definite goals.

The first continues to be specialized training for the making of a living, or of a home. Specialization is not to be condemned merely because it has presented us with complex social problems. Indeed, specialization is an urgent necessity in modern society, and it is a necessity which education must help to satisfy. Without it, our economic prosperity would be drastically reduced, human misery vastly increased. And democracy itself requires the high productivity yielded by specialization, for a democratic society will be sustained only in an atmosphere of abundance. At least it must be said that totalitarianism spreads only in an environment of human misery.

So of course we must train competent engineers, economists, physicists, and do so with increasing skill in view of the growing intricacies of each area of specialization. But we must do more than this—which brings me to the second of the five goals we've been aiming at for Kansas State.

The second goal is to help each student achieve an understanding of all the broad fields of knowledge—the physical sciences, the biological sciences, the social sciences, the humanities. Of course, no one mind, in four brief years, can achieve specialized training in a single field and at the same time gain detailed knowledge in other fields. He can, however, achieve a general introduction to other fields which, if properly made, will not only enable him to educate himself in them throughout his life, but will also stimulate his desire to do so. Only if they achieve the foundations of self-education, will most individuals leading a specialized life be able to keep themselves broadly and accurately informed as modern democratic society demands of the responsible citizen.

As first steps toward this second goal, we at Kansas State have introduced what we call comprehensive courses in the several fields of knowledge, each built around an integrating theme—courses entitled "Man's Physical World," "Man and the Cultural World," "Man and the Biological World," "Man and the Social World." Students take those comprehensives which are outside their own fields of specialization. We're trying to build courses aimed at broad understanding, while avoiding mere compendiums of unrelated items of information.

A third goal toward which we are aiming at Kansas State is the development of the skills of communication. So many of us in America these days don't really know how to read, or write, or speak, or listen. I often think of what a great surge forward we could have in our society if all individuals and groups attained logic and clarity in communication. Every individual is dependent on others in a multitude of ways, and his true success or failure—as a producer and as a citizen—depends vitally on his ability to analyze and assess what he hears or reads, and to state logically and clearly what he knows, thinks, or wishes to ask. A fairly low level of proficiency in communication is one of the present handicaps to the successful functioning of our free society. At Kansas State, as in most other institutions, we are trying to lift the level of achievement in this field.

This brings me to the fourth goal toward which we're aiming: the fostering of wisdom, or the development of the capacity for sound judgments. Here, how students are taught is as important as what they are taught. Or, more accurately, how students learn, is as important as what they learn. Perhaps the greatest achievement a student can attain is to learn how to learn. Involved in this is learning how to select knowledge relevant to a problem. Involved is it is the exercise of critical thinking about alternative solutions. And involved in it is sensitivity—the deeper intuitions whence arise moral or spiritual values.

Precisely because this goal of wisdom is all-inclusive, it must permeate the entire college program. It cannot be developed through a single device of course. It is as important to develop the habit of critical thinking in a course in history as it is in mathematics, in philosophy as in chemical engineering. And the all-college environment must make its contribution, too. Is the school, with all its fun, really dedicated in class and out to the serious purpose of education? Are students, in class and out, given

opportunity and encouragement to formulate judgments, express them, and test them against objective facts and judgments of others? Unless the answer to these questions is "Yes," the college is not, I fear, working satisfactorily toward this fourth goal.

And this brings me to the fifth, and last of our goals.

At Kansas State we are determined that every student should gain from his total experience in college an abiding commitment to the democratic way of life—a commitment based, not upon indoctrination, but upon genuine understanding. We want this commitment to be so firm that each student will become an effective, participating citizen in all the democratic procedures open to him—working constantly and effectively for the protection and development of our interdependent freedoms.

I may be quite blunt about this: We have established and supported in this country a Nation-wide system of education designed primarily to lift the level of understanding of all the people so that the maintenance of democracy may be assured. Every citizen has a right to expect that our educational institutions will contribute directly and effectively to the democratic system which maintains them.

But I'm afraid a great many people do not realize that good results in this regard do not derive merely from proclamations. A mere emotional commitment to freedom and democracy is not enough. A student who has only an emotional attachment to democracy is easy prey to contrary arguments, both here and abroad.

A genuine, abiding commitment can be achieved only if the student really understands the basic theories and practices of democracy, as well as the basic theories and practices of other systems and ideologies—in all the forms they have taken throughout history. The glory of it is that democracy, with all its shortcomings, is the best social system ever devised by man. It is the only one that is compatible in practice with man's innermost spiritual or religious convictions. It is the only one that permits man to release the springs of his own greatness. Hence, the free democratic system can stand comparison successfully with all other systems, ancient and modern. Out of comparison and the development of his own value-judgments, each student is certain to develop the kind of commitment needed in the effective free citizen.

To help along the process of commitment to democracy, both at the secondary and higher levels of education, we established a few years ago at Kansas State under a grant of $200,000 from the Volker Foundation, an Institute of Citizenship. It is working with students on the campus, with adults throughout the State, and with teachers in cooperating high schools. It is constantly experimenting with both the processes and subject-matter of citizenship education. The results of these experiments—and some of them have been highly successful—are soon to be published in a series of bulletins which a few of you may wish to read.

With this, gentlemen, is my view of the responsibility of higher education in a free society. Perhaps I can sum it all up by saying that what each student should get out of college is himself—himself as a mature personality with capacities and incentive for continued growth, himself as an informed and effective citizen in a free society, himself as a deeply moral creature of God.

If he is notably trained in a field of specialization, has sufficient understanding of other fields of knowledge to be self-educative, has developed habits of critical thinking, can communicate with logic and clarity, and is committed, on the basis of his own value-judgments, to the democratic way, he will inevitably be a priceless asset to America. He will insist upon the maintenance and extension of liberty, regardless of what changes the waves of event may bring. He will insist upon shared power in political democracy, mutuality in human relations in personal democracy, and competition and a wide diffusion of responsibility in economic democracy. He will help to promote and harmonize the interests of agriculture, industry, labor, and commerce.

If there are enough of him—and we must see to it that there are enough—he will, in the words of Washington, "so develop the blessings of democracy as to recommend it to the applause, the affection, and the adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it."

Purchasing Value of the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a table showing the purchasing value of the dollar as measured by the consumers' price index. The table has been prepared by the Institute of Life Insurance.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Purchasing value of the dollar as measured by the Consumers' Price Index

[The January 1939 dollar=100 cents]

	Index
1820	214.6
1821	234.7
1822	219.3
1823	229.8
1824	248.1
1825	242.1
1826	256.1
1827	245.1
1828	243.1
1829	242.1
1830	261.8
1831	251.2
1832	245.1
1833	251.8
1834	273.2
1835	293.1
1836	304.9
1837	194.6
1838	196.5
1839	198.5
1840	205.8
1841	204.7
1842	255.8
1843	273.2
1844	271.0
1845	261.1
1846	242.1
1847	242.1
1848	261.1
1849	276.2
1850	288.4
1851	293.6
1852	258.3
1853	219.3
1854	219.3
1855	211.0
1856	202.8
1857	202.0
1858	208.7
1859	222.7
1860	220.4
1861	220.6
1862	196.8
1863	165.0
1864	135.7
1865	128.9
1866	130.2
1867	136.4
1868	137.4
1869	143.1
1870	147.3
1871	154.6
1872	155.8
1873	159.0
1874	162.3
1875	168.4
1876	171.5
1877	174.5
1878	180.0
1879	182.8
1880	180.0
1881	173.3
1882	167.2
1883	177.6
1884	186.6
1885	191.6
1886	189.0
1887	189.0
1888	184.2
1889	184.2
1890	184.2
1891	189.0
1892	186.6
1893	191.6
1894	196.9
1895	196.9
1896	194.2
1897	191.6
1898	191.6
1899	188.0
1900	179.9
1901	175.4
1902	171.2
1903	168.4
1904	165.3
1905	165.3
1906	159.7
1907	151.3
1908	158.0
1909	158.0
1910	149.7
1911	149.7
1912	141.0
1913	143.7
1914	141.0
1915	139.7
1916	130.7
1917	110.6
1918	94.6
1919	83.2
1920	70.8
1921	82.4
1922	86.6
1923	84.3
1924	83.3
1925	81.2
1926	80.6
1927	82.4
1928	83.5
1929	83.9
1930	86.9
1931	96.6
1932	108.1
1933	112.8
1934	106.3
1935	102.7
1936	100.5
1937	96.3
1938	98.9
1939	100.2
1940	99.4
1941	94.5
1942	85.4
1943	83.8
1944	79.7
1945	78.5
1946	73.5
1947	65.0
1948	61.1
1949	[1] 59.1

[1] Based on 11 months' data

Sources: Bureau of Labor Statistics; Federal Reserve Bank of New York; National Industrial Conference Board; Institute of Life Insurance

Unemployment in the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we are very much concerned in the Pacific Northwest about the growing unemployment problem. The Oregon delegation in Congress has received a communication from one of the representatives of CIO labor in the Pacific Northwest dealing with this problem and I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION,
Portland, Oreg., February 24, 1950.

Members Oregon Delegation in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: An unemployment survey conducted by my office indicates that on February 1, 19 percent of the State's labor force was unemployed. Statistics obtained from maritime unions, including my own, reflect up to a one-third drop-off in work since 1947.

Since longshore and offshore employment in this State is closely related to our principal cargo item—lumber—my union has made a detailed inquiry into the situation in lumber at this time. We find:

1. British Columbia is cutting deeply into our Atlantic coast and California markets. The following table is revealing:

British Columbia shipments to California (in board feet):	
1947	None.
1948	7,879,611
1949	6,[illegible],679
British Columbia shipments to east coast (in board feet):	
1947	None.
1948	86,071,921
1949	323,125,459

By the end of 1949, British Columbia had taken over one-third of our markets on the east coast. The shipments, during the first 8 months of the year, amounted to 24.77 percent of the province's total lumber production. (Bureau of Dominion figures.)

When unemployment in west coast lumber and maritime industries is considered in the light, not only of the above but of the total volume of Canadian lumber exports to the United States in 1949, the outlook for 1950 is dark indeed.

Last year, Canada, according to the Commercial Bulletin of Boston (issue of Saturday, February 18), exported 1,637,500,000 board feet to the United States. That is a lot of lumber, and is roughly equivalent to the total shipments, both domestic and foreign, for the year from Oregon and Washington. It is also equivalent to 81 percent of Canada's total lumber production.

In job terms for Oregon-Washington workers, the British Columbia shipments to our east coast alone, in 1949, were equivalent to some 3,600,000 man-hours for woodworkers and 30,352 gang-hours (14 men to a gang)—work Oregon and Washington loggers and sawmill workers and Puget Sound, Portland, Astoria, Coos Bay, Longview, and St. Helens dockers did not get.

This represents something like a $1,800,000 wage loss for ILWU members—money they did not have to spend at the corner store.

Much of the lumber shipped by Canada to this country found its way into FHA building channels.

2. We find that some $4,000,000 in ECA funds were recently allotted Great Britain for the purchase of lumber. But out of the 87,000,000 board foot order which resulted, only 5,000,000 board feet went to our mills. Canadian mills got 82,000,000 board feet.

3. We find that Great Britain has just been issued an additional procurement order for $10,000,000 to cover purchase of some 122,-000,000 board feet.

If Great Britain is permitted to spend this money in Canada, our west coast woodworkers will lose some 1,584,000 man-hours and our longshoremen will lose between 14,000 and 16,000 gang-hours.

We have information showing that the British, in considering bids on ECA allotment purchases, discriminate against certain American ports. For instance, they refuse to consider bids from Eureka, Newport, and, in some instances, from Coos Bay, although American ships and vessels in the Pacific Coast European Conference place no restrictions against those ports. Since we have locals in all three ports, this matter is of direct concern to us.

4. We find that within the next 2 months, some 20 ships are slated to load lumber in British Columbia for our east coast, in addition to 14 ships so loading between November 3 and December 31.

Apparently not a single ship chartered for the recent British timber purchase was an American ship, although ECA regulations specify that 50 percent of the cargoes must be carried in American bottoms.

The loss of California and east coast markets to Canada is reflected in figures obtained from the Pacific American Steamship Association in San Francisco on intercoastal and coastwise vessels operating out of west coast ports. Of 150 dry cargo vessels operating in the intercoastal trade before the war, there are today only one-third that number. Coastwise carriers have declined from 30 to 12.

5. We find, also, that our markets in Japan, China, and the Philippines are a total loss.

In 1931 Oregon and Washington shipped 325,784,561 board feet to Japan; 314,475,323 board feet to China; and 2,120,870 board feet to the Philippine Islands.

Last year, only 5,941,936 board feet went to Japan (of which only 22,873 was from Oregon); no lumber at all went to the Philippines; and, after March, no lumber to China.

The employment loss for woodworkers and longshoremen, as reflected in the above figures, is some 7,704,000 man-hours for woodworkers and more than 60,000 gang-hours for longshoremen.

Were we exporting lumber to the Orient in the quantity in which it was shipped in 1931, Oregon and Washington longshoremen this year would be richer by more than $2,-000,000.

You know, of course, that the United States Bureau of Employment Security notes that when the unemployment is 12 percent and over, the situation is sufficiently serious to warrant consideration and remedial efforts at local, State, and possibly Federal levels.

It would appear that unemployment in many Oregon counties has reached the danger point, while American diplomats fail to deal realistically with the Chinese situation and while American tax dollars are used to boycott Northwest cargo items and to subsidize a foreign merchant marine.

The end effect of such a situation can only be to force down our American living standards, cause widespread labor unrest, force many businesses to the wall, and throw heavier and heavier burdens on the relief agencies.

In conclusion, I am urging you to (1) start a congressional probe into the ECA lumber deals; (2) move to restrict ECA lumber purchases to American mills; (3) sponsor an FHA requirement that all lumber used in FHA-financed homes be manufactured in the United States; (4) act to wall up the loophole in the ECA Act which permits cargoes in excess of the act to be carried in foreign ships; (5) urge removal of trade barriers with China; (6) extend credit to China, Japan, and the Philippines to purchase the products of our country.

Respectfully yours,

MATT MEEHAN,
International Representative.

Excise-Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington enjoys talking each week by radio with his constituents at home. The subject of war-created excise taxes was the subject of his talk on Monday, February 27. Because a good many citizens have requested copies of the remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the radio statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is HARRY CAIN in Washington, D. C., in your Nation's Capital.

On the 19th of January of this year it so happened that I was the Senator who offered a motion that the Senate ought to consider the merits of an excise tax reduction bill which has been quietly slumbering on the Senate Calendar since last June. This motion was vigorously debated but when the question came to a vote the motion was defeated strictly on party lines. The administration leaders, including the majority leader, Mr. LUCAS, and the Senate Finance Chairman, Mr. GEORGE, said they were sympathetic to repealing some excise taxes and reducing others but that it wasn't yet time to tackle the question. Since the motion was defeated a good many of us have been watching those who speak for the administration to determine when the time is right to get rid of taxes which are burdensome to you and which have outlived their justification and usefulness.

Last week Senator GEORGE, a very distinguished and influential Member of the Senate, spoke his piece in no uncertain terms. In doing so he spoke in opposition to what the White House wants done. Mr. GEORGE was simply speaking for himself but his voice is a big one and many Democrats and Republicans are hopeful that his recommendations will be followed, and quite soon.

Senator GEORGE came out definitely for outright repeal of the wartime excise taxes, excepting only those now levied on alcohol, gasoline and tobacco. He estimated it would cost the Government about $3,250,000,000 in immediate tax revenue losses but he predicted that about half of that gigantic sum would be recaptured by the Treasury as a direct result of the incentive given the businesses affected. The remaining loss, he

thought, could be made up by cutting Government spending. It is good to have a responsible Democrat reflect on this possibility isn't it, and by going all out to plug tax loopholes. Senator GEORGE appears to be strongly opposed to the administration's proposal to make selective cuts of around $600,000,000 in these wartime levies and to increase other taxes by any war excise tax loss. Senator GEORGE maintains that this would be nothing short of a cursory approach to a pressing and important problem and in his words "it would simply postpone a job we ought to do now."

The Senator stated publicly that the 1941, 1942, and 1943 increases were imposed chiefly to check consumer purchases of war-scarce commodities and services. That need passed after the war but the excises stayed on. Nearly all of them have a present-day repressive effect on business. The Senator thinks that these taxes can't be handled selectively and that the Congress ought to be wise enough and bold enough to make the cuts now. Whenever the good Senator gives the word—for either he or Senator LUCAS controls the green-light go-ahead signal—I can think of 42 Senators on the opposition, or Republican, side of the aisle who will cry "hooray" and vote to eliminate the taxes.

For the next few minutes I want to talk with everybody about these taxes and about what they are doing to our economy and to your happiness and education. Everybody must be interested in the subject because the taxes in question are of basic concern to housewives, industrialists, members of labor unions, farmers, little-business men, big-business men, landlords, tenants, veterans, businessmen, and in fact every man, woman, and child in America.

Many of these taxes were in existence long before the war, but were raised substantially as a wartime measure. The war has been over for nearly 5 years, and the promise your Government made to you to repeal these taxes at the war's end was and has been broken. We are still paying a 20-percent admission tax on amusements, 20 percent on furs, 20 percent on jewelry, 20 percent on luggage, purses, toilet cases and handbags; 20 percent on cosmetics; 15 percent on transportation; and 25 percent on telephone and toll messages, telegraph, cables, or radio messages.

As an example of the regressive effect, which almost holding back of these taxes on business, the fur industry in Washington State is suffering badly. Those contemplating the purchase of fur coats are waiting in the hope that in the near future the tax will be repealed. As a result, business is falling off; many employees, both of the manufacturers and retailers of furs, are being reduced to a part-time work basis, if they have not been laid off entirely. Obviously, this goes far deeper than forcing the ladies, or their husbands, to pay an additional 20 percent on the retail price for furs. By depriving the industry of its normal expectancy of business, it radically imperils the industry itself as well as the income of its employees.

Strong pressure, which certainly I approve, is now being exerted on the Congress to repeal the amusement taxes, especially those affecting that great segment of the American public, rich and poor, who rely on the movies as a wholesome type of entertainment which the family can enjoy together. A 20-percent tax on a single admission is one thing for an adult; it is quite another if it is a youngster who strives to save his pennies for a Saturday movie. It is also a serious thing to the parents of large families, especially in the light of what is left of the father's take-home pay after deductions.

Taxing the movies and circuses, the only form of recreation many people in rural areas have, the levy is against the poor man's entertainment and the pleasure of children. It is, in part, responsible for the decline of theater attendance. In failing to distinguish between low-priced suburban or country movies and the big, high-priced, first-run city theaters, an injustice is worked on the masses, the laboring people, the women, and the children.

The levy of taxes also on admissions to agriculture fairs, again hits the great mass of the people, both rural and urban, and in addition indirectly puts a tax on the education of farmers who use this medium for the exchange of ideas and for an opportunity to learn progressive methods of operation and procedures, from one another, and from the industrial exhibits of new farm implements and machinery.

As applied to the legitimate theater, musical concerts, and operas, the tax on admissions places the United States in a position of taxing an industry that other nations have traditionally considered a proper subject of state assistance. In this country, our great symphony orchestras, large and small, are made available to more people who love music, because they are subsidized by civic-minded private citizens in the various communities, otherwise, the price of admission would of necessity be beyond the pocketbooks of a large majority of the people. There is not one symphony orchestra in this country today which does not owe its existence to the loyal financial support of those who have the heart and the money to furnish private subsidy to orchestras in order that those on limited incomes may enjoy fine music. The 20-percent admission tax which every ticket buyer must pay, only adds to his burden as well as to that of the many others who not only give generous sums each year in support of symphony and philharmonic orchestras over the land, but buy their admission tickets as well.

The admission tax was established under the Revenue Act of 1917. It was uniformly set at 1 cent for each 10 cents, until it was raised to 1 cent on each 5 cents by the Revenue Act of 1943. Previously there had been some exemptions, which ranged as high as $7 between 1928 and 1932. There are no such exemptions now.

For the fiscal year 1948 the tax on general admissions alone brought in a revenue of $383,626,814. Added to that exacted on leases of boxes or seats, ticket broker sales, admissions to cabarets and roof gardens, and similar forms of entertainment, and club and initiation fees, $464,127,037 flowed in an unending stream into the Treasury of the United States in 1948 from your pockets.

The excise tax of 20 percent on leather goods, trunks, handbags, suitcases, etc., was a wartime tax adopted in 1943 as a wartime conservation measure. It puts all leather goods in the category of luxuries. I do not argue with the stand that some of the expensive ones are, but the average shopping bag, woman's purse, school bag, or suitcase is an essential.

They can in no way be considered articles of adornment, as is jewelry, for instance. It has never been made clear why these articles should be taxed when women's gloves and hats have escaped. There has been a tremendous protest both from the consumer and the industry against what both claim to be unjust and unjustified. Certainly the effect on the industry as a whole is regressive and repressive, cutting production sales and employment.

The excise tax on the transportation of persons was clearly a wartime measure designed partly to help dissuade civilians from further burdening the already overcrowded public carriers engaged in the movement of troops or other personnel essential to the wartime effort. The levy is now a sales tax upon an essential service that is not a luxury and has to be used repeatedly by a large segment of the population. It is also discriminatory against certain sections of the country far removed from the large centers of the population. Especially does this apply to us in the far West. It discriminates against us because persons in the East who under normal circumstances would be willing to pay the increased fare to say the Northwest, as compared to that of the Northeast, cannot meet the added expense of the tax which increases proportionately with the fare—a sufficiently added burden to cause the traveler to choose the Northeast instead for his vacation and travels.

The increased excise tax on telephone, telegraph, and radio messages was also a wartime measure. The most inexplainable thing about this tax is the rate. If one goes to a night club or buys a piece of jewelry, he pays a 20-percent tax. If he uses public transportation on a vacation, he pays a 15-percent tax, but if he makes a long-distance call, business telephone call, or sends a telegram, he pays a 25-percent tax. This is a tax imposed on business and social necessity, and is based on no sound principle nor has it a justification in peacetime. Certainly these cannot be considered luxuries. They discriminate against businesses which have to make frequent use of our communication services. Like the transportation tax, it also discriminates against sections of the country far removed from the centers of the population, again, included in the far West.

As to the tax on cosmetics and other toilet preparations, I am sure there isn't a woman listening to me tonight who won't agree with me that they have been articles of everyday use, and by custom a virtual necessity. Certainly they are to any woman who wants to hold her job and, shall we say, her man.

One last comment; the administration will oppose the "bold and wise" and immediate tax cuts which Senator GEORGE has so honestly recommended. The reason is simple: war excise taxes are easy to administer, they are collected automatically, and they provide large sums which the insatiable spending appetite of the administration demands.

This reason won't prevail once the question is debated by the Congress. The taxes will go at the first voting chance. A promising prediction, isn't it? Your job then is to continue to needle your Congress to do what a majority of its Members want to do for you.

Until next week at the same time this is HARRY CAIN saying good night and good luck.

Danger From Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by Mr. John Temple Graves, a leading southerner, orator, and writer, before the National Automobile Dealers Association, in Atlantic City on February 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our danger at home isn't the march of communism, it is the creep of socialism. Into our schools and colleges, conditioning minds like those of Alger Hiss, Judy Coplon, Elizabeth Bentley. Into our government, telling it to play God. Into our literature and the philosophies of our men of good will. Into our American spirit, persuading us to play safe and ask a security that is gone with the bomb. Into our morals, saying right and wrong are subject to change without notice. Into our churches, telling us the angels in heaven have left wings only.

The soft under belly of America for Communist attack is this creeping socialism.

A Socialist is a Communist who doesn't know the facts of life. He thinks you can be sweet and nice about it, pass around the civil liberties, be law abiding, let the people rule, and all that. But you can't. Russia knows and Britain is learning. You can't play God and be subject to the whims of a legislature and periodical votes of the people. Sooner or later, as a practical matter, you have to do it the Russian way, with a dictator and policemen.

There are many kinds of socialism now. In Europe there are national socialism, Christian socialism, democratic socialism, Soviet socialism. In this country we have the regular Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party. And lately, for the first time on a national scale, we have developed what may be called tax-spend-elect, or Pendergastian socialism.

The Pendergastian Socialist is cynical. He doesn't care for socialism, but he doesn't mind. He brings it about in course of handing things out. He gets his name from a political machine which flourished once in Kansas City. Some of the people in that machine are dead, some are in jail, and some have moved to Washington.

Tax, spend, elect, works. We have seen that, and are seeing it now. Only three things can stop it. One is bankruptcy. One is the full socialism to which it leads. The third is visibility of taxes. When taxes become visible as a burden, people begin to complain. The golden goose begins to squawk. They are complaining this year. A $5,000,000,000 deficit is a pretty visible thing. No wonder our tax-spend-elect Socialists want to reduce excise taxes and up taxes on business. The public can't see business taxes. Not right away.

A party line for America, it seems to me, is a line in two parts. A part against too much government and a part against government too far from the governed. Antistatism and State's rights—they are two faces of the same coin.

We need a lot of government these days, far more than 50 years ago, or, perhaps, even 15 years ago. Few dispute it now. The true issue is whether you recognize a danger point in too much government or whether you "pooh-pooh" the idea, call it a red herring out of selfish interests and say, What is statism, anyhow? Whether we have passed the danger point yet is something on which we may honestly disagree. But I don't see how anyone who believes in the free way with which we made this Nation and have lately won two wars at once on two sides of a planet can refuse the fact that there is a point in government controlling, spending, and taxing beyond which you can't go and have (1) democracy, (2) solvency, (3) incentive to work, or (4) incentive to enterprise and invest.

Democracy and too much government are incompatible. So are democracy and government too far from home. We knew that when we threw King George's tea in the water at Boston, government too far from the people governed is government that doesn't understand, government that doesn't have the sympathy of those governed, and, therefore, government that must operate more and more through force bills and police.

We talk of civil liberties, and it is precious talk. In my part of the country we need to talk and practice it more, and we are learning. But the most civil of all our civil liberties is the liberty to be governed at home on problems peculiar to us at home. Some call this home rule, some local self-government, some cross-roads democracy. In the South we use the quaint name of States' rights.

God is not mocked by our God-players of today. Still He confuses their tongues as in days of Babel, whether they play through a big government, a big business, or a big labor union. In big government we call the confusion bureaucracy. It isn't in my Bible, and my preacher didn't tell me, but I suspect that when the children of Israel had built the Tower of Babel so high that it began to invade heaven and play God, and when the Lord had decided to topple the tower over and had already confused the tongues of the builders so that they were making noises like many a one that has come out of Washington these 18 years, I suspect that at that very moment they found on top of the Tower of Babel a little fellow with horn-rim glasses and a Harvard accent, shooting rules and regulations at all of heaven's stars and bombarding all creation with questionnaires, each to be answered in triplicate. He was the first bureaucrat, on top of the first thing that got to be too big and tried to play God. His tribe has increased.

They are the two freedoms of 1950. Freedom from too much government. Freedom from government too far from home. Enough Americans believe in them to make a majority, if those who believe can be put together, and put to work. Already they make a political party. It is a party without a name and without an identified leadership, but its roots are in all the grasses of this green land, and sooner or later it is going to express itself not only in the Congress but in great realinement under our two-party setup.

Totalism is incompatible with our American set-up no matter who runs it. Total government, total business, and, especially now, total organized labor. Wisely we have passed laws against combinations in restraint of trade, but never in our history have there been such combinations in such restraint of so much trade as those over which John Lewis and several other labor leaders are presiding over. We exempt labor from the law because we say labor is not a commodity, and it isn't. That is a core principle of American being. But it begins to be a question whether we, the rest of the people, are a commodity, to have our economy crushed like a crate of eggs at the bat of a bushy eyebrow. The only solution is the simple solution. It is to include these Nation-wide totally organized unions in key industries in the operation of our antitrust laws, as Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia, is proposing.

Not by votes alone, or speeches alone, or even by understanding, is our American philosophy of freedom to be saved now, it seems to me. It depends at last on American character, individual character. Our free enterprise depends on Americans who, in character, are fit for their freedom and full of the enterprise. You don't have to have character to be a Communist. You just memorize the party line, and take care not to deviate lest you liquidate. You don't have to have character to be a Fascist. You just march along in ranks, singing your song, wearing your silly feather or cap or button or Ku Klux Klan regalia, overcome by somebody else's false emotions. But you do have to have character to be free and self-governing in the most intricate and dangerous world that ever was, with Russia and the split atom to be lived with.

I believe our people are seeing it. I believe they are looking to a great renaissance of individual character, in public life and private. I believe, for example, that they are going to reelect Senator TAFT in Ohio next November not because he is a Republican, not because of the Taft-Hartley law or his foreign policy, but because they are bewitched at the spectacle of this not at all bewitching gentleman who nevertheless, has the courage and honesty to ask election for what he thinks is good for his country, rather than with wanton promises to put together a winning combination of pressure groups.

The character to be honest and brave and to resist hand-outs and to assume responsibility and, most of all, the character to be insecure. Roosevelt told us in 1933 that all we had to fear was fear itself. I think that was true in 1933. But it seems to me that what we have to fear in 1950 is unwillingness to live fearfully, to take chances, to accept a life of profit and loss, ups and downs, danger and change.

We can live fearfully like this, I think, only if somehow we have the balances and assurances and serenities of a faith in things eternal. Such a faith is suggested now, not challenged, by physical science. The splitting and fusing of atoms takes us to the limits of the physical world. It takes us to a dim edge where there is some other world. It takes us to a place where physics turns to metaphysics—and mathematics touches God.

1949 Progress in the Tennessee Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James P. Pope, director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, before the Athens Kiwanis Club at Athens, Tenn., on February 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1949 PROGRESS IN THE TENNESSEE VALLEY

The chairman of your program committee has requested that I talk to you about TVA today. Since this is a rather large subject, as you know, I think it would be well for me to limit it to the progress of the Tennessee Valley during the last year. Progress has continued on all fronts and in some respects it has been very rapid as, for instance, in the field of rural electrification. The construction and installation of new generating facilities by TVA have also gone forward rapidly during the year.

Private enterprise has prospered and advanced throughout the region. Production has increased generally, both in agriculture and in industry. Interest and activity in the location of new industries have grown during the year. And some major developments, such as the proposed Oak Ridge expansion and the Air Engineering Development Center near Tullahoma, have been assured. TVA construction has included rapid progress on the New Johnsonville steam plant. And an announcement has recently been made of the location of another large steam-plant site at Widow's Creek in northern Alabama.

Nineteen hundred and forty-nine has been an important year in the development of the valley along all lines—not only in those just mentioned but in navigation, flood control, and conservation. During the year there was celebrated the planting of the two hundred millionth tree as well as the furnishing of power to the millionth customer.

The records disclose that there was substantial progress in traffic on the Tennessee River, with 470,000,000 ton-miles being carried. This was an over-all increase of 6 percent in ton-miles of traffic over 1948. The increase in 1949 was more than 46,000,000 ton-miles over the volume of river traffic in 1948. And the 1949 traffic volume was over 219,000,000 ton-miles more, or over 85 percent greater than 1945, the first full year of operations in the completed river channel.

These traffic increases apply to all commodities, with the principal exception of coal, during the year. The decrease in coal shipments was due to strikes and to the fact that TVA used less coal last year because of heavy rainfall and a good supply of water in the river. As to some important commodities the increase is remarkable. Steel shipments, for instance, increased 1350 percent over 1948. Petroleum products increased 10 percent, grain 75 percent, coke 80 percent, and automobiles 36 percent. Savings to shippers on last year's river traffic, although final calculations have not yet been made, are expected to be substantially larger than those in 1948, which were about $4,000,000.

As to flood prevention during the year the record is good. There was no flood damage of consequence either on the Tennessee, the lower Ohio, or the lower Mississippi Rivers. While there were no major floods during 1949 comparable to those in the three preceding years, the holding back of waters in the two lesser floods in the valley saved Chattanooga about $860,000 in damage. And the reduction of flood crests on the Ohio saved an estimated damage of some $200,000. These savings of over a million dollars in 1949 are worthy of mention, although not comparable to savings in past years which have totaled over $40,000,000 at Chattanooga alone.

It is of current interest that the crests of the recent floods on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers were so reduced as to make it unnecessary to blast open the fuse plug levee of the Birds Point-New Madrid floodway in southern Missouri—according to the joint statement of the United States Army engineers and TVA. The Kentucky Reservoir held back large quantities of floodwaters in accomplishing this result. This saved millions of dollars in flood damage in the floodway where 12,000 people live.

It requires no argument to convince the people along the Tennessee, and the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers of the tremendous value of flood control on the Tennessee. They know its great value. They also know the large value of the all-year-round navigation on the Tennessee River. And yet one still hears in other parts of the country from those who serve the interests opposed to TVA that navigation and flood control provided by TVA are of little value—that they are really camouflages for the power development.

The fact that these contentions were made by the private power companies in numerous suits testing the constitutionality of the TVA Act, and that the courts held them invalid does not seem to deter the same interests from repeating the arguments outside the valley region. The contention is still made that TVA is primarily a power agency. But the fact is that the generation of hydropower is subject to the use of the river for navigation and flood control. The navigation channel must be maintained at a 9-foot depth and floods must be dealt with as they come. If it becomes necessary to spill water to serve these purposes, it is done regardless of the effect it has upon the production of power. Large amounts of water are sometimes spilled as has been the case within the last few weeks. Flood conditions may, and generally do, cut down the amount of water that can be used for generation of power.

In spite of these conditions, however, TVA has become the largest integrated power producer in America. It produced last year over 17,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours which was 11 percent increase over 1948. Its installed capacity was increased during the year by 258,000 kilowatts, and its transmission lines were increased by about 300 miles. Its gross revenue from sale of power was increased by $9,200,000 and its net income by several million dollars.

The most striking advance was made in the field of rural electrification. Of the 127,000 new customers served, 92,000 of them were rural consumers. Most of the 17,000 miles of new distribution lines were rural. The percentage of electrified farms increased from about 55 percent in 1948 to 70 percent in 1949. Now about 300,000 of the 425,000 farms in the TVA area are electrified and rapid progress is being made in reaching other farms. The estimated savings on power bills of the million TVA customers were about $33,000,000 last year compared with average rates on the Nation.

This progress is very well illustrated by last year's record of operations of your city of Athens. This system built 28 miles of new rural lines, increased the number of customers served 27 percent and the amount of electricity furnished them 34 percent. The number of urban customers was increased 6 percent and the amount of electricity used in the city was increased 19 percent. This is a fine record and your power management deserves commendation.

In the field of farm and forest conservation steady progress was made during the year. Research has gone forward at the Muscle Shoals laboratory and plant principally with reference to new fertilizers. Various combinations of fertilizer ingredients are being tried out. For instance, pilot plant studies during the year were successful in producing dicalcium nitrophosphate containing both nitrogen and phosphate. Tests and demonstrations of new fertilizers are being made on actual farms. The increase of cover crops and decrease in row crops are continuing. More and more winter cover crops are being planted. About a million acres of land have been shifted in the last 15 years from row crops. The valley is greener this winter than it was last winter.

No better illustration of what is going on in soil conservation and farm management can be found than that of Mr. Rex Moses here in McMinn County. Since 1940 Mr. Moses has been a TVA-Extension Service test-demonstration farmer on his 162 acres of land. In 1940 he had a dairy herd of 6 cows and 7 other cattle. By 1948 he had a dairy herd of about 24 milkers and 25 heifers and other cattle. With diversification on the land, with application of fertilizers, and with good management, Mr. Moses has built up his land, his production, and his standard of living. He has built a new home with modern electrical conveniences, a new garage and smokehouse, a tool shed and workshop, a modern dairy barn, and other new buildings and improvements. Every year this farm is improving; it was better in 1949 than in 1948.

The work in forestry conservation is going forward. About 15,000,000 new trees were planted last year, reaching the two hundred millionth from TVA nurseries since the program began. Most of these were planted on private lands by the owners. Thousands more acres of timberlands were brought under adequate fire protection and more forestry demonstration tracts were added last year. Again we have an example of such progress here in McMinn County. Almost 100,000 new seedlings were put out on the lands in the county last year. The total that has been set out in the county since the beginning of the program is almost 5,000,000.

Malaria control has gone ahead rapidly. Fifteen years ago, when the program began, about 30 percent of the people in the malarial sections were infected. Now less than one-tenth of 1 percent are infected in the areas along the reservoirs. Preventive measures of all sorts have proceeded during the year.

Recreation developments, particularly along the shores of the lakes, have gone forward rapidly during the year. Investments along the shore line have increased about $3,000,000. Gross incomes from business enterprises on the lake fronts increased during the year something like $200,000. Incomes from commercial fishing jumped about $50,000 last year. It is estimated that the total tourist income for the Tennessee Valley area was about $175,000,000 in 1949.

Industrial development of the area stands high in the record of valley development. In addition to the Oak Ridge expansion and the Tullahoma project, supplies of natural gas are being provided; the research project at the Redstone Arsenal at Huntsville, Ala., is assured; the Reynolds Metals Co. at Sheffield is making a large expansion; an important paper industry by du Pont is being established at Pisgah, N. C.; two large, new companies have located plants at Elizabethton; a Quaker Oats plant is being located at Chattanooga; and other large industries are planning or investigating locations in the region. The Redstone Arsenal project is being moved from Fort Bliss, Tex., and will employ about 1,100 scientists. These are some of the larger industrial developments and projects. Many smaller private enterprises are similarly interested.

These are some of the reasons why we can call 1949 a banner year in the history of the Tennessee Valley development. And this is attracting the attention of people all over the world. The number of visitors to the TVA projects last year increased 1,100,000—from 5,000,000 to over 6,000,000. They came from almost every nation in the world, as well as all the States in this Union. Hundreds of them are distinguished visitors, ranging from technical men to the chiefs of states. Many of them report to us that they are planning similar developments in their own countries and in some of them such developments have already begun. Interest in the Tennessee Valley and its progress is world-wide.

A Frank Review of the Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "A Frank Review of the Hoover Report," delivered by Hon. James A. Farley, before the New York Press Association at Syracuse, N. Y., on February 10, 1950. It is a timely discussion of the Hoover report. Coming from Mr. Farley, with his long experience in government, I think the address is well worth reading by every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This country is composed of two kinds of people. One group believes that the Government can support all the citizens. The other wonders whether all the citizens can support the Government. I feel certain that all of us here tonight belong to the second group.

In an address early in January, President Truman said that on the basis of the growth of this country over the past 50 years we would in another 50 years have a national income of a trillion dollars. I have no doubt about his figures nor his expectations, but we can reach some frightening conclusions when we take the past 50 years as a measure of the increase of the next 50 years.

One of those conclusions is that if we take the cost of Government for 1900 and compare it with the cost of Government for 1950 and then figure the same rate of increase for the next 50 years, our Government would cost $8,000,000,000,000, or six times as much as the whole national income. On that basis, we would also have working for the Federal Government alone 20,000,000 men and women. The lesson of these simple figures is that unless we find some way of reducing the cost of Government it will soon grow so great as to consume not only everything that we all earn, but everything that we have all saved, and ultimately everything that we call property, which is owned by all of us.

This is a very sobering situation. And I think it is to the interest of every citizen to impress upon those whom he has elected to office the necessity that this increase in the burden of Government be checked, or we shall find ourselves living under a form of Government which is utterly different from that in which we were born and under which our forefathers built a great country.

This problem is not a political issue. It is an American issue, and every true American, regardless of party, owes it to himself to study it, understand it, and do something about it. It comes down to two questions. First, has our Government the capacity to control its own growth? Second, are those who are elected to office or who are running for office going to be able to tell the people the truth about what Government can do for them and what it cannot do for them?

The first part of my remarks will be about what is called the administration of government as it is. The second part will concern the broader question of what we ought or ought not to expect government to do. The first part deals with what was generally covered in the studies and the report of the great Hoover Commission which completed its work almost exactly a year ago. The second goes beyond that to the broad American question of what a government should be expected to do in our American civilization.

The Hoover Commission was created by Congress and appointments were made by both the Congress and the Executive. Its title was "The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government." It was composed of distinguished Americans, headed by our only ex-President, Herbert Hoover deserves the respect and gratitude of all Americans for this great undertaking. While some of us may have disagreed with him when he was President, and while we may disagree with some of his views, none of us can question his sincerity, his patriotism, and his vast knowledge of Government and public policies. He undertook this job at an age when most of us will be thinking of quiet retirement and when a great many of us will be passed from this earth. The job entailed as arduous a task as has ever been laid upon an American.

In the first place, the field that the Commission had to cover involved a study of public expenditures amounting to $40,000,000,000 a year. It reached into every corner of our vast governmental establishment. Mr. Hoover's part in it, moreover, involved the reconciling of the views of the 11 men who shared with him membership in the Commission. It meant a minute examination of thousands of pages of task-force reports on dozens and dozens of technical aspects of government. It involved questions of finance, military affairs, engineering, medicine, banking, agriculture, business, labor, science, personnel, and administration generally. It involved road building, electric power, hospital care, and foreign trade. It involved the relations of our country to many foreign governments, each of which presented a special problem of need and responsibility. It involved the conduct of our foreign affairs, with all of the vast world-wide ramifications that are covered by that service. Never, I venture to say, has any commission been invested with responsibility of covering so many subjects in such detail within the limit of time that was imposed upon this task.

All of this Mr. Hoover and his patriotic associates in this Commission took as a serious responsibility. They have given us in this report the distilled wisdom not only of their own knowledge and experience, but of the hundreds of people who assisted them. It is the solemn duty of every American citizen to take this report with the utmost seriousness and to cooperate, as the years pass, in bringing about the adoption of its helpful and excellent recommendations.

This Commission started with the premise that in Government, as in business, the heart of administration is control. If Government is to control as much of our lives as it does, then there must be some means by which we can control Government. It is also essential that if Government is to control us then Government must have the means to control itself.

One of the most startling things in this report is the fact that it proves pretty conclusively, I believe, that Government as now constituted has grown so fast, so great, with such haphazard methods, that it is actually out of control of the very people who are conducting its affairs. That means that, with things as they are, Congress lacks the real means of controlling its own expenditures, and the President himself lacks the means of controlling the very departments over which he has the constitutional responsibility of direction.

In discussing this question I cannot within the time assigned to me do very much except to touch on some highlights. It is a very long report and it covers a vast multitude of subjects. But a few of the subjects selected with care will illustrate what I mean by the lack of administrative control. Let us first look at two departments of Government that were created as a means of direction and control of expenditures. First is the Bureau of the Budget, and second is the General Accounting Office. I take these two because one is responsible to the President and the other is, technically at least, responsible to the Congress.

The Budget of the United States, as you all know, is a very large and complex document. It is supposed to be a means by which the President, through his Bureau, reviews of the needs and requirements of every department of government, and, after careful counting and pruning, presents to the Congress the requirements of government for the next fiscal year. With this before the proper committees of the Congress, it should theoretically be possible for the legislative branch of the Government, which, after all, is the spending and taxing authority under our Constitution—to decide for itself whether it will grant or whether it will deny those Executive requests. However, the budget over the years has grown so large that it is almost impossible by an examination of this printed document to determine with any degree of accuracy the real necessities of government and to eliminate those which, in the wisdom of Congress, can be dispensed with.

With reference to this budget and to the Bureau of the Budget, which creates it, the Hoover Commission had some very critical things to say. These criticisms were seriously regarded by the President, and to his credit it must be said that the budget presented last month represents a great improvement over the budget presented a year ago. It shows for the first time the cost of the various projects, set up in such a way as to indicate their total cost. Previously, the costs of projects were scattered under so many classifications that it was impossible to view any one as a whole and to measure its cost against its probable benefits. This is a step in the right direction, and the Hoover Commission can be credited with at least the beginning of a reformed budget.

The other great agency of control is the General Accounting Office, at the head of which is the Comptroller General of the United States. The Hoover Commission had some rather critical things to say about this agency of government. It pointed out that in its efforts to scrutinize enormously detailed expenditures of government it had loaded upon itself such a burden that it was almost impossible to fulfill other responsibilities which had been placed upon it by law. To express it briefly, the Comptroller General, in checking over every voucher and expenditure and in determining whether those expenditures were within the law, had in substance taken away from the executive department a responsibility which in every business must rest with the executive of that business. In an American business like the one with which I am associated, the general policies are vested in a board of directors. That board of directors then employs a president and other officers. In turn, the board of directors is elected by and responsible to the stockholders.

Under the operation of such a business, the executives—the president and his associates—set up a system of accounting which at all times provides for them a picture of what is going on in the business. The board of directors, in order to have a completely unbiased and impartial picture of the business over which it presides, employs an auditor, who goes over the books of the business from time to time and reports back to the board of directors. Thus, there is in business a distinction between accounting and auditing.

In our national system, the Congress can roughly be called the board of directors of our national business. The President and the executive departments are the officers, and the stockholders are all of us. Unlike ordinary businesses, however, in Government the functions of auditing and accounting are confused. The Hoover Commission proposed that they be separated, with the Comptroller General conducting auditing business for Congress and an Accountant General in the Treasury Department conducting the accounting for the President. It will take a long time to accomplish this change, but it is one of those essential necessities of control that we shall need, if we are to bring Government clearly within the pattern set by our own modern business methods of administration.

Another thing that business does—and if it doesn't do it, it soon goes broke—is to require a real accounting of property that is

owns. Such an accounting of Government property is not present in our Government, which owns something like $70,000,000,000 worth of personal property.

I have always believed in the principle of civil service. The intent was good when it was created, some 67 years ago. As it has grown, however, it has become to some degree a hindrance, rather than a help to good and efficient administration. It is too difficult in Government now to install the best sort of personnel, and it is too difficult to get rid of incompetent employees. The Hoover Commission proposes that the responsibility of selecting employees be decentralized and that the Civil Service Commission limit its activities to determining the standards under which Government employment shall be carried on by the departments.

One of the reports of the Hoover Commission tells an amazing story about the records that the Government keeps. It points out that the actual paper records of the Government, if all brought together in one place, would fill six Pentagon buildings. Under a more efficient method of record-keeping, about a third of this paper stuff could be thrown away and a lot of the rest could be moved out of Washington into less expensive quarters.

As all of you know, the Government has become one of the biggest bankers in the history of the world. It has innumerable lending agencies—the best known of which, of course, is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Hoover Commission makes some very clear-cut recommendations concerning these agencies. Their operations should be concentrated, and in many instances should be eliminated. Many of these lending agencies could very well be put into deep freeze and kept ready in case another depression comes along for a resumption of their operations. There is altogether too great a temptation, when Government money is being lent so readily and so broadly, to lend more than is necessary and to take from the private banks and insurance companies their responsibilities in this matter.

The Hoover Commission goes on farther and recommends a unification of Government hospitals, public health and medical research. It points out as an indication of great waste that at the time of its investigation there were in our Federal hospitals beds for 325,000 patients and that only 155,000 were occupied. Despite this fact that there was a surplus of 70,000 beds, Congress proceeded to make additional appropriations for 50,000 additional beds, at a cost of $1,000,000,000. President Truman cancelled out $300,000,000 of this program. That was some help.

The Hoover Commission made a very elaborate study of what we are doing in the way of conserving our water and our water power. It was found that there was a great deal of duplication there. A great rivalry exists between the Army engineers and the Reclamation Service, which has been a particularly economical conflict. The Hoover Commission recommended the unifications of these services, which would involve a saving of hundreds of millions of dollars.

One of the most serious tendencies in our Federal system is the effect to which the Federal Government, through grants-in-aid, is absorbing the obligations and responsibilities of our State governments. Three years before I entered the Federal service—that is, in 1933—the total of Federal grants-in-aid to the States was about $100,000,000. When I left the Government service this had risen to almost $900,000,000. I do not want to suggest to you gentlemen or anyone else that I had anything to do with this great increase. I was kept pretty busy with the Post Office Department during that time.

These grants did not increase during the 5 years of war and preparation for war. But after the war and over the past 5 years they have begun to go up at a much more rapid rate. The figure has more than doubled and, according to some estimates, will reach something like $2,000,000,000. These grants, of course, are not made in accordance with the amount of money taken out of the States. The Federal Government takes five times as much out of the State of New York as it gives back. We are a great State, and we are proud of our productive wealth. But we can hardly afford a continuation of this trend over a period of years. Nor can, in fact, many of the other States.

It may be true that the Federal Government has a proper responsibility to see that States that are unable to offer the essential services to their people should be helped by Federal grants. I am not sure, however, that these grants are disbursed on any such principle. The trouble under this system is that some States are getting more than they should and other States are giving more than they should.

The most vital part of this Federal-State relationship is that, if this thing goes on, the States will gradually give up all of their responsibilities and the Federal Government will absorb them. The result will be, not a Federal system such as was set up under our Constitution, but a centralized unitary government which can never fit the 48 individual requirements and special conditions of a country as broad as this one. The way to stop this trend is to restore to the States some of the sources of taxation that the Federal Government has taken over. Here again the Hoover Commission has some very constructive and important recommendations.

The danger in the extension of the personal income-tax system is that it becomes so easy to raise money through the Federal income tax that many other proper sources of revenue are overlooked and neglected. We must establish in this country equality of taxation. And that taxation ought to be distributed so that individual initiative and wholesome business growth will not be stifled by unwise methods of taxation.

I have been talking, so far, about the essential recommendations of the Hoover report, with a few examples. Now, as we all know, it is one thing to believe in good things and to recommend them, and another to get the recommendations accepted. Congress is under so many demands for the expenditure of funds that it finds it almost impossible to resist them. What is needed is that Americans be organized to put just as much pressure on Congress to save as the various pressure groups have put on it to spend. A start toward this has been taken since the Hoover report was issued. There has been established a national citizen's committee, the purpose of which is to support the recommendations of the Hoover report and to get them enacted by Congress and by the administration. State and local subcommittees have been created to assist in this in the various States of the Union. The efforts of this great national committee and of its subcommittees should be supported by all of us.

Up to this time I have been talking about administration, with particular reference to the recommendations of the Hoover report. I wish to make it clear that this was a nonpartisan, nonpolitical report and that its function was not to suggest the wisdom or the unwisdom of any of the activities carried on by the Federal Government. The determination of such questions becomes a matter of national policy over which Congress has final control. In short, the Hoover Commission takes things as they are and suggests, through methods of reorganization, the more efficient disbursing of existing services and a consequent lower cost. If all the recommendations of the Hoover Commission were adopted the saving would be considerable—perhaps more than $3,000,000,000. If some of the long-term recommendations were adopted, this sum might be increased over the years because of greater efficiency. All this, of course, would lighten our tax burden and help us to reduce the cost of Government and the danger of too much government.

I wish to note, however, that even if all these recommendations were adopted in the present year, we would still be running a deficit of $2,000,000,000 or more. This is not the way that a wise and thrifty country ought to be running its affairs. In time of prosperity we should be balancing the budget. A few dollars saved here and there are not going to do it, and we are not going to do it even if we adopted the most efficient principles of administration.

What we must do is to make a decision as to what should come first in the way of Government expenditures and then stop the increase.

I realize that, as President Truman pointed out, a vast amount of the present budget of more than $40,000,000,000 is required to pay the cost of past wars and the expenses of the present cold war. But, nevertheless, there can be savings in what is expended over and above military and foreign aid. I am not at all sure, moreover, that we cannot save on our military expenses and at the same time have adequate defense. I am not at all certain, moreover, that we cannot reduce our foreign aid to more reasonable proportions.

Beyond that, we are ignoring expenditures in the civil side of Government that should be carefully scrutinized by Congress. We must find some means of keeping our agriculture prosperous without involving a constantly increasing Government expenditure to pay for crops that should not be raised. I realize that such supports cannot immediately be taken away, but I think we all ought to find a means by which over a few years we can reduce the present staggering sum that we are giving for the support of one segment of our economy at the expense of other segments.

Before we undertake new and vast experiments in social services of various sorts, we ought to consider putting first things first.

These are matters that are not partisan. I have had enough experience in the National Government to know that in the scramble for congressional appropriations we cannot distinguish the energy of a Republican from that of a Democrat. The National Congress is a great body and I can count in its membership scores of warm, personal friends and fine patriots, but I sincerely feel that there ought to be much more of a spirit of national security, rather than of local urgency, in its activities. We have got to have men in Congress who look to the need for a sound national economy with a balanced budget, and a little less concern for what certain communities and particular departments are demanding. This is a national cause and it requires a national point of view.

For, as I said a moment ago, we cannot, if we expect to remain a great and growing Nation, indulge in an extension of the practice of deficit spending in times of great prosperity such as these. Our tax burden now is about all that we can support. An increase in our income taxes would probably yield less, rather than more, revenue. We must reduce our cost of Government, and we must reduce it even if some people get hurt in the process.

It will not profit any of us to be members of a Nation which is pursuing unattainable objectives and is employing unsound methods. The public welfare is the welfare of all of us, not necessarily each one of us. The public welfare is the welfare of our Nation. And in the face of that, our individual concerns should be subordinate. It is my hope that this principle may more and more occupy the serious attention of everyone faced with the responsibility of public office.

Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune discussing the attack made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] on the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS THE DUCHESS SAID—

The Tribune must confess that it is more flabbergasted than convinced by Senator HUMPHREY's sudden entrance into the arena of Government economy. It is hard to believe that HUMPHREY really wants to slay the brute of Federal extravagance. One wonders, as he advances menacingly toward Ferdinand, if he will not ultimately sit down and sniff the pretty spending flowers with him.

The Senator wants to abolish the joint congressional committee on reduction of nonessential expenditures in the name of economy. He thinks the committee has been spending too much money, and that it serves no useful purpose. It occurs to HUMPHREY that the interests of Federal economy could be excellently served by liquidating an agency which has been vigorous and constant in promoting the interests of Federal economy. To us this is a good deal like recalling the fire department because it has been using too much water putting out the fire.

The joint committee which HUMPHREY wants to scuttle is headed by Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia. BYRD is the foremost spokesman for economy in the upper House. Year in and year out, he has kept up a steady assault on Federal waste and extravagance. Far from being an irresponsible and superficial spokesman, he is always careful to buttress his case with facts and figures. Thus we recall one report of BYRD's joint committee which cited more than 900 cases of overlapping and duplication in the Federal Government.

This committee preceded the Hoover commission on reorganization, and its efforts have been devoted to much the same good end. Considering its cost (HUMPHREY indicates total expenditures of around $350,000 to date) it is about as cheap a fiscal watchdog as can be imagined. If the Byrd group were to be dissolved tomorrow, the whole cause of Government economy would suffer. It would be about as dreary a piece of pennywisdom and pound-foolishness as Congress could devise.

When HUMPHREY attacks the Byrd committee for extravagance, we think that Minnesotans are entitled to a few polite snickers. A comparable absurdity would be Senator BYRD rapping HUMPHREY for being too niggardly with Federal funds, or Mr. Truman demanding the abolition of the Democratic National Committee because it was pro-Truman. The logic is awry; the pieces do not fit together; the part that HUMPHREY plays is strangely out of keeping with many of the scenes that went before.

If Minnesota's junior Senator wanted to end the life of the Byrd committee—period—we could understand it. There would be no mystery at all in that, for HUMPHREY would then be reaffirming a familiar theme, to wit, that Government spending is the lifeblood of the Nation, and that economy is a sort of measle-like rash upon the body politic.

But when HUMPHREY wants to scuttle the Byrd committee on nonessential expenditures for the sake of economy, we are completely bewildered. The mystery, though, may be dissolved in time. As the Duchess sagely remarked in Alice in Wonderland, "Tut, tut, child, everything's got a moral if only you can find it."

Communists in Government Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix a portion of a radio broadcast made over the American Broadcasting Co. network last evening, March 2, by the radio commentator, Mr. Jack Beall.

This distinguished veteran newspaper writer and radio commentator, substituting for Mr. Elmer Davis on this program, is known as a fact-getting reporter and news analyst. His observations in this excellent analysis of one of the most controversial subjects of the day should be of interest to every citizen of this country. I respectfully commend it to the attention of every Member of the Senate and the House.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Truman's conference yielded more news today. He came out with a statement which backs down a bit from his previous declarations about the McCarthy probe of the State Department Communist situation. Previously Mr. Truman indicated he would resist the effort of the Senate subcommittee in seeing the files. Today he said he is perfectly willing to cooperate with the subcommittee in furnishing information. Mr. Truman patted himself on the back for being the only one in the Government who has taken any concrete action against the Communists—a thing which would seem astonishing to anyone who remembers his repeated statements of "red herring" when congressional committees, and even the Department of Justice, were conducting hearings and trials of Communists or their sympathizers. But the swing-about today, in attitude, would indicate that the President had taken sage counsel from his supporters in Congress, who do not wish to have any clear-cut political issue develop on the subject of administration softness toward the Communists, who may still be in the Government.

It was extremely interesting to learn today that the State Department has acknowledged to Senator KNOWLAND, of California, that 257 loyalty review cases had been pending in the Department for more than a year. It was explained that one of the reasons for the delay was that the FBI had asked for more information and clearer fingerprints on some, and that many of these cases were overseas.

In these days of State Department pouches going by plane and when no spot on the earth is supposed to be more than 72 hours away by air, the delay of a year on loyalty cases concerning people abroad representing our Government would appear to be very dilatory. With those still in this country the excuse is less, both from the standpoint of the individual and of the Government, in keeping them for more than a year on the suspect list. It would tend to bear out Senator MCCARTHY's claim that not too good a job has been done of cleaning out the State Department.

If there is one thing that should be settled doctrine by now, it is that no Communists or Communist sympathizers have any right to employment by the very Government they are striving to overthrow and defeat. They may have a right to other jobs, but not to Government jobs, and particularly not to Government jobs in a sensitive agency like the State Department.

Federal Union for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Time Has Come," published in a recent issue of the Nashville Tennessean. The editorial relates to the proposed Atlantic union. Editorials such as this one will do much to convince the public that, truly, the time has come.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TIME HAS COME

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee will open hearings next week on Senator KEFAUVER's bold proposal of last year that the signatories of the Atlantic Pact, along with other acceptable democratic nations, seek to form a federal union for world peace along the pattern set by the union of the Thirteen Colonies into the United States of America.

This idea has lost nothing of its force since the Senator placed it before Congress. It has, in fact, gained significant support. Nearly 30 Senators and Representatives have signed the bill.

The objective is world peace, a peace by law rather than precariously balanced power and variable sentiment.

Since Russia's conduct has thwarted the realization of the one-world vision inspired by World War II, Senator KEFAUVER wants to work at least for one free world, for federation of democratic and like-thinking nations.

The Senator's bill does not call for such a union. It merely authorizes the President to name delegates and call an exploratory conference with delegates of other nations to see how close they can come to agreement on the legal and governmental machinery of permanent peace.

Just as Bretton Woods explored the economic phases of international agreement as a necessary prelude to San Francisco, so would the Senator's conference explore all possibilities of this new and closer concept of federal union.

The Senator's proposal will not commit the country. It will cost us nothing but the trouble of learning where we stand and what our chances are of achieving the nucleus of peace.

Without ignoring the difficulties or advocating the creation of such an international union, the Nashville Tennessean thinks the trend of world events has made Senator KEFAUVER's concept sufficiently important to warrant prompt authorization of the exploratory conference by Congress.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most active and well-informed groups of air-minded individuals in the Midwest area is the organization known as the Flying Farmers of Prairie Farmer Land. It has been my pleasure to be identified with the Illinois wing of this organization, and I have found the members not only interested in aviation personally but gravely concerned over matters of national defense as well. At their State meeting, held on February 9 and 10, 1950, at the University of Illinois, in Champaign-Urbana, they endorsed unanimously a statement of policy on national defense worthy of consideration. For that reason I take the opportunity granted by the House to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include the text of their resolution, which is as follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Whereas we are now living in one of two diametrically opposed worlds, and

Whereas ours could be the weaker of the two if a serious mistake is made in our defense planning, and

Whereas such a mistake might bring national disaster, even to the point of subjugation by a Communist power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Flying Farmers of Illinois, do in regular convention assembled urge the Congress of the United States to take the following steps:

I

Amend the Armed Services Unification Act by adding a fourth member to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with said member representing the United States Marine Corps.

II

Empower the Navy to proceed immediately with the construction of a prototype aircraft carrier commonly known as a flush-deck carrier.

III

Establish once and for all the right of Congress to question either in closed or open hearing members of the armed services, and to guarantee to those questioned freedom from reprisals or punitive measures.

IV

Amend the National Defense Act so that it will clearly establish the right of each of the armed services to develop its own prototype weapon without fear of veto by the heads of the other two services.

V

Be it further resolved, That the United States Navy be urged to decommission the battleship *U. S. S. Missouri* and to use the funds thus saved to bring out of moth balls and recommission Essex-type aircraft carriers so badly needed in our defense setup.

Whereas it is important that Members of Congress be apprised of the thinking of their constituents: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That our executive secretary be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to each and every Illinois Congressman and our two United States Senators, and to such others as may be necessary to the end that the Congress, the military, and the executive branch of our Government may be fully apprised of our wishes.

BILL RENSHAW,
Executive Secretary, Indianapolis, Ind.
HARLAN WALKER,
De Kalb, Ill., Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

FEBRUARY 23, 1950.

Specifications for a Republican Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, there appears in the current issue of the Atlantic Monthly magazine an article entitled "Modernize the GOP—Specifications for a Republican Program," written by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. It has occurred to me that this article, being both interesting and thought provoking, might well be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I am sure all Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, will be interested in reading the article if they have not done so already.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MODERNIZE THE GOP—SPECIFICATIONS FOR A REPUBLICAN PROGRAM

(By HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.)

(A Yankee born at Nahant on July 5, 1902, HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., was educated at Middlesex School and at Harvard. He began as a journalist in the Washington bureau and then on the editorial staff of the New York Herald Tribune. After two terms in the General Court of Massachusetts, he was the only Republican to replace a Democrat in the U. S. Senate in 1936, defeating ex-Mayor Curley by a plurality of 142,000. He was reelected in 1942; went to Africa in the first detachment of American tanks with the British Eighth Army; then resigned his Senate seat to serve in Italy, southern France, and Germany. He was elected to the Senate for the third time in 1946, where his record stamps him as one of the strongest younger men in the party.)

The American political party, whether it be Republican or Democratic, is not an end in itself; it is significant only as a part of our two-party system. I believe the continuance of this system is absolutely essential to the United States, and that the system is in danger only when one party appears to be losing its hold. There is talk today of the realinement of the American parties, and in this talk the Republicans are too often labeled as conservatives and reactionaries. Some of them want to be, as is evidenced by the following letter published in the Wall Street Journal after the 1948 election:

"We have in this country two major political parties whose philosophies of government are becoming more and more identical with each succeeding campaign. * * * If the two-party system is to remain virile and effective, the Republican Party must * * * return to a position of unmistakable conservatism, dedicating itself to a determination not to compromise with New Dealism."

This opinion, in my view, is anchored to a dead past. It expresses a philosophy with which the overwhelming mass of Republicans disagree. It denies the spirit which gave birth to the Republican Party, and if this opinion prevails it will condemn the party to certain defeat.

We must have a program which is obviously good for the country, a program which can be stated in specific terms and which will put us back on a competitive basis with the Democrats. Such a program does not mean "me-too"; neither does it mean mere negation. Instead of scolding the darkness, let us light a lamp.

I propose to confine this article to a domestic program and shall begin with taxes—always a sensitive subject in March.

TAXES

We should inaugurate a form of tax reduction which will encourage the growth of new economic activity and will therefore, in the larger sense, be most advantageous to the Government finances.

SPECIFICATIONS

1. Republicans should support a change in the law relative to the taxation of corporations doing a business of less than $1,000,000 so that they could file their returns as a partnership. Practically all the activities of venture capital start as small businesses. This would provide a powerful lift to the little man with a bright idea who is fundamentally the source of new jobs and new wealth.

2. Penetrating analysis—on a more purposeful and optimistic basis than has ever been undertaken before—should be given to the revision of our tax laws so as to reward those businesses which lower prices, increase production, stabilize employment, and keep their people at work even though they are old. A method should be worked out to ease the taxes on young people who are starting new business ventures. There has been a defeatist attitude about this type of incentive taxation—as distinguished from punitive taxation—which should cease.

CIVIL RIGHTS

To be true to our traditions we should embark on a realistic civil-rights program. This is a field in which the Democrats will always be weak, faltering, apologetic, and divided. It is a field in which we can be vigorous, effective, and bold. We can no longer tolerate the idea of having second-class citizens in this country, and the Republican Party must be the party to bring this truth home. To do so would be in the clearest possible Republican tradition. We were born as the antislavery party and the party of civil rights at the time of the Civil War, and it would be foolish and grossly negligent for us not to seize this issue again.

SPECIFICATIONS

In our legislation for civil rights we Republicans work to:

1. Eliminate the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting for Federal officials.

2. Make lynching a Federal offense.

3. Extend the right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life to all citizens, irrespective of race, religion, color, or country of origin.

4. Insist on administrative action which would end racial segregation in the armed services as rapidly as possible.

5. Eliminate segregation in housing projects or in educational aid projects which are financed by the Federal Government. In both these fields the present administration opposed legislation which would have effectively blocked such discrimination.

These are moderate demands which are essentially public and civic. They do not impinge on private life. They are the minimum to keep modern government in harmony with the statement in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal," and with the mandate of the Constitution "to establish justice."

SOCIAL LEGISLATION

In the field of social legislation we must not try to outbid the Democrats, who, let it be noted, have not achieved satisfactory results despite all their talk and 18 years in office. There are unquestionably problems in housing, health, agriculture, and social security. We must accept the challenge of producing the best solution.

The men who fought in World War II have been impressed by the fact that, when war broke out, the Government took off its coat, rolled up its sleeves, and proceeded to do whatever needed to be done regardless of the conventional theories about too much government. Many of the veterans reason today, therefore, that if Government was such a useful servant in time of war, it had better be equally useful in time of peace.

This statement is all right as far as it goes. But it is not complete without stating that the reason for our great performance in World War II was the competitive system, which in peace had developed incomparable efficiency enabling it to produce wartime munitions at an accelerated pace. Even if we admit the premise that we must use the power of Government whenever it can be used efficiently, we must never carry it to the point where we destroy the free system which is the source of peacetime prosperity, the trump card of our national defense, and the foundation of political liberty.

We need to draw a line between what is good and bad in the field of social legislation.

Republicans should approach such legislation believing that the American competitive economic system is the greatest possible producer of material welfare but that, excellent though it be, it is not perfect. There are some chinks which it does not fill. If nothing is done about filling those chinks, discontent will grow until it endangers the whole system. I, therefore, favor social legislation to fill in the chinks, both as a matter of decency and humanity and in order to maintain enthusiasm for the competitive system.

This is a very different type of social welfare program from that which the Democrat Party has undertaken. The difference between the two parties would be as broad as the difference between what is wasteful and what is well managed, between what is controlled locally by public-spirited citizens or controlled centrally by political bureaucrats, between something which really serves the people and something which appears to serve the people but in effect aggrandizes the State. There are two aspects of social legislation which come close to the heart of every family: health and security for old age.

HEALTH

Here is an issue which the Republicans must meet in such a way that the sick will receive good medical care without lowering the standards of the medical profession, without depriving the patient of the choice of his doctor, and without creating a system which is so overwhelmed by goldbrickers and malingerers that the really sick cannot get proper attention. The specific problem, of course, is to ease the financial burden of medical care for the individual citizen who is neither a millionaire nor a charity case.

The administration would approach this problem by putting the doctor into a compulsory system and so forcing the community to run the risk of socializing the medical profession. This is dangerous. We can obtain the desired results if in our program we aim for these objectives:

SPECIFICATIONS

1. Take action which will increase the number of high-quality young doctors; with inducements so that they will practice in places where they are most needed.

2. Lower the cost of the hospital bill—such an important item in medical expenditures—by using public funds for hospital construction and for the maintenance of such hospital services as the care of the indigent on welfare rolls; the education of residents, interns, and nurses; accident rooms; ambulances—services which are now often rendered at much less than cost.

3. Provide free diagnostic clinics, including X-ray service, so as to catch the disease before it gets established.

4. Furnish periodic health examinations for all school children.

5. Provide expensive medicines and appliances free of charge.

6. Provide funds for research and experimentation in the field of voluntary health insurance. We need to determine the utmost possibilities of such private insurance schemes as Blue Cross and Blue Shield. Extensive study should particularly be given to schemes such as that suggested in the Ives-Javits bill, which is a clearly superior approach to that of the administration. Sixty-one million people are already covered by voluntary insurance and the number is growing. Private schemes have a much lower overhead than that which would exist if the Government were to operate them; in them the individual would receive more for his money. People who have chronic heart disease or other ills which are not insurable by orthodox insurance methods would be cared for by issuing to them Blue Cross or Blue Shield cards, entitling them to exactly the same benefits as regular subscribers to Blue Cross and Blue Shield.

These proposals are not only radically different from that which the administration is sponsoring; they are more sound and truly generous. We should work out procedures along these lines and then the amount of dollars to be appropriated for these purposes would be separately decided in the light of the need and of the state of the budget.

OLD AGE

Never before have we had so many vigorous old people in this country. Many of them are well and could be productive; none of them want to be a burden on their children. The fact that people live longer than they used to has resulted in a large group tragically described in the phrase "too old to work and too young to die." To react to this fact by saying that men over 45 are too old for industry—as some have done—is clearly inhuman and absurd. The majority party, judged by actual legislation, does not meet the issue broadly.

SPECIFICATIONS

1. The Republican Party should insist that the Government increase the coverage and amount of old-age and survivors' insurance. The bill which passed the House at the first session of the Eighty-first Congress does not go far enough. We have the word of the Secretary of Labor that today "social security gives an old couple only $41." This is obviously far too low to support even a frugal living standard in our cities where the cost of living for a couple is estimated at from $120 to $150 per month. It actually compels about one-tenth of all persons receiving old-age insurance benefits to get public assistance as well—to which, of course, they have never contributed. It constrains many persons to stay at work when they are not really fit to do so, thus defeating a prime purpose of old-age security. I propose an increase to be financed if necessary by raising the pay-roll tax by not more than 1 percent, so that an old couple would receive an average benefit of between $90 and $100 instead of the average of $40 in the present law and of $80 in the House bill. This change could give a couple who were credited with an average monthly wage of $300 a benefit of about $150.

2. We should also insist on making the coverage as broad as possible, particularly so as to cover the more than 6,000,000 farmers and farm workers who today are ineligible for social-security benefits. This should result in a more intelligent and truly constructive type of farm legislation and should ease public-assistance costs in rural areas where they are highest. I contend that the wider the coverage the better for the country.

3. Every individual should be entitled to tax exemptions up to a stated portion of his income for the purpose of investing in a bona fide annuity plan. This would encourage both individuals and employers to provide for supplementary pensions or annuities, chiefly through tax concessions. This is a point which is not covered by the House bill. Our tax system should be revamped so as to give corporations a wider latitude in the framing of pension plans to suit their particular needs.

4. The House bill does not sufficiently liberalize the eligibility requirements for the aged. If relief costs are to go down in the future, the eligibility requirements for old-age insurance should be reduced along the lines suggested by the advisory council of the Senate Finance Committee to the Eightieth Congress. Under the House bill, a man 65 years of age would have to work a minimum of 5 years before he could retire. Only workers aged 69 or over could retire in less than 5 years. Yet these are the very people who will keep relief costs up because their earning power is so low. The advisory council suggested that persons aged 62 or over be qualified for benefits after 1½ years of coverage and contributions, thus shortening the time they are on relief. Such a provision would be a vast improvement over the administration bill and would really—and not merely hopefully—help to decrease relief costs in the near future.

These changes are defensible on humanitarian grounds; they would also promote economy in Government—Federal, State, and local.

PRIVATE RESPONSIBILITY

The arrangements regarding old-age pensions which were agreed to last November by Steel are all but one on a noncontributory basis, which means that the worker has no personal rights in his pension.

The worker loses his pension if he moves away from his job. This is obviously bad for the worker, bad for business, unsatisfactory for the community, and a potential danger in case of war, when workers would be wanted for transfer to defense industries. Moreover, the agreement by the large industries to pay direct pensions outside of the Social Security System naturally creates a demand to have small businesses do the same thing, and many small businesses simply cannot afford to do so. Clearly, the progress of the pension movement should not become one more discouragement and one more obstacle to the prosperity of small business. On the other hand, pension benefits received from the Government-operated social security fund are on a contributory basis.

Worker contributions along with the contributions of industry have built up this fund on a share-and-share-alike basis. The recipient has a vested right in his pension and carries that right with him even when he changes his job.

The agreements that were reached with the big steel companies provided that industry should underwrite a guaranteed pension payment of $100 per month on the understanding that whatever amount the Government provided out of social-security payments would be deducted from the amount which industry has to pay. To the extent, therefore, that Government social-security payments are increased, the burden of industry is reduced.

This is not in conflict with the idea that the more that industry, working through labor and management, assists in developing the security of the citizen, the better. Industries which, for example, can progress toward an annual wage to their employees, or industries which will agree to keep their older employees on the job, are perhaps the most powerful forces working toward the enhancement of our private competitive economy. The more our private enterprise carries the load, the less the demand on the State and the more we enhance the private enterprise system. Wider coverage and larger amounts under social security make the citizen more mobile; his potential for production is increased. Under a system based on a contribution by the worker, taken out of his own production, the result actually is that private enterprise bears a larger share of the cost even though the payments are made in the name of the Government. The worker, too, is, in the most literal and truthful sense of the word, private enterprise.

SPECIFICATIONS

Republicans should start legislation which would, all other things being equal, give preference, so far as Government contracts are concerned, to industries which guarantee an annual wage to their employees. This will be an effective denial to the rather helpless reaction of the majority party that the only solution to all problems is the inevitable extension of government.

These recommendations taken together would mean a much reduced burden of old-age assistance (or relief) locally, which cost $250,000,000 more in 1949 than in 1948. There would be a consequent reduction in local and State taxation, since social security would be financed out of earnings. Instead of throwing people on charity, either private or public, when they were old, we would now insure that they would have a modicum of existence as a matter of right.

Writing in the New York Times for December 26, 1949, A. H. Raskin said that one out of every four Americans past the age of 65 is currently on relief and the cost of assistance is running nearly three times as high as it did in 1936. This is clearly not the best way to handle this problem.

We Republicans should say to the voter: We offer you social legislation without socialism, a welfare society without a welfare state; we offer you a self-executing, self-liquidating plan. We think the desire for security is normal and human and good, in war and in peace, and that we can have it without red tape, without bureaucracy, without governmental stupidity, without tariffs of opportunity, and without loss of personal liberty. We Americans have more better things than that in our history.

THE FARMER

Problems of the farm include another type of social legislation, and, to be fair, the majority party must be judged by its latest agricultural bill, which became law on October 31, 1949. This bill will not promote the best long-range interests of either the producer or the consumer because it is not soundly based on the premise that the farm must be related to human food, which is produced either directly for human consumption or indirectly as feed for animals. Without such a relationship the consumer is taxed twice—once when he pays his Federal tax, and again when he buys his food. This current agricultural act is also bad for the producer because obviously he cannot have the prosperity to which he is entitled without the existence of a prosperous market. It appears all too likely that this farm law, with its rigid price-support provisions, will have the end result of increasing agricultural surpluses which may rot before they can be eaten. It will add more speculative elements to the whole structure of agricultural economics and, by inflating the price of animal feed, will increase the cost of raising cattle so much that the average consumer will be even less able to buy meat, dairy products, and eggs than he is now. As this is written, complaints are arriving in Washington from farmers confirming the worst fears of those who opposed the administration's farm law. They charge that the so-called big-factory farms, raising speculative crops, are subsidized by Washington but that the small family farm, raising food for people to eat, is out in the cold.

Surely, this is not the only approach to the farm problem. The Republicans should, here too, offer a program which is radically different, sounder, and in the end more generous. We should say that the farm must be related to food; that we think of agriculture not in terms of Henry Wallace's "ever-normal granary," but in terms of the "ever-normal refrigerator;" that we think of the farm as a place which grows the things that people put in their refrigerators because they are the things which are good to eat—milk, cream, butter, cheese, eggs, lamb, pork, and steak. No bill has passed Congress in the lifetime of anyone reading this article which has done anything to make steak more plentiful or cheaper for the consumer, or to make the production of steak more attractive to the farmer.

SPECIFICATIONS

1. A first step would be legislation ending the discrimination against the family-type farmer who raises hogs, poultry, and cattle—human food; discrimination which is in the present law. We cannot end the system abruptly, but we can and should eliminate its flagrant defects and move gradually toward the new objective of farm for food.

2. Legislation giving automatic protection against the kind of market collapses which ruin food producers could inaugurate this farm-food relationship and be of immense benefit to producers and consumers alike. But Congress must not only start thinking of the farm in terms of food; the parliamentary alliances between food and fiber growers must also cease. Were such an approach made, the voter would be given the choice between a system which piles up unwieldy surpluses, wastes the consumer's substance, and defrauds the farmer; and one which, on the other hand, being soundly based on the mutuality of interest of the farmer and the consumer, produces a better diet for the American people and a richer market for the farmer. There must indeed be no pitchfork stuck in the back of the farmer—or the consumer. The solution I propose sticks no pitchfork in anybody's back.

3. Congress, as I have argued, should extend social security to cover farmers.

4. Help should be extended to the farmer to assist him in the procurement of capital equipment, and it would be sound policy to extend direct aid for maintenance and improvement of the quality of the soil.

5. Republicans should subscribe to the idea that a good agricultural program must be designed primarily to protect those who need protection when they need it; not those who do not need it. Above all, it must protect the national economy. If anyone is going to be favored by this type of social legislation, it is the small farmer—not only for his benefit but for the good of the whole.

6. Out of our surpluses we must see that food will get to those consumers who particularly need it, through school lunches and food-stamp programs.

7. New uses for farm products such as those being developed through chemurgy should be encouraged.

All these procedures and objectives would in time put farm legislation on a new, sounder, and eventually more economical basis than exists today. The size of appropriations would have to be determined in the light of the need and the state of the budget each year.

LABOR

Here Republicans should favor specific and prompt corrections of those clearly proven defects of the Taft-Hartley law which are causing immediate hardships and inequities. For example, a labor leader came to me the other day and said that in certain parts of the watch industry new assembly-line procedures are currently eliminating the jobs of certain craftsmen. But because of a quirk in the law the union cannot use strike action for the retention of these men on one of the new assembly-line jobs, should such action be deemed necessary by the union. Correction of such manifest imperfections may perhaps incur the displeasure both of those who wish to retain Taft-Hartley without change and of those who are satisfied with nothing short of total repeal.

In fact, the watch worker's problem may seem to be a minor matter, of consequence only to the watch worker. But the solution of his problem by specific legislation opens a way for intelligent legislative treatment of the whole labor problem.

Up to now this has been dealt with by the "omnibus" approach, which forces a vote on a single legislative package, containing many and divergent legislative proposals, some good, some bad, and labeled "all or nothing." This has resulted in the rank and file of labor and the public becoming the unhappy victims of extremists in the Democratic Party, in the Republican Party, in management, and in the labor movement. The watch worker's problem is also important because it illustrates how a group of workingmen can be compelled to wait unnecessarily, perhaps for a whole year, before "omnibus" legislation can be finally agreed to, pending which their particular and essentially simple problem cannot be solved. They, therefore, symbolize the many other groups who for no good reason are suffering from an "all or nothing" political approach to labor legislation. (Let it also be emphasized that the vital interests of the rank and file of labor are not nowadays exclusively centered in laws affecting unions, but are strongly affected by all things which pertain to economic security.)

SPECIFICATIONS

1. Republicans, accordingly, should favor a bill removing the present legal prohibition against negotiations on matters in which technological changes are involved so that the situation in the watch industry described above will be subject to the same type of labor action as applies in industry as a whole.

2. To the best of my judgment there are at least two dozen other specific defects, many of which would be corrected by Congress if they could be brought up in individual—not "omnibus"—bills. These should be acted on quickly and new defects should be corrected as fast as they come to light.

3. The rank and file of labor would also be directly benefited by specifications previously described in this article which aim to improve the worker's diet, foster his health, make secure his old age, and which, by stimulating progress toward guaranteed annual wages, would stabilize his employment.

These then are a few specifications for a modern republicanism. There are necessarily omissions, such as conservation, military affairs, and foreign policy, all of which may become issues between the parties, but have not yet done so. The specifications proposed in this paper are neither negative nor imitative and I believe that, regardless of party fortunes, they are good for the United States. With them, of course, goes the vital duty of the minority to act as a check on the majority by constant scrutiny and investigation.

Underlying the entire program is the urgent need for a balanced budget and its corollary, a stable currency. A dollar of constant value has always been necessary to the successful transaction of business; to the millions receiving checks from the Government the constancy of the dollar is a matter of economic life and death. Republicans should work faithfully and enthusiastically toward making possible a balanced budget by a definite date, following a dependable timetable. This would be based in part on putting into effect measures of the type recommended by the Hoover Commission for the elimination of overlapping and duplication in the Government—a job which we should be able to do better than the Democrats because we have no political machine to protect. It would be achieved in part by the tapering off of Marshall plan and similar expenses which has already been announced and virtually accepted by both parties.

No man can say that this program alone will elect a Republican administration. Such an achievement may well be beyond the power of any program. Also, the full Presidential program comes with the national convention in June of 1952. Success at that time will depend on the candidate and his traits as much as it will on a program. Success also depends on the extent of the desire to throw out those in power. Luck and the irresistible forces of circumstances also play a part.

When we consider the Democratic reaction to this program, we come up against the predictions of many seasoned Washington journalists that there will be no legislation of consequence at this session of Congress and that it is part of the smart politics strategy which is currently dominating national affairs not to legislate, but to keep all the glittering legislative goals intact so that the party in power will reap a harvest of votes at the 1950 election in anticipation of favors to come. Those who remember the vigorous efforts of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt to get Congress to act will note this difference and, perhaps, wonder at it. Clearly, the lack of constructive achievement in 1949 in such fields as civil rights, agriculture, and public health lends color to this journalistic opinion, however much we may deplore it.

If these observers are right, an issue arises between the parties which is in addition to the challenge which these clear and constructive specifications propose. The strategy of smart politics paints a picture of an administration making a cynical offer of political bait and thus raises the naked issue of sincerity, of responsibility, of achievement. This is an issue on which many a political campaign has been won in the past. But Republicans should not depend on administration shortcomings for success. We must press our own program—bold, different, practical, and constructive. Inspired by the beginnings of the Republican Party in the fight for human rights, we should press this program. We should do so because we believe that it will create a political climate in which the strength and self-reliance of the individual human being will grow and flourish. On this ground we will gain the victory because we deserve to win.

Hot and Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT A. MEYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, an old-time Hit Parade tune contains this refrain, "The song is ended but the melody lingers on." Now that the coal strike has been settled, President Truman, when he improvises at the piano, might well play that tune but change the refrain to "The coal strike is ended but my malodorous action lingers on."

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include editorial from the Washington Times-Herald which sets forth why President Truman might well paraphrase this refrain as suggested:

HOT AND COAL

Announcement that John L. Lewis and the northern coal operators have reached a virtual agreement is the big news today.

However, the failure to convict the United Mine Workers of contempt is one of the worst miscarriages of justice that has ever occurred in our courts.

KEECH IS BLAMELESS

And the blame for it rests completely on President Truman and his Department of Justice. The not guilty verdict returned by Justice Richmond Keech was the only one he could have found on the basis of the evidence presented to him by the Government lawyers.

But there was plenty of other evidence that could have been produced by the Government which would undoubtedly have given the judge something on which to make an effective decision.

Senator TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, coauthor of the law under which Truman belatedly and lamely has attempted to halt the coal strike, too late, has pointed out that the Government did not show the judge the 60 affidavits furnished it supporting the contention that the back-to-work order of John L. Lewis didn't mean what it said.

These affidavits state that presidents of various locals told the men the orders didn't mean what they said; that it was decided at local meetings that the members would not go back, disproving the claim that the strike is the result of individual action.

Anyhow, common sense tells anybody the violence and threats used to keep a number of miners from working were evidence that some central authority was directing the whole thing.

TRUMAN IS AT FAULT

Why weren't those affidavits used? Why didn't the Government attorneys carry on a more vigorous prosecution? There's only one answer that fits the pattern drawn by Truman.

Truman hates the Taft-Hartley law. He's tried to get it repealed and failed. So he's going to do everything he can to smear it. By failing to ask for an injunction months ago, he attempted to rig a claim that Taft-Hartley is ineffective. The mock prosecution was clearly part of the same plan.

After he had his not-guilty verdict he asked Congress to give him power to throw Taft-Hartley aside and seize the mines. And right on the heels of that request came the announcement last night that an agreement on basic principles had been reached.

Why didn't Truman direct his Justice Department attorneys to file a new charge of contempt against Lewis and his union and prove their guilt with the evidence at hand? Is he so mulish or timid that he cannot admit he was wrong?

It would do no good for the Justice Department to appeal the case they have made before Keech. They made no case on which an appeal could be based.

Industry has been closing down all over the country because of the lack of coal. Hundreds of thousands of persons are suffering from cold and loss of work. All because Truman has been ducking his sworn duty to uphold the law of the land.

He has no moral or legal right to cast aside a law because somebody doesn't want to obey it. It's up to him to see all the laws are obeyed. And he cannot make exception because he doesn't like a law. Congress should insist he enforce the law at hand before they give him any more power.

Planned Slavery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert therein the following article by Victor Riesel, which appeared in the New York Daily Mirror. It gives a graphic description of life in the Soviet paradise:

PLANNED SLAVERY

(By Victor Riesel)

Our Government has just received detailed information from a former highly placed Russian, who slipped into the American zone of Berlin recently, which discloses for the first time the exact manner in which the MVD (Soviet secret police) operates more as a slave manpower overseer than as an internal counter-espionage corps.

The information supplied during weeks of conversations between this Russian refugee and United States officials in Germany has been made available exclusively to this column and will be used shortly by the western democracies in a public fight within the United Nations councils.

Without the exploitation of 20,000,000 people in MVD slave labor camps the economy of the Soviet Union and its vast armament program would collapse, according to the Russian, who was a top echelon official of GOSPLAN, the U. S. S. R.'s highest planning agency.

SLAVE LABOR BATTALIONS

In fact, this former Gosplan executive, now under secure guard in Western Germany, reveals that the Soviet secret police was the main construction agency of the U. S. S. R. just before the German invasion, with a great part of its work devoted to building the Russian aviation industry. It still is.

Here, then, is the first accurate picture of the Soviet security police, not as an internal spy force, but as builders of special projects ordered by the Kremlin. These details were assembled and interpreted by the Commission of Inquiry Into Forced Labor, directed by a minister, Albert Herling.

The secret police's slave labor battalions build everything from children's nurseries to housing projects, from mining facilities to logging camps, from defense area to paved roads of national importance, from camp facilities to railroad lines running through vast isolated regions.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF FORCED LABOR

Its prisoners mine uranium, gold, coal, chrome and iron ore, cut down huge forests for timber and dig for oil. The MVD even uses its concentration camp corps to make furniture and kitchenware. The refugee Gosplaner disclosed that a year or so ago this secret police division was ordered to turn out: One-eighth of the total production in the timber industry; 10 percent of all furniture and kitchenware production; 25 percent of the total U. S. S. R. freight tonnage and over 40 percent of total Soviet chrome production.

This was only a small part of its assignment that year.

The refugee revealed that since 1938 the MVD has provided "slaves" to produce 75 percent of all gold production and had large quotas for machinery, cement and the operation of oil fields in the Komi area near Ukhta.

The point is that the Russians long ago abandoned arrests for suspicious political activity and now simply seize thousands on short notice from their official manpower division just to provide enough forced labor battalions to produce on the Soviet's timetable.

PLANNED SCHEMES AND TERR

For example, when the secret police chief, Lazrenti Beria, was called in and told that the Germans had captured the Donbas coal fields and new sources were needed, he merely ordered the arrest of thousands of workers on suspicion of enmity to the state and threw them into construction of a railway line across hundreds of miles of tundra to the Pechora River basin to tap the coal supplies there.

Just as recently as last June, word came that labor battalions were needed in central Asia. Some 30,000 persons of Greek, Turkish and Jewish origins were given 3 hours' notice to be ready to leave their homes and shipped en masse to the Orient. So were entire peoples, like the Crimean Tartars and the Chechens in north Caucasus, for special projects.

According to the United States Government's Russian informant, the principal force which moves the political prisoners is hunger—not violence, not wages. The amount of work performed by the MVD prisoners in corrective labor camps determines how much they will eat. Those who weaken or refuse to work are hustled into solitary confinement, receive just subsistence rations and then are left to die if they rebel for long. When the forces are depleted, a new call goes out, and other groups suddenly find themselves suspicious characters.

Another type of forced labor not yet revealed here is performed by persons too valuable to ship across the tundra. They work under police guard at their normal jobs, but for reduced wages.

The Russian refugee said that fully half the political sentences in the Soviet Union cover this sort of arrest—intended just to freeze specialists into their jobs.

So, for many a Russian the secret MVD is with him literally from the cradle to the grave, for he is born in the secret police's hospitals, raised in its nurseries and dies in its labor camps.

Expressions of Views by Service Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Can't a General Speak to a Senator, Even in the Strictest Confidence?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN'T A GENERAL SPEAK TO A SENATOR, EVEN IN THE STRICTEST CONFIDENCE?

During the Formosa controversy, Walter Lippmann thought it necessary to remind General MacArthur that soldiers should confine expression of their views to superiors, and that they had "no right to conduct a public agitation, using the press and politicians as their mouthpiece, to challenge and discredit the policies of their government."

Of course, it is perfectly true that a soldier in uniform cannot appropriately enter public controversy. However, as we understand it, this is not what General MacArthur is supposed to have done. The assumption has been that, when he was asked certain specific questions by Senator KNOWLAND, of California, and Senator SMITH, of New Jersey, the far eastern commander gave them his opinion as to the importance of Formosa in the defense of the Pacific area against the further spread of Communist power. Was that improper? If it was, the question arises how, in existing circumstances, the views of military authorities on a military problem are to be ascertained at all.

As a matter of practical fact, the reluctance of military and naval officers to express their views has contributed considerably to the present situation. At Yalta, we now know, a high military officer did his best to communicate to the American delegation the view of the armed services that it was unnecessary and dangerous to bribe Russia to enter the war against Japan. The officer expressed his views solely through "official channels," in which they were sunk without a trace—official channels being what they were. Had there been a couple of big-eared Senators about, to hear the story, who can say how different history might have been!

A little more indiscretion on the part of military men at international conferences might have held up the deal on the Kurile Islands or even the forced treaty by which China surrendered substantial rights in Manchuria to the Reds. But the leaks would have had to be directed outside official channels, which were so clogged with Services, Davieses and Hisses as to be all but impassable to the quaint notions of the men who have to rig up an American defense in spite of what the statesmen and their befogged experts do.

Maybe General MacArthur should have taken off his uniform and resigned his command before speaking quietly to Senators. But it is a hunch at least that the American people would support the idea that the general in the field should have some way of getting his views across.

Nebraska Is 83 Years Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, I took the floor to give the membership some information about Nebraska as a Territory and Nebraska as a State. Sterling H. McCaw, editor of the Norfolk Daily News, of Norfolk, Nebr., on that same day wrote an editorial giving a more detailed and more interesting story about Nebraska. I include this editorial with my remarks:

On March 1, 1867, this State came into the Union by proclamation of President Andrew Johnson, but through no favor of his. President Johnson had twice tried to block the admission of the State, for partisan political purposes. Once he succeeded, the second time he was frustrated by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress.

A lot of history was made between the time the first attempts were made to organize Nebraska into a Territory, and the day 13 years later when it took its place as a member of the family of States.

The signing of the territorial bill on May 30, 1854, by President Pierce, according to our office encyclopedia reopened the fierce sectional conflict between north and south. The conflict split the Democratic Party, destroyed the Whig Party, led to the organization of the new Republican Party and to the series of events leading to the Civil War.

Quite an accomplishment for a Territory soon to be inhabited by a peaceful and industrious people. It might also have been said that the bill had brought back into politics one Abraham Lincoln, who was to play an important part in the events of the succeeding decade. Lincoln had retired from politics, but when the Nebraska bill was reported out he put on his fighting clothes and slugged it out with Stephen A. Douglas, sponsor of the bill, and though beaten in the early rounds, won the final victory in his election to the Presidency.

The reason for the turbulence, of course, was slavery. The bill contained a provision that the people of the Territory might decide whether it should come into the Union free or slave. The Missouri Compromise of 1820 had provided that the new States should come in as free States. The free soilers looked upon this as a betrayal.

The battle gave the United States Senate what has been called its most turbulent session. But on March 3, 1854, after an all-night session, the Senate passed the territorial bill. The House followed in a couple of months and Nebraska became a Territory.

Originally Nebraska included all the territory extending from what is now the southern border of Kansas to Canada and west to the summits of the Rocky Mountains. But luckily this vast territory was divided at the fortieth parallel of latitude, and the area below that was made Kansas Territory.

That act saved Nebraska a lot of turbulence and bloodshed, for Kansas was the fighting ground of slavery and antislavery factions for several years. Beecher's bibles, as rifles sent from the East were called, were smuggled into the Territory and used with good effect.

But this is only incidental to Nebraska's birthday story. The State legislature on January 4, 1860, passed an act looking to the admission of the State, but the people were not ready for it, and it was defeated at the polls by a vote of 2,094 for it, to 2,372 against.

A new constitution was presented on June 2, 1866, and was adopted by a majority of exactly 100, the vote being 3,938 to 3,838. It was the soldiers' vote that saved the day. The members of the First Nebraska Cavalry gave the constitution the 100 majority, breaking what otherwise would have been a tie. The soldiers' count was 134 for and 34 against.

The fight had been a bitter one. The Republicans favored statehood in order to give their slim majority in Congress two more Senators and one Representative. The Democrats opposed it because they had formed a coalition with President Johnson's liberals and had hoped to organize the new Congress.

So when Congress, just before adjournment, passed the bill admitting Nebraska as a State, President Johnson gave it a pocket veto. The President pointed out that the constitution limited suffrage to white citizens. The Republicans saw the point and repassed the bill with a provision that the State legislature must eliminate color as a qualification for voting. President Johnson vetoed that bill, but the two Houses repassed it over his objections.

But the conditions that Congress had attached to the measure almost wrecked statehood. When the color provision came before the legislature it required seven votes to carry it through the senate. Seven senators favored accepting it, all Republicans, but one was sick. It looked dark for statehood until Isaac S. Hascall, of Douglas County, a Democrat, broke away from his party and cast the deciding vote for statehood.

"The air," according to C. H. Gere's account, "was blue with Democratic expletives at that time, but if the genius of that venerable organization haunted the chamber of the offender at the solemn midnight hour, and, fixing him with his glittering eye, said, like Othello to Cassio, 'No more be officer of mine,' 10 to 1 the tough and wiry Isaac hung out no signal of distress, and the ghost retired abashed."

Thus, painfully and precariously, Nebraska was born 83 years ago tomorrow. And at 83 it is full of vigor and of faith that the best days of its life are ahead of it.

Judge Keech Decision Seen Putting Truman in a Terrible Spot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Washington Evening Star of March 3, 1950:

JUDGE KEECH DECISION SEEN PUTTING TRUMAN IN A TERRIBLE SPOT—GOP HAS BEEN HANDED MAJOR ISSUE ON LACK OF RESTRAINING LAWS

(By David Lawrence)

Judge Keech, through his decision acquitting the miners' union of contempt, has put President Truman in a terrible spot, politically and otherwise. But he had a right to reject conjecture and insist on evidence of collusion by the leaders with the striking miners.

Whether the Justice Department was overconfident and presented what it believed was an adequate case based on the precedents created when Judge Goldsborough uttered his now famous "wink and nod" doctrine or whether Judge Keech, who was a former White House assistant, leaned over backward to pronounce judgment on the basis of lack of proof will be debated for a long time to come.

Certainly the Republicans have been handed a major issue on a platter. This would tend to refute any idea that the case was not pressed in good faith. For today, instead of a Taft-Hartley law that is "oppressive," especially in its injunction feature, the country suddenly discovers that its labor-management laws are not strong enough.

OPPORTUNITY FOR SPEAKERS

Plainly nobody in the Democratic administration has wanted to see such a contingency arise, for it affords an opportunity for Republican stump speakers to put further blame on the Democratic Party.

Most important is the blunt fact now dramatized beyond any doubt that there is no law on the statute books that restrains an economic group bent on causing suffering and impairing the national health and safety.

Obviously, the mine workers union could have gotten the workers back on the job if it wished to do so. There is no lack of discipline in a closed-shop type of union. Undoubtedly also the strategy to circumvent the injunction if it came was worked out in great detail long before the strike occurred. It is a question whether anyone can be tried for a conspiracy to take steps to circumvent an injunction before it is issued.

But, on the other hand, there can be little doubt that the Government, by using the resources of the FBI and serving restraining orders on every officer of local unions, could secure the necessary evidence of a concerted refusal to go back to work. As Judge Goldsborough said, many hundreds of thousands of men in a union do not operate as individuals but in unison when they disregard plainly worded orders to go back to work. If, in truth, there has been such a collapse of discipline, then the right of a national union to conduct an industry-wide negotiation can also be questioned. So can the effectiveness of any signatures that may be affixed to a contract by union officers who have lost control of their men.

WON'T RESOLVE ISSUE

Seizure of the mines will not resolve the larger issue that has arisen—the arbitrary manner in which the public interest has been damaged. Nor will any one-sided seizure bill get through Congress. If profits are held up, so probably would wage rates and working conditions be frozen until such time as both sides agree on a settlement.

Demand for a general revision of the labor-management laws will be pressed, too, and Congress may find itself taking up the Taft-Hartley amendments which have been pigeonholed by the Democratic Party at the behest of the union leaders.

The American people now are face to face with the fact that economic groups have arisen which are apparently more powerful than the Government and which can make a mockery of court orders and the whole collective-bargaining process. It certainly calls for a leadership which thus far neither party in Congress has been willing to assert.

Is Socialism a Scare Word?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial in the Evening Observer is timely and to the point; therefore under leave to extend heretofore granted I am inserting the editorial in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ONLY A SCARE WORD

President Truman thinks socialism is just a scare word. He said so. He said, "Their (the Republicans) current scare word is socialism."

Perhaps socialism is just a scare word to many Americans, but this light treatment of it makes it all the more a frightening fact rather than just a word.

Socialism is not just a word to Russia, to Czechoslovakia, to the troublesome minorities of Italy and France, to Cardinal Mindszenty, to Alger Hiss, to the Communists convicted of treason in fair American courts, to Chiang Kai-shek, to the Koreans, to Hungary, to Tito, to Poland, to east Berlin, to the British, to the Finns.

"For the Republicans to drag out the same old moth-eaten scarecrow of socialism again in 1950 * * * is an insult to the intelligence of the American people," says President Truman.

How remote can a President get from the facts of life? Were it not for socialism today the American military budget could be cut by two-thirds, the foreign-aid program could be diminished by a like percentage, taxes could be reduced, and the budget be cut by from one-quarter to one-half. Were it not for socialism there would have been no announcement of an H-bomb, no threat of a chain reaction which might destroy the planet. Were it not for socialism the United Nations would be moving smoothly and effectively, not stalemated by veto power.

Of course the President was speaking in a domestic sense, but in so doing he seemed unaware of the subtle movements by which a nation abandons free enterprise and develops socialism. That condition which is only a scare word to the President can be approached by both revolutionary and evolutionary processes. In the end it is the same socialism which can be and usually is a far worse tyranny than any which the founding fathers resisted in the creation of our Republic.

Surely the President's eyes cannot be closed to modern history, to contemporary history. How can he believe socialism to be a red herring, a scare word? The greatest, the most deadly, and the most insidious doctrine and way of life in the world today impresses the President as no more than a political bogey man. And that, we fear, reflects the smug attitude of too many Americans.

Politics by the Bushel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report from Republican State headquarters at Des Moines, Iowa:

POLITICS BY THE BUSHEL

Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan tossed the farm program right smack into the middle of partisan politics when he appeared at the National Farm Institute. If there was any doubt that Brannan planned to make farm legislation a political football it disappeared in the smoke of what was billed as a "discussion of farm policy" but could be more accurately described as Pendergast political harangue.

Brannan took more than an hour to lambast farm organizations and their leaders and it wasn't until after he had delivered his blistering attack and promised to stump the country for his plan that he attempted to explain.

After listening to the Secretary for more than 80 minutes—during which there was no explanation of the plan—the panel chairman asked the Cabinet member to explain it in simple terms. But Brannan the politician didn't do it. He did devote 15 minutes to generalities, skirting the subject at every

turn. He failed to give an adequate explanation of the plan—something hundreds of persons in the audience had come to hear—and many went away as a dirt farmer in southwestern Iowa put it "more confused than ever before."

The Secretary apparently thinks he's going to have a tough time selling his plan. He attacked farm organizations and their leaders in an effort to discredit their position without stressing the merits of his own plan. Even on his plan the Secretary was confused. At one point he said there was nothing new or revolutionary in it and that most of it was lifted from the Agricultural Act of 1948. A few minutes later he said 125 employees of the Agriculture Department worked night and day for 6 months drafting the plan.

Brannan didn't get around to explaining his plan. But he did make it clear that he intended to stump the country to elect Representatives who will support it. He reminded the audience that he toured the country blaming the Eightieth Congress during the 1948 campaign. But this year he's going to blame, not the Eighty-first Congress, because it is controlled by his own party, but "selfish groups in the Eighty-first Congress."

He spent a great deal of time playing potato politics. He blamed the potato and egg situation on everyone but the Department of Agriculture.

As Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, told the Senate recently: "Secretary Brannan now has ample authority under existing laws to handle the surplus-potato situation. He has been dramatizing potato supports and trying to make Congress look bad."

The crowd roared with laughter when Brannan said: "I am for Government economy." That really sounded funny in light of the Hoover Commission Report, which pointed out that the Department of Agriculture has mushroomed from 18,000 to more than 95,000 employees in 20 years, and its share of the national budget from less than seventeen million in 1913 to a high of $2,500,000,000.

Brannan also said we don't have regimentation. But a look at the so-called farm bill which bears his name belies that fact.

The following provisions of section 401 (b) on page 79 of the Brannan-plan farm bill:

"Farmers engaged in the production of any agricultural commodity shall furnish proof as to their acreage, production yield, storage, and marketing of the commodity in the form of records, marketing cards, reports, storage, or sales receipts or otherwise as the Secretary may prescribe as necessary for the administration of this title.

"Any person failing to make such a report or keep any record as required by this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $500 and any such person making a false report or record shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

That language, which the Secretary didn't take time to explain, sounds very much like regimentation.

The Los Angeles Examiner, commenting on the vote bait being used by the Truman administration, said: "Of course, the Brannan plan is modeled to catch votes among workers as well as farmers * * * this scheme resembles the current British Socialist Labor Government farm plan. The gold brick element of the Brannan plan is here in the fact that the city dweller in reality will pay twice for food—once to the store and again to the tax collector."

Brannan apparently let his feelings of vehemence against a farm organization cloud his vision and instead of discussing "the extra bushel" he tossed out bushels of politics.

United Nations Must Be Strengthened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that the United Nations Charter must be amended in the light of our experience and in view of the change of world conditions since the United Nations was founded.

I believe the changes necessary include: The elimination or drastic revision of the present veto provision, and the tightening of joint procedures of the democracies in cases of aggression or threatened aggression. Certainly a new definition of aggression should be made in the light of the Soviet refusal to cooperate with the great majority of the United Nations signatories plan for atomic-energy control, which must include internal inspection of all nations' facilities.

Under unanimous consent, I include with these remarks a statement which I made on October 12, 1949, before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. My statement was in support of a resolution to achieve this purpose.

STATEMENT OF HON. CHET HOLIFIELD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have never believed that a preventive war against the Soviet Union presented even a last-ditch alternative to a peaceful solution of the world crisis. I have never believed that our sole possession of the secret of the atomic bomb gave us anything more than a fleeting moment of time in which to develop a policy which might lead to a peaceful solution. I have never believed that a peaceful solution could be found through purely negative means—that is to say, through a policy which aimed merely at stopping Soviet or Communist expansion.

Given the existence of the Soviet menace, I have gone along with the various means improvised to contain that menace, in the effort to make western Europe as a whole impervious to subversion or military conquest. I have accepted the necessity of maintaining our own military strength at a level which should make it clear to the men in the Kremlin that aggression would involve the Soviet Union in a war in which it would meet overwhelming military strength.

Nevertheless, I have felt that these negative, precautionary steps were not enough—that our policy lacked an affirmative constructive approach to the making and preserving of a lasting peace. I have felt that, while defensive preparation has been essential to the Nation as a preventive to war, defensive preparation alone could not lay the foundations of lasting peace. Moreover, it has been apparent for some time that defensive preparation to prevent war, if carried far enough, would eventually lead to war; that a sterile arms race would preempt the resources needed for building the peace; that a way must be found to halt the vicious circle of mutual distrust and provocation.

I am convinced that the only way to halt the arms race is to do the one thing which makes disarmament possible, namely, to establish world law and world law enforcement. This, I know, cannot be done overnight. But what we can do overnight is to make the establishment of world law and world law enforcement the avowed aim of American foreign policy. Once we do this, all our defensive actions will fall into an entirely different context. Once we do this, we shall give a constructive purpose, a clearly understandable constructive purpose, to our at-present disjointed efforts to promote economic health and political stability.

The fact that Russia has broken our monopoly on atomic weapons merely confirms a thing which has been apparent for a long time: There can be no way out of our present difficulties through war. It follows that the United States must take the lead in turning its back upon reliance on armaments and start working toward the establishment of peace machinery which will make such devices unnecessary. The resolution before us is merely the first step in this direction. The road to the development of the United Nations into a world federation is long and arduous. Many obstacles stand in our path. But, irrespective of these obstacles, we shall have failed in our mission as a Nation if we do not now, at this moment, make up our minds to start along this road to overcome the obstacles by patient effort and to lead the world at last into the tranquil harbor of a secure and enduring peace.

A Tax Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include extraneous matter, I am inserting a letter which I have received with reference to a tax problem which is disturbing business. I am also enclosing an article by Raymond Moley entitled "A Tax Against Safety and Progress."

FEBRUARY 28, 1950.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: Thank you for sending us a copy of H. R. 6563 and of your statement on the introduction of the bill in the House on January 3.

We think that your bill and your comments thereon represent one of the most constructive approaches to the tax problem that we have seen.

We have particularly noted your proposed revision of section 102. Your proposal is, of course, in the right direction and represents, we assume, your realistic appraisal of the extent to which the Congress might be persuaded to go in alleviating this menace to the sound economic growth of our country.

We urge you, however, to consider whether in view of the increasing realization that section 102 as applied to active business corporations is fundamentally unsound, the Congress might not recognize the need of more drastic revision. For example, it might be provided that no company shall be deemed to have accumulated surplus beyond the reasonable needs of its business if its total capital and surplus at the end of the tax year is not in excess of its expenditures for pay roll and purchase of materials during the year plus investments in fixed assets, or is not more than double the expenditures for pay roll and materials exclusive of fixed assets. Another possibility would be to provide that section 102 is not applicable to any corporation where 90 percent of the shareholders own less than 50 percent of the voting stock, because in such instances the minority stockholders themselves have recourse through the State courts to prevent any undue accumulation of earnings.

Enclosed is a copy of a reprint of an article by Raymond Moley in the February 6 issue of News Week, which you may have seen. You will note that he has suggested that section 102 should either be repealed or amended to make it clear that it does not apply to companies employing a given amount of labor or realizing a given turnover of goods in relation to the amount of capital invested.

Your efforts in the direction of sound tax laws are sincerely appreciated.

Respectfully yours.

A TAX AGAINST SAFETY AND PROGRESS

(By Raymond Moley)

If Congress really wants to increase national wealth, guard us against depressions, and protect the jobs of workers, a good place to begin is with section 102 of the Internal Revenue Act. This section was innocently written in 1913 and ignored for 25 years. It was rediscovered in 1938.

In 1935 President Roosevelt shocked and angered Congress by proposing his notorious share-the-wealth tax program. He did it because he was at the moment afraid of Huey Long, who intended to run in 1936. One of the proposals then recommended was a tax on corporation surpluses, designed to force the paying out of profits in dividends. This idea was enacted into law in 1936. In 1938, against the President's vigorous opposition, it was substantially repealed. Roosevelt then turned to the sleeping section 102.

Under this law, the Treasury, not the business concerned, decides how much a company should withhold from stockholders and keep as a reserve against future needs and emergencies. The people who make this decision are not the people who have made and live with the business, but are revenue officers without business experience generally and altogether without knowledge of the specific business involved. The section has been an unjust burden and a sinister threat, particularly to small business.

There has been a stepping up of this threat since President Truman assumed office. In the 1946 tax-return forms the Treasury inserted a warning which meant to most companies that they should dissipate their earnings or else. This was later omitted. Meanwhile, the Department of Commerce was encouraging companies to invest more and more of their surplus funds in Government bonds, substantiating this suggestion by a reference to section 102.

The fallacy of this policy is that it implies that a business surplus is an unnecessary economic precaution. The fact is that a surplus constitutes basic purchasing power. It represents the ability to pay labor, buy raw materials, restore machinery and equipment, and provide security for business credit. It becomes the central power plant which supplies jobs, purchasing power, improved products, and a better standard of living for all.

To build up strong and productive companies means more income for normal taxation and larger revenues for Government. But to compel this security to be dissipated in dividends produces an insignificant amount of tax revenue. The wide scattering of share holdings, in which 80 percent of stocks are in the hands of relatively small taxpayers, provides a very limited tax source. Thus, the drastic enforcement of section 102 decreases tax revenues.

This law was originally intended to prevent abuses through incorporated pocketbooks. That purpose is already accomplished through the personal holding company tax.

Section 102 should either be repealed or it should be amended.

One part of an amendment should be to make it clear that it does not apply to companies employing a given amount of labor or realizing a given turn-over of goods in relation to the amount of capital invested.

Further, the burden of proof should be placed upon the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to show both the unreasonableness of the accumulated surplus and the existence of a real tax-avoidance purpose. In addition, it should be provided by law that long-term capital gains should be excluded from section 102 net income.

And corporate reserves set up out of profits already taxed, which reflect higher costs of replacing plant and equipment, should be excluded from section 102 net income.

Finally, there is a problem that has grown as the Government has, more and more, placed its heavy hand on business enterprise. That is the problem of unreviewable administrative decisions. The Supreme Court has refused to review cases brought under this law. As a result, the only law available to taxpayers and advisers has been the law as interpreted by the Treasury. The result is that business has been the helpless victim of administrative caprice.

Lewis Defends His Tactics, Asks Dealing With Owners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times of Friday, March 3, 1950:

LEWIS DEFENDS HIS TACTICS, ASKS DEALING WITH OWNERS—INSISTS IN INTERVIEW PUBLIC IS IN NO DANGER—STOCKS HELD SUFFICIENT IF DISSEMINATED—HE ASSERTS PROFITS BACK HIS CAUSE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 2.—John Llewellyn Lewis, whose leadership of the coal miners of the United States has for years alternately paralyzed the flow of this essential fuel into commerce or released it to turn the wheels of ever-expanding industry, in an interview authorized for publication today answered seven questions that ranged from the source of his power to the most effective methods of preventing and settling disputes between labor and management.

Although Mr. Lewis is the target of more bitter criticism from the public than he ever experienced except during the wartime strikes of the United Mine Workers in 1943 and 1945, he submitted to the questions and agreed to let his answers be published.

Publication of Mr. Lewis' comments on the situation in the coal industry was deferred while the Government's civil and criminal contempt charges against his union, the United Mine Workers, were on trial before Federal Judge Richmond B. Keech here. Today Judge Keech dismissed as unproved these charges—that the union, though not Mr. Lewis, connived to keep the miners from returning to work in defiance of the judge's order.

In his answers the president of the UMW made these statements:

"No strike in the coal fields, including this one, has ever imperiled public health or safety.

"Enough coal is on hand, if fairly distributed, to last out the time we shall require to adjust the current dispute fairly."

His current wage and other demands on the operators are justified by statistics of the Departments of Commerce, Labor, and Interior which demonstrate to him that the profits of the coal industry (before taxes) rose from $34 per miner per annum employed in 1939 to $733 per miner per annum employed in 1948.

The power attributed to him has its source only in the degree to which the coal miners will follow his leadership, and this they do only when he is right.

His control of the selection of some officials in the union mine districts is exercised only where and because the miners, left to themselves, would make choices against their true interests.

The sole proper way to settle disputes where public health and safety are concerned is through collective bargaining in good faith, and in the current dispute the industry has never wanted that, being convinced that delay would bring into operation the Taft-Hartley Act. The procedures of the Railway Labor Act merely defer a strike, not settle it or its causes.

If he could bargain always with the real owners of the mines instead of their employees it would produce prompt and fair settlements.

As substitutes for the Taft-Hartley and the Wagner Acts he favors a simple law which would guarantee collective bargaining in good faith and establish a few unspecified, unfair practices for both management and labor.

He is not enthusiastic over Government mediation, but at times it can be useful.

The coal industry deserves the epithets of "cruel" and "conscienceless" which he at times has launched against it, as its cessation of welfare payments recently demonstrated.

A PRIVATE PERSONALITY SPEAKS

After Mr. Lewis answered the seven questions, this correspondent asked him to clarify and expand three of his replies and submit to two more. These are listed at the end of this dispatch.

Mr. Lewis said he did not have the time at hand to deal argumentatively with these. This is regrettable, though understandable in his current circumstances, because this material, whether or not to the satisfaction of his critics, would fill out or clarify what they are certain to point to as omissions and evasions.

Mr. Lewis' responses to the seven questions were written down by this correspondent from memory, but soon after he made them. In authorizing the language as his own, the union leader said:

"Naturally you have not written it the way I would write it, but 'it will do.'"

In a personal conversation of this character Mr. Lewis gives a very different impression of his personality than the one he projects to the public. His tone is devoid of wrath, his words carry no trace of that purple bombast which is so familiar to readers of his public prose. His diction is clear and extensive, and he finds the mot juste without visible effort. His speech reflects deep reading, and is both simple and cultivated. The barking polysyllables which he employs for propaganda and personal attack are wholly absent.

The impression one gets is that Mr. Lewis, like most effective dealers in the marketplace of politics and social economy, puts on that make-up and assumes that dramatic role, as an actor does, which he has decided are best suited to create the impression he feels will serve his purpose best.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The questions and Mr. Lewis' answers follow:

"Question. Do you think you have too much power for one citizen?

"Answer. What is my power? As a union leader I have no more special privilege under

the law than any other, and much less scope under the Taft-Hartley Act than I had under the Wagner Act. The mine workers in the coal fields have usually followed and supported me because they believe that their cause is mine.

"If I had the power suggested by your question, would they not have returned to work the other day when I urged them to do so for the protection of their welfare and that of the union? When they think I am right they follow me, and that is the extent of it.

"I know it is said that between the local officers and members and myself there is a set of secret signals, that I phrase such urgings as the above in a way which they will understand to mean the contrary. But how could there be such signals? And if there were, why has no one in the industry, with spies all about, been able to detect and expose them? It is nonsense.

"Tomorrow a psychological wave might pass through the minds of the mine workers and wash away whatever influence over their actions I have as an individual and as president of the UMW. That isn't power in the sense the word is generally employed about me.

"The President has power which no psychological change can take away from him while he holds his office. Other officials have the same. Industrialists have the power conferred by financial resources on which labor depends for its bread. That is real power, of which I have none.

"Question. Do you think that labor's sense of responsibility has caught up with its present power?

"Answer. I believe that in the unions as elsewhere a sense of responsibility always catches up with increased economic strength. I think that is the situation in labor today.

"Question. I understand that in some areas miners do not elect their own union officers. If this is so, why?

"Answer. In perhaps a dozen districts the miners do not choose their district president and secretary. That is because these districts showed a tendency to make poor choices and the national organization decided its interest required that these officers be selected for them until their choices could be more relied on. But in these districts as well as in all the others each miner has a vote on the national officers and the decisions of each convention.

"I have heard it said that I have the power to expel a union member for any reason I may wish. The truth is that not for years has any attempt to expel been ratified by the controlling committee.

"Question. How should a labor dispute be settled where public health and safety are imperiled, as in this one in the coal industry? Would the Railway Labor Act procedures help? Would labor and management be better off if both the Taft-Hartley and the Wagner Acts were repealed and nothing substituted?

"If you and the operators do not present demands when negotiations begin how can there be prompt bargaining? Would it be helpful if both sides were required by law to state their demands in writing at the outset?"

GOOD FAITH AS ONLY WAY

"Answer. Collective bargaining in truly good faith is the only way to settle any labor dispute. And no strike in the coal fields has ever imperiled public health or safety, this one included. When has the Nation been really imperiled by one? There is enough coal on hand, if it were fairly distributed, to last out the time we shall require to adjust the current dispute fairly. The outcries are coming in part from those who did not stock up as they should have in view of the end of the contract period last June. Others did, some in remarkably large quantities.

"As you travel through Indiana and Pennsylvania these days you will see reserve piles of coal for the steel industry, piles so high that they obscure the big plants. And the TVA has a reserve of 650,000 tons. It should be simple to send around a few carloads to hardship cases in that region.

"Now for the Railway Labor Act. This has become weaker and weaker in practice, and in full operating strength it merely delays a strike; it does not prevent one. The present strike in the coal fields was delayed without such procedure, and the next time you are on a train if you will talk to any railroad employees you will find they no longer take stock in this act.

"The delay in this current coal strike came because the union did everything possible to avert it—witness the 3-day week—and continued to hope that management would sincerely sit down to real collective bargaining. Until that disposition was made manifest I could not protect the miners and at the same time state my requests either verbally or in writing. It was clear that the operators were anxious to drag out negotiations—if they could be called that—to the point where Taft-Hartley would be invoked. Had that law not been on the statute books I believe we would have had an agreement long ago. The operators want to weaken the mine union and they know that Taft-Hartley is the means to do that.

"I am for its repeal, as I have made plain, but I would not want to surrender all the protections of the Wagner Act. What I propose is the substitution of both acts with a simple statute, giving labor the protective guaranty of collective bargaining and adding a proscription of certain unfair practices on the part of labor and management alike. That, with supplemental laws like Norris-La Guardia, Wages-and-Hours, etc., would be all the labor legislation needed to maintain a steady economy."

MEDIATION SERVICES AN AID

"Question. What part should State or Federal mediation services play in labor disputes? Have they been helpful in the terms of your own experience? If not, how could they be made so?

"Answer. In my experience, these services have been somewhat helpful but not more. It is useful occasionally for labor or management to have solutions suggested by official conciliators that, for tactical reasons, cannot be proposed by either party to the controversy. In this way settlements have been forwarded now and then.

"Question. Nearly always you and the coal operators accuse each other of failure to bargain in good faith. You represent some of them as conscienceless, cruel men. What is the solution of these attitudes?

"Answer. Here are some figures showing the consequence to disabled miners, their widows, their children—some of them orphans—of the stoppage of welfare-fund contributions by management in the coal business. [These listed thousands without this means of subsistence.] This is what I have in mind when I sometimes represent the operators as cruel, conscienceless men. Even now, when the court says the old contract is temporarily in force, many of them have not resumed payments to the welfare fund. Yet Government statistics reveal that the coal industry, which made a profit of $34 per miner in 1939, made a profit of $733 per miner in 1948.

"I don't know how to melt the hearts of such men. But a step toward a solution of what you call these attitudes would be for the coal industry to send its real owners to the bargaining table. I speak for the union. But on the other side of the table I find only employees who have no authority to come to terms which I have the authority to offer. If the industry will send its owners to the table, we can come quickly to fair agreements, as was demonstrated when Myron Taylor and I made the first contract in the steel industry. Instead of George Love and the others I deal with, the industry should send Ben Fairless, G. M. Humphrey, R. R. Young, and James D. Francis, as examples."

LABOR AS POLITICAL ENTITY

"Question. With the British example in mind, do you still oppose the formation of American labor into a political party? And what do you think of statements that your methods are taking coal out of the competitive fuel market and costing the miners large sums of take-home pay every year?

"Answer: Let us begin with the case of Great Britain. The population there is sitting on a coal deposit which, if taken from the earth by modern methods, would solve the economic problem of the British. But first British management made the mistake of letting obsolescence weaken the industry. And then British labor made the mistake of becoming a political party and using the political instead of the economic approach to national problems. The result is what you see. In 1948 American miners took out approximately 600,000,000 tons, British miners took out less than 200,000,000 tons. And in this country the mining force was 404,000 and in Britain it was 736,000. The UMW has been greatly responsible for the methods employed in the industry and its modern equipment. This should be remembered when the dead cats and brickbats are flying around the heads of coal union leaders.

"However, I read editorials which say that my methods have advanced the use of competitive fuels and doomed coal to become a drug on the market. When the miners read that they laugh. They laugh because they know that any housewife whose husband can find the money will put in gas for fuel; it is clean and requires no hand labor. They also know that industry will use coal over other fuels because its lower cost appeals to industry."

LOST PAY VERSUS STRIKE GAINS

"I also read editorials which say that the pay I cost miners who go out on strike represents much more in any year than any wage gains I procure for them. When the miners read that they laugh, too. They laugh because they know these things: That about 200 work-days per year is maximum in the industry and that the time spent in strikes would be idle time, anyhow. That is history, and it will be the same in 1949–50 when this strike is settled.

"The trouble with the editorial writers and many others is that you have to know coal miners before you can write about their affairs and their leadership. Mining is the only labor which is done underground. It is performed amid hazards, in foul air and is backbreaking. To choose to be a coal miner means that you are a certain type of man. These I know well, their needs, their interests and their psychology. For many generations members of my family have been miners or operators, and I well know labor in the depths of a mine."

The answers Mr. Lewis was asked to amplify were as follows:

"Question. In 1948 you did deal with the tricts where this is the arrangement? Are the elections of members to the international executive board also barred to these workers? Is it true, as has been stated, that the last opposition candidate for president of the UMW was taken off the ballot and out of the convention by something resembling force? How much beating up of the opposition is the practice?

"Question 6. What is there in the industry contention that they suspended welfare payments partly because you were spending the money faster than it was coming in?

"Question. In 1948 you did deal with the real owners, Messrs. Fairless and Humphrey, and got the able and willing chalk from them, over the protest of Charles O'Neill. Do you think that proves or damages your argument in this respect, from the public viewpoint?"

The additional questions submitted but not answered were:

"What are the arguments for a wage increase at this time beyond the profit per miner figures you gave me? What is there in the belief that your strategy all along has had the objective of Government seizure?"

STATISTICAL DATA CITED

For statistical data supporting his answer No. 6, Mr. Lewis offered the following:

"Office memo to Mr. Lewis:

"We have just completed a thorough analysis of the bituminous-coal industry profits per employee for the 10-year period 1939–1948, based on Department of Commerce national-income figures and United States Bureau of Labor Statistics employment figures. This shows:

"1. Profits—before taxes—per miner employed, increased from $34 per miner in 1939 to $733 per miner employed in 1948.

"Rate:

1939	$34
1941	182
1942	225
1945	313
1947	577
1948	733

"2. A wage increase of 95 cents per day, and a royalty increase of 15 cents per ton could be given, on the basis of 1948 figures, without any price increase and with a 22 cents per ton profit to the industry.

"The 1948 figures show 404,000 employees and profits of $296,000,000; per employee, $733, or approximately 50 cents per ton.

"Applying the wage and royalty increase to this 1948 data, profits would be $130,068,000; per employee $322, or approximately 22 cents per ton.

"Sources of profit data: from table 17—Corporate Profits Before Federal and State Income and Excess Profits Taxes, by Industry, in United States Department of Commerce's National Income Supplement to Survey of Current Business; years 1939, 1941, and 1942, page 30, July 1947 issue; years 1945, 1947, and 1948, page 16, July 1949 issue.

"Sources of employment data: from table A-6—estimated number of employees and indexes of weekly pay rolls in selected nonmanufacturing industries, in United States Department of Labor's Handbook of Labor Statistics, 1947 for years 1939, 1941, 1942, 1945, and 1947, page 24. Year 1948 from United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, Bulletin C. M. 1 No. 12, page 11, table 5—average number of men, days active, man-days, man-hours, and production in bituminous coal and anthracite mines during January-December 1948."

Statement of George J. Burger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, before the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., February 15, 1950:

My name is George J. Burger. I am vice president and a member of the board of directors of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., head office, San Mateo, Calif., a national nonprofit organization organized under the laws of the State of California, which has the largest individual membership of any business organization in the Nation. I am also in charge of the Washington office of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., located in the Bond Building, Washington, D. C. We also maintain offices in Chicago, Cincinnati, and New York City.

I want to take this time to thank the chairman, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, for the privilege extended to me in behalf of the federation and its membership to appear here today and present our views on this major legislative proposition. In the first instance, it has been the keystone of the objectives of the federation to protect our free enterprise system and through this the people we represent, independent business, through the all-out enforcement of antitrust laws. Our position in this matter was stated in plain and understandable words in the privilege extended to us in our appearance before the platform committees of both the Republican and Democratic National Conventions held in the city of Philadelphia in the summer of 1948. At this time I want to have it on the record that we received the most courteous and interested attention of both committees to the federation's position on antitrust law enforcement. Our position then was, and it is now, and I quote:

"First and foremost, members of the federation desire that a consistent, vigorous, effective antimonopoly campaign be waged by Government. To this end, federation members have repeatedly urged their Congressmen to vote adequate appropriations to the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. To this end, officers and directors of the federation have constantly contacted Congress and congressional committees, including the congressional Joint Committee of the Economic Report, suggesting that both these agencies be freed to voluntarily inform congressional Committees on Appropriations whenever, and the extent to which, their budget requests have been cut by the Bureau of the Budget.

"In this connection, federation members have consistently demanded that Congress strengthen our antitrust laws wherever needed and have urged Congress and Government to refrain from all actions designed to weaken these laws. Recognizing the fact that present antitrust-law-violation penalties are really insignificant and ineffectual, they have repeatedly asked Congress to legislate stiffer penalties for violators of these laws. And, in recognition of the fact that antitrust-law litigation is many times subjected to suffocating delay, it has been requested that Congress act to provide some means of speeding action on this type of litigation.

"You may wonder at the stress that federation members lay on this phase of Government activity. The fact is that the tendency in our economy is toward more rapid and more certain concentration of power in the hands of a relatively few business giants, both in private hands and in the hands of cooperative-type organizations. Facing this trend toward concentration is an increasing disregard for the rights of independent business, which is mirroring itself in increasingly serious curtailment of economic freedom of opportunity. Our members see as one of their main bulwarks the antitrust laws of the Nation, and they demand that these laws be used for that purpose."

It must be understood, Mr. Chairman, that no officer or group of officers sets the position of the federation, but our position is set exclusively by the registered vote of the Nation-wide membership of the federation through its official publication, the Mandate, and in the Mandate itself a ballot is affixed on which the member votes his views and the ballot is returned by him to the district chairman, an independent businessman, and the ballots are then forwarded by the district chairman direct to the respective Members of Congress. The federation's position then is controlled exclusively by the expressed vote of its members. Such a procedure has been consistently followed by the federation's members in their use of the ballot through the Mandate, and I attach herewith as a matter of record, which I would like to have included in the record, Mandate Nos. 158, 159, 160, 161, and 162 which contain questions on antitrust enforcement.

On November 17, 1948, I was requested to appear and give testimony before the subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee To Investigate Monopolistic Practices. In my testimony I said in part:

"In my visits in the respective cities it would appear that antitrust violations are becoming more rampant than ever before in the history of our Nation. It has reached an exceptionally low level. In most States there are laws for protection where violations are taking place, but it is my opinion that many States are deficient in carrying out the laws and the public is being gouged through such practices. More important, small business is being misled and the free-enterprise system is falling by the wayside.

"In my own industry, rubber tires, with which I have been connected for close to 40 years, I do know that many of the suggested and recommended ideas for violations of either State or national laws originate in the minds and thinking of the big monopolists of that industry. I say this without fear of contradiction, and apparently if such conditions exist in that industry, possibly the same pattern is being followed in other industries controlled by monopolies. Again, small independents are being misled and free enterprise is being destroyed, and regimentation is coming from the dictates of those who desire to protect the monopoly in their respective field, and not from the Government as monopoly would have us believe.

"Encouragement should be given to the youth of this Nation to go into the various trades so that the services of sufficient and adequate numbers in their own businesses will be available to the American public.

"It must also be understood that we take no position that merely condemns big business because it is big, for such is not the case, but we do condemn big business where, by its own action, it prevents the free-enterprise system from functioning, and the public is the victim."

It is our opinion that the committee should thoroughly explore the public hearings Senate document titled "Officers and employees of the Federal Government, hearings before the Committee on Civil Service, United States Senate, Eightieth Congress, first session, on Senate Resolution 41, a resolution to investigate certain matters relating to officers and employees of the Federal Government, part 2, February 4, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15 and 18, 1947." The committee will be particularly interested in that part of the testimony relating to the Hon. Wendell Berge, where the matter of the application of fines and jail sentences was thoroughly

explored by the members of the committee present during Mr. Berge's testimony before them.

We are particularly interested in the statements from committee members or by the witness as to the application of fines levied by the courts where convictions took place, that is, as to their value as a deterrent to continual violations, irrespective of what the fine might be.

It is interesting to quote some of Mr. Berge's testimony. He said:

"We can get convictions in price-fixing cases, and we generally get them, and I would point out the amount of fines we collect annually in the criminal cases is very substantial, but my point, Senator, is this, if your defendant is a large corporation, and they generally are, the financial penalty is not a big item to them and they'll spend hundreds of thousands of dollars—I know of a case where they spent $2,000,000 in attorney fees—to fight a fine liability at most of a few hundreds of thousands of dollars."

It is interesting to note during the same hearing, an exchange between Mr. Vogel of the committee and Mr. Berge, and I quote:

"Mr. VOGEL. Did you ever think of the question that your penalties have not been sufficient to do the job? That is, the penalty of $5,000 was not a deterrent and possibly a jail sentence might produce something that had not been produced in 57 years.

"Mr. BERGE. Of course, we have considered it. But as I told you, and for whatever my judgment is worth—I may be wrong—but I am sure if we are given a mandate that Congress wants jail sentences, we will go out and try to get them. We had not understood that was what was wanted. It has been our judgment that was not."

Later in his testimony Mr. Berge made the following statement:

"My experience, and I would be less candid if I did not bring to your attention, is that the courts are very loath to impose even the maximum fines we have now because there is some feeling, which I do not share, but nevertheless there is something about a Sherman Act violation that is a little nicer than the ordinary kind of crime, and we cannot be tough with the kind of a defendant we have in Sherman Act cases."

He continues:

"No; how do we get around that and have an effective penalty? It is not because the court is afraid to extract money from the average corporate defendant. He knows that they can afford to pay it and knows that the lawyers before him are drawing more in a single day than the maximum fine he could impose. So when he decides to make it $2,000 instead of $5,000, it is not because he does not want to impose the burden but because there is a feeling in the minds of many people, including judges, that criminal fines are not quite the kind of punishment that defendants ought to have. I say that as a fact that you cannot ignore."

In view of the above authority, the Chief Assistant Attorney General, a career man in the Department of Justice, is of the opinion that the fine provisions in antitrust law violations will add to a deterrent to continual violations of the antitrust laws. It goes without saying that the fine penalty would be a deterrent to independent businesses where they are found in violation of antitrust laws and convicted, and in most cases our opinion would be that fines could really put independent business out of business, but in the higher brackets in our business economy, where big business functions in high gear, we hold to the view that fines would be no deterrent, irrespective of the amount of the fine involved. For example, during the World War II emergency, when rubber tires were an essential commodity for our war efforts, and at which time the Government laid down specific regulations and laws where violations took place, we find that when the Government moved in to correct the violation of a small firm and the penalty was inflicted, in most cases it resulted in the fact that the small fellow's right to do business was suspended for a term, which action put them out of business. But, on the other hand, when a larger member of that industry deliberately, Nation-wide, violated the law in a similar manner, by some manner or means he was able to get away with it. Or would we put it this way, Mr. Chairman, "Don't do it again," which is the line with the comments referred to above as made by members of the Senate Civil Service Committee during the examination of Mr. Berge, the then Assistant Attorney General on antitrust enforcement.

Mr. Chairman, it would be in order, in our opinion, to amend H. R. 6679, and to add thereto the provisions outlined in H. R. 4402, as follows:

"That any person convicted of any offense under the antitrust laws shall, as part of the punishment for such offense, be barred, for not less than 2 nor more than 5 years, from serving, directly or indirectly, in the capacity of officer, director, executive, legal counsel, adviser, and any similar capacity, with any corporation or corporations convicted in the same proceedings, and from directly or indirectly receiving any compensation, remuneration, or other consideration therefor, or by way of indemnification for being so barred. If he shall have been connected with any such convicted corporation in any such capacity during the commission of the criminal acts for which he has been convicted, he shall be so barred from such corporation for not less than 3 years, instead of 2 years as provided above. If he is a second offender by reason of prior conviction under the antitrust laws, he shall be barred for not less than 10 years, instead of the time provided for above; if a third offender, he shall be permanently barred, and the bar shall extend to serving with all corporations engaged in commerce."

Finally, as we see the situation, speaking solely in the interest of independent business of this Nation, we come to the conclusion that increasing fine penalties would not arrest the continual violations of antitrust laws, but, on the other hand, if the penalties for removal of officers were added thereto, and the Congress would vote such legislation, it would result in a watchful step by many corporations and their executive officers before they would chance losing their jobs through their own actions, either for a time or permanently.

We also believe there is immediate need for Congress to vote such recommended legislation in view of the fact that such action should be taken before any attempt is made for financial aid for independent business, as the above legislation would provide real protection for long-term capital loans.

It is our hope that your committee will take under advisement the suggested amendment to the bill under consideration and report out the amended bill at the earliest possible moment as such action would be in keeping with the expressed platform promises to independent business for more vigorous enforcement of antitrust laws and the strengthening of the laws by both the Democratic and Republican platform committees. This would be keeping their pledge to independent business of this Nation whom we believe number 3,000,000 or more. We believe for the good of our Nation's welfare that stronger antitrust laws must be enacted immediately, and the penalties for violations being more severe, if our free-enterprise system is to remain and function as independent business of this Nation understands the words "free enterprise."

Hospitalization of Mental Patients by the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. M. (DON) WHEELER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am enclosing herewith a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Georgia which I think will be of interest to the Members of this House who may have such conditions as described in the resolution existing in their States.

Mr. Speaker, in line with the resolution referred to above, I have introduced H. R. 7534, a bill to amend veterans' regulations to establish for persons who served in the armed forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 3 years from the date of separation from active service. I commend this bill to the attention of the membership of this House and hope that we may secure speedy passage of same so that many deserving veterans may be taken from county jails and placed in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

The resolution follows:

Whereas it has been forcefully called to the attention of the several members of this house of representatives by the State department of veterans service that hospitalization for mental patients by the Federal Veterans' Administration has become so critical as to be almost unobtainable; and

Whereas we are informed by the Veterans' Administration that this crisis is due to the lack of bed facilities in the various Veterans' Administration hospitals in the vicinity of our State; and

Whereas there are Georgia veterans suffering with mental disabilities languishing and suffering in Georgia jails because of the inability to secure beds for them in Veterans' Administration hospitals; and

Whereas there are many of our young veterans that can be cured of these mental conditions if adequate treatment is received without delay; and

Whereas there are 130 Georgia veterans entitled to hospitalization in Veterans' Administration facilities who are hospitalized in the State Hospital for the Insane, Milledgeville, Ga., because the Veterans' Administration was unable to hospitalize them because of the lack of bed facilities; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration hospital at Augusta, Ga., will admit only veterans suffering with mental disabilities incurred as a result of service in the armed forces of the United States of America; and

Whereas the laws of the United States of America provide for hospitalization of veterans irrespective of their service-connected status and since these laws do not discriminate as to the type of disability and since there appears to be discrimination by the Veterans' Administration against mental patients resulting in the aforementioned deplorable condition of our mental patients; and

Whereas it is felt that the Congress of the United States of America did not intend nor does it now desire that the men and women who fought for the preservation of our way of living against the enemies of

our country be thus abandoned to the tortures of mental derangement in jails, inadequate homes and wherever else they may be because the Veterans' Administration will not accept them, and until beds can be made available at the already overcrowded State hospital: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Georgia herein assembled strongly deplore the treatment received by Georgia veterans suffering mental disabilities at the hands of the Federal Veterans' Administration by refusing hospitalization for non-service-connected mental cases, thereby necessitating their prolonged incarceration in the jails of the various counties of this State without treatment and adequate care; and be it further

Resolved, That this critical condition be made known to the Georgia delegation of the Congress of the United States now in session so that they may do all within their power to relieve this critical situation by securing more beds and adequate medical personnel to staff the Veterans' Administration hospitals whereby effective treatment may be rendered and these veterans removed from the pitiful conditions now existing; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the House and that copies be sent to the United States Senators and Representatives in the Congress from this State.

In house, read and adopted February 9, 1950.

J. BOONE,
Clerk of the House.

Visit to the United States by Delegation From World Congress of Partisans of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a State Department release relative to the proposed visit to the United States by a delegation from the World Congress of Partisans of Peace.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES BY DELEGATION FROM WORLD CONGRESS OF PARTISANS OF PEACE

The World Congress of Partisans of Peace, the leading over-all Communist-front organization in the world, has announced that it is sending a delegation of 12 Europeans to the United States on March 3. The announced purpose of the delegation's visit is to present a petition to the Congress of the United States for (1) cessation of the armaments race by immediate reduction of war budgets and military effectives; and (2) prohibition of atomic weapons.

Members of the delegation have applied for visas to come to the United States. The 12 delegates, on the basis of available information, are either known Communists or fellow travelers and are therefore subject to exclusion from the United States under the immigration laws.

The Department of State, because of the avowed intention of the group to present a petition to Congress, has consulted with majority and minority leadership in both Houses. On March 1, the majority leader of the House, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, addressed the House on the subject. Mr. MCCORMACK said in part:

"Heretofore, the function of this Soviet front-organization has been manipulation of the peace symbol in ways calculated to exploit for selfish Soviet purposes the sincere longing for peace of hundreds of millions of souls throughout the world. It has shown little genuine concern for peace as that term is understood in the free world but abundant zeal for the establishment of conditions favorable to extension of Soviet powers.

* * *

"It is singularly presumptuous of this Soviet-front organization and its sponsors to assume that the legislative branch of this Government would, for a single moment entertain any fraudulent appeals calling on this body in effect to abandon its principles and disregard its solemn responsibilities to the American people and their allies for the security of the United States and the preservation of democratic institutions throughout the free world.

"I am sure the State Department recognizes the situation and will govern itself accordingly in the proper way."

At the close of Mr. MCCORMACK's remarks, the minority leader, Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., requested permission to make the following statement:

"I agree with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and I hope the State Department will take the proper action and not permit the visit to be made."

On March 2 Senators TOM CONNALLY, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee; SCOTT LUCAS, majority leader; and KENNETH WHERRY all spoke in opposition to the granting of visas to the delegation. Similar opposition was expressed in the House by Congressmen JOHN KEE, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and JAMES G. FULTON.

The Department of State, in full concurrence with the congressional expressions above stated, is therefore refusing to grant entry to the proposed delegation.

ANNOUNCEMENT AND SPONSORSHIP OF THE PROPOSED VISIT

The first public announcement of the membership of the delegation to the United States was contained in the February 18, 1950, issuance of the Paris Communist newspaper Humanite. The same source, on February 10, had reported on a February 9 meeting of the Paris Secretariat of the movement at which the decision was made to send delegations to various countries including the United States.

On February 23 a welcoming committee for the World Peace Delegation, with its headquarters in New York, extended an invitation to the delegation to come to the United States. The American group is headed by O. John Rogge and reportedly includes Bishop Moulton, Dr. Linus Pauling, and others who were associated with the so-called Cultural and Scientific Conference on World Peace which met at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, March 25–27, 1949.

BACKGROUND OF PARTISANS-FOR-PEACE MOVEMENT

The partisans-for-peace movement was organized at Communist-line meetings held in Paris and Prague, April 20–25, 1949. It stemmed from an earlier international peace congress at Wroclaw, Poland, held in August 1948. The World Congress of Peace Partisans at Paris established a permanent world peace committee as the central unit in the peace movement. The committee consists of representatives from 54 countries and includes key leaders from such Communist-front organizations as the World Federation of Trade Unions. It has a smaller executive bureau headed by the French atomic scientist, the Communist, Frederic Joliot-Curie.

The peace congresses held in various countries under the auspices of this organization have uniformly followed a Communist line. They have centered their attack on "United States warmongers" and have been most sympathetic to the U. S. S. R. and Soviet foreign policy. The organizational pattern has been to use as spokesmen prominent intellectuals, some of whom are consistent fellow travelers and some of whom are independent leftists, while the direction and machinery remained firmly in Communist hands. Rarely have non-Communist viewpoints been expressed at these congresses. When presented they were quickly blanketed by orthodox Stalinism.

PROGRAM OF THE PARTISANS FOR PEACE

As a major Soviet instrumentality for propaganda and political pressure, the partisans-for-peace movement encompasses virtually all important front organizations through which Communists are appealing for support to labor, women, youth, and other peace-loving people. Leaders of the movement have stated recently that the movement has completed its basic organizational stage and that the time has come for it to undertake concrete tasks.

A series of campaigns, seeking such concrete results, is under way at the present time. A striking aspect of this stage of developments is its open connection with the Cominform and the world Communist movement. Thus, the best summary of the Partisans of Peace program is to be found in the leading editorial of the Cominform organ for February 10, 1950, which claims that the world-wide struggle for peace is entering a new phase of concrete patriotic action against war in which declarations and pacifist phrase-mongering are not enough. The Cominform, therefore, states that the tasks of the Partisans of Peace include a campaign to secure refusal by the workers to produce weapons of death; a campaign among western European transport workers to obtain their refusal to handle American arms, agitation for the withdrawal of French troops in French Indochina, the replacement of the present reactionary governments in France and Italy in order that their parliaments will stop the arms race and annul the North Atlantic pact, and the active support of Soviet proposals to prohibit atomic weapons and to conclude a peace pact among the big powers.

Although the Partisans of Peace are participating in each of the campaigns mentioned by the Cominform, the most important work is being done with reference to two of these. The most spectacular campaign is directed toward closing European ports to American shipments under the mutual defense assistance program. The effort to do this centers largely around a strike campaign coordinated by the World Federation of Trade Unions, an affiliate of the World Congress of Partisans of Peace. The various local and national committees of the Partisans of Peace movement in Europe and actively assisting in this strike campaign by attempting to mobilize mass support through demonstrations, other propaganda methods, and the collection of funds, and by providing a propaganda cover to the strike campaign, which is justified in the name of peace.

In the second of the important Partisans of Peace campaigns, an effort is being made to mobilize world public opinion behind a series of peace proposals which coincide with those presented by the U. S. S. R. delegation to the United Nations—a connection that is mentioned in the official journal of the Partisans of Peace.

A variety of methods is being used by the Partisans of Peace in their effort to mobilize what they will claim to be world public opinion in support of their proposals. These include the collection in a number of countries of millions of signatures for peace ballots, torchlight processions, and other demonstrations, and the petitioning of thousands of municipal councilors and members of parliaments. In this country there is now underway a drive to collect a million signatures in protest against H-bomb diplomacy to be presented to President Truman on April 12, the anniversary of President Roosevelt's death.

The most important aspects of the Partisans of Peace campaign in support of the Soviet peace proposals centers around the effort to secure their formal ratification by the various national assemblies of the world (of which the proposed delegation to the United States is one example). This is being done in two ways: First, the Partisans of Peace organizations in each country are petitioning their own parliaments to ratify these proposals. (A number of satellite parliaments, including Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, have already responded to such appeals.) Second, the World Congress of Partisans of Peace is now planning to send a number of international delegations to appeal to the parliaments of such countries as Belgium, Holland, Italy, France, Mexico, the Soviet Union, and the United States.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE DELEGATION TO THE UNITED STATES

Pablo Picasso: World-famous Spanish painter. A member of the French Communist Party since 1944, he has been a leading figure in various Communist-front organizations, including the International Committee of the World Partisans of Peace.

Rev. Hewlett Johnson: Dean of Canterbury. Member of the editorial board of the Daily Worker. Delegate to several conferences of the Partisans of Peace and British member of the World Peace Committee.

Ivor Montagu: British film producer, director and scenarist, and active in many phases of motion-picture production. He has been a Communist Party member since 1923 and is a member of the Daily Worker editorial staff.

Dr. Max Dupuy: Belgium's foremost atomic scientist and associate of Professor Piccard since 1933. An avowed Communist sympathizer, Dupuy has been playing a vigorous role in various front organizations.

Eugene Aubel: Professor of chemistry and biology, University of Paris. A member of the French Communist Party. Active in Communist-front organizations. Delegate, World Congress of Intellectuals, Wroclaw, Poland, 1948, and a member, National Council Combattants de la Liberte et de la Paix (Fighters for Liberty and Peace).

Rene Brul: Well-known Swiss modernist painter. An ardent fellow traveler, he is a member of the Swiss-Soviet Friendship Association.

Jean Lurcat: Artist, reportedly a member of the French Communist Party and an active member in numerous Communist-front organizations.

Luigi Cacciatore: A parliamentary deputy, Cacciatore is an active leader of the Italian Socialist Party which cooperates with the Italian Communist Party. He was Minister of Posts and Telecommunications in the De Gasperi cabinet in 1947.

Dr. Mario Montesi: Communal councilor of Rome since the liberation. He was at one time active in the Christian Democratic Party but later joined the Pro-Communist Christian Movement for Peace.

Giuseppina (Pina) Palumbo: A socialist senator and former social worker, she was the first woman given a post in the Italian government after liberation. She is now active in leftist women's groups.

Prof. Ottviano Mario Olivo: Highly regarded Italian specialist in anatomy and histology and one-time Rockefeller fellow in the United States. He took part in the leftist-sponsored Congress of Italian Culture in 1949.

Furio Diaz: Communist mayor of Leghorn since the liberation. Thirty-three years old, law graduate; formerly taught at University of Pisa. Member of the Italian Communist Party and its organ, the Friends of Unità.

Not Fooled by President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press of Pontiac, Mich., dated March 2, 1950.

The President may think that he can fool all of the people all of the time. This outstanding newspaper has pointed out in its editorial that the one person to blame for the present coal famine is President Truman, himself.

Many telegrams have reached my desk, urging that impeachment proceedings be instituted against the President.

As long ago as October 27, I wired the President, urging action in the coal crisis. That appeal has been repeated by me to him since that time. Such appeals have been entirely ignored.

Whatever credit the President may take for settling the coal strike is entirely unjustified. The people of the country should know that for political purposes and for political purposes only, he neglected to do his duty to the American people.

The editorial follows:

THE TRUMAN COAL FAMINE

Is your coal bin empty?

If it is or so nearly so that you are alarmed by the threat to your family's health, do you know who is to blame?

The easiest answer to that question would be John L. Lewis and the mine operators. But it wouldn't be the right one.

Mr. Lewis and his United Mine Workers certainly must accept great responsibility for the catastrophe now gripping the Nation. Neither are the mine owners guiltless. But the major weight of blame belongs to one man.

He is President Harry S. Truman.

His dilly-dallying brought on the crisis.

It explains why Pontiac is one of the forty-six Michigan communities forced to the last ditch resort of coal rationing and sharing.

His refusal to take a firm and early hand in this dispute idled nearly 200,000 employees of coal-using industries, besides the 370,000 miners still on strike in defiance of two court injunctions.

At every stage of this slowly developed national emergency the President has procrastinated. Perhaps, as has been suggested, he desired to show the weakness of the Taft-Hartley Act as a means of settling disputes endangering the national welfare.

Instead he has proved his own weakness. And the people are left in the middle.

They are being squeezed between the two ruthless forces of a big labor monopoly and a socialistic Democratic-Labor administration.

The United Mine Workers Union belatedly has been brought into court on a charge of contempt. But there is no certainty that even a heavy fine will persuade the miners to resume work.

Sentiment in Congress is growing for legislation authorizing the President to seize and operate the mines.

We hope this can be avoided.

It is objectionable on two counts.

For one thing it would put Government into a business which should be privately operated. Second, it would enable the administration to make a contract with the UMW the union never could hope to win from the operators.

Past experience shows that the result would be higher coal prices and no greater probability of uninterrupted production in this sick industry. An administration banking heavily on rank-and-file labor votes can't be expected to handle contract negotiations without those votes in mind.

This very step apparently has been the goal of John L. Lewis ever since he cut the workweek to 3 days with the definite intention of bringing on a critical situation. All the way through many months in which the national situation grew steadily worse, President Truman sat quietly by, replying to frequent questions merely that there was no crisis.

The American people should know by now where the major blame lies. They know that votes put the man mainly responsible in the White House. If they don't like the way he has acted, they should remember that votes also can take him out of it.

Transit Radio's Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, there has been some agitation about the pros and cons of radio broadcast to trolley cars and busses here in the District of Columbia.

Transit Radio, Inc., is a concern of high reputation and its operations are participated in by some of the best daily newspapers in various sections of the United States. Perhaps music makes some people nervous but this article points out in an honest manner that, contrary to recent agitation, the broadcasts are welcomed by most car and bus riders and, of course, they are not used for anything but legitimate commercial purposes as are any other lawful broadcasting companies. In order that the people of the country will not be deluged by hysteria on the subject I am presenting the following article, reprinted from Broadcasting-Telecasting, a trade publication, issue of February 6:

(By C. L. (Chet) Thomas, president, Transit Radio, Inc., general manager, KXOK-AM-FM, St. Louis)

The case for Transit Radio has never been fully made. It is impressive. The main arguments in favor of Transit Radio are:

The riders of public transportation like Transit Radio.

They like its music. It is good music—popular in the best sense, neither heavily classical nor radically "jive." It is the type of music that, according to psychologists and experts in industrial relations, soothes people and reduces tension. Without cost the riders of public transportation are given the same kind of service with which many businesses at considerable cost provide their customers and employees. Without cost the riders of public transportation receive the very best radio service available to the riders of private automobiles. Without cost they hear this service reproduced with a fidelity equal to that of the most expensive receiving sets in private automobiles. The riders of public transportation receive this excellent transmission of this excellent program during what is to most of them the most tedious parts of their day.

CITES LISTENER APPEAL

The riders of public transportation like the nonmusic services provided by Transit Radio also. They like the brief newscasts and weather reports. Most of them like the advertising because it acquaints them with available goods and services.

We know the riders of public transportation like Transit Radio because we have checked it. Here is the summary of the results of five surveys made in St. Louis, Washington, D. C., Baltimore, and Kansas City by Edward G. Doody & Co. during 1948–49:

"Eight out of 10 riders favor Transit Radio as a part of regular service. Less than 1 out of 10 object. The rest don't care or are undecided. However, even among those who say they object, there is a substantial group which would not object, if the majority favored permanent installations. Thus, only a fractional group of active objectors remains opposed even against majority will."

Transit Radio helps the transit companies provide sound, efficient, and economical service.

Insofar as Transit Radio provides public-transit companies with a source of income in addition to their fares, it is helping to make possible good public transportation at minimum cost.

Transit Radio makes it possible for the drivers of busses and streetcars to meet emergencies.

In this regard Transit Radio has already shown its capabilities. Because of newscasts received over Transit Radio, bus and streetcar drivers in Washington, D. C., and St. Louis have known how to avoid areas blocked off by fires. Because of newscasts over Transit Radio, drivers in Houston, Tex., did their jobs better during a hurricane. These instances are portents of vastly more important uses.

The American people are just beginning to look full in the face the job of reducing their vulnerability to atomic attack. The need was underscored once when the United States developed the atomic bomb. It was underscored a second time when the Soviet Union did likewise. It is being underscored a third time by debate over the forthcoming development of a hydrogen bomb, potentially 1,000 times more powerful than the A-bomb. One of the obvious and essential requirements of civil defense will be a means by which the public transportation systems can be mobilized to move great numbers of people out of threatened areas and to move civil defenders to their posts of duty. The means, of course, is FM radio, which was used by tanks, artillery, planes, infantry, etc., during World War II.

Thanks to Transit Radio, the busses and streetcars of 19 American cities are already equipped with radio which in the event of an emergency could be used for guidance. This is done without cost to the taxpayers, the riders, or the public transit companies. It is being done while giving the riders the best radio service available. It is being done while giving that same service to the entire community. Arrangements are under way to provide Transit Radio to 25 or 30 other American cities.

Against this imposing array of advantages, only one argument has been advanced by its critics. "It violates the rider's right not to listen," they say. "In this way it violates his right to privacy and assails the freedom of his mind."

First, how many riders of public transportation do not like Transit Radio? Take the 8 out of 10 riders who like Transit Radio. Add those who are undecided. Add those who do not care. Add those who do not like it but who withdraw their objections in deference to the majority preference. As the Edward G. Doody Co. says, "only a fractional group of active objectors remains." This fractional group ranges from 1.2 percent to 5.3 percent.

But the critics brush these figures aside. "It isn't a question of percentages," they say. "It is a question of the rights of the minority however small. The offensive thing about Transit Radio is that it holds its audience captive."

Is advertising over Transit Radio really different from advertising generally? The answer is no. All advertising tries to hold the attention of its audience.

Take the ads in newspapers and magazines. Can a person escape seeing them? Not if he wants to read the paper or magazine. The periphery of his vision takes them in, willy-nilly.

HIGHWAY SIGNS

Take advertising on aural radio or TV. Can a person in his home escape hearing and seeing the "plugs?" Not if he wants to listen and watch. Of course, he could switch the program off or turn it down during the commercial. But he doesn't. And to do so would require a greater attention and a greater exertion than not doing so.

Take advertising signs along the highway, particularly those head on at curves. Can a driver escape seeing them? Not if he wants to keep the car on the road.

This list could be expanded—the show windows of stores, the card advertising in busses and streetcars, the posters on subway pillars, etc.

In each case the individual who does not want to hole up like a hermit is exposed to advertising.

But he certainly is not a captive. He frees himself by controlling his attention, either consciously or, more often, unconsciously. The stream of stimuli assailing the senses is limitless and unending, even on a desert island. The mind selects those it wants to use and of necessity ignores the others. This is elementary psychology. Everybody does this every minute of every day, even when asleep. One does it so naturally that one isn't aware of doing it. Nobody, on a bus or streetcar who doesn't like transit radio need pay attention to it. One can bring to bear the same habits by which one is able to ignore other things one wants to exclude.

People who ride public transportation systems are already prepared to "tune out" transit radio if they want to. They have been trained to do so by the noises that inevitably attend public transportation, the sound of the motor, the clash of gears, the jolts and jars, the horn, etc.

Privacy on a bus? The same kind of privacy that there is in Madison Square Garden: The privacy of concentration. If a rider doesn't want to listen to the conversations of his fellow passengers, he doesn't have to. ("This morning when I got up I didn't feel well. I wasn't really sick. Just butterflies in the stomach, you know.") If he wants to, he can pay attention. ("And I told my husband, if you want to keep your little girl friend, you can, but you can't keep me.") In the same way the rider can tune transit radio in or out at will.

Minority rights are not at stake. But the rights of the majority are at stake—the rights of the 8 out of 10 riders, who want transit radio. These the competitors of transit radio would deprive. They would deprive them of the radio service they like. They would deprive them of an agency that may some day save millions of lives.

The real reason for most of the opposition to transit radio is not ideological at all. It is mercenary self-interest.

Transit radio is able to do effectively what all advertising tries to do. It reaches a mass audience. It can tell its clients precisely how big. It reaches special kinds of audiences. It can tell its clients precisely what kinds and the precise times when they can be reached. It provides these services to the advertisers in the best tradition of advertising—while providing a public service that the people need and like.

Competition for the pieces of the pie of the advertiser's dollar has always been keen. It has never before been so keen as it is today. Established media have always tried to block newer competitors. AM radio was opposed. FM radio was opposed. Car-card advertising was opposed. Billboard advertising was opposed. And so on. Now, and for the same reasons, transit radio is being opposed. The only differences are two: The opponents of transit radio are hiding their commercial motives behind a facade a bit more fancy than usual. And the opponents of transit radio are resorting to tactics of unprecedented viciousness and desperation.

The Future of the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a resolution calling for the creation of a special bipartisan commission, appointed in the same manner as the Hoover Commission on Organization of Government, to study the coal industry and report back to the Congress in January 1951. The commission would recommend a long-range program to put the industry on a sound economic basis and prevent the recurrence of the constant crises in the industry which in recent years have so seriously threatened our country's economic stability.

Two excellent articles in the Christian Science Monitor for March 2 present data which show the need for such a study. Both are written by the able journalist, Harlan Trott.

I include these articles, entitled "Coal's Smoky Future" and "Coal Faces Dark Technological Future," in the RECORD and commend them to the serious attention of my colleagues:

COAL'S SMOKY FUTURE

(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—Just because the Nation is in the throes of a national crisis over the miners' refusal to dig coal is no sign that management in the coal industry is without its blind spots.

The big commercial operators do not seem alarmed unduly over the fact that their market is shrinking at the rate of several million tons a year due to switchovers to oil and gas, not just by householders, but by big industrial users as well.

One hears little about these shrinking markets except during coal strikes, at which time comments on John L. Lewis' ability as a gas and oil salesman are in order.

Coal operators take the view that the future of coal is secure because of its essential tie-in with the electric power industry. The latest bituminous coal annual has this to say: "If this be the 'age of electricity,' consider that bituminous coal is the foremost fuel for producing electric power and lighting, and it is basic to the expansive prospects. The electric utilities in 1949 became bituminous coal's largest single market, and will probably continue so."

Lately, however, several big electric power companies have switched from coal to oil, and some of the big coal companies along the eastern seaboard have gone into the business of selling oil to industrial customers who have converted to oil.

Communities of steam-generated electric plants from coal to natural gas are increasing, too. Gas pipe lines are spreading their steel tentacles all over the map. Right now, Texas natural gas is warming its way to Bangor, Maine.

One wonders whether coal operators are not being unduly optimistic about their security in the age of electricity. Opponents of public service monopolies would have us believe that the linked power systems they call the electric power trust still approximates the danger of bigness.

But how about oil?

Actually, the electric power industry does not begin to compare in size with the business of supplying fuel for the Nation's millions of automobiles.

Private electric power companies own about 100,000,000 horsepower of combined installed generating capacity. But the automotive industry manufactures 100,000,000 horsepower of new automobile engines every 2½ months. That means that five times a year the branch of private enterprise which technologists call the "oil-power trust" duplicates the electric power industry's entire installed capacity.

In order to fuel this vast market, big oil companies have acquired control of crossroad corner lots and staked out their claim with shiny motor pumps. These oil-power dispensaries are known to our increasing folklore as gas stations. Their slogan is "Fill 'er up!"

In thinking about coal, the country seems to have fallen into a kind of mass fatalism whereby we write off any future for coal on the theory that, as President William Green of the AFL told Congress last week, it is a "sick" industry. Calling a thing sick never healed it.

For a long time coal technologists have been trying to tell us that there's nothing sick but the industry's thinking. They have been demonstrating that the industry dust off its data and widen the horizons of its research in order to perfect and apply the processes of converting coal into oil.

If the coal industry's faith in the electric power industry's shaky dependence on it is not enough to save it, perhaps oil will. Many years ago State authorities and Federal research agencies learned how to run automobiles on gasoline distilled from coal.

Officials in the United States Bureau of Mines have said on numerous occasions that the bulk of the Nation's vast coal deposits contain upward of 20 to 30 gallons of good refinery oil per ton of coal.

This is another way of saying that the Nation wasted in excess of 300,000,000 barrels of oil last year in the 600,000,000 tons of raw coal that Mr. Lewis' men poured into the market.

Bureau of Mines officials will tell you that the smoke that goes up the chimney is more than a blot on the landscape. It's writing on the sky, a warning against squandering the earth's wealth, an appeal to make this a richer and more beautiful America.

Barely a fortnight ago the Standard Oil Co. announced the closing of its oil-from-coal experimental plant at Library, Pa., due to unstable labor conditions. Given the vigorous, perceptive leadership of a union leader like Walter Reuther, the miners would not have let this happen.

Here certainly is the underlying challenge that emerges from this current crisis in coal. Put technology to work, and there will be work enough for the men who dig coal.

COAL FACES DARK TECHNOLOGICAL FUTURE

(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—"There is no technology in sight to save the coal industry."

This is the opinion voiced by the Government's second-ranking expert on synthetic fuels. He is Dr. W. C. Schroeder, Chief of the Office of Synthetic Liquid Fuels in the Fuels and Explosives Service of the Bureau of Mines.

Dr. Schroeder's views carry special impact, coming at a time when the Nation is in the grip of its worst coal crisis in history.

Behind the unwillingness of John L. Lewis' 450,000 members of the United Mine Workers to dig coal without a contract is the economic fact that competition from natural gas and oil has cut into the coal market so badly that full-time employment for most of the coal miners appears to be a thing of the past.

ATOMIC PLANT CONVERTED

A series of postwar coal strikes has forced many large industrial coal users as well as householders to turn to other fuels, which are not only more convenient than coal but the supply will not be interrupted by strikes.

Uncertain coal supplies resulting from labor unrest in the mines was directly responsible for the Atomic Energy Commission's decision to convert its huge Oak Ridge project from coal to natural gas.

When the Pittsburgh Consolidated Coal Co. and the Standard Oil Co. opened their joint coal gasification pilot plant at Library, Pa., a couple of years ago, it appeared that industry leaders were determined to try to save the coal business by converting the Nation's vast, latently oil-rich coal deposits into synthetic liquid fuels by this German-pioneered approach to oil-from-coal technology.

Such an undertaking held big implications for the men who dig coal. Mr. Lewis was invited to the formal opening of the pilot plant. Bowing to George Love, president of Pittsburgh Consolidation, the miners' chieftain told the gathering: "The great financial efforts of the company to increase not only its own earnings, but those of its employees, augurs well for the future stability and strength of America."

No such fanfare marked the closing of this project last January 6, while the Nation was suffering for want of enough of the 2,000-year supply of coal that lies underground.

Mr. Love blamed the failure of the project on the miners.

"Things are so bad from an economic standpoint," he declared, "that we see no reason to carry on this particular work further at this time. To be successful, a plant of the type we had planned would have to have cheap coal and complete assurance of a regular coal supply. Under present circumstances the labor relations in the industry are so bad that none of these things are possible. No sane person would dream of investing great sums of money in a venture which was tied to coal as a raw material when the future cost is so indefinite and the supply of coal so unreliable."

Standard Oil took a different tack.

LONG-RANGE VIEW

"With the return of a more nearly normal increase in oil demand and with greatly increased world petroleum supplies," the company said, "it now appears that the need for converting coal to oil is not pressing."

Dr. Schroeder discounted the explanation given out by Mr. Love. He said he thought Standard Oil had "got all the data out of it they were going to get."

Some observers are wondering how the coal miners feel about this oil-company view of the miners' dismal long-range prospects for steady employment.

A prominent coal technologist recently told Mr. Lewis that now is the time to begin making a coal and shale supply the base load of the Nation's oil requirements.

At the same time, he was asked to throw his weight behind the idea of having the country's diminishing petroleum take care of seasonal peaks or national emergencies. He was told that the miners should have a say in the best use of the Nation's fuel reserves.

Mr. Lewis was told that this was labor's opportunity to create new, steady, full-time employment, and to help develop low-cost power for the farmers, who now use 10 times more oil-consuming automotive power than industry.

Ye Were Afraid To Live, and So Ye Perished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by Hal Boyle:

YE WERE AFRAID TO LIVE, AND SO YE PERISHED

(By Hal Boyle)

There came a time when the earth was divided into two hemispheres, the east and the west.

Great was the contention between them, and each charged the other with seeking to rule the world. And the hemispheres became armed camps.

There were then 4,000,000,000 people in the world. No man's mouth was free to speak his yearning, and all men bent under the burden of readying their hemisphere against the enemy.

Nine-tenths of every drop of sweat, every yard of cloth, every pound of gold, every ton of steel was spent to safeguard the peace. This was true everywhere upon the globe. The people groaned in their tatters, but the engines of war were gleaming and fed.

It chanced that on a warm and moonless night in April the Island of Bermuda disappeared, with a titanic crash, beneath the surface of the sea. Two passing air liners saw it go down in a dim tower of foam. They radioed an alarm.

Three hours later a 50-square-mile area of forestland in Siberia erupted in broken greenery from the impact of a gigantic force.

The chancelleries of the world held hurried conference and agreed: Counterattack.

And the engines of war were unleashed. Each side sent up huge guided missiles, carrying hydrogen bombs in their warheads. The slender missiles passed in midair over the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, leaving a murmurous sigh in their wake.

Where they landed, cities or landscapes disappeared—and so did radio stations, and cows, and violins, and old books, and the paintings of Rembrandt, and the lives of millions of people.

"Victory or death," cried the eastern leader.

"Win or perish," cried the western leader.

And the bombs mushroomed by the hundreds, then by the thousands. And great winds arose and carried the dust of death over every land. In 6 weeks every man, woman, and child, every bird, every beast, was gone. The trees gave up their leaves, the moss turned white, and no ant crawled.

The last thing on earth to die was a worm 4 miles south of Oak Ridge, Tenn. It was washed out of the soil by a radioactive rain—and collapsed.

Then the spectral spirits of earth's 4,000,000,000 people flew in a vast host to the gold bar of Heaven. Through the gates they could see green grass and rainbow flowers. And the gates opened, and the souls of all the slain children skipped into Heaven.

And the parents surged after them, but a mighty voice called:

"Wait." And they waited.

"Why did ye this unto Me?" said the voice.

"They started it," cried the leader of the East.

"No, you started it," cried the leader of the West.

So, the celestial bookkeeper was called, and he said:

"On a night in April a small island in the Atlantic was struck by a large meteor. Three hours later—hmmm, very unusual—another meteor landed in a Siberian forest. Then everyone on earth just seemed to lose his mind."

"Why?" said the mighty voice.

"Because we were afraid," said the leader of the West.

"Yes, because we were afraid," said the leader of the East.

"Ye were afraid to live—therefore ye died," said the voice. "Look at the Eden I gave ye."

The great host turned and looked across the fields of space. They saw the dear familiar earth, the hills of home, spinning in gray ruin under a silent sky.

And as they watched the gates of Heaven closed noiselessly behind them.

The Fearless, Able Work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Ability of J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI To Ferret Out the Truth and Their Courage To Make It Known Made Possible the Exposure and Conviction of Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the persistent, able, patriotic, and fearless efforts of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and the work of J. Edgar Hoover and his FBI forces, the ablest fact-finding organization in the world, brought to light the treasonable acts of Alger Hiss in stealing secret documents from the files of the State Department and turning them over to a Russian spy ring. There would have been no exposure of Hiss and he would not have been indicted, tried, and convicted for perjury in denying his treasonable conduct but for the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the FBI.

Always, as a Member of the House, I have supported both the Committee on Un-American Activities and J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article concerning the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which appeared in the United States Investor under date of February 18, 1950. This Corporation protects more than 100,000,000 depositors in our banks, and it is the major stabilizing influence for the entire banking structure.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FDIC ITSELF—TWO PHASES NOT ASSOCIATED WITH THE PRESENT MOVEMENT TOWARD REDUCTION OF ASSESSMENTS

HAS MADE OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS

In all this discussion, now current at Washington, as to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and its assessments, two phases can easily be overlooked. One is that the Corporation has made other definite contributions to the uplift of American banking besides the protection of depositors from loss. Our banks of State charter operate on a definitely higher level now than in the days before this Corporation came into being and no small degree of credit for the improvement must be given to the Corporation and to the very capable men who have served at its head.

MEMBERSHIP COST THUS FAR

The other is the fact—and we are prepared to defend this statement against those who cling to an opposite view—that the cost represented by the annual assessments paid by banks into the Corporation has not been exorbitant. We do not mean by this that the present movement for reduction of these assessments is out of order or even badly timed. We do wish that the banks of some of our States were blessed with greater capital funds than they have thus far accumulated. A ratio of capital funds to deposits of no better than 1 to 20, existing now in several major States, is not so large a first defense against bad banking or economic upheaval as it should be. But with the American Bankers Association on record as believing that the funds saved through reduced assessments may well go to the building up of capital account, the case for reduction at the present time is strong. Hitherto, the money accruing to the Corporation from the assessments has represented no more than a reasonable outlay by the American banking system for the protection of its depositors.

THE PROBLEM OF STATE EXAMINATIONS

Let's talk a bit further about each of these phases of the problem. First, about the uplift to American banking which the Corporation has very definitely helped to bring about. It was no secret, in the days prior to 1933 that bank examinations varied in quality as between national banks and State banks in a good many parts of this country. Of course, in a State like New York or Connecticut or Massachusetts, there had been a determined purpose to bring the examinations of State banks and trust companies up to the level of national-bank examinations and for the most part this result had been accomplished. Even in those States, however, there were occasional lapses from the avowed high purpose. Some less worthy person, pushed forward on political considerations, would obtain the office of superintendent or commissioner of banks and a let-down in quality of bank supervision would almost inevitably follow. On the whole, however, you could count on the State bank examinations of part of our States.

Unfortunately, there were plenty of other States where examinations of State-chartered institutions were way below the level of examinations of national banks. It became something of an axiom among people moving their businesses from one State to another that if they wished to play safe with their bank accounts they would better lodge these with a national bank. The quality of national-bank examinations was good and had a tendency to become even better. For a number of years before 1933 the office of Comptroller of the Currency was held by a series of strong men and they instilled the quality of strength in the bank examining force. In the States, there was much less attention given by Governors to the quality of commissioners whom they appointed and these in turn set mediocre standards or worse for the work of their examiners.

CORPORATION HAS ACCOMPLISHED MUCH

Indeed, when the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation first became a reality, there were plenty of critics to declare that it would certainly flounder upon the reefs created by poor State bank examinations. One of the greatest tributes one can pay to the splendid record which Leo T. Crowley made as the first chairman of the corporation is to say that he sensed quite clearly the challenge presented to him by the then character of State bank examinations. One of his first undertakings was to lift such examinations to a level comparable with that of national-bank examinations. Under chairman Hart this same high purpose has been continued.

At times, this undertaking on Mr. Crowley's part called for a considerable measure of diplomatic skill. State bank examiners have never been noted for their enthusiasm over suggestions from Federal authorities. To make matters more complex, there was a considerable disposition among the State banks themselves to look askance at the new bank examining force which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was creating and to complain that this meant duplication of examinations of State banks and a lot of annoyance, therefore, to bank operating men. But patience and diplomacy on the part of the head of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation won out in the end. Not only is there a fine spirit of amity today between State bank examiners and the examiners of the corporation, but there is a genuine purpose that examinations shall be of a distinctly high order.

LESS OF POLITICAL KIND

The commissioner of strong political antecedents and present political activity is a rare creature among our State banking systems today. It is literally true that in some of our States where political rivalry is very much in evidence, all of the factions seem to have come to the common belief that politics has no place in the office of the Commissioner of Banks. One State of the South comes very much to mind in this connection, where three groups are savagely contending for mastery of State affairs and where in ordinary matters no holds are barred. Yet in that State, the bank commissioner's office has been kept quite out of the struggle and examinations of banks are worthy of the standards which the most enlightened States are setting. A large degree of credit for this goes to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation which has set high standards of examination for itself and by its example has

done much to create high standards among each State's own examiners. As a matter of fact, the men who operate State banks would probably make their voices heard if State examinations were to drop below the Federal level.

ITS OWN EXAMINING FORCE

All along, of course, the corporation has felt the grave need of keeping its own examining force up to a high level of quality. The Corporation has an exceptionally heavy assignment. It must keep itself so strong financially that it will never fail to indemnify the bank depositors of this country against loss. It has a substantial trust fund committed to its care for this purpose, and it must protect that fund to the extent of its ability from erosion. Big as $1,200,000,000 of capital and surplus sounds, to the ears of most of us, it is really a tiny accumulation when compared with the hundreds of billions of deposits which it undertakes to insure against loss. The Corporation really has no choice but to keep capable and wide-awake examiners on the job if it is to make that modest insurance fund do the work. There is no room for political appointees in that examining force. There is room only for the best examiners that the means of the Corporation will permit it to employ.

Now how does it go about the selection of men for this force? It selects them by two kinds of examinations. There is first the written examination, common to all people nowadays who wish to enter the civil service of the Federal Government. As everybody knows, however, written examinations can turn up some bewildering results. Your man whose marks are high is not always adapted to the work of examining a bank. He has to have personal qualities in keeping with this particular kind of work. Besides the ability to go over books of account and wring from them the story they have to tell, and perhaps the secrets they are withholding, the examiner must know how to get along with people, how to cooperate with his fellow examiners and how to make the people of the bank respect the work he does and the things he says.

So each person who passes the written examination appears before a committee for judgment of his personal aptness. There are representatives of the Civil Service Commission, of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and of the banks on this committee. The man who emerges from this vast sieve to make a good assistant examiner, the grade to which he is assigned at first.

THE TRAINING IS CONTINUOUS

Don't you believe, however, that the efforts of the corporation to keep its examining force up to a high order stop with this set of examinations. It has a vigorous educational program which all the assistant examiners must take. As of a comparatively recent date, over 200 members of the examining force of the corporation were taking courses through the various chapters of the American Institute of Banking. They are expected, you see, to train themselves for greater skillful work. The force already contains a great number of AIB graduates.

Then a picked group who have advanced from assistant examiners to examiners and have shown particular aptitude for the work are given courses at the expense of the Corporation either in the Graduate School of Banking conducted under the auspices of the American Bankers Association at Rutgers University, or at the corresponding school in Wisconsin and on the Pacific coast. Something like a dozen men, we believe, were enrolled at Rutgers as of a recent date, and several others enrolled at the two other institutions.

Quite a far cry, isn't it, from the kind of bank examiners which this plan aims to create, and we think does create, and the kind of examiners of other years who not infrequently owed their appointments to the endorsement of some man high in political life or to the proneness of some bank commissioner for favoring his political henchmen? While it has been lifting the quality of State bank examinations generally, the Corporation has devoted earnest effort to equipping itself with a dependable and capable examining force. Through these it is conducting the examinations of 6,600 banks or nearly half the whole number of insured banks in this country.

THOSE OUTLAYS FOR INTEREST

Now for our second assertion, namely, that the cost of deposit insurance up till now has not been exorbitant. When we say that, we must naturally produce a yardstick for measuring the accuracy of our statement. We can do it. Prior to the banking troubles of the early 1930's, one extravagant expenditure had taken deep root among the banks of this country, that of paying interest on demand deposits. Somehow the banking profession could not get rid of this evil, no matter how much the more thoughtful bank men were inclined to deplore it. Competition among banks had brought the unfortunate practice into being and that same competition was too keen to permit discontinuance of the practice. Some fine old banks stood out against it but they succumbed in the end for fear of losing deposits to the banks which were paying interest. This one outlay constituted a drain upon bank income which was considerable, and we are firmly of the belief that it contributed in some measure to the banking debacle of 1933.

Along with this unhappy practice was another mischievous arrangement, the effort on the part of banks to pay rates of interest on time deposits which earnings did not warrant. The practice reached its worst phases in areas where joint stock banks, National or State, attempted to pay the same rates as mutual savings banks were paying. The latter could very comfortably pay 4 percent and sometimes paid 5 percent. And commercial banks competing with them tried to keep up with this pace that the mutual savings banks were setting. As they look back now, they know that they cut an absurd figure by any such antics as these. The savings banks had abundant surplus funds on which they had no interest to pay, whereas the commercial banks were quite without this happy feature.

So here were two drains upon the commercial banks in the 1920's and early 1930's, interest on demand deposits and excessive payments of interest on time deposits. Not until the Government itself stepped into the situation and brought order out of chaos was anything done to cure this evil. The Government decreed that no interest whatever should be paid on demand deposits and it put control over interest on time deposits in the hands of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

MAKES COST OF INSURANCE LOOK SMALL

Now we have no figures as to the whole amount of money that was being wasted each year through these two drains. We have some figures from the national banks as to how much they paid out each year in interest on demand deposits. In 1928 the amount was $164,287,000, in 1929 was $173,204,000, in 1930 was $170,858,000, and in 1931 was $152,383,000. Remember, these outlays were for interest on demand deposits alone. What the national banks paid by way of excessive interest on time deposits is a figure not available. Furthermore, we have no figures for the payment of interest in these same years by State-chartered banks on either demand deposits or by way of excess payments on time deposits. So it is safe to say that the amount wasted in 1929 was several times $166,267,000 and was likewise several times the amount given above for the succeeding years.

Well, here is our yardstick for measuring what has been the actual cost of Federal deposit insurance to the banks of this country in each of the years from 1934 through 1948. The total assessments paid by the banks in 1945 were only $93,662,000. That, you see, is just about one-half the amount paid by the national banks alone in 1928 for interest on demand deposits. The whole amount of the assessments paid by the banks of this country for deposit insurance in 1946 was $107,033,000. In 1947 it was $114,429,000; in 1948 it was $119,227,000. How modest is each of these figures compared with what national banks alone were paying out prior to the act of 1933 for interest on demand deposits alone, and how positively tiny it must be in comparison with what National banks and State banks together were paying by way of interest on demand deposits and excessive interest payments on time deposits. So it cannot very well be argued that deposit insurance has been a luxurious outlay for our banks, taking them as a whole, when this outlay is so much less than they were paying in the 1920's as a penalty for certain evils of competition which they could not eradicate.

PURGED OF WEAKNESSES

The story of Federal deposit insurance is a record of splendid achievement. It confounds those of us who were inclined to look askance at the whole idea at the time of its inception and to question whether it had one chance in many of success or even of survival. Part of this success, of course, is due to the fact that both National and State banking systems had been pretty thoroughly purged of weak situations before the Corporation came into being. But the Corporation, by diligent attention to its own bank examinations, on the one hand, and to those of the State bank commissioners, on the other, has done much to keep State bank systems purged in the years that have followed. One may fairly say that, thus far, Federal insurance of deposits has been worth all it has cost.

Hon. Walter F. George, of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Senator WALTER GEORGE," under the caption "Did you happen to see," written by John White, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of March 3, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DID YOU HAPPEN TO SEE

SENATOR WALTER GEORGE

Here is the rock of Capitol Hill, the great moderate, the immovable moderate, the man who believes that the country's future depends on careful, thoughtful, slowly wrought change, the long-term optimist who will not be discouraged by sudden jerks which threaten to upset the governmental structure, nor falsely encouraged by the appearance of quick illusory blessings.

Like a rock in stormy seas, he seems occasionally lost in the winds and waves which rear over Capitol Hill—but when the storm subsides, there he is, unshaken. He goes on and on. Not overly concerned with present fame or blame, he concerns himself always with the future.

President Roosevelt found that out in 1938. F. D. R., because GEORGE had opposed the Supreme Court packing plan, tried to purge him from the Senate. GEORGE, the long-term optimist, showed a thorough mastery of short-term politics—he campaigned himself to a thumping victory—but the first thing he did when he returned triumphantly to Washington was appeal for peace in the Democratic Party.

He, like TAFT of the Republicans, displays the rarest of qualities of modern statesmanship, a profound and fixed regard for important issues and their ultimate effects.

WALTER FRANKLIN GEORGE was born some 3 miles from Preston, county seat of Webster County, Ga., on January 29, 1878, and in 1889 moved to Cordele, where he went to school. He also went to school in the musically named town of Arabi. For 2 years he taught school, then in the fall of 1897 he entered Mercer University, emerging in 1900 with a bachelor of science degree. Mercer has since honored him with an honorary doctor of laws degree and has named its law school after him.

He was admitted to the bar in 1901, practiced in Vienna, pronounced Vi-anna, Ga., became a solicitor general, a judge, and finally an associate justice of the State supreme court.

In 1922 he was elected to the Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Thomas Watson, and he has been reelected faithfully ever since. In 1938 he was his State's choice for the presidential nomination.

His main interest has always been finance, although for a while he had to divide his time between chairmaning the Finance Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, and in his 28 Senate years he has taken part in some of the most important tax legislation ever passed in this country.

Now he is particularly anxious to broaden social-security coverage and increase benefits, abolish wartime excise taxes on necessities, and in general revise our tax-law structure.

GEORGE is a serious, direct man, who has watched with great concern the drift of Government toward expansion, more power, and more bureaucracy. He does not like this drift. But he believes it is inevitable, and he believes the solution depends not upon laws, but men, "selection of good men by the executive branch—good American citizens of broad vision and devotion to the economic and political system we have built up, men who regard administration of the laws as a sacred trust."

Men, that is to say, like himself.

JOHN WHITE.

Corporate Profits, Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Corporate Profits, Taxes," published in the Evening Star-News of Culver City, Calif., on Monday, February 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORPORATE PROFITS, TAXES

A Department of Commerce report shows corporate profits, one of the big sources of taxes to support the Government, turned upward in the third quarter of 1949, but will be considerably less for the year than for 1948. In 1948 corporate profits before taxes amounted to $34,800,000,000 compared with an estimated $25,900,000,000 last year.

But after taxes corporate profits retained for dividends and reserves for improvements were reduced last year from $21,200,000,000 in 1948 to an estimated $17,500,000,000. This is a little less than 8 percent of the total national income of $223,400,000,000 or a little over 12 percent of the compensation of all employees amounting to $142,200,000,000.

While profits for corporations were down last year, compared with 1948, compensation of employees was up and amounted to nearly 65 percent of the national income. Corporate taxes to be paid this year on last year's earnings will amount to $11,400,000,000, only $5,400,000,000 less than the pay rolls of Government civilian workers last year, which amounted to $16,800,000,000 or almost 15 percent of all the wages paid to all the workers in private industry.

Corporation profits are very much overestimated by many uninformed voters who do not realize that wages, interest, proprietors' business, professional, farm, and rental income last year accounted for nearly 86 percent of the national income. Corporation taxes, therefore, are a heavy burden placed on less than 15 percent of the national income.

Yet corporate profits after taxes are only a little more than the wages of all the civilian workers in the Government service. The Government workers produce nothing and, therefore, their wages and salaries add that much to inflation and increased prices on goods produced outside the Government and taxed to support Government bureaucracy.

Corporation taxes like all other taxes must be added to production costs. Therefore, the greater the cost of Government the greater the cost of living to those at work outside and inside Government bureaucracy. And, added to the high prices of goods and services because of high taxes, we are now faced with further inflation in the cost of living by deficit financing at Washington that will increase the public debt and still further increase the cost of living for this and perhaps future generations.

Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Taxes!" which appeared in the Cavalier Chronicle, published at Cavalier, N. Dak., on the 12th of January 1950. I particularly recommend this to all Senators who have been voting in favor of sending American money across the ocean.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXES

Although the weather has been cold for the past some time in our good country, there is one subject that may not warm the atmosphere too much but it does bring up the blood pressure so a person can get warm under the collar regardless of what the thermometer says outside.

When groups of individuals (two or more) are in a huddle and having a discussion you can bet that they are all talking about the same thing. The writer is not too sure that many are not only talking over this subject but it is constantly on their minds while they sleep as well.

Well, it may be that people have become aroused, and many have become angry over this subject that seems to be first in the minds of the folks today.

Readers, it is not the atomic bomb, it is not the China question, it is not the price of wheat, spuds, or any other farm products. Neither is it John Lewis, Truman, or the Governor. All these seem to be in the background now.

The big question today is taxes.

Since the tax notices have been sent out a person hears nothing else discussed.

For the benefit of those who are not interested in decreasing taxes the writer wishes to inform them that the people are not only talking about the situation, but they will see that something is done about it. They will not stand idly by and see this situation continue.

Like everyone else, this writer has no idea where or how to start. That is the $64 question. But there is a way and if the people continue in the spirit they now have you can bet they will find a way to decrease the tax burden as it is today.

This big increase in taxes is not piled onto any particular group or class of people, according to reports that have reached the ears of this writer. The farmer, the businessman, the home owner, and the owner of personal property have all been hit and hit hard. Some received a stiffer rap than others because of unjust valuation of property, but generally speaking everyone has been hit and, believe me, hard too.

Let me point out the seriousness of this situation and the writer hopes some definite action will be taken before it is too late. If it continues we are in for times much harder than can now be realized.

How will we be able to continually pay this heavy tax burden if our income continues to go down?

Remember those taxes must be paid. They are not an income tax and your ability to pay is not based on your income, but you must pay them. Income tax is paid on the basis of your income. Property tax of any kind must be paid regardless of whether you have made the money to pay them or not.

According to law, if you do not pay property taxes, in time you will lose your property. That is what must be prevented, not when it is too late.

It is well known that income to almost everyone in Pembina County and over the Nation has decreased. Cost of production continues to rise, whether you are engaged in farming or in business, and in case of an employee his cost of living shows no signs of going down.

With production cost continually rising and income or business volume decreasing it is obvious that something must happen. What it will be no one knows or when; no one knows—except Truman—who can see big things in year 2000.

The writer believes it is best for us not to wait 50 years or take much stock in Truman's predictions that in 50 years all will be rosy. Something has to be done now to prevent, as one farmer stated, "death by taxation."

One good, honest, reliable man, who does not have the reputation of being a complainer, stated to the writer this morning that "you can bet there will be nothing done in Washington this session to reduce taxes." That looks like the picture.

It is the belief of many that economy should start in Washington, and start this session, not after they are elected this year.

Personally I read several newspapers and looked them over closely, but I do not find many in Washington today thinking along the lines of economy. It seems they have a tendency to increase our taxes rather than save.

We as taxpayers—that means all of us—should show the politicians, regardless of what party they are associated with, that we want economy and want it now.

No doubt there will be action if the temperament of the people today is an indication of what is to come. People cannot and should not be expected to have such a tax burden placed upon them. There must be a way to find cuts, and no doubt organizations will be formed that will look into the question and make a drive for economy.

Voters, this is your year to put the ax to spendthrifts. Don't let politicians make promises and break them. Let them know we want economy and will accept no substitute.

We realize the opinions of this newspaper will not change the tax deal, but we wish to tell those responsible for such tremendous increases that no one likes it, and it will not be taken lying down by the people of Pembina County.

They will not allow anyone to tax them out of their homes, off their farms, out of business, or take their personal belongings by taxation.

They will rise up and fight this thing until economy gets into the heads of the powers to be.

If taxpayers will sit down and write Messrs. Lanham, Young, Symons, and Langer and tell them in no uncertain terms how they feel about economy, they, at least, know what the people want from Pembina County. What they will do to help cut expenses is another question but they at least will know what is expected of them at this session.

These discussions bring out different opinions as how to cut taxes, and there are many. The writer cannot answer that question, but he is sure things will have to change some way to get the tax bill down to where it is tolerable.

If we do not fight this now from all angles, it will continue to be a burden to us, and at present it does not look like those in the driver's seat are looking for economy.

It is up to us—so let's make themselves heard and get action.

Unemployment Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a message from Gov. Thomas E. Dewey to the Legislature of the State of New York, dated March 3, 1950, in which he points out certain inequities and undesirable features in the present administration of unemployment insurance as a part of Federal policy under existing law. Governor Dewey does not criticize the Federal Government, however. He calls rather for the enactment of new Federal legislation to take care of this inequitable condition which is causing great trouble in States like New York in the direct administration of their respective unemployment insurance laws.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, N. Y., March 3, 1950.

To the Legislature:

For many years the people of the State of New York and of all other States have been the victims of the tangled Federal law relating to the administration of unemployment insurance. In the hope that a joint resolution adopted by your honorable bodies might increase the likelihood of improved Federal legislation, I urge such action.

The Federal Government levies on employers a pay-roll tax of three-tenths of 1 percent for administration. By appropriation it decides how much of the money so collected shall be returned to the States. The Secretary of Labor then apportions this money among the respective States.

During the operation of the unemployment insurance law the employers of New York have paid to the Federal Government through this tax for administrative costs $150,000,000 more than the State has received back for the administration of the system. Each year for the past 12 years the amount allowed to the State of New York has been grossly inadequate. So unscientific has been the planning of the Federal Government that the Division of Placement and Unemployment Insurance has been faced regularly with the complete exhaustion of funds before the end of succeeding fiscal years. Many employees have been released only to be rehired or replaced a few months later.

With such instability of employment and such a sense of insecurity among the employees, it is a miracle the law works at all.

Lack of funds and personnel makes exceedingly difficult the detection of improper and fraudulent benefit claims. It impedes and periodically suspends all efforts to cope with tax evasions. It makes impossible effective policing of the placement and unemployment insurance program. These facts have been repeatedly made known to the Federal Social Security Board and its successor in function, the Secretary of Labor. No relief has been forthcoming.

The Federal Government has been regularly siphoning money collected for unemployment administration into its general funds for use in its general purposes. The general revenues of the Federal Government have profited by over $1,000,000,000 from diversion of these taxes. Conceding that the tax collections of the States for administrative purposes should be pooled to permit wealthier States to contribute to the administrative costs of smaller States, there is no justification whatever for diversion of moneys so collected into general Federal revenues.

If we are to improve the administration of placement service and unemployment insurance in this State, there must be a fundamental overhauling of the system which controls the allocation of necessary funds. The rise in the number of persons unemployed makes such a change imperative.

Legislation is presently pending before Congress which would earmark all taxes collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and provide for their return to the States in an equitable and sensible fashion. The objects of this legislation are most desirable. They are:

1. Earmark all taxes collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act for use in connection with the unemployment insurance and employment service programs.

2. Permit Congress to continue to restrict the total amount which it deems necessary for efficient basic State administration.

3. After making provision for the amounts granted to all States, return to the States the excess of taxes collected within each, for additional administration expenditures or to meet benefit claims.

Properly administered unemployment insurance is a program of inestimable value. Improperly administered, it is an open invitation to waste and indolence. In times of decreased employment such as we have had during the past year, it has kept families from need and sustained business generally. The enormous size of the system administered in this State is little realized. It will distribute in benefits this year some $400,000,000—more than is spent for State purposes by the entire State government.

Like any insurance venture of such size, there is great danger of fraud. Such fraud is a danger not only because of the immediate loss it causes or the dishonesty which it encourages, but also because it brings the entire system into disrepute and encourages movements to curtail its benefits and to embarrass the people who through years of hard work have become entitled to benefits during periods when they are unemployed through no fault of their own.

Bungling, unscientific administration is a hazard to any program. Unemployment insurance is one of the great accomplishments of recent years. In the next few years when our systems may be called upon to make full use of this benefit, we must be assured of competent administration. To this end I urge the action of your honorable bodies.

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

The Coal Strike

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it requires either courage or judgment or leadership to let the Nation sweat out a crisis. I hope this House and the Senate will take action to provide legislation which will at least be ready and available when needed in the inevitable recurrence of the present crisis. I do not know whether the policy makers of this Nation's Government realize it or not, but a lot of people get hurt on every occurrence of crisis such as the one which now confronts us. Domestic economy and national security are threatened. I think it is part of our job to help provide the machinery to prevent its recurrence and to provide it now. We, the Congress, and the administration, have a responsibility to the American people. We can, at least, discharge ours.

The Oklahoma Leopard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Sad Story of the Leopard Stirs Philosophic Musings," by John M. Cummings, a political columnist of the Philadelphia Inquirer, published in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Friday morning, March 3, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAD STORY OF THE LEOPARD STIRS PHILOSOPHIC MUSINGS

(By John M. Cummings)

If pressed for an opinion we should say the happiest leopard in Oklahoma is the one that died the other day, victim of poisoned bait planted by the most intelligent and at the same time the cruelest critter that walks the face of the earth—man.

Life had been anything but happy for this particular leopard during the 60 days that elapsed from the time of its capture in an India jungle to the moment of its demise in a cage at the Oklahoma City Zoo.

Perhaps the leopard did get some sort of cattish satisfaction from the excitement—and the fear—of the countryside for miles around during the 61 hours it was at large. Man, intelligent man, trembled and quaked at the thought of this 175 pounds of sleek and sinewy jungle cat, its savage nature intensified by hunger, roaming a region where untold wealth gushed from the earth in the form of oil.

This was strange country to the leopard. In its jungle habitat the problem of survival, tough as it is for all wildlife, would be easy compared to the handicaps it faced in a wilderness of oil derricks. Trained hunters stalked the big cat, even the Marines were called out to help capture an animal which made an 18-foot leap from a "safety" pit to gain its freedom.

The urge to live is great. Of no less importance is the urge of a species to perpetuate itself. When to these are added the driving force of hunger you can understand why the Oklahoma leopard, having avoided the hunters, the marines, and the dogs placed on its trail, returned to the point of departure. There it would find food, there it would find its mate.

The leopard found food, all right. But it was poisoned food, food loaded with dope. It was not the intention of intelligent man to kill the leopard with poisoned meat. The idea was to give it enough of a powerful sedative to put it to sleep—in fact, an Oklahoma veterinarian now says excitement and overexertion killed the beast. Rendered helpless it could then be safely returned to its cage. But this was a hungry leopard just returned from 60 hours of liberty. It ate a lot of the meat and consequently got a lot of dope. In 17 hours it was dead.

Freedom is a precious thing. It is difficult to realize how precious it is until it is lost. The easiest way of life is the surest way of losing your liberty. In its India jungle home the leopard saw a piece of meat—a hand-out. It went for it because it offered a meal without effort. In seizing the meat it sprang a trap. Its liberty was gone. Sixty days later it was in an Oklahoma zoo.

To the leopard, as to some men, the loss of liberty proved unendurable. The leopard took a chance and got away. But it was in a wrong environment. Hunger sent it back to its jail—hunger and a female.

There is a lesson for intelligent man in the life and death of the Oklahoma leopard. The hand-out of today may mean prison, poisoned meat, and death tomorrow.

Torture of Offenders Against Communist Regimes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, recent reports of shocking tortures to which alleged offenders against the Communist regimes in eastern Europe have been subjected were tragically confirmed in the official statement and affidavit just made public by the State Department regarding Soviet methods in this field.

The State Department release, which includes the verbatim affidavit which 32-year-old Michael Shipkov, a Bulgarian, wrote in the American Legation at Sofia, after he had been grilled for 32 hours by the secret police there, presents to the world first-hand factual confirmation of the methods reportedly used by Communist officials to extort confessions such as were made use of in the trials of Cardinal Mindszenty at Budapest, of the 15 Protestant clergymen at Sofia, and on other occasions.

It is a horrible record of Soviet brutality thus documented—one that should be given fullest publicity in order that the people of the entire world may know and appreciate the brutal and inhuman lengths to which Communist leadership will go to justify their own actions and to prejudge the unfortunate victims of their hatred.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SHIPKOV ON HIS INTERROGATION IN BULGARIA

(Following are the text of a statement by the State Department on an affidavit by Michael Shipkov, Bulgarian, who was employed in the United States Legation in Sofia and is under indictment for espionage, and excerpts from his affidavit, which was released in full by the State Department.)

UNITED STATES STATEMENT

As a result of the publication on February 21, 1950, of the Bulgarian public prosecutor's indictment of Michael Shipkov, the American Legation learned with regret that this innocent employee has fallen once again into the hands of the Bulgarian security militia. Accordingly, the Department of State is honoring the request of Michael Shipkov to publish his sworn affidavit, which he concluded by writing:

"I want the Legation to bring to the knowledge of the militia that any attempt of theirs to make use of that statement of mine [i. e., his forced confession] will be countered by exposure of this. * * * I furthermore request that this statement here be made public and used to justify the good name of the Legation and my name in case the militia attempts to make use of the confession they drew out of me."

Like Cardinal Mindszenty, the Bulgarian evangelical pastors, and recently the American citizen, Robert Vogeler, Michael Shipkov was forcibly persuaded in August 1949 to sign a false confession. At the end of his ordeal he had written and signed a seven-page confession and an agreement to return to the Legation as a spy informer for the militia. Among other things, he confessed that, under orders, he had organized intelligence contacts to submit economic, political, and military information to the American Legation; that these orders came from the American Minister and other officers of the Legation; that he had willfully and "venemously" exaggerated, distorted, and misinterpreted events in Bulgaria to discredit his country and its Government in the eyes of the outside world; and that in this manner he had hoped to be instrumental in encouraging foreign intervention in the internal affairs of Bulgaria.

A familiar pattern

The pattern of Mr. Shipkov's confession has become tragically familiar, whereas the method of how such confessions are extorted has remained a mysterious enigma. For the first time, however, a victim of this apparently hypnotic process has had the spiritual fortitude and courage painfully to piece together again the shattered pieces of his moral character and to reveal in detail how a man of integrity can be completely broken and forced to describe in his own words a fantastic story of imaginary crimes of espionage and treason.

In reading Michael Shipkov's affidavit, it is essential that the reader first have a clear understanding of his mental condition at the time he wrote it. In addition to his own personal ordeal, he still had fresh in his memory the recent death of his colleague, Ivan Secoulov, who had met death 3 days following his arrest by the militia.

Mr. Shipkov's affidavit is being released exactly as he wrote it, untouched and without a comma or word removed. The story he tells is not an orderly one. It represents a series of thoughts written as they came to him as he struggled to search his memory and recall every minute item of his interrogation that might be of value as throwing light upon the methods used by the secret police to force confessions from innocent people. His affidavit must be read carefully for its full significance to be appreciated. Otherwise it is difficult to separate and place in the right perspective the factual and interpretative material which is interwoven without distinction throughout his statement.

The reader will see that in many sections of his statement Michael Shipkov is relating how he was compelled to build out of his own imagination details of meetings with Americans and other officials and other acts, which in reality never took place, but which would meet the militia's conception of espionage and treason.

Under months of pressure

It is important to realize that Michael Shipkov was not broken down by the 32-hour interrogation alone. For months prior to his arrest, as he explains near the end of his statement, he was afflicted with a feeling of oppression, fear, and resignation, owing to the steady pressures exerted by the militia on his sisters, his brother, and his colleagues in the American Legation, particularly Ivan Secoulov, who had just died.

Michael Shipkov's affidavit exposes, as he had hoped it would, the complete falsity of

the charges made against him, the American Minister, and against members of the Legation staff in the indictment published on February 21, 1950, by the Bulgarian Government. This indictment was built up on imaginary evidence which Shipkov proved was extracted from him by force in August 1949, following his arrest and 72-hour interrogation.

Not only has Shipkov destroyed the validity of the evidence contained in the indictment against him, but as important a Communist authority in Bulgaria as the Foreign Minister, Vladimir Poptomov, who is now also a Vice Premier and member of the Politburo, confessed officially to Minister Heath his conviction that Michael Shipkov was innocent.

During the prolonged negotiations which Mr. Heath conducted with the Foreign Office for the issuance of passports and exit visas to Mr. Shipkov and his family, during which time Mr. Shipkov resided in the American Legation, Mr. Poptomov personally assured Mr. Heath on October 11, 1949, that the maltreatment of Shipkov was absolutely against the policy of his Government. He went so far as to inform Mr. Heath that he had personally recommended to the Interior Minister that passports and exit visas should be granted to the Shipkovs.

Michael Shipkov knew when he returned to the Legation and requested that he be permitted to remain there that he was already a doomed man as far as the militia was concerned. If he failed to leave Bulgaria and fell again into the hands of the Bulgarian militia, he knew that his fate was determined. It was to provide for this eventuality and to fight back at the militia and all it stands for through the only means available that he provided the Legation with his detailed statement.

His tangible bequest

Another compelling reason for providing the Legation with his statement was Mr. Shipkov's desire to salvage his good name and moral character. In a real sense, Shipkov's affidavit represents the only tangible item he felt he could bequeath to his survivors.

Michael Shipkov was not a spy. He was not an intelligence agent of the United States. Michael Shipkov was not a traitor. He was an employee of the American Legation who performed the routine, legitimate, and nonconfidential duties of a translator. However, Michael Shipkov was an intelligent, honest Bulgarian citizen who nourished not only a deep-rooted devotion to his Christian ideals, but also a concern for the welfare of his country.

As a private citizen he did not conceal his nonadherence to Communist dogma, nor his opposition to certain policies of the present Government. The pursuit of this freedom of expression and conscience, guaranteed to him and to all Bulgarian citizens by the treaty of peace and the Bulgarian Constitution, did not, in his eyes now, according to the standards of any civilized democratic country, constitute a crime or treason.

However, in the words of the public prosecutor, his family background, his act of seeking employment with the American Legation and the expression of his opposition to the Communist creed and to some of the Government's policies, constituted treason, for which the prosecutor concluded in his indictment of February 21, 1950, that Michael Shipkov was turned over to the Sofia County Court to be tried, to be found guilty, and punished.

SHIPKOV'S STATEMENT

(In opening his statement, Shipkov told how he was picked up by a plainclothes policeman on Saturday, August 20, 1949, as he was bicycling home from his job at the American Legation in Sofia. He was taken to the National Assembly Building, where he was forced by guards to enter an automobile that took him to police—or state security militia—headquarters. There he was escorted into a small office.)

On entering, I was made to stand left of the door, in the corner, facing the window. In front of me was a desk, two chairs on either side, and a metal cabinet on the right of the window. On the wall to my left was a picture of Lenin, on the opposite wall a frame with the phrase, "Merciless fight against foreign agents."

I was taken up by a team of two agents of the State Security, age between 25 and 30, stern, serious, and incredibly earnest. I was ordered to empty out my pockets on the desk, which I did. I had been previously asked whether I carried any arms on me. I was not made to take off my watch.

I was then asked whether I was aware of where I had been taken, and the reasons for my detention. I replied that I was in the building of the militia—they corrected that to state security militia. I told them that I was perfectly aware and that I had been expecting for many months, that any employment at the legation would end in trouble with them.

First, presumably until the arrival of a superior functionary, I was made to answer the questions contained in militia form No. 10-7, which I had filled out on two previous occasions when I had been trying to obtain a passport. * * * I noticed that they were writing down my replies in perfunctory manner, which confirmed my belief that that was to give time to the actual investigator to arrive.

Effort of resignation

My state of mind at that stage: I was trying very hard to reconcile myself with what I had long considered inevitable and to impress into my mind the necessary fortitude and resignation. Already I had been faced with the difficulty of maintaining any continuous line of thought within me, while having constantly to correspond to their moves and give them the replies or indications requested.

In about 30 minutes another functionary arrived, presumably of superior standing, as the chair at the desk was ceded to him. After a whispered conference, he began to direct the interrogation. There always was a great play of locking and double locking the door whenever anybody came in or out of the room.

I was immediately faced with the accusation, no, with the statement, that I had been a spy, a traitor, and a saboteur of my country; an enemy. I was told with a fair display of solemnity that I had been arrested on express authorisation of the chief prosecutor, on the strength of undeniable proof, and that now I was to complete their knowledge by a full confession and repentance of my guilt. * * *

While this lasted, I had made the acquaintance of all the seven functionaries who dealt with me throughout my stay in the building. There were two relays of lesser agents, working in teams of two, one of which was always on hand. Then there were two higher ranking functionaries, aged between 30 and 40, who conducted the interrogation proper—the lesser ones merely ranking men, head of section, department, etc. * * *

I maintained a show of resistance, without a semblance of defiance, up till some time late in the evening—8-10 o'clock. Tempers had been rising in the meantime, I had been often warned not to exhaust their patience, not to force them to turn the other leaf. I was told that this had been the behavior of all the numerous spies and traitors who had passed through their hands in this very room and they mentioned Dimitrov, Pooy, Hadji Christov, my brother, Cheshme, Nikola Petkov, the Protestant pastors. And they stressed that any such obstinacy on my part would only worsen my future, without any real inconvenience to them. They also stressed and to which I sincerely agreed, that I could not really hope for aid from the Legation.

I had been so long prepared for this that I agreed sincerely and told them I was quite resigned to accept their judgment and penalty. Already there appears in the mind of the person arrested a desire to be told the extent of one's punishment, and to begin serving it, if only to be gone from the pressure and fear of their presence. Before the investigations passed from one to another, the outgoing one would come near, bluster, slap me in the face: one of the middle category ordered me to turn around and face the wall and then hit me on several occasions with the thick of his palm, I imagine, in the back of the neck. I recall that this treatment was not particularly painful nor frightening, nor that I was so afraid of its recurrence.

The head of the team

Before I had broken down, I saw the head of the team in the room for half an hour—a short, stout, pasty-faced individual of evident superior rank to all the others. Yellowish tinge, thinning hair, carelessly and slovenly dress, no culture, great energy, very sharp and cunning, very high-strung and tense, very self-assured, I suspect, very self-satisfied. He professed and indicated more knowledge of me than even myself. * * *

It was he who gloated—there is no other word—on the quixotic mental attitude of my brother, who had refused in a very romantic way to translate for the English and inform the security militia at the same time. And the familiar way in which he used my brother's first name, and recalled the further unhappiness which had befallen him, made me think it had been him who had ordered my brother to be beaten up into insensibility in the street, to pay him for his gallantry. He lingered long on the subject of my private family life, accepting the theory that I had nothing any more in common with my wife, that I had engaged in picking up mistresses here and there, and that I had not cared if my wife did the same—mentioning persons of the tennis club.

It was again he that suggested the parallel between my espionage and that of the Protestant ministers—and that was ruthlessly taken up later by his subordinates, until they had got me to tell them exactly the words that fitted their theory—that the British were the master minds in all the systems of espionage, and that this espionage, this loyalty they exacted from their agents, included espionage on the American employees to the benefit of the English. * * *

I was ordered to stand facing the wall upright at a distance which allowed me to touch the wall with two fingers of my outstretched arms. Then to step back some twelve inches, keep my heels touching the floor, and maintain balance only with the contact of one finger on each hand. And while standing so, the interrogation continued—nor was I allowed to collect my thoughts.

This posture does not appear unduly painful, nor did it particularly impress me in the beginning. And yet, combined with the mental strain, with the continuous pressure to talk, with the utter hopelessness and the longing to go through the thing and be sent down into silence and peace—it is a very effective manner of breaking down all resistance. I recall that the muscles on my legs and shoulders began to get cramped and to tremble, that my two fingers began to bend down under the pressure, to get red all over and to ache. I remember that I was drenched with sweat and that I began to faint, although I had not exerted myself in any way.

If I would try to substitute the forefinger to the big finger, I would be instantly called to order and the same if I tried to bolster my middle finger by placing the forefinger over it. No attention is paid to the suffering, nor is there any place for hope that they would take pity on you. And when the trembling increases up to the point when I collapsed, they made me sit and speak. I did get several minutes respite, catching my breath and wiping my face, but when I had uttered again that I was innocent, it was the wall again.

Final breaking down

And after a time of this, I broke down. I told them I was willing and eager to tell them all they wanted. The main appeal is to end the pain, to stop needless, futile resistance, and to come nearer to the moment when they would let me in peace. * * *

At this moment I believe that I had covered the worst and that I would tell them I am a spy and a traitor and that I would be sent below into a cell to await or serve my punishment. And that did not appear very grim at the moment.

It is a very painful surprise to realize the error I was in. The interrogation took on again, unrelaxed. Here I want to describe their method of interrogation. You are a spy and a traitor, tell us what tasks you were given to do, who gave them to you, in what manner and with whose help you achieved them and to whom and in what manner did you report? No further indication and no generalities, no over-all statements of guilt accepted. And this went on, hour after hour, throughout the night, throughout the day, without respite or end.

How can I best explain? The only straw for which I could reach is the impression that I had, in my emptied, vacant thoughts, of some sentence that had pleased them, or that had conformed with the pattern I had so often seen in the newspapers. And if I were to stop and plead fatigue, or poor memory, or ask to rest—the wall again and again, and the slaps, and the blows in the nape. And I remembered I would come up gasping and talk and talk and feel utterly broken.

It began with my prewar origin—the well-to-do bourgeois family, the American school, the attraction of English prestige and power. September 9—I am a class enemy, if only my antecedents have made me into a natural class enemy. Then, turn this class enemy into active resistance—then come the British—hasten to place myself in their service.

(At this point Mr. Shipkov related in great detail how the police gradually forced him with hours of questioning to construct a story of espionage involving him falsely with British and American officials in Sofia. Those thus brought in included a General Oxley, head of the British section of the Allied Control Commission for Bulgaria at the end of the war; Maynard Barnes, who had been United States political representative there; Milton C. Rewinkel, a United States Foreign Service officer during the armistice period; Robert C. Strong, another Foreign Service officer; a Mr. Weitzel, former Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. representative in Bulgaria; John E. Horner, a United States Legation secretary; Raymond F. Courtney, also a Legation secretary; the American Minister, Donald R. Heath, and others.

(Mr. Shipkov also referred to many Bulgarians in his statement—acquaintances and friends, but the State Department said it could not identify them.)

The forced confession

How about your personal letter to Maynard Barnes, asking for intervention? First, I refused having ever written MBB, later confessed. How about your mistresses, who are they, when did you meet, how often, in whose apartments? And there comes a time when I found myself in such unbearable depths of degradation and misery that I would gladly have ended it all at once. You plead with them not to force you to incriminate innocent persons, persons whom you have never engaged in any such activity—no response. Speak on, tell us more.

Out of the jumbled memories, some impressions stand out vivid. One: They are not overinterested in what you tell them. It would appear that the ultimate purpose of this treatment is to break you down completely, and deprive you of any will power or private thought or self esteem, which they achieve remarkably quickly. And they seem to pursue a classic confession, well rounded off in the phraseology, explaining why you were induced by environment and education to enter the service of the enemies of communism, how you placed your capacities in their service, what ultimate goal did you pursue—the overthrow of the People's Government through foreign intervention.

And they appear to place importance on the parallel appearance of repentance and self-condemnation that come up with the breaking down of their prisoner.

Second: I rarely could perceive any personal hatred or enmity for me—contempt certainly but sooner an academic detached dealing with an annoying problem in order to achieve the goal, and a fanatic, rabid obsession of devotion to communism and hatred for Anglo-American resistance to them—all the newspaper talk is to them gospel truth.

And in this respect they are to be taken as disciples and fervent followers of the dogma. Not much imagination, nor quick brains nor much intellectual baggage nor sensitivity—but enormous stores of character, undeviating loyalty to their creed, fanatic belief in their own cause, fanatic hatred and mistrust of anything else. No possible contact with them on any intermediary grounds. No fear of possible retribution, not within the ranks that I met. No conscience, unless that of their duty to their creed.

Toward the evening of Sunday, I had given them satisfaction. They gave me a glass of water, a bit of bread which I could not eat, and altered their bearing. I had been taken to urinate in a nearby toilet. And I was given a cigarette, and time to relax and control my trembling—hands, feet, teeth, so that I could write down what I had told them. It was then—just before I sat down to write, visited by the chief who seemed satisfied and mentioned, or sooner alluded to, my nearly freedom in exchange for perfect frankness and sincerity, and I remember him mentioning my daughter and that it was worth while looking up to seeing her again.

Writing out a statement

I wrote six lined pages, beginning with my unfortunate origin and education, my formation into a class enemy, then a description of my espionage with stress on each individual task—who had entrusted me with it, when, how I had achieved it, whom I had enrolled to help, how I had handed in my report. At the end, a plain statement of the purpose I had been pursuing—the destruction of the regime through foreign intervention. Signature after that—and although my deposition was controlled and checked paragraph by paragraph by the two lesser persons on duty, one of the superiors insisted that I add specific information as to my secret preference for the British and on my spying for them on the Americans.

When that was completed I was allowed a cigarette and some rest and I remember dozing off straightaway. Then one of the superiors went into a lengthy preparation of my future, on my youth, my daughter, on the necessity to reform and be an honest Bulgarian—on my acceptance to collaborate secretly with the State security and report to them everything I see, hear, or learn of the attempts of foreign spy centrals to undermine the people in Bulgaria. He dictated the thing to me in most solemn manner, and I wrote and signed. * * *

(Shipkov was then released.)

In the morning I overslept. * * *

In the Legation, my first obsession was to clear my conscience of the sense of guilt I had for all the people I had incriminated. I wrote a brief statement in the morning, intending to enlarge on it in the afternoon. I could not do so I wished as I felt observed and attended all the time by other Bulgarian employees. * * * On Tuesday, I tried first through Wallace and then through Burke to get Courtney to call me in the ordinary way. When he did not, I sent up the two statements through Burke and when that was done I knew that the militia no longer had any power to use me and to use my words against other people.

(Frank E. Wallace was a guard in the Legation; Timothy J. Burke was vice consul.)

I would like to make a few points very clear. I have been officially connected, first with the British Military Mission, and then with the American Legation, from the end of 1944 up to now. And from the very beginning, I have even more clearly understood and borne the mistrust, suspicion, and hatred of the regime for anybody who is in any way connected with the British or Americans.

This feeling of oppression and fear has grown steadily, first because of the chain of unhappiness and hardship which have descended on my friends and relatives—my two sisters expelled from their homes with their families and deported to the provinces; my brother, first beaten into insensibility in the street, with a cowed spirit afterwards, later packed off to a concentration camp; my closest friends arrested, obviously subjected to some similar method of intimidation, and then, one of them has disappeared, the other doing his second stretch in a concentration camp; the succession of other Bulgarian Legation employees who are arrested and either disappear from view or are reported hanged.

Building up of fear

This is in parallel to the other instances of fear, those that are featured in the newspapers and which I have had to translate—a translation which has been more and more personally depressing with time. This depression is augmented by a feeling of helplessness and despair, no possibility of evasion, no issue, no real hope for assistance or protection by the legation, not while the militia alone has force on its side. Resignation is achieved to a certain extent never enough to keep off the fear of the day when it will arrive on me. And the last instance, that of Secoulov, was very difficult to resign myself to.

(Ivan Secoulov, another Legation employee, had died in police hands.)

Therefore when I had been resisting them in the first day I had long since been prepared to accept my lot—prison, concentration camp, without any hope for reprieve. From that it is easy to decide to end the struggle, accept their accusation, give them satisfaction, and be allowed to relax my mind. And this breaking in is immediately followed by the realization that it is not the end but the beginning of an even more painful period, much more degrading, because before I believed I would draw upon myself their penalty by agreeing to their accusations and the thought of prison or camp for myself only is not so awful as that moment.

However, with the first acceptance my power of resistance grew weaker and I slipped steadily lower and lower, not only drawing punishment but time and time again speaking of others—friends and relatives of mine, involving them in deeds or thoughts utterly untrue, unfounded, slanderous. And then the feeling of resistance is wholly broken;

and I remember going deeper and deeper in this awful disloyalty, feeling utterly degraded and unclean, and yet powerless to protest and deny. Indeed, the only things I did not tell them were things they never thought of leading me into describing. At the end, when I wrote down the confession of guilt and repentance, I remember that the whole thing appeared fantastic and ridiculous, but it seemed to give them complete satisfaction.

News Letters by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD copies of my biweekly news letters for January 12, February 9, and February 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

JANUARY 12, 1950.

Don't be fooled by the FEPC and excise-tax riders on the oleo bill. They aren't intended to lift the wartime luxury taxes, or to give us a Fair Employment Practices Act. Both riders are aimed at killing the oleo tax repeal—and nothing more.

A stalemate would occur in the House if the Senate were to adopt either rider. The reasons are technical, but essential to full understanding. These facts are important:

The Senate and House must agree down to the last comma before any measure may be sent to the President for signature.

Oleo, excise taxes, and FEPC are unrelated issues—and each is handled by a different legislative committee of the House: oleo by the Agriculture Committee, excise taxes by Ways and Means, FEPC by the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Only the oleo bill has been passed by the House—an FEPC bill is out of committee and on the House Calendar— and the House Ways and Means Committee has not completed its work on excise-tax legislation.

So, though I support FEPC and reduction of excise taxes, I oppose both riders because they're improperly intended here to cause confusion and block oleo tax repeal.

Both the Senate and House are scheduled to debate FEPC within the next few weeks. Our experience with the Fair Employment Practices Commission that guarded against employee discrimination by firms handling Government war contracts was extremely successful and I intend to fight vigorously for the adoption of FEPC legislation this year.

Excise taxes will be reduced by Congress this session. These are the wartime taxes on so-called luxury items—fur coats, ladies' handbags, luggage, cosmetics, theaters, and others—and the heavy taxes put on travel and telegrams to discourage excessive use of wires and unnecessary travel.

President Truman and leaders of both parties recommend changes in excise-tax laws. The reasons for these war measures have changed. The House of Representatives, which, as required by the Constitution, must originate all tax bills, will act promptly to aid consumers and stimulate business by relieving the excise-tax burden.

And as a member of the Senate Finance Committee (which has Senate jurisdiction over tax matters) I'm confident we will act speedily when the House sends the excise-tax bill to us for consideration.

New social security legislation is now the big job before the Senate Finance Committee. In the closing days of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, the House passed the bill, after lengthy consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee. The bill makes numerous liberalizing amendments to the old social security law, amendments which will afford much more adequate protection to widows, orphaned children, the disabled, and the retired.

I plan to summarize the social security amendments in a subsequent News Letter after Senate hearings give us a better picture of the changes we may wish to make in the bill.

Housing legislation for middle- and lower-income families will be considered shortly by the Senate. The pending bill aims at encouraging investment and construction of private housing for families now more or less priced out of the housing market. The proposed legislation is a comprehensive companion for the Public Housing Act of 1949, and in a later News Letter, I will outline the major provisions of the new housing bill.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

FEBRUARY 9, 1950.

What are your plans for retirement? Your future—and that of your family—will be influenced by the kind of social-security law Congress passes this year, and thus it's essential that you understand the proposals now before the Senate.

You—or your family—may be eligible now, or later, for insurance benefits resulting from retirement, disability, or death.

As a taxpayer—possibly as a recipient—you'll be affected by the Federal grants-in-aid to States for public assistance in the form of money or emergency medical care for the needy blind, the aged, the disabled, or the dependent children.

And Federal assistance to States for Child Welfare Services plays an important role in the development of healthy, responsible citizens.

A Nation-wide, self-supporting insurance program is the ultimate social-security goal. Adequate insurance protection can do away with distress resulting when families lose their income because of death, retirement, or injuries which make future employment impossible.

Thirty-five million of the sixty million working Americans now contribute to social security. Seven to eleven million would be added by provisions now being considered. These new groups include the self-employed small businessman (grocers, barbers, etc.), nurses, social workers and others employed by nonprofit charitable, religious or social organizations, some cab drivers, some domestic workers, contract loggers, mushroom pickers, poultry workers, many salesmen, perhaps others.

Farmers and farm workers weren't included in the Social Security bill as it passed the House last year—although more and more farmers want to be covered because one-fourth of them have contributed to social security while working at seasonal jobs or in war plants.

All employees of local and State governments—teachers, clerks, police, others—will become eligible for social security for the first time. This is primarily to help thousands of these employees who today have no pension coverage, but those now covered by their own pension systems may add the Federal program to their present benefits if groups of them decide by referendum to do so. However, I am submitting an amendment to safeguard the benefits now enjoyed against possible reduction as a result of this provision.

Insurance benefits would be doubled for the 3,000,000 now drawing social-security payments if the House provisions are adopted. This would not run social security into the red because the Federal insurance program is now more than self-supporting. Another new feature would permit insurance benefits to the permanently disabled, whatever their age.

Present grants to States would be increased. These are Federal contributions to the public-assistance programs operated by each State to meet urgent needs of millions of older people, dependent children, and the blind who are without insurance protection or income from other sources. Public assistance payments are now inadequate, and large State and Federal funds must be spent to help our needy until more people have insurance coverage.

Old-age assistance payments in Pennsylvania are small * * * averaging only $89.57 monthly * * * $4 below the national average. Thirty-one States make larger old-age grants * * * and four States gives 50 percent more than Pennsylvania. The proposed bill would add $19,000,000 next year in Federal money to Pennsylvania for all public assistance. Both the Federal share and old-age payments would be larger if Pennsylvania were willing to increase its old-age contributions.

Direct public assistance grants can be decreased as more people are permitted to pay for retirement and disability insurance. This is a strong argument for social-security insurance because it is a self-supporting, self-respecting means of providing for the future without depending upon tax-supported public-assistance grants.

America is growing security conscious. More and more people are planning ahead by combining social-security benefits with private retirement policies. And this thoughtful looking ahead has developed tremendously since the first social-security law in 1935.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

FEBRUARY 23, 1950.

Good health is everybody's business. Health protection costs us at least $10,000,000 a year. Our 150,000,000 people spend about $2,000,000,000 for treatment and drugs. State and local governments spend another $1,250,000,000—and the Federal Government, $750,000,000.

But our health protection is inadequate. These facts aren't contested:

As a Nation, we go to the doctor too late. Troubles that could have been detected in a periodic check-up are often neglected until they cost much more to correct, or are allowed to become completely incurable.

Though our doctors, dentists, nurses, hospitals, research facilities and medical schools are the world's best, few people get the best available.

Health protection is expensive. It takes years of training and thousands of dollars to become a doctor. Research is costly, but must go on. And the best in scientific, technical equipment and hospitals is expensive.

Prolonged illness, usually unexpected, can wipe out savings and drive families far into debt.

Our rural areas need help desperately. The Hoover Commission said "for practically every category of service, the rural population receives services smaller in quantity and lower in quality than urban, and far less adequate than would be warranted by the burden of illness and impairment it bears."

All levels of Government are working to provide more people with better care. These activities are carried out largely by local and

State health and welfare officials, usually assisted by Federal funds and technical advice and training from Federal agencies. Here are some of the United States Government grants that went to Pennsylvania in 1949:

Children's Health and Welfare: $342,592 for aid to crippled children—$146,815 for delinquent, homeless or neglected children, $448,967 to aid Pennsylvania with its maternal and child care program. In addition, the Federal Dental Health Service has helped 32 Pennsylvania communities provide fluorine treatment for protection of children's teeth.

Hospital Construction: Over $4,500,000 in Federal grants went to Pennsylvania communities for building public and nonprofit hospitals in 1949—mostly in smaller towns and rural area. Last session, the Eighty-first Congress doubled this program, and Pennsylvania will get $9,241,058 yearly.

Cancer Research: $151,036 for research and aid to Pennsylvania doctors for special training in treatment and control of cancer.

Tuberculosis: $265,639 for detection, prevention and cure of TB.

General Health Assistance: $739,708 to be used by the State as it saw fit for such things as health education, industrial hygiene, research.

Pennsylvania engages in most Federal health programs, though our State (and Wyoming) has not entered the United States Mental Health program, and we've lost $200,000 yearly since 1947.

Meeting doctor and hospital bills still remains the big problem for most families. Some form of health insurance is the only solution. The American Medical Association, once opposed to any health insurance, now supports voluntary group insurance as its answer to proposals for Government health insurance that would provide protection for everyone.

Voluntary health plans should be encouraged in every way. In the past 15 years, 3 million of our 39 million families have become regular members of some health insurance program. The Senate, recognizing that the success of voluntary plans depends upon enlarging all medical facilities, passed and sent to the House a bill providing medical scholarships and Federal grants to enlarge medical schools—as well as a bill establishing clinics for school children. Research funds for ruthless killers, polio, heart disease and cancer—and direct grants for rural health facilities—are essential. Government help through such programs as there is imperative if voluntary health insurance is to be the way our people provide themselves with the best that modern science and skilled training can offer.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Republican Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "More Advice to the Republican Party," from the current issue of the Exeter (N. H.) News Letter. The article is by Dr. Henry Phillips, of the faculty of Exeter Academy, and refers largely to an article written by our colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. LODGE), which appeared in the Atlantic Monthly, discussing the Republican Party.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL WEEK—MORE ADVICE TO THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

One of the results of the recent parliamentary election in Great Britain, in which the voters demonstrated a swing to the right, is said to be renewed hope that this country too may turn to the more conservative Republican Party in the 1950 congressional elections. This overlooks the fact that trends in the two countries have, more often than not, been in opposite directions. For example the swing here away from Republicanism in 1932 was matched in England by a return to conservatism under Stanley Baldwin and then Neville Chamberlain.

However, this may be, it does no harm to seek trends where they may be found and judge them for what they may be worth. Trends are worth no more than the forces which cause them, and among these may be numbered luck, personalities, and good management.

Good management includes giving the voters some notion as to what a party stands for, and we have taken occasion twice within the last 2 months to comment on statements of Republican Party principles. The first was a reference to Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, who, at his inauguration, expressed support for reforms proposed by the Hoover Commission, certain economies and improvements in State government, and above all economy at the level of the Federal Government.

The statement issued by the Republican National Committee early in February stated the issue between the parties as "liberty against socialism." It, too, saw extravagant spending by the Federal Government, with its powers of taxation, as one of the critical dangers of our time. It also pointed to the danger inherent in the increasing tendency to look to the Federal Government for solution of all problems.

Now Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., writing in the Atlantic Monthly, offers some suggestions toward modernizing the Republican Party in order that it may fulfill its function in a strong two-party system, provide the country with an attractive alternative to the policies of the present administration, and possibly win elections.

Senator LODGE's program is limited to domestic policies and does not cover all the possible fields of opposition to the Democrats. He favors tax reductions, especially in favor of corporations doing under a million dollars worth of business a year, and of businesses which help to stabilize general production with low prices, increased production, steady employment and use of older employees.

On civil rights the Senator is more specific than the statement of policy of the national committee. He favors elimination of the poll tax in elections for Federal officials, making lynching a Federal offense, enacting fair employment legislation, doing away with segregation in the armed forces, and in Government housing projects.

Health legislation can be enacted by the Republican Party which will be superior to the proposal for socialized medicine by the administration. His aim would be to increase the supply of young doctors and get them to the places in which they are needed; lower the costs of medical care through financing the building of hospitals, educating nurses and interns, and expand the possibilities of the voluntary hospital and medical associations which already have a membership, it is claimed, of 80,000,000.

The problem of the aged should be tackled more realistically than by a program which allows an aged couple $41 a month—the present social-security figure. Tax exemption on income toward a voluntary annuity plan is one suggestion for bringing up old-age assistance to $150 monthly. Also tax assistance to industries which provide benefits, keep employment steady by annual wage plans and agree to provide jobs for older employees, is one of the strongest guaranties of the strong competitive economy which is the key to the country's greatness.

Senator LODGE's proposals in agriculture center around the need to favor food farming against speculative farming. That is, present legislation discriminates against the small food-growing farmer, and in favor of the large factory farms which pile up huge surpluses and waste the taxpayers' money in support programs.

Finally, on labor the need seems to be for remedial legislation to cover individual problems in the labor front, rather than package legislation which lumps all labor problems together. Labor will also benefit from other items of legislation previously referred to: health, social security, old-age assistance.

No constructive program, however, will succeed unless it rests on sound finances. A balanced Government budget and stable currency are prime considerations.

EXCHANGE.

Bipartisan Approach to the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Pillsbury Raps Food in Politics; Urges Bipartisan Approach to Farm Problem," from the Minneapolis Star-Journal. The article is very thought-provoking, and I think it would be well to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that all may read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PILLSBURY RAPS FOOD IN POLITICS—URGES BIPARTISAN APPROACH TO FARM PROBLEM

Phillip W. Pillsbury, president of Pillsbury Mills, Inc., proposed a bipartisan food commission today "to put an end to the folly of using food as a political football."

Speaking as general chairman of the annual Minneapolis farm forum at Nicollet Hotel, he said:

"Politicians are outpromising each other for votes with food issues as bait. Half the world is hungry. This country's mechanized farms are producing surplus after surplus.

"Food is too important to too many people—and to world peace—to be in politics any longer."

With a Bernard Baruch or a Herbert Hoover as chairman—Pillsbury proposed:

"The same bipartisan approach to a solution of the food and farm problems as the Hoover Commission brought to reorganization of the Government or as the Republican and Democratic Parties brought to our foreign policy."

Pillsbury's plan urged establishing at once "a bipartisan food commission, staffed to

develop an intelligent, efficient program for economical use of our abundant food."

"There is not, nor never was, a food surplus," he declared. "Let's once and for all get the best thinking of the Nation at work telling the food we produce."

Pillsbury said he decided to call for the bipartisan food commission at the outset of the farm forum to lift its program beyond the realm of party politics.

He desired, he said, to explore the commission plan with such farm leaders as Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange; Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation; Ezra T. Benson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and D. W. Chapman, president of the Montana Farmers Union, who were to speak at the forum session on national farm problems.

"It's not just a United States farm problem we are up against," he declared. "It is a world-wide food program we need—a food plank for peace.

"If our experts can make an 11-bushel that will work, we ought to have men who can make a food plan work—and for peace, at home and abroad."

Wire Tapping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Clarification Needed on Wire Tapping," which appeared in the St. Louis Star-Times on the 18th of January.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLARIFICATION NEEDED ON WIRE TAPPING

The present Federal law concerning wire tapping is entirely inadequate. It provides that no person, not being authorized by the sender, shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance * * * or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person.

Two interpretations have been put upon this provision. One, by a succession of Attorneys General over the past 16 years, holds that it is not illegal to intercept provided there is no divulgence or publication. If this is correct, then anybody may tap any wire without punishment provided he does not divulge what he learns. This situation would be intolerable.

The other interpretation, by such persons as James L. Fly, former Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, holds that all wire tapping, even by the Federal Government in situations of extreme danger to the national security, is illegal. If this is correct, an important gap in the Nation's security legislation needs to be filled.

A situation where in the use of wires the enemies of society would be protected and the protectors of society would be hampered would not make sense. It would not be expected by those responsible for the defense of the country. It is quixotic to expect that in the fight against spies and saboteurs military intelligence and the FBI are going to be bound by Marquis of Queensberry rules. They haven't been. They won't be. Even Frank Murphy, a staunch disciple of civil rights, permitted wire tapping to be used when he was Attorney General.

Why should wires alone be held sacrosanct? A man's home, under proper procedure, may be searched. A man's papers, under proper procedure, may be subpenaed. Under proper procedure, wire tapping should be permitted.

Wire tapping is everything it has been called. It is dirty business. It is sneaky. It is revolting. But so is spying. So is sabotage. So is kidnaping. So is extortion.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt stated the difficulty. How to balance the needs of law-enforcement agents for use of a method they consider essential in certain types of cases with the need for protecting citizens against the abuse of such power, he said, raises the most delicate problem in the field of democratic statesmanship.

This is a delicate problem, but it is not new. The solution is suggested by the ways other dirty businesses, like the search of a man's home and the seizure of his papers, have been dealt with.

The Federal law should permit the FBI to tap wires in a few specifically defined kinds of cases. Espionage, sabotage, kidnaping, and extortion have been suggested. The procedure should be spelled out, requiring a description of the persons suspected, the purpose of the tapping, setting a time limit, and being granted only on specific written authorization of the Attorney General.

The evidence obtained by legal wire tapping should be admissible in trials the same way evidence obtained after use of a search warrant is admissible.

Stiff penalties for wire tapping by unauthorized persons, including members of the FBI, should be set and enforced.

All courts should be instructed not to admit evidence obtained by illegal wire tapping.

Provisions such as these would at the same time give society the use of wire tapping where it is necessary and give the members of society protection against its abuse.

If, as some charge, the FBI is using wire tapping indiscriminately, this should be found out and stopped. But the investigation should be just one part of a new and searching inquiry into the subject. The best way to avoid the abuse of a power that cannot be neglected is to define precisely its permissible use.

Plan for Electoral Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Gould Lincoln appearing in the Washington Evening Star of February 21 on the subject of proposed electoral reform:

THE POLITICAL MILL—COUDERT PUSHES PLAN FOR ELECTORAL REFORM—SYSTEM SEEN GIVING GOP BETTER CHANCE

(By Gould Lincoln)

As a substitute for the Lodge-Gossett constitutional amendment to do away with the electoral college for the election of Presidents and Vice Presidents, Representative COUDERT, Republican, of New York, will press an amendment to the Constitution to "reform" the electoral college.

Under the present system, Presidential electors are chosen in each State by a plurality vote in a State-wide contest. Mr. COUDERT proposes to choose the Presidential electors just as Members are elected to Congress, one for each Member of the House in each congressional district, and two from each State at large as Senators are elected. To be elected President a candidate must have a majority of the total electoral vote, or the election would be thrown into a joint session of the House and Senate.

The Lodge-Gossett constitutional amendment has already passed the Senate by the necessary two-thirds vote. It awaits action by the Rules Committee of the House. Its proponents are hopeful. This amendment not only does away with the electoral college, but provides that the electoral votes of a State be divided among the Presidential candidates in proportion to the number of popular votes cast for these candidates.

SYSTEM HELD FAIRER

It provides, too, under the so-called Lucas amendment which Mr. LODGE accepted in the Senate, that unless one of the candidates receives at least 40 percent of the total electoral vote, the election shall be thrown into Congress, with all Members of the House and Senate participating and each Member having one vote. It is Senator LODGE's contention that the system he proposes, with Representative COUDERT, of Texas, is much fairer and more representative of the popular will than the present manner of electing Presidents.

Mr. COUDERT, for his part, fears the Lodge-Gossett amendment might be "appalling in practice." It could, he insists (as does Senator TAFT, of Ohio) be a decisive step in the establishment of one-party government, because its immediate effect would be to increase the weight of the one-party, Democratic States of the South.

Senator LODGE's contention is that, under his plan, Republican voting in the South would increase greatly, breaking down to a considerable extent the one-party system prevailing in that section. This, Mr. COUDERT replies, is to build a dangerous illusion.

BETTER CHANCE FOR GOP

Mr. COUDERT, like Senator LODGE, desires to get away from the system under which the entire electoral vote of a State shall be given to a Presidential candidate, even though he has only a bare majority or a plurality of the total vote cast in that State. Under his proposal, he contends, a Republican would have a far better chance of winning a Presidential race than under the Lodge plan.

Senator LODGE, however, argues that the Coudert plan fails to do away with the electoral college and would take the election of a President even farther away from the popular vote. Senator TAFT is inclined to support the Coudert plan, but insists that there should be further study. He points out that since the State legislatures fix the boundaries of the congressional districts—and frequently resort to gerrymander tactics to strengthen one particular party—and frequently do not change for years—disproportionate results might still be obtained.

The Constitution leaves to the State legislatures the manner in which Presidential electors are to be appointed. No uniform plan existed in early elections. The three most usual methods, however, were: (1) election by legislatures, (2) election by the people in districts, (3) election by the people on a general or State-wide ticket. Only the third is now practiced. The second plan is the Coudert method and presumably the States could adopt it without a constitutional amendment, but would not. The Coudert amendment would make it mandatory on the States to do so.

Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include several resolutions adopted by the stockholders of the Midwest Creameries, Inc., at their seventeenth annual meeting at South Bend, Ind., February 24, 1950. The resolutions, in part, follow:

Federal support of dairy products: We oppose the present method employed by the Government in support of dairy product prices by purchasing butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids on an f. o. b. plant basis without consideration of transportation costs and distance from terminal markets. Such methods of purchase are not conducive to the orderly marketing of these products and disrupt the domestic distribution of these products resulting in the Government purchasing greater amounts of these products than is necessary. We urge that the Department of Agriculture abandon its current methods of purchase and reinstate the methods used so successfully in former years by the Dairy Products Marketing Association and the Commodity Credit Corporation. Since DPMA can operate readily on the exchanges, we urge the Secretary of Agriculture to permit it to assist in the conduct of the purchase program.

Farmers cooperative income tax exemption: We again urge that nothing be done to impair the right to income-tax exemption of bona fide farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperative associations that are operated on a true cooperative basis.

To this end we oppose any change in section 101 (12) of the Internal Revenue Code, the regulations promulgated under that section of the interpretations of those regulations that have been made by the Treasury Department.

American Dairy Association: We again urge support of the American Dairy Association and its program to promote and expand the sale and consumption of dairy products, and recommend that the cost of collection of funds be kept to a minimum in order to provide the highest percentage of moneys collected for direct use in advertising and promotion of dairy products.

We favor extending the check-off period for advertising purposes to cover at least 3 months instead of the usual 30-day period.

Filled dairy products: We oppose the substitution of other fats and oils for milkfat in dairy products. We also oppose the production and offering for sale of any imitation product made in semblance of, or which purports to be a dairy product.

The consuming public and the dairy industry alike must be protected from fraudulent and deceptive practices which undermine the public health and the welfare of the Nation.

Chain-store discrimination: We urge producers of dairy products to voice their opposition to proposed governmental restrictions on types of food distribution such as represented by the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., which in the past have increased consumption of food especially butter and other dairy products. Anything that is done to hinder such types of distribution will only result in less dairy products and butter being consumed.

Contagious bovine diseases: We support joint Federal-State programs for the control and eradication of Bang's disease and bovine tuberculosis, and we favor adequate appropriations to carry out these programs. The slaughter program carried out in the fight against Bang's disease has not proven entirely adequate. We have found that calfhood vaccination under proper Federal-State supervision has reduced the incidence of Bang's disease.

There is great need for information. Extensive research is paramount in controlling Bang's disease and mastitis. We therefore favor the allocation of adequate funds under the Hope-Flannigan Act for research to reduce and, if possible, to eliminate these bovine diseases.

Transportation tax: We believe that the 3 percent special excise tax on transportation which bears heavily on perishable food and particularly on the movement of milk from farm to processor can no longer be justified. We urge our member creameries and officers to press vigorously for its early repeal.

Improvement of quality: The butter industry is faced with a serious decline in the demand for butter, due in part to loss of our markets during the war when the production of butter was deliberately discouraged by the Government, and partly by the inroads of imitation dairy products. We endorse all voluntary programs to improve the quality of butter, and urge our dairy farmer members to aid in this project by the continued improvement of quality and production techniques.

Lower Mississippi Valley Flood-Control Projects Near Completion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include an article entitled "Lower Mississippi Valley Flood-Control Projects Near Completion," by Brig. Gen. P. A. Feringa, of the Corps of Engineers, president of the Mississippi River Valley Commission, delivered before the Waterways Division, ASCE annual meeting, in January 1950, at New York. I think the subject matter included in this article is of general interest to all believers of flood control in the United States. It reads as follows:

LOWER MISSISSIPPI VALLEY FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS NEAR COMPLETION—WORK OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION SUMMARIZED

(By P. A. Feringa, M. ASCE, brigadier general, U. S. Corps of Engineers; President, Mississippi River Commission, Vicksburg, Miss.)

Functions of the Mississippi River Commission, as created by the act of Congress of June 28, 1879 were to consider and mature a plan to correct, permanently locate, and deepen the channel and protect the banks of the Mississippi River, improve it for navigation, prevent destructive floods, promote and facilitate commerce, trade, and the postal service.

The act provided that the Commission should consist of seven members: Three from the Corps of Engineers, of whom one would serve as President; one from the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and three from civil life, two of whom must be civil engineers. All members are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The present membership consists of Col. Ernest Graves; Col. Clark Kittrell; Rear Adm. Leo O. Colbert, Coast and Geodetic Survey; Edward Fiad and DeWitt L. Pyburn, civil engineers; Albert L. Culbertson, and the writer. With the exception of Mr. Culbertson, who is not an engineer, all are members of ASCE.

WORK DONE WITH LOWER APPROPRIATIONS

Major problems to be solved were those of the river below Cairo, and while the surveys required by the act were duly completed from Lake Itasca to the Gulf, the plans and operations of the Commission, with comparatively minor exceptions, have dealt with the lower Mississippi and its alluvial valley. The actual construction work is handled in the same way as in an ordinary Corps of Engineers division. There are three districts set up within the boundaries of the Commission—Memphis, Vicksburg, and New Orleans.

The alluvial valley extends from Cape Girardeau, just above the mouth of the Ohio, to the Gulf of Mexico. It averages approximately 40 miles in width and contains approximately 20,000,000 acres, much of which represents some of the most fertile land in the Nation. The distance by river from Cairo, at the confluence of the Ohio and the Mississippi, to the Gulf, is roughly 1,000 miles.

FIVE TYPES OF FLOOD-CONTROL WORK

The flood-control problem which confronts the Commission is to take care of a design flood estimated at 2,450,000 cubic feet per second between the mouth of the Ohio and the mouth of the Arkansas and at 3,000,000 cubic feet per second below that point. The design flood was deduced by determining the most severe combination of synchronous floods of the tributaries of the Mississippi that could be expected under logically assumable hydrologic conditions. The drainage area involved includes 41 percent of the United States, or 1,240,000 square miles. The problem of flood control is met by five types of work.

1. Overbank floodways to carry flows in excess of the safe capacity of the leveed river channel. The New Madrid floodway, in Missouri, is complete and was used in 1937. The other floodways are in the State of Louisiana. The design flood, at the latitude of Angola, is 3,000,000 cubic feet per second. Design floods at various sections of the river are shown in figure 1. The safe capacity of the Mississippi River at New Orleans is 1,250,000 cubic feet per second. The Bonnet Carre floodway above New Orleans has been designed to take care of 250,000 cubic feet per second, discharging directly into Lake Pontchartrain. Thus the Mississippi River, plus the Bonnet Carre floodway, will take care of one-half of the design flood. The remainder must find its way to the Gulf of Mexico by means of the Atchafalaya Basin, including the West Atchafalaya floodway (250,000 cubic feet per second), the Atchafalaya River (650,000 cubic feet per second), and the Morganza floodway (600,000 cubic feet per second).

Bonnet Carre floodway is complete and has been used successfully on two occasions, in 1937 and in 1945. The West Atchafalaya floodway is complete and can be used if needed. The capacity of the Atchafalaya River is sufficient to take care of its share, and the Morganza floodway is under construction. It is expected that the entire Atchafalaya floodway—including the Morganza structure, the greater levees confining the flood flows, and the work below Morgan City—will be completed early in the calendar year 1953.

2. Levees, which have been and are being built to a height and cross section which will enable the Mississippi River to carry the design flood. There are 1,581 miles of Mississippi River levees. The levees will be 73 percent complete by June 1950.

3. Bank revetment, installed to hold the river in place and to prevent it from wandering as it has done in the past. Continued meander would destroy levees, with resultant need for setbacks, and would regain some of the length taken away when the cut-offs were made. A total of 425 miles of revetment will be needed, of which 199 miles will be in place by the end of the 1950 fiscal year.

4. Reservoirs, which are constructed beyond the limits of the alluvial valley on tributary river systems, such as the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the White, the Arkansas, the Ouachita, the Red, and within the alluvial valley itself, on the St. Francis and the Yazoo. The design flood at Cairo was adjusted to reflect the effects of reservoirs above that point.

5. Cut-offs, designed to shorten the course of the river and increase its slope and discharge capacity, are complete.

Black-Eyed Peas or Black-Eyed Beans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following information in regard to black-eyed peas:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, November 23, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of November 16, 1949, in which you quote from a letter addressed to you alleging billing of black-eyed peas shipped from California as black-eyed beans, which billing is claimed to result in lower rates to the advantage of California growers over Texas shippers of black-eyed peas, describing them as such and paying a higher rate.

Your informant does not state the points of shipments of black-eyed peas from Texas or the destination points of the California shipments competitive to the Texas shipments. I find that the applicable tariff rates on dried beans from California to Kansas City, Mo., St. Louis, Mo., and Chicago, Ill., as representative points, are the same as the rates on dried peas. Likewise the rates on dried beans from Marlin, Tex., to these three destination points are the same as the rates on dried peas. Therefore, it is suggested that you secure further information from your constituent with respect to the specific origin and destination points of both Texas shipments and California shipments of black-eyed peas. I shall then be able to determine whether there is any difference in the rates applicable to transportation of the shipments with which he is concerned.

For such bearing as it may have on the question, it may be added that I have received advice from a representative of the Department of Agriculture to the effect that so-called black-eyed peas are classified by the Department of Agriculture as beans. Upon receipt of the information requested above I shall make further inquiry into the matter in accordance with your request.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES D. MAHAFFIE,
Chairman.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, December 16, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of December 12, 1949, with which you enclosed a letter addressed to you by George S. Buchanan, Marlin, Tex.

Mr. Buchanan discusses the description and labeling of black-eyed peas as black-eyed beans sometime in the past and suggests that the action may have been employed either to secure a lower freight rate or to have obtained more favorable consideration as to rationing or ceiling prices established under orders of the Office of Price Administration. In response to your inquiry as to whether there was an advantage enjoyed in the OPA days on freight rates, it may be said that since June 30, 1941, there has been no difference in the rail carrier rates on peas and beans destined to Middle West points and originating either in California or Texas.

In accordance with your request, Mr. Buchanan's letter is returned to you.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES D. MAHAFFIE,
Chairman.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, January 5, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am returning the copy of letter addressed to you by former Chairman Mahaffie, dated December 16, 1949, on which you have noted a request as of December 30, 1949, for information as to any differences on freight rates applicable to shipments of black-eyed peas and black-eyed beans before June 30, 1941.

I have had a further check made of tariffs in effect from 1930 to the present time. That check reveals that during the entire period there was no difference in the rates applicable to shipments of dried black-eyed peas and dried beans destined to Middle West points and originating either in California or Texas.

Although your previous inquiries apparently have dealt with domestic shipments, as a matter of possible interest I may add that prior to October 26, 1943, in the case of export traffic on shipments originating in California points the rate on dried peas was 10 cents per 100 pounds higher than the rate on dried beans shipped by rail to Texas ports for export. During that period there was no difference between the rates on dried peas and dried beans from Texas origin points to Texas ports. By tariff effective October 26, 1943, the rates on dried peas and dried beans from California points to Texas ports for export were equalized and have continued to be the same.

Cordially yours,
J. M. JOHNSON, *Chairman.*

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., November 23, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have your letter of November 16 quoting from a communication sent you by a constituent dealing with black-eyed peas.

Under the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, a standard of identity for the canned product has been promulgated and this requires that the article be labeled as "black-eyed peas" or "black-eye peas." While we are aware that there are some sections of the country which have referred to the raw product as a bean, the information available to us is that consumers generally think of the product as a type of pea, and the product was standardized under its common or usual name.

We are not familiar with any differences in freight rates depending upon their classification for shipping purposes as peas or beans.

Sincerely yours,
L. D. ELLIOTT,
Associate Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 1, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of November 16, 1949, addressed to the Secretary of the Army, which has been transmitted to this Department for a reply. You quote from a letter from one of your constituents relative to the practice of shipping black eyes from California classified as beans, whereas the black eyes produced in Texas are called peas.

Black eyes are classified as beans under the official United States standards for beans and have been so considered by this agency since the promulgation of the bean standards. They are, therefore, not mislabeled when shipped from California and marketed as black-eyed beans.

Sincerely yours,
F. K. WOOLLEY,
Acting Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., December 28, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This letter makes reference to your communication of recent date in which you ask whether the Department of the Army advertises for black-eyed peas or black-eyed beans when procurement is initiated for Army consumption.

I have been able to determine that when the advertisement for bids is extended, the nomenclature used is as follows: Beans, dry, type E. In accordance with Federal specifications, type E is listed as black-eyed beans. When shipment is effected, the above nomenclature is used.

I am glad to be able to secure this information for you. If I can be of further service please do not hesitate to call upon me at any time.

Sincerely yours,
C. G. BLAKENEY,
Colonel, General Staff Corps.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your memorandum dated December 15, 1949, relative to the fact that black-eyed peas are also called black-eyed beans.

The current Federal specification shows them as black-eyed beans. However, this specification is under revision, and the new issue will show them as "Class 4, black-eyed peas (black-eyed beans)." The Navy cookbook has recipes for black-eyed peas.

These peas have been used in Navy general messes for many years, and personnel are familiar with the fact that they are sometimes called black-eyed beans. It is considered highly unlikely that bids submitted for black-eyed peas would have been rejected because of the reference to peas.

Your interest in the Navy subsistence program is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
C. W. FOX,
Rear Admiral (SC) United States Navy, Chief of Bureau.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of December 19 regarding the classification of black eyes.

Dry black-eyes are classified as beans under the United States bean standards. Many of the black eyes produced in Texas are marketed in the fresh state rather than in the dry or ripe state. Fresh or green black-eyes are generally considered as peas in the trade and do not come under the bean standards, since they only apply to dry beans. Their handling is comparable to that of other fresh vegetables, whereas the handling of black eyes in the dry state is comparable to that of other dry edible legumes.

Sincerely yours,
RALPH S. TRUE,
Administrator.

Taxes and Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, many innovations are being proposed in the sound Government policies that have been followed by the Congress in safeguarding the liberty and advancing the welfare of the individual citizen since the Nation was established. Under our Government and its legislative policies great advancement has been made in almost every line of human endeavor, notably in the science of medicine. Today we find that medical science has conquered the dread enemy of childhood, diphtheria. Our doctors have made our shores impregnable to the invasion of yellow fever and have searched out and destroyed the yellow fever germ-carrying mosquitoes. Our medical men are fast conquering dreaded tuberculosis; they have overcome in a large measure the ravages of the incurable scourge, leprosy. The magnitude of the victories of medical science is beyond the comprehension of the average layman. When we consider the advances that have been made in medicine as applied by our physicians few can fail to be impressed with the able and conclusive presentation on the subject made by that veteran statesman and great American leader, Hon. James F. Byrnes, in a recent article appearing in the March 4 issue of Collier's magazine from which I quote:

To pay his Federal taxes, the average worker today puts in about 47 days a year—close to 1 day a week. But new programs are proposed, such as the construction of plants to produce materials determined by some official to be in short supply, when such official decides private enterprise will not furnish adequate production; socialized medicine, which is certainly ultimately to cost billions; Federal aid to education; the bold plan to help the backward people throughout the world; the Columbia River Authority, and the Missouri River Authority, etc.

If all these new programs go into effect with the minimum expenditures proposed, the average worker will then have to give the pay from 67 days of his work to pay Federal taxes of all kinds. When he does this, he is saying, by implication, to the Federal Government: "Here, you take my money and buy me something with it. You know better than I do what I want." Such dependence will lead to pernicious political anemia.

What is the need for the Federal Government doing so much more than is now being done? What is the hurry? There is no crisis. Let us examine just one field in which there is a great push to expand Government activities, the field of public health. Proposals for some kind of socialization in this field are put forward as a "must"—a word that is an insult to the Congress though, unfortunately, many of its Members do not seem to realize it. How bad is the health situation at present? What are the terrible conditions that demand radical steps?

Perhaps we can get the story from news releases put out by the Federal Security Agency, of which public health is a part. Here's one that tells us, "A greater proportion of births in the United States were delivered in hospitals or institutions in 1947 than in any previous year on record. * * * Since 1935, the first year that data of this kind became available, the percentage of total births delivered in hospitals has more than doubled—rising to 84.8 percent."

And here is another release: "Maternal mortality decreased to a new low in the United States." Still another: "The infant mortality rate in 1947 was the lowest on record." And again: "Latest available figures show that the average length of life of the people of the United States is nearly 2 years above the level reached in the 3 years just before the war." And finally: "The death rate for the United States in 1948 was the lowest in the history of the country."

All of these releases appeared in 1949, giving presumably the latest figures and showing plainly—if I can read figures—that the general health conditions in the United States are excellent, and improving rapidly. I cannot think of one compelling reason to change from a health system that is giving us progressive and sensationally good results to one that is doubtful and experimental. Those who argue that conditions demand a change in our health system should argue also, if they wish to be logical, that Notre Dame should change its football system.

Regardless of how much money is appropriated for a Government bureau, you cannot get medical treatment for more people unless you have more doctors. But you cannot secure a doctor by legislation—he must be trained. Medical colleges are already working on their own to increase their faculties and their students. If the politicians will let the doctors alone, the Government will be able to continue its boasts about improved health conditions.

Some advocates of socialized medicine, who apparently doubt the strength of their own proposal, seek support by calling it a New Deal proposal. It was not President Roosevelt's proposal. Five days before the election in 1940, when Willkie was a candidate for President, I was in Indianapolis. Senator Champ Clark—now Judge Clark—telephoned me that some doctors in Chicago were charging that Roosevelt had promised to support a program of socialized medicine. When I asked the President about it, he said it was not true and he would correct the impression in a radio speech on the following day at Bethesda, Md.

F. D. R. STATES HIS POSITION

In that speech on October 31, 1940, among other things, President Roosevelt said: "Neither the American people nor their Government intend to socialize medical practice any more than they plan to socialize industry. In American life the family doctor, the general practitioner, performs a service which we rely upon and trust, as a Nation." He made the statement deliberately to reassure the voters who then, as now, feared socialized medicine and socialized industry.

So far as I know, he did not thereafter change his views.

When the present Congress closed its first session, there was a flood of appraisals of what it had done and left undone. Among those stories I saw a disturbing number of times the declaration that the Congress had failed dismally to carry out the President's program, and there followed lambasting and belittlements.

Just what do people who say things like that think the Congress is supposed to do? What is their idea of our form of government? In their minds, checks and balances appear to be harmful. If Congress must carry out whatever a President wants, why not abolish Congress? What these people seem to want is a powerful Executive, and an obedient Congress. Whatever that might give us at the start, it would end in dictatorship, in tyranny, the condition the founding fathers feared most.

If the Congress should obey, what about the courts? Shall we have a system under which the executive branch of the Government is supreme? Only men who do not like our system of government, or silly men who do not pause to think, would say that a Congress must be obedient to the President if it is to serve our country. Under the Constitution the Congress is supposed to be an equal and independent branch of Government, not a me-too adjunct of the Executive.

Full Employment—In Exchange for What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following enlightening article on the subject of full employment by Dr. Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics at New York University:

FULL EMPLOYMENT—IN EXCHANGE FOR WHAT?
(By Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics, New York University)

Should the full-employment bill become law, the people of the United States apparently will find that something of far greater importance has happened to them than they now seem to suspect.

Although several competent analyses have been made of this bill, their net effect may be extremely limited. The sponsors of the proposal have the means by which they can smother such analyses while, at the same time, they can give wide dissemination to glittering statements and plausible propaganda in favor of the proposed program. A far-reaching propaganda machine is in operation, and it is steadily gaining momentum.

Furthermore, the proposals in the bill are presented in a manner that will tend to win approval more or less automatically and to disarm those who may not read between the lines or grasp any dangerous implications which the plan may contain. The principal device employed to accomplish this aim is the incorporation in the bill of a lengthy declaration of supposedly admirable purposes. Such material is in the nature of a preamble; and this is not law, despite the fact that it follows the enacting clause. "Legislating by preamble," a device that has been employed extensively in Washington in recent years, cannot be defended in legislative law; and it is dangerous because it is used to mislead a trusting public.

It is this preamble type of material that enters chiefly into the popular discussion of this bill and is utilized, because of its emotional appeal, in the organized propaganda now being brought to bear upon the general public and Members of Congress by certain administrative, congressional, and various other pressure groups.

But the major defects or virtues of this bill are not found in the announced purposes. They are in the mechanism designed to provide full employment. And since this mechanism involves complex questions regarding statistical measurements and intricate causal relationships in the economic world, many economists and others opposed to the socialization of our economy fear that the general public may not be in a position to weigh the factual evidence which reveals the merits or dangers in this program. Regarding many, if not most, of the basic assumptions made in the bill, some of our most experienced and reputable economists are entering vigorous denials as to their accuracy or practicability.

The bill provides for a national production and employment budget, shortened to national budget—a budget which far exceeds in complexity of concept our large and complicated Federal budget. It is to include the estimated size of the labor force and the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditures by private enterprises, consumers, and State, local, and Federal Governments supposedly required to produce the gross national product deemed necessary, at expected prices, to provide full employment opportunities. It is also to contain estimates of the contemplated investment and expenditures of these groups, apart from the national budget program, including such foreign investments and expenditures for exports and imports as affect the volume of the gross national product.

The President is required to transmit such a budget to Congress at the beginning of each regular session. The budget is to be applicable to the ensuing fiscal year or such longer period as he may deem appropriate. If the estimated volume of prospective investment and expenditure for any fiscal year or longer is less than the estimated volume required to assure full employment, the national budget shall provide for correction of the deficiency. The President is to set forth ways of encouraging non-Federal investment and expenditure to increase employment and, to the extent that these are thought likely to prove insufficient, he is to provide a program of Federal investment and expenditure. His recommendations are to favor the utilization of private enterprise "except where the performance of such work by some other method is necessary by special circumstances or is authorized by other provisions of law."

If, conversely, the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure is more than is supposed to be required to assure full employment, the President is required to present a program designed to contract this volume.

He is also authorized to submit supplemental or revised estimates, or programs, or legislative recommendations to Congress "from time to time." He is required to review all Federal investment and expenditure quarterly to ascertain any changes supposedly needed in the volume of Federal investment and expenditure, and the rate of Federal investment and expenditure may be varied to whatever extent and in whatever manner the President may determine to be necessary for the purpose of assisting in assuring continuing full employment.

This National budget is to be prepared in the Office of the President in consultation with the members of his Cabinet and other heads of departments and establishments. In addition, there is to be a joint committee on the national budget composed of 15 Members of the Senate and 15 Members of the House who are supposed to study the budget and to report to Congress by March 1 of each year.

The bill provides that nothing in it shall be construed as calling for or authorizing the operation of plants, factories, or other productive facilities by the Federal Government, or the use of compulsory measures in the distribution of manpower, or any change in existing procedures on appropriations; or the carrying out of, or any appropriation for, any program set forth in the National budget, unless such program shall have been authorized by some law other than this bill.

The arguments that have been offered in behalf of this program are essentially those set forth in the bill's declaration of purposes. The significant considerations for the people of the United States are those raised by analysts who have studied the bill carefully and are in a position to appraise its implications with accuracy. In general, their queries and observations, thus far, follow closely the following summarization.

Serious questions arise concerning the concept of the national budget. Its reliability and value, quite apart from matters of purpose and practicability of administration, rest upon other concepts such as those of gross national product, the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure, regular and full-time employment, and so on, regarding which our statistical data are inadequate and of a questionable character. Most of these concepts are matters of dispute among economists both as to definition and as to the possibility of accurate measurement.

What, for instance, is regular and full-time employment—how many days per week must one work, how many hours per day, how many adult members of the family must work, how many holidays may there be, at what age may one begin work, and at what age may or must one retire? How can the notion of continuing full employment be applied to seasonal workers, specialized workers, migratory workers, apprentices, incompetents who are discharged, and those changing jobs? Is not the need for full employment greatest when the living standard of people is lowest, and least when their standard is highest? Does not the idea of full employment dissociate wages from productivity? Are not prosperity and productivity, rather than full employment, the major considerations?

Some of the other concepts mentioned, such as that of gross national product, involve, probably, even more difficult questions.

This bill directs the President to proceed as though our statistical data on the basic elements involved were complete and reliable or can be made available when needed. It directs him to make predictions on the basis of data known to be incomplete and unreliable. It proceeds upon an assumption that a deficit in what is supposed to be the proper amount of spending and investment can be stated with accuracy, and that this deficit can be related in a definite manner to the unemployment which has prevailed or may be predicted.

Indeed, the bill is essentially a series of assertions cut loose from realities. It states how governmental policies are to promote private enterprise, how they are to bring about the desired activity on the part of business, how they will assure full employment, how consumers' expenditures will be increased or decreased as desired, how capital outlays of business will be increased or decreased as needed, and so on, just as though assertions of this type in a law can effect the ends desired.

The bill incorporates what has come to be known as a compensatory economy program, the soundness of which has been challenged repeatedly by many of our most responsible economists. Provision is made for Government spending to take care of the deficits in the national budget. No consideration is given to the effects of taxation or borrowing on the private economy. Insofar as the theories in this bill go, taxation and borrowing might be exceedingly heavy and disturbing. No consideration is given to the possible size of the Federal debt nor to other unfortunate disturbances which the proposed Government policies and actions probably would cause. Under this plan we could have a series of deficits until the public credit collapses.

The bill, like the general run of comments on it by its proponents, seems to reveal no clear understanding of the net effects of similar Government policies in the past, as, for example, during the 1930's. When a policy, much like the one proposed, was tried in this country during those years, the economy was so disturbed that unemployment remained at a high level despite the heavy governmental expenditures. The flow of capital into new enterprises declined to a mere trickle. The velocity of bank deposits, which in general reflects people's optimism or pessimism, declined to the lowest level on record up to the time we embarked upon our armament program—to a point below that reached at the depth of the depression in July 1932. Facts of this type are ignored by the proponents of this bill. Moreover, its sponsors offer none that would warrant support for the theories on which it rests. They are asking the people of the United States to accept the bill on faith—on the basis of assertions and the declaration of purposes.

Another important consideration is whether a government can really do the things which this bill takes for granted. There are qualified persons who maintain that it is more reasonable to assume, in the light of the evidence that is available, that governments will make serious mistakes and cause maladjustments than it is to assume that they will always act with wisdom and proper foresight.

The bill takes for granted that even though a nation has been plunged into a severe war, with all the attendant serious and radical adjustments that are involved, the central government, if it will only take appropriate measures, can effect a smooth transition to a peace economy and enable the country to escape a severe postwar reaction. Many economists doubt that there is any basis in economics, or in economic history, for such an assumption. They insist that much of our thinking in the late 1920's was of this type. We thought then, they say, that if we could maintain a stable price level and continue certain other enlightened policies,

which our Government was supposed to be pursuing, we could escape a secondary and severe postwar reaction. We were soon taught the foolishness of those notions. Today we are seeing essentially similar assumptions made. The importance of a stable price level is being stressed just as in the late 1920's.

There is nothing in the proposed plan that would indicate how much Government spending is necessary to put a certain number of people to work. For instance, during the days prior to the pump-priming program of the 1930's, when the Federal budget was approximately $5,000,000,000, what was the relationship of this budget to the number of people employed? According to fairly conservative estimates, the best we can expect in the way of a normal-time postwar budget is one of, say $25,000,000,000. With a budget of five times the pre-pump-priming budgets, what would be the relationship of this extra 20 billions of Federal expenditures to the number of people that would and would not be employed?

The plan fails to recognize what qualified economists know to be the difficulties in solving the problem of unemployment by Government action: A government is a cumbersome machine and slow in launching public works. It is difficult to start these in the areas of unemployment and, therefore, labor often must be moved to distant points and perhaps be provided with special housing and other facilities. Projects, once started, are rarely stopped when the need for such employment disappears, partly because of the waste involved in the incompleted enterprises. There is the question of how to utilize the products or services for which there may be little or no demand. The supervisory bureaucracy is wasteful, expensive, politically minded, and tends to perpetuate itself and to expand its undertakings. There is a tendency to compete unfairly with private enterprises and to cause it to shrink or die, which, in turn, provides the excuse for still further expansion of Government employment activities.

Despite provision for advisory and other committees, the proposed national budget would be in control of a small group of statisticians who would devise programs of national expenditures based upon their statistical estimates. It is hardly reasonable to suppose that the 30 otherwise busy members of the joint committee of Congress would go behind the reports of the statisticians and obtain a genuine understanding of the nature and shortcomings of the raw material used in such estimates. What one can count on is that this committee and other advisory groups, Congress, and the President would take what this small group of managerial statisticians gave them, and that both Congress and the President would act upon such estimates. Otherwise, they would be defeating the chief purpose of the program. The probable consequence would be the discovery that, through the passage of this bill, we had instituted in large degree a federally managed economy with the management actually in the hands of a small group of statisticians.

Another serious question involved in the program is whether security in the form of assurance of "useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment" can be given to individuals by any government without at the same time sacrificing, to an undesirable degree, the freedoms which individuals must have if they are to go forward in the best possible manner. The bill does not face the fact that an individual cannot have freedom without, at the same time, incurring risks. It assumes that the people of the United States have reached a stage in which they are willing to sacrifice their guarantee of freedom to obtain what is in fact a spurious guaranty of employment. It embodies the doctrine that every person is entitled to obtain a living from the Government regardless of whether he has the ability or the willingness to produce enough to justify the pay which it is proposed that he shall have.

Just how does the Federal Government propose to see to it that the person who desires "useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment" is to get it? Who will decide whether the job is "useful" and what is "remunerative"? Will rates of pay differ or will they be uniform? What is a "regular" and a "full-time" job, and how is one to get it if there are no openings in the fields where one's qualifications lie? The net meaning of all these vague words—"useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment"—can be nothing but Government regimentation of those people who may be so unfortunate as to become the victims of the system which the bill, by its nature, apparently will institute.

The fact is that if an attempt is to be made by the Government to provide employment in accordance with the vaguely worded promises in this bill, the Government, of necessity, must determine when, where, and under what conditions the seekers of employment may work. This fact is not altered by the statement in the bill that nothing in the plan may be construed as calling for or authorizing the use of compulsory measures of any type whatever in determining the allocation or distribution of manpower. The existence of a painful amount of unemployment will supply all the compulsion that is necessary. This bill opens the way to far-reaching Government action to insure such employment as it may see fit to provide. The Government could, and probably would, enter many fields of activity that are not proper functions of Government—if we are to maintain the system of private enterprise.

Although the declaration of purposes is not law, but rather a psychological trick, the statement that one of the purposes of the plan is to contribute to the full utilization of our national resources is symptomatic of the unhealthy nature of this bill. No well-informed person could possibly expect to have or to want full utilization of our national resources. Such utilization would mean the end of all conservation and would leave little or nothing for future generations.

Despite the great concern repeatedly expressed in the bill over the preservation and fostering of free, competitive, private enterprise, the program in its essence is a monument to a striking lack of faith in the virtues and strength of private enterprise. The faith of the sponsors of this bill lies in the so-called welfare state, a fact adequately demonstrated by the declaration of purposes. And the true nature of the welfare state is a matter of grave concern to those who wish to maintain private enterprise in this country. "The slave state," says the British economist, Hayek, "always starts out as a welfare state. It promises freedom from worry, want—as many freedoms as you wish, except freedom from the state itself." This bill provides for much less, not more, freedom from the state. Indeed, some careful critics regard this program as probably the boldest attempt yet made in this country by Government planners to usher in a federally controlled peacetime economy.

Continuing full employment cannot be assured in a free society. If this bill should become law, the probable effect would be to discourage rather than encourage private enterprise and to decrease rather than increase nongovernment employment. The Federal Government will have assumed an explicit responsibility for full employment and for unemployment in this country. Presumably the best administration would be the one that would employ the most people. This could easily lead to huge Federal spending, huge bureaucracy and patronage, and finally, to national bankruptcy.

Although the bill expresses again and again an aim to encourage and to utilize private enterprise in carrying out the proposed program, escape clauses are invariably provided which would enable the President, with the cooperation of a majority in Congress, to do practically anything he pleases. In addition, there are various broad and vague provisions under which those responsible for the proposed policies could attempt almost anything in the way of instituting a federally managed economy.

The alternative to this bill does not involve doing nothing to combat unemployment—a matter of great concern to all enlightened people. There is, as qualified economists well know, an alternative that can be helpful and at the same time actually preserve and strengthen private enterprise and foster a healthy economy.

In brief, if our Government officials really desire to preserve and to encourage private enterprise and private capitalism, they should give more attention to what makes it function best and what causes the maladjustments that result in unemployment. Then they should endeavor to create the atmosphere favorable to the best functioning of the system.

Specifically, they should foster free and fair competition. They should not compete unfairly with private enterprise. They should provide the Nation with currency and fiscal systems in which the people have confidence and which facilitate rather than disturb the operation of the system of private enterprise. They should protect the weak from the strong and give careful consideration to ways to aid the needy aged and helpless without undermining their self-reliance and self-respect. They should see to it that those who handle other people's money adhere to the highest standards of ethics. They should encourage science, invention, and learning, and seek to broaden rather than to narrow the scope of individual freedom. They should regulate in the interests of peaceful settlement of disputes rather than to endeavor to produce and to direct. They should narrow rather than enlarge Government activities. They should encourage hard work, prudence, saving, and self-reliance. They should cease to cultivate the enervating notions that self-reliance is no longer a virtue, that the Government owes all citizens a job and a living, that there are distinct limits to the penalties that may attach to lack of prudence, and that there can be too much saving and that "oversaving" is a bad thing.

They should do other things of a similar nature. Some public works, if they are needed and if they can be properly conceived and executed in times of unstable unemployment, might accomplish some small benefits; but there is no basis for supposing that the benefits can ever be comparable to those assumed in this bill. Such works, when designed primarily to provide employment, besides being too expensive, rarely produce anything that leads to continuing employment. At their best, their accomplishments compare poorly with those resulting from a small fillip in the private enterprise system.

It is in these directions, rather than in more national planning of the type proposed in this bill, that our non-Socialist economists of repute believe the road to higher standards of living, greater individual freedom, and greater national well-being is to be found.

A basic question presented to the people of the United States by the full-employment bill is whether their thinking and activities are to continue in the direction of preserving and enlarging the freedom of the individual or whether they are to follow those of Socialist-Communist-authoritarian Europe.

America's Tradition of Asylum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the HIAS in New York on March 5, 1950:

AMERICA'S TRADITION OF ASYLUM

In the face of all we know—in the face of history—how can anyone sit back, smug and complacent, and deny that one of the greatest sources of American strength is in its tradition of asylum? But I think it is one of the bitterest commentaries of our time that men of good will are forced again and again to take the position of defending the immigrant, that men of good will again and again are forced to repeat the facts, to deny the slanders and review the history of immigration to our country. As far back as 1813, the same hue and cry was set forth against the immigrants. Almost 150 years ago men were making political capital of talking about closed frontiers, limitation of opportunity, and displacement of the American worker. These were men of little faith, restricted in imagination with tight, little minds who understood neither the era in which they lived nor the era to come. This is as true today.

The United States Congress had made provision when the struggle began in 1924 to restrict immigration, for the admission of 153,000 yearly. That law stands today. For almost a decade under that law just prior to and during the chaotic war years only a fraction of that number came in. Even under the now accepted restrictive Immigration Act of 1924, thousands upon thousands—almost one million and a half—seeking asylum could have entered without a dissenting murmur had the law provided that each year's unused quota would not lapse. Had these thousands been able to come in under the law, nobody would have talked of the displacement of American workers. Nobody would have talked about housing, etc., etc. It would have been taken for granted. Mind you, I make no brief for this act, which is based on eligibility of admission rising out of national origin. If 153,000 people are to be admitted yearly, what difference does it make if they are Poles, or French, or British, or Germans? This business of racial emphasis is an evil one. It translates prejudices into law and gives official sanction to the baseless concept of racial superiors. I cannot help but face this issue honestly, but I must likewise admit that the temper of the times is such that any attempt at repeal of such concept would meet with defeat—a defeat so complete that it must surely injure such attempts when made at a more propitious time. But I pledge myself to work unceasably to eradicate racialism from our lives. I shall not rest secure until any immigration law, based upon so-called racial superiority, is wiped clean off our statute books.

To go back to the law as it exists today with the possible admission of 153,000 yearly and with the lapse of over a million and a half quota numbers in the last decade—think what sound and what fury accompanied the discussion of a displaced-persons program in the United States. The displaced-persons program, of course, is a problem apart from our general immigration problems, but it is intimately related because of the prejudices and distortions which accompanied the enactment of a law in 1948—a law which relaxed the intolerance that made its first appearance in the law with the Immigration Act of 1924.

I think it is a fair question to ask what would the United States have been without the enrichment and vitality brought to it by the immigrant. We have a vigorous and dynamic society because we have utilized and amalgamated numerous cultures, numerous skills, numerous philosophies, and the product of that amalgamation, of that fusing together, is unmistakably and characteristically now a merit. Just as families inbred through years of highly selective marriage finally disintegrate, like the royal families of Spain and the Hapsburg Empires, so a nation stops growing when refinement of blood is its only goal. This is historically true and has been demonstrated again and again through the course of mankind. For example, it has been clearly shown that the years of greatest prosperity coincided with the years of the greatest immigration waves. It has been demonstrated that the States with the largest immigration population are most prosperous, spending more per capita for education, for road construction, for health, and for other general-welfare projects than those States barren of immigration blood. James G. McDonald, former High Commissioner of Refugees under the League of Nations, described the exiles from Germany, whom we admitted as being among the political and intellectual leaders under the German Republic—Democrats, moderate Socialists, pacifists, liberal professors, journalists, Catholic priests, and Protestant pastors. So selective was the emigration that Hitler's Germany, Mussolini's Italy, and Franco's Spain became practically intellectual deserts. As a further indication of the outstanding quality of the group that sought asylum amongst us in the 10 years 1932 to 1942 alone, it should be noted that 12 were Nobel Prize winners and that at least 103 of them have attained the distinction of being listed in Who's Who in America and 220 in American Men of Science, despite the short time they have been here. The number so listed is twice as large as would be expected if the same ratio to general population characteristic of Americans were to be applied to them.

Literally hundreds of refugee scientists made substantial contributions to the success of the Allied arms. Prof. Karl Sollner, a refugee scientist at the University of Minnesota, was a coinventor of a portable device to enable shipwrecked sailors and airmen to convert sea water into drinking water. A Polish engineer, T. Janiszewski, invented a new type of portable demountable V-type deck bridge which became standard United States Army equipment. An Austrian, Alfred Schwarz, research director for an optical company, designed a synchronized shutter used by Air Force and Signal Corps photographers. Czech specialists in the glass industry brought in a number of secret processes that were utilized in plane manufacture and in plastics. Iron and steel men from the Skoda Works contributed special knowledge and skill to the manufacture of munitions. These are just typical examples of the extensive contribution made by refugees to the war effort.

Most dramatic of the new discoveries was the development of the atomic bomb, which turned into a race between German and Allied scientists. Ironically enough, Germany started the experiments, but we finished them. In this we were aided by refugee scientists, a number of whom had been expelled by the Nazis because they were Jews. Among them were Albert Einstein, who provided the mathematical equation which showed just what the relation of matter to energy is and how one can be converted into the other, and whose letter to President Roosevelt resulted in the appointment of the Advisory Committee on Uranium. Dr. Lise Meitner, who discovered with Prof. Otto Hahn the important clue to the release of atom energy, fled to Denmark where she communicated her results to Dr. O. Frisch, a physicist likewise driven from Germany, and worked with Dr. Neils Bohr, a Nobel prize winner, until the German occupation in April 1940, when she escaped to Sweden and continued her research work, the results of which were sent to the United States; Dr. Bohr, formulator of the theory on which the atomic bomb is based, who was whisked from the grasp of the Nazis in his occupied homeland, went to England and also came to the United States where he assisted in developing the atomic bomb; Prof. Ruduif Peierls and Dr. Franz Eugen Simon, two German physicists who fled to England where they participated in the British part of the program; Dr. Enrico Fermi, Italy's foremost physicist and a Nobel prize winner, a refugee to the United States, who discovered how easily a slow neutron can slip into an atom to burst its nucleus and release terrific energy and who also did much to show how the chain reaction could be controlled; and numerous refugees of other nationalities who assisted in bringing the A-bomb to perfection. As the New York Times of August 8, 1945, remarked editorially: "Though the credit for having forestalled Germany must go to the air forces that bombed German research laboratories where secret weapons were developed, we have some reason to thank Hitler and Mussolini for handicapping themselves. The Fuehrer's irrational glorification of Nordics and Il Duce's acceptance of the Nuremberg policy had the result of presenting us with some of the best physicists of Germany and Italy and of occupied countries. There must be scores of others who were not mentioned in the official announcements—engineers, technicians, chemists, physicists of distinction, all gifts of Hitler and Mussolini."

Many alien baiters and xenophobes, in the most arrogant fashion, proclaim their superiority. They alone, for example, are responsible for winning the war, so they say. They have a monopoly on patriotism. They forget the contributions of immigrants and sons of immigrants in World Wars I and II. They forget such heroes as Abe Krotoshinsky, of the famous Lost Battalion; General Rose, son of a rabbi; Don Gentile, famous flying ace, son of Italian immigrants; Meyer Levin, of Polish descent; and Colin Kelly, of Irish descent. Of the six servicemen who participated in the historic flag raising at Iwo Jima, three of the men were aliens, one a Swede, one a French Canadian, and one a Carpatho-Russian, born in Czechoslovakia. The fourth was a full-blooded Pima Indian. In 1854, Lincoln rejected the proposed endorsement of the Whigs and Know Nothings, who were the alien baiters of his day. At the time he said: "Who are native Americans? Do they not wear the breech-clout and carry the tomahawk? We pushed them (Indians) from their homes and now turn upon others not fortunate enough to come over as early as we or our forefathers. Gentlemen, your party is wrong in principle." Then he told this story.

"I had an Irishman named Patrick cultivating my garden. One morning I went over to see him and asked how he was getting along. 'Mr. Lincoln, what do you think of these Know Nothings?' he asked. I explained what they were trying to do and asked Pat why he had not been born in America. 'Faith,' he replied, 'I wanted to but my mother wouldn't let me.'"

Let me again, in the interest of clarification, make this clear. I do not hold the premise that immigrants are better than other people. Neither are they worse. They are, in short, human beings with all the failings and with all the virtues that go to make up people. But I do make the premise that the intermingling of cultures and that the applications of alien skills in a country enrich it, serving both the nation

and the immigrant. I do hold the premise that a country which bars immigrants, which holds fears of aliens, which embraces chauvinism, will bring on self-destruction. I don't mean that the country will die out. I mean self-destruction in terms of growth and progress in its economy, in its arts and sciences; in short, a country which bars its immigrants has dried up the bed of its life-giving waters.

Let us look for a moment at our displaced-persons program which goes so far to demonstrate these truths. True, the present law contains restrictions and limitations which have proved detrimental to the entire program. The displaced-persons programs of the other countries, with the exception of Israel, have been on the basis of mass "labor recruitment," with selection by the governments of these countries. These countries have the widest latitude under their respective laws and regulations providing for the selection of immigration of displaced persons. Only in the United States has the program been rigidly circumscribed by a law which includes restrictions, limitations, preferences, and priorities upon all displaced persons who seek entrance into our country. It must be remembered that these special requirements are placed on top of all other requirements which our customary immigration law provides. We require individual assurances for jobs and housing which will not displace citizens; we find a 40-percent preference for those of Baltic origin and a 30-percent preference for agricultural workers. The 40 percent allotted to nationals of the Baltic States and the 30 percent allotted to agricultural workers comprise less than 19 percent of the displaced persons in the camp and this 19 percent arbitrarily receives 40 percent and 30 percent, respectively, of all visas issued. The Displaced Persons Commission is thus placed in an impossible position where it has to withhold the granting of visas until nationals of Baltic States and agricultural workers are found to meet these percentages. And they cannot be found.

Factually, there are not enough of these two groups to meet the 40- and 30-percent categories. Those who have job and housing assurances who are neither Balts nor agricultural workers must, perforce, sit back and wait. This has made the administration of the present law a most intricate and dismaying business.

In the early days of its operation under the 1948 act, the Displaced Persons Commission tried religiously to adhere to the prescribed percentages. When it became obvious that this policy slowed down the progress of a 2-year program of admission, the Commission informed the Congress in March of 1949 that in order to comply with the requests of American sponsors filing assurances it would temporarily pay less attention to the Baltic and agricultural percentages in order to expedite the flow of displaced persons under the 1948 act. The fact that the House of Representatives had as far back as June 2, 1949, passed the Celler bill eliminating the arbitrary and discriminatory preference percentages constituted an encouragement for the Commission to continue this sound policy. A much faster and more expeditious flow of displaced persons to the United States ensued. Many of the camps in Europe were emptied: many of them were closed and other countries such as Israel, Australia, and Canada, encouraged by the progress of our program, have greatly increased the number of displaced persons they have decided to admit. The outlook for complete and final dissipation of the displaced-persons problem was excellent.

But it is now obvious that the application of these restrictions, the unworkability of which has been predicted repeatedly, is preventing the fulfillment of the intent of Congress. It may well be because of these percentage preferences that the pathetically low figure of 205,000 will not be reached with the result that the displaced person problems will continue to be with us.

Even if there were a way found to make the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 workable, there would still remain 180,000 displaced persons in Europe by the end of the year.

The solution is an obvious and simple one. The Celler bill, which, as stated above, passed the House and is now awaiting action in our Senate, increases the number of eligible displaced persons to 339,000 and removes the unworkable percentage limitations. Out of 360,000 now remaining, 200,000 have already been listed for resettlement in other countries.

Thus the passage of my bill would insure a resettlement program fully complete except for the hard core of displaced persons which contained the disabled and the sick. This hard core would then necessarily fall within a mercy program which some countries have already undertaken. All reasonable people agree that every sound reason exists for the enactment of my bill.

The increases under the present law have created no additional housing problem; they have constituted only one-three hundredth of 1 percent of the labor force; 25 percent have been placed on farms, according to the statement of the Department of Agriculture; they have created no criminal problem, according to the statement of the Department of Justice; and their social integration has been excellent, according to the Federal Security Agency Administrator. The voluntary relief organizations, which have concerned themselves with their resettlement, report that there have been no instances where it has been found necessary to place any one of them on relief rolls, nor has their resettlement been concentrated in already crowded cities. Twenty-five percent as noted have gone to rural areas, and that percentage is increasing at a rapid rate. They have brought with them occupational skills which have been in short supply. All the orphans under 16 years of age attend school full time. None of the children under 16 work. Of the immigrants admitted under the act approximately 25 percent were under the age of 18, and 84 percent of all displaced persons who arrived were under 45 years of age. Seventy-six percent of the displaced persons were in family groups.

Questionnaires concerning the resettlement program were sent out by the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives to the appropriate executive departments, to the 48 governors of the various States, to labor organizations, and to social welfare agencies. More than two-thirds of these various groups replied, and in no one reply was there expressed any dissatisfaction with the displaced persons. Twenty-seven governors have already replied to date, and two-thirds of them state that they could use more displaced persons. Replies coming from the midwest and southern regions of the country have asked for more displaced persons with professional skills. The National Catholic Welfare Conference in its reply states:

"Of the total number of displaced persons sponsored through War Relief Services—NCWC, 40,592, not one person is either receiving relief or is unemployed. Opportunities for more displaced persons come into this office at the rate of about 700 a week; the program's success may be judged by the continuous stream of new assurances for displaced persons. The displaced persons who have resettled in the United States have sold the program to the American people by their willingness, honesty, and devotion. The few whose resettlement has not immediately been successful are forgotten when the program is viewed as a whole."

The United Service for New Americans, Inc., reports:

"It is our feeling that the program of resettlement of displaced persons in the United States has been a real success to date and is an augury of the satisfactory integration of the entire 205,000 people who are eligible to enter the United States under the DP Act of 1948."

The Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society states:

"The new arrivals apparently have adjusted themselves because, to our knowledge, no DP's have had to turn to welfare authorities for financial aid. Socially, they have been law abiding—none has thus far run afoul of the law; many have become leaders of religious congregations; some have entered the artistic fields; and still others have excelled in scientific studies. The DP, generally speaking, is a conscientious, reverent, and energetic person, who wants to make good and is willing to start at the bottom. We have seen men of letters accept jobs as menials, in a spirit of tolerance and profound appreciation for the immigration opportunities afforded to them."

I cannot leave off without stating how strongly I feel about the Senate Judiciary Committee amendments to the Celler bill. These amendments were the brain child of Senator McCARRAN, of Nevada. What he has done is to take my bill and under the guise of liberalizing it, has perverted it to the use of German expellees. It is cleverly written to leave the impression that it accepts the principles of an increase in the admission of displaced persons in this country, but nothing is further from the truth.

The Celler bill is designed to deal specifically with the problem of the displaced persons camps—to look toward their quick dissolution, and to relieve the taxpayer of their burden of support for these camps. All facts point to the conclusion that the passage of my bill will achieve that result. The changes proposed by the Senate committee, despite their appearance to the contrary, would do no such thing. They leave untouched the central problem which is the elimination of the displaced persons' camps. The Senate committee bill does that primarily by including in its definition of the displaced person "persons of German ethnic origin" * * * "who are expressly excluded under the constitution of the International Refugee Organization." That provision coupled with its other restrictive provision that 30 percent of the authorized visas shall be issued to persons who have been for at least 2 years at some previous time or times engaged principally in agricultural pursuits practically bars entry to those in the DP camps. The Displaced Persons Commission has testified that the agricultural restriction in and of itself has made the present act unworkable because of the difficulty in finding so high a percentage of eligible agricultural workers. There will be no difficulty in finding agricultural workers among the persons of German ethnic origin, but where does that leave the displaced person?

In addition thereto the proposed changes strengthen the provision that 50 percent of the German and Austrian quotas shall be available exclusively to persons of German ethnic origin who were born in Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Russia, or Yugoslavia, or areas under the control of any such countries.

Thus we see in effect a bill not for the persons in the displaced persons' camp, but for persons of German ethnic origin. In other words, the persons in the DP camps will have to compete with a heavy and overwhelming advantage in the law on the side of Germans for admission to the United States. This spells out a studied attempt to close our doors to the persons in the DP camps. It means that the American taxpayer will have

to continue maintaining these camps for an indefinite period; it means that the DP problem will remain with us to be refashioned and refashed over and over again; and it means that the hopes of dissolving the IRO on March 31, 1951, to which the United States is so heavy a contributor, will be dashed.

In addition to the expenses borne by the United States in maintaining these camps and in contributions to the IRO, the United States will be called upon to pay for all transportation costs of those persons of German ethnic origin since these persons do not come within the jurisdiction of the IRO. The constitution of the IRO forbids the organization from paying transportation costs for persons so excluded. Let me point out that the IRO bears the costs of transportation of displaced persons within their own definition. It will be noted, of course, that the Senate Judiciary Committee has changed the definition of a displaced person which heretofore has been the definition used by the international organization. Acceptance of these provisions will mean a denial of our international obligations as well and a rift in the direction of international harmony.

I note, too, that the Senate Judiciary Committee proposes to include the word "Marxist" in addition to the word "Communist" already included in the Celler bill in its definition is many things to many men. What is a "Marxist" and who is a "Marxist" is far from being settled, and to use so vague a term legislatively is a grave error. Does a "Marxist" mean George Bernard Shaw, Clement Attlee, or Tito, or Molotov, or any or all of them?

The Celler bill at best was a compromise bill, but it does have the merit of dealing directly and centrally with the problem of the displaced person.

Let us all fervently hope that that day never dawns when we set aside forever America's great tradition of asylum.

Improving Our Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate:

IMPROVING OUR ELECTIONS

Cartoonists have long depicted our ancient electoral college system as hoary and outmoded. By and large, they have correctly popularized the notion that returns in our Presidential elections were badly needed. The Senate last week responded to the popular appeal by voting the necessary two-thirds majority for the amendment offered by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts.

The plan provides that the electors shall be able to reflect popular preference for a candidate by casting their ballots for a minority candidate. In other words, instead of the winner-take-all theory that has led to lop-sided electoral counts in the past, the outcome will allow candidates in a Presidential election to retain their votes in proportion to the popular ballots. In 1948, when the election was still in doubt, the Dixiecrats might have held the balance of power had one of the large States gone the other way.

Such perversions of the popular will would be obviated in the future, under the Lodge amendment. The act must still be voted and approved by two-thirds of the House and from there must be approved by 36 of the States. There is a good possibility that the twelfth amendment will be revised and the reform incorporated into our Constitution.

The plan is not the pure democratic process whereby a President would be elected by popular vote alone. But it is a good compromise. The amendment offered by Senator LODGE, providing that no candidate can win without 40 percent of the popular vote, adds to the attractiveness of the reform. In the absence of such a plurality, the entire Congress, not just the House, elects the President. The improved electoral revision deserves the support of the House and the Connecticut Legislature, as well as all others interested in fair and equitable elections.

Mao Returns to China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 4, 1950:

MAO RETURNS TO CHINA

Mao Tze-tung, chieftain of the Chinese Communists, is now back in his native land after his extended pilgrimage to Moscow. Because of the fact that he went there to negotiate a treaty most of the emphasis upon his return has been placed, so far, on the question: What did he come back with? It is equally pertinent to ask: What did he come back to?

It is not so easy to make an appraisal of the exact situation, but plainly Mao comes back to an inflation of the same sort as that which undermined the Nationalist Government of China. The promise of $60,000,000 a year for 5 years that he received from the Russians won't help much to halt the already downward spiral of Communist currency. Apparently the policy of forced loans was not enough. The tactics used in forced rice collections and return of these loans to get moral credit apparently won't work when it comes to money.

A factor in the deteriorating economy, of course, is Nationalist bombardment and blockade. Whatever its cost in other respects, it is apparently proving to be more effective in the economic field than many persons had supposed it could have been. Chiang, who was upbraided for the lack of will to resist on the part of his armies, is showing more than a little ability to resist and to do real damage with his navy and his air force. At the moment he is forcing the Communists to lose ground economically.

This is a curious and fateful reversal of roles. It is easy to see that the effectiveness of the Chinese Communist movement derived to a very considerable extent from the fact that its attack over a long period was not on the field forces of the Nationalist Army but on the basic economy of the Government of China itself. The Communists boasted that when that viable economy had been sufficiently undermined the resistance of the Government would fall of its own weight, and events justified their boast. The situation has now swung around and it is the Communists who must try to establish and sustain a working economy for China. Their present outlook is not bright.

At the same time the character of Nationalist resistance has improved. Chiang, in resuming the presidency, is simply responding to the logic of forces and events. He has rehabilitated resistance on both Hainan and Formosa. He has at last put the real liberals and reformers into key positions. In place of some of the liberal followers of Li Tsung-jen, who came into office on the theory that it was possible to make an honorable peace with the Communists and wound up in Peiping, he has put authority into the hands of such acknowledged leaders as Wang Shih-chieh, K. C. Wu, George Yeh, C. K. Yen, and O. K. Yu. In the military field he has the services of skilled and imaginative commanders such as Chen Cheng, Hsueh Yueh, and Sun Li-jen.

MAO's return, in this light, must be viewed as something short of triumphal. He has won some of his battles in China. He may or may not have won his battle in Moscow. He still has an economic and political and military war on his hands.

Sunny and the Devil's Capsules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Al McCready, from the American Weekly for March 5, 1950:

SUNNY AND THE DEVIL'S CAPSULES

(By Al McCready)

A spotlight picked her out, and Sunny Burnett danced, and when she was done the theater audience whistled and cheered. It happened in big cities and small ones, from one coast to the other, and people who saw that dazzling sprite in those days in the late twenties and early thirties, still brighten up when her name comes to mind.

Other people, in the dim back rooms of drug stores and in hospital wards, remember her, too, and when they hear her name they grow abruptly silent. They knew her when her dancing days were over.

Sunny was a foundling. She was adopted by a foster mother in an Oregon town near Portland. She was such a happy little girl that soon she was "Sunny" to everyone, and she kept the name for good.

By the time she walked, she seemed to want to dance; before she was 4, she was learning ballet and tap steps in a dancing school; at 6, she was a professional, and on the stage.

Vaudeville houses dotted the country then, and when she was still in her early teens, Sunny made the 1-night stands and the longer ones of the Pantages and Orpheum circuits.

After that, there was a tour of Europe, and then, because she was really dedicated to ballet, she put aside money-making dancing for more study. She practiced several hours a day and in that period finished high school.

When the Ballet Russe de Monte Carlo visited Portland, Oreg., she danced with it in the Civic Auditorium; and she kept on afterward with the hard grind of practice; and in 1938 she starred in a musical production in the Portland Civic Theater.

"How about a cup of coffee?" a young man asked her one night after a performance. That was the way she met Ray Ward, the young foreman of a cleaning and dyeing plant. She had coffee with him in a nearby restaurant, and within the year they were married.

She had everything to live for then, she said; a husband she loved, security, and her goal ahead, the time when she would be a ballerina.

When she fell ill of appendicitis she wasn't worried. An operation at a Portland hospital would set her right. But after the surgery she found she couldn't sleep.

She began at night to take what she thought was a harmless pill, and soon she was taking two a night, and then three or four.

Before either she or her husband realized it she became one of those unfortunates who find that sleeping pills are habit forming.

She tried to keep on dancing, she tried to keep regular hours and lead a normal life, and the efforts were pitiful. She had to have more pills. She couldn't be without them.

"I sent her to a rehabilitation hospital where they try to cure people of the dope habit," Ray Ward said recently in an interview with a representative of the American Weekly. "It was the beginning of a 10-year nightmare."

Five days after she came out of the hospital "cured" her husband found her lying in a stupor on the floor of their apartment. A partly filled bottle of sleeping pills stood on a bathroom table.

"I sent her back to the hospital," Ward said. "She was 'cured' again, and went back still again. Each time the same thing happened."

Sunny tried to free herself of the habit. She suffered, Ward said. But she couldn't force her steps past one door or another where, if she turned in, she could get a fresh supply.

Her husband began to make a round of doctors and druggists, pleading with them not to let her have any more of the barbiturates. Some agreed willingly. He said he was shocked to find others callously indifferent.

One druggist, he said, in a 2-week period filled 18 prescriptions given to Sunny by 16 different doctors.

Some doctors, he said, were not above taking advantage of the fact that she seemed to be a sleeping-pill addict. One of them, not in Portland, sent her pills by mail, c. o. d., and the price was high.

A State law restricted the sale of the pills but Sunny—as her dancing days waned and her stupors grew deeper and more frequent—managed to stay adequately supplied.

She went to one hospital after another, one clinic after another, throughout the Pacific Northwest. She was hospitalized 28 times and Ward paid out $15,000 in fees, trying to have her really cured.

It wasn't any use. There was no reason any more to call her "Sunny." She was never herself.

One day in 1944, groggy from barbiturates, she fell from the balcony of her room in a hospital and fractured her skull and spine. Surgeons took a piece of her shin bone to repair the spinal break, but she never danced again. The old hope of fame as a ballerina vanished. Sleeping pills took its place.

Twice, falling asleep in the daytime, she set fire to furniture. Once, in the night, Ward awoke to find her lying beside him, her hair aflame from a cigarette, and her pillow burning.

They talked it over, later. They agreed on a divorce. They parted friends and he paid her $150 a month. That was in 1947. Later he increased the payments and he paid hospital bills.

One evening in December 1949, after he had remarried, he met her on the street, gaunt and haggard, and he asked her how she was.

"O. K.," she said, and she walked on quickly.

A week later, Portland police headquarters reported:

"Sunny Burnet, 35, was found dead in bed in her apartment Wednesday night. The coroner's office attributes death to an overdose of sleeping pills."

Excise Taxes and Hotel Operators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I recently addressed the Michigan Hotel Owners Association at Kalamazoo, Mich. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of that address:

Mr. Chairman, I shall discuss some problems that I believe are of particular interest to you who are in the hotel business.

You know, it was not so many years ago—most of us here can remember it—when the things that would be of interest to one group in one State were not so important, or of such great interest, to the same kind of group in another State. Our problems once were almost wholly local problems. But due to the changing times—to factors our people might have controlled, if they had wished, and to other factors that were beyond the control of any of us, in a real sense—we find that similar groups in every State are interested in similar problems.

One of the big reasons for this similarity of problems—among all business groups—has been the steady, undiminished, unparalleled growth of Federal power.

The situation has changed so rapidly in recent years that many persons, formerly alert and informed of trends in existence, find that they have overlooked important and vital factors by not being fully informed every day.

Twenty years ago decisions made in Washington were not nearly so important to your business. You innkeepers kept a few traveling Federal agents. I can remember when everybody in town would talk about it when a Federal man came through. He might have been an inspector for the post office, a Treasury agent, or a representative of the Tariff Commission. The local editor would interview every one of these Government officers, if he could get them to say anything, and record the interview in his local paper.

But today, I dare say, the owner of the smallest hotel of the smallest town represented here keeps not one or two but dozens of Federal agents every week. They do not represent just this or that agency but hundreds of Federal agencies. There are a good deal more than 2,500 different departments, establishments, agencies, bureaus, and subbureaus, with more than 2,000,000 employees. They are busy, attending to the enormous duties and responsibilities pitched into the lap of the Federal Government by an unwary people.

The problems which face us now are incomparably more complex than they have ever been before—at least those with reference to our Government. Once, an innkeeper was not, in effect, a collector of taxes for the Bureau of Internal Revenue. But that is exactly what you are now. If you don't know it, let me prove it to you.

If your hotel sells liquor or tobacco, you collect excise taxes for Uncle Sam. If your hotel has a cabaret, or a dine-and-dance place of any kind, however small, you have to collect taxes for Uncle Sam. If you put on any kind of amusements, or allow these to be put on in your hotel, you either have to collect the amusement tax, or be certain that it is collected correctly and sent to Uncle Sam.

In an unofficial capacity, you see to it that the Government collects a lot of other taxes. You are unofficial greeter for persons who have paid an excise tax on the goods that have been hauled to them through private transportation facilities, or who have paid an excise tax or their air line, bus, or railway fares. You, yourself, pay an excise tax on every light bulb your hotel uses, every match you or your employees use, all the food-warming or refrigeration equipment you have to buy for your kitchen or coffee shop, and on a wide variety of other goods and services, such as telephones in your rooms and the telegrams you send.

I often have remarked to myself that I suspect no other group of businessmen suffered so directly as did hotel men when wartime excises were imposed. But even before that, your industry was paying excises on a wide variety of commodities.

I am particularly happy to bring you a light ray of hope to lighten some of the business clouds. Congress is going to repeal some of these wartime taxes and revise others downward. I believe the House of Representatives will act first, probably in February or March, and that the Senate will drag along as usual, but will act on excises before the session is over. Senator SCOTT LUCAS (Democrat, Illinois) the majority leader, already publicly has promised the Senate that it will have a chance to vote on excise tax revisions before the session is over.

You men of the hotel industry, I believe, have one of the most graphic stories to tell Congressmen and the public of how you have been wronged through the workings of the wartime excise taxes.

Take the story of the excise tax on goods and services sold in cabarets, or dine-and-dance places maintained at many leading hotels. The Bureau of Internal Revenue collected $6,357,000 on this tax in October 1946. That indicated pretty good business, just as the war had been over for a year.

Then, the injustices of this excise tax began to become apparent.

By October 1947 receipts of the Treasury from this source fell more than $1,000,000. To be exact, receipts fell to $5,198,000. In another year, by October 1948, receipts fell off to $4,218,000. By last October 1949 receipts from this source were down to $3,565,083 and were still trending downward.

In other words, over a 3-year period, Treasury receipts from the excise taxes on cabarets were cut virtually in two. The figures show that in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, Uncle Sam took in $72,076,800 from this source, and in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, he took in only $48,856,000.

I am proud that I was among the first to agitate for removal of this—and other wartime excise taxes. I could see that these excises would act as a brake on business and would penalize the groups affected far out of proportion to what they, or any group, deserved to be penalized in peacetime. As early as 1947, I introduced legislation to repeal the excise tax on cabarets and on a wide variety of other goods and services.

I know that I reveal no secret when I say that the Republican Eightieth Congress had it on the agenda to repeal these excises, but the leadership put it over until January, 1949, in the thought that it would be easier to accomplish thoroughgoing repeal with a Republican President in the White House. This isn't the first time the Republican leadership has been overly optimistic, but I hope it proves to be the last.

At any rate, when we came back into session a year ago, the Fair Dealers were in the saddle. JOE MARTIN, the minority leader, and I decided to try for excise tax repeal, even though there had been a change in the congressional personnel. JOE MARTIN prepared a discharge petition—and my name was the first name under his on it—to force excise revision legislation on to the floor for a vote. We had 61 signers in just a few hours, but the Democrats did not want to help us. They played politics with the issue and, in fact, got two other men to start two other petitions. If all the persons who signed all the petitions had signed the Martin petition,

the House of Representatives would have acted on excise tax reforms last year.

Be all this as it may, on this particular issue, I am proud to be able to repeat my prediction that the future looks bright to me.

If I may be allowed to become a pessimist for a little while, however, I should like to draw your attention to some of the darker aspects of life. President Truman said in his opening message to Congress that the State of the Nation is good, that we are in the midst of a great prosperity, that all of us should be happy. It is true that more money is circulating around than ever. But any man who is optimistic about our Nation today, or about the future, has to be blind to certain facts of life.

As businessmen, you know that you cannot operate your establishments on a deficit basis for year after year without inviting serious consequences. You will understand me when I say, then, that we as a people must be apprehensive about our future in this Fair Deal heaven that Truman is planning.

For 20 years, except for 2, the Federal Government has been running a deficit. The deficit in this fiscal year ending June 30 will be more than $5,000,000,000, while the deficit for next year, if the President's new budget is followed, will be $5,000,000,000 more. In other words, while you get excise-tax relief this year, the long-range outlook is either for election of a Congress that will cut Federal expenses to the bone or for you to get ready to pay more taxes. There is no escaping the consequences of an economic act. We as individuals might dodge the consequences here or there by inheriting money, finding some in a cave, or otherwise having a stroke of luck. But as a people, we all must pay for the mistakes we all make.

Inevitably, an unbalanced budget has meant higher taxes. It will mean that again, and again, and again, unless somewhere along the line our people can be awakened to the dangers of our present course.

President Truman hinted that everybody should be happy. But the cold facts of his own statisticians disprove this. One-fourth of the wage earners now take in less than $2,000 a year, due to reasons of health, age, or other causes. These are family people. They are suffering more and more because of inflationary policies. They are not customers of yours because they cannot be. You can't afford to lower your prices because of policies of the Federal Government. The vicious circle is upon us. Poor people can't buy at high prices. The Government encourages high prices by high taxes. Yet, the Government pretends to be wanting to help the poor. By its methods of helping the poor, it not only hurts the poor, but it also hurts the more healthy, productive citizens. It taxes them to death.

I should like to be able to tell you that prices would come down. But I cannot in all honesty say it to anyone, rich, poor, or in-between. For years, I have been warning the people of my district to prepare for higher costs, higher prices, more of the vicious kind of inflation that men and women are bewildered when they face. Now, that kind of inflation is on you. It will get worse. It is due, of course, to the crazy-quilt financial pattern the New Deal and the Fair Deal have been following. We have been seeing our money spent by the billions in Europe, under the guise of stopping communism, while watching the Communists gobble up huge areas in Asia. Every acre of ground lost to freedom is another acre we some day may have to regain at the bloodiest kind of cost, and I can't help but believe there has been treachery in high places.

Somehow or other, you and I are going to have to get to our friends, neighbors and customers with a message of how we can restore some financial soundness to our Government operations at home and abroad. As you undoubtedly realize, I am greatly interested in seeing the Hoover Commission reforms put into effect. But I have to admit that if every one of these reforms were passed, as long as we have our present bungling administrators in the Federal Government, the money would be wasted efficiently instead of inefficiently. Trying to stop Government waste after the Fair Dealers have caused it, by voting huge appropriations in Congress, is a lot like trying to stop the Mississippi River from flooding by building a dam at New Orleans.

If we want to stop a flood on the Mississippi River, we have to stop the flow of water way up in Minnesota, Illinois, and all around by building up heavily forested areas and the dams by the hundreds, such as the Corps of Engineers has done through the years. Then, and only then, can the flood be minimized. Likewise, if we are going to stop huge Federal waste, we are going to have to get the people back in the cities and towns to quit demanding, and to quit voting for, projects that will push the total of Federal expenses far above the amount we can reasonably collect in taxes.

The job of informing and helping to educate the people in simple economics is a good job for every intelligent citizen, and most particularly for hotel men. I commend it to you.

We have tremendous problems at home and in the field of foreign affairs. Our foreign policy has been bad, terribly and tragically bad, in the past several years. Its fruits are becoming apparent to everyone. Five years ago, Stalin ruled 190,000,000 persons. Today, he rules more than 680,000,000—at least one-third of all the people on earth. If he ever gets them organized and can equip them, the disunited other two-thirds of the earth will be easy prey to him. We must begin to build now ever firmer frontiers against onrushing communism. We have waited too long and it is almost too late.

If we can get just a few of the people to see what we must do to save this country, there is still a great chance that we can move forward into a better life. Instead of more poverty through less production, we could have more prosperity through more production. Instead of creating new frictions through more taxes and higher and higher Government expenses, we could build firmly and efficiently.

I am not by nature a pessimist. I have been an optimist most of my life and hope to be again. But, as I say, the only way a man can be real optimistic today is by blinding his eyes to the cold facts of life. There is another fact that gives us hope, however; it is the fact of our still-continuing freedom of speech. As long as we can inform the people, they can awaken and we can go forward again. As long as we keep open and unhampered the communications to our friends throughout the world, outside the iron curtain, we can count on spiritual, moral, and material support. As long as man can think freely and talk freely, we can have visions of a better tomorrow.

There are many who charge us Republicans with looking back. I do not fit into that pattern. I am looking ahead. And if our people will but just see a few of the economic and political facts of life, we all can have a bigger and better and finer America, in every respect. I know that you join with me in the hope and in the prayer that that America will come to pass. Let us, as individuals, do our part to see that it does come to pass.

Nothing Funny About Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include therein a radio address delivered by me over WJR, the Good Will Station of Detroit, Mich., on Friday, March 3, 1950, on the subject of taxes:

There is nothing funny about taxes. The power to tax is the power to destroy; all of us know that.

As one of your Representatives in Congress, I have voted consistently against Federal tax increases, and against Government projects when in my opinion they added needlessly to the public debt. Even when public money was requested in behalf of my own district, I made sure that the expenditure was imperative and would return benefits in excess of the amount expended.

With this policy, I feel free to criticize and to offer suggestions concerning the tax policies pursued by the Truman administration and supported by the Democratic majority in Congress.

Indeed, those policies remind me of the story published a few days ago in a national magazine about the taxpayer who admitted to his Congressman that nothing is certain except death and taxes, but who nevertheless pointed out that death does not get worse every time Congress meets. He might have added that any further increase in taxes would make departure from this life somewhat more attractive. But, as I remarked before, there is nothing really humorous about taxes.

Because of extensive publicity by press and radio, all of us are aware that President Truman has asked Congress for about $42,500,000,000 to defray the cost of Federal Government during the fiscal year beginning next July 1. For the same reason, all of us know that the United States Treasury estimates Federal tax income—the only income the Government has—at about $37,300,000,000 for the same period. Thus deficit spending by the Federal Government next year cannot be less than $5,200,000,000. The $5,200,000,000 will be added to the present public debt of $258,400,000,000.

But this is not all. There is a whole lot more, which is being deliberately concealed from the taxpayers and the public at large. This consists of about $9,200,000,000, carried in the 1951 budget as contract authorizations. By the phrase—contract authorizations—is meant that various Government agencies, notably the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineer Corps, would be authorized to make contracts, calling for total outlay of $9,200,000,000, for irrigation and electric power projects, flood control, and rivers and harbors improvements, in advance of appropriation by Congress.

If these contract authorizations are approved by Congress, then the total of Federal Government expenditures for the 1951 fiscal year will be $51,700,000,000, instead of $42,500,000,000. True, the money would not be paid out until some later date, when Congress would have to appropriate whatever sums had been obligated, but the money would be spent next year—spent in exactly the same way anyone spends when he signs a purchase contract, and installment notes, for a new automobile or anything else.

From what I have said, it becomes apparent that President Truman wants to spend, not $5,200,000,000 more than the Government will take in next year, but actually $14,400,000,000 more. Thus instead of adding $5,200,000,000 to the public debt, he would add $14,400,000,000. This would make the debt $272,800,000,000, or $9,400,000,000 more than ever before, even at the end of the most costly war ever fought in the history of the world.

President Truman has said that the 1951 budget was pared to the bone before it was sent to Congress. If this be so, then why does the budget provide for adding 24,583 new civilian employees in 37 Government departments and agencies which are not connected with national defense? Government civilian employment already is close to the wartime peak. Administration talk of efforts toward Government economy is nonsense, and a fraud upon our people.

The President and his supporters in Congress know that the Hoover Commission called for a drastic reduction in Government personnel. They know that by putting into effect even a part of the Hoover recommendations next year's Federal deficit could be wiped out. And by carrying out most of them a tax reduction equal to that made by the Republican Eightieth Congress would be made possible. But instead, the President sends to Congress a budget which would add the equivalent of an army corps to the Government's civilian payroll. At the same time, the President demands higher taxes to pay for what he calls unavoidable Government expense.

Recently the President cast the blame for this year's deficit of more than $5,000,000,000, and the prospective deficit of anywhere from $5,200,000,000 to $14,400,000,000, on the Republicans for reducing income taxes by something over $4,000,000,000 annually in 1947. Incidentally, this reduction took more than seven million low-income taxpayers off the tax rolls entirely.

But the President forgot, or ignored, the fact that the 1947 tax reduction was made at a time when a 1948 surplus of $8,500,000,000 had become a certainty. He conveniently forgot, too, that in 1947 he advanced his own tax reduction program. It would have reduced each individual's tax bill by $40, and would have made up the $3,200,000,000 revenue loss by increasing income taxes on corporations. This program would not have taken low income people off the tax rolls. Furthermore, those who saved $40 in direct tax would have paid out the same money in higher prices for everything. Higher prices because corporations, like individuals, have to pass tax costs on to the consumer if they hope to stay in business.

The most important thing forgotten, or ignored, by President Truman was that the amount of tax income increased after the income tax was reduced by the Republicans in 1947, just as it did after the $6,000,000,000 cut in excess-profits taxes on corporations was made effective in 1945. Federal tax income increased in each instance, of course, because tax relief stimulated business. Both corporations and individuals had larger incomes on which to pay taxes.

Public opinion now demands elimination, or at least drastic reduction, of wartime excise taxes on such things as freight charges, passenger fares, telegrams and telephone messages, and theater tickets—to say nothing of cosmetics, women's handbags, luggage, baby powder, and many other things of daily necessity. As a result, the administration, because of its wild and reckless spending, is engaged in a frantic search for other tax income to make up for the loss it fears with respect to this source.

Anyone would concede that the elimination of hidden taxes on these things would stimulate business sufficiently that Government tax income from other sources would more than offset the loss. Excise taxes of all kinds make up 18 cents of every tax dollar collected by the Federal Government.

Excise taxes are not the only hidden taxes with which the American people are burdened. The hidden tax burden has become heavier than that of direct income taxes. For example, the wife's new Easter bonnet will have 150 taxes on it. You paid 206 hidden taxes on your new automobile. The egg you ate for breakfast had 100 invisible taxes in its cost to you. You paid 11½ cents in hidden taxes on the package of cigarettes you bought today.

When your wife bought a 21-cent quart of milk yesterday at the grocery store 13 cents was for milk, 8 cents for taxes; she paid 25 cents in taxes on a 75-cent pound of meat. When you last bought a ton of coal—if you could get it—$5 of the price was for taxes. If you bought a Ford automobile this year, $700 of the price was for taxes. Everything you buy is loaded with hidden taxes.

In view of this situation, the President once more insists—publicly, at least—that excise tax cuts must be followed by corporate tax increases. But according to some sources within the Ways and Means Committee—the committee which writes the tax laws—the White House last week let it be understood that possibly present taxes on corporate enterprise should be reduced slightly instead of increased. This because many large industrial companies have laid aside expansion plans, and even have delayed replacements, owing to excessive tax costs and lessening demand for their products and falling prices in the buyers' market. The result, of course, is increasing unemployment.

All of these things lead to but one conclusion. Government spending at every level, except that of national defense, must be cut drastically—and now. The Hoover economy measures generally must be carried out—and now, not later. The reckless Fair Deal administration must be curbed—their worldwide WPA projects for nations which use our ECA funds and goods for political purposes instead of rehabilitating their economies, must end.

The people must rise against the Fair Deal further loading Government pay rolls for political purposes. The Communist traitors and their Socialist allies in our Government must be cleaned out and removed from the pay rolls. The Fair Deal must be prevented from establishing its welfare state program and spending this country into bankruptcy, thereby destroying our precious liberties.

With the help of public opinion, the Congress of the United States can do these things. The Congress now has an opportunity to adopt a 1951 budget of only $36,000,000,000; an alternative to the President's budget of more than $42,500,000,000. Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, its originator, points out that it would provide for none of the Fair Deal socialistic proposals, but would provide for every essential Government service and for adequate national defense. He ought to know, because he undoubtedly is the Nation's outstanding expert on Government finance. By adopting this budget, or one closely resembling it, the Congress can, and should, remove the pressure for higher and ever higher taxes; and indeed, make possible some substantial tax relief for the people.

As an American citizen, as a Member of Congress, as a Republican, I am for the lowest possible budget. I shall do all in my power to help bring about its adoption, as a step toward the ultimate preservation of the Republic.

Segregation in Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to an article in the New York Herald Tribune of February 19, 1950, by Mr. Walter White, lauding the Justice Department for the work it is doing in defense of civil rights. I, too, wish to add my word of commendation.

The article follows:

SEGREGATION OF SCHOOLS—LAUDS JUSTICE DEPARTMENT FOR ADDING SOUTHERN NEGROES' SUIT

(By Walter White)

If the amicus curiae brief which has just been filed by the Justice Department is heeded by the Supreme Court the good which for more than half a century has been "interred with the bones" of the late Justice Harlan will come to life again.

Mr. Harlan, of Kentucky, was the lone dissenter against seven colleagues when he said, "We boast of the freedom enjoyed by our people above all other peoples. But it is difficult to reconcile that boast with a state of the law which, practically, puts the brand of servitude and degradation upon a large class of our fellow citizens, our equals before the law. The thin disguise of 'equal' accommodations * * * will not mislead anyone, nor atone for the wrong this day done."

The Solicitor General of the United States, Philip B. Perlman, and the Special Assistant to the Attorney General, Philip Elman, are asking the Supreme Court to put into practice the incontrovertible logic of Justice Harlan. The cases in which they intervene as friends of the Court on behalf of the Government are those of G. W. McLaurin, a graduate student preparing for a doctor's degree in education at the University of Oklahoma, and Heman Marion Sweatt, who wants to study law in Texas.

"McLaurin and Sweatt are Negroes," the brief states. "For that reason alone they have been subjected under the laws of the States in which they live to various educational restrictions not imposed on white students. McLaurin * * * is required to sit at a special desk set aside for him in the doorway of the classroom; he may use the library, but only if he takes his books to a designated desk on the mezzanine floor; he may eat in the school cafeteria, where he is served the same food as other students, but only at a different time and at a table specially set apart for his use."

As for Sweatt, of Texas, he has been barred altogether from the law school and offered instruction at a "separate" school which Texas hastily tried to set up for Negroes to escape the wrath of the courts. The United States Government has gone unequivocally on record in the present brief as saying and believing that "the fact of racial segregation is itself a manifestation of inequality and discrimination," which, if allowed to continue, will mean that "the ideals embodied in our Bill of Rights would be ridiculed as empty words, devoid of any real substance."

Those who have a vested interest for political, economic, or racial reasons in perpetuating educational segregation are already protesting lustily the action of the Justice Department in joining the fight for justice.

But the majority of students and faculty members in southern schools have demonstrated over and over again that they want the farce ended.

Heavily burdened taxpayers are waking up to the fact that it is as expensive as it is absurd to pay for two law schools, two medical schools, two dental schools, two engineering schools, two forestry schools, two graduate schools of education and two of every other kind of professional and graduate school. All this is obeisance to white supremacy. This rapidly growing awakening to the absurdity of such duplication was trenchantly expressed by the president of one of the South's largest State universities when he said recently, "We can't build a cyclotron for a single student."

Among the road blocks to the success of the efforts to preserve the status quo in the South are the swiftly expanding industrialization with new moneys for development and new and younger personnel, a growing resistance to the financing of hate movements by northern industrialists (who formerly made suckers of southerners by their divide-and-rule practices), and the phenomenal growth of the Negro and labor votes.

Consider Florida: In 1948 Governor Warren won by the narrow margin of 21,000 votes in an election in which a half million Floridians voted. In 1944 Senator CLAUDE PEPPER squeaked through by a mere 9,799 ballots. Today there are slightly more than 100,000 registered Negro voters in Florida, and other Negroes are registering at so much more active a pace than others it is conservatively estimated that no less than 125,000 Negroes will vote in the May 2 primary. To a greater or lesser degree the same trend is seen in every southern State, including Mississippi and South Carolina.

Erosion back on every front—judicial, political, economical and moral—white supremacy advocates still assert loudly and belligerently that the South will never tolerate interference with the southern pattern of segregation. Only 2 years ago they shouted the same moth-eaten platitudes when the Supreme Court was considering legal cases involving the so-called white Democratic primary. Today Negroes—and a considerably larger percentage of younger and more intelligent whites—are voting in all but the Klan-ridden rural areas of the South. Everyone except the most bigoted and timorous southerners believes that the same extension of true democracy will come about in graduate and professional tax-supported schools in the South.

Time marches on—even in Dixie.

Resolution of Illinois Fruit Growers Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to insert in part a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Illinois Fruit Growers Exchange at Carbondale, Ill., February 28, 1950. And I want to commend the splendid citizens of my State for their clear thinking in expressing their opposition to the action of the Department of Justice in the case of the Atlantic and Pacific Tea Co., their expressed opposition to the Brannan plan, and their recommendation that wartime excise taxes be eliminated.

The resolution follows:

1. *Be it resolved*, That the Illinois Fruit Growers Exchange in this annual meeting, express our opposition to the action of the Department of Justice in the case of the Atlantic and Pacific Tea Co. and its similar actions pending or already started against other large firms, when based on the same principles as that taken against the Atlantic and Pacific Tea Co.

2. *Be it resolved*, That the Illinois Fruit Growers Exchange express its opposition to the Brannan plan and that the proper authorities be so informed.

3. *Be it resolved*, That the Illinois Fruit Growers Exchange support the Illinois fruit promotional efforts of the Illinois Fruit Council.

Connecticut State Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Waterbury (Conn.) American, of March 2, 1950:

STATE HOUSING PLAN NO HELP TO THIS EX-GI

To the EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN:

In December 1949, I heard about the Connecticut State housing. It all sounded wonderful. It was for us moderate income earners. I earn $2,000 yearly on a 4-day week, and I've got a 4-month-old son. Interest would only be at 1½ percent. It just sounded too good to be true. Seeing that we live in a small three-room rent, and pay $45 monthly, this own-your-own-home plan initiated by our Governor, was just the thing.

Incidentally us GI's were required to put down only a very small down payment. So I immediately applied for this and, in about 2 months I received my certificate of eligibility. This meant I could either buy or build a home at a 1½-percent mortgage.

Along with this certificate I was sent a book. In this book it showed that on a $7,500 home $193 was required for a down payment; on an $8,000 home, a fraction higher, etc.

It also showed that taxes on any of these homes were $8 per month. I still don't know how the State arrived at this figure, but I have been told that this is an average of all cities and towns in Connecticut. Anyway, suffice it to say that this figure is at least 50 percent wrong; $16 per month would be closer, here in Waterbury.

So, armed with all this information, I went to the State's local correspondent. I immediately was told that there were no $7,500 homes, $8,000, or $9,500 homes. Prices started at $9,000 and up. Well, making only $2,000 yearly, one can readily see that these homes were out of my means.

I asked them, what about the $7,500 homes? Their reply was that the State had no idea about what it cost to build a house.

Well, since I couldn't buy a reasonable home, I thought I would build. After a week of getting estimates, I submit the figures below for your approval:

Lumber	$2,400
Carpenter	1,200
Mason	1,775
Plumbing and heating	1,800
Electrician	300
Painter	500
Lot	800
Building permit, surveying, etc	100
Total	$8,875

Well, I can buy for $9,000 or build for $8,875. The only thing that is stopping me is that I can't afford it.

Why?

Because I am a moderate income earner. Well, now, what is a moderate income earner?

This is answered by the State housing authority itself.

They state that to qualify for this program, you have to earn less than $2,500 yearly, plus $600 for each dependent, and you must have less than $3,000 cash.

Well, since I received a certificate of eligibility, I guess I qualified.

Well, getting back to my owning a home, I found myself stymied. I read in the papers that a representative of the State Housing Authority was coming to Waterbury on Monday, February 27. So I went there, with the intention of finding out my next move. Incidentally, I wrote a letter to Governor Bowles and told him how I couldn't buy or build a home under his program. I have yet to receive an answer.

As I was saying above, I went to this meeting of the representative of the State housing. I told him of my problem. As for $7,500 homes, he said, you take that up with the local State correspondents. The $8 taxes per month was a round figure.

When I said that taxes here were twice that much, he seemed to be preoccupied with someone else.

Well, about this time I waved my certificate of eligibility at him and asked him what I should do with it. He then went on to say that I shouldn't act like this when our good Governor is trying to do something good for us.

I then reminded him that on my $2,000 yearly earnings, I was unable to take advantage of our good Governor's generosity.

To this our State representative added, "Why don't you get a part-time job? He went on to say how he did at one time. Apparently our friend is optimistic. Otherwise he would realize how conditions are in Waterbury.

But that is neither here nor there.

I have a certificate of eligibility.

What shall I do with it?

It can't buy me a house. Did our good Governor say this program was for moderate-income earners?

S. C. G.

WATERBURY, *February 28, 1950.*

The Next Coal Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest problems facing this Congress and this country is the recurrence of the coal strikes periodically, as and when the contract between the operators and the United Mine Workers expires. The Washington Post, in its Sunday issue of March 5, 1950, has written an excellent editorial which should be read by all Members of Congress. It appears to me that this is an appropriate time for the Congress to begin to work upon and enact legislation to prevent recurring strikes in the coal industry and to save the public from the hardship and suffering that generally results when coal cannot be produced in sufficient quantity for the welfare, health, and safety of the people of this Nation.

John L. Lewis should not be permitted to profit from collective bargaining and at the same time repudiate and shirk union responsibility in getting the union members back to work, as has just recently been done. Union responsibility should match bargaining power. I include herewith the editorial entitled "The Next Coal Crisis":

THE NEXT COAL CRISIS

The apparent agreement between the coal operators and the United Mine Workers has relieved Congress of the necessity of passing an emergency seizure bill, as requested by President Truman, and there is a strong tendency to sit back with a sigh of relief and say, "Thank goodness it is over." But that is precisely what the country has been doing for many years, with the result of encouraging new crises. If we have any capacity to learn from experience, now is the time to press for long-range legislation. For the strategy that John L. Lewis has employed so successfully is certain to be used again, and the only machinery the Government had for dealing with such crises has been left a shambles. To slump into complacency because the immediate emergency has been eased would be to invite a worse ordeal when the new contract expires.

In addition to asking for seizure powers, the President recommended that Congress set up a commission to make a thorough study of the coal industry in terms of economic, social and national security objectives. This is a step of the greatest importance. We have often pointed out that interruptions in coal output will continue until the industry finds means of stabilizing production, eliminating high-cost mines and providing steady work at wages that will not drive coal out of competition with other fuels. The industry has proved utterly incapable of diagnosing and curing its own ills. Since a steady flow of coal is vital to both economic well-being and national security, the Government is under the strongest sort of obligation to try to bring order out of the present chaos.

If the mines are to remain in private operation, moreover, some means will have to be found of averting these periodic holdups of coal consumers. Thoughtful observers have always recognized that the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act were a weak reed on which to rely. Senator Taft himself pushed through the Senate last year a bill to permit seizure of struck plants or mines for 60 days as well as to restrain strikes by court order while efforts to settle disputes threatening the national health and safety are being made. Judge Keech's ruling that the UMW was not guilty of contempt has now made reexamination of this issue imperative.

Not much fault has been found with the court's ruling because of the weakness of the case the Department of Justice presented. Apparently the department took it for granted, because the United Mine Workers had twice before been punished for similar offenses, that the continuance of the strike itself would be sufficient to establish contempt. There is much sympathy with Judge Keech's rejection of this easy assumption. Yet if a union is able to escape all responsibility for a strike that it initiates and then fails to stop when the point of a national disaster is reached, the result will be a mockery of all law and order.

Either a union is responsible for the concerted action of its members or it is not. Logic would have demanded that if the miners were in rebellion against Mr. Lewis, as his case presented to the court indicated, he should not have represented the union in collective bargaining efforts. Instead, it is unmistakably plain that he continued to wield the power of the UMW in all matters except calling off the strike. Incidentally, he candidly recognized the strike as such in his talks with newspapermen and assumed that it would continue during "the time that we shall require to adjust the current dispute fairly." In other words, the union leaders took full advantage of the strike while washing their hands of responsibility for its continuance. No union official resigned because of repudiation of his leadership. No defiant local union was disciplined. Regardless of what the requirements for proving contempt may be, one cannot avoid the conclusion that the UMW won a notable victory by hoodwinking tactics.

Congress will have to meet this problem. If unions are not responsible enough to halt a threatened disaster which they have set in motion, Congress may have to forbid industry-wide bargaining. Mr. Lewis cannot eat his cake and have it too. It is possible, of course, that this fatal weakness in the law would not have developed if the Department of Justice had shaken the lead out of its shoes and given the courts an accurate picture of the goon squads and other union pressures that prevented the miners from going back to work. But one thing is certain: If union responsibility cannot be expanded to match bargaining power, bargaining power will have to be shrunk to match union responsibility.

Time To Wake Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, Fred R. Zimmer edits and publishes at Hartington, Nebr., the widely read Cedar County News. Hartington is a progressive county-seat town. Cedar County, one of 24 counties of the Third Congressional District of Nebraska, is a first-rate agricultural county by any comparison. The people of Cedar County are industrious, thrifty, patriotic Americans that love their country and take an alert interest in affairs of government. In this environment and with this inspiration, Mr. Zimmer has written an editorial, Time To Wake Up, that, because of its timeliness and perception, is included in these remarks:

TIME TO WAKE UP

It is time for all Americans to wake up. It is time for all of us to do some thinking and working for ourselves. This applies to every American citizen, rich and poor, Democrat and Republican.

Do you know where the Fair Deal is taking us? Do you know what the welfare state will lead to? If you do not already know, it is time to wake up and look at the sign posts along this road down which we seem to be traveling so easily.

It is not entirely the fault of the Government in Washington. They are giving us what the vocal majority seems to be asking for. Namely, something for nothing, security without work, payments, aid, and relief.

What is all of this Government aid costing us as individuals? First of all we are paying in taxes the money which is returned to us in the form of Government aid and subsidy. Secondly, for our cradle-to-the-grave security we are giving up increasing amounts of our freedom and independence, which in years gone by the American people have prized so highly.

People have been prone to take the easy road. They have asked the Government for this and that. The Government has granted the requests, but in return they have taken more and more tax dollars, and infringed more and more upon private enterprise. The higher taxes are placing a greater burden upon individual business each year. Each year private business is faced with more and more competition from Government. Government business pays no taxes, nor does it have to operate at a profit, because the taxpayer makes up the losses. Private business cannot continue to function for long under such a program.

The ultimate result is socialism. The Government will operate everything. They will set our standard of living, and they will harness us with controls, until like the horse, we will have to obey the commands of the one holding the reins. That is not the way Americans like to live, but that is what they are heading for if they do not wake up soon and put an end to the present trend.

The Federal Government has grown more and more powerful. Today it is squeezing out the State and local governments as well as the individual. Our National Government takes such a big share of the individual income that States and local governments can no longer collect the taxes they need to carry on their functions. So, they are forced to trade some of their rights to the Federal Government for grants-in-aid to help build roads, airports, and hospitals and to help care for the poor and needy.

This puts the local and State government under the thumb of the Federal Government, just like the individual. What is even more harmful is the waste of money in the Federal-aid program. The State could get the same things done with less expense. When the Federal Government handles your tax money before they hand it back in aid they deduct the cost of handling. Handling charges for bureaucratic control come high. The red tape takes more than time; it takes money.

We must call a halt. We must stop this idea that anything we can get from the Federal Government is free. We must get away from these demands for Government aid, assistance, and security. We must get away from Government in business. We must put Government back in the business of government, and allow the people to carry on under the system of free enterprise that made America great.

It is not going to be easy getting back where we were in the twenties when Government was just "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," but if we want to continue the American way of life we must take the road back. We must break the give-me habit. We must put our shoulder to the wheel in place of holding our hand out with our eyes on Washington.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution from the Union Leader, Buffalo, N. Y.:

COUNCIL RESOLUTION ON COURIER EXPRESS-IAL

Whereas the Greater Buffalo Industrial Union Council in following the principles and policies laid down by our national CIO constitution, support, completely the program of Brotherhood Week, which is a week set aside for all citizens of the United States to practice the holy and laudable phrase, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." We call upon our members throughout the Niagara Frontier to advocate and carry out this principle during this important week, and we also call upon all the citizens of our community to censor those who either by tongue or pen, engage in or advocate hate because of a person's race, creed, color, nationality, or station in life; and

Whereas the Buffalo Courier-Express in its leading editorial in this morning's paper, under the heading of "It's his own fault," launches a vicious and biased attack against the working people of this community and Nation and the coal miners in particular, by proposing their own program called, "Hang John Lewis Week," when their editorials should be carrying and advocating the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God; and

Whereas this newspaper, operating under the sanctity of freedom of the press, allows itself through either ignorance or otherwise, on the part of its owner and editors, or through editorials, to sink into a quagmire which brands it a provocateur of violence and a purveyor and peddler of hate by its advocacy of a slogan which calls jestingly for the hanging of an individual: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the CIO who have been attacked in this editorial, carrying out the principles of Brotherhood Week, simply state "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," and we hereby call upon all of our members and the citizens of this community to set aside each day for the balance of this week, a time in the morning and in the evening, to pray to our Father in Heaven, asking him forgiveness for the sins which these owners and editors of this paper have committed, and we pray our Lord also, that He may lift up the minds, the hearts, and the hands of the owners and operators of this paper, out of the quagmire of hate and intolerance in which they find themselves, and we, the members of the CIO, ask the Courier-Express to impose upon itself, a penance for this sinful act which has been committed in this editorial, and that they print for the remainder of the week as their leading editorials, the Beatitudes from the Sermon on the Mount, and further, that they apprise the reading public of this community with the fact that the mine operators and managers of industry are not free from sin; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this be sent to the Courier-Express, enclosing a copy of the Beatitudes, in the hope that this newspaper will never again desecrate the sanctity and holiness of such a laudable program as the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God, by attacks upon the workers of the nation.

We Jaywalk as the Juggernaut of Doom Bears Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar:

WE JAYWALK AS THE JUGGERNAUT OF DOOM BEARS DOWN

(By Edward J. Meeman)

A man walks leisurely across the street in the middle of the block. He looks neither to the right nor the left.

He walks as men walked before the mighty locomotives we call automobiles were invented.

He does not notice, seems not to care, that one of these engines of destruction is bearing down upon him.

The automobile swerves—and the man escapes being crushed.

That is modern man.

He goes his way as if the destruction of atomic war were not bearing down upon him.

MAYBE IT WILL PASS—MAYBE

Yes, this destruction may be deflected. Stalin may pass, and his empire may be broken up by strife among those who would succeed him. Stalin himself may stop short of unloosing mutual destruction of east and west.

Maybe, only maybe.

We dare not count on getting a lucky break.

We need to do things we would never have dared to do if this awful danger did not confront us.

We have done things somewhat daring. We have made considerable military preparations with the idea of deterring the Red dictator from attacking. We have made a mutual defense pact among the Atlantic nations.

So far so good.

But not far enough. Not good enough.

WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

We need to strengthen the United Nations to unite the nonaggressive nations against the aggressor. Within the United Nations we need to federate the free democracies in a permanent great union, in order to get the fullest benefit of their potential power.

Some say it is impossible, that there are too many diverse interests, diverse views among the free nations.

Impossible? Look what a handful of men have done. They have welded together almost half the world, many nations of diverse languages and ancient hates, into an empire so unified that we know it is a terrible menace to us. They have done it by compulsion and propaganda.

Shall we say that the citizens of the free world cannot do as much, cannot do better, by voluntary action and by reason?

WHAT REASON TELLS US

Reason tells us that we face destruction unless chance intervenes. Will the same reason let us dare trust to chance?

To survive, we must compose the differences in the free world. What we must do, we can.

We cannot afford the easy ways of earlier, carefree days.

We cannot afford the luxury of bitter recrimination and internecine strife between labor and management, between Democrat and Republican, between white and colored, between Socialist and free enterpriser.

DARE NOT STOP TO TAUNT

We free enterprisers dare not taunt our Socialist friends, who now comprise much of our free world, with the reckless statement that "socialism is the same as communism." It isn't true. If it is true, as we liberals believe, that there is danger that socialism may eventually lead to the police state and communism, it is a danger that is remote. It will not threaten us beyond repair before the imminent danger of the physical destruction of the free world either passes by rare good luck or is averted by our intelligent and purposeful action. After the great immediate danger is over, freemen can settle—with vigorous contention if they please—the question whether freedom can stand socialism, and, if so, how much.

You can move away from socialism in a democracy, as the recent elections in New Zealand and Australia have shown.

A people once gripped by Communist tyranny can't move away from it. A civilization destroyed by atomic war cannot be revived.

IF AND WHEN IT FALLS

A man who sees a hydrogen bomb descending from the skies above his city will not, in that last moment, think that he could not have done more.

I may be that man. You may be that man.

We can summon the pure reason that lies under the layers of prejudice, self-interest, and sloth that cover our minds. We can summon the will to do what reason says must be done to save ourselves.

We do not have to jaywalk to our doom.

Alaska Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the argument was made during the course of the Alaska statehood debate last week by some of those opposed to the measure that Alaska's population is too small to entitle it to statehood. No better reply to that argument could have been made than was given by the New York Times editorially yesterday:

STATEHOOD AND POPULATION

In attacking the bill providing for Alaska's statehood, which the House of Representatives wisely passed, some Representatives of more populous States objected to the fact that Alaska, with a population of about 100,000, would have the same Senatorial representation as New York or California, with populations exceeding 10,000,000. This argument is unsound and the House was right in disregarding it.

In our Federal form of government the representation in our bicameral Congress was designed precisely to meet the question of disparity of population in the federating units. In the lower House representation is on a population basis. In the upper House it is on a unit basis. Several States have been admitted to the Union when they had populations smaller than that of Alaska and when the disparity between their populations and other States was as great or greater.

Raising Second-Class Mail Will Reduce Volume and Revenue and Will Increase the Deficit of the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the postal increase bill, H. R. 2945, I tried to point out to the membership that the proposed increases on second-class mail would likely result in decreased revenues and increased deficits instead of increased revenues and decreased deficits as claimed by the proponents of the bill and the administration.

Just yesterday, an editorial was called to my attention which bears out my contentions and supports my views. The editorial is entitled "Revenue That Isn't There." It was published in the Minneapolis Star for February 20.

I have asked permission to include this editorial in my remarks for the benefit of the Members of the House.

The editorial follows:

REVENUE THAT ISN'T THERE

Fellow called us on the phone Saturday afternoon. "I've been thinking about that House of Representatives bill to raise postal rates," he said. So have we, we said, referring him to an editorial, Costly postal service, February 11.

"I read that," he said, "but you didn't point out all the inconsistencies in the legislation." For instance, we said.

"Well, take second-class mail—magazines, newspapers, and such." You could tell by the way he talked he had it all figured out. "The Congressmen sponsoring the House bill want to raise the rate on second-class mail so the post office will take in $15,000,000 more for handling it. Those Congressmen claim that's going to mean $15,000,000 more revenue for the Federal Government.

"They're dead wrong. It's going to work this way:

"Say a magazine or a newspaper company is supposed to pay $60,000 more for mailing its publication under the proposed new rates. The company's just going to add that $60,000 to its operating expenses and deduct that much more from the profits it has to pay taxes on. So the Government's going to get less in corporation taxes from that company and every other outfit in the publishing business that is hit by the new mail rate.

"Now there's no telling exactly how much this will amount to in the publishing business, but it's plain to see the Government's going to net a good deal less than the $15,000,000 some Congressmen think they're going to get by raising the mail rates.

"On the other hand," our caller went on, "if the Post Office Department saves $140,000,000 by cutting expenses—as the Hoover Commission showed it could do—that's a clear gain. It's like money from home."

And you know, he's dead right in everything he said.

The Hoover Proposals—Pro and Con

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Disabled American Veterans' National Commander David M. Brown, as printed in the Vet-Times, February 25, 1950:

THE HOOVER PROPOSALS—PRO AND CON

National directors of the Disabled American Veterans have recently completed an intensive study of Hoover Commission proposals for Government reorganization which would affect veterans. Results of this study conclusively prove that if such proposals were enacted into law the over-all administrative cost of the veterans' program would be greater while, at the same time, the standard of service would be lowered.

We of the DAV certainly realize that a greater number of shortcomings exist in the present program under the Veterans' Administration. However, administrative economies can be made effectively within the framework of the VA itself. When a house leaks the sensible thing to do is repair the roof, not to tear the house down.

Our directors divided the study into five parts, covering each veteran service which would be affected by the Hoover Commission proposals. These include medical activities, hospital construction, veteran preference in civil service, Government insurance, and GI loans.

The main points which are clarified by the study are listed below under the various veteran services to be affected.

REGARDING MEDICAL ACTIVITIES

1. The proposed consolidation of Government hospitals would impede the efficient handling of veterans' claims for compensation, pension, insurance, and other benefits where a physical examination is necessary. Major benefit programs are so dependent and integrated with the medical, hospital, and domiciliary care programs as to preclude their separation from the Veterans' Administration without disastrous effects on the efficient administration of veterans' benefits.

2. Hoover Commission proposals state that the present VA hospital building program serves no purpose except to make beds available for non-service-connected cases. Thousands in this category are actually service-connected but have failed to file a claim or their claim has not yet been adjudicated. Many have service-connected disabilities but are suffering from conditions where service connection is denied. Failure to treat these cases often results in the veteran becoming totally disabled and eligible for a non-service-connected pension which is far more costly than prompt treatment.

3. Approximately 55 percent of VA hospitalized patients are suffering from mental disorders and 13 percent have tuberculosis. They are indigent or will become so in the future and must be cared for by the taxpayer, whether service-connected or not.

4. Hoover Commission proposals are based on two major assumptions: (1) an armed forces draft of doctors would be necessary to replace young physicians leaving service and (2) an alarming lack of medical and surgical specialists in the armed forces. The draft of doctors has not materialized as predicted. Rather than suffering from a lack of specialists, the armed forces are confronted with the necessity of adjusting their training program because of a developing excess of specialists in most fields.

5. Hoover Commission proposals state that the Commission's recommended medical program will reduce the drain of doctors away from private practices. The present VA hospital program has brought about the greatest economy in medical manpower of any Government branch furnishing hospitalization, according to Dr. Paul R. Hawley, former chief medical director of the Veterans' Administration and member of the Hoover Commission Task Force.

6. Past bitter experiences, when veteran hospitalization was under the Public Health Service and claim records were handled by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, clearly prove that the same inefficiency would result if the VA handled the files and the proposed medical administration handled examinations and hospitalization.

7. It is an elementary principle of the theory of administration that every change involves additional costs, because the prevailing pattern must be disrupted.

8. Last, but far from least, the proposed merger represents a vigorous stride in the direction of socialized medicine. Full utilization of all Government hospital facilities can easily be accomplished by closer cooperation and a system of liaison between agencies concerned, rather than by the drastic change recommended by the Hoover Commission.

REGARDING HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

1. Hoover Commission proposals recommend the transfer of hospital construction activities from the VA to the Department of the Interior. By such transfer of authority there would not be the close working relationship required between those who construct and those who design to meet the necessary medical requirements.

2. Over a period of 20 years the VA has developed highly qualified architect engineers who have, by long experience and intimate knowledge of the program, become experts in the design and supervision of new hospitals to meet the needs peculiar to the care of veteran patients. Actual construction contracts have always been awarded on the basis of competitive bidding by private concerns, with the lowest bidder receiving the contract.

3. Division of the two functions of medical care and construction of hospitals between two agencies would breed delays and render impossible the placing of responsibility.

4. The Commission's report indicates that the VA would still be required to maintain an engineering and architectural staff, while the Interior Department maintained a full staff to perform similar functions. Needless to say, this would not lead to economy nor efficiency.

5. Testifying before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, Army, who assists in VA hospital construction, said, "It would be neither economical nor efficient to equip a new agency to perform the service the Corps of Engineers is now performing."

REGARDING VETERAN PREFERENCE IN CIVIL SERVICE

1. The Hoover Commission proposals recommend that the Civil Service Commission decentralize its examining and recruiting process. This would mean that every one of the more than 140 Government agencies conduct its own recruiting and examining programs. Instead of one central examining board doing the job, with a single staff, each

department and agency would be required to maintain a full-time staff to conduct examinations. This method would require some 2,700 additional boards and an estimated increase in cost of operation of $40,000,000 annually.

2. The Civil Service Commission would be completely destroyed as a recruiting agency. By decentralizing hiring and doing away with numerical rating of examinations, the way would be wide open for favoritism, political pressure and return to the spoils system.

3. The section of the Commission's report dealing with reduction-in-force is so filled with generalities that expert authorities in the Civil Service Commission themselves have been unable to figure out just how the plan would work. The rating process for reduction-in-force, proposed to be handled by a Committee of Examiners, would be entirely inadequate as numerical ratings would also be absent in this field. Such a system would breed jealousy, distrust, and ill-will among employees and supervisors alike.

4. Such recommendations, if put into effect, would require the virtual repeal of the Veterans Preference Act, thus rendering as impotent all protection in Federal employment now rightfully enjoyed by veterans and their dependents. Veterans would be given mere lip service since there would be no yardstick for rating examinations or setting up categories.

REGARDING GOVERNMENT INSURANCE

1. Hoover proposals which recommend transfer of insurance administration to a new Government Insurance Corporation fail to mention the tremendous cost of supplying the new corporation with a staff for related services such as legal, personnel, supply, finance, and indexing. In the present set-up, these services are furnished by units serving all of the benefit programs of the VA.

2. Adoption of this recommendation would mean the creating of a gigantic autonomous agency of the Federal Government. It would mean increased overhead and a gradual absorption of further fields. In fact, it may well be called progress in the direction of a Nation-wide socialized insurance program.

3. In all probability premium rates would be increased as insurance trust funds become burdened with costs due to deaths resulting from the extra hazards of war service. Under present legislation, Congress annually appropriates funds to cover such deaths. There is no guaranty that this will continue in the proposed program.

REGARDING GI HOME LOANS

1. Adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendation to relocate veterans' home loan guaranties in the Housing and Home Finance Agency would further divide responsibility for such administration as the VA would continue to certify the eligibility of a veteran but would not actually grant the guaranty. Such a division of an integrated operation is against all principles of sound business practices. The Hoover Commission was strangely silent regarding business loans.

2. Although the Hoover Commission states that the Veterans' Administration is inexperienced in the lending field, recent statistics reveal that veterans of World War II have purchased more than 1,604,000 homes with financing guaranties provided by the VA of $4,566,232,866. Claims paid by the VA under the guarantee for defaulted loans amounted to less than three-tenths of 1 percent of the total guaranteed. This splendid record certainly does not indicate a lack of experience in the lending field.

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the same people who objected to woman suffrage have reappeared, even with that same old argument about the protections that women would lose when they got the vote. And above all, the lack of respect that they would receive at the hands of the chivalrous males, who, when this argument came up then, as it comes up today, seem to be a strange mixture of Sir Galahad and Sir Walter Raleigh.

Well, I get on perfectly well with the men of my family and acquaintance and I do not expect or want them to put me on a pedestal and tell me, as Galahad did, that "my strength is like the strength of 10, because my heart is pure." I have always thought that a rather priggish remark and it also gives me a great feeling of inferiority that such a supremely noble creature should look upon me with veneration because circumstances over which I have no control make it possible for me to be a mother while he is by a like set of uncontrollable fates precluded from being one.

I am also not at all anxious for any gentleman of my acquaintance to put his best coat down on the muddy ground because I have forgotten to wear my rubbers. I would also like to point out that the great Sir Walter only did this once, and there is no record that he ever did it for any woman but his Queen.

This is the great trouble with this much-vaunted protective legislation; it applies to a few women, not to the mass of women.

When we are giving women full legal rights under the Constitution we are not taking anything away from them; we are simply making them first-class citizens.

One very distinguished Senator made the startling statement that men and women are different.

There is nothing shattering in this discovery; a lot of us knew it already and are quite well pleased that it is so.

Old men are different from young men, and we have legislation that protects them, if you will, but they still have equal rights under our Constitution. There is a difference between black men and white men, but they are still equal before the law under our Constitution. There is a difference between veterans and nonveterans, and veterans get plenty of legislation that is completely protective and highly preferential, but they still are equal with their fellowmen under the Constitution.

Under the United Nations, and in many countries where universal suffrage prevails, the words occur that there shall be complete equality under the law for all persons regardless of race, creed, color, or sex. This is notably true in Soviet Russia. There is no question that if the Constitution were being written today this wording—race, creed, color, or sex—would be included.

Our Constitution was written long before woman's suffrage. It also was written when slavery still flourished and was accepted as a part of our civilization.

It is very interesting to note that the State of Georgia, before the Civil War, had some very fine protective laws to ensure the proper care and treatment of slaves and I have heard of many persons at the time of the emancipation who told heart-rending, and no doubt perfectly true, stories about old and devoted slaves who did not want their freedom and begged to be kept in the families they loved and be protected as they were in the past.

But the majority of the slaves did not feel that way and today those who wanted protection are well-nigh forgotten in the march of progress. This same thing will happen after the equal-rights amendment has been written into the Constitution. We will smile at the arguments for protection that the favored few who are protected, advance. We will laugh a little at the talk about the great biological difference and the weakness of women. Look at your insurance charts if you are worried about "the lass with the delicate air." Count up the widows of your acquaintance and you will find that the female of the species is far deadlier than the male, and also huskier.

Granted, she has not the muscular strength, but we are not living in an age of muscle. No, even Galahad with his broadsword and his strength like unto the strength of 10 could not do much against a woman holding an atom bomb.

All this amendment does is to state this very simple proposition:

SECTION 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

SEC. 3. This amendment shall take effect 1 year after the date of ratification.

The equal rights amendment has been a plank in the Republican platform since 1940 and in the Democratic since 1944. In 1948 it was in the platforms of the Republican, Democratic, and Progressive Parties.

It is, therefore, a matter that is entirely outside and above party politics and it seems rather cynical not to say plain dishonest, that after all these professions of policy and planks in the platforms, nothing has been done until very recently about carrying out these solemn promises.

I would like to quote from the speech of a woman attorney, Helen Elizabeth Brown, before the Lawyers Civic Association of Maryland, because she answers specifically the question that is always brought up by the opponents of the amendment: In what way are women, under the law, inferior to men?

Men, aliens, and corporations are persons entitled to the equal protection of the laws in this country: American women are not.

It is unconstitutional to try a Negro man with a jury from which Negro men have been excluded; it is not unconstitutional to try a woman, black or white, with a jury from which women have been excluded.

It is unconstitutional to place restrictions on men's liberty to contract; it is not unconstitutional to restrict women's liberty of contract.

It is constitutional to bar women from any lawful means of earning a living; such laws as to men are unconstitutional and void.

Women may be subjected to labor restrictions; men may not.

Women may be excluded from business and the professions; men may not.

Women in business and the professions may be discriminated against; men may not.

Women may be deprived of their property without due process of law; men may not.

Now all the nonsense about seats in factories for women and maternity benefits are so much eye wash.

There is no more reason why women should not have seats if they need them than that the GI's should not have special educational advantages that are not open to ordinary civilians. There is no reason why a woman should not have maternity benefits, any more than that a veteran should not have a bonus. She is doing just as much for her country as the soldier, and in both instances they are each doing something the other could not do.

If women have the right to vote they certainly have the right to be considered equal under the Constitution.

The fight for suffrage was more intense and vehement than this one, but this amendment will be written into the Constitution in time. It is the last step on the long road of freedom for women in the United States. We want equality, not protection. We want justice, not privilege.

We are the descendants of the pioneers just as much as our men are and we want to stand beside them in the modern world as equals, ready to make our contribution to the development and prosperity of this good land which is our heritage.

Popular Support Behind Maritime Commissioner McKeough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for 8 years the Second Congressional District which now I have the honor to represent was brilliantly represented in this body by the Honorable Raymond S. McKeough, who as representative and the nominee of his party for United States Senator carried the torch in Illinois for democracy and progressive advance in the critical years when, under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, America was being pulled from the wreck that years of Republican reactionary government had brought about.

Our former colleague, Mr. McKeough, has continued his outstanding public service as a member of the Maritime Commission, and I am inserting in the RECORD the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 1, 1950, as reflective of the high regard in which he is held by the country and the stout support in public opinion which he enjoys in his contentions with other members of the Maritime Commission:

MARITIME SHIFT

As reports continue that the President may abolish the Maritime Commission and reconstitute it in the Department of Commerce, it is important to look at the real source of trouble in the Commission. That trouble is, purely and simply, a reluctance to administer the law as it is written. The commission majority has convinced itself that bigger shipping subsidies are desirable, and it has contrived devious ways to grant them—over the consistent objections of one commissioner, Raymond S. McKeough, and against the biting criticism of the House Executive Expenditures Committee and the Comptroller General.

We sympathize fully with the President's efforts both to hold down subsidies, and to bring them out in the open, and we support the idea of an over-all subsidy study. Once Congress has set a subsidy policy, however, the job of a regulatory body is to administer it fairly. Here it becomes apparent that the fault is not so much with the Maritime Commission structure as with the attitude of the members carrying out policy.

Unless the President is prepared to recommend the consolidation of all transportation-promotion functions in a single agency, it is hard to justify the singling out of a single commission for reorganization. That would merely serve to increase the hodgepodge in which regulatory bodies operate. Whatever may be said for a Federal department of transportation, much could be accomplished under existing law by the promulgation of a unified set of objectives for transportation agencies in a national transportation policy. Specifically, with respect to the Maritime Commission, improvement could be made by the simple means of replacing present commissioners, when their terms expire, with men whose first dedication is to the public interest.

Should There Be an Extension of Federal Standards Over State Employment Compensation Insurance Laws?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio interview in the American Forum of the Air over the National Broadcasting Co. system:

Chairman GRANIK. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

In his state of the Union message and in his Economic Report President Truman urged legislation improving the operation of our unemployment-compensation system and increasing its coverage and benefits. The President indicated that he sought an extension of Federal standards over State unemployment insurance laws. This has brought protests from some quarters that the President apparently feels that the States are not equal to the task of dealing with their own problem and that the Federal Government must step in.

Now, Mr. Secretary, you stated recently that you have in mind, not federalization, but merely the fixing of levels beneath which no State would be allowed to fall. What are those levels, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary TOBIN. We feel that there should be an approach toward the objective that was common at the time the act was passed by Congress in 1935—to give an unemployed worker approximately 50 percent of his wage. At the start when the bill first went into effect in the respective States it averaged about 44 percent, but there has been a gradual decline with the increase in the cost of living until today the average worker receives between 35 and 37 percent of his basic wage. There is also the feeling that unemployment compensation should be paid over a period of 26 weeks, because of the fact that some States have as low as 12 weeks, because of the fact that better than 1,500,000 workers during the year 1949 exhausted their benefit payments in respective States and then had no source of income at the termination.

Then another one of the objectives is to increase to cover all workers. At the present time the Federal law calls for compulsory insurance for all employers with eight employees or more. Many of the States have gone down to one, and ranging up to eight, but we believe that every worker in the country should be covered.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator BRICKER, what do you think about it?

Senator BRICKER. In my opinion, Mr. Granik and Secretary Tobin, the States have done an excellent job in this program which was an integral part of the social security law of 1935. This was one program that was left to the States, along with the old-age assistance program which was partly financed by the Federal Government, the Federal Government taking over the survivors and old-age benefits program with an assessment equally upon labor and management. The total cost of this program is paid by management in the various States. There are various rates of pay. There are various rates of allowances to unemployed workers. In my judgment the States have done an excellent job up to the present time. They have assumed the responsibility fully, have met local conditions which are diverse from one section of the country to another according to the industrial situation, according to the character of labor, and as to the degree of centralization of working forces.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Secretary?

Secretary TOBIN. If left to the States, we would have no unemployment compensation insurance law on the books today. In 1935, in order to get unemployment compensation on the books, it was necessary for the Federal Government to pass a law requiring a 1-percent payroll tax on every employer in the country on all wages up to $3,000. In the event that a State failed to pass an unemployment compensation law within a period of 2 years, that money was to flow into the Federal Treasury without benefit to either the employer or the workers in the respective States. Under this compulsion, the 48 States of the Union did pass unemployment compensation laws. So there was your very first standard. On the basis of Senator BRICKER's argument, were

he a Member of the Senate at the time, on the basis of States' rights, to be consistent he would have had to vote against the unemployment compensation law of 1935. Fortunately, all of the States did pass laws, and we now have a great protection for the unemployed worker, and I think everyone will agree that we do not want to go back to the days of WPA, back to the days when we had millions of unemployed people in the country, dependent upon the charity and the bounty of the Federal Government, the States, and local governments. I think an insurance system is far better, and if it is worth while, it should be a good one, it should be adequate to protect the average worker and adequate to protect and to buttress the economy by placing purchasing power in the hands of the American workers during unemployment.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator BRICKER.

Senator BRICKER. Secretary Tobin assumes an unfounded presumption that there would not be any unemployment compensation in the country. Some of the States had unemployment compensation, just as they had old-age assistance and pensions prior to the time of the enactment of the Social-Security law in 1935. I think Wisconsin was the first State——

Secretary TOBIN. Wisconsin was the only State, and they passed it just prior to the enactment of the Federal law.

Senator BRICKER. Legislation was introduced and being considered at the very time in various States. I want to say that in the very beginning this was a violation of the Federal relationship in the country. Federal relationship assumes that the States still have some responsibilities to their people and to their local communities. It was a compulsory, arbitrary national enactment with which I do not disagree at this time because it has worked successfully up to the present time. Even the President in his state of the Union message said that this was one of the laws which had helped in the unemployment shock of 1939.

Chairman GRANIK. He said it served to support the demand for goods in his economic review.

Senator BRICKER. He has commended it many times, and it is worthy of commendation because the States have done a good job. The State funds are not bankrupt at the present time.

Let me refer to the Labor Information Bulletin of October of this past year. After the experience that the President talked about wherein this program had been successful under State operation, this says:

"In that year there were 22 States in which benefits exceeded collections and interest, in a few States by a wide margin. However, while generalization is difficult because of the tremendous variation between the States in benefit costs, size of present reserves and tax income, very few States need to be concerned about their ability to weather even a substantial economic recession."

Let me say to you that the only two States at the present time that are in any danger at all—that they are not in any substantial danger—are the State wherein our distinguished colleague here today, Secretary Tobin, was Governor, that is, Massachusetts and the State of Rhode Island, which is of course in much worse shape than Massachusetts.

Chairman GRANIK. That is where the Attorney General is from.

Senator BRICKER. The States are in very good shape, and even last year in the unemployment crisis, they were able to increase their reserve funds, which now total about $7,000,000,000.

Secretary TOBIN. Total amount is close to $7,500,000,000 in the reserve fund of the country.

I would like to say in connection with the statement that has been made by Senator BRICKER that if unemployment compensation has made a contribution to the stabilization of the economy—and I am going to quote from Business Week in just a moment—we should have a good system. Senator, we have one State in the Union that in 1936, when it passed its law, established a $15 maximum payment. They have let that maximum payment remain for 14 years. That gives to the average worker, to the worker who is unemployed getting the maximum payment in the State, a purchasing power equal to $8.22 based on 1939 costs. I feel that we should have Federal standards, Nation-wide standards from one end to the other, minimum standards below which no State can go. We first have always required federally that all of the States in the Union have an unemployment-compensation law. Secondly, we have required that employers of eight or more have insurance coverage for their workers, and I think it is reasonable to establish minimums below which no State can go.

Let me just cite from Business Week.

Chairman GRANIK. Let's go to the Senator and then come back to you. Go ahead, Senator.

Senator BRICKER. I might say in comment upon what the Secretary has just said that in 1940 the average weekly benefit payments were $10.56; in 1949, $21.01.

Let us turn to this federalization operation that the Secretary desires in this program, and that is what it amounts to. Maybe it is not a federalization program. It is more in the nature of a nationalization program which would completely ultimately wipe out the State's position in the unemployment-compensation field.

Let us turn, though, to the old-age and survivors insurance program which is administered by the Federal Government. That in 1940 paid an average of $22; in 1948, $25. There is a 12-percent increase, while there was a 100-percent increase in the amounts paid under unemployment compensation. That 12-percent increase took place under the operation of the Federal Government when costs of living was rising practically 70 percent.

Let us turn also to the old-age pension program which has increased about 100 percent. True, the Federal Government does contribute 50 percent of that, but it is still under the complete operation of the States, subject to State law in every respect.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Secretary, did you want to comment on Business Week?

Secretary TOBIN. This is a copy of Business Week dated May 7, 1949. Here is the picture of the conditions in the city of Lawrence, one of the hardest-hit cities in the United States. Business Week has this to say:

"It takes a lot more to make a depression in 1949 than it did in the early 1930's."

It then goes on and says:

"But despite this, business conditions were about the same for the country as a whole."

In other words, there are 23,000 workers, according to the report, unemployed out of 57,000 workers in Lawrence.

"Unemployment compensation has proved to be an effective cushion for business as well as workers against the impact of unemployment."

Since unemployment compensation has made this contribution, not alone to the workers of America, but to the business of America, I think that we should have standards in this country—and incidentally I do not believe in federalization. I believe in a perpetuation of the Federal-State program. The one guaranty we are going to have for the preservation of the State program is to have it effective and to meet the needs of America's economy at the present time. I do not think it proper or fair to have workers in the United States receiving as low as 20 percent of their weekly wage, and that is true in altogether too many States of the Union. With the establishment of the Federal standards and an approach toward the objective of 1935 of a 50-percent payment of the loss of wage, we can be sure that there is going to be an adequate income for the average unemployed worker, and there will be a buttress to the economy that will carry us through and prevent future depressions in the United States of America.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator BRICKER?

Senator BRICKER. Secretary Tobin merely emphasizes the fight, which is 15 years old, in regard to unemployment compensation. The philosophy of the law that is to be presented is nothing new. There has been a constant battle between those who believe in the rights of the States in this field and those who want to completely nationalize the program. The proposition that is made so far is a result of a circular that was sent to the State unemployment bureaus on the 29th day of November by Mr. Goodwin, who is the head of the Unemployment Security Section in the Department of Labor. The State employment directors were asked by the 5th day of December to submit a complete report as to whether or not they approved or disapproved the suggestions that were made. I would like to know the results of that poll, and I hope that the Secretary of Labor can give them to us before this program is concluded. I do know what they did in my State. They are absolutely opposed. The director—I am advised—and I am sure correctly advised—that the Governor supports him in his position—is opposed to the Federalization, so-called, or nationalization program, because it absolutely makes a minimum of the present maximums of payments, of duration of payments, and of the qualifying requirements, and almost completely relieves all restrictions on employment. Furthermore, it emphasizes the fact that this is not a relief measure. It was originally passed for the purpose of absorbing the shock of unemployment. If it is to be a relief measure, the handing out of a dole dependent upon needs, there are other departments of both the Federal Government and the State governments that are thoroughly adequate and are at the present time charged with the responsibility of taking care of those programs.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Secretary, do you care to comment on that?

Secretary TOBIN. Yes, I would like to comment on it. Back in the thirties under the days of WPA, PWA, and the like, the State of Ohio received $1,100,000,000 in direct grants from the Federal Government of the United States. We don't want to see those days in America again, so I say that it is sound to have a sound insurance system that will take care of the unemployed in this Nation for a period of 26 weeks, and I further contend that we would not have had unemployment compensation in the United States if it had not been for the Federal law that practically compelled the States to enact such laws.

There was only one State in the Union in 1935 that had unemployment compensation, and that was the State of Wisconsin. It was because of the Federal standards requiring the States to establish these laws that we have them on the books today and that Business Week is able to write the wonderful story about the city of Lawrence. In the city of Lawrence workers are paid for a period of 23 weeks. They are paid a maximum of $25 a week. If we did not have unemployment compensation, certainly the merchants of Lawrence would not be as prosperous as they are today, and the retail sales in the city would not have been staying practically abreast of the rest of the United States of America.

So if unemployment compensation is a sound system for America, then let us have standards that will make it genuinely sound and let us work toward meeting the objectives that were set in 1935 of giving an unemployed worker approximately 50 percent of his earning wage.

Chairman GRANIK. How about that level, Senator?

Senator BRICKER. I can't help but call attention to the fact of the conditions existing under State administration in the location that was cited by the Secretary and that the same conditions didn't exist in all the States. While the funds in one State were being depleted, the funds in other States were being built up at a terrific rate. We should not let the conditions of one State control a national program that has been successful up to the present time and which has, in the very words of the Secretary himself, worked so successfully.

I mentioned a moment ago that this was to be submitted to the Security Council by Mr. Goodwin, a report made on it, and subsequent legislation to be introduced as a result of that. That is the only group that I know of, the group in the Department of Labor, that are advocating anything like this. I hold in my hand the Federal-State Relations Report of the Council of State Governments, which definitely says, on page 237, that this should be left as it is, as a responsibility of the States. Thorough study was given to that. I remember the consideration that was given to it at the time. We had a committee of the Congress, the Council of State Governments, and the governors of the States. Fifteen governors, I think 10 Congressmen, and 6 Senators, met in Chicago and spent 2 days on this subject 2 years ago. That report is in Senate Document 1054, and it definitely says that:

"The Federal Government should relinquish to the States the Federal tax on employers levied to cover the administrative expenses of the State employment security programs. The States will assume the responsibility for the administration of the unemployment compensation and employment service programs."

Chairman GRANIK. What is your comment?

Senator BRICKER. I have a couple more here, after the Secretary comments on those.

Secretary TOBIN. Let him go ahead. I will comment on all of them when he finishes.

Chairman GRANIK. We have just a minute, before questions, if you want to comment here.

Secretary TOBIN. There is naturally opposition on the part of certain people to Federal standards. The selfsame arguments were offered in 1935 against the establishment of unemployment compensation as a result of a Federal law that compelled the 48 States to enact those laws. The same arguments are being advanced by Senator BRICKER now and would be logical if it is an infringement on States rights to establish minimum standards. Remember, the minimum standards are to approach 50 percent of an earner's wage up to $30 a week. In other words, if a worker earns over $60 he will not get better than 50 percent of his $60, or $30. So it is my contention that if it was sound in 1935 to write the basic law, it is sound after 14 years of experience and after giving the States an opportunity for 14 years to approach those standards, to have the Federal Government establish minimum standards for the protection of the economy and for the protection of individual workers.

Chairman GRANIK. Gentlemen, let's take some questions from our studio audience. I see Miss Penuel has a lady with a question.

Question. I should like to know why the United States Employment Service is using public funds for advertising in the newspapers and on the radio for applicants for jobs in direct competition with private employment agencies.

Secretary TOBIN. In direct competition with private employment agencies?

Question. Yes.

Secretary TOBIN. For the purpose of rendering a service to the American people. I am certain one American who feels that any government owes it to the people to help them procure jobs without the payment of a fee; and when we save individual workers from paying a week's pay or 2 weeks' pay for the purpose of procuring a job, I think we are rendering the kind of service that the Government of the United States should render to their citizens.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to comment on that, Senator?

Senator BRICKER. I would like to comment on that because of the attitude of the Federal Government in the administration of this law all along. I would just like to quote from one of the administrators of the unemployment-compensation fund in the States as to the attitude of the Federal Government. I don't want to get into personal recollections of the matter, because Mr. Goodwin and I had this out in Ohio years ago as far as civil service is concerned, long before you were in it, Mr. Tobin. Herschel Atkinson, who was administrator of this program in Ohio, has this to say about the relation of this program to the Federal Government and to the State governments, which is still part of our system, talking about this very thing of Federal administration and action.

"One of the most amazing statements to me when I was administrator was when a representative of Federal Security came out to Ohio and said, and I quote: 'This money is for velocity spending. This is to get spending power out in the hands of the people. We will never audit you on the payments made. If a man walks in and signs a slip, pay it to him. What do you care? We will never audit you. Get the money out. This is a spending velocity law.' Believe you me, that pressure was put on me repeatedly."

A recent article called, "Rainy Day Money, or Give It Away Show," referred to this article, the statement of Mr. Atkinson, and had this further to say:

"I have heard the same statement from administrators still in harness. They say the States which accede to such demands get more money to administer their programs, while those who do not are continually on or near a deficit spending basis."

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to answer that?

Senator BRICKER. Let me accentuate that with one thing.

Secretary TOBIN. The Senator quoted Mr. Goodwin, who now heads the Unemployment Service. He was Regional Director of Federal Security at the time when Senator BRICKER was Governor. I asked Mr. Goodwin who is present in the audience, if he ever heard it. He was the representative in the State of Ohio. He never said it to Mr. Atkinson, and he knows no man who ever did say it.

Further than that, I have a letter from Mr. Teets, who is the president of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies of the United States, denying that statement by Atkinson, and he says he has checked with his executive board and he has checked with the other State directors, and not one of them knows of a single instance in which a Federal official ever talked that way to them.

I think it is a false indictment that is without foundation. Mr. Goodwin is right here in the audience. He was the regional director at the time, and he will contend that it never happened.

Senator BRICKER. Let me say further that the Federal administration—I have had some experience in this field, Mr. Tobin—fined the State of Ohio $1,250,000 at one time because of a quarrel between Harry Hopkins and Mr. Altmeyer and my predecessor, Governor Davey, whom I do not intend to defend here today, as I never have. As a result of that, showing the power of the Federal Government, their callous disregard of the right of workers, they withdrew from Ohio, $1,250,000 of administrative expense money, and we had to dig down in the State general revenue after I become Governor to pay it back.

That is the attitude of the Federal Government, and that is the reason that the Governors Conference, when you were a member of the Governors Conference, Secretary Tobin, in 1944 passed a resolution against federalizing and for leaving this as it is, in the hands of the States. That was reiterated at the Governors Conference in 1947 by a unanimous vote, because they don't pass any other kind of resolutions.

Secretary TOBIN. This program is not a federalization program. It leaves it still as a Federal-State program in the hands of the States, with additional standards comparable to the standards that were passed in 1935. It is not a federalized program at all.

Chairman GRANIK. May I take another question? Go ahead, sir.

Secretary TOBIN. I do want to say this in that connection. In the year 1939 the State of Ohio was perfectly willing, during the period of time that you were Governor, to accept WPA money for the feeding of the people of the State of Ohio, when a special session would not be called for the purpose of feeding them and the Government of the United States had to do it.

Senator BRICKER. We also appropriated money by the State legislature. That fight was solely on a local political basis as to whether the State would furnish all of it or the cities a part of it.

Chairman GRANIK. Let me squeeze in a question here.

Question. I would like to ask Senator BRICKER if he recalls the 1948 position of the Republican Party on the matter of unemployment compensation.

Senator BRICKER. I haven't checked the vote at all. I certainly was in favor of it at the time. We supported it in Ohio during my administration and made it work effectively.

Question. I was wondering if there were any new ideas the party would like to put on the statute books at the present time.

Senator BRICKER. New ideas have virtue only if they are constructive. There is no merit in itself in having something new. In fact, the Constitution of the United States has stood for over 150 years, and I think the people of Ohio, because it is old, have a high appraisal of their constitutional structure that provides for a Federal system of government. This isn't a federalization program at all; it is a nationalization program which takes the maximums at the present time and makes them compulsory as minimums upon every state in the Union. That is taking over; that is not cooperation. The Federal system recognizes the rights of the States, and this program doesn't in any way give the States any position, practically, except as administrative units of the Federal Government.

Chairman GRANIK. Gentlemen, we must have your summaries now. Mr. Secretary, will you summarize briefly, please?

Secretary TOBIN. Yes.

National City Bank of New York praises unemployment compensation as a contributing factor to the stabilization of our economy and the avoidance of a depression. Business Week does the same in this article in reference to the city of Lawrence. Since it is accepted as a sound principle and a help to our private-enterprise economy, then I say we should make it equally effective with minimum standards—remember, minimum standards—in the 48 States of the Union and eliminate the possibility of individual States leaving their law unchanged, taking no recognition of the increased cost of living that has occurred since this law was originally written. I say that if it was sound for the Government of the United States in 1935 to compel the States to write the law, it is sound in the year 1950 to have minimum

standards that will make it equally effective in all sections of the United States.

Chairman GRAVEL. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Senator BUCKLEY, your summary, please.

Senator BUCKLEY. Mr. Gramk, I have presented here evidence in support of the Labor Information Bulletin; of two governor conferences, of one of which the distinguished Secretary of Labor was a member; of the Social Security Advisory Council to the Senate Finance Committee, which was chairmaned by the late Edward R. Stettinius, who was then chancelor of the University of Virginia; and of Sumner Slichter, who is professor of economics at Harvard University.

I have presented support for the present State-administered program from the legislative council of the council of state governments.

I have found yet no one who supports the forcing onto the States of these minimum standards which are at the present time the maximum standards of the various States of the Union. It has worked well, according to the testimony of the President and of Mr. Tobin himself, and we should not disturb a program which has met increasing costs by increasing the allowances 100 percent when the old-age and survivors insurance program under his Department has increased only about 12 percent at the same time.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the National St. Lawrence Project Conference has again been exposed as a front for selfish interest. In an editorial, Seaway and Selfishness, published in the distinguished independent newspaper, the Milwaukee Journal, March 4, the conference is revealed as a front for corporations who have their own reasons for fighting the much-needed seaway project. With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach the editorial:

SEAWAY AND "SELFISHNESS"

The National St. Lawrence Project Conference has a pretty high-sounding and dignified name for an organization that confers only on ways and means to bury the proposed St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway and power project.

But the conference has more than a high-sounding name—it has a shotgun that is not only double-barreled but shoots in two directions.

In recent days the conference has been burdening the post office and editorial desks with antiseaway propaganda that attempts to establish these two diverse themes:

First, the seaway is pushed by iron and steel firms for the "private benefit of ore exploiters or shippers or iron and steel companies." This is an indication of selfish private interest.

Second, the seaway is being pushed by "economic planners" who are interested in promoting the welfare state and who will, one day, take over the selfish private interests that now seek an "immediate but temporary advantage."

This picture of "selfish" private enterprise and the "welfare state" advocates fighting side by side to despoil the Nation is intriguing—and a perfect example of the kinds of arguments the real selfish interests can use when facts aren't strong enough to support their stand.

The new ore discoveries in Labrador and Quebec and Venezuela are not the main arguments for the seaway—merely additional arguments. The seaway looked like a good bet long before anyone started mouthing the words "welfare state"—and was so considered by such Presidents as Hoover and Coolidge, who could hardly be called "welfare statists."

One thing must be said for the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, however. For a fight against "selfish interests" and "for the people" the organization certainly picked the right officers. As representatives of the Nebraska Stock Growers' Association, the American Mining Congress, and the Republic Coal & Coke Co., of New York, they know a "selfish interest" when they see one.

The Importance of the American School Teacher to Our American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, the time has come in the present session of the Eighty-first Congress for all Members who are deeply concerned about the present and future welfare of America to begin to consider the teaching profession.

For many years the American teachers, inspired by a great desire to improve the youth of this great land of ours, have continued in their profession at low and inadequate salaries. No other group in this broad land of ours is as underpaid as the teaching profession. This has approached almost a national calamity. If our best teachers are forced by poverty to abandon their profession the onward and upward march of America will be reversed and we will turn our faces back toward the Dark Ages.

The teachers in every school in America—rural, village, city, and township—can and do inspire their pupils with all the power that they possess. They teach them while they are in their youth, and in a receptive state of mind how to work and play and how to share with others. They can and do inspire them with the great freedoms of America that has enabled this Nation to reach the pinnacle of power and happiness in the history of the world. They put in the minds and hearts of their pupils ambitions to accomplish much in this world. If we properly support our school teachers in this divine undertaking of theirs, we can build a greater America out of the future generations that pass through their hands daily.

All great uplifting movements start in the little school units of the United States. Each school teacher has his share in building the soul, mind and power of America. It is literally true that they hold the future destiny of this great Nation in the hollow of their hands. All other professions stem from the product of the teaching profession.

These patriotic men and women, who have molded the lives of our young people, if we will wake up in America and pay them adequately, will do more to prepare the following generations of American citizenship to take their part in the world and to bless all mankind than any other profession. They have worked for generations on disgracefully low salaries mostly without complaint but they cannot do the impossible. Living standards have greatly increased as well as the cost of living and there is no other group in America that has been so consistently underpaid.

Most of them have remained in this great profession because they love it. Tens of thousands of them are looking to the men selected by the people of America to pass adequate laws so they they can be properly paid. All good citizens should resolve that this shall be done and we should devote enough of our national wealth to support them adequately in their great endeavor. It is within the power of the teaching profession of America to bring up our young men and women possessed with the qualifications to solve our national problems and the problems of our States, counties, and cities.

In the dawn of this great scientific age, if we improve equally over the United States the educational opportunities of every American child, America will continue to grow and be a blessing to all mankind. These teachers can develop not only industrial skills of their pupils but they can sow the seeds in the minds, hearts and souls of young America the finer qualities of life so that in addition to being able to create great wealth, our people in the future can grasp the great beauties and happiness that is the divine purpose of mankind.

Today and for years past millions of American children, with sturdy bodies and bright and capable minds, have been allowed to remain in ignorance and have never been able to exercise and enjoy their latent powers and abilities that their creator endowed them with.

One is reminded of Gray's Elegy in a Country Churchyard, when this great poet sat silently gazing upon the little headstones and footstones at the graves of the country people and when he said:

Full many a gem of purest ray serene
The dark unfathom'd caves of ocean bear;
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air.

We no longer want the youth of America to be wasted. We should form a national standpoint as well as a State and local standpoint, burst asunder the bonds of ignorance. We should adequately and generously support our teachers and pay them well, and we should build and equip our schools knowing that they are the ground sills of the American way of life.

When Jesus Christ was on this earth He had three great professions. He was a minister, He was a physician, and He was a teacher. When He choose his 12 apostles, He trained them and sent them forth to teach the peoples of the world. Throughout 20 centuries His teachings and the teachings of His chosen teachers have rung down the centuries to uplift and bless all mankind.

The teachers of America are in need of our support and while we serve the great people of our land, let us give to them the full measure of what they deserve.

For the practical businessmen of our Nation, who know that we must keep this Nation solvent, let me say this:

Three hundred million dollars for Federal aid to public schools will all be spent here at home. Salaries of teachers have been so low for so many years that this supplemental and increased pay will immediately be placed in the current money circulation almost 100 percent. Each monthly salary check to the teachers will be spent for food, clothing, household furniture, books, and every other kind of daily necessities of life and will pass along from one businessman to another in commerce and turn over many times each year.

Millions of pupils who will acquire better education through this supplemental fund will become larger earners to create more wealth here in the United States. Thousands of these pupils who would otherwise remain ignorant and become charges upon society, not earning and contributing enough to pay their own way in our American way of society will be moved up across the productive profit line where they can pay their own way and beneath which line many of them have lived for so long.

Our national income will be substantially and permanently increased. More taxes will be paid into the Federal Treasury all along the line. It will be a good investment, it will pay immediate economic dividends to the entire United States and to all of its individual citizens. This Federal aid-to-public-school bill will also add substantially to our cultural, spiritual, and educational uplift.

For all these foregoing reasons I urge my colleagues to enact into law a good bill providing for Federal aid to our public schools.

Sermon on Manganese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take the time of the House for a few minutes in order to preach a short sermon on the subject of manganese.

As the president of the American Manganese Producers Association told the Public Lands Committee not long ago, manganese is the "starch" which stiffens steel—no adequate substitute has been found for it and none is immediately in prospect. Without manganese, no matter how much steel we have the capacity to produce, we cannot make munitions.

In the last issue of that eminent trade paper, The Engineering and Mining Journal, Mr. Norwood B. Melcher of the United States Bureau of Mines, states:

The critical shortage of manganese ore evident at the close of 1948 was intensified in the first quarter of 1949 by a virtual embargo on exports of manganese ore to the United States.

Yet I understand, Mr. Speaker, that if and when the O'Mahoney bill, S. 2105, comes to this floor, there may be made on the part of the Government agencies an attempt to amend it to prevent manganese producers from benefiting from its provisions. This is just a rumor which has reached me, but if true, how serious are its implications may be seen from the following quotations from the same article by Mr. Melcher:

Speaking of the plans of the Government to attain a satisfactory balance between total domestic requirements and supplies, most of the programs begun in 1949 will not be effective for several years, but some that were already under way January 1, 1949, showed substantial results by the second half.

Completion of a program begun in 1948 to supply railroad cars to the Union of South Africa resulted in a substantial increase in exports to the United States in 1949. Shipments were expected to exceed 300,000 short tons compared with only 217,000 tons in 1948. Similary shipments from India are expected to nearly double the 1948 total of 216,000 short tons. India was the largest single supplier to the United States in 1949, furnishing 27 percent in the first 10 months. Exports from the Gold Coast also increased in 1949, reaching 330,000 short tons of ore. In addition, imports of ferromanganese made from the Gold Coast ore were received from Norway and Canada equivalent to about 120,000 tons of ore. Thus, in terms of ore equivalent, Gold Coast was the largest source in 1949, furnishing about 450,000 short tons.

Inadequate transportation facilities in Brazil held the 1949 shipments of ore to about the 1948 level of 144,000 tons. Cuba and Mexico each shipped about 4 percent of the 1949 total, and small shipments (3 percent in all) were made from Angola, Belgian Congo, Chile, France, French Morocco, the Philippines, Portuguese Asia (Goa), United Kingdom, and Liberia. Imports of manganese ore during the first 10 months totaled 1,201,240 short tons; of this 61,319 tons was battery grade.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is all well and good, and I am delighted that we are getting all possible manganese from all possible sources. I do not think the total imports come anywhere near our requirements if you take into consideration stock piling as well. But note, after the detailed information on foreign supply, that the domestic situation is dismissed with these words:

Domestic production of manganese ore in 1949 dropped off slightly from that of the previous year, due largely to mechanical problems, and is estimated at 115,000 short tons.

Is it mechanical problems, or price, that really is the difficulty, Mr. Speaker? I hear of no programs to supply railroad cars, or anything else, to manganese producers in Nevada or elsewhere in the United States. I introduced a bill some time ago which would have authorized the payment of up to 50 percent over the foreign price under stock-piling contracts, but that bill reposes in the Armed Services Committee unheard. As a matter of fact, I believe the Bureau of Federal Supply has sufficient authority to pay almost any price for domestic manganese for stock piling. Let them announce that a sufficient price will be paid and I dare say the increase in domestic production would surprise them. If, instead of applying all possible stimulation, there really is a scheme afoot to remove manganese from S. 2105, it is altogether a shameful thing and I shall resist such a move as far as it may be within my power to do so.

The moral of this sermon, Mr. Speaker, is, paraphrasing the old saw about charity beginning at home, that manganese production should begin at home where neither the wind, waves, shortage of shipping, snorkel submarines, or enemy seizure of foreign sources of supply can cut our supply lines. The quicker we realize this elementary truth about manganese and other strategic and critical minerals the better prepared we shall be should the misfortune of another war develop. I should be most unhappy, Mr. Speaker, were I to think that future historians might look back at these United States as we do at the Roman Empire and say, "sic transit gloria mundi." Let us not speculate with our future; let us be prudent now, rather than sorry later.

Henry McLemore's Column

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Henry McLemore, newspaper columnist, in the Washington Star of February 28, 1950:

MCLEMORE CALLS ON NATION TO WAKE UP

(By Henry McLemore)

To read the newspapers and listen to the radio is to wonder why the United States of America is called the United States of America.

At the moment the States seem to be about as united as Ingrid and Dr. Lindstrom. A much better name, for the time being, at least, would be the Disunited States of America.

Just read the headlines and subheads, and listen to the radio announcers who, truth to tell, do little more than read the headlines and the subheads out loud.

"Miners Stiffen as Coal Famine Brings Show-down.

"Dixie Battle Plans Drawn Against FEPC.

"New Block Hit in Talk on Phone Strikes.

"GOP Blocks Plan for Spy Ring Inquiry.

"Probers Told Reds Control Progressives."

SO WHAT TO DO?

What sort of reading is that for a country which is faced with destruction by an enemy which makes no bones about what it would like to do? Russia, I'm talking about. If Russia lets us know how much it hates us in public, just how much more do you figure Russia hates us in private? About ten-thousandfold, I'd say.

So what do the so-called United States do? Fight night and day among each other, group against group, bloc against bloc, majority against minority, party against party, statesman against statesman, politician against politician, neighbor against neighbor,

It seems to me, silly as I am, that now is the time, if there ever was a time, for this country to pull together. If a coal strike affects steel and steel affects the building of the materials of preparedness against war, then there should be no coal strikes. The same goes for all the other strikes and for all the other hold-outs against unity.

LET US WAKE UP

I have said this before but I want to say it again. There seems to be a widespread belief in this country that there is a relatively small group of men willing and anxious to die for their country; a group who, as doughfoots, wants to freeze and shiver and get slugs in their bellies; a group who, as flyers, wants to streak to death of injury in the skies; a group who, as sailors, wants to freeze in the oceans of the earth.

There are no such men. Even the wildest-eyed kid finds war a little too much to stand and prays to get home. But unless this country starts working as a unit, faces the common danger with a united front, a few million poor devils are going to have to pay the price for the selfishness or stupidity or both of millions and millions of others. The next Pearl Harbor will be a dilly. Most of the major brains in the country have prophesied that. It won't be a handful of bombers coming over, but a terrific, all-out thrust that will make front-line combatants of even babes in their cribs.

The Taft-Hartley Act Should Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday March 6, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article which appeared in the Collinsville Herald, Collinsville, Ill., on Friday, March 3, 1950:

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW IS DEAD—JUDGE KEECH FINDS UMWA NOT GUILTY OF VIOLATING ORDER BECAUSE MINERS REFUSED TO WORK

Adopting the legal theory developed by James O. Monroe, publisher of the Collinsville Herald, in an address to the House Labor Committee in Washington a year ago, Judge Richmond B. Keech in the Federal district court in Washington Thursday afternoon held that the United Mine Workers Union was not guilty of contempt of his no-strike injunction order because of the refusal of the coal miners to return to work at the direction of the union officials.

Monroe in his address to the Congressmen had predicted that at some future time there would be a strike where the dissatisfied men would refuse to follow the orders of their officials who would be acting under threat of a court injunction. That was what happened following Judge Keech's order of 10 days ago to the UMW officials. Union President John L. Lewis issued an order to the men to return to work, but they failed to do so.

Judge Keech's finding that the union is not guilty of contempt because of the failure of the miners to resume work ends the court proceeding. It demonstrates what Monroe has said from the beginning, that the injunctive process would be unavailing to prevent or to end a strike. It means that the Taft-Hartley law is virtually dead. Monroe predicted Thursday that the law now would be either repealed or radically revised.

Following is the portion of Monroe's statement to the House Labor Committee discussing the futility of the Taft-Hartley law as a strike-breaking measure:

"The greatest error on the part of those who framed the Taft-Hartley law was that they acted as if they regarded the union and its officers as being the controlling agents over the union members, a doctrine specifically stated by Judge Goldsborough, saying, 'as long as a union is functioning as a union, it must be held responsible for the mass action of its members.'

"Union officials are regarded by the members as leaders and not as dictators nor as being empowered to determine policies and to bind the men to them. In the Typographical Union, to which I belong, no action can be taken, including the election of officers, without a referendum of the membership, both in the locals and in the International, and strikes are entered upon only by a vote of the membership affected. I understand that this is true in the Mine Workers, who are the largest industrial group in my city, and in most other unions. Labor unions are not corporations, which elect directors and officers who manage the business for a year or some other stated period and who during that period can commit the stockholders to policies and obligations. 'Labor czars' are no more potent than 'political bosses.'

"This fallacious thinking, which Judge Goldsborough first expressed, is at the bottom, so it seems to me, of the provisions in the present law which seek to prevent strikes by court injunctions against only the union and its officials, and which seek to direct union activity by requiring officials to take a non-Communist oath. And this thinking, and the legislation which it fostered, leads inevitably to the practical difficulties of establishing industrial peace by them. For men who recognize their officials as leaders, and not as dictators, cannot be expected to respect and accept and follow a law, first, which affronts their instincts, second, which thwarts established practices in the settling of disputes with management, and third and most important, which lays its impact solely on the union and its officials and which suggests no coercion, and imposes no penalties upon the men themselves, either as individual citizens in the commonwealth or as members of the union.

"The more practical question, it seems to me, is, regardless of the theoretical responsibility of the union, whether or not members are under any responsibility too, and therefore will respect the orders of the union, particularly when the union orders are in contravention of the union's policy and are, moreover, delivered under duress of a court order. Neither the union laws nor the statute nor the court order suggests any such eventuality. So far as I can discern any inhibition in the law, the men can strike as quickly and as long as they please. And, again being practical, no matter how crippling a court order may be to the union, nothing is achieved for industrial resumption unless the men go back to work. One may say that the men have some responsibility to obey the orders of the officers, but the law does not say so, and Judge Goldsborough did not say so; and even if both said so, there is no penalty on the men if they refuse—which makes the law well nigh a nullity.

"As yet there has been no real test of the capacity of the injunction against unions to stop a paralyzing strike. I know that it will be said at once that John L. Lewis called off the miners' strike last April. But it must be remembered also that at the same time he got what he wanted in the welfare fund which was at issue. The longshoremen's strike last November on the two coasts was not ended by the order to the men to go back to work, but by the settlement, while they were still idle, of the disputed matters.

I do not want to be taken as an inciter to strikes or to defiance of the Government by workers, but I predict that under the present law there will be strikes where the men will not follow the orders of the officials who give them under injunction. And I suggest to you that in such event you will have left the Nation helpless."

Democratic Party Responsibility for the Rise of Russia—John B. Chapple

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have had thousands of Lincoln Day and Washington Day speeches throughout the Nation. Most of them sounded silly and missed the boat completely. The most outstanding speech in the Nation in my opinion was delivered by a small-town editor, John B. Chapple, of Ashland, Wis. I might add that this is the same John B. Chapple who won the Republican nomination for United States Senator in 1932. He won that nomination on a platform of anticommunism—the first public figure in America to see the light in 1932 as he sees it now in 1950.

Americans will take pride in reading this speech. That is why I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD so that 70,000 copies will go all over the Nation.

His address follows:

[From the Ashland (Wis.) Daily Press of February 25, 1950]

Friends of Ontonagon, we have been pioneers, your ancestors and mine, from the days when the first white man came to this Lake Superior shore, on to the time that our Nation was founded with a Declaration of Independence proclaiming human rights and human dignity to all the world, and on down to the time of our First World War.

That period of the First World War proved to be one of the great turning points in world history.

While we of America were busy in a war which we hoped would end war, in a war to make the world safe for democracy, a philosophy that was the exact opposite of what we were fighting for, the exact opposite of ours, a poisonous philosophy that had been spawned in Germany, gained support in Russia during the revolutions in which first the Czar and then representative government were overthrown—and there was let loose upon the world a philosophy of government the exact opposite of everything we believe in—a philosophy that denied God, that denied the sacredness of the human family, that denied honor and honesty and everything that America for 300 years has stood for—yes, a philosophy that denied, and still does deny, everything that the Ten Commandments have stood for down through the ages, and stand for today.

For a few brief years after World War I, this Communist philosophy of the denial of God and the denial of human rights, this overturning of the philosophy of human brotherhood for a philosophy of hate and treachery, was held at bay by America.

Then, in the confusion and paralysis of the depression that was the aftermath of that First World War, there came into power in

America a man and a party that gave the official recognition of the United States to a philosophy that is the deadliest enemy that America ever had or ever could have—not only gave official recognition to the Communist power of Soviet Russia, but has aided and abetted it until it is sweeping over much of the world and has actually become the world's greatest power, relegating America to second place.

Those who did this knew what they were doing when they did it.

They knew that for 15 years since the Communist revolution in Russia its leaders had flaunted the words of Karl Marx in the faces of the world that "religion is the opium of the people."

They knew the words of Lenin, predecessor of Stalin, that "children must be taught to hate their parents if they are not Communists. If they are, then the child need not respect them; need no longer worry about them."

They knew Lenin's advice to his Communists to "practice trickery, employ cunning, to sometimes even overlook or conceal the truth" in carrying on their work.

They knew the words of Mejinsky who had said, "As long as there are idiots to take our signature seriously, and to put their trust in it, we must promise everything that is being asked, and as much as one likes, if we can only get something tangible in exchange."

They were acquainted with the words of Lenin when he said: "Down with love of one's neighbors. What we need is hatred. We must know how to hate; only thus shall we conquer the universe."

They knew all these things; everyone in America knew them. They knew it when they did it.

And in the short space of 18 years since the Democratic Party went into power in America and made the deal with Soviet Russian communism which has finally produced today's world crisis in which every heart is secretly filled with terror about the future, the Democratic Party has written the blackest and most tragic chapter in American history.

The story of Nero fiddling while Rome burned has a ghastly parallel today in President Truman's bewilderment as Russia takes away from us control of the world.

This is Brotherhood Week, and from the White House President Truman issued the following splendid statement. I quote:

"Respect for human dignity is the central issue in the world struggle today.

"America is dedicated to the conviction that all people are entitled by the gift of God to equal rights and freedoms even though they may differ in religious persuasion, in social and political views or in racial origin. Our greatness is and will be measured by the degree of our recognition of this fundamental truth.

"Millions of people in our world are living in slavery. They are subject to the iron rule of despots who make the state supreme and who constantly violate God-given human rights. Free people everywhere are horrified to witness the subjugation of their fellow human beings by the totalitarian states. No group is being spared. Protestants, Jews, Catholics, Orthodox, are being crushed into submission. Statesmen of democratic spirit, and writers, teachers, and scientists of independent mind are being destroyed. The conscience of the free world is appalled by their shocking martyrdom."

That is the end of the quotation.

Ladies, and gentlemen, President Truman wrote the truth when he wrote these words. But what he failed to add is this:

If America is done for in the days to come, it is because the Democratic Party got control in 1932, and in the unbelievably short space of 18 years, nurtured and supported with billions of dollars of our own heart's blood a country whose leaders are the sworn enemies of human rights and freedom, and everything we believe in, and who are succeeding at their task of taking the world away from America, and away from those who believe that the Ten Commandments are the foundation of civilization.

In the incredibly short period of 12 years, the Russian empire has increased its population from 180,000,000 to 800,000,000 people.

Here is what Soviet Russia has been able to incorporate into its empire in that time:

Eastern Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Karelia (part of Finland). This brings the Russian empire in Europe to the Elbe River on the west; to the Adriatic Sea on the southwest; close to the Aegean, with only a narrow strip of Greece, as a barrier, on the south. The present position of the Russian empire in Europe makes the Scandinavian peninsula indefensible.

This embraces 800,000,000 human beings, one-third of the total population of the earth.

In January 1945 Moscow ruled 190,000,000 human beings.

In June 1948 Moscow ruled 450,000,000 human beings.

By November 1949 Moscow ruled over 800,000,000 human beings.

The total human population of the earth is about 2,500,000,000.

Moscow rules one-third of the human race.

And here is the latest chapter:

At 10:18 this morning, over the United Press leased wire in the Daily Press office, came this bulletin:

"WASHINGTON.—The State Department announced it has broken diplomatic relations with Bulgaria. The Bulgarian delegation was ordered from Washington. Bulgaria accused the United States Minister at Sofia of conspiring against the so-called People's Republic of Bulgaria—the front name for Soviet Russia."

The Democratic Party over the past 18 years has built up this enemy of America, and now the situation is desperate.

I need scarcely remind you how every evil force in America was concentrated behind the Democratic Party in 1932. All the millions of dollars of the whiskey trust were dumped into that campaign. Every evil political power of the big cities was turned loose. The shell-shocked people of America, struggling through a depression caused by World War I, cracked under the strain and turned the reins of government over to what turned out to be the world forces of evil. Proof of this came in the quick recognition of Communist Russia.

An evil force took control in America at that time that reversed the direction of our Government and sent us spinning down hill.

A blind, stupid foreign policy failed to give any encouragement to the Republican postwar government of Germany that was struggling to get onto its feet after World War I, and by this lack of support actually helped Hitler rise to power.

Instead of doing something to help stabilize postwar Germany and keep a maniac named Hitler out of power, the Democratic Party of the United States turned its attention to Soviet Russia, which it officially recognized in 1933, creating an even greater peril to America than Hitler, as time has proved.

Out of the Democratic Party's blindness, Hitler, who had already proclaimed his attack upon the Jews, was actually allowed to rise to power.

And in that same fateful year of 1933, right after taking power in America, the Democratic Party officially recognized Communist Russia and put that nation on its feet later with billions of dollars of American money, and Communist Russia's agents, spies, and criminals were brought into this country with the encouragement and connivance of the Democratic Party until the whole bloodstream of our Government was poisoned with enemies not only of our Nation but of every ideal of decency that we believe in. The Democratic Party and the Democratic Party alone is guilty of this act which historians of the future will doubtless classify as treason to our country.

President Truman's statement Thursday that he is standing on his order not to release the secret loyalty files in the present investigation into Communist influences within the State Department speaks for itself.

This same Democratic Party let loose in the labor relations of our country the same venom and hatred that the Communists proclaim openly is their weapon. Who gave birth and political preferment and untold power to John L. Lewis, who sponsored him and nurtured him in the belief that he has the right to bring hunger and suffering upon millions of innocent people instead of seeking to settle labor controversies with the assistance of sane government and civilized mediation of differences, of which human beings who are made in the image of God are capable? Who is responsible for stirring up and encouraging in human hearts every evil trait—suspicion of their fellow men, envy, malice, violence? This must be laid squarely at the door of the Democratic Party.

Who has tried for political reasons to break the spirit of the American people, to make pioneers like our fathers and ourselves dependent upon Government, regimented under Government regulations so that we begin to feel like helpless pawns of Government?

Who created this world power of Communist Russia that is spilling over Europe today, that is taking over China, that is at bay with us over Germany, that greedily eyes India and Africa, and that eventually plans to strangle us and crush the life out of the kind of an America that we know and have fought and worked for? Who has sold America out to Russia? The Democratic Party must take the full and complete responsibility.

Today the release of George Sokolsky, the columnist, for February 21 came to my desk. Sokolsky is the son of an American rabbi. He edited a newspaper in Russia and later worked in China and is a man of world-wide vision and in my opinion the greatest columnist in America today.

Under the title, "Let's Face It," he wrote these words that throw the situation sharply into focus. He writes:

"I was sitting in a train in conversation with a man. Our conversation grew increasingly gloomier. He hoped that everything I said was untrue, unfounded, nonsense. And the reason? He did not want his grandchildren to have to live in the kind of world that seemed inevitable from our conversation.

"Of course, he and I are not designing the next historic period. It was designed for us at Yalta. We have to get that into our heads. It was designed principally at Yalta, with side arrangements at Quebec, Tehran, Moscow and other places. There three men formed a design—an historical design of tremendous dimensions. If these men thought badly, as they undoubtedly did, we shall spend many decades getting out of their arrangements. The chain process that is started by an historic mistake is rarely arrested except by war or revolution.

"The point is that history deals with people—not with lands or boundaries or treaties, but with living, working, hoping, aspiring people. Politicians often forget that. They shove 50,000,000 souls here and 100,000,000 there. They smash a system of government and substitute another. They end a war and start another. They waste productivity and starve a hitherto productive race.

And when they have done their work and die, the heritage they leave may be, for a century, little more than blood and sweat and tears.

"It is important for us in this decade to understand precisely where we are. In 1938, we were annoyed with the Japanese and we were very angry with Hitler and Mussolini. Then came the European war which should have been localized but was not. It became, instead, world-wide, involved us to the extent that we took it over, became the leader of one side, defeated the enemy, and found a changed world, in which the smaller of our two principal allies came out the victor and simultaneously our enemy.

"It took us a long time to understand what had happened. Could it be that those smart men who knew everything—Roosevelt, Churchill, Harry Hopkins, Hull, Stettinius, Byrnes, George Marshall, Henry Morgenthau, Dean Acheson, Alger Hiss, Owen Lattimore—could it be that they were all wrong?

"The answer of history is clearly that they were wrong. That has nothing to do with whether you like them or not; whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, a Liberal or a Conservative. None of this makes any difference, because the historic fact is that World War II was won by the Russians, and we lost it. The Russians got the spoils, and we got the expenses. They moved into first position.

"So now we have to get out of that. And as Americans we face some very tough problems.

"This is what we face:

"1. The possibility of direct attack on our soil;

"2. The possibility of economic and political isolation;

"3. The danger that the cost of safeguarding ourselves from 1 and 2 may so damage our national economy as to imperil the life which has made us the great Nation that we are;

"4. The preservation, in spite of 1, 2, and 3, of the liberties of our people, without which it hardly matters whether we succeed at all. In a word, we must not lose our freedoms no matter what else we have to do.

"So that is what World War II has produced for us. And it would not be so difficult if we did not have among us pro-Russians, pro-Britishers, internationalists, and just plain ostriches who refuse to face up with the brutal facts of history. Maybe if we could deal with this strictly as Americans, we could do something vital about it."

That is the end of the George Sokolsky quotation.

Let me repeat part of his final sentence:

"If we could only deal with this situation as Americans," he writes.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is only one party in America today that can deal with this situation as Americans.

Here we stand—at bay with the forces of evil. Twenty years ago none of us thought these forces would ever gain the power they hold today. They hold that power because of the most ghastly conspiracy against the welfare of America that can be found in our American history.

And all the Democratic Party can do in this situation is to try to cover up.

Anything goes in America today, under the guidance of these Democratic misleaders. It is the bread and circuses period of the decline and fall of the Roman empire, all over again, only this time we in America are the victims. Our whole social structure is falling to pieces under the assaults of the Democratic Party and its evil philosophers. They have even talked of giving the atom bomb and the H-bomb to Russia to complete our destruction.

I don't propose to allow any administration or any party to protect the forces destroying the ideals of my children, enlisted them, and then send them off to war to pay with their blood once more for Democratic Party folly in world affairs.

Men and women of Ontonagon, the sands of time for the Democratic Party are running out. They have built up the only enemy that America ever had in all its history that has become actually stronger than America itself. They have committed the unpardonable sin—sin against their mother country—yes, that conceivably may even mean the death of our Nation and the ideals we have known since the founding of America.

In this situation, it is a question of do or die. The Republican leadership in America must tear the control of our Nation out of the hands of its present evil Democratic leadership, or die with it.

In the words of Washington, we must once again raise a standard to which the wise and honest may repair. As he said in that earlier crisis, the event is in the hands of God—and the Democratic Party and its alliance with godlessness over the world are stacked against us.

In this crisis we have a terrific responsibility.

As we move forward in this crisis, let us tell the American people in clear words what it is that we as Republicans seek for all Americans.

Not the freedom of the anarchist, where anything goes, but the freedom of a life in which human beings may respect themselves and have reasonable hope for their children.

Not the freedom of the enemies of God and of the moral foundations of family life to destroy our civilization, but the exalted freedom of a government that protects family life, that recognizes the family as the foundation stone of human society, that protects the ideal of marriage, that protects motherhood, that protects children, that protects each family in its right to adequate food and housing, and its right to be safeguarded from such degrading influences as the commercialization of the Ingrid Bergman-Rossellini affair. We must tell the people of America that in time of stress and strain our ideal is that the American family not only is most certainly entitled to protection from hunger and want by the Nation, but that our highest goal is the freedom to work our own destiny under a system that gives the family a chance to survive as a family, and is not choked and strangled by a government that is riding the Nation to death until our economy cannot produce what people need. We must assure the people that we demand the constant improvement in the distribution of what we all produce, so that we need not resort to the criminal democratic practice of destroying food or hiring people not to produce it while other people are still hungry.

We must make clear to the American people that if a thing is good and sound and wholesome for the welfare of the American family, then the Republican Party is for it and will fight for it, and that it is the only truly American party today.

The Republican Party does not go along with or protect any power based on a philosophy that religion is the opium of the people, or that children should hate their parents if they are not Communists, or that we should practice trickery, employ cunning, and sometimes even overlook or conceal the truth, or that as long as there are idiots to take signatures seriously, to promise everything that is asked, or a philosophy that says, "Down with love of one's neighbors—what we need is hatred."

We have an appointment with destiny right now to rescue the American people from terror and despair.

It is indeed time, as Washington so clearly phrased it in that earlier crisis, to raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. Once again, as he said, the event is in the hands of God.

Automotive Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include the following from Mr. Lou Hosking, general manager, Minnesota Motor Transport Association, 2453 University Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.

Mr. Hosking is an outstanding authority on all phases of motortruck transportation. He has carefully and earnestly considered the automotive excise taxes from every viewpoint and their ultimate effect not only on the motortransport owner and operator but likewise on businesses and the consuming public.

In order that the Members of the House may have the benefit of the Minnesota Motor Transport Association views as presented by Mr. Hosking, under leave previously granted, I am inserting the letter herewith:

MINNESOTA MOTOR
TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION,
St. Paul, Minn., February 23, 1950.

Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEN: The proposed repeal of certain excise taxes, now before Congress, is of vital importance to Minnesota truck operators; and, in ultimate effect, to the thousands of businesses in our State which they serve.

I would like to enlist your vigorous support in equalizing this burden which far outweighs any monetary gains which may accrue to the Government from its continuance.

Specifically, we urge the outright repeal of the 3-percent tax on the transportation of freight and a cut-back of additional highway-use taxes to prewar levels. Even a prewar level on these taxes is not justified but your problem and that of Congress in sustaining a reasonable tax level cannot be disregarded. We are fully cognizant of it.

I firmly believe that the present 3-percent freight-transportation tax is a depressing assessment which indirectly hits the pocketbook of every man, woman, and child buying any commodity, and I further believe that a cut-back to prewar levels of other highway-use taxes would boost, rather than harm, our economic well-being. The percentage of all income paid for transportation charges on all commodities is very high—more than most people realize—and if lowering of these highway-user taxes will in effect encourage lower transportation rates, or sustain a stronger transportation system to render dollar-saving transportation, then the loss in revenue to the Federal Government will more than be offset by additional net dollars to every constituent of yours in Minnesota.

We ask that the 3-percent tax on new trucks and trailers be cut back to the 2½-percent level which prevailed before the war; that the tax on truck parts and accessories be cut back to the 2½-percent which prevailed before the war; that the tax on tires and tubes be cut by 50 percent, thus restoring prewar levels; that the tax on lubricating oil be cut by 25 percent which would restore them to the levels prevailing before the war.

We further recommend that the present Federal tax on gasoline be cut from 1½ cents to the 1-cent level which prevailed before the war.

Our association members are in highway-freight transportation. They are direct servants of the people. The freight they handle is in their possession only temporarily. Any corrective measure which will facilitate their operations is of direct and immediate benefit to the consumer.

In this connection, I must state that no other form of transportation pays the excise taxes that our members do. These motor-freight carriers are subject to corporate taxes, income taxes, and all of the other types of taxes that business or individuals in general are subject to. Yet, in addition, they must pay a special levy on their equipment, maintenance parts, and many of their major items of operating expense such as gasoline, lubricating oil, and tires. It is unfair.

There is no pretense in the excise tax that the proceeds are for highway purposes. To that extent it is a penalty to truck transportation. No other forms of freight transportation are subject to such excise taxes. They thus are placed in a privileged category and enjoy an unearned advantage.

Since the ultimate benefactors to repeal of the 3 percent transportation tax, and, to an equal extent, a cut-back on other highway-user excise taxes are your constituents and our customers, it behooves us to fight for this enactment of excise-tax repeals. We do not speak of luxuries, of items which one can do without. These taxes are on services and items which are a vital key to one's economic well-being.

I would like very much, dear Congressman, to have you actively work for this program, and would like to know if it would be possible for you personally to appear before the House committee which is considering the reductions and present our views. It will be difficult, if not impossible, for us to make this appearance in Washington. We would be very happy to hear from you.

Thank you very much.

Very truly yours,

LOU HOSKING,
General Manager.

Address of Very Rev. Vincent J. Flynn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Very Rev. Vincent J. Flynn, president of the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn., and president of the Association of American Colleges, Cincinnati, Ohio, January 10, 1950:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure and an honor to speak to you as president of the Association of American Colleges. I am proud of the association; I am proud to have been its president during the past year.

First of all, I am proud of being president of the association for a personal reason. Quite naturally it is gratifying to me to feel that I have the esteem and friendship of my colleagues. It is naturally a matter of some satisfaction, that, after having been on the board for 3 years, my fellow college presidents would ask me to be their president. But apart from this personal satisfaction, which I, being human, have no desire to suppress, there is another consideration involved of far greater importance.

I take pleasure in being a member of this organization because to me it seems to furnish an example of the unity and harmony so badly lacking in our Nation, and in the world at large. In our deliberations, there are, of course, differences of opinion, but I know of no similar organization where there is less friction and more fundamental good will than our own; and I think it a tribute to the fair-mindedness of the membership of the association, which is predominantly Protestant, that they should have chosen for their president a priest of the Catholic Church.

Man is by nature one. That is the teaching of any theology that I know of, and sociology, as well; that is to say, human beings are essentially the same. This does not mean, of course, that all are alike in every respect; in fact, it is part of the mystery and fascination of life that no two human beings are alike in all respects. But when we say that all men were created equal, we mean that men in their very essence are the same, regardless of race, color, or creed. Christianity teaches that we were all created by the same Father, all redeemed by His Son, and that we all have a common destiny.

Until recent years, this concept of the oneness of man, although admitted speculatively, had not been brought into the realm of practical political thinking. A little over a century ago, Tennyson, dipping into the future, saw a vision of "the Parliament of man, the federation of the world." The first faint realization of his dream was, of course, the League of Nations. Today, with the extraordinarily rapid development of transportation and communication, as well as the discovery of new means of destruction, there is a more urgent clamor than ever before for world unification of some sort. We have our United Nations organization, struggling bravely to maintain its existence, in the face of enormous difficulties; we have the World Federalists, who wish to go a step further; because of our recognition of the mutual interdependence of nations, we in the United States are trying to help Europe get back on its feet. It is becoming increasingly clear that the problems of one nation are the problems of all; that, in fact, we are our brothers' keepers.

To achieve world unity is, of course, a colossal task. The difficulties are all too obvious. But this is no excuse for abandoning the attempt.

If world unity is a good thing, obviously unity within a nation is a good thing, and likewise within the separate political and social units of the nation—the various States or Territories, the counties, the cities, the families. Anything which sets a man's heart against his brother is wrong; anything that binds him to his brother in charity is good; and because I believe that the Association of American Colleges falls into the second category, I think that it is good.

Now it would be, indeed, an extremely optimistic person who would expect perfect harmony among all men for any length of time. But that does not lessen, in my opinion, the moral obligation of mankind to strive for this goal. And there is always the possibility of a certain amount of success. Even the most pessimistic would admit that.

If we are to have any success in achieving unity and harmony among men, we shall need first to discover what it is that divides and separates them. To me it seems that the answer lies in the very nature of man as he exists today. Briefly, man, as we know him, is an imperfect creature both in his intellect and in his will. Men disagree because in many matters the truth is by no means immediately evident; its discovery is often a long, tedious process. Men differ in intellectual powers, as well as in the cultivation of those powers. Only God is all-wise; only He comprehends truth in its fullness. And men disagree because of an exaggerated selfishness in their hearts. Most of us, according to Aristotle, follow our senses rather than our reason in competing for "wealth, honors, and bodily pleasures." It is the exceptional man, says Aristotle, who is truly a lover of self, in desiring that he should always "act justly, temperately, or in accordance with any of the other virtues," and in general in trying "to secure for himself fine honorable course." And from the imperfect understanding of an issue by an imperfect intellect, and from an inclination toward an irrational selfishness, come the deforming passions of fear, of anger, of hatred, of the desire for revenge.

These are the things, in my opinion, which divide and separate man from man.

The next question is, what kind of unity do we want, and how can we achieve it?

I think that we may as well face the fact that we are not likely soon to get the whole race, or our whole Nation, or our whole city, to agree on anything. Ideally, of course, if we accept the theistic position, we should all have the same faith. But actually we live in a world filled with Buddhists, Mohammedans, Shintoists, Jews, and so forth, not to speak of the various Christian bodies. All believe in some sort of Supreme Being, all have some sort of moral code. If we are ever to have one world, or anything like it, we must, I think, first accept the fact of diversity, and secondly, we must tackle the problem with charity as our basic attitude. We shall need, to be sure, our experts in politics, economics, and sociology, but all of our technicians will avail us nothing unless we work together in a spirit of mutual love. Let me explain what I mean.

When I use the word "charity" or "love" as existing between man and man, I mean that one has a desire for the total good of the other. Life, as someone has said, consists in a series of relationships with other persons. The relationships are not between ideas; they are between human beings. Now, it is quite possible for me to love a man while hating his ideas. According to the precept of Christ, we must therefore love even our enemies, and do good to those that hate us. We need not agree with the ideas of our enemies, or with the things that they do. But we must wish their well-being in time and in eternity, and be willing to do anything within reason to help them attain it. And the reason for this is the unity of the race—we are all children of the one Father. Until the leaven of this idea somehow permeates the mass of men, or at least their leaders, international unity will have, I fear, very little chance.

The same is true, I believe, with regard to national unity, State unity, civic unity, and even family unity. You may begin at the top or the bottom of the scale, but you will find no real unity in a body of men without charity. Differences and disagreements will exist, even in the best of families. But I appeal to your experience: where love is present, agreement can usually be reached—at least in the field of action, if not in that of opinion. Where love is not present, no unity is likely. There may be uniformity, or conformity, enforced by the police. Totalitarian states try to reach unity through this method. But is it a method repugnant to all that we Americans cherish.

Since ours is a national organization, let us look for a moment at the present state of our Nation, from the point of view of national unity. We find here in America persons of the most widely diverse ancestry, representing all, I daresay, of the races of men, and holding various political and religious beliefs. Whether we wish it or not, this diversity is going to continue for a

long time. Can there be any harmony in this pentecostal population?

I think that there can be. During the war, Americans exhibited a high degree of unity indeed. The political parties got together on a bi-partisan program; labor and capital buried their differences; Army and Navy chaplains of different faiths worked side by side, and there was comparative peace between their various contingents. But now that the emergency—that particular emergency, the threat of utter destruction—has passed, we are demonstrating to the world that as a people we can quarrel among ourselves as lustily as the best.

While I deplore any unseemly disputes, of course, in the realms of politics and economics, I am not nearly so troubled by them as I am by those in the realm of religion. And here the situation is none too good. In recent years there has been a resurgence of bad feeling between Protestants and Catholics in the United States. Without attempting to fix the blame, we can all agree, I am sure, that the fact is highly regrettable. It is regrettable because, as I have already said, anything that sets brother against brother is regrettable; and it is especially regrettable because it gives scandal to the unbeliever, who like ourselves—according to Christian teaching—has been made to the image and likeness of God. But is he likely to abandon his unbelief and join our ranks when he sees us quarreling like heathens? Woe to him by whom scandal cometh. Which Christianity? Is the question the puzzled pagan asks when we invite him to accept the faith of Christ. By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another.

How what can we possibly do to keep the peace between persons of different religious faiths? Shall we fight it out with firearms? Few, I hope, wish that solution. Shall we send missionaries to each other? In a sense, we are always doing precisely that. By our lives (God forgive us) as well as by our words, we are trying to persuade others of the correctness of our views. But what if we cannot? Must we then accuse each other of bad faith? Hardly. The Christian believes that it is only God Himself who can scrutinize the secrets of the human heart; for that matter, any man of sense will agree that he cannot with certainty know the motives of another.

What program then shall we recommend? The program that men of good will have always followed; the program that even civilized pagans have followed, at least to a degree. We shall not go about picking quarrels about doctrinal differences, but we shall try to cooperate with each other in matters that affect the common good. I do not mean that doctrinal differences are unimportant. They are important, unless truth is unimportant. But we must accept the fact that, for the present at least, we must live in a world of many religious faiths. The question is, How can we live and work together without compromising our beliefs?

One answer is that we are already doing it, both in America and abroad. For years it has been common to see Catholics and Protestants working side by side in matters of civic and community concern—the Red Cross, the Community Chests, school boards, city improvements committees, and so forth. Similarly we find both banded together for their common good in labor unions, in the National Association of Manufacturers, in business leagues, in the various associations of professional men. For centuries, this has been true among men devoted to the fine arts, and for almost as long, I should say, among scholars.

Let me give you an instance from my own experience. Some years ago I had the privilege of spending 15 months in various libraries in England, France, Italy, Germany, Austria, and Belgium. At Oxford, Cambridge, and the British Museum, I was treated with the same courtesy as I found at the Vatican library. And similarly in the libraries of France, Germany, Belgium, and Austria, when I seldom knew whether I was speaking to a devout Catholic, a devout Protestant, a Jew, a free-thinking agnostic, or a professed atheist. And when I was at the Vatican I learned that the building had recently been repaired by the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace, because the members of the foundation had regarded the library as promoting peace—scholars from all lands use it—and that money from the same source was being provided to pay for a new card catalog. And this fact is also instructive: when I was about to leave London for Rome, I was given a letter of introduction to an official in the Vatican library by a Jewish scholar from the University of Heidelberg, who happened to be working in the British Museum at the time, and no one, either at the museum or at the Vatican, thought it odd. Of course I could probably have got into the Vatican library through other channels; but the point is that my friend in London had a friend at the Vatican, and he wished me to receive special attention. Furthermore, when I mentioned to the officials at the Vatican the names of two of my friends at the University of Chicago (where I received my degree), Prof. Charles H. Beeson and B. L. Ullman, I was treated with added respect: Mr. Ullman had been for years a correspondent of the then Pope, Pius XI, when the latter was librarian at Milan, and later in the Vatican; Mr. Beeson, under whom I had studied, was recognized abroad as one of the two or three leading paleographers in America.

But, it may be pointed out, our present-day religious quarrels are due, not so much to doctrinal differences, as to the feeling of one body that its interests are being threatened by another, or a fear that they may be threatened in the future. To be specific, some Protestants in the United States fear that if Catholics ever became strong enough to do so, they would deny freedom of worship to persons of other religious faiths. And some Catholics have a paralyzing fear of certain Protestant organizations.

Now there is historical reason for fear, I admit, in both instances. For various reasons, civil liberties have not developed throughout the world as they have in the United States. But, to my mind, the important question is this: Are we in this country likely to follow exactly the same pattern in human relations as that which has been followed elsewhere?

Personally, I do not think so. I believe that most of the Protestants I know have no desire to curb my freedom of worship. And I trust that most of the Catholics I know are equally fair.

American history, I believe, supports the view that we are, in truth, a freedom-loving people, and that we are steadily making advances in the domain of human rights. Our forefathers came to this country, not to think alike in political and religious matters, but to live peaceably with their own convictions. No matter what has happened elsewhere, I believe that we in America have developed, and that we can in the future further develop, so strongly our understanding of the rights of the individual conscience that no fear in this regard need be felt by anyone. I feel that we Americans can learn to live together in peace. If we are to look at the matter realistically, the cross-currents of interest—political, economic, and social—are so diverse in America that people here are not, in the main, arrayed for or against each other chiefly on religious grounds. And I doubt, too, whether, in the foreseeable future, any responsible religious body would wish to enslave another. For that would mean that the majority of Americans would be reversing their thinking completely; and it takes a long time indeed for people to make such a shift. And the mere fact that we Americans are gradually getting to know each other better helps the situation enormously: it is usually the stranger whom we dislike and mistrust.

Another reason for optimism in this matter, I think, is the development in some quarters of a new approach to the question of religious differences. Whereas some persons have begun the discussion by declaring that error had no rights, others have been pointing out that rights inhere in persons, not in abstractions; and that all persons, even those in error in their thinking, have rights; and that, furthermore, we must be extremely careful of the rights of the individual conscience even when it is in error. Reduced to practical terms, this means that for every person his conscience is the guide which he must follow, even though he be objectively in error. For example, if a college instructor's conscience tells him—however erroneously—that he must liquidate the president of the institution, then he is morally bound to do so. Certain inconveniences, to be sure, result from this doctrine; but it is still sound, according to my theological friends. The doctrine of the rights of the erroneous conscience is, of course, recognized in the prevalent attitude toward conscientious objectors to military service; most people regard the position of the objectors as erroneous, but still respect their right to act according to their own convictions. The same doctrine underlies the legislation in some churches, among them my own, which forbids members to baptize a person against his will, even though these churches regard the person in objective error if he does not wish to be baptized.

There are, to be sure, people in this country who would impose an artificial harmony upon us by trying to make us all agree upon everything. As a step toward this idealistic condition, they would do away with the private educational institutions. They would say, for example, that it is wrong for the Lutherans, the Baptists, the Catholics, and other religious denominations to have their own colleges; they hold that such a condition makes for division among our people. But if I understand my history correctly, the early settlers came to America so that they might believe as they saw fit, in matters political, economic, religious, and otherwise. And since they themselves founded church colleges, I think that they would most heartily applaud our having colleges today maintained by the different denominations.

Why do I speak about these matters to college administrators? Because I think that they are relatively free from the prejudices which militate against our national unity; because I think that they have been foremost in the fight for a true unity, a unity based on understanding and sympathy, not force; because I think that by virtue of their position they can do more than any body of men of like size to promote this idea of unity; because I think that they have given an admirable example, in this association especially, of the patient forbearance and of the Christian charity which must underlie all our efforts to effect peace and harmony among Americans and among all the peoples of the earth.

Nero Was a Piker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the

RECORD, I include therein a very thought-provoking editorial from the February 24 issue of the Dayton Press, of Dayton, Ohio:

NERO WAS A PIKER

Deep in the wilderness of Siberia some fifty-odd miles from the village of Aleksandrovskoe, buried far down in the bowels of the earth behind masonry walls 30 feet thick, thousands of scientists labor diligently to build up their stock pile of uranium bombs—which they were not supposed to know how to make for another 5 years. And they are not far afield in the processing of the hydrogen bomb, in the mastery of guided missiles, in the art of making war by bacteriology. Already these grim men of death have given Stalin formidable fleets of long-range submarines armed with apparatus for lobbing A-bombs into our coastal cities from spots far below the horizon.

The men of the Politburo are realists. They hold in their hands the fate of two billion human beings. They would risk anything—even the complete destruction of the world—to gain their ends.

On the other side of the world from them the leader of a great nation pushes away his $100 dinner plate, climbs slowly to his feet and launches into his old tirade against special interests. He twists the opposition party for having no platform and with the cocky assurance born of smug victories predicts the overwhelming defeat of the enemy at the 1950 election, and the eventual passage of his hand-out program which would make all of his people wards of the Government. And the next day the men in the Kremlin applaud, for they know that as long as minds are occupied with trivia there is nothing to fear.

Nero was a piker.

Half the world goes hungry to bed. Children whimper in their sleep and strong men stare vacantly into darkness in the direction of that other land across the seas where millions of bushels of potatoes rot in storage bins or are shoveled to hogs too fat to grunt their thanks; where billions of dried eggs and oceans of powdered milk distract Government men from their plans to grant renewed subsidies to bring greater production of potatoes and eggs and milk.

Hungry children, of course, know no better, and even strong men may be forgiven if they cannot understand the ultimate sin of wasting food while millions are hungry, or the spectacle of a strong Nation dissipating its good will.

Nero was a piker.

War threatens and there is no peace at home. Half a million coal miners are in open rebellion against their Government, for they flout the orders of the high courts and thumb their noses at executives who by their inept handling of the emergency have given encouragement to anarchy. A Nation-wide telephone strike is at hand and one of the great unions of the country is making plans to sabotage communications by "jamming" the switchboards of the Nation.

With criminal disregard of facts, the Secretary of the National Defense blurts out that if this country were attacked at 4 a. m. it would be fighting back at 5 a. m. Without coal, Mr. Secretary, and telephones? A few well-planted A-bombs would paralyze the Nation. There would be no time to get the miners back under ground, to haul fuel to the far stretches of the country, to make the weapons of war we should have to have. It would be a short war.

Congress indulges in an oratorical binge; the President furrows his brow over the details of his socialistic program. The people must have their beer and their television and their movie scandals. And nobody has told them their ship is without a competent helmsman, that bureaucracy is a bloodsucker, that statism, socialism, and communism are one and the same.

Nero was, indeed, a piker.

A Proposed Law To Destroy Small Business—S. 1008

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND W. KARST

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. KARST. Mr. Speaker, on March 1 this body voted to appoint new conferees for S. 1008. The House also voted to table the Carroll amendments which a year ago it had voted to make a vital part of S. 1008, if enacted into law. If this measure is finally passed by the Congress without the Carroll amendments it will become, in my opinion, one of the most destructive measures ever passed by Congress. It will give big business a free hand to destroy small business through the method of price discrimination which the Robinson-Patman Act sought to prevent. It will also give big business, whose plants are largely concentrated in the northeastern part of the United States with an overflow into the Middle West, a free hand to destroy the industrial development of the South and West which occurred during the late war. Finally it will put monopolists beyond reach of existing antitrust laws—give them a legal green light in the future to finish their efforts of three-quarters of a century to monopolize industry.

I cannot understand how anyone who believes that small business is entitled to fair play in markets, who believes in the right of the South and West to grow industrially, who is opposed to monopoly in trade could have voted to table the Carroll amendments. Yet I am sure that a good many of my colleagues voted that way last Tuesday because they did not understand the real purposes of this bill. In the debate which preceded the vote of the tabling of the Carroll amendments I listened to many inaccurate statements made about this bill by those advocating its passage minus the Carroll amendments. I think such misstatements were an important factor in obtaining the votes necessary to table those amendments—and today I feel it imperative to point some of them out. I call your attention to the inaccurate representations of my colleague from Pennsylvania. Because of the great popularity and prestige of the gentleman in our body his misstatements undoubtedly influenced many members who otherwise might have voted differently. I like the gentleman and admire him, too, but on a measure as crucial as S. 1008 I feel it my duty to challenge them.

From its inception S. 1008 has been represented as simply a measure to clarify existing antitrust laws, so as to make it clear that individual sellers acting independently can quote or sell at delivered prices and can absorb freight. It has been claimed that the necessity for such clarification was caused by the obiter dicta remarks of one Justice of the United State Supreme Court when this Court convicted the cement industry of using a basing-point system to eliminate competition among producers of cement in violation of existing antitrust laws.

This was the beginning of the smoke screen behind which the true purposes of S. 1008 were skillfully hidden. The obiter dicta remarks of the Justice—and I have read them carefully—do not say that sellers cannot absorb freight in quoting or selling at delivered prices. All the Justice said was that the issue of whether a seller acting independently could or could not absorb freight had not been determined by the Court in the Cement case. But the proponents of S. 1008 seized upon this obiter dicta, claiming either that the highest Court in the Cement case had actually declared that freight absorption under the existing antitrust laws by sellers acting independently was illegal or that it left the whole matter in a state of confusion. Obviously the Court had not declared freight absorption illegal where sellers acted independently. It had only ruled freight absorption out where sellers, as in the cement industry, had acted in concert to use freight absorption so as to eliminate competition in the industry. The cry, that the obiter dicta remarks of the Justice had left uncertain the whole status of whether sellers acting independently could absorb freight under existing antitrust laws, was calculated and without substance.

The Federal Trade Commission had brought the suit against the cement industry. Its former chairman, Robert E. Freer, testified before a Senate committee that, in his opinion, the existing antitrust laws did not prohibit freight absorption by sellers acting independently. Mr. Walter Wooden, associate general counsel of the Commission and the Commission's prosecuting attorney in the Cement case, also testified before a congressional committee that this was also his opinion—that the Commission had never brought a case against sellers who were acting independently in absorbing freight. Mr. Everett McIntyre, Chief of the Commission's Division of Monopoly Trials, who assisted Mr. Wooden in the prosecution of the Cement case, also testified before a congressional committee that this was his opinion, too. In response to questions put to it by counsel for the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate, the Federal Trade Commission itself on February 10, 1949, stated to the committee its opinion that freight absorption by sellers acting independently was not illegal under existing antitrust laws. It reaffirmed this position in a letter to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate on March 1, 1949. It further affirmed the same position in a letter to Senator ESTES KEFAUVER as late as January 18, 1950. Now the Federal Trade Commission is charged with the enforcement of the antitrust laws by Congress and it had given businessmen ample assurance that sellers acting independently would not be prosecuted if they absorbed freight in quoting or selling at delivered prices. In the face of the Commission's repeated assurances, there was no confusion about the whole matter. Yet the proponents of S. 1008 have gone on claiming that there is, and that clarification of existing antitrust law is necessary.

But in his remarks to the House on March 1, the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated to this body that the obiter dicta remarks of the Supreme Court Justice had been picked up by the district court judge in the Rigid Steel Conduit case of the Federal Trade Commission and cited as the law, and that because of this, S. 1008 was necessary. The plain inference was that the District Court had interpreted the obiter dicta of the Supreme Court Justice in the Cement case to mean that sellers acting independently could not absorb freight in quoting or selling at delivered prices—a situation which, if true, would have justified a bill to give sellers acting independently the legal right, under the antitrust laws, to absorb freight in quoting or selling at delivered prices.

I am first surprised that my learned friend from Pennsylvania should not know that the Rigid Steel Conduit case was never heard in any district court of the land. Cases of the Federal Trade Commission go directly to a circuit court of appeals, and it was the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit which passed upon the Rigid Steel Conduit case. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to bring in the judges' opinion in that case and show this body any such construction of the obiter dicta remarks referred to. The fact is that the Judges did not cite the obiter dicta remarks of the Supreme Court Justice in the Cement case as law. At no time in the trial of the Rigid Steel Conduit case did either the Federal Trade Commission or the judges contend that freight absorption by sellers acting independently was illegal under the existing antitrust laws. When the Federal Trade Commission wrote the order in this case, the defendants petitioned the Commission to amend the order so that the right of sellers acting independently to absorb freight would be spelled out. The Commission rejected the petition stating that the order as drawn did not prohibit such action and went on record again that the Commission considered that existing antitrust law allowed this right.

My esteemed colleague from Pennsylvania also on March 1 sought to convey to the Members of this body that extensive hearings had been held on S. 1008 and that, when the bill was considered by the full Committee on the Judiciary of the House, Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN was accorded the privilege of testifying on it.

We who are opposed to S. 1008 have insisted that on this bill no adequate public hearings have ever been held—and we are absolutely correct in that claim. On the Senate side, it is true that extensive hearings were held by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on a bill by Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, in the Eightieth Congress. It is also true that in the Eighty-first Congress, this Senate Committee held hearings on a bill by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. There were thus public hearings on both the Capehart bill and the Johnson bill. But S. 1008 is neither the Capehart bill nor the Johnson bill, differing in essential details from both. On the Senate side, S. 1008 was submitted as a substitute for the Johnson bill on the floor of the Senate. The bill was passed without any public hearings whatsoever on it. On the House side there were no adequate public hearings on this measure.

The subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee held an open hearing in the sense that the witnesses could be heard by the public. But the fact is that they permitted only two witnesses to appear. Both of these witnesses were representatives of Government and favored passage of the bill. They refused to permit representatives of small business organizations and farm groups to testify at this hearing in opposition to the bill. From the standpoint of an adequate public hearing on this bill, the hearing of the subcommittee on it was a farce. When the subcommittee reported the bill to the full Judiciary Committee the chairman held executive sessions and also refused to allow representatives of small-business organizations and farm groups to appear in opposition to the measure. On the House side, therefore, small business was completely denied an opportunity to be heard at any hearing held on this bill, though small business claims that the bill is designed to destroy small business.

During the executive sessions of the full House Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania says that Mr. PATMAN testified. Even if Mr. PATMAN had testified, both the hearings of the subcommittee and the full committee on this bill would have been ridiculously inadequate. But when he says Mr. PATMAN testified, I am informed by the gentleman from Texas that this is not an accurate statement. The gentleman from TEXAS [Mr. PATMAN] says he appeared before the full committee in executive session to protest the inadequacy of the hearings held on the bill on the House side and to urge that adequate public hearings be held before reporting the measure to the House. While Mr. PATMAN was there the committee asked him some questions about the bill and Mr. PATMAN naturally replied. But had Mr. PATMAN been testifying, he would have come prepared to make a full statement on the measure and not simply to reply impromptu to questions asked him. In my opinion the gentleman from Pennsylvania misled the House when he sought to convey the impression that adequate public hearings had been held on S. 1008 and that Mr. PATMAN had testified before the House Judiciary Committee on it.

No, gentlemen, the argument of those advocating S. 1008 that it is needed to clarify existing antitrust law so that sellers will be in no doubt that they can legally absorb freight in quoting or selling at delivered prices is shabby subterfuge. It is clear to me that the repeated statements of the Federal Trade Commission ought to be enough to convince any seller that he already has such a right under existing law. But if the proponents of S. 1008 were really sincere about it being necessary to clarify existing law they could have submitted a bill containing only one sentence to accomplish that objective. The truth is that the clarification argument is only a smoke screen to hide the real and destructive purposes of the bill.

My colleague from Pennsylvania is correct when he told the House that S. 1008 does not seek to make basing point pricing systems legal in defiance of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Cement case. But he did not tell the House that the bill provides another pricing system which is made unreachable by the antitrust laws and which can be used fully as effectively as basing-point systems to suppress price competition in business—the single zone pricing system.

Nor did the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania disclose to the House that the bill would in effect wipe the Robinson-Patman Act off the statute books. To the contrary he strove also to confuse and becloud this ominous issue. He told the House that the Kefauver amendments—later strengthened by the Carroll amendments—were intended to legislate the rule of the circuit court of appeals in the Standard Oil of Indiana case. Nothing could be further from the facts.

Under the old Clayton law passed in 1914 price discrimination was forbidden in trade. But this prohibition could not be enforced because of another provision in the Clayton Act. This provision tolerated price discrimination where businessmen were meeting competition. The result of this second provision was that the first was reduced to an empty gesture. The Robinson-Patman Act in 1937 sought to close this fatal loophole in the old Clayton Act. It provided that discriminatory prices could not be defended on the ground of meeting competition if there was an injury to competition from such prices. In the Standard Oil case referred to, the FTC charged the oil company with giving discriminatory prices to certain of its buyers. The company defended on the ground that it was only meeting competition. The court ruled that this defense was no longer admissible under the Robinson-Patman Act and since the discriminatory prices given had injured competition the company was guilty. Now the Kefauver amendments were put into S. 1008 to prevent the bill from undoing by legislation the decision of the circuit court of appeals. Without such amendments the plain purpose of the bill was to restore the fatal loophole in the Clayton law which permitted price discriminators to get by with such discriminations on the ground that they were meeting competition irrespective of whether competition had in fact been injured. The Kefauver amendments consequently sought only to preserve existing antitrust law—and not as said to "legislate the rule of the circuit court of appeals in the Standard Oil of Indiana case."

I sincerely hope that my colleagues will take account of the inaccurate statements of the gentleman from Pennsylvania made in this body on March 1, so that when S. 1008 comes back to the floor from the conferees they will then either vote it down or restore to it the Carroll amendments.

Message of Luis Muñoz Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico, to the Seventeenth Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the message delivered by Luis Muñoz Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico, to the seventeenth legislature, on February 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE OF LUIS MUÑOZ MARÍN, GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO, TO THE SEVENTEENTH LEGISLATURE AT ITS SECOND REGULAR SESSION

Members of the Legislature:

In my message of last year I spoke to you of the sense of proportion and scale of priorities which should be kept in mind when considering the great and difficult task in which the people and the government are engaged. We have all made a great effort to act according to those norms in the year which has just come to an end. It is such a decisive matter for Puerto Rico that we act each day with greater precision on the basis of this understanding, that I believe it worth while to examine the subject more closely at this time.

The economic goal of Puerto Rico is to increase production as effectively as possible so that the greater number of Puerto Ricans that there are each year will have fewer days of unemployment, a higher standard of living, and depend less and less each day on aid and privileges which are not the result of their own productive activities. It goes without saying that this economic objective is not only desirable in itself but is also a basis and means for a more tangible justice among men and a broader possibility for the enjoyment of cultural and spiritual values. However just is the justice accomplished with insufficient means, it still falls desperately short in its practical results. The human spirit, besieged by the claims of material existence, is not as free as it should be.

The aim of production must also be to bring about a balance between importation and exportation. During the war Puerto Rico accumulated a favorable liquid balance of $260,000,000 because its exports to the continental United States exceeded in this amount its imports from the continent, which were greatly reduced due to wartime restrictions. When the war ended, and normal shipping conditions were reestablished, and emergency restrictions eliminated, Puerto Rico began to import more than it exported. Nevertheless, many millions of dollars come into Puerto Rico in other forms than that resulting from export trade, such as for example, the payments to veterans, the expenditures of the Army and Navy and civil Federal agencies, Federal aid for highways, public health, and vocational education. These forms of income compensate in great measure for the lack of balance in trade, but do not eliminate it. In 1948, for example, imports amounted to $170,000,000 more than exports, but since $128,000,000 came into the island from the noncommercial sources above mentioned, the unfavorable trade balance that year was only forty-two million. After substracting the $42,000,000, a favorable accumulated balance of $191,000,000 remained. For 1949 it is calculated that the discrepancy amounted to $22,000,000, leaving an accumulated balance of one hundred and sixty-nine million. Nevertheless, this debt of the economy of the United States to the economy of Puerto Rico is gradually being reduced, and if the unfavorable balance of trade is not corrected within a certain number of years, the debt will disappear completely and a real unfavorable balance will accumulate against Puerto Rico. This situation may be aggravated by the fact that the expenditures of the Army and Navy are being reduced, and that the rights to various types of payments to veterans are being exhausted. An increase in production is necessary to ocunteract this situation as well as to reduce unemployment, and to continue raising the standard of living and to support the many thousands of new inhabitants in Puerto Rico every year. It is necessary, furthermore, in order to make Puerto Rico less and less in need of Federal aid and Federal expenditures which do not depend on our efforts or our will. It is to achieve all these objectives that we must continue up the steep road along which we have begun to climb.

The struggle to achieve this economic objective we have called the battle of production. This is a battle which is being fought not only by a government responsible to the people but by the people themselves of all economic classes, who are those who gave the Government the order to fight.

To fight this battle and win it, it is not enough to have the will to win which the people of Puerto Rico have so patently developed, and which has given so much sympathy and prestige to their efforts in the eyes of those on the outside who observe and aid us. Nor does the forward march of technical development suffice, nor the skills of the workers, nor the know-how in all branches of production and marketing: even if we had all these things, and we do have some of them and are acquiring others, still one thing would be lacking. This is the stern and unflinching willingness to sustain a clear concept of priorities in regard to all the things we want to do and which have to be done to improve the living conditions of the people. A great deal of clear thinking is necessary if we are to make a conscientious choice among a thousand important things, which cannot be done at the same time, either with the funds at our disposal during 1 year or over a period of years, and to decide which of these important things ought to occupy first place on the priority list, and which of these important things must unhappily be left in the thousandth place.

We have striven toward this goal, but we must strive harder with every passing day.

Naturally, in a country with abundant natural resources, with a population which is sufficient, but not extreme in proportion to its resources, where it is necessary merely to maintain a situation which has already been achieved, the force with which this concept of priority must be applied may be much less than it has been in a community like Puerto Rico, where the natural resources are scarce, where the density of the population constitutes a problem, and where a great many matters must be attended to before we reach, after a stiff uphill climb, the plateau on which we may devote ourselves to the mere maintainance of a favorable situation already achieved.

The basic dilemma of priorities is that it involves choosing between great services which the people greatly need, and the great productive effort which the people greatly need, in order to develop and maintain those same services, and all the other aspects of a better life. Out of increased production come the means for giving better service to the people, while only a few services may result indirectly in an aid to greater production, and others, worth while in themselves from a humanitarian standpoint, result in no aid whatever to production.

Our tendency, as men who have been deeply identified with the great suffering stoically borne by the masses of our people, is to extend to them the services they need and which they so nobly deserve until we have spent the last cent available for such services. But if we allow ourselves to be carried away on the tide of this very human and decent tendency, we shall never be able truly and permanently to save our people from those same sufferings that so deeply move the heart, and will run the risk that our sentiments will tell us to employ all of our means on temporary relief, only to find ourselves powerless later on to effect a complete and permanent cure. The poverty-stricken farmer must exercise great will power not to assuage the hunger of his children with the grain he has with which to sow his fields. If he does not exercise his will power, greater still and more irreparable will be his hunger later on, but if he does exercise it, the crop he reaps will reward his sacrifice.

The fundamental decision which the people of Puerto Rico have to make, and on which will depend multiple minor details, in harmony with that decision is how to divide their present income between the amounts which are to be devoted, on the one hand, to consumption—by private citizens—and to services—by the Government—and, on the other hand, the amounts which are going to be devoted to improving and encouraging, and cooperating with, the increase in production.

That is to say, the dilemma lies between investing and spending. The more that is spent, the less there is to invest. The less that is invested, the less there is to spend later on. The more that is invested, the more there is to spend later on. Spending is the easier alternative, and furthermore, the results of spending, though more temporary, are more immediately visible. Therefore we must exercise our will power in order to invest as much as possible and spend as little as possible, since this is the way to put an end to the present situation, to enable our people to free themselves from want as quickly as possible, and achieve a modest degree of prosperity and security.

In pointing out the priority which investing should have over spending, I refer not only to the fundamental policies of the Government, but also to policies which ought to take root in the whole community of Puerto Rico. At the most humble level, some grain for the furrow, not all for the loaf. On a higher level, fewer useless luxuries, more concentration of capital in the furrow of dynamic production. Naturally it is true that at the lowest level there is sometimes not a single grain for the furrow which is not needed for the minimum diet, while on the higher levels there is a considerable amount spent on all kinds of luxury items, which might be converted into productive investment.

The work of government, as far as priorities are concerned, is divided in three parts: First, the creation of production, or direct inducements of production; second, services which contribute indirectly but basically to production; and third, services of unquestionable human value which nevertheless do not contribute, except very indirectly, to production. Among those services which, without being production or direct encouragement of production, are nevertheless necessary to productivity, are education, health, especially preventive medicine, pure water supplies, highways, and industrial, commercial, and agricultural research and experimentation. It is evident that an industrial civilization cannot reach a high point of efficiency and competitive opportunity in a community which bears a heavy

burden of illiteracy, deficient general and technical education, and bad health. Such services are therefore desirable, not only for the human values implicit in them, but also because they form an essential part of the economic development towards which we are struggling in the battle of production. Of course, if one wishes to stretch the interpretation, there will always be arguments to prove that almost any service should have priority because it is connected in some remote way with production. But not to artfully search for such far-fetched interpretations is part of the self-discipline that the situation requires.

This brings us to a great dilemma as to what our taxing policy should be in regard to (1) stimulating prior investments in industries and crops necessary for winning the battle of production, and (2) providing those public services which are not only humanly desirable but which form an inseparable part of the productive efficiency of the country. The greatest inducement to private investment in production is a tax rate which in general is low, and for this reason attractive to industries. I realize that this is better than a high rate with total exemption for certain new industries. We are trying to find a way to establish such a system, at the same time honoring all legal obligations contracted with new industries which have been established under the tax-exemption law. But it is not easy to find, in the case of Puerto Rico, a system which, in addition to being attractive to investors, will produce sufficient income to enable the Government to pay for such public services as education, health, experimentation, and research, without which the industrialization resulting from the investments would not be really effective.

We are struggling with this difficult problem, and in examining it closely we see the possibility of a system of taxation which, without special exemptions, would fall lightly on those who increase production, and which would give us the funds necessary for the services inherent to production by imposing heavier tax burdens on those activities which are not closely allied to boosting production. The treasurer of Puerto Rico has made some recommendations in this respect, but we are still not in possession of sufficient knowledge of the problem to attack it at its roots.

I know that the people of Puerto Rico have made up their minds to free themselves from extreme poverty and insecurity. I know also that they are willing to make the sacrifice that this implies. I know that we are willing to tighten our belts during these first years of our economic development, if we can see clearly that this is leading us, slowly but surely, to overcome once and for all the difficult situation of our people. I also wish to point out that if the spirit of sacrifice is to be found in all, even in those for whom their poverty makes it more burdensome, the example must be set by those who, because of their superior economic position, find the sacrifice less difficult. I am also fully aware of the responsibility which this places on our shoulders—yours, legislators, and mine. It is up to us to see that this sacrifice is not in vain. Every dollar invested, instead of spent, represents a restriction of human needs for pursuit of a hope. It is for us to defend that hope so that its fulfillment will not come to naught.

At this point I must inform you that although the economy of Puerto Rico is saving and investing between thirty-five and fifty million dollars a year, this investment is much less than we need. Our studies reveal that no less than $60,000,000, probably $100,000,000, in what the Puerto Rican economy, private as well as public, ought to save and invest each year if our aspiration is to carry us to the goal within a period of time that is not too long for even the most robust stoicism and the most vigorous hope. Our economy must eliminate that difference on the basis of greater investments, and we should count not only on those which may come in from outside, but also on those which are the fruits of a sober understanding of the situation of an attitude of the people based on that understanding, and of legislation which gives courageous recognition to these realities and takes the necessary steps to deal with them.

The Government of Puerto Rico has contracted an obligation with the people who have entrusted it with the struggle to solve their difficult problem of existence. This implies that we carefully examine the balance between what it is necessary to invest and what must be spent, in the light of our fundamental obligation to increase the productivity of Puerto Rico. This obligation which the Government has in regard to expenditures of public funds, should similarly be a matter of conscience and foresightedness for private citizens in making expenditures on their own initiative.

In striking a just balance between what the Government should invest in increasing production, directly or indirectly, and what it should spend on giving services which do not in themselves increase production, let us carry forward each day in greater harmony our established practice whereby both the executive and legislative branches are at the same time motor and brakes, rather than dividing the functions so that one branch will be the motor and the other the brakes. In other words, I should not be the one to propose an attractive but secondary baseball park, and you the ones who have to remind me that the productivity effort comes first. Nor should the roles be reversed; rather should we both feel the responsibility of creative risk and conscientious sacrifice, although we may come to different conclusions. Both you and I, all of us, must realize what it means to think in terms of a government of the poor and for the poor.

A government of the poor and for the poor is not a government which invests little or spends little on legitimate services. That might be perhaps a government of the rich for the rich, who, because they were rich, would be unwilling to contribute of what they had, and would not need to have others contribute to what they had. A government of the poor for the poor is a government which should use all its economic powers, without haggling, but within a strict and careful system of priorities, to raise the country's level of production as rapidly as possible to the point at which extreme poverty and insecurity will disappear from the life of man.

The idea which I wish to drive home to you and to the people of Puerto Rico is that of emphasis, of point of view, of what must be attended to first, of priorities of action. Each one must collaborate, thinking independently, to make clearer in the minds of all what the true priorities are in each case, in consonance with the common goal. What I ask of you is that we strive together and that together we keep vigil so that in deciding on each expenditure or public investment, and on the encouragement to be given to private investment, we conscientiously apply the criterion of what will help most to end—to end once and for all, and not just mitigate in part—the extreme poverty of our people.

Fellow citizens of the legislature: my most heartfelt recognition for the noble collaboration I have received from you during our first year of government, both in the attention with which you have received my recommendations, and in the criticisms and improvements of them by means of which you have so effectively contributed to the good work of our government.

Respectfully submitted,

LUIS MUÑOZ MARÍN,
Governor.

LA FORTALEZA, *February 23, 1950.*

Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorial and news comments about the so-called Byrd Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

First, I ask unanimous consent to have printed the broadcast of February 25, 1950, by Mr. Albert L. Warner, over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co., dealing with the recent proposal of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to abolish the Byrd Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. This broadcast analyzes the very splendid achievements of the Byrd committee, and concludes that the spendthrifts will have a difficult time to abolish the small counterweight of one committee which sturdily stands up to emphasize economy and efficiency and that Senator BYRD is not likely to be silenced that easily, nor will he be alone in the fight.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS WEEK IN WASHINGTON

(Broadcast by Albert L. Warner over ABC February 25)

This week President Truman and Senator HARRY F. BYRD, the Virginia Democrat, continued their battle over Federal expenditures. The Senator said the President was the principle obstacle to budget balancing. The President said the Senator's statement was all political.

There is a lively suspicion at the Capitol that this feuding led a supporter of the White House, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, to aim a blow of his own at his stalwart conservative colleague from Virginia.

Senator HUMPHREY took the Senate floor to demand that the Joint Congressional Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Government Expenditures be abolished. Senator BYRD is the chairman of that committee. "It serves no useful purpose," said Senator HUMPHREY, "it is used only as a publicity medium. It deals only in generalities and wastes public funds rather than conserving them."

Senator HUMPHREY said the Byrd committee had spent over $100,000 in appropriated funds, plus $250,000 worth of time and effort of the executive branch of the Government in compiling data, plus undetermined money for printing.

Now, when you go to the record for the facts about the Byrd Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, you find it has been in existence 9 years. During two of those years it did not get a cent of appropriations.

Senator BYRD's own staff contributed their time, keeping it going. But over the 9 years the committee has received appropriations totaling $127,000. That's at the rate of about $14,000 a year—as inexpensive a committee as could be found anywhere in Congress or the Nation's Capital.

The committee was set up to put Federal revenue and expenditures in perspective and to work for efficiency and economy. It has held hearings on 35 subjects, issued 25 formal reports, and made 53 major recommendations. The committee calculates that these have resulted in savings of $1,000,000 for every $17.50 spent by the committee.

A year ago the Byrd committee centered attention on the top-heavy number of civilian employees in the Military Establishment. The charge must have had merit even in the eyes of the Truman administration, because Defense Secretary Louis Johnson has been reducing the number ever since and declaring that the reduction is of no harm to his department and has even increased efficiency.

A regular monthly release from the Byrd committee gives the number of employees in each department and agency compared with preceding months.

The committee put into effect and required a system of accurate reporting on this subject by the executive agencies. But how this compilation of data could be considered an unnecessary expense is almost beyond comprehension. If there were no Byrd committee in existence the head of any department ought to be insisting that he have figures on his desk to show how many people are working for him at the end of every month.

Maybe there's a broader question at stake. Congress is weighted toward the spending side. Every congressional district has local projects to advance. Even chambers of commerce which often verbally cry for economy are behind those projects. In every district group pressures for this and that program involving expenditures are forceful and constant. The administrative agencies have the staffs to make out strong cases for the expansion of their activities.

It may be that many of the large Federal expenditures are good and that large executive staffs are necessary to carry out the functions voted by Congress, although Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, has said that you don't have to be a spendthrift to be a liberal.

But with all these dominant influences already operating on one side of Congress, it is now proposed to abolish the small counterweight of one committee which sturdily stands up to emphasize economy and efficiency. Senator BYRD is not likely to be silenced that easily, nor will he be alone in the fight.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I next ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Valuable Publicity Medium," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Monday, February 27, 1950.

This editorial strongly defends the Byrd Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and points out how the committee has had a restraining effect on Federal departments and agencies.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VALUABLE "PUBLICITY MEDIUM"

Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, wants to abolish the Byrd Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures on the ground that it is "used only as a publicity medium." But a lot of people who are more worried about Federal spending than Senator HUMPHREY seems to be will contend that the committee's publicity activities are a very good reason for continuing it in existence.

It is true that Senator BYRD and his colleagues of the joint group have publicized freely and often the inefficiencies and extravagances of the Government. The committee has kept the spotlight focused on the growing size of the executive establishment, a trend that is all the more disturbing in view of the fact that the war emergency ended nearly 5 years ago. It is hard to measure the benefits of this publicity in specific terms. There is good cause to believe, however, that the watchdog role of the Byrd committee has had a restraining effect not only on the departments and independent agencies but on Congress as well.

To those who regard governmental retrenchment and thrift as old-fashioned and unnecessary, the joint committee's frequent reports on Federal expansion and spending are understandably irritating. That, in itself, is as good an argument as any for making certain that the committee keeps up the good work. The relatively small cost of maintaining this congressional "publicity medium" is a profitable investment, the returns on which, in terms of administrative savings, can be large indeed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Never Say Senator HUMPHREY Is Opposed to All Retrenchment," from a recent issue of the Baltimore Sun.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEVER SAY SENATOR HUMPHREY IS OPPOSED TO ALL RETRENCHMENT

Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, a standout even among the left-wing democracy as a talker and a spender, is mad at Senator BYRD. What troubles him particularly is the Byrd Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. And guess what Senator HUMPHREY objects to in the joint committee? Its expenditures in 9 years of $100,000 for expenses. This, says the junior gentleman from Minnesota, is the "No. 1 example of waste and extravagance."

In other words, Senator HUMPHREY stands for one retrenchment: He wants to economize on devices aimed at economy.

Pennsylvania Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the testimony I gave before the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on behalf of Pennsylvania flood control and rivers and harbors projects.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have always enjoyed these appearances I've made, through the years before your committee to ask for sufficient appropriations to carry on flood control and rivers and harbors projects in Pennsylvania and nearby States effectively.

These flood control and rivers and harbors projects represent gains which may prove themselves at any time, perhaps tomorrow if the spring rains begin. They represent positive increases in the amount of revenue gained from our income-tax laws. They forestall what has always been, in my mind, Government expenditure which should have been avoided—appropriation of emergency funds for the relief of flood-stricken area. These emergency expenditures offer no long-range relief—no steps which could prevent another flood tomorrow, or next week, or next year.

We have heard a great deal of debate in the Senate these past few weeks on conditions brought about by lack of water in the far West—and possible remedies. And not too long ago newspapers throughout the country headlined the story of the water shortage in the metropolitan New York area and those chaveless Thursdays.

But the water problem is an old story to those of us in Pennsylvania. Our problem, throughout the history of the Keystone State—so important to the industrial production of this country—has been to control the waters we do have. We have too much water—or at least too much water in the wrong places. As I have previously told this committee, there's hardly an area of Pennsylvania whose residents are not acutely aware of problems arising from our waterways. We have several outstanding ports and harbors in Pennsylvania, and the economy of the entire State rests upon continued efficient operation of those ports. At the same time, Pennsylvania has many areas which are extremely vulnerable to floods which cause severe hardship and dislocation as well as a substantial amount of real suffering and even loss of life.

Your committee has a long history of recognizing the importance of those projects in Pennsylvania. I have always felt, after completing such testimony as I am giving today, that the people in Pennsylvania are indeed fortunate that the men who are on the Appropriations Committee have shown a real understanding of the worth-whileness of flood-control and rivers and harbors projects. One could easily understand the temptation felt by your committee to make these projects the "whipping boy" and to thereby present to Congress and to the people of the country a more economy-minded budget. But as I have said so many times in the past, such economy is false economy. It represents saving $1 today and throwing away $6 tomorrow. Consistently, your committee has rejected this temptation. Consistently, you have provided at least minimum funds, have overcome attempts to cut to a foolhardy sum the amount appropriated for civil functions projects. Let me say at this time the people of Pennsylvania are sincerely grateful for these past actions. The volume of mail I receive asking me to thank you for such affirmative and responsible actions is just one indication of their gratitude.

The Corps of Army Engineers have done in the past—and shall, I know, continue to do—a remarkable job in giving our country the

maximum in flood-control protection and rivers and harbors improvement at the minimum cost. They want to accomplish the most possible for all the country.

That's why I am convinced the amounts recommended by the engineers and adjusted by the Bureau of the Budget should be completely appropriated, with no cuts. These recommendations are not the result of guesswork; they are based on the studied judgment of men especially trained in this highly technical, complex work. Careful consideration was given to fiscal requirements of the projects now under way. The estimates provide for a minimum rate of progress consistent with logical construction programing and timing of the various features of the individual projects.

And, of course, any proposed figures of the engineers were subjected to the careful scrutiny of the Budget Bureau. So, the amounts finally listed in the budget are not high—far from it. It would probably be much more accurate to say that in many cases they represent the very barest minimum needs.

I honestly feel that any reduction in the estimates before you will inevitably result in increased costs to the Federal Government. The engineers have pointed out that such increased costs might be direct and tangible—such as those associated with the closing down of a contract due to insufficient funds. Intangible increased costs are also involved. Consider the increased contingency factors in future Government contracts to protect the contractor against losses resulting from the necessity of operating major equipment at a rate below that necessary for efficient operation.

At this point, what Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of the Engineers, told the House committee considering these same appropriations bears repeating. He pointed out that "Longer construction periods require additional costs for inspection and supervision over the extended construction period." Eventually, we must do the job anyway. And to stretch out and delay work from year to year only succeeds in propagating the eventual costs involved. That, obviously, is not economy. It is the worst type of short-sightedness.

I would now like to go into just a little detail on the various projects which most directly affect Pennsylvania. First let me discuss flood-control projects.

1. Conemaugh Reservoir: The total cost of this project is $44,200,000. Of this amount, $26,715,000 has already been appropriated. The 1951 budget calls for $9,000,000, which will put the project within about a year of completion.

The importance of this Pittsburgh area in the industrial production picture of our country hardly need be emphasized at this time. Any cut-off in production in this area because of flood conditions is bound to have an immediate effect throughout the 48 States. Perhaps the fact that the Pittsburgh district alone outproduces each of 36 States will present a more graphic picture of what I'm saying here.

Unfortunately, such a flood is more than a if-could-happen-here affair. It has happened here, many times, with the St. Patrick's Day flood of 1936 the most disastrous one in recent years. That flood alone caused $130,000,000 worth of damage in just the Pittsburgh area.

That flood, let me point out, did not merely hit the pocketbook of the individuals, factory owners, or factory workers, or businessmen in this area. That flood also resulted in greatly decreased revenue for our Government. Western Pennsylvania alone paid more income tax to the United States Treasury in 1946 than 44 States.

This reservoir is on the stream which caused the great damage in 1936. It is the key dam in the whole flood-control project around the Pittsburgh district, and will do as much for Pittsburgh and the whole Ohio Valley in providing defense against future floods as all of the existing reservoirs combined now accomplish in flood protection for that area.

2. Sunbury: The total estimated Federal cost of the Sunbury diking system is $7,300,000. Of this, $5,856,000 has been appropriated to date, and the Engineers are asking for $1,200,000 to make their work 96 percent complete. The money will be used for flood walls, pumping stations and interceptor sewers. I know it is always particularly satisfying to me—and it must be to you also—to see that a project has finally been completed. Incomplete protection, no matter what amount has been expended, just does not do the job if and when a community finds itself facing flood waters.

3. East Branch Clarion Reservoir: The total estimated Federal cost of this reservoir is $9,612,000. To date, $5,388,600 has been appropriated, and this year's budget calls for an additional $2,000,000. This dam is one of the major protections against floods for Johnsonburg, Ridgeway, and the upper Clarion Valley.

Work on this reservoir has reached the point where any interruption, even for a year, would prove very costly. The closure is to be effected shortly. And unless work is continued, the portion of the dam already constructed will have to be protected—this is an earth dam and such dams must be completed once they are started.

4. York: The $90,100 requested for fiscal year 1951 will complete this $5,100,000 project. There was no appropriation for construction in 1950. This modest sum will be used to rebuild a local wall built by local interests.

5. Williamsport: The total estimated Federal cost of this project is $17,000,000. Of this, $9,344,000 has been appropriated, and this year's budget provides for an additional $1,200,000. This project illustrates perfectly what I mean by saying flood control projects can prove their value in dollars and cents. The Williamsport flood-protection program was first authorized by Congress in 1936. Since that time—only 14 years—Williamsport has had two floods—one in March 1946, and another in May 1946—which caused damages totaling more than the total cost of this project.

And the Williamsport story, too, indicates the weakness in the argument of those who would have us go ahead with construction at a slow rate to drag out the costs of the projects. Ten years after the project was authorized, the partial construction that had been accomplished did not help in the least to hold back the flood waters.

Fortunately for the people of Williamsport, the engineers have made considerable progress on the project since 1946 and by November of last year, the work had approached the stage of providing the proposed degree of protection for the central portion of Williamsport, bounded by Lycoming Creek, the west branch of Susquehanna and Miller's Run.

The congressional action authorizing the Williamsport project provided that the works should be maintained and operated upon completion by a local cooperating agency in accordance with Army regulations. The city government has already taken preliminary steps to handle this responsibility.

We must not assume that just because one section of the Williamsport project is completed, we can let the other portions go for a few years. As I told this committee last year, the flood wall around Williamsport proper could well divert stream flow in high water into the Newberry section and wash out railroad lines and threaten a great many residences.

These then are the budget amounts for construction work of flood-control projects in Pennsylvania. They should, in my opinion, all be approved.

MAINTENANCE

In addition to appropriations for construction work in flood controls, the engineers have asked for funds to maintain the projects already in operation. I do not see how anyone can oppose these appropriations—nothing would be more ridiculous than to appropriate millions of dollars to build these projects and then to refuse to appropriate the funds to maintain them. I therefore ask this committee to approve the $60,000 requested for the Tionesta Reservoir; $60,000 for the Crooked Creek Reservoir; $33,500 for the Mahoning Creek Reservoir; $40,000 for the Loyalhanna Reservoir; $60,000 for the Youghiogheny Reservoir; $15,000 for the Johnstown project; $8,000 for the Punxsutawney project completed this year; and $18,000 for the York project, which includes the care of 180 flood gates.

PLANNING

There's still another phase to the engineers' work in flood control. That, of course, is the planning work that must be done for projects already authorized by Congress. As you know, people who live in areas constantly threatened by floods find it difficult to understand why it takes so long for actual work to begin, even after a project has been authorized. They have the right to expect that Congress will appropriate enough funds to permit the engineers to go ahead drawing up plans, plans which when translated into actual construction will mean great savings in property damages and even in loss of lives.

The following amounts have been requested by the engineers for planning funds in Pennsylvania—$30,000 for the Allegheny River Reservoir; $50,000 for the Allentown project; $50,000 for the Bear Creek Reservoir; $10,000 for Johnsonburg; $25,000 for Prompton Reservoir; $50,000 for Shenango River; $30,000 for Swoyersville and Forty Fort, and $40,000 for Uniontown. I urge the committee to appropriate the full budget amount and give the people in areas affected by these projects the assurance they are not being forgotten.

RIVERS AND HARBORS PROJECTS

At this point, I would like to take up certain rivers and harbors projects. Unfortunately, it is always a bit more difficult to get people enthusiastic about this type of work. News of a flood can always make the headlines, but discovery that a harbor vitally important to the economic welfare of our country is rapidly filling up and may soon become useless can only get into one of the back pages.

The fact of the matter is—those projects do have an intimate tie-up with the economic well-being of our country. Reduction in funds for navigation improvements and maintenance can seriously affect our industrial and commercial state of health.

1. Morgantown lock and dam, Monongahela River: This project involved a total estimated Federal cost of $8,850,000. Of this amount $6,800,000 has already been appropriated and this year's budget calls for $2,000,000, which will make the project 88 percent complete.

Though located in West Virginia, this project is of great importance to Pittsburgh and to the steel and coal industries of western Pennsylvania. The new construction will replace two older, hand-operated locks which are no longer adequate to handle the volume of business activity in the Morgantown area, greatly expanded during the war years.

2. Schuylkill River, above Fairmount Dam: The engineers justify this $52,000,000 project—only $17,000,000 of which is to come

from the Federal Government, with the remainder from State and local interests—on the basis of savings to Government in maintenance dredging of navigation channels in Delaware and Schuylkill Rivers, reduction of flood hazards, and betterment of quality of water for domestic and industrial uses. As a life-long Philadelphian, who has been greatly concerned over the tremendous waste of water potential because of the filthy condition of the Schuylkill, and as a Member of Congress who has watched the Federal Government expend thousands of dollars in dredging navigation channels of these rivers, I can personally testify to the accuracy of the engineers' claims. That's why I so welcomed the opportunity of sponsoring the original enabling legislation in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Already we can begin to see the results of work on this project. In one section the stream is now carrying less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the solid matter it carried 2 years ago.

Of the $4,000,000 asked for this year $215,000 will be used for completion of disposal areas for Plymouth and Flat Rock pools, $1,000,000 for dredging Plymouth pool and partially dredging Flat Rock pool, and $2,785,000 for the Darby Creek disposal area and partial dredging of the Fairmount pool.

If waste material is allowed to remain on the bottom of the stream—as has been the case all those many years—any agitation of the stream during floods moves it down into existing channels below dams, where it has to be dredged out.

3. Ohio River lock and dam construction: Of total estimated Federal cost of this all-important project, $111,621,000 has already been appropriated. This year's budget calls for an additional $500,000, the money to be used to extend guide walls on two of the locks.

As you undoubtedly know, the Ohio River is probably the heaviest-used river in the United States. The two locks in question are ones where tows of considerable size come loaded out of Pittsburgh with heavy, bulky iron products and the like. The construction work has been scheduled because of the considerable difficulty encountered here in recent years.

4. Ohio River, open-channel work: This project involves a total Federal expenditure of $21,114,000. To date, $15,589,000 has been appropriated and this year's budget sets aside an additional $250,250. There is no overlapping between the Ohio River lock and dam construction and this open-channel work. Here the engineers are concerned with channel dredging between the locks and dams and in the pools—with dredging and widening channels in constricted areas, with lengthening turns and with taking out bars. Though the work done is similar in character to regular maintenance work on the Ohio, the engineers will operate here in previously untouched areas.

In regard to both of these Ohio River projects, let me reemphasize that the Ohio River might well be the most important waterway in our country. It moves through highly populated cities like Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Louisville, Wheeling—cities which are really the heart of this country's industrial production.

The barge traffic alone on the Ohio last year totaled 6,600,000,000 ton-miles. When we compare this with the annual average of 3,000,000,000 ton-miles during the 5 years preceding the war, we can see clearly why locks and dams 40 or more years old could not handle the increased traffic unless we complete the job of making the Ohio River a modern waterway.

5. Lock 2, Monongahela River: The total estimated Federal cost of this project is $15,690,000. The $8,760,000 requested this year will make the project 73 percent completed.

The lock involved in this construction work is practically within the city limits of Pittsburgh. With this money, the riverward lock will be completed and the landward lock initiated. The old lock being replaced is completely inadequate to do the job.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF RIVERS AND HARBORS PROJECTS

This completes the list of new construction work on rivers and harbors in Pennsylvania. As for the money requested for maintenance and operation of such projects, what I've just said about such appropriations for flood-control projects is equally true for these projects. There is simply no point in permitting a harbor to fill up after we've spent much clearing it out.

I, therefore, request the full budget amount for the Monongahela River—$69,300 for maintenance dredging in the pools formed by the dams and $1,011,500 for operation and care of existing locks and dams; Allegheny River—$33,500 for maintenance dredging and $342,700 for operation and care of locks and dams; Youghiogheny River—$20,000 for maintenance dredging in the 9-foot channel between the mouth of the river and McKeesport; Ohio River lock and dam construction and open-channel work—$8,835,700 for maintenance; Schuylkill River—$1,000,000 to maintain dredging necessary to provide adequate facilities for the large commerce, amounting in 1948 to about 15,000,000 tons; Erie Harbor—$67,000 for dredging to maintain the 25- and 26-foot depths in channel entrances and the harbor itself, ranging in depth from 18 to 23 feet.

I would like to go into a bit more detail on the maintenance funds for the Delaware River, particularly that portion between Philadelphia and the sea. The budget amount for this portion is $3,248,000. There seems to be considerable doubt whether even this amount will do the trick in dredging this important harbor to its authorized 40-foot depth, and the engineers are now preparing a report for me on the present situation. We are faced here with the problem of a harbor allowed to shoal up, during the war years, to a depth considerably less than its authorized one.

I also recommend that the engineers be appropriated the $200,000 needed to maintain dredging in that section of the Delaware between Philadelphia and Trenton.

PRELIMINARY SURVEYS

The engineers should also be allowed $2,000,000 requested for examinations and surveys—surveys so essential if we are to have an up-to-date assessment of conditions of our waterways.

SPECIAL REQUESTS

The Senate as yet has had no opportunity to vote on the omnibus civil-functions bill which has been delayed in committee for so long. But chances now seem good for a vote on these projects in the near future.

In view of this, I would like to request that the Appropriations Committee authorize planning funds for certain of these projects. If such action is not taken now, these projects—all of them really needed—will face another year of postponement.

Dyberry Reservoir for the Lackawanna River is one such project, and $50,000 in planning funds are needed. This is the companion reservoir to the Prompton Reservoir for which Congress appropriated planning funds last year. Originally the two reservoirs were slated to be constructed simultaneously, but the House cut Dyberry out of its 1948 omnibus bill.

The Bradford flood-control project, also in the Senate omnibus bill now pending, has a long history of delays. Right after a preliminary survey was completed by the engineers in 1947, a flood hit Bradford, a major one. And 1948 brought still another flood. Because of these floods, the engineers were forced to resurvey the area, and the project could not be included in any authorization bill until this present one. Surely, though, these two floods in this important crude-oil production area are the best sort of proof that Congress must act now. Furthermore, the State which is to contribute a substantial sum to the project cannot act until Congress actually appropriates money. About $50,000 is needed for planning funds for the Bradford project.

I further request that $100,000 be appropriated for planning funds to make further improvements in the Monongahela. Though the work involved here would be done in West Virginia, it would have an important beneficial effect on the entire steel-producing section, of which Pittsburgh is the heart.

A few last words. We in Congress know the long legislative road these projects must travel from the time their need is first acutely felt until they are completed. There's the investigating by the Representative and Senator before he decides to introduce the necessary bill, the preliminary survey by the engineers, the congressional authorization, the detailed planning by the engineers, and finally the appropriations which must be fought for over a period of years. I remain convinced that any project which could not prove itself, in terms of saving of lives, or of property, or as a necessary defense or industrial measure, simply would not be a topic of conversation this morning. These projects are needed, and needed now.

Rabbi Nachum David Herman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the observance of the sixty-seventh anniversary of the Hebron Yeshivah and its National Youth Rehabilitation Center of Jerusalem. This anniversary is being celebrated this month by all freedom-loving people who believe that the foundation of democracy is allegiance to God.

This morning, at the opening of the session, Rabbi Nachum David Herman, American chairman of the anniversary committee, delivered the invocation. May I say a few words about my distinguished friend and spiritual leader. Rabbi Herman was born and bred in New York City. He graduated from Hebron Yeshivah in Jerusalem, and thereafter did postgraduate work at the Fountain of the Great in Jerusalem. He is presently rabbi of the Congregation Tifereth Israel, Bedford Avenue and Clymer Street, Brooklyn, the largest orthodox synagogue in America.

Rabbi Herman was appointed by the chief rabbi of Israel, Dr. Isaac Herzog, as chairman of the anniversary committee, and in conjunction with this high

honor bestowed upon him, Rabbi Herman is now preparing a manuscript depicting 20 centuries of Jewish history evolving around the study of the Torah and religious observance which sustained the Jews in every corner of the world, despite the tidal waves of anti-Semitism which uprooted them, stymied civilization and cast a blot upon our generation, a blot that has yet to be erased before the supreme bench of justice.

Our democracy under God is an amalgamation of minorities, each contributing its share of culture, making our Nation truly representative of harmonious living and a challenge to bigots and rabble rousers who would want us divided.

Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor Supports Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, following is a declaration on point 4 adopted by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor at its recent meeting and transmitted to me by Chairman Matthew Woll of the International Labor Relations Committee, A. F. of L. It is an eloquent statement of labor's determination to give all-out support in the struggle for free institutions and individual liberty now going on in the world:

DECLARATION ON POINT 4 ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, A. F. OF L.

After giving careful consideration to the report of Assistant Secretary of State Willard Thorp on point 4, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor declares:

1. We reaffirm our support of the guiding lines and policies elaborated in the comprehensive resolution adopted by our sixty-eighth convention held at St. Paul in October 1949 dealing with President Truman's point 4 program.

2. In view of the disaster which has befallen the great Chinese people through the overrunning of their country by the Russian-directed military forces and fifth column operating under the orders of the Cominform, the executive council underscores the great urgency of speeding up the application of point-4 policies in the non-Communist areas and countries of Asia.

3. In line with our convention declaration, we urge our Government to aid the Republic of India in overcoming its immediate food difficulties, in developing public education, and in the improvement of her public health. We also urge American initiative in the World Bank for a loan to speed the development of an agricultural extension service in India. Vigorous and generous application of point 4 to Formosa, where encouraging economic achievements have already been obtained through the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction, will not only further improve the economic and social conditions on this very important island of resistance to Communist totalitarianism in China. It will also dramatize to the people of occupied China and to freedom-loving people everywhere that America has not turned its back on the struggle for liberty and national independence in this vast Asiatic country with which our Nation has always had the friendliest relations.

4. We cannot reaffirm too strongly our convention resolution which emphasizes that labor must have adequate representation in the formulation and application of specific plans and policies and that technical aid to underdeveloped areas in Asia and elsewhere should include provisions for the transmission of bona fide free-trade union, cooperative, and farmers' know-how which will enable the workers and peasants of Asia to build effective, democratic unions and self-help organizations. This will permit the toiling folks of Asia not only to secure their material betterment but also to enhance their appreciation of their dignity as human beings on a basis of equality with all other races and peoples on other continents. American aid to such moral and spiritual enhancement will far outweigh in importance and lasting value the generous dollar aid we have been providing for the conquest of poverty and tyranny and for overcoming the threat of war.

5. The successes attained to date through the ERP, in raising the levels of production in the countries aided, only underline the necessity of preparing now for the time when the Marshall plan as such will end. It is clear that in the interest of developing a sound and balanced economy in the free part of the world, the democratic nations must lose no time in combining the various measures taken under ERP and point 4. There can be no effective integration of the economy of democratic Europe unless its economic life becomes more closely related with that of Africa, the Western Hemisphere, and the democratic countries and areas of Asia. More and more western Europe should be able to find markets for its manufactured products in the under-developed countries. Given this common outlet, the various European national economies, which are competitive in many respects, would tend to integrate more easily. In return, these underdeveloped areas could provide western Europe with the raw materials which it needs for its manufacturing industries. By following such a policy, we would be able to eliminate any attempts to expand business relations with Russian-dominated areas and thus to prevent the feeling of appeasement generated by business-as-usual tactics. This business-as-usual attitude might prove catastrophic to the democratic cause in the event of German heavy industry producing for the Chinese market. The present Russian baby blockade of Berlin and the Communists' accelerated national unity campaign in Germany are no doubt part of the Kremlin's over-all strategy for wearing out and drawing Germany into Moscow's military economic orbit. Thereby, Russia hopes to conquer Europe and Asia.

6. The urgency of gradually combining the basic features of ERP and point 4 is made all the more imperative by the fact that the increased productive capacities of Europe and America are operating in a much-reduced trade area. Totalitarian communism has torn out of the world market nearly half the population and about one-quarter of the area of the entire globe. Because Russia and its satellites in Europe and Asia have militarized their economies and are gearing themselves solely for aggressive warfare, very little trade in the normal and peaceful sense of the word is possible for them.

7. In view of this critical situation, all efforts and energies of the democratic world should be bent toward raising the productive capacities of the free peoples and toward increasing the possibilities for mass consumption by improving their purchasing power and living standards. There is no other way of counteracting the effects of Russia's disruption of the world market. There is no better way of demonstrating the moral and material superiority, and assuring the triumph, of the democratic over the totalitarian Communist world than by our creating and expanding those conditions of life and labor which will enable many additional millions of people to attain more liberty, greater material well-being, and spiritual happiness.

Civil Liberties and the "War Bride" Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the House an editorial in the New York Times of last Saturday, March 4. This distinguished newspaper has done a notable public service in emphasizing the grave questions of civil liberties in the present procedure by which the Attorney General may exclude arriving aliens without a hearing. Two other outstanding newspapers, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the New York Post, have done an equally fine job of alerting the Government and the public about this issue.

Naturally, I can have no informed opinion about the merits of the case of Ellen Knauff. My concern in this matter is with the civil-liberties problem, which I believe is serious and immediate. I may say that the American Civil Liberties Union and the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers share this view. The bill referred to in the New York Times editorial which follows is H. R. 7476, to provide that aliens who have arrived in the United States shall not be excluded without a hearing:

THE CASE OF THE WAR BRIDE

The still-current case of the war bride who was denied admission to this country without a hearing may yet serve a notable purpose. It may yet result in bringing about a change in one remarkably un-American aspect of our immigration procedures.

The right—if one can call it that—of the Department of Justice to exercise the formidable power of barring aliens without explaining why stems from wartime regulations still in force. But we believe—and we are confident that most Americans believe—that irrespective of a man's citizenship as well as of his race, creed, or color, he should be informed of charges against him and should have the opportunity of answering them. In fact, denial of this simple proposition comes perilously close to falling into a pattern of thought characteristic of the police state.

This whole issue has been dramatized in recent weeks by the case of Mrs. Ellen Knauff. A few weeks ago the Supreme Court held that even though she was the war bride of an American citizen, she could be permanently barred from the United States without a hearing. But in an eloquent dissent, on which we commented at the time, Justice Jackson noted that not even a court can find out why the girl is excluded. She may or may not have been the victim of the malevolent, the misinformed, the meddlesome, and the corrupt. So far as the official record goes, neither she nor anyone outside the Justice Department can know. About to be deported, she was actually aboard ship this week when a last-minute habeas corpus proceeding gave her a respite at least until Monday.

Meanwhile, Representative F. D. ROOSEVELT has introduced legislation—since the Justice Department has shown strange reluctance to modify its own procedure—that would guarantee to aliens the right of every free man, i. e., the right to have a hearing, even if a secret one. We think it most important that the record of the United States be set straight on this issue, and that there be reaffirmed without equivocation the fundamental American belief in fair play—especially toward the weakest and the most defenseless.

Farm Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I do not think enough publicity has been given to the provisions of the Housing Act of 1949 which relate to farm housing. The fact that farm housing was included in the Housing Act proves that the Eighty-first Congress has the interests of farmers at heart. I think more people should realize what this act does.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include here a brief summary of the farm housing provisions of the Housing Act of 1949, as explained in a supplemental report of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

The title authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to extend through the Farmers' Home Administration three types of financial assistance to owners of farms to enable them to construct or repair dwellings and other buildings on their farms to provide them, their tenants, lessees, share croppers, and laborers with decent, safe, and sanitary living conditions and adequate farm buildings:

1. Loans up to 33 years at not to exceed 4 percent interest. The loans would not require a first mortgage on the farm property and could be secured by the farmer's equity in the farm.

2. Similiar loans, supplemented by annual contributions applied as a partial credit on interest and principal payments, to the owners of farms which are not presently self-sustaining but which, through a satisfactory program of enlargement, improvement, or adjusted farm practices, can be made self-sustaining within a period of not to exceed 10 years. The annual contributions could not be made available to a farm owner after the farm is made self-sustaining or, in any event, for more than 10 years.

3. Loans and grants for minor improvements and minimum repairs to farm dwellings and other farm buildings on farms which, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, cannot be made self-sustaining. The amount available in such cases would be limited to $1,000 for any one farm or dwelling or building owned by one individual, and not in excess of $2,000 in the aggregate to any one individual, and the grant portion with respect to any one dwelling or building could not exceed $500.

Loans are to be refinanced through cooperative or other responsible private credit sources whenever feasible.

Relation Between the Transportation Industry and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged on March 3, 1950, on the invitation of Brig. Gen. Paul F. Yount, president of the New York chapter, National Defense Transportation Association and commanding general of the New York port of embarkation, to speak before their group at the Statler Hotel, New York City, on the relation between the transportation industry and national defense. Under leave to extend my remarks, I append herewith my speech:

At the outset, I wish to thank General Yount for the kind invitation he, as president of the New York chapter of the National Defense Transportation Association, has extended to me to speak before this fine gathering of men and women who are keenly interested in the transportation industry and its relation to national defense. It is indeed an honor and a privilege, which I very deeply appreciate.

The Elder Count von Moltke, as most of the distinguished military gentlemen present here this evening will undoubtedly agree, was considered one of the greatest strategists of the latter half of the nineteenth century, and was proclaimed the creator of the modern method of directing armies in the field.

Even in his day, as it was in the time of Caesar, and as it is in ours, the question of properly expending the moneys allotted for his war machine was a perplexing one.

When the question was put to von Moltke as to how an allocated sum of money should be expended, he stated quite firmly and clearly, that he would rather have another railway than all the fortifications in the world. Thus, the father of modern strategy made it evident that transportation plays a paramount and vital role to be reckoned with when one considers national defense. And in these days, that subject—national defense—must be carefully considered.

However, to sing the praises of the importance of transportation to this assemblage is, I am sure, as superfluous as informing a young mother that she has an exceptionally beautiful and intelligent child. She knows it, just as you members of the National Defense Transportation Association are convinced that transportation, whether it be by sea, by land, or by air, is as important to the commerce of war as it is to the commerce of peace. And you know it—otherwise you would not be here—that your work and development now is essential to success in any future emergency.

The problems of transportation are basically similar, and the underlying principles are omnipresent whenever the law of supply and demand operates. Though the press of traffic is always greater in war than in any preceding period of peace, the fundamental principles established by democratic competition in time of peace are put to enthusiastic utility by the military in time of war.

It is in these days of cold, uneasy peace that we prepare, not only in the obvious manner of training reserve manpower, or intensifying mobilization plans for industry, but in the not so obvious method whereby vigorous and free peacetime competition tests the ingenuity of our people and develops tremendously effective operational and economic techniques.

Take an example which you all know, in the field of motor transport. By the interchangeability of truck bodies, a 1½-ton chassis can be paired with the standard cargo truck body, or a dump truck body, whichever is needed most. Another example of a highly developed peacetime technique exploited to great advantage by our Military Establishment in the past conflict was the development and the simplification in numbering of interchangeable spare parts.

It is in the countless numbers of such prosaic but businesslike methods that there was developed so many wonderous and amazing instruments of destruction, as if by magic, in the time that followed Pearl Harbor.

Since, as I have said, the problems of transportation are basically similar in war and peace, and the underlying principles are the same, it behooves us all to encourage, protect, and foster the needs for the transportation industry.

Since a healthy, well-nourished, and thriving transportation industry, as of right now, is a most important must to a strong and adequate transportation system in time of hostilities, you well may ask, "What, then, is being done by your Congress in the field of transportation legislation?" I am glad to report that much is being done. So much, in fact, that one could easily say that the subject of transportation with all of its wide ramifications—though perhaps not such a spectacular subject as, say, atomic development, is certainly of such importance as to occupy a great deal of the time of those who help guide the destiny of this Nation, as your elected Representatives.

I propose this evening to present the evidence of the awareness of Congress of the fundamental tie-up between the transportation industry and national defense. Presently on the agenda are bills covering each of the three major fields of transportation: Air, land, and water. I would like to discuss some pending developments in all three fields and highlight those that I consider extremely significant.

From the air viewpoint, analysis of some seven proposed items of legislation reveals that the bill entitled "The Air Merchant Marine Act of 1949" is of a far-reaching importance as the title would indicate. This act is patterned, as one would suspect, on the tried and tested Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Its purpose is to insure a number of cargo aircraft adequate to meet the potential commercial requirements of our Nation and to integrate that need with a number equal to meet our military reserve requirements.

This will be accomplished by the creation of the Aircraft Development Corporation, within the Department of the Air Force, which will be administered by that agency but which will exercise its function independently of the Secretary of the Air Force. It is proposed that this Corporation be initially capitalized at $100,000,000. Its functions will be to survey, study, and report to the Congress the potential commercial and military reserve requirements for cargo aircraft. So long as the number of cargo aircraft is inadequate to meet the needs of commercial cargo requirements and the military reserve, it will be the duty of the Corporation to purchase from manufacturers within the United States the number of cargo aircraft necessary to meet these needs. The planes so purchased will be leased by the Corporation to citizens engaged in the transportation of commodities in air commerce, provided, among other things, that 75 percent of the personnel employed by the lessee in connection with operation of leased cargo aircraft shall be members of the Reserve components of the armed forces. Quite naturally, such organizations will be susceptible to instant assimilation within the Air Force in time of emergency. So much for air.

In the field of water transportation, before discussing the aspects of pending legislation, I'd like first to make a distinction: the national policy on inland waterways and coastwise shipping is as much a matter of national defense as is our policy with respect to our intercoastal water shipping. However, in the case of the former, our problem is mainly one of integration, whereas with the latter, our problem is one of competition with foreign-flag shipping.

One might say that the difference which lies between our inland waterway policy and our ocean policy is like that difference existing between tactics and strategy; one is a problem of detail, and is local; the other is a problem of large scale, and is of worldwide scope.

But we cannot overlook the importance of the domestic scene in favor of the immediate international distractions. I well remember when opponents of the program to modernize the New York State Barge Canal (historically known as the Erie Canal), stated that putting money into such an enterprise was about as useful a project as building an ice house in the Arctic Circle. However, in the trying days of the war just past, it more than proved its worth; an unceasing 24-hour train of barges, tankers, tugs, and supply craft of all varieties moved on that modernized canal.

That lesson, I hope, has been well taught. Our inland waterways cannot be forgotten. They are necessary adjuncts of our national defense. At the present time there is pending a bill pertaining to the Inland Waterways Corporation which will carry out the announced congressional policy to continue the transportation services of the Corporation until, among other provisions, "there shall have been completed in the rivers where the Corporation operates, navigable channels as authorized by Congress, adequate for reasonably dependable and regular transportation service" * * * and * * * "terminal facilities shall have been provided on such rivers reasonably adequate for joint rail and water service."

So today, insofar as the national defense picture is concerned, there is certainly not found lacking consideration of the practicability of exploiting the natural assistance of our inland waters.

But now how about shipping on the high seas and our transportation policies in relation to our ships which ply the oceans engaged in world commerce? What is being done to strengthen national defense in this connection? A bill has been introduced which is of sweeping importance to industry as well as to the national defense concept, which would amend the Merchant Marine Act. This bill proposes to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine. It is of such sweeping significance it might be well to consider it rather fully.

As you know, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was the basis for the development of our merchant marine, privately owned and operated by our citizens, but available as auxiliary to the armed forces in time of national emergency.

The establishment of such a merchant marine assists immeasurably in the development and advancement of the know-how necessary for the construction of modern ships and provide for their operation so that there might always be available an auxiliary force in the event of an emergency such as has arisen twice in the past generation.

Under our system of free enterprise constant effort is made to avoid Government subsidy to specific industries. The need for an adequate and well-balanced merchant marine has always been well recognized, and in these troubled times it has been essential and desirable to foster and bolster such a merchant marine with Government aid when necessary. Due to existing economic conditions in the other maritime nations, it is essential to provide some form of Government assistance which will aid in offsetting the unequal advantage held by competitor nations with their lower standards.

Our military leaders have repeatedly attested to the necessity for the continued development of the merchant marine. Therefore, in order to avoid wasteful expenditure of colossal sums and to conserve precious time in a future emergency, it is clearer now than ever that we should foster as strong a merchant-marine development policy as we do for the other branches of the Government concerned with national defense and security.

Without going into all the intricate details of the proposed amendment to our Merchant Marine Act, I would like to point out one or two phases of it. First, let us touch on the subject of "construction-differential subsidy," with which the act is principally concerned. First, the term itself. What does the term "construction-differential subsidy" mean? We've all noticed that term in the newspapers, and of late, since discussion of the proposed amendment, its use has become increasingly prevalent, and rightly so, since around that phrase is the nub of contention.

Well, we all know that subsidy means to aid or promote a private enterprise with public money. What about this "construction differential"? It can best be explained by illustration. For example, the X Steamship Co. wants to build a ship. The lowest bid for construction is twenty million. But they won't have to pay that twenty million, for the Maritime Commission has ascertained and determined that the vessel would cost only fifteen million if built in a foreign port. Therefore, that's all the X Steamship Co. pays. The Government pays the difference. That is an illustration of how "construction-differential subsidy" works. In my opinion this is a small price to pay for insurance for the future. In case of another emergency, when we need the ship, it will be there, and this may well serve to prevent future Bataans or Corregidors.

Now the old act (that is the one presently in effect) provides for the granting of the "construction-differential subsidy" upon operation of the vessel so aided, on specific essential services, routes, or lines in the foreign commerce of the United States. The new bill proposes to maintain the subsidy, but to eliminate the restriction by extending such provisions to vessels to be constructed for the inland waterways and intercoastal trades, and removing the requirement that vessels receiving "construction-differential subsidies" be operated on certain essential trade routes. This will serve to encourage the creation of liner services to many places not presently served with correspondingly beneficial effect on foreign commerce to those places, as well as to ourselves.

This amendment will eliminate the provision which prohibits operating differential subsidy contractors, or any of their affiliates, subsidiaries, or associated firms from engaging in the domestic, intercoastal or coastwise service without the written permission of the Maritime Commission.

As I mentioned previously, there are other details. However, the expansion of the subsidies for the shipping industry is the most significant aspect of the proposed amendment to the Merchant Marine Act, and the controversy over its execution has created a great deal of congressional interest. So far, it appears that the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget have signaled their opposition to it. It is endorsed by the Maritime Commission, and the Departments of Defense and Navy are expected to back up the Commission.

Thus far I have discussed piecemeal and in a fragmentary way certain items of pending legislation pertaining to the transportation industry which concerns national defense.

But in my mind, the most momentous item of legislation pertaining to national defense and transportation, I have yet left untouched. In prefacing this subject, I would like to quote to you a paragraph from Edward Hungerford's excellent book, Transport for War. In his discussion of the men in the transportation industry, whom we know as the many-numbered brethren of Casey Jones, Mr. Hungerford says, "in the last analysis, a railroad is a far-flung army, a well-organized and long-standing army of men and locomotives and trains, all working in unison. Its men long since were trained in discipline and in organized effort just as are the soldiers of any well-trained army. They are on an unceasing lookout for emergency or disaster: flood, holocaust, washed-out bridge. Any of these things can come to pass in a day's work. The railroaders are trained to meet them. In the present emergency (he was referring to World War II, of course) the armed forces of the United States found this railroad army already trained and seasoned, quite ready to do their bidding and work side by side with them." My point in quoting this to you is not only to indicate my agreement with every word of it, but to go further and state that it is not only the men of the railways, but those of the highways, the airways, and the shipping lanes as well who, in the last analysis, are a far-flung complement, an organized and long-standing army of men, working in unison, men long since trained in discipline and in organized effort just as are the soldiers of any well-trained army.

And what's more, I have cited this passage and added my comments to emphasize the fact that factually and psychologically, there is a great natural unity and affinity between the industry of transportation and the problem of national defense.

I would like to quote again, this time from an equally excellent and scholarly source, the fine joint achievement of Professors Johnson, Huebner, and Wilson, in their comprehensive work on the subject of transportation. "It is a mistake," they say, "to consider the various types of transportation and carriers as separate and isolated business enterprises. They are not * * * They may serve international, national, sectional, or local areas. Essentially, however, they are parts of a transportation system, the integration and coordination of which constitutes one of the most important economic problems of recent times."

Again I agree with the learned authors, and again I would like to go further and state that not only is the integration and coordination of transportation one of the most important economic problems—it is one of the most important problems from the standpoint of national defense. Accordingly, there has been presented before the Senate and House identical bills for the establishment of a Department of Transportation. This proposes a Secretary of Transportation who will have the following already established governmental agencies assigned to his department:

The Interstate Commerce Commission.

The United States Maritime Commission.

The Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, the Weather Bureau, the Inland Waterways Corporation; and most important, the Office of Defense Transportation.

So, ladies and gentlemen, you see at long last the development of a focal point—a long needed heart and soul—for the transportation industry: One general, high-level administrative authority for the coordination of the national transportation system, and the establishment of a national transportation policy which will be, as it must be, a bulwark to our national defense.

Of course, with the possible establishment of this Department of Transportation, there will be by no means an infringement upon the continuance of private ownership and operation.

Today, the keynote in Government is the same as it was in 1787—unification. It is nothing new. The Latin phrase, "E Pluribus Unum"—"One out of many"—is as basically sound as the coins upon which that phrase is engraved.

Unity is the keynote; for in unity there is strength. Besides, there is a diminishing distinction between the civilian and the soldier, and there is a necessity not only for unification of the Military Establishment for the purpose of national defense, but a unification of the armed forces with industry, including the transportation industry, for that same purpose.

It is foolish to keep up the nineteenth century distinctions between the soldier and the civilian when we live in a world which is manufacturing missiles of destruction that do not know, and are incapable of knowing, any such difference. These weapons are cold bloodedly indifferent as to who, or what, is to be its victim.

And whether we like it or not, we must face the cold fact, that in the case of another conflict, it will not be some far-off beachhead with a foreign-sounding name which will be the target for the night. There will be no strange, fantastic name like Bizk, Morotai, Wadke. There will be names of places familiar to our ears, like Seattle, like Chicago, like New York.

Gentlemen, you have a responsibility when you walk out of this fine hotel this evening and breathe the free, fresh air. For it is up to you, in or out of the armed forces, as someone connected with the dynamic transportation industry through which, and by which, the lifeblood of the Nation flows in either tranquil or contentious times.

As that individual it is not only your patriotic duty, it is your very personal, moral duty to the principles which you carry within yourself, to think and act to integrate and affiliate your particular transportation endeavor with national defense.

And you can do it, gentlemen, whether it be in the crating of boxes for domestic shipment or in the planning for the sailing of a fleet to the far-flung reaches of the earth. If you think your task is really too insignificant I'd like to remind you of a fable we all learned in childhood which we are now too prone to forget:

"Because of the nail, the shoe was lost,
"Because of the shoe, the horse was lost,
"Because of the horse, the rider was lost,
"Because of the rider, the cause was lost."

I want to thank you for your kind indulgence, and to publicly acknowledge a debt of gratitude to my dear friend, Col. Norman Gold, who is responsible for stimulating my interest in the problems of transportation. Up to a few months ago my love was social legislation. I'm afraid from now on I may be accused of being a little Schlo.

Highways and Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the forty-seventh annual meeting of the American Road Builders' Association, March 6, 1950, at Cincinnati, Ohio, to wit:

HIGHWAYS AND CIVILIZATION

Civilizations have always advanced as highways have been constructed. A country or a community without roads is a country or a community which has never developed. Highways and progress have always gone hand in hand.

MOST IMPORTANT ROAD

The highest road in the world is in the Peruvian Andes. The longest is the old Silk Road in central Asia. The finest is the Appian Way. The most heavily traveled is between New York and Philadelphia. But the most important road in all the world is the road that passes by one's own door.

ANCIENT ROADS

There are records of the existence of roads in Europe, Asia, and Africa as early as 3000 B. C. At first they were used for the transportation of precious stones and spices. They were also used for policing and collecting taxes from subject peoples.

The Amber roads, as the name suggests, were first used for the transportation of amber and metals, and later on for furs and tin. These roads extended north and south as well as east and west in Europe.

The Lapis Lazuli road led from the Lapis mines in northeastern Afghanistan across south Persia and then northward to the Mediterranean ports. Lapis lazuli were precious stones used by the ancients for decoration.

One of the great Silk roads led from China to the Mediterranean ports. Another of the Silk roads led from east central China across Burma into India. It was over these routes that the products of China were first introduced to Europe.

The famous Tin Road led from Cornwall in England to the shore where tin was carried by ships to Denmark. The Tin Road then followed the amber roads to the Mediterranean area.

ROMAN ROADS

The earliest roads about which definite construction facts are known are those of ancient Rome. The oldest and most celebrated Roman road for the grandeur of its work was the Appian Way and it was built in 312 B. C. Roman roads are outstanding in engineering and construction. Many of them still remain to form the foundation of modern roads. They were the arteries by which the culture of that day was introduced to the barbarian lands of France, Spain, and England. Between 300 B. C. and 400 A. D. approximately 50,000 miles of Roman roads were constructed. Ethlyn Miller Hardwick, in these lines, tells of the greatness of Roman roads:

"Great roads the Romans built that men might meet
And walls to keep strong men apart, secure;
Now centuries are gone, and in defeat
The walls are fallen, but the roads endure."

FRENCH ROADS

France started a national system of roads in 1597. Adequate drainage was provided. These roads were surfaced with broken rock.

ENGLISH ROADS

John L. Macadam, the distinguished Englishman, in the eighteenth century utilized scientific principles in the construction of roads. Macadam emphasized surfacing and drainage. Macadamized roads are named for him.

AMERICAN ROADS

The roads of the United States are most significant to us. They are responsible for the development of the motor vehicle and for the industrial and agricultural progress of our country. Thomas Jefferson early recognized the importance of roads. He stated that it was much more rational to spend public money for roads than for waging war. George Washington, in 1785, in a letter to Patrick Henry, said that the convenience of the country required that roads leading from one public place to another should be straightened and established by law.

WILDERNESS ROAD

The development of the United States west of the Alleghenies did not begin until the Wilderness Road was opened in 1796. Prior to that time there was no road westward to accommodate vehicles. With the opening of the Wilderness Road mountains were crossed and exploration westward began. Pioneers opened the trails. The Army followed close behind constructing forts to protect against Indian raids.

GREAT TRAILS OF THE WEST

The great trails of the West provided for the explorations which began early in the nineteenth century. The travels of the pioneers are among the most thrilling annals in American history. They followed the Santa Fe, the Overland, and the Oregon Trails. They settled for the United States the great domains of the West. These trails were remarkable. They were the principal routes of travel. One of them—the Oregon Trail—has been described as the most remarkable route known to history. No transit located a foot of it. No level established its grades. No engineer built any bridges or surveyed the mountain passes. The general quality of the 2,000 miles of the Oregon Trail was most remarkable.

THE GALLATIN PLAN

As the United States expanded from the Atlantic seaboard across the Alleghenies, the need for roads was emphasized. In 1808, Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury, formulated a comprehensive plan in which he recommended the construction of a continuous turnpike to provide for travel from Maine to Georgia which would unite the major seaports along the Atlantic coast. He also recommended roads across the Alleghenies between the Atlantic Ocean and the great western rivers. The plan was never adopted because of sectional differences and on account of its alleged unconstitutionality.

CUMBERLAND OR NATIONAL ROAD

In response to the need for transportation in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, Congress appropriated funds for a number of road projects. As early as 1806 appropriations were made for the Cumberland, or National Road. Maintenance of the road depended upon the collection of tolls, but there was violent opposition to tolls then as now. In 1822 President Monroe vetoed a bill to provide for the collection of tolls to maintain the Cumberland Road. The road extended to Wheeling and then across Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, to St. Louis.

TOLLS THEN AND NOW

The veto message of President Monroe in which he refused to approve the collection of tolls on a road for which Congress had made appropriations inaugurated the policy against the collection of tolls on Federal roads for which Federal aid is provided. The Cumberland Road was also known as the National Road. For some 40 years Congress made appropriations from time to time for the Cumberland Road, and in a few instances, for other roads for military and mail purposes. Travel was by coach, by canal, and by boat. With the advent of the railroad prior to the War Between the States, and with the expansion of railroads following that war, appropriations for Federal roads were discontinued.

Then followed the era in which the railroads were constructed. The stage coach was supplanted by the passenger coach. Finally the steamboat was also supplanted by the passenger train. River traffic disappeared with the beginning of the twentieth century.

The early roads of the United States were the roads of hope. They led the pioneers to

new lands. They were the means of opening up new lands and extending civilization.

THE BEGINNING YEARS

For almost 100 years there was no Federal participation in road construction or maintenance. The highways were built and maintained by States and counties, and the streets were constructed by municipalities.

With the advent of the automobile, at the beginning of the twentieth century, better roads became imperative. Appropriations for experiments were made, and in 1912 Congress made a modest appropriation to construct a few roads as examples for State and local road building. Federal appropriations for roads, which were only small for 25 years and disappeared for more than 75 years, became a necessity when the motor vehicle was perfected. As Herbert Spencer well said: "Progress, therefore, is not an accident, but a necessity." Good roads became imperative. The United States was growing and developing. As Whittier said:

"And, step by step, since time began
I see the steady gain of man."

FEDERAL AID ROAD ACT OF 1916

The Federal Aid Act of 1916 was the beginning of the present system of Federal aid. It was amended in 1921. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1921 made provision for Federal aid for primary roads. It was the beginning of the Federal-aid primary system. The States designated a highway system and a definite formula was adopted for the allocation of Federal aid. Construction costs were on a 50-50 basis. Authorizations have been passed for 2-year periods since.

EXPANSION

In 1924 and in the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1934 the policy of Federal aid was expanded and extended to embrace secondary roads. States were required to match Federal funds. Provision was made for the elimination of railway grade crossings. As the production of motor cars increased highway construction increased. It was stepped up materially in the 1930's and particularly during the depression of that decade.

During World War II, except in aid of the war effort, construction was materially reduced. In many cases it was delayed.

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1944

Before the end of hostilities, in 1944, Congress made provision for the expansion of Federal aid for highways. The act of 1944 was the most constructive highway act ever passed by the Congress. It continued aid for primary roads. It extended aid for secondary roads. It provided for the elimination of railway grade crossings. It extended aid to urban areas. It set the pace, not only for Federal aid, but for State and local construction. For the first time authorizations were provided for 3 years.

DELAY

On account of the increased cost of construction and the scarcity of material construction was delayed. The act was amended to extend the time in which States could match Federal funds.

The 1944 act provided for annual appropriations of $500,000,000 and provided also for an interstate system of approximately 40,000 miles.

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1948

The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1948 authorized appropriations of $450,000,000 for each of the two fiscal years, 1950 and 1951.

AUTHORIZATION BILL

The House Committee on Public Works is conducting hearings on an Authorization Act for the fiscal years 1952 and 1953. It is well to keep in mind the needs and the problems for highway construction, as in all human endeavors, we will go backward if we do not go forward.

THE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

There are in the United States today over 2,300,000 miles of highway, roads, and streets. Three million miles are in the rural areas. Over 300,000 miles are in the urban areas. Federal aid is being extended to 636,037 miles of roads today. The primary system in rural areas is 219,568 miles. The secondary system is 398,488 miles. Urban roads total 18,000 miles. The interstate highway system is included in the primary and urban roads. It embraces 37,800 miles.

In the State system of highways there are 349,929 miles. The city streets contain 316,537 miles. Since 1921, 95,793 miles of the Federal-aid highway system have been reconstructed and improvements have been made on the entire system since 1921 aggregating 237,025 miles. In addition to the various Federal-aid systems there are 72,000 miles of roads under Government control in the national parks, forests, and reservations.

OBSOLESCENCE

The average life of a Federal-aid road is 30 years. Obsolescence is multiplying. Twelve thousand miles of primary roads must be reconstructed annually and 30,000 miles of secondary roads must be reconstructed annually. Roads wear out.

REGISTRATIONS

For 1949 the estimated registrations of automobiles, busses, and trucks aggregate 43,800,000 vehicles, an increase of more than 35 percent since 1940. The vehicle miles of traffic in 1949 aggregated 418,800,000,000 miles, an increase of more than 38 percent since 1940.

LOADS AND SIZES

The average load carried by trucks in 1948 was 38 percent higher than in 1941 and 73 percent higher than in 1936. Actual loads of 18,000 pounds were found on an average of 13 out of every 1,000 vehicles in 1936 and on 93 out of every 1,000 vehicles in 1948, a 615-percent increase. There has been a tenfold increase in larger loads of 22,000 pounds and more since 1936. Not only are the loads larger but many of the trucks resemble boxcars and many of the trailers look like pullmans. Roads are being destroyed and a danger is being promoted on the highways.

RURAL AND URBAN AREAS

One-half of the traffic is in the rural areas and one-half in the urban areas. More and better streets, as well as more and better roads, are needed.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

There were 20,000 miles of new construction in highways in 1948, but the production in that year of automobiles, busses, and trucks, placed bumper to bumper, aggregated 20,000 miles.

INCREASED COSTS

There has been an increase in the costs of construction from 1940 to 1949 of approximately 123½ percent. The increase since 1945 has been 48 percent. At the same time, there was an increase of approximately 3,000 miles in new construction in 1949 over 1948. However, the work done in 1949 just about equals the work done in 1936 because the dollar buys less due to increased costs, although the authorizations are larger.

INTERSTATE IMPROVEMENTS

The interstate system improvements for the fiscal year 1949 account for 30 percent of the total amounts programed for primary and urban roads. Twenty-three percent of the primary funds and 48 percent of the urban funds were for interstate improvements.

TRAFFIC AND POPULATION

The population is increasing and the traffic is multiplying. If I were asked the most important problem confronting the United States today I would answer that there must be more highways. The roads must be wider and straight. Safety must be promoted.

SAFETY

I am gratified to report that safety has been promoted, and while deaths and injuries are still entirely too numerous there were fewer in 1949 than in 1948.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS ARE SELF-LIQUIDATING

For the fiscal year 1949 the Government collected $1,326,054,091 in highway-user taxes, of which $503,648,471 were derived from the 1½-cent Federal gasoline tax. The policy of Federal aid for highways is self-liquidating.

STATE FUNDS

State and local revenues available for road construction have not kept pace with the increased costs of construction in the past 10 years. Funds are being diverted. Highway police and administration, as well as highway maintenance, take a large percentage of State funds. It is imperative that the States make provision for matching Federal funds.

STATE AND COUNTY DISTRIBUTION

There is need for better farm-to-market roads. It is well to keep in mind, however, that in many States a disproportionate part of funds for roads are spent in the construction of local roads. The cost has been shifted to the highway users. In Ohio, for instance, rural road agencies received in 1946 $30,850,000 from the State and spent $35,953,000 for the construction and maintenance of local roads. This means that in Ohio the State provided the equivalent of almost 86 percent of the local-road expenditures. In Michigan the ratio is 95 percent. The States generally are providing for local roads, for these roads are State and local problems.

BETTER ROAD EQUIPMENT

While the costs of construction have increased, a better type of road is being built. The country is indebted to American road builders for a revolution in road construction. The improvements in road building enabled the United States to do many things in World War II that never had been dreamed of. As a result of improved machinery airfields were constructed, army and navy bases located and roads opened more speedily than ever before.

THE PACE

While Federal aid contributes to the construction of approximately 15 percent of all highways, roads, and streets annually, it sets the pace for construction. Improvements are being made as a result of the experiments carried on in the laboratory of the Bureau of Public Roads. Foundations are being stabilized. Soil studies are contributing to a better type of road. The experiments are resulting in a more economical local road. The Bureau of Public Roads is taking the lead for better road construction.

THE FUTURE

There is a $250,000,000,000 economy in the United States today. Production is essential to the progress of the Nation. The Federal Government is profoundly interested in highway construction. Employment is provided for millions. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report estimates that the cost of correcting the present deficiencies of roads, streets, and highways in the United States amounts to over $41,000,000,000. The largest single need is $23,000,000,000 for modernizing State highway systems and their urban extensions. The remainder of the $41,000,000,000 reflects the need of city and village streets and local roads. For the expanding population and for the progress of the Nation production must be increased and production without transportation is impossible.

NEXT STEPS

The authorizations for Federal-aid highways must be increased over previous authorizations for the next two fiscal years. The program must be expanded. There are many steps to take. I mention but a few:

1. There should be an increase in the Federal contribution to the interstate system. The increase should be fixed and definite for all of the States. The Federal contribution can well be increased from 50 to 75 percent as the national defense is involved in the interstate system.

2. The Federal contribution should be increased as soon as practicable for four-lane divided highways with controlled access extending for 10 miles from all larger urban areas. Those who use the roads pay for them. One-half of the traffic is in the cities. Four-lane highways are in the interest of the public.

3. While it may be difficult for the Federal Government at present to provide a larger amount for rural roads, I believe that the next step in solving the rural road problem is for the United States to assist in providing adequate engineering administration of local roads. There is need to get the farmers out of the mud, but there is also a great need to protect the revenues of the taxpayers. We cannot protect our revenues without adequate engineering talent.

4. Express highways and adequate arterial roads in the cities are imperative. Traffic is being impeded. Progress is being delayed.

5. Many of the State laws for acquiring rights-of-way are antiquated. The statutes were passed for horse-and-buggy days. They are outmoded and outdated. Rights-of-way are expensive and additional assistance must be provided.

6. I cannot overlook in the sixth place the need for express highways in populous areas. New Jersey and New York are taking the lead in the construction of such highways. Their lead must be followed by other States. The Federal Government must cooperate.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 should not only set the pace for the highway needs of the present but provide for the highway needs of the future as well. The policy of Federal aid has been tested. It should be continued and expanded to provide for the multiplying needs of a $250,000,000,000 national economy.

BUILDING CIVILIZATION

I have stressed the building of roads and I have mentioned the improved machinery for better road construction. I began by saying that highways and civilizations have always gone hand in hand. We cannot build roads unless we build men. We cannot grow and prosper as a government unless men grow. An enlightened citizenship will mean a better civilization. Science and invention are important, but the progress of humanity, after all, is based upon the moral law. The material is important, but the spiritual is more important. An enduring civilization is based upon faith, justice, and righteousness.

COMPLACENCY

After the sacrifice of war we are prone to become complacent. We are inclined to be soft. We turn from the sacrifices of war to the pleasures of an uncertain peace. We are prone to substitute complacency for sacrifice. The men and women who have left their impress on human history have been those who gave in sacrifice and in unselfishness.

STRONG AMERICA

Our civilization cannot advance unless America is strong. The strength of America is not in the atom bomb nor in the hydrogen bomb, but the strength of America is in the spirit of the people of the United States. We must profit by the lessons of history. It would be most unfortunate for the United States to place its confidence in any bomb or in any power. Civilization would not advance for man would not grow. Our plans must be sound. Our Government must be stable. Our faith must be abiding in man, country, and God. If we placed our dependence upon any weapon we would relax, we would not be vigilant, we would lose our liberty.

We must not substitute selfishness for service. In the frontier days the greedy merchants could not resist the lush prices offered by Indians for guns and ammunition and often they sold their personal guns and belts to the Indians and when they did they sold their own scalps as well.

I repeat, we must profit by history. The French placed their confidence in the Maginot line rather than in the strengthening of their Government, and France lost. She was easily overrun and conquered in World War II.

Science is essential to the advancement of civilization but morality is more essential. The spirit is more important. I do not underestimate the effect of the atom bomb but I recall that at the conclusion of the First World War poisonous gases were being brought into play and it was announced that their use in the next war would mean the destruction of civilization. But the scientists who compounded the poisonous gases were confined to no one country and at the beginning of World War II all nations had supplies of poisonous gases but not one country made use of them.

Already the Russians have split the atom. The scientists who invented the atom can discover and perfect a defense against the atom.

OPPORTUNITY

As the most powerful Nation, and as the wealthiest people, with unparalleled natural resources and with undeveloped scientific frontiers, there has come to the United States the greatest opportunity for growth and development of our civilization that was ever enjoyed by any Nation in history. If we utilize inventions, discoveries, science, and knowledge for building and not destroying civilization, the people of the United States in the next 25 years will not only maintain, but will extend and expand, the highest standard of living that was ever before enjoyed by man.

OUR GENERATION

I would like for our generation to be constructive. The individual, like the Government, that does not grow will die. Democracy is not only a growing but it is a dynamic faith. We are concerned in these uncertain days of peace about national security. If we build our civilization on a solid foundation the future is secure. The great men and women of history have not sought an easy place. They have not been satified with personal security. They have taken the risk. They have sacrificed. We must be patriotic. We must be prepared to sacrifice for our ideals and for our country if our civilization is to endure and to advance. We must walk upright, with our feet on the ground, with our eyes toward the stars. We must be "guided by the stars and not by the lights of each passing ship."

On the walls of the magnificent building of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in the city of Washington are carved the thoughts of Daniel Webster, uttered by him more than 100 years ago, which our generation should adopt, as we build and improve our civilization:

"Let us develop the resources of the land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, to see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Development of Peat Resources

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 7338 to encourage the development of our peat resources. I think it is imperative that the Members of the House be informed on the progress made in the utilization of peat; particularly in Russia and Great Britain.

I think the following translations of Russian newspaper accounts and government reports on peat development merit our attention. With our great untapped peat resources, this progress is open to us in the interest of our national economy, national defense, and national security.

[From Pravda of July 6, 1947]

Moscow, Leningrad, Gorki, Yaroslavl, Ivanovo, and a number of other industrial centers met their needs for electric power to a large degree from stations operating on peat as a fuel. Peat is also used for municipal heating, and the textile industry has heavy demands for it. The season for peat extraction is half over. The production plan is being fulfilled but the process of peat drying is not being carried out satisfactorily. Poorly dried peat cannot be used. Several electric power stations met difficulties at the beginning of this year due to lack of fuel in spite of the fact that hundreds of thousands of tons of peat lay in the fields not far away, but was not in condition to be used.

[From Pravda of April 20, 1948]

THE TEMPO OF PEAT PROCUREMENT MUST BE SPEEDED

During the * * * months it will be necessary to stockpile millions of tons of peat for the national economy of our country. The chief consumers of peat are our power plants. The Soviet Union occupies the first place in the world in regard to the amount of power generated by plants run on peat. Besides being used by power plants peat is also largely utilized by the textile, light, glass, and other branches of industry. The municipalities of many of our cities are using peat to heat hospitals, schools, and homes.

The Soviet Government is paying great attention to the peat industry, its technical servicing, the mechanization of its labor processes, and to the betterment of the housing and living conditions of workers employed by the peat industry, and it demands a similar attitude toward this matter on the part of local organizations * * *.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, who believed in the great importance of the peat industry as a foundation for electrification, was the initiator of its mechanization. This branch of industry is utilizing at present the latest technical means. In particular, peat is obtained by the hydraulic method. This year much machinery of new design is going to be utilized, * * * excavators, and others.

Last year's plan was not fulfilled, and this year's plan likewise is endangered. Work of monumental proportions remains to be done this year, such as building 55,000 square meters of new living space for the peat industry workers.

The seasonal character of the peat industry demands a planned approach to actual

mass propaganda work. Every man and woman worker of the industry must be made to understand how important to the state is the work they perform.

A new method of handling peat, developed this season in the Ural peat fields, U. S. S. R., utilizes a combination of dredge and electric spreading machine. The foreign press describes each unit as being composed of one four-row, multiscoop excavator and two electric spreading machines. The peat moss is processed by the dredge after which the electrical machines form it into briquettes and spread them over the field.

The unit, designed by the Institute of Mechanization of Peat Production, has a reported capacity of 200 cubic meters of peat moss an hour, which is 10 to 12 times the capacity of the dredges alone. The new method requires only about one-third of the electric power and one-fifth the manpower used in the elevator system of peat excavation and an improved quality of product is claimed.

Eleven of these machines have been built by Sverdlovsk Oblsovnarkhoz and 19 by a special workshop of the Monetny peat enterprise. During the peat season this year, 45 dredges and 26 electrical spreading machines have been in operation on the peat fields on the Sverdlovsk oblast.

Production of a peat sucking portable crane is being started by the Works Collective of the Ivanovo Peat Machinery building plant which planned in the third quarter of 1945 to build three of these machines each weighing 27 tons. In addition to beginning the production of the new peat sucking portable crane and a universal peat excavator, this plant's pledge for 1945 was to treble the 1944 output of peat equipment, including cranes, peat loaders, peat suction pumps, and spare parts.

(Based on items in Trud, October 11; Izvestia, July 27; and Pravda, July 28, 1945.)

[From Trud, September 12, 1946]

A newly built plant in the city of Sverdlovsk, the Urals, is now producing electric-powered combines for the Soviet peat industry. These combines press peat mixture into briquettes and spread the briquettes over the field to dry. The capacity of the combines is 200 cubic meters of peat pulp per hour.

The plant will build 40 of these combines a year.

[From U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin of July 30, 1947]

Workers of the Peat Institute of the Byelorussian Academy of Sciences, under the direction of Professor Klimov and Engineer Chutnovsky, have developed a method for the complex utilization of peat as fuel for power stations and as raw material for synthetic gasoline.

In the new process the peat is treated chemically and transformed into gaseous form before being sent to the power station. The power station thus receives excellent gaseous fuel, and what remains of the peat after gasification is used to make synthetic gasoline.

The process of complex utilization of peat reduces the cost of synthetic-gasoline production by 14 percent and reduces the peat consumption in power stations by 30 to 35 percent.

UTILIZATION OF PEAT—ACTUAL AND POSSIBLE

Fuel: Lump peat, peat briquettes, powdered peat, peat fuel oil, gas, gasoline, kerosene.

Chemicals: Ammonia, paraffin, wax, methyl alcohol, acetic acid, asphalt, phenol, peat tar, cresols, lysol, furfural.

Agriculture: Fertilizers (composts, peat ashes), litter (moss) mulch, food yeast.

Medicine: Surgical dressings (sphagnum).

Metallurgy: For smelting pig iron in blast furnace and cupolas.

Paper industry: Peat used in the manufacture of paper.

Construction: Base for artificial wood (torfite), bricks, or as a filler for clay bricks, for insulation.

Miscellaneous: Lubricating oils, in the manufacture of varnishes and dyes, in cosmetics, benzine, antiscale solution for boilers, textile and building industries.

Experiments showed that in the processing of peat by artificial dehydration, the following byproducts can be obtained for every ton of finished peat product:

Ethyl alcohol of 94.5 percent, 6–10 liters.
Fodder yeast (pressed), 25–35 kilograms.
Dry ice (carbon dioxide), 20–30 kilograms.
Furfurol, 1.5–3.0 kilograms.
Methyl alcohol, 0.8–1.0 kilogram.
Acetic acid, 1.0–1.1 kilograms.

Because of the fact that the above chemicals represent byproducts of the processing of peat, their cost of manufacture is less than that involved in regular production.

The manufacturing processes for ethyl alcohol and yeast have been developed and checked in practice; the processes for the manufacture of dry ice, furfurol, etc., have undergone only laboratory experimentation.

Alcohol is obtained by the following process:

The liquid obtained during the steaming of the peat flows into a container. It is then pumped into a sediment tank where it is freed of all peat particles. This is followed by neutralization with peat ash or lime while, after this, it is filtered in "Prokaka" filters and heated (or cooled) to 30 degrees centigrade.

Yeast for the fermentation of the liquid obtained from peat in the autoclaves is made in the Linder apparatus, in a mother-liquor vat, and in a fermenting tank. Fermentation of the liquid is done by repeated use of the ferment (20 times). After fermentation, the liquid is distilled and rectified in a distillation apparatus with cooling coils. The alcohol produced in this manner is 94.5 percent by weight.

In addition to alcohol, the distilling wash and liquid from steamed peat can yield fodder yeast by a process similar to the manufacture of alcohol. However, a special culture of yeast produces pressed yeast with high sugar content.

As can be seen from the foregoing, the processes of manufacturing alcohol and yeast are similar to the usual alcohol and yeast production processes.

It has been determined that the capital investment in one liter of alcohol amounts to 4 rubles and the production cost is 1 ruble, 50 kopecks. The investment in one kilogram of pressed yeast amounts to 40 kopecks and the estimated production cost is 20 kopecks. (M. I. Sarmatov, V. Y. Patsulo, and G. N. Sinov, the Floating Peat Plant, Peat Industry, No. 4, July–August 1945.)

Water gas can be obtained from peat semicoke. Composition of the water gas obtained from peat semicoke is as follows:

Ammonia also can be obtained from peat. According to the Soviet newspaper For Industrialization of October 11, 1946, there were in the U. S. S. R. "in process of construction a number of peat-chemical plants in which a large number of products were to be made, including ammonia." (S. A. Tsurupov, The Peat Institute and Its Problems in 1946. The Peat Industry, No. 2, 1946 (summary)).

The institute has at present 1,400 students, which is more than before the war. Beginning with 1945, 400 students will be accepted annually and at least 200 to 250 engineers will graduate. In the next 3 to 4 years the number of students in the institute is expected to rise to at least 2,000. For more than 2 years the institute has had a preparatory section.

The U. S. S. R. has two-thirds of the world's peat preserves, the industrial reserves of peat in the country occupy the second place among other combustible mined fuel. In electric stations it forms 50 and sometimes almost 100 percent of the fuel supply, yet the country has only 700 to 800 engineers specializing in peat. This naturally impedes technical progress in that branch of industry.

The institute has now been granted the right to educate engineers for the peat industry in six specialties and from 1945 on has commenced educating engineers in three faculties—technological, mechanical, and building faculties. The institute can, therefore, henceforth provide the peat industry with specialists in all the main branches necessary for its development. It remains to organize faculties for the chemical and thermic treatment of peat. A chemistry section has already been organized with prominent specialists in the gasifying and chemical treatment of peat, but a special faculty for the education of engineers specializing in these branches will be opened later in the year.

As regards scientific work, the institute has been working mainly on theoretic problems connected with the development of the peat industry and new technological schemes and methods.

(These reports are taken from the legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress TP 360 on Peat Industry of the Soviet Union.)

[From the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research report, The Winning, Harvesting, and Utilization of Peat, published by His Majesty's Stationery Office 1948]

UTILIZATION OF PEAT

The principal uses for peat at the present time in Great Britain are as a fuel for domestic purposes, as peat-moss litter in agriculture, and as a soil ameliorant in horticulture. In other countries peat has found use industrially as a fuel for power generation by burning under steam boilers or gasification in producers. It has also been used industrially for the production of peat coke which was used as a producer fuel and for metallurgical purposes. Various other methods for the utilization of peat, e. g., as a heat-insulating and packing material, in the manufacture of paper and textiles, for coal-gas purification, for the production of alcohol, etc., have been exploited commercially.

Peat is a very free-burning fuel which requires only a very low draught to maintain a satisfactory rate of combustion. In a modern well-type, open-hearth fireplace this can frequently be arranged by keeping closed the regulator admitting air under the fire, but it is sometimes necessary in addition to cover partially the bottom of the grate by means of a sheet of metal or tiles. There are now on the market in Eire a number of appliances which will burn peat satisfactorily.

USE AS INDUSTRIAL FUEL FOR STEAM GENERATION

There are two main methods in which peat can be used industrially for steam-raising purposes. These are:

(a) Burning to complete combustion under boilers, either in the form of air-dried blocks or coarse powder (milled peat) or as a dried pulverised fuel.

(b) Complete gasification in producers, with or without recovery of by-products, followed by combustion of the gas in gas-fired steam boilers.

The use of peat fuel for steam raising at electricity generating stations has been developed on a large scale in the U. S. S. R. with apparently a considerable degree of success. The peat is obtained partly by the hydropeat process. In the northern and central districts of the U. S. S. R. where climatic conditions are not favorable for this process, the use of milled peat as a fuel has been developed. In 1933 approximately 30 percent of the power stations in operation in the U. S. S. R. were burning peat fuel, these stations having a capacity of over 1,000,000 kilowatts. Under the second 5-year plan it was proposed to increase this capacity to nearly 4,000,000 kilowatts. Larger power stations, each having a capacity of between 100,000 and 200,000 kilowatts, have been built at Shatura (Moscow), Dubrovka (near Leningrad and at Balakna in the Gorki (Gorgres station). At these stations hydropeat or machine-formed air-dried peat is burned under water-tube boilers fitted with a special type of grate, known as the Makarev shaft-chain grate. This grate is a combination of gas producer and chain grate. The peat is fed from bunkers into a shaft through which preheated air is passed. The more volatile constituents of the peat pass through suitable openings into the main combustion chamber, and peat reaching the bottom of the shaft discharges onto the chain grate. The most satisfactory results have been obtained in this system when using peat containing about 30 percent of moisture.

An alternative method by which peat can be used in solid form for steam-raising purposes is to burn it in a pulverized fuel system. In Sweden pulverized peat from a works at Vislanda has been used for locomotive firing on certain sections of the state railway. The results of tests have been published and indicate that the method adopted was satisfactory. Using peat having a calorific value of 7,740 B. t. u. per pound, 4.7 pounds of steam per pound of peat were produced.

Utilization of peat for purposes other than as a fuel: Agricultural and horticultural uses, extraction of wax from peat, production of alcohol from peat, other uses for peat.

Peat has been used for a large variety of other purposes, but these have been on a very small scale only and are not likely to be extended.

Fibrous, cotton-grass peat has been used in the manufacture of building materials, paper, millboard, and textiles.

Raw milled peat has been successfully used as an absorbent in filter beds and sewage beds, and it has found application in the manufacture of filters for reducing the hardness of water. The absorbent power of peat has also been utilized in medicine, the peat being used as a filling for surgical dressing.

Estimates made indicate that approximately 1,000,000,000 tons of air-dried peat could be made available by the development of peat reserves in this country.

Owing to the shortage of coal in Eire, especially during the war years, the production of peat has been stimulated. Information received indicates that about 1,000,000 tons of air-dried peat are now won annually, mainly by hand-winning methods.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Bureau of Mines, Minerals Yearbook of 1948, Florida, New Jersey, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, California, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Georgia, Indiana, Colorado, Alabama, Texas, Maine, Washington, and Massachusetts have rather large deposits of peat.

We have to ask the question why it was needed that "imports of moss peat continued to increase totaling 91,073 short tons in 1948, an increase of 16 percent over the 1939 prewar figure?"

Broadcast by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD No. 21 in the biweekly series of broadcasts I am making.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF TRANSCRIPTION BY HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS OVER PENNSYLVANIA RADIO STATIONS, WEEK END OF MARCH 3–5, INCLUSIVE

(No. 21 in biweekly series)

The potato, which in the years since the war has grown hotter and hotter, finally got dumped on the Senate floor 10 days or so ago, and for a few days a regular battle royal ensued.

It was the decision to destroy some 450,000,000 worth of the 1949 potato crop purchased by the Government under our price-support program that really got the potato talk going recently. Most of the talk has been confined to the absurdity of using 50,000,000 tax dollars for unjustifiable destruction—and as a result, we haven't heard much about the events leading up to the potato surplus.

So, for a bit, I want to give you some potato history, as it were, because I don't believe that by and large many people are aware of the basic problem which the potato surplus reflects.

Back during the war period, our farmers had a tremendous job thrown at them—the job of feeding not only our own people and our fighting men—but in addition, our farmers undertook the task of feeding millions of others all over the world.

It was in the war period also that the tremendous quantities of cotton, wool, wheat, and a number of other storable agricultural commodities which the Government had previously purchased and put in storage really came in handy. The Government, as you may recall, had bought and stored these commodities to help our farmers keep their incomes from sagging badly in years that our production exceeded our national demand.

As I've already indicated, these stored surpluses came in handy during the war, and, as a matter of fact, the Government was able to sell its stored wheat, cotton, wool, and so forth, at a profit and we emerged from the war with our entire price-support program over the previous years having not only paid for itself, but, in fact, the Government actually made money through having bought and stored surpluses in bumper-crop years and selling them later when we weren't producing enough to meet demand.

But, as you can appreciate, not every farm product can be stored without spoiling, and when we were faced with the job of feeding people in the war areas, we just didn't have a sufficient supply of perishable foods such as vegetables, butter, and so on. Faced with this difficult problem, the Congress came up with a program designed to encourage farmers in increasing their production of these commodities, and potatoes happened to be one of the foods that we were short on. So that's how the problem started.

That wartime potato baby has grown up to be a giant. Potatoes can't be stored, and despite the fact that commercial alcohol can be obtained from a potato, we simply don't have a sufficient demand for industrial alcohol to use all our potato surplus for this purpose. I might add here that the Russians use the potato for a concoction known as vodka, though, as yet, I haven't heard anyone suggest seriously that we put our potato surplus to that kind of use.

Now in the farm bill, adopted by the Congress last fall, a provision was made which permitted the distribution of surplus perishable foods owned by the Government to charitable and welfare agencies, free of charge. The bill, however, did not provide that the Government would pay the freight on these surpluses from the point of storage to the welfare groups who needed them. Fortunately, some of our present surpluses are stored close enough to communities that need the food for relief purposes, but the truth of the matter is that our surplus of potatoes is far larger than needed for welfare purposes. I might add that some surplus powdered milk and dried eggs have also been distributed to charitable organizations as a consequence of the so-called welfare section of last year's farm bill.

But the free distribution of perishable surpluses is a far cry from a real solution to the problem. The fundamental difficulty is the fact that potato production is now far too large to meet any conceivable needs, and the only real answer is to be found through cutting back our production until it is again within reasonable limits. As matters now stand, this can't be done by reducing the number of acres we are planting. This was actually done with the crop in 1949, and yet we turned out more potatoes than ever, simply because many farmers moved the rows closer together, and thus got higher yields per acre. Practices of this sort are disastrous, because they result literally in mining the land—in robbing it of its productive value—and ultimately, of course, in destroying the power of the land to grow food.

Now there are basically two ways to handle the potato problem: first, to withdraw price supports altogether; and secondly, to withdraw potato supports unless farmers agree to cut back on their production.

The first possibility must be rejected. Both the Democratic and Republican parties have adopted as part of their national platforms the promise that price supports of some kind are necessary to help stabilize farm income * * * and for some time it has been part of our Nation's policy to support the foundations of our farm economy against the calamities it has suffered in the past.

Those of us who can remember back into the twenties and early thirties recall with painful clarity that the stock-market crash of 1929 was not the first danger signal which warned us the depression was on the way. From the middle twenties on, the bottom had dropped steadily out from under farm income, and the farmer's situation was desperate long before the Wall Street bubble burst. Mortgage foreclosures on farms were a commonplace by 1929, and most of our farmers had virtually ceased to be consumers of the industrial goods they had previously purchased. Naturally, as farm income dropped, this had a serious effect on our banks, particularly those in rural areas, and it had a big influence on our factory output because industry after industry lost important segments of its market.

The tide that swept in ever-worsening depression conditions on our farms was not reversed until the first of our basic farm laws put in an appearance in 1933. Since 1933, the farmer has been able to improve his position steadily. Today Federal conservation programs play an essential role in saving our valuable topsoil and enriching the food we

eat. Programs developed under the Farmers Home Administration and its parent agencies created in the middle thirties have been of enormous assistance in helping farmers to obtain long-term loans for making needed repairs on their farm buildings and other improvements necessary to get farms on a paying basis. Other Nation-wide programs, enacted by the Congress over the past 16 or 17 years have, taken together, performed yeoman service in making it possible for the farmer to get back on his feet as a self-sustaining and independent businessman and producer * * * and these national programs depend heavily for their success upon the basic principle of farm-income support.

So we cannot afford, as a matter of national policy, to throw the farmer to the wolves and pitch ourselves once more into the national calamity of a withering farm income by abandoning the farmer altogether.

On the other hand, we cannot afford to underwrite, through Government purchase, limitless and wholly unusable over-production.

About 10 days ago, just as the first of the 1950 crop of potatoes was being planted, Senator SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, the majority leader of the Senate, came up with an amendment which would have solved the potato problem. His amendment—which I supported and which was backed by other administration leaders in the Senate—would have cut back the size of the 1950 potato crop to fit our needs by proposing to withdraw price supports for potatoes on the coming crop unless farmers would accept production-quota control.

Quota controls would simply mean that the Secretary of Agriculture would be called upon to establish a potato production goal for 1950 on which the Government would support prices at a reasonable level. This production goal would represent our total foreseeable needs for potatoes in the coming year. Thereafter, when the farmers voted to accept quota controls, a fair share of the potato production would be allocated among them, and once the production target had been established and agreed to by the farmers, a fine would be levied on any farmers who refused to cooperate and insisted upon marketing potatoes grown in excess of the production quota.

The administration amendment to solve the potato problem was overthrown in the Senate by a Republican-led revolt, in which some Democratic Senators joined, which insisted that we should continue our present potato policy for at least another year. The net result is simply that this time next year we will have another bumper crop of potatoes bought up by the Government—and once more, in all likelihood, we will be forced to destroy a large share of the quantity we buy.

So a small majority of the Senate refused to settle the potato problem in terms of the 1950 crop—though the Senate later agreed to apply the Lucas amendment to the 1951 crop. In short, the Senate was willing to accept the Lucas proposal as workable a year from now, but would not apply it to the 1950 crop.

I don't get this kind of thinking at all. If the Lucas amendment is the answer—as the Senate seems to agree that it is—it should be used now, and I did everything I could to get it adopted for this year. I feel that the Senate made a disastrous mistake in rejecting the administration proposal—and I feel that the entire health and well-being of our farm economy is seriously threatened by this failure to handle the hot potato.

We had another explosion in the Senate on Saturday, February 25, when the Senate Appropriations Committee voted against authorizing funds needed to administer the Rent Control Act between now and the time the present law is due to expire on the 1st of July of this year.

You'll recall that the Eighty-first Congress made some repairs last spring in the rent-control law adopted by the Eightieth Congress, and we extended the law for 15 months—or until July 1, 1950. It was estimated that $21,000,000 would be needed to administer the law during the fiscal year which began last July, but the Congress last session voted only $17,500,000 of this amount with the understanding that the balance of $3,500,000 would be approved early in 1950. It was this $3,500,000 which the Appropriations Committee refused to approve a week ago.

The action of the Senate Appropriations Committee is not final, however, and very shortly I expect to see the matter brought before the Senate. I feel we must go through with the promise made by the Congress last year in agreeing to continue rent control until July 1. We expect a big fight on this in the Senate, but I intend to do everything I can to see that the needed $3,500,000 are made available to carry out the law for the next 4 months. I don't believe it is proper to kill off a law through the expedient of refusing funds needed to administer a law the Congress has already declared to be national policy.

I also feel strongly that it will be necessary to extend rent controls for at least another year. As I've said repeatedly in the past, rent control is messy business, and it is utterly impossible to have any kind of rent-control law that doesn't put some limitations on somebody, somewhere. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that critical housing shortages continue to exist in many localities in Pennsylvania.

I think this can be proved by the fact that most communities and States have not decontrolled their rents, although the Federal law adopted last year permitted local decontrol when people in any area felt controls were no longer needed.

And from the experience of communities that have prematurely voted to decontrol rents before the shortage was licked, we have seen that there are still landlords—not many, but a few landlords who ruin things for everyone—who will indulge in rent gouging when they know their tenants can find no other place to live.

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee will hold extensive hearings on the subject of continuing rent control beyond July 1 of this year to determine if it is still necessary in view of changes that may take place before the present law runs out.

I do believe that these congressional hearing on extending rent control for another year will produce facts which will show clearly that the controls must go on for a time longer. And if the facts do show conclusively that rent control must be continued, you may be sure that I shall do everything in my power to see that the law is extended.

Statement of Army and Navy Union, United States of America, on Armed Preparedness

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have all been very much interested in having our civilian population instructed as to what can be done to cope with the atomic bomb for the protection of the civilian population and also what can be done against communism.

I am including as part of my remarks a release from the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, dated March 5, at their request. It reads as follows:

Whereas the President's Own Garrison, No. 104, Army and Navy Union, United States of America, is vitally interested in national civil defense and in being heard in connection with the various phases thereof; and

Whereas the possibility of an enemy attack upon our cities with the terrible devastation that would result therefrom, is now fully realized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the civil defense planning against such attack upon our cities, both from within and without, be accelerated; be it further

Resolved, That the vital part to be played by all means of communication in the control of the civil population in the event of such emergency or attack be recognized; and that the civil defense planning recognize the great value of radio broadcasting through warnings and instructions to the civil population of our cities by established broadcasting stations and through the use of transportation broadcasting such as in use on trains, buses and streetcars; be it further

Resolved, That it be recommended to United States Attorney George Morris Fay that his office investigate the actions and motives behind the actions of any who would interfere with communications systems essential to the national defense, since such interference might endanger thousands of lives in the event of an attack on cities of our Nation; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Department of Defense, the District Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, Members of Congress and the press; be it further

Resolved, That our national headquarters, departments and other posts be informed of the adoption of this resolution and that such headquarters, departments and posts be requested to adopt this resolution; be it further

Resolved, That the New York Journal American be congratulated for its special story of February 27 portraying effects of atomic attacks upon our cities.

The above resolution was passed at the regular meeting of the President's Own Garrison, No. 104, Army and Navy Union, United States of America, held Monday evening, February 27, 1950, and distributed for the Sunday press of March 5, 1950.

By order of Commander Bladen.

Trade and Tariff Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address of

King George VI to the British House of Parliament, as it appeared in last night's Star. I call particular attention to the point in the address where the King said:

You will be asked to approve orders making certain changes in the customs tariff arising from agreements which my government concluded last summer at the meeting at Annecy, at which the governments of the Commonwealth were represented.

It is evident that in Great Britain, as in most other countries, the legislative body approves trade agreements negotiated by the executive branch. I believe the United States is one of the very few countries in which the legislative branch has no say whatever in approving or disapproving these trade agreements.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF KING'S ADDRESS

My Lords and members of the House of Commons, I am proud to recognise that my people, by a sustained endeavor, have increased industrial and agricultural production, and thereby helped our country forward to greater prosperity. In this task they have been greatly assisted by the help and cooperation of the governments and peoples of other parts of the Commonwealth.

The world shortage of dollars, in which this country has shared, has again been eased by generous help from the United States of America and Canada. Renewed efforts will, however, be required to secure a balance in the country's overseas trade and, in particular, to increase earnings in North America.

My government will maintain their wholehearted support of the organization for European Economic Cooperation, through which it is hoped to work out a new European payments scheme.

PLEASURE BY COLOMBO PUBLIC

I look forward with great pleasure to the visit of the President of the French Republic and Mme. Auriol.

My government in the United Kingdom warmly welcomed the opportunity provided by the recent meeting of Commonwealth Ministers in Colombo for a valuable exchange of views on foreign affairs.

In accordance with the recommendations of the meeting, my ministers look forward to cooperating with other Commonwealth governments in south and southeast Asia.

My government welcomes the inauguration of the 27th of December last of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia as an independent sovereign state, with whom diplomatic relations have been established.

On the 6th January my government accorded recognition to the central people's government of the People's Republic of China.

On the 7th of February my government granted recognition to the States of Viet Nam, Laos, and Cambodia, as associate states within the French Union.

SUPPORT PLEDGED TO UN

My government will continue to give full support to the United Nations, for it is only through an effective system of security that world peace can be assured. In particular, they will use their utmost endeavors, through the United Nations, to assist in finding a durable solution to the tremendous problem of atomic energy so that international agreement for adequate control and supervision of the production of atomic energy may be secured.

My government will do their utmost to insure the success of the Council of Europe. The formation of a federal German government has made possible a progressive transfer of responsibility from the western Allies to the Germans. As a result my government has been able to make substantial reductions in the cost of their administration of Germany.

My ministers will maintain the closest relations with the other powers signatory to the North Atlantic and Brussels Treaties, and play their due part, in collaboration with the other powers, in strengthening common means of defense. My government will continue to take all necessary steps to insure that my armed forces are ready to meet their responsibilities in all parts of the world and the new Organization of Civil Defense will be developed.

COLONIAL DEVELOPMENT

My government is actively promoting the economic and social development of the colonial territories, and the Colonial Development Corp. is proving a useful instrument to this end.

Members of the House of Commons, the estimates for the public services will be laid before you in due course.

You will be asked to approve orders making certain changes in the customs tariff arising from agreements which my government concluded last summer at the meeting at Annecy, at which the governments of the Commonwealth were represented.

My lords and members of the House of Commons, the economic difficulties of this country have emphasized the need for renewed effort to expand the production of food from our own soil, and my government will continue to take all practical steps to encourage our agricultural population to increase output by every efficient means and to make better use of marginal land. The improvement of water supplies, particularly in rural areas, will continue to occupy the attention of my ministers and preparatory steps will be taken with a view to the introduction of legislation as soon as circumstances permit.

LIMITED LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

In view of the restricted time available and the heavy volume of financial business to be transacted, my government propose only a limited program of legislation for the present session. Nevertheless, should other measures prove in their view to be immediately necessary for the maintenance of full employment and the national well-being, my minister will not hesitate to submit them to Parliament, even though they may seem likely to prove contentious.

A bill will be laid before you to amend the law relating to allotments in England and Wales and in Scotland.

A bill will be laid before you to amend the medical acts so as to raise the standard of medicinal education and to modify the constitution and disciplinary procedure of the general medical council. Legislation will also be introduced to vary the constitution of the central midwives boards and to make other alterations in the law relating to midwives.

A measure will be laid before you to provide a uniform code for regulating the breaking-up of streets by public utility undertakings; also a measure to empower highway authorities to place and maintain cattle grids in highways.

You will be invited to pass a bill to regulate and improve the living conditions of the crews of fishing trawlers.

You will be asked to approve legislation giving further encouragement to the transfer of industrial undertakings to the development areas.

The Senate and the Displaced-Persons Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "The Senate and the Displaced-Persons Bill—The Truth Behind America's Shame," by Rabbi Richard C. Hertz, of Chicago. The speech has been edited in accordance with the rules of the United States Senate, because, in my personal judgment, in its original form it contained certain comments which I thought violated the rules of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE AND THE DP BILL—THE TRUTH BEHIND AMERICA'S SHAME

Text: "And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not do him wrong. The stranger that sojourneth with you shall be unto you as the home-born, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." (Leviticus 19: 33-34.)

Last Saturday night the United States Senate, eager to finish its busy calendar and get home to mend political fences, permitted a horrible travesty of American idealism to be perpetrated by a handful of obstructionist Senators. By a vote of 36-30 it decided to return the DP bill (known officially as H. R. 4567) to the Senate Judiciary Committee for further consideration, which was a polite way of killing it for this session.

There is a story behind this shameful and unworthy act of the Senate that ought to be made known. This morning I propose to tell something about the present law of the land known as the DP Act of 1948, how it came to be law, why it isn't working as well as it ought; what happened to the DP bill, who opposed it, what their tactics were, and why the bill failed. I am deeply aroused over this because I believe we Americans have a duty to perform and a responsibility to discharge.

Furthermore, I speak to this question this morning because religion must always be concerned with kindness, generosity, and humanitarianism, with "one law for the stranger and the home-born," and when these are thwarted, as they were this week, the pulpit must speak out with its eternal message—before it is too late.

I

To find some clues for understanding the whole problem let's go back into a little American history. This country's traditional immigration policy has clearly established the principle of offering asylum for the oppressed. That has always been one of our most cherished political doctrines. Leaders of all parties and all periods have consistently supported it. By virtue of that doctrine America has become synonymous with freedom, with opportunity for pioneer men and women to share with their sturdy children in the development of a great continent.

All of us are immigrants or descendants of immigrants. Only the Indians are true natives. And to the Indians, the Pilgrims in their day seemed like undesirable aliens. We are a nation of immigrants, as Louis Adamic has described us. Thirty-five million newcomers have spilled themselves over

a new continent; they grubbed and lugged and heaved and dug, until this modern democratic Republic was created.

The history of immigration to the United States of America can be divided into four periods: (1). The colonial period, from the initial white settlement to 1783, was a period when immigration was considered essential to the future development of the Colonies. Lord Baltimore and William Penn engaged in gigantic real-estate operations. They needed manpower. They brought over all the immigrants they could—with bounties, prizes, and inducements. (2) There followed a period of "free immigration" from 1783 to 1830, when the entry of people was totally unregulated. (3) From 1830 to 1882, the States controlled their own immigration policies, each according to its own interests and views. States' rights ruled supreme. (4) From 1882 to the present time, during which Federal controls of immigration have operated.

In 1921 the United States drastically changed its immigration policy. Until then almost any person in good physical and mental health and of sound moral character could enter. After World War I widespread demand for restriction of mass migrations set in. It was a time of narrow isolationism: we abandoned the League of Nations, we tolerated KKK, we listened to Henry Ford. In 1924 the Johnson Act was passed which became our basic immigration statute: the number of immigrants who could enter the United States in any year was limited by quota to 153,000. The quota system became law.

What are the arguments of the narrow nationalists who oppose any liberalizing of our immigration restrictions? Mostly they appeal to fear; fear of the foreigner, fear of his manners and customs, fear of job competition, fear of his political ideology, fear of contamination from aliens, fear of letting down the bars recently set up. * * *

I read through hundreds of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this week. Over and over again in long-winded speeches, Senators said the same thing. What an insight one gets into our legislative process by reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The truth is that immigrants do not merely take jobs; they create jobs for others. They don't merely receive wages; they spend wages and increase the demand for goods and services. They stimulate rather than drag upon the economic life of the country. They start new enterprises, develop new markets, introduce new processes. Immigrants become new buyers, new consumers. They often bring skills in critically needed categories, like tailors, doctors, nurses, carpenters, shoemakers.

The other great fear of little men who oppose bringing DP's to America is that they bring with them subversive doctrines that will infect this country with communism. But the law is clear on this point, and no one advocates its change; the law stipulates that "aliens entertaining or advocating views inimical to organized government or who are anarchists will not be admitted." Let the law be enforced. No one is pleading for special privileges for the Communists. Let the FBI do its job. Let the courts do their job. Liberals ask only for justice, decency, and humanitarianism for the stranger.

Some reactionary special interests who have not quite gotten over their prewar isolationism take the position that until homes are found for all Americans, until our unemployment problem is solved, until the foreigners legally and illegally here are assimilated, until we are sure those already here do not imperil our way of life and our national security, there should be no further immigration permitted. But they forget that we have not finished the war against Hitler until we have provided homes and hope for the first and most pitiful victims of Hitler. The war is not over and neither is the peace won. We have only an armistice, an armed truce. The cold war now being waged with the Soviet Union is largely a battle of power politics and propaganda. How can we gain allies among different nations of the world if we cannot show them that democracy is superior to communism? How can we give other countries this assurance when we preach one thing and practice another?

II

Then we come to the pitiful plight of the war's aftermath—the DP's—those 800,000 Poles, Lithuanian, Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainian Yugoslavs and stateless people who still languish in concentration camps, fed and maintained by the International Refugee Organization which incidentally is supported chiefly from American taxes.

The question is: What is to become of them?

Three alternatives must be dismissed at once. They cannot be repatriated to their homes behind the iron curtain. They cannot be sent to Germany, a country still nazified and now being renazified under the very noses of the Allies. They cannot be maintained indefinitely in the assembly centers with no hope of a future. A fourth alternative is inescapable: they must be resettled in free countries where they can strike new roots and build new productive lives for themselves and their children.

Nearly 30 countries began accepting DP's before our Congress passed the DP Act of 1948. When that bill finally came to the White House, President Truman saw at once that it was poorly drawn and discriminated against the very people whom he wanted to see helped: the DP's themselves. He reluctantly signed the bill because the Eightieth Congress had already adjourned; to veto the bill would have meant no law at all. Its provisions were unfair, discriminatory, and un-American.

It was no surprise then that the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 is not operating as a success. To show you how poorly the Displaced Persons Act has been working, just look at the statistics for its first year of operation.

Under the terms of the law, 100,000 might have entered the United States in its first year of operation which ended June 30, 1949. Actually only 39,734 entered. Of these 20,182 were dependents—over half the number; 9,470 were wives and 10,712 were children. In a nation of 60,000,000 jobs, some Senators are worried about less than 20,000 wage-earners upsetting the whole American economy!

Why, you may ask, has the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 not worked out more successfully? Why must it be amended?

In the first place, the "cut-off" date is too early. By the "cut-off" date is meant the date after which displaced persons are not eligible for the benefits of the act. The "cut-off" date was set as December 22, 1945, but many DP's fled from behind the iron curtain into Allied zones after December 22, 1945. Consequently, they could not qualify for visas under the terms of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

In the second place, the act stipulated that 30 percent had to be agriculturalists. If that figure was not met, the entire number of visas issued had to be lowered proportionately. But most DP's are not farm folk. They are artisans and workmen, professional people, or just wives and children. This has caused another bottleneck, slowing down the processing of DP's.

In the third place, 40 percent had to come from territories annexed by Soviet Union—Eastern Poland and Baltic countries. But when a man is torn from his roots and roams about Europe, his citizenship papers, his birth certificate, his personal records, are frequently lost or destroyed. This stipulation has been another bottleneck thwarting the administration of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 requiring amendment.

Congressman CELLER, of New York, introduced a bill which immediately became known as the DP bill (H. R. 4567). This bill proposed that the date of eligibility for DP's be changed from the discriminatory date of December 22, 1945—the date which arbitrarily excluded all deserving DP's who had fled into Allied zones after that date to a new date, January 1, 1949. The new date would give opportunity to recent political refugees—especially Catholics and Jews—who had fled from Poland, Hungary, and other iron-curtain countries.

Secondly, the bill would increase the number of DP's to be admitted to the United States from 205,000 in 2 years to 339,000 in 3 years—an increase of 134,000.

Thirdly, the bill eliminates the discriminatory features of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 in that 30 percent had to be agriculturalists, and 40 percent had to come from territories recently annexed by the Soviet Union. These two features have been the principal bottlenecks of the present act.

And fourthly, the bill provides for special screening to be sure that Communists and Fascists are barred from coming to the United States.

Actually then, H. R. 4567 is merely a bill to liberalize an existing statute—an amendment of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, so that the bottlenecks and administrative headaches might be removed and the law made more workable.

In the course of debate, Senator IVES, Republican, of New York, declared:

"Somehow many people seem to have acquired the erroneous idea that the United States already has taken a large share of the DP's in Europe. Nothing could be further from the truth. Actually, this country has accepted only about 15 percent of all the DP's. * * * Of the 604,000 DP's resettled, the United States has accepted only 84,000, of whom 44,000 had been admitted * * * prior to the enactment of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. * * * Compare these figures to the 123,000 persons taken by war-torn little Israel * * * and the 99,000 persons taken in by bombed-out Britain, herself in the throes of serious domestic problems." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 81st Cong., 1st sess., October 15, 1949, p. 14676.)

Two Senators were careful to note the moral obligation of the United States in the course of the debate. Senator SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, declared:

"It is my desire to see the United States fully live up to its responsibility as the greatest power in the world today. Helping in times of distress is a great characteristic of our Nation. The displaced persons are the aftermath of war. Other countries have helped to a far greater degree in proportion to their ability than have we to find them homes." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 81st Cong., 1st sess., October 15, 1949, p. 14677.)

And Senator MORSE, Republican, of Oregon, went on to say:

"We are dealing here with a great moral obligation. * * * It (the bill) asks the United States to take only a fair share of these people, on the basis of terms and conditions which are reasonable. * * * By the passage of this bill, I think we shall give great reassurance to the peoples all over this world that we do practice our ideals. * * * Once again America has a tendency to talk in terms of personal liberty and freedom and protecting the dignity of the individual, but frequently (she) falls short of putting those ideals into practice. * * * The passage of this bill will be an irrefutable answer to those who are seeking to spread that sort of propaganda against my country." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 81st Cong., 1st sess., October 14, 1949, p. 14547.)

IV

Late Saturday night—October 15, 1949—the final vote came: 38 Senators voted to recommit the bill to the Judiciary Committee

with orders to report back on the bill by January 25, 1950; 30 Senators voted against this "no-action this session" way of killing the bill; 30 Senators did not vote at all. They were absent at the time of voting.

When you analyze the Senate voting record, one fact immediately strikes you in the face. It was the absentees who beat the DP's.

Senator MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, chairman of the immigration subcommittee had refused to let the bill come to the Senate floor. Only a bi-partisan motion to force the bill out of committee, led by Senator LUCAS, Democrat of Illinois, and Senator TAFT, Republican of Ohio, both great friends of the DP bill, brought the measure to the floor of the Senate for debate. But by then it was too late. The Senate was anxious to go home—impatient with long sessions. The bill would have passed with a clear majority had it been scheduled earlier in the session.

Senator MCCARRAN waited until the end of the session before deciding to go to Europe. He cabled the Senate he had made a great discovery. Some DP's did not have bona fide passports. Now isn't that a terrible thing? What did the distinguished Senator from Nevada think those poor devils have been doing for passports all these years, waiting for his little inspection trip? They had passports all right. They were passports to nowhere.

So Senator MCCARRAN asked the Senate to wait for his return before voting. But the Senate wanted to go home. They wanted to settle up their unfinished business. So a "gentleman's agreement" developed to force a vote when many Senators had left town for the weekend, because they thought a filibuster was on and there would be no vote until Monday. Late in the session Saturday night, with 30 Senators off the floor, a vote was called. The result, 38 voted for recommitment, 30 against it. That means: 38 Senators voted against the DP's, 30 for them. DP's must languish in concentration camps still longer before the American Senate finds it convenient to voting them life, liberty, and a chance to pursue happiness.

Passing or defeating this bill is not going to make much difference in the American economy. But it is going to make a great deal of difference to the thousands of Nazi and Communist victims in Europe. Even more important, it is going to make a great deal of difference to the honor and conscience of the United States, which of all countries in the world can best afford to provide a haven for those who have suffered religious and political persecutions * * * for the very kind of people who have done so much to help make this country the great nation that it is. (New York Times, October 14, 1949.)

A moral duty was missed, said the New York Times, "a moral disaster in which the convenience of absent Senators has been permitted to outweigh the misery and the heartbreaks of thousands of refugees in Europe to whom the bill meant new life and hope." (October 18, 1949.)

V

The decision of the Senate is not final—just postponed. There is something for each of us to do.

What, then, can each of us do?

1. Tell Senator LUCAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, who are now home from Washington, that we citizens of Illinois are proud of the gallant fight which they put up for decency and humanitarianism. Encourage them to go on fighting for an American principle. It is awfully easy for a Senator to get the idea that the folks back home do not appreciate the abuse he takes when he fights for a great cause. People take for granted the fine things a Senator does. But when he makes a single mistake he hears plenty. So tell Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and Senator SCOTT LUCAS that the people support the stand they have taken.

2. If you have never been a letter writer before, start writing a letter right now, as soon as you get home from Temple, to the editors of each of our four metropolitan newspapers. The "letters to the editor" printed on the editorial page represent a cross-section of the people's opinions; sometimes they even influence the thinking of editorial writers. Write and tell our local papers in a short, simple way just what I have been saying this morning—that it is scandalous for the Senate to desert those DP's; that America has a responsibility to show peoples of the world that we practice the humanitarianism we prescribe for others.

3. Have any convention you attend or business organization you belong to pass a resolution and send it to all 96 Members of the Senate.

4. Support the effort of the Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 308 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., led by Earl G. Harrison, former United States Commissioner of Immigration. This is the organization that is working night and day to mobilize public support for the forgotten DP's.

All this must be done now. The Senate has adjourned until January. The Judiciary Committee, to which the displaced persons bill was remanded, was ordered to report back on the bill by January 25. Let the members of that committee know that we, the people, demand justice and decency for those whom a few Senators have talked to death.

VI

One final thing I want to make clear. Most of the 800,000 DP's in Europe are not Jews. Only a small proportion, less than 20 percent, are Jews. And among the so-called hard-core category of DP's—the old, the sick, the infirm, the handicapped—less than 5 percent are Jews.

But Jews know what it means to have no home. Our own tragic experience in the thirties and forties has taught our people a profound sympathy for any human being who is displaced from his home and from those he loves. Our religion has taught us for 3,000 years to pour out our hearts and our treasure to the stranger * * * to treat him as our very own.

I raise my voice as a rabbi, not alone for the fractional proportion who are my people, but for all the DP's—Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinists, even those who have lost their faith. They are human beings. They are children of God. They are my brethren, and I must be my brother's keeper. Judaism teaches me that. "One law shall there be for the stranger and the home-born; thou shalt love him as thyself * * * for once ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." (Leviticus 19: 33-34.)

It is a terrible responsibility to be an American these days. The traditions of the United States as a land of opportunity and sanctuary for the oppressed have not been forgotten by those thousands of DP's who look desperately to America. We are the only country with the resources, the space, the traditions, the potentialities.

What is more, we will live much more comfortably with ourselves if we bestir ourselves to do something for others. Let us at least keep our self-respect by striving to prove worthy of the inscription guarding the entrance to New York Harbor. Let all America reverberate with EMMA LAZARUS' motto on the Statue of Liberty:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse to your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, the tempest-tossed to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Evidence of Contempt," from the Washington Post of March 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVIDENCE OF CONTEMPT

Though the coal strike is over, the basic question that it raised is far from being settled. That question is whether the Government can compel a union which is endangering the national health and safety to end its strike. We had supposed that this issue was settled by the rulings of the higher courts in similar cases. But Judge Keech found the miners not to be in contempt. The Department of Justice, he said, had not proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the union was responsible for continuation of the strike. This caused us to believe that the Department had been negligent in not submitting the kind of evidence that would have been convincing, for the fact of contempt seemed to be indisputable.

We had felt, specifically, that the case could have been buttressed by evidence of goon squads at work to keep men out of the mines and various other acts in defiance of the court's order. It has been brought to our attention, however, that evidence of this type might have confirmed the UMW's contention that continuation of the strike was due wholly to the action of individual miners, and there was no evidence of secret communication between the UMW and the locals counteracting Mr. Lewis' return-to-work order. In these circumstances the Government felt—and on reconsideration we now feel—that the most convincing evidence of contempt was to be found in the fact that 170,000 miners continued their strike and the UMW continued to take advantage of that strike in bargaining with the operators. Certainly if the courts are going to disregard such evidence and rely upon verbal instructions by union headquarters, which obviously do not convey the real wishes of the union officials, protection of the national health and safety by means of injunction may well prove impossible.

For this reason it is of the utmost importance that this legal issue be settled. The Department of Justice has appealed Judge Keech's ruling to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. We hope that the court will find it feasible to rule on the law involved in spite of the wind-up of the strike; for it the present state of confusion were left unresolved, Congress and the courts would be at a great disadvantage in dealing with any similar national emergencies that might arise.

There is some reason for believing that Judge Keech misunderstood the ruling of the court of appeals in the case that grew out of the 1948 strike. In that instance Mr. Lewis had failed to order the miners back to work on April 5 when the temporary restraining order was served on the union. He gave no instructions to the miners until April 12, when the dispute concerning the welfare fund was settled. The Court of Appeals did

say, in upholding the conviction for contempt, that "if Lewis had sent on April 8 telegrams of a directory or advisory nature, similar to those he sent on April 12, neither he nor the union would have been guilty of contempt of the court's order." But this has to be read in the light of the fact that Mr. Lewis' order of April 12 had the effect of sending the miners back to their jobs. In the present instance Mr. Lewis went through the motions of ordering the men back and the miners, knowing he was under compulsion, respected his wishes instead of his word. Certainly this relieved Mr. Lewis from any charge of contempt; but should it free the union from contempt when the totality of its membership was openly defying the court's order?

In the previous case the court of appeals noted: "The evidence is overwhelming that the walk-out was concerted." The evidence of concerted action was even more overwhelming last week. Should the courts decide to ignore such evidence and rely upon some overt act of contempt upon the part of union officials, they would be issuing a general invitation to lawlessness and irresponsibility on the part of big national unions. It is difficult to believe that the last word from the courts will be so out of keeping with the realities of present-day union practices.

L'Affaire Coca-Cola

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "L'Affaire Coca-Cola" from last night's Evening Star. It is apparent from this editorial that the French are not at all anxious to reciprocate the many favors the United States has done for their nation. On this particular occasion the proposal to ban Coca-Cola did not quite succeed; but we have no assurance, of course, that the proposed ban will not be made after our gifts under the Marshall plan have come to an end.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

L'AFFAIRE COCA-COLA

The old adage that politics makes strange bedfellows has just been vividly illustrated by an action of the French National Assembly. There, an oddly matched bloc of conservative Popular Republicans and Communists, hitherto unable to agree on anything, united to bar Coca-Cola from France.

As may be imagined, the reasons behind this singular combine are very different. The Popular Republicans responded to pressure from the great French wine-growing interests, which are among their most powerful backers. It would seem that far too many Frenchmen are neglecting the traditional vin ordinaire. So the wine growers are up in arms. Their propaganda attracted the attention of the Communist high command, which saw a golden opportunity to use the issue as another stick to belabor Uncle Sam. So France is deluged with Communist warnings against the "coca-colonization of France," denounced as a pernicious economic invasion of the country and as a vehicle of United States imperialism. The French consumer is pictured as soon to be made "coca-colique," with the aid of lurid advertising techniques. All this, despite the fact that sales of Coca-Cola involve no loss of dollar credits to France, since the concentrate is made at a factory in French Morocco, while distribution is entirely in French hands.

Nevertheless, the measure as passed by the Assembly would effectively ban the beverage from France. Ostensibly this rests on grounds of health, albeit it is not specifically mentioned in the bill, for that would openly violate trade agreements by discriminating against an established United States product.

Problems of the United States in the Present War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Gen. William J. Donovan on the occasion of the presentation to him of the Alexander Hamilton award by Columbia University on February 16, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Soviet Union has completed the conquest of China and this has been given formal approval by the 30-year peace treaty.

Throughout the Far East this marks a defeat for the United States.

This victory now makes Russia the dominant power in Asia as well as in Europe.

There may be disagreement whether this breach of the former balance of power in Asia has already gone so far that it threatens our security. But there can be no difference of opinion that the balance of power on which formal peace depends will be hopelessly upset if the Russians carry out their projected extension of the Chinese conquest to Indochina, Hong Kong, the Philippines, Siam, Malaya, Indonesia, and Burma. This was the path by which the Japanese before them got all the way to India.

I visited all these countries, except Burma and Korea, and also visited Japan. During my trip the Russians boldly announced that they were going to try for just such an extension of their continental conquest. They made that announcement by recognizing the Communist revolutionary parties as the government of French Indochina. Within a week the Western Powers had to accept the challenge. The British, the French, and ourselves recognized the opposition government of Bao Dai. In Asia it is completely appreciated that the Russians have declared a subversive war on the rest of non-Communist Asia and ourselves. I wonder if the significance of that choosing up of sides has really come home to us here in the United States.

In the face of this Russian declaration of further conquest beyond China, with the Russians having demonstrated that they do know how to wage this kind of war, the non-Communist Asiatics wonder if the poet Shelley does describe us, if we indeed are "An ineffectual angel beating in the void his luminous wings in vain."

They want to be on our side if we're safe to be with, if we can be relied upon to stick with them when the going gets bad.

What is there we can do to justify their reliance upon us? What are the elements in that area that we can pull together for the sake of the people there as well as for our peace and security? As a line of departure I accept the statement of the Secretary of State that "It is hardly necessary for me to say that an attack on the Philippines could not and would not be tolerated by the United States, but I hasten to add that no one perceives the imminence of any such attack." Let us see how, even at this late day, this defense could be accomplished.

Southeast Asia stretches from the subcontinent of India to the Australia subcontinent. In the center of this great south Asian triangle lies the spreading culture of southeast Asia—on the Indochinese peninsula, on Burma, Siam, and Malaya. On the triangle at its base are the archipelagoes of Indonesia and the Philippines.

Within this triangle live almost 600,000,000 people or about 25 percent of humanity.

The first thing we have to do is to recognize that the theater is one theater—Burma, India, Siam, Indochina, Manila, Malaya, Formosa, Korea, Japan.

That it is all one in spite of the differences that lie between. That it is one in which victories won, time gained, or material salvaged, in Indochina or Formosa may greatly help in an intelligent defense of the Philippines or in the reconstruction of Burma or Indonesia.

When we look at our map and wipe out of our minds the wartime artificial separation into theaters of operation, we see that the western Pacific is a strategic unit of which the Philippines are an integral part.

There is disorder to the point of chaos in Burma. Yet it is the bulwark before India and only speedy political and economic reform can save it from Soviet exploitation. In Indochina the Soviet has picked Ho Chi-Minh, to do there what they used Mao to do in China proper. In Malaya the British are contending against a campaign of ambush and assassination by the Malayan Communist Party.

Japan and its associated islands 1,600 miles from the Philippines give it protection from the north and Formosa almost halfway between must be denied to enemy occupation by National China until next June at least.

Indonesia is the master key for the defense of the Philippines because with Malaya it forms a protective shield against the south and that shield is given depth by Australia only 300 miles south of it. Strategically, southeast Asia is of more than local interest. Whoever controls the Straits of Malacca and Singapore dominates a sea route comparable in importance with the Panama Canal. Indonesia is an island gate between the Pacific and the Indian Ocean. In 1942 Japan took the islands and broke out of the Pacific to extend its operations as far west as Ceylon. The Indian Ocean may well be the warm water target that Russia has always sought.

The American naval and air bases in the Philippines are only a thousand miles from Saigon in French Indochina.

Indonesia is the most important of the southeast Asian countries that have emerged from colonial status into nationhood. An archipelago stretching nearly 4,000 miles, or one-seventh of the way around the earth, and having some 750,000 square miles of land area and a population of 75,000,000.

It is probably the most westernized of the far-eastern countries. Its economic, financial, and even its transport system are based upon western models. It is even by modern standards rich in resources, and is fully able to repay any loans advanced to it for reconstruction and capital expenditures.

Its top leadership is anti-Communist by conviction. Although on lower levels, there is needed experience in organization and administration, the Government in control is about the best that could be obtained. The four or five leading men are competent and honest. They seek United States technical advice both of an industrial and military nature. If we could meet this request for aid as well as counsel, our position would gain strength from the fact that for the last 2 years we have carried out a policy there, consistent, definite, and to a degree successful.

In addition our ambassadors in the vital countries of India, Siam, and Indonesia are men of training, experience, and understanding. They already have the respect and friendship of those countries to which they are accredited.

There is general agreement among those whose opinion should be given weight that Russia has a program in southeast Asia and that the timetable for that program has been stepped up in an endeavor to take full advantage of the momentum from their speedy victories in China.

The urgency requires leadership now. It requires a leader, whether you call him a supreme commander or a high commissioner with the authority, the experience, and the ability to deal with political as well as military problems. He should be vested with the discretion to deal with those problems on the spot and should be located in the theater close enough to see it at first hand, yet not so close as to lose his perspective.

The cooperation of the British, the French, and the Dutch would be eagerly given, and they know our leadership is needed. The establishment of such leadership would be welcomed by the people of the countries concerned and would allay their present fear that we would abandon them.

We must make clear to them that having picked our friends we will stay with them to the finish whatever the consequence.

We have a precedent for this action.

In June 1948 Russia, in the Berlin blockade, employed a menacing and dangerous tactic to test the will of the western Allies and to stop the European recovery program at the outset.

General Clay met the challenge with boldness and resolution. The dramatic success of Operation Vittles, which maintained Berlin's food supply despite the seizure of the city, caught the Soviets flatfooted with surprise.

General Clay saw that, if the Soviets intended war, war could not be avoided by a retreat from Berlin. On the contrary, it would mean that we would be driven progressively to weaker positions. He saw, too, that if Russia was bluffing, that the moment had come to call the bluff or to surrender the initiative he had won.

The courageous and common-sense action of General Clay in that crisis is a guide and an example for us all.

We have shown our great desire for peace with Russia and our willingness to settle differences. But we have learned that up to now, at least, agreement with the Russians is a hopeless illusion.

We now see that what happens in Berlin or in Peking has its repercussions in every area of the world where our country and the Soviet Union face each other. It is a war of subversion on a global scale, in which Russia is trying to whipsaw us from one side of the world to the other.

We must win now the war in which we find ourselves. It is a war which on many fronts Russia has been waging and winning. A war that we can lose without a shot being fired. A war that if we win may make impossible a shooting war. We can neither buy our way out nor appease our way out. Our strength must be found in ourselves—in our decision and in our resolution.

The Government Potato Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Farm Program Must Be Rewritten," by George Minot, which was published in the Boston Herald on March 5, 1950. This is one of the most timely articles of its kind that I have seen, and it should interest the Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES FARM PROGRAM MUST BE REWRITTEN—$6,000,000,000 WILL BE TIED UP IN SURPLUSES A YEAR FROM NOW

(By George Minot)

It is about time the American farmer was taken off the political auction block. And it is long past the time when the American taxpayer should demand that the whole vast program of private supports be reviewed. The Irish potato, on which we have spent upward of half a billion dollars in 5 years of price support, is only a tiny part of a terrific mess.

Secretary Brannan has been talking about dumping the potatoes or selling them for a penny a bag as if that would solve the whole matter. Pretty soon he will try the same tactics with 200,000,000 dozen dried eggs and $27,000,000 worth of dried milk. Senator LUCAS wants to remove all price supports from potatoes unless the Maine farmers accept rigid production control. Somebody should ask him how he feels about a similar program for corn and wheat that are raised in his State of Illinois. He sings a different tune on that.

Right now the Department of Agriculture has more than three and a half billion dollars' worth of surplus commodities it cannot get rid of. It is little wonder that there is overwhelming resentment against the farm program. It hits the public's pocketbook in two ways. It takes tax dollars to buy up and dump unneeded surpluses. In doing this it holds consumer prices higher than their natural levels.

SUPPORT PROGRAM CAN'T BE STOPPED

The farmers will tell you, on the other hand, and they are upheld by economists, that if the support program is abandoned or trimmed too sharply, it will result in a depression that will engulf the Nation. That's probably correct.

Let's look at some of the surpluses on hand the value of which adds up to $3,345,129,317:

Tobacco	pounds	367,258,290
Cotton	bales	9,036,588
Wheat	bushels	465,226,944
Linseed oil	pounds	294,827,620
Flaxseed	bushels	13,943,222
Corn	do	510,654,688
Dried eggs	dozen	210,000,000
Butter	pounds	96,260,068
Wool	do	69,403,900
Dry beans	hundredweight	4,650,795
Barley	bushels	24,626,019
Dried milk	pounds	215,780,800
Cheese	do	22,800,000

Other items in the surplus list have a value of $314,000,000.

It doesn't end there, because the perishables have to be stored in commercial cold storage and dry storage warehouses all through the dairy farm belt from New York to Minnesota. The Government—that is you—has to pay the storage costs, and they are not inconsiderable.

For instance, for butter it is 35 cents per 100 pounds for the first month, and 15 cents per hundred every month thereafter. What it amounts to here is that the price of the butter is advancing about a cent a pound for the first 6 months, and a little less than a cent more for every 6 months thereafter.

SEPTEMBER MESS

The day is fast approaching when the Department of Agriculture is going to be faced with proposals for the wholesale destruction of much of the $3,500,000,000 worth of commodities listed above.

To complicate the situation, the House passed a bill the other day to add from 1,000,000 to 2,000,000 acres to this year's cotton crop and added an unspecified number of acres to this year's peanut crop. The cotton and peanut farmers were helped in this action by representatives of the wheat and corn areas, with the implied understanding that their request for increased acreage on both wheat and corn will be supported by the cotton and peanut representatives.

The Senate followed suit by adding acreage to cotton, wheat, and peanuts.

These are the people in Congress who really are murdering the eastern farmer. Take the poultryman. He is going to be forced out of business or into bankruptcy because he cannot possibly pay the artificially high costs for commercial feeds resulting directly from the Government's high support program.

The eastern dairy farmer is just beginning to feel the pinch. His situation is going to be exactly like the poultryman's unless something is done to rectify the inequalities under the support law as it now exists.

FARM PICTURE BLACK

There are a couple of other items that make the farm picture look black.

First, Americans are not eating as much as they used to. They have cut down their appetites significantly in the last couple of years. The answer is supposed to be that they have so many other things on which to spend their money nowadays—automobiles, television sets, refrigerators, and homes—that they just are not spending as much as they used to for the things they eat.

Secondly, the value of the food commodities we ship overseas is expected to drop between half a billion and a billion dollars this year.

Export, principally under the ECA programs, has provided a big outlet for three main money crops raised by United States farmers—wheat, cotton, and tobacco. During the 1948–49 crop year we shipped out half a billion bushels of wheat, almost as many pounds of tobacco and 4,750,000 bales of cotton. Each of these will drop significantly this year, primarily because of good weather and big crops overseas.

In the ECA countries alone, it is said, farm production is now at 90 percent of the prewar level. And on a long-range basis, these European countries are devoting a constantly larger part of their manufacturing capacity to the production of fertilizers and trucks and farm machinery. This means they will need less and less from us.

SPUD SURPLUS

At home, it seems obvious that there will be another surplus of potatoes. In fact, the Government already is buying early-grown 1950 crop spuds to carry out price guaranties.

Then it is obvious that although the Government has more than $100,000,000 worth of surplus eggs and dried milk, which it is

trying to give away for relief use, even larger purchases of these items, as well as of butter, will be necessary this year.

There is also the probability that the Government will have to buy large quantities of pork this year to support hog prices. This would be taking supplies of meat away from consumers—with their own tax money—at a time when the Government is trying to get more and more meat onto the market.

Finally, in the darkening farm outlook there is almost certain to be an accumulation of additional surpluses on this year's crops of cotton, wheat, corn, and peanuts, which the Government will be obliged under the law to buy up and take off the market.

A MILE APART

The Associated Press estimates that the Government may have more than $6,000,000,000 tied up in surpluses a year from now, and that its postwar losses on perishable products may total upward of a billion dollars.

Thus when you take into account such developments as a rising public debt, Mr. Truman's pleadings for higher taxes and heavy expenditures for national defense, it becomes obvious that something must be done about the billions we are spending on the farmers. But almost everybody is a mile apart when they start to talk about what should be done.

For a starter, a good-sized slash in the cost of Government and a reduction in taxes would be the best kind of Federal aid the American farmer could get.

Control of Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the very fine organizations of which I am proud to be a member is the Wisconsin Grange—a vital element of the National Grange movement. In the March 1950 issue of the National Grange Monthly there is a splendid editorial comment by the distinguished master of the National Grange, Mr. Albert S. Goss. The theme of his comment is "Control of Monopoly"—a matter of crucial historic significance in the background of the early Grange movement and a matter of interest to every farmer, every laboring man, every businessman, every housewife, in the United States.

Albert Goss is one of the finest spokesman in our Nation on matters affecting the national welfare and particularly American agriculture. The members of the Grange, as well as the members of other vital farm organizations look to him as one of the real statesmen in American life, and Members of the Congress respect his wise counsel and judgment.

Time after time he has testified, with other distinguished farm leaders, on crucial issues affecting agriculture, and his suggestions have been of invaluable aid in the actual writing of farm bills.

He has commented on this crucial issue of monopoly. He wisely points out that monopolistic control in any hands—whether it is the hands of labor or of business or of Government—is harmful. Through the years I, too, have commented on this issue, for the fight against monopoly is a never ending fight.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this splendid editorial from the National Grange Monthly be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONOPOLY CONTROL

Twenty years ago in 1929 agriculture employed 10,500,000 persons. By 1949 employment had shrunk to 8,000,000 persons, but the physical volume of agriculture output had increased 42 percent.

This tremendous increase in agricultural production efficiency is due principally to mechanization, improved seed and breeding stock, improved insecticids and fungicides, and improved farm practices generally.

Who benefits from such increased efficiency? The answer is that in a free economy, everyone benefits, if we define a free economy as one in which the government protects its citizens from both physical and economic aggression (Guide Post No. 3), so that they are free to develop their own talents in their own way, so long as they do not impose on others.

If someone held a monopoly in the automobile industry, or any other major industry so he could charge whatever the public would pay, the economic wealth created in a few major industries would soon be concentrated in a few hands. In such circumstances the benefits of technological improvements would result in a concentration of wealth and poverty such as America has never known. The farmers were the first to detect this danger with the rapid expansion of industry during the early days of the Grange, and to call for control of monopoly. It became the great issue around which the Grange was built three generations ago, and resulted in the enactment of the Sherman antitrust law, the only such law among the major nations of the whole world. Effective competition resulted in the advantages of invention, discovery, and technological improvement being gradually but steadily passed on to all our people, through a constant lowering of production costs and selling prices and a consequent rise in the standard of living. The results are many and noteworthy. Four only are noted: (1) In a few brief generations America has jumped from a third- or fourth-rate power to the wealthiest and most powerful nation on earth; (2) among the great nations America has the largest middle-class group of any nation on earth; (3) Americans enjoy a better living standard than any other nation on earth; (4) Americans spend a smaller percent of their income for food than any other nation on earth, and eat better.

Turn anywhere else in all the world and we find that control of many of the essential sources of wealth lie in the hands of a comparatively few. There is a wide income gap between the working people and a small property-owning group. In most countries few of the workers are ever able to bridge that gap. They had no automobiles, electric refrigerators, telephones, or many of the conveniences which we commonly own and class as necessities, and very little hope of ever getting any. With a limited property-owning group, protected by varying degrees of periectly legal monopolies and cartels, it is little wonder that they turn to socialism and communism as a means of bettering their position. They have never had experience with the American way and know nothing about it. The strange thing is that so many people in this country, where we have kept reasonable control over the abuse of monopoly, should turn to the remedies which so many European countries have tried to apply to their monopolistic abuses rather than applying more of our own remedy which has produced such good results.

Although the results of monopoly control have been good here in America, there is still room for much improvement. In time of the recent shortage of supplies, competition broke down in many instances and the public paid through the nose. We have not yet learned to apply voluntary controls effectively in such circumstances, and our efforts at Government price control in many instances only served to aggravate a bad situation. Also, in an effort to grant labor equality in bargaining position, we have set up the possibility of labor monopolies quite as threatening as industrial monopoly.

Despite these shortcomings, we are way ahead of the rest of the world in dealing with this problem, and very clearly the answer is not to abandon the course we have chosen in favor of Government monopoly, but rather to search out and remedy the shortcomings in our method so that the benefits of our great productive capacity will redound to all in lower costs and continually improved living standards from the bottom up.

Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the Capital Press, of Salem, Oreg., written by the editor thereof, Mr. Henry M. Hanzen. The editorials deal with the problem of excise taxes, and the editor takes the position which the junior Senator from Oregon has taken for some years in the Senate, namely, that wartime excise taxes should be repealed.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLDS TOP HAND

(By Henry M. Hanzen)

Canada is booming.

So declares a high Canadian official.

He attributes the boom to Canada's repeal of a number of wartime excise taxes and the slashing of others.

Said this official:

"This tax program has already given the people more money to spend.

"Business is booming.

"From every side we get reports of increased business—increased income.

"We have avoided the business slump and the increase in unemployment the United States experienced recently.

"We are tremendously optimistic.

"We are sure now that the revenue flowing from the increase in business and our national income will more than offset the immediate loss of revenue from the tax cuts."

Canada has repealed the tax on transportation, amusements, telegraph and telephone messages.

It has cut the tax on jewelry, cosmetics, furs, luggage, handbags, fountain pens, cigarette lighters, and similar commodities.

Americans are still paying these wartime excise taxes.

They pay a tax of 15 percent on transportation, 20 percent on amusements, 20 percent on jewelry, 20 percent on cosmetics, 20 percent on luggage, handbags, fountain pens, cigarette lighters, and similar commodities.

In his message to Congress President Truman recommends that these excise taxes be reduced.

He declared the most serious inequities exist in these taxes, adding that were they cut it would help business.

But in his message the President made the cut in these excise taxes contingent on Congress increasing corporation, gift, and estate taxes to recoup the loss in revenue.

The President also took occasion to denounce tax loopholes which allow some groups to escape paying their fair share of the tax burden.

He cited the oil operators as one group and the moving-picture operators as another, pronouncing the tax evasions of both as shocking.

He demanded that these loopholes be closed by Congress and other tax reforms be made.

While Congress generally is agreeable to slashing excise taxes, the Republicans and Dixiecrats are balking on any increase in corporation, gift, and estate taxes.

Consequently the message will likely precipitate a tug of war between the Executive and the conservative Members of Congress.

The President, however, would appear to hold the top hand.

He has the veto power, and there are probably enough administration men to sustain it.

With this veto power he may be able to force through his tax program.

All the excise taxes the President recommends be cut were imposed during the war.

Primarily their purpose was to discourage civilian buying and save raw materials and labor for war work.

The war ended several years ago, and it is time now that the consumers were given a break.

CARNIVAL OF TAXES

(By Henry M. Hanzen)

The Tax Foundation, a private research organization, has been probing into hidden taxes.

It found plenty.

It found 151 taxes hidden in a loaf of bread, and 100 inside the shell of an egg.

It found similar taxes hidden in everything else we eat—every bite of food.

That is the principal reason why food prices are so high.

The Tax Foundation further found 116 taxes woven into a suit of clothes—found them woven to a greater or less extent into everything else a man wears, everything a woman wears, everything children wear.

That is the principal reason why wearing apparel is so high.

The Tax Foundation further found that Uncle Sam collects $210,688,163 annually on jewelry, $33,969,241 on cosmetics and toilet articles, $82,607,133 on luggage, $61,946,247 on furs.

That is the principal reason why so-called luxury articles for women are so high.

The Tax Foundation further found that there are between 700 and 1,000 hidden taxes in a new house.

That is the principal reason why the dream houses of GI couples are so high.

The Tax Foundation further found that Uncle Sam collects annually $2,247,000,000 in taxes on liquor.

That single item is larger than the total revenue for the Federal Government for the year 1933.

We pay hidden taxes on everything we eat, everything we drink, everything we wear, everything we use, every business transaction.

Altogether these hidden taxes total annually the giant sum of $7,600,000,000.

Combined with direct taxes these taxes comprise the Federal budget for this fiscal year, $42,400,000,000.

It is estimated that this budget represents $1 in taxes out of every $6 earned in the country.

Yet the Government will be $5,100,000,000 short.

How is all this money spent?

It is spent for foreign aid, defense, aid to veterans, social programs, development of natural resources, aid to farmers, public works, housing, education, labor programs, general government, interest on the public debt.

How much of it is wasted?

Billions.

The nonpartisan Hoover Commission, whose recommendations for the overhauling of the Federal Government has the blessing of President Truman, estimates the waste at a minimum of three billions.

Every State, county and municipal government is also permeated with waste.

We are living in a carnival of taxes, and waste of public funds.

It is time to call a halt on this colossal waste of the money of the taxpayers.

How Propaganda Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "KERR Denies His Gas Plan To Bring Increase," from the Tulsa Tribune, Tulsa, Okla., March 2, 1950. The article is a factual news story which gives some interesting background on the techniques employed to influence public opinion.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KERR DENIES HIS GAS PLAN TO BRING INCREASE

(By Malvina Stephenson)

WASHINGTON, March 2.—The battle over natural-gas regulation continued to rage on the national scene today, following a radio interview in which Senator ROBERT S. KERR denied that his pending legislation would bring increased gas rates to the American consumer.

On a radio program here with Columnist Marquis Childs, Senator KERR pointed out that Southwest independents are selling gas under long-term contracts already fixed for years to come. His legislation "assuring independents continued freedom from Federal regulation does not disturb a single contract," according to KERR.

"All of the present supply was secured by the consuming market without the independent producer ever having been regulated by the Federal Government," KERR said.

"The best interests of the consumer in the future will be served as it has in the past by the independent producers being free to sell to them without regulation or restriction. The amendments do not change in any way the jurisdiction or power of the Commission."

The frontal attack against the Kerr legislation is being led by the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, with various other interested forces joining in the fray. The institute passed a resolution opposing the legislation at its convention in Kansas City last December, but officials here said City Attorney Bob Davidson, of Tulsa, voted against that resolution.

Individual members of the National Conference of Mayors are getting in their licks, but the organization as yet has taken no formal stand. Paul V. Betters, executive secretary, while not acting formally in the absence of an organization resolution, is assisting members in getting the opposition information.

The American Municipal Association, the general organization for all city officials, met last fall, but its publicity spokesman here said no resolution on the subject was even presented.

Charles H. Rhyne, Washington representative of the institute, spokesman for the critics of the Kerr bill, is getting convenient data from experts he doesn't identify. Rhyne, himself, appears unfamiliar with the subject. He did not know about the activities of State corporation commissions. He could offer no substantiation for his contention that the Kerr legislation would mean a 5-cent increase per 1,000 cubic feet, but said the estimate came from experts in certain cities.

The opposition to the legislation is faring well enough in the public battle of words, partly because handy generalizations are easy to make and technical legislation hard to get across to the public.

Name-calling, personal attacks, such as Rhyne launched on Kerr, always attract more attention and are difficult to combat when an issue is painted as a battle against the vested interests. That alone lures certain politicians into the fray. They see themselves riding as knights in shining armor in defense of the American consumer—and to political glory. The controversy over the gas legislation is snowballing on the national scene, and the climax will be reached when it is fought out on the floor of the Senate probably next week.

Proposed Peace Conference Between the United States and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Door Is Still Open," published in the Portland Oregonian for February 15, 1950. The editorial was sent to me by Joseph R. McCready, of Forest Grove, Oreg.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DOOR IS STILL OPEN

Scarcely have the statements of Secretary of State Acheson and President Truman ceased from reverberation—to the effect that it is useless to direct a peace appeal to the Kremlin—than the State Department issues an invitation to the Russians to resume discussions of atomic energy at a hearing in the United Nations.

The sticking point remains, we assume, with Russia pinheadedly blocking the American and UN proposal of international control and inspection. But the situation is too potentially cataclysmic for impatient treatment. The surly suspicion of the Kremlin must be reduced, if humanly possible, by attrition, through reassurance and reason. Mankind isn't gunning for scalpels, but for survival. One hopes, and prayerfully, that the Russians will agree to a resumption of the talks.

It must occur to any logical analyst that Russians may in truth be as worried about the atomic energy dilemma as we are, and to mask their dread are resorting to brag and bluster. They are fools if they aren't scared out of their best felt boots. We are admittedly frightened, not of the potential enemy alone, but of the hideous choice we might have to make. That is why we grasp eagerly at the straw—if such it is—of resuming discussions. And that is why we read with intense gratification that favorable talk is current in Russia.

Said the attorney general of Great Britain, Sir Hartley Shawcross, of the deadlock that must be broken, if it is breakable, "I do not believe war is inevitable; I believe statesmanship can still avoid it." For our conduct in the promotion of peace we are accountable to ourselves, as the Kremlin is for its own. We must not weary of endeavor, through appealing to the Russians by every moral means, lest civilization should blunder into radioactive oblivion, dragging all life with it. The theoretical prospect begggars the fancy of Dante. If sustained patience is any insurance against it, let us cultivate the virtue as never before, for humanity's sake.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article relative to the settlement of the coal strike, written by Mr. Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 4.—A great many people, including some of the strongest party supporters of President Truman's program as well as its Republican and Democratic opponents in Congress, apparently are united in the conviction that he bamboozled the crisis over the Nation's soft-coal supply in a manner which was certain to lead to his request for power to seize the mines, and an intervening or ultimate settlement largely in the miners' favor. Many competent observers have been saying all along that this was John L. Lewis' objective from the end of the miners' contract period last July.

Hence, the President is under fire on three serious charges: (1) He delayed coming to grips with the plain threat in the coal fields to national health and safety until it was a reality; (2) he refrained so long from making use of the Taft-Hartley injunction procedures that the miners took this as encouragement to flout the law for which Mr. Truman showed such obvious distaste, which he had attacked as a slave labor act and sought to repeal; and (3) his tactics not only made inevitable his request for Government seizure, and the ultimate triumph of Mr. Lewis, but forced another national step toward nationalization (in this instance of the mines), which is a basic tenet of socialism.

RECALL TRUMAN STATEMENT

And his critics go on to say this drift and this result were the work of a President who said only recently that he "hasn't a drop of Marxist or Socialist blood" in him.

There is documentation for these harsh charges, though to prove them to the popular majority and make them endure as a political liability of Mr. Truman and his administration is the task which will first confront his critics in the congressional campaign of 1950. By the time the voters come to decision on Democratic candidates he favors for election in November, events may have blunted some or all of the accusations or the topic may be submerged in far graver ones.

Nevertheless, it is already plain that Mr. Truman and his administration are to be made the general issue in the 1950 elections—he, his Democratic opponents and the Republicans agree on that—and his handling of the coal situation in 1949–50 is certain to be a part of the issue. Among its facets these will appear:

1. The President has long denounced the Taft-Hartley Act as a slave-labor law, designed to put workers into involuntary servitude, and has constantly striven to repeal it, as he promised the voters in 1948 he would do. Insofar as this could undermine public acceptance of a law Mr. Truman was sworn to enforce, it has done so.

LAW PROVED TO BE WEAK

2. But when the President finally brought himself to invoke the law in an effort to suspend the coal strike, the virtually unanimous refusal of the miners to respect its enforcement by the courts showed that, instead of being an instrument of enslavement, it is too weak. Also, the miners' disregard of this and of the court injunction which grew out of the corollary effort to suspend the strike that was made by the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board calls for reconsideration by Congress of the bans it declined to legislate against industry-wide bargaining and against strikes at the sources of essential national supplies.

3. In every respect, therefore, the President was wrong about the kind of labor legislation which is needed and dilatory in making use of what there is.

At this writing, it seems that there will be powerful arguments against the President, his administration, and those Democrats who have supported and will defend them. If the items do not add up to a major political liability which could be liquidated by the election of another Congress opposed to the Fair Deal, then the President's opposition will have missed the boat again, or subsequent events will minimize what now appears to be the political peril of the administration, or the popular majority will show itself still disposed to support Mr. Truman on balance.

Administration Democrats who have been shying away from strong defense of the President's course, were beginning to take heart today, however, with the claim that the seizure message forced the operators to make a "fair" settlement. But numerous Democrats will not take that line—its accuracy is open to doubt. And most Republicans are seizing on the issue with avidity.

The President, in his message to Congress Friday asking for power to seize the mines temporarily, suggested the outline of the campaign answer he will make to the accusations. It is in general a declaration of faith in collective bargaining as the proper means to settle industrial disputes without Government intervention and in the propriety of his course first in delaying and then in using seizure as a settlement club. In detail, it makes the point that the coal industry is sick from causes which no administrative acts or policies can eradicate until a commission of inquiry can find the root of the trouble and a "solution of the basic difficulties."

SEEMING BASIS OF MESSAGE

In other words, the message seemed to be saying this:

"No law now existing or proposed, and no men entrusted with law enforcement, are capable of solving the problems of the coal industry as they now are or as they have been evaluated. Until the trouble is found and the remedy prescribed and taken, the only thing to do is to try to make collective bargaining work and assume that it will up to the twelfth hour and beyond."

The question is, Will that be an effective shield from the political attacks?

Importance of Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Wake Up America," by Melvin O. Steen, of the Missouri Conservation Commission.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAKE UP, AMERICA

(By Melvin O. Steen, Missouri Conservation Commission)

If you would know the true story of Americans, their wildlife and their land, look first to history. On its pages you will find that story revealed in the critical light of historical fact. To better understand this story, however, it is necessary to first scan the history of other men and their land. It is necessary to look at yesterday as well as at today.

Look at history, and you will see nation after nation march across its pages, to rise and flourish on the rape of a fertile land, and to pass on into national decay or oblivion with the depletion of that fertility. Look at history, America. When you do, you will see that civilized man has always misused the land. You will see many unproductive scars on old Mother Earth, lands that once housed and fed great nations. Look at the history of any nation that has ever tilled the soil, and you will see that man is not worthy of his stewardship of the land. He always despoils the land, and the degree of his destruction can be measured in terms of his tenure plus his so-called civilization.

When the source of man's sustenance and material glory will no longer sustain his way of life, he does one of two things: He sinks into individual and national decay, or he takes, by force of arms, more fertile land from some other nation. That is history.

Van Loon defines history in this short but tremendously significant sentence: "History is the story of a hungry animal in search of food." But man is not possessed of physical hunger alone. His hunger engulfs the whole array of human desire, and he uses the land to satiate that hunger without much regard for the future. Man's philosophy with respect to the land is "rip it off the hills; gouge it out of the soil; get it into the bank in one generation if possible." His slogan is, "To hell with tomorrow, I want mine today."

These are searing words, but they are not my words. I only quote from history. These are not my words; these words are written on the sands of time; they are scrawled across the pages of history, that "story of a hungry animal in search of food."

So much for yesterday; now let us look at today.

You are young and you are strong, America. You are progressive, you are wise. Your way of life is different; your ideals are high; you will not do these things, you say. Let us look at the record, at your history.

You are young, America. This land has been under your control some 300 years, more or less. For about 100 years you have used it intensively. Tonnage yields to feed the world has been your goal. You have produced, but at a price. You have produced, but you have also ruined, partially or completely, more than half the fertile topsoil you possessed. It took the Chinese 10 times as long to do as much to China.

You are strong, America. But may I remind you that your way of life, your institutions, and your society are builded on, sustained by, and no better than the land on which you live. I remind you that adequate nutrition requires more than mere bulk, that nutrition is a qualitative as well as a quantitative thing. I remind you that your hillbilly is a hillbilly because he grows his food on hillbilly land. In the light of present-day knowledge there can be little doubt that the true hillbilly is what he is because of malnutrition; qualitative malnutrition that dulls his mind, saps his strength, and smothers his ambition. This American is already in the process of degeneration. Do you not see him rave, and burn, and hack, and gouge the impoverished soil on which he lives, further depleting its ability to sustain and nourish him? Can you not see the vicious circle in which he lives, a circle that moves relentlessly around and around, a circle from which but few escape. Must I remind you that there are other groups within our society which suffer a like fate? What are your "Tobacco Road" and "Grapes of Wrath" if they are not symbols of this truth.

These are searing words, America, but they are taken from history—your history.

You are progressive, America. When your land fails to produce the tonnage you desire you fix things up with chemical fertilizers. But you pay no attention to the warnings of scientists whose long experience in tilling the soil leads them to say that chemical fertilization is only a delusion, a stop-gap, a tonnage producer that does not restore essential, life-giving elements inherent in a fertile soil.

You are wise, America. When your overworked corn lands lost much of their fertility and their ability to produce, you came forth with hybrid corn. Your corn yields skyrocketed, and you are still congratulating yourself on your ingenuity. But you fail to take note of one significant thing. You overlook that fact that history will record hybrid corn as being that corn which had the ability to take fertility out of the soil twice as fast as any corn that man had ever grown before.

The truth is that your own land-use history records you as the greatest spendthrift of all time. You have developed bigger, better, and faster ways of using up soil fertility than has any nation in all the world. You are the champion playboy of all history, and your extravagance is exceeded only by your disregard of the consequences.

"And what," you may well ask, "has all this to do with wildlife?" Simply this, that nature makes no distinction between wild and tame life insofar as soil fertility is concerned. In Old Mother Nature's book nutrition is nutrition, and life is life. It makes no difference whether that life be wild or tame.

It is true, however, that misuse of the land is a two-edged sword insofar as wildlife is concerned. It reduces protective cover as well as fertility. Adequate protective cover and adequate nutrition are the two big essentials of wildlife production, and both these essentials are impaired by misuse of the land.

At the present time prices of farm products are very high and the economic incentitive to squeeze every last pound of production out of the land is great. The immediate effect is to increase erosion and reduce wildlife, but the long time effect is to reduce land fertility; and hence, all production.

The simple truth is that man cannot reduce soil fertility without all life suffering the consequences. That truth is supported by evidence which grows steadily in volume and significance. This evidence puts the emphasis on qualitative rather than quantitative nutrition. Soil fertility determines the quality and contents of foodstuffs, and the quality and contents of foodstuffs affects all life. The evidence is overwhelming. When insane men are made sane through the avenue of nutrition alone, one can no longer doubt that quality counts. Some day foodstuffs will be valued on the basis of quality, not quantity. When that day comes we may have the economic incentive that will save our soil. Until we do, we must save the land by any means we can.

The simple truth is that the growth, vigor, survival, and reproduction of all life is wedded to the land by unbreakable bonds. The truth is that America should maintain, without impairment, the fertility of all her lands. To do otherwise is unthinkable, and must eventually lead to disaster. It is not wildlife alone that hangs in this balance. It is America herself that is at stake.

If this be true, what are we doing to maintain the fertility of our land? Let us look at the record. Let us look at history—today's history.

As individuals we are doing relatively little. Here and there an individual has learned that he can maintain the fertility of his farm and make more money in the long run than if he misused his land. But that individual is relatively rare. The masses know nothing of this. In fact, the masses, including the vast majority of those who till the land, know little or nothing of the true significance of land fertility and the real dangers of land abuse.

As a Nation, we have done very little to save our agricultural lands. Our most effective governmental actions have been the establishment of the Soil Conservation Service, and the initiation of benefit payments to American farmers for soil-conserving practices. But neither of these came by any united design or desire of the American people. The first came into being largely because of the inspired leadership and dogged persistence of a single American citizen. The second does not have even that background. Benefit payments for soil-conserving practices in America came into being by chance—they were initiated because the Supreme Court of the United States said we could not pay public money to American farmers for plowing under crops and killing little pigs. Thus was born America's national efforts to save her soil.

If this is not enough to convince you that America does not know the score, look to the seat of your government, look to Washington. There you will see your government appropriating $45,000,000 to the Soil Conservation Service to finance their work of holding America's water where it falls and her soil where it lies, and, at the same time appropriating $185,000,000 to the War Department with which to make down payments on dams designed to stop the water that doesn't linger where it falls and the soil that doesn't stay where it lies.

Forty-five million dollars to the doctors who feverishly strive to sew up your severed and gushing arteries, America—and frankly admit that they are waging a losing fight—$45,000,000 to the doctors who feverishly strive to suture your severed and gushing arteries, and four times that sum to the tinsmiths who beat out buckets with which you propose to preserve your life's blood.

That is not—as some may assume—an indictment of tinsmiths. It is an indictment of you, America, you, who entertains and tolerates such a twisted, distorted, cockeyed concept of national values and national needs.

If you are not yet convinced that America doesn't know the truth, look again to Washington. There you will see many of your leaders and representatives sponsoring a movement to slash, by one-third, the appropriation for soil conservation benefit payments. You will see the scalpels poised and ready to cut the heart and backbone out of America's effort to save her land. These men contend that you cannot afford to pay for saving the soil, that you have other and better things to do with public money. You can afford, it seems, $11,000,000,000 plus for national defense, but you cannot afford $300,000,000 to save the very thing you propose to defend. You can afford to subsidize navigation, aviation, hydroelectric development, flood control, and other special interest groups, but you cannot afford to subsidize the saving of the land, in which every living American has a stake, as do all the generations yet unborn.

You can afford to mobilize American manhood into armies that you count by the millions, to equip them with implements of destruction that stagger the imagination, you can afford navies that swarm the seven seas, you can afford aircraft that figuratively—and literally—blot out the sun, you can afford $300,000,000,000 in the prosecution of a single war, you can afford barrels—nay, rivers, of American blood; all this, and more, you can afford to save America from danger from without, but a little lip service, and a token gesture here and there is all you can afford to save America from disaster within.

America, you go the way all men have gone. You are a living symbol of the truth, that history repeats itself. ("A hungry animal in search of food.") You are not young, you are not strong, you are not wise, you only dream these things. You live an old, deceitful dream, that blinds your eyes against the truth, that leads you down disaster's road. You have one chance and only one. Wake up. Shake off this dream. Wake up. Shake off this spell, that you may see that you may take a better road.

Let's Stop Wallowing in Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let's Stop Wallowing in Fear," which appeared in the Evening Star of Washington, D. C., on March 4, 1950.

Today we have too many prophets of doom and too few prophets of peace; too many who arise each morning to predict a day of fear and too few who arise to look for the road to peace.

These are difficult days, but we should recognize that we cannot find a way to solve our problems by wringing our hands and crying, "There is no hope."

There is hope—if only we have sense enough to recognize it. I commend the editorial, and urge all Members of Congress to read it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S STOP WALLOWING IN FEAR

The other day, in his new role of private citizen, David E. Lilienthal had some decidedly sensible things to say about the foolishness of constantly harping on the frightful possibilities of A-bombs and H-bombs. The possibilities undoubtedly are terrible, and they need to be kept in mind, but he has taken the very sound view that the calamity howlers are not rendering a real service either to the Nation or the world when they keep on howling as if they wanted to give everybody a nervous break-down.

Of course, as the recently retired Chairman of our Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Lilienthal has more than enough grim information to persuade him to concede that today's actual and potential weapons of mass destruction make the annihilation of mankind at least theoretically conceivable. He is willing to concede, too, that the subject demands a great deal of public study and discussion. But what he does not concede is that the study and discussion should be dominated by end of the worlders who seem to take a morbid delight in the extravagant and sensational picturing of the horrors of atom warfare.

In other words, what Mr. Lilienthal is against, what he is fed up with, is the more flamboyant of the scare-the-dopes school of experts who feel that the people (the "dopes") can be alerted to the dangerous nature of our time only if they are ceaselessly bombarded with all sorts of frightening talk—such as talk about how 500 tons of heavy hydrogen might be used to wipe out all life on this planet, or about how the seat of our National Government should be established in some city other than Washington, or about how 60,000,000 Americans should be dispersed from our urban centers. As Mr. Lilienthal has put it, speculation about the end of man adds up to a kind of neurotic wallowing in the hazards of atomic warfare, and suggestions for the drastic decentralization of our cities, or for a gigantic dispersal of our population, amount to nothing but a lot of high intellectual nonsense, because the thing can't be done and it won't be done.

More than that, as Mr. Lilienthal has rightly declared, such talk, far from alerting people, can have the opposite effect. For the average human being has the altogether healthy trait of not wanting to be afraid. He ceases to be agitated by the cry of "Wolf! Wolf!" when it is repeated too often, and he tends to grow more and more bored these days by the endless succession of furid doomsday speeches. He refuses to crawl in under the covers and quiver in his bed. He wants his life to be reasonably enjoyable. The frightening words begin to pall on him, the tocsin ringers and the atomic Paul Reveres become increasingly tiresome, and he gets progressively less and less interested in them until he forgets about the whole business and turns his attention away from the calamitous to the pleasant.

Thus, instead of awakening the American people, the "scare-the-dopes school," by overdoing things, bids fair to bore them to the point of indifference or fill them with the feeling that the atom leaves them pretty much helpless and hopeless. Quite obviously, that is a poor way to promote national security or sound public thinking. Nothing could be more sterile. In Mr. Lilienthal's words, "To face the dangers of a very tough world, what we need is not to be overwhelmed by them but to understand them, and then with courage and resolution and patience face up to them and see them through."

It is good to have this said by a man like Mr. Lilienthal. Within recent weeks, the Cassandras have been filling the American atmosphere with just too many high thin cries of woe. We need to get back to our traditional language of hope, self-confidence, and affirmation. The atomic speech makers—scientists, legislators, and all others vocal on the subject—would do well to stop shouting about the end of the world and take a calmer, more level-headed view of the immediate realities. We have had too much wallowing in fear. It is a spectacle that can win no respect for us in Russia or anywhere else.

No Victory for FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of February 24, 1950:

NO VICTORY FOR FEPC

Under existing circumstances, passage of a fair-employment-practices bill by the House yesterday represents no real victory for those who sincerely desire fair-employment-practices legislation. The original administration bill has been so diluted that very little is left of it but an expression of good intentions. Thus, almost exactly 5 years after FEPC first emerged from a House committee, after conventions of both parties had endorsed it in principle, but after every parliamentary device known to man had been employed to scuttle it, the net result is that virtually no advance has been made toward establishing FEPC as an effective arm of the Federal Government.

If circumstances had been different, something might have been said in favor of the basic provisions of the bill that the House finally did approve. In essence, it establishes a Fair Employment Practices Commission to assist State and local agencies to combat job discrimination against minorities, but the assistance would be through investigation, recommendation, and persuasion without power of enforcement. In view of Southern feelings, this might not have been a bad way, as a starter, to bring the Federal Government into the picture. It would have clearly established Federal policy on discrimination, and this approach to an admittedly touchy subject might have been a wise first step.

But such legislation cannot be looked at as if it were in a vacuum. The unhappy fact is that the opposition to FEPC has shown that it will not compromise; it will not retreat an inch; on this issue it will not pay any attention either to the party platforms or, for that matter, to the spirit of the American democracy. It has engaged in a long and bitter parliamentary struggle to prevent any action at all on an FEPC bill; and when these tactics failed, it cynically supported a toothless measure that, in view of all that has gone before, no one now expects to be taken seriously. The whole affair has become a mockery of responsible legislative practice; and the prospective filibuster awaiting FEPC in the Senate only adds to the hollowness of the entire procedure.

Community Development in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What This Town Needs," by Norman Kuhne, published in the Nation's Business for February 1950, which is an excellent article on community development in the State of Arkansas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THIS TOWN NEEDS

(By Norman Kuhne)

Scarcely a day goes by in any community without some resident telling anyone willing to listen something like this:

"Now what our town needs is * * *."

"The trouble with this town is * * *."

"We're never going to get anywhere in this town until * * *."

Forget the chronic complainers. Usually such statements preface constructive suggestions by citizens eager to make their home towns better places to live.

Civic leaders everywhere have sought to translate this latent desire for progress into ways to build better communities. A plan which does just that marks its second anniversary in Arkansas this month. It's a joint enterprise of private industry, business associations, and State government called the community development clinic program. Working hand in hand to build better home towns in the Wonder State are the Arkansas Economic Council-State Chamber of Commerce, the Arkansas Power & Light Co., the State government's resources and development commission, and some 100 local chambers of commerce.

In numerous towns and cities people have learned what they can accomplish by accepting the responsibility of good citizenship. The community clinic program promises to become a vital force in other places, with several States, cities, and even foreign countries having investigated the plan with a view to adopting it.

The Arkansas program has aroused such interest because it can be adapted to meet the needs of the most, as well as the least, advanced community. Such clinics can stimulate multi-million-dollar projects like airports and public buildings or modest improvements like neighborhood playgrounds. They can insure the developed area against civic complacency and the underdeveloped against stagnation.

Fort Smith, a bustling city of 50,000 in western Arkansas, for years had been pursuing an active development program through its chamber of commerce and other organizations. But this community, like many others, had come to depend on a small group of old reliables willing to work. And businessmen never were sure the projects they sponsored were those with widest popular support.

A community clinic transfused new blood into the Fort Smith program. It disclosed the names of several hundred persons willing to work, many of them already active on various committees. What's more, civic leaders know their present program includes projects considered most important, which makes it truly a community undertaking.

Fort Smith's clinic high lighted the need for new streets. Many older thoroughfares, paved with brick, were breaking up. After the clinic, a group of citizens persuaded the city council to adopt ordinances permitting the formation of street-improvement districts. A delegation called on the county judge who controls State-aid highway funds. He agreed to release $115,000 provided the city would raise $57,000. Householders whose properties are on the streets to be repaved will put up the balance. Eight street improvement districts are being created and work will begin this spring.

Favorable action on a $650,000 bond issue for school improvements also is credited to the clinic by Arthur Murphy, Fort Smith chamber manager, as are a dozen other projects.

Throughout Arkansas, cities and towns are erecting public buildings, beautifying highway approaches, establishing parks and playgrounds, constructing youth centers, building farm-to-market roads, providing off-street parking facilities, extending water and sewer mains and doing numerous other things toward a higher standard of living and greater human comfort.

In many communities local residents say they've moved ahead faster in the 2 years the clinic program has been operating than in any previous decade. And the accomplishments have been things the home-town folks considered of first importance.

To see how a community clinic works, let's examine one I attended at Dardanelle, a town of 2,000 in west central Arkansas.

At 9 a. m. 56 Dardanelle businessmen, farmers, housewives, and workingmen met in the American Legion club room on the town's main thoroughfare. They were greeted by Warren McGuire, a grocer and president of the local chamber of commerce, who explained the purpose of the meeting. Then McGuire introduced I. J. Steed, chief planning officer of the Arkansas Resources and Development Commission, to lead discussion.

Steed explained the basic needs of any community. His was no high-flown lecture. It was the conversation of a man reared on an Arkansas farm, just like many of his listeners.

He discussed practical industries, up-to-date stores and service establishments, market facilities for farmers, accommodations and attractions for tourists. He stressed the social factors: schools, libraries, churches, recreational facilities, art and music. Then there were the physical factors: condition of streets and sidewalks, municipal services, appearance of public buildings and grounds, look of private homes, vacant lots, and highway approaches.

By talking about things that apply to any town, Steed established a yardstick for Dardanelle—one with which the townspeople themselves could measure the standing of their own community.

He distributed 5- by 8-inch cards on which was space for the writer to jot down the things he thought Dardanelle needed. Each person was asked to sign his name and address and signify if he were willing to work on a committee that might be created to carry out the projects in which he was most interested.

The meeting lasted a little more than an hour and, at 10:30, a second group arrived for a similar session. This group, too, represented a cross section of community interests. In the course of a 2-day clinic, Steed held 14 meetings with groups ranging in size from 30 to 60, including one with the high school senior class and another with a delegation of colored citizens who account for about 20 percent of the local population.

In all, 487 townspeople filled out cards. About half said they would work for the projects suggested. Such suggestions ranged from street and sidewalk paving, which would entail a sizable bond issue, to cleaning up a river-bank dump which would require an afternoon's work by volunteers. There were lofty proposals like one calling for the construction of a local library to supplement the county bookmobile service. There were homely ones like that advocating "wet toilets" in the outlying sections.

His brief case full of suggestions, Steed returned to Little Rock to prepare a report. The cards were tabulated and the project most frequently suggested became No. 1, and on down the line.

After listing desired improvements in tabular form, the report took up what the people said they wanted. One man mentioned the need of a traffic light at a highway intersection. The report noted the specific corner. Another man proposed repaving an intersection on a back street and the report listed that. An appendix named those attending the clinic, their chief interest, their willingness to work on a committee.

Mimeographed copies of the report were returned to the Dardanelle chamber's board of directors for action. At this writing it's still too early to tell how the community will follow through on the proposed program but, if experience elsewhere is any guide, results will show.

The fact that large numbers of people turn out to discuss local problems and suggest their own course of action has awakened a civic consciousness that formerly lay dormant in many Arkansas communities. In a dozen towns I visited, business leaders said that their clinic had generated enough interest in local projects to insure favorable action on bond issues that otherwise might have failed.

Typical was a $165,000 sewage-disposal plant and sewer-main extension project in Bentonville, a city of 3,500 in the northwest corner of the State. The issue had been hanging fire for several years and was coming up for a vote, with the outlook none too favorable. But after a community clinic, held a week before the election in April 1948, the picture changed.

People began to talk it up. Businessmen like Arthur Smith, president of the bank; Clayton Little, deputy prosecuting attorney; Terry Peel, realtor; Roy Stewart, steel fabricator; and J. C. Knott got on the phone and kept their lines busy telling associates to get out and vote. Others made a block-by-block canvass.

When the ballots were counted, the bond issue carried by a vote of 368 to 227. According to Bruce Williams, manager of the Bentonville Chamber of Commerce, the vote would have been adverse but for the civic enthusiasm generated by the clinic.

Other communities, too, credit the clinic with providing the margin between success and failure of local projects. Trumann businessmen say there is no doubt but that their clinic assured approval of a $100,000 bond issue for school improvement and was a material factor in raising $70,000 by public subscription for the same purpose.

In Arkadelphia the clinic indicated great interest in sewer improvement, resulting in a city-wide vote to spend $200,000 on the project. Perhaps it was action like this which prompted George S. Dews, manager of the Arkadelphia Chamber of Commerce, to say:

"In 17 years' service in this office I have never known as much interest or as many people at one time being interested in civic improvement to the extent that they will say what they want and then work unselfishly to see that it is well done."

Wesley Gordon, Fayetteville chamber manager, says a clinic gave the needed impetus for a $1,000,000 waterworks for that city.

Fayetteville is an example of how a chamber of commerce uses its clinic report. Copies went to all civic groups and their cooperation was enlisted. One contemplated project was a better park. A park committee composed of representatives of various civic organizations was established. With an ante of $400 contributed by members, the chamber raised $1,500 by public subscriptions to provide park rest rooms. The Rotary Club, Lions Club, American Legion post, and Women's Civic Club each financed the construction of a concrete tennis court. In all, civic groups contributed $15,000 for park improvements and persuaded the city council to put up $20,000 for a swimming pool.

Elsewhere the story is similar. In Montecello, the clinic disclosed the need for more street markers. The Veterans of Foreign Wars donated them. At Mount Ida, the P. T. A. contributed $700 to modernize school rest rooms. In Newport, a private citizen donated a library building. In Warren, the Junior Guild equipped an office for the health department. At England, the Heritage Club installed new traffic lights.

Some suggestions made at clinics require action by private industry—and industry has acted. At the De Queen Clinic, several people spoke about a rough railroad grade crossing. A railroad employee was in the audience. Within 48 hours a repair crew was at work. At Osceola, several persons suggested a more convenient location for the bus station. The bus company met their desire. Bentonville people disliked the way an unsightly junk yard at one approach to the city impressed visitors. After the clinic, a city beautification committee was established with the junk yard proprietor as a member. Shortly an attractive showroom for new cars replaced the junk yard.

Through the stimulus of these clinics people are coming more and more to grips with such fundamental issues as: How can we balance our economy, diversify our agriculture, extend our trade area, stabilize employment, improve local government, get away from dependence on Washington? By starting a search for answers to questions like these, the program can produce far-reaching results.

The community-clinic program is a postwar development in Arkansas that owes its existence in part to chance and part to design. When the war ended, C. Hamilton Moses, president of the Arkansas Power & Light Co., and some of his staff went to New York to get financing for an expansion program. In a meeting with a committee of underwriters, their credit standing was questioned, principally because they did business in Arkansas—considered by some a backward State.

Meanwhile several Arkansas cities were trying to woo industries. More than one chamber secretary was told by an industrial prospect to make another call after his city had better schools, more paved streets, greater fire protection, and the like.

These frank statements did much to awaken State business leaders to the need for greater civic improvement. Moses called a meeting of the Arkansas Economic Council-State Chamber of Commerce which he headed. What to do about a program that would help cities and towns to progress?

As an experiment, several community planning experts were called in from other States to survey various cities and make recommendations. They did a competent job but when they pointed the finger of scorn at local conditions, townspeople got their backs up. It became clear that any future program must originate within the community itself.

Group meetings were decided to get people thinking about local development projects. A man familiar with community problems generally would lead discussions. As long as he was from Arkansas he would be accepted. As a nonresident of the community where the clinic was held, he couldn't be charged with playing up his own pet project at the expense of some other. The resources and development commission and the economic council each had a man and the power company had two who filled the bill. They were loaned to the new program.

Cards for recording suggestions were printed. A written report embodying the wishes of the people would become the basis for action.

A number of businessmen from Pine Bluff, a city of 35,000, had taken part in the initial planning. They were interested in revitalizing their own chamber of commerce by giving it specific jobs to tackle. Pine Bluff was selected as the guinea pig.

The clinic produced immediate action. The discussion made it possible to separate the practical from the financially impossible projects. A projected municipal institution was sidetracked in favor of a new sewage disposal system. Four neighborhood playgrounds were established, a new school built, an industrial foundation revitalized, and a fund-raising campaign for a $15,000 youth center was stimulated.

Since that trial run in Pine Bluff in February 1948, more than 100 clinics have been held in communities ranging in population from Fort Smith's 50,000 to villages like Mount Ida which boasts 900 "during school hours."

Trial and error perfected the technique. Experience showed early that a series of small group meetings produced more results than one or two mass sessions. Discussion leader and participants profited by the informality of small meetings. They aroused more interest, provoked more questions.

Detailed discussion of local wants proved more satisfactory than general summarization. During the clinic at Paris a student suggested beautification of highway approaches by planting redbud trees. When the report spelled out that suggestion, local garden clubs went to work and planted 5,000 redbuds. A similar suggestion from another clinic, lumped in as one more tally for "city beautification" was lost.

Simply holding a clinic won't solve all a community's ills. Follow-up on work programs still is weak in some places. Lack of revenue has stymied other ambitious projects in small villages. But the village with a surplus of ingenuity can overcome a shortage of dollars.

Folks in Waldron, a town of 2,000 in the Ouachita Mountains area, were loyal followers of their winning high-school football team. They thought nothing of driving 100 miles to attend one of its games.

But when visitors came to Waldron, residents were always a little shamefaced about the home athletic field.

After a clinic in February 1948, the school board was persuaded to buy an 8-acre tract near the city limits for $2,500. That left the treasury low, so 1 acre fronting on a main road was sold to the county for $1,500 to provide space for a highway-equipment garage. Then Waldron had 7 acres of raw land, a far cry from the athletic field it wanted.

But townspeople turned to. Volunteers graded and sodded the site. Others erected a fence, put up bleachers, installed lights for night games.

The mayor swung a shovel. The banker a hammer, the merchant wielded a paint brush. Now there's a gridiron, baseball diamond, rodeo arena, shower, and locker rooms. The athletic field still is no Yale Bowl, but it's one that would do credit to any community of 2,000.

In larger communities the program has brought coordinated action by local organizations. In Hot Springs nearly every civic group was promoting a municipal auditorium, yet each unaware of the others' progress. After the clinic, a central committee was established and now much of the work preliminary to construction has been completed.

Many projects suggested involve engineering, legal, financial, or other complicated problems. When that's the case, the community can call on any one of the three State-wide sponsoring agencies for technical assistance and get it. A fair association needed a landscape architect to lay out its cattle show grounds. A city needed an engineer to help on a water-supply project. Another needed help on a revenue problem. According to Hamilton Moses, there are about 1,000 industry members in the economic council whose personnel are available to help communities work out their local problems. Also on tap are experts of the State government and the power company. Between them they've been able to handle every request for assistance.

Arkansas leaders believe their plan can be adapted to meet the requirements of other States and communities. What if there's no State development agency? The extension services of many colleges and universities are prepared to help with development programs and so are State chambers of commerce. What if the power company doesn't cooperate? Try the industrial department of a railroad. In any State there is some business group that will help the community that wants to help itself.

Now and then you'll meet a man who labels the clinic program "something the power company cooked up" or "just a chamber of commerce stunt." There's no denying that a rising standard of living and rising sales of electric power go hand in hand or that chambers of commerce are eager for local development. But it's also a fact that the sponsoring agencies have shown the same interest in communities served by other utilities—in farm communities served by rural electrification cooperatives as those on A. P. & L. lines—and in communities where there is no local chamber, clinics have been held under the auspices of organizations such as the American Legion Auxiliary, the town's planning association, the junior chamber of commerce, and the Rotary Club, as well as various other civic-minded groups.

The community clinic program literally is changing the face of Arkansas. Around the town squares and along main streets men and women are talking about ways of equalizing property assessment so that local tax yields can be increased. The question one hears is: "How can we do it ourselves?" and not "Whom can we get to do it for us?" New attitudes on governmental relationships are being developed. There's more to it than reaffirmation of the doctrine of State's rights. It's also a practical matter of dollars and cents.

The city of Siloam Springs found by financing the construction of a new hospital locally it got a better job for $82,500 less than it could have by participating in a Federal-grant project.

Perhaps the lesson that Arkansas is learning from the program is best summed up by the statement of W. L. Fulmer, past president of the chamber of commerce at Booneville, who said:

"A development from within is more to be desired than an invasion from without. The benefits are more lasting and of greater value in the long pull."

The people down in Arkansas are thinking of the long pull.

Tribute to Ernest L. Kurth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on December 14, 1949, at Lufkin, Tex., there was given by the citizens of Lufkin and Angelina County a testimonial in honor of their most prominent citizen, Ernest L. Kurth.

Theretofore, Mr. Kurth had been officially proclaimed "Man of the South" by the magazine Dixie Business. He was selected over a number of other eminent and distinguished personages as the man of greatest achievement in the South for 1949.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Man of the South for 1949," which was printed in the magazine Dixie Business, describing the testimonial to Mr. Kurth.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN OF THE SOUTH FOR 1949

(By Col. Hubert F. Lee, Stone Mountain, Ga.)

The longest and most impressive testimonial ever held for a living American took place in the piney woods of east Texas at Lufkin, on December 14, when Ernest L. Kurth was officially proclaimed Man of the South of the Year 1949 by the editor of Dixie Business.

Many of the 5,000 who voted him the top honor in the annual Dixie business advisory poll were on hand to pay personal tribute to the man of greatest achievement in all the South for 1949.

Letters and telegrams from most of the South's 50 foremost business leaders named this summer by Dixie Business were among the hundreds received by Ernest Kurth in a genuine demonstration of sportsmanship that is one of the fine characteristics of the leaders of the South. Ernest Kurth was one of the South's foremost 50 and was named for the top honor when he received the greatest number of votes in letters, cards, and telegrams ever read by the edior of Dixie Business since the annual "South's hall of fame for the living" movement began.

And every man and woman who took part in the great Kurth day celebration had their own reasons for wanting to honor Ernest Kurth.

Newspaper publishers of the South saw in him the man who made their dreams come true when he became the first to mass-produce newsprint at his Southland Paper Mills in January 1940.

His friends in the lumber industry honored him for the years of leadership as head of the Angelina County Lumber Co., and his pioneering in perpetual reforestation.

The people of Lufkin and Angelina County, who put on the great event, hailed him as the man who transformed a small lumber town into the fifth largest industrial stronghold in the biggest State in the Nation.

* * * * *

For years there have been loud cries of the need for conservation of the trees of the South and Ernest Kurth has been a "tree-farmer" since he learned the art following his father through the piney woods from which they farmed timber for use in the great Angelina County Lumber Co. mill.

The Memorial Hospital at Lufkin is the first built for workers of a community by its industrial leaders and Ernest Kurth was first in making this possible.

* * * * *

The Kurth Day celebration was sponsored by the Angelina County Chamber of Commerce and in some way or other it seemed that everyone in Lufkin, Herty, Keltys, and Angelina County had some sort of part.

* * * * *

"Ernest L. Kurth accepted his honors Wednesday night before more than 900 southerners who came here to tell him why he was chosen.

Newspaper publishers, businessmen, Government, and civic leaders were in the crowd that heard Kurth described as a leader among the men who had the vision to bring industry to the South, as a great businessman who carved an east Texas career that reaches far outside the State.

Kurth appeared on the verge of tears.

He called Kurth Day one of the greatest markers of my life. But he said the honors really were bestowed upon every man and woman in Angelina County.

Time magazine devoted a column and a half in the December 26 issue in Business and Finance department:

"Mr. East Texas"

"In Lufkin, Tex.—population 22,500—one cold night last week, 900 citizens jammed into the high school gymnasium. There, over a roast beef dinner, they listened to some famed Texans—including United States Senators TOM CONNALLY and LYNDON JOHNSON—praise a fellow Texan in terms extravagant even for the Lone Star State. Said ex-Governor William P. Hobby: 'He is the kingfish of free enterprise.' Added Governor Allan Shivers: 'He is Mr. East Texas.'

"The 'Kingfish' is big—6 feet, 230 pounds—shy, pink-cheeked Ernest L. Kurth, 64, a jack of all trades—lumber, insurance, banking, theaters, construction, utilities, machinery—and master of them all as well. Kurth's dozen-odd enterprises employ 3,250, indirectly support 50 percent of Lufkin's population. But the Kurth achievement that most east Texans boast about, and the one that is of prime importance to the southern economy, is newsprint. Set up only 9 years ago as the South's first newsprint producer, Kurth's $18,000,000 Southland Paper Mills, Inc., last week was rolling out enough newsprint—132,718 tons last year—to supply some 70 percent of southern newspapers, and was grossing $15,000,000 a year."

A score of newspaper correspondents covered the Kurth Day celebration and as many news photographers. Paramount News had a cameraman. Television equipment was set up.

To Texans it was the top news story of 1949.

Isthmian Canals and Atomic Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Governor of the Panama Canal under Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress, recommending the construction of a new Panama Canal at sea level was transmitted to the Congress by the President on December 1, 1947, without comment or recommendation.

The plan urged in the Governor's report contemplates changing the physical form of the present canal from the eminently successful high-level lake-lock type to a sea-level lock design, a project of great magnitude, whose primary premises of security and national defense, as well as estimates of cost, have been challenged by eminent authorities. Extensive discussions about many of the vital issues may be found in the sources given in the bibliographical list on the Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1949, in an extension of remarks by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, chairman of the special subcommittee now investigating the matter of financial operation of the Panama Canal under House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress.

Among the most outstanding papers listed in this bibliography is the authoritative presentation by former Representative Willis W. Bradley, of California, entitled "What of the Panama Canal?"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Eightieth Congress, second session, April 22, 1948, volume 94, part 10, Appendix, page A2449. This contribution by Captain Bradley—perhaps the most comprehensive statement on its subject in congressional history—affords a deep insight into the basic facts of the current discussions as to the future of the Panama Canal—from the viewpoints of both ship-transit operations and national defense. He emphasizes the overwhelming opinion of leading atomic experts that no canal—regardless of location or type—can withstand an actual atomic attack.

In my studies of the national defense and national security aspects of the proposed sea-level project I have observed that among its principal advocates have been certain members of the Corps of Engineers of the Army who have urged it as being mandatory because of the atomic bomb. It is noteworthy, therefore, that some of the authors of the very able articles on the atomic bomb—upon which both Captain Bradley and I have based our opinions—are also members of the Corps.

A recent contribution with respect to atomic defense, published in the November–December 1949 issue of the Military Engineer, volume XLI, No. 284, page 417, is a technical paper by Lt. Col. Richard D. Wolfe, also of the Corps of Engineers of the Army.

Colonel Wolfe, in his presentation of the subject, does not specifically mention the Panama Canal, or interoceanic waterways; but he does supply a most constructive approach to the problem of atomic defense, with special attention to the bomb as a radioactive contamination weapon. His statements thus add to our understanding of the Isthmian defense problems, and tend to produce sounder thinking and planning for a more effective national security.

Thus, support is further given the previous deductions I have unfailingly derived from the writings of many atomic-warfare authorities, namely, that the defense of any type of canal—at Panama, or elsewhere—like the defense of the ports, highways, rivers, railroads, locks, dams, reservoirs, and public utilities and vital production plants in the United States, is an over-all governmental responsibility. This defense depends on the combination of our industrial capacity and the active might of our armed forces, equipped with the most powerful modern weapons and protective devices, rather than merely on passive defense features which may be embodied in the designs of canal construction, and which would constitute, in effect, another Maginot line.

It is obvious, therefore, that the expenditure of vast sums and the utilization of great stores of strategic resources in the construction of projects—such as the so-called sea-level canal at Panama, with the virtual scrapping of the existing Canal; or the building of a canal at another site—would divert funds from other more urgently needed defense projects, situated in the United States, thereby affecting, in a most serious and adverse way, our "national security."

The Isthmian Canal question most certainly is one which must not be taken lightly by the Congress; but it should receive the most careful consideration, with the advice of the best-informed technical authorities, of wholly independent character.

The utter fallacy of the contention that a sea-level canal will prove invulnerable to atomic attack is completely shattered in that the H—or hydrogen—bomb, now to be made by our Government, is declared by scientists to be infinitely more powerful and devastating than the existing A-bomb—perhaps a thousand times more so. In my former discussions of this subject I have sought to call attention to the fact that the atomic bomb was yet in its infancy—though powerful enough to destroy any type of canal, if permitted to strike—and that soon scientific development will leave it far behind. Such is the case already. The official proponents of the sea-level project were, therefore, either wholly lacking in vision in failing to realize that the atomic bomb was only in its initial stage—though deadly enough, at that—or, else, they undertook, through the avowal of a false premise, to mislead the American Congress and people, and to frighten them into acceptance—in the name of security and protection—of a vast "boondoggling" enterprise of astronomical costs and uncertain value—a veritable Tower of Babel in reverse. Thus it has come to pass that the H-bomb—before it is actually made—has destroyed the sea-level canal—before it is built. Indeed, a paradox; but a very gratifying one for the American taxpayer and shipowner.

All of which, as I believe, emphasizes the urgent need for the enactment of legislation providing for the creation of an Interoceanic Canals Commission, of independent and broad-gauged membership—and charged with the duty of making a full and complete study of all the problems involved in the various proposals urged—both at Panama and elsewhere—and the submission of a comprehensive report in the premises. In addition to the all-important engineering features to be determined, there are very grave treaty questions to be considered, and such a body could make a comprehensive study of every factor that must be taken into final account; and make a report, thus grounded, for the information and guidance of the President and Congress.

To make Colonel Wolfe's timely discussion more readily available in the technical literature that is now accumulating, under leave granted, I am ex-

tending my remarks by inclusion therewith of the full text of his paper:

ATOMIC DEFENSE—A CONSERVATIVE APPROACH

(By Richard D. Wolfe, lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers)

Since the advent of the atomic bomb, many articles have appeared in the public press and elsewhere concerning the terrifying after-effects of the radioactive contamination produced by the explosion. Unfortunately, much of this writing has been in thoroughly alarmist vein, implying or stating in so many words that nothing can be done immediately to minimize the effects of this contamination or subsequently to remove it. These exaggerated "scare-head" statements have frequently been in error as to fact. More important, in best Sunday supplement style, they have often presented ideas by implication and facts in conjecture, all of which are calculated to produce the impression that the radioactive after-effects of atomic explosion are always present, always horrible beyond imagination, and impossible to do anything about.

This is a negative attitude which is completely inconsistent with our national character as a vigorous people who can tackle a practical, finite problem, however complex, with ingenuity and with improvisation if necessary, to arrive at a workable solution. The correction of the unfortunate impression which the "nothing-can-be-done" school of thought has attempted to create in the public mind is the subject at present of an educational campaign sponsored by the Atomic Energy Commission, the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project, and other agencies.

THE BOMB AS A BLAST WEAPON

No attempt is here made to minimize the immediate blast effect of the bomb as an explosive weapon. But as pointed out in a recent issue[1] the bomb is a finite weapon which differs in intensity but not essentially in quality from other weapons. Its immediate effect as an explosion on materiel and personnel in the worst case could be reproduced by high explosives; high explosives used in conjunction with chemical warfare agents could in turn reproduce the conflagration effect if numbers of casualties rather than type of injuries are used as a criterion of effectiveness. The defense against the explosive effects lies in dispersion, in placing a few key installations underground, and in preventing the enemy from delivering the weapon in one's own neighborhood.[2] If it be argued that this constitutes no real defense, then equally there is no defense against mass strategic bombing as practiced by this country and its allies in the war just concluded.

Considering the bomb as essentially a large-scale blast producer (in which role it utilizes its destructive power most efficiently), it creates maximum physical damage when exploded in the air fairly high over the target, as was done at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In this case, in which it acts predominantly as a high explosive, any direct radioactive effects are practically instantaneous with the explosion and cause not more than 10 to 15 percent of personnel injuries. The radioactive byproducts of the explosion boil up immediately in the cloud of hot gases and are dissipated to infinite dilution in the upper atmosphere. Residual contamination on the ground is minimal or nonexistent.

THE BOMB AS A CONTAMINATION WEAPON

When the bomb is exploded beneath the surface of water or earth, it does become in some measure a new weapon.[3] In this case the only practical evidence we have to go on is the Baker test (underwater explosion) at Bikini. From the data of this test and by analogy to underwater or underground conventional explosions, the surface damage produced will be much less than in the case of the air burst. There will also be damage from the subsurface shock wave to ships and utilities in an area roughly equal to that damaged by an air burst. The additional new aspect is that the water or earth thrown up by the explosion contains a fair proportion of the radioactive byproducts of the explosion and will probably be distributed over an area approximately equal to that suffering maximum damage in the case of the air burst. The comparison between the air burst and the subsurface burst reveals the following facts: (a) The air burst produces immediate destruction or damage to matériel and, in the absence of forewarning, to personnel in an area, say, 3 miles in diameter. (b) The subsurface burst produces immediate destruction or damage in a smaller area (say, 1 mile in diameter) and, in addition, covers the 3-mile-diameter area with radioactive contamination which does no material damage but which is potentially dangerous or lethal to animal life.

It is evident, therefore, that the only new feature of the bomb as a contamination weapon is that it differs in quality from the bomb as a blast weapon. The extent of physical damage to structures in the subsurface explosion is less, whereas the number of personnel casualties in the area in the worst case is probably no more than with the air burst. Herein lies the fallacy in the claim that the underwater (or underground burst is a more dangerous and destructive weapon than the air burst; on the one hand, the damage done by the air burst inside the 3-mile diameter is immediate and is effective in destroying both material things and living creatures; on the other hand, the immediate damage from the subsurface burst is much smaller in area and the potential danger from contamination which extends to the 3-mile diameter applies only to living things, is not instantaneous, and therefore permits action to be taken in mitigation of the hazard.

Three factors permit reduction of casualties in this doughnut-shaped area lying outside the radius of the heavy physical damage and inside the radius of radioactive contamination. The first is the fact that the contamination falls from the air in the form of rain or dust, or both, in a matter of say 5 minutes after the explosion occurs, and thus is restricted initially to external surfaces of buildings and to ground areas. Now the dangerous radiations emitted from the contamination are dissipated by distance, and by the shielding afforded by any solid material such as earth, or the walls or roof of a building. Thus, if the populace can be trained, to remain indoors in the center portions of structures, as far from outer walls and roof as the building permits (preferably in basements), being careful to wash off any contamination which they may have acquired by contact with the outdoors, casualties can be considerably reduced. The populace must be further convinced that it must remain in such protective isolation, whatever the inconvenience, for at least 4 days, as explained below.

The second factor, which in reality makes the first effective as a measure of protection, is the fact that the radioactivity in the contamination dies out quite rapidly as an inverse exponential function of time following the explosion, such that within approximately 4 days movement can be permitted in the area by properly equipped working parties for limited periods of time. This permits the third defensive phase to become active, that is, evacuation of personnel, together with decontamination.

DECONTAMINATION

The statement has frequently been made (often by supposed authorities on the subject) that decontamination is impossible, or at best impracticable.[3,4] This echoes the negative do-nothing approach mentioned above. The statement is untrue both in fact and in implication. Much has been learned concerning practical methods of decontamination, and research now in progress at the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory and elsewhere gives promise of even better methods than are now known.

However effective these methods may become, it should be realized at the outset that they will always be expensive in man-hours and materials; sufficiently so as to preclude anything approaching complete decontamination of areas and structures immediately following an underwater or underground burst. Initially, decontamination efforts will probably be limited to those predetermined approach ways, areas, and structures whose reoccupation and continued use are vital to prosecution of the war effort. After evacuation of personnel, other areas must be blocked off and isolated for the time being. Later on, the decision can be made whether it is cheaper to decontaminate, to replace the structures and facilities in a new area, or to delay for a period of months until reduction of radioactivity by decay has reduced both the personnel hazard and the difficulty of decontamination.

Practical field decontamination to date has largely been concerned with the decontamination of ships following the atomic bomb tests at Bikini in 1946. The methods used are successful in removing contamination, although they are considered to be inordinately time-consuming and expensive. Ships have nevertheless been completely cleared for normal usage as a result of decontamination performed by the San Francisco Naval Shipyard in conjunction with the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory. In general, the results indicate that any ship, no matter how badly contaminated, can be successfully decontaminated by present methods provided the ship itself is sufficiently valuable to warrant the time and expense involved, together with replacement of such equipment as cordage, wooden decking, et cetera.

RESEARCH FOR ATOMIC DEFENSE

Much of the work done by the agencies of the Manhattan Engineer District and later by the Atomic Energy Commission has contributed valuable information toward defensive measures. However, since their aims have been primarily toward development of offensive nuclear weapons and the development of nuclear power, none of these agencies has pursued an integrated program aimed at the defensive aspects of the problem. In fact, the only agency in the Nation, service or civilian, which is actively prosecuting a broad research and development program pointed toward defense against the various forms of radiological warfare is the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory (NRDL) at the San Francisco Naval Shipyard.

* * * * *

The present research program of the laboratory embraces four principal fields of endeavor: (1) Studies on the contamination and decontamination of land installations, ships, and aircraft; (2) Evaluation, test, and development of radiation detecting instruments including portable and semiportable survey instruments and such laboratory-type instruments as are necessary in prosecuting the work; (3) Investigation of individual and collective protective devices to determine their ability to safeguard personnel against inhalation and ingestion of radioactive material; (4) Investigations in the medical and biological field with a view to determining the nature of radiation sickness and the means of early diagnosis of radiation damage, together with prognosis as to probable effects on the efficiency of the individual and his life expectancy.

Put in another way, the first job of the NRDL and of the National Military Establishment to implement radiological defense is to provide for the immediate and continuing safety of personnel. This involves determining allowable limits for each type of radiation under varying operational situations. Following that, instruments must be provided to indicate what kind of radiation is present and how much there is. The next step is to provide diagnostic procedures to determine the imminence of radiation damage, to establish criteria for its detection and estimation of its seriousness either in the immediate postirradiation period or distant future. A very important auxiliary job related to the latter is the one of working toward an understanding of the mechanisms of radiation damage, so that treatment of it can be provided on a more rational basis than is now possible.

The second principal task is the discovery and development of expeditious and economical means of removal and disposal of radioactive contamination, meanwhile providing protection for personnel engaged in this operation to insure that they are not overexposed in the process.

* * * * *

As stated earlier, one of the principal efforts of the laboratory is the field of decontamination studies, for which the burden of research falls on the chemistry branch and its chief, and also on the engineering applications branch. The mission of the chemistry branch and, in part, of the engineering applications branch is to find a practical means of decontaminating structures, ships, or aircraft which have become contaminated by radioactive materials as a result of some form of radiological warfare, and to investigate practical means for eliminating or minimizing initial contamination.

Depending on the time intervals after the blast (assuming an atomic bomb detonation), the contamination may consist of a mixture of part or all of some 50 elements which have been rendered radioactive by the explosion, plus unexploded material from the bomb itself. This contamination is deposited initially on surfaces by "falling-out" from the radioactive cloud, or is contained in water or earth thrown up by an underwater burst. In general, the contamination is found to be associated almost entirely with the external surface of the area on which it lands. Thus, there are three general methods toward decontamination, or toward preventing contamination. The first consists of surface removal methods. In this category are the successful methods used to date in decontamination of ships. In crudest form they include paint removal by caustic solutions, and such brute-force methods as sandblasting and scraping to remove paint and part of the surface of the material. The second approach is that of decontamination without affecting character or quality of the surface; this method includes the use of chemical solutions to dissolve the contaminants and to carry them away. The third method involves the means of preventing contamination, including such devices as the interposition of a water film on the surface, which mechanically impedes the attachment of contamination to the surface itself. Obviously, there is great variation in the relative contaminability of various surfaces. Naturally, rough or porous materials will tend to hold contamination to a much greater degree than hard smooth surfaces.

PLANNING, ORGANIZATION, TRAINING

As with all research, progress tends to be slow and laborious. Nevertheless it is hoped that within approximately 1 year practical, expeditious, and relatively economical means of decontaminating structures and areas will have been reached. This time limit applies to the fundamental technique as developed in the laboratory. Following this step, engineering development must take place and procurement must be instituted in order to make the benefits of these discoveries available for practical use by services in the field. In addition, personnel must be trained in the techniques of such decontamination work and in the use of the equipment developed. Organization must, therefore, be set up within the current organizations of Naval, Army, and Air Force units, all in coordination with similar plans for civil defense.

It is obvious that a great deal of thought and action must go into the job of preparing the military services and the civilian population to act both as organizations and as individuals, according to precepts outlined earlier, in order to minimize casualties as a result of radiological warfare. A start has been made in this direction, both by the military services and by the Office of Civil Defense Planning. The scope of the task is broad, however; probably it will be of the same magnitude as the effort expended in producing the atomic bomb itself. It will not be solved by shoestring operations, splinter efforts, or by the part-time consideration of planning staffs, whether civilian or military. It requires an energetic, coordinated, integrated effort which has the support of an educated populace as well as of governmental and military agencies, backed by sufficient funds to implement a firm program. Such a program of organization, procurement of equipment, and training in its use will not be accomplished overnight nor in a period of a few weeks or months. The program will require vigorous prosecution if it is to be done in 1 or 2 years.

But the problem is finite, and far from impossible of execution. It is probably no more difficult of solution than the tremendously complex planning and training which was performed in preparation for any of the large amphibious operations of World War II, or in preparing the very effective organization of the British citizenry to cope with the air attacks in the blitz of 1940 and after. Finally, it is a job which must be done, and the earlier the better for our peace of mind and protection as a nation—at least until international control of atomic energy becomes a reality and the threat of war is much less than it appears to be at present.

[1] Industrial Vulnerability to Bombing, Maj. Gen. C. F. Robinson, the Military Engineer, January–February 1949.

[2] Nuclear Weapons, Lt. Col. A. W. Betts, the Military Engineer, March–April 1949.

[3] No Place To Hide, Dr. David Bradley; Little, Brown & Co.

[4] No Place To Hide, Dr. David Bradley; Little, Brown & Co.

[5] Civil Defense for National Security, page 78, Report of the Office of Civil Defense Planning. United States Government Printing Office.

Big Government Is in Your County, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Country Gentleman for March, 1950:

BIG GOVERNMENT IS IN YOUR COUNTY, TOO

(By John Strohm)

Twenty-five of the best farmers in De Kalb County, Ill., were asked this question: "What would be your rough guess as to the number of Federal farm agency employees—either part or full time—in De Kalb County in 1949?"

Their average guess was 56 Federal hired hands in their midst. And 21 of the 25 farmers went on to say this was too many.

They were flabbergasted when told the right answer was more than three times their guess. For 176 men and women were working for the Federal Government in De Kalb County last year—just to tell farmers what they should do, what they can do, and, in some instances, what they cannot do.

These 176 persons put in part or full time and were paid from $8 a day up to $5,350 a year. They worked only on the various Federal farm service programs inside that one county. One hundred and twenty-three of them actually live right in the county; 55 of them live outside the county but regularly visit as part of their duties. Jobholders in State, regional, and national bureaus who influence but never see De Kalb County were not counted.

Uncle Sam spent $86,065.60 in tax money to bring their services to the county's 2,500 farmers. This does not include the Federal portion of salaries received by the 55 workers who live outside the county and made occasional visits.

"This 'free advice' is costing too much!" exploded one amazed farmer when shown these figures.

It took 65 De Kalb men and 5 girls a total of 590 days to sign up, check performance, figure up results, and pay out $35.01 apiece to farmers who cooperated in the Government's PMA program. These farmers were paid to spread limestone, spray weeds and plow under clover—practices that 96 percent of those surveyed said they'd done anyway.

The Soil Conservation Service's bill was $14,040 for offering technical advice to 95 farmers—3.8 percent of those in the county. That's a cost of about $147.68 each. One "cooperator" admitted: "Oh, I just signed up to get their soil map—I'm not following the rotation they set up for my farm."

Farmers get free advice on crop rotation from at least three different Government agencies, in some instances five, and yet more than 100 De Kalb County farmers have put up $40 apiece to hire their own farm-management consultant.

Youth leaders, paid in part with Federal funds, head up 4-H Club work and Future Farmers—overlapping youth groups whose members frequently belong to both. Yet, two-thirds of the farm boys and girls are reached by neither. Two 4-H leaders receive a total of $2,940 Federal funds, while 23 teachers, who spend a portion of their time leading Future Farmers and Future Homemaker groups, get $14,780 of their pay from the Federal Government.

De Kalb County farmers have been increasingly worried about big Government. Many of them have heard about the Hoover Report and how the cost of Federal Government has skyrocketed from 4 to 40 billion dollars in the last 20 years—how we used to hire 600,000 Federal workers, and now have 2,100,000 on the pay roll—how the average American works about 65 days a year to pay Federal taxes alone.

But few realize big Government is not all in Washington. Few had stopped to analyze the numbers of Federal-hired farm hands under their very noses at the county level.

"I've been disturbed by this growing feeling to let Government do it—but this is worse than anything I ever dreamed of," was

the shocked comment of a prominent cattle feeder who saw this report. "No matter how good a job these agencies are doing for us, someday, if this continues, we'll wake up and find our freedom gone."

"Never even knew my township PMA committeemen got $6 a day," exclaimed one surprised farmer. "Maybe we should have just one for a township instead of three."

"Why should we get paid at all?" asked Fred Willrett, township committeeman for many years. "School board members don't get paid. We'd better think before it's too late—we've got to have the guts to cut down some of these Government programs."

"And what bothers me," said E. E. Houghtby, "is that we collect these taxes, send them to Washington, but only get a few dollars back. It's like a De Kalb County farmer giving himself a blood transfusion from one arm into the other—and spilling a couple of quarts of blood in the process."

De Kalb farmers have a practical stake in the Federal tax dollar. Most of them paid an income tax last year of between $800 and $3,000 in this unusually good county in northern Illinois. They recognize the merits of many of the farm education and action programs, but are beginning to question the conflicts and duplications as well as the costs.

"The Production and Marketing Administration ("That's the old AAA dressed up" explained the county chairman) will pay farmers $1.30 a ton for spreading limestone within certain limits—no soil test required. "I've had to tell some farmers they were spreading too much limestone—that they would probably be doing more harm than good," recalls W. C. Mummert, former De Kalb County farm adviser, or county agent.

"The PMA will pay for plowing down clover or sweetclover, but not alfalfa. I've rotated with alfalfa since 1941 and I know this crop is worth much more to De Kalb County than clover," reports Henry Parks, pioneer farm and livestock leader. "It doesn't make sense that we can't adapt ourselves to local conditions, but Washington told them they can't do it, so our State and local PMA committees are helpless."

De Kalb County, a fertile, level prairie, got $53,700 from PMA for soil-building practices in 1948. Morgan County, Ill., with 14 percent of its land too eroded for crops, 7 percent so eroded it can be used only in grassland, and 33 percent needing terraces and contouring—Morgan County got only $38,000.

"The PMA is geared to 15 years ago when they had to bribe farmers a bit to get them started on conservation practices," asserted a veteran farm leader. Harney King, county PMA committeeman, admitted that lots of farmers would follow soil-building practices without payment, so the program really was a device to give a farmer extra income.

"But why have a big organization to give away $35 to a farmer?" asked a big-fisted, ruddy-cheeked grain farmer. "I have to drive 17 miles to De Kalb to sign up for the program. I come into the county office in the winter with receipted bills for limestone. If I've done some contour farming, an $8-a-day Government hired hand comes over to inspect the job. The girls in the AAA office flips over my report (in between reading their magazines and talking about what they did on their dates the night before). The reports are sent to Decatur, where some more job holders check them during their busy 5-day week. And I finally get a check—and I understand it costs our Government $5 just to write a check. Sounds like a pretty expensive way to hand out $35."

Farmers are uneasy about the big corn surplus. The realist something must be done. They're not sure PMA's current acreage reduction will do it. "Why, the last time we had corn-acreage controls, the AAA field man himself showed us how we could substitute Atlas sorgo, which takes more out of the soil than corn, and which gave us more forage than corn," said one brow-furrowed veteran of those threadbare thirties. Nine out of ten farmers interviewed thought they could raise almost as much corn with their 1950 acreage cut by planting thicker, adding more fertilizer, using their best ground.

Congress says the Extension Service shall carry out all educational programs in farming. Yet in De Kalb County, the Soil Conservation Service is primarily educational and spends three times as much as Extension. Two full-time men with salaries totaling $7,760, plus 6 others who work part-time in De Kalb County, and drive 5 Government cars, offer farmer cooperators soil maps which most farmers want, plus advice, mainly on rotation, which many do not follow.

Although technical help on laying out contours, strip cropping, and terraces is included in their program, the SCS admittedly soft-pedals these because a few farmers want to do them. Yet, leave out such things, leave out the map, and you have much the same program which the Extension Service has been preaching for 30 years.

"We show farmers how turning under the third crop of alfalfa-brome will put $100 worth of soil nutrients into the soil," said the SCS soils man. But the PMA in the office downstairs has not been able to pay farmers for turning under alfalfa—just clover, sweetclover, and rye.

Fred Willrett, speaking as a director of the De Kalb County soil conservation district, believes the SCS is doing an extremely valuable job, but frets at the slow pace. "We have only 95 plans in operation after 3 years—and we have 250 applications we haven't been able to get to."

"We really need another man to follow up the plans we've already laid out," asserted the SCS conservationist's aid.

There are three lending agencies in De Kalb County using interest-free Federal funds. Farmers get Commodity Credit Corporation price-support loans, administered by PMA, through the local banks or PCA. The local Production Credit Association lent 125 farmers about $1,350,000 in 1948. Although it has set its goal to be a completely farmer-owned credit agency, it still has $90,000 Federal money which it can keep as long as it wants to without paying interest. For each $100 a farmer borrows, he gets $95 cash and a $5 share of stock which makes the interest rate really higher than the current 5½ percent. Local banks now charge from 4 to 5 percent for cattle-feeding loans. Farmers generally feel that the PCA has brought lower rates from private banks.

"Yes, farmers can now borrow money for less at the private banks," admitted Ben McNeely, cattle feeder. "But Production Credit will give you a bigger and longer loan on a bunch of feeder cattle. I could get a $10,000 loan on a $10,000 bunch of cattle by giving a chattel mortgage on them and a crib of corn—the bank won't do that."

De Kalb County bankers quickly say: "We won't, because the same Government that says PCA can, tells us we can't."

PCA boosters say they have the confidence of the farmer—a sort of across-the-backfence way of doing business which the farmer likes. "Another thing which makes our position attractive—we catch all the traffic that goes into the PMA and Farm Bureau offices," said Martin Donnelly, PCA fieldman. (Their office is right inside the front door of the building that houses most of the Government agencies.)

The catch-all for the risky loan business is the Farmers' Home Administration, which 24 out of 25 De Kalb County farmers surveyed said was not needed. It makes loans which the Government forbids other loan agencies to make. Robert Becker, supervisor from outside the county, looks over the six tenant-purchase farms in De Kalb set up by the Farm Security Administration. He handles distress loans to producers, and has the new job of sifting applications for the Public Farm Housing Loans to farmers who want to build a home, put in a bathroom, or build a hog house, and who can't get credit elsewhere. A fifth of his time, and of his office help, takes $1,612 in Federal money.

The 11 vocational agriculture teachers in De Kalb County are paid an average of $4,225.33 each, about one-fourth of which comes from Federal funds. The 12 home economics teachers get about $2,600 each, of which a fourth comes from Federal funds. The agriculture teachers lead Future Farmer clubs; the home-economics teachers, Future Homemakers clubs. In aims and purposes, they are not unlike the 4-H Clubs.

"About 90 percent of our Future Farmers were also 4-H Club members," said W. C. Mummert, who was an agriculture teacher for 7 years, a farm adviser for 6 in De Kalb County. "But we were constantly warned from the State and Federal offices when I was an agriculture teacher to get out of leading 4-H Clubs—to emphasize to the boy with a beef calf that while it could be used in both FFA and 4-H work, the calf definitely was a Future Farmer project being used as a 4-H project and not a 4-H project being used as a Future Farmer project."

The Future Farmers have a district fair. The 4-H Club members have a county fair—mostly the same boys and girls, same animals, same projects.

Yet, there are 2,000 farm boys and girls between 10 and 20 in De Kalb County who are members of neither organization. Better organization between Government-paid youth leaders would permit us to reach more of them, believes Mummert. He used to have regular meetings with the vocational-agriculture teachers when he was in extension work. We have so much in common and could do so much more if we'd have one coordinated program. There's wasted opportunity here for furthering agriculture.

Training veterans how to farm is costing the Government 50 percent more than its 11 agriculture teachers and 12 home-economics teachers. The United States Veterans' Administration poured $20,118.04 into the county to train 111 boys. In addition to the agriculture teachers who get an additional $55 a month for teaching a veterans' class, seven extra instructors were hired at $65 a month to teach one night class a week—three self-employed veterans make up one class.

Extension activities in De Kalb County cost the Federal Government $7,660. About $5,000 of this pays part of the salary of the farm adviser (county agent), his assistant, home adviser and her assistant, while the balance is for the part-time services of 48 university extension specialists who visited the county for 1 day or more during the course of the year. The county itself contributes $6,932, and the State $3,922 toward the farm and home advisers' wages.

The statistics show the farm adviser spent 173 days in the office, 126 in the field, had 9,226 phone calls, wrote 7,554 letters, visited 107 farms, had 98 night meetings and 6,000 office visits. The home adviser and her assistant worked 241 days with adults, 240½ with 4-H Clubs and older youth. They made 113 home visits, had 1,234 office calls, 1,590 telephone calls. They have 678 home-bureau members, 308 girl 4-H Club members, and 75 rural youth. "This is one group we really overwork," one farmer commented when he saw these statistics.

A former extension director of De Kalb County feels there can be improvement here. "We have extension specialists come up from the university for a 1-day stand, and maybe 16 to 30 farmers show up for the meeting. And they're the same farmers who come meeting after meeting. We should have the information from the specialists in a form that would get it out to all 2,500 farmers in De Kalb County."

In a nearby county, a health extension specialist (salary: $5,000) came from the State college, 165 miles away (expenses: $25) to talk to a meeting on health. Her audience: six women. The cost: $10 each.

The Production and Marketing Administration paid 83 men and women for working on the farm program in De Kalb County—committeemen, office girls, crib inspectors, auditors, field men. The bill for 1949 will be an estimated $31,746.57. This does not include any conservation payments, crop loans, or the $64,082 to set up cribs and seal corn.

"The farm program is run by the farmers," the PMA chairman said. "But elections for PMA committeemen are getting to be pretty much of a joke," said one farmer. This past year only 180 out of 2,500 farmers voted. The three township committeemen and their two alternates, voting for themselves in each township, could have swung the elections throughout the county. In two townships, only four men showed up to cast ballots.

"I'm afraid that when a farmer is elected to the PMA committee he becomes biased in spite of himself," believes Henry Parks. "And once we set up a temporary Government bureau, it quickly becomes permanent."

"If you think PMA has a big staff now," cracked one former official, "wait till we get corn and wheat quotas and maybe soybean-acreage control—brother, you'll see the PMA grow and grow."

With all of these facts and statistics, De Kalb County is a most unusual county:

1. It has fewer Federal employees than most counties of similar size. It has no REA, Crop Insurance Corporation, Forestry Service, Reclamation Service, or half a dozen other Government agencies that have been set up to help the farmers farm in many counties.

2. Its employees, prodded by intelligent farm boards, do a better-than-average job. Example: The local PMA committee spent only 9 percent of the total soil-conservation payments for administration, while the State average was nearly 14 percent and some counties spent almost 20 percent—just to figure up and send out the checks.

3. Cooperation between Government bureaus is as high as in any county I've visited. "Sometimes I think the Extension Service, the PMA, and PCA have to have so many meetings to keep their wires straight, they waste time when they should be working," smiled E. E. Houghtby.

4. There is a strong desire by De Kalb County farmers to stand on their own feet. Through their County Farm Bureau—2,900 members at $15 each in a county of 2,500 farms—they have spent $6,200 on youth and extension activities. They have hired a livestock marketing expert for $4,000. One feeder said he made $1,900 when Lee Moser advised him to reject a country bid and ship his cattle to Chicago. Another afternoon, he visited four different farms, and those farmers by following his advice on shipping, made an extra $3,600. Last year he gave advice to 900 livestock men. "That's the kind of advice we can't get from Washington for any price," says the County Farm Bureau president, George Bark.

Last year, worried about high taxes, they hired a tax expert for $4,192. "We get our tax bills, bellyache and then forget them," says Bark. "We wanted our citizens to know where their tax money goes, so we can get the most for our tax dollar."

They invested $2,800 in a soil-testing laboratory. They test soil free, and will pick up soil samples for 10 cents an acre.

De Kalb County farmers know they can do things at the county level—they also feel that they can do more of their own thinking there.

"In forty-two years of farming, Uncle Sam looked to us to keep him going. Now it seems everyone is looking to Uncle Sam to keep them. Let's look after ourselves. Farmers at the grass-roots level are just as smart as they are at the State or Federal level," declared Frank Schweitzer. "We're petted too much politically."

County PMA Chairman Terwilliger had something to say on that too: "We can stand on our own feet. We're able to think for ourselves. We don't want dictation from the State offices. We don't have to take guff from anyone outside the county. Give the farmers the right to decide what they want."

De Kalb County farmers, appreciating the need of some kind of farm program, nevertheless want it kept simple. They don't like to see Big Government get bigger, and controls get more rigid.

Daniel Webster's Speech 100 Years Ago Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today is another anniversary that will live long in the history of America. One hundred years ago today Daniel Webster made his famous Seventh of March speech.

That speech contains some colloquy between him and John C. Calhoun. Present that day was Jefferson Davis, later President of the Confederacy, and also Senator Cass, of Michigan, who I believe was at one time the Democratic candidate for President.

Daniel Webster made more enemies in the North with that speech than any other speech he ever made, for the simple reason he was trying to avert an internal conflict, the War Between the States.

It came after he passed away and his son, probably his only son, Fletcher Webster, was killed in the first battle, the Battle of Bull Run.

As I look back over that history I wonder if it would not be good for the Members of the House to reread that speech and reread the colloquy between him and Mr. Calhoun and to get back on the beam, if you please, and take the advice of Calvin Coolidge.

On one occasion I attended an American Legion convention in Boston. I saw two Presidents of the United States on the same platform, a former President and the then President of the United States. It was the only time I have ever seen that situation. The only man in this House who was present, if I remember correctly, was the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]. The boys were all singing "We've paid our debt to Lafayette; who the hell do we owe now?" They were clamoring for Mr. Coolidge to make a speech. Mr. Hoover at that time was President and was on the platform with him.

Finally the pressure got so strong that Mr. Coolidge rose and made one of the best speeches I have ever heard a man make in one sentence. He said, "We have paid our debt to Lafayette; now let us pay our debt to ourselves," and sat down.

It is time for us to take that sage advice and save America for Americans—for our children and our children's children to the remotest generation.

The speech made by Daniel Webster 100 years ago today is as follows:

SPEECH IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 7, 1850

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions submitted by the Senator from Kentucky were made the special order of the day at 12 o'clock. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Walker] has the floor.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. President, this vast audience has not assembled to hear me; and there is but one man, in my opinion, who can assemble such an audience. They expect to hear him, and I feel it to be my duty, as it is my pleasure, to give the floor, therefore, to the Senator from Massachusetts. I understand it is immaterial to him upon which of these questions he speaks, and therefore I will not move to postpone the special order.

Mr. WEBSTER. I beg to express my obligations to my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. Walker], as well as to my friend from New York [Mr. Seward], for their courtesy in allowing me to address the Senate this morning.

Mr. President, I wish to speak today, not as a Massachusetts man, nor as a Northern man, but as an American, and a Member of the Senate of the United States. It is fortunate that there is a Senate of the United States; a body, not yet moved from its propriety, not lost to a just sense of its own dignity, and its own high responsibilities, and a body to which the country looks, with confidence, for wise, moderate, patriotic, and healing counsels. It is not to be denied that we live in the midst of strong agitations, and are surrounded by very considerable dangers to our institutions and government. The imprisoned winds are let loose. The East, the North, and the stormy South, combine to throw the whole ocean into commotion, to toss its billows to the skies, and disclose its profoundest depths. I do not affect to regard myself, Mr. President, as holding, or as fit to hold, the helm in this combat with the political elements; but I have a duty to perform, and I mean to perform it with fidelity, not without a sense of existing dangers, but not without hope. I have a part to act, not for my own security or safety, for I am looking out for no fragment upon which to float away from the wreck, if wreck there must be, but for the good of the whole, and the preservation of all; and there is that which will keep me to my duty during this struggle, whether the sun and the stars shall appear, or shall not appear, for many days. I speak today for the preservation of the Union. "Hear me for my cause." I speak, today, out of a solicitous and anxious heart, for the restoration to the country of that quiet and that harmony which make the blessings of this Union so rich and so dear to us all. These are the topics that I propose to myself to discuss; these are the motives, and the sole motives, that influence me in the wish to communicate my opinions to the Senate and the country; and if I can do anything, however little, for the promotion of these ends, I shall have accomplished all that I expect.

Mr. President, it may not be amiss to refer very briefly to the events which, equally sudden and extraordinary, have brought the political condition of the country to what it now is. In May 1846 the United States declared war against Mexico. Our armies, then on the frontiers, entered the provinces of that Republic, met and defeated all her

troops, penetrated her mountain passes, and occupied her capital. The Marine force of the United States took possession of her ports and her towns, on the Atlantic and on the Pacific. In less than 2 years, a treaty was negotiated, by which Mexico ceded to the United States a vast territory, extending seven or eight hundred miles along the shores of the Pacific, and reaching back over the mountains, and across the desert, until it joins the frontier of the State of Texas. It so happened, in the distracted and fertile state of the Mexican Government, that, before the declaration of war by the United States against Mexico had become known in California, the people of California, under the lead of American officers, overthrew the existing provincial government of California, the Mexican authorities, and run up an independent flag. When the news arrived at San Francisco that war had been declared by the United States against Mexico, this independent flag was pulled down, and the Stars and Stripes of this Union hoisted in its stead. So, sir, before the war was over, the forces of the United States, military and naval, had possession of San Francisco and upper California, and a great rush of emigrants from various parts of the world took place into California in 1846 and 1847. But now, behold another wonder.

In January of 1848, the Mexicans, or some of them, made a discovery of an extraordinarily rich mine of gold, or, rather, of a very great quantity of gold, hardly fit to be called a mine, for it was spread over the surface, on the lower part of the south or American branch of the Sacramento. They seem to have attempted to conceal their discovery for some time; but soon another discovery, perhaps of greater importance, was made of gold, in another part of the American branch of the Sacramento, and near Sutter's Fort, as it is called. The force of these discoveries spread far and wide. They influenced more and more the spirit of immigration toward California, which had already been excited; and persons crowded in hundreds, and flocked toward the Bay of San Francisco. This, as I have said, took place in the winter and spring of 1848. The digging commenced in the spring of that year, and from that time to this the work of searching for gold has been prosecuted with a success not heretofore known in the history of this globe. We all know, sir, how heedlessly the American public was at the accounts which reached us, at first, of these discoveries; but we all know, now, that these accounts received, and continue to receive, daily confirmation, and down to the present moment I suppose the assurances are as strong, after the experience of these several months, of mines of gold apparently inexhaustible in the region near San Francisco, in California, as they were at any period of the earlier date of the accounts. It so happened, sir, that, although after the return of peace, it became a very important subject for legislative consideration and legislative decision, to provide a proper territorial government for California, yet differences of opinion in the councils of the Government prevented the establishment of any such territorial government, at the last session of Congress. Under this state of things, the inhabitants of San Francisco and California, then amounting to a great number of people, in the summer of last year, thought it to be their duty to establish a local government. Under the proclamation of General Riley, the people chose delegates to a convention; this convention met at Monterey. They formed a constitution for the State of California, and it was adopted by the people of California in their primary assemblages. Destroying immediate connection with the United States, its Senators were appointed and Representatives were chosen, who have come hither, bringing with them the authentic constitution of the State of California; and they now present themselves, asking, in behalf of their State, that it may be admitted into this Union as one of the United States. This constitution, sir, contains an express prohibition against slavery, or involuntary servitude, in the State of California. It is said, and I suppose truly, that of the members who composed that convention some 16 were natives of, and had been residents in, the slaveholding States, about 22 were from the nonslaveholding States, and the remaining 10 members were either native Californians or old settlers in that country. This prohibition against slavery, it is said, was inserted with entire unanimity.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator give way until order is restored?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will see that order is restored, and no more persons admitted to the floor.

Mr. CASS. I trust the scene of the other day will not be repeated. The sergeant-at-arms must display more energy in suppressing this disorder.

Mr. HALE. The noise is outside of the door.

Mr. WEBSTER. And it is this circumstance, sir, the prohibition of slavery by that convention, which has contributed to raise, I do not say it has wholly raised, the dispute as to the propriety of the admission of California into the Union under this Constitution. It is not to be denied, Mr. President, nobody thinks of denying, that, whatever reasons were assigned at the commencement of the late war with Mexico, it was prosecuted for the purpose of the acquisition of territory, and under the alleged argument that the cession of territory was the only form in which proper compensation could be made to the United States by Mexico, for the various claims and demands which the people of this country had against that government. At any rate, it will be found that President Polk's message, at the commencement of the session of December 1847 avowed that the war was to be prosecuted until some acquisition of territory should be made. And, as the acquisition was to be south of the line of the United States, in warm climates and countries, it was naturally, I suppose, expected by the South, that whatever acquisitions were made in that region would be added to the slaveholding portion of the United States. Very little of accurate information was possessed of the real physical character, either of California or New Mexico; and events have turned out as was not expected; both California and New Mexico are likely to come in as free; and therefore some degree of disappointment and surprise has resulted. In other words, it is obvious that the question which has so long harassed the country, and at some times very seriously alarmed the minds of wise and good men, has come upon us for a fresh discussion; the question of slavery in these United States.

Now, sir, I propose, perhaps at the expense of some detail and consequent detention of the Senate, to review historically this question, which, partly in consequence of its own importance, and partly, perhaps mostly, in consequence of the manner in which it has been discussed in one and the other portion of the country, has been a source of so much alienation and unkind feeling.

We all know, sir, that slavery has existed in the world from time immemorial. There was slavery, in the earliest periods of history, in the oriental nations. There was slavery among the Jews; the theocratic government of that people ordained no injunction against it. There was slavery among the Greeks; and the ingenious philosophy of the Greeks found, or sought to find, a justification for it exactly upon the grounds which have been assumed for such a justification in this country; that is, a natural and original difference among the races of mankind, and the inferiority of the black or colored race to the white. The Greeks justified their system of slavery upon that idea, precisely. They held the African, and in some parts the Asiatic, tribes to be inferior to the white race; but they did not show, I think, by any close process of logic, that, if this were true, the more intelligent and the stronger had therefore a right to subjugate the weaker.

The more manly philosophy and jurisprudence of the Romans placed the justification of slavery on entirely different grounds.

The Roman jurists, from the first and down to the fall of the empire, admitted that slavery was against the natural law, by which, as they maintained, all men of whatsoever clime, color, or capacity were equal; but they justified slavery, first, upon the ground and authority of the law of nations, arguing, and arguing truly, that at that day the conventional law of nations admitted that captives in war, whose lives, according to the notions of the times, were at the absolute disposal of the captors, might, in exchange for exemption from death, be made slaves for life, and that such servitude might descend to their posterity. The jurists of Rome also maintained that by the civil law there might be servitude or slavery, personal and hereditary; first, by the voluntary act of an individual who might sell himself into slavery; secondly, by his being received into a state of slavery by his creditors in satisfaction of his debts; and, thirdly, by being placed in a state of servitude or slavery for crime. At the introduction of Christianity, the Roman world was full of slaves, and I suppose there is to be found no injunction against that relation between man and man, in the teachings of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, or of any of his apostles. The object of the instruction imparted to mankind by the founder of Christianity was to touch the heart, purify the soul, and improve the lives of individual men. That object went directly to the first fountain of all political and all social relations of the human race, as well as of all true religious feeling, the individual heart and mind of man.

Now, sir, upon the general nature, and character, and influence of slavery, there exists a wide difference between the northern portion of this country and the southern. It is said on the one side that, if not the subject of any injunction or direct prohibition in the New Testament, slavery is a wrong; that it is founded merely in the right of the strongest; and that it is an oppression, like unjust wars, like all those conflicts by which a mighty nation subjects a weaker nation to its will; and that slavery, in its nature, whatever may be said of it in the modifications which have taken place, is not in fact according to the meek spirit of the Gospel. It is not "kindly affectioned"; it does not "seek another's, and not its own"; it does not "let the oppressed go free." These are sentiments that are cherished, and recently with greatly augmented force, among the people of the Northern States. They have taken hold of the religious sentiment of that part of the country, as they have more or less taken hold of the religious feelings of a considerable portion of mankind. The South, upon the other side, having been accustomed to this relation between the two races all their lives, from their birth; having been taught, in general, to treat the subjects of this bondage with care and kindness, and I believe, in general, feeling for them great care and kindness, have not taken the view of the subject which I have mentioned. There are thousands of religious men, with consciences as tender as any of their brethren at the North, who do not see the unlawfulness of slavery; and there are more thousands, perhaps, that, whatsoever they may think of it in its origin, and as a matter depending upon natural right, yet take things as they are, and, finding slavery to be an established relation of the society in which they live, can see no way in which, let their opinions on the abstract question be what they may, it is in the power of the

present generation to relieve themselves from this relation. And, in this respect, candor obliges me to say, that I believe they are just as conscientious, many of them, and the religious people, all of them, as they are in the North who hold different opinions.

Why, sir, the honorable Senator from South Carolina, the other day, alluded to the separation of that great religious community, the Methodist Episcopal Church. That separation was brought about by differences of opinion upon this particular subject of slavery. I felt great concern, as that dispute went on, about the result; and I was in hopes that the difference of opinion might be adjusted, because I looked upon that religious denomination as one of the great props of religion and morals, throughout the whole country, from Maine to Georgia, and westward, to our utmost western boundary. The result was against my wishes and against my hopes. I have read all their proceedings, and all their arguments; but I have never yet been able to come to the conclusion that there was any real ground for that separation; in other words, that any good could be produced by that separation. I must say I think there was some want of candor and charity. Sir, when a question of this kind seizes on the religious sentiments of mankind, and comes to be discussed in religious assemblies of the clergy and laity, there is always to be expected, or always to be feared, a great degree of excitement. It is in the nature of man, manifested by his whole history, that religious disputes are apt to become warm, as men's strength of conviction is proportionate to their views of the magnitude of the questions. In all such disputes, there will sometimes men be found with whom everything is absolute, absolutely wrong, or absolutely right. They see the right clearly; they think others ought so to see it, and they are disposed to establish a broad line of distinction between what is right, and what is wrong. And they are not seldom willing to establish that line upon their own convictions of truth and justice; and are ready to mark and guard it, by placing along it a series of dogmas, as lines of boundary on the earth's surface are marked by posts and stones. There are men who, with clear perceptions, as they think, of their own duty, do not see how too hot a pursuit of one duty may involve them in the violation of others, or how too warm an embracement of one truth may lead to a disregard of other truths equally important. As I heard it stated strongly, not many days ago, these persons are disposed to mount upon some particular duty as upon a war horse, and to drive, furiously on and upon, and over, all other duties that may stand in the way. There are men who, in times of that sort, and in disputes of that sort, are of opinion that human duties may be ascertained with the exactness of mathematics. They deal with morals as with mathematics; and they think what is right may be distinguished from what is wrong, with the precision of an algebraic equation. They have, therefore, none too much charity toward others who differ from them. They are apt, too, to think that nothing is good but what is perfect, and that there are no compromises or modifications to be made in submission to difference of opinion, or in deference to other men's judgment. If their perspicacious vision enables them to detect a spot on the face of the sun, they think that a good reason why the sun should be struck down from heaven. They prefer the chance of running into utter darkness, to living in heavenly light, if that heavenly light be not absolutely without any imperfection. There are impatient men, too impatient always to give heed to the admonition of St. Paul, "that we are not to do evil that good may come;" too impatient to wait for the slow progress of moral causes in the improvement of mankind. They do not remember that the doctrines and the miracles of Jesus Christ have, in 1,800 years, converted only a small portion of the human race; and among the nations that are converted to Christianity, they forget how many vices and crimes, public and private, still prevail, and that many of them, public crimes especially, which are so clearly offenses against the Christian religion, pass without exciting particular indignation. Thus wars are waged, and unjust wars. I do not deny that there may be just wars. There certainly are; but it was the remark of an eminent person, not many years ago, on the other side of the Atlantic, that it was one of the greatest reproaches to human nature, that wars were sometimes just. The defense of nations sometimes causes a just war against the injustice of other nations.

Now, sir, in this state of sentiment upon the general nature of slavery lies the cause of a great part of those unhappy divisions, exasperations, and reproaches, which find vent and support in different parts of the Union. Slavery does exist in the United States. It did exist in the States before the adoption of this Constitution, and at that time.

And now let us consider, sir, for a moment, what was the state of sentiment, North and South, in regard to slavery, at the time this Constitution was adopted. A remarkable change has taken place since; but what did the wise and great men of all parts of the country think of slavery, then? In what estimation did they hold it at the time when this Constitution was adopted? Now, it will be found, sir, if we will carry ourselves by historical research back to that day, and ascertain men's opinions by authentic records still existing among us, that there was no great diversity of opinion between the North and the South, upon the subject of slavery. And it will be found that both parts of the country held it equally an evil, a moral and political evil. It will not be found that, either at the North or at the South, there was much, though there was some, invective against slavery as inhuman and cruel. The great ground of objection to it was political; that it weakened the social fabric; that, taking the place of free labor, society became less strong and labor was less productive; and, therefore, we find from all the eminent men of the time the clearest expression of their opinion that slavery was an evil. And they ascribed its existence here, not without truth, and not without some acerbity of temper and force of language, to the injurious policy of the mother country, who, to favor the navigator, had entailed these evils upon the colonies. I need hardly refer, sir, particularly to the publications of the day. They are matters of history on the record. The eminent men, the most eminent men, and nearly all the conspicuous politicians of the South, held the same sentiments; that slavery was an evil, a blight, a blast, a mildew, a scourge, and a curse. There are no terms of reprobation of slavery so vehement in the North of that day as in the South. The North was not so much excited against it as the South; and the reason is, I suppose, because there was much less of it at the North, and the people did not see, or think they saw, the evils so prominently as they were seen, or thought to be seen, at the South.

Then, sir, when this Constitution was framed, this was the light in which the Convention viewed it: The Convention reflected the judgment and sentiments of the great men of the South. A Member of the other House, whom I have not the honor to know, in a recent speech, has collected extracts from these public documents. They prove the truth of what I am saying, and the question then was how to deal with it, and how to deal with it as an evil. Well, they came to this general result: They thought that slavery could not be continued in the country if the importation of slaves were made to cease, and therefore they provided that after a certain period the importation might be prevented by the act of the new Government. Twenty years was proposed by some gentleman, a northern gentleman, I think, and many of the southern gentlemen opposed it as being too long. Mr. Madison especially was melting warm against it. He said it would bring too much of this mischief into the country to allow the importation of slaves for such a period. Because we must take along with us, in the whole of this discussion, when we are considering the sentiments and opinions in which the constitutional provision originated, that the conviction of all men was that if the importation of slaves ceased the white race would multiply faster than the black race, and that slavery would therefore gradually wear out and expire. It may not be improper here to allude to that, I had almost said, celebrated opinion of Mr. Madison. You observe, sir, that the term "slave," or "slavery," is not used in the Constitution. The Constitution does not require that "fugitive slaves" shall be delivered up. It requires that "persons bound to service in one State and escaping into another shall be delivered up." Mr. Madison opposed the introduction of the term "slave," or "slavery," into the Constitution, for he said that he did not wish to see it recognized by the Constitution of the United States of America that there could be property in men. Now, sir, all this took place at the Convention in 1787; but connected with this, concurrent and cotemporaneous, is another important transaction not sufficiently attended to. The Convention for framing this Constitution assembled in Philadelphia in May and sat until September 1787. During all that time the Congress of the United States was in session at New York. It was a matter of design, as we know, that the Convention should not assemble in the same city where Congress was holding its sessions. Almost all the public men of the country, therefore, of distinction and eminence were in one or the other of these two assemblies, and I think it happened, in some instances, that the same gentlemen were members of both. If I mistake not, such was the case of Mr. Rufus King, then a Member of Congress from Massachusetts and at the same time a member of the Convention to frame the Constitution. Now, it was in the summer of 1787, the very time when the Convention in Philadelphia was framing this Constitution, that the Congress in New York was framing the ordinance of 1787. They passed that ordinance on the 13th of July 1787 at New York, the very month, perhaps the very day, on which these questions about the importation of slaves and the character of slavery were debated in the Convention at Philadelphia. And, so far as we can now learn, there was a perfect concurrence of opinion between these respective bodies, and it resulted in this ordinance of 1787, excluding slavery as to all the territory over which the Congress of the United States had jurisdiction, and that was all the territory northwest of the Ohio. Three years before Virginia and other States had made a cession of that great territory to the United States, and a most magnificent act it was. I never reflect upon it without a disposition to do honor and justice, and justice would be the highest honor, to Virginia for the cession of her northwestern territory. I will say, sir, it is one of her fairest claims to the respect and gratitude of the United States, and that, perhaps, it is only second to that other claim which attaches to her—that from her counsels and from the intelligence and patriotism of her leading statesmen proceeded the first idea put into practice of the formation of a general Constitution of the United States. Now, sir, the ordinance of 1787 was applied, thus

to the whole territory over which the Congress of the United States had jurisdiction. It was adopted 2 years before the Constitution of the United States went into operation, because the ordinance took effect immediately on its passage, while the Constitution of the United States, having been framed, was to be sent to the States to be adopted by their conventions, and then a government was to be organized under it. This ordinance, then, was in operation and force when the Constitution was adopted and the Government put in motion, in April 1789.

Mr. President, three things are quite clear as historical truths. One is, that there was an expectation that, on the ceasing of the importation of slaves from Africa slavery would begin to run out here. That was hoped and expected. Another is, that, as far as there was any power in Congress to prevent the spread of slavery in the United States, that power was executed in the most absolute manner, and to the fullest extent. An honorable Member, whose health does not allow him to be here today——

A SENATOR. He is here. (Referring to Mr. Calhoun.)

Mr. WEBSTER. I am very happy to hear that he is; may he long be here, and in the enjoyment of health to serve his country! The honorable Member said, the other day, that he considered this ordinance as the first, in the series of measures, calculated to enfeeble the South, and deprive them of their just participation in the benefits and privileges of this Government. He says very properly that it was enacted under the old confederation and before the Constitution went into effect; but my present purpose is only to say, Mr. President, that it was established with the entire and unanimous concurrence of the whole South. Why, there it stands! The vote of every State in the Union was unanimous in favor of the ordinance, with the exception of a single individual vote, and that individual vote was given by a northern man. But, sir, the ordinance abolishing, or rather prohibiting slavery northwest of the Ohio, has the hand and seal of every southern Member in Congress. So this ordinance was no aggression of the North on the South.

The other and third clear historical truth is, that the Convention meant to leave slavery in the States, as they found it, entirely under the authority and control of the States themselves.

This was the state of things, sir, and this the state of opinion, under which those very important matters were arranged, and those three important things done; that is, the establishment of the Constitution with a recognition of slavery as it existed in the States; the establishment of the ordinance prohibiting to the full extent of all territory owned by the United States, the introduction of slavery into that territory, while leaving to the States all power over slavery in their own limits; and creating a power, in the new government, to put an end to the importation of slaves, after a limited period. And here, sir, we may pause. We may reflect for a moment upon the entire concurrence and concurrence of sentiment, between the North and the South, upon all these questions, at the period of the adoption of the Constitution. But opinions, sir, have changed, greatly changed, changed North, and changed South. Slavery is not regarded in the South now as it was then. I see an honorable Member of this body paying me the honor of listening to my remarks (Mr. Mason); he brings to me, sir, freshly and vividly, what I have learned of his great ancestor, so much distinguished in his day and generation, so worthy to be succeeded by so worthy a grandson, with all the sentiments he expressed in the Convention in Philadelphia.

Here we may pause. There was, if not an entire unanimity, a general concurrence of sentiment, running through the whole community, and especially entertained by the eminent men of all parts of the country. But soon a change began, at the North and the South, and a severance of opinion showed itself; the North growing much more warm and strong against slavery, and the South growing much more warm and strong in its support. Sir, there is no generation of mankind whose opinions are not subject to be influenced by what appears to them to be their present, emergent, and exigent interests. I impute to the South no particularly selfish view in the change which has come over her. I impute to her certainly no dishonest view. All that has happened has been natural. It has followed those causes which always influence the human mind and operate upon it. What, then, have been the causes which have created so new a feeling in favor of slavery in the South, which have changed the whole nomenclature of the South on that subject, so that, from being thought and described in the terms I have mentioned and will not repeat, it has now become an institution, a cherished institution in that quarter; no evil, no scourge, but a great religious, social, and moral blessing, as I think I have heard it latterly spoken of? I suppose this, sir, is owing to the sudden uprising and rapid growth of the cotton plantations of the South. So far as any motive consistent with honor, justice, and general judgment could act, it was the cotton interest that gave a new desire to promote slavery, to spread it, and to use its labor. I again say that that was produced by causes which we must always expect to produce like effects; the whole interest of the South became connected, more or less, with it. If we look back to the history of the commerce of this country at the early years of this Government, what were our exports? Cotton was hardly, or but to a very limited extent, known. The tables will show that the exports of cotton for the years 1790–91 were not more than $40,000 or $50,000 a year. It has gone on increasing rapidly, until the whole crop may now, perhaps, in a season of great product and high prices, amount to a hundred millions of dollars. In the years I have mentioned, there was more of wax, more of indigo, more of rice, more of almost every article of export from the South, than of cotton. I think it is true when Mr. Jay negotiated the treaty of 1794 with England, that he did not know that cotton was exported at all from the United States; and I have heard it said, also, that the customhouse in London refused to admit cotton, upon an allegation that it could not be an American production, there being, as they supposed, no cotton raised in America. They would hardly think so now.

Well, sir, we know what followed. The age of cotton become the golden age of our southern brethren. It gratified their desire for improvement and accumulation at the same time that it excited it. The desire grew by what it fed upon and there soon came to be an eagerness for other territory—a new area or new areas—for the cultivation of the cotton crop, and measures leading to this result were brought about rapidly, one after another, under the lead of southern men at the head of the Government, they having a majority in both branches to accomplish their ends. The honorable Member from South Carolina observed that there has been a majority all along in favor of the North. If that be true, sir, the North has acted either very liberally and kindly or very weakly, for they never exercised that majority efficiently five times in the history of the Government when a division or trial of strength arose—never. Whether they were outgeneraled or whether it was owing to other causes, I shall not stop to consider, but no man acquainted with the history of the country can deny that the general lead in the politics of the country for three-fourths of the period that has elapsed since the adoption of the Constitution has been a southern lead. In 1803, in pursuit of the idea of opening a new cotton region, the United States obtained a cession from Georgia of the whole of her western territory, now embracing the rich and growing State of Alabama. In 1803 Louisiana was purchased from France, out of which the States of Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri have been framed as slaveholding States. In 1819 the cession of Florida was made, bringing in another region of slaveholding property and territory. Sir, the honorable Member from South Carolina thought he saw in certain operations of the Government, such as the manner of collecting the revenue, and the tendency of measures calculated to promote emigration into the country, what accounts for the more rapid growth of the North than the South. He ascribes that more rapid growth not to the operation of time but to system of government and administration established under this Constitution.

That is matter of opinion. To a certain extent it may be true; but it does seem to me that if any operation of the Government could be shown in any degree to have promoted the population, and growth, and wealth of the North, it is much more sure that there are sundry important and distinct operations of the Government, about which no man can doubt, tending to promote, and which absolutely have promoted, the increase of the slave interest and the slave territory of the South. Allow me to say that it was not time that brought in Louisiana; it was the act of men. It was not time that brought in Florida; it was the act of men. And lastly, sir, to complete those acts of men which have contributed so much to enlarge the area and the sphere of the institution of slavery, Texas, great and vast and illimitable Texas, was added to the Union as a slave State in 1845; and that, sir, pretty much closed the whole chapter, and settled the whole account. That closed the whole chapter, that settled the whole account, because the annexation of Texas, upon the conditions and under the guaranties upon which she was admitted, did not leave within the control of this Government an acre of land, capable of being cultivated by slave labor, between this Capitol and the Rio Grande or the Nueces, or whatever is the proper boundary of Texas, not an acre. From that moment, the whole country, from this place to the western boundary of Texas, was fixed, pledged, fastened, decided, to be slave territory forever, by the solemn guaranties of law. And I now say, sir, as the proposition upon which I stand this day, and upon the truth and firmness of which I intend to act until it is overthrown, that there is not at this moment within the United States, or any Territory of the United States, a single foot of land, the character of which, in regard to its being free-soil territory or slave territory, is not fixed by some law, and some irrepealable law, beyond the power of the action of the Government. Now, is it not so with respect to Texas? Why it is most manifestly so. The honorable Member from South Carolina, at the time of the admission of Texas, held an important post in the executive department of the Government; he was Secretary of State. Another eminent person of great activity and adroitness in affairs, I mean the late Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Walker, was a conspicuous member of this body, and took the lead in the business of annexation, in cooperation with the Secretary of State; and I must say that they did their business faithfully and thoroughly; there was no botch left in it. They rounded it off, and made as close joiner work as ever was exhibited. Resolutions of annexation were brought into Congress, fitly joined together, compact, firm, efficient, conclusive upon the great object which they had in view, and these resolutions passed.

Allow me to read a part of these resolutions. It is the third clause of the second section of the resolution of the 1st March

1845, for the admission of Texas, which applies to this part of the case. That clause reads in these words:

"New States, of convenient size, not exceeding four in number, in addition to said State of Texas, and having sufficient population, may hereafter, by the consent of said State, be formed out of the territory thereof, which shall be entitled to admission under the provisions of the Federal Constitution. And such States as may be formed out of that portion of said territory lying south of 36°30′ north latitude, commonly known as the Missouri Compromise line, shall be admitted into the Union with or without slavery, as the people of each State asking admission may desire; and in such State or States as shall be formed out of said territory north of said Missouri Compromise line, slavery or involuntary servitude (except for crime) shall be prohibited."

Now what is here stipulated, enacted, secured? It is, that all Texas south of 36°30′, which is nearly the whole of it, shall be admitted into the Union as a slave State. It was a slave State, and therefore came in as a slave State; and the guaranty is, that new States shall be made out of it, and that such States as are formed out of that portion of Texas lying south of 36°30′ may come in as slave States to the number of four, in addition to the State then in existence, and admitted at that time by these resolutions. I know no form of legislation which can strengthen this. I know no mode of recognition that can add a tittle of weight to it. I listened respectfully to the resolutions of my honorable friend from Tennessee, Mr. Bell. He proposed to recognize that stipulation with Texas. But any additional recognition would weaken the force of it; because it stands here on the ground of a contract, a thing done for a consideration. It is a law founded on a contract with Texas, and designed to carry that contract into effect. A recognition now, founded not on any consideration or any contract, would not be so strong as it now stands on the face of the resolution. Now I know no way, I candidly confess, in which this Government, acting in good faith, as I trust it always will, can relieve itself from that stipulation and pledge, by any honest course of legislation whatever. And, therefore, I say again that, so far as Texas is concerned, in the whole of Texas south of 36°30′, which, I suppose, embraces all the territory capable of slave cultivation, there is no land, not an acre, the character of which is not established by law, a law which cannot be repealed without the violation of a contract, and plain disregard of the public faith.

I hope, sir, it is now apparent that my proposition, so far as it respects Texas, has been maintained; and that the provision in this article is clear and absolute—and it has been well suggested by my friend from Rhode Island that that part of Texas which lies north of 34° of north latitude and which may be formed into free States, is dependent, in like manner, upon the consent of Texas, herself a slave State.

Well, now, sir, how came this? How came it to pass, that within these walls, where it is said by the honorable Member from South Carolina that the free States have always had a majority, this resolution of annexation, such as I have described it, found a majority in both Houses of Congress? Why, sir, it found that majority by the great number of northern votes added to the entire southern vote, or at least nearly the whole of the southern votes. The aggregate was made up of northern and southern votes. In the House of Representatives it stood, I think, about 60 southern votes for the admission of Texas, and about 50 northern votes for the admission of Texas. In the Senate, the vote stood for the admission of Texas 27, and 25 against it; and of those 27 votes, constituting a majority for the admission of Texas in this body, no less than 13 came from the free States, and 4 of them were from New England. The whole of these 13 Senators, constituting, within a fraction, you see, one-half of all the votes in this body for the admission of Texas, with its immeasurable extent of slave territory, were sent here by free States.

Sir, there is not so remarkable a chapter in our history of political events, political parties, and political men, as is afforded by this measure for the admission of Texas, with this immense territory, that a bird cannot fly over in a week. [Laughter.] Sir, New England, with some of her own votes, supported this measure. Three-fourths of the votes of liberty-loving Connecticut were given for it, in the other House; and one-half here. There was one vote for it in Maine, but I am happy to say not the vote of the honorable member who addressed the Senate the day before yesterday [Mr. HAMLIN], and who was then a Representative from Maine in the House of Representatives: but there was a vote or two from Maine, aye, and there was one vote for it from Massachusetts, given by a gentleman then representing, and now living in, the district in which the prevalence to some extent of free-soil sentiment for a couple of years or so has defeated the choice of any member to represent it in Congress. Sir, that body of northern and eastern men, who gave those votes at that time, are now seen taking upon themselves, in the nomenclature of politics, the appellation of the northern Democracy. They undertook to wield the destinies of this empire, if I may call a republic an empire, and their policy was, and they persisted in it, to bring into this country, and under this Government, all the territory they could. They did it under pledges, absolute pledges to the slave interest in the case of Texas, and afterward they lent their aid in bringing in these new conquests to take their chance for slavery or freedom. My honorable friend from Georgia, in March 1847, moved the Senate to declare that the war ought not to be prosecuted for acquisition, for conquest, for the dismemberment of Mexico. The same northern Democracy entirely voted against it. He did not get a vote from them. It suited the views, the patriotism, the elevated sentiments of the northern Democracy to bring in a world here, among the mountains and valleys of California and New Mexico, or any other part of Mexico, and then quarrel about it; to bring it in, and then endeavor to put upon it the saving grace of the Wilmot Proviso. There were two eminent and highly respectable gentlemen from the North and East, then leading gentlemen in the Senate—I refer, and I do so with entire respect, for I entertain for both of those gentlemen, in general, high regard, to Mr. Dix, of New York, and Mr. Niles, of Connecticut—who both voted for the admission of Texas. They would not have that vote any other way than as it stood; and they would have it as it did stand. I speak of the vote upon the annexation of Texas. Those two gentlemen would have the resolution of annexation just as it is, and they voted for it just as it is, and their eyes were all open to its true character. The honorable Member who addressed us the other day from South Carolina, was then Secretary of State. His correspondence with Mr. Murphy, the Chargé d'Affaires of the United States in Texas, had been published. That correspondence was all before those gentlemen, and the Secretary had the boldness and candor to avow in that correspondence that the great object sought by the annexation of Texas was to strengthen the slave interest of the South. Why, sir, he said so, in so many words——

Mr. CALHOUN. Will the honorable Senator permit me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. WEBSTER. Certainly.

Mr. CALHOUN. I am very reluctant to interrupt the honorable gentleman; but, upon a point of so much importance, I deem it right to put myself in rectus in curia. I did not put it upon the ground assumed by the Senator. I put it upon this ground: that Great Britain had announced to this country, in so many words, that her object was to abolish slavery in Texas, and through Texas to accomplish the abolishment of slavery in the United States and the world. The ground I put it on was, that it would make an exposed frontier, and, if Great Britain succeeded in her object, it would be impossible that the frontier could be secured against the aggressions of the abolitionists; and that this Government was bound, under the guaranties of the Constitution, to protect us against such a state of things.

Mr. WEBSTER. That comes, I suppose, sir, to exactly the same thing. It was, that Texas must be obtained for the security of the slave interest of the South.

Mr. CALHOUN. Another view is very distinctly given.

Mr. WEBSTER. That was the object set forth in the correspondence of a worthy gentleman not now living, who preceded the honorable Member from South Carolina in the Department of State. There repose on the files of the Department of State, as I have occasion to know, strong letters from Mr. Upshur to the United States minister in England, and I believe there are some to the same minister from the honorable Senator himself, asserting to this effect the sentiments of this Government, viz: that Great Britain was expected not to interfere to take Texas out of the hands of its then existing government, and make it a free country. But my argument, my suggestion is this; that those gentlemen who composed the northern democracy when Texas was brought into the Union, saw, with all their eyes, that it was brought in as a slave country, and brought in for the purpose of being maintained as slave territory to the Greek Kalends. I rather think the honorable gentleman who was then Secretary of State might, in some of his correspondence with Mr. Murphy, have suggested that it was not expedient to say too much about this object, lest it should create some alarm. At any rate, Mr. Murphy wrote to him, that England was anxious to get rid of the constitution of Texas, because it was a constitution establishing slavery; and that what the United States had to do, was to aid the people of Texas in upholding their constitution: but that nothing should be said, which should offend the fanatical men of the North. But, sir, the honorable member did avow this object himself, openly, boldly, and manfully; he did not disguise his conduct, or his motives.

Mr. CALHOUN. Never, never.

Mr. WEBSTER. What he means he is very apt to say.

Mr. CALHOUN. Always, always.

Mr. WEBSTER. And I honor him for it. This admission of Texas was in 1845. Then, in 1847, flagrante bello between the United States and Mexico, the proposition I have mentioned was brought forward by my friend from Georgia, and the northern democracy voted straight ahead against it. Their remedy was to apply to the acquisitions, after they should come in, the Wilmot proviso. What follows? These two gentlemen, worthy and honorable and influential men, and if they had not been they could not have carried the measure, these two gentlemen, Members of this body, brought in Texas, and by their votes they also prevented the passage of the resolution of the honorable Member from Georgia, and then they went home and took the lead in the Free Soil Party. And there they stand, sir. They leave us here, bound in honor and conscience by the resolutions of annexation; they leave us here, to take the odium of fulfilling the obligations in favor of slavery,

which they voted us into, or else the greater odium of violating those obligations, while they are at home making capital and raising speeches for free soil and no slavery. [Laughter.] And, therefore, I say, sir, that there is not a chapter in our history, respecting public measures and public men, more full of what should create surprise, more full of what does create, in my mind, extreme mortification, than that of the conduct of this northern democracy.

Mr. President, sometimes, when a man is found in a new relation to things around him and to other men, he says the world has changed, and that he has not changed. I believe, sir, that our self-respect leads us often to make this declaration in regard to ourselves, when it is not exactly true. An individual is more apt to change, perhaps, than all the world around him. But, under the present circumstances, and under the responsibility which I know I incur by what I am now stating here, I feel at liberty to recur to the various expressions and statements, made at various times, of my own opinions and resolutions respecting the admission of Texas, and all that has followed. Sir, as early as 1836, or in the early part of 1837, there was conversation and correspondence between myself and some private friends, on this project of annexing Texas to the United States; and an honorable gentleman with whom I have had a long acquaintance, a friend of mine now perhaps in this Chamber, I mean General Hamilton, of South Carolina, was knowing to that correspondence. I had voted for the recognition of Texan independence, because I believed it was an existing fact, surprising and astonishing as it was, and I wished well to the new Republic; but I manifested from the first utter opposition to bringing her, with her slave territory, into the Union. I happened, in 1837, to meet friends in New York, on some political occasion, and I then stated my sentiments upon the subject. It was the first time that I had occasion to advert to it; and I will ask a friend near me to do me the favor to read an extract from the speech, for the Senate may find it rather tedious to listen to the whole of it. It was delivered in Niblo's Garden, in 1837.

(Mr. Greene then read the following extract from the speech of Mr. Webster, to which he referred:)

"Gentlemen, we all see that, by whomsoever possessed, Texas is likely to be a slaveholding country; and I frankly avow my entire unwillingness to do anything which shall extend the slavery of the African race on this continent, or add other slaveholding States to the Union.

"When I say that I regard slavery in itself as a great moral, social, and political evil, I only use language which has been adopted by distinguished men, themselves citizens of slaveholding States.

"I shall do nothing therefore, to favor or encourage its further extension. We have slavery already among us. The Constitution found it among us; it recognized it, and gave it solemn guaranties.

"To the full extent of these guaranties, we are all bound in honor, in justice, and by the Constitution. All the stipulations contained in the Constitution in favor of the slaveholding States, which are already in the Union, ought to be fulfilled, and, so far as depends on me, shall be fulfilled in the fulness of their spirit, and to the exactness of their letter. Slavery, as it exists in the States, is beyond the reach of Congress. It is a concern of the States themselves. They have never submitted it to Congress, and Congress has no rightful power over it.

"I shall concur, therefore, in no act, no measure, no menace, no hostile show of purpose, which shall interfere or threaten to interfere with the exclusive authority of the several States over the subject of slavery, as it exists within their respective limits. All this appears to me to be matter of plain and imperative duty.

"But when we come to speak of admitting new States, the subject assumes an entirely different aspect. Our rights and our duties are then both different. * * *

"I see, therefore, no political necessity for the annexation of Texas to the Union—no advantage to be derived from it; and objections to it of a strong, and, in my judgment, of a decisive character."

Mr. WEBSTER. I have nothing, sir, to add to, nor to take from, those sentiments. That speech, the Senate will perceive, was in 1837. The purpose of immediately annexing Texas at that time was abandoned or postponed; and it was not revived with any vigor for some years. In the meantime it had so happened that I had become a member of the Executive Administration, and was for a short period in the Department of State. The annexation of Texas was a subject of conversation, not confidential, with the President and heads of departments, as well as with other public men. No serious attempt was then made, however, to bring it about. I left the Department of State in May 1843, and shortly after I learned, though by means which were no way connected with official information, that a design had been taken up of bringing Texas, with her slave territory and population, into this Union. I was in Washington at the time, and persons are now here who will remember that we had an arranged meeting for conversation upon it. I went home to Massachusetts and proclaimed the existence of that purpose, but I could get no audience, and but little attention. Some did not believe it, and some were too much engaged in their own pursuits to give it any heed. They had gone to their farms, or to their merchandise, and it was impossible to arouse any sentiments in New England or in Massachusetts, that should combine the two great political parties against this annexation; and indeed there was no hope of bringing the northern democracy into that view, for their leaning was all the other way. But, sir, even with Whigs, and leading Whigs, I am ashamed to say, there was a great indifference towards the admission of Texas, with slave territory into this Union. The project went on. I was then out of Congress. The annexation resolutions passed the 1st of March 1845; the Legislature of Texas complied with the conditions and accepted the guaranties; for the phraseology of the language of the resolution is, that Texas is to come in "upon the conditions and under the guaranties herein prescribed." I happened to be returned to the Senate in March 1845, and was here in December 1845, when the acceptance by Texas of the conditions proposed by Congress was communicated to us by the President, and an act for the consummation of the connection was laid before the two Houses. The connection was then not completed. A final law doing the deed of annexation, ultimately, had not been passed; and when it was put upon its final passage here, I expressed my opposition to it, and recorded my vote in the negative; and there that vote stands, with the observations that I made upon that occasion. It has happened that between 1837 and this time, on various occasions and opportunities, I have expressed my entire opposition to the admission of slave States, or the acquisition of new slave territories, to be added to the United States. I know, sir, no change in my own sentiments, or my own purposes, in that respect. I will now again ask my friend from Rhode Island to read another extract from a speech of mine made at a Whig Convention in Springfield, Mass., in the month of September 1847.

Mr. Greene here read the following extract:

"We hear much just now of a panacea for the dangers and evils of slavery and slave annexation, which they call the 'Wilmot proviso.' That certainly is a just sentiment, but it is not a sentiment to found any new party upon. It is not a sentiment on which Massachusetts Whigs differ. There is not a man in this hall who holds to it more firmly than I do, nor one who adheres to it more than another.

"I feel some little interest in this matter, sir. Did not I commit myself in 1837 to the whole doctrine, fully, entirely? And I must be permitted to say that I cannot quite consent that more recent discoverers should claim the merit and take out a patent.

"I deny the priority of their invention. Allow me to say, sir, it is not their thunder. * * *

"We are to use the first and last and every occasion which offers to oppose the extension of slave power.

"But I speak of it here, as in Congress, as a political question, a question for statesmen to act upon. We must so regard it. I certainly do not mean to say that it is less important in a moral point of view, that it is not more important in many other points of view; but, as a legislator, or in any official capacity, I must look at it, consider it, and decide it as a matter of political action."

Mr. WEBSTER. On other occasions, in debates here, I have expressed my determination to vote for no acquisition, or cession, or annexation, North or South, East or West. My opinion has been, that we have territory enough, and that we should follow the Spartan maxim, "Improve, adorn what you have, seek no further." I think that it was in some observations that I made on the three-million loan bill, that I avowed that sentiment. In short, sir, the sentiment has been avowed quite as often, in as many places, and before as many assemblies, as any humble sentiments of mine ought to be avowed.

But now, that, under certain conditions, Texas is in, with all her territory, as a slave State, with a solemn pledge, also, that if she shall be divided into many States, those States may come in as slave States south of 36° 30', how are we to deal with this subject? I know no way of honest legislation, when the proper time comes for the enactment, but to carry into effect all that we have stipulated to do. I do not entirely agree with my honorable friend from Tennessee [Mr. Bell], that, as soon as the time comes when she is entitled to another Representative, we should create a new State. The rule in regard to it I take to be this: that, when we have created new States out of Territories, we have generally gone upon the idea that when there is population enough to form a State, 60,000 or some such thing, we would create a State; but it is quite a different thing when a State is divided, and two or more States made out of it. It does not follow, in such a case, that the same rule of apportionment should be applied. That, however, is a matter for the consideration of Congress, when the proper time arrives. I may not then be here. I may have no vote to give on the occasion, but I wish it to be distinctly understood, today, that, according to my view of the matter, this Government is solemnly pledged, by law and contract, to create new States out of Texas, with her consent, when her population shall justify and call for such a proceeding, and so far as such States are formed out of Texan territory lying south of 36° 30', to let them come in as slave States. That is the meaning of the resolution which our friends, the northern democracy, have left us to fulfill; and I, for one, mean to fulfill it, because I will not violate the faith of the Government. What I mean to say is, that the time for the admission of new States formed out of Texas, the number of such States, their boundaries, and the requisite amounts of population, and other things connected with the admission, are in the free discretion of Congress, except this,

to wit, that when new States, formed out of Texas, are to be admitted, they have a right, by legal stipulation and contract, to come in as slave States.

Now, as to California and New Mexico, I hold slavery to be excluded from those Territories by a law, even superior to that which admits and sanctions it in Texas. I mean the law of nature, of physical geography, the law of the formation of the earth. That law settles forever, with a strength beyond all terms of human enactment, that slavery cannot exist in California or New Mexico. Understand me, sir; I mean slavery as we regard it; slaves in gross, of the colored race, transferable by sale and delivery, like other property. I shall not discuss the point, but leave it to the learned gentlemen who have undertaken to discuss it; but I suppose there is no slave of that description in California now. I understand that peonism, a sort of penal servitude, exists there, or rather a sort of voluntary sale of a man and his offspring for debt, as it is arranged and exists in some parts of California and some Provinces of Mexico. But what I mean to say is, that African slavery, as we see it among us, is as utterly impossible to find itself, or to be found in California and New Mexico, as any other natural impossibility. California and New Mexico are Asiatic in their formation and scenery. They are composed of vast ridges of mountains of enormous height, with broken ridges and deep valleys. The sides of these mountains are barren, entirely barren; their tops capped by perennial snow. There may be in California, now made free by its constitution, and no doubt there are, some tracts of valuable land. But it is not so in New Mexico. Pray, what is the evidence which every gentleman must have obtained on this subject, from information sought by himself or communicated by others? I have inquired and read all I could find, in order to acquire information on this important question. What is there in New Mexico that could, by any possibility, induce anybody to go there with slaves? There are some narrow strips of tillable land on the borders of the rivers; but the rivers themselves dry up, before midsummer is gone. All that the people can do in that region is to raise some little articles, some little wheat for their tortillas, and all that by irrigation. And who expects to see a hundred black men cultivating tobacco, corn, cotton, rice, or anything else, on lands in New Mexico, made fertile only by irrigation? I look upon it, therefore, as a fixed fact, to use an expression current at this day, that both California and New Mexico are destined to be free, so far as they are settled at all, which I believe, especially in regard to New Mexico, will be very little for a great length of time; free by the arrangement of things by the power above us. I have therefore to say, in this respect also, that this country is fixed for freedom, to as many persons as shall ever live in it, by as irrepealable and more irrepealable law, than the law that attaches to the right of holding slaves in Texas; and I will say further that if a resolution, or a law, were now before us to provide a Territorial government for New Mexico, I would not vote to put any prohibition into it whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle, as it respects any effect it would have upon the Territory; and I would not take pains uselessly to reaffirm an ordinance of nature, nor to reenact the will of God. And I would put in no Wilmot proviso for the mere purpose of a taunt or a reproach. I would put into it no evidence of the votes of superior power, for no purpose but to wound the pride, even whether a just pride, a rational pride, or an irrational pride, to wound the pride of the gentlemen who belong to Southern States. I have no such object, no such purpose. They would think it a taunt, an indignity; they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard a proper equality of privilege; and whether they expect to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it at least a plain theoretic wrong; that something more or less derogatory to their character and their rights had taken place. I propose to inflict no such wound upon anybody, unless something essentially important to the country, and efficient to the preservation of liberty and freedom, is to be effected. Therefore, I repeat, sir, and I repeat it because I wish it to be understood, that I do not propose to address the Senate often on this subject. I desire to pour out all my heart in as plain a manner as possible; and I say, again, therefore, that if a proposition were now here for a government for New Mexico, and it was moved to insert a provision for a prohibition of slavery, I would not vote for it.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I proposed to go into any line of observation to establish, the proposition with which I set out, and upon which I propose to stand or fall; and that is, that the whole territory of the States in the United States, or in the newly acquired territory of the United States, has a fixed and settled character, now fixed and settled by law, which cannot be repealed; in the case of Texas without a violation of public faith, and by no human power in regard to California or New Mexico; that, therefore, under one or other of these laws, every foot of land in the States or in the Territories has already received a fixed and decided character.

Sir, if we were now making a government for New Mexico, and anybody should propose a Wilmot proviso, I should treat it exactly as Mr. Polk treated that provision for excluding slavery from Oregon. Mr. Polk was known to be in opinion decidedly averse to the Wilmot proviso; but he felt the necessity of establishing a government for the Territory of Oregon, and, though the proviso was in it, he knew it would be entirely nugatory; and, since it must be entirely nugatory, since it took away no right, no describable, no estimable, no weighable, or tangible right of the South, he said he would sign the bill for the sake of enacting a law to form a government in that Territory, and let that entirely useless, and, in that connection entirely senseless, proviso remain. Sir, we hear much of the annexation of Canada; and if there be any man, any of the Northern Democracy, or any one of the Free-Soil Party, who supposes it necessary to insert a Wilmot proviso in a territorial government for New Mexico, that man will of course be of opinion that it is necessary to protect the everlasting snows of Canada from the foot of slavery by the same overspreading wing of an act of Congress. Sir, wherever there is a substantive good to be done; wherever there is a foot of land to be staid back from becoming slave territory, I am ready to assert the principle of the exclusion of slavery. I am pledged to it from the year 1837; I have been pledged to it again and again; and I will perform those pledges; but I will not do a thing unnecessarily that wounds the feelings of others, or that does disgrace to my own understanding.

Mr. President, in the excited times in which we live, there is found to exist a state of crimination and recrimination between the North and South. There are lists of grievances produced by each; and those grievances, real or supposed, alienate the minds of one portion of the country from the other, exasperate the feelings, and subdue the sense of fraternal affection, patriotic love, and mutual regard. I shall bestow a little attention, sir, upon these various grievances produced on the one side, and on the other. I begin with complaints of the South. I will not answer, further than I have, the general statements of the honorable Senator from South Carolina, that the North has grown upon the South in consequence of the manner of administering this Government, in the collecting of its revenues, and so forth. These are disputed topics, and I have no inclination to enter into them. But I will state these complaints, especially one complaint of the South, which has in my opinion just foundation; and that is, that there has been found at the North, among individuals and among legislators, a disinclination to perform, fully, their constitutional duties in regard to the return of persons bound to service who have escaped into the free States. In that respect, it is my judgment that the South is right, and the North is wrong. Every member of every northern legislature is bound by oath, like every other officer in the country, to support the Constitution of the United States; and this article of the Constitution, which says to these States, that they shall deliver up fugitives from service, is as binding in honor and conscience as any other article.

No man fulfills his duty in any legislature who sets himself to find excuses, evasions, escapes from this constitutional obligation. I have always thought that the Constitution addressed itself to the legislatures of the States or to the States themselves. It says that those persons escaping to other States shall be delivered up, and I confess I have always been of the opinion that it was an injunction upon the States themselves. When it is said that a person escaping into another State, and becoming therefore within the jurisdiction of that State, shall be delivered up, it seems to me the import of the passage is, that the State itself, in obedience to the Constitution, shall cause him to be delivered up. That is my judgment. I have always entertained that opinion, and I entertain it now. But when the subject, some years ago, was before the Supreme Court of the United States, the majority of the judges held, that the power to cause fugitives from service to be delivered up was a power to be exercised under the authority of this Government. I do not know, on the whole, that it may not have been a fortunate decision. My habit is to respect the result of judicial deliberations, and the solemnity of judicial decisions. But, as it now stands, the business of seeing that these fugitives are delivered up resides in the power of Congress and the national judicature, and my friend at the head of the Judiciary Committee has a bill on the subject now before the Senate, with some amendments to it, which I propose to support, with all its provisions, to the fullest extent. And I desire to call the attention of all sober-minded men, of all conscientious men, in the North, of all men who are not carried away by any fanatical idea or by any false idea whatever, to their constitutional obligations. I put it to all the sober and sound minds at the North as a question of morals, and a question of conscience. What right have they, in their legislative capacity, or any other capacity, to endeavor to get round this Constitution, to embarrass the free exercise of the rights secured by the Constitution to the persons whose slaves escape from them? None at all; none at all. Neither in the forum of conscience, nor before the face of the Constitution, are they justified, in my opinion. Of course, it is a matter for their consideration. They probably, in the turmoil of the times, have not stopped to consider of this; they have followed what seemed to be the current of thought and of motives as the occasion arose, and they neglected to investigate fully the real question, and to consider their constitutional obligations; as I am sure, if they did consider, they would fulfill them with alacrity. Therefore, I repeat, sir, that here is a ground of complaint against the North well founded, which ought to be removed, which it is now in the power of the different departments of this Government to remove; which calls for the enactment of proper laws authorizing the judicature of this Government, in the several States, to do all that is necessary for the

recapture of fugitive slaves, and for the restoration of them to those who claim them. Wherever I go, and whenever I speak on the subject, and when I speak here I desire to speak to the whole North, I say that the South has been injured in this respect, and has a right to complain; and the North has been too careless of what I think the Constitution peremptorily and emphatically enjoins upon her as a duty.

Complaint has been made against certain resolutions that emanate from legislatures at the North, and are sent here to us, not only on the subject of slavery in this District, but sometimes recommending Congress to consider the means of abolishing slavery in the States. I should be sorry to be called upon to present any resolutions here which could not be referable to any committee, or any power in Congress; and, therefore, I should be unwilling to receive from the Legislature of Massachusetts any instructions to present resolutions expressive of any opinion whatever on the subject of slavery, as it exists at the present moment in the States, for two reasons: Because, first, I do not consider that the Legislature of Massachusetts has anything to do with it; and next, I do not consider that I, as her representative here, have anything to do with it. Sir, it has become, in my opinion, quite too common, and if the legislatures of the States do not like that opinion, they have a great deal more power to put it down than I have to uphold it; it has become, in my opinion, quite too common a practice for the State legislatures to present resolutions here on all subjects, and so instruct us on all subjects. There is no public man that requires instruction more than I do, or who requires information more than I do, or desires it more heartily, but I do not like to have it come in too imperative a shape. I took notice, with pleasure, of some remarks upon this subject made the other day in the Senate of Massachusetts, by a young man of talent and character, of whom the best hopes may be entertained. I mean Mr. Hillard. He told the Senate of Massachusetts that he would vote for no instructions whatever to be forwarded to Members of Congress, nor for any resolutions to be offered expressive by the sense of Massachusetts as to what her Members of Congress ought to do. He said that he saw no propriety in one set of public servants giving instructions and reading lectures to another set of public servants. To their own master all of them must stand or fall, and that master is their constituents. I wish these sentiments could become more common, a great deal more common. I have never entered into the question, and never shall, about the binding force of instructions. I will, however, simply say this: If there be any matter pending in this body, while I am a Member of it, in which Massachusetts has an interest of her own not adverse to the general interests of the country, I shall pursue her instructions with gladness of heart and with all the efficiency which I can bring to the occasion. But if the question be one which affects her interest, and at the same time equally affects the interests of all the other States, I shall no more regard her particular wishes or instructions than I should regard the wishes of a man who might appear to me as arbitrator, or referee, to decide some question of important private right between him and his neighbor, and then instruct me to decide in his favor. If ever there was a government upon earth, it is this Government; if ever there was a body upon earth, it is this body which should consider itself as composed by agreement of all, each Member appointed by some, but organized by the general consent of all, sitting here under the solemn obligations of oath and conscience to do that which they think to be best for the good of the whole.

Then, sir, there are the abolition societies, of which I am unwilling to speak, but in regard to which I have very clear notions and opinions. I do not think them useful. I think their operations for the last 20 years have produced nothing good or valuable. At the same time, I know thousands of their members to be honest and good men; perfectly well-meaning men. They have excited feelings; they think they must do something for the cause of liberty, and in their sphere of action they do not see what else they can do, than to contribute to an abolition press, or an abolition society, or to pay an abolition lecturer. I do not mean to impute gross motives even to the leaders of these societies, but I am not blind to the consequences of their proceedings. I cannot but see what mischiefs their interference with the South has produced. And is it not plain to every man? Let any gentleman who doubts of that, recur to the debates in the Virginia House of Delegates in 1832, and he will see with what freedom a proposition made by Mr. Randolph for the gradual abolition of slavery was discussed in that body. Every one spoke of slavery as he thought; very ignominous and disparaging names and epithets were applied to it. The debates in the House of Delegates on that occasion, I believe, were all published. They were read by every colored man who could read, and to those who could not read, those debates were read by others. At that time Virginia was not unwilling nor afraid to discuss this question, and to let that part of her population know as much of the discussion as they could learn. That was in 1832. As has been said, by the honorable Member from South Carolina, these abolition societies commenced their course of action in 1835. It is said, I do not know how true it may be, that they sent incendiary publications into the slave States; at any event, they attempted to arouse and did arouse, a very strong feeling; in other words, they created great agitation in the North against Southern slavery. Well, what was the result? The bonds of the slaves were bound more firmly than before; their rivets were more strongly fastened. Public opinion, which in Virginia had begun to be exhibited against slavery, and was opening out for the discussion of the question, drew back and shut itself up in its castle. I wish to know whether anybody in Virginia can, now, talk as Mr. Randolph, Governor McDowell, and others talked, openly, and sent their remarks to the press, in 1832? We all know the fact, and we all know the cause; and everything that this agitating people have done has been, not to enlarge, but to restrain, not to set free, but to bind faster the slave population of the South. That is my judgment. Sir, as I have said, I know many abolitionists in my own neighborhood, very honest, good people, misled, as I think, by strange enthusiasm; but they wish to do something, and they are called on to contribute, and they do contribute; and it is my firm opinion this day, that within the last 20 years as much money has been collected and paid to the abolition societies, abolition presses, and abolition lecturers, as would purchase the freedom of every slave, man, woman, and child, in the State of Maryland, and send them all to Liberia. I have no doubt of it. But I have yet to learn that the benevolence of these abolition societies has at any time taken that particular turn. [Laughter.]

Again, sir, the violence of the press is complained of. The press violent. Why, sir, the press is violent everywhere. There are outrageous reproaches in the North against the South, and there are reproaches no better in the South against the North. Sir, the extremists of both parts of this country are violent; they mistake loud and violent talk for eloquence and for reason. They think that he who talks loudest reasons best. And this we must expect, when the press is free, as it is here, and I trust always will be; for, with all its licenticousness, and all its evil, the entire and absolute freedom of the press is essential to the preservation of government on the basis of a free constitution. Wherever it exists, there will be foolish paragraphs and violent paragraphs in the press, as there are, I am sorry to say, foolish speeches and violent speeches in both Houses of Congress. In truth, sir, I must say that, in my opinion, the vernacular tongue of the country has become greatly vitiated, depraved, and corrupted by the style of our congressional debates. [Laughter.] And if it were possible for those debates to vitiate the principles of the people, as much as they have depraved their taste, I should cry out "God save the Republic."

Well, in all this I see no solid grievance, no grievance presented by the South, within the redress of the Government, but the single one to which I have referred; and that is, the want of a proper regard to the injunction of the Constitution for the delivery of fugitive slaves.

There are also complaints of the North against the South. I need not go over them particularly. The first and gravest is, that the North adopted the Constitution, recognising the existence of slavery in the States, and recognizing the right, to a certain extent, of representation of the slaves in Congress, under a state of sentiment and expectation, which do not now exist; and that, by events, by circumstances, by the eagerness of the South to acquire territory and extend her slave population, the North finds itself, in regard to the relative influence of the South and the North, of the free States and the slave States, where it never did expect to find itself when they agreed to the compact of the Constitution. They complain, therefore, that, instead of slavery being regarded as an evil, as it was then, an evil which all hoped would be extinguished gradually, it is now regarded by the South as an institution to be cherished, and preserved, and extended; an institution which the South has already extended to the utmost of her power by the acquisition of new territory.

Well, then, passing from that, everybody in the North reads; and everybody reads whatsoever the newspapers contain; and the newspapers, some of them, especially those presses to which I have alluded, are careful to spread about among the people every reproachful sentiment uttered by any southern man bearing at all against the North; everything that is calculated to exasperate, to alienate; and there are many such things, as everybody will admit, from the South, or some portion of it, which are disseminated among the reading people; and they do exasperate, and alienate, and produce a most mischievous effect upon the public mind at the North. Sir, I would not notice things of this sort appearing in obscure quarters; but one thing has occurred in this debate which struck me very forcibly. An honorable member from Louisiana addressed us the other day on this subject. I suppose there is not a more amiable and worthy gentlemen in this Chamber, or a gentleman who would be more slow to give offense to anybody, and he did not mean in his remarks to give offense. But what did he say? Why, sir, he took pains to run a contrast between the slaves of the South and the laboring people of the North, giving the preference in all points of condition, and comfort, and happiness, to the slaves of the South. The honorable Member, doubtless, did not suppose that he gave any offense, or did any injustice. He was merely expressing his opinion. But does he know how remarks of that sort will be received by the laboring people of the North? Why, who are the laboring people of the North? They are the North. They are the people who cultivate their own farms with their own hands; freeholders, educated men, independent men. Let me say, sir, that five-sixths of the whole property of the North is in the hands of the

laborers of the North; they cultivate their farms, they educate their children, they provide the means of independence; if they are not freeholders, they earn wages; these wages accumulate, are turned into capital, into new freeholds, and small capitalists are created. That is the case, and such the course of things among the industrious and frugal. And what can these people think when so respectable and worthy a gentleman as the member from Louisiana undertakes to prove that the absolute ignorance and the abject slavery of the South are more in conformity with the high purposes and destiny of immortal, rational, human beings, than the educated, the independent, free labor of the North?

There is a more tangible and irritating cause of grievance at the North. Free blacks are constantly employed in the vessels of the North, generally as cooks or stewards. When the vessel arrives at a southern port, these free colored men are taken on shore, by the police or municipal authority, imprisoned, and kept in prison, till the vessel is again ready to sale. This is not only irritating, but exceedingly unjustifiable and oppressive. Mr. Hoar's mission, some time ago, to South Carolina, was a well-intended effort to remove this cause of complaint. The North thinks such imprisonments illegal and unconstitutional; and as the cases occur constantly, and frequently, they regard it as a great grievance.

Now, sir, so far as any of these grievances have their foundation in matters of law, they can be redressed, and ought to be redressed; and so far as they have their foundation in matters of opinion, in sentiment, in mutual crimination and recrimination, all that we can do is to endeavor to allay the agitation, and cultivate a better feeling and more fraternal sentiments between the South and the North.

Mr. President, I should much prefer to have heard from every Member on this floor declarations of opinion that this Union could never be dissolved, than the declaration of opinion by anybody that, in any case, under the pressure of any circumstances, such a dissolution was possible. I hear with pain, and anguish, and distress, the word "secession," especially when it falls from the lips of those who are patriotic, and known to the country, and known all over the world, for their political services. Secession! Peaceable succession! Sir, your eyes and mine are never destined to see that miracle. The dismemberment of this vast country without convulsion! The breaking up of the fountains of the great deep, without ruffling the surface! Who is so foolish, I beg everybody's pardon, as to expect to see any such thing? Sir, he who sees these States, now revolving in harmony around a common center, and expects to see them quit their places and fly off without convulsion, may look the next hour to see the heavenly bodies rush from their spheres, and jostle against each other in the realms of space, without causing the crush of the universe. There can be no such thing as a peaceable secession. Peaceable secession is an utter impossibility. Is the great Constitution under which we live, covering this whole country, is it to be thawed and melted away by secession, as the snows on the mountain melt under the influence of a vernal sun? disappear almost unobserved, and run off? No, sir! No, sir! I will not state what might produce the disruption of the Union; but, sir, I see as plainly as I see the sun in heaven, what that disruption itself must produce; I see that it must produce war, and such a war as I will not describe, in its twofold character.

Peaceable secession. Peaceable secession. The concurrent agreement of all the members of this great Republic to separate. A voluntary separation, with alimony on one side and on the other. Why what would be the result? Where is the line to be drawn? What States are to secede? What is to remain American? What am I to be? An American no longer? Am I to become a sectional man, a local man, a separatist, with no country in common with the gentlemen who sit around me here, or who fill the other House of Congress? Heaven forbid. Where is the flag of the Republic to remain? Where is the eagle still to tower? Or is he to cower, and shrink, and fall to the ground? Why, sir, our ancestors, our fathers and our grandfathers, those of them that are yet living amongst us with prolonged lives, would rebuke and reproach us; and our children and our grandchildren would cry out shame upon us, if we of this generation should dishonor these ensigns of the power of the Government and the harmony of that Union which is every day felt among us with so much joy and gratitude. What is to become of the Army? What is to become of the Navy? What is to become of the public lands? How is each of the 30 States to defend itself? I know, although the idea has not been stated distinctly, there is to be, or it is supposed possible that there should be, a Southern Confederacy. I do not mean, when I allude to this statement, that anyone seriously contemplates such a state of things. I do not mean to say that it is true, but I have heard it suggested elsewhere, that that idea has originated a design to separate. I am sorry, sir, that it has ever been thought of, talked of, or dreamed of, in the wildest flights of human imagination. But the idea, so far as it exists, must be of a separation, assigning the slave States to one side and the free States to the other. Sir, there is not, I may express myself too strongly, perhaps, but some things, some moral things, are almost as impossible as other natural or physical things; and I hold the idea of a separation of these States, those that are free to form one government, and those that are slave-holding to form another, as a moral impossibility. We could not separate the States by any such line, if we were to draw it. We could not sit down here today and draw a line of separation that would satisfy any five men in the country. There are natural causes that would keep and tie us together, and there are social and domestic relations which we could not break if we would and which we should not if we could. Sir, nobody can look over the face of this country at the present moment, nobody can see where its population is the most dense and growing, without being ready to admit, and compelled to admit, that ere long America will be in the valley of the Mississippi.

Well, now, sir, I beg to inquire what the wildest enthusiast has to say on the possibility of cutting that river in two, and leaving free States at its source, and its branches, and slave States down near its mouth, each forming a separate government? Pray, sir, pray, sir, let me say to the people of this country that these things are worthy of their pondering and of their consideration. Here, sir, are five millions of freemen in the free States north of the River Ohio: Can anybody suppose that this population can be severed, by a line that divides them from the territory of a foreign and an alien government, down somewhere, the Lord knows where, upon the lower banks of the Mississippi? What would become of Missouri? Will she join the arrondissement of the slave States? Shall the man from the Yellowstone and the Platte be connected, in the new Republic, with the man who lives on the southern extremity of the Cape of Florida? Sir, I am ashamed to pursue this line of remark. I dislike it, I have an utter disgust for it. I would rather hear of natural blasts and mildews, war, pestilence, and famine than to hear gentlemen talk of secession. To break up, to break up this great Government, to dismember this glorious country, to astonish Europe with an act of folly such as Europe for two centuries has never beheld in any government or any people. No, sir; no, sir. There will be no secession. Gentlemen are not serious when they talk of secession.

Sir, I hear there is to be a convention held at Nashville. I am bound to believe that if worthy gentlemen meet at Nashville in convention their object will be to adopt counsels conciliatory, to advise the South to forbearance and moderation, and to advise the North to forbearance and moderation; and to inculcate principles of brotherly love and affection, and attachment to the Constitution of the country as it now is. I believe, if the convention meets at all, it will be for this purpose; for certainly, if they meet for any purpose hostile to the Union, they have been singularly inappropriate in their selection of a place. I remember, sir, that when the treaty was concluded between France and England, at the peace of Amiens, a stern old Englishman and an orator, who regarded the conditions of the peace as ignominious to England, said in the House of Commons, that if King William could know the terms of that treaty he would turn in his coffin. Let me commend this saying of Mr. Windham, in all its emphasis and in all its force, to any persons, who shall meet at Nashville for the purpose of concerting measures for the overthrow of this Union, over the bones of Andrew Jackson.

Sir, I wish now to make two remarks, and hasten to a conclusion. I wish to say, in regard to Texas, that if it should be, hereafter, at any time, the pleasure of the Government of Texas to cede to the United States a portion, larger or smaller, of her territory which lies adjacent to New Mexico, and north of 34 degrees of north latitude, to be formed into free States, for a fair equivalent in money or in the payment of her debt, I think it an object well worthy the consideration of Congress, and I shall be happy to concur in it myself, if I should be in the public counsels of the country at that time.

I have one other remark to make. In my observations upon slavery as it has existed in the country, and as it now exists, I have expressed no opinion of the mode of its extinguishment or melioration. I will say, however, though I have nothing to propose, because I do not deem myself so competent as other gentlemen to take any lead, that if any gentleman from the South shall propose a scheme of colonization, to be carried on by this Government upon a large scale, for the transportation of free colored people to any colony or any place in the world, I should be quite disposed to incur almost any degree of expense to accomplish that object. Nay, sir, following an example set here more than 20 years ago by a great man, then a Senator from New York, I would return to Virginia, and through her for the benefit of the whole South, the money received from the lands and territories ceded by her to this Government, for any such purpose as to relieve, in whole or in part, or in any way to diminish or deal beneficially with, the free colored population of the Southern States. I have said that I honor Virginia for her cession of this territory. There have been received into the Treasury of the United States $80,000,000, the proceeds of the sales of the public lands ceded by her. If the residue should be sold at the same rate, the whole aggregate will exceed $200,000,000. If Virginia and the South see fit to adopt any proposition to relieve themselves from the free people of color among them, or such as may be made free, they have my free consent that the Government shall pay them any sum of money out of its proceeds, which may be adequate to the purpose.

And now, Mr. President, I draw these observations to a close. I have spoken freely, and I meant to do so. I have sought to make no display; I have sought to embrace the occasion by no animated discussion, nor have I attempted any train of elaborate argument. I have wished only to speak my sentiments, fully and at large, being desirous, once and

for all, to let the Senate know, and to let the country know, the opinions and sentiments which I entertain on all these subjects. These opinions are not likely to be suddenly changed. If there be any future service that I can render to the country, consistently with these sentiments and opinions, I shall cheerfully render it. If there be not, I shall still be glad to have had an opportunity to disburden my conscience from the bottom of my heart, and to make known every political sentiment that therein exists.

And now, Mr. President, instead of speaking of the possibility or utility of secession, instead of dwelling in these caverns of darkness, instead of groping with those things so full of all that is horrid and horrible, let us come out into the light of day; let us enjoy the fresh air of liberty and union; let us cherish those hopes which belong to us; let us devote ourselves to those great objects that are fit for our contemplation and our action; let us raise our conceptions to the magnitude and the importance of the duties that devolve upon us; let our comprehension be as broad as the country for which we act, our aspirations as high as its certain destiny; let us not be pigmies in a case that calls for men. Never did there devolve on any generation of men higher trusts than now devolve upon us, for the preservation of this Constitution, and the harmony and peace of all who are destined to live under it. Let us make our generation one of the strongest and brightest links in that golden chain, which is destined, I fondly believe, to grapple the people of all the States to this Constitution, for ages to come. We have a great, popular, constitutional Government, guarded by law, and by judicature, and defended by the whole affections of the people. No monarchial throne presses these States together; no iron chain of military power encircles them; they live and stand upon a Government popular in its form, representative in its character, founded upon principles of equality, and so constructed, we hope, as to last forever. In all its history it has been beneficent; it has trodden down no man's liberty; it has crushed no State. Its easy respiration is liberty and patriotism; its yet youthful veins are full of enterprise, courage, and honorable love of glory and renown. Large before, the country has now, by recent events, become vastly larger. This Republic now extends, with a vast breadth, across the whole continent. The two great seas of the world wash the one and the other shores. We realize, on a mighty scale, the beautiful description of the ornamental edging of the buckler of Achilles—

"Now the broad shield complete, the artist crown'd
With his last hand, and pour'd the ocean round;
In living silver seem'd the waves to roll,
And beat the buckler's verge, and bound the whole."

Agricultural Services by the Federal Government

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, an obscure headline in one of the Washington newspapers yesterday caught my eye and as I considered the implications contained in the statement of fact, or perhaps the predictions contained in that headline, I received a letter from one of my constituents in southeast Missouri which further impressed me with the fact that our people are becoming more conscious of the need for greater efficiency and more economy in the operation of our Government. The headline, "Few Federal agencies can expect increase in funds by House group," headed an article which stated in part that—

> Representative WHITTEN, Democrat of Mississippi, chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee, reminded Agriculture officials of the big Federal deficit in a closed meeting and he added: "We will be fortunate if we can go along at the same rate that we have in the past, much less increase appropriations. * * * We have reached a point where we have to be selective."
>
> The Agriculture budget as recommended by the President would add funds for 2,600 new jobs.

Coming as I do from one of the richest and most productive agricultural districts and representing a constituency which includes as progressive a group of farmers as will be found anywhere, I believe I am thoroughly conscious of and deeply appreciative of the many fine services which are being rendered by the several agencies in the Department of Agriculture.

For some time, however, I have been deeply concerned over the apparent conflicting interest and the overlapping functions of some of these services. For many years I have been a member of the farm bureau in my home county which sponsors the county agent's office, and I am familiar with the many accomplishments of the Extension Service in that area. I am always impressed when I read the annual report which sets out the activities in which the county agent and the home demonstration agent are engaged.

I have witnessed the development of the PMA organization throughout my district and I know that this program has made a most valuable contribution and has provided the machinery for implementing the farm program which has been responsible for many farmers enjoying a prosperity which was unknown prior to the early thirties.

More recently, farmers in three of the counties in my district, recognizing the benefits which are possible through a soil-conservation program, have organized soil-conservation districts. Despite the fact that these districts have been operating only a short time, the results which have been obtained are doing much to create interest in this program throughout the other counties of the district.

Unfortunately, despite the valuable contributions which are being made by each of these agencies, I have been conscious of the fact for some time that there is an overlapping of their functions, and while this in itself might not be a sufficient ground to demand that some action be taken to bring about a unification or an integration which would prevent a duplication of their efforts, since only a comparatively small percentage of the farmer taxpayers are being reached by either or all of the agencies. The fact that there is an apparent lack of coordination, which at times has resulted even in a conflict which has brought about contradictory policies, leads me to believe that it is time for a comprehensive study to be made of this situation.

In the letter above referred to, my constituent in reporting a meeting which was held in one of the counties of my district for the purpose of discussing the possibilities of establishing a soil-conservation district, reports that "farmers at the meeting agreed that there are far too many overlapping duties and services offered by the many Federal agencies interested in agriculture. It has reached the point where the various agencies are 'sniping' at each other in public to the detriment of themselves and certainly to the farmers."

The writer who is a former teacher of vocational agriculture and who has since been employed in the Missouri Department of Education as director of veterans' education, in which capacity he had the opportunity to work with and through many other Federal agencies, but who is now in business for himself, makes this further comment:

> No doubt all of the agencies render a certain amount of good service to the farmer. It may be that all of the services now being rendered—and proposed—are necessary. It is a shame, however, that these services cannot be offered by a coordinated branch of the United States Department of Agriculture, thereby eliminating the confusing contradictory advice now given the farmer and certainly eliminating the costly overlapping now existing.

While this writer does not propose to have the answer and as he states:

> This letter is not for the purpose of condemning any particular agency, I hope you can use it as a fair reflection of the thinking of at least some farmers in your district in your efforts to improve agricultural services to the farmers by the Federal Government.

At the meeting to which he referred in his letter, he pointed out that there was some discussion and quotations made from a recent article in the Country Gentleman, March 1950 issue, entitled "Big Government Is in Your County, Too." In this same issue is also an editorial by Dean Rusk of the Illinois College of Agriculture which bears out the theme of the article. I have read this article and also the editorial and I believe it does present in an interesting and informative manner the problem which has been causing me some concern, in that a similar condition exists not only in the 10 counties of my district but also in hundreds of other counties throughout the agricultural section of this Nation.

I think that we have a situation in the Department of Agriculture which can be compared to the Department of Defense. Just as no one would suggest doing away with the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, neither am I suggesting that we abolish the Soil Conservation Service, the Production and Marketing Administration, or the Extension Service, yet I do believe that there is a need for unification and an integration of the services within the United States Department of Agriculture, and I believe that there is an opportunity for the same type of economy to be effected within the Department of Agriculture which is being brought about in the Department of Defense.

I am today extending my remarks in the Appendix, in two instances, including the article, Big Government Is in Your County, Too, and an editorial, A Cure for Big Government Ills, which appeared in the March 1950 issue of the Country Gentleman.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said for and against the proposal to admit Hawaii to statehood; a proposal to create an additional State in our Union.

I have had the honor to work closely with the Delegate from Hawaii and I have had the honor to second the motion to report the Hawaii proposal.

I desire to record my sincere thanks to the Delegate from Hawaii, Hon. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, for the careful, considerate, and learned manner in which he made available to my committee and myself the many considerations contained in this proposal. I believe this gentleman is entitled to great credit from this Congress for his untiring work, to the end that our work was made as light as possible under all the circumstances.

H. R. 49, the Hawaii bill, provides for the addition as a State of a Territory as large as Connecticut and Rhode Island. It contains a population of one-half million people.

Hawaii offered to exchange her independent sovereignty for annexation to our country 53 years ago, and by that independent act and the continuous demonstration of unquestioned loyalty, has sufficiently shown a planned intention of being one of us. We accepted that annexation 52 years ago, and "Pearl Harbor" and the consequent conduct of the people of Hawaii is proof of the wisdom of that annexation.

The desire for statehood has been brought to the attention of Congress 15 times since annexation. That indicates readiness for peaceful democratic action. It is a model of peaceful planning on the part of Hawaii; and is critically indicative of the slowness of the democratic processes upon the part of the other—the Congress.

Statehood will increase immeasurably the prestige of America throughout the Orient, at a time when it is badly needed.

The National Military Establishment and the Departments of Agriculture and Interior have made favorable reports in behalf of this proposal.

I urge my colleagues to prompt and favorable action upon this proposal.

Liberalism in the Present Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many of us in this House believe that we are true liberals in the full sense of the word, but at times it is difficult to give an exact definition of the word or a clear connotation of the concept of liberalism. We are living in a time of confusion. Terms pertaining to political concepts and ideologies that were so readily understood by all only yesterday, have been twisted and misrepresented to the point where we are not certain what they stand for today.

I believe the Members of this House, whether they consider themselves liberal or not, will enjoy reading the following article, published in the New Republic, March 6, 1950:

LIBERAL CACHEXIA: ITS CAUSE AND CURE

(By David Goldknopf)

Lately I have been sitting up with my favorite sick friend, the liberal. You say that liberal doesn't mean anything any more and yet you know perfectly well what it means. You know that my friend used to be a New Dealer, that he is now a Fair Dealer, that he is not progressive. He does not believe that private enterprise is ever strictly private, and he does believe that in large and important areas where its services have been somewhat less than adequate—health, housing, education—government ought to do something. In other words, he isn't afraid of the Government meddling in his life as long as he feels that it's his government. He likes Eleanor Roosevelt and Chester Bowles, Walter Reuther and Estes Kefauver, David Lilienthal and the Douglasses of both Senate and Supreme Court (not to mention Helen Gahagan). You can continue this sort of documentation almost endlessly. You can predict how my sick friend will feel—if he is well enough to feel anything—about nine-tenths of the bills to come before the next Congress. How can you call any word meaningless that tells you so much?

No, the trouble with "liberal" is not lack of meaning; it is lack of motion. My friend is suffering from cachexia: (ka-kek'si-a), a condition of ill health with malnutrition and wasting of the body, due to some chronic constitutional affection, as tuberculosis or cancer (Webster). His limbs are lax, his eyes dull, his movements random and ineffectual. Bright lights disturb him (and so, for that matter, does dim light). He cannot stand loud noises, whether from the left or the right. Occasionally a hollow groan escapes him, as if in the memory of an unpardonable and irremediable error. And there are times when, out of the depths of his ineffable despondency, he feels compelled to repeat his dismal story—

"I am a liberal. I abhor communism. But in my abhorrence of communism I find myself allied to those very elements of society that I have always distrusted and often despised. This is my incubus. I raise my voice against the abuse of a minority, and the Communist raises his voice, too. And somehow he can always raise his voice higher than mine. I whirl upon him snarling. 'How many slave laborers are there in Siberia?' 'That's telling 'em!' pipe my ancient enemies of the right. 'Vile Francophiles!' I shout at them. 'Don't you call me comrade?' 'Double in spades!' crows the Commie. Back to my left! 'Stay away from me,' I cry menacingly. 'I'll tito you?' 'Let him have it!' the Hearst press yodels. 'I'll hold his hands!' Back to my right! 'Union-buster!' 'Fascist scum!' and the Commie hisses. 'Mad-dog reactionary!' Left! Right! And another left! And another right! I fall back against the ropes. A left, another left; I'm slipping down; the count, three, four; I—what happened?"

Tears come to his eyes. And to mine, too, for I remember him so strong and indomitable—the tilt of his chin in the old May Day parades, his picket-line stamina. I turn my head so that I cannot see his pain, so that he cannot see my grief.

I am a liberal. I abhor smallpox. But in my abhorrence of smallpox I find myself allied to those very elements of society that I have always distrusted and often despised.

Nobody ever says that. It's creviced with all kinds of fallacies.

1. I am a liberal. I abhor smallpox. In this case juxtaposition certainly implies connection: Abhorrence of smallpox is an attribute of liberalism. But we know that it isn't so, that there is no connection between liberalism and the abhorrence of smallpox.

2. I abhor smallpox. Who doesn't? But why make a point of it? Why this obsessive need to put yourself on record? And how much time can you afford to devote to the abhorrence of smallpox? Even if you spent as little as a half-hour a day on it, wouldn't your life be seriously distorted?

3. But in my abhorrence of smallpox I find myself allied to those very elements. This is sheer nonsense. Alliances aren't fortuitous; they are expressions of intent. You don't "find" yourself allied any more than you "find" yourself married. It may be a mistake, but it's not an accident.

Then what ails my friend? If his self-styled incubus can be disposed of with a casual sweep of the logical brooms, how does one account for his lamentable condition? Obviously his troubles do not lie within the luminous boundaries of reason. For example, he seems to have been terribly worried about maintaining his identity, his "position." But why haven't his adversaries of the right and left been similarly preoccupied? In a recent congressional vote on a foreign issue (it doesn't matter what issue; that's exactly the point) three New York City Representatives voted "nay." One was a Democrat who has, however, always enjoyed American Labor Party support. Another has followed every twist and turn of the Communist Party line with contortionist dexterity. The third was an unregenerate conservative who made his political reputation, such as it is, by conducting a shameless prewar witch hunt in the colleges of New York—a witch hunt that did put a Communist instructor in jail for perjury, but completely ignored an outspokenly Fascist college professor who was, in fact, to broadcast for Hitler during the war. All three Representatives voted the same way on an important policy bill—without embarrassment. They were not afraid that they would be compromised by their association. They did not consider themselves associated.

Only the liberal is dismayed by oppositions of this sort. Why? The Communist changes his "position" as casually as a trapeze artist. Reactionaries can be just as mercurial. The imperialist of yesterday becomes the isolationist of today without any noticeable "sturm und drang." The apologists of free enterprise vote gaudy subsidies for Maine's potato farmers. Nor can these paradoxes be marked off as political hypocrisies. Both on the left and on the right there are profound convictions that are never violated. But these convictions, being profound, have nothing to do with the relative

superficialities of "program" or "position." They are, in fact, not at all political. They deal with the nature of man and how much say he has in his destiny.

The Communist, we know, believes that man has very little say in his destiny. He redefines freedom as submission—submission to the dialectical current of history—"the recognition of necessity." The Communist believes in economic determinism. He believes in the supremacy of class interests.

On the face of it, the conservative has an altogether different view of things. Man has an immense, an almost unqualified control over his destiny. Success is universally attainable; anyone can make good if socialistic government doesn't mess up the American way. But what is success? Success is—ah—well—success, the ranch house in the suburbs, the good car, the devoted wife, getting what you want out of life. And what's more (this, far more confidently), the only reason a man will work is to achieve success. To get what he wants, to keep what he has got.

Somehow or other, success is never defined in terms of—oh—the Golden Rule or the Brotherhood of Man, or any of the other ideals to which the conservative sincerely and often actively subscribes. In fact, the conservative seems merely to have substituted personal for class interest. Whether he realizes it or not, he believes in the inherent, intransigent, and apparently limitless selfishness of man. Sometimes that selfishness is enlightened; that is to say, a man may forego a small house today for a larger, juicier one tomorrow. And there are rules in the dog fight we call life—rules that must be obeyed if you don't want to go to jail, or to hell, or to both. But these are limitations upon the expression of selfishness, not upon its influence or applicability. Success is a personal, never a social achievement. A man may slave for his children; it is because they are his, and let other men slave for theirs. Man being man, that is the way it has got to be, and any tampering with this primordial condition can lead only to socialistic chaos.

You might say, then, that the Communist takes a mechanical view of life and the conservative takes a biological, or more specifically, Darwinian, view. Or—Communist thinks that man is pushed to his destiny, and the conservative thinks that he is pulled. But is there really a great deal of difference between the electric goad under the tail and the carrot in front of the nose? A mule is a mule.

Doesn't the liberal believe that man is pushed? Certainly. Slums, disease, poverty predispose thousands to delinquency, for example, and we ought to get rid of those evils. (But the relationship between, let us say, poverty and crime is a statistical one; you cannot attribute the brutalization of any one person to his environment.) Is man pulled? Sure. We'd never get anything done without incentives. (But these incentives vary widely, and the fact that they are incentives does not necessarily make them ungenerous. The altruist receives satisfaction from his altruism, the hero from his heroism; it does not follow that self-satisfaction is the motive for altruism or heroism.) Pushed or pulled, says the liberal, man nevertheless keeps his feet and walks forward under his own power and by his own volition. And he does not walk alone.

Therein lies the difference between the liberal and his adversaries of the right and left. It is not a difference in program, and the liberal who predicates his difference on program is bound to be categorized as conservative and Communists now temporarily toward him. The liberal is different in that he believes in at least a limited freedom of choice—and that means choice of ends as well as means. He believes in altruism. He believes that the human race is a community, if not yet a fraternity. He respects man.

The Communist does not. He has some respect for the capitalist, none at all for the workingman. The worker is a dupe, a pawn, who must be led every inch of the dialectical way—"educated." Actually, you can't blame the Communists for feeling as they do. Respect implies responsibility. If a man is, as the solacing phrase goes, a "product of his environment," you can no more respect him than you can iron ingots. (Properly speaking, you cannot hate him either, and it is a fact that in the early days of the Russian revolution Lenin cautioned his followers against hating the people they were forced to murder. But this particular discipline seems to have been relaxed over the years.)

On the other hand, it isn't easy to respect the conservative ideal either—the man who has made good. Even the conservative senses this. It isn't enough to make good; you must use power and wealth usefully. The conservative ideal is a man who has spent 60 years of his life accumulating his pile, and the rest of his years dispensing it philanthropically. During his last years he completely reverses his field. And he knows it. But all he can do is grunt in that gruff old way which fools no one—the old rascal—"Well, you can't take it with you." A number of movies have been built around this situation. You can expect a great many more. (As a matter of fact, a pretty good case could be made for the thesis that Scrooge is the conservative ideal.) But no movie is going to solve the most serious conflict in the conservative philosophy: the conflict between make-good and do-good.

The liberal respects man. He believes in man. He believes in him not as a dialectical pawn, nor as a refugee from the jungle. He believes in him as a distinguishably human being. He believes in society. He believes in it not as an instrument of suppression or of progress, nor as a device for controlling or arbitrating the beastliness of man. Nor as a convenience. Nor as an invention. He believes in society as an aspect of man's humanity—source and outgrowth, flower and root.

What makes man that way? One might as well ask, "Why mind?" "Why life?" "Why matter?" "Why motion?" Strictly speaking, none of these Sunday-sermon topics is legitimate. That is the way things have happened. And altruism is no more incredible than breathing, breathing than gravitation. Nothing explains anything. Matter does not explain mind; sex does not explain love; biology does not explain society.

In fact, biology explains a lot less than we've been brought up to think. It is true that sight has great survival value, but once a man has eyes he can use them for anything he pleases. He can paint pictures that have no survival value—in any sense of the phrase. More important, the sighted person is not a blind man plus sight. He is an altogether different person. Similarly, the social being is not an individual in society; that is the definition of the unsocial being. If anything, the social being is society in the individual. This may be the contributive insight of our century. Just as the eighteenth was the mechanical century and the nineteenth the biological century, so the twentieth may be the social century. If that's the case—and we've still got half a century to go—there'll be some changes made. You can expect even so monumental a nineteenth-century achievement as psychoanalysis—Darwinism extended to the mind—to undergo eclipse or profound modification. You may expect the current childish and undignified quest for private religious salvation to run its course. You may expect liberalism to become increasingly confident and expressive.

Diversity of human goals, freedom of choice, altruism, the social nature of man: for the liberal they are facts, not hypotheses or utopian aspirations. Considered collectively, they make up the distinguishing character of liberalism. The liberal who remains true to them need never fear the contamination of the left or right.

Will this prescription bring the sick liberal instantly to his feet? Probably not. His present disorders are, fortunately, symptomatic rather than essential, but a symptom can be almost as noxious as the disease itself. Alcoholism is a system of deep psychic disorders, but before the alcoholic can be cured he must stop drinking. Similarly, the liberal's preoccupation with communism cannot be airily dismissed. The burden of disavowal has become too onerous, the repudiation of past associations too demanding. The history of this preoccupation has a certain clinical charm. But so far as treatment goes, the future is more important than the past. And most important of all is the present.

It is a tragic blunder for the liberal to be mouse-trapped into an anti-Communist position. It is a tragic blunder for him to be mouse-trapped into an antianything position. The premises of liberalism—consider them again—are all positive. The conservative and the Communist are both at their best as a member of the minority opposition. In fact, both can be very useful to the liberal in that role. Put either of them into power, and the result is ruinous. But the genius of liberalism is best expressed when the liberal is in power. To allow himself therefore, to be cast in the role of opposition is a sure route to self-annihilation. The primary tactical principle of the Communists has always been dominate or destroy. Negative domination is a highly efficient technique of destruction. That is why the Communist will go to great extremes to alienate the liberal, to force a fight. In a political dog fight he can't lose. The role of underdog is immensely gratifying to him, ideologically, tactically, and psychologically. Ideologically, because it bears out Marxist predictions; tactically, because martyrdom is his greatest asset; psychologically, because it vindicates all the bitterness, sadism, and insecurity that predispose him to communism in the first place. But the liberal is a friendly person. He does not enjoy rancor. He wants to work with people. He wanted to work with the Communists before the war, during the war, and immediately after the war. He is a trusting person. He believes in sincerity and good intentions. He is a sanguine person. Antagonisms make him bilious. My friend is very bilious.

All of which leads to several categorical conclusions. When Communists hold a cultural conference, liberals do not hold a countercultural conference. When Communists march down Eighth Avenue on May day liberals do not march down Fifth Avenue. When the Communists commission Paul Robeson to sing for civil liberties, liberals have no part in any protest demonstration. Liberals do not carry on in this infantile way. They do not rise to the Communist bait. In the words of the sidewalk psychologist, "They do not give them that satisfaction."

The liberal spends his time and energy doing what comes naturally—beating the drum for liberalism. He believes in at least limited freedom of will and he tries to extend its limits. He believes in the diversity of human goals and arbitrary restrictions in this respect meet with his sharpest disapproval. He believes in altruism and he believes that man should be sufficiently liberated from his biological obligations to be able to practice it. He believes in the sociality of the human race, but he notes, regretfully, that a great many of its details remain to be worked out.

In other words, he has a full-time, self-perpetuating job on his hands. And the next time the Reds and the reactionaries start swinging at each other I hope he has sense enough not to step in between them. We lose more damn liberals that way.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said for and against the proposal to admit Alaska to statehood; proposal to create an additional State in our Union.

I have had the honor to work closely with the Delegate from Alaska and I have had the honor to make the motion to report out the Alaska proposal.

I desire to record my sincere thanks to Delegate, the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska, for the careful, considerate, and learned manner in which he made available to my committee and myself the many considerations contained in this proposal. I believe this gentleman is entitled to great credit from this Congress for his untiring work, to the end that our work was made as light as possible under all the circumstances.

H. R. 331, the Alaska bill, provides for the addition to the Union as a State our "last frontier." It adds a State that is a vast storehouse of undeveloped resources which our people will need. It is larger than 12 other States, in population, at the time of their admission as States.

The tradition of self-government is a strong American tradition, and today fulfills the obligation of the United States under the United Nations Charter "to develop self-government."

During the last year alone 138 corporations were authorized to do business in Alaska. This indicates a large new reservoir of business and trade for our Nation. Two national forests of 21,000,000 acres give our country a huge reserve of timber products. That is all in compliance with our historical and economical planning.

Commodity Credit Corporation

REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I understand that Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan was awarded a gold medallion for outstanding service to agriculture at a convention of the so-called Farmers Union in Denver, Colo., yesterday. Most of us from the Middle West understand Mr. Brannan's service to the American farmer only too well.

For example, several days ago he came before the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, to request $2,000,000,000 additional borrowing authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation. When he took office 20 months ago, the corporation had, unimpaired, its full borrowing authority of $4,750,000,000. On February 14, 1950, the balance of its borrowing authority had shrunk to one and one-third billions under Mr. Brannan's administration. And, remember, appropriations for the Department of Agriculture are not included in the three and one-half billion CCC dollars he has spent in a little more than a year and a half.

But perhaps we should quote Mr. Brannan himself on his strange service to agriculture. Here is what he testified before the committee last Wedesday:

> In 2 years, gross farm income has dropped more than two billion dollars, and cash expenses have gone up by more than one billion. After paying cash expenses, farm operators last year had 17 percent less money than in 1948 and about 22 percent less than in 1947. The purchasing power of farm families in terms of 1947 dollars dropped about two billion dollars in 1948, another two billion dollars in 1949, and could drop still another two billion dollars in 1950 if farm prices do not strengthen.

Yes, indeed, Mr. Brannan has compiled quite a record of service to American farmers. I wonder, though, how many farmers will appreciate his service in reducing their income tax liability by slashing their incomes so drastically.

Then there are other services to agriculture in which Mr. Brannan has had sterling assistance from other executive departments of the Truman Administration. An outstanding example is the program of shrinking our exports and encouraging increased imports of foodstuffs which we have in surplus supply—such as potatoes, beans, and pork. To permit this continued importation of surplus foods is to betray the American farmer. No saving is reflected to the consumer because the Commodity Credit Corp. buys, stores, and eventually sacrifices at a substantial loss any surpluses that are accumulated. In short, Mr. Brannan's service on this score results in subjecting the American farmer to unwarranted criticism, and in saddling the American taxpayer with senseless expenditures that benefit neither the producer nor the consumer.

In addition, Mr. Brannan has performed no small service in his 1950 acreage-allotment program which will save our farmers the trouble of cropping more than 30,000,000 fertile acres that were under the plow last year. There will be even more idle land in 1951 unless he stops killing American agriculture with his special brand of service, and starts distributing intelligently the surpluses he has accumulated.

Mr. Brannan's greatest service to agriculture, however, lies in his continued attempts to sabotage the efforts of the Congress and the responsible farm organizations to work out a sound, long-range program for American agriculture—a program based on price supports sufficiently flexible to insure profitable farming operations with a minimum of Government controls and at a reasonable cost.

Mr. Speaker, if the present Secretary of Agriculture really wants to earn the gold medallion that has been given him for alleged service to our farming population, he can do so very easily—by simply submitting his resignation to the President.

Veterans' Credit Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

> NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS, BRANCH NO. 377,
> *Evansville, Ind., March 4, 1950.*
>
> Hon. WINFIELD K. DENTON,
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN DENTON: I have been informed that H. R. 87, the veterans credit bill, will probably be called up in the House Tuesday, March 7. Efforts will be made to kill this bill with "kindness" by various amendments which would increase the cost to such a figure that H. R. 87 would fail of enactment.
>
> One of these so-called liberal amendments would extend the benefits of H. R. 87 to veterans in every department of the Government. As postal employees we have no objection to veterans in other departments receiving a salary commensurate with the position they occupy, however I would like for you, Mr. DENTON, to point out that when the reclassification act of 1945 was passed these employees received an increase of $360 per annum and said increase was added to the entrance salary. As a result every employee who has come into these other Government agencies since 1945 has received the benefit of that increase.
>
> This is not the case in the postal service. When the reclassification act was passed July 1, 1945, every regular employee received an increase of $400 per annum and every substitute carrier and clerk received this $400 when they advanced to a regular position, but the entrance salary was left at $1,700 and every veteran coming into the postal service since July 1, 1945, has been short this $400 that was given to all those employees who were fortunate enough to remain at home during the last war. Obviously this is very unfair and penalizes a man for being away in the defense of his country. I trust that you can agree that the veterans who entered other Government positions have already received $360 per annum that our boys in the postal service are still striving for.
>
> The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has voted to instruct Chairman TOM MURRAY to offer an amendment to H. R. 87 substituting S. 660 as passed by the Senate last August. I hope that you will be present to support the committee amendment and to vote against all amendments that would increase the cost of this legislation to a figure that would prevent it becoming law.

If the veterans in the other agencies are entitled to still more than those in the postal service there is a bill pending in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee granting them credit for their military service. If it is the desire of Congress to give this credit it should be passed on its own merit and not be tacked on to our bill that we have worked for so many months.

Sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD W. HARNETT,
President.

P. S.—I will appreciate very much having this in the RECORD.

Ethiopian Government Protests Appointment of Fascist Gen. Guglielmo Nasi as Administrator in Somaliland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and memorandum:

ETHIOPIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1950.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Ethiopian Embassy wishes to enclose herewith a memorandum made by the Imperial Ethiopian Government registering their objection to the proposed appointment of the Fascist Gen. Guglielmo Nasi to run the administration of former Italian Somaliland under the United Nations trusteeship.

With best wishes and regards of the Ethiopian Embassy,

Sincerely yours,

MENGIN BOGAREDE.

ETHIOPIAN GOVERNMENT PROTESTS APPOINTMENT OF FASCIST GEN. GUGLIELMO NASI AS ADMINISTRATOR IN SOMALILAND

It has come to the attention of the Imperial Ethiopian Government that Italy proposes to appoint as its administrator of former Italian Somaliland, under the United Nations trusteeship, the Fascist General Nasi.

We wish to protest this appointment with all the vehemence at our command, for the reasons here set forth:

1. General Nasi was an active participant in the Italo-Ethiopian War. He played an important part in the invasion and occupation of Ethiopia, and has, therefore, been listed as a war criminal by the Allied War Crimes Commission.

2. He is one of the senior Italian officers who, together with General Graziani waged the unprovoked 1935-36 campaign against Ethiopia. His return to East Africa, where he took part in the initiation, planning, and launching of the aggressive war against Ethiopia from within Somaliland, is considered a menace to the security of our country. We must point out in this connection that during the occupation, he was at one time Governor of Harar Province in Ethiopia, and subsequently became vice Governor General of Ethiopia under the Duke of Aosta. Consequently the Imperial Ethiopian Government views with serious concern his proposed appointment as Administrator of Somaliland, where, under the Fascist regime, he once served as Governor of Harar and Somaliland combined.

3. The Imperial Ethiopian Government is in possession of ample documentary proof of the educational policies fostered by General Nasi during the occupation, a policy of ever maintaining the status quo of illiterate people. We have, therefore, no doubt that no one is less fitted than General Nasi to guide the destinies of the very people whom, under the United Nations mandate, Italy is expected to prepare for independence within 10 years.

In view of our intimate experience with General Nasi, the Imperial Ethiopian Government trusts that the United Nations will not let this proposed appointment, which we consider most undesirable, go unnoticed.

We trust, too, that members of all peace-loving nations will take our view seriously and support the rejection of this appointment.

South Carolina Pioneer in Patents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the Mayflower Hotel on Monday, March 6, 1950, under the auspices of the American Patent Law Association:

Mr. Chairman, members of the American Patent Law Association, distinguished guests, as evidence of my gratitude for sharing your dinner tonight I intend to be brief enough to justify your inviting me again. After these several years of expert indoctrination in patent law at the hands of many of your skilled colleagues, I am beginning to feel that I now am only semi-illiterate in this important subject, but I am yet far from constituting a competitive threat to even the lowliest of those present. While that apprenticeship does not qualify me as an authority on our patent system, it has at least given me a constant and growing awareness of its profound importance to our American way of life and of its sensitivity to change. What started out as a perfunctory legislative assignment for me has become a considerable interest by choice.

In a way, the patent system is part of my inheritance as a South Carolinian, and perhaps that accounts for the more than random interest I had even prior to coming across the facts that I am now about to relate:

These facts concern the vital role played by my State in the early history of the patent and copyright laws.

It is a strange coincidence that South Carolina had a patent law of its own, even before the adoption of the Constitution. Most of the independent States had their own copyright laws, but South Carolina alone had her individual patent law.

On March 26, 1784, the General Assembly of South Carolina enacted a law "for the encouragement of arts and sciences." This law related to both copyrights and patents, and provided for securing exclusive rights to authors and inventors. Of course, this law was rather simple in its terms, but it does show an appreciation of the desirability of a patent law on the part of South Carolina. As I have indicated, none of the other States had any similar statute.

This is not all. The Constitutional Convention, which met 3 years later, found South Carolinians foremost in the introduction of patent and copyright clauses to the Constitution.

It was our brilliant young Charles Pinckney who on August 18, 1787, as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, introduced a resolution that the legislature of the Government they were framing be given the power: "To grant patents for useful inventions," and "To secure to authors exclusive rights for certain times." Though Pinckney was the youngest man in the Convention, more of his ideas were written into our organic law than of any other delegate.

John Rutledge, another South Carolina delegate, headed the Committee on Detail to which the various resolutions were referred. In their report, the said committee included the clause relating to patents and copyrights which was unanimously adopted by the Convention as a part of our Constitution. I need not repeat its familiar language to you, but wish to point out the similarity between the objective specified in the Constitution—promoting the progress of science and the useful arts—and that specified in the title of the South Carolina statute of 1784—encouraging arts and sciences.

Finally, the bills which became our first patent and copyright laws were presented on April 10, 1790, to Congress by Representative Aedamus Burke, of South Carolina as chairman of a special committee on patents and copyrights.

So you see that in my present capacity as chairman of a congressional subcommittee responsible for patent legislation I am only doing what comes naturally.

The patent laws, born as they were of wisdom and fortified through the years by the genius of our people, justly merit our pride and our constant effort toward their preservation and strengthening. It is a tribute to the authors that the major structure of those laws, as they were enacted in the 1830's remain largely unchanged in principle today and have accommodated themselves with astonishing ease to the revolutionary advances in technology through the intervening years. The twentieth century in particular, with its overwhelming progress in science and in business strategies, has subjected the patent laws to great tests.

The evidences of this wear and tear are nowhere demonstrated so effectively as in the record of legislation which has been proposed and considered during the past two decades in Congress. In my brief tenure we have been confronted with patent proposals of the most complex nature, difficult for the lay mind to comprehend, and even more difficult, once understood, to determine. If you learned gentlemen feel disposed to question the diligence of your legislators in considering your patent problems, lay it not to our lack of interest but rather to your own talented disagreement.

By this time you have all probably received preliminary drafts of a proposal to revise and amend the patents title of the United States Code. I am heartened by the manner in which the organized patent bar has come forward in a commendable and constructive fashion to help Congress in undertaking this formidable assignment. Your instantaneous cooperation has been one of the most dramatic evidences of the democratic process that I have had the pleasure of witnessing. With the attitude you have adopted I am confident that we shall perform a painstaking, objective study of the subject that will ultimately produce a body of laws which will serve our future as well as the present ones have served our past.

May I assure you again that the draft which you have received is merely a starting point. The committee has given it neither prolonged study nor endorsement, and its sole purpose is to serve as a target. We believe it is a workmanlike, professional document, entailing skill, knowledge, and patience on the part of its authors. It embodies many similar suggestions, many borrowed from other sources, and some novel in themselves. This will be your opportunity, gentlemen, to help mold the future of our great patent system.

May your restless, inquiring, inventive minds continue to search and thus harness even the elements of nature and alleviate pain and suffering among all mankind everywhere so that lightning and light, frost and flame, and all the secret subtle powers of the earth and sky may be made subservient to man's will under God.

A Cure for "Big Government" Ills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Country Gentleman:

A CURE FOR "BIG GOVERNMENT" ILLS

(By Dean Henry P. Rusk)

What is wrong with the USDA? No one can read John Strohm's article on page 21 of this issue without realizing that something is seriously wrong.

Over the years, the Department has enjoyed the confidence of a vast majority of our citizens—farmers and nonfarmers alike. Probably it has rated higher in the minds of more people than any other department of the executive branch of the Government. In such an atmosphere the Department of Agriculture, with the support of the State experiment stations and the Cooperative Extension Service, came to be recognized as an important servant of our whole economy.

Public confidence in the Department as a source of sound information on an ever-widening range of problems has brought increased demands for service and forced expansion of activities. The evolution of the Department has been characterized not only by tremendous growth, but also by the addition of functions that may have conflicting implications.

From a beginning devoted to the increase of production, it has in later years received legislative mandate to control production.

From a beginning dedicated to the expansion of opportunities, it has come to have responsibility for the security of those with limited opportunities.

From a beginning directed to greater use of our natural resources, it has come to place major emphasis on conservation.

The original functions remain, and the newer responsibilities, or as is often the case, increased emphasis on separate phases of old responsibilities, have been undertaken by more or less independent administrative units. The agricultural task force of the Hoover Commission found that this type of development has resulted in a loose confederation of autonomous bureaus and agencies with strong tendencies to develop independent, overlapping, and duplicating programs.

John Strohm has pin-pointed the problems as he found them at the grass-roots level. Among the farmers of one outstanding agricultural county, he finds confusion and misunderstanding regarding the functions, services, and jurisdiction of various agencies operating in the area. And among the agencies themselves, he found overlapping of programs and duplication of effort.

The normal reaction after reading Mr. Strohm's article is to ask, "Whose fault is it? Who is to blame for this situation?" No individual is to blame and certainly not Secretary Brannan. He is just a new tenant in an old house, to which new additions have been built year after year by preceding generations; and the house, though often altered, has never been thoroughly remodeled and modernized. Secretary Brannan is not responsible for this, but an aroused public should hold him jointly responsible with Congress for a thorough remodeling job.

Strohm's criticism is directed at the local level. To correct the most obvious faults at this level, the task force recommended consolidation of field services where possible, administration of action programs by departmental employees through offices based on the States as units, and the establishment of State and county councils of elected farmers whose major responsibility would be to represent the farmers rather than the action agencies. These council members would receive no pay, but would be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses.

But the basic faults in the organization and procedures of the USDA are at the top. The rapidity of the Department's growth can be partially measured by the increase from 18,000 to more than 80,000 employees in 20 years. Its share of the national budget increased from less than $17,000,000 in 1912 to a high of approximately 2½ billion, including restoration of 1½ billion of CCC capital, in 1947. This rapid growth has been accompanied by diffusion of authority, failure to develop clear lines of authority, and failure to clearly designate delegated authority. Some 20 different offices report to the Secretary.

The Hoover Commission's task force on agriculture sought to remedy the major faults of the present organization by grouping the functions of the Department into logical administrative units, later called services. Those recommended by the task force are: (1) Research Service, (2) Extension Service, (3) Agricultural Resources Conservation Service, (4) Commodity Adjustment Service, (5) Regulatory Service, (6) Agricultural Credit Service.

The task force believed that the Rural Electrification Administration was essentially a Government credit agency and that its services to borrowers' cooperatives could be handled most effectively through the reorganized Agricultural Credit Service. It believed that the REA's research and information programs should be handled through the Research Service and the Extension Service.

Apparently the Commission believed that the record of the REA had been so good and public opinion was so favorable that it was not feasible at this time to incorporate REA into the more logical functional pattern recommended by the task force, for in its final report the Commission lists a seventh Service—the Rural Electrification Service.

In this connection it may be pointed out that the record of the cooperative agricultural credit agencies has been just as good as that of REA. The Federal land banks have rendered an outstanding service, repaid the United States Treasury for all borrowed capital, and become wholly owned by the borrowers. The leading editorial in the January issue of Country Gentleman reports that the 36 production credit associations of Texas are paying off the last dollar of capital advanced by the Government. They, then, like the land banks, will be wholly owned and controlled by the borrowers. This record of handling credit like credit rather than like subsidies speaks well for contributions of the whole cooperative credit system to the support of American free enterprise. The more nearly all Government lending to agriculture can fit this pattern, the better off we will all be.

An example of some of the absurdities in organization and procedures found by the agriculture task force is the dual set-up for the management of a large body of public forest land in Oregon and California, where the USDA and the Department of the Interior administer alternate sections in each township. The confusion resulting from paralleling and overlapping functions, policies, and programs of these two independent and unrelated Government agencies is obvious. The task force on agricultural activities recognized the serious need for better coordination and integration of Government programs for management and conservation of our natural resources. It viewed them properly as a community of interests, which could be most successfully administered by a single agency in one department.

Its recommendations were largely followed by the Commission, which proposed that all major soil, range and forest conservation agencies should be brought together in an Agricultural Resources Conservation Service.

Adoption of the basic features of the Hoover Commission report is not seriously jeopardized by differences in the opinions of those honestly endeavoring to secure the most efficient and economical organization of our governmental procedures. The real danger comes from those who want to maintain status quo. Most of those who violently resist change are among the hundreds of thousands of Government employees. Every proposed change for any department affects the status of some employees. They know where and how to make their complaints, influence administrators and Members of Congress.

Public opinion is overwhelmingly in favor of the Commission report, but it is not so vocal as the opposition. If the public allows this type of opposition to defeat our country's major effort to improve the efficiency of the executive branch of the Government, we shall have to admit that there is some ground for the fear of some that we are tending away from "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," toward a government by bureaucracy in the interest of its employees.

Former Secretary CLINTON P. ANDERSON, who has had experience in attempts to reorganize the Department of Agriculture and knows all the difficulties involved, in a recent public address said:

"If we approach every proposed reorganization of the Department of Agriculture with the condition that no employee is to be separated from his task, that no responsibility is to be lessened, that no services are to be regrouped, then no progress will be made either toward increased efficiency or reduced costs. It is only when there is determination that simplification must and will be achieved regardless of who is involved or how many positions are abolished that there can be any effective result. * * *

"Therefore, I suggest that we start by agreeing that reorganization is possible and should be undertaken. The plan proposed by the Hoover Commission may not be the only one that could be developed. It is, however, available and specific. It deals directly with conditions as they now exist. In the absence of a current and better proposal, it deserves a trial."

Resolutions of Ottumwa, Iowa, Federated Home Culture Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include a

set of resolutions adopted by the Ottumwa (Iowa) Federated Home Culture Club expressing its united opposition to any proposals for socialized medicine:

Be it resolved, That the Ottumwa (Iowa) Federated Home Culture Club does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control.

We are against socialized medicine because of the following:

Whereas the American family has received the finest quality of medical care available in any country in the world, developed under our system of free enterprise; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance, wherever tried, has caused a decline in national health and deterioration of medical standards, and facilities, to the detriment of family welfare; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance, wherever tried, has taken away the family's right to choosing its own family physician; and

Whereas invasion of family privacy and violation of the sanctity of the patient-physician relationship have proved to be one of the most objectionable features of compulsory health insurance, wherever tried; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would result immediately in a tax of 3 percent on the income of the American workingman, rising within a few years to 6 percent and higher, creating a new tax burden which would reduce household budgets and bring down family standards of living; and

Whereas Government control of medical services, by gradually undermining free enterprise and establishing heavy new tax burdens and unprecedented national deficits, would threaten national bankruptcy and encourage the spread of socialism, which would endanger the rights of our children to the individual freedoms which have been the American heritage.

FEPC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

IMPERIAL COURT, DAUGHTERS OF ISIS,
New York, January 21, 1950.

In re FEPC bill.

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: The 5,000 members of the Imperial Court, Daughters of Isis, Auxiliary to the Imperial Council Ancient Egyptian Arabic Order Nobles of the Mystic Shrine of North and South America and Its Jurisdictions, Inc. (Prince Hall Affiliation), stand firmly behind you in your battle to secure passage of H. R. 4453, the FEPC bill.

Our several subordinate courts throughout the country devote themselves to charitable work. A true Daughter of Isis must, like a true physician, serve her needy fellow men without thought of recompense. Like physicians and other practitioners of the Golden Rule, we would welcome the opportunity to have abolished that particular need for our existence.

The physician may earn his income by treating our sick but his constant aim is to abolish sickness. Likewise, the Daughters of Isis exist to administer charity to the needy; but we hope, pray, work, and fight for elimination of such need.

Time and time again, experts have testified to the economic results of discrimination. Billions of dollars are poured annually down the drain as the exaction of bigotry. As a byproduct, millions of citizens—members of so-called minority groups, are pushed aside from the main stream of American life and forced into economically depressed ghettos. From among these ghetto dwellers come the most constant calls for our charitable ministrations.

The President's civil-rights program, by removing the dollar leak of discrimination, would go far toward eliminating the economic ghetto and improving the whole American economy. FEPC stands foremost of all the items formulating the civil-rights program.

We urge you to be firm in your battle to enact this legislation. Lift up the depressed by breaking down the walls of bullion. Give all citizens an equal opportunity through gainful employment. Enact FEPC—by so doing, the greatest work of all will be accomplished; that of striking at the causes which create applicants for charity.

Wishing you every success, we remain,

Fraternally yours,

ESCELLE HARMON MOORE,
Imperial Commandress,
Imperial Court, Daughters of Isis.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Following its recent action on Alaska, the House of Representatives now takes up the question of statehood for Hawaii. The same strong and fundamental argument for favorable action applies in this case as in the other: namely, the fact that the people of these islands, like the people of Alaska, ask to be represented in the Government which taxes them and makes their laws. We on the mainland cannot reject this appeal without repudiating a basic principle of our own democracy.

En route to a decision, the House will meet two counter arguments which were raised in the debate over Alaska: That the Hawaiian Islands, though American soil, are not contiguous to continental United States and lie at a great distance from it, and that their population is too small to rate representation by two Members in the Senate. So far as the first point is concerned, other noncontiguous bits of land (Manhattan Island comes to mind) are and always have been represented in Congress, while the argument of distance has vanished with the air age. As for the second point: Hawaii outranks seven continental States (one of them an original member of the Union) in respect to population.

An additional counter argument (not heard in the case of Alaska) is that the Islands have a mixed population. So have we all, as individual States. And if it is further objected that Hawaii's mixed population includes many orientals, with an implied query as to how loyal a State so constituted would be, the answer is that all groups of the Hawaiian people gave a convincing demonstration of their loyalty and fortitude under the severe tests of a war that began with an attack upon Hawaiian soil.

Before the present session of Congress ends we hope that the stars of the new States will have been added to the flag.

Somerset County Maple Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY CAVALCANTE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, each year in Somerset County, Pa., the citizens of Meyersdale conduct the Somerset County Maple Festival. This year it is expected that this festival will be bigger and better than ever, and because of its national importance, it is a pleasure for me to extend an invitation to all of my colleagues to attend this great occasion. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an invitation from Mr. M. Frank Beamer, Jr., chairman, Somerset County Maple Festival, his personal invitation to each and every Member in both Houses:

SOMERSET COUNTY MAPLE FESTIVAL,
Meyersdale, Pa., March 6, 1950.

Mr. ANTHONY CAVALCANTE,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAVALCANTE: We again extend to you as our esteemed Representative in the Congress of the United States, a very cordial and hearty invitation to be with us during the Somerset County Maple Festival, to be held in Meyersdale, March 24 and 25.

We also request that, in behalf of the maple festival committee, you extend to those distinguished gentlemen in the United States Senate and House of Representatives, our invitation to accompany you to the hills of Somerset County and be in Meyersdale on March 24 and 25 for this great festival.

Meyersdale is located in the famous Allegheny Mountains, near the summit of Mount Davis, the highest point in the State of Pennsylvania. The days are warm, the nights are cool, and the fair breezes blow making the sweet waters flow from the heart of the maple, thus enabling the aborigines to produce the finest, purest, and sweetest maple sirup in the world. For years Vermont sirup processors have been bragging about their wonderful blended maple sirups, yet, few people realize that it takes the 100 percent pure maple sirup from Somerset County, Pa., to make the Vermont sirup good.

Also tell them that here they will see one of Somerset County's fairest young ladies crowned as queen to reign over the festival, in a colorful, elaborate coronation ceremony. There will also be served buckwheat cakes smothered in butter and in this finest and purest of all maple sirups. A pageant depicting the maple-sirup industry will be presented and in it they will see a historical picture of Somerset County when it was a part of the great Cumberland County. There will be a mammoth parade with hundreds of marching units from surrounding States, and dancing at the queen's ball with music by a nationally known band. Tours of well-known sugar camps in the area will be conducted to see how this sweetest and purest maple sirup is produced and processed. All activities will be broadcast via national net-

works and completely covered by news agencies.

As James Whitcomb Riley so aptly wrote in his poem, "'Mongst the Hills of Somerset"—

'Mongst the Hills o' Somerset—
Wisht I was a-roamin' yet!
My feet won't get used to
These lowlands I'm trampin' through.
Wisht I could go back there, and
Stroke the long grass with my hand,
Like my schoolboy sweetheart's hair,
Smoothed out underneath it there.
Wisht I could set eyes once more
On our shaddera, on before,
Climbin' in the airly dawn,
Up the slopes 'at love growed on,
Natcheral as the violet
'Mongst the Hills o' Somerset.

How 't 'u'd rest a man like me
Jes' fer 'bout an hour to be
Up there where the mornin' air
Could reach out and catch me there!—
Snatch my breath away, and then
Rinse and give it back again,
Fresh as dew, and smellin' of
The old pink I us't to love;
And a-flavorin' ev'ry breeze
With mixed hints o' mulberries
An' may-apples, from the thick
Bottom lands along the crick,
Where the fish bit, dry or wet,
'Mongst the Hills o' Somerset!

Like a livin' pictur' things
All come back; the bluebirds sings
In the maple, tongue and bill
Thrillin' glory fit to kill!
In the orchard jay and bee
Ripen the first pears to me;
And the "Prince's harvest," they
Tumble to me where I lay
In the clover, provin' still
"A boy's will is the wind's will,"
Clean forgot is time, and care,
And think hearin', and gray hair;—
But there's nothin' I forget
'Mongst the Hills o' Somerset.

Middle-aged—to be egzact,
Very middle-aged, in fact—
Yet a-thinkin' back to them,
I'm the same wild boy again.
There's the dear old home once more,
And there's mother at the door—
Dead, I know, for thirty year,
Yet she's singin', and I hear;
And there's Joe and Mary Jane,
And Pap, comin' up the lane.
Dusk's a-fallin', and the dew
'Pears like it's a-fallin' too—
Dreamin' we're all livin' yet—
'Mongst the Hills o' Somerset.

Once again, please accept and extend to the Members of Congress of the United States our most cordial and sincere invitation to be with us during the festival.

Sincerely yours,

M. F. BEAVER, JR.,
Chairman, Somerset County Maple Festival.

More Light on the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Santa Monica (Calif.) Evening Outlook of March 2, 1950:

MORE LIGHT ON THE STATE DEPARTMENT

The following is a quote from an Associated Press story out of Washington, dated February 28, dealing with testimony about the State Department given before a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee:

"The Hiss matter came up after Department Undersecretary of State John E. Peurifoy had testified that in the last 2 years the Department has rid itself of 202 employees who were under security investigation.

"He said 91 of the 202 were homosexual cases, explaining that such persons are rated bad risks because they might be blackmailed by spies."

We confess that we were more startled by that casual statement than by any other revelation that has come out of Washington in many months.

The Department of State is a good-sized agency, with 21,208 employees at last count. Whatever the number, it is shocking that 202 employees of the Department had to be dismissed because their loyalty was doubtful, and that 91 of these doubtful cases were found to be homosexuals.

Add to favorite swish occupations: A career in the United States State Department.

Now at last we know why American foreign policy in the Orient has been so confused. While the more manly Reds and fellow travelers argued in favor of embracing the Chinese Communists, the representatives of the third sex wanted to give everybody a good slap on the wrist.

Hong Kong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Time magazine for March 6, 1950:

HONG KONG

WITH HIS MAJESTY'S COMPLIMENTS

In Hong Kong last week a British colonial court decided that 71 United States-made planes, formerly the property of Nationalist China, now belong to the Chinese Communists. With the aircraft (including DC-3s, five Convairs and five four-engined Skymasters) went 20,000 tons of maintenance equipment; altogether the property was worth $30,000,000.

The planes had been operated by Nationalist China's Government-owned CNAC and CATC. As Communist armies overran the mainland, the lines retreated to Hong Kong's Kai Tak Airfield. There, last November, most of their Chinese personnel declared allegiance to the Communist (Time, November 21) and shooed off Nationalist officials.

To get the planes out of Communist hands, the Nationalist Government sold the property to a United States corporation headed by its good friend of Flying Tiger fame, Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault, who operated Nationalist China's other air line (CAT). But when Chennault tried to take possession, Hong Kong authorities blocked him. There were reports of Communist threats to British business interests; one story was that the Communists threatened to confiscate one British business in Shanghai for every plane that went into Chennault's hands.

Meanwhile, there was an unexplained delay in a final court hearing. Then, in January, His Majesty's Government recognized Communist China. In last week's decision, Chief Justice Sir Leslie Gibson ruled that British recognition established Red ownership of the disputed planes. "Any question as to sovereignty * * * of a foreign state," he said, "is a question on which the court must be guided by the attitude of His Majesty's Government * * *. Our state cannot speak with two voices on such a matter, the judiciary saying one thing and the executive another."

At Kai Tak Airfield, exultant Chinese Communist mechanics painted Red flags on 71 fuselages.

Doctor Assails Dollar Chasing by Colleagues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of March 7, 1950:

DOCTOR ASSAILS DOLLAR CHASERS BY COLLEAGUES

Dr. R. J. Wilkinson, president of the Southern Surgical Congress, last night ascribed greed and selfishness to members of the medical profession and demanded a medical program which will give good treatment to all people at a price they can pay.

Dr. Wilkinson's remarks were part of the presidential address delivered at the end of the first day of the congress' 4-day convention in the Shoreham Hotel.

CALLS FOR LEADERSHIP

Charging a menace of being "manhandled by forces that are ruthless and have neither the doctor's nor the patient's welfare at heart," Wilkinson called for "fearless leadership to awaken the doctors to their responsibilities.

"Most of our young doctors, upon completion of college work, are pseudo scientists instead of well-trained practitioners of medicine," he said.

"In most instances," he continued, "the young graduate's patient must be hospitalized because the doctor has been taught to depend largely on hospital facilities for both diagnosis and treatment.

"Is it any great wonder,'" he asked, "that we are unable to supply doctors for our rural areas or for them to condescend to answer many night calls?"

SLAPS MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

With an oblique slap at the American Medical Association, Wilkinson said the association's ironclad rules, ultraconservativeness, and lack of fearless leadership are responsible for the present plight of the doctor.

Wilkinson cited the rapid growth of the Nation's population compared with the failure of medical schools to keep pace by providing a corresponding number of graduates.

He said there were 600 more young doctors graduated in 1949 than in 1949. With the Government (VA) absorbing many of them and the annual doctor death rate of 3,500 remaining constant, the plight of the patient grows serious, he added.

HIGH EDUCATIONAL SET-UP

The doctor detailed the present educational requirements, established by the AMA which compel medical students to go to school for 10 or 11 years, then finish as men who consider themselves specialists and charge high prices for services they are not yet qualified to give.

The diminishing of ordinary general practitioners in this country, Wilkinson said, may be accounted for by these long years of required study and by the inroads made by the Government's "balled hook."

EFFECTS OF VA ASSAILED

Referring to the Veterans' Administration practice of paying a flat $50 for a few hours of a specialist's time, Wilkinson said this can be considered "hush money" and accounts for the medical profession's hands-off policy in the matter of attacking regimented VA medical methods.

"Today," he said, "many of our young physicians are seeking employment with the VA, not for the high-type training offered, but because of the promise of a life of ease and pensionship after 20 years' service."

"Some undoubtedly are afraid of complete regimentation and are seeking this protection in the hope of immunity when and if the fatal day arrives. I am afraid these boys will be disillusioned regarding their status if the day comes."

Wilkinson concluded with a demand for more State aid of medical schools, shortened educational requirements without sacrificing rigidity, condemnation of VA's socialistic methods, and an increased volume of medical students.

HIGH RATE DOLLAR CHASE

Dr. Harry Hess, vice chairman of the council on medical service, AMA, told the group that current differences between physicians and hospitals, primarily based on financial matters, can be resolved if both sides stop thinking about the almighty dollar and become more interested in the public good.

Dr. Hess echoed Wilkinson's words by charging the Veterans' Administration with opening the doors to all ex-servicemen who become ill, although those hospitals were originally established to care only for service-connected disabilities.

The convention is represented by doctors from 12 States and the District of Columbia. The greater part of the session, which ends Thursday afternoon, will be taken up with reading medical treatises, with discussion periods following each reading.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

EAST END CIVIC LEAGUE,
Little Rock, Ark., February 21, 1950.

CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

GENTLEMAN: The news has reached us through our local paper (Arkansas Gazette) that the one Dr. J. M. Robinson, president of the Arkansas Negro Democratic Association of which we are a part, stated that the Negro in the South is not ready for civil rights; such statements we do flatly denounce.

Dr. J. M. Robinson also stated in his letter that the South is not ready for full participation in civil rights. It is our thinking that we are one Nation indivisible. He also stated, "I believe that reform of this kind should take place by gradual integration and not by overnight legislation." In question of power, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "Let no more be heard of confidence in man but bind him down by the chain of the Constitution" (legislation).

We further believe that the citizens of each State should be entitled to equal privileges and protection regardless of skin color, hair texture or religious faith. We are asking only for protection in the things God has given us; for out of one blood God has made all nations of men to dwell on the face of the earth, not as chattel, but as men.

Again, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "All men are born equal." This document has been carefully investigated and after much deliberation by our organization we thought to send a copy to each of the above-named persons. We would have you know that it is the offspring of our thinking, uninfluenced by any political party.

Now, therefore, we pray you upon your sacred honor that you will exert your every effort to see that this civil-rights bill be passed immediately. You have our confidence. May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.

J. L. HAWKINS, *President.*
MRS. M. JACKSON, *Secretary.*
ASHLEY BYNUM,
JESSE BAKER,
AMOS NICKERSON,
S. SCOTT,
J. L. HAWKINS,
Committee.

The Mopac Turns to Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am proud to call attention to the fact that the Missouri Pacific Railroad and the M. K. & T., which serve Missouri and St. Louis, are pioneering the use of radio. They have found it helpful and are extending its use. The timely editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 21, which follows, discusses this subject:

To those of us who are supporting H. R. 378, and working for railway safety in the face of blind and obstinate opposition of those who oppose the use of radio or any other safety device, it is refreshing to know that the Missouri Pacific and the Katy, which are so large a part of our everyday life, are showing the way.

THE MOPAC TURNS TO RADIO

Included in the Missouri Pacific's $5,399,000 improvement program is $164,000 for train radio. This is a small but important item of the total bill, because radio is largely neglected as an aid to railroad safety. In this region, the Katy is the only other line to make much use of radio for any purposes.

Actually, safety is not the principal reason for the Mopac's action. It is installing the radio equipment on 53 freight trains, largely for cab-to-caboose communication in switching work. This will help operating efficiency more than safety. Still, some accidents have developed from slowness in getting freights onto sidings. Here, the cab-to-caboose system can help.

Passenger trains, however, should have first call on train radio, and it should be intertrain radio. The use of radiophone between trains could have helped prevent many accidents. One was the Otterville collision on New Year's day 1948, when one Mopac train ran into the rear of another and 14 persons were killed.

Most railroads have opposed efforts to make them adopt train radio on grounds that it is too experimental. Though neither the Mopac nor the Katy are making anywhere near full use of radio for safety reasons, they have gone far enough to dispose of the argument that train radio is impractical.

Public Works for Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Washington Post of March 7, 1950, on the subject of unemployment:

IDLE NOW TOTAL 4,684,000, HIGHEST POINT SINCE AUGUST 1941

Unemployment figures rose to 4,684,000 in February, highest since August 1941.

The figure, reported by the Commerce Department yesterday, is an increase of 204,000 over January.

The total does not count those idle because of strikes.

In the Government's statistics, strikers are counted as employed since they have a regular job, even though they are not working at it while on strike.

Secretary of Commerce Sawyer said in a statement:

"The slight rise in unemployment between January and February appears to be due mainly to a seasonal increase in the labor force and not to any cutbacks in employment.

"Nonfarm employment seems to be holding steady this year in contrast to last year."

The Census Bureau, which prepared the figures, observed that between January and February last year there was a 500,000 increase in the number of jobless, "with nonseasonal cutbacks in employment an important factor in the rise."

The 204,000 rise in unemployment from January to February this year resulted from the fact that 210,000 persons, including midyear school graduates, entered the labor force—and only 6,000 new jobs were available immediately.

The 6,000 new jobs raised the total of those with regular work to 56,953,000.

The 4,684,000 total of unemployed compares with 5,620,000 in August 1941.

In this connection, I wish to refer to H. R. 5010 which I introduced on June 6, 1949 and which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, which reads as follows:

A bill to authorize the expenditure of $5,000,000,000 through the Federal Works Agency to provide for needed public improvements and to promote full employment

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that within the provisions of this authorization and through the organization of the Federal Works Agency measures be taken to restore full employment within the United States and to construct projects in cooperation with the local communities in order to provide needed public improvements.

SEC. 2. Work on all projects shall be paid for at the hourly rates of wages equal to those prevailing for similar work in private industry in the locality or to the union scale of wages obtained for such work in such locality.

SEC. 3. No worker shall be denied employment because of sex, race, color, religion, length of residence within a community, political opinion, or membership in any economic, political, or religious organization, excepting persons who are members of organizations advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence.

SEC. 4. The Administrator of the Federal Works Agency is hereby directed to distribute equitably between the States the various projects with a view especially to meeting the unemployment situations as they may exist.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Works Agency the sum of $5,000,000,000 for the purposes named.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be noted that the current unemployment of 4,684,000 does not include persons who are idle because of strikes. Such persons, in the computation of the Commerce Department are considered as having jobs. It is also to be noted that the current figure represents the highest number of unemployed since August 1941. Hence it is apparent that good reasons exist for taking immediate action on such legislation as H. R. 5010.

Public works in this country have been retarded during the period of the war and its aftermath. Modern and adequate road construction for highways and through cities are needed or else the production of automobiles in this country will be interfered with. The construction of needed post offices, other Federal buildings and schools would benefit communities with improvements that are overdue and would put men to work and would reverse this trend of growing unemployment.

I am requesting the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives to commence hearings on such legislation.

American Planes in Hong Kong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to call attention to the speeches made on March 1 by Mr. LODGE, of Connecticut, and Mr. LARCADE, of Louisiana, about the American planes in Hong Kong. The State Department should take effective action to prevent these planes from falling into the hands of the Chinese Communists. Our consul general in Hong Kong, Karl Rankin is known to me as a man of exceptional abilities but he cannot be expected to act effectively unless his superiors in the State Department will give him appropriate instructions and back them up. The British are our allies in the Far East but they are endangering the foundations of this alliance with consequences so serious as to outweigh any temporary advantage they may reap from what amounts to paying "squeeze" to the Communists with American property. That in my opinion is not the way for the British to save Hong Kong.

I append an article by Clyde Farnsworth appearing in the Washington News of February 28 last and a dispatch from London appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of February 28:

[From the Washington News of February 28, 1950]

PROTEST OVER PLANES LACKS REAL PUNCH

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

HONG KONG, February 28.—Whatever Secretary of State Dean Acheson may have said about the vigor of American conversations with the British over their gift of 71 American-registered transport planes and other aviation assets to the Chinese Reds, the State Department has been pulling its punches.

The State Department has been using strong language but not strong enough to make the British back up on a deal that was cooking for 3 months as part of Britain's recognition of Red China.

United States Consul General Karl Rankin has been going as far as his instructions permit in voicing official American disapproval. But he said today there had been no actual protest over last week's ruling of the Hong Kong Supreme Court.

Representations to Hong Kong haven't been elevated to the plane of formal notes. An official said the State Department had gone no further than to say that if a fair trial was not granted by the British to determine title to the airlines' assets, the United States would view that shortcoming as an unfriendly act.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 28, 1950]

HONG KONG RULING TO STAND

LONDON, February 27.—The British Government cannot and will not interfere with a Hong Kong Supreme Court decision handing over 90 Chinese air-line planes to the Communist Government of China, a Foreign Office spokesman said today.

He confirmed that representations against the ruling have been made to Great Britain by the United States, which contends the planes passed into the hands of an American company through purchase. But, he added, the court ruling in the British colony is something over which the British Government has no control.

The VA Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES P. NELSON

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are many of us in the House who are sincerely interested in economy to whom the proposed cut in Veterans' Administration personnel poses a problem. We would all like to know why and where those cuts are to be made and just whom they will affect. No such cut could be justified if it materially affects the treatment of veterans with service-connected disabilities and especially those veterans who now live and may always live in the psycho wards of our hospitals because of the horrors of war. To us then the statement of the council of the American Psychiatric Association is most disturbing. I am informed that this association represents 5,500 psychiatrists throughout this country. I believe that statement should be spread in the Record for our information.

On Friday, March 10, 1950, 8,000 employees of the United States Veterans' Administration will be notified of their dismissal if immediate action by Congress is not taken. Government procedures prevent Veterans' Administration officials from telling Congressmen directly of the disastrous results which will follow. Contemplated reduction in personnel will result in immediate deterioration of medical care to veterans and discourage remaining personnel in the performance of their duties.

This kind of false economy always results in less effective treatment which ultimately means greater expense to taxpayers.

The American Psychiatric Association strongly maintains that unless this action is prevented, medical care of nervous and mentally disabled veterans will deteriorate below accepted adequate standards.

The President's Vacation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the President is going down to Key West next Sunday for another vacation. The White House explains that he is tired and needs a rest. Very likely the President is tired because of two things. It must have been an extreme exertion for the President to insist over and over again that the coal strike was not a national emergency, that the people were not suffering from the severe winter weather and that the Nation's economy was not upset despite the fact that the strike idled 600,000 workingmen.

Secondly, the President certainly must be exhausted over the labor of devising ways and means to spend the people's money and just how to continue his plans to spend us into false prosperity.

We can expect developments on the spending front during the Key West vacation. Remember the last time he went down to the sands of Florida, it was from there that his Budget Director announced that the 1950 budget couldn't possibly be balanced without a tax increase.

It was also at Key West last November that the Democratic National Chairman solemnly said that the people would gladly accept any tax increase the President might request in 1950.

So, Mr. Speaker, we should keep attuned to the pronouncements coming from Key West during the next few weeks. I am certain they will affect the whole Nation.

Along this line, under permission to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer which everybody in the country should read. It certainly hits the nail right on the head.

THIS IS NOT FICTION

Will the reader pretend that he has an obscure neighbor by the name of Harry Truman? And will he pretend that Neighbor Truman has decided he must borrow money, a decision which many of us ordinary folks have reached at times in the tempestuous course of life?

Neighbor Truman, we're going to pretend, steps into the bank to apply for the loan, and we're going to have the privilege of observing the transaction.

"I want to borrow $500," says our neighbor. (Now most will anticipate the next few questions, having been through it.)

"Do you have any debts at the present time?" the banker inquires.

"Yes," says our neighbor. "I owe the bank at this moment about $35,600."

"What is your annual income, Mr. Truman?"

"I have take-home pay amounting to $3,750 a year," says he.

"Hmmmmmm," the banker hmms. He at once is suspicious of the client's ability to pay the old debt without $500 more added. And aren't his eavesdropping neighbors suspicious, too?

But the banker gives allowance for unforeseen circumstances. So he asks Mr. Truman, "Do you think you will be able to save a large portion of your income this year and each succeeding year to reduce your indebtedness?"

"Oh, no," Neighbor Truman replies to the surprise of the banker, and the neighbors listening in. "My necessary living expenses this year will be $4,250. I'll be forced to spend more than I earn."

"Pardon me," the startled banker interjects. "Do you mean that, owing already an amount that constitutes seven times what you'll take in during a year, you're going to spend more than you earn?"

"That's right," says Neighbor Truman. "You see, I must provide tuition at private schools for my children. I must help a poor relative set up a new business in which he's going to lose money for a long time to come."

"Just what kind of business is that relative going to sink your money in?" the incredulous banker asks.

"Why," says Mr. Truman, "he's got a wonderful humanitarian idea. He's going to sell milk to the Hottentots at a price they can afford to pay."

"But just those things won't eat up your whole income this year, will they?"

"No, but that isn't all," says Mr. Truman. "I am building security for my children by putting price supports under them. My boys sell newspapers to the neighbors at a nickel apiece, but I give them an extra nickel. My daughters make lamp shades which they sell for $5, but I don't think that's a fair price, so I give an extra $3 for each one they sell. Besides my wife wants a television set."

The banker now steps aside to get his breath. Here's a fellow who owes more than he can ever repay if he lives frugally below income seeking to borrow still more, and at the same time boldly proclaiming his intention of carrying out fantastic money-spending schemes.

What will the banker do?

Will he lend the new money? It's silly even to ask the question.

This scene is not fiction. It constitutes a faithful reproduction of the program set forth in regal solemnity by President of the United States Harry S. Truman. Multiply all figures by 10,000,000 and you have the Truman budget, his plan of government, the Government's income, and the Government's debt.

In this case Congress is the banker. If it makes the loan, Borrower Truman's note will have to be signed by the taxpayers, which is to say by all the people. Who, in his right mind, would voluntarily sign the note of such a profligate spender?

World Peace Threatened by the Arms Race in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, knowing that many of my colleagues are as perturbed as I am over the arms race in the Middle East, and the lack of action on the part of our State Department to stop it, I am including in the RECORD my letter to the Secretary of State, so that Members of the House may know what I have requested of him.

MARCH 7, 1950.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The purpose of this communication is not merely to express alarm and concern over the great arms race in progress in the Middle East, but to call upon you, as countless others have, to use all the power vested in you, to stop it.

Authoritative reports—admitted by all the nations involved—prove that the Arab nations, Egypt, Iraq, Transjordan, and Syria, are rearming for war. They have recently purchased and contracted for, large numbers of jet fighters, heavy bombers, artillery, and mobile units, as well as modern and heavily gunned destroyers, corvettes, and submarines. In November 1949, we learned that the Egyptian Purchasing Mission was placing orders for $45,000,000 worth of artillery, jet aircraft, infantry equipment, and sea torpedo craft. She will soon have a total of six new warships. It is not necessary for me to lay facts and figures before you. As our Secretary of State you have access to much more material and information than do our regular news sources.

That the greatest arms race in the history of the Middle East is on, is acknowledged. We also know that the equipment involved has come from Britain, and that she is also appropriating huge sums in her budget for the rearming of the Arab states. At the same time, the United States is supplying money, arms, and ammunition to Britain, and we are told that surplus American arms which we left in England, are today in the possession of Egypt and other Arab states. Therefore, unwittingly, the United States is contributing toward the rearmament of the Arab nations, and increasing the threat to Israel. Yet, the position of the United States has been that export of arms to that area of the world should be strictly limited to such arms as are within the scope of legitimate security requirements.

The British insist on their freedom to ship arms overseas, claiming that such shipments are necessary to establish the morale of the Arab states as a buffer against further Communist expansion. We know that the shipments are not necessary, nor are they being made for the purpose of maintaining internal law and order, and for the purpose of self-defense. All this dates back to an agreement that Great Britain made after the end of World War I, when she was entrusted with the Mandate of Palestine. At that time (1920) Transjordan was considered a part of Palestine. Two years later, the British Government declared "the exclusion of Transjordan from the article of the mandate relative to the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine." Then the Emir of Transjordan organized a regular armed force. This force, known as the Arab Legion, was commanded by Col. F. G. Peake Pasha, a Britisher. In 1938, Colonel Peake was replaced by Col. Glubb Pasha, another Britisher. Under these two British officers the Arab Legion came to be the most effective fighting force in the entire Arab world.

At the end of World War II, Britain signed a treaty with Transjordan, recognizing it as a fully independent state and agreeing to give military aid to each other as a result of an armed attack by a third party; she also agreed to afford financial assistance in meeting the cost of the military units of Transjordan as well as to provide British officers for training in all fields of military and aeronautical instruction, including such arms, ammunition, equipment, aircraft, and other materials as may be necessary. In view of the terms of this treaty, England found herself bound by her word and believed that from the spring of 1946 she was obliged to render financial and military assistance to Transjordan. Although the treaty did not specify a definite sum of money, it was later agreed that the sum would not exceed two and one-half million pounds sterling annually (about $10,000,000 at that time). In the 1949-50 budget, this annual payment was raised to three and one-half million pounds sterling. As soon as the UN Security Council lifted the arms embargo on August 7, 1949, Britain started to send arms to the Arab nations.

The extravagant military preparations on the part of the Arabs points to only one thing—war. Any other conclusion is only wishful thinking. The volume and kind of arms being purchased by the Arabs from England and other European nations are far in excess of what are needed for ordinary defense in peacetime. And who is the potential victim? Israel. The Arabs have threatened a "second round" against Israel. Statements by their military and government officials as well as a hostile press, all point to a renewal of hostilities against Israel.

There is at present no peace between Israel and the Arab states. There is merely a cessation of hostilities. But we had all hoped that Israel and the Arab states would soon agree upon final and lasting peace treaties. To encourage and assist them in an armaments race at this time is cruel, and the results will be disastrous.

Our Government has maintained that it is dedicated to helping people of all democratic nations so that they may live in peace, free from the threat of aggression. Yet, by giving military and financial aid to Britain, we are helping her to undermine the safety and security of Israel. Britain contends that by sending arms to the Arab states, she is not violating her agreement with us under the mutual defense program. I maintain that if it is no direct violation, then it is such a circumvention of the pact that our aims are destroyed. The fact is that in helping Britain, we make it possible for her to arm aggressor nations in the Middle East. These nations have Israel as their target, and have sworn to conquer her.

A short time ago, we welcomed Israel into the world's family of democracies. She has emerged triumphant after years of bloodshed, untold hardships, and struggle. Although faced with all the economic and governmental problems of a new nation, she undertook at the same time to receive 150,000 displaced persons and to resettle and assimilate them as well as 200,000 more of the homeless and disinherited human beings who looked to her for shelter.

It is a stark tragedy that at this crucial point in Israel's history, she is forced to divert her manpower, energies, depleted finances, and efforts, to defense activities instead of being assisted along the path of peace, security, and freedom for which she has fought so desperately. Furthermore, it is a sad commentary upon the leading nations of the world, that we are to a great extent, responsible for her plight.

Mr. Secretary, you have remained very calm in the face of these developments. Your attitude has been that we should wait and see what happens. Surely, you know what happens when potential enemies are geared for war and when one of them is boasting that it will conquer the other. Surely, I need not point out to you that war in any part of the world today, threatens every other nation in the world. There must be no renewal of the Palestine conflict.

What is tantamount to a violation of protocol occurred in Washington last week. The State Department let out a story about an Israeli request to purchase arms from the United States. Normally, the applicant publishes such a request, if he so wishes, but the recipient of the application rarely does so. The statement given by the State Department failed to place accurate emphasis on the Israeli request. Israel's communication protested arms shipments to the Arab states, hoped America would take steps to prevent such a race, and added, in conclusion, that as a means of prevention Israel wished to purchase arms in America.

By not revealing the background against which the Israeli request was transmitted, the State Department created the impression of an outright arms request. Thus, it might be interpreted that Israel's past protests against arms shipments to the Arab states were merely a blind or smoke screen preparatory to Israel's own arms request.

Again let me emphasize—Israel wants peace, not conflict. You, as a powerful Cabinet officer, our Secretary of State, have at your command the means to avoid such a conflict. You can insist that the British Government stop the shipments of arms to the Arab nations until the United Nations has had a chance to investigate the entire situation in the Middle East. The United States should stop all aid to Britain as long as she persists in arming aggressor nations.

The United States has assumed a leading role in the world. This being so, let us aim for the respect of nations by upholding the cause of peace, and have the courage to insist upon the right. Any other attitude on our part will bring shame upon us and the derision of our enemies. To continue to close our eyes to the impending shooting war in the Middle East is to violate our commitments to the world.

Mr. Secretary, what are you going to do?

Sincerely yours,

ISIDORE DOLLINGER,
Member of Congress.

Billions for Arizona Landholders but Not One Cent for a Crippled Child

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the State of Arizona, which is now asking the Congress for a $1,500,000,000 reclamation gift, has just announced a new policy that reveals the great "humanitarian instincts" in the hearts of the Arizona people.

That policy is: No crippled Indian child shall be helped.

The Public Welfare Board of Arizona, which favors the proposed central Arizona project, recently voted to refuse their annual Federal grant of $100,000 for crippled children rather than include Indian crippled children.

All other States provide treatment for crippled Indian children on the same basis as for other crippled children.

Not Arizona.

Arizona is now asking that the Federal Treasury hand out one and a half billion dollars for a project to bring Colorado River water to a few thousand acres of land which is owned by a few large growers and speculators.

This is to be a gift to rich white Arizonians by the American taxpayers.

But what will these rich Arizonians do for the crippled children of their State? Rather than let Indian crippled children be helped, they have refused their annual Federal grant. Thus, they have not only deprived the crippled Indian children, but have deprived the white Arizona crippled children as well.

Regarding this matter, Miss Katharine F. Lenroot, chief of the Children's Bureau, Federal Security Agency, is quoted as follows:

The Children's Bureau did not voluntarily or arbitrarily withdraw funds for crippled children in Arizona. The decision was that of the Arizona State Board of Public Welfare. Over 2 years ago the Children's Bureau advised the Arizona State Department of Public Welfare that the exclusion of Indian crippled children from the treatment services was contrary to the intent of the Social Security Act.

What has Arizona been doing with the Federal money it received each year for aid of crippled children? The Indian Rights Association states that for years Arizona has been taking this Federal money on the basis of including Indian children, but has refused to help Indian crippled children.

The victims of this devious and reprehensible practice are physically handicapped Indian children—

Declares the association.

Another indication of how little regard Arizona has for Indians, crippled or not, is the fact that the proposed central Arizona project would flood an Indian reservation, destroying the farms and homes of these Indians, and repay them nothing. The project would, however, make scores of white millionaires at the expense of taxpayers of other States.

In December 1949 the Children's Bureau proposed that Arizona accept Indian crippled children in need of treatment on an equitable basis with non-Indian children, the cost not to exceed 15 percent of the total expenditures in the State for this program. Indian children make up about 15 percent of the child population in Arizona. The State of Arizona rejected the Bureau's proposal.

Miss Lenroot stated:

Because of this discriminatory action on the part of the Arizona Welfare Board and its refusal to accept any Indian children for treatment, other crippled children in the State are deprived of the care which could have been purchased with the $100,000 of Federal crippled childrens' funds allocable to Arizona each year.

But even this was not enough for the generous Arizona officials. They had to strike another blow at Indians. The welfare board also decided to discontinue all State funds for children with rheumatic fever who received care from the board of public health. The reason for this action? The public-health program of care included Indian mothers and Indian children.

As stated further by the Indian Association, this unjust action of Arizona fits into a pattern of State discrimination which has for years denied the Indian aged, blind, and dependent children the social-security benefits extended to all other Arizona citizens, including the big landholders who are trying to raid the Treasury for more than a billion dollars.

Under the Social Security Act, Federal aid is granted to all States for the care and treatment of crippled children on the basis of the total number of all children, not just on the basis of non-Indian children.

Apparently this is Arizona's policy:

Free millions for each white landholder, but not one cent for a crippled Indian child.

The United States and the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in the recent past—notably on February 20 and 28—I drew the attention of the Members of this House to the fact that a general rearmament race is now taking place in the Near East which is bound, sooner or later, to lead to a renewal of warfare in that part of the world and to the most dire consequences for the peoples of the Near East and the peace of the world.

The United States is vitally interested in maintaining peace throughout the world, including the Near East. It is quite clear and readily understood today by the people of this country that an act of aggression anywhere in the world is a disturbance of the peace everywhere.

There is reason to believe that some of the surplus American arms and military equipment from the recent war, as well as some of the arms which we are shipping to England and other western European countries to bolster their defense, is finding its way to Egypt and the other Arab states. Thus, indirectly, our country is a partner to Britain's rearmament of the Arabs. By our support and tacit approval of Britain's action we are condoning such deeds and encouraging Arab aggression against Israel.

The upshot of this has been that Israel was compelled to divert a substantial

part of its resources for armaments in order to face realistically the terrible threat of war. Instead of devoting its full attention to solving its economic problems and to the absorption of the many homeless Jews who have found a place of refuge and a new home in Israel, the young Jewish state is forced to turn its attention to armament in order to secure its future existence and that of its people.

If, for reasons of security, our country finds it necessary to rearm the Near East, then such policy of rearmament should apply to all countries, including Israel. I have been to Israel twice in the past year and a half and I can assure the Members of this House that the United States has a most loyal and devoted friend in the Jewish state, where there is a deep understanding and appreciation of our way of thinking, our mode of life, and our civilization. Israel is a true bastion of democracy in the Near East.

Now Israel has approached the United States with the request that it be permitted to purchase the necessary arms in this country. I would much prefer that the United States use its good offices and its most convincing arguments to persuade Britain to abandon her dangerous policy of arming the Arab States as the best way to prevent the outbreak of hostilities in the Near East.

If, however, this is impossible at the present time, then our country should make available arms to Israel in order to balance the rearmament program in the Near East and in this way eliminate the restlessness and fear which is rampant among the peoples of that area. By so doing, we shall also hasten the attainment of genuine peace treaties between Israel and its neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I want to read an editorial entitled "For Middle East Peace," from the Jewish Advocate, Boston, Mass., of March 2, 1950, as follows:

FOR MIDDLE EAST PEACE

The disclosure that Israel's Ambassador to Washington, Eliahu Elath, had requested the State Department to permit the sale of arms to the new state was neither surprising nor unwarranted.

The Arabs have long been receiving heavy arms from Britain, and our own Secretary of State has defended London's policy on the ground that shipments were made under long-standing treaties aimed at enabling the Arab countries to maintain internal security. The fact that the shipments were of so heavy and abundant a nature as to preclude the conclusion that they were meant solely for internal-security purposes did not deter Mr. Acheson from displaying irritation when pushed against the wall. In fact, shortly after Louis Lipsky, chairman of the American Zionist Council, called on the State Department to protest against the heavy shipments of British arms to Egypt, Mr. Acheson found it necessary to stress at his press conference that he had not changed his mind about the basic.

Now, if Washington and London are so concerned about internal security in the Arab lands, the corollary follows that they should be equally concerned about Israel's ability to maintain internal security. And if the Arab countries get tanks, destroyers, submarines, and jet planes—as Drew Pearson told the U.J.A. national conference at Miami Beach last week end—for the preservation of internal order, there is no reason to assume that Israel doesn't need them.

But the truth of the matter is that a dangerous cold war is being conducted in the Middle East against Israel and that the shipping of heavy arms to those countries foreshadows the possibility of a second Arab round against Israel and its people. If that is the motive behind Britain's heavy sale of arms, it is simple logic that American sale of arms to Israel would prevent another war in that segment of the world. The argument that the arming of the Arabs is part of the world picture, a sort of precaution against an aggressive Soviet move, is too specious a contention to merit serious consideration. The realists in Washington and in London know full well that if they must count on the Arabs to hold back the march of the hammer and sickle in that area they might just as well write off the Middle East.

If it is peace in the Middle East that is really the concern of our policy makers, they have only one course—either have Britain abandon her dangerous policy or else offset that evil by permitting Israel to secure arms in the United States.

Political Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Rothwell Brown in the Washington Times-Herald of January 20, 1950:

POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

President Truman, with a cynical effrontery without precedent in American history, has now openly and brazenly asserted the mastery of the executive power over the legislative branch of the Government.

This is the sinister significance of this week's show-down battle in the House of Representatives over a resolution to restore the power of the rules committee.

"I am doing everything possible," said the President in a direct quotation, "to have that motion beaten when it comes up for consideration on the floor of the House."

Those shocking words, hitherto unfamiliar to American ears, represent the most flagrant and unconstitutional attempt at executive usurpation of power since the adoption of the organic law of the Republic.

They mean that the President of the United States has viciously undertaken to dictate to the House of Representatives the making of its own rules.

No President in this country ever before thus publicly claimed a royal prerogative which went out of fashion in the English-speaking world with the overthrow of the Stuart kings and the Declaration of Independence.

The Constitution of the United States provides that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings.

The form of government it provides is strictly one of separate and independent branches, legislative, executive, and judicial.

A President of the United States has no more authority to tell the House of Representatives or the Senate what rules it may or may not adopt, than he has to tell the United States Supreme Court what decision to hand down in a pending case in which, as President, he might be interested.

As a matter of fact the rules of House and Senate are carefully designed to preserve the constitutional functions and independence of those bodies and to prevent any attempt at executive encroachment.

The President's impudent interference in the vital question now agitating and dividing the membership of the House is a deliberate and premeditated infringement upon congressional liberty of action under the Constitution.

It is a challenge to the high estate of the House and its freedom from all Executive penetration, and is enough in itself alone to inspire the House to repudiate this attempted invasion of one of its most sacred rights, by ignoring the President's pressure—and it is plenty—and restoring its powers to the Rules Committee.

The President's intemperate attack upon the constitutional integrity of the House of Representatives was made before a so-called civil-rights group that has been meeting in Washington.

This outfit made a great show of excluding all Communists who clamored for admission, but with transparent insincerity it has swallowed nearly the whole of what the Communists stand for.

But there is more than FEPC or civil rights involved in the revolt of conservative Members of both parties in the House against Executive domination.

Notwithstanding it was deprived of its traffic control of pending legislation on January 3, 1949, the Rules Committee, controlled by a bipartisan conservative majority, has been bottling up since the adjournment of the last session of Congress a prospective welfare-state-treasury raid involving eventually upward of $15,000,000,000. Some estimates are much higher.

The continued solvency of the United States is hanging in the balance in the Rules Committee at this very moment.

If the floodgates of squandermania are opened this country is sunk.

Thus far the Rules Committee has been keeping back the threatening tide of unconscionable spending that could only end in national bankruptcy.

But in its present condition of limited power it cannot hold back this impending flood of red ink indefinitely.

Mr. Truman knows that if the conservative coalition in the House can rehabilitate the Rules Committee the scheme to socialize America cannot be carried any further this year.

From his point of view his design to browbeat the House into submission to his will is perfectly understandable.

Aided by the powerful labor dictators who are deluging Members with their demands and orders, the President is pouring it on.

Will the Republican minority play Truman's game?

It is up to them.

The Coal Industry Wanes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I reproduce the editorial taken from the Shreveport Times of February 26, 1950, entitled "The Coal Industry Wanes." This editorial is as follows:

THE COAL INDUSTRY WANES

Ten years ago a month-long strike in the coal industry was enough to bring the economic life of this country to a dead stop. Times have changed. The mines have been

shut down two-thirds of the working time for the past 8 months. A dead stop is not in the picture.

During 1949 coal production in this country dropped 170,000,000 tons below the level of 1948 because of strikes and the short workweek. But this low level of production fell only 10,000,000 tons short of meeting the full demand for coal in the United States market.

This down slide of the coal industry as a factor in meeting the total fuel demand is at the bottom of the labor-management strife in the industry, and the important thing is that the situation for the industry seems certain to become worse, much worse, in the months and years ahead.

Among the one-time giant consumers of coal which have turned to other fuels at a fast clip in recent years is the railroad industry. A generation ago 99 percent of all fuel used by the railroads was coal. Two years ago coal constituted 68 percent of all rail fuel. But today, because of the rapid change to Diesel oil, only 26 percent of all passenger mileage is being regularly provided by steam-powered locomotives and only 46 percent of all freight mileage. These figures are based on normal operations, not on operations curtailed because of the coal strike.

Many other industries are abandoning, or have abandoned, coal as fuel. The steel industry is still a large user, primarily because no effective substitute for coal has been found in steel making. But the research experts of the major steel companies are at work seeking new processes which will permit abandonment of coal. If a process is found—and it is likely one will be found—the demand for coal will take a fresh skid.

The prospect is then that many of the mines now being operated skip-stop fashion because of labor difficulties will close down entirely before many years have passed. The mine owners and miners alike have been trapped by a sweeping change in fuel use, and the closing of the trap has been accelerated by labor wrangling, higher production costs, uncertainties as to supplies.

One characteristic of our highly industrialized economic life is that it is unfriendly to high costs wherever they may be. The coal industry for too long harbored the conviction that the country cannot get along without coal. And now the country is well on the way toward doing it. Any philosophy of production or of management or of marketing which is premised on the belief that the consuming public must have a certain commodity or service or production method is resting on a flimsy foundation in these days of rapid research development and sharp industrial competition.

CARE Book Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star:

CARE BOOK BILL

When at war's end, Selective Service Director General Hershey strongly recommended that the wages earned by the conscientious objectors and paid into the Treasury should be appropriated for a welfare fund for these men and their families, the conscientious objectors themselves rejected the proposal. They voted instead that the money, which amounts to $1,327,641.67, be turned over to CARE for furtherance of its program of restocking the war-ravaged libraries of the world with the latest and best in scientific and technical books and journals. The crying need for such intellectual nourishment in countries which suffered an almost 10-year blackout of medical, scientific, and professional information need hardly be labored here. Nor does it seem necessary to point out that the advantages of making self-help available to professional men in other countries are mutual.

Yet, this humanitarian gesture was slapped down in the House on Wednesday. The measure was defeated amid a chorus of unworthy fulminations about economy, isolationism, and drearily familiar money-down-the-rathole formulas. Since the fund does not come out of tax money, the economy talk is not convincing. The contention that the program duplicates the work of the State Department library service was not well made, since CARE seeks only to provide books for already established national institutions, while the State Department must house, equip, and staff its libraries. The objections voiced to the conscientious objectors themselves were simply irrelevant. These men contributed a total of 8,237,866 man-days of labor during the national emergency. They have, as Representative JUDD, sponsor of the bill, points out, a moral equity in the funds paid to those among them who were assigned to private employers. They have chosen a worthy purpose for their disposition.

Freedom on the Baltic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my privilege to speak at Webster Hall, in New York, to a considerable gathering of American citizens, or prospective citizens, of Lithuanian birth or derivation. The occasion was the meeting, on February 19, of the Luthuanian-American Council of Societies, to celebrate the thirty-second anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Lithuania—a date revered in their hearts, though Nazi terror and Soviet might have eclipsed the reality.

A resolution was adopted at that meeting which, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD at the request of the council, that the dream of liberation may not die:

Citizens of New York meeting under the auspices of the Greater New York Lithuanian-American Council of Societies, on the 19th day of February 1950, at Webster Hall in New York City, for the purpose of fittingly commemorating the occasion of the thirty-second anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Lithuania; after deliberating upon the present-day political situation as it affects Europe and particularly Lithuania and its neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, make note thereof herein and the following resolutions thereon, to wit:

Whereas after military victory over Nazi Germany, the promise of freedom, happiness and justice to the enslaved peoples in Europe has thus far been denied due to the Soviet Russian aggression and the peoples of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors are subjected to systematic mass extinction and deportations to Arctic Russia and Siberia; and

Whereas the Atlantic Charter and four freedoms gave promise of freedom to the enslaved peoples of Europe; that the great powers of the world would not seek territorial aggrandisement and that the Atlantic Charter was a proposed basis for a just peace for which we fought and bled; and

Whereas the peoples of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors Latvia and Estonia have been subjected to mass extinction and deportations of their peoples, fathers separated from their wives and children and families systematically broken and disrupted and it is noted that more than 800,000 persons had disappeared from the country under Soviet auspices prior to 1948 and some 200,000 vanished in the self-same year, and these practices fall within the definition of genocide which is described as the willful destruction, in whole or in part, of a national, ethnical, racial or religious group; and

Whereas the question of the ratification of the Genocide Convention is now before the United States Senate, and it appearing that several of the members of the United Nations have already approved same, and it appearing that genocide is a most horrible crime which must be prevented and punished: It is therefore unanimously

Resolved, That the President of the United States of America and the Secretary of State be requested—

1. That the United States of America in any peace settlement negotiations with Soviet Russia respecting Germany and the countries contiguous thereto, require the preliminary and immediate withdrawal of Russian occupation armies—MVD police and Communist Party forces, from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and to give aid to the peoples of the Baltic states, if so requested, in restoring the political sovereignty and interim regimes of those countries.

2. That the Baltic states in any such negotiations should be fully represented by the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation and the respective Latvian and Estonian representatives directing the liberation services.

3. That we urge most vigorously that the United States Senate ratify the Genocide Convention since it represents the first international legislation designed to effectuate the program initiated in the United Nations to abolish barbarous practices of mass killings and deportation of peoples as having no moral or legal sanction in this mid-twentieth century.

That copies of these resolutions be directed to be sent to the President, Secretary of State, and Members of Congress of the United States from the State of New York.

JOSEPH P. GINKUS,
Chairman.
DANIEL J. AVERKA,
Secretary.

The Tough Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include a very interesting editorial taken from the February 1950 issue of the Louisiana Farm Bureau News. It re-

lates to cotton production and new legislation, and is as follows:

THE TOUGH JOB

Just about the toughest job Congress has to face in writing a cotton acreage bill that will remove certain injustices in the present law is to steer a middle course between the proposals of some folks who have odd ideas about successful farming and other successful business operations and the proposals of other folks who may not understand the situation and who might make it worse by what would be described as inverse generosity.

The present law is unjust to the many growers who would have to make unfairly drastic cut-backs in their cotton acreage. This part of the law should be corrected. But it might be dangerous if the correction went so far as to make the whole acreage-allotment and marketing-quota program ineffective. Cotton growers know that better than anyone else.

Whatever their troubles, cotton growers aren't asking for a free ride on the gravy train. Neither the cotton grower nor any other farm group expects the Government price-support program to take care of unlimited production, or even of production so large that vast surpluses continue to pile up. As a matter of self-interest, it should not be necessary to point out that such a development might endanger the entire price-support program for cotton and even the rest of the farm program.

The Basing-Point System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

NELSON CO.,
Detroit, Mich., February 23, 1950.

The Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WALTER: I have been very much disturbed because certain Members of Congress opposed to S. 1008 have made emphatic statements that this bill is dangerous to and is opposed by the small-business man.

We operate a small local business, employing between 100 and 120 people. The elimination of the basing-point system has already caused us financial losses, and it is apparent to us that unless S. 1008 is made into law our pipe-distribution activity will be destroyed.

I wish, therefore, to present to you, as a member of the conference committee on this bill, the facts as we see them.

I trust that you will take time to read the attached paper and that it will give you some new and additional viewpoints on this legislation.

Yours sincerely,

H. B. DEERBOER,
Purchasing Agent, Nelson Co.

The opponents of the basing point (or more properly, the freight-absorption) pricing system claim that it (1) is harmful to the small-business man; (2) constitutes an unfair method of competition; (3) results in price discrimination; (4) creates monopolies; (5) is in the interests of big business and (6) that legislation to outlawing that or a similar system will destroy present antitrust laws and the Robinson-Patman Act.

It is apparent that, if these claims were correct, this company, composed of loyal Americans operating a small business, would likewise be opposed but our experience with and without basing-point pricing on steel pipe indicates that the evils mentioned above exist only under the nonbasing-point system.

1. Freight-absorption legislation will preserve, not harm, small business.

The steel-pipe mill nearest to Detroit is at Lorain, Ohio. Under the basing-point system, all Detroit steel-pipe distributors bought at the Lorain base, meaning that even though their pipe came from farther away, they paid freight only from Lorain to Detroit. Under nonbasing-point pricing distributors who buy from the Lorain mill pay, because of varying freight charges, $1.20 per ton less than those who buy from Youngstown, Ohio, and $2.80 per ton less than those who buy from Pittsburgh, the two next nearest sources.

In a competitive economy, in a free-enterprise system, a commodity like steel pipe cannot be sold by one distributor at a higher price than his competitors. The distributor buying from the Lorain mill establishes his selling price based on mill costs plus freight from Lorain. Detroit distributors who buy from Youngstown or Pittsburgh must sell at that same price. It is apparent that a distributor whose supply of pipe comes from Pittsburgh at an extra cost of $2.80 per ton, would, on an annual volume of 1,000 tons (which is not unusual) suffer a loss of $2,800 without in any way affecting the corporate big business condemned by the opponents of the freight-absorption pricing system. Small businesses—local distributors of steel pipe—all over America have suffered such and much greater losses since the basing-point pricing system was dropped—and nobody has gained. It is contended that steel mills can absorb these extra freight charges providing they do not do it in collusion. The steel mills, however, claim that such absorption under existing legislation is in violation of the Robinson-Patman Act.

2. Lack of freight-absorption pricing destroys free competition: It is apparent from the above that certain distributors have a cost advantage over others and, therefore, the latter group has no competitive opportunity. Theoretically, competition would be restored if all distributors purchased from the nearest mill but this is impossible under today's conditions because the nearest mill is unable to take on any more distributors in this area. This likewise applies to other mills in other areas. If all pipe distributors in each area bought from one mill it would establish a regional monopoly which would be entirely in control of prices and competition in each area.

3. Lack of freight-absorption pricing causes price discrimination: From the above example, it is apparent that price discrimination is not a fault of the freight-absorption pricing system but is caused by the lack of such system.

4. Lack of freight-absorption pricing will create monopolies:

In the absence of freight-absorption pricing, all distributors of steel pipe will eventually be compelled, so far as is possible, to make their purchases from the closest source of supply or go out of the pipe distribution business. Under these circumstances, each steel pipe producer will have a monopoly in the area in which he has a freight advantage. This condition does not exist at present because some mills do not have sufficient capacity to supply everyone in their monopoly area, while other mills are able to produce a great deal more than their monopoly area can consume. As some mills increase their production while others reduce theirs, the eventual consequence will be that each mill will have only sufficient capacity, manpower, and machines to supply their own monopoly area.

For example, many steel pipe distributors on the eastern coast who previously purchased their pipe elsewhere now buy it from a mill at Sparrows Point, Md., because of freight losses if purchased from their previous source. When the lines are finally drawn and each mill is producing only the pipe they can sell in their own monopoly area, a shutdown of the Sparrows Point mill because of labor difficulties, fire, an act of God or any other cause would mean that the entire east coast would have no source of supply. This same condition would apply to all monopoly areas.

5. Lack of freight-absorption pricing benefits Big Steel, hurts Little Steel.

The first effect of the banning of basing-point pricing was the voluntary and involuntary discontinuance of sales by steel mills to customers in areas where freight cost difference would compel these customers to seek a nearer source of supply when steel shortages no longer exist. Thus, large steel corporations with multiple-plants have an advantage over smaller one-plant producers.

The second effect was an endeavor, successful in many cases, to persuade steel-consuming manufacturers to move their plants or build new ones near to existing steel mills. This can be accomplished by guaranteeing a supply of steel to consuming-manufacturers nearest the mill.

Smaller one-plant steel corporations supplying distant customers cannot, without freight-absorption pricing, compete with large multiple-plant producers having a plant nearer the customer and must, therefore, seek customers nearer home or go out of business.

It is the contention of opponents of freight-absorption pricing that new steel mills will be built in various parts of the country to supply high-consumption areas. There is nothing to stop such construction under freight-absorption pricing as witnessed by the steel mills in Detroit and elsewhere which were built during the basing-point pricing era.

Under a non-freight-absorption pricing system, however, the restriction of sales in monopoly areas, the transportation cost of raw materials and several other important factors would legislate against the construction of new mills in many if not all areas where mills do not now exist. It is very probable, too, that if such mills were constructed they would be built by the larger steel corporations, thus further stifling small steel. Steel mills cannot be constructed as cheaply nor as quickly as other manufacturing plants and, therefore, it is to the interests of Big Steel to persuade steel-consuming industry to come to steel rather than steel to go to them. The old saying, "It is easier to sweep the little to the lot than the lot to the little" aptly expresses this condition.

6. Lack of freight-absorption pricing may centralize industry: Inasmuch as it is improbable that steel mills will be built all over the country and inasmuch as steel-consuming industry has already begun to move nearer existing steel mills, it is very possible that the final result will be a centralization of industry that could be very disastrous to our country if war should occur.

7. Lack of freight-absorption pricing restrict freedom of choice:

When the inevitable happens and all pipe distributors in each area are purchasing, as a matter of survival, their supply of pipe from the one pipe mill most advantageously situated to serve their area, neither they nor the ultimate consumer will have any choice as to which brand of pipe they may buy.

For example, recently a steel consumer wishes to buy two carloads of pipe made of a special steel needed for a specific purpose. They first approached the nearest mill because pipe from there would cost them less. The pipe was needed within 60 days and the nearest mill could not make delivery of all items within that time. The next nearest mill (still operating in the Detroit area only because the nearest mill cannot take care of all demands for standard pipe) agreed to supply those items of pipe which the nearest mill could not furnish.

When, as is inevitable under a non-freight-absorption pricing system, all pipe mills have adjusted their production capacity to take care of only their monopoly area, such freedom of choice will be impossible and the consumer will be compelled to wait until the monopoly-area mill can take care of his needs.

8. Freight-absorption legislation need not affect anti-trust legislation nor the Robinson-Patman Act:

The Robinson-Patman Act, as well as all antitrust legislation, was designed to protect the American people from those who might have the power to destroy the opportunity for free competition on which this country was built. The lack of freight-absorption pricing on commodities destroys that opportunity and, therefore, legislation to keep that opportunity in existence is in line with such laws rather than opposed to them.

9. Effects of regional monopolies created by lack of freight-absorption pricing: Consider some of the effects of regional monopolies in the manufacture of steel pipe. Assume that all of the steel pipe needed for gas, water, steam, oil, air, and thousands of industrial uses in any manufacturing area came from one producer, that which could deliver pipe to that area at the lowest price and asume, too, that some unavoidable circumstance forces that mill to suspend operation. Where, then, would the people of that area get steel pipe? All other mills would be operating at full capacity to supply the requirements of their own monopoly area and would not be capable of nor interested in taking on the requirements of an area which will not need them when the monopoly mill resumes operation. What would happen under those circumstances if our country should suddenly be thrown into war as it was on December 8, 1941? If the Detroit area was the one affected, how would war-matériel plants be able to do their part? If it was an oil-producing area, what then? And even in peacetime, how would the emergency problems in plumbing, heating, manufacturing, gasoline refining and distribution and the thousands of other places where steel pipe is a necessity be solved?

This presentation is based almost entirely on one steel product, pipe, but practically everything which has been said about it applies as well to all steel products. Regional monopolies will restrict the production of all manufacturers, will prevent the starting of new enterprises, will stifle the need for industrial research, thus depriving the American people of new and improved products and will seriously damage if not destroy the American system of competition and the most important guaranty of the American Constitution, the freedom of opportunity.

Thoughts About War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bruce Barton from the Washington Sunday Star of March 5, 1950:

THOUGHTS ABOUT WAR

(By Bruce Barton)

We Americans romanticize too much—about everything from love to hot dogs. But one thing we should be coldly realistic about is war.

To bring our history into better focus, we might begin by remembering our wars. What we call World Wars I and II really were III and IV.

World War I was Europe's Seven Years' War, England and Prussia were allies against France, Austria, Russia, Sweden, and Spain. Over here it was the French and Indian War. Our ancestors teamed up with the British (George Washington was a young officer in the English forces) and tossed out the French.

World War II (a continuation of I) we call our American Revolution. Our ancestors teamed up with the French and threw out the British.

Both these wars were fought for splendid principles, but they also were very profitable.

The last profitable wars that ever will be waged were our Mexican War and England's war in South Africa. By our peace treaty we got from Mexico, for a paltry $15,000,000, Utah, Nevada, California, and large parts of New Mexico, Arizona, and Colorado. The British got the South African gold and diamond mines.

Our war with Spain grew out of what the great historian, Charles A. Beard, called the devil theory of war. There are in the world good people—ourselves—and bad people—devils. When the devils do what we good people think they shouldn't do, it is our duty to shoot them.

The Spaniards were doing wrong to the Cubans. We fought them in an inexpensive, badly managed war, and promptly were victorious. We wound up with Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and a sort of general mortgage on Cuba—all rich islands.

What we didn't realize until later was that these islands had masses of poor people, for whom we had made ourselves responsible. We have paid billions for that easy victory and still are paying.

World wars III and IV almost could be called the wars that nobody won. The English and Germans and French now know that, while they were shooting enemies, they were shooting customers. They lost their wealth, their plants, and their markets. For our part, we are paying through the nose to support both our allies and our enemies.

World war V, if it comes, will complete the destruction of Great Britain and Europe, throw Russia back into barbarism, wipe out our entire wealth, and destroy all the progress we have made in our 150 years as a nation.

These thoughts are unpopular. It is popular to talk about our moral obligation to prepare to defend freedom all over the world. I prefer to talk about a war that we somehow ought to be smart enough to avoid, since it is perfectly certain, that while we won't lose, we cannot possibly win.

Apportionment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding persons in the country who has devoted a lifetime of study to the problem of congressional reapportionment is Dr. Walter F. Willcox, formerly of Cornell University, now living at 3 South Avenue, Ithaca, N. Y. A summary of the results of his studies has been published in a recent issue of the Cornell Law Quarterly. However, Dr. Willcox has written to me his own summarization of the conclusions reached as the result of his studies, which I am taking the liberty of inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for reference by any future students of this problem, as well as for the assistance of appropriate committees of the Congress and the Congress itself in dealing with the question of congressional reapportionment.

Because of Dr. Willcox's outstanding position in this field, I feel certain that his views, conclusions, and recommendations will merit and receive the careful consideration and attention of the Congress.

ITHACA, N. Y., *February 17, 1950.*

Hon. W. STERLING COLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLE: After nearly 50 years of work on the apportionment problem I have reached results which are explained and defended in an article in the forthcoming number of the Cornell LAW QUARTERLY, two preprints of which go to you under another cover. A summary of the conclusions follows:

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The number of methods of apportionment which satisfy the mathematical conditions of the problem is indefinitely large.

There is no mathematical reason for preferring one method of apportionment to another.

When these different methods are applied to the 1940 figures, nineteen different results are reached. Under the 1950 figures the number is not likely to be less.

These results differ only in the number and the allotment of what might be called transferable seats, that is, seats which would go by one extreme method to a State with more and by the other extreme method to a State with less than the average population.

Between these extreme methods a series of intermediate methods can be constructed so that each method would transfer one, and only one, seat from a large State to a small one, or vice versa, as compared with the methods on either side of it in the series.

The proper basis for preferring one set of results to another is to be found not in mathematical or political considerations but in deciding how to interpret the ambiguous phrase of the Constitution, "shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers."

The method which was used before 1840 apportioned all transferable seats to large States, although there is no evidence that Congress intended this or realized that it was the inevitable result of the method.

The debates and votes since 1840 indicate that Congress now aims at equalizing the district population in the two groups of large and small States.

Every method used or proposed for a century has divided the transferable seats almost evenly between large and small States.

These methods differ in the weight given to fractional remainders. The one used before 1840 rejected all such remainders. The intermediate methods which succeeded it give additional seats to remainders larger than about one-half but differ among themselves in where they place the critical fractions separating those large ones which are given weight from those smaller ones which are rejected. The smaller the critical fraction, the more transferable seats are apportioned to small States.

Among this group of intermediate methods the method of major fractions, under which the critical fraction is one-half, makes the district population of the two groups of large and small States most nearly equal.

Under 1940 figures the present method of equal proportions requires a critical fraction of .45 instead of .50. Whenever its results differ from those of the method of major fractions, that is because it adopts a critical fraction somewhat less than .50.

If Congress should decide that the conflict of interests between large and small States, so crucial in the constitutional convention, a conflict which points to the method of major fractions, is no longer important and that in consequence to aim at equalizing the district population of the 48 States individually is better than to aim at equalizing the district population of the two groups as units, that decision would point toward the method of included fractions.

The realization since 1900 that Congress must start apportionment, not from scratch, but with a body of 48 Representatives, one for each State, prescribed by the Constitution tells also in favor of the method of included fractions.

Under that method Representatives are apportioned one after another, beginning with No. 49, to whatever State has at that point the largest district population.

The results of the method of included fractions differ from those of the method of equal proportions and all other methods by reducing the difference between the largest and the smallest of the 48 district populations and also reducing their average to the lowest point possible.

W. F. WILLCOX.

Actual Farmers Headed for Trouble in the Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to sound this note of warning to the Members of Congress who represent the actual farmers of this country. Acreage allotments are based on the 4-year average preceding the year for which the allotment is determined. For example in 1952, the allotment will be based on the acreage of 1948, '49, '50, and '51.

Individuals and incorporated concerns, who are not actual farmers and have no interest in a home on the land, are busy in western Kansas and Colorado breaking up thousands and thousands of acres of land with high-powered machinery. To show just how fast these acres are being brought in by big operators, I will say that there were 7,000 acres brought in 1942 and 177,000 in 1949.

In 1949 a contractor broke up 63 sections of land in Colorado, and that process is quite general in those two States. By 1952 there will be 8,000,000 acres of additional wheat acreage, hence if this acreage is spread over the years 1948, 1949, 1950, and 1951, those 8,000,000 acres will be eligible for allotment. Since the allotment program is based on acreage, these 8,000,000 acres will compete with those who have made and are making farming a business. Those farmers will have to share the allotment acreage with those bringing in these huge acres, and in North Dakota alone, by 1952, it will mean that the farmers will be cut a 1,000,000 acres.

On the small farms, where farmers live and operate on a family-sized farm, the acreage allowed will be so curtailed that the small farmer will be unable to plant enough wheat to supply his family, pay for his expenses, taxes, and machine equipment. In fact, that situation is already here in a small way, and many farmers who operate small units are objecting vehemently to the acreage cuts for 1950.

Another cause for great alarm among small farms is the fact that in figuring the acreage base, not only the actual land planted to wheat, but the summer-tilled acreage all goes in as cropped land and swells the historic base.

Unless the members of the Agriculture Committees of the Senate and House are alert and understand what this wholesale production of new acres means, the whole farm belt will be up against such a severe cut in acreage that many small farmers will be put out of business.

Not much harm has yet been done, but looking ahead just a year or two it is easy to see the disaster awaiting.

Isthmian Canals and Atomic Bomb Defense Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in previous extensions of remarks I have commented at length with respect to the basic fallacy in the presentations of the promoters who urge the building of a new Panama Canal at sea level on the alleged ground that such construction is dictated by the atomic bomb and new weapon dangers.

In my extensions I have unfailingly emphasized the view that the security of any type of canal depends not upon passive defense features that may be embodied in the designs of construction, but upon the active might of our armed forces supported by our industrial capacity and the traditional American spirit.

It is most fitting, therefore, to include in the RECORD an enlightening statement of Dr. Vannevar Bush, the eminent authority on modern weapons, on the general subject of defense against atomic bombs and the projected hydrogen bomb, made before the Senate Committee on Armed Services on February 9, 1950, and published in the Associated Press dispatches on that date.

The full text of the Associated Press story follows:

A-BOMB DEFENSE PLANS BASED ON OLD METHODS—DR. BUSH SAYS NO TRICK WAY HAS BEEN FOUND TO DEFEND UNITED STATES FROM ATOMIC ATTACK

WASHINGTON, February 9.—Dr. Vannevar Bush, atomic scientist, said today there was no trick way to defend the United States against attack by A-bombs or the projected hydrogen superbomb.

"There is no defense against a bomb, as such," Dr. Bush told newsmen after he had testified at a secret 2-hour session before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

By that he said he meant no method had yet been worked out by American scientists to detonate atomic weapons carried by enemy planes before the bombs have been dropped.

Dr. Bush quickly hedged, however, by saying defenses against any new weapons developed so quickly it is dangerous to forecast what may emerge from defense laboratories in the future.

ONLY TWO WAYS OF DEFENSE

But at present, he said, the only way to defend against an atomic bomb is to "stop the airplane or other carrier before it gets to the target—bomb the place that is manufacturing the bombs."

Dr. Bush was one of the Nation's top scientists advising military leaders during World War II. He served as Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development and as adviser to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Behind closed doors Dr. Bush talked at length with members of the Armed Services Committee, drawing a broad picture of what can be expected in future warfare.

Senators were close-mouthed about his testimony, but Chairman TYDINGS, Democrat of Maryland, later told newsmen Dr. Bush said there was no "complete defense" against atomic or hydrogen bombs. "Dr. Bush gave us a very concise account of modern warfare and what has been and is being done," TYDINGS said.

The Maryland Senator said Dr. Bush urged "more research and development" toward building up national defense, but TYDINGS gave no details.

Coincidentally, Senator BRICKER, Republican of Ohio, dropped a hint that United States scientists possibly have been working on the H-bomb far longer than generally supposed. It was a week ago Tuesday that President Truman gave the go-ahead order for development of the so-called hell bomb.

But BRICKER, a member of the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee, commented to newsmen:

"Dr. Bush told us about the hydrogen bomb 3 years ago—about as much as has been made public recently."

Estimates on how long it would take to build the H-bomb have ranged from 1 to 4 or 5 years. Scientists say it would be 8 to 1,000 times more devastating than the wartime A-bomb and theoretically would have no limit to its destructive fury.

Froelich's Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, the February 28, 1950, issue of the Development Bulletin published by the Iowa Development Commission contains the little-known but dramatic story of the invention of the tractor by John Froelich, of Froelich, Iowa, in my district.

Modern farming on the scale which it is practiced in the United States would be impossible without the tractor. Its invention initiated the rise of the American farmer as the greatest food producer in the history of mankind. The name of the inventor, John Froelich, should be as familiar to every schoolboy as the names Eli Whitney, Cyrus McCormick, and Luther Burbank. Unfortunately, Froelich's name is relatively unknown.

It is important that we revere the memories of these great inventive geniuses, not merely because of their marvelous contributions to the advancement of civilization, but also because they symbolize what freemen can accomplish under a free-enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article referred to:

IOWAN INVENTED TRACTOR

About the time the cry of "Gold" rocked a growing nation, another cry was heard out on the prairie land of Iowa, made by a baby boy who was destined to invent a machine which would revolutionize farm work.

The machine he was to invent in Iowa alone helps cultivate the fields which annually produce more wealth than all the gold mines in the world.

Today, that machine—the tractor—is the flagship of the farm, with more than 2,000,000 in operation on farms in the United States. About 213,000 are in Iowa.

The inventor, John Froelich, is little known.

John Froelich was born November 24, 1849, in Giard, Iowa, but was living in nearby Froelich (named after his father) when he began dreaming of plans for the tractor.

From youth he had shown an inventive turn of mind. Among his inventions were a washing machine and a corn picker. But, like his father, he was also a businessman and operated an elevator and feed mill at Froelich in the 1880's.

He made good side money with a well-digging outfit and for 4 years took his threshing rig on "runs" in Iowa and South Dakota. It was during the time Froelich operated his two outfits that he realized the impracticality of the big steam engines which made modern farming at that time.

Then in 1890 John Froelich started hinting around about a mechanical power machine he had in mind. Most folks around the community were amused. They admitted he was a good businessman, but after all John wouldn't see 40 again, and he knew better than to go around saying that some day traction engines would do the work of horses on farms. And as for his talk about a smaller traction engine that would run on gasoline—had he been out in the sun too much?

John Froelich heard these snide remarks, but went about his work. In 1892 he went to Cincinnati where he bought a large vertical one-cylinder gasoline-powered engine which he shipped back home. It had a 14-inch stroke and bore. He placed the engine on wooden beams mounted on the running gear of a steam traction engine.

The two parts didn't fit together too well. In fact, in many respects, they didn't fit at all, and Froelich and his helper, William Mann, had to borrow, design, and recast many new parts.

It took time, but gradually in John Froelich's little blacksmith shop there took form a hybrid contraption that made folks smile. But the day came when the machine was assembled and ready for trial.

Froelich tugged at the massive flywheel. The machine wouldn't start.

No matter how hard Froelich and Mann yanked on the flywheel, the machine simply would not start; and somewhere, among the spectators, there was a snickered "I thought so."

Then Mann had an idea.

He twisted the bullet from a rifle cartridge, wedged the cartridge in the priming cup, hit it with a hammer.

That did it.

With a cough and a roar, the engine came to life and the flywheel began to spin. The closest spectator jumped back, horses reared and tried to pull loose from the nearby hitching rail. "Good boy, John," shouted the spectator who a few minutes before had scoffed.

Froelich, on the driving platform, nimbly eased his invention into gear. It lurched forward. "Back 'er up, John," someone called. He tried the reverse. The machine clanked backwards.

Out on the road he went, and to a farm where a neighbor was threshing grain. His machine was substituted for the steam engine. It did the job.

That was a summer day in 1892 when the first self-propelled gasoline-powered traction engine, capable of forward and reverse motions, chugged along at the snail's pace of 2 miles per hour.

A few weeks later, Froelich and a crew took the new invention and a new threshing machine to South Dakota where they harvested 72,000 bushels of grain.

Success seemed a cinch. But success was still 20 years away, and John Froelich was to be separated from his invention which went on to fame and became the product of a whole new industry.

After successful field tests, a group of businessmen at Waterloo organized the Waterloo Gasoline Traction Engine Co. John Froelich was president. The company built two tractors, but both were returned. Somehow all efforts to manufacture a practical tractor failed.

But John Froelich believed in his machine and experimentation went on. Then, in 1895, after the company had decided to make stationary gasoline engines to secure income to offset experimentation costs, the company was reorganized as the Waterloo Gasoline Engine Co. But John Froelich, whose interest was in tractors not in engines, withdrew from the company. Later he moved to St. Paul, Minn., where he died May 23, 1933.

In 1913 the company offered a successful model—a two-cylinder opposed engine on a four-wheel chassis. Twenty tractors were sold. The tide had turned.

The upsurge has gone on, and in its wake great plants have arisen throughout the Nation, some of them in Iowa, which make the tractors that came from the brain of John Froelich, of Giard, Iowa.

He has been almost forgotten down the roll call of years. Even after the value of his contribution to agriculture was established, the world gave him little recognition. But Froelich, Iowa, the town where his dream started, remembered him. In 1939 the little community dedicated a historical marker to his memory. Part of the marker reads:

"In this village, John Froelich built the first gasoline tractor that propelled itself backward as well as forward. Far reaching in its effect on modern agricultural history, it moved out of this village and into the world in 1892."

Reform of Electoral College System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter sent to me by J. Harvie Williams, a constituent of mine, who is a student of political science. Mr. Williams has made a careful analysis of the present electoral college system, the Lodge-Gossett proposal, and my resolution, House Joint Resolution 414, which is an alternative reform proposal of the present electoral college system.

The letter follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 22, 1950.*

Hon. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COUDERT: As you requested, I have made a comprehensive study of the comparative effect of the electoral reforms proposed in Lodge-Gossett amendment and in the amendment which you introduced on February 6 in House Joint Resolution 414.

To Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, and Representative GOSSETT, of Texas, must go the bulk of the credit for bringing the need of electoral reform to the fore in the public mind. And to Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., of Princeton, N. J., must go the credit for the most scholarly and complete study of the subject that I have seen, published as the leading article in Political Science Quarterly for March 1949. These gentlemen have forced the cause to its present vantage point in public thought. They have pointed out some of the weaknesses of our present electoral system. Senator LODGE has won the acclaim of all friends of electoral reform by his remarkable achievement in winning more than a two-thirds majority (64 to 27) in the Senate for his electoral reform plan, although many able and thoughtful men question the principle on which it is founded and doubt seriously that it would solve the problem in view.

Before the House of Representatives comes to act on the measure, most careful consideration should be given to these questions regarding it:

1. Does the Lodge-Gossett amendment conform to the established structure of American government?

2. Does it bring into closer balance the electoral power and the congressional power of the political parties in the States and therefore in the Nation?

3. Does it reduce or eliminate the present basis of ideological conflict between the President and the Congress—the greatest weakness of the present system?

The whole case for the electoral college is set forth in a single paragraph in George Bancroft's History of the United States, VI (pp. 339–349):

"And now the whole line of march to the mode of the election of the President can be surveyed. The Convention at first reluctantly conferred that office on the National Legislature; and to prevent the possibility of failure by a negative vote of one House or the other, to the Legislature voting in joint ballot. To escape from the danger of cabal and corruption, it next transferred the full and final power of choice to an electoral college that should be the exact counterpart of the joint convention of the two Houses in the representation of the States as units as well as population of the States, and should meet at the seat of Government. Then fearing that so large a number of men would not travel to the seat of government for that single purpose, or might be hindered on the way, they most reluctantly went back to the choice of the two Houses in joint convention. At this moment the thought arose that the electors might cast their votes in their own States, and transmit the certificates of their ballots to the seat of government. Accordingly, the work of electing a President was divided; the Convention removed the act of voting from the joint session of the two Houses to

electoral colleges in the several States, the act of voting to be followed by the transmission of authenticated certificates of the votes to a branch of the General Legislature at the seat of government; and then it restored to the two Houses in the presence of each other the same office of counting the collected certificates which they would have performed had the choice remained with the two Houses of the Legislature.

Thus it is clear that the founding fathers regarded the electoral college as a counterpart body of the whole Congress. It was necessary then—and still is necessary now—to articulate the Federal and national features of our Government in the election of a President as they are articulated in the two Houses of Congress, the Senate being a Federal body with equal representation for the States as units and the House of Representatives being a national body with representation based on the population of the States. Too, the electoral college was and is necessary to maintain the separation of executive and legislative power, an essential element in the structure of our National Government. This articulation of Federal and national principles in our Constitution, while the result of a political compromise in the Convention, is the root of our greatest contribution to the knowledge and practice of statecraft and government—the eminent and successful principle of dual sovereignty.

To each State the founding fathers gave electoral power equal to its congressional power, and so it remains today. But the concept of the electoral college as the counterpart of Congress in the articulation of Federal and national electoral power was destroyed by political leaders of the larger party in each of the States. To win all of the electoral power in a State these political leaders had things rearranged so that all presidential electors ran for election on general State-wide tickets. This is the arrangement that permits the entire electoral vote of a State to go to the presidential candidate of one party by as little as one vote plurality. This practice is the source of the complaints against our present electoral system. This is the situation sought to be corrected. I don't believe there are very many among the American people who want to change violently the structure of our Government, and I am certain that the sponsors of the Lodge-Gossett amendment are not among that number.

I am equally certain that the Coudert electoral reform plan embodied in House Joint Resolution 414, will make the electoral college the exact counterpart of a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives. It provides:

"SECTION 1. Each State shall choose a number of electors of the President and Vice President, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress, in the same manner as its Senators and Representatives are chosen * * *."

The effect of this provision would be to put an end to the prevailing practice in the States of choosing all of their presidential electors by the general State-wide ticket system. Rather, only the two Federal electors, corresponding to each State's two Senators, would be elected on a State-wide basis, unless, as in some States, some of the Representatives are elected at large; and the national electors, corresponding to the Representatives in Congress, would be elected in congressional districts, or at large in a few cases.

Adoption of the Coudert amendment would have these important political effects:

1. Divide each State's electoral power among the parties on the same basis that its congressional power is divided among them. Thus national parties would have electoral power commensurate with their congressional power—an ideal situation.

2. Give the Presidency to any party that won a bare majority (218) of the seats in the House, and won a bare majority of the States (25) with two electors each, for a total of 268 electoral votes, or won more congressional districts and carried fewer States.

3. The President and the whole Congress would have exactly the same constituency cast up in the same form. Pressure groups of all kinds would have the same weight in electing the President that they have in electing the whole membership of the House and Senate. There would be no basis for an ideological conflict between the President and the Congress when both were of such close political complexion.

4. Both large and small States would have their political weight properly divided among the parties in the election of the President.

5. States having large blocs of doubtful electoral votes would no longer be the exclusive sources of party candidates for President, although they would continue to have the largest delegations at the nominating conventions.

6. New York's 47 doubtful electoral votes under the present system would be reduced to a doubtful 12 under the Coudert amendment, since only 10 of its 45 House seats (43 before 1932) have changed their party representation since 1920. The two Federal electors would always be doubtful. New York would continue to be a dominant State, but its dominance would not be overwhelming. The same would be true of other large States like Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and California.

It is clear, then, that the Coudert amendment conforms squarely with the established structure of our National Government, that it would almost exactly balance the electoral and congressional power of the political parties, and thus would eliminate the basis of the present ideological conflict between the President and the Congress—a conflict that will doom our form of government if it is not soon ended.

It should be noted that the Coudert amendment maintains the requirement of a majority of the electoral vote for the election of the President; and it should be emphasized that the majority requirement is the primary basis of our two-party political system. Under the Coudert amendment, when no candidate for President or Vice President received a majority of the electoral vote the final choices would be made by a joint session of Congress voting as a single body, from among the persons having the three highest numbers of votes on the lists of those voted for for each office. Three-fourths of the combined membership of the Senate and the House would be required as a quorum.

On the other hand, by introducing a new and novel application of the principle of proportional representation for the division of each State's electoral vote proportionally among the candidates for President, and allowing the election of a President by a plurality of only 40 percent of the electoral vote, the Lodge-Gossett amendment would violate the established structure of our National Government and remove the foundation of the two-party system. By abolishing the electoral college entirely the Lodge-Gossett amendment attempts to remove the Federal feature from our form of government, insofar as it is possible politically to do so. It denies the validity of dual sovereignty.

Conceivably in 25 years, once the proportional principle has been dignified with constitutional authority, several of our larger States will be electing their Representatives in Congress by some system of proportional representation; and, conceivably, several new minor parties will be electing, together, a bloc of 25 to 35 Representatives who will be a continuing balance of power in the Congress of the United States. It should be remembered that the proportional principle is the source of the multiparty systems that have paralyzed European governments and brought up dictators to relieve the paralysis. Both Hitler and Mussolini had their political origins in the conditions created by proportional representation.

Based on previous elections, which can only be guides, for under either, electoral reform plan campaigns would have been conducted differently, the Lodge-Gossett amendment would have violently shifted the parties' source of electoral power. The Republicans in 1948 would have won from the Democrats 32.4 additional electoral votes. But, 20.2 of them would have come from the 11 Southern States and 13.9 of them would have come from the five border States of Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, and Oklahoma, for a total of 44.1 electoral votes. A Republican loss of 11.7 electoral votes in the 32 Northern States brings the net gain down to 32.4 electoral votes. To match this gain of 44.1 votes in electoral power in the Southern States and the border States the Republicans have only 5 House seats of congressional power and carried only the State of Maryland by a plurality.

A comprehensive study of the prospective shifts of electoral power under the Lodge-Gossett amendment reveals that Republican gains are consistently in the southern and border States and the Republican losses are, of course, in the North. Both parties would lose electoral power where they would have congressional power, and would gain electoral power where they have little or no chance of gaining congressional power. Thus, the Lodge-Gossett amendment would produce as great a disparity between the sources of the parties' electoral and congressional power as exists under the present system, with a growing basis for the continuance of the ideological conflict between the President and the Congress.

There is enclosed a table showing the net electoral vote advantage by the sectional political divisions of the country for the parties in terms of the Coudert plan over the Lodge plan, for the 1948, 1944, and 1940 elections.

You will note that the Coudert plan is consistently better for Republicans in the 32 Northern States—both in the 8 largest States and in the other 24—and is equally advantageous for the Democrats in the border and Southern States. Except in 1940 when some odd parties elected Representatives in some of the Western States, other parties are consistent net losers in all sections under the Coudert plan. Vice versa, the other parties would be consistent gainers in all sections under the Lodge-Gossett plan.

Sincerely,

J. HARVIE WILLIAMS.

Red Victim Bares Confession Agony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following article from the Brooklyn Eagle by Edward V. Roberts entitled "Red Victim Bares Confession Agony":

RED VICTIM BARES CONFESSION AGONY

(By Edward V. Roberts)

WASHINGTON, March 4.—A man who may now be dead has given the free world its first detailed picture of Communist secret police methods used to obtain confessions in Soviet-type political trials.

The State Department said today the story—a tragic tale of the utter break-down of a man's will to resist—is the first time the civilized world has been told how the Soviets force men to swear publicly to crimes they did not commit.

The Department released a sworn statement by Michael Shipkov, former employee of the United States Legation in Bulgaria, describing how he confessed espionage and treason after 32 hours of questioning and torture by the Bulgarian State Security Militia last August.

After confessing he agreed to return to the Legation and serve as an informer for the police. Instead, he immediately wrote the details of his experience in an affidavit which he gave to American officials. Then he remained hidden in the Legation for 6 months.

He finally left February 11, was recaptured, and promptly indicted for treason.

HIS FATE STILL A MYSTERY

Inasmuch as such trials frequently are carried out in secret, there is no way of knowing whether he has yet been tried. The penalty for treason in Bulgaria is death.

The State Department suggested that Shipkov's affidavit shed light on how confessions were obtained from Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, imprisoned for treason in Hungary; Robert A. Vogeler, American businessman, imprisoned for espionage in Hungary; and 15 Protestant pastors convicted of spying for the United States last year in Bulgaria.

Shipkov's story was told in an 8,000-word affidavit, written in longhand. He told how his confession was extracted from him and how he was made to implicate others. The confession, he said, was "dragged out of me against my will, against any knowledge of actual truth, under duress."

Shipkov said he was questioned by seven militiamen, working in teams. The interrogation began on a Saturday afternoon and continued until Sunday night. The only interruptions, he said, came during his periodic collapses from exhaustion.

During most of the questioning Shipkov was forced to stand facing a wall, bent forward, with one finger of each hand pressing against the wall. When his answers were unsatisfactory he was slapped or struck on the back of the neck.

"This posture does not appear unduly painful, nor did it particularly impress me in the beginning. And yet, combined with the mental strain, with the continuous pressure to talk, with the utter hopelessness and the longing to go through the thing and be sent down into silence and peace—it is a very effective manner of breaking down all resistance," Shipkov wrote.

"And after a time of this I broke down. I told them I was willing and eager to tell them all they wanted. The main appeal is to end the pain, to stop needless, futile resistance, and to come nearer to the moment when they would let me in peace."

Shipkov thought the worst was over then. They let him sit down, gave him a cigarette, "even lit it for me."

But he was wrong. The interrogation was only beginning. The inquisitors wanted details.

"And this went on, hour after hour, throughout the night, throughout the day, without respite or end.

"How can I best explain?" he wrote. "The only straw for which I could reach is the impression that I had, in my emptied, vacant thoughts, of some sentence that had pleased them, or that had conformed with the pattern I had so often seen in the [Communist] newspapers.

"And if I were to stop and plead fatigue, or poor memory, or ask to rest—the wall again and again, and the slaps and the blows in the nape. And I remembered I would come up gasping and talk and talk and feel utterly broken."

CONFESSION WRUNG BIT BY BIT

Bit by bit, he said, he made the "confession" they wanted, naming people they seemed to want named, inventing details they wanted; yes, he had spied for the British and for the Americans, and on the Americans for the British; yes, he had distorted events in Bulgaria "to provoke hatred and cause foreign intervention"; and so on, for hours and hours.

Out of his agonies Shipkov's mind retained two vivid impressions which he wrote down:

"1. They are not overinterested in what you tell them. It would appear that the ultimate purpose of this treatment is to break you down completely and deprive you of any will power or private thought or self-esteem, which they achieve remarkably quickly.

"2. I rarely could perceive any personal hatred or enmity for me—contempt certainly, but sooner an academic detachment dealing with an annoying problem * * * and a fanatic, rabid devotion to communism and hatred for Anglo-American resistance to them."

Alaska Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, Statehood for Alaska, lead editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune for March 7, makes such a compelling argument for Alaska statehood that it answers every objection which has been raised against the statehood bill which was approved by this House last week. I do not see how anyone could fail to be swayed by the persuasive language of the Herald Tribune editorial which is quoted here in full text:

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

At a time when Russia frowns across the Bering Strait at the northernmost frontier of the United States, it is of supreme importance that Alaska be a strong point of American defense. This is not exclusively, nor even most importantly, a matter of physical armament. It requires, rather, that Alaska be sound and vigorous, militarily, economically and politically; that it share in the main currents of American life. In the cold war, the best garrisons are not those who wear uniforms; they are citizens with the full rights of citizenship, promoting the prosperity of their communities and aware of their responsibilities. Such rights as Alaskans have enjoyed under the Territorial government are, to be sure, far superior to those which any subject of a Soviet dictatorship is granted by his masters. But American freedom should not be exemplified in a crucial region, by half measures. As an example of the intrinsic dynamism of the American way, if for no other reason, Alaska should be admitted to statehood.

Such a decision—which has already been approved by the House of Representatives—will have other practical benefits. As a State, represented in Congress and able to vote for Presidents, Alaska could attract a larger population, work more freely to develop the riches of its huge area, help to dispel the ignorance which has hampered its growth. Too many Americans are still only vaguely aware of the potentialities of Alaska; its semidependent status has fostered an impression of wild wastelands, romantic but exotic. To bring Alaska into the familiar political pattern of the American States will adjust this viewpoint, allow a more realistic appraisal of Alaska's value and encourage the investment of capital, skills, and human hopes.

Yesterday the House gave a voice vote for statehood for Hawaii as well. There is no necessary connection between the two; Hawaii must be considered on its own merits, which are strong. But the Alaskan case is, in our judgment, overwhelming. Virtually all of the opposition in the House to Alaska's entry has been based on political considerations—the fact that as a State it would have two Senators, like all the rest, despite the disparity between its present population and that of New York, for example, or California. But if statehood will increase Alaska's citizenry, it would be a mistake to hamper the growth of an important portion of America because of a situation which may well be temporary and which, in any case, was expressly provided in the Constitution to balance the political power of large and small States. Shifts in population have before this made many of the arguments used against the acquisition of Territories by the United States ludicrous—it used to be said, for example, that Oregon was worthless because of the "1,500 miles of unredeemed and invincible sterility, with a backbone of snow-covered and (for most of their length) impassable mountains" separating that region from the East. Time proved the folly of this judgment; given courage and imagination in Congress, time can do the same for Alaska.

The Challenge of Atheism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Challenge of Atheism," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, an officer of the Mystic Shrine, before the joint meeting of the Central States and Midwest Shrine Associations, Sioux City, Iowa, on February 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF ATHEISM

There is a Godless ideology in this troubled world of ours that is spreading like a prairie fire. Loyal and God-fearing Americans cannot read their newspapers or listen to their radios without recoiling emotionally at the thought that we have in our country an organization whose leaders brazenly tell us that in time of war, if that war were with the Soviet Union, they would follow the Red flag instead of the Stars and Stripes. That, I submit, is a plea of guilty of treason in advance of the act.

We face a more formidable enemy today than ever before in the history of this Republic. We face an enemy who can and who will destroy us if we permit him to divide us, as he is well on the way to do. In 1939 he was an enemy of 170,000,000 people. In 1945 he was an enemy of 345,000,000

people. In 1950 he is an enemy of 800,000,000 people. In 1939 he lay east of Poland. In 1950 he is on the River Elbe with nothing between him and the English Channel but weak, divided, and disorganized people whom his agents have infiltrated. In 1950 he is controlling the whole western Pacific, from Vladivostok to the Hainan Islands. This enemy is a power stronger than we, and the sooner we recognize this fact the less chance there will be of our being absorbed by Communist Russia.

While the hour is late, it isn't too late yet for us to save ourselves from that Godless ideology, but we cannot temporize with it much longer and remain freemen. The Communists are infiltrating all departments of our Government—the State Department, the Treasury Department, the Department of Justice, and the executive department. David Demarest Lloyd, who admitted joining the Washington Cooperative Bookshop, which is on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations, and who for an appreciable period of time was a member of the National Lawyers' Guild, which has been listed as a Communist front by the House Un-American Activities Committee, is now one of President Truman's speech writers. It was Lloyd who wrote the President's Oklahoma speech in which the President defended his stand insofar as Reds in our Government are concerned. Since resigning from the Washington Cooperative Bookshop and the National Lawyers' Guild, Lloyd has written complimentary articles on Alger Hiss, who was recently convicted for lying about his giving state secrets to the then Communist courier, Whittaker Chambers.

Inasmuch as membership in Masonry is a prerequisite for membership in the Shrine, the future of our organization is contingent upon the health and growth of Masonry. That's why I shall emphasize what the Communists in our Republic are doing to destroy Masonry and, indirectly, the Shrine of North America. Lest you think I am an alarmist, I shall read brief excerpts from the 1949 annual report of the Grand Master of Masons from one of our Southern States.

"I learned early in the grand lodge year," said the grand master in his report to the grand lodge, "through conference with a sister jurisdiction that there existed an organized Communist campaign to destroy the effectiveness of Freemasonry through infiltration and boring from within. My investigations showed that in many subordinate lodges the investigation of petitions was ineffectual and inadequate. Radical changes were made in our form of petition and procedure of investigation for the purpose of keeping Communists out of our fraternity."

We know that Communists have infiltrated some of our lodges and we know what they are doing to keep the best type of citizens out of blue lodges by the exercise of the ballot.

Our form of government was virtually born in Masonic lodges. The Masons, as you know, engineered the Boston Tea Party and, on the occasion of his midnight ride, Paul Revere was an officer of his lodge. A large majority of the signers of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States were Masons. Masons, in my opinion, have a greater responsibility to keep America American and thus preserve our way of life than any other segment of our human family. There are said to be 3,500,000 Masons in the United States, most of whom would, if organized and energized, become Paul Reveres, in which event, we would need have no fear for the safety of our country.

The founders of our way of life placed their belief in the existence of the Supreme Being. You cannot read the Constitution of the United States or the Declaration of Independence; you cannot read the constitutional debates, out of which our Republic was born, without realizing that our founding fathers recognized that a government of freemen must necessarily rest upon spiritual values. Was it not Paul who said, "Where the spirit of God exists, there will be found freedom." The Communists deny the existence of a Supreme Being and brazenly proclaim that the spirit of Christianity—belief in God—must be exterminated everywhere before communism is safe anywhere. No greater indictment could be drawn of any movement than to say it cannot exist in a religious atmosphere.

Kill the spirit of God in America and our liberties will evaporate almost overnight. The Communists know this and that's why they are infiltrating our churches; yes, I said our churches, and all other organizations whose structures are founded upon a belief in God.

We are engaged in an atheistic war which is sapping our financial strength. This war is called a cold war yet it is proving to be as expensive as a hot war from a monetary standpoint. It was Lenin, that patron saint of communism, who said many years ago that sooner or later the Communists hope to force America to spend her way to destruction. In a measure, that's what is being done in our country today. The war in which we are engaged is a perilous one, more perilous than the hot war with the Germans and the Japs. We have lost virtually all of the preliminary battles. It takes a courageous people to face that fact, but I submit that if we don't have the courage to face it honestly we will certainly be destroyed.

We must divorce our minds from the things that are trivial and concentrate upon the great problem of saving our civilization from atheism and communism, which go hand in hand. We can save our way of life if we have the courage and the character to follow the advice of our Masonic forefathers who did so much to make our way of life possible and if we are worthy of our heritage, we must put forth the same kind of effort which they put forth.

Nothing pleases the Communists more or advances their interests more rapidly than the wasting of human effort through strikes and unrest, the dissipation of our mineral resources and fertility of our soil which we are doing by various forms of subsidies and governmental extravagance which pyramid our national debt. In his Farewell Address George Washington, one of our Masonic forefathers, admonished us to, "Cherish public credit and avoid the accumulation of debt." This, among other things, we have failed to do. Our Masonic forefathers gave us a way of life which has produced a greater degree of liberty and a higher living standard than ever experienced before in the history of civilization. If we Masons fight for its preservation and encourage others to emulate our efforts, we shall not fail.

What Is the Sixteenth Amendment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, Charles Coburn, the eighth generation of Coburns born in America, has never allined himself with politics. An actor of stage and screen, therefore a servant of the people, his interests politically have been in the preservation of the Constitution and the American way of life, rather than in party politics.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Coburn:

WHAT IS THE SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT?

(By Charles Coburn)

Ask the first 100 people you meet the question, "What is the sixteenth amendment?" and you will be amazed to find not more than one can give you the answer.

The Constitution of the United States is a contract of agreement between the "people" as party of the first part, and the "servant of the people" (the Government) as party of the second part.

All contracts are based upon "intent," "purpose," and "consideration"; consequently, any proposed change in or any added clause to the agreement should be in keeping with the original intent, purpose, and consideration upon which the contract is based.

It is my belief that the sixteenth amendment is directly opposed and antagonistic to the Constitution of the United States and repugnant to the intent upon which the contract is based.

In the Declaration of Independence our forefathers stated very clearly that men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Among the charges made against the dictatorship of King George III were:

"For imposing taxes on us without our consent.

"For abolishing the free system of English laws and establishing an arbitrary government."

The fear expressed by our forefathers of leaving any possible loophole whereby our Government might ever become a political dictatorship was emphasized by Benjamin Franklin who said:

"We have gone back to ancient history for models of government, and examined the different forms of those republics which having been formed with the seeds of their own dissolution now no longer exist. And we have viewed modern states all round Europe, but find none of their constitutions suitable to our circumstances."

The main intent of our system of checks and balances—that is, of having three departments of government—executive, legislative, and judicial—was to prevent any arbitrary power being given to any one department of government.

The purpose of the contract is expressed in the preamble of the Constitution:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

All the articles and amendments in and to the Constitution, up to the sixteenth amendment, are in support and full accord with the intention expressed in the preamble.

George Washington in his Farewell Address warned his fellow citizens "against the insidious wiles of foreign influence * * * since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government."

It is obvious that our form of government was never intended to countenance fascism, communism, socialism, or welfare statism, or any other form of dictatorship destructive to our system of free enterprise and to the liberty and independence of a free people.

The insidious seed of dissolution was injected into the Constitution against the warning of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington, and "we the people" were sold down the river when through stupidity or cupidity our trusted representatives of 42 State legislatures ratified the sixteenth amendment granting dictatorial powers to Congress.

The sixteenth amendment is worded as follows:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

Up to and including 1932, the figure for living expenses was arbitrarily set at $2,500 for a single person and $3,500 for a married couple. Today the figure is arbitrarily set at $600 for a single person and $1,200 for a married couple. And this is done at a time when living expenses are perhaps three or four times as much as they were in 1932. So with one fell swoop the Government takes out of each taxpayer's income $1,900 for a single person and $2,300 for a married couple. In other words, this law puts arbitrary power into the hands of a branch of the Government to take a man's life without a hearing, for, as Shakespeare says:

"You take my house when you do take the prop that doth sustain my house; you take my life when you do take the means whereby I live."

Through the present brutally unfair and viciously discretionary system of taxation our National Government has added bureaucrat to bureaucrat and subsidy to subsidy and there are now more than 19,000,000 persons living in whole or in part on the National Government, supported by the workers and salaried people of the country.

Chief Justice Marshall was right in saying: "The power to tax is the power to destroy." Not only has the sixteenth amendment nullified most of the clauses of the Constitution which protected our system of free enterprise, but it is a whip in the hands of a political machine rapidly driving us into socialism or welfare statism and pauperism.

For who can live on $600 a year at the present high cost of living which is due to our present system of taxation. It is obviously an admission of dishonest thinking for the Government to allow a hard-working taxpayer only $600 a year for his living expenses and then appeal to Congress for $1,200 a year for old-age security. Though I am in favor of $1,200 for old-age security, this kind of reasoning is illogical to say the least.

"We the people" are fast becoming the slaves of a bureaucratic Government, for no matter what we earn by the sweat of our brow we may keep only as much or as little as the czars of taxation are pleased to allow us. In these circumstances how can a man provide for himself and his family and set aside anything for the future? This is certainly not the intent of the contract which definitely promises the people "the right to be secure in their persons" * * * "Justice" * * * "domestic tranquillity" * * * and the "blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity."

The political slogan of "soak the rich" for the purpose of getting votes has been exploded by the arbitrary power to tax—and the socialistic practices of England have already proven there is no such thing possible as an even distribution of wealth—any more than it is possible to have an even distribution of brains or intelligence. The only thing which can be and is distributed evenly is poverty—and America is headed in that direction under the present practice of deficit spending by the Government.

If the Supreme Court of the United States can find any legal technicality for not declaring the sixteenth amendment unconstitutional, or if Congress cannot find ways and means of taking the teeth out of this amendment and compel the administration to eliminate wasteful expenditures, then it is the duty of every loyal American, regardless of his political affiliation, unless he is in favor of having a socialist government, to insist upon the repeal of the sixteenth amendment, which is unquestionably un-American in spirit and repugnant to the original Constitution of these United States.

Who is here so base that would be a slave? If any, speak; for him have I offended. Who is here so vile that would not love his country? If any, speak; for him have I offended. Who is here so stupid that would destroy our Constitution? If any, speak; for him have I offended. I pause for a reply.

Nomination of William Crawford Gorgas in the Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise my remarks, I include a letter I have written to Dr. Sockman, director of the Hall of Fame, in behalf of the memory of Gen. William Crawford Gorgas:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1950.

Dr. RALPH W. SOCKMAN,
Director, New York University Hall of Fame, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. SOCKMAN: I wish to add my endorsement to the many you are receiving in behalf of the nomination of William Crawford Gorgas to the Hall of Fame.

The Dictionary of American Biography has called Dr. Gorgas the man who made possible the construction of the Panama Canal. This alone is an eminent achievement. But Dr. Gorgas did more. It was his conquering of disease in Habana and later in Panama which made possible the eradication of yellow fever in the Western Hemisphere.

Historians agree that one of the chief causes of French failure to build the Panama Canal at the end of the nineteenth century was the twin scourge of yellow fever and malaria. Records show that during their 9 years on the isthmus, the French lost nearly 23,000 workers. At all times at least one-third of their labor force was sick. Panama had earned the name "White Man's Grave."

It was to this veritable pest hole that Dr. Gorgas came, fresh from his successful sanitation campaign in Habana where both yellow fever and malaria was brought under control for the first time. In due time, according to Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., "Gorgas so improved the sanitary conditions of this death-laden region that it became more healthful and showed a lower death rate than any community in the United States." This public-health miracle wrought by Dr. Gorgas made possible the building of the Panama Canal with little loss of life.

Modern American communities have been rendered almost immune to mass epidemics of plague proportions because of the amazing advance of preventive medicine and public-health techniques. Most Americans find it difficult to visualize the horror of the plagues that devastated the Old World and America too until comparatively recent times. As late as 1873 my home town of Birmingham, then 2 years old, was almost wiped off the map by a cholera epidemic. Having heard tales from our grandparents of that terrible experience, we can more readily picture the desolation visited upon a community by such a scourge—the frenzied exodus of all able-bodied citizens, leaving the sick behind without care, the almost complete paralysis of business and all normal life.

In 1878, shortly before Gorgas began his yellow-fever work in Habana, the United States had more than 100,000 cases of yellow fever and more than 20,000 deaths. Today the disease is almost unheard of. But the significant fact to be borne in mind is that the brilliant pioneering of one man in preventive medicine and sanitary engineering freed the modern world of this dread disease. If it were not for Dr. Gorgas our statistics might still be heavy with deaths from yellow fever.

Therefore it is not only as one of the architects of the mighty Panama Canal that we revere the memory of William Crawford Gorgas, though this accomplishment in itself adds permanent luster to his name. It is because of the effect of his life and work upon the health and welfare of all mankind that we feel he belongs beside the other great immortals in the Hall of Fame. In the words of Maj. Gen. Robert E. Noble, United States Army, Dr. Gorgas "was a soldier, a doctor, a humanitarian. The good he did will live to bless the peoples of the world in generations yet unborn."

For these reasons, then, I respectfully request your earnest consideration of the nomination of Alabama's Dr. William Crawford Gorgas to the New York University Hall of Fame.

Sincerely yours,

LAURIE C. BATTLE.

Statement by Henry Ford II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very important announcement from Henry Ford II, president of the Ford Motor Co. It deals with that company's organization of a fund in an attempt to discharge obligations as an industrial citizen in the fields of charity, education, public and private health and hospitalization, civic and community development. In my opinion, it is an outstanding example of industrial citizenship.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Henry Ford II, president of Ford Motor Co., made the following statement today (March 6):

"We wish to announce the formation, under Michigan charter, of Ford Motor Co. Fund, a charitable, nonprofit corporation.

"The purpose of Ford Motor Co. Fund will be the alleviation of want and human suffering and the betterment and improvement of mankind through the making of contributions to organizations operating exclusively for charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes.

"The fund will be financed principally by contributions from Ford Motor Co.

"This action is an attempt to organize ourselves to discharge to the best of our ability our obligations as an industrial citizen in the fields of charity, education, public and private health and hospitalization, civic and community development in Dearborn, Detroit, and elsewhere.

"It is our observation that traditional sources of financial support of private institutions operating in these fields are tending to disappear. We do not like the consequences inherent in the alternative facing such private institutions—that of having to turn to government for much-needed financial aid. In our opinion, this situation places an increasing responsibility upon American business in their role of industrial citizens.

"Ford Motor Co. Fund headquarters will be located in Dearborn.

"The board of trustees of the fund are Henry Ford II, Ernest R. Breech, L. D. Crusoe, John R. Davis, Benson Ford, William T. Gossett, D. S. Harder, and T. O. Yntema.

"Henry Ford II is president of the fund, Ernest R. Breech is executive vice president, Allen W. Merrell is vice president and chairman of the administration committee, L. E. Briggs is vice president and treasurer, and Fred A. Thomson is secretary."

Depletion Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD, for the consideration of the Members of the House, a letter I have received from Mr. John E. Hughes, attorney at law, of Chicago, Ill. He presents a very interesting comment on the proposed change in existing law with respect to depletion allowance.

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 1, 1950.*

Hon RALPH E. CHURCH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CHURCH: The President, in his tax message, said one man had an income of $1,000,000 a year for the 5-years 1943–47 and by using it to drill for oil escaped income taxes on it and now has properties yielding $5,000,000 a year.

It is too bad for the revenue there are not more such men because these properties must be worth $25,000,000, and when he dies the Federal estate tax thereon at present rates will be about $16,800,000, and also if he now has income from the property of $5,000,000 a year he pays an annual income tax of 77 percent on half of his income, or almost $2,500,000, unless he has a wife who survives him and to whom he leaves half his property, in which case his estate will be half that but her estate must pay on the balance when she dies.

If he had not drilled for oil the Treasury would have collected only about $4,000,000 in income tax from him for 1943 to 1947, inclusive. Thus, instead of losing money by the provisions the President attacks the Treasury gains as above-stated. Also, the example failed to note that oil drillers were in high-tax brackets and the $1,000,000 spent in development did not escape tax because they paid tax on a considerable portion of it at high rates.

Furthermore, if the depletion allowance is modified, then oil producers should have the same treatment now afforded timber operators who only pay 25-percent tax on timber sold under section 117 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code. Oil, unlike timber, is irreplaceable.

I am writing you on my own behalf as an oil operator.

Faithfully yours,

JOHN E. HUGHES.

The American Taxpayers Are on the Sucker Lists of Arizona Landholders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the lesson for today will be on the subject of men making fortunes at the expense of our National Treasury. The particular example I shall use involves a gigantic reclamation project for the State of Arizona. This proposed development—the central Arizona project—would cost the Nation's taxpayers an initial billion and a half dollars.

The Arizona landholders who would benefit the most from this fantastic project do not propose to pay any of its original cost. The whole thing would be a gift to them from the people of the United States. Yet, these same Arizona landholders would make untold millions of dollars if the Congress should approve this incredible scheme.

How could such a thing happen? I shall tell you.

Under somewhat unusual circumstances, of which the Arizona promoters are well aware, the big landholders would operate beyond the control of reclamation laws. They would be excess owners, yet the 160-acre limitation law could not be applied to them.

Let us consider the evidence.

The Bureau of Reclamation report on the central Arizona project states, on page R-9, that about 628,000 acres in the project area have a history of irrigation.

The report continues:

About 33 percent of the land with a history of irrigation is held in excess ownership.

Thirty-two percent of 628,000 acres is 200,960 acres.

Excess ownership means land held by individuals in excess of the 160-acre limitation law for projects constructed with Federal money.

The excess-ownership estimate of the Bureau of Reclamation is not only incorrect but is deceptive. Hidden in the Bureau's own report are figures which show the excess ownership to be much greater.

On page R-12 is this statement:

An estimated 7 percent of the farms are 500 acres or larger in total acreage and contain an estimated 55 percent of the irrigated land.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Bureau says approximately 628,000 acres in the project area have a history of irrigation. Some simple arithmetic reveals that 55 percent of 628,000 acres is 345,400 acres.

Therefore, the Bureau's excess-ownership estimate of 200,960 acres is completely untrue. The fact is that more than half of the irrigated land in the project area, 345,300 acres, is held in excess ownership.

Now, Mr. Speaker, ordinary irrigated farm land in the project area is worth about $300 an acre. Therefore, if the proposed project were approved, the 345,400 acres held in excess ownership could be sold for $103,620,000.

That is a tidy sum. But wait. Who would get it?

The Bureau report says there are about 6,000 farms in the project area. Seven percent of these farms contain 55 percent of the irrigated land. Seven percent of 6,000 is 420.

Therefore, we have the startling disclosure that under the project 420 large landowners in the project area would be in a position to sell their holdings for $103,620,000.

Let us take some specific examples to prove the case.

It so happened that in Pinal County, Ariz., between 1939 and 1947, about 193 excess ownerships were created by using water pumped from natural underground storage basins. This pumping was done in the face of dire warnings that there was not adequate water for such operations. But the speculators wantonly continued their plundering, and there was no law to stop them.

These 193 excess ownerships in Pinal County alone contain more than 137,000 acres. Using the basic value of $300 an acre, the 193 excess ownerships under pumped water in Pinal County would have a selling value of at least $41,000,000 if the proposed project were approved.

Yet, these 193 excess ownerships would pay none of the cost of the project. They could get this high figure for their excess land because under the project there would be an assured water supply, which costs them nothing.

In due course I shall name the 193 excess owners in the Pinal area.

First, Mr. Speaker, I should like to explain this underground water gimmick, which makes the proposed project the greatest Christmas present in reclamation history.

The plan of the proposed project is to bring water on the surface from the Colorado River to the project area. Enormous amounts of this water will flow into the underground basins.

The Federal 160-acre limitation law applies only to water carried to the project. Now what about this water after it goes down into the underground basins?

There is the gimmick.

I have shown that there are in one part of Pinal County alone at least 193 excess ownerships, created between 1939 and 1947, which use only underground water. Under the project these excess ownerships would be given free a dependable source of water, a gift from the Federal Government.

Why? Because there is no way to apply the 160-acre limitation law to underground water.

These 193 excess ownerships could remain in excess, and there would be nothing the Government could do to bring them under the limitation law. They could take all the water they needed from the underground basins. Therefore, they would receive all the benefits of the project without paying 1 cent of its cost.

There are, of course, many more such excess ownerships in other sections of the project area which would receive similar Christmas presents.

It is a rosy prospect, indeed, especially for the large landowner in the project area, and Arizona's own statements support this contention.

Let us look at the record for a moment. In the last session, hearings were held on the Arizona project before the House Public Lands Committee. Mr. V. E. Larson, an engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation, testified that the 160-acre limitation law would be applied to the proposed Arizona project, and that "some of the larger areas or farms would have to be broken down to fall within the limitation."

Mr. Larson was careful to use the word "some," for the large farms using underground water exclusively would not have to be broken down at all. These pump farms would go right on taking what water they needed, and no one could stop them. I am sure that Mr. Larson and the Reclamation Bureau is very much aware of this fact.

In the same public lands hearing, the distinguished Congressman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], questioned a witness, Mr. Charles A. Carson, as follows:

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Carson, if this legislation should be enacted, will not this project be a Federal reclamation project?

Mr. CARSON. Yes, of course.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will not the 160-acre limitation law apply as elsewhere?

Mr. CARSON. Yes.

Now, Mr. Carson is a leading water attorney for the State of Arizona. He is a fervent advocate of the proposed Arizona project. In the hearings he was questioned at length, and I should like to read a short excerpt from the record when he was being questioned by my colleague, Mr. ENGLE of California:

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Carson, I notice that on page R-12 of the Bureau of Reclamation report that it states that the largest individual farm, in terms of irrigated acreages, averaged * * * 10,430 acres under irrigation during the period 1940 to 1944. * * * Do you mean to say that these farms with an average irrigated acreage of 10,430 acres under irrigation are going to be all reduced to 160 acres?

Mr. CARSON. Yes, sir. Most of those now are not dependent upon surface diversion. They are pumped areas, Mr. ENGLE, and not under any Federal reclamation project. They are under no regulation by the Government nor anybody else. They are outside the boundaries of all the irrigation districts that are established in Arizona, or that share in the Federal reclamation project water. If this project goes through and is authorized, it is my understanding that this would all be Federal reclamation project and that those ownerships would be broken down.

Mr. ENGLE. Do you know of any practical way to apply the 160-acre limitation to underground water?

Mr. CARSON. No.

Mr. ENGLE. I do not, either.

And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that it cannot be done. These Arizona landholders using pumped water from the underground pools cannot be controlled, or forced under the 160-acre limitation law. They could, under this project, go right ahead using the underground water, and no one could stop them. That is what Mr. Carson, Arizona's leading spokesman, himself, said. And in this instance, I agree with Arizona.

Now, Mr. Speaker, who are the 193 excess owners in Pinal County? Here are their names, and the amount of acreage registered to them on local Government records between the years 1939 to 1947:

	Acreage
P. H. Ethington	6,807
Arizona Farm Products Corp.	5,814
C. A. Owen	4,232
T. Decker	2,945
P. Bianco	2,720
J. N. Harber	2,691
E. H. Smith	2,550
J. F. Nutt	2,235
R. H. Hawn	2,080
J. D. Singh	1,919
Murphy et al	1,760
I. H. Wallace	1,542
Pretzer et al	1,492
F. W. Shedd	1,472
H. Wasner	1,357
E. K. Porter	1,343
General Farms Co.	1,320
Table Top Ranch Corp.	1,306
California Cotton Oil Co.	1,281
E. B. Miller	1,280
G. H. Shay	1,280
L. A. Oss	1,280
N. Rasmussen	1,279
Clemens Bros.	1,275
Fuqua et al	1,245
Park & Guy Gilbert	1,175
W. H. Horchheimer	1,116
H. Galloway	1,060
J. L. Rogers	960
Hildebrand	960
D. Harmon	930
C. F. Cherry	960
J. O. Amburger	960
R. C. Smith	960
G. E. Schaefer & J. Zwans	960
J. H. Zellweger & Pete Grubb	954
L. T. Russel	940
D. A. & F. O. Trekell	919
W. A. & A. Thomassen	880
O. W. Rugg	879
C. & J. H. England	839
Sunshine Valley Ranch	805
McCarthy	800
Hough Murphy Ranch	800
J. Nichols	800
A. J. Miller	790
W. E. Shoemaker	724
J. A. Roberts	720
M. E. Clark & J. G. Oldman	720
J. Poonian	680
V. W. Chandler	660
E. E. Smith	657
R. H. Chattin	643
F. L. Kennedy	641
J. H. Payne	640
H. C. Tiffany	640
W. H. Weast	640
M. A. Anderson	640
C. B. Anderson	640
H. E. Kleck	640
R. B. Howk	640
R. S. Phillips	640
R. and A. Self	640
T. B. Wheelis	640
H. Davison, Jr.	640
J. D. Dickey	640
M. K. Sellers	640
R. J. Self	640
E. A. Watson	640
H. A. Naftziger	640
Kelly et al	640
Eloy Ranches, Inc.	640
J. W. White	640
Santa Cruz Farms	640
J. D. Goree	640
S. Peterson	639
F. Wuertz	637
W. M. Hauser	634
R. Delange	634
J. D. Johnson	632
L. and G. Effinger	622
H. Wacker	617
R. D. Bechtel	611
L. S. Steen	610
L. C. Barlow	608
A. Peters	600
R. W. Kenworthy	598
A. Kenworthy	590
H. H. Cake	560
J. J. Tweedy and A. A. Ball	558
M. Jones	549
J. W. Blake	545
P. B. Hannah	507
P. E. Hartman	480
Anderson et al	480
F. Early	480
N. S. Cooper	480
G. B. Steward and P. W. Venses	480
N. Beggs	480
M. H. Hanson	480
W. D. Boswell and H. L. Brown	480
Vensel & Steward	480
H. Davison	480
Dunn et al	480
Wiggins et al	480
D. C. and D. H. Maud	475
E. E. Thode	471
H. S. McKinney	471
G. Van Horn	440
C. P. and L. C. Honeycutt	405
W. L. and W. W. Isom	400
G. Ziegler	400
Woodruff et al	400
L. L. Johnson	400
S. J. Norman	400
L. Bunts	400
C. Summerfield	400
Avita Hogue	400
C. V. and E. Hanna	385
B. and V. Scott	360
L. W. Morrill	346
J. D. and P. M. Brophy	344
F. E. and F. W. Sutterlee	321
L. R. Holbrook	321
Saunders Bros., Inc.	321
J. C. Milligan	320
A. Rogers	320
C. P. Austin	320
E. Lane	320
C. Brooks	320
J. G. Johnson	320
H. L. Early	320
E. V. Hooper	320
C. K. Raber	320
H. F. Kruse	320
H. L. Holland	320
P. Ulmer	320
K. J. Wadsworth	320
N. S. Stephenson	320
S. C. Kleck	320
W. Vander Hart	320
S. C. McFarland	320
L. E. Weddle	320
Western Cotton Oil Co.	320
D. E. Wallace	320
A. Hodgman	320
E. L. Bayless	320
I. McCown	320
J. Pretzer	320
J. D. Waugh	320
A. B. Houser	320
F. L. Zock	320
L. B. Tuttle	320

	Acreage
R. W. Dickey	320
M. Botts	320
J. T. Crowley	320
T. Willmoth	319
G. Kinne	319
J. W. Brooks	318
D. Bolan	316
L. Douglas	315
M. C. Montgomery	315
L. A. Paterson	314
R. H. Pottebaum	314
G. W. Kuhlman	313
L. Ward	310
H. J. Belford	310
J. B. Strickland	310
C. B. Shiflet	310
P. H. Davies	301
H. A. Odam	297
A. L. Bartlet	295
W. R. Sikes	285
H. R. Baker	285
L. Mayfield	280
M. H. Montgomery	280
Beth Jones	280
C. W. Lane	278
G. K. Kennedy	250
L. A. McIntyre	240
A. M. Ward	240
G. Hartzig	240
T. M. Carlton	240
N. Moore	240
A. E. Carter	240
Ten Ten Ranch Co.	240
O. E. Jordan	240
A. B. Houser	240
A. H. Gobes	240
W. H. Steele	232
O. Wytcherly	200
R. D. McCain	190
G. M. Marsh	181

So, Mr. Speaker, we have the situation where the excess landholders and speculators in Arizona would get all the benefits from this incredible proposed project and would have to pay none of the costs.

I can see why the Arizona landholders want this project, but I cannot conceive of the Congress authorizing it.

This Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona Tribune of March 6, 1950:

THIS FREEDOM

While we're talking so much about freedom in this country, all of us should get down to brass tacks and check up on our freedom.

Do we have as much as we once had? Is our freedom gradually disappearing? From the standpoint of the individual, is our Government a good Government. Or, under the American interpretation, is it becoming a bad Government?

It is necessary in a large sense to regard freedom from an economic, as well as a political standpoint. If a people are treading a road to economic serfdom, it must be reasonable to suppose that they have lost their freedom.

Now, examine the American scene from that vantage point. A good government will guide a people, will help them to help themselves, offer unity, and give them economic freedom by permitting them opportunity, and the privilege of retaining as much of the money they earn as possible.

On the other hand, a government that does anything less is a bad government, as Americans regard freedom and opportunity, political as well as economic.

February 11, in this column, we discussed the subject, Was Lincoln a Reactionary? Some of the quotations attributed to Lincoln were taken from quoted sources, in the belief they were Lincoln's. Mr. Walter Winchell, the radio commentator, a few days later, took us, and others to task, for using these quotations as attributed to Lincoln.

Mr. Winchell, a friend of long standing of the New Deal, said they were mere propaganda from Republican sources.

However, if his purpose was defense of the New Deal, it would appear he was quibbling over the issue. For, Lincoln did express sentiments opposing the kind of ruinously spendthrift Government we now have.

Here is another quotation from Lincoln, which even Mr. Winchell must acknowledge as authentic. It is entirely to the point we wish to make:

"Inasmuch as most good things are produced by labor, it follows that all such things ought to belong to those whose labor has produced them. But it has happened in all ages of the world that some have labored and others have enjoyed a large proportion of the fruits. This is wrong, and should not continue.

"To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor as nearly as possible is a worthy object of any good government."

It needs only a glance at American taxation today to realize that under this definition of good government, we do not have it.

Earned income is taxed by the Government up to 90 percent. Federal taxation penalizes economic growth, it curbs improvement of living standards, and actually threatens national security.

Our economic strength is our greatest defense asset. Gen. Paul von Hindenburg, after World War I, said, "Germany's armies were not defeated in the field. Germany was vanquished by the overwhelming weight of American production."

That same production which provided the metal sinews of war from Stalingrad to the South Pacific was a major factor in the victory in World War II.

Yet, America now is laboring under a Federal tax policy which interferes, actually retards, the long-range growth and expansion needed to keep America strong.

The majority of all corporate equity investment is financed through profits. But, the administration has been leading a campaign in recent years to make profits look like stealing candy from a baby. To back up this attitude, it has imposed severe corporate taxes that drain off in large measure the funds that otherwise would go for plant expansion, and creation of new plants.

The postwar record shows that industry has saved a smaller amount of the funds needed to finance physical growth than ever before in a time of good business.

High individual income taxes add to the problem. They have drained off what used to be the risk capital that created new industry. These taxes reduce both the capacity and the willingness of the public to save and invest in business and industry.

We have created a Government that is taking an average of 25 to 30 percent of individual income in taxes.

It is a policy that is crushing the system that gave the world the greatest war production it ever had seen, and gave the allies the strength needed for victory.

We are going to need that strength again, if not to win a war, certainly, to win the peace.

Labor Is Opposed to Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in recent years I introduced bills and submitted statements to the House Ways and Means Committee urging the repeal of wartime excise taxes, especially the retail tax on furs, jewelry, luggage, and cosmetics. I pointed out how continuation of these taxes is stifling business activity in the country and affecting employment.

I have before me a copy of a statement submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee by Mr. Jack Wieselberg, president of the International Handbag, Luggage, Belt, and Novelty Workers Union, A. F. of L., urging repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on luggage, handbags, and other leather goods.

Let me call the attention of the membership of the House to the very interesting fact brought out by the president of this union, representing industries in which are employed over 100,000 workers, to the effect that "during the past year there was a curtailment of from 30 to 40 percent in production in the plants in which our members are employed." Mr. Wieselberg's statement to the committee follows:

STATEMENT OF JACK WIESELBERG, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL HANDBAG, LUGGAGE, BELT AND NOVELTY WORKERS UNION, A. F. OF L.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee, in behalf of the many, many thousands of members of the International Handbag, Luggage, Belt and Novelty Workers Union, A. F. of L., and their families, in every part of this country from coast to coast, I urge the outright repeal of war-imposed excise taxes on handbags, luggage, traveling bags, and personal leather goods.

Firstly, I call to your attention that the Congress is morally obligated to honor its original commitment that this excise tax should have been removed 6 months after the termination of hostilities.

Secondly, the original purpose of the excise tax to help raise required funds for the successful prosecution of the war and in order to conserve vital war materials has long since ceased to exist. Hostilities were victoriously completed and the raw material going into the manufacture of our products now exists in a superabundance.

Thirdly, by no stretch of the imagination can our products be labeled a "luxury." Consequently the continued 20-percent excise tax of handbags, luggage, and personal leather goods is inequitable and unconscionable. Yet, it continues to exist without any justification whatsoever. The fact that milady's handbag is as necessary and essential to the feminine portion of our population as the pockets of a man's suit or coat is so obvious as to require no further comment. It is utterly fantastic and unrealistic for anyone to label this item a luxury and to make it subject to a luxury tax. And you, the members of this committee, who must carry back and forth with you to Congress and back to your homes items such as luggage, traveling bags, briefcases, and wallets—are these items luxuries? How could you function as legislators if you were deprived of any one of these items? Could you, by any stretch of the imagination, be charged with indulging in a luxury because of the practical necessity to own and use these items? The traveling salesman, the technician, the professional man, all of whom could not conduct their business or make a living without these items—are they indulging in carrying about and lugging about luxuries? These items are as much the tools of the trade for the people who need them as the mechanic's and laborer's equipment.

There is still another, more important and more persuasive reason for the immediate and complete elimination of the wartime "luxury" 20-percent excise tax upon handbags, luggage, traveling bags and personal leather goods. At our recent international convention held in Atlantic City the 240 delegates representing 80 locals from every part of our country went on record unanimously demanding the complete elimination of this unconscionable and inequitable tax. Why? For the very vital reason that this tax is not only inequitable and unconscionable but because it is ruinous and demoralizing to the very industries in which our members are employed, and upon which their families depend for a livelihood. Our survey and report shows that during the past year there was a curtailment of from 30 to 40 percent in production in the plants in which our members are employed. Consequently, there was a resultant enforced idleness experienced by a corresponding lay-off of large numbers of workers. There was a reduced income for those fortunate enough to work part time.

It is for the foregoing reason that our delegates to the convention unanimously demanded the immediate repeal of this unconscionable tax. It is for such reason that the American Federation of Labor supports this demand for the elimination of this "luxury" tax.

Our industries have been hit harder than any other—although there was less justification for imposing this tax on our industries than on any other one.

Let us face this problem with realism. Let us not make this problem a political football. How long can a 20-percent wartime "luxury" excise tax be maintained on admittedly essential commodities? How long can this condition be continued when it causes irrevocable loss and threatens the very existence of American industries which employ more than 100,000 workers—and affect the hundreds of thousands who are members of their families and who depend upon the continued existence of these industries for their very livelihood? Every survey conducted by us, and yes, by independent impartial agencies, report that there is buyer resistance because of this unconscionable and inequitable tax. The thousands of small-business people who retail these items to the general public report that they are constantly asked "When are these taxes going off?" There is no satisfactory answer and the public doesn't buy. How many tens of thousands of small-business people are being ruined by such shortsighted policy can be understood by any person willing to face the facts. The demoralization of the industries manufacturing these basic necessities has been permitted to a point that cries out for speedy and immediate relief. The consequent unemployment in those industries has reached a point of crisis.

Be assured, gentlemen, that our Government is losing money because of the continued imposition of this inequitable tax. Not only have many manufacturers gone out of business during the past year, and others ceased operation for 6, 7, or 8 months, but those that have operated have done so on a part-time basis. Consequently there has not only been an economic loss to the industry and its workers but the Government has lost in taxes and will continue to lose in taxes on incomes, business, etc., far more than the ruinous 20 percent excise tax will or can bring in henceforth. So far as the Government is concerned this is bad business procedure. I haven't even mentioned the cost to Government in paying out relief, unemployment insurance, etc., all of which is directly traceable to the curtailment of manufacture due to the 20 percent tax.

In conclusion permit me to point out to you that the American public does not consider basic necessities such as handbags, luggage, traveling bags, briefcases, personal leather goods, etc., as luxuries. In fact, Congress never classified these items as luxuries. The continued levy of this tax upon these products is burdensome and ruinous. It is a suicidal tax policy which literally kills "the goose that lays the golden egg."

The imposition of an excise tax on the production of essential goods has no place in a peacetime tax structure. This is particularly true when the items subjected to the excise tax are necessities and not luxuries. Such taxation constitutes an obstacle which cannot be hurdled in the path of an expanding economy. It is absolutely ruinous to industries manufacturing essential goods which have already been demoralized and seriously crippled because of this burdensome tax.

To save our industries, to revive and stimulate employment, and to promote the growth and welfare of American industries manufacturing essential items such as handbags, luggage, traveling bags, and personal leather goods requires the immediate repeal of the 20-percent luxury excise tax upon these items.

Who Is an Indian?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting statement by Paul L. Fickinger, Area Director of United States Indian Service, Billings, Mont., made before the Rotary Club, Billings, Mont., February 20, 1950:

I am pleased with the privilege of discussing briefly some phases of Indian administration. Some of the things I will say today may not completely represent the thinking and views of the Department and therefore I take full responsibility for my remarks.

Why is there a Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs?

The Federal Government first got into the Indian welfare business through the regulation of trade. Benjamin Franklin had reported to the Albany Congress of 1754 that "many quarrels and wars have arisen between the Colonies and the Indian nations through the bad conduct of traders who cheat the Indians after making them drunk."

In the Federal Constitution the States delegated to the National Government the duty of regulating commerce with foreign nations, among the several States, and with the Indian tribes. By Jefferson's time we began to take thought as to how the Indians might be accommodated to the life which was rapidly engulfing them. Jefferson himself wrote: "Encourage them to abandon hunting, to apply themselves to the raising of stock, to agriculture, and domestic manufacture. * * * The ultimate point of rest and happiness for them, is to let our settlements and theirs meet and blend together, to intermix, and become one people."

Two decisions of Congress had the effect of moving the Federal Government from the limited responsibility of regulating trade to a wider one in the field of welfare—in the direction, indeed of carrying out the objective stated by Jefferson.

The first of these was the passage of the Indian Removal Act of 1830 which resulted in the physical removal of some 30 tribes from east of the Mississippi to an all-defined Indian Territory west of the river. These removals involved the United States in expenditures for the costs of removal including the cost of land improvements owned by the Indians, and for tools, equipment, and assistance in establishing themselves in the new country.

The second of these decisions was the adoption of language in the Appropriation Act of 1871 declaring that "Hereafter no Indian nation or tribe within the territory of the United States shall be acknowledged or recognized as an independent tribe or power with whom the United States may contract by treaty." The decision had the effect of bringing the Indian people under the legislative control of Congress to an extent not previously attempted. Prior to 1871 a total of 374 treaties were entered into by the United States Government with the several Indian tribes. Since 1871 nearly 5,000 laws having to do with Indians have been placed on the statute books.

Originally jurisdiction over Indian matters was in the military branch. The Bureau of Indian Affairs was created in 1824 and was placed in the War Department. When the Department of the Interior was created in 1849 the Indian Bureau was transferred to it and came under civilian administration. However, there were constant calls upon the military branch all through the succeeding generation and many Indian agencies were supervised by military men on loan to the civilian branch.

We have long since moved away from military measures in our handling of Indian affairs but there has remained the attitude that Indians are a people apart and that the Indian Service deals with matters which are not of general concern. Legislation providing privileges or benefits for the general population is still being written in a manner to exclude Indians from the application of the legislation. It is necessary to pass special legislation if they are to benefit. There is no reason for this; welfare laws of general application should extend to Indians.

Let us now define a few terms.

1. What is an Indian? This one is easy. An Indian is a human being, even as you and I are pleased to consider ourselves.

2. The next one, Who is an Indian? is not so easy to define. For some purposes an Indian is one who is of one-half or more degree of Indian blood. In other circumstances an Indian is one who is of one-fourth or more degree of Indian blood and in still other instances an individual is considered an Indian if he has one-eighth, one-sixteenth, one-thirty-second, one-sixty-fourth, or one one-hundred-twenty-eighth, etc., degree of Indian blood and is an enrolled member of some tribe. Quite confusing.

There is real need for a declaration by the Congress of the United States as to just who is an Indian. The matter of clarifying this item has been approached many times by many authorities but the complications of old treaties, tribal rights, conflict of individual interests, and various statutes have, to date, made it impossible to have a meeting of minds on the subject.

In my opinion, our Congress will have to settle the matter by an arbitrary blood quantum, or some other equally arbitrary definition.

3. The third definition, What or who is a ward Indian? is likewise a simple one even

though the term "ward" is universally misunderstood and loosely used when applied to Indians. There are no ward Indians except a small handful who have been declared by the courts as non compos mentis, or insane. Indians are no longer prisoners of war. They are full citizens of the United States of America and of the States in which they reside. The so-called reservations on which some of them live are not prison areas; they are the homes of a segment of our population free to go and come as they please.

The term "reservation" derives its name from the fact that the land within a given area was reserved by the Indians for themselves when they gave, sold, or had taken from them, the vast holdings they once owned. We could just as easily apply the term "reservation" to Billings because we have defined an area known as the city of Billings which you and I have reserved, through purchase, as a home for ourselves.

True, most of the remaining land of our Indian reservations is held in trust by the Federal Government for the Indians and as such there are certain restrictions against its alienation. A discussion of that matter would involve more time than is available to me today. There also is the fact that so long as the land remains in this trust status it is unassessable. This tax-free status of the land, however, was a part of the compensation awarded the Indians for the vast bodies of land they ceded to the Government of the United States, which in turn was made available to our forefathers for homestead entry, and certain sections in each township to the States for school purposes.

The fact of Federal restrictions on trust property and an "institutional simile made use of by the great John Marshall form the thread upon which has grown the popular concept of Federal wardship and the discriminations practiced in some States and communities against the ward wards.

Holding of lands in trust constitutes wardship for the Indian no more than for the pioneer homesteader. Yet, our great State has by recent legislative enactment placed a statute on the books defining a ward Indian as anyone whose name appears on a tribal membership roll and as such denies to him certain privileges accorded other citizens of the State—this in spite of the fact that many Indians do not live within the boundary of a reservation. (Others own property in fee title and as such pay taxes.)

If this can be done for one group of our citizens, what is to prevent similar legislation to deny rights and privileges to other segments of our citizenry? Those whose names appear on the roll of Rotary International, for example. Obviously, such legislation is unconstitutional and should never have been enacted.

What is the nature of the Indian problem?

The general picture of the Indians today is one of poverty and of limited opportunity. Land constitutes the economic base for the world population, and so it is with the Indian, yet today one-third of the Indian population is totally landless and for at least another one-third the land holdings are in such a state of divided interests as to be practically useless to them. Even with this situation the picture might not be so dark if the land still in Indian ownership were more equally distributed or if it lay in more favorable climatic belts but neither of those conditions prevail and the living standard of those Indians suffers in consequence.

The principal causes of the present land situation stems from the General Allotment Act of 1887 which, though beneficially intended, had the effect of forcing the alienation of large areas of Indian land. Under this act, each Indian whose name appeared on the tribal roll was allotted a given acreage of land from the tribal holdings, ranging in size generally from 40 acres of irrigated land to 640 acres of western grazing land, generally also with little thought being given to the adequacy of the allotment as an economic unit.

The individual allottees were then authorized to obtain fee title and to dispose of their holdings. Between 1887 and 1934, by reason of this legalized alienation, Indian lands decreased from 138,000,000 acres to approximately 52,000,000 acres. During this same period the Indian population increased by approximately 100,000. The area lost was with few exceptions the most desirable and productive land. Some lands have since been restored to Indian ownership to bring the total to its present 56,000,000 acres.

Let us look now briefly at the problem in Montana. We have within the State seven Indian reservations, and an Indian population of some 20,000. Indian lands total in round figures 6,500,000 acres of which roughly 1 percent is irrigated, 6 percent dry farm, 71 percent open grazing, 15 percent forest and woodland, 3 percent other types, and 4 percent are barren and waste.

A great many of the allotments are so involved in heirship, frequently with heirs through three generations and so numerous, that partitioning or division between heirs is economically impossible. The usual practice then is for the land to be leased, sometimes to an Indian, but more frequently to a non-Indian, because few of the Indians are economically able to finance such a venture. The lease rentals are divided between the heirs in accordance with their undivided heirship interest in the land. It is not uncommon for an heir's share to amount to only a few cents. This causes a tremendous administrative problem—one that is increasing day by day.

Another problem lies in the fact that the original allotments were not economic units to begin with. One 640-acre grazing allotment might have water but 10 others lying adjacent to it would not have, and as such were useless by themselves. The result—the whole is leased as a unit, sometimes to an Indian but more frequently to a non-Indian.

Other contributing factors against a greater use of existing resources include a lack of know-how of our American economy—an economy quite foreign to the early life and tradition of the Indians—lack of adequate credit with which to get a start and unquestionably in some instances a lack of interest, and finally the continued pressure of outside forces to gain possession of Indian land.

I am constantly besieged with requests from Indians wanting a patent in fee to their land so that they can sell it to a non-Indian. In some instances these are legitimate requests but by far the greater number come from Indians who have lived all their life on the reservation and will continue to live there. In many instances the bulk of their income comes from lease money on the very land they wish to sell. Its sale offers immediate possession of a few hundred or thousand dollars which would soon be gone and they would then be wholly dependent on someone for a living. In many such instances the holding is not adequate for use by itself, and the rental income is small.

The situation presents a serious problem. What would you do about it?

True, not all Indians want to farm or raise stock even if there were adequate, usable land for them all. That, too, poses a problem of what to do, proper training in skills, acceptance in a community, and adjustment.

I do not mean to imply that all of the Indians in Montana are faced with this kind of a problem. There are many who, through trades and purchases, have built themselves an economic unit and through Indian Service assistance from a meager credit fund have gotten a start and are successful farmers or ranch operators. Others are working in towns and cities, have adjusted, and are substantial citizens of their communities. Their number is far too small in comparison to those still remaining. They have done this, too, in the face of terrific odds.

The lack of resources, lack of training, and health deficiencies combine to make it difficult for Indians either to survive in their home environments or to establish themselves in communities where opportunity is richer.

This by no means exhausts the list of Indian problems in Montana, but let us consider for a moment some solutions.

The problem of the Indian must be worked out in terms of developing to the utmost such of their resources as are capable of development and their proper use by the Indians. As a coordinate of this program, there must be an intensification of the training of Indians, secure them in good health, and establish them in communities where they can support themselves, when such support cannot be obtained in the reservation area.

Some of the requirements for implementing such a program involve:

1. Regrouping of land holdings into proper economic units—a stupendous job.
2. Further development of the available resources—extension of irrigation facilities, conservation, etc.
3. Development of sound individual farm and ranch plans.
4. Availability of adequate credit facilities.
5. Intensification of training in skills for those desiring work in industrial fields and for whom a land base is not available.
6. Facilities for relocating and establishing families in a permanent economy in communities.
7. A vehicle whereby Federal responsibility to rehabilitated families may be terminated.
8. Repeal of the Federal Indian liquor law.
9. An outlawing of the use of peyote.
10. Passage of a law of uniform descent to eliminate further complicated inheritance tangles.
11. Development of a social structure.

This will cost money, but by far the greater amount would be in the form of credit, and thus recoverable, but, in my thinking, a greater expenditure now to clean up the situation will be a good investment and eliminate future expenditures such as will be required if we continue on our present piecemeal course.

The ultimate purpose of Indian policy is to attain that objective stated by Jefferson "to intermix and become one people." Personally, I am impatient with the slowness of attainment. The process must be speeded up.

I have been an employee of the Bureau of Indian Affairs for nearly 18 years and it has never been my thought that the Indian problem is the sole responsibility of the Federal Government and the Indian Service. That responsibility must be shared by every citizen of Montana—by every citizen of the United States, Indian and non-Indian alike.

Until that principle is accepted and activated we will fail miserably in the stated objective. There is no room in the program for emotionalism or sentimentalism. We must work on the basis of cold hard facts and realism tempered with firm but sympathetic understanding. There is no place in this program for political maneuvering.

As the Indian achieves certain privileges, such as handling his own leasing, property, etc., he must likewise accept and discharge the responsibilities that go with such privileges. We hear the oft repeated cry from a small irresponsible group "We want to be like other people," "Abolish the Indian Bureau," "Turn us loose." What many of them mean is that they want all trust restrictions on their money and property removed but not have to assume the related responsibilities.

Several months ago we issued from my office an opinion and directive to our superintendents to the effect that automobiles owned by Indians (unless title to the automobile was in the United States Government in trust for the Indian, and few if any are in that status) were subject to property tax even though purchased with funds derived from leases or other income from trust land. Prior to this opinion most Indians and county authorities had assumed they were nontaxable. Pursuant to our opinion, the State attorney general issued a similar opinion to county officials. A vocal few of the Indians are protesting the opinion and attempting to enlist the aid of attorneys, congressional delegations, etc., to break the opinion. They want title to such automobiles in their own name so that they can do as they please with them, sell, mortgage, etc., but they do not want to accept the responsibility of taxes that goes with that privilege.

In fairness to the great majority of the Indians, I must say they are paying their tax and accepting the responsibility.

This leads me to the point, however, that such cooperation cannot all be one-sided. Today Indians are paying taxes as you and I do on most of their property except their trust land.

We other citizens of the State of Montana must accord to them the same privileges we enjoy. Such things as the order from the State welfare board in January reducing ADC grants to Indians but to no one else can only retard the ultimate goal. If the State is running short of money and a reduction must be made, that reduction should apply to all ADC recipients, not just Indians. I am glad to say that order has been rescinded.

Other forms of discrimination must be eliminated and avoided. Signs in hotel lobbies and cafe windows reading "Indians not welcome," "Indians and dogs not allowed," and advice from citizens to Indians who are trying to establish themselves in a community "Go back to the reservation," only complicate and retard the program.

Such episodes as occurred this winter in the northern part of the State with the emotional and hysterical stories of starving Blackfoot Indians destroy years of constructive work. The weather and snow were severe, maybe more so than usual, but Blackfoot Indians were not starving. There was an orderly relief program in effect, and had been, long before the stories broke. The effect of the emotional display was to completely disrupt this orderly relief program so that many Indians not actually in need received relief.

The matter of snow removal was something different. We needed help on the reservations as did the counties and State, to break open the roads. However, we were delivering supplies and fuel to isolated Indian families and bringing any seriously sick in to the hospital by a weasel that we secured from the Army 3 years ago during that severe winter. The point I am making is that winter comes to this north country every year. We and everyone else know it. Residents should prepare for it. Fuel and food supplies should be laid in during the summer.

In my opinion relief assistance should not be provided to any employable Indian or non-Indian without the performance of some useful and constructive work. Every time this is not done you weaken the moral fiber of those people. You destroy initiative and the acceptance of responsibility to do things for themselves and this will call for greater and greater appropriations for relief purposes. The constructive answer to such a problem of course is an economy that provides work opportunity for such employables, and I do not refer to the temporary economy of a WPA program.

Now to sum this up in a few words let me say to you that unless we all work together and solve these various problems, instead of spending $50,000,000 a year on Indian matters, in time we will be spending $150,000,000, $200,000,000, $300,000,000 a year and still be no farther along. In fact, in my opinion, we will be farther from a constructive solution than ever. When I say we will be spending, I mean you and I, for it is our tax dollar that is being used.

At any rate, when we have assisted the Indians to a sound economic status and to intermix and become one people then and only then can we reduce or eliminate Federal expenditures on their behalf and abolish the Bureau of Indian Affairs. From a humanitarian as well as a financial standpoint, may we, with God's help, speed that day.

The British Socialists Take Over Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, George Sokolsky in his broadcast of February 26 points out that the British Socialists—the Labor Party—started out to nationalize business on a modest scale but it has now reached a considerable development. Under leave to extend my remarks I am including part of his broadcast:

The Socialists in Great Britain set out to build a welfare state, but slowly. They proposed to limit their nationalization of the means of production and distribution and the welfare of the people to 20 percent. But the nature of modern life is such that if 20 percent is nationalized, it affects the whole of life. Fabian socialism is a slow step to the totalitarianism of communism.

This is what the Socialists have done:

March 1, 1946: The Bank of England was nationalized.

August 1, 1946: Civil aviation was nationalized.

January 1, 1947: Coal mining industry was nationalized.

January 1, 1947: Telecommunications were nationalized.

January 1, 1948: Inland transportation was nationalized.

April 1, 1948: Electrical utilities industry was nationalized.

July 5, 1948: Health services were nationalized.

May 1, 1949: Gas industry was nationalized.

November 24, 1949: Bill enacted to nationalize iron and steel.

The Socialists could only accomplish that program if the United States made up the deficits, if the United States paid part of the bills. And the United States has been paying part of the bills—a huge part. They are our very expensive cousins.

And while we have been paying part of the bills, the labor government has been making separate arrangements with the Communist states, with Poland, Czechoslovakia, China, and maybe with others, to our detriment.

And now there are several proposals before our Government to make a great contribution to Great Britain—another contribution in billions of dollars. Among the most fantastic is the proposal to let goods come into this country which is to undersell American-manufactured goods. Then when the Americans go broke, the United States Government will pay the owners of the company a subsidy, and labor a dole, to make up for the loss. This nonsense must be given full debate, for it can wreck our economy.

At any rate, the British people have turned down socialism and the welfare state, as New Zealand and Australia have voted against socialism and the welfare state. Ernest Bevin said last July that the United States was, "As much a welfare state as we are, only it is in a different form."

But now Great Britain has repudiated socialism—definitely and unmistakably. The effects of the repudiation are naturally not yet clear, but as the weeks unfold the picture, it will become clearer—the full effects of this election will be clearer.

Obviously, the Attlee government is stymied. It cannot do much in continuance of its Socialist program. It cannot propose new legislation to nationalize more of British life. It must stand still.

On the other hand, the British are an extraordinarily patriotic people. It is inconceivable to believe that Winston Churchill would do anything to imperil his country. No matter how ambitious an Englishman may be, he never risks his country. He never puts self above King, as he would say it. Therefore Winston Churchill and Clement Attlee, no matter what their differences, will watch closely that whatever they do, England will not be at a disadvantage.

The right of a people to choose and to change its own government is one of the most essential of human rights. It correctly makes government the servant not the master of the people.

Different peoples devise different methods to achieve this result and to preserve this right.

The British have from earliest times, from Alfred the Great to this last election, worked at representative government as has no other people in history. They have achieved a method that is more representative than our own.

And even more, they have achieved a maturity of responsibility among public servants that can be the envy of all peoples. And it still works.

Congratulations to Max Abelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle honoring a distinguished gentleman of Brooklyn, N. Y., Mr. Max Abelman:

Our congratulations to Max Abelman, secretary of the board of Jewish Hospital, who was the guest of honor at a birthday luncheon the other day at which a large group of his friends presented him with a plaque dedicated to his 40 years of community service. We join in the tribute to Mr. Abelman because we know the story of his unselfish devotion to Brooklyn, his never-failing eagerness to participate in activities which reflect credit on the borough. It is our hope that he enjoy many more years of service to others, as we know full well that out of this he gets his greatest joy in life.

Passing of Daniel Frisch Is a Great Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Daniel Frisch, president of the Zionist Organization of America, died March 7, 1950, at the Presbyterian Hospital, Columbia Medical Center, after a serious operation. He was 53 years old.

He is survived by his widow, Tillie; a daughter, Mrs. Marvin Bacaner, of Boston, Mass.; and a son, Lazar, a student in the University of California.

Funeral services held in New York were attended by men and women from every walk of life and of every religious denomination. His body was then taken to Indianapolis for interment. The body was escorted by a prominent ZOA delegation. Despite serious illness, Mr. Frisch carried on with his presidential duties in directing the affairs of the Zionist Organization of America until he was taken to the hospital. He was the first president in the 53-year history of the organization to die in office.

Mr. Frisch's election to the presidency of the organization at the fifty-second annual convention held on May 27–29, 1949, at the Hotel Statler, New York, climaxed a career of more than 30 years of active association with and participation in the American Zionist movement. Born in Palestine, Mr. Frisch was taken by his parents to Rumania at the age of 1 year and immigrated to the United States in 1921 and settled in Indianapolis, Ind.

From the very day he immigrated to this country, Mr. Frisch was active in the work for the Zionist cause and for the welfare of the Jewish community in general. Combining idealism with practical approach, Mr. Frisch soon was accorded recognition for his organizational abilities and for the indomitable spirit to which he applied himself to the task of furthering the cause of Zion reborn. Despite the pressure of a successful business, Mr. Frisch devoted most of his time and energies to the cause of Zion and to the community.

While Mr. Frisch attended the Yeshiva—rabbinical seminary—abroad and a scion of famed rabbis in Rumania (his father and grandfather were rabbis in Rumania), he assumed the title of layman as a byline in his extensive writings. A writer and speaker of note, his articles on the philosophy and organizational problems of the Zionist movement have attracted international attention.

Before taking up his residence in New York some 5 years ago, Mr. Frisch during his domicile in Indianapolis was elected the delegate of that community to the American Jewish Conference and was subsequently named the outstanding Jewish citizen of the State. For a number of years he was chairman of the board of education of the Jewish Education Society of Indianapolis and was president of the Beth El Zedeck Temple there. He was a founder of the Indianapolis Zionist district and later was elected president of the Ohio Valley Zionist region.

Mr. Frisch attended most of the World Zionist Congresses during the last 2 decades and also was a delegate to the London Zionist Conference held before the end of the war. In 1934 he was elected a member of the national ZOA administrative council and later he became its chairman. He was also a member of the national ZOA executive for many years and until his election to the presidency in May 1949 he served as vice president of the ZOA and vice chairman of its inner committee.

Although only 9 months in office, Mr. Frisch left an indelible mark on the American Zionist movement by the inauguration of several major constructive projects embodied in his program for action for work in Israel and for cultural survival on the American Jewish scene, which was unanimously adopted by the national administrative council and national executive committee of the ZOA.

Immediately after the convention, Mr. Frisch left for Israel on a mission of close cooperation with the Israel Government and to lay the groundwork for the launching of ZOA projects embracing aid to the middleman, or the forgotten men as Mr. Frisch termed them, and for the erection of a ZOA house in Tel Aviv which is to serve as a center of information for American tourists, Jewish and non-Jewish, as well as to provide information on the American Jewish community to the Israelis.

Mr. Frisch again visited Israel last month, and together with Mr. Fred Monosson of Boston, chairman of the ZOA house building committee, he broke ground for the erection of the house. The ceremonies were attended by Prime Minister David Ben Gurion, United States Ambassador James McDonald, members of the Israel Cabinet, and members of the Knesset (Parliament). During this visit to Israel, Mr. Frisch made arrangements with the colonization department of the Jewish Agency for Palestine for the settlement of American pioneers on two ZOA colonies which are to be established under an agreement signed by Mr. Frisch in November with the Jewish Agency for Palestine and the World Confederation of General Zionists. He returned to this country an ill man.

Mr. Frisch's widely acclaimed program also called for a drastic revision in Hebrew education and the presentation of a comprehensive plan for the democratization of the Jewish communities.

In all his actions and writings, Mr. Frisch assumed a militant stand on major questions affecting the future of Zionist movement. He was frank, outspoken and minced no words in voicing his convictions.

The national ZOA office today released the text of a letter which Mr. Frisch dictated from his hospital bed on the eve of the operation. In this letter, which was addressed to the officers of the ZOA regions and 800 branches throughout the country, Mr. Frisch said:

You might find it rather strange that one who, like myself, is facing an unavoidable major operation, should dictate from his hospital bed a letter to his friends—but strange things do happen in life.

I trust you will believe me when, standing at the crossroads of life in more than one sense, I tell you that I am convinced that a strong ZOA and a vigorous general zionism (not zionism in general), are as indispensable today to the welfare and growth of Israel, both as a state and as a people, as they have been.

During the 9 months of my presidency, I have given the ZOA and the Zionist movement my very all. I have tried to manage the affairs of the ZOA without regard to past politics or any attempt to settle old accounts. I have tried to do my very best; I think I have earned the right to call on others to do theirs.

We are now facing the next convention. Believe me that, as I lie here, I have nothing on my mind concerning personalities that may compete for one position or another. All I am concerned about is that the dignity and the power and usefulness of the ZOA should be reflected in the next convention. We must come to the convention with a treasury capable of carrying us through the lean summer months and with a membership as large, if not larger, than that of a year ago. For the ZOA cannot maintain its influence and creativity without funds and a large membership.

May I appeal to you to help me and the ZOA by doing your very utmost within the next 60 days, from March 15 to May 15—our two mobilization months—so that we may exceed by far last year's membership and the proceeds of the American Zionist Fund, without which the ZOA cannot function?

I shall be thinking of you, looking forward to your help.

May life be kind to you always.

Cordially yours,

DANIEL FRISCH, *President*.

As the world joins us in mourning our loss, we in ZOA pledge ourselves to fulfill his last request.

More Debt and More Taxes Is Not the Cure for Excessive Debt and High Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, many thoughtful and prominent citizens are deeply concerned with the present trend of Government spending and its final result.

Recently there was received a copy of a letter on Government spending addressed to the President by a former schoolmate and now a prominent businessman of Spokane, Wash., which is inserted here for the consideration of the Members of Congress:

FEBRUARY 23, 1950.

His Excellency HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Don't you think, Mr. President, that it is about time we got our house in order? At the present moment we are Russia's No. 1 enemy and the No. 1 enemy of China. Russia would strike in a moment if she believed she was strong enough or we were weak enough. We are becoming weaker internally each day, and we cannot continue to spend our substances without one day becoming too weak to resist a strong aggressor nation. In 1926 Lenin is reported to have said, "Some day we shall force the United States to spend itself into destruction."

You must know, Mr. President, that an individual or a nation can't spend more than they take in without having disastrous results. We could probably cut $7,000,000,000 from our budget and our people would be better off and national defense would not be reduced nor necessary foreign spending impaired. It would take courage, of course, but the welfare of this Nation is far more important than the welfare of any individual or group of individuals in it.

You may ask, Where can we save $7,000,000,000? And I suggest the following savings:

Veterans' program	$2,000,000,000
Housing	1,000,000,000
CCC and reclamation	675,000,000
Rural electrification	218,000,000
Army engineers	200,000,000
School aid	290,000,000
Stock piling	350,000,000
Hoover economies	2,700,000,000

These savings will total over $7,000,000,000.

Russia, Mr. President, is getting stronger and we are getting weaker. We are becoming encircled by Russia, and some day, unless we change our ways and become strong internally and externally, it will be too late. Again, we cannot dissipate our substances and remain strong. There'll be no Marshall plan to help us.

One of our principal troubles is excessive debt and taxes, and we cannot cure these by more debt and more taxes. In spite of suggestions to the contrary, we cannot buy friendship or peace. Only strength and character will guarantee that.

Yours very truly,

EDITH EICHELBERG.

Hydrogen Bombs Versus Human Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an address by my friend, Mr. L. T. Merrill, of Beloit, Wis. His subject was The Handwriting on the Wall. I commend it to every Member of this body, because it is timely and points out dangers for the future that we must avoid:

THE HANDWRITING ON THE WALL

(By L. T. Merrill, pastor, Shopiere Congregational Church)

"I call heaven and earth to record this day against you that I have set before you life and death, the blessing and the curse. Therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live."—Deuteronomy 30: 19.

As at Balshazzar's feast, we see ominous handwriting on the wall confronting humanity with fateful choices. Looming into our consciousness are the gigantic letters, HB, written twice. It is the same combination of letters, but one HB has suggestions of benevolence and a power for the healing of the nations. The other has a portent that is terrible and sinister: "Choose ye this day." Joshua told the children of Israel. Which HB will we choose: Human brotherhood or the hydrogen bomb?

The fateful juxtaposition of the two alternatives confronts us paradoxically when churches and schools are called upon to observe this as Brotherhood Week and the President calls us to live by the Sermon on the Mount, but at the same time exercising what he says is his sole prerogative of decision in a democracy of 140,000,000 persons, he orders full speed ahead on attempted production of an H-bomb, which Winston Churchill this week said may be a thousandfold more terrible than the atomic bomb. If used, it will make a murderous mockery of the word brotherhood and a travesty of the international pact we are being urged to adopt against genocide or mass slaughter.

Newspapers lately carried report of an eastern professor who played the suicidal game of Russian roulette, in which the player stakes his life on a 1-to-5 chance. He puts a single cartridge into one chamber of a revolver, points the weapon at his head, whirls the chambers, and pulls the trigger. Twice this young man twirled the chambers and pulled the trigger and nothing happened. He gambled the third time and blew out his brains. We say, "What folly in the individual!" But how much greater and more tragic the folly of a civilization proceeding to point an H-bomb at its own head and letting brass hats and confused and fear-driven politicians get their quivery fingers near the trigger for blasts that may blow our civilization to bits!

Twice in a generation we let them pull the trigger with devastating but not wholly fatal consequences. Give them their third gambler's chance. What then? Vividly a modern thinker phrases the question: "Will some angel," he writes, "flying through the vault of Heaven look down upon the blackened cinder that was our earth and say: 'Here once dwelt a race of men and women made in the image of God, but they rebelled against His divine law and used the forces given them for their own extinction.'"

The anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth that ushered in Brotherhood Week calls to mind his qualities of leadership lifting him above the littler men fumblingly wielding power today. We long for the statesmanship of a Lincoln—with all his political abilities, his shrewdness, his acumen, his adroitness, his clever manipulation of men on the checkerboard of politics and diplomacy. Lincoln would not have come down to us so cherished and enshrined in the Nation's memory if he had not had besides, in consummate degree, that human quality of kindliness, that welling capacity for compassion, for sympathy, for mercy, and for understanding the hopes and dreams of the common man.

Where is the spirit of Lincoln today? We need another Lincoln, because not merely a nation but a world has been torn asunder, because its wounds are deeper, the devastation is more terrible, the spread of human woe wrought by war is more widespread than in any previous martial upheaval in the world's history. And that freedom from fear, one of the precious four freedoms that the war statesmen promised us, has not come; instead a rule of international fear gripping the minds of politicians and military men who shape our policies for us and who have at their command means of unexampled power to lead the world from fear to destruction—fear and the power of annihilation in dreadful combination.

Where is the hope of salvation for our human brothers here or around the world in these thunderbolts of cataclysmic destruction? "When wilt Thou save the people, O, God of mercy, when?" runs the opening line of an expressive brotherhood hymn. But God is not responsible for men's folly. God has a right to expect the people whom he has endowed with free will and with the ability to search out some of the deeper secrets of His power, which they have found in atomic energy, God has a right to expect that His human children will be less foolish than some of their leaders.

Dr. Harold Urey, atomic scientist, testifying before a Senate subcommittee last week, said if a hydrogen bomb is developed to its maximum efficiency there will be no place to hide. If two nations have H-bombs, Dr. Urey stated he didn't know what the result would be. "Perhaps in the end there isn't any solution," he said. "It may be hopeless."

Are the people of the world content with continuing in a course that leads down that blind alley of moral nihilism to annihilation? After 19½ centuries of Christendom's upward striving toward a better hope, must we accept that sort of suicidal solution in this Brotherhood Week in the year of our Lord 1950? "No!" the voice of Lincoln would be telling us. "No!" the voice of Christ is telling us. "No!" we are saying in our hearts if we believe in the universal Father, the God of love who "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth" (Acts 17: 26).

A single individual's expression may seem pretty futile. Yet a mass prayer to God should go up and a mass petition to our scientists and to our political leaders, who in a democracy are our servants, not our masters, imploring them to explore further the possibilities of human understanding and brotherly reconciliation before it is too late, before we build up international hate, suspicion, and fear to a point from which there will be no returning. Winston Churchill wisely suggested such further exploration of these possibilities in an election speech in Britain this week. His counsel should be heeded in the White House, in Congress, and in the Kremlin, when he says, "I feel that Christian men should not close the door on any hope of finding a new foundation for the life of the self-tormented human race."

We read in the Scripture, "He that hateth his brother is in the darkness and walketh in darkness and knoweth not whither he goeth. * * * Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer" (First John 2: 9; 3: 15).

"A new commandment I give unto you that ye love one another," said Jesus, who is the Lord of life rather than the Lord of death (John 13: 34).

The formula of Lincoln's second inaugural address for the reconciliation of the people after our throes of civil war was as old, as humane, and as Christian as the Golden Rule, and as the rule of brotherhood that the Master preached. But he was taken from us by an assassin's bullet and vindictive littler men frustrated his purposes, prolonging the bloody and hateful era of reconstruction.

The world for which Lincoln died, and for which Jesus died must apply their spirit and teachings in a more sincere, more purposeful, more far-reaching effort for the reconciliation of peoples and the healing of the nations; otherwise we shall be voices crying in a wilderness laid waste by diabolically directed science, "Peace, peace, but there is no peace."

"Love suffereth long and is kind. Love hopeth all things. Love never faileth" (First Corinthians 13: 4, 7–8). Paul meant that it would not fail if we really tried it, and the world must make another try at it or the consequences of failure in this atomic age are too terrible to contemplate.

"Thus saith the Lord, behold I set before you the way of life and the way of death" (Jeremiah 21: 8). It is a fateful choice. As we view the handwriting on the wall, which HB will we choose—the hydrogen bomb or human brotherhood?

Fair Employment Practices Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the February 25, 1950, issue of Business Week, pages 114 through 117, presents a national survey on fair employment practices legislation. This article is entitled "Does State FEPC Hamper You?" In light of the fact that we shall soon be debating the issue of fair employment practices legislation, I ask unanimous consent to have this article reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOES STATE FEPC HAMPER YOU?

How much of a headache—if any—have State fair employment laws proved to employers? With FEPC coming up on Capitol Hill, and more antibias bills pushing out of State legislatures in the next year or so, management has been pressing that question.

To get an answer, Business Week did some asking of its own. It queried a group of employers on just how State FEPC laws were affecting them. To get a fuller picture, it also queried State commissions.

Briefly, the answers boil down to this:

Employers agree that FEPC laws haven't caused near the fuss that opponents predicted. Disgruntled job-seekers haven't swamped commissions with complaints. Personal friction hasn't been at all serious. Some employers still think there's no need for a law. But even those who opposed an FEPC aren't actively hostile now.

Commissions say that the laws have created no new problems for either a business or a community. They haven't interfered with any employer's basic right to choose the most competent man for a job, the commissions say. And the unanimous view is that minority groups are finding openings in places barred to them before.

I. THE STATE LAWS

Eight States have adopted enforceable FEPC laws since 1945. Two others have laws calling for employers to stop job bias on a voluntary basis. And laws have been proposed, so far, in 14 other States.

Enforceable laws are on the statute books in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Washington, Oregon, and New Mexico.

Nonenforceable laws are in effect in Indiana and Wisconsin.

Proposed laws are before the legislatures of Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana (to add teeth to the present law), Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Utah.

In addition, four cities—Chicago, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, and Minneapolis—have enforceable local ordinances barring job bias.

What the laws do

FEPC laws in the eight States with enforceable statutes are all modeled after the wartime Executive order that terminated in 1943, and on the pioneering New York law (Business Week, June 30, 1945, p. 94). They have been through a pretty thorough shakedown period. But they have come through with only a few changes.

Broadly, these laws bear directly on an employer in three ways: (1) They bar him from refusing to hire, from discharging, or discriminating in advancement, because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; (2) they prohibit discriminatory job advertising; and (3) they ban questioning job applicants about their race or creed.

In all, the laws provide more or less tight job protection for so-called minority-group members: Catholics, Negroes, foreign-born residents, Jews, Mexicans, and Spanish-speaking residents.

II. THE COMMISSIONS' REPORT

Here's what State commissions had to say about the operation of their laws:

Connecticut: During the 1948-49 reporting period the commission handled 65 formal complaints of job discrimination—58 against employers, 5 against employment agencies, 2 against unions. It also investigated 40 cases that did not lead to formal complaints.

Half the charges involved manufacturing establishments; most alleged discrimination in hiring. Two-thirds were valid complaints, necessitating adjustment. All but one were settled without court action.

Generally, the commission reports no unfavorable comments from anyone.

Oregon: Most of the commission's work thus far has been devoted to disseminating information about the law. It has had four formal complaints of job bias—all from Negroes. One was dismissed for lack of evidence; one was substantiated and settled in conference with the prospective employer, who hired the complainant; two are still pending.

New Mexico: The commission has had six or eight complaints, of which three weren't justified. The others are in the process of investigation or conciliation.

Massachusetts: In 1948 (last year for which there is a final report) the commission handled 142 complaints and settled 135 after investigation and conference, without a single formal hearing or [having] a matter settled through conference brought into a court of law for further consideration. The other complaints were still pending when the commission reported.

The Massachusetts FEPC reports scores of job opportunities opened up for members of minority groups—including Negroes hired for the first time as retail store sales clerks. It said that a survey of settled cases indicated there had been no burden upon employers with respect to either management-employee relationships or employer-customer relationships.

New Jersey: The commission disposed of 423 formal, 195 informal, and 131 miscellaneous complaints in 1948-49. Of the formal complaints, 74 percent charged discrimination in hiring practices, and 13 percent alleged discriminatory dismissals.

The commission reports it closed 40 percent of the cases amicably, through conference; it dismissed 40 percent for lack of evidence of job bias; and the complainant withdrew in 20 percent of the cases.

The commission said that a check of 79 major New Jersey employers indicated: (1) No new difficulties or problems in business policy; (2) no interference with their basic right to select the most competent workers for [their] operations; and (3) as far as we know, the law has been fairly and effectually administered. The commission had had no complaints of FEPC-bred racial tensions or of anyone's refusing or vacating a job because of minority-group employment.

New York: The New York board has been functioning smoothly for almost 5 years. As a result, says its general counsel, Henry Spitz, minority groups have had broader employment opportunities. They're accepted today in places where they were never accepted before. The most noticeable spots, department stores and restaurants.

There's still resistance to job equality—and a great deal of discrimination. The commission is attacking these through educational efforts.

III. WHAT EMPLOYERS SAY

Reports were received from companies operating in Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York, and from Aluminum Co. of America—which has plants in six FEPC States.

Some of the comments:

Alcoa: FEPC laws have made very little difference in personnel policies, although the company has made minor changes in application forms to comply with technicalities of the various laws.

The laws have not increased the labor supply—as FEPC proponents promised they would. Alcoa said its labor market is substantially the same now as it would have been had these laws not been passed.

There have been a few cases in which we have been accused of discrimination by an applicant, where actually no discrimination existed. So Alcoa has had to adopt more precise methods of evaluating the ability of workers and more elaborate records as a potential defense in the event of future charges of discrimination.

Posting notices of compliance with the laws tended to irritate * * * employees who do not favor FEPC laws. So the company suggests more educational work among these groups.

Prudential Insurance Co.: The company has its home offices in Newark, where it employs a large white-collar work force. It feels that the job-bias ban has neither helped nor hurt—nor has it interfered with management's hiring prerogatives. Prudential has run into no opposition from employees to an antibias policy, and has had no discipline and grievance problems.

Elizabeth (N. J.) Iron Works: Management's normal rights have not been subjected to any serious pressures, and the New Jersey law hasn't created any new problems. There have been no adverse comments from employees.

Bridgeport (Conn.) Brass Co.: In Connecticut, none of the disastrous results anticipated by FEPC opponents * * * have come to pass—such as mass walkouts of employees forced to work with minority groups, loss of patronage by mercantile establishments, etc. Instead, the law is getting voluntary acceptance * * * by the vast majority of employers, employment agencies, and unions.

It has eliminated entirely a large and growing Communist campaign being waged * * * among the large urban Negro groups. It has widened job opportunities for minority-group members; but without interfering in the prerogatives of management so far as we have yet noted.

The law has had no injurious effects on the company's personnel relations, has caused no grievance or disciplinary problems. It has been ably administered—with a determined effort to get acceptance of the law through education rather than persecution.

Hat Corp. of America: The Connecticut law "has in no way interfered with our employment practices," this South Norwalk company reports. It has created no problems whatever.

Allen Manufacturing Co.: This Hartford, Conn., metalworking company has had no difficulties, is much impressed with the Connecticut law.

Pitney-Bowes, Inc.: The Stamford, Conn., postage-meter company "started a Negro integration program * * * before the enactment of the Connecticut [FEPC] act. Many of the problems which we encountered would have been much less difficult had we the support of [the] legislation." Pitney-Bowes believes the Connecticut act is "functioning very successfully."

Western Electric Co.: Plants under New York and New Jersey laws "have not had any difficulty in meeting the requirements of these laws," and the laws have not "entailed any undue hardship on employers who are trying to do a conscientious job in employee relations." The laws "have been accepted generally by our employees."

New York Shipbuilding Corp.: The Camden, N. J., firm reports no "interference with our right to select the most competent workers" and "no added problems or difficulties."

New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.: No serious difficulties have arisen under the New Jersey law, and there has been no interference with hiring on a basis of competence.

Lea Fabrics, Inc.: This Newark textile company was charged with discrimination shortly after the New Jersey law went into effect. On investigation, the company was cleared. After that first experience, the company has had "no new difficulties" in complying with the law, or in selecting the most competent workers.

St. Regis Paper Co. (Panelyte division): A few cases requiring State investigation have arisen at its Trenton, N. J., plant, but the company reports "very little difficulty" with the State act. And it reports: "No problems that have not previously been with us have been raised since the inception of the law, nor has it interfered with our hiring procedure."

Health Insurance Is Next

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who advocate a comprehensive national health program welcome a significant article in the March issue of Fortune magazine titled "Health Insurance Is Next." The article was written for the Henry Luce publication by Russell W. Davenport.

The article is an important contribution to greater understanding of the need for a national health program. While we do not agree with many of Mr. Davenport's conclusions about voluntary programs, his facts about the urgent need for some kind of national program are impressive.

There is nothing radical about the author. His most prominent political activity was managing Wendell Willkie's presidential campaign in 1940. He is a Republican. What can be said about Mr. Davenport should also be said about Henry Luce, the publisher of Fortune. He is a Republican whose wife, Clare Boothe Luce, served as a Republican of considerable prominence in the House of Representatives.

This article marks a great forward step in our understanding of the state of the Nation's health. We now have groups in both political parties who realize that this serious problem is beyond political boundaries. They differ as to method, but there is no real difference of opinion that something must be done by Government action.

Mr. Davenport is very definite in declaring that the American Medical Association is doing itself and the American people a real disservice in its propaganda designed to prove there is no problem. He makes it finally and eminently clear that more than half of the American people do not get adequate medical care.

From that point of agreement, I think the legislative process can work to solve the problem. With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present the Fortune article:

HEALTH INSURANCE IS NEXT

(By Russell W. Davenport)

It is now certain that one of the big questions before the American people during the next few years will be public health. Already seven major bills have been introduced into Congress, with several others on the way. Prospective candidates are sizing up the question and feeling for their positions. All signs point to a good, old-fashioned political debate.

The issues involved in the debate are momentous. There is first of all the issue of whether a nation whose health and health services rank among the best in the world needs any major legislation at all. But secondly, even if it is granted that major legislation is needed, the controversial question arises of the kind of legislation desired. Here the inquiring citizen runs straight into the so-called welfare issue, but on a scale larger than anything he is likely to have encountered thus far. The attempt to solve the problem of health by Government initiative—as the administration proposes—would constitute a more advanced step in the direction of state socialism than the American people have yet been willing to take.

Now of all the proposals made thus far, only two approach this issue in a thoroughgoing manner on a national scale. One is the administration proposal (S. 1679 and H. R. 4312 and 4313), which has as its keystone the principle of compulsory insurance administered through governmental agencies. The other is the remarkable proposal (S. 1970 and H. R. 4919) of a group of progressive Republican Senators and Congressmen, based upon the voluntary principle. (The sponsors: Senators FLANDERS (Vermont) and IVES (New York); Representatives AUCHINCLOSS and CASE (New Jersey), FULTON (Pennsylvania), HALE (Maine), HOLTZ (Massachusetts), JAVITS (New York), MORTON (Kentucky), and NIXON (California).) This principle, of course, has been used in many plans, notably in the Hunt bill, which is comprehensive in scope, but vague as to its provisions and costs. More typically, however, as in the Taft bill and the Hill bill, voluntary plans are partial plans, aimed at alleviating some portion of the medical problem. But the progressive Republican plan defines a method of implementation (which the Hunt bill lacks) whereby the voluntary principle can be applied effectively on a national scale. This bill, therefore, which has had remarkably little publicity, ought to be better known, inasmuch as it seeks the achievement of an important social goal in a uniquely American manner.

An examination of all legislation dealing with health would be a lengthy process. Inasmuch as the two bills in question are the only ones that set forth a complete national health policy, with practical proposals for implementation, we shall do best to confine our inquiry to them.

Now there is a strong body of opinion, hitherto led by the American Medical Association, that there is no need for any such basic legislation as either of these bills proposes. This position rests on the record of United States medicine thus far. Since 1900, for example, life expectancy has increased from an average of 49 years to 68 years; while the population has doubled, the number of old people has nearly quadrupled; enormous strides have been made in combating pneumonia and communicable diseases; infant mortality is the lowest in the world (except in Sweden); and so forth.

Moreover, the United States is relatively very well supplied with physicians and medical facilities. There are almost 180,000 active and available licensed physicians, or, in round numbers, 1 for every 1,000 persons. We spend privately about $7,400,000,000 on medical care, $2,000,000,000 publicly, and $80,000,000 on medical research—a total of about $9,500,000,000 a year. There are about 6,000 hospitals with a total of 1,500,000 beds, which, during 1946, took care of 1 out of every 10 persons in the population. Moreover, this vast health system is bolstered in many ways. Some 18,000 local political units provide medical services of various kinds; United States industry has shown a good deal of initiative in setting up services for its employees; and there are about 500 voluntary health-insurance organizations that give some form of medical protection to 65,000,000 people. In short, says the AMA and its followers, while it may be necessary to make better provision for underprivileged groups, there is no need for comprehensive legislation.

But unfortunately these rosy statistics are neither complete nor realistic. The truth is that some portion of the American people—no one knows exactly the number—can and do get the best medical care in the world. But another portion get this kind of care only when they are lucky, or if they make a tremendous financial sacrifice; while still a third portion do not get it at all. And the disconcerting fact seems to be that the second and third groups, added together, constitute more than half of the population. The AMA itself observed in 1939 that families with incomes under $3,000 a year could not afford to pay the costs of a major or chronic illness. If this figure were adjusted for the rise in the cost of living it would today be close to $5,000 a year and would apply to about 80 percent of the population.

The illusory quality of the over-all statistics arises chiefly from the bad distribution of doctors and of medical facilities. The State of New York, for example, has 1 doctor for every 500 persons, but Mississippi has only 1 for every 1,500. In many counties of the United States there is no resident physician at all. In California there is 1 dentist for every 1,300 persons; in South Carolina 1 for every 5,000. In Connecticut there is 1 nurse for every 300 persons; in Arkansas 1 for every 2,100. In one-third of the 3,000 counties of the United States there is not a single full-time health nurse. And in specialist fields, such as pediatrics, it is found that out of a total of 3,500 pediatricians, only 4 percent are practicing in small towns or rural areas, where 60 percent of the children live. The same uneven distribution characterizes medical facilities. Forty percent of the counties in the United States have no acceptable general hospital, and not a single State has enough general hospital beds to meet the standard established by the National Health Assembly (4.5 per 1,000 of population).

Generally speaking, therefore, it can be said that the medical services of the United States, while adequate, or nearly so, in certain wealthy areas of the country, fall in other areas far below any standard that an American could conscientiously defend.

THE COST OF MEDICAL CARE

These considerations enable us greatly to clarify the debate. Almost everybody, including the AMA, agrees that direct Government aid is desirable for the expansion of medical facilities, especially hospitals; for

increasing the capacity of the medical schools; for special aid to backward areas, etc. Both the administration bill and the Republican bill provide for such aid about equally, but the amount cannot be determined until actual appropriations are made. Aid to hospitals has already been started under the revised Hospital Construction Act, which provides $150,000,000 of Federal funds annually for construction purposes.

Yet the expansion of facilities and services is by no means the whole problem. The biggest part of the problem, and the most difficult to solve, has to do with the cost of medical care; and it is here that the political debate begins in earnest. On one side there are those who contend that Government should not concern itself with this problem at all. Then there are those, such as Senator TAFT, who say that some aid must be given to cover costs, but only to those who are unable to pay. And finally, there are those who maintain that the question of costs can be met only through a national system of insurance. This is the position taken by the framers of the two bills under discussion.

It is a powerful position that will certainly win the backing of the people in the long run. For the threat of medical costs looms over the average American family in a truly disaster way. The threat does not lie in the average cost but in the fact that a serious illness may drive the cost for a particular family up into the thousands of dollars. Hence the doctor is avoided, symptoms are concealed, and diseases that might have been prevented had they been detected at the outset are permitted to develop into irreparable human tragedies. Only if these fears are disposed of by a system of insurance, it is argued, will the American people begin to approach the problem of their own health intelligently.

Of course, as already stated, about 65,000,000 people (40 to 45 percent of the population) are already covered by some form of voluntary medical insurance. But the coverage of almost all of these policies is very inadequate. Virtually all of these people are covered for hospital benefits of some kind, though often meagerly. Only about half are covered for surgery. And a pitiable 5 percent (about 3,500,000 people) are covered by relatively comprehensive plans. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield give hospitalization and some medical and surgical benefits, but their premiums, levied as flat rates, are beyond the reach of lower income groups. Moreover, 60 percent of the Blue Cross members live in six industrial States, only 17 percent in the South and West, and less than 3 percent in the rural districts. This same uneven distribution probably characterizes commercial insurance plans, employee-benefit associations, union plans, etc., etc.

In a survey recently released by the Henry Street Settlement of Manhattan it was shown that out of 200 families with incomes under $3,000 a year, there were 151 who had medical bills in 1949 ranging up to $1,000 per family. On top of these relatively tremendous costs, in many cases, a job was at stake. One woman, whose husband earned $55 a week, had to have a hysterectomy at a cost of $1,000 (doctor $400, hospital $300). In addition she paid $100 for dental care for her four children and $50 for dental care for her husband. Another woman with a chronic heart condition had not been to the doctor for 2 months because she couldn't afford to go (her husband earns $65 a week). She had a prescription for some pills, but they cost $1.90, and she had not called for them at the drugstore because she could not pay for them.

The majority of these people go to free clinics, but they dislike them intensely. The great complaint is that they have to sit around the waiting rooms sometimes as long as 6 hours, often for 3, before the doctor can get to them—women with children and household cares, men with jobs. Such people are torn between their dread of the clinics and their fear of being unable to pay the doctor. As a result, the practice has grown up of calling an ambulance, no matter what the sickness is. The ambulance has to come (with two attendants), and the person goes to the hospital, where he is properly diagnosed—all at the expense of the city. In rural areas, where there is rarely an ambulance to call, the chief problem is often to find any medical care whatever.

THE RIGHT TO LIFE

The conclusion to be drawn from such consideration is that most Americans are financially unable to care for themselves medically. If this is true, then something much more profound is involved than the AMA has admitted. With reference to the first article of this series, The Greatest Opportunity on Earth (Fortune, October 1949), it is apparent that nothing less is involved than the right of life.

As that article sought to make clear, this right, when originally framed in the Declaration of Independence, may have had a somewhat restricted meaning. But to insist on what may have been its original construction, without taking account of the evolution of the society, is in effect to discard the right. If we are to maintain the right we must endow it with contemporary meaning. And the evolutionary fact that we must take into account in the present instance is the growth of modern medicine, which gives to those who can pay for it enormous advantages over those who cannot. If we are to take the right to life seriously in our time we cannot rest our medical service upon clinics that the people dread, doctors whom they avoid, and costs capable of ruining them. We must find out how to deliver reasonably adequate medical care at a cost that anyone can afford.

And it is precisely here that all those plans fall which, like the Taft bill, propose to solve the problem by taking care only of those who are unable to pay, i. e., the indigent. A man earning $50 a week is not ordinarily described as "indigent." Yet if his wife needs a hysterectomy—not to mention a host of other hazards, some less, some more expensive—he becomes at once medically indigent. On this basis, as already pointed out, 80 percent of the American people are medically indigent, or are in danger of becoming so. The medical problem, in short, is national in scope.

This brings us face to face with the question of method. In last October's article it was pointed out that there are in general two ways to reach the social goals that have become necessities of our time. One is to permit the government to take the initiative—in which event, it was maintained, there can be no final solution except that of state socialism. The other is to encourage the voluntary initiative of private parties, whether these be business concerns, individuals, or fraternal or benevolent organizations. Insofar as such private initiative is able to implement the necessary social goals, the proper role of government remains restricted; insofar as it fails in this, the role of government is of necessity expanded.

The two medical plans presented here pose this most profound issue of our time with a precision rarely found in politics. The administration plan gives the initiative to the Government; the Republican plan, while providing Government aid, gives it to the people themselves.

THE ADMINISTRATION BILL

The chief and unique feature of the administration bill, as already indicated, is compulsory national health insurance. This is to be financed by a 3-percent pay-roll tax, which will total $4,200,000,000 a year. The basic financing of the plan is similar to Federal old-age insurance but with complications that involve considerable sums from general taxation. The bill provides for the prior appropriation of an amount equal to 1 percent of all wages (about $1,400,000,000) as a reserve fund, half of which has already been recommended in the President's budget message, with the further recommendation that it be raised by a special pay-roll tax. In addition, the bill provides for an appropriation, specifically from general taxation, equal to one-half of 1 percent of all wages (about $700,000,000) for dental services and other expenses for each of the first 3 years—and 1 percent annually (about $1,400,000,000, assuming the total for wages remains the same) for the second 3 years. The total cost of this insurance from all sources, based on the administration's estimate that 80 percent of the population will be covered, therefore, would be about $6,300,000,000 the first year (including the reserve), $4,900,000,000 the second and third years, and $5,600,000,000 a year for the second 3 years.

Two points regarding these figures are worth noting. In the first place, in the British experience, the actual cost of their national health program during the first year turned out to be about double the original estimate, according to Minister of Health Aneurin Bevan. The administration proponents claim that this cannot happen to their estimates, owing to the calculating methods used; but the difficulty of forecasting the rate of increase in medical and hospital services is almost insuperable, and it is a safe guess that the present estimates would have to be revised upward.

Secondly, however, it cannot be said that costs of this order of magnitude are out of line with the task that has to be done. The aim of any national health-insurance program is to provide better medical care for more people; hence it will of necessity result in the expenditure of something more than the $9,500,000,000 that the people are now spending in the health field. Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that the Federal expenditures would not all represent new spending: a very large portion of them (just how much would be difficult to determine) would go to pay medical bills that the people are now paying for themselves.

Perhaps the most serious defect of the administration bill is its failure to face the result of suddenly dumping such a huge load on existing medical facilities. In this connection administration supporters are not always candid. They contend that the load would not be unduly large, and they cite the experience of Britain.

It is true that statistics can be cited to show that the increased load on British medicine, caused by the national health plan, has not been unduly large. Yet it is a well-known fact in the medical profession that British doctors, with panels ranging up to 4,000 patients, and with a mass of paper work to finish every day, are carrying an enormous burden. This is made clear in the excellent report, the National Health Service of Great Britain, by Willard C. Rappleye, and in other documents. A nation's medical capacity, though impossible to measure accurately, is a real, not an imaginary factor. An effort to exceed that capacity through government compulsion can have only one result: the substitution of mass techniques for individual techniques. And while there may be much room for the development of mass techniques in American medicine, the attempt to push this too far too suddenly is bound to result in a lowering of standards, from which it would be difficult for the profession to recover.

Administration enthusiasts are inclined to make a virtue of this defect. Said the bill's father, Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing, in his 1948 report to the President, "Facilities and manpower expand in response to effective demand and demand depends on

total group purchasing power. * * * It is acknowledged that there is a shortage. * * * [But] the plan as outlined here * * * will provide the funds and generate the steady and increased demand which will assure us enough medical manpower and facilities in the foreseeable future."

Yet this reasoning fails to meet the realities. It is quite true that a demand creates a supply. But it is necessary to ask, "A supply of what?" We are not in this case talking about a supply of bobby pins. We are talking about a supply of medical care, and this means—if it is to mean anything honest—a supply of personal attention. As Winslow Carlton, a medical-care consultant, has put it, "The rapid processing of patients in a clinic can provide effective screening for gross diseases, but the mesh is far too coarse for the majority of ills that cause suffering and cut off life. * * * The science of medicine has greatly advanced, but * * * most medical care is still an art * * *."

It is true that millions of Americans desperately need medical care. It is true also that for these people care of some sort, even if the standard is lower, would be better than nothing. Still, the administration bill is in danger of promising the American people something that it cannot deliver. Should the bill succeed in its stated objective of reaching 80 percent of the people, within (let us say) 5 years, not only would the care of the lower-income groups be second rate, but a medical inflation would result, complete with black-market fees. People who could afford to do so would pay private fees for special attention. The inequitable distribution of good medical care would thus become even more pronounced. And the experience of our time teaches us what the remedy for this scarcity situation would surely be: more government controls.

The administration plan, in short, can succeed only insofar as it fails, within the first several years, to reach its objective of service to 80 percent of the people. A promise of medical care commensurate with American medical standards can only be honestly fulfilled if time is provided for orderly growth.

THE PROGRESSIVE REPUBLICAN BILL

This bill starts from the proposition that any group of Americans can set up an insurance plan adapted to their needs. Such groups might include those already in existence, such as Blue Shield and Blue Cross, employer plans, union plans, benefit-association plans, or entirely new plans worked out by responsible citizens. State and regional boards must approve the plans, but they would not initiate them.

The major requirements laid upon the voluntary programs, if they are to participate in Government aid, are (1) that they be nonprofit; (2) that their governing boards shall be composed of a majority of laymen; and (3) that their subscriptions shall be determined as a percentage of the subscriber's income (up to incomes of $5,000 a year and with a minimum charge of $6 a year). This latter feature is unique. Almost all the voluntary plans now in existence charge flat rates, whatever the subscriber's income, and they are therefore usually beyond the reach of lower income groups. This fact should be remembered when it is claimed that, according to past experience, voluntary insurance provides insufficient coverage. By requiring that rates be based upon a percentage of income the Republican proposal makes such plans more available than they have ever been.

Thus in a 3-percent plan, a family with an income of $5,000 a year would pay $150 a year, or $12.50 a month; one with $3,600 would pay $114 a year, or $9.50 a month; one with $1,500 a year would pay $45 a year, or $3.75 a month. They would all get the same services. It is estimated that the $3,600 family would just about pay its way on an actuarial basis. Smaller incomes would be subsidized, mostly by public funds, but partly also by the higher-income people in the plan. It is worth noting that this partial subsidization of the lower income groups by the higher ones is just what happens now, a rough and unsatisfactory way, through the scaling of charges by the doctors and the hospitals. Persons with incomes over $5,000 could join a plan, and would undoubtedly choose to do so; but in most plans they would probably be paid fixed sums (called indemnity benefits) rather than the complete costs of their care (called service benefits).

The amount of Government aid that any particular plan would receive would be determined by a formula that sounds rather complicated but is mathematically simple. To begin with, there is set up in the bill itself a yardstick plan, based on a charge of 3 percent of a subscriber's income, and providing certain specified benefits (doctors, both general and specialist; visiting nurses; hospitalization for 30 days; ambulance service; and rehabilitation). A regional board estimates the cost of providing these benefits in its region, and this estimate (if accepted by the State) is called the "cost norm" for that region. Let us suppose it to be $50 per capita. Each plan in the region is then assigned an allowed cost, depending on the number of services it offers. Manifestly, if it offers the yardstick services its allowed cost will be the cost norm of its region. If it covers lower-income groups, however, its charge of 3 percent of subscribers' incomes will result in something less than this allowed cost—let us say $37.50 per subscriber. The amount of Government aid owing to a plan will be the difference between actual subscribers' payments and the allowed cost—in this case the difference between $37.50 and $50, or $12.50 per subscriber.

An interesting feature of this formula is that if a plan is heavily loaded with lower-income groups, and has consequently a lower gross income, Government aid will be greater. Conversely, if the income groups served by the plan are relatively high, Government aid will be less. It is estimated that on the average the Government's contribution (State and Federal) will be about a quarter of the allowed cost.

A plan does not have to adhere to the yardstick, however. It may provide fewer services, in which case its allowed cost will be correspondingly less than the cost norm and it will charge less to its subscribers (say 2 percent). It will still get Government aid to cover the difference between the allowed cost of its services and the payments from subscribers. Or it may (with State approval) offer more than the yardstick and charge more than 3 percent.

By the use of this formula a maximum of freedom is assured for all concerned. Not only may patients, doctors, and hospitals stay out of all plans, but, if they want to come in, they will have a variety of plans to choose from. In fact, it is anticipated that the system will lead to a good deal of healthy competition. Some plans may devise means (for instance, by the installation of a first-rate system of group insurance) to provide more service than the yardstick, though charging only 3 percent. They would not get more Government aid than other 3 percent plans, but their popularity with subscribers would exert a competitive pressure upon less efficient plans.

It is exceedingly difficult to estimate the cost of this proposal because it is not known how fast the plans would grow. The framers of the bill have made the assumption for working purposes that in 4 years the voluntary plans could build up to a volume of about $3,000,000,000, to which the Government contribution (part State, part Federal) would be an additional $1,000,000,000. This bill, then, contemplates a somewhat smaller expenditure than the administration bill, although the two plans are set up so differently that an exact comparison is almost impossible. Since the long-range objective of both is complete national coverage, it may be assumed that their ultimate costs will be of the same order.

THE OBJECTIONS

Since only 1 day's hearings have been held on the Republican bill, it has not yet received much criticism. One objection is that it subsidizes the high costs of voluntary plans, which, besides ordinary administrative expenses, include substantial items for collection and sales promotion. Yet this objection fails to take account of a number of factors. In the first place, Government bureaus themselves are not ordinarily conspicuous for economical operation. The FSA has given a good account of itself administratively, but the administration of the health bill would be infinitely more complex than that, of say, of OASI. It would involve not merely the administration of funds but the administration of services. Secondly, competition between the voluntary plans should foster economical operation. And finally, while sales promotion would still be necessary, this would constitute a form of medical education—which is very much needed if any kind of national insurance is to be a success. In such matters the cheapest way is not always the best. Americans encourage small enterprises, for example, even though in innumerable instances these are demonstrably less efficient than very big ones. As a supporter of the Republican bill has remarked, "The additional cost of voluntary programs, if any, represents the cost of free choice."

Some people object to the plan's complexity. It is admittedly difficult to understand at first, but this is partly because it embodies some really original thinking. So far as the yardstick formula is concerned, it entails very little actuarial work that is not already done to set up any voluntary medical plan. This work will be done by actuaries and statisticians, not by the subscriber. From the latter's point of view the proposal is simple enough: Government aid to voluntary plans will enable you to insure yourself medically at a great bargain. Your concern, therefore, is to choose that plan which will give you the best service for your money.

Another and more serious objection concerns the States. The Republican plan makes Federal aid contingent on State aid, according to a formula that gives the poorer States an advantage. Thus, in order for the plans to start, States must undertake to make substantial outlays. In addition, a great many States will have to change their laws (a) to allow consumer-sponsored plans and (b) to provide for the fixing of charges on the basis of a percentage of income. These difficulties are real, but surely not insuperable. They arise partly from the fact that the States are given a real choice, whereas by the administration plan they are compelled.

The fundamental objection to the Republican proposal has to do with voluntary plans in general. Administration proponents assert that their growth has been inadequate, their costs high, and their coverage scanty. They declare flatly that the lower income groups will never subscribe to such plans. Moreover, how is the necessary capital for starting a plan to be raised? Private funds for such purposes are becoming increasingly difficult to get. In short, many an administration advocate will declare that he would prefer the voluntary system in principle; but he will add, flatly, that it won't work.

In answer to the objection about the difficulty of raising the original capital funds, the advocates of the Republican bill admit that this exists. Nevertheless, they think that the administration people exaggerate it. It is true that some voluntary plans have required very large capital funds: the health

insurance plan of Greater New York cost $250,000 to start, and the New York Group Health Assurance cost $500,000. But these plans were faced with special problems. Group-health plans in Washington, D. C., Minnesota, and Seattle cost respectively $10,000, $16,000, and $15,000 to start; and even the large Associated Hospital Service in New York City cost only $30,000. The Republican bill, moreover, provides that the Federal Government may advance [illegible]-bearing loans to an approved plan up to 50 percent of the total of the starting capital.

The answer of the Republicans to the categorical objection to voluntary plans in general is made difficult by the fact that their bill is in effect proposing something entirely new. It is the contention of its sponsors that a voluntary system has never really been tried. It is true that many voluntary plans exist. But a concerted effort—promoted, possibly, by communities and civic organizations—has never been made to educate the people to the virtue of such plans, offered at below cost through Government aid. The Republicans point out that the American people have been able to educate themselves on many other matters (life insurance, for example); that vast facilities exist for the purpose; and that if community leadership were aroused throughout the country, with the help of the right kind of legislation, an entirely different atmosphere could be created that would make past experience obsolete. They feel that the administration supporters are failing to make allowance for the potentialities of the American people.

The advocates of the Republican bill believe that if universal health insurance is ever to be achieved in this country, without sacrificing the qualitative excellence of American medicine, a fairly long evolution lies ahead. The compulsory system advocated by the administration contemplates forcing this evolution. A voluntary system would stimulate it as much as possible, but never in excess of the ability of the medical profession to grow in an orderly way. The Republican plan contemplates starting with a nucleus of about 65,000,000 people who are already educated, through voluntary plans, to the idea of some medical insurance. It would not be too difficult, the Republicans think, to educate these people to the idea of complete medical insurance. From this nucleus it is no far cry to the coverage of everyone on a pay roll, where the device can conveniently be used of periodical deductions—undoubtedly with the employer sharing in the contributions. And at the same time, everyone on relief would be joining the plans, for the simple reason that most States would subscribe for them.

Such a growth of demand, the Republicans believe, would develop great pressures, not only for more medical services, but for better ones. The necessary expansion has already started in the Hospital Construction Act, and would be carried further by various provisions for direct aid to medical schools, backward areas, etc., proposed in their bill. At the end of 5 or 6 years some of this expansion would have taken place, and it would then be possible to push on toward complete national coverage. If special legislation is needed for this final step, we would then know what kind of legislation it ought to be. But to attempt to take the final step before the necessary preliminaries have been achieved seems to the Republicans both foolhardy and unnecessary.

DEMOCRATIC INTANGIBLES

Underlying all the arguments regarding these plans there are a number of important intangibles, not the least of which is the question of how far the power of government is to be enlarged.

The framers of the administration bill [illegible] a massive effort to reduce Federal powers to a minimum. The functions of the National Health Board, the top medical authority for the plan, would be essentially threefold: (1) To account for the funds; (2) to distribute the funds; and (3) to set standards. All other administrative tasks would be passed down to the States, and thence to regional boards. These powers sound innocent enough. Yet they are, after all, the ultimate powers so far as the plan is concerned; and since the whole plan is by Federal law compulsory, the Board is bound to prevail wherever its duties lead it into conflict with local interests.

But even assuming that the States would have a good deal of working power under the administration bill, we should not forget that a State is also a government. And the question is whether any government, Federal or State, ought to be drawn into such decisions as the administration bill requires some government to make. Merely to guarantee doctors control over professional matters is not enough. Doctors will be put in the position of contracting with the State concerning their fees, for example. Hospitals will also be in this position. The determination of what is adequate, what constitutes incentive, what constitutes undue profit—all this, and the paper work pertaining to it, becomes the concern of government.

The danger of this can be illustrated by a single example from the British experience. Before they installed their compulsory health-insurance system the British had a partial plan designed especially to help lower-income groups. Under this earlier plan the Government set certain rates for filling teeth, and another rate for extractions. The rate for extractions, however, turned out to be too high; the temptation for every dentist was to take a bad tooth out rather than to try to save it. This seemed to the Ministry a bad policy, and when the full-fledged compulsory-insurance plan was installed, the rates were altered, giving relatively better rates for fillings. The effect of this was to encourage dentists to save teeth; indeed, where a dentist was very busy (and almost all of them were) it became difficult to obtain an appointment for an extraction, unless one was willing to pay the dentist a private fee.

Very likely the policy of saving teeth is a wise one. But the real question is whether it is wise to implicate government, whether Federal or State, in decisions having professional repercussions that are completely unforeseeable.

Soft-Socialist planners cannot avoid this kind of thing no matter how hard they may try. For it is their invariable practice to start their planning at the wrong end of the social organism. If you start with an entity called government and work downward, there is no real way to limit its power, because nobody has more power. True limitation of government power can come only by working from the people upward. This is perhaps the most basic concept of American politics, and we shall overlook it at our peril.

The chief virtue of the progressive Republican plan is that it proceeds in exactly that manner. It is true that in order to provide for full national coverage, and especially for the lower-income groups, the Republican bill gives the Federal Government a lot of power. It has the power, that is, to approve a State's plans, and above all, to pass upon the propriety and accuracy of a State's claims for Federal aid with reference to the yardstick. Even at that, the Republican proposal gives the Federal Government far less direct power than the administration plan does: Government has nothing whatever to say, for example, about medical fees, which are wholly determined by the doctors in their contracts with the voluntary plans. Yet all that is really secondary. The great advantage of the Republican proposal lies in the fact that the initiative must come from the people and not from any government, whether Federal or State. The people and the local communities retain the power, because theirs is the decision whether to act and how to act. If the Government yardstick is not realistic they will refuse to act. The power of Government is thereby checked and balanced by the people themselves.

The ultimate question, therefore, is whether the American people have got the initiative and the intelligence to subscribe to voluntary health plans. The administration supporters do not think so. The Republicans, on the other hand, do not declare flatly that they have. They merely say that nobody knows—because nobody has really tried.

It may well be that Americans are not what we like to think they are—individuals capable of making intelligent decisions regarding their own affairs. But if this is the case, then it would seem that socialism in some form, and especially the principle of State compulsion, is unavoidable. The progressive Republicans merely maintain that this conclusion cannot be reached a priori. They say that the voluntary method should be tried first, to see how far it will go. They suggest that it will perhaps go so far that the problem of including everyone can be solved by much simpler means than those that the administration now proposes—for example, many States today require automobile drivers to carry some form of insurance, though this may be (and usually is) private insurance. The progressive Republicans believe that the hope of freedom lies in the intelligence of the millions of individuals of which our society is composed. They desire to test this proposition before surrendering it. And they maintain that the medical issue, which now faces the Nation, provides almost a perfect test.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE—TWO PLANS

There are seven major health bills now before Congress. Of these, the Taft bill and the Hill bill are both chiefly concerned with providing aid to the lowest-income groups on a basis of Federal charity. The Keating bill seeks to stimulate voluntary health insurance by providing for income-tax deductibility. The Bosone bill provides for compulsory health insurance financed by a pay-roll tax, which would pay medical bills over $50, dental bills over $25—the catastrophe type of insurance. The Hunt bill is an amorphous plan for voluntary insurance, with the Federal Government in the role of insurance company. The two bills outlined herewith are the most complete. They embody two different political philosophies, each liberal in character, which are bound to clash in coming months.

Administration plan

How it works: If an employee or self-employed, you are subject to a Federal tax, which entitles you to medical insurance. You choose your own doctor. If he has joined the plan and if he accepts you—he doesn't have to do either—he will care for you and send the bill to a Government insurance agency—either State of local—which will pay him according to the system chosen by himself or a majority of doctors in his area—salary, fee per service, or flat fee per patient on his list. The amount of his fee will be determined by a contract between him and the State or local agency, based on existing income standards in the State or area. The bill instructs that "regard shall be had for * * * annual income," and that fees should be calculated to insure "professional and financial incentives."

Regional role: The local committee or officer administers the plan in the region; publishes names of doctors, hospitals, etc., participating in the plan; disseminates information; receives and adjusts complaints; cooperates with medical profession, hospitals, etc.

State role: The State agency makes a survey to determine resources and needs of the State; then develops a program and sets up local health service areas. It enters into agreements with all legally qualified furnishers of service—including voluntary prepayment plans—specifying what services are to be provided and what fees are to be paid. It reports all this to the National Board.

Federal role: The bill sets up a National Health Insurance Board of five, together with an Advisory Council. The Board allocates the funds to the States, taking account of population eligible for services, medical facilities, number of doctors, etc., in accordance with its own and State estimates of "the cost of reasonable and equitable compensation." It determines the extent—beyond the guaranteed minimum—of the hospital services to be rendered by the plan. It can limit dental, home-nursing, and auxiliary services. It sets the standards for specialists. It has power of approval over all State plans, and if a State fails to submit a program it must step in and administer the plan in that State.

How financed: Federal pay-roll tax of 3 percent of salaries or net income up to $4,800 per year—probably half from employers, half from employees—plus, from general or pay-roll taxes, $1,400,000,000 before the plan starts, as a reserve; plus, from general taxes, $700,000,000 a year for first 2 years, $1,400,000,000 a year for next 3 years.

Benefits: Medical, surgical, and hospital; plus home nursing, auxiliary, and dental, if available.

Hospitals: Free to join or stay out. Participating hospitals contract with the State or local agency for payments for services, based on "reasonable costs of hospitalization" and on "least expensive multiple-bed accommodations available in hospital," but National Board can set maximum payments. Plan guarantees 60 days with nursing.

Professional personnel: Doctors as individuals or groups contract with State, not with private parties. They are, however, guaranteed control of professional matters, are represented on general advisory committees, and form sole membership of special professional committees.

Republican plan

How it works: Voluntary nonprofit health-insurance plans are started in your community (with help of Federal loans). The cost of joining one will be a certain percentage of your income every year ($6 a year minimum). Your plan, if approved, will get Federal and State aid, enabling it to provide services at less than cost. The amount of aid is determined by reference to a Federal yardstick plan, which specifies certain services to be rendered for a charge of 3 percent of subscriber's income (up to $5,000). On the average, Government will contribute about a quarter of a plan's gross income. Most plans will probably follow the yardstick, but they don't have to; some may offer fewer services and charge less, others (with State approval) more services and charge more. There will thus be a variety of services. The plans will make contracts with doctors and hospitals, leaving all free to choose without Government interference.

Regional role: A regional health authority approves cooperating plans. It estimates the normal costs in its region of the yardstick services, from which, with State approval, it determines the amount of Government aid due to that particular plan.

State role: A State that decides to join the plan (it doesn't have to) divides its area into health regions and districts, authorizes any group of persons in good faith to establish a voluntary plan, and sets up a State health council. The council approves the voluntary plans. It also approves the normal cost estimates of the regional authorities, from which the amount of Government aid is calculated. The State allots such funds to the different plans, supervises their operation, and pays the subscription charge of persons on relief or unemployed.

Federal role: The Surgeon General, advised by the Health Council (11 members, all laymen), certifies State plans. He allocates funds to the States according to the formula provided by the yardstick, and also according to a formula based on per capita income of the States, which would give poorer States relatively more aid than richer ones. His role is thus chiefly one of applying formulas. He has no administrative or professional authority over the voluntary plans.

How financed: By voluntary subscriptions based on a percentage of subscribers' incomes (up to $5,000), which, according to estimates, would total about $3,000,000,000 by the fourth year, plus Federal-State aid equal to about 30 percent of the total, or $1,000,000,000 by the fourth year.

Benefit: A plan can give any benefits it wants, subject to State approval. The yardstick benefits include complete medical, surgical, hospital, and visiting-nurse services.

Hospital: Free to join or stay out. The hospitals contract directly with the voluntary plans. Government has nothing to say about it.

Professional personnel: Doctors contract with voluntary plans; Government has no say in their arrangements. Plans must be administered at all levels by a majority of laymen.

Idaho Potatoes and the Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, much is being written and said about potatoes and the Government potato price-support program.

Potatoes are one of our most important and useful farm crops, and besides their use for food, potatoes can be manufactured into many valuable commercial products such as starch, alcohol, and potato flour.

Potatoes that are perishable in their natural state can be turned into a staple product by being dehydrated in wholesale quantities that can be packaged and preserved over the years, as they were during the war in many dehydrating plants of large capacity now idle in Idaho, Maine, and elsewhere.

Dehydrated potatoes fell into disfavor during the war due to improper cooking and serving in the Army and Navy mess. With proper preparation and cooking, dehydrated potatoes are as palatable and nourishing as cooked fresh potatoes.

It appears our Government is overlooking a big opportunity to turn a perishable farm commodity into a staple product and salvage its potato investment. For the information and consideration of the Members of the Congress, there is inserted herewith a letter, memorandum, and resolution received from the Idaho Potato Producers Association:

IDAHO POTATO PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Idaho Falls, Idaho, February 23, 1950.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed are resolutions passed by the Idaho Potato Producers' Association.

I have attended meetings all up and down this upper valley the last 2 weeks; in every meeting they voted to discontinue support on potatoes if the rest of the States would do the same.

On February 1 Idaho had sold to the Government for support 69 sacks of No. 1 potatoes. These were the last of an early grower that had no other market at the time. All the propaganda now coming out of Washington has pushed our market into a slump. I am sure all our potatoes this year in Idaho would have found a ready market at no expense to the Government if this front-page publicity had not have happened. I am hoping these resolutions will help you in forming some program this year. We do not want a compulsory support program with quotas on a bushelage basis.

The Bingham County Farm Bureau, representing over 1,400 members and the second largest potato-producing county in the Nation, has approved these resolutions.

Very truly yours,

EVERETT ENCOTT,
Chairman, Resolutions and Legislative Committee.

IDAHO POTATO INDUSTRY THREATENED

If present legislation now being written in Washington goes into law, Idaho may be forced to grow a potato similar to other States that will yield in comparison to Maine and North Carolina. Idaho has the know-how and can raise a potato that will yield 400 to 500 bushels to the acre. Our only market for this kind of a potato, however, would be the Government as our freight rates to consuming markets make it impossible to ship this kind of a potato.

The Idaho Russet or Russet Germ is a low-yielding, high-quality potato compared to other varieties. PMA committeemen are now only allowing support on the famous Idaho potato in the larger Idaho producing counties.

It has been proven in the past that the grading and sacking process is costly to our Government and serves no useful purpose. Freight and processing has cost the Government more than the grower received for the product in many cases.

RESOLUTIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE IDAHO POTATO PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION

Whereas the potato producers of Idaho are becoming increasingly alarmed at mounting potato surpluses, with consequent waste of Government funds; and

Whereas we believe all potato-producing States should be interested primarily in producing and marketing a quality potato through regular trade channels, and that consumer preference be recognized; and

Whereas the present subsidy program is encouraging some producing areas to grow a low quality, high-yielding potato for sale to the support program; and

Whereas we believe that the place to curtail the high cost of the subsidy program is at the source, or in the area where surpluses are created, and where heavy sales are being made to Government support; and

Whereas we are drifting toward the situation, wherein the Government, in order to strengthen their position further, and to cut the cost of potato subsidy, will harness the potato growers with still more stringent and intolerable controls and regimentation: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the potato producers of Idaho, recommend to the Congress—

1. That a flexible support price be continued on the potato industry.

2. That only No. 1 potatoes 2 inches minimum be protected at full support.

3. That B grade and No. 2 potatoes be eliminated from support.

4. That certified seed growers be supported for their full crop at No. 1 support level.

5. That State potato acreages be cut in direct proportion to the surpluses that they sell to the support program, even as much as 25 percent of this surplus each year, until a proper and natural balance between production and regular consumer markets are obtained.

6. That State PMA committeemen be chosen by county PMA officials and marketing organizations affected.

7. That Idaho potato producers oppose the importation of Canadian potatoes under the present program.

8. That future potato programs be based on bulk delivery at the farmer's storage or point of processing.

Russian Plans for World Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a great deal lately about peace missions to Moscow and renewed efforts by our Government and leaders to persuade Stalin to sit down with our representatives and discuss peace. It seems to me that we certainly have been patient with the Russians these past few years and have given them numerous opportunities to meet us half way. Yet we continually hear pleas for "one more chance" or "one more peace conference."

The American people do not want war. I believe the Russian people do not want war either—if only they had the opportunity to speak their mind freely. But if war nevertheless engulfs this world, it will be due to the insatiable lust for power on the part of the present rulers of Soviet Russia.

The noted political commentator, Heptisax, has written a fine analysis of the situation in which he points up the futility of a peace conference with Stalin and why a conference of this kind must necessarily be worthless. His analysis was published in the New York Herald Tribune, March 5, 1950, under the title "Russian Plans for World Empire," and is as follows:

RUSSIAN PLANS FOR WORLD EMPIRE—A DISCUSSION OF THE FUTILITY OF A PEACE CONFERENCE WITH STALIN

(By Heptisax)

A few months ago a great deal was being said, particularly by the Communists and other progressives, about the hysterical temper of the witch hunt. Actually there was no widespread popular hysteria. A few extravagances were perpetrated, mostly by officialdom in Washington. A few laws were passed that we could have done without, mostly by State legislatures. And there were a few incidents to deplore, mostly provoked by the Communists. But if the witch hunt, so-called, had been pursued with anything like popular hysteria, there would have been a multiplication of incidents far more deplorable than the Peekskill affair, there would have been mob action against Communist offices and meetings, no known Communist could have moved safely in the streets, and the Communist fraction to hysteria would not [illegible]

only have driven the Stalinists underground but would have imposed many foolish regulations on all of us.

If one wants to see hysteria developing, the quarters in which to look for it are not those in which the bitterest anti-Stalinists assemble, but those in which the emotionalists feed their imaginations on the possible horrors of a hypothetical "hell-bomb" war, and then shriek themselves hoarse about peace. To hear this clamor or to read the appeals which individuals address to their Congressmen, and which long lists of notables, as the Communist publications call them, address to the White House, one would think that no effort had ever been made to negotiate real peace with Soviet Russia and that Stalin was standing with arms outstretched and tears in his eyes, begging for peace, while the leaders of all the non-Communist peoples exchanged cynical grins and ignored him.

These emotionalists listen eagerly to assurance from those who know Russia, and from those who think they do, that the Soviet Union does not want war. Certainly the Kremlin does not want war with this country and its allies if it can get what it wants without the risk of war.

While the Stalinists hope that they can ruin the capitalist world without head-on conflict with the West, and then simply walk into possession of the world, they have every reason to hope that there will be no war. The major device they are employing now was prescribed by Lenin in 1924, not long before his death. He advised his following to abandon the thought of a direct attack on Europe; but to go east and come back through Asia on a bankrupt and demoralized Europe. That is being done, and the prospects of making Asia worthless to Europe are so excellent that the plans for doing the same in Africa are openly discussed. Then would come South America. Great Britain and Europe cannot live without overseas markets and sources of raw materials, unless they live on us. This they couldn't do forever, but they might do it long enough to impoverish and demoralize this country. Then would come the push over in Europe and the United States—with the help, of course, of the fifth columns which would be doing their best all along with both material and moral sabotage.

Now, no one who reads Stalinist literature can have any doubt at all that that is the great plan. No one but a very simple soul can believe that the Kremlin can be persuaded to abandon that plan through suasion, cajolery, bribery, or an appeal to Stalin's finer instincts, as one letter writer who was gasping about the H-bomb recently suggested.

For these various reasons I feel that bringing popular pressure on the administration to go to Stalin begging for peace or the worthless lip service to peace which would be the result of such an effort, is wholly wrong headed. The Russians have had all the opportunities, time, and means of expression they need to demonstrate that they want live-and-let-live relations with the non-Stalinist world.

So far they have demonstrated in a hundred ways—including clear enough statements of their objectives—that that is what they do not want. The proponents of peace by incantation say that we should give them another chance, because it is possible that fear and suspicion of us account for their unfriendly and aggressive manners. I don't believe that. I think that they are moved to no small degree by fear; but what they fear is their own people and the peoples of their victim states. They feel that they cannot be secure in their despotic powers while capitalism, and the democratic institutions and freedoms associated with it, survive in this world and can be advertised to their enslaved populations as an attractive alternative to state capitalism and their ruthlessly exploited wage slavery.

Another conference, another pilgrimage of the high and mighty to a meeting place of Stalin's choice, would give the Stalin regime "face" at home and would be a depressing spectacle to such resistance forces as there are behind the iron curtain. If such a conference won us some worthless promises, it would probably be because we had left more friends in the lurch and were pledged on our part to lower our guard. If it won us nothing and had to be proclaimed a failure, the Communists would advertise the world over that it had failed because of our recalcitrance, because our war-mongering bankers and generals had no use for peace; and against their highly organized mendacity our protests would carry little weight.

The sad end to all this line of thought is that there is not going to be any peace until the sins of the Stalinist regime against the Russian and other neighboring peoples catch up with them and a tide of counterrevolution washes the rotten foundations from under the massive Red edifice. That day may come tomorrow or it may be many years away; but it is the only possible solution to the toughest problem that humanity has ever faced. But we don't hasten that day by running from the imaginary horror of H-bomb extermination into the real horror of a phony peace at Stalin's price.

The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Belle Zeller, of Brooklyn College:

THE FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

(By Belle Zeller, Brooklyn College)

Although the need for such action had long been apparent in Washington, it was not until 1946 that a Federal statute was enacted for the regulation of general lobbying activities. Prior to that year Congress had, on a number of occasions, investigated lobbying practices, and as a result had enacted measures which reached a limited number of groups engaged in them. The Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, the congressional act in 1936 affecting the shipping interests, and the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 were important regulatory measures, but they reached only a few of the groups exerting direct and continuous influence in Washington. The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of August 2, 1946, is more general in its coverage, and it has been in force long enough for its effectiveness to be tested.

In this article it is my purpose (1) to supply a brief historical background for the measure referred to; (2) to examine the statute's provisions; (3) to appraise the objections raised to it; (4) to examine the actual administration of the act and point out the difficulties of enforcement, particularly during its first year; and (5) to offer recommendations for strengthening the law.

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Bills to regulate lobbying appeared in Congress as early as 1907 and were introduced from time to time thereafter. In 1928 Senator Thaddeus H. Caraway, of Arkansas, introduced a bill which only the Senate passed.[1] In defending his measure, the Senator pointed out that there were between 300 and 400 "alleged associations" listed in the Washington telephone directory, "90 percent of which * * * are fake associations organized for the sole purpose of profit for those who are at Washington, [and] are engaged in obtaining money from those who live away from Washington under the belief that they are promoting some theory of government in which they are interested, or protecting or advancing the interests of some business in which they are engaged. Ninety-five dollars out of every hundred that the public pays to these alleged associations go into the pockets of the promoters of these fake associations. It might be safely said outside of a dozen there is not a penny paid to these associations that is not worse than wasted. * * *"[2]

In 1935 the excesses of the utility lobbies attracted Nation-wide attention. Of their activities, the House Rules Committee said on February 27, 1936: "The campaign to influence utility holding company legislation was probably as comprehensive, as well managed, as persistent, and as well financed as any in the history of the country.[3] As a result of this publicity, bills to regulate lobbying poured into the Seventy-fourth Congress. Senate bill 2512, sponsored by Hugo L. Black, of Alabama, and H. R. 11663, introduced by HOWARD W. SMITH of Virginia, passed their respective Houses, but their wide divergence, although bridged by the conferees, did not meet with congressional approval, and they failed to become law.[4]

However, Congress was determined that the utilities should not escape regulation, irrespective of the fate of the general lobbying bill. It therefore wrote into the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, not only the provision that utilities should not contribute to party campaign funds, but the additional stipulation making it "unlawful for any person employed or retained by any registered holding company, or any subsidiary company thereof, to present, advocate, or oppose any matter affecting any registered holding company or any subsidiary company thereof, before the Congress or any member of committee thereof, or before the Commission (Securities and Exchange) or Federal Power Commission, or any member, officer, or employee of either such Commission, unless such person shall file with the Commission in such form and detail and at such time as the Commission shall, by rules and regulations or order prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors or consumers, a statement of the subject-matter in respect of which such person is retained or employed, the nature and character of such retainer or employment, and the amount of compensation received or to be received by such person, directly or indirectly, in connection therewith."[5] The law further requires that financial statements be filed with the Commission "within 10 days after the close of each calendar month during such retainer or employment."[6]

Encouraged by its success in passing this legislation concerning the public utility holding companies, Congress turned its attention the following year to the lobbies of the shipbuilders and ship operators; and in 1936 a statute similarly regulated these pressure interests through registration with the United States Maritime Commission.[7]

With war clouds hanging over Europe, and activity of foreign agents on the propaganda front intensified, Congress took a protective step in 1938 by passing the first Foreign Agents Registration Act (amended in 1942), requiring that every person who is an agent of a foreign principal shall file with the Secretary of State a statement describing in detail the nature of his activities. The law provided also that political propaganda disseminated by such agents shall be so labeled and copies of such matter filed with the Librarian of Congress and the Attorney-General. Under an Executive order, effective June 1, 1942, President Roosevelt transferred to the Department of Justice the administration of registering foreign agents. Registration statements, open to public inspection, had thereafter to be filed with the Attorney General every 6 months, and a copy of each registration statement had to be furnished the Secretary of State. It should be particularly noted that the Attorney General was required also to make reports from time to time to Congress concerning the administration of the act.[7]

In reporting the special areas of lobbying activity upon which Congress has acted, it is perhaps well to include the amendment to the Criminal Code in 1940. This forbade anyone to endeavor "corruptly or by threats of force, or by any threatening letter or communication, to influence, intimidate, or impede any witness, in connection with any inquiry or investigation being had by either House, or any committee of either House, or any joint committee of the Congress of the United States" or by such methods to attempt to interfere with the proper administration of law or proceedings of inquiries. The above language appears sufficiently broad to cover the influence exerted by lobbyists upon Congress.[8]

In studying the problem of lobbying regulation at the Federal level, much can be learned from the experience of the States, 35 of which regulate lobbying in some way.[9] Of the 35, 25 now provide for the registration of legislative agents and legislative counsel employed in such capacity for compensation. The secretary of state is the officer with whom the statements are customarily filed. The required information usually includes the name and address of such agents, by whom employed, date of employment, duration of employment if it can be determined, and the special subject of legislation to which the employment relates. Seventeen of the twenty-five States also require the filing of statements of all expenses paid, incurred, or promised in connection with the promotion of legislation; thirteen require that these expense statements be filed within 30 days after the adjournment of the legislature, and two within 2 months after. In 1945, both Nebraska and Wisconsin amended their statutes to provide for the filing of expense statements during the legislative session.

These State lobbying provisions have at least established the principle that the public has a right to know who are the paid lobbyists and what is the source of their funds. It must be said, however, that the record of lobby control in most States reveals that it has not been as effective as it should be, because faulty definition has failed to include the pressure groups as well as their paid agents, and because of inadequate enforcement.

The year 1946 seemed propitious for the enactment of a general Federal lobbying law. For one thing, the first year after the cessation of the war witnessed an unprecedented amount of lobbying in connection with many controversial questions before Congress—particularly veterans' housing, price control, public-power projects, and strikes. President Truman inserted in the prepared text of his Jackson Day address on March 23, 1946, a declaration that "my friends in Congress have got to make up their minds whether they're for the veterans' rights or whether they are going to bow to the real-estate lobby."[10] Senator MURRAY, of Montana, called attention to a small ruling clique in the American Medical Association which is trying to defeat the administration plan for congressional health insurance.[11]

Earlier, on March 11, 1946, Speaker RAYBURN had called attention to lobbying activity in another area, when he stated from the floor of the House that this town, for the past 6 months, has been seething with lobbyists out to kill rural electrification and public-owned power in general.[12] The next day Chairman SABATH, of the Rules Committee, offered a resolution proposing that a special committee be established to investigate any and all groups which have or are engaged in present propaganda campaigns or lobby to defeat legislative measures for the relief of the acute housing shortage * * * to abolish or weaken price control; all groups which have or are engaged in the power lobby. This resolution was revised by the Rules Committee, directing that the investigation be made by the Rules Committee itself and that lobbying activities by Federal agencies and employees as well as by private groups be covered.[13]

Even before these and other attacks upon lobbying activities in 1946, the Special Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was giving its attention to the need for a congressional lobbying law. In fact, the committee on Congress of the American Political Science Association, under the chairmanship of Dr. George B. Galloway, who later was named research staff director of the joint congressional committee, had recommended in 1945 that all groups, representatives of which appear before congressional committee, should register and make full disclosure of their membership, finances, etc.[14]

---

[1] S. 1095, 70th Cong., 1st sess.

[2] S. Rept. 342, 70th Cong., 1st sess., 1928, pp. 3, 3.

[3] H. Rept. 2081, 74th Cong., 2d sess., p. 3. An earlier investigation of lobbying practices in which the National Association of Manufacturers figured prominently occurred in 1913. Cf. H. Rept. 113, 63d Cong., 2d sess.

[4] H. Rept. 2948, June 3, 1936.

[5] U. S. Code, 1940, title 15, ch. 2C, secs. 79 (h) and 79 (i). See also Forms U-12 (1)—A and B of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

[6] See U. S. Code, title 46, sec. 1225; U. S. Maritime Commission General Order No. 9, July 13, 1937; and Forms 807-1 and 807-2, together with accompanying instructions for such forms.

[7] U. S. Code, title 22, secs. 611–621; Executive Order No. 9176, Federal Register, vol. 7, June 1942, p. 4127. See Report of Attorney General to the Congress of the United States on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 as amended for the period from June 28, 1942, to December 31, 1944 (June 1945). Also Karl E. Ettinger, Foreign Propaganda in America, Public Opinion Quarterly, vol. 10 (fall, 1946), pp. 329–342.

[8] U. S. Code, title 18, sec. 241a, approved January 13, 1940.

[9] A fuller story of the State lobby laws has been told elsewhere. See especially E. B. Logan, Lobbying, Supplement to the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, July 1929; Belle Zeller, State Regulations of Lobbying, in the Book of the States, 1948–49, pp. 124–130; Belle Zeller, Pressure Politics in New York (1937), pp. 251–263, for detailed examination of the administration of the New York State lobbying law.

[10] New York Times, March 24, 1946.

[11] F. M. Brewer, Congressional Lobbying, Editorial Research Reports, vol. 1, No. 18 (May 8, 1946), p. 320.

[12] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, p. 2156.

[13] This resolution, H. Res. 557, and another similar in purpose, H. Res. 416, introduced earlier by Representative SMITH of Maine, did not pass.

[14] The Reorganization of Congress; a report of the Committee on Congress of the American Political Science Association (1945), p. [illegible]

Many complaints of the attempts of organized pressure groups to influence the decisions of Congress were heard during the hearings of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, although [illegible] evidence on the need for lobbying legislation was not given at these hearings.[15] In its report to Congress on March 4, 1946, the joint committee recommended "that Congress enact legislation providing for the registration of organized groups and their agents who seek to influence legislation, and that such legislation include quarterly statements of expenditures made for this purpose."[16] On August 2, 1946, the President signed the Legislative Reorganization Act, title III of which is the Regulation of Lobbying Act.[17]

II. PROVISIONS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE LOBBYING TITLE

Provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act are set down in sections 302–311, inclusive. Section 307 is designed to define the application of the title and includes any person (defined as an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons), "who by himself, or through any agent or employee or other persons in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, solicits, collects, or receives money or any other thing of value to be used principally to aid, or the principal purpose of which person is to aid, in the accomplishment of any of the following purposes: (a) The passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States; (b) to influence, directly, or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States."

Section 305 states that every person receiving any contributions or expenditures for the purposes designated in (a) or (b) of section 307 shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives only, between the first and the tenth day of each calendar quarter, a statement containing the name and address of each person who has made a contribution of $500 or more, and the name and address of each person to whom an expenditure of $10 or more has been made, with the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure. The Clerk of the House supplies Form A for the information required under this section.

In section 308, the act requires any person who engages himself for pay or for any consideration for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation to register both with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate before doing anything in furtherance of such object. The registrant must state his name and business address, the name and address of the person by whom he is employed and in whose interest he appears or works, the duration of such employment, how much he is paid and to receive, by whom he is paid or is to be paid, how much he is to have for expenses, and what expenses are to be included. Form B is supplied by the Clerk and the Secretary for this information.

Each person who registers in accordance with section 308 between the first and tenth day of each calendar quarter, must also file with the Clerk and the Secretary, so long as his activities continue, a detailed report of all money received and expended by him during the preceding quarter calendar in carrying on his work; to whom paid; for what purpose; and the names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials; and the proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose. Successive reports within a calendar year must be cumulative. This information is filed on Form C. All reports and statements under the Lobbying Act must be made under oath (sec. 309).

All information required to be filed under the provisions of section 308 is to be compiled by the Clerk and the Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The statements required by the title are to be preserved for a period of 2 years, and to be open to public inspection during this interval (sec. 306). Any person who violates the provisions of this title, upon conviction, is guilty of a misdemeanor and may be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 and/or imprisonment for not more than 12 months. Such convicted person is also debarred for a period of 3 years from influencing, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of legislation. Debarred lobbyists who continue their activities are guilty of a felony (sec. 310).

In section 308, the act further specifically exempts from its application (1) any person who merely appears before a committee of Congress in support of or opposition to legislation; (2) any public official acting in his official capacity; (3) any owner, publisher, or employee of a newspaper or other regularly published periodical acting in the regular course of business. Nor does the act apply to party committees or to practices and activities regulated by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act (sections 307 and 311). The report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress adds further that the lobbying title does not apply in any manner to persons who appear voluntarily without compensation, and concludes the category of exempt groups by stating that the law "does not apply to organizations formed for other purposes whose efforts to influence legislation are merely incidental to the purposes for which formed."[18] An examination of the remarks of Representative HOWARD W. SMITH on the floor of Congress, June 17, 1936, indicates that the joint committee took over the Congressman's exact words in noting this last exception.[19]

Many organizations have turned to this last statement in the committee's report for clarification of legislative intent, and for an explanation of the words "principally" and "principal" in section 307. Their failure to comply with the provisions of sections 305 and 307 is based largely upon defining "principal" as "primary" or "major." There is little doubt that a literal reading of the provisions of the lobbying title presents a mass of contradictions and ambiguities. As a criminal statute, it is technically defective because such statutes are construed strictly and must define prohibited acts with certainty.[20]

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress stated that section 307 defines the application of the title.[21] Section 307, then, may be construed as conflicting with sections 305 and 308. As noted above, section 307 refers to anyone who solicits, collects, or receives money; section 305, however, is not limited merely to those who receive contributions, but includes persons who expend money for such purposes. Does this mean, if section 307 controls, that that part of section 305 dealing with expenditures is superfluous? There are organizations which hold that they do not solicit or receive funds for the principal purpose of lobbying, but who nevertheless expend money in hiring professional lobbyists. The implementation of the act, during the first year, clearly demonstrated that many organizations are holding section 307 the key to the coverage of the act, thus exempting from the strongest provisions of the act organizations whose legislative activities are not their principal concern, and who are careful not to accept funds earmarked for lobbying.

The relationship of sections 307 and 308 is ambiguous. By its terms, section 308 appears to exclude the definitions of section 307. Section 308 covers engagements "for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation." Many persons who have registered under this section call attention to the minor proportions of their time devoted to influencing legislation. In so doing, they are undoubtedly following the interpretation that section 308 does not stand alone, that section 307 qualifies this section as well, and that influencing legislation must be their "principal" activity before registration is required. However, section 308 should be construed as bringing within its scope persons paid for performing services if any part of that job—no matter how infinitesimal—is concerned with influential legislation. To support this position, it is not necessary to go further than to point out that section 308 exempts from registration public officials acting in their official capacity. Except for a very small group of legislative representatives of public agencies, no reasonable interpretation could consider public officials as principally engaged in influencing legislation.[22]

The legislative history of the bill does not establish beyond any doubt the intention or the aim of Congress. Representative Dirksen, a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, stated on the floor of the House when the lobbying section was under debate:

"The question has been raised as to whether or not an organization that pays a man to be vigilant upon legislation here would have to schedule all of their assets and all of their receipts, and probably file a very long administrative record with the Clerk of the House. That is certainly not the intention of the committee. There are some clarifying sections and some exclusions which you will find in section 308. * * * What we are trying to do here is to reach those whose principal purpose, not incidental purpose, but whose principal purpose is to come here and endeavor to influence the passage of legislation either by bringing about its defeat or its enactment."[23]

[15] Hearings before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, four parts, 79th Cong., 1st sess., March 13, 1945, to June 29, 1945. See especially helpful comments of George H. E. Smith, research assistant to the Senate minority leader at page 411 of these hearings. After the close of the hearings, the writer submitted to the joint committee upon request, a memorandum on the subject of Federal Regulation of Lobbies. For the text of this memorandum, see print of Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, June 1946, pp. 65–69, and George B. Galloway, Congress at the Crossroads (1946), pp. 302–307.

[16] Senate report 1011, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 37.

[17] Public Law 601 (Senate bill 2177), 79th Cong., 2d sess.

[18] S. Rept. 1400, 79th Cong., 2d sess., May 31, 1946, p. 27.

[19] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 80, p. 9751.

[20] *Screws* v. *United States* (325 U. S. 91, at p. 136): "It is axiomatic, of course, that a criminal statute must give a clear and unmistakable warning as to the acts which will subject one to criminal punishment. And courts are without power to supply that which Congress has left vague."

[21] S. Rept. 1400, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 28.

[22] For an examination and interpretation of the provisions of the Federal Lobbying Act see the brief filed on January 28, 1948, by the National Association of Manufacturers in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. See also Columbia Law Review, vol. 47, January 1947, pp. 98–109; Yale Law Journal, vol. 56, January 1947, pp. 304–322.

[23] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, July 25, 1946, p. 10138; on June 17, 1936, Representative SMITH said: "It [the lobbying bill] does not apply to organizations formed for other purposes whose efforts to influence legislation are merely incidental to the purposes for which formed." (Cf. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 80, p. 9751.)

However, a wider purpose of the legislation was understood by Senator La Follette, chairman of the committee, as seen in his discussion with Senator Hawkes on the floor of the Senate, the day after Representative Dirksen made his comments:

"Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin give me his opinion on one subject which has been brought to my attention by some of the finest organizations in the United States? They are somewhat concerned lest the provision in the reorganization plan against lobbying might be construed to apply to institutions such as the United States Chamber of Commerce, for instance, which was organized at the request of the President of the United States to assemble information and make it available for ready reference for members of his Cabinet and the various governmental agencies. I should like to have the Senator from Wisconsin express his opinion whether it affects these fine institutions which are a part of our business and industrial system in the United States.

"Mr. LA FOLLETTE. So far as any organizations or individuals are concerned, * * * it will depend on the type and character of activity they undertake. * * *

"Mr. HAWKES. Just a moment, Mr. President. Would not the Senator from Wisconsin be willing to express an opinion regarding such organizations of years and years standing?

"Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I cannot tell the Senator whether they will come under the act. It will depend on the type of activity in which they engage, so far as legislation is concerned.

"Mr. HAWKES. Does not the bill contain language to the effect 'if they are organized to do a business of lobbying principally'? And does not that mean something to the Senator, who knows, of course, that there is not a business organization or chamber of commerce in the United States whose representatives do not come to see Senators and Representatives and interview them regarding legislation?

"Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It will all depend on the type of activity that is carried on. I cannot give the Senator a blanket interpretation."[24]

It certainly would appear that the Joint Committee in 1946 was thinking of a broad application of the legislation, when in its report it listed the following three distinct classes to which the lobbying title applied chiefly:

"First. Those who do not visit the Capitol but initiate propaganda from all over the country in the form of letters and telegrams, many of which have been based entirely upon misinformation as to facts. This class of persons and organizations will be required under the title, not to cease or curtail their activities in any respect, but merely to disclose the sources of their collections and the methods in which they are disbursed.

"Second. The second class of lobbyists are those who are employed to come to the Capitol under the false impression that they exert some powerful influence over Members of Congress. These individuals spend their time in Washington presumably exerting some mysterious influence with respect to the legislation in which their employers are interested, but carefully conceal from Members of Congress whom they happen to contact the purpose of their presence. The title in no wise prohibits or curtails their activities. It merely requires that they shall register and disclose the sources and purposes of their employment and the amount of their compensation.

"Third. There is a third class of entirely honest and respectable representatives of business, professional, and philanthropic organizations who come to Washington openly and frankly to express their views for or against legislation, many of whom serve a useful and perfectly legitimate purpose in expressing the views and interpretations of their employers with respect to legislation which concerns them. They will likewise be required to register and state their compensation and the sources of their employment."[25]

As an additional example of its broad intention, the Joint Committee, in its two reports on the legislative reorganization bill, stressed pressure groups rather than the individuals employed by them.

"Mass means of communication and the art of public relations have so increased the pressures upon Congress as to distort and confuse the normal expressions of public opinion. * * * In order to enable Congress better to evaluate and determine evidence, data, or communications from organized groups seeking to influence legislative action, we recommend the adoption of legislation requiring the registration of all groups engaged and individuals employed in such activity."[26]

And again, the committee stated:

"A pressure-group economy gives rise to government by whirlpools of special-interest groups in which the national welfare is often neglected. * * * Without impairing in any way the right of petition or freedom of expression, Senate 2177 provides for the registration of organized groups and their agents who seek to influence legislation. * * * Full information regarding the membership, source of contributions, and expenditures of organized groups would prove helpful to Congress in evaluating their representations and weighing their worth. Publicity is a mild step forward in protecting government under pressure and in promoting the democratization of pressure groups."[27]

Still another fact to note in defense of the broader intent of Congress in 1946 is that the lobbying title is part of an omnibus bill dealing with the improvement of the organization and operation of Congress, and did not come as a demand to check the predatory pressures upon that body.

Almost immediately after the lobbying title became effective, many organizations called upon their counsel for advice concerning the applicability of the statute. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in its long memorandum of interpretation, reasoned that it did not fall within the purview of sections 305 and 307, and consequently did not file under Form A. The memorandum added: "It should be noted, however, that even though the organization does not have lobbying as its principal activity, an employee or other person paid by the organization who has lobbying as his principal activity may be subject to the act."[28] Was the chamber of commerce playing safe when two of its representatives filed under Form B prepared for the information required in section 308—one of whom stated in his report that his salary was $15,000 per annum, "although not more than one-fourth is paid for the principal purpose of influencing legislation as defined in section 307"?[29]

Some tax-exempt organizations were even more cautious, and filed no information under any of the forms for fear of jeopardizing their exemption under the Internal Revenue Code. For example, this is the legal advice given to one such organization:

"Since the principal purpose of the Anti-Defamation League is not to influence legislation, the mere publication of the Legislative Information Bulletin, even if it may be considered a publication which directly or indirectly affects Federal legislation, the ADL will not be compelled to register or file. The answer should be the same even in contemplation of the added factor of a Washington representative whose incidental purpose may be to influence Federal legislation. Section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code provides that a tax-exempt organization loses its tax-exempt status if a substantial part of the activity of such organization is the influencing of legislation. Such a provision may be important if the legislative activity of a tax-exempt organization, or its Washington representative, becomes greater than that of merely incidental activity."[30]

On the other hand, counsel for the American Farm Bureau Federation recommended that the federation and its employees, substantially active in influencing legislation, register under the forms supplied by the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate. "While considerable uncertainty exists as to the meaning and scope of the Lobbying Act, I am of the view that the only safe course which your organization can pursue is to register under the act." He argued that section 307 is "made decisive as

[24] Contrast this language with that of Representative SMITH, who sponsored lobbying legislation 10 years earlier: "The amendment proposes to change that language by striking out the words 'in whole or in part' and by inserting the word 'principally.' The reason for that amendment is, it was brought to my attention, and I think to the attention of other members of the committee, that there were many organizations of national scope who have large memberships of thousands and some of millions of members organized principally for other purposes than affecting legislation, but many of those organizations do from time to time become interested in legislation, and they undertake to do something about it. It was not thought necessary or proper that that class of organization, because a minor part of its funds were devoted to purposes of influencing legislation, should be required to report all of the dues of their hundreds of thousands of members, and for that reason this amendment is proposed so that it would not apply except where the money is collected for the principal purpose of undertaking to influence legislation or the election of Federal officers." (Cf. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 80, March 27, 1936, p. 4525.)

Unlike the bills sponsored by Senator Caraway in the 70th Cong. and Senator Black in the 74th Cong., the Lobbying Act of 1946 does not specifically define lobbying. It may, of course, be construed that the acts and practices under the statutes that require the filing of statements may be called lobbying. In Senate bill 1095 of the 70th Cong.: "A lobbyist, within the meaning of this act, is one who shall engage, for pay, to attempt to influence legislation, or to prevent legislation, by the National Congress." In Senate bill 2512 of the 74th Cong.: "Lobbying * * * shall consist of any effort to influence the action of Congress upon any matter coming before it, whether it be by distributing literature, appearing before committees of Congress, or interviewing or seeking to interview individual Members of either House of Representatives or the Senate."

These definitions were patterned after the broader one in the House report of 1913, which defined lobbying as the "activities of a person or a body of persons seeking to influence Congress in any way whatever." (Cf. H. Rept. 113, 63d Cong., 3d sess., 1913, p. 15.)

[25] S. Rept. 1400, 79th Cong., 2d sess., May 31, 1946, p. 27.

[26] S. Rept. 1011, 79th Cong., 2d sess., Mar. 4, 1946, pp. 26–27.

[27] S. Rept. 1400, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 3.

[28] Memorandum dated August 28, 1946, p. 6.

[29] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, January 3, 1947, p. 52.

[30] However, subsequently Paul Richman filed under Form B and stated that he was employed by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and that he "devotes less than 5 percent of his time, if any, to activity within the terms of the statute." Cf. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, May 12, 1947, p. 5210.

to what persons or organizations must register under section 308. Unfortunately, section 307 is ungrammatical almost to the point of being unintelligible. * * *"[28]

III. CRITICISMS DIRECTED AT THE ACT

The lobbying title shows poor draftsmanship in other respects. The sections do not constitute an integrated whole. There is every indication that the drafting was done hurriedly, with little fresh thinking on the problem. An examination indicates heavy dependence upon the bills introduced by Representative HOWARD W. SMITH and Senator Hugo L. Black in the Seventy-fourth Congress, 10 years earlier, and the lobbying title of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is only a slightly modified version of these earlier bills.[29] Occasionally words are used loosely; for example, a broad definition is given of a "person" in the introductory section of the title, and yet in sections 304 and 308 "individual" is used where "person" would appear to be more accurate. Furthermore, it would be difficult to understand how an association under this broad definition of "person" could be punished by imprisonment, unless individual members of the group were held responsible, in which event a serious question of deprivation of constitutional rights could be raised. There are unclear, and what appear to be contradictory, references to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act in sections 307 and 311. Section 307 exempts from the provision of the lobbying title, "duly organized State or local committees of a political party." Section 311 states that "this title shall not apply to practices or activities regulated by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act." If any reference at all to the Corrupt Practices Act is necessary here, it should be a simple statement exempting the political committees of all legally recognized parties from the provisions of the Lobbying Act. Others may be required to file under the Lobbying and Corrupt Practices Acts, depending upon their activities.

The President received the bill at the fag end of the session and signed it without detecting a typographical error that had slipped into the bill while it was being engrossed. In section 304, the word "rendered" was used instead of "render." The clear intention was that every person who receives contributions of $500 or more for the purpose stated in the law, "shall within 5 days after the receipt thereof render to the person or organization for which such contribution was received a detailed account thereof. * * *"[30] Unimportant as this error was, it received considerable unfriendly newspaper notice. In fact, on two occasions, two newspapers dealt with it exclusively. The Boston Globe[31] stated: "In any event, an act of Congress will be required to correct the mistake, and lobbyists subject to registration may take advantage of the situation and delay signing up." The Buffalo News[32] concluded its remarks on the matter this way: "You can never tell when a tense situation will be rendered past, present, or future on Capitol Hill."

Vigorous opposition was directed against section 308 of the statute because it exempts from its purview "any public official acting in his official capacity." This opposition to the exempting of "tax-paid lobbyists" was voiced by a number of organizations at the time they filed their own reports under protest, or while questioning the applicability of the law to their particular organizations. On October 9, 1946, the representative of the National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Service wrote to the clerk:

"The proponents of the legislation in question have indulged in every form of propaganda and publicity they have been able to devise, including the most venomous and unfair attacks, in the leftist press and otherwise, on the National Physicians Committee and its personnel. This propaganda has, in the main, originated in and stemmed from certain branches of our Federal Government where there are long-established and well-entrenched groups of professional bureaucrats, with distinctly collectivist leanings, who are completely committed to the cause of socialized medicine and all that it entails.

"These propagandists, with the resources of the United States Treasury behind them, can and do flood the magazines and newspapers with press releases, in addition to the millions of Government bulletins and publications that are constantly going out to the general public, all at public expense. But, by the express terms of the Lobbying Act, these bureaucrats are not 'lobbyists'; they need make no reports and are subject to no penalties regardless of the millions of dollars of Uncle Sam's money they see fit to spend, or however they spend it."[33]

In its memorandum on the lobbying law, the Committee on Constitutional Government, a private organization, said:

"If Congress were properly concerned about lobbying, it might and should long ago have dealt with lobbying by the bureaus set up by the President and itself. For it was shown by Representative GROSS, of Pennsylvania (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 10, page A1501) that 'the worst and most persistent lobbying comes from the various bureaus within the Government in their effort to perpetuate themselves.' As one of the several illustrations, he mentioned that when Secretary Ickes appeared before the Insular Affairs Committee he was surrounded by 19 lieutenants * * *. We just recently saw the spectacle of the OPA whipping Congress to a standstill and dictating to the President. During the debate, Senator TAFT exhibited (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 7, page 8450) the OPA as the worst of all lobbyists, using the radio and propagandizing in a highly organized manner, even reaching into the schools. The bureaucrats were so impudent that they burnt TAFT in effigy in Ohio three times."[34]

There is, of course, ample precedent, in States with lobbying legislation, for exemptions of public officials who, in their official capacity, attempt to influence legislation. Furthermore, the purpose of lobbying legislation is to identify the many private organizations and their agents who are engaged in promoting or opposing legislation. Surely the Congress has other effective means at its disposal—for example, the power of the purse—to discipline such representatives of the Federal agencies who, with too much zeal, or in other objectionable ways, go about the business of influencing the legislation they are expected to administer. It would seem that appropriate local government agencies, not to mention the constituents of elected local officials, could adequately discipline State and local officials who use objectionable methods in influencing Federal legislation. It would seem reasonable, however, to withhold exemption of the provisions of the lobbying title from associations of public officials, supported in whole or in part, from private sources.

It has been charged also that the lobbying law is unconstitutional because it violates amendments I and IV of the Constitution of the United States—that the act is in contravention of the specific constitutional requirements that freedom of speech and the right to petition the Government shall not be abridged. One organization further claimed:

"The requirements of this lobbying act * * * make a system of search of the books, records, and papers of the citizen without probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, in violation of the fourth amendment. The records which the act prescribes to be kept by the citizen are to be used against him when occasion offers. * * * In the courts of the States, as well as in the Federal courts, the constitutional provisions protecting the citizen against unreasonable searches are liberally construed in favor of the man. * * * Wherever there is a lack of jurisdictional oath, or of absolute clarity as to 'the place to be searched, and the persons * * * or things to seized,' the man wins."[35]

This is a grave charge, and it seems difficult to substantiate it. It may be in order to question the relevancy of injecting the fourth amendment into the discussion, and of the reasoning on the part of those who try to make out a case against this Federal law by citing a series of Supreme Court decisions involving that amendment but bearing questionable relation to this problem.[36] Twenty-five States now require lobbyists to register, and 17 of these also require the filing of expense statements. Are pressure groups so influential in these States as to be largely responsible for the lax enforcement of these laws, and hence find it unnecessary to raise objections to them on constitutional grounds or any other?

Surely the regulation of the lobby does not interfere with the constitutional right of free speech, or free press, or the right of petition. It denies to no one the high right of appeal to Congress or to the public for the purpose of influencing legislation.[37] Penalties are provided for those who fail to comply. Of course, one of the objectives of the law is to put the whole game of pernicious lobbying out of existence and the bad pressure boys out of work. This legislation may be regarded as a curb against abuse of petition, as laws of libel and slander are in the case of freedom of speech and of press. It seems doubtful that section 310 (b) debarring a convicted person from engaging in lobbying for a period of 3 years would be considered unconstitutional either as a bill of attainder or as violative of due process. However, it is difficult to see how this penalty can be applied to associations as "persons." No constitutional question has been raised in those seven States that have similar provisions for debarment.[38]

A further complaint is made that the Lobbying Act does not go far enough. For example, the American Legion and its legislative representatives, who filed promptly under all three forms, complain (1) that the names and addresses of contributors of $499 or lesser amounts do not need to be reported; (2) that many "witnesses" who appear before committees are "lobbyists" and "should be required to state under oath on whose authority they are testifying and also to state in detail whether they received any travel expenses or other gratuities for their testimony, with the amounts thereof," (3) that all lobbyists who claim to represent organizations submit sworn statements as to their membership and by what authority they speak for such membership.

In connection with the first point, while some abuses may be practiced in the collection of contributions under $500, it would appear inadvisable to change this figure. The listing of names and addresses of thousands of persons whose contributions may really be dues paid by members of legitimate associations should not be required or encouraged. In respect to the second recommendation of the American Legion concerning witnesses before committees, rules of the two Houses can adequately meet this desirable suggestion. The Legion's third suggestion can be met by amending the statute to require such information to be furnished preferably by the organizations, rather than by their paid legislative agents. It is evident that the lobbying title stresses the financial background of lobbyists rather than the representative character of the organization, or the processes by which its decisions are reached.[39]

Lastly, another complaint directed against the act is that it goes too far—that it is built on the unwarranted assumption that all persons who collect money for the purpose of lobbying may use it in degradation of public policy, and that, therefore, all persons should be treated as potential wrongdoers. It would be difficult to produce rational evidence supporting this charge. The lobbying title does not draw a distinction between good and bad lobbying. Its aim is to stress the public character of those who participate in influencing legislation.

Wide coverage was given to the Legislative Reorganization Act by the newspapers of the country after the President affixed his signature to the bill. On the whole, the press, in both its news and editorial columns, received Congress' attempt to regulate the lobby favorably. The Cleveland Plain Dealer commented editorially on August 2, 1946: "Since most legislation is sought or opposed by special interests, it is well to have these special interests identified, and it is better to have the representatives of the special interests conduct their activities in the open rather than in secret and sometimes mysteriously. Thus, it appears that Congress has not only reorganized itself but has brought about a reorganization of the lobbyists." On the following day the Journal of Atlanta, Ga., said that "the requirement that lobbyists register and disclose the source of their funds will curb, though not eliminate, an ancient American disgrace." The Washington Post, in an editorial entitled "Goldfish-Bowl Lobbying," noted that "legislators will be able to distinguish more clearly than ever before the plea of organized money from that of individual citizens."[40] On the other hand, a number of newspapers, through feature stories, high lighted the vague terminology in the legislation under headlines that read: "New lobby law spreads confusion"; [41] "Lobbying law stirs confusion in Washington—Many puzzled groups ask lawyers if they must register under new act"; [42] "Lobbying law goes into effect, but exact meaning is not clear"; [43] "Lobbyists slow to register"; [44] "What's a lobbyist?" [45]

IV. ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT

How has the lobbying title in the Legislative Reorganization Act been administered, particularly during the first year after it took effect on August 2, 1946?[46] With the Seventy-ninth Congress already adjourned on this date, and after numerous inquiries, the Clerk of the House of Representatives announced that the lobbying title would take effect at once.[47] To aid in both the interpretation of and compliance with the act, the Clerk's office, in consultation with the Secretary of the Senate, promptly prepared the three forms, A, B, and C, on which the information was to be set forth.[48]

Replies in the negative were given by the Clerk and the Secretary for administrative rulings or opinions relating to the interpretation and enforcement of the act. An early conference after the title became law between the Clerk and the Attorney General resulted in no official interpretation by the Justice Department.[49] It was deemed advisable to let the new statute take its course, permitting the courts to render decision, should a test be made.[50]

The following reply is typical of the Clerk's interpretation:

"The provisions of this act appear to be quite clear as to its interpretation. There remains only the possession of detailed knowledge as to the activities of a person * * * in order to apply the test very specifically set forth in the act. It is the opinion of this office that such a determination should be made by the person who believes he may come within the provision of this law, and that the Clerk of the House should not make a decision for him. For your complete information, additional copies of the forms developed by this office to assist persons in complying with the provisions are herewith. These forms by their very nature tend to simplify the process of understanding the application of this law."[51]

---

[28] F. E. Lee to Donald Kirkpatrick, November 26, 1946. The American Farm Bureau Federation filed quarterly A reports in 1947, and four individuals, including the president, filed B reports, indicating annual salaries totaling $37,000. Each of these four representatives also filed quarterly expense statements under Form C.

[29] H. R. 11223 and H. R. 11663 and S. 2512, all 74th Cong. See H. Repts. 2930 and 2925, 74th Cong., 2d sess., and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 80, p. 4535.

[30] The term "render" appeared in the bill read to the House of Representatives. Cf. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 25, 1946, p. 10137. "Render" also appears in section 3 of H. R. 11223 (74th Cong.) and H. R. 11663 (74th Cong.).

[31] August 10, 1946.

[32] August 13, 1946.

[33] See also New York Times, October 18, 1946, and Philadelphia Inquirer, October 31, 1946. E. H. Cary, chairman of the National Physicians Committee, testified on April 19, 1946, before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor that his group had spent $905,259 on various forms of educational work during the last 5 years. The committee reported expenditures of $200,541.83 for the first 9 months of 1947 under the Federal Lobbying Act.

[34] First memorandum on Regulation of Lobbying Act, p. 3, probably late August 1946. The Committee for Constitutional Government reported under the Lobbying Act expenditures of $465,080.97 for the period August 2, 1946, through June 30, 1947, but gave no information on contributors.

[35] Memoranda on Regulations of Lobbying Act of the Committee on Constitutional Government, p. 3 of the first memorandum, and p. 4 of the second.

[36] Cases cited in the two memorandums prepared for the Committee for Constitutional Government include *Boyd* v. *United States* ((1886), 116 U. S. 616); *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* (1881), 103 U. S. 168); *Sinclair* v. *United States* ((1929), 279 U. S. 263); *Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Brimson* ((1894), 154 U. S. 447); *Federal Trade Commission* v. *American Tobacco Co.* (1924), 264 U. S. 298); *Hale* v. *Henkel* ((1906), 201 U. S. 43); *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* ((1927), 273 U. S. 135); *Jones* v. *Securities and Exchange Commission* ((1936), 298 U. S. 1.) The brief filed by the National Association of Manufacturers in the United States Federal court in Washington, D. C., on January 28, 1948, also holds that the lobbying title is in conflict with the Constitution.

[37] Senator MCCLELLAN, who preferred a lobbying bill limited to professional lobbyists, viewed the lobbying title before passage as a possible violation of civil liberties: "I should not be willing to pursue that purpose so far as to prevent the president of the Federal Farm Bureau, or the president of the CIO, or the president of the A. F. of L., or the president of the Farmers Union, or the secretary of the chamber of commerce, * * * from coming to Washington and conferring with their congressional delegation unless they agreed to register and to report as professional lobbyists. I do not think the legislation should go that far * * * I think it is probably an abridgment of the civil rights of our citizens and our constituents, when and if the law does go that far * * * I do not think we have a right to say to any citizen of our State that, as a citizen of the State, he cannot, without becoming a criminal because of violation of this proposed law, contact his Senator or his Representative in Congress and discuss with him legislation in which he or his organization is interested, unless he registers and acknowledges himself to be a lobbyist" (cf. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, June 10, 1946, p. 6678).

[38] Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Wisconsin. See Belle Zeller, State Regulation of Lobbying, The Book of the States, 1948–49, pp. 129, 130.

[39] That the latter was also the intention of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress may be seen from its report, (S. Rept. 1400, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 5).

[40] August 26, 1946.

[41] New York Times, August 10, 1946.

[42] New York Herald Tribune, August 24, 1946.

[43] St. Louis Post Dispatch, September 22, 1946.

[44] Journal Gazette, Fort Wayne, Ind., October 10, 1946.

[45] Chicago Times, September 13, 1946.

[46] The writer has had opportunity to examine, periodically, the reports filed under the provisions of the lobbying title with the clerk of the House of Representatives and the secretary of the Senate, to talk directly with persons in these offices and with those responsible for the drafting of the legislation, to examine the memorandums of interpretation and advice prepared by counsel for a number of organizations affected by the legislation, to communicate by telephone and letter with some of the counsel and with a larger number of the Washington lobbyists themselves, to examine the press coverage from coast to coast on this lobbying title, and in some instances to talk directly with the Washington press correspondents.

[47] New York Times, August 10, 1946. Unlike other titles in the Legislative Reorganization Act, title III provided no specific date on which it was to take effect.

[48] In this connection, counsel for the American Farm Bureau Federation commented: "The simplification which the Secretary and the Clerk have thus undertaken is advantageous to persons required to register under the act, except that Form A, which is for use by organizations, states that it is filed under section 307, thus implying that any organization filing it is engaged principally in lobbying." Cf. letter of F. E. Lee to Donald Kirkpatrick, November 26, 1946.

[49] Interview with H. Newlin Megill, Acting Clerk of the House of Representatives, December 6, 1946; United States News, vol. 31, September 6, 1947, p. 70.

[50] It was disclosed on December 25, 1947, that the United States Attorney General had earlier appointed Irving R. Kaufman as his special assistant to conduct an investigation of lobbying activities. Cf. New York Times, December 26, 1947, and interview with Irving R. Kaufman, January 2, 1948. On January 14 the Attorney General announced that he had given Mr. Kaufman written authorization to appear before a grand jury in cases warranting prosecuting; and on March 25 it was disclosed that a grand jury in Washington, D. C., had started receiving evidence from the Department of Justice on alleged violations of the Lobbying Act. Cf. New York Herald Tribune, March 24, 1948. On March 30, 1948, this grand jury indicted the United States Savings and Loan League. Cf. New York Times, March 31, 1948. On January 28, 1948, the National Association of Manufacturers followed what appears an unusual course when it appealed to the Federal district court in a civil action for an injunction to enjoin enforcement of the Federal Lobbying Act, which is a criminal statute.

[51] Clerk to Edward A. Rumely, of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., October 10, 1946. The same advice was repeated subsequently by the Clerk to officers of the organization. On July 8, 1947, Mr. Rumely wrote the Clerk, "* * * I protest that I am not under any legal obligation to file reports under said act, and again request a ruling on this question for future guidance."

On another occasion the Clerk returned a registration on Form A with the advice "that it should perhaps properly be filed in the name of the organization and sworn to by you as the agent thereof." And again a Form A was returned because it reflected no information. "It would appear," said the Clerk, "that such a form should be filed by the person * * * with whom you are associated, if they are receiving any contributions or expending any money for the purposes designated in paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 307. * * * In such a case, a statement by an organization should reflect some type of receipt or some type of expenditure or some information."[32] However, this procedure was soon changed. The clerk now files all reports, regardless of the nature of their contents.

The Clerk made the following reply to the request of the representative of the People's Lobby for postponement in filing his financial statement: "I note that your basis for this request is your present illness. There is no authority that lodges with the Clerk of the House in the administration of this act that would permit him to vary the requirement of this statute."

One barometer for measuring compliance is the number of registrations under the lobbying title during its first year. A total of 216 different organizations filed a total of 450 entries with the Clerk of the House under Form A.[33] These quarterly reports ranged from one to four for each organization, and, unlike the data filed on Forms B and C, are not published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Furthermore, the data supplied on Form A pertaining to the first three questions on amount and sources of contributions are meager indeed. Fuller information is supplied in answer to the last three questions concerned with the expenditures of the associations. On the other hand, too many among the 216 organizations that filed at least once during the year on Form A gave no information at all—"none" or blank spaces appearing in answer to all six questions.[34]

Many itemized expenditures, even of less than $10, appear on separately attached sheets. These statements should, and most of them do, include the expenses incurred by the lobbyists employed by the association. However, if the lobbyists' expenses are included on Form A, this does not absolve the lobbyists from registering under B and C.[35]

Among the organizations that indicated in detail not only all expenditures, but also the contributors with their names, addresses, and the amounts given, was the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. The chief concern of this organization, which employed 27 registered lobbyists, was to procure passage of the Stratton bill (H. R. 2910). The committee reported on Form A that during the first 6 months of 1947 it received contributions amounting to $236,753.25 and disbursed $185,431.42.

[32] South Trimble, Clerk of the House of Representatives, to Charles E. Saltzman, November 20, 1945.

[33] By January 31, 1948, an additional 21 "persons" filed under Form A.

[34] Among such organizations were the National Farmers Union, the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, the Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers, and the United Health League.

[35] For example, J. Byron Wilson, chairman of the legislative committee of the National Wool Growers Association, filed no B or C statements. He is reported to be one of the best-known lobbyists on the Hill. The National Wool Growers Association, however, did report on its Form A, filed on July 9, 1947, that Mr. Wilson spent a total of $2,457.21 during the first two quarters of 1947, but made no mention of his annual salary. His colleague, J. M. Jones, secretary of the association, did file under B and C.

The following list gives a representative sampling of the amounts reported to have been spent by associations during the first 6 months of 1947:

American Federation of Labor (in campaign to defeat Taft-Hartley bill)	$819,648.16
Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc	248,505.58
Townsend National Recovery Plan and Weekly	236,599.42
National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Service	135,367.86
National Association of Electric Companies	126,039.75
National Home and Property Owners' Foundation	77,333.82
Southern States Industrial Council	51,686.95
Southern Pine Industry Committee	34,988.23
American Legion	29,788.22
Unemployment Benefit Advisors	25,157.79
American Farm Bureau Federation	23,097.12
Sea Air Legislative Committee	21,326.20
National Association of Cooperatives	21,119.35
National St. Lawrence Association	20,381.05
Central Valley Project Association	18,306.38
American Medical Association	15,174.11
Christian Amendment Movement	9,875.40
American Library Association	7,990.17
National Conference of Railroad Investors	7,525.83
The People's Lobby	6,694.10
National Federation of Post Office Clerks	6,283.66
North Dakota Resources Board	4,978.21
Western Defense Housing Co.	4,848.08
American Parents Association	3,372.59
Federation of American Scientists	3,007.67
Irrigation Districts Association of California	2,576.22
American Veterans of World War II	494.20
National Committee for Strengthening Congress	248.20
Legislative Bureau of the Communist Party, United States of America	34.95

Twenty-two organizations that filed under Form A had no record of having hired legislative agents. This, of course, is entirely possible under the Lobbying Act, as the following statement, attached to the Form A of the Committee for United States Information Abroad indicates: "This is a volunteer committee composed of prominent individuals who are publicly supporting legislation to continue a United States information program abroad. It has no paid employees other than the office staff listed in the enclosed Form A: therefore, we are returning the blank forms B and C."

Even among the organizations that filed under A are a number which registered under protest or with reservations. For example, the American Library Association filed Form A with a statement that although this association "* * * is of the opinion that the provisions of this act do not apply to its activities, we feel that the purpose of the act merits the cooperation of every association in the United States and is, therefore, complying with the requirements as a matter of policy."[36]

The National Association of Electric Companies stated that it was very unwillingly filing forms A, B, and C. "* * * for the information of the Congress of the United States under title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, but seriously questions whether and to what extent that act applies to this association. The scope of that title is not clearly stated, and the forms have been prepared without the benefit of official interpretation."

However, it is the information required under Form A rather than B and C that throws important light upon the organizations that influence legislation—although occasionally the registrant under B gratuitously gives information about the association employing him. The data required in Form A emphasize what the State lobbying laws disregard, namely, that it is more important to know something of the structure, finances, and policy-making machinery of the organization than of the activities of the lobbyist employed by the pressure group.

Thus a cardinal weakness in the administration of the lobbying title must be judged by the failure of organizations to file under Form A (some of the most powerful and influential associations are in this category); and, secondly, by observing that in many cases very meager information was supplied by organizations that did file.

On Form B, 845 different registrants recorded 677 "persons" as their employers.[37] If a liberal interpretation had been given to the word "principal" in section 307, the correlation would have been higher between those who filed under Form A in accordance with sections 305 and 307 and the employers of Form B registrants reporting under section 308.[38] These 677 organizations employed a total of 1,058 legislative agents. Included among this latter figure were 74 who recorded that they were employed by more than one person. In fact, these 74 represented 287 organizations and individuals. The record is held by Walter F. Woodul, who represented 24 railroads in Texas, Missouri, and California, and the Imperial Sugar Co. of Texas. James E. Curry, representative of 18 Indian tribes, is promised 10 percent of all recovery in claims plus "reasonable fees for other work." Stephen Walter represents 14 different power companies.[39]

The registration figures also disclose that a number of associations have in their employ at the same time more than one person who is responsible for the group's legislative work. The record is held by the Townsend National Recovery Plan. Thirty-four different individuals for twenty-five States filed under Form B and indicated the Townsend National Recovery Plan as the organization in whose interest they were working. While some of the Townsend registrants indicated they were paid a flat salary of $50 or $75 a week, 18 others indicated that they received as commissions from 25 to 50 percent of the financial contributions or dues of members in their respective States. The employees at the national headquarters in Cleveland listed salaries ranging from $4,000 to $7,800 and additional expense allowances.[40] The Citi-

[36] However, the American Library Association listed its expenditures but not its contributions on its four quarterly Forms A. Letter of Carl H. Milam, executive secretary, to Leslie P. Biffle, Secretary of the Senate, October 10, 1946.

[37] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, January 3, 1947; February 5, 1947; May 12, 1947; August 15, 1947.

[38] Although by January 1948 a thousand lobbyists had registered, they represented a total of about 750 employer organizations and individuals. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, November 17, 1947; vol. 94, January 29, 1948.

[39] It is possible that among these 74 registrants are some who terminated their services with one organization before being employed by another. This may apply to those who filed at different times under Form B. A specific statement of termination of employment should be required on Form C.

[40] On Form A the Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., reported for 1946 contributions of $210,146.34 and expenditures of $584,833.47.

zens Committee on Displaced Persons followed the policy of having all of their 27 employees, including office and field workers, file individual registrations on Form B, and thus a total pay roll of $165,000 annually was recorded. It seems unnecessary to add that the number of lobbyists employed by any one organization does not indicate its strength or influence. Congress has not adopted the program advocated by the Townsend plan, nor did the Stratton bill, urged by the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, become law in 1947.

Significantly, former Government employees were registered as lobbyists, but not to the extent that one would expect after reading the statements of the late Senator Caraway.[41] The statements filed under the lobbying statute during its first year disclosed that eight former Members of Congress were registered, and several former officials of the Federal administrative branch.[42]

Sixty-five women are numbered among the 845 individuals who registered as lobbyists. It has been estimated that their total salary is about $170,000 per year in a field of employment that is reputed to draw down in salaries four or five million dollars annually. The highest salary reported for a woman lobbyist was $7,000 per annum, and the next highest was $6,400.[43] The majority of the women lobbyists, however, draw annual salaries ranging from $3,000 to $4,000. Three make less than $1,500 a year, while a number of the women are volunteer workers drawing no salary, but only necessary expenses. The largest number of women registered for a single organization is the 10 employed by the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons.[44]

The highest salary on record is $65,000 paid to Purcell L. Smith by the National Association of Electric Companies, who stated: "On the basis of the activities of the association to date, I estimate that not over 25 percent my time is spent on legislative matters within the purview of the act."[45] The runner-up is Stephen M. Walter with an annual salary of $52,000, while Ernest W. Greene is paid $45,180 per annum as agent for the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association.[46] Top labor leaders, as William Green and Philip Murray, have not registered as lobbyists for their respective organizations. However, three legislative agents for the American Federation of Labor registered, each with $7,280 per annum salary, and two for the CIO at salaries of $6,000 and $4,820. It is perhaps superfluous to note that some salaries are very low indeed, one registrant recording $5 a year from the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs. There are also a number of volunteers, even among the male representatives who have registered, although a reading of section 308 of the lobbying title would appear to exempt agents not employed for compensation.[47]

Approximately 400 of the nearly 700 employers of registered legislative agents came from various categories of business, whereas about 75 were labor and government employee associations. Agricultural, veteran, professional, civic, and miscellaneous groups made up the remainder.

A check of the addresses of "persons" employing lobbyists indicated that all but seven States of the Union were represented, as well as the following Territories: Alaska, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii. In addition, organizations with addresses in Mexico, the Netherlands, Egypt, Cuba, and the Canal Zone employed registered lobbyists. About 172 organizations have Washington, D. C., addresses; 107, New York addresses; Illinois comes next with 43; then California and Texas with 35 each. It has been estimated that there are about 3,000 lawyers in Washington, D. C., more per capita than in any other city in the country. A large number of the lawyers with District addresses represent, as registered lobbyists, not only organizations located in the District, but also organizations with addresses elsewhere in the country, in the territories, and in foreign countries.

Sixteen legislative agents during the first year requested that their registrations be canceled. Undoubtedly several more of the 845 registered lobbyists terminated their services without specifically notifying the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate. In these cases one could assume that the failure to file the quarterly financial report would indicate that their services as lobbyists were at an end. The Clerk so ruled in reply to the request of Samuel Rosenman to "withdraw" his registration because his activities in connection with the specific legislation for which he represented the Associated Fur Coat and Trimming Manufacturers had come to an end with its enactment. In reply, the Clerk stated: "The act requires persons registered to file quarterly reports as long as they are engaged in the activity, and therefore failure to file such quarterly reports is a notice of withdrawal of registration pursuant to the act."[48]

In answer to the question on Form B, "the duration of such employment," either a fixed termination date was stated, or, more frequently such replies as "indefinite," "at will," "undetermined," "permanent," were recorded. One of the representatives of the American Federation of Labor, in answer to this question, said: "Until fired, resigned, retired, or dead."[49] A Rev. James C. Olden recorded that he was working for the American Negro "until the problem is solved," and that he was supported in these labors by "free will offerings of churches and interested individuals."[50]

The number of reports on Form C listing the quarterly expenditures of individual lobbyists has increased with each quarterly compilation. For example, 149 filed for the first quarter, 198 for the second, 539 for the third, 631 for the fourth, making a total of 1,517 who filed Form C during this first year.[51]

Most of the lobbyists have complied with the filing of their quarterly financial statement, although some statements came in slowly. In a number of cases, statements have been filed for two quarters at the same time. Furthermore, in a few cases, legislative agents have erroneously used Form A instead of C for their personal filing records. This confusion undoubtedly was caused by the use of the word "person," which normally means an individual rather than an association.[52] Financial statements are not required for any quarter in which the lobbyist did no lobbying. However, a few lobbyists prefer to file the C form and state, for example: "No participation in lobbying during second quarter, and I shall not be lobbying on labor legislation as set forth in first-quarter report."[53]

The statute recognizes the importance of publications in promoting legislation. Form C therefore asks for "the name of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials." In the overwhelming number of cases, either "none" was recorded, or no reply at all was given. However, there are examples in which some registered agents listed newspapers and periodicals to which news releases and articles had been mailed, or in which they had been published." More often, a single specific publication is mentioned, and that is usually the organ of the association employing the lobbyist, e. g., "None other than weekly newsletter published by employer."

In answer to the last question of Form C, "The proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose," the replies take different forms. Agents for "the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons mentioned H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act (Stratton bill). In another case there appears a series of specific bills. The representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation replied: "In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions, adopted by the federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed."[54] More often some such general

[41] H. J. Res. 227, 70th Cong., undertook to prohibit former Members of Congress from engaging in the practice of lobbying, but the resolution did not pass.

[42] Former Congressmen were Albert E. Carter, employed by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. at $12,000 per annum; John A. Danaher, of Connecticut, Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., at $25,000 per year; Wesley E. Disney, of Oklahoma, National Gas Association of America, at $10,000 per year plus legal fees from other groups; Winder R. Harris, of Virginia, Shipbuilders Council of America, at $15,000 per annum; Fritz G. Lanham, of Texas, National Patent Council, State Rights Association, and others, at a total of $16,000 per year; Robert Ramspeck, of Georgia, Air Transport Association of America, at $25,000 per year; H. Jerry Voorhis, of California, Cooperative League of the United States of America, at $7,500 per year; Clifton A. Woodrum, of Virginia, American Plant Food Council, Inc., at $36,000 per annum.

Prominent among the other former public officials were Samuel Rosenman, employed by the Associated Fur Coat and Trimming Manufacturers, Inc., at $40,000 per year; and William P. MacCracken, Jr., employed by Remington Rand, Inc., at $12,000 per year, while his services to the American Optometric Association are paid for from time to time, the amount depending upon the nature of the work and the time involved.

[43] These salaries are paid, respectively, to Margaret K. Taylor by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation and Hilda W. Smith by the Committee for the Extension of Labor Legislation.

[44] In addition to the list published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, see New York Herald Tribune, May 15, 1947.

[45] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, January 3, 1947, p. 54.

[46] Representatives of the Association of American Railroads and the United States Beet Sugar Association are each paid annual salaries of $40,000.

[47] One Jostus R. Moll recorded that he received "no money or other valuable consideration" from the Frisco System Board of Adjustment, except the payment of his annual dues, and he even paid his own expenses. He added: "In addition to said consideration, I hope to receive as other consideration mentioned in the statute, the continued loyalty and gratitude of the membership of Frisco System Board of Adjustment (or any other bona fide labor union) in return for my efforts."

[48] April 8, 1947. It is evident that it would be well if some provision were made on form C specifically called for a statement of resignation or cancellation.

[49] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, January 3, 1947, p. 49.

[50] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, May 12, 1947, p. 5209.

[51] The last two quarters covered the first 6 months of the 80th Cong. By the end of January 1948, 2,592 filed on form C.

[52] For example, this was done by Charles E. Saltzman, who represented the New York Stock Exchange until he resigned in July 1947 to become Assistant Secretary of State.

[53] Entries for Herman M. Booth, Jr., in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, May 12, 1947, p. 5216, and August 15, 1947, p. A4468.

[54] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, August 15, 1947, p. A4492.

[55] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, August 15, 1947, p. A4493.

characterization is given as "anti-monopoly legislation," "measures affecting the ownership and operation of real estate," "legislation affecting credit union," "measures affecting the mortgage-banking industry," "supporting legislation for the unemployed," "all legislation of interest to business such as bills on taxes, budget control, portal-to-portal pay suits, general labor, claims, etc.," "legislation for workers."

It has been observed that 677 persons were listed as employers on Form B. In addition, there were 22 associations that filed under A, but did not employ lobbyists, according to the Form B records on file. A breakdown of this total figure of 699 indicates that 498 were associations or member organizations, while 201 were individuals or individual companies and corporations. How many organizations are really active in the area of national legislation? Samuel H. Tower stated in the New York Times that "lobbying has reached, if possible, a new pitch of activity in the present session of Congress."[79]

Joseph and Stewart Alsop reported that "in the presence of lobbyists, the Eightieth Congress of the United States has behaved like a blowsy chorus girl just starting on her second pint of rye. * * * At this session something very like the beginning of a lobbyists' carnival has been plainly discernible * * * the power lobby is the most active, and most conspicuously well-heeled, in Washington. Its grand panjandrum, the high-powered F. L. Smith, representative of the National Association of Electrical Companies, gets a salary in the Hollywood class—$65,000 annually, with an ample expense account. But even the prosperous Smith is less important than the numerous officials of the large utilities companies. These converge on the Capitol at frequent intervals to make the boys on the Hill see the power question in the old free-enterprise way. And behind these large operators, there is a whole network of lawyers with retainers from the utilities, bankers with deposits from them, and other influential figures. These speak from the voting districts to Washington with voices of authority. Besides stirring up the sordid attack on David E. Lilienthal, the power people have scored major successes at this session with the Appropriations Committees."[80]

In vetoing the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, President Truman stated:

"One of the most stubborn obstacles in the way of any constructive housing program has been the opposition of the real estate lobby. Its members have exerted pressure at every point against every proposal for making the housing program more effective. They have constantly sought to weaken rent control and to do away with necessary aids to housing. * * * It is deplorable that this lobby should be permitted by its brazen operations to block programs so essential to the needs of our citizens. Nothing could be more clearly subversive of representative government. * * *"[81]

And again, Ned Brooks, Washington correspondent wrote:

"The real-estate lobby's series of successes in Congress has soothed the sting of President Truman's rebuke to it. * * * They have won all major objectives in the current session. * * * Six weeks before the session began, Boyd Bernard, then president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, told members to 'wait for the new Congress on the Capitol steps with a proposal for a cushioned decontrol of rents.'

On May 12, after the House had passed the bill opening the way for rent increases and repealing most of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act, the association notified members: 'We won the first round of rents through the passage of the Wolcott bill. This embodies substantially the program we wanted.'

At the same time the association was soliciting its membership for $5 contributions to conduct 'legislative and research work' here in Washington. Officials ridiculed statements that it had a $10,000,000 fund available for putting over its program, saying its goal of voluntary subscription was only $59,000.[82]

The six leading organizations which constitute the real-estate lobby in Washington are: Association of Real Estate Boards, National Home and Property Owners Foundation, National Association of Home Builders, Buildings Products Institute, United States Savings and Loan League, and National Retail Lumber Dealers Association. According to statements on file in the Clerk's and Secretary's offices, their 14 agents receive salaries totalling $81,450 per annum. Only two of these organizations during the first year filed under Form A. The National Association of Real Estate Boards reported expenditures of $39,355.72 in 1946, and the National Home and Property Owners Foundation recorded, for a 7-month period in 1946, expenditures of $232,132.08.[83]

In the New Republic, Helen Fuller refers to the "Eightieth Congress * * * [as] a demonstration of government by lobby and steamroller." She indicts, among others, the Association of American Railroads for its lobbying budget of nearly $5,000,000 per year, which got the Reed-Bulwinkle bill (exempting railroads from the antitrust laws) through the Senate; and the sugar interests, which put through "a sweet deal in the Sugar Act of 1948"; and the "big business' biggest guns, the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce, concentrated on labor first, taxes second."[84]

On the other hand, organized labor, with the assistance of consumer and other civic organizations, was far from quiescent. The registrations under the lobbying title record about 75 organizations affiliated with the A. F. of L. and CIO., as well as unaffiliated groups. Unprecedented sums of money were spent in legislative battles, particularly over the elimination of price controls in general, rent controls, the Taft-Hartley Labor Act, and the reorganization of the Labor Department. As never before, in enterprising and novel ways, radio and newspaper advertisements were used to carry labor's message to millions of people.

On June 28, 1947, Representative ARENDS, of Illinois, on the floor of the House, said:

"Last week, during the discussion of the President's veto message on labor, some 800 lobbyists were reported to have come to Washington in an automobile veto caravan. They came here for the purpose of influencing the President to veto the Labor Act and to exert their influence on Members of Congress to sustain such veto.

"Who paid their expenses? Have they registered as lobbyists?

"There have been reports that labor organizations have spent more than $1,000,000 in lobbying against the Labor Act and for sustaining the veto. Have those expenses been reported as lobbying costs?

"Phil Murray, president of the CIO, was interviewed on a radio program Friday night called Meet the Press. In that radio interview Mr. Murray said that he had talked to various Members of Congress about the act. Mr. Murray was asked if he thought that would come under the head of lobbying. He replied that he did not believe so. Many Members had called him asking about the act, he replied. Is that lobbying and is Mr. Murray registered as a lobbyist?[85]

The American Federation of Labor filed under Form A for the first time on July 11, 1947, a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements for the period from April 23, 1947, through June 30, 1947. It showed that the Federation had received for its fight on the Taft-Hartley bill contributions aggregating $992,452.30 from 102 of its national and international unions and from its local trade and Federal unions, and had spent $819,-648.18.[86] The largest items in its expenses were: for newspaper advertising, $423,821.58; for radio advertising, $322,839.26; for radio entertainment, $61,673.54; and for telegrams, $3,641.33. The three unions making the largest contributions were: United Mine Workers of America, $90,000; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, $90,000; and International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, $93,750. Judging from these figures of the American Federation of Labor, it can be concluded that all of organized labor must have spent millions of dollars in its unsuccessful campaign to keep the Taft-Hartley bill from the statute book.

It is, of course, difficult to estimate with accuracy the number of pressure groups that are active in the area of national legislation. It is undoubtedly an understatement that, even with a strict interpretation of the lobbying law, more than the 699 employers that can now be found in the files should have registered under the lobbying title. According to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, more than 3,000 national trade and professional associations are represented at the capital in some manner.[87] The report of the Temporary National Committee on "Economic Power and Political Pressures," prepared by Donald C. Blaisdell in 1941, listed 331 national organizations with permanent representatives in Washington.[88] Many of the associations recorded under the lobbying law during its first year are not, of course, national organizations, and undoubtedly do

[79] New York Times, June 1, 1947.

[80] Washington Post, July 25, 1947, reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, July 25, 1947, p. A4067.

[81] New York Times, July 1, 1947.

[82] Washington Daily News, July 21, 1947, reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, July 25, 1947, p. 10353.

[83] On March 30, 1948, the Federal grand jury in Washington, D. C., indicted the United States Savings and Loan League for its failure to file under form A of the lobbying law. Three of its legislative representatives did file under form B. When a Federal grand jury brought an indictment against the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the Washington Real Estate Board on grounds of conspiring to fix commission rates for real-estate dealers, the president of the national association saw in this action a reprisal for disagreement with the administration on housing. Cf. New York Times, August 29, 1947.

[84] August 4, 1947.

[85] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, June 23, 1947, p. 7716. Neither Mr. Murray nor Mr. Green has registered under the lobbying act.

[86] For the period April 23, 1947, through December 31, 1947, receipts were $1,045,478.03 and expenditures $834,565.38.

[87] C. J. Judkins, Trade and Professional Associations of the United States (Washington, D. C., 1942), U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. The associations are broken down as follows: 1,900 trade associations (business competitors in one industry); 300 other "business associations" (not trade associations, but composed largely of businessmen); 600 other organizations (the activities of these are of special interest to business, such as the American Farm Bureau Federation, American Federation of Labor, American Medical Association); 300 additional associations. The National Association of Manufacturers states that there are about 1,500 national or regional trade associations of commercial or industrial enterprises.

[88] TNEC Rept. No. 26, pp. 197–201.

not all have permanent representatives in Washington. Eighty-two organizations in this 1941 list registered in some form under the lobbying law in 1946–47.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING THE ACT

During its first year, the Federal lobbying law has been of limited effectiveness. However, a sufficient number of registrants have complied in one way or another to justify an early revision. Soon after the law became effective, an Omaha newspaper reported: "A cynical alliance stands as a new threat to the La Follette-Monroney Congressional Reorganization Act. The World Herald's Jack Jarrell reports from Washington that some of the Nation's top lobbyists have joined forces with the unofficial Congressional Old-Timer's Club in a drive to undercut the bill."[89] Whether or not the Omaha correspondent was correct, the Federal Department of Justice may force the hand of Congress, and revision of the lobbying law may be seriously undertaken.[90]

Unlike the original title, all proposed amendments should be subjected to careful scrutiny by committee members, following full public hearings.[91] The value of carefully planned hearings cannot be overestimated. On this point, Prof. Joseph P. Chamberlain, of Columbia University, told the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress:

"I think, in my experience, it is enormously important in order to get good legislation to have careful committee consideration. I have drafted a good many bills in my time for private organizations, for State departments and bureaus, and I have never felt any satisfaction about any measure to which I might have given a great deal of time and consideration unless it had had a careful hearing before a committee—and I knew that the common sense of that committee had been expended on that bill."[92]

Methods employed to influence legislation are no longer restricted largely to buttonholing Members of Congress in the Nation's Capitol or at home. Mass channels of communication and the art of public relations have increased the pressures upon Congress and other Government agencies, and thus have drastically changed modern pressure techniques. It is recommended that:

1. The lobbying title of the Legislative Reorganization Act be completely redrafted and its various sections considered as an integrated whole, in order to avoid contradictions and ambiguities.

2. The words "principally" and "principal" now appearing in section 307 be deleted, and the Lobbying Act be made applicable to all organizations that now expend a specific sum (for example, at least $1,000 for any one quarter of the year) in influencing public opinion or the agencies of Government, directly or indirectly, in the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States. While it cannot be denied that organizations such as labor, chambers of commerce, trade associations, farm groups, etc., do perform major services not directly related to influencing legislation, such legislative activity as they do engage in, even for limited periods, may be of vital importance to the existence of these organizations. It is difficult, even at times impossible, to separate the so-called nonlegislative from the legislative expenses of any organization.[93] Therefore, the act should require a statement of the total budget of these organizations, broken down into broad categories of expenditures with a listing specifically of all items of expenditure labeled legislative. The names and addresses of contributors of $500 or more in any one quarter should appear in the statements filed under the lobbying title, whether specifically earmarked for legislative purposes or not.

3. A statement of the bona fide total membership of organizations should be required. It would also be effective if each organization were required to state how its legislative policy is determined and to indicate the responsibility of the lobbyist in conveying these views on behalf of the membership of the organization. It would then be a simple matter to expect chairmen of standing and special committees to require of a witness appearing at hearings a sworn statement as to whom he represents, the membership of his organization, and the internal structure of such organization, indicating how the position taken by the witness was arrived at. This might prove a great step in the direction of making pressure groups more representative of their actual and potential membership, and more democratic in their procedures.

4. It should be the responsibility of a specially designated agency to enforce the Lobbying Act. This agent should be the Attorney General of the United States. It would be his responsibility to see that complete information is supplied in accordance with the terms of the act and that such information is given the fullest publicity. Publicity is the key to effective enforcement of lobbying legislation. The compilation of the data for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is only a first step. The Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, now responsible for the compilation of the data on Forms B and C, lack police power. The information on all forms, to be prepared by the Attorney General in the first place, should be published at quarterly intervals in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. One copy should be filed with the enforcement agency and one with the Clerk of the House. It is further recommended that the compilation of the data be furnished either by the enforcement agency or by the Clerk of the House to the Press, Radio, and Periodical Press Galleries at stated intervals, in sufficient number to permit distribution to each accredited member of the galleries.[94] Copies of the compiled lobbying data should also be sent at weekly intervals while Congress is in session to the presiding officers of each House in sufficient number to permit distribution to each Member of Congress.

Furthermore, the Attorney General should be specifically required to evaluate in his annual report to Congress the working of the lobbying act during the past year, to interpret the information yielded under the act, and to suggest improvements through administrative or legislative action. It would be highly advisable for the appropriate congressional committees annually to evaluate the act, as provided in the Legislative Reorganization Act.

5. The act should be revised to require the the filing of statements and registration of persons who exert influence upon any Federal bureau, agency, or Government official. The Congress having taken the first step in requiring registration of persons exerting influence upon the legislative body, the extension of its provisions to the administrative agencies would be a simple matter. It would be further recognition of the fact that the pressure upon the administrative division is considerable.[95]

6. The act should specifically prohibit the employment of any person to promote or oppose legislation when compensation is contingent in whole or in part upon the passage or defeat of legislative matters.[96]

7. The exemption granted in section 308 to newspapers or other regularly published periodicals should be extended to radio.

8. The contradictions in sections 307 and 311, as affecting the Corrupt Practices Act, should be resolved, making it clear that only duly organized State and local party committees are exempted from the provisions of the lobbying act and that others may be required to file under the lobbying and corrupt practices laws, depending on their activities.

If the foregoing suggestions were adopted, many organizations now enjoying tax exemption status under the Federal Internal Revenue Code might lose this status if they complied with the lobbying statute so amended. This is undoubtedly one of the chief reasons why many organizations have not filed under the ambiguous terms of the present law. It would seem, then, that Congress might be required to amend the Internal Revenue Code if it wished these organizations to continue as tax-exempt groups.[97]

No one doubts that it is a nuisance to require such full information from private organizations. Yet the time is opportune to insist upon it. These groups have grown accustomed in the past two decades to furnishing more and more information to the Government. Teeth should be put into the lobbying title at the earliest practicable moment. It is far better for Congress to clarify its position than for the courts to do so. Groups engaged in the legitimate activity of helping the people's representatives formulate public policy are in a sense clothed with a public interest. A democracy is entitled to

[89] Omaha World-Herald, October 9, 1946.

[90] See footnote 53 above. The Justice Department holds that the phrase "principal purpose" in sec. 307 means any purpose which is not incidental to the activities of the "person" in question, that any other interpretation would be meaningless and would clearly defeat the expressed intention of Congress. See testimony of Irving R. Kaufman, before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, February 17, 1948. See footnotes 53 and 83 above.

[91] The Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has already held such hearings, in which the writer participated on February 17, 1948, New York Times, February 18, 1948.

[92] Hearings before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, 79th Cong., 1st sess., pt. 4, p. 1007.

[93] For example, the chairman of the National Legislative Committee of the American Federation of Labor, in order to support his statement "that the legislative expenses of our organization is a very minute proportion of its activities," points to the annual report of the Federation for the year ending August 31, 1946, in which the total expenditures of the federation were given at more than two and a half million dollars and legislative salaries and expenses amounted to $16,441.57. Cf. letter of W. C. Husking, December 6, 1946, and report of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, 1946, pp. 2–3. For the year ending August 31, 1947, although the total expenditures of the federation exceeded $5,-000,000, legislative salaries and expenses were $22,474. These figures do not include the sums spent in the federation's campaign to defeat the Taft-Hartley bill.

[94] For membership of the Press, Radio, and Periodical Press Galleries, see Congressional Directory, January 1948, pp. 731–753.

[95] Senate bill 2512, 74th Cong., introduced by Senator Black, made such provision.

[96] This prohibition is found in many of the State lobbying laws. Contingent payments may tend to encourage questionable practices. A registrant, in answering question 4 on form B, "how much he is paid and is to receive," stated: "$10,000 per annum as a retainer as Washington counsel on all matters affecting the economic and legal welfare of the [fur] industry, plus a fee of $15,000 in the event excise tax on furs is cut from 20 percent to 10 percent, plus an additional fee of $25,000 in the event the entire excise tax on furs is repealed on or before July 1, 1948." Cf. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, January 29, 1948, p. 741.

[97] See U. S. Code, title 26, sec. 101 (6), 1938.

the fullest information from all the sources that constitute its functioning parts—and who would deny that pressure groups play a valuable and indispensable part in the dynamics of government?

However, regulatory legislation by itself, no matter how carefully drawn or vigorously enforced, will not eliminate the predatory lobby or discourage the use of questionable or illegitimate practices by pressure groups. Significantly, the lobbying title is part of the Legislative Reorganization Act which aimed to improve and modernize the organization and operations of the Congress. For example, by placing greater professional expert and clerical assistance at the disposal of legislative committees and Members, Congress has made itself less dependent on unofficial sources of information than ever before. Strengthening the ability of Government to formulate legislative policy will go a long way toward providing effective regulation of pressure groups.

The Myth of the "Untouchable" 71 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a bulletin entitled, "The Myth of the 'Untouchable' 71 Percent," published by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, signed by Alvin A. Burger, research director.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MYTH OF THE "UNTOUCHABLE" 71 PERCENT

Spenders in and out of Congress have been utilizing what has proved to be an effective device for countering demands from folks back home for reduced Federal spending and a balanced budget. The device works this way: Pointing a frosty index finger at the complaining taxpayer, a prospending Senator (for example) will say, "Do you know that 71 percent of the proposed 1951 Federal budget goes to pay for past wars and to prevent future wars? National defense takes $13,500,000,000; services and benefits to veterans, $6,100,000,000; foreign aid, $4,700,000,000; and interest on the Federal debt, $5,600,000,000; $29,900,000,000 all told, or 71 percent of the total expenditure. Now, Mr. Public, do you want to cut down on national defense? Do you want to abolish services to our veterans? Do you want Europe to be overrun by Communists? Do you want to default on the interest on the debt? No? Well, then, that leaves only 29 percent of the budget that can be cut, and that includes outlays for health, social welfare, agriculture, labor, natural resources, and so on. Are you prepared to say where and by how much these items should be reduced?"

The average citizen is taken aback by such an assault. He has no pat answer to the phony assumption that 71 percent of the budget is immune to pruning. Left with the remaining 29 percent to ponder upon, he finds himself frustrated and silenced.

What he realizes in due time, of course, is that he has been the victim of a percentageal "con" game at which the spenders in Washington have long been adept. The scheme is to get the public to believe that 71 percent of the budget is untouchable (last year it was 76 percent), and that in any event the opportunities for substantial expense-paring are negligible.

Now what are the facts? Briefly, here they are:

1. Of the $42,400,000,000 of estimated spending in the proposed 1951 budget, only $9,400,000,000, or 22 percent, represents fixed charges not subject to reduction by Congress. The largest item in this sum is interest on the debt, estimated at $5,600,000,000.

2. Of the remaining $33,000,000,000, $14,600,000,000 is subject to outright reduction by the appropriation process, while the rest, amounting to $18,400,000,000, can be reduced somewhat by the appropriation process and substantially by amending existing laws authorizing the expenditures involved. In this latter category are programs involving Federal grants, subsidies, payments to individuals, home-mortgage purchases, etc.[1]

3. Expenditures for the Military Establishment and for veterans' services and benefits, far from being untouchable, offer abundant opportunities for spending reduction without impairing our national defense or curtailing reasonable services to veterans. Reports of the Hoover Commission and recent statements by Defense Secretary Johnson and Veterans' Administrator Gray support this.

4. Foreign aid and military-assistance expenditures are certainly subject to control by congressional appropriation except for certain obligated balances carried over from previous appropriations.

5. Ordinary domestic peacetime expenditures of the Government—those not related to past or future wars—have risen from $6,700,000,000 in 1948 to an estimated $12,300,000,000 in fiscal 1951, an increase of 84 percent.

6. The President's 1951 budget provides $953,000,000 to initiate 34 new spending programs. If Congress refuses to approve them, $953,000,000 will be saved. If Congress approves them, not only will this sum be spent, but the continuing programs will require much larger annual outlays in the years to come.

7. Despite recent improvements in many agencies of the Government, the 1951 budget still covers up much of the waste, duplication, payroll padding and inefficiencies exposed by the Hoover Commission, Byrd Committee and other survey agencies in their numerous reports. These add up to billions of dollars of possible savings.

REDUCING MILITARY EXPENDITURES

The 1951 expenditure estimate for national defense is $13,545,000,000. This huge sum nearly equals the total amount of taxes collected last year for the support of all our State governments, all our municipal and county governments and all our school systems combined. Now we all want a strong system of national defense in these days of cold war. The question is, can we, in striving for a balanced budget, achieve a cut in military spending and at the same time maintain an adequate system of defense? Senator HARRY F. BYRD maintains that we can. So does Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois. Both have proposed that substantial cuts be made. But most encouraging of all is the attitude of Defense Secretary Louis Johnson himself, who, although a strong advocate of armed security, has shown himself to be no respecter of the sanctity of military budgets. Although he has said that military spending would probably continue at a $13,000,000,000 level until 1952, he has undertaken economy measures under the Unification Act which he estimates should result in $1,000,000,000 of savings by August 10 next. Greater combat effectiveness can be achieved as a result of these savings because of reduced excessive overhead and waste.

[1] The figures used in 1 and 2 are taken from Budget Bureau testimony before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, January 18, 1950.

But Secretary Johnson's commendable economy efforts are encountering opposition from five principal sources. These are:

1. Certain military, naval, and Air Force brass to whom budgets are incomprehensible and the thought of conserving tax resources is repugnant;

2. Certain short-sighted industrial pressure-groups having a vested interest in military spending;

3. Certain local interests that are more eager to retain unessential military installations within their boundaries than to see the Nation's budget balanced;

4. Certain employee groups which oppose reductions in the huge civilian pay rolls of the armed services; and

5. Certain Members of Congress who speak for the various interests here listed.

There is little doubt but that these interests are setting up costly obstacles in the path of true unification of the armed services. Failure to defeat them will result not only in costing the taxpayers large sums of unnecessary taxes, but also in weakening our system of national defense through foolish dissipation of its resources of manpower, materials, and money.

SAVINGS IN VETERANS' SERVICES AND BENEFITS

The estimated expenditure for veterans' services and benefits in the President's 1951 budget amounts to $6,080,000,000. The overlapping, duplication, and waste prevailing in these activities have been given full public airing through the findings of the Hoover Commission. The Commission's recommendations call for a business-like overhauling and streamlining of all veterans' services, particularly the hospital and insurance programs. If adopted, these proposals would not only save hundreds of millions of dollars to the taxpayers, but would provide more effective services for deserving veterans.

But the chief cause of much of the waste found in the Government's outlays for veterans lies in ill-advised legislation passed by Congress from time to time. A glaring example is found in certain provisions of measures providing education and training benefits for World War II veterans. Expenditures for these benefits in 1951 are estimated at $2,700,000,000.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 was passed to assist the returning veteran in making his readjustment to civilian life after separation from active service. Among other things, the act set up a sound system of education and in-service training benefits for veterans whose education had been delayed or impeded by war. But as time went on, Congress passed liberalizing measures which have made a large part of this program a costly farce. Abuses include:

1. The setting up of thousands of poorly qualified training schools which bid for veteran enrollments and derive exorbitant profits from tuition fees paid by the Government.

2. The enrollment of veterans for the primary purposes of income from the Government.

3. The enrollment of veterans who are temporarily unemployed or on strike.

4. The wholesale changing of courses by veterans (1,117,000 individual veterans had changed courses up to July 1949, thousands of them as many as 3 or 4 times).

5. The enrollment of veterans in courses wholly unrelated to their present or intended means of livelihood.

It is clear that the terrific waste incurred in this program stems not from faulty administration so much as from very bad laws. Responsibility for plugging up the bulk of this waste obviously rests with Congress.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

The President's 1951 budget sets aside $4,700,000,000 for foreign aid and other international finance programs. Of this amount

$3,300,000,000 is for ECA and $645,000,000 is for the military assistance pact entered into last year. None of these programs is a "sacred cow" insofar as the power of Congress to reduce or modify appropriations is concerned.

One of the serious questions which a Member of Congress must ask himself in voting foreign aid funds is whether he is serving the best interests of a friendly foreign nation by approving sums which throw our own budget out of balance, thus weakening the economy of the Nation on which the free world depends for aid. May we not be serving that neighbor better when we provide him fewer dollars but keep the source of those dollars solvent and sound?

IT'S UP TO CONGRESS

The plain truth is that Congress has all the power it needs to reduce Federal spending sufficiently to balance the 1951 budget.

It is Congress which appropriates funds for the executive branch to spend. It is Congress which legislates new spending programs. It is Congress—not the executive branch—which has the power to modify and repeal all such spending legislation.

The executive branch cannot spend what Congress does not appropriate. The executive branch cannot initiate spending activities which Congress does not authorize.

It is, therefore, the height of effrontery for any Member of Congress to characterize as arrant nonsense proposals that the budget be balanced through spending reduction.

The Government would quickly descend upon any taxpayer who might say, "I can't—or won't—balance my household budget. Therefore I can't pay my Federal income tax this year."

That is what the President and Congress tell us when they say, in effect, "We want to spend $5,000,000,000 in excess of our expected income next year. So if you don't mind, we'll put it on the cuff."

ALVIN A. BURGER,
Research Director, Council of State Chambers of Commerce.

Taxes! Taxes! Taxes!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I include for the RECORD an article on taxes written by Mr. Edward F. Hutton in the Palm Beach (Fla.) Daily News of February 23, 1950. The fundamental truths he stresses and the simplicity of his presentation should invite the attention and consideration of all of the Members of this House.

Mr. Hutton's article follows:

TAXES! TAXES! TAXES!—WHO LIKES THEM?
(By Edward F. Hutton)

They are not liked because the take is too big.

Everyone should know, including Government that the dollars which are withdrawn from industry are taxes for big Government and the tax dollars are lost to production.

Government produces no wealth and that is the only source which can yield taxes. The more money we, the people, have left, after taxes, goes into productivity as venture capital risk, which creates and increases jobs.

The correct doctrine was that taxation should be held down as low as possible consistent with: "provide for the common defense"; "maintain law and order"; "insure domestic tranquility"; "provide public service"; after which the more money which was left in the hands of we, the people, could be applied to fertilize the growth of new endeavors to create jobs.

But the climate has changed. The redistribution of wealth does not take the crude form of sharing the dollars and wealth, but, in effect, by taking from the people too much of that which they earn by their labor. This is being done by subsidies and so-called free service.

The method of confiscatory taxation obviously destroys the incentive to earn anything more than a modest income. Authorities must know how powerful the present income tax operates to restrict effort.

Human nature is what it is. So who is going to strive by hard work to double his income, only to incur heavier taxes?

Why exercise one's talents?

PENALTY ON SUCCESS

Why try to climb the ladder of success, if no rewards are to be granted?

Why penalize success?

Why penalize human ambitions?

Why destroy character and courage and initiative?

You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. When that is accomplished, government becomes the wage payer. Ponder this:

What will then be the worker's hours of labor—will your pay check be more or less? How much more will be deducted from the pay envelope? And what about your life-insurance policies?

The growth of business should not be slowed down because of size. When that happens, Government stops prosperity by man-made laws. But the wheel has turned, and taxation is regarded by some as a prime instrument in achieving a socialized change in our form of government.

The ambition to attain by hard work the legitimate rewards of success is one of the most powerful motives which goes to the preservation of family life. If man be realistic, high principled, and earnest in his belief that the preservation of human dignity is a manifestation of God on earth, then government must admit also that it is possible only where all people have freedom. The Government should preserve such freedom.

THREAT TO GOVERNMENT

Government cannot continue to be strong by destroying the people's initiative and independence. The history of every business is literally a pattern of the human ambitions of all living under liberty. We are not a perfect people. Our profit-and-loss and competitive system is not perfect. Unionism is not perfect. The bar association, the church, the Government, the academy of medicine are not perfect. Nothing is, nor ever will be perfect 20,000 years hence. But the profit-and-loss and competitive system is better than any other system on God's green earth.

Show us where on the face of this earth has there been a country or form of government by which socialism, collectivism, or any other ism has given us more comforts, luxuries, and happiness than the American system?

Show us, not by arguments, dreams, blueprints, or imaginary figures, but with facts.

Show us, where is, or was, that other country that gave as much to its people as America has always given to us.

Show us; give us concrete evidence. Prove it by example. Prove that any other system is better than ours—prove that the system, founded on our Constitution and Bill of Rights gives less life, less liberty, less opportunity, and less freedom than any other system.

Show us whether the dictates of a socialized state are more important than constitutional liberty and freedom.

There are many people in this country, in and out of Government today, who are attempting to change the entire concept of liberty in America by socialistic legislation, which is the next step to communism.

There is no better way of life on the face of this earth than that which we have. To most people, America is a foretaste of heaven. We still have a system that works best for the greatest good of the people.

It is time all foreign isms be exposed for exactly what they are, and what they will do to the people, and not for the people. It was the individual know-how—individual planning and financing in free markets, regulated, but not controlled, which made America the leading industrial power. Bureaucracy—political management—by governmental direction, should not invade the fields of competitive enterprise and compete with business, which they are now doing with the taxpayers' money. Governments never have produced, nor can they produce wealth. That is not their function or duty. They should police the laws, but not control the functions of business. The only money Government has, or can get, is through taxing the people, and when it cannot get enough in taxes—directly—it hides them. The hidden taxes are deceptive and immoral. So these foreign isms mean the denial of the rights and capacity of the people to manage themselves and the things they own. Management should explain that to the people. Management is paid its salary by those whose moneys are at work in the business—so-called shareholders. They expect a return—a so-called dividend—for the use of their moneys. The expectation is a reasonable assumption. There is nothing morally or ethically wrong about that. When you destroy the incentive for a return on invested money, you destroy productivity, which is made possible by venture capital risk. It is like taking feed away from the cow, and still expecting milk.

The reverse is, Government takes the money from the people to compete against business activities without the know-how to return some rent—interest—for the taxpayers' money.

In other words, governmental take of the moneys the people earn, by confiscatory taxation, means the complete denial of the rights and capacity of the people to manage themselves and the things they own; and if these conditions continue, it means America will become a fourth-rate nation because productivity by the people, and for the people, will cease to create capital venture risk, which provides employment and increases jobs.

God created man for His purpose, to be free, and to be of service to his fellow man; not to any state.

Socialism is the "system of society in which individual ownership would be abolished and all capital and means of production would become the property of the state." And that is not God's purpose.

The present trends toward Government authority and less individual responsibility are more vicious precisely because they are hidden revolutionary acts, and hence imperceptible to the average citizen. The greater the number who profit from governmental benevolence, the lesser the public vigilance and the greater the public complacency. These are the erosive processes that wear down the rock of liberty, and then suddenly the rock is not there any more. In its place is the quicksand—political "authority," and that soon hardens into concrete bands—"the ball and chain." Always remember, power, once usurped, is never

voluntarily surrendered. Real power rests in the hands of the people, if they will only use it; and so our countries are in a race between education and catastrophe. We cannot expect the people to defend that which they do not understand. The people of our country can do anything if they are only told why, but they must be told; otherwise they will accept some foreign ism. A person's judgment is no better than his information. Business should expose these trends.

By continuous wasteful Government spending—so-called deficit financing—and increasing bureaucracy, the Nation's business is being taxed into weakness. These man-made trends, unless checked and reversed, will make business subject to political dictation.

The strength of our Government is the productivity of the people. When these foreign isms provide man's security by doing for him that which he could, and should, do for himself, it assails his best work, and destroys human ambitions. We would become a Nation subject to governmental dictation. That ends liberty—period.

Wildlife and Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the State of South Dakota has long been known as a splendid area in which to hunt game, notably the Chinese ringnecked pheasant, deer and elk, grouse and ducks. However, the people and their governmental representatives are also conscious of the need for conservation and restoration.

In that connection I wish to include here a statement from the office of the Honorable George T. Mickelson, Governor of South Dakota:

Governor Mickelson today proclaimed the week of March 19-25 as Wildlife Restoration Week in South Dakota. The Governor said the week was being sponsored nationally by the National Wildlife Federation.

Governor Mickelson said the purpose of the observance is to focus attention of South Dakota people on the urgent need for wildlife conservation and its importance upon their daily life.

State, county, and local groups were urged to hold meetings, at which time public discussions might be held with regard to better management of the State's natural resources, including water, soil, trees and all other plants, as well as animal life.

No Longer the Watchdog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial from the Capital Journal of Salem, Oreg., on the recent action of the Armed Services Committee in the Denfeld-Matthews controversy:

NO LONGER THE WATCHDOG

A slap on the wrist is all that Secretary of Defense Johnson and Navy Secretary Matthews got for firing Admiral Denfeld last fall.

The House Armed Services Committee did no more than describe Denfeld's removal as Chief of Naval Operations as a reprisal for his frank and honest criticism. A minority group on the House committee wanted to go further. The minority urged the Attorney General to consider charges against Secretary Matthews. Such charges would be brought under a 1948 law which forbids the influencing or intimidating of congressional witnesses.

As will be recalled, Denfeld testified at the request of the committee on how unification of the armed forces was working. He was told to be frank. His views would be protected by the committee. So Denfeld told his version of how the Navy was being submerged to the detriment of the Nation. Johnson and Matthews retaliated by dumping him, an officer to whom they already had offered a new tour of duty as Chief of Naval Operations.

Johnson was praised in some quarters for preserving civilian control of the military. But that was not the point at issue in this case. It was a matter of the top naval officer being questioned by Congress as to the condition of the branch of the service he commanded. Because bull-headed Johnson didn't like the testimony, he gave Denfeld the boot.

The House Armed Services Committee didn't have the nerve to tell Johnson to stay in his own bailiwick and not overshadow the legislative branch of the Government. From now on out, Johnson will know he can get away with his control of the military—and congressional committee.

The House committee is no longer the watchdog of the country on the armed services. It is Johnson's obedient pet, waiting in fear of what its master, the Defense Secretary, will think of it. The protection it promised Denfeld amounted to no protection at all.

The Little Fellows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANK WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of February 7, 1950:

THE LITTLE FELLOWS

This country's long-suffering patience with strikes is rooted in our natural sympathy for the little fellow in any argument. We would all like to see little Elon College lick Notre Dame, story-book fashion. The striker shines as the little fellow and the company is the massive mastodon.

It seems to this newspaper that it is time we reexamined the question, Who is the little fellow? Who is striking against whom?

We presently have a case in which several hundred thousand coal miners have struck against a handful of coal companies, a clear case, it would seem, of the interests of the many against the interests of the few. The other little fellows involved are forgotten.

There is first of all the little fellow who heats his home with coal. A prolonged strike means real hardship for him, and if the coal miners by their concerted action win their will, it means this little fellow will pay more for every lump of coal. Further, the price of coal affects in one way or another—through higher shipping and manufacturing costs—the price of nearly everything this little fellow buys with his wages. The price of all these things too will go up, and all the little fellows will pay.

We also have presently threatened a strike in the telephone industry. In this case, about 100,000 installers and repairmen plan to walk out. The telephone company is one of the largest companies we have; this would seem a perfect example of the little men battling the Goliath. Perhaps; but whom else are they striking against?

There is again the little fellow who uses the product, and in this instance it includes just about everybody in the country. A really successful telephone strike would create an unimaginable chaos and, if won, the winnings would be paid for by everybody who uses the telephone.

But disregarding that, what of the malefactors of great wealth who own this "octopus," this telephone company? Why should we waste any sympathy on them?

Well, if that is a true picture we must have an awful lot of malefactors. Some 940,000 people jointly own the telephone company, most of whom are little people with little savings. More than one-third of the owners have less than five shares. And, curiously, among the owners are 175,000 employees of the company. Now whom are the employees striking against?

None of this is an argument against higher wages for coal miners or telephone workers. Considering the value received from a telephone and from a ton of coal it could be that the producers of these things are worthy of greater hire, that is, that all of us should pay more for their products. What we are here urging is simply more thought about the nature of these strikes.

The unions that have monopolies over whole industries are the new Goliaths. They can coerce the little fellows in their own membership—what man, however badly he wants to work, dare defy a picket line? They can coerce the rest of us—where will you get coal, or steel, or phone service, if the unions say you shan't? You have become the little fellow.

Developing an honest and fair labor policy is never going to be an easy task, but we shall not even approach it until we realize that in all these strikes there is another little fellow who has been almost forgotten.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Alaska statehood debate in this House last week which revolved partly around the proposition of population, I desire to submit a letter written by Mr. Paul H. Whitney, of Flushing, N. Y., which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune for March 7:

ALASKA STATEHOOD—OTHER TERRITORIES ADMITTED WITH LESS POPULATION

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

The specious reasoning of several of our Congressmen in their attack on the Alaska

statehood bill should be questioned. They cry with alarm that the two Senators from Alaska, representing only 100,000 population, could nullify the votes of Senators from the more densely populated States. Exactly! It was for this express purpose that the founding fathers, after months, even years, of bitter quarreling, finally agreed that there should be equal representation in the upper House of the Congress.

It was a bitter pill that Virginia (population 747,610) swallowed when she at last agreed to stand on a parity in the Senate with Delaware (population 59,096). Pennsylvania was not happy that her 434,373 citizens might be voted down by Rhode Island's 68,825. North Carolina, with a population greater than the State of New York when the Nation was formed, recognized sparsely settled Vermont as her equal in the Senate. That fight was fought and decided more than 160 years ago, but the gentlemen from California, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan appear to have forgotten their history lesson.

No precedent is being established in giving Alaska two Senators as Representative LEROY JOHNSON, of California, should know, for his State had only 92,597 population when admitted to the Union. Representative EDGAR A. JONAS should be reminded that Illinois could count only 12,282 heads when she was admitted. For the benefit of Representative ALBERT J. ENGLE, of Michigan, let it be recorded that his State had the smallest population of any that has ever been taken into the United States—a scant 4,762 according to the official Federal census. Yet that little colony of Wolverines could have nullified the votes of the Senators from Virginia or New York, either of which had a population of close to a million. Representative FRANK B. KEEFE, of Wisconsin, stands on very firm ground in fighting Alaska's plea for statehood because his State had a population of 130,945 when it first sent two Senators to Washington. Of course, he wouldn't remember that at that time New York had a population of 2,500,000.

Not counting any of the first 13 States, there have been 21 States admitted to the Union at a time when they had a population considerably less than Alaska has now.

If Alaska is to be kept out of the Union because she has only 100,000 citizens, then, by the same strange reasoning Nevada, Delaware, Vermont, and Wyoming should be evicted. Any State having fewer citizens than the "big five" should have a Senator taken away from them and any having less population than the 10 next most populous States shouldn't be allowed to have a Senator at all. How much fairer it would be to deprive of all representation in Congress such States as elect to Congress men who reason as do the Messrs. JOHNSON, JONAS, ENGLE, and KEEFE.

PAUL H. WHITNEY.

FLUSHING, N. Y., *March 3, 1950.*

Fertilizing Influence Fast Becoming a Serious Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on October 10, 1949, I drew the attention of the Congress to the fact that eight Members of the United States Senate had protested against the monopolistic practices of the fertilizer industry, and had asked for an investigation; and that the distinguished Representative from Wisconsin, the Honorable FRANK B. KEEFE, and the distinguished Representative from Illinois, the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH, had each offered resolutions requesting the appointment of a special committee to make a full and complete investigation of the fertilizer industry, and to find the facts in connection with the statements recently made by competent judges that present methods of fertilizer manufacture are not only responsible for unnecessarily increasing the amount of the farmer's national fertilizer bill $250,000,000, but are also the cause of the extensive spread of destructive plant diseases, and of the increased incidence of vascular diseases and degenerative diseases.

There are serious matters, Mr. Speaker, but the most serious phase of this matter is the fact that Federal court records show that a large number of fertilizer companies were indicted and fined for having exerted an illegal influence on State lawmakers, and that while this influence was being exerted, the State laws were so amended as to allow the manufacturers to lower the quality of fertilizer by using excessive proportions of the cheap, soluble sources of nitrogen without letting the farmers know that this was being done.

A letter dated February 25, 1950, written by Mr. William G. Holman, a well-known citizen of Virginia, to Mr. Osborne B. Bond, publisher of Liberty magazine, Chicago, Ill., contains some statements far more shocking and serious in their implications than any that have heretofore been brought to the attention of the Congress in connection with this matter. I ask that Mr. Holman's letter be inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for the Congress to inquire into the charges of collusion, and to take such steps as are necessary to free the fertilizer industry from monopolistic control which is proving to be a detriment to the health and welfare of the people, and obviously a detriment to the morals of public officials. To do otherwise would sound the death knell to popular government in this country, and all of us know that popular government throughout the world was never in greater peril than it is today.

The letter referred to follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 25, 1950.*

Mr. OSBORNE B. BOND,
Publisher, Liberty Magazine,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. BOND: I have just read a letter you wrote to a Congressman, in which you asked the question: "Isn't it time that something be done to keep America together?" and then that: "As a Nation we're spending billions to impress other peoples with the importance of free enterprise and what we know as the American way of life, but how about our own people at home?"

Yes, how about our own people at home, and how about the importance of, and necessity for, something that you and I know deep down in our hearts we don't have today—free enterprise?

If we really had free enterprise, would it be possible for "one-eighth of 1 percent of all the corporations in America to acquire 51 percent of the Nation's assets," and would it have been possible for 3 percent of the farmers in America to own 41 percent of the farm land?

If we really believed in free enterprise would we shrug away and do nothing about the criminal exploitation of the farmers by the Fertilizer Trust, and fertilizer practices that endanger the health of the people?

Would we condone the leasing of public lands to a few corporations on which are found the principal potash deposits in this country which enabled these corporations to obtain a monopolistic control of such an essential fertilizer ingredient as potash and to use this control to the harm and injury of the farmers?

Would we meekly submit to the encouragement given to a few fertilizer manufacturers though an Act of Congress (Webb-Pomerene Act) to acquire a monopolistic control of such essential fertilizer ingredients as phosphate rock and acid phosphate, and to the use of this control to force the smaller manufacturers to lower the quality of fertilizers, and thus impose upon the farmers and endanger the health of the people?

If we knew that collusion existed between the fertilizer industry and the Bureau of Plant Industry, and that gifts of money to this agency of the Federal Government by the fertilizer industry had blinded the eyes of these Government officials to fertilizer practices that were harmful to the health and welfare of the people, and we shrugged away the shocking implications of such a situation, wouldn't that amount to an admission that monopoly was in the saddle and free enterprise was a thing of the past? If you want the facts, open the columns of your publication to your humble servant and I will present the unvarnished facts.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM G. HOLMAN.

Promotion of Veterans of World War II in Field Service of Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I arise at this time to reaffirm my support of H. R. 87. I was one of the original supporters of this necessary remedial legislation. My testimony is included in the hearings and this statement is reprinted in the August issue of the Union Postal Clerk.

It is regrettable that a number of amendments are to be offered which will have the effect of killing the bill. This bill as modified by the substitute should be approved and I intend to support it.

I would like to review the situation in a particular community, namely, Grand Rapids, Mich., my home town. As this committee knows, all civil-service examinations for the post office were frozen during World War II. In the period between 1941 and 1946 the Department used many temporary employees but none in this group achieved permanent status because no qualifying examinations were given.

The first examinations for post office employees were held in September 1948.

The veterans of World War II who initially entered the postal service after the late war took this examination at the first opportunity, along with those who had been temporary employees during the war. I think we can validly assume that many veterans would have become post office employees during the period between 1941 and 1945 if military service had not intervened. A number of veterans passed this examination along with a few temporary employees. Those temporaries who passed examinations and became classified employees upon appointment as regulars received an automatic increase of $400 per year. This gave them a period of only 6 years in which to reach top-grade salary. Veterans of World War II have to work 10 years to reach top-salary grade.

In my estimation, under the present law an unfair discrimination presently exists as far as World War II veterans are concerned because the former temporary employees get the benefit of a $400 increase in salary while the veteran when he becomes a regular employee does not derive the same financial benefits even though his forced absence from the postal service was no fault of his. I have no desire to penalize the temporary employee who worked diligently during the war for the Post Office Department, but I certainly think we should give the veteran credit for his war service once he enters the postal service as a permanent career employee.

A failure to remedy this situation will be harmful to employee morale. This is best illustrated by a specific example. Rather than use names, I will refer to employee A, a veteran who took and passed a civil-service examination given in September 1946. A was appointed January 1, 1947, as a regular because of his high rating on the examination. Employee B, a nonveteran, took the same examination but he had been hired on May 1, 1945. B did not get his regular appointment after the September 1946 examination until April 1, 1948.

What is the situation today? B is now making $3,350 per year while A earns only $2,750 annually. There is this differential even though A has 15 months additional seniority as a regular or permanent employee. Furthermore A has been graded "outstanding" while B has only a "satisfactory" rating. Both these men do the same job, they work side by side. Employee B, the nonveteran, now earns approximately $11.54 more each week than his veteran coworker, despite A's better qualifications, both on the examination and on the periodic grading system. This is only one of many such cases but it well illustrates the inequities which must be rectified.

For the committee's examination I include a table showing the precise situation in the Grand Rapids post office. It will be seen that the veterans of World War II, who make up a substantial portion of the postal employees, are being penalized and the morale of the entire service will unquestionably suffer if this legislation is not approved.

In closing, let me emphasize the need for this legislation. Veterans of World War I have received credit for time spent in military service, even those who were not employed in the postal service prior to their entry into the armed forces. Veterans of World War II who worked for the Post Office Department previous to entry into the armed service in the last war have received credit for their military service under present pay schedules.

I therefore strongly recommend favorable consideration of H. R. 87 by this committee in order that richly deserved benefits will accrue to those veterans who direly need financial assistance at this time and in the years to come.

Classification	Regulars	Classified substitutes	Total of both	Number who are veterans of World War II	Number of World War II veterans who are eligible for Vursell Act benefits
Supervisors	37	0	37	0	0
Clerks	182	31	213	107	73
Carriers	205	52	257	118	81
Mail handlers	12	2	14	7	7
Motor-vehicle service	30	0	30	0	0
Special delivery	9	2	11	3	2
Custodial	20	[1] 1	21	3	2
Rural carriers	5	[2] 0	5	2	1
Total	499	76	575	248	169

[1] Charwoman.
[2] Substitutes for rural carriers are not carried either as regular or classified employees.

Summary

Total employees—Regular and classified substitutes	575
Total World War II veterans	248
Total World War II veterans who would be eligible for Vursell Act benefits	169

British Import Discriminations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill designed to help prevent discrimination against American-owned and controlled companies in foreign commerce. Particularly, it is designed to bring Presidential powers under the customs laws of the United States up to date and to provide against new types of discrimination which are threatening to grow up in postwar practices in world trade.

The British Government has recently placed severe limitations on the amount of petroleum products that can be shipped into the United Kingdom by American-controlled companies.

This loss of more than 150,000 barrels of our foreign market a day is complicating and making more severe the problem domestic oil producers are having with importations of off-shore oil. The flood of imported oil is increasing to such proportions that it is endangering the stability of our domestic market. The British ban against oil from American-controlled companies, applying both to foreign and domestic production, is certain to make more difficult this problem of imports.

These severe limitations are not applied to conserve the Empire's dollar reserves, nor to protect local oil production in the Dominions. They apply against all oil coming from what the British have defined as "American-controlled companies." This definition provides that such companies which are substantially owned, directly or indirectly, by American citizens, regardless of the laws under which such companies might be incorporated are under the ban.

Thus, any such company, even if incorporated under the British flag and complying with all British laws—and even if offering their oil on exactly the same terms and for exactly the same currency as British, they are off-limits and are subjected to these severe limitations for importation into the United Kingdom.

As a result, a British-controlled company, incorporated under the British flag, may ship oil from its Middle East wells and refineries into Britain and sell it for sterling, without restriction. An American-controlled company, incorporated under American, British, or third country flag, offering oil produced or refined in the identical Middle East area, and willing to accept the identical sterling in payment, is subject to the ban.

American investments are thus clearly discriminated against by this British action in an unreasonable manner. Our State Department regards this British action as discriminatory and has so advised the British Government. Our State Department is on record that the proposed discriminatory action is not reasonably necessary to solve any current British currency shortage and that corrective measures should be taken.

Present discussions, looking toward a modification of the British action are now under way between our Government and the British Government, and directly between the oil companies concerned and the British Treasury. While everyone hopes that these discussions will result in a withdrawal of this discrimination it is likely under present circumstances that they will fail.

One important reason why the current negotiations may fail is that our Government lacks the power under present law to take effective action if the British refuse to modify their position of discrimination against American-controlled companies.

Under present law, the President may, if he finds a foreign country is discriminating against American commerce, act in three ways:

First. He may impose additional United States customs duties on the products of such country; or

Second. Withdraw tariff concessions previously granted to such country under a reciprocal-trade agreement; or

Third. Where the President finds a foreign country has placed any burden upon the commerce of the United States by discriminatory regulations, conditions, restrictions, or prohibitions the President can offset this burden by imposing additional rates of duty, not to exceed 50 percent ad valorem on any products of the foreign country.

The British Government knows that these present methods of combating discrimination do not fit the newer designs of trade barriers.

Most of us are familiar with the now famous Nairobi letter of December 17, 1949, in which the British Government's Secretary of State for Colonial Affairs advised his subordinates of the new discriminations imposed by the British Government on American controlled companies, and stated that the Americans have, as expected, not gone beyond expressing regret at the action taken.

The only effective way of meeting discrimination against American investments is by treatment in kind. Our customs laws have embodied this principle for many years. The methods outlined above were designed to correct examples that had previously occurred but do not cover today's commodity wide discriminations against American-controlled companies.

They do not clearly authorize the President to retaliate in kind against the new types of discrimination that have been devised in recent years, such as the recent British ban on oil imports from American-controlled companies.

The bill I introduced today adds a new subsection to the tariff code. It authorizes the President to retaliate in kind against any foreign discriminatory action effecting American commerce. If the President should find, for example, that the British Government has placed improper restrictions upon imports by American-controlled companies into the United Kingdom, to retaliate by placing equivalent restrictions upon imports by British-controlled companies into the United States.

It is my earnest hope that the power granted by my proposed amendment would never have to be used. I am in full accord with the administration's policy of tearing down trade barriers and removing as many restrictions as possible to encourage multilateral world trade.

Unfortunately, unrestricted world trade is going to be difficult to achieve so long as foreign nations are free to discriminate against American commerce without fear of any retaliation of any kind. My bill would serve merely as a notice to the world that any foreign nation which hits American commerce below the belt can expect to be hit back. In my opinion, the mere existence of such a law on our statute books will discourage discriminatory measures abroad and make its use unnecessary.

CO's Gesture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 7, 1950:

CO's GESTURE

Although the United States has prided itself that it respected liberty of conscience even during wartime, the House has cheapened the value of the work done by conscientious objectors. The relatively small number of men conscripted for "work of national importance" as an alternative to military service received no Government compensation or family allowances, and when they were hired out to private employers most of their wages was paid into a frozen fund held by the Treasury. Now the House has turned down the Judd bill which embodies a request of the CO's themselves that the money be given to CARE to provide scientific and professional publications for depleted libraries abroad.

The hunger for additional technical reading matter is most apparent in countries such as Germany, where the war interrupted normal contacts with the outside, and in the new independent states, such as India. The furnishing of such material under the auspices of CARE would have complemented existing programs and would have been one of the best ways of promoting friendship and understanding. Perhaps the poorest of all excuses for the House action is the one that seemingly received most attention—that the Treasury cannot afford the expenditure. The $1,300,000 involved is not Government money; it is money legally earned by the CO's themselves, who have renounced all claims to it. There could be no better use for it. One may suspect that the real explanation for the defeat was a hidden effort further to punish the conscientious objectors and to kill their gesture.

Speak Up for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio speech I made to the constituents of my district:

Friends of the radio audience, this is your Congressman, WILLIAM S. HILL, speaking to you from Washington, D. C. Today I wish to speak on world peace.

If we are to continue at peace with the world, the people of the United States must speak up. Either we redouble our efforts for maintaining the peace we won at such a horrible price in lives, blood and treasure, or we continue a headlong plunge into world war III.

Dangers of the peace are increasing. The tip of the scale one way or the other, might touch off another war—a war more terrible and destructive than the last. It could be the war to end all wars. It could wipe out our civilization. The very thought is horrifying. Our finite minds are incapable of visualizing the consequences of an A-bomb or an H-bomb dropped on this country.

But the purpose of this warning isn't to scare you out of your wits. It is to awaken you to the idea that now is the time to speak up. Those of us who want peace must be heard. Our voices must ring out with an appealing force to halt the mad dash for superbombs and superduper death-dealing weapons of mass destruction.

Part of the guilt for the armament race is on our consciences. President Truman authorized the dropping of the atomic bomb on Japan. The late President Roosevelt initiated the scientific experiments and provided the finances for construction of the A-bomb during World War II. Now the President has given the green light for the building of the hydrogen bomb. We are out in front in the rearmament race, but it isn't, to my way of thinking, a thing to be proud of. We should be in the forefront of those in the world who want to maintain peace. Our leadership should be for moral and spiritual rearmament rather than military force.

In the world court of opinion, we have left our sincerity and high purposes open to question? The hopes and aspirations of the people, who overwhelmingly desire peace, must be brought out into the light for the world to see. Our diplomatic maneuvers and our military activities have cast a false reflection on the basic motives of this Nation. We are a peace-loving Nation; the majority of our people are most anxious and eager to spread to the four corners of the earth their expression of good will. But somehow this opinion becomes distorted and twisted by the actions of our political and military leaders.

It is time for a constructive call of the great political powers of the world to settle the problems of the cold war. Our leaders have attempted to assuage our conscience by rationalizing the use of the A-bomb and the H-bomb. Perhaps, they are entirely right in their assumptions. But, we should, with equal vigor and honesty to ourselves encourage a policy of world disarmament. All of our efforts politically, economically and otherwise have the single objective of stopping the Red tide of atheistic communism from engulfing the world. Russia is our enemy, now; in the war she was our ally. What caused Russia to change her attitude toward us? Admiral Leahy, who was President Roosevelt's adviser at the Big Five conferences, until the late President's death, attributed the difficulty last week in an article, as arising out of differences between Stalin and Roosevelt. But it was 5 years later before the people were advised of these conditions through Admiral Leahy's magazine disclosure. Why weren't we informed long ago?

Former Prime Minister Churchill of Great Britain has thrown another light on American entry into World War II as a result of Pearl Harbor, in his current writings in Life magazine and the New York Times. He established the fact that for a year and a half before Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, he had pressed President Roosevelt to come into the war on Great Britain's side. At the Atlantic conference in August 1941, he said he informed Roosevelt's party and I quote—"that I would rather have an American declaration of war now and no supplies for 6 months than double the supplies and no declaration."

Churchill said that he related this incident to General Smuts, Prime Minister of South Africa, stating—and I quote again—"We must not underrate his (Roosevelt's) constitutional difficulties. He may take action as Chief Executive, but only Congress can declare war. He went so far as to say to me—this is Roosevelt speaking—'I may never declare war; I may make war. If I were to ask Congress to declare war they might argue about it for 3 months.'"

It will be remembered that the attack on the fleet at Hawaii was presented to the American people, who knew nothing at the time of our American economic sanctions, our unyielding diplomacy with Japan, and our other secret maneuvering, came as a shocking surprise—an act of treachery on—and I quote President Roosevelt—"a date which will live in infamy."

Churchill had this to say with reference to Pearl Harbor. And I quote him again: "I do not intend in these pages to attempt to pronounce judgment upon this tremendous episode in American history. We know that all of the great Americans round the President and in his confidence felt, as acutely as I did, the awful danger that Japan would attack British or Dutch possessions in the Far East and would carefully avoid the United States, and that in consequence Congress would not sanction an American declaration of war.

Quoting Churchill further, he said: "Roosevelt, Hull, Stimson, Knox, General Marshall, Admiral Stark, and, as a link between them all, Harry Hopkins had but one mind. A Japanese attack upon the United States was a vast simplification of their problems and their duty. How can we wonder that they regarded the actual form of the attack, or even its scale, as incomparably less important than the fact that the whole American Nation would be united for its own safety. Moreover, they knew, earlier than we in Britain could know, the full and immediate purpose of their enemy."

The armed power of the world is again divided into two camps. Is there a war party in this Nation, as there is in the Kremlin? Communist dictatorship is not only designed for a surprise attack with all the arms it has, but the Kremlin can violate any agreement it signs to gain advantage and abrogate at will the agreements it makes.

But our free people have greater productive and moral powers. We can unite our strength, unless it is undermined and weakened by secret action of our political leaders.

We must make our stand for peace through the United Nations. We must declare our intentions and desires. We have no assurance from available public reports that Russia would cooperate in an effort at disarmament in the strengthening of the objectives of peace, but that should not stand in our way. We should look into every avenue for a way to lasting peace. If our sincerity is clear, our reasons and examples steadfast, then before the eyes of the world we have made our claim.

WE CAN DO NO LESS

Are we going to let someone push us into world war III? Is fear of the A-bomb or H-bomb going to deter us from striving for what we know is right, and what the peoples of the world all believe in—peace? Regardless of the actions of their leaders—and this includes Russia, too—I believe that all peoples of the world want peace. But they must speak up; they must be heard before powerful influences get us so involved in political and economic circumstances that resulting action winds up in war.

At present the United Nations is the only world organization in operation. Through it let us urge the representatives of the United States to work for peace. The adoption of certain measures would augment the efforts of the people in presenting our case to the peoples of the world. In the past Russia has overshadowed the rest of the nations participating in the UN and have effectively used it as a propaganda agency. If necessary, let the United States assume the Christian responsibility for guiding the UN into discussions of big-power politics in outlawing the A- and H-bombs; renewing the forces of religious and spiritual leadership toward a new birth of moral indignation into the depravity of a supermarment program. Men must learn to live together. War is not the economic savior of broken and decadent political philosophies. This fact must be impressed on those who seek to fasten its chains upon the people.

Unless there is a quick turn in the course of events, the intensity of the cold war will surely increase. It is time for us to unite and demand that every effort be exhausted to maintain the peace. The hour is late.

The expenditure of huge sums for defense weapons or for the purpose of winning friends abroad is not the answer. The answer will come from the deep-rooted desire of all peoples to live together in friendship. Exploitation by political leaders for momentary advantage will not assure a period of international tranquillity. But the earnestness and sincerity of the good peoples of the earth can bring about what selfishness, greed, and political chicanery cannot achieve. Until we have placed this country in the position of exhausting every possibility of peace so that our sincerity and honesty stand crystal clear before the rest of the world, let us not resign ourselves to the cynical attitude that the only solution to our problem is to arm ourselves to the teeth and develop an arms race which in the end can only mean the ultimate destruction of our civilization.

Repealing the Taxes on Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the approval of this conference report will write the final chapter in the long controversy between the small dairy farmers of America and the oleomargarine monopoly. A clever and highly financed oleomargarine lobby has done a good job of propagandizing the country. Some 28 oleomargarine manufacturers are now completely in the saddle and the liquidation of many small dairy herds will begin. The dairy farmers will most certainly lose their market if oleomargarine takes over the major portion of the demand for a spread. Some say that cannot happen here, but the fact remains that during the past several years per capita butter consumption has gone down and oleomargarine consumption has gradually been on the increase. The natural result will be that many of the 2½ million dairy farmers will eventually be forced out of business. Now for the first time the oleomargarine interests will be permitted to appropriate unto themselves the historical butter color of golden yellow. This can only mean the perpetration of great frauds upon the consumers of this country, in spite of the so-called protective provisions in the bill. The conference report should be rejected.

Who Won?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Indianapolis Times of March 5, 1950:

WHO WON?

The coal strike that wasn't a strike is over.

The miners who wouldn't go back to work when John Lewis told them to, went back to work when John Lewis told them to.

The bitter battle that disrupted the whole industry for 8 months has ended—for a year.

Who won?

Not the coal miners.

Their pay goes up 70 cents a day. At that rate it will take 1,714 working days for a miner to get back what he lost in wages in the strike. In just a few days less than 7 years the man who never misses a day's work in the mines may break even on this pay raise. The contract is actually for 1 year, but might be stretched to 2 years.

Who won?

Not the folks on mine pensions and welfare.

The welfare royalty goes up 10 cents a ton, to a total of 30 cents. At the old rate it took three whole years to collect enough money to pay pensions and welfare for 14 months. At the new rate all the royalties collected over the next 3 years might possibly be enough to pay pensions and welfare for 18 months. And the spending of the fund is placed again in the same hands that recklessly squandered it before.

Who won?

Not the mine owners.

Their losses in the past 8 months of hit-or-miss operation already have been staggering. But they have barely begun. Millions of homes, thousands of industries have quit using coal because of this very battle. Every oil furnace that's gone into a home means at least 1 day's work a year a coal miner won't have. A good many thousands of coal miners have struck themselves permanently out of a job. There won't, in their lifetimes, again be work in the coal mines for all the men who were working there when this strike began. A big chunk of the market for coal is gone forever.

Who won?

Not the people who use coal.

They'll pay every dime of the increased wages and the increased pension royalties, added right on the price of every ton of coal they buy.

Who won?

Not the workers in other industries.

The thousands laid off from their jobs because there was no coal haven't even a pay increase to get them back part of the wages they lost in a dispute they weren't in. They do, though, have a higher cost in the factories where they work, which will make it harder for them to get pay increases themselves, in future.

Who won?

Not the general public, which suffered in the cold.

Not the school children, whose education was halted.

Not the Government of the United States, which was too weak to act when the crisis threatened national security.

Not, surely, the six women and children who died in Indianapolis trying to keep warm with makeshift fuel as a direct result of this mine strike.

Who won?

Not even John L. Lewis.

Clearly he lost what he called the strike to get—monopoly control of the whole coal supply of the whole Nation. He didn't get it. He had to give up the willing-and-able-to-work gimmick he's been using to regulate coal output and sign a contract that is a genuine contract, as the old one was not. The gains he got were no more than unconvincing face-saving, that substantially could have been had for the asking before the strike even began.

Then who did win the coal strike?

Nobody won it.

Everybody lost: the miners, the mine owners, the school children, the union boss, the employers, and the workers in other industries, all the people of the United States.

There must be a better way to settle such things.

In fact there is a better way.

This Nation long ago learned what to do when business monopoly threatened to get bigger than the Government of the United States.

Now, maybe, we've learned that there is no real difference between a business monopoly and a labor monopoly.

John Crown's Legacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Howard A. Rusk, M. D., which appeared in the New York Times on March 5, 1950, entitled "John Crown's Legacy":

JOHN CROWN'S LEGACY—VETERAN LEAVES AN EXAMPLE OF COURAGE AND A PLEA THAT LOVE SUPPLANT GREED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

(In 1946 a letter was published in this column from a young veteran in Halloran Hospital, a letter created by suffering, anguish, and bewilderment. Last week, after 4 years of struggle, the writer, John Crown, died. His legacy to the world was an example of courage and a philosophy of life which, in these troubled and uncertain days, plead even more eloquently for the necessity of understanding than the day on which his letter was written. In this era of precocious technology, hydrogen bombs, guided missiles and all the additions to the horrors of war that have caused an epidemic of anxiety and tension throughout the world, this pain-wracked boy's prescription for peace among men merits thoughtful rereading.)

My name is John Crown. I am a paraplegic at Halloran General Hospital. My physical wounds are very small in comparison with my spiritual wounds. I have come back from death to a world that I do no longer care for. I, who have been engaged in the great struggle to save the world from tyranny and having seen my comrades die for this cause, can now find no peace in the world or in my country.

Having lived close to death for 2 years, the reasons why there is no peace seem infinitesimally flimsy. Russia wants the Dardanelles, Yugoslavia wants Trieste, the Moslems want India, labor wants more wages, capital wants more profit, Smith wants to pass the car in front of him, Junior wants more spending money. To these, I say, is it necessary to kill and cripple human beings for these petty gains?

Anyone who thinks a human body is so cheap that it can be traded for a tract of land, a piece of silver, or a few minutes of time should be forced to listen to the moans of the dying night and day for the rest of his life.

All the troubles of the world originate in the common man. The selfish and greedy ways of nations are just the ways of each individual man multiplied a hundredfold. When the morals of the common man drop, so do the morals of the nation and of the world.

As long as our individual morals remain at a low ebb, so will be the world. Until each of us stops hogging the road with his car, stops fighting over the seat on the bus, stops arguing over who is going to cut the grass, there will be no peace in the world. If man wishes peace again, he must return to the great commandment, "Love thy neighbor as thyself for the love of God."

Suppression of Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., March 6, 1950:

FIGHT AGAINST CRIME

Proposals for some kind of Federal action against crime organizations are rapidly gaining adherents, both in Washington and in many cities and State capitals. A study of laws by a committee of municipal, State, and Federal officials is to be one result of a conference on crime held recently by the Federal attorney general, and the Senate Judiciary Committee has on foot an inquiry into gambling which could well produce recommendations for new Federal criminal laws.

There are many possibilities for real help by Federal authorities in the suppression of crime. At the same time there also are inherent political dangers against which careful safeguards must always be maintained. The larger a Federal police force becomes, the greater are the potential misuses of it by the unscrupulous. Every new Federal police control over citizens is a potential check on the individual's independence of action. A fine balance is needed between the safeguarding of individual rights and sufficient police power to control the underworld. The experience of some cities with crime syndicates indicates that we do not have the correct balance at the present time.

Another point which must be kept constantly in mind is that neither local responsibility nor local authority should be abdicated to Federal crime busters. It is the responsibility of local government to enforce municipal and State laws, and in the great majority of cases if this is done well and energetically even crime syndicates with powerful intercity and interstate connections will find themselves unable to operate. Local government should never welcome the intervention of higher government in dealing with local problems until after the utmost effort has been made to employ local authority against them.

Secretary Brannan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that Brannan and company are out to ruin the economy of our country in general and the economy of our farmers in particular. The following article is from the Sunday Times-Herald:

SECRETARY BRANNAN AND THE POST PLOT "SMEAR"

(By Philip Warden)

Agriculture Secretary Brannan has joined in a plot with Eugene Meyer's Washington Post, cole administration newspaper here, to smear successful Corn Belt farmers and making them the "whipping boy" for blocking congressional acceptance of the Brannan plan.

The conspiracy was exposed yesterday when copies of a letter sent by the Agriculture Department to its Extension Service agents accidentally fell into hands of newspaper reporters covering the Department.

BETA BOUGHT FROM AGENTS

The letter ordered the extension agents to send the Department at once the names and activities of the biggest farmers in their community for a Post series by reporter John Ball "to show how some farming is really big business." Ball has been Brannan's principal medium for circularizing Brannan-plan propaganda to Members of Congress regularly of late.

Big farms are ineligible for "benefits" promised in the Brannan farm price support plan. Brannan has emphasized that his plan is aimed at encouraging the break-up of big farming enterprises into family-size farms.

The material Brannan has directed the extension agents to send the Department for Ball on the biggest farmers could provide just the material he needs to make Congress believe the Brannan plan is opposed only by big business although the large farm groups have publicly expressed their opposition, congressional sources reported.

BALL LETTER WINS OFF

Brannan made an unusual exception to Department policy by using the Department's free mailing privileges to send a copy of a letter written by Ball to all the State extension agents. The wide circulation of the letter is best illustrated by Brannan's estimate this week that the extension agents contacted 6,500,000 farm families in 1949.

The Ball letter was enclosed in a packet which accompanied the weekly letter from Lester A. Schlup, chief of extension information at the Department, to State extension editors. Of the Ball letter, Schlup wrote the editors:

"John says he wants to show that farming is really big business. He is particularly interested in what the biggest farmers do that makes them successful, how well they follow the recommendations of the Department and State experiment stations, and so on."

GOVERNMENT STATIONERY USED

"John has syndicated a number of stories lately about the farm program. He hopes the stories he writes, based on tips from you, will have much wider circulation than in the Washington Post, although the Post reaches a large, important audience here."

The Ball letter, addressed to Schlup but mimeographed by the Department on Government stationery, said he wanted to get a list of the Nation's biggest farmers—either individual or corporative.

"For instance, I had in mind," Ball wrote, "the biggest corn planters in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Nebraska, and other States in the Corn Belt. Also the biggest wheat raisers in the biggest wheat States, Kansas, Nebraska, etc."

BALL OUTLINES PLAN

"I think I'd like to cover them in this order: 1. Those farming the biggest areas in each of the important States, in aggregate crops; 2. The biggest growers of cotton, corn, wheat, peanuts, soybeans, potatoes (I have

the figures for Maine), citrus fruit, sheep, cattle, and hogs. Also, in certain States such as California, the largest honey growers.

"I know this is a large order. I have in mind a series on the biggest in their lines to show how some farming is really big business. Maybe I'm asking too much."

The letter was signed "John Ball."

At the end of Schlup's letter under the words "actions requested" (printed in heavy black type) was a reminder that John Ball of the Washington Post wants tips for stories on large-scale successful farming.

Brooklyn's Woman of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am very proud to call attention to an article which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle on February 19, 1950, by Jeanne Toomey, honoring Brooklyn's "Woman of the Week," Elizabeth Goodman, general chairman of Brooklyn Week for the Blind, 523 Atlantic Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

BROOKLYN'S WOMAN OF THE WEEK; BLIND HAVE A REAL FRIEND AND SHE PROVES IT DAILY

(By Jeanne Toomey)

Boss of a man's business that most men would find quite technical, Elizabeth Goodman, general chairman of Brooklyn Week for the Blind, has made the plight of the sightless her own because, as she says, "I enjoy beautiful sights and love to read."

"Blindness has always struck me as a great handicap because I appreciate how much of our comfort and safety depends on good sight," Miss Goodman said the other day in her office at 523 Atlantic Avenue, where she spends 6 days a week from 9 to 5 as owner of the Safety Gas Main Stopper Co.

Since her brother, Francis, died in September 1938, she has headed the privately owned business started by her late father, Patrick, who invented the gadget manufactured by the concern.

The only survivor of seven children, Miss Goodman, who lives at 652 East Eighteenth Street, learned the details of the business early. As a child of 10 she typed her father's special letters, and has even invented new devices in connection with the product she describes as a "safety tool used to shut off gas in mains during repairs and alterations."

A blue-eyed, white-haired woman who holds her master's degree in philosophy from Columbia University, she started out with the intention of becoming a high-school teacher. She abandoned that purpose gradually and regrets it only when those long school vacations roll around.

IRELAND PREFERRED

However, she has managed to make four trips to Europe. Although she took over the Alps in an open car, visited Venice, Rome, Monte Cassino, Scotland, England, and France, she remembers Ireland, home of her parents, as the country she most enjoyed visiting.

Each trip included a long stop-over on the Emerald Isle and she is now beginning to plan another trip there.

"It rests the spirit," she said. "It has a special atmosphere."

As an example of the friendliness of the Irish people, she recalls a stop made at a crossroads general store in Bally St. David, to ask for information about the road before her party attempted to drive over the mountain with a fog coming down.

"The owner of the store asked us in for tea because his wife had scones ready," she recalled. "He turned out to be a classical scholar who read Greek and Latin."

She particularly recommends a visit to the Blackwater in County Waterford in the south of Ireland where the dusk lasts until 10:30 at night.

A patriotic American, Miss Goodman is quick to point out that she toured her own country many times before visiting the land of her ancestors. The family came to Brooklyn from upper Manhattan and joined the parish of Our Lady of Refuge Roman Catholic Church, Ocean and Foster Avenues.

WORKED WITH MOTHER

Miss Goodman's mother, who died last August at 89, brought flowers from her garden to make into boutonnieres for the men during the first observance of the week for the blind. Mother and daughter were charter members of the board of directors of Anthonian Hall, a nonsectarian home for blind women under Catholic auspices, located at 107 Greene Avenue.

This enterprise is termed "my most beloved project" by Miss Goodman, whose workmen know the folks at the home by name since they frequently paint and do other work there. One of the workmen, Beni Lione, has been making Goodman stoppers for 42 years.

Ask Lione about the firm and he'll tell you: "I couldn't stay so long if I wasn't happy here. This is my whole life. I was 19 when I joined the firm, then located in the Bronx, and I'm 63 now."

Canvas, leather, felt, army duck, rubber, and steel are a few of the materials used in making the gas-main stoppers, which range in diameter from 3 to 48 inches.

In Miss Goodman's very feminine office are two framed certificates honoring her father for inventing the stopper. In 1904, at the Universal Exposition at St. Louis, he received a silver medal, while in 1915, at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition at San Francisco, he was awarded a gold medal.

THEY UNLADYLIKE

Although Miss Goodman says of her work that it is a very unladylike business, she proudly points out that it is a good, constructive, and necessary little enterprise, the oldest in its field.

Present goal of the drive for the blind, which has already opened although the special week will be in May, is $100,000. The Brooklyn Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor and the Brooklyn Bureau of Social Services are sponsoring the benefit campaign.

At their offices, at 401 State Street and 285 Schermerhorn Street, respectively, pillow cases, towels, aprons, ironing-board covers, woven floor mats, and all kinds of mops, as well as stuffed toys, and leather, and woven belts are now on sale. These articles are made by the blind and their sale insures the independence sightless persons desire.

Jewish temples and sisterhoods, Protestant churches, and Catholic parishes are all joining to make the drive a success. A total of 75,000 volunteer workers are giving their time to the project.

During the official Week for the Blind, May 9, will be Catholic Day; May 10, Protestant Day; and May 11, Jewish Day. All proceeds will be donated to the two sponsoring agencies that train and employ the blind.

Of the efforts of these agencies to make people who cannot see self-supporting, the general chairman of the drive says:

"The ability to work is very important and we feel that getting jobs for blind persons comes first so that they can earn their own money and feel that they are holding their own place in society.

"They want to feel they're contributing something for what they get."

The Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, March 7, 1950:

STEADY IS THE WORD

We have never seen a time—not even after Pearl Harbor—when American thinking was more in need of calm steadfastness. Multitudes have been jumping not merely to atomic conclusions but into an abyss of H-bomb extinction. A most potent antidote for this fever is the article by George F. Kennan in the current Reader's Digest, reprinted in this newspaper March 2.

Mr. Kennan, who has been head of the State Department's policy planning, believes any early war with Russia is unlikely. He offers reasons that deserve attention. One is the Communists' confidence in their own doctrine, which leads them to expect capitalist countries to crumble without military attack. The Soviet is having more trouble than is commonly realized in chewing up what it has bitten off since the war. Another reason is the fear that retaliation would wreak damage which could not be hidden and might upset the Kremlin regime.

Moscow might by miscalculation or in desperation resort to war, Mr. Kennan says, but so far it sees pressures and propaganda as cheaper and safer. At the same time he offers no hope of early settlement with Russia, and declares an agreement would have only the value of the power required to support it. He is convinced that the situation will improve if the United States maintains its own strength, proves its own free system, and wisely supports other peoples who show themselves ready to fight for freedom.

Americans will do these things more effectively if they can keep free alike from atomic apathy and hydrogen hysteria. Those seeking assurance that war will not break out tomorrow need not depend wholly on Mr. Kennan's reasoning. Military experts believe several weeks of preparation would be required—preparation which could not be hid from American intelligence agents. Beyond all such material factors, many persons will find assurance in the power of prayer. And in this situation multitudes are ready to trust it.

Evolution in Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Evolution in Aviation," prepared for me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVOLUTION IN AVIATION

Our Government has recognized the need for a national system of airports for economic and security reasons. However, it appears that our civil aviation industry is now in a very unfavorable position to render the services upon which it may be called, in case of a national emergency, due to economic conditions forced upon it after the last war and to other conditions, which, if further aggravated, will close many of the Nation's smaller airports and bases of operations and thereby place our civil aviation industry in a chaotic struggle for survival.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration has recently named a 12-man committee to study and make recommendations regarding this and many other problems facing the Government relative to the establishment of a national system of airports contemplated by the Federal Airport Act of 1946. Their report represents the consensus of opinion of the cross section of aviation leaders in both industry and Government. Every segment of the aviation industry has responded with its carefully considered opinion and the result will be found consistent in principle with the many previous studies and treatments of the subject upon which very little or no action has been taken. It is the expressed opinion of both industry and Government that now it is time for more action and less words, and it is with this sincere hope that the following recommendations are submitted for your consideration and prompt action.

The airports of the Nation are divided in classes 1 through 6 and larger. For the sake of this report, we will not consider class 4 nor larger airports, inasmuch as they are usually located in metropolitan areas which have established good general aviation policies and programs which suit the particular need and their airport is financially sound and reflecting a satisfactory operating balance sheet, with very few exceptions which can be corrected. The No. 1 problem of this system of airports is the accelerated rate of airport closures in the more average-size communities throughout the Nation, and it would seem timely to direct our efforts toward the solution of this basic problem.

The specific causes of this serious problem are many and varied. A few of the airport closures are the result of overdevelopment, poor design, and bad location; however, these will be found to be the exception rather than the rule. The main underlying cause for abandonment of airports lies in the inability of the industry to have made a satisfied aviation customer of the general public and should be broken down into the psychological and functional factors involved. It is conceded that the aviation industry is a service industry and that good, safe, economical service must be made available before it can have public confidence and acceptance. Considering that aviation is now 46 years old and that it has been accepted partially by only 5 percent of the public is sufficient reason to warrant investigation and corrective action, and, though the Government has assumed the responsibility for development of aviation, the aviation industry must cooperate more fully and place its unified and complete support with its Government if the problems are to be corrected in the near future.

The psychological factors revolve around three distinct groups of people:

1. The people comprising the aviation industry proper whose principal interest, like that of any other free enterprise in this country, is evolved around the possibilities of rendering service for financial gain.

2. The local State and Federal Government agencies who have found the need for providing the general public with airport facilities in order that it may participate in the advantages of air commerce.

3. The general public in whom must be created a desire to use aviation, having been shown its convenience, economy, and other advantages.

Intraindustry relations have been consistently weak, inasmuch as the services of aviation are made available to the general public through the medium of an airport or fixed base operator who has his operation usually located upon an airport provided for by a governmental agency and inasmuch as the airport operator is generally conceded to be the liaison man between the aviation industry and the general public, his state of mind and psychology of aviation should be the keystone of this situation. Except in a very few isolated cases the airport operator has labored under the delusion that everyone was against him—that the airport manager was against the operator, the Government was against him as well as the general public when they would not buy his products or services. This state of mind and versus philosophy of aviation has not helped the cause of aviation.

It is recognized that certain segments of civil aviation have grown and prospered to an amazing degree in comparison to others. For example, our scheduled air carriers have given the United States the finest system of transportation known to the world. Its powers were ably demonstrated in the execution of the last war and its routes of commerce now extend all over the world. Likewise, our aircraft-manufacturing industry has adapted itself to the know-how methods of mass production and is capable of designing and building any number of any type of aircraft that our country may require. These examples would indicate that our system of Government assistance in the development of aviation could and has been successful. And of these developments, the entire industry as well as the general public, can be rightfully proud. However, the airport operator has not done so well as the scheduled air carrier or manufacturer. He, of course, is not strongly organized and although 6,000 in number his voice individually is very weak in places. The airport operator most certainly would have the most to gain by discarding his versus philosophy of aviation and making a sincere effort to understand better and to cooperate with the other segments of aviation. He should furnish the initiative in improving these relationships.

It is common for the local airport operator to attribute his failure to the lack of local support in his community. This, of course, is usually traced back to his reluctance to cooperate with the administration to assist them in the problems of airport design, construction, management, or operation. The average airport operator has usually done very little to help create or improve the civic interest in the local airport; nor has he offered to cooperate in studying the local problems with the other operators in, for example, an airport-users conference in which all users of the local airport make a serious study of the cost and revenue formulas for the apportionment of the various funds applicable to the certain areas of the airport. It is generally conceded that a properly designed and properly managed airport should break even from its aviation sources of revenue and reflect a profit from the nonaviation sources of revenue. It should be the airport operator's spirit which helps establish this policy in his community, for any airport rendering a service and which is not a financial burden to the community can and should have the civic interest and pride which will afford the airport operator the local support so necessary to his existence.

It must also be recognized, however, that just the mere ability to fly, build, or repair an airplane does not necessarily qualify any person to have the proper training, experience, and abilities of an aggressive businessman. However, his attitude and active interest in civic matters, particularly those pertaining to the airport, will do much to overshadow any shortcomings the operator may possess.

Public relations constitute a basic factor in practically every business operation today. The conduct of an airport operation is a business. Public relations properly conducted can and will aid the operator in an exact ratio to the time and effort expended. The average airport operator or manager grossly underestimates the importance of his position as the focal point of the aviation world in the eyes of the general public, who get their first impression of aviation from his operations. This attitude relative to public relations has been caused in part by the flight training programs, CPT and WTS, and more recently the VA program which have encouraged an influx of new airport operators into the field and has created the illusion that there was much easy money to be made quick in aviation. Inasmuch as the airport operator is in direct contact with the public and therefore the first recipient of any gains in improved relationships, he should voluntarily assume the responsibilities for passing on any unsatisfactory service or product to his customers and is therefore in the most logical position to create the greatest improvement or to be responsible for the greatest damage.

The American traveling public all want to conserve more traveltime in order to do more business, have more recreation or more fully enjoy life. An equal effort should be concentrated on both the nonflying and the flying groups of the public. The nonflying groups have as their chief reasons for not using aviation that it is too dangerous, the cost is too high, and there is a decided lack of dependability and convenience. These reasons, of course, do not apply to the air lines, but are partially justified in the personal flying category who could well afford to follow the pattern of the scheduled air carriers in minimizing this public objection to their services and at the same time proceed to diligently find and remove the cause for these criticisms.

Another objection voiced by the public is its dissatisfaction with the general appearance, attitude, and service rendered by the airport operator, whose position is quite comparable to that of the operator of the early-day automobile garage and service station when faced with the same lack of public acceptance of his product and service joined with his manufacturer, the oil companies, the local public officials and others and greatly improved not only the utility of the automobile, but the service stations, garages, roads, and every other facility upon which the public depended for convenient automotive transportation. This was accomplished in a very few short years and with the proper attitude and effort this method appears to be the most logical procedure for cleaning up the civil-aviation industry which forcefully indicates the value and possibilities of a unified civil-aviation structure.

The aviation industry of this country cannot grow and develop in a piecemeal manner. Each segment thereof depends to some extent upon the others. Not unlike the development and growth of a tree, aviation also has its system of roots, branches, trunk, leaves, fruit, etc., each of which must discharge its functional responsibilities or, in its failure, will retard the normal over-all development and growth. There is no disagreement regarding the present unhealthy condition of

the airport operator's segment of civil aviation, which if not remedied will all too soon spread like a disease and affect the remaining healthy segments of our aviation structure and, if necessary, our every means and resource should be utilized to restore this segment of aviation to a position where it will be self-sustaining and ably discharge its responsibilities to the industry as a whole.

It is recommended that—

The Civil Aeronautics Administration continue the leadership in bringing together each of the several segments of civil aviation and to effect the coordination of a national policy and program for civil aviation.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration initiate a program to indoctrinate and direct their agents to more adequately serve the industry in matters relating to public relations including the press and radio programs; civic responsibility improving the spirit and activity of the airport operator; adult and public school air age educational programs; general knowledge and promotion of good airport management and operational practices; and proper sales, safety, and accounting procedures, stressing the educational instead of regulatory methods of development.

A revision of our present curricula of pilot training be instituted taking full advantage of the existing utility in the present personal aircraft, concentrating upon the practical problems involved in cross-country flying thereby reflecting better training and pilot ability. It is most desirable that the present VHF radio facilities be revised to include voice identification and all procedures should be simplified as much as possible.

The utility of the personal type airplane must be programed by gradual improvement rather than by revolution and should include a procedure for assisting the manufacturer to make practical application of the research and technical developments of aeronautical engineering. It is important to increase the operating range of the present aircraft as much as possible with the greater emphasis being placed upon the stall and landing speed end of this range; automatic navigational and landing devices must be made applicable to the personal type airplane operated by the amateur pilot; aircraft engineering and production should incorporate to the final degree every combination of methods which will make the airplane extremely easy to operate to the extent that it will fly hands off in a straight level attitude for at least 15 minutes; the present marginal rate of climb requirements should be substantially increased and spiral instability characteristics should be eliminated in the interest of safety.

A concerted industry-wide national program should be activated to accomplish the following results:

(a) Improve domestic postal service by handling of more first-class mail by air.

(b) Improve domestic transportation system by certification of additional small feeder air lines.

(c) Improve the stature of the aviation industry with general public relation program adapted to national, State, and local levels.

Centenary of Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the occasion of the centenary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder and first president of the Republic of Czechoslovakia, issued by the Czechoslovak National Council of America.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA

In this most critical moment of international tension over the menace of the new terrible weapons of war which is engendering deadly fear among all peace-loving peoples and threatens to involve the world in a new catastrophy, we declare for sincere exploring of all decent means and ways which might lead toward lessening of the tension and achievement of a real international understanding.

While ardently hoping and praying for peace we believe that a lasting and durable peace may be obtained only if it be based on righteousness and justice.

No matter how desirable might be achievement of some modus vivendi which might be negotiated between the western and eastern powers, it would bring about new tension, new uncertainty and would lead to another misunderstanding if it would be based on legalization of injustices and exploits of aggression in the past.

Without proper guaranties, any modus vivendi between east and west cannot be trusted to fulfill what mankind expects from it.

We believe that the first guaranty of good faith on the side of the Soviet Union should be the fulfillment of promises given the peoples behind so-called iron curtain in wartime agreements among the big powers, that they would be accorded the right to freely decide their fate for themselves.

Only free elections under the control of the United Nations offer fulfillment of those promises.

We firmly believe, with the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, as he declared in his speech on Washington Day, on February 22, in Alexandria, Va., that, in the long run world's hopes for peace do lie primarily "in the growth and expansion of freedom and self-government."

On the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of birth of Thomas G. Masaryk of Czechoslovakia, great fighter for self-determination of nations and civil liberties guaranteed by the governments, we appeal to our American Government, to the United Nations, to all western powers and to the conscience of all civilized world to take or aid measures leading toward restitution of the right for self-determination to Masaryk's people. We demand that Czechoslovakian people be accorded the right to hold free elections under the control of the United Nations with proper guaranties of the freedom of expression during the election campaign and with elimination of any outside pressure or coercion.

We demand the same right for other peoples behind the iron curtain knowing that they desire nothing more than to become a peaceful neutral link between east and west instead of being a bone of contention among the big powers.

We also appeal to the Government and the peoples of the Soviet Union to demonstrate their good will, sincerity of intent by favoring this most peaceful solution of the great problem and thus enable us, as well as themselves, to use the new marvelous sources of energy and miraculous advances in science for the good of mankind instead of its destruction.

Story of Navy Secretary Francis P. Matthews and the Late Henry Monsky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article concerning the story of the Secretary of the Navy Francis P. Matthews and the late Henry Monsky, written by Bill Schofield and published in the Boston Traveler of March 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAVE YOU HEARD

(By Bill Schofield)

It could happen only in America, that a Jew and a Catholic could live such parallel lives, win such similar honors and gain so many mutual friends.

It's the story of Navy Secretary Francis P. Matthews and the late Henry Monsky. It's proof of the fact that there still exists in the world at least one nation where a man's success depends upon what he is—not upon his religious beliefs, his forebears' homeland, or the way he spells his name.

And 1 week from tonight, on March 14, it will add one more stitch to its pattern of similarity, for that's when Secretary Matthews will be principal speaker at a veterans' night dinner given by the Brotherhood of Temple Ohabei Shalom in Brookline. Monsky, you see, was a speaker there, too, shortly before he died 3 years ago come May.

The story of these two men goes back more than threescore years to the State of Nebraska. There, in the town of Albion, Matthews was born on March 15, 1887. And there, in the nearby city of Omaha, Monsky was born on February 4, 1890.

To gain an education, each headed for the halls of Creighton University at Omaha. Matthews picked up his college diploma with the class of 1910. Two years later, Monsky left with a sheepskin in his hands.

Each man had his heart set on becoming a lawyer. Thus, in 1912, Monsky was admitted to the Nebraska bar, with Matthews following 1 year later. Their weddings came along within 6 months of each other, that of Matthews in November 1914 and that of Monsky in May the following year.

Then they began to climb, and the way their paths followed parallel ascending stairways might well have stamped them as identical twins, except that one went regularly to mass while the other worshiped in a synagogue.

They were among the first to recognize the great value of Father Flanagan's Boys' Town. It's been said that Monsky gave the priest his first $1,000 for that project, and it's recorded in Who's Who that Matthews and Monsky frequently sat together on the board of trustees. They were together on other groups as well, for each served on the board of governors for the Omaha Community Chest and each in turn put in a term as president of that organization.

They climbed high and they climbed fast. Being a Jew, Monsky joined the Omaha Lodge of B'nai B'rith and rose to be president of the Supreme Lodge by 1938. Being a Catholic, Matthews joined the Knights of Columbus and reached the office of Supreme Knight by 1939.

Meanwhile, their names could be found among the workers wherever there was a welfare job to be done, whether the recipients might be Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish. The unswerving formula they followed was to help a man first and inquire about his background later, if at all.

The Catholic Church sent some of the highest lay awards of the Vatican for Matthews' acceptance. Jewish organizations wrote the name of Monsky on their most important boards. Their paths curved into national affairs, and Monsky worked with the first United Nations Conference in San Francisco while Matthews tramped the ragged roads of European towns to help war victims mend their broken world.

Then they were together one night in Monsky's home at Omaha, when Col. Elliott A. Niles of Boston was present as a guest. And stemming from that meeting, Matthews as Secretary of the Navy will be here next week to address the brotherhood to which Niles belongs, from the platform where Monsky once spoke.

This simple group, so capably guided by President Robert R. Gordon, has listened to other men of national prominence. But few have come here with a closer tie of sympathy than the friend of the late Henry Monsky.

Viewed from this point, it promises to be a colorful night. Maj. Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, will be the guest of honor. Rabbi Dudley Weinberg, national chaplain of AMVETS, will receive a citation. There's a long list of familiar names scheduled to attend—men like Rear Admiral Hewlett Thebaud, Commandant of the First Naval District; Brig. Gen. A. Robert Ginsburgh, representing Defense Secretary Louis Johnson; Maj. Gen. Frank A. Keating, commanding general New England Military District; Rabbi Joshua Goldberg of the Third Naval District; Judge John E. Swift, supreme knight of the Knights of Columbus; Maj. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan, and others of rank and office.

The head table guests will get together for a reception at the Niles home in Brookline shortly before the dinner. And in the evening, the Navy band will show what it can do with Jewish music.

But through it all, for anyone who stops to think, there'll be a theme of human brotherhood that's too swiftly disappearing from the earth.

It will be the theme that made such warm friends of a Jew named Monsky and a Catholic named Matthews.

They proved the thing can work.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby on Friday evening, February 10, before the Alabama Press Association. Mrs. Hobby is executive vice president of the Houston Post, and is the first woman president of the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association. She served with me as a member of the United States delegation, of which I was chairman, at the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information, at Geneva, Switzerland, in April and May of 1948—a conference to which she refers in her most admirable paper. Her inspiring and constructive address will be most interesting, I believe, to the Congress, as well as to publishers and editors throughout the country. I, of course, deeply share her belief that the traditional freedom of the American press has a historic mission.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hamlet's bemused "To be or not to be?" echoes today through many newspaper offices.

The New Yorker observes that "The first duty of a newspaper is to stay alive. And the most important single fact about any newspaper is that it differs from the next newspaper and is owned by a different man or group of men. This fact (the fact of difference) transcends a newspaper's greatness, a newspaper's honesty, a newspaper's liveliness, or any other quality.

"The health of the country deteriorates every time a newspaper dies of strangulation or is wiped out in a mercy killing. The solemn fact about the absorption of the Sun by Scripps-Howard is not that we lose a conservative paper, or an ancient paper, or an honest paper, or a funny paper, but that we lose a paper—one voice in the choir."

The mortality rate of daily and weekly newspapers in the past decade suggests the necessity for more self-analysis on the part of publishers, editors, reporters, craftsmen, and the entire personnel of a newspaper establishment. Examinations have always seemed preferable to autopsies.

Admitting, then, that our hardest battle today is simply to be, to continue to exist, how can we win that battle? I believe the only way is by being genuinely excellent. Excellent in daily journalism, in editorial policy, in management, and in our business operations.

The newspaper world around us is changing constantly. It has always changed, but never so much as in the past decade. Because the daily and hourly notation of change is our life work, we in the profession sometimes find ourselves too absorbed with the pace to take heed of the direction, the technique, or the quality of our product. It is only at meetings such as this one that we can stop, review the local and world community which we serve, and analyze our quality of service.

For example, how good are we in daily journalism? The role of the daily and weekly newspaper has never before been so important as it is today; the press in all its expressions is the eyes and ears of the world. How well do we live up to this responsibility, especially in our reporting of world events?

The lawyer, the cook, the college student, the mayor of a town—none can go to Europe and study the economic conferences of the Benelux nations. None can inspect the operation of Allied occupation in Japan. None can stay at the United Nations to keep informed on its progress, its set-backs, and its achievements. They know only what they read in the newspapers, in news magazines, or what they hear in brief comments on the radio.

Because of the expert work done by news magazines, by the newsreels and the network commentators, editors sometimes feel that they can relegate the greater part of the national and international picture to others. Every paper has so many demands for its column space. Businessmen want more stock quotations, farmers more agricultural news. Women's clubs want pictures and feature stories. The PTA units want individual stories for each school, the better to pad the scrapbooks which they exhibit at State conventions. And, of course, the city desk has its own pet newsruns.

But today's newspapers have a duty to inform their people on world events, because in today's world, the citizens of Wetumpka or Selma or Talladega or Fort Payne may be called on to decide whether or not to continue the Marshall plan, or whether or not to relinquish Formosa; or he may even have some influence for world peace through his demands on his governmental representatives.

An Alabama Congressman once made this statement in Washington: "My people," he said, "never subscribe to Time, or Collier's or the New York Times. A lot of them don't even see the Birmingham News. They do see their home town dailies or weeklies and it is from these sources they must obtain their information. All they know about what's going on in the world comes from their home town papers."

If the American people are to be informed on world events, our newspapers, dailies and weeklies must do it. And it is also our job to make world events seem as real as those of our individual towns and counties. If the laundryman shoots the corner florist, that is something real and immediate and enormously interesting to everyone who has ever walked into the florist's shop or had his clothes picked up by the laundryman. Perhaps the United Nations daily schedule will not boost circulation quite so much as the town shooting—and I should be the last to ask any newspaper to strip itself of circulation—but somewhere there is a happy and intelligent blend of news which readers want to read and news which they should read. By skillful writing and presentation, even the most foreign and esoteric of articles can be made readable. That, I think, is part of our task. We must learn to evaluate the news we present in terms of its relative importance to the individual, as well as in terms of its relative interest.

An equally important question in this self-analysis is: How good are we in editorial policy—in our choice of causes to champion and community goals to be emphasized? Do we set objectives or do we, like Scarlet O'Hara, say, "I'll think of it all tomorrow." "After all, tomorrow is another day."

Conditions differ in different communities, and each publisher must answer this question according to his own judgment. There are questions on all levels from the local to the international confronting us. A newspaper attempting constructive leadership of the community will feel obliged to comment upon these questions in its editorial columns. In our town of Houston, for instance, the Houston Post is particularly interested in health and sanitation—a crucial problem because of our sudden growth. It is one which your city or town may have already solved.

In our State of Texas, the Houston Post is giving emphasis to the care of the aged. The State is rich in potentials, but this burden of care is one not easily solved. To solve it properly, we face the unpalatable accompaniment of deficit financing; we must decide whether or not we shall let ourselves in for a bonded indebtedness. We have done so only once before—during the depression. Shall we do so again?

On the national level, the Post considers that the Hoover Commission recommendations merit substantial coverage. The Federal Government is a bit like Humpty-Dumpty—a Humpty-Dumpty who has grown so corpulent and ungainly that he has lost his original agility. If he falls off his perch, all the king's horses and all the king's men cannot put him together again. It is nationally important—and therefore important to every citizen of Texas—that we reduce Humpty-Dumpty and put him back into efficient trim before he runs any danger of falling.

In the international field, the Houston Post is asking that we consider an Atlantic Union of the Free. A resolution to that effect is now before Congress. It proposes that the President of the United States call a conference of the Atlantic Pact democracies to

explore the possibilities of a Federal Union among them. We have already taken the dangerous step of military unity. Under an Atlantic Union, we would gain the economic benefits which we in America badly need and will need even more badly as the years of international spending continue.

These are some of the special points of the Houston Post's editorial policy. There are, of course, others; but all of them boil down I think, to a general question which should be that of every publisher: Is my paper first and foremost a witness for a free people, a true conscience for democracy?

We often hear about freedom of the press, sometimes almost as if it were a privilege given us for our special enjoyment. It is, rather, a sword for the protection of freedom of the people, and we have an obligation to use it as such. Of what use would a life preserver be in the hands of a sailor too lazy to throw it to a drowning man? What good is freedom of the press if we see injustice done and remain silent? Not only remain silent, but condone the injustice?

These are not just rhetorical questions. I am thinking, for example, of the case of Dr. Condon. A respected scientist and a public servant, he was labeled "one of the weakest links in our atomic security" in a report released to the press by J. Parnell Thomas, then chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Though Dr. Condon repeatedly demanded the right to a public hearing and official denial, he was not granted his right. The American press should have demanded the right for him. Worse—we gave three and four times the amount of space to the charges than we gave to statements relating to his innocence. In other words, we have given equal display to unsubstantiated charges made against Dr. Condon, a distinguished scientist and an American citizen, as we have given to Dr. Fuchs, a German-born citizen and a naturalized British citizen, against whom formal charges were filed, and who was arrested, and who will be tried shortly for espionage.

There was a time when every citizen was adjudged innocent of a crime until legally proved guilty in court. This was a precedent we inherited from English common law. Now almost suddenly, in mid-twentieth century, this long established protection of the ordinary citizen against possible injustice is being nullified. When sensational charges are made against anyone—not by a jury, not by a district attorney, but sometimes by vacant-minded or hysterical people—the charges are broadcast from coast to coast; and the public instinct is to accept charges as proof.

I realize these are pains that go along with democracy but it is a frightening tendency, to which the American press is contributing. We must resist it. We must set it in true perspective with a question mark. In the case of accusations such as those against Dr. Condon, we must immediately ask, "What is your proof? Have you legal and unassailable evidence that this is true?"

I sometimes think that the greatest single failure of the American press is its willingness to forget the question mark. If I could, I should like to build and endow a memorial to the question mark—of course with many people I have wished I could endow the period—but surely it is the duty of the press to question.

We—with all our fellow-Americans of the twentieth century—have lapsed into a dangerous tendency to accept things: To accept almost any statement as true once it has been printed; to accept any columnist as a good one; to accept institutions as things of virtue until a public charge is made against them; to accept minority government for the United States because the majority is either politically illiterate or refuses to accept responsibilities of citizenship.

Instead, we should question everything—good as well as evil. Under question, the good only stands forth more clearly revealed for what it is, and evil is bared for all to see.

Most specially, we newspaper publishers should question what goes into our own columns.

We who print our newspapers far from the scenes of Federal Government or internal crisis cannot cover major national or overseas events with our own staff, and so we draw on columnists and the news agencies. As was pointed out recently in the Economist, the good columnists—Walter Lippmann, the Alsop brothers, Marquis Childs, Doris Fleeson, and Thomas Stokes, to mention a few, have great value in a country where distance prevents any newspaper from getting more than a local—or at most a regional following. For a few dollars a day, an editor in a small town can get material he could not afford in any other way. "But there are also bad columnists," the Economist reminds, "and ignorant ones."

How true. All of us in this tremendous country have a tendency to respect as being authoritative anyone who writes from the source. We read and believe the Washington columnists and correspondents because they are in Washington and should know. We think they must be good, or they wouldn't be writing up there where the competition is stiff.

But if any of you read Our Armchair Correspondents, written by one of them, you will know how pitiful are our illusions.

Let us therefore form the habit of questioning the caliber and performance of all writers whose work comes to us from the outside, as we question those on our own staffs.

Finally, let us question ourselves. I believe that the newspaperman—be he publisher or cub—should take stock of himself every year, or even every month. In honest self-analysis, he should try to clear out fuzzy thinking, should try to outline his own principles or philosophy of Government and of living, should try to review his own store of information, and discern which is prejudice.

He should try to be very sure that he knows exactly what words mean before he uses them. For example, there is a great difference between socialism and communism. There is a greater difference between democratic socialism and political communism. But how clearly do we define and distinguish the differences for our readers? Have we fallen into the fuzzy-minded habit of labeling all Communists, Socialists, and Liberals together as "left wing," thereby implying that the United States is "right wing," reactionary, hide-bound, controlled? This kind of thing is playing directly into Russia's hands. As a matter of fact, the United States is the most liberal—in the true sense of the word—the most progressive, and the most un-hide-bound country in the world. False labels create false ideas, and we who are the American font of ideas should know their propaganda value and be more careful how we use them.

The American press is not bad. I never realized how good it is until I saw all the world's press represented at the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information and the Press at Geneva. Not even our fellow democracies can equal us. The British press is crippled by newsprint shortages. The French press suffers from lack of advertising and from subsidy by political parties. And, of course, the Russian press is simply the voice of the Soviet Government.

If we are to serve our tradition and our function in a free government, we must grow in excellence. Nothing has ever stood still—except the sun that day—and we shall either merit a continued existence or we shall negate our historic guaranty, freedom of the press.

Ours is a terrifying responsibility for the happiness of the individual and the welfare of the country. We must remain in constant, hourly awareness of how important what we say is to little people and big ones too.

If we decide that our historic freedom of the press has a historic mission, then every one of us must judge for himself whether or not, at the end of 1950, he can say "objective sighted," or "mission accomplished."

Encouragement of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on encouragement of science delivered by the distinguished scientist, J. Robert Oppenheimer, director of the Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton University, at the Science Talent Search Award banquet, held in Washington, D. C., on March 6. I believe the address is particularly relevant to national-science legislation now pending in Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are here tonight to honor you and to celebrate the high promise of your future as scientists. We are happy to be with you. We think of that future with respect and curiosity. We think of the discoveries which you will make. We think of the questions to which we today have no answer, and to which you will come to know an answer. Even more, we think of the answers that we have today, and of the new questions that you will put to those answers. We think of how altered and how deepened our knowledge of the world will be before you are through with it. My first wish to you is that you may make and that you may share in the making of great and beautiful discoveries which enrich our knowledge of the world of nature and of man. I have a second wish for you; but that must come at the end of my talk.

I do not propose to talk to you of such topics of the day as the hydrogen bomb and the statutory provisions of the National Science Foundation. If these matters are not in a very different state when you shall have come to assume the full responsibilities of citizenship, you will have reason to reproach you elders for your inheritance.

Science has profoundly altered the conditions of man's life. During the last centuries, the discoveries in science, and their applications to practice, have changed the material conditions of life. They have changed as well many matters of the spirit. They have changed the form in which practical problems of right and wrong come before us; they have changed the focus of moral issues, both for the individual and for governments. They have given us new methods for defining the meaning of problems that face us, and for judging whether or not our solutions are just.

The most manifest of the changes are the material ones. Yet even here it takes a certain perspective to see their true extent. Advances in the study of man and other

living forms have extended our life span by decades. Discoveries in physical science have immeasurably lightened our toil, and enriched our lives. They have given leisure to an ever-widening group of men. They have made a reasonable education not a special privilege, but a common right. They have made the world, in its physical dimensions, a small place, and established the means by which people in remote parts of the earth can communicate with each other, can get to know each other, and can learn to work together. They have put at the disposal of everyone the resources of physical power, of ease and of knowledge that were in the past reserved for the few.

Not all of the changes in material well-being that science offers are realities. Yet the very fact that they are possibilities has changed the nature of the responsibility which we bear, both as individuals and as a community of men and women banded together in government. In the Greek cities, political democracy, and civilization itself, appeared possible only on the basis of a slave economy. Technology, born of science, has altered that; it has enabled mankind, as it has forced mankind, to deal with the issues of slavery as a moral issue. Poverty has always been an ugly thing, and in its extremes a desperate one. Today, it is an evil, in the sense that it lies within human hands and human hearts to abate it. Science can provide us, for the first time in history, with the means of abating hunger for everyone on earth.

Perhaps nowhere has the impact of science more clearly altered the specific terms of a great political issue than in the effects of scientific development on warfare. This is a can of worms with which I have myself unhappily been engaged for some years. It would not be honest to say—as it would be folly not to hope—that the very terror of modern weapons would in itself put an end to war; it would not even be honest to say that because of this terror the abolition of war and the maintenance of peace have become the one absolute, final objective of all political decisions. There are other things in man's life: his freedom, his decency, and his sense of right and wrong, that cannot so lightly be subjected to a single end. But what we need to remember is that war today has become, and is increasingly becoming, something very different from what it was a century ago or a millennium ago. We need to recognize the new situation as new; we need to come to it with something of the same spirit as the scientist's, when he has conducted an experiment and finds that the results are totally other than those that he had anticipated.

Four months before Hiroshima, in the last days of his life, President Roosevelt's thoughts turned to these questions. In the last words that he wrote, in words he did not live to speak, the President looked to the future, to the atomic age. He looked to the past, to the days of the founding of the Republic. He wrote:

"Thomas Jefferson, himself a distinguished scientist, once spoke of the 'brotherly spirit of science, which unites into one family all its votaries of whatever grade, and however widely dispersed throughout the different quarters of the globe.'

"Today science has brought all the different quarters of the globe so close together that it is impossible to isolate them one from another.

"Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together, in the same world, at peace."

Science has greatly extended the range of questions in which man has a choice: it has extended man's freedom to make significant decisions. Is there anything in the methods of science itself, or in the spirit of science, which can help in the making of these decisions? To what extent is there a play on the word "science" which can mislead us and take us up false roads when we speak of this science of human relationships? Is there anything we can learn from the relevance of science to politics?

If we are to answer these questions, and answer them honestly, we must recognize important and basic differences between problems of science, and problems of action, as they arise in personal or in political life. If we fail to recognize these differences, we shall be seeking magic solutions and not real ones. We shall delude ourselves into laying aside responsibility, which it is an essential part of man's life to bear.

In most scientific study, questions of good and evil, or right and wrong play at most a minor and secondary part. For practical decisions of policy, they are basic. Without them, political action would be meaningless. Practical decisions, and, above all, political decisions can never quite be freed from the conflicting claims of special interest. These, too, are part of the meaning of a decision and, of course, of action, and they must be an essential part of the force of its implementation.

Political decisions are unique acts. In politics there is little that can correspond to the scientist's repetition of an experiment. An experiment that fails in its purpose may be good or better than one that succeeds, because it may well be more instructive. A political decision cannot be taken twice. All the factors that are relevant to it will conjoin only once. The analogies of history can provide a guide, but only a very partial one.

These are formidable differences between the problems of science and those of practice. They show that the method of science cannot be directly adapted to the solution of problems in politics and in man's spiritual life. Yet there is relevance of a more subtle, but by no means trivial, kind.

In trying more fully to explore this relevance, I should like to start with a text. This text is a letter written by Thomas Jefferson to a young man who had inquired of him as to the usefulness of his studies of science. I am indebted to Dr. Julian Boyd, of Princeton University, for the copy of this hitherto unpublished letter. It was written in the middle of the year 1799, the year in which Napoleon abolished the directory and began to assume dictatorial power in France, the year before Thomas Jefferson was elected for the first time as President of the United States. Jefferson and the diverse brave and hopeful men who with him laid the foundations of our own Government had learned much from the peoples of other nations. Many of their highest political ideals and their most powerful political instruments were built on the experience, the insight and wisdom of European scientists and philosophers. Even today we need to remember that this was so, and that there may be much that we can learn from others, and that we should be glad to learn, as in turn by example, we should be glad to teach.

Jefferson's letter starts with a survey of the subjects in science which he believes young Munford ought to pursue. I will quote one characteristic passage which may strike a familiar and homely note for you:

"The science of calculation also is indispensable as far as the extraction of the square and cube roots; algebra as far as the quadratic equation and the use of logarithms are often of value in ordinary cases; but all beyond these is but a luxury; a delicious luxury, indeed; but not to be indulged in by one who is to have a profession to follow for his subsistence."

But that is not really the part of Jefferson's letter which I commend to you. Here it is:

"I am among those who think well of the human character generally. I consider man as formed for society, and endowed by nature with those dispositions which fit him for society. I believe also, with Condorcet, as mentioned in your letter, that his mind is perfectible to a degree of which we cannot as yet form any conception. It is impossible for a man who takes a survey of what is already known, not to see what an immensity in every branch of science yet remains to be discovered, and that, too, of articles to which our faculties seem adequate."

And later, in the same letter, still more explicitly:

"And it is still more certain that in the other branches of science great fields are yet to be explored to which our faculties are equal, and that to an extent of which we cannot fix the limits. I join you, therefore, in branding as cowardly the idea that the human mind is incapable of further advances. This is precisely the doctrine which the present despots of the earth are inculcating, and their friends here reechoing, and applying especially to religion and politics: 'that it is not probable that anything better will be discovered than what was known to our fathers.' We are to look backwards, then, and not forwards for the improvement of science and to find it amidst feudal barbarisms and the fires of Spitalfields. But thank heaven the American mind is already too much opened to listen to these impostures; and while the art of printing is left to us, science can never be retrograde; what is once acquired of real knowledge can never be lost. To preserve the freedom of the human mind, then, and freedom of the press, every spirit would be ready to devote itself to martyrdom; for as long as we may think as we will and speak as we think the condition of man will proceed in improvement. The generation which is going off the stage has deserved well of mankind for the struggles it has made and for having arrested that course of despotism which had overwhelmed the world for thousands and thousands of years. If there seems to be danger that the ground they have gained will be lost again, that danger comes from the generation of your contemporary. But that the enthusiasm which characterizes youth should lift its parracide hands against freedom and science would be such a monstrous phenomenon as I cannot place among possible things in this age and this country."

To me there are two striking impressions which this letter of Jefferson's makes, even beyond its eloquence and its beauty. The first is that the letter is pervaded with the idea of progress, that ideal that owes so much to the development of science and that in turn has provided the great enriching human faith in which scientific discovery and invention has flourished. Jefferson is confident that an increased understanding of the world will lead to progress; he is convinced that the barbarisms of the past cannot stand up against inquiry and understanding and enlightenment; he is confident in man and sure that as men know more they will act more wisely and live better. In our contemporary expressions of hope that catastrophe could be averted and civilization yet be saved, that confidence has lost much of its robustness.

The second point is that for Jefferson there is something in the ways of science that is relevant to political life. Even in religion and politics he holds that it is probable that better things will be discovered than what was known to our fathers. This conviction that new knowledge is possible and that not all the answers are known is, of course, the stuff of the day-to-day life of the scientist. Science itself does progress; new knowledge is possible; and new knowledge, because it does not destroy or ignore the old, can only increase our understanding. The very idea of the development of science is an example of progress, and of progress which in no true sense can ever be reversed. But this is only part of the story. It is true, as Jefferson knew, that in the large, science has flourished in conditions of human freedom, and that

its growth is parallel to the growth of democratic institutions. Today, looking back on more than a century and a half of further history, we can be even more sure of this. We have seen not only the inspiriting example of science and democracy flourishing together, but the tragic examples of their foundering together. We express the hope that of this tragedy we shall soon have seen the end.

What are these lessons that the spirit of science teaches us for our practical affairs? Basic to them all is that there may be no barriers to freedom of enquiry. Basic to them all is the ideal of open-mindedness with regard to new knowledge, new experience, and new truth. Science is not based on authority. It owes its acceptance and its universality to an appeal to intelligible, communicable evidence that any interested man can evaluate.

There is no place for dogma in science. The scientist is free to ask any question, to doubt any assertion, to seek for any evidence, to correct any error. Where science has been used in the past to erect a new dogmatism, that dogmatism has found itself incompatible with the progress of science; and in the end, the dogma has yielded, or science and freedom have perished together.

Our own political life is predisposed to openness. We do not believe any group of men adequate enough or wise enough to operate without scrutiny or without criticism. We know that the only way to avoid error is to detect it, that the only way to detect it is to be free to enquire. We know that the wages of secrecy are corruption. We know that in secrecy error, undetected, will flourish and subvert.

Let me be clear. Science is not skepticism. It is not the practice of science to look for things to doubt. It was not by a deliberate attempt of skepticism that physicists were led to doubt the absolute nature of simultaneity, or to recognize that the laws of strict causality embodied in classical physics could not be applied to the details of atomic phenomena. There is probably no group of men who take more for granted in their daily work than the scientists. Common sense, and all that flows from it, are their principal basis for what they do in the laboratory and for what they make of it on paper. But for scientists it is not only honorable to doubt, it is mandatory to do that when there appears to be evidence in support of the doubt. In place of authority in science, we have and we need to have only the consensus of informed opinion, only the guide of example. No scientist needs to order his colleagues to use a new technique of experiment or to enter a new field of discovery. If he has done this, it will be an invitation to his fellows to follow.

These then are some of the attitudes of mind, these are some of the disciplines of spirit which grow naturally in the scientist's world. They have grown there in part as a result of a humane and liberal tradition in political life, and in part as a cause of that. The open mind, the reliance on example and persuasion, rather than on authority, these are the heritage of the centuries in which science has allowed the face of the earth. Science can help in diverse ways in preserving and extending this heritage. Its very universality speaks across frontiers to make truth manifest in lands otherwise darkened; its material applications create the preconditions—in leisure, in education, in means of communication—for the converse of men with each other. Science provides the material and the intellectual basis for a world in which example and understanding can help all men to improve their lot and fulfill their hopes. Today we need to remember that our country, founded on these practices, and grown strong by their exercise, owes its strength to them. In this time of crisis, we need to cherish that strength.

And this brings me to my second wish for you. I wish you not only the joy of great discovery, I wish for you a world of confidence in man and man's humanity, a world of confidence in reason, so that as you work you may be inspired by the hope that what you find will make men freer and better—in which, working as specialists in what may be recondite parts of the intellectual life of the time, you are nevertheless contributing in a direct and basic way to the welfare of mankind.

Illusion or Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in my hand I hold a document which, for a change, brings good news from western Germany where the future of democracy hangs in the balance. In that arena true democracy as we know it here is pitted against the godless materialism of the left and a resurgent materialism of the right.

The constructive forces in the new German Republic are being aided by a world-wide ideological movement known as moral rearmament, initiated by an American, Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, of Pennsylvania. In a way that we had hoped might happen, and yet feared would never happen, this movement is creating industrial teamwork as an answer to class war. It has achieved the seemingly impossible by winning over some of the top Communist leaders of western Germany. These men who have for years been spreading their false ideology among the miners and workers of the Ruhr came last summer to the World Assembly of Moral Rearmament at Caux, Switzerland, to which this House sent an official committee. The Communists found there what they described as an ideology superior to that for which we have fought.

On their return to Germany they not only resigned from the Communist Party but devoted their militant energies to spreading this new ideology among their former comrades—with such effectiveness that they too have left the party in large numbers.

In Altenessen the chairman of the Communist Party, who had founded the party there 25 years ago, said that he so now believed in moral rearmament as the answering and uniting world ideology that if the Communist Party did not accept this ideology, he would take a third of the Communist Party of Altenessen, which has a membership of 10,000, out of the party with him in support of moral rearmament. He said "Caux is where we belong."

In fact, only a few weeks ago the executive of the Communist Party in western Germany were summoned to a special conference at which they stated they were going to reorganize the entire executive and secretariat because it had become tainted with an ideology inimical to the party.

The extent of the success of this movement and the strength of its opposition is illustrated by an editorial published in a Bremen newspaper. It was sent me by my son, Harold, who is over there learning at firsthand how to have a part in this strategic work of bringing a democratic ideology to Germany.

This ideology has taken hold and is assisting in the development of democratic processes in Europe, and this is clearly shown by an editorial entitled "Illusion or Reality," which appeared in the Bremen Weser-Kurier of Monday, February 6, 1950.

I thought it would be of interest to the Members of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so I ask permission to insert it in the RECORD at this point.

An English version of the editorial is as follows:

ILLUSION OR REALITY

The presence of the cast of the movement of moral rearmament in Bremen, and the performances of the industrial play Der Vergessene Faktor, have found an echo in all the vital intellects of our city, that has by far exceeded the expectations of the skeptics. So what has happened in other cities has been repeated in Bremen. Whatever your point of view, negative or positive, no doubt can be left that through the moral rearmament movement the people have been touched by something for which they have long been waiting.

There is in the millions a latent readiness to devote themselves to a great uplifting idea; to direct their good will for an aim; to give their life and work a meaning without which they cannot carry on their existence. These millions are looking for something. They know also that mortal danger hovers over them, and that trying to meet the danger by material means alone is very questionable.

The people of Caux understand this situation. The danger that threatens Christian culture and thus Europe and all countries whose spiritual origin is in Europe, is not primarily dependent upon the means of power mobilized by the Communists, nor upon tanks, planes, and atom bombs, but upon people who have themselves subscribed to the Communist ideology. Neither are those who have been forced into the Communist sphere of influence by pressure and terrorism the dangerous ones, but the idealists who are deeply convinced of communism: not those who seek fame and power, but those who are willing to sacrifice and who have committed themselves body and soul. Indeed, the latter as idealists have a claim to the respect even of those who think otherwise.

Because millions know this danger, or in any case feel it unconsciously, they are not wholly reassured nor given a feeling of inner security by the might of the Western democracies and those peoples whose life is based on a God-inspired culture, even though this might is so immense as to lend a sense of outward security.

Why does not the power of the West reassure or, when it does, only partially? Because the inner foundation of real power is lacking—the ideology to which material power is subordinate; the ideology that in extreme emergency even gives the use of force a moral justification.

I am fully aware of the dangers of this last statement. The president of the Bremen KPD faction in a letter to the Kurier which we published recently said: "They do not notice that President Truman and others are using them to rearm morally for new wars." In other words, that the movement of moral rearmament is an attempt of the war-hungry capitalists to find a moral facade for their offensive aims.

Now there is always the risk that idealists will be used by unsavory materialists. It would be foolish to deny such a possibility, especially in our time when Communist leaders are misusing the idealism of millions in a way that has alarmed the whole civilized world. But no one who knows or has understood the spirit and the people of Caux can really believe that impure elements could ever succeed in misusing their idealism.

We have said that millions of people today lack something, since democracy without an ideological basis loses itself in outward mechanics which cannot satisfy man, nor free him from fear, nor give him the capacity for sacrifice. The movement of Moral Re-Armament supplies this lack by giving the democratic system a moral foundation.

The head of the Parliamentary Communist faction, Mr. Rafoth, is quite right when he says that this idea was already born 1,950 years ago, but he is not right when he belittles as futile this world-spanning attempt to remake man from within. He and his ideological friends in the Kremlin know that in spite of all battles, in spite of all the progress and regress of Christianity and Christian culture, the edvelopment of the West and the New World has been determined by it, and that this ideology is still today the bulwark against the world victory of communism. Caux has set itself to the task of filling the Christian teaching with new lifeblood; of plunging into the middle of the problems of our time, saying to man that the changing of men and systems must always begin with man himself; that we must free ourselves from hatred and mistrust; that the road to reconciliation between the millions starts not with putting a moral challenge to your neighbor but with putting it to yourself, because only by your own personal example can you decisively affect the world around you.

Beliefs that come from inner conviction do not lose their value when someone rejects them as old. On the contrary, their age proves their indestructibility. The Bremen Communist Party does not say in its statement that the aim of Caux should be rejected, but that its realization is an illusion.

The people of MRA do not try to answer this argument by theoretical discussion. They prove the durability of their ideology by living it. Their world influence can be traced far beyond the expectations of so-called realist politicians, and it is this that gives them the happy inner certainty of being on the right road. Innumerable men and women who know the danger that threatens Christendom from the dedicated fanatics of the Communist ideology—far more than from their weapons—will follow on this road, because today the durability of the Caux movement is no longer an illusion but a reality.

FELIX VON ECKARDT.

A Reply to Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and member of Senate Finance and Armed Services Committees:

The President of the United States recently gave Mr. Arthur Krock an exclusive interview of universal interest. Mr. Krock is a brilliant journalist whose dispatches are meticulously accurate. The President has confirmed the accuracy of the report.

My name was mentioned in that part of the interview relating to the Federal fiscal situation. Under the circumstances, in the interest of both accuracy and clarity, I am compelled to comment on certain of the President's statements with respect to deficit spending, taxes, and reduction of Federal expenditures.

DEFICIT SPENDING

The President told Mr. Krock that in no sense does he tolerate deficit spending. He said he hates deficit spending as much as HARRY BYRD ever could, and it is only a temporary condition brought on by necessities which could not be removed by any genius of statecraft known or available to him.

In the five fiscal years President Truman has been in office the budget has been balanced twice and both of these occasions were during the Eightieth Congress. In 1947 there was a surplus of nearly $1,000,000,000. In 1948 there was a surplus of $8,500,000,000. For the coming year, beginning July 1, he does not even go through the formality of proposing a balanced budget, with or without additional taxes. In fact—in his budget message, in his economic report, and in his tax message—the President has advised Congress three times since January 1 against balancing his 1951 budget. From his record it would appear that he not only tolerates deficit spending but, in effect, he also recommends it.

If the President regards chronic deficit spending during peak prosperity as a fatal menace to our form of Government and free enterprise, as I do, the Federal budget would be balanced now with the full influence and prestige of his Office brought constantly to bear on this objective.

The President today is the chief obstacle to balancing the budget. I feel justified in saying this because he is now urging upon Congress the adoption of a budget more than $6,000,000,000 in excess of actual expenditures in 1948. This he calls a "tight" budget and he is resisting any reductions by Congress. In our fiscal affairs the President is taking the easy course of procrastination waiting for some unspecified time in the future to do what he should and can do now.

How many times have we heard that before? President Roosevelt used to say we'll balance the budget when we get out of depression and into prosperity. Now President Truman says we'll balance the budget when prosperity is greater.

If the Federal budget can't be balanced in years such as this when income and employment are at or near their peak, when there are no domestic emergencies, and when the need for economic assistance abroad is supposed to be diminishing, when can we balance it?

How long is "only a temporary condition" mentioned by the President in refering to deficit spending? If we follow the President's recommendations, a whole generation, within the coming year will have reached its majority under a deficit-financed government. We have been on a deficit basis in all but 2 years since 1930 and the President proposes it again for the coming year. If Congress, at the insistence of the President, authorizes the expenditure of billions more than the revenue during the year beginning July 1 it is probable that the budget never will be balanced again until we go over the precipice of financial disaster.

How long can we pile new deficits on a postwar debt of more than a quarter of a trillion dollars and expect democracy and free enterprise to stand the burden? Neither can exist in insolvency.

Two years ago the Federal Government spent $34,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1948. We balanced the budget, and there was a surplus. In that year, which ended only 19 months ago, when we spent $8,000,000,000 less than the $42,400,000,000 expenditure budget the President is requesting now, our economy did not disintegrate, our national defense was not impaired, and we were spending more for foreign assistance than the President now proposes. In the field of foreign spending the President in his pending budget proposes to spend $4,700,000,000 as compared to $4,850,000,000 in 1948 when total spending was $9,250,000,000 less than he now recommends.

Of the $8,250,000,000 difference between these two budgets $5,300,000,000 is for increased domestic-civilian projects, excluding foreign assistance, excluding national defense, excluding interest on the debt, and excluding the cost of veterans programs. The President now proposes to spend $12,200,000,000 for domestic-civilian projects, with all of the exclusions just mentioned, as compared with $6,900,000,000 for domestic-civilian projects in 1948.

These figures show that domestic-civilian expenditure increases total more than the $5,100,000,000 deficit for the coming year as estimated by the President. It follows that the deficit may be attributed largely to increases in expenditures for activities and programs which are not related to past wars or future defense. Compilation of increases in the domestic-civilian categories explodes the President's contention that the budget cannot be cut because of fixed charges resulting from previous wars and the requirements of our defense in the future.

TAXES

The President told Mr. Krock that "there wouldn't be any (deficit) if the Republicans had not cut the incomes taxes in the Eightieth Congress." He said tax changes should not be made piecemeal at any time, but they should conform to a general plan. He told Mr. Krock "this was equally true when he approved the repeal of the excess-profits taxes, and he wishes he had not done this." But, he said, he was "new at the job."

In his February 16 speech the President repeated his reference to the Republican tax cut and said "much of our present financial difficulty is the result of it."

This is not the first time the President has said deficits this year and next are attributable to tax reductions by the Eightieth Congress. He has also said the same thing about the deficit last year. This is another red herring of which he has made frequent use.

What are the facts?

He admits his own indorsement of a $6,000,000,000 reduction in excess-profits taxes on corporations enacted in 1945 when there was a $21,000,000,000 deficit, but he blames all recent, current, and future deficits on the Eightieth Congress, which followed up his corporation-tax reduction with a $4,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 reduction in individual income taxes made effective in fiscal year 1948 when there was a surplus of $8,500,000,000.

As in his February 16 speech, the President now says the 1948 income-tax reduction was "ill-timed and irresponsible," but in his state of the Union message dated January 7, 1948, he justified a 1948 income-tax reduction proposal of his own as follows: "During this period in which the high cost

of living is bearing down on so many of our families tax adjustments should be made to adjust their burden." No tax proposal could be more piecemeal or conform less to a general tax plan than his scheme to reduce each individual's income-tax bill by $40, with its $3,200,000,000 loss in revenue to be compensated by an increase in corporate profits taxes.

This proposal urged by the President instead of the 1948 tax bill, which he criticized so bitterly did not have a single advocate on the Senate Finance Committee and it never mustered sufficient appeal to be presented in the Senate as an amendment or otherwise.

Let us recapitulate the President's tax policy.

What tax proposals by the President have not been piecemeal? What tax proposals by the President constitute a general plan to which we may conform?

With respect to corporation taxes: In 1945 he endorsed the $6,000,000,000 reduction in corporation excess-profits taxes. In 1948 he proposed to restore $3,200,000,000 by increased taxes on corporate profits. In 1949 he proposed in the winter to increase corporate taxes by $4,000,000,000. In the summer he withdrew the proposal. By autumn he was talking again about increasing them. Now in the winter of 1950 he proposes to increase corporation taxes by half the amount he proposed a year ago.

With respect to individual income taxes: In 1948 the President proposed his own reduction of $40 per taxpayer, opposed the formula which was approved by both the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate, ignored the community-property amendment which had the support of both parties in Congress, and vetoed the 1948 tax bill, as passed, including the community-property-tax provision.

With respect to social security pay-roll taxes on individuals as well as business: He proposed last year to increase them by $2,500,000,000, and this year he is proposing an increase of $1,750,000,000. In neither case would the pay-roll taxes required for socialized medicine even begin to finance the program he proposes.

As to excise taxes, he now proposes to withdraw some, but not all, of the wartime levies.

How can private enterprise plan its expansion under such inconsistent and constantly changing tax proposals by the President of the United States? How can investors calculate their risks? How can heads of families assure their security? How can the Government keep its fiscal affairs in order?

Is it logical for the President to excuse his own approval of a $6,000,000,000 tax reduction in a deficit year and at the same time blame past, present, and future deficits on the Eightieth Congress, which reduced individual taxes by a lesser amount in a surplus year?

It would seem by the record that, if throughout future years we are to blame Federal deficits on the tax reductions in some prior year, the President must assume much of this responsibility.

EXPENDITURES

The President told Mr. Knock: Senators Gossett and Byrd "call for a reduction of $6,000,000,000 in the budget. They know it can't be done." He said he is an old hand at budget making. He told Mr. Knock "he has cut" the budget for fiscal year 1951 "as much as can be done in consideration of the basic needs of the foreign program and the dynamic domestic economy he seeks to create and maintain."

It is gratifying to learn that the President knows "the committees have a blueprint" for the budget. For years he has been saying no one would tell him where to cut it. Now the platitude is changed to say Senator Gossett and I know our proposals can't be accomplished. As a former Senator the President knows how difficult it is for Congress to reduce Federal expenditures without at least a sympathetic attitude by the President, and he knows it is practically impossible against open opposition by the President such as he has voiced three times this year since he sent in his new budget. Perhaps the President had this fact in mind when he said Senator Gossett and I know it can't be done.

To the contrary I am confident that a majority of Congress believes the budget can and should be reduced to a balance now and the fact that he is the principal obstacle will not deter determined efforts in Congress to bring this about.

I have suggested how it can be done in a budget outline detailing expenditures totaling $36,000,000,000. This reduction would be at least $6,000,000,000 under the President's requests. Senator GOSSETT, a hand of nearly 30 years' experience at Federal budget making, has announced his support for such a reduction.

A $36,000,000,000 budget would be $2,000,000,000 more than the budget of 1948, which was balanced by the Eightieth Congress, whereas in comparison with 1948 figures the President proposes to increase expenditures by over $8,000,000,000, more than half of which—I repeat for emphasis—would be in domestic-civilian expenditures unrelated in all respects to wars or rumors of wars. In this period of less than 2 years what has developed on the home-front horizon to justify an increase in domestic-civilian expenditures of near 100 percent?

It is not enough to say these expenditures are less in proportion to the national income than they were 10 years ago. The fact that the Federal tax-take alone out of the national income has increased 500 percent in the same 10 years is only one of the many factors which must be considered along with such a statement.

The record shows that as such programs as foreign assistance begin to expire more domestic-civilian programs are added.

The prosperity we have is suspended dangerously from the unpredictable economics of a Federal debt already more than a quarter of a trillion dollars. The President proposes that we increase the debt at the rate of nearly a half billion dollars a month. Under such a policy how long can we expect to maintain the domestic economy, the private-enterprise system or our form of government?

Democracy and freedom here and throughout the world depends upon the preservation of our solvency which is being jeopardized by growing debt and chronic deficits.

A $36,000,000,000 budget for progress, in tabular form with comparisons

[In billions of dollars]

Expenditure categories	Fiscal year 1948 (which ended June 30, 1948), actual	Fiscal year 1950 (which will end next June 30), estimated, Jan. 9, 1950	Fiscal year 1951 (which begins next July 1)	
			Byrd 36-billion dollar budget	President's Jan. 9 proposal
I. Domestic civilian (exclusive of veterans and interest)	6.9	11.4	8.9	12.2
Social welfare, health, and security	1.9	2.3	1.9	2.7
Housing and community facilities (including RFC secondary mortgages)	.1	1.0	1.0	1.3
Education and general research	.1	.1	.1	.4
Agriculture and agricultural resources (including CCC)	.6	2.7	2.2	2.2
Natural resources	1.1	1.8	1.2	2.2
Transportation and communication (including postal deficit)	1.3	1.9	1.2	1.7
Finance, commerce, and industry	.1	.2	-.1	.3
Labor	.2	.3	.2	.2
General government	1.5	1.2	1.0	1.3
II. National defense	11.0	13.1	11.3	13.3
III. Veterans	8.8	8.8	5.3	8.1
IV. Foreign	4.8	6.0	4.4	4.7
V. Interest on the Federal debt	5.2	5.7	5.7	5.8
Grand total expenditure budget [1]	34.3	42.3	36.8	42.4
Revenue [1]	42.2	[2] 37.5	[3] 37.5	[2] 37.5
Deficit, surplus	+8.0	[2] -5.5	[3] +2.0	[2] -5.1

[1] Detailed figures may not add precisely to totals due to rounding and omission of reserves.
[2] Maximum estimate.
[3] Minimum estimate.

What the taxpayers of each of the 48 States would save by the adoption of the $36,000,000,000 Byrd budget for the fiscal year 1951 as compared with the cost to each State of President Truman's proposed $42,400,000,000 budget

	Percent of Federal taxes borne by State [1]	Cost of Truman budget	Cost of Byrd budget	Saving under Byrd budget
United States total	100.00	$42,430,000,000	$36,000,000,000	$6,430,000,000
Alabama	1.17	[illegible]	421,200,000	[illegible]
Arizona	.37	157,024,000	133,300,000	23,624,000
Arkansas	.72	305,566,000	259,200,000	46,366,000
California	6.62	2,808,024,000	2,385,200,000	422,824,000
Colorado	.90	381,912,000	324,000,000	57,912,000
Connecticut	1.67	708,254,000	601,200,000	107,054,000
Delaware	.40	169,736,000	144,000,000	25,736,000
Florida	1.29	547,416,000	464,400,000	83,016,000
Georgia	1.61	594,140,000	504,000,000	90,140,000
Idaho	.32	135,808,000	115,200,000	20,608,000
Illinois	7.59	3,221,120,000	2,732,400,000	488,720,000
Indiana	2.28	971,552,000	824,400,000	147,152,000

[1] The formula used in estimating each State's share of Federal expenditures consists of 3 factors: (1) The percent of individual income taxes collected from each State; (2) the proportion of corporate income taxes borne by each State, measured by the State's percent of the national income; and (3) the proportion of excise and miscellaneous taxes (excluding social-security taxes), borne by each State, measured by the State's percent of total population. Thus we get a picture of Federal taxes borne by rather than received from, each State, which we believe more nearly reflects the true distribution of the Federal tax burden. Each of the 3 factors is weighted according to the percent each tax bears of the total Federal tax revenue (1949 figures): individual income taxes, 47.52 percent; corporation taxes, 30.42 percent; and excise and miscellaneous taxes, 22.06 percent; total, 100 percent.

What the taxpayers of each of the 48 States would save by the adoption of the $36,000,000,000 Byrd budget for the fiscal year 1951 as compared with the cost to each State of President Truman's proposed $42,400,000,000 budget—Continued

	Percent of Federal taxes borne by State [1]	Cost of Truman budget	Cost of Byrd budget	Saving under Byrd budget
Iowa	1.26	$[illegible]	$[illegible]	$[illegible]
Kansas	1.13	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Kentucky	1.20	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Louisiana	1.22	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Maine	.44	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Maryland	1.06	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Massachusetts	3.61	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Michigan	4.71	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Minnesota	1.86	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Mississippi	.71	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Missouri	2.14	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Montana	.35	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nebraska	.80	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nevada	.13	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
New Hampshire	.36	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
New Jersey	3.29	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
New Mexico	.28	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
New York	14.47	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
North Carolina	1.30	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
North Dakota	.30	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Ohio	5.78	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Oklahoma	1.27	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Oregon	1.04	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Pennsylvania	7.62	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Rhode Island	.56	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
South Carolina	.75	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
South Dakota	.38	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Tennessee	1.37	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Texas	4.38	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Utah	.34	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Vermont	.18	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Virginia	1.46	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Washington	1.42	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
West Virginia	.82	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wisconsin	1.10	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wyoming	.18	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Alaska	1.46	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

Source: Federal Spending Facts, prepared and published by Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Jan. 26, 1950.

How Rent Control Operates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter from an intimate friend of mine from Stockton, Calif. This man was one time an elected official of the State of California, voluntarily retiring from the office to devote his entire time to the practice of law. He is an able and respected member of the bar of California and a gentleman who is fair and equitable in all his dealings with his fellow men.

This letter shows what rent control does in specific cases, which probably could be multiplied by the hundreds of thousands in the United States.

During the war I believe that rent control was essential and for sometime thereafter I believed in rent control during the readjustment period due to the extreme shortage of houses, especially in my home State of California.

But that time has passed and we should now give those who have invested their life savings in real property and improvements thereon the same chance to obtain a return on their investments that other segments of our economy have. My experiences with the Rent Control Bureau have never been very satisfactory. I dealt with many specific cases, especially those of old people who had invested their life savings in rental property try to get adjustments but in practically every case were refused any adjustment. When the rent-control law went into effect they were renting their apartments and their flats at reasonable rentals. These figures remained in practically every case that I know about throughout the war and for some time thereafter, although the cost to the landlord in taxes kept getting higher and other things climbed higher. The instances cited in the enclosed letter illustrate the distortions that are practiced and can be practiced under rent control. For obvious reasons, I do not wish to disclose the name of the individual who wrote it—the main reason being that I have not received his permission.

I hope that everyone interested in rent control will read the letter, which is as follows:

Hon. J. LEROY JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You haven't heard from me for some time, have you? I want to urge on you not to vote for any more rent control when the present act expires. The thing has never been fair, as it has practically frozen all rents on the 1942 level, during which time not only expenses of operation; taxes, etc., have risen, but the ability of the tenants to pay rent in terms of dollars has doubled. Oh, yes, in occasional instances, by fighting the tenants at the rent office the landlord is able to get at most a 15-percent increase, as compared with a hundred-percent increase in almost everything else in the same period, including the tenant's income. We could put up with all that unfairness for a while, as long as there seemed to be a great scarcity of rental units. That scarcity, however, has ceased, except in isolated spots. In others there is an apparent scarcity, because of families spreading out in large houses which they can get for low rent, and one or two people occupy places which would easily accommodate five or six, without crowding. I have a tenant, who, when rent control went into effect, was occupying a seven-room house, with a family of three or four children. She was paying $20 per month. Upon my petition, the rent has gone up to $27.50 per month. Her children are grown up and gone. She can't rent a single room with kitchenette at that low a rent, so she continues to occupy the seven rooms all by herself, and I can't get her out as long as she pays the rent.

Another illustration: We bought a house in Carmel for a summer home. With the furnishings, it cost $20,000. In order to get some income from it during the times we did not intend to use it, we proposed to rent it. We had the rent director look over the property, and he gave us a figure of $175 per month as maximum rental. It had never been rented before. A tenant was not secured until last November. At that time the rental period was pretty well past. We secured a particularly desirable couple, and, because of the lateness of the season, and the fact that they appeared to be very fine people, and would take good care of the place, and only wanted it for a few months, we let them have it for $125 per month. We were then required to register the maximum rental for the place at $125 per month, because that is the rent we allowed this couple to pay. We are told now that, in order to increase it from $125 to $175, which the director himself admits it is worth, we will have to file a petition showing hardship, etc. We are further told that, having once rented it by the month, we can never rent it by the week to summer mountaineers at anything more than a pro rata of the low wintertime rental. The result of all this regulation is that, when we get that house back, we intend to take it off the rental market completely; then, rent control helps create a scarcity of housing.

A client just came in. Through an estate he acquired a house which had never been rented before. He offered it for rent fully furnished. A real-estate firm advised him that $95 was a fair rental. They secured a tenant who was willing to pay that amount and signed a written lease for a year, agreeing to pay it. The tenant was represented as having a family consisting of his wife and a small baby only. The tenant took possession, moving in himself, his wife, his wife's mother, a grown son, and three children. Shortly thereafter, he filed a petition to decrease the rental from the $95, which he freely and voluntarily agreed to pay, to $62.50. It is probable that petition will be granted. That kind of fraud is perpetrated on the owners and countenanced by the rent office constantly. Under this law a tenant cannot be held for the most palpable fraud, but the landlord can be assessed triple damages for some technical violation.

You may place no value on my personal opinion in this matter, but you can't get around what happens in actual cases. I have heard that once a Government bureau gets its tentacles on the public, it never lets loose. I hope this is one bureaucracy which you can help abolish.

With best regards, I am

Yours very truly.

Union Hiring Halls in the Maritime Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, already there are signs of the undermining effect of the Taft-Hartley law on American industry. The recent action of the United States Supreme Court, sustaining a lower court ruling of the maritime union hiring hall as illegal under the Taft-Hartley Act, brings closer to realization the disruptive influence of this ill-conceived piece of legislation.

In the maritime industry, more than anywhere else the Taft-Hartley ban on the closed shop poses a problem that must be reckoned with immediately. Otherwise a virtual break-down of the industry's ever-increasing efficiency of operations looms large. For the Taft-Hartley closed-shop ban not only strikes at the heart of the seafaring unions, but it is an immediate threat to the stability of the industry of which they are a part.

Management, as well as labor, stands to lose if the outlawing of the hiring hall is not rescinded.

Undoubtedly that was not the intention of the proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act. Nevertheless that is exactly what the closed-shop ban is on the verge of accomplishing in the maritime industry at least.

Any objective study of the maritime unions' hiring halls will demonstrate the value to all concerned of the continued use of this method of employment. These hiring halls are at the very core of the industry's operations. Arbitrarily to knock them out would inevitably upset the entire pattern of operations and invite a return to chaos, confusion, and even corruption.

I have observed the hiring halls, as maintained by the seafaring unions, in action. As a result of these observations I am unqualifiedly in favor of giving them legal status—for the simple reason that they have accomplished much in behalf of the American seamen and the American shipowner, with consequent advantage to our Nation.

On a recent stopover in New York, I visited the headquarters of the Atlantic and Gulf district of the Seafarers International Union, A. F. of L., for the purpose of establishing in my mind how the hiring hall principle was applied.

In the seafarers' hiring halls the seamen obtain employment through what is called the rotary system of shipping. A man who comes in for a job is registered and is given a shipping card. His name is then placed at the bottom of the shipping list, and as jobs are called out they are offered to the men at the top of the list.

The men at the top of the list may accept the jobs or reject them—without affecting their prior claim when another job is called. In this way the list rotates. In other words, jobs are distributed on a first-come-first-served basis. No other consideration enters the picture. The only qualification is the required competence for the job, and all eligible applicants have certificates of endorsement issued by the United States Coast Guard.

The rotary system is democratic in principle, and at the seafarers hall I witnessed it as democratic in practice.

This, then, is the method of employment which the SIU and other maritime unions are defending in their fight against the Taft-Hartley ban. And they are morally justified in doing so.

Anyone even slightly familiar with the sordid hiring practices in the maritime industry prior to the advent of the union hiring hall will readily admit the justification for the unions' stand.

In the preunion hiring hall days ships' complements were filled by the most odious means. Men were drugged and hustled aboard ships by unscrupulous characters who received fees for their piracy. A detestable breed of parasites known as crimps sunk seamen deep into debt, then forced them to take jobs aboard vessels under any kind of conditions as a means of releasing them from financial indebtedness.

A man who went after a job on his own was subjected to discourtesies and abuses which he had to bear lest he jeopardize his chance for employment. Seamen were stripped of every vestige of dignity. Understandably, the merchant marine could not be expected to operate efficiently in the midst of such medieval treatment of the men handling their vessels.

Merchant seamen like those in the SIU are determined to keep the present democratic method of job distribution, which, they maintain, is only possible through the medium of their union.

But the clincher in the argument for immediate action to return the union hiring halls to their pro-Taft-Hartley status is the fact that the shipowners themselves have indicated their desire to continue present hiring methods. From management's standpoint, dispatching men to ships from the union halls has proved to be decidedly economical.

Under the present hiring-hall system the shipowners know that their ships will arrive and leave on time. They know that their ships are in the hands of responsible, competent seamen who are demonstrating an ever-increasing responsibility.

In the light of conditions in the maritime industry today, the Taft-Hartley Act's ban is a mistake. It should be recognized as such. To sit by and do nothing to ward off the damage it could reek would simply be compounding the error.

A frank, objective approach indicates that remedial legislation is essential to correct the injustice of the Taft-Hartley ban on the hiring hall to the American seamen, the American shipowners, and to the Nation.

The Case Against Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Case Against Mr. Truman," published in the March 9, 1950, issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE AGAINST MR. TRUMAN

The outcome of the coal strike confronts the Truman administration with serious charges, of which it is bound to hear much in the future. Seldom has a government engaged in a series of concerted moves more calculated to undermine the authority not only of a particular law but of law in general. Mr. Truman may congratulate himself upon what he assumes to be the breakdown of the Taft-Hartley Act. But he shall find, in the long run, that he, and not the law, is called to account.

The political campaign which Mr. Truman has waged against Taft-Hartley, echoing the empty cry of "slave law," could not have been better devised to induce the miners into disobedience. Did they not have every reason to suppose that a law which was thus attacked by the Chief Executive would be enforced, if at all, in a half-hearted way? Mr. Truman's repeated denunciations might have been excused had they been part of a sincere attempt to have the law improved. Yet he blocked amendment deliberately. He might have had written into the law a plan for seizure, giving him in advance the weapon he sought desperately at the last moment; he might have had written into it a provision for fact-finding boards empowered to make recommendations. These amendments, as well as many others, were approved by Senator TAFT and would have been enacted except that Mr. Truman preferred to keep alive what he supposed to be a profitable political issue. To have continued his slurs upon the Taft-Hartley Act was, in these circumstances, a course of utter irresponsibility.

Having thus weakened the law's authority, the President proceeded to delay invoking it until the last possible moment. An Executive whose freedom from partisan motivation was entirely assured might have been given the benefit of the doubt in choosing his own moment to ask for an injunction. But the tardiness, coming on top of Mr. Truman's previous behavior, could only be interpreted as one more indication that he did not take the law seriously. It had the additional result of bringing the country so close to a severe catastrophe that time was not available for bringing the necessary legal processes to their end. An earlier resort to the Taft-Hartley injunction would have made possible an appeal from Judge Keech's decision, which might have left the legal situation entirely different from what it is now.

To crown all this, the Government's prosecution of the contempt case against the union was notably lacking in vigor. It will be observed that Judge Keech held it to be entirely conceivable that the strike in the face of the injunction had been ordered, encouraged, recommended, instructed, induced, or in some wise permitted by means not appearing in the record. The gist of his decision was simply that, evidence of this kind not having been presented, he could not convict on conjecture. But why was it not presented? Senator TAFT and others claim evidence to show that union officials recommended disobedience of the back-to-work order and that organized goon squads kept union members from the mines. It would certainly seem possible for the Government, where no clear an indication of union responsibility existed, to document the case effectively. Why was this not done? Or if it was done, why was the evidence not put in the record?

A persistent attitude and a long train of acts show the Truman administration to lie under the charge of having subverted the Nation's laws in the hope of gaining political advantage. That is as heavy a charge as can be made against a Chief Executive. It is inconceivable that a people conscious of the duties and the supreme responsibility of their President should soon forget it.

ITO Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by George Sokolsky dealing with ITO agreements, and with the effect such agreements are having on industry, especially the pottery and chinaware industry, particularly in the State of Ohio.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

While the State Department is pushing its multiple trade agreements and the internationalists are pressing for the adoption of the ITO agreements, another american industry is being squeezed to death by cheap-wage competition and dumping by dollar-anxious governments.

The item is chinaware and pottery.

This American industry is widely scattered and is held by comparatively small businesses. There is a concentration of pottery and chinaware manufacturing in the vicinity of Zanesville and East Liverpool, Ohio, but this is an unusual industry not only because it is widely scattered but also because there remain in it one- and two-man plants.

It is therefore difficult for chinaware manufacturers to exert great political pressures.

According to the Vitrified China Association, the wage scale of workers in this industry in 1948 was: the United States, $1.20 per hour; England, 43 cents an hour; Belgium, 31 cents; Germany, 30 cents; France, 26 cents; Italy, 25 cents; Czechoslovakia, 22 cents; Japan, 9 cents. And in this country, wages have gone up since then.

As labor costs are the biggest item in the production of this commodity, American labor cannot compete with low-scale wages, particularly when the tariff is manipulated to favor the foreign product.

I am told that over 100 small one- and two-man plants around Los Angeles have been driven out of business since the war, due to dumping from Japan.

Medium-grade chinaware is in competition with chinaware from Czechoslovakia. Considerable so-called Dresdenware is coming into this country marked Meissen, Czechoslovakia. But Meissen is not in Czechoslovakia; it is in Saxony, in east Germany, which is in the Russian zone.

In a word, our customs officials permit the Russians to fake a label. As there is no American consul in Meissen, the manifests are handled from our consulate in Prague as though it were Czechoslovakian goods.

Perhaps it really makes no difference, but there are Americans who would not buy Russian-made or controlled goods at any cost. Such persons are being fooled into buying this stuff on the assumption that it is Czechoslovakian and not Russian-zone goods, if it makes any difference.

Imports are on the constant rise. Although the total dollar volume of this generally low-priced commodity is not high, the effect of the imports on our industry is important and, in some places, disastrous.

An astonishing callousness toward American producers of chinaware was recently noted by Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, who called attention to the fact that American embassies use German (that is, Russian) chinaware in preference to the American-made. This was done without a bid, without advertising, without giving the American manufacturers a chance.

Allen (Allyn?) Donaldson of the State Department is reported to have explained this unusual attitude toward American goods as follows:

"The reason why we didn't advertise this thing was because we didn't want commission men to come down here from New York."

It probably would inconvenience Mr. Donaldson—take his time and that sort of thing.

The British have some regard for their own manufacturers. Senator BUTLER's report includes this letter, which to me makes sense:

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, November 8, 1949.

Mr. ROBERT F. MARTIN,
Vitrified China Association, Inc.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 31st of October, and would point out that, as the United Kingdom is itself the manufacturer of some of the finest chinaware in the world, we are not in the market for china manufactured elsewhere; nor do I think that any of the other embassies in the British Commonwealth would be interested in your proposal.

Yours very truly,

P. A. DE MOLTYNS.

After what happened to the Waltham Watch Co. in competition with Swiss watches, American producers of articles which compete with European and Asiatic goods ought to study the various measures which the internationalists have cooked up against us.

They cry that those who need dollars should be permitted to dump their goods into this country. It is even being suggested that if our industries go broke, the owners of companies are to be given a subsidy and American laborers a dole on condition that they do not produce American goods.

Servicemen's Readjustment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution adopted by the Revere City Council under date of March 6, 1950, at Revere, Mass.:

Resolution memorializing Congress relative to Public Law 346 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944

Whereas Public Law 346 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, more generally known as the GI bill of rights for World War II veterans, approved June 22, 1944, and specifically that portion which relates to readjustment allowances payable to honorably discharged veterans with 90 days or more of service, after September 16, 1940, was intended primarily to assist veterans to readjust themselves to civilian life by granting of security payments during the process of transition, up to a maximum of 52 weeks, with payment rates of $20 weekly; and

Whereas many veterans did not avail themselves of the benefits of said law because not in need during its life; and

Whereas many veterans are now in need, and whereupon others shall be in need in the future for like assistance as prevailed while the law was in force: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized that the provisions of said law be therefore revived and extended, such as to offer equal opportunity to those veterans who have not hitherto availed themselves of its provisions.

Proposed Benefits to Government Employees Who Retired Prior to April 1, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated February 6, 1950, addressed to me by George Cutler, president, Second Division, National Postal Transport Association.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL POSTAL TRANSPORT
ASSOCIATION, SECOND DIVISION,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1950.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: It has been with considerable regret and misgivings that I

have been following the slow progress of S. 878, a bill designed to give those employees who retired prior to April 1, 1948, certain deserved benefits which were unfortunately denied them under Public Law 426, Eightieth Congress.

All Federal civil-service employees are fully aware of the major role that you played in the enactment of the legislation best known to us as the Langer-Chavez-Gerrenson Retirement Act, and appreciate that many of its most favorable features would not have been incorporated therein but for your efforts.

We are also cognizant of the fact that you felt, as we did, that Public Law 426, despite your best efforts, contained a glaring inequity toward those employees that retired prior to the effective date of the act. These men, after a lifetime of faithful and efficient service, trying to exist on completely inadequate annuities in a period of runaway inflation, were offered the unfair choice of either a 10% annual increase in their annuities or a provision for a widow's annuity should they predecease their wives.

We can well appreciate the dilemma of these men, forced to choose between the $300 they needed so desperately to make ends meet and the protection that their lifetime helpmates were entitled to have in the event of the annuitant's prior death. Surely this was a terrible choice to inflict upon a faithful employee after a lifetime of service. It should not be forgotten also that these men contributed to the retirement fund during all of their service in dollars worth 100 cents while their annuities were being paid in dollars worth less than 60 cents in terms of relative purchasing power.

This inequity has now persisted almost 3 years and should be corrected without further delay and we are certain that you will do all in your power to secure enactment of S. 878 in the interests of justice and equity.

In common with all postal employees, let me again take this opportunity to express our appreciation for your constant efforts in our behalf and to assure you of our sincere gratitude for your interest in our problems.

Sincerely,

GEORGE CUTLER,
President, Second Division, National Postal Transport Association (Formerly the Railway Mail Association).

Government Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter signed "Sam Citizen," which appears in the February issue of the Swift News, published by Swift & Co. I believe the sentiments therein expressed are shared by millions of Americans. I am indebted to Joseph M. Nolan, a member of the City Council of Kansas City, Mo., for calling attention to this excellent little article.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERYTOWN, U. S. A., *1950.*

UNCLE SAM,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR UNCLE: Let's talk this thing over. Somehow I have had the idea you were working for me—that I gave you your job by my vote.

It looks now like the shoe is on the other foot. You've got me working for you. I don't quite know how it happened, but here are the figures:

	Days each year
To pay our debts for former wars I work	11
For defense and the cold war I work	24
For other Federal expenses, I work	12
Total	47

Now you're talking about spending more. If you put these bills across, they will cost me another 20 days per year. In addition, I have to work for State and local government expenses 14 days.

That is a total of 81 days. There are only 252 working days in a year. So, you and others are putting the bite on me in taxes for almost a third of everything I earn. And it hurts.

President Truman appointed a bunch of pretty smart people to study the problem of Government economy a while back. Their outfit was named the Hoover Commission. I'd like to see you follow their recommendations.

Now I know, Uncle, that I've asked you to do a lot of things for me. Too many, I guess, considering how much they all cost. If I depend on you to put aside more money for my old age and to meet my bills when I'm sick, somebody will have to pay. And if you're going to pay me whether I work or not, build me a house, and send my kids to college, there's just one thing that's certain. Your hand will be in my pocket all the time instead of just about one-third of the time, or else you'll be bankrupt. Credit is a great thing, but you can stretch yours too far just like I can mine.

So, what am I going to do about it? Well, Uncle, I'm going to let my Congressman know what I think we taxpayers can afford and what we can't pay for. And I'm going to tell him, too, that he has to limit spending to absolute necessities.

Yours truly,

SAM CITIZEN.

British Columbia—Forty-ninth State?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it is not my habit to insert personal letters in the RECORD, but I received yesterday one which I think contains an original suggestion with reference to proposed statehood bills, and I should like to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ZION, ILL., *March 6, 1950.*

United States Senator BUTLER,
Member, Interior and Insular Committee, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our local paper, the Waukegan News Sun, recently had an article referring to your stand on statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. The Chicago Herald American has been pushing this idea for weeks.

I believe definitely in your stand on blocking this action until we can use a more sane and realistic approach to our national safety.

My idea in writing to you is this. We Americans care nothing for the political angles, but what is best for all of us for our betterment as a whole and national safety problems. I have read many times of Canadians wanting to join us. Provinces or certain districts.

Why not start negotiations to see if British Columbia would vote to join us and make Columbia our forty-ninth State? Then Alaska would become the fiftieth State.

This is the best method to keep our borders contiguous and realistic in adding new States. Otherwise, to make far-away places or islands, States, is laughable.

This would make it possible to better build up our coast defenses of the west in radar and landing fields.

Hope this sounds sensible and await your kind consideration to your fellow Members. I am

Respectfully yours,

CHESTER G. ROSS.

The Real Damage Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 8, 1950:

LAW SEEN DAMAGED MORE THAN ECONOMY BY LEWIS' VICTORY—SYSTEM OF ENFORCEMENT AND LABOR REGULATION LOST BY COURT RULING

(By David Lawrence)

A survey of the wreckage strewn by John L. Lewis and the mine workers' union shows much more serious damage to the fabric of law and order than to the Nation's economy.

What was lost in dollars and cents by the mine owners and by the miners and the disinterested public is not as great as the injury done to the whole system of law enforcement as well as to the field of labor-management regulation by law.

For from now on all union officers have a precedent encouraging them to defy court injunctions and court orders merely by claiming that the individual members act spontaneously and not by concerted decisions.

John Lewis readily gave up the clause in the contract declaring that his members would mine coal only when "able and willing." This clause became superfluous the moment Judge Keech's decision was rendered. Wildcat strikes and so-called unauthorized work stoppages now can be undertaken apparently without fear of the orders of a court which heretofore would have been expected to secure compliance with its orders to desist from violation of contract law or the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

EVIDENCE SUPPRESSED

What is worse is the way the administration here, unchecked thus far by Congress, has suppressed evidence showing how the court's injunction was flouted by a conspiracy inside the miners' union. Thousands of words of affidavits told the Justice Department attorneys plainly how the mine unions held local meetings throughout the coal fields several days in advance of the expected issuance of a court injunction and how, by word-of-mouth arrangements, the plan was engineered to disregard the telegrams sent by their own officers at the behest of the court.

Now John L. Lewis boasts in the newsreels shown in the moving-picture theaters throughout the Nation this week that his union "discredited the Taft-Hartley abomination"—by which he means, of course, the injunction provisions that constitute its teeth. He is right—the union has discredited not only the law but the whole system of enforcement of the orders of the Federal courts of America.

The State courts have also been damaged in prestige. Although many suits have been filed alleging a violation of laws governing restraint of trade by means of the 3-day week and other controls over production, the operators, as a condition toward getting the Lewis signature on the contract, were compelled to agree to drop all such suits and in effect, withhold from the State authorities any evidence to prove law violations. Thus is economic duress used to break down the proper functioning of State courts.

GAINS NEW INFLUENCE

Most important is the new influence which Mr. Lewis gains over the whole labor movement. Though not in the AFL or CIO, he has begun to dominate them both. He offers $1,000,000 to Walter Reuther's auto workers, sends back the $500,000 which Philip Murray's steelworkers sent him and revives his idea of a mutual-aid pact for defense whereby the hundreds of millions of dollars amassed from workers' dues shall be used to buy legislation and influence the election of those who will do the bidding of union groups. Mr. Lewis frankly admits, in a recently published biography, that he paid $500,000 to the Roosevelt administration to buy the passage of the Wagner labor-relations law.

Mr. Lewis also has led the way to something else—far more significant. He is the first labor leader to achieve for his union a 2-to-1 control of the trustees of a big pension fund and involving shortly about $300,000,000 of money. Other union leaders will demand the same thing now.

Mr. Lewis bids fair by his challenges to make a last supreme effort to bring about a dictatorship by means of a working alliance among the big unions. The other leaders may be jealous of him, but he has demonstrated to the rank and file that he is bigger than Presidents or Congresses—they become putty in his hands.

The abuse of the public interest in the coal controversy brings nearer the day when an exhausted and desperate public will demand some form of Government control of both unions and industry.

Labor Curbs in Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Labor Curbs in Britain," and an editorial dealing with the same subject, published in the Wall Street Journal of March 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR CURBS IN BRITAIN

(The following report on the extent and use of labor controls by the British Government was written by Allan Flanders, formerly an official of the Trades Union Congress of Great Britain. It is condensed from Labor and Industry in Great Britain, a quarterly review, published by the British Government. For a discussion of this report, see the editorial "Never? Well, Hardly Ever" in today's review and outlook columns.)

In discussing the controls over Britain's economy, there is usually very great misunderstanding over the extent to which labor is controlled.

It is true that Britain has retained in the years since World War II some statutory controls over the movement of labor from one occupation to another. Unfortunately, however, the purpose, nature, and extent of these controls are not always understood or even correctly reported, with the result that sometimes strange and unrecognizable pictures are formed of the industrial life of Britain's workers.

Let us first glance, however, at the reasons why it has been necessary in postwar Britain for the government—with the full support of the trade unions—to exert any influence on the movement of labor. Basically this is due to the maintenance of full employment. As long as the fear of unemployment forced most workers to keep to whatever jobs they could find, no industries were seriously bothered with the problem of a labor shortage. Full employment has given to the workers a new industrial freedom.

THE UNDERMANNED INDUSTRIES

According to their qualifications they can choose a job to their liking, one in which the wages and working conditions taken together seem likely to provide them with the maximum satisfaction. During a transition period this new freedom was bound to lead to the existence of undermanned industries. In the long run a relative improvement in the wages and conditions in these industries—which has already taken place to some considerable extent in agriculture, coal mining, and textiles—is likely to overcome their labor shortage. But this takes time and the rate of improvement is limited by many other considerations. In the meantime there is an urgent need to match full employment with full production and to ensure that essential work is not held up by the lack of essential workers.

The control-of-engagement order, introduced in October 1947, has been the main legal instrument employed for this purpose. Under this order workers within certain categories of employment (excluding most salaried occupations) and within age limits (18 to 41 for women and 18 to 51 for men) have to report to an employment exchange when they are out of work. Subject to the important qualification that it should be suited to their industrial qualifications, they are offered work in the essential industries, from a list of first-preference vacancies. They are not, however, compelled to accept any of these vacancies providing they look for some form of essential work.

Very often the employment exchanges receive applications from workers to take jobs which they have found for themselves, or from employers to engage particular workers. Although they may seek to persuade the workers concerned to accept first-preference vacancies, the exchanges are not allowed to use the order to prevent workers from taking employment of their own choice providing it is essential.

THE VALUE OF PERSUASION

The value of persuasion can be illustrated by the fact that in 1948 the total manpower employed in the principal first-preference industries increased by 3 percent (in textiles it was as high as 6 percent) as compared with 1.1 percent in other industries and services. The results since April 1949, however, have been less striking, partly because the requirements of many first-preference industries for additional manpower have become smaller, more specialized, and harder to fill.

It is true that the wartime powers of direction of labor are still retained by Britain's Government, but these powers have been used almost exclusively to prevent workers from leaving coal mining and agriculture. Since October 1947 in all 473 mine workers and 159 agricultural workers have been refused permission to leave their industries, but this particular control has now been withdrawn. Otherwise direction has been used in only 29 cases out of some 9,500,000 vacancies filled by the Ministry of Labor since the introduction of the control-of-engagement order.

The problem of the undermanned industries has been eased a good deal in the past 2 years, partly because of the influx of foreign workers into civilian employment in Britain. But some industries—notably textiles—are still short of manpower. Moreover, there is an immediate need following devaluation of sterling for measures which would help to secure some redistribution of labor in favor of the dollar-earning and dollar-saving industries.

NEW METHODS OF EASING LABOR MOBILITY

The National Joint Advisory Council to the Minister of Labor, on which the British Employers' Confederation, Britain's Trade Union Congress, and the nationalized industries are represented, has, in fact, been considering whether there should not be some overhaul of the present procedure under the control of engagement order. As yet no decisions have been announced, but it is most unlikely that there will be any attempt to use the powers of direction.

A tightening up of the administration of the Control of Engagement Order has also been considered. This may take the form of limiting the range of jobs offered to workers by employment exchanges to less than four or more alternatives usually provided at present. A shorter list of priority industries may be drawn up and employment exchange managers may be encouraged to consider the merits of individual firms in their districts in regard to dollar earning or saving.

In short, Britain is still confronted with the problem of moving workers to essential work, but encouraged by her past experience she continues her efforts to solve the problem without using the equally undesirable compulsions of outright direction or unemployment.

SHALL WILL, HARDLY DARE

No government in history, Sir Stafford Cripps once remarked, has ever succeeded in managing an economy without using compulsion on labor.

But the British Socialist government, he added, was going to prove it could be done, that a free people could have a planned economy without compulsory labor. Britons never, never, shall be slaves.

In an adjacent column this morning we print a report on the compulsions used on British labor by the Socialist government to support its planned economy. This report is intended as a defense of the Government's labor policy; it was written by a former official of Britain's Trades Union Congress and a friend of the Labor government, and it was published by the official British Information Service.

This report speaks unintended volumes.

The Socialist government, says Mr. Flanders proudly, has used compulsion against British workingmen in a total of only 661 cases. These have been almost exclusively to prevent workers from leaving coal mining or agriculture; otherwise, compulsion has been used in only 30 cases. Furthermore, workers have never been compelled to accept a specific job provided they would look for some form of essential work, i. e., work the Government considered essential.

Now, this is a fine tribute to the moderation of the Socialist government. In all Britain only 661 persons have had to be put to forced labor to fit the plans, doubtless a matter of great comfort to the coal miners who could not leave the coal mines and to the farm hands who could not leave the land.

Once, it is true, there was an ugly name for the practice of chaining a man to a job. It was called serfdom. But now it is called "a new industrial freedom."

In this new industrial freedom the powers of compulsion are not used promiscuously or by whim. They are invoked only because it is at times "necessary to secure some redistribution of labor" and only when the Government's plans are "confronted with the problem of moving workers to essential work." The planners are proud that this is hardly ever.

It is most unlikely, says Mr. Flanders, that there will be any greater attempts to use the powers of direction in an absolute sense. The most that is now being considered is a limitation of the range of jobs offered to workers to less than four, the number usually provided a man at present. The worker can take any job he likes so long as he likes one of the two or three approved by the Government. The Socialist planners, encouraged by their past experience, will continue their efforts to plan for greater freedom without using undesirable compulsions.

No government in history, Sir Stafford Cripps once remarked, has ever succeeded in managing an economy without using compulsion on labor.

Veterans' Hospital for South Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, It has often been said that while the battle wages and the sacrifices of our patriots are fresh memories in the hearts of our countrymen, the soldier and veteran need not worry about the American Government doing its utmost to compensate him for his sacrifices; but that as war, with all its tragedies, becomes more distant in our memories, the Government tends to forget its responsibilities to these men.

A true example of this can be cited in the plight of the veterans in south Texas. They recently received an order from the Government eliminating 125 contract beds awarded to the Veterans' Administration for treatment of service-connected and emergency cases in the south Texas area. This is an area comprised of 30,000 square miles and having within its perimeter well over 170,000 veterans.

This is a new country and a rapidly growing country in which civilian hospitals have not been able to keep pace with the increase in population. Throughout south Texas all civilian hospitals are filled to capacity. A check of these hospitals in the area shows that they have no surplus beds that might be used for veterans even if reimbursement from the Veterans' Administration were possible.

The only facilities for treatment of veterans in south Texas are Brooke General Army Hospital in San Antonio and the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Houston. These two hospitals are approximately 400 miles from the valley and it is obviously hazardous for acutely ill patients to travel such long distances. In the case of mental patients who are often violent, they have to be confined in local jails until arrangements can be made to transport them over these vast distances to a veterans hospital that can accommodate them—a tragic reward for a man who has donned his country's uniform and through his sacrifices has become mentally or physically ill.

The hospital at Corpus Christi, although not in my district, is adjacent to it and the 125 beds therein which were designated for veterans use have been of considerable assistance in helping us meet part of our problem. The Veterans' Administration states that throughout the country we have an average of 1 bed available for every 423 veterans. Compare this with the veterans of our area who have over 170,000 veterans within a 30,000 square mile area and not one bed available for either service-connected or emergency cases.

The hospital at Corpus Christi was placed in operation on July 1, 1941. It is well constructed and could not be duplicated for twice the original cost of prewar construction. It has excellent planning, each ward having a glass-enclosed room for the nurse with every bed in sight at all times.

I have been told that the elimination of these 125 contract beds was for the purpose of economy, but I cannot believe that a careful study was made or the result would have been otherwise. A check of the daily food cost per patient shows an average of $1.08, which is an unusually low food cost. At present the daily patient cost is $13.53, and if the 125 contract beds are denied and it is reduced to 100 beds for naval personnel only the cost will rise to $20 a day or approximately 50 percent above the present cost of hospitalization. The hospital is now adequately staffed, but some specialists will still be required in various categories to serve the 100-men hospital. A reduction of over 50 percent in the beds will result in a reduction of only 4 doctors, 10 nurses, and 30 corpsmen. At the present time the hospital has a manager and medical assistant, 1 psychiatrist, 1 chief surgeon, 1 chief medical service, 1 EENT specialist, each having an assistant; 1 urologist, 1 laboratory specialist, 3 obstetricians, 1 dental officer, and 1 administrative assistant, a total of 23 medical specialists. There are 23 nurses and 124 corpsmen on duty.

At the present time there are 111 war veterans in this Navy hospital. A survey shows that 30 percent have service-connected disabilities and this is considerably above the national average. Eighty-one veteran patients are nonservice connected but were admitted as emergency cases. Of these 81 patients none could afford to pay for private hospitals.

One patient interviewed by the American Legion field representative is a Legion post commander from Bay City, Tex. He states that he was unconscious when admitted for pneumonia and came to while under an oxygen tent. He said he would have died if emergency hospitalization had not been possible.

Once more it appears that too often our Government departments look to the veterans first when they must economize in the Government. We have been told that the best prophet is a man with a good memory. We have but to remember the attack on veterans' services following the First World War to realize where this present trend is headed. The economy proposed in this measure is, indeed, a false economy, for a study of the facts shows that if these veterans are transferred to other hospitals, as is set out in the order, the cost to the Veterans' Administration will be considerably more. In turn, the taxpayer will suffer because of this ill-advised, so-called economy move. The total per diem cost for treating patients in VA hospitals throughout the United States averaged $15.41 as compared to the daily cost of $10.75 for VA patients in the Navy hospital. If the order is carried out, it will be an additional cost to the taxpayer of $4.66 per patient, or $552.50 a day more than would be expended in the present hospital at Corpus Christi. This amounts to $201,662.52 per year. The argument that this is an economy move just does not make sense in view of the figures shown. In addition to this, it will result in not only an inconvenience to the veterans of this area but the possible loss of life due to a lack of facilities for emergency treatment in the distance to hospitals that can take care of the patient. In addition to the increased cost to the Veterans' Administration for taking care of these patients at other points, the Navy, too, will bear an increased cost of $6.94 per patient, or $263,155 a year.

I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee in asking that this order, along with similar curtailments of hospital facilities, be delayed until a congressional investigation of the matter can be made. I have been told by members of that committee that a subcommittee will personally investigate the proposed reduction at Corpus Christi and will visit the base hospital this month. In the name of the veteran and the taxpayer, I ask revocation of this unwarranted and ill-advised order for reduction of VA hospital beds at Corpus Christi.

Depletion Allowance Vital to Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of February 24, 1950:

DEPLETION ALLOWANCE VITAL TO DEFENSE

An oil well is not like a factory. Except for normal wear and tear on buildings and equipment, a manufacturing plant can be expected to go on producing at approximately the same rate year after year without losing its productive capacity, and with only periodic need for new large-scale capital investment. But every time an oil well produces a barrel of oil it is that much nearer to exhaustion. Every barrel of oil brought to the surface drains away part of its capital assets and diminishes the value of the property.

So the oil producer, if he wants to maintain his producing level, must be constantly engaged in the search for new oil. That is roughly analogous to the problem that would face a manufacturing concern if it had to build a new plant, or add substantially to its present plant, each year. The cost of searching for new oil, with wells now being drilled deeper and deeper, is high. And, as anyone with even the most casual knowledge of the oil industry can testify, it is an extremely hazardous and uncertain business.

That, in substance, is the picture painted by L. F. McCollum, president of Continental Oil Co., in a Fort Worth speech before seventh district members of the Texas Bankers Association to show why the administration's effort to abolish or drastically reduce the present tax allowance for depletion of oil wells is unwarranted and dangerous. The theory of this allowance is that the oil industry should be given special tax consideration if the new capital required to seek out and develop new sources of oil is to continue to be available.

This depletion allowance of 27½ percent of the gross income of each oil-producing property is in no sense a loophole in the tax laws but a percentage fixed by Congress in 1926 as a result of actual experience in the rate of exhaustion of oil fields. It is entirely in accord with the principle that capital should not be taxed but only the income from capital. It is recognition also of the the high risks involved—risks which make it possible that the producer has sunk much money into drilling dry holes before he brought in the well on which he is allowed to recover his capital tax-free.

Even in proven oil territory, as Mr. McCollum pointed out, one out of every five wells drilled turns out to be a dry hole. For purely exploratory drilling, this percentage of failures naturally is much higher. In 1949, 82 percent of the wildcat wells drilled in the United States were dry. Of all the wells drilled in this country last year—wildcats and development wells (those drilled in supposedly proven areas)—more than one of three was a dry hole.

Money invested in such operations is risk capital indeed, and if the tax incentive is wiped out or substantially reduced there may be few who will be willing to take the gamble. The ultimate results of a sharp lessening of the effort to find new oil reserves are not difficult to see: Less domestic oil available, dependence of the United States upon foreign oil which could be cut off in the case of war and price-manipulation in time of peace, shrinking incomes of oil producers and the many businesses dependent upon the petroleum industry, lower State revenues which would have to be made up from other sources. These unwelcome prospects bear out Mr. McCollum's statement that not only would all the public be made to suffer from a change in the tax allowance, but the national security might be seriously menaced.

As Mr. McCollum also pointed out, the attack on the tax status of the oil industry comes at a time when it is harassed from other directions. The postwar demand for crude oil has slackened its rate of rise just at a time the industry has completed a $1,750,000,000 program to increase its productive capacity. A flood of foreign oil began to pour into the United States just at a time when domestic demand was dropping behind domestic supplies, and these imports show no sign of slackening. The British announced a policy which freezes American dollar oil out of much of the world market, thereby bringing the prospect of release of even more American-produced foreign oil into the United States.

All this, plus the threat of drastic revision of the tax law, falls with especial harshness upon the independent producers—the little fellows of the oil industry. They are the men who, according to Mr. McCollum's figures, in 1948 put down 78 percent of all the development wells drilled in the United States and who are responsible for most of the wildcat oil discoveries.

Texas, as producer of 40 percent of the Nation's oil, already has seen the effect of sharp production cut-backs upon its State finances. The $26,000,000 State deficit in prospect at the end of the current fiscal year is directly due to the tax loss resulting from lowered oil production. Further discouragement of production would deal a heavy blow to a tax structure which is already wobbly.

Mr. McCollum calls it a fantastic paradox that the Government on one hand is trying to curtail future oil production ability in order to increase tax revenues, and on the other is proposing to spend millions of dollars to develop means for producing synthetic fuels. Quantity production of such substitute fuels is still years in the future. Meantime the oil industry, if not hamstrung by a penalizing tax policy, is capable not only of producing to meet the Nation's peacetime needs but of building up the capacity which would be vital in the case of emergency.

If the ill-advised policies now being advocated in Washington had been in effect before World War I the United States could easily have lost that conflict instead of winning it. And if those policies had been put into effect prior to World War II the United States could not have won that war either.

It has been said many times that the ability of this country to produce enormous quantities of oil from reserves already located and proven spelled the difference between victory and defeat. Are we foolishly to close our eyes to the lessons of the past?

To adopt an unrealistic tax program that would discourage oil exploration, or to smother the domestic petroleum industry by unrestricted imports of foreign oil would be to trifle inexcusably with our national economy and the Nation's defense.

Address of Gen. Omar N. Bradley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before the Women's National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on Wednesday, March 8, 1950:

It would have been easier for the American people if the mantle of world leadership had fallen across their shoulders in a time of peace and international harmony. Circumstances, however, have willed it otherwise. The economic, political, spiritual, and military leadership of the Western World has devolved upon us in the midst of a cold war of economic distress, political insecurity, and international tension.

For 4 years after World War II, Americans thought more about reconstruction than defense, more about peace than about war. In the background lurked the ominous shadow of the atomic bomb. But we alone held the atomic weapon.

However, in the past 6 months since the President's announcement of an atomic explosion in the Soviet Union, the American public has given more thought to the possibility of war. There has been increasing doubt about our own security, and continued preoccupation with Russian capabilities of aggression.

This international tension has fostered national confusion. If we allow this confusion to persist, we can only expect a future period of national frustration. In our bafflement, we could make errors in judgment and action that would do us irreparable harm.

American leaders, with the full support and understanding of the American people, can dispel the present confusion by thinking sensibly, calmly, and clearly about national security.

On the foreign policy of our Government, and its supporting military strength, rests the confidence of all friendly nations.

If Americans intend to pursue a course leading to an increasing security, it is essential that they give more attention to long-range plans for defense. This Nation has adopted a long-range policy of international peace, and international collective security. This policy needs the support of a sound, long-range military policy that cannot be bent by each shift in the wind, tempered, or softened from day to day.

If the military preparations behind the iron curtain become the barometer for our national policies, then the likelihood of peace becomes as unpredictable as the March weather.

The headline phrasing of the question for 1950 is this: Are the United States defenses adequate? This question may be an oversimplified statement of the confusion on defense matters.

If we believe that war is to be thrust upon us in the near future, a $13,000,000,000 budget fails to provide the air power, the naval power, and the ground units essential to waging it by ourselves.

But our question can no longer be applied only to United States defense. For in the studied opinion of any aggressor, the industrial, commercial, and cultural prime of the world is western Europe.

Our defense needs, and our appraisal of adequacy, must include all of the friendly nations of the North Atlantic Treaty organization, as well as those other nations in

Europe whose security is tied in with our own.

As we study the problem of our own security, we must realize that our first goal is the prevention of war. The program for gaining this objective is the responsibility of the President, the Congress, and the President's Cabinet advisers, among whom the most important is the Secretary of State.

At the same time, however, it is the responsibility of the Secretary of Defense and his military advisers to assist in the programs for peace. The Department of Defense must provide the military backing for these national policies.

Several hundred thousand men and women of the National Military Establishment are overseas engaged in such activities for the Nation. Our occupation forces in the Far East, and in Europe, and all the supporting naval and air forces, are engaged in carrying out national commitments which are a sequel to World War II, and a preface to the world peace which we hope to attain.

It is obvious that a great portion of the defense budget is expended in this role of the Defense Department. The Joint Chiefs of Staff devote a great part of their thought and effort to the support of these programs. Many of the papers handled by the Joint Chiefs of Staff from day to day are for these specific purposes, in order that we can advise the President, through the Secretary of Defense, on the military implications of the plans, programs, and actions involving national policy.

If these programs and policies of the peace offensive at any time falter or break down, then we are charged with the protection of the United States by armed force, and the ultimate protection of any nation or group of nations whom the American people acknowledge as allies.

Our basic military structure consists of two main elements—the forces in being, and the mobilization base. Because the United States will not make war of its own volition, a fact as apparent to any aggressor as it is to us, our forces in being are maintained at a strength which can prevent disaster in the event we are attacked, and which can strike a retaliatory blow that will be strong enough to slow down the aggressor while we mobilize. It would be economically foolhardy and politically inconsistent for us to maintain forces in being sufficient to win a major war.

Our mobilization base must provide the educational, training, and logistical facilities that will assure us of a quick expansion of the armed forces in order that we can eventually bring the full might of this Nation, in conjunction with allied nations, to bear upon the enemy.

The forces in being must be maintained at sufficient strength, and with sufficient weapons, to protect the United States and to hold the bases which we would need in case of war. The Navy must have the capacity of keeping the sea lanes open to these bases, and to our allies. At present, the greatest threat to this ability is the modern submarine. Admiral Sherman's submarine program and his antisubmarine program must go along as fast as our research and development facilities will permit. We must not stint on any well-conceived and coordinated plan for solving the submarine menace. I am glad to be able to tell you, from my personal observation, that we are progressing rapidly in this field.

The Army has managed to effect the savings demanded in the present budget and still provide 10 divisions of ground forces, plus additional regiment combat teams, with their essential combat-support and supply units.

The Air Force program at present is building toward 48 groups, which, in many respects, are larger and stronger than similar groups that were in existence 2 years ago.

The present forces cannot give the United States an absolute guaranty against a disastrous blow. But these balanced forces are a part of the longer-range plan to provide an optimum chance of withstanding an attack, to be followed immediately by mobilization.

Our stock pile of atomic bombs, and our ability to deliver them, affords us an immediate but inconclusive blow of retaliation. Our research and development program, not only in bombs and missiles, but in other weapons and techniques, if properly maintained and supported, should continue to improve the position of the United States and its friends.

Our mobilization base, which includes our industrial mobilization program, demands constant and careful evaluation. When budget economy cuts out an Army division, or a Navy ship, or an Air Force squadron, it is quickly apparent. But when a budget economy cuts sharply into the mobilization base, its effect is not so readily apparent. It is in this field that reductions may do us great harm for the long pull, and yet it is in this field that cut-backs can be most readily applied.

During the past year, the Department of Defense has reported a continuing program of economy to the people of the United States, and there have been publicly expressed grave doubts as to whether these economies had adversely affected our security. It is unfortunately true that no matter how hard we try, in many instances real savings can only be made by cutting down the funds allowed. To cut out the fat and build the muscle, you frequently have to cut out the rich diet. Wartime habits of operation in a hurry, at a greater expense, are hard to break, but once broken, improved efficiency with real savings is the result.

In some measure, this present $13,000,000,000 budget cuts the pocketbook for economy's sake, and, we hope, for improved efficiency in the next fiscal year. There are real evidences that duplications and extra expenses have been curtailed. For that reason, I went along with the present budget reduction, feeling sure that in the long run we could improve our security.

At the conclusion of World War II, with this Nation feeling sure that further combat was not required, the fighting units were demobilized faster than the service units and the shore stations. As we have moved further from World War II, and have taken care of as much property that was left over from the war as we could, having disposed of some and stored some, we can now cut back on service and shore establishments.

At present, I feel that the economies in our defense structure have not cut too deeply into our mobilization base. On the other hand, I also feel that further economies in some of the mobilization programs, including industrial preparedness, should not be effected without very careful consideration of what it may mean to the United States security in 5 or 10 years. Secretary Johnson and I agree on the importance of the mobilization base.

One of the most important duties assigned to the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the recommended allocation of funds to the three services. In this area, the defense plans come face to face with dollars, and with the basic question of whether or not we are providing adequate security. However, in the preparation of this budget for fiscal year 1951, cognizance has been taken of the fact that the size and expense of our armed forces must not be allowed to destroy the economy of this country. It is frankly acknowledged that this latter consideration is not within the purview of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, nor the Secretary of Defense.

In regard to our budget, I must refer once more to the concern of the American people with Russian military capabilities. Over a long period of peacetime, the United States should not expect to match the Soviet Union plane for plane, ship for ship, division for division without lowering its standard of living.

It is truly understood that forces in being, including ground, air, and Navy are not sufficient now to fight a major war. Nor would they be sufficient for such a calamity by the end of the fiscal year of 1951.

But I feel that we are going to achieve the necessary forces to prevent a disastrous attack from crippling this Nation. I also believe that our forces in being, and our mobilization base, will be sufficient, together with the forces and potential of friendly nations, to win a war if it comes.

Whenever we count up our armed forces, we must include the dependable forces of the friendly nations who are allied with us toward a common goal of prolonged peace and collective security. Even now, if we take account of our total planes, and ships, and of the ground combat units, the relative position is not as insecure as indicated at first glance. As time goes on, we will be able to count even more effective units in the air force, navy, and army units of friendly nations, if we continue present programs of mutual assistance and collective strategic planning.

If it is the desire of the American people to assemble forces that will statistically give the United States a preponderance of military power next year, then we shall have to become an armed camp. We will have to lower the American standard of living, and I am sure, permanently adopt large peacetime conscription. Eventually, such forces will be a drain, not only on the economy but on democracy and its many freedoms.

I have stated many times that, in my opinion, we may be able to work out a solution to this international conflict without a war; that I hope we can work out a solution for permanent peace; that we can combine our military potential and our peaceful intention in a strategy for peace.

These statements are based on the assumption that we, the American people, are always going to insist on remaining strong—economically, politically, and militarily. If we do not maintain this strength—and especially if we become confused to the point of disarmament—we will sacrifice any possibility that this Nation may finally forge a lasting peace.

In summary, I believe that: We are building toward sufficient forces in being to avert disaster and to retaliate vigorously in case we are attacked. We have a mobilization potential which will insure victory in the end; and we must combine with friendly nations for collective security.

Study of Monopoly Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I am including herein a copy of a letter and enclosures which I addressed to the Federal Trade Commission and to the Attorney General of the United States as a result of recent hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power:

MARCH 9, 1950.

Hon. J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
The Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: A case meriting investigation by the Department of Justice has come to my attention. I refer to the testimony adduced during the recent hearings on a proposed bill to amend the Webb-Pomerene Act when a representative of the Typewriter Manufacturers Export Association testified before the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power. I have personal doubts as to the legality of the operations of the members of this association both in the export and domestic markets.

Although the Webb-Pomerene Act confines exemption from the antitrust laws to an export association "entered into for the sole purpose of engaging in export trade and actually engaged solely in such export trade * * *," this association, according to testimony, "has concerned itself primarily with agreements relating to trade practices and the gathering and dissemination of statistical information relating to typewriter exports," while "each of the members has continued to do its own selling as before." Has this been organized as a paper corporation seeking to obtain the benefits of the Webb-Pomerene Act while refraining from engaging in export trade as defined by that act?

What has been the attitude of the Department of Justice toward this corporate structure? Here are the words of the association's own representative:

"Before our association was organized we submitted a memorandum with respect to its purposes and a copy of its proposed bylaws to the Department of Justice, and they made certain suggestions as to certain changes that they thought were desirable, and those changes were incorporated, and they said they had no objection to it."

What has been the attitude of the Federal Trade Commission? The association's representative claims that the "Federal Trade Commission over the years has interpreted the statute as permitting associations of the type such as ours." It was also testified to that the Commission has never set foot within the association's office to examine its records or to subject it to close administrative surveillance.

The members of this Export Association have apparently not been content to take advantage of the deficiencies in interpretation and enforcement of the Webb-Pomerene law, as a glance at their behavior in the domestic market will reveal. The four members of this association, Underwood Corp., Remington Rand, Inc., Royal Typewriter Co., Inc., and L. C. Smith and Corona Typewriters, Inc., manufacture over 90 percent of the typewriters produced in this country. This Big Four was indicted by the United States on July 28, 1939, for engaging in many reprehensible practices, among them price-fixing. A civil complaint was likewise filed against them and a consent-decree entered perpetually enjoining them from fixing or determining the prices to be charged in the sale of typewriters. But almost 10 years after the entering of that decree, prices quoted by these concerns to the United States Government (1948–49 less tax) for a standard 11-inch keyboard machine were as follows:

Underwood	$107.55
L. C. Smith	107.52
Remington	109.17
Royal	109.02

The domestic consumer has apparently fared little better. Lowest prices to other than the Government in the domestic market for standard 11-inch keyboard models were the following:

Underwood	$121.10
Royal	121.13
Remington	121.30
L. C. Smith	119.48

The enclosed tabulation of these and other figures belies the existence of competition in the typewriter industry.

The profits of these monopoly partners have also swelled the tills of these corporations as a reading of the net profits of these four typewriter companies for several selected years, which I am including herein, will show.

I believe that the foregoing facts warrant prompt and thorough investigation by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission into the corporate structure of the Typewriter Manufacturers Export Association and a reexamination of the practices of its members in the domestic market with special reference to the provisions of the consent decree already entered against them.

Yours very truly,

EMANUEL CELLER, *Chairman.*

Typewriter prices, July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949

	Manufacturers' list price	Lowest price to other than Government [1]	Tax	Total	Government price	Tax	Total
Underwood, 11	$149.50	$121.10	$8.37	$130.47	$107.52	$6.47	$113.99
(Best non-Government) 12	155.00	125.55	9.30	134.85	112.62	9.30	121.92
Remington, 11	149.75	121.30	8.86	130.27	109.17	8.99	118.16
(Best non-Government) 13	156.00	126.36	9.36	135.72	113.73	9.36	123.09
Royal, 11	142.50	121.13	8.45	129.58	109.02	8.55	117.57
(Best non-Government) 12	148.50	126.23	8.91	135.14	113.61	8.91	122.52
L. C. Smith, 11	147.50	119.48	8.85	128.33	107.52	8.85	116.37
(Best non-Government) 12	154.50	125.15	9.27	134.42	112.83	9.27	122.10
Woodstock, 11	142.50	103.98	8.55	112.43	93.48	8.55	102.03
(Best non-Government) 12	148.50	108.26	8.91	117.17	97.43	8.91	106.34
Ralph C. Corbeil, model DA 11 [2]	490.00	400.00	31.50	431.50	441.00	31.50	472.50
Varityper, model D 16 [2]	385.00	295.00	25.65	410.65	346.50	25.65	372.15
I. B. M., model 111-12 [2]	335.00	255.00	20.10	355.10	301.50	20.10	321.60
(Electric) model 112-16 [2]	390.00	260.00	21.60	281.60	328.00	21.60	349.60

[1] This does not include prices on typewriters for educational purposes, which is exempted by Public Law 600.
[2] Special writing machines.

Return on invested capital—4 manufacturers of typewriters

[Percent of net income to net worth]

	1941	1946	1947	1948
L. C. Smith & Corona Typewriters, Inc.	13.88	8.86	18.04	16.01
Underwood Corp.	17.03	8.16	21.72	19.29
Royal Typewriter Co., Inc.	22.24	6.26	26.55	20.25
Remington Rand, Inc.	30.08	22.40	37.26	28.50

Source: Moody's Manual of Investments, Industrial Securities, 1948 and 1949 edition.

British Shipment of Arms to the Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me to the Secretary of State:

MARCH 7, 1950.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have the honor to address you on behalf of my constituents, and, I believe, on behalf of the overwhelming majority of American citizens, in regard to the attitude of the Department of State concerning the continued and increasing British shipment of arms to the Arab states.

As the sound of gunfire after the last great war died away, the nations of the world began to examine their national economic wounds. Our closest ally, Great Britain, was in dire straits indeed. It became rapidly apparent that this nation must receive immediate economic therapy in the interest of our own security. This was begun in 1946 by granting to the British Government a loan of $3,750,000,000 at only a nominal rate of interest. In 1948, after huge loans and other forms of assistance to the various nations of Europe, we initiated the Marshall plan for aiding European economic recovery. This plan was necessary to stave off complete ruin for Europe and all of the horrible economic consequences that would have been entailed for us too. We wisely foresaw that the best way to resist the pressures of communism was to avoid the economic and political vacuum which this nefarious ideology so eagerly attempts to fill.

The cost of the Marshall plan to the American taxpayer has been tremendous. In 1948 we expended $5,055,000,000 for the ERP. In 1949 we paid out $4,702,380,000 in ERP assistance. The estimates of the ERP cost to us in 1950 reach almost $8,000,000,000. Great Britain receives the lion's share of this huge aid program. And to the extent that the economic recovery of Britain is consistent with the aims of the program this is not to be criticised. But let us examine the two major aims of this costly program and see if Britain's behavior in the political and military world has been consistent.

First of all, the Marshall plan aimed for European economic recovery on a healthy, productive basis. We have met with some limited success here, but we are hampered by the dissipation of Britain's production potential in the face of her own increasing economic precariousness. Secondly, the aim of the Marshall plan was to create, by, and along with, such economic recovery, conditions which would make for a peaceful world.

However, the behavior of Britain has been diametrically at variance with such an aim.

The new and progressive State of Israel signed the last of several armistices with the attacking Arab States in July of 1949. At that time the Security Council of the United Nations lifted the Arms embargo to the middle eastern nations. However, in the debates concerning such action the spokesmen for several of the Security Council members, including, ironically, Great Britain, pointed to the great moral obligation to keep armament shipments to these nations at the minimum level consistent with national defense needs. But Britain, instead of honoring such moral obligation, has continued to supply heavy, offensive-type weapons to the Arab States at an ever-increasing rate. This fact is attested to by reliable observers and not denied by the British Foreign Office.

Thus it is that Britain dissipates her now-limited production capacities while unabashedly taking, almost demanding, more and more of our dwindling financial resources. Certainly this is no way to speed economic recovery.

It must also be apparent to all that this policy of fostering a Middle East armaments race runs counter to the aim of promoting world peace. Moreover, it contributes in large measure to the general instability of the Middle East and so works into the plans of the Communists. It would not be an unhappy situation for world communism if the Middle East, which should be devoting its energies to social and economic progress, were again torn by a disastrous war, which might this time so politically bankrupt the area that communism could easily usurp control in the best traditions of that ideology.

Therefore, Mr. Secretary, I urge that in the name of our Government you protest most vigorously any further shipment of arms which Britain makes to any of the Arab States. I further urge that you warn Great Britain immediately of the strong feeling of our citizenry in this regard, and indicate that the cessation of Marshall-plan aid to that country will certainly be the unfortunate but logical outcome of continued violations of her moral obligations.

Sincerely,

LOUIS B. HELLER,
Member of Congress.

Our Sick Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, coal represents 95 percent of our supply of mineral fuels, or sources of energy. Gas and petroleum reserves constitute the other 5 percent. Other things being equal, therefore, coal should be supplying 95 percent of our energy and heat requirements. Coal today, however, supplies only 56 percent of those needs; petroleum, 25 percent; and natural gas, 7 percent. During the last 20 years the use of coal has been reduced by one-third, while the use of both petroleum and natural gas has increased by 800 percent. Why? Because "coal has been priced out of the market."

What about the wages paid to the coal miners as compared to wages paid in all manufacturing plants? In 1939 the average weekly wage in all manufacturing plants was $23.86 and the coal miner was getting an average weekly wage of $23.88. In 1949 the average weekly wage in all manufacturing had advanced to $54.41, but the coal miner received $76.84 as a weekly wage in 1949—a 128 percent increase in factory wages, and a 200 percent increase in coal mining wages.

What about the danger incurred in coal mines as compared to factory work or railroad work? Government figures, taken from the Bureau of Mines and the Interstate Commerce Commission, show that injuries in the coal mines are far less per man-hours worked than either in manufacturing or in the railroad industry. Accidents in the coal mines have been reduced 50 percent in the last decade; accidents in industry have been reduced 10 percent; while accidents in the railroad industry have increased by 50 percent. On the basis of Government reports, therefore, work in the transportation field is three times as hazardous as in the coal mines, and work in coal mining is only half as hazardous as in manufacturing.

Taking all these facts into consideration, the coal industry is a sick industry largely because first, coal has been priced out of the market, and second, the great inconvenience caused the public through coal shortages, artificially created by the ruthless exercise of dictatorial powers by one man, John L. Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, as a further explanation of the coal situation, I include as a part of my remarks the following editorial, Poststrike Inventory, taken from the Christian Science Monitor, of Tuesday, March 7, 1950:

POSTSTRIKE INVENTORY

Where does the coal settlement leave the Taft-Hartley Act?

John L. Lewis is quoted to the effect that had there been no Taft-Hartley Act there would have been no emergency—the operators would have settled long ago. Which makes exactly the same sense as remarks by some employers about strikes a few years ago: That had there been no Wagner Act there would have been no trouble—the strikes would soon have been broken.

Probably many Americans, not trade-unionists, are entertaining a troubled feeling that the law, somehow, failed.

While we are on record as favoring a number of changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, we would point out that had it not been for this law no court action whatsoever could have been taken against the mine shut-down until after a long trial. Furthermore, because of this law, the willing and able, and the unlimited memorial holiday clauses—both sources of difficulty—do not appear in the new contract.

But it is arguable that had the law permitted a fact-finding board with power to make recommendations, considerably more pressure could have been brought against both sides to make a settlement.

The application of the law by the administration and its interpretation by the courts are quite something else, however. And we would censure one and question the other.

Had President Truman invoked the injunctive procedures of the act before the Bureau of Mines warned that the emergency had come, he would have been interfering in behalf of one side of what was still an economic wrestling match between private parties. But once melting coal piles made the public interest paramount, he should have acted with speed and decision. He did not.

No one knows whether either a court order or Government seizure a month ago would have got coal mined. But action then would have put greater pressures at the Government's disposal and given the Nation a wider margin against calamity. It was the President's duty to try, at least.

Judge Keech's acquitting the union of contempt concerns less the Taft-Hartley than "judge law" as laid down by Judge Goldsborough and affirmed by the Supreme Court. Can a functioning union which is offering to contract for delivery of the collective labor of its members be absolved from all responsibility for failure to control its members in the face of a national emergency? Judge Keech so absolved the United Mine Workers, and we doubt that his decision will stand the test of future industrial strife. It still should be appealed, if for no other reason than to clarify the issue.

Where does the settlement leave the industry?

In a still poorer competitive position against other fuels. But also where it can hardly justify this time any boost in the price of coal beyond the 25 cents a ton added by the new wage and welfare costs.

Where does the end of the strike leave the miners?

Very well paid indeed, by the day. But we doubt any better paid by the year, because they are pricing more and more coal out of more and more markets—and there are too many miners. There is hope in the confidence expressed by operator-spokesman George H. Love—perhaps the industry is learning at last that unless it works to stabilize employment John L. Lewis will. And hope in the Senate's welcome to Mr. Truman's proposal for a thorough legislative study of the industry's problems.

Where does all this leave the public?

A bit baffled, we fear—baffled that no sure answer has been found to the anarchy of battles between giants in an essential industry.

An Educator's Viewpoint on the Smith Amendment to the National Science Foundation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, from Cyril Stanley Smith, director of the Institute for the Study of Metals, University of Chicago, and whose eminence as a scientist is attested by his service on the most important and respected engineering and scientific committees of national scope, I have received a letter on the subject of the Smith amendment to the National Science Foundation bill. Mr. Smith sets forth in such clarifying manner the sound objections of the scientists and educators of the Nation to this amendment that I think it should be brought to the attention of the House and receive thoughtful consideration of the Members thereof. The letter follows:

INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF METALS,
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., March 7, 1950.

HON. BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have noticed with interest and approval the increased public awareness of the importance of science to national welfare, and have been anxiously awaiting the establishment of a National Science Foundation which would permit the Federal support of scientific education and research on a less restrictive basis than is possible through the use of funds appropriated for the military services. I am therefore greatly distressed at the passage by the House of the bill carrying the Smith amendment requiring FBI investigation and clearance of all employees and recipients of funds of the Science Foundation. It must be obvious by now that anything short of an extremely detailed, painstaking, and expensive investigation will fail to detect an occasional person of Communist sympathies. I believe that the use of public funds to pay for the training or research of an occasional person of leftist tendencies is a very small price to pay for freedom, particularly when contrasted with the alternative, which is to introduce police-state paraphernalia and suspicion into the educational system of this country.

It must be remembered that the Science Foundation is not concerned with secret science, but aims to provide fellowships and scholarships to assist training in nonsecret fields and to support research in the fundamental sciences on which technological and military developments eventually depend. This will not be helped by the setting up of an elaborate mechanism to exclude all Communists. I believe that FBI investigation of college students and research men is exceedingly harmful and should be invoked only for those scientists engaged on secret military work. It will inevitably introduce an attitude of suspicion, breed spiteful informers, and tend to prevent the expression of diverse points of view and the free search for truth that it is the duty of the universities and of scientists to encourage.

It must be realized that an open and inquiring mind is an essential characteristic of a good scientist, and nothing is gained by demarking a whole field into which a young man cannot even inquire. I am personally convinced that the best answer to communism is the exposure of its fallacies by free discussion throughout the country, not the setting up of an environment wherein any man who expects to work in science or other domains of public service is afraid ever to mention the word in conversation and campus "bull" sessions.

FBI investigations do not seem to have prevented the presence of an occasional Communist agent even in high Government circles. The dilution of its efforts caused by making the Bureau examine the intimate associations and opinions of every young man who leans toward a scientific career will render it still less able to devote time to critically important security problems.

I believe most strongly that the atmosphere of suspicion and the restraint of free discussion that will inevitably result from the requirement of FBI clearance for a scientific career will discourage a large fraction of young men who otherwise would go in this direction, and is bound to have the effect of lowering the caliber of men remaining in science, and thus of weakening this country's competitive position in both industrial and military fields.

I am writing this letter as a private citizen. My opinion, however, is reinforced by my experience as Director of this Institute and by service on a number of engineering and scientific committees of national scope, for example the executive committee of the Institute of Metals Division of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, the Metallurgical Advisory Committee to the United States Bureau of Standards, the Materials Subcommittee of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and last but not least the Presidentially appointed General Advisory Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission.

The amendment tends to nullify the very purpose for which the foundation was proposed. If you wish a strong science on which to base future industrial and military advances, I sincerely hope that you will urge the committee to eliminate the restrictive amendment.

Very truly yours,

CYRIL STANLEY SMITH.

Chicago Will Hold First World Trade Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an article that appeared in the Chicago Journal of Commerce on February 28, 1950, entitled "Exhibition To Contribute to Prosperity and Peace."

This International Trade Fair is to be held in the city of Chicago, from August 7 to August 20, 1950.

After many months of planning by the leading manufacturers of this Nation and the nations of the world, Chicago was selected because it is the strategic geographic center of all the Nation's communications system and can be reached easily from every part of the country, and also because it is a buying center for the Nation's greatest industrial and merchandizing organizations. Chicago being the hub of the Nation, has held more trade shows and expositions than any other city in the world.

To illustrate the magnitude of this International Trade Fair, I would like to call to the attention of Congress, the fact that representatives of the Organization of European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) will participate and that already, Frederic Berbigier, Commissioner General of the Trade Fair Board of the OEEC, has met with Chicago's great mayor, the Honorable Martin H. Kennelly and Mr. I. S. Anoff, president of the First United States International Trade Fair. In addition, President Truman has indorsed the fair as being of significant help in improving economic and political relationship throughout the world and thereby contributing to the cause of peace.

Mr. Speaker, I am also inserting the copy of President Truman's letter commenting on this fair.

EXHIBITION TO CONTRIBUTE TO PROSPERITY AND PEACE

(By I. S. Anoff, president, First United States International Trade Fair)

Size notwithstanding, there's still plenty of the old pioneer spirit in Chicago.

The city that has always had a reputation for gettings things done quickly and directly has tackled the problem of world trade in its traditional quick and direct manner.

Chicago—not Detroit, Atlantic City, Philadelphia, or New York, all of which announced plans to hold a fair—is staging the First United States International Trade Fair in 1950.

Chicago, not these other cities, is establishing a reputation in every part of the globe as the market center for the entire world.

More than $15,000,000 will be spent by visitors and exhibitors in the fair in Chicago.

MAKING UNIQUE CONTRIBUTION

And with all of the benefits to the city and to its business, Chicago's First United States International Trade Fair will make a signal contribution to world trade, world prosperity—and we hope and pray—world peace.

The idea of an international trade fair naturally would appeal to Chicagoans, because they long have been familiar with the value of a giant market place where buyer and seller can meet and do business.

Chicago is the home of many commercial markets, which in the American economic tradition—unlike the August world trade fair—are vertical markets. But they are great markets and the merchandise mart, the largest building of its kind in the United States, and the furniture mart, one of the great commercial centers in the Nation, are evidences of Chicago's status as the market place, as one of the greatest buying centers for America's great industrial and merchandising organizations.

These are facts that everyone knows, but when Detroit and the other cities made their bid for the fair, they pointed out that Chicago was an isolationist city, unfamiliar with foreign trade.

INTEREST IN EVIDENCE

As a matter of fact, there is considerable evidence in Chicago already of an interest to build healthy trade with the world. It is the only city in the United States with its own import-promotion organization, and only 2 weeks ago, the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry published an import directory that listed 487 importers in the city. At least 100 more could be added to the list. From January 28 to February 3, more than 30,000 persons visited the French travel and trade exhibit, where more than 100 potentially new importers were developed.

Chicago, therefore, has all of the natural advantages of the best geographical location, of being a market center, of being the world's greatest transportation center—and, in addition, it has already evidenced an interest in the problem of foreign trade.

These are the reasons why it was natural that Chicago—the commercial, industrial, and transportation center of the United States—should be the first host to the producers of the world's goods at the First United States International Trade Fair.

OTHERS PLAN FAIRS

Other cities—Detroit, Philadelphia, and Atlantic City—already have announced plans to hold fairs in 1951, and we in Chicago welcome their participation in the same manner as the government sponsors of the Canadian Fair in Toronto welcome our fair. Like the Canadians, we recognize that a number of fairs in all parts of the United States will enable foreign businessmen to make sort of a grand circuit of fairs and do a better job of penetrating more markets.

At the same time, by virtue of Chicago's exclusive advantages, and the fact that it is host for the first fair of this kind in the United States, we are confident that the Chicago World Trade Fair will be established as the one outstanding annual trade event around which all of the others revolve.

Chicago can anticipate a business boom as a result of the fair. Approximately $15,000,000 will be spent locally for incidental expenses, such as hotel rooms, food, entertainment, and local transportation, by the visitors and exhibitors to the fair.

The combination this summer of the First United States International Trade Fair and the great Chicago Fair of 1950 will do much to stamp Chicago as the dynamic city for spectacular worth-while expositions. The two fairs are certain to complement each other and to go down in history along with the Columbian Exposition of 1893, a Century of Progress in 1933 and 1934, and the recent Railroad Fair of 1948 and 1949.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 23, 1949.

I welcome the decision of Chicago's forward-looking businessmen to establish an International Trade Fair in their city next year. The interchange of goods among nations is an important means of improving political and economic relationships throughout the world. The Chicago Fair should be of significant help to this end—and the end, therefore, of establishing a firm peace in the world.

I know that the businessmen of the world will find Chicago a gracious and warm-hearted host.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Great Britain Fights United States Oil Industry With American Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you and the other esteemed Members of this House have read many news items in recent months about the conferences on oil and the dollar-sterling relationship which have been held between representatives of Great Britain and the United States.

I believe that it is high time that the Congress of the United States concern itself with this subject.

The Persian Gulf area contains almost unlimited quantities of oil which can sustain industrial development and raise the standard of living not only of the United States but of the entire world. However, I wish to invite your attention to the ownership or control of the oil-producing countries of that area.

The Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., which is 56-percent owned by the British Government, 22 percent by the Burma Oil Co., and 22 percent by individual stockholders, has the concession for the known oil-producing area of the country of Iraq.

The Iraq Petroleum Co.—which is owned 23¾ percent American, 23¾ percent Dutch-English, 23¾ percent French, 23¾ percent British, and 5 percent individual—has the concession for Iraq, Iran, Transjordan, most of Syria, two Trucial Sheikdoms, Oman, Hadhramut, and Dhofar.

The Bahrein Petroleum Co., which is United States owned but incorporated in Canada, owns the concession on the island of Bahrein.

The concession for Kuwait is 50-percent owned by the Gulf Oil Co. and 50-percent by the British-controlled Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. In the neutral zone of Kuwait both Pacific Western and American Independent have concession interests.

All of the above concessions are either owned or controlled by British companies, are incorporated under British or Dominion laws or the British have political control of the country in which the concession is located.

The sole company in that area which is United States-owned and incorporated outside of Great Britain or her Dominions is the Arabian-American Oil Co. which is owned 30 percent by SONJ, 30 percent by SOCAL, 30 percent by Texas Co., and 10 percent by Socony Vacuum Oil Co.

For the last 3 weeks the New York Times has published a number of interesting articles in its financial section on this subject in which it has been reported that the future and, in fact, the very existence of our oil interests outside of the United States are being threatened. They are as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 17, 1950]

UNITED STATES, BRITISH PACT ON OIL IS UNLIKELY—AVAILABILITY OF DOLLARS AFTER END OF MARSHALL PLAN HELD THE DECIDING FACTOR—MATTER VITAL TO BRITAIN—LIFE AND DEATH TO STERLING AREA, ONLY DIVIDENDS TO US, HER DEFENDERS SAY

(By J. H. Carmical)

Any long-range agreement with the British over the sale of oil by United States concerns in the United Kingdom and the sterling area appears virtually impossible at this time.

The position of the British Government is that it cannot now determine the number of dollars that will be available to pay for oil from United States companies when the Marshall plan expires in 1952.

A British Government source last week said that when the Marshall plan expired it would be necessary to review the entire field of international trade and particularly that between the dollar and the sterling areas. The policy then adopted with respect to oil and other imports, he said, would involve how much the United States bought from the sterling area, how much it invested there, how much it lends, and how much it gives away.

The latest proposal by the British Government on oil imports applies only so long as the Marshall plan is in effect. During that period the British agree to impose no further restrictions on oil sales by United States companies in the sterling area. This, however, will cost the British no dollars, since virtually the entire cost of such oil sales will be paid by the United States Government.

LACK OF DOLLARS SEEN

With the expiration of the Marshall plan, a British Government source said, it may be jolly difficult to get hold of dollars. He emphasized that the United States was the only creditor nation and that it virtually was self-sufficient, needing to purchase relatively little from foreign sources. Thus, he said, it would be most difficult to obtain enough dollars in the regular commercial way to buy essentials necessary to the industrial activity of Britain.

Oil is the largest single item calling for dollar payments in the sterling area. It is estimated that there is a dollar deficit of $600,000,000 a year from oil operations in the area. With the dollar deficit for the entire sterling area placed at $1,500,000,000 a year, oil alone accounts for nearly 40 percent of the total.

A large part of the expense incurred by the British and the British-Dutch oil companies in their operations must be met in dollars. Of the estimated 80,000,000 tons of oil these companies now are selling each year in the sterling area, there is a dollar cost of $275,000,000 for which exchange must be provided.

The cost in dollars of oil supplied by the British companies to the sterling area is said to be about one-fourth that for the United States companies. In view of the lower dollar cost to the British companies, it is pointed out that, with a dollar deficit, it would be folly for the British Government not to use oil produced by its own nationals to satisfy the needs of the sterling area. However, it was said, there would be no objection to the United States companies competing for this business if it could be done on a basis where it would cost no more in dollars than the oil produced by the British companies.

LIMIT TO SALES LIKELY

The whole question of the sale of oil by United States companies in the sterling area primarily is one of dollar exchange, it is maintained. Unless some device is arranged after the expiration of the Marshall plan to supply these dollars outside the regular commercial way, it is believed there will be no recourse other than to limit drastically the sale of oil from dollar sources in the sterling area.

In this connection it is argued that the sale of oil by United States companies in the sterling area is only a matter of dividends, but that it is a case of life or death to Britain, including the entire sterling area.

To the United States oil companies, however, more is involved than profits. For years the United States oil companies have been operating abroad and have huge investments, many of them made at the suggestion of the United States Government. These foreign oil properties are needed not only as a supplement to domestic oil operations but are considered vital for national defense.

Further, the royalty payments on the oil produced in foreign countries by United States concerns go a long way toward paying the cost of local governments. If the United States companies expect to hold their concessions abroad they must operate them at a reasonably high level and they can do this only by having a market for their product.

On an equal basis with the British companies, United States companies maintain that they would have no difficulty in meeting competition and holding their share of the world markets. However, through exchange controls and unilateral trade agreements made by the British, they maintain that they are being squeezed out of markets outside the sterling area.

There are some indications that the British may be easing their drive on markets outside the sterling group. One of these is Argentina, where the British more than a year ago negotiated an agreement through which a large amount of oil was exchanged for meat and other foodstuffs. One of the reasons for the possible change in attitude is understood to be the realization that, with the expiration of the Marshall plan, the British companies would not have sufficient oil to supply entirely the markets outside the sterling area.

With the British maintaining that they must have the oil markets in the sterling area if the economy of that group of nations is to be aided, it is becoming evident that the United States companies will have to depend on areas outside the sterling bloc for an outlet for their oil.

BRITISH OIL OFFER TIED TO WIDE RULE—AMERICAN EXECUTIVES SAY CALL TO ASSISTS CONTROL MEANS LOSS OF FOREIGN FIELD—RETURN FAVORS REBUFFED—STERLING RESTRICTION, DIVIDEND LIMIT, AND 50-PERCENT TAX ON NET CITED AGAINST PROPOSAL

(By J. H. Carmical)

The British Government's proposal last week that American oil companies operating abroad assign their concessions to British corporations and submit to British control and taxes would result eventually in bringing international oil trade under the domination of the British, according to oil executives here.

For some time it had been rumored that the British would make such a suggestion. In fact, if such a proposal were accepted, the British Government said, it would relax its cartel operation, cease making barter agreements, stop the freezing of sterling exchange, and also refuse to recognize any nation that previously had not been recognized by the United States Government.

The British proposals, which generally are considered harsh and unreasonable are not likely to be accepted by United States companies holding oil concessions abroad. It is contended that the only thing they would receive in return was the promise that, so long as the Marshall plan continued, Britain would not impose restrictions on dollar oil beyond those previously proposed. Under this, it is said, about 65,000,000 barrels a year of dollar oil could be sold in the United Kingdom.

MAIN POINTS OF PROPOSAL

Generally, the British proposal would permit the sale of oil for sterling anywhere in the world only through corporations managed and controlled by Britishers and with ownership clear back to the oil source. In addition, the new British companies are to be subject to the British tax laws, which means a levy of a little more than 50 percent from net income.

The new companies may convert their sterling earnings into dollars only to the extent necessary to meet dollar expenses and to pay dividends at a rate prescribed by the British Government but not to exceed 6 percent on investments. The balance of the sterling earnings may be used only to pay labor costs and to buy items needed by the companies in their own operations. Any sterling not so used apparently would be "frozen" indefinitely.

In the oil indurtry here it is said that the British Government fully realizes the necessity that the American companies have virtually free access to the international oil markets if they expect to hold their foreign concessions. Some oil executive from the start have sensed that the imposition of exchange controls by the British was to get hold of concessions held abroad by the American companies.

DIFFERENCES IN DOLLAR COST

In its regulations the British Government arbitrarily has classified as sterling oil all petroleum produced or marketed by companies of beneficial British-Dutch ownership regardless of the dollars it might cost to produce or acquire the sterling oil.

There is a dollar cost in most oil whether produced by American or British companies. In some instances the dollar cost is greater when oil is produced by a British company rather than a United States concern. For example, it is estimated that the British company operating in Venezuela has an estimated dollar cost of around $1.50 for every barrel of oil produced. On the other hand, a United States company operating in the Middle East has a dollar cost of only 50 to 60 cents a barrel.

The discriminatory feature of the exchange control scheme is emphasized when the British company operating in Venezuela is provided a market in the sterling area for all the oil it may produce, while the United States company operating in the Middle East may not sell its oil for sterling, even though its dollar cost is only about one-third that of the British company in Venezuela.

The result of this action by the British has been not only to reduce exports from this country but also to increase imports here from foreign concessions held by the United States companies. This has greatly reduced the portion of the home market formerly held by domestic producers.

Last year, it is estimated that the domestic producers could have brought to the surface an average of 832,000 barrels daily more oil than was produced without overproducing the wells. The estimated shut-in domestic production now is in excess of 1,000,000 barrels a day.

So far, Texas has borne the main burden in restricting production so as not to upset the petroleum markets. However, there is some doubt as to how long the Texas Railroad Commission, the regulatory authority in the State, can continue "holding the umbrella" over the domestic petroleum industry.

If the commission should be successfully challenged, it is feared that the domestic industry might become demoralized. However, the importing companies are aware of the danger and recently have been reducing their schedule of imports.

The seat of the trouble appears to be a series of moves which have been made by the British as a part of a program to correct their unfavorable dollar balances. We in this country have been very much aware of Britain's dollar problem and through the fine work of ECA have made a considerable contribution toward rectifying the situation. But it must be obvious to all that it is unwise to single out the petroleum industry to bear the brunt of Britain's efforts to save dollars—particularly when the effect of that action may well be to deprive the United States of foreign-oil concessions which are, because of our mutual interest, vital to the security of both countries.

Britain's recent unilateral action in restricting the importation of United States oil into the United Kingdom has brought matters to a head. The British have informed the United States-controlled companies that their fuel-oil imports to the United Kingdom and certain other sterling-area countries are prohibited and their motor-gasoline imports reduced one-third. The only way these United States-controlled companies can continue to meet their marketing requirements in these areas is to purchase so-called sterling products from British-controlled companies. These sterling products have a considerable dollar-cost component that in some cases is higher than the dollar-cost component in so-called dollar oil. The logical conclusion is therefore that under the guise of saving dollars, the British are to gain commercial advantages for the British oil companies at the expense of United States-controlled oil companies.

This was followed almost immediately with similar restrictions imposed at the suggestion of the British Government by India, Australia, and the British Crown Colony of Kenya. Considerable publicity has recently been given to the letter ascribed to sources within the British Government, and never disavowed, which instructed the British colonial possessions to disregard all United States protests as, apparently, they were not seriously intended.

The British have struck another heavy blow at United States oil companies by means of a series of bilateral trade agreements made with Argentina, Sweden, and Egypt and there are further agreements in prospect with Denmark, Spain, and Portugal. These agreements are essentially barter arrangements. In each case it must be recognized that United States oil is being displaced by British oil with the direct assistance of the British Government.

It appears that Great Britain may be attempting to restrict American oil companies business by imposition of currency controls. For example Arabian-American Oil Co.'s production of 530,000 barrels per day a year ago is now down to below 450,000 barrels per day. Largely as result of British exchange controls and bilateral trade agreements with other countries that result in United States controlled oil companies not only losing business in the British Empire but also in such countries as Argentina, Sweden, and so forth. The British by means of operation of exchange control are even trying to get the business of United States-controlled oil companies in Japan.

It is not my purpose today to attempt an evaluation of the markets for United States oil which have been lost and will be lost in the future as a result of British encroachments. There are people in the State Department who are far better qualified for that purpose than I. It is apparent, however, that repercussions will be felt in the form of lost United States oil production in South America, the Middle East, and the Far East as well. The Government of Venezuela has already shown serious concern over the possibility of a reduction in the oil royalties which are so important a part of its total revenues.

In the last war this country needed every bit of oil it was able to get from South America, the Middle East, and elsewhere in order to supplement our own overburdened production in the United States. Frequently, our ability to obtain oil supplies in various parts of the world was valuable purely as a matter of logistics—permitting the saving of much valuable shipping space as the war emphasis shifted from one theater to another. If we ever become involved in another war, you may be certain that we will be tapping all available foreign oil reserves probably more heavily than ever before since new techniques of warfare require ever-increasing quantities of petroleum supplies.

I do not mean for a moment to overlook the importance of our domestic production to us. It is a matter of first importance that we maintain a high level of productibility in this country. There have been recent reports to the effect that the United States currently has a shut-in production of between 800,000 and 1,000,000 barrels of oil a day. This is as it should be. For our military security we need a shut-in production of at least that amount. We had a margin of 1,000,000 barrels per day when the last war started and it barely saw us through.

For 10 years I have been a member of the Naval Affairs and House Armed Services Committees and have often been concerned with the armed services petroleum supply. At present I have been reliably informed that Arabian-American Oil Co.'s crude is the source of at least 12,000,000 barrels of fuel oil,

5,700,000 barrels of Diesel oil and 2,000,000 barrels of gasoline supplied every year to the armed services of the United States. The price paid for fuel oil in particular is much less than going market prices and I want to see that continued.

But my people at home are also concerned over the cost of oil, gasoline, and oil products. I do not believe in the unlimited import of oil produced outside the United States but neither do I believe we should shut out all such oil and thereby force up or maintain an artificially high price at home.

Coal is important to us industrially but I remind this body that today when our mines are being operated, we mine and use approximately the same amount of coal we mined 30 years ago. Our ability to increase our industrial output and our standard of living over the past 30 years has been based on an oil and gas economy.

I consider that the retention of the United States oil concessions in the Persian Gulf area are of the utmost importance to us nationally. If through any means or for any reason, we lose control of our small part of the total oil available in the Persian Gulf area we will have lost a priceless asset and future generations of Americans can, in that case, say we have failed our country and them miserably and have been unfaithful to the trust placed in us.

Mercedes Didn't Get the Handbag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent:

MARCH 4, 1950.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINSHAW: Mercedes did not get the handbag.

Mercedes is a special friend of mine—going on three—who talks to me in Spanish, but sings Happy Birthday to You in English, kisses me when she sees me and otherwise brings sunshine to a gloomy world. So, when I was in the dime store this morning and saw that dashing red handbag for 50 cents I immediately knew that it would brighten the life of Mercedes. However, there was a 20-percent excise tax and a 3½-percent local sales tax, which brought the item out of bounds and so Mercedes did not get the handbag.

I wouldn't go so far as to say that because Mercedes did not get this handbag she will later become a problem child, a juvenile delinquent, a suicide, or anything else so gruesome; but I do say that the immediate result of that excise tax and others like them is pretty bad. True, the loss of one 50-cent sale will not make or break the dime store, but multiplied by similar instances throughout the country, it can result in such a drop in sales of handbags, for instance, that the manufacturer becomes overstocked and finally closes down for a period—or for keeps. That means folks out of employment—out of buying power—reduction in sales of other items—more lay-offs—more people looking for jobs—fewer jobs available—but you take it from there.

Mr. HINSHAW, the best thing Congress could do for the country today is to cut down on taxes. Suppose Harry does have to pass up some of his grandiose schemes. Let him. After all, he brags that he went bankrupt. Is that any reason why he should bankrupt everyone else? I don't think so, but he'll do it if Congress doesn't take a hand in it and limit his spending.

If we can keep what we earn—can have a personal exemption for income-tax purposes of not less than $1,500 each (you can't live on less in this country) and have taxes scaled so that no matter how much we earn we can keep two-thirds of it—individuals, corporations, and all—you'll be surprised how much better off the Nation will be. Right now we are headed for bankruptcy and when that happens, where will the money for all the free schemes come from? The golden goose may not be dead yet, but it's pretty sick.

There is no branch of Government today—no department or what have you—that cannot get along on less money. For instance, as you probably have read, Los Angeles has put on a sales tax on alcoholic beverages. My license is for a letter shop—not a grog shop—yet I get notice to collect the tax. Undoubtedly mine is not an isolated instance caused by misfunctioning of the sorting machine at city hall, so you can estimate the amount of wasted effort in mailing notices to the thousands of licensees who do not sell alcoholic beverages, plus the printing and postage required. Is it any wonder that taxes are mounting when such nonsense goes on.

This waste is not isolated. It is not peculiar to Los Angeles City or Los Angeles County. It happens in Sacramento, in Washington, in every Government office and department in the country, and the pity of it is that necessary and useful functions of Government was impeded by such waste.

Another thing, why can't you make it possible for us business people not to have to be tax collectors without compensation. Get this, I don't want to be compensated—all I want is to be relieved of the burden so that I can pay my help what they earn each week and not have to keep a lot of records for some grim-visaged, otherwise gruesome auditor to examine a couple years from now and become more grim-visaged and gruesome especially if he finds the records in shape and no fines applicable. Why should I have to collect taxes from a man and at the end of the year have part or all of it returned by the Government. It doesn't make sense.

Back in early 1941 I bought a good used car for personal and business use. Came the war. My work necessitated that I use the car. OPA kept my prices down, but my other expenses increased. Came the end of the war and my expenses sky-rocketed. Taxes remained at wartime levels, eating into my capital, as has been the case with many and many a small-business man. My car wore out last fall. Under a proper Government set-up and view of taxes, etc., I could have put aside enough to have replaced it. So far, I have not been able to do so. I really feel very bitter about that, Mr. HINSHAW, for I have worked very hard since 1941 and could have and should have had a new car long ago. But the money that I earn is being taken from me and spent by persons who never operated a business in their lives. Or, if they did, they went broke and think that qualifies them for mangement of the Nation's affairs.

I need a car in my business. In fact, I am losing business right now by not having it. Furthermore, I have earned the price of that car, and in 1 year have paid in income tax a very substantial down payment on a car, and since the war ended my income tax payments could have easily bought me a very good car. It's not because I have earned so much that I pay so much income tax, it is the insane manner in which it is figured and the quaint idea that I can live on $600 a year. It is not taxation any more—it is confiscation.

Anyhow, Mercedes didn't get the handbag.

Yours very truly,

HELEN LEE.

Report on Grazing Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years I have endeavored to assemble and bring before the Congress and the people an annual report on the extent to which our Federal Government is taking care of and improving the grazing lands upon which we depend greatly for livestock feed and soil conservation. At the conclusion of these remarks, I want to include a table comparing the acreage held by the nine Federal agencies controlling range lands, their revenue therefrom, and the amount spent on research and improvements on these lands for the last 3 years.

We have made some fine improvements recently and the estimates for 1950 indicate that we finally have awakened some Federal agencies to their responsibilities to care for the lands under their control, even though grazing may be of secondary importance on those lands. The Army and Navy, particularly, are investing greater portions of their grazing receipts in improvements of their gunnery ranges and other lands which are rented out for stock feeding. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Tennessee Valley Authority spent less in 1949 for improvements than in 1947, the latter primarily because of reduced acreage. The Bureau of Reclamation and National Park Service, neither of which collects substantial grazing fees, spend nothing for improvements.

Research on grazing problems is handled by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, chiefly the latter, with the total amount spent in 1949 being 20 percent higher than in 1947. Information gained is disseminated to other Federal agencies but there is no over-all policy requiring those agencies to adopt new practices recommended as a result of the research.

Over-all receipts on the Federal range lands were $1,385,263 greater in 1949 than 2 years before, totaling $7,876,761.42. At the same time, total acreage was reduced from 303,964,126 to 298,057,159 acres. Of this amount, the Army lost more than 2,000,000 acres and the Forest Service more than 4,000,000 acres, while the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Reclamation, and Fish and Wildlife Service substantially increased their holdings.

Seven of the nine agencies increased their revenue from grazing last year. The Army and TVA receipts dropped due to reduced acreage. Most agencies

raised their grazing-fee rates during the last 2 years.

The total amount spent in 1949 for improvements and research on grazing lands was approximately one-third of the total revenue received. This is almost exactly the same ratio as was indicated by the 1947 report. Results of the research, of course, are also made available to holders of privately owned range lands.

The tabulation follows:

United States grazing lands

[Compiled by Hon. Walt Horan, 5th District, Washington]

Department and bureau	1947		1948		1949		1950 anticipated gross revenue
	Number of acres	Gross revenue	Number of acres	Gross revenue	Number of acres	Gross revenue	
Interior:							
National Park Service	1,705,780.00	$13,776.67	1,718,880.00	[illegible]	1,678,796.00	[illegible]	Same
Indian Affairs [1]	44,811,000.00	1,438,000.00	[illegible]	1,325,000.00	45,205,000.00	1,710,000.00	(2)
Bureau of Land Management [3]	163,784,000.00	1,058,827.00	163,784,000.00	1,419,113.00	163,784,000.00	1,302,485.00	$1,413,000.00
Bureau of Reclamation	492,791.32	[4] 56,890.54	455,763.28	[5] 62,196.46	1,057,911.66	[6] 119,319.43	Same
Fish and Wildlife Service	853,207.00	112,140.20	897,431.00	123,600.00	980,829.00	145,382.20	Same
Defense:							
Army	3,017,427.00	1,069,135.00	1,696,602.00	610,512.80	827,919.00	894,745.00	[illegible]
Navy	189,287.00	89,178.00	130,000.00	78,820.00	108,000.00	93,574.00	Same
Agriculture:							
Forest Service	83,163,918.00	2,250,773.00	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Soil Conservation	6,493,893.00	335,000.00	6,498,135.00	360,000.00	6,454,357.00	[9] 640,000.00	[9] 640,000
TVA [8]	39,823.00	44,378.40	33,267.00	43,744.00	28,900.00	44,812.00	(10)
Total	303,964,126.32	[illegible]	[illegible]	7,304,521.39	[illegible]	7,876,761.42	

Department and bureau	1947		1948		1949	
	Expended for research	Expended for improvements	Expended for research	Expended for improvements	Expended for research	Expended for improvements
Interior:						
National Park Service	None	None	None	None	None	None
Indian Affairs [1]	None	[illegible]	None	[illegible]	None	[illegible]
Bureau of Land Management [2]	$15,560	796,350	$25,000	736,000	$25,000	[illegible]
Bureau of Reclamation	None	None	None	None	None	None
Fish and Wildlife Service	Incidental	40,000	Slight	50,000	Nominal	25,800
Defense:						
Army	Nominal	Nominal	None	25,000	None	[illegible]
Navy	Nominal	Nominal	Nominal	Nominal	Nominal	4,000
Agriculture:						
Forest Service	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	321,873	[illegible]	[illegible]
Soil Conservation	None	[illegible]	None	480,000	None	447,623
TVA [8]	None	20,000	None	20,000	None	[illegible]
Total	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	2,012,875	415,000	[illegible]

[1] 342,000 acres of Army Department aerial gunnery range lands within the exterior boundary of the Pine Ridge Reservation of South Dakota, placed under the supervision of Bureau of Indian Affairs for grazing purposes pursuant to 25 CFR 73. Fiscal year 1949 receipts approximately $32,000; estimated receipts for fiscal year 1950, $32,000.

[2] Slightly higher.

[3] Exclusive of Alaska.

[4] Calendar year.

[5] 213,430.48 acres is acquired land; $35,283.01 gross revenue from acquired land.

[6] This amount applies to range research expenditures largely applicable to Federal range lands, national forest, and other; results of this research apply also to comparable range lands in private ownership.

[7] Exclusive of range reseeding expenditure of $730,828.

[8] Estimated revenue from grazing fees only on fiscal year basis.

[9] TVA does not administer any range lands as such. However, in developing the Tennessee River and its tributaries for navigation, flood control, and power, TVA has acquired some acreage along the margins of its reservoirs. On this land TVA has encouraged a variety of uses, including pasturing, raising hay, and row cropping according to standards advocated by agricultural agencies in the region. Such use of the reservoir land is, of course, subsidiary to the primary purposes of navigation, flood control, and power. Methods of administering these properties are probably quite different from situations where extensive land holdings are not subject to the needs of navigation, flood control, and power. For example, much of the land listed in (1) (number acres) consists of acreage which lies within reservoir flowage zones, and is not available for year-round pasture.

[10] Approximately 20-percent less.

NOTES.—Estimated improvements for fiscal year 1950: Bureau of Indian Affairs, $420,000; Bureau of Land Management, $1,190,000; Army, $35,000; Forest Service, $479,000; Soil Conservation Service, $527,000; Fish and Wild Life Service, Navy and TVA, all same as for fiscal year 1949. Total estimated improvements, $2,677,726.

(All information obtained from Federal sources.)

Our Constitution Needs Another Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the January 1950 issue of Inn Dixie, a magazine published monthly by the Dinkler Hotels, there appears an editorial by Editor William G. Hastings, entitled "Our Constitution Needs Another Amendment."

Under leave previously granted, I insert this article herewith:

OUR CONSTITUTION NEEDS ANOTHER AMENDMENT

A fine service was rendered in 1933 by the passage of the twentieth, or lame-duck amendment to the Constitution of the United States. This changed the expiration dates of the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress from March back to January.

Formerly those selected for such places in the November elections did not take office until the following March, which left Congress disorganized for months. This method has been in operation since the adoption of the Constitution in 1787.

It is time now for Congress to go a step further towards increasing the value to the country of our public officials.

This can be done by extending the term of office of a Representative from 2 years to 4 years. Senators are elected for 6 years but a Member of the House is limited to 2 years. This may have served in 1787, though we doubt it; certainly it does not serve well today.

Under a 2-year term a Member of the House of Representatives has to begin campaigning for reelection almost before he assumes his office. This forces him into commitments which many would not make if their terms were long enough for the value of their views to be determined. Partly because of this pressure groups practically control our country today. Most, if not all of them have no interest in the general welfare of the country. This self-interest is their only concern. They will oppose the greatest statesman in Congress if he should vote against any of their programs, regardless of his value to the Nation as a whole.

As a rule the people of a republic can be depended upon to form sage judgments on national issues. But not always. Mass hysteria and self-interest sometimes dull the judgment of the wisest and most honest. They are two things that are not amenable to reason at the time; time alone may rectify such false judgments.

In 1786, the year before the Constitution was adopted, the great democrat Jefferson said, "The animosities of sovereigns are temporary and may be allayed, but those which seize the whole body of a people (and a people, too, who dictate their own measures) produce calamities of long duration."

The bad judgment of the public was illustrated years ago in the matter of woman

suffrage. This was so ridiculed by the "hemen" of the time that some good officials found themselves in mighty hot water and were defeated for espousing it. If any Member of Congress proposed to rescind it today he surely would be unseated at the next election. This is just one case where the majority changed, but it took time for them to recognize their mistake. Whether the "hemen" opponents of woman suffrage were convinced by the reasoning of their wives, or by their rolling pins, is not known, but we do know that their minds did change.

Give Congressmen a term long enough for the public to properly evaluate their votes in Congress, and we will have infinitely more independence of thought and more independence of action than ever will be possible under 2-year terms.

Formosa—Another Munich?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the fear that Formosa may become another Munich, unless proper aid is given that anti-Communist island, is graphically told in the column of Eddie Zeitner, Over the River, of the New York Mirror.

Under the leave given me, I include a portion of Eddie Zeitner's column highlighting the present over-all situation as related to him by Elliott H. Simpson, an American of over 30 years of intimate contact with the Orient.

The article follows:

OVER THE RIVER

(By Edward Zeitner)

CHINESE-AMOUR

To one Brooklynite, China means more than a midnight snack of egg rolls and chicken chow mein. He's Elliott H. Simpson, rubber and commodities broker, with 30 years of probing the Orient behind him.

Elliott is one of our close pals. For years he has wowed us with tales from his storybook career. No one we know has a better insight on happenings in the Far East.

In the last war, Elliott beat it out of Singapore a half-step ahead of the Japs. A civilian with a couple of thousand Nippon yen on his handsome skull, he came back with worthy intelligence.

Now he has returned once more, after nearly a year of roaming through the necklace of territorial trouble which strings around the throat of the Dutch China Sea from Hong Kong, Indochina, Singapore, the Straits Settlements and deep into Indonesia.

We sought an intimate view on what's happening in the heart of the world's No. 1 hot spot.

Right off, Elliott said that the United States, in by-passing aid to the Nationalists on Formosa, is bartering for another Munich. "We ought to send Chiang Kai-shek money, ammunition and food," he said. "MacArthur is strong for fortifying Formosa."

He though a moment, then added:

"All this talk about the Generalissimo being a wrong guy. That's rot. He was the victim of a sell-out by exploiters in his cabinet. He took the rap for a bunch of rich Chinese and carried too much responsibility on his own shoulders.

"No one believes we have to send soldiers to stop the Red movement which is rapidly strangling not only China, but Indochina, the Malay States and the East Indies," he continued. "But we must give arms now, or you'll have a third world war before the E bonds of the last one mature."

How do the Chinese look upon America now? we queried.

"The masses in China have an expression, 'that glorious flag' meaning the Stars and Stripes. They will have an affection for Americans. Only the younger student element is intent on causing a rupture. Of course, they're guided by an outside influence," he added.

"The Communists can never live up to their promises. In fact, they are nothing but a band of pirates, these war lords who now control China. I look for them to soon begin bedevilling the people worse than the misery dished out when the banking houses of the Kungs, and Soongs controlled the Chinese Republic."

He said the British hastened to recognize the Communist regime to protect Hong Kong, adding: "I fear that's another Munich too."

Elliott warns that Burma and Siam are being squeezed by the Communists. He takes a dim view of the rampant Reds being kept off the back of the Philippines. There's not a thing to stop them except a guy named MacArthur. He may be engulfed one day too, if we let Formosa go by the board," he warned.

"Take Singapore," Simpson explained. "Labor now controls this area and the leaning is toward communism. In Indonesia, the infant republic is not yet in position to govern itself. This would be a push-over too for the red-flagged legions in their drive eastward. It's so bad there that occidentals have moved into the cities from their inland estates, fearing murder."

As the only non-Chinese to be admitted to a club in New York's Chinatown, Elliott is sure where the sympathies of the local Chinese lie.

"There are one or two student groups who outwardly profess fealty to the Reds, downtown, but the FBI has them pretty well watched, even if they ever got away from the domination of their patriotic elders."

Public Opinion Poll Reveals Present-Day View of Residents of Central Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with the cooperation of the daily and weekly newspapers in my congressional district comprising Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties in central Pennsylvania, a public-opinion poll was conducted during January and February for a period of 4 weeks.

Nearly 2,000 persons participated in the poll. A break-down of the vote by counties is as follows: Blair County, 768; Centre County, 570; and Clearfield County, 530.

The tabulation of the vote on the various issues is as follows:

Tabulation of the 14 questions representing the views of 1,876 residents of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties

1. Should the Taft-Hartley Act be—
   (A) Repealed 292
   (B) Amended 372
   (C) Left alone 1,226

	Yes	No
2. Do you favor reenactment of the Wagner Labor Act?	638	1,200
3. Do you favor extending rent control?	826	932
4. Do you favor Federal aid to education?	884	1,084
5. Do you favor compulsory socialized medicine?	195	1,512
6. Do you favor voluntary health insurance?	1,238	458
7. Do you favor universal military training?	798	966
8. Do you favor 70-group Air Force?	1,170	[illegible]
9. Do you favor price control?	[illegible]	1,408
10. Do you favor an increase in personal income taxes?	196	1,598
11. Should wartime excise taxes be repealed?	1,358	400
12. Do you favor liberalization of the Social Security Act?	962	790
13. Do you favor the outlawing of the Communist Party?	1,336	440
14. Do you favor the so-called Brannan plan?	[illegible]	1,026

NOTE.—Many participants did not answer all questions giving as their reason that they lacked sufficient information on the subject to vote intelligently.

ANALYSIS OF POLL BY OCCUPATION

White collar	840
Housewife	276
Farmer	120
Labor	630

More than half of the questionnaires were accompanied by explanatory letters discussing many issues of national importance not covered in the newspaper questionnaire.

In connection with the vote on outlawing the Communist Party the 440 who voted in the negative qualified their votes by stating they were not in favor of the Communist Party, but believed it unwise to drive the Communists underground.

Every community in the three counties participated in the poll. In many cases the participants stated that this was the first time they had ever contacted their Representative in Congress.

Hazardous Treasury Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Times-Picayune, New Orleans, of Wednesday, March 3, 1950:

HAZARDOUS TREASURY DEMAND

Our oil industry's major problem is the maintenance of production and reserves at nationally adequate levels. As oil wells in one field play out, new fields must be found and developed. With the new uses and constantly growing demands for oil and its products, the exploration for new supplies grows more urgent. It involves heavy financial risks, for many more wells come in dry than productive.

To meet this situation, Congress in 1918 set up percentage-depletion allowances for oil, gas, and related industries. Its purpose—to provide funds for discovery of "new reserves of vital natural resources which are being used up"—justified the experiment. With respect to oil and gas, the depletion allowances have justified themselves fully by practical results. Reexamined by Congress in the middle 1920's and in 1940, its reapprovals made them a part of the Nation's settled tax policy.

Now the Treasury Department demands their drastic reduction, to increase the Federal tax take and the present administration's spending money. If there is other and sounder reason, it does not appear. Wrote Representative Boggs of the House Ways and Means Committee, in a recent letter to this newspaper, "I cross-examined the representatives of the Department at great length to ascertain whether or not studies had been made which justified the arbitrary reduction of the allowance. * * * No evidence could be presented along this line. I also questioned the effect the reduction would have on the continued expansion of the oil and gas industry. This matter too had not been studied."

Spokesmen for the oil industry warn that the Treasury demanded cut of the depletion allowance "will decrease the incentive necessary to the development of adequate productive capacity and reserves. That service is rendered chiefly by independents, called wildcatters. Its cost to them has been multiplied since the present depletion allowance was fixed. The loss risks are correspondingly grown. Of 6,728 wells drilled during 1948 in the search for new oil, 5,480—or 81.5 percent—were dry, and 78 percent were drilled by the wildcatters. The one think that has made it possible for this group to live or die by their own efforts, testified one authority, is the application of the percentage depletion as we know it.

Whether or not the Treasury Department is interested in long-run results, the defense services show both interest and concern in the maintenance of adequate oil production and reserves here in our own land. Slackened search for new fields would diminish the defense reserves also, and the margin of national safety. Not only so; a slump in oil discoveries eventually would bring a slump in oil production and thus diminish the Federal tax take from the industry, making the Nation's next position—financial, economic, industrial and defensive—worse than its present one.

Congress, responsible guardian of the Nation's welfare, must take all these things into its reckoning. As the case stands, the Treasury's demand for destructive alteration of a national tax policy vindicated by more than 30 years' practical experience should in our judgment be rejected both as unfair and harmful to a key industry and hazardous to the Nation's domestic economy and safety.

Congressional Committee Bares Facts on Alleged Di Giorgio Ranch Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, a matter of great importance to many Members of the House has just occurred.

After the adjournment of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, entitled Subcommittee No. 1, investigated alleged agricultural labor disturbances at the Di Giorgio Ranch, in Kern County, Calif. The ranch belongs to the Di Giorgio Fruit Corp.

The committee's interest and the interest of this House was aroused by the release of a movie film and narrations which depicted deplorable conditions and physical disabilities of men purporting to result from the unconscionable actions of the employer, Di Giorgio Fruit Corp. The film was shown to the Committee on Education and Labor during hearings on pertinent labor legislation.

I recommend as the majority report of the subcommittee, signed by three members thereof, to all Members of this House who have any doubt about the libelous nature of the film as narrated by Mr. Harry W. Flannery. This majority report is conclusive proof that for 30 pieces of silver, more or less, Mr. Harry W. Flannery and his associates deliberately fabricated falsehoods. The officers of the National Farm Labor Union then admittedly used the fabrication to collect hundreds of thousands of dollars from workingmen throughout the country to finance a purported strike that did not exist. The majority report is another disclosure of corrupt men deliberately bearing false witness to do untold damage to employers and employees, as well as disservice to the legitimate American Labor movement, for a pittance by way of gain for themselves.

I am, therefore, including herein a copy of the majority report which has been signed by three members of the five-man Subcommittee No. 1.

My purpose in offering it today is that the Di Giorgio Ranch, referred to in the report, lies entirely within the Tenth District of California, which I represent. Public opinion in the area of the Di Giorgio Ranch is incensed over the falsehoods embraced in the said moving picture and narration and the fraud that has been perpetrated to the advantage of a handful of men. That area is desirous of immediately correcting the unfavorable publicity resulting from the libelous action. I am including the report in the RECORD today inasmuch as it may be several weeks before it is distributed in printed form by the subcommittee. It follows:

AGRICULTURAL LABOR AT DI GIORGIO FARMS, CALIFORNIA

Special Subcommittee No. 1, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, was constituted by the following authority:

The Honorable CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: By virtue of the authority vested in me as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and pursuant to House Resolution 75 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session, I hereby appoint you as chairman of Special Investigating Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on Education and Labor. Other members of the subcommittee will be the Honorable LEONARD IRVINE of Missouri, the Honorable TOM STEED of Oklahoma, the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON of California, and the Honorable THRUSTON BALLARD MORTON of Kentucky.

You are hereby authorized and directed to investigate conditions to provide for the education of children residing on certain nonsupporting federally owned property and children residing in localities overburdened with increased school enrollments resulting from Federal activities in the area and for other purposes as outlined in H. R. 4115.

You are further authorized and directed to conduct a thorough study and investigation of labor-management relations at the Di Giorgio Fruit Corporation known as the Di Giorgio Farms, in Di Giorgio, Calif.

You are further directed to hold such public or executive sessions as you may deem advisable, and you are hereby authorized and designated by me to issue and have served such subpenas as may be necessary in this investigation.

Upon completion of your study and investigation you are directed to prepare a report to the Congress with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as in the judgment of your subcommittee the facts warrant.

Very sincerely yours,

JOSEPH LESINSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

Pursuant to the authorization and direction of the whole committee, the subcommittee met on November 12–18, 1949, at Bakersfield, Calif. It heard sworn testimony from witnesses called by the National Farm Labor Union, the subcommittee, and the Di Giorgio Fruit Corp. It also viewed two motion pictures, one submitted by the union and one by the fruit corporation; and it visited the Di Giorgio Farms, Di Giorgio, Calif., and the surrounding area.

The hearing at Bakersfield and the visit to Di Giorgio Farms were for the purpose of inquiring into the background of a labor disturbance which occurred on October 1, 1947, at Di Giorgio Farms and thereafter. At least theoretically, it continues to the present day. There was a large volume of testimony on the part of the union concerning conditions of living and working on farms owned by corporations in general; and in a brief filed with the subcommittee the union took the position that such testimony was germane to the Di Giorgio Farms disturbance. There was also some testimony concerning conditions prevailing at Di Giorgio Farms in the past, going as far back as 1934. The subcommittee has been compelled, in order to report upon the issues involved in its investigation, to separate all such extraneous matter from that relevant to the question involved.

The subcommittee's view is that its authority and instructions were to investigate: (1) The hours, wages, working conditions and living conditions of the employees of Di Giorgio Fruit Corp. at Di Giorgio Farms during the period relevant to the labor disturbance there, i. e. roughly the period from June 1, 1947, to date; (2) the nature and history of the dispute; (3) consideration of proposed legislative changes suggested in connection with the foregoing.

I. THE DI GIORGIO FRUIT CORPORATION AND ITS DI GIORGIO FARMS

Di Giorgio Fruit Corp. is a Delaware corporation, with its principal office in San Francisco, Calif. Its business is the production and marketing of fruits and vegetables, and the activities incidental to that business. In 1946 its total assets were somewhat over $19,500,000, its total revenue over $18,000,000. Its founder and principal stockholder is Joseph Di Giorgio, who owns 48.9 percent of the class A common stock, 38.8

percent of the class B common stock, and 31.4 percent of the cumulative preferred stock. The remainder of the stock is owned by some 5,000 stockholders.

The corporation owns 11 orchards and one farm in Florida, and 8 orchards and vineyards in California. It also owns some interests in 3 fruit auction markets on the eastern seaboard, a box company and a wine company.

Joseph Di Giorgio is chairman of the board of directors of the corporation; his address is Di Giorgio, Calif. The president of the corporation is Philip Di Giorgio of New York City. One of the vice presidents, J. A. Di Giorgio, resides on Di Giorgio Farms. The other officers of the corporation reside either in New York or San Francisco; the directors in New York, San Francisco, Southern California, or Florida, and one in Cuba.

Di Giorgio Farms is a tract of almost 11,000 acres, or 18 square miles, in the San Joaquin Valley, about 15 miles southeast of Bakersfield, in Kern County, Calif. The development of the land to its present condition began with the purchase in 1919 of 2,000 acres of Kern County land by the fruit corporation's predecessor. At that time there was no significant agricultural production in Kern County; the land was dry and barren. Joseph Di Giorgio was active in the management of the company and the development of Di Giorgio Farms. By drilling deep wells for irrigation and experimenting with suitable crops, the land was brought to production and presently bears grapes, plums, potatoes, and asparagus, in order of importance.

Selection of crops by the fruit corporation has depended on two factors: (1) Individual crops which were suitable for the soil and weather of the area; (2) a combination of crops which would enable it to employ a relatively stable permanent labor force throughout the year. Employment ranges from approximately 1,200 permanent employees to 2,500 at harvest season; other growers in the area may have a temporary-permanent employment ratio of as much as 15 to 1.

II. THE DEPUTE OF THE FRUIT CORPORATION WITH THE NATIONAL FARM LABOR UNION

Early in 1947 the National Farm Labor Union sent Hank Hashiwar to Kern County as its western representative, to organize the farm workers there. He established Kern County Farm Union Local 218 and proceeded to organize some Di Giorgio Farms employees. In September of 1947 he requested the fruit corporation to recognize the local as the exclusive bargaining agent of its employees, claiming to represent a majority of them. The fruit corporation declined recognition, contending that local 218 did not represent its employees or any substantial number of them. Thereupon, on October 1, 1947, local 218 established a picket line at Di Giorgio Farms.

The evidence before the subcommittee, including the testimony of the secretary of the California State Federation of Labor, establishes that the sole issue in this dispute is recognition. Members of the union testified to various grievances concerning wages, hours, working conditions, and living conditions, but all of these were obviously afterthoughts and makeweights. This strike was solely one for the purpose of organization.

The National Farm Labor Union does not hold any collective bargaining contracts in the State of California. Yet it has maintained a picket line against a single employer for over 3 years, and its representatives and others have testified that the wages, hours, working conditions, and living conditions on that employer's farm are not inferior to those elsewhere; the subcommittee finds that they are, for the most part, superior. Wages, hours, working conditions, and living conditions have never been a real issue in the Di Giorgio strike.

III. WAGES AND WORKING CONDITIONS AT DI GIORGIO FARMS

Although these issues are not actually present in the dispute between the fruit corporation and the union, there is much testimony in the record concerning them, and the subcommittee deems it desirable to report on wages, working conditions, and living conditions at Di Giorgio Farms. The union presented its film, Poverty in the Valley of Plenty, which is designed to represent living and working conditions at Di Giorgio Farms. The fruit corporation presented its film, The Di Giorgio Story, relating to the same matters.

The union film was also shown to the committee during its hearings on H. R. 2032 in Washington on March 16, 1949. The committee has been seriously imposed upon by the union by the presentation of the film Poverty in the Valley of Plenty at that time. The film itself, and the president of the union in presenting it, represented to the committee that the conditions depicted in the film existed on Di Giorgio Farms and led up to a strike there. The committee's belief in the truth of these statements induced it to authorize and instruct this subcommittee to investigate the facts. The union's president now takes the position that the film relates, not to Di Giorgio Farms but to corporate farms in general. The educational director and the western representative of the union insist that the film is a true picture of the Di Giorgio Farms. The subcommittee finds that, insofar as it purports to represent conditions existing on Di Giorgio Farms, the film Poverty in the Valley of Plenty was made and was presented to the committee in disregard of the truth.

The film purports to relate the facts surrounding the wages, working conditions, and living conditions of employees of the fruit corporation at Di Giorgio Farms. The subcommittee finds the facts to be as follows:

Wages: The lowest wage paid at Di Giorgio Farms is 80 cents per hour for field work. The highest is $1.10 per hour for loaders. These wage levels are, if not the highest, at least as high as any in the area. Neighboring farmers testified that the fruit corporation had always been the leader in the matter of raising wage scales, which the other farmers followed in order to keep their employees. There is testimony in the record by a union witness to show that wages at Di Giorgio Farms rose from a depression-born low during the midthirties by steady progression to their present levels.

Wages are not a grievance or a strike issue.

Working conditions: Individual members of the union testified to various grievances over a 15-year period. One of these was that persons often came to Di Giorgio Farms seeking employment, and if not hired were not paid. There was no evidence that the fruit corporation ever called in a worker and failed to hire or pay him. Another grievance was that foremen were given the power to discharge field workers; another that foremen and supervisors were extended privileges not extended to field workers; that drinking water in the fields was not iced; that workers in refrigerating rooms were not given extra pay; that foremen had to supervise too large groups of employees.

Insofar as the afore-mentioned grievances are concerned, the subcommittee found that in some instances they were not supported by the evidence, in others they were inconsequential and that in no event did they constitute an issue in the strike.

In its motion-picture film, Poverty in the Valley of Plenty, the union said that the fruit corporation required its irrigators to work 12 hours, but paid them for only 11. This statement was wholly false, as witnesses both for the fruit corporation and the union agreed.

Living conditions: The union film also represents that living conditions on Di Giorgio Farms consist of disreputable, filthy shacks, and that the living habits of the occupants are substandard and squalid.

The film contains unmistakable innuendos that the houses pictured in it are on Di Giorgio Farms. None of the houses shown is fit for human beings to live in. They are in varying states of disrepair, unpainted and sordid. They are surrounded with junk and with undernourished children and dogs. Near one is a shower, said to be used by 25 or 30 families, lacking in hot water, and situated next to a cow pen. The film charges that the fruit corporation rents washing machines to employees for 50 cents per hour, and that women are compelled to heat water over open fires. No one could doubt that these charges are leveled straight at the corporation.

All of these representations are false. The shacks portrayed, said to exist on Di Giorgio Farms, are not on the farm. It is inferred that the fruit corporation charges its employees $25 per month for such housing; all the witnesses agreed that $3 per month is the maximum ever charged; and that at present all company housing is rent-free.

In fact, the National Farm Labor Union film, Poverty in the Valley of Plenty, insofar as it purports to represent conditions existing on Di Giorgio Farms, is a shocking collection of falsehoods, almost wholly unrelieved by any regard whatever for the truth and the facts. The subcommittee believes that responsible labor leadership will join with it in decrying the attempt of the National Farm Labor Union's organizers to win their case by dishonest presentation. The cause of organized labor is not aided when one group of union organizers are willing to besmirch the public reputation of labor as a whole, in order to advance their own interests.

The evidence and the subcommittee's visit to the premises demonstrated that the housing conditions at Di Giorgio Farms are at least as good as any to be found on similar properties in agriculture. The fruit corporation maintains several types of housing: cottages for supervisory personnel; smaller houses (2–4 rooms) for field and shed workers; apartments; and dormitories for single men. The houses are respectable, though not pretentious, enjoy modern facilities, including electricity, and in addition have garbage disposal service and fire protection at company expense. Separate facilities are maintained for workers whose backgrounds give them different dietary tastes, and they are provided with food which is acceptable to them. All the union witnesses agreed that the food furnished by the company is better than average.

Recreational, educational, and religious facilities: The union represented to the committee that Di Giorgio workers were deprived of all recreational, educational, and religious opportunities. The evidence shows that the fruit corporation provides swimming pools and tennis courts for all employees. It does not maintain any schools or churches. However, there are ample, modern well-equipped schools in the vicinity, including a new high school in Arvin. A new grammar school building near the farm was made possible by a gift of 40 acres of land and $150,000 cash by the fruit corporation. The fruit corporation supports these schools by payment of 64 percent of the taxes of Di Giorgio school district; and it has contributed land or cash or both to the churches in the area.

Welfare provisions: The union in its film represented that Di Giorgio workers were without any protection in case of accidental injury, and depicted a maimed worker in the fields who, it said, would receive no

compensation for his injuries from the Di Giorgio Farms. The evidence shows that this individual was not injured on the Di Giorgio Farms and that in fact the fruit corporation has always maintained full workmen's compensation insurance protection for all of its employees, though not required to by law. Such statements have convinced the subcommittee that the union did not make a fair and truthful presentation.

An official of the fruit corporation testified that the company did not provide unemployment insurance for its workers; had no pension plan; provided no old-age insurance. However, the fruit corporation offers employees of 1 year's standing a group life insurance policy, on which the company pays 60 percent of the premiums.

Mexican labor: The union in its film Poverty in the Valley of Plenty insinuated that the fruit corporation engaged in a program of smuggling Mexican aliens, wetbacks, across the border to work in its fields. At the hearing it did not charge smuggling but did complain at length of the hiring of Mexican nationals by the fruit corporation.

The fruit corporation had participated in the program instituted by the Federal Government during the war of hiring Mexican nationals to supplement the Nation's farm labor force. One hundred thirty of these nationals remained at Di Giorgio Farms when the union set up its picket line on October 1, 1947. After the situation was explained to them by a representative of the Department of Agriculture, they unanimously signified their desire to continue to work, and did so. The fruit corporation contends that the farm labor union brought pressure to bear on the State Department and, in violation of the Government's contract, these nationals were removed from Di Giorgio Farms.

Illegal aliens have from time to time been found on Di Giorgio Farms, just as they have been found on almost every farm in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and southern California. There is no evidence that the fruit corporation ever smuggled any alien into the United States, or hired an illegal alien knowing his status. The union's charges in this respect appear to be completely unfounded. In any event they throw no light whatever on the issues involved in the labor disturbances, and have no real place here.

IV. THE LABOR DISPUTE AT DI GIORGIO AND THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

After the picket line was set up at Di Giorgio Farms the work of growing, harvesting, and shipping the produce of the farm continued. A majority of the employees of the fruit corporation continued to work, or returned to work within a few weeks. There were allegations of a few isolated cases of violence by both sides in the early months of the strike; but the picket line may be regarded as a relatively peaceful one, and the subcommittee finds that the union made it its policy to discourage violence.

Since the picket line failed to affect the operations of the fruit corporation or to accomplish the organization of its employees, the union embarked upon a series of secondary activities. In this it had the aid of a few of the members of a winery local at Di Giorgio Winery, and of some other trade unions. The farm labor union picketed the winery; it picketed another distant winery, owned by a wholly separate company; it placed a mass picket line across the tracks of the railroads which serve Di Giorgio Farms, and it boycotted the produce of Di Giorgio Farms in southern California cities by picketing distributors in that area.

After an investigation of complaint, the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board sued out an injunction against this conduct, which was granted by the United States District Court for the Southern District of California against the unions involved, including the farm labor union and other unions acting in concert with it, under section 10 (j) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

The fruit corporation thereafter filed unfair labor practice charges with the Board against the same unions under section 8 (b) (1) (A) and 8 (b) (4) (A) of the act. The trial examiner found that all the factual charges in the complaint were true. He exonerated all the respondents under section 8 (b) (1) (A). He recommended that the Board's order issue under section 8 (b) (1) (A) against all the unions except the farm union and a teamsters' local, both of which purported to represent, for the purpose of the proceedings, agricultural workers only. The theory of the trial examiner was that the Board could not impose sanctions upon the farm union, since, he said, the act does not extend its benefits to the farm union. The fruit corporation and the general counsel of the Board filed exceptions to the trial examiner's report, and the matter has been submitted to the Board.

The farm union takes the position in its brief before the subcommittee that it is inconceivable that any group could be subjected to the sanctions provided by the act, unless it were extended privileges and benefits under the act. Counsel for the fruit corporation, in a statement to the subcommittee, said that the position of the fruit corporation is that Congress "need not purchase compliance with the laws of the United States at the price of benefits and privileges."

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATION GROWING OUT OF THE DI GIORGIO LABOR DISTURBANCE

The law, the strike issues, and the investigation: The hearing and investigation at Bakersfield and DiGiorgio Farms were held at the request of the National Farm Labor Union. The reason stated for this request was that a situation existed on Di Giorgio Farms which called for immediate action in order to prevent further unfair and ill treatment of agricultural workers at Di Giorgio Farms. The committee was told that legislation was required in order to correct the abuses of corporation farmers and their lobbies.

Relying on this request and these representations, the subcommittee came to Bakersfield and visited Di Giorgio Farms. Witnesses were called by both sides, and the subpena power of the subcommittee was made available to the union and the fruit corporation. The union called no pickets to testify; and there was no picket line at the farm when the subcommittee went there. No employee of Di Giorgio Fruit Corp. was called by the union to testify to his wish to become a member of the farm labor union, and to the fruit corporation's thwarting of his wish. The subcommittee interviewed Di Giorgio employees and no one of them signified a desire to become a member of the union or his acquaintance with any other employee who held such a desire. No witness called by the union testified to anything which represented a substantial strike issue, or even approximated the charges depicted in the union's film, Poverty in the Valley of Plenty.

The contrast between that film, with the testimony accompanying it in Washington last March, and the case made by the union at the Bakersfield hearing and investigation, is most striking. The way in which the union presented its evidence shows that this committee has been induced to spend its time and the taxpayers' money to publicize the leadership of a labor organization which has no contracts, no grievances, no strike, no pickets, and only a handful of members; its only apparent reason for existence is its voluble leaders.

The processes of the Congress of the United States have been perverted and misused by the National Farm Labor Union in order to furnish a soundingboard for its claims. The committee should certainly not be without power to prevent the recurrence of this kind of abuse of its functions and impositions upon its energies.

Workmen's compensation: The question of workmen's compensation is not relevant here since, contrary to the charges of the union, the fruit corporation has always provided full compensation-insurance protection for all its employees, including agricultural workers of every description.

Fair-labor standards: This matter likewise has no bearing on the present issues. The undisputed evidence shows that the fruit corporation had a minimum-wage level of 80 cents per hour long before the Fair Labor Standards Act was amended to provide even 75 cents.

Old-age and unemployment insurance: The fruit corporation has not provided benefits of this character. However, the question whether its employees should be covered has been repeatedly considered by the Congress, and the Congress has repeatedly found that they should not be. Lack of coverage is the result of exemptions in the law, and not the action of the fruit corporation. The fruit corporation does provide low-cost life insurance as a measure of welfare protection.

The National Farm Labor Union recommends removal of the exemptions of agricultural labor from labor legislation. Agricultural labor has been exempted from all labor relations legislation ever written. The evidence before the subcommittee shows that it would be harmful to the public interest and to all responsible labor unions to legislate otherwise. The evidence shows that a strike of any serious proportions in agriculture would choke off interstate commerce in necessary foodstuffs, would cause incalculable harm to the public, and would antagonize public opinion to the cause of trade-unionism. It would not only result in temporary distress of a character more serious than has ever been experienced, it would result in permanent loss of farm employment and permanent loss to the public of farm production, and, of course, permanent ruin to the farmers of the Nation.

The union has suggested that the fruit corporation is of such a size and character that it should be differentiated from other farm producers. The union did not, however, suggest any valid basis for differentiation of small farmers from large ones, or of corporate farms from farms owned by individuals or other forms of business organization. In fact, the union disclaims taking the position that the mere bigness of the fruit corporation is a vice. This must be apparent to anyone who has seen Di Giorgio Farms. It is perfectly obvious that, were this acreage distributed to its permanent workers, none of the 1,200 could make a living on his 9 acres. If Di Giorgio Farms had not been developed and operated by a corporation, or some individual or organization possessing comparable capital, it could never have been developed or operated at all.

Mere size is not a sound basis for differentiating between farmers. It is evident that any condition imposed by law upon a large farmer, automatically becomes a condition under which every farmer, however small, must operate. It is idle to contend that 1 or 2 or 10 farms in Kern County may be subjected to congressionally imposed standards, without subjecting their neighbors to the same standards.

The subcommittee finds that the exemption of agricultural labor from the Labor Management Relations Act is sound, being based upon facts which clearly differentiate agriculture from industry in this regard.

Other legislative recommendations: The fruit corporation contended that the exemption of labor organizations from the antitrust laws resulted in serious abuses which

required repeal of the exemption. The evidence before the subcommittee showed that the farm union possesses no collective bargaining contracts, at least in California, and has created no labor disturbance except at Di Giorgio Farms. The only conduct of the union which violates the antitrust laws is its secondary boycott activity, and in this regard the exemption is created by Supreme Court decisions construing the Norris-La-Guardia Act. Since the secondary boycott is already made unlawful by the Labor Management Relations Act, as discussed above, no recommendation is here made with respect to this contention of the fruit corporation.

The union made certain recommendations for State legislation which the subcommittee does not deem it appropriate to discuss.

It also recommended certain Federal legislation, most of which is discussed above. The evidence shows that all of the union recommendations not previously discussed have no application to the facts at Di Giorgio Farms, and the subcommittee therefore considers them irrelevant.

RICHARD NIXON.
THORSTEN R. LADY.
TOM STEED.

Michigan Alumni in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there is included herewith an extension of remarks covering a recent item in the Michigan Alumnus of January 14, 1950:

TWENTY-ONE ALUMNI ARE SENATORS IN CONGRESS

From the earliest days of the university, Michigan's alumni body has produced many men and women who have contributed distinguished public service to their communities and to their countries. In years past, a significant number of former university students have become members of the Congress of the United States.

It is doubtful if any information agency has ever attempted to tabulate a complete listing of all Michigan alumni who have been elected to the Senate and the House of Representatives, although Ira A. Campbell, 1895, '02l, in contributing a chapter to Michigan and the Cleveland Era (University of Michigan Press, 1948), presents an excellent summary of the former students who gained membership during two specific periods—the two Presidential terms of Grover Cleveland.

At times, alumni of the university have constituted 5 percent of the entire membership of the National Legislature. During the Cleveland era, which spanned the Forty-Ninth and Fiftieth Congresses (1885 to 1889) and the Fifty-Third and Fifty-Fourth Congresses (1893 to 1897), many Michigan alumni served in Congress.

Of the 76 Senators and 325 Representatives in the Forty-ninth Congress, the University was represented by one Senator and by 10 Representatives. The succeeding Congress again had one Senator who had received his education at the university, while the number of Representatives increased to 13. In the Fifty-third Congress, there were two Senators and 16 alumni representatives, and in the Fifty-fourth the representation again increased, to 4 Senators and 18 Representatives.

Today, the membership rolls of the Eighty-first Congress of the United States list the names of 22 alumni of the university. Some of the legislators completed all of their higher education on the Michigan campus, while others took credit courses at Michigan as well as at other educational institutions. Two of the men attained alumni status although they did not pursue any degree work in Ann Arbor. Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas was a recipient of an honorary degree of doctor of laws at the 1948 commencement, while Representative ALBERT J. ENGEL, of Michigan's Ninth District, in 1937, was unanimously elected by the board of regents as an honorary alumnus.

A total of seven United States Senators are alumni of the university. The State of Michigan is represented by ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, l'01–'02, A. M. (Hon.) '25, LL. D. (Hon.) '47, of Grand Rapids, and HOMER FERGUSON, '13l, of Detroit. The other Senators are CLINTON P. ANDERSON, '15–'16, LL. D. (Hon.) '46, of Albuquerque, N. Mex.; SHERIDAN DOWNEY, '07l, of Laguna Beach, Calif.; LISTER HILL, as'14, of Montgomery, Ala.; ALEXANDER WILEY, l'04–'06, of Chippewa Falls, Wis., and SENATOR FULBRIGHT.

Senators VANDENBERG and HILL have both served their constituents for more than two decades. In 1928 Senator VANDENBERG was appointed to that body by Gov. Fred W. Green, '96l, to fill the remainder of the term left vacant by the death of Woodbridge N. Ferris, as'73–'74. In the fall of 1928, Senator VANDENBERG was elected to the post which he has held ever since. Senator HILL, who studied in the university's law school during the summer of 1914 following his graduation from the University of Alabama, first went to Washington as a Member of the House of Representatives. He served in eight successive Congresses, from 1923 until 1939, when he resigned to become a Senator.

Youngest of the alumni Senators, in point of service, is Senator ANDERSON, whose term began with the Eighty-first Congress, following the elections of November 1948. Prior to running for this office, however, Senator ANDERSON had a distinguished career in many responsible Government posts, including the Cabinet position of Secretary of Agriculture. Senators DOWNEY, FERGUSON, and WILEY are serving their second terms.

Last year Albert P. Blaustein, '41, New York attorney, wrote a series of articles for the American Bar Association Journal which required research on the legal background of the Members of the Eighty-first Congress. He found that there were 64 lawyers included in the 96 men comprising the Senate. In addition there were 15 ex-judges and 31 former city, county, State, and Federal attorneys. These men attended 99 different universities, Harvard topping the list with 9 alumni. Columbia contributed 7 of its former students; University of Alabama, 5; Yale, 4; Georgetown, 3; 2 alumni each from 15 more universities; and 1 each of the remainder.

As noted, 5 of the Michigan alumni Senators took courses in the university law school. Blaustein's report notes that the membership of the Senate represents 40 different law schools. In addition to the men who studied law in Ann Arbor, 6 men went to Harvard; 5 to Columbia; 3 each to Yale, Alabama, and Georgetown; 2 each to the universities of Virginia, Maryland, Temple, and West Virginia; and 1 each to the remainder of the 40 institutions.

Similar data was compiled for the membership of the House of Representatives. Of the 435 Members, 254 were lawyers. The 435 Members attended 206 colleges and universities and, in addition, the 254 lawyers attended 74 law schools. In both of these categories, the total of university alumni in the House of Representatives ranked near the top behind leading Harvard University.

Fifteen Members of the House have taken academic work at Michigan. Two of them, PAUL CUNNINGHAM, '14, '15l, of Des Moines, Iowa, and ALVIN F. WEICHEL, '22, '24l, of Sandusky, Ohio, gained both their bachelor's and law degrees from the university. Four more came to Michigan to complete their preparation for legal careers: WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, 12l, Flint, Mich.; JAMES S. GOLDEN, '16l, Pineville, Ky.; FRANK B. KEEFE, '10l, Oshkosh, Wis.; and ROLLA C. MCMILLEN, '06l, Decatur, Ill.

Representative GERALD R. FORD, Jr., '35, Grand Rapids, Mich., played varsity football while completing his undergraduate work, and Representative RALPH E. CHURCH, '07, l'07–08, Evanston, Ill., attended law school for 1 year following his graduation from the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts. Other alumni now in Congress, all of whom received a portion of their education at Michigan, are: LEO E. ALLEN, '19–'21, l'21–'22, Galena, Ill.; FRED L. CRAWFORD, Saginaw, Mich., who studied political economy for 3 years, 1925–27, through the extension service; J. CARL HINSHAW, g'16–'17, Pasadena, Calif., who took graduate work; EARL C. MICHENER, l'00–'01, Adrian, Mich.; PAUL W. SHAFER, Battle Creek, Mich., who received some of his legal training through Michigan extension courses; and GEORGE H. WILSON, l'26–'27, Enid, Okla.

Of all the Michigan alumni now holding membership in the Eighty-first Congress, Representative MICHENER has been in office for the longest period. With the exception of one 2-year term, he has represented the Second Congressional District of Michigan—which includes the city of Ann Arbor—continuously since 1919.

Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article in the March 9 issue of the Washington Post on the Brannan plan.

I feel that it is an interesting article and points up some of the areas of thought and discussion that should be valuable to us in the present controversy over "What farm program shall we have."

Definitely it can now be established that Secretary Brannan would have been on better ground had he proposed his so-called Brannan plan for perishables alone and have allowed more time for a proper disposition of the War Board price support program on nonperishable and storable commodities.

THE BIGGEST TROUBLE, THOUGH A SUBTLE ONE, WITH ALL PROGRAMS IS THAT IT PUTS THE GOVERNMENT BETWEEN THE PRODUCERS AND CONSUMERS

It is because of my own introduction of this observation that I am pleased to herewith include the article by Ysabel and Robert Rennie:

BRANNAN PLAN MAY BE THRID IF PRICE SUPPORT MESS GOES ON

(By Ysabie and Robert Rennie)

If present farm supports continue to get out of hand, as they have been doing in the case of potatoes, Congress may yet give the Brannan plan a try.

Last year it was opposed by every major farm organization except the National Farmers' Union, and Congress turned it down. Today farmers as well as Congressmen are beginning to wonder whether anything might not be better than the present mess.

Secretary Brannan's farm-support program is aimed primarily at the perishables which account for 75 percent of farm income. These are commodities which will spoil in storage—things like milk, poultry, eggs, meat, fruits, and vegetables.

Today we buy up nonperishable crops to keep prices at high support levels. But for perishables like potatoes the solution will not work.

Secretary Brannan would sell these products on the open market for whatever they would bring. If the market prices were below support levels, the Government would make up the difference in production payments to the farmer. The consumer would get the benefit of low food prices, the farmer of high incomes.

WOULD MAINTAIN BUYING POWER

Support prices would be set to guarantee that a bushel of potatoes or a box of oranges would have the same purchasing power as in the base period, whatever happened to the price of the things the farmer must buy. The base would not be an obsolete period like 1910–14, but rather the first 10 of the preceding 12 years. Each year the base would move forward.

The Brannan plan would put a brake on the farm prices during downswings. It would also prevent the violent year-to-year fluctuations which have characterized farm income in the past.

After all, the prices of things the farmer buys—cars, tractors, furniture—change very little from one year to another. But farm prices have risen and fallen with the sickening speed of a small boat in a heavy sea.

There is one other feature of the Brannan plan which should be mentioned. It would limit support payments to the maximum output of a family-size farm—at 1949 prices, about $25,000 worth of produce. Under present law, some farmers received hundreds of thousands of dollars in subsidy payments and at least one farmer received several millions.

OTHER POINTS OF DIFFERENCE

There are other points in which this program differs from the present Agricultural Act.

For one thing, the Government would not, on most foods, buy commodities to keep their prices up. Not only would food prices drop to free-market levels, they might actually drop below them. This is because high support prices encourage larger output, and the greater the production, the lower the market price.

To prevent a glut of food and a collapse in market prices, the Brannan plan would have to rely on direct controls like marketing quotas and acreage allotments. This is a feature farmers do not like.

If every wheat farmer was ordered to cut acreage by 20 percent, farmers with high-yield land would be forced to take much of it out of production. At the same time, the marginal farmer would be encouraged to sow on poor land. This is no way to raise farm productivity. It has quite the opposite effect.

Limiting benefits to the average output of large family farms would have the same result. Family farms are not as efficient as the larger industrialized ones.

By penalizing efficiency, we are confusing social and economic objectives. It may be socially desirable to keep the small-family farm as a way of life, but we should understand that the policy has its economic costs.

FARM SUBSIDY COSTS HIDDEN

Would the Brannan plan cost more than our price-support program? This is the question that bothers Congress. At present the cost of farm subsidies is pretty well hidden. Much of it is paid by the consumer at the grocery store. Only the minor portion shows up on his tax bill.

Under the Brannan plan, almost the whole bill would be paid by congressional appropriation. The amount probably would be higher than the present cost, in taxes and food prices, of the farm program. There are two reasons for this: the support level would be higher, and it would cover many products which are not now supported.

On the other hand, the average family would eat better because food prices would be much lower. For the same reason our agricultural exports would once more become competitive in the world market.

Secretary Brannan calls his plan an income-support program. It is, of course, nothing of the kind. No price subsidies can raise farm income where it is lowest, on the small-family farms which raise little more than what they consume.

Out of the 1,559,706 farms harvesting cotton in 1939, almost 80 percent reported less than eight bales. Obviously, neither the Brannan plan nor the present support law would solve their problem.

Price supports, however clever the formula, can only guarantee a higher living standard to the farmer who already has a reasonably high one.

Harry Outen Cole, Interoceanic Ship-Canal Engineer and Builder of the Pacific End of the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, 1950, West Virginia lost one of her most illustrious sons, Harry Outen Cole, of Morgantown, who died at his home in the early morning of that day, ending a life of extraordinary distinction.

As an engineer of the highest order of ability his career transcended the confines of normal experience in that his constructive contributions covered a wide range of projects and interests and were international in scope. His greatest achievement was, as resident engineer in charge, the responsible supervision of the construction of the entire Pacific end of the Panama Canal south of Culebra Cut, 1908–14. This work included the two Pacific locks and the Pacific sea-level section of the Canal with the accessory features.

Though his activities carried him to distant lands on a variety of major undertakings, he always thought of his canal work as being the high point in his experiences, and he became a lifelong student of that tropical waterway, ever solicitous of its integrity and interested in its rational improvement.

When, in 1947, the old 1906 issue as to the form of the future Panama Canal, known in canal literature as the "Battle of the Levels," was resurrected under the guise of "conversion" by the recommendations in a report of the Governor of the Panama Canal under Public Law 280 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, Mr. Cole was deeply interested.

After studying the available new data he became seriously concerned about the recommendations of the Governor and undertook to enlighten the American people on the subject—to reveal what he considered the principal fallacies upon which the proposed sea-level project was developed and to outline what he felt was the best solution.

In that effort he was forthright and fearless in his approach. After a careful study he recognized the operational inadequacy of the present Pacific lock system, and the serious navigational hazards in the lock and channel arrangements which would have been produced by the third locks project. He instinctively recognized and accepted the terminal lake plan for the future Panama Canal as offering the soundest and most economical means for the modernization of the Panama Canal from every point of view, especially from that of the vessel which transit the canal. He did this in spite of the fact that—as he fully realized—such work would require the reconstruction of the Pacific locks whose building he had supervised. Hence it is clear that his judgment as an engineer was not clouded by any considerations of sentiment.

With respect to the sea-level proposal he was an implacable foe. His writings are replete with exposures of the unwarranted assumptions upon which that plan was promoted in 1947. He often expressed the opinion that the sea-level plan, as proposed, would be less satisfactory operationally and vastly more costly to construct and maintain than the canal it would replace, and that it is entirely unjustified from every point of view, especially national security and national defense.

In a moving address delivered on May 8, 1948, in Washington, D. C., before the Panama Canal Societies of the United States in tribute to the late Sydney B. Williamson, who from 1908 to 1912 was his superior at Panama, Mr. Cole declared in words which reflected his heartfelt sincerity:

Were Colonel Williamson with us today he would join with the late C. A. McIlvaine in saying, "The Panama Canal was the great love of my life, the one thing I have encountered worth devoting my life to." That is the way all the men and women who built the Canal feel.

I want you to know that some of us who had the unparalleled engineering experience of building the Canal and know at first hand about its serious problems and dangers have some very definite ideas in the recent recommendations for the conversion of the present Canal to sea level, and we know that the public is not being as adequately informed on this question as it should be. At the right time we shall be heard. It is your duty to write your views to your Representatives and Senators on the subject.

Many eminent engineers have from time to time expressed themselves in strong opposition to a sea-level canal at Panama for reasons based upon definite knowledge and experience. Among these statements the most eloquent, the most forceful, and the one most historically based was made by the former Chief Engineer, John F. Stevens, on July 13, 1927, before the American Society of Civil Engineers. When discussing the sea-level controversy of 1906 and the decision of Congress to build the high-lake-type canal, he stated: "I have been privileged to be of

some little service to my country, and the greatest service I ever gave to it was the part I took in preventing foreign votes from foisting a nameless, useless, sea-level canal (as proposed by the majority of the consulting board) upon a too-credulous American people."

These words of Senator are just as true today as they were when he said them. We are now in another critical period for the Panama Canal.

I feel it my duty to warn you and the American people that, if this so-called sea-level conversion project is undertaken, it may prove to be the practical destruction of the Panama Canal and disruption of the world's maritime shipping for an indefinite period of time, to say nothing of the futile and wasteful expenditure of billions of dollars and the blot on the reputation of the American engineering profession that could never be erased. (Hon. Chapman Revercomb, Tribute to the Late Sydney E. Williamson. (Extension of Remarks. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 80th Cong., 2d sess., May 21, 1948, vol. 94, part 11, Appendix, p. A3191.))

Other recent writings of Mr. Cole of technical nature have been published in extensions of remarks by Members of Congress and are now listed as matters of historical interest:

Hon. Melvin C. Snyder, What Should Be Done To Improve the Panama Canal? CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Eightieth Congress, second session, May 4, 1948, volume 94, part 10, Appendix, page A2743.

Hon. HARLEY O. STAGGERS, Panama Canal—the Sea-Level Project, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Eighty-first Congress, first session, February 9, 1949, volume 95, part 12, Appendix, page A562.

Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN, Waterway Improvements, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 14, 1949, volume 95, part 12, Appendix, page A760.

These papers set forth his views on the canal question in words of power. Together they form an important part of the technical record which restored national thinking concerning this grave subject to a sound basis. I am happy that I was privileged to include one of his writings in an extension of my remarks. The death of Harry Cole—especially at this time—is, indeed, a national loss; but, fortunately, his ideas are recorded in permanent form. They will remain vital and serve as an important beacon in the stream of future events.

A Practical Step Toward Better Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal for March 4, 1950:

A PRACTICAL STEP TOWARD BETTER EDUCATION

By a senate resolution, Kentucky has taken the first step to enter the plan of cooperation among Southern States for college education. It is natural that this will revive the debate over racial segregation. Many see the plan to be an effort to evade the Constitution and the Supreme Court and to perpetuate segregation.

This newspaper believes, however, that if every State in the South broke down tomorrow all laws and customs on segregation, the regional college plan would still be a good and desirable one. The issue of segregation and the issue of better education and better opportunities for all are two different things.

It may be admitted that the cooperative plan was first thought up as a way of keeping segregation by building first-rate colleges, mutually supported and used, to which Negro students would be sent. In the early narrow contemplation this would comply with the Court's mandate of equal facilities for all and still avoid a supposed touchy situation. But the idea has gone far beyond that.

Today the aim is to pool resources to build strong professional schools in which all States may share. In many fields of education, no Southern State has been doing a good job. Money is notoriously lacking in a region of low resources. Southern educators long have seen that they could not hope to set up all the facilities needed on a State-by-State basis. At this rate, each State duplicating the schools of the others, no school would be really good.

The idea grew that if instead of 11 schools for teaching, say, veterinary medicine, one institution, or three or four institutions could be maintained, it would be better all around. The original idea was left behind. The broader idea was explained by Millard Caldwell, former Governor of Florida and chairman of the board of control for Southern Regional Education. "The plan is not intended," he writes in an analysis of the legal points involved, "to relieve the States of any responsibility under the fourteenth amendment of the United States Constitution; nor could it, for that matter."

In other words, if segregation were wiped out and jealous tradition laid aside, the result would apply to regional schools as well as State schools.

Negroes and white groups opposed to segregation in colleges are not opposed to the plan of regional education in itself. Their attitude was set forth in an editorial in the Journal of Negro Education last year, which said:

"Why are Negroes opposed to segregated regional graduate and professional work? The answer briefly is that they are opposed only to the segregated aspects of it. They have no objection to and see considerable advantage in regional services which are based upon a principle which looks forward to a greater educational future for the South, rather than backward to a decade or more ago."

As matters stand now, it is a fact that citizens of several States, white and colored alike, cannot get at home certain professional training. Segregation has no place in their situation. Florida and West Virginia, for example, have no medical schools. To remedy this situation would cost upward of 10 to 20 million dollars for buildings and equipment, and large sums for operation. The problem is solved for them under the regional plan. The regional compact, which 10 States already signed, opens to their citizens medical schools at Vanderbilt, Tennessee, Tulane, Louisiana State, Meharry (the Negro college at Nashville), Duke, and Emory. The States pay $1,500 a year a student. John I. Ivey and William McGlothlin, directors of the system, make it plain:

"A State shares the school it has in one field and buys use of a school elsewhere in a field in which it is deficient. The system adds up to a more efficient use of facilities and a practical application of the regional philosophy. It permits the region to put its combined strength into the development of a school that, through location and present growth, holds greatest promise for service to the region."

Package Freight Trade on the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include statement of Mr. Harry C. Brockel, Milwaukee, Wis., before the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Maritime Matters of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, February 11, 1950.

The problem of restoring our Great Lakes package freight trade is of major import and worthy of serious study on the part of the Congress of the United States. I hope every Member of Congress will read Mr. Brockel's very complete statement on the need for revitalizing package freight and passenger service on the Great Lakes. This is additional proof for the necessity of amending the Ship Sales Act of 1946 as provided for in bills introduced in this body by 28 Members, including myself and Congressman BLATNIK.

STATEMENT OF HARRY C. BROCKEL, MILWAUKEE, WIS., BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND MARITIME MATTERS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 11, 1950

I appear before your honorable committee as a public witness in behalf of the maritime interests of the Great Lakes region. I am municipal port director of the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Milwaukee, and appear here as representative of that city.

I am also secretary of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, which represents some 25 to 30 Great Lakes ports, large and small, and my statement represents the views of that organization also. Further to qualify myself, may I say that I am immediate past president of the American Association of Port Authorities, which is vitally interested in the rehabilitation of domestic shipping, coastwise, intercoastal, and Great Lakes. I also represent the Great Lakes on the Joint Committee for the American Merchant Marine.

The net effect of World War II, insofar as our seagoing merchant marine is concerned, was to modernize our ocean fleets and to expand our off-shore fleet tremendously. In direct contrast, World War II had the effect of completely destroying some very vital segments of Great Lakes shipping. The recent war, in some respects a blessing to our ocean merchant marine, was directly the opposite insofar as the Great Lakes is concerned.

The Great Lakes are one of America's major transportation arteries. They serve an area which is one of the most highly productive regions of the globe, with a population of 50,000,000 people. No other nation or continent has been favored by inland seas of such magnitude and importance nor with such volume and value of commerce.

Although the Great Lakes serve an immense water-borne commerce, certain segments of Great Lakes water transportation have been seriously affected by competitive factors, and there has been considerable displacement of vessels as a result of World War II. The unfavorable conditions which confront the domestic merchant marine generally have been felt on the Great Lakes as well as in the intercoastal and coastwise trades. The problems which beset the domestic merchant marine are much the same on the Great Lakes as on salt water, and an adequate solution of the domestic merchant marine problem must take cognizance of the lake situation as well as the oceans.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Unlimited space could be devoted to an historical discussion outlining the rise and fall of the Great Lakes package freight trade. To summarize briefly the competitive and commercial conditions which led to the progressive decline in the volume of package freight handled on the Great Lakes, mention several important factors. These include the prewar competitive attitude of the rail carriers, which permitted package freight services a mere existence and over a period of years progressively reduced the number of commodities available for water carriage; the new competition of truck carriers, which drove out of existence the so-called alongshore vessel services operating port-to-port services of regional importance; the gradual rise in operating costs even prior to World War II, accompanied by a parallel decline in revenues; and finally, the necessities of war, which resulted in the United States and Canadian Governments requisitioning of scores of lake ships for ocean service, thus forcing the suspension of all general cargo services available at the outbreak of the war.

Thus a trade which 25 years ago employed a large fleet of vessels and gave productive employment and profitable activity to seamen, stevedores, warehouses, terminals, shipyards, and other phases of the marine industry, gradually declined from its earlier importance and was barely existing when World War II placed the final quietus on these historical services these trades are dormant today, as steamship operators have either been unable or unwilling to reenter the trade, and there has been no constructive action by Government agencies looking toward restoration of these services.

ECONOMIC VALUE TO THE LAKE REGION AND TO LAKE PORTS

The Great Lakes were discovered, explored, and colonized by water transportation. The whole economy of the region is traditionally a water-transportation economy. The displacement of a large segment of the Great Lakes merchant marine is a distinct loss to shippers and to the economic structure of the entire Middle West. The Great Lakes package freight services offered transportation services at appreciable savings under all-rail freight costs; gave shippers the benefit of alternate routes during periods of railroad congestion, and maintained a competitive relationship between rail and water rates.

While the preponderance of lake shipping is devoted to the so-called bulk trades (coal, ore, stone, grain, and petroleum) which move tonnage in tremendous quantity, it is significant that comparatively few shippers can use this type of service to advantage; i. e., those industries which by their very nature can deal in cargo lots and which have the capital resources necessary to permit of full utilization of bulk shipping facilities by way of investment in docks, handling apparatus, large stock piles, and the ships themselves. On the other hand, the balance of the lake commerce available for movement by package freighters, passenger and freight vessels, and unscheduled steamers is of interest to an infinitely larger number of enterprises, numbering literally thousands, ranging all the way from small town merchants and manufacturers up to great national industries.

From the standpoint of port interest, important lake terminal facilities whose operations are predicated upon these commercial movements, may find economic survival difficult. Major port facilities require large initial investments and have substantial maintenance and overhead costs which cannot be supported unless they earn regular revenues. The disappearance of normal shipping services and of commodity movements, upon which these terminals depended for revenues, presents a serious question to public and private terminal operators. The entire economy of the Great Lakes area is affected by this situation.

In the event of any substantial business recession, the repercussions would be serious from the standpoint of employment. The removal of approximately a hundred ships from the American fleet as constituted prewar means that there are a hundred fewer staffs of officers and seamen employed on the lakes. Thousands of stevedores have had to find other occupations. In Milwaukee, for example, before 1942, we had a force of 500 stevedores continuously employed in handling general cargo. As of today, we find it difficult to maintain employment for 50 stevedores. The same condition prevails in the whole pattern of economic activity that springs from an active merchant marine.

RAILROAD COMPETITION

The present situation of the domestic merchant marine is due to abuses of long standing. For many years past, domestic water transportation has been progressively undermined by ruthless railroad competitive practices. This is not a mere accusation but a condition which has been recognized in official reports of the Maritime Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, and other authoritative agencies.

The Transportation Act of 1940 vests in the Interstate Commerce Commission the duty of regulating both rail and water carriers so as "to preserve the inherent advantages of each * * * without unfair or destructive competition." It was hoped that this act would provide a solution to the rail-water competitive problem, but after 9 years of operation under this act, the situation has deteriorated steadily, and, in fact, has reached the point of crisis.

While the Maritime Commission has taken some encouraging steps to initiate a complete investigation of rail-water rate structures in the intercoastal and coastwise trades, this proceeding has lagged and thus far there is no indication as to when a final conclusion by the Interstate Commerce Commission may be forthcoming.

No study of the domestic merchant marine can be complete without full recognition of the rail-water competitive situation and the demonstrated determination of the railroads to capture Great Lakes, coastwise, and intercoastal traffic even though on noncompensatory rates. Unless the Interstate Commerce Commission takes appropriate action to terminate these ruthless competitive practices and to restore a reasonable balance between rail and water services in accordance with the several congressional declarations of policy, it will be necessary to seek congressional consideration of the problem and to secure a legislative mandate of a character which will permit the domestic merchant marine to exist. It can neither operate nor exist under present conditions. Depressed rail rates are an effective barrier to the increase of water rates, and the water carriers are thus unable to recapture the added cost of operation under present inflated conditions. The railroads, through the maintenance of depressed rates, have made it impossible for water lines to operate on a compensatory rate basis. As long as this situation continues, domestic water lines are in a hopeless condition.

EFFECTS OF WORLD WAR II

The following table showing the status of the United States Great Lakes fleet as of 1939–46, shows graphically the decline in the Great Lakes merchant fleet as a result of World War II:

United States Great Lakes fleet (over 500 tons registry)

Type	1939		1946	
	Number	Gross tons	Number	Gross tons
Bulk freighters	414	2,170,486	330	2,102,[illegible]
Package freighters	24	87,130	8	0
Car ferries	22	80,742	22	74,543
Passenger steamers	19	70,557	19	42,[illegible]
Total dry cargo	[illegible]	2,408,[illegible]	380	2,220,509
Oil tankers	28	58,285	35	85,[illegible]
Total dry cargo and tankers	517	2,467,[illegible]	415	2,305,[illegible]

Percentage 1946 of 1939:	*Percent*
Number of vessels	80.3
Registered tonnage	92.6

Between 1939 and 1946, the United States Great Lakes fleet of more than 500-ton registry declined from 517 ships to 415 ships, a decrease of 102 vessels. In numbers of vessels, the fleet declined approximately 20 percent and in registered tonnage, it declined approximately 7 percent as shown by the table. The Canadian Great Lakes fleet declined from 274 ships in 1939 to 212 ships in 1946.

Of the 102 vessels removed from the Great Lakes fleet during this period, a few were lost by disaster or retirement. However, the vast preponderance of the reduction is represented by ships taken from the Great Lakes for war service, which have in no manner been replaced.

The entire fleets of the principal package freight services were ordered into ocean service upon the outbreak of World War II. Whereas 24 package freighters were operated in 1939, none are in postwar operation. Two of the largest passenger ships on the Lakes were converted into aircraft carriers for naval aviation training, while other passenger ships were taken from the Lakes for use as transports or for conversion into freight carriers. Motorship services which formerly operated between the Atlantic seaboard and the Great Lakes were forced to discontinue cargo service to lake ports. Automobile carrying vessels were converted into bulk carriers to meet wartime demands.

The Maritime Commission, during World War II, built 16 large modern ore vessels for the Great Lakes trade. As a condition of the construction and acquisition of these ships, lake shipping companies were forced to surrender 36 moderate-size Great Lakes bulk freighters, of obsolescent types, which immediately after the war, were sold for scrapping. The 16 large ore carriers added to the Great Lakes fleet are of such dimensions that they can be safely and economically operated only into a few of the principal Great Lakes ports, primarily the ore ports. The Great Lakes fleet thus gained 16 large ships whose usefulness is limited to a few ports and lost 36 ships of moderate size which were capable of operating into practically any lake port. As a result of this transaction, lake shipping lost much of its flexibility and while the ore trade may be well served, many of the

smaller ports are now at a disadvantage in securing vessel space.

The demands of World War II thus caused the removal from the Great Lakes of nearly 100 ships of all types, including passenger ships, bulk carriers, motorships, tankers and other useful vessels, large and small, which furnished a flexible transportation service adaptable to most lake ports. The removal of these ships by the Federal Government has automatically terminated the movement of many commodities economically important to the Great Lakes region and has caused great injury to the commerce of the Great Lakes.

After the First World War, the Great Lakes area was fortunate in securing the services of small salt-water ships built for the Great Lakes for ocean service. After World War I, many of these so-called lakers came back into the Great Lakes and were an important transportation asset between the two world wars. During World War II, the shipbuilding program concentrated on vessels of dimensions too large to enter the Great Lakes unless and until the St. Lawrence seaway is developed. Few if any small cargo ships suitable for Great Lakes operation were built during World War II, and the result is that the pool of Great Lakes shipping is considerably smaller after World War II than before the war. This condition is in striking contrast to the wealth of tonnage now available for foreign service.

To summarize the present status of the Great Lakes fleet, it is admirably served from the standpoint of bulk commodities but is totally lacking in vessels suitable for general cargo trade and in small flexible types of bulk carriers adapted to various trades and to serving the smaller ports. The lake fleet is much less flexible than before World War II, and its tonnage is now largely concentrated in the bulk trades (coal, ore, and grain) leaving great deficiencies in other aspects of Great Lakes commerce.

To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, we on the Great Lakes have had exactly two acquisitions in the way of vessels out of World War II. Those are two LST's one of which is hauling pulpwood from Canada to a Wisconsin paper mill and the other is carrying new automobiles across Lake Michigan. These two LST's represent our net replacement for the 100 or more ships lost to the area during World War II, as a result of Government action.

MARITIME COMMISSION POLICY

The Great Lakes situation was forcefully called to the attention of the Maritime Commission by the Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners as early as September 1943, as the radical effect of the war upon lake shipping already was fully manifest. The Milwaukee presentation received wide support throughout the Great Lakes area.

Admirals Land and Vickery, formerly Chairman and Vice Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, both verbally and in writing committed the Maritime Commission to the rehabilitation and restoration of Great Lakes shipping. Continued negotiation between lake interests and the Maritime Commission over a 7-year period has, however, produced nothing substantial and not a single vessel of the entire vast surplus fleet has been assigned to the Great Lakes by the Commission.

Admiral W. W. Smith, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, on March 26, 1947, addressed a letter to the Honorable John R. Steelman, Assistant to President Truman, discussing in some detail the domestic merchant marine crisis. He said in part, "The problem of reestablishing domestic water carrier services, which before the war played a vital part in the distribution and marketing of commodities in interstate commerce, is the direct concern of Government agencies responsible for orderly reconversion to peacetime economy. Moreover, there has been an indisputable obligation upon the Government since it disrupted the business of these steamship lines by requisitioning their ships for war uses, to do its best to help them recapture their position in the transportation industry."

This is an admirable statement of policy and an admirable recognition of the Government's moral obligation to the domestic carriers. However, 8 years have elapsed since the end of the war without a single substantial forward step having been taken either by private enterprise or Government agency to restore the hundred ships diverted from the Great Lakes to the war effort. In the meantime, vast numbers of surplus American vessels have been disposed of to foreign purchasers under preferential terms, and the American merchant marine languishes while foreign flag fleets rapidly rehabilitate themselves.

Canadian shipping enterprise is moving to provide modern vessels and expanded service on the Great Lakes and in the St. Lawrence River. Unless American enterprise keeps pace with Canada, the inevitable result will be foreign domination of many segments of the Great Lakes trade, bolstered by modern and efficient vessels, in contrast to an aging American fleet, marked by great gaps in our shipping services as a result of wartime requisitioning.

Comprehensive reports on the Great Lakes problem have been presented to the United States Maritime Commission, to the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine, and more recently to the Merchant Marine Committee of the House. We are most appreciative of the interest which the House and Senate committees are demonstrating with regard to the Great Lakes problem and are grateful to General Fleming, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, who, at the request of Great Lakes interests, initiated a complete study of the Great Lakes shipping problem, which we understand is nearing completion. Some of the specific measures recommended to the Maritime Commission include the following:

1. The initiation of studies looking toward development of one or more vessel types designed for the special conditions of the Great Lakes package-freight trade, with special reference to low cargo-handling costs, fast turnaround, lowest fuel costs consistent with reasonable speed, and minimum crew requirements.

2. Pending design and construction of vessels dedicated specifically to the Great Lakes trade, it was recommended and requested that the Commission allocate to Great Lakes service suitable types of vessels in sufficient numbers to permit reestablishment of the Great Lakes package-freight and miscellaneous freight services, upon favorable terms consistent with Government policy, recognizing the public interest involved in the restoration of these important services.

3. It was requested and recommended that the Maritime Commission aggressively support legislative and rate policies which will permit the operation of Great Lakes package freight and general cargo carriers on a sound, healthy, and economical basis. The rate history of these trades indicates that Great Lakes package freight and general cargo operations have not had the support of the Federal Government and that there has been a progressive decline in these trades over a period of years through encroachment by rail and truck carriers.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was enacted at a time when the greatest danger to the American merchant marine was its inability to compete with foreign operators. Construction and operating subsidies were provided by Congress to overcome these handicaps and to assure that the American flag would continue to fly the seas. The economic dislocations caused by World War II have entirely reversed the situation. The foreign trades now enjoy an improved position as compared to its prewar status, and the domestic trades are now in demand of public attention and assistance.

GREAT LAKES SHIPBUILDING

Closely allied to these questions is the problem of an adequate Great Lakes shipbuilding resource. During the war, approximately 20 shipyards on the shores of the Great Lakes built ships under Maritime Commission, Army, and Navy contracts. Some of these yards did not exist before the war and most of them have since gone out of existence. Prior to the emergency, Great Lakes shipbuilding was in the doldrums, with little activity in the way of new vessel construction.

The national interest requires that Great Lakes shipbuilding facilities not be allowed to fall into a state of disuse and disrepair. Policies should be formulated for development of Great Lakes, coastwise, and inland waterway transportation, which will utilize these shipbuilding resources on a regular and consistent basis, to insure their continued operation and maintenance. In time of peace, the Great Lakes shipbuilding industry, so maintained and supported, would constitute an economic asset of great value to the Great Lakes area and to the Nation at large; and in the event of future wars, would be able to produce ships speedily and efficiently for the national defense. When the St. Lawrence seaway becomes available, Great Lakes shipyards will be able to build and deliver ships of much greater capacity than at present, up to and including vessels of 10,000 tons in size; but in any event, these resources should be utilized consistently and maintained in working condition.

Most of the materials required for modern vessel construction are to be found on or near the shores of the Great Lakes, in close proximity to the industrial machinery and the skilled labor required for vessel production. In this sense, the Great Lakes shipyards are probably in a position to deliver ships at cost equal to or lower than other shipbuilding areas because of their central location, which minimizes transportation requirements in the way of materials and machinery and tends to eliminate cross hauling of materials and equipment.

The maintenance of lake shipbuilding on a sound and healthy basis should be closely integrated with programs for restoration, rehabilitation, and expansion of Great Lakes shipping and commerce. To the maximum extent possible, ships intended for lake service should be built in Great Lakes yards, thus tying together the entire shipbuilding, shipoperation, and ship-repair economy of the region.

We recommend and request, therefore, that your committee, in the course of its studies looking toward rehabilitation and modernization of Great Lakes shipping, give consideration to the suggested liaison and integration of Great Lakes shipbuilding and Great Lakes shipping services.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

It is self-evident that an adequate domestic merchant marine is essential to our national defense. There can be no quibbling on this point in the light of the record of the domestic fleet in World War II. The intercoastal, coastwise, and Great Lakes fleet bore the first brunt of the war and provided this country with shipping capacity at a time when our national security hung in the balance. The ships were readily available, were manned by experienced crews, and furnished our first line of defense, until the wartime shipbuilding program swung into action and began producing tonnage in quantity a year or more after the outbreak of World War II.

One may well ask what the situation of the United States would have been after

Pearl Harbor has there been no intercoastal, coastwise, and Great Lakes fleet. The answer is obviously that national disaster might have ensued. Yet, in the face of this record, there are those who would gamble with our national security by arguing that domestic shipping has served its role in our national development, that the railroads need the traffic, and that domestic shipping must go the way of the horse and buggy.

In 1937, 517 merchant ships plied the Great Lakes under the American flag. Four hundred and fifteen ships were in this trade as of 1946. The disappearance of 102 ships from the Great Lakes fleet means more than the loss of actual bottoms. It means that 102 fewer skilled crews of seamen and 102 fewer sets of capable officers will be on call during the next emergency. If these ships and their commerce are not restored it means a proportionate reduction in seamen, stevedores, marine personnel, and terminal facilities generally. These vital facilities will be found lacking in some future national emergency.

The national defense demands the restoration of these ships not only as a matter of actual bottoms but in the matter of maintaining a pool of trained officers, seamen, and port facilities. It has been repeatedly stated by our top military authorities that an adequate merchant marine is essential to our national defense, that the Navy cannot function without it, and that the Army cannot convey expeditionary forces to distant battlefronts without it. No detailed discussion on this point should be necessary. Similarly, little discussion should be needed to emphasize the vital role of the domestic merchant marine in this over-all picture.

CONCLUSION

The vessels of the Great Lakes and the thousands of skilled officers and seamen manning these ships form a vital part of the American merchant marine—although the limited recognition extended to lake shipping thus far by the Congress, regulatory commissions, and ocean shipping interests raises the question as to whether the Great Lakes are so recognized.

Great Lakes shipping has been largely self-sufficient during the past century, which is probably the best reason for its lack of prominence in congressional consideration of merchant-marine matters. The Merchant Marine Shipping Act of 1936, the basic law prescribing the functions of the Maritime Commission and establishing our national merchant-marine policy, makes only passing reference to "domestic" and "inland waterway" transportation. The phrase "Great Lakes" occurs only two or three times in 30 pages of fine print in this act. The foreign-trade policies prescribed by the act refer specifically to offshore shipping. A considerable degree of legislative indifference to the Great Lakes is apparent in this act, which is the fundamental merchant-marine law of the land.

The American people have a tremendous stake in Great Lakes commerce and in its ports and harbors. The Nation has no greater avenue of water transportation and no cheaper form of transportation. Its contribution to the national welfare and economy both in war and in peace cannot be challenged. A great public investment has been made in navigation and harbor improvements on the Great Lakes, the full benefit of which cannot be realized unless lake shipping is fully restored.

Maintaining the strength and vitality of Great Lakes commerce is just as important to the citizens of the Middle West and to the entire Nation as is the development and promotion of seaboard and foreign commerce. All phases of the Nation's commerce are as deserving of aid and recognition as our foreign commerce.

The Maritime Commission has a vast fleet of 5,500 vessels to dispose of, in accordance with congressional policy for the fostering and promotion of both our foreign and domestic trade. Thus far the Commission has not seen fit to assign so much as one ship of this vast fleet to the Great Lakes as even a token replacement of the many vessels sacrificed by the Great Lakes toward victory in World War II.

The Great Lakes area has traditionally supported the establishment of ocean shipping on a sound and healthy basis. It earnestly feels, however, that the Great Lakes problem as well as salt-water shipping problems should have responsive and liberal treatment by the Federal Government. While the distressed condition of Great Lakes shipping is only one of the major problems confronting the Federal Government, we submit that it is a problem requiring the best thought, and much more speedy and aggressive action than it has received heretofore.

In your consideration of national merchant marine policy, we sincerely hope that the Great Lakes situation will receive your earnest consideration. We hope that this report will in some measure assist you in your deliberations. The restoration of Great Lakes commerce is one of the most vital problems confronting the Middle West and the entire Nation.

In connection with your hearings relative to ship sales and charters and the extension of the Ship Sales Act of 1946, Great Lakes vessel operators will make certain legislative recommendations to your honorable committee, which we hope will have your serious and careful consideration. We hope sincerely and devoutly that from the deliberations of your committee will come a realistic program for restoration of common carrier shipping services on the Great Lakes, a vital but overlooked segment of the American merchant marine.

The Great Lakes region is interested in recognition as part of the American merchant marine. Sound and useful shipping opportunities will again be offered by the Great Lakes. Lakes shipbuilding, ignored in peacetime and suddenly valued under the stress of war, should receive greater recognition. With 9,000 miles of shore line and scores of fine harbors, with great natural resources and a reservoir of skilled labor, the Great Lakes were allowed about 3 percent participation in the wartime shipbuilding program, in terms of tonnage.

A fleet of 500 vessels, manned and officered by tens of thousands of competent seamen capable of moving more than 200,000,000 tons of freight in an 8-month season cannot be ignored in surveying the national landscape. The Lakes demand recognition of these shipping and human resources which together constitute a great national asset.

States' Rights and Lefts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the shocking conduct of Philip B. Perlman, employed by the people of the United States as their solicitor general but, who, in fact, obviously represents other interests and not the people who employ him, was the subject of a recent column by William H. Fitzpatrick, editor of the New Orleans States.

To be more accurate I might say that Mr. Perlman's actions became the subject of Mr. Fitzpatrick's column after Mr. Perlman had become the subject of the American Bar Association. I make this distinction in order to point out that Mr. Perlman also became the subject of the American Bar Association after he, Mr. Perlman, had become the subject of most serious discussion and action on the part of the Judiciary Committee of this body.

Let me fill you in.

As Solicitor General, it is Mr. Perlman's job to act as the trial attorney for the people of the United States and the various agencies of the Government.

When the chips were down in an important case, however, Mr. Perlman unblushingly declared himself on the opposite side of the people from whom he draws his salary.

So unparalleled was his action that the Judiciary Committee of this body took unparalleled action and by a majority vote of the majority and minority sides of the committees denounced Mr. Perlman's action and said, in effect, that since Mr. Perlman had abandoned his client and had deserted to the other side it was time that the Congress, the elected representatives of the people, have somebody to speak for them. One of this body's most distinguished Members, SAM HOBBS, of Alabama, the ranking majority member of the House Judiciary Committee, was selected to represent the Congress and the people since Mr. Perlman had taken a run-out powder on his client.

It is almost unbelievable but it is a fact.

Such action on the part of any run-of-the-mill lawyer would have brought down immediate action by the ethics committee of any bar association in any State.

Of course Mr. Perlman's action was no surprise to Members of Congress who were familiar with his previous action in New York where he read into the housing legislation certain rules, regulations, and restrictions which the Congress on several occasions had specifically rejected.

This is the gentleman who is the subject of Mr. Fitzpatrick's column in the New Orleans States and New Orleans Times-Picayune.

Now Mr. Fitzpatrick himself is no ordinary run-of-the-mill, fly-by-night editor. He is editor of a newspaper which long ago established its integrity and its right to be heard. On two occasions the New Orleans States has been nationally recognized by being awarded the Theta Delta Chi medal for distinguished service and courage in journalism. This newspaper has every right to be proud of these two awards.

In view of the high standing in the community of the New Orleans States and recognition of the fact that the New Orleans States is not a propaganda sheet or an apologist claptrap, nor a carrier of imported and foreign ideas, Mr. Fitzpatrick's article on Mr. Perlman is of more than passing moment.

STATES' RIGHTS AND LEFTS

(By W. H. Fitzpatrick, editor, New Orleans States)

The papers last week revealed that some of our lawyers are upset about the way a Washington lawbooks named Philip B. Perlman has been carrying on, and so there will

be so misunderstanding at the outset, they are right as rain.

Perlman is one of these bald-eyed zealots who wants to reform—according to his own sickness idea of what information means—the whole structure of the Federal courts, the ethical concepts of the American Bar Association, and the morals of a people.

I have had pieces before about how intolerant upper-case Liberals really are. If you can't see things their way, brother, you're lucky you're not living with them in Salem in the seventeenth century.

All of this was a bit too much for Cuthbert Baldwin of New Orleans and Le Doux Provosty of Alexandria. They have asked the bar group to cool Perlman down.

They charge Perlman with maligning Federal judges of the fifth circuit court and with abandoning clients, and if the committee on grievances and ethics finds him guilty, the board of governors can kick him out.

This gentleman under discussion isn't just a night court lawyer—he's the Solicitor General of the United States. As such, he filed before the United States Supreme Court petitions for writs of certiorari last October alleging that the Court of Appeals of the United States Fifth Circuit was following a pattern of denial in cases before it involving the National Labor Relations Board.

Along with these petitions he filed a chart showing how many NLRB cases the fifth circuit had enforced, how many it had modified, set aside or remanded, and compared its record and results with other circuit court decisions. This formed his pattern. In Perlman's book, the fifth circuit is an alley rat.

But even to a layman like me, there is a certain respect for evidence and facts. I say this to his patterns. What was the evidence in each of the cases he complains about? That's what I want to know and that's what every lawyer ought to want to know, including the boldest boys on the Supreme Court.

For this fearsome zealot chart, which has left the judges of the fifth circuit visibly unimpressed, the American Bar Association is going to decide whether or not Perlman has violated its ethics through a pursuit of "unjust criticism and clamor."

This isn't the only charge resting against the honorable Solicitor General. There is the little matter of abandoning a client, too.

This latter criticism of Perlman arises from a suit filed against the Interstate Commerce Commission by Elmer W. Henderson, attacking an ICC ruling setting up separate but equal dining facilities for whites and Negroes on railroads. Perlman, who ought to be defending the ICC, his Government client, hopped the fence and filed a brief supporting Henderson's position.

For this, the bar association's committee on ethics is studying the charges of Messrs. Baldwin and Provosty that Perlman has "abandoned its (the ICC's) defense and espoused the cause of its alleged adversary."

These are not the first evidences of the attempts of Perlman, through his office, to centralize control in the executive branch of the Government for purposes of his own and to run roughshod over the judicial and legislative. In those cited above he has tried to break down the lower courts in the NLRB cases and nullify Supreme Court and ICC rulings upholding segregation in the Henderson case.

There was the time on December 4 last, when in New York, for political purposes, he made a speech in which he said that the Federal Housing Authority would no longer lend funds to projects which sought to enforce racial restrictives.

This was in direct contravention to the wishes of Congress which has refused, each time Federal Housing has come before it, to adopt similar restrictions. The Congress is wise enough to know that local law and local customs ought to determine whether segregation should be enforced.

This is the record of Mr. Perlman. It comprises disregard of the Congress, disregard of Supreme Court and ICC rulings, charges of abandonment of clients and unjust criticism of Federal courts and violation of the basic ethics of his profession for his own designs.

Maybe from this evidence you can follow the pattern being woven by this ideological ambulance chaser now holding the high office of Solicitor General of the United States.

Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit some additional comment on the conference report on H. R. 2023, the bill to repeal the taxes on oleomargarine, and on the statement of the managers on the part of the House which accompanied that report.

The oleomargarine bill as amended carries a provision designed to make clear the intent of Congress that the raw oils destined for human consumption in the form of oleomargarine shall be required by the Food and Drug Administration to measure up to the same sanitary standards applied to the milk and cream used in the manufacture of butter. The statement of the managers on the part of the House states that this provision adds nothing to section 402 (a) (3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as that act has been interpreted and construed by the administrative officials charged with its enforcement.

I think it would be well for the record to show what that interpretation is. An official of the Food and Drug Administration has assured the conferees that under section 402 (a) (3) the raw oils intended for use in oleomargarine could and would be subjected to the same sanitary standards presently applied to the milk and cream used in the manufacture of butter and also that the plants extracting oils for use in oleomargarine could and would be required to meet the same sanitary standards applied to creameries handling milk and cream to be manufactured into butter.

The amendment therefore serves as a ratification or approval of that interpretation and as a directive to the Food and Drug Administration to bring about this equality of standards in actual operation. The amendment does not increase the standards for butter, milk, or cream, or for oleomargarine or the refined oils used therein, as such, but merely requires that the raw oils intended for human consumption in the form of oleomargarine shall be kept clean and sanitary from the time of the original extracting of the oils to the same extent that milk or cream is required to be kept clean and sanitary from the time it reaches the creamery until it is used in the manufacture of butter.

Another amendment in the bill prohibits advertisements which represent or suggest that oleomargarine is a dairy product.

This amendment is intended to put an end to the use in oleomargarine advertisements of grade labeling similar to the grade labeling authorized by law or regulation for butter. Specifically it is intended to reach at the present time the use of grade designations in oleomargarine advertisements such as grade AA, grade A, grade B, and so forth, or the use of grade designations which are similar to the score system of grading butter, such as 92 score, and so forth. This amendment would also prevent the use in oleomargarine ads of dairy scenes or dairy terms, such as pictures of cows or dairy farms or equipment, or such terms as dairy breed names, churned, and so forth. The amendment would also prevent the grouping of oleomargarine with dairy products in advertisements, particularly where such grouping occurs in a box or under a heading entitled "Dairy Products," or suggesting that the products so grouped are dairy products.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the bill I introduced yesterday, I would like to include a statement of my position on social security:

I believe in the right of all people to a good and decent life when they are no longer able to work because of age, disability, or responsibility for young children.

I believe this right is most secure under a social-insurance program in which a person unable to support himself receives benefits as a matter of equity right because he and his employer have contributed during his working years. This is the self-respecting American way.

I have always been a supporter of the Social Security Act, great pioneering measure of the Roosevelt New Deal, which established that right in our law.

I have supported every recommendation of President Roosevelt, President Truman, and the Democratic platform for making this program more adequate to the needs of all people.

I voted for H. R. 6000, the social-security amendments passed by the House last year, which extended this program to 11,000,000 more workers, greatly increased its benefits, and added insurance against permanent disability. This bill was a great forward step as far as it went but it didn't go nearly far enough.

I, therefore, have urged a further liberalization and extension of the Social Security Act to make security, on an adequate level, a reality for every person who works or has retired. I have introduced a bill for this purpose, H. R. 7617, which would add to the steps already taken, these further provisions.

My bill extends social-insurance protection to everyone who works, whether for himself or another, whether in agriculture or industry, whether in a big enterprise or small. All working people not covered under other Federal systems would, through their own and their employer's contribution, be entitled to benefits as a matter of absolute right without any means test, when they retired.

My bill further increases the social-insurance benefit level. It sets as a minimum monthly payment the $75 which we in California decided at the polls was the least on which any individual could maintain a decent life. Above this basic amount the person retiring would receive 15 percent of his average monthly earnings up to a maximum of $400 of earnings, plus 1 percent for each year he worked in covered employment. His wife would receive the $75 monthly minimum. Thus a worker and his wife retiring after 20 years of covered employment with average earnings of $300 a month would receive a monthly benefit payment of $219.

Men would be entitled to retirement benefits at 65, women at 60. But if a worker became permanently disabled before that time he would be immediately entitled to his retirement benefit. If he should die, his widow and children would receive proportionate monthly payments.

My bill recognizes the justice of the plea for similar treatment from those who have already retired by granting them insured status at the minimum level of $75 a month. All men over 65, all women over 60, and all those permanently and totally disabled would receive the minimum social insurance benefit of $75 a month if they had retired. The Government would purchase this insurance for them as a part of the transitional cost of launching this universal program.

It is no fault of this retired group that they were not able to make pay-roll contributions during their working years. It is the accident of their birth date that has deprived them of the protection of a dignified social insurance program and forced them to submit to the indignity of the public assistance means test.

I believe that the contribution they made to the economy, to the building up of our young and still growing state, entitles them to social insurance on at least this minimum basis. To recognize the just claim of this group will strengthen the social insurance system and thus help to protect the equity of the younger workers.

I do not believe that security is an end in itself. It is the means to all other values. Who can fulfill the creative and spiritual promise that lies within every man when he is obsessed by the uncertainty of how he and his family will live when he can no longer work? Fear is the enemy that corrodes human dignity; insecurity engulfs the human spirit. We who are rich in resources must make ourselves equally rich in the human values which can only fulfill themselves when we have banished fear and insecurity.

I am committed to that battle.

Society of Friends Endorses United States Participation in International Trade Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

BY

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, recognizing the secure economic base necessary for world cooperation to achieve peace, and the need for fair rules in international trade as a precedent for the permanent and sure settlement of international differences in other endeavors, the Friends' General Conference of the Religious Society of Friends has recommended approval of the Habana Charter for an International Trade Organization. Appended hereto is the statement issued by this religious body whose roots are deep in American history and culture supporting the ITO and giving reasons why the United States should accept the charter:

THE HABANA CHARTER FOR AN INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

The Friends' General Conference of the Religious Society of Friends wishes to record with the Committee on Foreign Affairs its recommendation that the Habana Charter for an International Trade Organization be approved by the committee and reported favorably to the House of Representatives.

Until an organization is established to deal with the many difficult problems that arise in the field of trade relationships, the structure of cooperation for the peaceful settlement of international differences will be incomplete. The Habana charter would establish such an organization. It is a product of protracted negotiations. It affords a basis upon which the nations of the world can now agree.

The charter embodies the principle that nations, instead of taking action in their own interest without regard to the harm that may be done to others, must first enter into consultation in an effort to achieve a solution that will be in the interest of all. It would create an instrument for the promotion of mutual understanding and the reconciliation of conflicting purposes. By inaugurating a process of continuous accommodation, it would hold in check the ever-present temptation to resort to the weapons of economic warfare.

The creation of an international trade organization was first proposed by the United States. The charter that is now before you is a product of American initiative. If our country were now to turn its back upon it, it would appear to all the world to be abandoning the principles of peace and freedom that it has long espoused. American leadership is desperately needed in the troubled times in which we live. But if it is to be respected, it cannot afford to falter. It must be steady, sure, and strong.

As a practical and constructive contribution toward the organization of a peaceful world, the Habana charter should be approved.

Eighth National Banquet a Significant Occasion—Declaration of American Citizens of Hellenic Descent—Constitution of the Order of Ahepa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of March 7, 1950, at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., Mrs. Doyle and I were among several hundred other guests on the occasion of the eighth national banquet of the Order of Ahepa.

We were guests of the chapter of this order consisting entirely of American citizens of Hellenic descent of my home city of Long Beach, Calif.

It was announced that the Order of Ahepa holds such national banquets here in the Nation's Capital every other year.

Following is the text of their constitution, to wit:

CONSTITUTION OF THE ORDER OF AHEPA

PREAMBLE

We, American citizens of Hellenic descent, desiring to form, institute, and perpetuate a fraternal order and promote its objects and principles; to effect a perfect and harmonious understanding between ourselves and others; to inculcate loyalty and patriotism to and for the country in which we live; to stimulate the spirit of good fellowship and cooperation; and to aid in the solution of social and civic problems, do hereby establish and ordain this constitution.

OBJECTS

The order of Ahepa, and every member thereof, shall always strive to teach, exemplify, and achieve the following objects, principles, and ideals:

To promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America; allegiance to its flag; support to its Constitution; obedience to its laws and reverence for its history and traditions;

To instruct its members, by precepts and examples, in the tenets and fundamental principles of government, and in the recognition and respect of the inalienable rights of mankind;

To instill in every one of its members a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship, and the sacred duties attendant therewith; and to encourage its members to always be profoundly interested and actively participating in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor, and always to strive for the betterment of society;

To awaken in every member an abhorrence of all political corruption—the destroyer of free institutions—and pledge its members to do their utmost to stamp out from this country every trace and influence of this evil;

To arouse mankind to the realization that tyranny, wherever it may exercise its baneful power, is a menace to the life, property, prosperity, honor, and integrity of every nation; and that the preservation of our liberties can be assured, only as this country becomes the champion of liberty and the defender and protector of all oppressed and downtrodden peoples;

To promote throughout the world, and especially in the United States of America, a better and more comprehensive understanding of the Hellenic peoples and nation, and to revive, cultivate, enrich, and marshal into active service for humanity the noblest attributes and highest ideals of true Hellenism;

To labor in every manner possible, and to utilize every means available for the perfection of the moral sense in its members; to promote good fellowship among them; to endow them with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence and helpfulness; and to point out to them, in unmistakable methods, the advantages of education, the beauties of sacrifice and the deformities of selfishness;

To champion the cause of education; to support the American system of public schools and keep them free from religious prejudice; to promote and augment the educational advantages of this country; and to open, establish, and maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning; and

To resist, by lawful means and methods, any tendency toward a union between the civil government and any church or religion, and to repel the interference of any religion in governmental affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the beautiful and appropriate printed program set forth the supreme lodge of the Order of Ahepa as follows:

The supreme lodge: John G. Theros, supreme president; Constantine G. Economou, supreme vice president; Peter N. Dentis, supreme secretary; Charles Pedeles, supreme treasurer; Peter L. Bell, supreme counselor; Pantelis Lambros, supreme governor; Constantine Verinis, supreme governor; Hak Strattin, supreme governor; Peter Drammar, supreme governor; Arthur H. Lalos, executive secretary.

The district governors: Spero Depetris, Peter V. Paulus, George J. Margoles, John Priggiouris, George Kapetanakis, Steve E. Poppa, Chris A. Politz, Gus Rakus, C. G. Morgan, James Argyros, John Hagemann, John Krus, George M. Paradise, Gus Cellas, Leo G. Athans, Paul Dentes, Bill Simopoulos, Leon J. Marketos, William Germanas, George A. Speros, V. C. Beekos, Gus Marfiros, Stephen Bentsilis, Constantine Vlassis.

The mother lodge, Order of Ahepa, is as follows: John Angelopoulos, Harry Angelopoulos, George Campbell, James Campbell, Nicholas D. Chotas, George A. Polos, Spiros Stamos, James Vlass.

The committee for this significant and happy occasion was as follows:

Basil Anargyros Thomas, chairman; Peter C. Charuhas, vice chairman; Andrew D. Vrocolos, vice chairman.

Arrangements: Luke Carmen, Bjelos Cleanaris, Anthony Bapis, Charles Charuhas, Caleroy Panos, Dr. Harry S. Sembekos, Arthur H. Lalos, executive secretary.

The program for the evening was one of enriching information and inspiration, and was as follows:

Presiding chairman: Basil Anargyros Thomas.

National anthem: The Star-Spangled Banner.

Ode to Liberty—National Anthem of Greece.

Invocation: The Most Reverend Michael, archbishop of the Hellenic Orthodox Church.

Toastmaster: V. I. Chebithes, past supreme president, Order of Ahepa.

Speakers: Hon. Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor; Senator Homer Ferguson, Michigan; Senator Brien McMahon, Connecticut; John G. Theros, supreme president, Order of Ahepa.

Benediction.

Dinner music by Jack Morton.

Mr. Speaker, in the Eighteenth Congressional District of my native State of California, these American citizens of Hellenic descent, are the most stable, industrious, active, particular and practicable citizens of our State; and contribute substantially to the progress of the State and the Nation. They contribute substantially and vigorous to the perpetuation of the America we all love. You will note that paragraph 2 of their constitution states that one of their objects is "to promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America; allegiance to its flag; support to its Constitution; obedience to its laws, and reverence for its history and traditions."

Live for Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under and by virtue of permission heretofore granted, I extend my remarks which I made by letter Tuesday last, town meeting day in Vermont, as of my annual custom, heretofore followed, to the people of my home town assembled in town meeting at Northfield. That convocation is really the savior and the fortress of every American and of the constitutional liberties which, so expanded, we do now enjoy, as well as the guarantor of the perpetuity of those liberties we, of the blood of our ancestors, all propose to protect and to defend against all comers from within or from without.

So I said:

DEAR MR. MODERATOR AND NORTHFIELD FRIENDS: Of necessity, my annual letter must be brief. I am a member of the subcommittee of five men to whom is entrusted the responsibility of undertaking, originally, to say just how much of dollars and cents of the taxpayers' money shall be appropriated to defend this country to maintain the armed services both against attack and for necessary defense. The figure presented to us was $13,500,000,000, which is some money even in Northfield. I am very busy.

"When I was young and in my prime," as some of those who are listening to me will recall I once was when we sang that song while I was ringing Northfield fire alarms and church bells, in celebration of Hallowe'en or Fourth of July (in those days of quite some long ago) I never thought I would come to this.

That should be a threat as well as possibly an inspiration to every single boy born in Vermont, particularly Northfield.

I am never unmindful of the fact, nor am I ever ungrateful, as I recall that beastly cold day of the latter part of December some years ago when 900 and more of you sent me to Congress; without regard to partisan political affiliation. I shall never forget it. I hope I have never made any of you who supported me sorry for what they did.

So I presume to say to you that these really are desperate days in which we are permitted to live and to play a part.

The burden is on us to undertake to transmit to those who follow us, not a burden, nevertheless a responsibility, and better, an opportunity such as no people ever had the chance to enjoy since the world began.

I am much concerned to do my part to see to it that the United States adopts a stabilized program free from and not disrupted by those who call themselves Free Thinkers, Liberals, Progressives, or those, too cowardly to brand themselves as registered Communists, or who undertake to avoid the fact that they are Socialists, as subversively together they have been undertaking to socialize Vermont and in effect to reduce it to the situation similar to that in which Great Britain finds herself today.

I am proud of the fact that I am said to be as reactionary as the Ten Commandments. Call me what you've a mind to. I still thank whatever Gods there be for the enemies I have made amongst those groups to whom I refer which undertake, subversively, cowardly and under a blanket supported and publicly endorsed by the Communists and the anarchists and the Socialists and the leftists, to destroy this America of mine and my State.

Five civilizations have been buried by people in Mexico and elsewhere under exactly such theories as are today advocated by those who would undertake to tell you in Vermont that I am a reactionary. That is a part of their program.

Some of my very best friends are being misled. They do not appreciate nor realize the end which these folks seek to attain, nor see the method they employ. My friends should put every ounce of effort back of the United Nations in an endeavor to see and to insist that it shall be given the police power to enforce its edicts, without which it will be as powerless as was the League of Nations. It is time to realize that fact. The fact is obvious there can be no world federation so long as Russia undertakes to maintain and still insist, as it does, upon its position. So why waste effort?

The American ideal which has been idolized and idealized is not only an ideology but a fact. Privileges greater than ever before in the history of the world have been offered to the average person in America to make a living and to live a life in these United States such as none ever enjoyed heretofore, yet there are those in the groups to which I have referred who would undertake, subversively and persuasively, to destroy the very sources which would deprive you, as individuals, of every chance and of every right which you now enjoy.

Unless we, you and I, wake up and shake off and deny and defy those with fallacious and subversive theories offered as incentives to get an easy living off us which would destroy all individualism, all industry, all enterprise you and I are going to be held responsible for burying not only a possibility for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, but the greatest Republic God ever gave man an opportunity to create, in the first place; in the second place, to develop; in the third place to continue; the last of which opportunties is the burden of your responsibility. This is a country of free people so long and only so long as we maintain that right to be free. See to it that you keep it free. That's your job. It is the job of nobody else. It is time that you recognise that fact before it is altogether too late, if it is not already and altogether too late. It is later than you think.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Member of Congress.

New Worcester Diocese Proudly Installs First Bishop, Most Rev. John J. Wright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, in extension of my remarks, I should like to include an article, by staff members T. J. Sweeney and P. J. Cogswell, which appeared in the March 7 issue of our newspaper, the Evening Gazette, describing the color and ceremony attendant upon the installation of Bishop John J. Wright as the first ecclesiastical head of the

newly created Roman Catholic diocese of Worcester, Mass.

Citizens of every faith and creed joined with church dignitaries, national leaders, and community officials in welcoming this distinguished prelate to his papal assignment in the heart of the Commonwealth.

At the age of 40, Bishop Wright comes to us as one of the youngest residential bishops in the entire country. His diocese now comprises 95 parishes with 365 priests. Within his jurisdiction will be 8 orphanages, 2 colleges, 1 hospital, 15 high schools, 48 grammar schools, and 12 missions.

A brief history of John Wright as layman and priest will reveal the justification of his choice for such uncommon responsibilities at an age when most of his contemporaries are being entrusted with their initial mature duties.

John Joseph Wright was born in the Dorchester section of Boston on Sunday, July 18, 1909, as the first of six children.

When old enough to go to school, he attended the Trescott School in Hyde Park, Mass., and subsequently entered Boston Public Latin School. At Boston Latin this young man began to show his real prowess. He excelled in his studies, in debating and in public speaking. He was graduated with honors in 1947.

After high school he attended Boston College, where he was awarded the Fulton medal for oratory, and in his senior year was elected as the one who had done most for Boston College during his studies there.

Following graduation from Boston College, feeling called to serve God in the holy priesthood, a call now gloriously confirmed in his elevation to the Episcopate, John Wright enrolled in the department of senior philosophy at St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass. Following his course at Brighton, he attended the Gregorian University in Rome, where he was graduated with high honor at that most advanced Jesuit institution in the world.

Upon his return to this country, Father Wright taught in the philosophy department of St. John's Seminary at Brighton, Mass.

At this time, also, Dr. Wright inaugurated the English course in the new minor seminary, St. Clement's Hall. In his spare time he conducted the Italian Academy, wrote innumerable articles and pamphlets, gave a great number of sermons and addresses, and served as retreat master in various houses of recollection.

In 1943 Cardinal O'Connell appointed Father Wright his secretary. Following the death of His Eminence in April 1944, Auxiliary Bishop Cushing was named archbishop. His first official appointment was that of Father Wright as his secretary. In December 1944, Father Wright was named a papal chamberlain, and in May 1946 elevated by His Holiness to the rank of domestic prelate. In May of 1947 Monsignor Wright was named as auxiliary bishop of the Boston archdiocese. Bishop Wright's elevation to the hierarchy made little change in his routine except to add to it the extra duties which a bishop may perform and by which an auxiliary bishop can assist his superior. He became widely known throughout the country, especially for his eloquence and remarkably diversified learning.

No greater testimony to Bishop Wright's promise can be given than to quote directly from Archbishop Cushing's sermon on the occasion of the elevation of Bishop Wright at the Cathedral of St. Paul, in Worcester, on Tuesday morning, March 7, 1950:

Bishop Wright's love for God and for his neighbor will not be left on any abstract level, nor find its expression in empty platitudes or unfruitful principles. I can promise the people of Worcester County, Catholics and their neighbors alike, that their new bishop is a doer of the law, not a hearer and a preacher only. His love for God and neighbor alike will be made manifest in good works, kind deeds, generous self-dedication. He will eloquently preach God's love and will lift his voice in constant teaching of the need for love among men. But he will ever be mindful of the wisdom taught by his patron and name-sake among the Apostles: "Let us not love in word alone nor in tongue, but in deed and in truth" (1 John 3: 18).

Resonare Christum, to be the echo of Christ, is the motto under which the first bishop of Worcester takes up his work in central Massachusetts. Fulfilling the Scripture eulogy—"in a short time he has accomplished much," a happy augury for the conduct of his new responsibilities in the church. As Archbishop Cushing said in his address, "May the Lord preserve him, and grant him length of days and give him every grace, and never deliver him into the hands of enemies. Amen."

The article by the Messrs. Sweeney and Cogswell follows:

(By Thomas J. Sweeney and
Philip J. Cogswell)

Bishop John J. Wright today was enthroned as first ruler of the new-born Roman Catholic Diocese of Worcester.

The ceremonies, at St. Paul's Cathedral, fused ecclesiastical elegance and high humility in a gripping pageant governed by ancient formulas still intact.

Officially, Bishop Wright, 40, became the spiritual leader of 225,000 Catholics of the diocese at that precise moment of the ceremonies when, while he was seated on his oaken throne, Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston, presented him with a crosier.

This shepherd's staff, symbolic of the authority vested in him by Pope Pius XII, indicated he had acquired formal jurisdiction as the youngest diocesan head in the United States.

The cathedral proper bulged with 1,400 witnesses to the ceremonies. Their number included prelates and parish priests, nuns and dignitaries from all walks of life, political, business, civic and educational, and the bishop's parents, brothers and sisters.

CLERGY OF NEW DIOCESE

At the right of the church, their eyes fixed on their new spiritual leader, to whom later, one by one, they pledged their loyalty, sat the clergy of the new diocese.

Nearly a thousand other persons, attracted by the historical and religious significance of the occasion, filled the lower church of the cathedral, where they followed the ceremonies as transmitted by loud speakers by the narrator, Rev. David E. Sherin, of St. Ann's Church.

Hardier persons huddled outside the cathedral, on High, Chatham, and Main Streets, in reverent silence to listen.

A description of the ceremonies came to them, too, by loud speakers.

Muted by the solemnity of the services, they heard Bishop Wright chant the pontifical blessing and they heard Archbishop Cushing, in his sermon, extol the virtues of Worcester's new spiritual leader.

They heard, also, the liturgical prayers, linking the past with the present, sung even as they were sung centuries ago.

Handfuls of spectators were drawn to the scene of the ceremonies as early as 8 a. m. and despite chilly temperature, they remained to be joined by increasing thousands of others.

CHIMES PEAL FIRST TIME

The procession, with an estimated 900 in line, started at 9:40 as the cathedral chimes pealed for the first time. By this time the onlookers were numbered in the thousands.

Piety and pomp were blended in perfect proportions in the procession as it began to wend its way in quiet dignity from the rectory and school to the cathedral.

But when Bishop Wright, toward the rear of the line, came into view, a burst of hand-clapping shattered the stillness.

He was vested in white mitre and robes, setting off his dark features.

Again, when Archbishop Cushing, preceded by the bearer of the metropolitan cross and wearing his cappa magna, symbols of his rank as chief of the bishops of New England province, drew near the cathedral, applause sounded.

The bishop and archbishop, who brought up the rear of the procession, nodded and smiled to acquaintances among the spectators.

Several women rushed forward to kiss the episcopal ring of Archbishop Cushing.

RICH, COLORFUL SIGHT

The procession offered rich contrast between the parish priest, most of them bareheaded and wearing white surplices over their black robes, monsignori and bishops in their purple raiment, and Trappist Fathers from Cumberland, R. I., in their flowing white garments, their close-cropped hair focusing attention on them.

Two eastern rite prelates also were in the procession. They wore large black headpieces.

Only four nuns were in line. But hundreds of others—somber-robed in black, brown, and gray—occupied seats in the cathedral.

BISHOP MOVED BY CEREMONY

Bishop Wright was visibly affected on his entrance into the vestibule of the cathedral. His face paled.

Together with his attendants, he withdrew to the left of the vestibule, while Archbishop Cushing knelt and prayed at a small desk covered with a green drape.

Bishop Wright stood with hands cupped. His eyes alternately swept upward and downward.

Archbishop Cushing accepted from Rt. Rev. Msgr. John P. Phelan, temporary administrator of the diocese and pastor of Blessed Sacrament Church, who had awaited his, and Bishop Wright's arrival in the vestibule, an aspergil, or holy water sprinkler. He made the sign of the cross.

He extended it to Bishop Wright to touch. The archbishop then sprinkled nearby attendants.

Monsignor Phelan offered incense to Archbishop Cushing to complete the ceremonial entrance to the cathedral without so much as a word spoken.

SEMINARY CHOIR HAILS LEADER

As Bishop Wright and Archbishop Cushing entered the cathedral proper and walked toward the altar, the St. John's Seminary choir sang the joyous notes of Ecce Sacerdos Magnus in acclaim of the new spiritual head.

All in the cathedral stood.

After they paid homage to the Blessed Sacrament, Bishop Wright was seated on a faldstool, or small chair, at the foot of the main altar and Archbishop Cushing was seated on his throne on the Epistle side of the sanctuary.

They retained their seats during the reading, first in Latin and then in English, by Rev. John F. Gannon, of Leominster, notary, of the papal documents decreeing the erection of the new See of Worcester and appointment of Bishop Wright as first head of the Diocese of Worcester.

The bishop knelt at the faldstool before the altar after conclusion of the reading. Monsignor Phelan approached the altar and chanted a prayer for the bishop, with the choir making responses.

After the choir sang in honor of St. Paul, titular saint of the cathedral, Bishop Wright ascended the steps, kissed the altar reverently, and chanted the prayer of St. Paul.

The prayer completed, Bishop Wright descended from the altar, was clasped by the hand by Archbishop Cushing and Monsignor Phelan, who led him to his throne, where he was seated.

ACCEPTS CROZIER, SYMBOL OF OFFICE

The archbishop placed in his left hand the crozier, symbol of pastoral office.

Bishop Wright held it with both hands.

He now had been formally installed as first bishop of Worcester.

He rose and gave his first solemn blessing in that capacity.

Then the archbishop intoned the first words of the hymn, Te Deum, and the choir and clergy joined in. As the music swelled through the cathedral, priests under Bishop Wright's new jurisdiction made their formal act of obedience to him.

First the officials on the altar, then the priests of the diocese filed slowly across the sanctuary, kneeled before the episcopal throne, grasped the bishop's right hand, and kissed the ceremonial ring.

It was half a handshake and half an obeisance. To each the bishop spoke a few words of greeting.

One priest, who walked across the sanctuary with a decided limp, prepared to kneel before his superior. But the bishop raised his hand so the priest would not have to bend over in what obviously would have been a painful effort.

PROCESSION OF PRIESTS TO ALTAR

The Te Deum ended, but still the procession of priests to the altar continued. It was nearly 30 minutes before all the clergy had fulfilled their obligations.

Through it all, Archbishop Cushing stood, hands folded on his breast, easily the tallest and most imposing figure on the altar.

The altar itself was simply decorated with silk roses of red roses contrasting with the gleaming marble. A single altar cloth of white lace was the only other decoration.

The ceremony of obedience indicates the promise of the clergy to obey and revere Bishop Wright and his successors in the See of Worcester. Its completion marked the end of the installation ceremony proper.

Bishop Wright then prepared to resume celebration of the mass for the first time in his cathedral church. While seated on his throne, his assistants went through the age-old ceremony of vesting the priest for the mass.

The glittering white and gold cope was removed and the bishop donned white buskins, or shoes, and long white stockings. Then he put on the heavily encrusted gold and white chasuble, or outer garment, which was worn by the late William Cardinal O'Connell at his first pontifical mass in Rome in 1906.

WHITE AND GOLD FOR JOY

Vestments of the assistant priests, the deacon and subdeacon were all white and gold, symbolic of the joyousness of the occasion. The day marks the feast of St. Thomas, a doctor of the church.

Midway through the mass, after recitation of the Gospel, Archbishop Cushing moved to a reading stand at the center of the altar rail to deliver his sermon.

His powerful voice and clipped diction carried his voice to the high-vaulted corners of the cathedral. The archbishop read from a manuscript, his hands placed quietly on the reading stand, depending for emphasis only on his inflection.

CALLS FOR PRAYER FOR NEW BISHOP

For the most part his voice boomed loudly but he spoke softly at one solemn moment. That was when he called on the Catholics of Worcester to pray for their new bishop.

"A mitre can be a crown of thorns," he said. "A crozier can be a sorry support to weary limbs. A cappa magna can conceal a broken heart."

After Archbishop Cushing's sermon Bishop Wright continued the mass. The Gospel was sung by the deacon, Very Rev. John A. O'Brien, S. J., president of Holy Cross College, and the Epistle by the subdeacon, Very Rev. Henry J. Moquin, A. A., president of Assumption College.

The seminarians of St. John's choir sang the responses to Bishop Wright's prayers. Included was a chant for the well-being of the new bishop.

"Let us pray for John, our bishop. May the Lord watch over him and grant him length of days and happiness upon this earth, and deliver him not into the power of his enemies."

CEREMONIAL KISS EXCHANGED

After the solemn moment of the consecration all the clergy in the cathedral exchanged the pax, or ceremonial kiss of peace. One by one, bishops, monsignori, abbotts, and priests turned to their neighbors, embraced, and said, "Pax tecum," or "Peace be with you."

At the end of the mass the bishop left the altar and returned to his throne where he removed the mass vestments and donned for the first time the cappa magna.

The length of the scarlet train necessitated a train bearer to help the bishop move unencumbered. It is trimmed over the shoulders with a white ermine cape.

The cappa magna is the symbol of the bishop's authority in his diocese.

From the lectern at the center of the altar rail, the new bishop of Worcester then spoke his first words in his cathedral.

"Let our first words this day be words of gratitude," the prelate said. He asked for divine guidance and strength for his task as spiritual leader of the diocese, and called on church and saints to second our earnest petition to God that faith in these parts will never fail.

Then he expressed his thanks to Pope Pius XII who appointed him bishop of Worcester, to the apostolic delegate, Archbishop Cicognani, of Washington, D. C., to the visiting prelates, to the civic officials present, and to those of the Catholic faith and those not of it who have made him welcome.

Finally he declared he could not forget those blessed dead who gave so much of themselves for the establishment of the church here.

He cited the French, Irish, Italian, Lithuanian, Polish, Syrian, and faithful of all the other national origins "out of whose work this diocese has been born. We are prayerfully conscious of our debt to them."

At the end of the bishop's talk, the line of clergy re-formed and the recessional began.

GIVES BLESSING TO FAITHFUL

As Bishop Wright left the altar he gave his blessing with upraised hand to those on either side of the center aisle.

As he passed his parents, on his left side, he gave them his blessing but did not pause.

The archbishop brought up the rear of the procession.

As the new head of the diocese left the center door of the church and walked slowly toward the rectory, the throng of spectators who had waited patiently since the beginning of the long ceremony, broke into cheers and pressed forward.

The bishop raised his hand and gave his blessing to those surrounding him. The crush of onlookers was to great, many seeking to kiss the episcopal ring, others to snap his picture, that it took him nearly 20 minutes to reach the quiet of the rectory.

Act Now or It Will Be Too Late—Millions of Dollars of Perishable Surplus Commodities Will Be Lost Unless Quick Action Is Taken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article, I submit an article by John W. Ball, Post reporter, published in the Washington Post of Sunday, March 5, 1950.

Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1950, I introduced H. R. 7134 authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of surplus potatoes and eggs, gratuitously to the people of the United States, and no action was taken.

On March 1, 1950, learning that there was also 100,736,962 pounds of butter that also was in surplus and about to spoil, I introduced House Joint Resolution 430 to include butter and all other surplus commodities which the Secretary of Agriculture could not otherwise dispose of under the existing law, and the method and arrangement was fully outlined in the said resolution.

From the article which I am quoting below, it is my opinion that the cost to the Government to distribute these precious commodities to the States of the Union for the use of the people, on a basis of population, would be negligible in comparison with the amount that the Government is paying for the storage of these commodities, many of which will spoil and be lost unless they are utilized quickly.

Mr. Speaker, while some of those in Washington may not know—the fact is that there are literally millions of our people who are in need of these foods and are unable to purchase same, and I sincerely believe that the same should be distributed to the people rather than pay these millions of dollars for storage and be lost by spoilage.

The article referred to is titled "Four Billion Dollar Pantry" and is as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 5, 1950]

FOUR BILLION DOLLAR PANTRY—STORAGE OF FARM SURPLUS COSTS UNCLE SAM $25,000 AN HOUR OR $200,000,000 A YEAR

(By John W. Ball)

America's surplus of farm commodities—the things that food, clothing, and shelter come from—is so great that it is costing from $25,000 to $30,000 an hour, 24 hours a day, just to store it.

In other words, the storage costs of the $4,000,000,000 worth of commodities Uncle Sam has taken off the market in order to keep their prices high, runs to a staggering $550,000 to $600,000 a day or about $200,000,000 a year. If interest charges and deterioration are computed, the total cost would run at a rate of about $1,000 a minute.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, which handles the Government's vast price-fixing program, revealed the $4,000,000,000 storage total last week. Commodities in storage under price supports amount in value to about $30 for every man, woman, and child in the country. For an average family of four, that means there is about $120 worth of stuff in Uncle Sam's pantry.

There is enough wheat to meet all our domestic needs without raising a single grain this year—and another crop is growing in the winter wheat belt now. There is enough cotton to carry the country through a full year if necessary. Other things are in abundance in varying degrees.

In addition to the storage costs there is the tremendous charge for interest.

Agriculture Secretary Charles F. Brannan testified this week that CCC pays the Treasury 1¼ percent for the money with which it operates.

That adds up to $50,000,000 a year for the $4,000,000,000. That is almost four and a quarter million a month, or about $150,000 a day.

On top of that is piled the loss through deterioration. Actual loss, charged off in the last 7 months was $96,000,000—about $450,000 a day.

CCC officials freely admit that doesn't in any degree cover the loss. Most of this year's tremendous $100,000,000 anticipated loss in potatoes has not yet been realized. Also, deterioration would run to another immense sum. A lot of dried eggs and dried skim milk—together they total one hundred and thirty-three millions—is getting to an age where it soon won't be of great value.

Thus storage costs, interest, and deterioration is running at a daily rate of above a million and a quarter dollars a day—or more than $50,000 an hour. In other words, roughly around $1,000 a minute.

The tremendous growth of the price program is best realized when compared with a year ago. In 12 months the total more than doubled. A year ago it was only $1,873,000,000.

In fact, this increase points out eloquently the need for the additional $2,000,000,000 that CCC recently asked of Congress. Last week several Congressmen suggested adding riders to this CCC measure, such as "trial runs" for the Brannan plan, and limitations on individual benefits from price supports. Each time Agriculture Secretary Charles F. Brannan urged them not to do anything that might delay action.

At the present rate of increase in the Government's investment in price supports, CCC is in danger of running out of funds before this calendar year is out. Even the two billion additional now asked may not last more than a year.

The Government's far-flung storage bins contain an amazing assortment of more than 30 commodities. Its investments range from $84,000 in flax fiber—the kind from which linen is made—to more than a billion dollars in each of two items, wheat, our chief bread grain, and cotton, our chief source of clothing. We have an enormous $980,000,000 tied up in corn, with the season far from over.

Although the fiber flax is a small item, the total flax program is tremendous. Uncle Sam has almost a quarter of a billion dollars invested in flaxseed and linseed oil that comes from it.

Few taxpayers realize that a lot of tax money has been put up to maintain a high price for ship's stores—rosin and turpentine. CCC has $90,000,000 in rosin and almost two and one-half million in turpentine, both agricultural products.

If, as now appears likely, a support program for hogs becomes effective, Government's total storage cost will go up much higher proportionately.

List of surplus commodities

Commodity	Quantity	Value
Cotton, long staple ..... bales	5,[illegible]	$[illegible]
Cotton ..... do	8,[illegible]	1,012,[illegible]
Cottonseed ..... tons	118,[illegible]	5,[illegible]
Flax ..... pounds	178,145	84,158
Butter ..... do	100,[illegible]	[illegible]
Cheese ..... do	20,207,[illegible]	8,317,[illegible]
Milk ..... do	274,723,[illegible]	[illegible]
Linseed oil ..... do	[illegible]	[illegible]
Peanuts ..... do	[illegible]	[illegible]
Peanuts, shelled ..... do	14,[illegible]	2,154,[illegible]
Fruits, dried ..... do	[illegible]	3,718,[illegible]
Potato starch ..... do	10,172,827	[illegible]
Potatoes ..... 100 pounds	11,480,547	8,[illegible]
Barley ..... bushels	[illegible]	[illegible]
Beans ..... 100 pounds	11,823,912	[illegible]
Corn ..... bushels	[illegible]	980,651,[illegible]
Flaxseed ..... do	[illegible]	117,671,[illegible]
Grain sorghums ..... 100 pounds	[illegible]	[illegible]
Oats ..... bushels	[illegible]	[illegible]
Peas ..... 100 pounds	558,421	1,721,510
Rice ..... do	1,[illegible]	7,247,314
Rye ..... bushels	1,363,[illegible]	2,[illegible]
Seeds (pasture) ..... pounds	725,[illegible]	146,515
Soybeans ..... bushels	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wheat ..... do	[illegible]	1,011,791,572
Wool ..... pounds	51,378,149	[illegible]
Eggs, dried ..... do	75,[illegible]	[illegible]
Turkeys ..... do	1,017,105	[illegible]
Rosin ..... do	[illegible]	[illegible]
Turpentine ..... gallons	5,107,213	2,343,452
Tobacco ..... pounds	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total		3,942,[illegible],790

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, Secretary of the Air Force W. Stuart Symington made an address before the Yale Alumni Association at Yale University on February 22, 1950, appraising the national defenses.

While the junior Senator from Nebraska does not now pass upon Secretary Symington's conclusions, he believes the address is of timely interest.

I ask unanimous consent for insertion of Secretary Symington's address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful to President Seymour for asking me here today. Memories of 4 years at Yale are among the happiest of my life. In fact a little envy was mixed with the pleasure of seeing my two sons this morning, both members of the class of 1950.

A famous American once said:

"There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

Those words sound as if they were stated recently. Actually they were spoken 172 years ago by the man whose birthday we observe today.

In other words, at the beginning of our existence as a nation, George Washington warned that the price of peace is adequate preparedness—that weakness invites aggression.

Today the price of peace remains the same—preparedness. But this air-atomic age no longer allows us the luxury of building up defenses over a period of time, after either we or our Allies have been attacked.

The United States is a peaceful democratic nation. Hence our military plans do not embrace the thought of being an aggressor. But our policies for national security must emphasize what America will do if and when attacked by the only nation that now has the power to launch such an attack.

The more one studies this critical problem, the more one becomes convinced that the greatest defense America can create for its protection is capacity for instant and sustained devastating retaliation against any aggressor. This is true because under modern methods of warfare there can be no sure defense.

Picture the change in this situation even since the last war. In 1941, the British were confident that if they could destroy appreciably more than 5 percent of the attacking Nazi bombers on each raid, the latter could not continue their air offensive against England; and after the RAF did knock down some 10 percent on the night of May 10, 1941, for several years thereafter the Nazis never seriously bothered England from the air; only starting again in 1944 after they had developed the V-1 pilotless missile.

Today, however, in this air-atomic era, if America was successful in knocking out 25 percent of the first surprise raid, or even 50 percent, where will our cities be when the other 50 percent get through?

The practical urgency for full recognition of this problem was brought home to every American at the time the President announced last September that an atomic explosion had occurred in Russia.

It is not significant to realize that the atomic explosion occurred in the land of a dictatorship which has reiterated many times, both to its own people and to the rest of the world, that it is conducting the modern equivalent of a holy war against all who do not believe in the Godless faith of communism.

In every issue of Communist dogma, under the title "Problems of Leninism," published over the signature of Stalin, appears this basic Communist tenet:

"We are living not merely in a state, but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialistic states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable."

That statement of Communist policy has been repeated by Stalin since the close of World War II in 1945.

All this is self-evident in current Russian policy, a policy which so far has frustrated every effort of the United Nations to eliminate war—particularly the use of atomic weapons—as an instrument of settling disputes among nations. This blockade of peace has been successful despite America's conviction that the only war which can be won is the war that never starts.

These words of the leaders of the Communists speak for themselves; but their actions speak even louder than their words.

As illustration, since World War II Russia has engaged in an armament building program which overshadows the combined programs of all the Alantic Pact nations put together.

That country, Russia, today maintains a ground army greater in numbers than the combined armies of the United States and its allies.

Following World War II Russia demobilized to some 20 percent of its peak wartime strength. In contrast, the United Kingdom demobilized from 88 army divisions to their present strength of about four divisions; and the United States demobilized from 90 war strength divisions to a 10 division peacetime structure.

Today Russia has the world's largest submarine fleet, several times larger than the number Hitler possessed when he started World War II.

In terms of air strength, the situation is comparable. Today Russia has an air force whose strength, in nearly all categories, is the largest in the world, and growing relatively larger month by month. Since World War II, Russia has produced far more combat aircraft than have the United States and all other Atlantic Pact nations combined.

As part of its program for air supremacy Russia is steadily increasing the strength of its long-range strategic-bombing force—a type of plane it did not have in World War II.

The Communists do not need long-range strategic bombers in order to conquer Eurasia. Should we not ask ourselves therefore, why are they being built?

Those are the simple truths about the world in which we live, and they should be correlated with the revelation of that atomic explosion.

As our President so ably pointed out in his recent state of the Union message, we have now come to a crucial point in world history. Its unmistakable words he said:

"The human race has reached a turning point. Man has opened the secrets of nature and mastered new powers. If he uses them wisely, he can reach new heights of civilization. If he uses them foolishly, they may destroy him. * * * The swift pace of events promises to make the next 50 years decisive in the history of man on this planet."

The President was referring in part to developments in the field of atomic energy. In that connection, this Nation is fortunate in having at the head of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy your distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut, BRIEN MCMAHON, whose awareness of the magnitude of this atomic problem, and whose capacity to deal with it, have been so clearly demonstrated.

Based on the above facts, it is not difficult to reach the following conclusions:

1. As the result of recent developments, real security can be assured only by the elimination of war itself.

2. If all our efforts to prevent war fail, then the United States must win. Defeat means slavery.

3. Victory now requires we not lose the first battle—in that a surprise atomic offensive might inflict a mortal wound from which no nation could completely recover, no matter how long and how desperate the ensuing struggle.

4. In all defense preparations for modern total war, the United States must live within its means—must not destroy its economy and its way of life. To do otherwise would invite defeat from within, nearly as fatal as defeat from without.

As to the latter point however, namely, the necessity of building a real strength this Nation can afford—both the President, in his latest state of the Union message, and the Secretary of Defense in repeated statements, have emphasized that security must come ahead of economy.

But Secretary Johnson also rightly insists that "our armed forces must be organized so as to give the maximum degree of security we can get for the money we have to spend. There can be no luxuries. We cannot afford anything we do not need."

With the problem so stated that we must have that combination of efficiency, the good and relatively growing military strength of Russia must be weighed by those who clamor for a balanced budget. Such balance is both logical and desirable. But surely these critics should realize that during this current year 50 cents of their tax dollar goes for security, 34 cents to the Pentagon and 16 cents for foreign aid; and that, despite this vast expenditure, Russian military strength meanwhile grows relatively greater as against the strength of the United States.

Russia's economic problems are negligible, because the coin of their realm is the order of the dictator. Nor do they have a labor problem, because their military and political prisoners, in fact all their citizens, are but slaves to their state.

So when critics of the administration demand that we balance or further slash our budget, we should ask them to seriously consider the need for that calculated military strength provided for in the President's budget, which strength is so essential to the preservation of our freedom, our Nation, and ourselves.

In a democracy it is important that everyone know the truth. The people of this country have demonstrated many times that, given the truth, they will meet the problem.

Keeping Alive the Spiritual Ideals of Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, 40 years ago a group of progressive educators, recognizing that American girls wanted and needed an organization of their own, dedicated to their special interests and desires, helped establish Camp Fire Girls.

Since that time more than 2,500,000 girls have passed through the experience and training and association of Camp Fire Girls. Each of them profited, I am sure, from the belief of the group's first national president, Dr. Luther Halsey Gulick, that girls learn best by doing.

Today, more girls than ever before—more than 360,000 of all ages from 7 to 18, and of all races and religions—are enjoying the fun, friendship, and high ideals of Camp Fire.

Camp Fire Girls' program is both practical and inspirational. The leisure-time training supplements wisely the training of home, church, and school. Camp Fire Girls learn the arts of homemaking, of baby and child care, of outdoor living, of furthering friendships through pen-pal letters and gifts. All the work is in the spirit of Camp Fire's two purposes: "To perpetuate the spiritual ideals of the home," and "To aid in the formation of habits making for health and character."

Camp Fire Girls, a nonprofit, nongovernmental group, is doing a great work for all of us, the adults of America, and for our Nation. It is instilling in the hearts and minds of our girls a sense of the meaning of democratic ideals and it is equipping them for greater service by keeping alive the spiritual ideals of home.

We in Texas are especially proud that a charming and gracious Texas lady, Mrs. Richard W. Blalock, of Marshall, is national president of Camp Fire Girls, in this fortieth anniversary year. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD three letters of greeting to Camp Fire Girls from the President of the United States, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

All Members, I am sure, will want to join in extending to Camp Fire Girls, past and present, congratulations in this fortieth birthday week, March 12 through March 18. We wish for the organization many more years of useful service.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 8, 1950.

Mrs. RICHARD W. BLALOCK,
President, Camp Fire Girls, Inc.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MRS. BLALOCK: Please convey my congratulations and best wishes to the Camp Fire Girls as they celebrate their fortieth anniversary.

Since their founding, the Camp Fire Girls have given some two and a half million girls the opportunity to make the most of their leisure time, to perpetuate the spiritual ideals of the home, and to aid in the formation of habits that make for health and character. Civic organizations know that they can always count on the Camp Fire Girls to give generously of their time and efforts in working for deserving community projects. Even international organizations such as UNESCO and the International Children's Emergency Fund have enjoyed the support of the Camp Fire Girls, who have done their part to promote friendship with children of other countries through donating gifts and exchanging letters.

The task of fostering the well-being of our citizens and stimulating international good will does not fall to adults alone. The vigor and inspiration of young people who will face tomorrow's problems are also required. The Camp Fire Girls not only espouse our American ideals—they put them into practice. I urge all who wish to encourage young people in promoting the American way of life to continue to insure the success of the Camp Fire Girls through their active support.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, March 2, 1950.

Mrs. RICHARD BLALOCK,
President, Camp Fire Girls, Inc.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MRS. BLALOCK: I am particularly happy to have the opportunity of extending greetings to the Camp Fire Girls on the occasion of their fortieth anniversary, not only because of the fine work being done by that organization, but because of the excellency of the leadership which the organization enjoys.

Those of us, who are concerned daily with the current problems which face our country, are cognizant of the fact that the future of this Nation rests upon the young people who will some day occupy positions of responsibility. Today, as never before, it is essential that these young women have an opportunity to learn through their daily activities their responsibility of citizenship and service.

The Camp Fire Girls for four decades have sought not only to provide a means of worthy recreation and training for girls between the ages of 7 and 18, but at the same time be instrumental in putting them into contact with the more serious aspects of the society which we have sought to maintain.

Reaching as it does into the lives of girls in every station of life and every type of background, the Camp Fire Girls organization has a unique opportunity to build friendship throughout our country and among the youth of other lands in promoting democratic principles.

Sincerely yours,

ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1950.

Mrs. RICHARD BLALOCK,
Marshall, Tex.

DEAR MRS. BLALOCK: It is a pleasure to extend my hearty congratulations to you and through you to the hundreds of thousands of girls who are fortunate enough to constitute the membership of the Camp Fire Girls of America on the fortieth anniversary of that splendid organization.

It is well known that millions of our finest women today have benefited from the fun and the training and the experience that they enjoyed as members of the organization during their younger days. You and your coworkers are entitled to the thanks of our entire people for the unselfish service of love which you are giving to these young people and for the contributions which you are thus making to future America. Each of the 360,000 girls who presently are members are to be congratulated upon the opportunity which the organization is now giving them to build character and to prepare for a more useful life while enjoying the play and the friendship of their girlhood days.

With cordial good wishes to you and to your organization, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SAM RAYBURN.

Food and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Food and Politics," from the Minneapolis Star of Monday, March 6, 1950. In my opinion, this is a very good editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD AND POLITICS

Two of the best talks at the Minneapolis Farm Forum last week urged a nonpolitical or bipartisan approach to agricultural problems.

Philip W. Pillsbury, chairman of the forum, suggested a food organization of the stature of the Hoover Commission to develop an intelligent program. Food is too important to too many people—and to world peace—to be in politics any longer.

Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, would abolish much of the power of the Secretary of Agriculture over price supports and instead let a bipartisan 13-man board run the program.

At the present time Democrats and Republicans are growing hoarse trying to outbid each other for the farm vote. Their chief offering is an easier approach to the Public Treasury.

In a sense, bipartisanship is working along these lines. It went into action very effectively in the Senate the other day. Senator LUCAS, majority leader, had proposed that price supports for potatoes be cut off unless growers abided by severe acreage and marketing controls. The Nation has spent more than $400,00,000 since the war to bolster potato prices.

Republicans and Democrats defeated the plan for those rigid restrictions in 1950. But in order to win their point, the potato State Senators had to vote for increased acreage for cotton, peanuts, and wheat, all of which are in surplus. The Government already has more than $600,000,000 tied up in cotton and our high support level has priced us out of world markets.

That sort of bipartisanship is dangerous to the economy and, in the long run, to the farmers. The kind that is needed would reconcile the various farm-program suggestions without new unwarranted raids upon the Treasury.

Pillsbury's plea to lift the Farm Forum beyond the realm of party politics was scarcely heeded, and maybe the sessions were more interesting because so many controversial issues were raised. But his suggestion of a national food commission, headed by a Bernard Baruch or a Herbert Hoover, should not die.

The best thinking of the Nation needs to be employed so that the question doesn't lick us.

The Fuchs Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Got Tipped on Fuchs in 1946," published in the Washington Daily News of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES GOT TIPPED ON FUCHS IN 1946, BUT NOTHING WAS DONE, MAGAZINE SAYS

Dr. Klaus Fuchs, it was stated today by the Canadian news weekly, the Ensign, was suspected of being a spy by the Canadian Government in 1946, and this suspicion was passed on to both the British and United States Governments.

Nevertheless, nothing was done about him, and Dr. Fuchs was allowed to work in the highest branches of atomic research in Britain and to have access to top United States and British atomic secrets. Dr. Fuchs confessed his spying activities and was sentenced on February 28 to 14 years in jail by a London judge.

The Ensign is a national news weekly published in Montreal. It is a Catholic paper but is not an official publication of the church. Its lead story date lined Ottawa and published today stated:

"Positive proof that the Canadian Royal Commission on espionage had ample reason to suspect that Dr. Klaus Fuchs was involved in the Russian spy ring, and that these suspicions were passed on to the United States and British authorities in 1946, was disclosed to the Ensign last week."

WARNINGS IGNORED

Despite these clear warnings, Fuchs was permitted to continue working for 4 years in atomic research. It was during this period that he passed most of the atomic information to Russia for which he was sentenced.

Until last week, all that was publicly known, apart from Fuchs' trial confession, was that his name had appeared in a notebook belonging to one of the men accused in the Canadian spy trials of 1946.

A United Press cable from London that a Russian agent's notebook containing Fuchs' name and the word "Nash" (Russian for "ours") was found in Canada last year was inaccurate.

This notebook, belonging to Col. Vasily M. Rogov, Soviet Embassy Director of Atomic Espionage, was shown to Igor Gouzenko, Soviet Embassy cipher clerk, who broke the spy ring, and its contents reported to the Royal Commission 4 years ago.

SPY ROLE REVEALED

Last week the Ensign learned that the Royal Commission knew in 1946 that Colonel Rogov revealed Fuchs' spy role to Igor Gouzenko. Both Fuchs and Dr. Allan Nunn May were considered for assignment to Canada to collect and report atomic secrets. Dr. May was selected but Fuchs was held in reserve. Then Fuchs was sent to the United States in 1943.

These facts were passed to United States and British authorities in 1946. The Federal Bureau of Investigation in the United States wanted to make further investigation of Fuchs, and a number of other suspects, but was not permitted to investigate atomic espionage until 1947. Actually, they have been working on the Fuchs' case for less than a year.

Why British authorities did not inquire into Fuchs' activity in 1946 and prevent him from passing atomic secrets to Russia during the last 4 years remains a mystery. MI (War Office counterespionage branch) knew that Fuchs had fled Germany in 1933 as a self-confessed Communist.

They had the reports from the Canadian Royal Commission in 1946.

VISITED EMBASSY

They knew also that Fuchs openly visited the Russian Embassy in London, a curious practice for an atomic scientist.

Other evidences of grave weaknesses in Britain's security system alarmed the United States last year and undermined British efforts to persuade the United States to share more of its atomic secrets. The Fuchs' case merely confirmed earlier fears.

In Ottawa, one indignant official told the Ensign: "Unless the authorities in Canada, the United States, and Britain quickly realize that every Communist and every fellow traveler is a suspect, our security measures will not give us much protection. The least we can do is to clean them out of places of authority and trust."

Sesquicentennial of Establishment of the Capital in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by State Senator P. H. McEachin, of Florence, S. C., at the Departmental Auditorium, Washington, D. C., on March 2, representing South Carolina at the exercises celebrating the sesquicentennial of the establishment of the Capital at Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On behalf of the people of South Carolina I want to express our deep appreciation for the honor bestowed upon us by the dedication of these sesquicentennial exercises to our State, of whose record we are so proud and to which we are so ardently devoted.

South Carolina's importance in the making of the new Nation over which this Federal Capital was to preside can hardly be said to have been excelled by that of any other. For more than a hundred years before Washington was established South Carolina had borne the principal burdens of defending the southern frontier against the encroachments of Spain and France, thus holding a vast territory that later became part of the United States. In the movement leading to the separation of the Thirteen Colonies from England South Carolina was the first to embody the new principles of self-government in a thorough and complete Constitution. In the long war that followed no other State was called upon to make greater sacrifices of life and property. The very mention of such names as Rutledge, Gadsden, Hayne, Laurens, Jasper, Moultrie, Sumter, and Marion, bears witness to the extent and worth of these sacrifices.

South Carolina was no less interested in the new Federal system than she had been in the war that made the union possible. To the Federal Convention of 1787 they sent John Rutledge, Pierce Butler, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, and Charles Pinckney. Each contributed in some important way to the drafting of the Constitution. It is now admitted, after much controversy, that Charles Pinckney laid before that convention a plan which anticipated a greater number of the provisions of the finished Constitution than did any other. I cannot resist calling attention to one of these provisions, which concerned the establishment of the Federal Capital. It was Charles Pinckney, I am proud to say, who first proposed article I, section 8, paragraph 17 of the Constitution which is now the basic law of the District of Columbia, and the city of Washington.

I think Pinckney was influenced in this by the fact that South Carolina, a few months before, had decided to transfer its capital from Charleston to a spot near the center of the State. In the procedure the State followed, there are striking similarities to the procedure used in arrangements for the Federal Capital. In both cases, the site selected was in open country, not in a populous town. In both cases, the name of Washington was proposed for the new city. South Carolina did not choose that name, but it is interesting to note that the name it did choose, Columbia, was later given to the Federal district around Washington. Finally, I should also point out that the architect who designed the South Carolina state house, James Hoban, later drew plans for the White House and other buildings in Washington.

Such were the ties between the State of South Carolina and the early history of the Federal Capital. They were surface ties, it is true, but they were indicative of the deeper bonds of devotion to the great dream of a federal republic in which men could be equal and free under a system of government the world had never known before.

End the Secret Snatching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last night it was my pleasure to deliver by transcription a radio address over the great prairie farmer voice, Station WLS, Chicago, a message on the subject of the staggering cost of hidden taxes. I emphasized the importance of the American public being made aware of the huge amount of taxes which they are paying and which most of them do not realize are snatching pennies, nickels, dimes, and dollars from their purses. On a single loaf of bread there are 151 hidden taxes, all along the line from the wheat in the farmer's field to the time the bread is placed on the family kitchen table.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this radio address over Station WLS be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

END THE SECRET SNATCHING—A REPORT ON ENDING HIDDEN TAXES

Wise old Benjamin Franklin told us Americans that "Nothing is certain but death and taxes."

Well, folks, at this time of the year, Ben Franklin's comment seems particularly appropriate. Every March 15 or thereabouts, over 45,000,000 American taxpayers make out their returns for Uncle Sam.

It is not an easy thing, of course, to part with the dollars which you have earned by the sweat of your brow, to part with savings which a man or woman wants to use for his or her own enjoyment, or for the children, or for putting away for a rainy day.

WE ARE GLAD TO PAY OUR WAY

Nevertheless, we are glad, as patriotic American citizens, to meet our responsibilities and to carry our share of the Government burden. We recognize that America, in these times, has many responsibilities to her own people and abroad. This necessarily involves a lot of money.

Our total budget, as you probably know, is around $43,000,000,000. Around 70 percent of that sum is devoted to the payments for past wars or preparations against (God forbid) future wars—for interest on the national debt, for aid to veterans, for defense, and so on.

WE MUST CONCENTRATE ON DEFENSE

Now, folks, these vital budget needs must be met. We dare not leave our country undefended, because we might have squandered our budget money for other extravagant trifles—for unnecessary items.

Just look abroad at this dangerous world situation, the menace of world communism, at the Soviet Union, which already controls a major proportion of the world's peoples. We note that Russia has 157 divisions, and we have but 10. Russia has 14,000 first-line planes. We have less than 2,000. To guard our own shores right now—to guard 150,000,000 Americans—we only have only about four divisions. Why? Because the rest are overseas or are noncombat troops. Those are important facts, serious facts, my friends. These facts emphasize that the greatest responsibility of the Federal Government is to preserve the Union, to protect it from would-be aggressors, to prevent another Pearl Harbor.

Yet, you and I know that the Federal Government, instead of concentrating on that one main problem, seems is going haywire. It wants to expand its field into just about every other insignificant problem under the sun.

CONGRESS MUST NARROW ITS FIELD

You know, folks, Congress has over 10,000 bills. Some of those bills are 100 or 200 pages long. It stands to reason that your Senators and Representatives cannot possibly handle all 10,000 bills adequately. The result is that many important items are considered in too brief a time, while piddling matters—mere trifles—often take up too much of Congress' time.

And, so we see, my friends, that instead of asking the Congress to expand Uncle Sam's field of operations, instead of asking the Congress to have Uncle Sam poke his nose into the field of medicine or poke his nose into purely intrastate matters, we—you and I—ought to be taking Uncle Sam's nose out of those affairs. We ought to have Uncle Sam devote his major attention to the crucial problems of the atomic age—defense, self-preservation.

But there's another major reason why we ought to decentralize Federal operations, so to speak, and return them to the States and localities. And that reason is what we might call secret snatching. By that I mean that your pennies and your nickels, and your dimes and dollars are being snatched in secret without your knowing it. You are paying a fantastic burden of secret taxes. Now, friends, if some racketeer or hoodlum were to snatch your money openly or in secret, you'd call a policeman, and you'd call him fast, because you have a right to protect your money against theft. But how can you protect your income from hundreds of hidden taxes on everything from diapers to tombstones; yes, taxes, from the "womb to the tomb."

When you go to buy a bottle of milk which costs, let us say, 21 cents, the milk cost is only about 13 cents; whereas, taxes, all along the line from the farmer to the man who picks up the milk, to the milk processor, the truck hauler, the retailer, and so on, account for 8 cents. If you buy a pack of cigarettes for 19 cents, 11 cents of that is for hidden taxes. If you buy baby powder for 29 cents, the hidden tax bite—that is, additional taxes—account for 18 cents. Just imagine that, my friends—18 cents for hidden taxes and 29 cents for the baby powder.

Your telephone bill is taxed, your home is taxed, your electric light bulb, your refrigerator, your wife's hosiery, your alarm clock, your auto and auto equipment in particular are taxed. That is what I mean by secret snatching—hidden taxes which cut your purchasing power. I'm referring principally to Federal taxes of course. Well, I say Uncle Sam must cease soaking the taxpayer.

WE MUST ENACT TAX REPEAL BILLS

For that reason, I have introduced a considerable amount of tax-repeal legislation. I have previously discussed with you over the microphone of WLS this question of repealing nuisance taxes. I mean the direct taxes on photo equipment, on furs, jewelry, theater admissions, cosmetics, and hundreds of other items like that.

SOME PEOPLE THINK THEY GET SOMETHING FOR NOTHING

But we've got to attack this whole idea of secret snatching. I can think of no more insidious danger to our American way of

life than these hidden taxes. Why? Well, the reason is obvious. So long as some people think they're getting something for nothing they'll continue the ruinous policy of demanding more Federal aid without realizing that in the long run, they themselves will be paying through the nose for them.

The Federal Government can't give you anything, unless it first takes something away from you. Namely, your money, and, in fact, your liberty.

SUMMARY

Now, friends, let me sum up the various points thus far:

1. The major business of the Federal Government is to look out after our national defense. Remember, experts have warned us that if a surprise atomic attack should come, 50,000,000 people in American cities could be destroyed in a matter of minutes. We must be calm, cool, and eternally vigilant.

2. In order to concentrate on problems of national defense, on problems of decentralization, Uncle Sam must get rid of those State and local functions which he took over during the war and depression emergencies.

3. If Uncle Sam does succeed in turning back some of these functions to the States and localities, then, he'll be able to cut your taxes. Not only cut your direct taxes, but most important of all, cut hidden taxes.

4. Now, fourth, we note that the whole history of taxation reveals the fact that once a tax is imposed, instead of being repealed, it is usually increased.

In other words, it's going to be a hard job to cut taxes. What we need, therefore, are specific techniques to end this secret snatching. We need a specific program. And that is what I should like to suggest now.

SET UP A LITTLE HOOVER COMMISSION

1. Right now, there is pending before the Senate, legislation to set up a little Hoover Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations. The purpose of this legislation is to end the overlapping and duplication between Federal, State, and local authorities by setting up a commission which would analyze the problem of Federal, State, and local powers and taxes. This Commission could do as wonderful a job in this field as the Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization has done.

2. Congress should immediately proceed to act. Every single committee of the Senate and House of Representatives should confer with the Federal agencies under its jurisdiction and direct those agencies to prepare a program for getting rid of certain of their less important functions and returning them to the States and localities.

It is not going to be an easy job to get them to do this. These agencies will probably try to sabotage this decentralization program; but if you, the American citizens insist on it, you can accomplish this purpose.

BUSINESSMEN SHOULD PRUNE HIDDEN TAX COSTS OF PRODUCTS

3. Now, third, I suggest that manufacturers of various business products voluntarily try to compute, for example, the cost of hidden baby-powder taxes, the cost of hidden soap taxes, and bread taxes, and so on. Then, if possible, those tax figures should be printed on the product that you buy. The American public should be informed about this secret snatching. If, for example, a woman buys a purse for $10, she should be aware of the fact that hidden taxes on that purse are going to cost an additional $5. Now, obviously, the cost of those taxes can't be printed on the purse itself. But it wouldn't take very much effort to attach a little label to state that the cost is going to be increased by $5 because of the secret snatching.

Newspapers and radio stations can voluntarily cooperate by emphasizing the significance of those hidden taxes, the harmful effect of this secret snatching on business and on consumers.

Some years ago, we had a tremendous problem of kidnaping. There was secret snatching of youngsters that horrified the Nation. We ended that crime by the efficient action of the FBI. Well, today, fortunately, our children are not being kidnaped, but our money is being kidnaped—not illegally, but legally by some so-called public servants. I say it is time that these public servants begin to cut down on this secret snatching—on the kidnaping of your income.

CONCLUSION

Well, ladies and gentlemen, if you agree (or for that matter, if you disagree) with the ideas I have expressed, I hope that you'll drop a note to me in Washington, D. C., care of the Senate Office Building. Just write a penny post card to Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin. But more important, write to your own Representatives in the Halls of Congress, or write to other Senators. Let them know how you feel. Let them know, as I believe you want them to know, that Uncle Sam must cut down on spending, must cut down on unnecessary functions, and most of all, must cut down on ruinous direct and hidden taxes.

Thanks for your kind attention, and good luck to you all.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the House has passed a bill to grant statehood to the great Territory of Alaska, and it now comes before the Senate committee. So that Senators may be informed regarding the salient facts, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, entitled "Bright New Star From the North," and an article from the Los Angeles Examiner, entitled "More Oil Than Arabia, 'Glacier Priest' Says."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer]

BRIGHT NEW STAR FROM THE NORTH

Heeding the aspirations of a vigorous young American Commonwealth, and echoing the desires of the American people as a whole, the House of Representatives has voted to admit Alaska to the Union.

Now the long-awaited dawn of the forty-ninth star needs only the approval of the Senate to become fact.

What has been acknowledged a necessity long ago, solemnly promised by the platforms of both Republican and Democratic Parties and by the formal avowals of their leaders, is thus at last near fulfillment.

Nevertheless, there are forces and influences at work in the Senate that would deny, and will strenuously attempt to frustrate, the legitimate ambition of Alaska for statehood and the great benefits it would present to the safety and economy of the entire country.

These denials, evasions, and objections must immediately give way to the just demands of the national interest.

It is only too clear and urgent why admission to the Union of Alaska now, and Hawaii as soon as possible thereafter, is of vital importance to the Nation.

Alaska is, beyond question, the most valuable strategic position on the globe today. It needs adequate representation in Congress to achieve full development as a frontal bastion of our defense.

Alaska is potentially one of the richest areas on earth. Statehood would stimulate growth of population, increase investment, strengthen industry, and enlarge commerce. These are historically the results of newly won State rank.

Obviously these tangible values would accrue as much in proportion to the 48 States as to the forty-ninth.

There is besides an intangible factor of inestimable importance.

Alaska is an American land, explored, settled, and civilized by Americans. It is as patriotic and progressive, as full of zeal to create and build as were every one of the once pioneering States that are now principal partners of the federation.

To deny the title and rights of full American citizenship, to withhold rightful representation, to maintain this critically situated and richly promising part of America in the status of a ward, is to deny every principle of our democratic doctrine.

In the light of these incontrovertible reasons for Alaskan statehood, technical objections whose very technicality is highly questionable, promise to make the debate in the Senate acrid and prolonged.

They are already foreseen in the coming hearings of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which must precede senatorial vote.

Whether in committee or on the floor, the carping objections must be overridden, so that the broad and glowing certainties of the future can stand out in the full light of reality.

As Alaska Delegate BARTLETT said to the House:

"Give us statehood and we will give you before long a mighty State whose population will grow constantly, whose business and industry will develop in harmony with the resources upon which they are based. * * * Statehood should enable the pioneer hands in Alaska and those who will go there to carve a mighty new State for this Union from our most western frontier."

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Examiner]

MORE OIL THAN ARABIA, "GLACIER PRIEST" SAYS—FARMS BETTER THAN DENMARK AWAIT SETTLER, HE DECLARES

Statehood for Alaska will throw open a vast frontier of tremendous resources to a new surge of colonization and development.

Statehood will facilitate defense of America's key bastion of the north, which lies in Communist Asia's back yard.

It will grant a basic right of democracy—representation—to fellow Americans who are now denied it in Congress.

So believes the famed "glacier priest," Father Bernard R. Hubbard, one of the world's foremost authorities on Alaska.

In an interview at Loyola University yesterday, Father Hubbard drew upon a quarter century of knowledge of that land.

PROSPERITY

"Alaska," he declared, "has everything any State could have for tremendous prosperity.

"The oil resources alone of the Alaska-Canada arc are greater than Saudi Arabia's.

"There are great regions of arable land, comparable to central Europe or Denmark, awaiting farming and dairying.

"I believe statehood will speed up its development.

"Settlers will be attracted first, and industry will follow. I know plenty of capital is waiting to come in with proper assurances of local protection for private investments."

Such expansion and civilization will facilitate defense, too, he said.

"Alaska is of paramount strategic importance. From bases there, B-36's could fly over the polar-ice pack by the shortest routes, to let any nation in the world feel our weight and power."

Alaskans themselves want statehood, he said, because it will give them elected representatives, responsible to them, instead of laying their problems to "voteless Delegates" in a Capital 4,000 miles away.

Ultimately, he said, successful statehood will be bound up with more cordial trade relations with Canada.

With the State of Alaska, Canada, and other United States working closely together, he said, "We will truly have a glorious North America."

Balancing the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Greater Peril Than Bombs," from the Indianapolis Star of a recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GREATER PERIL THAN BOMBS

Indiana Democrats sat back from their $25-a-plate feast Saturday night and heard Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, voice his grave concern about a problem which the head of the Democratic Party pretends is nonexistent.

Governor Stevenson warned fellow Democrats that they must devote more of their attention to balancing the national budget. "If we can't balance our budget now, when will we?" he asked. He called the problem of balancing the budget while living sanely and making the required total effort in the cold war as urgent a question as this country has ever faced.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower expressed similar concern Sunday night in a New York address. He counseled Americans to worry more about averting national bankruptcy and less about the hydrogen bomb. "We can do something about the possibility of bankruptcy," he said.

Mr. Truman's attitude is in alarming contrast to that of Governor Stevenson, General Eisenhower, and numerous other influential Americans, many of them leaders of Mr. Truman's party. These Americans see the dark peril of continued deficit spending. The President, however, remains blithely indifferent to his projected $9,000,000,000 deficit. Instead, he continues to demand social programs which would greatly increase the deficit.

Atomic warfare, as General Eisenhower implied, is a threat over which we do not have full control. A part of the initiative here belongs to the Russians. But national bankruptcy is a peril which Americans can control fully through their elected representatives. Atomic warfare is still in the if-and-when stage.

That is why General Eisenhower urged us to worry more about bankruptcy and less about bombs. That is why Governor Stevenson injected what might be called a sour note into a happy gathering of Democrats here in Indianapolis. If he succeeded in denting the complacency of some of his fellow party leaders, the result will be worth $25 a plate for every man, woman, and child in Indiana.

"He Made Me Think"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Two Fine Addresses," from the Delphi (Ind.) Journal of February 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO FINE ADDRESSES

HOMER E. CAPEHART, senior Indiana Senator, made an appearance in Carroll County last week and gave two addresses—one to a group of avowed Republicans at their annual Lincoln Day banquet and the other to a gathering of Delphi Rotarians and their farmer guests.

In those two talks Senator CAPEHART left more food for thought in Carroll County than has many a speaker in many a month.

Speaking with the earnestness of a man who has been in the shadow of death itself, CAPEHART left more people wondering about our American form of government than had probably even considered the matter in the past year.

A young man said later, "He really made me think about some things that I had passed over lightly before." The young man has a young daughter and he added that he wants his youngster to grow up in America—America as he knew it before and while he was helping fight a world war.

Senator CAPEHART laid English socialism out for inspection and then showed how dangerously close the United States has drawn to that same situation.

Make no mistake, Democrats who heard the Senator's address at Rotary-Farmer meeting were impressed and have something to ponder. It's not a political question where capitalism, socialism, and communism are concerned. It is a question of self-preservation, of individual freedoms and the right to own a home, a business, a farm, and the opportunity to manage them in the way one sees fit.

If you didn't hear the Senator, you missed hearing one of the best food-for-thought addresses given in these parts recently. A second best would be to take a suggestion made a week ago and read the popular Road Ahead, a wonderful condensation of which appeared in the February issue of Reader's Digest.

Report to the Second District of Illinois on the FEPC Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think it is proper that from time to time we who serve as the Representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States should report to those who sent us here in what manner we have used our influence and our votes to advance the sort of legislation in which our constituents are interested.

Furthermore I think such reports to our constituents should be made publicly in this Chamber that our distinguished colleagues, whether of our party and our own convictions or contrariwise, should the better understand our sincerity and the fidelity with which we seek to represent the public sentiment of the voters in our respective districts.

In the Second District of Illinois there prevails a strong dislike of anything in the nature of discrimination because of differences in race, color, creed, or station. We believe that equality in opportunity is as essential to a functioning democracy as impartiality in the administration of justice.

In the Second District of Illinois men and women of all religions and all denominations, of all racial groups and of all stations of life, believe that they and all other men and women should have equal opportunity in the obtaining and the holding of employment. To say to a worker that he cannot apply for employment on his own qualifications and his own character and on an equal footing with all other qualified applicants to the people of the Second District of Illinois is abhorrent. To say that he cannot be considered and subjected impartially to the same tests because of his religion, his color, or even his race, to us in the Second District of Illinois is to question democracy itself. We feel that in a real democracy there must be among citizens, united with the common purpose of making that democracy function, a sense of cooperating brotherhood at least to the extent of according to all an equality of opportunity.

EXPERIENCES OF THE MELTING POT

Why do we feel as strongly as we do on the matter of the proposed Fair Employment Practice Act? A few of our distinguished colleagues from the South have said in the debates in this Chamber that our motivation was one of political interest and not of conviction. How little they know us. How scant is their understanding of the experiences of life in a great melting pot from which peoples of all races and of all religions have come to contribute by hard work and loyalty their part to the strength and the greatness of the land of liberty.

Fair and equal opportunity for employment has not always been accorded the Irish immigrant, the Jewish immigrant, the Scandinavian immigrant, the Italian, the Polish, the Lithuanian, the Croatian—I could go on down the call of the nations and the races and I could not omit the Anglo-Saxon because against some of the later immigrants from the British possessions has there been directed by some employers that which amounted to discrimination.

If we are opposed, uncompromisingly opposed, to signs in factories and on the walls of offices reading, "No Negroes may apply," one reason may be found in the experiences that are a part of our background.

"Jews not wanted"—there have been such signs to bring tears to the eyes of honest men and women, and of children.

"No Irish need apply"—is it not understandable by our southern colleagues that one in whose veins Irish blood does course would ever wish on men and women of any race the doors of employment to be shut?

"No Polish workers wanted"—yes, in our Chicago, the greatest of the inland cities of America, the metropolis carved in the very center of the American melting pot, we have known that affront to be thrown into the faces of good and God-fearing people who came to America to work and ask only for the chance.

"No Italians wanted," "No Scandinavians hired here"—on down the list of immigrants who came to make their homes with us and to join with us in making our city and our land a place of happiness for all.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, in Chicago we learned our brotherhood in the experiences of our own kind. Even those who were born in America, but came from the farms, and were inexperienced in the ways and manners of urban life, had, too, at the beginning some measure of discrimination to combat.

MORE DEMOCRATIC OF CITIES

Chicago never would have become the great city that she is, perhaps the most democratic large city in the world, if from the very first our people had not seen to it that whenever discrimination showed itself, and upon whomsoever visited, that discrimination was crushed under an avalanche of populous disapproval. We of all racial groups and of all religions have worked together as a team in tolerance and in mutual understanding to bring to our Chicago, and all the people who dwell therein, the greatest possible measure of human contentment.

We apologize to no one for placing the quality of character ahead of the circumstances of birth. I suppose that you might call us a religious people, judging from the many churches and synagogues, always filled during the hours of worship. The point that I wish to emphasize here is that in our daily lives in Chicago we seek to give a practical expression in our contracts with our fellow men to the teachings of our religions. To us in Chicago the brotherhood of man is something more than a bit of vocabulary.

I may say to my distinguished colleagues from the South, and especially to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. SUTTON), who in the debate on FEPC raised the cry of hypocrisy against Members from a North that he does not know, from an East that he does not know, from a West that he does not know, that long before the wounds of an intersectional war were healed in the South there came to Chicago and to Illinois many fine southern men and women, who by us were received with open arms as friends and neighbors to work with us, without prejudice or discrimination because but recently the States from which they came were at war with us. We do not believe in discrimination. You cannot live long in the democratic atmosphere of Chicago until this passion for recognition of human rights, and their enjoyment by all without any taint of discrimination anywhere, becomes a part and parcel of your being.

I do not think any of the fine southern men and women who were the first to join our Chicago family after the close of hostilities in the sixties would have had it in their hearts to charge us with hypocrisy because we neither believed in nor practiced discrimination.

SINCERITY OF SOUTHERNERS

I should add, in all fairness, that the great majority of our colleagues from the South, who debated with us on FEPC, refrained from the charge of hypocrisy. They joined with the great majority of the advocates of FEPC in keeping the debate on a high level of logical argument advanced in a spirit of mutual respect. The fact that the delegations from the 12 southern States, including Members ordinarily of liberal trends of thought and many Members of lofty and spiritual character, voted as a unit against FEPC we from the North, East and West could not leave unnoticed. It was not so much a matter of geography—because, Mr. Speaker, we are all one people and we in this chamber find in commingling together that there is little fundamental difference among us—rather, I would say, the explanation for the division along sectional lines lay in the fact that our democracy in such a city as Chicago has longer been under the refining tests of personal experiences. They have been the experiences of the great melting pot into which have come one wave of immigrants after another, each perhaps with its own nationalistic customs and usually under the handicap of learning a new language and the habits of new ways. We have found from our personal experiences, and those of our own kind before us, in the great melting pot in which we became as one team the goal of which was the contentment of all, that human hearts and human minds are pretty much alike, and that race and color and religion and station cannot divide when there is brotherly desire to understand and a sincere willingness to accord to others that exact equality in opportunity expected and demanded for oneself.

Meanwhile, as we were going through the cycle of these experiences, which reached, as I have said, into the "groupal" backgrounds of all of us, the Southern States, emerging from the difficult problems of reconstruction years, continued under a social order only slightly altered. Toward those of a race not too long ago released from the status of slaves there remained an attitude of protection, guardianship, and undoubtedly what was deemed helpfulness. But in the melting pot of many races we had found that you can give all of these—protection, guardianship, helpfulness—and if you have omitted recognition of the dignity of man you have given nothing. It is that recognition of the dignity of man, which all human nature craves and which is of the very spirit of religion, that brings out the finest attributes in the individual and spurs each race to develop within its members those graces of manners and qualities of character that best recommend them in the society of the members of other races and of other groups.

Suffice to say, Mr. Speaker, that in return for the recognition of our sincerity, which most of our southern colleagues generously accorded us in the FEPC debates, we gave to them with equal generosity and in equal measure recognition of their sincerity.

A new order is supplanting an old order, and neither the advocates of a new that is destined to prevail nor the defenders of an old that cannot continue in a modern world can serve any good purpose, either in advocacy or in opposition, by raising a question of sincerity.

DISCRIMINATION IS A POISON

To all in the Second Congressional District of Illinois, to the men and women, and even the children who in their generation will carry the torch for democracy, humanity, and brotherhood, do I make this report of how, with humbleness of spirit, but I hope with that driving force which sincerity gives to our words, I have tried in the halls of Congress to make my voice the sounding board of their voices and my vote truly expressive of the universal sentiment of tolerance, understanding, and brotherhood prevailing among the people I represent in the Second District of Illinois.

On July 1, 1948, I said in the House of Representatives:

I abhor discrimination of any kind being directed against law-abiding men and women who walk in the image of their God, doing the share of the work of the world that is given them to do. All my adult life, actively expended in championing the causes of ordinary men and women who too often have too few to speak for them, I have fought discrimination wherever I have found its ugly head.

On coming to this Congress, a new Member and at an age where there could be no ambition except to be true to myself and the philosophy by which I had lived my life, I made to myself the pledge that wherever I found discrimination my vote would be withheld and wherever I found that which in sound legislation would eradicate in some measure some form of discrimination there would my vote be and there would it be counted.

Discrimination, Mr. Speaker, in a democracy such as ours is the poison that destroys; slow-working poison, it is true, and for that reason the more insidious and to be guarded against.

USE OF RADIO IN FEPC FIGHT

As a Member of the Congress, active in the fight for FEPC legislation and eager that behind us in that fight should be the strength of an aroused public interest, I appeared frequently on radio programs, both local and national. On January 8,

1950, over Station WWDC in Washington, I said:

Should Congress enact a Federal fair employment practices act? You couldn't expect me to answer that except in the affirmative. The platform of my party, which in all good conscience is binding upon me, declared in no uncertain terms for such an enactment.

If I had been defeated in November of 1948 and my Republican opponent had been elected to represent the people of the Second District of Illinois, I do not see how he could have answered the question except in the affirmative. The platform of the Republican Party, which, in all good conscience, should be binding upon the Republican members of the Congress, declared in no uncertain terms for the enactment of a Federal fair employment practices act.

Who am I to say, or who else has the right in the presumption of wisdom above his fellow men to say that both the Democrats and the Republicans were talking nonsense in their respective platform pledges and that the American people, having declared their overwhelming approval of legislation to end discrimination in the opportunity for employment, should be put in their place by the Members of Congress they thought they had elected to be their representatives and not their masters?

I cannot lose sight of the fact that this is a representative Democracy, that its proper functioning rests upon party responsibility and that, in the absence of a conflict with individual conscience or preselection pronouncement to the contrary, the men and women sent as Senators and Representatives to the Congress are morally and in all decency and honesty obligated to vote in the Congress according to the directions of the voters as expressed in party platform.

There are probably some in the Eighty-first Congress who are honestly fearful of democracy itself just as there were those among the early Americans who were fearful of extending the right of suffrage to those who owned no property and who possessed no superior education. They would have discriminated against men of their own color, of their own religion, of their own national origin, even to the extent of depriving them of a vote and a voice, and only because they were poor and the circumstances of their early lives deprived them of educational opportunities.

There have always been those who were afraid of the competition of equality in opportunity. They have preferred the comfortable cushions of a convenient status quo to the exertion of rolling up their sleeves and meeting their fellows on an equal footing.

They have always been a negligible minority in these United States of America. Their number in the Eighty-first Congress—I mean those who honestly find in their consciences something revolting and terrifying in the concept of equality in the opportunity of employment—is so piteously negligible that as a bloc it would not dent a pat of butter.

Equality in opportunity for employment in a democracy is so essential that where it does not exist there is no democracy. To deny equal opportunity in getting and holding available jobs is nothing less than holding to the discarded concept of master and servant, of classes determined by circumstances of birth, of superior races and of superior religions.

CONVICTION JOINS THE BATTLE

In the extension of my remarks I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, 1950, my reply to the request of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago that I support the FEPC bill and also sign the discharge petition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. My reply as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, 1950, to this great federation of all the Protestant churches in the metropolitan Chicago area follows:

DEAR SIRS: This is to acknowledge receipt of your form letter concerning H. R. 4453. I am happy to note the position taken by the board of trustees of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago in support of legislation aimed at removing discrimination in the opportunity to obtain and hold employment.

Such legislation, reflecting as it does the Christian concept of brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God, could not fail to inspire deep sympathetic interest among the men and women whose spiritual strength is maintained and augmented by attendance and worship at the many Protestant churches of all denominations comprising the membership of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago.

It is heartening that your board of trustees has responded to this universal sentiment among Christian people in our community by officially declaring the support of H. R. 4453 by your federation, truly representative of and the spokesman for the United Protestant Churches of Greater Chicago.

You request me to sign discharge petition 20. I am happy to inform you that I was one of the first to sign this petition and that I also signed discharge petition 21, which is of a similar nature. Discharge petition 20 was filed by Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT and discharge petition 21 by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. It is significant to note as indicating no division among those supporting FEPC that ROOSEVELT signed POWELL's petition, as well as his own, and POWELL signed both his own and ROOSEVELT's petitions.

As the 1948 national platforms of both major parties pledged support of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act, I see no good reason why any individual Member of the House should not feel free to sign any or all discharge petitions the objection of which is to bring an early vote on proposed legislation redeeming the pledge of both parties. Certainly, if each individual Member applied to his own actions the test of fidelity to campaign pledges of his own party it is inconceivable that a discharge petition for H. R. 4453 would fail of the required 218 signatures.

Regardless of the fate of the discharge petitions now on the Clerk's desk, I can assure you with the utmost confidence that H. R. 4453 will reach the floor of the House early in this session and be passed by a substantial majority. The sincerity and determination of the President and of the House leadership is beyond question, and I am sure there is equal sincerity and determination that the FEPC bill shall be passed among sufficient numbers of the opposition party.

The action of the board of trustees of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago has been a stimulating contribution, of real value, to a good fight for the good cause of a functioning democracy geared to the conception of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

VOTED AGAINST ALL AMENDMENTS

I remained on the floor during all of the 15 hours and more of that historic February 22, 1950, the anniversary of Washington's birthday when the good, the long, the gruelling fight was made for recognition of the human rights of all our people. I opposed and voted against all the amendments that were offered. I wanted not only the principle adopted but also the enforcement provisions that would make the principle respected in its application as intended.

You will find on page 2200 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 22, 1950, my reply to the contention of a southern Member that there is a distinction between civil rights and human rights. My remarks in the Halls of Congress on the occasion of that great debate, I quote:

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SIMS], whose sympathy with many liberal viewpoints has won him the friendship of liberals from the North, has sought in his presentment of the southern viewpoint on the pending bill to make a distinction between civil rights and human rights. His opposition to that bill he bases upon his conclusion that its effects would place civil rights in priority to human rights.

I am afraid I cannot agree with the distinguished gentleman. That which for convenience in reference we call a bill for civil rights stems from the human right of all men and women to live. Men and women in a complex industrial society, unless born of families of means, cannot live unless they have gainful employment. Shelter, food, clothing, everything necessary to keep body and soul together, must come from the proceeds of that employment.

This bill aims at affording all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States an equal opportunity in obtaining and holding such employment without any discrimination based upon racial and religious prejudices.

I fail to see where there could be any human right more fundamental than the right to live, and it is to establish that right to live on the part of millions of our countrymen now discriminated against that this proposed legislation has been presented. I don't care what you call it—civil rights, as is the easy term in the vocabulary of its proponents, or something sought to be forced upon us in priority of human rights, as the gentleman from South Carolina says. I do not think the good men and women in the galleries above us are interested in labels. No matter what you call it, this is a bill to give human beings the right to live and to enjoy equal opportunities in employment when possessed of equal qualifications.

I can conceive of a situation when a period of great unemployment, such as was visited upon us in the early thirties when the policies of a reactionary government brought us to a wreck, those men and women in the groups discriminated against, being the first to be dismissed and the last to be reemployed, would be doomed as individuals and as a group to unwarranted privations, and in many instances to actual starvation.

No, Mr. Chairman, the right to live of all human beings, without regard to color or race or religion, can never be inferior to any of the rights of a more fortunate and numerous group. I know of nothing in the Constitution of the United States, certainly nothing in the law of God, that establishes the right to discriminate against one's brother in priority to the brother's right to live.

Mr. Chairman, this day in this Chamber, where so many great battles have been fought and won for human rights, will long be remembered. Today an old and passing order made its last stand.

The galleries in this Chamber have been filled for the many hours that we have been here. Until the general debate began, 5 hours after we convened at noon, there was little of excitement to command the interest of those packed galleries. The monotonous calling of the hundreds of names on one roll call after another was all that we, the representatives of the people in what has been termed the greatest deliberative body in the world had to offer.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, those galleries have remained packed hour after hour, and they will be packed, I venture to say, all night and all day tomorrow if it takes that time to bring this bill to a vote.

I ask my colleagues to look upward at the faces of the men and women looking down on us. There is nothing of idle curiosity in those faces. I have never seen reflected in the faces of any gathering more sincerity of feeling, more intensity of emotion, the greater marked because restrained. With rapt attention from the galleries above they look upon everything which is transpiring.

If I read aright the expression in their faces it is one reflective of their joy that on this day and in this Chamber the good fight has been made and is on its way to triumph—the good fight to end discrimination in the opportunity to get and hold a job—the good fight for the human right to live of everyone, even those of other races, creeds, and color.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say that in the Second District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent, the sentiment for the passage of this bill is overwhelming. In Chicago we do not like any sort of discrimination.

I HAVE REPRESENTED MY DISTRICT

I have the faith that the people I represent, the great Republican rank and file as well as the Democratic, men and women of all religions and creeds and of all races and nationalistic derivations, will approve of what I have done. I repeat, we in the Second District of Illinois do not like discrimination. We like all men to stand on their own feet, to enjoy equal opportunity and to measure up in the esteem of their neighbors by the quality of their individual characters without seeking an unfair advantage in the circumstances of birth.

Moral Rearmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, several weeks ago, in commenting on certain matters under discussion on the floor of the Senate, I called attention to the fact that there appeared in the galleries at that time a group of young people from overseas representing 12 or 15 countries. I also made the statement that the Chaplain of the Senate had written several fine editorials in the Washington Sunday Star, which I understood had been incorporated in the RECORD. I find that I was mistaken in that respect. I therefore ask at this time that the two editorials one entitled "A Rainbow Over the Alps" and the other entitled "At the End of the Rainbow," written by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—A RAINBOW OVER THE ALPS—MORAL REARMAMENT IDEAL SEEN AS A WAY TO WORK NECESSARY CHANGE IN HUMAN CHARACTER

(By the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Litt. D.)

Spanning the sky like a radiant scarf of blended colors, I saw a rainbow overarching the majestic peaks of the Alps. Under that sign in the heavens lay a little town perched on the mountainside 3,000 feet above the city of Montreux and that liquid-blue gem which is Lake Geneva. As a blazing star once hung over Bethlehem of Judea so a rainbow hangs over a little town in another small land, lovely Switzerland.

That spot, high and lifted up, is a modern Mecca which, as a magnet, has been drawing to its spacious Mountain House pilgrims from all parts of this fear-haunted earth. For during these crucial months, when it is later than we think, the paths of peacemakers who are to be called the children of God have led to Caux, pronounced in our English tongue Co.

All for which Caux has become an inspiring symbol fits in perfectly with that opulent word, "cooperation." Here is an enchanted mount where the Sermon on the Mount is being put into practical operation in this very year of crisis and chaos. That mountainside has been called by a distinguished Member of the United States Congress "the brightest spot in the dark picture of Europe." In many aspects that somber picture is dismal indeed. One of the world's most profound thinkers, whose frank telling of unpleasant truth has earned him the title of the "Gloomy Dean," Dr. Inge, of St. Paul's, London, has just emerged from retirement after much brooding over the present ominous world situation with this startling warning: "Either the nations must surrender some fraction of their independence to a supernational authority which will have the power to settle disputes peaceably or peace will be restored as in the Roman Empire by a knockout blow by the strongest power. This last looks painfully like a Tartar domination of Europe and Asia. Shall we have the sense to choose the former alternative?" But the fatal trouble is that the "former alternative," namely, just adjustments of the differences dividing mankind cannot be chosen unless men and nations change. Above political, diplomatic, and economic levels, earnest men and women weary of frustrated mechanical shuffling of the same old cards of fate, are frankly facing the fundamental necessity—change, changed hearts, changed desires, changed attitudes, changed motives, changed objectives.

A Burmese leader at Caux, speaking for the teeming east, declares: "We need money. We need about everything. But we need most of all changed people, a change which will enable us to trust one another."

Communism is out on a world-wide scale to liquidate one class and put another unchanged class at the top of the heap. Socialism, often sincere enough in its attempts to eliminate exploitation in order to bring the good things of life to all people, is still dealing with unchecked selfishness which can wreck any social scheme. Even in a chastened capitalism, management and labor confront each other with belligerent bitterness and suspicion in a constant tug-of-war. With legislative bricks, a sorry attempt doomed to futility is being made to build an altruistic edifice on the sinking sands of an unchanged society. It is self-evident that the utopian plan will not work without the utopian man.

The only escape from catastrophe is to change human nature. That diagnosis is as old as the Matchless Figure who enunciated the Sermon on the Mount and who insisted, as He fronted the deepest needs of the individual and of society, "You must be changed." "Born again," He called it. That is the working gospel of Caux—change, not in some sweet by-and-by, but in the here and now. That is the rainbow over the Alps. Here men and women by the thousand, representing all walks of life, from more than half a hundred nations, are finding the secret of actually practicing the presence of God—the God who did not cease to guide and to speak when some holy book was closed centuries ago, but who is speaking now to those who will but listen. Here at Caux, in a hostile world longing for peace but preparing for war, in an arsenal of the spirit where the invincible instruments of moral rearmament are being put into the hands of eager crusaders who are marching forth with the old cry which once rang through the embattled hosts of Europe, "God wills it." Here is the laboratory proof that human relationships, individual and social, dull, defeated, and divided, may be changed to relationships radiant, victorious, and united. Seeing that rainbow, parliamentarians, diplomats, legislators, cabinet members, labor leaders, capitalists, Communists, miners, and ministers—Protestants, Catholics, Jews, Moslems—are climbing the path to Caux, to carry back with shining faces the answer.

Next week the Spires of the Spirit will point to the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—AT THE END OF THE RAINBOW—MORAL REARMAMENT CONFERENCE AT CAUX REGARDED AS A SIGN OF HOPE FOR THE WORLD

(By the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Litt. D.)

High up in the Alps at Caux inspired men and women, having been shown the pattern in the mount for a new world, are going out with the leaven which must leaven the whole earth, unless a new Dark Age is to emerge, with the split atom as its nemesis. The fight whose strategy Caux plans is not a war against something. It is primarily a fight for something, for a master ideology which is superior and supreme. After a visit to Caux, a United States Congressman exclaimed: "The unmatched ideology here offered to a frustrated world is undoubtedly the Gibraltar of hope to which we must all cling."

The creed of Caux is: An evil idea can be stopped with only one weapon, a better idea. The basis of its ideology is to build a quartet of virtues and values into every human relationship—purity, honesty, unselfishness, and love. That combination in action is irresistible. In the struggle between class and class, and race and race, it offers the healing balm of an understanding and a mutual trust which bridges all gulfs. It is all happening now at Caux, for Marxists and capitalists, for captains of labor and of management, for men from the Orient and the Occident, for white and black and brown. With old hates and hurts forgotten, clenched fists have changed to clasped hands.

Under the spell of Caux once rabid Communists have utterly renounced the Marxian gospel of hate. One who had followed the party line for 30 years testified: "I see now that Marxists carry in their minds a great deal of rubbish." And so do Socialists and capitalists. They all need to be changed.

A labor leader, heading unions influencing over 200,000 members, beholding selfishness change to altruism, competition to cooperation, conflict to concord, ownership to stewardship, in that human laboratory in the Alps, declared: "They have the spiritual atom bomb. Here is the secret for building the new world that we Socialists have always wished for."

Yes, it is no illusion. There is a rainbow over the Alps. It speaks of one more chance for men to turn pending catastrophe into a flowering renaissance which will bring a new Eden for all.

Twelve thousand from 50 nations, reaching Caux by land, sea, and air, have found there the headquarters of the hope of the world. Our own Department of Justice, speaking for America which backs the Marshall plan and all other bulwarks against the threatened flood of communism, sealing this rainbow in the sky, has issued this statement: "Moral rearmament is a world force, and its objectives are recognized by the Department as worthy and helpful in the strengthening of democratic forces throughout the world."

No wonder our Congress sent at Government expense this summer a delegation, who left its busy session to fly to Caux and see for themselves this great thing that has come to

pass. One high official speaks for all in reporting what they saw and how they felt, as he testifies: "No man could attend the conference in Caux and watch the emotions of a new hope light the faces of the people and not come away convinced that the organized forces of good in this world can defeat the organized forces of evil."

As we left that mount of transfiguration, far down beneath us lay the city, emblem of the busy haunts and restless hearts of men. Peering earthward from our eerie balcony, naught could be seen below but billowy clouds shutting out all sign of the valley. But we could see plainly that the blue sky was the truth, for we were above the clouds. They seemed only symbols of the suspicions and misunderstandings which hide the vision splendid from the men of the valley.

But, descending to the lake level and looking up to the everlasting hills, lo, at that moment the sun broke through and, like a vast searchlight, poured its glory on Caux. And from the dizzy heights of Mountain House the turrets flashed and flamed like a bouquet of diamonds. And then, across the Alps arched as brilliant a rainbow as our eyes ever had beheld. And the pot of gold at the end of that promise flung across the heavens is beauty in blended unity.

Yes, there was a rainbow across the Alps. And above this world which hath in darkness there is a rainbow of hope.

Continuation of Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made last week in connection with the deficiency appropriation for the Office of the Housing Expediter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. WILLIAM BENTON, OF CONNECTICUT, URGING THE CONTINUATION OF RENT CONTROLS

There is growing alarm among tenants throughout the country over the possibility that Federal protection for the ceiling price of their shelter rent may soon be suspended.

The national policy regarding this basic element in the cost of living for millions of our citizens is being determined in a manner which is equally alarming.

Last year the Congress passed an extension of rent control until June 30 of this year. The Senate Appropriations Committee has now denied additional operating funds to the Office of the Housing Expediter for the balance of the current fiscal year. The result is that the country faces a premature termination of this whole program.

This is an unsound procedure. I do not believe that the appropriation process should be used to thwart the expressed intention of the Congress. The action of the Senate Appropriations Committee is an indirect method of rendering the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 inoperative and ineffectual. It takes the teeth out of a law which was designed to give fair and equitable treatment to tenant and landlord alike.

Failure to restore these operating funds in the deficiency bill now before the Senate means the end of effective rent protection for tenants of 12,000,000 rental housing units throughout the United States.

Law enforcement is jeopardized in 74 American cities with populations of 100,000 or more which have deliberately elected to enjoy the benefits of Federal rent control. Public service to both landlords and tenants will soon be suspended or drastically curtailed in 1,000 United States communities where rent ceilings are now being maintained.

The stage will thus be set for a sudden and ill-considered disruption of landlord-tenant relations in 43 of the 48 States. Even before the Congress has fully considered the grave implications in the expiration of rent controls on June 30 next, this serious change in national policy will be accelerated in a reckless and irresponsible way.

This prospect is before us at a time in my own State when a shortage of over 70,000 homes still persists and when over 50,000 workers have exhausted their unemployment benefits.

Only last month, for example, the Board of Aldermen of the City of Waterbury, a key Connecticut industrial center, sent me a resolution requesting the extension of Federal rent control "for at least 1 year", because "there still exists a serious shortage of housing adequate to the needs of our citizens." Rent advisory boards in Hartford, New Britain, New London, and Middlesex and Tolland Counties have voted against rent decontrol in any part of these areas at this time. An acute shortage of low-rent housing is indicated by waiting lists in New Haven and Bridgeport.

Gov. Chester Bowles has unequivocally stated that the lapse of Federal rent control poses the most serious consequences for the economic stability of the entire State of Connecticut.

I concur in these misgivings, not only as they involve Connecticut but for the Nation at large.

I see no element of reasonable doubt to the statement that an acute shortage of moderate-priced rental housing continues to exist. There is every reason to believe that the elimination of rent controls will result in a lower standard of living for those who can least afford further strain on the family budget. I am not at all persuaded that the rental emergency is over, or that the Congress can lightly cast aside its obligations to face up to that emergency.

British Health Seen Slipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, my attention was called this morning to an article in the Washington Times-Herald entitled "British Health Seen Slipping." The article is date lined London, March 12. It points out that a recent national survey shows a 7-percent increase in sickness and an 8-percent increase in visits to doctors and hospitals among persons between the ages of 16 and 64, compared with last year. For persons over 64 years of age sickness rose 20 percent. I do not know just how the increases are related to the present socialized medical system in England, but I believe that the appropriate committees of Congress which are considering socialized medicine and so-called compulsory health legislation might follow through on the information contained in this article and ascertain what the cause for the increase is. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH HEALTH SEEN SLIPPING

LONDON, March 12.—A striking increase in sickness among Britons of working age, apparently indicating the health of the nation is declining, is disclosed in the latest survey by the Ministry of Health, published today.

A Conservative Member of Parliament, R. S. Russell, will ask Aneurin Bevan, Minister of Health, in the House of Commons what steps he intends to take to deal with the "serious trend disclosed by the official figures."

The survey shows a 7-percent increase in sickness and an 8-percent increase in visits to doctors and hospitals among persons between the ages of 16 and 64, compared with last year. For persons over 64 sickness rose 20 percent.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent well-thought-out editorial from the New York Journal-American, on the subject of statehood for Alaska.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDEEM THE PROMISE

The power to strengthen this Nation immeasurably against the greatest potential enemy in its history rests with 13 men in the United States Senate.

As members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, theirs is the power to report out of committee, for a full Senate vote, the Alaska statehood bill.

The bill was passed by the House March 3. There is a strong reason to believe that the Senate, if given a chance to vote, would pass it by a substantial nonpartisan majority.

Alaska wants statehood with the fervor men and women give to a transcendent cause. An overwhelming number of men and women voters in the United States want statehood for Alaska. This Nation needs Alaskan statehood to advance her defense, sustain her security, and discharge her deep moral obligation.

The 13 Senators should not delay.

There should be no delay for the reason that delay weakens our Pacific security by permitting Soviet Russia to strengthen her Siberian redoubts while also influencing the native population of western Alaska and of the strategic islands of the Bering Strait.

Published in the Saturday Evening Post of February 4 was a revealing article by Sally Carrighar.

This informed writer told what is going on.

The Russians have fortified adjacent Siberia with heavy guns and other coastal equipment to guard their airfields—airfields from which they may seize our air bases at Anchorage and Fairbanks, establishing themselves to bomb our Pacific areas and our internal centers as far east as Detroit.

The Russians have set up an Eskimo espionage system.

The Russians are suborning the Eskimo settlements in Alaska by collectivizing the primitive industry of their Siberian neighbors and kinsmen—giving them doles while making them state chattels—and by using them as emissaries of Communist paternalism.

If, through neglect or indecision or timid partisan considerations, we withhold statehood from Alaska we shall have dealt a devastating blow to the morale of Alaska's white population.

We shall have injured immensely our world prestige.

We shall have assisted communism in its enticement propaganda designed to win the support of the Eskimos.

We shall have reneged shamefully on our long-promised rights of statehood to one of our most valuable possessions.

We shall have weakened our defenses possibly beyond repair.

For these reasons the 13 Senators in a very real sense hold the fate of Alaska—a fate joined inseparably with the security of this Nation—in their hands, and hold also a tremendous responsibility.

Let us hope fervently that they discharge it well.

Tribute to Wilton E. Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Augusta Herald of March 2, 1950, paying a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Wilton E. Hall, of Anderson, S. C., the publisher of the Independent and Daily Mail.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DISTINGUISHED CAROLINIAN SPEAKS TO WORLD EDITORS

A fine recognition, and one well deserved, came to Wilton E. Hall, of Anderson, S. C., a few days ago, when he was invited to address the opening session of the Columbia University Journalism Seminar in New York City.

While his newspapers are not published in the largest city in his State, Mr. Hall's papers are among the best known in the country, having been cited by many outstanding organizations for their signal services to the city of Anderson and to the State of South Carolina.

Mr. Hall has been publisher of the Independent (morning) and the Daily Mail (evening) for a number of years. He has served his country as United States Senator, but his most conspicuous services have been in the field of journalism.

Augusta civic leaders were given yeoman assistance by Mr. Hall in the development of the Clark Hill project, and today he is sparking the movement to bring about a similar development on the Savannah River near Hartwell, Ga.

Mr. Hall knows and understands the South as probably no other person and his address and round-table discussion at Columbia University was no doubt most illuminating.

Another southern man spoke in New York about the same time. He was Judge J. Waites Waring of the United States court of Charleston, who is temporarily sojourning in the big city.

Judge Waring and Mrs. Waring are vying for public attention at the moment by belittling their own people and their own race.

These people have already had more publicity than they deserve, but since the judge, in New York, was moved to tell a Negro audience that, "The white people of my part of the country are sick mentally, obsessed with the false doctrine of white supremacy," we cannot resist the opportunity for writing about a really distinguished South Carolinian, Wilton E. Hall, who is not mentally ill and who holds none of the views being espoused by the Charleston judge.

It was a Scotsman, we believe, who said something about feeling that everybody is crazy "except thee and me and sometimes I fear that thou art a bit queer."

If everybody is mentally ill down this way save the judge and his wife, what is to hinder us feeling that they, too, are a bit queer?

Public Library Service Demonstration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this library demonstration bill. First, it sets up another unnecessary bureau in Washington and starts by appropriating $150,000 to the Federal Security Agency to handle the initial cost of administration necessary in this Department.

Secondly, it offers to appropriate out of the Federal Government $40,000 a year to each State on a matching basis. That is the first plan.

The second plan in this bill would permit the Federal Government to appropriate the difference between $40,000 and a hundred thousand dollars a year to States which would match that amount. The bill is supposed to run for 5 years and could cost the Federal Government in 5 years under the plan $40,000,000.

Not a person in my district has written me asking me to support this bill, and probably not 20 people in my district know that the Federal Government is trying to force this bill on to the States. If we pass this legislation, we are assuming that the people out in the various States are not sufficiently interested in education and libraries to manage their own business; that we of the Congress and the bureaucrats in Washington know better what the States and the people should have than they know themselves.

I am against this legislation because to enact it would be a waste of the taxpayers' money that should be left with him to spend for books and periodicals for his children as he so desires.

When this Congress opened I made up my mind I would not support any new legislation that would add additional expense to the Government unless I was convinced it was absolutely necessary. I know this legislation is not necessary in any way, and a majority of the Members of this Congress must feel the same way about it. For that reason I ask you to join with me in defeating this legislation that would add more millions to the cost of government. I ask you to help defeat this legislation because all of the 48 States are in good shape financially and are more able to pay any educational expense at the present time than is the Federal Government.

The Members of this Congress know, and the people should know, that you cannot cut the cost of government, you cannot stop deficit financing; yes, you cannot prevent bankrupting the Federal Treasury unless the Congress has the courage to stop voting to spend money that we do not have, but will have to borrow from the people.

This legislation is unnecessary. Let us do our duty and defeat it in the interest of all the people.

Long-Range Housing Research Will Strengthen America and the American Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am keenly interested, as I know also are many of our colleagues, in the research work in home construction for which we provided in the public housing bill of the first session. The goal of a decent roof over every American family, and within the means of that family, can be reached. It is not something only to dream of and to talk about. Until we have attained that goal we have not assured the permanent security of our country from the chaos and the ills that attend discontent. Those who are homeless, or are forced to shift about from place to place to find shelter they can afford, often finding it in atmospheres not conducive to healthy family existence, cannot be expected to furnish that stout foundation in a contented citizenry upon which any State must rest.

There is only so much that we in the Eighty-first Congress can do, constructively, to meet the problem of residential structures being priced too high for most people. We made a fine start in providing for public housing and slum clearance. We shortly will have before us the middle-income housing bill, and if we pass that, which I hope we will, we will have made another real contribution to the solution of the problem. But the real solution is in research. In research we will find new and better ways

of construction, new and better materials, new and easier ways of financing.

Because this is a subject in which all of us are so much interested I am inserting in the Appendix a most informative and constructive letter which I have received from James Prestini of the Armour Research Foundation of Illinois Institute of Technology, Technology Center, Chicago. The letter follows:

MARCH 6, 1950.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your support of a vigorous Federal housing research program is needed. I realize that Federal housing is a relatively new concept in this country which has come about only because of the dire needs which exist. Your support and the support of everyone to this effort assumes more than normal importance in that what is done will set the pattern for several years to come.

There are few if any matters more urgent, more involved, or nothing more varied than the housing problem. To solve this problem the United States must set up a Nation-wide, long-range comprehensive program of research which is concerned with fundamental knowledge of the technical and design factor as well as the social and economic factors of housing research and which is comparable to the research work done by the Department of Agriculture. This much needed comprehensive housing research program should not be bypassed by substituting a small technical program which struggles from year to year to survive and produces immediate results of little long-term value.

Sound technical research ultimately develops new materials, new structural systems, and leads to reduced construction costs. Research gives data whereby we can anticipate the loadings and the deteriorating influences which building materials must withstand, establish useful properties of construction materials, and develop efficient assembly methods. Greater emphasis must be placed on developing mass-production techniques as related to housing construction. Only through extensive research can this be achieved and reduced building costs assured. The following serves as a sample of some of the technical research problems to be solved.

Development and improvement of methods of testing materials, structures, and components. Design and development of equipment for the conduct of tests.

Design and development of instruments for measurement.

Development of standards for evaluating performance.

Development of materials, structures, and structural design.

Design and development of building equipment.

Establishment of criteria for building and safety codes.

Establishment of specifications for purchases.

Studies in the problems of maintenance.

Development and improvement of techniques to increase production. Some of the design research problems are:

An approach to the problem in its town-planning aspect, in order to determine the most economical and rational type of local settlement for any given population.

Architectural design to determine the best type of plan and form of house.

A study of human conduct is probably the most difficult phase of housing research. Because of its complexity, it has been avoided for the most part. Exhaustive studies need to be made on the human physical and psychological relations to fatigue and comfort of such physical environmental factors as acoustics; illumination; forms; space and size; heating and ventilation; materials, finishes and surfaces. Research techniques need to be developed which will measure and determine conclusively consumer tastes, attitudes and behavior in terms of housing.

Research in economics would include studies in costs of financing home building. There is need for simplification of procedures relative to the transfer of property. The variety of provision of State laws which control foreclosures and registration of titles creates unnecessary confusion and cost. The creation of national systems of mortgage guarantees and supervision of local lending agencies bring out the need for clarification and simplification.

These parts of the technical and design factor as well as social and economic factors of housing research which are mentioned are not intended to be complete but rather a sample of what is meant by the problem being urgent, involved and varied. Setting forth these parts serves to emphasize the belief that only a government agency, such as the Housing and Home Finance Agency, could coordinate a nation-wide basic research program in housing.

It is obvious that the building industry has not been able and is not able to coordinate a nation-wide housing research program of a long-term value. To a degree the building industry has itself to blame for this inability. The industry is impeded by thinking and construction methods which grew out of a craft type of industry. The resulting house has not produced savings commensurate to those in other industries which have integrated twentieth century research, mass production methods, and mass distribution. The very nature of basic research does not produce immediate returns and this discourages the building industry from financing such a program. Research must be based on new systems and not on the old which merely mitigate and perpetuate the shortcomings of the current building industry.

The Government's position is one of supplementing—not sublimating—the efforts of private enterprise. Since the over-all housing research field is such an immense and complicated problem it is reasonable to believe that no one individual, no one organization, neither the building industry nor the Government alone, can completely solve it. The problem is of such magnitude that the help of all is needed for a solution. To fit our system of private enterprise a Government program of research under the able leadership of Dr. Richard U. Ratcliff, director of research, Housing and Home Finance Agency, could do much to foster a coordinated program for basic research in housing by universities, independent research groups, and other existing not-for-profit organizations. This agency could furnish the incentive and crystallization which are necessary. It should be authorized to undertake such a program to correlate the results of both public and private research and to disseminate the results in such a way as to encourage a modernization of the building industry. Such a research program would supplement rather than duplicate private research efforts. Though it should be undertaken in cooperation with all segments of the home-building industry, basic research should be an independent operation to be assured of the best and unrestricted results. By using the existing and established facilities to carry out the work, we would be assured the fastest, most efficient and most economical solution and at the same time hold to a minimum the criticism of Government participation. Another advantage is that the universities could develop personnel through a teaching program which would integrate theory and first-hand experience. In fact, utilizing the existing established facilities would lessen the amount of criticism, and might be the necessary margin of difference to make an extensive research program possible.

The financing of a program of research of the nature which has been briefly reviewed here will require extensive funds. The Federal request for $3,300,000, most of which will be used for current operations is insignificant. It is not in keeping with the billions in Federal commitments for current housing insurance, guarantees, and subsidies. Large amounts are needed if we are to have a real, broad focusing of the research effort on the manifold aspects of housing.

I hope that through this letter I have made a little clearer the magnitude of the housing-research problem to justify your active support for extensive appropriations and to assure that the program will get the favorable hearing it deserves.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES PRESTINI.

Statehood for Alaska Is Declared Vital for West Coast Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent article on Statehood for Alaska, written by Dorothy Thompson, and published in the Washington Star of March 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA IS DECLARED VITAL FOR WEST COAST DEFENSE—MANY IN AREA BELIEVE UNITED STATES CONSIDERS TERRITORY "EXPENDABLE" WITH WAR

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Several months have elapsed since an article by Gov. Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, in the United States News and World Report, attracted wide attention by its unfavorable report of Alaskan defenses.

So absent-minded are our citizens about Alaska that not long ago a distinguished journalist after visiting northeast Norway described the area as "the only frontier of the Atlantic powers on the Soviet Union," forgetting the frontier on this continent, separated from Soviet Siberia only by a narrow strait.

Recently, in Seattle, an energetic visiting Alaskan told me that many Alaskans believe the United States considers Alaska "expendable" in case of war.

Alaskans are acutely aware that the Territory once belonged to the Russian Empire, whose widest limits Stalin has showed himself determined to restore regardless of how the territories were originally acquired or by what agreements they were subsequently relinquished.

SEMICOLONIAL STATUS

These factors, and others, demand the entrance of the great northern Territory as a full-fledged State into the Union. It is absurd for the United States to support anticolonialism everywhere while retaining a semicolonial status for integral parts of American Territory.

The opposition to Alaskan statehood has come, in the first line, from grasping economic interests who want the Territory as a privileged market, but not as a producer even for its own needs. It comes, in the second place, from Members of Congress representing populous States who protest against two Senators for a State with only 100,000 inhabitants.

In a letter to the New York Herald Tribune, Mr. Paul H. Whitney reminded such congressional critics that some of them represent States which entered the Union with much smaller populations than Alaska's, among them the great States of California, Illinois, and Michigan, and that, all together—apart from the original 13—21 States have been admitted with under 100,000 population.

Senators are United States Senators, and in our history small States have often furnished superior statesmanship. The United States of America is represented in UN by a former Senator from Vermont, whose entire population does not exceed that of a middle-sized city. The present Vermont Senators—GEORGE D. AIKEN and RALPH E. FLANDERS—are among the most respected members of the higher legislative body.

RAPIDLY GROWING AREA

It by no means follows that a community of a million will produce 10 times as many men of brains and virtue as a community of 100,000. Athens produced immortal sages when its population was, in present-day terms, that of a large village. Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, and Franklin appeared when the largest American State was a tenth the size of present-day Greater New York City. And if there are now any of their like about, we could certainly use them.

The population of Alaska will stagnate as long as Alaskans have only second-rate citizenship—despite the fact that the Northwest States are the most rapidly growing part of the Union, and the Northwest Passage probably the most important global air route. During the war, the heaviest air traffic was through Edmonton in Canada's Alberta.

But Americans have not been northminded. Many conceive of Alaska as an icebound waste. Alaskan experts, however, insist that it could absorb and support at least 2,000,000 people in areas where the climate is as favorable as in several well-settled States of the Union and Canada.

The neglect of the north may cost us dearly one day. Such neglect is not shared by the Soviets, who rank first in Arctic science. Eskimos, who often have family ties on both sides of the Strait and pass back and forth, have reported greatly increased activity on the Siberian side, near and beyond the frontier.

Finally, it is practically a natural law that no nation, in the long run, holds territory it fails to colonize and develop. Russia became the vast power she is largely by colonization, in which she has had no historical rival. And with growing population pressures, this law is not likely, in the next generations, to fail to operate.

Surplus Potatoes Defeat Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY CAVALCANTE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, everybody is hearing a lot of talk about the communistic activities in this country and very rarely is any credit given to the American public for their constant vigilance against this terrible menace. During the recent work stoppage in the soft coal mining areas, various communistic-inspired outfits attempted to worm their way into favor of the coal miners. They lost sight of the fact that Americans of the best stock come from the coal-mining areas and I am pleased to report the Commies were unsuccessful in their attempts.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from my secretary in Somerset County, Pa., Mr. Gerald N. Zeigler, pointing out one of the unsuccessful Communist missions in the mining regions of his county. The contents of this letter are self-explanatory and should be read by every Member in this House so that he can see how constant is the vigil of the real American.

WINDBER, PA., *March 5, 1950.*

Hon. ANTHONY CAVALCANTE,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: This past week we had a contact with what we believe is a Communist-inspired outfit.

The United Electrical Radio and Machinist Workers Local, No. 418, of East Rutherford, N. J., contacted the local United Mine Workers saying they wished to help the plight of the miners with some financial assistance. The local secretary wrote back and in comes a check for $207.26 to the Eureka Stores to furnish food to the miners.

The letter from local 418 was signed by William Steinman, secretary, and that part of the letterhead which previously showed the CIO label was scratched off.

When the local boys saw what was brewing, they asked the Eureka Stores to return the check as not wanted.

Mr. Finko, the Democratic central committeeman, tells me that some food baskets have come into Central City from the Communist outfit in Pittsburgh. You can readily see the merits of the surplus potato distribution which took the pressure off hungry families and made it unnecessary for them to accept food relief from any of the Communist outfits. Mr. Finko also said he thought there were about 50 Commies in Central City. Mr. Zahurak says that in the Windber local he knows of two.

Mr. Brannan, the Secretary of Agriculture, deserves the gratitude of the American people for his foresight and his American way of combating communism.

As your secretary in Somerset County, I forward you this matter in accordance with your instructions to report all visible communistic activities in this county.

Yours very truly,

G. N. ZEIGLER.

Award to Hon. Oscar R. Ewing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 11, 1950, the Sidney Hillman Foundation tendered a luncheon to the Honorable Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, at the Commodore Hotel in New York City. The purpose of the luncheon was to present to Mr. Ewing the foundation's annual award for meritorious public service.

The function was presided over by Jacob S. Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO, who is also president of the foundation. His remarks on that occasion, in presenting the award on behalf of the Foundation to Mr. Ewing, were as follows:

Mr. Ewing, honored guest, ladies and gentlemen, once a year, in my capacity as president of the Sidney Hillman Foundation, it becomes my happy duty to introduce to a distinguished audience and to the American people generally, the recipient of the annual Hillman Award for meritorious public service.

A year ago it was my pleasure and honor to introduce the first recipient of this award, Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM, the distinguished United States Senator from North Carolina.

The trustees and directors of the Sidney Hillman Foundation believe that we set a high standard, indeed, by naming Senator GRAHAM as the first to receive our award. The man we name today has also lived and worked in the highest and best tradition of human welfare. I am sure that Sidney Hillman, were he alive today, would approve our choice of Oscar R. Ewing—a fighting liberal.

As you know, the Sidney Hillman Foundation was established, among other purposes, to recognize Americans consecrated to the public welfare. Sidney Hillman's whole life was so dedicated, and the founders of the Hillman awards were determined to carry on in his spirit and to recognize those men and women who felt as he felt concerning the plain people of America—workers, farmers—the professions, and others who have contributed to the greatness of our beloved country.

Sidney Hillman was especially interested, during his public life, in creating opportunities for the dispossessed and disinherited. He was concerned about racial discrimination and the denial of minority rights. He fought for an ever-increasing standard of living and for genuine industrial political democracy. He fought for world peace.

Those of us who were privileged to live and work with Sidney Hillman knew his passionate concern that no man, woman, or child be denied his birthright as a human being.

In honoring Oscar Ewing today with the Hillman award, we acknowledge the acts of a great public servant. As Federal Security Administrator, and before, Mr. Ewing has fought for the underdog. Perhaps, even beyond the call of duty, he has fought for civil rights and FEPC.

He has opposed discrimination in all its forms. He has fought for an adequate housing program and Federal aid to education. He has opposed the Taft-Hartley Act. He is a fearless crusader for the common man.

He has made a determined campaign to extend old-age and survivors insurance to millions of persons not now covered. He has fought for increases in social benefits. He is making a fight to aid unfortunate Americans who do not presently qualify for insurance benefits. Most Americans are in debt to this great public servant for his fight in behalf of comprehensive welfare programs, including public assistance and family welfare services to safeguard mothers and children.

But most of all Oscar Ewing has earned the gratitude of millions of Americans because of his stand in support of national health insurance. Though staunchly supported by millions of neglected Americans suffering from inadequate medical care, he has been the object of bitter, unscrupulous

attacks by organized professional and big-business interests. He has been the principal target of their attacks. He has won, in our eyes, the highest accolade when called by his enemies, the American Medical Association, "Mr. Socialized Medicine" himself.

Of course, it is not socialized medicine. It is nothing of the kind. It is national health insurance, paid for, just as social security is paid for. It destroys the curse of charity and would bring to millions of Americans, not now adequately protected, the latest and best medical aid known to science.

It is for these reasons, ladies and gentlemen, that we honor Oscar Ewing today. He is a public servant in the very best and noblest sense. He has set aside considerations of personal gain. He has devoted his heart and his talents to the greatest good of the greatest number. He is the kind of man we are proud to call an American and a true liberal.

And, so, in recognition of your faithful service to the citizenry of our great country, I present you, Oscar, with the Oscar of the Sidney Hillman Foundation, with our sincere good wishes for your continued good health, and for the ultimate victory of your crusade.

I hand you this medal drawn by a great artist, Mr. Bastelo and this citation which reads:

"The Sidney Hillman Foundation has the honor to present its 1950 award for meritorious public service to the Honorable Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator. His courageous fight for the Nation's health in the face of powerful opposition; his concern for the widows, the orphans, the sick, the disabled, and the aged; his warm and lively interest in those who toil and make our country great; his enlightened stand on Government's responsibility to its citizens, place Oscar R. Ewing in the forefront of our great public servants and have earned for him the esteem and affection of millions of his countrymen."

From One Great American to Another

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the Sidney Hillman public-service award was presented to a great American and a great Democrat, the Honorable Oscar Ewing, Administrator of the Federal Security Administration.

A popular magazine recently referred to Mr. Ewing as "Mr. Welfare State himself"; but it is no exaggeration to say that without the profound influence of Sidney Hillman, Oscar Ewing might not, in his lifetime, have had the opportunity of wearing that nomination.

It is certainly fair to say that this award came from one great American to another, from one great democrat to another, and here I use the small "d," for both Sidney Hillman and Oscar Ewing have been noted for democratic qualities which transcend party lines.

Mr. Ewing is the second recipient of this award which was created to perpetuate the memory of Sidney Hillman's achievements and contribution to America; it would be hard to imagine a more perfect choice.

It is my pleasure to insert, under leave, Mr. Ewing's address in receiving the award:

ADDRESS BY OSCAR R. EWING, FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR

An award for meritorious public service, presented in the name of a great American, Sidney Hillman, is a very rare and precious honor. I am proud to have been chosen to receive this award, and I accept it with genuine emotion.

Every liberal-minded person in this country has, in one way or another, felt the influence of Sidney Hillman's leadership, his idealism, and his intelligent realism. In making this award to me, you are in a sense touching me with the torch of his intense liberalism. You are handing me, not a diploma for past behavior, but a spur to future action—not a compliment but a challenge.

Sidney Hillman himself put this challenge into words. He died less than 4 years ago, in the summer when the infamous Eightieth Congress was playfully engaged in ripping apart the fabric of American progress. But Hillman was not among the weak-kneed. He had not lost faith in the future of America, or in the wisdom of our people. A few weeks before his death, at the convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, he said:

"We want a better America, an America that will give its citizens, first of all, a higher and higher standard of living so that no child will cry for food in the midst of plenty.

"We want an America where the inventions of science will be at the disposal of every American family, not merely for the few who can afford them—where it will be possible for all groups, regardless of race, creed, or color, to live in friendship and be real neighbors—an America that will carry forward its great mission of helping other countries to help themselves, not thinking in terms of exploitation, but of creating plenty for all everywhere."

That was the kind of America that Sidney Hillman wanted. It is the kind of America I want. And the only way to approach this ideal is to fight for what we believe in.

It is the fate of the American liberal to be a scrapper. He cannot sit back and say that things are wonderful, so let's go to sleep. Instead, he is spurred by the desire to change things that are bad so as to make them good; to keep pace with the progress of ideas and science; to move forward. Hillman was a great and patriotic American; that is precisely why he wanted America not to stay just as it was at some distant point in past history but to be a better America. Hillman knew that our standard of living was higher than anywhere in the world, but he also knew that some among us were not enjoying the fruits of that high standard. He knew that we had made giant strides in scientific research and development, but he also saw that many among us could not afford to make use of the great inventions of our time. He was familiar with the magnificent American tradition of liberty and equality, but he could not overlook the fact that this tradition has not always been applied to all our citizens, regardless of their color or their faith or their origin.

Sidney Hillman, as a liberal, could not help but be a scrapper. He fought for something real—for the advancement of the workingman, in his own trade and throughout the country; for the emergence of a mature labor movement that would accept its responsibilities for statesmanship in the pattern of our national life; and for the betterment of all America.

These are reasonable goals. But they demand eternal vigilance if they are to be approached; and every one of us who believes in the expanding future of the free world is engaged in the struggle for their achievement. We are in the front lines of politics—as we were in the past under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, as we are today under the leadership of Harry S. Truman, as we shall continue to be so long as there is room for improvement in the human condition.

When I accepted the President's invitation to serve as Federal Security Administrator, I knew that I was walking into an exposed salient of the political front line. The Federal Security Agency is the one portion of the executive branch of our Government which deals with people as people—with their health, their education, their social security, their children, their capacity to go into a grocery store or a drug store and feel that what they buy will not harm them. Inevitably, our task is controversial. That is because the well-being of the people is always controversial. I am not afraid of controversy. I like it. It does something to my glands—so long as I am sure I am on the right side of the controversy. My glands have been thriving during the past 2½ years.

There are two kinds of battle lines in America today. One is the line drawn between those who are by inclination and judgment liberals and those who are by inclination and judgment conservatives. It is possible to be a sincere conservative; although as a career it has little to be said for it. Between the honest liberal and the honest conservative there can be worthwhile debate, to the everlasting benefit of the people as a whole. Since 1932, the majority of our people have shown that, when they know the facts, they choose the liberal position.

But they do not always know the facts, because on the second battle line we are confronted, not by facts, but by distortions and half-truths and phoney appeals to emotions. A few weeks ago, the Republicans rallied in Washington, in an attempt to show that they were just plain folks, after all. After great labor, they announced to the country that their issue in 1950 would be "Liberty or Socialism." They would have done better to leave this nonsense in their lunch boxes and to have concentrated on the cold chicken.

What kind of a political slogan is that—"Liberty or Socialism"? Do they mean that only a Republican is dedicated to liberty in America? Do they dare to say that American liberals, who have produced men like Roosevelt and Truman and Hillman, do not know the value of individual liberty, of human dignity, of American freedom?

And as for socialism—at a time when American industry is a hundred times healthier than at any point during the last years of the last Republican administration, these lackwit leaders of reaction presume to raise the scarecrow of socialism.

I do not often give advice to opponents. But, in a spirit of generosity, I urge them to look for something more imaginative, something more positive, something more honest, than so empty a slogan.

Do not misunderstand me. I believe in the clash of ideas. I believe in politics. I think it is a noble profession, and a healthy one. But I believe in the kind of politics that deals in honest ideas. I think we have a right to suspect those who shy away from honest facts and ideas, and resort instead to the strategy of error.

Let me give you an example of what I mean. The American Medical Association is spending $3,000,000 this year to fight the President's plan for national health insurance. The plan itself is a simple one, designed for the sole purpose of removing the financial barrier to adequate medical care in the United States. It would collect a small wage deduction from the earnings of all employed people, which would be matched by an equal contribution from employers—under a system very much like social security. Out of this money would be paid the bills

for medical, hospital, and other care. What it does, in brief, is to make sure that no American would be confronted with bankruptcy if he became seriously ill—because his bills would be paid out of the fund which he himself had helped to create. That is what it does, and that is all it does.

Now, the trade association of the doctors does not like this idea. I am not sure I understand its true reasons for opposing national health insurance, because its expressed reasons make very little sense. I have in my hand an expensively printed little pamphlet, in several colors, which puts the AMA's case. It starts off, "If you value your health—and if you value your liberty—help keep politics out of medicine." Underneath is a full-color reproduction of the well-known painting, The Doctor, by Sir Luke Fildes. It shows a little child lying ill on a bed made from two chairs, in a small and obviously impoverished home. Near the window, the child's mother sits at a table, her head cradled in her arms. Behind stands her husband, with one hand on her shoulder, looking distractedly at his child. Next to the bed sits the doctor. He is leaning forward, with his chin resting on his hand, looking fixedly at his little patient.

When Sir Luke painted this picture, I am certain that he intended to give us the impression of the good family doctor, in the old tradition, whose single concern was to bring the child back to health. But the AMA has put a different interpretation on the painting. In a little box in the upper left-hand corner, like the balloon in the comic strip, the AMA has inserted a slogan—"Keep politics out of this picture." And as a result of the AMA's recent action, most of us are now given the distinct feeling that our good country doctor is not thinking about what he must do to cure his patient, but rather about how he must word his next letter to his Congressman.

In the pamphlet itself I find at least 19 misstatements or misrepresentations. If the doctor in Sir Luke's picture were to practice medicine with the same disregard for painstaking accuracy that the doctor's lobby uses in practicing publicity, the little child would have small chance for survival.

I think it is important, on occasions like this one today to shove to one side the distortions, inaccuracies, lies, and sensationalism, and to return to the bedrock of honest principle. We have no need to be on the defensive. We are proud of our concept of America's destiny.

In our concept, the key to our future lies in the protection and extension of equal opportunity for all our people—opportunity to live, to advance, to think, to achieve. We do not want to hand life on a silver platter to every newborn child in America. Nobody can do that, and it would not be a good thing if it could be done. But we do want to make sure that every person in the United States is given a fair chance: a fair chance at education; a fair chance at health; a fair chance to enjoy his declining years; a fair chance to keep his home together in times of economic stress.

Freedom is meaningless, in our time, unless we can provide this kind of equal opportunity. What you or I may make of these fair chances must depend on ourselves—on our ability, our talent, and our initiative. But what good is ability to the child whose home town is too poor to provide him with adequate schooling? What good is talent if it is smothered by the oppressive burden of paying off debts incurred because of an unexpected serious illness? What good is initiative if it is overwhelmed by fear of an impoverished old age?

These are our new frontiers today. They lie in the human person. This is our new responsibility—to the individual. I believe in the human being. I believe in his infinite capacity to improve, to grow and prosper. I believe that, if he has the equal opportunity to a decent job at a fair wage, to as much education as his ability and his desire may warrant, to adequate medical care when he is sick, to minimum protection against the hazards of old age or economic distress—I believe that if he has these opportunities he will make for himself a greater freedom than has ever before existed. I believe this because I have faith in mankind.

And I will tell you what is wrong with our conservative opponents. The trouble with them is that they do not trust the individual American. They are afraid to provide America with the fruits of the American tradition. They cannot understand that we must use the community machinery which we call government if today we are to guarantee equality of opportunity to all in our complex society. They measure a Federal budget—or a State budget—in terms only of dollars, and they overlook the most important items of all, the items marked humanity and fredom.

Their idea of a better America is that of a left-over America from the last century, before there were corporations and automobiles and atomic piles and any of the vast interconnecting networks of our American economy. They hear the child cry for food, and they say, give him charity—but never, no, never give him the opportunity to enjoy in self-respect the equal opportunity to our country's high standard of living. They wonder at the inventions of science, but they are willing for these inventions to be at the disposal only of the relative few who can afford them. They pay lip service to the concept of American neighborliness and equality, but too often they are ready to team up with the forces that stand for unfair unemployment, discrimination, and segregation.

Why? Because they are afraid. They are afraid of the present, and they are even more afraid of the future.

This is a time when all of us on this planet have good reason to be concerned about the future. We live under the threat of war from an aggressive Communist imperialism. We know that today weapons exist which can annihilate hundreds of thousands in one sudden explosion. We have accepted leadership in a free world where many nations are not yet able to provide their people with the minimum demands of human life anywhere. These are heavy burdens for all of us, and we cannot afford to consider our domestic progress as being separate from them. You and I know that the only protection that makes sense today is what Sidney Hillman stood for.

You and I know—as Sidney Hillman knew—that only those who believe in their fellowmen are equipped to cope with these problems and to fulfill the promise of America. Hillman had unyielding faith in the people of the United States. He lived by that faith, and died by it. You who are gathered here today share that faith. It is my faith as well. And I am proud to accept this award as your challenge to me to help perpetuate the ideals for which a great American lived and died.

Price Supports for Hogs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1950, 13 Members of the House of Representatives addressed a joint letter to Secretary of Agriculture Brannan urging that the support level on hogs after March 31, 1950, be announced at once. Copy of that letter was printed on page 2500 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 28, 1950. Under date of March 7, 1950, the Secretary replied to said letter and thereupon 12 Members of the House of Representatives, including those who signed the original letter, dispatched a further communication to Mr. Brannan under date of March 11, 1950. Under leave to extend my remarks, both of these letters are submitted herewith, as follows:

MARCH 7, 1950.

Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOEVEN: This is in reply to the recent public letter to me which was signed by you and 17 other Congressmen, each of whom will receive a copy of this answer. I disagree with you as to there being confusion among hog producers by reason of the fact that we have not announced a support program for hogs after March 31 of this year. I have assured farmers by public statements that price supports will be continued, even though hogs are no longer in the mandatory category.

However, I concur with your view that the announcement as to level of support should be reached at an early date, and you may rest assured that such a decision will be made as soon as circumstances will permit.

In the meantime, if you have any recommendations as to whether there should be hog-price supports for the coming year or portion thereof and the level of support, either in parity terms or in dollars, I would be happy to receive them.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

MARCH 11, 1950.

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We have at hand your letter of March 7, 1950, in reply to a letter addressed to you on February 24 by 13 Congressmen requesting an early announcement of the support-price level for hogs after termination of the present program on March 31.

Your reply amounted to little more than a proposal that if we "have any recommendations" on the support program you would be happy to receive them.

This attitude on the part of responsible Government officials charged with administering the programs enacted into law by the Congress is becoming increasingly open to question. In your own case, you have repeatedly attempted to pass the buck to Congress on problems which you were appointed by the President of the United States to meet and which the Department of Agriculture is adequately staffed to handle.

The fixing of the support-price level for hogs should not be a matter of guess, hunch, or wishful political thinking. It should be based on information and data gathered from experts in the field with regard to the whole economy.

The Agriculture Department which you head enjoys the following:

A. An appropriation for the current fiscal year of $3,571,500,000.

B. A full-time staff of 80,556 employees and 12,274 part-time employees, or a total of 71,830 people to assist you in arriving at decisions. In addition, there are 137,037 people serving as State and county committeemen either on a per diem basis or at no salary at all, to supply the Department with information. Thus, in all there are 208,867 persons

channeling information into your office on various agricultural problems.

It would appear that you, as Secretary of Agriculture, with a budget of $2,871,000,000, and a staff and field force of [illegible] persons, should be equipped to arrive at decisions on vital agricultural matters promptly, fairly, and without delays that depress the market or otherwise injure agriculture, and without employing the device of pleading helplessness in asking Members of Congress for their recommendations.

Members of Congress are elected to enact laws which members of the executive department, including you as Secretary of Agriculture, are supposed to administer. A member of Congress does well to have an average of three people employed in his office. A member of Congress naturally has many sources of information, but the staff of the entire Congress is no more than a fraction of the staff that you have at your disposal.

Naturally there should be close cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of our Government, but under the policy of passing the buck to Congress which you are following, the line between "cooperation" and "buck-passing" is becoming far too thin in Government today.

You have attempted to dump the potato problem and the grain storage question in the lap of Congress when you have had ample authority under laws enacted by Congress and under appropriations made by Congress to proceed at all times. Therefore, it would appear desirable in the instance of the support price level for hogs, that you move at the earliest possible moment to make an announcement without further effort to shift responsibility which is yours.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Eighth District of Iowa; ROY O. WOODRUFF, Michigan; PAUL CUNNINGHAM, Iowa; CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska; HAROLD O. LOVRE, South Dakota; KARL M. LECOMPTE, Iowa; CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio; AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Minnesota; BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa; HENRY O. TALLE, Iowa; FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota; JAMES I. DOLLIVER, Iowa; H. R. GROSS, Iowa; CHARLES H. ELSTON, Ohio; THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio; THOMAS E. MARTIN, Iowa; CLARENCE J. BROWN, Ohio; HAROLD C. HAGEN, Minnesota; JOHN W. BYRNES, Wisconsin; J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Ohio; JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Michigan; ALBERT M. COLE, Kansas; A. L. MILLER, Nebraska; LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Wisconsin; GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin; RICHARD M. NIXON, California; THOMAS H. WERDEL, California; LESLIE C. ARENDS, Illinois; GARDNER R. WITHROW, Wisconsin; JOHN PHILLIPS, California; WILLIAM S. HILL, Colorado; CHARLES W. VURSELL, Illinois.

Peat Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, last week the Members of the House of Representatives voted to admit Alaska into the Union as a sovereign State of the United States. For this, the citizens of Alaska are most grateful and we all sincerely hope that the other body of this Congress will not hesitate to uphold this vote. It will mean the achievement of a goal that our Delegates have brought before Congress since 1916 and which the people of Alaska have had in their hearts since Alaska became a Territory of the United States.

During the debate on this bill, many of my friends continually emphasized the importance of Alaska's strategic location as our last frontier and most forward outpost in the North Pacific. But military considerations alone do not make Alaska important to the United States. Of equal importance are our vast expanses of valuable undeveloped natural resources. Neither in agriculture nor in industry have we begun to tap the wealth of resources that wait only to be put to productive use.

As Alaska's political institutions have progressed toward statehood under the tutelage of the United States, so the development of its resources under the tutelage of industrial and agricultural research will make it a State economically secure and prosperous.

Its varied climatic conditions, soils, and land forms have accounted for numberless resources, among them large deposits of various types of peat peculiar to the different regions of Alaska. For this reason, I was happy to see that my friend the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. FRED MARSHALL, has introduced H. R. 7330 to stimulate research and development of peat production and its industrial and agricultural by-products.

Research into the effective and economical production of peat products can mean much to the economic growth of Alaska and to the national security of the United States. Preliminary research has convinced scientists that new products and technological methods can even be of benefit to the fishing and canning industries of Alaska, as well as the establishment of new industries. The development of all of Alaska's resources to their fullest extent will be in the interests of the United States as a whole.

Some research made with Alaska peats by Dr. A. P. Dachnowski-Stokes, Dr. Leopold Pistner, and Dr. Derso Shybekay, registered professional engineers, indicates even in their preliminary surveys that proper utilization of these peat deposits will be a valuable asset to our agriculture and growing commerce. New industries will mean new employment opportunities and an increase of permanent inhabitants in Alaska who will contribute economically, socially, and politically to the growth of their new state.

Only a program of thorough and directed research will show us the number of products that can be derived from our peat. As the members from Minnesota have already pointed out to the House, other countries have outstripped the United States in the utilization of peat and some with remarkable success. Russia, with the world's largest peat resources, has found it not only a source of low-cost fuel but industrial chemicals, building materials, insulations, and fertilizers. And in the United States, it has been used in the production of heat-insulation packing materials and fertilizers.

What other chemicals or uses can be found for the various peat deposits of Alaska, can be determined through further research. Many of the processes which have already undergone laboratory experimentation can be turned into manufacturing practice.

Particularly since I know first-hand the importance of a sound program of developing natural resources in building the economic strength of a Territory or a State, I hope every Member will give serious thought to the proposals made by my colleague in the Committee on Public Lands. I am sure that he will welcome the advice and assistance of all who are concerned with making the best use of every natural resource for the citizens of the United States.

Commercial Natural Gas in Marion County, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is my happy privilege to announce that natural gas, in commercial quantities has been found in Marion County, Ala., in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent here.

This discovery was made by Mr. Harry L. Cullet, on a location which he calls No. 1-A Lewis on the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 23, township 11 south, range 14 west, of Huntsville Meridian. It was what is commonly known as a wildcat venture.

The initial gage of the well showed a flow of 620,000 cubic feet of gas per day, through a 20 by 64 inch choke.

According to press reports, Dr. Walter B. Jones, State geologist of Alabama, has stated that this Marion County gas well is the first high quality commercial gas producing well to be completed in Alabama since 1914.

This new gas well is located within a few miles of the enterprising towns of Hamilton, Guin, and Winfield. It is near United States Highways 43 and 78, and Alabama State Highways 118 and 167.

Mr. Speaker, it is my judgment that this new commercial gas well is the forerunner of widespread exploration, drilling, and development of the gas resources of Marion County. These resources, when developed, will contribute greatly to the industrial development of the county.

This new gas well is a real addition to the resources of Marion County, which already include wonderful climate, a 50-inch annual rainfall, large deposits of coal, fine farming lands, good hard working people, large timber resources, an excellent highway system, commercial clays and chalks, and large groups of far-sighted people, scattered all over the county who are interested in bringing new industry and enterprise to the county. Interest in better housing, more

paved roads, better schools, and rural telephones is high.

The opening of a new gas field in Marion County will help the county to attain the fine objectives that its citizens have set for it.

Abduction of Greek Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, on March 7 it was my pleasure and honor to attend the eighth national banquet given by the Order of Ahepa here in the city of Washington. This organization is composed of American citizens of Hellenic descent, its purposes being to promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America, support of its Constitution, obedience to its laws, and reverence for its history and traditions; to instill in every one of its members a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship and the sacred duties attendant therewith; and to encourage its members to always be profoundly interested and actively participating in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor and always to strive for the betterment of society.

The order has many other worthy objects, but from those quoted above we can see that this great organization serves a most useful and worth-while purpose.

The American citizens of Hellenic descent have proven their good citizenship and have contributed much to the intellectual, social, religious, and business life of this Nation. They have set an example that others might well emulate.

The heart of America goes out to the Greek Nation; that brave nation which made such an heroic stand against the Fascists and Nazis and, since the war, against the Communist guerrillas. In this connection I hope that all of you will read a letter written by Mr. Chris Katechis, president, Greek Orthodox Community of Montgomery, and published in the Mongomery Advertiser, Tuesday, February 28, 1950:

EDITOR, THE ADVERTISER:

As president of the Greek Orthodox Community of Montgomery, Ala., and citizen of the United States of America and Montgomery for 30 years, I am constrained to comment on the subject of the kidnaped children.

Thousands of Greek children have been forcibly abducted from their homes. They are being detained in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany.

I visited Greece in 1946, and remained there for a period of 6 months. I saw the situation as it then existed and it has not been remedied. I know from first-hand observation the sorrow and anguish which these Greek mothers and fathers have suffered and endured. Some 28,000 children snatched from their homes and held as hostages by the Soviet Government and its satellites, to be trained, so the Communists hope, to be the fifth columnists of tomorrow.

Why haven't these children been returned to their homes? The answer is: Russia will not give her consent for them to be returned.

If heartaches and tears would bring them back they, long ago, could have returned on a river made navigable by the tears of Greek mothers and fathers. However, grief and sorrow, tears and heartaches, loneliness and homesickness, have little appeal to Russia and her communistic satellite countries.

I appeal to my friends in Montgomery, of every race, creed, and color—Greek, Jew, Catholic, and Protestant—everyone in whose breast beats a heart filled with the love of humanity, of justice, of righteousness, of home, country, and family. I appeal to all my friends everywhere who are appalled at so heinous a crime as that which has been perpetrated on the Greek people, many of whom are kinspeople of Greek-Americans, some of whom live in Montgomery, by Russia and her satellite countries in the kidnaping of these Greek children.

I say to you, friends, please join with me in sending a message to the President of the United States of America—the greatest, most wonderful, and most powerful country in the world today—urging him, as President, to call upon the United Nations to insist on the resolutions which requested the prompt repatriation of these children, and to urge the International Red Cross and the League of Red Cross Societies to continue their noble efforts toward implementation of the United Nations resolutions pertaining to the return of these Greek children.

The people of Greece cannot stop these crimes. They are powerless to do so; they are suffering the aftermath of an awful war. They must look to humanity in general and especially to Christian America for help in stopping these heinous acts which are so revolting to humanity. They have been loyal to America in the past and will be in the future. Their cup of appreciation would run over if America and the United Nations would say to the Soviet Union and her satellite countries: "Stop those crimes and return those children and we don't mean maybe."

That is the language even a bully understands.

Wire or write the President about this matter, please.

CHRIS KATECHIS,
President, Greek Orthodox Community of Montgomery.

I am sure that the Members of Congress join with Mr. Katechis in demanding that these children be returned to their homeland. We cannot, as a Christian Nation, further tolerate such atrocities.

Poage Answers Star-Telegram Intimation That REA-Financed Cooperatives Are a Drain on Federal Treasury and Pay No Local Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, it was my privilege to speak at the dedication of the Bob Poage steam plant, which has been erected by the Brazos River Electric Transmission Cooperative, Inc., between Temple and Belton in my district. On that occasion, among other things, I said:

I look upon this plant as far more than simply a rather ugly building with some large and strange machinery. I look upon it as far more than just a power plant—more indeed than the source of essential power to light the homes and lighten the work of thousands of men and women throughout central Texas. I look upon it as a concrete emblem of our American way of life. This plant does not represent the Russian idea of state ownership. The Government does not own this plant, nor does it own the great system of transmission lines with which it is connected. The farmers of Texas own those lines and they own this plant. True, they could not have owned them had it not been for the enlightened policy of our Government which seeks to help our people help themselves rather than doing the job itself. The Government provided a source of credit open to power cooperatives and private power companies alike. A source of credit where all who will provide service for rural areas can go and borrow money at the same low interest rates just as banks and railroads can borrow from the RFC.

This has been branded as socialism. I want to believe that those who so brand it are simply uninformed as to our rural electric program. Actually this program is the very antithesis of socialism. This program makes it possible to maintain basic competition in the electric field. I don't mean competition as to who will serve an individual house. I don't mean the kind of competition that involves two sets of wires down every road. I mean basic competition. The kind of competition that makes each producer and distributor know that he must give a satisfactory service at a fair price or see someone else give it. I mean the kind of competition that enables the consumer to always receive the benefits of all technical advancement. I mean the kind of competition that makes monopoly impossible.

The existence of this kind of competition is the distinguishing mark of our American economy. More than any other one thing competition distinguishes our American free enterprise from the foreign type of controlled enterprise where favored instrumentalities, cartels, and outright government monopolies are not only tolerated but even encouraged.

Monopoly inevitably follows the lack of competition. Monopoly characterizes both the communistic and the fascistic systems. Under fascism private interests monopolize industries vital to the welfare of the nation. Under communism the government itself operates similar monopolies. I consider monopoly a dangerous evil in either public or private hands. A generation ago our country approached perilously close to fascism. The great trusts led by the old Standard Oil sought and were fast securing monopolistic control of many of our vital industries. Both our State and our Federal Government acted vigorously. We recognized the truth of and applied the provision of our Texas Constitution which declares that "monopolies are contrary to the genius of a free people and are hereby prohibited."

Our approach in the trust-busting days of Teddy Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and R. V. Davidson was essentially negative. We pretty well broke up the threats of 40 years ago, but we did not always assure service for the people. Today the people of the United States demand service in every line. If private industry does not supply it, and at reasonable prices, there is certain to arise a ground swell of public opinion which few legislators could or would resist, demanding that the Government itself provide the desired facilities. Of course, if the Government does provide the services we are, in fact,

traveling down the same road which our British cousins have followed so far with such disappointing results, and we will, in fact, be headed to the same destruction to which the Russian people traveled some years ago. I want to avoid such a course as I know it can only lead to ruin.

On the other hand, when the private power companies said 15 years ago that they had already served practically all the rural customers who were worthy of service; when the private telephone companies said just a year ago that they were adequately meeting the need of rural people for telephones, in spite of the fact that there were less rural phones in the United States in 1940 than there had been 20 years before; when I see and hear of such situations I realize that the only alternative for public ownership and ultimate socialism is to foster and strengthen competition. The American people will never again submit to private monopoly. I don't want to see them simply exchange the ruthlessness of private monopoly for the inefficiency of public monopoly. I consider public monopoly equally as dangerous as the private variety, but I know it is inevitable unless we can offer our people a way of making free enterprise meet their legitimate needs.

This steam plant is a symbol of the determination of our people to follow the road of free enterprise rather than the road to socialism. This steam plant, together with the hydroelectric plants with which it is connected, and with the transmission lines which connect them all, make it possible for the rural people of central and north Texas to supply their own electric needs regardless of the attitude of the private power companies. They make it possible to do this without creating a monopoly of any kind. I therefore look on this plant as of tremendous significance in shaping the course of our economic policies. I look on it as a bulwark for the protection of both the private power interests against nationalization of their industry, and of the public against exploitation at the hands of monopolistic private interests.

The effect of competition as a factor has been amply illustrated by the expansion of private power companies into rural areas as soon as a competitive agency came into being. Just as the power companies are today serving nearly 2,900,000 rural homes which they had said were ineligible, so the private telephone companies are daily extending service to thousands of rural homes, even though the first rural telephone loan was just approved last Friday.

Nor need there be any ill feeling between the older private companies and the more recently organized REA-financed cooperatives. Just last week the Brazos River Electric Transmission Co-op signed a contract with the Texas Power & Light Co. for a mutual interchange of power which I believe will work to the decided advantage of both parties. The cooperative happens to need firm power. That is power that they can use at any time any day in the year. The power company has this kind of power but it needs "peaking power"—that is power for a few minutes or a few hours during the peak of demand each day or season. This type of power is especially valuable to the company because if it has to fire an entire steam unit to provide for his power needs for only a 30-minute peak, that power is tremendously expensive. The water at the Morris Sheppard Dam can be turned on and power is immediately available. By using this power the company saves money. By using power from the company's great steam plants around the clock the transmission cooperative saves money. By using each other's transmission lines both systems save money and in the long run the public benefits. This is the basis of the contract recently signed between the cooperative and the company. I think the officials of both are to be congratulated on putting away any feelings of jealousy and working for their mutual benefit and the benefit of the rural people of this great area. I am encouraged to believe that we are seeing the sunrise of a new and better day in industry relations.

Some days later the Fort Worth Star-Telegram published an editorial referring to my speech as follows:

POWER COMPETITION

Congressman W. R. POAGE, of Waco, was the honor guest and principal speaker the other day at the dedication of a new rural electrification power plant on the Leon River between Temple and Belton.

Mr. POAGE was technically correct when he stated that the new plant belongs to the farmers who own the 19 rural-electrification cooperatives which make up the Brazos River Transmission Electric Cooperative. But it is hardly the private-business enterprise which Mr. POAGE's statement might lead some to think it is.

The transmission cooperative did build the plant, but with money supplied by all the taxpaying citizens of the United States through the United States Treasury and the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. POAGE also was technically correct when he said power plants such as this provide the kind of competition which makes monopoly impossible and distinguishes American free enterprise from the foreign type of controlled enterprise. Mr. POAGE failed to mention that Government-financed plants such as this also provide the kind of competition that is rather unfair to privately owned power plants which carry their full share of the local, State and national tax burden.

By coincidence the news item carrying Mr. POAGE's remarks at the dedication of the Leon River plant appeared in some editions of the Star-Telegram adjacent to an item about the Texas Electric Service Co.'s annual report having been filed with the city of Fort Worth and the secretary of state at Austin. Among other things the report showed that during 1949 TESCO's city, county, school district, State, and Federal tax bill totaled $4,218,263.

Plants like the one the Waco Congressman helped dedicate provide the kind of competition that makes it difficult for privately owned companies such as TESCO to continue making such tax payments.

I feel that this editorial shows a lack of understanding as to the taxpaying status of all REA financed cooperatives and a similar lack of understanding of the fact that these cooperatives are neither Government owned, nor Government subsidized. On March 8, I addressed the following letter to the editor of the Star-Telegram:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1950.

Hon. JAMES M. NORTH,
Editor, Fort Worth Star-Telegram,
Fort Worth, Tex.

DEAR MR. NORTH: A friend has just sent me your recent editorial entitled "Power Competition," but inasmuch as the date of the paper was not shown, I cannot refer to the specific issue. In this editorial you stated that I "failed to mention that Government-financed plants such as this (the Brazos River transmission electric cooperative plant near Belton) also provide the kind of competition that is rather unfair to privately owned power plants which carry their full share of the local, State, and national tax burden."

You did not in so many words state that this plant would not pay its full share of local, State, or national taxes, but I think you will agree that that was the plain implication of the article, particularly in view of the fact that you referred to the tax bill of the Texas Electric Service Co.

I have long been at a loss to understand some of the criticism and attacks that have been made on these farmer-owned, REA-financed, cooperatives. I do not intend any offense, but I have been forced to the conclusion that many of our editors throughout the country are not familiar with the fact that these electric cooperatives do pay taxes on exactly the same basis that the private power companies pay. It is, of course, perfectly true that very few of these cooperatives have reached a point where they have any net income because the very reason for their existence is that they are selling their product and rendering their service at as near cost as it is possible to do.

I recognize, therefore, that you will be able to substantiate the intimation that little, if any, Federal income tax is paid, but certainly little, if any, income tax would be paid by a privately owned industry that was operated on the same profit principle. When it comes to State and local taxes, these cooperatives are subject to exactly the same taxes that any private power company pays.

True, the valuations on their property are fixed by the county commissioners of each county. That is also true of the valuations on the profit-making plants. Some counties have doubtless given their own cooperatives an advantage in the matter of valuations just as many counties give local merchants an advantage in valuations as compared with out-of-town firms, but leaving aside the personal equation which is present in the matter of fixing valuations on all property in every county in the State of Texas, these REA-financed, farmer-owned cooperatives pay exactly the same rate on the valuation of their property to the cities, counties, school districts, and the State as do privately owned profit-making concerns of the same type in the same area.

I think that there have been abuses of the cooperative method of doing business. I think some people have used it to escape proper taxation, but I am afraid that these "shot-gun" attacks on all cooperatives with the intimation that these farmer-owned organizations are escaping local taxes that are being paid by stock companies can only result in extending unwarranted protection to those who have abused the cooperative system. My plea to you, therefore, is the same as I have made to business organizations and to cooperative associations; that we try to determine just where the cooperative form of organization is being abused and to correct the abuses, but at the same time that we carefully avoid any blanket condemnation that might stigmatize the cooperatives that were not guilty of any abuse or special privilege.

Another misunderstanding of equal importance arises from your statement that "The Transmission Cooperative did build the plant but with money supplied by all the tax-paying citizens of the United States through the United States Treasury and the Rural Electrification Administration." Nowhere did you suggest that this money was made available in the form of a loan and that these loans are being repaid with interest and that the record of repayment is far better than any bank in Fort Worth can cite over a comparable period.

Actually, as of December 31, 1949, REA had loaned $1,999,379,707. Of this, $203,346,158.56 had become due and payable. Only $88,872.94 or about two-fifths of 1 percent was delinquent as much as 30 days; $20,714,203.49 of principal and interest, or about 10 percent, had been paid in advance of maturity.

I submit that with such a record of repayments, it is hardly fair to give your readers the impression that the United States Government is footing the bill for the construction of the power plant on the Leon River or for any other farmer-owned cooperative in the United States.

You suggested that this plant helps provide the competition that makes it difficult for privately owned companies. Undoubtedly such plants have made it difficult for privately owned companies to maintain their previously established rate schedule. In fact, when the first steps were taken to organize the Brazos River Transmission Electric Cooperative, Inc., the rural wholesale rate to all the electric cooperatives in north and central Texas was 15 mills. Today it is slightly more than one-third of that amount. Of course, no comparable reduction in rates has occurred in Fort Worth or any other city in this area because the competition that these rural plants and distributing systems have provided is effective in rural areas only.

On the other hand, there were 12,000 rural homes electrified in Texas at the time the Bartlett Rural Electric Cooperative was energized 15 years ago whereas today there are approximately 301,746 rural homes enjoying this service. Most of the power used for these homes is sold either directly or through a local distributing cooperative by the privately owned power companies of Texas. These cooperatives that you condemn as destructive of the privately owned corporations have developed a tremendous market for these very companies.

I think that this record completely justified my statement that these REA-financed cooperatives have provided competition which has been helpful not only to the rural people of Texas, but to the privately owned power companies themselves.

Yours sincerely,

W. R. POAGE,
Congressman, Eleventh Texas District.

A Lesson From Chickens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an article by my good friend, Robert L. Kincaid, president of Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tenn., appearing in the October 1949 issue of the Lincoln Herald, a publication issued by that fine institution.

This article can be read with profit. It contains a lesson to us of this day and generation when the Government attempts to provide for people who come to believe that Government owes them a living—people who believe that they can get something for nothing.

In this editorial, chickens provide us with a healthy example of the fallacy of indolence. I commend it to the reading of every Member of the House.

CHICKENS THAT SCRATCH

(By Robert L. Kincaid)

Not long ago I was talking with a farm woman about her chickens. She said she was getting about 24 dozen eggs a week from her hens. At 55 cents a dozen, that made a tidy little income without too much outlay of cash for feed. I asked her if she used an incubator to hatch her young chickens, or if she bought them from hatcheries. "Neither," she replied emphatically. She said that chickens raised in brooders were lazy and shiftless, and would wait around all day to be fed.

"But when a hen raises a brood of chickens, she takes them out each morning and teaches them to shift for themselves. She weans them in about 6 weeks, and then they are on their own. You ought to see how these young chickens shift for themselves. After I feed them in the morning they scatter in all directions. They hustle out to the fields and the little patches of woods about the place, and are busy all day long, scratching and rustling. When I call them in the late afternoon they come running. The young pullets grow up into fine healthy hens and make good layers. No, I would not have any of these incubator chicks. They are too lazy and depend too much upon me for their feed."

I came away from my visit with my farm friend deeply impressed. She had learned a valuable lesson. Life can be made too easy even for a chicken.

We hear much these days about the welfare state in which every citizen is guaranteed security from the cradle to the grave. We in America are being lured by such promises of a life of ease and prosperity, regardless of our own efforts. Many of our political leaders seem to think all we need to do to achieve such a Utopia is to set up bureaus in Washington and to dip into the Federal Treasury to equalize benefits for all. It is a laudable goal, but the great danger is that in creating such a welfare state we will destroy the initiative and self-reliance so vitally necessary to a strong nation.

Wealth is created by production. Production comes only from hard work. Every citizen should give an honest day's labor for an honest day's reward. True security can come only to those who work for it and exercise thrift. Too much dependence upon a benevolent government will destroy the very thing which makes us strong. What our country needs is less promise of absolute security without work and more of an overwhelming resurgence of the spirit of self-reliance and personal effort. Only those willing and able who "scratch for a living" can be assured of a decent, comfortable security and the blessings of a happy and contented life.

Our young people have grown up in this universal atmosphere of more favors for less work. Our colleges and universities face a grave problem in training leaders for the next generation. We must reverse the trend, and teach them the dignity of honest labor, and quicken within them the ambition to become producers rather than dependents. That is the primary objective of Lincoln Memorial University.

S. 1411 and H. R. 3942

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Wichita Pediatric Society, of Wichita, Kans., is the source of a number of errors of fact with respect to past and projected Government maternal- and infant-care programs. They can be found in a widely circulated appeal for letters to Congress against S. 1411 and H. R. 3942.

I want to take this occasion to correct the errors in this paragraph from that appeal:

A similar measure called emergency maternal infant care that was enacted as a wartime emergency measure for the care of the younger children of servicemen only, cost the taxpayers of this country approximately $175,000,000 in the year 1945 alone. Of this sum approximately 60 percent went for administrative purposes only. How does this compare with a business anywhere?

First. The program was not for the children exclusively. Under the program a total of 1,223,000 wives as well as 231,000 sick infants were cared for. They were the wives and children of servicemen in the four lower-pay grades and aviation cadets.

Second. The total cost of the program to taxpayers was $127,000,000, not for 1945 alone, but for the entire period of the program, in effect from April 1943 to June 1949.

Third. The cost for 1945, the year in which the circular claims $175,000,000 was spent, was only $46,000,000. That was the program's peak year. Over-all, the average cost of maternity cases was $92 and sick-infant cases $64.

Fourth. The administrative expenses amounted to 2.3 percent of total expenditures rather than 60 percent. The remaining 97.7 percent was paid by State health departments to hospitals, physicians, and other professionals rendering services to servicemen's wives and infants.

How, I might ask, do these figures compare with business anywhere—if business is what interests you when the health of women and children is involved.

On that subject, I might point out that in 1942, before the EMIC program was in effect, the maternal mortality rate among the group treated was 25.9 per 10,000 live births. By 1948 this had been reduced to 11.7. The infant mortality rate in 1942 was 41.2 per 1,000 live births. By 1948 this had been reduced to 32. Figures are not available for 1949.

All these figures are authentic, compiled by the American Parents Committee, a nonprofit, public-service association. They may be checked in the Children's Bureau of the Federal Security Agency by anyone with the time and interest to do so.

This may seem an isolated example of a bona fide medical group acting on misinformation without checking its sources. Actually, it is just one flagrant incident in a whole series. The advertising hatchet men of the American Medical Association have discarded the fact and logic as weapons belonging to the advocates of better health programs. Bald misstatements of this kind are getting more frequent by the day. This is by way of putting Congressmen on their guard against them.

This happened to be contained in an assault on the school-health program. The others may touch on aid to medical education or research bills or even the social security bill now that the AMA has expressed its opposition to portions of that legislation.

I serve notice that these errors will be brought to the attention of the House whenever and wherever they may be discovered.

S. 1008 Analyzed by Hon. Robert Elliott Freer, Former Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission—This Impartial Analysis Worthy of the Attention of Every Member of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Robert Elliott Freer, of Ohio, former Chairman and Republican member of the Federal Trade Commission, has made a very fine analysis of S. 1008, as it will come before the House on Tuesday, March 14. A careful reading of this analysis by my colleagues should resolve any doubts they may have as to the deleterious effects S. 1008 will have on our antitrust laws should it be enacted. Mr. Freer's statement, made at the request of the president of the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, has, I understand, been mailed to each Member of the House. I trust it will be given careful consideration. The statement in full follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 8, 1950.*

Re second conference committee report on S. 1008.

Mr. ROBERT P. PECK,

President, National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. PECK: In response to your request, the following brief analysis is submitted of the provisions and probable effects of S. 1008 in the form in which the second conference committee will report it,[1] as indicated by an announcement[2] of the conferees' agreement published in the Daily Digest of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 2, 1950:

SECTION 1

Intended apparently to be a legislative declaration of that which the Federal Trade Commission states the present law to be, section 1 would amend section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to legislatively declare the right of sellers to absorb freight in the absence of conspiracy or collusive agreement. The question is whether such legislative declaration is necessary. No decision of the Commission challenges that right, nor can freight absorption, competitively employed, logically be challenged as an unfair method of competition under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. In denying a motion to modify count II of the order in the Rigid Steel Conduit case (D. 4452), the Commission, on July 12, 1949, specifically stated that that order did not prohibit independent as distinguished from collusive use of freight absorption.

While sections 2, 3 and 4 of S. 1008 would amend the Clayton (Robinson-Patman) Act, their inclusion in S. 1008, along with section 1 which would amend the FTC Act, might tend to add to rather than to dissipate any confusion existing as to the status of freight absorption under the latter act.

Additional construction of the new law by FTC and the Court's would be required before the Commission could speak with the assurance it did in its previous statements, as to the legality of individual use of freight absorption under the FTC Act and the illegality thereunder of industry-wide employment of freight absorption (or other geographic system) as a means of matching delivered prices to all customers at any given destination.

SECTION 2

Section 2A would exempt from possible challenge under the Clayton Act the limited-zone method of delivered pricing as well as the one-zone or so-called postage-stamp method.

Dicta in the late Chief Justice Stone's opinion in the *Staley case* (324 U. S. at p. 751) indicates that the postage-stamp method may be exempt without necessity of this amendment.

The test applied by FTC under the Robinson-Patman Act to geographic pricing is injury to competition. In the *Cement case* (333 U. S. 683) it was destruction of competition between sellers; in the *Staley case* (324 U. S. 746) the injury was to those buyers paying phantom freight charges. Section 2B would exempt from challenge under the Clayton Act, freight absorption employed to meet the equally low price of a competitor. What has been said about section 1 and section 2A is applicable here also. If freight absorption is neither collusively employed as a device for eliminating price competition among sellers, nor systematically used to the injury of mill-side purchasers in competition with their more distant competitors, it is not subject to challenge under the Robinson-Patman Act.

SECTION 3

Section 3 apparently would legislatively reverse not only the decision of the United States court of appeals in the *Standard Oil of Indiana case* (173 Fed. (2d) 210), but also the considered judgment of the Seventy-fourth Congress regarding the effect of meeting competition in good faith as a defense to a charge of discrimination injuring competition. In the Standard Oil case, if Standard had only reduced its price in good faith to meet the equally low price of another major oil company the result would have been competition. Standard, however, gave unjustified quantity discounts to four customers and not to several hundred other competing customers. The defense was that other oil companies either had offered to meet or would have met the demands of these four favored customers for a jobber classification and a lower price. The good faith of such a meeting of a lower price might have been a defense, despite the resulting injurious discrimination, under the good-faith proviso of old section 2 of the Clayton Act prior to the 1936 Robinson-Patman amendments; Congress, however, deliberately changed that proviso's status to a procedural status by the Robinson-Patman Act.

Section 2B did not provide that such good-faith lower price would justify an injurious discrimination only that it might serve to rebut the prima facie case made by a mere showing of price differences. Section 3, despite the Carroll amendment, not only might restore this defect in enforcement of the old section 2, but also might add even more difficulties of enforcement than existed in the administration of old section 2. For example, predatory price cutting, a tool of monopoly rather than that of healthy competition, is presently hard to reach because it is defended as a defensive meeting of local competition; under section 3, it might become almost impossible.

SECTION 4

Sections 4A, B, and C provide definitions of some but not all of the new terms employed in sections 1, 2, and 3, and are of importance in appraising the changes wrought in the law by use, in those sections, of the terms which are here defined.

Section 4D provides a definition meriting somewhat greater consideration since it would reverse the United States Supreme Court's decision in the *Morton Salt case* (334 U. S. 37) which interpreted the phrase "effect may be" in the act as meaning "a reasonable possibility." Section 4D's definition is that this phrase shall mean "reasonable probability" of the specified effect.

In practice, the FTC has neither employed the "reasonable possibility" interpretation nor indicated any disposition to do so. Adoption of section 4D, therefore, appears to be a matter of legislative discretion, depending on whether Congress deems it necessary to take positive steps to prevent "possible" rather than "probable" FTC implementation of this Supreme Court interpretation of the term "effect may be."

To fully appraise the changes in substantive law which S. 1008 would produce there is submitted the following brief recitation of the decisions which led to its introduction:

GEOGRAPHICAL PRICING

Uniform delivered pricing systems: In any industry where transportation charges are of real importance, some systematic method of equalizing transportation costs must be employed in determining the laid-down cost of the product to the customer so as to enable each seller to be able to match exactly his delivered-price quotation to a distant customer with those of all his competitors. The key to this geographic-price-matching problem under the FTC Act is collusion. Various systems found to have been collusively used are: (1) Single basing point, involving both phantom-freight and systematic-freight absorption, for example, the *U. S. Steel* (Pittsburgh plus) (U. S. Court of Appeals (3d) Oct. 5, 1948 and *Rigid Steel Conduit* (168 Fed. (2d) 175) cases; (2) multiple-basing point, likewise involving both phantom-freight and systematic-freight absorption, for example, *The Cement Case* (33 U. S. 683); (3) freight equalization, involving systematic-freight absorption and similar to the multiple-basing point except that technically no phantom freight is involved, since every mill is a base, for example, *Milk and Ice Cream Can* (152 Fed. (2d) 478) and *Bond Crown & Cork Cases* (176 Fed. (2d) 974); (4) zone pricing, another variation of the multiple-basing point used to obviate any natural advantage of location from price determination, for example, *Fort Howard Paper* (156 Fed. (2d) 899) (crepe paper) case.

In all of these cases the evidence before FTC has been held by the courts to have established collusion; in the maintenance of such geographic-pricing systems contrary to section 5 of the FTC Act. None of the cases forbids individual or competitive employment of freight absorption. It is the fixing of prices by collusion which is held to be per se illegal, not the means (system) employed in the particular case, despite intimations in some of the cases that those particular systems were so complex as to warrant a doubt that they could have been employed at all in the absence of the established collusion among the sellers.

The Robinson-Patman Act has sometimes been used by FTC along with section 5 of the FTC Act in basing-point cases. Geographic pricing under the various basing-point systems generally means that customers in different localities are charged different prices which are systematically related to the distance from the controlling base but which bear no relation to the distance from the seller's mill. If these price differences are not shown to injure competition, they do not violate the Robinson-Patman Act. If they do injure competition they are illegal unless justified by the seller. And here it is that the perverse relationship which his price differences bear to his freight costs militates against the seller's successfully claiming that these price differences are not illegal discriminations because justified by differences in cost of delivery (one of the statutory justifications).

PRICE DISCRIMINATION

Just as collusion is the key to the pro under the FTC Act, injury to competition is the key to the price discrimination problem under the Robinson-Patman Act.

Section 2a of the Robinson-Patman amendment to the Clayton Act provides, in pertinent part, "That it shall be unlawful for any person * * * to discriminate in price between purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality * * * where the effect of such discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition * * *", excepting, however, by its proviso, "* * * differentials which make only due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale or delivery." This condemns price differences not justified by cost differences where the effect is to suppress competition among sellers or to injure competition among competing customers of the discriminating seller. Section 2b recites that a prima facie case is made by the mere showing of a "discrimination in price," but, in its proviso, states that a seller may rebut such a prima facie case "by showing that his lower price * * * was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor. * * *" In several cases, the Commission has found against this defense on the facts. In the Cement case, for example, collusion to avoid competition negatived the good faith of the multiple basing point system of matched prices as a meeting of competition (333 U. S. 623). In the Staley case, the matching of single basing point prices also failed to meet the good faith test (324 U. S. 746, 757). In Standard Oil of Indiana, however, the proof of injury to several hundred retailers of Standard's Red Crown gasoline resulting from Standard's subsidized discrimination practiced through its four so-called wholesalers (all of whom sold Standard's Red Crown gasoline at retail in competition, not with Standard, but with Standard's several hundred other retailers), was considered to counterbalance Standard's defense of good faith meeting competition of other sellers. Section 2b being held to be merely procedural, and not to provide a substantive defense, served only to offset the Commission's prima facie case; and since it did not outweigh the proof of injury to competition, no finding of either good faith or lack of it was found necessary in the case.

As stated by Representative Utterback, "a discrimination is more than a mere difference * * * some relationship * * * between the parties to the discrimination * * * entitles them to equal treatment * * *." The FTC, therefore, proceeds against a sellers' difference in price as an illegal discrimination only where its investigation indicates competition between his buyers or their customers and a "reasonable possibility" of injury thereto, or where, as in count II in the Cement case, it finds the discrimination to be of collusive origin and to result in injury to competition among sellers. Under FTC policy as a practical matter there must be more than a "reasonable possibility" of injury to some level of competition before the Commission will take action.

CONCLUSION

Instead of clarifying the law, enactment of S. 1008 may have the opposite effect. Price fixing is seldom accomplished by formal agreement signed and sealed in the blood. The agreement usually is shown to have existed by reasonable inferences drawn from all the surrounding facts and circumstances, rather than by the introduction in evidence of a written agreement to fix prices. The nub of the controversy over the recent court decisions appears to be whether FTC and the Federal courts should continue to be able to draw a reasonable inference of the collusive agreement to fix prices from the other facts established by direct evidence, such as, for example, the collective efforts of the industry to maintain its price structure. In the Cement case these were summarized by the Supreme Court at page 710 of its opinion, to include "* * * boycotts; discharge of uncooperative employees; organized opposition to * * * new cement plants; selling cement in a recalcitrant price cutter's sales territory at a price so low that the recalcitrant was forced to adhere to the established basing-point prices; discouraging the shipment of cement by truck or barge; and preparing and distributing freight-rate books which provided respondents with similar figures to use as actual or phantom freight factors, thus guaranteeing that their delivered prices (base prices plus freight factors) would be identical on all sales whether made to individual purchasers under open bids or to governmental agencies under sealed bids. * * *"

The Federal Trade Commission has not issued orders against anyone solely or even primarily on the basis of his individually quoting or selling at a price identical to or matched with that of a competitor. In cases where orders have issued they ran against matched prices maintained by collusion and generally were based on some direct evidence of the collusion as well as upon reasonable inferences drawn from the collective efforts of the industry members to effectuate certain programs such as those cited by the Supreme Court in the Cement case.

Whatever the feeling of businessmen generally may be as to whether collusion may continue to be inferred from direct evidence of such collective activities, a part of the business community do not urge S. 1008 on that ground, but on the ground that its enactment would legalize the kind of basing-point selling found illegal as collusive price fixing and in which the injuriously discriminatory geographic prices had the effect of suppressing price competition among sellers.

No case holds freight absorption illegal under the FTC Act in the absence of collusion. Nor can any hold it illegal under the Robinson-Patman Act in the absence of a showing of unjustified injury to competition. Section 1 of S. 1008, in legislatively declaring the legality of freight absorption, attempts to safeguard against a return of the Cement case type of freight absorption maintained by conspiracy.

As pointed out earlier, the results of litigation to test the adequacy or inadequacy of the section 1 safeguard would have to be predicted to appraise the real effectiveness of this effort to safeguard the public against a return of collusive geographic pricing. Delay and uncertainty in the interim, which is predictable, would handicap FTC in enforcement of its orders against continued use of geographic pricing involving freight absorption, previously found to have been maintained by collusion contrary to section 5 and/or to have resulted in unjustified discriminations destructive of competition contrary to the Robinson-Patman Act.

S. 1008 would legislatively reverse not only several decisions of the United States Supreme Court and other Federal courts, but also, insofar as its amendment of section 2B—"good faith"—proviso of the Robinson-Patman Act is concerned, the considered judgment and deliberate action of the Seventy-fourth Congress, taken after full hearings in both Houses, held following submission to the Congress of FTC's chain-store investigation (S. Doc. No. 4, 74th Cong., 1st sess.), showing the destructive effect on competition of price discrimination in favor of large buyers. Such a legislative reversal should be based on a showing of real need for the change rather than the showing of confusion regarding what new pricing methods may legally be substituted for those collusive and injurious geographic systems held illegal in the cases evoking the bill.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT ELLIOTT FREER.

[1] A comprehensive analysis of S. 1008 as reported by the first conference committee (and still applicable except as to sec. 4D) is found at pp. 609–615 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19, 1950.

[2] The announcement reads as follows:

"PRICING PRACTICES

"In late session yesterday the conferees on S. 1008 to define application of Federal Trade Commission Act and Clayton Act to certain pricing practices, legalizing the basing-point system in the absence of conspiracy to lessen competition, agreed to file a second conference report on the differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of the bill, the first conference report having been recommitted by the Senate on January 26, 1950. The second conference report, as approved by conferees last night, reaffirms the action of the first conference committee except in the case of House amendment No. 4, an amendment to section 4 (d) of the bill, to which the Senate conferees receded, accepting the House amendment. The report is not expected to come up in the House until after March 13, with the House acting on the report first."

Uncle Sam Refuses To Protect His People Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when the conduct of our foreign affairs is so weak and inept that our citizens abroad remain unprotected against detention by the Communists it is time that Secretary Acheson resign his position. This is an act long overdue.

As part of my remarks, I am including an article by United Press which should compel every loyal citizen to hang his head in acknowledgment of a great wrong being committed against fellow citizens abroad. It will take more than feeble whisperings on the part of Mr. Acheson to correct this deplorable situation.

REDS DETAIN UNITED STATES CITIZENS IN CHINA—BUSINESSMEN VIRTUAL HOSTAGES

Chinese Communists are detaining a group of American businessmen as virtual hostages, it was reported today.

The Americans are safe in Shanghai but cannot leave because the Communists will not issue exit visas.

Authoritative sources here said the Communists were detaining the Americans to make sure that American-owned enterprises in China would continue to function.

Americans refused permission to leave were said to include responsible officers of the Shanghai Power Co., the Shanghai Telephone Co., Standard-Vacuum Oil Co., Caltex Oil Co., the Chase National Bank, and the National City Bank of New York.

On previous occasions, China's Communists have detained Americans until they completed payment of dismissal pay to Chinese employees. Under Chinese law, dismissal pay ranges up to 3 months' salary.

Authorities here believed the problem this time was more serious.

The Communists, it was said, want to make sure the American-owned utilities and basic business enterprises keep operating, at least until trained henchmen of the Communists can take over.

ONE THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED WANT OUT

About 300 Americans now in Shanghai are trying to leave the Communist-occupied city. Another 1,000 foreigners also asked United States officials to try to arrange transportation for them from Red-held areas.

United States Consul General W. P. McConoughy, Montevideo, Ala., is trying to help all the foreigners he can. But he was described as far from optimistic about getting exit visas for the American businessmen.

The American President Lines, through an arrangement with the State Department, plans to send three or four LST's into Shanghai to evacuate foreigners. Bigger ships cannot be used because Nationalists have mined the major water approaches to Shanghai.

ACHESON PROTESTS

The Nationalists' attempts to blockade Communist-held China have brought United States-Nationalist relations to a dangerous low.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson disclosed yesterday he once again has protested Nationalist attacks on blockade-running American freighters and has received no reply.

Salary and Privileges of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, a survey into the resources and the privileges of President Truman discloses that in addition to being one of the best, if not the best paid man in the world today, he also enjoys services undreamed of by his predecessors.

After taxes of $40,000 are paid on his original $100,000 salary, the President then receives $50,000 which is tax-free. How many other men today have a take-home pay of $110,000 a year?

The President has 42 facilities at his disposal for traveling, vacationing, and entertaining. These include his planes, the *Independence* and the *Sacred Cow*, the yacht *Williamsburg*, naval escort destroyers, a private pullman car, 35 White House automobiles, the Blair House, his vacation house at Key West, Fla., and Shangri-La, the woodland retreat in the Catoctin Mountains of Maryland.

It is estimated that it takes 865 persons to operate these facilities, either full or part time. These include ship crews, plane crews, maintenance forces, pullman staff, Shangri-La staff, White House servants, secret service, police, and auto drivers.

It is also estimated that the salaries of these 865 persons come to $1,491,540 a year. The original cost of the President's facilities—yacht, planes, private car, automobiles, and so forth—is placed at $30,433,000.

The White House travel bill for 1948 was $33,856, and $40,506 has been appropriated for 1950. Airplane travel cost is not included in this bill. It is charged to the Air Force, which maintains the planes.

The yacht *Williamsburg* has a crew of 100 men paid by the Navy. The yacht is also maintained by the Navy. It is estimated that if the *Williamsburg* was owned by a private citizen, it would take $225,000 a year to operate it. The crew costs alone are $190,000 annually.

The President's personal plane, the *Independence*, was built in 1947 at a cost of $1,133,000. It is a de luxe DC-6. It is operated by the Air Force and all its costs are assumed by the Air Force. The *Independence* has a crew of 8, drawing more than $3,000 a month in salaries and allowances. Four enlisted men draw $75 to $165 a month, plus allowances to keep the plane under a 24-hour guard. It is one of a few planes cared for by a maintenance crew of 56 men. Every hour in the air requires 3 man-hours of maintenance. Total crew costs are about $120,000 a year.

The President's other plane, the *Sacred Cow*, is a C-54, and has all the conveniences of the newer *Independence*—kitchen, refrigerator, sleeping quarters, and a built-in elevator. On long flights over water a crew of 8 is required, a crew of 4 for land flights.

Construction cost of the President's private railroad car is placed between $250,000 and $350,000. It is equipped with radio, telephone, private bedrooms, kitchen, dining room, and shower. A steward and two mess boys from the *Williamsburg* man the dining room and provide other services.

There is another White House railroad car which is attached to the Pullman on Presidential train trips. This is a specially built radio car, equipped by the Signal Corps with all the latest communication facilities.

When the President cruises in the *Williamsburg*, a Navy destroyer accompanies the White House yacht. The Navy says the average destroyer costs $876,000 a year to operate and has a crew of 10 officers and 247 men.

Twenty-five secret-service men protect the President. Their salary is $109,200 a year. In addition there is a special force of 107 White House police at a cost of $350,000 annually.

At Key West, the President occupies what once was the residence of the admiral in charge of the wartime facilities at that post. The *Williamsburg* is also used to house White House guests and personnel when the President is in Florida.

Shangri-La, the Maryland retreat, is a hide-out 70 miles from Washington and is guarded, when the President is in residence, by the Marines, 4 officers and 57 men who are on call for duty there. Shangri-La is maintained and administered by the White House.

When the President visits Shangri-La, cooks, waiters, and mess boys from the *Williamsburg* provide the servant staff.

At the White House itself there are 61 employees costing $150,000 a year. These include 6 engineers, 6 carpenters, a painter, 4 electricians, 8 gardeners, 3 plumbers, 3 laborers, a storekeeper, messengers, a housekeeper, 5 butlers, 7 cooks, 4 doormen, 7 housemen, and 4 maids.

The White House is getting a fleet of 10 new cars, including the specially built limousine, which can be entered while wearing a top hat, and which has gold plated doorhandles, vanities, and perfume cases.

In addition to the 10-car luxury fleet, there are between 20 and 25 other White House cars with 30 chauffers to drive them. Drivers salaries run to $90,000 annually.

Mr. Speaker, on top of all this, President Truman has the biggest and best paid staff of any Chief Executive. Mr. Truman's staff consists of about 225 persons and the White House salary list is $998,254 a year.

By comparison, President Roosevelt, in 1945, had a staff of 53, costing $256,431, and President Hoover's staff totaled 37 at a salary bill of $127,200.

The President has three top secretaries, a special counsel, five administrative assistants, and three high-ranking armed service aides, and a personal physician, an Army general.

The secretaries to the Presidents once walked to work, but they now arrive in White House cars. And their role and function has changed over the years. Originally occupied with clerical duties they now have turned to policy making.

A private citizen, to match the standard of living now enjoyed by the President, would need an income of between $3,000,000 and $3,500,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, everyone should agree that economy in every walk of life is a most admirable thing. In these days of wild-eyed and reckless public spending for almost every conceivable thing, good or bad, it is my opinion that those in high office should be the first to set an example for the people throughout the country. The above facts disclose beyond peradventure that economy has become a lost art in the highest office of the land.

Labor Leaders and Politicians Pay Lip Service to FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Negro Labor News of February 25, 1950, of Houston, Tex., calls the turn on the racketeers who have been exploiting the Negro vote in this country. I am including this front page editorial by Mr. C. W. Rice at this point in the RECORD.

AS I SEE IT—LIP SERVICE TO FEPC—LABOR LEADERS AND POLITICIANS GIVING LIP SERVICE TO FEPC TO HOLD NEGRO MEMBERS AND GET THEIR VOTES

(By C. W. Rice)

As I see it, one of the most notorious deceptions ever worked on the Negro race since the carpet-bagger era, when the northern politicians promised every Negro emslave 40 acres of land and a mule, is being pulled now

by politicians and union-labor leaders who make the Negro believe they want and are working to get the fair employment practice law enacted.

Any student of organized labor can readily see that it will be paradoxical for labor unions to go all out for a law that would transfer the hiring hall from the labor unions to government control in Washington.

For the past 18 years, labor unions have fought to control the government rather than to have the government control them. They dictated to the government and private industries as to whom to hire and fire during the dark and dismal days of the World War. During this time, we had every type of a strike to force labor's demand—the sit-down strike, the lay-down strike, strike to make employers collect dues, the strike over what tools to use, and even a strike over whether a worker should drink milk out of a glass or bottle, and yet, there was not a single strike to my knowledge called by labor unions to force the employment of Negroes where they were not employed.

The unions did not call a strike to force any industries to up-grade Negro workers. There is, however, a record of labor unions in Houston taking a strike vote which resulted in a vote of 8-2 to call a strike if the company would comply to a wartime FEPC directive order to upgrade Negroes from ditch diggers and other common laborers to truck drivers.

As I see it, Negro leaders who are leading the fight for the passage of an FEPC and at the same time, campaigning for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, are either uninformed or playing politics at the expense of the Negro working classes.

The greatest handicap of Negroes in getting fair employment on the basis of skill and ability, has come from organized labor itself, which either by written or unwritten laws and labor-union customs or traditions, barred Negroes from both the labor union and the job.

Despite the 18 years of New Deal and Fair Deal talk at Washington, with labor unions riding high, wide, and handsome, there are still reported to be 26 national and international labor unions that bar Negroes from the unions that control the best-paying jobs in America. This practice, on the part of labor unions operating in the North and South, has been more destructive and discouraging to the progress of the Negro worker than any other evils practiced in the country on account of race.

As I see it, the Taft-Hartley law which has so many Negro leaders, labor-union officials, and professional politicians squawking for its repeal provides for the right to work. Under this law, no longer can a worker be discharged for not joining a union. The anti-closed-shop provision of the Taft-Hartley law guarantees every person his God-given right to work and make an honest living regardless of race, creed, or color.

It is obvious that this provision of the Taft-Hartley law offers the Negro worker stronger protection as a group than the proposed FEPC, while the FEPC seeks to protect minority groups. The unions generally single out the Negro for discrimination.

What the union politicians claim to be asking the Government to do in the FEPC can be done in convention assembly. A weak FEPC as now operating in New York and Chicago offers little or no job security to Negro workers.

As I see it, the Senate should consider the right to work amendment to the FEPC bill now being proposed by Senator MCCLELLAN, Democrat, Arkansas.

Senator MCCLELLAN said he is working on an amendment that would also make it illegal to discriminate "because of membership or nonmembership in a labor union."

S. 1008 Threat to Robinson-Patman Act Cited by Original Sponsors—Spokesman for United States Wholesale Grocers' Association Warns Against Weakening Effect of S. 1008—Claims S. 1008 Is a Subterfuge "To Gloss or Conceal the Lethal Stabbing of Anti-trust Laws"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association was one of the original sponsors and supporters of the Robinson-Patman Act. This group of small-business men worked day and night to throw back the forces which would have perpetuated cutthroat pricing, price discrimination, and restraints of trade by the giant chain-store systems of our country.

This group of small-business men has been in the forefront of the fight to prevent the passage of S. 1008. At the convention recently held in Cincinnati, this fight was continued. An article by Harold O. Smith, Jr., executive vice president of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., which appeared in the New York Journal of Commerce on March 10, points up many of the dangers which will confront small business if S. 1008 is enacted into law. I commend to the Members of the House a careful reading of Mr. Smith's article, which follows in full:

WHOLESALERS' GROUP SEEKS CLOSER PROCESSOR ACCORD

(By Harold O. Smith, Jr., executive vice president, United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc.)

Wholesaler-manufacturer conferences will be an increasing important part of the annual conventions and mid-year meetings sponsored by the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc.

Working as a team, wholesalers and manufacturers will put into operation programs to aid retail grocers in better merchandising.

It is timely that we think soberly and act wisely—but get in there and pitch.

These are momentous times for all factors in the food and grocery trade.

Wartime scarcities and the sellers' market have given way to abundant supplies and even surpluses in many items.

TO FIGHT CHISELING

The past 14 years, under the Robinson-Patman Act, has placed the emphasis on efficient operations and good merchandising rather than chiseling in buying. As an association, we will continue our fight to keep it that way, strive to strengthen the law and oppose emasculating amendments.

The past is not where we are going to live. It is the responsibility of USWGA to help independent wholesale grocers and their retail grocery customers improve their position in their markets, assuring a stable future for the trade.

It is the responsibility of every member of the trade to support the efforts of USWGA in maintaining the American way of free enterprise. We must make certain that the protecting antimonopoly laws are not rendered ineffective since that would only lead us to a choice between private monopoly and Government monopoly.

UNITED APPROACH NEEDED

There will always be some difference of views, no matter how small a group may be. But, we believe that a united approach to the problems with manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, working together with confidence and integrity is the answer and will develop the aristocracy of service.

We have a great responsibility in that the biggest part of the family budget goes for food and other grocery items.

Before the Robinson-Patman Act large buying groups, such as national chains, sprang up and flourished on the tremendous extras they were able to wring out of their suppliers through their coercive pressure tactics. They also developed improved techniques of warehousing and merchandising.

Today, there are outstanding examples, among independent wholesale grocers, of the awakening in the trade.

Many big operators view with alarm their rapidly dwindling advantages when they realize the full meaning of wholesale grocers like Charlie Ragland, Tom Harrison, Bob Goff, Clem Kreckler, Van Selley, and a host of others.

How can the octopus organization hire enough top-flight warehouse executive personnel and retail store management to effectively compete with wide-awake owner-operated wholesale and retail grocery firms? The answer is plainly, they cannot compete with wide-awake independent wholesale grocers and retail grocers so long as the anti-trust laws are strong enough to outlaw chiseling in buying. Therefore, they seek to drive a wedge into the antitrust laws or wreck the Robinson-Patman Act with the hope of personal advantage.

LEGAL SAFEGUARDS

Thrown into high light during the past year is the life or death necessity of the wholesaler and retailer maintaining unimpaired, the legal safeguards against price and other discrimination in favor of the big mass-buying organizations—safeguards that they attained at great expenditure of time, thought, and effort.

Insidious attacks have been made on the Robinson-Patman Act by forces which, to serve their own interests, would break down the prohibitions against unfair practices and restraints of trade.

Independent business, to too large an extent, has not realized the seriousness of these threats to its welfare. Seemingly, there has been forgetfulness of the conditions that prevailed prior to the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act—a time when one large chain system alone was receiving concessions amounting annually to $8,000,000 ($6,000,000 in extra quantity discounts and advertising allowances and $2,000,000 in brokerage fees)—concessions that the independent operator received not at all, or in very minor amounts.

MONOPOLY THREAT

Had the Robinson-Patman Act not stopped this racket run wild of advantages, exacted from manufacturers by concentrated purchasing power, grocery distribution would today be in the hands of a comparatively few large concerns, which might not include some independents who are now disposed to quibble over the dangers represented by S. 1008, the basing-point bill, and S. 2190, the brokerage raiding bill, and who delude themselves with thinking a few crumbs of benefit will come to them from enactment of these measures. They might indeed get the crumbs, but the chains and other big buyers would get the cake and the topping, too.

Truly no amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act, and the other antitrust laws, should be considered or approved which does not strengthen those statutes, and any amendment that weakens or confuses the language, provisions, or enforcement of those laws should be flatly and definitely rejected. No plea or subterfuge of misinformation should be allowed to gloss or conceal the lethal stabbing of these protective measures. Obtaining the Robinson-Patman Act was hard bought. Any slicing of its effectiveness should be hard fought.

Red Professors in Our Educational Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Communists have mysterious ways their wonders to perform. One of those ways is to subsidize college professors throughout the United States to spread their communistic doctrines through the student bodies of America.

Several days ago, I pointed out that one Harlow Shapley, a Red professor in Harvard University, is going to try to dictate the appointments of members of the so-called Science Foundation in the event it is created. At this point, I am inserting a statement I received from the Committee on Un-American Activities showing the Communist-front organizations with which "Dr." Harlow Shapley has been affiliated.

The matter referred to follows:

[Information from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, U. S. House of Representatives]

MARCH 1, 1950.

For: Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN.

Subject: Harlow Shapley.

A search of the public records, files, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities has revealed the following information concerning Harlow Shapley:

A letterhead of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, dated September 23, 1939, lists the name of Harlow Shapley as a member of the national committee of that organization. He signed the organization's open letter, setting forth a five-point program to aid refugees, which was sent to the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State. (See Daily Worker, July 25, 1940, p. 2.) Letterheads of the organization dated January 17, 1940, and May 28, 1940, list him as a member of the executive committee.

In 1942 the Special Committee on Un-American Activities found that "in recent years no other organization has been more closely changed as a Communist front" as the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom. (Report of the special committee, dated June 28, 1942, p. 13.) Again, in 1944, the special committee cited the organization as a Communist front which has defended Communist teachers. (Rept. 1311 of the special committee, dated March 29, 1944.)

A folder of the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder, issued in 1942, names Harlow Shapley as one of the prominent Americans who favored Presidential clemency for the release of Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party in the United States. "When Earl Browder was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder." (Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944, p. 6.) The Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder had previously been cited as a Communist organization by Attorney General Francis Biddle. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7687.)

Harlow Shapley has been affiliated with the Council for Pan American Democracy as one of those who signed the open letter which that organization prepared and sent to the President of Brazil to save Luis Carlos Prestes, Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International. The list of signers appeared in the December 3, 1940, issue of New Masses (p. 20). The Council for Pan American Democracy, also known as the Conference for Pan American Democracy, has been cited as a Communist front in two reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. (Report of June 25, 1942, p. 18; and report of March 29, 1944, pp. 161 and 164.)

The Council (or Conference) for Pan American Democracy has also been cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark. (See press release of June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948.)

The affiliation of Harlow Shapley with the League of American Writers is shown in the Daily Worker of July 31, 1940 (p. 7), which reveals that he was one of those who signed the League's open letter to Secretary of State Hull and the Pan-American Conference. The League of American Writers was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its reports of January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. Attorney General Francis Biddle found that the league was "founded under Communist auspices in 1935. The overt activities of the League of American Writers in the last 2 years leave little doubt of its Communist control." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7686.) The League of American Writers has also been cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark. (See press releases of the United States Civil Service Commission dated June 1, and September 21, 1948.)

Harlow Shapley was one of the sponsors of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, as shown on a letterhead of that organization dated February 15, 1940. The Daily Worker of May 13, 1940 (pp. 1 and 5), disclosed that he was one of those who signed an open letter issued by that organization in support of one of its policies. The National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944 (pp. 88 and 121).

According to the Daily Worker of March 13, 1945 (p. 3), Harlow Shapley was one of the signers of a statement issued by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties which hailed the War Department order on Communists for Commissions. This organization was cited as a Communist-front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report of June 25, 1942 (p. 20), and again in the report of March 29, 1944 (p. 30). Attorney General Biddle characterized the organization as "part of what Lenin called the noise system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7687.) The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has also been cited as "subversive and Communist" by Attorney General Tom Clark. (See press releases of the United States Civil Service Commission dated December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.)

Harlow Shapley was one of those who signed the New Masses letter to the President, as shown in the April 2, 1940, issue of New Masses (p. 21). Both the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and Attorney General Francis Biddle have cited New Masses as the weekly organ of the Communist Party. (See committee reports of June 25, 1942, p. 4, and March 29, 1944, p. 46; and Attorney General Biddle's citation which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 24, 1942, p. 7688.)

A telegram which was prepared by the New York Conference on Inalienable Rights and sent to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Jackson on behalf of the International Fur and Leather Workers' Union, defendants, was signed by Harlow Shapley. (See Daily Worker of September 17, 1940, p. 1). The New York Conference for Inalienable Rights was named as a Communist-front organization in Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944 (p. 145).

A letterhead of the Spanish refugee appeal of the joint anti-Fascist refugee committee, dated February 26, 1946, lists the name of Harlow Shapley as one of the national sponsors of that organization. An invitation to a dinner in New York City, March 31, 1946, listed Harlow Shapley as cochairman of the national reception committee for Mme. Irene Joliot-Curie, in this country for the purpose of making a speaking tour under the auspices of the joint anti-Fascist refugee committee. A letterhead of the organization dated April 21, 1949, still carried the name of Harlow Shapley as a sponsor.

The joint anti-Fascist refugee committee was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 174). The organization was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark. (See lists released to the press December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948). On March 29, 1946, the chairman of the joint anti-Fascist refugee committee, and on April 16, 1948, members of the executive board of the organization, were cited for contempt of Congress for refusal to testify and produce records subpenaed by a congressional committee. All were convicted in the District of Columbia courts on June 27, 1947.

Harlow Shapley spoke at a meeting of the Brooklyn Chapter of the Congress of American Women, as shown in the Worker (Sunday edition of the Daily Worker) for September 26, 1947. Attorney General Tom Clark cited the Congress of American Women as subversive and Communist on lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board. (See press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948.) The Congress was the subject of a special report by the Committee on Un-American Activities, October 18, 1948, in which it was stated that "the Congress of American Women is an affiliate of the Women's International Democratic Federation, which was founded and supported in all times by the International Communist movement. The purpose of these organizations is not to deal primarily with women's problems, as such, but rather to serve as a specialized area of Soviet political warfare in the current psychological campaign to disorganize and demoralize the United States and democratic nations generally, in order to render them helpless in the face of the Communist drive for world conquest." (Report on the Congress of American Women, Committee on Un-American Activities, October 18, 1948, p. 1).

Harlow Shapley was one of those who signed a statement in defense of Gerhart Eisler, which statement was printed in the Communist Daily Worker of June 20, 1947 (p. 6). On February 6, 1947, the Committee on Un-American Activities held public hearings concerning Gerhart Eisler, at which time Eisler was revealed to be an international Communist agent directing Communist activities in this country.

The Worker of April 13, 1947 (p. 3M), reprinted a speech which had been delivered by Harlow Shapley. The Worker is the Sunday edition of the Communist Party's official organ, the Daily Worker.

Harlow Shapley was one of the sponsors of the "Bill of Rights Conference of the Civil Rights Congress, held in New York City July 16-17, 1949 (see Call to the Conference, p. 4; and Daily Worker June 17, 1949, p. 5).

The Civil Rights Congress was formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); it is "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it." (Report 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated September 2, 1947, pp. 2 and 19.) Attorney Gen. Tom Clark cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist on lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board. (See press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.)

Harlow Shapley was one of the sponsors of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, held in New York City March 25-27, 1949, under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions. (See Conference Program, p. 12; and Conference Call); he was chairman of the program committee of the conference (Conference Program, p. 3); and also chairman of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (letterhead received January 1948.)

"Parading under the imposing title of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, the gathering at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on March 25, 26, and 27, 1949, was actually a superconvention of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations." (From a Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, released by the Committee on Un-American Activities April 19, 1949, p. 1.)

An interview with Dr. Harlow Shapley by Abraham Chapman was reported in the March 1949 issue of Fraternal Outlook. Mr. Chapman relates that "no gathering of artists and scientists has aroused so much interest as this conference (Cultural and Scientific Conference * * *). The United States State Department issued a statement criticizing the conference in advance of its deliberations. Most American newspapers featured a wide assortment of attacks on the conference. To ascertain the true character, scope, and purpose of this unprecedented gathering, I interviewed Professor Shapley (chairman) * * * on the eve of the conference. * * * Professor Shapley personifies the highest achievements of American science. Born in Missouri and educated at the University of Missouri and Princeton University, he rose rapidly in his field, amassing degrees and honorary degrees from many universities here and abroad. From 1914 to 1921 he was astronomer at the Mount Wilson Observatory in California, and in 1921, while still a young man in his thirties, he was appointed director of the Harvard Observatory a post he holds with distinction. He is a past president of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and has won awards and honorary degrees for his research and scientific work from universities and scientific bodies all over the world. He is without question, one of the world's top-ranking scientists."

Fraternal Outlook is the official publication of the International Workers Order, "one of the strongest Communist organizations" (Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7688). The organization has also been cited several times by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (reports of January 3, 1940, March 29, 1944, January 3, 1940, and June 25, 1942); it was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark (see press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948).

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to permit this spread of communism through our educational institutions to continue, then God save America.

American Give-Away Mania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include a very excellent article by Mr. Henry Hazlitt, which appears in the current issue of Newsweek. I commend it to all Members as it relates to the ECA bill which will soon be under consideration by the House. It is time that some common sense be used in the further expenditure of taxpayers' dollars that we do not have. Reckless spending is the order of the day under Truman's New Deal "Fair Deal" program. This "Deal" is fair to everybody but the American people.

THE AMERICAN GIVE-AWAY MANIA

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The administration is now possessed with a mania for "lending" or giving away the American taxpayer's money to any foreign government that it can coax into taking it. This mania grows by what it feeds on. The Marshall plan is only one channel for it. In addition there are the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank, the International Fund, the arms aid program, and the proposed global union-all, point 4. Our foreign policy can almost be summed up in four words: "Give 'em more money."

If none of these Government hand-outs had been devised, Europeans would still have had great need for American capital. They would have had to apply for private loans. And they could have got them only by restoring the confidence of American private investors. It is not difficult to specify the reforms they would have had to make to insure such confidence:

1. They would have had to convince anybody who put money into Europe that he could get it out again. This means that they would have had to make their own currencies freely convertible into dollars. They could have done this simply by eliminating their wartime exchange controls.

2. They would have had to assure foreign holding periods, taxes, or fear that these currencies would not depreciate. This means that they would have had to halt inflationary inflation. To do this they would have had to return to balanced budgets.

3. To return to balanced budgets European governments would have had to give up nationalizations, which has meant huge deficits in the nationalized industries. They would have had to reduce to manageable dimensions their subsidies and overgenerous relief and social-security programs.

4. They would have had to stop threatening still further nationalization, expropriation, and seizure.

5. They would have had to relax or abandon controls over wages, prices, interest rates, and profits.

6. They would have had to reduce confiscative taxation.

If Europe had been obliged to attract private capital, such reforms would already have gone far further than they have. They would have brought not only far more production, but the freer and more balanced trade, the currency convertibility, the multilateralism, and the integration for which our ECA officials have made futile exhortations. The reason for their futility is clear. As long as foreign governments can pick up easy money from our own Government they don't have to make these reforms.

As a result European recovery has not only been slow and precarious, but the recovery that has taken place has been in the wrong direction. Production indeed has gone up; but the added production is not primarily for export, as it should be, but for home consumption. So foreign trade is still unbalanced, and Europe's self-induced dollar shortage remains.

The dilemma of the Marshall plan and of point 4, the dilemma of every government-to-government hand-out, is plain. If our Government imposes no conditions on its hand-out, the money is worse than wasted. If it does impose conditions, they provoke foreign resentment.

Our ECA officials vacillate between the horns of this dilemma. First they say that they won't interfere in the internal affairs of these countries. Then, of course, the European governments getting our aid make in return none of the economic reforms so desperately needed. The British bureaucrats repay us by discriminating against American motion pictures and American oil companies. The French repay us by threatening the sale of Coca-Cola. Then our ECA officials talk of getting tough. But when it comes to a show-down they cannot risk insisting on reforms that would be really effective. So we end by submitting foreign-government discrimination against our own industries.

In short, Government loan and gift programs like the Marshall plan and point 4 do not promote world recovery; they retard it. We are subsidizing and prolonging socialism and socialistic thought, and impeding our own free-enterprise system to do it.

Statement of S. Abbot Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement of Mr. S. Abbot Smith, president of the Thomas Strahan Co., Chelsea, Mass., before the House Ways and Means Committee on February 28, 1950. I believe this statement to be worthy of the serious consideration of the Members of the Congress as he is speaking in behalf of small business.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is S. Abbot Smith. I am president of Thomas Strahan Co., a small company manufacturing fine wallpapers in Chelsea, Mass. I am also a director of the

Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc., and a member of their committee on taxation.

The first objective of any tax bill is to raise the revenue needed but how it is done may produce very different results. We might girdle a maple tree when collecting sap in the spring, which would produce a lot of sap once, but never again. We don't girdle it, but tap the tree to obtain the sap and not injure its growth. Likewise with taxes, we want to obtain the revenue but at the same time want to keep business and employment expanding with consequent growth in Treasury revenue.

Taxation is at the root of one of the most important problems of all business, especially small business, namely, the lack of long-term and equity capital financing. Consequently, if we can improve the tax situation we may be able to so help small business that some of the suggested legislative remedies may be unnecessary.

If small businesses were able to retain a larger part of their profits they would to that extent be able to plow back those earnings, thus lessening the need for that outside financing which is so difficult to obtain for growth and expansion.

With that end in mind, Congressman FENNO last April at the request of Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc., introduced a bill, H. R. 4431, which would exempt from Federal income tax the first $25,000 of corporate income. This exemption would apply to all corporations but it would of course be of more importance to small businesses than to large ones.

Another provision of this same bill would eliminate the so-called notch rates on corporate income between $25,000 and $50,000. I am glad to see that the Treasury recognizes the injustice of those higher rates and also recommends their elimination.

This bill if passed would enable more small businesses to grow and expand by plowing back earnings, thus creating more jobs, more buying power and so directly increased revenue for the Treasury. Another result would be that as these small companies are thus strengthened it would be easier for them to obtain short-term financing at once. In the long run, too, it is probable that investors would look upon them more favorably when it came to supplying equity capital.

It is also encouraging to see that the Treasury proposes the reduction of certain excise taxes, especially those on transportation of property and persons. Obviously, they are treated as a part of cost by each processor and so pyramid rapidly, raising costs and hence prices to the ultimate consumer way out of proportion to the tax itself.

Small businesses are especially hurt by these taxes. Since many of them were imposed or raised as a war measure to discourage the use of the materials and services, not primarily to raise revenue, they should be eliminated now when the need is to encourage business and the use of those same materials and services, thus creating more jobs and raising incomes.

The Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc., has for some time pointed out the injustice of allowing competing businesses to be tax-exempt just because they are owned by educational, charitable, or cooperative institutions. This exemption not only gives them an unfair advantage as competitors but whatever tax burden they escape must be shifted to the shoulders of those who do pay taxes. We believe, therefore, that if the earnings of cooperatives are retained in the business for business purposes they should pay the same taxes as those with whom they are competing. We believe also that businesses run or owned by charitable and educational institutions but not directly connected with their main purpose should likewise pay the same taxes as their competitors.

We applaud the Treasury suggestion of a 5-year carry-over and 1-year carry-back of earnings. Our association has for some time stressed the fact that the income of small businesses fluctuates much more widely from year to year than does that of big companies, so a provision of this kind is essential to iron out somewhat the peaks and valleys.

Believing as we do that the health and prosperity of small business have a major influence on the strength of the economy of the United States and on the revenues of the Treasury, we strongly urge that your committee give consideration to several other points not yet touched on. One is flexible depreciation rates so that businesses may charge off their equipment as best suits their interest and thus stimulate capital expenditures and growth. This would be of especial value to small businesses. No more than 100 percent could be charged off anyway, the companies would have better up-to-date equipment, the Treasury would gain ultimately from healthier businesses, the public from better products and services at lower prices.

We believe, too, that some steps, even though necessarily small now, should be taken toward the reduction and eventual elimination of the double tax on dividends. Only in this way can we start to loosen up the flow of equity capital which alone can keep business expanding and the standard of living constantly rising in our free enterprise economy.

It is perhaps outside our discussion today but I should like to remind you, gentlemen, that our Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc., feels strongly it would be most helpful to all business to eliminate the present tax exemptions accorded State and municipal bonds. Not only does being able to borrow so easily encourage unnecessary spending and extravagance but, more important, we feel those bonds are a haven for capital which would otherwise be invested in industry where it would be put to work expanding our whole economy, i. e., those bonds are draining off potential equity capital badly needed by business.

Finally, gentlemen, when writing the new tax bill, please make it as simple and clear as possible and direct the Treasury to make their forms simple and clear also. That alone would be a boon to small business.

I recognize that in this statement I have outlined several proposals which would at the moment decrease Treasury income while making only two which would produce an immediate increase. However, we small-business men are hopeful that governmental expenditures can and will be reduced at every possible point by the firm determination of top operating officials like Secretary of Defense Johnson and Secretary of the Treasury Snyder. We read that plugging tax loopholes will also produce more income and better enforcement of present tax laws.

In the final analysis, however, we must all remember that the bulk of our revenue comes from business. Oppressive taxes retard business, may kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. As a practical matter, just as a mountain climber can carry a heavier pack farther and longer if it is well adjusted, so business can pay more to the Treasury if the revenues are raised through a system of taxation carefully devised to hinder its growth and expansion as little as possible. Lower rates with large volume will produce more than high rates and low volume and will provide more jobs, too.

The present tax structure bears too heavily on small business, both directly and indirectly. Did you ever stop to think how many thousand more employees the Treasury would have to hire if we businesses did not collect so many of their taxes for them—and without recompense? (To be sure, the cost goes into general expense and is charged off before taxes, but what about the company which makes no profit? The expense of collecting those taxes comes right out of that chap's pocket.)

When 1 big company with 2,500 employees is about to shut down, everybody scurries around trying to help it continue in business. On the other hand, if a hundred small companies with 25 employees each were to shut down it would cause scarcely a ripple. Small-business failures are on the increase.

Our tax system must be such as to foster the small businesses upon which almost half of the people of this country are dependent for jobs, which are the mainstay of so many of our communities, which are the seedbed for our big business, the best customers of big business, in short—the backbone of our American economy.

I am sorry it is not possible to open the whole tax structure for review and revision because both are badly needed but we all hope that the new tax bill will at least provide for:

1. Exemption from income tax of the first $25,000 of corporate profits.
2. Elimination of wartime excise taxes.
3. Taxation of charitable, educational, and cooperative organizations on same basis as competing businesses.
4. Five-year carry-over and 1-year carry-back of earnings.
5. Flexible depreciation rates.
6. A start toward elimination of double taxation of dividends.
7. Simplification of tax law and forms.

Thank you, gentlemen, for giving me this opportunity to lay before you these ideas of the Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc. which, if adopted, we believe would be of great help to business in general and especially to small business.

Hell-Bent for What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission heretofore granted, I include as part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Hell-Bent for What?" which appeared in the Oregon Journal on March 5, 1950:

HELL-BENT FOR WHAT?

Progress report for 1950 A. D.—Letter to Satan: "Plans are progressing nicely to blow the world to hell."

Ridiculous? Not at all. This could well be the last generation of so-called civilized men. There's no place to hide our civilization if ever the A-bomb and the H-bomb are released with insane furies behind them. Men, women, and children will die like flies. That is, the lucky ones will die. A few will be unfortunate enough to live.

What if Hitler had possessed a large stock pile of A-bombs and H-bombs and means of getting them all over the world? Do you think he would have hesitated in taking civilization along in his suicide? In his crazed mind he would have thought it a great and heroic joke. There have been other Hitlers in history. There may be another.

Almost 5 years have passed since the fateful day that a special crew of the United States Air Force dropped an atomic bomb over Hiroshima, followed by another bomb in a few days on Nagasaki. These terrible explosions, utilizing the primary forces of nature, left in their wake almost 100,000 men, women, and children dead, and about twice that number injured in varying degrees.

NOW A NEW MONSTER

Almost 5 years have passed. The atomic bombs have been improved. Tests at Bikini and Eniwetok showed greater destructive power. President Truman has announced Russia has the atomic bomb—and that was expected. President Truman announces the decision to go ahead with the hydrogen bomb, many times more powerful and destructive than the atomic bomb.

We talk of the cold war, of civilian defense and start to reorganize that defense; we talk of bombs and atomic spies; we see a mockery made of justice and democracy in the Soviet satellite states. In many months there is the continuing assertion that war is inevitable. We see nations again playing the old balance-of-power game, increasing armaments, and using diplomacy as the basis for obtaining advantages against potential enemies.

It is a game as old as history. It is a game that always has led to war.

Are the people of Oregon so mad at the people of Bessarabia that we feel that all of them should be killed off—wiped out, every man, woman, and child? Are the people of Budapest so angry at the people of Montreal that they'd like to put every one of them in an unmarked grave?

Of course not, and it seems absurd even to talk that way. But that's exactly about what will happen in an atomic war—atomic and hydrogen bombs are not discriminating against any flesh, or sex, or age, or nationality.

Why then are the people of the world allowing an atomic arms race, the results of which may well be atomic war and the virtual destruction of world civilization? Before discussing atomic control—its failure to date—we should keep four things in mind:

1. There will be no winners in an atomic war.

2. We, the United States, set the precedent for the use of atomic bombs at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In 1947 former Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson asserted that nine men made the decision to use the atomic bomb against Japan as "our least abhorrent choice" to save American lives. But, once there is war, any nation can use that argument.

3. Virtually all nations can make atomic bombs and possibly hydrogen bombs. It is no secret. As early as March 1946 the Atomic scientists of Chicago told us this: "All large nations, and perhaps some smaller ones as well, will be able to produce atomic bombs within not more than 10 years, and some will probably be able to do so within less than 5 years. In fact, it is possible that the U. S. S. R., for example, will have atomic bombs within 2 or 3 years, quite independently of any technical disclosures which may be made on our side." (This statement, remember, was made 4 years ago.)

4. We cannot expect to meet on a common moral ground for agreement between Christian nations and Russia. Our morals are based upon the teachings of the Bible and Christ. Soviet Russia's are based upon Marxian materialism. Any agreement reached must be on check and balance based upon mutual healthy suspicion and inspection, for the very simple reason we cannot give an inch of faith before the same God.

Now, with those things in mind, let us look at the record—

Shortly after the Japanese blasts and ending of the war, there was definite worldwide action to try to act like human beings. In London the United Nations Political and Security Commission adopted unanimously the Moscow resolution, previously worked out at Moscow by representatives of Russia, Britain, United States, Canada, and France, for establishment of an Atomic Commission. The resolution stated that "the work of the Commission should proceed by separate stages, the successful completion of each of which will develop the necessary confidence of the world before the next stage is undertaken."

This met with general approval—as a start, at least.

THEN, NOW THIS

Many significant statements were made in this country in 1946. Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, demanded in the Senate that President Truman immediately call a world disarmament conference to prevent an atomic world war. Dr. Arthur H. Compton, Nobel peace prize winner, urged all nations to surrender the right to make war by putting the atomic bomb and other weapons of mass destruction exclusively in the hands of an international police force.

And then the talk went. This country, at least, was ready to surrender part of its sovereignty. It was indicated, to make atomic control really work. There were similar expressions from all over the world. Russian dictators remained comparatively quiet except for periodic blasts about warmongers.

In June 1946, elder statesman Bernard Baruch made his proposal for the international control of atomic energy, outlawing bombs, providing for practical inspection to see that outlawed bomb making was not violated.

He asked for a security program not composed merely of pious thoughts but of enforceable sanctions—an international law with teeth in it.

HOPE IN THE UN

Here in the United Nations was the hope. Seven members of the UN Security Council, the Atomic Energy Commission's parent organization, sat listening—The Netherlands, Poland, Russia, the United Kingdom, Australia, China, and France. Also at the table were representatives of the United States, Mexico, Brazil, Canada, and Egypt. Here was the power to institute a practical plan. Here was the hope for a world at peace. Here was the hope of settling the fears generated by the awesome atomic bomb.

Baruch laid down this simple plan:

"When an adequate system for control of atomic energy, including the renunciation of the bomb as a weapon, has been agreed upon and put into effective operation and suitable punishments set up for the violations of the rules of control which are to be stigmatized as international crimes, we propose that—

"1. Manufacture of atomic bombs shall stop.

"2. Existing bombs shall be disposed of pursuant to the terms of the treaty; and

"3. The authority shall be in possession of full information as to the know-how for the production of atomic energy."

He emphasized that the matter of punishment "lies at the very heart of our present security system," and pointed out that such punishment goes directly to the veto power contained in the Charter of the UN.

"There must be no veto to protect those who violate their solemn agreements not to develop or use atomic energy for destructive purposes," he stated. (Any one of the big five—China, Britain, France, Russia, United States—could veto any punishment action.)

This meant giving up a certain amount of national sovereignty for common world good and security. It was a new and daring plan that met the problem honestly. It was generally applauded.

But as time went on it became apparent that Russia would not give up the veto power; it would not consent to inspections. The plan bogged down in red tape and propaganda contributed largely by the vocal Soviet delegation. Finally, at Lake Success, on March 6, 1947, Andrei Gromyko jolted the hopes of immediate control with the blunt statement that—

1. Russia will not permit UN agents to roam unrestricted through the Soviet in search of illegal atomic activities.

2. Russia will not let an international agency manage its atomic activities.

3. Russia will not give up its power to veto the punishment of a country caught making atomic bombs illegally.

4. Russia will find it "difficult, if not impossible," to agree to any kind of control machinery unless the United States first junks its existing atomic bombs.

"VETOS INSTEAD"

What plan, then, did Russia have? Its plan was to set up vague inspection and control organs under a commission which would make decisions by majority rules and the veto power would not apply in them. Their work, however, would be subject to review by the Security Council, where there was the veto power. They proposed a conference to outlaw the bomb.

But all knew that a statement to outlaw the bomb without inspection and enforcement meant nothing. And so time went on.

A conference was held in Paris the fall of 1948 between foreign ministers. Atomic control was discussed. Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vishinsky delivered bombastic abuse at the United States. Nothing was settled on atomic matters.

The year 1949 saw little, if anything, accomplished on atomic control. Berlin blockade, Communists in China, seething in the Balkans, Tito's mutiny, words and words, more armaments. From time to time someone who could tear himself away from atomic spy scares and international mudfings and fulminations would ask that the "big seven" of the major countries get together to solve this atomic control problem.

ARMAGEDDON BACK

We enter 1950, facing a dismal and frightening picture—bigger and more powerful bombs, bigger armies, and air forces, fear and mistrust, a weakened United Nations unable even to settle such a minor international problem as Jerusalem. The A-bomb and the H-bomb swing pendulum-like closer to humanity.

President Truman on February 10 announced he isn't budging from the Baruch plan for international inspection and resorts a little cooperation from Russia is all that is needed to set up effective world atomic controls.

Will that cooperation be forthcoming? It is time, past time, to find out. It is time for meeting at the very highest levels.

It is time to make another attempt to remove the threat of destruction from world civilization. Now we are on the way to create our own hell here on earth.

St. Patrick's Day, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the St. Patrick's Day greetings of Tom Brawders, of New York City, which I feel are most appropriate this week due to the fact that we celebrate St. Patrick's Day on March 17.

This statement of Mr. Brawders contains some good common-sense advice and is worthy of the serious consideration of every Member of the Congress. I sincerely hope that by the time another

Irish week rolls around in the history of our country that Ireland will be blessed with the abolition of partition.

TOM BRAWNER' ST. PATRICK'S DAY GREETINGS, 1950

This year I am devoting my annual St. Patrick Day greeting card to my personal friends and public officials, where it might help, throughout the United States. My one desire for 1950 is that partition of Ireland will get the consideration it deserves from those who are in position to help. You and I can help by passing along the truth as to the tyranny that allows this desperate condition to exist.

In the summers of 1946, 1947, 1948 and 1949, wherever I was registered throughout the 26-county area, each hotel was packed with English and 6-county guests. The hotelkeepers certainly showed no animosity toward them in any way. It proved to me that the average Irishman, whether he lived within the 6-county or the 26-county area could get along together if there was no official obstruction. I met shipyard workers, bank clerks, civil-service employees, etc., from the Belfast vicinity whom, after meeting at the dining-room table for, say a day or two, you might get in a political question, with practically the same answer. When you would take the liberty to say, "What is wrong between the South, where you come, annually, to enjoy the good wholesome living conditions for your holiday, and the North, that even up to this date is merely getting sufficient rationed subsistence as will keep body and soul together?" The answer, to me, for four consecutive summers, has almost been identical: "What can we do about it, if our government refuses to come into diplomatic agreement with the Dublin government?"

During the past summer I enjoyed my usual annual vacation in Ireland and spent 1 week of my sojourn in and around Belfast. Before World War II, I had often included such lovely spots of interest as Warrenpoint, Glens of Antrim, the unforgettable coast road to the Giants Causeway, Portrush, and Derry. These summers the names of these lovely six-county resorts are to be found on the various hotel registers at Killarney, Tralee, Ballybunion, Salthill, Galway, Clifden, and Dublin. All happy in the 26 counties—the land of plenty. To me this partition of Irish people, who constantly demonstrate that they could live happily together, is one of the most ridiculous of geographical fantasies.

Our Government, down through the years, has definitely shown sympathy that has materialized into justice. What about these six counties? Take a look at the map on the cover of this folder. It could remind you of the State of Maine remaining aloof, for one reason or another, from the rest of our Union. Under these geographical conditions the six counties have the most violated freedom of elections. These six counties, of course, vote strictly for the Crown, exactly as if the Bronx Hill section of Boston was gerrymandered from the rest of the city; or the Park Avenue section of New York spoke for the rest of the electorate.

Ulster, down through the centuries, contained nine counties, but the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, tossed off Donegal, Monaghan, and Cavan and formed a government consisting of Armagh, Antrim, Tyrone, Londonderry, Down, and Fermanagh.

We here in the good old United States are continually putting pressure on our governmental representatives, pleading for a fair plebiscite in some far-away place. Yet in Ireland, the birthplace of our parents, where there exists the most severe example of gerrymandered elections, we sit by without one word of protest. I know that many of us made governmental appeals to get them in the Government forces and then sit back. That is merely the start—not the finish. Our governmental representative is a busy, poorly paid individual who has so many calls on his time that unless you keep constantly on the subject it will lapse behind the immediate pressure of other important items on his agenda. We, of Irish descent, are definitely looking for someone in Washington powerful enough, politically, to fight and win enough support to be heard in the British Colonial Office in London, saying, "we demand a plebescite of the 32 counties of Ireland"—or even dare them to hold an election in the original nine counties of Ulster.

In Belfast a prominent businessman, sitting at my hotel luncheon table, chock full of conversation and austerity food, came sort of sharp when the partition subject was broached. "How is it, sir," asked my table neighbor, "that you first- and second-generation Irish, in America, hate England so much?

"Only, sir, because we want to see the 32 counties of Ireland enjoying the same mode of life and opportunity that our fathers and mothers, irrespective of their native county, enjoy in America. As for hating England, we will go along with you on that item, too. Name one country that was, or is, a colony that does not feel the same way? The policy of your British Colonial Office down through the centuries from the days of our Thirteen Colonies, down to the present, has never changed. In America, sir, we always say, 'Freedom is everybody's business' and that goes for Ireland, too, until her 32 counties are all of one government. Our help will continue to come from across the seas in any way the majority of Irish people ask for it. They are the ones to say in which manner the 6 counties are to come over to the other 26.

"This I will say: That no colony of England, America included, ever got complete severance from your colonial office through any graceful, diplomatic gesture. There is only one medicine that England doesn't like—even though it is her greatest reliance—the bayonet. As we say in America, 'England likes to dish it out—but she can't take it.' In other words, England can hold the six counties only by the enormous number of military personnel that she now has throughout these held counties.

"Should the people of the 26 counties decide to do it 'the Tom Barry way' (remember him?)—America will say, it is the will of the majority of Irish people, and help accordingly. Sir, may I give you my personal opinion, humble as it is, from a first-generation Kilkenny man, who loves Ireland, as to an immediate cure for all partition evils? Take the British soldiers out of the six counties and the question will automatically rectify itself."

Red Termites

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

America is in graver danger from within than she has ever been before at any time in her history.

The petted enemies within our gates who are plotting the destruction of our Government are more bold, more aggressive, and more effective than they have ever been before at any time.

Since my extension of remarks in which I included the Communist record of Albert Einstein it has developed that said Einstein was instrumental in getting into this country Klaus Fuchs, one of the most dangerous Communists who ever betrayed this country, as well as Great Britain, and who has just been convicted of treason in the British courts.

It has developed that Einstein was instrumental in getting in this country Gerhart Eisler, who is now leading the Communist forces in Germany.

Turning from faker Einstein to the other enemies within our gates, I want to quote from a part of a broadcast made by the Honorable Henry J. Taylor on February 13, 1950, which every American should read.

The matter referred to follows:

RED TERMITES' PROGRESS

Subject: Have you further information on the Communist spy plot, Mr. Taylor?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly. The Red termites have eaten into our Government house so that the pillars of security just are not there any more. Listen, if you will, to the case of Nathan Gregory Silvermaster.

Courageous J. Edgar Hoover, who fears no one, and the FBI have a file on this man a mile long. So did the House Un-American Affairs Committee, until that committee was throttled by the present Congress. Now the committee appears ready to come up with one whitewash after another.

HE CLIMBED UP AND UP—ON THE DOLE

My information about Nathan Gregory Silvermaster goes back nearly 9 years. On my return from trips overseas during the war—especially from Finland and Turkey and from Germany itself—I would report, at the request of the Army, to war agencies on economic affairs affecting the enemy abroad. During that time I saw Nathan Gregory Silvermaster sitting in Washington as head economist of the Board of Economic Warfare, of all places.

He is Russian-born, and a former $10,000-a-year, top-pay Government economist on the public pay roll.

Silvermaster was born in Odessa. He came here in 1915. He sailed into Federal authority, and onto the Government pay roll in 1935—3 years after Alger Hiss.

Starting in the Resettlement Administration, he moved to the Maritime Labor Board as chief economist, then to the Labor Division of the Farm Security Administration, as its director, no less. In short, he climbed up and up, and on the inside, like Alger Hiss.

By 1944 Silvermaster was over in the Treasury Department, and he finally wound up with the RFC. Along the way, just as Alger Hiss sat in on international conferences with the Russians, Silvermaster helped Assistant Secretary of Treasury Harry Dexter White—later named by Whittaker Chambers and other confessed Communists as a source of information for Stalin—to draw up the Bretton Woods international conference agreement for American funds, which involved the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, Silvermaster served as United States Department of Commerce representative on the Inter-Department Committee which decided what American exports, including uranium, could or should not be sent to Russia.

LET'S LOOK AT THE FILE

Now, remember, this is not hearsay. This is firsthand reporting. For here is the official Civil Service Commission listing on Silvermaster—and I quote from the official files.

"Silvermaster has been known and listed in the files of the Service Police Department, the Thirteenth Naval District, the San Francisco Police Department, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation as a member and leader of the Communist Party."

Accordingly, civil-service investigators recommended—as early as 1942, 8 years ago—and I quote from the official file—that "Silvermaster be declared ineligible for the position of head economist, Board of Economic Warfare" and—at last—proposed to "bar him (from official authority) for the duration of the national emergency."

But the Civil Service and FBI findings didn't mean a thing to Silvermaster. He was able to sail right along. To do so, he admitted, he obtained the aid of Lauchlin Currie, economic adviser to the President inside the White House.

Now, let me turn to the files of United States naval intelligence. They, too, were looking at Silvermaster. The naval intelligence report bluntly called Silvermaster a Communist, not to be trusted in his office. Nevertheless, for four solid years after these security checks had been presented, and overruled from the inside, Silvermaster held important places in the Government of your land and mine.

ALMOST UNBELIEVABLE INVESTIGATION

Now, as I begin to find out more and more about Silvermaster, a known Communist agent described him as in the straight pay of the Soviet secret police, as an NKVD agent in America. He testified before Government authorities that Silvermaster maintained, in his Washington home, photographic and microfilming equipment on which he allegedly photographed and microfilmed Government documents for delivery to Russia.

One confessed agent testified to having actually seen Silvermaster do so, allegedly in cooperation with a Major William Ludwig Ullmer, of the United States Army Air Forces in the Pentagon Building. Silvermaster had lived in Washington with Ullmer since 1937.

Yet, when Silvermaster was officially questioned on August 4, 1948—over a year and a half ago—he refused even to say whether or not he was a Communist. His grounds, and now I quote Silvermaster himself, were that "any answer I may make to this question may tend to be self-incriminating."

So the outcome is "Step down, brother. That's all." Wherewith Silvermaster lets out a laugh and disappears.

But Silvermaster did not disappear completely. I can tell you that at this moment he is on a little island off the Jersey seacoast. If the newspapers are interested, the name of the island village he has gone to is Barnegat Cedars.

A CHARGE—NOT JUST SOME RUMOR

But the remarkable thing is not that Stalin has had, and has today, his minds workers here. The remarkable, incredible thing is that anybody in an official position, or at any standing, would for any reason—year after year—call this vicious threat to our security a "red herring" or a "witch hunt" or try to distract the country from the importance of cleaning this place out.

The safety of America is at stake in the face of a backstabbing, cruel, unfeeling, ruthless, and clever Asiatic enemy, and his fifth column in your land and mine.

The Sick Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include the following well considered and thought-producing editorial appearing in the Boston Post of March 6, 1950, entitled "The Sick Industry":

THE SICK INDUSTRY

President Truman may soon have a study authorized by the Congress looking into the economics of the coal industry. It is certain that the Congress will have a committee looking into the deficiencies of the Taft-Hartley law. Both of these add up to the danger of a degree of nationalization of the coal industry, or, at least, stronger Federal controls in the public interest.

Coal is unquestionably a sick industry, but what kind of ailment has not been determined. It all depends upon what doctor looks the patient over. The miners will claim that the operators have made the industry sick by inefficient operation and by attempts to exploit the miner. The operators will claim that the union has made the industry ill by excessive wage demands which forced up the price of coal and compelled industry and the railroads to seek some other cheap source of fuel.

Some of the doctors seem to have admitted to the clinical history of the sick industry the plain fact that there are too many miners and not enough work for all of them. The United Mine Workers went on a 5-day week from last July until mid-September, and then went into a series of "no day" work weeks until November, when John L. Lewis called a truce and sent the miners back to work. In December the miners' leader put the miners back on a 3-day week.

By January there were spontaneous strikes and on February 3 there was a Nation-wide stoppage in the soft coal fields.

Not until the middle of February were the coal stocks on hand, necessary to industry, depleted to the point where there was alarm and lay-off of workers in other industries. It is fair to say that for 5 months out of the year the miners produced enough coal on a 3-day workweek to provide the Nation at the height of its productivity with enough coal to operate industry. Plainly there are too many miners, and probably too many mines, or, at the very least, too many inefficient mines.

John L. Lewis has been able to force up wages only by work stoppages that depleted the stocks of coal above ground. It is his sole weapon—and he has used it effectively to collect a total of 70 cents an hour in four rounds of wage and welfare increases for his followers. But, he hasn't raised their living standards by any comparable degree, because their payless periods have eaten up most of their gains.

Truly, coal is a sick industry, and will be so long as there are too many miners and not enough work for all of them. Let it be determined now, however, that the nostrum for the patient is not nationalization in any form. The remedy was tried out in Britain. It very nearly killed the patient.

The Coal Strike—The Winner and the Losers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Racine Journal-Times has made some very pertinent observations on the Lewis coal strike in its issue of March 6, 1950. So that his timely comments may be brought to the attention of the people of this country I shall include it as part of my remarks:

THE WINNER AND THE LOSERS

Once again a coal strike has been settled at the eleventh hour—just short of real disaster, but not soon enough to avert a considerable degree of suffering, much economic paralysis, and interruption of normal life in this Nation.

Once again the miners have successfully defied the Government of the United States.

Once again John L. Lewis has emerged with a measure of victory—not with everything he asked, but with enough to save face adequately, strengthen his hold on the miners, and satisfy his power ego.

Once again the public, innocent victim of hardships imposed by the strike, will pay for its fruits through inevitable further boosts in the price of coal.

The big loser of face in this deal is the Government of the United States, and the Truman administration cannot dodge its share of the blame.

A Federal court ordered the miners to return to their work. They refused. Their union was tried for contempt. Federal Judge Richmond Keech found the union not guilty. His reasoning was that the organization has asked the men to obey the return-to-work order but they had refused as individuals. Perhaps this was the only conclusion the judge could reach on the basis of pure legality, though there might have been strong suspicion that union officials had issued their work 'command' with their tongues in the cheeks hoping that the men wouldn't obey. And certainly the end result of the union members' defiance of the Government was pleasing to United Mine Workers' officials including the top boss himself. By holding out, the men forced a settlement much in the union's favor.

Here was a case of a union with the power to bargain for the men, but without the power to control them. Common sense would dictate that if a union cannot control its membership, how can it rightfully make contracts for them? If it cannot keep them from disobeying the Government, how can it guarantee that they will observe the terms of a contract?

Some may say that the strike proved the Taft-Hartley law to be ineffective and unworkable. But though we think it demonstrated the need for strengthening that law for protection of the public against too powerful combines of either industry or labor, it should be obvious to even the most casual observer that the existing law was not given a fair test in this case. It was not applied in time to give such protection and relief as an 80-day stay of the strike might have provided through the cold winter months, when coal is most needed.

And here the fault rests with President Truman himself. Though others saw the emergency coming when the strike started last October, the President refused to recognize it. As late as January 26 he said "the coal situation does not constitute an emergency." Finally he appointed a fact-finding board to work outside the Taft-Hartley law, which he does not like for political reasons. Even when efforts of this board came to naught, Mr. Truman stalled. It wasn't until March 2, with industries crippled, thousands of men laid off, schools closed, and coal bins empty in many homes, that he finally considered the situation was serious.

No matter what kind of law you have, if those charged with enforcing it don't make the best possible use of it, the law will fail.

Now we're going to have a Government study of the whole industry, including the situation of the operators and the miners. If the resulting report is honest, unbiased,

and without political tinge, it should be helpful. It should give public backing to whatever law is necessary to avert a repetition of what Americans have gone through year after year through closing of the mines upon order of John L. Lewis.

Adenauer's Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Item of March 9, 1950:

ADENAUER'S CHALLENGE—TIME TO JUMP IN AND PUSH

Chancelor Konrad Adenauer, crusty leader of the West German Republic, has thrown down the gauntlet of peace.

He has proposed a complete union between West Germany and France as the basis for a United States of Europe.

In an interview with Kingsbury Smith of International News Service, he has struck at the heart of the matter in devastating fashion.

Do we save Europe or don't we save Europe? That is Adenauer's question. The answer cannot safely wait.

Three years ago the Item urged Congress to press for the speedy realization of a United Europe. In the interim we have frequently discussed the need for a genuine federation on the continent. The subject is but new.

The argument for European union is simple. No one nation standing by itself can enjoy the security necessary to its physical safety and economic development. Banded together, the various states can realize the full potential of their peoples and resources.

Leading statesmen of Europe have conceded the ultimate need for union. Some, like Winston Churchill, have openly urged immediate steps. A consultative assembly has met. Observers on the scene report widespread popular support for a close federation.

These people know just how senseless are the barriers that divide and weaken them. They understand the vicious circle of currency restrictions, quota systems, and other artificial restraints on the free flow of goods. They sense the disaster that might befall them in the event of an attack from the east.

Why, then, are they so reluctant to take the necessary plunge?

The reasons are many. They boil down to the fact that "the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak." Western Europe was smashed by the war. With our help, she has regained some of her former tone and color. But the strength both to initiate and put through a revolutionary change of pattern is lacking.

The time has come for the United States to jump in and push.

The American people have shown a great willingness to put forward the effort and money needed to secure peace. Their misgivings about ECA stem from the complaint that it is not enough to do the job. The widespread response to Senator McMahon's $20,000,000,000 "peace crusade" is sufficient proof of a desire to avoid war at whatever monetary cost.

Building here than a United States of Europe, we believe, can provide the basis for independent and lasting security. For political, economic, and military reasons, federation is urgent.

The man to pick up Chancelor Adenauer's gauntlet is not France's Premier Bidault, but the President of the United States of America.

We suggest that Mr. Truman prepare a message for delivery before both Houses of Congress pledging this Nation's all-out support for a Union of Europe.

With the sanction of Congress, Mr. Truman should then call on the heads of European governments to meet with him in Paris to discuss the ways and means of bringing federation into being.

For historical impact and statesmanship, this assertion of American leadership would surpass all previous efforts for peace. It is our great opportunity to influence permanently the course of human events.

The High Cost of Low Incomes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, nearly 10,000,000 American families are making a futile effort to make ends meet on an annual income of $2,000 or less. This is a matter of public concern, because most of these people are a charge on the public for aid of some kind to supplement their incomes. What is the best way to handle this situation? What conditions cause this poverty? Are they correctable?

These and other questions about our lowest income families are answered by Prof. Sumner Slichter, of Harvard, in an article appearing in the New York Times magazine. I should like to insert this most important article in the RECORD. It is as follows:

THE HIGH COST OF LOW INCOMES

(By Sumner H. Slichter)

In 1948, the most prosperous year in the history of the country, nearly 10,000,000 American families had cash incomes of $2,000 a year or less. The condition of such families concerns the entire country. For one thing, these families contain about 9,000,000 children, and the small income of the family may deprive the children of fair opportunity. Moreover, low incomes are frequently the result of low productivity; if the productivity of these families could be raised the whole country would have more to consume. Apart from these considerations, low-income families contain a high proportion of people hard hit by misfortune, and all humanitarian peoples want to do what they can for the unfortunate.

The situation of the nonfarm low-income group, numbering about 6,900,000 families, is probably more difficult than that of the farm families, so this article will center on impoverished people living in towns and cities. Three principal questions stand out: Who are these families and what are the reasons for their low incomes? What kind of lives do they lead? What can be done about the problem of low incomes?

Over two-thirds of the low-income families fall into one of three large groups: (1) Families whose head has been disabled by accident or disease; (2) broken families—that is, families headed by women because of widowhood, desertion, or divorce; and (3) families whose head is 65 years of age or more.

The exact size of the first group, headed by persons permanently disabled for long periods, is not precisely known, but it numbers well over a million. These are persons of working age who at one time were members of the working force but now are totally disabled for an indefinite period. The second group, headed by women who have lost their husbands, includes 1,500,000 families. More than one-third of these families have no earners. The third group, headed by older persons, includes 1,700,000 families—more than one-fourth of all nonfarm families with incomes of less than $2,000. About half of these families have no income earners among their members.

In addition to these three major groups, there are many other kinds of low-income families. Some families are in the low-income class only temporarily—because they are starting new businesses or have experienced business losses, or because the chief earner has been temporarily disabled. Then, too, the low-income families naturally include many headed by persons who are incompetent, or misfits, or maladjusted, and who have trouble in getting and holding jobs. The misfits include persons with low intelligence who require so much supervision that they are hardly worth employing and persons who suffer from phobias and complexes of various sorts and do not easily fit into an organization.

Included among the misfits are many alcoholics. Information about their numbers is not reliable, but a recent conference on alcoholism in Chicago concluded that about 1,500,000 alcoholics are regularly employed. Of course, not all alcoholics are in the low-income class, but alcoholism frequently results in low income.

What kind of lives do the low-income families lead? Here is the part of the population, of course, where hardship is concentrated. The best measure of this fact is the high proportion of low incomes absorbed by expenditures on food. Nearly three-quarters of the income of nonfarm families receiving less than $1,000 a year and nearly half of the income of families in the $1,000–$2,000 class goes for food—in comparison with about one-third for the average-income nonfarm family.

Nevertheless, many of these families are not so badly off as one might suppose. In the first place, there is a general tendency for people to understate their cash incomes. In the second place, many families have resources apart from cash income, particularly in food and in shelter of their own houses. Also, the low-income families are smaller than the average. In addition, such families tend to be concentrated in the smaller cities and the rural nonfarm areas, where, as a rule, it is easier to live simply and cheaply than in a large city.

In fact, the low-income families have a surprising amount of property. This probably reflects the fact that at some earlier time—before the family head retired or died or was disabled—these families were better off. At any rate, almost half of such families own their own homes, and about three out of four of these homes are owned mortgage-free. Over one-fourth own an automobile—of sorts—and the ownership of United States savings bonds and saving accounts is equally frequent. In 1948, over one out of four of these families purchased such goods as furniture, radios, refrigerators, washing machines, or television sets.

What can and should be done about the problem of low-income families? Since there are many causes of low income and many kinds of families in the low-income group, there is no panacea. Many of these persons who have suffered severe disabilities can learn new work or, in a few cases, new ways of doing their former jobs. In 1948,

53,000 persons were rehabilitated under the joint Federal-State retraining program, but there are about 1,500,000 persons in need of retraining. Great expansion of retraining programs is indicated.

Many disabled persons are prevented by illness from holding jobs and some of them are not able to learn new ones. In nearly all of these cases public or private assistance is needed. The Federal Government now helps the States that provide assistance to the blind and to families having dependent children. And last summer the House of Representatives passed H. R. 6000, which provides for grants to the States for assistance to permanently and totally disabled persons not covered by existing programs. It was estimated that this program would help about 300,000 totally disabled persons.

If there are dependent children in the family of the disabled worker, help may be given under the Federal-State program of aid for dependent children. In July 1949 about 540,000 families were being assisted under the program by an average monthly payment of more than $70. Federal participation in aid to dependent children is not as liberal as Federal participation in old-age assistance or aid to the blind. The Advisory Council on Social Security, appointed by the Senate Finance Committee of the Eightieth Congress, has recommended that this difference in Federal help be eliminated.

A long-range program dealing with the problem of disability should include insurance against the loss of income because of temporary or permanent disability. Under present conditions the problem of temporary disability can be handled best by the States, and New York and several other States already have started such schemes. More important is the insurance against disability of indefinite duration (say 6 months or longer), or so-called permanent disability.

Many insurance experts do not believe that it is practical to write such insurance because the possibility of getting an income for many years, and perhaps for life, creates too powerful a temptation to malinger. Others believe that total and permanent disability is an insurable risk provided it is required that the disability be medically demonstrable.

The Advisory Council on Social Security has recommended that the present old-age and survivors insurance plan be broadened to cover insurance against permanent and total disability and such insurance is included in the social-security bill passed by the House of Representatives last summer. The insurance would be limited to persons who have been in the labor force for at least 10 years and whose disability, can be medically proven.

In nearly two out of three of the broken families, the wife or one of the children is gainfully employed. The proportion of widows or divorced mothers and of children between 16 and 17 years of age who are in the labor force has increased substantially since 1940. Hence, the maintenance of a high demand for labor is particularly helpful to members of broken families. While certain jobs are not good for children, children of 16 and over are likely to be helped by some employment if it does not interfere with education.

In the main, however, the income problem of broken families must be solved in ways other than by employment of the mother or children. Where there are dependent children in the family, the help can be obtained through the Federal-State program of aid to dependent children.

Nearly four out of five broken families have lost their chief breadwinner by death. Hence, a great step would be taken toward reducing destitution if the Federal old-age and survivors insurance plan were extended to the 35,000,000 jobs not now covered. The benefits also need to be made larger and eligibility requirements more liberal. At present the average primary benefit (on which survivors' benefits are based) is only about $26 a month.

Two changes in the law would be particularly helpful to families broken by the death of the chief breadwinner. One would raise the benefit of the first dependent child or of a dependent parent to three-fourths of the primary benefit. The other would permit widows of deceased workers to begin drawing benefits at the age of 60 instead of 65. Widows caring for a minor child of the deceased worker draw benefits now.

The largest class of low-income families comprise those in which the breadwinner is retired. Consequently, measures to meet the needs of these families offer the most promising way of attacking the broad problem of low incomes. Three changes would be particularly useful: (1) Raising the usual retirement age in industry, (2) modifying the so-called work clause in the present Federal pension laws, and (3) providing a more generous Federal pension system.

A large proportion of persons 65 or over are quite capable of continuing their occupations, as the practice of some companies of retaining all employees at the age of 65 is quite noteworthy. Furthermore, it increases the number of low-income families, and thus aggravates the problem of low incomes. Studies of the Social Security Agency show that most retirements occur against the will of the worker. The problem of low-income families would be substantially reduced in importance if the retirement age in industry were made 68 or 70 instead of 65. In addition, the output of industry would be raised, and the standard of living of the country as a whole would be improved.

The present Federal old-age pension law contains a peculiarly vicious work clause. It is designed to prevent persons from drawing pensions who are also receiving income through employment. The law provides that a pensioner recipient who earns $15 or more a month shall lose his pension as long as his earnings equal or exceed that amount. The obvious effect is to discourage beneficiaries from supplementing their pensions by useful work.

A more sensible arrangement would be to permit pensioners to earn a fairly liberal income, say $75 a month, without losing their pensions, and to provide that for every dollar above $75 a month earned by the pensioner a dollar would be subtracted from his pension for that month. This would encourage retired workers to help themselves.

The third change—to extend and liberalize the present old-age insurance scheme—is the most promising way of dealing with low incomes among retired workers. As has been pointed out, the plan at present covers only about three out of five jobs. It should be made virtually universal. In addition, the benefit payments should be raised to about 50 percent of a man's earnings before retirement. This would eliminate much of the problem of low-income families. The present pension payments of $26 a month for persons without dependents and $46 for persons with dependents are far below a decent level.

In addition to these direct measures, there are numerous indirect ways to help low-income families, some important, others less so. Since a high proportion of low-income families have their savings in Government savings bonds, one form of help to them (and to many other families as well) would be for the Government to issue a savings bond payable to a fixed amount of purchasing power rather than a fixed number of dollars. Persons who bought Government savings bonds in 1948, 1949, or 1949 have lost a large part of the purchasing power which they put into those bonds. Small-income families working to save should not be compelled to speculate on whether the price level will rise or fall.

Another kind of indirect help would be the removal of economic barriers to opportunity. More abundant scholarships to young persons of demonstrated ability would be one way to do this. Setting limits on the initiation fees that men must pay in order to join unions would also help. Fortunately, most unions are opposed to high initiation fees, but a minority charge $100 or more. An amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act should impose a maximum $25 initiation fee for admission to any union which is granted exclusive bargaining rights or which is permitted to establish a union shop.

Still another form of help would be modification of the Government program of supporting the prices of farm products. Because low-income families spend a high proportion of their cash incomes on food, the price-support program, which now includes wheat, corn, pork, butter, eggs, potatoes, cheese, apples, pears, concentrated orange juice, lard, and other commodities, is especially burdensome to nonfarm families with low incomes. The so-called Brannan plan of agriculture and has gravest faults—in particular, it undertakes to support farm incomes at too high a level—but it would have the important merit of letting farm products be sold at free-market prices.

The most important indirect aid of all is encouragement of technological research, because it is from a rise in all incomes that more adequate support can be given the low-income groups. Not only does technological progress raise the incomes of all classes, but it has had the important result of reducing the proportion of unskilled jobs and of increasing the proportion of jobs that require skilled or semiskilled workers. Between 1930 and 1940, for example, common laborers dropped from 36 percent to 30 percent of the labor force. Converting of common-labor jobs into semiskilled or skilled jobs reduces the proportion of workers receiving low pay and helps people rise out of the impoverished class.

These measures—direct and indirect—to aid low-income families are of great importance not only to the persons immediately concerned but to the Nation as a whole. They would raise the contribution of the low-income families to production, and thus diminish the extent to which these families are supported at the expense of the rest of the country. Broadening and liberalizing social insurance would reduce the dependence of low-income families upon relief, and thus reduce—though not eliminate—the possibility that help for the low-income groups could become a corrupting influence in politics.

Most important of all, good correspondence for meeting the problems of low-income families would raise the extent to which the American economy is held forth here and abroad. Critics of American economic institutions have been forced to admit that these institutions are remarkably efficient and give the country an unmatched standard of living, but they insist that this highly efficient economy neglects human needs.

As a matter of fact, few other countries distribute as large a proportion of income on the basis of need as does the United States. Income distributed on this basis was about $30,000,000,000 in 1948 and was about three times as large relative to all personal income as in 1929.

Nevertheless, a rich and successful economy such as that of the United States must be expected to look out for the comprehensive or low producers more adequately than do the less efficient economies. Arrangements for meeting the problem of the newly more generously will show the critics of American institutions that this economy is the most efficient in the world.

Basing Point Aimed at South, West, and New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I believe that most Members of this body from the South, the West, and New England would like to see steel mills established in their regions. And why should they not have them?

Certainly, in each of these areas the demand for steel is far in excess of the supply. Certainly, each of the regions is either naturally endowed with the necessary raw materials for steel making as is true of the South and the West, or can readily secure them at low cost from nearby sources, as is true of New England, which will be able to use the newly discovered Labrador ores. Certainly each of these areas has the labor force required to operate a steel mill. Certainly, the capital is locally available for the construction of the mills. In other words, the demand, the raw materials, the labor force, the capital—all of the necessary ingredients are present. But will steel mills in these areas be erected?

If S. 1008 is passed, the answer is no. The restoration of the basing-point system spells finis to the hopes of these great areas for a steel industry of their own. Why is this so? Let me answer by recounting what has actually happened to the mills located in one of these areas, the South. The experience of the mills at Birmingham, Ala., provides a vivid illustration of what happened to a mill in an outlying area under the basing-point system.

As is well known, the Birmingham mills are the most efficient in the country. They are the only mills in the land which are located virtually in the midst of the three raw materials required for steel production—iron ore, coking coal, and limestone. Hence, the failure of the Birmingham mills to gain anything more than a relatively small share of the southern market cannot be traced to high costs or inefficiency.

One would think that under normal conditions southern buyers would secure a fairly large proportion of their steel requirements from the Birmingham mills not only because of their lower mill costs but also because of the smaller transportation charges involved.

Actually, under the basing-point system both of these advantages are wiped out, since the delivered price to any given buyer is the same from all mills. The delivered price to the buyer in Birmingham, itself is the same whether he buys from the Birmingham mills, from Pittsburgh, from Chicago, from Sparrows Point, from Cleveland, or from any of the other places where steel is produced. This is the unique feature of the basing-point system—identical delivered prices from all mills to any given destination point.

Therefore, since under the basing-point system there is no advantage to the southern buyers in purchasing their steel from Birmingham, they have bought in large quantities from the distant northern mills. We have always believed this to be true. Now we have the facts to prove it. On February 20, 1950, I put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some very interesting figures, prepared by Dr. George Stocking, of Vanderbilt University, showing the extent to which, under the basing-point system, the Birmingham mills have been deprived of the southern market.

These figures show that during February 1939 the nine Alabama counties surrounding Birmingham obtained no less than 37.4 percent of their structural shapes from distant sources, most of which—27.9 percent—coming from faraway Chicago. Buyers in all other Alabama counties relied to an even smaller extent on Birmingham mills, obtaining nearly half—47.5 percent—of their structural shapes from northern mills.

The neighboring State of Mississippi obtained no less than 72.1 percent of its structural shapes from the remote northern production centers. Georgia secured 33.5 percent of its structural shapes from the northern mills; Tennessee, 45.6 percent; Florida, 36.6 percent; North Carolina, 91.4 percent; Kentucky, 94.7 percent; and Texas, 82 percent.

Obviously, if the basing-point system had not been in existence, there would have been two incentives for southern buyers to purchase from the Birmingham mills: First, the lower costs of the Birmingham mills and, second, lower transportation expenses—which in a heavy product such as steel is an important factor. Thus, if the buyers in the nine Alabama counties surrounding Birmingham had obtained their structural shapes from Birmingham their freight charges would have only been 94 cents a ton as compared to $11 to $15 a ton for shipments from the northern mills. In all of the Southern States the saving in transportation costs as a result of buying from Birmingham rather than from the northern mills would have been substantial. By buying from Birmingham Mississippians would have saved about $11 a ton; Georgians would have saved about $7 a ton; Tennesseans about $5 a ton; Floridians about $5 a ton; Carolinians from $3 to $4 a ton; and Kentuckians from $3 to $10 a ton.

The material prepared by Dr. Stocking shows that the same situation prevails with other steel products such as steel plates, plain drawn wire, hot-rolled strip and hot-rolled sheets, the Birmingham mills obtaining only a small share of the southern market and southern buyers paying delivered prices which contained high-freight costs from northern mills.

There is one other lesson to be learned from these figures. If the delivered price to a southern buyer is the same from Birmingham as from a distant northern mill—as is the case under the basing-point system—then it must follow that the delivered price must necessarily have been established at an extremely high level. Only if the delivered price in the South is fantastically high could northern steel mills ship into the South, absorbing freight charges ranging from $10 to $20 a ton and still make a profit. All of us know that the northern steel mills are not in business for their health. When they ship into the South it is for the purpose of making a profit, but if on such shipments they are absorbing freight charges of from $10 to $20 a ton they would obviously lose money unless the delivered price in the South were set at an extraordinarily high level. This, of course, is exactly what occurs under the basing-point system. As the Supreme Court held in the Cement case, the basing-point system is a handy instrument to bring about elimination of any kind of price competition. In other words through the mechanism of the basing-point system the steel companies have been able to eliminate price competition and set delivered prices at levels so high as to enable the established northern mills to make a profit on sales to practically any area. Without the basing-point system, they will find it extremely difficult to engage in this form of price fixing.

In conclusion let me raise this question: If under the basing-point system the Birmingham mills, with all their advantages, have not been able to secure more than a small share of the southern market, how could it be expected that if the system is restored new mills in the South or the West or New England will fare any better? If the Birmingham mills get only 26 percent of the adjoining Mississippi market, only 12 percent of the Texas market and so on, how could it be expected that under the basing-point system a new mill in the West, in New England, or in the South, for that matter, could do any better? It is most unlikely that the cost of such a mill would be any lower than those of the Birmingham mills. It is unlikely that the excess of demand over supply would be any greater than it has been in the South. It is unlikely that such mills would have available a larger labor force. On what basis then can it be expected that under the basing-point system such mills will succeed in obtaining a reasonably large share of their home market, when the Birmingham mills—the lowest cost mills in the country—have so conspicuously failed?

That, Mr. Speaker, is the question with which every Member of this body from the South, the West, and New England should be immediately concerned.

Basing-Point System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, every student of southern history knows that the expansion of the South has been retarded, more than anything else, by the practices of northern monopoly interests. Perhaps the most well-known of these practices aimed against the South has been the freight-rate discriminations. The facts have conclusively proved that this particular form of discrimination stems from the efforts of northern financial interests to protect their own established investments from any possible competition which might develop from an expanding southern economy.

But while the character and effect of freight-rate discriminations are known to practically all southerners, there is another form of discrimination practiced against the South which has equally injurious effects but which has been surrounded in mystery. I am referring to the regional discrimination inherent in the basing-point system. Under the basing-point system it makes no difference to the buyer what mill he buys from. He receives the same delivered price down to the last ten-thousandths of a cent from all mills. Therefore, he obviously fails to receive the benefit of the lower costs which one mill may have as against other mills.

This characteristic of the basing-point system is peculiarly disadvantageous to the South in that there is located in our region the most efficient, lowest-cost center of steel production in the country. I am referring of course to the mills of Birmingham, Ala. The Birmingham area is unique in its possession of the three raw materials required for steel production—iron ore, coking coal, and limestone. Other mills throughout the country have to obtain one or more of these raw materials from distant areas, involving heavy transportation expenses. But in Birmingham the materials are all at hand. The advantages to the Birmingham mills resulting from this situation were revealed in a study made just before the last war by the Board of Investment and Research. This Board which was established by Congress to formulate a minimal transportation policy, issued a report, the Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, which shows the number of ton-miles required to bring together at a steel mill the iron ore, coal, and limestone required in steel production. Only 45 ton-miles were required to assemble these various raw materials for the production of one ton of pig iron at Birmingham—22 ton-miles being required to bring in the iron ore, 20 miles for the coking coal, and 3 miles for the limestone. Now does this figure of 45 ton-miles stand up against comparable figures for other steel production centers in the country? It takes no less than 122 ton-miles to assemble the raw materials for the production of one ton of pig iron at Pittsburgh, and the same amount for production at Chicago-Gary. 207 ton-miles are required to assemble raw materials for production at Youngstown. 561 are required for Sparrows Point, Baltimore, with usually greater distances being required for the century in other steel-producing centers.

Because of the fact that practically no transportation charges are involved in bringing together these raw materials, the assembly costs of raw material for iron and steel production are much lower in Birmingham than in other parts of the country. According to this same report, in 1939 the cost of assembling the iron ore, coking coal, and limestone required to produce one ton of pig iron was $2.68. This is to be contrasted to a comparable figure at Pittsburgh of $5.30; at Chicago-Gary of $7.31; at Youngstown of $6.54; and at Sparrows Point of $6.88. In other words, the total cost for assembling the raw materials required to produce pig iron was from two to three times higher in the northern steel mills than at Birmingham.

Similarly the cost of assembling raw materials required to produce one ton of finished steel was only $4 at Birmingham, as compared to $7.36 at Pittsburgh, $10.20 in Chicago-Gary, $8.05 at Youngstown, and $12.36 at Sparrows Point. Again, costs at Birmingham are from 50 to 70 percent lower than in the North.

I believe these figures reveal one of the reasons why the northern steel interests are moving heaven and earth to get S. 1008 passed. They simply want to bring about the restoration of a situation in which it makes no difference to the buyer what mill he buys from. And if it makes no difference to him, why should he buy from the Birmingham mill just because it is the lowest-cost mill?

On the other hand if this bill is not passed, it could be expected that over the long-run the Birmingham mills would obtain the natural advantage of their lower costs. Buyers would be expected to purchase their steel at Birmingham for the simple reason that it can be produced there more cheaply than anywhere else. It could be expected that southern steel consumers would at long last secure their advantage of proximity to this low cost source of steel production. It could be expected that southern steel consumers, by obtaining steel at lower prices made possible by the low costs at Birmingham, would be able to widen the area in which they are able to compete. It could be expected that as a result of this expansion, southern industries would be able to provide more jobs for southern workers, more profits for southern investors, and more expansion and greater well-being for the South generally.

But it should be obvious that these benefits will be denied the South if this bill is passed. The steel companies have clearly indicated their intention to return to the basing-point system immediately upon the enactment. And if this happens, the potential great expansion of the South will be nipped in the bud. This is evident from what has happened in the South under the basing-point system in the past. It is a fact that during the existence of the basing-point system, despite their lower costs, the proportion of the Nation's pig iron capacity held by the Birmingham mills actually declined. In 1925 Alabama mills held 7.1 percent of the Nation's pig iron capacity. By 1938 its proportion had declined to 5.2 percent.

Similarly, the proportion of the Nation's steel capacity held by Birmingham mills remained about constant. In 1925 Alabama mills held 2.7 percent of the Nation's capacity to produce finished hot-rolled steel products; by 1939 the proportion had risen only slightly to 2.1 percent. And this, I repeat, despite assembly costs which were from 50 to 70 percent lower in Birmingham than in the northern mills and despite total costs which were more than 30 percent lower in Birmingham.

In short, we are presented with the paradoxical and fantastic situation that the lowest-cost mills have actually lost ground in pig iron and failed to gain in steel. Yet the relative importance of the higher-cost producers has increased. Only under monopolistic conditions could such a frequent reversal of all of the laws of economics take place. If S. 1008 is defeated, Birmingham will regain its birthright of efficiency and the normal operation of competition will bring about one of the greatest expansions in southern history. But if the bill is passed, Birmingham mills will be denied the benefit of their natural location, the southern consumers will be denied the advantage of the low costs at Birmingham, and the South in general will once more be placed in the position of paying prices which the northern monopolists set and of producing only what the northern monopolists permit.

Forceful Presentment of the Viewpoint of the Famous Atomic Scientists of the Nation on the South Amendment to the National Science Foundation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of March 11, 1950, appeared an article by Clifford Grobstein, vice chairman of the Federation of American Scientists, entitled, "Three Bests in the Science Foundation." This is so clear and potent a presentment of the viewpoint of the scientists and educators of the Nation in the matter of the South amendment to the National Science Foundation bill that I think it should and will receive the thoughtful attention of the conferees on the Science Foundation bill when resumed.

I might explain that the Federation of American Scientists had its beginning during the war in the atomic-energy laboratories. Three years ago the group expanded to admit all scientists, but its primary concern is still with matters of atomic-energy control, both domestic and international. The stated purpose of the organization is to direct the flow of the benefits of science into constructive social ends. The chairman of the Federation is Dr. Hugh C. Wolfe, head of the Department of Physics at Cooper Union. The president of lesser scientists, Albert Einstein, is a member. Included on the advisory panel are Dr. J. Robert

Oppenheimer, head of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, and formerly director of the Los Alamos project, also two of my very distinguished constituents of the second district of Illinois, Dr. Harold C. Urey, Nobel prize winner, and Dr. Leo C. Szilard, the outstanding atomic scientist who was the first to present to President Roosevelt the designs for the atomic bomb. Dr. Urey and Dr. Szilard, I am happy to say, are on the faculty of the Institute for Nuclear Study of the University of Chicago, which numbers among its distinguished alumni many members of this body.

The article by Dr. Grobstein follows:

THE BOMB IN THE SCIENCE FOUNDATION

(By Clifford Grobstein, vice chairman, Federation of American Scientists)

In your editorial of March 8 you refer to the drastic provision for FBI investigation of National Science Foundation employees and fellows contained in the bill passed by the House on March 1. You ask, "Where is this absurdity to stop?" May I suggest that it will not stop so long as democratically minded citizens resign themselves, as you suggest, to the view "that it is better to have the bill with the restriction than not to have it at all."

The Federation of American Scientists has urged the importance of this legislation, as the Washington Post has so splendidly done, but it knows, too, the nature of the time-bomb planted in the legislation by a misguided group in the House. There are at least two good reasons why this legislation, now unfortunately loaded with political dynamite, is not better than none at all.

First, the chances of success of the House proposed NSF are jeopardized at the outset by its violation of a first principle of scientific tradition—freedom from political qualification. Scientists will not strike against legislation. But more and more of them simply will prefer to look elsewhere for their support, or go without it, rather than subject themselves to procedures so unnecessary and repugnant.

Second, the issue raised goes beyond the Science Foundation, indeed almost relegates it to the background. It is not only as scientists, but as citizens concerned for the future of our way of life, that we protest this new height in antidemocratic measures offered to protect democracy.

The loyalty provision of the House version reads as follows: "No person shall be employed by the Foundation and no scholarship shall be awarded to any person by the Foundation unless and until the FBI shall have investigated the loyalty of such person and reported to the Foundation such person is loyal to the United States, believes in our system of government, and is not and has not at any time been a member of any organization declared subversive by the Attorney General, or any organization that teaches or advocates the overthrow of our Government by force and violence."

In light of the fact that this provision is applicable to an agency intended to devote itself primarily to education in the sciences and, moreover, research. It deserves comparison with the provision governing the Atomic Energy Commission, an agency concerned with highly secret research and information: "Except as authorized by the Commission in case of emergency, no individual shall be employed by the Commission until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation and report to the Commission on the character, association, and loyalty of such individual."

The proposed NSF provision is far more drastic than the AEC provision in at least three important respects.

1. Membership in a single organization on the Attorney General's list, of however short duration, demonstrates disloyalty, regardless of other evidence to the contrary. Evaluation is based not on an individual's total record, but on what may have been a single action.

2. Not only present membership, but past membership demonstrates disloyalty. An individual who has performed a single purportedly disloyal action can never again be regarded as loyal. And, according to the language of the NSF provision, this applies ex post facto—an individual is disloyal even though he resigned from an organization before it appeared on the Attorney General's list.

3. The FBI is given not only investigative responsibility to establish facts, but evaluative responsibility as well. Before any person is employed or awarded a scholarship, the FBI must certify that he is loyal. If this provision is accepted, Congress, for the first time, would have declared that the FBI is more than a fact-gathering agency, that it is responsible for judging, and certifying to the loyalty of free citizens. Whether or not this is regarded as a proper function of the FBI, the question certainly should not be decided in legislation to establish a Federal science agency. If we wish the FBI to do this, it should be accomplished in legislation specifically designed for the purpose.

How far this absurdity is to go, to use your apt phrase, depends upon how far we will allow ourselves to be led without more than grumbles and protests for the record. In the opinion of the Federation of American Scientists, loyalty checks of any kind are unnecessary and unwise for scientists not having access to secret information. The Foundation is expected to support very little secret research, and we would prefer, in fact, that it support none at all.

What secret work it may do is adequately protected in both House and Senate versions by the provision that the Foundation, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, "shall establish regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property (having military significance) in connection with scientific research under this act and for the proper safeguarding of any information or property so classified." Under this provision, if necessary, the FBI could be called on to investigate particular individuals in sensitive positions. There is no reason for a blanket provision applying to the great majority of persons associated with the Foundation who will be concerned only with information of completely unrestricted nature.

Under these circumstances, the drastic general loyalty provision is completely inappropriate and must be viewed as a maneuver designed for other purposes. Either the hope is to kill the bill by including a provision completely unacceptable to its supporters or to use the bill to establish a precedent for later legislation involving Federal support, as, for example, to education.

If these tactics are to be beaten, the grave general issue must be recognized and public opinion mobilized to insure deletion of the provision by the Senate-House conference committee which will be appointed shortly. The Senate version of the legislation, written in more temperate days, contains no unnecessary loyalty provisions. Conference committee members may be expected to exercise more reasoned judgment than did the House, particularly if it is made clear that the House version is totally unacceptable, not only to scientists but to all those who are more concerned with free thought than with safe thought.

Statement of A. B. Averill Presented to the Honorable Jamie Whitten, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. B. Averill, of Fremont, Wis., presented the following testimony.

This statement is a grass-roots opinion of a public-spirited constituent that came to Washington, at his own expense, to make constructive suggestions. His opinions on the farm problem is very much in keeping with the expressions of a majority of the farmers of our district.

The statement:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Pat Averill. I reside in Fremont, Wis., a little village of 437 inhabitants, in Waupaca County, Wis., about in the south central part of the State.

In this village I own a small meat market and grocery store. I also own a small farm on the outskirts of this village where we milk from 25 to 30 cows, have about 100 hogs, and a family-size flock of chickens. We raise practically all of our own feeds only buying a few concentrates. On this farm we employ help the year around.

I feel that I can speak from a small-town businessman's and a small farmer's point of view.

As we all know, the farmer's income has shrunk considerably within the last couple of years and at the rate it is going it does not paint too bright a picture for a small farmer nor for the small-town businessman. As a businessman we depend upon the greater majority of our business from the farmer and if the farmer does not thrive, the small-town business suffers equally as much.

I recently talked with nearly all of the businessmen up and down the street and they all tell me the same story. For example, your farm implement dealer; a few years ago the farmers were all clamoring for farm machinery. Now it is being stockpiled in the dealer's yards and warehouses and the dealer can find no other cause for it than the small income among farmers.

Our bankers also tell me business is not as good as it was a few years ago. Farmers who had their account paid up are now coming back for new loans.

I feel that every effort must be put forth to maintain stable prices and assure reasonable living conditions for all parties concerned. None of us want to hit the skid row we did back in the thirties.

I realize the fact that the Government has had a triple A program for several years, though now they have changed it to PMA, whatever that means, but to me it is still a triple A program under which we have worked for some time and I firmly believe in a program of that kind. Both as a farmer and businessman, I am thoroughly convinced that this is the proper program for agriculture. Practically all the members on this committee in this program are farmers elected by farmers who know what is best for farmers in their immediate locality. To

me the only thing wrong with the program is—there isn't enough of it.

Before I came here I had a talk with our FSA chairman. I was surprised to learn that 95 percent of the farmers in our county take part in this program. He also told me that in recent years the budget for this program has been cut to a point where it is hard to get some of the small farmers interested in building up their soil. The family-sized farm needs it most of all.

A number of the farmers are hard hit and this is no fault of their own. They may have large families or poor farms, or both. And it is extremely difficult for them to improve their farms without a little more assistance. I am sure they are all grateful for what the program has done for them in the past. It has done a great job in protecting our top soil and I feel it is the only program that is working on a large scale and in order to really accomplish conservation it must work on all farms; at least if we are going to continue to feed the greater part of the world.

I did not come here to ask for more money, but I would like to see you rearrange and earmark some of the money so more of it would get into the hands of the family-sized farmer. The commercial farmer has the knowledge and the finances to investigate these programs from all angles while the small farmer does not see where he can afford the time and money when he gets only a comparatively few dollars a year for his benefits.

And while on the subject, I think it would be of great benefit if there was more of an educational program put on so it could be thoroughly understood by all concerned. I, as a farmer, feel it would be a great benefit to me. By building up the soil one gets good crops and nothing makes the farmer feel happier and more light-hearted than to have good crops even though he doesn't get much for them.

It has been a privilege for me to meet with you and try as best I could to have you understand the situation as it exists in my part of the country.

I am extremely proud to have met you and I want to take this opportunity to thank you for permitting me to express my views.

Springfield High Schools Win Honors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to tell the Members of Congress that the young people in my district have been winning national honors for school publications. The competition includes every State in the Union and it is described in detail in the accompanying newspaper article.

I know the Members will want to join with me in congratulating the young people from the Second District of Massachusetts who have done such an excellent and outstanding job.

The article from the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News of Friday, March 10, 1950, follows:

TWO LOCAL SCHOOL PAPERS JUNIOR BEST IN COUNTRY—CATHEDRAL AND CLASSICAL IN FIRST PLACE; BUCKINGHAM AND WEST SIDE JUNIOR RUN ABOVE HONORS

Competing with school publications from every State in the Union, the products of two Springfield high schools have won highest honors in their respective groups, it was announced today from Columbia University, where 3,500 school journalists are attending the twenty-sixth annual convention of the Columbia Scholastic Press Association.

First-place honors go to the Cathedral Chronicle in the division for printed newspapers in high schools with enrollments of 1,500 to 2,500, and the Classical Recorder in the same category for schools with enrollments of 750 to 1,500.

Four other schools in this area share in the contest awards. Next highest honors go to the Scribe, put out by students at Easthampton High School, in competition with other duplicated magazines of high schools with 300 students or less.

Suffield High School's Reader's Reflection took second place in the duplicated senior high-school magazine division of 300 to 750 enrollment.

A third-place award was won by the publication of Buckingham Junior High School, the Beacon, in the division for printed newspapers in junior high schools with enrollments of 750 to 1,250.

Another third-place award goes to the Observer, of West Springfield Junior High School, competing with duplicated newspapers of junior high schools with 750 or less students.

In rating the 1,300 entries, the judges considered such factors as make-up, typography, news, and story content.

The awards will be presented tomorrow at a luncheon at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, marking the conclusion of the 3-day convention. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, of Columbia, will address the final session.

A Sell-Out of American Workers by the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. I take this occasion, Mr. Speaker, to call to public attention the serious plight facing workers in the rubber-footwear industry. Some of the nonreciprocal trade agreements negotiated by our State Department are resulting in reduced standards of living in this country.

Since 1933 import duties on both waterproof and rubber-soled canvas footwear have been applied on the American selling-price principle. While this did not totally discourage imports, it did afford some measure of protection to the American workingman. Under this system labor costs in this country were a consideration in the amount of duty paid. There is now a movement afoot to abandon this system and to apply duties on invoice value. Not content to strangle the rubber worker economically in only this one regard, the diplomatic "bright boys" are preparing to negotiate the present 25-percent to 35-percent tariff rates downward at a reciprocal-trade conference later this year.

Let me state unequivocally that employees in the rubber-footwear industry and their families will not long tolerate this complete disregard for their welfare. In the town of Naugatuck, Conn., alone more than 3,000 are employed in the manufacture of rubber footwear and allied products. Many thousands more depend upon the continued prosperity of this single facility. Most of the manufacturing plants for rubber footwear are located in the two New England States of Massachusetts and Connecticut. Is it not enough that every administration policy seems dedicated to removal of these industries to other sections of the country?

Indignity is heaped upon indignity, and it is now proposed that we relinquish employment and manufacturing opportunities to the Russian satellite, Czechoslovakia. It is proposed that slave labor in a nationalized, Communist industry compete evenly with free Americans paid a decent, living wage.

How, in Heaven's name, can a Congress representing the American people countenance this outright give-away of the birthright of citizens of the United States? All anyone asks, in this instance, is the opportunity to be employed at a task of one's own choosing.

I call upon Congress to reject any proposal which would substitute the principle of invoking tariff duties on invoice or foreign value rather than upon the American selling price principle. This thesis was upheld by two former Presidents, Herbert Hoover in 1933 and Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1937.

I submit for inclusion, with these remarks, a letter from the president of the Goodyear Rubber Co., Middletown, Conn., and the Case for Rubber Footwear:

GOODYEAR RUBBER CO.,
Middletown, Conn., March 7, 1950.

The Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Once again the American rubber footwear industry is facing a serious threat from foreign imports and from efforts of our Government to encourage further the flow of manufactured goods from abroad. As one of the thousand American manufacturers, we appeal to you to use your good offices to obtain for us the protection we need to continue to operate and provide jobs for our present employees.

At the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Conference in Geneva, 1947, the duty on waterproof rubber footwear was cut virtually in half. Since that time, imports, especially from Czechoslovakia, have increased steadily and have reached dangerous proportions.

Now two new developments are in the making in Washington. The more serious is the attempt to abolish the American selling price principle, under which duties on waterproof and rubber-soled canvas footwear now are applied. This method was invoked by President Hoover in 1930 and continued in 1937 by President Roosevelt. It is our understanding that the provision to remove the essential protection of the American selling price principle is contained in a bill, now being drafted, to revise procedures of the Bureau of Customs.

From our long experience in competing with goods made abroad with cheap labor, we know that the removal of the protection given under the American selling price principle will have disastrous results on the American footwear industry. Facts and reasons supporting our position are given in concise form in the booklet the Case for Rubber Footwear, issued by the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., which we are sending with his letter.

The second development which we anticipate is involved in the next conference on reciprocal trade announced for September of this year. It is expected that the American delegates will offer to negotiate the tariff on rubber-soled canvas shoes. We are cognizant of the force a reduction in this duty would do us in particular and the industry generally; and we respectfully urge you to do whatever you can to prevent such a reduction.

At present, the duty is 35 percent based on the American selling price. While this may appear to the uninformed as a high duty, we have evidence that even today rubber-soled canvas footwear is being offered for delivery in New York far below the lowest American price, and far below the point at which American manufacturers can hope to compete successfully for their own domestic market.

Within the past 20 years, the American rubber footwear manufacturers have on two occasions satisfied the proper governmental officials and the President of the United States that it needed tariff protection for its very existence. We respectfully ask you to help us retain this essential protection.

Your interest in this matter is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully,

THE GOODYEAR RUBBER CO.,
ALBERT A. LAPTOW, President.

THE CASE FOR RUBBER FOOTWEAR

The rubber footwear industry is an American enterprise.

It was founded by Americans more than 100 years ago. Although its early history is vague, 1843 is generally accepted as the year of its birth.

It was developed by Americans and American manufacturers have been foremost in the promotion of design, quality, and efficiency.

The American pioneers in the rubber footwear industry had the entire world for their market.

While foreign competition was developing, American manufacturers maintained their leadership in the world markets for more than three-quarters of a century.

This leadership in the export field was lost in the late twenties to Japan and Czechoslovakia.

United States Department of Commerce statistics tell dramatically how American manufacturers of rubber footwear were driven virtually out of the export field by Japan and Czechoslovakia.

In 1919 American manufacturers accounted for more than half the total world exports of footwear. In 1935 (the last year the Department of Commerce issued its report) the American exports were just over 1 percent.

The decline of the United States and the ascendency of Japan and Czechoslovakia are graphically shown in the following table showing percentages of total world exports of rubber footwear (waterproof and rubber-soled canvas):

1913:	
United States	58.87
Japan	0
Czechoslovakia	0
1924:	
United States	34.71
Japan	2.95
Czechoslovakia	0
1935:	
United States	17.24
Japan	29.15
Czechoslovakia	.38
1936:	
United States	1.11
Japan	62.83
Czechoslovakia	7.80

NOTE.—For the sake of brevity the above table covers the Department of Commerce report in 5-year steps, except for 1936 which was the last year the report was published.

These foreign competitors who swallowed the world markets and moved menacingly into the domestic market contributed nothing new to the development of rubber footwear. They merely copied American designs and American methods.

Their sole advantage was cheap labor which enabled them to undersell American manufacturers in their own markets.

These foreign offerings did not in the slightest expand the domestic market. Each pair of imported rubber footwear sold to American buyers simply took the place of an American pair which either remained unsold on the dealer's shelf or unmade by the higher-paid American workman.

In 1932 the influx of rubber footwear imports was so great the Tariff Commission made an investigation of costs in both the foreign and the domestic industries and reported to President Hoover.

The threat to the American rubber-footwear industry was so serious, that President Hoover issued a proclamation making duties on rubber footwear applicable on the American selling-price basis. The rates of duty (25 percent on waterproof and 35 percent on canvas) remained unchanged, but they applied to the domestic selling price of American-made footwear like or similar to the imported articles. Prior to the Hoover proclamation these rates were assessed generally against the invoice or foreign value of the imports.

This saved the American industry.

In 1937, when the Czechoslovakian Trade Treaty was under consideration, President Roosevelt sustained the action taken by President Hoover and refused to negotiate on rubber footwear.

Shortly after the conclusion of the Czechoslovakian Trade Treaty, the world started on its path to total war and for the next decade there was no import problem. With the end of the war, foreign manufacturers turned their eyes toward the American market.

Czechoslovakian rubber footwear manufacturers—now nationalized—began shipping their products into the United States. American manufacturers were aware of the danger that threatened. They realized that the margin of protection granted by two past Presidents would be ineffectual if the Czechoslovakian Government chose to use its nationalized rubber-footwear industry to obtain dollar credits in the United States.

It was at this time—1947—that the American delegation to the Reciprocal Trade Conference in Geneva granted to Czechoslovakia concessions on waterproof rubber footwear, which, for practical purposes, cut the American duty in half.

The trade treaty became effective in April, 1948.

Czechoslovakia accelerated its exports of rubber footwear to the United States. Receipts up to the present are not large when compared to American production, but they are steadily increasing.

The imports are priced at from 20 percent to 40 percent under the usual American prices. The presence of even a small amount of low-price goods in an industry as seasonable as rubber footwear can be most upsetting to the market. The least damage is the retarding of buying. Inventories are piling up more than usual as American manufacturers build against expectation and store the finished goods in order to provide continuous employment for their workers.

While it is normal to build up some inventory in this period of the year, gambling on economic and weather conditions 6 months or more ahead, the industry's hazards are increased this year by the foreign offerings in the market and the threat of unknown future importations under the reduced tariffs.

Unrestrained importation of rubber footwear can lead only to the curtailment of the American industry, and probable failure of some companies.

It will not put more rubber footwear on American feet.

The domestic industry—except during the recent war when it was restricted to the manufacture of military footwear and a limited list of essential civilian items—always has been able to supply the public demand for its goods. Every year in its history its manufacturers have carried over substantial inventories from one season to the next.

Imported rubber footwear, produced by workmen whose wage level is far below American rates, may give the public the questionable benefit of temporary lower prices. Such imports are priced low because they have to be to compete. No guarantee is given that they will remain low if they can oust their competition from the market.

If American manufacturers are forced by such competition to cut prices below what sound business demands, the differences must come out of the manufacturers' pockets or out of their workmen's wages, or both.

Is the American rubber footwear industry worth saving?

There are 13 companies engaged in the manufacture of standard line rubber footwear. They produce 98 percent of the rubber footwear made in the United States. Several specialties manufacturers account for the remaining 2 percent.

These 13 have given steady employment to more than 20,000 men and women. An unusually high percentage of the industry's costs are for labor. In 1948 factory salaries and wages were 47 percent of total factory costs.

Since the end of the war the industry has produced rubber footwear with an annual average value of well over $100,000,000 at the wholesale level.

During the war the industry made more than 45,000,000 pairs of rubber footwear for the armed forces and at times half its capacity was devoted to military orders.

In addition, allocations of rubber—the most critically short war material—were made to enable the industry to produce a restricted list of civilian footwear which the Government held to be essential to the national health and welfare.

Is the American rubber footwear industry worth saving?

New Gouge for Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article, which appeared in the New Republic of March 13, 1950:

NEW GOUGE FOR CONSUMERS

(By Robert Wallace)

The petroleum interests which monopolize the Nation's natural-gas resources have found a new way to remove billions of dollars from the consumers' pockets and will soon begin doing so if Congress will pass one little law.

This bill, sponsored by Senators ROBERT KERR and ELMER THOMAS, of Oklahoma, and Representative ORREN HARRIS, Democrat, Arkansas, passed the House handily last summer; it is close to passage in the Senate today. If it does become law, the gas bills of 40,000,000 natural-gas consumers will rise by one hundred and thirty to five hundred and fifty million dollars annually, with total extra costs of four to sixteen billion dollars over a period of 30 years. These levies on cooking and on the heating and lighting of our homes will add to the immense fortunes of the Rockefellers, the Mellons, the Pews, the Phillipses, and the other monopoly combines which control the oil-and-gas industry.

The gas bill would prohibit the Federal Power Commission from regulating the prices charged by independent gas producers to the operators who pipe the gas to consumers and allow them to charge what the traffic will bear. Among these independents may be found Standard of New Jersey, Standard of New York, Standard of Indiana, Gulf, Shell, Sinclair, Phillips, Texas, and Cities Service. They are independent because they sell to the pipe-line companies but are not affiliated with them.

Representative ROBERT CROSSER, Democrat, of Ohio, who led the fight against the bill in the House, has named 24 of the gas producers who would profit by this bill. They are all mammoth corporations. Their total assets amounted to $14,000,000,000 in 1948 and their profits averaged 24 percent after taxes; they are hardly distressed companies in need of relief.

The backers of the bill maintain that if it passes, competition among the producers will keep both prices and profits down. They point out that the prices of coal and oil are not regulated by Government. Why not depend on competition to suppress prices in the gas industry as well?

The answer lies in the concentration of ownership in the production of natural gas and the monopolistic control of its distribution.

There are 2,300 gas producers who sell to interstate pipe-line companies. Three percent of them account for 70 percent of the sales. The seven Southwestern States of Arkansas, Kansas, Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Mississippi, and New Mexico contain nearly 90 percent of all the gas reserves in the country. There are 600 nontransporting gas producers, but only 12 of these producers sold more than half of all the gas going into interstate pipe lines from the Southwest.

Coal can be transported by truck, barge, or rail, and fuel oil can use these means as well as pipe lines. If prices are unreasonable at any particular coal mine or oil refinery, a buyer can get trucks or railroads to haul from another. For these reasons competition is at least feasible among the producers of coal and oil. But gas does not lend itself to such freedom. If a pipe-line company decides to buy gas from a particular field, it lays its pipe line. But if the producers in that field get together and raise their price, the company must either pay the increase or tear up the pipe line and lay a new one to a field with lower prices. Once a pipe line is laid, the competition of other fields is almost nil.

What about the possibility of competition among the various producers in a given field? Cannot one producer underbid another in the same area? The Federal Power Commission posed this question. It carried out studies of fields with combined reserves of 15.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. It found that in each case, one, two, or three companies owned from one-half to all of the natural gas.

Price fixing is, of course, contrary to the Sherman Antitrust Act. That means simply that companies which conspire to fix prices take care not to leave any documentary evidence lying around. Even though the same prices may be charged by all the producers in a single field, proof of conspiracy is hard to obtain.

From 1938, when the Natural Gas Act was passed, to 1947, the price of gas at the well was generally reasonable. Gas reserves, usually discovered during a search for oil, were considered a consolation prize and sometimes a liability. The FPC did not regulate the prices of the nontransporting gas producers during this period. But as the remarkable growth of pipeline companies created an ever-expanding demand for gas in the North, East, and other regions, prices at the wells soon began to skyrocket.

In recent years, gas prices have doubled and sometimes tripled. Speculation has been widespread and reserves have been held off the market in the expectation of even higher prices. Yet producers had one great apprehension—the possibility that the FPC might move in to protect the public by regulation.

The oil and gas lobby began a campaign during the Eightieth Congress to remove this possibility. Their campaign produced the Moore-Rizley bill, which undertook to prohibit regulation of the nontransporting producers and to permit the pipe-line companies which owned their own gas wells to charge higher prices to the tune of $50,000,000 a year.

The primary emphasis of the Moore-Rizley bill was placed on allowing higher prices for gas produced by pipe-line companies, since, up to that time, no real attempt had been made by the FPC to regulate the nontransporting gas producers. The bill failed. But the campaign of the lobby gained in force.

Early in 1948, the FPC completed a study of the natural-gas industry. It indicated the startling degree to which prices had gone up and the concentration of ownership of gas reserves increased. As a result of this study, Commissioner Leland Olds began his fight for regulation of the prices charged by the nontransporting producers. This effort to protect the public welfare cost Olds his job. Senators from the gas-producing States blocked his confirmation for another term.

The monopolists of the natural-gas industry had good reason to fear Olds. One struggle before the FPC involved the Phillips Petroleum Co. In 1945, the Michigan-Wisconsin Pipeline Co. contracted with the Phillips Petroleum Co. for gas at a price of 5 cents per 1,000 cubic feet. But after pipe-line construction was well under way, the contracts were renegotiated and additional contracts signed which increased the minimum price to 8.5 cents, with some gas going at 10 and 11 cents. Added yearly costs to consumers amounted to $5,000,000 in this case alone. The price had doubled in 4 years.

If the gas bill is defeated, the FPC will probably bring producers' gas prices under regulation and, while allowing a fair return on investment, will protect consumers from excessive charges. But if the Kerr bill passes, the gas industry will aim for the highest profits possible and will charge the limit. Natural-gas prices may well go as high as oil and coal on an equivalent heat-value basis, and perhaps higher, since the cleanliness of gas makes it preferable for domestic use. This is already the case in Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia, where gas costs more than other fuels.

If the price of gas rises in this way, it could ultimately increase as much as 20 cents per 1,000 cubic feet on an average for the whole country, assuming 1947 fuel-oil prices. Based on 1952 consumption, this would mean an ultimate annual increase of more than $500,000,000 in amounts paid by consumers to the big gas companies.

Were gas to increase by the more conservative estimate of 5 cents per 1,000 cubic feet—and it has already done so in some areas—consumers would still pay an extra $132,000,000 annually. Additional amounts paid out by the various regions would be approximately as follows:

Middle Atlantic States	$5,200,000
East North Central States	13,400,000
West North Central States	13,400,000
South Atlantic States	5,800,000
East South Central States	4,000,000
West South Central States	21,500,000
Mountain States	3,700,000
Pacific States	2,700,000

The strangest phenomenon shown here is that the consumers in the West-South Central region, containing the four States of Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Oklahoma, would suffer more than any other region if the gas bill becomes law, and yet this is largely where pressure for passage of the bill is coming from. While the big gas companies, having wells located in this region, would profit greatly, the consumers in the same region would be hard hit.

The fate of the gas bill will be decided very shortly in the Senate. Senators KERR, of Oklahoma, and JOHNSON of Texas, Democrats, backed by other Senators from gas-producing States, are leading the fight for the bill. Senator FRANCIS MYERS, of Pennsylvania, Democratic whip; Senator JAMES MURRAY, Democrat of Montana, veteran liberal, and Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, who also helped to lead the fight against the basing-point system, are leading the opposition. Senators AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont; KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee; HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and GILLETTE, Democrat, of Iowa, have also indicated a keen interest in fighting the gas bill.

The oil-and-gas lobby is, of course, all out for the bill. Labor and consumer groups as well as municipalities have begun to move into opposition.

Many Senators have not made up their minds on this issue, and the outcome will, to a much greater extent than usual, be decided on the basis of the debates and the mail basket. Rumors about President Truman's attitude continue to fly, but the Budget Bureau has stated that the bill is "not in accord with the President's program." As of this writing, the President has not repudiated this position. In view of his blasts at "special interests," it is difficult to imagine his accepting this bill. It is an outstanding example of the efforts of selfish interests to profit at the expense of the public welfare, against which he successfully campaigned.

Rulers of Red China Call on British To Negotiate Return of Hong Kong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting an article by Constantine Brown, columnist, which appeared in the Sunday Star, of Washington, D. C., of date March 12, 1950, with respect to a question which was of the utmost interest to the United States, that is, the recognition of the Red regime in China by the British Government and the abandonment of their, and our former, ally, the Chinese Nationalist Government.

Mr. Speaker, this seems to be one instance where British diplomacy will boomerang.

The article referred to is reproduced ex follows:

RULERS OF RED CHINA CALL ON BRITISH TO NEGOTIATE RETURN OF HONG KONG

(By Constantine Brown)

The new Chinese People's Republic has told the British representative, with whom it has been negotiating in Peiping, that it cannot accept Britain's recognition unless the British support Chinese Communist entry into the United Nations and are willing to negotiate the return of Hong Kong to China.

The first condition could easily be met by the London Government, since it officially has broken relations with the Nationalist regime. The situation is more difficult with respect to Hong Kong, the preservation of which was one of the main reasons for Britain's haste in recognizing Moscow's newest puppet.

The British administer the crown colony under a charter dated April 5, 1843. In recent years the Chinese have disputed British rights to that territory. At the Cairo conference in 1943 between President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek the generalissimo insisted on retrocession of Hong Kong to China, but eventually he yielded when Mr. Churchill reminded him and Mr. Roosevelt that he did not become His Majesty's First Minister in order to preside over the dissolution of the British Empire.

SITUATION GLOSSED OVER

Thus, while Manchuria and Formosa were "returned" to China, the question of Hong Kong was glossed over. Chiang did not press the matter, but Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai, the Chinese Communist leaders, pressed it.

They have now informed the British negotiator through a minor official of the Peiping Foreign Office that the question of Hong Kong must be discussed and settled before the Chinese People's Republic can consider the British offer to resume normal diplomatic relations. What the Chinese Communists now are asking is that Britain admit that Hong Kong is a mere leasehold, which they will pledge themselves to evacuate a number of years hence.

The actual time for the British departure is left open for negotiation. But the principle that the crown colony actually is a Chinese territory and eventually is to be returned to China must be settled before the Peiping government will agree to exchange Ambassadors with Great Britain.

The new situation may result in reversal of Britain's policy toward the Chinese Communists. There is an outside chance that Mr. Churchill, in agreement with the Government, will raise the question in the House of Commons, require Foreign Secretary Bevin to explain the status of the negotiations, and then force—by a vote of confidence if necessary—withdrawal of the preferred recognition of the Communist regime.

REVERSE OF ITS KIND

Strange as it seems, the Labor government rushed into recognition of the Peiping government at the pleading request of Britain's big business. Banking and export firms which have been making handsome profits in China for the last 150 years pleaded with Mr. Bevin to consider their vital interests rather than political and ethical considerations in dealing with the Moscow puppets.

Unable as they are to make good profits in socialistic Britain, businessmen are trying to revive their old trade with the Far East, where they once reigned supreme.

Since the requests of the business firms did not conflict with the ideology of the Labor Party, the British Government decided to recognize the Communist regime in China about 3 months ago. The Foreign Office and the old "China hands" were taken back, however, when the Communist leaders were less than lukewarm to this offer of recognition.

Because of Britain's past prestige in the Far East, the Government and businessmen believed that Mao Tse-tung and Chou Enlai would accept eagerly the extended hand of British friendship. Instead, both Chinese leaders went for a long stay in Moscow, and the British diplomat assigned to negotiate resumption of relations was left cooling his heels in Hong Kong. He could not get a permit to enter Communist China.

Normally the British would have been indignant at the insult by the Chinese Reds and would have ordered their diplomat back to Britain. Eventually the Foreign Office representative received a visa to go to Peiping. He was received by underlings in the Peiping Foreign Office, who transmitted to him the conditions under which China was willing to consider conversations leading to eventual resumption of normal relations.

From Dear Hearts, Gentle People, a New West Springfield Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, the country already knows about the famous Springfield plan which is mentioned in the accompanying newspaper article.

I also want to call the attention of the Members of Congress to another plan in a neighboring community called the West Springfield plan. I hope all the Members will take the time to read the description of it.

FROM DEAR HEARTS, GENTLE PEOPLE, A NEW WEST SPRINGFIELD PLAN

A few years ago much was heard about the so-called Springfield plan, the basis of which was the very simple idea that people of different races and creeds can get along together and work toward common desirable objectives.

The plan caught hold and received national attention. Books were written about it, magazines and newspapers sent special writers to Springfield to see it in action, and the radio used it effectively in programs designed to stimulate neighborliness and fair play.

WORLD-WIDE IMPACT

Indeed, the good that grew out of the Springfield plan cannot be measured, and the spirit it engendered spread throughout the country and, via our soldiers in foreign lands, was known even in far corners of the world.

GI's serving overseas from this area came to be asked about the Springfield plan.

There was a heartening contagion about this idea, as people of good will everywhere sought to uproot prejudice and promote better understanding.

It was and is such a good and effective idea that it is worth a new impetus, and the purpose of this article is to suggest that West Springfield furnish fresh drive for the spirit that created it.

Let's have a West Springfield plan.

Since this is already the Friendly Town, bustling with dear hearts and gentle people, it would be quite in line with our normal outlook to seize hold of this idea of community good will and give it a new fling that it might light other fires of good will in other good hearts.

DIVIDE AND DESTROY

If there is any enemy at work today seeking to destroy America or what America stands for—and there are signs that we have such foe—certainly one of the weapons they are turning loose against us is that which seeks to divide, that we might be the more easily conquered.

Beware the whispered word that seeks to poison our mind against a neighbor!

Tear through the insidious insinuations that seek to lump all those of opposite color or creed in separate camp, that would have us build fences to keep out fellow citizens.

Remember, that whatever our differences, nothing is so vital in the world today as that men of good will should stand together.

Some such slogan might be the basis of a West Springfield plan.

It takes more than writing about it, of course to make such a plan. The community must practice it.

There is ample opportunity in many existing frameworks, which by simple recognition of a West Springfield plan and extension of program could make it a vital force in the community.

ALREADY AT WORK

Already it is a dominating factor in some of our groups, such as the West Springfield neighborhood house, where program and good will cut through all superficial barriers of race and creed.

In our schools, both public and parochial, there is much to encourage the fundamental allegiances that make for a strong democracy and effective brotherhood.

Indeed, in almost every circle within the community there is a force for the West Springfield plan. A consciousness of the objectives could rouse a considerable activity town-wide in impact which could thrust this community into the forefront of a movement world-wide in scope.

There is no lack of good will in West Springfield, but even the most optimistic among us knows full well what opportunity there is for amplifying and insuring the continuity of this good will.

BUT NEEDING LEADER

It requires intelligent program and some effort to promote a plan such as this. The latent materials are at hand. The leadership is needed.

The importance of the work is beyond dispute in this troubled day. The reward is peace.

Atomic Crisis Needs Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following interesting article written by Judge Thomas F. Quinn, of Boston, Mass., and appearing in the Boston Post of March 5, 1950:

ATOMIC CRISIS NEEDS ACTION—KNOWLEDGE OF FISSION GIVES NATIONS TOO POWERFUL WEAPON—CHANGE IN UN CHARTER CAN HELP

(By Judge Thomas F. Quinn)

We have heard much about social security. We recognize and we are concerned with a general insecurity. In a free America these concerns may not be left to a select few.

The aggravated atomic crisis confronting all of us requires more than receptive bravery. It requires an insistent demand by the people for action broad enough to deal with and control this unleashed power.

Social security forever more on this earth depends upon peace between nations. The world-wide knowledge of atomic fission and thermonuclear weapons has placed in the hands of nations and in the control of national political leaders, war weapons sufficient to destroy all life on earth. The Russians may match and outdo us. We may match and outdo the Russians. It appears certain that on such a course we will both undo each other, undo other nations, undo future generations, and social security to boot.

Our national leaders in aid of our defense have done much more than authorize extermination weapons. Confronted by a cruel and tyrannical Soviet expansionism that has marched into Europe, that has crushed peoples as far as the Danube, that has swept over Asia to the Pacific, that has infiltrated its agents of hatred and fury amongst all the peoples on earth, we have moved slowly but inexorably to create a common defense with all people outside the iron curtain.

IN MANY FIELDS

We have moved in the field of international politics, with economic aid to other nations, with economic aid to our own citizens to secure our internal stability, with military arms to those who will stand for freedom and justice and honor. We are participants with nations abroad in Atlantic and Mediterranean defense pacts in which an armed attack on any national signatory is regarded as an attack on all so bound.

We are sharing in the physical protection of the countries of North Africa and southern Asia. We are pouring our wealth into many lands without hope of any return other than a common sustenance. We have encouraged a European economic union. We look with favor upon stability in Europe in a community of nations or through federation. We are aiding upon the rearmament of England and part of the European Continent. We have bolstered the United Nations Organizations with hope for their future. Our national political leaders, our officials, our industrialists, our bankers, have not been idle.

COLD WAR HOT CONTEST

After all these temporizing activities, where do we find ourselves? What of our security? We find ourselves directly or indirectly cheek by jowl with Communist militarism in every corner of the world. We find ourselves engaged in a cold war that is in fact about the hottest contest in the history of mankind, with no normal interchange of goods or services or information with the mass of humanity imprisoned by the Soviet war machine. We find humanity marshaled or joined in two great camps, madly testing great instruments for mass destruction.

There is no earthly security through our present split global arrangements. The mere marshaling of human labor to produce the enormously expensive and burdensome instruments of destruction will corrode a free society, and soon may wipe out any extensive holdings of private industry or any proper individual economic freedom. The two great armed camps are likely to destroy earthly freedom without moving into any explosive action. If they move, they are likely to destroy life on earth. In any event, we, the people, cannot permit the development of destructive power to move on to obliterate our lives or our freedom.

Our political leaders do not like this situation. The Russians could not be so stupid as to be either apathetic or content with their position. None wish to be the Pied Pipers of doom. Where then is the path through the maze? Where are the chains that bar the road to sanity and peace, that we may cut them?

MILITARISTIC CHAINS

We should consider whether the chains that bind all of us are militaristic chains now united with the chains of nationalism. Nationalism is good and proper and necessary for national affairs. The militaristic chains are so monumental now that they have become galling in the common affairs of all mankind. Atomic fission is such a common affair. Mass destruction is such a common affair.

The basic power to cut these chains lies under God with the people of the world. May we use any part of the United Nations to institute the organization of this power of the people? I think so. The preamble of the Charter of the United Nations, placing the source of authority in the peoples of the United Nations, sets forth a determination to live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, and "to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security."

A proposal for amendment to the Charter might be made in the Assembly in accordance with article 108, so that regulation adequate for survival may be vested in the United Nations free of veto in the Security Council. The ultimate objective would be to activate and implement all the structures of the United Nations to their proper ends, but we are considering initially only a resurgence of the spirit and the will of the peoples of the world for definite and effective controls of armaments.

COULD SPONSOR PROPOSAL

Our Congress, by joint resolution, might direct our representatives in the United Nations to sponsor the initial proposal. This proposal might affirm that the security of the peoples of the world is endangered by weapons for mass destruction, and by the inability of member nations to formulate separate agreements adequate for national defense and for the supervision and control of such weapons.

Then we would sponsor an amendment to chapter V, article 27, by adding after the words "including the concurring votes of the permanent members" the words "excepting votes upon any and all destructive armament the maintenance of which shall be regulated by the Security Council upon principles common to all nations by votes of two-thirds of the members, and for said purposes of regulation, complete and continuous rights of inspection in every part of every member nation are granted to the Security Council." This amendment would be effective upon adoption in accordance with provisions of chapter XVIII, article 108.

It seems to me that such an amendment under present conditions would not impair the right and duty of the Congress to provide for the common defense. International regulation upon principles common to all nations may be the most effective and practical way now to insure our defense. We will be obligated to abide by these common regulations only upon assent by all the permanent members of the Security Council, including the Soviet. We grant none of our sovereignty, nor any part of our domestic responsibility. It is about as far as we may expect other nations to advance now with us.

We must act boldly for the security of all people. If we fail to act we leave ourselves and all the world in serious and imminent danger. If others fail to agree to regulation, world opinion may arise in a more common unity with us to impel common protection.

CAN HAVE NO ILLUSIONS

We should have no illusion that a mere writing of words or a mere agreement in words will keep the peace. International regulation of destructive armaments, including the elimination of certain types of weapons, and the limitation of others, may provide further time for the people to lay the foundations for a enduring peace.

Common inspections will generate common talk at the peoples' level. Common concern to alleviate suffering in most depressed areas should give rise to considerable common action to that end. Reasonable access to the most important natural resources upon fair terms should be facilitated and encouraged. We should study with other peoples the intricate task of developing fair exchanges of all necessary goods and services. In short, we should acquire time to search for peace, and we should use that time to reduce the economic causes of war. We must activate our proclaimed spirit of good will by sacrifices necessary to save humanity.

Some may say that this program means communism for all of us, however good our intentions, and that Red Riding Hood with her market basket will never survive against the wicked revolutionary gutter tactics of the big bad wolf. There is that danger. But why send Red Riding Hood? After all, we are talking about human beings—Russian human beings—with whom we propose to compete and cooperate, depressed human beings that we propose to place on their own two feet, human beings all over the world who react very much as we do.

I think that many of our business leaders may think too narrowly, but for weal or woe we are world leaders and the best that we have, backed up by the most skillful free people on earth will not be afraid to tackle any necessary economic assignment on the face of the earth.

NEED PLANNING AND HELP

We need not lose our right to hold all the private property necessary to our freedom. We do need guidance and planning and governmental help to reconvert haphazard processing for domestic waste to a balanced abundance for domestic and foreign peoples.

If we can find the way to turn our energies away from the destructive armaments now fabricated by our taxes, to useful goods, the distribution of which may be accomplished by similar taxes, we may save the lives of our children. A common survival need not mean stagnation. A common survival need not mean loss of individuality or of any appropriate freedom.

On the path that I indicate lies the hope of survival. We may remember that the path of good will is our only hope of reaching temporal security, and if it lends us hope for fair days hereafter we might try that together, for we are all headed that way.

Federal Officers or Employees Convicted of a Felony in Connection With Their Service Should Be Barred From Annuity Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, any Federal officer or employee, including a Member of Congress, who commits a felony in connection with the conduct of his office should forfeit any claim he may have to a Federal contribution to retirement benefits. Affronted faithless to his trust, he should not ask the Government to assist in paying the cost of a retirement annuity appropriately awarded to conscientious and faithful public servants. His only right should be to recover the amount of his own contributions to the retirement fund.

Chapter 15 of title 18, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," contains provisions relating to the conduct of Federal officers and employees, including Members of Congress. I am today introducing a bill to add a new section to this chapter to provide that anyone convicted of a felony committed in connection with his service as an officer or employee of the Government shall receive no award of annuity under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act. One so convicted, under this measure, will only be repaid the amount credited to his individual account arising from his own contributions to the fund less any sum which he may already have received on an annuity previously awarded.

Conviction of a felony already carries with it forfeiture of the franchise and frequently disqualification from holding an office of honor or trust in the Government. Certainly when an offense has to do with the performance of one's official duties, conviction should carry with it loss of the benefits designed to reward those who serve with integrity and fidelity. Insofar as pension rights derive from the purse of the American public, they have a right to insist that malefactors in office shall not share in the annuity benefits which they provide.

It may be argued with considerable force that the bill I have offered does not go far enough in that it is limited to a conviction of a felony committed in connection with or related to the service of the Federal officer or employee. It may be considered desirable by the Committee on the Judiciary to extend these punitive provisions to one convicted of any felony whatever. I have endeavored, however, to design a measure which would have the widest possible support. Thinking it might be contended that conviction of a felony provided in some of the States statutes or arising possibly as the outgrowth of political rivalries should not carry with it this additional penalty, I have limited the applicability of this legislative proposal strictly to malfeasance in office.

The fact that Members of Congress under existing law might profit from their own wrongdoing at the expense of the public makes it imperative that we act and act quickly to indicate our recognition of the need for change in existing law. The preservation of public respect for Federal officials is essential to the successful functioning of our form of government. This is an issue upon which we cannot afford to delay or equivocate.

The Red Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the March 11, 1950, issue of the New York Journal-American relative to famine in China which is the rest of the Communist conquest of that country:

THE RED FAMINE

In the wake of the Communist conquest of China has come the inevitable tragedy of a helpless and hopeless nation whose bewildered people have been uprooted from their homes and their productive lives.

Infinitely worse than the destruction and devastating Red conquest of China is the ensuing Red famine.

Ten millions of the Chinese people will surely die of starvation in the next few weeks, and ultimately as many as 70,000,000 may perish—a horror of such vast proportions that the annals of human history may be searched in vain for a parallel.

This is happening because the conquering Communist armies have swept through the land like thieves and locusts.

The available supplies of food have been confiscated for the use of the Communists alone, leaving the masses of the people to starve and die.

The people are not planting new crops, because they would only feed those whose ruthless and crushing heel is on the neck of China.

So the great Red famine is stalking throughout the land and spreading like a plague to the uttermost reaches of the enslaved and agonized country.

There is no relief for China in this grim disaster, for only the Communists are in a position to help the people and, of course, it is the Communists who have caused the disaster and are reaping the gruesome profits from it in terms of the power and authority they are now able to wield over the people and at their expense.

The bitter irony in this situation arises from the fact that China has many friends among the nations of the world, but none of them can help her.

None of China's friends are more able and willing to help than America, but Americans too must sit back and watch China die.

Communism has brought this ghastly tragedy to China, as to all other countries that have fallen under its evil spell, even and especially Soviet Russia itself.

It is not a new experience in world history for famine and pestilence and death to descend upon a people, in the wake of conquerors who have laid the land waste by despoiling it.

But it is new for all the rest of the world to be compelled to stand by helplessly while the whole work of horror is wrought, not by the violent acts of nature but by the deliberate designs of evil men.

The Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the one question uppermost in the minds of the American people today is economy in Government. This is especially true now when we are all called upon to pay our Federal income tax and it certainly does not make us any more anxious to pay our taxes when we realize that much of the money paid is wasted in unnecessary and unessential governmental spending.

At the beginning of the present session of Congress, President Truman estimated that the 1951 deficit would be $5,100,000,000. Last year the President estimated that the deficit this year would be $300,000,000. He could, of course, be just as wrong on the 1951 estimate as he was this year, in which event the deficit could be considerably more than the present estimate.

Based on the President's present estimate, the 1951 budget is $8,200,000,000 more than the expenditures in 1948. Under the 1951 budget, domestic civilian expenditures—exclusive of veterans and interest—would total $12,250,000,000 as compared with $6,900,000,000 in 1948, and $11,400,000,000 estimated for 1950. This amount for non-war-connected purposes is far more than the total budget, including defense, foreign, veterans, and interest, in any peacetime year before the war.

In this budget, foreign expenditures are reduced by $1,800,000,000 and domestic expenditures are increased by nearly a billion dollars, indicating that as foreign expenditures and recovery programs are decreased, expenditures are to be increased for domestic programs.

As the budget now stands, the proposed program for the military will cost more than any year since demobilization was completed in 1948—this in spite of the fact that this will be the third year of unifications, which was to materially reduce the cost of the armed services.

Frankly, I am opposed to many of the policies financed in the pending budget, and I think it imperative that we reduce, rather than increase, our governmental expenditures and make a sincere effort to balance the budget. No other big business could long continue deficit spending, and, in my opinion, neither can the Federal Government. It is the responsibility of the Congress alone to appropriate money for Federal expenditures, and I sincerely hope we will make a real effort to reduce Government spending and try to balance the budget.

Too many people are asking the Federal Government to perform the functions of State and municipal governments. Too many people want to lean upon the Government. Too many people are thinking of security instead of opportunity. Too many people are going to sleep dreaming of economic security guaranteed by the Government, and I fear they will wake up in a nightmare of austerity guaranteed by socialism.

We are today spending more than tax revenue justifies. Without adopting any of the new programs urged by the administration, it is conservatively estimated that during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, we will have spent between five and seven billion dollars more than our income, but if we adopt all of those new programs, no one can tell exactly how much we will have to borrow. We do know, however, that deficit financing as a result of spending beyond our revenue is destroying the purchasing power of the dollar, destroying the value of every insurance policy, every deposit, every pension, social security, and so forth.

Today our banks have more money on deposit than ever before in peacetime history. Farmers are reasonably prosperous. Few factories are idle. More men are employed than ever before, and our people are better fed and better clothed. If our Government cannot live within the national income today, what will it do should we have a serious recession in business?

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, has submitted a budget to the Senate amounting to $36,000,000,000, a cut in the 1951 budget of $6,000,000,000. I have no doubt the affairs of Government could be efficiently carried on with this amount. We must economize and we must confine our expenditures to conform to our income. If we do not reduce our expenditures, we necessarily will have to increase taxes by more than $7,000,000,000, if we expect to preserve the purchasing power of the dollar. God knows none of us want to raise taxes, because taxes are already so high that they are choking the life out of the incentive to do business.

I am confident that achievement of a sound balanced budget would reaffirm the confidence of the public in prospects of our continued solvency, and strengthen the private-enterprise system which is our basic form of government. This confidence is based upon the conviction that a sound and reasonable budget would—

First. Balance the budget and create a surplus sufficient to justify correction of tax inequalities and injustices which admittedly exist, and this might provide a business stimulus to pave the way for tax reductions.

Second. Break the momentum of deficit financing policies.

Third. Dispel the fear of private enterprise inherent in Government encroachment through public debt and by Federal controls which lead to socialism.

Fourth. Stimulate constructive investment, development, and expansion in industry and agriculture for the production of more of the still tremendous backlog of things people everywhere need and desire at prices they can pay.

Fifth. Put savings to work through private enterprise creating the wealth which is required to lift the great millstone of debt from our backs and leave us erect with the dignity of a sufficient and creative people, free and unregimented in the pursuit of happiness.

Should we accept Senator BYRD's recommendation of a $36,000,000,000 budget, it would result in a saving of $108,000,000 a year for the people of Maryland, which is about one-seventh of the amount of Federal taxes paid in Maryland in a year. I was interested in reading the following editorial in the Baltimore Sun of February 27, 1950:

WHAT FEDERAL BUDGET PRUNING COULD MEAN TO MARYLANDERS

When someone suggests a pruning program for the multi-billion-dollar Federal budget, the average person, if he gives the suggestion any thought, is very likely to push it hurriedly out of his mind with a frustrated "So what?" That is so because the Federal budget is too big and complicated for the average person to be able to translate a pruning program into anything remotely resembling personal pocket-saving terms.

Senator BYRD has now come forward with a statistical table which should be of great help to those who want to know what Federal budget pruning could mean to them. The table shows how much the taxpayers of each State would save if the Byrd plan to cut the Truman budget proposal were to be adopted. The cut would reduce the budget from $42,400,000,000 to $36,000,000,000.

The result in savings to Marylanders would be $108,000,000. What would that mean in terms of reducing the taxpayers' burden in this State? To make a comparable saving in State taxes it would be necessary to slash the State budget by 70 percent. That would then allow the elimination of the State sales tax, income tax, gasoline tax, property tax, alcoholic-beverage taxes, automobile taxes (licenses, titling, etc.) race-track taxes, inheritance taxes and half of the tuitions at the University of Maryland.

There were loud cheers when Governor Lane put forth his plan to reduce the State tax burden by $3,750,000. But that reduction, welcome as it is, is chicken feed in comparison to the saving that would accrue to Maryland taxpayers if Senator Byrd's plan to prune the Federal budget were adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote at every opportunity for a reduction in governmental expenditures, and I firmly believe that if we all try, we can keep the budget within the $36,000,000,000 a year recommended by Senator BYRD.

American Legion Supports Cooperative Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1950.

Hon. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'BRIEN: The American Legion at its national convention in 1949 unanimously endorsed Senate bill 2246 having to do with housing legislation. The House last year passed part of that legislation in H. R. 6070 and will soon consider H. R. 7402, which includes cooperative housing and other perfecting amendments. The American Legion strongly urges the passage of H. R. 7402.

Prior to our endorsement of the cooperative housing proposal we gave it serious and conscientious study. We consider it to be in keeping with the private-enterprise system and we cannot agree with the objections raised by its opponents.

In passing H. R. 6070 last year the House eliminated the direct loan back-up for veterans. The American Legion respectfully urges that this provision be added as an amendment to H. R. 7402 or that it be agreed to in conference between the Senate and House conferees. The American Legion further urges that no action be taken that would increase the rate of interest under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act beyond 4 percent.

Thanking you for your favorable consideration of the above, and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director, National Legislative Committee.

Unions Necessary, But Improvement Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, few familiar with industrial problems object to unions which obey the law, maintain fair play in their own organizations as well as in their disputes with employers.

From the Allegan Gazette of March 6 comes an editorial written in answer to the president of a local union who evidently can see no fault in unions or their practices.

One thing union men apparently forget and that is that as wages to meet the increased cost of living go up, so does the cost of living.

The remedy? You ask. A return to the law of supply and demand. Following that law there is always some injustice, some inequality, but the injustice and inequality are far less when we stick to nature's laws than when man attempts to avoid those laws, run the universe under those he makes.

Prices for everyone sometimes are too high, sometimes too low, but never, so far as I can recall, has there been as much injustice as under the laws which we have recently used in our so-called planned economy. All one needs to do to realize this is to think of the price the grower receives for potatoes, the price the consumer pays, and the subsidy paid by the taxpayers generally. Nor need we confine our argument to potatoes. The same result in greater or less degree has followed every attempt of every Government to fix prices.

The editorial is as follows:

UNIONISM AT ITS WORST

For the past month the people of this country have seen unionism at its worst. During that period, union coal miners in mobs up to as many as 1,000 men have roamed through the coal districts attacking nonunion coal workers and operators, destroying property, and kidnaping workers; all in an attempt to enforce union will upon the people of this country.

To be more specific, a mob dynamited two loading docks at Brockway, Pa., the explosions damaging 30 nearby homes and stores and injuring 3 women living nearby. Damage to the docks was estimated at $9,000 and to private property (homes and stores) at $3,000.

On the same day a mob chased a truck driver to his home at Grafton, W. Va. There this man surrendered to the mob so as not to endanger his family. The mob then took this man to a mine and attempted to question him relative to nonunion activities, telling him when he refused to talk that they would refresh his memory. At the mine, police rescued him from the mob.

Near Murraysville mobs destroyed property and attempted to ignite coal piles by throwing Molotov cocktails.

More recently two nonunion mines were blasted by dynamite northwest of Birmingham, Ala., total damage estimated at $115,000.

Last September at one of these mines, owners and employees defended the mine against an armed attack by 300 pickets and

in the pitched battle one of the pickets was killed by a shotgun blast.

These are just examples of what has been going on in the coal districts for the past month.

According to the Department of Labor, the coal miners for the year 1949 received a pay averaging $76.32 a week.

During this period of violence union mobs have committed arson, assault and battery, kidnaping, malicious destruction of property, and felonies by the score, all under the benevolent pretext of advancing the cause of unionism.

Meanwhile, President Truman has done practically nothing to prevent what we believe is civil war.

We predict that the United States Government headed by Truman will in the end take over the coal industry, surrender to the union mobs, and give them whatever it is that they want.

If Mr. Gibson thinks that this is kicking the wrong dog we will publish any reply he chooses to make provided he limits it to a half column and provided it is in answer to this editorial.

Today Russia Is Really a Weakling and Not a Tower of Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, we hear and read a great deal these days about the war might of the U. S. S. R. and perhaps most of us who are not too well informed on the subject anyhow, and have not resorted to individual thinking, are prone to believe implicitly what we have heard and read on the subject.

In the March issue of the National Grange Monthly, beginning at page 12, appears a most enlightening article written by Mr. J. T. Sanders, legislative journal of the United States Department of Labor, entitled "Russian and American Food Potentials," which is a real eye opener for everyone who will take the time to read it.

The real test of the war might of any nation is not its population, or its soldiery, or its battle armament, but its food and water supply and the efficiency of its networks of transportation facilities.

A great American general once said that an army marches on its soldiers' bellies, and that statement is as true today as it was when it was first spoken. The last war proved that fact when almost invincible forts, such as Corregidor fell, largely for the want of food and water. So also on other theaters of World War II activities, food supply and the ability to move it, if it was available, where needed, were the controlling factors and upon which was spelled out either defeat or victory.

This splendid article, which I recommend to my readers, is as follows:

RUSSIAN AND AMERICAN FOOD POTENTIALS

(J. T. Sanders)

One very important difference between the economic position of Russia and the United States, the difference in costs of food supplies, is often overlooked in comparing the present and future economic strength of the two nations. Despite the popular belief of the contrary, Russia is and will continue to be at a great disadvantage to the United States in abundant and cheap food to feed a rapidly growing population.

Take a look at the simple table on this page and note the present great disadvantage of Soviet Russia compared with the United States. These figures were issued by the United States Department of Labor and reveal that, measured in terms of the unweighted average of the seven basic foods shown, Russia now pays for a composite pound of food 16 times as many minutes of toil and sweat as we do. Part of this great difference is the greater degree of mechanization and efficiency on American farms. How much is due to this we do not hazard a guess. Despite their 30 years of intensive totalitarian efforts to collectivize and mechanize farms it certainly would be humiliating, I should think, for the Communists to admit this, although they must know that their farmers are far behind American farmers in mechanization and efficiency. We are convinced Russia's farmers will never equal ours in this respect; but this is not the main purpose of our discussion. Our main purpose is to show that there are important reasons other than basic inefficiencies in the two kinds of economies, which account for this extraordinary difference in the cost of foods in Russia and the United States. One very significant reason is the unbelievably great handicap of transportation that hangs like a millstone around everything that Russia does. The word "transportation" should be written in bold letters across all Russia's 5-year plans to remind her of handicaps that she must overcome to surpass her hated capitalistic America. Here is surely the physical Achilles' heel of Russia.

If one could accurately measure the physical cost of moving a bale of American cotton from Chickasha, Okla., to Moscow, and a bale from the Russian cotton-growing areas around Tashkent to Moscow, he would find that the shipment of the Oklahoma bale costs considerably less. Shipping a commodity 2,000 miles over a desert most of the way is indeed expensive freight, especially when the railway is mainly supported by a one-way haul.

Minutes of labor required to pay for a pound of various indigenous foods in the United States and U. S. S. R.

[Basic data from Labor Review, November 1949, of U. S. Department of Labor]

	Minutes of labor required to buy a pound of—							
	Flour	Rice	Beef	Butter	Milk	Egg	Sugar	Unweighted average of 7 foods
United States	8	5	29	32	9	27	4	16
U. S. S. R.	52	145	254	542	50	158	141	264
U. S. S. R. as a multiple of United States	13	18	6	17	6	6	35	16

Take a close look at the figures of the different food costs in the table above, and it will be seen that transportation is accountable for an important part of the differences in costs. In Russia, beef, milk, and eggs are consumed near production areas and are not shipped long distances, partly because of poor refrigeration facilities, but also for other economic reasons. Flour, rice, butter, and sugar, on the other hand, are transported over much longer distances. In Russia a pound of the first group is marketed for only six times the amount of labor that this group costs in the United States. The second group, where longer hauls are involved, requires from 13 to 35 times as many minutes of labor to purchase, as is the case in America. This statement does not imply that all this great difference is traceable to transportation.

Let us look at the physical basis for this great influence of transportation, and why there is such a handicap placed on Russian farm production and sale to consumers. The good agricultural lands of Russia are to a large extent in the so-called black and brown earth soils which stretch, with minor interruptions, over 5,000 miles from western Ukraine to eastern Russia at Vladivostock. Almost all Russia's land other than the black and brown earth soils are either too infertile, too rugged, too dry, or too cold for good agriculture. This area of productive farm land averages about 200 to 270 miles across. In other words, it is 25 times as long as it is wide. The area in the United States where the great predominance of the food shown in this table is produced, is a great compact triangular area about 1,200 miles in extent on each side, embracing roughly the Mississippi River drainage area, lying in the heart of America. It stretches from Pittsburgh to the northwest corner of North Dakota, thence to near Austin, Tex., and back to Pittsburgh.

TRANSPORTATION

Thus our food-producing area is located in the very center of the Nation and shipment is from this center to the outer edge. Our food haul probably will average not over one-fifth that of Russia when the latter develops its undeveloped agricultural resources as completely as we have ours. Practically all of the undeveloped agricultural resources of Russia lie in Asiatic Russia where the body of good cropland is 3,000 miles long, averages only a little over 100 miles wide, and is much less in an uninterrupted body of good land than is true in European Russia—that is, the good agricultural land in Asiatic Russia is probably 30 times as long as it is wide. The whole 5,000-mile narrow stretch of productive land is bounded almost every mile on the south by barren deserts and at least all of its 3,000 Asiatic miles to the north by the Siberian frozen wastes. Since European wheat lands in Russia have long been intensively used, future new areas of crops must be developed east of the Ural Mountains in Siberia with longer and longer hauls.

Another important difference to note between Russia's agricultural land and that of the United States is that Russia's good land gets from 10 to 20 inches of rain with an average of not over 15, whereas the great agricultural triangle of the United States gets a rainfall about double that of Russia. As a consequence, per-acre wheat yields in the United States average around 50 percent more than those of Russia. Year to year fluctuation in yield is also about twice as high in Russia as in the United States. In other words, yields of wheat in the United States are and will continue to be 50 percent greater and twice as dependable as those of Russia. Since future expansion of agricultural production in Russia must be in the main toward drier and drier, as well as more distant areas, yields will almost certainly tend to be smaller and less reliable in the future than at present or in the past.

Despite Russia's great effort to conserve moisture and make rain artificially, this great handicap compared with the United States will remain with Russia as long as

time lasts. It will always make food costlier in human toil in Russia than in the United States. Improvement in transportation efficiency will help, but will never eliminate this handicap.

LOW YIELDS—HIGH RISK

Since wheat at present is grown in all parts of the good agricultural lands of Russia, this wheat handicap of low yields and high risk characterizes and indicates the extent of Russian agricultural handicaps for most farm products except possibly barley, rye, potatoes, and some other root crops. Certainly its dairy, pork, and, to a less extent, beef production is similarly handicapped. Russia has not the physical basis for producing great quantities of feed grain that will even remotely compete with our Corn Belt—by far the world's best.

Americans should not view these great unsurmountable handicaps of our present greatest and most bitter antagonist either in a gloating spirit or with complacency. We should get from this knowledge a better perspective of relative economic strength of Russia and America; but we should also recognize that Russia can in part meet this handicap by pitifully low living standards for the great mass of her people. Neither would we appraise the situation honestly if we contend that free enterprise and democracy for her would remove her handicaps, for it would only do so partially.

STANDARD OF LIVING

To maintain even the present comparative lower standard of living of Russia, is certain to require in the future a far greater part of Russia's total labor capacity than we as a Nation will ever require. We will in the foreseeable future be fed much better and cheaper than Russia will, thanks to America's unsurpassed natural agricultural resources. Our implicit faith in the superiority of our democratic and free-enterprise system gives us the added consolation that our farmers' efficiency will for decades to come be unsurpassed and unequalled by that of Russia.

These few simple comparative agricultural facts should give us a perspective that adds to our faith in America. We can only hope that in the not too distant future we can have a relationship with the great Russian people that substitutes friendship for hostility, for only in friendship can the handicap of Russia be softened and reduced. Until that blessed day we can get comfort from a realization of the natural superiority of our position and form of government.

The Dawn Is Breaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for a long time the Detroit Free Press, under the guidance of John S. Knight, followed to a certain extent, the New Deal line, praising it and abusing and vilifying Congressmen who, in the beginning recognized the New Deal for what it was.

That Editor Knight is repenting—and I hope his repentance will stick—is evidenced by the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of Sunday, March 5, 1950:

POINT 4 CALLED A POINT OF NO RETURN

An old-time friend of mine is a retired newspaper editor who used to work for one of those rare specimens, a New Deal publisher in the South.

"Tom," I said one day, "did you always share the views of your liberal, world-saving boss?"

"I'm afraid not, Jack. You see I was never that enlightened."

Editor Tom was reflecting the viewpoint of millions of other Americans who want to see the world progress but are not sufficiently "enlightened" to go into raptures over President Truman's proposed global Fair Deal.

Of course, they may be slightly on the stupid side and lacking in the finer understanding that impels other big and noble-minded people to accept development of the world's backward areas as the primary responsibility of the United States.

But, in their literal, unimaginative way, they can't figure out why the American taxpayer should finance "Backwardarea" when our own Government is running better than $5,000,000,000 in the hole with the highest peacetime taxes in history.

The Truman plan for "Backwardarea" is better known as point 4.

It was first proposed by the President in his inaugural address of January 20, 1949, when he said:

"We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas.

"We should make available the benefits of our store of technical knowledge and we should foster capital investment in areas needing development. The program can greatly increase the industrial activity in other nations and can raise substantially their standards of living."

In 1944, Earl Browder, then head of the American branch of the Communist Party, proposed substantially the same program in a book called, Teheran: Our Path in War and Peace.

Comrade Browder maintained that Government-financed giant industrial-development corporations, each in partnership with some other government, or group of governments would become the best investment the American capitalist class had ever made in its whole history.

As Henry Hazlitt points out in an interesting little booklet, Illusions of Point Four, there is nothing new in the belief that sound international investment promotes world production.

What is new is the paternalistic assumption that the process of international investment must not be undertaken, as hitherto in modern times, by private investors at their own risk, to private borrowers who have proved their credit worthiness and responsibility, but must be nursed, spoon-fed, furnished with crutches, and guided at every step by the Government.

Like Browder, President Truman assumes that it is this Nation's duty to raise standards of living in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

This may be a fine humanitarian concept of America's responsibility, but nevertheless the weary United States taxpayer should understand that as the world's standards of living are raised by point 4, his own living standards will have to come down.

For example, if we spend millions for a housing project in Patagonia, less money will be available for housing in Detroit.

The proponents of point 4 would have us believe that the United States can become richer by giving our money away, on the theory that merely by investing capital anywhere in the world, you necessarily add to the wealth of the world.

Actually, nothing of the kind can be accomplished by point 4.

Money taken away from American taxpayers to assist the natives of "Backwardareas" simply means that the "Backwardareans" will have more, and the Americans less.

In addition, when we have accepted the premise that it is our duty to help everyone, everywhere, when and where can we ever call a halt without being threatened that "Backwardarea" will go Communist or Fascist unless we come through with more money pronto?

We have been "blackmailed" in Europe and South America ever since World War II. Every nation with a shaky economy has "communism for sale." Our overseas friends have shrewdly capitalized upon our propensity for believing that dollars will cure anything.

Three years ago, in an editorial opposing the Truman doctrine, I said "that if this policy is carried out to its logical conclussion, it will drain our treasury while destroying any hope that the United States and Russia can ever work together.

"Since virtually everyone concedes that the next war, if it comes, will be fought with atomic weapons and rockets, perhaps some apologist for the Truman program will explain how the expenditure of $400,000,000 in Greece and Turkey will 'contain' Russia when she has learned how to manufacture atomic bombs and decides to use them on us."

Three years later, Where do we stand? Is Russia being "contained" by the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan or is she more powerful in every way?

The President's point 4 program is even more fantastic than his earlier visionary schemes. The original cost, thirty-five to forty million dollars a year, seems so small in comparison to other Washington projects that few voices have been raised in protest.

But a principle is involved which, if adopted, would commit us morally to following the recommendations of the Government's technical commissions in underdeveloped areas.

If our experts find that "Backwardarea" needs a hydroelectric plant, the assumption normally follows that the United States Government will put up the money.

By taking on the first obligation, we suggest the second.

Do the American taxpayers want to let themselves in for that kind of a deal?

If, for the sake of argument, we concede (1) that there can be no lasting prosperity in the United States with a world in disorder and (2) that the world is in need of development, why cannot private-venture capital be substituted for Government aid?

If, instead of volunteering to pour the money of American taxpayers into foreign lands, the Government would obtain assurances from these nations that private-risk capital would not be confiscated, nor the profits of the American investor wholly retained in the country where his plant has been built, there would be ample venture money available for foreign investment.

Undertakings of this nature could be negotiated by the State Department with countries seeking development capital. The State Department could be tremendously helpful in showing these nations that it is to their self-interest to encourage the investment of American capital, possibly with a minority stockholding interest.

Such arrangements would work to the advantage of both the American investor and the nation in need of industrial development.

This thoroughly feasible plan has no chance whatsoever if President Truman's point 4 is given congressional approval.

A bill has already been introduced in Congress which would insure all risks in foreign investment.

This means that an automobile manufacturer who built a plant in Europe or South America could keep his profits but his losses would be taken out of the hides of the United States taxpayers.

Such a cockeyed deal would lead to the eventual nationalization of all foreign investments and the further dilution of our competitive profit-and-loss system.

And have you noticed that Secretary of State Dean Acheson and ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman are proposing some form of direct relief for victims of foreign competition?

In other words, we have been taxed to build up Europe so that the Marshall plan nations can sell their products abroad. Acheson and Hoffman would now tax us again to subsidize American industries suffering from European competition which has been financed with our own dollars.

How nutty can we get?

The President, who professes to be neither a Socialist nor a believer in deficit financing, is constantly flirting with schemes that are socialistic in character and so costly as to make impossible a balanced budget and ultimate reduction of the national debt.

Point 4, the maddest of them all, may appear to him as a cooperative enterprise with other nations of the world, but to the United States citizen who pays the bills, it should more accurately be renamed "the point of no return."

JOHN E. KNIGHT.

National Correct Posture Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, for many years past the first week in May of each year has been designated by the National Chiropractic Association as National Correct Posture Week and observed throughout the United States unofficially, with special educational campaigns conducted through schools, social and fraternal organizations, professional and labor groups, and others.

The huge economic loss due directly or indirectly to the poor posture habits of the American people, measured in lowered efficiency, less production, lost wages, and doctor bills is serious. There can be no doubt that the better posture campaigns of the chiropractors and the remedial treatments have helped to reduce that staggering loss. The National Chiropractic Association and the chiropractic profession have been valiantly performing an invaluable public service.

BILLS BY LOCAL OFFICIALS

As Members know, Mr. Speaker, National Correct Posture Week has been recognized by many State and local officials and legislative bodies. A complete listing of the proclamation or legislative enactments would take too much space; but I can mention that our former colleague, the Honorable Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., now mayor of Baltimore, has already called on that huge city to observe National Correct Posture Week from May 1 to 7, inclusive, urging all our citizens to give serious thought to the importance of correct posture and to join in the various educational programs being arranged.

The Governors of Minnesota, New Jersey, and Arkansas have issued similar proclamations for 1950, and many more announcements are expected.

It is my sincere hope that my resolution may be acted upon promptly in order that national observance may be made.

GOOD POSTURE CONTRIBUTES TO GOOD HEALTH

The National Chiropractic Association calls Correct Posture Week "a week devoted to reminding all Americans that long life and sound health demand correct posture."

It is hardly necessary to say, Mr. Speaker, that for the content of these remarks I am indebted to the information supplied by the National Chiropractic Association, and especially to its excellent and eye-catching literature on the subject; for I am an attorney by profession, not a practitioner of the healing arts. I am especially indebted to Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, of Washington, D. C., director of public relations of the National Chiropractic Association.

RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

If so much good can be done without official notice from the Federal Government, it seems to me that more good could be done by the official designation, through proclamation by the President, of the first week in May each year as "National Correct Posture Week."

Accordingly, on February 20 I introduced House Joint Resolution 422, the text of which I wish to include at this point in my remarks:

House Joint Resolution 422

Joint resolution designating the period beginning May 1 and ending May 7 of each year as National Correct Posture Week

Whereas clinical and statistic evidence proves conclusively that correct posture in childhood and in maturity has a great and beneficial effect on the health of the individual and thus on the collective health of the Nation; and

Whereas it is self-evident that the general welfare of the people of the United States, both in peace and war, is best served by promoting a general high level of good health in the Nation; and

Whereas it has been adequately demonstrated that habits of correct posture can be readily acquired through self-discipline of the individual when properly instructed; and

Whereas for many years the first week of May has been sponsored by the National Chiropractic Association and observed unofficially as National Correct Posture Week, with special educational campaigns conducted through schools, social and fraternal organizations, professional groups, and other media of information: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the period beginning May 1 and ending May 7 of each year is hereby designated as National Correct Posture Week. The President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling upon schools, social organizations, and professional groups to cooperate in the observance of such week by conducting educational campaigns to provide instruction in the acquisition of habits of correct posture and to demonstrate the beneficial effect of correct posture in health.

GOOD POSTURE IS GOOD SENSE

Good posture is more than standing or sitting straight. It is that position of the body in which all of its parts are working effectively and with proper balance, ease, and comfort. Good posture is important. The internal organs have plenty of room and nerves are free from pressure at the spine when the body has good posture. Lungs, heart, and digestive organs function better when they have room.

You feel better.

Chiropractors—and for that matter other orthopedists—have traced bad posture, in a majority of instances, to specific causes. Among them are poor diet, lack of rest, poor shoes, soft mattresses and chairs, bad eyesight, too little exercise, and worry.

POSTURE HABITS FORMED EARLY

No child is too small to begin the formation of posture habits which will affect his carriage in later life.

If, from the beginning, the baby is trained and encouraged to stand, walk, sit, and lie correctly, and if those specific causes I have named are removed, his chances are good for growing into maturity without the consequences of bad posture.

With the growth of true sciences of healing, it is recognized that good posture is the foundation of good health. The White House Conference on Child Health stressed this in its recommendations to the Nation.

POOR POSTURE IS EXPENSIVE

The chiropractors of America tell us that poor posture is expensive. Poor posture habits—improper body mechanics if you prefer—are responsible not only for many days of lost time and wages, which means lost productivity and purchasing power, but also for poor response to the needs of a job, or of everyday living, and eventually for a shortened life of top efficiency.

I agree with Dr. Murphy that no greater contribution can be made by the chiropractors of America to the Nation than by improving posture and thus increasing the efficiency of Americans.

Our industrial civilization has encouraged bad-posture habits. Workers are required to remain in unnatural positions, frequently under nervous and emotional strains, for hours on end, while the cry for more and more speed is heard.

BAD POSTURE WIDESPREAD

Studies conducted by the Chiropractic Research Foundation indicate that 35 percent of all children have faulty posture and that 35 percent of all adults have spinal defects likely to lead to organic disease unless corrected.

Good posture and good health go together; conversely, bad posture and bad health seldom part company.

CHIROPRACTORS RECOMMEND

These are the recommendations made by the National Chiropractic Association:

First. Learn to stand tall, sit tall, and walk tall.

Second. Follow a few simple exercises daily to preserve the strength and tone of the ligaments and muscles which support the spinal column.

Third. Learn to relax completely

More About This Socialized-Medicine Scare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association representatives on every possible occasion, and sometimes also when it seems impossible to a clear thinking mind, point to the British health plan as the terrible thing which brought old England on bended knee into the circle of socialistic governments. Of course, almost any child who is not halfwitted, knows that that is not true, but this medical society persistently and closely follows the pattern of other dictators and keeps repeating the lie in the fond hope, I guess, that sheer repetition will in and of itself, cause the people to believe the claim to be the truth, even if the falsely spoken words are not believed by the very praters themselves.

They say they do not want any outsiders to set their fees, but they forget that every compensation and liability insurance company for lo these many years has been doing just that very thing and that the practice-mad doctors of the Nation have been fairly trampling each others shoe-pinched toes off to get the business.

Health and accident insurance companies also set the fees of doctors and the doctors just love it.

The Blue Shield and the Blue Cross set the fees of the doctors and also the hospital charges, and the doctors just love it.

All insurance-company-kept doctors know if they are yet capable of knowing anything for sure, that fee setting by the big and little industries of our country has been the order of the day and the doctors have just loved to get the business.

However, when national health insurance might provide a fee schedule for doctors they throw an intellectual fit which would do credit to any old-time fit maker.

They say that our national health insurance plan is socialized medicine like the British plan is, when that is as false as most any old doctor's United States income tax return, and the hypocrite doctors know it full well.

I guess no greater truth was ever spoken than the words of the poet Milton that hypocrisy is the only evil which walks concealed except to God alone.

Heretofore, I have always been a real friend of doctors in my practice of law. I have protected them and have helped them. I never sued any doctor but one and that was shortly after I was admitted to the bar.

The doctors never had occasion to kick me upstairs politically as they have some other Members of Congress.

I want to tell them here and now that if they ever kick me downstairs they will wish to God that they had left me upstairs.

I do not know what has come over the great bulk of the medical profession which I am acquainted with. They do not seem to have a profession any more at all. It seems now to be a harsh, cruel business. I believe that my friend, Dr. Hart of outstate Nebraska, had the correct answer when he told me that the medical profession was running out of humanity and character; that the storehouse which God had given them containing character and humanity was nearly exhausted through misuse and general neglect and spoilation. Today they seem to have no more character and humanity left to draw out of the great bank and storehouse of good deeds.

Many doctors today, will not face up to simple truths let alone great truths.

When running for office, I sent out letters telling the doctors and other of my district that I was against socialized medicine and that my examination and evaluation of national health-insurance bills, filed as of that time, convinced me that they were not socialized medicine.

After I came to Congress I sent out to doctors and others of my district a pamphlet which analyzed three of the pending bills and accompanied it with a letter stating that I was favorable to a national health-insurance plan. The reactionary Republican doctors of my district then seized upon the thought that I had broken faith with them and had falsified to them in my first letter, when such a claim was far afield from the real facts and was a deliberate falsehood told so as to furnish them with a reason to cudgel me politically.

During the vacation period I tried to convince these golden-calf worshippers, and otherwise evil men again, that I was against socialized medicine and would not support any national health plan but a voluntary one, and I explained that by that I meant that the insured should have the right to say whether or not he wanted national health insurance, and should have a right to personally select his own doctor, and that every doctor should have the right to say whether or not he desired to accept the patient I could have employed my time, however, to better advantage by talking to the monkeys in any old zoo than by talking to them.

All they would carp back was that I advocated socialized medicine. What can one do for such hideously benighted people? You tell me and I shall try it.

Any national health-insurance plan should be voluntary, because many people now have health and accident insurance which is to their liking, and why load them up with additional insurance, and be the cause of their losing insurance which they have carried for a long time, and in which they might have a real investment perhaps. I was loaded up myself on life insurance and lost it all during the depression and I have no insurance now. I know from experience what that means.

No veteran would need national health insurance because he can receive now, medical and hospital attention from the doctors of the Veterans' Administration and the veterans' hospitals. He can also secure dental care. Why load the veteran up with insurance he does not need or perhaps want. Let him say whether he wants national health insurance or not.

Also many persons who have worked years for railroads and industry may have paid into a fund for medical and hospital care. Why load them up with insurance they do not want or need?

It has been said that in a special congressional election held some time ago, the American Medical Association spent in excess of $300,000 to defeat a woman candidate. It is claimed that an exposure of this matter is due very soon.

Is not it just too bad that this organization did not see fit to pour this money back upon the neglected and needy members of our present-day society as a humanitarian gesture to the general public of the Nation upon whose bounty they, the doctors, have lived so long, so splendidly, and so well?

In conclusion, I wish to quote the following article from the March 13, 1950, issue of the CIO News, because it is indeed very enlightening to say the least:

LIGHT, NOT HEAT, ON BRITISH HEALTH PLAN

YOU'RE RIGHT, SOLDIER

A State-wide lobby tie-up in Wisconsin between the American Legion and the American Medical Association to fight the proposed national health insurance bill was exposed recently in the Capital Times, of Madison.

On its front page, the Times reproduced a letter from the president of the State medical society to Legion post commanders urging the posts to adopt resolutions opposing the program as socialized medicine.

One commander sent the letter to the Capital Times with this note scrawled across the top: "I received this as county commander of the American Legion. Alas, we have fallen upon evil days."

(By Hollace Ransdell)

If all the articles and news stories written about the British health system were laid end to end, it would undoubtedly take quite a walk to pace them off. Yet few Americans really know much about the subject and too often what they think they know is inaccurate or entirely untrue.

The American Medical Association can take much of the credit for this. Their $100,000-a-year publicists, Whitaker & Baxter, a husband and wife team, can be criticised harshly for the type of lurid propaganda they turn out, but they can't be accused of laziness. Millions of copies of the pamphlets, leaflets, and other releases they issue in behalf of the AMA's fight against national health insurance circulate throughout the country.

(The AMA tops the list of lobbyists with the whopping total of $1,500,000 spent in 1949, according to figures given in the year-end financial reports filed under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act.)

Britain's health system is a favorite topic in the AMA propaganda, although just what it is or how it works is never explained. Instead of facts or honest analysis, the AMA gives rumors, prejudiced opinions and calls names.

Representative BUSHFIELD, Democrat, of Wisconsin, one of the sponsors of a bill for a national health insurance system for the United States, last week called the attention of Congress to the general misconception in this country about the British health plan. Everyone has an opinion on the experiment, he said, "but very few people know the facts about it."

To throw some much needed light on the subject, he asked to have an article by Dr. James Howard Means on England's public medicine inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Dr. Means is a professor in the Harvard Medical School and chief of the medical services at Massachusetts General Hospital. He is the author of many books and over 150 articles on medical subjects. The article quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD appears in the March issue of the Atlantic Monthly.

Dr. Means explains that he holds no brief either for or against the British health service, but believes that information about it will be of great value to Americans. "We can be aided by the experience of others," he says.

The article is of special interest because it not only explains from an unbiased viewpoint how the British system works, but also takes up the objections made against it in this country and Britain, and examines their validity. Dr. Means says his analysis is based on observations extending back to 1913. Last year he spent some time in England and Scotland studying various phases of the present health system.

"Americans either hold up the British health service as a horrible warning," the doctor writes, "or use it as a talking point in favor of compulsory health insurance for the United States," whereas what is needed "is less recrimination and more investigation."

Dr. Means found a practically unanimous opinion in Britain at present that the health service is there to stay. He quoted, however, there was much discontent among British doctors running all the way "from trifling dissatisfaction to something approaching actual hostility."

The direction taken by the present health service was set by the Emergency Medical Service, set up to take care of the military and civilian wounded and sick, he states. Although set up hurriedly, the EMS worked smoothly and efficiently.

The service is not compulsory, he points out, although it is intended to provide medical care for all people, even aliens temporarily in the country. Any doctor or person who wants to can stay out of it. Doctors may serve under it and keep their private practice at the same time.

Here are some of Dr. Means' answers to questions raised about the British plan and to attacks constantly made on it:

How well is the health service working? Fairly well, he says, though, of course, not perfectly. After all it has been in effect only about 19 months. Efforts to improve it and to remove the bugs are continually being made.

Has medical care deteriorated under it? Based on observations extending back to 1913, Dr. Means says he found no important change, and certainly no deterioration in the quality of the care provided. At no time either in Britain or America, he declares, has medical care been as uniformly good "as medical knowledge of our time would permit it to be. * * * There is always abundant room for improvement."

Isn't it true that America has the best medical care in the world? "Possibly, but how many people get it?" replies Dr. Means. "I am unable to assert that the general standard is higher in Britain under the National Health Act than it was before that went into effect, but on the other hand, I have encountered no convincing evidence that it is lower, and certainly more people get it."

Is it undermining the incentive of doctors? Dr. Means admits that this would be a serious defect, if true, but he differentiates prophets of doom to remember that there is nothing available on the subject at present but opinion. "Only experience will answer the question, and 19 months' experience with the health service is not enough time by which to judge it accurately," he says.

What about the complaints that general practitioners are overworked? It is true that at present they are overworked, underpaid, and insufficiently related to the hospitals, answers Dr. Means, but amendments to the bill to correct these and other abuses are now before Parliament.

Don't patients abuse their privileges and go to the doctor more often than necessary?

Steps are being considered to remedy this difficulty, possibly by imposing a token fee to put a slight brake on such a tendency, Dr. Means states.

What about this clamor about free eye glasses, dentures, and even free wigs?

All this would seem to mean "when viewed dispassionately," says Dr. Means, "is that under the previous system there were great numbers of people who needed prosthetic appliances and could not afford to get them. The stories of abuses of these privileges I am convinced are exaggerated, and I am assured that steps are being taken to eliminate such abuse as does exist."

In rounding out his analysis of the British system, Dr. Means emphasizes the fact that local health centers are one of the important elements of the program, although so far they are still largely in the blueprint stage. When they get going, they will implement and facilitate the work of general practitioners and even provide them with office space in many instances.

Although our own problems are in many ways different from those of the British, Dr. Means feels that we have much to learn from Britain's momentous experiment.

"We should be grateful to Britain," he concludes, "for making this venture."

New Postage Bill Reduces Revenues and Increases Deficits to the Post Office Department

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent debate on the administration's bill to increase postal rates on first-, second-, third-, and fourth-class mail. Members of the House will recall that I made quite a point of the fact that many of the larger publications throughout the country would set up their own distribution systems if postage rates were increased on second-class mail. I claimed at that time that if the increases were adopted by the Congress, and of course I opposed most of the increases, many users of the mails would adopt other methods of distribution.

It has now been revealed publicly that the larger magazines of the country will do so, and a number of test programs have proven economical and now it is proposed that a plan be expanded to additional magazines and additional areas throughout the country. In other words, because of the threatened increase in rates, magazine publishers in order to keep their subscription rates as low as possible to the public, will now adopt a more economical distribution program for their magazines.

If the Post Office Department still believes that it loses money on magazine second-class mail, they perhaps will at least not oppose the new plans, of the publishers to distribute their publications

The plan has generally proven successful and now it is likely to spread through the publishing industry and especially in the case of the larger publications of the country. As I predicted during the debate on the postal bill, this will increase in less volume to the Post Office Department and no doubt greater deficits. It also will result in decreased jobs for post-office employees. Furthermore, it will set up a situation which will result in eventual poorer service and further curtailment of service to the public.

The plan is outlined in detail by an article published in the Wall Street Journal for March 6, by two writers, Michael J. Saada and J. Howard Rutledge.

The article is as follows:

Magazine publishers are thinking of saying good-by to the postman.

Mail costs of selling and distributing their periodicals to householders are already as high as many publishers can afford—and the possibility of higher postal rates is in the offing. So in Reading, Pa., they're having a first try at doing for themselves the job which now is performed elsewhere by the mailman.

Curtis Publishing Co.—Saturday Evening Post, Ladies' Home Journal, Country Gentleman, Holiday, and Jack and Jill—is currently operating the plan—on its own behalf and for the publishers of eight other top magazines—through a subsidiary, Curtis Circulation Co.

The plan is already slated for extension in April into Columbus, Ohio, and South Bend, Ind.; field men are now studying routes and other details. Other cities to which it may be extended later include Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, and Baltimore. Ultimately, Curtis thinks in terms of putting the program on a Nation-wide basis with additional magazines participating.

THE SIDE-STEP

The scheme for side-stepping the post office is simple enough. It provides for freighting the magazines to a central point in each city. Salaried agents pick these up and distribute them by auto to subscribers' doors. They also take subscriptions and renewal orders, further lightening the pay load of Uncle Sam's carriers, who have been toting publishers' form letters by the millions.

Immediately, it's true, the plan offers no savings over mail delivery. President Walter Fuller, of Curtis Publishing, says the comparable costs in Reading are close. But hanging over publishers' heads is a House-passed postal bill which would raise rates for distributing most magazines and some newspapers by about 50 percent. In addition, it calls for a stiff hike in fees for letters and post cards used by publishers to solicit readers. Passage of this measure by the Senate is regarded in Washington as a 5-5 possibility.

If this happens, says Marvin Pierce, president of McCall Corp., a major publishing house, the Curtis plan might very well work out to be cheaper than postal methods of delivery and subscription of magazines. Even if the bill is sidetracked, as it was at the last congressional session, he favors further experimentation with the new undertaking to make it more economical. Curtis is determined to continue.

PASSENGER LIST

Two of Mr. Pierce's journals—Redbook and McCall's—are included in the Reading delivery-sales plan. Other magazines entered are Better Homes and Gardens, Coronet, Cosmopolitan, Esquire, Good Housekeeping, and Sports Afield.

Three Curtis publications are participating—Saturday Evening Post, Ladies' Home Journal, and Holiday. Omitted as yet are

Country Gentleman, designed for rural readers, and Jack and Jill, which, because it carries no advertising, would be much more lightly afflicted by the postal bill.

Time, Inc. (Life, Time, Fortune, Architectural Forum) is still outside the plan looking in. "We are following the development with great interest," says F. De W. Pratt, circulation director.

Most publishers like the dodge-the-postman plan as a way of distributing magazines, but some firmly opposed any arrangement that would take control of their subscription programs.

DEBATE

One publisher-dissenter says: "We think subscription selling know-how is a big factor in keeping up our circulation; we don't want to entrust this important job to anyone else."

Objects another: "It's bound to work out that an agent selling subscriptions for a group of magazines—as under the Curtis program—would favor some over the others."

Declares a third: "Costs of hiring men to solicit magazine business are at least three times those of doing the job by mail—and I'm putting it mildly."

Curtis President Fuller takes exception. He insists that, far from being more expensive, the door-to-door salesmanship of the Reading magazine squad is achieving savings that pay the major share of expenses for the entire experiment.

And he observes he is quite aware of the fear that agents might show sales favoritism. Some executives of other publishing houses have suggested that if any single national agency is to be soliciting subscriptions for rival journals, it should be a co-op. "My best answer," Mr. Fuller says to this sort of comment, "is that under the Reading operation we are doing very well for other publishers in the sales of subscriptions and in renewals to their magazines."

Actually, subscription field forces for Curtis Publishing and two other big magazine houses—Hearst and Crowell-Collier—have for many years written new subscriptions for one another and for other publishers. Nevertheless, most magazines now make their heavy subscription selling efforts individually—customarily through the mails.

HOW SYSTEM WORKS

Enthusiasm runs high among the Curtis forces in Reading, where the sales-delivery plan has been operating 6 months.

As in other localities to which the experiment will be extended, the city is divided into districts—six in this case. One agent is assigned to each; he gets a salary, a car allowance—and a bonus for writing new subscriptions and renewals in excess of his quota.

Issues of the 11 magazines distributed under the Reading experiment reach town 3 to 5 days in advance of delivery date. "We plan it that way to be sure of deliveries," says Harold J. Bean, vice president and subscription manager of Curtis Circulation Co.

Copies are given to householders without the usual label, the agent merely checks his subscription list as he covers his territory. Since the magazines are shipped into Reading in neatly wrapped bundles, each copy is fresh on receipt and the men are careful to keep them that way.

The group of agents is headed by a local subscription manager, in Reading he's named George Borts, and he has this to say:

"The most favorable aspect as I see it from the front line is the personal contact with subscribers. It opens wider fields for magazine selling, puts more finesse into the job. Subscribers like the personal touch."

The public tends to think about magazine delivery as an ethical problem, Mr. Borts has discovered. One woman who recently signed up with this service explained she had never subscribed to any magazine before because she didn't like to burden the poor mailman. Against this, he encounters numerous complaints that we are doing the mailman out of a job, that we are cheating the Government, that it isn't right to bypass the Government's organized postal service.

At such times he patiently explains the new method takes no bread from any postman's mouth, post office hirings and assignments are governed largely by the burden of first-class letter mail.

Governor Dewey's Rent Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of the State of New York, in a recent message to the State legislature, discussed his plan for having the State take over rent control. Upon analyzing the projected GOP law, I contend that the Governor is attempting to perpetrate a fraud upon the people of the State of New York. The proposed rent-control law will not only be another spineless attempt by New York State to regulate the vital matter of rent control, but also will not provide adequate safeguards against increases and evictions.

I recognize the Governor's plan as an attempt to garner votes because of the confusion which now exists regarding rent controls in general. It is attempted by the bill, to sound the death knell of Federal rent control. I predict right now, that after election, rent control in New York State will be ended. Then, the people without any protection whatsoever, will be left to the mercy of the real-estate wolves.

It is of paramount importance that rent control be continued on a Federal basis. We must do everything we can to obtain a strong rent-control bill. However, even a weak Federal rent-control law, inadequately administered, is preferable to none at all, and the New York State bill is none at all.

I am including in the RECORD, a copy of an editorial which appeared in the New York Post of March 10, on this subject, which also points out the necessity for the continuation of Federal rent controls:

GOVERNOR DEWEY'S RENT HOAX

In his special message to the legislature on Wednesday Governor Dewey denounced Democratic failures in rent control and promised that this State's Republicans would show us how it should be done. Not many hours later the GOP State rent-control measure was made public. It is a cynical repudiation of the Governor's pledge and we do not believe that Dewey will be able to get away with it. The detailed, eight-point attack on the bill released by the Democratic leadership is a devastating document and ought to be widely read in this city.

The Democrats admittedly face a tough problem—a problem initially created by the weakness and ineptitude of Federal Housing Expediter Tighe Woods. It was largely as a result of Woods' performance that the city administration was forced to create its own rent commission. It was because of Federal failure that the drive to substitute State for Federal controls in this State gained headway. We have generally supported that move; we have felt that New York—whether under State or city rule—can have stronger rent controls than Woods is able to offer. That has been demonstrated in this city under the rule of the city rent commission. But the Dewey formula is a fraud. It is, we think, another dramatic example of the Governor's fatal tendency to try to play both sides of any public street. He has talked tough and given the realtor lobby an incredible series of concessions. He has offered us a high-toned hoax.

The loopholes in the projected GOP law are big and numerous; each rereading of the draft seems to reveal another thinly disguised joker. Eight major deficiencies were cited by the Democratic spokesmen yesterday as they submitted alternative legislation. They pointed out that the proposed measure did not require a hearing in individual cases as the city rent law does. (After the protests started, the GOP legislators hastily amended the bill to require such hearings, but there is still no provision for a stay of increases pending appeal.) The bill permits increases based on the vague formula of "comparability" as well as hardship—and "comparability" is the open door for large-scale rent boosts. It exempts all housing accommodations produced by conversion since February 1, 1947. It offers far less adequate protection against eviction than residents of this city now possess and places no limit of any kind on evictions where landlords propose to alter or remodel the premises. It proposes a fantastically small appropriation for administration of the law. The GOP measure also contains no provision for rent reduction where services and property have deteriorated.

But the most flagrant give-away clause in the bill is the provision which would, in effect, enable the State rent commissioner to write his own rules after March 1, 1951, regardless of whether they are consistent with the proposed law. In short, the limited protections afforded by the Dewey bill could vanish soon after election day this year. Nice timing. In his message Governor Dewey decried the atmosphere of uncertainty created by bungling in Federal rent rule. The GOP now proposes to enact uncertainty into law.

We still have no nostalgia for retention of Federal control in New York. Belated efforts by Tighe Woods to regain public confidence are unconvincing. In any case, the issue is academic at Albany; the real battle is over the State bill. If we were a Congressman in Washington we would vote to continue the Federal set-up only because some States are unwilling or unable to establish any form of rent regulation; in those areas even Woods' inadequate administration is preferable to none at all. But that isn't the choice for the people of this city.

We have established effective municipal rent control; we are living under it now. If the State won't give us substantially better protection than the Federal Government offers, the city's representatives at Albany must renew the fight for municipal option. In the long run that may be the best solution for this crowded metropolis. At this moment neither Federal control nor the Dewey blueprint offers real safeguards for the inhabitants of our town. Unless public pressure forces a major Republican retreat at Albany, the answer for this city is continuation of local rent control.

California State Works for Veterans' Employment Issues Special Pamphlet of Advice and Information to Help Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, a very valuable booklet has been issued by my native State of California Department of Employment. One good thing about the veterans' employment service is that it has a veterans' advisory committee made up of the commanders of the American Legion, AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, and Veterans of Foreign Wars. I congratulate my State upon this vigorous, vigilant service being rendered.

I bring it to your attention in anticipation of the fact that no doubt many other States who are not doing substantially the same thing will be glad to have this information.

The following is a copy of the booklet:

VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT HANDBOOK

(State of California, Department of Employment, James G. Bryant, director. The Veterans Advisory Committee: commander, American Legion; commander, AMVETS; commander, Disabled American Veterans; commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars)

INTRODUCTION

The California State Employment Service provides special services to all veterans in accordance with Federal and State laws. Regulations of the Veterans' Placement Service Board further stipulate that classified veterans shall receive preferential treatment from the local employment office.

In order to provide the best possible assistance to veterans, it is necessary that veterans themselves be familiar with these special services in order that they may cooperate in filling job openings for which they are qualified. The term "qualified" means fitted by vocational experience, training, and education received from employers.

PRIORITIES AND PREFERENCES

(A) A veteran is a person who:

Served in the active service of the armed forces of the United States during any of the following periods and has been discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable:

Spanish-American War: April 21, 1898, to August 13, 1898.

Philippine Insurrection: August 13, 1898, to July 4, 1902. (If service in Moro Province, ending date is July 15, 1903.)

Boxer Rebellion: July 20, 1900, to May 12, 1901.

World War I: April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918. (If service in Russia, ending date is April 1, 1920.)

World War II: December 7, 1941, to December 31, 1946.

(The determination of eligibility for special services because of veteran status is based on documentary evidence of periods of service and character of separation.)

(B) A disabled or "PT" (preferential treatment) veteran is a veteran who:

1. Is currently rated 10 percent or more disabled by the Veterans' Administration; or

2. Meets the Employment Service definition of a "handicapped applicant" regardless of whether or not the disability is service incurred.

SPECIAL SERVICES AND PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT

Special services to veterans include:

1. Priority in referral to open jobs for which they qualify, except that first priority of referral shall be given qualified disabled (PT) veterans.

2. A job development program through which veterans who have individual vocational problems can be placed in suitable employment.

3. Employment counseling to assist veterans to:

(a) Evaluate their aptitudes, experiences, and training, and job preferences in the light of current and prospective job opportunities.

(b) Determine additional training required to prepare themselves for suitable employment.

(c) Adopt practical plans for obtaining such employment.

4. Information and assistance concerning the training on the job program.

5. Advice regarding services available through other public and private agencies and referral to the appropriate agency.

6. Current labor market information about job openings and employment prospects locally and elsewhere.

Veterans Employment Representatives are on duty in California State Employment Service offices. It is the VER's responsibility to insure that veterans receive the special services created and maintained for them and to see that veterans entitled to preferential treatment, as well as other veterans, are given the best possible assistance and attention.

HOW VETERANS CAN HELP CSES HELP THEM

When a veteran applies for employment to the CSES, he will be asked to submit a record of his past employment, training, education, and provide other necessary information.

It is important that the employment record be completed carefully, since it will represent the veteran to the Employment Service in his absence. Whether he can be referred to a certain job may depend upon his written application.

Veterans are registered on salmon (pink) work records and are issued identification cards of the same color. In addition, the work records and identification cards of veterans who are entitled to preferential treatment are marked with a red "PT."

Incoming job orders are checked against active work records and applicants are called in and referred in accordance with their qualifications and priorities. (To make certain that a work record is in the active file, the veteran must make a personal contact with the employment service at least once each calendar month.)

Applicants are urged to register for work regardless of whether they are claiming unemployment insurance.

Applicants may register in as many CSES offices as they will accept referrals from and maintain active records in, providing they possess qualifications for occupations handled by those offices.

VETERANS ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Through the State veterans advisory committee to the director of the department of employment, and through local veterans advisory committees to local office managers, CSES cooperates closely with veterans' organizations and all other groups with a primary interest in the placement of veterans in employment.

All veterans can participate in the job-development program effectively. The veteran who knows of a job for which he does not qualify, or in which he has no interest, will be of service to other veterans if he will report existence of the job to the employment service immediately; or if he is a member of a veterans' organization, to the employment officer of his post or chapter.

OTHER INFORMATION

The California Department of Employment administers the California Unemployment Insurance Act, including disability insurance provisions of that law. The department also administers title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

More comprehensive information will be found in the booklet, California's Employment Security System, available upon request at local offices of the department of employment.

The California State Employment Service is a public employment service operated by the California Department of Employment with offices located in the principal towns of the State.

Competition Is Coal's Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the New York Times of March 12, 1950, printed a pointed and interesting editorial defining the principal problems confronting the Nation's coal industry. Chief among the coal industry's problem, according to the Times editorial, is the ever-growing competition of other fuels and the end of the long monopoly which coal has held in many regions.

This is an editorial all Members of the Senate should read, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COAL'S NO. 1 PROBLEM

The President has asked Congress to set up a commission to study the basic problems of coal. The end of the coal strike, he observes in letters to his congressional leaders, "has in no way diminished the need for a long-range study of the coal industry, with the view of finding * * * the best solutions of its problems from the standpoint of the miners, the operators, and, above all, the national interest."

It was following an earlier strike in the bituminous coal fields that another President proposed an inquiry of this kind. The year was 1922 and the President was Mr. Harding. And strange as it may seem, the basic problem then—or what seemed to be the basic problem—was strikingly similar to that of today. Said Mr. Harding on August 18, 1922:

"In the bituminous coal fields are vastly more mines than are requisite to the country's needs, and there are 200,000 more mine workers than are needed to produce in continuous employment the country's normal requirements. * * * Men divide the working time, and high wages are necessary to meet the cost of the barest living."

Mr. Harding had declared that even then, nearly 30 years ago, the country was "at the mercy of the United Mine Workers." The Commission's report, which emerged 3 years later, found that the principal need of the industry was "constructive leadership to solve its own problems," and urged that the policy of the UMW be shifted "from a purely militant basis to a more constructive one."

Today's sickness in coal stems basically from the difficulty of making the adjustment from the monopoly position which the industry long enjoyed to the competitive role it occupies today. Why has the transition been so difficult? Why has a temporary maladjustment become a chronic ailment? It does not require a four-volume study such as the one produced in 1922–25 to provide the essential answer to that question. The coal industry's problem stems from the fact that it has to dispose of its production in a highly competitive market, while its costs are determined by a dictator who holds a complete monopoly on the labor supply in that industry. Wages, which represent the principal element in the cost of producing coal, are not established through collective bargaining, and they are not established with reference either to the market or to the desirability of providing a maximum number of jobs. The result is constantly mounting costs, a steady shrinkage in the market for coal, and a continual decline in the number of work hours for labor. Efforts are made to shore up the slipping structure by shortening the workweek and providing huge welfare funds to care for the idle and the aged. But both these processes themselves add enormously to the cost of doing business. And since it is more and more difficult to pass such costs along to the public, the net result is to speed up still further the vicious circle of mounting prices and contracting markets.

For anyone who doubts that this is basically what was going on in the bituminous coal industry—and is now going on at an accelerated rate—attention is invited to some pertinent facts presented in this newspaper a few days ago by A. H. Raskin. These show, for example, that even the two major strongholds of demand for soft coal have been crumbling since the war—namely, the railroads and the power companies. It is greatly in the interest of the railroads, as haulers of coal, to encourage the use of that fuel. Yet they are turning away from it more and more as a source of their own power. According to Mr. Raskin, out of a total of 5,083 locomotives delivered to the railroads since the war only 348, or less than 7 percent, have been of the coal-burning type. For those currently on order the figure is about 1 percent. In the cities oil has in many cases completely or largely supplanted coal as the source of municipal power. In Cleveland, for example, oil is used exclusively; Philadelphia uses 70 percent oil; the Public Service Co. of New Jersey is using oil for 90 percent of its power.

It may be desirable to make a fresh study of the ills of the coal industry, but that does not lessen in any way the necessity of dealing realistically with the problem of John L. Lewis. As a matter of fact, we might well find that if we really solve this, the industry's No. 1 problem, we shall have made further study largely redundant.

He Fought for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. BUCKLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the following talk delivered by Dorothy C. Salisbury during a program on March 6 over radio station WBCC:

HE FOUGHT FOR FREEDOM

(By Dorothy Cleaveland Salisbury)

On Pennsylvania Avenue at Thirteenth Street NW., there stands the bronze figure of a cavalry officer wearing the round fur hat and military cape of a European army's uniform. The inscription below the horseman reads: Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski. Fell in battle at Savannah. Brigadier General of the United States. Marshal General of Poland. Brandywine, Valley Forge, Egg Harbor, Charleston, Savannah, Germantown.

Within these few words are compressed the career of perhaps the greatest military genius of his time and one of the most zealous and indefatigable fighters for freedom of any age.

Day before yesterday, March 4, was the two hundred and second anniversary of the birth of this Polish-American patriot.

In one of his first military engagements after reaching America, Pulaski probably prevented a premature end to the young republic when he warned Washington of a British ambush near Warren's Tavern. Five days after the battle of Brandywine, the American troops under Washington had halted for rest and refreshment at this spot on the Lancaster Road, 23 miles from Philadelphia. Within the tavern Washington was holding a council of war.

Suddenly up dashed Count Pulaski, newly-commissioned brigadier general of cavalry. He demanded of the startled sentry that he be admitted instantly to General Washington. "The general is in council and must not be disturbed," was the reply.

But the excited cavalry officer insisted with vehemence, till the commander in chief himself came to the doorway to demand the cause of the disturbance. To him Pulaski explained in a torrent of French and broken English that while he was on reconnaissance with a detachment of cavalry, he had come upon the whole British Army under General Howe, encircling the American position, and dangerously close. He had delayed only long enough to charge the vanguard and so halt the advance for a time.

Washington, dismayed and at first incredulous, was soon convinced of the truth of the report. Promptly dispatching 300 infantrymen to reinforce Pulaski's cavalry, he quickly withdrew his remaining forces to safety.

Just 202 years ago, on March 4, 1748, Casimir Pulaski was born on an estate in southeastern Poland. His father, Count Joseph Pulaski, was a successful and wealthy lawyer and able magistrate. His sons, Casimir, Francis, and Anthony, spent their boyhood in the saddle. Taught by the armed Cossack retainers on the family estates, the boys became unexcelled riders and crack swordsmen and pistol shots in a land of fighting horsemen.

On February 29, 1768, when Casimir was barely 20, the Pulaskis, father and sons, together with a few close friends, organized the Confederation of Bar, a patriotic movement to drive the encroaching Russians from Poland and restore Polish independence. The next 4 years Casimir spent as a cavalry commander of the confederation. By brilliant marches and dashing cavalry raids, he covered the country—recruiting peasants, enlisting the aid of patriotic nobles, and making his name a terror to the Russian troops sent against him.

But patriotic zeal and military genius were not enough to stand against the overwhelming numbers and resources which the Empress of Russia poured upon the confederates. Casimir's father, military head of the confederation, was treacherously seized and died in a Tartar prison. His brother, Anthony, was taken prisoner by the Russians. Francis was killed, almost at his side, in battle. Yet Casimir, taking his father's place as marshal of the patriot army, fought on with undiminished ardor, scorning the enemy's offers to him to capitulate.

Finally Casimir was persuaded to join in an unsuccessful plot to kidnap the King of Poland. When it failed, Casimir, now Count Pulaski, was outlawed and his estates confiscated. This brought to an end his work in Poland.

For the next years the Count was a wanderer. Finally the exile arrived in France sick, half-starved, in tattered clothes, and without a sou. There he heard of the battles of Lexington and Bunker Hill, of General Washington and the Declaration of Independence. With the fall of his hopes for a free Poland, he had despaired for the future, but now his courage and his enthusiasm returned. "My country has lost her freedom," he exclaimed, "but let us fight for that of a new people."

On June 13, 1777, when the brig *Massachusetts* slipped out of the harbor of Nantes, Pulaski was aboard her. He landed at Marblehead on July 23 and pushed on immediately to Boston to interview General Heath as to the American situation. These were dark days for the new Republic. General Burgoyne was on his march by Lake Champlain and Lake George to cut the Americans in two. Fort Ticonderoga had already fallen.

From Boston the eager warrior rode nearly 400 miles on horseback to join General Washington at his encampment on the Neshaminy, a few miles north of Philadelphia. While waiting for the Continental Congress to grant him a commission, Pulaski joined Washington's staff as a volunteer. During the battle of Brandywine on September 11, the Polish patriot saw his first active service for his new country. As the battle turned against the Americans, he led Washington's bodyguard in a sudden cavalry sortie which threw back for a time the British advance and gave the Americans a breathing space. Four days later Congress commissioned Count Pulaski "brigadier general in command of the horse," uniting under him, for the first time, all the American cavalry.

Next day came the skirmish at Warren's Tavern.

After the battle of Germantown in October, the Army went into winter quarters at Valley Forge. All that winter the new cavalry general worked incessantly with his command, teaching cavalry riding and military drill and tactics to men little used to discipline.

The count was recognized as the best swordsman in the Army and on horseback he was a veritable centaur. He delighted in practicing on the drill field the stunts he had learned as a boy from the Cossacks. With his horse at full gallop, he would fire his pistol, toss it in the air, and catch it as it fell. Or he would hurl it far ahead, dash up to it, and, leaning with one foot out of the stirrup, would snatch up the weapon and, without slackening speed, regain his seat.

Recruiting, drilling, providing for both men and horses kept the energetic Pole hopeful and exasperated by turns. By many short forays and scouting expeditions in small groups he gave his men experience in the field, and by harassing the British foraging parties he helped to keep General Howe's men closely penned in Philadelphia. And with it all, the cavalry veteran found time to write out his regulations for the cavalry as a separate division of the Army.

But the jealous hostility of some of his subordinate officers who resented serving under a foreigner speaking English brokenly, disheartened him. Only Washington's friendship and confidence kept him from resigning his commission and returning to Europe. He did relinquish command of the cavalry. He then prevailed upon Congress to authorize the formation of an independent mobile unit, the famous Pulaski's Legion.

The first of April 1778, Pulaski opened a recruiting office in Baltimore, Md. For the next 4 months he was busy organizing and training his corps. His officers were largely former officers in the armies of Europe, some of whom had served under him in Poland.

The Legion at full strength consisted of three companies of cavalry armed with lances and three companies of light infantry, three hundred and thirty all told. The commander and his officers soon successfully welded them into a splendid fighting machine. He had the gift of inspiring his men with something of his own ardent spirit.

In place of the motley rags and tatters on most of the American soldiers, Pulaski supplied his Legion with brilliant new uniforms of green coats, red vests, and white buckskin breeches. On the march he rode proudly at their head, his military cloak billowing behind him and the gay cockade on his great bearskin shako dancing. Over their heads floated the crimson banner embroidered for him by the Moravian "single sisters" of Bethlehem, Pa.

By the end of July the Legion was ready for the field, but it was weeks before they were to see active service. Except for a few minor engagements, another winter of inaction followed for the impatient Pulaski. But with the spring came a new campaign and renewed hope and enthusiasm.

Early in 1779 the Legion was ordered to join General Lincoln's army in the southern theater of war. The British had captured Savannah in December, and from there were threatening the rest of Georgia and South Carolina. Leaving Minisink on the Delaware River in February, Pulaski's corps started on its long and strenuous march southward. The infantry was dispatched by the post road through York, Baltimore, and Richmond. The general led the cavalry south through the Shenandoah Valley. Both groups hurried by forced marches to reach the scene of action before it would be too late.

On May 11 the two forces were reunited outside Charleston. Not a moment too soon. As the Legion reached the Cooper River, General Prevost, British commander, crossed the Ashley River and sent a message to the city fathers demanding surrender. With one or two other brilliant leaders, General Pulaski fairly browbeat the councilmen into defying the British demand. "As an officer of the Continental Army I forbid you to surrender," he stormed at them.

Next day, while enthusiasm still ran high, he led his cavalry in daring charges against the superior British forces, cutting his way back, often without loss. Pulaski's praises were on every tongue. General Prevost gave up his plan to take the city. The British commander, harassed by the Legion Cavalry which hung on his flanks, stinging like hornets, retreated down the sea islands to Savannah.

With Charleston safe, the Americans set about ridding the Carolinas and Georgia of hostile troops. By September the British retained only a foothold at Savannah. Hopes were bright that before winter the entire South would be cleared of the invaders. To add to the feeling of assurance, Admiral d'Estaing with a squadron of the French fleet arrived off Tybee Roads, 20 miles off Savannah. Pulaski spearheaded the American advance, picking off British outposts on his way to make contact with the French. By September 16 the allied blockade of Savannah was complete.

But d'Estaing, impatient with the slowness of siege operations and fearing the autumn storms, urged an assault on the well-fortified city. General Lincoln, in command of the American army, reluctantly consented, and on October 9 the allies attacked. Plans had been carefully made, but a deserter had warned them and carried them to the enemy. Thus all advantage of surprise and uncertainty was lost to the attackers. The ensuing battle was one of the bloodiest of the war.

One of Pulaski's officers vividly describes the scene. "For half an hour the guns roared and blood flowed abundantly. Seeing an opening between the enemy's works, Pulaski resolved to charge through. Imploring help from the Almighty, Pulaski shouted to his men, 'Forward,' and we, 200 strong, rode at full speed after him, the earth resounding under the hoofs of our chargers. For the first few minutes all went well. We sped like knights into the peril. Just, however, as we passed a gap between the two batteries, a cross fire, like a pouring shower, confused our ranks. I looked around. Oh, sad moment, ever to be remembered. Pulaski lies prostrate on the ground."

The fallen leader was rescued by some of his soldiers in the face of the enemy's fire and carried on board the United States brig *Wasp*, to be taken to Charleston. In spite of the care of French surgeons, he died on board her 2 days later and was buried at sea.

So died, at 31, the first commanding general of the United States cavalry, a gallant but ill-fated fighter for freedom both in his homeland and in the land of his adoption.

Today, more than 200 years after Pulaski's birth in far-off Poland, his spirit lives on in the hearts of his compatriots on both sides of the Atlantic, through whose efforts we may yet see fulfilled the dreams of a free Poland beside a free America in a free world.

Promises Versus Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, in Chicago there is a great Negro newspaper known as the Chicago Defender. Most Democrats are familiar with this newspaper, and have had a right to be familiar with it for the last decade and more.

Many of its fine articles have from time to time been honored in many ways by members of the Democratic Party, for reasons of benefit to them. However, on the front page of the Chicago Defender for Saturday, March 4, 1950, there appeared a two-column editorial which has not been properly honored by the Democratic Party.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert this editorial from the Chicago Defender in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that all the Members of the Eighty-first Congress will have opportunity to read it, and so that the article may be given due honor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROMISES VERSUS PERFORMANCE

As we enter the 1950 election campaign, the Democrats, both locally and nationally, should do a little soul searching.

Locally there seems to be a growing conviction on the part of Boss Jack Arvey and company that the Negro vote is in the bag for the Democratic Party. As the song goes, they seem to think that they have the world in a jug and the stopper in their hands.

We would like to remind them of that delightful tune from Porgy and Bess, It Ain't Necessarily So.

The Democrats here have, as we pointed out some weeks ago, ignored the wishes of the people in the First and Fifth Senatorial Districts by putting up hand-picked hacks. They have shown similar stupidity by refusing to give Judge Wendell Green the designation for the superior court.

As a matter of fact, the Democratic Party as a whole seems to be suffering from indigestion. They have apparently been eating too high on the hog, and now they are sleeping on a full stomach. The Democrats in Illinois and in the Nation have been and are now in a position to live up to their promises.

Here are some of the questions in the minds of the voters:

1. When will the people see some leadership in breaking the bottleneck on Mayor Kennelly's housing program?

2. Can Governor Stevenson compare his record to date with past administrations?

3. What happened to the administration's leaders in Congress in the fight for a strong FEPC?

4. How did it happen that Chairman Boyle, of the Democratic National Committee, stated that Congressman DAWSON was vice chairman of the committee and now nobody in Washington is quite sure what position DAWSON has on the committee?

5. Why were the qualified Negro candidates overlooked in the appointment of the new Governor for the Virgin Islands?

The action promised by the Democrats in 1948 caught the imagination of the people. Now, 2 years later, we have more promises and few accomplishments. This lack of action is cause for grave concern among voters who turned the tide in 1948 and who may turn the tide again.

The wishes of the people have been ignored and forgotten for the benefit of a small group of selfish men concerned only in maintaining their own little selfish political interests.

They have forgotten the people, but the people have yet to be heard.

Performances, not promises, will set the course.

United States Losing a Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Losing a Market," which appeared in the Kansas City Star of Kansas City, Mo., under date of March 1, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES LOSING A MARKET—SOUTH AMERICA TURNING TO EUROPE, PUBLISHER REPORTS

LAWRENCE, KANS., March 1.—Dolph Simons, publisher of the Journal-World, said today the United States has temporarily lost its markets in South America to European competitors.

He expressed the opinion the Marshall plan had boomeranged to our disadvantage in 9 out of 10 South American nations.

Simons returned today from a tour of Latin America. He said "our neighbors south of Panama are not asking for big chunks of financial aid, but they can't understand why they don't get a single dime while Uncle Sam is giving away billions in other parts of the world under the Marshall plan."

"Everywhere except in Venezuela," he said, "European countries have been given the green light to fill Latin-American stores with manufactured goods * * * while bans have been clamped on nearly all imports from the United States.

"South Americans largely prefer United States cars, radios, and other goods, but they don't have the dollars necessary to buy them. So they buy from England, France, and other countries which are breathing with new industrial life, thanks to billions of dollars from America."

Equal Rights Proposal Called Two-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

EQUAL RIGHTS PROPOSAL CALLED TWO-WAY STREET

To EDITOR, THE NEWS:

In an editorial on equal rights you have used a clever phrase, "This will be a neat trick if it can be done." I agree. You are referring to Senator HAYDEN's rider to the equal rights amendment. The amendment says "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex." The rider says that this shall not be construed to impair any benefits or exemptions conferred upon the female sex.

The rider tries to freeze laws about seats in factories, hours for day and night work, etc., which it is the job of men in the State assembly to discuss. They make statutory law.

But the amendment, adopted in the Senate on January 25 is to be added to the Bill of Rights, like the principle guaranteeing freedom of the press.

New Jersey State Bar Association made an appeal which resulted in equal rights which resulted in equal rights under the law for women in that State, given by the new constitution adopted 3 years ago: "In spirit women have attained a legal status equal with men, but in fact they are still in a subject class. This is incompatible with the right to vote and with the responsibilities women are assuming." New Jersey is the only State in the Union where women have full citizenship; where they are not treated as adolescent and incompetent by the law.

Strange as it may seem, the word "persons" in our Constitution has been interpreted by the Supreme Court as male, so equal protection of the laws guaranteed in the fourteenth amendment omits women.

Now the equal rights amendment is a two-way street. It does not mention women, or men. If Senator HAYDEN feared it would impair protection for women, why not for men? Are legal safeguards for sailors on the high seas, miners in coal pits, soldiers risking their lives to be thrown overboard, white seats in factories for women are saved? That would be a neat trick—and make of women the most selfish and unlovely of mortals.

FLORENCE L. C. KITCHELT,
Chairman, Connecticut Committee.

NEW HAVEN.

Seeking Security in Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Seeking Security in Prayer," by Mary Hornaday, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEEKING SECURITY IN PRAYER—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM NEW YORK

(By Mary Hornaday)

NEW YORK.—Readers of the New York Times have been surprised recently to see among the clothing and housefurnishing advertisements, two large displays—one entitled "God and the Atom," and a second, "Prayer, an Answer to 'God and the Atom.'"

In both cases, names of the persons sponsoring the ads were omitted. The first merely gave the name of an advertising agency for replies; the second was signed by a generally unknown group, "Fellowship in Prayer."

Reporters seeking out Ferris Booth who inserted the original "God and the Atom" ad in the Times on October 3, half expected to find what in the newspaper business is referred to as a "crackpot." Instead they located, in one of New York's swankiest hotel-apartments, a six-foot-four bachelor, son of a former vice president of the Guaranty Trust Co., and former manager of the Columbia University crew, who has been spending much time lately thinking about the big problems of the world.

Mr. Booth belongs to no church but usually attends St. John the Divine, the Episcopal Cathedral. He pointed to a shelf full of books on world problems that he had read before he decided to spend $2,500 on the "God and the Atom" ad. The announcement of the Russian bomb gave him his cue.

"There's no angle at all," he told surprised reporters, "but I always thought it was silly to have fights all the time. We can always get worse weapons but what's the use? The money we are paying out for past and present wars only means bankruptcy for all of us. There has to be some other answer, that's all."

Since Mr. Booth specifically addressed his ad to President Truman as a "sincere and most respectful suggestion," he naturally turned there for the first reaction. But a reporter who asked the President about it at a press conference was brushed aside.

But Mr. Booth said he expected God's help in getting a response to the ad. To date he has received 700 letters. In addition it evoked a second large ad in the Times of December 13, placed by C. A. Evans, retired associate executive secretary of the United Board for Christian Colleges in China, who heads a group of 15 calling themselves the "Fellowship in Prayer."

Mr. Evans sits modestly in what would normally be the public-stenographer's office in a hotel just across from the famous Little Church Around the Corner. After 20 years with Protestant church organizations, Mr. Evans, like Mr. Booth, came to the conclusion that there must be an interdenominational turning to God to meet the threat of communism and other antireligious forces. Thus far, he has received enough money from similarly-minded people to put the ad in the Times.

Mr. Evans calls his ad an answer to Mr. Booth because he does not agree with everything Mr. Booth said. He sees no use in bolstering Confucianism in China, for instance.

Also, he believes that, instead of putting responsibility in President Truman's hands, it should be put upon each individual who believes in God, regardless of his religious affiliation.

"The new approach that is needed," Mr. Evans says, "is simply prayer—prayer which recognizes that all great religions believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; that there are basic truths which apply to all great faiths and which may present a common denominator of attributes for which all people may pray. Truth, justice, mercy, and honesty are fundamentals over which there should be no controversy."

People are already writing to Mr. Evans to ask what they can do to further the spiritual renaissance on which both he and Mr. Booth set to work almost simultaneously. He put some recommendations into his ad: Begin now to pray in your own manner. Do it frequently or at stated times. Talk it over with your family, your neighbors, your friends, your spiritual adviser. If possible, get your local newspaper to copy this article or comment upon it. Fellowship circles could be formed. Do not, however, let it interfere with your regular religious duties—rather combine it with them.

The next step in the God and the atom campaign? "It may sound corny and trite," says Mr. Booth, "but I really believe God will take care of that." Says Mr. Evans, "No elaborate organization is planned. God has so far inspired the various steps of progress and he will direct and lead developments. All we know is we can't let the antireligious forces in the world win."

Many who are already effectively applying religion in their own way to the problems of our day will be interested in these efforts as new evidence of the widespread desire for more active peacemaking through religion.

One Great Hour of Sharing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe that we are all familiar with the magnificent job that was performed in the 100,000 Christian churches throughout our country 2 days ago, Sunday, March 12, in collecting contributions for world relief.

This was the program known as the initial One Great Hour of Sharing.

Throughout Wisconsin as throughout the Nation, churches of the Protestant and Catholic denominations joined together in this heartwarming application of the principles of the Great Teacher. I have in my hands, Mr. President, an advertisement carried in the Janesville Daily Gazette of March 10, sponsored by the Christian churches of that fine city. This advertisement mentions a series of radio programs on Station WCLO which were designed to spearhead the One Great Hour of Sharing drive. I believe

that the spiritual and layman leaders of the Christian churches throughout our country who initiated and carried through this great drive should indeed be congratulated. It is a magnificent demonstration of American unity in fulfillment of our Christian responsibilities to the suffering, the hungry, the naked, and the diseased. It is indeed an "operation good Samaritan."

I believe that this one advertisement shows perhaps more clearly than a Nation-wide summary exactly how the One Great Hour of Sharing program worked in one city. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this advertisement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Am I my brother's keeper?"—Genesis 4: 9.

ONE GREAT HOUR OF SHARING

Tonight, March 10, from 6:45 to 7 o'clock, and on Saturday evening, March 11, from 6 to 6:15 o'clock, WCLO will broadcast the last two programs in a dramatic series titled "Operation Good Samaritan" as part of the Nation-wide One Great Hour of Sharing overseas relief program to be held in your church on Sunday, March 12. This appeal will take place in more than 100,000 Christian churches throughout America. And we, the churches of Janesville, ask you to listen, attend, and give.

Listen, attend, share. Nearly 25,000,000 members of 19 major Protestant and Catholic denominations are participating in the One Great Hour of Sharing. The success of One Great Hour of Sharing, designed specifically to raise many millions of dollars for world relief in the thousands of churches throughout America, depends entirely on the number of people who give at 11 a. m. on Sunday, March 12, following the broadcasts. It is for this reason that we, the churches of Janesville and America, urge you, the Master, to listen tonight and tomorrow night, and to tell your friends to listen, and then go to church on Sunday and give. The hunger of heart, the nakedness of mind, the sickness of soul of millions of men, women, and children of Europe and Asia need help—your help. Only when all men can hold their heads high will the world be truly on the road to peace.

Sponsored by First Lutheran Church, St. John's Lutheran Church, First Congregational Church, First Baptist Church, First Christian Church, Cargill Memorial Methodist Church, Christian and Missionary Alliance Church, Emerald Grove Congregational Church, First Presbyterian Church, Church of the Reservoir, Evangelical United Brethren Church, St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Church, St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church, Salvation Army, Rock Prairie Presbyterian Church.

The President's Handling of the Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 1), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Clifford B. Ward, appearing in the Fort Wayne News Sentinel under date of March 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD EVENING

(By Clifford B. Ward)

President Truman's handling of the coal strike is sufficient grounds for his impeachment on a basis both of incompetence and malfeasance.

Obviously, he played the worst kind of cheap partisan politics with a situation more threatening to the general welfare of the United States than any plot, real or fancied, on the part of Communist Russia.

In effect, he violated for many months his oath of office by refusing to recognize a Federal law and by refusing to treat as an emergency something which every schoolboy knew was an emergency. When he did take recourse to the Federal law which covers such a situation he did so in a manner that was contemptuous of that law.

At no time did the President make any serious appeal to the coal miners of this country to go back to work and it is likely that an appeal, made by Truman, as President of the United States to the miners might have worked, if he had shown that he meant it.

WORST TYPE OF ENEMY

John L. Lewis was able to do what any avowed enemy of the United States would wish to do but would not be able to do. He was able to take a country which was headed for an unusually prosperous year of business and knock it back on its heels economically even worse than Communists would have been able to do if given full permission to do so. Today there is not a person in the United States who has not been hurt seriously by Lewis' coal strike.

That the Taft-Hartley law is a slave-labor act has been shown to be the most silly sort of charge. The Taft-Hartley Act is on the books and a national strike threatening the welfare of all the Nation occurred.

The contempt charges against Lewis were predicated on the basis that Lewis is the union. He is not. The union, even if Lewis did not, ignored the orders of a Federal court to go back to work until a fact-finding board completed its work.

NOT RESPONSIBLE UNITS

If unions are not responsive to court orders, they are not responsible organizations and cannot be so treated by Government or by those who deal with them and sign contracts with them. If union leaders cannot handle wildcat strikes, unauthorized union actions, and if they can't exercise the leadership to get their members to obey court orders, then it is silly to suppose that there is such a thing as union responsibility.

Every human being in this country has certain inalienable rights, but no human being in this country has an inalienable right to use an inalienable right to deprive some other citizen of an inalienable right. One man in defense of his rights cannot seriously threaten the rights of everyone else.

WOULD BE HISSED

If any capitalist were to willfully damage this Nation's economy as Lewis has done, his name would be hissed by every other citizen in this country. If a capitalist were to refuse to feed our army of occupation in Japan until he was promised the best profit on food needed, we would ask him to be tried for something comparable to treason.

Yet, Mr. Lewis, in effect, said that he was willing to hurt every innocent person in the United States, if necessary, to see to it that miners get what they were demanding.

A public official who takes an oath to preserve law and order and carry out the requirements of his oath can be impeached if he does not do his duty. Mr. Truman is such a public official.

Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some letters I have received about housing:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
PERSONNEL POLICY BOARD,
Washington, D. C., December 9, 1940.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In contacting the military departments and agencies of the Department of Defense, I found that the information which you requested in your note to me on October 25 was being compiled and sent to you by the Secretary of Defense. Therefore, I waited until that letter was sent to you before responding to your request. I hope that this letter from Mr. Stephen Early, as Acting Secretary, sent you on November 30 supplied the desired data on family housing in Alaska.

Vice Admiral McCrea is sending additional housing figures to you in compliance with your notes on his letter of October 3. This should reach you in a few days.

I have been very happy to furnish you with what information was available because of your deep interest in the welfare of the families of men and women in the service.

My delays, and those of Admiral McCrea's, in answering your inquiries promptly have been occasioned by the fact that the Personnel Policy Board does not normally deal with statistical data on housing. This is the responsibility of the Munitions Board and the Office of the Budget, Office of the Secretary of Defense. Therefore, the information which we gathered for you was second or third handed, coming first from the services and then through these two mentioned agencies. I have a suggestion which is respectfully submitted in case you desire further family housing data. There is now another group within the Department of Defense which is going into the housing business very deeply. I refer to the Department of Defense Housing Commission, which was appointed by Mr. Johnson on November 16, 1949, to study all phases of the family housing problem and to plan for an over-all solution to these problems. The studies and research of this commission should produce more complete and accurate figures than have been available heretofore.

I hope you enjoyed your recess and were able to spend most of the time in your home at Gladewater and in your district. I envy you in this respect because my military service has kept me away from my home in San Antonio for about 6 years now.

For your information, I have recently been assigned from the Personnel Policy Board to the Joint Technical Planning Committee, the group which is responsible for operations in connection with the atomic bomb test scheduled for Eniwetok at a later date. I'm very enthusiastic about the new job because of the background it will give me in the use of this most important weapon.

Again, I repeat, it has been a pleasure to furnish any assistance which I could to you. I am apologetic about the delays in time, and I am sincere when I say that these delays were necessary in order to insure that the data was correct and based on sound facts.

Respectfully,
ROBERT R. GIBSON, Jr.,
Colonel, United States Air Force.

P. S.—Attached please find Air Force magazine with an article about housing. Thought you might be interested in reading it.—R. R. G., Jr.

HEADQUARTERS, BENJAMIN HARRISON AIR FORCE BASE,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 24, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: With reference to your letter of January 10, 1950, the following information is furnished:

Officers with families at this base	168
Airmen with families at this base	331
Officers with families furnished Government housing by this base	63
Airmen with families furnished Government housing by this base	86

No information on additional housing units needed at this base can be furnished inasmuch as this base will be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army on February 1, 1950, and future plans for this base are not known by this headquarters.

Very truly yours,
ROGER E. LEE,
Lieutenant Colonel, United States Air Force, Commanding.

[Headquarters, Three Thousand Three Hundred and Tenth Technical Training Wing and Scott Air Force Base, Ill.]

OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL,
January 31, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In reply to your inquiry of January 23, 1950, the following information is furnished:

Number of officers with families assigned to the base	908
Number of enlisted men with families assigned to the base	2,534
Number of officers with families occupying Government quarters	205
Number of enlisted men with families occupying Government quarters	213

Additional housing units needed: Officers, 703; enlisted, 2,321.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN F. MCBLAIN,
Brigadier General, United States Air Force, Commanding.

[Headquarters, Ninety-first Strategic Reconnaissance Wing]

BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, LA.,
January 30, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In answer to your letter received at this station January 25, 1950, the following information is offered:

1. Number of officers with families at this base, 1,175.

2. Number of airmen with families at this base, 2,546.

3. Number of officers with families now occupying Government quarters on the base, 106.

4. Number of airmen with families now occupying Government quarters:

(a) On the base, 123.

(b) Barksdale Homes (off the base, but immediately adjacent), 101.

(c) Greentree Homes (22 miles from the base, 115. (Homes are not considered adequate due to the distance from the base and the present condition of the homes.)

5. Additional housing units required at this station for officers with families, 855. (This figure is based on the total married officers, less the number now furnished Government quarters, less 20 percent who would not desire Government quarters.)

6. Additional housing units for airmen with families, 2,323. (This figure includes those airmen presently living at Greentree Homes.)

Your attention is invited to the fact that a total of 1,500 additional housing units was recommended by the Federal Housing Administration, of which 692 have been approved and contract let.

We are pleased to furnish you with this information. If we can be of any further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to write us.

Sincerely yours,
HORACE M. WADE,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Deputy Commander.

HEADQUARTERS FORT BRAGG,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL,
Fort Bragg, N. C., January 31, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of January 19, 1950, the following information is furnished:

Number of officers with families at this station	1,531
Number of enlisted men with families at this station	5,903
Number of officers with families furnished Government quarters by this station:	
Permanent	124
Mobilization type	[illegible]
Number of enlisted men furnished Government quarters by this station:	
Permanent	140
Mobilization type	[2] 1,012
Number of additional housing units needed for officers at this station	818
Number of additional housing units needed for enlisted men at this station	[3] 4,751

[1] Converted from mobilization-type buildings.

[2] 475 units (Honeycutt housing area) are located 8 miles from the post. 537 units converted from mobilization-type buildings.

[3] This figure includes 2,550 enlisted men for whom housing on or offpost is desirable.

The requirement for 818 officer units and 4,751 EM units is the current need. To this figure must be added units required for replacement of the converted mobilization-type housing, which has an estimated life of not to exceed 5 years.

The above figures do not include 1,000 units which are to be constructed by civilian contractor under the provisions of the Wherry bill.

Trusting that the above covers desired information, I am

Sincerely yours,
HOMER W. KIESER,
Brigadier General, General Staff Corps, Chief of Staff.

[Headquarters, Mitchel Air Force Base (Twenty-five hundredth Air Base Group)]

NEW YORK, *January 30, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of January 19, 1950, please be advised of the following status of family housing at this station.

(a) There are 643 officers assigned this station with families.

(b) There are 1,525 airmen assigned this station with families.

(c) There are 100 officers assigned Government family quarters at this station; these quarters are in the following categories:

1. Permanent, 29.
2. FPHA, 29.
3. Converted barracks, 12.

(d) There are 307 airmen assigned Government family quarters at this station; these quarters are in the following categories:

1. Permanent, 68.
2. FPHA, 145.
3. Converted barracks, 94.

(e) There are 38 airmen residing in privately owned trailers on Government trailer lots at this station.

(f) Based on availability of housing in the adjacent communities, housing is required for personnel of this station as follows:

1. Officers, 315.
2. Airmen, 315.

Please be assured of our continued cooperation in this and other matters within the confines of existing regulations.

Very sincerely yours,
ROBERT W. C. WINGATE,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Commanding.

[Headquarters, Four Thousand Four Hundred and Eighth Air Base Squadron]

LAWSON AIR FORCE BASE,
Fort Benning, Ga., January 30, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your communication of January 27, 1950, regarding Government housing for military personnel assigned Lawson Air Force Base.

For your information, Lawson Air Force Base is on the military reservation of Fort Benning, Ga., and a pro rata share of housing is available to this station from that headquarters. At present we have 33 officers with families stationed at Lawson Air Force Base, 7 of these presently assigned Government quarters on the Fort Benning Reservation. We have 123 airmen with families assigned this station with 7 being furnished Government housing on Fort Benning. To provide adequate housing for all military personnel at Lawson Air Force Base, we presently would need 26 sets of quarters for officer personnel and 115 sets of quarters for airmen.

For your information, 600 units are presently under contract under the Wherry bill on the Fort Benning Reservation. Also approximately 200 sets of noncommissioned officers' quarters are almost completed. A pro rata share of these quarters will be made available to Lawson Air Force Base upon completion.

Yours truly,
RICHARD O. JOHNSON,
Major, United States Air Force, Commanding.

[Headquarters, Four Thousand One Hundred and Eighth Base Service Squadron]

SMOKY HILL AIR FORCE BASE,
Salina, Kans., January 30, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference your recent inquiry of January 23 relative to the number of officers and enlisted men with families stationed here, the following information is submitted:

(a) Number of officers with families, 14.

(b) Number of enlisted men with families, 168.

There are no officers or enlisted men occupying Government quarters at this station, and no additional units are required at present, since this station is in process of being deactivated and is scheduled to be placed on a stand-by basis on April 30, 1950.

Sincerely yours,

D. M. JONES,
Lieutenant Colonel, United States Air Force, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS, FORT DEVENS, MASS.,
February 1, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: As requested by you, the following housing information is furnished:

Officers with families at this station	226
Enlisted men with families at this station	1,236
Officers with families in Government housing	200
Enlisted men with families in Government housing	512
Additional housing units needed for officers with families at present time	26
Additional housing units needed for enlisted men with families at present time	705

The forecast for the future is more unfavorable, although definite figures are not available at this time. An increase in the permanent garrison is anticipated which will increase the shortage by approximately 500, should current plans, as yet unannounced, materialize.

Sincerely,

R. W. CRAW,
Major General, United States Army, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS, CAMP LEE,
Camp Lee, Va., February 1, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I have received your letter of January 27, 1950, in which certain information was requested as to the family housing situation existing at Camp Lee, Va.

The information requested is being compiled and will be submitted through the Legislative and Liaison Division, Department of the Army, for coordination.

Sincerely,

R. C. L. CRAWFORD,
Major General, United States Army, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS, THE INFANTRY CENTER,
Fort Benning, Ga.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In response to your inquiry of January 19, the following information is furnished:

(a) Number of officers with families, 2,005. Of this number there are 153 living in bachelor-type quarters who draw family allowance. Due to nonavailability of Government quarters or reasons of their own, including compulsion, the families of these officers have remained in their home communities throughout the United States. There will always be a certain number of officers and enlisted personnel of this category. Practically all of these officers are in non-Regular Army components.

Number of enlisted personnel with families, 1,326. Of this number 239 are in the status of the 153 officers described above. (The figure 2,309 includes enlisted personnel authorized quarters or quarters allowance only. In addition, there are 4,212 enlisted personnel of lower grades with families who are authorized neither quarters nor quarters allowance.)

(b) Number of officers with families in Government quarters, 894.

Number of enlisted men with families in Government quarters, 338.

(c) Number of quarters required for officers, 1,111. This figures includes quarters for the 153 officers described in (a) above.

Number of quarters required for enlisted personnel, 2,871. This figure includes quarters for the 239 enlisted personnel described in (a) above.

For your further information, 200 units of $65 to $70 rentals have been built on the Fort Benning Military Reservation under the act of August 5, 1947 (61 Stat. 774) (per 10 U. S. C. 1270), that are now occupied. Contracts have been let for 600 housing units with rental value at $70 through $95 to be built on the Fort Benning Military Reservation under the Wherry bill. In addition, 50 housing units (Government quarters for authorized enlisted personnel) are under construction on the main post with target completion date April 1, 1950. For planning purposes these 650 units reduce the requirements in paragraph 1 (c) above.

The foregoing indicated requirements are based on actual existing conditions, whereas requirements used in submission of budget requests are ordinarily based upon projected peacetime strengths utilized for long-range planning. The projected strengths for Fort Benning represent a total peacetime requirement of 5,601 family units for officers and 9,859 family units for noncommissioned officers, resulting in a total family housing requirement of 15,460 units.

Yours very truly,

J. S. BRADLEY,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Commanding.

[Headquarters, Westover Air Force Base (One Thousand Six Hundredth Air Transport Wing, ATLD-MATS)]

WESTOVER AIR FORCE BASE, MASS.,
February 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Acknowledgement is made of your letter of January 25, 1950, in which you request information regarding housing available and required for officers and airmen at this installation.

In accordance with the provisions of Air Force Regulation 11-7, dated April 25, 1949, your inquiry is being forwarded to the Director of Legislation and Liaison, Headquarters, United States Air Force, for reply. Pertinent information will be furnished you by that office in the near future.

Sincerely,

J. E. BARZYNSKI, Jr.,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Commanding.

AIR PROVING GROUND,
EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLA.,
February 1, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am in receipt of your letter of January 26, 1950, in which you request information relative to the numbers of officers and enlisted men with families who are stationed at this base and the numbers of such personnel who are furnished Government-owned housing.

In answer to your specific questions and to provide you with a comprehensive picture of the current housing requirements at this station, the following table of information is offered:

1. Total personnel strength by categories, Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.: Officers, 635; airmen, 1,921.

2. Total personnel strength by categories with families: Officers, 490; airmen, 2,303.

3. Total personnel by categories with families who are furnished Government-owned housing: Officers, 149; airmen, 544.

4. Number of existing Government-owned family units deductible from (2), above: Officers, 149; airmen, 544.

5. Present housing deficiency by categories: Officers, 350; airmen, 1,758.

The above figures, relating to personnel with families, are supplied from a survey recently completed as of December 31, 1949, and will not normally vary over an extended period by more than 5 percent up or down. Any attempt to furnish more current information, as to the numbers of officers and airmen with families, would necessitate an additional survey which could not be completed for approximately 15 days, however, experience shows the percentage of officers and enlisted personnel with families will vary only slightly with any normal turn-over of personnel.

It is anticipated that the figures given herein regarding the present housing deficiency will increase in the near future, consistent with proposed future expansion of Eglin Air Force Base; however, justification for future deficiency cannot be made at this time.

It may be noted that the above table indicates 2,303 enlisted men with families for whom a definite housing requirement is established, however, of that number only 1,419 are within the pay grades for which Government housing is normally furnished under current regulations.

I trust this information will be satisfactory for your use.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. KEPNER,
Major General, United States Air Force, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS, OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE,
Omaha, Nebr., February 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Furnished below is the information requested in your letter of inquiry dated January 26, 1950.

Officers with families at this base	449
Airmen with families at this base	929
Officers having Government housing	37
Airmen having Government housing	27
Additional units needed for officers	412
Additional units needed for airmen	902

Sincerely,

GERALD G. ROBINSON,
Lieutenant Colonel, United States Air Force, Deputy Commander.

HEADQUARTERS, CAMP LEROY JOHNSON,
New Orleans, La., February 3, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: In reply to your letter of January 26, 1950, requesting data on the housing situation at this post, the following report is submitted:

Number of officers with families assigned	51
Number of enlisted men with families assigned	390
Officers furnished Government housing	5
Enlisted men furnished Government housing (the above housing is not on the post, but furnished by the Navy Bienville Housing project)	38
Housing units needed for officers	34
Housing units needed for enlisted men	352

Trusting that this information is what you desire, I am,

Yours very truly,

H. C. SEES,
Colonel, Field Artillery, Commanding.

[Headquarters, Lowry Air Force Base and Three Thousand Four Hundred and Fifteenth Technical Training Wing]

DENVER, COLO., *February 3, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference your letter of January 23, I regret that I am unable to furnish you the information requested. However, your letter has been referred to the Director of Legislation and Liaison, Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, and you may expect a reply from him.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN R. CARTER,
Brigadier General, United States Air Force, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS,
THE ARMORED CENTER,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL,
Fort Knox, Ky., February 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of January 19, 1950, regarding housing statistics at this station, and the following information is submitted:

(a) Number of officers with families assigned to this post	1,328
(b) Number of enlisted men (consisting of grades E-5, E-6, and E-7; and grade E-4 with seven or more years of service) with families assigned to this post	2,597
(c) Number of officers with families occupying Government quarters	680
(d) Number of officers with families occupying Government substandard quarters	15
(e) Number of enlisted men with families occupying Government quarters	629
(f) Number of enlisted men with families occupying Government substandard quarters	317
(g) Number of officers with families living in privately owned trailers located on the post	117
(h) Number of enlisted men with families living in privately owned trailers located on the post (all grades)	159
(i) Number of officers with families living on post, totals of subparagraphs (c), (d), and (g)	812
(j) Number of enlisted men with families living on post, totals of subparagraphs (e), (f), and (h)	1,105
(k) Number of additional housing units needed for officers with families at this post	516
(l) Number of additional housing units needed for enlisted men with families at this post	1,492

Under current Army regulations, enlisted personnel of the three highest grades with dependents are assigned quarters if available. Enlisted personnel in the remaining lower grades with dependents may be granted authority to occupy public quarters when such quarters are not required for assignment to personnel of the three highest grades.

At the present time there are additional housing units in process of construction which includes 152 Government units plus 1,000 units by private concern under Government lease (Wherry bill) or a total of 1,152 units.

Upon completion of these new units, the housing shortage at this station will be relieved considerably, and the 856 officers and/or enlisted men—totals of subparagraphs (k) and (l) above 2,008, less new units being constructed 1,152—will be able to find family quarters in communities adjacent to this post due to personnel moving into the new units.

In view of above no justification for additional housing can be foreseen at this time.

I will be very pleased to be of further assistance if you find it desirable to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

WM. G. LIVESAY,
Major General,
United States Army, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS,
FORT WILLIAMS, MAINE,
February 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The following information is furnished in response to your inquiry of February 1:

(a) Number of officers, with families, assigned to this command, 22.

(b) Number of enlisted men, with families, assigned to this command, 161.

(c) Number of officers, with families, furnished Government quarters, 19.

(d) Number of enlisted men, with families, furnished Government quarters, 42.

(e) In view of the fact that this station and its satellite stations is scheduled for a drastic reduction in strength and eventual deactivation, no additional housing units are needed for either officers or enlisted men and their families.

L. W. GOEPPERT,
Colonel, Coast Artillery Corps, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS,
WENDOVER AIR FORCE BASE,
Wendover, Utah, February 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference your letter of February 1, 1950, requesting information relative housing of military personnel assigned this station.

Presently there are 2 officers and 23 enlisted men, with families, assigned this station. These personnel are housed in a Government housing project in the adjacent town of Wendover, Utah. There are no quarters available on the station for military personnel.

This station is in the process of inactivation and it is not anticipated that housing units will be required.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. CRUM,
Major, United States Air Force, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS, CAMP CARSON,
Camp Carson, Colo., February 9, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In answer to your communication, dated January 26, 1950 pertaining to housing at this installation, the following information is submitted:

Total officers with families	464
Total enlisted men with families	1,949
Apartments	
Total government housing for officers	136
Total Government housing for enlisted men	268
Additional housing needed for officers	121
Additional housing needed for enlisted men	803

I am sorry to have caused you this delay but the compiling of this information through a thorough screening of our records necessitated more time than contemplated.

Sincerely,

THOMAS E. MOORE,
Colonel, Field Artillery,
Deputy Commander.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 13, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in further reference to your letter of January 9, 1950, addressed to the Commanding Officer, Andrews Air Force Base, Washington 20, D. C., in which you requested housing information.

The following information has been supplied by the Commanding Officer of Andrews Air Force Base:

Officers with families	610
Officers furnished Government quarters	182
Additional housing units needed for officers	428
Airmen with families	1,127
Airmen furnished Government quarters	12
Airmen quarters under construction and nearing completion	120
Additional housing units needed for airmen	995

Sincerely,

J. F. MCCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force,
Chief, Congressional Liaison Division.

HEADQUARTERS, MARINE CORPS SCHOOLS,
Quantico, Va., February 14, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The information requested in your letter of February 10, 1950, concerning the housing at the Marine Corps Schools is as follows:

(a) Number of married officers, 814.

(b) Number of married enlisted, 1,183.

(c) Number of married officers occupying Government quarters, 322.

Number of married officers occupying Government-controlled rental quarters, 66.

(d) Number of married enlisted occupying Government quarters, 207.

Number of married enlisted occupying Government-controlled rental quarters, 271.

(e) Number of quarters now under construction, none.

(f) 450 units have been requested under the provisions of the Wherry Housing Act.

As you know, the housing situation at the Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va., is one of our major problems at the present time. Your interest in the situation is deeply appreciated.

As you requested, I am returning your letter.

Sincerely yours,

LEMUEL C. SHEPHERD, Jr.,
Major General, United States Marine Corps, Commandant, Marine Corps Schools.

HEADQUARTERS,
HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE,
Alamogordo, N. Mex., February 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of January 23, 1950, relative to housing at this base, the following information is furnished:

(a) Number of officers with families, 102.

(b) Number of airmen with families, 302.

(c) Number of officers occupying Government quarters, 60.

(d) Number of airmen occupying Government quarters, 240. (These 240 quarters are of the "cracker-box" variety built as temporary housing in 1942. They are substandard, inadequate, and have deteriorated to a point where they cannot be economically maintained.)

(e) Number of quarters now under construction, 82.

(f) Total number of quarters required by both officers and airmen, 350. (This number

has been requested under the Wherry Housing Act.)

Your interest in the housing situation at this station is deeply appreciated and I will gladly furnish any further information that you request.

Sincerely,

CARL B. NELSON,
Lieutenant Colonel, United States Air Force, Coordinator of Congressional Matters.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
DIRECTORATE OF LEGISLATION AND LIAISON,
Washington, February 15, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 1, 1950, requesting information about the housing at Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz.

Information in regard to this matter is being obtained and you will be advised further in the near future.

Sincerely,

J. F. MCCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Chief, Congressional Liaison Division.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 21, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in further reference to your letter of January 10, 1950, addressed to the commanding officer, Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, regarding Government housing.

The following information has been supplied by the commanding officer of Kirtland Air Force Base:

Officers with families	[illegible]
Enlisted men with families	900
Officers with families having Government housing	25
Enlisted men with families having Government housing	75
Additional housing units needed for:	
Officers with families	153
Airmen with families	500

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. F. MCCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Chief, Congressional Liaison Division.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 21, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in further reference to your letter of January 26, 1950, addressed to the Commanding Officer, Westover Air Force Base, Mass.

The following information has been supplied by the commanding officer of Westover Air Force Base:

Personnel occupying family-type quarters on the base:

Officers	98
Airmen	87
Civilians	2

An estimate of family housing needs as of December 31, 1949, was as follows:

Officers	612
Airmen	1,633
Civilians	338

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. F. MCCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Chief, Congressional Liaison Division.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
DIRECTORATE OF LEGISLATION AND LIAISON,
Washington, February 21, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in further reference to your letter of January 10, 1950, addressed to the Commanding Officer, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, requesting housing information.

The following information has been supplied by the commanding officer of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base:

Officers with families stationed at base	1,546
Airmen (enlisted) with families stationed at base	1,042
Officers with families furnished housing on base	343
Airmen (enlisted) with families furnished housing on base	372
Number of additional housing units required for officers' families	1,203
Number of additional housing units required for airmen's families	670

Sincerely,

J. F. MCCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Chief, Congressional Liaison Division.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 23, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reference to your letters of January 10 and 14, 1950, addressed to the Commanding Officer of Hamilton Air Force Base, Hamilton, Calif., concerning housing data and black-eyed pea procurement at that base and to your communication of January 31, 1950 on the above matter.

One hundred and forty-four pounds of black-eyed peas were purchased at Hamilton Air Force Base from Tiedemann and McMonan, 65 Berry Street, San Francisco, Calif., at $.0979 per pound. One hundred and ninety-two pounds were purchased from Haas Brothers, Third and Channel Streets, San Francisco, Calif., at $0.1637 per pound.

As of January 1, 1950, there were 607 officers and 1,710 airmen with families at Hamilton Air Force Base of which 108 officers and 268 airmen were assigned public quarters.

Your interest in the Air Force is appreciated.

J. F. MCCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Chief, Congressional Liaison Division.

HEADQUARTERS, SEVENTY-EIGHTH FIGHTER WING,
HAMILTON AIR FORCE BASE,
Hamilton, Calif., January 26, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Please be advised that the information desired of the number of officers with families at Hamilton Air Force Base and other related questions in your letter of January 10, 1950, and the number of black-eyed peas or beans that are purchased annually and the source and price in your letter of January 14, 1950, has been referred to the Director of Legislation and Liaison, Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, Washington, D. C.

The Director of Legislation and Liaison has been requested to furnish to you the pertinent information requested.

If I may be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE L. UBBEN,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Commanding.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 27, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is further reference to your letter of February 1, 1950, addressed to the commanding officer, Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz., requesting information concerning housing at that base.

Following is the information relative to the housing accommodations at Williams Air Force Base:

Personnel occupying family-type quarters:

Officers	54
Enlisted men	64

An estimated need for family housing was—

Officers	226
Enlisted men	851

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. F. MCCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Chief, Congressional Liaison Division.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 28, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reference to your letter of February 14, 1950, addressed to Mr. Symington, relative to the housing situation at March Air Force Base, Calif.

Following is the information relative to the housing accommodations at March Air Force Base:

Personnel occupying family-type quarters:

Officers	65
Enlisted men	105

An estimated need for family housing is:

Officers	217
Enlisted men	807

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. F. MCCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Chief, Congressional Liaison Division.

HEADQUARTERS, FIFTEENTH AIR FORCE,
March Air Force Base, Calif., February 10, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Your letter of February 1, 1950, has been forwarded to me by the commanding officer of the caretaking detachment of the air field at Victorville, Calif., for the purpose of answering the questions contained in paragraph 3 of your letter.

Unfortunately, specific answers are not available, as the personnel from March Air Force Base who are to go to Victorville with the First Fighter Wing when it moves to that station have not been definitely selected. It has been estimated, however, that at least 400 units will be required for airmen's housing and 250 units for the officers. These units are presently planned for construction under the provisions of Public Law 211.

Information on the current housing status at Victorville is contained in the enclosed letter from the commanding officer of that station.

It is hoped that the information contained herein is a satisfactory answer to your questions. If additional information is desired, this office will make every effort to provide it.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MCCOY, Jr.,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Liaison for Wherry Housing, Victorville.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 28, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reference to your letter of January 23, 1950, to the commanding officer of Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colo., concerning housing data at that base.

There are 99 officer families and 61 families of enlisted men quartered on Lowry Air

Force Base. An additional 326 family quarters would be required to house all married officers and 1,501 additional family quarters would be required to house all married enlisted men at this base.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. F. MCCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Chief, Congressional Liaison Division.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Permit me to refer to your recent memoranda to various commanding officers of Army installations, wherein you requested information on family housing requirements.

In accordance with our telephone conversation, complete information relative to the housing requirements at Army installations has been consolidated in a single report and is enclosed herewith. In view of this report, it is assumed that individual replies from commanding officers are not required.

Sincerely yours,

T. A. YOUNG,
Assistant to the Chief, Legislative Liaison.

Department of the Army housing requirements, Dec. 31, 1949

Post or station	Officers					Enlisted men				
	Number living on post with families	Number being furnished Government quarters			Number additional family units required	Number living on post with families	Number being furnished Government quarters			Number additional family units required
		Permanent-type construction	Temporary-type construction	Total			Permanent-type construction	Temporary-type construction	Total	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Md.	412	[illegible]	39	95	317	577	24	112	136	[illegible]
Army Chemical Center, Md.	[illegible]	116	27	143	186	189	7	146	153	[illegible]
Army-Navy General Hospital, Arkansas	51	7	[illegible]	27	24	113	10	6	16	[illegible]
Army Medical Center, District of Columbia	312	11	46	57	255	269	[illegible]	9	85	[illegible]
Anniston ordnance depot, Alabama	[illegible]	3	12	15	5	0	0	0	0	0
Arlington Hall Station, Virginia	173	3	0	3	170	75	[illegible]	0	0	0
Atlanta general depot, Georgia	112	10	27	37	75	[illegible]	3	12	15	[illegible]
Auburn general depot, Washington	9	0	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Department of Army receiving station, Maryland	2	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	11
William Beaumont General Hospital, Texas	[illegible]	25	14	[illegible]	39	43	11	21	[illegible]	11
Fort Belvoir, Va.	408	[illegible]	195	283	260	1,344	72	151	224	1,[illegible]
Benicia Arsenal, Calif.	24	6	10	16	8	35	7	13	20	15
Fort Benning, Ga.	[illegible]	435	459	[illegible]	1,111	[illegible]	148	190	[illegible]	1,[illegible]
Black Hills ordnance depot, South Dakota	12	0	5	5	7	2	0	2	2	0
Fort Bliss, Tex.	1,009	157	[illegible]	[illegible]	1,[illegible]	1,849	103	83	186	[illegible]
Blue Grass ordnance depot, Kentucky	10	5	2	7	3	2	0	1	1	1
Fort Bragg, N. C.	1,531	114	[illegible]	704	827	[illegible]	96	912	1,008	1,[illegible]
Brooke Medical Center, Tex.	438	112	72	184	254	714	[illegible]	110	180	[illegible]
Camp Carson, Colo.	256	0	72	72	184	688	0	270	270	[illegible]
Camp Campbell, Ky.	660	0	[illegible]	339	[illegible]	1,101	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	615
Carlisle Barracks, Pa.	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	96	101	[illegible]	57	[illegible]	96
Charleston small boat wet storage basin, South Carolina	8	0	0	0	8	1	0	0	0	1
Chicago quartermaster depot, Illinois	[illegible]	0	0	0	[illegible]	41	0	0	0	41
Columbus General Depot, Ohio	68	31	0	31	37	19	2	0	2	17
Camp Cook, Calif.	[illegible]	0	8	8	[illegible]	[illegible]	0	23	23	[illegible]
Fort Crockett, Tex.	8	8	0	8	0	37	[illegible]	1	[illegible]	1
Fort Custer, Mich.	111	8	16	[illegible]	87	262	24	[illegible]	98	171
Fort Devens, Mass.	225	66	0	[illegible]	159	710	45	301	346	[illegible]
Camp Detrick, Md.	35	16	14	[illegible]	5	[illegible]	5	12	[illegible]	0
Detroit Arsenal, Mich.	30	0	0	0	[illegible]	0	0	0	0	0
Fort Dix, N. J.	[illegible]	31	107	138	665	1,921	21	167	[illegible]	1,[illegible]
Dugway Proving Grounds, Utah	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
Erie ordnance depot, Pennsylvania	19	7	12	19	0	13	8	0	13	0
Fort Eustis, Va.	570	6	102	108	462	750	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colorado	205	47	16	63	142	[illegible]	[illegible]	0	[illegible]	[illegible]
Frankford Arsenal, Pa.	11	8	2	10	1	13	4	0	4	9
Granite City engineer depot, Illinois	37	[illegible]	0	[illegible]	0	[illegible]	0	0	0	30
Fort Hamilton, N. Y., and New York Port of Embarkation, N. Y.	514	[illegible]	0	47	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	0	[illegible]	[illegible]
Camp Holabird, Md.	257	8	0	17	[illegible]	310	[illegible]	9	29	[illegible]
Camp Hood, Tex.	[illegible]	61	253	324	[illegible]	2,[illegible]	155	833	[illegible]	1,[illegible]
Fort Sam Houston, Tex.	458	169	6	175	[illegible]	[illegible]	73	117	[illegible]	[illegible]
Fort Jay, N. Y.	[illegible]	[illegible]	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	184	115
Fort Knox, Ky.	1,220	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	293	[illegible]	1,213	1,147
Fort Lawton, Wash., and Seattle port of embarkation, Washington (quarters for Seattle port personnel are provided at Fort Lawton)	346	18	0	18	[illegible]	328	15	114	119	[illegible]
Fort Leavenworth, Kans.	[illegible]	447	[illegible]	683	[illegible]	701	[illegible]	2	[illegible]	[illegible]
Camp Lee, Va.	[illegible]	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	478	776	0	179	179	616
Letterkenny ordnance depot, Pennsylvania	31	0	15	15	16	21	0	7	7	14
Letterman General Hospital, California	[illegible]	9	49	[illegible]	135	115	0	9	9	[illegible]
Fort Lewis, Wash.	1,745	187	[illegible]	513	1,232	3,045	141	228	[illegible]	2,616
Lexington signal depot, Kentucky	[illegible]	0	4	4	[illegible]	[illegible]	0	0	0	0
Lima ordnance depot, Ohio	[illegible]	0	6	6	4	0	0	0	0	0
Louisville medical depot, Kentucky	[illegible]	2	0	2	[illegible]	0	0	0	0	0
Midwest chemical depot, Arkansas, Pine Bluff Arsenal	26	0	25	25	1	[illegible]	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Madigan General Hospital, Washington (these quarters are located at Fort Lewis, Wash.)	[illegible]	[illegible]	0	[illegible]	68	173	49	0	[illegible]	[illegible]
Marion engineer depot, Ohio	7	0	6	6	1	0	0	0	0	0
Fort Mason, Calif.	[illegible]	[illegible]	4	[illegible]	322	[illegible]	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	147
Marietta TC depot, Pennsylvania	17	0	8	8	9	11	0	0	0	11
Fort Meade, Md.	838	61	[illegible]	[illegible]	614	1,241	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	1,[illegible]
Fort McNair, D. C.	[illegible]	34	0	34	235	[illegible]	[illegible]	0	[illegible]	65
Fort McPherson, Ga.	467	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	274	[illegible]	27	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Memphis general depot, Tennessee	[illegible]	16	3	19	[illegible]	1	0	1	1	1
Milan Arsenal, Tenn.	11	11	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
Miller Field, N. Y.	17	17	0	17	17	[illegible]	[illegible]	0	[illegible]	[illegible]
Fort Monmouth, N. J.	624	[illegible]	37	[illegible]	[illegible]	695	60	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Fort Monroe, Va.	280	127	114	251	[illegible]	[illegible]	63	68	131	[illegible]
Mount Rainier ordnance depot, Washington	12	0	12	0	0	8	0	0	0	8
Fort Myer, Va.	1,[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Navajo ordnance depot, Arizona	11	0	7	7	4	0	0	0	0	0
New Cumberland general depot and U. S. Disciplinary Barracks, Pa.	[illegible]	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	0	0	0	[illegible]
New Orleans port of embarkation, Louisiana (quarters are located at Camp Leroy Johnson, La.)	99	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	0	[illegible]	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	0
Oakland Army Base, Calif.	[illegible]	0	0	0	[illegible]	280	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	226
Fort Ord, Calif.	580	0	0	0	[illegible]	1,320	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	1,[illegible]
Philadelphia quartermaster depot, Pennsylvania	77	0	0	0	77	5	0	0	0	5
Picatinny Arsenal, N. J.	[illegible]	20	0	[illegible]	1	8	3	0	3	0
Fort Preble, Maine	6	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	4	0
Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	1,[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

Department of the Army housing requirements, Dec. 31, 1949—Continued

Post or station	Number living on post with families	Officers: Number being furnished Government quarters: Permanent-type construction	Officers: Number being furnished Government quarters: Temporary-type construction	Officers: Number being furnished Government quarters: Total	Officers: Number additional family units required	Enlisted men: Number living on post with families	Enlisted men: Number being furnished Government quarters: Permanent-type construction	Enlisted men: Number being furnished Government quarters: Temporary-type construction	Enlisted men: Number being furnished Government quarters: Total	Enlisted men: Number additional family units required
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Presidio of Monterey, Calif.	238	55	0	55	183	123	19	8	27	96
Pueblo ordnance depot, Colorado	11	6	0	5	6	2	0	0	0	2
Raritan Arsenal, N. J.	[illegible]	6	6	6	13	8	8	0	8	0
Red River Arsenal, Tex.	30	0	29	29	1	59	0	0	0	59
Ravenna Arsenal, Ohio	13	13	0	13	0	7	2	5	7	0
Redstone Arsenal, Ala.	[illegible]	13	6	19	20	87	0	0	0	87
Richmond quartermaster depot, Virginia	[illegible]	11	3	14	10	4	0	0	0	4
Rock Island Arsenal, Ill.	15	11	0	11	2	1	0	0	0	1
Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Colo.	[illegible]	0	7	7	28	31	0	3	3	28
Rossford ordnance depot, Ohio	13	0	0	0	18	13	0	0	0	13
Sacramento signal depot, California	28	18	0	18	10	24	0	6	0	18
Savanna ordnance depot, Illinois	8	6	0	6	3	8	0	0	0	2
Schenectady general depot, New York	38	5	20	25	33	5	0	0	0	5
Sharp general depot, California	39	0	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	0
Fort Sheridan, Ill. and Headquarters, Fifth Army, Chicago, Ill. (12 sets of quarters at Fort Sheridan are utilized by Headquarters, Fifth Army)	449	97	50	97	352	499	51	52	103	[illegible]
Sierra ordnance depot, California	[illegible]	0	21	0	0	4	0	0	0	1
Signal Corps Photo Center, New York	62	0	0	0	62	26	0	0	0	26
Fort Sill, Okla.	[illegible]	[illegible]	117	[illegible]	[illegible]	1,656	152	296	[illegible]	1,208
Sioux ordnance depot, Nebraska	9	0	0	0	9	6	5	0	0	1
Springfield Armory, Mass.	12	12	0	12	0	1	1	0	1	0
St. Louis Administration Center, Missouri	[illegible]	28	0	[illegible]	133	[illegible]	0	0	0	[illegible]
St. Louis medical depot, Missouri	45	1	0	1	42	32	0	0	3	[illegible]
Camp Stoneman, Calif.	[illegible]	36	0	5	222	403	0	64	64	[illegible]
Tooele ordnance depot, Utah	19	0	5	5	14	23	0	12	12	11
Fort Totten, N. Y.	108	23	8	41	67	118	55	6	39	73
Fort Tilden, N. Y.	8	2	0	2	6	17	0	11	17	0
Tres Rack Ranch, California	16	8	3	11	8	72	0	4	4	[illegible]
U. S. Disciplinary Barracks, Milwaukee, Wis.	38	19	0	19	23	241	8	2	10	231
United States Military Academy, N. Y.	[illegible]	269	14	[illegible]	123	[illegible]	127	46	173	[illegible]
Utah general depot, Utah	[illegible]	0	45	45	0	3	0	3	3	0
Umatilla ordnance depot, Oregon	10	5	2	7	3	0	0	0	0	0
Fort Wadsworth, N. Y.	28	9	0	9	17	85	1	34	[illegible]	[illegible]
Fort Worden, Wash. (including Fort Flagler, Wash.)	194	35	0	[illegible]	159	618	32	[illegible]	[illegible]	596
Watervliet Arsenal, N. Y.	13	10	0	10	1	2	2	0	2	0
Watertown Arsenal, N. Y.	17	17	0	17	0	2	2	0	2	0
Western Chemical Center, Utah	[illegible]	8	20	20	18	101	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
White Sands Proving Ground, N. Mex.	[illegible]	47	0	47	[illegible]	185	119	0	119	[illegible]
Fort Riley, Kans.	756	104	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	1,692	108	[illegible]	[illegible]	1,264
Wingate ordnance depot, New Mexico	5	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fort Worth quartermaster depot, Texas	20	8	0	8	22	9	0	0	0	9
Vint Hill Farms, Va.	60	28	1	29	11	117	0	3	3	114

[1] Includes 3,000 bachelorettes, Department of Army officers.

Soviet "Freedom"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following two items which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, the first on March 9, and the second on March 12, typify the operation of "people's democracy" in Soviet Russia:

UNITED STATES PRIEST FINALLY IN RUSSIA BUT STILL CAN'T HOLD SERVICE—FATHER BRASSARD'S VISA DOES NOT ENTITLE HIM TO SAY MASS, HE LEARNS

(By Joseph Newman)

BERLIN, March 8.—The Reverend John O. A. Brassard, an American priest of Assumption College, Worcester, Mass., waited 10 months for a Soviet visa so he could conduct services for Americans and other foreigners in Moscow.

Finally, when he arrived in Moscow last January, Soviet agents refused to let him hold any services on the ground that he did not have authorization for such activities. Father Brassard is therefore singing in the choir with other members of the foreign colony, according to a private report received today from Moscow.

On the first Sunday after his arrival Father Brassard went to the Church of St. Louis of the French, the only Roman Catholic Church in Moscow, to say mass. He was stopped by a Soviet agent who had taken control of the church some time ago and told that he could not conduct mass.

The reason he was given was that he had not been registered by Soviet authorities either as a resident of Moscow or as a priest. When he protested that he had been given a Soviet visa for the purpose of conducting services, he was told that his visa was to make it possible for him to look after foreigners but not necessarily at the church.

Father Brassard, accompanied by an official of the American Embassy, called at the Foreign Ministry to inquire about the latest twist in the treatment of American clergymen in Moscow. They were told that Soviet authorities would look into the matter. Several weeks passed without any word from the Soviet Foreign Ministry and as far as is known Father Brassard, who is said to have a rich baritone voice, is still singing in the choir in the noon mass held at the church for foreigners every Sunday.

This service is conducted by a French priest, Jean de Matha Thomas, who was permitted to say mass once a week after he surrendered the keys to the church in May 1949. At that time he was told he could no longer be in charge of the church, which was turned over to the Rev. Mr. Adamovitch, who was imported by the Russians for that purpose from Latvia. The Church of St. Louis, established by the French colony many years before the Bolshevik revolution, had always been in the hands of French or American priests.

Soviet actions against American clergymen began early last year when Father Antonio LaBerge, an American priest, previously stationed in Moscow, was denied permission to return from a vacation in the United States. The Russians invalidated a reentry visa which they had previously issued to him. Requests were then made for a visa for another American priest to replace Father LaBerge. After repeated demands by the State Department and the American Embassy in Moscow, a visa was finally issued to Father Brassard.

The Soviet censor refused to permit foreign correspondents to report the treatment accorded Father Brassard. Earlier they had been allowed to report his arrival in Moscow, but when they referred to the Church of St. Louis of the French, where he was expected to conduct services, the censor eliminated the words "of the French." To the censor the abbreviated name "Church of St. Louis" evidently sounded more Russian and less foreign.

JEWISH LABOR GROUP ACCUSES SOVIETS ON JEWS—EXILE TO SIBERIA, SPIRITUAL ANNIHILATION AND PHYSICAL DESTRUCTION ARE ALLEGED

(By Paul Tobenkin)

ASBURY PARK, N. J., March 12.—Jews in Russia and other Communist-dominated countries are facing spiritual annihilation, mass exile to Siberia, complete degradation, and in some cases physical destruction, it was alleged today by the Jewish Labor Committee, an organization representing more than 500,000 American Jewish trade unionists.

The JLC at its convention a year ago made the first public allegation of widespread antisemitism in iron-curtain countries. Today's report, delivered by Jacob Pat, secretary of the organization, to the JLC's national executive committee, outlined the changes that have taken place during the last year.

The 150 delegates, after hearing the report, unanimously adopted a resolution asserting that "this horror-ridden situation can no longer be tolerated" and protesting "the brutal inquisition which has been visited on the surviving population of 2,500,000 Jews behind the iron curtain."

REPORTS ON WEST EUROPE

The report will be transmitted to the State Department, to William Green, AFL president, and Philip Murray, CIO head, in an effort to enlist their support in bringing about a change in conditions described.

In dramatic contrast to the condition of Jews in Russia and her satellite nations, Charles Kreindler, a vice president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, AFL, who has just returned from Europe, reported the condition of western European Jewry has greatly improved economically and culturally during the last year.

The report was prepared by the research staff of the JLC on the basis of information obtained from newspapers, documents, and persons who have escaped from behind the iron curtain. Some of the unions which are part of the JLC have close affiliation with European trade unions.

The report, covering Russia, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, differs from last year's report in that for the first time conditions within the Soviet Union itself are described. Last year, while there were indications of what was going on in Russia, the specific information available was too sparse to be included in the report.

Discussing Russia and its incorporated territories of Latvia, Lithuania, Esthonia, eastern Poland, and Bessarabia, the report stated that of a prewar Jewish population of 5,300,000 only 2,000,000 Jews were left, the rest having been victims of Nazi legions, died in Siberia or been liquidated.

LITERARY FIGURES VANISHED

"During 1949, almost all Yiddish literary figures, even though they were members of the Communist Party, vanished," the report stated. The most outstanding of these were Itzik Peffer, Perets Markish, David Bergelson, L. Kvitko, S. Alkin, and Nistor. Inquiries by American Jewish organizations at the Soviet Embassy concerning the fate of these Yiddish literary figures have met a stone wall of silence. When the Yiddish literary almanac, the Star, in the Ukraine, was closed, the reason given was that it cultivated Jewish national consciousness.

"Simultaneously," the report said, "a drive started against all Jews who occupied important places in general Soviet life—the struggle against so-called cosmopolitanism. Of all the so-called followers of cosmopolitanism who were liquidated about two-thirds were Jews. The most important of them were active in Soviet literature, science, philosophy, history, the theater, and included even special writers, on sports matters. The Communist line was that Jews are landless, stateless, and are not an integral part of Russia and her people, and that they are devoted to abstract Jewish nationalism, which is basically Jewish chauvinism.

"During the year," the report said, "concrete signs of antisemitism emerged. In a very prominent position among those attacked were persons who had Jewish names, and who for years had been writing under Soviet pseudonyms. In numerous instances the Russian names were followed by the original Jewish names in parentheses."

MASS DEPORTATION CHARGED

"The worst, however, that the Jews had to go through in 1949 was the mass deportation to Siberia of Jews from the Ukraine, eastern Galicia, Bukovina, Bessarabia, and the Baltic states. Some 30,000 Jews were deported from the city of Lemburg alone. Very little information about this forced exodus has reached the outside world. American relatives of some of these victims have given up hope of locating them."

The conclusion drawn in the report about Russia is that today "there is not a shred of Jewish cultural life" remaining; that all contact between Russian and western Jews has been destroyed; that Israel is considered an American-British colony; that emigration is forbidden, and that the Jews left face spiritual annihilation. Birobidjan, which had been set up as a Jewish republic in Russia, was dismissed as a complete failure.

In the discussion of Poland, it was said that the 60,000 or 70,000 Jews in that country in 1949 were subjected to a savage liquidation of their cultural life similar to that in Russia although not quite so intense.

Let's Look at the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to point out briefly the critical situation facing dark-fired tobacco growers in Virginia. When the Government-controlled program for tobacco was inaugurated some years ago, Virginia dark-fired tobacco type 21 was combined into the same program with types 22, 23, and 24, which types are grown in Tennessee and Kentucky and are dark-fired tobacco but of different texture from Virginia type 21.

Historically, Virginia type 21 dark-fired tobacco has brought a better price than the other types, and has different marketing qualities and uses. In the past 10 years, Virginia dark-fired tobacco harvested acreage has been cut from 23,000 in 1939 to 10,600 acres in 1949. The other types of dark-fired tobacco have only been cut from 91,500 acres to 47,700 acres. We will see from this that even though Virginia dark-fired tobacco is in the same farm program with other types of dark-fired tobacco, type 21 has been reduced substantially more in harvested acreage than have the other types of dark-fired tobacco. This is equally true as to poundage.

In 1939 there was a production of type 21 tobacco of 20,900,000 pounds. In 1949, this was reduced to 11,900,000 pounds. Types 22, 23, and 24, in 1939 produced 73,500,000 pounds of tobacco, and, in 1949, had been only reduced to 59,230,000 pounds. This shows on its face that type 21 Virginia dark-fired tobacco has been reduced in acreage approximately 54 percent; whereas, the other types have been reduced approximately 47.9 percent. The difference is even more marked as to the reduction in poundage in type 21 as distinguished from the reduction in the other types.

For the past 8 years, we have, each year, sold and disposed of more Virginia dark-fired tobacco in the normal trade channels than has been produced by our growers, with the exception of 1946; whereas, this is not true of the other types of dark-fired tobacco.

In 1939 stocks of Virginia dark-fired tobacco amounted to 23,400,000 pounds. In 1949 it amounted to only 21,900,000 pounds. The other three types in 1939 had 112,800,000 pounds in stock, and in 1949 had 135,300,000 pounds, an increase of nearly 23,000,000 pounds; whereas, the Virginia dark-fired tobacco stocks have been reduced; particularly has this been true in the last several years.

Production and sale figures for the last several years show conclusively that Virginia dark-fired tobacco planters are not producing an ounce more than the trade can afford. In fact, the production is slightly under the needs of the market. This is not true of the other types of dark-fired tobacco, but, as a matter of fact, they continue to pile up a surplus, which is increasing rather than decreasing year by year.

Auction prices for types 22–23 averaged 28.8 cents per pound for the season's sales through February 28; about 8 percent lower than last season. Virginia fire-cured type 21 auction closed February 16, and prices for the season averaged a record 33.5 cents per pound compared with a previous high of 32.9 cents last season.

When the price, 33.5 cents, received for Virginia fire-cured tobacco is compared with the average price received for types 22–23, 28.8 cents, Virginia fire-cured tobacco sold for 4.7 cents per pound more in 1949–50 than the other dark-fired cured types. If this 4.7 cents is applied to the 12,300,000 pounds sold, a total in excess of $500,000 was paid Virginia growers above Kentucky-Tennessee growers for this amount of tobacco. Surely buyers do not, out of the generosity of their hearts, pay as much as $500,000 more for Virginia fire-cured tobacco than they would for an equal amount of Kentucky-Tennessee fire-cured.

Supplies of type 21 are inadequate in many of the grades necessary for buyers buying to fulfill a brand requirement, therefore necessitating paying higher prices for our type of tobacco. This is not as it should be. We should be permitted to produce 15,000,000 pounds of fire-cured tobacco in order to satisfy the demands of the trade in the number of

the grades necessary for them to fulfill their requirements.

In the face of all this the Virginia dark-fired tobacco growers have been given over a 15-percent cut in their acreage allotments for 1950. This is due to the fact that type 21, the Virginia dark-fired tobacco, is lumped with types 22, 23, and 24 of dark-fired tobacco, which is grown in Tennessee and Kentucky. These are separate and distinct types with different markets from type 21.

Fortunately, the law permits the Secretary of Agriculture to separate the different types of tobacco if a proper case is made out showing the difference in markets, prices, and so forth. I am convinced that the above makes out a case which will permit the Secretary of Agriculture to disassociate type 21 dark-fired tobacco and set it in a program separate and apart so that it can stand on its own merit, thereby permitting the growers of Virginia dark-fired tobacco to produce sufficient poundage to meet the needs and demands of the market. That is all our growers are asking—to be allowed to produce a sufficient quantity and only a sufficient quantity to meet this need.

On behalf of the dark-fired tobacco growers of Virginia I am calling on Secretary Brannan to go into this matter carefully and to make that decision that will carry out the full intent of the law that was passed by this Congress and do justice to those people who till the soils of Virginia, the greatest State of the Nation and the best people on the face of this good earth, who are asking for justice and only justice on the merits of their case.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I was granted permission to include an editorial carried in the Farmville Herald, Farmville, Va., on Friday, March 10, 1950. This editorial was written by Mr. J. Barrye Wall, a distinguished and honored citizen of Farmville, Va., who is known far and wide for his intense interest in his fellow men, for his outstanding contribution toward the development of southside Virginia, and for his sterling character. He has the admiration and respect of our entire section of Virginia, as well as people of other sections who know him. He has worked untiringly for those things that go for the betterment of the community in which he lives. He is an outstanding newspaperman, the owner and publisher of one of the finest newspapers in Virginia, and I heartily commend his editorial.

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD

The meeting of Virginia growers of dark-fired tobacco Saturday in Farmville to discuss tobacco acreage allotments in this belt is of utmost importance to the future of south-central Virginia. For well over 150 years the economy of this area of 14 counties has been based upon the production of Virginia dark-fired tobacco, known as type 21. In no other place can tobacco with the texture, taste, and tone be grown. This type, Virginia dark-fired, is in a class by itself.

Let's look at the record and see what has happened and what the future outlook is. Since 1922 production has steadily declined from 90,000,000 pounds to 25,000,000 pounds in 1933, 18,000,000 pounds in 1940, and 12,000,000 pounds in 1948. The 1950 acreage allotments further reduce acres to be planted by 15.9 percent, which will be reflected in a corresponding decrease in poundage. The trend is obvious.

Older growers will recall the hectic days of 1933 when tobacco prices and everything else were very low. It was then that Virginia farmers, and rightly so, voted for the Government-control program which placed a floor under prices and a ceiling on acreage. Allotments were made to individual farms according to past records of the farm. Dark-fired tobacco has been under this program since 1934 with exception of the war years of 1943, 1944, and 1945, during which period acres harvested in Virginia declined because of lack of manpower. It is interesting to note that during this period production increased in Tennessee types 22, 23, and 24. Reference will be made to this later.

At the beginning of the Government-control program Virginia type 21 was combined with types 22, 23, and 24, it was said, to facilitate administration of the program. Tobacconists agree that the types are different in character. The difference is further substantiated by the fact that for the past 8 years the production of type 21 has not supplied the demand. In other words, the growers have produced less tobacco than has disappeared through normal trade channels. The mere fact that type 21 fails to meet the market demand is prima facie evidence that it is a different type of dark-fired tobacco from the Tennessee and Kentucky types with which it has been combined under the Government program. This fact needs no further proof—the buyer so decrees.

The case with the other types is exactly opposite. Production has exceeded demand by approximately one-third. This excess production in relation to disappearance in types 22, 23, and 24 has caused an overproduction in the dark-fired types as a whole, and the administrators of the control program have continued to order a reduction in acreage throughout the area. Virginia growers are being penalized by being classified with growers of our sister States. Further inequalities in the allotment program came about when the program was reinstituted in 1946. Future quotas were based on production during the 1943–1945 period, which we have shown decreased in the Virginia belt, but increased in the Kentucky-Tennessee belts. Thus the Virginia base was further reduced, which contributes to the acreage decrease now faced.

But let's look further into what is happening. The best way to understand is to bring it down to specific cases or areas. How does this condition affect the individual grower?

Let's look at the record.

In the belt the average acres allotted to each farm was 3.1 in 1934. It has dropped to 1.4 in 1950.

In Prince Edward County there are 780 dark-fired tobacco growers, of whom 370 have an allotment of less than an acre of tobacco for 1950, and of this number 143 growers will have an allotment of half an acre or less. Tobacco growers agree that it is not economically sound to raise less than an acre of tobacco. Furthermore, at the average yield of 1,125 pounds to an acre sold at the average price of $53 per hundredweight, a half an acre would net a grower $167.14. It is obvious that 143 half-acre growers in Prince Edward are about out of the tobacco growing business, and possibly 227 with an acre or less allotment. The danger is that 370 growers, approximately one-half of the growers in the county will either go out of the business now or relatively soon. Multiply this by 10 and you would have a fair belt average.

The pity of it is that these farmers are less able to adjust their production to other products. Why don't they go into cattle? It takes capital to go into the cattle business, and furthermore these men know how to grow tobacco. There is a demand for the tobacco that they know how to grow. Why shift them into the highly competitive cattle business or perhaps the potato business?

There are many reasons for the decline in production of dark-fired tobacco, among them, the change from chewing tobacco usage to cigarettes; the culture of tobacco in foreign countries, which can be substituted in part for Virginia dark-fired, and others. But there is one thing which can be done, namely, to place Virginia dark-fired tobacco on its own and allot Virginia farmers enough acreage to supply the demand for this type.

In order to bring this situation to the attention of the United States Department of Agriculture officials, a meeting has been arranged in Farmville Saturday, March 12 at 10 o'clock in the Farmville High School auditorium and gymnasium, to discuss the situation.

Mr. Farmer, Mr. Businessman, if you are interested in what is happening to your tobacco industry in central Virginia you should attend this important meeting.

The problem is acute—the remedy urgent. It means dollars in your pocket; it may mean more to you.

Mr. Lie Opposed on China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication which appeared in the New York Times of March 14, 1950, relative to the suggested replacement of the authorized representatives of the Government of China:

[From the New York Times of March 14, 1950]

MR. LIE OPPOSED ON CHINA—PROPOSAL TO REPLACE REPRESENTATIVES CALLED STAB IN BACK FOR UN

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Friends of the United Nations are deeply shocked at the suggestion of Trygve Lie, Secretary General of that body, that the authorized representatives of the lawful Government of China, be repudiated and replaced by the designees of a group which through fraud and force of arms has imposed its will for the moment upon a large part, but not all, of the Chinese people and Chinese territory.

International law and order cannot exist unless founded upon elementary morals. Nor can any instrumentality of international law and order long survive the negation of elementary morals. Counsels of expediency wrecked the League of Nations. Trygve Lie's proposal in the name of expediency is a stab in the back of the United Nations.

His argument is simple enough: The United Nations in order to function as intended requires the cooperation of the five great powers. One nation, Soviet Russia, refuses to cooperate unless the existing and lawful Government of one of the five—namely, China—is repudiated and a self-constituted, usurping Government is accepted in its place. Therefore, says Mr. Lie, repudiate the lawful government, notwithstanding its great contributions to the United Nations, and accept a government which has demonstrated itself to be the very antithesis of international peace and goodwill.

Entirely apart from bad morals which condemn the suggestion on its face, what does Mr. Lie hope to gain as a matter of expediency? Had Russia cooperated in furthering the aims of the United Nations before this issue was raised? Is there any reason to suppose that if the free nations yield despite the resulting injustice any genuine cooperation could be expected from Russia? Having yielded in this case, could the free nations consistently decline to refuse a similar demand when the next country in Asia or elsewhere is partially overrun by Communist aggression?

It would be an incalculable tragedy if the United Nations were to fail the hopes and prayers of the peace-hungry peoples of the world. If that failure should flow from Russian contumacy, Russia will inevitably answer sooner or later for that result. If failure should come because the free nations sacrifice justice and morals to Russian contumacy, the United Nations would still fail, though it might simulate continuance, but only as a symbol of universal cynicism and cruel mockery of mankind's noblest aspirations; and the free nations could not evade responsibility for that result. It was not Italy in Abyssinia or Japan in Manchuria which wrecked the League of Nations. It was the weak-kneed, spineless reluctance of the other powers to take a resolute stand upon the ground of manifest morals and justice.

The indication that the United States of America refrain from defining its opinion of Mr. Lie's proposal until a majority of the Security Council had expressed itself is unworthy of the position of leadership which events have accorded America.

The issue is clear and calls for forthright policy.

There is a lawful constitutional Government of China. In the critical years when our own fate was in the balance that Government faithfully, loyally, and successfully defended the bastion of Asia against our mortal enemy—and Russia's. With our allies we entered into a solemn obligation to defend the integrity of China against aggression.

We have done badly enough in fulfilling that obligation without participating in this final, fatal betrayal suggested by Mr. Lie.

HAROLD RIEGELMAN.

NEW YORK, *March 13, 1950.*

Mr. Hope's Opinion of the Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Congressman HOPE, of Kansas, is an outstanding member of the House Committee on Agriculture. On March 9 he aired his views on the Brannan plan over the radio of NBC. He scored heavily against the plan and I am including his speech as a part of my remarks. It is a timely answer to those who would fool the farmer and the consumer as well if Mr. Brannan's ideas were to be adopted by this Congress. Here is good campaign material. The address follows:

THE BRANNAN PLAN

It is now almost a year since the Brannan farm plan was presented to the public. During that time it has been widely discussed. In fact, during a period which has been notable for the happening of many world-shaking events and when some history-making sensation occurs almost every day, the Brannan farm program has continued to be a subject of great interest. This interest is due, in part at least, to two things: First, the plan's unquestionable political appeal, and, second, its questionable economic soundness.

The secret of its political appeal is that it offers something to everybody. From that standpoint, it's a stroke of political genius. On the one hand, its advocates say to the farmers, "The United States Government is going to guarantee you an income at high wartime levels." And to consumers they say, "We are going to give you low-priced food." That comes mighty close to being Utopia. It sounds too good to be true. And, unfortunately, it is—because when you bring the plan down from the stratosphere and look it over to see what makes it tick you find that a lot of ugly, un-Utopian things show up.

You find that this isn't legerdemain, after all, and that if farmers are to get high incomes and consumers are to have cheap food, someone is going to have to pay a bill, and a pretty big bill it's going to be, if the plan is carried out on the scale envisioned by its proponents. How big? Secretary Brannan says he doesn't know. Up to date no advocate of the plan has come along with any figures. They don't like to talk about that part of it.

A good many people have tried to make an estimate. The department of agricultural economics of the University of Illinois has said: "It could easily be as much as the total Federal budget before the war." The same department, taking hogs as an illustration, has estimated that hog supports alone might cost $700,000,000 annually, and hogs represent only one-seventh to one-eighth of the output of our farms. The American Farm Bureau Federation, after a study of the cost of the plan as to milk alone, estimated it would amount to $2,480,000,000 annually.

Other estimates as to the cost of the plan as proposed have ranged from two billions to ten billions per year. Some of the advocates of the plan have compared it to the British food-subsidy program, the cost of which has increased every year, amounting in 1948 to the colossal sum of $2,272,000,000. Our population is three times as large as that of Britain so on the basis of population alone the cost of a similar plan here could run to almost $7,000,000,000. But that doesn't take into account that the British are on an austere diet. If they consumed per capita the food we do in this country their cost would undoubtedly be higher and so we are safe in assuming, I think, that the plan here would cost more than three times as much as the British plan is costing.

To make the plan work someone is going to have to dig up billions of dollars because there's no other way to give the farmer high income and the consumer low prices. And where will the money come from? Well, from Uncle Sam—and the only money Uncle Sam has is what you and I give him. That means that every consumer and every farmer is going to have to dig down in his pockets and fork over the money to carry out this gigantic spending operation, and when you count taxes this cheap food may be pretty high priced food.

But suppose we don't dig up the dollars? Suppose Congress says that with a $5,500,000,000 deficit already existing, we just can't appropriate the additional billions which will be necessary to enable Uncle Sam to pay a part of everybody's grocery bill.

What will happen then? Well, initially at least the farmer will be left holding the sack. He will have done his part. He will have produced all that the Secretary of Agriculture asked him to produce. By reason of this heavy production his prices will have declined just as they always do in a time of heavy production when there are no price supports. The consumer will be getting his cheap food but the Secretary will have to tell the farmer, "It's too bad but Congress didn't appropriate the money." Maybe consumers will think that is a good thing but if they do they will be taking a very short-sighted view because low farm prices and bankrupt farmers in the end mean depression and hard times for everyone. At least that's been the case in the past.

So the Secretary will have to look around for some other means to make good his promise of high incomes for farmers. What can he do? Well, for one thing he can start limiting and controlling the production of farm products on the theory that scarcity will bring high prices. To do that in any effective way will in all probability result in the ultimate nationalization of agriculture. We'll have in this country exactly the same thing they have in England where the Government tells every farmer what he must produce and how much he must produce and if he doesn't carry out the orders in that respect he loses the use of his farm and it is turned over to someone else to operate.

If this sounds fantastic to anyone, I suggest they write their Congressman and get a copy of the bill S. 1971 which puts the Brannan plan into legislative form. This bill was written in the Department of Agriculture and sent to Congress for introduction. It was introduced in the Senate on May 11, 1949. It is 86 pages long. A part of it is a restatement of some of the laws already on the books but much of it is new. Fifteen pages of the eighty-six relate to penalties upon farmers and there are more pages with penalties for those who deal in agricultural products. I think most farmers would be interested in reading the provisions of section 401 (b) on page 79 of the bill.

This section provides that all farmers must keep such books and records and make such reports as may be required by the Secretary; and that if they fail to keep these reports and records they will be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction fined not more than $500. And if they make a false report or record they shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction fined not more than $1,000 and imprisoned for not more than a year. My prediction is that if this bill ever becomes a law we'll either have to have more farm bookkeepers or bigger jails.

We've never had any experience here with an absolute Government-controlled agriculture so we don't know exactly how it will work out but if the history of other countries in any criterion we know that such control will eventually mean less production and more inefficient production. It will mean higher food prices. So in the end the Brannan plan will be just as much of a gold brick for the consumer who has been led to think he will get cheap food as it is for the farmer who wakes up some morning and finds that he has lost control of his farm. Is all this an exaggeration? Not in the least. If the Brannan plan is actually carried out to the extent necessary for its proponents to make good on the promises which they have been making to both producers and consumers.

I think it should be said in justice to the farmers of this country that the Brannan

plan did not originate with them. They were not consulted. They had no part in formulating it. Rather it originated with the political leaders of organized labor. It is frankly an effort on their part to form a political coalition between farmers and organized labor. They say, in effect, to farmers, "Help us elect Members to Congress who will repeal the Taft-Hartley law and we'll help you get the Brannan plan." The labor politicians can't lose on that one. If successful they get repeal of Taft-Hartley toward which they've been moving heaven and earth, and cheap food temporarily. And I know of no way farmers can win on it because the ultimate result must inevitably be lower farm prices, or in the alternative Government control of all agricultural production and ultimate nationalization of the industry. Politically, what will happen is what has always happened when a farmer-labor coalition has been attempted. The labor politicians take over the organization and the farmer is left out in the cold.

Now let me make it clear that what I have been discussing is the political Brannan plan of something for everybody. That's the basis on which its proponents are trying to sell it and the basis on which it must be judged. I don't think the farmers of this country will fall for this political Brannan plan. They are too smart to be caught that way. The wonder is that anyone who knows farmers would expect them to be for it. I am afraid that the labor politicians who concocted this plan have gotten their idea of a farmer from the funny papers and are laboring under the delusion that he will buy the Brooklyn Bridge if a sufficiently clever line of sales talk is used.

A lot of farmers are wondering why, if the Brannan plan is such a good thing for farmers, it wouldn't be just as good for the manufacturer and the workingman. Why not apply it to the production of automobiles or farm machinery or much-needed housing? Everybody knows the prices of those things should come down. This could be done by reducing wages and cutting other costs. No one would lose. Workers would get a subsidy out of the Treasury to make up the loss of wages. Employers would be given Government payments to make up their losses. And the public would get cheap automobiles and farm machinery and housing and maybe a lot of other things. Something for everybody. Isn't it lovely?

Our Immigration Authorities Are Doing a Good Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, irresponsible statements have appeared from time to time to the effect that hundreds of thousands of aliens are illegally entering this country annually and that millions of illegal aliens are roaming the United States. All of this is, of course, nothing more than a concerted effort to defeat the current attempt in Congress to liberalize the Displaced Persons Act, which presently contains discriminatory clauses aimed against certain religious groups.

Fantastic stories are spread about 5,000,00 illegal aliens running loose in the country. Today there are only about 3,000,000 aliens in the United States registered pursuant to the Alien Registration Act of 1941. With relatively few exceptions, nearly all of them entered as legal immigrants.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service, which is entrusted with guarding the thousands of miles of our borders and the numerous ports along the Atlantic and Pacific, are doing as good a job as can be expected with their limited appropriations. In 1948 a total of 20,371 persons were deported from the United States, about three-fourths of them on the grounds that they had entered without inspection or by false statements, without proper documents, or overstayed the time granted them.

This shows that our immigration authorities are on their toes. It also shows that the fantastic charges about numerous loopholes in our immigration laws, inadequate immigration surveillance, and refusal of the courts in New York or elsewhere to enforce the immigration laws, are simply not true. It is high time that anti-immigration forces stop trying to fool the American public with such scarecrows. Let us proceed to amend the DP Act in a liberal manner and thereby continue our reputation as the land of asylum for the oppressed and the persecuted.

It's Time To Stop Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, political fearlessness is one of the attributes of public service highly desired but not generally found to a degree commensurate with the requirements of the public interest. Representative WADSWORTH is such a public servant, possessing as he does to an unusual degree the quality of honest forthrightness in performance of his public duties irrespective of the effect upon his personal political fortunes. This has been typical of him for the many, many years of his great career as a public servant and has served as a model for some of his associates to emulate.

Recently he announced his determination to oppose all Federal expenditures for a new purpose no matter how laudable except such as might be absolutely essential to the national interest. This policy will offend many people who taste the sweetness of Federal expenditures in some special plea or another. For this positive position he has been hailed and properly so.

Until such time as the Members of Congress find the courage to turn a deaf ear to the persuasive pleadings of special groups for portions of Federal revenues to support new programs, even though of great merit, the budget will continue to be impaired, deficits will become a permanent part of our structure, public debt will mount in ever greater proportions, taxes will continue stifling, inflation will be fanned, production will be restricted, and bankruptcy inevitable. More power to JIM WADSWORTH and men such as he.

In this connection I am pleased to include an editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of March 11, 1950, as follows:

IT'S TIME NOW TO STOP SPENDING—LET'S BE OBSTINATE

Representative JIM WADSWORTH told Congress the other day that from here on he is going to vote against every measure that will increase the future financial commitments of the Federal Government.

"Even though I may be called an obstinate old man," he said, "I shall fight against every bill that does so unless I am confronted with some dire crisis in which dollars and cents can't count."

Well, the word obstinate is JIM'S word. Maybe we'd have picked another one. But somewhere between headstrong, refractory, intractable, or stubborn we need a word that implies persistent resistance to a wrong course.

And Mr. Webster says obstinate means not yielding, not easily subdued, adhering to an opinion, purpose, or course. So we're for you.

That's what this country needs on new schemes to spend. There are times when obstinacy is the highest virtue. This is one of them.

The Government is the biggest banker, the biggest merchant, the biggest consumer, the biggest employer, the biggest spender on earth.

It is the biggest debtor.

And it's the biggest fall guy for any new scheme for going further into debt.

The maw that devours what you and your neighbors produce by your labor staggers the imagination. This year Government is taking in taxes one and a half times the cost of the First World War. But after spending this, it is going into debt as much as the total cost of Government in any peacetime year up to 1935.

And still the new schemes for spending come. Yet Government has nothing and can have nothing except what all of us produce. There simply isn't anything else.

Isn't it time to stop? Now? Isn't it time to be obstinate?

The Times-Union believes the only way to stop this free-wheeling ride to bankruptcy is to mobilize Nation-wide demand for an end to new Federal outlays. Commitments already on the books will make the burden even harder than it is now.

Below is your certificate of membership in the Legion of Obstinate Men and Women. Oh, sure, the spenders are going to pounce on JIM WADSWORTH'S word obstinate and try to have fun with it. They've been doing that for 20 years.

And they've laughed you into a debt of $260,000,000,000 that even your great-grandchildren will be struggling to carry.

Let's laugh last. If they're going to load you with a mule's burden, as they are, let's be as obstinate as a mule about carrying any more.

This isn't a partisan proposition. Democrats and Republicans both carry the same load. Zip out the coupon and send it to your Congressman, and every other Congressman and Senator whose name you know.

Tell them you're obstinately sure you're carrying enough now.

Thomas Jefferson on the Presidential Tenure of Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once said of the Presidency that—

> The service of 8 years with the power to remove at the end of the first 4 comes more nearly to my principles.

This is the proposal for limiting the term of the President that was submitted to the States by the Eightieth Congress. It is interesting to note that already, less than 2 years after this proposal was sent to the States, 23 of the necessary 36 States have approved this proposed amendment.

This prompt approval by so many States seemingly indicates that the amendment will be approved by the necessary 36 States probably by 1952, in which event the tenure of all future Presidents will be limited to two terms.

States which have so far approved this proposed constitutional amendment are: Maine, March 31, 1947; Michigan, March 31, 1947; Iowa, April 1, 1947; Kansas, April 1, 1947; New Hampshire, April 1, 1947; Delaware, April 2, 1947; Illinois, April 3, 1947; Oregon, April 3, 1947; Colorado, April 12, 1947; California, April 15, 1947; New Jersey, April 15, 1947; Vermont, April 15, 1947; Ohio, April 16, 1947; Wisconsin, April 16, 1947; Pennsylvania, April 29, 1947; Connecticut, May 21, 1947; Missouri, May 22, 1947; Nebraska, May 23, 1947; Virginia, January 28, 1948; Mississippi, February 12, 1948; New York, March 9, 1948; South Dakota, January 21, 1949; North Dakota, February 25, 1949.

Jefferson's views on the President's tenure of office and other matters, are told in the following excellent article by Columnist Guy Allison in the News-Press, of Glendale, Calif.:

DEFENDER OF HISTORY

(By Guy Allison)

What noted American changed his mind with reference to the length of time a President of the United States should serve?

When a man reaches the age of 62 years his judgment should be well seasoned, and particularly should his judgment be reasonably reliable if it concerns the type of work which he has pursued for 40 years of his adult life. If such a position is accepted, then the opinion of Thomas Jefferson is worthy of consideration, for it was when he had reached the above age and had been in political office for 40 years that he gave the following answer to the question, "How long shall a President of the United States be permitted to serve?" Said he, on January 6, 1809:

"My opinion originally was that the President of the United States should be elected for 7 years and be forever ineligible thereafter. I have since become sensible that 7 years is too long to be irremovable, and that there should be a peaceable way of withdrawing a man midway, who is doing wrong.

"The service of 8 years, with the power to remove at the end of the first four comes more nearly to my principles, as corrected by experience, and it is in adherence to that that I have determined to withdraw at the end of my second term. General Washington set the example of voluntary retirement after 8 years and I shall follow it."

In a letter to Gov. Mann Page, of Virginia, Jefferson also said:

"I have always found that rogues would be uppermost. Those who, rising above the multitude, always contrive to nestle themselves into the places of profit and power. These rogues set out with stealing the people's good opinion, and then steal from them the right of withdrawing it, by contriving laws and associations against the power of the people themselves.

"It is the practice of despots to use part of the people to keep the rest in order, and those who have once got the ascendency and possessed themselves of all the resources of the Nation, have immense means of retaining their advantage."

Is it not about time for Americans to do some serious thinking upon a subject against which such a man as Thomas Jefferson warned them?

Hawaii and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial from the Washington Post of March 12, 1950, as follows:

HAWAII AND ALASKA

In voting to admit Hawaii and Alaska to statehood, the House recognized the overwhelming logic in the pleas of these two Territories. The situation of the whole free world argues for an extension of the principle of union, and the argument is particularly cogent as respect two American Territories prepared for statehood by tradition and long years of tutelage. In the case of Hawaii the approval repeats similar action by the House nearly 3 years ago. It serves to confirm the fact that full membership in the Union for Hawaii is justified by every criterion. In the case of less populous Alaska, legislators gave weight to her strategic national defense position. Statehood also would open the door to the full economic development that Alaska now lacks.

Although the prospect seems to be for harder going in the Senate, we hope Senators will have no truck with the many irrational and groundless objections to statehood. Communism in Hawaii, for example, is a perpetual red herring. The question has been explored at length, and there is no reason to believe that Hawaii is less competent to cope with it than any State. The contention that Alaska does not have enough population is countered by the fact that some 12 States had smaller populations when admitted to the Union, and that territorial status probably is holding down expansion.

The one argument that does have some merit is that a disproportionate representation in Congress. The argument is far less applicable in the case of Hawaii, which now has more population than half a dozen States, but it is true that Alaska would be on a par in the Senate with several States more than 100 times her size. It is precisely because of such differences, however, that the founding fathers devised the two-House system, with House membership apportioned on the basis of population. Alaska's total representation of three—two Members in the Senate and one in the House—would not give it undue influence. Moreover, the fact that Senators serve for 6 years tends to encourage thinking on a national level, at least after a period of service.

Although there have been no new admissions to the Union for 38 years, it was never intended that the Union should remain static. Indeed, this is a time when the United States ought to be giving an example—and an invitation—to the free world.

World Health Organization Battles Disease on Global Scale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Michael Goldsmith:

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION BATTLES DISEASE ON GLOBAL SCALE—MAIN ATTACK CONCENTRATES ON MALARIA, TUBERCULOSIS, AND SYPHILIS, WHICH TAKE 10,000,000 LIVES YEARLY

(By Michael Goldsmith)

GENEVA.—An aggressive world-wide battle against disease is being waged from Geneva headquarters by the World Health Organization—the United Nations' public-health department of the world.

Disease knows no frontiers. The creation of WHO is the most ambitious attempt thus far to pursue disease across national barriers.

Nearly 70 nations belong to the organization. Their major aim in setting up WHO within the United Nations framework in 1948 was to enable medically advanced countries jointly to aid the less advanced for the benefit of all.

WHO's main attack now is concentrated on three preventable diseases: Malaria, tuberculosis, and syphilis. WHO estimates that these three kill upward of 10,000,000 persons every year, but considers these figures extremely conservative. In many parts of the world health services are so inadequate no one knows how many more millions die without ever seeing a doctor.

Hundreds of thousands more are killed every year by cholera and plague, also high on WHO's priority list. In many areas of India and China these two diseases have claimed their dead every day for centuries. As long as these hard cores of infection remain, the danger of a catastrophic epidemic sweeping through the world continues a permanent menace.

HOMELESS PROBLEMS

Old-fashioned quarantine methods are no longer effective in the air age. "No country can depend solely on its own protective arrangements," says Maj. Gen. Brock Chisholm, WHO's director general. "Each must be assured of satisfactory controls in all other countries as well. The protection of one country depends on the effectiveness of health administrations in other countries and upon the success of their collective action."

Dr. Chisholm—he has dropped his military title—is a soft-spoken little man with twinkling eyes who is recognized as one of the world's outstanding psychiatrists. He has organized WHO into divisions and area commands on military lines, possibly on the basis of his experience as wartime head of the Canadian Army's medical services.

His organization is one of the most successful of the UN specialized agencies. With an annual budget of $7,500,000, WHO sends medical missions and specialists to a score of countries, maintains a permanent watch against the spread of pestilence, organizes full-scale campaigns in particularly disease-ridden areas, aids and records progress in medical research throughout the world, and assists any member nation in the development of its health services and the training of its doctors.

Dr. Chisholm's pet project is an ambitious malaria-control program to be spread over the next 5 years in test areas of the Middle East, Southeast Asia, and Latin America. The test was organized by WHO, and the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization under President Truman's "point four" world-development and technical-assistance program.

Malaria, which strikes an estimated 300,000,000 persons every year, can be eliminated in any area by vigorous action against the anopheles mosquito. The three test projects will cost $10,000,000. WHO expects the immense increase in food production in the test areas will repay many times the original expenditure.

MOTHERS COOPERATE

New techniques in malaria control are being employed by a number of small WHO demonstration teams already operating in half a dozen Asiatic countries. Armed with DDT insecticide, these teams penetrate into the jungles of Central India and the mountains of Afghanistan to fight malaria and show medical students and sanitary engineers how to do the job themselves.

WHO has abandoned the old technique of spraying DDT from airplanes as wasteful and unnecessary. The system was widely employed in Greece and Sardinia, but experts now agree that individual indoor spraying of houses is preferable.

The malaria teams run into unexpected difficulties in isolated area. In the Teral district of India a team headed by Dr. Peter Issaris of Athens met with Buxas, a tribe where the head of the family is always a woman. The mothers thought the malaria blood tests were a cunning selection system for the Indian Army and spirited their sons into hiding. Bribed with packets of DDT to kill their lice and small bottles of benzola against their scabies, the mothers were persuaded to cooperate.

In some areas the antimalaria teams wiped out even more deadly diseases. In Shimoga, India, Paul Burnstein, a WHO sanitary engineer from Shenandoah, Pa., found his DDT campaign also killed fleas carrying plague, eliminating the dreaded disease from that area. In East Bengal Dr. Gabriele Granichia from Rome, Italy, fought malaria in an area infested with kala-azar, a deadly tropical disease transmitted by sand flies. Dr. Granichia's DDT killed the sand flies, wiping out kala-azar in the district.

WHO'S antimalaria teams operate on an annual budget of $250,000. Teams fighting other diseases in many parts of the world are handicapped by an equally limited budget.

One team made a survey of venereal diseases in the isolated Ganges Valley of north India and found nearly half the population infected with syphilis. A handful of WHO specialists showed local volunteers how to diagnose syphilis and to inject penicillin. After 3 months' work, the team reported new infections had ceased.

Syphilis and its related diseases are usually estimated to cause 2,000,000 deaths per year but Dr. Thorstein Guthe of Oslo, Norway, chief venereal disease expert, believes the true death toll is much greater. Millions of babies are born with syphilis every year. Most of them die before they are a year old.

Throughout southeast Asia, the West Indies, Africa, and the Middle East, two forms of syphilis known as yaws and bejel cause untold death and suffering. They are easily transmitted through a handshake or an infected drinking cup. In Europe itself, tens of thousands of Yugoslav Moslems suffer from a local form of syphilis which is also passed from person to person without intercourse.

Fortunately, all the variations of syphilis can be cured with penicillin. WHO experts in many countries are teaching new techniques of treatment. A large-scale project is under way in Haiti and adjacent areas of the Dominican Republic to rid the population of syphilis and yaws.

In fighting venereal disease, WHO experts again found themselves up against ignorance and superstition in many areas. In Ethiopia, which probably has the world's highest venereal-disease rate, Dr. Guthe saw tribal witch doctors prescribing the blood of a black male goat as a cure for syphilis.

THE GREATEST KILLER

In the more highly developed countries, syphilis is concentrated mainly in the big cities and seaports. Important navigable rivers carry the infection far inland. For decades the River Rhine has been renowned as a black stream of venereal infection between Rotterdam and the inland ports all the way up to Switzerland.

A special international commission was set up under WHO auspices to coordinate and improve the treatment of syphilis in Rhine boatmen in all the countries bordering on the river.

The greatest killer of all among the infectious diseases is tuberculosis. More than 5,000,000 people die of it every year, although it has been preventable since Koch discovered the tuberculin bacillus in 1882. The reason, WHO says, is a total lack of doctors and medical equipment in large areas of the world.

Antituberculer BCG vaccine was introduced in 1921, but it was never extensively used until WHO opened a vast anti-TB campaign 2 years ago. In cooperation with the Danish Red Cross and the International Children's Emergency Fund, more than 18 million European children were tested for tuberculosis and half of them vaccinated with BCG. The program is to be extended all over the world this year.

"The intense tuberculosis problem is not in Europe at all," Dr. John B. McDougall, of Edinburgh, Scotland, explained. "The worst areas are in Asia, in the Pacific Islands, and in Latin America. In India alone tuberculosis kills more than one million persons every year."

Dr. McDougall, WHO chief tuberculosis expert, returned recently from a survey in India. "The surprising thing is not that the death and sickness rates are so high," he said, "but that many of these poor people are able to live at all."

Tuberculosis centers to be established by WHO in India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon will combine prevention and treatment with training of personnel, Dr. McDougall said, "so that the whole project will grow snowball fashion." Centers eventually will be set up in areas where no doctor has been seen before.

SOVIET WALKED OUT

On all WHO health maps there is a large blank space—Soviet Russia. The Soviet Union and its satellites originally took an active part. Last year, however, the Russians walked out. Bulgaria followed suit and most of the other satellites have become lukewarm. But even while the Soviet Union was a full member, no information on disease in Russia ever reached the experts in Geneva.

WHO still regards Russia legally a member and regularly sends medical literature and periodicals to the Soviet Ministry of Health and to universities in Russia and the Ukraine. The books are never returned, but neither are they acknowledged.

At WHO's first annual assembly in 1948, Czechoslovakia pressed for the establishment of a regional office in Prague to give special assistance to "war-devastated nations" in eastern Europe. The proposal was turned down, mainly for financial reasons. Now with more funds available WHO would like to set up a European office, but the Czechs are no longer interested.

Although political dissension has stalled progress in Europe, WHO is setting up "health regions" elsewhere to decentralize its war on disease. Regional organizations are already functioning in southeast Asia and the Middle East, while the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau has become its regional organization for the Americas.

The various campaigns eventually will be controlled at regional levels, where cooperation of governments works more smoothly and WHO officials can remain in close touch with their workers in the field.

Creeping Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely and pointed article from the February 22, 1950, issue of Human Events:

HOW DEFICITS ARE CAMOUFLAGED

In the political breathing spell, before the 1950 congressional campaigns get fully under way, it is helpful to reflect on the economic message sent to Congress by President Truman on January 6.

The immediate journalistic reaction was that this message signified a turn to the right, designed in advance to counter the "Liberty versus socialism" slogan of the GOP. That analysis is probably correct as far as it goes. But that analysis does not go far enough.

Superficially, the economic message reads like a collection of clichés. But every word was chosen with the utmost care to do the political work assigned to it. It was a significant part of the myth-making by which the greatest Nation in history is being transformed by a handful of men. And it should be studied as such.

According to the myth, our economy is in fine shape. With hardly a ripple we have surmounted the most devastating of all wars. We have solved the elusive problem of stabilizing capitalist production. The only difficulty is a lag in business investment, and the administration will take care of that by enlarging consumer markets. It follows that anyone who is against the administration's program is against progress, and has doubts about the ability of the American people.

To be sure the administration must spend $42,000,000,000 a year (or $50,000,000,000 according to the estimates of Congressman TABER). It will run a deficit of 5 to 10 billions even with onerous wartime tax rates. But this deficit is due to business, Congress, and the enemy.

Of course enlarging consumer markets for business brings us by a new route to very old spending programs—public housing, social security, everything that Hopkins or Wallace ever urged. But they are minor issues now. The major issue is the ever-growing advance of Government to the heartland of the free society, the productive system itself.

II

In the old days, when the New Deal was a militant minority, Tugwell and Corcoran delighted in attacking business, in outraging every accepted economic belief. Now business is not important enough to deserve official denunciation.

One sentence in the message tells why. The Government is to help little business take risks—as if the clipper ships of New England or the first Ford automobiles were built by big business.

Obviously it means that government is going to insure loans for small business. Government is now guaranteeing loans for public housing. The price-support program for farm products like potatoes is now much to the fore. There is a bill in Congress to insure risks in foreign investment. This method can be applied to every segment of private business. But if government is the risk bearer, where is free enterprise? Obviously only the State is either free or enterprising.

This is the end product of economic technology. Economists were once philosophers, men of learning and wisdom. Then we began to train economic experts who knew all the minutiae of their science but had little critical judgment or moral responsibility.

The technicians caused little damage at first, because we had an inherited social framework which held us together. But it was inevitable that the new political leaders would take over the rootless technicians as part of their cultural front and inflate their importance to impress the public. A few very able economists and lawyers were used for another purpose. Their work was to take apart the free capitalist society bit by bit and put it together again according to a totally different pattern, but camouflaged to look unchanged.

They are products of the wartime experience in disintegration by which men learned to look at a landscape, to ignore its true significance, and analyze it into fragments, to discover just which details give the illusion of a park, and then make a synthetic reproduction of these details to conceal a munitions plant.

The purpose of both kinds of camouflage is to deceive. Behind their verbal deceptions the little teams of technicians have advanced like commandos into our agriculture, our industries, our housing, our State and city governments. They have, with their financial tools, disconnected the ties which bound each community to the people who built it. They have put in wires that now connect every community with the master switch in Washington. They have combined all our independent activities into one tightly organized production line, where everyone's work is financially geared to government. They are careful to use the orthodox words and phrases, to give the illusion of familiar security to the whole. But the administration in Washington is now completely master of the economic process.

III

Economics is not a parade of wooden figures. It is a metabolic process, a form of life. The people of a nation take certain substances from their resources, transform them by their work and skill into what they need, and do it with such an economy of energy that there is a margin left for growth.

When this vital process of replenishment and growth breaks down the society, like an individual, is dying. The outer limbs may still be robust, but inwardly the turn is toward decay.

The New Deal mined our capital resources and wasted them in made work, in political strife, and and inflated war costs. It restrained our people to distrust their individual ability to plan, taught them to avoid work, and to trust political promises calculated to deceive.

President Truman could have reversed that trend. He has chosen to complete it, though perhaps his advisers really made the choice. The President's economic message of January 6 was a truly historic document. It sounded the death knell of American economic growth, not less so because Mr. Truman himself may not realize what is happening.

The key argument now is full employment of resources, money, machines and men. Both chattel slavery and feudalism succeeded in providing full employment. The free economy improved on these by seeking the most productive employment of all factors. It put every man and every dollar where it would do the most fruitful work. That is why it had rising income to pay them. No one was put on made work, which produced no income, and so no one worked without pay. That wasn't just dull economics. It was one of the greatest political achievements of all history: the abolition of unpaid work or serfdom. We have let abuses under capitalism blind us to the essential value of the system.

"Full employment of resources" is the deceptive phrase hiding the turn back to a system of employment for capital and labor without compensation. The state can give full employment to men or dollars only by putting them at superfluous work. Of course for a while they can be paid by the confiscation of existing capital, laboriously accumulated by our forebears. But soon payment is made by lowering the income of the majority, calling this process "fair shares," as they do in Socialist Britain. Instead of full-time slavery for part of the people we now have part-time slavery for all—involuntary labor to pay taxes.

The planners know this. But they also know that it is politically feasible to go on looting our national capital fund. They need only spend part of the take for gigantic projects to satisfy the people, like Gov. Willie Stark, or like the model villages built by Potemkin to fool the Empress Catherine. These economic Nuremberg festivals are the promotional cost of the welfare state. They are the phosphorescent glow that hides the decay beneath.

IV

In every country the first stage of the welfare state is political squandering of the nation's capital. The second stage is renewal of the exhausted capital fund by the only means at the disposal of the State—by making everyone work longer hours, at less pay, for the dictators who rule in the name of the people.

The second stage of the welfare state appears in its 5-year plans, meaning assignment of workers to jobs that officials choose for them. That is old stuff in Europe. Now we see that it can happen here.

The economic message introduces the note of austerity into American thinking. Workers must work harder. Businessmen must take more risks. Everyone must pay even heavier taxes. To make it all well-rounded the administration vaguely promises to be economical sometime, somewhere—time and place not specified.

So, in America, we move without reason or foresight into the degeneracy of the welfare state.

Why does no one stop this grim decay? This is not Czarist Russia slowly collapsing in corruption. It is not defeated Germany taken over by the band of Nazi plunderers. It is the United States of America, the last, best hope of earth.

The real trouble is not with the power-seekers or the technicians. It is some weakness in ourselves. Froude tells us of the Indian tribes which suffered so deep a trauma from the rush of Spanish violence, and the incomprehensible spread of slavery to a people who had been free, that they willed their collective death.

The cure is easy, if we have the will. We must take back from the administration its power over our money, which is our work.

Money is only a receipt for work done. Credit is an I O U for work not yet done. Any nation which lets its government operate on credit in peacetime is a nation of indentured servants. It is on its way to becoming a nation of serfs. If we let the state use deficit financing in peacetime, we are agreeing to let it conscript our labor in peacetime.

The point at which to attack the evil is in the budget of the Federal Government. For it is there that slave men are fighting to enslave a people who, by their own indifference, are already half enslaved.

Radio Address of Hon. R. Walter Riehlman, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio broadcast delivered by our able colleague, Hon. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, Representative of the Thirty-sixth Congressional District of New York, over Station WHAM, Rochester, N. Y., on March 6, 1950. He evidences the same sound common sense and devotion to the principles which have formed a bulwark of strength in the upbuilding of our country which have always characterized his service in Congress. I commend his views to my colleagues.

The address follows:

I want to talk to you about socialized medicine. In the past 14 years one or more bills have been pending before sessions of Congress proposing that the United States Government participate in the furnishing of compulsory medical care to its citizens. All the socialistic countries of Europe for some years now have had programs of this character. I have been invited to speak on this program to express my views on the subject. I am opposed to Government-furnished medicine in the same degree as I oppose Government-furnished food, goods, or services which by custom in our country have been heretofore reserved to free enterprise.

The bankrupt nations of Europe today which are either participating in or furnishing health services are at the same time depending heavily upon us to furnish them with goods and credit and it seems strange that we, one of the few solvent nations in the world, would be interested in borrowing concepts from those countries. In most European countries liberty and freedom are dying because their systems of government do not reward initiative but instead shackle their people and deprive them of their liberty. The free-enterprise system remains healthy in the United States. However, it is threatened by persons who are attempting

to import foreign ideologies, including socialized medicine, into the United States.

Let's analyze without emotion the administration's socialized-medicine proposal. This legislation would draft the services of doctors, dentists, nurses, and other professional personnel, including technicians, and place them on the Federal pay roll for the purpose of rendering medical services to everybody. Wherever tried this type of medical care has degenerated to a low quality of care. The administration's program would be supported by another pay-roll tax, plus contributions from the Federal Treasury to make up underestimates of the cost. The eventual cost of the program has not been definitely determined by the sponsors of this wholly un-American scheme, but estimates do range from the administration's "guesstimate" of $7,000,000,000 to estimates by reliable authorities of $18,000,000,000 annually.

It is inconceivable that our successful medical system should be substituted by a system which has been inaugurated elsewhere and failed to produce the same high quality of medical care already achieved in the United States. We have the lowest death rate, the highest ratio of physicians to population, and ours is the only system which guarantees a confidential doctor-patient relationship.

The latest administration health-insurance bill contains 183 pages. Several pages are dedicated to the proposition that the patient will be guaranteed freedom to choose his own physician. However, if the doctor's panel were filled, there would be no opportunity for the patient to select him. This is the scheme which is used everywhere socialized medicine exists and is the only workable arrangement.

It is interesting to know who is seeking to sell socialized medicine to the United States. John T. Flynn, in his recent book, The Road Ahead, advises us that unprincipled politicians seeking perpetuation in office offer this social scheme in the hope of winning votes. Flynn warns that they are imitating the socializers of Great Britain, and we could become victims of a deadly parallel—copying Great Britain and starting down "austerity road" to socialism and an all-powerful state.

Mind you, I am not for a moment blind to the problem that many people have difficulty in obtaining medical care at a cost which they can afford, but I am not willing to accept socialism in any form in trade for hard-fought for and well-earned American freedom. We must not lose sight of the fact that socialism does not mix with free enterprise. We can't have a little socialism—it grows and chokes out free enterprise just as weeds, if not eradicated, take over a garden. There is no more reason to nationalize the medical profession than there is to nationalize farming, the steel industry, the mines, our transportation systems, the lawyers, the butchers, or the bakers. All our industries and professions present difficulties to the economy from time to time, but there have always been found American remedies for such problems—certainly we need not resort to socialism as a cure for American ills.

The biggest fallacy of those who would nationalize and socialize to bring about economic cures lies in the fact that socialism hasn't worked successfully in any country where it has been tried—this type of cure is worse than any of the ills with which we are confronted.

I don't wish to end this discussion in opposition to the administration's medical scheme without leaving with you a suggestion as to how better medical care might be assured for the American people at reasonable costs. Briefly I support recent legislation introduced by the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, of the Fortieth District of the State of New York. His bill, H. R. 6819, provides that persons who wish voluntarily to purchase health insurance policies, may deduct the cost of the premium from their Federal income taxes. This will certainly provide an incentive to persons within that bracket of taxes, roughly between $2,500 and $5,000, who today need the protection of insurance against the cost of serious illness. To my mind the words "voluntary and American" blend in a happier union than do the words "compulsion and American." Thank you.

Shipment of Arms to the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter that I have received from the Department of State in response to the protest that I received from the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Boston, Mass., with respect to the shipment of arms to the Near East:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 13, 1950.

The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LANE: I have received your letter of February 21, 1950, and enclosed telegram from the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Boston, Mass., concerning the shipment of arms to the Near East. Your courtesy in making the telegram available to the Department for consideration is greatly appreciated.

In view of the termination of hostilities in the Near East, it was determined by the Security Council last August that the embargo on arms shipments to the area was no longer necessary. During the discussions in the Council the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom stated that their respective countries did not wish to see an arms race take place in the Near East. The United States subsequently established a policy for the exportation of military equipment from this country to the Near East under which it has permitted shipment to the Arab States and to Israel of equipment which has been determined to be necessary for the maintenance of internal order and for the reasonable requirements of self-defense.

A renewal of the Arab-Israeli conflict would be a tragic development which must not take place. This Government has been keeping a close watch on developments affecting Palestine and an analysis of available information does not lead to the conclusion that serious measures are being taken in preparation for a renewal of hostilities.

There have most certainly been inflammatory and bellicose statements made in both the Arab and Israeli press concerning a renewal of the fighting. While such an attitude on the part of journalists is deplorable and harmful to the eventual establishment of good relations between Israel and the Arab States, under the circumstances, with bitter fighting only so recently terminated, it would probably be too much to expect that highly aroused passions should quickly cool. Some of the warlike pronouncements of officials of near eastern governments may have been made for the purpose of domestic consumption. The Department does not believe that the remarks of individual radio and press commentators should be taken as a reliable indication of any serious or immediate intent on the part of the respective Governments to resume hostilities.

At the present time, the relations between the Arab states and Israel are governed by valid armistice agreements signed by those states in the early months of 1949. In these agreements, the parties committed themselves to refrain from further acts of hostility, and the execution of the provisions of the agreements is being actively supervised by United Nations personnel on the spot in Palestine. These representatives have reported that the area is tranquil. Should a threat to the peace arise in the Near East, it would be the duty of the United Nations representatives, and the state concerned, to report this development to the Security Council, which remains seized of the question of the maintenance of peace in Palestine.

In considering the export of arms to the Near East from the United States, and from other countries, the Department has constantly kept in mind the danger of enhancing the possibility of a renewal of the Palestine conflict. As stated above, our analysis of all information available to us does not indicate any serious preparations to this end. Should such information be received, the United States Government would be quick to use all of its influence in an attempt to prevent such an eventuality, both within the United Nations and outside.

The telegram enclosed with your letter is returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,
JACK K. MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Excise Taxes on Communication Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under consent heretofore granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD my remarks as follows:

We in America are both proud and justly thankful that we still have a free communications system but we certainly cannot be proud of the fact that our great communication services which are a vital business and social necessity continue to be taxed at a rate deliberately designed to restrict and discourage their use. The present restrictive rates which are the results of successive increases by the Revenue Acts of 1941, 1942 and 1943 are as follows:

	Percent
Telephone toll messages of 25 cents and over	25
Local telephone service and toll messages of 24 cents and under	15
Domestic telegraph, cable, and radio messages	25
International telegraph, cable, and radio messages	10
Leased wire services	25
Wire and equipment service	8

These taxes are not a tax on the companies but are imposed directly on the users of the services. The taxes are collected by the communications companies from the people and remitted monthly to the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The communications taxes are basically wartime taxes and they have no conceivable place in an economy which depends for its survival on continued growth and expansion. That these taxes are wartime taxes and that the present rates are designed to restrict the use of the services is manifest from their legislative history.

The first tax imposed on communications services was that contained in the Spanish War Act of 1898 at a rate of 1 cent for each telephone or telegraph message for which a charge of 15 cents or over was made. This tax was subsequently repealed but reimposed by the act of October 22, 1914—emergency revenue laws—at the same rate. This act was then repealed by the Revenue Act of 1916 but due to the heavy expenditures incurred in the prosecution of World War I the Revenue Act of 1917 reimposed the tax on the same class of communications services at a rate of 5 cents for each 15-cent message. When the war emergency was carried over into 1918, the rate was increased by the Revenue Act of 1918 to 5 cents on messages ranging from 15 cents to 49 cents and to 10 cents on messages of 50 cents and over. This act added a new tax on leased wire services between local service areas at the rate of 10 percent.

The Revenue Act of 1921, which repealed many of the other World War I excise taxes, merely made a slight change in the brackets subject to the 5-cent and 10-cent rates of tax.

The Revenue Act of 1924 repealed all of the then existing excise taxes on communications services.

In 1932 in order to meet rising Federal expenditures Congress reimposed excise taxes on communications services in the Revenue Act of 1932. Excise taxes on telephone messages were imposed at the rate of 10 cents on messages of 50 cents to 99 cents; 15 cents on messages of $1 to $1.99; and 20 cents on messages of $2 and over. Telegraph messages were taxed at 5 percent and there was a 10-cent tax on each cable or radio message. A tax at the rate of 5 percent was made applicable to amounts paid for leased wires between local service areas. These depression emergency taxes were still in effect in 1941 when the country embarked on its defense program.

In the Revenue Act of 1941 the rates on telephone messages of 25 cents and over were increased to 5 cents for each 50 cents or fraction thereof with telegraph, cable, and radio messages being taxed at 10 percent. The rate on leased wires was increased to 10 percent and made applicable to all leased wires and, for the first time, an excise tax was imposed on wire and equipment services at the rate of 5 percent, and on local service, including toll messages under 25 cents, at the rate of 6 percent.

As the war emergency continued, excise taxes on communications services were further increased, first in the Revenue Act of 1942 and further increased in the Revenue Act of 1943. The rate on telephone toll messages was increased to 20 percent of the charge and then to 25 percent. The rate on domestic telegraph, cable, and radio messages was increased to 15 percent of the charge and then to 25 percent. The rate on leased wire services was increased to 15 percent and then to 25 percent. And, the rate on local service, including toll messages under 25 cents, was increased to 10 percent and then to 15 percent.

A tax on our communication services cannot be justified on any sound principle of taxation. Such taxes do violence to the ability to pay principal because they fall with equal impact on all classes and actually discriminate against individuals who have to make frequent use of communication services. Moreover, such taxes are a particular hardship on our farmers and all persons in rural areas and also discriminate against certain sections of the country which are often far removed from the centers of population.

Even those who argue that these taxes should be continued because they are productive of revenue and easily administered cannot on any rational ground defend the present rates. By no stretch of the imagination can communication services be classified as a luxury and yet they are taxed not only at luxury rates, but in the case of telegrams and long-distance telephone calls at a 25-percent rate which is higher than the rate applied to such items as movies, radios, perfume, jewelry, night clubs, cosmetics, and other items.

Sixty-six percent of all our families and almost all of our businesses have telephones and of the approximately 38,205,000 telephones in the United States one out of six, or approximately 6,841,000 are owned and operated by an independent (non-Bell system) telephone company.

In my opinion there is an indispensable place in the Nation's business and social system for a privately operated telegraph system but the continuation of the present tax of 25 percent has already destroyed any competitive possibility and as a result the Western Union Co. has been and is now operating at a considerable deficit. In 1949 the telegraph users paid to the company for its services more than $216,000,000 including the tax, but $36,500,000 of the funds collected by Western Union from the public were remitted to the Internal Revenue Bureau. If the present tax restraint is lifted, it wil be possible for this industry to operate succesfully, and this fact together with the recognition of the wholly illogical and unsound continuation of the present comunication taxes makes this a matter requiring the immediate attention of Congress.

Veterans' Preference in Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have been extremely interested in postal legislation since coming to Congress in September 1946, as, prior to my service in World War II, I was a postal employee at College Station, Tex.

Early in the Eightieth Congress, I introduced the first legislation which had as its purpose the granting of military credit to our postal employees for pay purposes. Therefore, I am very glad to support H. R. 87, which was reported out of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the Eighty-first Congress, and I urge the Members of this House to favorably consider this bill which will allow World War II veterans in the postal service to be credited with the time spent in the military service.

Those of us who are familiar with postal legislation will know the justification for such a bill as H. R. 87 inasmuch as length of service determines the amount of pay our postal employees receive.

Take, for example, two young men who have finished high school in the early 1940's and both having expressed an interest in entering the postal service, we find that one of them had been drafted early in the war and did not have an opportunity to receive an appointment in the postal service. The other young man, however, was not called by the military until a later date and had already entered as a clerk in the postal service. When the latter is separated from the armed forces, there is legislation providing him with military credit to be applied for pay purposes. The other young man, whom we feel has been done an injustice, enters the postal service after completing his tour of duty in the armed forces, and he is not granted any credit at all for the time spent in the armed forces. This bill would grant him credit and would give him the pay grade that we feel he is entitled to.

I sincerely urge Congress to favorably consider this legislation.

Tolerance Is a Lie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, stamping out intolerance so that every individual in the United States can fully enjoy the rights guaranteed to him under the Constitution is a challenging job facing all of us.

There recently was brought to my attention an example of the efforts being made by one of the Nation's oldest and most widely respected unions in the task of removing intolerance. That union is the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, chartered in 1897. The article was written by its president, Mr. Earl W. Jimerson, and its secretary-treasurer, Mr. Patrick E. Gorman, both of whom have spent the greater part of their life in the trade-union movement.

President Jimerson started working in a packing plant at East St. Louis, Illinois, when he was 16 years of age, earning 7½ cents an hour at the time. He became one of the leading organizers of the union during World War I, rose to the position of vice president in 1921, which he held until 1942, whereupon he became president of the union. He is one of the best known trade unionists in America.

Mr. Gorman has an equally impressive record of accomplishment. He started working in a packing plant at Louisville, Ky., at an early age. While so employed, he earned a law degree at the University of Louisville, and became a business representative of his local, and shortly thereafter was elected vice president of the international union. In 1923, at the age of 28, he became president of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, the youngest person ever so honored. He remained president for 20 years, and became secretary-treasurer 8 years ago. In 1948, the American Federation of Labor chose him to be a delegate to the Trade Union Congress held at Margate, England.

For numerous years both of these men have been concerned with the problem of achieving for all Americans equality of opportunity in employment and through numerous speeches and written articles have been leaders in the fight to attain this goal.

Their latest effort in this direction is an article which appears in the March 1950 issue of the official publication of the union, the Butcher Workman. It is reprinted below:

TOLERANCE IS A LIE

If one cannot tolerate a person or a race of people and proclaims it to the world, he is considered on those particular subjects as being intolerant. There are thousands of well respected men and women in all walks of life who are, in their communities, considered to be the very essence of tolerance and who at heart are bigots to the core.

The word tolerance is the largest lie in the English language. It is our most weasel word. If we could only read the minds of so-called tolerant people, we would discover that hate still secretly predominates the true character of millions who for business, social, or political reasons tolerate things they actually hate.

Recently at a health resort in one of our Southern States we met a man who could find nothing wrong with our beautiful hotel except that the Jews have taken possession. When we protested the remark, the usual crawfish act was forthcoming—"Now please don't misunderstand me. I like the Jewish people." He was a pure and simple unadulterated liar. He hated the Jews but back home he secretly tolerated them because he wanted to be a regular guy or something.

It is needless to mention the secret terrific anti-Catholic feeling which predominates in so many sections of our Nation. Oh, yes, in the open the bigot praises the Catholics as being good people. On the surface these intolerant Dr. Jekyls and Mr. Hydes are very tolerant, but let a Catholic aspire for political office in these localities and he is buried beneath an avalanche of votes by those who mark their ballots with their genuine narrow character instead of with their supposedly tolerant reputation.

The Jews and Catholics are well also to take care of themselves but when we come to the Negroes of our Nation the picture is altogether different. The Negro is the personification of tolerance of those things that cut him to the heart. He is making tremendous headway under adverse conditions only because he is learning how to cast his ballot and many of the politicians who are posing as his friends are as secretly intolerant of him as was the man down South who liked our hotel except that the Jews have taken possession.

In Washington, our Nation's Capital, the Federal FEPC bill has been kicked and badgered around in a shameful way. Only a few, including President Truman, are willing to make it a clear-cut issue. Others have their eyes and ears back home to ascertain if the issue will cost or gain them votes. In this such politicians are proving the lie of the word "tolerance" and the Negro with admirable patience tolerates the thumb-twiddling of those who were elected to office with a substantial block of Negro votes.

It is ironical that in our same Nation's Capital the living conditions of the Negro as well as white tolerance of his well-being is little better than the plight of his brothers in the Negro slums of the capital of South Carolina. The most gifted sons of the Negro race are still denied half equal rights in dining rooms, hotels, and the like, when the human debris from skid row would be welcome.

So far as we know, not many of the white friends of the Negro holding senatorial or congressional togas have raised their official voices to bring about reform. It is about time to call a halt on such intolerant political hypocrisy. Let us admit that tolerance in matters of this kind is a contemptible lie. Let us, therefore, have the Federal FEPC law now. Its enactment is long overdue. The time has come when so-called friendly Congressmen and Senators must stand up and be counted. The Negro has been politically double-crossed long enough.

Rt. Rev. Walter S. Carroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 24, 1950, Msgr. Walter S. Carroll, of Pittsburgh, died at Georgetown University Hospital. With his passing his church suffered a most untimely loss. Monsignor Carroll at the time of his death was an official of the Vatican Secretariat of State which post he held since 1940. He was the third American to be honored with an assignment with the secretariat and as vicar delegate to the American armed forces during the past war he rendered countless services to American troops and was entrusted with numerous and important diplomatic missions. He was born in Pittsburgh on June 18, 1908; graduated from Duquesne University in 1930; received his doctorate of philosophy from the University of Fribourg in Switzerland in 1933; his degree of S. T. L. at the Gregorian University in 1936, and his doctorate of canon law from the Pontificate Institute of Canon Law, Rome, in 1939. He was ordained on December 8, 1935, and in a short span of 8 years rose to the rank of monsignor. He was assigned to the Vatican in 1940. His passing at the age of 41 came as a shock to his many friends and admirers in this country and abroad and terminated a career that undoubtedly would have led to many and greater honors. His passing was noted by the celebration of Masses by His Holiness, the Pope, and by the Most Reverend Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, apostolic delegate to the United States. To his mother, Mrs. B. Margaret Hogan Carroll, and his two brothers, the Reverend Colman F. Carroll and Msgr. Howard J. Carroll, general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, go our heartfelt sympathy on their loss. They will be consoled, I am sure, by the thought that their distinguished son and brother has been called to a higher service.

Organization of a Constitutional Government in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, may I refer to H. R. 7674 which I introduced yesterday. It provides for the organization of a constitutional government in Puerto Rico.

Under the Constitution of the United States there are certain rights and privileges which may not be applicable in a given area. But there are certain rights which are fundamental. American citizens wherever they may live are endowed with them.

The people of Puerto Rico are an organized community of American citizens living in the land of their birth, the island of Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico is American territory although unincorporated territory.

The Congress of the United States, since 1900, has provided for the operation of Federal laws in Puerto Rico. It has determined the economic relationships to exist between Puerto Rico and the mainland. It has determined that the people of Puerto Rico are United States citizens. Such legal and economic provisions of our organic act the people of Puerto Rico are not aiming to disturb. Rather, they wish to reaffirm them and expressly register their consent to their application.

The Congress has also provided for the establishment of a local government in Puerto Rico and has progressively expanded the democratic nature of such government. Today, we have responsible government in Puerto Rico. It is served by officials which the people themselves elect or select.

However, the charter upon which this local governmental structure is based, has never been adopted by the people of Puerto Rico. That such charter be substituted by a constitution of the people's adoption is now a fitting and necessary

step in order to perfect the democratic nature of our system of government.

To this effect I have introduced H. R. 7674. In so doing, I am the interpreter and the voice of the people of Puerto Rico in this Congress. As a result of the elections of 1948 the wishes of the people of Puerto Rico on this score are unmistakable.

The bill is a simple one. It declares it to be its purpose to duly recognize the principle of government by consent. Under such principle, the people of Puerto Rico would accept this act. The present Federal provisions of our organic act would be continued. Within such framework the people of Puerto Rico would adopt a constitution, under which they would organize their local government.

The Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations with respect to the Territory or other property belonging to the United States. Under this provision of the Constitution, Congress has, in the course of time, adopted such rules and regulations for Puerto Rico as it has considered needful. Congress has been called upon to do so under the terms of cession of sovereignty under the Treaty of Paris of 1898. The Federal provisions of the present organic act would be reaffirmed under my bill. They are needful regulations for the establishment and maintenance of proper relations between the island and the mainland and the Federal Government. But for a community of American citizens at such stage of organization and democratic development as the people of Puerto Rico have attained, it is not needful to determine how their local government should be organized. They can do it themselves. The time has arrived when such community of citizens be recognized in this desire; in the wish to organize their local government as they see fit.

The bill, therefore, is both a recognition of a fact and the recognition of a principle. The fact is that the people of Puerto Rico wish and are able to provide themselves with a local constitution for the organization of their own local government. The principle is that American citizens are endowed with such privilege and exercise whenever circumstances permit.

The right to organize a local government, the right to live under a government of the people's choice is expressly recognized in the Constitution of the United States. Amendment IX of the Constitution reads:

> The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

There is no question that at the time the Constitution of the United States was adopted the people had and did not relinquish the right to organize their Government. They had already adopted their State constitutions. Later they adopted the Federal Constitution. It is such simple and elementary right the people of Puerto Rico wish now to exercise. They wish to adopt a local constitution and reaffirm their station within this Union.

What then would be the status of Puerto Rico should this bill be passed? Puerto Rico would be a Commonwealth of American citizens, living within the federation, in accordance with such provisions of the Constitution of the United States as are applicable in the case, living under a local government shaped and organized and functioning with the consent of the people of Puerto Rico, within this great federation. This would not make Puerto Rico a State, but it would make of Puerto Rico a community of American citizens living in the American way. We would not participate in national elections nor be represented in Congress any more than we now are, but we would have local government as democratically organized as in a State, and, with few exceptions, Federal laws would apply as in a State.

The point might be raised that never in the past has such procedure been followed. To such consideration I would reply with the following consideration:

Up until 1898 all territories added to the original territory of the original Union were incorporated at the time of acquisition. Such additional territories have been admitted or are in the process of being admitted to statehood as it should be. Since 1898 other areas have come under United States sovereignty. They have remained unincorporated, subject to further determination of Congress concerning their status. In one of these areas, in Puerto Rico, a new form of federative relations have been developing. The form is new, but it follows the fundamental principles of the Constitution. It has developed in a line parallel but not coincident with that followed by the incorporated territories attaining statehood.

Puerto Rico started in 1900 with a government comparable to that of an incorporated territory. By a series of enactments Congress has brought Puerto Rico to a status today which is way beyond a territorial pattern of government. It is much more comparable to that of a State. What my bill proposes to do is to perfect such status for Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico would have a position parallel to that of a State, although it would not have such participation in the Federal Government as the people of a state have. In other words, we are not asking for the right to vote for presidential electors, we are not asking for the right to elect two Senators, we are not asking for the right to elect Members of this House other than a voteless resident commissioner.

We are asking to continue to live under the Constitution of the United States as heretofore. We wish to continue to live under Federal laws as heretofore; but we are asking also that as far as our local governmental organization is concerned, we may proceed to shape it, in accordance with the same principles and in accordance, with parallel procedures as the people of any of the States organize their State governments. The fact that there has been no precedent should not deter Congress; such fact did not deter the Eightieth Congress from authorizing Puerto Rico to elect its governor.

We are developing a new pattern of federation, applicable to our circumstances, which do not permit us at the present, nor in the foreseeable future, to develop along the classical lines and the uniform pattern followed by former or present territories in their ascent to statehood.

The Constitution of the United States is not a static document. It is a dynamic instrument of Government. The wisdom of the founding fathers made it so, the wisdom of successive generations, past and present, has made it so. The United States are not composed of residents of the 48 States only. It is composed of all American citizens wherever they may be and wherever they might meet and gather and organize upon American soil. It is only natural, logical, it is inescapable, that they should strive to organize and live in an American way.

I plead with my colleagues in the House that such bill as I have introduced may receive their most considerate attention. I plead with my colleagues in the House that the people of Puerto Rico may be allowed to see their wishes fulfilled. In that region of the Caribbean where we live, we face the whole Spanish Main. Such enormous expanse of land is inhabited by people of an origin similar to ours in Puerto Rico. We are the advanced guard and the exponents of the American way of life in that area. All we want now is to maintain it and to perfect it. We want to show the world that democracy not only in practice, but also in principle, always follows the flag.

Wool Support Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include therein a resolution adopted by the Iowa Sheep and Wool Growers Cooperative at their annual meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, on March 7, 1950. I want especially to emphasize, for the benefit of Members of Congress, the concern of this association that much of the value of the wool support price program likely will be lost because of the present plan to base the 1950 support prices, by grades, on the 1-year price relationship that existed during 1949 rather than to base the support prices, by grades, on the 10-year average price which is the basis for parity. Such action would be a severe blow to the wool producers in the fleece-wool States, such as Iowa, and would tend to further discourage sheep numbers, which are at an all-time low.

Whereas the February 23, 1950, release of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics indicates that the 1950 purchase price for the

various grades of wool may be based on grade differentials established by market prices during 1949, and

Whereas the 1949 prices on medium fleece wools were abnormally low, both because of slow demand and due to the sale of CCC wool of the medium grades at prices 4 to 5 cents below cost to the CCC, and also because of CCC disposal of medium grade stock piles for previous years; and

Whereas a large percentage of the wool produced in Iowa is medium wool: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Iowa Sheep and Wool Growers Cooperative in annual meeting assembled, representing about 8,000 wool producers, demand that the Production and Marketing Administration give a complete and impartial hearing to association representatives of the Seele-wool States and to the National Wool Marketing Corporation, before establishing any new method of determining wool support prices for 1950.

Letter of John J. Phillips, of Temple City, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. John J. Phillips, of Temple City, Calif.; also his outline of a sound labor law mentioned therein:

TEMPLE CITY, CALIF., *February 27, 1950.*

Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
Representative of Pennsylvania,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RICH: I note by yesterday's press your remarks relative to the study and arguments of other Members of Congress for aiding the middle-income wage-earners, etc., and am writing to commend you for your common-sense remarks and contentions in this matter and offer the following suggestions concerning same:

Our Government is getting in deep water and trouble in capital letters by concerning itself with the private affairs of everyone and attempting to raise the standard of living and provide housing, etc., for people regardless of what efforts the individuals put forth to provide these things for themselves. Even Almighty God does not try to feed and care for people as He did for the pilgrims in the wilderness and lets them know that if they do not get out and hustle and do for themselves, they will suffer or starve.

And what of this dollar income? How can we tell what income anyone should receive when the value of the dollar is fluctuating and cost of labor of organized groups is changed and increased over night by the power-drunk labor leaders and the measuring stick, or value of the rule of measure is changed to suit to the selfish demands of large groups month after month and every year, until now with the cost of living coming down, these powerful groups still demand more than they received during the highest point of inflated prices and can tie up our greatest industries and hold them for ransom until they (these labor groups) are again appeased for a short time.

Our dollar is our most important measure of value, and no one should be permitted to tamper with its purchasing value by force, not even the Government after it is once fixed in value and the people work and sell their labor and save on the basis of such value. Much less to permit little selfish groups to devalue the dollars and savings of all because they want more.

Only acts of God; shortage of production, and the natural laws in their free operation should affect the purchasing value of the dollar. It is to the workers' interest to see that this value is maintained at all times, by giving as much in labor and production for the dollars he earns one day as the next, so that he can rightfully expect that those dollars if saved will purchase as much production and labor at any future time, barring some acts or conditions over which men have no control. Only in this manner can we ever have stability of prices, and a sound economy.

Most of those so concerned for these low-income families do not seem to realize that the high income of the better paid groups is being paid from borrowed money and we are now and have been for years going deeper and deeper into debt, and everything is done on borrowed money. In the case of housing, the loans run for 20 years and the debt for such building is increasing 19 times faster than it is being repaid. Millions of people have their weekly pay checks mortgaged for as high as 3 years ahead for purchasing of cars and home appliances and even clothing is being sold on time payments and those making the cars and appliances, clothing, etc., will have spent the money they received for their work months and years before the installment debts are paid off and the debts of all kinds now stand at the astronomical figure of about $450,000,000,000 and are increasing by fully $20,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000 annually and interest alone at around $16,000,000,000 annually. If this borrowing were stopped at once, or the payments increased to where we pay back as much as we borrow each year and the debt held at the present level, we would have a depression in 2 weeks, so how can anyone say what income any family is entitled to under such conditions?

Now our country is in a mess and when the President talks about "borrowing and deficit spending in bad times to prevent a depression" while we have so much of every kind of food and commodity that they are now destroying millions of bushels of potatoes, and have so much cotton, and grains, etc., that they cannot find storage space for it. It is difficult to understand what we would call good times or what we would do with more food, and raw materials, etc., if God in His beneficence were to give us more?

The only thing that ever drove the cave man from his underground habitat and sent him out to attack a wild animal of that day was hunger, his stomach getting flat and gnawing at him and human nature has not changed and unless people are told plainly that it is up to them to make their own jobs and sell their labor for what others are willing to pay for it or their production, etc., and then let them run their own race or fall behind, we may as well submit to stateism and socialism and let the Government take over, and with every Government aid and welfare, we will surrender a part of our freedom and finally will have to submit to complete regimentation and control just as the people of Britain were coming to before this recent election. Step by step, regimentation and control will finally rule the daily lives of everyone, and the people will be told where they will work and what standard of living they can have and their whole lives dictated and controlled, despite any denials of the President or anyone else. And we are already far on the road to such control.

The chief cause of our trouble is that our economy has been taken from the hands of trained and experienced businessmen and put into the hands and dictatorial control of the selfish labor groups, who know nothing of sound economics and care nothing for anyone else but their own little groups; dog eat dog, and the devil take the hindmost, and the whole country and economy at the mercy of these little warring gangs who have their agents roaming the country and levying tribute on the pay of every worker they can drive into their grasp.

Since passage of the income tax law, every strike and demand for more and more pay, shorter hours and this benefit and that has been against the public, the brothers and sisters of these workers, who serve and provide the strong organized groups with everything they eat, wear and use and it is getting worse every year. Out here the building trades workers have forced their wages up and up with connivance and collusion of the contractors who get a percentage or commission on every dollar they pay for cost of construction, and they give in year after year to these selfish groups and their wages are now from $18 to $25 per day and some such as plasterers have contracts setting 6 hours as a day at straight time, but call for a full 8 hours of work, the last 2 hours to be paid at double time (not time and a half) and this craft gets $2.50 per hour for 6 hours and $5 per hour for 2 hours or $35 per day to help provide homes for the homeless veterans and others. Now they are out to extend this holdup 6-hour basic day and overtime to all of the other groups and force the home builder to borrow more money and further increase the threat of inflation, as well as pile up more debt and increase the monthly payments of the home buyer and reduce his standard of living which will in turn result in further loss of jobs for those supplying the monthly living food and so forth for these families and so it goes.

I herewith attach an outline of a sound labor law that would stop this raiding of the pantries and food budgets of every family by these organized groups and also stop this criminal waste of time by strikes which are weakening our economy and government in this most serious war with the most deadly sinister force—communism—that the world has ever known and which "cold war," we are losing on all fronts and if these labor groups had any concern for their own freedom and the future of their country, they would stop this bickering and fighting and get down to honest work and build up our economic strength to meet the assault which will be loosed against us from all sides when Russia and the communists get firmly set in China and now have us surrounded on all sides.

This demand for pensions for groups is nothing but a holdup of the rest of the public and will lead to ruin, since there cannot be sound investments for any such amount of money and it will upset and destroy the value of the savings of millions who have been saving and investing for their old age. No average pension can provide a full living standard for anyone, but can only supplement the income from savings put aside by thrift and sober living during one's working years and no matter how little one earns they can save something if they try. Therefore it is wrong and even criminal to permit any organized group to devalue these savings by demanding more pay for the same work and production, and tell every other person that "their dollars are worth but 90 percent or 80 percent or on down to but 50 percent of what they were up to that date," which is plain insanity. Not even the government should devalue the dollar and savings of the people much less every little ignorant and selfish group.

This labor plan would stop all of this, and if the Government can put a floor under wages to stop chiseling by employers, then we can also put a ceiling over the wage that groups can demand of their fellow men, and leave the employers free to negotiate the actual wage within these brackets of the maximum and minimum.

No honest worker should ask or demand that his brothers digging his food from the ground for him should work for a fraction of the pay of these ordinary crafts and trades as has been done in the past. Just plain greed and the power to go out and take it from the rest. This should now be stopped. If the Government does take action to help the low-income families, it will not mean a thing if we still permit these land pirates to go on raiding against all of us, and take still more for the same, or less work. Now we are in a mess and it is now time to stand up and tell these power-drunk groups they will not be permitted to continue such raiding, and piling more and more debt on children unborn to try to keep our economy operating.

What could be more fair for all, Mr. Rich, if all the labor leaders sit down together and work out such a fair wage scale and then hold it firm from year to year, and reestablish a firm price ceiling and value of the dollars of all and the purchasing value of the savings of the workers when they retire as well as all living on pensions, annities, and income from savings? All would be a thousand times better off than this continuous fighting and devaluing of the savings of all to where many are being forced to turn to the relief agencies for help to maintain a subsistance standard of living. It cannot possibly but end in bankruptcy and ruin for millions, and possibly the loss of our freedom and way of life, and it is much later than most people think.

Yours truly,

JOHN J. PHILLIPS.

NATIONAL LABOR COMMISSION FOR REGULATING LABOR RELATIONS

1. Enact a law repealing all present laws on labor relations and set up a National Labor Commission of five members.

2. Set up labor courts in all populous centers of the country with full power to settle all labor disputes peaceably with rights of appeal to the courts if either party to the dispute desires.

3. Adopt a National Labor Code, spelling out plainly all rights of workers, as to seniority and working conditions, etc., as well as obligations of workers to their employers and the public whose rights are paramount to those of any individual or group. And—

(a) Prohibit all strikes, lock-outs, slow-downs, sit-downs, or willful interference with full regular production, service, and transportation by either employers or employees, where demands of the public require. Only acts of God to be permitted to interrupt production, service, etc.

(b) Prohibit workers from quitting their jobs without first giving due notice of their intention to do so; 1 week, 2 weeks, or a month, according to how paid. Employer to give workers the same notice of dismissal, or an equal severance pay when discharged at once. This to prevent workers quitting in mass and disrupting service and supply to the public.

(c) Require every worker to carry a work book giving place of employment (or last and former employment) in which the employer will be required to state in writing over his stamp and signature, why the worker was discharged, and how he or she performed their work and if they complied with the law requiring notice of leaving the employer. These work books to be renewed each year, and carried at all times and give the Social Security number of the holder. Such books and evidence of former employment would be of great service to police in checking up on anyone arrested or picked up because of crime.

(d) Adopt a national system of apprenticeships setting forth the time a beginner must serve at a subsistence wage before being licensed as a journeyman. The number of apprentices admitted to any craft or trade to be regulated by the officials of the Labor Commission.

(e) Take the prevailing wage for farm labor as fixed by the laws of supply and demand, as the minimum and basis for figuring the wage for all other groups of workers in each district.

(f) Consider each craft and trade on its merits, as to skill required, hazards of the work, and time required in apprenticeship, and fix a maximum wage for each craft, beyond which organization groups will not be permitted to force their wage as long as the basic wage for farm labor remains relatively the same. A representative of the farm workers to sit in on these deliberations and be permitted to state what differential between his wage and that of the skilled crafts he feels is fair, and would not overly attract him or other farm hands to leave their jobs in the fields to try to get into the skilled jobs.

(g) Employer and employees to be left free to negotiate the actual wage, within the brackets of maximum and minimum wage as set forth. This to avoid price or wage fixing. It would be wage limitation for groups the same as we have a minimum wage fixed by law, but not wage fixing.

(h) Leave the employer free to reward good, trustworthy workers with whatever wage he feels such worker is worth to him above the maximum for the group. This to serve as an incentive for workers to give their best efforts and endeavor to improve their skill and production, and so forth.

(i) Wages for groups to be held firm from year to year and never permitted to rise for any whole group, unless all workers are given such increased wage. This to reestablish a firm value of the dollars of all.

(j) Every worker to be required to do an honest day's work, no featherbedding or standby work, and so forth. When production and profits in any business rises to where it is possible, the negotiators for the workers to negotiate a reduction in the price of the product or service which will benefit all workers and the public and retired and not upset this fair wage scale fixed by agreement between representatives of all groups.

(k) No one to be denied work because of his membership in a union or nonmembership. Employer to have full right of disciplining workers, and so forth.

Excise Tax on Theater Admissions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal about cutting the excise tax on theater tickets.

One of the most forcible approaches to this subject is an editorial that appeared in the Richmond (Calif.) Independent, under date of February 17. I commend it to my colleagues:

INEQUITABLE

There has been considerable talk, but no action, in Congress on the pros and cons of cutting out or reducing the wartime excise taxes.

And one of those taxes that certainly should be removed or sharply reduced is the 20-percent tax on theater admissions. Here is a tax that hits the little people and their cheapest form of entertainment.

The tax is unfair to the masses who find in the movies an economical means of entertainment and enlightenment. Did you ever hear of a tax burden that increased as the family grew in numbers? The vice of the theater tax is that it increases as the family increases, regardless of any increase in the family income.

The tax is discriminatory. Every theater owner in the United States is already paying all the taxes levied on business enterprises generally, together with special taxes and assessments peculiar to the theater industry.

The workingman and his family, unable to afford high cost entertainments, must depend on the movies for satisfying relaxation.

The admission tax is not a Hollywood tax—it is a tax that is paid directly by the people who purchase admission tickets to the theater. The admission tax does not reach to the fabulous salaries which until recently were blazoned in the headlines. Those salaries not only are being adjusted to meet a changed economic condition, but are reached thorugh a different form of taxation—the income tax.

A good way to make your wishes felt in the matter is to write to your Congressman and ask for his consideration when the matter is brought up for debate on the floors of Congress.

Letter of DeWitt Garrison, of Middletown, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MIDDLETOWN, N. Y., *March 7, 1950.*

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: I have never written a letter to either of my Representatives in Congress before, and why I should vent my feelings on you will have to be categorized as kismet.

It is not my intent that this letter shall depict wrath, because I have no feelings of ill will against you or any Member of the Congress. You, like your cohorts, were elected to office by your constituency which definitely placed upon your shoulders a responsibility to do your best for us at all times. That I expect.

Because I do not know the so-called inside, I cannot clearly express an opinion on any subject. There is always more than the eye can perceive.

But I do know that I am most weary of working to support my family and having the Government, to whom by the token of being born under the Stars and Stripes I owe an allegiance, fleece my hard-earned wages from my pockets when I would much rather see it spent on the welfare of my family. Each day the increase of prices alone makes my problem of living all the more difficult without the continual increasing of my taxes.

I work for a stipulated salary. I cannot go to my employer each time a new union contract is made, and which virtually always carries an increase, either financial, gratuitous, or token, and say to him, "Mr. Boss, this group and that group of workers have just received another increase which will mean

that everything that concerns me will increase my cost of living. Will you please compensate accordingly?" In our American way of living this isn't done, because there are more unorganized individuals than there are organized. I still like the philosophy of live and let live, because the man I am working for has the same costs applicable to himself and his family.

So, these organized minority groups continue to raise the cost of my household unrestricted and without apparent regard for me or my costs, or the hardship they cause me while fighting for that livelihood.

Then comes the Government. It buys potatoes, eggs, and other essential commodities that I need to feed my family with my taxes. So, I have to pay twice their cost over the counter. I don't think I would object quite so much if these products were put to essential use. What does my Government do? They burn them up, throw them away, or store them in some God-forsaken spot, which is an administrative cost, and 9 out of 10 chances will be constituted as worthless within a short period of time.

What else does my Government do? It taxes me to carry out the cost of the Marshall plan, which in some measure must carry food to feed the war-torn Continent. So we buy more food. We can't ship the potatoes that were destined at the time of planting to be burned or wasted. I had to eat dehydrated potatoes and dehydrated eggs when I was fighting nazism and fascism. I would think it little enough for these people to do the same for me now.

I have bought eggs for 15 cents a dozen. Now I pay 45 and more, and so the story goes. Can't you realize that I must now resemble a punch-drunk fighter? I feel that way, yet there appears to be no referee to stop the fight.

I have no desire for my Government to maintain or support me or my family, and yet it will not give me the resources to do my wish. I want to point with pride at my home and know that I, through hard work, made it mine. I do not want my Government to interfere with my private life, and yet each day expensive bureaus are created to do this or that for my welfare. I have the right to demand that I look after my own welfare. I do not want my Government as a silent partner in the deal. I do not mind paying for the upkeep of the White House—that is mine, too—but the house at 206 Wisner Avenue, Middletown, N. Y., has DeWitt and Lenore Garrison on the deed, and Uncle Sam is not requested. I would like to see every other red-blooded American have the spirit and the guts to do the same thing, instead of having my taxes build his house for him. This puts me in the sucker class, when my Government talks about going in the contracting business.

If I never saw a democratic government making a bunch of human souls lacking in spirit and initiative, I am seeing it now. May God rest the souls of those who fought at Concord, Lexington, and Bunker Hill.

My son will be college material in another 3 years. Can't you visualize what a struggle this will be, provided we continue as we are now? I do not construe this for more Federal education. I do not want red tape attached to my son's education. I still would want him to write his father about his marks and not some civil service clerk in Washington in order to determine whether his education would or would not be furthered. However, I must admit that I will be fortunate if I can feed and clothe him in 3 years under our present rate of taxation and increasing prices, brought about mainly by ever-increasing wages, except mine and a few million others like me who do not have high-salaried potentates writing the contract.

I reserve the right to instill in my son initiative and responsibility. If anyone is to spoil him or make a bum out of him, it is my prerogative, not that of his Government. It would be bad to have him despise his father, but a far worse sin to despise his Government, and yet the Government is fast trying to do me out of that, too.

You are one. But I beseech you to flail with any instrument at your command to bring about a general reduction of living costs and Government spending. I do not have to tell you what they are, for they speak for themselves. Now I have spoken and, as I have said before, I expect you through your elective office and your position in the Congress to do your utmost.

All I ask from my country is the right to live as a free man, able to assume responsibility, and activate my initiative. I do not ask that my God-given rights be slowly snatched away from me, and to be humbled by high costs and taxes which take away every opportunity that my forefathers planned for me. This is being done, and I resent it beyond words of expression.

This United States of ours was made great by men with initiative. What they made they could hold, and an all-powerful Government didn't take it away from them.

Sincerely yours,

DEWITT GARRISON.

At Least It's Worth Trying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following front-page editorial statement and a statement of mine published in an Ohio weekly newspaper, Public Opinion, Westerville, Ohio, a nonpartisan newspaper of considerable circulation, whose editor and publisher is A. M. Courtright.

The article is as follows:

IN THIS CORNER

AT LEAST IT'S WORTH TRYING

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—During these days of hate between nations; indulged in and fostered mostly by the leaders of the United States and Russia, it is hard to find a high Government official in Washington that does not advocate the chip-on-the-shoulder attitude of dealing with the U. S. S. R. We are convinced that the common man in Russia doesn't want a war with the United States any more than we want a war with him. We also are convinced that there can never be a world-wide peace until the leaders of all nations realize that ordinary people aren't interested in international intrigues and designs of conquest, either physical or financial. The only true world-wide peace will come when an honest effort is made by all sides to foster brotherhood and understanding among the peoples of the world, and we believe that such a policy would succeed for the simple reason that it is hard to hate a man you know. Unfortunately, our present leaders have so blinded themselves by the get-tough policy, that they believe no proposal, no matter what merit it may have, is even worthy of consideration unless it carries us further down the armsrace road to destruction. Therefore, it is good to see the action of our Congressman-at-large, STEPHEN M. YOUNG, who sent us the following article from his office in Washington. We'd like to emphasize Mr. YOUNG's question to President Truman and his advisers—really, what is wrong with trying to achieve peace between the Russians and ourselves by talking?—at least it couldn't be any more unsuccessful than our present policy. We wish more of our Senators and Congressmen would take up Mr. YOUNG's suggestion.)

Worth trying

Really, what would be wrong with sending Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson, of the United States Supreme Court to the Kremlin, to talk face to face with Joe Stalin and other representatives of the Russian dictatorship? Isn't anything worth trying to bring about permanent peace in this world? The Soviet Union is preparing to wage war against us. Otherwise, why its stupendous army and air force?

After all, Chief Justice Vinson served as a Member of Congress for 14 years, served as Justice of the United States Supreme Court, was Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Federal Loan Administrator and Secretary of the Treasury. He is a skilled and experienced negotiator. If necessary, he could probably drink his share of vodka and still look Stalin in the face with a coldly appraising eye. The tremendous costs of the armament race now being waged and the dread portent of A and H bombings justify all honorable steps to maintain peace. Bear in mind the onset of World War III, if such a war should come, would be so terrible, so devastating, that in retrospect Pearl Harbor in contrast might appear no more serious than Custer's defeat, Bull Run or even a traffic accident.

Veterans' Hospitals in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to call attention to a distressing situation in California that is steadily growing worse—that of the lack of hospital beds for veterans.

We made a solemn promise to the GI's that they would have free hospitalization on their return to civilian life. We must fulfill that promise. Each and every GI that needs hospital care must get it—not after a year or two of waiting—but when he or she needs it.

Last fall my distinguished colleagues, CHET HOLIFIELD and CECIL KING, arranged a meeting between the southern California congressional delegation, and representatives of the Veterans' Administration, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart. The purpose was to gather current information on the appalling situation in California, and to coordinate efforts.

The stories they brought back to Washington were no credit to our national honor. As a result of that inquiry, our California congressional delegation has recommended immediate action to permit the Veterans' Administration to take over those Army and Navy facilities that have been closed or are to be closed in southern California.

The reasons behind the recommendation are manyfold, any one of which

would be sufficient in itself to warrant a reconsideration of our policy with respect to veterans' hospital needs in California:

First. California's veterans' needs are based on old population figures. In the 1940 census, California was fifth in national rank, with a population of approximately 6,900,000. After the 1950 census, the Census Bureau estimates that California will be officially second, with a population of approximately 10,700,000.

Second. California's population, particularly southern California's, is being increased by upwards of 10,000 every month. The Disabled American Veterans estimate that over one-third of those who come to California are veterans. Many are in immediate need of hospital treatment—especially tubercular and neuropsychiatric. Many more will have to be cared for later as the need arises, and it most surely will.

Third. The State of California is in no position to cope with an additional burden of veterans in need of hospital care. California cannot cope with those who are already awaiting treatment that is theirs by right and not by largess on our part. According to the Veterans' Administration's own figure, as of December 8, 1949, there were approximately 900 mentally-ill patients and 250-300 TB veterans awaiting admission to hospitals in our State.

In recognition of California's needs, the Veterans' Administration some time ago approved new construction. Today the delays in the completion of approved VA facilities and the canceling of others is deeply disheartening.

Because of our acute needs the Veterans' Administration entered into contracts with the Army and Navy to set aside a certain number of beds in specified service hospitals until sufficient VA facilities were available. Recently two of those service hospitals were closed, and 325 of the beds contracted for by the VA for veterans' care were lost. Another 550 beds are scheduled to be lost to veterans when two more service hospitals are closed in the near future. Their closing has thus far been delayed because of protests and acute need, but the Secretary of Defense has stated that they will definitely be closed. If the armed services no longer have need of such facilities the veterans should be given those facilities, and immediately.

Fourth. California's present unemployment situation is such that any additional financial burden could be borne by the State only with great difficulty, and with injustice to our veterans. In 1948 unemployment in California averaged almost 300,000 persons, or 6.8 percent of the California labor force. This was twice the percentage of unemployment for the Nation as a whole. In 1949, the number of men and women out of work in California increased to an average of about 417,000, or close to 9.4 percent of the California labor force. If the number of unemployed in the United States had risen throughout the country to the same high level in 1949 as it did in California we would have had in 1949 an army of unemployed made up of more than 5,600,000 people. In southern California where the veterans' needs are greatest, the growing burden of unemployment relief is most acute.

The Veterans' Administration and the country must assure our GI's the hospital and medical care that is their due regardless of politics, local economic problems, or reorganization plans.

Hour of Sharing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Protestant and Eastern Orthodox Churches of America, which through their interdenominational relief agency, Church World Service, are conducting the campaign called One Great Hour of Sharing, are to be saluted. This is a truly Christian project; it is in keeping with the spirit of democracy; it is in keeping with the spirit of America. No doubt every American, no matter what his faith, will be glad to share in this hour.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "Hour of Sharing," which appeared in the Independent Press, Bloomfield, N. J., March 10, 1950:

HOUR OF SHARING

One of the greatest blessings given human beings is the opportunity to share with others what life has to offer. We share with our parents, our sisters and brothers, our schoolmates, our husband or wife, and then in turn, with our own children. True, this is a blessing, but also it is a grave responsibility. Sharing one's joy is a delight—sharing one's sorrow is a burden; but they must go hand in hand.

Today, our brothers in Europe and Asia are undergoing, and have been since the conclusion of the war, a period of deprivation of the bare necessities of life. Not only are they desperately in need of material things; above all, they need to know that somewhere in the world there is someone who cares what happens to them. They are seeking reassurance, and it is up to those of us who are in better circumstances to do what we can to give them this reassurance. When we do this we are not really sharing their burdens, for to do that we would have to know what it is to search for loved ones who have been lost since the war. It would mean going back to see the ruins of what was once a loved home. It means all the heartbreak that war brings in its wake. All we can do is lighten the burden.

It is written in the Scripture: "Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ." This is little enough to do for those who wander the face of the earth and cannot find one little niche to call their own; this is little enough to do for one who does not have a loved one with whom to share his misery, for many are alone—the lone survivors of a family.

The Protestant and Eastern Orthodox Churches of America, through their interdenominational relief agency, Church World Service, are conducting a campaign called one great hour of sharing. On Sunday all these churches will unite in one great effort to do their share in alleviating the desperate need which still exists in Europe and Asia. We ask that you give, and give generously, through your own church. But, above all, we ask that you go to church on Sunday morning and join with your own brethren in prayer. This participation will be magnified a hundredfold, for on that Sunday morning all the churches cooperating in the one great hour of sharing campaign will join together in prayer. Yes; sharing can be a joy, but it is surely a responsibility. How can we, as true Christians, face ourselves if we do not do our share?

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Syracuse (N. Y.) Herald-Journal of February 11, 1950]

JIM FARLEY'S SYRACUSE SPEECH

Irrespective of politics, former Postmaster General James A. Farley is one of the country's big men, both in stature and mentality. Hence the people of Syracuse and central New York would be interested at any time in his comments and suggestions on government.

But Jim Farley's remarks before the New York State Press Association at the Hotel Syracuse last night have special interest just now, due to the fact that he is being widely boomed for the Democratic nomination for Governor this year.

What does he think of the present picture? He is disturbed by Government spending, deficit financing, and high taxes. Discussing the Hoover report, he says that the country is composed of two kinds of people—those who believe Government can support all the citizens and those who wonder whether all the citizens can support the Government.

He refers to President Truman's statement that on the basis of national growth over the last 50 years we shall have a national income of a trillion dollars 50 years hence. Yes, says Jim Farley. But if the cost of Government continues to increase at the rate of the last 50 years, the cost 50 years hence will be 6 trillion dollars or 6 times as much as the whole national income.

The lesson is obvious: we can't go on boosting the cost of Government at the 1900-50 rate without national bankruptcy. We've got to learn to control such costs, there's no alternative.

As could be expected, Jim Farley rules out partisan considerations in dealing with this issue. "It is an American issue and every true American, regardless of party, owes it to himself to study it, understand it and do something about it," he says. That is right.

And what does Jim Farley suggest good Americans do about it? He says that Congress is under so many demands for the expenditure of funds that it finds it almost impossible to resist them. What is needed, he asserts, is that Americans be organized to put just as much pressure on Congress to save as the various pressure groups have put on it to spend.

He recognizes the truth of President Truman's statement that a vast amount of the present $40,000,000,000 budget is required to pay the costs resulting from past wars and the expenses of the present cold war. But he believes that there can be savings in what

is expended over and above military and foreign aid. And he thinks that it is quite possible that something could be saved on military expenses without damaging national defense. He also believes that foreign aid can be reduced to a more reasonable figure.

It hardly seems necessary for this newspaper to comment that Jim Farley's position is sound. We have on numerous occasions emphasized the imperative necessity of a closer check on Government expenditures.

But Jim Farley's Syracuse speech certainly will add noteworthy emphasis to this pertinent subject—emphasis which we hope will serve the broad and timely purpose of directing the attention of the whole American people to one of the urgent necessities of the hour.

[From the Syracuse (N. Y.) Post-Standard of February 12, 1950]

WRITTEN BY JAMES A. FARLEY

James A. Farley is a leader in a great segment of the Democratic Party that did not accept the New Deal. His protest against reckless spending at Washington is, accordingly, of marked significance.

Speaking to members of the New York Press Association, at Hotel Syracuse Friday night, Mr. Farley said that Federal spending has grown to such vast proportions that it threatens our constitutional form of government.

"Unless we find some way of reducing the cost of Government," he said, "it will grow so great as to consume not only everything that we all earn, but also everything that we have saved and ultimately everything that we call property."

The statement would have excited little attention had it come from a Republican, but Mr. Farley still commands widespread respect in the ranks of the Democratic Party. If he feels so strongly on the subject of Federal spending, many other members of the party think the same way.

It is a warning that President Truman and his lieutenants would be wise in heeding. The defection of only a few hundred thousand voters would cost them an election.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram of March 14, 1950]

FARLEY URGES HOOVER REPORT

Speaking to the New York Press Association at Syracuse last week, James A. Farley made an urgent plea to the Empire State editors to get behind the Hoover report for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

It is generally conceded by practically everyone in both major political parties that Mr. Farley's devotion to his country and its welfare supersedes his loyalty to the Democratic Party. The former Postmaster General and national chairman has proved that to the admiration and admiration of most people.

Mr. Farley thinks it is the duty of every citizen to become acquainted with at least the generalities of the Hoover report, which can be done by reading the numerous condensed reports which appear in the newspapers. The entire report contains 18 enormous volumes, written after nearly 2 years of exhaustive research into Government operation... The average man won't ever see it, but he can familiarize himself with the essential changes urged by the former President.

Mr. Farley says there are two kinds of people in this country. There are those who believe the Government can support all the citizens. The others, and Mr. Farley is in this group, wonder whether all the citizens can support the Government.

Some of his observations, based on experience and knowledge, are a little frightening. Mr. Truman in January said that on the basis of this country's growth in the last 50 years, we would have a national income of a trillion dollars, 50 years ahead. Mr. Farley has no doubt about the President's figures or expectations, but he looks ahead in another way. If we take the cost of Government in 1900 and compare it with costs in 1950, our Government will cost $6,000,000,000,000. And on that basis we would have 20,000,000 Government employees.

This is only one of numerous dangers ahead, unless we find a way to cut the costs so that the Government will not consume everything that we all earn, everything that we have saved, and ultimately everything that we call property, which is owned by all of us.

The Hoover report is not political. It seeks to solve an American problem, and Mr. Farley sees the report as the one constructive offering made toward that direction. "What is needed," he told the editors, "is that Americans be organized to put as much pressure on Congress to save as the various pressure groups have put on it to spend." In this, every American should lend a hand, to get all of the major recommendations of the Hoover Commission enacted into law.

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News of February 11, 1950]

A REDUCING DIET FOR UNCLE SAM

James A. Farley, who knows a thing or two about the art of getting things done in politics, offered some practical counsel Friday night on both the necessity to reduce the fantastic cost of Government, and the ways and means to achieve it. The occasion was a meeting of the New York Press Association in Syracuse, and his treatment of the subject was nonpartisan: A Frank Review of the Hoover Report. But his advice concerned much more than the excellent recommendations for administrative reform detailed in that report. The gist of it is that if big government is not going to overwhelm us, Americans must be organized to put just as much pressure on Congress to save as the various pressure groups have put on it to spend.

The National Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, with its subcommittees in nearly every State and locality, represents a highly impressive beginning in that direction, Mr. Farley says. But the kind of economy crusade he has in mind can't stop with administrative reform, as does the Hoover report. It was not that Commission's function to pass on the wisdom or unwisdom of any Federal activity, but only to suggest improvements in administration.

If all the Hoover recommendations were adopted at once, as the former Democratic national chairman noted, the savings would come to more than $3,000,000,000. But it is well to remember that this would still have us with a $2,000,000,000 deficit. To check the constant upward trend of spending, something more than administrative reform is needed—specifically: a determination in Congress, based on an unmistakable public demand, to stand firm against nonessential appropriations.

This, Mr. Farley insisted, is a national necessity and there is nothing partisan in it. "I have had enough experience in the National Government," he remarked, "to know that in the scramble for congressional appropriations we cannot distinguish the energy of a Republican from that of a Democrat * * * We have got to have men in Congress who look to the need for a sound national economy * * * and a little less concern for what certain communities and particular departments are demanding."

But to achieve that requires an organized, articulate voice of economy that speaks as loudly on all occasions as does the pressure-group voice for spending. "We must reduce our cost of Government," says Mr. Farley, "and we must reduce it even if some people get hurt in the process." Active support for the Hoover Commission's crusade for competence is a good place for responsible citizens to start showing that they mean business in that endeavor.

Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, Senators are carefully watching their mail these days for the little hint that will let them know how their constituents want them to vote on the natural gas bill S. 1498. This bill if passed will increase the gas bills in every major city to people using natural gas to heat their home and to those using this type of fuel for industries. It can mean an increase anywhere from 1 cent to 5 cents per 1,000 cubic feet.

I have voted against this bill H. R. 1758 when it was presented to the House. At that time I stated that the mayor and the Buffalo City Council were opposed to this type of bill.

Under this proposed bill, if Federal regulation were lifted, gas users would be forced to pay millions more for the privilege of using natural gas. This money would be paid by the household users and industries and all these millions would go to the coffers of a group of powerful companies, already recognized for their enormous profits of the past.

This is a struggle between the people and a handful of wealthy oil companies.

From statistics furnished by the Federal Power Commission, New York State consumers, at a 5 cents per 1,000-cubic-foot increase, would pay to these utilities approximately $1,500,000 a year more.

Natural-gas interests want to take from the Federal Power Commission the power to regulate the initial sale of gas from the producer to the pipe-line company. Then all rates could be determined by the prices the big concerns decide to charge in the field.

Twenty-four million consumers used natural gas last year. Thirty-eight companies produced 86 percent of gas over the pipe lines. In casting my vote against this bill I was voting for the interest of 24,000,000 Americans.

The United States Conference of Mayors is fighting this legislation. They know what it will mean to the gas bills of the people in the large cities.

This bill can still be defeated in the Senate and should be for the protection of the people who use gas for heating their homes.

The Mo Pac Moves Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herein an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of February 22, 1950, entitled "The Mo Pac Moves Ahead," which discusses the use of radio on the Nation's railroads as a safety measure.

We are proud to note that the Missouri Pacific Railroad, which is the worthy successor to the first railroad west of the Mississippi River, is availing itself of the many advantages of train radio. They have found it practicable and are moving for even greater use of this device

The editorial follows:

THE MO PAC MOVES AHEAD

Progress among the Nation's railroads in availing themselves of the many advantages of train radio comes distressingly slow. But it does come. Now Missouri Pacific Lines trustees reveal they are going in for expanded use of this device.

For 2 years the Mo Pac has been testing train radio on freights running between Alexandria, La., and McGehee, Ark. The experiments have been so successful that the road now proposes to spend more than $164,000 this year in putting the equipment on other freights.

Consistently this has proved to be the experience wherever the equipment has been tried. The benefits in both efficiency of operation and in heightened safety have shown the expense of installation to be well justified. It is difficult to understand why the railroads have been so slow in availing themselves of this aid to progress.

Only Monday, for instance, the Star-Times pointed out that train radio on the Long Island Railroad might have avoided Friday's tragic wreck. Now the road will have to pay much more in replacing equipment and settling damage claims than it would ever have had to pay for the radio.

Somehow, though, resistance to this obvious safety device looms big. Even on the Mo Pac now there are no plans to install radios on passenger trains at present, though the need is every bit as urgent there.

But at least the Missouri Pacific moves in the right direction. It's a direction in which all railroads will have to move if they want to show proper concern for safety. They'd do well to move early rather than late.

Look to Yourself, Dean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune on March 10, 1950, wrote the following interesting editorial on the activities of our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson. The editorial is as follows:

LOOK TO YOURSELF, DEAN

A call upon American men and women to join with their Government in a concerted effort to defeat Russia's plans for world domination was issued Thursday by Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

This, of course, amounts just to so many words. Perhaps Mr. Acheson means that this country should prepare to fight slavery abroad by instituting it here, through Government regulations. We cannot be sure, from his statement.

He speaks about the dangers of communism, and the threat of Russia. These things the American people know. They appear to be ready to fight communism in the American way.

We are not so sure the State Department and the administration are similarly prepared.

For example, Thursday, upon recommendation of the State Department and the Justice Department, a New York court which had convicted Judith Coplon and Soviet Diplomat Valentin A. Gubitchev, suspended the sentence imposed upon the Russian.

Miss Coplon was sent to prison for 15 years. Gubitchev got the same sentence. Then, because of the State Department's request, the court, with what seemed some reluctance; told Gubitchev he would be freed at once provided he left this country forever.

The State Department spokesman said this country doesn't want to risk prejudicing the situation of Americans now in eastern Europe.

That appears to be a strange situation to adopt, in view of Mr. Acheson's call upon the people for support.

Recently, an American, Mr. Robert Vogeler, was sentenced to 15 years in a Hungarian prison, by a Communist court, on charges of being an American spy. Our official envoys have been forced out of Bulgaria, and Americans have been imprisoned, tortured, and generally persecuted by Communist police and officials in Europe, and in Red China.

Now, for the only Red spy convicted in this country, the State Department asks freedom.

This is the kind of appeasement of which the Russians take full advantage. They have taken advantage of American appeasement ever since the days American armed forces were withheld from Berlin to permit the Russians to enter.

Despite our windy stand against communism at home, and our brainless charges issued by some Congressmen and Senators who toss accusations right and left, our Government has shown a consistent attitude of appeasement toward Russia.

And Russia has been steadily advancing because of it.

The most powerful, the most effective way to fight communism is being ignored by Mr. Acheson and Mr. Truman, and by the Congress, for that matter.

Every time Congress and the administration approve laws restricting freedom in America, every time they impose new tax burdens upon this free people they restrict liberty in America, they narrow the range of Americanism, and they weaken the greatest free country in the world.

How can we combat slavery abroad unless we guard our liberty at home?

It is ridiculous to suppose that the Government can tax and regulate Americans into a state of Federal servitude, and then expect effective support in the cold war against Soviet communism.

The greatest help the Communists can get is a short-sighted Government in Washington which drives America $15,000,000 deeper into debt every day, and which forces our people to work from 1 to 2 months a year to pay taxes, which seeks new methods of regulation, which plays favorites to groups which flout the law * * * as in the recent coal strike * * * and which generally ignores the basic strength of America * * * our freedom, our will to work, and to produce.

Mr. Acheson directs his appeal in the wrong direction.

His appeals should go not to the people, but to the White House, the State Department, and the Capitol.

Will Farley Go to Albany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of Tuesday, February 28, 1950:

HEFFERNAN SAYS

WILL FARLEY GO TO ALBANY?

One of the ablest political figures of Brooklyn and this commentator were discussing Jim Farley recently.

Is he a candidate for the Democratic nomination for the governorship, consciously seeking the nomination, or is his astonishing popularity carrying him along to that honor whether he wants it or not?

For there is small doubt that the man who backed the young country squire of Hyde Park and outplayed Al Smith at the game of which Al Smith was a master, has a greater grip on the rank-and-file of voters today than he had when he was the chief dispenser of patronage under the Presidency of Mr. Roosevelt. This has been evidenced at any public gathering of either party where he has been a guest or where his name is mentioned.

"Watch him," said the political leader with whom I was chatting. "He is coming along very rapidly."

"But," I said, "his Syracuse speech was neither an angling for Democratic votes nor a bid for the favor of the Democratic leaders of the Nation and State."

"That's Farley!" said my friend. "He can say with complete frankness what is in his mind and get away with it.

"It would not surprise me at all if the wave of affection and esteem that sweeps every gathering at which he appears would sweep the Democratic State Convention and drop the nomination in Jim Farley's lap, no matter what may be in the minds of Paul Fitzpatrick and other State and local leaders. You have not forgotten, have you, how ALBEN BARKLEY was nominated for the Vice Presidency at Philadelphia?"

That set me thinking. There are several reasons why James F. Byrnes might criticize the administration's fiscal policy and excite the irascibility of President Truman, and Jim Farley could touch on the same topic and leave the President undisturbed. One is the Dixiecrat movement in the South, of which Byrnes is now a leader. Another is that when the northeastern leaders were calling in panic for Eisenhower or Douglas, there were two noted Democratic leaders, and two only, in this neck of the woods,

who were for Truman, certain that he could be nominated and certain he could be elected. They were Jim Farley and John Cashmore.

Almost on the heels of his Syracuse address, at the recent Washington Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, Jim Farley said to Mr. Truman, "It isn't wise to hold these in an armory. If you are in with the committee of arrangements, you can get a seat where you can hear and enjoy the speeches. But otherwise you are out in right, left, or center field, and you just have a lot of disorder."

And Mr. Truman replied, "You are perfectly right, Jim. And while I am President, we'll never have anything like this."

It wouldn't be beyond the possibilities that, with Farley for Governor and LEHMAN for Senator, Mr. TRUMAN, who wants a strong Democratic leadership in this State, would be in Jim Farley's corner.

Postage Requirements on Farmers' Checks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the ruling that dairy plants must pay postage on the returns to farmers has been an issue for many years. I include a letter from a constituent and the answer by the Post Office Department as to the rulings on this question. The request is as follows:

MAPLEWOOD HOTEL,
Green Lake, Wis., February 15, 1950.

The Honorable REID MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REID: You doubtless realize that it is these unimportant things, as a rule, that make people the maddest. A goodly number of your constituents, myself included, are thoroughly "het up" over the following situation.

We are sending our milk to the local creamery. The cream hauler is employed by the creamery and is paid a fixed price per hundred for hauling. I am not perfectly certain of the following but it is substantially correct. The price paid this hauler is 20 cents per 100 pounds. Of this 20 cents, 1½ cents is deducted from our milk check and appears on our statement from the creamery as a deduction for hauling. The hauler is and has been for the past 40 years, that twice monthly when our check is due from the creamery, the hauler on the first and fifteenth of the month, when he picks up your milk leaves the creamery check and statement for the money due for previous deliveries. The postal department had an "agent" here, investigated the situation, and compelled the creamery company to put a 3-cent stamp on the letter containing the check and mark it canceled.

As I said in the beginning, this is not an extremely important matter, but we can't understand why our employer—as the person whose salary we principally pay—cannot bring us our check from the creamery without paying tribute to the postal department for a service they have not rendered. Any information you can circulate will be appreciated. So far, all we can get from the post office is, "Them are our orders."

With best wishes, I am,
Very truly yours,
V. B. EUCHNER.

The answer is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1950.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURRAY: This will reply to your letter of March 2, 1950, regarding an inquiry of one of your constituents relating to the payment of postage on checks delivered outside the mails.

Your constituent states that he sends milk to a local creamery and it is transported by a hauler employed by the creamery. He further states that the hauler delivers a check from the creamery twice each month and that a postal inspector now requires the creamery to put a 3-cent stamp on the letter containing the check and to mark it "canceled." You ask whether or not it is necessary for the creamery company to pay postage for the delivery of milk checks in this manner.

Your inquiry relates to the private express statutes (title 18, U. S. C. 1694–1697; 39 U. S. C. 500), which confer on the Post Office Department a monopoly in the transportation of letters for others over post roads. Bank checks in their ordinary form containing only the names of the drawer, payee, bank upon which drawn, amount of money and date of issue, are not letters within the meaning of the private express statutes, and may, therefore, be conveyed by contract carriers without violating the private express statutes. On the other hand, checks which show upon their face or by stubs attached to them such information as the weight of milk, quality, price, butterfat content, and test, deductions for hauling, and the like, are considered letters within the meaning of the private express statutes. As a general rule, such letters may not be conveyed by third persons such as contract haulers outside the mails unless the conditions of title 39, U. S. C., section 500, are complied with. That statute requires, as a condition to the transportation of letters outside the mails, among other things the payment of the same postage as would have been paid had the letters been sent through the mails.

Inasmuch as the postal monopoly does not extend to articles other than letters, there is no requirement that postage by paid on butter transported outside the mails.

Sincerely yours,
J. M. DONALDSON,
Postmaster General.

Mr. Speaker, just exactly how this ruling squares with the distribution of nonagricultural literature it may be difficult to fathom. It appears to me that the ruling is rather far fetched to say the least.

Address of Hon. P. H. McEachin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in presenting to the House a copy of a speech made by my fellow townsman and friend, Senator P. H. McEachin, of Florence, S. C.

Senator McEachin was selected to represent the State of South Carolina at the sesquicentennial exercises commemorating South Carolina's admittance to the Union. The sesquicentennial is honoring each of the Original Thirteen States as they were admitted to the Union. South Carolina was No. 8 of the Thirteen Original States to enter the Union, and we were delighted to hear Senator McEachin's presentation of some of South Carolina's rich and glorious history.

I sincerely hope that every Member of Congress will take a few minutes to read the brief remarks of Senator McEachin giving valuable information as to the leading part taken by South Carolina in the formation of the Union.

On behalf of the people of South Carolina, I want to express our deep appreciation for the honor bestowed upon us by the dedication of these sesquicentennial exercises to our State, of whose record we are so proud, and to which we are so ardently devoted.

South Carolina's importance in the making of the new Nation over which this Federal Capital was to preside can hardly be said to have been excelled by that of any other. For more than a hundred years before Washington was established South Carolina had borne the principal burdens of defending the southern frontier against the encroachments of Spain and France, thus holding a vast territory that later became part of the United States. In the movement leading to the separation of the Thirteen Colonies from England, South Carolina was the first to embody the new principles of self government in a thorough and complete constitution. In the long war that followed no other State was called upon to make greater sacrifices of life and property. The very mention of such names as Rutledge, Gadsden, Hayne, Laurens, Jasper, Moultrie, Sumter, and Marion bears witness to the extent and worth of these sacrifices.

South Carolina was no less interested in the new Federal system than she had been in the war that made the Union possible. To the Federal Convention of 1737 they sent John Rutledge, Pierce Butler, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, and Charles Pinckney. Each contributed in some important way to the drafting of the Constitution. It is now admitted, after much controversy, that Charles Pinckney laid before that Convention a plan which anticipated a greater number of the provisions of the finished Constitution than did any other. I cannot resist calling attention to one of these provisions, which concerned the establishment of the Federal Capital. It was Charles Pinckney, I am proud to say, who first proposed article I, section 8, paragraph 17, of the Constitution, which is now the basic law of the District of Columbia and the city of Washington.

I think Pinckney was influenced in this by the fact that South Carolina, a few months before, had decided to transfer its capital from Charleston to a spot near the center of the State. In the procedure the State followed there are striking similarities to the procedure used in arrangements for the Federal Capital. In both cases the site selected was in open country, not in a populous town. In both cases the name of Washington was proposed for the new city. South Carolina did not choose that name, but it is interesting to note that the name it did choose, Columbia, was later given to the Federal District around Washington. Finally, I should also point out that the architect who designed the South Carolina State House, James Hoban, later drew plans for the White House and other buildings in Washington.

Such were the ties between the State of South Carolina and the early history of the Federal Capital. They were surface ties, it is true, but they were indicative of the deeper bonds of devotion to the great dream of a Federal republic in which men could be equal and free under a system of government the world had never known before.

Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Oregon Daily Journal, of Portland, Oreg., in my congressional district, on March 7, 1950, published on its editorial page a guest editorial by the Governor of Oregon, the Honorable Douglas McKay, entitled "Good Government." This is a timely and excellent discussion of this most important subject and worthy of wide circulation. I am including the editorial as part of these remarks:

GOOD GOVERNMENT

(By Douglas McKay, Governor of Oregon)

The strength of any country lies not in its treasury statements but in the national character of its people.

It shall profit a man nothing to acquire possessions, knowledge, and power if the barter involves the loss of freedoms in which those gains are rooted. If freedom is to produce security as well as the bountiful life, then its sources must be continuously nourished by sacrifice, devotion, and service.

Democracy is a two-way street, and with its benefits comes the necessity of expending time and effort, intelligently and often unsparingly. Hence, it has been proved many times over that self-government is not a gift on which men may grow fat and indulgent.

Rather, self-government is an instrument by which men can—if they have the wisdom—safeguard their individual liberty and employ that liberty in their quest of happiness and fair regards for their labor, ingenuity, and intellect.

Since self-government is an instrument which demands unceasingly the services, the energies and the participation of those who benefit by it, it is weighted as heavily with obligations as it is with privileges.

Delegation of authority to subordinates is a custom of business, serving, as it does, to facilitate business growth and expansion. But the enthusiasm, alertness, and interest of the high company executive are not delegated along with these segments of authority.

In the matter of self-government, too many of us have, I fear, delegated too much of the responsibility and initiative that are directly our own. Instead of blaming ourselves for some governmental trend not to our liking, we complain to politicians and bureaucrats.

We find an increasing tendency to turn to the Government with our grievances—our economic troubles, especially. There is an alarming tendency to look for security rather than opportunity, and, by importuning the Government, we are encouraging both economic and political dangers.

Once we make a crutch of the Government, we are on our way to becoming political cripples. Overdependency on government moves us toward enslavement.

Too many of us are 100-percent Americans by creed but only 10-percent Americans by our daily life, with its neglect and indifference to our duties of citizenship.

There must be a rebirth in the hearts of our citizens—a rekindling of our appreciation of certain mandatory fundamentals. Our basis of free enterprise involves a priceless but really elemental formula which, in 175 years has made America the richest country in the world with the widest distribution of wealth.

This we must recognize. We must recognize, too, that conditions have changed us from a pioneering individualistic people to a highly organized industrial people. And, finally, we must appraise these changes and provide security along with opportunity.

The place to start a resurgence of our allegiance to the precepts that must not fail is right here at home. Oregon has always ranked high in patriotic endeavor. Oregon has become accustomed to good government over a long period of years. Its political climate would be conducive to a revival so sincerely conceived and comprehensively executed as to invite emulation everywhere.

Oregon's government—no government—is so good that it cannot be made better through the citizens' investment of their loyalty and energies in its operation. They should actively engage themselves in insuring the selection of sound individuals to the ranks of the precinct committeewomen and committeemen and to responsible positions with the county and State party organizations. They should see to it that only the very best aspirants become candidates for school-district offices, city councils, and county and State governmental capacities.

Good government obligates us to take an aggressive part in its workings and charges us incessantly to be mindful that freedom is not free.

Miss Ruth Cowan, Noted War Correspondent, Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, the Department of the Army awarded a certificate of appreciation to Miss Ruth Cowan, one of the distinguished members of the press and who covers both branches in Congress.

Miss Cowan, who is affiliated with the Washington Bureau of the Associated Press and a noted World War II correspondent, was among a group of three persons who were commended for their objective, factual, and patriotic reporting of matters pertainng to the Department of the Army.

A copy of the certificate of appreciation follows:

CITATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION

Miss Ruth Cowan, for outstanding patriotic service to the Department of the Army. Through war years while serving as an accredited correspondent with our combat forces in overseas theaters of operations and in the critical postwar years as a news correspondent covering army news developments while assigned to the Military Establishment in the Pentagon Miss Cowan has demonstrated outstanding ability as a journalist and as an American citizen. Her work has been conspicuous by her objective, factual, and patriotic reporting of matters pertaining to the Department of the Army and national security. The American public along with the Army has benefited from her interest, her industry and her devotion to the best interests of our Nation. Her valuable services to the American public, the Associated Press, and to the Army have been in the best traditions of democracy and the inalienable rights of our free press and merits the recognition of her fellow citizens and the thanks and appreciation of the Department of the Army.

Status of Sale of Coal and Asphalt Lands of Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, for the information of the House, I include the following release issued by the Department of the Interior:

Persons now holding coal leases and permits on the 400,000 acres of Oklahoma lands, purchased recently by the Government from the Choctaw-Chickasaw Indian tribes, will be given preference rights in the leasing of deposits, Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman announced today. The tribes received $8,500,000 from the Federal Government for the lands.

Applications for a preference right lease with respect to leases or permits expiring by January 1, 1951, must be filed with the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Washington 25, D. C., before that date. In addition, the Secretary's order allows holders of leases expiring after January 1, 1951, to obtain a new lease on these Oklahoma lands noncompetitively if they file within 90 days prior to the expiration of the current leases. The leases will be issued under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.

The transfer of this large area to the Government has raised problems regarding rights and privileges of surface users which probably can be solved only by additional legislation. Persons who have been using the surface legitimately will be permitted to continue such use until some method is worked out to protect their interests. They may continue to occupy the lands on the terms of their present occupancy making payments as heretofore, until further notice, it was said.

Legislative history shows that the Government through this purchase of coal and asphalt-bearing lands in 14 Oklahoma counties is fulfilling a 50-year-ago promise made to the Indian tribes under the Atoka treaty signed in 1898, and providing for the management of these lands by the Federal Government in trust for the Indians. By an act of 1902, ratifying the Atoka agreement, the Government through a commission, agreed to sell certain described coal and asphalt lands, totaling over 400,000 acres. The act expressed the intent that these lands would be sold in 3 years. Apparently no sales were made prior to 1918, and a sale in that year resulted in few bids received. At various times, some 50,000 acres, approximately, were sold. In the meantime discussions were held relative to purchase of the lands by the Federal Government in an effort to settle the claim of the Indians for the Government to fulfill treaty stipulations with respect to selling the coal and asphalt deposits. Appraisals for such purpose were made which ranged from $5,000,000 to $14,000,000.

The Department Appropriation Act of June 28, 1944 contained the authorization for Federal purchase of these lands from the Indians. It provided for disposition of coal and asphalt under lease. Although it specifically mentioned "land," no provision was made for sale, lease, or other disposition of the surface rights to this land. Under this act, a contract was negotiated and signed October 8, 1947. It provided for purchase of "lands and mineral deposits" for a price of $8,500,000. This contract was ratified by members of the two Indian tribes and the

Congress. By the First Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1949, signed May 24, 1949, funds were appropriated to buy these lands. Actual transfer of title has not yet taken place but will be done as soon as necessary deeds are prepared.

The coal lands are in LeFlore, Haskell, Latimer, Pittsburg, Atoka, Coal, Muskogee and Sequoyah counties. The asphalt lands lie in Johnson, Pontotoc, Carter, Jefferson, Pushmataha, and Murray counties. About 65,000 people reside in the area.

The lands are in the process of being reconveyed to the Government for administration by the Bureau of Land Management under public land laws.

They extend from the Arkansas line west for more than 100 miles and in a north-south direction for more than 60 miles. Although there are numerous towns located on the lands, there has in the past been no provision for public dedication of rights-of-way for telephone lines, sewer lines, or telegraph lines. Also, there are many town lots for which in the past only permission to use has been granted by the Indian Nations. The problem is further complicated, since leases or permits for occupancy have been given in the past for various types of surface uses including agricultural, grazing, industrial, and other purposes.

One of the first requirements for proper administration will be the examination and classification of the lands to determine their status with regard to outstanding leases, extent and appraisal of trespass damages and the highest use suitability and best management of their surface resources. This will be done as soon as possible after title to the lands has actually been transferred, Director Marion Clawson of the Bureau of Land Management said.

Purchasing Power Is Real Measure of Dollar Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, time and again sincere efforts have been made to demonstrate the incontestable fact that purchasing power and not face value is the proper measure of the real value of our dollar, or any other monetary unit.

Seldom, however, have I seen this fact stated more clearly and in more understandable language than in an article by Mr. Herman A. Lowe captioned "Income of $10,000 by A. D. 2000 May Turn Out to be a Mirage," which appeared in the March 11, 1950, issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

It is my hope that this article will be read and given your fullest consideration. Mr. Lowe has pointed out with clarity that the 1949 dollar would not purchase any more goods or services than 50 cents would have bought only 10 years earlier. I especially direct your attention to his statement, "And pity the poor guy trying to live on a fixed pension or an annuity for which he scraped and saved during many years."

All of us should most seriously ponder the question, What will our dollar be worth in purchasing power next year, or in 1960, or in the year 2000, if we permit inflation to go on unchecked?

As an extension of my remarks I include the full text of Mr. Lowe's article, which follows:

INCOME OF $10,000 BY A. D. 2000 MAY TURN OUT TO BE A MIRAGE

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, March 11.—When President Truman sounded off sometime back about a brave new world in the year 2000, when the average American worker would earn $10,000 a year, the question naturally arose, "What will a dollar buy 50 years hence?"

Today, it is buying less than at any time in our history. Thus, while most people are earning more dollars than before, they often have less genuine purchasing power. The American dollar is the most stable currency in the world but, under the microscope of time, our buck assays part rubber.

A dollar of the year 2000, for example, may very easily be worth only 30 or 35 cents of even the inflation-depreciated 1950 dollar.

The purchasing value of our dollar expands and contracts from day to day, from month to month, and from year to year. It goes up and it comes down; but over the long haul, the trend is downward.

A table recently compiled, and based on Government statistics, shows the picture in black and white. It has set up the dollar of January 1939 as worth 100 percent, or 100 cents. Then it has figured out the consumer purchasing value of the dollar for every year from 1820 through 1949, against the yardstick of that January 1939 basic dollar.

Working from January 1939, when a dollar was worth a full 100 cents, up to the present, the picture is one of steady decline in purchasing value.

In 1940, the dollar could buy 99.4 percent as much. By 1942, despite the wartime freezes and stability program, a dollar could get you only as much as 85.4 cents of that 1939 dollar. In 1945, your dollar would purchase only as much as 78½ cents would have bought in January 1939.

Then the war ended. Controls began to go off. Labor struck for higher wages and industry began to pour out vast quantities of new goods to fill the demands which had been accumulating for 5 years.

But that did not correct anything. Inflation really moved in. The 1946 dollar bought only 73.5 percent as much as the 1939 dollar. The 1948 dollar bought only 61.1 percent as much as the 1939 dollar.

Last year, in 1949, our dollar hit rock bottom as a purchasing unit. You could not buy any more goods with it than you could buy with 59 cents in the year 1939. That, brother, is inflation. The fellow who can pressure his wages higher by strike or other means may be as well off as he was in 1939.

But millions of Americans have not been able to do that. Financially they are much worse off today than they were in 1939, even though they have obtained some increases in their income. And pity the poor guy trying to live on a fixed pension or an annuity for which he scraped and saved during many years.

Now, about that pot of gold at the end of the rainbow in the year 2000 when everybody, according to President Truman, may be taking down $10,000 a year. What has happened to the value of the dollar in the last 50 years?

In 1949, the dollar could buy only 59.1 percent as much as the 1939 dollar.

In 1899, the dollar could buy 166.6 percent as much as the 1939 dollar.

That means that, so far as real buying value is concerned, a 1949 dollar was worth less than one-third of an 1899 dollar.

That is what can happen to money in 50 years.

It is what did happen to our Rock-of-Gibraltar dollar in the past 50 years. Even Mr. Truman does not guarantee that nothing like that will happen in the next 50 years.

Suppose it should happen again, then the technicolor, vote-getting vision of $10,000 in every workman's pay envelope in the year 2000, actually boils down to a little less than $3,300 of even the depreciated 1949 dollars for the average worker.

This then is the bright future held out for the American worker if he will permit his Government to continue its inflationary policy of deficit financing and of gambling that things will get better by and by.

It seems like a pretty thin heritage to leave to one's children for the privilege of being tickled with a gally colored feather.

Heart Trouble Needn't Get You Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ted McDowell entitled "Heart Trouble Needn't Get You Down," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, February 27, 1950:

HEART TROUBLE NEEDN'T GET YOU DOWN

(By Ted McDowell)

A program is under way to give heart disease sufferers something to do besides lie in bed and take digitalis.

Instead of remaining idle, a cardiac patient can make use of several programs designed, first, to keep his mind occupied and, later on, to train him for a nonstrenuous job.

These programs are what authorities call rehabilitation programs. They include occupational and physical therapy and vocational training. They are conducted by the district rehabilitation service, in cooperation with the Washington Heart Association.

Rehabilitation authorities are trying to let heart patients know about these programs. But they are having difficulties. They say the main trouble is that many doctors prescribe heart regulatory drugs and rest, but forget that inactivity, in itself, can be as harmful as heart trouble.

Officials of the rehabilitation service want doctors to tell patients about the programs. In this way, they say, all heart sufferers could be reached as soon as their ailment is diagnosed.

They are pushing for coordination between physicians and rehabilitation agencies, and have enlisted the aid of several prominent heart specialists and physical therapists here.

Suppose an active man is stricken with a heart attack. He is confined to bed for a number of weeks. Instead of lying idle and feeling sorry for himself, he can contact the Rehabilitation Service, a Federal Security Agency organization. This will set in motion a series of services ranging from massages to training in the making of dental plates.

All these services except physical therapy are automatically free. And if the patient cannot pay for the latter, the Rehabilitation Service will finance that treatment, too.

Throughout the process, the Service assigns a counselor to guide the patient, and the Heart Association provides him with an occupational therapist.

There is an old saying that "an egg gets rotten just sitting around." Activity is needed

for mental and physical well-being. The Rehabilitation Service can provide that necessary activity for a patient. For instance, take the case of the stricken truck driver who is used to heavy physical work.

While in bed, he can occupy his mind by tooling leather wallets, making jewelry and doing other craft work. This is occupational therapy. If physical therapy such as massage is indicated, it can be conducted concurrently.

Later, of course, he will want to get to work again. Truck driving is out. What next? He needs a job that will not tax his heart. This is where vocational training comes in.

The first step is to test him for aptitude. There are many jobs he could train for: X-ray work, perhaps. Tests may show the patient has great manual dexterity; maybe watch repair work is the answer. If the patient agrees, the rehabilitation service will contact a watch repair school, make arrangements for the man's training and pay for it.

After completion of training, the former truck driver has a job which will not tax his heart dangerously. Instead of being a burden on the community, he is gainfully employed. For the financially minded, it should be noted, he will be providing revenue through income taxes instead of living off relief funds.

"No better investment can be made than to put money in this program," Representative Kee, Democrat, of West Virginia, stated during recent congressional hearings on District appropriations.

The objectives of this program are summed up in a statement by David M. Amato, Director of the Bureau of Rehabilitation: "The majority of people suffering from heart ailments have many years of activity ahead of them. Our aim is to fit them for these years."

Labor Is Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in order to approach labor legislation and rulings on the basis of all labor, I have always tried to obtain the following facts. With this in mind, I wrote the following letter to Mr. Maurice Tobin, Secretary of Labor:

FEBRUARY 13, 1950.

Hon. MAURICE J. TOBIN,
Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY TOBIN: I noted in the press that under the Walsh-Healey Act you placed a 65-cents-per-hour wage for soap purchased by the United States.

Under the same legislative act, have you the authority to fix a wage rate in the field of agriculture on the same basis? Can you insist on a wage rate in the production and processing of agricultural products purchased by the Federal Government?

Under the Sugar Act a minimum wage has been placed on agricultural labor of as low as 25 cents to 32 cents per hour by the Secretary of Agriculture, although I do not believe by the present Secretary.

I believe you feel that labor is labor and that all labor is entitled to equal or comparable wage protection and would appreciate a letter from you on this important subject.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

On March 2, 1950, I received the following reply:

[Walsh-Healey public contracts, Public, No. 846, 74th Cong. Rulings and Interpretations No. 3]

MARCH 2, 1950.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURRAY: I have your letter of February 13, 1950, inquiring whether the Secretary of Labor has authority under the Walsh-Healey Act to fix minimum wage rates for the production and processing of agricultural products purchased by the Federal Government.

I am enclosing a copy of Rulings and Interpretations No. 3 issued pursuant to the Walsh-Healey Act, which is printed therein on pages 47–52. This act contains no authorization for the fixing of minimum wages; but section 1 (b) does authorize the Secretary of Labor to determine what actually are the prevailing minimum wages being paid in each industry receiving Government contracts, and this section prohibits payment of less than such wage rates on Government contract work. You will note that section 9 of the act on page 51 contains an exemption for perishables and for agricultural or farm products processed for first sale by the original producers, as well as an exemption for contracts made by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purchase of agricultural commodities or the products thereof. This language is interpreted in considerable detail in sections 9 through 12 of the Rulings and Interpretations on pages 5–9.

Although the growing and harvesting of agricultural products processed for first sale by the original producers are thus exempted by the act, some processing of agricultural commodities or the products thereof is not exempt. The wage determination for the evaporated-milk industry is the only one which has to date been issued for industries processing agricultural commodities or the products thereof. It is my intention to make determinations for all manufacturing industries which receive a considerable amount of Government contracts as soon as our facilities permit, including industries processing agricultural products.

Of course, you are aware that the proposals in H. R. 2033 and in H. R. 3190, as introduced in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, to extend the minimum wage protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act to employees on large industrialized farms were not included in the bill H. R. 3190 as reported by the Committee on Education and Labor for the reasons stated on page 24 of House Report No. 267, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

Yours very truly,

MAURICE J. TOBIN,
Secretary of Labor.

This gives a satisfactory picture of the present situation. The agricultural support program provides some 50 to 60 cents hourly wage return on most agricultural products, though winter wheat has shown in the study a higher labor return. My contention is that the provisions of the Walsh-Healy Act should apply to labor involved in producing agricultural products purchased by the Government.

This position has already been taken in the Government purchase of evaporated milk, and as Mr. Tobin's letter states:

It is my intention to make determinations for all manufacturing industries which receive a considerable amount of Government contracts as soon as our facilities permit, including industries processing agricultural products.

If the Government buys soap on the basis of a minimum wage of 95 cents per hour, why should sugar be purchased by the Government on this basis of a minimum wage of 25 to 32 cents per hour?

New Jersey Scholar Solves Baffling Literary Mystery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, the identification of the author of the famous Letters of Junius has been a question that has puzzled the most noted literary scholars of Great Britain and America for more than a century and a half. The authorship of these letters has from time to time been attributed to famous men in the English literary and political world.

Dr. Francesco Cordasco, of West New York, N. J., associate professor of English at Long Island University, is now reputed to have made convincing demonstration of the real author of the letters. And pertinent to this discovery is the appended newspaper article from the Jersey Journal:

PROFESSOR SOLVES IDENTITY OF JUNIUS, OF REVOLUTION

What is considered one of the most important literary discoveries in years and which will change impressions of the American Revolution has been made by Dr. Francesco Cordasco, of 6606 Jackson Street, West New York. Dr. Cordasco, associate professor of English at Long Island University, has solved a mystery that had baffled historians more than 150 years—the identity of the eighteenth-century firebrand, "Junius," whose letters did so much toward inciting the Revolution.

"Junius is now known to have been a Scotsman named Laughlin MacLeane, a one-time regimental surgeon with the British Army who fought here in the French and Indian Wars and who had lived in Philadelphia and New York. His letters on the Revolution, however, were written in Europe and published in the Public Advertiser, a London newspaper, during 1769–71. The letters were of incalculable importance to the American revolutionaries in the late 1760's, according to Dr. Cordasco. They influenced Thomas Paine so much that he signed himself once as "Junius Junior," Dr. Cordasco said, and there is no doubt the letters engendered the spirit of revolt among the American colonists.

FIVE-YEAR SEARCH

Found by Dr. Cordasco last June after a 5-year search, papers identifying the author of the Junius letters were traced to a home in Glasgow, Scotland, where those who had them in their possession were unaware of their significance and importance.

MacLeane also was the private secretary of the Earl of Shelburne, friend of William Pitt. It was this latter connection that led Dr. Cordasco to the discovery.

"The Earl said he would identify Junius before his death," the professor declared, "but he died 3 weeks after making the promise. It was assumed the secret had never

been committed to paper, but I felt sure the Earl had made a note of it somewhere."

The Earl's library was distributed and sold after the owner's death in 1806, and for 5 years Dr. Cordasco traced it through the British Isles. In the Scottish home where the professor discovered the missing papers in which Shelburne had made his notations, the owners were completely unaware of their significance.

Nestled among a sheaf of the Earl's papers was a note which read "let it be known forever, once and for all, that my secretary and associate MacLeane was 'Junius,' and that the secret now is secret no more."

The letters of Junius opposed the policies of the Dukes of Grafton and Bedford in North America which, historians say, led to the Revolution.

Probably the most famous Junius letter was the epistle which openly attacked King George III, warning that "While (the king) plumes himself upon the security of his title to the crown, he should remember that as it was acquired by one revolution, it may be lost by another."

A graduate of Columbia University, Dr. Cordasco is author of "A Junius Bibliography," and coauthor of a series of eighteenth century bibliographical pamphlets published by Long Island University.

A native of Manhattan Dr. Cordasco has lived in West New York 4 years. His wife is the former Miss Edna Vaughn, of South Carolina. The professor has taught at Columbia University and Pratt Institute and now teaches philology at Long Island University. He has 3 books in print and is the author of 35 articles that have appeared in scholarly journals.

1949 Annual Report of Benton County, Ark., Agricultural Conservation Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, soil conservation is one of the important projects which confronts the people and the Congress. If we are to sustain our position in world leadership in our quest for peace, we must by all means sustain the productive capacity of our soil.

The people of Benton County in my district are interested in soil conservation. A day or two ago I received from Scott Evans, of Maysville, Ark., the 1949 annual report of the Benton County Agricultural Conservation Association. These people are doing a great work, and, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks this report which Mr. Evans has sent me:

COOPERATION

The 3,[illegible] farmers who cooperated in the 1949 triple-A conservation program are the ones who made it a real success. Each of these farmers carried out one or more approved soil- and water-conservation practices during the year. Participation in 1949 represents a 21-percent increase over 1948.

THE LAND

Their farms include 1[illegible] acres of cropland, 6[illegible] acres of [illegible] open pasture land, and 5,245 acres of commercial orchard. Seventy-four percent of all cropland and 62 percent of all farmland in the county was included in the 1949 conservation program.

GOOD, SOUND SOIL AND WATER-CONSERVATION PRACTICES

Through the application of 5,345 tons of ground limestone, 8,114,952 pounds of 20-percent superphosphate and 199,800 pounds of potash to pastures, meadows, and cover crops these farmers provided not only a protective but a productive cover for 56,000 acres of land in Benton County.

The hills and valleys of our county were covered with an increased acreage of green pastures as farmers established or improved 30,000 acres of pasture by seeding 512,724 pounds of adapted pasture grasses and legumes during the year.

Controlling the weeds on 42,880 acres of permanent pasture by mowing contributed to an increased production of nutritious pasture plants.

The application of phosphate and lime to 40,000 acres of pastures increased the growth of grasses and legumes and prevented the erosion of our precious top soil.

Eight thousand and five hundred acres of summer and winter cover provided organic matter and nitrogen and retained plant food, as well as protected the soil from the pelting rains.

The construction of 52 farm ponds for livestock water contributed to a better system of grazing and aided in the development of additional acres of permanent pastures.

Legume and grass seed harvested from 1,508 acres helped to provide home-grown seed for the seeding of additional acres of pastures and cover crops.

MATERIALS

The furnishing of conservation materials, in the form of phosphate and lime, played an important part in the 1949 triple-A conservation program. Six million pounds of 20-percent superphosphate and 3,000 tons of agricultural limestone were handled on purchase orders.

MONEY

To assist farmers in carrying out this job of conservation, the Government spent $112,073 in Benton County during 1949. For every dollar thus spent the farmer matched it with $2 of his own money in addition to the labor furnished.

Compared to the total farm income of our county, we are putting back into the soil through taxes, one-half of 1 percent of the value of all crops produced in the county.

PUBLICITY

Side by side with the farmers who have performed this job of conservation on the farm, stand those who have kept the problems of soil conservation ever before the public—editors of the county newspapers and manager of radio station KUOA, Siloam Springs.

To all newspaper editors in the county go our sincere thanks for the space given to this important farm program. To the management of radio station KUOA our greatest appreciation for 17 weeks of radio programs during the year.

FARMER COMMITTEEMEN

Farmers who were directly responsible for the formulation and administration of the 1949 AAA conservation program in Benton County were Scott Evans, C. R. Broadhurst, and Dan B. Blair.

EDUCATION

Working with the county committee in an advisory capacity was P. R. Corley, county extension agent, who kept the committee informed on latest experiment station results as they apply to soil conservation problems and assisted with the educational phase of the program.

COMMUNITY COMMITTEEMEN

Seventy farmer committeemen elected by their neighbors advised with the county committee on the conservation needs in their community and made suggestions for improvements in the program. This grass-roots approach gave farmers assurance that money appropriated would be used in a way to get the most conservation.

The Little Sisters of the Assumption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable James A. Farley at the fifteenth annual subscription bridge for the benefit of the Little Sisters of the Assumption at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on Friday evening, March 10, 1950, on the occasion of his receiving the Humanitarian Scroll of 1950, presented by the Friends of the Little Sisters of the Assumption. The mammoth subscription bridge has been conducted for a number of years by the Friends, the moving spirit in which is Mrs. Martin J. Kennedy, whose distinguished husband ably represented New York in the House of Representatives for a number of years, and for many more has been active in all worth while civic and charitable ventures. Many New Yorkers, prominent in business, the professions, and politics, are patrons of the Friends.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, FIFTEENTH ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION BRIDGE FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE LITTLE SISTERS OF THE ASSUMPTION, HOTEL COMMODORE, NEW YORK CITY, FRIDAY EVENING, MARCH 10, 1950

Madam Chairman (Mrs. Martin J. Kennedy), members of the Glee Club of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, and all the friends of the Little Sisters of the Assumption, I am greatly honored by your selecting me to be the recipient of the Humanitarian Scroll of 1950.

Since 1935, I have followed with close interest the fine work of the nursing Sisters and the nursing centers. This magnificent card party, one of your many activities, has become the annual meeting place of almost 2,000 men and women of good will anxious to advance the cause of humanity through the Christ-like work of the nursing Sisters.

Your attendance, on this occasion, gives moral support to this truly noble cause and your financial aid will make it possible for the nursing Sisters to extend their work, in your name, among the sick poor in New York City. Like the population of our city, the Sisters come from every part of the globe and speak many tongues. Therefore, they are able to minister to any person in need of help, regardless of his language.

Throughout the past 89 years, the professional services of the Sisters have been at the command of any poor sick person. As you know, the rule of this religious community imposes upon each Sister-member the obligation to nurse the poor patient regardless of the nature of his illness, his origin, his race, or his creed. Because of this spirit of genuine sacrifice to the underprivileged, the work of the Little Sisters of the Assumption has a wide appeal to the generosity of our citizens—Jews, Protestants, and Catholics alike.

We find this Order of Sisters working in other cities of the United States and in many foreign countries. During my travels, I had the opportunity to observe, at first hand, the work of the Little Sisters of the Assumption in far-off lands. Their kind advice and hospitality given to our armed forces, to our prisoners of war, and to the men, women, and children, made homeless by the war, won a warm place in my heart and has made me a lifelong friend of the nursing Sisters.

My personal contribution to the subscription bridge is a small token of my appreciation for the maternal guidance that the Sisters gave to the women of America, serving our country, in other lands.

I believe tonight's gathering shall be our greatest success. In addition to the proceeds from the bridge party, attended by such a large number of supporters, the Sisters should gain many new friends to help them carry on their daily tasks. I am proud to be a member of the Friends of the Little Sisters of the Assumption and I cordially invite you to become an active worker and to assist in the every-day problems of the nursing centers.

Allow me to pay you my personal tribute for your cooperation in making this bridge party so attractive and enjoyable. I want you to know that the committee and the Sisters are most grateful to you. Our special thanks go to the young ladies and gentlemen who compose the junior committee. At all these parties, their work has been invaluable. Their youth, charm, and gaiety are vital to this festive evening. My friends of the glee club of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick have been loyal to this worth while charity. Their splendid musical program has been the high light of each of our fifteen bridge parties and they have our heartfelt thanks and the prayers of the Sisters.

Participating in this gala bridge party gives assurance that we are desirous of extending the nursing facilities and child-guidance services of the Sisters and the nursing centers. Gathered as we are, representing all creeds, gives encouragement to the hope that the Brotherhood of Man and the Fatherhood of God, as exemplified by the Little Sisters of the Assumption, shall always prevail in New York City.

Each day we read in the newspapers of heroic rescues and breath-taking services performed by our valiant policemen, firemen, and hospital personnel. Do you realize that the day-in and day-out work of the Sisters, while less spectacular and devoid of publicity, is on that same high level of devotion and professional skill? Tending a mother in her severe illness, supervising and feeding her children, cleaning her home and having dinner ready for her breadwinner is a job that requires the ability of a trained nurse, the tact of a diplomat, and the patience of a saint.

Profoundly grateful, I accept with most sincere appreciation the Humanitarian Scroll of 1950, designed and hand painted by one of the Sisters and awarded, each year, by the friends of the Little Sisters of the Assumption. I am doubly grateful because my name is now the second name on the honor roll. Let me assure you that I shall always cherish the distinction you have conferred upon me and, in the future, I shall consider it a privilege to continue to play my part in the work of your organization and to sing the praises of the real humanitarians—the Little Sisters of the Assumption.

Thank you and good night.

Why New York?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, March 13, entitled "Of Course New York" concerning an article which appeared in the February 11 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, together with a rebuttal—in excerpted form—of the Post article, also carried in the Herald Tribune of the same date, over the signature of Walter Hoving, president, Commerce and Industry Association of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I am New York born and bred, and I am glad to join with Mr. Hoving in defense of a truly great home town, which despite its size, has always proved most hospitable toward both its own businessmen and visitors—even from Philadelphia.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 13, 1950]

OF COURSE, NEW YORK

Habitual readers of the Saturday Evening Post may recall a recent article, entitled "Why New York?" It was a curious hodgepodge by Mr. Wesley W. Stout, who used to be a New York newspaperman once upon a time, and conveyed the general notion that New York is a dreadfully expensive, inconvenient hole unsuitable to most business or normal human existence. This, of course, is a favorite thesis of Post editors which comes bobbing out of Philadelphia with seasonal regularity. We are used to it.

Now there is not much use arguing with people who are convinced that New York is composed of 8,000,000 neurotics, an evolutionary development of subways, night clubs and the struggle for South Pacific tickets. They like to believe it. Such subjective judgments are hard to dispute or disprove. The truth is that while New Yorkers are largely a devoted lot of homebodies, they do feel passionately that this is a pretty wonderful city. Our assets, virtues, and stimulations are so vast and complex that most of us are puzzled at dissenting reports. And as for asking "Why New York?" the question must be shrugged off as downright ridiculous.

But tolerance can be carried to excess. Misstatements about New York, repeated often enough, may gain just enough acceptance to cause trouble. Fortunately the Commerce and Industry Association of New York has spoken up against Mr. Stout's farrago. On this page appears a detailed rebuttal by Walter Hoving, president of the association, which deserves careful reading. It is a sober statement of facts against loose generality, a point-by-point exposition of what makes New York great in people and culture, business, and industry. Everybody knows that New York is the magnet to America, the center of management for the great corporations, a ferment of creative vigor. And it is excellent that the firm bases of New York's leadership, the reasons why our population and business are constantly growing, are painstakingly presented. Furthermore, if the silly question "Why New York?" is ever asked again, let us slap it down hard and promptly with the facts.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 13, 1950]

WHY NEW YORK?

WALTER HOVING, ANSWERING THE SATURDAY EVENING POST, STATES THE FACTS

(A month ago the Saturday Evening Post published an article entitled "Why New York?" The following letter of rebuttal by Walter Hoving, president of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, in excerpted form, is self-explanatory.)

Mr. BEN HIBBS,

Editor, Saturday Evening Post,

Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR SIR: The article by Wesley W. Stout in the February 11 issue of the Saturday Evening Post posed a question: "Why New York?" to which the author responded with a variety of answers based, for the most part, on myth and legend rather than fact.

Most of the answers critical of New York are ascribed by Mr. Stout in his article to a member of a firm which devotes itself to locating sites in other communities for business firms in New York and elsewhere. But before expressing his informant's viewpoint, Mr. Stout, on his own, unequivocally asserts that New York "is the most costly city in all ways in which to live and do business," etc. Let us analyze that one first:

The cost-of-living index for New York City, for December 1949, was 164.9. With the exception of Portland, Maine, and Boston, Mass., this represents the smallest percentage increase, over the base period (1935–39=100), of any of the country's 34 large cities. A projection of the data of the United States Department of Labor on The Annual Budget Required To Maintain an Average Family of Four shows that in December 1949, New York City was in eighth place of the 36 largest cities for which comparable data was available. This budget for a New York family of four would be approximately $3,517, compared with $3,684 for Washington, D. C., the highest, New York City being only 11 percent higher than New Orleans, the lowest city in the group.

The facts that New Yorkers maintain 5,769,065 individual savings accounts totaling $9,906,353,000, an average of $1,544 per account or $1,113 per capita, compared with a per capita average of $362 for the country as a whole, is evidence that New Yorkers do not have to spend all their earnings in order to keep body and soul together.

Mr. Stout continues with an attempt to soften his own most costly city blow by admitting that, despite the alleged disadvantages he outlines, more businesses are moving into the city than are moving out. He then quotes his aforementioned informant as follows:

"New York has one thing only to offer a normal manufacturing business. * * * This is the largest and most varied pool of labor skills. All else is against New York." There follows a list of liabilities.

Here are the facts about these liabilities and other projected by Mr. Stout:

"Wages are the highest." Latest available United States Department of Labor figures show that for November 1949, the average weekly earnings of production workers in manufacturing industries in New York City were $55.98, compared with the average for the States of Utah, $66.92, and Washington, $64.45; the cities of San Francisco, $61.68; Los Angeles, $61.53; Buffalo, $61.16; Chicago, $60.45; Milwaukee, $59.43, and St. Paul, $58.62; and a United States average of $54.22.

Nor are clerical salaries exorbitant. According to a recent survey by the National Industrial Conference Board, the average median salary for the principal clerical classifications showed New York no higher than the average median salary rates for

these in the 20 large cities covered in the survey. The average median for New York stenographers is $46. Seven of the 20 cities were higher, with San Francisco topping the list at $54. Similar comparisons occur in other job classifications such as file clerks, senior copy typists, comptometer operators, despite the better type of personnel available to employers in New York City.

"Labor turn-over is the highest." This is pure fiction and hopeful guesswork since the United States Department of Labor states no comparative figures for cities are available.

"Labor efficiency usually is lower for a variety of reasons." No comparative data are available but anyone with an elementary knowledge of labor markets recognizes, and even the article admits, that New York not only has the largest supply, but the best-trained labor force for many skills. That is one of many prime reasons impelling manufacturers to locate here.

"Building and rental costs are the highest." New York is the only major city in the country where commercial and business rents are controlled by law, restraining rates to 15 percent above the 1943–44 levels. According to United States Department of Labor's latest data (October 1949), with the exception of Washington, New York has had the smallest increase in residential rents of 34 large cities. The index, 106.5, shows less than a 9-percent increase above the 1935–39 levels. The average index for the 34 cities is 1215, with Birmingham, 142.7; Jacksonville, 140.7; and Chicago, 139.7.

"State taxes are exceeded per capita only by Rhode Island." According to the latest data (1948), published by the Taxation Foundation on per capita State collections, including unemployment compensation, State taxes per capita for New York were $64.91. Not only was Rhode Island ($68.61), higher, but also eight other States: Washington ($91.07), Arizona ($82.62), California ($84.06), New Mexico ($76.95), Colorado ($72.44), Nevada ($72.32), Michigan ($70.16), and Utah ($66.78).

As for the statement that the over-all tax burden is highest, a reading of the Report on Relative Tax Costs Within Seven Selected Cities for Three Groups of Manufacturing Industries, prepared by Prof. Harley L. Lutz, of Princeton University, will go far in dispelling this myth about Many New York City business taxes.

"Electricity is the most costly, prohibitively so, for large users. A typical residential electric bill runs $14.22 for 500 kilowatts. The York, Pa., rate for 500 kilowatts is $7.71." The Consolidated Edison Co.'s research department could have furnished accurate, up-to-date data which show that the cost of electric current to New York industrial users is by no means the highest and that the rate quoted for uncontrolled service of 500 kilowatts for York, Pa., is inadequated. This was increased on January 17, 1948, to $11.55, while the New York rate on January 30, 1949, was reduced to $13.10.

New Yorkers relax in their apartments only as a last choice * * * they sleep fewer hours and less soundly. This sage observation might better be expected from a tourist taking notes on a corner at Times Square. New York City is made up of five boroughs, and a majority of the people working in Manhattan live in its four adjacent communities. Most of them, too, have their own homes and little gardens and live as normal a life as any other American city dweller.

Strikes are a more real and immediate peril. A check of the record will show that New York City has less difficulties from strikes than almost any other large industrial center.

Mr. Stout concedes that nearly half of the 100 largest United States corporations and hundreds of lesser national corporations have their headquarters in New York City. But he fails to point out that this city is the management center of the country. These headquarters offices of large concerns furnish a large part of the executive and clerical employment to the citizens of this city.

But let us look at New York business as a whole. According to the latest data, more than 234,540 business firms (including 41,343 manufacturers) are established and doing business in the city. These concerns give employment to more than 2,979,743 persons and have annual pay rolls totaling well over $9,000,000,000. New York City's manufacturing firms alone produced over $12,000,000,000 worth of wares in 1947, according to the census of manufacturers.

New York's retail sales in 1948 reached the staggering total of $7,902,859,000 and its people had an effective buying power (disposable income) in 1948 of $14,236,438,000; according to data supplied by Sales Management magazine.

Surely the heads of these 234,540 businesses wouldn't remain in any city unless they were convinced it offered them the best opportunity to prosper.

Businessmen come to New York and remain here because the city offers them many advantages. To enumerate a few:

1. An abundant supply of skilled labor.
2. Availability of raw materials.
3. Adequate power facilities.
4. Close proximity to a large consumer and industrial market for their products in the New York metropolitan area.

However, New York manufacturers do not have to depend upon the New York City market alone for their business, since the metropolis is the center of the wealthiest and most productive part of the country.

New York City is also the country's largest wholesale buying center. Most of the Nation's department and chain stores maintain their principal buying offices in the city, thus making it convenient for local manufacturers to market their products with a minimum amount of traveling. The markets and raw materials of the world are readily available to New York manufacturers through the thousands of foreign trade brokers who make their headquarters in lower Manhattan. Rapid and efficient transportation by rail, air, truck, and steamship is available to New York manufacturers.

The opportunity for success in New York acts as a magnet for the most aggressive and potentially successful people in the country. The influx of highly skilled, talented personnel continually replenishes and furnishes material for continual expansion of its business concerns.

The city offers the highest standard of living to its citizens of any city of comparable size. Its facilities for better health, education, and recreation are equaled nowhere else in the country.

New York has everything that one could desire, whether he be a business leader, a worker, a housewife, or a growing child. New York is a vigorously expanding city of opportunity for any man or woman who wants to make a place for himself and is willing to work for it.

These are the facts. The Commerce and Industry Association, as the largest service chamber of commerce in the East, can vouch for them. They comprise the real answer to the question, "Why New York?"

Very truly yours,

WALTER HOVING,
President, Commerce and Industry Association of New York.

Citation for Contribution Toward Preserving American Ideals of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpts from an address by Hon. M. Vashti Burr, deputy attorney general of Pennsylvania, and president of the All Pennsylvania College Alumni Association, of Washington, D. C., at the second annual dinner of the association February 20, 1950, at the Mayflower Hotel:

We came together for the first time at an All Pennsylvania College Alumni dinner in October of 1948, more or less as a spontaneous growth in connection with the observance of Pennsylvania Week.

What was the common cause that could draw together in Washington the alumni of Pennsylvania's colleges and universities? Something around 30 percent of the alumni in this area are not natives of Pennsylvania.

The common cause was—and is—our common concern in promoting and encouraging an educational system of which not only Pennsylvania but the Nation can be proud.

* * * * *

We are confident that the colleges themselves must benefit in fair measure from this increased activity by their alumni in and near the Nation's Capital.

* * * * *

In the constitution of the association we speak of the freedom, dignity, and integrity of the individual—of a government of laws and not of men—of an enlightened public opinion—of the principles and precepts underlying our American system and the social and economic bases of American life—and of the preservation and extension of the American ideals of education, to assure to the youth of America not only the opportunity to develop their special skills but also the opportunity to become better citizens.

The meaning of such phrases is and always has been quite clear to those who understand and believe in the system of self-government and the way of life which have made America preeminent among nations—a system and a way of life which Longfellow surely knew and loved when he wrote:

"Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!"

It has become all too popular a pastime in these days of confused thinking to speak disparagingly of the precepts and philosophy which are the very essence of America's greatness.

We are well aware that there are all too many—among Americans as well as aliens—who miss no opportunity to becloud the simple, self-evident truths and to ridicule all that is distinctly American, choosing rather to praise alien ideas which, like wolves in sheeps' clothing, purport to pay homage to the so-called common man when in truth they relegate man to the ignominious place of a ward or chattel of the State, isms, or ideologies which are, in truth, antihumanity, if not anti-God.

There are those who would like nothing better than to see our educational system in America refashioned to the pattern of those alien ideas. Let us not deceive ourselves.

They have been working long and hard toward that end.

Before the ceremonies this evening have been completed the association will have conferred upon an individual a citation for "outstanding contribution toward preserving and extending the American ideals of education."

We have in mind those ideals which, since the early years, even long before the Declaration of Independence, led to the establishment of an educational system adapted to the liberal concept of a government founded on the freedom and dignity of the individual, or, as expressed by George Washington, "the right of free-born men to govern themselves in their own way."

Those ideals have had their firm foundation upon the bedrock of certain principles which, if maintained, will serve as a bulwark and shield against destructive external influences.

The first of those principles is and must be this: The soul of man is our primary concern. A recognition of the spiritual, religious nature of man is the major premise on which the education of a civilized people must be founded.

Each of the State constitutions adopted immediately after the Declaration of Independence established certain principles as fundamental law. A decade later, when our Federal-State system was being charted, those principles were assured continued recognition by the inclusion in the famous Ordinance of 1787, adopted by the Continental Congress, of a declaration reading as follows:

"Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and means for education shall be forever encouraged."

Even in our legislative bodies, in our town meetings; yes, even at a dinner meeting of alumni of Pennsylvania colleges and universities, our first act is to recognize the spiritual nature of man and our oneness with God—through prayer. That is symptomatic of the moral philosophy of our people, as much a part of our way of life as freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

The first principle, therefore, is the recognition of the soul of man as our primary concern.

As a corollary principle it is acknowledged that in our American system there are moral limitations on the civil power, the real function of government being perceived as an aid to individual initiative and enterprise and the safeguarding of the family as the keystone of the social structure.

It is the traditional American ideal of education to promote and develop an educational system that will ever make the people conscious of these basic principles.

Pennsylvania's 60 institutions of higher learning have adhered to the highest tenets and the noblest traditions of the American system.

As alumni of those institutions, we are proud (1) to promote a more widespread knowledge of their existence and excellence, and (2) to encourage them to continue the development of an educational system that has contributed immeasurably toward strengthening the moral fiber of the American people.

Do You Want Socialism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Banner, Knightstown, Ind., for March 10, 1950:

DO YOU WANT SOCIALISM?

It is unfortunate that everyone could not have heard Stephen Noland, former editor of the Indianapolis News, when he spoke last Wednesday before the Knightstown Kiwanis Club.

Mr. Noland described the British socialistic system as he saw it during the 2-month period which he spent in England.

No responsible, thinking American could possibly support the further socialization of this Nation if he had heard Mr. Noland.

The socialization of America is well under way, but the unfortunate part about it in this country is that those who desire to socialize the Nation are flying under false banners. Instead of running on the Socialist ticket, they are using one of the major parties as the tent under which they may hide.

Here are some of the facts which Mr. Noland cited, and which Americans may expect if and when the Socialists finally succeed in capturing everything:

1. British labor has lost most of its bargaining rights, since the large segment of labor is now working for the Government.

2. British businessmen are being closed out. Many industries have already been taken over by the Government.

3. A British workingman finds it almost impossible to move from one part of the country to another because of regulations on his working and also on his housing.

4. No real incentive, initiative and effort are evidenced in Great Britain.

5. British medicine has become a routine matter—with the little individual attention being given to patients.

6. The British mother and wife is the big loser. She doesn't know whether her children belong to her or the Government, and Government rationing has prevented her from preparing any kind of decent meals.

7. Under national housing, it's getting so that the Government tells everyone where to live and how to live.

Think over these facts, Americans. Ask yourself whether these are things you want in this country, and whether you are going to be misled by golden promises which can never be fulfilled. Ask yourself if the established American system, despite its shortcomings, isn't just about the best plan.

They Want Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bridgeport Post:

THEY WANT FARLEY

Connecticut friends of James A. Farley—and we wouldn't attempt to count them because they're too numerous—must have been thrilled at recently published stories to the effect that spontaneous "Farley for Governor" booms are springing up in various parts of New York State. Contests for governorships cannot cross State lines, of course, but if they could and Jim Farley were the nominee he'd get a tremendous vote in Connecticut.

As for those Democrats in New York State who are hoping to draft the former Postmaster General and former State and national chairman of their party, they are showing good sense thereby. The present governor of New York is a Republican and the Democrats naturally covet the office. And what better start could they make toward that end than by nominating the man who is undoubtedly the most popular citizen in their commonwealth?

Not that personal popularity alone is a reason for making a man governor or President, but it certainly does help on election day. And in the case of James A. Farley he has already given more than sufficient proof of his ability to handle large affairs with skill and efficiency.

In public life he was a splendid Postmaster General and in private life he is an eminently successful businessman. As a Democrat he believes in party regularity and his record in that respect is without a blemish but at the same time he has never been a New Dealer, fair dealer, a miss dealer, or any other kind of dealer. Just a Democrat with a capital D.

In consequence he is admired and trusted on the other side of the political fence even by those who have no particular use for the Democratic Party as constituted today. He would command a great independent vote and no small amount of Republican support solely on the basis of character, personality, and ability.

As it is, the boom appears entirely spontaneous and it is not at all certain that he would consent to run. He declined the same nomination in 1938 when it was his for the taking, and stepped aside in favor of HERBERT H. LEHMAN, who was elected.

For our part, we hope that the present draft movement will be successful. After all, Connecticut and New York are neighboring States and even if the New York election isn't any of our Yankee business here in Connecticut, most of us would feel happy to know that that habitual good neighbor, Jim Farley, was in the executive office in Albany. We could not then imagine any problems arising between the two States which couldn't be settled in the fairest way and in the easiest and friendliest manner.

Let Americans Take Notice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an article from the Detroit Times of March 8, 1950.

This article includes a statement made by one Emil Masey, who is represented as secretary-treasurer of the UAW-CIO. If such a statement had been made by an irresponsible person, it could be ignored; but this declaration comes from an official of a labor organization.

I am constrained to believe that the philosophy expressed by this man does not represent the thinking of thousands of loyal Americans in that organization itself.

If confiscation is to be the rule in America, then freedom will soon be extinct.

BROTHER AND MAZEY REVEAL 15-YEAR GOAL OF AUTO UNION—"ALL WE PRODUCE," IS ARM OF EARL

(By Jack Crellin)

Chrysler Corp. and the automobile industry were told today what they could expect in the way of demands from the UAW-CIO in the weeks and years ahead.

The double-barreled warning was given by Walter Reuther, UAW president, and Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer.

Speaking at a mass meeting of 30,000 Chrysler workers held in the State Fair Coliseum yesterday, Reuther told the corporation that for every day and week the Chrysler strike, now in its seventh week, is prolonged it will cost Chrysler more for a settlement.

TWO-HUNDRED-DOLLAR PENSIONS

He also revealed that the ultimate goal of the union, perhaps 10 years from now, is a pension of at least $200 a month.

Mazey, an avowed Socialist, was even more explicit when he declared:

"We are only asking for a little of what we produce. One of these days when we are organized politically we are going to ask for everything we produce."

Reuther said he had given Chrysler this ultimatum:

"The longer you drag this strike out the more it is going to cost you."

GOAL IN 10 YEARS

Then referring to goals of the union he declared:

"We are going to build back by brick up to $200 pensions, where they ought to be. Give us 10 years and by working at the Federal Government level and collective bargaining we will get the $200."

Directing his remarks to K. T. Keller, Chrysler president, and pointing out that the corporation is spending hundreds of thousands for advertisements, Reuther asserted:

"Nobody is being fooled by your propaganda. You had better save your money because you are going to have to pay it to us before this is over."

He said the union will not retreat one inch from its stand that any pension plan at Chrysler must be a funded one created through fixed hourly contributions for each employee by the corporation.

Mazey delivered a financial report which dealt in detail with the cost of the walkout to the international.

He estimated that the international would receive between $900,000 and $700,000 a week from the assessment of $1 a week on all working members of the union.

He said the international has already paid out $372,258 for prosecution of the strike and is prepared to spend "its last dime if necessary to win."

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS FOR INSURANCE

Of this amount, $150,324 has gone to local unions to replenish strike funds, while another $150,000 has been paid in premiums on Blue Cross hospital insurance for Chrysler strikers.

At least 4,000 veterans on strike have received about $200,000 from the State's veterans' trust fund while 12,000 other strikers have obtained emergency community welfare aid amounting to at least $130,000.

Richard Matthews, UAW Chrysler director, described the Chrysler management as "the most vicious in the history of the United States."

He warned: "We are going to fight, and we are going to make sure all of our people get the equity they deserve. We'll stay out till hell freezes over."

Negotiations with Chrysler were resumed today at the Sheraton Hotel.

Establishment of Fees for Special Federal Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on the establishment of fees for special Federal services.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTABLISHMENT OF FEES FOR SPECIAL FEDERAL SERVICES

Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, stated today that the study now under way by the committee staff, with respect to establishment of fees for special Federal services, is arousing widespread interest both within and without Government circles.

In a press release of March 6, the Senator said, there was made available preliminary findings of the staff based on discussions held with the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Communications Commission. In each instance the staff had found not only an active interest in the subject, but also discovered that detailed studies had already been undertaken in the past or were currently under way.

The Federal Communications Commission has been particularly active in the area and has now submitted to the committee a written report, quoted below. Senator McCLELLAN said that this report exemplifies the types of services in which the committee is interested and appears to point up the practicability of shifting to the recipients and beneficiaries a greater portion of the actual cost incurred by the Government in rendering special services which at the present time are a burden of the taxpayers at large. At the same time, the Senator repeated his assurance that the committee has no thought whatsoever of recommending that charges be made for services of which the beneficiaries are the general public; the study is aimed solely at determining the feasibility of charging for those services which benefit particular individuals, groups, or interests.

To illustrate more specifically the nature of the committee's study, Senator McCLELLAN directed particular attention to the following excerpt from the Federal Communications Commission's report:

"As to the activities of the Federal Communications Commission for which charges might be made, they may be grouped into the following classes:

"(1) Radio application filings.

"(2) Applications for authorizations under title II of the Communications Act and Cable Landing License Act.

"(3) Continuing regulatory or servicing activities.

"(4) Inspections.

"(5) Equipment tests and approvals.

"(6) Miscellaneous filings—which would cover such items as petitions, motions, appearances, and similar papers filed chiefly in connection with the conduct of hearings."

With respect to the first item in the above list, radio application filings, the FCC reports that "construction-permit applications constitute the Commission's most important work load" and suggests that "a filing fee could be required to accompany each such application." The Commission states further in regard to this category that "the processing of applications for new stations is the most costly function performed by the Commission."

In clarification of the second item in the above list of FCC activities, Senator McCLELLAN pointed out that proceedings under title II of the Communications Act and Cable Landing License Act involve, with respect to common-carrier communications, issuance of certificates of convenience and necessity for the construction of a new line, the extension of any line, or the acquisition or operation of any line. Further, and with certain exceptions, a carrier must obtain FCC approval before discontinuing, reducing, or impairing the service. Under this same legislation, FCC processes applications for the landing and operation of submarine cables. Senator McCLELLAN pointed out that while these activities clearly work to the benefit of the general public through the providing of essential communications facilities, it also seems obvious that clearance by FCC constitutes undeniable opportunity for financial profit to the licensees.

With regard to the third item of the Commission's functions, continuing regulatory activities, FCC suggests that regulation of rates, services, and accounting for communication common carriers might be equitably financed by turning "toward the plans of various State commissions of requiring reimbursements from the individual companies subject to the regulation for the time and expenses of Commission personnel actually engaged in projects directly connected with such companies." As to FCC radio regulatory functions, the Commission suggests that the "charges might be assessed on a yearly basis or might be required in connection with applications for licenses and renewals of licenses."

Senator McCLELLAN said that the committee is particularly interested in equipment approval by FCC. The Senator stated that performance characteristics of communications facilities are subjected to tests in the Commission's laboratory and, if specifications are met, an approval number is issued to the manufacturer. The advantage to a manufacturer in the acquisition of such FCC approval is obvious.

In emphasizing the above salient features of the report, Senator McCLELLAN commended it as complying with the needs of the committee in furthering its study. He stressed the fact that the committee itself has arrived at no conclusions whatsoever and will not do so pending receipt and evaluation of all pertinent data. The nature of agency submissions to the committee thus far would seem to indicate that public hearings would be desirable.

The full report from the Federal Communications Commission follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1950.

Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCLELLAN: This will answer your inquiry of February 20, 1950, relative to the possibility of charging fees to the general public or to special interests for services performed by this Commission.

As to cases where fees are now charged for Commission services there are only two such instances. The first case is in connection with the inspection of the radio installations

aboard certain vessels for which charges are made pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (f) (2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U. S. C., sec. 154 (f) (2)). The Commission is required by law to make periodic inspections of this equipment in order to determine whether or not it will perform its primary function which is to provide communication service for the protection of life and property at sea. Because of the nature of the shipping business, vessels are sometimes not accessible to our inspectors during the usual office hours and our people are required to work overtime to perform the inspection. In such a case the ship owner is required to reimburse the Government for the amount of this overtime. The money is not returned to the Commission, but is required by statute to be covered into the Treasury's miscellaneous receipts account.

In the second case, the Commission has authorized the Civil Aeronautics Administration's private pilot examiners to issue the radio telephone operator permit for a fee of not more than $1 per issuance. This fee is retained by the examiner. The same authorization may be obtained free of charge from any of the Commission's field offices if the applicant desires to make application there.

The matter of charging fees in other instances of issuance of licenses and in the rendition of other services by the Commission has been designed as one of the items to be investigated in connection with the President's management improvement program under Executive Order No. 10072. Work now in progress on reorganizing the Commission's staff will take so much time, however, that work upon the problem of charging fees may be delayed considerably.

A concrete proposal relative to the matter was advanced in Congress in 1932 in connection with amendment of the Radio Act of 1927. The proposed amendment would have added a new section 17 to that act setting out a definite schedule of charges to be made in connection with the activities of the (then) Federal Radio Commission. The amendment was withdrawn by its sponsor, Senator DILL, and resubmitted as a separate bill, S. 5201. The latter bill was never reported out of committee. (References: S. Res. 351 (70th Cong.), S. Rept. No. 564, 72d Cong., 1st sess.)

As to the activities of the Federal Communications Commission for which charges might be made, they may be grouped into the following classes:

1. Radio application filings.
2. Applications for authorizations under title II of the Communications Act and Cable Landing License Act.
3. Continuing regulatory or servicing activities.
4. Inspections.
5. Equipment tests and approvals.
6. Miscellaneous filings—which would cover such items as petitions, motions, appearances, and similar papers filed chiefly in connection with the conduct of hearings.

The considerations as to each of these items are given below:

1. Radio application filings: The major classes of applications filed are: Radio station construction permit; radio station license; renewal of license; authority for assignment of license; and authority for transfer of control over licensee.

Applications for construction permits are required in the case of all new broadcast stations and other stations with the exception of amateur, ship, aircraft, and railroad mobile stations. These construction permit applications constitute the Commission's most important work load. In the case of broadcast stations, many of them—and the number is constantly increasing—must go to a formal hearing, since the granting of one application very often means that one or more other applications must be denied. (The Communications Act requires that applicants be afforded the opportunity of a hearing if the Commission is unable to find, from the application, that it should be granted.) A filing fee could be required to accompany each such application.

After a construction permit has been granted and the station is in satisfactory operating condition, an application for license must be filed. (Where no construction permit is required, a license application is submitted originally.) If a license is granted, operation may be continued for the term thereof (a maximum of 3 years for a broadcast station and 5 years for other stations) without further filings. At the end of the license term an application for renewal of license is submitted. If a licensee desires to assign his license to another party, or if control over the licensee is transferred, prior approval of the Commission must be requested in the proper application. The processing of applications for new stations is the most costly function performed by the Commission. After the granting of a construction permit or initial license the bulk of the Commission's work falls in the continuing regulatory field.

2. Applications for authorizations under title II of the Communications Act and Cable Landing License Act: There are many applications filed by common carriers under title II of the Communications Act, which title has to do with the regulation of common carrier communications. Thus with certain exceptions, a certificate of convenience and necessity must be obtained by a common carrier from the Commission under section 214 of the act for the construction of a new line, or of an extension of any line, or the acquisition or operation of any line. Also, with certain exceptions, a certificate is required under section 214 of the act before a carrier may discontinue, reduce, or impair service to a community or part of a community. Sections 221 and 222 of the act provide for applications to the Commission for authorizations with respect to telephone and telegraph mergers, respectively. In section 203 of the act, provision is made for application to the Commission for authority to make tariff schedules effective on less than 30 days' statutory notice. Section 212 of the act requires authorizations from the Commission for certain interlocking directorate and officer positions. In addition, under Executive Order No. 6779, the Commission processes applications seeking licenses under the Cable Landing License Act of 1921 (42 Stat. 8 and 9) for the landing and operation of submarine cables. In order to give you a partial indication of the volume of these various applications, in the year 1949 there was a total of 1,443 applications filed under sections 214 and 221 of the Communications Act; 178 applications were filed during that year for special permission under section 203 of the act to file tariff schedules on less than statutory notice.

3. Continuing regulatory activities: The major part of the Commission's work in the field of common-carrier regulation is related to continuing regulatory activities as distinguished from the processing of specific applications. In the common-carrier field, the Commission is principally concerned with the regulation of rates, services, and accounting of the communication common carriers furnishing interstate and international services, to the end that such rates, services, and accounting shall be just and reasonable in the public interest. If fees are to be collected with respect to such activities as these, it might be more practical to turn toward the plans of various State commissions of requiring reimbursements from the individual companies subject to the regulation for the time and expenses of Commission personnel actually engaged in projects directly connected with such companies.

As to the Commission's continuing regulatory activities with respect to radio stations, charges could be assessed against going radio stations and used to offset the cost of the Commission's continuing regulatory activities such as service developments, frequency measurements, developments and maintenance of rules and regulations, etc. The charges might be assessed on a yearly basis or might be required in connection with applications for licenses and renewals of licenses.

4. Inspections: The Commission inspects radio stations to determine whether or not equipment is in such condition that it will conform with the rules. In the case of certain classes of ship stations inspection is compulsory under the law and in the case of other stations it is optional. The extent to which it is carried out depends on the availability of personnel to do the work.

5. Equipment approval: Equipment is checked in certain cases to determine whether or not it meets performance specifications and if it does meet such specifications, a type approval number is issued to the manufacturer and is required to be affixed to all subsequently manufactured identical pieces of apparatus. Specifications are particularly rigid in the marine field where safety of life and property may depend upon the proper functioning of such equipment. Testing in the Commission's laboratory is frequently required.

6. Miscellaneous filings: These are chiefly papers of a legal nature such as petitions, motions, etc., which are filed in connection with hearings. They are numerous and constitute a sizable work load.

As statistical data which would indicate the numbers of items for which fees might be charged, there is attached the Commission's latest release on the number of radio authorizations valid and outstanding and it is suggested that you further refer to the Commission's fifteenth annual report, which has been made available to the staff of your committee. This report shows the number of applications handled by the Commission, the number of grants made, the number of hearings held, and also gives financial data which shows revenues, expenses, and other items with respect to radio broadcast stations and common carriers.

I hope that the foregoing will provide you with the data which will assist you in the conduct of your investigation as far as Federal Communications Commission is concerned. Please do not hesitate to call upon me for further information or for clarification of the data furnished you herewith.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE COY, *Chairman.*

Compulsory Licensing of Motion-Picture Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me in opposition to "police

"state" legislation to establish compulsory licensing of motion-picture industry.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPOSITION TO "POLICE STATE" LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH COMPULSORY LICENSING OF MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY

Mr. President, I should like to make just a brief statement on the subject of the bill introduced by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] yesterday, S. 3237, which would provide for the licensing of motion pictures in interstate commerce. I have a tremendous admiration for my colleague, whose long service in the Senate and whose devotion to his State and Nation are so well known as not to require repetition. It is with surprise and deep regret, therefore, that I read in the newspapers and noted in the RECORD his introduction of this stringent legislation. Let me set forth my views on this point.

I SHARE CONCERN OVER DISINTEGRATION OF MORALS

1. I share absolutely Senator JOHNSON's fundamental concern over any factor which would disintegrate the morals of the American people. I believe, with him, that motion-picture actors and actresses have a heavy responsibility for righteous self-conduct, in view of the fact that they are held up as ideals by our AMERICAN citizens, particularly by our young people. I believe that the individuals to whom Senator JOHNSON referred, connected with the picture Stromboli, are to be condemned as any other individuals must be condemned for breaking the moral law, for violating the principles of God and man, for transgressing the code of human decency.

Every American churchgoer, every minister, every righteous-thinking citizen in our land deplores this breaking of the moral code, particularly by individuals who have been held up as ideals. We deplore, too, any action by the motion picture or any other industry which might crudely seek to commercialize on the basis of publicity given to a breaking of the moral law.

WE SHOULD BE FIRMLY, BUT SMOOTH

2. However, to generalize on the individual, isolated case of Stromboli misconduct and to ask that a whole system of Federal regimentation be set up to prevent such comparatively rare abuses in, I believe, to commit a grave mistake. Why use a 100-barrel shotgun where a fistgun would do? I, for one, therefore, would oppose, as I am sure practically every Member of the Senate would oppose, this bill with its tremendous implications of a European police state—a Soviet-type OGPU.

Senator JOHNSON's bill would require the setting up of a tremendous bureaucracy which would license every motion-picture actor and actress, every producer, every script in this land. It would vest in the Department of Commerce dictatorial powers which could mean life and death over the entire motion-picture industry.

SOVIETS MIGHT WELL DECLARE THIS LAW UNCONSTITUTIONAL

3. Such powers would obviously be but the beginning of an entire dictatorial train of legislation which could end up by licensing every stage star, every radio and television actor, and the entire entertainment profession. Where it would end, no man could foresee.

The Department of Commerce does not want these dictatorial powers; the Congress would not want to enable such powers; and the American people would not want these powers conferred. Moreover, I believe the Supreme Court would throw this legislation out the window as unconstitutional even if it were passed.

The greatest means by which the American people can assure Hollywood's abiding by the moral law is by their refusal to (a) patronize objectionable pictures and (b) to support objectionable actors or actresses by box-office patronage. I emphasize, however, objectionable pictures, because I believe that Americans will differentiate between objectionable individuals who might participate in pictures and objectionable pictures, as such.

Whenever Hollywood learns that the American people will not patronize any pictures featuring a particular individual, that individual quickly leaves the Hollywood scene.

Right now there are many fine organizations such as the Legion of Decency and other groups which look into the question of the moral content of American motion pictures and which advise our people accordingly. I do not believe that we need any Federal gestapo to supplement their powers.

4. Let me point out, Mr. President, that this picture Stromboli, to which Senator JOHNSON referred, is a foreign-made picture. If there was anything morally objectionable in it, the reel could never have entered our country, because the United States Treasury Department through its Customs Offices possess powers to ban admission of morally objectionable items.

MR. JOHNSTON IS NOT A CZAR

5. I should like to point out, too, that while my colleague referred to Mr. Eric Johnston as a motion-picture czar that this is not an accurate description. Mr. Johnston is president of the Motion Picture Association of America. The MPA can approve or disapprove films, but it does not possess czaristic powers to, let us say, ban a particular individual appearing in a film.

LICENSING IDEA REPEATEDLY REJECTED

6. This is not the first time that licensing suggestions have been made. Through the years many individuals have suggested compulsory licensing in the motion-picture industry, but the Congress has always wisely rejected any such move.

WE DO INTEREST WITH OVER-ALL MORAL CRUSADE

7. Let me reiterate that I share the fundamental moral convictions of Senator JOHNSON. Right now, there are many evidences of a great and necessary moral crusade on the part of the American people. More and more we are learning that the real answer to the problems of the atomic age is, today, as it was 2,000 years ago, by fulfilling the principles of the Great Teacher, the Master, whose Sermon on the Mount is the greatest single guide to human conduct.

As Senator JOHNSON himself said "Hollywood for the most part is made up of fine, wholesome, clean, respectable, God-fearing people." I am sure that the good people of Hollywood deplore the transgression of the moral law which occurred in the incident which Senator JOHNSON cited, but we in turn would be transgressing and violating the law of man's God-given freedom if we established a police state gestapo over the motion-picture industry or any other industry.

LET US NOT ADD THE RUSSIAN GESTAPO TACTICS

The Soviet Union is the sort of country that believes in compulsory licensing of individuals before they may pursue a given profession. We in this country believe that so long as a profession itself is legal, any individual has the right to participate in it without asking anybody's permission, aside, of course, from such technical standards as are required in the medical profession, the engineering profession, etc.

Mr. President, I have previously brought to the Senate's attention the magnificent record of Hollywood's patriotic contributions in war and peace. But Hollywood needs no defense on my part or anyone else's part. This vast industry should not be judged and condemned on the basis of a few disgusting, isolated instances of moral misconduct or suggestive advertising or crude commercializing.

Let us not destroy the Constitution under the guise of protecting the Constitution. Let us not further the trend toward state socialism. Let S. 3237 be rejected by the Commerce Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that there be appended to this statement the text of a release which was released last night by the Motion Picture Association.

The Motion Picture Association of America, today, March 14, 1950, made the following statement:

"Senator JOHNSON of Colorado has not thought through the implications of the motion-picture licensing bill he introduced today in the Senate.

"This is a police-state bill, whether so intended or not. It would subject the American motion picture to the same sort of Government slave-control that exists in all police states.

"If it should ever happen that the motion picture should be made subservient to government, then freedom as we have known it in this country will have vanished. The newspapers, the press associations, magazines, books, radio, television—all mediums of expression—would be the inevitable next victims.

"Senator JOHNSON belittles all Hollywood when he says that 'out of her (Ingrid Bergman's) ashes may come a decent Hollywood.' Hollywood doesn't need a certificate of character from anyone. It has given the world too much in wholesome entertainment that all Americans can view with pride.

"Hollywood, like every other community, has its share—but no more than its share—of people who violate the moral code. The majority of people in Hollywood are the finest types of Americans, devoted and loyal to their families and their country.

"Senator JOHNSON is misinformed as to the way the motion-picture industry operates under its system of self-regulation. Motion-picture producers in 1930 voluntarily adopted a production code to assure decency and good taste in the content of motion pictures. The pictures produced under this code meet its high standards.

"The code applies only to the content of motion pictures themselves and not to the private lives of the actors and actresses.

"Senator JOHNSON's references to money changers is reminiscent of a hateful ideology that millions of Americans fought to destroy.

"It is a disservice to America for a United States Senator to condemn an industry that has such a fine record of performance and patriotism in war and peace."

The Case of Max Perlow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, article, and statement:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1950.

Hon. PAUL M. HERZOG,
Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been brought to my attention that there is pending, and has been pending for some time, a settlement in the case of Max Perlow, an alleged Communist, representing the United Furniture Workers of America.

Officials of the Comfort Spring Corp., of Baltimore, Md., indicate that they have no intention of dealing with a man of this caliber and, undoubtedly, every good American citizen will concur in their action.

I am writing this letter to supplement their request that an early decision be made in the case of Max Perlow and to call to your attention the fact that Mr. Perlow is the type of person the citizens of this country are not supporting. In the event that there is question of his attitude, I direct your attention to an article appearing in the New York Times, under date of June 6, 1949, wherein it states that though Mr. Perlow has resigned from the Communist Party in order to retain his post as an elected union officer, he did not intend to renounce his belief in Communist doctrines or to refrain from advocating them.

Attached, for your information, is Mr. Perlow's record as furnished me officially from the files of the Un-American Activities Committee, which speaks for itself.

It was the apparent intention of Congress when the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted that not only persons carrying membership cards of the Communist organization were to be affected but also those individuals who express themselves as believing in the principles of the Communist Party.

It is not my intention to influence the action of the Board in any way but I do feel that you should be thoroughly cognizant with the type of individual with whom you are dealing. Business at present is bedeviled by many regulations and restraints and it seems highly irregular that a man of Mr. Perlow's acknowledged beliefs and reputation should be given credence by your Board.

Your careful consideration and early report in this matter will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON,
Member of Congress.

[From the New York Times of June 6, 1949]

UNION LEADER QUITS REDS TO KEEP POST—OFFICIAL OF FURNITURE WORKERS COMPLIES WITH TAFT LAW BUT HOLDS TO BELIEFS

(By A. H. Raskin)

Compelled to choose between continuance in union office and membership in the Communist Party, Max Perlow, secretary-treasurer of the United Furniture Workers of America, CIO, announced yesterday that he had quit the party.

The choice was made necessary by the decision of the union's international executive board to file non-Communist affidavits under the Taft-Hartley law. Mr. Perlow, who supported the decision to file the affidavits, was the first union officer in the 2 years since the law was passed to announce publicly that he had given up Communist Party membership to comply with the affidavit requirement.

He made it plain that his sole purpose in resigning was to retain his post as an elected union officer and that he did not intend to renounce his belief in Communist doctrines or to refrain from advocating them "through peaceful, constitutional processes."

Whether the qualifications put by Mr. Perlow on his resignation might make his affidavit unacceptable presented a problem last night to officials of the National Labor Relations Board and the Department of Justice.

Under the law a union officer must swear that "he is not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party, and that he does not believe in, and is not a member or supports any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

NO GENERAL RULE LAID DOWN

Robert N. Denham, NLRB general counsel, said in Washington that the Board did not attempt to lay down any general lines of philosophy in accepting affidavits but that a person making reservations publicly might be embarrassed.

In normal course, Mr. Denham observed, the Board took the affidavits at face value but, when it received information indicating that the oath had been signed falsely, the matter was referred to the Justice Department for possible prosecution. Jail sentence and fines are specified as penalties for the filing of fraudulent affidavits.

In other left-wing unions that have filed non-Communist affidavits, officers reputed to have Communist ties have signed the affidavits without any public explanation or have withdrawn as officers and accepted immediate reappointment as paid organizers, administrators, or international representatives.

The only Congress of Industrial Organizations affiliate that has avowed Communists as top officers is the International Fur and Leather Workers Union. Irving Potash, 1 of the 11 members of the party's national board now on trial in Federal court, is an international vice president. Ben Gold, the union's president, is also a Communist leader. This union is not complying with the Taft-Hartley law and its officers have not filed affidavits.

In announcing that he had decided to leave the Communist Party, Mr. Perlow said it was no secret to the membership of the furniture union that he had belonged to the party for many years.

"It is because of the teachings of this party," Mr. Perlow said, "that I came to the conclusion that there can be no higher privilege, no greater principle, than to serve the working people in their struggle for a higher standard of living, for higher wages, for job security, for greater and greater guaranties for the workers to live decently and bring up their children as free people without fear to face the future."

He denied that the party advocated overthrow of the Government by force and violence and emphasized his own conviction that communism could be established within the framework of democratic processes under our Constitution.

As a union member for 28 years, he objected to being deprived of the opportunity to continue in union office if he refused to sign a non-Communist oath. He characterized this as a "yellow dog" provision inserted into the the law by "reactionary elements" bent on subjecting the Nation to thought control.

He said that he would stand on his constitutional right to believe that Marxism is the best expression of the hopes and aspirations of mankind to rid himself of the mounting evils which threaten the world today.

Three years ago Morris Muster, who had been president of the United Furniture Workers for 9 years, resigned, charging that the union's executive board was Communist-dominated. He directed particular criticism at Mr. Perlow. The union's secretary-treasurer joined with its other officers in accusing Mr. Muster of seeking to split and weaken the organization. Mr. Perlow did not announce at that time that he was a Communist.

Morris Pizer, who succeeded Mr. Muster as president, recommended in November 1947, that the union officers comply with the Taft-Hartley law, but this recommendation was rejected by the executive board. Last week the board decided to abandon its policy of noncompliance.

A joint statement by Mr. Pizer, Mr. Perlow and Ernest Marsh, director of organization, said the union's inability to take part in NLRB elections had caused it to lose 4,000 members to other unions that had qualified under the law. The statement blamed the Truman administration, the leadership of the CIO and the American Federation of Labor for Congress failure to repeal the law.

MARCH 10, 1950.

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For: Hon. GEORGE H. FALLON.
Subject: Max Perlow.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning Max Perlow:

The Communist publication, the Daily Worker of July 18, 1933 (p. 4, ch. 4), identified Max Perlow as a member of the Communist Party. In sworn testimony before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, August 13, 1938, John P. Frey, president of the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, made the following statement:

"Another individual high in the ranks of this union (United Furniture Workers, CIO), is Max Perlow of New York City, who has been a member of the district committee, district No. 2, of the Communist Party in New York City. Both (Morris) Muster and Perlow were leaders of the Furniture Workers Industrial Union when it was one of the groups working under the jurisdiction of the Trade Union Unity League, which was formed by the Communist Party headed by William Z. Foster." (Vol. 1, p. 99, Public Hearings by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1938.)

On May 20-23, 1944, the Communist Party assumed the name of the Communist Political Association for strategic reasons and resumed the name of the Communist Party of the United States on July 26-28, 1945. (Committee on Un-American Activities, Rept. 209, April 1, 1947, p. 29). In the printed proceedings of the Constitutional Convention of the Communist Political Association which was held May 20-22, 1944, the name of Max Perlow is shown as a convention delegate and speaker.

On June 7, 1949 (p. 5), the Daily Worker carried an article to the effect that Max Perlow, international secretary-treasurer of the CIO United Furniture Workers, this week end announced regretfully his resignation from the Communist Party in order to fulfill the requirements of the UFW's general executive board decision to sign Taft-Hartley affidavits. * * * In announcing his resignation, Perlow at the same time defended the party from its attackers, and reaffirmed his conviction that Marxism is the best expression of the hopes and aspirations of mankind to rid itself of the mounting evils which threaten the world today. In the same article Perlow was quoted as saying that "it is no secret to our membership, that I have been a member of the Communist Party for many years. It is because of the teachings of this party that I have decided to devote my entire life to the cause of the workers" and "I am forced to sign the affidavits or give up my work in the service

of the membership of our union, to which I have dedicated my life." The article revealed that Perlow said he was forced to submit his resignation from the Communist Party.

In the past, Max Perlow has sponsored numerous organizations which have been officially cited as Communist and/or Communist fronts. In 1947 and 1948 he was affiliated with the Civil Rights Congress, having been one of the sponsors of the national conference of that group, held in Chicago November 21-23, 1947 (see program Let Freedom Ring; and also the Daily Worker of October 21, 1947, p. 5); he signed a statement of that organization, opposing Red-baiting and attacks on Communists as shown in the Daily Worker of May 25, 1947 (p. 9). In 1948, Max Perlow was one of the sponsors of the freedom crusade of the Civil Rights Congress (Daily Worker, December 15, 1948, p. 11); he signed an open letter of the organization, addressed to Congress and urging the defeat of the Mundt bill (H. R. 5852), as shown on a letterhead of the Civil Rights Congress dated May 4, 1948, and also a full-page advertisement which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times of May 11, 1948 (p. 37).

The Civil Rights Congress has been cited as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties) dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party (Committee on Un-American Activities, Rept. No. 1115, September 2, 1947, pp. 2 and 19). Attorney General Tom Clark cited the group as subversive and Communist in reports to the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.

Max Perlow was named in the fall term (1947) booklet of the School of Jewish Studies as one of the sponsors of that school. He was one of the sponsors of a bazaar held under the auspices of the American Jewish Labor Council (Daily Worker, November 18, 1948, p. 7). He endorsed a demonstration sponsored by the American Council for a Democratic Greece (Daily Worker, February 13, 1949, p. 11); and signed a telegram of the council on behalf of Communist seamen (Daily Worker, November 8, 1949, p. 11). Attorney General Tom Clark cited the School of Jewish Studies as an adjunct in New York City of the Communist Party (press release of December 4, 1947); he cited the American Jewish Labor Council as subversive (press release of April 21, 1949); and cited the American Council for a Democratic Greece as a subversive and Communist organization formerly known as the Greek-American Council (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948).

In a pamphlet entitled "The People Versus H. C. L." which was published by the Consumers National Federation (December 11-12, 1937), Max Perlow's name appears as one of the sponsors of the federation. He signed a declaration of the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee honoring Georgi Dimitrov, former head of the Communist International. Both the Consumers National Federation and the Reichstag Fire Trial * * * were cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944 (pp. 156 and 112, respectively).

The Daily Worker of January 17, 1938 (p. 5) reported that Max Perlow signed a "Call" to the Morning Freiheit Conference; he spoke before the Morning Freiheit Association in New York, as shown in the Daily Worker of September 20, 1944 (p. 3). He signed an open letter to President Truman on Franco Spain, prepared by the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee (see mimeographed letter attached to a letterhead of the Joint Anti-Fascist, dated April 28, 1949).

Attorney General Francis Biddle cited the Morning Freiheit as a Communist Yiddish daily (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7686); the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944, cited the publication as "the official Communist newspaper published in the Yiddish tongue." In the same report (p. 174), the special committee * * * cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a Communist-front organization. Attorney General Tom Clark cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as subversive and Communist. (See press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948).

In report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities the United May Day Conference was cited as being "entirely engineered by the Communist Party for its 1937 May Day demonstrations, (and) numbered Frank E. McGrath as one of its members, along with such outstanding Communist Party leaders as Ben Gold and Max Perlow." Max Perlow signed the call to the United May Day Conference which was held in New York City in 1937 (Daily Worker, March 17, 1937, p. 4); he signed the call to the conference in 1938 (Daily Worker, March 19, 1938, p. 4); he was a member of the United May Day Provisional Committee in New York, as shown in a pamphlet, An American Holiday, May Day 1939 (p. 2); on the call for a United May Day Conference, March 30, 1940, he was listed as secretary-treasurer of the Provisional May Day Committee, New York; he spoke before the committee for May Day 1949, as shown in the official press release of that committee; he was one of the sponsors of the Provisional Committee for a United Labor and People's May Day, as shown in the Daily Worker of March 14, 1949 (p. 8); he spoke at a May Day demonstration in 1949 (Daily Worker, May 2, 1949, p. 9).

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities has cited the United May Day Conference and the United May Day Provisional Committee in Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944. The report states that "the May Day parade in New York City is an annual mobilization of Communist strength" (Rept. 1311, p. 179; also pp. 124 and 139). Attorney General Tom Clark cited the United May Day Committee as "subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, United States of America" (see press release of December 4, 1947).

Records of this committee show that Max Perlow has openly defended Communists and their activities over a period of years, and as late as January 1950. He was a sponsor of the National Free Browder Congress and signed a petition of that group to free Earl Browder (Daily Worker, March 1, 1942, p. 2; Daily Worker, May 2, 1941, p. 2; Daily Worker, January 25, 1942, sec. 2, p. 5). He signed a statement of the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder (Daily Worker, March 11, 1942, p. 5). He attended a meeting of the American Peace Mobilization and signed the organization's petition to free Earl Browder (Daily Worker, May 2, 1941, p. 2).

The National Free Browder Congress and the Citizen's Committee To Free Earl Browder were both cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944; Attorney General Francis Biddle cited the Citizen's Committee To Free Earl Browder as a Communist organization. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7687.) Earl Browder was general secretary of the Communist Party, United States of America, who had been convicted and sentenced to Atlanta Federal Penitentiary for passport fraud. The American Peace Mobilization has been cited by Attorney General Tom Clark, Attorney General Francis Biddle, and on three occasions by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. (Press releases dated December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7684; reports of the Special Committee, dated January 2, 1943, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944; respectively).

Max Perlow was one of the sponsors of the Schappes Defense Committee and signed various petitions and pleas for the pardon of Mr. Schappes. (Pamphlet, In the Case of Morris U. Schappes, p. 9; undated letterhead of the organization; Daily Worker, February 4, 1942, p. 5). The Schappes Defense Committee has been cited as "a front organization with a strictly Communist objective, namely, the defense of a self-admitted Communist who was convicted of perjury in the courts of New York." Morris U. Schappes "was on the teaching staff of the College of the City of New York for a period of 13 years. In 1936 his superior on the college faculty refused to recommend him for reappointment. This action led to prolonged agitation by the Communist Party." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944).

Israel Amter was one of the original American Communists and held many important positions in the Communist Party; he ran for Governor of New York in 1942 on the Communist Party ticket. Max Perlow supported Mr. Amter in the 1942 elections (Daily Worker, October 9, 1942, p. 4); he was a member of a committee which supported Amter (New Masses, November 8, 1948, p. 25); and one of the sponsors of a labor committee supporting Amter (as shown on a leaflet, Vote for Victory).

In 1940 Max Perlow signed a telegram of the Joint Committee for Trade Union Rights, directed to President Roosevelt on behalf of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union, defendants. (Daily Worker, November 11, 1940, p. 1). Both the Joint Committee for Trade Union Rights and the International Fur and Leather Workers Union were cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944.

Max Perlow supported the French Communist-led strikes in 1947 (Daily Worker, December 4, 1948, p. 2); he issued an individual endorsement of the Civil Rights Congress and the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, in defense of 12 Communists who faced deportation (among whom were Irving Potash, Alexander Bittelman, Ferdinand C. Smith, Alex and David Balint, and others). In 1949 he protested (together with Benjamin J. Davis, Communist) against interference with a student strike held at City College, New York. (See Daily Worker, April 13, 1949, p. 3).

The citation of the Civil Rights Congress appears on page 2 of this memorandum. The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born is "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944). Attorney General Tom Clark called the organization subversive and Communist on lists submitted to the Loyalty Review Board. (See press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948.)

In announcing a "defense rally for the freedom of Alexander Bittelman, veteran Jewish leader and member of the national committee of the Communist Party," the Daily Worker of January 20, 1948 (p. 4) quoted a statement issued by Max Perlow, secretary of the CIO's United Furniture Union, as follows: "As a trade-unionist and as a Jew, I recognize this attack as a threat to the American people as a whole."

Max Perlow was one of those who signed a telegram, addressed to Attorney General Tom Clark, on behalf of John Williamson, a Communist (Daily Worker, February 16, 1948, p. 6).

Max Perlow led a picket line, sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress (New York State division), on behalf of the 12 indicted Communist leaders (Daily Worker, September 20, 1948, p. 3). He sponsored the Civil Rights Congress Freedom Crusade, protesting the indictment (Daily Worker, December 31, 1948, p. 3); was a member of a delegation on behalf of the leaders (Daily Worker, July 15, 1949, p. 2); and sponsored groups defending them (Daily Worker, July 18, 1949, p. 2; October 5, 1949, p. 2; and October 11, 1949, p. 3; and a letterhead dated September 9, 1949).

The Daily Worker of January 12, 1950 (p. 2) reported that Max Perlow, secretary-treasurer of the United Furniture Workers, would speak at a meeting of the union on behalf of those who opposed a split in the union if "the Communists aren't expelled."

Social Security and Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOBY MORRIS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, March 14, 1950, I made a statement before the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, concerning social security, and more especially as to old-age assistance and old-age pensions. I discussed the bill I have heretofore introduced, H. R. 2620.

I went into the matter pretty fully and gave some figures and facts which I believe are important and are worthy of our consideration. I particularly discussed certain features of H. R. 6000 which passed the House last session. My full statement is as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY AND OLD-AGE PENSIONS

STATEMENT OF TOBY MORRIS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, OF OKLAHOMA, TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 14, 1950

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am deeply interested in the subject of social security and old-age pensions. It is, therefore, a great pleasure to me to know that your honorable committee is giving time for thorough consideration of this subject. It is also a pleasure to present to you some observations I have made to the House of Representatives and also publicly with regard to this matter generally, and to the matter of better security for our aged citizens particularly.

My interest in this subject goes back even much further than my tenure as a Member of Congress. For many years, the great need for an adequate and dependable income for aged people, and what it would mean to all citizens, has impressed my mind and heart. I am also of the opinion that an adequate, regular, dependable income to our retired elder citizens will constitute a well-distributed buying power in this segment of our population that will be a factor in maintaining our high level of national income which is so important to our national economy. If it is possible for our citizens to retire on a reasonable pension at retirement age, job opportunities will be open to younger people, the responsibility of supporting parents on the part of children will be obviated, and the entire population will benefit.

I am pleased that progress has been made in this field

While our present legislation, in effect, is not adequately meeting the great needs of our people, the provisions that have been made, are truly a great help. Much good has been accomplished. In many cases, dire suffering and want has been alleviated. Perhaps the dollars that the Congress has made available through old-age assistance have gone as far toward meeting dire needs of many helpless and deserving citizens, as any appropriations that have been made. I want to be understood as in no way attacking or decrying the good work that has been accomplished in this field.

There is much more to be done

Our present legislation falls far short of taking care of the great needs for adequate security for our elder citizens. Many who badly need regular incomes, and who are of retirement age, are not included. Neither is it possible for them to qualify under our present laws. Great inequities exist in the operation of our present system. Different and, in fact, greatly varying payments are being made to recipients in our States. Hardly do we find the same payments, month by month, in any two of our States. Moreover, we also find that the payments may vary in different parts of the same State. These inequalities should have our careful consideration. I wonder if Members of the Congress have stopped to consider the actual conditions with regard to the operations of our present system. Let me illustrate.

Under our present Federal laws, and under old-age assistance, as shown by the report of the Federal Security Agency for the month of October 1949, which is the last report that I have before me, I am taking figures for just two of our large States in population, and also two of our smaller States. I am comparing the payments on the following points:

1. Number of beneficiaries.
2. Amount of monthly payment to each beneficiary.
3. Total amount of payments for the month in each State. These comparisons show clearly what I mean by inequalities. Here they are:

State	Number of recipients	Monthly payment	Total amount paid for month
California	264,672	[illegible]	[illegible]
Pennsylvania	96,891	[illegible]	4,621,980

Does it not seem strange that the number of recipients should be so much greater in the one State than in the other, when the States are not far from equal in population? Again note the average payment to the individual. In one State, it is over $70 while in the other, it is less than $40. Then, look carefully at the total amount received during the month by the recipients. In one State, it is over $18,000,000 while in the other State, it is only over $3,000,000. Certainly these facts deserve careful consideration.

Now, let me look at the figures from two States of small population. Let us look at Virginia as compared with Colorado. Let us remember, also, that Virginia has a population of more than double that of Colorado. Please keep this fact in mind and then study the figures. Here they are:

State	Number of recipients	Average monthly payment	Total amount paid for month
Colorado	48,592	$73.01	$3,644,929
Virginia	18,568	[illegible]	[illegible]

When we look at these figures, certain very important facts are inescapable. Virginia, with more than twice the population, has less than half as many beneficiaries. The old folks in Colorado received over $75 per person for the month of October; while in Virginia, they received less than $21. The total benefits in dollars paid to recipients for the month, was almost ten times in Colorado what it was in Virginia, notwithstanding the fact that in population, Virginia is almost twice that of Colorado.

I believe these simple comparisons illustrate clearly what I mean by inequality of our present system among the various States. I shall, however, file with the committee, the entire report showing the figures from all the States, from which these figures are taken. I suggest also, that each Member of Congress might watch these monthly reports and study them carefully as they are issued month by month by the Federal Security Agency.

What should Congress do about it

A bipartisan group in the House of Representatives, led by my colleague, Representative VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, representing the minority, and myself, for the majority, have been giving serious study to this problem. We have united with us, in this effort, now more than 130 Members of the House. We have our individual opinions as to many details concerning remedial legislation, and each Member is, of course, entitled to his own opinion. However, we do find that there is a definite field of agreement, and there are positive points of agreement, on which we seem to be united. Among these points, are the following:

1. We should enact a Federal pension to take the place of "old age assistance" under the Social Security Act.

2. The pension should be paid uniformly in all the States without regard to what the States pay.

3. Eligibility of recipients should be liberalized. A property owner should be considered as well as those who have no property.

4. Many of us believe the amount of the Federal pension should be $100 per month, but the figure on which we have agreed is at least $60 per month.

I introduced a bill in the House, H. R. 2620, embodying these features and will file a copy of it along with my remarks, with the committee. I hope it will have the careful and full consideration of the committee, and that when your report is made to the floor of the Senate, you will have seen fit to recommend a decided improvement in our provisions for those citizens who are now of retirement age.

It is well to legislate for the retirement of our workers

I am deeply interested in the future of America. It shall be my pleasure to give full and complete attention to the future problems of security for those who are now actively engaged in production. I am anxious, insofar as we can, that we shall anticipate the needs of all of our active workers, and plan for their security, once they are old enough to retire. However, as important as this appears, it is not an emergency that must be met at this moment. Young people, those who are the workers of today, will not need retirement until they retire. For this reason, I do trust that we will put first things

first, in this matter. I am thinking first of those who have served so well in peacetime and in war, and have brought us to the proud place we now occupy as the leading Nation in many ways in all the world. I am very deeply concerned about those who are now old to the point where there is no hope for them in labor, business, professions, or in industry. They are in need of old-age security now. Young people may be able to wait at least a little while. But, unless we do something for those who are now old, we are missing a vital opportunity.

Postponement or delay is serious

If we fail, Mr. Chairman, to meet our obligation to this important segment of our population—I am speaking of those who are now too old to earn—it will be disastrous. Many of them are in dire need. I certainly see no depression coming but the specter of unemployment is casting its menacing shadow across our land. We are looking for markets to keep our farms, mines, mills, and factories going. We are facing the problem of keeping money in circulation. Let us consider the matter of American old-age pensions in this light. It will be a very efficient and equitable way to keep money circulating in every section of the land. Should we see that our elder citizens can have just a reasonable cash amount each month, giving the employment they now have to younger people, it should benefit business and strengthen our economy. It will aid in maintaining or increasing our national income. This is very important to our future growth and prosperity. In addition to that, it will perhaps accomplish more in genuine happiness and well being among those deserving security, than any other like amount of money which the Congress will appropriate. Should we fail—then I shall dread to contemplate the position in which we have left the deserving fathers and mothers of our country.

Of these facts, Mr. Chairman, I feel sure:

1. America can well afford a reasonable, uniform pension to all citizens of retirement age.

2. There is a great and crying need for such a pension.

3. The pension money being spent in our markets month by month would go a long way toward compensating our economy for the burden of any added tax.

4. While security for our young people, when they become old, is important, it can well wait until the present crying needs of our deserving older citizens have been provided for.

I know of no action that this Congress can take short of that which deals with our national security that will yield as much in happiness and general good as to provide a generous American pension for our deserving retired American citizens. I trust and I pray that this Congress will give the matter full and complete consideration, that we may have such a pension enacted as early as possible this year. Most certainly an old-age pension is better than old-age assistance.

In conclusion, may I say that the bill I introduced, H. R. 2620, provides in substance that every citizen of the United States who is 60 years of age or older, and who does not have an income sufficient to require him or her, as the case might be, to file a Federal income-tax return, and who applies for same, is entitled to a Federal pension at the rate of $60 per month. I think that this is a simple, moderate, and workable plan. It would do away with the present means-worker system and with much of its administrative cost. It would not be necessary to set up any new boards or bureaus, as the question of income tax could be determined under the present law and rules and regulations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

A number of groups in our society now have retirement benefits, such as coal miners, steel workers, Government officials and employees. Why should not all of our citizens enjoy retirement benefits when they reach the proper age? It is sometimes pointed out that the groups just mentioned pay into their retirement fund. The real truth of the matter is, as I see it, that society generally pays into these funds and not the individual beneficiaries, for the reason that salaries and wages are raised either by fiat of law or by employers so that said groups may have sufficient money to pay into their fund. When salaries and wages are raised, the increased tax and the increased cost of production, such as coal and steel, is passed to the public. So in truth and in fact the public pays the bill. If the public pays the bill for these groups, why shouldn't it pay it for all groups and treat them all alike? I certainly do not complain that the groups mentioned have retirement funds—I am glad that they do have them—but my desire is that all groups have the same or similar privileges to what they have.

If the Congress does not think it wise at this time to replace the old-age-assistance section of the Social Security Act with an old-age-pension program, then I respectfully request that it give consideration to the following formula in the old-age-assistance title of H. R. 6000, to wit: That the Federal Government pay five-sixths of the first $30 of the average payment per recipient, plus one-half the balance up to a maximum on individual monthly payments of $60. In substance, the net effect of this proposal is to provide an additional $10 in Federal funds per month.

I am truly grateful to the committee for having given me this opportunity to present my views in regard to this most important matter.

H. R. 2620

A bill providing a direct Federal old-age pension at the rate of $60 per month to certain citizens 60 years of age or over

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Federal Security Administrator (hereinafter called the "Administrator") shall pay, out of any funds hereafter appropriated for such purpose, an old-age pension to qualified individuals at the rate of $60 per month.

(b) For the purposes of this act an individual shall be deemed to be a qualified individual—

(1) if he is 60 years of age or over, is a citizen of the United States, and has been a citizen of the United States for not less than 10 years;

(2) if he resides in the United States and has been a resident of the United States for not less than 10 years;

(3) if his gross income is less than the minimum amount with respect to which a Federal income-tax return is required to be filed; and

(4) if he has made application for the benefits of this act.

(c) Payments to qualified individuals shall be made monthly.

Sec. 2. Any individual making application for the benefits of this act shall furnish such evidence of age, citizenship, and residence as the Administrator may by regulation prescribe. Whether a Federal income tax with respect to the income of any individual were payable for any taxable year shall, for the purposes of this act, be established from records and data in the possession of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury shall upon request furnish to the Administrator any documents, records, or information which he may have relating to whether a Federal income tax were payable for any taxable year with respect to the income of any applicant for the benefits of this act.

Sec. 3. No payment to any State under title I of the Social Security Act, as amended, shall be made for any quarter beginning on or after the date of enactment of this act.

Sec. 4. The Administrator shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Sec. 5. As used in paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of the first section of this act, the term ""nited States" means the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on last February 23 the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] under extension of his remarks, inserted in the RECORD an article entitled "Nylons and Lipsticks Ruin Marshall Plan," as published in the Kansas City Star on February 17. This was part of an article originally printed in the Providence Journal on February 13, entitled "Greek Student at Bryant Charges Marshall Plan Is Choking Itself."

I have received from Paul Hoffman, Administrator of the ECA, a letter dated March 10, in answer to this newspaper article. Believing that it will be of interest to the Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the complete original article and Mr. Hoffman's letter.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREEK STUDENT AT BRYANT CHARGES MARSHALL PLAN IS CHOKING ITSELF—SAYS GREECE GETS UNNECESSARY THINGS—TERMS ECONOMY STIFLED, PEOPLE MADE LAZY AND DEPENDENT

(By Philip C. Gunion)

The Marshall plan is choking itself to death on nylon stockings, lipsticks, plastic combs, and canned tuna fish, Nicholas Farmakis, a Greek who is a student at Bryant College, charges.

The insistence of the United States in shipping little but finished products—and then things that are unnecessary to life in Greece—is stifling Greek economy and making the people lazy and dependent, Farmakis said.

Raw materials which could be converted by native labor into articles really needed by the Greeks would start up industry in Greece and make it a strong bulwark against the Communists to the north.

But the American idea that what an American thinks is right and all that foreigners think is wrong is causing the Marshall plan to backfire into an agency of dissatisfaction among the people of Europe, Farmakis thinks.

AMERICAN TUNA DUMPED

Tuna is an ideal canned product for America with its vast inland territory, Farmakis admits, but it could help make idle thousands of Greeks who fish for a living, when shipped in large quantities to Greece—if only the Greeks would use it.

But they don't. They prefer the native fresh-caught fish. The American tuna is stored in warehouses until the space is needed, then it is dumped. But it keeps coming, Farmakis said.

Lipsticks and nylons do a lot for the American girl, said Farmakis, who is a student of more than business administration, but their use among the economic level of persons supposed to be helped by the Marshall plan is slight in Greece.

The tall, 23-year-old student, who hopes to go into politics in Greece when his studies in America are completed, feels that all aid under the Marshall plan should be stopped immediately until the nations involved can meet with the United States and set up a program by which they can get the things they need—and the things that we think they need can be left in this country.

CONCRETE PILES TO GREEKS

Farmakis said that when the Greek Government told the United States that it wanted cement and other building materials to start a construction program, it got machines that went around laying concrete piles that were identified as houses by Americans. They remained piles of concrete to Greeks.

Farmakis' father is president of the Greek Rubber Co., and he wants to import raw rubber to Greece so that it can be manufactured by Greeks into things that Greeks need. But the Greek need for these products is met by Marshall plan administrators in shipments of finished rubber goods.

These fail to benefit the people because the Greek Government imposes import taxes on them to protect the native rubber companies, and other Greeks suffer.

Naturally, Farmakis explained, this creates resentment among the Greeks—instead of the fine feeling of fellowship against communism which is the hard-headed reason behind the Marshall plan.

IT IS VERY BAD

"It is very bad," Farmakis said, "because if Greece collapses to the Russians, the United States won't be far behind. Of course, if the United States went first, Greece would go at the same time."

Farmakis would like to stay in the United States forever, but when he finishes his education at Bryant, he will return to Greece.

"I am in a good position because of my father and I feel that perhaps some other Greek boy, less well situated, could come here in my place and get a chance to succeed," he said.

He lives with four American roommates in an apartment at 71 Hope Street and finds this beneficial to his understanding of this country.

His service in the Greek underground during World War II, he shrugs off—"Everybody was doing it."

He is also modest about his excellent English. "When I can understand a New York taxi driver, I will say that I possess the American language," he said.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1950.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: This is a further reply to your letter of February 17, attaching a newspaper article entitled "Greek Student at Bryant Charges Marshall Plan Is Choking Itself," which we acknowledged in our letter of February 23.

The article contains a number of misleading and erroneous statements and we appreciate your giving us an opportunity to comment on it.

In the first place, it is the policy of ECA not to ship any unnecessary or undesirable commodities to a participating country.

We should like to correct the impression conveyed by the article that ECA financing is allowed for importing into Greece lipsticks, plastic combs, nylon hose, and canned tuna fish. Personal accessories such as lipstick, plastic combs, and nylon hose are included on the list of items which have always been ineligible for ECA financing. This list of prohibited articles was sent by ECA to all participating countries and to United States banks holding ECA letters of commitment some time ago, and in those cases where these items have been purchased, ECA has obtained reimbursement from the participating country. Import licensing procedures in Greece, controlled by the Foreign Trade Administration (a Greek Government agency), and the auditing procedures of the ECA controller assure proper restrictions on the use of ECA funds. Items such as those mentioned above could be brought into Greece through two legal methods. First, many of these items reach the people as gifts sent by relatives and friends, and eventually reach the market. Second, they might be obtained through use of non-ECA funds. However, such items are not eligible for financing by ECA.

Canned tuna fish is considered a luxury item and is not eligible for ECA financing. Tuna is prohibited from purchase by a price restriction incorporated in the procurement authorization, which establishes a maximum value that can be paid for canned fish. This controlled price makes it impossible for any country to procure tuna with ECA funds. In prewar years, even before her fishing fleet was depleted as a result of occupation and World War II, fish was among Greece's chief imports. The 1936–39 yearly average import was approximately 23,000 metric tons. Total imports authorized through use of ECA dollars amount to only about 4,600 tons, and these have been limited mainly to wet salted or dried fish.

The importance of building up the Greek fishing industry was taken into account by the Greek-Turkish aid program under the operation of the United States Department of State and subsequently by ECA. American aid under these two programs has contributed materially to improving the industry and making it more productive. New boats have been provided and marine Diesel engines and refrigeration equipment have been supplied to modernize the existing fleet. Tons of twine and other materials have been sent to Greece for repairing fish nets and making new ones. It is encouraging to note that fresh-fish production in 1949 was about 14 percent above the 1935–38 average.

Procurement of crude rubber has never been financed by ECA. Crude or raw rubber is obtainable from sterling areas and, therefore, is not eligible for dollar financing under ECA. The importation of crude rubber, therefore, is a Greek Government problem. The Greek import program for the current year provides for a limited amount of crude rubber, allied gums, and synthetic rubber. This applies also to raw materials for plastics, from which finished products such as combs are made.

Contrary to the newspaper article, ECA does not prescribe the goods to be shipped to Greece. The programing procedure under ECA requires the Greek Government to prepare its own estimates of import requirements. They alone determine what they wish ECA to finance. The import list is then studied by both the ECA mission in Athens and by ECA in Washington and procurement authorized, if approved. In view of Greece's fiscal situation, careful planning is required in allocating expenditures for essential foodstuffs, fuel, etc.; raw materials for those existing industries whose products contribute most to the Greek economy, and for reconstruction materials.

In the beginning of the ECA operation it was necessary for the Greek Government to bring in a larger portion of manufactured articles and equipment in lieu of raw materials. Many industries had been seriously crippled or destroyed as a result of occupation and World War II. Guerrilla warfare, which subsided recently, further destroyed or disrupted Greek industry. As the guerrillas were pushed northward and defeated, reconstruction began and manufacturing plants are being restored. There has been a proportionate increase in the flow of machinery and industrial equipment for the purpose of rehabilitating manufacturing plants. As a result, more raw materials are being shipped for further processing or fabrication in Greece. This is in line with established ECA policy of improving participating countries' production.

Greece has, accordingly, been increasing the importation of construction tools for the purpose of utilizing local building materials for housing. No materials necessary for housing are imported unless they are not available locally.

We should greatly appreciate having any information Mr. Farmakis might be able to furnish which formed the basis for his statements to the press. Upon receipt of such information, we would be in position to request our ECA mission in Athens to make a complete investigation.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL G. HOFFMAN,
Administrator.

The President's Reorganization Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an editorial entitled "Streamlined Boards," from the Washington Post of March 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STREAMLINED BOARDS

The President's Reorganization Plans Nos. 7 to 13 are an attempt to bring greater efficiency into seven Federal regulatory commissions without destroying their quasi-judicial character. Administrative boards are universally regarded as inefficient. Some reformers have urged that they be stripped of all functions, except the decision of cases. The Hoover Commission did not go that far. It recommended that the chairman of each commission be made primarily responsible for its administrative work and supervision of its staff. Reorganization Plans Nos. 7 to 13, which the President has sent up to Congress, would implement this idea.

Two months ago we pointed out the dangers in the strong-chairman plan. If the chairman is permitted to become a dictator, he can destroy the independence of a board or commission, despite the fact that the only reason for assigning regulatory tasks to boards is to get a well-rounded judgment. This danger has been minimized, if not eliminated, in the plan now devised for such agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the National Labor Relations Board. The chairman in each case has been given responsibility for the appointment and direction of personnel and for the conduct of the routine business of the agency. But he would be bound by the general policies adopted by the board. The chairman would prepare the budget, but the commission

[illegible] review it and determine the general distribution of funds. Each commissioner would retain control over personnel in his immediate office, and the agency as a whole would have to appoint the man chosen by the chairman to head the various administrative units. Chairman might abuse this power in some instances, but we suspect that on the whole it would greatly improve the operations of the regulatory bodies.

The most controversial item in this segment of the reorganization program is the elimination of the general counsel of the NLRB. This action lends itself to criticism because Congress so recently gave the general counsel separate status in the Taft-Hartley Act. However, the independence of the general counsel has created more problems than it has solved. The judging and prosecuting functions were separated, but the prosecutor himself became also an administrator and policy maker. The task force of the Hoover Commission concluded that the position is an untenable one and recommended that it be reabsorbed into the Board or into one of the executive departments. The Senate, too, voted to abolish the separate general counsel in passing the Taft bill (S. 360) last year. Since then General Counsel Denham has publicly attacked the NLRB, and the Board has clipped his wings. To avoid a prolonged and costly feud, the office ought to be abolished in favor of a general counsel subordinate to the Board.

The Oleomargarine Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to the oleomargarine law, from the Wall Street Journal of March 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIRTH OF A LAW—MARGARINE MEASURE IS VIVID EXAMPLE OF HOW A BILL GETS ON THE BOOKS—WAS BOTTLED UP, DISCHARGED, PIGEONHOLED, FILIBUSTERED, ALLOWED TO DIE, REVIVED—IT'S NOT LIKE THE TEXTBOOK

(By Carl Thompson)

WASHINGTON.—President TRUMAN is about to sign into law a bill repealing the 64-year-old Federal taxes and license fees on oleomargarine. Behind this bill of lawmaking is a little-understood story. It dramatizes what happens to most legislation from the day it's drafted until it winds up on the statute books.

The margarine tax-repeal measure isn't necessarily typical—it had more difficulties than most bills—but the way it got enacted will tell you more about how laws are passed in Congress than you can learn from most textbooks.

This particular legislation was bottled up, discharged, pigeonholed, filibustered, amended, substituted, allowed to die, revived, compromised, and saddled with riders. It split like rotes of the usually solid farm bloc. It sent liberals like Democratic Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, scurrying to the side of conservative Republicans. It caused some conservative southern Democrats to line up with the CIO.

"DON'T I AM THE AUTHOR"

So much happened to the bill that its original author repudiated its final form. The measure bears the number H. R. 2023. That bill was introduced January 31, 1949, by Democratic Representative GRANGER, of Utah. On March 7, 1950, as the House prepared to pass the agreed-on version of H. R. 2023, Mr. GRANGER felt it necessary to "deny that I am the author, or have any right, interest, or title in any word, comma, or period in this bill. I am just opposed to it."

In remaining months of the Eighty-first Congress, what happened to the margarine bill will be repeated, with variations. Your taxes, your social security, the spending of your tax dollars, and the farm programs affecting your grocery bill will all run the same legislative obstacle course.

Take a look at the sketchy textbook version of how laws are made at the United States Capital; then fill it in with what happened to the margarine measure:

A typical textbook starts off, "Any Member of the House or Senate may present a bill."

Actually, thousands of bills get introduced at every session of Congress. Few are passed. In the first 2 months of 1950, a total of 1,501 measures was introduced in the House and Senate. In the same period only 29 bills became law, and only 10 of these were public laws affecting most citizens. The others were private bills granting relief to some individual.

MARGARINE BILLS SINCE 1886

Public bills dealing with margarine have been before Congress since 1886, when the first taxes on the spread were approved. Since then hundreds of bills have been proposed. In the first 2 months of the Eighty-first Congress which convened in January 1949, more than 45 bills were introduced to repeal the margarine levies. For at least 4 years a majority of the House and Senate has favored wiping out the taxes and fees. But only this week did a bill get to the White House. Why the delay?

The repeal measure is a compromise. It isn't quite what the margarine makers wanted. Some Federal regulation over the butter substitute remains. In public places, margarine will either have to wear a special label or be served in what one lawmaker calls "diaper-shaped patties" and what another refers to as "triangular cubes."

The law also is far from what butter interests sought. They wanted to hinder margarine's use of the "golden color of yellow" which they claimed was somehow an exclusive attribute of butter. They hoped to prohibit the sale of yellow margarine in interstate commerce, even after they had become reconciled to removal of the Federal taxes. (Many States retain local levies and restrictions on margarine, colored and white.)

THE RIDER: FTC FINES

In the final pulling and hauling, the Senate tacked on an amendment that could affect almost every industry. This provides $5,000-a-day fines for every day a final cease-and-desist order of the Federal Trade Commission is violated. Previously, the limit was $5,000 for each violation. Originally aimed at preventing margarine makers from making misleading claims for margarine, this proviso applies to every company under FTC scrutiny.

So it goes with most laws. A rare few are enacted in about the same form as they're introduced.

Says the textbook: "All the bills are * * * referred to committees. The committees will hear all who want to be heard for or against the bill."

Frequently such hearings turn into protracted battles between two opposing groups. In 1948, at least half a million dollars was poured into the margarine battle, a good chunk of it for lobbying. The National Milk Producers Federation led the fight against repeal; the National Association of Margarine Makers for it. In 1949, another $500,000 was admittedly spent. This time the American Butter Institute chipped in over $46,000 on the side of the dairy people; Best Foods, Inc., spent $36,000 for the margarine tax repeal.

"Information about the merits and defects of a measure is not the only thing that the average Congressman wants to obtain," says the textbook. "What his own voters think about it is important, too."

In an elaborate presentation by the Milk Producers' Federation, this point was bluntly hit. The legend on a booklet read: "The dairy farmers' vote is politically sensitive. Dairy farmers always vote to protect their interests."

A FARM PROBLEM

For decades, proposals to repeal margarine taxes were handled in the House of Representatives as a farm problem, not a revenue measure. The House Agriculture Committee was given the job of considering margarine tax bills. And for decades each new measure was "bottled up" in this committee, dominated by Congressmen whose own voters included large and small dairy farmers.

But House Members can thwart a committee that refuses to clear a bill for action. In March 1947 the Agriculture Committee tabled all bills dealing with margarine taxes. That meant no further action by the committee. Representative MENDEL RIVERS, a Democrat from South Carolina, promoted a discharge petition—a maneuver to force the bill out of committee—signed by a majority of House Members.

By April 1948 Mr. RIVERS' petition brought margarine tax repeal before the House and it passed by the decisive vote of 260 to 106. But the final version of the bill didn't get through Congress for almost 2 years. The measure died with the Eightieth Congress, was revived by the Eighty-first, finally passed both Houses and got to the President's desk this week.

TROUBLE IN THE SENATE

The textbook goes on: After the House acts, "all bills are signed by the Speaker and transmitted to the Senate. * * *."

For the average bill this means more trouble. When the Senate in 1948 got the House-passed margarine bill, the biggest fight centered on this question: Should it go to the Senate Finance Committee, whose members favored the measure, or to the Senate Agriculture Committee, ready to "bottle up" the bill as the House committee had done? The finance group got the bill, approved it, and sent it to the floor.

But 1948 was a hot election year. Opponents threatened a filibuster—a minority talk-fest designed to delay action until a weary majority agrees to postpone action. The threat succeeded.

The 1948 margarine bill died with the end of the Eightieth Congress. All bills not acted on when one Congress completes a 2-year session must start their journey back at the starting line.

In 1949, when the Eighty-first Congress convened, the House Agriculture Committee held long and bitter hearings on 44 oleomargarine bills and finally reported one to the House in March of last year.

The textbook says: "The committee may approve the bill just as it stands * * *."

But a committee often reports a bill favorably with amendment. The amendment may strike out everything after the opening clause, "be it enacted by the Senate and House * * *," and put in a completely new and often different bill.

The House Agriculture Committee did recommend the bill to repeal margarine taxes introduced by Utah's Representative GRANGER. But there was a "joker." It also would have prohibited shipment among States of colored margarine. The dairy-States men figured this would help stifle trade in margarine. Even under tax handicaps margarine production had soomed from about 300,000,000 pounds in 1939 to over 1,000,000,000 pounds in 1949. Postwar high prices for butter and improved flavoring and coloring techniques for the substitute had brought a switch from butter to margarine among many families.

On the House floor, however, Representative POAGE, of Texas, succeeded in substituting a pro-margarine measure for the committee-approved bill of Representative GRANGER. This passed the House 289 to 87. That was April 1, 1949.

The Senate in 1949 never did get around to acting on the bill. Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin led the opposition and threatened a filibuster. Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas finally got the Democratic leadership to agree to let him bring up the bill the first thing this year. Opponents couldn't filibuster from January 3 to the very end of the session, he reasoned.

The Senate took up margarine tax repeal on January 4, 1950.

Then came a deluge of delaying amendments—to abolish the Southern poll tax, to enact an antilynching law, to set up a fair employment practices commission, to repeal wartime excise taxes. These were knocked down one by one. But before the bill passed the Senate, 56 to 16, the "rider" strengthening FTC penalty powers had been attached.

TRIANGULAR TRICK

Everything seemed fine for the bill's proponents—except for one little gimmick. The Senate had stuck in a change that required all margarine to be molded and packed "so as to be triangular in shape." That meant the one-pound packages and quarter-pound sticks of margarine all had to be triangles.

Representatives of the margarine industry did some scrambling. This would mean completely junking all existing packaging machines and cutting dies, they screamed. It would cost the industry up to $5,000,000 for new packaging machinery and would take up to 5 years to get the equipment, it was claimed.

When the House and Senate have each passed differing versions of the same bill, the textbook casually says: "The matter goes to a conference committee." The conference committee is made up of members of the committees in each house that originally dealt with the measure. They compromise the measure.

In the case of the margarine bill, the triangle packaging issue almost led to a stalemate. This was finally settled by making it mandatory for restaurants to serve the spread in triangles, or else label it plainly as margarine. Then the compromised bill went back to House and Senate and sailed through with little difficulty, and was sent to the White House for Presidential approval.

The textbook was never so right as when it concluded: "It is only the most robust bills that survive to the end."

Fair Employment Practices Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 23 this body voted to scuttle H. R. 4453, the Powell FEPC bill, and in its place substituted the McConnell bill, which is practically meaningless insofar as effective elimination of job discrimination is concerned. At that time I and a number of other Members of the House stated that this was a sell-out of FEPC and that the passage of the McConnell bill would serve as a signal for intensification of discrimination in employment against minority groups throughout the country, thus destroying one of the basic principles upon which our country was founded, namely, the right of all citizens to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Only a few short weeks after the passage of the McConnell bill we see that the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee unanimously reported a bill, H. R. 7185, which has as its purpose the continued denial of skilled jobs to Negroes in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Treasury Department.

When one reads this bill the impression is gained that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is concerned with increased job opportunities for veterans, but an examination of the actual situation which the bill proposes to correct will reveal that this bill was introduced only after the Fair Employment Board of the Civil Service Commission had instructed the Treasury Department to cease discriminating against a group of its Negro employees and give a long-postponed examination for apprentice plate printers.

Further proof that the bill is aimed at continuing the discriminatory practices now in effect at the Bureau of Engraving and not for providing increased job opportunities for veterans is revealed by the fact that at the opening of the hearing on the bill the chairman of the committee requested the Treasury Department to postpone the examination scheduled for March 15, which will make possible for the first time in its history for the Bureau of Engraving to employ Negroes who are qualified as plate printers.

The Fair Employment Board stated in its formal decision:

> The Board is gratified to learn that the Department of the Treasury has now rescheduled for March 15, 1950, the promotional examination, the indefinite postponement of which precipitated the appeal in this case. This is an encouraging step in the right direction but is of itself insufficient treatment of the basic problem. The civil-service laws and regulations, the financial resources of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the numerical strength of the plate printer force, and the pattern of work organization around the plate printing press provide ample management flexibility to permit the operation of a recruiting system free from any taint of racial discrimination.
>
> It is the recommendation of this Board that the best corrective of the existing situation will be found in the early initiation and continuous operation in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of an inservice-training program with respect to the plate printing craft, related numerically to the normal turn-over in that employee classification and to the total Government and private employment in this craft. This program should be open to all qualified employees of the Bureau within these numerical limits, thus effectuating the intent of Executive Order 9980 as implemented by the Department's promotional policy announced in Departmental Order No. 114 of June 1, 1949.

The Fair Employment Board of the Civil Service Commission is not an irresponsible body. It was appointed at the direction of the President to correct the problem of discrimination against minority groups in Government employment. It did not arrive at its decision on the Bureau of Engraving and Printing case without thorough and painstaking investigation of the problem. That Board found that the following conditions exist at the Bureau of Engraving:

> The number of plate printers employed throughout the country is relatively small, and the Bureau is by far the largest employer. On January 1, 1950, it had on its employment rolls 492 plate printers, a number which is more than 50 percent of the total number of this craft now in employment. Over the past 20 years the Bureau force, with some fluctuations, has grown from about 400 to nearly 500, despite improvements in equipment and technology which have increased individual production capacity. No Negro is or ever has been employed by the Bureau as a plate printer.
>
> Journeyman plate printer in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing must have had 4 years of apprenticeship, or its equivalent in practical experience. * * * No Negro has ever been recruited or employed as an apprentice plate printer in the Bureau.
>
> For at least 20 years prior to 1933 the Bureau met its plate printer personnel recruitment needs through appointment, on certification by the Civil Service Commission, of journeymen who had served an apprenticeship in private industry. The Civil Service Commission requires the full apprenticeship experience of 4 years or, since 1942, its equivalent of practical experience, as a prerequisite to such certification, but the Commission in no way restricts the operating Bureau to this single channel for meeting its need for plate printers. The recruitment of journeymen plate printers solely from private industry had the effect of erecting a barrier against Negroes who might aspire to become plate printers in the Bureau, because in private industry up to this time, Negroes have not had equal opportunity to secure the requisite training.
>
> Over the 13 fiscal years 1938 to 1950 inclusive, the Bureau recruited 75 apprentice plate printers, and it has carried on its rolls an average of 21 such apprentices for each of those years. None has been recruited since April 15, 1946.
>
> Of these 75 apprentices, 61 were chosen from lists of eligibles certified by the Civil Service Commission from assembled written examinations, advertised and held throughout the United States, and 14 were recruited by such noncompetitive action as transfer, promotion, or reassignment. Negroes competed in the examinations and were certified as eligible, and at the same time qualified Negroes were available for noncompetitive assignment within the Bureau as apprentice plate printers. But none of the 75 apprentices were Negroes. In at least one case a Negro eligible failed of appointment while white eligibles of lower rating on the same certificate were appointed. This Negro eligible was subsequently certified to another Government agency where he served his apprenticeship, and is now employed as a journeyman in another craft.
>
> The cessation of apprentice recruiting in 1946 recreated the recruitment situation which existed prior to 1933. Negroes in considerable numbers, presently employed in the Bureau, and veterans of World War II, aspire to become plate printers. The announcement of the promotional examination in July of 1948 opened the channel for a specified group of Negroes in the Bureau, including the appellants. Continued postponement of the examination restores the exact situation which existed prior to the announcement and closes the only channel by which the

Negro applicants can become plate printers in the Bureau.

Who are the Negro employees at the Bureau of Engraving who fought for and secured this decision on fair employment in their agency? They are all veterans of World War II, many with overseas and combat service, some with four and five battle stars and a few with citations for outstanding heroism in the face of enemy action.

H. R. 7185 is designed to destroy the opportunity of these men to enter into a skilled craft from which members of their race have been barred for the last half century both in government and private employment. I am familiar with the fight of these men, for they and their union came before my subcommittee when it was holding hearings on the recently scuttled FEPC bill, H. R. 4453. I heard their stories and I have had Negro employees by the scores come to me and say this is it.

When the Fair Employment Board decision on the Bureau of Engraving case was issued a new atmosphere of freedom and brotherhood was created in that Government agency. Many of the Negro veterans who were affected by that decision and saw for the first time in their lives an opportunity to enter a hitherto lily-white trade, came to me and said now we are beginning to realize some of the things for which they told us we were fighting in the last world war. They told me that not only did they feel that way but that a number of white veterans of World War II who had been caught in the agency's discriminatory squeeze play also had these feelings.

No; the issue behind H. R. 7185 is not the technical one of giving additional job advantages to veterans. It is just the contrary. The motivation is to take away from these Negro veterans their recently won opportunity to enjoy some of the democracy for which they fought and bled. The issue posed by H. R. 7185 is whether or not fair employment practices in our Government agencies will be maintained and upheld or whether a group of narrow-minded, bigoted racists will have complete control over skilled jobs in the Bureau of Engraving by virtue of the passage of this bill.

In effect, the very dignity of this Fair Employment Board which was appointed by the authority of the President is threatened by this bill. If Congress reverses this decision, the civil rights of Negroes and other minority groups in Government employment will have been done an irreparable harm. This is the stain which H. R. 7185 would place upon the conscience of the Members of this House.

I want to serve warning to all of those who propose to hide behind this bill and to give vent to their prejudice by support of this bill that they will be fought tooth and nail on the issue of civil rights. The fight for FEPC will go on.

To support H. R. 7185 will be to support the most vicious discriminatory legislation this House has seen. It will make a further lie of the Republican and Democratic platforms. It will be a direct insult to every Negro, veteran, and believer in democracy.

Only Tuesday, March 14, 1950, Judge Keech rejected a request for an injunction against this examination. The request for this injunction was made by a lily-white group which seeks to continue the racial exclusion policy in this agency. Judge Keech's refusal in district court yesterday to grant an injunction which would postpone this examination is an indication of the complete illegality of any action to overthrow the fair employment decision.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT BOARD,
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

Name of appellants: Earl E. Ashton, Raymond F. Cooke, Paul F. Cooper, John E. Harris, Francis E. Janifer, Thomas M. Keys, Edward L. Mitchell, Edgar Sims, Frederick Wiggins.

Department: Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Treasury Department, Washington, D. C.

BASIS OF APPEAL

The above-named persons appealed individually to the Fair Employment Board under Executive Order 9980 from the decision of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, dated December 29, 1949, that there was no racial discrimination in connection with the postponement of a promotional examination for apprentice plate printer in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. All of the appellants had applied for, and were eligible to take the examination. The appeals were consolidated for hearing.

The appellants alleged, in substance, that in the recruitment of apprentice plate printers and plate printers by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing discrimination against Negroes has long prevailed; that the promotional examination for apprentice plate printers announced July 16, 1948 was a practical and very welcome step toward removing this discrimination; and that the indefinite postponement of the promotional examination on November 5, 1948 reerected a barrier which effectively deprives all Negroes of any opportunity to qualify for, or attain employment as, plate printers in that Bureau.

Admittance to the promotion examination was limited to seven classifications of Bureau employees having permanent civil-service status and, within these classifications, to veterans of World War II under 41 years of age. From 100 entrance applications originally accepted, 94 applicants remain. Of these, 47 are Negroes.

The announced reasons for the postponement were: (1) that 20 power plate printing presses of considerably greater potential output than the presses then in use had unexpectedly become available and had been purchased for immediate installation; (2) that a program for modernization of the presses then in use had been developed and adopted; and (3) that if those steps proved successful the plate printers requirements of the Bureau could easily be met with existing personnel, therefore making it unnecessary to appoint apprentice plate printers for an indefinite period of time.

The bulletin postponing the examination held out for the applicants only the prospect that, "If the program fails, obviously it will be necessary to revive consideration of the apprentice program."

HEARING AND INVESTIGATION

The Board held a hearing on January 30, 31, and February 1, 1950, at which the appellants, their representatives, and a representative of the Treasury Department were present. Testimony was adduced from witnesses presented by the appellants or called by the Board itself. In addition to the information secured at this hearing and from a review of the file of the Treasury Department, the Board has obtained supplemental data from the Treasury Department, the Civil Service Commission, and other sources, with particular reference to possible racial discrimination in the recruitment and employment of plate printers and apprentice plate printers in the Government service.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The position of plate printer has been clearly identifiable in the pattern of Federal employment for many decades. It is unqualifiedly subject to civil-service laws and regulations. All citizens, regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin, are, therefore, entitled to an open channel toward employment as plate printers in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

2. The promotion policy of the Treasury Department, which is the only agency of the Federal Government employing plate printers, provides, in its departmental order No. 114, dated June 1, 1949, that—

"It is the policy of the Treasury Department normally to fill vacant positions above the customary recruiting levels in each bureau, office, and division by the promotion from within of qualified employees whose abilities have been demonstrated and who have the capacity to undertake more advanced work. Promotions will be based solely on merit. There will be no discrimination because of race, color, creed, or for any other reason. Preference will be given to seniority only when other qualifications are equal."

3. The number of plate printers employed throughout the country is relatively small, and the Bureau is by far the largest employer. On January 1, 1950, it had on its employment rolls 492 plate printers, a number which is more than 50 percent of the total number of this craft now in employment. Over the past 20 years the Bureau force, with some fluctuations, has grown from about 400 to nearly 500, despite improvements in equipment and technology which have increased individual-production capacity. No Negro is or ever has been employed by the Bureau as a plate printer.

4. Journeyman plate printers in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing must have had 4 years of apprenticeship, or its equivalent in practical experience. At present there are no apprentice plate printers employed in the Bureau, as the last apprentice became a journeyman this year. No Negro has ever been recruited or employed as an apprentice plate printer in the Bureau.

5. For at least 20 years prior to 1938 the Bureau met its plate printer personnel recruitment needs through appointment, on certification by the Civil Service Commission, of journeymen who had served an apprenticeship in private industry. The Civil Service Commission requires the full apprenticeship experience of 4 years or, since 1942, its equivalent of practical experience, as a prerequisite to such certification, but the Commission in no way restricts the operating Bureau to this single channel for meeting its need for plate printers. The recruitment of journeyman plate printers solely from private industry had the effect of erecting a barrier against Negroes who might aspire to become plate printers in the Bureau, because in private industry up to this time, Negroes have not had equal opportunity to secure the requisite training.

6. Since 1938 the number of plate printers appointed to the Bureau has averaged 49, and the number of separations 46 per year. As of January 1, 1950 there were 492 plate printers on duty in the Bureau and 20 vacancies to be filled. The Director of the Bureau expects that, subject to possible fluctuation in demand for currency and stamps, the plate printer force will be stabilized at approximately 500 journeymen after the installation of new presses and the modernization of old presses have been completed.

7. For several years there has been a shortage of qualified journeyman plate printers. This shortage is reflected in the amount of overtime worked by the plate printers on duty in the Bureau. On November 29, 1949, the Civil Service Commission announced an open continuous examination for plate printer. To date, as a result of this examination, the Commission has not secured a sufficient number of eligibles to fill existing vacancies in the Bureau and to provide for the normal annual turn-over in plate printer personnel. According to the Bureau's own estimate, separations are anticipated as follows: 1950, 36; 1951, 30; 1952, 30; 1953, 34.

8. Over the 13 fiscal years, 1938 to 1950, inclusive, the Bureau has recruited 75 apprentice plate printers, and it has carried on its rolls an average of 21 such apprentices for each of these years. None has been recruited since April 15, 1946.

Of these 75 apprentices, 61 were chosen from lists of eligibles certified by the Civil Service Commission from assembled written examinations, advertised and held throughout the United States, and 14 were recruited by such noncompetitive action as transfer, promotion, or reassignment. Negroes competed in these examinations and were certified as eligibles, and at the same time qualified Negroes were available for noncompetitive assignment within the Bureau as apprentice plate printers. But none of the 75 apprentices were Negroes. In at least one case a Negro eligible failed of appointment while white eligibles of lower rating on the same certificate were appointed. This Negro eligible was subsequently certified to another Government agency where he served his apprenticeship, and is now employed as a journeyman in another craft.

9. The cessation of apprentice recruiting in 1946 recreated the recruitment situation which existed prior to 1938. Negroes in considerable numbers, presently employed in the Bureau, and veterans of World War II, aspire to become plate printers. The announcement of the promotional examination in July of 1948 opened the channel for a specified group of Negroes in the Bureau, including the appellants. Continued postponement of the examination restores the exact situation which existed prior to the announcement and closes the only channel by which the Negro applicants can become plate printers in the Bureau.

DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The method of recruiting plate printers is clearly the responsibility of the executive branch of the Government and, particularly, of the officers charged with general management of the employing bureau. Generally speaking, these officers must be allowed to determine whether such recruitment shall be accomplished exclusively by recruiting journeymen or in whole or in part through an apprentice program. Such discretionary authority should, however, be exercised within the framework and in the light of the spirit and intent, as well as the letter, of civil-service law and regulations and of Executive and departmental orders. If the exclusive recruitment of journeymen operates, for any reason, to deprive any group of American citizens by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin, of opportunity to qualify for the civil-service position of plate printer, the recruitment policy and program should be changed.

The Fair Employment Board recognizes that the postponement of the apprentice plate-printer examination in 1948 was, at the time, an exercise of reasonable business judgment. But it concludes that any continuation of past recruitment methods and procedures as applied to plate printers in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing will inevitably involve an element of racial discrimination against Negroes, in that it will perpetuate a system which has operated effectively to bar Negro citizens from the civil-service position of plate printer in the Bureau.

The Board is gratified to learn that the Department of the Treasury has now rescheduled for March 15, 1950, the promotional examination, the indefinite postponement of which precipitated the appeal in this case. This is an encouraging step in the right direction, but is of itself insufficient treatment of the basic problem. The civil-service laws and regulations, the financial resources of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the numerical strength of the plate-printer force, and the pattern of work organization around the plate-printing press provide ample management flexibility to permit the operation of a recruiting system free from any taint of racial discrimination.

It is the recommendation of this Board that the best corrective of the existing situation will be found in the early initiation and continuous operation in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of an in-service training program with respect to the plate-printing craft, related numerically to the normal turn-over in that employee classification and to the total Government and private employment in this craft. This program should be open to all qualified employees of the Bureau within these numerical limits, thus effectuating the intent of Executive Order 9980 as implemented by the Department's promotional policy announced in Departmental Order No. 114 of June 1, 1949.

By direction of the Board:

JAMES L. HOUGHTELING,
Chairman, Fair Employment Board.

FEBRUARY 20, 1950.

A Congressman's Duty

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the News-Palladium of Benton Harbor asks—

> What is a Congressman's duty when he must vote on a measure which he dislikes but which is favored by so many of the people of his district that a vote against it might cost him his job? Should he abandon his own beliefs and vote for the measure, thus protecting his popularity at the polls? In doing so he might be the best representative of his district, which after all is what a Congressman is supposed to be. * * *
>
> Or should he stand by his own convictions and attempt to justify himself to his constituents on the ground that he did what he thought was best for the Nation? This course, too, could be right in some cases, where the Congressman might be convinced that the proposed action * * * would be harmful to the Nation as a whole. If it would harm the Nation, it would eventually harm his district also; seeing this, it would be his clear duty to vote for the good of the Nation and try to show his voters that he had done so.

The editorial raises an issue which almost daily confronts every elected legislative officeholder. There is no "yes" or "no" answer. The answer is sometimes "yes"; sometimes "no."

For example, everyone wants more at less cost, but it would be disastrous to enact legislation which would give to everyone, regardless of his need—let us say, a pension of $300 per month. Funds to pay that kind of a pension could only be obtained through taxation which would be ruinous. Certainly, no sound-thinking Congressman with the good of his country at heart would vote for something which he knew would destroy the Nation's economy.

Again, how can a Congressman know what his people actually want? Frequently, minority groups put on the heat, write the most letters, use the most newspaper space, talk the loudest. There is no easy answer to the question, "What do the people of my district want?"

There was a time when the people elected a Congressman because they had confidence in his judgment, trusted him to act for the benefit of the district and the Nation.

More recently, pressure groups have become numerous, well organized, vociferous; threaten their Representative with defeat if he does not vote the way that particular group wants, or thinks it wants. If I actually knew what a majority of my people, after having given consideration to the facts, wanted, I would either vote for the measure as advocated, or at least make my opposition thereto clear, give my reasons for that opposition so that at the next election, they would have an opportunity to select someone whom they thought would more often vote for the measures in which they believed.

A Congressman, unlike an employee in business or industry, is out of a job every 2 years. He must go to the voters to get a job. All things considered, a Congressman who does not truly represent the prevailing sentiment in his District is not re-elected. Inasmuch as it is almost impossible to ascertain in advance of the vote upon any one particular measure whether a majority of the people of the district favor it, a Representative is forced, if he is worth his salt, to vote his honest convictions. If that elected legislative official remains in office one term after another, it is therefore safe to assume that he has not only voted as his judgment and convictions indicated, but that he has also voted as a majority of the people desired. The only exception would appear to be when some wave of hysteria for a particular unsound course of action sweeps the country and the officeholder has not been able to point out the unsoundness of the proposed course of action.

A rapid turn-over in officeholders is usually due either to the pressure of a militant, powerful group representing special interests, or to the failure of the officeholder to make his views clear, to think and to act for the good of the Nation as a whole.

Ordinarily, a Representative who survives more than two terms is one who not only votes his own convictions, but at the same time votes as the real majority of his constituents wish.

Usually a Congressman votes his convictions and his convictions are from a practical standpoint, those of his people.

Tax Reduction

REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a specific suggestion about how to bring about a large boost in the living standard of every American, create more employment and better the general welfare of every American. My suggestion is simple. Cut taxes.

Last year our country's total tax bill was $56,000,000,000. This is considerably higher than our total food bill. If we reduce taxes by, say 20 percent, all of us will be able to eat about 20 percent better. Everyone would be better off—the farmer, the food processor, the retailer, and the customer. Remember the total value of all the farms in America plus all the farm machinery and all the livestock on all the farms is only $44,-900,000,000.

This same tax bill of $56,000,000,000 is almost as high as the combined annual cost of all food, housing, all household expense, medical care, and recreation for every person in this country. A 20-percent tax cut could mean about a 20-percent improvement in every one of these items. Think of it—20 percent better housing, 20 percent better furnishings, 20 percent better medical care, and 20 percent better recreation for every person in the country.

Taxes drag down our living standards. Let us reduce taxes and insure a better life for every American.

The Eightieth Republican Congress restored confidence to the people. The 1948 farm income, both gross and net, the laboring man's average annual income, and the businessman's income was the highest in the history of our Nation. Thanks to the good record of the Eightieth Congress.

Here are a few facts about the Republican Eightieth Congress:

Taxes: The people were saved $4,800,-000,000 by a tax-cut bill passed over three Presidential vetoes. Low-income groups gained greatest benefit.

Labor relations: Passed Taft-Hartley Labor-Management Relations Act over veto. It liberated workers, cut strikes, stabilized jobs, increased income to workers.

Un-American activities: Revealed Communist spy rings and exposed infiltration of Communists into Government positions with high authority.

National defense: Passed Unification of Armed Forces Act and greatly expanded the Air Forces, thus strengthening the Nation's defenses.

Home building: Freed the people of red tape, rules, regulations, and directives, permitting private initiative to double home building in 2 years.

Aged and blind: Passed a bill over President's veto increasing payments for aged and blind and needy dependent children.

Agriculture: Extended full 90 percent parity-price supports on basic farm crops.

Soil conservation: Appropriated more than $500,000,000 for soil-conservation practices on farm lands.

REA: Approved $800,000,000 for REA loans to provide electricity for nearly twice as many farms as any previous Congress.

Roads: Authorized and provided funds for 1948–49 farm-to-market road-building program five times larger than any previous single year.

Veterans: Increased benefits for needy and disabled veterans, their widows and children, and dependents of deceased veterans.

Health: Provided Federal aid for research into causes and treatment of cancer, heart, and teeth diseases.

Bureaus: Reduced number of useless Government agencies, boards, bureaus, and commissions over strenuous Presidential objections.

Foreign affairs: Cooperated in every way to the fullest extent with our United Nations officials in their efforts to negotiate peace.

Foreign aid: Gave relief to numerous foreign nations to help them reestablish themselves and enable them to restrain Communist aggression.

Budget: Balanced the Federal budget for the first time in 16 years.

National debt: Paid $7,000,000,000 on the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, above all else, in two crowded years the Republican Eightieth Congress gave new life and new meaning to the fundamental principle of American government, which is that government is the servant and never the master of the people.

Tax Reduction

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent war, Americans were footing the biggest tax bill in the Nation's history—shouldering the burden along with the other special wartime sacrifices which they were called upon to make. But today—nearly 5 years after the end of hostilities—our annual Federal tax bill is only slightly smaller than it was at its wartime peak in 1945. The astronomical tax figure may be more understandable when we realize that 18 cents of every national income dollar was paid to the Federal Government in some form of tax in the fiscal year 1949. Compare this to 8 cents per dollar of income which represents the tax bill only a decade ago. The farmer—the factory worker—the businessman—feels the heavy hand of Government in his pocket and he is voicing his complaints. The taxpayer is more than a harassed looking little man in a newspaper cartoon; he is a man with a voice who decries the extravagance of Government for which he must pay each time he receives his pay check, buys a train ticket or a package of cigarettes, or goes to a movie. If he is in a low-income group and would enjoy some of these so-called luxuries, he must bear an unfairly large portion of the excise taxes.

There seems to be rose-colored theory at present which says prosperity will last forever. Such a theory is dangerous if it blinds men to economic reality and keeps them from facing squarely the problems at hand. Economists and businessmen are finding warning signals in our economy which would be well to heed—signals which seem to indicate that continued prosperity is not inevitable without some incentives to maintain high levels of production and employment.

One danger signal became evident last year when businesses and individuals showed more reluctance to spend their money. Last year businesses were cutting back plans for expansion—putting less money into new plant and equipment for the first time since the end of the war. It might be interesting to note that the profits left to corporations in 1949, after paying what was owed to the Federal Government, were less than twice the amount of the tax payments themselves. Can this tax policy be called an incentive for business expansion? Industry must be able to offer the investors who make expansion possible a decent return on their money. If we are to have a growing economy, we must not shackle it with tax chains and repress its expansion.

The fuel that keeps the machines of business running is the consumer's dollar. A large and steady flow of dollars from consumers who are willing to buy is the basis for high levels of business activity. But in 1949 another danger signal was flashing for those who would look. For the first time since 1938, the volume of retail sales dipped below the level of the previous year—consumers were more reluctant to buy goods and services. A declining demand for goods necessarily affects the jobs of the people who produce them; in 1949 the number of unemployed persons rose to a monthly average of 3,500,000—the highest level since 1941.

As the postwar boom fed by accumulated wartime demand for goods slackens, any forces which tend to weaken purchasing power become more dangerous. The dollars which consumers have to spend are limited by the large slice of their income taken by the Federal, State, and local governments in the form of taxes. Some of these taxes are paid consciously, but many are hidden in the price which the consumer pays for the goods he buys.

Figures for 1948 show that about 23 cents out of each dollar spent by consumers was taken for taxes, assuming that all dollars spent in the United States share equally in the total tax load. Such excessive taxation only leads to economic deterioration, taking from the productive machine the consumer dollars which it needs to keep it running smoothly at high levels.

The cry to cut taxes is not the whole answer. Unless Government can live within its income by making appropriate economies, we must face the possibility of being saddled with an even larger public debt.

In these days when it is so important to make our free-enterprise system work and keep our country's economy strong, we must not stand by and watch a repressive tax policy stifle the economic progress of the Nation.

Reorganization Plan No. 12

REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution rejecting Reorganization Plan No. 12, which the President submitted to us last Monday, along with 20 other plans.

Reorganization Plan No. 12 abolishes the office of general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board and transfers all its functions to the Board and its Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, this plan is an illegal attempt, under the guise of being a Hoover Commission recommendation, to destroy the effectiveness of the Taft-Hartley Act. By this plan President Truman is brazenly attempting to repeal one of the most important features of the Taft-Hartley Act. He is attempting to do by indirection that which he has been unable to do directly.

Again he complies with the demands of certain union leaders, even to the extent of attempting to do that which is expressly prohibited by the Reorganization Act of 1949 and, at the same time, attempting to deceive the American people into believing that the proposal constitutes one of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to section 5 of the Reorganization Act, which act gave the President the power to prepare reorganization plans. Section 5 of that act placed certain limitations on the powers. That section expressly states that "no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—" and now I read from subsection (4)—"authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress."

In the light of that definite prohibition in the Reorganization Act itself it would take a great deal of legerdemain reasoning to justify legally the proposal of the President by which the National Labor Relations Board is to be vested with the functions of the Office of General Counsel.

I remind you that the Office of General Counsel was established by Congress in order to separate the prosecuting and the judicial functions of the National Labor Relations Board. It was first embodied in the so-called Smith bill which passed the House by overwhelming votes on two occasions, only to die in the Senate Labor Committee. It was incorporated in the Taft-Hartley Act, in a modified form which, as you know, the Congress enacted into law over the President's veto, and which we have consistently refused to repeal.

It is almost too elementary to mention the needed separation of prosecuting and judicial functions, particularly in such an act as that involving labor relations. A man cannot act as an advocate of one side of a controversy and, at the same time, inspire public confidence in his impartiality to decide that very same case in fairness and justice to all sides.

I do not wish to take the time now to discuss the various functions of the Office of General Counsel. There are doubtless certain things that should be done to redefine the functions of that office. That is what the Hoover Commission recommended.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the President would have the American people believe, the Hoover Commission did not recommend that the office be entirely abolished and its functions transferred to the Board and its Chairman.

I call your attention to what the task force report of the Hoover Commission had to say on this specific Office. It recognized—page 139—that the Office of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board was somewhat unique, as it serves as a prosecutor, administrator, and a policy maker. To the suggestion that the office should again be placed under the Board, the Hoover Commission task force called attention to the objection to having the prosecuting functions and the hearing of complaints united. It then suggests the following as a solution, and I quote from page 141 of the task force report on regulatory commissions:

> It may be that the administrative and policy-making functions could be subordinated more clearly to the Board's control while still maintaining an adequate separation of the truly prosecuting activities.

Reorganization Plan No. 12 submitted to us by President Truman does not carry out any recommendation of that character. His plan is merely masquerading as a Hoover Commission recommendation. He is using the Hoover Commission, which the people support, as a vehicle to carry out the demands of certain union monopolists, who want no restraints whatever on their power. These union monopolists want the office abolished because the General Counsel has refused to succumb to pressure to ignore violations of the law by labor organizations.

Surely our memories are not so short that we do not recall how our people suffered as a result of the recent coal strike. While the President sat idly by and allowed the coal shortage crisis to grow worse and worse, the General Counsel happily had authority to take some independent action. He obtained from the court an injunction to prohibit the strikers from seeking to make the operators agree to contract provisions which are expressly prohibited by law. His action served to narrow the issues in the coal dispute and served to hasten the coal-strike settlement.

Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have urged early action on the Hoover Commission recommendations in order to effectuate some economy. I have been very impatient with the delay on the part of the administration in putting this program into effect, and I have expressed that impatience on the floor of this House.

Last Monday, the day President Truman submitted these plans to us, I rose to express the hope that they would be in line with the Hoover Commission recommendations and that they would not just be some of the administration's pet schemes under the guise of the Commission's proposal.

Reorganization Plan No. 12 is not a Hoover Commission recommendation. It is not even legal. It is a plan expressly prohibited by the Reorganization Act itself. It is another one of the administration's pet schemes. It is another attempt to give the union monopolists whatever they want, the existing law, the Congress of the United States, and the American people to the contrary notwithstanding.

Senseless Taxation

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress assembled January 3, 1947, and ended January 3, 1949. The 1948 tax law was enacted April 2, 1948 and made retroactive to January 1, 1948. The President and his spokesmen constantly claim that this tax law is responsible for his budget deficit difficulties. What are the facts?

In fiscal 1948, which includes 6 months of calendar 1948, during which the new law was effective, personal income tax collections amounted to $29,997,780,639.

In fiscal 1949, a period when business generally had begun to slump, total personal income tax collections showed a drop of $2,272,628,261.

In fiscal 1948, corporate tax receipts were $10,174,409,834. In 1949 they jumped to $11,553,669,234, or an increase of $1,379,259,400.

Business was stimulated by the tax reduction granted the people by the Eightieth Congress, so that corporate profits soared, resulting in a net loss of revenue from corporate and personal income taxes of only $893,368,861. In that same year, a deficit of $1,700,000,000 was incurred. Mr. President, how do you and your supporters still contend that the

tax-reduction law passed by the Eightieth Congress is solely responsible for your budget deficits?

The fact is, we spent only $36,900,000,000 in fiscal 1948 as against expenditures of $43,100,000,000 in fiscal 1949, under complete Democratic control. The reason you are facing deficits is because you are spending too much money. More detailed information will be presented later.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include as part of these remarks an editorial appearing in the San Diego Union on Thursday, March 9, entitled "Senseless Taxation":

SENSELESS TAXATION

A lot of people at the seat of the United States Government should be given a course of required reading of the Constitution of the United States. If they read intelligently, they would find this primary provision relating to the taxing powers of Congress:

"The Congress shall have power—

"To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

Thus the taxing power of the Congress is definitely and specifically limited.

There is no authority to levy taxes for the purpose of giving or "lending" money to any foreign nation.

There is no authority to make levies for punitive or political purposes.

There is no authority to levy discriminatory taxes which take up to some three-fourths of the incomes of certain classes.

There is no authority to reach a taxing hand into the pocket of one citizen and hand his taxes over to another citizen.

There is no authority to impose taxes to promote experiments in socialism.

The abuse of the taxing power in recent years has been through invocation of the "welfare" clause. This has been made the excuse for outrageous favoritism and deliberate misinterpretation. There has been a continued and persistent effort to pervert this clause for the benefit of special groups and for donations to foreign nations. The thing which these tax eaters overlook in connection with welfare is one word:

"General."

The "general welfare" means the welfare of all the people—not one favored element or group, but the population as a whole.

It is inconceivable that the authors of the Constitution ever could have sponsored any system of taxation designed to give special benefits to one portion of the people through penalizing other elements.

It is inconceivable that they intended to permit the abuse of the taxing power to levy on the common necessities of life and thus increase the burdens of citizens through higher living costs.

Tables, drawn on authentic information, lately have been published in this newspaper showing what taxes cost the rank and file of people.

Taxes on a 13-cent bottle of milk total 8 cents.

Taxes on a package of cigarettes are 11 cents.

Taxes on a 5-cent bar of soap are 2 cents.

Taxes on a 50-cent can of baby powder are 18 cents.

Taxes on a $1,400 automobile are $700.

Taxes on a gallon of gasoline average 11 cents.

Taxes on a railway, bus, or airplane ticket are 15 percent.

Taxes on a $5 purse are $1.

And so it goes.

These are not all Federal taxes, but Federal imposts that compose the heavier load.

It has long been an axiom of able economists that when taxes take 25 percent or more of the national income, national bankruptcy must be the inevitable sequel. Already we are at that stage.

In the midst of all the pretentious talk about increasing our income as a Nation, Government is doing its best to prevent the increase by tax levies which discourage production and consumer expenditures.

"Taxation without representation" was the slogan of the Revolution which gave us our liberty. We are suffering the same evil now, through levies upon us by nonelected bureaucrats and executive autocrats.

Unless somebody at Washington resurrects the outmoded Constitution and insists on following its precepts the United States of America soon may be on the way out.

Juvenile Delinquency, Comic Books and Strips

REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the wave of juvenile delinquency throughout the Nation in the postwar period has focused attention on what parents and grown-ups are doing to arrest this tendency in child conduct. Faced as we are in this advanced age with the moving picture, the radio, and now the television, supplementing the great advances in the printing art, has given rise to many problems not alone with juveniles but with adults as well. Many serious thinkers have come to believe that the modern programs on the screen, in the air, as well as in comic books and strips, are not only accentuating the child-delinquency problem but are one cause leading to crimes of sex and violence.

The comic book has particularly come under observation by many of our citizens who are seeking answers to these perplexing questions. In fact many States and cities have attempted by the enactment of legislation to solve the problem. The New York State Assembly enacted the Feinberg comic-book censorship. It is reported that 60,000,000 comic books are sold in America every month. Not only did the New York Legislature enact such a law but some 14 other States and many cities have taken similar action. Some of these have aroused opposition, resentment, and the contention that such legislation is a direct threat to the freedom of the press. The book committee of the Child Study Association suggests that comic strips which stimulate sex by showing amorous women or scantily clad maidens struggling in the grip of jungle monsters, aren't suitable for young readers. Who, I pray, would contend that they are?

The Association of Comic Magazine Publishers itself has appointed an advisory committee of distinguished membership to point out ways of so improving the comics that they will become, not a menace to morals and incentive to crime, but an educational force in the mass marketing areas. Too much commendation cannot be given to this association for its attempt to clean house.

Our neighbor to the north, Canada, has recently revised its criminal code which has to do with obscene written matter. This provision makes everyone guilty of an indictable offense and liable to 2 years' imprisonment who makes, prints, publishes, sells or has in possession for any such purpose, any crime comic. The Canadian law specifically provides that the motives of the accused shall in all cases be irrelevant and that ignorance of the nature and presence of the matter shall not be considered a defense.

The great freedom enjoyed by the youth and particularly the children of tender age here in America and the opportunity accorded to the boys and girls of America to see depicted on the screen and over the television circuits and to hear radio programs as well as to read in the daily newspapers and magazines and comic books a multitude of salacious and sexy stories and crime problems arouses an unnatural interest in the children and forms lasting impressions on adolescent minds. It follows that some protective supervision over these media of transmission of thought should be exercised by duly authorized officials in order to protect the morals and well being of modern youth who will be the citizens of the tomorrows. The old saying that the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world is still true but today the mother in too many cases has abandoned the safeguards which formerly protected growing youth and has permitted outside influences to have the upper hand which in many cases leads the young mind and heart into devious paths to the detriment of the child.

An inquiry of the legislative bureau of the Congressional Library brings the information that there is no pending legislation in the national Congress seeking to provide some controls over the comics which capitalize on crime and sex for reader interest. There is need for a comprehensive study and appraisal of this whole problem so vital to the welfare of our Nation's youth with the end in view of enacting necessary legislation to meet the problem.

Housing Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *March 10, 1950.*

Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
New House Office Building.

DEAR VICK: I understand that at long last debate will be started on the House floor on the general housing bill. This is good news to the building industry because, in the most part, this legislation is needed at this time in order that we may continue at our present high level of home production.

However, in my opinion, the amendment known as H. R. 7402 which has to do with cooperative housing carrying with it direct subsidy from the Federal Government would prove to be very dangerous legislation.

According to the testimony given before the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. Foley admitted that H. R. 6518, now known as H. R. 7402, was designed to house people in the income brackets from $2,400 to $4,800 per year. For your information, this simply means that the Federal Government would be put in the position of subsidizing home purchasers who are today being approved by FHA on homes selling from $7,200 to $14,400. If a man's credit is good, FHA will approve a loan for him equal to three times his annual income; therefore, a man earning $4,800 per year could buy a home selling for $14,400.

I believe you will find that the official records will show that 68 percent of all the homes FHA insured during the first 6 months of 1949 were sold to people making $4,800 and less per year, and that 47 percent of the homes sold in the high-cost New York City area were sold to people earning less than $4,800 per year.

Little did we think only a few short months ago when the public-housing bill, designed to house the lower one-third of our population, that at this early date certain groups would be attempting to push a bill through Congress that would house the middle one-third of our population and also at the expense of the taxpayers.

I honestly believe that if this bill is passed the results will be (1) highly inflationary because certainly a great number of units would be built. We would have a further scarcity of materials (we have been forced to close our operations down for 2 weeks during the last 90 days because we have not been able to get sheetrock). (2) Discriminatory in that a man earning up to $4,800 can buy or rent shelter for approximately 25 percent less (at the taxpayers' expense) than his neighbor living across the street who bought on our present FHA and VA home-loan plans. (3) It will be one more long and I fear dangerous step for the Federal Government to take in the housing field.

I believe that this is the first time that I have attempted to make my feelings strongly felt to you with reference to any bill being considered on the House floor. I do hope that after you have analyzed this bill and heard the debate by the members of the Banking and Currency Committee that you will concur in my feelings in regard to the possible results of such a bill becoming a law.

With sincere personal regards,

W. P. ATKINSON.

Alaskan and Hawaiian Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, last week the House approved statehood bills for Alaska and Hawaii. Alaska was acquired from Russia about 1867 and Congress approved an organic act making the people of the Territory citizens of the United States about 1912. When this Territory was thus incorporated into the Union, the people of the United States, acting through the Congress, in substance said to the people of Alaska that in due course when your economy has developed sufficiently and when you have demonstrated your ability to handle your affairs of government, you will then be entitled to become one of the States of the United States of America. This is the historical program which the United States has followed since the inception of its organization and the creation of the Northwest Territory. Many of our present States first became organized Territories and later were accepted into the Union as States. They, too, had a very small population when accepted as States.

The very interesting point about Alaska is that the present Russian Politburo under the leadership of Mr. Stalin takes the position that the Czarist Government had no authority to sell Alaska to the United States of America, and, therefore, the present Russian Government seriously questions the validity of the ownership of Alaska by the United States of America.

In view of Alaska's most important strategic position in connection with the defense of the United States as well as Canada, and in connection with our international program of today, the whole world, outside of Russia and her satellites, have taken the position that the sooner we extend statehood to Alaska the better it will be for all of the people of the United States of America.

HAWAII

We should bear in mind that Hawaii was a self-governing people under a representative form of government at the time they asked for permission to annex themselves to the United States of America. After necessary negotiations the people of the United States and Hawaii agreed to join their resources, their economy, and their forms of government, and Hawaii was likewise incorporated into the Union as an organized Territory. For approximately 52 years the good people of those islands have been preparing for statehood. The Hawaiian Islands are likewise a pivotal defense base in our approach to the Far East.

The Hawaiian people contribute vast sums to the United States Treasury; have a very sound and efficient economy; are extremely loyal to the United States of America. If any organized Territory has ever justified being recognized as a State, we must admit the Hawaiians have qualified.

How soon the Senate will approve statehood for these two Territories is questionable. Some of the more vociferous take the position, first, that the Hawaiian people are not loyal, and, secondly, that due to the small population of Alaska as well as Hawaii, these islands should not be permitted to place two Senators in the United States Senate. Such a protest is indefensible; it is contrary to every principle we have advocated in connection with the last two world wars, which have cost us in dollars alone approximately $700,000,000,000, to say nothing about the dislocation of our economy, the loss of lives, and the troublesome days which still lie ahead for our people.

AMERICAN SAMOA

American Samoa is a group of islands some 900 miles south of the Equator acquired by the United States of America during the period 1889–99 through agreement between Britain, the United States, and Germany. At that time the great Samoan race was split by this agreement without their consent and approval. These three great powers simply made a division of the territory which suited their convenience and ideas. During all of these years American Samoa has made great progress. These people are as magnificent in character and intelligence and loyal and as ambitious as any people you could find in colonial life. In all of the colonial possessions of the earth there could be found no finer people. In stature, in general appearance, cleanliness, and sincerity they are par excellence. In American Samoa you find no poor people, rich, or so-called middle-class people of consequence. The economy of the islands is operated under the "matai" or "chieftan" system, with "high talking chiefs, talking chiefs," and other chiefs. The "matai" and the "chiefs" see that all of their clansmen or tribesmen—the very young, the teen-agers, the middle-aged, and the old—are all properly fed, clothed, and housed. They are ambitious from the standpoint of education and of striving toward obtaining a full and complete life as sought by the American people. The American Samoans and other parts of their race which are now under the control primarily of New Zealand—Germany having lost this territory to New Zealand following World War I—look forward to the day when the machinery of the Trustee Council of the United Nations, together with the Congress of the United States of America, will bring the whole Samoan race back together under the protection of the United States of America. Shortly our Congress will be called upon to consider the approval of an organic act setting up a civilian form of government for American Samoa—they having been under our Navy rule for the past several decades—and this act, when approved, will unquestionably offer American citizenship to the Samoans, giving them a bill of rights and set them up as a possession, but not as an organized territory, subject to becoming a State at some future date. The impact of the collapse of Dutch, British, and French colonial power in the far Southwest Pacific, together with our granting to the Philippines their independence, and the collapse of the Japanese Empire and the sweep of the Communists across China, all impose on the United States an obligation to quickly join together our citizens, our resources, our total strength. Hawaii and Alaska should be made States without further delay.

Address in Honor of Hon. Harris S. Richardson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered in honor of Senator Harris S. Richardson, of the Massachusetts Senate, on March 11, 1950, at Winchester, Mass.:

My friends of Winchester, to all of you I extend warm greetings and I want you to know I am deeply pleased to be here on this occasion. You are very kind to ask me to say a few words this evening and I am delighted to have this opportunity. I am extremely delighted to have this opportunity for two reasons.

First of all, and most important, it gives me tremendous pleasure to participate with all of my friends of Winchester in this meeting to honor two very distinguished citizens of Winchester and Massachusetts. It has been my privilege to know Senator and Mrs. Richardson for many years. We have worked together on many matters beneficial to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Always, I have experienced nothing but complete and generous cooperation. For years, I have considered myself most fortunate to have the assistance of such an able and distinguished gentleman as Senator Richardson. His honesty and sincerity are outstanding. His loyalty to me and my efforts and the work of serving this district in Congress has been a constant inspiration to me. It is my hope that the citizens of Winchester and all of us in Massachusetts will have the benefit of his wise counsel and services for many years to come. I say to you again, I am extremely delighted to be here this evening and to have this opportunity to briefly express in your presence my thanks and appreciation to Senator Richardson for his loyalty and the many fine contributions he has made to the life of our community.

When I was invited to express a few remarks this evening, I was requested to speak on issues relating to the national level. I do not believe this is the moment or the occasion to enter into a detailed discussion of the many problems that confront our Nation today. I am delighted, however, to touch on one important matter, on which I believe there is some incorrect information. It relates to my position regarding the subject of economy in Government. This is the second reason why I am delighted to be here this evening.

Recently, I have received a few letters from members of the League of Women Voters in Winchester inferring I am opposed to economy in government. At this moment I desire to nip that inference before it buds and develops into a springtime bloom. I am completely opposed to the deficit-spending program of the present administration in Washington. I am completely opposed to the socialistic schemes proposed by the administration in Washington. I am completely opposed to the Government control policies of the present administration, which gain deficit spending is financing. If my record in Congress is thoroughly examined I think the examiner would find I have consistently fought for lower taxes and for economy of operation of the Federal Government. It is my belief that if this Government proceeds on its present road of deficit spending this road will wind its way to only one end and that is socialism with its many hidden pathways leading to communism. Certainly I do not have to say to an audience of my friends in Winchester how vigorously I have fought against the rise of communism. I have fought for years and I am still fighting to stamp out communism in America. This must be done.

The inference regarding my position on the question of economy in government which I mentioned to you a moment ago, probably has been formed from the views and action I have taken in regard to the treatment of the Nation's disabled war veterans. There are thousands and thousands of disabled men in every State in the Union. Now that the last great war is a few years past it is so easy to forget the obligation and debt this Nation owes to them. If you happen to be so unfortunate as to be a disabled veteran or if one of them happens to be a member of your family, you do not forget. These men are in constant need of medical care and hospitalization. The need for hospital care is increasing rather than decreasing. When these men marched off to war—to defend America—our way of life and our freedom—the Great Government of the United States and the country as a Nation solemnly promised them that if their flesh and limb were torn by the enemy's steel they would be completely cared for at the moment and in the years to come. I know these men—I have talked to thousands of them—I have seen their wounds—I know of their suffering. So long as I am a Member of Congress, yes, as long as I am physically able I shall fight and strive to see to it that our Government and our country keeps that promise. As far as I am concerned, there is no economy involved in the elimination of hospitals, so seriously needed for the care of our disabled.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the Congress, of which I am a member, is much closer to the constant and continuing needs of the disabled veteran than the Hoover Commission. The Veterans' Committee is a permanent committee of Congress shouldered with the responsibility of knowing the facts at all times. The Hoover Commission is not organized on a permanent basis and certainly was not and is not in a position to make recommendations based upon changing factual situations. Certainly no committee or commission has the moral right to make recommendations which might interfere with the duty and solemn promises of the Government of the Nation. Where honor is involved there is no compromise.

Often it has been said the public has a short memory. Sometimes I believe there is evidence of truth in this statement. Well do I remember, and so do you, that fateful morning of June 6, 1944, as the dawn broke the blackness of night, when the press and radio announced to the Nation that millions of our men were storming the enemy beaches of the Normandy coast. Many of them fell that morning on the cold, wet sand. About midday the editorial writers of our press, our clergy, and our national leadership called for a silent 5 minutes for the people of this Nation to pray for their safety and for their success. Writers and leaders throughout the Nation expressed in every newspaper and magazine and medium of publication that there was nothing too good now or in the future for these American boys, these American boys who at that moment were driving head-on into the rain of the enemy's fire. With them they carried the prayers and hopes of freemen throughout America and the world. My friends, that was just 6 years ago come this June. In just 6 years of ageless time we hear the hue and cry—eliminate these veterans' hospitals, cut down our military hospitals, these hospitals cost too much money, too much is being given to these disabled veterans. Oh, how easy it is to forget, to forget particularly if you and you and you who are doing the forgetting are safe and secure in your warm comfortable homes and are in no way involved.

Ladies and gentlemen, I repeat to you now, and again say to the American people with all of the sincerity and force at my command, I am opposed to the elimination of these already overcrowded veteran's hospitals, under the cloak and guise of economy. Economy, true economy, is always both an admirable and popular objective. There are some gentlemen in the Government today who would have you believe they are the great master minds, the super minds, sent to us just in the nick of time, to knock heads together and make a saving by putting two disabled veterans into one bed. Whenever such a person attempts to knock the heads together of able intelligent and sincere leaders thoroughly familiar with every detail of their responsibility all such a person reaps is headaches and more headaches. Based upon my knowledge of the facts, I know the elimination of these hospitals and doctors certainly is not economy and those who think about the matter for 1 minute can come to the same conclusion as I do, that it is not economy. When an individual in the community betrays his word or his promise he loses respect among his fellow men. When a nation breaks it's word or it's promise it no longer is worthy of honor and is unworthy of the respect, not only of its citizens but of the rest of the people of the world. This Nation, this America, must keep its promises. It must keep the faith.

In concluding my remarks this evening, I shall leave with you this important consideration. In view of recent developments in warfare, the atomic bomb, the hydrogen bomb, and other methods of population annihilation; the most important issue facing all of the people in this great and honorable land is survival. I do not propose to discuss with you all of the elements of this issue. I just want to say to you this: I believe in economy in government just as you do. I believe in the lowest possible tax rate, just as you do. I am in favor of the repeal of the nuisance taxes, and I am in favor of efficiency and common sense in the conduct of government, just as you are. But when our freedom, our free way of life, our very life itself is at stake; it is folly, utter folly, to think and believe that the saving of dollars can save America. If this great and wonderful country, all of us love so dearly, is to live out this twentieth century and the centuries to come; we must be strong, stronger than any potential enemy. Freedom is not cheap. Freedom cannot be maintained at bargain prices. If you want freedom, if you do not want your country ruined, if you still want the sweet life of these lovely, charming, and glorious old towns and villages of America—such as Winchester—you must pay the price.

James R. Tetler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to enclose a fine eulogy on the life of the Honorable James R. Tetler, ex-postmaster of Lawrence, Mass., which appeared in the editorial column of the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on March 14, 1950.

The kind and lovable Bob Tetler died as the result of an automobile accident while carrying on his humane work in assisting one of his neighbors, Mr. Smith, when he became suddenly ill while awaiting a bus.

Mr. Tetler will long be remembered by many of us in Essex County, as an able and capable legislator, an excellent public servant, and widely admired husband and father:

A GOOD CITIZEN PASSES

As a result of a characteristically gracious act of neighborliness, James R. Tetler is dead. Needless to say, his death has occasioned much grief in hearts of the many friends he made throughout a busy lifetime of public service.

One of the stalwarts of the Republican Party here for many years, Mr. Tetler was favorably regarded as a dependable man of quiet strength—a man whose resourcefulness and quick mind made him a desirable ally in a tough situation. His political acumen was widely respected. Many a fledgling in politics benefited by the wisdom he accumulated during long years devoted to the Republican cause. No fanciful theorist, he had a practical approach to the problems of the day. He believed that solid men of affairs, acting intelligently in concert, could deal with anything. Nothing could persuade him that it was necessary to depart from ordinary common sense to get good results at any level—city, county, State, or in Washington.

As a State senator, as postmaster here, as superintendent of Essex County training school, he exemplified what he believed. In the negative sense, he never abandoned the sane principles which repudiated radicalism of any sort. In the positive sense, he brought to every job he tackled a high degree of competence, abounding energy, and the quiet enthusiasm of a man healthily interested in his work, his community, and his fellow man.

Cooperative Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to analyze the cooperative-housing bill.

THE PROPOSAL

A Government controlled and managed corporation would be set up within the Housing and Home Finance Agency for the purpose of making 50- to 60-year loans to housing cooperatives. The estimated interest rate of 3 percent and the amortization period of twice that obtainable from private sources would permit lower monthly payments.

This Federal-lending corporation would obtain its money by an initial United States Treasury stock purchase of $100,000,000 and by issuing debentures guaranteed by secondary 3-year debentures which are in return guaranteed by the Federal Government. This device is an amendment of the original form of Government-guaranteed debentures in a futile attempt to meet objections made by the Federal Reserve Board that this lending scheme is inflationary. One billion dollars—$2,000,000,000 in House version, H. R. 7402—would thus be obtained, plus twenty-five million United States Treasury dollars for preliminary planning loans. The cash down payment would be 2½ percent on application, 2½ percent on completion, and an additional 5 percent payable over 20 years. There are no limits on construction costs; the loan to the cooperative can be up to 100 percent of costs. The Government mortgage corporation would be tax exempt. The cooperative-housing organizations would enjoy the usual cooperative-tax exemptions under their State laws, and by reason of their nature would pay no Federal income taxes.

REASONS FOR REJECTION

First. It is not necessary. The private home-building industry is already adequately providing for the middle-income group. Proponents of this bill say they seek to shelter the $2,400 to $4,800 income group for a monthly shelter cost of $45 to $75, exclusive of utilities. In 1948, 65 percent of all new for-sale housing insured under FHA was purchased by those earning less than $4,800 per year. The equivalent shelter rent was between $36.21 and $74.45 per month. In the first 6 months of 1949, 68 percent of this new housing went to the under-$4,800-income group. According to Federal Reserve Board figures, 50 percent of nonfarm families with incomes of less than $4,000 now own their homes, of which 75 percent are mortgage-free. The persons for whom this bill is stated to be intended constitute the customers for private building.

Second. The Federal Government would become a mortgage lender. This device of a Government-controlled corporation using $100,000,000 of Government funds plus $1,000,000,000 in Government-guaranteed debentures is a thinly disguised form of direct Government lending. There is no distinction between this and the sale of Treasury bonds, the proceeds of which might be used for Government lending. Further, the tax-exempt status of such a Government agency gives it an uneconomic and unfair competitive advantage over private lending agencies.

Third. It will undermine the present savings and investment system. Its passage would threaten the security and incomes of millions of small depositors in insurance companies, banks, and building-and-loan companies. It will force such companies to reduce the return paid on savings nearly to the vanishing point and thus tend to destroy all incentive for thrift. It is the stated objective of the bill to make loans at 3 percent interest for a term of 50 years—extendible up to 63 years. No private lender can compete with this. The inevitable result will be to channel all lending into this pattern.

Fourth. It is highly discriminatory. The more favorable financing terms available to a selected class of individuals in cooperatives, which likewise enjoy State and Federal tax advantages, discriminate against veterans and nonveterans alike who are paying or who may undertake in the future to pay for their homes at higher rates of interest for shorter terms and paying full taxes. Those not desiring to join a cooperative, or whose incomes are too high or too low, would likewise be discriminated against.

Fifth. It will undermine the present FHA and VA programs in housing. If this scheme is adopted, few people would seek to purchase or to rent homes under the higher interest rate and shorter terms afforded by VA and FHA. This would adversely affect the volume as well as the long-term security of properties the financing of which is now guaranteed or insured by agencies of the Federal Government.

Sixth. It is inflationary. The stimulative effect of low interest, 50- to 60-year financing will serve to drive construction costs upward. An estimated 225,000 units would be constructed under the proposed law, but the authorization would be added from time to time in substantial amounts and numbers as political pressures for more and more easy Government credit would develop. The proposal has been amended from its original form by providing Government guaranty now one step removed from the debentures issued by the mortgage corporation, in an attempt to meet severe criticism by the Federal Reserve Board that the whole device is inflationary. The new form of guaranty does not in any way meet this objection. While an attempt is made by its advocates to compare the guaranty to FHA mortgage insurance, it is completely different in that FHA encourages the use of private financing by private lenders direct to the borrower whereas this scheme collects a pool of capital in the hands of a Government corporation through the sale of Government debentures, relying solely on the Government credit. It diverts and changes the flow of mortgage funds into Government hands rather than stimulating it through private lenders.

Seventh. There is no limit on construction costs. The bill contains no dollar limits on the construction cost of or the maximum mortgage amount which can be loaned to a project either on a room or a unit basis except for general language cautioning against elaborate or extravagant construction. This is in sharp contrast with the limits on mortgage amounts ordinarily contained in FHA insurance on privately built and privately financed rental housing. It should be noted that the same bill which permits 100 percent Government loans to cooperatives without any limit on construction cost, seeks to reduce the mortgage limit upon section 207 FHA insured privately financed operations from the present $8,100 a unit under section 608 to a maximum of $7,200, in the case of smaller apartments, and $8,000 in the case of apartments averaging 4½ rooms or over and valued at

$10,000. Thus, the bill accomplishes the effect of allowing the smallest and most unfavorable mortgage to privately financed rental construction; slightly higher mortgage to those cooperatives financed by FHA insured mortgages under section 213; and, a totally unlimited mortgage—at privately unattainable terms of interest and amortization—to cooperatives receiving financing through this direct lending scheme.

Eighth. Occupancy is not limited, even to middle-income families. There is nothing whatsoever that limits occupancy to the persons for whom it is stated by its proponents to be intended. The bill requires merely that the project be suitable for persons of middle income. Further, even if original occupants are, by voluntary action of the Administrator, limited to middle-income persons, there is no requirement that occupants whose incomes increase in excess of the $4,800 level shall move. (In testimony in favor of the bill, Administrator Foley stated that it was not intended to so require and that such a requirement would be impossible of administration.) It is therefore entirely possible that persons with incomes well over $5,000 could remain in the accommodations produced under this scheme, enjoying extraordinary low rents made possible by Government credit.

Ninth. It will establish a vast additional Federal bureaucracy. In addition to the considerable staff required to handle the issuance of $1,000,000,000 in debentures, to appraise projects and to handle details of loans to the cooperative associations, the bill calls for technical assistance and supervision of their operations. It may be expected that an additional Federal agency, equaling or exceeding in size any of the present housing agencies (FHA, PHA, and HLBB) will be required for administration.

Tenth. Cooperative participants in the scheme are doomed to eventual dissolution. A 50-year 3-percent loan on a level payment basis amortizes at the negligible rate of 72 cents per thousand for its first year. For the first 10 or 15 years of the loan, physical depreciation of the property is considerably more rapid than amortization of the debt. Over this period of time, the cooperator will be carrying a debt considerably in excess of the mortgage value of his unit. During the first 20 years, when the home purchaser would normally have his home almost completely paid for, a cooperator in one of these units will succeed in reducing his outstanding debt practically not at all.

Since his monthly charges must continue at the same level over a period of 50 years or longer (almost a normal lifetime), he will one day find the carrying charges on his unit in competition with lower charges on newly constructed projects. During the 50-year period, if past experience is any guide, construction costs may well drop below present levels. While proponents of this legislation cite an attainable $65 rental (in claimed contrast to present-day $90 rentals), it should be remembered that 10 years ago construction costs were such that rental housing could be profitably produced and rented for $50.

ELIMINATION OF VA SECTION 505 (A)

S. 2246 provides, at page 108, title IV, that on or after 180 days from its enactment into law, no further guaranty shall be granted under section 505 (a), combination FHA–VA loans.

REASONS FOR REJECTIONS

First. Elimination of this section would destroy one of the most prolific sources of private credit and would, by that much, diminish the financing opportunities available to veterans, consequently increase sales of mortgages to FNMA, and ultimately cause demand for direct Government lending; and

Second. Under section 505 (a) a veteran, who by reason of change of work or residence has to purchase another home, can use his GI rights again; under section 501 alone, he cannot.

When the House passed H. R. 6070 last year, unfortunately a similar provision striking this highly useful and desirable section was allowed to remain in the bill. VA reports that, as of the end of 1948, 155,983 such second mortgages had been guaranteed; 93,624 of these were in 1948 alone. Thus the need to continue section 505 (a) is clear.

DIRECT GOVERNMENT HOME MORTGAGE LENDING THROUGH VA

S. 2246, section 512 (a), page 108 title IV, provides for $150,000,000 of direct Federal loans to veterans up to $10,000 at 4-percent interest where it is shown that the veteran is qualified for a GI 501 loan but cannot obtain it.

REASON FOR REJECTION

Direct Government lending, except in the direst emergency, discourages private credit, progressively usurps fields of private activity and has dangerous possibilities of waste and political favoritism. This was rejected by the House last year when it passed H. R. 6070, containing general revisions of FHA and VA mortgage insurance and guaranties.

DISPOSITION OF WAR HOUSING

S. 2246, at page 31, title II, contains the proposal (stricken from H. R. 6070 by the House committee) which deals with authority to dispose of both permanent and temporary Lanham Act war housing. This title of the bill contains 39 pages and completely reverses previously expressed congressional policy with respect to war housing disposition which, under the Lanham Act, was to demolish the temporary housing as soon as possible and to sell the permanent housing to private investors.

REASON FOR REJECTION

Disposition of war housing is a separate subject which has no place in a bill dealing with mortgage financing. It should be considered separately so that it can receive the attention which its importance and detailed length warrant.

The provision in this bill would turn over 43,709 permanent units, plus any others requested within 60 days, to local public housing authorities to become tax-exempt public housing. In addition, 62,800 units of veterans reuse housing and 162,200 units of temporary war housing would similarly be given away to local agencies.

TWENTY-FIVE MILLION DOLLAR RFC FHA LENDING AUTHORIZATION

In the Senate bill, S. 2246 at page 123, title VI, the Housing and Home Finance Agency is given $25,000,000 under a new provision (paralleling that formerly existing in RFC under its section 102 but not including mass production of conventional houses) to make loans to finance the purchase and erection of prefabricated houses or site improvements for prefabricated houses.

REASONS FOR REJECTION

First. Previous authorization to RFC to make loans of this character went almost entirely to Lustron Corp. The experience was, to say the least, not too happy even under RFC's sound and comparatively conservative administration. Certainly experience does not warrant continuation of this device in the hands of HHFA which is completely unfamiliar with lending of this sort.

Second. Enactment of this proposal would carry still further the process of converting HHFA into an operating agency for direct Government lending; instead of preserving its original purpose of over-all policy making.

PRESIDENTIAL POWER TO REDUCE LOANS, AND SO FORTH

S. 2246—section 606, page 122, title VI—contains a provision, also contained in H. R. 7402 as section 301, which gives the President power to reduce the maximum amount, ratio of loan to value, of maximum maturities of any loan made, insured or guaranteed by any agency of the Government.

REASONS FOR REJECTION

First. This would provide an arbitrary summary power to reduce or completely eliminate effective governmental aids to private finance such as FHA or VA, without any opportunity for the private building industry to be heard. It cannot be doubted that this provision carries possibilities of drastically curtailing private construction, in view of experience to date, in which administration proposals have held private housing mortgage aids to considerably less favorable levels than advocated for cooperatives and granted to public housing.

Second. This device strongly suggests experience in England in which private builders have been permitted to construct only one house for every five built by public housing authorities.

Tons of Skim Milk Available to Agencies—Former Mayor Johnson's Friend Campaigns for Food Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks and include clippings from newspapers, I am inserting the following items from the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News of date March 11 and March 9, 1950:

TONS OF SKIM MILK AVAILABLE TO AGENCIES—CATCH IN UNITED STATES PLAN IS FOR SEEKERS TO PAY HANDLING CHARGES

WASHINGTON.—The Department of Agriculture has 4,601,104 pounds of dried skim milk stored in a warehouse in Hoboken, and available to public welfare agencies which can show a need for it, guarantee its distribution and pay for handling charges.

In addition, there are 866,096 pounds of dried eggs similarly stored in another warehouse in Jersey City.

In the New England States there are millions of bushels of potatoes in Government storage, and throughout the Nation there are millions of tons of other foodstuffs, including butter, beans and even meat.

STORAGE RATE HIGH

It was all bought up as surplus by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and in addition to losing its high food value by the hour through decomposition, it is costing the taxpayers about $60,000 a day for storage.

The man who has supervision over the foods stored in New Jersey is James S. King, State supervisor of commodity distribution, whose office is at 520 East State Street, Trenton.

Representative JOHN W. HESELTON, a Massachusetts Republican, is currently receiving congratulatory letters from all over the country for the effort he has been making to get this food into the homes of those who need it, on a paid freight basis.

To date, he has had some success in his own area, because public and private welfare agencies have been alerted and have organized to do the job; but he hasn't been able to do so well in other sections.

The fly in the ointment is that the Department of Agriculture can't release this food to an agency which can't transport and distribute it, and can't pay for all other handling charges.

Private welfare agencies can only get potatoes, and since there are no Government spuds in storage in this State (although there are some in New York City) it wouldn't be practical for such agencies in New Jersey to get into the picture.

The Salvation Army, for instance, did it up in Representative HESELTON's bailiwick, however. The Army found out who needed potatoes, carted them from a warehouse, and saw that they were distributed to eligible families.

Public welfare agencies, city and county, can do with the skim milk and dried eggs stores in New Jersey, precisely what the Salvation Army did with the potatoes in Massachusetts.

They had better get a wiggle on, Representative HESELTON warns because much of the food is going bad, although most of it is still edible and wholesome.

FORMER MAYOR JOHNSON'S FRIEND CAMPAIGNS FOR FOOD DISTRIBUTION

WASHINGTON.—A Massachusetts friend of former Mayor John R. Johnson of Passaic is waging a one-man fight in Congress to force the Department of Agriculture to distribute millions of dollars worth of surplus food to needy persons, free of all charge.

Representative John W. HESELTON, Republican, of Deerfield, Mass., hopes President Truman will bring some pressure to bear in the matter "before the end of this week, when I understand he is going to leave for a vacation in Florida."

The Massachusetts Congressman and the former mayor of Passaic are friends of long standing, and on several occasions have been together in Florida, where Mr. Johnson has spent some winters in recent years.

Weeks ago Representative HESELTON called the attention of Congress to the fact that tremendous surplus stores of potatoes, dried eggs, and other commodities were available in Government warehouses, and demanded that they be distributed to agencies which could turn them over to needy persons.

A hitch in the program developed, however, when the Department of Agriculture declared that recipient agencies would have to pay all handling and transportation charges involved, and would have to foot all bills for whatever packaging might be necessary.

Eligible to receive the food under current regulations are schools which can use it in lunch programs, and State and local public-welfare organizations. Private welfare agencies are eligible to receive potatoes only.

In all cases the recipient groups must pay for transportation and handling from wherever the food is stored to areas in which it will be distributed.

New Jersey is included in the Department of Agriculture's northeast area, embracing Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont and West Virginia. The area office is at 641 Washington Street, New York City.

Waste of Surplus Foods and of Public Funds

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I understand the President has landed safely at Key West, so I sent him another telegram. I should like to read it:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 15, 1950.*

The PRESIDENT,

Yacht "Williamsburg," en route to Florida:

Another $60,000 wasted. Total loss to American taxpayers, $2,460,000. Some 52,000,000 of these taxpayers will have paid their taxes to Federal Government by midnight. All the taxes of 45,555 taxpayers since February 2, the date when H. R. 7137 and 2 companion bills were filed in House, which are going to redeem this inexcusable waste. Regret to report that since your request to Secretary Brannan Saturday that he give my correspondence his careful and appropriate consideration I have heard nothing from him. This inexplicable silence and inexcusable lack of action will not be forgotten or forgiven by the American taxpayers when they finally realize the full facts. Nor will the thousands of needy men, women, and children, who could and would eat this food now, understand the failure to act promptly as I have repeatedly requested. I regret you had such a difficult trip to Key West, but assume you have fully recovered from the effects of it. I now repeat my urgent request that you order specific remedial action immediately.

I also wish to quote here copies of letters I have sent to the President and Secretary Brannan:

MARCH 15, 1950.

The PRESIDENT,

Key West, Fla.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing a copy of a page from the RECORD of yesterday for your files, together with confirmation of the day letter I sent you this morning.

Sincerely yours.

MARCH 15, 1950.

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,

Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For your information I enclose a copy of a day letter I have sent to the President at Key West this morning, and a page of the RECORD of yesterday.

May I ask you also to take the promptest kind of remedial action and see that your approval is sent to the House Committee on Agriculture of H. R. 7135, 7136, 7137, and 7138.

Sincerely yours.

I telephoned the office of the gentleman from California (Mr. WHITE) to advise him that I intended to discuss his remarks of yesterday and his misunderstanding of the situation now prevailing. I am advised that he has left for an important out-of-the-city engagement, but will be here tomorrow. I shall try to clear this matter up then, but for his ready convenience I am listing the dates and pages of the RECORD when I have discussed this matter: February 2, resolutions introduced; 9th, page 1734; 13th, pages 1768, A1018; 14th, page 1803; 20th, page 1997; 21st, page 2017; 23d, page 2308; 25th, page A1365; March 4th, page 2819; 7th, page 2953; 8th, page 3038; 9th, page 3142; 13th, page 3257; and 14th, page 3311.

Special Favors for a Special Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to an important editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 14, 1950:

SPECIAL FAVORS FOR A SPECIAL GROUP

It goes without saying that legislation which purports to help the middle- ($3,700-$4,400) income group to get cheaper housing carries tremendous popular appeal. That is why the administration is backing it to the limit. That is why the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Boyle, is calling all politicians to apply the heat to Senators when they vote tomorrow. But no matter how popular may be the appeal, the legislation is bad and ought to be defeated.

It ought to be defeated because it is discriminatory and unsound. Using tax money contributed by all Americans, it singles out a special group of Americans—those in the middle-income brackets who choose to join a housing cooperative—for special benefits. Under this bill, the American who joins a cooperative can obtain the benefit of low interest—3 percent or under—and pay off his housing loan in 50 or 60 years, a come-on proposition designed to mislead borrowers and perpetuate debt. But the American in the same income bracket who prefers not to join a cooperative housing scheme must pay 4 percent or more and pay off the loan in 25 years. The same Government, indirectly or directly, would be backing both types of loan.

In a system of society based on free enterprise, which we are spending a large part

of our substance to protect throughout the world, cooperative, nonprofit enterprises are as permissible as any others. But like other demonstrations of free enterprise, they should stand on their own feet. The pending bill goes much further, however. It offers hidden Government subsidies in a variety of forms as a mark of special favor to nonprofit cooperatives. If the principle behind this bill is carried to its logical conclusion, and supported with public funds and Government credit to make it work, there will be no room in America for one of the largest of all taxpaying, private-enterprise industries, the private housing industry. It would eventually become an industry supported by Government, with everybody joining a housing cooperative under the supervision of another huge Government bureaucracy.

The bill ought to be defeated on other grounds. It would place private housing, including FHA and veterans' housing, at a serious competitive disadvantage. It would in time weaken the stability of billions of private funds invested in such housing by insurance companies, building and loan companies, and millions of middle-income men and women whose savings have been put into the independent purchase of homes. For when the Government makes cheap money available nobody can beat the Government at offering cheaper money.

The financial aspects of the bill have been opposed by the Federal Reserve Board, and the Board's objections, in the opinion of distinguished members of the Senate's Committee on Banking and Currency, have not been removed by committee amendments. The bill violates rules of risk that private lenders must observe. Its effect on bringing down the cost of housing is challenged. For billions of cheap money would be poured into housing construction at a time when housing construction is already going at top speed. The effect would be more likely to inflate already inflated costs of construction than to bring the costs down. And while ostensibly singling out the middle-income group as the group in special need of help, this bill is singling out a group for which as much if not more housing now is being built than for any other.

Responsible Members of Congress will consider this bill on its merits, and not because the real-estate lobby opposes it or the Democratic National Committee favors it. If so considered, it ought to be defeated by a healthy margin.

Letter to a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to a constituent:

DEAR FRIEND: For reasons best known to themselves, the Oneida Dispatch has started a crusade against your Congressman. Their chief complaint is that Edwin Arthur Hall is "all things to all men".

If that is so, I gladly accept the challenge.

Ever since I have served you in Congress, I have tried to look upon all men with a friendly understanding.

Perhaps I am wrong, but I feel that every American citizen has the right to expect his elected representatives to be for him rather than against him.

Whenever anyone comes to me with a problem, I try to help him, not scoff at him.

Why the Dispatch does not approve of this position, I do not know.

Are they carrying the ball for a handful of petty dictators who feel that I should serve them and not the Madison County people who elected me?

Your Congressman

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

Statement of D. C. Greer Before the Committee on Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Works in the House of Representatives is conducting hearings on a bill entitled "A Federal Aid Highway Act of 1950." Mr. D. C. Greer, State highway engineer of Texas, and also president of the American Association of State Highway Officials, appeared before this committee on March 13, 1950. I wish to include his statement in the RECORD, together with a statement of policy which had been adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials in Chicago in November 1949.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the accomplishments of previous aid highway acts, as this method has proven very successful in providing an integrated highway system for our Nation. However, with millions of additional automobiles on our highways today together with the fact that highway construction was greatly curtailed during the war, we must give serious consideration to an expanded highway program for the next few years.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement made by Mr. D. C. Greer before the Committee on Public Works:

STATEMENT OF D. C. GREER, STATE HIGHWAY ENGINEER OF TEXAS, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the American Association of State Highway Officials is, as its name implies, an association composed of the highway officials of the 48 States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, with the cooperation of the United States Bureau of Public Roads.

Approximately 34 years ago, the National Congress passed the basic Federal-aid Highway Act of 1916, which was destined to be the beginning of a policy on road transportation that has proven in the subsequent years to be one of the greatest, if not the greatest, contributions of the national government to the economic welfare of our people. Traditionally, since this original law, it has been the practice of the National Congress to re-enact from time to time the Federal-aid Highway Act, in order to provide continuity of the road improvement program of this country.

The Federal-aid highway program was suspended, of course, during the period of World War II and it was started again with the post-war program authorized by the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1944, which provided Federal-aid for roads for the fiscal years 1946, 1947, and 1948. This act was supplemented by the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1948 and furnished Federal aid funds for roads for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951.

The allocation of the last year's funds, as provided in the 1948 act, was made this past October. Therefore, in order for the Federal-aid highway program to continue without interruption, it is essential that the National Congress enact new Federal-aid highway legislation during this, the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. Additional allocations under such new legislation would become effective with the fiscal year 1952. It is essential that Federal aid authorizations for highways be enacted well in advance of the actual date of availability of funds, in order that both Federal and State Governments may make the necessary long-range plans well in advance of the actual initiation of the programs of work for which the funds are provided.

As I have previously pointed out, the Federal Government has, in the past, assumed the duty and responsibility of providing the leadership to the States in a well-conceived highway development program. We feel sure that it is your desire to continue this leadership which has proven so profitable in the past. Consequently, it is not our purpose to appear here in an attempt to sell you or to beg a specific road program. We do, however, consider it our duty and responsibility as highway officials, with long experience on the front line of the highway program, to report to you our studied and sincere judgment of the proper methods that might be utilized by you to accomplish the greatest good for this country in the realm of roads during the coming years.

We do not consider it necessary to point out to you that America is literally a Nation on wheels and the world's greatest automotive country, with 42,000,000 motor vehicles registered in the United States last year, which represents a 30 percent increase in the past 10 years. We know that you have a complete knowledge of the value of the present day dollar in buying such things as roads and bridges. We know that you are well acquainted with the fact that the Federal Government is now collecting in taxes approximately $1,300,000,000 per year from the motor vehicle users in this country and we further know that you gentlemen of the Congress are well acquainted with the day-by-day wear and tear on our highway system, in addition to the need of the further expansion of the road system in this country. Consequently, it will be my purpose to discuss briefly with you the possibilities of a program accomplishing the desired objectives on roads, so well known to you.

At this point, gentlemen, I would like to insert in the record an estimate of needs of the Federal-aid systems as of December 31, 1949, prepared under the direction of a special subcommittee of the American Association of State Highway Officials for a study of highway finance problems. In filing this estimate of needs, may I point out that it is based on the best information available to us as highway officials at the present time. Obviously, an estimate of such proportions as this must be varied with changing conditions of traffic and it should be construed as a gage of our needs at this time, based on the knowledge available to us at this time.

The highway officials of the United States and Territories met together last November and discussed for several days the highway problems of the Nation. After carefully analyzing the highway needs and the abilities of the States to carry out the details of a new and expanded highway program, almost unanimous decision was reached by the States and Territories concerning a new highway program and our presentation will be

based upon this agreed decision. I might add that our position is not considered perfect for any one State but, based upon a tolerant, give-and-take attitude, is considered the best balanced program for the entire United States and Territories that could be conceived under present conditions.

With your permission, I would like to insert in the record the complete statement of policy which I have previously referred to as adopted by this association, meeting in Chicago in November 1949. I should also like to insert in the record two tabulations of the apportionment of Federal-aid funds; one, based on the dollar amounts as proposed in the policy statement previously referred to, and one on the dollar amounts as set forth in H. R. 7398.

In our discussion, it will be our purpose to comment concerning the provisions as outlined in H. R. 7398, now pending before this committee.

It is our suggestion that the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 contain authorizations for Federal-aid funds on four separate and distinct systems of roads; namely, the interstate, primary, urban, and secondary. This constitutes the addition of one more category of roads; that is, the interstate system, which has not heretofore been provided for in national legislation. These four systems are carefully and properly outlined in H. R. 7398. It is our suggestion that $210,000,000 be allocated annually to the interstate system improvement, $270,000,000 to the primary system improvement, $150,000,000 to the urban system improvement, and $180,000,000 to the secondary system improvement. These figures, as you will note, are somewhat higher than those included in H. R. 7398.

It is our suggestion that Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban allocations be distributed among the States in accordance with the regular formula and matching basis, as provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1944 and 1948. This is exactly as contemplated in H. R. 7398.

It is our suggestion that the interstate funds be apportioned on the basis of the population of the State; that no State receive less than three-quarters of 1 percent, and that the matching ratio be 75 percent Federal funds and 25 percent State funds. This is essentially provided in H. R. 7398.

It is our suggestion that these interstate funds may be utilized at the option of any given State to apply on the principal of bonds on toll-free facilities that may be used by such State for the purpose of improvement of the interstate system of roads. This provision is included in H. R. 7398.

It was our studied opinion that we would suggest to the National Congress several other minor corrections and modernizations of the Federal-Aid Highway Act and we have noted with a great deal of satisfaction that these corrections and modernizations are included in the text of H. R. 7398.

In summation, we desire to state that H. R. 7398, now being considered by your committee, embraces the principles and advancements that we believe to be essential to a modern highway program, but we are hopeful that the Congress may find itself in a financial position to make a more expanded investment in the road system of our country which is so badly needed at the present time.

It will be our purpose to present subsequently at this hearing, members of the executive committee of the American Association of State Highway Officials to discuss the four systems of roads, as outlined in this preliminary discussion, in more detail. We would also like the privilege of introducing several more highway officials to present experiences and needs of a few of the typical States of the Union, in order that you may have an over-all picture of the problem as represented by highly qualified State highway officials.

On behalf of the State highway officials throughout the country, I wish to thank the members of this committee for the consideration shown us on this and on all other occasions. We have noted with the greatest admiration your understanding of the Nation's highway problems and have marveled at your grasp of their details. Please be assured that we are at your service and that we have no other purpose than to serve faithfully the people we represent and to do a highway job in this country that will be a credit to you. We are confident that the present Congress will deal wisely and promptly with this problem.

STATEMENT OF POLICY

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS,

Washington, D. C., November 28, 1949.

The American Association of State Highway Officials, in special meeting in Chicago, Ill., on November 21, adopted an important and far-reaching statement of national policy on new Federal aid for highways.

The postwar program of highway construction began with the enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, which provided $500,000,000 per year of Federal aid for the fiscal years 1946, 1947, and 1948. This act was supplemented by another act known as the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, which provided $450,000,000 per year for the fiscal years of 1950 and 1951.

The allocations of the last year's funds, as provided in the 1948 act, were made this past October. Therefore, in order for the Federal-aid program to continue without interruption, it is essential that the Congress enact new Federal-aid legislation during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, beginning in January. New allocations would become effective for the fiscal year of 1952. It is essential that Federal-aid authorizations for highways be enacted well in advance of the actual date of availability of funds, in order that both Federal and State governments may make the necessary long-range plans well in advance of the actual initiation of the program for which the funds are provided. It is under these circumstances, therefore, that the association convened in special session in Chicago on November 21.

Membership of the association is made up of the officials of the 48 State highway departments, the highway departments of the Territories of Hawaii and Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia Highway Department and the Bureau of Public Roads of the Federal Government.

After long and earnest discussion, the association adopted a statement of national policy on the matter and therein advocated an annual program approximating $810,000,000 per year in Federal funds. The new recommendations, for the first time, would provision for work on the interstate system of highways, as such; setting up a special category in the amount of $210,000,000 per year Federal funds, to be matched on a 75–25 basis by State funds. This contrasts with the 50–50 matching basis on the primary, secondary, and urban programs. The interstate funds would also be available on a new formula of population. The complete statement of policy follows:

1. Four authorizations of Federal-aid funds on an annual basis:

System	Proposed	(1948 act)
Interstate	$210,000,000	($0,000,000,000,000)
Primary	270,000,000	(225,500,000)
Secondary	180,000,000	(135,000,000)
Urban	150,000,000	(112,500,000)
Total	810,000,000	(450,000,000)

2. That the Federal-aid primary, secondary and urban allocations be distributed among the States in accordance with the regular formulas and matching basis, as provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1944 and 1948; that not more than 25 percent of the amount apportioned to each State for the primary and secondary systems may be switched from one system to the other, provided the State highway department makes such request and it is approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads as being in the public interest.

3. That the interstate funds be apportioned on the basis of population of the States and that no State receive less than three-quarters of 1 percent; that the matching ratio be 75 percent Federal funds and 25 percent State funds.

4. That these interstate funds may be utilized at the option of any given State, to apply on the principal of general obligation bonds on toll-free facilities that may be used by such State for the purpose of expediting the improvement of the interstate system of roads.

5. That the provision in the Federal-Aid Highway Act requiring the withholding of Federal aid from any State failing to properly maintain a Federal-aid project be amended so that in the case of secondary and urban projects where a county or city has accepted responsibility for maintenance, future Federal-aid funds will be withheld from the county or city failing to maintain rather than from the State as a whole.

6. That a section be added to the proposed Federal-Aid Highway Act authorizing an amount not to exceed $10,000,000 to be utilized by the Bureau of Public Roads, under specific emergency conditions, for the purpose of cooperating with the State highway departments in highway disaster relief on an area basis when an emergency has been declared by a governor of a State and concurred in by a Commissioner of Public Roads, without limitation as to systems, and on a 50–50 matching basis.

7. That a specific appropriation of $100,000,000 be authorized for the purpose of advancing funds to the State highway departments for the acquisition of rights-of-way to be repaid over an extended period of years.

8. That the present one-third limitation on Federal aid for right-of-way purposes be increased to 50 percent.

It should be understood that the above is a statement of policy of the American Association of State Highway Officials. The recommendations will be submitted to the Congress for its consideration by officials of the association at an early date.

D. C. GREER,

President, American Association of State Highway Officials.

Thirteen Korean Assemblymen Jailed for Red Contacts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Associated Press dispatch:

THIRTEEN KOREAN ASSEMBLYMEN JAILED FOR RED CONTACTS

SEOUL, KOREA, March 14.—Thirteen members of the Korean National Assembly were sentenced to prison today for terms as long

as 20 years for violating national security by having contacts with Communists.

Assemblyman Ro Il Hwan and Lee Mion Wun were sentenced by presiding Judge Sa Kwang Ook to the longest terms—10 years.

At the long trial from November 17 to February 10 before a three-judge panel without a jury—Ro and Lee were declared to have admitted they had received money from alleged Communists.

Both men testified that purported confessions were taken from them under torture.

Prosecutor Oh Che Do said before the trial all 13 assemblymen had made written confessions. He introduced no others after Ro and Lee testified they were tortured.

Address of Hon. D. Hiden Ramsey, of Asheville, N. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MONROE M. REDDEN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 11, Hon. D. Hiden Ramsey, of Asheville, N. C., delivered an address at the annual meeting of the North Carolina Democratic Club of Washington. Mr. Ramsey is general manager of the Asheville Citizen-Times Co., and is generally recognized as one of the ablest speakers and newspapermen of the South. I believe the Members of Congress will be inspired by his speech, which follows:

I am delighted this evening to join with the members of the North Carolina Democratic Club in doing richly deserved honor to the 14 eminent North Carolinians who represent our State in the National Congress. It is not presumptuous to assert that in what we say and do this evening, we speak and act for an overwhelming majority of the people of the Old North State.

No State of this Republic is more fortunate in the character and capacities of the men who represent it in the Halls of Congress. Other States may be larger and richer. Some of them may attract more attention—not always flattering attention—by the legislative prima donnas whom they send to Washington. But none can surpass North Carolina in the high level of intelligent and industrious devotion to simple duty and of solid achievement which our delegation sets and maintains.

Viewed as individuals, our 2 Senators and 12 Congressmen are men, good and true, who do their work with competence, energy, and integrity. There isn't a scalawag, a mercenary, a sluggard, a buffoon in the whole 14. With their demeanor and their convictions, they contribute nothing to that disrespect in which so many American citizens—not altogether without excuse—view the National Legislature.

Measured as a group, our Senators and Congressmen are typical of North Carolina in all of its varied richness of resource, of geography, of economic outlook and activity. If we could take the 14 lawgivers and roll them into 1, we would have a perfect lawmaker from the viewpoint of North Carolina. He would be the great common denominator of that dynamic democracy which is the Old North State.

This 14-in-1 lawgiver would have the incredibly easy and captivating eloquence, the tranquil temperament, and the sagacious judgment of Senator HOEY.

This composite lawmaker would have the steadily glowing idealism, the utter selflessness, the richly furnished mind, and the irresistible charm of Senator GRAHAM.

This consolidated Member of the National Congress would possess in full measure the democratic simplicity, the vast experience, and the unfailing common sense of Representative DOUGHTON.

The North Carolina lawgiver would understand full well—and this is the beginning of wisdom for the lawmaker—that laws are necessary but very imperfect instruments for maintaining good order and promoting progress and justice in modern society. For the judicial experience of Representative KERR, once an able trial judge, would be an essential part of the stuff out of which he was compounded.

Our typical Tarheel Member of Congress would speak the language and know the thinking and the needs of those sturdy North Carolinians who live within the sound of the Atlantic Ocean. For Representative BONNER would provide that indispenable understanding. In this 14-ply solon would be much of the clear-eyed, unflinching individualism of those self-sufficient Tarheels who live their lives and do their work along the slopes and in the valleys of our mountain section. For Representative REDDEN, a highlander par excellence, would be their spokesman.

This multiple solon would comprehend both the rights and the duties of an enlightened industrialism for Representative CHATHAM, an able industrialist and a Tarheel to the very marrow of his being, would provide that comprehension.

Our typical lawmaker would recognize the Nation's inescapable obligation to foster and sustain a prosperous agriculture as the very bedrock of our national economy, for available to him and even pressing upon him would be the sound convictions and the vast information of Representative COOLEY.

Our North Carolina lawmaker would agree and insist that the Nation has a vital stake in equalizing and enriching the educational opportunities of its youth. But he would stand steadfastly against any Federal control, in whatever guise, of our public schools. For Representative BARDEN would speak forthrightly for him on this urgent question.

Our composite lawgiver would be plain-spoken and urbane at one and the same time, for with Representative DURHAM's furnishing no inconsiderable part of his official stature, he could not be otherwise.

The coastal regions of North Carolina melt gradually into the Piedmont, and the Piedmont marches slowly into the mountain section. Two congressional districts lie athwart the State from New Hanover to Wilkes. Their representatives, Representatives CARLYLE and DEAN—gentlemen both of light and leading—serve as the linchpins that tie the State together and emphasize and illustrate the essential oneness of our people.

North Carolina is no longer a State exclusively of small towns and rural sections. We are developing clotted centers of population with their peculiar problems and viewpoints. Representative JONES would bring to our composite lawmaker the experience of one who has seen Charlotte grow from a gangling town into a great metropolis.

One Congressman who has contributed much to the sturdy character, the energy and the sure grasp of national problems which have distinguished our North Carolina delegation is retiring at the end of his present term. But Representative BULWINKLE has written a record of substantial achievement of which all North Carolinians are proud.

This 14-in-1 lawgiver would be a simon pure Tarheel by birth and residence. His ancestral ties with North Carolina would reach back through several generations and across the whole history of our commonwealth.

His age would be about 59. But he would be as vigorous as the youngest and as sage as the oldest.

Virtually every college in the State would have had a hand in his educational upbringing and the mark of both the old field school and the modern public school would be indelibly upon him.

In matters denominational, he would be very representative and very tolerant for he would worship in the Methodist, the Baptist, the Presbyterian, the Episcopal and the Lutheran churches. It must be added, however, that being a typical North Carolinian he would show a slight preference for the Baptist persuasion.

He would have served his Nation in two mighty wars. He would know alike the hardships and the carefree life of the buck private and the authority of the commissioned officer. He would be at one and the same time an infantryman and an artilleryman. In his military experience, he would be at home in the air, on the sea and on land.

He would have pursued farming both as a stern livelihood and as the pleasant avocation of the city dweller.

In his professional life, he would be very much of the lawyer. His wits would have been sharpened in the lively give and take of hotly contested trials. He would have the fluency of speech of the well-trained attorney.

But his mind would not be exclusively the mind of the successful lawyer. He would know from personal experience both the austerities and the exhilarations of the school teacher. He would have operated that great town meeting of our local democracy—a small-town drug store where issues, great and small, are debated by busy men and loafers. He would be a progressive industrialist with a high sense of responsibility for the well-being of his employees. There would even be a faint tinge of printer's ink upon his fingers.

His election to the National Congress would have come after long public service to his State and community. He would have administered justice as a judge. He would have prosecuted criminal cases as a solicitor. He would have served on local school boards and on State commissions and boards. His legislative experience would have covered both houses of our general assembly. He would have been governor—a great governor—of North Carolina. He would have even been the chief keeper of that lighthouse which illumines the life of our State—the University of North Carolina in its triple glory. His apprenticeship in public service would have been long and faithful.

In his political views, this composite North Carolina Member of the National Congress would be both a liberal and a conservative. But what rational man can always be accurately defined as an unvarying liberal or an unvarying conservative? Only unthinking citizens, legislators, and States allow themselves to be taken captive by mere labels which have only the meaning which the individual reads into them. The truly great statesman has the conservative's regard for the past, the liberal's concern for the future, and the wise man's thought of the present. Being a discerning and contemplative person, he lets the very real present determine whether he shall lean to the unreal past or the unreal future on any particular issue.

Of this 14-in-1 Tarheel lawgiver, one thing can be said: He is a Democrat by inheritance and by conviction. He may hail from the East where Republicans are as rare as zero weather. He may come from the West where Republicans are embarrassingly and even infuriatingly numerous. Parenthetically, we have in the West some counties that, reckoned in percentage points, are more hopelessly joined to their Republican idols than even Vermont and Maine are in their more unregenerate moments. Speaking in Boston in 1889, Henry Woodfin Grady paid a very moving tribute to the steadfast loyalty of the Vermont Democrat who refused to be discouraged or dismayed by the Republican landslides which were his regular biennial visitations. Stancher still in his Democratic faith and voting is the Avery County Democrat. Every 2 years he goes bravely and confidently to the polls, seeking hopefully, even wistfully, the triumph which is never his. May the god of the politically helpless be kind to this stout-hearted follower of the forlorn hope.

Whether the typical North Carolina lawgiver comes from the East or from the West, from the level Piedmont or from the rolling hills of the upper Piedmont, he is a Democrat by profession of faith and by practice.

As an individual, of course, this composite legislator does not exist. It takes 14 North Carolinians with their differing talents to make him exist even in fancy.

But if he did live in the flesh as one individual, he would be the very paragon of lawmaking excellence.

Most important of all, he would be typical and representative of North Carolina—of all North Carolina. His experience would be an accurate cross-section of the experience of our people. His political views, I venture to believe, would be the composite views of North Carolina.

When we appraise our congressional delegation as a whole, when we view our lawmakers from the vantage point of a citizen of the State rather than of a voter of a specific district, we do command the incomparable services of such a composite lawmaker. Our exceedingly good fortune should make us grateful. North Carolina can truthfully say that it is competently and faithfully represented in the National Congress.

Of course, the members of our congressional delegation are not of one mind on every issue. On many legislative matters, they disagree—sometimes with positiveness but always with seemly appreciation of the sincerity of each other. It is well that it is so. We are not sending 14 slavish votes to Congress. In North Carolina we still believe that intellectual integrity and independence are among the hallmarks of good lawmakers.

But when the issue involves essentials of party faith, the members of the North Carolina delegation succeed in achieving unity. When they disagree, it is usually about the peace rather than the goal of progress.

In this regard, the Democratic Party of North Carolina and our Democratic delegation in Congress can point a moral and adorn a tale for the Democratic Party of the Nation.

In his road shows, Gene Autry gets a laugh from his audiences by saying drolly: "I don't belong to any organized political party. I am a Democrat."

There is a hard core of truth in this wisecrack. The Democratic Party has never been a severely disciplined, harshly regimented party. It has been more a way of political life than a case-bound political mechanism. Historically, it has extended the utmost hospitality to all private citizens who accepted its basic principles.

That was the spirit which Thomas Jefferson breathed into the Democratic Party at its birth. That was the spirit which enabled John Quincy Adams, the personal embodiment of New England culture and industrialism, and Andrew Jackson, the very personification of the turbulent frontier, to be Democratic rivals for the Presidency. That was the spirit that made it possible and even logical for Grover Cleveland and William Jennings Bryan, Oscar Underwood, and Woodrow Wilson to have a common party affiliation.

There are those who would drive from the Democratic fold the sincere conservatives. There are those others who would expel the honest radicals. They talk in terms of reprisals and purges.

It will be an ill day for the Democratic Party if it ever seeks to close the door on either its genuine conservatives or its genuine radicals. We need them both. With their clashing viewpoints, they provide that internal discipline which every healthy party requires.

Anything that moves—and the Democratic Party is a thing of movement—needs both a brake and an accelerator. We need the counsel and the correction of the conservative to make certain that we do not act without due regard to the lessons of experience. We need the agitations and the urgings of the honest radicals to keep our eyes from straying too frequently from the beckoning future. Woodrow Wilson once defined himself as "a radical with the brakes on."

The balance weight of the Democratic Party is the middle class which weighs the sober fears of the conservatives and the far-ranging visions of the radicals—and decides.

The Republican Party is all brakes. It has long since discarded its accelerator. It has no room for the La Follettes, the Teddy Roosevelts, the LaGuardias, as it had in its wiser and more spacious days. It has achieved solidarity of a sort but in the process of accomplishing this dreary unity, it has whittled its forces down to impotence.

In North Carolina, we have both conservative and radical fringes in the Democratic Party and we do not believe that either is necessarily traitorous to the party faith. In our North Carolina delegation, we have both conservatives and moderates and liberals and we respect all of them as honest representatives of the party.

About 400 years ago a great German theologian laid down this rule of guidance for the contending factions of the Protestant faith:

"In necessary things, unity; in doubtful things, liberty; in all things, charity."

The Democratic Party has followed that rule rather faithfully in North Carolina with results that are manifest in the membership of our congressional delegation and in the quality of progressive, honest government which the party has given to the State over the past half century. The Democratic Party of the Nation can do no better than to follow this example.

Truly, at this troubled, even anguished juncture in the life of civilization, the National Democratic Party, drawing its strength from its historic past, its challenge from the present and its vision from the future, can follow no wiser course than to embrace and practice the admonition of the preacher of that far-off day to the brawling Lutheran factions:

"In necessary things, unity; in doubtful things, liberty; in all things, charity."

Washington Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the New York Times of March 15, 1950:

WASHINGTON HOME RULE

The Democratic platform of 1948: "We favor the extension of the right of suffrage to the people of the District of Columbia."

The Republican platform of 1948: "We favor self-government for the residents of the Nation's Capital."

Action of the Senate in 1949: Passage by voice vote on May 31 of the Kefauver bill, which would permit the people of the District of Columbia to vote for their own city council, would reorganize the District government and would relieve Congress of the ridiculous chore of acting as a board of aldermen for a city of 900,000 people.

Action of the House in 1949: Pigeon-holing of the home-rule bill in the District of Columbia Committee, from which it has not yet been budged. One of the reasons for committee inaction is undoubtedly the fact that one-third of Washington's population is Negro. The mere statement of this reason for denial of local franchise to Washingtonians is enough—or should be enough—to condemn it.

The one practical way of getting the home-rule bill out of committee at this time seems to be through a discharge petition, which now lacks only 40 of the requisite 218 signatures. Members of the House do not sign a discharge petition lightly—and they are right not to do so—but in view of platform pledges this is one piece of legislation that no committee is justified in withholding from floor consideration.

For obvious reasons, it is a matter of major importance to the citizens of Washington. And it should be a matter of genuine concern to all the other citizens of the United States that the inhabitants of one of the country's great cities are deprived of even the most elementary rights of self-government. Furthermore, the time Congress wastes in settling the minutiae of Washington's municipal affairs—from regulation of District of Columbia barbers to organization of a police force band—could doubtless be put to better use in matters of somewhat wider national interest. The home-rule bill should be brought out to the floor and passed.

A Baby Every Day—Triplets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Catahoula News, of March 9, 1950:

DAY BY DAY THE HARDIE FAMILY GROWS AND GROWS AND GROWS—A BABY EVERY DAY—TRIPLETS

Jonesville citizens breathed a sigh of relief Thursday, not only because the flood waters surrounding the town were receding, but also because Mrs. Lester Hardie finally completed a 3-day period of having babies.

Triplets—each with a different birthday—were born to Mrs. Hardie one at a time, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday at Nasif's clinic.

Dr. N. G. Nasif, attending physician, has been besieged with calls concerning the most unusual case in his career and, as far as Jonesville people are concerned, in the career of any doctor.

On Tuesday morning at 8 o'clock, Mrs. Hardie had her first baby, a 5-pound boy. On Wednesday morning at 9 o'clock, she had her second, a 6-pound girl, and then on Thursday morning, at 12:15 o'clock, she had her third and last, a 7-pound girl.

There was a total of more than 49 hours elapsed time between the first and third

births. Between the first and second births, 26 hours elapsed. Between the second and third births, 15 hours and 35 minutes elapsed.

Dr. Nasif said the babies were full time, and all were in good condition.

Thursday morning, as townspeople "ohed" and "aned" about the "believe-it-or-not" births, Mrs. Hardie was asleep, with no visitors allowed. Dr. Nasif was tired, too, but proud of the achievement.

Lester Hardie, the father, was of course, proud, but somewhat worried. There are seven other children in the family besides the new triplets, making a dozen mouths to feed. Times are bad, and so is his health.

Hardie is a commercial fisherman, has been for many years, and since 1937 the family has been living on a houseboat about 3 miles up the Ouachita from Jonesville. Long years on the water in all kinds of weather have aggravated his sinus trouble, and chronic bronchitis. Often when fishing is right, Hardie's health prevents his working, he says. And as everyone knows, fishing isn't right now, during the high water.

"The fish are too scattered now," Hardie explained. "You can't get a very good catch." The Red Cross is now helping the Hardies, as it is many other families of flood-stricken Catahoula.

Mrs. Hardie will be 38 in May, and he will be 35 in June. They have been married since 1933. Five of the other children, Edna Lucille, Anise Clothilde, R. L., Myrtle Geraldine, and Wilburn, are in school. Two, Lester Paul and Shirley Ann, are pre-school age.

There are no names yet for the triplets. Hardie said that he had promised an aunt, Mrs. Lilly Ford Harris, of Quitman, that she could name the babies. She has helped Mrs. Hardie out in previous births, he said, and had asked to be allowed to name the babies.

"But," Hardie explained, "she went home or to Ferriday last night and didn't leave a list of names."

Because of their birthplace where three rivers meet, the names "Tensas," "Ouachita," and "Little" were suggested. Hardie agreed they would be good names but said he had promised Mrs. Harris the naming honor. "I want to let her have her 'raisers' about it," he said.

Mrs. Hardie was formerly Mabel Harris of Columbia. Her parents are dead. Hardie's mother is dead, but his father, Richard Hardie, is still living.

Wednesday night, waiting at Nasif's clinic, he said, "I have lots of grandchildren. So many, I don't get excited about them anymore".

"If you aren't excited about these," he was told, "you are about the only person in town who isn't." "Grandpa" Hardie grinned.

Trying to trace back the "twins" on either side—there were definitely no triplets—"Papa" Hardie said that his wife's mother had had twins, born dead, and that one of his cousins had twins.

Aside from the fact that the triplets have different birthdays, there are other circumstances of the birth that are unusual. Dr. Nasif modestly admits that the case is "probably unique in medical annals." He has never delivered triplets before, he said, and had never heard or read of them arriving one each for three consecutive days.

Twins with different birthdays are fairly common, with such births usually occurring around the midnight hours. Twins have also been born in different years, when one was born on December 31 and one on January 1.

Dr. Nasif said that the birth of the first baby was normal and by spontaneous labor. The second two were breech births by induced labor.

"After the first baby came," he said, "I thought the second would follow soon as a normal procedure. After I saw that it wasn't coming of its own accord, labor was induced. Then when the second came, I expected the third to follow, but it would not, so labor had to be induced again."

The first and third babies are identical twins, Dr. Nasif explained, in that they were contained in the same placenta. The second-born baby was in a separate placenta, and biologically is a "fraternal twin" of the others. But being three, they are triplets.

Hardie was planning to move his houseboat and the remainder of his family down to Jonesville Thursday afternoon, to be nearer his wife, and new babies, who will be hospitalized for a while longer.

How to Ruin a Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie (Ind.) Star:

HOW TO RUIN A FARM PROGRAM

Two congressional committees took action on Wednesday that threatens to dig the grave of any sensible and popularly supported farm program. The House Banking Committee and Senate Banking Committee approved an increase of $2,000,000,000 in the funds allowed for keeping farm prices high. That would make a total of $6,750,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation could spend buying eggs and potatoes and grain and milk to be stored, allowed to rot or to be plowed under for fertilizer to grow more surpluses to be bought by taxpayers' money.

The total cost of administering the Federal Government 20 years ago was less than $6,750,000. How long does Congress think the big majority of the American people are going to stand for high farm prices in the market and higher taxes to pay these support payments? The people know that the Government has millions of eggs, potatoes, bushels of grain and pounds of dried milk; enough to feed thousands of people for a year. They also know it is now going to waste.

They know that their Government is sending billions of dollars to Europe so people there can buy food while we have food running out of our ears over here. They know that most of that $6,750,000,000 is going to come right out of their pockets in the income taxes they are paying this month. Does Congress think the people like paying these taxes so that they have to pay high food prices and at the same time make the Government the biggest food miser in history?

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan rightly thinks that the people will revolt against these high rigid price supports. But he believes he can sell his plan to pay the farmer a direct cash subsidy, control his production and his income, and at the same time allow market prices to drop way down. Yet his plan will cost at least $6,000,000,000 a year and probably more. The taxpayers will still have to foot the bill while the farmer becomes the hired hand of the Government.

What is more likely to happen, when next year's surplus potatoes and grain and eggs and milk are dumped in the rivers and plowed under for fertilizer and burned in pits, is that the people will decide they have had enough of the whole idea of Government support for farmers. They are quite likely to say to their Congressmen, "throw the whole program out." And that is what Congress might have to do next year or the year after, if the politicians keep bidding for the farm vote with the taxpayers' hard-earned cash.

The Political Issues of the 1950 Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of my colleague from Michigan, Hon. CHARLES E. POTTER, to be delivered over Station WJR:

Thank you, and good evening, friends.

In selecting the topic, The Political Issues of the 1950 Campaign, I am expressing my own views as an individual Member of Congress. To me all indications are that the 1950 campaign will be a most vigorous one. The Democrats will endeavor to hold the gains that they made in the 1948 election, and the Republicans, of course, will endeavor to pick up additional congressional and senatorial seats in order to gain control of the Congress.

It is my personal observation that this 1950 nonpresidential-election campaign will be one where no holds will be barred by either party. In my humble opinion, the 1950 elections are extremely important to every man, woman, and child in this country. There are many collateral issues, but the underlying issue the voters have to decide by November is whether they wish to go on supporting a party that will continue to take them down the road to complete state socialism or whether they wish to support a party which believes that true prosperity can only be had through our free-enterprise system.

I believe the issues of this coming campaign will be clearly defined. The Democratic leadership will have to accept the program of President Truman, and the following are some of the measures which the voters will be asked to either endorse or reject, come November:

National compulsory health insurance is one of the major planks of the Democrat platform. This program is commonly referred to as socialized medicine. The administration believes that this plan has considerable vote appeal. National compulsory health insurance, if enacted, would make it mandatory that every family in this country pay a pay-roll tax ranging from 6 to 8 percent. Then, in case of illness, a family could go to a doctor and receive free medical treatment. This is similar to the medical program in England.

We all realize that we do have certain national health problems. However, as Republicans we believe that these health problems can best be met by the training of more doctors and by providing more and better hospital facilities. We propose that our medical training centers be expanded, in order to double the number of medical students. Our way of life is based on competition, and competition in the medical profession is just as healthy as it is in any other line of endeavor. By the training of more doctors the competition itself will reduce the cost of medical treatment. The Federal Government is now cooperating in a hospital construction program in conjunction with the States and local communities. This program in a very short time will solve our hospital problem. We encourage the use of voluntary health insurance. Voluntary insurance is much cheaper than paying a compulsory 6- or 8-percent pay-roll tax for national insurance.

Socialized medicine would reduce medical care to its lowest level. We know the experiences we have had in the past in the treatment of welfare cases, where the doctors are paid for their services by the State and other local agencies. In many cases this treatment has not been too satisfactory. National compulsory health insurance would place our medical profession under Government control and regulation and would destroy the initiative to render the most adequate and best possible service to a patient. The doctor would be swamped with Government red tape, which impairs his medical efficiency.

Another major issue of the 1950 campaign will be the so-called Brannan farm plan. The administration has come out wholeheartedly for this plan, sponsored by the Secretary of Agriculture, Charles F. Brannan. Of course, this plan is nothing new. It was first conceived when Henry Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture. Henry Wallace did not have the nerve to bring it to the light of day. The administration today, however, has no hesitancy in submitting this plan to the people. We have come quite a ways down the road since Henry Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture.

What does the Brannan plan do? First, it has a very appealing catch-on slogan of promising high prices to the farmer and low prices to the consumer. From the best information that we have to date—and, you know it is difficult to get positive information because the Secretary of Agriculture keeps revising his plans every other day—the Secretary would allot marketing quotas to every farmer; should the Department of Agriculture guess right and so control production, of course, food costs to the consumer would not decrease but rather would increase and the farmer would be assured 100-percent parity for his produce. If, however, the Department of Agriculture should guess wrong, and set marketing quotas for surplus foods, prices would drop from a normal to a subnormal level. This because there then would be no incentive for marketing. Then the difference between the market price and the 100-percent-parity price would be made up to the farmers by direct payments from the Federal Treasury. For example, if the Brannan plan had been in effect last year, it would have cost the taxpayers of this country over $5,000,000,000 in direct subsidy payments. Even with our present farm-support program—which we admit has many bugs in it—the net program loss on operation for the 1949 fiscal year stands at $254,762,000. Of course, the dangerous result of this proposed Brannan plan is that management of the farms of this country would be controlled by the Secretary of Agriculture. No farmer can stay in business unless he agrees to come under the Brannan plan. Once he is under the program, and even though his money is invested in a certain type of farming, the Secretary of Agriculture could tell him to do away with his dairy herd, for example, and raise potatoes.

Experience has taught us that depressions are always led by a decline in farm income. It is necessary to maintain adequate purchasing power in the hands of our farmers. This can be done without restorting to Government farming and by our doing two things. First, finding new markets for, and new means of utilizing, our farm produce. As an example take our present potato fiasco. We have a great surplus of potatoes. The Government has spent thousands of dollars to destroy our surplus potatoes. There is no reason why these potatoes could not be used for the manufacture of alcohol.

Second, we should improve our system of distribution. Of course, the price of farm produce increases 100 percent after reaching the city limits. The cost of the produce over the counter in the city has little relationship to the amount the farmer receives for raising the produce. There is no need in a country such as ours for destroying food of any kind. We all remember when Henry Wallace ordered the killing of little pigs. Soon thereafter we were in want of pork.

It is ironical that this past year when we had a period of farm surpluses the administration imported thousands of pounds of butter, cheese, eggs, wheat, corn—yes; and even potatoes. We must discontinue our policy of permitting the importation of farm produce from foreign nations, of which we have a surplus. This foreign competition is most unfair to our American farmers.

Another issue of the 1950 campaign will be that of our present fiscal policy. The Democrats sponsoring socialized medicine, the Brannan farm plan, and other costly measures, of course, have to accept the responsibility for maintaining a high national budget and high taxes and the continuation of deficit financing. As Republicans, we believe that a Nation is no different than we as individuals and should and must live within its income. I know that when I spend more money than I make and continue doing so, eventually there will come a day of reckoning. I think many in the radio audience have experienced the same thing. We cannot condone a Government which in peacetime spends five to eight billion dollars a year more than it takes in in taxes. We are convinced that we have reached the saturation point as far as taxes are concerned. We Republicans are convinced that our present high tax structure has been a definite deterrent to business.

I believe we can take a lesson from our good neighbor Canada. Since the end of World War II, Canada has materially decreased her income taxes; has repealed her wartime imposed excise taxes; reduced her excess profits tax and even with such tax decreases, Canada's national income has increased each year. Canada has made payments on her national debt and has balanced her budget each year. Certainly the experience Canada has had with her fiscal policy should be a lesson to us that true prosperity cannot be had under a high-tax administration.

Another issue in the coming campaign will be charges made by the Republicans that this Democratic administration has been lax in its efforts to weed subversive employees from the Government pay roll. We all realize that Alger Hiss and Judith Coplon were not alone in their activities. We feel the administration has been reluctant to make a concerted effort to remove disloyal employees from the Government pay roll. The Democrats, of course, will charge that this is political witch hunting and that there are no disloyal employees in Government. We must remember Alger Hiss was considered a good security risk until he was exposed by the House Un-American Activities Committee and finally indicted. It is my personal belief that the loyalty of a Federal employee—whose salary is paid by taxing the public—should be above reproach. I see no reason why the burden of proof to establish loyalty should not rest with the individual, whether he be now employed by the Government or whether he is seeking Federal employment, rather than with the Government.

We know our foreign policy is going to be a bigger issue in this 1950 campaign than it has been for some time. The so-called bipartisan foreign policy is breaking at the seams. For the past several years there has been little of a bipartisan approach to any of our international problems. Foreign policy has been dictated by the Department of State and thrown to Congress to accept. Certainly there is nothing bipartisan, for example, about our lack of policy in China.

During the 1950 campaign, I assume, the administration will charge that the Republicans are scrapping our bipartisan foreign policy and we Republicans will charge that such bipartisan foreign policy does not even exist.

These are but a few of the many issues that will be raised in this coming election campaign. The American people will have clear-cut issues. There will be no attempt to say we stand for the same things, but we would do it better. This is a fork-in-the-road election where the American people must decide which way they want to go—whether they want to continue to copy the British Social Labor Government—which has proven disastrous—or whether they wish to tackle our problems in the American way.

We are most appreciative to WJR for putting on this series of programs. WJR has been, and is, performing a great public service in allowing this time to various Members of Congress in order to inform the people of the important issues of the day.

Statement by R. B. Anderson Before House Ways and Means Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 1950, Mr. R. B. Anderson, president of the Texas division of Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee to present his testimony on the pending question of reduction of the depletion allowance for oil development. Mr. Anderson has supplemented his original statement by additional testimony in answer to the question as to whether the large producers are using the benefits of the percentage depletion provision in the manner intended by Congress.

I recommend to your reading the following statement by Mr. Anderson, which I wish to insert in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

STATEMENT BY R. B. ANDERSON, SUPPLEMENTING HIS TESTIMONY OF FEBRUARY 14, 1950

In my testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee on Tuesday, February 14, 1950, on the question of percentage depletion as it applied to the oil and natural-gas industry, I urged the committee to retain the present depletion and intangible well-drilling cost provisions in the income-tax law without change.

A member of the committee raised a question as to whether the large producers were using the benefits of the percentage depletion provisions in the manner intended by Congress. In response to that question, a detailed survey has just been completed of a group of large oil companies, including all of the so-called major companies in the industry for a 12-year period from 1936 to 1947, inclusive, which is the longest period for which complete and accurate data could be assembled covering their operations. The survey shows that this group of companies spent more in their efforts to find new oil reserves than the total percentage depletion allowed for the same period, or $1,833,000,000 more in their effort to find new oil than the total additional taxes they would have paid

without the percentage depletion provisions in the law. The money spent in the finding effort does not include intangible development costs or the additional monies spent subsequent to discovery in drilling and equipping producing wells and leases.

The total sum expended by this group of companies during the period, including both exploration and development, was $5,541,[illegible]000,000, or more than twice the total percentage depletion allowed.

The Congress, recognizing the hazards of the oil producing business, enacted the percentage depletion provision and has continued it in the law in order to enable an oil producer to recover his capital value. It is the necessary incentive to the oil and gas producer, whether large or small, to plow back his funds in the search for new and essential reserves. It is also the incentive for new and additional risk capital from outside sources to be expended in the search for new and additional oil reserves.

The facts shown by the survey are conclusive evidence that these provisions have done what they were intended to do and that the larger producers are as dependent upon the percentage depletion provisions as the smaller operator in their continuous search for oil.

The average cost per well for exploratory wells drilled in the United States in the search for new oil reserves has almost tripled in the period 1935 to 1948, having increased from $32,578 per well in 1935 to $87,337 per well in 1948. At the same time the number of such wells required to discover a million barrels of new reserves doubled during the same period. As a result, the average cost of finding a million barrels of new reserves increased during the period by 533 percent.

These sharp increases in the cost of finding oil obviously affect everyone who searches for oil irrespective of size. They seriously affect those of our producers who have sufficient capital to undertake the risk of exploring high cost areas. In many instances, the larger producer makes substantial contributions to the smaller producer in order to enable the latter to drill exploratory wells. Generally, it is only the larger producer who can afford the enormous costs involved in the search for oil in many portions of the Rocky Mountain region, or in the swampy areas along the Gulf of Mexico, or in the submerged lands underlying the open ocean off our shores, or in the many unproven areas of the United States where deep test wells are necessary.

I should like to emphasize that the continued search for oil by those comprising the industry, whether small, medium, or large or whatever degree of size, is dependent upon the continuation of the long established percentage depletion provisions of the law without any change.

House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities Prepares to Open Public Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times, on Sunday, March 12, carried an article entitled "Washington Lobbyists Again Under Scrutiny—House Group, After Long Preparation, Is Ready To Open Its Investigation." Written by Mr. John D. Morris of the Times' excellent Washington bureau, this article sets out fairly and objectively, I believe, the thinking among members of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities in seeking to make of this investigation into lobbying and pressure groups a constructive contribution both to public understanding of the place of lobbying in a democracy and to improved procedures and clearer lines of jurisdiction of the Federal regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946.

As Mr. Morris indicates in this article, an investigation of this sort could easily turn into nothing more constructive than a search for some new headline sensation each day. Or, on the other hand, it could develop the need for and the means of improving our relatively new statute on lobbyist registration and identification and thus do a most worthwhile job.

As chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, I have been impressed by the constructive spirit in which all members of this committee, including Representatives LANHAM, DOYLE, ALBERT, HALLECK, BROWN, and O'HARA of Minnesota, have approached this challenge of making of our investigation a real contribution to wider understanding of a complex subject which is so close to the legislative process.

The New York Times' article, Washington Lobbyists Again Under Scrutiny, follows:

WASHINGTON LOBBYISTS AGAIN UNDER SCRUTINY—HOUSE GROUP, AFTER LONG PREPARATION, IS READY TO OPEN ITS INVESTIGATION

WASHINGTON, March 11.—After a 5-month wind-up, the Select House Committee to Investigate Lobbying Activities is about ready to toss out the opening pitch in an investigation that could produce a sensation a day—or turn into a flop. Public hearings are to start March 27.

Chances are that the inquiry will steer a course somewhere between daily headline-hunting and steady digging into the complex subject of what makes the $8,000,000-a-year lobbying industry tick and how to improve the Federal law, enacted in 1946, that is supposed to regulate it.

A dozen or so investigators, lawyers, clerks, and researchers have been quietly at work since last December in laying the groundwork for public hearings.

The object of the preliminaries, according to Representative FRANK BUCHANAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the special committee, is the compilation of what might be termed "a catalog of basic fact on the theory and practice of lobbying."

AREAS OF INQUIRY

The committee then plans to make a detailed inquiry into four so-called twilight zones where question has arisen as to whether activities constitute lobbying as defined by the registration act. These areas are listed by Mr. BUCHANAN as follows:

1. The peculiar position of attorneys. For the most part, the lawyers involved contend that they merely represent their clients in the normal attorney-client relationship and are compensated for that service rather than for any incidental lobbying they might perform. The assumption is that many other possible lawyer-lobbyists, believing they are exempt, have failed to register.

2. "The peculiar position of officers of companies and associations." Many of these officials have registered under protest, asserting that their lobbying activities were only an incidental part of their regular duties.

3. "The peculiar position of public relations counselors." Similar arguments are advanced by some public relations units employed by organizations and business concerns. An additional consideration in their case is the extent that publicity prepared for dissemination to the public constitutes indirect lobbying covered by the act.

4. "The peculiar position of legislative reporters." Many organizations employ Washington representatives to keep them abreast of proposed legislation of special interest to them. The reports that these representatives make to their employing organizations, many of them in the form of bulletins and circulars, could be classified as indirect lobbying if they are designed to stir up sentiment for the purpose of influencing legislation.

In the course of examining these borderline areas, the committee expects to produce several examples that might be regarded as typical and explore them in detail. It thus hopes to develop exhaustive information on lobbying methods by questioning those in the business.

Among the lobbies selected for thorough investigation are those that operated in connection with the public housing fight last year. The campaign for repeal of war-time excise taxes, which reached new heights this session, may also be scrutinized. It is emphasized that the activities of lobbies on both sides of the various issues will be explored without bias or prejudice.

Great Danger in Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Mr. Thomas F. Downey, which appeared in the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., on Sunday, March 12, 1950:

PROPAGANDA AIMED AT UNITED STATES CANNOT BE TAKEN LIGHTLY—ARMED FORCES ALERTED TO EFFECTS

(By Thomas F. Downey)

Don't make the mistake of taking the cold war lightly. It is a dangerous situation and it is up to every citizen of this great democracy to be on guard against un-American propaganda.

With the hydrogen-bomb coming to the forefront of the cold front hostilities, psychological warfare has reached its peak in the throbbing and thrilling twentieth century.

Although the great battlewagons are riding at peaceful anchor in the mothball fleet and the cannons of war are rusted, top leaders of the military forces of the Nation warn that propaganda can be a powerful force which can be deadlier than a gun, a bomb or any other weapon of war.

REALIZE RESULT

Leaders of the Nation realize that psychological warfare can be worse than a shooting war. They know that when the minds of men are constricted with a paralyzing fear, by intimidation and by persuasion, their bodies can be more easily captured.

Many Americans today give little thought to the cold war which is being waged at top speed throughout the world. The forces of blind obedience to sword rattling Communists are on one side and on the other the democratic nations which believe that all

men have a fair and unhampered chance at freedom, success, and happiness.

NOT TAKING CHANCES

High military officials of the United States are not taking any chances on the effects of the cold and deadly psychological war infiltrating to our stalwart men in uniform. The general public will do well to take a few pages from the warning pamphlets which the armed forces have issued on the cold war.

Members of the armed forces throughout the Nation and those on foreign duty are studying the methods of understanding and combatting psychological warfare. The Office of Secretary of Defense has prepared special information on the dangerous subject for ranking officers to disseminate to the men in their outfits.

This Nation's leaders feel that the informed serviceman is best equipped to guard himself and his Nation against dishonest propaganda. The serviceman of the various branches of the armed forces who has not followed the course of events, both in peace and during war, can become an easy prey to the sinister propagandist.

CAN EXPOSE THEMSELVES

If a man or woman is unable to distinguish between fact and falsehood, between accurate and inaccurate they are liable to expose themselves, their organization, community or Nation to serious dangers.

In a special message to the armed forces issued by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, military authorities stress that a serviceman unarmed against a vicious propaganda attack on the Nation is just as bad as a soldier or sailor who is without proper arms in battle.

MORE STUDY PROPAGANDA

Every American—civilian or member of the armed forces—must develop the ability to analyse propaganda. They must know how to detect subversive propaganda, for this is a personal responsibility of every person who wants to keep this Nation a great, peaceful democracy.

Americans must be able to evaluate each and every item of gossip or information that comes their way. This is not a query, to be easily thrown over one's shoulder. The activities of Red- and Soviet-front groups are more numerous and dexterous than a swarm of bees in a sugarcane field.

If you sit back and analyze the situation, modern warfare is made up of four basic types. These are military, which includes air, sea, and land operations; economic, political, and psychological. The world today is struggling under the latter type of deadly conflict.

WARFARE PSYCHOLOGICAL

Officials of the Office of the Secretary of Defense at Washington stress that in the final analysis all warfare is psychological in that it is waged to influence and swerve or intimidate the mind of the enemy.

Pure psychological warfare is distinct in itself. It has its own system. This is not a system or weapon of the last resort. Under honest and skilled leadership it can save lives on the battlefield and help prevent or shorten a war.

Actually, psychological warfare is the application of the principles of psychology (the study of the mind) to the conduct of war. It has many facets.

NOT MODERN DISCOVERY

Psychological warfare is not a modern discovery, officials of the Armed Forces Information and Education Division stress in a recent special message to the men in uniform.

"The pattern—employed 2,500 years ago by Xerxes, the Persian general, who used rumormongering as a means of waging propaganda war—was successfully imitated by the Nazi government in World War II, they point out.

"Xerxes scared the daylights out of the Greek warriors by circulating rumors that when the Persians shot their arrows they shut out the light of the sun.

"It was the same myth of invincibility which in World War II scared Europe out of its wits and enabled the Nazis to conquer Austria and Czechoslovakia with no more than a few random shots."

Hannibal, the Carthaginian king, was another who used rumors expertly. He planted tales about his Roman enemies, claiming that he had a "secret weapon which could not be stopped, and could not even be pierced." The Roman legions mulled about like frightened youngsters, asking what millions wondered about the Nazis, "How can we resist?" They discovered too late that Hannibal's secret weapon was only a herd of armored elephants.

Horrifying shrieks and war masks of ancient Japanese and the African and South Sea island tribes were psychological weapons. So were the blood-curdling cries of the warring American Indians.

American colonial forces at the famed Battle of Bunker Hill used one of the earliest types of front-line combat propaganda. They circulated leaflets pointing to sharp class distinctions then existing between British officers and enlisted men.

Hitler was the worst propagandist of World War II. His main purpose was "to sow mental confusion, contradiction, indecision, and panic" in the Allied countries and among the Allied governments.

REINFORCED BY ALLIES

But Hitler and his lieutenants were not the only experts in the art of organized propaganda. The Axis propaganda swords were parried and the lunges returned by allied counter-propaganda.

In the struggle to influence men's minds, a fundamental difference existed between the propaganda of democracy and that of the Axis powers, our Nation's military leaders are quick to point out.

The Axis blindfolded their own people against the truth as the Russians are doing today. They used distortions and falsehoods. "The greater the lie, the more effective a weapon it is," Hitler wrote.

MET TRADITION

By contrast, Allied propaganda stressed the truth, concentrating on straight news and commentaries. Since the aims and ideals of the western democracies were predicated on international justice and the right of nations to self-government, they did not resort to deception to make a case for themselves.

The strategy of truth which characterized Allied propaganda was in full accord with their democratic traditions. They could not have resorted to organized distortion and suppression of truths without discrediting themselves in the eyes of their own people.

In the long run, honesty and truthful propaganda proved a far more realistic and profitable policy for dealing with their own people, the neutrals and also the enemy.

NOT ALL IS FALSE

Every American in this chaotic era must understand that not all propaganda is bad or untrue. Propaganda is used for good purposes. Worthy welfare agencies, for example, use it to promote their ideas and programs. In these instances propaganda is good publicity or promotional activity, free from selfish interests.

All persons should be on guard, however, against unscrupulous individuals and groups who utilize propaganda to advance their special brand of ideas. In plain language, propaganda can be based on truth or on falsehood; it can be useful or harmful, depending on the purposes for which it is used.

Then the big question posed for every freedom-loving person is: "How can I do my own thinking and evaluating about national and world issues in order to avoid falling the victim of a dishonest propaganda artist or philosophy?"

PRETTY SUAVE OPERATOR

It must be remembered that the dispenser of dishonest propaganda is often a pretty suave operator—in other words, the proverbial wolf in sheep's clothing. Here are some tips from top military authorities on ways of sifting and analyzing propaganda:

The first thing to do is get the facts. Knowledge is the No. 1 enemy of false propaganda. If somebody tells you something wrong about which you have the correct facts, then it is your duty to set him right and halt the spread of false propaganda.

In the world today fear seems to be the aim of much propaganda. If you have the facts you won't be frightened by malicious or nerve-twitching rumors.

CONSULT AUTHORITY

When you go after information get the full and relevant facts. This means going to competent authority to prove the reliability of the information.

Cultivate a discriminating mind. This don't mean you have to become a 100 percent doubting Thomas. But you should refuse to accept uncritically any information or news that comes your way via an unreliable or doubtful source.

Consider all sides of an issue or bit of information. Don't forget to also consider your own personal leanings. Humans often believe what they want to believe on the basis of their emotions.

DISTINCTIVE MARKS

Be propaganda wise. One sure way to distinguish the honest propagandist from the dishonest is to compare the methods employed. While the honest propagandist bases his appeal on demonstrable facts, the dishonest propagandist spreads falsehood deliberately.

The honest propagandist is fair-minded, but the dishonest propagandist assumes the appearance of being fair-minded. The former appeals most to our intelligence. The latter persistently tries to arouse the emotions.

The honest propagandist does not dodge the pros and cons of an issue. He is willing to change his conclusions on the basis of new evidence and maintains an open-minded attitude. The dishonest propagandist is intolerant of open discussion and conflicting views. His mind is closed to everything but his own selfish goal.

Internal Security of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no matter confronting the Nation today of more importance than strengthening the laws relating to our internal security. Recent happenings both in and out of court have revealed a situation that cannot go unchallenged. The subversive activities of some in high policy-making departments of our Government, as well as by some who are

duly appointed representatives of foreign governments, calls for drastic action. There must be a tightening up of our laws and the adoption of criminal procedures that will make it impossible for traitorous offenders to escape punishment. The bill now before us is a step in the right direction. I am wholeheartedly in favor of the bill and it should have the support of this House. I am certain that it will have such support. While there may be at times divisions among the membership, yet, in a matter of this kind there has never been, and I am certain there never will be, any division, for this is a patriotic and not a partisan or political matter. Patriotism transcends party affiliation and no one political party has ever had a monopoly on love of country. Thus Democrats and Republicans stand together on matters of this kind with unity and single purpose. This is as it should be.

The bill was originally drafted by and has the support of the Interdepartmental Intelligence Committee, a joint group consisting of representatives of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the Department of the Army, the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Department of the Navy, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

The provisions of the bill not only increase the penalties that can be exacted of those found guilty, but, it also increases the scope of offenses. In this latter respect the bill has been drafted on the basis of the experience gained in recent investigations and trials that brought to light the insufficiency of existing laws. It will undoubtedly close loopholes and make criminal prosecutions far more effective than at any previous time.

It is imperative that legislation of this character be adopted. Serious gaps in our present laws permit people, both citizens and aliens alike, opportunities to acquire information vital to our national security and to use that information to the disadvantage and danger of the United States without fear of prosecution in our courts. Numerous cases have come to light in recent years pointing to the weakness of these laws when they are subjected to attack. There now exists in our midst a threat of our form of government and to the liberties guaranteed to all of us by our Constitution. The magnitude and strength of this threat is something new and strange to America. It is a threat which is most difficult to counteract, particularly when our law-enforcement agencies are hampered by lack of effective laws.

This bill may not solve all of the problems of security, but, if experience shows that it does not then amendments can be made that will meet any such contingency. But, it is certain that as now presented to the House it will be of inestimable assistance to the agencies of the Government charged with responsibility of maintaining our national security.

The bill should be passed and without delay.

The American Citizen and His Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, within the last few days I have received letters which indicate a great deal of thinking on the part of the American people about the type of Government that we have and enjoy and should endeavor to maintain. Two of these letters in particular are so very worthy of your consideration that I asked they be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The first letter is by Mr. J. Elmer Pate, of Bryan, Tex., and the second letter which conveyed the thoughts of Dr. John Ashton, of College Station, Tex., is entitled "A Checkrein on Government Spending." Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert these two letters:

The Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: The Declaration of Independence was the product of men who struggled against being in bonds; men who dared fight the usurper; men whose courage and vision opened the gate to the highest plane of achievement a nation has ever known. Again we need men: Our prosperity and lack of suffering hardships for liberty has dulled our senses to the stealthy, ominous creeping of other usurpers, with their silken thongs of bondage. What a time for a Washington or a Lincoln. It just doesn't make sense to go back down the hill.

Heretofore I've hesitated to write you about legislation because I feel that, in you, we of this district have a good Representative; one who will give all proposals a conscientious study. But if there ever was a time when good men needed the support, and sorry men the condemnation of their countrymen, it is now. That's why I'm writing you about the Hoover Commission report. It seems to me the theme of the whole report, from the General Management of the Executive Branch to Federal-State Relations, is efficiency. And efficiency in government is the forerunner of economy in government. We need this levee in the path of back-to-bondage spending. To be sure, what's a few billion in our day of squandermania? But our day isn't forever. We may not have many more chances to turn the tide.

And we have children. I have a fine athletic son and two beautiful daughters. A variation of that statement challenges the mind and heart of every parent, and of everyone who can understand the dignity and purpose that, in the beginning, God revealed to man.

It's too bad that man doesn't always live up to his possibilities. In our district we are typical men and American; rural and urban, deep-rooted in the soil. Two generations ago the land was virgin, rich, and covered with native growth. Now, as you know, much of it is barren and scarred with gullies. Why? Greed grabbed, and carelessness and ignorance indulged. It didn't matter. After their generation the kids could "go west." A few terraces would have saved a lot of moving—soil and people. The kids didn't mind it much though; the United States was boundless. For what good reason are we "going west" again; this time, to the land-of-no-return, dissipating our liberties via the hand-out route.

We realize you have grave responsibilities, Congressman TEAGUE. You are our leader; we are behind you, but you'll probably have to save us from ourselves. Don't yield every time we holler "milk." It's time we were weaned. And when you meet the force of power-drunk wastrels, whose chief purpose is to grab more power, and who, in the cloak of human welfare, hope to buy the human soul under a colossal state, don't yield. Throw up some road blocks; build some embankments; hold the fort. Or some day our children, groveling under an intolerable yoke, will curse our memory.

Respectfully yours,

J. ELMER PATE.

A CHECKREIN ON GOVERNMENT SPENDING

(By Dr. John Ashton)

It should be obvious to the average voter who has read the series of articles on the Recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, by H. Mewhinney, reprinted from the Houston Post (copyright 1949), that waste and inefficiency are the two disturbing factors in the normal operation of our Government, as so clearly set forth in the Hoover Commission reports.

Firmly convinced that colossal sums of money could be saved the American taxpayer by the introduction of proper business-like methods and procedure in the various bureaus and departments of the Government, the writer of this letter advocates the creation of a new post, having high or perhaps Cabinet rank, endowed with adequate power to bring about a drastic reform throughout the executive branch of the Government, and to supervise, reorganize, streamline, and put into operation, such methods and plans as would tend to bring about great savings in money and more efficiency in operation.

Such an official should be selected with the utmost care, and he should, moreover, be a man of wide experience and knowledge of modern business methods, besides being possessed of ample resource as an administrative leader—in fact, the type of executive normally expected to bring order out of chaos.

He would be responsible to nobody but the President, and through him to Congress. He should be appointed for sufficient period of time as would permit him to bring about favorable results, and, if mutually agreeable, the office could be extended for a further period. In addition to his many admirable qualities for such a post, the incumbent should be totally free from political bias.

He should have—and his opinion should be considered in the choosing—an assistant of undoubted merits and high administrative capacity, besides several under secretaries or officials of like rank to superintend the staff work and general functioning of a large and important bureau.

He would be given the power to appoint in every important bureau or department of the executive branch of the Government an officer whose duties would be devoted exclusively to curbing waste and promoting efficiency, and such officers would confer frequently with their chiefs and write periodic reports as deemed necessary.

The chief himself would confer whenever convenient with the Chief Executive, and his recommendations and views would be placed before the President on such occasions—all in the interest of greater economy in the operation of the essential work of the Government.

With only the recommendations of the Hoover Commission report to guide him, such an officer, together with his trained aides and actively encouraged by a cooperative

President, could doubtless accomplish wonders in stopping leaks, sweeping aside duplications of effort, simplifying procedures, reducing red-tape, abolishing cumbersome laws and regulations of no use whatever, and in separating the chaff from the grain among the employees in Government offices and bureaus.

Then, and probably only then, will deficit spending be a thing of the past.

God save America!

Our Money Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of March 13, 1950:

FAR FROM WOODWARD AVENUE—OUR MONEY GOES

Never mind the fine-spun economic theories which even the authors of them cannot understand.

Never mind the sweet dreams of heaven on earth that come from the satin pillows of the cloud kissers.

Never mind the cruelties of practical politics by which these vagaries of the lotus eaters are used to cinch the do-gooder votes.

As an idealist, President Truman reminds us of a gregarious and convivial Elk dressed up as Little Eva for a benefit performance of Uncle Tom's Cabin.

Never mind any of these things, because what we most desperately need is the truth. And, as Al Smith used to remark, the only place you can find that is in the record.

So here is a startling example of how Mr. Truman's politically motivated point 4 program will work out.

His plan—he says—is to save the world from communism when he is actually moving us into the lobby of its edifice with his socialistic program. By point 4 he plans to spend billions and billions of American taxpayers' money to make the backward people of the world happy and prosperous.

Now, let us look at what is going on in Indochina.

That's a long way from Detroit's collapsing city hall and our own bread lines. Mr. Taxpayer, but get the spot in focus, because that's where Mr. Truman wants to spend some billions of your money and that of your fellow citizens.

The French never won the friendship of the people of this lush and profitable Indochina colony. After the Japanese, who had moved into it with Vichy connivance, were ousted, the natives rebelled against France.

The most forceful of the Nationalist leaders was, and is, Ho Chi Minh, a Moscow-trained Communist.

As a counterweight to Ho, the French set up Bao Dai, a former Emperor of Annam, who had collaborated with the Japanese and then fled the country.

Viet Nam, as the puppet state he heads is known, was then admitted to the French Union but with strictly limited sovereignty. The French kept control of defense and foreign affairs. That isn't what the Viet Namese want. They want to be as free as India is.

A few weeks ago Mr. Acheson's State Department recognized Bao Dai and promised him economic and other aid.

A special mission is now studying the use of economic assistance to combat communism in Indochina and elsewhere in southeast Asia.

At this point the Governor of North Viet Nam declares that American aid must be given directly to the Bao Dai regime and not through France.

Otherwise it would have a bad effect politically.

"We want full, complete independence. We have had many promises in the past. We now want to see real transfer of power."

The Viet Namese fear that if the French have the disbursement of American aid they will use it to strengthen their hold on Indochina.

The French, for their part, fear that if our aid is given directly to Bao Dai he will use it further to loosen that hold.

We've got to choose in this Achesonian art of making enemies and influencing nobody.

The same choice will have to be made if and when Congress authorizes President Truman's bold new program for developing underdeveloped areas.

The French were frank enough to state that they did not want this aid if American notions of freedom for colonies were attached to it.

The Dutch sought our financial assistance in Indonesia. The Belgians have drawn up a 10-year development plan for the Congo in expectation of point 4 aid.

As our policy in Asia is reduced to trying to save the fringe of that vast continent, and its offshore islands, from communism, we can't afford to buck the national spirit of independence with which the entire area heaves.

So we are confronted today with the three-cornered struggle of European colonial imperialism, expertly trained Communist agitators from Moscow, and the nationalistic, patriotic love of submerged and exploited peoples for their own lands.

Mr. Truman has the mad concept that he can settle all this by spending your money—billions of it.

Pandora's box was a harmless cookie jar compared to what the practical politician, Mr. Truman, is prying loose for us in order to win the support of the panty-waist boys and the Helen Hokinson girls. He has already got the precincts of the political bosses, who think Indochina is a type of chicken favored by poultry breeders.

Reduction in Force of Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, within the last few days I have been in receipt of many pieces of correspondence from members of veterans organizations and other citizens who are interested in the welfare of veterans. They protest vehemently the recent reduction in force in the Veterans' Administration because, in their opinion, it will materially affect the services now being provided to veterans.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter addressed to me from the department commander of the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, which merits serious consideration. It presents an intelligent approach to the serious implications of the reduction which has been effected:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF NEW JERSEY,
Trenton, N. J., March 13, 1950.

The Honorable PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN RODINO: This letter is an analysis of the most recent reduction in the forces of the Newark regional office of the Veterans' Administration and the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Lyons, N. J., by direction of the Veterans' Administration general office at Washington, D. C.

It also contains our opinion as to the effect that these reductions will have upon veterans' activities in New Jersey.

In presenting this information to you, it is the official opinion of the American Legion, Department of New Jersey. This letter has been read to the meeting of the Department executive committee held on Saturday, March 11, in Trenton, N. J., and was approved by them.

NEWARK REGIONAL OFFICE

The total reduction of force in the Newark regional office is 156 employees. Of these, 62 are medical personnel, principally doctors and medical technicians and some associated clerical employees. This service is principally clinical and out-patient treatment of veterans.

In order to accomplish the reduction with minimum disruption of the service, the Regional Manager has decided to close the medical and dental clinic and out-patient services in the Camden suboffice. Some reduction will also be made in the Trenton, Newark, and Union City offices.

The effect of this will be to slow up materially the rate at which patients may be treated in the offices where medical personnel is retained. In the Camden office, the clinical and out-patient treatment will probably be placed on a fee basis.

As the increased load develops upon the reduced forces in the Trenton, Newark, and Union City offices to back-log proportions, the method of relief will be to place a portion of this load also on a fee basis.

In considering the economics of this reduction, there will be a direct pay-roll saving of employees who will be separated from the service. As an offset, however, there will be an increase in the fees paid to outside doctors for all types of clinical, dental, and out-patient treatment. It is not practicable at this time to estimate what this cost will be but, in our opinion, it will assume substantial proportions in due course.

Secondly, with regard to the physiotherapy and dental units, which are of the latest type of equipment, it will make idle a substantial capital investment. Furthermore, by reason of the reduced professional personnel, it will be necessary to eliminate certain services in these departments which have been available to veterans one or two nights a week. The point here is that the veteran entitled to this treatment will, of necessity, be required to come to the clinics during the day hours with probably loss in pay from his employment or, in fear of losing his job, will fail to receive the necessary treatment.

Of the afore-mentioned reduction of 156 employees, 36 are in the Adjudication Service. These are employees who consider and determine the disability ratings of claimants and fix the pensions to which they may be entitled. In full effect, this reduction means that a present total of 13 rating boards, the force will be reduced to 10 rating boards. On the face of this situation, this means that the remaining 10 boards will have to assimilate approximately a 25-percent increased

load upon them. As it is our present observation that all of these 13 boards are substantially occupied with the present load, elimination of 2 of the boards and the transfer of the case load to the remaining boards will mean a less deliberative and considerate rating of claims and will, in due course, cause a backlog in the number of cases awaiting determination.

As you know, veterans who are delayed in obtaining their ratings and consequent pensions, become rather vocal if the delay is protracted. Too hasty a determination on the part of rating boards in rating cases leads to errors of omission and commission, which invariably become controversial and require rehearings and reviews. This means further increasing the load upon the remaining rating boards.

As a further consideration, it will be necessary for these rating boards, in order to expedite the handling of cases, to thoroughly screen and perhaps deny veterans the right of personal appearances before the rating boards. This always instills in the mind of the veteran the idea that his case is not receiving the personalized attention it deserves. It also means that all veterans organizations, the American Red Cross, and State agencies, having authorized right of appearance before rating boards, will have a material increase in complaints to them by veterans which will result in an increase in the referencing and rearrangs of cases upon their representation.

There is a further consideration also to be borne in mind that veterans who are dissatisfied with conditions arising out of these circumstances inevitably appeal to you for assistance in their behalf.

It is our studied judgment that a reduction in the Adjudication Service, while effecting a pay-roll saving, in no wise reduces the case load and can only, in due course, cause an increase in expense should it be necessary to put the remaining rating boards on an overtime basis.

There are also some further reductions in personnel of miscellaneous character which we have not analyzed. Among these are rehabilitation and training personnel having to do with vocational rehabilitation and educational benefits.

LYONS HOSPITAL

The Lyons Hospital is, as you know, a neuropsychiatric hospital which has a rated bed capacity of 2,224 beds. This has been supplemented by 268 beds of emergency character which were set up in certain buildings initially intended as administrative buildings. The total available beds therefore are 2,522. As of March 10, the patient population at the Lyons Hospital was 2,462.

This hospital has been continuously, for years, overpopulated and understaffed. The American Legion has registered innumerable complaints concerning the understaffing of this institution.

Under the reduction-in-force program, made effective this week, the total employee force of this institution is reduced from 1,371 employees to 1,318 employees, a pay-roll saving of 69 employees. Without attempting to analyze in detail the various categories of employees to be included in this reduction, the American Legion is most concerned with the reduction in the nursing staff, which is 4 registered nurses and 35 hospital attendants. In addition to this, there is a reduction of two doctors.

Considering the fact that a major portion of the patients at this hospital are of an unstable mind, any reduction in the personnel committed to the direct care of patients has serious implications. It should not be necessary for us to invite your attention to the shocking crimes of violence which have occurred in our own State and neighboring localities committed by persons of unsound mind. Without recourse to hysteria, the American Legion is most concerned with these dangers as they pertain to veterans who may be released from this hospital prematurely or without adequate determination as to their state of sanity, which will permit them to be safely returned to the civilian population.

We estimate that if this reduction in force in the Lyons Hospital prevails, it may be necessary to make at least 300 beds inactive because they cannot be properly staffed. There is danger here in the possibility that some demented veteran may be denied or unduly delayed admittance.

In conclusion, we present these facts to you upon their merits. We have endeavored not to make any exaggerated statements. We feel that our conclusions are tempered with our experience.

We sincerely solicit your personal consideration as to the situation in our State in connection with the Veterans' Administration services here. We fear that the current controversy inspired by discussions of the Hoover report, insofar as it concerns veterans' affairs, may have inspired these gestures of economy.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY V. GROOMS,
Department Commander.

The Command Is "Forward"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the National Tribune Stars and Stripes, Washington, D. C., of this week:

THE COMMAND IS "FORWARD"

Thirty-one years ago this week there was born in Paris, France, one of the greatest nonpolitical organizations in our Nation's history. It had its predecessors in organized groups of veterans of previous wars, but none ever reached its size in numbers, in prestige, or in actual accomplishment. We are happy to dedicate this column to the American Legion in honor of its devotion to America and to the men and women who have preserved it against our enemies both at home and abroad, and as an added incentive to Legionnaires to a continuance of their purposes as outlined in the preamble to their constitution.

Some 20 servicemen of World War I conceived the idea of an association of veterans of that conflict on February 16, 1919, at a dinner which followed a staff meeting in Paris. Realizing they had no authority to more than start the ball rolling, these men, led by the son of the soldier President Theodore Roosevelt, issued invitations to a caucus, half enlisted men and half officers in composition, that met in the French capital on March 15 to 17 of that year. A thousand delegates there named an executive group which hit upon the name, the American Legion, and in April it drafted a plan of organization and designated a committee to begin operations at home. Another caucus was held at St. Louis in May. Delegates were present from every State, and plans were adopted for the first national convention in Minneapolis the following November.

It has been related on a multitude of occasions that the Legion was predicated upon selfish motives and that it is a pressure group designed to take care of its own at the expense of the average citizen. Nothing could be further removed from the truth. Democratic in all of its aspects, from the choice of its leadership to its program of mandates, its every action is dictated by convention delegates. Although acknowledging that it has its own political machinery as does every other society of any kind that is closely organized, one need only go back to the 1919 meeting in St. Louis to know about its nonpartisan principles which have been carried forward to the present hour and that have given to the Legion the sinews that have made of it a power with which all must reckon. There, as this country's fighting sons, it took its stand against coddling conscientious objectors. It condemned anarchists and international socialists. It demanded deportation of alien slackers, insisted upon a neutral attitude in industrial strife, endorsed land reclamation and initiated its course relative to securing the rights and privileges of ex-servicemen under the law.

The first national convention, in November 1919, approved these policies. It took a stand in foreign relations, spoke out for the first time against militarism in this land and asked for a system of universal military training in order to give our youth a chance for survival in any future war. There, and in its next convention the following year in Cleveland, it spoke out for adjusted compensation for those who fought in war while others, who remained at home, earned high wages in shipyards and elsewhere. Little by little, but ever with increasing force, the Legion has taken its place in the forefront in seeking solutions to the larger problems of national security, Americanism, child welfare, youth delinquency and foreign affairs. It is anything but selfish in principle even though it is fighting jealously to secure also the happiness of its disabled and aged.

At its thirty-first birthday, the American Legion enjoys a membership in excess of 3,000,000 and has associated with it a million auxiliary women. It boasts over 17,000 separate post units and owns or controls properties valued in the billions. As it has prospered, it has increased its activities and, in the normal course, it has aroused envy among the nonveteran class. Quite naturally, and almost entirely because enthusiasm and patriotism die as we become further removed from war years, it has found strong antagonists among those who are forgetful and whose interest in the almighty dollar supersedes thoughts of proper care for men and women who have borne the battle. The complexion of the Legion itself has undergone a change with the passing of a new world conflict. From a strength of a million members it has tripled in numbers. Young men from new generations compose two-thirds of its ranks, and their ideals, while paralleling closely those of their fathers, are differently expressed. In the normal course of events, leadership has gone over to the younger comrades in arms, and new methods of administration and differing means of approach are reflected in their thinking. It is principally of these things that we would concern ourselves as we compliment the Legion on its thirty-first anniversary.

One of the most heartening demonstrations of solidarity it has ever been our privilege to witness has been the patent desire this year, on the part of the first strictly World War II commander, to work in harmony with the national leaders of brother organizations. George Craig has performed a distinct service to all veterans and their dependents in following the course he has chosen. We know now that some old dyed-in-the-wool Legionnaires did not see eye-to-eye with him in his purpose to cooperate with others for the good of all, but it should be obvious to everybody by this time that Craig's vision was clear, and, unpopular as may have been the decision in the beginning, his judgment has been confirmed by events.

Enemies of the veteran class are on the warpath. There has never before in history been such a propaganda flow against veterans and their hard-earned privileges, excepting possibly the campaign in 1932-33 which resulted in the loss of many veterans' rights and the repeal of their laws. Instead of fighting back with an impotence born of division within the ranks, Commander Craig had the wisdom to accept a place in a coalition of all of the major recognized veterans' organizations and, with no loss of prerogative or identity, he has the representatives of millions of other war veterans and their kin battling with him. He and they will win their struggle because the right is on their side and because they had the courage and foresight to work together in a common cause.

We of the Tribune would look ahead a little. It is one thing to fight a delaying action and to establish a strong line of defense. Given sufficient strength against a common and well-organized enemy, that might win a battle but it will never win a war. Fuzzy-brained idealists are engaged today in altering the entire course of this country's future conduct among nations. They do it in the name of the peace that all veterans so dearly desire, but they play into the hands of others whose ideals stand in absolute contradiction to the principles upon which America was founded and upon which it has grown to a position of leadership among world powers. The great American Legion and its allied veterans' societies are the hope of the civilized world in halting this trek toward ultimate destruction. Other strong movements, backed by millions of gullible citizens and by the coffers of rich supporters, would deny needed legislation to this country's fighting veterans and their loved ones and would destroy some privileges they already possess. Nobody more than the present Legion leadership knows this, but we fear a tendency to carry on a defensive action rather than an offense that will insure the winning of a cause for which all veterans have organized, the one nearest and dearest to them.

There are proposals in legislative form on Capitol Hill that must be written into law. Many of them carry Legion sponsorship. Some are opposed by the older among the Legion membership who happen to be motivated by that human failing which causes people to think in terms of self rather than to broaden their outlook in the realization that they owe a duty to their less fortunate fellow men. We are certain that if the Legion is to move ahead to greater accomplishment, if it is to do all for which it was created 31 years ago and if it would hold within its ranks many of those who gave it birth and who saw it safely through its formative years, the time has come for it to begin an offensive of as great proportions as the delaying action it has so far fought this year. A little soul searching is in order. The other organizations can be depended upon to carry their part of the load, so let us not forget the disabled and needy in this time of stress. While congratulating the American Legion on the splendor of its past, we look ahead to what can and must be done. The command is "forward."

A Veteran Explains the Hoover Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, must reading for Members of Congress and all citizens of the United States—especially veterans—is A Veteran Explains the Hoover Reports, written by Herman W. Steinkraus, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. This article is particularly timely due to the misconceptions of the Hoover reports. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this excellent statement:

A CALL TO VETERANS

(By Herman W. Steinkraus, veteran of World War I, past national commander of the Legion of Valor; president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States)

DEAR FELLOW VETERAN: I'm addressing this message to you because I feel sure you will want to help in a very worthy cause.

Our Nation is in trouble. Serious trouble. It needs your help again.

The job isn't military, but it takes courage, just the same. I'm asking you to look at some facts and to help clear up some misunderstandings which are spreading among your former buddies and mine.

The facts have to do with your veterans' benefits and the Hoover Commission. I believe if you know the facts you will help to see that others learn the truth, too.

You may have heard it said that the Hoover Commission would deprive veterans of benefits, involve them in lots of red taps, dismember the Veterans' Administration, and take hospital beds away from disabled veterans or even send them to prison hospitals. That is absolutely not true.

Those are some of the false statements which have been made by some careless or misinformed people.

In all fairness to yourself and to our country, I ask you to read through this pamphlet and see just exactly what the truth is.

First, let's recognize that the Government has an obligation to treat the veterans right. But it should also spend the taxpayers' money wisely and not waste it by inefficient methods which do no good for the veterans but weaken the financial strength of our country.

Right now our National Government is costing us citizens $120,000,000 a day.

It is spending $14,000,000 more than it takes in every single day.

The Federal debt already amounts to all the money that the Government can expect to collect in the next 7 years, at present tax rates; and you surely agree that taxes are high enough now.

WASTE HELPS NOBODY

Government waste and higher taxes can threaten your job, your savings, your freedom, and future security, just as surely as the Kaiser or Hitler and Tojo would have done if we had lost the wars.

All this huge Government spending is serious enough, but we have plenty of evidence that it is wasting several million dollars a day because of overlapping, duplication, and unbusinesslike procedures which benefit nobody.

This waste can be stopped, and that's where you come in. Your help is needed in stopping it.

Now let me say a word about the Hoover Commission. This Commission consisted of 12 prominent men picked by the President and the leaders of Congress. Six members were Democrats and six Republicans. See their names on pages 12–15. You will know most of them. Nobody claims that the Commission did a perfect job, but those who really know, including President Truman, have said that it did a good job and a very fair one.

The Hoover Commission's 18 reports to Congress ran about 2,000,000 words. That's a lot of words. Together they make a set of books over a foot thick. Very few people have found the time to read them all. It's not surprising then, is it, that misunderstandings have arisen?

The recommendations affecting veterans alone make up 4 of the 18 Hoover reports, and take a lot of reading before they can be understood. But a trained group of experts of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has spent several months and made a careful study of every individual recommendation. These experts are mostly veterans themselves. They have worked hard to make an impartial report. Their answers are contained in this booklet. For your own good, for the future welfare of your children and our country, I urge you to read it.

The Hoover Commission made the most thorough study of Government operations that we have seen in our lifetimes. Government departments have grown so complicated, and are still growing so rapidly, that if this effort to increase their efficiency fails, there probably will not be another chance like this again. In a few more years government will be so big and so complicated that it will ruin our future. We must not let this happen.

The sections of the Hoover reports dealing with veterans are vitally important to this reorganization program. If they are rejected, the whole project will be severely crippled.

The Hoover reports do not recommend cutting out a single one of your veterans' benefits. Just read exactly what the Hoover Commission did propose and why. See for yourself that these proposals do not take anything away from you or any other veteran. Then give your support to the Hoover Commission proposal and help to put an end to any false statements about them you hear.

THERE ARE 19,000,000 VETERANS

When the Veterans' Administration was first established in 1921 under the name of the Veterans Bureau, there were only four and a half million veterans in the United States. Now there are 19,000,000. It makes sense, doesn't it, that the best and latest methods are needed to handle all those veterans' affairs? While it might have been possible to handle the problems of four and a half million veterans efficiently in 1 compact Federal bureau, it is over 4 times as big a job when we have 19,000,000 veterans to deal with.

Remember, there are only 50,000,000 income-tax payers in the United States, and nearly all the 19,000,000 veterans are taxpayers too. You have a real reason for wanting better, more economical, more efficient government. You, yourself, are a taxpayer as well as a veteran.

You don't want to be coddled, nor do you want to take unfair advantage. You just want what's rightly coming to you as a veteran and as a citizen, and a good chance to make your own way in this country for which you fought. The grateful American people want you to have that chance. They want you to have certain benefits. The people don't want them taken away from you. But they do need your help in furnishing these benefits without wasting money.

This booklet is prepared in the form of questions and answers. If any of your questions aren't answered here, please let me know and I'll get the answer for you. I'm asking you this favor as one veteran to another (and I have a son who is a veteran, too). Read this over carefully; discuss it with others.

Here's another chance for you to serve your country as a patriotic citizen. You fought for it in war and now you can help it in peace to adopt a more effective, speedier, and better plan of handling veterans' affairs.

Yours very sincerely,

HERMAN W. STEINKRAUS.

PART I. THE HOOVER COMMISSION

Question. Who served on the Hoover Commission?

Answer. There were 12 members, as follows:

The chairman was Herbert Hoover, the only living former President of the United States. Mr. Hoover has had a long and distinguished public and private career. During World War I he was United States food administrator. In 1946, at President Truman's request, he undertook the coordination of world food supplies in 38 countries. He headed a mission to study German food problems in 1947. Mr. Hoover's chief business interests have been in mining. He holds 48 honorary degrees and is author of several books on political and economical problems.

The vice chairman was Dean Acheson, new Secretary of State. Mr. Acheson is a World War I Navy veteran. A lawyer by profession, he was Under Secretary of the Treasury in 1933 and served as Assistant Secretary and later as Under Secretary of State from 1941 to 1947.

Other members were:

GEORGE D. AIKEN, United States Senator from Vermont since 1940. He formerly was Governor of Vermont, and before that was a local school director. Senator AIKEN is a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee and the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

CLARENCE J. BROWN, Congressman from Ohio since 1939. Representative BROWN had a son in the war. Before going to Congress, he served as Ohio State Senator and later as Lieutenant Governor of Ohio. He is a newspaper publisher.

Arthur S. Flemming, president of Ohio Wesleyan University and former college instructor in government. Mr. Flemming was a member of the United States Civil Service Commission from 1939 to 1948. He also served with the labor division of the Office of Production Management in 1941-42, with the Manpower Survey Board of the Navy in 1943-44, with the Retraining and Reemployment Administration of the Labor Department from 1944 to 1947.

James Forrestal, who was a business executive from 1916 to 1943. His specialty was investment banking. A World War I veteran of the Naval Air Service, Mr. Forrestal was appointed Under Secretary of the Navy in 1940. He later became Secretary of the Navy, and then the first Secretary of Defense upon the unification of the armed forces.

Joseph P. Kennedy, business executive and statesman, who lost a son in World War II. Mr. Kennedy has engaged successfully in shipbuilding, investment banking, and the film business. He has served as Chairman of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, and as Ambassador to Great Britain.

Carter MANASCO, Congressman from Alabama from 1941 to 1948. A lawyer by profession, Mr. Manasco has had a long career of public service.

JOHN H. MCCLELLAN, United States Senator from Arkansas since 1942. Senator MCCLELLAN lost a son in World War II. He himself is a veteran of World War I. In the Senate he serves as chairman of the Expenditures Committee and member of the Appropriations and Public Works Committees. His experience in government dates back to 1928, when he was a prosecuting attorney in Arkansas.

George H. Mead, chairman of the board of directors of the Mead Corp., a pulp and paper firm. Mr. Mead lost a son in World War II. He held the following positions in Government: Member of the Commerce Department's Business Advisory Council, 1933-46; Chairman of the Industrial Advisory Board under the NRA in 1934; member of the President's Committee of Businessmen to advise on war mobilization and reconversion, 1941-44; also, member of the National Defense Mediation Board and of the Federal Price Control Board.

James J. Pollock, professor of political science, University of Michigan. A professor of history and politics since 1921, Mr. Pollock is author of several books on United States and European political problems. He has been a member of the United States Industry Committee of the United States Labor Department's Wage and Hour Division, and special adviser to the United States military government of Germany.

James H. Rowe, Jr., a World War I Navy veteran and assistant to President Roosevelt from 1939 to 1941. Mr. Rowe has had a distinguished career as lawyer and administrator since 1934, when he was secretary to Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. He has served in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Labor Department, the Public Works Administration, and the Justice Department. He was technical adviser at the Nuremberg trials, after which he returned to private law practice, although still acting as consultant to the United States Budget Bureau on public administration matters.

Question. Who appointed these men to the Hoover Commission?

Answer. Mr. Acheson, Mr. Flemming, Mr. Forrestal, and Mr. Mead were appointed by President Truman. Senator Aiken, Mr. Kennedy, Senator McClellan, and Mr. Pollock were appointed by Senator ARTHUR S. VANDENBERG, who was then President pro tempore of the Senate. Mr. Hoover, Representative Brown, Representative Manasco, and Mr. Rowe were appointed by Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, who was then Speaker of the House of Representatives. The law specified that in each group of four members picked by the President and the two leaders of Congress, not more than two could belong to the same political party.

PART II. GENERAL MEDICAL SERVICES

Question. What did the Hoover Commission think should be done with veterans' hospitals?

Answer. Briefly, it said that hospitals operated in this country by the Veterans' Administration, the Army, Navy and the Public Health Service should all be combined into one Federal hospital system, named the United Medical Administration. This would be a partnership arrangement. The four agencies, VA, Army, Navy, and PHS would set up a board and would operate the hospitals jointly.

Question. Why?

Answer. Because each of those agencies now operates its own Nation-wide system of hospitals. In some large cities, there are hospitals operated by all four agencies. A VA hospital may be overcrowded, short of doctors and nurses, while half a mile away an Army hospital may have hundreds of empty beds and dozens of idle doctors, and yet, under the present system, a veteran could not be moved to an Army hospital bed. He would have to wait for a vacancy in the VA hospital or go to some VA hospital in another city, possibly far from home.

Hoover Commission investigators found these conditions:

In the San Francisco area, 13 Federal hospitals (not counting the VA's specialized tubercular and neuropsychiatric hospitals) had a capacity of 9,905 beds and had only 4,180 patients on hand. (This situation has improved somewhat since the Commission made its study in 1948.) If 7 of the smaller hospitals had been closed and all 4,180 patients moved into the remaining 6 hospitals, those 6 would still have been filled to only 84 percent of capacity. And yet 3 more Federal hospitals with a total capacity of 3,000 more beds, were being planned in the area at a cost of $70,000,000 of your tax money.

In New Orleans there were 5 Federal hospitals within a 6-mile radius, with a capacity of 1,620 beds and only 912 patients on hand. Two were general hospitals, one operated by the VA and the other by the Public Health Service. Each had a staff of about 100 full-time physicians representing various medical specialties. And while medical equipment and desperately needed medical talent were being duplicated and thus wasted in these two hospitals, the three military hospitals in the city were so poorly staffed and equipped that patients needing specialized treatment had to be sent to larger military hospitals in Texas and Florida.

Those are just two examples of what the Hoover Commission found. There were others.

Question. But the hospitals take care of different groups of people, under different conditions. Isn't it unwise to try to handle veterans, soldiers, sailors, military dependents, and Public Health Service patients all in the same hospital?

Answer. Why should it be? When a doctor looks at a mangled arm, he doesn't ask whether it happened in a shell burst or in a truck accident.

Question. What about the military personnel? They are subject to military regulations in hospitals. What about the morning reports, the sick book, the clothing reports, pay records, and other details that must be looked after? Who would take care of those things in a civilian hospital?

Answer. Military personnel could be assigned to a hospital to do that. It isn't necessary for the military to operate its own hospitals just for that reason.

Question. That's well enough but what about the veteran? Especially the one with service-connected disability? The Government has a special obligation to him. He doesn't want to have to compete with the military and with all the types of civilians the Government cares for when he needs a hospital bed.

Answer. The right of veterans to hospitalization is fixed by law and would in no way be interfered with by adoption of the Hoover reports. There would be plenty of beds to go around, if the hospitals were merged. In fact, there would be a lot more spare beds than there are now in many hospitals. The Hoover Commission's survey showed that as of June 1948, there were 225,000 beds in Government hospitals and only 155,000 were occupied. Of this total, VA hospitals had 127,000 beds and 105,000 patients. All the other agencies together had 128,000 beds and only 50,000 patients. Don't let anyone tell you that the Hoover Commission program would cause battlefield-disabled veterans or any other deserving veterans to be dumped out of beds to make room for sick nonveterans. VA would be required to see that veterans got preferential treatment. Actually, the Hoover recommendations would mean more beds for veterans right away, and closer to home, because veterans would have access to hospitals which are now barred to them.

Question. Well, put it this way: A veteran is used to taking his troubles to the VA. When he needs hospitalization, he doesn't want to have to put himself at the mercy of some big new civilian outfit called a United Medical Administration. What's fair about that?

Answer. The veteran would continue to deal with VA as always. If he required only clinical diagnosis or dispensary care, the VA would still be equipped to provide it. If he needed hospitalization, the VA would be fully responsible for seeing to it that he was placed in the Government hospital and provided with the type of care called for in VA regulations. All hospital certification

of veterans would remain entirely in the hands of VA. But just as in the case of military personnel, it seems hardly necessary for the VA to run its own hospitals just to see that its regulations are carried out, does it?

Question. The Government takes care of prisoners in hospitals, too. Are veterans supposed to be put into beds alongside criminals?

Answer. Most emphatically not. The Hoover Report on Federal Medical Services specifically says that hospitals run by the Bureau of Prisons and the Indian Affairs Bureau should be kept out of the United Medical Administration and continued as they are.

Question. It still doesn't seem logical for the Hoover Commission, which is trying to trim down big government, to come out for the creation of a gigantic new Federal hospital administration. Wouldn't a new outfit like that create thousands of new jobs and make it necessary to train numerous inexperienced new officials?

Answer. Let's think about that one for a minute. What new jobs would it create? It certainly would take fewer, not more, doctors and nurses if these four hospital systems were combined—if, for example, the 13 hospitals in the San Francisco area were reduced to 6. It surely wouldn't be necessary to train any doctors or nurses or hospital technicians. Those who had been treating veterans could treat the same ailments in military personnel without any further instruction, couldn't they? Hospital administration also is much the same, regardless of whose hospital it is. True, there would be more specialized paper work in a combined hospital than in one which admitted only a single category of patients. But the paper work is all being done in the various hospitals now. Some of the officials who are doing it now could move into a combined hospital and do it there. The fact is, under the Hoover Commission proposal more hospitals could specialize in different major ailments and the Government would have medical talent to overcome some of its shortages.

Question. But after all, the veteran would lose the exclusive hospital service which is provided for him now, wouldn't he?

Answer. No. He would have the same rights and the same care he is getting now and the VA would still be represented there, protecting his interests.

Question. Who made the hospital study for the Hoover Commission?

Answer. A task force of 17 members. Eleven were doctors. The others were hospital experts. Seven members were veterans. One of them, Gen. Paul R. Hawley, was formerly director of VA hospitals. The chairman of the task force was Col. Tracy S. Voorhees, a World War II veteran. Rear Admiral Joel T. Boone was secretary.

PART III. CONSTRUCTION

Question. Is it true that the Hoover Commission proposed to strip VA of its control over construction, including the building of VA hospitals?

Answer. What the Commission proposed was that all Government construction be done by the Interior Department, instead of by 12 different departments. Hospital construction would be directed by a medical board and VA would be represented on that board to assist in hospital planning.

Question. But isn't it true that through years of experience, the VA has demonstrated that it has the technical know-how for building and equipping such specialized institutions as it needs?

Answer. Since World War II, Army engineers have handled the construction of virtually all VA hospitals. As recently as January 24, 1950, Army engineers let the contract for a $15,000,000 VA hospital at West Haven, Conn. So except that the Interior Department, instead of the Army engineers, would be letting the contracts, the same situation would prevail under the Hoover Commission program as now.

Question. What purpose would be served by having Interior do the job?

Answer. By centralizing all construction, the Government could put an end to the waste caused by Federal agencies bidding against each other for scarce labor and materials. Money also could be saved by mass purchases.

Question. The Hoover Commission reported that the Interior Department's Reclamation Bureau was guilty of gross underestimation of the cost of some of its jobs. For instance, it estimated that the Hungry Horse project in Montana would cost $3,300,000 and the cost actually was $93,500,000. Wouldn't that argue against letting the Interior Department take over all Federal construction?

Answer. The Hoover Commission proposed many reforms in the Interior Department, too. Remember, this program is not confined to veterans' affairs. If the whole plan is adopted, such underestimation of costs will be stopped.

PART IV. INSURANCE

Question. Is it true that the Hoover Commission wanted to take the veterans' insurance program away from VA and give it to some new Government agency?

Answer. No. The Commission proposed that a corporation be set up within the VA to handle the insurance business. The Veterans Administrator would be president of the corporation and he would appoint all the directors.

Question. What would be the purpose of a corporation?

Answer. To make the service more efficient. At present, the Treasury Department handles VA insurance money and the General Accounting Office audits the insurance accounts. There is an enormous flow of insurance paper work among the three agencies. VA now must get approval from the Treasury and account to the GAO for every insurance expenditure it makes. By incorporating the insurance business, the flow of paper work would be greatly reduced and the veteran would get much quicker service, because Government corporations are allowed to disburse their own money. These corporations, such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which makes loans to business, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, which lends to farmers, operate under special laws. They have certain privileges not enjoyed by other Government agencies, and they are subject to certain requirements. For instance, they must adopt certain business procedures. The veteran surely cannot object to that. His VA insurance is a business proposition. He wants the VA to be able to adopt some of the practices that are used successfully by private insurance companies. VA could do so if its insurance operations were incorporated.

Question. Wouldn't the setting up of a big VA insurance corporation be expensive?

Answer. No. It might create more jobs at VA, but by reducing the present paper work at the Treasury and at GAO, it would mean savings in personnel at those two agencies. Another thing, VA automatically would pick the employees of its own insurance corporation, subject to civil-service rules, and it is to be assumed that VA would give veterans the first chance at the new jobs.

Question. Under the present arrangement the cost of handling veterans' insurance is paid out of VA funds. Did the Hoover Commission want the veterans to assume this cost by having it added to their premiums?

Answer. Specifically not. The Commission proposed that the costs of operating the Veterans' Life Insurance Corporation be paid out of funds appropriated by Congress. The only difference would be that the Government would have a clearer picture of what the insurance program costs.

Question. What is the matter with the way veterans' insurance is handled now?

Answer. Here are some of the things the Hoover Commission found wrong: VA had 15,432 employees handling insurance. These persons were for the most part so poorly trained and supervised that they handled an average of 450 policies each, compared to an average of 1,762 policies handled by employees of private companies. VA was posting premium payments by hand when they could have done this by machine. Cases were found where payment of death benefits had been delayed as much as a year, due largely to VA's system of handling death claims separately from insurance operations. Half the VA insurance conversion cases studied had been delayed unnecessarily, and 25 percent appeared to have been mishandled. On converted policies the average time required to process death claims was 80 days, whereas private companies pay 70 percent to 82 percent of claims within 15 days.

Question. What reasons were found for such mishandling and delays?

Answer. The methods used at VA were responsible. The Hoover Commission reported that VA has failed to make adequate use of work measurement standards, or of private inspection services to corroborate claims. Some VA policies were found to have lapsed without the veterans' knowledge, because VA clerks failed to check records or to doublecheck one another's work, as is done in private companies. It is logical to assume that if the VA handled its insurance business the same way that private companies do, then it, too, could pay claims within 2 weeks, and a veteran's widow would not have to wait as much as 3 or 4 months for her money, as many widows are having to do now.

Question. Who made the actual study of veterans' insurance problems for the Hoover Commission?

Answer. This was done by a task force which looked into all VA matters. The task force was headed by Col. Franklin D'Olier, first national commander of the American Legion. Colonel D'Olier was director of the United States strategic bombing survey of Germany and Japan (1944-45) and at one time he was chairman of the board of directors of the Prudential Life Insurance Co. of America.

PART V. VETERANS' PREFERENCE

Question. Did the Hoover Commission recommend that veterans' preference in the Federal civil service be abolished?

Answer. No. The Commission proposed that disabled veterans continue to have absolute preference in Federal jobs, as they do now. Other veterans would be given additional credit for each 6 months of military service to help them retain their jobs whenever there are reductions in force from the Federal pay roll.

Question. But nondisabled veterans who now have absolute preference retention would lose that advantage, would they not?

Answer. Yes. That is just about the only advantage veterans would lose under the Hoover Commission program. And the Commission offset this by other recommendations which would bring more veterans into Government service.

Question. How would this be done?

Answer. The Commission said that selected Government agencies should establish a positive, comprehensive, Nation-wide program to recruit veterans only, in Federal positions. This program should be conducted for the next 3 or 4 years in principal communities, the Commission said. Since the purpose would be to get competent veterans into Federal service, it would be necessary to remove present incompetent employees so that

jobs would be available. Actually, competent veterans would replace incompetent workers who might or might not be veterans.

Question. What was the chief feature of the Commission's proposals for Department personnel?

Answer. The main recommendation was that the heads of Federal departments and agencies be permitted to do their own hiring, instead of relying on the slow, cumbersome Civil Service Commission procedure.

Question. Would this mean setting up thousands of independent hiring boards to replace the single Civil Service Commission?

Answer. Not at all. It would simply enable the executive of a Federal agency to hire the right man for the right job at the right time. The present system sets up all sorts of barriers against hiring the best man, against promoting the best man, and against firing the worst man. Veterans on the civil-service register for junior professional assistant have found out all too well how slow and uncertain the Civil Service Commission system works.

PART VI. HOME LOANS

Question. Is it true the Hoover Commission suggested that the home-loan program be taken away from VA?

Answer. No. It was proposed that the Federal Housing Authority act as VA's agent in this program, just as Interior would be VA's construction agent. VA would continue to certify veterans for home loans, to control the loan funds, to set the standards for loans. FHA would only make the appraisals and guarantee the loan. It should make no difference to a veteran who guarantees his loan. In fact, VA now guarantees only 50 percent of a loan, up to a $4,000 limit, while FHA guarantees 90 percent of a full loan.

Question. Why take this function away from VA?

Answer. Well, FHA already handles a large part of GI home loans under a joint arrangement with VA. The way the program operates now, VA and FHA make separate and often widely different appraisals of the same property and they charge different interest rates, thus involving the veteran in needless confusion and red tape. VA is not experienced in the lending field and as a result it will be compelled, by its creditors, to go into real-estate management.

Question. What would be the advantage of letting FHA operate the program?

Answer. Duplication would be eliminated. There would be a saving in personnel. The veteran would not have to get two different kinds of loans on his home. FHA has had more experience than VA with home financing.

PART VII. VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Question. Aren't all these recommendations about veterans' hospitals, construction, insurance, and home loans designed, in a sense, to dismember the Veterans' Administration?

Answer. Not at all. The effect would be to leave VA fully responsible for the planning and control of its programs and to turn over actual operation in some cases to highly specialized Federal agencies which are now, or would be, performing the same services for nonveterans anyhow. The Hoover Commission made no recommendations for curtailing any of the services to veterans. It was concerned only with finding ways to get the job done faster and at less cost. The Commission said: "The basic question as to what the Government owes to its veterans and the dependents of members of the armed forces is a policy matter which must be determined by the Congress." The Commission took the view that as long as the service is properly performed, it should not matter to the veteran how that service is rendered.

Question. Assuming that the Hoover Commission suggestions were put into effect, wouldn't the result be that a veteran no longer could go to one agency and inquire about his disability claim, check up on his chances to get vocational training, make application for hospitalization, ask about a GI loan, or, if called in for a physical examination, do it all in one place?

Answer. That is a misconception. The veteran would go to the VA just as he does now in every one of those cases. He would get the answers directly from VA too, because VA would still be in charge of all benefits and would decide whether the veteran is eligible for them. His master record, the C-file, would remain at VA and if FHA, for instance, was guaranteeing his home loan, it could be supplied with carbon copies of whatever documents it needed from his file.

Question. Weren't there other recommendations for changing the whole structure of VA?

Answer. Yes. The Commission recommended a thorough overhauling job. Briefly it proposed that all pension, retirement benefit, disability compensation and guardianship matters be consolidated in a Veterans' Benefit Service, and that all vocational rehabilitation, education and readjustment programs, as well as the certification of veterans for loan guaranties, be combined in a Readjustment Service. But these transfers would be strictly internal. Nothing would be taken away from VA. All it means is that the two new services would be set up to take the place of several scattered operations, so that like functions could be grouped more logically within the VA.

Question. But why such a shake-up? Is VA so disorganized as all that?

Answer. Here are some of the Commission's findings: VA now finds it necessary to use 88 different manuals, 665 varieties of technical bulletins and more than 400 circulars of various kinds to explain all its procedures. In one instance, VA took 994 pages to explain two 8½ page laws on a veteran's eligibility for education and other benefits. Doesn't that look like too much red tape to be tolerated in an agency that spends $6,000,000,000 a year or 30 percent of all Federal nondefense funds? The Hoover Commission estimated that $70,000,000 a year could be saved by improving the internal operations of VA. It said that large reductions in the staff and supervisory personnel could be made if there were better office procedure. It pointed out that conditions are so bad that there is an annual turnover of 34.8 percent in VA employment. In other words, more than a third of the employees quit each year. The Commission found that 3,600 representatives of 24 veterans' organizations have space in VA offices, helping to prepare cases for individual veterans who do business with VA. So many mistakes had been made in VA offices that some veterans had been overpaid $179,000,000 and $50,000,000 of this still had not been received at the time the Hoover commission made its study.

Question. How could such conditions arise? What did the commission say was wrong, generally?

Answer. That VA is top-heavy with staff officers; too many people report to the Administrator; operations are scattered; there are too many supervisors; responsibility is divided; there is no clear line of authority between Washington and the field offices. Those are some of the general findings.

Question. How would these basic troubles be overcome?

Answer. The Commission recommended that the Administrator be given firmer control; that subordinates be stripped of independent authority; that the Administrator himself be responsible for drafting all central office directives; that lines of authority be clearly set out and the number of organizational units and their top personnel be reduced; that research, inspection, and investigation be placed under one head. Those and the establishment of the two main services mentioned earlier were the major recommendations.

Question. Getting back to those two services, wouldn't a reshuffling of the whole benefit program, for instance, lead to all kinds of confusion, at least while the changes were being made?

Answer. No, not necessarily. Pension, retirement, disability, and guardianship services, now costing $2,000,000,000 a year and due to rise to $2,700,000,000 in about 10 years, should never have been scattered in the first place. The Hoover Commission said that records of pension payments and compensation now kept by the Office of Contract and Administrative Services could be transferred at once to a new veterans' benefit service. It proposed that active records kept in branch offices be transferred, during the liquidation of those offices, to the regional offices and kept separately from the readjustment, education, and insurance accounts.

Question. About the proposed new readjustment service which includes education—isn't it true that the Hoover Commission made some critical comments about the education program and that the reorganization would interfere with schooling under the GI bill?

Answer. It is true that the Commission found much wrong with the way the education program has been handled. But it did not recommend that any of the education or training services be reduced. The education program, by the way, cost $2,743,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949. The Commission found that VA was paying the highest possible tuition and equipment charges to schools in cases which were hard to justify. It said that only after long delays did VA make any efforts to reduce recreational courses, or to enact standards for on-the-job training, or to discover that "institutional on-farm" training was unsatisfactory.

Question. Just what did the Commission think should be done about education?

Answer. It made several recommendations. One was that VA be given authority to establish a system for certifying schools which are not regularly accredited places of learning. In other words, VA should establish standards which would prevent veterans from wasting their time in so-called fly-by-night schools. About 90 percent of the schools attended by veterans are regularly accredited and would not be affected by this proposal. The other 10 percent are not accredited, and the Commission believed that some standards should be set on the kind of teaching they give veterans. Here are some more of the Commission's recommendations: That VA consider giving grants to States to provide better job and school training; that VA consider cooperating with the Labor Department's apprentice-training program to prevent the lowering of apprentice-training standards through the use of Federal funds; that VA study the justification for paying nonresident tuition fees for veterans living within the State; that a simpler system be worked out for handling subsistence allowances.

That's the real story. The Commission was not trying to reduce the chances for education. It was interested in cutting red tape, in seeing that the veteran got the most for the money, and in reducing the burden on the taxpayers by more economical methods. President Truman shares the view that the rules applying to GI training in irregular educational institutions need to be tightened. He sent a report to Congress February 13, 1950, saying that some of the present abuses are "costly to the veteran, to his family, and to the Nation."

Defeatism in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann, from the Washington Post of March 14, 1950:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

DEFEATISM IN WASHINGTON

Seen from the Arizona desert, and some points in between, the picture of Washington at the moment does not make much sense.

For each day there are two series of news stories which recur, as Chesterton once said, with all the monotony of roses in a wallpaper pattern. One series comes from Capitol Hill telling how some Republican Senator has warned the country not to trust the State Department and Mr. Acheson; the Senator is going to prove that they are the dupes of the Communists. The other series comes from the State Department warning the people that they would be the dupes of the Communists if they were so stupidly innocent as to feel "that somehow or other there was an answer to our problem if only we were smart enough to figure it out."

There must be a better way to run a Government, which is supposed to be leading the free peoples of the world, than to announce daily that the Senate does not trust the Secretary of State and that the Secretary of State is afraid the people cannot be trusted. The Republican Senators have got Mr. Acheson in a squeeze where he appears to be spending half his time denying that he is a friend of the Communists and the other half figuring out ways to show how much he dislikes and distrusts the Communists.

And although he has now talked himself into a position which makes Winston Churchill an appeaser and a misguided idealist by comparison, the Secretary of State is treated on Capitol Hill with less courtesy and with smaller regard for the rules of evidence than if he were a convicted horse thief.

In this atmosphere of total distrust it is idle to talk about total diplomacy. There can be nothing total about the actions of a Government which is a house so divided within itself. And of diplomacy there can be virtually none when the Secretary of State feels he must distrust the instinct of the people instead of clarifying, guiding, and rationalizing it.

"We clearly are not focusing" he said the other day, "our total resources on the winning of that struggle." Clearly we are not focusing our total resources, including our resources of brain power and of heart. Why not? Because we have not been given any objective on which to focus. The people and the Congress have supported every measure of any importance which the administration has recommended: the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic security pact, the military-aid program, the annual military appropriations, the unification bill, the United Nations, the World Bank, the Monetary Fund, and all the rest. They cannot be expected to focus more resources than their responsible leaders ask them to focus. If the administration thinks that more is needed, then it should say what it is that is needed, and why.

But in fact what we see is that Mr. Acheson has nothing new to propose to the Russians and that he has nothing new to propose to the American people and to our allies. Thus the diplomatic situation is frozen in Washington while the actual situation in Europe and Asia is deteriorating. The State Department has for the time being run out of ideas which evoke energy, offer hope, and create confidence.

This sterility and defeatism is understandable in view of the persecution—that is the right name for it—being carried on by the Republican Senators. But it is also true that the persecution goes on, and will go on and on, because the administration has not had for over a year a single new, interesting, and constructive idea to which the Nation could rally.

Yet, the events of the past year have been momentous. In China, in Japan, in south Asia, in Germany and central Europe, in the race of armaments the situation today is radically different from what it was believed to be a year ago. But except that we have announced our intention to make the hydrogen bomb, our official doctrines and our policies are just what they were.

We are still operating the Marshall plan on the assumption that western Europe can be integrated without a solution in respect to eastern Germany and eastern Europe and the sterling area. We are still operating the North Atlantic Pact and military aid without any public recognition of the new insecurity of Germany, Austria, and Scandinavia after the Soviet achievement of the atomic bomb. We have renounced Chiang and we are still thoroughly entangled with Chiang. No wonder that the American people, and even more poignantly the people abroad, feel that somebody ought to try to be smart enough to figure out some answers to their problems. They do not like to be told that it would be foolish to try.

And in fact they will try. If Washington won't try, then Paris, London, Bonn, Delhi, Tokyo, and the rest will try. For what is happening as a consequence of the freeze-up in Washington is that the leadership we had by virtue of our ideas and our power is rapidly disintegrating. We are losing touch with the peoples of the world—with their fears, their hopes, their needs, their purposes, and their will to survive—and we are talking not to them but to ourselves in a self-induced mood of defeatism and impotence about how much we must distrust one another and our own better instincts and our own capacity to think and to believe.

FEPC and the CIO Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an article by Ralph Matthews which appeared in the Washington Afro-American, February 18, 1950:

THIS WEEK

LABOR BEING SOLD SHORT BY MURRAY?—"OPERATION DIXIE" OR HOW OUR RACE IS DOUBLE-CROSSED

(By Ralph Matthews)

Several weeks ago when I first pounced on Messrs. Roy Wilkins, Willard Townsend, and company for their audacity at screening the Americans who would and would not be allowed to attend the recent Civil Rights Mobilization here, I was merely indignant over what I thought was patriotic snobbishness.

At the moment I only abhorred the idea, which has grown too popular here of late, of one group of so-called Americans setting themselves up on a pedestal as the true patriots while denouncing others as traitors and skunks.

Bad medicine for all

This I believe to be very bad medicine, both for the prescribers and for the Nation as a whole, because being a good American means many different things to many different people.

I knew only that my idea of what constituted a good American and RANKIN'S idea were incompatible.

Therefore, when the present leaders of the NAACP, with their CIO cohorts, accepted the RANKIN formula and tried to force the rest of us to conform to that mold, I realized that somebody had gotten fouled up somewhere.

Believes he was duped

But now I know what I had only suspected then, that Roy Wilkins had allowed himself to be duped into a big game of power politics in which he was the victim of his own inability to see farther than his nose.

In permitting the mobilization to be used as a sounding board against the so-called leftist CIO unions, Mr. Wilkins turned his back on most of the things the NAACP stands for and made a marriage of convenience with an emaciated skeleton which is but a shadow of the once liberal CIO.

Their only crime

The reason most of the so-called Red-dominated unions have been given the boot and are now castigated by their former associates is not that they adhere to any Moscow line, but that they insist on following the line of interracial liberalism, which the CIO followed itself before it got fat and greedy.

The unions which are being purged and with which Mr. Wilkins refuses to associate are the same unions which refuse to fall in line with the new CIO policy which calls for conformity with America's traditional policy of segregation and Jim Crowism.

It is no strange coincidence that the so-called Red unions all maintain their original interracial composition from the top down, while the so-called loyal unions, the ones Mr. Wilkins prefers to associate with, are not only lily white but are making a desperate effort to break the membership of the purged unions up into Jim Crow segments.

Parent body to blame

This goes even for the parent body of Philip Murray himself, whose United Steelworkers' Union has not one colored member on its 41-man board, in spite of the fact that better than one-third of the membership is colored.

This also goes for the saintly Walter Reuther, whose 22-man board of the United Auto Workers is also lily white.

I wonder whether, when Mr. Wilkins decided to joins forces with the CIO purge, he knew that the new national policy of CIO calls for the organization of Jim Crow unions throughout the South.

I wonder whether he knew that the national CIO, during the last election, threw its support behind John J. Sparkman of Alabama, whose campaign cry was "Vote for me and your mother and sister will not have to work beside a colored person."

But the so-called leftist unions opposed him.

Again leftists disagree

I wonder whether he knew that in Birmingham CIO organizer Cary Haigler supported Bull Conner for police commissioner after he had introduced a bill in the city council setting up ghettos for colored citizens.

But the so-called leftist unions opposed him.

I wonder whether Mr. Wilkins knows that Fred Piper, director of the Louisiana CIO, now engaged in organizing workers in that State into Jim Crow unions, was a delegate to the Dixiecrat convention. He has since been promoted by the national organization.

I wonder whether Mr. Wilkins knows that the CIO union halls in South Carolina have Jim Crow toilet facilities, and that George Baggard, chief of "Operations Dixie," refuses to permit colored workers to use the same halls with whites.

Maritime situation critical

I wonder whether he knows that now that the CIO has dropped its liberal ideals that there are separate hiring halls for Maritime workers in Houston, Tex.

I wonder whether Mr. Wilkins knows that after Joe Curran, head of the National Maritime Union, staged a red purge, that he slipped through a resolution which practically freezes all colored seamen in grades below World War II level.

The rule provides that no seaman shall be employed at skills he did not posses prior to World War II. This nullifies all the progress and upgrading made by colored seamen on Liberty ships during the war.

The so-called leftists fought this rule and got purged for their pains.

They only follow orders

Reds William Townsend and sidekick, George Weaver, who set themselves up as the high priests of the labor movement, are little more than glorified office boys carrying out the work of the real CIO brain trusters.

Proof of this is found in the fact that, right now, Townsend's henchmen are down in Dixie trying to raid the created and interracial tobacco union and corral them under the banner of his United Transport Workers.

Just where tobacco and transportation merge is a mystery, but the increased dues collected will be his pay-off for helping to smash the textile union.

All of these facts only prove that, under present conditions in America, one can get away with murder if he can only convince somebody that the victim was a Commie. That makes integrity too cheap.

New Uses for Farm Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, a prosperous United States will buy all the American farmer produces for food. One hundred fifty-one million people demand even an increase in food crop production. What then shall be done about the vast amount of farm produce now in storage and the additional amount which we can anticipate will be in storage in the foreseeable future?

The answer is this: Encourage the manufacture of nonfood products which must utilize farm crops as the basic raw material of manufacture.

The farm products stored under the Commodity Credit Corporation could be sold to these nonfood product makers at a rate low enough to stimulate building and expansion. The regular food-consumer market could absorb the direct-sale products of the farm.

This plan is feasible. It is workable. The opinions of the serious scientists of the Department of Agriculture—not the big-city politician jobholders—bear me out in my thinking.

Let us look at corn.

The CCC has currently in storage 627,480,162 bushels of corn valued at $880,651,970.

Here is what could be done with that corn industrially in the manufacture of nonfood products.

By dry milling, we could get industrial alcohol and acetone. Through this same process "furfural"—an important industrial chemical—could be turned out.

By yeast fermentation, more useful industrial alcohol could be made plus carbon dioxide gas, which has its use in industry, and fusel oil—an increasingly important industrial solvent.

By bacterial fermentation of corn, butyl alcohol is developed as well as acetone. Byproducts of this process help in the production of lacquers, stains, varnish removers, smokeless powder, and other products. Ethyl alcohol is at present only a minor byproduct of this method of fermentation.

Wet milling of corn creates a variety of useful commodities. These include starch, dextrins, dextrose, mixed sugars, glucose sirups; corn oil, corn gluten, zein, and steep liquor. Some of the starch is used industrially for sizing cotton warp yarns and paper, for laundering, and for making nitro starch, an explosive. Dextrins are used in pastes and glues. Corn sugar is used in spinning rayon. Dextrose and glucose sirups are used in tobacco products and for filling sole leather. Steep liquor is used in the production of penicillin by mold fermentation. Zein is used to make an artificial textile fiber which, blended with wool and other fibers, can be made into suits and dresses.

The Bureau of the Census reports that there were more people unemployed in February 1950, than at any other time since August 1941—4,684,000, not including the 600,000 forced into idleness by the coal strike. The development and expansion of the nonfood products manufacture of corn alone would help to put a sizable part of that 4,684,000 Americans back on the job again.

Let us look at wheat.

The CCC has currently in storage 475,034,491 bushels of wheat valued at $1,011,791,572.

Here is what could be done with that wheat industrially in the manufacture of nonfood products. Wheat flour is used in the preparation of pastes for use in paper-hanging and bill-posting. Wheat bran is a "must" in the dressing of furs and the "mold bran" is a valuable substitute for malt in the fermentation industry.

Like those of corn, wheat starches and sirups have basic nonfood uses. One of the most striking instances of such use is the oil which is separated from the wheat germ. This oil is a source of vitamin E for medicines and is also used to keep other vegetable oils from getting rancid.

Wheat as a source for industrial alcohol is well known. During World War II more than 100,000,000 bushels of wheat were used for this single purpose.

For many years, that by-product of wheat—straw—has been used on a large scale for the manufacture of strawboard. It has also been used recently on a small scale for the manufacture of insulating board, and is now coming into use for the manufacture of bleachable pulp for blending with chemical wood pulps in the making of high-grade papers.

And what about rye?

The CCC has currently in storage 1,563,618 bushels of rye valued at $2,416,819.

Although the industrial uses of rye have barely been subjected to even a preliminary exploration, it has already been found that rye pastes can be used in industry even as corn and wheat pastes. A good quality of industrial alcohol is procured from rye. Rye straw is used with wheat straw in the making of strawboard. And rye straw provides an excellent straw braid for making straw hats.

And what about oats?

The CCC has currently in storage 41,698,990 bushels of oats valued at $30,019,468.

Oats present a challenge to the agricultural scientist. At present, they are used only for the manufacture of oatmeal or rolled oats. The oat hulls, the byproduct, can be converted into the valuable industrial chemical, furfural. However, recently, oats have been employed in the manufacture of nylon.

And then, there are the soybeans.

The CCC has currently in storage 13,102,695 bushels of soybeans valued at $28,770,499.

Soybean oil is being processed on a limited scale for use in paints and varnishes and in the making of synthetic resins. Processed soybean meal is gaining momentum in industrial plants designed to turn out molding powders and plywood adhesive.

And what about the potato—the lowly "spud," which Secretary Brannan pleases to cast on the waste heap complete with blue dye?

The CCC has currently in storage 10,172,827 pounds of potato starch, valued at $607,814; and the equivalent of 11,480,547 100-pound sacks of potatoes valued at $8,074,728.

Both Maine and Idaho have potato starch plants. The product of these plants is used, chiefly, in the cotton industry for sizing warp yarns and, to a lesser extent, for making dextrins for use as adhesives.

Less than 10 years ago scarcely any potato alcohol was made in this country. It is sufficient commentary on the change-over to point out that in fiscal 1949 more industrial alcohol was produced in the United States from potatoes than from grains.

I have spoken of only a few farm products. I have cited only a few of the nonfood uses of these products. I have mentioned only a score or so of the industrial uses to which these nonfood farm products are being put today. In other words, I have only scratched the surface of the tremendous possibilities involved in using the food now being menaced with destruction and rot in CCC warehouses for nonfood industrial purposes.

Americans are still a pioneer breed although one American may have landed on these shores only yesterday while his next-door neighbor's ancestors may have come over in the Mayflower. There are still frontiers in this Republic of ours.

Let us accept the challenge of the stored farm crops in the silos and elevators of the CCC. Let us not waste this taxpayer's property. Let us maintain fair farm prices for food crops, but let us also make the CCC accumulation more easily available for those who have the courage, the foresight and the know-how to start new industries in these troubled days.

About all, may we never forget that the farm—producing both food crops and industrial raw materials—is the salvation of America.

Wherever we are, we should take our hats off to the farm man, the farm woman—yes, and the farm children, too—who toil endlessly to make our soil produce. These people—and the land they work—together, form the key to a prosperous, free and happy future for the whole people of the United States.

A Meaningless FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an article which appeared in the Black Dispatch, Oklahoma City, Okla., written by Roscoe Dunjee, editor, on March 4, 1950, entitled "A Meaningless FEPC":

A MEANINGLESS FEPC

More and more those who think progressively are beginning to realize the need of a third party in this country. The downright surrender last week by both of the old parties to southern reaction is another positive exposure of this necessity if the Nation is to move forward in social thinking.

It will be recalled we said early in the Truman administration, "No chain is stronger than its weakest link," meaning that irrespective of the good intentions of the President, it would be impossible for him to pull Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia up to his level of judgment. Last week we saw the Dixiecrats pull the liberal element of the Democratic party down into the gutter of shame. As the count stands of the moment, both the Republican and the Democratic parties have utterly repudiated and turned their backs upon the solemn promises made in Philadelphia 3 years ago.

Despite the disappointment suffered by millions at the disgraceful apostasy of a Democratic Congress we want to assess the proper value to the stubbornness of the President in his insistence on the passage of civil rights legislation. Despite the downright treasonable attitude of his associates we believe that continued insistence of the President upon Congress to pass this legislation is doing more to arouse the conscience of America to the hypocrisy sheltered in our institutions than any one single individual who has occupied the Presidency. It should in actuality reverse the thinking of those who have hitherto felt "no good can come out of Nazareth." Truman came from Missouri, a part of the slave South during antebellum days. The southeast tip of Missouri is just across the river from Mississippi, Arkansas, and Tennessee, and yet in the White House today we have a man from Missouri who offers a formula for human freedom what would warm the cockles of the heart of William Lloyd Garrison.

The Black Dispatch has always sought to be fair in its evaluation of men and parties, and we say here and now that President Truman, who in every public utterance continues to ding-dong on civil rights, is doing something to the thinking of America that is knifing reaction in an unseemly way. What he is doing will of course not affect the elderly group who are joined to reaction, but the impact of his new philosophy in the realm of social adjustment is bound to bear fruit in the next decade.

The bill as it was passed last week is practically meaningless. It is on the level of many of the efforts of our interracial movements which are always proposing a "survey of facts already the common knowledge of all. The present FEPC legislation sent to the Senate proposes that Congress will have the right to "investigate, educate and recommend." We believe Representative MARCANTONIO properly described the present situation when he said that reaction had cut off the legs and arms of FEPC and handed it back to President Truman. You can realize fully that FEPC as enacted by Congress is utterly helpless when Congressman RANKIN of Mississippi voted for the substitute submitted by Representative MCCONNELL. Negro Republicans should keep in mind that MCCONNELL is a Pennsylvania Republican who maneuvered GOP strategy in an effort to embarrass the President.

No one should falter in his approach to this type of legislation because of this temporary barrier erected in the House. The fight now goes to the Senate where there can be a continued fight to build up moral fiber in the masses of the people. That is what the Truman leadership is doing. Slowly but surely there is coming an open cleavage between right and evil in this Nation on the altar of civil rights. More and more of the dominant group are gathering courage and beginning to speak out. We feel as though the approach Representative HAYS of Arkansas has made to FEPC, while still reactionary, shows a tempering of spirit down in Dixie on the subject, which is noteworthy. While Representative HAYS is opposed to FEPC, he shows willingness to discuss the subject with candor and frankness. This is unquestionably progress, as compared to the rabid ranting of other Southerners who are die-hards on any question dealing with social, economic or political equality for black citizens.

Whites and blacks, minority groups, and all lovers of fair play and justice must resume the fight for FEPC in the Senate. It is perhaps unthinkable that the bill will pass in its present form in the Upper House for the filibuster will be used effectively by those opposed to this legislation, but the larger view proves that continued pressure for social decency will have its proper effect among the masses of the people.

After all, the fight for FEPC is an abbreviation of the broad principle which we feel should be spelled out clearly and imbedded in the Constitution of the United States, and there never will be pure democracy practiced in this Nation until this is done. Several years ago we proposed in an NAACP conference in Chicago that such an amendment be sought. Not only with respect to the economic self of minority groups should the laws be harsh and unrelenting, but embedded in the Constitution there should be provided guarantee for the social, political, and absolute equality of every citizen of this Republic.

The ancient Persians recorded the story of Haman, who was finally hanged on the gallows he had prepared for Mordecai. Somehow we cannot resist belief that reaction in America in this atomic age is making the same sacrifice on the international scene. We suspect that the action of Congress with respect to civil rights last week is today being grotesquely presented as we write these lines to millions of people in Asia who will gather suspicion and fear of western culture and attitude toward dark people.

Perhaps when later we in a crucial hour seek alliances in manpower in other sections of the earth we will feel the true reaction that stems from selfishness and hate. Sometimes in the life of men and nations there come realization "We gather in the harvest what we sow."

"Leave Behind" Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, as the number and amounts of withheld deductions from pay rolls have increased, we have heard more and more the term "take-home pay."

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, but that "take-home pay" is the important factor to the Nation's wage earners, for it is that amount only which they are able to spend at their own discretion.

However, the withholding of taxes by employers does have the effect of making wage earners much less conscious of the enormous sums which they earn but never actually receive. Therefore, I was much impressed by an editorial entitled "'Leave Behind' Wages," which appeared in the Friday, March 10, 1950, issue of the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News. I especially call attention to the thought expressed in the editorial that if everyone got paid what was coming to him and then paid back on his own what the Government demanded, wage earners would be asking much more searching questions concerning what the Federal Government is doing with such large portions of their earnings.

As a part of my remarks, the editorial follows:

"LEAVE BEHIND" WAGES

A friend of ours who had just finished his annual go-around with form 1040 was saying what a relief it was to know that he had an ace in the hole. What he meant was that when the wheels had finished grinding out the figure he owed his Government he knew that withholdings would take care of a good share of it. We couldn't give him an argument because we had just gone through almost identical stages of frustration, worry, and relief ourselves.

But we got to thinking about a man who came into the office the other day. He sold these specially printed salary checks that most firms use and with which most of us are familiar. But his checks had a new pitch. The varying amounts of deductions, for Federal and State taxes, health insurance, and the like, were listed as they are in most checks nowadays. But they were arranged in such a way as to point up graphically how much of a swipe these withholdings

were taking out of one's earnings. On the perforated sheet attached to the check itself the gross amount of your pay jumped out at you. Various deductions were given equal prominence. The effect of the check was to make you say, "Good Lord, look what I would have taken home if—"

There are slicker ways of getting the same story across. One Midwest firm we've heard about pays off in cash. The entire amount is paid over, then, in front of the employee, deductions are pulled back. Every employee—debt-ridden or otherwise—is bound to ask: "Is what I leave behind being put to good use? Am I getting my money's worth?"

No wonder. The biggest share of an employee's "leave behind" wages goes into the Federal Treasury. In fact 19 cents of every dollar the taxpayer earns goes into it. Are we getting our money's worth? Well, we can't help thinking that if everyone got paid what was coming to him, and then paid back on his own what the Government demanded, relieving the employer of the job of tax collector, people would be asking more searching questions.

Chances are they would leap to support such recommendations for better Government as have been proposed by the Hoover Commission. They would be less apt to be drawn into joining groups planning mass Treasury raids.

Look Who's Spending Your Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorial:

LOOK WHO'S SPENDING YOUR MONEY

Income-tax day, next Wednesday, would be a good time for Americans who lay their money on the line for Uncle Sam to do some serious thinking about taxes and Government spending.

The President has presented a budget for the coming fiscal year which aims at spending more than $43,000,000,000. Twenty years ago Federal expenditures for all purposes ran to about $4,000,000,000.

While the war is a partial explanation, it is not the sole answer. The President calculates that 71 percent of the spending goes to pay for national defense, the costs of World War II, and other past wars, and for the promotion of world peace.

That makes spending for purposes other than for wars and defense amount to 29 percent of the total or $12,500,000,000. This is more than three times the total Federal expenditure of 1930 which also took account of the costs imposed by a World War and other past conflicts.

It is common for those who defend the vast range of Federal spending to point to the social-security system as a great public gain. But Federal spending for welfare, $1,368,000,000, amounts to only one-tenth of the President's budget.

The most discouraging feature of the budget is that it carries a deficit of five billions. This at a time of general prosperity and with employment. The President has no date for balancing and he opposes attempts to cut spending as short-sighted.

Executive taxation lowers the power and the incentive of business to expand. If we left the money not needed to support the Government in the taxpayers' pocket what would be the result?

Business would feel the traditional impulse to take the initiative. The venturing of risk capital would again spur progress.

Americans who have grown rich in an unfettered economy would feel the old impulse to give generous support to educational cultural and artistic institutions, and to philanthropy. Such private beneficence was a characteristic of the traditional American system.

As for the ordinary citizen, he is perfectly willing to let Washington have all that a free American Government needs to perform its proper functions, but he doesn't want to finance restrictions on his own initiative, liberty and legitimate pursuit of happiness.

Government spending in the last analysis is political spending, and as Calvin Coolidge once said, the proper place for money not absolutely needed to carry on Government is in the taxpayers' pockets.

Wouldn't you rather spend your own money?

"This Is Not Fiction"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Newtown Enterprise of March 2, 1950, as reprinted in the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of March 9.

The confused and ridiculous spending policies of our Federal Government are pictured in terms of ordinary day-to-day problems and actions. No one would plan either his family budget or his business budget along the lines which have been followed in Washington for many years past. When you stop talking in billions and bring the real point out in the understandable figures of everyday life, the faults and failures of the whole policy becomes clear.

"THIS IS NOT FICTION"

(Newtown Enterprise, March 2, 1950)

It is difficult to make facts and figures on Government financing interesting and understandable in a newspaper story. Particularly has the term "deficit financing" found the man in the street scratching his head in confusion.

But here is an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer which is an outstanding contribution toward a better understanding of their Government by the average citizen. We print it in full.

Will the reader pretend that he has an obscure neighbor by the name of Harry Truman? And will he pretend that Neighbor Truman has decided he must borrow money, a decision which many of us ordinary folks have reached at times in the tempestuous course of life?

Neighbor Truman, we're going to pretend, steps into the bank to apply for the loan, and we're going to have the privilege of observing the transaction.

"I want to borrow $200," says our neighbor. (How most will anticipate the next few questions, having been through it.)

"Do you have any debts at the present time?" the banker inquires.

"Yes," says our neighbor. "I owe the bank at this moment about $12,800."

"What is your annual income, Mr. Truman?"

"I have take-home pay amounting to $6,750 a year," says he.

"Hmmmmm," the banker hums. He at once is suspicious of the client's ability to pay the old debt without $600 more added. And aren't his eavesdropping neighbors suspicious too?

But the banker gives allowances for unforeseen circumstances. So he asks Mr. Truman, "Do you think you will be able to save a large portion of your income this year and each succeeding year to reduce your indebtedness?"

"Oh, no," Neighbor Truman replies to the surprise of the banker, and the neighbors listening in. "My necessary living expenses this year will be $4,250. I'll be forced to spend more than I earn."

"Pardon me," the startled banker interjects. "Do you mean that, owing already an amount that constitutes seven times what you'll take in during a year, you're going to spend more than you earn?"

"That's right," says Neighbor Truman. "You see I must provide tuition at private schools for my children. I must help a poor relative set up a new business in which he's going to lose money for a long time to come."

"Just what kind of business is that relative going to sink your money in?" the incredulous banker asks.

"Why," says Mr. Truman, "He's got a wonderful humanitarian idea. He's going to sell milk to the Hottentots at a price they can afford to pay."

"But just those things won't eat up your whole income this year, will they?"

"No, but that isn't all," says Mr. Truman. "I am building security for my children by putting price supports under them. My boys sell newspapers to the neighbors at a nickel apiece, but I give them an extra nickel. My daughters make lamp shades which they sell for $6, but I don't think that's a fair price, so I give an extra $3 for each one they sell. Besides, my wife wants a television set."

The banker now steps aside to get his breath. Here's a fellow who owes more than he can ever repay if he lives frugally below his income seeking to borrow still more, and at the same time boldly proclaiming his intention of carrying out fantastic money-spending schemes.

What will the banker do?

Will he lend the new money? It's silly even to ask the question.

This scene is not fiction. It constitutes a faithful reproduction of the program set forth in regal solemnity by President of the United States Harry S. Truman. Multiply all figures by 10,000,000 and you have the Truman budget, his plan of government, the Government's income, and the Government's debt.

In this case Congress is the banker. If it makes the loan, Borrower Truman's note will have to be signed by the taxpayers, which is to say by all the people. Who, in his right mind, would voluntarily sign the note of such a profligate spender?

Cooperative Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the pending middle-income cooperative housing bill is grossly unfair because it

discriminates against 7,875,000 middle-income families. Fifty-nine out of 60 families could not benefit even if the bill authorized expenditures of $1,000,000,000.

At an estimated $8,000 cost per unit provided by the bill, $1,000,000,000 would build only 125,000 units.

The proposed bill contained provisions for a $25,000,000 propaganda fund. It is compared to the $250,000 fund that organized builders are attempting to raise nationally to spark a drive to sell home ownership and the accomplishments of the building industry.

The measure we have in mind is intended to supply housing to so-called middle-income groups, and by accepted welfare standards it is a bad piece of legislation.

In the old days the ideal criterion of a good law was that it should apply to everyone impartially, whether poor, rich, or of the middle condition. Under a changing conception of fairness, discrimination between classes has come to seem socially right when it is applied to such things as income-tax rates and aid to the needy. It has never been deemed right, however, to permit discrimination between people in identical categories: even the advanced state welfarist professes to believe that equals should be treated equally.

The proposed middle-income housing legislation actually promises to treat equals unequally. The bills now pending before the Banking and Currency Committees of the two Houses of Congress would make home-purchase money available at 3-percent interest to citizens in the middle-third income bracket—roughly $2,700–$4,400 a year. In addition to the low interest rate the bill would provide authorization of loans over a 50- or even a 60-year period. But to get this easy money the applicant must first elect to become a member of a Government-financed housing cooperative. This is where the discrimination between equals comes in. For, where a cooperatively minded householder would be getting his money at 3 percent with a lifetime to pay it off, middle-income people who prefer to obtain houses on their own would still have to pay 4 percent or more, even with FHA help. As for the 1,750,000 veterans who are now getting housing money at 4 percent with a 25-year amortization privilege, many of them are in the middle-income brackets. Would they take the sight of other middle-income people getting 60-year amortization money at 3 percent without screaming to high heaven about the very obvious injustice of it all?

If the new middle-income housing bill passes Congress it will, in effect, drive the general mortgage rate down toward 3 percent. Equals will insist on being treated equally. This would undoubtedly serve to stimulate the housing market, but what practical good would such stimulus do as long as the Nation is already in the ecstatic throes of a housing boom? One million new homes are in the works for 1950, and labor, lumber, contracting charges and architects' fees are already sky high. The net effect of cheaper money would not be more homes; it would be costlier labor and more expensive Douglas fir and white pine with resultant hardship on all home builders, rich or poor.

Government has entered the area of housing to stay. But in housing, as in other things, Government will do well to stick to the principle of treating equals equally. Otherwise, even by welfarist standards, Government will become an abhorrent monstrosity.

Distribution of Subversive Literature Through the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including with my entire approval, copy of a resolution adopted by the Gate City Council No. 5 of the Order of United American Mechanics of the United States concerning the distribution through the mails of subversive literature.

I call upon the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to report legislation promptly that will control such distribution of literature.

Whereas the overburdened United States mails are today being flooded with literature, pictorial displays, and other propaganda material extolling the pretended advantages and virtues of present life in Soviet Russia; and

Whereas this is a link in a series of steps and part of a campaign aimed mainly toward infiltrating into our school libraries and classrooms certain tempting and poisonous appeals by which to corrupt and debauch the minds of American school children in their most impressionable and receptive ages which must eventuate in the destruction of our public-school system; and

Whereas this campaign represents a brazen effort to subvert, and ultimately to overthrow, the sanctity of our traditional institutions of the home, the church, and the school, by setting up revolutionary fallacies and evils to take their place; and

Whereas the distribution of this material, through the United States mails, under the ostensible protection of our Government, is helping to increase the rapidly growing deficit under which our postal establishment is operated, while, at the same time it threatens to weaken, and inevitably to destroy the very structure which makes this great postal facility possible; and

Whereas under the existing postal laws and regulations, there appear to be no means by which these nefarious falsehoods can be excluded from the mails, because of the fact that the same do not actually and distinctly advocate outright insurrection or counsel overt treason, insurrection, or forcible resistance to the laws of the United States, as now defined in the existing Criminal Code of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by Gate City Council, No. 5 of the Order of United American Mechanics of the United States, in regular meeting at Atlanta, Ga., on March 8, 1950, That we urgently recommend to our Senators and Representatives of Congress, that they vigorously press for the immediate adoption of such strengthening amendments to the existing laws and regulations governing our postal establishment, as will bar from the use of the mails any and all such insidious and dangerous propaganda, which has for its primary aim the weakening of the fabric of our institutions, the corruption of our youth and the erection of a hideous vision of intolerance, foreign doctrines and false ideals which will eventually bring about the overthrow of every hallowed and blessed privilege of freedom which form the bulwark of America's priceless heritage.

LOUIS A. BURTON,
BASIL STOCKBRIDGE,
VESTER M. OWNBY,
Special Committee on Resolutions.

Contracts Used To Be Sacred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON D. McKINNON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oceanside Daily-Blade-Tribune, Friday, February 24, 1950:

CONTRACTS USED TO BE SACRED

(By H. B.)

If you will look at the San Diego County tax statement, you will find on it a tax rate of 46 cents for the metropolitan water district and 10 cents for the San Diego County Water Authority per each $100 valuation on your property. That is what the taxpayers of Oceanside are paying to have Colorado River water brought to our water mains. A similar tax is shouldered by taxpayers in every one of the 27 agencies that comprise the great metropolitan water district.

The United States Senate this week ignored the people of southern California who had the vision to go to the Colorado River for a supplementary water supply to insure the growth of their respective communities, and voted for a minimum Federal expenditure of $738,000,000 to develop a few acres of land in Arizona.

The people of California do not have any quarrel with the people of the great State of Arizona, but they do resent the fact that a few powerful politicians in the United States Senate swayed a majority of their fellow Senators—Democrats and Republicans alike—to ignore the fact that the people of southern California have sweated and sacrificed to bring distant water to their own communities at their own expense while a few landowners in another State will have water brought to them at the expense of the taxpayers as a whole. That is double taxation.

Under the cloak of reclamation this incredible project now approved by the Senate and soon to be considered by the House of Representatives would:

1. Spend $738,000,000 of Federal funds to bring Colorado River water to the central portion of Arizona at a cost per acre of $1,850, a cost 1,100 percent greater than the average for all western reclamation projects to date.

2. Use public funds to enrich private landowners, of whom a favored 420 would receive average benefits of $550,000 each.

3. Enable private citizens to profit by this huge expenditure without requiring them to contribute 1 cent to the project's capital cost.

4. Deprive the people of California of water to which they are entitled under existing

Government contracts that are supposed to be sacred, valid contracts.

5. Saddle a new tax obligation upon the taxpayers of all the States, in order to benefit a limited number of people in one single State.

In brief, the Arizona project would provide Colorado River water for 25,000 persons in Arizona, but it would cost nearly a billion dollars in Federal funds to get the water to them. California has a long-standing contract with the Department of the Interior for that same water. It will serve 5,000,000 persons in California and require no Federal subsidies.

The point foremost in our minds is whether this country has reached the point where contracts, entered into by the Western States with the Federal Government, receive no recognition from our United States Senate. Such contracts always have been held a sacred trust between the Government and the States in the past. Some of our foreign detractors of old said of the present surreptitiously ignored agreement: Surely the people of the United States are not going to allow this to go unchallenged here.

California's Senators, SHERMAN DOWNEY and WILLIAM KNOWLAND waged a gallant fight to protect California's interests. Arizona won its fight because Arizona's Senator HAYDEN is about the most powerful man in the upper Chamber. With 28 years in the Senate, he is chairman of the patronage committee, the Rules Committee, and a ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. His friendship and good will proved more valuable to supporting Senators than the best interests of the people of the Nation as a whole.

Surely the House of Representatives, whose membership is closer to the hearts of the people, will not desert the people of America by approving this terrific expenditure for the benefit of just a few.

Surely President Truman will not condone this action of the United States Senate. Many of us recall the pledge he made in 1948 in a speech in San Diego and from a railroad car platform in Coronado that the future of California depended upon an adequate water supply.

Critical days face this country if this irresponsible piece of legislation is not decisively defeated.

Necessity for Construction of St. Lawrence Seaway To Meet Critical Iron Ore Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a statement prepared by me relative to the critical iron ore situation facing the country, and the necessity for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway as a measure of relief.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. President, iron ore constitutes one of the most basic sinews of American military and industrial strength. Our Government has, however, virtually ignored this sinew and has allowed a situation to approach whereby this country would find itself behind an ore shortage "eight ball."

MY WARNINGS IN FEBRUARY 1948

Two years ago in February 1948 I brought to the attention of the Senate the very serious national crisis that was developing as a result of the gradual exhaustion of the iron-ore resources in the United States. I did so in connection with the debate then under way on Senate Joint Resolution 111, concerning the development of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

At that time those who for sectional reasons opposed the seaway project found it necessary to question and to doubt the facts then presented.

Mr. President, grim revelations in the past 2 years have fortified and proved the accuracy of the facts concerning the iron-ore situation. It is now admitted by all the steel companies in the United States that the iron-ore reserves of the Lake Superior region are being depleted and that this country, in the interest of its own stability and national security, must find new sources of iron ore. The only question that seems to be a matter of controversy at the present time is from what source we should get the additional iron-ore supplies and where the steel mills should be located to receive them.

WE MUST BRING ORE TO ESTABLISHED MILLS

Mr. President, it was my contention 2 years ago, and it is still my contention, that if we wish to preserve the steel industry of the great Middle West, that ways and means must be found to bring iron ore to the established mills in Pittsburgh, Youngstown, Cleveland, and other steel-making centers. And since the Mesabi range, which has supplied the major part of the requirements of these mills is being rapidly depleted, the only alternative way of bringing this ore to the Middle West is through the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. President, I predicted 2 years ago that if the St. Lawrence seaway is not authorized and constructed, the depletion of the Lake Superior iron ore resources would lead steel companies to consider seriously the establishment of steel mills on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts in order to receive low-cost, ocean-borne iron ore from offshore sources, and that gradually the steel industry would be weaned away from its present location in the Middle West. Since then we have learned of specific developments which confirm these predictions.

STEEL COMPANIES HAVE ALREADY STARTED ACTION

The United States Steel Corp. has recently announced the acquisition of 3,800 acres of land on the Delaware River between Philadelphia and Trenton for the establishment of an integrated steel mill. At the same time the Bethlehem Steel Corp. has announced the expansion of its Sparrows Point plant in Baltimore. Both of these firms will utilize, according to announcements, newly discovered iron ore reserves in Venezuela, in the Orinoco Basin, which are being extensively and expeditiously developed. It has also been brought to the attention of the Senate through the Joint Committee on the Economic Report that New England is ambitious to establish a steel mill, and there are, in addition, reports that Mobile, Ala., is being considered for a new mill.

MAJOR TRANSFORMATION OF UNITED STATES INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION LOOMS

Mr. President, the excuse for all these activities in every instance is the fact that iron ore resources of the Lake Superior region are being exhausted and that substitute sources must be found. We are, therefore, confronted with a major reorganization of our industrial structure—a transformation of a system of industrial production that has been established over the past 75 years as a result of natural factors in the location of iron ore and cheap water transportation in the Great Lakes area. I shudder to think of the terrible consequences—the dislocation that would be caused in my own State of Wisconsin and in her neighbors.

Mr. President, these radical and momentous changes in our industrial set-up, it is my contention, are not in the interest of the United States and of its people. They are not economical and they are not necessary if the Congress of the United States will do its duty by the country and make the necessary authorization for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

I say, Mr. President, that it is not in the interest of the people of the United States to transfer large segments of the steel industry from its present location in the Great Lakes area to new locations on the Atlantic coast. It may benefit some real-estate owners and other interests in the new locations at the expense of those who have adjusted their lives and their livelihood to the present industrial structure; but it is not in the interests of the Nation as a whole to see these transfers made against the advice of those concerned with security matters.

ATLANTIC COAST PLANTS COULD EASILY BE ATTACKED

Plants located on the Atlantic coast will be vulnerable to enemy attack in case of national emergency, not only by air, but also by water, and the supply lines of the raw materials being brought in oceangoing bottoms will be subject to submarine attack. It is a well-known fact that of the seven or eight deep-draught, ore-carrying boats that an eastern steel company had in operation between Chile and Baltimore during World War II, three-fourths were sunk during 1942, and the others had to be withdrawn from service. Ore had to be brought to Baltimore expensively and laboriously by rail for 1,500 miles from Minnesota. It is not to the advantage of the country to have a major share of its steel-producing capacity subject to the vicissitudes of enemy attack.

Neither is it to the advantage of the United States, through inaction, to permit the dislocation of economic values and community life that would be forced upon these Middle Western industrial centers when major segments of the steel industry shut down in their present locations and open up in new locations on the east coast.

WHY SENATOR WILEY HAS ADVOCATED SEAWAY

I have advocated the St. Lawrence seaway project because I feel strongly that the supply of raw materials to the existing industries of the Middle West is vital to the economic stability and national security of this country.

LABRADOR ORE OFFERS MAGNIFICENT SUPPLY WITH INTERNAL LINES OF COMMUNICATIONS

It is fortunate that a group of independent steel companies have discovered a new continental source of iron ore located in Labrador, north of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, which is accessible to the middle-western steel mills through internal lines of communication not subject to submarine attack. These iron-ore resources will also permit the maintenance of the present scale of operations in the Lake region and thereby encourage the development of low-grade taconite in Minnesota.

Mr. President, I am not opposed to the establishment of new mills in the East if thereby the economic and national-security interests of the United States would be served. There may be conditions under which expansion of the steel-producing capacity of the United States may be best achieved by the establishment of new plants in strategically located areas. I do object, however, to any scheme that will result in the displacement of middle western mills by coastal establishments, because I do not consider that an advantage to the people of the country and to the security which we seek.

MIDWEST INDUSTRY CONFRONTED WITH STARVATION OF RAW MATERIALS

Our first interest, therefore, must be to consider ways and means of protecting the industry of the Middle West against a starvation of raw materials which is threatening at the present time. I cannot see how such an objective is detrimental to the interests of any section of the country. At a time when we are all concerned about the preservation and improvement of the productive capacity of far-away areas in Europe and Asia in defense of the democratic way of life, it ill behooves any American in or out of Congress to maneuver so as to upset the established productive capacity of this country, which has stood so well by the American way of life.

THIRTY-MILLION-TON SUPPLY FROM NEW SOURCES NECESSARY

Let me point out that we need, under ordinary circumstances, 80,000,000 tons of iron ore to maintain the current operations of the steel industry in the Middle West. We have been getting this supply from the Lake Superior area. To the extent that depletion of open-pit ores makes it impossible to secure this total supply from the same sources as heretofore, we have to find supplementary supplies. It is estimated that in the course of the next 10 to 20 years, even with the development of taconite ore in Minnesota, new supplementary sources in the amount of 30,000,000 tons a year would be required in order to supply the total of 80,000,000 tons needed in the Middle West.

It is imperative, therefore, Mr. President, that the St. Lawrence seaway be authorized to insure a means of transportation for this vitally needed raw material. If we do not construct this waterway, then we must confront the inevitable prospect of seeing one-half of the steel capacity of the Middle West transplanted to new locations with all of the depreciation and obsolescence of plant, community facilities, housing, and human beings that necessarily follow any such major industrial revolution.

CONCLUSION

I am confident, Mr. President, that if the full impact and the significance of this situation, is appreciated the regional considerations that seem to befuddle the controversy on the St. Lawrence seaway will be dissolved and that we shall begin to think of the interests of the country as a whole and approve this vital channel of communication which is necessary to the stability and security of the two essential components of democratic strength—Canada and the United States.

It is still not too late in this second session of the Eighty-first Congress to pass St. Lawrence seaway legislation. Where there is a will, the proverb rightly says, there is a way. Where there is vision, determination on the part of leaders in the Congress, we can swiftly enact legislation on this urgent theme. Let us not allow our country to lose her vital sinews of national defense. Let us complete this great waterway.

Gas Barrage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gas Barrage," from the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GAS BARRAGE

Proponents of the Kerr natural gas bill scheduled to come up today in the Senate are trying to have their cake and eat it too. They contend that this bill, which would amend the Natural Gas Act specifically to exempt so-called independent gas producers from Federal Power Commission regulation, would not take away any of the jurisdiction that the FPC now possesses. If that were the case, why would there be any need for a bill of exemption?

Natural gas producers are of two kinds—the producers affiliated with pipe-line companies, clearly under FPC regulation, and the independents. Independent in this sense is something of a misnomer. Although there are many small producers, a few large companies do most of the business, and some of the largest operators are oil companies. The authority of the FPC to regulate sales by independent producers destined for interstate commerce was affirmed by the Supreme Court in the Interstate case in 1947. It is true that the FPC has not actively regulated such sales in the past—principally because prices were not unreasonable—but it has not relinquished jurisdiction. Indeed, it is now using this authority in price proceedings against the Phillips Petroleum Co.

Senator KERR, among others, has admitted that a prime purpose in his bill is to facilitate increased prices. Yet there is no reason to believe that present prices, or the fair rate of return contemplated by the FPC, are discouraging enterprise; far from it. It may be suspected that another purpose of the Kerr bill is to remove gas as an active competitor of oil, which is unregulated. Since 1947 there has been a tremendous increase in the use of natural gas in cities (Washington, for example), and conditions have changed from a buyers' to a sellers' market. The effect of the Kerr bill would be to let large producers set the price all along the line to consumers. Not only would this discriminate against regulated pipe-line companies and affiliated producers, it would render all gas regulations more or less futile.

Aside from price protection, one essential purpose of regulation is to prevent the growth of monopoly among producers. A case can be made that the really small producers should be exempted from regulation. Also, it is undeniable that a great deal of confusion exists over what Congress actually intended in the Natural Gas Act, and a more specific law would be desirable. But a time when natural-gas regulation is taking on increasing importance is no time to be removing a fundamental protection which, once lifted, could be restored only with the greatest difficulty. Senators ought to take a very close look at the very large special interest that is masquerading today in the guise of free enterprise.

Is Our Social Security Sound?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Senate Finance Committee today:

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to our social security system. It is unsound. Furthermore, it does not meet the needs of today's aged.

My remarks will be directed primarily at the old-age and survivors insurance usually referred to as OASI. The bill before you is a $12,000,000,000 a year program. It will cost that much when it matures before the close of this century even if the benefits are never again increased. It is actuarily unsound and I know of no actuary who is not in the employ of the Social Security Administration who approves or endorses it. Improving it, is not the answer. We need a new system.

It isn't necessary to argue that our social security system is not taking care of this generation of old people. Although the program has been in force 13 years, we have 8,400,000 men and women over 65 who are ineligible for its benefits. Apologists for the program promptly assert this is because the program is new. This argument cannot stand when we consider the admission of the Social Security Administration's head actuary that under H. R. 6000, 10 years from now there will still be 7,200,000 men and women over 65 ineligible for its benefits. This results from certain basic defects in the program.

Our present social security law is not only unfair, it is harsh and cruel. The benefits that are now paid are not equitably distributed. Individuals who are already out of the labor market, widows, who were widows when the law went into effect, orphans, whose fathers were not in covered employment, as well as countless millions who make their contribution to society without earned income are not helped by mere extension of coverage to all the occupations. They are outside the so-called insurance part of the social security law. Yet, in a social program these are the groups that should have first claim on whatever the American taxpayers can pay out for these purposes.

The program is geared to give advantage to the high-salaried and to discriminate against the low-paid. For instance, the man retiring on an average wage of $250 a month draws $16 a month more in OASI benefits than the man whose average wage was $100. Yet, he has only paid for $2.47 more protection in his social security taxes.

The present program as well as H. R. 6000 fails most of our aged, but offers attractive windfalls to the privileged few. A banker or a corporation officer whose salary has been $3,000 or more, who retires at 65 this year can, with his wife draw about $100 a month. The man's life expectancy is 12 years; his wife's is 14 years. He has paid into the social-security system a total of $390, or less than 4 months' benefits. Across the street there may be an aged individual who has toiled and produced for years, but if he were taken out of the labor market before he became fully insured, he either gets nothing or is subject to a needs test for relief. This means that he has to declare himself a personal bankrupt and turn his life over to a case worker. Social security advocates attempt to point out that the corporation executive has paid for his retirement and the other man has not. Mr. Chairman, the people know more about social security than you realize. They know that the individuals drawing the benefits have not paid for them. They have made a very small token payment only.

Of the primary beneficiaries now on the rolls, virtually none has paid more than $600, in employee contributions; some have paid less than $10, and the average total employee contributions for these benefits have been less than $150. For this average contribution of $150, each beneficiary will receive retirement payments totaling $3,000.

If allowance were made for the value of a wife's and other benefits, the value would be much greater.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I believe that if the American taxpayers are to help orphans, they should treat all orphans alike. The survivor benefits under OASI are as discriminatory as the retirement benefits. A family of children of a deceased father who earned $80 a quarter in covered employment over a period of six quarters, is eligible for the minimum benefits. This deceased father had paid in taxes for these benefits the total sum of $3. How can you say to another widow and her fatherless children that they are not entitled to anything and that the first-mentioned family paid for their benefits. This program constitutes neither sound insurance nor a fair social program.

Our system of social security lacks flexibility. Who can say that 65 will be the proper retirement age toward the end of this century. Benefits cannot be tied to past wage records and still do the job in any particular year. H. R. 6000 is an admission of this. For 13 years our Government has been paying for the keeping of voluminous and detailed wage records allegedly because they were needed to figure benefits. Yet in the bill before you, benefits were revised to meet present-day need. Flexibility in a program is desirable. The wage-record system prohibits flexibility besides being a costly procedure.

Another objection to a program in which the number of beneficiaries is much smaller in early years than in later, is that, regardless of what financing method is adopted, there will be an unconscionable tendency toward undue liberalization of individual benefit amounts. With only relatively few beneficiaries on the rolls now and in the immediate future, it is too easy to propose individual benefit rates be approximately doubled; that primary benefit amounts in excess of $100 a month be promised, as well as the combined husband-and-wife amounts of $150 a month. With a relatively small number of beneficiaries now and with present benefit disbursements all far below contribution receipts, the ability to fulfill these promises over the next few years seems to be all that matters. The tremendous future cost that will result when there are many more to whom we have made these commitments is too easily ignored.

In our population over 65, only one out of five is now eligible for benefits. On this basis we are fixing benefits so high that when the time arrives that five out of five become eligible, the program will be an impossible financial burden.

I have repeatedly stated that H. R. 6000, 40 years from now, will cost $12,000,000,000 a year. This is a very conservative estimate. Compared with the life of our Republic that is not a long period of time. I have a son 10 years old. Adopting this program means that when he is 50, the taxpayers then must pay $12,000,000,000 a year for old-age and survivors insurance alone. The taxpayers of that day will have no voice in determining the amount of payment. For it is in the nature of a contractual agreement. We have no right to force such a program upon our children. The workers today have no right to expect a retirement benefit for themselves that today they are unwilling to provide for their parents.

Some may suggest that when these benefits are to be paid 40 or 50 years from now, they will be paid from an accumulated trust fund adequate to meet these benefits. This is a fantasy. It is a myth. In the first place, we have no assurance that the progressive tax rates will go into effect and that any such fund will be accumulated.

If the sum could be collected, how would it be managed? Should these many billions in the so-called trust fund be retained in cash by the Treasury? The effect of such a procedure on the economy is well known to you gentlemen. Should these funds be invested in securities other than Government securities? If this were done, the Social Security Administrator would soon control all the Nation's major business enterprises. That leaves only Government bonds as an investment. I maintain the Government cannot carry a trust fund in its own Government bonds.

When a recipient is to receive his benefits this year or 40 years from now, he wants them in dollars. There are only three ways to get dollars. These ways are (1) Current taxation; (2) issue of more bonds to borrow the people's money; (3) inflation through printing press money or devaluation. It matters not so far as our economy is concerned whether there are three warehouses of Government bonds in the trust fund or 40 warehouses of Government bonds. The people have to provide the money when the benefits must be paid.

What is the answer? We should adopt a pay-as-you-go program. We should make these benefits available now for all our aged, and all our widows and orphans. We should collect the money now. I submit that in any given year, those individuals who are so blessed as to have a job and good health should carry the load for those unable to provide for themselves in that particular year. The full cost should be paid each year and when that year closes, nothing is owed and nothing is promised.

If this basic change is impossible at this time, then I suggest that no legislation be passed or that a stop gap measure be approved providing additional money for the country's needy.

This should be followed by a thorough and objective study of the program. With due regard to the high caliber and public spirit of the individuals comprising the various advisory councils on social security, I regret these councils have not been able to make a more thorough reexamination of the fundamentals. Each council has been composed of experts in their own fields, and who, being extremely busy men in these outside fields, could not take the necessary time to make such reexamination; consequently, acceptance of the proposals developed by the Social Security Administration staff members became an almost inevitable course. I feel a study should be made by a group consisting largely of persons who can devote full time for several months to the work, who are largely technicians in this field, and who at the same time are fully independent of administration pressure. Only in this way can a wholly objective and thorough chart be laid for future development.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement addressed to the Eighty-first Congress by a group of citizens who were members of the Round the World Town Meeting of the Air Seminar. This group included Alfred A. Albert, of the American Civil Liberties Union; Irving Brown, European representative of the American Federation of Labor; Edith Sampson, of the National Council of Negro Women; George W. Welsh, of the United States Conference of Mayors; Sadja Stokowski, Dr. Clarence Decker, Robert S. Byfield, Robert Hansen, and Walter White. It is a statement which may be of particular interest to the Senate in its forthcoming consideration of civil-rights legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Eighty-first Congress.

GENTLEMEN: The undersigned American citizens traveled at their own expense around the world from June to September to talk on a people to people basis about the questions which concern us all. We sought everywhere to interpret our Nation's aspirations and aims to those whose friendship and support we need to survive. We sought also to answer the misinterpretations and deliberate falsification in some instances of American democracy, not by attacking other ideologies but by telling the truth about the United States.

We were members of the Round the World Town Meeting of the Air Seminar but we wish to make clear at the outset that what we say to you in this letter is our individual and collective opinion as individuals. Neither the Town Hall nor the organizations we represented are accountable nor responsible for our views. They are strictly our own. The names of the organizations we represented are affixed to our individual names for purposes of identification only.

You as Members of the Eighty-first Congress are embarking on the second session of that Congress at what may be the most crucial time in contemporary history. As makers of the laws and formulators of the national policies of the world's most powerful and envied Nation the eyes of the world will be upon everything you say and do. Particularly will this be true when you debate and vote upon civil-rights legislation.

Wherever we went on our journey—Europe, the Near East, the Middle East, the Far East, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific—we were invariably confronted with questions regarding mob violence, discrimination in employment and education, disfranchisement and segregation based on race, creed, color, or place of origin. Repeatedly we were asked to explain the signing with 47 other nations of an international declaration of human rights by the United States when those same rights are denied certain minorities in the United States. We found that not only is Soviet Russia industriously spreading the news in Asia, Africa, and other parts of the world about our shortcomings but that many countries and peoples friendly to us are puzzled and made suspicious of us by these acts.

As American citizens we were appalled at the extent of damage to American prestige which these anti-American practices have done. It is for this reason that we appeal to you to keep in mind the world as well as national implications of your every word and act on this most basic of issues. We appeal to each of you to debate fully and fairly each one of the civil-rights proposals but refrain from obstructionism and undignified discussion. We appeal to you to refrain from any tactics to prevent a fair discussion and vote. We appeal to you to think of this issue of human rights as an American and not a politically partisan one.

Our Nation's reputation and security hang in the balance. We are confident that each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives will fully measure up to the grave responsibility which is his.

The Battle Against Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no more piercing appraisal of the national state of mind has been made than that entitled "The Battle Against Fear" by David Lawrence in a recent issue of United States News and World Report. I insert it in the RECORD for the edification of our citizenry:

THE BATTLE AGAINST FEAR

(By David Lawrence)

"The world may be destroyed by chain reaction from a hydrogen bomb. No time to lose. The clock is ticking toward disaster. There must be more armament. More bombs than Russia. Maybe they'll strike first. Maybe we should."

And so the whole world is enveloped in fears of its own making.

It is as if death-dealing weapons had never before destroyed men, women, and children—as if war had never taken a horrible toll—as if death by man-made bomb is any different from death by the sword or the bullet.

Many centuries ago the Commandment was given: "Thou shalt not kill." But man, while punishing individual murder, has condoned organized murder.

Has a sense of guilt finally overtaken the world? Is that the reason we are now weighed down by the awfulness of war itself?

It is easy to rationalize war. We proclaim with all sincerity that we never make war on others—we fight only when attacked and only in self-defense. And, it is asked, should there not be armament to protect against such aggression?

There must, of course, be armament and there must be defense forces—just as there must be fire houses and fire-fighting equipment. But there also must be fire prevention. Wars are not a matter of spontaneous combustion. Wars are man-made, and rarely is the guilt for a war wholly on one side.

Wars don't commence only when hostilities are begun. They begin years and years before in the hearts and minds of men. Communists with evil spirit were not born yesterday. Their exploitation of millions of helpless persons is the direct consequence of man's failure to deal with human problems—with the failure of man to take note of the plight of his brother.

We today are bringing on the next war. We may not yet see clearly our own tendency to become provocative. But it is there—a bland refusal to inform ourselves on the real issues, a willingness to accept superficiality, prejudice, hysteria, and mere arms as a complete substitute for any other approach to man-made dilemmas—as, for instance, the approach by faith and the spirit.

To many persons this is mawkishness, softness, and even insanity. They impatiently erect barriers in their own minds. They have been taught to fight with their fists. They know less about victories that come out of the head, out of genuine faith and out of honest self-examination.

We today are bringing on the next war—by our orthodoxy of method, our rigidity of formula in diplomatic intercourse, our pride, and our belief that vicious animals have never been tamed except by the whip.

Granting that in Moscow is a small band of evil men, how long will the few rule the many forever? Are 210,000,000 minds really unreachable? Are they ready for extermination? Have they no fears like ours? Have the Russian people heard nothing about our B-36's and of the 70 target cities marked for destruction by our atomic bombs?

The whole world cannot continue to live this way, in an atmosphere of threat and counter threat, in abject fear.

The Scriptures speak of those "who through fear of death are all their lifetime subject to bondage."

We must have faith in man's genius, in man's capacity to find a way to improve living standards in a world of both poverty and abundance. Is materialism and selfishness our only doctrine? Do economic power and property afford the only enjoyment, the only compensations? Or are we ready at last to understand that spiritual compensations can bring greater happiness?

The battle against fear is a battle against guilt, against man's sins of omission in a world that has not yet learned true brotherhood.

We must begin to conquer our fears and face truth. Bombs themselves are harmless pieces of metal. Only man-directed weapons can destroy anything. It is fear of our fellow man and not of his contrivances that puts us in a panic.

When shall man learn how to control man? This is not a matter of physical weapons. It is a matter of justice, of fairness, of kindliness, of tolerance, of unselfishness, of sacrifice, of willingness to face evil with the strength that faith in God alone can give. "Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me."

A Plea From Two Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, a friend and constituent, Mr. Charles Eyanson, has forwarded to me an original plea from two children which contains much food for thought. It follows:

WE KIDS ARE DOING A LOT OF THINKING ABOUT YOU GROWN-UPS THESE DAYS

I

We are just a couple of kids—my sister and I.

Same kind of kids probably, that you have at home.

We haven't been around long and I guess we don't know much yet.

But we are watching you and we have to laugh.

It amuses us to see how you are thinking, the kind of things you grown-ups are doing and the stuff you swallow.

But at the same time we're a little scared.

II

We haven't been handed social-security numbers up to now but it won't be too many years before we get them.

All we ask of you is that you hold things in check for us so that we won't lose the kind of voting system that you have and so that our social-security number won't be a puppet string which will make us jump any way the Government wants us to jump.

If you do hold things then we'll stop laughing at you for acting like puppets yourselves.

III

You oldsters can't hold things in check just by cussing the people at Washington and the State capitol among yourselves.

You'll have to stop blaming the officeholders and politicians.

They will do what you say if you are right and if you convince enough of your friends and neighbors you are right.

No leader in this country can lead unless people follow him.

No officeholder can keep his job if the people don't want him.

IV

You can't be very happy when you think how this country is drifting.

You shouldn't think you are giving us a fair deal by preparing the socialist welfare state for us.

By 1960 most of you won't be here but we'll be in our thirties.

We would like to think then that you did as much to build this country and keep it on the right track as you think your father or your grandfathers did.

In 1960 we would like to be celebrating Washington's, Jackson's, Jefferson's, Lincoln's, and Lee's Birthday, instead of the birthday of some guy who got his ideas from Marx or Stalin or Fabian or some of the fellows who are trying to shape up things now in our country.

V

You say you'd "do anything in the world for you kids," and we know you mean it.

But no matter what you do it won't mean a thing to us in the end if you socialize us.

If by 1960 we are known only by our social-security numbers instead of our names and by what we have been able to do for ourselves, we'll say you gave us a raw deal instead of a fair deal.

When we go after our first job we want to pick it for ourselves and leave it when we like, without a permit from the Government.

We want to be able to make and save enough money to buy the things we need and want even after we are too old to work.

We will want our kids to go to public or parochial school where they can learn the things you learned and not what the Government planners say they should learn.

We will want to pick the doctor for them when they are sick and not have to take a Government doctor.

We don't want a government which says "we'll take enough out of your pay and load taxes on you to give you the things you need to live on and pay you a little each month when you can't work any more.

We don't want that kind of government for ourselves and we don't want it for our children.

My sister and I want the same chance that your father and your grandfathers had and that you started out with but which you are now letting slip away.

VI

My sister and I are not so much afraid that you will let this country drift into a dictatorship like Germany or Italy were, or a communist state like Russia is.

But we are afraid that you are going to hand down to us and to our children a government built on the new Socialist state idea as they call it in England or welfare state as they are calling it in Washington, D. C.

When we are told, as we were not long ago, that by the year A. D. 2000 the real income of my family and my sister's family will be $12,000 each a year even if we're only average, we get scared.

Today the dollar you earn isn't worth 100 cents by a long way.

It's worth only 43 cents.

If you let your Government go on with some of the things it's doing and some of the things it's planning to do, our dollar won't be worth anywhere near 43 cents.

Maybe it will take that whole $12,000 just to pay our grocery bill.

That's why we're scared.

You won't be here by A. D. 2000.

Neither will the President nor the governor.

Maybe there won't be any President.

Socialist welfare states don't have presidents.

VII

I am only in the first grade. My sister is in kindergarten so we can't read The Road Ahead by John T. Flynn.

But you better read it and do something about what's going on if you and other grown-ups mean what you say that you'd "do anything in the world for your kids."

VIII

We don't believe that you want us and our children to have any less of a chance than you and your father had.

I'll bet you want even better things for us.

You can give us better things if you will stop these planners and not let them lead you into a Socialist welfare state.

Yes, we'll be thinking of you in 1960 and in A. D. 2000.

Natural Gas Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there has ever been more propaganda conveying erroneous impressions to the public through the medium of the press on any legislation than the attack constantly being made on the proposed amendment to the Natural Gas Act, clarifying the original intent of Congress as to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over the independent producers and gatherers of natural gas, sold at arm's length.

We had this barrage of newspaper publicity at the time the House passed this thoroughly justifiable proposal last year and now as it is being considered in the other body, the same type of unfounded propaganda through columns and editorials is being presented in complete disregard for the actual facts.

If those who are responsible for such misleading information would only take the time to become informed, if not already, of the actual facts and intention of this highly technical problem, I am fully confident that their comments and writings would be in an altogether different vein. I do not like to imply that any person, editorial writer or others, would deliberately try to mislead the public. I fear some, though, may be deliberately doing this. However, most of the outstanding newspapers who have been making such attacks are simply in my opinion, not informed of just what is involved. They are misled and persuaded by certain ones of an economic result which does not and would not exist.

It is a sad commentary when the Commission itself carrying out the full intention of the act for 12 years found themselves in a dilemma by certain language in the opinion of the court and recommended that this Congress do just what this proposed amendment is designed to do.

There are two extreme views responsible for this dilemma. One I can readily appreciate but the other that no doubt is responsible for the activity at this time in many large centers where gas is consumed, is very difficult to understand. When any groups take a position that their special interest must be bailed out even though it was not the original intent of Congress or else an entire industry must be completely and wholly relegated to Federal controls they are in my opinion inconsistent in their philosophy and advocacy of free and competitive enterprise. It is a strange philosophy or principle of Government to adopt only when personal gain is the final result, even though the business has long since been recognized as a regulated controlled monopoly.

Seldom have I seen in the newspapers a correct analysis of this problem. There appeared in the Washington Post today, however, a communication which I should like to call to the attention of the Members of this Congress. It was written by Emby Kaye, of Tulsa, Okla. I do not know this party but it is the most factual discussion that I have seen in the press on this matter. I am, therefore, including it with these remarks:

A COMMUNICATION

The press from Washington has carried several attacks against Senator KERR keyed to his espousal of certain amendments of the Natural Gas Act of 1938. The Kerr bill seeks only to preserve by law the right of an independent producer of gas—operating at arm's length from a pipe line or distributing company—to make a contract for the sale of gas from his own wells without regulation of any Federal agency.

The bill, if enacted into law, will not, per se, increase the price of gas, either in the field or at the consumer level. Under the present law, the Federal Power Commission has not claimed and never has exercised the right to control the price at which gas in the field is sold to the pipe line. The price has under the present law increased from 3 and 4 cents per thousand cubic feet to 6 cents in many fields and in some instances to as much as 10 cents a thousand cubic feet, with step-up provisions beyond these prices for future years. What the Kerr bill seeks is to confirm the present practice: the right of a producer to sell gas at arm's length at the best price the seller can obtain and which the buyer is willing to pay.

Oil and gas production are part of our free enterprise system. Unless there is nationalization or confiscation, or unless the business is by an irrational philosophy decided to be a public utility, there is no place for price fixing in that industry. Natural gas is not a monopoly. There are many fields producing gas which have no markets today. It is available to buyers.

City gas plants are not dependent upon natural gas. In the Eastern seaboard, practically every large city has contracted for and is clamoring for a larger share of available natural gas for one reason: it is cheaper than artificial or manufactured gas produced from coal or oil.

Gas companies taking on natural gas generally maintain their plants in working condition, against emergencies. Many continue to produce gas and blend their low B. t. u. gas with natural gas. If gas should unreasonably be advanced in price, the buyer could reduce his take and manufacture a larger proportion of his requirements. But that is not in the cards because purchase contracts are set up for long periods, generally 20 years. Certainly if fuel oil was to drop to the prices of a year ago or even lower, and gas could be manufactured at a lower cost than natural gas can be obtained, natural gas lines would get no new customers, and would be held to minimum deliveries by old ones.

Hitherto the producing end of the natural gas industry did not have to worry about the prospect of the Federal Power Commission fixing or limiting the price of gas at the well. Even today, with a tremendous market, gas in the field is generally underpriced, often brings 3 or 4 cents under "life of lease" contracts entered into many years ago. As a result, the regulatory authorities in the States of Oklahoma and Kansas have established by law or regulation a price of 7 and 8 cents, respectively, as the minima to be paid at the well. The courts are to test the validity of these steps. The writer does not applaud this means of obtaining an equitable price for gas.

The dispatches argue that a 6 percent profit set for utilities ought to be enough for a natural gas producer, that such a profit would content other industries. It is one thing to be content with 6 percent profit but quite another to have it fixed by the Government. As to the oil and gas industry, price fixing at the well is not sound. The critics apparently do not understand the hazards of drilling for oil and gas. Dry holes and poor wells must be paid out of income of those wells which produce. The law of supply and demand should determine the price.

I wonder whether the dispatches referring to "closing the loophole which permits oil and gas drillers and mining companies to charge off excessive depletion allowances" give the correct picture. The provisions in the present Federal income-tax laws governing "depletion and the charge of intangible development costs as expense have been worked out by Congress over a period of years as equitable and economical means of providing the necessary incentive for petroleum development that is indispensable to national welfare and security."

The Kerr bill seeks to give the approval of Congress to the historical practice in the industry so that a basically sound business philosophy might not be overturned at the whim of a commission, when chance changes the political or economic complexion of that commission. So basic a change, if ever made, should be in the purview of the Congress and not in the power of one of its creatures.

EMBY KAYE.

TULSA, OKLA.

Stuttgart Evicts Hitler Victims To House SS Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL CHUDOFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article that appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin on March 9, 1950. If conditions exist in Germany as set forth in this article, I feel that this Congress should do something about it.

The article follows:

STUTTGART EVICTS HITLER VICTIMS TO HOUSE SS MEN—COURT ACTION COMES AMID DENAZIFICATION SCANDAL IN GERMANY

STUTTGART, March 9.—The government of the state of Wuerttemberg-Baden apparently is punishing no one and is not even pressing for a full investigation of the local denazification scandal.

United States officials here appear to have washed their hands of the matter, feeling that it is the business of the Germans to punish any local official guilty of selling absolution to the Nazis, as has been charged.

Yet at the moment another scandal, also involving former Nazis, is developing.

The denazification problem came to a head on February 6, when United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy criticised the State government for not investigating the case fully and attacked Minister President Reinhold Maier for having told the Americans that the scandal was none of their business. Although McCloy's statements were a sensation here a month ago, it has since become apparent that the High Commission is not planning to insist on an investigation.

CALLED A GERMAN AFFAIR

Maj. Gen. Charles P. Gross, United States Commissioner for Wuerttemberg-Baden, now insists that the case is purely a German affair and the Germans are happily pointing out that this is exactly what they said at the start.

The new freedom of the state government to deal with the former Nazis is indicated by the case of the Rotweg housing development, where victims of Nazi persecution are being evicted to make room for former members of the SS, Hitler's Elite Guard.

The Rotweg project was constructed in 1939 when only high priority military construction was permitted. It is composed of 100 one-family houses with an average of five rooms each. The project was to house members of the SS and politically acceptable friends of the SS. These people moved in and lived there until the end of the war when a majority were arrested as Nazis.

The development was taken over at first by UNNRA and subsequently the refugee organizations to house Poles. In 1947 it was turned back to the city of Stuttgart and used to billet the victims of Nazi persecution and plain citizens in desperate need of shelter.

IN MEN REINSTATED

In the meantime the SS men were denazified by the Wuerttemberg-Baden Ministry of Justice. All the Rotweg families were ruled minor offenders. In the same class are a flat 80 percent of the personnel of the Ministry of Justice, including a majority of the former Nazi judges who sat in the denazification hearings. Purified of their sins, the Rotweg SS men promptly sued the city of Stuttgart to regain possession of their homes.

Ministry of Justice courts decided that they were entitled to them. They then sued for eviction of the present tenants and it was ruled that they should be evicted.

Feeling that they had at least a moral case, the evictees asked the United States officials for help. None has been forthcoming, although the Americans let it be known that they are following the case with interest. The evictions are continuing, however.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley States: "If It Is the Desire To Assemble Forces That Will Statistically Give the United States a Preponderance of Military Power Next Year, We Shall Have To Become an Armed Camp, Lower the American Standard of Living, and Permanently Adopt Large Peacetime Conscription"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I have been reading in the press for several days about a wonderfully clarifying statement with respect to national defense made by Gen. Omar N. Bradley in an address made before the Women's National Press Club.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I make an overstatement when in saying that there are but few men in the United States who more completely enjoy the confidence of the people in our country than does Gen. Omar Bradley.

Not alone is General Bradley a great soldier, he is a great scholar and philosopher and humanitarian whose every public utterance evidences his marked intellectual capacity to think a subject through to finality.

When General Bradley speaks, contemplative men listen.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no one thing which today concerns the people of this country more than the question as to the adequacy of national defense and the security of this Nation.

Second to that is the economic and efficient operations and administration of our armed services and the Defense Establishment.

I have heard a great deal for a long time, spoken and written, about unification, of the savings effected, as to the adequacy and the inadequacy of the armed services, individually as well as collectively, and about their ability as well as inability to fulfill their respective missions.

The news article which brought General Bradley's statement to my attention quoted some of the general's associates as having said that he had given a great deal of time and thought to the preparation of what he regarded as a major statement on military policy.

"These associates," said that article, "indicated that the general was deeply disturbed by public skepticism about American defenses and by demands for bigger military forces."

It was not, however, until I read the editorial published in the Washington Post of Friday morning commenting on the Bradley speech to the Women's National Press Club that I determined to obtain a copy for study.

Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary to point out that some of the nationally known columnists and commentators have been hypercritical of administrative policies with respect to the economies effected by Secretary Johnson and which at times they contended "were made at the expense of national defense."

Mr. Speaker, I have read and reread General Bradley's talk, and certainly no man could do so without reaching conclusion that it constitutes a great public statement emanating from a great authority and a great man.

Briefly, clearly, logically, and rhetorically, he analyzed and exhibited every facet of the question of the adequacy of our national defense when examined in the light of national and financial economy * * * in the face of the cold war that exists and * * * the shooting war that is anticipated.

My reading of the General's statement causes me to say that I can see very little difference existing between what has been spoken by President Truman, Secretary of Defense Johnson, Secretary Symington of the Air Force, and other members of the great team that now makes up the United States Department of Defense.

I wish every Member of this House would read and note the candor with which Gen. Omar Bradley discusses the realities of the continuing program of economy that has been reported to the people by Secretary Louis Johnson as contrasted with the doubts expressed by some as to whether or not the great savings made by Secretary Johnson had not adversely affected our national security.

I wish you would read what this trusted soldier and statesman had to say about what he called the $13,000,000,000 budget cut to fit the pocketbook of our people, and contrast that with the thousands among us who wish, as the general points out, to assemble forces that will statistically give the United States a preponderance of military power next year and which he said will result in our becoming an armed camp.

Mr. Speaker, with those few observations, I call to the attention of the Members of the House the speech made by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before the Women's National Press Club, and which was inserted in the RECORD on Thursday, March 9, 1950, by the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY, of Texas. It appears on page A1807 of the Appendix of the RECORD.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL J. LINEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. LINEHAN. Mr. Speaker, St. Patrick's Day is the traditional occasion in America when everyone becomes Irish. Americans of every national background sing Irish songs and praise the illustrious deeds of the worthy sons of Erin. For it was St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland, who brought to that country, more than 1,500 years ago, a small band of Christian missionaries, and there began a struggle of ideas and ideals from which emerged the modern Ireland of the spirit. It is important to see what that spirit was, and is, because Irishmen have carried it to the uttermost corners of the earth. St. Patrick's Day celebrations, whether carried out in the full knowledge of St. Patrick's contribution or not, are a tribute to that spirit.

Most memorable among the poetic lines left by St. Patrick which exemplifies the spirit of freedom are these taken from the prayer known as the "Breastplate of Patrick":

I arise today
Through God's strength to pilot me,
God's might to uphold me,
God's wisdom to guide me,
God's eye to look before me,
God's ear to hear me,
God's word to speak for me,
God's hand to guard me,
God's way to be before me,
God's hosts to save me,

From the snares of the devil,
From the temptations of vices,
From everyone who desires me ill,
Afar or near,
Alone, or in a multitude.

In this lofty religious spirit St. Patrick carried on his missionary work and inspired the people of Ireland to codify the laws of their land and to purify the literature in their schools. St. Patrick loved the Irish character and he struggled to save the ancient language and literature and to reconcile them with Christian character and literature. Not only did he accomplish this, but he also enabled the Irish people to throw off their ancient pagan beliefs and establish a national life and government according to Christian principles. Good government based upon a spirit of justice and enlightenment was the ideal of the Irish people, and this ideal spread throughout the western world, even as far as to America.

In the colonization of America the Irish were numerous, and they brought with them not only crafts and skills; through their societies they clamored for freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly. They were among the pioneers of the spirit of American liberty. The most determined, most vigorous defenders of the rights and liberties of the common man, the Irish furnished more than their share of leaders, not only for their own people but their more numerous English neighbors as well.

This is why we find so many Irishmen among the signers of the Declaration of Independence and among the Members of the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Interestingly enough, it was the success of the American Revolution that raised the hopes of freedom in Ireland.

Among America's greatest patriots are found sons of St. Patrick. Every schoolboy knows the story of Andrew Jackson—how as a mere lad he fought against the British in the Revolution; how he led the revolt of the pioneer and democratic West against the rule of the dynasties of profit and greed; how he was elected President and established the leadership of the new Democratic Party in the affairs of the Nation until the Civil War. Jackson was a typical Irishman. Irishmen in American politics today are generally found on all sides of every great issue, except that of coldly planned graft for personal gain.

Irish patriots in America have not limited their deeds to early wars in America. Famous "firsts" of Irish in World War II are fresh in our minds:

First. The first American bombardier to sink a Jap ship was Colin Kelly.

Second. First American to kill a Jap was Michael Murphy.

Third. First American flier to bag five planes was Edward O'Hare.

Fourth. First American to be eulogized for bravery by the President was John Patrick Power.

Fifth. First American Coast Guard member to catch a spy was John Patrick Cullin.

Sixth. First American to make himself a human torpedo was Edward O'Rourke.

Although the War Department does not classify data on the basis of nationality, the Irish War Veterans, United States of America, have estimated that during World War II 3,500,000 persons of Irish or part-Irish descent served in the armed forces.

What exactly have the Irish contributed to the American way of life?

The first thing that we can say is that the Irishman has cooperated enthusiastically to make the American way of life what it is.

Second. He energized both the democratic struggle for liberty and equality, and the struggle for territorial expansion.

Third. Even when he did not introduce a higher spiritual insight into individual living, he did introduce a loyalty to ancient spiritual sanctions sadly needed in American life.

Fourth. He contributed to the drive for social welfare, particularly the welfare of labor.

Fifth. He introduced an element of flashing humor into every difficult situation.

Sixth. He introduced a strain of poetic tenderness into neighborliness in American life.

Seventh. In company with his Celtic cousins in America, the Pennsylvania Germans, he introduced a love for the land and a skill in farming and conservation of natural resources, which, after 300 years of reckless exploitation, bids fair to set the example for a universal program of conservation.

Yes the sons and grandsons of Ireland have done as much as the men of any other race or nation to energize, spiritualize, and humanize the American way of life.

Is This a Partial Reason for New England's Troubles?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, a letter I received from Walter W. Cenerazzo, president of the American Watch Workers' Union, points out vividly some of the handicaps under which the New England area suffers. A pointed disregard by the Democratic administration of New England's problems is clearly demonstrated. Administration nonreciprocal trade policies; maintenance of excise taxes; political misuse of natural resources; and lack of representation on Federal agencies and boards all work to the disadvantage of this pioneer industrial area. Mr. Cenerazzo is an intelligent, broad-minded union leader, who realizes that what benefits America also benefits all of its citizens. I commend his communication to your perusal:

THE AMERICAN WATCH WORKERS' UNION,
Waltham, Mass., March 13, 1950.

Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: Believing that you, as an elected official representing a segment of the New England population, are interested in the well-being and prosperity of New England, I am taking this opportunity of presenting to you some serious observations which I have made during the past several months in my efforts to obtain Federal Government assistance to preserve the century-old Waltham Watch Co.

It is my strong belief that the principal reason New England's economy is declining, that we are unable to compete satisfactorily on domestic markets, and that we have such rising unemployment is that New England does not have representation in the Federal Government agencies having to do with business and commerce.

The 10 Northeast States of the Union, the 6 New England States, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Ohio have 70 percent of the unemployment in the United States; and we, in New England, have a great percentage of this unemployment. These statistics make it apparent that New England could have a real depression while the rest of the United States would be fairly prosperous.

I would like to bring to your attention that there are only two New Englanders serving on the boards of all the independent agencies in our Federal Government: Paul Rowan on the Securities and Exchange Commission and Sumner Pike on the Atomic Energy Commission. Nowhere else will you find a resident of New England on the board of an independent agency.

When we realize the powerful impact independent agencies of Government have on our economy, it is cause for grave concern for the residents of New England. New England has no representation on the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Tariff Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the many other important independent agencies of our Federal Government.

In addition to this, we have no representation at the top level in the administration of the economic recovery program or in the Commercial Division of the State Department, where many important economic decisions are being made that affect the commerce of New England.

As for the Cabinet of the President of the United States, two New Englanders serve on it. Neither one has accomplished anything for the economy of New England in his present position. Of course Attorney General McGrath has to do only with the courts of justice and law enforcement.

But Secretary of Labor Tobin is an advocate of the Fair Deal program which includes increasing the minimum-wage structure supposedly to equalize competitive conditions between the North and the South. This program advocates collective bargaining which brings about, and rightly so, increased wages, paid holidays, paid vacations, pension plans, group insurance, and other increment benefits.

What this program does not take into consideration is that Secretary of Labor Tobin has never raised his voice to speak out against those in the present national Democratic administration who have brought about the entry of foreign goods into the American market produced by workmen who do not exercise collective bargaining, and obtain wages far less than do American workmen.

It is unfair to raise the domestic cost of production through such measures as Secretary of Labor Tobin advocates and then allow goods to compete with domestic production from foreign countries that have no such comparable unit costs. There is no equality at the border today between domestic goods and foreign imports.

Most of the tariff cuts put into effect by the national Democratic administration have been on goods that directly compete with New England products, rather than with products manufactured in other parts of the country. There is a great inconsistency in the program of Secretary of Labor Tobin and the actions of the Democratic national administration.

Add to the entry of foreign goods into the United States, at far less than we can produce them for in the United States, the effect of the basing-point decision which requires steel companies to charge freight from the factory to point of delivery, is having on the machine-tool industry and fabricated products here in New England, and one must come to the conclusion that dire days are ahead for us in New England unless drastic action is taken to change the pattern of our National Government.

Excise taxes on manufactured goods and transportation have sharply curtailed retail sales on manufactured goods. Inventory has piled up on the retail, wholesale, and factory level, causing lay-offs. New England has been particularly hard hit because of these excise taxes, as we are particularly an economy of many small companies in the manufacturing business. The Fair Deal program does not take the effect excise taxes are having on the New England economy into consideration.

Another point of great importance to us here in New England is that the Federal Power Act does not take into consideration that New England was densely populated before electricity was put into commercial use. The distribution lines for electricity were established by private utilities, and there is little room for expansion of distribution lines in New England. Our problem is the generation of power, not the distribution of power. To date, the Federal Government, through the Federal Power Act, prohibits New England utilities from utilizing Government funds in the creation of hydroelectric projects and the use of water power. No other method or program can give to the people of New England cheaper electricity than the creation of hydroelectric power and allowing the present utility systems to distribute it. Yet, the Fair Deal program talks about cheap power for New England but refuses to pass the enabling legislation to the Federal Power Act which would bring about cheaper power. It would rather castigate the private utilities than adopt the program that would coordinate Federal Government assistance and private distribution through existing utilities.

When one takes into consideration the amount of money which New Englanders pay in Federal taxation, both direct and indirect, and the small percentage of this that returns to New England, it seems to me that regardless of party affiliation, you, as an elected official, should help organize an effective voice to protect New England by the appointment of New Englanders to every independent agency of the Federal Government dealing with our economy.

I hope that you will find this information of interest to you.

Very truly yours,
WALTER W. CENERAZZO,
National President.

Kerr Natural-Gas Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Emby Kaye, of Tulsa, Okla., published under the heading, "Kerr natural-gas proposal," in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KERR NATURAL GAS PROPOSAL—A COMMUNICATION

The press from Washington has carried several attacks against Senator KERR keyed to his espousal of certain amendments of the Natural Gas Act of 1938. The Kerr bill seeks only to preserve by law the right of an independent producer of gas—operating at arm's length from a pipe line or distributing company—to make a contract for the sale of gas from his own wells without regulation of any Federal agency.

The bill, if enacted into law, will not, per se, increase the price of gas, either in the field or at the consumer level. Under the present law, the Federal Power Commission has not claimed and never has exercised the right to control the price at which gas "in the field" is sold to the pipe line. The price has under the present law increased from 3 and 4 cents per thousand cubic feet to 6 cents in many fields and in some instances to as much as 10 cents a thousand cubic feet, with step-up provisions beyond these prices for future years. What the Kerr bill seeks is to confirm the present practice—the right of a producer to sell gas at arm's length at the best price the seller can obtain and which the buyer is willing to pay.

Oil and gas production are part of our free enterprise system. Unless there is nationalization or confiscation, or unless the business is by an irrational philosophy decided to be a public utility, there is no place for price fixing in that industry. Natural gas is not a monopoly. There are many fields producing gas which have no markets today. It is available to buyers.

City gas plants are not dependent upon natural gas. In the Eastern seaboard, practically every large city has contracted for and is clamoring for a larger share of available natural gas for one reason: It is cheaper than artificial or manufactured gas produced from coal or oil.

Gas companies taking on natural gas generally maintain their plants in working condition, against emergencies. Many continue to produce gas and blend their low B. t. u. gas with natural gas. If gas should unreasonably be advanced in price, the buyer could reduce his take and manufacture a larger proportion of his requirements. But that is not in the cards because purchase contracts are set up for long periods, generally 20 years. Certainly if fuel oil was to drop to the prices of a year ago or even lower, and gas could be manufactured at a lower cost than natural gas can be obtained, natural gas lines would get no new customers, and would be held to minimum deliveries by old ones.

Hitherto the producing end of the natural-gas industry did not have to worry about the prospect of the Federal Power Commission fixing or limiting the price of gas at the well. Even today, with a tremendous market, gas in the field is generally underpriced, often brings 3 or 4 cents under life-of-lease contracts entered into many years ago. As a result, the regulatory authorities in the States of Oklahoma and Kansas have established by law or regulation a price of 7 and 8 cents, respectively, as the minima to be paid at the well. The courts are to test the validity of these steps. The writer does not applaud this means of obtaining an equitable price for gas.

The dispatches argue that a 6-percent profit set for utilities ought to be enough for a natural-gas producer, that such a profit would content other industries. It is one thing to be content with 6-percent profit but quite another to have it fixed by the Government. As to the oil and gas industry, price fixing at the well is not sound. The critics apparently do not understand the hazards of drilling for oil and gas. Dry holes and poor wells must be paid for out of income of those wells which produce. The law of supply and demand should determine the price.

I wonder whether the dispatches referring to "closing the loophole which permits oil and gas drillers and mining companies to charge off excessive depletion allowances" give the correct picture. The provisions in the present Federal income-tax laws governing "depletion and the charge of intangible development costs as expense have been worked out by Congress over a period of years as equitable and economical means of providing the necessary incentive for petroleum development that is indispensable to national welfare and security."

The Kerr bill seeks to give the approval of Congress to the historical practice in the industry so that a basically sound business philosophy might not be overturned at the whim of a commission, when chance changes the political or economic complexion of that commission. So basic a change, if ever made, should be in the purview of the Congress and not in the power of one of its creatures.

EMBY KAYE.

TULSA, OKLA.

Red Herrings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

BY

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Leader, the daily newspaper of my home town, Madison, S. Dak., on the intriguing subject of red herrings.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHERRY STORKS

No recent political event has given this column more of a charge than yesterday's statement by Dean Acheson that maybe Alger Hiss wasn't such a good boy, at that.

This whole story of Russian spy entanglements in the executive departments of the Government, dating back to the Roosevelt regime, is gradually unfolding, step by step, until some day we will get it all.

First, the Un-American Activities Committee, of which KARL MUNDT, then a Representative, was an active member, was regarded by the administration and certain left-wing commentators as just a bunch of blundering publicity seekers.

There was much writing about unfounded charges against sterling citizens, who didn't have a chance to defend themselves as their reputations were being smeared in public.

One by one, some of these gents wandered into jail, and some of us rustics out in the hinterlands began to wonder whether our KARL hadn't dug up something important.

MUNDT kept coming back to South Dakota and, in speeches and interviews, told the story of the committee's work more fully.

About that stage, Mr. Truman pulled his red-herring remark, which has been quoted against him so many, many times.

When the committee actually prodded the Department of Justice to act on some of the evidence it had cleared, people started jumping off rooftops, indictments began to

pop out of grand-jury rooms, and in general the red herring began to assume the proportions of a red whale.

Although Alger Hiss was at Yalta, and Hoover and others declare he was Roosevelt's principal adviser there on far-eastern affairs, the State Department's version of the Yalta Conference, recently published in a national magazine, doesn't mention Hiss in any way. He was the little man who wasn't there when we gave away Asia to Stalin in return for his staying in the war which was already won.

Now Acheson begins to admit that the jury which convicted Hiss might possibly be right. We thought in our stupid way that when a man is convicted by a Federal jury, he is guilty.

Next thing, we may get an official statement from the White House that maybe Boss Pendergast, of Kansas City, was the leader of a corrupt political machine.

But we doubt that.

Disability Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the New York Times, by Mrs. Abraham Epstein, giving reasons why permanent total disability insurance should be included in the pending social-security bill, H. R. 6000.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISABILITY INSURANCE—ITS INCORPORATION IN SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM IS ADVOCATED

To the EDITOR of THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Senate Committee on Finance is now holding hearings on H. R. 6000, the House-approved social-security bill. From the standpoint of the welfare of the American people, this is one of the most significant bills before this Congress. Among the improvements which H. R. 6000 would make in our social-security program is the provision of insurance against permanent and total disability, one of the most important links in the social-security structure. The adoption of disability insurance is an essential step toward greater security for Americans.

A majority of the groups who have studied the problem within recent years have concluded that permanent and total disability insurance is desirable. Fifteen out of seventeen members of the advisory council on social security appointed by the Senate Finance Committee recommended permanent and total disability insurance; a majority of the House Ways and Means Committee recommended the adoption of this type of protection; and last fall the House of Representatives overwhelmingly voted for disability insurance along with other amendments.

A minority, however, has recommended that newly disabled persons be taken care of through public assistance, with no provision for disability insurance benefits. Adoption of this recommendation would make it impossible to attain the objectives which these very groups wish to achieve—the strengthening of our social-insurance system and reduction of our reliance on assistance loads. Prolonged total disability is one of the chief causes of poverty in the United States. At the present time over three-quarters of a million persons are on the federally aided public-assistance rolls because of disability, and an additional one-third of a million receive State or locally financed general assistance because the person who would normally support them is disabled.

The only way to keep the assistance burden down to a reasonable level is to provide disability benefits on a social-insurance basis.

The bill under consideration by the Senate committee would tie in the disability insurance closely with State vocational rehabilitation programs. The conservation of human resources which will result from this fact alone will save the Nation untold millions of dollars. Disability insurance and rehabilitation work hand in hand; a small, steady income, which the worker has helped to pay for, through his social-insurance contributions, assists in maintaining his morale and his desire to return to productive work, as well as the financial resources of the family, especially if there are added provisions for dependents similar to those of the old-age and survivors insurance program. Such insurance benefits would give a basic feeling of security and independence, but would be low enough so that the disabled person's incentive to improve his condition would not be destroyed.

The Nation can no longer afford the tremendous waste attendant on the continued neglect of our disabled population; adoption of disability insurance is essential to prevent this waste.

HENRIETTE C. EPSTEIN.

NEW YORK, *February 16, 1950.*

A Reasonably Effective Defense Is Possible, if We Are Willing To Pay the Price, But We Cannot Rely on Defense Alone—The Enemy's Greatest Problem Is the Damage We Can Inflict Upon His Homeland and Source of Strength—For This Reason Our Strategic Striking Force Is the Greatest Deterrent to War Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I notice that today's press carries a report that some of the members of the House Committee on Appropriations now wish to cut the defense budget for the coming fiscal year below the thirteen billion requested by Secretary of Defense Johnson as approved by the Bureau of the Budget and sent to the Hill by President Truman.

But a short time ago we were hearing a great deal spoken about the fact that in his administration of the Department of National Defense during the year he has been in office that Secretary Johnson had saved too much money; that his defense economy program had not alone "fried a lot of fat out of the armed services" and had saved hundreds of millions through the elimination of duplication of effort in defense activities but that he had made the savings at the expense of national security.

Mr. Speaker, there is no disputing the fact that Louis Johnson has affected a savings of nearly a billion and a half dollars in the last year and that he did so in the face of rising costs. At the same time, however, I am convinced that he improved the national defense as well as the security of the Nation.

When I think of Louis Johnson and his critics, I am ofttimes reminded of another great and good friend whom I shall always remember. He was possessed of one of the most intelligent, scholarly, and informed minds and was indisputably one of the most beloved men who ever served in the Senate of these United States.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to our good and mutual friend, the late Honorable Senator Ellison D. Smith, who for more than 35 years represented the State of South Carolina in the Senate of these United States.

Senator Smith, or "Cotton Ed," as he was affectionately called by his friends, not unlike Louis Johnson, frequently found himself the stormy center of heated debate while serving in capacity of chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

Senator Smith then had to contend with the cockeyed economic program of Henry Agard Wallace, the program for plowing up cotton, burning wheat, and drowning pigs—as practiced in the Wallace administration of our agricultural affairs.

I remember sitting one evening with Senator Smith, Senator Bankhead, our good friend Senator GEORGE, Congressman Kleberg, and several others engaged in a discussion apropos of the great surplus of agricultural products, which, then as now, were burdening our agricultural economy and had resulted in a marked decline in farm prices.

With a humorous twinkle in his eye, Senator Smith referred to the criticisms being leveled at him for the factually sound program he advanced with respect to the economic administration of our national farm problem.

He told of how he had certain senatorial colleagues who had condemned him for not supporting certain proposals they advanced and who were now condemning him for supporting those very proposals when made applicable to similar problems.

In fact he said he was reminded of a little jingle that goes something like this:

I can and I can't, I will and I won't
I'll be damned if I do, and I'll be damned if I don't.

Mr. Speaker, as it was with Senator Ed Smith, so it is with our great Secretary of Defense. He too has been criticized for having already affected a savings of nearly a billion and a half dollars and for having removed 151,542 from the civilian pay roll instead of the 135,000 promised.

He has been criticized for having reduced last year's expenditures, for having constituted himself as the watchdog of the Federal Treasury, and not spending all that the Congress appropriated

and—now comes critical proposal that he has not cut it enough—now it is proposed that the Congress itself should still cut expenditures by whittling another billion or two off the defense appropriations without regard to the security of the Nation.

That just does not make sense.

All of the foregoing is a sort of a prologue to the introduction of a talk delivered by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, at San Bernardino, Calif., on Friday, March 10.

It is a notable fact that every statement that comes to our notice from our Air Force today closely exhibits the business administrative program laid down by the Honorable Stuart Symington with respect to the administration operations and maintenance of the Department of the Air Force the very day that he was named as the first Secretary of that newly created Department of President Truman 2 years ago.

The United States Air Force is now recognized on a Nation-wide basis—as a young, virile, direct-action department of government headed up by young, administratively as well as battle-trained and seasoned veteran officers. Every statement which emanates from them is factual, short, brief, concise, and to the point.

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg on that occasion, after a few complimentary remarks, limited himself to a mere 1,000 words, which were spoken in but 5 or 6 minutes.

Every sentence in General Vandenberg's speech is replete with facts. There is neither evasion nor verbose embellishment.

Certainly no man can read that statement and not recognize that the United States Air Force is on its toes and stands as one with the Secretary of Defense when he stated:

We do not propose to be penny pinchers with national security. Security must always come first and economy second.

That statement is so brief, so timely, that it is something which, in the light of the cold war that now exists, should be read by every Member of this House.

It reads as follows:

I wish many more Americans could come to California at this time of the year and see how bright the sun and the sky and scenery can be. The experience would do a great deal to dispel some of the gloom that afflicts so many citizens at this time of the year. The gloom seems to be particularly thick this year, and not entirely without reason. Our Nation, despite its internal prosperity and progress, is faced with problems of military security which are more serious than ever before. No honest man who knows the facts can pretend that there are any simple and easy solutions. And we must not try to delude ourselves that there are any cheap solutions.

A few years ago we were so concerned about American lives that we paid little attention to dollars. We did spend a great amount of money. Under the leadership of the Secretary of Defense, all the services are making every possible effort to minimize the cost of national security.

Of all the services, the Air Force requires the highest investment in operating equipment. More than 2 years ago the Secretary of the Air Force insisted upon the introduction of modern management and cost-control methods into Air Force administration. We are very proud of our accomplishments in this respect, and of our increased savings and efficiency.

Our principal problem in the atomic age, however, is not one of savings, but of adequate defense. As the Secretary of Defense has said, we "do not propose to be penny pinchers with national security. Security must always come first and economy second."

A few weeks ago Mr. Symington, speaking at Baylor University, enumerated three facts which every American should know:

"1. Behind the iron curtain there has been an atomic explosion.

"2. Behind that iron curtain is the air equipment capable of delivering a surprise atomic attack against any part of the United States.

"3. We have no sure defense against such an attack."

These statements are undeniably true and they are portentous.

The ability to conduct intercontinental warfare is no longer a future possibility. It is a present-day fact, with which we Americans must learn to live from now on. The employment of atomic energy in intercontinental warfare is no longer a matter for sole decision by the United States. It appears that Russia will soon have the ability to launch such an attack in considerable strength. The grave question now facing us is whether this ability is increasing more rapidly than our own ability to resist such an attack.

It is true that we can scarcely hope to achieve a defense that is 100-percent effective. But a reasonably effective defense is possible, if we are willing to pay the price.

The fact that no absolute defense is possible does not mean that we should neglect to provide such defense as is feasible. But it does mean that we cannot rely on defense alone. Our ability to strike back is of first importance. The best defense cannot win a war; it can only postpone defeat. The greatest problem facing a potential enemy is not the damage we might do to his attacking force. His greatest problem is the damage our retaliatory striking force could inflict upon his homeland and his source of strength. For this reason the continued existence of our strategic striking force is the greatest deterrent to war today.

If we should be attacked, this strategic striking force will be our primary reliance for the destruction of the remaining aircraft and bases of the long-range force directed against us. It will also be our primary means of reducing the enemy's capacity to continue his war effort, so that we may have time to mobilize for ultimate victory. Within the means available to us, the Air Force must continue as a matter of priority the modernizing, supporting, and training of this strategic striking force. It must be immediately effective when called upon. This strategic striking force includes only 18 of our 48 groups and only 16 percent of our total personnel, but it is our most essential element of strength.

Our ability to strike back is our best deterrent to attack and our best insurance against defeat, but our ability to resist the staggering blows that can now be directed against us must be rapidly increased. No other course of action is possible. We must get our air-defense system into full operation and in place on the alert 24 hours a day. We can no longer plan or depend upon a time-consuming mobilization period for our air-defense forces. An atomic offensive might suddenly be launched against us without warning in one concentrated effort designed to saturate our limited defenses. Unless effectively opposed, such a surprise attack would cripple our ability to strike back through the air, destroy our Capital, and devastate our great industrial centers.

The Air Force has other missions and responsibilities. We must be able to provide adequate support for our forces on land and sea. The extent to which we can carry out all our responsibilities is, of course, dependent upon the resources that can be made available for our employment. It is not within my province, as a military man, to determine the amount of the resources the American people can afford to invest in purely military security. My duty as Chief of Staff of the Air Force and as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is to estimate and to state our military needs as I see them.

The ultimate decision concerning the extent to which these needs can be met rests with the Government and the people of the United States. Speaking for the Air Force, I can promise you the best possible employment of the means provided to carry out our full share of responsibility for the security of the Nation.

In this air atomic age we must build that type of air defense and air striking power which will serve as a deterrent to any aggressor.

Only if we are willing to face the facts can we have insurance against defeat and the slavery which would inevitably follow.

Surely we must develop as far as possible the strength we need to guarantee our security and our freedom.

British National Health Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Never Take This Road," published in the Washington (Pa.) Reporter of Thursday, March 9, 1950. I particularly call attention to the statement of Harold E. Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania, on the health and medical situation in Great Britain. He states that there were 72,125 more deaths in Britain after the national health program went into effect than in the preceding year.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"NEVER TAKE THIS ROAD"

Harold E. Stassen recently returned from England, where he made an intensive study of Britain's health program—a program which is similar in many particulars to the compulsory government health insurance scheme proposed for this country, Mr. Stassen's findings have been summed up in a series of articles in Reader's Digest.

According to Mr. Stassen, Britain's version of socialized medicine has been characterized by a lower quality of care, for more people, at a higher cost. Preventive medicine is being grossly neglected. Doctor's time and energies are largely consumed by malingerers and hypochondriers.

Worst of all, to quote Mr. Stassen directly, "During the first year of the operation of the British National Health Service * * * the death rate in Britain went up rather sharply! * * * In infant mortality, the death rate has shown an improvement, and

and reduction of our swelling assistance of effort in defense activities but that he ing all that the Congress appropriated

this has been hailed by those administering the program. The fact is, however, that the slight improvement in infant mortality * * * has not been as great an improvement proportionately as that which occurred in the United States and throughout the western world. * * *

"It does seem that the additional tombstones in the British cemeteries—72,125 more than in the year before the national health program went into effect—are grim signposts on which we can read: 'Never take this road.'"

Will Americans be wise enough to profit from this sad example?

Veterans Honor Hon. James E. Van Zandt, of Pennsylvania, for Service to the Veteran and the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, was signally honored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States on February 15, 1950, at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., when he was awarded a certificate of recognition for service to veterans and the Nation.

The National Tribune-Stars and Stripes issue of March 16 contains the following article which I feel will be of interest to my colleagues:

VAN ZANDT IS CITED BY VFW FOR SERVICE TO VETS AND NATION

In mid-February Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, three times commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, was awarded a certificate of recognition by the VFW at a congressional dinner in the Presidential Room of the Hotel Statler in Washington.

Acting for Commander in Chief Clyde A. Lewis, the citation was conferred on VAN ZANDT by Junior Vice Commander in Chief Frank C. Hilton, of Wyoming, Pa. Hilton read the following record of VAN ZANDT's organization services:

Representative JAMES E. (JIMMY) VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, has the unique distinction of being the only member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to be chosen three times as commander in chief of our organization.

Naturally, we of the VFW think of "JIMMY" in terms of his outstanding service to the veterans of this Nation. We recall his election to the highest office which the VFW can bestow on any American in 1933. The qualities of leadership which he displayed and his militant battle on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents in the days of the famous Economy Act were widely recognized by the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and were effectively expressed by his unanimous reelection as commander in chief in 1934 and again in 1935.

We realize, of course, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars has no exclusive claim to the leadership qualities, conscientious devotion to duty or dynamic energy of "JIMMY" VAN ZANDT. His entire life has been one continuous series of achievements, and for as many different groups or causes.

"JIMMY" VAN ZANDT was born in Altoona, Pa., December 18, 1898. He enlisted in the United States Navy a few days after the entry of the United States into World War I. After 2½ years of outstanding service he was discharged from the Navy with the rank of chief quartermaster. He immediately enlisted in the Naval Reserve and has been an active member to this date. In fact "JIMMY" almost failed to make the dinner tonight because he had a Naval Reserve inspection earlier this evening.

I know it is unnecessary for me to remind his colleagues in Congress of the contributions of Congressman VAN ZANDT to the security of our Nation in the Seventy-sixth, Seventy-seventh, and Seventy-eighth Congresses. And we World War II veterans gratefully remember his successful efforts to secure a $50 monthly base pay for service personnel and provisions for dependency allotments.

The World War II service record of "JIMMY" VAN ZANDT was one of the finest in the armed forces. He earned three promotions in recognition of his courage, leadership, skill, navigation, and gunnery prowess. He was in command of LST units that landed Navy, Marine, and Army combat units and serviced them at 26 beachheads. He was promoted to captain and awarded the Bronze Star and the Naval Reserve Medal with Oak Leaf for more than 20 years of meritorious service.

Elected to the Eightieth Congress in 1946 "JIMMY" has continued his courageous support of those programs, sponsored in a large measure by the VFW, designed to promote the security of our Nation and the welfare of our citizens.

It is with great pleasure, therefore, that I, as a fellow Pennsylvanian and a comrade of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, present to Past Commander in Chief JAMES E. VAN ZANDT this certificate of recognition of his outstanding service to the VFW and the veterans of our Nation.

The Chance Was There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of Wednesday, March 15, 1950:

THE CHANCE WAS THERE

General Motors has just announced its 1949 profits—the biggest in United States history, 49 percent greater than GM's 1948 all-time high, 11.5 percent of its return from total sales.

We would be the last to begrudge General Motors this success. We only wish all the automobile manufacturers could approach such prosperity. It represents a triumph in sales enterprise and efficiency engineering. But, we are compelled to observe, GM has also scored something considerably less than a triumph in human engineering.

Just 3 weeks before announcing these record profits GM took full advantage of the cost-of-living clause in its contract with the United Auto Workers and cut employees' wages 2 cents an hour. It cut its car prices, too. But only $10 to $40.

The company acted fully within its rights. But, in the light of its extraordinary prosperity, and in the light of the rudiments of good human relations, did it have to? Might it not have invoked its contractual rights and then waived them?

The union lived up to its part of the contract and took the cut quietly. But when bargaining for a new contract opens in May, if the company is confronted with some extreme demands (and report now says it will be) and a militant union, GM's management should not be surprised.

Reply to Specious Arguments Opposing Reorganization Plan No. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a resolution—House Resolution 512—proposing a rejection of Reorganization Plan No. 12 which President Truman recently submitted to the Congress together with 20 other reorganization plans, has been introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH]. To enter such resolutions of disapproval is the privilege of every Member, but I must caution the Members that the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois to support his resolution of disapproval contains, in my opinion, misleading, distorted, and specious arguments. His statement will be found in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A1927.

The gentleman from Illinois alleges first, that the plan is an illegal attempt, under the guise of being a Hoover Commission recommendation, to destroy the effectiveness of the Taft-Hartley Act. In behalf of his allegation, he cites section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 which provides in subsection (4) that no reorganization plan shall have the effect of authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transferred to Congress. He argues that this subsection prohibits the President from vesting the National Labor Relations Board with the functions of the office of general counsel.

The gentleman indulges himself in a plain misreading of the law. By Reorganization Plan No. 12 the President is not authorizing the National Labor Relations Board to exercise any new statutory function. The President is merely authorizing the Board or its Chairman to exercise the functions heretofore vested in the Office of General Counsel. This is a simple transfer of functions within an agency, and the authority for such reorganization is amply and clearly contained in the Reorganization Act of 1949. The President is specifically empowered by that act to prepare reorganization plans to, first, make transfers of one agency or function to the jurisdiction or control of another agency; second, abolish all or any part of the functions of any agency; third, consoli-

date or coordinate the whole or any part of an agency or function with the whole or any part of another agency or function; fourth, consolidate or coordinate any part of an agency or its functions with another part of the same agency or its functions; fifth, authorize any officer to delegate any of his functions; and sixth, abolish the whole or any part of an agency which loses its functions upon reorganization.

What can be more clear than the authority of the President, particularly under items 2, 4, and 6, to transfer the functions of the Office of the General Counsel to the National Labor Relations Board or its Chairman, and to abolish the office?

The gentleman alleges secondly that the Hoover Commission did not recommend that the Office of General Counsel be entirely abolished and its functions transferred to the Board and its Chairman. By using the word "entirely" the gentleman begins to give away his case, for he implies that the Hoover Commission favored abolishing the office at least in part. The fact is that the Hoover Commission did not address itself specifically to the Office of General Counsel in the National Labor Relations Board. However, in its report on regulatory commissions the Hoover Commission flatly and unequivocally states as its first recommendation: "We recommend that all administrative responsibility be vested in the Chairman of the Commission." The Hoover Commission listed nine regulatory commissions of the Federal Government, including the National Labor Relations Board. By Reorganization Plan No. 12 the President proposes to carry out this basic recommendation in the case of the National Labor Relations Board, thereby making its administrative relationship of Chairman to Board identical with that of the other regulatory agencies for which reorganization plans have been submitted.

Apparently the gentleman fails to understand that the fulfillment of this basic recommendation of the Hoover Commission in respect to the National Labor Relations Board requires that the present division of responsibility and the administrative confusion created by the independent statutory Office of General Counsel be eliminated. Anyone who has studied the Hoover Commission reports and accepted their basic principles of government organization knows that one principle was emphasized above all others; namely, that clear lines of authority and responsibility be established and maintained. This was indeed the very first of all the Commission's recommendations, and one which all of the Commission members regarded as basic and fundamental. Reorganization Plan No. 12 is in accord with this recommendation as well as with the one specifically relating to the vesting of administrative responsibility in the chairman of each regulatory agency.

The gentleman cites the Hoover Commission's task force report on regulatory commissions to support his stand against Reorganization Plan No. 12. The citation is to a sentence on page 141 of that report (appendix N) which reads: "It may be that the administrative and policy-making functions could be subordinated more clearly to the Board's control while still maintaining an adequate separation of the truly prosecuting activities." This is not a recommendation of the Hoover Commission; it is not even a recommendation of the task force; it is merely a tentative suggestion advanced in a discussion of various proposals for a better integration of the functions of the General Counsel in the Government structure. If anything, this suggestion supports the action of the President in Reorganization Plan No. 12 rather than the continuation of an administrative arrangement which is regarded as intolerable even by friends of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The task force plainly indicated its reluctance to make specific recommendations in a field so charged with controversial elements—appendix N, page 137. However, certain conclusions were drawn by the task force from its discussion, and the one relating to the matter at issue here, reads as follows:

> The Office of General Counsel should not be left independent of both the Board and the executive departments but should be integrated more closely into one or the other according to the functions to be performed. (Appendix N, p. 141.)

Nothing in this conclusion can lend comfort to the resolution of rejection introduced by the gentleman from Illinois.

The gentleman favors himself by citing the task-force report to the effect "that the Office of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board was somewhat unique." The words quoted are the gentleman's own construction of what the task-force report said. Its indictment of the Office of General Counsel was far stronger than "somewhat unique." The task-force report pointed out in chapter XIII dealing with the National Labor Relations Board that the Board had been changed from a "unified organization" under the Wagner Act to a "bifurcated agency" under the Taft-Hartley Act—appendix N, page 134. It stated with regard to the Office of General Counsel:

> The existence of such an office, independent both of the Federal departmental structure and of the Board, marks a departure from previous administrative practice. If permitted to set a pattern for future Government organization, it may lead to a diffusion of responsibility. (Appendix N, p. 139.)

The task-force report pointed out further that the General Counsel is "in a peculiarly exposed position," subjected to heavy pressures without agency protection and tending to seek unduly for congressional committee advice in self-defense, thus blurring the desirable separation of legislation and administration—appendix N, pages 139–140. The task force also described the administrative position of the General Counsel as "anomalous" and giving rise by virtue of this unusual position with its divided administrative authority to severe internal problems of administration.

Our conclusion—

Reported the task force—

> is that the present position of the General Counsel is an unstable one. (Appendix N, p. 140.)

As demonstrated above, the task force left open the question of the final disposition of this office, seeing, as one of several possible alternatives, integration within the Board. This alternative was taken by the President in Reorganization Plan No. 12, particularly since the failure to do so would have rendered impossible the carrying out of the basic Hoover Commission recommendation to vest administrative responsibility in the Chairman of the Board. The Taft-Hartley Act had divided up administrative responsibility between the Board and its General Counsel.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in its majority report relating to repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and proposed new labor-management legislation, referred to "the evil of dual policy making" consequent upon the creation of the independent General Counsel under the Taft-Hartley Act and noted examples of internal agency friction and conflict which have plagued the Board since enactment of the 1947 law. The majority concluded on this point:

> The operation of the act to date fully vindicates the opposition to the establishment of the independent office of General Counsel. In the guise of separating the adjudicative and prosecutive functions, the act has transferred vast prosecutive, administrative, and injunctive powers to the General Counsel at the most critical stages of labor disputes. When to this concentration of power is added the internal disruption and the uncertainty and delay which the present system engenders, the conclusion is compelling that this experiment in two-headed administration has proved a costly mistake and should be scrapped (81st Cong., 1st sess., S. Rept. No. 99, p. 41).

The minority report agreed with this conclusion to the extent of eliminating completely from its own version of the labor-management bill section 3 (d) of the Taft-Hartley Act which had set up the office and authority of the General Counsel—Eighty-first Congress, first session, Senate Report No. 99, part 2, page 69.

Senator TAFT explained in the floor debate that the minority had agreed that the provision for the Office of General Counsel should be eliminated and "that we should return to the administrative procedure of the National Labor Relations Board"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 7, page 8712.

The Taft-Donnell-Smith version of the bill, with the Office of General Counsel abolished, passed the Senate on June 20, 1949.

Thus it is plain that both leading proponents as well as opponents of the Taft-Hartley law see no value in continuing the anomalous administrative

position of the General Counsel. Certainly its continuation cannot be justified on grounds of administrative efficiency and orderly conduct of governmental affairs. The Washington Evening Star, in an editorial of March 15 on the President's reorganization plan, states:

As a purely administrative matter, the division of authority between the Board and its counsel has not worked at all well. It is, at best, a clumsy arrangement.

The Star, in defense of the Taft-Hartley Act, however, raises the question whether administrative efficiency should not be sacrificed to the continued existence of a "Taft-Hartley policeman" in the person of the General Counsel. If this is the position taken by the gentleman from Illinois in opposing Reorganization Plan No. 12, then he is guilty of the action he attributes in such heated accents to President Truman; namely, attempting to foist a particular labor-management policy on the Government at the expense of efficient Government administration.

The President is proceeding in accord with a basic recommendation of the Hoover Commission. Whoever opposes this reorganization plan must bear the burden of opposing the most widely accepted principle of organization recommended by the Hoover Commission. In the President's words, Reorganization Plan No. 12 "eliminates a basic defect in the present organization of the National Labor Relations Board and provides an organizational pattern consistent with that established for other regulatory agencies."

Many Questions Raised by Electoral Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Arthur Krock which appeared in the New York Times of March 12, 1950:

MANY QUESTIONS RAISED BY ELECTORAL REFORMS—HOUSE TAKES A CRITICAL VIEW OF LODGE AMENDMENT FOR THE PROPORTIONAL PLAN ADOPTED BY THE SENATE—POLITICS IS A MAJOR FACTOR

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 11.—The road to reform in the method of choosing Presidents and Vice Presidents of the United States is littered with the wrecks of previous attempts. Though the inequalities and other defects of the present system are generally conceded, it has been protected from change for more than a hundred years by a mixture of natural American conservatism where the letter of the Constitution is concerned and a bipartisan political combination effected by what some major party politicians believed to be self-interest.

This same combination, unless overwhelming public opinion favors a change and registers itself as it rarely does no such issues, may once more defeat the most promising movement in this respect since the old method of choosing electors by districts was replaced by that of awarding all of the electors of a State to the candidates for President and Vice President who get a plurality, however small, over all others.

The current effort is the result of spade work begun in the early thirties by the then Representative Clarence Lea, of California, in which he was later joined by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, Senator Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee (then a Representative) Representative Ed Gossett, of Texas and a few more. At the last session of this Congress Mr. LODGE began the reform drive, of which he has become the spearhead and which owes its progress chiefly to him, that culminated when the Senate unexpectedly, on February 1, 1950, approved—64 to 27—the submission to the people of the Lodge-Gossett amendment to the Constitution. This would prorate a State's electors in proportion to the popular vote cast for the several national candidates.

BLOCKED IN 7-TO-4 VOTE

But now it has been blocked in the Rules Committee of the House where 7 of the 11 members have refused to give the amendment a privileged place on the docket. The fact that three southern Democrats and one Republican from Mr. LODGE's State (Representative CHRISTIAN A. HERTER) voted to bring out the bill, and that four northern Democrats, and three northern Republicans voted not to, illustrates how the professional politicians think it would operate.

Together with Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, a number of northern Republicans view the amendment this way from the standpoint of purely party interest:

It would always give the Democratic national candidates some electors in the populous doubtful States outside the South which over the years have gone more often to the Republicans en bloc under the present system. These electors would far outnumber the few which the Republican ticket might hope to pick up in the South by the prorata method of the Lodge-Gossett amendment.

The southern Democrats generally favor the amendment on this same reasoning; also because they think the South would regain its old place in the Democratic Party councils through the obvious fact that henceforth movements like that of the 1948 Dixiecrats would carry a larger defeat potential for the national party ticket.

BIPARTISAN OPPOSITION

A roving bipartisan band opposes any electoral change, partly because of natural conservatism, partly because they fear the Lodge-Gossett plan would encourage the formation of splinter parties. (Curiously enough, its authors are confident it would end the power of shifting, usually radical, groups which now hold or assert a large enough following to tilt an entire State bloc of electors.)

In agreement with this bipartisan band of rovers are many leaders of such groups.

Despite this mix-up of views, the Lodge-Gossett amendment has the support of President Truman and the spokesmen of Americans for Democratic Action—both very practical when it comes to politics.

Yet long experience with the present system has shown its operation can, and has, put Presidents in the White House with less than a majority of the popular vote and thrown national elections into the House of Representatives. If the Republican farm States from Ohio to Iowa had not given Mr. Truman the small pluralities he got there this would have happened again in 1948.

SUPPORT FOR ALTERNATIVE

However, since the Senate approved submission of the Lodge-Gossett amendment (it must pass both branches by two-thirds and be approved by three-fourths of the State legislatures before it can become a part of the Constitution), it has been subjected to less selfish and nonpartisan scrutiny on a merit test. This has produced some support for the alternative reform proposed by Representative F. R. COUDERT, JR., of New York City, which reverts to the original method and was described by Madison as the one "mostly, if not exclusively, in view when the Constitution was framed and adopted."

The Coudert amendment provides that each State be divided before a national election into electoral districts, which could have the same boundaries as the districts in which Members of the House are chosen. These districts would equal in number those which elect a Member of the House of Representatives. Each of these districts would then, by majority or plurality, choose a single Presidential and Vice Presidential elector, and the entire voting population of the State would select two others at large.

MANY SUPERIORITIES

The superiorities of this method over the Lodge-Gossett amendment are many. It dispels the factor of proportional representation which in practice, especially in Europe and the New York City Council, has given radical splinter groups disproportionate power to block and confuse. It maintains the geographical constituencies and gives an equal voice to equal units of the population rather than to equal aggregations of those who go to the polls. To make the district groupings wholly equitable, Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., of Princeton, who is a leading authority on electoral reform in this country, would require Congress to create, for national elections uses only, compact and contiguous districts containing, as nearly as practicable, an equal number of inhabitants.

Until, in Jackson's time, the system of submitting State-wide tickets which acquired all a State's electors by a mere plurality became general—it is now universal—the Coudert-Wilmerding proposal was the practice. One of its best effects is to prevent an entire State bloc of electors going to a candidate merely because of bad weather in the rural districts or because of the inequitable weight of an acute local issue in one district.

But the Coudert plan has found no favor with the political leaders of the House, one probable reason being that it is concerned entirely with sound reform and not with possible political consequences to the major parties and their internal factions as they now exist. The virtues of the proposal from the standpoint of the public interest, which Mr. Wilmerding has made plain, have thus far evoked no strong interest in the House.

Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a statement I made a few days

ago before the House Ways and Means Committee relating to a number of changes in excise taxes which I have proposed.

In my original statement I filed a num- of bills, reports, briefs, and so forth. I do not desire to have them placed in the RECORD today, but merely want to put in the remarks I actually made.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I very much appreciate the opportunity of appearing before your distinguished committee today.

During the last few years I have introduced quite a number of bills and proposed quite a number of amendments relating to various excise taxes. To date, very few of them have been favorably acted upon since this is the first real study of the excise tax structure that has been undertaken by any congressional committee since the end of the war.

During the past few years a number of injustices and inequities have appeared, and I very much hope that Congress will do a thorough job of correcting these situations this year, since it may be some years before it will be possible to undertake another study of the excise tax structure.

There is no particular question of pride of authorship involved in these various proposals. I am not particular about who gets the credit for such changes as are made. I wanted to appear before this committee because, of course, all revenue measures must originate in the House. Also, I believe my proposals will have a better chance of ultimate passage if they are brought to the attention of this committee.

I shall not attempt to explain all of my proposed amendments in detail. Some of them have already been discussed in your hearings. I want to discuss just one or two. As to the others, I have prepared some written statements which I will file with the committee.

TAX ON "HOT TRACTOR FUEL"

I want to propose that section 3412 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code be amended in the manner provided by my bill, S. 2129. This amendment would eliminate the tax on tractor fuel. I would like to file a copy of my bill at this point.

This amendment will get rid of a useless and wasteful procedure which does not bring in one cent of revenue to the Federal Treasury. Under present law the definition of gasoline is so written that the Federal tax is levied upon a fuel used widely in my State and several other States known as "hot tractor fuel." This fuel was especially developed for use in tractors, and it has a higher boiling point than gasoline. Its properties are somewhere between those of gasoline and kerosene. It is used exclusively in tractors. It is absurd to classify this fuel as gasoline in the Federal Code.

Here is the point. The Federal Government does not get any revenue from the tax on this fuel now. The tax is all refunded to the user—the farmer. Our Internal Revenue Code sets up a system whereby the so-called gasoline tax can be refunded to the taxpayer if the fuel that is taxed is not used for propelling a motor vehicle along the highway or road. Under this system the farmers in my State and other States every year make out thousands of certificates certifying that "hot tractor fuel" that they buy is not used in a car or truck on the highway, and they get their money back. There is no revenue to the Federal Treasury as a result of including "hot tractor fuel" within the definition for gasoline. It simply requires a costly and time-consuming procedure of collecting a tax and then refunding it. Instead of losing Federal revenue, we can save on Federal expense if this amendment is adopted. We can cut out a lot of useless paper work that does not bring in any revenue.

I have introduced this bill, or a similar bill, several times. The Treasury has generally reported unfavorably on my bills. The only objection that the Treasury Department has been able to present, however, has been that this amendment would make more difficulties in administration.

My own State, Nebraska, also has a tax on gasoline, as do all the other States. In Nebraska, our State taxing authorities do not attempt to collect a tax on this fuel. The definition of gasoline is much more realistic. Our State law simply defines gasoline as any fuel with an initial boiling point under 200° Fahrenheit. I am informed that my State has no difficulty at all with enforcement of this tax, although the tax rate is much higher. In Nebraska we do not have a passion for useless paper work. If the State of Nebraska can administer a gasoline tax without trying to tax and refund on "hot tractor fuel," I do not see why the Bureau of Internal Revenue cannot administer the same kind of tax.

The farmers and the distributors of petroleum products in my State have been complaining about this whole foolish system for years. It makes unnecessary paper work. It requires the dealer to tie up hundreds of dollars unnecessarily in inventory and freezes his capital to that extent. The dealer suffers some loss when he neglects or is unable to secure the signature of the purchaser to the tax-exemption affidavit. It is just a nuisance all around.

This fuel cannot be used in a car. If you put a tankful in your car, it will not run. As a matter of fact, you cannot even start a tractor with it. You have to start your tractor with gasoline and then switch over to the lower cost "hot tractor fuel." I am advised that the type of automobile and truck that could burn tractor fuel in a mixture with gasoline has not been manufactured since 1931. I believe our tax law is just about 19 years out of date. I hope very much this committee will see fit to bring it up to date by adopting my amendment.

APPLICATION OF CABARET TAX TO BALLROOMS

The attention of the committee is invited to another proposal of mine, incorporated in S. 730, which would provide a specific exemption of ballrooms and dance halls from the carbaret tax. I would like to place in the RECORD at this point a copy of my bill, with the suggestion that some such language be incorporated as an amendment to the legislation that the committee is considering.

As the committee probably knows, a cabaret is generally a place providing food, drinks, and amusement in the way of a floor show or something of that sort. There is customarily no admission charge, and the tax is levied on the total bill rendered for the food and drinks consumed by the patron.

A ballroom or a public dance hall on the other hand provides primarily music and dancing facilities, and an admission is charged upon which the tax is paid at the time the patron enters the establishment. Any refreshments served are generally on the order of soft drinks, light sandwiches, and so forth.

During the past year there has been an attempt by some collectors of internal revenue to collect the cabaret tax on any items that may be sold inside the ballroom including soft drinks, sandwiches, cigarettes, charges for hat checking services, etc. I do not believe it was intended to collect a cabaret tax on these small incidental services and refreshments.

My proposal would make it clear that ballrooms would not have to pay an extra nuisance tax under the cabaret provision of the bill. They would, of course, continue paying the admissions tax. Both the admissions and cabaret taxes are at the rate of 20 percent.

Without going into this proposal in any great detail, I would like to file with the committee a brief that has been prepared for me on this subject.

TAX ON LIMOUSINE SERVICE TO AND FROM AIRPORTS

I now invite the attention of the committee to my bill, S. 181, of which I would like to place a copy at this point in the hearings. This bill is designed to correct an injustice. Under present law, taxicab services to and from airports is not subject to the tax on transportation of persons. Limousine service, covering perhaps the same group, is subject to the tax, which is 15 percent. This places firms operating such limousine services at a severe competitive disadvantage.

I do not believe we should discriminate in our tax treatment between the two types of services, but should treat them both equally and allow them to compete on a fair basis. I believe many of the limousine service have had the greatest difficulty in competing. In at least one case that came to my attention in my own State, it seemed that this discriminatory tax was driving the limousine operator out of business.

OTHER PROPOSED TAX CHANGES

This committee is already familiar with the proposal to exempt from the cosmetic tax those preparations used in a barber shop or beauty parlor. In fact, the committee and the House of Representatives approved a bill to take care of this situation, H. R. 3628, introduced by Congressman CURTIS, of Nebraska, in the Eightieth Congress. I will not take time to discuss this proposal, since the committee has previously studied it but will ask permission to place in your record a copy of my bill, S. 516, of this Congress, and also a copy of this committee's report (House Rept. 1970) on H. R. 3628 of the last Congress.

I have previously introduced a bill, S. 517, to exempt agricultural fairs from the admissions tax, and I hope the committee will consider that bill also. A great many other Members of Congress have likewise introduced similar bills, of course. I imagine that this committee if it takes the matter up might want to restore the exemptions for admissions to nonprofit, educational, and charitable functions as a group as we had before the war. I would like to place my bill on this subject in the record also (S. 517).

With respect to the general subject of excise-tax reduction, I proposed an amendment in the Senate a few weeks ago to a piece of pending legislation. My amendment provided for a fairly broad reduction in present excise-tax rates. I hope this committee will go just as far as we possibly can afford to go in cutting down or eliminating these wartime excise taxes.

I want to mention just one which I believe is particularly important, and that is the tax on photographic apparatus. I would like to place in the record at this time my bill, S. 515, which would make sharp reduction in the photographic tax.

I would also like to place in the record a letter I have received regarding the effect of this tax on the photographic industry. The committee will note that the tax has very seriously damaged production and employment in the industry and that volume in 1949 for the items subject to the 25-percent tax actually dropped almost 50 percent from the preceding year.

Annual Report of Wayne County (Iowa) Conservation District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Iowa, always forward looking, is taking no chances on losing its reputation for high productivity of its land, and in order to assure continued success in its great agricultural endeavors it is going all-out for soil conservation. An account of what is being done is contained in the annual report of the Wayne County, Iowa, soil conservation district, and for the benefit of other Members of Congress I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include this fine report of progress in my home county:

WAYNE COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT ANNUAL REPORT, DECEMBER 31, 1949

We, the Commissioners of Wayne County, take great pride and pleasure in presenting to you, the cooperators, our annual report for the year 1949.

We shall try to take stock for you of our accomplishments for the year in bold print; but, needless to say, there are some shortcomings of which we are not proud, but which we shall try in the future to remedy.

It seems fitting and proper for all of us to be proud of our county these days as we drive down the road and see the new barns going up, the full bins of corn, oats, and hay in them and piled up outside—the fact that we are making great strides in road surfacing, schooling; but the one that makes us swell our chest a little is the abundance of feed—and with less acres than before in the depression years of the thirties. We have come a long way since then and we feel that soil conservation has played a great part in this, the prosperity of the forties. When we think back over the forties, we have fought a long and prolonged World War; we have fought the equally important resurrection of those foreign countries, bankrupt, homeless, foodless, and without hope for the future, so that there is now some remembrance of hope in the world for peace and welfare. We have fought a scourge of mankind—inflation. That is, we have the land almost free of encumbrance of debt; but think of this, gentlemen, even with all of the above happening in the decade of 1940 to 1949, the land of Wayne County is in better shape for production than before.

In looking back through the years it has always worked the other way. When a calamity faced Le Nation the farmers would work to relieve the calamity, but with a loss of soil. To us this factor of soil conservation is the pay-off.

In the thirties, contouring, terracing, diversions, buffers, and the establishment of waterways were almost unheard-of practices. This is a start of a new age in farming, and demand for conservation has just begun. We repeat, the demand has just begun, and the clamor for help in conservation is so large that now four men are working night and day to take care of this great cry for help from the farmers.

The event to which goes a lot of credit is the annual field day, held this year at the Leroy F. Ohrt farm, 4½ miles south of Humeston. The field day was sponsored by the Wayne County USDA Council and made possible by contributions from the chambers of commerce from Humeston, Seymour, Corydon, Clio, and Allerton, the county farm equipment dealers, and earth-moving contractors—the Davis Bros. and Deane Bevard from Wayne County—and Mr. Henthorne from Decatur County.

This event was of only 1 day's duration, but in that day things really happened. Howard Ballew and his boys were responsible for a lot of planning with local organizations and field lay-out. Terraces, contour lines, surface drains, a pond, windbreak, and waterways were all carefully staked and established.

Bigger and better was the comment heard on all sides concerning the third annual field day held this year on the 22d day of September. It was estimated by the highway patrol that there were approximately 5,000 people visiting the various activities. It would be rather difficult to point out the outstanding event that day due to the various interests of farmers and their own pet projects. However, there were enough different projects present to keep everyone on his toes to see them all during the day.

Among the many distinguished guests and lookers-on were Dean Andre, Iowa State College; Herbie Hazen, chairman, PMA; Horace Chaney, agronomist, Iowa State College; Howard Oak, former Wayne County Work Unit Conservationist; Karl LeCompte, Representative in Washington from the Fourth Congressional District; Pearl McMurry, State senator; Gene Poston, State representative, and many others. Dean Andre gave an interesting and inspiring talk on agriculture.

An added feature of this year's field day was the State wildlife conservation exhibit. This exhibit of animals native to the State of Iowa attracted all the school children throughout the day and lots of grown-ups, too—like taking the kids to the circus—only pop wanted to go worse than the kids. One teacher was heard to remark that she had taken her children through three times, and that each time even she had seen something new and different to remember about the animals.

The plowing contest, held in connection with the field day, was very well received by the crowd in that very few of the people watching the contest had even seen one before this one. The contest was won by Dwane Lewis, with Rex Baker taking second, Howard Carter third, and Harley Sponsler fourth. The prizes were donated by the district commissioners and later reimbursed by the State committee.

The Humeston GI classes assisted in parking cars, getting canary grass for the establishment of waterways and various other jobs.

The district commissioners have embarked on a new program this year with the financial assistance of the State. Under a new law passed during the last legislature, Wayne County is to receive in money for conservation: $500 to be used to help pay the commissioners' yearly expense—transportation, advertising, postage, and printing, and so forth; and $2,000 to apply on additional help for the Soil Conservation personnel in the office and in the field, buying machinery to assist the farmers in their conservation programs and to buy equipment for the district.

We, the district commissioners, felt the crying need of most farmers was terracing equipment and, therefore, plans are going forward to the purchase of a whirlwind terracer to be loaned out to the cooperators for their own use in making their own terraces. We feel that this is a big step forward in the right direction toward more soil conservation.

We feel greatly indebted to G. E. Hibbs and W. A. Tock for the fine movie they made of the Wayne County field day. This movie is in color and takes about 30 minutes to be shown. We know that when the chance comes to see it, you, too, will enjoy it as much as we do. Then, too, we appreciate the cooperation and help of PMA extension service, Farmers Home Administration, county newspapers, commercial and civic clubs, veteran training groups, church groups, vocational agriculture departments, 4-H Clubs, State conservation commission, county board of supervisors, local earth moving contractors, Soil Conservation Service, and last, but by no means least, the farmers cooperating with the district.

If you remember at the start of this report, we mentioned that we had some shortcomings. We will admit they are numerous and long; but the main one is simply—there is yet so much to be accomplished. We have scratched only the surface in soil conservation thus far. The ditches are still yawning big at us, flats need draining, pastures need renovating, corn still needs contouring and hills need terracing. We feel that with your help in the coming year, more great strides will be made to correct this situation; and we, the district commissioners in Wayne County, do hereby promise that we will do everything in our power to make this country a better place for good farming with the help of Soil Conservation.

Some of the important accomplishments for the year 1949 are as follows: Plans prepared and signed, 51; acres, 9,134. Applications for complete farm plans, 67; acres, 10,546. Regular commissioners meetings, 12. Newspaper articles printed, 35 in three papers. Contouring on cooperators' farms, 2,085 acres. Waterway construction, 5,950 lineal feet. Area of upland flat drainage, 193 acres. Diversions, 17,992 lineal feet. Terracing, 4 miles.

WAYNE COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT GOVERNING BODY,
ARLO NOBLE, *Chairman.*
WALTER HICKMAN.
MAURICE GOODE.
ROBERT J. COULTER, *Secretary.*

World Health Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. L. E. Burney, health commissioner of the Indiana State Board of Health, in the following letter, sets out his views regarding H. R. 334, which raises the ceiling of the budget authorization for the World Health Organization.

Coming from a doctor whose experience and public-health service has been extensive, I believe his opinion should be of great value to the Members of Congress.

STATE OF INDIANA,
STATE BOARD OF HEALTH,
March 14, 1950.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MADDEN: I understand that House Resolution No. 334 which raises the ceiling of the authorization for the budget of the World Health Organization from approximately $1,900,000 to $3,000,000 has been reported favorably by the Foreign Affairs Committee and is now before the Rules Committee. As one who is familiar with the fine work of the World Health Organization, I hope very much that favorable consideration can be given to this resolution.

We are rapidly becoming one world; certainly, as far as health conditions are concerned. The health hazards in foreign countries are of interest and concern to those of us in the United States. A good example of this is the case of the man from Mexico who traveled across the country to New York by bus, developing smallpox on the way and dying at his destination. Eleven other people died from smallpox as a result of contact with him, and several million people in and around New York City had to be vaccinated because of this one imported case.

The World Health Organization has accomplished a great deal in getting some of the backward nations to develop improved public-health programs especially for the eradication of certain diseases which have an adverse effect upon the economy. The Organization also has a record of being one of the most efficient and well managed of the specialized agencies of the United Nations.

Another important factor is that the language of health and the discussions regarding health are ordinarily not controversial and hence this specialized agency has an opportunity of being effective in promoting better understanding between nations.

In view of the amount of money involved it seems rather small as compared with what is being contributed for the international program, but considering the value of the work of the World Health Organization it is a most important item.

Sincerely yours,

L. E. BURNEY, M. D.,
State Health Commissioner.

Sale of Coca-Cola in France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a few days ago I made a few comments regarding the lack of cooperation we are receiving from the French Government in the administration's program to open up trade channels throughout the world. I have particular reference to the legislation in the French National Assembly designed to bar Coca-Cola from France, and I said I thought the action showed clearly that the French are not very much interested in treating American business on a fair and reciprocal basis.

I now have a statement which I would like to insert in the RECORD, from Mr. James A. Farley of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., which bears out my comments completely. It is evident from Mr. Farley's statement that the press dispatches have not made the situation entirely clear. I believe most Americans gained the impression from the newspapers that the proposal to bar Coca-Cola from France was primarily sponsored by the Communists in the French legislative body and was defeated.

Mr. Farley's statement makes it very obvious that the proposal was not defeated at all, and that Coca-Cola is likely to be barred, within the very near future, under the Boulet bill, sponsored by the MRP. The Boulet bill does not mention Coca-Cola by name, but authorizes the Health Ministry to bar particular products. The author of the bill has indicated that he had Coca-Cola in mind.

Mr. President, I am not personally concerned about Coca-Cola in particular, but I object very strongly to any actions by the French Government to bar any particular American product. I believe the incident illustrates my point that our so-called reciprocal trade agreements program is not reciprocal at all.

I ask to have Mr. Farley's statement inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ISSUED BY JAMES A. FARLEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF THE COCA-COLA EXPORT CORP., MARCH 9, 1950

On November 8, 1949, a Communist group in the French National Assembly proposed a resolution to prohibit the importation, the manufacture and the offer for sale of Coca-Cola in France, in Algeria, and in the countries and territories of the French Union. This is known as the Gros proposal.

On the same day and at the same session of the National Assembly, Mr. Boulet, a deputy of the MRP (Mouvement Republicain Populaire) Party, introduced a bill designed to bar Coca-Cola from France without specifically mentioning the product by name. Due to efforts of the French Government action on the Boulet bill was postponed.

On February 28, 1950, the Boulet bill, supported by an alliance of Communists and the MRP Party, passed the Chamber of Deputies by a show of hands. An effort was made by several Communist deputies to tack on amendments to the Boulet bill to specifically mention Coca-Cola by name, and these amendments were rejected by a recorded vote. After assurances from Mr. Boulet, the sponsor of the bill, that he personally approved of the intention of the amendments, the decision of the precise product to be banned, should be taken by the Health Ministry. It was suggested that the name of the beverage involved had been omitted because, otherwise, the bill would have violated existing trade agreements by discriminating against an established United States product.

The Boulet bill is now before the Upper Chamber, the Council of the Republic, and will become law unless further legislative action is taken.

On the following Saturday, March 4, the Communist deputies, dissatisfied with the Boulet bill, again introduced their own proposal to specifically and by name bar Coca-Cola, and this was again rejected.

It was the second attempt on the part of the Communists to revive the amendments rejected in the original bill that caused confusion in parts of the press.

The fact remains that the Boulet bill, specifically designed to bar Coca-Cola, will become law in France unless other legislative action is taken.

Meanwhile, the product Coca-Cola is still on sale in France, as no action can be taken under the Boulet legislation until it becomes law. However, French Government officials have resorted to tricks in delaying techniques and have placed an effective embargo on the importation of necessary raw materials from French Morocco, which will have the effect of closing down the business in several weeks when present supplies are exhausted.

The Road Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon delivered on Lincoln's Birthday, February 12, 1950, by Dr. Walter R. Courtenay, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Nashville, Tenn.:

THE ROAD AHEAD

(II Chronicles 10: 1-16)

During the period when Hitler was making his bid for power, the German church talked of theology and heaven, ignoring the social dangers rising all about it, and thus, through indifference and carelessness, added to Hitler's strength, and the world's eventual ruin.

I make no apology for taking the position I shall hold this day. It is time that church leaders who believe in democracy and the free-enterprise system stand up and say so. Others are speaking for us; others are saying that the tide of socialization is too strong to be halted and that we must go with the tide. This I do not believe. Today I speak in defense of the traditional American system of government and economics, and I speak against all leaders in all fields who are doing all in their power to wreck our national structure and lead us in socialism.

In times past I have spoken to you of the dangers of communism at home and abroad. Because many so spoke, our Government has taken proper action, with the result that Communists have been located and labeled. But today I do not aim my verbal blows at communism as such, but at the socialism that is rising all about us. True, it does not so label itself and it is not a party headed by Norman Thomas, but it does exist in high places and is influencing our national leaders toward the socialized state. There are too many clergymen, educators, writers, and commentators, Senators, and Congressmen who think pink and talk pink. They are not Communists and most are but victims of the socialized state.

One more thing I would make clear: I am speaking as a Christian minister. I am not a politician; neither am I a fly-by-night medicine man or a stooge for some pressure group. I am not paid to say what I am going to say; nor do I say it to gain favor with those who want it said. I am a free American speaking about a dangerous trend in American life which concerns the whole future of the Christian church and the entire safety of this country.

I speak this day in defense of America's free-enterprise system and the democratic state. I plead for the deluded millions of the world who have been tricked into the slavery of socialism. I plead for the church, which ought to defend the rights of men, and ought to be a watchman on the towers of this Nation. I plead for the world in which our economic and political system represents the last dim lights of civilization, and when I so speak and plead I am still preaching the Gospel. Let no man doubt it. I want America to remain free from foes within and foes without. I have no desire to help kill Uncle Sam and I have no intention of attending his funeral.

Solomon and Rehoboam have been on my mind for weeks. Solomon was the original

tax-and-spend leader. He came to the presidency of his country cultured, schooled, and wealthy. He felt he had a right to do as he pleased with the historic forces of his land. Under his program of tax and spend the appearances of prosperity were present but the heart of prosperity was missing. The burdens of the people increased and they were asked to accept them as blessings.

In due time Solomon died, and his son Rehoboam came to power. He spurned the advice of the elders of Israel. He listened to the young men who knew all the answers to all the social questions of that day. The successor to Solomon increased the taxes and continued the program of wasteful spending. The result was the death of the nation.

Well, America's Solomon is dead and Rehoboam is in the White House. Our modern Rehoboam has turned his back on the elders of America and has listened to the young men who know all the answers, and who are thoroughly sold on the program of tax and spend. If the present policies are continued another 5 years I see no hope for the continuance of the American way of life.

With these thoughts in mind I call your attention to John Flynn's startling book, The Road Ahead. An abridged copy of it appears in the Reader's Digest for February. While I am not saying that Mr. Flynn is infallible, I do say that what he has to say is worth hearing, and his book ought to be read by every American, and certainly by every Christian.

The sickness of the twentieth century is socialism. Under the theory of offering something superior to our free enterprise system, this sickness rots away the structure of our Nation. Fortunately it is no longer just an exciting theory. We can see what it has done in Russia and the neighboring lands. We can see its results in Britain. It ought to be clear to all who read and think that socialism is a mirage that drives men mad.

Socialism is a dishonest movement. It does not permit itself to be labeled. Most Socialists talk about welfare, pensions, insurance, socialized medicine, aid to education, aid to the farmer, and all the time they are promoting socialism. The best of the Socialist welfare ideas could more profitably become a part of our traditional system, but the dreamers, the economic planners, begin with the assumption that our American system is useless: They must have a new one. They do all in their power to see to it that the old system does not work; they impede its progress at every turn, substituting socialistic ideas which they consider more modern and progressive.

THE BRITISH SOCIALIST EXPERIMENT

Let us examine the rise of the Socialist power in England and thereby be warned. It began in 1884 when a group of intellectual visionaries, attracted by the theories of Karl Marx, formed what they called the Fabian Society, naming their group after Quintus Fabius, the Roman general who defeated Hannibal by biting off a segment of his army at a time, thus destroying it piece by piece.

Here is the program they proposed to follow:

1. Establish a school for the training of Socialist leaders, writers, speakers, and so forth.

2. Never call an idea or program socialistic. Talk about pensions, compensations, health insurance, welfare, but not socialism.

3. Launch the program a bit at a time. Do not frighten people by showing them the whole program at once.

4. Assure the common people that their rights will be protected. Tell them that whatever is done will be done for the further well-being of the average man, "the little fellow."

5. Capture the labor unions, and through them destroy the Liberal Party.

6. Use the Liberal Party to get things going, and then cast it aside.

7. Work through schools, churches, and clubs. Never miss a chance to implant the seeds of dissatisfaction with the old system and a love for the new.

By 1905 the Fabian Society had grown in unity and power. The labor unions were duly at heel. These workingmen's organizations which were created for bargaining purposes now became political forces. In 1906 they made a deal with the Liberal Party, headed by Asquith and Lloyd George, whereby labor would support the Liberal Party in exchange for a number of things labor wanted enacted into law, one of these being the invalidation of the Taff-Vale Act making unions liable for damages incurred during strikes.

That is when the New Deal struck England. Out of Parliament came the 8-hour day, workmen's compensation, pensions, government-housing projects, public payment of election expenses. Labor was delighted. The deal had paid off.

The Fabians were more than delighted. The camel's head was now inside the free enterprise, democratic tent. Their final victory was merely a matter of time.

By 1914 the Labor Party had representatives in Parliament. By 1923 they placed Ramsay MacDonald, the Fabian fair-haired boy, in office as Prime Minister. In 1945 they took over completely and have socialized in a most unsocial manner. The only thing they lack is the British version of the iron curtain.

Think of it. In 1905, when the Fabians got their program under way in earnest, Britain was the strongest nation in the world. She had everything. In 40 years, the Fabian Society, which never listed more than 4,000 members, became the master of England. The two great wars, plus the Fabian weakening processes within, have made mighty England a land of tears and fears.

The Liberal Party died in 1923 when its leaders threw their votes on the side of the Labor Party. Since that time the Liberals have had neither strength nor standing in British politics. They were liquidated by the Socialists.

In 1924–25 when the Labor Party was first in power they spent nearly £800,000,000 spending more on so-called welfare than they spent on government. They boasted of their successes, and promised Englishmen higher wages, less work, and state control of all basic industries. They were taking over. They talked too much, and the Conservatives were returned to office, and remained in until 1929. World and national events were on the side of the Fabian dreams—the depression struck. The people, sickened by conditions, returned the Labor Party to power. Then began the full-scaled program to weaken the older order. They soaked the rich, and promised the poor a golden future on the rich man's gold. Yet they talked little of socialism. Always their programs were phrased in terms that would hide socialism and praise welfare. They let the glitter of gain blind the eyes of the masses to the fact that enslavement was the logical end of socialism. The end results were kept hidden.

This was the situation when Hitler began his rise to power. Pacifism gripped the British people. Little was done to meet the rising tide of dictatorships on the Continent. The Socialist government was loathe to tell the people the truth and curtail social expenditures in order to meet national preparedness needs. The leadership vacillated. They lacked the patriotic spirit necessary to the times. They lived so much in dreams that they feared realism. The result: England entered World War II as unprepared as Ethiopia. When the dark days came and Britishers needed a man with a voice and something to say, a man with courage and determination, a man big enough to match the hour, they called on Churchill—a Conservative, a reactionary, a man of the "old regime." The story of valiant Britannia under his leadership you know. But when the war was over the people, tired of austerity, listened again to the glib generalities and rainbow promises of the Fabians, and returned the Labor Party to office. Under them England has become a truly socialized country.

Has socialism blessed the British? The ordinary citizen now knows the full misery of heavy taxation. There are no rich people any more, and the Government owns most of the basic industries. Taxes are higher. Food is scarcer. Wages are higher. Production is lower. Cost of production is higher, and the cost prohibits the British from being strong competitors in the markets of the world. Not a single nationalized industry in England functions with efficiency. The workers mine less coal and produce less in the factories. Socialized men work less efficiently than they do for private owners under a free-enterprise democratic system.

Many defenders of the Socialist experiment will say that only 25 percent of the economic system has been nationalized. The fact is that all basic industries, except steel, have been nationalized and everything else in England socialized. The working people are frozen to their jobs. By law houses and businesses may be entered without legal warrants. Workers can be made to work wherever the Government decrees they must. Farmers who do not meet the Government quotas can have their land sold out from under them and Government managers installed. No wonder that many British firms are moving to Africa and Australia carrying with them their full personnel.

Prime Minister Attlee, after making an erroneous claim for his socialization program, now admits that it has helped only the lower third of the Nation. Think of it. They have wrecked the Nation in order to help the lower third. Yet, even so, under socialism the lower third now lives below the poverty line, and the upper two-thirds live closer to it.

I say to you in all sincerity that there is a diseased sympathy in the world as well as a healthy one. Socialism is diseased sympathy. It is short-sighted, and constantly mistakes mirages for the real thing. The fertile oases they envision do not exist.

Are the British people better off under socialism? If you were a Britisher today you would be allowed 1½ eggs per week, 3 ounces of butter, 6 ounces of margarine, 1 of lard, 1 of cheese, 1 of bacon, 8 of sugar, 6 of meat, and 2 of corned beef.

If you were a Britisher this morning with an income of $2,800 a year, and had a wife and two children, you would be allowed deductions of about $1,760, and would pay a tax of $268 on the balance. A workman in America would pay $26.

If you were a Britisher this morning you could be assured of Government care from the cradle to the grave. Every baby receives $16 at birth, and the Government will contribute $80 to his funeral expenses when he dies. The Government will also give him a few dollars a week for groceries. It will take care of all his medical expenses, and grant him a pension when he is too old to work. But the man gets nothing for nothing. He pays in taxes for every service rendered. No longer do the rich people help pay the poor man's bills. There are no rich. No longer does industry pay its millions. They pay no taxes because the Government owns them.

Britain today under the Labor Government is a restless, confused, unhappy land. The people are worse off now than they were during the war. Their leaders know the bottom is in sight. Spirituality is low, and distrust is rampant. Never has England

known such depths. Yet, in the present general election campaign, the Fabians find excuses for the blunders and waste, and offer more golden promises.

Slowly but surely Englishmen are learning that the socialistic state is inefficient and expensive. It robs men of liberties, and imposes on men burdens too grievous to be borne. They are also realizing that the socialistic state cannot operate without penalties and compulsions. Where socialism reigns, liberty dies.

If this is the situation in England today with our Marshall plan aid, what would the situation be without it? What will it be without it? We must call a halt. Not only has the local Britisher been taxed to support the socialization of Great Britain, but I, here in Nashville, Tenn., have had to pay my tax for the same support. I have helped enslave my brothers in Britain. What a mess.

THE SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Let us now turn to America. What is happening here? Are we in any danger from this Fabian movement to overthrow our traditional Government and socialize America?

I say to you that the program is already well advanced and is walking in 7-league boots. There are a million signs aloft saying that we are being sold down the river.

In 1933 we were in a depression, but we still had our American system. Then Solomon became king, and Solomon soon decided to change the American system, to tax and spend, to browbeat and bludgeon men into doing the will of the Government: to make the Government the master of the people. By 1938 a new group came to power in Washington. These were not elected by the people. These were young men fresh from law offices, teaching positions, and businesses. They had no love for America's traditional system of government and economics. To them there was only one "good" system—socialism. Of course they did not call their ideas socialistic. They labeled them welfare, help for the average man, aid to the poor, and what not, just as they had in England. Remember Wallace? What a field day he and the unelected had.

In 1944 the Democratic Party made a deal with labor, the same deal the British Liberal Party made in 1905. For $500,000 on the barrel head labor was promised legislation that would grant labor an inside position in the life of the Nation. The labor leaders henceforth would be in the saddle and could spur the industrial horse to exhaustion if they wanted to do so. Remember Hillman?

In 1947 a new movement was created, called Americans for Democratic Action. It is about as democratic as Stalin. Look at its main figures: David Dubinsky from the AFL, Walter Reuther and James B. Carey from the CIO, John L. Lewis from you know where, A. F. Whitney from the Railroad Brotherhoods, Mr. Elmer Davis, Leon Henderson, Keyserling, Wyatt, Ewing, Douglas, Frankfurter, Senator Graham, and others, all of them leaning far to the left of the American system. Here is the source of all the programs, welfare, and otherwise, that are crippling this Nation. The Democratic Party has lost its soul to the Socialists just as surely as the Liberal Party in England did, and we are now in the control of the Washington economics planners, the young men who know all the answers. Big government is determined to destroy free enterprise and democracy.

I have a feeling that if Jackson and Jefferson should visit the Democrats in Washington today, they would challenge about 65 percent of them to duels in the cherry orchards within the next 24 hours. I cannot imagine these true Americans feeling at home with the present administration or feeling that the wise men who are leading us to statism and a "planned" (Socialist) economy are Americans save by birth.

What is happening to us? Well, look at the facts:

1. Government no longer is our servant. It is our master.

2. Government is no longer the legislative part of America.

It has invaded the realm of banking.

It has invaded the realm of electric power.

It has invaded the realm of agriculture.

It now proposes to invade the realm of medicine, education, and anywhere else where it can interfere with free enterprise and democratic liberties.

If we pass the Spence Act the President will have complete power over the entire industrial life of this Nation, empowered to do as he personally pleases and all under the pretense of helping to keep the free enterprise system alive. Imagine Rehoboam with that kind of power.

Then there is the Brannan plan. You know, the plan that buys up some 30,000,000 bushels of potatoes and then dumps them because it would cost the Government something to ship them where they can be used? This is the plan that paid a farmer in Minnesota some $2,500 for his potato crop, and then the farmer bought the whole lot back for about $16, and the potatoes never left his farm. What a system. And they call it "planned economy."

Well, what can be done? Mr. Flynn has several ideas, and so do I.

1. Let us find out what the free-enterprise system really is instead of letting the social planners tell us what it is.

2. Let us stand up to the economic planners. Let us defend our American system. Let us have an end to letting them have the field all to themselves.

3. Let individuals, groups, and communities stop looking to Washington for handouts. Remember that what the Government gives and spends is taken from our own pockets. The only money it has comes to it in taxes.

4. Remember that human freedom is the scarcest and most precious commodity in the world today.

5. Let us rid ourselves of the planners when the opportunity comes, as it will come.

6. Let us put an end to this wasteful spending on the part of our Government.

It is startling to realize that we spent only $147,000,000,000 to run the American Government in all the years from Washington through Mr. Roosevelt's first term in office. Mr. Truman has spent $184,000,000,000 in 3 years.

7. Let us look at Russia and Britain, and then fall in love with the United States of America.

I dare not close this address without saying a word about Mr. Flynn's condemnation of many of the leaders in the Federal Council of Churches. I must confess that I share Mr. Flynn's conclusions concerning the social and political views of Bishop Oxnam, E. Stanley Jones, and John C. Bennet. I do not think that these men are Communists or wicked. I do feel that they are opposed to our traditional American view of government and economics, and are Socialists at heart, though Christian Socialists. They, too, easily mistake human weaknesses for weaknesses of free enterprise.

Having said that, let me hasten to say that while this phase of the Federal Council's work is to be regretted and condemned, there is much in it to be praised. I feel that they have done much in the way of interdenominational cooperation, evangelism, Christian education, and the enrichment of worship. I feel that they have been of great help in speaking for Protestantism in Washington, where Protestantism does not always wield sufficient force. I do not feel that the answer to the shortcomings of the Federal Council is to be found in our withdrawal and self-righteous condemnation. It is not in retreat that victory lies, but in advance. Why don't we send stronger men to the meetings of the council, men who know where we stand on these matters as a denomination, men who will fight for our view? Why do we southern Presbyterians always think in terms of defense rather than in offense? Why do we always talk in terms of negatives rather than in terms of positives? Why not change the council so that it says what we and others like us to believe? I would regret our withdrawal from it, even as I regret their misrepresentation of us in matters of political and economic import. The Southern Presbyterian Church cannot honorably withdraw from the Federal Council until we have done more than we have done to improve it.

I have spoken unto you this day as a Christian clergyman. I want the free-enterprise system continued in a democratic environment. I see no reason why we cannot solve our various economic and social problems within the historic framework of our land. I see no cause for our becoming a socialistic land at a time when socialism is rotting away the liberties of all mankind. Under free enterprise and our republican form of government I see every reason why we can rise to still higher levels of greatness, and render to the world a service it sorely needs. Under the further socialization of America I see the death of the last sweet fruits of the struggles of valiant men throughout the Christian centuries. I would personally rather see my Nation die cleanly under the H-bomb than rot away under socialism.

Let us get clear in our thinking one thing: a social planner in Washington differs not at all from one in Moscow or London. They are all Socialists and therefore enemies of the basic liberties of men.

Can things be changed? As I survey the American scene it seems clear that the hope of America is to be found in the South. We are guilty of many sins, and we pet fondly many prejudices we should throw away, but we still believe in State rights and liberties. We are not purists to be sure, for we have been riding the Federal "gravy train" too often in recent years to call ourselves true champions of free enterprise.

Here in the South, where the war of brothers left us in poverty, surrounded by citizens, some white and some black, who were ill prepared to weigh the vital issues of our States and Nation, we have been compelled by circumstances to seek aid from beyond our southern borders. Much of this aid has been Federal money, granted by the economic planners. We are in a precarious political situation: on the one hand we condemn socialism, and yet at every turn we ask that a fair portion of the Federal socialistic "gravy" be channeled in our direction.

If the South is to serve its purpose of preserving the Union in the twentieth century by championing free enterprise and human freedom, then let us go all out, guarding ourselves against the human weakness of getting something for almost nothing.

The economic planners in the Democratic Party know our weaknesses and dire needs. They will play ball with us when it is to their advantage and spurn us when it is not. That is why the FEPC bill is so important to the economic planners who concocted it and are pushing it. That bill was not created from the moral fabric of a tender conscience which weeps for the downtrodden and the dispossessed. Oh, no. It is merely the political means of grabbing a bloc of votes which are of paramount importance to the social planners. With it they could hasten their rule over us all.

It is my personal conviction that the Democratic Party has lost its soul to these men who seek the death of our American way of life. I do not see how any serious-minded citizen who wants the free-enterprise system and democracy continued can again vote for this party. To keep these men

in office and give them further opportunities to kill America seems to me the epitome of stupidity.

Will the Truth measure up to the demands of this hour? Will we be willing to change our thinking sufficiently to enable us to rid America of this cancer that kills? The American Fabians are using the Democratic Party to bring about the death of Uncle Sam. What are you doing about it?

I am not pleading with you to go Republican. I am asking you not to be so traditional that you fail to protect this Nation against the sickness of the twentieth century which is now upon us. You can be either the victims or its victors. There is yet time to decide.

King Solomon is dead, and Rehoboam is in the White House. The wise young men in Washington who know all the answers are guiding Rehoboam and America down the path of socialism. Surely the Christian church has a better answer than the one they offer.

Recently the Memphis Commercial-Appeal carried the following parody on the Twenty-third Psalm:

"The state is my shepherd, I shall not want; it maketh me to lie down on good jobs; it leadeth me by the still factories. It destroyeth my soul; it maketh me in the paths of idleness for politics' sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of slothfulness and economic disaster, I will fear no evil, for it will be with me; its rods and paternalism, they comfort me. It prepareth a Utopia for me by appropriating the earnings of the frugal. It filleth my head with fool expectations; my mounting inefficiency runneth over. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: I shall live on the bounty of the state forever."

God save America. God save the world through America. God save America through us.

Rural Electric Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to insert in the RECORD a very short editorial regarding the REA cooperatives, from the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman for March 14, 1950. This is a newspaper published in Omaha primarily for the farmers, the livestock dealers, and others active in the business life of the Omaha area. It is always heartening to me to see that the REA movement is supported by practically all groups and classes in my part of the country. I think that very fact is an exceptionally fine tribute to the way in which the program has been conducted.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPORTING RURAL COOPERATIVES

Farmers take electricity seriously. Proof of that is the fact that some 4,300 of them, representing nearly 1,300,000 families now served by REA, journeyed to Chicago this year for the annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association.

At the convention, the extent to which the farmer has embraced electricity was readily obvious. The seriousness of his talk, and the interest he showed in exhibits revealed that.

The farmer who has electricity is a big user of it. He averages using around 50 percent more than the average urban consumer. And that is not surprising when it is considered there are some 400 uses of electric power possible on a farm fully equipped to utilize it.

Refrigerators are in particularly big demand on farms, and in all probability, this item is first on the list for most farmers when electricity is made available to them. Washing machines, electric ranges, irons and home freezers are popular items. And there are countless extras, such as milking machines, electric brooders for pigs and chickens, milk coolers, water heaters and others which the farmer figures he can hardly afford to be without, once he has power.

Only recently the three millionth consumer received REA service. It is claimed 83 percent of farms in the Nation now receive electric power from a central station, as compared to 10 percent before REA. It is little wonder, considering this and the benefits which electricity brings to the farm, that farmers are staunch participants in electric cooperative matters.

The Byrd Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] last Sunday, March 12, in which he outlined the work of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, headed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 20)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

In this talk I want to direct your attention to what has been offered as an economy move by a spokesman for the administration now in power in Washington.

I want to discuss a proposal set forth in a bill introduced in the Senate by HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Senator HUMPHREY's bill, if enacted, would make a saving in the cost of government of $12,000 to $14,000 a year. It would do this by abolishing the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Non-Essential Federal Expenditures.

This committee is popularly known as the Byrd Committee. Its chairman is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, undoubtedly the outstanding leader in the fight to eliminate waste, extravagance and duplication in Federal Government.

Let me tell you who else serves on the Byrd Committee. Its membership includes the chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee and of the Senate Finance Committee. It includes other ranking members of those committees. In addition, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget are members of this committee.

Yet, an administration spokesman has introduced legislation to abolish this committee which under the able and vigorous leadership of Senator BYRD has fought for 9 years against unnecessary spending and overloading of Federal pay rolls. It has saved the Nation and its taxpayers millions upon millions of dollars.

An administration which spends over $42,000,000,000 a year wants to abolish this committee. Despite the spending of over forty-two billions a year and a deficit of more than $5,000,000,000 for this year alone, it is suggested that savings can be achieved through abolishing a committee which spends less than $14,000 a year.

That may seem funny to some people. Perhaps it is. But more than that, it is a great tragedy. It reflects the thinking of an administration which believes in high taxes and big spending.

I am proud to say that I immediately associated myself with Senator BYRD and many other Senators—both Democrats and Republicans—liberal, middle-of-the-road, and conservative—to serve notice that we would fight the bill to the last ditch.

Among the leading Members of the Senate who have joined in this fight against abolishing one of the most important forces for economy in Congress are Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, chairman of the Finance Committee; Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, of Nebraska; Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire; Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware; Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota; Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, and many others.

In the course of the debate I said:

"I know of no one in public life whose utterances are followed more carefully in my own State than those of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia.

"I should like to ask him a question. From the Senator's experience as a public official, not only as a Senator of the United States, but also as the chief executive of one of our leading States, is he of the opinion that one of the best methods of national defense is a sound fiscal policy and a balanced budget?"

Senator BYRD replied: "I agree with the Senator that it is the greatest security we have."

Then I asked Senator BYRD this question: "From the Senator's experience, does he believe that it is possible for us to fight a third world war, using the free-enterprise system, unless we do balance our budget and begin to reduce our public debt?"

Senator BYRD replied:

"I agree with the Senator that our greatest security lies in a balanced budget, sound government, and preservation of the free-enterprise system."

My fellow Pennsylvanians, it behooves us all to make it known in Washington that we too believe in a balanced budget, sound government, and the free-enterprise system.

During the course of debate one Senator arose to recall that last year he sat on a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee which heard 453 Government witnesses testify regarding their budget requests. Four hundred and fifty-two of them asked the committee for more money than their agencies had spent the previous year.

Only one of them expressed himself as agreeable to taking a cut.

In the course of the debate also, Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, quoted from a statement made by Senator HUMPHREY at the end of last September. Senator HUMPHREY declared at that time, and I quote:

"The Senator from Minnesota does not believe in a balanced budget at this hour, nor is he afraid to say so."

I regret that the Senator from Minnesota apparently doesn't believe in a balanced budget at this hour, either, nor in efforts to reduce spending toward the goal of a balanced budget.

This is the Truman viewpoint, unfortunately. The President himself has declared there will be no budget balancing this year or next year, and probably not for years to come—that is, until there is some other President.

But people with that viewpoint, with complete willingness to have the country go deeper and deeper into the red, are out to protect themselves from criticism.

They want to protect themselves by abolishing the committee which calls for economy and attacks wasteful spending.

Their unwillingness to accept criticism, even from an official Government source, bears a close resemblance to the methods of dictatorship.

Yet this attitude persists. When President Truman was Senator Truman he took an entirely different view. Let me quote to you what Harry S. Truman said while he was still in the Senate. He said:

"It seems that when public funds are to be expended no one has any interest in what happens to them, no matter what his responsibilities may be under his oath of office.

"I dislike to make such a statement, but unless this body and the House of Representatives exercise their prerogatives in connection with the purse strings of the Government, much of the money appropriated will be thrown away for no good purpose whatever."

That was Senator Harry Truman speaking as chairman of the War Investigating Committee. That was a patriotic American, deeply concerned with wasteful spending of the people's money. That was a man who agreed that there must be a congressional watchdog over spending to prevent reckless, extravagant men from wasting the money taxed from the pockets and savings accounts of our workers.

The joint congressional committee—this Byrd committee—has been such a watchdog. But now the picture has changed completely.

This administration wants no watchdog committee, no criticism at all. Instead it wants to abolish the committee doing the very work which Senator Harry S. Truman said, only a few years ago, was so essential for the good of our country.

That is something for the people to consider.

In my opinion, the attempt to wipe out the Byrd committee and to deprive the people of its valuable service is another example of the stubborn opposition of the administration to every suggestion for cutting the cost of Government.

You all know about the fine work of the Hoover Commission, which submitted plans to increase efficiency and to reduce costs in the various Government departments and agencies.

The President strongly endorsed that report, except in two important things.

The Hoover Commission strongly backed up and supported the findings of the Byrd committee. The Hoover Commission found much waste and duplication in Government. The administration failed to sustain those findings.

And the Hoover Commission, like the Byrd Committee, called for numerous reductions in spending to effect a saving of 2 to 5 billion dollars a year.

It is significant that the administration has put into effect most recommendations of the Hoover Commission except those which would require cutting the pay rolls and the reduction of unnecessary spending.

The departments and agencies fought those proposed reductions hammer and tongs. And, I regret to say, backed up by the White House, they fought the cuts successfully.

That is the course taken by an administration whose leader and spokesmen declare that they are opposed to balancing the budget now or in the immediate future.

It is another manifestation of the spend-what-you-haven't-got school—the fellows who pile the national debt higher and higher with the explanation that it doesn't matter—our children and grandchildren will pay the bills.

I have quoted from several of those who spoke on the Senate floor in opposition to the bill to abolish the Byrd committee.

At this point, I feel you should hear the words of Senator HARRY F. BYRD, himself. In the course of the debate, he had this to say—and I quote:

"If we continue deficit spending, sooner or later we shall go over the precipice of financial disaster.

"Every Senator knows we are about to embark on another year of deficit spending—although it is a year of perhaps the highest prosperity the country has ever know—a year when there are no new economic emergencies abroad.

"The President has recommended in his budget message less foreign assistance money than is to be spent this year. There are no economic emergencies at home except that brought on by the coal strike.

"With all the earnestness of which I am capable, I ask Senators this question: If we cannot balance our budget now, in God's name when can we balance it? What reason is there to believe that it will be easier to balance it next year, or 5 years from now, or 10 years from now, than it is now?

"I should like to say, further, that 2 years ago we expended $34,000,000,000. No worthy object suffered then. The economic crisis abroad was greater than it is now.

"Now we are spending $42,000,000,000, an increase of $9,000,000,000 in 2 years of peace, with no new emergencies to justify the additional domestic civilian expenditures at home. Six billion dollars of the increase for next year is purely for domestic civilian spending unrelated to past or future defense or foreign assistance. We have nearly doubled our non-war-connected domestic spending in 2 years.

"I think the time has come for us to face the situation squarely and realize that if we embark now on deficit spending resulting from domestic-civilian increases, under the conditions which now exist, we may never again balance the budget of the United States Government."

Those are words of deep significance and stern warning.

They were spoken by a sincere democratic statesman whose love of country rises above political consideration.

They should be given serious thought by every American regardless of political affiliation.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, to my friends on the Republican side of the House who fought the FEPC bill because they felt it would hamstring employers in selecting their workers, let me call to your attention an article appearing in the February 25 issue of Business Week, certainly not a New Deal or a Fair Deal publication. The article reports a poll of some of the largest corporations in the country who are operating under FEPC laws containing enforcement provisions, including the Prudential Insurance Co., the Aluminum Corp. of America, Pitney-Bowes, Inc., the New York Shipbuilding Corp., among others. Without exception, the employers have indicated that the FEPC law has interfered in no respect with the right of the employer to select the most competent workers and they have had no discipline or grievance problems.

To my friends from the southern States, who charged the FEPC bill as being Communist-inspired, let me point out that the article cites the case of the Bridgeport Brass Co., of Connecticut, which reports that the bill has eliminated entirely a large and growing Communist campaign being waged among the large urban Negro groups and that it has widened job opportunities for minority group members without interfering in the prerogatives of management.

To my friends on the Republican side, again let me point out that the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, certainly not a New Deal or Fair Deal organization, has thrown its support in favor of an enforceable FEPC because they realized that voluntary FEPC under which the city had operated, was not the whole answer. I am sure this will give food for thought to those who insisted upon the McConnell bill.

CHICAGO NEEDS AN FEPC LAW—AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CHICAGO ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE

CHICAGO ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Chicago, Ill.

GENTLEMEN: We're sending a letter of congratulations to the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. We hope that in the near future we'll be able to send a similar letter to your organization.

The Cleveland chamber is right on the ball. Thanks to its help—and that of labor and other civic groups—the city of Cleveland now has a fair employment practices (FEPC) law. As you know, FEPC makes it illegal to discriminate on account of race, color, religion, or nationality when hiring, firing, or promoting.

When an FEPC was first proposed in Cleveland, the chamber there said: "Let's try it the voluntary way." So for about a year Cleveland groups tried a program of persuasion without the help of a law. They asked employers to hire people on the basis of their qualifications, not on the basis of their skin color or the church they go to or the country their parents came from.

The voluntary approach flopped. The Cleveland Press said editorially: "We learned that voluntary FEPC, no matter how diligently and sincerely run, is almost valueless." Chamber of Commerce leaders, admitting that the voluntary way was not the whole answer, put their stamp of endorsement on an FEPC ordinance. The city council passed it last month by a 27 to 3 vote.

Chicago already has a partial FEPC ordinance. It applies only to the city government and commercial firms with which the city has contracts.

In the past, whenever someone urged extension of Chicago's FEPC to commercial

employers, business representatives have usually said that the voluntary approach is adequate. They said the same about State and Federal FEPC bills.

We're praying that your organization will take a cue from Cleveland. We're hoping that you recognize that the voluntary approach in fair employment usually winds up in a let-Joe-do-it attitude. We're hoping that you recognize that FEPC is the only practical solution.

If you'll study the Cleveland FEPC, you'll see that the law itself embodies much of the voluntary approach. The law provides steps of moral persuasion. First, an attempt is made to settle every complaint of discrimination by a 16-member community relations board. If the board fails, then the mayor tries his hand. If the mayor fails, there is a public hearing. If the public hearing fails, only then is the complaint turned over to the city law department for prosecution.

In many States where FEPC is now the law, employers who first opposed it have since found that their old fears were groundless. They found that they could not only live under the law but actually thrive under it.

Let me give you an example of how they thrive under it. Let's say two men walk into your office and apply for a white collar job. In this case Mr. A is better qualified for the job than Mr. B and Mr. A is a Negro and Mr. B is white. Right now in Chicago, most businesses would pick Mr. B, the white man, if they had to choose between the two.

Under FEPC it becomes more and more the accepted thing to hire people for their ability and not for some phony reason. This is good for business and it is good for people.

We're hoping that you'll give FEPC the same consideration as did your chamber of commerce brothers in Cleveland.

ELMORE CY WORK.

What Would the Loss of Liberty Mean to You?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I read with a great deal of interest an editorial by that great American, E. F. Hutton, in the Palm Beach Daily News under date of March 7 last entitled "What Would the Loss of Liberty Mean to You?" Mr. Hutton was the founder of Freedom's Foundation of Valley Forge and has devoted a great deal of his time and thought in fighting communism here and abroad. I commend his editorial for your thoughtful consideration:

WHAT WOULD THE LOSS OF LIBERTY MEAN TO YOU?—THINK THAT THROUGH!

(By E. F. Hutton)

Six years ago Benjamin DeCasseres, one of the outstanding editorialists of our time, wrote the following message. He has since taken his long journey. It is worthy that this should be reread today by those who have forgotten, and those who, perhaps, never saw it—and particularly by our youngsters in the schools.

"I AM THE BILL OF RIGHTS

"I am 153 years old, having been born on December 15, 1791.

"I am the first ten commandments to the Constitution. Until I was written into the Constitution, that document was like a body without a soul.

"I AM YOUR BILL OF RIGHTS

"Don't take me for granted. Like all mortal creations, I can be killed.

"The giant shadow of totalitarian state—slavery—moves over the world. Wherever that shadow falls, I am obliterated. That shadow has fallen over the United States.

"Three men—Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and George Mason—fathered me. As men brought me to life, I can be slain by men—and will be slain unless you and you and you traditionalist Yankee Doodle Americans organize to defend me.

"I AM THE BILL OF RIGHTS

"I am freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly. I am the privacy and sanctity of your home. I am your guaranty of trial by jury, as I am the policeman who guards your property rights.

"Cruel and unusual punishment and excessive fines and bail cannot be visited upon you so long as I am alive. In order that all rights not specifically mentioned in the Constitution shall be retained by you—the people. I am the rights of the States against engulfing centralized power.

"I AM THE BILL OF RIGHTS

"Your signed lease to spiritual, mental, and physical freedom. I ask you to meditate on all my ten clauses. Memorize them. Engrave them on your hearts.

"My existence depends on your vigilance—on how vigilantly you watch your rulers. And my eternal enemies, known as dictators, are abroad in the world and here in the United States.

"Personal unlimited power has destroyed the liberties of many peoples in ancient and modern times. It can happen to you, and maybe, subtly and unknowingly to you, it is happening.

"Put every law that is proposed in Washington and elsewhere into the crucible of my 10 commandments. Your question must always be: Not what does a law give me, but what does it take away from me?

"I AM THE BILL OF RIGHTS

"When I am violated, a part of you dies.

"I am 153 years old. Will I reach my 169th year? That depends on you and your children."

Liberty is our national asset. It belongs to "we, the people." There are those who are advocating communism, collectivism, and planned economy. If any of these "isms" become a fact, liberty then will belong to those in power. "We, the people" will have lost it. It is only by direct action on youth by the men and women of our country that a better society can successfully be molded.

Military Air Power in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present herewith an article appearing in the November issue of the National Air Review:

MILITARY AIR POWER IN EUROPE

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

A shadow is being cast across the face of Europe today by the wings of Soviet Russia's Red air force.

Soviet military aviation now consists of about 15,000 first-line aircraft divided among (1) air armies attached to the ground forces (2) the interceptor arm of the Soviet air defenses and (3) the independent long-range bomber force now being expanded by special order of Stalin. There also are air units attached to the Soviet navy.

The Red air force is numerically the strongest air force in the world although its offensive and defensive capabilities certainly are far below those of the combined strength of the United States Air Force and naval aviation. It is more than twice as large as the German Luftwaffe, which had nearly 6,000 first-line planes available on all fronts in the summer of 1940 to implement Nazi dreams of conquest.

New production for the Red air force includes a jet interceptor with swept-back wings, probably designed by Artem I. Mikoyan and Mikhail Gurevich, and four-engined bombers resembling the American B-29 Superfortress.

Soviet aviation is backed by an aircraft industry which—according to Stalin—produced 40,000 aircraft of all types, including trainers and liaison planes, in 1944. This, by way of comparison, was the year in which the United States constructed 96,000 airplanes, a large percentage of which were four-engined bombers.

The United States supplied 14,795 aircraft of all types to Soviet Russia during the recent war.

There is general agreement among strategists in Europe that the Red air force is a formidable instrument for cooperating with the Red army in a sweep westward across the continent. In fact, in its present composition it is an air force organized primarily for supporting ground troops—mechanized cavalry in particular.

Most strategists believe that with allied forces now available in western Europe—and these forces are being strengthened—the Red air force could hardly be bested or kept from gaining air superiority at any point east of the Pyrenees or the English Channel.

An accurate picture of Soviet air power, however, must bring into focus both strong points and weaknesses. There is evidence of the existence of many of the latter.

The Red air force, for example, did no strategic bombing worth mentioning in World War II. As a strategic air force capable of trading blows against industrial targets during the next 3 years with heavy bomber units of Great Britain and the United States, the Red air force is regarded as second or third rate.

This is so—even now that Soviet scientists have accomplished an atomic explosion—unless the British and Americans allow it to become first rate by default. All signs point to the opposite right now.

Morale of the Red air force, except under conditions of combatting invasion of the Soviet Union, is open to question. This is attested by the not insignificant number of deserters up to the rank of colonel who have been claiming refuge in western Europe during the past 2 years.

During World War II sizable aviation detachments of the German-sponsored Russian army of liberation, commanded by Lt. Gen. Andrei A. Vlassov, former hero of the Soviet Union, were organized at Marienbad and Eger, Czechoslovakia. Recruiting was from among captured Red air force pilots. General Vlassov's air chief was Maj. Gen. Victor Maltsev, former Red air force officer. Ground units of this anti-Stalin army performed well on the eastern front but surrendered without fighting to the Allies in the west.

It is not generally known in the United States that the Red air force high command has been purged again and again by order of Stalin from 1937 through the present postwar period. This is true also of the directorates of top Soviet aeronautical research centers such as the Zhukovsky Air Engineering Academy in Moscow.

Stalin's policy of using alternately the knout and sugar-candy reward is nowhere more apparent than in the Soviet aircraft industry. A. N. Tupolev, famous designer of bombardment aircraft, and many other outstanding aeronautical engineers have (1) served jail terms for crimes against the Soviet state and (2) received high decorations and Stalin prizes for aviation achievements.

During the last 12 years the post of chief of the Red Air Force has become almost as unhealthy for its holders as was that of Minister of the Interior under the last Czars of Russia. The latter office frequently became vacant suddenly as the result of direct action by revolutionists; the Red Air Force post is vacated only by order of Stalin and the Politburo but the changes come with the same abruptness.

Starting with Gen. Yakov I. Alksnis, who also held the position of Vice Commissar of Defense, the following commanders of the Red Air Force have been removed during the years indicated either by firing squads or by sudden demotion to insignificant posts and disgrace:

Gen. Yakov I. Alksnis, 1937; Gen. Alexander D. Loktionov, 1938; Gen. Pavel Rychagov, 1940; Gen. Yakov Smushkevich, 1941, and Marshal of the Air Force Alexander A. Novikov, 1946.

The careers of General Alksnis and Marshal Novikov shed light on what can happen to high officers in Soviet Russia who make political mistaps. General Alksnis was an old-time Bolshevik who became chief of Soviet aviation in 1933. He was obsessed with the idea of making it as progressive and powerful as that of any other nation. In 1934 he visited Great Britain and the Netherlands to observe air progress, and in 1946 he visited Czechoslovakia for the same purpose.

This foreign travel evidently was a serious error. At the start of Stalin's widespread purges of Soviet military men accused of conspiring with foreign powers General Alksnis was appointed to the tribunal which condemned to death Marshal Mikhail N. Tukhachevsky. A short time later General Alksnis faced a firing squad himself.

Marshal Novikov came to power in 1941, a few weeks after the German invasion of Soviet Russia. More than 2,500 Russian planes were destroyed on the ground in forward areas by the Luftwaffe during the first few days of the war. General Smushkevich, then Air Force head, disappeared suddenly.

When he took over General Smushkevich's post, Marshal Novikov was 34 years old and a major general. Almost immediately he was promoted to lieutenant general and on January 18, 1943, to colonel general. The following month he became the first Soviet marshal of aviation and personally conducted Red Air Force operations at Stalingrad.

Marshal Novikov became friendly, as did his opposite number in the Red Army, Marshal Georgei Zhukov, with American military and air leaders. Apparently he lost prestige after Stalin and Molotov made a postwar visit to Germany and saw the results of the combined British-American strategic bombing offensive. There may have been no direct connection between this episode and what resulted, but early in 1946 Marshal Novikov was removed from his post without explanation. It is known that he was sentenced to from 6 to 8 years in prison. Only his outstanding war record saved him from the fate of General Alksnis.

RUSSIAN AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY LAGS

Marshal Stalin is credited in official Soviet publications with being an authority in many fields, including economics, finance, agriculture, labor relations, painting, music, the drama, philosophy, education, literature, history, and others.

Some of Stalin's personal contributions to the arts and sciences are open to question, but there is no doubt about his direct and personal influence on Soviet air strategy.

Stalin's precocious son, Vassily, who at 20 is a Red Air Force lieutenant general, said publicly that not a single Soviet aircraft type existed which does not in some manner embody the suggestions and guidance of my father.

Probably no chief of state has intervened so often in air force affairs as Stalin, except possibly Adolf Hitler. It was Hitler who personally decided over the arguments of Air Marshal Hermann Goering and other Luftwaffe chiefs that the fast German Me262 fighter was to be used instead for bombardment.

This turned out to be one of the luckiest decisions of the war—for the Allies. How constructive some of Stalin's equally arbitrary decisions will be, remains to be seen. Until recently nearly 75 percent of Soviet air strength was assigned to air armies attached directly to and designed primarily to cooperate with the Red army commands.

Such air force organization and stress on ground support aircraft can be traced directly to Stalin's personal experiences in the Russian civil war. An official World War II publication of the Soviet government disclosed:

"In the summer of 1936" (NOTE.—Just before Stalin's first purge of the air force high command), "Stalin said that in 1920 he had observed the tremendous effect of low-flying attacks by Soviet planes on Baron Wrangel's retreating White Guards. Acting upon Stalin's instructions, Sergei Ilyushin designed the IL-2, a classical type of attack plane popularly known abroad as the Stormovik.

"In analyzing the rout of armored German troops, the historians of the future will note the important part played by the IL-2."

There is no question that the Stormovik was an excellent weapon for knocking out German tanks—particularly after the bulk of Germany's air power was shifted to the western front. This was done in an unsuccessful attempt to halt the British-American strategic bombing offensive which eventually paralyzed German oil production and communications.

Historians are likely to remember also, however, that Mr. Ilyushin, the Stormovik's designer, told American correspondents in a wartime interview: "We never agreed with the theory that aircraft would play an independent role in the next war * * * we believed that the air force would be an arm of the ground forces primarily."

Stalin now has changed his mind, reportedly after viewing the results of strategic bombing in Germany. Marshal Alexander A. Novikov, who put Stalin's ground support theories into practice during most of World War II, has been purged, and Gen. Alexander Golovanov, commander of the long-range bomber force which Stalin has ordered expanded, is now a Red Air Force marshal.

Mr. Ilyushin apparently can take a hint, for his most recent designing efforts have been concerned with a four-jet bomber patterned after the new United States Air Force Boeing B-47. This plane crossed North America earlier this year at better than 600 miles an hour.

Serious difficulties have been encountered in putting the new Soviet aviation policy in effect. The aircraft industry of the Soviet Union was the last of any major nation in the world to give up wooden construction of major portions of its first-line aircraft.

Marshal Konstantine A. Vershinin, who succeeded Marshal Novikov as chief of the Red Air Force on March 22, 1946, has been vociferous in calling for increased production efforts from the Soviet aircraft manufacturing industry "to counter the intrigues of international reaction."

In an address on the last Red Air Force Day, Marshal Vershinin, probably inadvertently, pointed a finger at three chief weaknesses of Soviet aviation. He stated then that the Soviet Union was putting special efforts into the development of (1) high-speed jet interceptors for defense; (2) multi-engined strategic bombardment aircraft, and (3) radar aids for all-weather flying.

There is further evidence that one additional weak point—possibly the most basic and important one—is jet aircraft engines. Paul H. Wilkinson, editor of Aircraft Engines of the World, and an experienced engineer, is certain that the Soviet Union is several years behind in jet developments as it was previously in piston engines.

At the beginning of World War II all engines used in combat aircraft of the Red Air Force were slightly modified or redesigned versions of America's Wright cyclone engine, France's Gnome Rhone and Hispano-Suiza engines and Germany's BMW, for which licenses to manufacture had been purchased.

During the early days of the present British Labor Government, the Soviet Union was allowed to purchase more than 50 British jet engines of the Rolls-Royce Nene and Derwent type, but this soon was stopped. Soviet designers have the present help of numerous German technicians but it is unlikely that they have solved all problems of mass producing an outstanding jet engine. This still is a kink in the United States aircraft industry which built the world's best piston engines.

In addition to its lack of strategic bombardment background the Red Air Force during World War II had no actual experience in countering strategic attacks with radar-directed interception. Nearly all escaped Soviet pilots have mentioned particularly the lack of electronic aids to all-weather flying available in the Soviet Union and the obvious progress of the United States in this field. Two years ago Soviet transport planes never operated at night, a feat which Americans have been doing for more than a decade, as ordinary routine.

BRITAIN STRENGTHENS AIR DEFENSES

Britain is playing a vital role in European aviation today but for the time being it is chiefly a defensive one.

The nation is expanding and modernizing the British Royal Air Force and the Royal Navy Air Arm with primary emphasis on the defensive capabilities of both. All first-line day-fighter squadrons in the United Kingdom are equipped with Vampire jet interceptor-fighters of the type holding the world altitude record of 39,000 feet or with Meteor jet fighters having operational speeds of better than 600 miles an hour.

The total personnel of the Royal Air Force at present is about 228,000 as compared with 419,000 in the United States Air Force. There are 30 major aircraft-manufacturing companies in Britain together with 7 additional companies building aircraft engines. Nationalization of the industry is extremely unlikely, a member of the Ministry of Supply told this correspondent.

By June of 1950 the RAF expects to double the present strength of its jet day-fighter squadrons in Great Britain. It also plans to equip all night-fighter squadrons at present flying Mosquitos—one of the fastest twin-engined piston aircraft of World War II—with twin-jet night fighters.

A new swept-back-wing jet fighter developed from the Vickers attacker is being produced for supersonic interception. Fighter planes of superior armament and speed were the RAF's chief asset during the Battle of Britain and now, as before, quality of product is stressed.

Britain is selling relatively small quantities of Vampires and Meteors to all the

friendly nations of western Europe including Sweden and Switzerland. The nation's air representatives have followed this up with negotiations for producing these types under license in the above countries.

This is bringing about a standardization of both aircraft types and strategy among European nations faced with the threat of the Red Air Force.

One of Britain's most important air centers at present is the central fighter establishment located in Norfolk County and commanded by Air Commodore D. F. W. Atcherley. Its current No. 1 priority problem is defense against high speed bombers. This is linked with a study of the likely trends of future air attack against Britain and the nation's allies.

Every RAF pilot now is trained to fly in all types of weather. One cannot get his wings unless he has demonstrated competence as an instrument flyer. All-Empire schools specializing in instrument flight instruction are being created in Great Britain, and pilots from allied nations will be admitted to these and other specialist schools.

Although the British authorities feel that they are unable at present to afford large-scale production of giant bombers of the United States Air Force B-36 type, they have just flown their first jet bomber, the English electric A-1 twin-jet. Also, the nation is known to have larger ones on the drawing boards.

One year from now the RAF expansion program calls for limited production of medium jet bombers. The RAF bomber command's chief offensive weapon at present is the four-engined Lincoln, a conventional piston-engined bomber of slower speed than the American B-29 but larger bomb capacity.

Meanwhile, the Royal Navy has been conducting experiments with jet fighters in collaboration with the British Ministry of Supply looking toward the complete elimination of aircraft undercarriages in shipboard operations. This is done through use of catapults and a new secret flexible flight deck.

Some Navy enthusiasts even foresee the disappearance of the orthodox aircraft carrier with its long flight deck in favor of new carriers of the future which would be less vulnerable to bombardment. They look even further ahead and predict that small teams will be able to set up mobile catapults and mattresslike "flexible flight decks" on land in a fraction of the time now necessary for the building of even small airships.

The Vampire was the world's first jet aircraft to land and take off from a carrier at sea. A slightly modified version of the aircraft called the Sea Vampire already is in operational service with the carriers of the Royal Navy.

In spite of the Sea Vampire's superior performance, Royal Navy authorities conducting the landing experiments believe that complete elimination of the aircraft's undercarriage will save approximately one-twelfth of the all-up weight. This gain, they point out, could be translated into improvements in range, ceiling, climb, or firepower.

Initial tests were made first with models and gliders to determine hitherto unknown details about landing fast jet fighters having no undercarriage. Later production-type Vampires were used on an experimental "flexible flight deck" constructed at Farnborough and later they were repeated on the flight deck of the Royal Navy carrier H. M. S. Warrior.

The carrier *Formidable* is being reconstructed to take the Royal Navy's most modern jet aircraft including designs still under development. The flight deck and other equipment of the carrier *Indomitable* has just been surveyed with a view to modernization, for despite the achievements of the R. A. F. in World War II the British discovered that a strong and modern navy air arm was a great asset in modern warfare also.

RADAR WALL, JETS, GUN CREWS

The master plan for defense of western Europe against the Soviet Air Force calls for a radar wall around all of the democratic nations, backed up by jet fighter squadrons and antiaircraft batteries.

The radar wall will extend more than 1,500 miles from the Baltic Sea across Europe and the Mediterranean Sea to the southern boundaries of French North Africa. It will include western Germany and as much of the nation as is in democratic hands when the wall becomes operational.

Each of the nations which signed the Atlantic Pact is expected to take part in the scheme eventually, although the initial plans were worked out by Great Britain, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, and France. These countries plan to start constructing radar stations on their own territory before the end of 1949.

The major part of the electronics equipment under present plans will be manufactured by Britain and France, although some may come from the United States.

Cooperation for air defense measures among the nations of the so-called Western Union passed the planning stage last month when on request from the Belgian and Dutch chiefs of staff, the British War Office dispatched two heavy antiaircraft training teams to Europe. One went to Deventer, about 20 miles northeast of Arnheim in the Netherlands and the other to the Belgian Artillery School at Brasschaat, north of Antwerp, for instructional purposes.

Maj. Gen. C. W. E. Heath, commanding general of Number One Antiaircraft Group controlling the air defense of London, went with them. The request, incidentally, went through the Western Union defense committee's advance echelon headquarters at Fontainebleau near Paris.

Nearly all the nations of democratic western Europe now have chosen the British-designed De-Havilland Vampire or the Gloster Meteor as their standard jet interceptor. Quantity delivery of Gloster fighters and dual-control jet trainers for the Belgian air force is about to start.

France, which is making a considerable effort to become a first-ranking air power, already has received a small number of Vampires from the British Government.

This correspondent learned in France that the nationalized French aircraft company Societe Nationale de Constructions Aeronautiques du Sud-Est had just signed an agreement with the British deHavilland Co. to manufacture the Vampire under license in France.

One of the most interesting developments in aviation on the European Continent is the return of private enterprise to French aircraft manufacturing. Before World War II the entire industry was nationalized and had a poor production record during the crucial months before the fall of France.

Part of this failure was due directly to the sabotage of production by Communist workers during the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact. At this time official Marxist dialecticians were describing the fight of Britain and France against Nazi Germany as an imperialist war.

In the current post-war period which saw Communist ministers included in several French Cabinets, numerous Communist Party card holders wormed their way into positions of responsibility in the French aircraft industry.

A short time ago, while this correspondent still was in France, the government discharged nearly 300 aircraft industry workmen of the nationalized company S. N. C. A. du Nord. These men, all members of the Communist-directed General Confederation of Labor, appeared at a Paris airfield where a new jet fighter prototype manufactured by their company was being tested and vociferously attacked manufacture of weapons for the coming imperialist war.

Later the Government moved security troops into the company factory at Issy les Moulineaux. The 1,400 workers were advised that because of obvious and continued sabotage of combat aircraft construction the factory would be closed until further notice.

A bill has passed the French National Assembly which will allow the French Government to dispose of such parts of the nationalized aircraft industry as the Minister of National Defense designates. It is understood that the present middle-road French Government is anxious to close a large number of the nine nationalised and Communist-dominated aircraft plants in the Paris area.

The industry at present is still between 75- and 80-percent nationalized, but some of the outstanding new military aircraft prototypes are the products of private factories.

The French army of the air has a total effective personnel at present amounting to 73,000 men, Jean Moreau, the Air Minister and an old pilot, admitted to this correspondent that this is insufficient for bringing into being an air force strong and well organized in accord with the place which France and the French Union will occupy in the world of tomorrow.

Sweden is not a member of the Atlantic Pact but the cooperation between Sweden and Great Britain is much closer than is realized in the United States. Considerable numbers of British-built Vampires have been delivered to Sweden during the last 2 years and an unusual agreement has just been concluded. This will allow Svenska Flygmotor A. B. to build deHavilland Goblin jet engines at Trollhattan, send them to British duty-free for installation in Vampire fighters which then will be flown to the Swedish Air Force for delivery.

ONLY UNITED STATES CAPABLE OF HEAVY AIR ASSAULT ON RUSSIA

America's air power, in conjunction with the atom bomb, is providing the only real counterbalance in Europe to the strength of the Red air force.

Important elements of this air power include Air Force squadrons of very long-range bombers operating from bases on land, and Navy air units of very fast planes attached to carrier task forces capable of roaming almost at will the seven-tenths of the earth's surface which is water.

Britain's fast jet interceptors are beginning to gird western Europe defensively, together with radar and anti-aircraft batteries. It may be that in the unlikely event of war with the Soviet Union during the next 3 years these jet aircraft will be able to exact ruinous attrition from Red air force bombardment units.

British Hurricane fighters did that with Air Marshal Goering's invincible Luftwaffe in the Battle of Britain and actually halted the attack. But defense alone does not win modern wars. And admittedly only the United States at present can afford to produce in quantity the complex air weapons necessary to exploit by offensive bombardment several clearly defined weaknesses in the economic and military structure of the Soviet Union.

How formidable is the gantlet of Soviet fighter defense which they would have to run? According to press association cables from Moscow, the Soviet Union demonstrated some jet fighter planes so fast that foreign observers who watched them streak past could not agree on their characteristics.

This description of dazzling speed would have been more impressive if the detail that the jet fighters flashed across Tushino Air Field at altitudes under 1,000 feet had not been added. At low altitudes even 100-horsepower light planes look fast, as promoters of midget airplane races in the United States discovered some time ago, and the noise is terrific.

The low-altitude flying act is not exactly a new trick in the repertoire of Soviet propaganda. Thirteen years ago on May Day, 1936, press dispatches from Moscow reported that an air fleet which included squadrons of four-engined bombers skimmed the spires of the Kremlin and then at low altitude roared over the crowd with such speed that few figures on the size of the fleet agreed.

The previous May Day, 1935, according to other cables, a formidable air armada of 700 military aircraft came across the Red Square "flying so low that they seemed in danger of clipping the czarist double eagles which still top the Kremlin towers." The cables added: "Speed of the aircraft * * * impressed foreign observers."

During World War II speed was one characteristic for which Soviet combat aircraft were not noted, and although Red Air Force ground-attack aircraft such as the IL-2 Stormovik performed well, Soviet four-engined bombers made only a few sporadic raids throughout the conflict. It would not be well to underestimate Soviet jet fighters, but it also is worth keeping in mind that air shows in the Red Square are not intended to provide data for objective foreign appraisals.

The most obvious weakness of the Soviet Union right now is oil. Air Marshal Goering sourly stated a truism growing out of bitter German experience when he told his Allied captors: "Without oil nobody can fight a war." After American and British strategic bombardment of German oil-supply sources, German panzer units were stranded for lack of fuel. Fighter units could fly only once a week in many cases because they lacked aviation gasoline.

At present the Soviet Union, which produces only one-eighth of the petroleum available to the United States by conservative estimates, is not well supplied with petroleum products for the nation's own economy.

The nations of western Europe are relatively oilless. In the event of a Red Army advance toward the English Channel, the Soviet Union would need large additional quantities to operate the area's transportation system and industry. Before World War II, crude petroleum produced in western Europe amounted to less than 2 percent of the area's total consumption.

New oil fields are being exploited under intensive pressure from Stalin in Siberia and in the huge square of land between the Volga River and the Ural Mountains northeast of Stalingrad. Considerably more than 50 percent of all Soviet petroleum still comes from the rich and concentrated oil fields at Baku on the Caspian Sea.

Until recently, at least, approximately 80 percent of all Soviet aviation gasoline was refined in the Baku area. This, incidentally, is within easy range of American B-29's and British Lincoln heavy bombers based in the Middle East.

To modify this situation, the Soviet Union has been making almost frantic attempts during the last 2 years to move all existing equipment from the German synthetic-oil plants in their zone of occupation to undisclosed areas deep inside Russia. For several years these could produce unaided only a portion of the fuel needs of the huge Red Air Force. Even if sufficient, the benefits of this production would depend on the efficiency of the Soviet transportation system.

Actually, the railroads of Soviet Russia are considered by Allied strategists to be highly vulnerable to air attack, even though there are few marshalling yards in the European sense. The Soviet Union, with, roughly, three times the land area of the United States, has less than one-third the railroad mileage.

Under war conditions, the Russian railway system would be under severe strain without any outside interference. Air bombardment would certainly intensify the strain.

Other high-priority targets in the Soviet Union after oil centers and communications probably would be (1) electric power stations, (2) Soviet aircraft engine factories, and (3) centers such as Moscow. (Besides being a ball-bearing and aircraft manufacturing city, Moscow is the location of many top Soviet air research and aeronautical engineering laboratories.)

The United States Air Force is within theoretical reach of some of the most important strategic targets in Soviet Russia through B-29 units operating from Britain and western Europe, the Middle East, Scandinavia, Okinawa, and several other points.

These attacks could be supplemented and possibly supplied with fighter escort from highly mobile air carrier task forces of the United States Navy. Chiefs of this service have disclosed that the new North American AJ-1 bomber is a plane designed specifically for carrying the atomic bomb.

The United States Air Force is building its future long-range strategy around the huge Convair B-36 with the idea of "conducting, if necessary, intercontinental warfare from bases inside the United States." Gen. Muir S. Fairchild, Deputy Chief of Staff of the Air Force, told this correspondent:

"There is discouraging evidence that the full significance of our widely discussed long-range weapons is seldom completely grasped. Our possession of some such aircraft already has made obsolete the old method of defense against air power which involved conquering or absorbing all possible base areas which would be useful for strategic attack. Now that air attack is possible from great distances to the heart of any major power, none can defend itself from such an attack by piece-meal conquest of other nations."

Whether or not the B-36 is as good as the Air Force claims it to be, this correspondent cannot say. It is beyond question, however, that any future war involving the United States would see major emphasis put on the strategic air offensive. The B-36 has been chosen by the Air Force as its basic future weapon until a better one can be built. Its use should enlarge the capacity of the Nation to destroy any enemy's will to resist.

Tax Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the editorial on Tax Freedom Day, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald this morning, particularly interested me, so I went to work to find out what our friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MEYER] said to his people. What he said deserves broader distribution than that covered by the columns of his local newspaper as evidenced by the attention paid to it by the editor of the Times-Herald and my own interest therein.

Under permission heretofore granted, I am inserting both the editorial on Tax Freedom Day and the letter to which it refers:

TAX FREEDOM DAY

Representative HERBERT MEYER, of Kansas, has just reported that he is putting all the weight of his office behind a proposal made by the Florida Retailers Association to set aside April 28 as a new national holiday—Tax Freedom Day.

GOOD REASON FOR CELEBRATING

"All of us," says MEYER, "work for the Government from January 1 to April 28 this year—for that proportion of your income goes to pay taxes. On April 28 you will be liberated to work for yourself and your family."

The good Congressman then went on to point out that even those who pay no income tax still get nicked by hidden taxes, such as the 78 different taxes on a quart of milk and the 151 taxes on a loaf of bread and the 201 taxes on a gallon of gasoline. Hidden taxes form one-third of all rent, food, clothing, and fuel costs.

We free Americans are now paying out 32 cents in taxes from every dollar we earn.

Let us by all means observe Tax Freedom Day—if only to commemorate the spirit of our ancestors who fought, bled, and died resisting foreign governments which sought to gain much less power over us than our own Government is grabbing for today.

VIEWING THE CONGRESSIONAL SCENE WITH CONGRESSMAN HERBERT A. (HUB) MEYER

The other day the Florida Retailers Association came up with what I think is an excellent idea. They suggested that April 28 be set aside as a new national holiday to celebrate TAX Freedom Day. You see, all of us, from January 1 to April 28 this year, work for the Government, for all the money you make goes just to pay taxes. On April 28 you will be liberated to work for yourself and your family.

Maybe you don't realize it, but 32 cents or nearly a third of every dollar you earn goes for taxes. Of that amount 21 cents are for hidden taxes, some of which I have told you about. Many people who pay no income tax are under the impression they pay no taxes at all. But the American Taxpayers' Association says this is a fool's paradise. You pay hidden taxes on everything. For instance, a man who earns $900 a year paid out $123.84 in hidden taxes, according to this organization. A man earning $1,800 a year paid out $243. Here is how you pay. There are 78 different taxes on a quart of milk; 151 taxes on a loaf of bread; 100 taxes on an egg; 125 taxes on a woman's cotton dress; 118 taxes on a man's suit of clothes; 154 taxes on a cake of soap; 201 taxes on a gallon of gasoline. Hidden taxes form one-third of all rent costs and one-third of what you pay on food, clothing, electricity, gas, rent, fuel, and other items of everyday living.

Wanting to know just how all of these taxes affected you good folks of the Third District, I asked a tax-research expert to figure out just what share of the colossal national debt of $252,000,000,000 which is anticipated at the end of the fiscal year 1951, is owed by the taxpayers of the nine counties comprising the Third District.

Now hold your hats! You'll have to after you see these figures. Your share of this debt is $455,405,100. Here it is, broken down into counties. This computation is based on population estimates as of January 1,

1949, and a per capita debt of $1,759. Chautauqua County will owe $13,898,100; Cherokee's share is $21,322,800; Cowley will owe $60,434,800; Elk County's share of this debt is $12,092,900; Crawford will be hit for $97,-967,900; Labette comes up with $38,102,800; while Montgomery County's obligation runs to $66,828,500. Neosho County is in the fifty for $41,236,500, and Wilson County's share is $20,496,600.

I venture to say you never realized that your shares in this tremendous debt ran into the millions.

But that isn't all so grab your hat again. The President has proposed a spending budget of $42,429,000,000 for 1951.

This tax expert broke down this figure for me to show what each county will be liable for in the 1951 proposed spending budget. He computed it on the consumer income figures in the district for 1948, since the spending power of the people will determine how much of this budget each community must pay.

Are you ready? Chautauqua County's share, based on consumer spending is $1,410,-900; Cherokee is down for $4,421,300; Cowley's share is twice as much, amounting to $9,-898,300; Crawford County would have to shell out $19,912,800; Elk County gets off easy with $1,264,000; Labette goes up to $7,-621,800; Montgomery County has a whopper in $13,426,200; Neosho County gets by with only $8,568,800; and Wilson County comes up with $2,011,200.

Maybe you can get your mind off all this money you owe and your share of the national debt and the new spending program by spending a quiet evening at home reading back catalogs prepared which you can get for free but paid for by your tax money as Secretary Midkiff of Ornamental Plants, Take Care of Household Butter and Food for Two, provided, of course, you have any money left to buy food for two.

Taxes have gone up 900 percent since 1941. You can hardly afford to live and if you die your friends have to pay taxes in order to bury you, for all you leave will be eaten up in Federal and State inheritance taxes and the balance due on your last income tax. "To be, or not to be," still is the question.

Revenue Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this morning a bill (H. R. 7736) providing for revenue revision and correction of many tax inequities to which I desire to call the attention of the Members of the House.

I have introduced this bill at the request of the section of taxation of the American Bar Association, and this bill represents long and tedious research and work of that section, and their work has been approved by the American Bar Association.

I feel that the views of these distinguished lawyers are worthy of our most serious thought and study, and while I may not concur in each and every item, I have read the bill and I do heartily concur in most of it. This bill, if finally passed, will not, in my opinion, affect the revenue to any great extent, but will remove many inequities that should have been corrected long ago.

Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a full summarization and explanation of the bill prepared by the section of taxation.

SUMMARY EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS OF H. R. 7736 AND H. R. 7825

These bills, introduced March 16, 1950, by Representative A. SIDNEY CAMP, of Georgia, and March 23, 1950, by Representative DANIEL A. REED, of New York, at the request of the American Bar Association, collect in an orderly fashion a number of proposed changes in the internal revenue laws recommended by the association.

The following statement is designed to set forth in summary the nature of each of the changes proposed by the bill and the reasons therefor.

TITLE I—INCOME TAXES

Section 101, taxable years affected: Except as otherwise expressly provided, all amendments made by this title shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1949.

Section 102, elimination of the life-insurance factor of pension trusts from taxable income of employees: Under the present law, if a plan provides retirement-income-insurance benefits together with death benefits, the employee receiving such protection is deemed to receive current taxable income measured by the cost of term life insurance in the amount provided during the year. The result is inconsistent with the long-standing rule to the effect that group-insurance benefits are not currently taxable to employees. The amounts are generally small and the administrative difficulties far outweigh the advantage in revenue to the Government. PS-58, promulgated January 30, 1947, and revised March 7, 1947, mitigates this burden somewhat, but does not cure the administrative nuisance, both to the Government and to employers and trustees, of treating the life-insurance factor as taxable income. The bar association proposes to eliminate the insurance factor of pension trusts from taxable income by an amendment to section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Section 103, extension to 75 days of the time within which taxpayer on accrual basis may contribute amounts to pension plan and secure deduction therefor on year of accrual: Under the present law, a taxpayer on an accrual basis cannot take a deduction for accrued amount of payments to a pension or profit-sharing plan unless actual payment is made within 60 days after the close of the taxable year of accrual. The bar association has recommended that section 23 (p) (1) (E) be amended so as to extend this time period to 75 days after the close of the taxable year. The payments under many plans are determinable only when the audited results of the year's operations are known, and often this is difficult to obtain within 60 days.

Section 104, union welfare trusts, deductibility of contributions: The enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act has brought into the limelight so-called union welfare funds, many of which provide pension or annuity benefits. It is understood that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has taken the position that contributions by employers to such funds which provide such benefits are not deductible for income tax purposes unless they meet the requirements of section 23 (p) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to conventional pension or annuity plans. The result of this position is to put in jeopardy the deduction of such contributions, since it will be difficult in most cases, if not impossible to meet the requirements of actuarial soundness applicable to deductions under section 23 (p). Accordingly, it is proposed to rectify the situation by making it clear that the deductibility of contributions to welfare trusts which meet the requirements of section 302 (c) (5) of the code, relating to ordinary and necessary business expenses. This is believed to be consonant with the intention of Congress, which could hardly have intended that the 1942 amendments to sections 23 (p) and 165 of the code should apply to these welfare trusts. This provision is made applicable to all taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941.

Section 105, pension and profit-sharing plans; extension of capital gains treatment to distributions made within 1 year on account of either the employee's separation from the service or death: Under the present law, if the total distributions payable under a qualified pension or profit-sharing plan are paid to the distributee within one taxable year of the distributee on account of the employee's separation from the service, the amount of such distribution is considered a capital gain to the extent that the amount exceeds the amounts contributed by the employee. This provision is a very desirable one because if, when an employee retires and receives a lump sum payment, he were taxed at ordinary income rates in 1 year on the total amount of distributions over what he has contributed, a large percentage of the amount he receives might be taken by the tax authorities. Subsection (b) of the bar association proposal would amend section 165 (b) of the code so as to extend capital gains treatment not only to situations where the payment is due to the employee's separation from the service, but also to situations where it is due to the employee's death after his separation from the service.

Subsection (a) is an amendment to section 22 (b) (2) (B), to extend the same capital gains treatment to nontrusteed plans. There seems no reason why, if the particular pension or profit-sharing plan of a corporation is set up on an annuity basis rather than on a trust basis, this technical distinction should mean a different method of taxation to the recipient of the payments.

This section would be applicable to all taxable years since 1941.

Section 106, pension plans for partnerships and individual proprietorships: Under existing law, partners and sole proprietors may not be included as beneficiaries under pension plans for their employees under section 165 of the code, although stockholders employed by their corporation are not so affected. The result is to discourage the establishment of such plans for the employees of business conducted in these forms, and to discriminate against employees of unincorporated business. Section 106 would amend section 165 of the code by providing that the sole proprietor or partner who performs personal services in the business shall be treated as an "employee" as well as an "employer" for the purposes of that section; that the part of his income from the business which is attributable to his services shall be deemed "compensation"; and that where both personal services and capital are material income-producing factors, the apportionment of income to services shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner.

Section 107, taxation of annuity payments: Under present law, annuity payments are treated as in part a nontaxable return of premiums, and the balance as taxable income. However, the formula used treats as taxable income all of the excess annual receipts over and above 3 percent of the amounts paid for the annuity. The result is that many annuitants are never able to recapture their outlay tax-free, while others, through such recapture, incur a sharp rise

in taxable income in the year following that in which the total cost has been recovered under this arbitrary formula.

The proposed amendment substitutes a constant yearly exclusion for the life of the annuitant. If he lives out his exact life expectancy, he will recover tax-free exactly the cost of the annuity. If he lives beyond such expectancy, he will recover tax-free more than his premiums paid; if he dies before the expiration of such expectancy, he will recover less. However, on the average, the results are equitable in that the revenues will not be reduced, and the annuitant's taxable income from this source will be constant.

Section 108, cancellation of indebtedness: Section 22 (b) (a) of the code permits a corporation in certain situations to elect to exclude from gross income the income which would otherwise be taxable to it upon the cancellation of indebtedness, on condition that the basis of its property under section 113 be correspondingly reduced. This provision, in situations to which it applies, relieves hardship by deferring an additional tax burden upon a taxpayer already embarrassed financially. However, the provision is a temporary one, not applicable to cancellations of debt occurring after December 31, 1949; the election to get its benefits must be made at the time the return is filed, it does not apply to noncorporate taxpayers, and it does not apply unless the cancelled debt was evidenced by a security as therein defined.

Section 108 would make the provision a permanent part of the code; would extend the period of election until the expiration of the period for filing a claim for refund; would make the provision applicable to all taxpayers; and would eliminate the requirement that the debt be evidenced by a security. The reason for extending the date for election is that there is great uncertainty under the decisions (Cf. *Helvering* v. *American Dental Co.* (318 U. S. 322) and *Commissioner* v. *Jacobson* (336 U. S. 28)) as to when cancellation of debt results in taxable income to the debtor, and the taxpayer is often unable to determine what action to take at the time the return is filed.

Section 109, last-in-first-out inventory: Subsection (a) gives the Commissioner of Internal Revenue discretion (which he does not now have) in determining when the taxpayer must exercise the election under the involuntary liquidation and replacement provisions as to elective inventories contained in section 22 (d) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, so that it will be possible for him to provide relief in cases of hardship where the necessary election has not been made within the period prescribed by the statute.

In cases where, upon replacement of elective inventories involuntarily liquidated, deficiencies or refunds are determined for the year of involuntary liquidation, the present law provides that no interest is payable on such deficiencies or refunds. Subsection (b) provides for interest on such deficiencies from January 1, 1948, or from the date for the payment of the tax for the year of replacement, whichever is later; and provides for interest on such refunds from January 1, 1948, or from the date of filing of the claim for refund, whichever is later.

Section 110, alimony paid under separation agreement: Under sections 22 (k) and 171 (a) of the Code, amounts paid in accordance with the terms of a separation agreement between husband and wife, where they are not legally divorced or separated under court decree, are not deductible by the husband or taxable to the wife. With the privilege of splitting income introduced by the Revenue Act of 1948, which is open to all married couples not separated under a court decree, it is believed that where separate returns are filed, amounts paid under separation agreements should be deductible by the husband and taxable to the wife, even though they are not legally separated under court decree. The proposed amendment is to that effect although it should be noted that the husband and wife who are thus separated may, at their option, file a joint return, in which event the recommended change would become inapplicable.

Section 111, deduction of worthless stock loss in case of affiliated corporation: This section amends section 23 (g) (4) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code to remove an apparently unintended discrimination.

Section 23 (g) (4) provides that a corporation may deduct as an ordinary loss the loss on worthless stock in an affiliated corporation. In defining what is an affiliate for purposes of that paragraph, section 23 (g) (4) (B) provides that a corporation shall not be deemed to be an affiliate with the taxpayer unless more than 90 percent of the aggregate of its gross income for all years has been from sources other than royalties, rents, dividends, interest annuities, or gains from securities transactions. The limitation was put into the statute in order to exclude holding companies from the benefits of section 23 (g) (4), but as now worded the law inadvertently excludes a number of operating companies, such as banks and investment companies, just because much of their income is derived from rents, interest, or the like. The proposed amendment would extend the benefits of section 23 (g) (4) to losses on the stock of corporations "actively engaged in a trade or business," whatever the source of their income.

Section 112, extension of business-bad-debt reduction: Under existing law a distinction is made between business bad debts and nonbusiness bad debts. The distinction is important because the former are deductible in full and the latter (in the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation) are treated as short-term capital losses which are deductible only against capital gains plus not more than $1,000 of ordinary income. The nonbusiness bad debt is so defined under existing law as to include true business debts which do not become worthless until after the taxpayer has terminated his business. Since it is manifestly unfair to distinguish in this manner between business debts which become worthless while the business is still in operation and those which become worthless at a later date, section 112 amends the definition of a nonbusiness bad debt so as to exclude a debt arising in the course of the taxpayer's trade or business.

Section 113, change of election with respect to standard deduction: Existing law permits the individual income taxpayer to elect to take a standard deduction instead of itemizing his deductions. This election must be made on the tax return in a manner prescribed by regulations. An election so made is irrevocable. This provision has worked unjustly for taxpayers who find subsequently that they have acted unwisely or whose correct taxable income is subsequently found to be different from that on the return. Section 113 permits the taxpayer to change an election with respect to the standard deductions for any taxable year within the period of the statute of limitations. Such change must be made under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

Section 114, wages paid to dependents: Under existing law a taxpayer is permitted to claim a deduction under the income tax for wages paid by him to a person who is a dependent and for whom the taxpayer claims an exemption. Since these wages reduce the extent of the recipient's dependency, it is undesirable to allow the deduction while also allowing the dependency credit. Section 114 disallows the deduction of wages paid to persons who are dependents of the taxpayer.

Section 115, unpaid expenses and interest, related taxpayers: Section 24 (c) of the code was passed at the request of the Treasury to eliminate a great inequity against the Government. Prior to that act, corporate taxpayers would be permitted deductions on the accrual basis for amounts of salaries or interest or the like accrued to related taxpayers, but the related taxpayers (being on the cash basis) might delay for a long time paying or might never pay a tax on the income. Despite the clear purpose of section 24 (c) which was simply to correct the injustice against the Government which was previously possible, the Bureau of Internal Revenue has with success applied that section even to cases where the related taxpayer, although on the cash basis, is actually taxed upon the accrued item upon a theory of constructive receipt. See *Lake* v. *Commissioner* (148 F. (2d) 899). Section 115 of the bill would amend section 24 (c) so as to provide that, if the recipient of income is actually taxed on the income, whether or not received by him, the deduction will be allowed to the related taxpayer.

Section 116, credit for dividends received: Under existing law, section 26 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code limits the dividends received credit to 85 percent of the amount received as dividends from domestic corporations which are subject to income taxation. This credit is not extended to resident foreign corporations having substantial income from sources within the United States. Such resident foreign corporations are frequently owned by domestic corporations with the result that, although the foreign corporation is subjected to the regular 38 percent normal and surtax rates with respect to its earnings from the United States sources, dividends to the parent domestic corporation do not furnish a basis for the dividends received credit otherwise afforded similarly owned domestic corporations. The proposed amendment will remedy that situation by extending such credit, with what are believed to be appropriate limitations.

Section 117, installment sales: Section 44 (b) permits use of the installment method, in the case of sales of realty and casual sales of personalty, only where the payments during the taxable year in which the sale is made are less than 30 percent of the selling price. Where no payments at all are received in the initial period, the Treasury holds that the conditions are not met and the installment method may not be used. The proposed amendment would avoid this interpretation and would permit application of the installment sales provisions where no part of the selling price is received during the taxable year.

Section 118, installment obligations: This section extends to the estate or beneficiary of a decedent who has elected to report income from installment obligations upon the installment basis a deduction for that portion of the estate tax which was imposed upon the value of such obligations, where the executor or beneficiary makes a similar election.

Section 119, taxable years of approximately 12 months: This section gives specific legal sanction to the practice of authorizing the use of a 52-week or 53-week year for the purpose of reporting for the income tax.

Section 120, service rendered for a period of 36 months or more: Existing law provides that if at least 80 percent of the total compensation for personal services covering a period of 36 calendar months or more is received or accrued in a single taxable year by an individual or partnership, the tax may be calculated as if the income had been received ratably over the period, prior to such receipt or accrual, in which the services were performed. The relief provided by this averaging device is limited specifically to cases where compensation has been received in a single year for at least 80 percent of a complete task. Relief is denied in situations

where an individual is employed continuously for long periods but receives portions of his compensation for his work in lump sums at infrequent intervals. Section 120 extends averaging treatment to cases in which 80 percent of the total compensation for work done to date over a period of 36 months or more is received or accrued in a single taxable year. This provision is made retroactive to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

Section 121, elections as to recognition of gain in certain corporate liquidations: Many corporations having no substantial accumulations of earnings and profits nevertheless hold real estate or unlisted corporate securities not readily marketable but considerably appreciated in value. Several times Congress has passed temporary legislation to permit such corporations to be liquidated under certain circumstances without adverse effects upon the stockholders; that is, by taxing to the individual stockholder as ordinary income only that part of the distribution which represents accumulated earnings, the remainder being treated as a capital gain, but excluding from tax the unrealized appreciation in value of assets, that gain being postponed until the stockholder sells such assets. See section 112 (b) (7) of the code. Section 127 of H. R. 6712, the revenue revision bill of 1943, would have again provided for such treatment but only for liquidations occurring within some one calendar month in 1943. It is felt that the purpose accomplished generally by this type of legislation is beneficial to the public; and, if this is true, it should not be limited to a single short period. The proposed amendment would make permanent in the Internal Revenue Code the temporary provision of section 127 of H. R. 6712.

Section 122, gain or loss in connection with certain corporate liquidations: Under existing law, if a corporation is liquidated by distributing its assets to its stockholders, no tax is imposed on the corporation on any appreciation in the value of the assets over their adjusted basis (or cost) to the corporation. As far as the stockholders are concerned, any excess of the value of such assets over the cost or other basis of the stock is taxed as capital gains.

On the other hand, if the corporation sells its assets just prior to liquidation, a tax is imposed on the corporation, and when the proceeds are distributed to the stockholders another tax may be imposed on them. In a great many cases disputes have arisen between the Government and the taxpayer as to whether a sale was made by a corporation or its shareholders. The problem first went to the Supreme Court in the *Court Holding Company* case (324 U. S. 331 (1945)), and again in the *United Public Service Company* case, decided January 9, 1950, where the Court said: "The oddities in tax consequences that emerge from the tax provisions here controlling appear to be inherent in the present tax pattern. * * * Congress having determined that different tax consequences shall flow from different methods by which the stockholders of a closely held corporation may dispose of corporate property, we accept its mandate."

Section 122 provides that if a corporation sells its assets just prior to liquidation, no gain or loss shall be recognized to the corporation. It contains safeguard provisions against liquidation being used as a device for paying at capital gain rates on sales in the normal course of trade.

Section 123, stock dividends: As the result of recent Treasury Department rulings, the receipt by a taxpayer of preferred stock taxfree as a stock dividend or in a corporate reorganization depends not only upon whether the dividend is in form a tax-free stock dividend or the reorganization is in form a tax-free reorganization, but also upon whether the preferred stock so received is sold by the receiving stockholder or whether it is subject to redemption under sinking fund provisions or by reason of an agreement that the stock may otherwise be redeemed by the corporation in whole or in part. This Treasury attitude makes uncertain the previously well-established law as to tax-free stock dividends and as to the tax-free status of stock received in exchanges under section 112 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code. This uncertainty is hampering many legitimate transactions which should be consummated.

The effect of the proposed amendments is to state explicitly what is deemed to be declaratory of existing law, namely, that the effect of the tax-free character of a corporate distribution of stock should not be lost merely because the stockholder sells or intends to sell his new securities or that the new securities are subject to a sinking fund provision of reasonable length fixed with reference to assuring the marketability of the stock or that the stock is subject to redemption, in whole or in part, at the option of the issuing corporation. The proposed amendments also include a provision that would close any loophole that may exist by reason of a taxpayer entering into a tax-avoidance plan to receive a tax-free distribution of stock, sell the stock, and then to have the stock redeemed in the hands of the purchaser.

Section 124, involuntary conversion: Section 112 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code postpones the taxation of profits realized in involuntary conversions where similar properties are acquired to replace those converted. The present statute has been construed to limit the relief to situations where the specific funds received on the involuntary conversion can be traced into similar property. It is often necessary to replace the property before the proceeds of the involuntary conversion are actually in the hands of the taxpayer. Section 124 of the bill amends section 112 (f) so as to provide that it is immaterial whether the money into which such property has been converted is expended directly in the acquisition of other similar property or whether it is used to replace funds already expended by the taxpayer in such acquisition.

Section 125, definition of reorganization: This section provides that section 112 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to recognition of gain or loss in corporate reorganizations) be amended so as to provide that no gain or loss shall be recognized where assets exchanged solely for stock are transferred to a corporation which is a wholly owned subsidiary of the corporation from which the stock is received. Under the present definition of "reorganization" in section 112, as construed by the courts, a reorganization which would in all other respects be nontaxable may be made taxable if the assets transferred in exchange for stock are transferred not to the corporation issuing the stock but to a subsidiary of that corporation. The nature of the interest of the corporation transferring the assets and the nature of the interest of the corporation issuing the stock in return therefor are substantially the same whether the assets are transferred directly to the corporation which issues the stock or to a subsidiary of that corporation.

Section 126, distribution of stock on reorganization: This section of the bill provides for the nonrecognition of gain from the receipt of stock in certain corporate reorganizations known as "spin-offs." A typical "spin-off" occurs where a part of the assets of the corporation is transferred to a new corporation in exchange for all the stock of the new corporation which is thereupon distributed to the stockholders of the original corporation without the surrender by them of any of the stock of the original corporation.

A similar provision was contained in section 112 (g) of the Revenue Act of 1932 and prior acts but this was omitted in the Revenue Act of 1934 because the decision of the Board of Tax Appeals in *Evelyn F. Gregory* (27 B. T. A. 223 (1932)) indicated that such provision might be subject to abuse and held to apply to what was regarded as in substance the distribution of a dividend. The reversal of that decision in 69 F. (2d) 809 (CCA2, 1934), affirmed 293 U. S. 465 (1935), removed the danger of such abuse. Judicial and administrative interpretation of the law since 1934 has established safeguards which now prevent such abuse of the reorganization provisions. It is proposed to restore this provision to the law because it is believed that it is economically unsound to impede reorganizations which divide one corporate enterprise into a greater number of corporate enterprises where such division is undertaken for legitimate business purposes and is not a mere device for the distribution of a dividend. Where stock of a new corporation is distributed without the surrender of stock of the old corporation, the result is identical, in substance, with transactions in which stock of the new corporation is distributed in exchange for the surrender of either all or a portion of the stock of the old corporation—transactions which give rise to no recognized gain under present law. It is not intended to change the existing law as to such transactions but to amend the law so as to permit in the future the same substantial result to be accomplished with the same tax consequences by a "spin-off" reorganization, all three types of reorganizations being subject to the general limitations embodied in the Gregory case and subsequent decisions based thereon.

Section 127, basis of property included in decedent's estate: Under the present law, if property passes by virtue of a decedent's will or inheritance from him, the income-tax basis for such property in the hands of his estate, devisee or heir, becomes the value at the date of death (or such other valuation date as is used for estate tax purposes). With two minor qualifications, the foregoing rule does not apply to property transferred inter vivos by a decedent even though such property may be includible in his gross estate for estate tax purposes, as, for example, property transferred in contemplation of death. The proposed amendment would change the law so that if property were transferred either inter vivos, or by reason of the decedent's death, and if such property were includible in his gross estate for estate tax purposes, the income tax basis of such property would become, after his death, its value on the date of death (or other applicable valuation date).

Section 128, adjustment of basis for depreciation: This section amends section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code and prior revenue laws to mitigate the effect of the Supreme Court's decision in the case of *Virginian Hotel Corporation* v. *Commissioner* (319 U. S. 523 (1943)). Section 113 requires that the original cost or other basis of property be adjusted to reflect depreciation and depletion sustained since the property was acquired. In 1932 the provision was amended to require the deduction of depreciation "allowed" where it was in excess of the depreciation "allowable." The amendment was made at the request of the Treasury, and the legislative history of the amendment shows very clearly that the sole purpose of the provision was to cover a situation where the excessive depreciation resulted in reducing the taxes collected by the Government in a year which had become barred, so that if the excessive depreciation were restored the taxpayer would in effect be getting a double deduction against the Government. However, the Court in the Virginian Hotel case reached an incongruous and inequitable result. That decision prevents a taxpayer from correcting a prior erroneous depreciation figure, even when the Government has not been injured by the error. Section 128 would correct this situation in a manner similar to that proposed in H. R. 1104 introduced in the Eightieth Congress, first session. The amendment, in line with the otherwise universal practice of the Federal income tax statutes from 1913 to date, would permit a taxpayer to compute the taxes for any year on a correct basis, without regard to any error in prior years, so long as the error did not deprive the Government of taxes to which it was entitled.

Section 129, redemption of corporate stock in decedent's estate: Difficulty has been experienced by decedents' estates in providing money with which to pay Federal estate taxes and State inheritance taxes where the assets of the estate include stock of a closely held corporation. Stock and securities of that character are quite often difficult, if not impossible, to sell at a price approximating the value determined in fixing the Federal estate tax. A possible source of funds for that purpose is the sale of the stock to the issuing corporation, or the retirement of the stock if it is preferred or redeemable stock. Concern has been expressed, however, that in many such cases the redemption or purchase of the stock (unless the estate's entire holding is so disposed of) will be treated as a dividend, subject to income tax, under the provisions of section 115 (g), which taxes as a dividend distributions in cancellation or redemption of stock that are considered to be essentially equivalent to the distribution of a taxable dividend. To provide liquidity in this respect the proposed amendment makes section 115 (g) inapplicable to such distributions with the proviso that the stock must be subject to the Federal estate tax and with the limitation that section 115 (g) will be inapplicable only to the extent of the amount of death taxes to which the estate is subject.

Sec. 130, retirement of bonds: Section 117 (f) provides capital gain treatment for the redemption of bonds and similar securities in registered or coupon form, although the gain from payment of other evidences of indebtedness is ordinary income. Under the present law, it is possible to convert ordinary evidence of indebtedness into bonds and similar securities without gain or loss and the gain from the redemption thereof will be treated as a capital gain. The Treasury complained that ordinary income could thus be converted into capital gain merely by changing the type of the evidence of indebtedness and in order to prevent this practice H. R. 6712, the tax revision bill of 1943, contained a provision to the effect that capital gain would result in such cases only where the evidence of indebtedness was originally issued in coupon or registered form. It is believed that the purpose sought to be accomplished by this proposal was proper but that it was too extreme. Assets of a character which give rise to capital gain need only be held 6 months under section 117, and the proposed amendment provides capital gain treatment where the conversion occurred 6 months or more prior to the redemption.

Section 131, holding period for capital assets: Under existing law, it has been held (*Commissioner* v. *Gracey* (159 F. (2d) 324)) that if a noncapital asset is exchanged for a capital asset, the holding period for the former may be tacked on to the holding period for the latter for purposes of deciding whether the capital gain is long term or short term. This construction offers a loophole for tax avoidance, and the proposed section closes this loophole by preventing such a tacking on.

Section 132, capital gains upon maturity or surrender of insurance policy: Under the present law, amounts received upon the maturity of an endowment policy or the surrender of a life-insurance policy during the lifetime of the insured are treated as ordinary income. In practical effect, the present system amounts to the taxation in a single year of income that was actually accumulated over a period of many years, and the result is that the recipient may be taxed at a considerably higher rate than that at which he would have been taxed if the net gain had been paid out to him over the life of the policy in the form of distributed earnings. Section 132 of the present bill would eliminate this harshness by amending section 117 of the code so as to extend capital gains treatment to such situations.

Section 133, unlimited deduction for charitable contributions: This is merely a technical amendment correcting an error made in the current Tax Payment Act of 1943.

Existing law waives the 15 percent limitation on allowable charitable deductions of individuals in cases where, for 10 successive years, the contributions of the individual, plus his income taxes paid during the year with respect to preceding years, exceed 90 percent of his net income. However, under the current tax payment system taxes are paid with respect to the current taxable year rather than the preceding year. The current Tax Payment Act failed to make an essential amendment of section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the 90 percent limitation applies also to taxes paid with respect to the current year. This amendment, therefore, is retroactive to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

Section 134, net operating loss deduction: The present law permits a corporation, but not an individual, to include in the computation of a net operating loss carry-back or carry-over losses arising from the sale of property used in a trade or business. The proposed amendment is intended to accord to individuals the same privilege now granted to corporations.

Section 135, refunds based on foreign tax credit: Section 131 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code permits the Commissioner, without any time limitation, to assert additional tax for prior years resulting from any claim of foreign tax credit in excess of the foreign tax which is ultimately paid by the taxpayer. However, if the amount of credit claimed under section 131 for foreign taxes is less than the amount ultimately paid, and if the statute of limitations for filing refund claims has expired under section 322 of the Code at the time that the additional foreign taxes are finally determined, the taxpayer is barred by the statute of limitations from securing a refund of United States taxes paid for the earlier year because of his not having claimed a sufficient amount of foreign tax credit. In other words, the assessment of additional United States taxes is never barred, whereas the refund of United States taxes is barred within the customary periods in section 322.

The proposed revision affords parallel treatment in the two instances referred to, providing equality to taxpayers with respect to the treatment of such foreign tax credits.

Section 136, accrual of foreign taxes: Under present rulings, credits for foreign taxes are not allowable to accrual-basis taxpayers until the final determination of controversies abroad with reference to such foreign taxes. Delay in such foreign determination often results in the taxpayer's loss of any substantial benefit of the credit, because of reduction or elimination of foreign income in the later year and the resultant credit restriction under section 131 (b) of the code.

The proposed amendment authorizes the computation of such foreign-tax credits under the rule of accrual in the year with respect to which the tax is imposed.

Section 137, taxation of the income of estates and trusts: Under the law as it existed prior to 1942, the income of many trusts was wholly or partly taxable to the trust rather than the beneficiary, although the income was actually distributed to the beneficiary. To prevent this form of tax avoidance, Congress adopted in the Revenue Act of 1942 a very complicated set of rules for the determination of distributable income. Two of these rules, known as the 65-day and 12-month rules, require the computation of trust income for arbitrary periods of time, and have proved unduly burdensome and difficult to apply.

The proposed amendment will eliminate these highly technical rules without reopening the loophole for tax avoidance which Congress sought to abolish in the 1942 act. This is accomplished by taxing to the beneficiary any distribution from a trust, provided the amount of this distribution does not exceed the amount of net income realized by the trust by the end of its taxable year.

The amendment limits the amounts includible in the income of the beneficiaries to the net income of the estate or trust, thus abrogating the rules of the *Johnston* v. *Helvering* (141 F. (2d) 208), and *McCullough* v. *Commissioner* (153 F. (2d) 345). The amendment is intended to provide that income shall retain its character and identity in the hands of the beneficiary, thus making it clear that the estate or trust is a conduit of property passing through it to a beneficiary.

The proposed amendment also clarifies the law relating to the ultimate tax on items such as capital gains which are taxable as gross income under Federal tax law, but are treated as items of principal under State law. Such items under the proposed amendment will remain taxable to the fiduciary unless the will or trust instrument specifically provides for their distribution to a beneficiary.

Section 138, income of discretionary insurance trusts: This section of the bill provides that section 167 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the taxation of income of insurance trusts to the grantor, be amended so as to tax the grantor only to the extent that trust income is actually used to pay premiums on insurance policies on his life. This would bring the taxation of insurance trusts in line with the present taxation of maintenance trusts as to which, since 1943, it has been provided that the grantor will be taxed only to the extent that trust income is actually used for the support or maintenance of persons he is obligated to support.

Section 139, statute of limitations in case of failure to file return: There is presently no statute of limitations where no return was filed, however innocently. The proposed amendment would provide a 6-year statute of limitations (which is double the normal period) where the failure to file a return was not due to fraudulent intent. In the absence of fraud, the reasons underlying the policy of repose in other fields appear equally applicable to tax liabilities.

Section 140, statute of limitations where failure to file return results from commissioner's ruling: Under the present law, where a taxpayer files no return, there is no period of limitations upon the assessment of additional taxes even though, in failing to file a return, the taxpayer relied upon rulings of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Where the commissioner's rulings, at the time a return would otherwise be due, are to the effect that no return is necessary, the normal period of limitations should operate just as though a return had been filed, and this section would so provide.

Section 141, penalty for failure to file return: Under this section, the provisions of the income tax law relating to penalties for failure to file returns would be amended by liberalizing the conditions under which no penalty is applicable and by vesting in the Commissioner discretion to reduce or remit

penalties in proper circumstances. Under the present law, penalties are not imposed if failure to file is due to reasonable cause, but the courts have defined these words so stringently that in many cases the section works great hardship. This section proposes to eliminate this hardship by an amendment in section 291 of the Internal Revenue Code, and to eliminate a parallel hardship now maintained in section 396 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code which denies a deficiency dividend credit to a personal holding company if there is a finding that any part of the deficiency is due to a failure to file the return on time, unless such failure is due to reasonable cause. The principal changes are (a) to provide specifically that if the failure to file results from the belief, founded upon a reasonable basis that no return is required, this shall be deemed reasonable cause and (b) to give the commissioner authority to abate, remove, or refund the penalty, as he deems proper under the circumstances.

Section 142, period of limitations on claims against transferees: Under existing law, the Commissioner is given 3 years in which to assess income taxes against the taxpayer. If the taxpayer has transferred his assets without consideration, the Commissioner is given an additional year to assess against the transferee. Where, however, the Commissioner has done nothing within the 3 years and the taxpayer thereafter transfers his assets, there seems to be no reason to allow him to revive his dead claim by assessment against the transferee, and the proposed section would specifically prohibit him from doing so.

Section 143, transferee not bound, in absence of timely notice, by determination against transferor: The law provides generally that if assets of a transferor are transferred to another, the transferee, under the trust fund doctrine, shall be responsible for such taxes as may be held to be owed by the transferor. Under the present law, it frequently happens that after such transfer the Commissioner will issue a deficiency notice to the transferor without notifying the transferee against whom the tax will ultimately be assessed. In such cases, as in the case of a dissolved corporation, a petition may be filed by former officers who have no real interest in the liability and the decision may be rendered that the tax is due by the transferor. In a number of decisions it has been held that such a decision against the transferor is binding on the transferee regardless of the fact that such transferee has not had any opportunity to defend himself. Thus, the transferee may never have his day in court.

The proposed amendment provides that no decision rendered against the transferor after the transfer of assets shall be binding upon the transferee unless said transferee shall have been given personal notice of liability and a full opportunity to appear and be heard in said previous proceeding.

Section 144, limitation on refunds in cases of waiver: Section 322 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code was inserted therein by section 169 of the Revenue Act of 1942. Section 203 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1943 gave this subsection retroactive effect. The stated purpose of section 322 (b) (3) was to extend the period within which claims for refund might be filed in cases where a waiver of the statute of limitations is given, by permitting such claims to be filed at any time within 6 months after the expiration of the waiver. However, according to the interpretation placed upon these amendments by the Treasury Department, they have the effect of cutting down the usual 3-year period after payment within which claims may be filed, in any case where the waiver expires more than 6 months before the expiration of such 3-year period. The provisions of these amendments are quite complicated and, if the Treasury Department's construction is correct, have served as a trap to lull taxpayers into the belief that they would continue to have the right to file claim at any time within 3 years after payment. The amendment here proposed would have the effect in all cases of permitting a claim for refund at any time within 3 years after the payment of the tax.

Section 145, limitation period in certain cases before the Tax Court: By reason of uncertainties frequently existing as to the year for determining the deductibility of a bad debt or of a worthless security, the Revenue Act of 1942 provided a special 7-year period of limitations within which to claim refunds or credits attributable to the allowance of deductions for such items. This was accomplished by the insertion of section 322 (b) (5) in the Internal Revenue Code. This section (as amended by section 504 of the 1943 act) is applicable to years beginning after December 31, 1937.

Under section 322 (d) of the code, this special 7-year statute of limitations is made applicable to proceedings in the Tax Court but that section in this respect was made applicable only to years beginning after December 31, 1942. It thus happens that in certain proceedings before the Tax Court, the 7-year statute is inapplicable to years ending before December 31, 1942, although the taxpayer, had he not filed a petition with the Tax Court, would be at liberty to file a claim for refund and, if necessary, prosecute the refund in other courts. The proposed amendment would make the 7-year statute applicable in all such proceedings.

Section 146, extension of period for refund in case of waiver by transferee: Under existing law, both the taxpayer and his transferee may agree in writing with the Commissioner to extend the period of limitation for assessment of the tax. If the taxpayer does so, his time for claiming a refund of overpayment is correspondingly extended. However (probably due to a legislative oversight), such an extension of transferee liability under existing law does not extend the transferee's period for claiming a refund of an erroneous payment. The proposed amendment would remove this discrimination and give the transferee a similar extension of time.

Section 147, exemption of personal holding company classification of corporation joining in consolidated return: Under the Revenue Act of 1942, a personal holding company not filing a consolidated return was subject to personal holding company tax but not to excess-profits tax. When the 1942 act extended the privilege of filing consolidated returns to affiliated corporations generally, it provided that if an affiliated group wished to file a consolidated return all of the corporations in the group, including any affiliated personal holding company, must join in the return. The bar association believes that it was not the intention of Congress that a holding company in such circumstances should be subject to both the personal holding company tax and the excess-profits tax, and has recommended an amendment to section 501 (b) of the code which would exempt such corporations from the personal holding company classification. Section 131 of the Revenue Act of 1943 changed this rule for the later years of the excess-profits tax (See S. Rept. No. 627, 78th Cong., 1st sess., p. 64), and, of course, the bar association recommendation has no application to years after the elimination of the excess-profits tax. The recommendation applies only to correct inequities done in 1942 and 1943.

Section 148, family partnerships: This section would clarify the tax status of so-called family partnerships. This subject has become greatly confused by judicial decisions which have departed from the otherwise generally recognized principle that the income from donated or purchased property is taxable to the donee or purchaser of that property. The amendment proposed to section 3797 is somewhat longer and more detailed than might be wished, but this detailed treatment seems necessary in order to safeguard the Government's interest and prevent family partnerships from being used as a device to avoid taxes on the income from personal services of one member of the family. Under the proposed amendment, a partner who has contributed capital to the partnership must be recognized as a partner, even though he acquired that capital by gift. On the other hand, if the gift was made by a member of the donee's family, who continues as a partner, the proportion of the donee's interest in the partnership income must bear the same ratio to his capital as that of the donor; if in excess of that ratio, the excess would be taxed to the donor. In such a situation, it is also provided that, if the partnership agreement does not provide for a reasonable allowance for personal services rendered by the donor, a reasonable amount shall be attributed to such services, taxed to the donor and deducted from the taxable share of the donee of the partnership interest.

Section 149, mitigation of statute of limitations: The present section 3801 includes provisions dealing with certain situations in which one taxpayer is taxed on an item of income which has previously been erroneously taxed to another taxpayer, and is designed to avoid the Government's keeping both levies. As it stands now, however, such remedial effect does not apply except where the taxpayer who erroneously reported the income was, at the time of the erroneous reporting, related to the taxpayer who correctly reported the item of income, as (A) husband and wife, (B) grantor and fiduciary, (C) grantor and beneficiary, (D) fiduciary and beneficiary, legatee, or heir, (E) decedent and decedent's estate, or (F) partner.

The proposed amendment eliminates the requirement of relationship, so that if an item of income is taxed to any taxpayer, any other taxpayer who has already paid income taxes on the item will be entitled to a refund of such income taxes.

Section 150, net operating losses allowable to transferors and transferees in nontaxable reorganizations: Where there is a continuity of proprietorship in corporate reorganizations so that gain or loss on such transactions are not recognized for tax purposes, the nontax-recognized transaction should not establish a bar to the normal net loss carry-over and carry-back or the excess profits credit carry-over adjustments. Basis for assets and statutory invested capital are frozen in these transactions, and the successor is for all practical purposes indistinguishable from its transferor. Section 150 of the bill would permit the treatment of net loss carry-overs consistently with this identity, and section 192 would extend similar treatment to the excess profits credit carry-over.

Section 151, interest on deficiencies offset by overpayments for same year: In cases where there is an overpayment of excess profits tax and resulting underpayment of income tax, or vice versa, the taxing authorities charge interest on the entire underpayment from the due date of the return, but credit interest on the entire overpayment, only from the date it was paid, which may be the date of the last installment. Since the underpayment could have been paid in installments if it had been paid on time and since the amount of each installment of the overpaid tax was greater than was legally due, it is only fair to the taxpayer to set off the overpayment against the underpayment and charge or credit interest on the balance. However, present law does not permit this. The section proposal would require it.

Section 152, tax treatment upon death of partner: Partnership agreements often provide for payment of specified amounts of future partnership income to the estate or widow of a deceased partner. Such provisions are designed to produce roughly the equivalent of the decedent's interest in the assets, including his share of income earned by the partnership but not received or accrued at death. The tax status of such payments is uncertain under existing law. In some cases such payments have been taxed as income to the surviving partners and to the estate or widow of the deceased partner.

Section 152 excludes amounts so distributed from the distributive share of the surviving partners, except that this rule does not apply to that portion of the distributions which represents payments for decedent's interest in tangible and other assets of the partnership which have an adjusted basis in excess of zero. Amounts so excluded from income of the survivors are treated as income of the estate or widow of the decedent in the year received.

Section 153, gain or loss on sale or exchange of residence: Under existing law a gain realized upon the sale or exchange of a taxpayer's personal residence is taxable, but a loss so realized is not deductible from income. During the current inflation in real estate, many taxpayers who have been forced by circumstances to move their residences have been taxed upon large gains when they disposed of the old residence but have been forced to reinvest the entire proceeds or even more in order to obtain a new home. This has caused widespread complaint at taxation of ephemeral profits, and it is believed that relief is warranted.

The proposed section 153 limits the recognized gain to the cash and other benefits received and not reinvested, with appropriate provisions to cover anticipatory replacement cases and the rather complicated problem of assumed mortgages. It also provides that the cost of the new property shall be reduced by the amount of gain not recognized on sale of the prior residence or increased by the loss on such sale, as the case may be. The effect is that there is a continuing transaction from the purchase of the first residence until sale of the second, with no tax consequences (except for cash received and not reinvested) upon the disposition of the first residence.

Section 154, employees' stock options: In *Commissioner* v. *Smith* ((1945) 324 U. S. 177) the Supreme Court held that an employee who exercised a stock option which had been given him as compensation was taxable, at the time of exercise, upon the excess of the value of the stock at that time over the option price. Since then the Treasury has laid down such broad rules based upon the decision that it is impracticable for corporations to issue incentive options to their employees, since if the tax accrues at the time of exercise of the option a large part of the stock may have to be sold at once in order to pay the tax, which in some instances, at least, may be based on a paper profit which may never be realized in cash.

This proposal provides deferment of the tax until sale or other disposition of the stock, with appropriate provisions to prevent tax avoidance. It also provides that the taxable compensation cannot exceed the gain recognized on sale of the stock. If the option is sold prior to exercise the entire amount realized therefor is treated as taxable compensation to the extent that it exceeds the cost basis. The proposal is applicable only at the election of the taxpayer, who may elect to be taxed under the present rules if he so desires. It is believed that this proposal will facilitate use of stock options as an incentive factor, will provide a reasonably simple, workable set of rules, and will afford adequate protection of the revenue.

TITLE IA—EXCESS-PROFITS TAXES

Section 191, effective date of amendments: Except as otherwise specifically provided, this title becomes effective upon the enactment of the act.

Section 192, carry-overs and carry-backs allowable to transferors and transferees in nontaxable reorganizations: This is a companion provision to that appearing in section 150, discussed above.

As the law now reads, the excess profits credit carry-over or carry-back is allowed only to the taxpayer. If a corporation loses its identity in a reorganization, the new corporation cannot carry over the unused credit of the old company or companies; neither can an unused credit of the new company be carried back against the excess profits net income of the old company. This section would permit the normal application of these credits by respecting the substantial identity of the old and new corporation.

Section 193, source of preferred stock dividends paid in first 60 days of taxable year, in enacting section 718 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, Congress apparently desired the conclusive presumption there established as to the source of distributions made in the first 60 days of the taxable year to act as a deterrent to the postponement of distributions by corporations into a succeeding year—postponement often carried out in order that there might be, by this manipulation and timing, a minimization of the reduction of equity invested capital for the year. In the case of preferred stock, where periodical payments are provided for under charter or bylaw provisions, there is no such field for manipulation; and there is no need for the application of a conclusive presumption which may be contrary to actual fact. Section 193 amends section 718 (c) (2) of the code to make the conclusive presumption inapplicable in such cases, and leave the effect of such distribution upon equity invested capital to be tested factually during the first 60 days just as it is tested factually during the remainder of the year.

Section 194, computation of equity-invested capital: Prior to the amendment of section 718 of the code by section 219 of the Revenue Act of 1943, in computing the invested capital of a corporation which acquired all of the assets of another corporation solely for the voting stock, only the basis of the assets on hand at the time of the acquisition by the new corporation could be included in invested capital. In other words, the deficit of the old corporation which did not reduce its own invested capital did reduce the invested capital of the new corporation. Section 219 of the Revenue Act of 1942 was designed to overcome that result and to provide that the invested capital of the new company should be the same as the invested capital of the old company and that the deficit of the old company would not be applied to reduce the invested capital of the new company. In interpreting that section in T. D. 5267 (adding section 30.718-7 of Regulations 109, approved May 27, 1943), the Treasury has taken the position that section 219 does not apply to a tax-free exchange involving two or more transferors. Section 194 of this bill amends section 718 (c) (5) of the code to provide explicitly that, if a corporation acquires all of the assets of one or more corporations under the conditions set forth therein then the benefits of that section should be derived by the resulting corporation.

Section 195, review of abnormalities by the Tax Court: This section would change existing law in the following respects:

1. Restriction of assessment and collection of deficiency while application for relief pending: Since 1924, it has been provided by law that, except in certain unusual cases, a taxpayer may litigate taxes, other than excise taxes, before being called upon to pay them. However, under the excess-profits-tax provisions, as now interpreted by the Tax Court and administered by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Commissioner may determine a deficiency in excess-profits taxes and may proceed to assess and collect such deficiency even though the taxpayer has pending a claim for relief, which may or may not eliminate the deficiency in whole or in part. The bill would amend section 732 (a) so as to prohibit the assessment and collection of the proposed deficiency until the claim for relief is finally determined.

2. Tax Court jurisdiction where tax not paid: In *American Coast Line, Inc.*, v. *Commissioner* (6 T. C. 67 (affirmed 150 F. (2d) 665)), the Tax Court held that it had no jurisdiction to review a denial by the Commissioner of a claim for relief under section 722 where all of the statutory excess-profits tax had not been paid. A dissenting opinion in that case described the decision as ascribing an "inconsistent and inequitable" purpose to the Congress, since the statute provides that the taxpayer may withhold a part of the tax in dispute until the relief claim is determined. The bill would resolve this apparent inconsistency and make it clear that the Tax Court may pass upon such relief claims before the tax is paid.

Section 196, appellate court review of abnormalities: Sections 732 (c) and 732 (d) of the code provide that decisions of the Tax Court rendered in relief cases shall be reviewed only by a special division of the Tax Court, and that no review shall be had of such decisions by the court of appeals. The special division of the Tax Court permits no hearing on review of the trial judge's decision. This proposed amendment provides for review of such relief decisions by the full Tax Court, and for review of law questions by the courts of appeals in the same manner as other decisions of the Tax Court are reviewable.

TITLE II—ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES

Part I—Estate tax

Section 201, estates to which amendments applicable: Except as expressly otherwise provided, the amendments apply only to estates of decedents dying after the enactment of the act.

Section 202, rates and credits: The present estate tax rate structure is, for historical reasons, complicated and unwieldy and should be simplified. The proposed amendment combines credits and makes possible computation of the tax due by applying a single schedule to the net estate, which itself would be arrived at by subtracting a single specific exemption and then subtracting a single set of credits.

Section 203, proceeds of life insurance: This proposed amendment to section 811 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code would make it clear that insurance is to be treated like any other property, and affected by all provisions governing the inclusion of other property in a decedent's gross estate. When proceeds of policies are receivable by a beneficiary other than a decedent's estate and all of the incidents of ownership in respect to said policies were irrevocably transferred by the decedent during his lifetime, and not in contemplation of death, the proceeds of such policies should not be included in the gross estate. The present rule seems very unfair, in that life insurance, to the extent that the decedent has paid the premiums thereon, may not be assigned or transferred by complete and outright gift in such manner as to exclude the proceeds from the donor's taxable estate, although such a disposition can be made of any other kind of property.

Section 204, transfers in contemplation of death: This section of the bill amends section 811 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to gifts in contemplation of death, to provide that no property shal be included in an estate on a theory of contemplation of death if the transfer occurred more than 5 years prior to death. In enacting the contemplation-of-death provision, Congress intended to meet those situations where, in a very real sense, the transferor attempted to

get rid of his property at a time which bore some reasonable relation to impending death. Where the gift has occurred long prior to death the likelihood of tax motivation is remote, and—of equal importance in the satisfactory administration of the law—the problem of proof of the motive for the gift is so difficult as often to result in much unfairness, simply by virtue of the fact that the executor is unable to prove his case.

Section 206, exclusion of interest in employees' trusts: Section 165, while it exempts employees' trusts from income tax under certain conditions, subjects the beneficiaries of such trusts to income tax on the benefits received. It seems undesirable and probably not in accord with the intent of Congress to subject these benefits to both income and estate taxes; and it seems more logical that they should be subject to the income tax rather than to the estate tax. Yet there appear to be some indications in the law today that Federal estate and gift taxes might be applied to the value of a deceased employee's interest in a plan, and to a living employee's power to deal with such interest, respectively. Sections 206 and 207 of the bill would clarify this by amending sections 811 and 1000 of the Code so as to provide that employees' interests in trusts qualified under section 165 shall be exempt from Federal estate and gift taxes.

Section 208, optional valuation: Under present law, an executor can elect at the time he files the estate-tax return to value the property of the decedent as of the date of death or as of a date 1 year after death. This election, once made, cannot be changed. It sometimes happens that at the time the return is filed, the executor considers the election to be of no importance because the value of the gross estate is less than the specific exemption authorized by the law. If the Commissioner of Internal Revenue later increases the value of the gross estate by adding inter vivos gifts which the executor had considered not a part of the gross estate, the election may become most important.

The proposed amendment would make the election available to the executor of an estate not only at the time the return is filed, but also at the time the election becomes important because of the inclusion by the Commissioner of other assets in the gross estate, or because of the increased valuation of reported assets.

Section 207, deduction of expenses paid from nonprobate assets: Under the existing provisions of section 812 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, permissible deductions from the gross estate for administrative expenses, claims, and the like are only those which are recognized and permitted under laws of the jurisdiction within which the estate is being administered. As a consequence, where expenses have been incurred in connection with assets includable in the gross estate but not comprising a part of the probate estate, and such expenses have been properly paid out of nonprobate assets, a deduction for Federal estate tax has been denied. For example, in *Estate of Wright* (8 T. C. 531 (1947)), a deduction for attorney's fees paid by the beneficiary to collect life insurance which was included in the insured's taxable estate was disallowed. Section 207 of the bill would amend section 812 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow a deduction on account of administration and like expenses which are in fact paid out of assets included in the gross estate but not administered as part of the decedent's probate estate, or which are paid by the persons beneficially interested in such assets.

Section 208, time for claiming credit for State death taxes: Under existing law, the credit for State inheritance, estate, legacy, or succession taxes is allowable against the basic Federal estate tax only to the extent that such taxes are paid and the credit claimed within 4 years after the estate tax return is filed. Usually, the amount of State taxes payable cannot be finally ascertained until the Federal estate tax liability is settled. Where that settlement is not reached within 4 years after the Federal return is filed, the credit is lost to the extent of any State taxes paid after the expiration of the 4-year period. The proposed amendment will remedy that situation by extending the credit for taxes paid within 4 years after the Federal return is filed, or before the Federal estate tax is paid, whichever is later.

Section 209, credit for gift taxes: At the present time the Internal Revenue Code provides for a credit for gift taxes paid by a decedent during his lifetime. The limitations placed upon this credit, however, are such as to result in a disallowance of a large part of the amount actually paid as a gift tax in those cases where property on which a gift tax has already been paid is for some reason still required to be included in the gross estate. Section 209 of the bill would amend section 813 of the code to make the credit equal to the full amount of gift taxes that resulted from the prior taxation of the property transferred as a gift.

Section 210, deduction for litigation expenses: In Federal estate tax cases which must be litigated in the Tax Court, the district courts, or the Court of Claims, it is not always clear under what circumstances a deduction is allowable from the gross estate for attorneys' fees and other expenses incurred in such litigation. While the Tax Court has promulgated a rule under which such deductions may be allowed, the proposed amendment would make the deduction of these expenses allowable not only in the Tax Court, but in the other Federal Courts.

Section 211, limitation period for transferees: This section would amend section 900 (b) of the Code to provide that the period of limitation for assessment of the estate tax against a transferee or fiduciary shall be the same as the period of limitation for the assessment of such tax against the estate, except where the estate is insolvent. The Commissioner should be allowed the additional year to proceed against transferees only where the additional tax was asserted against the executor within the 3-year period but was uncollectible because the transfer left the estate insolvent. See comments on section 255, below.

Section 212, extension of period of limitation: Under existing law, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has no authority to enter into an agreement with a taxpayer to extend the time within which the estate tax or the gift tax may be assessed. Such authority does exist in the case of income taxes. The proposed amendment would extend such authority to estate taxes, and section 253 would accomplish the same result in the case of gift taxes. Occasions arise in which the absence of this authority means that settlement negotiations must be hurried, or that no real negotiations can be undertaken at all because of the shortness of time within which the Commissioner may assess the tax.

Section 213, lien for tax: This would amend section 827 of the code to provide that the lien imposed by the estate tax provisions will be subject to the same limitations as liens for income taxes when applied against purchasers for value and others in like situations, such as bona fide mortgagees and pledges and judgment creditors. Under the present law, the estate tax is a lien for 10 years against the gross estate—a lien which need not be recorded, and which attaches to the property in all but a few instances even though mortgaged, pledged, or sold to a bona fide purchaser for value. It does not attach to property sold to a bona fide purchaser by a transferee, trustee, beneficiary, etc., but does attach to property mortgaged or pledged by such persons and also to property sold by an executor to a bona fide purchaser. It is felt that estate tax liens, like liens for other taxes, should be recorded in order to be valid against mortgages, pledges, and bona fide purchases for value. Section 213 of the bill, therefore, makes the provisions of sections 3672–3679 of the code, which relate to recording release and enforcement of liens for other taxes, applicable to the estate tax.

Sections 214 and 256, powers of appointment: These provisions simplify sections 811 (f) and 1000 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to estate and gift tax on powers of appointment.

The present law taxes all powers to appoint, whether exercised or not, except two specified classes of powers. One of these exceptions relates to powers to appoint to certain near relatives. The other is intended to exempt fiduciary powers but has proved inadequate for the purpose.

The present law is artificial and complicated to apply, and tends to force property dispositions into narrow and rigid patterns. It was enacted in 1942, but applies to powers created before as well as after its enactment. A short period was originally provided for the release of preexisting powers without tax liability where such release was legally possible. This period has been repeatedly extended because of widespread dissatisfaction with various features of the law. The current extension expires June 30, 1950.

The new provision would take effect July 1, 1950. It treats powers created before the effective date of the 1942 act separately from those created thereafter. Before the 1942 act only the exercise of a general power of appointment was taxable. The 1942 act taxed the exercise of such powers, and also the possession of unexercised general powers, the exercise of many limited powers, and the possession of those limited powers although unexercised. It applied to powers already in existence as well as to those to be created in the future. As to powers created before the 1942 act, the present bill restores the law which was in force prior to 1942, with one minor change, to eliminate the "passing" problem.

The provisions of the 1943 act, taxing the exercise of limited powers of appointment and the mere possession of unexercised powers, constituted a radical innovation. They extended, or might be construed to extend, to emergency powers to invade principal, discretionary powers given to trustees, and other types of powers which had theretofore not been regarded as powers of appointment. The prior law, taxing only the exercise of general powers, had been in force for nearly 25 years. In 1942 there were in existence a great many powers which had been created years before, in reliance on the law as it then existed.

Experience with the practical application of the provisions of the 1942 act to preexisting powers has demonstrated that the pre-1942 law should be restored as to those powers, for the above and other reasons, among which are the following: The impracticability of reviewing all wills and trust agreements already in force in 1942, in order to discover whether they did or did not create powers which might be taxable under the new law; the fact that many such powers will not be discovered until it is too late for the donees to do anything about them; the fact that often such powers are not legally releasable, and in many cases where the power is legally releasable the donee (usually a trustee) feels under a moral obligation not to release it, or the release would seriously impair the arrangements made by the creator of the power for the benefit and protection of his family; powers will be released in most cases where it is possible to do so; and application of a new statute to preexisting powers will tend to promote litigation. Little or no revenue will accrue to the Government, and such as is received will come

from the unwary or those who are powerless to help themselves.

As to powers created after the passage of the 1942 act, the bill subjects to estate tax the possession of an unlimited, unrestricted power of appointment which is exercisable in favor of the decedent or his estate, whether or not the power is exercised, and subjects to gift tax the exercise or release of such a power. This includes a general beneficial power to appoint by will. It also includes an absolute right to consume principal. It provides a test of taxability which is simple, clear-cut, and easy to apply. It is the same test which is used in the marital deduction provisions of the Revenue Act of 1948 to determine whether a power of appointment given to a surviving spouse is such as to make her the virtual owner of the property.

No revenue consideration is involved. Experience under the 1942 act indicates that whether the statute is narrow or liberal, powers will be drawn so that the possession and exercise of them will be nontaxable. The 1942 act tends to encourage the use of inflexible dispositions of property and to discourage the use of individual trustees. Both of these developments are undesirable. Neither the power of appointment provisions of the 1942 act nor the present amendments will bring in any appreciable revenue. The most important consideration is to make the law simple and definite enough to be understood and applied by the average lawyer, and the present bill will accomplish that purpose.

PART II—GIFT TAX

Section 251, gifts of future interests: At present any gift of a future interest is subject to gift tax irrespective of amount. The proposed amendment to section 1003 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code would allow an exemption from gift tax of any gifts of future interests to the extent of $3,000 in any year for all such gifts. The purpose is to remove the necessity of many small returns, and since the exemption for each year is nominal in amount, the effect on the revenue would be negligible.

Section 252, lien for tax: See the comments relating to section 213, above. While section 1009 of the Code divests property sold to a bona fide purchaser of the lien, there is no protection for bona fide pledgees and mortgagees and no specific provision for recording the lien, and this amendment would apply to gift taxes the provisions of sections 3672–3679 of the Code, which relate to the recording, release, and enforcement of liens for other taxes.

Section 253, extension of period of limitation: See the explanation of section 212, above.

Section 254, adjustment of values after period for assessment: While the concept of a statute of limitations is firmly grounded in our law, in the tax field one situation has arisen which is technically not covered by any statute of limitations but which in actual practice should be. In certain cases the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has altered the values placed by the taxpayer on property transferred by gift, after the expiration of the statute of limitations with respect to the gift tax return on such property; or the Commissioner has gone back and revised certain exclusions which were allowed or which were not questioned at the time. The Commissioner has contended that, although he cannot assert any additional tax deficiency based on an outlawed gift, there is no statute of limitations to prevent his placing a subsequent gift in a higher tax bracket by revising values reported in returns for earlier barred years. The result is essentially the same as an extension of the statutory period, however long the time elapsed since the transfer. This amendment to section 1016 of the Code would prevent an increase in taxes for open years by a revision of gift tax returns for earlier years to which the statute of limitations bars the collection of additional taxes.

Section 255, limitation period for transferees: Section 1016 (a) of the code provides a 3-year period of limitation on the assessment of deficiencies in gift tax. Section 1009 makes the donee personally liable for taxes not paid when due, and section 1025 gives an additional year for assessment against transferees, including donees. As construed (See Evelyn N. Moore (1 T. C. 14, aff'd 146 F. (3d) 824)), the Commissioner is allowed 4 years to collect from the donee, even where no attempt was made to collect from the donor within the 3-year period and where the donor was at all times financially able to pay. For the same reasons stated in connection with section 211, above, it is proposed to amend section 1025 to give the additional year to proceed against the transferee only in cases where timely collection from the donor was prevented by his insolvency.

Section 256, powers of appointment: This section is explained by the comments on section 214, above.

Section 257, exclusion of interest in employees' trusts: This section is explained by the comments on section 206, above.

TITLE III—MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAXES

Section 301, sale price: Section 3441 of the code, prescribing methods for determining the sale price by which various manufacturers' excise taxes should be measured, originated as section 604 of the revenue bill of 1932, which became section 619 of the Revenue Act of 1932. The report of the Ways and Means Committee on that bill (H. Rept. No. 708, 72d Cong., 1st sess., pp. 37–38) showed the intent to base the tax on the normal factory price, and that where, by reason of the relationship of the parties, the price charged does represent a fair value, the tax should be on the same value as in the case of similar sales between independent parties. However, the courts have held that, where the manufacturer acts as distributor or sells through a controlled sales agency, the tax must be measured by the distributor's sale price, while the manufacturer who does not perform the economic function of distribution is taxed only upon the factory price. See *C. W. Fitch Co. v. U. S.* (323 U. S. 583); *Campana Corp. v. U. S.* (38 F. (2d) 400); *Aver & Co. v. U. S.* (38 F. Supp. 384). These inequities and discriminations would be audited by the proposed amendment to section 3441, which would exclude from the tax base in such situations costs attributable to selling and distribution, as distinguished from manufacturing.

Section 302, removal of conditions on refunds: This section would repeal section 3443 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code which requires, as a condition to the recovery of overpayment of manufacturers' excise taxes, that the person who paid the tax establish (1) that he has not included the tax in the price of the articles with respect to which it was imposed, or collected the amount of the tax from the vendee or (2) that he has repaid the amount of the tax to the ultimate purchaser of the article or has secured the written consent of the ultimate purchaser to the credit or refund. These limitations on refunds are grossly unfair in at least two respects. They impose an impossible burden of proof as a condition to the recovery of taxes which admittedly were illegally collected. Generally taxes are refundable upon showing simply that they were illegally collected. If any restriction based on equity is to protect the Government against refund, the burden of establishing the existence and the extent of the equity should be on the Government which asserts it; and if the equity cannot be established the legal rights should prevail. Moreover, the provisions unjustifiably discriminate against one who has promptly paid the taxes claimed of him and in favor of those who have withheld payment.

Section 303, appeals to Tax Court: This amendment would give the Tax Court of the United States jurisdiction over disputes involving manufacturers' excise taxes imposed by chapter 29 of the Internal Revenue Code. At the present time the Tax Court does not have such jurisdiction, and, in contrast with the procedure permissible with respect to income, estate and gift taxes, a person has no alternative but to pay manufacturers' excise taxes and litigate their correctness subsequently—an alternative which is unusually burdensome in view of the restrictions on refunds discussed under section 302, above.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

Amendments and provisions

Section 401, statement of grounds for deficiency: In some cases the Commissioner's notice of deficiency is not complete and the issues are not clarified by his answer to the petition. The Tax Court has held that in such cases it has no power to compel the Commissioner to state the basis for deficiency. Such power should be conferred upon the Tax Court and section 401 provides that this be done by an amendment to section 1111 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Section 402, small claims and settlement branch of the Tax Court: An increasing number of cases have been filed with the Tax Court involving small sums of money, and it is common knowledge that there are many more cases in which revenue agents determine deficiencies of a few hundred dollars, sometimes on more or less arbitrary grounds, and the taxpayer feels impelled to pay the tax because of the expenses of appealing to the Tax Court and going to some distant city to have the case heard according to formal court rules. The expense of such a proceeding and such travel may well amount to as much as the tax involved. The persons against whom such small amounts are determined are often people who can ill afford to pay such amounts.

The proposed amendment provides for the establishment of a small claims branch of the court to be administered by one judge of the court. The judge is authorized to appoint part-time commissioners in all of the collection districts throughout the United States who will hear these small cases in an informal manner similar to that prevailing in the small claims acts in effect in many States. All cases in which the deficiency or claim is less than $1,500 would be heard in this manner unless the petitioner expressly moves that his case be heard by the court in the usual manner. Provision is made for appeals from the commissioner to the judge of the court in charge of the small claims branch who will then decide the case appealed subject to review by the full court or by the appropriate court of appeals. Provision is also made that service of any person as a commissioner of the court under the proposed provisions shall not bar such person from acting as attorney in other cases against the United States. This last provision is believed important because it is hoped that the commissioners may be drawn from well-qualified lawyers who would serve in such capacity as a matter of public service thus assuring appointment of the high type of commissioners necessary to make such a plan a success.

Section 403, employment taxes; exemption of payments to employees' trusts: The administrative difficulties and burdens on employers arising from including payments under pension and profit-sharing plans in computing employment taxes are very substantial, because of the requirements as to records, reports and collection of the trivial additional taxes, and the problems arising in the computation of resulting benefits. It is, therefore, proposed to amend sections 1426 (a) and 1607 (b) of the code so as to eliminate from Federal employment taxes all contributions to and distributions from pension and profit-sharing trusts.

Interoceanic Canals—Modern Arms and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my studies on the defense problems of interoceanic canals, and their relation to national security, during the past 2 years, I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of able papers and discussions by eminent authorities dealing with the broad subject of the atomic bomb, and the effect on national security and defense.

Most of these were the thoughtful productions of experienced officers with active service in the armed forces during World War II. Another timely contribution of major importance concerning the newest weapons and agencies of warfare, by Dr. Vannevar Bush, regarded as the foremost scientific military authority, was published in the February 1950 issue of Reader's Digest as a condensation of his recent book entitled, "Modern Arms and Free Men."

Dr. Bush, as Director of the Office of Research and Development during World War II, coordinated the work of 30,000 scientists, engineers, and technicians then engaged on the military and naval modern-weapons program. This position, he states, enabled him to observe "as much as any single man can see what science has done and can still do to the art of warfare." In his book he has most opportunely recorded his observations in a convenient form for others to share as "part of the obligation of any citizen who has been given such responsibility and opportunity." In this way he has published the essence of a vast and invaluable experience that should be of ever-increasing value in the future.

In my previous discussions I have regularly stressed the obvious deductions to be drawn from the writings of the distinguished authorities thus quoted by me, to the effect that any type of canal is vulnerable, regardless of its features of design; and that the defense of the Panama Canal, or of any other interoceanic waterway which may be constructed, depends on the combined might of the armed forces of the United States, supported by our industrial capacity, plus such local protective means as may be employed.

Underlying all that power, however, and fundamental thereto, as so ably presented by Dr. Bush and demonstrated during World War II, is the widespread scientific and technical ability of the American people. His study, though fully recognizing the terrifically destructive force of the atomic bomb, shows that the only defense against such weapons are potent military and naval organizations under capable leaders. In this respect he emphasizes that the combination of active protective measures and modern defense installations have reduced the ability of an enemy to reach the target; and that the future is far less dreadful and frightening than many have been led to believe. All this emphasizes the other all-indispensable factor I have sought always to stress: this, that the spirit, morale, and alertness of a free people must underly and support every agency and effort of defense.

The thesis of Dr. Bush strongly reinforces the central idea I have persistently presented to the Congress, viz, that the defense of any type of interoceanic canal like the defense of the ports, waterways, railroads, dams, locks, public utilities, and industrial facilities in the United States, is an over-all responsibility of the Federal Government, and depends primarily upon timely active defense measures of our armed forces, supported by the national economy and industrial capacity. It does not, and cannot, depend upon mere passive defense features, such as may be embodied in plans for construction.

In the light of information I have included in my previous remarks it is unmistakably clear that the interpretations, which have made the security and national-defense features in the report made pursuant to Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress, supreme considerations and determinate, are entirely too narrow. The great volume of data on the atomic bomb, published since the submission of the report under the indicated law; that is to say, in December 1947, clearly indicates that the security and national-defense factors, as thus urged, are entirely obsolescent and outmoded, and should not be controlling in the designing of navigational projects.

Thus, the disposal of this argument of defense reduces the problem of planning to its true criteria, to wit, the operational refinements and capacity of the present high-level-lake type of canal.

To make Dr. Bush's study readily available to the Government—especially to the committees of Congress with legislative jurisdiction over interoceanic canals, navigable waterways, and national defense—under leave accorded, I am extending my remarks to include its full text; and I respectfully commend its careful consideration. It follows:

MODERN ARMS AND FREE MEN

(Condensed from the book by Vannevar Bush, scientific military authority. He was director during World War II of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, which coordinated the work of 30,000 scientists, engineers, and technicians)

Is it true that a new all-out war, with atomic bombs and biological warfare, would destroy civilization? Can a democratic regime develop great military strength without distorting its true nature?

There are no precise answers to these questions, just as there is no complete answer to the bigger problem of how to avoid another war. But I believe the technological future is far less deadly and alarming than we have been led to think, and that the hopeful aspects of modern applied science outweigh by a heavy margin its threat to civilization. I believe also that the democratic process is itself an asset with which, if we can find the enthusiasm and the skill to use it and the faith to make it strong, we can build a world in which all men can live in prosperity and peace.

When the First World War ended there were in existence nearly all the elements for scientific warfare. For all the technical devices used in the second war, except only atomic energy, practically every basic technique had appeared by 1918, waiting only development. But the world then went to sleep on the subject, so the Second World War began almost where the first one ended. There were a few exceptions, of course, such as developments in aeronautics, in radar and sonar, and in the science of the atom. However, the whole gamut of new ordnance devices—rockets, recoil-less guns, guided missiles, proximity fuzes, bazookas, frangible bullets—waited for the pressure of war for development. And they then appeared largely outside the organized system of ordnance development, and sometimes in spite of it. Certainly in this country almost no scientific progress on military devices emanated solely from military laboratories or military men.

The Second World War was, far more than the first, a war of applied science. The great campaigns that swept across continents and oceans eventually drew heavily on the whole accumulated stock pile of fundamental scientific knowledge. Should a new war have to be fought in a decade or so, there will be innovations, but probably no such burst of new devices as accrued when organized science first turned its full effort into war, all but exhausting the great unused accumulations of the past.

WAR ON LAND MAY END IN DEADLOCK

There is no longer any such thing as land warfare, exclusively. Amphibious operations and the interaction of air operations with the movement of armies ended all that.

When the Second World War opened actively, with Hitler's offensive on the western front, it soon became evident that the deadlock on land, characteristic of the first great war, was virtually a thing of the past. Masses of mobile artillery could prepare holes, and cavalry in the form of the tank-air team could exploit them. Hitler conquered the Continent because his army had so perfected this method that it overwhelmed customary resistance.

From this fact it would be easy to jump to the false conclusion that the deadlock on land had been permanently and universally broken. Actually, the facilities of defense had improved enormously, and the means of successful break-through in 1940 had become utterly obsolete by 1944. In the final break-through many new factors were present: Long preparation by bombardment of communications, exhaustion of the enemy after 5 years of war, the finest armies the world has seen, effective coordination of allies in the field for the first time in history, unprecedented industrial production, and magnificent leadership.

One of the new primary aids to the defense that appeared in the interval was the use of great quantities of land mines. In the contest between land mines and means for removing them, the mines won out. Portable devices for detecting metallic mines were successfully developed; but they did not work for plastic mines. Dogs were taught to smell out mines—but there are too many ways of tricking dogs for this to be of much use. Great rollers, pushed ahead of tanks, had some success, but not much; an occasional very large land mine could wreck them. "Snake"—pieces of hose full of explosive, capable of being pushed ahead or pulled ahead by a small rocket—could be exploded to clear a lane. Tanks equipped with these devices could proceed, provided the tank itself was not destroyed, but this was a laborious method indeed for fields of great depth. The Russians ignored the fields, moved ahead, and accepted the losses. These could be very large, for example, when mines were built to project a can of explosive into the air to explode there and spread fragments over an area. Russian losses as they advanced reflect this fact. The days when hordes by their mere number could overwhelm fully prepared positions approached their end.

Moreover, toward the end of the war, a defensive element entered that the Germans did not have: the proximity fuze. In the old method, the shell was timed to explode at a chosen distance above the ground; it was not very precise and could be used only when one could see the target area. The proximity fuze contains a little radio set that triggers off the shell at a predetermined distance above the ground. No observation of bursts and no difficult presetting are necessary.

This fuze increased the effectiveness of artillery against personnel in the open by perhaps ten times, and this gain was equivalent to having ten times as much artillery at work. When artillery effect is multiplied against moving men there is a strong turn in favor of the defense. The proximity fuze appeared in land use in December 1944, at the Battle of the Bulge. On the northern side of the break-through it caught German troops in the open, in the fog, at road intersections, as they advanced, and it spread consternation. Its power was by no means fully exploited; this was a first use, and artillery officers, and especially the high command, did not appreciate what had been placed in their hands. Yet, by means of this fuze, together with air effort as the fog lifted, the lack of fuel on the German side, determined resistance and adroit movement of divisions, the break-through was stopped. The proximity fuze may well have saved Liége.

Mere combinations of tanks and men cannot penetrate a mine field covered by artillery or mortars with proximity fuzes. The tank, moreover, nearly met its match in the last war; perhaps it should have. A relatively small explosive charge can be constructed that, if properly shaped to focus its effect, and triggered off at the right instant and in the right manner, can penetrate the thickest armor a tank can carry. This was the principle used in the bazooka, a light rocket-firing weapon that could be carried and fired by one man. Its muzzle velocity was very low, its precision was poor, it was dangerous to use, but it could stop a tank, and its advent was new strength for the infantry.

The recoilless gun was another innovation that spelled difficulty for the tank. This gun shot forward and backward at the same time. It sounds like an inventor's lurid dream, but the forward effort gave a projectile good muzzle velocity and precision in a rifled barrel, while a backward blast through an orifice removed the recoil and was harmless unless someone inadvertently got close behind the gun. The importance of the gun was that it produced a powerful, hard-hitting, relatively inexpensive weapon of low silhouette, readily moved and used by a couple of men. This weapon and the shaped charge such as was used by the bazooka were never combined. There seems no inherent reason why they should not be. A tank exposed to such weapons would have a short life.

Techniques for airborne-infantry assault were much improved during the war. But the experience of Crete, Normandy, Arnhem, the Rhine crossings showed rather well that the airborne assault is an auxiliary to the advance rather than a means of starting wide sweeps behind the enemy lines. There might be a place for airborne assault in connection with surprise invasion on the scale of an enlarged Pearl Harbor, although this is doubtful. Airborne attempt to penetrate a line adequately protected by early warning, radar, and with fast interceptor planes, would be suicide.

There is a strong indication, therefore, that the defense may again be in the ascendant in land warfare, that the deadlock of the First World War might well reappear if antagonists substantially equal from the standpoint of skilled use of ample technical devices met again at a long land frontier. This might merely throw the weight of the effort elsewhere, but it is an important factor to consider as we look to the future.

Amphibious warfare is another matter. Certainly we can be sure that if neither antagonist could penetrate the enemy lines on land neither could do so by amphibious methods on a thoroughly defended coast. For the difficulties of the landing itself are superposed upon those of penetrating a prepared line and exploiting the break-through. Even if there is no line at all, a successful landing involves dominance in the sea and air and suppression of the enemy under the sea. Obviously we need not fear invasion in the foreseeable future, if we are armed and ready.

THE WAR AT SEA TODAY

The last conflict may well have seen the end of that most dramatic of the scenes of war: the clash of great fleets. The evolution of sea warfare in World War II, from a technical standpoint, revolved about radar. Radar had its real origin in 1925, when two physicists sent out short radio pulses and studied their reflections from the ionosphere, the conducting layers above the earth that reflect radio waves. There are two ways of using radiation to find the distance to an object: one, to examine the interference pattern of continuous radiation, and the other, to send a short pulse of radiation and examine the echoes. The first was used in the proximity fuze, and is excellent for short distances. The second readily won out as the better for naval use.

Using cathode-ray tubes in much the same way that a television tube displays a scene, radar can make the earth visible from a plane above the clouds, in fog, or at night, with a detail as though one had a map spread out before him. Such an instrumentality was bound to revolutionize many departments of warfare, and it did, especially on the sea.

There were great fleets of fighting ships in existence when the war started. As always, in naval shooting war, the decision in the long run went to the ships that could shoot straightest, soonest, and under most difficult conditions. After stumbling beginnings, we could shoot best, for we had the best radar.

The war ended, or became a contest against a relatively unskilled or unequipped enemy, before the full evolution of warfare on the surface of the sea had run its course. So one development of great potential significance that appeared did not come into full use. This was the guided, or homing bomb.

GUIDED BOMB VERSUS SURFACE SHIP

Bombing from moderate or high altitudes with ordinary bombs is a very haphazard affair. It is quite possible, however, to guide a bomb after it is released, and throughout the half minute or so of its fall, and thus attain real accuracy. This can be done either automatically or with manual controls. With a manual control, the bombardier holds a small joystick; as he moves this, so the bomb moves, for plane and bomb are connected by radio to transmit his signals. He can either watch the actual ship and the actual bomb, or he can watch two radar pips on a screen that correspond to the ship and the bomb, and a simple computer can help his judgment. In the automatic form all this is done by a mechanism inside the bomb itself, operating by radar or by thermal controls.

The Nazis first introduced this device in the Mediterranean during the Italian campaign, apparently prematurely and before sound engineering had made it reliable. Its performance was erratic and the bombs flew all over the sky. Nevertheless, the basic concept was sound and the weapon decidedly formidable. One wonders what would have happened if it had been really perfected and then put into use as a surprise and in ample quantity. As it was, it sank ships and was decidedly disagreeable to meet.

We introduced several forms of guided bombs and used them in eliminating the remnants of the Japanese Navy. In Burma, where an air effort to take out important bridges had been under way for a long time without much success, controlled bombs took them out promptly, the records indicating that one controlled bomb was worth a hundred ordinary ones. But most of the forms came too late to be of much use; in the European theater they did not catch on, largely because no really precision bombing was being attempted there except in support of troops, where rocket-equipped planes did very well.

In the future, guided bombs may be important indeed. With ordinary bombs, which fly many miles horizontally as they drop, high-altitude bombers cannot hit the side of a barn—they cannot even hit a small city with any assurance. The guided bomb alters this whole situation. It can hardly be made to hit with certainty a confused target such as one building in a city. But a great ship alone on the sea is a clear target to radar, and thus for a guided bomb.

Is there any effective defense against the very high bomber using guided bombs? If there is not, the days of large fighting ships—carriers as well as battleships—are over. In all probability, there is a defense, but how effective it may be will be questionable for a long time to come. In a possible future war, if it should occur while the world has its present general interrelationships, the only enemy fleet of any moment would be a submarine fleet.

SUBMARINES REMAIN THE SEA THREAT

The First World War showed the ability of the submarine to interrupt commerce, even though the U-boats of those days were clumsy, fragile affairs. In the interval of peace two things happened, one to the advantage of the submarine, one to its disadvantage. The submarine acquired more underwater speed, longer endurance, and a tougher hull. By the time the Second World War opened it could submerge rapidly to several hundred feet and maneuver in tight circles. The submarine could always use listening devices just as well as a surface craft could, and this fact, added to better performance, made the old forms of attack on the submarine practically obsolete. The depth charge, even when the second war began, was nothing but an ashcan filled with TNT with a hydrostatic fuse to explode it at a given depth, and it sank at a rate of only 5 feet per second, so that the submarine had considerable time in which to get out of the way.

However, during the peace a very important means of detection had been developed in naval laboratories both here and in England. Called sonar, the device is to underwater detection what radar is to air. The ship carrying it emits a pulse of relatively high-frequency sound and then examines the pattern of returning echoes. By timing the interval, and by a directional receiver, the distance and direction of the submarine can be obtained. Sonar can also determine the depth of the enemy.

It is important to note that radar pulses cannot travel more than a few feet under water. Moreover, there are strict limits as to what can be done with sonar pulses and their reflections, because of attentuation of the signal and confusion of echoes from the bottom, so that a few thousand yards under good conditions seems to be the limit of range. There is no such thing under water as radar's range of many miles in air, and searching craft were further hampered by the fact that their sonar would not work at high speeds. Still, sonar seemed to be the answer to the submarine as it existed during World War II.

Perhaps it would have been, if there had been an equal advance in attack weapons, but we entered the war with the same old subcans and held to them tenaciously even though they were clearly outdated. The undisputed power of sonar gave us overconfidence, and we paid for this later in excessive sinkings.

The submarine war developed into a race between techniques, and for a long time the issue was in doubt. By late 1942 sinkings of surface ships had mounted to the point where they threatened to cut us off from Europe and terminate our land efforts. By the spring of 1943, however, the power of new antisubmarine devices became decisive. Let us examine the methods of attack that saved the situation.

There were two great methods of broad search, highly effective at the time, and now both obsolescent or greatly reduced in value. The first of these was direction finding by radio. Through an error that will probably not be repeated, the Germans communicated by radio from Berlin with their submarines continuously throughout the war. Doing so enabled them to pass on information in regard to the position of convoys and to assemble their wolf packs for attack. But it was a boon to us. Radio stations listening to their messages could take cross bearings and give a rough position of the sending submarine. Consequently, we generally knew about where the enemy was located and could plan accordingly.

The second great method was that of radar. The submarines of the day had to spend a considerable fraction of their time on the surface to charge their batteries. When on the surface they could be detected by radar at a distance of 20 or 30 miles. A radar-equipped plane could therefore sweep great areas, as much as 5,000 square miles an hour. Even the enormous areas of the open ocean begin to yield when fleets of planes are thus equipped.

THE HUNTER-KILLER GROUP

The most deadly combination, however, was the hunter-killer group. A small aircraft carrier plus other surface antisubmarine craft accompanied a convoy, or left it for direct attack upon a U-boat concentration. Radar sweeps gave the necessary knowledge of position, and specially equipped aircraft, alone or in combination with the surface craft pressed home the attack. When we thus carried the war to the enemy, the tide began to turn.

Magnetic airborne detection, MAD, also appeared. While severely limited in range, it could find a submerged submarine by the distortion the submarine produced in the earth's magnetic field. The device never came to full fruition and was used mostly in blimps in coast defense. Yet it very neatly denied the passage of the Straits of Gibraltar to submerged submarines proceeding quietly with the tide, after all other means had failed.

The sono buoy represented some means and was particularly useful from aircraft. One cannot listen to a submarine's underwater noise from an aircraft or for that matter from a surface craft at high speed. But one can drop a small buoy to lie quietly on the surface, listen through a microphone that it lowers to suitable depths, and broadcast by radio what it hears. A submarine submerged after having been sighted on the surface by radar was no longer safe even if no surface hunting ships were present. Aircraft could keep contact with it by rings of sono buoys, each dutifully sending its identification signal and the news of the submarine's progress. Aircraft, in relays if necessary, could thus keep the submarine under surveillance until its underwater endurance was exhausted and it was forced to surface, or until surface craft could arrive and take up the trail by sonar. Moreover, new weapons appeared for attacking it while it was still submerged.

The large depth charge, which lost its combat value when submarine hulls became so thick that a nearly direct hit was necessary for lethal effect, was replaced by forward-throwing weapons which could spray a pattern of small charges well ahead of the attacking ship, by spigot guns or rockets. These charges sank rapidly, and when one hit the hull of a submarine it blasted out a hole bound to be lethal. The weapon was designed to cover an area with a pattern of charges like a shotgun pattern, leaving no gaps, and thus shooting became more deadly. Most important, it could be directed to one side or the other in accordance with last-second sonar observations and could be fired while the submarine was still under sonar contact, not after the attacking vessel in passing over the submarine had lost contact.

SUBMARINE-KILLING PLANES

The rocket-carrying plane was appallingly effective. To the U-boat crew on deck at night it must have been really terrifying. A high-speed plane, having located the submarine by radar, could come diving in at a moderate angle, switch on a blinding light for a final guidance or fire by radar alone. In the few moments of attack it had the fire power of a whole battery of field artillery. Its most deadly weapon was a rocket with a solid head. This was aimed to hit well short of the submarine; it had a long, shallow underwater trajectory; when it hit a submarine it went clear through, leaving a gaping hole on both sides and chaos within. Few submarines caught by surprise on the surface by such a plane could hope to survive.

It almost appeared that in the presence of the plane, radar and other deadly devices for attack, the day of the submarine was over, not only for the war but permanently. It might have been, except for two new and important improvements in submarines themselves, introduced by the Germans. If they had come soon enough they might have changed the course of the war. But when the Germans finally brought them out the battle had become much too one-sided for them to restore the balance.

These two innovations were the high-speed submarine equipped with snorkel, and the long-range torpedo.

The importance of the high-speed, relatively quiet submarines designed by the Germans lies in the fact that they can readily get into position for convoy attack and escape afterward. In fact, if they can outrun the surface antisubmarine craft, or travel at such speed that the latter's acoustic devices are greatly limited, they are much to be feared. They step up the pace at sea. During the past war we ran such ships as the *Queen Mary* safely without convoy because they were faster than the enemy submarines. If the submarine speed is the same as or greater than that of such ships, this method is ended.

The snorkel, however, is even more important than mere speed. The snorkel is merely a pipe arranged so that the submarine can run submerged on its engines, with a small end of the pipe sticking out, like a swimmer breathing through a long straw. An ingenious contrivance prevents difficulty if the seas slop over the top of the pipe by momentarily closing the pipe so that no water enters, and this is the real technical advance. In the brief intervals when the pipe is closed, the engines draw their air from the hold of the submarine, with some crew discomfort, but otherwise without reducing performance. A snorkel is very hard to see, either by radar or by eye, especially when there is a bit of sea running. It does not make the submarine completely immune to radar search, but it decidedly decreases the possibility of discovery. It is undoubtedly possible to build submarines that run on their engines when completely submerged, thus dispensing even with the snorkel.

The long-range torpedo introduces an element of surprise that is highly significant. The point is that the range of sonar against submarines is limited, and the range of a torpedo can be made to exceed it if one makes the torpedo large and expensive enough. Thus, if the submarine can fire a deadly torpedo from well outside sonar range, the advantage seems to be entirely with the submarine, which can pick off the escorts of a convoy and then close in for the kill.

The fact that emerges is that the day of the submarine is by no means over. If we entered a war soon, against a technically and industrially strong enemy, and if that enemy could effectively apply modern devices at sea, we should have the whole job of overcoming the submarine to do over again on a new and unattractive basis. Again we should face the severe threat that a nearly immune submarine fleet might determine the outcome of the war in favor of the enemy. Many of the successful methods of the last war are now obsolete against the truly modern submarine. There is no cure-all. To cope with the situation we need to be forging ahead in a dozen fields of difficult technical effort.

The situation is by no means hopeless, of course. If a submarine can be pinned down by air cover, using sono buoys, MAD and diverse other devices, it can most certainly be disposed of, and it will not matter whether or not it is a modern submarine of high speed and long submergence. We may have to adopt new tactics, perhaps, to clear and protect sea lanes rather than to convoy. We may have to depend more than in the past upon mines and upon blocking the submarine in its ports. More probably, we shall employ methods and devices not now fully visualized and developed as experience with modern submarines may indicate. The job will be touch. It can certainly be done.

Twice in recent history aggressors have sought to cut the world apart by submarine and thus to prevail. Twice they have failed. We must make sure that a third similar attempt would also fail. For this assurance we need a vigorous program in the hands of a virile and generously supported Navy, in the closest of cooperation with science and technology throughout the country. We need a Navy intent on the full accomplishment of its main mission, and not diverted by the sirens of more spectacular fields, or arguing on the defensive in regard to its importance as compared with any other service.

IN THE AIR: IS MASS BOMBING OBSOLETE?

Dogfighting in the air, as a determining feature of really modern war, is probably now a thing of the past. The appearance of the jet fighter changed that. Jet engines increased the disproportion between the performance of the long-range bomber and the short-duration fighter. They made speeds in the air so high and turning radii consequently so large that dogfights became almost impossible. Jet engines increased the effectiveness of the fighters' operation over their own territory with the aid of land facilities, and correspondingly decreased the possibility of defending bomber fleets by accompanying fighters. They may well have made mass bombing at moderate altitudes against an alert enemy obsolete.

To understand this, one needs to remember radar's part in defense. First, the long-range early-warning installation, located on coasts, or borders, capable of detecting planes as far as the curvature of the earth permits—at 200 miles or so if the incoming planes are high. Second is the interceptor-control radar which places on the cathode-ray screen images of all the planes within its range in the sky. Finally, there is the radar on the interceptor planes themselves, used to effect the final contact, and even to fire the guns. To penetrate a defense thus equipped is an appalling task for any bomber fleet.

We have one more threat to the bomber to consider—the guided missile. Two developments have led to the guided missile: the advent of automatic controls and the appearance of new ways of projecting a body through space. Soon after large planes came into use there appeared, also, automatic devices for handling them, notably the automatic pilot. This takes over on a long flight, steers a straight course at constant elevation, allows for all the bumps and deviations, and gives the pilot relief. Now here were all the elements of one sort of guided missile—an aircraft with no crew, adapted to be preset and to fly to a designated target, carrying a load of explosives.

In addition, a number of new engines for propelling aircraft were developed during the war. The simplest by far was the ram-jet. It is merely an open tube. Its own motion—it needs 3,000-miles-per-hour speed to work well—produces sufficient compression at the front end to blast hot gas out the rear and keep it going. A fire in the middle of the tube to heat the gas is the essential mechanism.

To drive short-range, high-speed missiles, the ram-jet is almost ideal. It can be shot out of a gun or driven by rockets to reach the desired high speed, and thereafter it can travel at bullet speed or higher and keep going for ten or perhaps a hundred miles. Over short ranges it certainly can be aimed in the vicinity of the target, and from there it appears that reasonably complex homing devices might bring it to the point where its proximity fuse could detonate it with lethal effect to an aircraft. The device is in its infancy, and only time will tell what can be accomplished with it. Its significance lies in the fact that it appears to be the great future enemy of the bomber.

Let us assume that devices of this sort can indeed attain a range of, say, 50 miles, and that with that range they can home with precision and a reasonable percentage of hits upon a bomber. Certainly the bomber cannot maneuver out of the way of a missile that comes in with the speed of a shell from a gun. Certainly it cannot survive a hundred pounds or so of high explosive detonated in close proximity. Perhaps the bomber can jam the controls of the missile, if it knows the missile is coming and knows its combinations of frequency, but the advantage here seems to lie with those on the ground, who can choose a variety of systems, so that if one is encountered others are not.

The days of mass bombing may be approaching their end. If so, it is a good thing for the world.

INTERCONTINENTAL ROCKETS UNLIKELY

No weapons in the form of pilotless aircraft appeared during the last war until near the end. The single entry in this field was the German V-1, the buzz bomb that began in June 1944 to harass London. This was just a self-controlled aircraft, redesigned for the specific purpose of bombing a city 30 miles in diameter, from a range of 200 miles. The air frame of the V-1 was made simple and inexpensive for quantity production. Its motor was an exceedingly simple affair, cheap to build and capable of running only for an hour or two before it was worn out. Each V-1 carried about a thousand pounds of high explosive. Had the Germans been able to launch these devices at the rate of about 3,000 per day as they had intended, they might well have stopped the invasion. But the device was highly vulnerable in the light of concurrent developments in antiaircraft artillery.

London, left wide open by the diversion of antiaircraft batteries to Normandy when the invasion occurred, suffered heavily from the buzz bombs for a while. When the batteries were replaced with radar-controlled guns, electrical computers and proximity fuzes, the buzz bombs made almost ideal targets, flying slowly at constant altitude and in a straight line. Ultimately the defense brought down some 85 percent of the buzz bombs that came within range. The buzz bomb was very decidedly countered.

The German V-2, unlike the V-1, was a true rocket, not a pilotless aircraft. It was an expensive and complex affair, involving great ingenuity and remarkable engineering skill. Its propulsive force was produced by a great blast of hot gases ejected to the rear. It flew in an arc, 75 miles up into the stratosphere, and descended at 3,000 miles per hour, well above the speed of sound, so that its arrival was not heralded, and one heard the roar of its passage through the air only after its ton of high explosive had detonated.

It was a guided missile in a certain limited sense. Its propulsion, which occurred only in its first flight up through the atmosphere, was somewhat erratic, so that its flight was watched by radar during this brief interval, and radio signals were transmitted to cut off its propulsion at the optimum instant. After that it flew in a free trajectory, and its precision was far from good.

Will high-trajectory guided missiles of this sort soon be spanning thousands of miles and precisely hitting chosen targets? Some eminent military men, exhilarated perhaps by a short immersion in matters scientific, have publicly asserted that they will be. We have been regaled by scary articles, complete with maps and diagrams, implying that soon we are thus all to be exterminated, or that we are to employ these devilish devices to exterminate someone else. All sorts of prognostications of doom have been pulled from Pandora's box of science, and these have had influence on the resolution and steadiness with which we face a hard future, and they have done much harm, vague as they are. But this one is explicit, and we can treat it.

The German V-2, of 200-mile range, carrying a ton of explosive, was nearly at the limit of effective range for a chemically propelled single-stage rocket. Its range can be substantially increased in three ways: Its payload may be decreased until at 400 miles or thereabouts it will carry no explosive whatever; its size and its cost may be increased to carry the present payload a greater distance, though range does not go up in direct ratio to size; it can be made into a multi-stage affair, with an enormous rocket giving birth, when it has done its work, to a smaller one that proceeds from there, and so on. If we are content to pay millions of dollars for a single shot at a distant target, it can be done in this way for any stated distance.

No escape from this dilemma is to be had in new chemical fuels. We are already near the limit of the amount of energy that can be chemically packed into a given weight. But doesn't the availability of atomic energy change this situation? Perhaps the best reply is that it is a close thing whether atomic energy can compete on a cost basis with chemical fuels for producing energy for commercial purposes even under the relatively easy conditions on the ground, where weight and space are not limited.

As we have stated, a rocket can be made to fly vast distances if one disregards costs. But can such a missile be made to hit anything at the end of its flight? The V-2 could be made to hit with reasonable frequency within 15 miles of a point of aiming at a range of 200 miles. A similar missile flying 2,000 miles could be depended upon to hit within 150 miles of its target with reasonable frequency. This performance can certainly be improved upon perhaps by adding to the missile instruments of precision, sights, and homing aids. It could then hit a target, perhaps within 10 miles, perhaps even within a mile or two if all went very well indeed.

Its cost would be astronomical. As a means of carrying high explosive, or any toxic substitute therefor, it is a fantastic proposal. If we employed it in quantity we would be economically exhausted long before the enemy.

There is a common notion that during war costs do not count. There is no greater fallacy. The error comes from the belief that civilian resources are unlimited. They are not. Costs are more important in war than at any other time, for the need for over-all effectiveness is then more imperative. Every development and procurement of a useless device detracts just that much from progress along highly necessary lines.

Before we devote a large amount of manpower and materials to building an expensive missile, we should be very sure it is going to damage the enemy more than the strain of building it damages us. No industrial concern would launch a development without prior cost studies or without causing it to run the gantlets of tough-faced engineers with sharp pencils. Military organizations can proceed without this unpleasant preliminary skirmishing, and often do.

NO WEAPON IS ABSOLUTE

What will war be like if it comes to the world in total form? It would involve intricate techniques, some of them new, but it would be no affair of push buttons. In fact, except for the greater use of the atomic bomb, it would not differ much from the last struggle.

No man can predict the future of the atomic bomb with certainty, but it is now clear that such bombs are expensive and will remain so. Of course radical short cuts in their manufacture may be found, but many of the best physicists, chemists and engineers of this country, and of Great Britain and Canada, have been seeking such a process now for nearly a decade. They have examined every conceivable approach, and they have not found it.

A large proportion of the cost of atomic bombs comes from the production of fissionable material itself; hence there is an accumulative factor which warrants close attention. Money spent in peacetime for weapons that deteriorate or become obsolescent may be money largely lost. But fissionable materials deteriorate very slowly, and they can be stored. In preparing for a war that may be remote, there is thus a considerable reason for concentrating on the weapon that is sure to last until needed, and this is especially important for democracies that fight when they must, not when they choose.

The atomic bomb is for the immediate future a very important but by no means an absolute weapon, that is, one so overpowering as to make all other methods of waging war obsolete. Indeed there is no sign whatever of the emergence of any device so deadly that it makes all others obsolete, and this applies to gas, the spreading of radioactive poisons, and biological warfare. The war gases have improved, but the means of delivering them have become more difficult as means of defense have improved. The spreading of radioactive substances offers great difficulties, and although the biological sciences have made spectacular advances which can be utilized in the spreading of diseases, they are also producing marked results on the side of protection. The theory that world conditions have so altered as to make biological warfare more effective is not supported by the facts.

If all-out war came tomorrow, or in a few years, or at any time before our enemy had a considerable stock of atomic bombs, would it destroy civilization? It certainly would not. War would again be a brutal contest, evil and distressing; the damage would be large, and we should share in it, but we would by no means be knocked out, and we would win it. Unless we get soft, unless we are clumsy in meeting the tactics

of cold war, we are not in immediate danger. If war begins, and the opening settles into a slugging match, the ultimate advantage will lie with that nation which has scientific and technical ability widespread among the people, industrial capacity and versatility, and a determined will to prevail. It is here that our strength lies, and it is in these aspects that we must preserve it.

A NEW PEARL HARBOR?

We ourselves cannot force a war, striking at some time when the advantage lies with us. For if we did then embark on a prophylactic war, we should lose the very freedoms we cherish; these freedoms would have to be suppressed to cause us to embark on such a course. We would not strike, because our moral sense as a free people would not allow us to do so; we would not strike, because we would sense that we would lose our birthright if we did.

Totalitarian states are bound by no such inhibitions. Indeed one thing is certain: if another great war is started by a dictator, it will be opened by a smashing, great surprise offensive calculated to paralyze us before we are aroused. He would send his submarine fleets to sea and place them on strategic trade routes, and thus gain a heavy advantage in the undersea warfare to follow. He would mobilize in secret and set his armies in motion so that they would assault strong points before they could be fully manned. Above all, he would launch his air fleets, and, if he had atomic bombs, he would direct them at our key cities. We must also take into account the delivery of bombs by submarine, the bombs being lobbed into coastal cities by rocket projectors perhaps from submarines 35 to 50 miles at sea. The threat of such a surprise attack is a handicap we must face, and it is a severe one. It alters, and makes wider, the margin we must keep in the race of preparedness.

The old scarehead story that atomic bombs could be moved in sections may be dismissed. The idea of bringing in the pieces and assembling them in an innocent-looking warehouse or committee is probably also far-fetched. It could be done, of course, even though a great deal of skill in assembly is called for. But one bomb thus planted would hardly be an effective opening blow in a war.

A real peril would be to carry atomic bombs in innocent-looking merchant craft that can be manned near cities, to be blown up bodily when the time for surprise attack comes. More feasible, and hence more to be feared, is the scheme of planting the bombs on the bottoms of harbors or in canals, through trapdoors in the holds of merchant ships, to be detonated later by time fuse or even by radio signal. Presumably bombs thus placed near various cities would be detonated all at once as the opening shot in a total war. There is no trick method of determining whether a ship carries such a deadly load. The atomic bomb does not advertise its presence in the unmistakable manner of highly radioactive materials. The damage to a city could be very large if such an infernal machine went off in its harbor—not so large perhaps as some of the newspaper stories would indicate offhand. Also, the wall of radioactive mist that spreads from the underwater explosion would be a very terrible thing.

The world is not now likely to be thrown into open war by accident as it used to be. It will come only if our potential enemy feels that his strength plus the surprise factor is sufficiently great to overcome us, and if he feels that time thereafter will be moving against him. We can decrease the value of surprise by staying alert to peacetime.

The principal element of our preparation for possible surprise attack is an intelligence system of high effectiveness, capable of warning us. Be iron curtain is utterly impenetrable. The operations necessary to set in motion a major surprise attack are ponderous and far-reaching. Dictatorship and oppression produce individuals who dare to flee and then dare to talk. There is no reason why we should not know, reasonably well, what is afoot.

After the war a Central Intelligence Agency was created, but it has been under the command of military men whose careers have lain elsewhere, it creaks at the joints, and it is not yet sufficient for its tough task. Scientific intelligence is not conducted well by Matt Hari methods or through agents who know no science. We need a modern intelligence agency in every sense of the word, using modern methods as they were partially developed during the last war, not a musical-comedy affair or a stodgy refuge, not even the half-successful affair we now have, but an organization qualified to meet our needs in this kind of world. It does not cost much. We know how to build it, after the experience of the last war, for we did not do badly at all on intelligence work then, after we got our hand in and learned how. But the really able men who functioned then have largely scattered into civilian life, the type of ability needed is rare, and the work is not attractive. The task can be done, by an individual of great mental and organizational capacity, having ample authority and the full backing of the President of the United States. As we value our peace of mind we had better be about it.

We conduct the disagreeable contest of the cold war at great disadvantage. But the manifold blessings of freedom give us enormous strength, in its full development dwarfing the potential strength of any system of regimentation. It has been popular for many years to complain about the wastefulness of the democratic system of government. We had come to expect 50 cents' worth of results for every dollar paid in taxes. Benevolent dictatorship was thought be to efficient by comparison, and it was held that a dictator could get results much more generally and cheaply. But when research teams were sent into Germany after the war to study such problems as the German handling of strategic materials, manpower, propaganda, military organization and coordination, they were amazed. The Germans had made astonishing mistakes in every sphere of action, which continued throughout the war without correction. Every team we sent returned convinced that the democratic system is clearly more efficient, dollar for dollar and hour for hour, than any totalitarian system.

The teams also found the key to the difference, the key to effectiveness of the democratic system. It lies in the fact that in a democracy criticism flows both ways, up as well as down. This factor, plus our Government's ability to secure the completely frank judgment of experts in any field, far more than offsets the apparent looseness of democracy.

The type of pyramidal totalitarian regime that the Communists have centered in Moscow is an exceedingly powerful agency for cold war. It can force its people to enormous sacrifice and thus build great quantities of war materials. It can educate large numbers of men and women in science and engineering, construct far-flung institutes, mechanize agriculture and ultimately create mass production. But it is not adapted for effective performance in pioneering fields, either in basic science or in involved and novel applications. It has many of the faults of the German dictatorship, magnified to the nth degree. Hence it is likely to produce great mistakes and great abortions.

This does not mean that we can cease our own advances in the techniques of war. The Communists can copy and improve, and a whole mass of scarcely developed techniques remains from the last war as material for this process. It does mean that we must continue to break new ground, and that we can do so with our heads high; we have a system essentially adapted for the purpose, if we do not distort it or sacrifice it to false gods of fancied efficiency.

One source of strength is our widespread industrialization. The fact that there are literally millions of youngsters who can drive and repair cars, who build their own radio sets and communicate as "hams" all over the world, gives us a whole generation of competent, resourceful mechanics and electricians and the best possible insurance for strength and safety in a world of modern war. Every corner garage, every radio club, is a center of training; training that can be quickly transformed into ability to operate the complex implements of war.

During the Second World War, for example, one radio ham, whose formal education had been limited to grammar school, helped fight from a laboratory. He was a mechanic and had picked up his knowledge of radio while he made his living, just as millions of other American boys still do. He became America's principal designer of magnetrons. He can talk today with Nobel-prize physicists, and can tell them things they want to know.

In the long, hard race we have embarked upon we must maintain and increase our industrial sinews, keep our free-enterprise system on an even keel and thus foster the strength of our economy. It will profit us little to have stocks of bombs and planes and then bring our governmental and industrial system crashing down about our ears.

Future total war need not come if we fully maintain our strength. It need not come if we realistically resolve that it shall not. It need not come if we make our democracy work. It need not come at all, for if the strength of free peoples prevents it for a generation, that same strength can then produce a new sort of world in which great wars will no longer occur. For this consummation we face a task that will test us as we have never been tested before, that will test whether we really mean it when we say that we believe in human dignity and human freedom, whether we can really submerge selfishness and petty motive and bring our enormous latent power to bear, to make our way of life function with true effectiveness for the good of all.

Research on Disease of Oak Trees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I append a letter from a valued constituent, William E. Gullam, of North Reading, Mass., in his capacity as secretary of the Massachusetts Tree Wardens' and Foresters' Association:

Massachusetts Senators and Representatives, United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE GENTLEMEN: By vote of the members of this association at our thirty-eighth annual convention, February 15-16, 1950, at Boston, the following resolution was adopted:

"*Be it resolved*, That this association go on record as backing the United States Department of Agriculture request for an appropriation for research work on the diseases of, or on, oak trees; and so notify our Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress."

We sincerely hope that they will be supported likewise by all other groups similarly interested in the preservation of our State and national shade trees; and that all means available shall be exercised for their protection and maintenance, as well as the prevention of those diseases now threatening us on a national scale.

We most earnestly urge that suitable action be taken to establish funds and provide facilities for the conduct of necessary research, and that preventive remedies and all information gained therefrom be made available for our general advantage in meeting this grave situation.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM E. GULLAM,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Tories Saw Business Ruin and Socialism in HOLC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the national weekly newspaper Labor, issue of March 18, 1950:

TORIES SAW BUSINESS RUIN AND SOCIALISM IN HOLC—NEW DEAL AGENCY PROVES GREAT SUCCESS, BUT SAME CRIES ARE RAISED AGAINST FAIR DEAL

A simple ceremony at the White House this week recalled events which should reassure the American people, when, as now, they read and hear assertions that the Government is ruining business.

President Truman watched approvingly while a $20,000,000 HOLC check was presented to John W. Snyder, who presides over Uncle Sam's Treasury. What was back of this ceremony?

In the days of the "Hoover hunger," there was desperation among the mortgage companies, building and loan concerns, and bankers who had financed homes at inflated values. Hundreds of thousands of jobless people could not keep up their mortgage payments. Real-estate money lenders all over the country faced bankruptcy.

The came the New Deal, like the Fair Deal of today, a bogyman of business. Congress created the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, gave it Government money and orders to save the situation.

Loud cries from the mortgage men pierced the skies. "The New Deal," they shouted, "was going in for socialism." Uncle Sam was embarking upon a foolish adventure that would cost him a loss of at least $1,500,000,000.

In short, the HOLC was greeted by Tories with the same outcries they make against Fair Deal measures now. But what happened?

The HOLC got busy, saved a lot of distressed home owners, and literally bailed out the banks, mortgage, and building and loan firms. In return for their sour mortgages, they got billions in good Government bonds from Uncle Sam.

The money lenders' frowning faces suddenly were wreathed with smiles. This HOLC is a pretty good thing after all, they privately admitted. But were they grateful?

As soon as they were saved, they turned around and tried to bite the hand that bailed them out. They pushed a bill which would force the HOLC to hand back to the money lenders all the mortgages which had become safe and sound, while Uncle Sam would keep all the mortgages which were still sour.

Of course, that would have made the HOLC a financial failure, and the Tories would have shouted we told you so.

That bill was fought and killed by John H. Fahey, an honest, able, and devoted public servant, who came from big business to head the HOLC. In all the country, Labor was the only newspaper of national circulation which supported Fahey in that fight. He was grateful and said so.

Under Fahey's management, the HOLC saved home owners, bailed out the mortgage men, and paid off $3,500,000,000 Government bonds provided for those purposes.

In the White House ceremony this week, the HOLC made its first repayment, $26,000,000, on the stock which Uncle Sam bought in that agency to give it a start.

Now, Truman said, the HOLC has paid off 95 percent of the Government's entire investment, and will soon pay the rest. Instead of the predicted $1,500,000,000 loss, Uncle Sam will come out with a handsome profit.

It is a good thing to remember that New Deal story, when the Tories of today shout ruin and socialism at the Fair Deal.

About Owen Lattimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of March 15, 1950:

ABOUT OWEN LATTIMORE

Thomas F. Murphy, the Hiss case prosecutor, said the other day that one of the hardest things to find in these times is a man who will admit that he is a Communist. It is better, he said, to set up a persevering watch to determine how closely a man's opinions coincide with the party line.

We think this formula could be more profitably applied by Senator MCCARTHY, particularly in the case of Owen Lattimore. Whether he is a card holder or not, it would produce weighty evidence that this State Department adviser on the Far East rarely has had a thought that would trouble the Kremlin.

He was among the first of that coterie of left-wing experts to underwrite the idea that the Chinese Communists were simple agrarian reformers.

In his 1945 book, Solution in Asia, Mr. Lattimore said the Asiatic peoples did not intend to become the victims of imperialism again, and that the Allies must understand their drive toward self-expression and cooperate by helping them. "These people," he explained in an interview, "may not be able to read or write, but politically they are mature."

Once an adviser to Chiang Kai-shek—on President Roosevelt's recommendation—he later turned on Chiang and denounced him for dictatorial tendencies. There's little argument about Chiang being dictatorial.

But Lattimore's 1945 book was described by a sympathetic reviewer as an "appeal to Chiang to set free the democratic forces which have proved effective in northwestern China."

And what were those democratic forces?

Those democratic forces were, of course, the totalitarian Communists—and a year later Gen. Marshall was in China on an abortive mission to work out a coalition between the Chinese Communists and the Nationalists.

Last year, when the State Department's White Paper wrote off the Nationalist cause, paving the way to our present debacle in China, it accurately reflected the thinking of Mr. Lattimore.

More recently, in the January Atlantic, Mr. Lattimore wrote: "Sound (United States) policy would avoid premature or excessive strategic deployment in the Far East." That had been made our policy.

Again: "United States policy should aim to increase the ability of countries in Asia to do without Russia." That, too—the suggestion that a potential Tito could be built up in Red China—has been made our policy.

And again: "For the problem of recognition of the new government of China, the United Nations offers the ideal avenue to a solution. If * * * a majority of non-Communist countries in Europe, Latin America, and Asia should vote to seat new Chinese representatives (meaning Communists) to the United Nations, the United States should not vote against that verdict."

And that also has been made State Department policy. Only last week it was announced that we would abide by a majority decision in giving the Chinese Reds places in the UN. Which would be recognition by the back-door route, despite the fact that we still recognize the Nationalists as China's legal government.

What real difference would it make if Mr. Lattimore, and the others responsible, had the purest of intentions? Molotov himself couldn't have master-minded an American Far East policy more to Moscow's liking.

Resolution to Repeal Sixteenth Amendment (Income Tax Amendment)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a resolution to repeal the sixteenth amendment, which authorizes the Federal Government to collect income taxes. The proposed amendment would permit the Federal Government to resort to an income tax only for the purpose of grave national emergency proclaimed by the President and approved by each House of Congress, and for the purpose of reducing the national debt and payment of the interest thereon.

Reduction of the debt is of the utmost importance to preservation of the value of the American dollar. If this amendment should become law, Congress should continue to pay off a minimum of at least one-half of 1 percent per year of the present $250,000,000,000 national debt by limited use of the income tax.

The income tax in the hands of reckless and irresponsible bureaucracy is the most deadly danger to the American system of government, and the liberty

which it was designed to safeguard. It is rapidly leading to complete breakdown of the States and localities as effective instruments of government, and transforming them into mere arms of the Federal Government to distribute Federal hand-outs. It is destroying the incentive and hope of the American citizen because it deprives him of the fruit of his toil and therefore of the possibility of independently achieving economic security. It creates an overpowering central government upon which the economically helpless citizen will become a servile dependent. What is left of liberty when government alone controls the pay check or the ration card?

Desperate situations demand desperate treatment. Only complete elimination of the Federal income tax power, or at least drastic limitation upon it, will effectively curb the destructive monster that the Federal Government has become—hence this resolution to repeal the sixteenth amendment, and to limit use of income taxes to the essential purpose of national debt reduction and payment of interest, and to use in war and emergencies akin to war.

Its enactment would curtail the activities of the Federal Government to a great degree and revitalize the States. It would leave sufficient funds to the Federal Government to provide for national defense, for veterans, and for the expenses of the general Government. The remaining necessary domestic activities now carried on at Federal level could be taken on by the States, which would have exclusive access to income taxation for that purpose.

Commitments for foreign aid by their own terms should expire in less than 2 years. There is little likelihood of adoption of such an amendment within that time.

Repeal of the sixteenth amendment would not affect the operation of the present Federal social-security system.

Only a thoroughly aroused public will get action. If all those citizens who are tenacious of the menace of the Federal income tax system, emphatically and persistently demand action, action will be had. If the American Republic is to survive in anything like its present form, if the traditional liberties of the American citizen are to live, if dollar earnings and savings are to retain any value at all, then action must come quickly. Congress will act if enough citizens demand action. Of course, it will not be easy to dislodge anything as firmly planted as the Federal income tax. But if we shy away from the impossible, we shall be less likely to achieve the possible.

Tariff on Rubber Footwear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, in commenting further upon the great interest among all the people of the city of Malden in my district over a threatened reduction in tariff rates pertaining to imports on rubber footwear, I bring it to the attention of my colleagues that a resolution has recently been adopted by the Malden city government introduced by Councilman Jacob Aronson, passed by the common council and by the board of aldermen, and approved March 10, 1950, by his honor Mayor Fred Lamson. A copy of this resolution as it has come to me under certification from Raymond F. Mooney, city clerk, is as follows:

Whereas any further reduction in tariff rates pertaining to imports on rubber wear would result in mass unemployment and the employees would find it difficult to obtain similar employment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Malden City Council go on record as opposing any further reduction in tariff on imports of rubber foot wear both waterproof and canvas.

St. Patrick, the Patron Saint of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on the 17th day of March we again honor St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland. In Catholic churches and at public meetings throughout the world, St. Patrick's benign spirit will preside with solemnity and prayerful mien over the altars of great and ornate cathedrals and over small and simple one-room countryside churches.

With graciousness and good cheer, the kindly spirit of St. Patrick will pervade the atmosphere surrounding the festive banquet tables of Irish fellowship clubs, the Ancient Order of the Hibernians, and other great Irish societies.

America is truly transformed on March 17 into an Ireland, with millions of Americans of Irish extraction wearing proudly the shamrock and the green carnation symbolic of the warmth and generosity of the Irish spirit and personality.

The story of St. Patrick, although well known, bears constant repeating. Patrick was born in greater Britain, the son of Calphwinius and Concessa. As a boy he fell into the captivity of warring tribes on three different occasions, each time being put to work keeping watch over flocks of sheep. Even at an early age he demonstrated a strong faith and reverent respect for God. It was his daily custom to arise before daybreak and pray at length; he would follow this procedure during the day and before retiring late at night in all kinds of inclement weather so as to adore and praise God.

After he was liberated, he undertook holy orders and began to study religious works. Suffering untold hardships, he traveled far and wide throughout France—then called Gaul—Italy, and the Tyrrhenian Sea islands.

Under the Primacy of Pope Celestine, he was consecrated a bishop and made his way to Ireland on behalf of the spiritual salvation of the Irish who were then worshiping idols. Only with the aid of a provident God could this sainted figure have succeeded in this mission where evil forces, enemies of the faith, physical hardships and privations were in the ascendancy.

These endeavors resulted in a religious revival during which catholicism spread throughout Ireland. Churches were built, priests ordained and bishops consecrated. Ireland became known as the Island of the Saints so effective was the preaching of St. Patrick.

The fame of St. Patrick spread to other lands. His prophesies and his spiritual greatness gave greater impetus to his endeavors on behalf of the Catholic Church to which he was endeared.

Exhausted and spent, after many years of fatiguing labors and administrative cares and responsibilities, St. Patrick, in the fifth century of Our Lord, passed on to his reward. Today he rests at Down, in Ulster, the apostle of Ireland.

On March 17, more than on any other day, I shall give kind thought and expression to the personal tribute paid me by the Irish government receiving as I have yearly, real Irish shamrocks—greetings to the Irish people through their legal representatives.

This bond of friendship between the people of Ireland and my humble self has been of many years' standing, for it was my great honor and privilege to draft and pass House resolution 49, in the Sixty-fifth Congress, declaring it to be the sense of the Congress of the United States that Ireland should be a free and independent state, free of British rule, oppression, and tyranny. Nothing in my legislative career of 44 years in the House has given me a greater thrill and satisfaction for I have always been cognizant of the heroic efforts of the Irish people in search of freedom, who in 1848 during the potato famine in Ireland, suffering the same indignities and privations of other immigrants from other parts of the world sought asylum here and went on to do their part to develop and contribute to the growth and progress of this great country of ours.

I always recognized and appreciated the broad and liberal views and policies of the Irish Nation on behalf of the oppressed and persecuted of other lands seeking refuge also in Ireland.

I wish to remind my colleagues that immigrants from Ireland, true to the American spirit, were like immigrants from other shores. It is because of the immigrant that the ideals of freedom and liberty, the foundation stones of our American Republic, have endured. These newcomers stood for political and religious freedom. They not only advocated these foundation stones—they fought for them. And so it has come to pass that from a country of 13 small States with a spread-out population of about 3,000,000 we have developed to almost 150,000,000 in 48 States, exclusive of our island territorial possessions, with more people desiring admission into our

sacred Union as, for example, Hawaii and Alaska.

I have seen a great many St. Patrick Days come and go, and with each passing I pay greater tribute to the immigrant Irishmen whose sons and daughters in each generation have faced, along with the sons and daughters of other immigrants, the difficult problems concerned with the maintenance and progress of our country. The Irish forebears met adversity and conquered it. They were willing and anxious to work, they helped build our buildings, our houses of commerce, they made their contributions to the professions—but more still they developed an unquenchable spirit for an American nationality which has become the desire of all peoples throughout the world to seek and attain.

How well this fact is demonstrated is seen in the development of my beloved city of Chicago. A perusal of its first city directory in 1844, when the population was 9,000, show a more than respectable number of Irish names, the Nortons, O'Briens, O'Learys, the Burns, the Burkes, the Caseys and Cassidys, the Daileys and the Donlins, the Gallaghers, the Givins, the Higgins, the Hogans, the Kellys, the Kennedys, and so on down the alphabet. They were men of the professions, tradesmen, artisans, and laborers. In short, they helped Chicago grow great—great in industry, in commerce, and more important than all, great in political and religious freedom.

I could enlarge further on the gifts of the Americans of Irish extraction to the growth and development of my beloved city, citing the names of mayors and governors in Chicago and the State of Illinois. Suffice it to say that at present our mayor, Martin J. Kennelly, recognized as an able administrator who is reflecting credit on, and following in the footsteps of, the many sons of St. Patrick who have dedicated themselves to the basic principles of the American system which dedicates itself to the equality of opportunity and self-improvement, a decent standard of living and the stimulation and preservation of human and spiritual values which the patron St. Patrick so eloquently typifies.

Well do I remember the many instances of the loyalty of Americans of Irish descent demonstrated in critical periods of our country's history. Many are the examples. However, one stands out very vividly in my mind, namely, the situation which prevailed in April of 1918 when we were at war with the Kaiser. At that time Ireland was still struggling for freedom from Great Britain. Irish patriots were fighting at great odds to escape the cruel and servile treatment of the selfish and unconscionable British aided by their Ulster allies.

It was at this time that Great Britain, sorely pressed after 4 years of hard fighting, called for conscription of the Irish youth. Immediately there began a fierce debate both in America and in Ireland. Should the Irishman, deprived of his constitutional and personal rights, allow himself to be conscripted into British forces? Should not—do not home rule and conscription travel together the same road? Is not Ireland fighting for moral issues—freedom and liberty against an aggressor? How then can Great Britain, it too fighting for a moral principle, require loyalty and fealty of Ireland when she refuses justice and equality to those of southern Ireland? Although evidently supporting the Irish cause and bitterly opposing Great Britain's persecution of the Irish in Ireland, the answer came immediately and without hesitation from the native-born and naturalized Americans of Irish extraction when they published that the Irishman in Ireland or their relatives and friends in America who do or say anything to hurt Great Britain in this her hour of peril strike at the cause of America and her allies who are banded together in common effort against a German war machine bent on enslaving the world.

I remember well how this sweeping declaration of faith and allegiance coming at a most critical period from the descendants of Old Erin brought renewed hope and courage to all engaged in the great battle "to make the world safe for democracy." For it brought heart to our disheartened allies whose low morale and tired bodies were giving ground to the sledge-hammer blows which the "boche" were dealing on French and Belgian battlefields. Revivified and with fresh courage and renewed confidence, the American doughboy of Irish origin, his comrades of all races and creeds, the English "Tommy" and the French "poilus" joined hands to carry on their counterattacks against the common enemy.

On the other hand, this declaration of fealty to the allied cause brought home to the Germanophyles all over the world and particularly the German propagandists in Ireland who infested the Emerald Isle that Ireland had rejected their advocacy of force and violence to foment discord and disunity in the country where they had hoped to stir up rebellion and civil war and from which they had hoped to attack England nearby. The campaign of treachery and treason had failed in Ireland. The open door was closed tight in the face of Kaiser Wilhelm and his boche hordes.

I must not fail to revert to my early days in my beloved city of Chicago where the memory of great and generous men of Irish origin who, many in number, helped make our city the great metropolis and melting pot it is. In public life, in our patriotic and civic organizations, be it in labor and industry in our commercial life, in the arts and sciences, in our schools, in the church, in our law-enforcing agencies, the men and women who on this day honor their patron Saint Patrick, always demonstrated a devotion to the ideals of good government and fine human relations.

I found them as a group true to every righteous cause of their country, indefatigable workers determined to carry on, in the best traditions of America, on behalf of justice, freedom, and democracy.

All praise and glory to the Irish on this St. Patrick's Day of 1950.

Uncle Bob Doughton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a fine tribute to a very distinguished Member of this great body.

The tribute appears in a recent issue of the Lutheran, a magazine of the Lutheran Church, and is contributed by a distinguished American, one of the leading pastors in America, Dr. Oscar Blackweider, pastor of the Church of the Reformation in Washington.

The membership of the House, I know, will appreciate this splendid article:

UNCLE BOB DOUGHTON

I once asked the late Mrs. Robert L. Doughton if she realized that her husband's homely appearance is a political asset. She wanted to know what I meant by "homely." I can hear the chuckle in her voice yet. I told her of a relative of mine in the North Carolina district which Mr. DOUGHTON has represented for 40 years, who said to me, "All you have to do is to look at BOB DOUGHTON to know he is honest."

He is the oldest man in Congress and the second oldest in length of service. He has served 40 years (20 terms) without a defeat. Representative ADOLPH SABATH, of Illinois, has the longest service, with 44 consecutive years.

Seriously, I have come to feel that a strikingly handsome man is handicapped in public life. Men just don't vote for him. I could document that statement. The handsome may carry the ladies' vote, but men seem to mistrust them.

RUNNING AGAIN

Mr. DOUGHTON is 86 and running for reelection. His mental dependability and his amazing physical health belie his years. A Washington newspaper editorialized on him, thinking he should quit. The letters received inspired another editorial, which bowed to the manifest devotion in which he is held by his constituents. Anyone who attempts to run against him is just wasting his time, money, and energy, in my opinion.

I chanced to be in the gallery of the House when a young, freshman Republican arose to oppose an argument Mr. DOUGHTON had just made. The freshman began with a profuse apology for daring to differ with such a mature man. Mr. DOUGHTON thanked him for his courtesy but added, in effect, that if he could not hold his own without having people defer to age, he would quit.

WAYS AND MEANS

He has chairmaned the powerful Ways and Means Committee, perhaps the most important in the entire Congress, for a longer time than any other in American history. And he is not honorary chairman either.

Uncle Bob is a very early riser and gets to his office between 6 and 6:30 a. m. A story got afloat some years ago that as he came across Capitol Hill going to his office one morning he chanced to meet a stenographer on his staff. He congratulated her on her sense of initiative and enterprise. "Come on in and let's start on some letters," he said. She came in and went to work but in reality was just getting in from a dance.

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

I hope I am not overpainting the picture of a good friend. Uncle Bob illustrates to me the way a man can make good in public life.

Here are some of the secrets of one of the most beloved men on Capitol Hill. He tends strictly to the business with which he is entrusted. He keeps close to his constituents and transacts their business with dispatch and accuracy. He is a great human being with splendid capacity for friendship. He is an indefatigable worker, capable even at his present age of long, strenuous hours. He has maintained the captaincy of his own conscience. He is a man of unimpeachable integrity. Men like Ben Dorsey make it easier to believe in representative government.

OSCAR F. BLACKWELDER.

Why an Investigation of Lustron?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, because of the wide interest in the Lustron situation, I wish to submit for the RECORD the following copy of a letter I have written to Mr. SABATH, chairman of the Rules Committee:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1950.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Chairman, Rules Committee,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SABATH: On October 19, 1949, I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 393, to authorize a select committee to investigate the Lustron loan.

I mentioned this resolution recently when I appeared before your committee. I will appreciate it very much if you will call up this resolution for hearing before the Rules Committee.

I am enclosing a short memorandum which contains a brief account of the reasons why I think this investigation is of great importance to the Congress.

Thank you very much for your courteous consideration of this request.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT M. COLE,
Member of Congress.

WHY AN INVESTIGATION OF LUSTRON?

In 1947, the RFC made its initial loan to Lustron as a pilot project to determine whether houses could be produced by mass production. Thirty-seven million five hundred thousand dollars have been used for this purpose. Eighty-two thousand houses were promised by the end of 1949. Actually, 2,960 were produced.

Lustron is now in the hands of a receiver, and conservative estimates place the loss to the Government at $30,000,000.

The pilot project is a failure. The success or failure of this, and similar future proposals, is of tremendous importance to Congress. A careful, nonpartisan investigation would answer these questions:

First. What is the field for Government in promoting pilot or experimental projects?

Second. How may monopoly and unfair competition be avoided if such projects are undertaken by Government? For example, Harnischfeger, of Wisconsin, has produced thousands of excellent prefabricated houses which sell for $6,500 to $8,300. This firm, and many others, are operating without Government assistance. Can this firm, and the other prefabricated house manufacturers compete against free-and-easy Government money?

Third. Did Lustron fail because all such pilot projects promoted by Government are doomed to failure?

Fourth. Did Lustron fail because of mismanagement and favoritism, or just lack of foresight and funds?

I believe Congress and the people are entitled to the answers to these questions.

Case for "Thou Shalt Not"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of March 16, 1950:

CASE FOR "THOU SHALT NOT"—TAKING POSITIVE STAND ON ISSUES ISN'T ALWAYS THE MOST CONSTRUCTIVE; THERE'S ALSO VIRTUE IN BEING NEGATIVE

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Americans are in the habit of hearing lectures on what a dreadful thing it is to be negative. Every proponent of some new scheme of spending billions of dollars of public funds for some vague and starry-eyed purpose tries to attach the adjective "positive" to his proposal and to blast its critics as persons cursed with a negative type of mind.

There are prophets of doom who suggest that America will go under if it does not propose some "positive" alternative to communism and prove that free institutions serve the average man better than dictatorships. Very often the suggested alternative turns out to be some form of leveling collectivism, very akin to communism, only without unpleasant features like concentration camps.

As for the supposed obligation of free political and economic institutions to prove their superior attractiveness, there is a very simple test that should convince anyone capable of being affected by rational argument. Line up on one side the people who often at personal risk to themselves and their families, have refused to live under totalitarian rule. Line up on the other those individuals who have voluntarily left free countries to enjoy the supposed blessings of dictatorship. The proportion in this fair and honest plebiscite would be about one hundred to one. And if one could interview freely the members of the minority, one would get some very sad and regretful stories.

"IT ALL DEPENDS"

But, so runs the argument, we must be "for," not "against," positive, not negative. Well, it all depends on the issue at stake. The Gadarene swine presumably were in a positive mood when they ran over the cliff and perished. They might have been better advised if they had been more responsive to negative arguments.

Nor is it true, as is sometimes alleged, that men can only be induced to fight and sacrifice and die if they are offered the prospect of being "for," not "against." It has often been easier to induce people to agree on what they don't have than on what they do.

It would not have been feasible to obtain general agreement among Englishmen of the seventeenth century on a positive political program. But most of them disliked the idea of being taxed without their consent, jailed without warrant and otherwise pushed around by agents of the Crown.

And so, out of many negative restrictions on the power of the executive branch, developed something very positive and very desirable indeed: the rights of the man and the citizen. The same story was repeated, with some variation, when the American colonies broke away from British rule a century later. The men who founded this Nation were united more by what they disliked than by what they favored.

In reading through the American Constitution it is remarkable how often those "negative" words, "no" and "not" recur. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press. * * * No soldier shall in time of peace be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner. * * * The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated. * * * Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted. * * * No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed. * * *"

But out of these and many other limiting and prohibiting clauses in the Constitution emerged the edifice of our civil political liberties.

The French Revolution never produced what its ideologists dreamed of: a society in which liberty, equality, and fraternity were the guiding principles. But, with all its fearful excesses, the effects of which are still painfully felt in French psychology and in the nature of French society, the Revolution achieved certain negative benefits. It swept away antiquated privileges of birth and caste and made opportunity much more nearly equal for all Frenchmen.

RECORD OF EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

We heard a good deal in the last American election about an alleged "do nothing" Congress. Actually the record of the much abused Congress would compare favorably with that of its predecessor or its successor. But what a fundamentally absurd idea it is to judge the efficiency of a Congress by the number of laws it passes.

One might just as reasonably rate a physician's competence by the number of doses or operations he would order for a patient. There is a world-wide tendency to pass too many laws, with the result that many are unenforced and some are unenforceable. A legislative body that passed a minimum of new measures and repealed a good many old ones, would most probably deserve very well of all the people who elected it.

"The state swelled and the people shrank." This is how a great Russian historian, V. O. Kluchevsky, describes the growth of absolute power in Czarist Russia. And this is a universal law of history. As the state becomes more powerful the individual shrinks, sometimes to the point of extinction.

The contrary side of this proposition is equally true. Where the state is kept within bounds by a long series of "Thou Shalt Not's," by strict legal limitations on its power, the individual enjoys the best prospect of a free, and happy, and prosperous life. The history of human liberty is very largely a record of negative restrictions and limitations, checks and balances, devised for the purpose of preventing the state from succumbing to the invariable temptation to arrogate too much power to itself,

The Americanism of Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address on the Americanism of Abraham Lincoln by Col. Robert M. Woodward of Chicago, Ill., broadcast from radio station WHFC, with studios in Chicago and Cicero, Ill., on Saturday, February 11, 1950:

February 12 is a date that is especially cherished, not only by all loyal and patriotic Americans, but also the world over by those who instinctively recognize greatness of soul in the conduct of human affairs. It can well be said, February 12 is a special day in the calendar of human advancement, for it is the one hundred and forty-first birthday of Abraham Lincoln, martyred sixteenth President of the United States, who alone of all the incumbents of that distinguished office, is considered worthy of being coupled with the Father of our Country.

We do well, to mark this annual occasion in American life with due solemnity, taking to heart Lincoln's inspired wisdom, marvelous patience, and touching kindliness which animated his being, and makes his truly blessed memory immortal. Here was a statesman and personality whose fame endures, and whose renown is as constant and as chastening as the stars: only he could have saved the Union and strengthened its foundation of freedom for all, as only his illustrious predecessor, George Washington, whom he idolized from the days of his youth, could have led our forefathers to freedom in their struggle for independence. Such leaders are, indeed, few and far between, they have marked out for all time, the course that must be followed in this great land of ours, if as Lincoln said in his classic Gettysburg Address, "Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

We know that we live in the most critical times, times that try men's souls. Fear, uncertainty, and mistrust prevail the world over. People everywhere are nervously asking, "What of tomorrow?" There is only one answer to this universal disquietude, and there is only one way to save the day and prevent the ultimate destruction of mankind by A-bombs and H-bombs, and perhaps weapons which may be even more dreadful and devastating. Now, as in Lincoln's time, when the Union was threatened with dissolution there is one hope for peace and for fraternal relationships between nations, and that is, by the application of the humanity and sanity of Abraham Lincoln, both in domestic and foreign affairs.

If the application of Lincoln's high, moral principles cannot solve such problems as our labor difficulties and end the recurring strife of wage earners and management, nothing else can. If the uprightness of Abraham Lincoln cannot do away with political corruption in city, State, and Nation, nothing else can. If the warmly, friendly approach of Lincoln in all matters and at all times, expressed so well by him, "with malice toward none, with charity for all" cannot resolve the stalemate between American democracy and proletarian dictatorship, nothing else can. The first thing we should take to heart as we feel Lincoln's noble spiritual presence in our midst, especially at this time, is that he loved and served his country with all his heart, soul, and strength. He was always concerned with safeguarding the future, and fulfilling the high ideals of the American Republic and to mankind at large.

His brooding concern for his native land made him keenly sensitive to any danger, both from within and without which threatened its growth, its happiness, and its very existence. Calmly he surveyed the situation, free from rancor, and it was consequently given to him to see with the eyes of a prophet.

I know of nothing that is better calculated to win for our beloved country, confidence in the uprightness and unselfishness of our intentions with regard to all other nations, and make it possible to adjust the existing differences, than the widest possible circulation, translated into every tongue the principles and ideals of Abraham Lincoln. We hope that as many Americans as possible are made aware that Lincoln defined the irrevocable objective of all true Americans within and beyond our borders.

We must be ever honest and sincere as Lincoln was in dealing with domestic and foreign problems of every kind, our faith and courage must be as dauntless as his was in pursuing this goal, which is nothing less than the goal of salvation for us and for all humanity.

Our prayer, as united Americans, now and always, must be that Lincoln's noble, human spirit may never cease to abide with us, for the minute that we forsake his counsel and his example, nothing else, however, formidable and seemingly invincible materially, can assure our strength and national security.

The Abraham Lincoln way of thinking and acting, and the exercise of the right to vote in all elections in every precinct throughout the Nation, is our only security. Furthermore, we must keep in mind that any kind of contravention of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution of the United States, is a thrust at the Nation's life, and treason to the American people. Make no mistake about it, violations of the rights, guaranteed by the Constitution, is subversive and more insidious than any other kind can possibly be.

Yes, I repeat, the Lincoln way of thinking and acting under all circumstances is the only way for all of us to conduct ourselves, whatever party we belong to, whatever creed we profess, and however otherwise we may differ one from the other. As I see it, our choice is between a united, strong, and impregnable America, and a divided, consequently weakened, despite our matchless material wealth and power.

We are called upon, particularly during the recurrence of Lincoln's birthday, to listen to a voice which will never cease to be heard by every generation of his fellow Americans, and humble ourselves, as he did, in seeking divine guidance in all matters affecting our national welfare and standing among the nations of the earth.

I conceive it to be the duty of everyone who is privileged to serve his fellow Americans in a public capacity, to steep himself in the life of Abraham Lincoln, and to conduct himself accordingly. Lincoln's life should always be the yardstick of public service, and those who are unwilling to be so guided in their public actions, demonstrate their unfitness to occupy positions of public trust of any kind, major or minor.

In the preservation of American freedom and democracy, Lincoln had an unfailing appreciation of the worth of all who toil for a humble living. He remains the champion of the cause of the common people from whom he sprung, and in whose interest he served to the end. "God must love the common people," he said, "He made so many of them." He repeatedly made mention of his humble origin. In a speech at New Haven, Conn., he declared: "I am not ashamed to confess that 25 years ago I was a hired laborer, mauling rails, working on a flatboat—just what might happen to any poor man's son. I want every man to have a chance." That is the American message, a message that will do more to rid the world of remaining autocratic and ruthless rule over the lives of the people of other lands, and points the way to real freedom and full opportunity, than is possible by any other course of action.

My fellow Americans, we can make our greatest contribution to the world's peace and progress by rededicating ourselves in these momentous days to the humanity and humility of Abraham Lincoln. A distinguished lawyer once said: "States are great only as men may make them great; men are great only as they dare and do." Lincoln said the rights and privileges preserved by the Constitution may not last unless every man, woman, and child shall recognize his responsibilities and duties under the Constitution.

You, my fellow citizens, are aware that many of us are often inclined to dwell on our rights rather than our duties. I say, it is the duty of every citizen in these critical times to stand firmly against all individuals or groups whose aims and purposes are to change our form of government, and I deem it appropriate to quote 10 golden rules of conduct so amply stated by the Honorable Leland M. Ford, who must have been inspired by the thoughts and actions of the immortal Lincoln when he stated:

1. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.

2. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

3. You cannot help small men by tearing big men down.

4. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.

5. You cannot lift the wage earner up by pulling the wage payer down.

6. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.

7. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.

8. You cannot establish sound social security on borrowed money.

9. You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence.

10. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

It has been wisely said that history is made up of the biographies of our outstanding men, men who have left an imprint on advancing civilization. It is from men of this character that we draw our greatest inspiration. They are the beacon lights that lead us onward and upward to greater and better things. This is why each year we should commemorate the birthday of Abraham Lincoln.

In conclusion I wish to remind you that Lincoln's life was comparatively a short one. However, the span of one's life is not measured by its length, but by the deeds performed during its brief period. The span of life of Jesus of Nazareth was only 33 short years, but after 2,000 years His example and teachings are among the most potent influences in the world today. Abraham Lincoln died at the age of 56, but in that short space he acquired immortality.

We cannot all be Lincolns, but we cannot escape the influence of his life upon humanity. The world is a better place, by far, because Lincoln's principles still live in the hearts of his countrymen, because no man had a greater regard and understanding of the human spirit than did Abraham Lincoln. His benign influence shall endure for all time—as long as there exists oppression, intolerance, and injustice. The beacon torch of Lincoln's spirit shall point the way of all mankind to follow.

Giovanni da Verrazzano

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an article by Daniel Santoro of Staten Island on the discoveries of Giovanni da Verrazzano:

GIOVANNI DA VERRAZZANO—A SHORT HISTORY OF HIS DISCOVERIES

(By Daniel Santoro)

The year 1960 marks the four hundred and twenty-sixth anniversary of the discovery of the Hudson River, the Bay of New York, and Staten Island by the Italian cosmographer and navigator, Giovanni da Verrazzano. The magnificent statue by Ettore Ximenes, erected in 1909 through the good will of the Italian colony of New York, stands symbolically overlooking the bay which he discovered. The inscription on the pedestal records a historic truth:

"In the year 1909, America and Italy commemorate Giovanni da Verrazzano, Florentine, the first European to sail these waters, preceding another, more fortunate, for whom they were named, and whose shores were destined to be the site of one of the world's capital cities."

Giovanni da Verrazzano, the son of Pier Andrea da Verrazzano and Mammetta Cappella, was born in Greve di Chianti, near Florence, Italy, about 1485. Some historians have attributed a title of nobility to the Verrazzano family, and the coat of arms of a count may still be seen in the old house in Via delle Pinacchiara, near the famous church of Santa Croce.

Early in life he had developed a love for the sea, and he became very familiar with the Mediterranean waters. Having acquired a certain skill and reputation as a pilot, we find him engaged in the services of France on an expedition to discover the supposed strait to Cathay. In August 1508, Verrazzano entered the Gulf of St. Lawrence, thus preceding Cartier by 27 years. This search for a water route to the East Indies, however, was futile, and the ship returned to France.

Not very much is known about Verrazzano's activities at this time. Undoubtedly he must have made the acquaintance of many leading Italian merchants and bankers who had fled from the Italian republics for political reasons, and had found refuge in France. Among these were the Rucellai, friends of the Verrazzanos.

Monarchs and merchants in their eagerness to expand their kingdoms and trade respectively, sought the services of Italian navigators who surpassed all others in knowledge and skill. Cristoforo Colombo had gained wealth and vast lands for Spain; Giovanni and Sebastiano Caboto, sailing on a northern route, had planted the banner of England on the coast of Labrador upon which England based her claims to the North American mainland; Amerigo Vespucci, serving the king of Portugal, discovered the great southern continent, and his name was given to both western continents. Giovanni da Verrazzano was chosen by France to fulfill her dream of wealth and empire.

Exhausted by religious strife, political rebellions and the war against Charles V, emperor of the Holy Roman Empire and archduke of Austria, France lagged far behind England in projects of exploration and colonization. The Papal Bull of 1493, strengthened by the Treaty of Tordesillas (1494) excluded her from all territory beyond 370 leagues west of the Azores. With the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, Genoa's trade was ruined, while Venice's greatly declined as a result of Portuguese sailors who sailed around the coast of Africa thereby establishing cheaper trade routes with India. Thus the center of world trade had shifted from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, and France looked to the west.

Undaunted by the threat of excommunication imposed on all who sailed under the French flag, and willing to risk hanging by the Spaniards, Verrazzano saw his opportunity. Finding favor at the French Court (for the Italian Luisa di Savoia exerted great influence on her son; Luisa di Savoia became Regent of France during her son's capture after the Battle of Pavia), he obtained permission to organize an expedition from Francis I (Francois d'Angoulême, son of Luisa di Savoia, who, upon the death of his father-in-law, Louis XII, became King of France on January 1, 1515). Turning to the wealthy Italian bankers of Lyons, the fuorusciti (political exiles), as they were called, he succeeded in obtaining their financial backing. These merchants were only too eager to increase their trade, and were easily persuaded by Verrazzano's eloquence and reputation. In August 1523 Verrazzano and his crew of 50 men sailed from Dieppe on the 100-ton ocean-going caravel, the *Dauphine*, with three other ships.

A violent gale, however, compelled them to return to Brest. Two of the ships were lost, and the third, the *Normande*, refused to hazard the treacherous journey. On January 17, 1524, Verrazzano sailed aboard the *Dauphine* intent on finding a passage to the Indies.

Sailing along a route in the neighborhood of 34 degrees north latitude, he sighted the American Continent (at a point above Cape Fear, S. C.), and coasted southward for about 50 leagues. Aware that the Spaniards were exploring the lands to the south, Verrazzano turned and proceeded northward charting the coast and giving names. To the isthmus separating the ocean from Pimlico and Albemarle Sounds, which Verrazzano erroneously mistook for the Oriental Sea, he gave the name of Isthmus Verrazzano. Other names with which he baptized the sea coast include: Arcadia (Maryland), di Lorenna (Delaware), the first promontory Lanzone (Cape Henlopen), the second Bonivetto (Cape May), the largest river Vandoma (the Delaware) and a small mountain, di S. Polo (the Havesink Highlands).

Verrazzano's report to the King of France is the first original account (thus far known) of the Atlantic coast of the United States and it clearly describes his voyage of discovery and exploration. The account of his first landing on the American Continent reads thus: "The inhabitants being numerous, we saw everywhere multitudes of fires * * * We sent the boat on shore with 25 men to obtain water * * * Many of the natives came to the beach, indicating by various friendly signs that we might trust ourselves on shore * * * A young sailor was attempting to swim ashore through the surf to carry them some knicknacks, like little bells, looking glasses, and other trifles.

"He tossed the things to them, and turned about to get back to the boat, but he was thrown by the waves, and so dashed by them that he lay as if he were dead upon the beach. When the people saw him * * * they ran and took him by the head, legs and arms and carried him to a distance from the surf. The young man * * * uttered very loud shrieks in fear and dismay * * *

"Afterward they laid him down at the foot of a little hill, expressing great astonishment at the whiteness of his skin. Our sailors in the boat seeing a great fire made up, and their companion placed very near it, full of fear * * * imagined that the natives were about to roast him for food * * * But as soon as he had recovered his strength * * * they hugged him with great affection and accompanied him to the shore. The young man made his way safely to the boat, and remarked that the people were black * * * that they had shining skins, (were of) middle stature, (had) sharp faces and delicate bodies." (The translation used is that of Joseph G. Cogsell.)

Sailing northward Verrazzano made various landings along the coast, and finally came to "a very pleasant situation (between) some steep hills" (the Navesink Highlands, and the high ground at the east end of Staten Island) "through which a very large river, deep at its mouth flowed to the sea; from the sea to the estuary of the river, any ship heavily laden might pass, with the help of the tide which rises 8 feet. But as we were riding at anchor in a good berth, we would not venture up in our vessel, with a knowledge of the mouth; therefore we took the boat, and entering the river, we found the country on its banks well peopled, the inhabitants not differing much from the others, being dressed with feathers of birds of various colors." Verrazzano then goes on to relate how the Indians greeted them with shouts of joy, and how they showed them where to land safely with their boat. Going beyond these hills (inside The Narrows) he describes "a very beautiful lake (the upper bay) three leagues in circuit" where the Indians were rowing "in 30 or more boats from one shore to the other." He called this Bay Santa Margarita, and the river and the surrounding land Angoleme.

How long they remained here is uncertain. "A violent contrary wind blew in from the sea" and forced them back to their ship. Weighing anchor Verrazzano sailed eastward but always within sight of the coast, and proceeded from inlet to inlet, from bay to bay along the Atlantic seaboard, he discovered "an island of triangular form" (Block Island or Martha's Vineyard) about the size of the island of Rhodes which he named Luisa (in honor of Luisa de Savoia). He did not land here because "of the unfavorable weather" and proceeded toward the mainland till he came to a "very excellent harbor," Rifugio (Narragansett Bay). From here he continued sailing past Maine, and reaching as far as northwest of Sable Island, he turned the ship and headed back to Europe landing in Dieppe on July 8, 1524. Verrazzano failed to discover the route to Asia; instead he discovered the Hudson River, the Bay of New York, and Staten Island.

Little is known of Verrazzano after his return to France. Some historians maintain that he made a second trip to America. Ramusio states that he was devoured by cannibals in Venezuela; others say in Brazil. The Italian poet, Giulio Giovio, in a recently uncovered poem, states that Giovanni's brother Girolamo da Verrazzano, watched helplessly from the boat while Giovanni "was being devoured by savage Indians." However, this is not very probable since on May 11, 1526, Giovanni had made him the beneficiary in his testament, and it is not likely that one names as beneficiary a person who was to undertake the same dangerous mission. Nor did Girolamo, who was an excellent cosmographer, indicate on his map the place where the incident was reported to have happened. Others still say that he was captured by the Spaniards in 1527 and hanged.

The official recognition given to Henry Hudson as the discoverer of the Hudson River by the legislature of the State of New York on March 27, 1908, rightfully belongs to Giovanni da Verrazzano. Early Dutch historians, eager to claim credit for their nation, hardly mentioned Verrazzano, while they filled their history books with stories of

Hudson. The English could not have given him the credit since it would have been against their interest.

But the voice of truth cannot be silenced; it is louder than the roar of the waves; mightier than the power of the storm. It shall be heard.

A Long-Range Farm Program—Republican National Committee's Agriculture Subcommittee Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present the report of the Honorable Axel J. Beck, of South Dakota, chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Republican National Committee. Mr. Beck's report gives the background of the committee's work as well as its recommendations.

The report follows:

FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The Republican National Committee, at its January 1949 meeting in Omaha, with Chairman Scott's appointment and Chairman Gabrielson's continuation of a subcommittee on agriculture, recognized the problems confronting that industry as basic economic ones, and as problems having like importance from a political point of view, and by that act delegated to your subcommittee the difficult task of finding answers and solutions which not only would meet the requirements of practical farming under conditions which now exist and be receptive to the farmers, but which also would fit into the scheme and pattern of the philosophy and concept of free enterprise.

We, as members of your committee, accepted that assignment with a great deal of hesitancy. We were dubious concerning constructive accomplishments. We recognized the tremendous difficulties which were involved and we entertained no great hope of finding answers to questions which over the years had proved so baffling and concerning which there had been so much disagreement.

Our preliminary investigations and inquiries, however, soon led us to conclude that the viewpoints of practical dirt farmers on questions relating to a farm program had seldom been sought an never emphasized and that our committee, even though it couldn't find all of the answers which it had been called on to supply, could at least make a contribution in this field by furnishing an opportunity for the operators in the field of agriculture—the ones who had seen and felt the impact of Government entry therein, the participants and actual observers—to tell of actual experiences and to advise and counsel on legislative proposals relating to a long-range farm program.

With such self-imposed restrictions as to the scope of our inquiries, we found no difficulty in deciding upon the heart of the farm belt, with Sioux City at the junction of three of the great farm belt States in its center, as our field of operations and upon that city as the forum from which the agricultural voice of America should be heard.

We need not in this report stress all of the particulars which preceded or which took place during the Sioux City meeting, except those which ought to be stressed and which we regard as being highly important.

The reception given us by the host State and city belongs in that category. Iowa, under the leadership of its distinguished citizen and Governor, William S. Beardsley, and Sioux City, expressing itself through its popular mayor, Dan J. Conley, and cooperating through a smoothly functioning chamber of commerce, extended a welcome to the conference which not only gave official prominence to it, but a vivid interest setting also.

The presence of and participation in the conference proceedings by nationally prominent Republican leaders, likewise, was tremendously important and significant. The conference but for the attendance of Senators Aiken, of Vermont; Young, of North Dakota; Butler and Wherry, of Nebraska; Thye, of Minnesota; Kem, of Missouri; Hickenlooper, of Iowa; and Mundt, of South Dakota; and Congressmen Hope, of Kansas; Andresen, of Minnesota; Stephan and Curtis, of Nebraska; Talle, Hoeven, Gross, Martin, and LeCompte, of Iowa; Case, of South Dakota; Governor George T. Michelson, of South Dakota; and Chairman Guy George Gabrielson, would not have been appraised as an event having national significance. That attendance silenced our critics who were ready to charge the Republican Party with indifference toward agriculture.

The farm organizations' participation in the conference proceedings are events which must be classified likewise. The conference record without their statement would not have been complete. In those statements we have expressions from recognized farm leaders on basic agricultural policies, on existing differences in viewpoints and on approaches to the solution of the long-range farm problem. All of them merit study and full consideration since they represent results of painstaking and conscientious and technical and practical research over a period of years in the field of agriculture.

Other observations which we made concerning that conference are summed up in our statement of October 1. It in substance told of the character of the conference proceedings, the interest it created, the commitments our party made and what was accomplished by it. We submit it for the record of this committee and as a part of our final report. It reads as follows:

"The subcommittee on agriculture today, through its chairman, made the assertion that the Republican Party's next step in its fight for agriculture and a restoration of a sound economy and as a sequel to the recent National Farm Conference, should be to see to it that the majority recommendations from the farmers at that conference for a long-range farm program prominently be kept before Congress as it formulates legislation of that type.

"These recommendations," he added, "consisted of demands for high level parity price supports, continuation of recognized soil conservation practices, storage, insofar as possible, on the farms, of adequate stock piles of nonperishable farm products, tariff protection at parity levels, and utmost freedom from Government interference with and control of farming."

"The Republican Party by sponsoring the conference and by inviting the farmers to participate in it," he continued, "impliedly pledged itself to keep those recommendations before Congress and it is a pledge that the party can be depended upon to keep.

"Something else, too," he emphasized, "came out of that conference, that some group of farmers reflecting the traditional independence and self-reliance of the farmers of America, declared themselves against subsidies and doles, strait-jacket Brannan-plan methods of regimentation, and the shackles and the chains it proposes for agriculture."

The farmers insisted in the course of that conference that adoption of the recommendations would result in prosperity for agriculture which in turn would mean prosperity for the Nation.

Commenting upon the character of these recommendations, he pointed out further, that the conference record consisted of complete statements from all of the major farm organizations, of statements by nationally known economists and of the experts in the field of agriculture and of more than 100 farmers from more than 15 Farm Belt States, and that those recommendations, therefore, represented a correct cross-section view of the farmer thinking of America.

"They reflected," he said, "realistic as well as constructive thinking on the part of farmers, in that they point the way to a gradual, safe, and systematic departure from our present rigged economy and a return to the American way of life and our system of free enterprise."

Concluding his remarks, he observed that the farmers of America at a conference spotlighted nationally, sponsored by the Republican Party, but otherwise nonpolitical, for the first time in history had a chance to tell their side of the story of agriculture. In telling it, they took the lead and they pointed the way. They warned that the rugged individualism, exemplified by the testimony of Dan Casement, the colorful Kansan who spoke at the conference, if invoked now, can be as harmful and as dangerous to our economy as the views of the extreme leftists and those who would make the farmers serfs in a welfare state. They brought practical sense to a problem which by reason of politics has been made confusing, and they give it an importance which must not be overlooked.

"The administration forces in Washington," he continued, "are already claiming that the farmers who spoke at the conference should be ignored, that their recommendations should be disregarded and that the conference record should have no effect."

"The Republican Party and the Republicans in Congress, on the other hand," he finally concluded, "will see to it that the conference pledge to the farmers of America will be kept."

Accordingly, your committee has reached the conclusion that recommendations as to objectives to be attained under a long-range farm program should be a part of this report. Such action is in line with the majority recommendations, which came out of that conference. It is in accord with the compact made with the farmers and the kind of results they were led to expect.

The recommendations we have agreed upon do not follow the methods or plans prescribed by any one of the farm organizations or by any individual or group of individuals, but are based on all of the evidence and testimony which is in the conference record and upon other evidence which has come to the attention of your committee and are intended as recommendations, only, for a plan, rather than the plan by which the desired objectives can be achieved.

OBJECTIVES

1. Administration by farmers through a system of farmer elected township and county committees and State directors, and a national farm board appointed by the President.

2. Full parity price at all times on all cash nonperishable crops, restricted only by marketing quotas on each farm when on August 15 of any one year the total estimated national supply of any specific commodity crop exceeds 150 percent of the predicted requirements for the next year.

3. Full parity price at all times, also, on all feed nonperishable crops—such crops to be in terms of production units based on feed value—limited only by acreage restrictions on individual farms when the supply of such

crops in terms of such units, stored thereon, on December 1 of any 1 year, will exceed 150 percent of its assigned production.

4. Unrestricted livestock production, supported at full parity in the market place, by Government purchases from livestock processors of enough of their products to maintain the market at that level. Losses, if any, from sales of accrued surplus, resulting from such purchasing operations, to be financed by a fee of $1 per hundred pounds imposed on the billing sale of all livestock. Such fee may be the crest of a declared marketing emergency be increased to as much as $3 per hundred, or, when unnecessary by reason of self-sustaining market, or a sufficient surplus of fee collections, be entirely suspended.

5. Eggs and dairy products to be supported at full parity price levels by a fee on the products marketed, under the same general plan as is established for livestock. The fee base in this field being liquid, it is safe to assume that a small fee will sustain such price structure.

6. Semiperishable crops to be maintained at full parity price levels, also, under a Government-purchasing and a market-quota system.

7. Facilities for storage of nonperishable feed crops on the farms.

8. A sound soil-conservation program to insure continued fertility of our soil, proper and essential mineral content, and one which will tend to minimize the disturbing facts of soil erosion.

9. Encouragement of research and new uses of agricultural products and the development of new industries to utilize additional production.

10. A flexible tariff at the parity level for all products of agriculture.

POLICY

The Republican Party, traditionally constructive, departs, under this plan, from negative philosophies of curtailed production, and enters an era of full productivity.

By it we propose incentive for agricultural production records, efficiency in operations, and we point to permanent means by which a farmer can operate at a profit, hold what he has acquired, and meet the problems of ever-increasing overhead costs.

With it we propose production which increases sales, engenders demand for goods and labor, and which raises standards of living. We boldly reject the hopelessness of the scheme of a low price for a big crop and a high price for a small one, with the results in terms of dollar income virtually the same.

As we launch it we shall abandon the false concept of scarcity as a means of acquiring plenty, and we shall underwrite a program for farm income at 1948 levels and correspondingly high ones in other fields.

The Republican Party, under the terms of this plan, in conjunction with full parity price for all farm products, proposes an end to further unwarranted Government intrusions in this field, a reshuffling of administrative and operational control to farmers and a creed which may properly be called, the American code of agriculture.

FARMER ADMINISTRATION

Control of the industry in which the farmers are directly interested should and can be exercised by them through election of township and county committees and State directors and majority representation on the national board. Such representation shall be by appointment by the president from State directors or persons who shall have held such positions. Other members of that board shall also be appointed by the President in a manner so as to represent other interests in the Nation. Such a board shall have controlling power in all matters relating to administration and policy; the Secretary of Agriculture shall be an officio member and its presiding officer.

PARITY

Parity is in the nature of an equalizing measure. It may also be referred to as a formula under which the price for the things that a farmer sells goes up and down as the prices in other fields fluctuate. Farm products, therefore, on principle, must be kept at full parity price levels.

SUPPORT PRICE

Full parity prices for cash and feed nonperishable crops can be maintained by 90 percent commodity loans callable at parity. This is in line with what experience has taught us.

STORAGE ON FARMS

Provisions shall be made to carry 50 percent reserve of nonperishable feed crops in storage on the farms at all times. Such a stock pile will protect the Nation against shortage in case of drought or war. It will operate as an automatic check on tendencies to overproduce. The useless costs incidental to Government storing will be eliminated. Shuttling of feed crops from farms to Government storage bins and back again when such supplies get low will be ended and savings will be effected both by farmers and the Government.

This method for storage will furnish insurance against crop failures, since the supply on each individual farm in short crop years can be sold on a higher market or used as feed. A crop reserve of that size in the possession and control of individual farmers can be likened to a reserve account by a corporation or a bank which is created to protect against unanticipated emergencies or losses. Such assets on every farm will add stability to the farming business and it will cover temporary individual farm unit setbacks, which otherwise might be quite serious.

SURPLUSES

By combining crop and livestock production under our plan, we are not only working toward more production normalcy in the field and more balance—factors which by themselves will simplify the troublesome question of crop surpluses and assure better incomes—but by the expedient of converting of increased amounts of such surpluses into livestock products—of which there is almost always a shortage and for which there is constant demand—we are providing channels for disposition which formerly did not exist, we are arranging to meet normal market demands and we are reducing the cost of absorbing such surplus to the extent that they can be paid without any expense to the Government and out of the fee we propose.

SELF-FINANCED

Upon a theory which from the standpoint of principle is comparable to that underlying minimum wages and the principle applied by business when it assesses the cost of its products, including taxes, to the consumer, we are not only freeing agriculture from the charge that it is recipient of subsidies and doles and holding prices of farm products at parity peaks, but we are also financing the whole venture by a fee which will be added to the price of the things which are produced.

SOCIAL FEATURES

The farmer under this plan will be free of the controls by overlords in the Department of Agriculture. He can make his plans for short periods or he can make them on a long-range basis. He can make his farming conform to special requirements of his own farm unit or to his own individual management pattern. He is once more restored to the position of independence he once held with a protection, however, which assures him earning opportunities comparable to that of individuals in other fields.

ISSUE PRESENTED

Your committee in making this report and submitting this plan, has sought not only to keep its pledge to the farm conference, but by our recommendations that the plan be submitted to the Republicans in Congress as objectives to be attained by the Republican Party in its fight for agriculture, we are not only suggesting specific commitments from our party to the farmers, but we are also focusing the attention of the Nation on the fundamental differences which exist between the so-called Brannan plan and the type of a farm program which the farmers want, which they must have, which they recommended in the course of that conference, which in substance is reflected by the plan we have proposed, and which as already indicated we have termed "the American code of agriculture."

CONCLUSION

The Republican Party is without a long-range farm plan. It must have one if it expects to win the confidence of the voters in the Farm Belt in the coming elections. That plan must be such as to appeal to the average, typical, and practical farmer. It must be positive and specific. Generalizations are not enough. The farmers are demanding a bill of particulars and are entitled to it.

This report contains proposals which meets those demands and it suggests objectives which not only fit into the American farmer's concept of free enterprise and ours, but also into the pattern laid down by the whole committee and the Republicans in Congress at the recent Washington meeting.

Your committee, in this connection, suggests that the 20-percent decline in last year's farm income, the predicted one for the coming year of an additional 10 percent, the admitted damaging effect of such declines on the whole economy and the Agriculture Department's implied admission of failure as it proposes dumping and destruction of surplus crops, has focused the attention of the Nation on need for specific and constructive measures to prevent prospective collapse of the farm products price structure. Announcement concerning such measures for that reason should be made at this time.

This report is being submitted to the chairman of the policy committee in accordance with the action taken by the whole committee at its executive session on February 5. We ask that it be filed and approved and that the recommendations in it, as to objectives, be submitted to the Republicans in Congress as suggestions for basic farm policy of the Republican Party.

Respectfully submitted.

Axel J. Beck, Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Republican National Committee; Subcommittee Members: Axel J. Beck, Chairman; Mrs. Gifford Mayes, Vice Chairman; Mr. B. L. Noojin; Mrs. A. C. Remmel; Mr. C. C. Spades; Mrs. Ralph A. Harris; Mr. C. Norman Brunsdale; Mrs. John B. Cooley; Mr. James P. Winne.

American Taxpayers Pay the Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, Valentin Gubitchev, the convicted Russian spy, is going back to Russia, not to jail, and the United States Government is paying the major portion of his passage aboard a North Atlantic luxury liner.

The State Department arbitrarily dictated that Gubitchev be sent to his homeland and that he be freed from serving a just sentence of 15 years for stealing vital United States secrets.

Gubitchev, as a Russian attaché of the United Nations, is paid by the United Nations. The United States, through the American taxpayers, contributes 46 percent of the cost of operating the United Nations.

Gubitchev has been drawing his pay ever since his arrest and all the time he was on trial, and the United Nations is buying his ticket back to Russia.

Forty-six percent of Gubitchev's salary came from the people of the United States—the people he was spying upon.

Forty-six percent of the cost of the spy's trip home will be paid by the taxpayers of the United States.

Forty-six percent of all of Gubitchev's expenses while in the United States was paid for by the American taxpayers.

Bureaucratic Control of Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution recently adopted by Unit No. 90 of the American Legion Auxiliary, Melrose, Mass., as certified to me by Emma L. Burns, president, and Irma L. Berthel, secretary. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the American veteran in two world wars has defended the American free-enterprise system, which has made possible the development in this country of the highest standards of medical care and the finest medical institutions attained by any major country in the world; and

Whereas having experienced the shortcomings of impersonal, assembly-line medical care inherent in the form of Government-controlled medicine necessary in time of war, the veteran understands the dangers of imposing such a system permanently on the entire population; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would impose an unjust tax on the veteran's pay check for medical care to which he is now entitled free of charge as a reward for his service to his country; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would force a tax of 3 percent on the income of the employed veteran, rising to a tax of at least 6 percent within a few years, creating new financial burdens which would increase the costs of necessities of life and lower the standard of living for veterans and other citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion Auxiliary, Melrose, Mass., Unit 90 does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from the State of Massachusetts, and that said Senators and Representatives be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

One Freedom Indivisible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, the story of Abraham Lincoln remains one of the greatest sources of inspiration in the history of our Republic. The annual observance of his birthday anniversary properly has become a source of renewed devotion to the cause of the people and their representative government. Under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to a challenging address delivered on Lincoln's birthday in his home city of Springfield, Ill., by Harold E. Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota and now president of the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. Stassen's audience was made of Young Republicans in Illinois, whose enthusiasm gives renewed hope for the preservation of the principles so well exemplified by the words and deeds of the Great Emancipator.

Mr. Stassen's address follows:

ONE FREEDOM INDIVISIBLE

(By Harold E. Stassen)

Chairman BROWN, Congressman DIRKSEN, Congressman JENISON, National Chairman Tope, members and guests of the Illinois Young Republican Federation, Abraham Lincoln was one of those few men in all history who deeply understood the nature of man and had the unshakable courage to act in accordance with his convictions.

He believed—he knew—that man was meant to be free, and in moving addresses he declared that this Nation could not endure permanently half slave and half free.

Standing fast upon this principle, Lincoln welded together a powerful and victorious political party; he took the leadership of the Nation, and he brought it through its hour of grim trial as one undivided United States of America. There can be little doubt now of the everlasting rightness of his position or of the benefits that have flowed to all mankind, regardless of color, by reason of Lincoln's actions. We salute the memory of Abraham Lincoln tonight.

At this midcentury point, in America and in the western world there is another, but closely related issue which needs clarification and decision. After Lincoln's time, as freemen were stimulated to invent and place into extensive use machines to work for men, rather than to have men toiling as slaves to them, remarkable productivity was achieved and unequalled progress was made. But with this rapid industrial revolution came abuses and dislocations, and booms and depressions.

Some of the resulting problems were wisely met by the adoption of important new rules and regulations and provisions, such as the antitrust and antimonopoly measures, the early enforcement of which was associate with Theodore Roosevelt; the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to safe-guard credit and deposits, which was set up under an amendment presented to the Congress by Senator VANDENBERG; and the social security measures to aid the temporarily unemployed, which were established under Franklin Roosevelt. These actions all applied the basic, sound methods of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. They established rules and prescribed limits of action whereby the exercise of one man's freedom would not unduly infringe upon his fellow man's enjoyment of freedom. These same methods had been employed from the very earliest days of our Nation.

Through the vigilance of our Republican Party and through some key decisions by the Supreme Court, we have thus far, in the main, retained our individual economic freedom in America. This is the principal reason for the fact that our average worker's home has a better standard of living than the average worker's home in any other country in the world and it is the principal reason that the number of good jobs available to the worker is very high.

Under that liberty, individual management and free workers and capitalist tools have together increased the results that can be obtained from a day's work by 100 percent in a single generation of 25 years. Unfortunately, a goodly part of that gain has been taken away from the worker through the cheapening of the wage dollar by the unsound economic policies of his government.

Unfortunately also, in that generation, the whole world has been lured by another set of proposals. Frequently confused and rarely clearly defined, the central purpose of these alien proposals is that instead of placing out carefully the means and limitations under which free men can work out their problems, with competition providing rewards for efficiency and penalties for inefficiency, these proposals manifest the belief that the simplest approach to any problem is for government to step in and take over the entire situation involved in that problem. "Let the government do it," is the slogan. Nationalization, government ownership, blanket controls, price fixing, heavy taxes, governmental distribution of goods, and governmental operation of all or a major part of the economy are the methods of this school of thought.

In various forms and in varying degrees it has crept into the entire western world. Its extreme form appears in the absolute collectivist views of the totalitarian materialists of the Continent: Marx and Engels and Feuerbach, Lenin and Stalin and Hitler. In the democracies, however, it has been frequently advocated as a defense against communism, as the ideal system of the future. Its purpose, as we are told emphatically, is to maintain the political and religious freedom of men.

But, as the various experiments in governmental operation of an entire economy, or in the nationalization of major industries or professions or sections of an economy, are attempted, we can observe the resultant effects upon the lowering standards of living, the decreased liberties, and the restricted way of life of the people. And as we watch the unfolding of these schemes a central point emerges. It is a point which I believe must be precisely stated and dramatically emphasized. It is this:

The economic freedom of man—that is, his freedom to buy and to sell, to work and to profit, to produce and to build, to invest and to manufacture, to mine and to distribute, to save and to spend, subject only to broad and fair rules of the economic road—cannot permanently be divided from his other freedoms.

In fact, in the long-term view, all of the freedoms of man are indivisible. The tendency to speak of a number of freedoms has resulted in confusion, it has created the impression that man can turn over to government a part of his freedoms and retain the rest. But throughout the world the evidence accumulates that man's situation is not static and that if he is but partly free, he will either gradually win full freedom or slowly lose all his freedom.

If a man becomes subservient to the men in authority in his government for what he may eat and what he may wear, for where he may work and what he may earn, for what he may produce and how he shall produ,

for what he may build and where he may live, then he cannot truly be free in what he may say or write, or how he may worship, or how he may live.

A man must either have complete freedom or he will not for long be truly free at all. A man cannot permanently be half a slave and half a freeman.

It is this great issue which our Republican Party must take hold of with a firm and confident grasp. Assuming clear and definite position, the party must translate the issue to the people in forthright terms. The issue must not be presented negatively, as mere obstruction, but by means of positive, dynamic programs by which progress can be made and freedom retained. Obviously there will be disagreements in the details of such a program, for no program of action can ever be worked out without adjustment of views and honest compromise finally arrived at. But on the great fundamental principle that the freedom of man is indivisible and that government must not have the power of economic life and death over its people, there can be no compromise, there must be no compromise.

I believe that this is the key truth which the Republican Party must make crystal clear and present to the people as its fighting issue.

It is the most progressive, dynamic principle of all time. Its correct interpretation will lead to greater progress, to better conditions of living, and to brighter prospects of world peace than any of the confused, pseudo-liberal, reactionary doctrines of these recent decades. It does not in any sense limit the objectives and goals of man. Rather it does precisely the opposite. It points out the only true course by which the goals of happiness and security can be realized and maintained. It sets the standards by which government shall establish fair boundaries to one man's exercise of his freedom, boundaries that prevent his infringing unduly on the exercise of the freedom of his fellowmen. It indicates the way in which government shall help in performing those functions which men cannot perform for themselves, but it prescribes methods that retain man's individual freedom and methods that do not subject him to the whim or caprice of other men in government.

And here are some more specific examples of what this principle does:

It emphasizes the importance of preventing monopolies and international cartels, which in effect take away man's freedom to buy and trade.

It brings to us a sharp realization of the fundamental evil of the dictatorial labor leader who prevents the members of his union from working though they wish to do so, who ruthlessly obliterates from his union those who have different views, and who slams shut the door on those who would be apprentices in the field of labor that he controls.

It warns that we must not permit Government to take over the control of the medical professions by any compulsory health plan.

It demonstrates that we must forbid Government to take actions which would greedily grasp such large portions of a man's earnings that he is denied the freedom to spend and use and enjoy the fruits of his own labor.

There is a double evil in the proposals to increase the economic power of the Government over the people.

I have emphasized the unfortunate restriction on the citizen's freedom. The other bad effect is that it increases the power and bigness of Government itself. All the warnings of the great men in our history against a too powerful and too centralized Government were wise. The current world scene corroborates earlier history in this respect.

Government is like a fire. If it is kept within bounds and under the control of people, it contributes to the welfare of all. But if it gets out of its place, if it gets too big and out of control, it destroys the happiness and even the lives of the people.

One of the lessons of America's unparalleled progress is that Government's principal role is to protect men and to prevent crushing burdens from being laid upon them and to leave them free—truly free and completely free. Our Government in the past has in the main held to that role, and the sum total of the results of the freedom it has fostered has been progress far in excess of anything that totalitarian systems can accomplish. Freedom means strength far beyond that of cumbersome and clanking collectivism, which cows the worker instead of releasing his energies. It is the virile idea which will penetrate iron curtains and push through colonial barricades and move all mankind toward progress and toward peace.

The bright source of the doctrine of the true freedom of man is that stream of philosophic thought that can be traced to ancient Greece. It received major impetus from the Christian religion and from Judaism, and was implemented by Magna Carta, by the Declaration of Independence, and by the Constitution of our country. The fundamental concept of man's inherent rights—that he is meant to be free and that he is an individual possessing human dignity—does not really permit of the mixed interpretations of socialism or of communism. Neither does it permit of a cold and ruthless capitalism, nor of a domineering, dictatorial hierarchy of labor. It requires the evolvement in this industrial age of a modern people's capitalism and a modern, free man's government which with skill and ingenuity and flexible adaptiveness constantly sets up those new rules and new limits to keep the game of life of free men fair, to ease the plight of those who are ill or unemployed or aged, but never to so burden the producer, or so reward the slacker, as to undermine the virility of an economy.

Let us always have in mind that every attempt in the history of the world to establish a loafers' paradise has wound up in a dictator's hellhole.

My message to the Young Republicans of Illinois and of the Nation today is this:

Let us rebuild the Republican Party as a dynamic, fighting party with this issue of the true freedom of man as our central rallying point.

Let us make it clear that if people are looking for a political party that will promise to everyone ever larger hand-outs from the Public Treasury, they should look elsewhere that we hold that the Public Treasury is in reality the people's pockets, and that we will not seek to win votes by false promises nor by leading the country down that road that inevitably ends in a cheapened dollar and ultimate misery and suffering for all when resources are drained.

Let us make it clear that if the people want a political party that will take over and politically dominate the medical professions in exchange for promises which the experience of Britain show cannot be fulfilled, they should look elsewhere.

Let us make it clear that if they want a political party that will try to delude them into thinking that someone else is going to pay the tax burdens, they should look elsewhere.

Let us make it clear we seek to build a political party that is frank and forthright with the people, a party that promises above all that it will not weaken or destroy any of the freedom of the people, that it will seek ever to maintain an incentive for every man and woman to use his hands and brains and capital in worth while and productive accomplishment and service, and that it will steadfastly refuse to maintain or to operate any system of governmental hand-outs, to provide soft cushions for loafers or chiselers or dishonest 5-percenters.

Let us also declare with deep sincerity that man cannot truly be free if discrimination against him because of his race or religion or ancestry shuts doors to him of education or of employment or of shelter or of justice. Thus we shall make clear that, having adopted this great principle, our party cannot contemplate and shall not consummate a fusion with those forces in our country affiliated by name with the opposition party who seek to join with us partially to protect economic freedom for themselves but even more to deny true freedom to others in their midst.

Rather should we associate ourselves with those thoughtful, forward-looking people throughout the Nation who seek sound and steady progress toward our high ideals for all our people without discrimination.

Our objective further means that our people must have and hold fast to that code of moral and ethical conduct which has been developed from the depths of our great religions and which provides a self-discipline in our relationship to our fellowmen that is more important than any laws or rules or decrees. The lessons of history indicate that unless there is a code of conduct which causes people as a whole to have respect for the rights of their fellowmen, to regard them as individuals endowed with human dignity, to treat them with justice regardless of the terms of any laws or rules, that unless there is such a basis for the relationship between men, there cannot be true freedom, for the only alternative method for keeping such a society functioning is through laws and decrees possessing such detail and providing punishment so rutheless and extreme as to wipe out human liberties.

This approach means that we cannot rest in the face of misery and suffering, and it means further that in our humanitarian efforts to alleviate misery and suffering we must never ask that the rights of those who are in need be subjugated to government. We must instead ingeniously devise methods of aid that permit the retention of full freedom of the individual who is aided.

Let me say bluntly that if we adopt this basic objective, ours will not be an easy road. Embodying it in programs and instruments of government is difficult; interpreting it to the will and understanding of a people is complicated. But it is worth the price. It is not a route to easy victory in elections. But I believe it is the only route to victories that are worth while. It is the only route to victories that can be crowned by administrations that contribute deep and lasting value to the people of the United States of America and to all mankind.

We must alertly recognize that many men, either because of a sincere but mistaken belief in socialism or because of a cynical indifference to everything but victory at the polls, employing local political-machine techniques will make exaggerated promises of material gains to the people, hoping thus to win elections and as a byproduct to place more and more power in the hands of those in government.

The course I advocate would require that each of us must guard the freedom of his fellow men as jealously and effectively as he guards his own. The businessman's economic freedom to produce and manufacture and sell and profit is really inseparable from the professor's academic freedom to teach and write and research. The laboring man's right to work and to quit work and to change work is inseparable from the doctor's and dentist's right to practice their profession independently. The right to buy and to sell is inseparable from the right to publish and to assemble. The entire way of life of freemen springs from one concept of the indivisible freedom of man. It is as

freemen, thoroughly understanding the importance of their freedom and helping other men to win true and complete freedom, that Americans can gloriously fulfill their position of leadership in the world. This, as I see it, is the great task of the Republican Party.

I ask you young men and women gathered here tonight, and the citizens listening in, to step forward throughout the Nation to meet the challenge of this task.

Brock Pemberton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on March 14 regarding the death of Mr. Brock Pemberton.

My wife and I were privileged to know Mr. Pemberton for a great many years. He was a charming and loyal friend. He was an able craftsman of the theater. He was a leader. He participated generously in the community in which he lived. He was a civic-minded citizen who played an intelligent and contributive part in the many matters which affect the welfare of the men and women who lend their skills and talents to the stage. He was interested in their problems. He was greatly loved.

Beyond all this, he was a patriotic and courageous American who strove energetically to preserve the vital opportunities inherent in our free society. He was deeply apprehensive regarding the threats to that society, both foreign and domestic.

He will be greatly missed and deeply mourned, not only by those who knew him and loved him but also by many others for whom he represented a dependable and helpful influence in the theatrical world.

I extend to his wife and to his brother my deepest sympathy at this time of grievous loss.

His life was gentle, and the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world "This was a man."

The editorial follows:

BROCK PEMBERTON

Brock Pemberton was first of all an American. He came out of the Middle West and proved that he could win success in New York as definitely as anybody from overseas. That was something pretty important to do in the twenties when foreign names were fashionable and even quite talented artists sincerely believed that it was imperative to have a European background. To set up as native a work as Zona Gale's Miss Lulu Bett against such a pattern took courage, but Mr. Pemberton had his share of that quality and proved it again and again whenever there was need of it in his experience.

Perhaps he owed something to the example of William Allen White, under whom he trained in Emporia. In any case he remained a newspaperman by instinct if not in continued practice all his days. He possessed a keen sense for situations compelling in character, however simple and unpretending in other respects. Most of the plays he produced were masters of addition—works in which details accumulated until they reached a wholly natural climax. He judged a script by its power to create a demand in the mind of the audience and then to meet that demand by satisfactory action. There were occasions when he failed, but the net result of his endeavors was triumphant achievement. If only for Harvey, he will have a permanent place in the annals of the American theater.

The Return of a Native

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week Oakland Cemetery in Petersburg, Ill., claimed the body of a great American author.

Edgar Lee Masters, who became famous almost overnight in 1914 with the publication of Spoon River Anthology, was returned last Friday for burial in Petersburg, where he had spent his childhood days. It is significant indeed that he chose to be laid away here where Spoon River Anthology had its setting and in the same cemetery that claims the bodies of two of the writer's subjects, Mitchell Miller and Ann Rutledge.

Mr. Masters was not only a great author, as he had also distinguished himself as a successful lawyer prior to the time he gave up his practice in Illinois to devote full time to his writings. He was an active Democrat and while in Chicago was one of the founders and the first president of the Jefferson Club.

While he has passed on, his works will live forever. He will go down in history as a great American author and one who added much to American literature. As part of my remarks, I include an editorial by V. Y. Dallman, editor of the Illinois State Register:

RETURN OF THE NATIVE

Edgar Lee Masters, poet and iconoclast, has come home. Always the land of the Spoon River was in his heart, and today he is laid to rest there, a native son returned to his own country.

Perhaps some future poet will pen as postscript to Spoon River Anthology, Masters' own epitaph. It will be as stark, as moving, as bitter as those of the anthology that lifted him to fame.

It was Masters' great tragedy to outlive his muse and the renaissance in poetry he created. His career was long and colorful, begun in great dreams and ended in frustration.

But always in his writings there persisted an unchanging affinity for the country of his boyhood. In one of his last books, the Sangamon, he tells in detail of the people whom he knew. Unlike much of his writing—caustic, searching, probing intimate depths—the Sangamon is written in a tender, reminiscent mood. To this country all of his life, Edgar Lee Masters gave unwavering devotion.

Today he returns a tired wayfarer. Squire Davis and Lucinda Matlock Masters, whom he idealized, are waiting for him.

The long journey is ended, and who can say how well or ill it was pursued? Better than us posterity can give the answer. Putting aside the triumphs and defeats and puzzling paradoxes, let us honor a man who used truth not like a swinging censer of mystic beauty as did Vachel Lindsay, but as a cutting edge, exquisitely keen, implacably wielded.

Let us not discuss his books or his philosophy or his individualism. Suffice it to say that Edgar Lee Masters has come home.

Inter-American Commission of Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following request for cooperation presented by the chairman of the Inter-American Commission for Women, Senora Amalia De Castillo Ledon, to the women Senators and Representatives of the Congress of the United States on January 26, 1950:

INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION OF WOMEN—REQUEST FOR COOPERATION PRESENTED BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION, SENORA AMALIA DE CASTILLO LEDON TO THE WOMEN SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 26, 1950

The functions of the Inter-American Commission of Women, as set forth in the Organic Statute of the Commission approved at the Ninth International Conference of American States, in Bogotá, include the following objectives: To work for the extension of civil, political, and social rights to the women of America; to study their problems and propose means of solving them.

The aforesaid Commission, which I have the honor to serve as Chairman, therefore appeals to you, the representatives of your countrywomen in the Congress of your Nation, to cooperate with active efforts and with your votes in promoting the adoption of laws that will tend to improve such aspects of the position of women in the United States as fall within the scope of the objectives of the Commission.

As you know, this Commission, which is striving to establish equality of rights between the sexes in all countries of our hemisphere, is not a politically partisan organization. Consequently its appeal for your cooperation is directed through me to all of you alike, the women Senators and Representatives of the two leading political parties in this country; for the problem of general interest, calling for a collective attempt to arrive at the solution, without distinction as to class or political parties and doctrines.

A Convention on the Granting of Civil Rights to Women, approved at the Ninth International Conference of American States, in Bogotá, was signed by the representatives of all the American countries except the United States.

With reference to that instrument the Assembly recently held in Buenos Aires by the Inter-American Commission of Women adopted a resolution which reads, in part, as follows:

"Whereas its importance (i. e., the importance of the convention) is bound up with the potential enjoyment of unanimous

support by agreements adopted within the framework of the American regional system;

"The interpretation of the term 'civil rights' has by now been made sufficiently clear in the constitutions and codes of a majority of nations, and reaffirmed by the 20 countries signatory to the above-mentioned convention.

"The Special Assembly of the Inter-American Commission of Women

"Resolves, To express the hope of the Inter-American Commission of Women that the United States will proceed, in due time and in conformity with the special restrictions of its legal system, to adapt its laws to the juridical norms under which it is feasible to sign the Inter-American convention on the granting of civil rights to women signed by the 20 countries at the Ninth International Conference of American States, in Bogotá; and the further hope that the countries signatory to the said convention will proceed to ratify it as soon as possible, if they have not yet done so."

Accordingly, I ask for your influential and decisive support within the legislative body in which you serve as representatives of the women of North America, in order that the hopes thus expressed by the Inter-American Commission of Women may meet with a favorable response conducive to a satisfactory solution of the problem in the near future.

At the same conference in Bogotá a convention on the granting of political rights to women was likewise approved. This instrument was signed by 12 countries, including the United States.

Consequently, as Chairman of the Inter-American Commission of Women, I make this additional request: That you intervene with the appropriate authorities in order to bring about the swiftest possible ratification of the above-mentioned convention by the Government of the United States. Such ratification will undoubtedly serve as a stimulus to the other signatory countries that have not yet ratified the instrument in question.

For the rest, as official representatives of your countrywomen—representatives elected to posts of such high eminence from among the ranks of the most distinguished and the most able—you must surely be the women capable of exercising the greatest influence in the Congress of which you form a part, for the purpose of enabling other women, in greater numbers than hitherto, to occupy in the future important elective posts in which they, like you themselves, can strive for the advancement of women in every phase of life.

It is a well known fact that the number of women in the Congress of the United States has decreased rather than increased, and our most attentive and vigorous efforts are required in order to remedy this negative trend.

Thus, on behalf of the commission, I solicit your valuable cooperation and ask for expressions of opinion and for pertinent suggestions, to the end that our organization may serve the interests of American women in the present and in the future, responding as effectively as possible to the hopes that they have placed in it.

The women of the United States have at their disposal the power inherent in their organizations, and to those organizations also we look for effective support. Moreover, North American women are in a position to draw upon experience acquired through long years of arduous endeavor, and upon vast cultural and economic resources. In short, they have available all of the elements necessary for decisive and valuable collaboration; and it is this collaboration that I request in the name of the commission, to the end that the basic principles of our organization, principles concerned with the welfare of American women, may be successfully applied for the attainment of their rights.

American Veterans Committee Asks Excise Repeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD a transcript of testimony given before the House Ways and Means Committee on March 2, 1950, by Mr. Robert R. Nathan, an outstanding economist and lawyer. Mr. Nathan spoke on repeal of excise taxes and general tax policy, in behalf of American Veterans Committee (AVC), an organization of World War II veterans which consistently pursues its policy of "citizens first." I think this sound expression of policy, together with the very illuminating colloquy between Mr. Nathan and the able chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, supplies essential background which we should all bear in mind as we approach the subject of new tax legislation.

Mr. Nathan's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT R. NATHAN, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE, AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. NATHAN. My name is Robert R. Nathan. I am an economist with offices at 3 Thomas Circle, Washington, and am appearing here today on behalf of the American Veterans Committee as chairman of their national legislative committee.

The American Veterans Committee, which is commonly called the AVC, is composed of World War II veterans. This organization is primarily interested in the preservation of the free and democratic process we have here, and in increasing the standard of living and achieving continued prosperity in America. The slogan of the organization is "Citizens First, Veterans Second." I think that signifies its general views.

In the last convention of the AVC organization held in Chicago about 4 months ago, there was stated in the platform the following reference to taxation:

"We favor adoption of a tax program based upon the ability to pay, flexible over time, and geared into a fiscal policy which will provide for full employment.

"One of the most pressing needs of our Government today is the revision of the national, State, and local tax programs to gear them to the needs of a fully employed and expanding economy with special reliance on the principle of taxation according to ability to pay. Toward this end, we urge the President of the United States to appoint a special nonpartisan, technical tax commission, similar in principle to the Hoover Commission, this commission to work with the Council of Economic Advisers to set up a sound, just, and stable tax program.

"We oppose Federal, State, and local sales and excise taxes because they fall proportionately more heavily on lower-income groups, not being based on ability to pay. We urge the immediate repeal of all wartime excise taxes and substitution of more progressive taxes to make up the loss in Government revenues."

That was the statement included in the last platform adopted at the last convention of the AVC.

The CHAIRMAN. Right there, just for information, you speak of recommending that the President appoint a nonpartisan tax commission. You mean bipartisan?

Mr. NATHAN. Bipartisan, yes, I am sure they meant that.

The CHAIRMAN. If it were to be nonpartisan, I should like to get acquainted with them.

Mr. NATHAN. To elaborate just briefly on those taxation principles of the organization, first of all I would like to emphasize that we believe in the achievement and maintenance of prosperity and full employment in America. It depends in a very substantial degree on the type of tax program which the Federal, State, and local governments, but more importantly the Federal Government, adopt. It is our belief that of all of the instruments that the Government has for guiding and directing and stimulating economic activity, the tax program offers the greatest opportunity of all. If there is one area of legislation which has the greatest influence on economic activity and the well-being of the country, it is our feeling that the tax program is the one that is the most important of all.

It is not only the amount of tax which is collected, but also the types of taxes, because as we all know, certain taxes have a much greater incidence and much greater impact and much greater burden on certain economic activities than do others. While there are some people who believe in the general principle that taxes should be collected for revenue purposes only, that view completely ignores the fact that different taxes do have different economic impacts. Therefore, we ought to carefully consider the types of taxes we adopt in order to raise the revenue essential to pay for the Government's services which are needed.

For instance, if there is need for additional buying power because there is unemployment, we feel that taxes should be cut at those levels which would tend to increase buying power. If there is need for additional investment, taxes can be shifted so as to provide greater incentives for investment. If the country is faced with inflation, then the tax problem, it seems to me and to our group, is obviously of a different nature, the needs are of a different nature than the taxes which are essential if the country is faced with unemployment and deflation.

Therefore, we feel that great emphasis should be placed on the fact that the tax program should be geared primarily to the economic needs of the country in order to insure full employment.

As you all know, at the present time unemployment appears to be on the increase. The Census Bureau of the Federal Government reported 4,500,000 people able and willing to work and seeking work in the month of January of this year. Figures for February are not yet available, but there has been some discussion among those familiar with the background of the data that probabilities are that unemployment was probably higher in February. That is, higher than in January. Maybe somewhere between four and one-half and five million unemployed.

I think this is clearly the result of the fact that there is not an adequate demand for the products of American industry. Industrial leaders, managers, corporate executives hire people when they can sell the products which they produce, and they do not hire people and they do not produce goods when they cannot sell all they can produce. Businessmen are not inclined to hire workers and produce products just because they like to. They produce mainly because they feel there is a market for the goods produced.

Therefore, we feel that the tax program at this time must relate to the fact that there is at the present time an inadequate demand for all of the products of American industry, and that is why we have this level of unemployment somewhere between four and one-half and five million. That is why we feel a reduction in excise taxes is appropriate at

this present time. Excise taxes are paid directly by the consumer or are passed on to the consumer. Therefore, they tend to bear directly on consumption. They are a burden on consumption. They tend to cut down expenditures by the consumer, and we think it is in the interest of the country at this time to reduce excise taxes. These taxes, especially the wartime excises, were imposed during the war to keep down demand, to keep demand down so that the resources of this country during the war would be diverted to producing matériel essential to win the war. That purpose was largely fulfilled, and therefore the purposes for which the wartime excise taxes were imposed no longer exist.

That raises the question about Government revenues and the balanced budget, the relation between expenditures and receipts. We believe that a balanced budget and debt retirement are entirely appropriate and desirable in periods of full employment and high levels of economic activity. There is now a moderate amount of unemployment, and whether or not we should have a balanced budget depends on how we can raise the revenues and whether higher tax revenues will tend to further restrict employment.

It is our feeling that it is possible at this time to raise some additional taxes to offset the excise taxes and these increases will not further harm the employment picture or the economic scene. In his message to the Congress, the President suggested many ways and means of getting revenues to offset the loss from the excise-tax reductions. We believe that his proposals to close the gaps and loopholes can be especially fruitful. I would just like to mention a few of those very briefly.

I happen to be personally familiar with some of the economic facts in the oil industry, and it is my impression that those loopholes that exist in favor of individuals and corporations in the oil industry are entirely unjustified. If those loopholes are closed and the oil industry were not given added incentives and were not given added benefits of the magnitude they have today, the Government could get additional substantial amounts of revenue without in any way really interfering with the development in that industry.

We recognize that incentives are important in this economy of ours. Incentives are necessary and must be provided. But after all, there is a limit to these incentives, and the permission granted to the oil industry to deduct all of the development costs as current expenses, and especially the fantastically large depletion allowances, have permitted individuals and companies to earn very great amounts without paying taxes thereon.

I think the Secretary of the Treasury in the Department's official statement before this Committee presented some figures on how large those gains were and have been. We feel such loopholes ought to be closed, and this will help to offset the loss from less in excise taxes, which in turn will help the economy and help business.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that your last proposal?

Mr. NATHAN. The elimination of these loopholes in the oil industry we feel will offset the excise tax losses, and the last statement I made was that the cut in excise taxes would really help business.

I feel that making the oil industry adopt its share of the tax burden will permit us to cut these excise taxes, replace that revenue, and the country as a whole will be better off.

I feel the same thing might be said of the State and local bond interest payments. The Federal Government should not permit this loophole to persist. If people pay taxes on the interest which they receive from Federal Government bonds, the law should provide that future flotations of issues by State and local governments should not be tax exempt, and interest thereon should be subject to income taxation.

About the over-all picture of taxes, I want to emphasize again that it is our feeling that the tax instrument is the most potent one which can help us to achieve and maintain full employment and not go through booms and busts as we have in the past. For the past 10 years this country has enjoyed a period of intensive prosperity, largely as a result of the war effort, and the backlog of wartime demands. Already there are many disturbing signs that this prosperity may not continue. We as veterans feel that there is an obligation to veterans and to every citizen in this country for the Government of this country to do everything in its power to be sure that this prosperity which we have enjoyed in war will be enjoyed in peacetime. It is not going to be possible to achieve these objectives if we sit back and sort of hope that we will have continuous prosperity. The history of our economic development is a history of boom and bust, of going up and down. There is no reason at all to feel that in the future, unless we have positive measures and positive steps and constructive programs to avoid depressions, they will not come again. We feel that they will come unless something is done to prevent them.

And in the area of taxation, the Government has an important instrument of doing something to achieve that objective. In periods of inflation the Government must tax so as to avoid the weaknesses, the distortions that develop and bring on depressions.

I have studied the subject myself for a long time, and I am convinced that depressions do not come from some divine source or that they are inevitable. We can do something to avoid them. Depressions come because certain weaknesses and certain distortions develop in the system in boom times, and in those times we should adjust and shift and change our tax program to avoid those weaknesses.

Similarly, when business begins to decline, we have to change our tax program. We have to reduce taxes at lower-income levels so that there is more consumption. We have to give more incentive to business, perhaps in the form of accelerated depreciation, so there will be investment when investment is declining.

I think that need for flexibility in the tax system, flexibility in accordance with where we are—in terms of economic activity—where we are moving, what the trends in business are, is a very, very important principle.

In the last 10 years we have had very little basic change in our tax structure. Of course, the rates have changed. Types of taxes have changed. Ten years ago the total tax take by the Federal Government was a much smaller percentage of the national income than it is today. Today the amount of taxes has a much greater impact on our total economy than 10 years ago. Therefore, the time has come for a thorough reappraisal and overhauling of the tax program, an overhauling of a complete nature, a thorough study of the program in relation to the impact that it has on our economy and economic policy. For that purpose I want to reiterate that the American Veterans' Committee calls for a commission representing the Congress and the interested public organizations, like the Hoover Commission, to be set up to intensively study the role of taxation, not only as a source of revenue but primarily as a vehicle to help achieve economic stability. It should reconsider all of our tax structure, all of our tax rates, to try to introduce a degree of flexibility, to introduce into our tax system the basic principle that tax policies, tax programs, shall be geared to achieving economic stability. We can accomplish that objective and help bring about prosperity if an intelligent tax survey is made and legislated.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much interested in your discussion of the tax problem and how it affects the economy of the country.

Your last remarks recommended a commission to make a comprehensive study of this problem along the line of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Hoover Commission report has been made. It is before Congress. What is the veterans' position on the report of the Hoover Commission insofar as it relates to veterans?

Mr. NATHAN. I am glad you asked me that. This last week end, Saturday and Sunday, we had a meeting here in Washington of the National Planning Committee of the American Veterans Committee, including 25 members from all over the country. We had representatives from Oregon, and Florida and Texas and Oklahoma, and other parts of the country. And unanimously that committee, which is the executive committee of the organization, supported the Hoover Commission recommendations for changes in the Veterans' Administration. We support fully and wholeheartedly the revisions that the Hoover Commission suggested with respect to the Veterans' Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there not been a great deal of complaint by many veterans over the country against the Hoover report, so far as it affects the veterans.

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, the American Legion has taken that position.

The CHAIRMAN. Where are the views of the veterans on that subject?

Mr. NATHAN. Different groups, of course, Mr. Chairman, do take different positions. The Legion has taken a stand against the Hoover Commission recommendations on the Veterans' Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Legion is pretty strong.

Mr. NATHAN. Quite strong, sir, in numbers.

The CHAIRMAN. If the veterans themselves cannot agree, I am not surprised that the Members of Congress should have difficulty in reaching a conclusion, either satisfactory to themselves or their constituents. I just want to get your viewpoint. I am very much interested in your entire discussion.

Mr. NATHAN. I feel there is almost no proposal or policy which would be recommended on any important subject on which there would not be quite divergent views, mainly because of vested interests. Some members of our organization in discussing this Hoover Commission proposal on the Veterans' Administration this past week end felt that some opposition to that revision was due to the feeling in some groups that they would not have as much power and control in the Veterans' Administration as before. Whether that is the reason they object to it, I do not know, but our own feeling was that the Hoover Commission recommendations were intelligent ones, well thought through, and would give more effective administration and would tend to save money.

I feel if there is enough education and discussion of this subject around the country, and there are many groups that have taken it up, the junior chamber of commerce has done an excellent job of organizing community forums, and if the people understand the implications of it, the Hoover Commission recommendations will be adopted. We could have a type of Hoover Commission report on taxation and it is likely that if they came out with a proposal of a certain nature, the NAM might take exception to this and the CIO might take exception to that; of course, we would not have uniform agreement.

If there is enough discussion and enough education so that people really understand

the house, we can come to some constructive conclusion. I do not think we will get uniform support for all of the measures.

The CHAIRMAN. It does appear to me that you are taking a broad, patriotic, and unselfish view of this subject, right or wrong. That is the way it impresses me, very definitely.

You suggested that the tax system should be geared in two ways, in both of which I was very much interested; first, geared to fit the economy of the country; and, second, geared to produce adequate revenue.

Mr. NATHAN. That is right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you visualize very great difficulty in resulting a sound conclusion on just how to gear a tax system to the economy of the country? Would there be as many opinions about that as there are business groups and industry organizations?

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, undoubtedly there will be, but may I just offer an illustration? In 1943 we were faced with quite an accumulation of wartime backlog demand. We have had considerable inflation in the postwar period. That inflation, I think, has brought certain difficulties to us. There are certain distortions in the economy that resulted from price relationships. I think that in the period from 1946 to the present period we had a much more rapid rise in investment, new plant and equipment, than we have had in consumption. That cannot take place for very long. I think that if in 1947, 1947, and 1948, we had tried to increase taxes to draw out some of this money that was going into investments, so we would increase our plant and equipment at a slower rate, of course, we would have had a lot of objections because certain individuals never want to pay taxes. After all, I do not think anybody really enjoys paying taxes. Nevertheless, if our program is geared to the fact that we can have continued good business and not have another 1929 or 1933 come along, and that is clearly understood, and again, it is a matter of educational process, we can bring enough American people around to have an overwhelming majority in favor of these principles. It is not simple.

The CHAIRMAN. What group in the country is there that does not complain about present taxes, or protest against higher taxes? The country is made up of groups.

Mr. NATHAN. As a matter of fact, I do not think there is any group in the country who would not object some way or other if you tried to increase taxes. For instance, I suggest that we ought to do something about these loopholes which I sincerely believe prevail in the oil industry.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you heard of any group opposing that?

Mr. NATHAN. The oil industry opposes it, sure, but that is always true. What we must do is try to place the broader interest above certain limited interest, and that is after all the democratic process. Maybe some of us would like to drive down the street 90 miles an hour and just enjoy it, but if we do, we will hurt somebody. So we have to protect the largest numbers by restricting those who would be inclined to go to extremes.

I believe that the overwhelming majority of the people today would feel that we ought to close these loopholes in order to put the tax system on a more equitable, more just basis, and a sounder economic basis.

The CHAIRMAN. In addition to gearing the tax program to the economic needs of the country, you stated that it also should take into account the fiscal needs of the Government. You referred to a balanced budget, but stated that you do not know whether this is exactly the time or not. I would like you to elaborate on that, whether we should continue the proposed rate of deficit financing, or whether we should have deficit financing, but on a lower scale at this time. Some of us believe that, so far as possible in peacetime, when the country is reasonably prosperous, Congress ought to provide sufficient revenue to pay the bills it incurs. I would like to have you elaborate on that a little at this time.

Mr. NATHAN. First of all, I agree with the general principle you just stated, namely, that in prosperous times we should have adequate taxes to pay the bills and to retire some of the debt. In times of less than full employment or in times when there is substantial unemployment, we cannot help but have a deficit, because the needs of Government spending are greater and sources of revenue are less.

At the present time, even with the four and one-half or five million unemployed that we have, the deficit can and should be reduced, but it can be reduced only if certain kinds of taxes are imposed.

May I illustrate? For instance, if your committee or the Congress insisted on cutting the deficit now by increasing excise taxes another two or three billion, that would be a tragic mistake. Such increases in excise taxes would bear directly on consumption. They would reduce the demand for goods. That would mean more unemployment.

On the other hand, if we today close some of these loopholes that exist, we could get more revenue, reduce the deficit, and it would not adversely affect the economic picture. We ought to move toward a balanced budget by trying to get taxes in those areas which will not affect total economic activity or have the least effect on them.

The CHAIRMAN. There are no proposals to increase excise tax revenues. On the contrary, there is a tremendous demand for some reduction in, and relief from the burden of, the excise taxes.

Mr. NATHAN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you think we would be able to offset the loss of revenues that would result from reduction of the excise taxes by closing loopholes?

Mr. NATHAN. I can only rely on the official figures of the Treasury, and there the indications are that by closing four or five loopholes, we could offset them. We probably could increase our total Federal revenue and more than offset the cut in excise taxes by increasing the taxes in other directions.

For instance, in 1948, the total corporate profit picture would have permitted some further taxation on corporate profits without destroying incentive. Our tax program must take into account the fact that not only must we try to stimulate more consumption, more demand on the part of the people, but also more investment on the part of business insofar as the total consumption will support that investment. The corporate profits in 1948 were at such a level that we could get a higher total revenue from corporate profits without curtailing corporate investment below what it would be anyhow. That is another source of revenue.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose taxes on corporate profits are increased. It may be that profits are very high in some corporations, even unreasonably high, which has resulted because demand for goods was so far in excess of the supply, and the manufacturer and the merchants could ask about what they pleased and still could sell their goods. The time has come now when they probably cannot do that. Should we increase the corporate tax, I am asking for information now, then is it probable that the corporations would offset that tax as they do now by increasing the price of their goods, so the tax would be paid by the consumer as a concealed tax?

Mr. NATHAN. There is a big argument as to whether or not corporate income taxes really can be passed on to the consumer when you have intensive competition.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your opinion?

Mr. NATHAN. In an intensively competitive industry, I do not believe that it can be passed on to the consumer. If companies do not have profits, they do not pay the tax. If they try to raise their price in order to meet that extra tax, I think the competitive situation will not permit that to take place. That is different from the steel industry.

The CHAIRMAN. I live in a section where the textile mills are a great industry. They have never been more fully employed, running night and day, than they are right now.

Mr. NATHAN. They had a decline last year.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know how the textile industry is in New England.

Mr. NATHAN. New England has had quite a decline and some areas of distress unemployment. But that industry right now is in better shape than a year ago. A year ago there was a decline. There are some industries where I am sure that the industry would try and probably be successful in passing on an increase in its corporate tax to the consumer, as in the steel industry. The steel industry raised its prices in December of 1949, presumably because they had the pension and welfare program, which I think was fully justified, and which was granted last fall. My own guess is that the steel industry in 1950 would have made, even without a price increase, more profits than ever in their history. Their cost of scrap has gone way down. Their cost of raw materials has gone way down. Yet they went ahead and raised the prices in face of record profits. That is not a very competitive industry where they can get away with that kind of an action. As soon as one company raised the prices, the others almost automatically did the same.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose the rate of taxation is geared to fit the steel companies. Income of other industries must be taxed at the same rate, but, in your opinion, can other industries stand as heavy an increase in the corporate tax as the steel industry? Might that not break the back of some other corporations or businesses?

Mr. NATHAN. It may, but first of all I would suggest that the increase in the rate be a modest one, and in the second place, in those industries where profits are not very high obviously the tax payment would not be high. If you went from 38- to 42-percent tax, obviously the amount of tax paid by a company not very prosperous would not be very much. But the amount of tax paid by a company which was very prosperous would be substantially higher.

I might add that we ought to restudy our whole corporate-tax structure and try to arrive at some kind of a progressive taxation on corporations which would introduce some of the principles of the excess-profits tax and some of the principles of the undistributed-profits tax.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the Government, in your opinion, be justified in adopting a fiscal policy that would increase the amount of our deficit financing? You have stated that ordinarily when times were reasonably prosperous and employment is high, we should not only balance our budget, but pay something on the public debt. We always expect some unemployment. Many people never will work and would not take a job to do a full day's work for a reasonable day's pay if you offered it to them.

Mr. NATHAN. There is always some turnover.

The CHAIRMAN. The unemployment problem is not very serious.

Mr. NATHAN. It is not what I would call satisfactory, but it is still not of major, serious proportions today.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you or do you not believe that we are spending too much money and perhaps should take some steps in lowering Government expenses to balance the budget and lighten the tax burden.

Mr. NATHAN. It depends on what we are spending it for.

The CHAIRMAN. If it is spent right.

Mr. NATHAN. If it is spent right we are not spending too much. We may be spending too little. For instance, I have talked to some people who think that a war is inevitable. At the same time they talk about cutting expenditures. If I were convinced that a war were inevitable, I would want to increase our expenditures 50 percent, maybe 100 percent for defense purposes. It all depends on the concept we have in mind. I do not think expenditures by the Government today are too high compared to the needs. Maybe we are not spending enough on certain defense areas. It depends on what the requirements are. To the extent, however, that there is any waste anywhere, obviously that cannot be justified. We should eliminate waste. We should increase the efficiency of government and eliminate duplication, but the biggest items of expenditures today are for defense, and the items that are related to the war, such as the veterans expenditures, and the ECA appropriations and interest on the national debt, which are fully justified. If our security were really seriously threatened today, perhaps we are spending too little, so the expenditures have to relate to the needs of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. So you do not believe that at this time there is any serious danger to the economy of the country from excessive taxation and unnecessary great expenditure of money?

Mr. NATHAN. By no means. I think that we have had in the last 4 years the greatest prosperity in peacetime we have ever had in America, except for a slight decline in the first half of 1949, with the highest tax rates we ever had in the history of this country, and actually we had higher taxes before the first part of 1948 than we have now. And we had great prosperity. I do not think that the present levels of taxation or expenditures are adversely affecting the economy.

The CHAIRMAN. Has not supply nearly caught up with the backlog in the demand for goods and services that developed during the war? And when production overtakes consumption, would that not affect the profits and employment, too? If we are about caught up, is not that one reason for unemployment?

Mr. NATHAN. We must realize that every dollar the Government spends, like on tanks or airplanes or ships, or every dollar it spends for veteran service or every dollar it spends for ECA appropriations is a demand just the same as you and I go out and buy groceries or buy automobiles or clothes. Government expenditures are demands for the goods of industry and create a market for American industry just the same as private. I agree, generally, it is much better to have the largest segment of the economy in private hands, rather than in public hands. I would like to see us, of course, go back to where we had a $5,000,000,000 budget of spending and $5,000,000,000 of taxes, but I do not think that is feasible under the present circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not go on record as saying you believe that a government can tax and spend itself into prosperity?

Mr. NATHAN. I believe it can spend itself into prosperity temporarily.

The CHAIRMAN. Maybe a man can spend himself into health by taking a lot of dope, but what about later on?

Mr. NATHAN. That is not the solution. We ought to look for a fundamental solution.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought you would not say that extravagance is the solution of our economic difficulties.

Mr. NATHAN. We spent our way into prosperity during the war presumably. In 1939 we had 10,000,000 unemployed, and by 1942 we had practically no unemployment. The reason was because the Government spent so many billions to demand the goods of industry. That is not certainly a desirable solution. The real solution is increased private spending, and a proper tax program can help achieve that objective.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

We thank you.

Mr. NATHAN. Thank you.

The Russian Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial from the Kelsonian Tribune, of Kelso, Wash. It is entitled "The Russian Question" and I feel confident that the Members of Congress will wish to read it:

THE RUSSIAN QUESTION

Why does not the Government of the United States take cognisance of a fact which should be self-evident to any schoolboy—that there will never be a permanent peace in the world until Stalin and his gang of Communist cutthroats are removed from power?

Why do we not build our foreign policy around the only guaranty which can insure world peace and prosperity—human liberty and equality throughout the world?

Why do we turn our backs on the lessons of our own Revolution, and dicker with dictators while their subjects writhe in slavery?

The average man will say, "Ah, but the policy you suggest will surely lead to war?"

Short-sighted viewpoint. The Communist world and the free world are drifting inevitably toward war as matters stand, and for the same reason that the North and the South clashed in the Civil War. The problem is the extension of the slave system, or the police-State system, into political and economic fields which both sides view as vital to their self-preservation.

The only hope of avoiding such a war lies in the overturn of Stalin's gang. The Communists see this clearly. They, too, want to avoid war. They want to avoid it by overthrowing all capitalist governments, and replacing them with regimes friendly to Moscow—that is, subservient to Moscow. This has been the announced objective of international communism for the past 30 years.

So there should be no reason to shrink from the reaction which would take place if we were to announce that our objective is to throw Stalin and his gang out of office, and replace them with a regime based on the voice of the people.

We found we couldn't do business with Hitler. We fought him, at great cost of life and substance. We are now trying to educate the German people in the ways of democracy.

Is there any reason to believe the Russians would be harder to educate in the ways of democracy than the Germans? No. There have been the seeds of democratic movements in the Ukraine, the Don Basin, the Caucasus, and all the satellite nations, for many years. Czechoslovakia was a true enlightened democracy until March 1939. She could be made one again tomorrow, if this country would announce its intention of ridding the world of Russian communism. If this country would initiate a movement of counter-revolution throughout the Russian dominated areas. If this country would immediately begin to give all aid, short of war, to anti-Communist movements anywhere. If this country would resuscitate the OSS, and begin the all-out penetration of the satellite countries with agents, arms, political agitation and propaganda, all with one aim—to create islands of freedom within the Red empire, and eventually to link these islands together and struggle the Red power.

If anyone protests that this is impossible, our reply is simply this: Choose this path, or face the certainty of atomic war within the bitterly near future.

There is only one addendum to our world prophecy. This Nation is getting scant and unrealistic service from its State Department. To carry on the global struggle for self-preservation in which we are now engaged, we need more than diplomats in the State Department. We need tough-minded strategists, whip-cracking planners and do-it-now political manipulators.

In 1947, your editor submitted to the State Department a manuscript arguing in favor of the policy outlined here. The only comment of the female "expert" in the State Department who reviewed our manuscript was that it was "naive."

To one who was an intelligence officer in a fine infantry division during 3 years of combat, and who had written enemy estimates before the Ardennes break-out, the annihilation of the Colmar pocket and the crossing of the Rhine, this gratuitous slap in the face from an armchair strategist was nettling, to say the least.

So we intend to keep hammering at this theme, whether anyone wants to listen or not. We are confident that history will write the final chapters with very few changes in the earlier text.

Voice of Alameda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the board of regents of the University of California recently ordered the members of the faculty to take a loyalty oath. Refusal to take the prescribed oath meant dismissal.

The faculty, through representatives, has announced resistance to this order. Nationally and internationally known educators at that great institution have led the fight against this move.

It is reported that among the regents who voted against the mandatory loyalty oath were Gov. Earl Warren and Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul.

The faculty group has not receded from its position as the deadline approaches.

The Alameda Times Star has published a timely and pertinent editorial on the subject. It points up the futility of trying to instill by law the love for our democracy that can only be sincere when it springs from within the individual.

The excellent editorial follows:

VOICE OF ALAMEDA

We are more than a little bemused to see that the board of regents voted for institution of loyalty oaths at the University of California, setting the penalty at dismissal for those who do not take them.

On many different occasions during the past year we have remarked that those people who vote for a loyalty oath to keep out Communists or other subversives do it either because they know no better, or because they have a cynical disregard for the public, thinking that by so voting they will keep themselves in public favor through this peculiar anticipation of the public's natural desires to keep subversives out of teaching posts.

Those regents who voted for the loyalty oath have shown themselves remarkably naive, we think, in our opinion.

They evidently have not yet been able to realize that:

1. Communists are duty bound to lie when by so doing they will advance their cause.

2. Through swearing a loyalty oath, Communists will be able to take on a protective coloration which will deceive those poor dopes, who would otherwise throw them out, into thinking them to be honest Americans.

The Automobile Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 19, 1950, which I consider most appropriate on the problem of air pollution:

THE AUTOMOBILE JOB

Last November a special committee composed of two physicians, two scientists, and two engineers found evidence of serious air pollution in some parts of Staten Island. Residents of Rossville, Across the water from industrial towns in New Jersey, complained of ill effects from smoke. A resolution called on the United States Public Health Service to make a comprehensive survey of air pollution on the island. Now we have the answer to that resolution. The proposed study has been deferred because "needed technicians for such a study are not available for the required 3- to 6-month period."

This, it seems to us, is a highly unsatisfactory conclusion. Medical men on Staten Island found 28 residents of the north and south shores complaining of stomach disorders, nose irritation, and inability to sleep. A Richmond County Medical Society committee confirmed that there was strong evidence of air pollution on the island. Yet a "scarcity of technicians" is permitted to prevent the thorough study that seems warranted in this interstate matter.

We are dissatisfied with the whole progress of air-pollution control in New York City. What the people need are periodic reports of the amount of soot-fall in various locations, along with other objective measurements, so that they can tell for themselves whether the city is making any progress on pollution abatement. If any such measurements are being taken by the bureau of smoke control, they certainly do not see the light of day. Some years ago such measurements were taken for a time, and it would be useful if we had comparisons of soot-fall in the same locations now.

Until we have scientific measurements throughout the city and such data are put in the hands of the public, we shall be forced to view with reserve all claims of progress.

Resolution of the FBI National Academy Associates of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the FBI National Academy Associates of Georgia met in convention in Thomasville, Ga., on January 18, 1950.

The membership of that organization are men who have a deep appreciation of the fine work which Director J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation have done over the years in protecting the citizens of America from criminals and from those who have engaged in subversive activities.

The members of the above-mentioned organization share the natural resentment which the American people generally have felt and expressed regarding recent efforts of certain left-wing elements to discredit Mr. Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. They, therefore, adopted in this convention a resolution expressing their respect for Mr. Hoover and commending him for the great contribution he has made to law enforcement and the protection of our country and Government.

This resolution also congratulates Attorney General McGrath and expresses the sentiments of the organization regarding several other matters.

I am glad to bring this resolution to the attention of Congress and under leave previously granted, I insert it herewith:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE FBI NATIONAL ACADEMY ASSOCIATES OF GEORGIA ON JANUARY 18, 1950

Whereas our Nation's foremost law enforcement agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has recently been unwarrantedly criticised; and

Whereas the FBI is the guardian of our national freedom, and our individual rights as citizens and as law enforcement officers; and

Whereas having the highest respect for Director J. Edgar Hoover, and being appreciative for his contribution to law enforcement and the public during his nearly 26 years of service; and

Whereas attacks on the FBI are attacks on our Nation's security and serve the purpose of undermining faith in democracy and the destruction of confidence in democratic institutions, and disregard for law and order: Therefore be it

Resolved—

1. Condemn vigorously the attacks which have been levelled at the FBI and Director Hoover.

2. Congratulate the Honorable J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States, for his clear thinking and forthrightness when he recently announced that he sees no reason to change the wiretapping policies with respect to the FBI.

3. Call upon the President of the United States to publicly endorse the policy of his predecessor as President who initiated the wiretap policies of the United States.

4. Commend heartily Director J. Edgar Hoover for his patriotism, protection of our liberties, and wise use of wiretaps.

5. Request Congress to authorize by law the FBI's right to use wiretaps in espionage and subversive activity cases where the national security is at stake, and in other types of criminal investigative matters where a human life is in jeopardy as has been the national policy set by the administration for so many years.

6. Expresses its indignation and most vigorous condemnation of the exhibitionism recently displayed in our courts and calls for an end to clowning in court and restoration of dignity to the courts.

7. In calling upon Congress to put an end to the Russian propaganda being spread by Communist and other disloyal persons; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary to—

1. The President of the United States.
2. The Attorney General of the United States.
3. Director J. Edgar Hoover, FBI.
4. Speaker of the House of Representatives.
5. President of the Senate.
6. Each United States Senator and Representative from the State of Georgia.

LT. JAMES H. WINN,
Secretary, FBI National Academy Associates of Georgia.

The Communists Don't Scare Easy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington News of March 16, 1950:

THEY DON'T SCARE EASY

Secretary of State Acheson has taken to the political stump to whip up interest in that new catchword of our foreign policy—"total diplomacy."

By that, as he has explained it, he means we should all get in the fight against expanding world communism and not leave it to the State Department alone—which is a more sensible thought than Mr. Acheson may suspect.

For instance, yesterday in his San Francisco speech the Secretary dramatically drew a chalk line between China and the rest of Asia, and warned international communism not to step over it. You know what'll happen if the Communists cross over? Well, America will give "limited" assistance to the resisting nations.

We very much doubt that this will stop communism in its tracks. In fact, there'll be no need for the Commies to cross the line—they've already gone around it. The Red threat that perils French Indochina today, for example, is not so much from a southward invasion as from the Moscow-assisted native Communist forces already inside the border.

The Chinese could tell Mr. Acheson all about that. But surprisingly we find Mr. Acheson telling them just how they got in their present mess:

"As old friends, we say to the Chinese people that we fully understand that their present unhappy status within the orbit of the Soviet Union is not the result of any choice on their part, but has been forced upon them."

This is a curious and belated departure from the old doctrine of the State Department left-wingers that communism in China

evolved from discontented agrarian reformers who represented the real Chinese people.

Mr. Acheson lamented that United States help "on a massive scale" after the war did not bring peace and recovery to China, whose conquest by the Communists he blamed on the failure of the Nationalists.

He did not mention that American support was withdrawn from the Nationalist Government because it failed to satisfy the Communists' demands for a coalition at a time when the Reds were all but defeated.

To Return St. Patrick to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I was much interested to note on a card sent me by a constituent commemorating the day of the patron saint of Ireland that St. Patrick's See at Armagh, his grave at Downpatrick, as well as the scenes of his boyhood at Slemish are cut off from the body of Ireland, being situated in Northern Ireland, which is still attached to Great Britain. Last month I introduced a resolution on the unification of Ireland which presents an effective plan for attaining this objective. The resolution provides for a plebiscite of the people of all Ireland to be taken under the auspices of a United Nations Commission for Ireland designated by the General Assembly pursuant to articles 11 and 35 of the Charter. It is stated to be the purpose of such a plebiscite to create conditions which will make possible the entry of Ireland into the United Nations. Article 11 and article 35 relate to the powers of the General Assembly thus dispensing with Soviet obstruction or the veto and provide specifically for bringing to the attention of the General Assembly the dispute to which a state is a party whether or not such state is a member of the United Nations. In view of the dispute between Eire and Great Britain on the subject of Northern Ireland, a dispute which affects the maintenance of international peace and security in that area, it would appear to be a matter for the General Assembly. The General Assembly could then proceed in all Ireland as it did in the cases of Greece and Indonesia to appoint a commission which would supervise an election and establish the conditions for it. Then it would be clear for membership by all Ireland in the United Nations, a question of the greatest importance in view of Ireland's position in the North Atlantic area. It is to be noted that this is a very practical solution as United Nations commissions of this character have been very successful in just such situations in using their good offices to bring about a conclusion to a long-standing dispute dangerous to world peace and security.

This resolution follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland and that the people of all Ireland, including the people of Eire and the people of Northern Ireland, should have a free opportunity to express their will for union and that this be attained by a plebiscite of the people of all Ireland under the auspices of a United Nations Commission for Ireland, to be designated by the General Assembly pursuant to articles 11 and 35 of the Charter, which shall establish the terms and conditions of such plebiscite with the objective of the entry of Ireland as a member of the United Nations.

Imports of Foreign Nuts Imperil Western Nut and Cherry Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, large quantities of walnuts recently have been imported into California from Manchuria and are selling at more than 30 percent under the prices of domestic nuts. If these imports of nuts continue, our nut orchards of the Pacific coast, an agricultural business in which thousands of families are engaged, face ruin.

Nut raising is not like most other farm and business enterprises. It requires seven or more years to bring nut orchards into a bearing stage. Yet this business of nut raising, after years of work and investment to get it into a productive and profitable stage, can be ruined almost overnight if foreign competition from low-wage, low-living standard countries is allowed to flood the American market with foreign nuts.

If this should happen many hundreds of orchardists with years of labor and money invested in their orchards will find it necessary to cut down their trees and go into some other type of agriculture. We should act to prevent this calamity befalling them.

I have before Congress a bill, H. R. 6780, which would restore the peril-point principle to the making of reciprocal trade treaties. Under the peril-point principle, the Tariff Commission, when a reduction in the tariff on any commodity is being considered, will make a study of the effects of a tariff reduction on the industry involved and will make a report, based on factual material, showing the level to which a tariff could be reduced, in the commission's opinion, without destructive effects on the industry.

If the peril-point principle is restored, as is proposed in my bill, H. R. 6780, it is less likely that any trade agreements will be made which would cause irreparable harm to such industries as walnut, filbert, and cherry raising.

Under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous material, I append to this statement a letter I have received from John E. Trunk, general manager of the Northwest Nut Growers, an organization composed of hundreds of Oregon-Washington nut raisers. Mr. Trunk's letter follows:

A short time ago when I was in San Francisco calling on the buyers I found in the hands of one of our customers a quantity of Manchurian shelled walnuts. This gentleman gave me considerable information. He said 2,000 cases of 55 pounds each had arrived from Manchuria and had been stored in bond, and therefore were not reflected in the usual import figures. He had purchased a quantity at 42 cents and said additional could be had at 40 cents. This price schedule is duty paid, delivered San Francisco, and is more than 20 cents per pound under the prices for comparative grades on the domestic market.

A situation of this kind just seems intolerable to me. Here we are having our Government spend a huge sum of money on behalf of our domestic walnut industry so that millions of pounds of shelled walnuts can be diverted to the oil mills with practically no revenue to be derived from that source.

It is my understanding that all of China, and particularly Manchuria, are under Communist control or domination. It certainly can't be said that we should be thinking of reciprocal or free trade with countries of that type.

I would like very much to see this looked into. Our own man in Chicago, Mr. E. R. Mars, writes to say that the Walter Johnson Candy Co., of Chicago, and who have a branch in Los Angeles, are the world's largest makers of fudge candy. They use pecans and walnuts, and when we tried to interest them in our shelled walnuts they said they would like to use them, but they were buying Manchurian in the 40-cent bracket.

There is no necessity of my telling you what this is doing to an already overburdened and quite sick shelled-walnut market.

Anything you can do to probe into this situation will be appreciated.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

NORTHWEST NUT GROWERS,
JOHN E. TRUNK,
General Manager.

Perennial Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of March 8, 1950:

PERENNIAL QUESTION

A hardy perennial among questions asked by Americans of themselves and others concerns the reason why so many otherwise courteous, considerate persons become ill-tempered boors when behind the wheel of a car. The fact is obvious, but the reasons are far and difficult to seek. Some observers say it proves the average human being is not well fitted for the control and exercise of power. Others suggest drivers work off on the general public their pques of various sorts, feeling fairly secure because of a large measure of ability to get away fast, and so on and on.

One main reason for discourtesy, or lack of courtesy, as the case may be, is found, we believe, in lack of education in safety and

lack of training in the use of an automobile. The community has an obligation to keep a program of education going all the time in this regard, but it is far easier to teach the young. This phase of traffic is just another reason why we think every graduate of a high school should have a diploma in automobile driving, in comprehension of the traffic laws, and in understanding of his obligation and responsibility to the general public while he is in the role of driver.

Income Tax—Gettysburg, 1949 Version

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing a commentary on the preparation of income tax from an unknown author:

GETTYSBURG, 1949 VERSION

One score and sixteen years ago, our fathers brought forth upon this Nation a new tax, conceived in desperation and dedicated to the proposition that all men are fair game.

Now we are engaged in a great mass of calculation, testing whether that taxpayer or any taxpayer so confused and so impoverished can long endure. We are met on form 1040. We have come to dedicate a large portion of our income to a final resting place with those men who have spent their lives that they may spend our money.

It is altogether anguish and torture that we should do this. But in the legal sense we cannot evade—we cannot cheat—we cannot underestimate this tax. The collectors, clever and sly, who computed here, have gone far beyond our poor power to add and subtract. Our creditors will little note nor long remember what we pay here, but the Bureau of Internal Revenue can never forget what we report here.

It is for us, the taxpayer, rather, to be devoted here to the tax return which the Government has thus far so nobly spent. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these vanishing dollars we take increased devotion to the few remaining; that we here highly resolve that next year will not find us in a higher income bracket; that this taxpayer, underpaid, shall figure out more deductions; and that taxation of the people, by the Congress, for the Government, shall not cause our solvency to perish.

Payment of Salary to Valentin Gubitchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the people of America have discovered, to their great sorrow, that Valentin Gubitchev is on the pay roll of the United Nations at $6,000 a year, and that 40 percent of this salary is now being paid and has been paid ever since his arrest for spying on the United States, by the United States through its contributions to the UN. Is it not about time that he was taken off that pay roll? And is it not about time that the representatives of the State Department should show enough interest in the United States to stop this activity?

Federal Reserve Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, since my speech in this House on February 21 in which I called attention to the un-American and immoral packing of the Federal Reserve Board I have been deluged with letters, telephone calls, personal visits, and telegrams from bankers, businessmen, lawyers, and other citizens from all parts of the United States, suggesting that I further explore the subject. I have received many letters on the subject; a truly amazing number in view of the very limited publicity given to my remarks. They reveal a state of mind—a fear of the powers and autocratic conduct of the Federal Reserve Board—on the part of bankers, bank customers, and business people generally that is quite different from any situation I have ever before noted in this Republic; and I think I am well advised to go into the matter more thoroughly and carefully.

I was very much surprised that no communication was sent to me by Mr. Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman of the Board, but I did note a rather impassioned one by the former chairman, Mr. Marriner Eccles. This indicated a weird situation of the Board wherein a former Chairman was mysteriously bounced from his job by President Truman, in a situation which has never been explained. Was it that the White House was aware of this packing procedure while Mr. Eccles was Governor, and in its soft-peddling way removed him from his position of one-man rule, surrounded by his stooges, and now still another stooge is yet in the person of the Chairman of the Board? I assume the communication is intended as a defense of his successful campaign to set up the Board as an obedient and submissive group who would do bidding without question or public remark. But, as a matter of fact, Mr. Eccles' letter openly confirms the most important criticism I have made; to wit, that the letter and spirit of the law has been violated in the selection of the Governors by failure to regard that provision intended to insure equitable geographical representation on the Board. Mr. Eccles does not deny that Governor Evans, a native-born, lifelong citizen of Iowa, a man who even to this day considers himself and refers to himself as an Iowan because of his large farming and business interests in that State, was, nevertheless, appointed from the grand Old Dominion State of Virginia, although he was only a temporary resident of that State because of his importation here to the Agricultural Department by Henry Agard Wallace, as Wallace's personal aid and protégé, as a corn-hog plower-under.

Mr. Eccles does not deny that the late Governor Clayton, a native-born, lifelong citizen of Utah, Eccles' personal protégé and clerk for more than 20 years, always, like Eccles and several members of his staff, a loyal Utah citizen, was appointed from, of all places, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Boston. What an unkind and underhanded blow to the ghosts of the sturdy New Englanders whose high principles of honesty and fair play have played such an important part in building the moral fiber of this Nation. In my previous talk on this subject I explained why the late Mr. Clayton was said to have moved to Boston shortly before his appointment to the Board.

Mr. Eccles did not deny that Governor Szymczak was reappointed at his, Mr. Eccles' insistence, in 1948 for a full term of 14 years, in spite of the fact that he had been serving continuously and without interruption as a member of the Board for more than 14 years; and that by his reappointment he would (and there seems no reason for his throwing up the "cushy" job)—if he serves out his term—he will have been a member of the Board continuously and without interruption for more than 29 years. This, in the face of positive provision written into the law by this Congress that no member of the Board would be eligible for reappointment if he had served a continuous term of 14 years. I am not interested in the devious evasions indulged in by Mr. Eccles, his staff of lawyers, and others, in accomplishing this continuance in office of one of Mr. Eccles' most loyal henchmen. What I am interested in is calling attention of this Congress to the brazen disregard of the letter and spirit of its laws, by these bureaucrats who, apparently and by their high-handed, star-chamber methods, regard themselves as untouchable and above the law and this Congress.

Mr. Eccles does not deny that in his own personal case as a member of the Board, the spirit of the law has been violated so that he, by having himself juggled and shifted from one term to another, will be permitted to serve a far greater number of years than the 14-year maximum which this Congress thought it was fixing when the Federal Reserve Act of 1935 was enacted. If Mr. Eccles serves out his present term he will have served as a member of the Board continuously and without interruption more than 24 years.

Stripped of all nonessential talk and consideration, the cold fact is that the great northeastern, southeastern, Southern, and southwestern sections of the United States are represented on the seven-man Federal Reserve Board by only one single bona fide resident of any of those vast areas, and that man is Thomas Bayard McCabe, a New Deal, Fair Deal, Republico Democrato, hailing

from Chester, Pa. Mr. McCabe is a pleasant, well-meaning and agreeable sales gentleman, with a limited knowledge and experience in Federal Reserve matters. The administrative ability as a public official of this delightful and successful sales manager of a toilet paper concern was thoroughly and painfully brought to light during the 4 months of hearings by the Senate committee which was considering his appointment 2 years ago. His ability as a private business executive is best illustrated by the fact that his paper company has progressed more in the few short years he has been away from it than it did during the entire period of his long career as its active president.

There is nominally one other representative of the Eastern States on the Board, a retired businessman named Draper, whose 10-year term on the Board expired on February 1 of this year, and he is serving in the embarrassing capacity of a "hang-over" awaiting the appointment of his successor. Governor Draper's service has been marked by routine and unquestioning obedience to Mr. Eccles, and I doubt that the minutes of the Board will reveal more than two instances during the entire 10 years that he voted contrary to Mr. Eccles' wishes.

At present there are only five members of this seven-man Board serving proper terms, Messrs. McCabe, Eccles, Szymczak, Evans, and Vardaman—with Mr. Draper occupying a sixth place because of failure of the President to name his successor. Governor Evans is absent from the Board most of the time, and has been for the past year or more, so four active members are conducting the Board's business in Washington, with Mr. Draper standing by "on sufferance," as it were. This is not a healthy situation, especially in view of the casual attitude of Mr. McCabe as an administrator and leader. It is a situation much to the liking, I presume, of Mr. Eccles and his hand-picked staff, because it gives them continued and practically undisputed sway in Board matters.

And my prediction is that unless this Congress puts some pressure in the proper place the two vacancies on the Board will not be filled, but the situation will be allowed to drag on indefinitely.

I note in the Eccles' letter no hint of the customary declaration that he was speaking as an individual and not for the Board. Of course, I thought—and so did the public, I believe—that Mr. Eccles had been repudiated and removed as head of the Board when Mr. McCabe was appointed Chairman in 1948. But after looking into the matter and asking many questions of people who should know, I don't seem to find any evidence that Mr. McCabe has done much else than to physically occupy the Chairman's office in the Federal Reserve Building, and causing Mr. Eccles the slight inconvenience of moving a few doors down the hall on the same floor.

As to Governor Vardaman, he is one of the closest personal friends of President Truman in Washington official life and there is less said about it than of any other man. I found out from long-time employees of the Federal Reserve Board, who are very uncomfortable about the one-man rule there, that Mr. Vardaman is regarded as the great dissenter in many of the Board's policies and I assume that his dissents reflect a very uncomfortable feeling of the man in the White House who sees a bureaucrat remaining as the real Chairman of the Board even after he has been displaced.

Certainly there has been no change in policy, or in basic thinking, or in arbitrary and bureaucratic conduct by the majority of the Board and Staff. It is true that the statements of the Board and its communications with the various committees of the Congress have become more verbose and longer and almost wholly innocuous and "straddling" in their content. But the old staff is still on the job, efficient, intact, and impregnable. Mr. McCabe has been allowed to bring in one economist, an excellent man, so I am told, by the name of Riefler, to try and teach McCabe the ABC's of national economics, fiscal finance, and otherwise guide him. This man has done a good job, it is said, but is apparently getting discouraged over his pupil, and it is rumored that he is considering becoming a member of the President's Economic Council—that new-thoughtist body headed by Mr. Leon Keyserling.

I am further informed that Mr. McCabe also brought along with him an able young assistant who up until a few months ago acted as his personal secretary. But late last year he too became discouraged, it is said, over the impregnability of the Eccles selected staff, and resigned his position with the Board and went back home to Chester, Pa., and the paper company.

As things now stand, Mr. McCabe is the nominal head of the Board, but he has not made one single major change in personnel or policy during his 2 years of administration. Since he has, presumably, the backing of the Administration, he could make almost any change he desired; so, I am bound to conclude, in view of his acquiescence and failure to act, that he, like some of his colleagues, is satisfied to be and function in all things as an Eccles satellite, or at least, as a messenger boy for Eccles' hand-picked board, and for Eccles' more thoroughly hand-picked staff.

It should be borne in mind that this Board is, theoretically, a direct agent of this Congress. It operates without any supervision whatsoever as to policies, personnel, or expenditures, except those broad provisions of congressional enactments directly applicable to the Board. It is not subject to the Bureau of the Budget. It is not subject to the Comptroller General. It derives its money from assessments on Federal Reserve banks made by the Board itself, and without recourse on the part of the banks. It spends its moneys thus derived without supervision or limitation or examination from any other Federal agency. It can employ as many people as it desires, and whoever it desires, without reference to any other person or Federal agency. And it can spend as much money as it wants for whatever legal purpose it wants, with little or no restriction, and with no accountability except to the Congress itself.

The only report of its activities and expenditures required by the Congress is the Board's long and laborious and boring annual report. This report covers the high lights of policy, activities, and expenditures, but is limited as to detail, and is in no sense a detailed financial report. There is also a policy record kept and filed with the Congress, I believe, but that relates solely to the official voting record of the Board members, and has nothing to do with other activities or expenditures.

I am not prepared to say at this moment that I am opposed to so much authority being given the Board; nor am I prepared to say that the Board has unduly abused its powers or made expenditures which were not justified. But one point I do want to make, and it is the one which is uppermost in my mind at the moment: And that is, that a Board such as this, with so much power for good or evil, for economy or extravagance, should be well above suspicion as to quality, qualifications, manner of selection, and legal qualifications of its membership. The selection of men to serve on such a Board should carefully follow the intent as well as the letter of the law. There should be no shifty skullduggery, or questionable procedure such as fake residency claims, technical avoidance of the law's letter as to length of service, or other technicalities. Above all, men of independent judgment, men of banking or business experience in their own right, and men above question as to their impersonal and objective approach to those questions properly coming before the Board should be selected. Any appearance of packing or of one-man control or domination; or overbalancing in favor of one political party or one school of thought—all of these weaknesses should be avoided.

And I submit that they have not only not been avoided in the case of the present Board; but I charge that many of the faults mentioned are present in the incumbent Board. And I think this Congress should look into the situation carefully and see just what this hand-picked Board and staff are doing with the tremendous and potentially dangerous authority it possesses, and just what is being done with the vast sums of money which the Board has at its command. And, too, I think the Congress should inquire into the question of Board membership to see if fraud was perpetrated in the appointment of Governors Evans and Clayton and in the reappointment of Governors Eccles and Szymczak. And the Congress might also inquire to see whether or not it is the intention of the administration to let the two present vacancies stand and allow the continuance of the present out-of-balance Eccles-dominated Board; or will the administration carry out the intent of the law and appoint two qualified men to fill these vacancies who shall give the Board

something in the nature of the legally intended balance geographically, economically, politically, and otherwise?

Repeal the District of Columbia Sales Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, August 4, 1949, I introduced H. R. 5470 to repeal the District of Columbia Sales Tax of 1949. Revenues far in excess of anticipations have already been collected by this sales tax. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are now preparing to ask for legislation to abolish personal property taxation in the District and to lower the real estate tax. The real purpose of the District sales tax is thus being disclosed. Its purpose was not so much to meet the financial obligations of the District and relieve the Federal budget from making up the District's deficit as it was to take local taxpayers out from under their existing tax obligations and put the tax burden inordinately upon the consumers purchasing the necessities of life. The Committee on the District of Columbia has not yet given consideration to H. R. 5470, the sales-tax-repeal bill which I introduced last August. They should do so before acceding to the request of the District Commissioners for legislation to eliminate the personal property tax in the District and to lower the real-estate tax.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, March 17, the day of St. Patrick's death, more than 1,500 years ago, is commemorated throughout Ireland and wherever the sons and daughters of Ireland have immigrated, as a tribute to the holy bishop who brought to the Emerald Isle the knowledge of Christ's teachings. Loving God and one's fellow man was the lesson of the Gospels and this was the lesson that St. Patrick brought to Ireland. It was the Christianity of Apostolic times vitalized by the blood of the early martyrs and ardent with the zeal of the catacombs. Through all the vicissitudes of conquest, rebellion, and liberation the people of Ireland have kept the faith as St. Patrick taught them and are a living example that the minds and wills of men can be proof against any force however mighty.

The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Otto E. Koegel, of the New York bar, as the fifty-sixth Founders Day address, at the American University in Washington, D. C., on February 23, 1950. Each year the Founders Day address is dedicated to a distinguished American. This year the address was dedicated to Mr. Daniel C. Roper, for 50 years a public servant. I am advised by the Public Printer that the manuscript will make approximately 2¾ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $225.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN WAY—DOES IT COMBINE IDEALISM AND INDIVIDUALISM OR MATERIALISM AND COLLECTIVISM?

(By Otto E. Koegel, of the New York bar, member of the board of trustees)

FOUNDERS DAY ADDRESS

The American University was chartered by Congress in 1893. Its founders were a group of Christian statesmen who believed that the growing cultural and world importance of Washington made necessary the creation of an institution of higher education which would be distinctly American in its traditions and program. The vision of Bishop John Fletcher Hurst, of the Methodist Church, commanded the support and interest of Americans in all the States.

On founders day in 1949 a group of industrial leaders joined together to place in Hurst Hall a carillon in memory of Daniel C. Roper. The committee on the memorial was headed by the late Hon. W. A. Julian, then Treasurer of the United States, with Gov. Ernest Draper, of the Federal Reserve System, as its secretary. The inscription on the carillon plaque reads: "Daniel Calhoun Roper, 1867–1943, for 50 years a public servant."

"For the true liberal there is but one country—the world; but one religion—love to God and man; one politician—he who benefits and elevates the human family."

A condition in the gift of the carillon provided that each year on founders day a distinguished American should deliver an address devoted to the theme of the meaning of the word "American." The Daniel C. Roper address was delivered on the fifty-sixth founders day by Otto E. Koegel, Esq., of the New York bar, a member of the board of trustees of the American University.

PAUL F. DOUGLASS,
President.

You may recall that during the war King George VI, speaking to a world audience, expressing words of faith and courage, spoke these lines of M. Louise Haskins, "I said to the man who stood at the gate of the year: 'Give me a light that I may tread safely into the unknown.' And he replied: 'Go out into the darkness and put your hand into the Hand of God. That shall be to you better than light and safer than a known way.'" Deep spiritual significance is implicit in this metaphor.

Does it represent the idealism of most Americans? I think it does. But to some very influential ones and to some opinion makers it should not. Why do I say that? For the reason that a materialistic view of existence and ethics is held by a numerically small but influentially large number of social scientists, jurists, and others in and out of Government. Such view under the name of pragmatism is infiltrating into our philosophy of law and Government. For good or ill it is time that we should all examine it and see how it affects our historical conception of fundamental human values.

To get straight to the point, the basis of Christian ethics—so use that term in a broad and nonsectarian sense—is under attack from vantage points of influence. Those leading the attack have emphasized the preeminent position that jurists and lawyers are in to make that attack take on substance. Changes in our underlying legal concepts, such as that which Jefferson expressed in the Declaration of Independence, that men are endowed with certain inalienable rights by their Creator, can have far-reaching effects. If the superstructure of the American way is adjusted to a certain underlying foundation, a shift of the foundation may topple the edifice.

There are amongst us those who feel that that would be a desirable result.

First, let me read to you a declaration of beliefs by a number of American intellectuals including John Dewey: "The time has passed for theism or deism—the universe is self-existing and not created—modern science makes unacceptable any supernatural or cosmic guarantees of human values." You may be astonished to learn that this is the pragmatism of Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes.

The dictionary definition of pragmatism is the doctrine that practical results are the sole test of truth. The idealist agrees that honesty is the best policy, but he rejects the thought that it is solely a matter of policy. The idealist believes that virtue is its own reward without relation to objective experience.

Now let me read the opening words of the declaration of human rights adopted by the United Nations: "Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world."

These words are in direct conflict with the declaration I first read to you. No real pragmatist would subscribe to them.

And the pragmatist haughtily rejects the words in the Declaration of Independence so familiar to us all. They are: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." And in the preamble of the Declaration of Independence refers to the laws of nature and of nature's God, which words they scorn even more.

Thus the main issue is joined between pragmatism—which is but a new look for materialism—and idealism, which is belief in a Divine Creator.

Most Americans accept idealism as their creed. Likewise they reject collectivism, believing it to be undesirable for them. Perhaps there is a connection between pragmatism and collectivism on the one hand and between idealism and individualism on the other. It seems we have two sets of twin ideas, not always identical and sometimes strange acting ones. But there is a discernible basic pattern of affinity between the ideas in each set. The outstanding collectivists denounce idealism as an arch enemy of the people.

To the pragmatist natural law—in the sense that men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights as Jefferson wrote—is humbug, a favorite word of Mr. Justice Holmes.

Having deprived men of all natural rights and relieved them of all natural obligations to one another it becomes philosophically easy to justify might makes right which the pragmatists do—and that is but a step to tyranny. Generally, that describes one of the sets of twins.

Now for the second set. To the idealist those sacred words in the Declaration of Independence and those which refer to nature and nature's God, express true law just as Cicero expressed it 25 centuries ago. "True law is right reason conformable to nature, universal, unchangeable. * * * It is not one thing in Rome and another thing in Athens, one thing today and another tomorrow; but in all times and nations this universal law must forever reign, eternal and imperishable. * * * God Himself is its author, its promulgator, its enforcer."

Americans accept this view. They believe that no earthly law-making body, past, present, or future, can alter the requirement that men shall show good will toward one another. Told that they don't know what that means does not alter their viewpoint. Apprehension of it may change according to time and circumstance, and it is not perfect except in the ideal. But where the individual is thus idealized he assumes a responsible self-esteem. He develops selfreliance or individualism. It was Oliver Wendell Holmes, Sr., father of the great Justice, who said the author of the song America, "Created something imperishable by using the word 'My' in 'My country, 'tis of thee,' instead of the word 'Our.'" It thus clearly appears as a country of persons, each with an individual sense of proprietorship and responsibility; not one in which the individual is but a corpuscle of the State.

I think the prime political objective of all men of good will is to abolish poverty. As to how best to do that, well-meaning men disagree. However, most Americans believe that our way to do it is ever to strive to create a better society of opportunity and incentive for the individual—a society in which the individual will experience the maximum of self-reliance; where each individual having physical or economic handicaps will be assisted to overcome them in order that he may become self-reliant. This is a big order and of course cannot be done all at once but it is the American ideal. That ideal is under attack. It is against that attack that I am addressing myself.

The author of the Epic of America has said that the American mind bears within itself at the same time a strong idealism and a strong realism. President Wilson gave full expression to American idealism in his message to Congress in 1917 asking for a declaration of war. Many will remember the moral curses we placed on our opponents in two world wars for their might makes right philosophy. I have suggested to you that Mr. Justice Holmes held the same view. Norman Thomas says there is such a thing as chain reaction in men's thinking. Well, Holmes, the great jurist—actually a conservative in politics—has left a legendary reputation among lawyers as liberal and idealist. He was neither. He was utilitarian.

Let us examine in a little more detail the case for individualism as against its opposite number collectivism (a political inquiry) and save idealism versus materialism (a metaphysical one) for our last and most important remarks.

Our political thought is enveloped in a welter of confusion of terms. We are apt to be led into that hazy medium of words wherein we all drown. Conservative, used now by some in an opprobrious sense; progressive and liberal which have many connotations; New Deal, Fair Deal, right of center, left of center; left and right wing; and so on. It would be a blessing if we were always alerted to these propositions: That accumulation and concentration of power always lead to a demand for more power; that every supernumerary in Government or on a Government pay roll means less production; that a pyramiding public debt if not checked leads to national bankruptcy or socialism; that 150 years of clinical evidence supports our incentive society as the most productive; that as Wendell Willkie put it, only the productive can be strong and only the strong can be free; that we cannot proceed indefinitely in a direction away from private ownership and responsibility without destroying our incentive society; that once in a great while it is desirable that we should take our political bearings. It has been said that "the definitising of error often is the beginning of its disappearance," or as Bacon saw it, "truth to emerge sooner from error than confusion."

Both major political parties and most Americans profess to be opposed to the general ownership and control in the State of the means of production and distribution of goods. That is what we call socialism. That term, like individualism, to Dr. Dewey is a majestic abstraction. I submit there is considerable room for a difference on that point. I should like to quote extensively from the late Dr. Borden Parker Bowne, one of our great philosophers, and a profound thinker in metaphysics and ethics. In his work the Principles of Ethics, he states the matter so clearly from my point of view that I feel justified in quoting extensively from him. He says: "The idealogist (not idealist) is a real menace unless he has practical wisdom or is held in check by others who have it. In particular, man is complex, and not always adapted to the schemes provided for him.

"(Socialistic schemes) have been favorites with speculative minds since the time of Plato; and in general they have had a lofty moral aim. * * * Socialism may have an aim essentially Christian. * * * The general difficulty with it is that it pursues a laudable end by unwise or destructive methods."

George Bernard Shaw has written that "modern socialism does not, like communism, advocate revolution as the only means for success. Neither does it reject it as a last resort. The difference is one of tactics and not of objective." A former New York City official in Philadelphia, on April 15, 1932, told the Academy of Arts and Sciences: "Having once captured the Government and shelved the Supreme Court, we Socialists would nationalize as many large industries as we could chew. We would do it peacefully if possible, and we would do it otherwise if necessary."

And returning to Bowne: "It is needful, first of all, to make clear to ourselves that the inequalities and evils found in society are by no means all due to society itself. To begin with, there is an inequality of power and faculty in the constitution of man, and no legislation in the world can ever remove this and its consequences. Equality, except in the sense of one law for all and impartiality in its administration, is an idle dream. Society can as little produce it, as it can enable a rhinoceros to sing, or legislate a cat into a lion.

"The most beneficent feature in the moral order is that which puts a premium on produce, skill, and character, and serves a writ of ejection on idleness, ignorance, and animalism."

Former Dean Pound, of Harvard Law School, said in New York last week that "security today is being made to include security against one's own fault, improvidence, or ill luck, or even defects of character; that to fulfill this expectation the law seems more and more to be called on to pull him out of the ditch, bind up his wounds, set him on his way, and pay his hotel bill. Relief from the burden of poverty, want, and fear are laudable humanitarian ideals, but much at least of the program, if not beyond practical attainment, is certainly beyond practical attainment through law."

Again, says Bowne, "The best thing about the view (that the instruments and forces of production should be taken over by the state) is the clear insight into the worthlessness of all the familiar, socialistic cure-alls; but its holders have never thought it out, whether in its economic bearings, in its internal organization, or in its adaptation to men as we find them. If it diminished production we should have less to divide. If it rewarded all service alike it would produce heartburnings and injustice. If it did not direct production there would be no security against wasted effort. If it did direct it we should need a very wise central authority and very submissive subjects. That we should have either is highly improbable. As to its adaptation to actual men, nothing could be more insane than the fancy that society is to be redeemed by removing the motives to individual effort which lie in private property and private ambition. It is pleasant to conceive of a society where each should exist for all, where the best should rule and the rest should serve, where the inventor should present society with the fruits of his genius, where those of feeble powers should thankfully accept the humble place assigned them by the ruling powers, and where everyone should have his eye fixed on the public good. Unfortunately, the men for such a scheme do not exist on this earth, and when they do the scheme will be needless. Meanwhile, we shall have to get on as we are, not only fixing our eyes on the millennium, but now and then taking some account of human nature itself."

And a great natural scientist, Prof. J. Arthur Thomson, of Aberdeen University, has said on the same subject, "Civilization has indeed mitigated the severity of nature's Spartan methods, and has thrown off the yoke of natural selection, but it has not put an end to struggle nor the need for it. We are face to face with ugly and terrible social savers, and since we cannot return to nature's stern regions which Plato approved, it behooves us more strenuously to substitute for natural selection a similar method on a higher turn of the spiral. We cannot return to nature's tactics, but we must adhere to her strategy or perish miserably." He is saying that, in the long run, we will perish if we abandon individualism for collectivism. Continuing, he says, "Huxley saw in nature a vast gladiatorial show, a ubiquitous Ishmaelitism, every living creature for itself and extinction taking the hindmost. But he did not adequately appreciate the fact that throughout the struggle for existence in nature, there is often a pathway to survival and success through increased cooperation, kindliness, and mutual aid, as well as through increased competition and self-assertion. And it is this line of continuation and mutual aid that man must especially follow; it is the one he has followed in making some of his greatest advances."

And Bowne, the sage and philosopher, was equally emphatic that mere opposition to all Socialist controls is not enough. Says he, "Legislation can do a great deal in the way of protecting public interests from private rapacity. Society also must look after the poor and the sick who are not otherwise cared for. It must do this also in a more humane fashion than has been the rule.

"But society cannot afford to do anything which will relieve the healthy individual from

the necessity of working out his own salvation."

Bowne, my kind of liberal, was by no means unaware of the common man. He disagrees with those who, since the time of Socrates, have urged that it is risky or foolish to give the vote of the peasant as much weight as that of a philosopher. He says, "History shows that the peasant with plain sense and rectitude of conscience is as trustworthy as the philosopher. Historically, distinctions of intelligence beyond those of plain common sense have wrought more harm than good."

The American people agree with Plato that the equality of unequals is inequality. But they also believe that human dignity demands that every man should be assured as a reward for his best efforts a decent minimum of economic security. What that should be and how to attain it is a big question, to be sure. However, one thing seems certain—most Americans do not want to give up their idealism and individualism in exchange for a promise of more creature comforts. They know the promise, even if initially kept, would ultimately be repudiated. Inevitably tyranny rises as freedom of the individual sinks.

I now come to the most important characteristic of the American way, idealism, which I have suggested is a corollary of individualism.

The American way is entirely incompatible with the Freudian dictum that religion is "the universal obsessional neurosis." It is a rejection of the dismal dictum that all we are is but the result of "accidental collocations of atoms." On our coins we read "In God we trust." It is not with the quality of empty ritualism that we sing from one of our great anthems, "Our Father's God, to Thee, author of liberty * * * Great God, our King."

Yet, some leaders in legal thought in this country go to Freud, the scientist, in search of the ultimate explanation. These leaders, including some of our highest judges, poke intellectual fun at those of us who have what they call the "carry-over of the childish respect for paternal omnipotence," and they say we feed on dreams and delusions. They say this is derived from a filial emotion and that a child, "left to his spontaneous conceptions, finds nothing very sacred about God," a statement that suggests to some of us philosophical illiteracy. Emerson long ago had thought of this and he has the answer: "Children, it is true, believe in the external world. The belief that it appears only is an afterthought, but with children this faith will as surely arise on the mind as did the first." Thus a child from its beginnings could be isolated and left to its spontaneous conceptions is a statement that does not even rise to the dignity of an hypothesis.

The chief exponent these views have produced has resulted in enthroning a few demigods outside of their own spheres. Mr. Justice Holmes, truly a very great jurist, is one. I have said before, many lawyers would regard him as a great liberal and an idealist. He was not an idealist and not a liberal in the sense of the current political use of the term. Perhaps utilitarian would be the best one-word description of him.

In a letter to Pollock when he was 79 years old, Justice Holmes said, "I see no reason for attributing to man (in the common) a significance different in kind from that which belongs to a baboon or a grain of sand." When 85 years of age, in a letter to Dr. Wu, he said, "It makes me enormously happy when I am encouraged to believe that I have done something of what I should have liked to do, but in the subterranean misgivings, I think, I believe I think sincerely, that it does not matter much. This is private talk, not to be quoted to others, for one is shy and sensitive as to one's inner convictions, except in these queer moments when one tells the world as poets and philosophers do." There is not much inspiration in a philosophy that nothing matters much.

And, again quoting the great Justice himself, "I hardly think of man as so sacred an object as Laski seems to think him. I believe that Malthus was right in his fundamental notion, and that is as far as we have got or are likely to get in my day. Every society is founded on the death of men. In one way or another some are always and inevitably pushed down the deadline. I think it a manifest humbug to suppose that even relative universal bliss is to be reached by tinkering with property or changing forms of government so long as every social improvement is expended in increased and unchecked propagation. I shall think socialism begins to be entitled to serious treatment when and not before it takes life in hand and prevents the continuance of the unfit."

There is more than a little fuzzy thinking in that observation. First he would not substitute socialism for the status quo until we decrease propagation. If socialism has any validity it surely is not limited to a future population which will owe its existence to a state planned parenthood scheme. Mind you, the great judge was speaking not only of the reproduction of the congenitally unfit. As to them there is very little if any disagreement. He was speaking also of increased propagation. Then what are to be the rules for producing the master race? Who is to make the rules? In a collectivist state, theoretically at least, everyone. I submit this to the verdict of common sense.

Writing to Pollock in 1920, Justice Holmes says, "I loathe war. But I do think that man at present is a predatory animal. I think that the sacredness of human life is a purely municipal ideal of no validity outside the jurisdiction. I believe that force, mitigated so far as may be by good manners is the ultime ratio, and between two groups that want to make inconsistent kinds of world I see no remedy except force. It seems to me that every society rests on the death of men."

In summing up, Prof. Harold J. Laski, has said, "There is, in short, in Mr. Justice Holmes a Spinoza proclaiming that might gives to right its letters of credit."

In brief, to Justice Holmes there is no such thing as moral ought. In his view, so we are told, the Golden Rule is there is no Golden Rule. One school of legal thought, consecrated to his philosophy, with many followers in high places, rejects the idea of free will, which it says appears "throughout literature, religion, philosophy, and legal dogma, but has little scientific evidence to support it," and its followers profess to believe that "by controlling the individual's environment you can control his character, and predict his future actions." Writing cautiously, one of them says, "The task of doing this is stupendous." This is the understatement of all time. Who is going to devise the control; and who is going to control whom?

This same professor, writing in the Harvard Law Review, also said, "The wise businessman, distrusting the judicial process, stays as far as possible from it, and then to many scientists the legal profession rises but little higher than that of the osteopath," a somewhat adventitious observation. Perhaps this was intended to displease the osteopaths. However, I know of some highly placed jurists who esteem them.

Justice Holmes was possessed of great mind and resolution. He made immense contributions to our jurisprudence. Although saying somewhat scornfully that the law was not for poets, he, the son of one, wrote very much like one. The very artistic quality of his writing gives him an especial influence. He recognized that no deed could compare with the ability to influence thinking, and he said so. Influence on men's minds may be a creeping one and its insidious nature not always easy to perceive.

It has long been anachronistic to speak of inert matter, but today it is thought of in almost abstract terms. Now, in conventional thought, we regard matter as energy, and energy as an attribute; but an attribute of what? Also many able, scientific thinkers see no conflict between science and religion, but view them as incommensurables. There are others, many of them so-called social scientists, who hold a contrary view. As to creation of living creatures, science offers certain contributions to the discussion and then, as Professor Thomson says, we remain qua science agnostic. However, to most minds it seems imperative to go on to metaphysical theory and it is better to do this frankly and deliberately than unconsciously or at random.

I think many pragmatists simply resolve the problem qua science and do not bother further with the problem because of a colossal unawareness of its existence. Emerson said, "He that has never doubted the existence of matter, may be assured he has no aptitude for metaphysical inquiries."

There would be less confusion in law and politics if we would accept the view that the law is an art and not a science, as some maintain.

"Where," asks General Smuts, philosopher and statesman, "was the Spirit when the warm Silurian seas covered the face of the earth, and the lower types of fishes and marine creatures still formed the crest of the evolutionary wave? Where was the Spirit when the solar system itself was still a diffuse fiery nebula?"

That question he has answered—but equivocally—affirming both idealism and what he calls naturalism. But our unequivocal and satisfying answer is the one found in the first four words of the most majestic passage of literature, the first verse of Genesis—"In the beginning God."

Or as Emerson has said it:

"Idealism sees the world in God. It beholds the whole circle of persons and things of actions and events, of country and religion, not as painfully accumulated, atom after atom, act after act, in an aged creeping past, but as one vast picture which God paints on the instant eternity for the contemplation of the soul. Idealism saith: matter is a phenomenon, not a substance."

Thoughts are things.

Lord Kelvin said "The only contribution of dynamics to theoretical biology is absolute negation of automatic commencement or automatic maintenance of life."

Dr. Einstein has given his approval to a book, The Universe and Mr. Einstein, in which it is stated:

"* * * if the universe is running down and nature's processes are proceeding in just one direction, the inescapable inference is that everything had a beginning.

* * * * *

"So all the evidence that points to the ultimate annihilation of the universe points just as definitely to its inception fixed in time."

Yet the pragmatist is not content to take a doubting position as to idealism. With confidence he issues a cold and barren manifesto in opposition. That is precisely the position taken by most leading collectivists of the world.

Science describes, but never explains. As it pushes back the frontier the philosophical problem still remains unchanged. "Science never destroys wonder, but only shifts it higher and deeper. When the halfgods go, the gods arrive." Then as Professor Thomson asks, Should we not get back oftener to

the emotional realization of height above height, which is expressed in Emerson's picture of the little child looking up through the maple branches—

"Over his head were the maple buds,
And over the tree was the moon,
And over the moon were the starry studs,
That drop from the angels' shoon."

Any subjective system of ethics must rest on a theistic foundation. Any other system is a precarious one. The Pater Noster—Our Father who Art in Heaven—is a part of the American way.

It was not a churchman but a victorious general in the hour of victory who stepped on the deck of the battleship Missouri to warn a listening world in these words: "We have had our last chance. * * * The problem of survival basically is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence."

The American people are progressive, not in spite of their idealism but because of it. Their idealism is what will make them continuously more tolerant and unbiased, without which there can be no progress. They know they have improved their incentive society and they are resolved with God's help to continue to improve it. In that they will succeed if they are not forgetful of fundamentals.

King Solomon's words have not lost their meaning, "Where there is no vision the people perish!"

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before Annual Meeting of the Tri-State Sheep and Wool Growers Association

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me before the annual meeting of the Tri-State Sheep and Wool Growers Association, at Washington, Pa., on March 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a real pleasure to be here with my own people—the folks from the farm.

Many of you know that I was born on a sheep farm, only 14 miles from where we are meeting tonight.

The first hundred dollars I ever accumulated was earned in the sheep business. That was a large sum of money in those days and represented a lot of hard work.

I know your difficulties and your problems. I know what competition from foreign markets means to you. I know what interference by Government can do to your business.

That is why I welcomed this opportunity to discuss with you the relations between Government and agriculture and the effect of that relationship upon the general welfare of all the people of the United States.

I had particularly in mind the trend in recent years toward greater and greater centralization of power in the Federal Government and the increasing danger of bureaucratic control over the destiny of every farmer and every worker.

Equally important, I wanted to hammer home the warning that a nation which adopts reckless, wasteful, and extravagant spending and continues year after year to pile up additional billions of dollars of debt is on the road to national bankruptcy.

So long as that course is pursued the day of reckoning must arrive. With it will come financial collapse. And what is more important, freedom of the individual will be destroyed.

The dictatorship of the socialistic state will gain control and this great Republic will no longer be the land of liberty and opportunity that made us the greatest nation on earth.

My friends, it is not pleasant to paint such a gloomy picture. But it is one that cannot be glossed over. It must not be ignored.

It would be easy to say it cannot happen here. But when we consider what has been happening and find that we are on the same course that has led other great nations into the strangling slavery of socialism we dare not fail to take warning.

Let us review briefly the increase in the size and the cost of Government.

In less than 20 years the annual expenditures of the Federal Government have skyrocketed from $3,000,000,000 to $42,000,000,000. In the same period the number of employees on the Federal pay rolls rose from 570,000 to over 2,000,000. The number of departments, bureaus, agencies and commissions increased fourfold to over 1,800.

Today the interest on the national debt alone is more than the total cost of Government only 16 years ago. And when we think about that debt, which now stands at almost $257,000,000,000 and is going higher every day, we must remember that it represents a burden of about $1,800 for every man, woman and child in the United States. That means approximately $7,000 for the average family of four.

Remember also that this staggering burden of debt, the greatest the world has ever known, is not a mere bookkeeping item. It must be paid. It will be left by those who created it as a liability to be met by generations yet unborn, our children's children and their children—far into the future.

During the present fiscal year the Government operated at a cost of $5,500,000,000 beyond its income. For the next fiscal year President Truman has recommended expenditures which mean another deficit of $5,100,000,000.

Is it not time to stop and ask ourselves how long we can survive as a free Nation if we are to continue to spend beyond our income at the rate of $5,000,000,000 a year?

I submit that question to you as Americans and as patriotic citizens who are deeply concerned with the future of America.

No segment of our population is so much interested in preserving freedom as the farmer. He knows that liberty and national solvency are interwoven. One cannot exist without the other.

The American farmer is an independent citizen who knows the value of self-reliance, hard work and thrift. He wants to build his security on his own efforts, his own skill. He asks no special favors from the Government. All he asks is a fair price at the market for his products and a fair price when he buys the things he needs.

The farmer wants to stand on his own feet. He wants to do his own thinking, free from restrictions, regulations and regimentation by bureaucratic Government officials.

Instead he has been made the victim of an administration that seeks to gain political advantage by promising everything to the farmer if he will submit to a program of Government control such as has been proposed in the Brannan plan.

That fantastic scheme would place the farmer under complete regimentation from Washington. It would make the Secretary of Agriculture a supreme dictator over the 5,000,000 farmers of America. The farmer is promised a high income at the expense of the taxpayers, but he would have to give up all his independence. He would have to submit to acreage allotments, production goals, marketing practices including marketing quotas and conservation and good land practices.

All of these restrictions upon the farmer's right to run his own affairs would be directed from Washington. That means he would be told how many acres he could plant, what crops he could raise, how to cultivate his land and where to sell his product. He would have to keep detailed records of all his operations and report the figures to the Department of Agriculture. After placing himself in this socialized strait-jacket the farmer would have to depend upon a hand-out check from the government for his livelihood.

It is impossible to estimate how much such a program would cost. But one thing is certain. It would saddle the consumers and taxpayers of America—and that includes the farmer—with an additional tax burden of at least seven to eight billion dollars a year.

The cost of administering the Brannan plan alone could be staggering. It would require an army of investigators, inspectors, bookkeepers, accountants, supervisors, lawyers, and experts, all on the Government pay roll.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the leaders of most of the recognized farm organizations have denounced the plan as dangerous, socialistic, and destructive of the farmer's initiative and incentive.

In the Hoover Commission's report on the Department of Agriculture it was pointed out that in the last 20 years the department has expanded from 22,000 employees to over 82,000 and that its expenditures have increased from $26,000,000 to $2,300,000,000 in 1948.

With this expansion there has developed a great deal of costly duplication and overlapping of services. In some rural counties from 8 to 10 separate agencies operate at the same time. Short-term loans to farmers are made by four separate Federal agencies. Some of the funds received from the Treasury by these agencies are invested in Government bonds so that the Government pays interest on its own money.

The Hoover Commission cited the case of a farmer who wrote to the Department of Agriculture seeking advice on the best type of fertilizer to use on his soil. He received answers from five separate offices and all the answers were different and contradicted each other.

Recently one writer stated that the Agriculture Department can't seem to make up its mind whether it is supposed to increase the Nation's farm output or decrease it. He pointed out that the price-support people are paying out $1,400,000,000 this fiscal year to keep surplus crops off the market while another office, full of experts, is spending the taxpayers' money to help the farmer increase his output.

These are some examples of Government in agriculture. They lead to the conclusion that it would be better for all concerned if there were less Government in agriculture.

A sound, efficient farm program is essential to the welfare of the whole country. A prosperous agriculture is fundamental for a prosperous America. The initiative and incentive of the farmer must be encouraged as the best insurance that the consumer will

have an adequate supply of food and fiber produced on the farm.

He must be given tariff protection against the importation of unlimited agricultural and livestock products.

In the early years of our Nation's history we were largely an agricultural country. Ninety percent of our people were engaged directly in farming.

It was then that Thomas Jefferson, great champion of individual freedom, sounded a warning, from which I quote:

"Were we directed from Washington when to sow and what to reap we should soon want bread • • • when all government, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all powers, it will become venal and oppressive."

Jefferson recognized the value of agriculture as one of the most important of all the activities of mankind. He feared the time when a majority of the people would no longer be tillers of the soil. He feared the time when the Federal Government would assume power to regiment and control the farmer.

He fought against the dangers to liberty and an all-powerful central Government and Government at oppressive cost.

We must take up that fight. We must not stand idly by while political demagogues and socialistic minded do-gooders spend us to destruction. We must not accept the sugar-coated promise of security to be handed to us on a silver platter by a generous paternalistic government.

If we depend upon that false promise we will see our freedom slip away, a little at a time, until all liberty is destroyed.

From the days of Lexington to the surrender of Japan farmers have been in the front line, battling for the God-given freedom of the individual.

The farmer has been steadfast in support of the church and has aided in strengthening the moral fabric of our Nation.

It is a glorious record and has contributed so much to the greatness of America.

At no time in the history of the United States has it been more important than now to put on the short sword and to fight for righteousness, clean and economical government and for the American way of life.

We need all safety in the battle for a strong, solvent, dynamic America.

All the various types of agriculture should organize to insist upon economy in government, sound fiscal policies and a balanced budget.

Working together in the spirit of patriotism, such organizations can wield tremendous influence for a better, happier, and more prosperous America.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, yesterday delivered a very notable address on foreign policy at Berkeley, Calif. I have in my hand a copy of an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune dealing with this address, and treating it very comprehensively and favorably. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BASIS OF POLICY

Secretary Acheson, in his speech at Berkeley yesterday, has stated with great strength and clarity the basic realities of the Soviet-western problem, and the basic principles and policies with which the administration, through him, is seeking to deal with it. Here is a considered capstone set upon that concept of total diplomacy which the Secretary, in a series of remarkable and forceful utterances, has been setting before the Nation and the world. And here is a firmness of grasp and sharpness of insight which are beyond challenge save on the most carefully weighed and responsible grounds.

The Secretary has been under simultaneous attack from two quite opposite directions. The idea that his policy is influenced by some insidious (and unexplained) sympathy for communism becomes merely frivolous in face of his masterly analysis of the real nature of the profound division between east and west—a moral issue of the clearest nature. The opposite, and more serious, attack accuses him of a do-nothing defeatism in face of this dangerous chasm, of inflexibility, of a failure to make new peace advances or think up new policies more apt than the present ones to soften the Kremlin's heart. Can this attack be sustained?

New policies or peace offers are obviously worse than useless unless they fit the actual problem at issue. The Secretary's statement of the nature of this problem is scarcely open to challenge. He outlines seven contributions which the Kremlin could make to the restoration of peace. Can any thoughtful American argue that asking for these is asking too much, or indeed that the United States could accept any peace settlement which did not provide at least these minimum conditions of assurgement and stability? They are, as the Secretary himself warns, conditions which the Kremlin has shown no desire of meeting. But can the west offer, within the limits imposed by the necessity of maintaining its freedom and its safety, anything which might change the Politburo's mind?

Those who so argue put themselves under a grave obligation to suggest just what such offers might contain. Unfortunately, it is one of the worst difficulties of the problem that the Kremlin today is quite satisfied with things as they are. Its tactics of infiltration and propaganda are doing well enough; it is under no breaking economic strain; it is not terrorized by atomic fears; it is under no particular pressure to make peace. It would probably be pleased if western rearmament were halted and could doubtless use western capital if it were offered in vast amounts, but it has given no hint that it needs these things badly enough to make any real change of policy in return for them. The truth is that cold war is in large measure a necessary "way of life" for the Soviet dictatorship, and to convince the Politburo that it had better be abandoned is not an easy problem.

"Our attitude," says the Secretary, "is not inflexible, our opinions are not frozen, our positions are not and will not be obstacles to peace. But it takes more than one to cooperate." And no suggestion for bringing the Kremlin to believe that cooperation will serve its own interest has yet been advanced that gives as much actual promise as the Secretary's policy—a policy of firmness, of strength, of freedom, of courage to sustain the cold war burdens and unity in holding firm for a real peace. The only alternative yet to be advanced is that which the Secretary mentions—"to allow the free nations to succumb one by one to the erosive and encroaching processes of Soviet expansion."

Farm Production and Farm Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some remarks by Mr. Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief of the Farm Journal, on the subject Crop Research Reward, as printed in the Nebraska Cattleman for March 1950.

In this address Mr. McMillen points out the great importance of conducting research to meet our problems of farm production and farm markets. As Mr. McMillen says, it may well be that $1 spent on research may accomplish more in the way of finding markets for our surpluses or new crops for our acreage than a hundred dollars spent on buying up and destroying surpluses.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CROP RESEARCH REWARD

(Parts of an address by Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief, Farm Journal, Philadelphia, Pa.)

Already this morning there has been considerable discussion of agriculture's biggest question. You have adopted a resolution on it—a magnificent resolution. That question is whether or not ranchers and farmers in America are going to continue to be free. There are innumerable aspects of the question, and perhaps I can illustrate only one of them by referring to a bit of agricultural history which is familiar to all of you.

There are, I see, among you a few who, like myself, can well remember, let us say, a quarter of a century ago, when, had anyone asked what was the foremost question before agriculture he would have been told that it was the question of farm surpluses. It was not long after that question first began to be acute when Government began to undertake to do things about it. Since 1933 Government has distributed in subsidies to agriculture, primarily intended to accomplish something to solve the surplus problem, more than $12,000,000,000, and has spent in addition the high percentage of cost for the administration and distribution of those subsidies, the political brokerage that goes on with all such matters.

We have had a series of laws designed to solve the surplus problem. Each law has cost a little more money. Each law has created new problems and set up new phases of the question. And today, 25 years later, right here in the very middle of the twentieth century, what do we hear? That there are rolling up great surpluses of wheat; that there is on hand a great surplus of cotton; that there are enough dried eggs in storage to provide a breakfast for every American for a year if the hens all quit laying; and that there are accumulations of this and that and the other; and that now, after $12,000,000,000 in 25 years, we must embark upon still more costly programs which impose upon farmers more and more problems. That is the history of Government whenever it undertakes to accomplish things which Government by its very nature cannot accomplish.

Government actually and properly has but two functions. One of them is to protect the citizens and the Nation from any attack by foreign powers. That is the primary function of government. The other is to protect the citizen from aggression by his fellow citizens. Now, government does not too well accomplish either of those functions. If governments were capable of accomplishing these two jobs, it would have been possible for us to say that during some 10,000 years of human history that we can guess at or know about there might have been a little more than 250 years of peace. Governments do not do a good job on their first function. And anyone who has ever had occasion to get himself tangled up in the courts of law will cheerfully agree that government does not too well and certainly not too economically perform the second function of protecting the citizen from aggression by his fellow citizens.

We have in the United States by common consent more or less agreed that government might undertake certain other functions in fields where private and individual enterprises cannot supply enough capital, assume enough risk or expect rewards adequate to the capital and risks incurred. We are accustomed to having our mail delivered by government. It might be done better nowadays by private hands, but probably could not have been when the post office was instituted. We are accustomed to suppose that it is entirely proper—and I believe it is—for government to, let us say, keep statistics on the livestock industry and upon grain production and upon the business activities and the employment of the country. We need that and it contributes to the advancement of our country. It is entirely proper that the government should engage in certain kinds of research, particularly of the fundamental kinds that helps us to understand a little better the laws of nature. It is proper for government, we believe, to assume some functions in the promotion of education. We think there ought to be some definite limitation as to how far we ought to permit government to go in that field.

Taking the field of research as it is of concern to you: We, I think, have no disagreement upon the idea that it is a function of the Federal Government to combat the existence and spread of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico in order to prevent it from attacking our herds in the United States. Upon that point I might digress just long enough to say that we have known for years and years that there could be other outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States. Mr. Mollin said we have had them as early as the latter part of the nineteenth century. Had we been farsighted enough in 1920 to have established that laboratory that we are trying yet to get established, we might by this time know enough about the character of foot-and-mouth disease and how to fight it so that it would not be the menace that it is today. We are just starting 25 or 30 years too late to build that laboratory—but again it is better late than never.

Through research, we are constantly lowering our costs, and as we lower costs, we enable more people to enjoy more meat and to enjoy it more often. Through lowering costs we widen our markets. And it is unfortunate perhaps that we permit ourselves in agriculture to think too much about the price we receive and not enough about the costs we put out, because in the long run the income that enables us to enjoy something beyond the necessities of life is the result of price times the quantity we have to sell minus the cost of production. Those are all factors of our agricultural income. Quality becomes reflected in price.

During this quarter of a century we have made some progress. You are doing things on your ranches today that no one would agree 25 years ago you could be doing today. On every farm in America practices are being followed today to lower costs and produce goods that were not possible a quarter of a century ago, and these real ventures have one thing in common; nearly every one of them, I think, is the product of research which has been placed in our hands today because scientists and engineers have come up with new facts with which our great business organizations and countless smaller organizations have been able to turn into new material and new buildings that we enjoy in our own labor.

The Government, you know, expended in order to look after the 1948 potato crop, something like $200,000,000. I inquired the other day as to how much was available during the same period for research to find out new ways to utilize potatoes. The figure was $50,000. That $200,000,000 to take care of a potato crop for 1 year was four times all the money that was spent for all kinds of research that year by the Federal Government. It didn't solve a single problem with potatoes. It created some new ones for this year.

Now, if we are going to spend any Government money should we not spend it in fields that are productive, in fields that will bring us results? You who live on the great plains would like to have more productive grasses. You would like to have some legumes, perhaps, if they exist anywhere in the world, that would add nitrogen to your soil. You in Florida would probably like to have a grass that would stand the heat and the freezes both so that you wouldn't have any interruptions, be without pasture. All over America we have the needs for new kinds of crops.

Just think of this: One new crop on the great plains of America that would pay a little better than wheat, enough better to tempt farmers to put 25 percent of their acreage in that new crop, would solve the wheat surplus probably once and for all. One new crop, or a few such new crops, in the cotton area, could prevent the recurrence of cotton surpluses.

Now we know that mere law making doesn't work. We know that research does work and there are plenty of places to look for new crops. We do know in the United States there are probably not more than 300 species of plants as crops. In the United States and Canada, north of the Rio Grande there are 15,000 species of plants native to our soil. On the face of the earth there are some 300,000 species of plants. Out of all that marvelous abundance we have found out how to use as crops only about 300. There alone is a field for research that challenges the imagination.

Rivers, Harbors, and Public Works in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made before the Committee on Appropriations on the subject of rivers, harbors, and public works in Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN

Mr. Chairman and members of the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in submitting this statement I wish first to express my sincere appreciation of the recognition given by your committee to the urgent need of Pennsylvania for more effective protection against damage by recurring devastating floods.

The extent to which many areas of Pennsylvania have suffered loss of life and property and disastrous dislocation of production is well known to members of the subcommittee.

There is ample testimony of record to justify the expenditures now requested. On behalf of the people of Pennsylvania whose welfare and economic progress depends to a large extent upon the completion of the flood-control projects now under construction, I ask approval of appropriations in the amounts recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. These amounts, I am convinced, represent the minimum requirements to insure orderly and efficient progress on the individual flood-control projects.

I am therefore requesting this committee to approve appropriations as follows:

Conemaugh Reservoir, $9,000,000; Saylorsburg, $1,205,000; East Branch Clarion Reservoir, $2,000,000; York, $90,100; Williamsport, $1,350,000.

For the maintenance of existing projects I ask the committee's approval of amounts as follows:

Tionesta Reservoir, $65,000; Crooked Creek Reservoir, $55,000; Mahoning Creek Reservoir, $33,500; Loyalhanna Reservoir, $40,000; Youghiogheny Reservoir, $60,000; Johnstown, $15,000; Punxsutawney, $8,000; York, $18,000.

In addition, I ask the committee to appropriate the full budget amounts that will enable the engineers to proceed with the planning work on new projects authorized by Congress.

The projects and the amounts requested are as follows:

Allegheny River Reservoir, $30,000; Allentown project, $50,000; Bear Creek Reservoir, $50,000; Johnsonburg, $10,000; Prompton Reservoir, $25,000; Shenango River, $50,000; Swoyersville and Forty Fort, $30,000; Uniontown, $46,000.

Two other projects for which I ask planning appropriations are included in the omnibus civil-functions bill. They are the Dyberry Reservoir project for the Lackawaxen River for which $50,000 is needed, and the Bradford flood-control project which requires $34,000.

In turning now to the rivers and harbors projects, I would like to call your attention to the fact that Pennsylvania is the only State of the Union which has three great ports giving access to the ocean trade routes of the world—the port of Philadelphia, with access to the Atlantic, the port of Pittsburgh through the Gulf of Mexico, and a Great Lake port at Erie. The maintenance of these great ports is vital to the industrial strength of Pennsylvania and to the economic expansion of the Nation.

Two items for which I ask approval are to carry forward improvements on the Monongahela River which are of vast importance to the coal, steel, and other industries in western Pennsylvania. They are the Morgantown lock and dam located at Morgantown, W. Va., $2,000,000; and lock No. 2 at Pittsburgh for which $9,780,000 is requested.

The completion of these modern locks and dams is of such great importance to the industrial life of western Pennsylvania that I request an appropriation of $100,000 for

further planning of Monongahela River improvements.

I ask the committee to approve the item of $4,000,000 for snag-removal operation on the Schuylkill River; $600,000 for the Ohio River lock and dam construction; and an additional appropriation of $250,000 for open-channel work on the Ohio River.

The importance of providing sufficient funds for the main tenance and operation of river and harbor projects cannot be overemphasized.

I therefore request approval of the full budget amount of $9,948,000 for dredging the Delaware River from Philadelphia to the sea, and recommend that $2,000,000 be appropriated to maintain dredging operations in the Delaware River between Philadelphia and Trenton, N. J.

I further request the full budget amount for the Monongahela River, $89,300 for maintenance dredging in the pools formed by the dams and $1,511,500 for operation and care of existing locks and dams; Allegheny River, $23,100 for maintenance dredging and $343,700 for operation and care of locks and dams; Youghiogheny River, $36,000 for maintenance dredging in the 9-foot channel between the mouth of the river and McKeesport, Ohio River lock and dam construction and open-channel work, $8,825,700 for maintenance; Schuylkill River, $1,300,000 to maintain dredging necessary to provide adequate facilities for the large commerce; Erie Harbor, $67,000 for dredging to maintain the 25- and 26-foot depths in channel entrances and the harbor itself, ranging in depth from 12 to 22 feet.

Radio Station WHAM

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, WHAM, Rochester, N. Y., is one of America's truly great radio stations. Public service has been the keynote in WHAM's operating policy since the station first went on the air in 1922.

In radio's early days, when the industry grew so rapidly, stations were changing frequencies and transmitting power almost at will, resulting in tremendous interference except in the cities where the stations were located. The persons who suffered by this interference were the farmers and small-town residents, who were almost completely forgotten by the then new wonder, radio.

On the advice of a group of radio engineers the Federal Radio Commission in 1928 set up 40 clear channels, interference-free frequencies, to give the neglected rural population at least part of the service which city residents then enjoyed. WHAM was assigned one of these clear channels, 1150 kilocycles. Then, as now, it proved worthy of that sacred trust—serving well its many listeners, rural and urban, in western New York and northwestern Pennsylvania.

To demonstrate the value of WHAM to its area I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on its highly valued orchard spray service, which is about to begin for another season, and to include also letters from agricultural leaders commending WHAM for this service.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAM'S CLEAR CHANNEL SERVES NEW YORK FRUIT BELT

Station WHAM is a 50,000-watt clear-channel station situated in the heart of the world-renowned fruit belt that lies along the southern shore of Lake Ontario in the State of New York.

Fruit growing is one of the really big industries in up-State New York. In the area served by WHAM, the 1949 fruit harvest totaled 20,090,000 bushels of apples; 1,428,000 bushels of peaches; 2,900 tons of sweet cherries; 17,500 tons of sour cherries, and 1,195,000 bushels of pears. Valuation of this crop was over $40,000,000.

Crops of this caliber are not products of chance. They are the result of scientific planning and culture, and Station WHAM plays a large part in the fruit program in up-State New York by cooperating each year in a fruit spray service that has pioneered a new orchard-growing technique that has gained prominence across the United States.

Back at the turn of the century, fruit growers in the WHAM area met their first big orchard foe, the San Jose scale. To combat this serious threat to the orchard industry, fruit men set up a spray program, the success of which was so obvious in terms of bigger and better crops that research in spraying was extended to other fruit pests and has continued without let-up in an ever-expanding program of endeavor and success.

Research has brought to light the priceless information that insect development and harmful tree growths are dependent upon combinations of precipitation, humidity, and temperature. Certain combinations of these factors will produce certain harmful results to orchards. Therefore in WHAM land, fruit specialists of the various county farm bureaus work in conjunction with the United States Weather Bureau, diagnose weather conditions, and then predict what preventive sprays or dusts should be applied.

In the early days of this technique, a telephone network was used to spread daily word of what should be done to prevent disease development. The slowness of this technique created a big difficulty. By the time the last member of the telephone network was contacted, it was often too late to spray effectively. In 1946, Ralph Palmer, fruit specialist for Monroe County Farm Bureau, worked out a plan with WHAM that overcame this objection. Special equipment in Palmer's home was remotely controlled from the station's studios. Each morning, after working out his specialized information, Ralph Palmer went on the air and told growers just what to do. The huge success of this plan in Monroe County paved the way for the same type of operation to be set up in Orleans and Wayne Counties. The broadcasts start early in March or April and continue until the middle of July. The system was of such importance that a full account was published by the United States Weather Bureau with its nationally distributed weather map for Friday, August 22, 1947, under the title "Weather and Fruit Growing."

Station WHAM considers fruit spray service one of its most dramatic examples of the assistance a radio station can extend to farmers and orchardmen when it has the facilities with which to do the job.

WHAM's complete farm division is rendering a highly valued public service to New York and Pennsylvania residents. Its fruit spray service is just one example of its value to the agricultural industry. WHAM, with its interference-free clear channel, is able to get this urgent information to growers over a vast rural area, many parts of which would have no radio service were it not for this clear-channel station.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AND MARKETS

Rochester, N. Y., August 24, 1949.

Mr. GEORGE HAEFNER,
Farm Announcer, Radio Station WHAM,
Rochester, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HAEFNER: I have recently been in contact with a number of farmers throughout western and central New York and cannot refrain from writing to tell you how much they appreciate your agricultural news, particularly the morning and midday periods. Apparently WHAM has been able to reach out to many of our New York State farmers and these farmers with whom I have talked certainly appreciate your fruit report and Market News Service.

May I, at this time, add my personal thanks for the cooperation you have extended to this office in the use of our market reports.

Very truly yours,
H. H. DUNCAN,
Assistant Director.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
STATE OF NEW YORK,

Rochester, N. Y., August 22, 1949.

Mr. GEORGE HAEFNER,
Radio Station WHAM,
Rochester, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HAEFNER: I want to take this opportunity to write you about the radio fruit program which WHAM has broadcast in recent years. As you know, this program started under the regime of Tom Murray some 4 years ago and immediately attracted a considerable audience with a strong demand that it be enlarged and extended. This year witnessed a considerable expansion over the 1948 season and was widely listened to.

Starting March 29, we broadcast 6 days a week until mid-April, when we went on 7 days a week. By late June we were back to 6 days a week, July 1 to 5 days and July 15 to 3 days. The program was discontinued August 15 and might well have run another week.

While the program was designed primarily for fruit growers in Monroe and Orleans Counties, it was widely listened to in all western New York—especially after June 30 when it was the only fruit program on the air in western New York.

Although the timing information was not readily usable outside of western New York, there was also a substantial audience in such other fruit areas as central and northern New York, the Hudson Valley, New England, and along the shore of Lake Erie in Pennsylvania and Ohio. We estimate that more than 5,000 western New York fruit growers listen regularly.

Many farmers who grow no fruit listen to the weather portion of the broadcast.

The fruit growers are very enthusiastic about the service and it would now not be possible to go through a spray season without it. In addition to being a splendid service program it has been highly effective as an educational feature and many growers have learned more in a few years about fruit problems from this broadcast than in the previous one or two decades.

Your organization is to be complimented on this public service and you would have a real argument on your hands should the program be abandoned or restricted.

Better plan on starting again March 15 or soon thereafter in 1950.

Sincerely yours,
RALPH G. PALMER,
Associate County Agricultural Agent.

KENDALL, N. Y., *August 26, 1949.*

STATION WHAM,
Rochester, N. Y.

Mr. RALPH PALMER,
Monroe County Farm Bureau,
Rochester, N. Y.

Mr. ARTHUR WEST,
Orleans County Farm Bureau,
Albion, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: My thanks for the fruit broadcast service for the season which has just closed. You may not receive many letters but I am sure that all fruit growers appreciated it very much. I know of many city workers who listened to it every morning on their way to work in their cars, and it caused many questions to be asked as to our problems. The weather forecast was one which caused comment because it was nearly always nearer to what happened than the other regular forecast.

You all did a swell job and I hope that it will be repeated next year.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. TUCKER.

ORLEANS COUNTY EXTENSION SERVICE,
Albion, N. Y., August 23, 1949.

Mr. GEORGE HAEFNER,
Radio Station WHAM,
Rochester, N. Y.

DEAR GEORGE: I would like to take this opportunity in behalf of our fruit committee to thank you and the management of WHAM for the excellent cooperation we have had this season in the radio fruit spray service.

We had about 1,300 fruit growers and about 600 vegetable growers following daily weather reports and spray service. Numerous city and village people listened in, too, and wrote for specific information on their trees or berries, and mentioned the program.

Fruit growers in adjoining southern counties also wrote us, indicating a wide coverage. A number of dairy-fruit growers report having put radios in the barn to get the daily spray service and weather reports.

Even the Geneva Experiment Station workers tune in to get the daily weather reports and follow field spray developments.

Growers are anxious to see the program continued again next spring, and we hope to have your continued fine cooperation.

Yours sincerely,
ARTHUR G. WEST,
County Agricultural Agent.

FEDERAL-STATE MARKET NEWS SERVICE,
Rochester, N. Y., August 19, 1949.

Mr. GEORGE HAEFNER,
Farm Director, WHAM,
Rochester, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HAEFNER: We expect to start our daily market reports on or about August 24 and at that time we will begin sending you (via teletype collect) excerpts from these daily reports for broadcasting over WHAM.

This is the beginning of the twenty-sixth season during which this office has furnished your station with agricultural information of vital importance to growers and shippers over the large territory which you cover.

During the 9 months of each season that you broadcast this information we received many very favorable comments from both growers and shippers in this territory regarding your station and the manner in which you handle our reports. Sometimes during a period of 24 hours your announcers often repeated two or three times many special reports that we might furnish; such as frost damage in competing sections, etc. Such handling of market reports is most certainly appreciated by the rural population of New York State as well as adjoining States.

Again let me thank you for the splendid cooperation that continues to exist year after year between this office and WHAM.

Very truly yours,
A. L. THOMAS,
Local Representative.

The Ministrations of Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Looking at Life," written by Erich Brandeis, and published in the Morgantown (W. Va.) New Dominion, on March 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOKING AT LIFE

(By Erich Brandeis)

A few evenings ago a truck driving through one of New York City's crowded melting-pot sections, skidded on the icy pavement, and ran over a boy who was playing in the street.

Both of the youngster's legs were crushed. He was unconscious. It was evident that he did not have long to live.

Out of the crowd came a priest. He kneeled down by the boy's side and prayed. The boy was a Jewish boy.

The truck driver, tears streaming from his eyes, had stopped his vehicle and he, too, kneeled down by the boy's stricken form and prayed. The driver, as I later found out was a Protestant.

As usual in New York, before the ambulance had time to arrive, thousands had rushed into the block, where the accident had happened.

It was only with the help of two husky policemen that the grief-stricken mother could make her way to her son's side.

Tenderly, she took her son's head into her arms and prayed to God—in Yiddish.

Then the ambulance came. The boy was taken to the hospital where he is now confined.

The doctors are hopeful that he may live, although he may be crippled for the rest of his life.

However, perhaps their skill and the combined prayers of Catholics, Protestants, and Hebrews will make him whole again.

Not much of a story in these days of world-shaking events.

Yet in it may lie the answer to so many unanswered questions we ask ourselves.

In it may also lie the answer to the hundreds who have written me and asked why there must be so much dissension in religion.

There is no dissension in religion.

The dissension is among the churches.

Whenever there is a disaster, whenever man's weak ego cries out for God's help—man knows only one God—the God of his soul.

When God is needed instantly nobody asks those who need help whether they are Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish.

That priest, that truck driver, that mother, although each belonging to a different church, did not pray to different Gods. They prayed to the same God.

How many gods do you stickers for methods think there are?

Do you, who believe that only in your faith lies salvation, dare to say that those who don't share it are heathens?

You may as well say that unless you pray to God dressed in a certain costume, He will not hear you.

You may as well insist that Heaven is reserved entirely for your own clique.

I, for one, deny that the very cleavages that divide man on this earth are God-made. I believe that man's soul cries out for unity, and I call upon the churches to set the example.

No FEPC Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from a recent issue of the Metropolitan Star of New York City. The statement will be useful, I think, to those who wish to evaluate accurately the position we are now in, in regard to civil-rights legislation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO FEPC RETREAT

Good victories are never bought cheaply. Sometimes, the road is easy. Sometimes it is a rough highway, filled with obstacles.

The road to passage of a just FEPC bill is not an easy one to travel. Progress in a democracy is slow but sure. That is the way of a democracy. That is the only way we would have it.

Thus, the good people seeking progress through enactment of a just FEPC bill should not be disheartened by the emasculated measure forced through the House by a coalition of narrow-minded Dixiecrats and reactionary Republicans.

There are liberal men and women in both parties—yes, even in the South—who will ultimately repudiate this blotch on American democracy.

This Congress was voted into office with a mandate to protect the civil rights of all Americans. There can be no compromise in this crusade. There can be no retreat from the front lines of decency and progress.

The FEPC fight now goes into the Senate. There still is a good chance of getting a good bill out of this Congress. But that will depend upon you—and you—and you.

The full force of American opinion must be brought to bear on Congress. Every enlightened American must inform his legislator of his intention to support a bill giving an FEPC power to enforce its decisions.

The fight for FEPC is not merely one against discrimination. It represents a battle that has been going on for years against reaction; against Rankinism and all that RANKIN apparently espouses. The entire world is watching the FEPC fight, for if we can wipe economic discrimination from the face of America we will encourage democratic forces elsewhere to combat discrimination, dictatorship, totalitarianism, and all the evils of bigotry.

We, in New York State, are fortunate in that both of our Senators are enlightened statesmen, in the forefront of the fight for just causes. Both our Senators—IRVING IVES, Republican, and HERBERT LEHMAN, Democrat—are pledged to support a just FEPC bill.

We must give them the support they deserve. We cannot falter now because of a temporary setback.

It is ironical that the cause of FEPC should have suffered its setback now on the eve of Brotherhood Week. It is up to us to correct that situation.

The time for action is growing short. The Administration bill—supported by every forward-looking American—still be brought up in the Senate by March 19.

Let them hear your voice now. Let the voice of America tell the Senate there will be no retreat along the road to progress. Together, Americans all, we must march ahead and inspire the world with our good deeds—pointing the way to peace and brotherhood for all mankind.

Banking Service for Everyone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an address by Mr. E. A. Mattison on banking service for everyone:

BANKING SERVICE FOR EVERYONE

(By E. A. Mattison, executive vice president, Bank of America, San Francisco, Calif; before the savings and mortgage conference, American Bankers Association, New York, March 13, 1950)

Banking service for everyone is probably an idealistic conception so far as the whole body of the banking business is concerned. Perhaps one way to achieve it would be to follow the suggestion which came to us in the form of a cartoon. The drawing showed a big sign over one of our larger branches reading: "No waiting, no delay, 48 vice presidents."

Even in a certain bank out in California, where banking service is already available for everyone, everyone doesn't use it. Everyone doesn't yet need banking service. But we are working on that, too.

Perhaps that indicates something of the nature of the job we face. Even though we are all progressive enough to think seriously of fully democratizing our banking services, and making them available to all who care to use them, we have an obligation to go farther than first.

The very nature of banking is uniquely one of service. Its only reason for existence is service to others. A shoemaker could wear his own shoes and a farmer eat his own corn and beef and a tailor wear his own clothing, and these three could trade around among themselves. But what good would the banker's product be merely to himself or a few neighbors?

The experience of some of us goes to show that the accomplishment of banking services for everyone is reached over a road which is made rough by many obstacles, many bumps and detours, misunderstandings, misinterpretations, and disappointments, and beset by vexations of the spirit and more than a few holdup men.

I, however, am not the man who would counsel you to stay off this road, as the scenery along the way is spectacular and your destination is worthwhile. And it is a road we all must travel, because no one can stand still where he is today, no matter how much he would like to.

A. P. Giannini, the founder of the Bank of America, who gave me my first lessons in actual banking, used to beat it into my head that the more important job was to conduct the business so that more and more people would want banking service—would need it. That meant operating in a way to advance the general economy, to foster growth and create opportunity.

I think you will agree that his point has been proved. You are well aware of California's economic position today. And that one bank, at last year end, had 4,088,000 deposit accounts, including 2,649,047 savings accounts. In that single year 1,398,000 borrowers were accommodated.

Therefore we can stipulate that savings and commercial banking is public service, and we can look anybody in the eye and make it stick. And mark this—it happens to be one of the living facts in the American scheme of things that can keep this trend toward the so-called welfare state from turning it into a farewell state—farewell to freedom, rising standards, and incentive.

I suggest to you, gentlemen, that if all bankers will unify into a shoulder-to-shoulder front on this concept of doing all business on the basis of public service, we will win the intelligent support of the people and cause the tide to turn.

Is that an extravagant statement? It is not. It is straight and narrow truth. Bankers are a lively force in every community throughout this land, and regardless of what is said by their traducers, bankers almost everywhere are respected and the example they set has a powerful influence for miles around.

Banking service for everyone, then, means more than opening the door to small accounts. It means constructive service to the entire community, a service which creates opportunity, enterprise, employment, and—naturally—new customers. By way of illustration let me mention that Bank of America has more customers today than there were people in the whole State of California 25 years ago.

I hope you'll pardon me making an occasional reference to that bank I just mentioned. I guess I'm like the man who was always talking about his wife. One day a friend protested. "For heaven's sake," he said, "don't you know any other women you can talk about?" And the man's answer was: "Oh, yes; but I know my wife better than the others."

Anyway, the effect of good banking service may be inferred from the recent figures which show the income of the average Californian is approximately $25 per month higher than the national average, and bank deposit figures show per capita bank deposits for the United States to be $894, as against $1,207 in California.

As a matter of fact, the banks of this country as a whole have advanced quite a way along the road of banking service for everyone. Some individual banks are lagging behind, but they are not represented here today. Everybody in this audience is here because he is progressive. So let us review the things that are being done to provide banking service for everyone.

First, we welcome a deposit account from anybody, whether he wears greasy overalls or a top hat, and we open his savings account for a buck even though it may cost us more than that to put it on the books.

We spend good money in advertising to bring these people in, and we spend more money to preach the gospel of thrift and to persuade these people to build up their accounts.

We incur increased operating costs by installing systematic savings programs such as Christmas Club and Thrift Club, knowing that although it costs us money we are making a sound investment, one which will bring us and our communities a fat return in happier, healthier and wealthier citizens, and a consequent big increase in the number of profitable customers.

We make a further investment in teaching oncoming generations the virtues of thrift by persuading the schools to install school savings systems, and we employ specialist tellers who travel to these schools and on specified bank days collect the deposits of the children. As we accept deposits of pennies the cost of collecting and recording and protecting them is often many times the cash value of the deposits, but we have proved by experience that no sounder investment could be made. The children who participate grow up familiar with at least part of the banking function. Many, many are the histories of substantial success won in the business world by men and women who got their first practical lessons in accumulating and conserving funds, and putting them to profitable work, through their school savings banking.

By the way, in these days of alarm over juvenile delinquency, there is a little noted constructive side to saving which was touched on in an editorial in a California newspaper last month. The editorial expressed the view that the youngster who is taught the meaning and value of thrift is not likely to grow up with a blind determination to get money or valuables which belong to others. The lad who is taught to save, said the editor, soon gains a sense of self-reliance and responsibility. He learns the importance of standing on his own feet and attaining his goals through his own efforts.

I have limited myself to savings banking up to this point because this audience is made up mostly of savings bankers, but the subject assigned me is banking service for everyone, which means I must touch lightly on other aspects of banking services before I wind up.

But before we temporarily turn away from savings, we of course have to refer to the lending services in that category, and here again the progressive minds in this audience will agree on this with me: That public service exists in the lending of savings funds just as emphatically as in the deposit services.

The insured loans in the FHA and the GI fields have enabled us all to extend credit for home construction to a much greater extent than would have been possible otherwise.

This has resulted in a much wider degree of home ownership with all its attendant virtues, which include more permanence in family life, a chance for more families to get their roots down, a chance for young folks to develop a real sense of home stability, a better standard of living, a higher moral tone, and an all-around healthier and happier mode of life.

If that isn't a substantial public service I never heard of one, and we have proved at the same time that the laborer is worthy of his hire by making some money at it. And it is only a small part of the story.

These same aspects appear in all types of real-estate lending, whether the loans are insured or not. That is—they appear when we have the wholesome view in mind that we are engaging in free private enterprise from motives of public service and enlightened self-interest. They do not appear where there is no motive other than self-interest. Fellows of that kind do not believe in banking service for everyone. A large "Do not disturb" sign, while not visible to the human eye, is as obvious over their doors and their desks as if painted on a card,

and it would make no difference how many vice presidents they had.

Of course, as I have hinted, this business of serving the public conscientiously is not all milk and honey. Popular acceptance can grow to the point where you stir up the destructive attention either of a jealous type of competition or of those professional reformers whose real profession is riding on the backs of those who really produce and achieve.

Any business institution, and especially a bank, can no more discharge its responsibilities to the community by merely paying taxes than can the individual citizen. We must all seek constantly for new services, new ways to extend our usefulness. And while on this theme let me mention that I agree with those savings bankers who believe that their lending functions, now legally limited to real-estate loans and corporation bonds, could, and should be extended to the personal-loan field, and bring more of this sort of financial service into the scope of banking.

Logic suggests that business done by loan companies must be bankable, as much of the money they lend is wholesaled to them by banks.

In the effort to render a full credit service, the savings banker is the most handicapped of all, and the field to which he is limited by law is one in which nonbank lenders are extremely active.

Incidentally, here in the East you savings bankers have a command of long-term money which gives you an advantage even over your cousins in the commercial banks. Perhaps you could apply more pressure to this advantage by paying more to your depositors to encourage their thrift and build your loanable funds, and earn more through your increased volume of lending. That would be no more than the type of good, clean competition from which the public would benefit.

The general scope of banking has certainly widened within this generation. To continue with the list of things being done to provide banking services for everyone, there are of course individual savings accounts, joint savings accounts, trustee savings accounts, Christmas club and thrift club savings accounts, time deposits, open accounts, allotment savings accounts, and certificates of deposit.

On the commercial side are the checking accounts, individual and joint, regular checking and tenplan, and such refinements as the personalized check, and such services as automatic transfer of funds from checking to savings accounts.

On the list of bank credit services, under a policy to provide the type of credit best suited to the needs of all, are commercial loans, real estate loans, loans to farmers, personal loans, automobile financing, automobile repairs, automobile loans, doctor-patient loans, household appliance and furniture financing, insurance premium financing, loans to buy, build, or repair homes, term loans for small business, loans to trucking concerns, industrial equipment financing, farm equipment financing, aircraft financing and GI home and business financing.

Then there are all the various trust services, the safe-deposit services, the collection of drafts and checks and installments for customers; courtesy cards, letters of introduction for travelers to correspondent banks, travelers checks, money orders for all occasions, and all the foreign banking services, including foreign exchange, letters of credit, collections and discounts and foreign-branch facilities.

That is just a quick run-down to remind us all how the variety of bank services has expanded and to indicate that, as we travel on, there is always a new horizon ahead for us all, new fields for healthy competition from which the public benefits.

It seems to me that an important part of providing these services for everyone is to see that everyone knows about it, just as much for the public-relations benefits as for increasing the volume of the business. But let us be sure we understand what we mean when we talk about public relations, because so many bankers interpret the term as no one else ever does, and they have been doing so for a long time.

I was sitting in our Los Angeles offices one day when an officer from a bank in Arizona dropped in. He said he wanted some briefing on public relations, as he had just been given that assignment by his bank. A bright young man of ours started on a thumbnail outline of public-relations concepts as we have learned them, but it soon became apparent our visitor was "all at sea." At last he broke in and said: "Hold on. I'm not talking about interpreting our bank to the public. I am a salesman after new business. How do I go about it?"

In other lines of business a sales representative never thinks of calling himself a public-relations man, and we in banking can hardly expect the public to understand our attempts at public relations if we do not understand them ourselves. And so it was patiently explained that while a salesman should not misrepresent himself as a public-relations man, he should nevertheless do his work with the knowledge that he must be governed by good public-relations policies.

Such policies must govern selling just as they govern all contacts with the public. And this brings me around to the most important point of this subject, the conclusion that good public relations demands we provide banking services for everyone. And that we sell them honestly, giving full value for value received. Any banker knows from experience with his customers that shoddy goods and services at fancy prices will ruin a business, and all the press blurbs inspired by another misconception of a public-relations man will not save it.

The full job of serving everyone takes us not only among the individuals to whom progressive bankers have opened their doors, but out beyond the walls of our offices to the groups and organizations and communities where opportunities for service may be found.

Take the organized American community, and when you set aside the few large centers where experienced financial guidance can be found within city government, there remain thousands upon thousands of cities, towns, and villages where professional staff talent of that kind simply does not exist. Consequently, when such communities are faced with bond issues and other problems of finance they would be exposed to exploitation and unnecessarily high costs but for the public-service-minded banker who makes the talents and facilities of himself and his organization available, at a fair cost, to that community. The very woods are full of opportunities to perform service for all.

In September, being convinced that no real depression elements existed in the economy, and believing that prices and quality were at a stabilization point, we inaugurated a campaign to instill confidence in people and inspire them to buy the things they desired but had been hesitant to purchase because of the uncertainties in these respects. Our buy-now campaign was waged over a broad advertising and merchandising front, through such mediums as newspapers, periodicals, billboards, radio, and direct mail. By these means, our thought and our voice were directed to help manufacturers and dealers to sell goods, and our credit facilities were made more widely available than ever before to assist people in acquiring worthwhile things.

Community building activity often calls for sacrifices of time and convenience, and thanks for it are often delayed, but it is the job of the banker to carry his share of the load, and he cannot make the claim of providing service for everyone until he does.

A good banker, of course, always counts the cost. But as he believes in balancing the books he counts the benefits as well. In addition to profits, one of the benefits is a growing appreciation for the banker in the community, and consequently a greater assurance of his continuance in business. There have been disquieting indications that without a larger degree of public appreciation the days of the private-enterprise banker in this country might be numbered. A. P. Giannini, in acknowledging the great growth of the Bank of America, made the statement that "if our institution has become great it is by consent of the people we serve." In my humble judgment that is a statement that could well be hung over every banker's desk. There could be no better reminder of who is boss.

Another area to be embraced by any complete set of banking service is that of small business.

Many of the small-business men in my circle of acquaintance are pretty self-conscious over the eternal fuss made about them by the politician. Out on the west coast, of course, the small-business man's financial needs are thoroughly taken care of by the private enterprise banker, and this was publicly confirmed by Secretary of Commerce Sawyer after his recent tour out there.

Incidentally, it was just a few years ago that a congressional committee came out our way to see what new laws could be passed to meet the financial needs of small business. After a few sessions in San Francisco the inquiry fell apart and the rest of the California schedule was abandoned. Small business had told the investigators: "Leave us alone. We are doing all right."

That illustrates exactly what I mean. When we do provide the banking services needed our customers tell the investigators: "Leave us alone. We are doing all right." We serve our own best interests by serving the public interest. Nobody denies that small business does have its financial problems. My point is, these problems can be solved with bankers who are willing and determined to solve them. It is when we neglect to solve them that the politician finds his opportunity to step in and close off another field to private democratic banking.

We have heard it said that in Moscow they teach the doctrine that capitalism has no basic soundness and therefore is bound to fall of its own weight. The Commies seem to think that all they have to do is give us a push or two, and then stand by to pick up the pieces.

That is a very queer doctrine in view of the most obvious fact that the whole modern industrial world was produced by capitalism, and it is equally obvious that without capitalism to support it, the world would disintegrate into chaos and poverty-stricken misery.

Since capitalism is founded on the principle of saving, and the use of savings in the production of goods and services by democratic privately owned enterprise, the importance of the role of the banker is as plain as the stripes in the American flag.

We must not let anybody take that importance away from us. We must not submit to constriction in our services, to derogation of our leadership in the economy, to a debasement of our functions or a subordination of our role. We must not continue submissively to accept bureaucratic or socialistic encroachments, for that could only end in defeat for all democratic enterprise.

Rather, we must advance. This advance can be made by providing banking service for everyone. Make it as cleanly competitive as you like, for ethical competition spurs progress.

Let's advance by improving our present services, hunting for new ones, promoting opportunity and employment. Let's shake off

inertia and any bindings with outworn tradition. Then, with popular support won by our combined efforts, we can prove, more than any other single segment of our society, that the American democratic-capitalistic way, properly administered, is more than a match for specious theorists who bait their totalitarian traps with appeals to human greed, shiftlessness and ignorance.

We are on the right road. Let's keep going.

Commodore John Barry, a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I am extending my remarks to include an address on Commodore John Barry which, on the invitation of the Irish War Veterans and the urging of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Nebraska, the Honorable EDGAR E. O'SULLIVAN, I am undertaking to deliver on St. Patrick's Day at the annual ceremonies at the monument in Franklin Square in Washington, erected by a grateful nation in memory of one of its greatest heroes. The address follows:

It is fitting that annually on St. Patrick's Day those of Irish blood should gather at the monument of Commodore John Barry.

On the occasion of the dedication of this monument President Woodrow Wilson said of him that when John Barry left the shores of Ireland he brought with him to the shores of America his heart.

I would pause here to suggest that the greatest of all the many contributions Irish blood has made to the lands of their adoption has been that of human sympathy. The Irish heart is a tender heart and Irish ears are never closed to the cries of distress from those who are in need of friends and of help.

It is said that in the first half of the eighteenth century 500,000 young men of Irish blood left their native land to scatter throughout the world. They served in every army and in every navy in all the countries of the universe. Their descendants remained in these alien lands, and it is not too much to say that it was their influence on public opinion that either sparked or aided in the sparking of every good fight for practices and laws on the heart side.

It could not have been otherwise. The long years of oppression, of cruel injustices, and of bitter hardships had put deep in the Irish blood something that barriers under more friendly circumstances could never remove. How long the ancestors of my Irish grandfather and of my Irish grandmother were eking out existence in the bogs when their lands had been taken from them, and they would not bend the knee to the snapping of the fingers of an invader, I know only from the legends of my family which is not unlike that of most Irish-American families. But what I do myself know, as you of yourselves know, is that the voice of protest against any kind of inhumanity that in the years of Ireland's grief was planted in Irish blood still speaks in the blood that is in me and that is in you.

We cannot reach back into the passageway of history and see the pain of Irish patriots and Irish martyrs. But God in His grace giving us strength and the opportunity, we will not cease wherever our lot has placed us to come to the aid of those who are abused and oppressed. The quickest way to reach the fighting Irish is through the heart.

Commodore John Barry in a very special sense is our hero of the War for Independence. I think this practice of giving special nationalistic acclaim to the fathers of our liberty serves a useful purpose. It tends to keep constantly reminding us of that which we never must forget. That which we have in this land of freedom, which we all enjoy and prize, was given us as the joint contribution of all the races and all the peoples from which we sprang.

For the memory of Commodore John Barry we feel an affection heightened by the fact that his modesty and spirit of self-effacement left it almost entirely to the researchers of history to establish long after his passing the tremendous magnitude of his work. In a period when many men in leadership were given, if not to self-laudation, at least to writing copiously of events in which they had been participants, Commodore John Barry did the job and having done it forgot it and started on another.

I am not surprised that one of his most recent biographers, not of his blood or of his religion, states that each new research into the forgotten records of the past establishes Commodore John Barry on an ever-heightening pedestal. His skill and his courage at sea and in combat long have been the subject of song and story. What we are glimpsing now, more and more with every year, is that Commodore John Barry was one of the outstanding constructive geniuses of his age.

I would say that the title that has been accorded him, "Father of the American Navy," is appropriately conferred and especially in one sense, which seems not to have received the attention it deserves.

During the years the American Navy has been noted for the independence of its officers and their impatience at times with civilian supervision. I do not wish to get into a discussion of this phase of Navy spirit in connection with recent events, as each situation must be judged strictly by the facts and circumstances governing that situation. Therefore any similarity, may I explain, is merely coincidental.

It is interesting, however, in viewing Commodore John Barry in the light of the title accorded him, "Father of the American Navy," to note that Barry was the first naval commander in our history to lock horns with a civilian authority that stood then much in the position of our present office of the Secretary of the Navy. The affair almost cost him his command. The vote in the Congress for his removal failed only because it was a tie. Had there been a change of but one vote, the genius of John Barry would have been lost to the American people in that field where he was so brilliantly preeminent.

What John Barry said to his civilian superior was that he knew more about ships than all the civilians put together, which, of course, was true, and when the superior thus addressed accused Barry of disrespect to the office of authority, Barry shot back at him this classic:

"Damn you, I don't value you more than my duty requires."

Barry was not a man of letters. His writing was confined to rough entries in the logs of his ships and the briefest of correspondence. Yet in the exasperation of receiving an order which to a seagoing man seemed the improper thing he coined a phrase which will live as long as his fame.

Commodore John Barry also was the first American naval commander to run head-on into an economy drive. The proud fleet that he had built, with the majestic flagship, the *United States*, the queen of the waves, was whittled down to the barest skeleton in the name of economy. Those were the years when the great sea power of Britain, opening to the British the rich commerce of the world, was in the building stage. One cannot but wonder how different might have been the fortunes of the British people for the last century and more if when economy was destroying the American fleet a similar economy was lowering the Union Jack.

But after his death the fame of Commodore John Barry gained the victory over another economy drive. In the name of economy the bill authorizing the building of this monument was fought in the Congress. Even after its passage, President Theodore Roosevelt was urged to veto the appropriation on the ground that the Federal Government could not afford to put $50,000 into a memorial for one of the greatest of heroes. President Roosevelt replied that he was determined to cut Federal expenditures to the very bone, but he didn't intend to begin by using the ax on good old Jack Barry.

We stand clustered around this monument on this St. Patrick's Day of 1950, as other gatherings will do in the years ahead, and we wonder if any appropriation of $50,000 almost four decades ago could have returned a richer yield. It is idle to say that the sight of a monument to a great man does not with all of us have the moving power of inspiration and of influence.

Countless thousands of men and women and children have stood before this monument and have gone back to their homes in every State in the Union, and to all corners of the world, the better for having had communion with the spirit of one of the greatest of our Revolutionary heroes.

Voteless Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Why Freedom Can't Ring Here—Citizens of the Nation's Captial Treated as Defective Americans," written by Jesse C. Suter and published in the March 1950 issue of the General Federation Clubwoman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY FREEDOM CAN'T RING HERE—CITIZENS OF NATION'S CAPITAL TREATED AS DEFECTIVE AMERICANS

(By Jesse C. Suter [1])

It is surprising how many people from out in the States are amazed when they visit Washington and learn that their fellow Americans permanently residing in the National Capital have no part whatever in the government of their country. For here these truly national Americans, holding allegiance to the United States but not to any State, are regarded as being American citizens solely for the purpose of bearing the burdens which fall alike on all Americans.

They are required to pay all national taxes, obey all national laws, and to fight, bleed, and perhaps die in the defense of their country, in whose government they are permitted no part.

Only in the bearing of these burdens are they on an equal footing with the citizens of the several States. But when it comes to the possession and enjoyment of valued fundamental American privileges, the equality vanishes into thin air.

Boys from the District and boys from the States serving overseas in the armed forces during World War II were brought to stern realization of this political inequality, when an opportunity was afforded servicemen to vote by mail in the national election. Those from the States were accorded the privilege of voting, while their comrades in arms from the District of Columbia, who were sharing the same hardships and dangers, could not in the same way participate in the government of their country for which they were fighting.

Viewing the originals of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States always gives visitors to Washington a genuine thrill. But they will look in vain in Washington for an exemplification of the underlying principles of the American Government which makes it a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. However, here it is, in effect, a Government of a part of the people, by a part of the people, and for all of the people. As strange as it may seem, the shot fired at Lexington and heard around the world has not been heard yet in Washington, and consequently freedom can't ring here.

Existence of so amazing a situation deserves analysis and an explanation, as it should be accounted for in some manner. We find that these 100 percent Americans permanently residing in the District, exceeding in population a number of the States, are not permitted representation in the Senate and the House of Representatives, which constitute the Congress. The Congress is both the local and the National Legislature of these voteless people. We also find that these people have no vote for the President, even though he is not only their President, but is virtually their governor, for he appoints all of their local administrative and judicial officers. That gives an explanation in a nutshell, but not an excuse.

NO POLITICAL STATUS

The existence of this state of affairs is due to the fact that the Constitution of the United States neither provides for nor prohibits such representation and voting privileges for the citizens of the seat of government. Provision for representation in the Congress and among the presidential electors applies only to the people of the sovereign States which comprise the Union. It is even silent as to defining the political status of the bona fide residents of the seat of government.

The only reference in the Constitution to the seat of government is found in article I, section 8 and seventeenth clause. It is as follows: "(The Congress shall have power) to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may by cessions of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the government of the United States."

This completes a full thumbnail diagnosis of the political ills and disabilities which beset these District people. The disease has been called political inequity, un-Americanism at the very heart of the Republic, but by whatever name it is called, it is a loathsome disease which should not be permitted to contaminate the entire country.

In a few words, the ailment is a complete lack of political status through omission by the founding fathers to include in the Constitution any provision for the enjoyment by these people of fundamental rights now denied them. It is hard to believe that those who had rebeled and waged a successful war against a similar condition would create at the seat of the new government a condition duplicating that to which they had so strenuously objected.

DISCUSSED IN 1801

Regarding the failure of the founding fathers to provide for the enjoyment of citizenship rights by the inhabitants of the future seat of government, of unknown location, Augustus Brevoort Woodward, in discussion on Some Considerations on the Government of the Territory of Columbia, published in Washington in 1801, had this to say:

"The novelty of the measure, and the great uncertainty which then prevailed whether the government they proposed would ever pass into actual operation, may serve as an apology for their not entering more into detail. * * * There can, however, be no apology for us of the present day, who have seen this Government prosperous and happy for 13 years; * * * and who now behold its advention to the place of its destination; if we refuse to turn attention to it at this period, and to make a deliberate, effectual, and constitutional provision for its participation in the general councils, and for its domestic government. * * *

"They have themselves afforded an easy and safe avenue to the amendment of that document which was the result of their labors. Not to use that instrument, which they have put into our hands, on an occasion which so urgently demands it, is to yield to a culpable lethargy. It would be an act of treachery to the people whose liberties are thus surrendered to the caprice of a legislature in which they hold no representation; it would be a vital wound to the existence of republicanism, in a nation which had such an example constantly in view."

AMEND CONSTITUTION

The diagnosis and case history having been completed, the next step is to apply the curative remedy. Many experts know that this will be thoroughly effective and will result in the complete Americanization of these voteless and unrepresented Americans.

The need is to amend the Constitution through an enabling provision under which the Congress could cure these unique political disabilities. During nearly 150 years, numerous proposals to amend the Constitution to correct this oversight have been drawn. A number of hearings have been held on such proposals, but the required joint resolutions carrying the proposals have had no consideration on the floor of either House of Congress.

Three times the Senate District Committee has made favorable reports. The House Judiciary Committee once favorably reported it, as did its subcommittee in 1945. Also in 1945, a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee favorably reported the amendment, but the full committee did not act. The only adverse report was in 1941 by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

A DEBT OF GRATITUDE

The District Federation of Women's Clubs has for years supported the proposal and with other organizations of women participated in most of the hearings. The late Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, head of the woman-suffrage movement, appeared in some hearings and was represented by letter at others.

On one occasion, Mrs. Catt related how she had been questioned in the capitals of South American countries about the voteless and unrepresented people of the District of Columbia. "So I find," said Mrs. Catt, "that this question of disfranchisement in the District of Columbia is not a thing that concerns only our own country, but the entire two continents." Continuing, she said: "Now in going about, when people ask me why the people of the District are disfranchised, I find that no history, and no explanation * * * has ever satisfied the person with whom I have been speaking. It never seemed fair, nor right, nor just to me; and I have never consequently been able to make it seem fair to anyone else." She also said: "I have never felt more certain of anything in my life than that an amendment of this character would be quickly passed by the legislatures of our various States by a large majority."

It is interesting that among leading workers for woman suffrage were able District women who gave unstintingly of their time and influence. They worked, knowing all the while that when the nineteenth amendment was added to the Constitution they would not be among the beneficiaries unless and until another amendment was added giving the men and women of the National Capital the right and privilege of being represented in the House and Senate by members of their choice and of voting for the President and Vice President.

The enfranchised women of the Nation owe these District women a debt of gratitude which they should discharge by going wholeheartedly into the fight to Americanize their voteless and unrepresented sisters.

PENDING AMENDMENTS

Proposals for the required amendment are pending in the Committees on the Judiciary of both House and Senate. House Joint Resolution 320, by Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas, is the same as the Sumners-Capper amendment. Senate Joint Resolution 132, by Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY, of West Virginia, differs slightly in form.

The Neely proposal would add the following amendment to the Constitution:

"The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine but such representation and powers shall be no greater than those of a State. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal."

The District, as the seat of the Government, is a populous and permanently separate unit which is not and should not become a State or a part of a State. The intent of the amendment is to provide that the effective rights of these citizens' participation in the Federal Government shall be as nearly similar to those of citizens of the States as may be, without impairing the supreme authority of the Government over its capital.

When the Constitution is so amended and the Congress has implemented its provisions, then we can let freedom ring.

[1] The writer, Jesse C. Suter, is a second generation District native. He is a member of the editorial staff of the Evening Star and the Sunday Star, acting chairman of the Citizens Joint Committee on National Representation, a vice president of the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, and former president of the Federation of Citizens' Associations and of the Society of Natives of the District of Columbia. He also was chairman of the Citizens' Advisory Council. He has for a number of years had a civic column in the Sunday Star, under the heading Civic problems, civic bodies.

Membership of the Federal Reserve Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to Representative PAUL W. SHAFER, of Michigan, written by Hon. Marriner Eccles, of the Federal Reserve

Board. This letter was written by Mr. Eccles in response to a statement by Mr. SHAFER upon the floor of the House of Representatives about the Reserve Board. In order that the point of view of Mr. Eccles be made available to the public, I believe this letter should be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 7, 1950.

Hon. PAUL W. SHAFER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHAFER: Your statements about the Federal Reserve Board in your speech on the floor of the House on February 21 and in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 15, contain so many misconceptions and misstatements of fact that I cannot permit these utterances to go unchallenged. They do a great injustice to R. M. Evans and M. S. Szymczak, members of the Board of Governors, to the late Gov. Lawrence Clayton, as well as to myself. In making the unfounded charge that the Board has been packed through violating the appointment provisions of the law, you cast wholly unwarranted reflections upon the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and the Senate itself, in the discharge of its function of confirming appointments. As a matter of simple justice I believe that the correct facts, which are set forth below, should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the first place, you are obviously unfamiliar with the intent of the provisions of the Federal Reserve Act with regard to appointments. Section 10 of the act states:

"In selecting the members of the Board, not more than one of whom shall be selected from any one Federal Reserve district, the President shall have due regard to a fair representation of the financial, agricultural, industrial, and commercial interests, and geographical divisions of the country."

This section of the law was purposely drawn in very general terms as Senator Glass was at pains to explain when the Federal Reserve Act was first presented in Congress. The House Committee on Banking and Currency, of which Mr. Glass was the chairman, in a report which you will find on pages 305 et seq. of the authoritative volume, the Federal Reserve System, by the late Henry Parker Willis, who was the economic adviser to the committee, stated:

"The provision that the President in making his selection shall so far as possible select them in order to represent the different geographical regions of the country has been inserted in very general language in order that, while it might not be minutely mandatory, it should be the expressed wish of the Congress that no undue preponderance should be allowed to any one portion of the Nation at the expense of other portions. The provision, however, does not bind the President to any slavish recognition of given geographical sections."

The law provides for seven members of the Board; there are 12 Federal Reserve districts. Hence, all districts could not be represented on the Board at any one time. It was never the intent of the law that the Board should be representative of sectional interests. The wording of the law was designed to negative sectional representation, and to emphasize the public interest through broad distribution of representation of financial, agricultural, industrial, and commercial interests.

Taking up the individual cases in the order in which you discussed them in your speech on the floor of the House:

You state that there was a deliberate evasion of the spirit of the law because Mr. Evans was appointed from the 8th Federal Reserve district. Mr. Evans has resided in the 10th Federal Reserve district since the fall of 1934 and, in fact, established his voting residence in Virginia, though this is by no means required as a condition for appointment from a Federal Reserve district. He was appointed in March of 1942 for the unexpired portion of the term of Mr. Chester C. Davis, who resigned to become president of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. Mr. Davis, who preceded Mr. Evans as the Administrator of the AAA, was himself named to the Federal Reserve Board from the same fifth Federal Reserve district. His appointment, as was that of Governor Evans, was passed upon by a Senate committee of which Senator Glass was a member, and chairman of a subcommittee on Federal Reserve matters. As the chief sponsor of the Federal Reserve Act Senator Glass was presumed to know more about its content and intent than any other living person. Senator Glass did not and, of course, would not, knowing the law, raise any such far-fetched objection as you stated in your speech, either to Mr. Davis' or Mr. Evans' appointment. Both came originally from Iowa. Both had resided for a number of years in the fifth Federal Reserve district. Both were selected to be representative of agriculture nationally.

You also stated that Mr. Evans, at the time of his selection, was a close friend of Marriner Eccles. The fact is that I had only a casual official acquaintance with Mr. Evans. He was strongly recommended by Mr. Davis, who had an intimate knowledge of his fine record in the agricultural field. He was also supported by national farm organizations, particularly the American Farm Bureau Federation. To suggest, as you do, that Mr. Evans would lend himself to a packing of the Board is an affront and an injustice which I resent on his behalf. If you had any acquaintance whatever with the man and his record, you would know how false this imputation is.

Your statements with regard to Mr. Clayton are equally far from the truth. Again, because you are ignorant of the law as it was drawn by Senator Glass, you make the false charge that Mr. Clayton's appointment violated the spirit of the law. Then you state that in January 1945 Eccles had Clayton moved to Boston, Mass., where he assumed the nominal position of president of Clayton Securities Corp., of Boston, a company owned and operated by Clayton's brother. You added that before he went to Boston it was understood that President Roosevelt had agreed to his appointment to the board after he had established a residence in Boston. There was no such agreement whatsoever nor did I have Mr. Clayton moved to Boston. When Mr. Clayton left Utah at my instance in December of 1934 to be my assistant when I became governor of the Federal Reserve Board he sold his home there, gave up his voting residence and settled in Washington. He had no plans for returning to Utah. He went to Boston at the request of his brother, to my great regret and not with my urging—quite the contrary. He bought a home there and became a voting resident of the State. So far as I knew he intended to remain there indefinitely. Your insinuation that this move was a part of a scheme to circumvent the law is utterly baseless and again a grave injustice to a man of independent mind and judgment. I urged his appointment to President Truman because of an internal situation which had developed on the Board. Governor Szymczak was absent on an important mission in Europe as an economic adviser to our military government in Germany. Ronald Ransom, of Atlanta, vice chairman of the Board, was gravely ill, and, in fact, on his deathbed. Governor Vardaman, who had been on the Board a comparatively short time, was visiting the various Federal Reserve banks to become better acquainted with the System and, as a result, was absent for extended intervals. As a consequence, the problem of obtaining a quorum of the Board became acute. In this situation I recommended to President Truman that he name Mr. Clayton inasmuch as he had had a long experience in commercial as well as investment banking, he had been my close associate in Federal Reserve policy matters and administration ever since 1934. In addition to his experience in banking and in the Reserve System he was a graduate of the Harvard Law School. I knew of no one better fitted by experience, by temperament, by qualifications generally than Mr. Clayton to come on the Board and immediately assume the responsibilities which an inexperienced man could not have been expected to shoulder without a long period of apprenticeship.

Again, your imputation of "packing" the Board by Mr. Clayton's appointment is a grave injustice to all concerned, including the President and the members of the Senate committee who thoroughly inquired into his qualifications. I had personally discussed his appointment with Senator TAFT, who was well acquainted with him, with Senator WHITE and with Senator MILLIKIN, the three ranking Republican leaders, and also with Senator TOBEY, then chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. They all indicated that they would favor his confirmation if the appointment were made. Likewise, other New England Senators, including Senators SALTONSTALL and LODGE, of Massachusetts; FLANDERS, of Vermont; MCMAHON, of Connecticut; and BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, were consulted and gave him their support. Moreover, the leading bankers of the First Federal Reserve District likewise supported Mr. Clayton's appointment. In fact, I am not aware of any dissenting voice that was raised in the New England district by bankers, Members of Congress, or anyone else. He was confirmed without a dissenting voice on the floor of a Senate in which the Republicans had a majority. Your insinuation that Mr. Clayton was a rubber stamp is as baseless as your other reflections upon Board members.

As for Governor Szymczak's appointment, your speech appears to imply that Board members should not serve longer than 14 years. The provision that "any person appointed as a member of the Board after the date of enactment of the Banking Act of 1935 shall not be eligible for reappointment as such member after he shall have served a full term of 14 years" was written into the Banking Act of 1935 for the first time and became effective on February 1, 1936. Previously there was no limitation. The 1935 act was not retroactive and there was no requirement, legal or otherwise, to stand in the way of Governor Szymczak's appointment as of February 1, 1948, to a full 14-year term. That was the judgment of counsel for the Board as well as the judgment of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee which inquired fully into this question and recommended his confirmation by the Senate, where he was unanimously confirmed. It would have been a great misfortune to lose the services of Governor Szymczak who is still a comparatively young man. His industry and devotion to his task are well known to all who are acquainted with him. Your tortured misreading of the facts are as unjust to him as to the others.

As for myself, it is ludicrous for you to suggest any lack of independence on my part. If there is any one thing with which I have been charged above all else is that I have been too independent of White House or Treasury or other influences, in or out of Government. I have never run for, or sought, public office, nor have I ever engaged in political activities. I have no political or other axes to grind. As one who has spent most of his adult life in banking and business I am quite as solicitous as you are to preserve our system of private enterprise and our democratic institutions. To this end I think it imperative to prevent any "packing" of the Federal Reserve Board and to maintain its independence.

Sincerely yours,

M. S. ECCLES.

Secretary Acheson and the Extremists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle entitled "Secretary Acheson and the Extremists" and an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Challenge to Russia."

I commend the sane and balanced tone of these editorials to the American people. They follow:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of March 2, 1950]

SECRETARY ACHESON AND THE EXTREMISTS

Secretary of State Acheson has been placed unfairly in a squeeze between extremist groups. We suggest that those Americans who are not extremists take stock of what's going on and give him the solid backing he needs to carry on with his job.

From one side, the leftists are heckling him for being too tough with the Russians. This is being carried on not only by the Communists but by a highly vocal segment of starry-eyed people who still believe humility on the part of America is the key to an accommodation with Russia. Both of these groups, for their various reasons, want Acheson to approach the Kremlin, hat in hand, and petition for another hearing on the atomic-energy matter and related problems. This would be highly pleasing to Stalin, and gratifying to Communists everywhere, but Acheson can see no further gain from holding our hat in our hand, and we believe most Americans thoroughly agree with him.

From the other side, the extreme rightists are giving him relentless trouble over the Hiss matter. From his statement expressing compassion for Hiss and from his previous statement that he would not turn his back on his personal friend, they are construing Acheson as a condoner of treachery and a partisan of communism. We do not see how this follows. It seems to us quite compatible with fundamental Americanism for a man to feel compassion for another, whatever the depths of his trouble. And Acheson's refusal to turn his back on his long-time friend impressed us as a position in support of human decency, rather than in favor of whatever defections of which Hiss might be guilty.

One thing is certainly clear—Acheson cannot be guilty of the accusations thrown at him by both sides, for they are irreconcilable.

We suggest that a careful review of Acheson's life and of his record in public office will disclose no shred of actual evidence that he is other than a human being and an earnest, devoted American. And his recent record convinces us that he is also a singularly competent Secretary of State, performing ably under a set of international conditions that render that job more difficult, and more critical in terms of potential consequences, than it has ever been in history.

Since the manner of performance of this international task bears importantly upon the lives, welfare, and survival, of all of us, we regret these systematic mud-slinging campaigns as aiming to diminish the effectiveness of the Secretary of State in the performance of his main duties. We do not, of course, expect the Communists to pipe down, and it would probably be starry-eyed on our part to expect the extreme rightists to realize they are playing into the Communists' hands. But there is need and opportunity for the overwhelming majority of nonextremists to raise their own voices in behalf of fair play, and a reasonable chance for Acheson to do the job he is trying to do for all of us.

[From the New York Times of Friday, March 17, 1950]

CHALLENGE TO RUSSIA

In two major statements on American foreign policy Secretary Acheson has challenged Soviet Russia to make good with deeds its propaganda for peace and the coexistence of the Communist world and the free world. In what may be taken as a reply to recent speeches in Moscow, Mr. Acheson has offered a seven-point program on the basis of which peaceful coexistence could be achieved and the cold war ended.

This program, in effect, calls upon Soviet Russia to halt its policy of aggression and to cooperate, with unmistakable evidence of good faith, in finding peaceful settlements for all outstanding problems. It particularly calls upon the Soviet Union to cooperate in concluding peace treaties with Germany and Japan, and final settlements with Austria and Korea, in conformity with Russia's wartime pledges and with the principles of the United Nations. It calls for the withdrawal of Soviet military and police forces from the satellite areas, so that the nations in these areas may achieve genuine independence and self-government, as agreed upon at Yalta. It calls for an end of Soviet obstruction in the United Nations and for Soviet cooperation in finding an effective system for the control of atomic weapons and the limitation of other armaments. Finally, it calls upon the Kremlin to stop using Communist fifth columns for the overthrow of other governments, to cooperate in assuring proper treatment for diplomatic representatives, and in general to cease distorting the motives and purposes of other nations and to open up Russia for an exchange of persons and ideas with other countries.

Mr. Acheson is, of course, aware that this program demands an abandonment of the Communist program of world revolution and a reversal of the policies which the Soviets have pursued during and since the war. For this reason he entertains little hope that the Soviet leaders will accept his challenge. Yet this is the only program on which we can negotiate without betraying the principles for which we stand and abandoning the nations which have placed their trust in us. It is a program for peace, but not peace at any price, or peace with dishonor.

Hope of progress in this direction not being bright, Mr. Acheson faces the grim alternative. This can be only a continuation of the cold war, in which we must wage total diplomacy until an honorable and trustworthy settlement can be reached. We cannot use Soviet methods of totalitarian diplomacy, but we can use programs of our own to build and strengthen a free world in which our way of life can flourish. This is the purpose of the Truman doctrine, the European recovery program, the North Atlantic and Rio Pacts, the military assistance program, the point 4 program for developing underdeveloped areas, and our championship of a world order based upon the United Nations.

Heretofore these programs have been of primary aid to western Europe. Now Mr. Acheson proposes to extend them to Asiatic nations as well, wherever they can be made effective within the limits of our resources. Recognizing that Asia is undergoing a revolution, he calls upon the forces of both freedom and nationalism in Asia to join in the struggle of the free world against Soviet imperialism and colonialism, and promises whatever aid we can give, either military or economic, as the case may warrant. He specifically warns the Chinese people against permitting their new Communist masters to plunge them into aggressive adventures beyond their borders.

This is a program which the American people can endorse as the minimum program for the achievement of the aims for which we fought in two world wars. It is a program aimed primarily at making peace with Russia. In supporting it, we will do well to consider the question whether we must wait upon Russia in all these matters, or whether we can adapt this program, in cooperation with the rest of the free nations, to extend the area of peace and freedom by making peace with our former enemies. This, too, would be an act of total diplomacy, the possibilities of which deserve examination.

Training Program for the United States Coast Guard Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a recent letter to me from Admiral Forrest Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD. Admiral Sherman sets forth his reasons why the United States Coast Guard Reserve ought to be provided with a training program. The Nation understands that port security will be a question of major concern in the future. The House of Representatives is presently considering the wisdom of activating the Coast Guard Reserve in this session of the Congress. Admiral Sherman's views will be helpful to this consideration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE
CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1950.

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: I have your letter of March 10, as well as that of March 7, which you gave me during our attendance at Operation Fortrex.

Your letter of March 10 is very much appreciated. I am grateful for your kind remarks and for your offer to be of help; both are quite heartening.

With respect to your letter of March 7, I feel that the interests of national defense will be well served by the establishment of a Coast Guard Reserve. That, of course, will require funds for the training of such a reserve at the present time. An annual appropriation of $4,100,000 for such purpose is not excessive.

In the event of mobilization, it is contemplated that the Coast Guard will perform the following specific functions: (1) Port security; (2) harbor master duty at advance bases; (3) beach patrol duty; (4) reactivation and manning of high-frequency direction-finding stations; and (5) harbor defense—inshore and offshore patrols in small craft.

A reserve component of the Coast Guard should be trained to proficiency in the foregoing matters. Such training would not

duplicate training now being given the Naval Reserve.

Thank you for your letter and your good wishes.

Cordially yours,

FORREST SHERMAN,
Admiral, United States Navy.

Fertilizer Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, no one can deny that fertilizer is a necessary product in the development of any successful agricultural program. Because of its importance and because of the necessity that the Congress and the various State legislatures be constantly alert to what is taking place in the fertilizer field, I have tried to secure the attention of the Congress to legislation that ought to be enacted into law. I offered H. R. 3045 more than a year ago in an attempt to deal with this problem.

Mr. William G. Holman, of Washington, has been devoting himself to this problem for years, and he recently wrote a letter under date of March 14, 1950, to the National Fertilizer Association, which is informative on this subject. In order that the record may be kept straight, under unanimous consent, I include that letter as part of these remarks:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 14, 1950.*

THE NATIONAL FERTILIZER ASSOCIATION,
Continental Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I have just read a statement made by you in the March issue of the Fertilizer Review which reads as follows: "We knew from the price indexes that the cost of a ton of fertilizer is higher today than it was in 1925. The actual figure is—let's see—8 percent; a ton of fertilizer costs about 8 percent more now than it did 25 years ago."

A statement made by Mr. O. V. Wells, Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, and published in the December 1948 issue of the Plant Food Journal, shows that your statement is far from being correct.

Mr. Wells said that: "The Bureau of Agricultural Economics indexes indicate that fertilizer prices last fall were only 55 percent above the average for the prewar years, 1935–39," and the Bureau probably did not take into consideration the facts that I shall bring to your attention.

Namely, that the farmer is forced to use 50 percent more fertilizer per acre today than would be necessary if the fertilizer had contained the same proportions of water-soluble and organic nitrogen that it did prior to 1925.

You failed to tell the public that prior to 1925, only one-third of the nitrogen in fertilizers was derived from water-soluble sources—such as nitrate of soda, and sulfate of ammonia—if we are to believe the source tags that appeared on the bags.

The remaining two-thirds of the nitrogen was derived from organic sources, such as dried blood, fish scrap, animal tankage, and cottonseed meal.

You probably know that Federal and State agronomists recommended these proportions, and believed that one-third of the nitrogen from quickly soluble sources was as much as the plant could take up before some of it was washed in the soil water beyond the reach of the plant roots.

You know that when fertilizer was made this way, the average consumption per acre was three to four bags—and it grew tobacco that made Buck Duke and Dick Reynolds rich and famous.

You also know that soon after the enactment of the Webb-Pomerene Act, a few fertilizer manufacturers acquired control of the phosphate market—see Federal Trade Commission report—and that soon after that they compelled other manufacturers to increase the water-soluble nitrogen content of the fertilizer to 65 percent, and to reduce the organic nitrogen content to 35 percent.

The farmers complained about this radical formula change, and soon thereafter, the State laws were amended. These amendments permitted the manufacturers to increase the total nitrogen content of all fertilizers 21 percent, to take the source tags off of the fertilizer bags, and to use almost unlimited proportions of the cheap, water-soluble sources of nitrogen without letting the farmers know that this was being done.

The radical reduction in the organic nitrogen content of the fertilizer forced the farmer to use at least 50 percent more fertilizer per acre in order to get enough organic nitrogen to feed his crop to maturity, and this increased the amount of the farmer's national fertilizeer bill $250,000,000.

The use of so much of the cheap, water-soluble sources of nitrogen was soon followed by an extensive spread of destructive plant diseases that had never plagued the farmers prior to the time these radical formula changes were made, and eminent scientists believe that food crops grown with an excess of soluble nitrogen have a lot to do with the increased incidence of vascular diseases and degenerative diseases.

The record shows that the National Fertilizer Association was indicted and fined $9,000 in a Federal court in North Carolina for violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act, and for having exerted an undue influence on State lawmakers, and law enforcement officials, and the attention of the Congress has recently been called to the fact that the fertilizer interests have been subsidizing the research work of the Bureau of Plant Industry. For what purpose, gentlemen, for the public good or for the purpose of enlarging and extending the corrupting influence of these predatory corporations?

This is an evil influence, gentlemen, and one that strikes at the foundations of popular government.

If I were in your place, and wanted the respect and esteem of the public, I would openly advocate the enactment of H. R. 3045 that will compel all manufacturers to be honest with the farmers; such a law would make it easier for State enforcement agencies to see that the farmer got an honestly made fertilizer, and would help to protect the health of the people.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM G. HOLMAN.

Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks in the RECORD the proclamation of Wildlife Restoration Week, March 20–25, 1950, by the Honorable William Preston Lane, Jr., Governor of Maryland:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, ANNAPOLIS, MD., GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION, WILDLIFE RESTORATION WEEK, MARCH 20–25, 1950

Whereas 11 years ago the President of the United States declared the week beginning March 20 as Wildlife Restoration Week; and

Whereas those interested in conserving our valuable wild birds, mammals, fish, oysters, and crabs, have continued to observe this period from year to year by fitting celebrations and meetings to bring before the public the need for protecting and conserving these replaceable natural resources; and

Whereas Maryland is one of the richest States in the Nation in these resources, and much progress has been made by nature lovers, farmers, sportsmen, and all conservationists in providing a better environment for wildlife. It is, therefore, proper and fitting that we pause in our daily rush and struggle for survival, and give our valuable wildlife and its perpetuation, due consideration.

Now, therefore, I, William Preston Lane, Jr., Governor of Maryland, do hereby proclaim and declare the week beginning Monday, March 20, to Saturday, March 25, as Wildlife Restoration Week and urge the people of the State interested in and concerned with wildlife and the welfare and progress of the State, to properly observe this period, and educate the people in every way possible to the necessity of preserving and increasing our wildlife resources through proper land-use programs and wise conservation laws; and to cooperate with all the State agencies charged with their management, so that they may be preserved and wisely utilized and enjoyed by this and all future generations.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Maryland, done at the city of Annapolis this 13th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1950.

WILLIAM PRESTON LANE, Jr.

By the Governor:

VIVIAN V. SIMPSON,
Secretary of State.

Veterans and the Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, two major proposals involving veterans and of much interest to our citizens are now very much to the front in Washington. One has to do with the educational features of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act and the other with the Hoover Commission report and recommendations on the Veterans' Administration itself.

A report to Congress by President Truman, recommending a tightening up of the regulations having to do with GI education at Government expense is now before it. Weaknesses in failures in the program as operated since the war are pointed out, and the President has recommended that Congress take suitable action, as it has done previously with respect to other types of training, to assure that all trade and vocational training conforms with the original sound intent of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

Advance notice to veterans taking GI educational courses will be issued on April 1, 1950, and will set up the Veterans' Administration policy for future guidance in such matters. In a report to Congress Veterans' Administration Administrator Gray states, "the crux of the matter is whether a veteran who has taken a course of training any time prior to July 25, 1951, and who has completed it or voluntarily withdrawn prior to July 25, 1951, will be eligible to initiate another course in the same or different field at any time between July 25, 1951, and July 25, 1956, the final termination date of the education and training provisions of the law for most veterans. This regulation says he will not be eligible to do so. We are convinced that this is in accord with the clear intent and legislative history of the law as well as being sound public policy. This regulation is important. The reason it is being issued so far in advance of July 25, 1951, is that this advance notice will provide opportunity for all veterans who are affected by it to make their plans in the light of it."

TIME PROVISIONS

The original servicemen's readjustment act provided that veterans should initiate any course they intended to take within 2 years after discharge or the termination of the war, which ever was later. This time was extended to 4 years by the Seventy-ninth Congress. For the purpose of this law the termination date of World War II was set at July 25, 1947, or 1½ years after general demobilization. Under this time limit most veterans would have had 5 to 5½ years after discharge in which to initiate a course of training.

We will be glad to assist any veteran in the Eighth District in any problem which he may have in this connection by obtaining additional information for him if he will send us his C number and information on his problem.

Tightening up is scheduled for some training courses and for a clamping down on schools and courses not beneficial to veterans. The President's message points out that there are many instances where a veteran was trained for occupation for which he is not suited and in which he will be unable to secure a job. The VA has recommended that Congress strengthen the educational program by prescribing minimum standards. Failure of some schools to cooperate has resulted in a volume of overpayments to students who ceased to take courses. VA also asks legislation to require schools to promptly report when veterans discontinue, interrupt, or fail to attend their courses.

Hoover Commission report on VA is now a storm center in veterans' circles. Certain officials of the American Legion have been outspoken in opposition to parts of the Hoover Commission recommendation for thorough overhauling of the structure of the Veterans' Administration. Similar opposition has been voiced by the Consolidated War Veterans Councils, representing nearly every organized veteran group in Michigan. The American Veterans Committee and the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the latter composed of many veterans, too, have endorsed the Hoover Commission proposals.

HOSPITALS

The Commission pointed out United States hospitals are being operated by the Army, Navy, VA, and Public Health Service and recommended these should be combined under one Federal system named United Medical Administration. The four agencies would operate Government hospitals in this field jointly. Penal and Indian hospitals would not be included. The Commission has recommended that all Government building construction be done under Interior Department. This would include VA hospitals but the VA would be represented on Interior's medical board.

INSURANCE

Pointing to deficiencies in the Veterans' Administration handling of United States Government life insurance and national service life insurance, the Hoover Commission proposes that an insurance corporation be set up within the VA to handle insurance matters.

LOAN GUARANTEES

The VA guarantees loans to veterans up to 50 percent of loans but not to exceed $4,000 on real property and $2,000 on personal and guarantees up to 20 percent of loans partially insured by FHA. Pointing out the VA is inexperienced in the lending field and foreclosures will add a burden of real-estate management, the Hoover Commission recommends that the veterans' housing loan guarantee program be transferred to the Housing and Home Finance Agency of Government, except the VA should continue to certify the eligibility of a veteran for these guaranties.

Duplications are also hit in the Hoover reports which show the VA has 88 different manuals, 665 varieties of technical bulletins, and over 400 circulars. It says there is also an excessive number of staff officers on major programs causing confusion. Lack of cooperation of the armed forces in fully advising servicemen of rights and insurance is blamed for other difficulties.

Great Record of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which appeared in the New York Times of March 10, 1950, on the thrilling story of the accomplishments of the HOLC, which through these years has done so much to protect the American home:

WASHINGTON, March 9.—A faded document of a year of despair was swapped in President Truman's office today for a $26,000,000 check for the Treasury.

The money was the first installment being paid by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation on the $200,000,000 advanced by the Government as capital stock in 1933 and afterward.

Thus, with the black ink of solvency, the Government began to write the final chapter of the vast operations that saved thousands of homes from foreclosure during the depression era. The $3,500,000,000 of bonded indebtedness of the HOLC has been paid off.

Only the old document was at the White House today. It was dated August 8, 1934, and it was a typewritten stock certificate, with faded signatures, for $26,000,000. John W. Snyder, the Secretary of the Treasury, had been notified by the Federal Reserve Bank in New York that HOLC had deposited the $26,000,000 check there.

Thereupon Mr. Snyder took out his pen, receipted the certificate and surrendered it to William K. Divers, Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board.

Expressing his pleasure in a long statement, President Truman harked back to the days when city homes were being foreclosed at the rate of 1,000 every day. He recalled that some people feared the Treasury would suffer huge losses by lending directly to home owners. Now that HOLC would be liquidated within a year, he asserted it would leave the Treasury a surplus of several million dollars.

VOICE OF AMERICA BEAMS STORY

The Voice of America made the most of the story, beaming it to Europe and over the iron curtain, apparently as an example of how a capitalist democracy copes with adverse economic forces.

"The record of the Home Owners Loan Corporation illustrates a lesson that has been proved time and time again in recent years," said President Truman. "It is that by wise use of its powers, the Government can engage in broad programs of social benefit—and conduct them efficiently and without waste of public funds.

"The Home Owners Loan Corporation was successful in terms of dollars and cents. But much more important, it was successful in terms of human values—in helping hundreds of thousands of families to maintain themselves as self-reliant home owners, secure in their hard-earned property, and free of the threat of eviction through no fault of their own.

"We should all be proud of this demonstration of bold and constructive Government action for the good of the whole country."

The certificate paid today was not the earliest that was issued, but it was the largest outstanding and so it was given priority for first repayment. Others at the ceremony were Raymond M. Foley, the Housing Administrator; J. S. Baughman, general manager of HOLC; O. K. Laroque and J. Alston Adams, members of the Home Loan Bank Board, and John Fahey, the former chairman of this Board.

Mr. Divers said the HOLC still has 125,000 accounts amounting to $175,000,000 on homes, the remainder of a huge program that once entailed more than 1,000,000 family accounts and $9,500,000,000 in their mortgages. The HOLC he continued, lost more than $300,000,000, or around 10 percent in defaults, but that this will be more than made up by the time liquidation is completed.

SALE TO BANK NEXT CITED

The outstanding accounts, Mr. Divers continued, are being sold in public sales to banks, loan associations, and other fiscal institutions, all at better than 100 cents on the dollar—at premiums ranging at a fraction of 1 percent to 3½ percent. As an example, he mentioned that the Dime Savings Bank of New York about 6 months ago bought the 42,000 outstanding accounts in New York State for more than $100,000,000.

Mr. Truman credited the Democratic administration in 1933 for passage of the Home Owners Loan Act. He added:

"In 2 years, the HOLC refunded the overdue mortgages of more than 1,000,000 families with long-term loans at lower interest rates. These loans, with later advances, amounted to nearly $3,500,000,000.

"Not only did these funds save families from foreclosure, but at the same time it enabled banks, insurance companies, savings and loan associations, and other real estate investors to exchange defaulted mortgages for $2,750,000,000 in cash and Government bonds. This new lifeblood saved many hundreds of financial institutions—permitting them to pay off their depositors or investors as necessary and to remain in business.

"Further, the HOLC program aided city and town governments in meeting their pay rolls and keeping up their essential services. As paying for the overdue taxes of HOLC borrowers, local governments received nearly half a billion dollars in less than 3 years."

House Resolutions 508 and 509

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as my remarks in connection with House Resolutions 508 and 509 that I introduced last week were included in the RECORD of March 13 and 14, I include the text of these resolutions as follows:

House Resolution 508

Resolution calling upon Interstate Commerce Commission in view of recent accident to ascertain adequate safety devices of Long Island Railroad

Whereas a railroad accident of unprecedented severity and tragedy occurred on the Long Island Railroad at Rockville Centre, N. Y., on Friday night, February 17, as a result of which 32 passengers were killed and more than 100 were injured, many of whom were valued, useful, and long-time residents of Suffolk County; and

Whereas it is clear that the catastrophe could have have been prevented had the Long Island Railroad used one of the several recognized safety devices available for stopping automatically a moving train, where the engineer has disregarded a stop signal; and

Whereas the Long Island Railroad is at the present time under the control of and is technically operated by trustees in bankruptcy appointed by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission is the agency responsible for the installation and approval of inequitable railroad safety devices: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission, the body having jurisdiction over railroad safety operations, be requested to undertake an investigation of the adequacy of safety devices upon the Long Island Railroad and take such steps as may be found necessary to make such safety devices modern, efficient, and secure in all respects.

House Resolution 509

Resolution for the investigation of organized crime

Whereas organized crime constitutes a growing threat to the general welfare and internal security of our Nation; and

Whereas it appears that criminal organizations, syndicates, and mobs are engaged in interstate gambling and racketeering and insidiously attempt to intimidate, bribe, corrupt, and interfere with the proper functions of government officials; and

Whereas such organized crime increases our tax burden by defrauding the Federal Government of millions of dollars of revenue annually in many ways, including the filing of false income-tax returns: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the appointment was made.

For the purpose of determining whether additional legislation should be enacted in order to more effectively combat organized crime, the committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of organized crime in the United States, and further directed as speedily as possible to report their findings and recommendations.

For the purpose of making such investigations, the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him and may be served by any persons designated by such chairman or member.

Administration of Law in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, a friend and constituent of mine has just sent me the original copy of my charge to the grand jury of Greene County, Ala., in the year 1921, when I was serving as the special judge under the orders of Gov. Thomas E. Kilby and Chief Justice John Anderson, of the Supreme Court of Alabama, holding a special term of the Circuit Court of Greene County. This charge was, of course, taken down by the official court reporter, and I suppose was written out and given by the reporter either to the foreman of the grand jury and after the adjournment of the special term of court got into the hands of my friend, who was especially interested, as he had been accidentally shot by a friend whom he was seeking to aid during a warning visit made by the local Ku Klux Klan.

Thinking that this ancient history might be of current interest, the charge is here set out:

CHARGE OF JUDGE SAM HOBBS IN EMPANELING THE GRAND JURY OF THE CIRCUIT COURT IN GREENE COUNTY, ALA.

Gentlemen of the grand jury, it is certainly a pleasure to be with you, and seek, as we are all seeking, to have justice fully, fairly, and impartially administered in Greene County. I know that many of you personally regret that Judge Jones is not to be with you at this time, and I sympathize with you in those feelings, but I hope that you will let me warm myself at the fireside of your friendship, and make new friends, and I bespeak the same consideration for Solicitor Thompson, who is to be with you in your deliberations and is to assist you in every way he can. We, over in the fourth circuit, think him the best solicitor in the State of Alabama. Of course, you have just as much right to your opinion as I have to mine, and I guess you esteem your solicitor as highly as we do ours. I assure you that it is a pleasure for both of us to be here and work with you, seeking the common good, as we are all sworn and bound to do.

In the darker days succeeding the dark and bloody days of the sixties, when a justly proud civilization lay prostrate in the dust, trampled upon by a horde of enemies drunken with the new wine of authority; when the last vestige of power—civil, political, and military—was in the hands of the newly freed slaves and scallawags and carpetbaggers; when ignorance was enthroned; when virtue was a vice, and culture a crime in the eyes of the authorities; in that night of despair, when the stars of hope had, one by one, flickered and faded and died, after superhuman endurance, through a long and terrible travail, from the mother of all invention, sired by the dauntless spirit of the men who followed Lee, the "invisible empire" was born and a new day dawned.

Out of the waste of untilled fields, from the ashes of ruined homes, the heroic remnant of our broken armies sprang silently but quickly to the new task. Ignorance was dethroned; vice suppressed; livable conditions established; civilization saved.

Then, the only legitimate ends of such an organization having been achieved, those brave men forever abandoned the mask and sheet, disbanded, and continued to build the new South, the blessings of which we now enjoy.

All honor to them, for they took the only course which was possible under the conditions they faced, and did their duty well, striving for law and order. But with the reestablishment of real self-government, the last reason or excuse for the existence of the Ku Klux Klan vanished. Our fathers realized this and voluntarily and gladly let the Klan pass into history. The klansmen thenceforth were and are the strongest supporters of our Government of law, administered by officials chosen by the legally qualified voters.

There can be no excuse nor valid reason for the new organization masquerading in the costume and disgracing the name of the old except the fat profits which go into the pockets of its paid organizers and officers.

Do they say the officers of the law fail to do their duty? We have a Supreme Court which has many times proven that such officials can and will be promptly impeached. And if any official in Alabama fails to live up to his oath of office and willfully fails to enforce the law he has sworn to uphold and enforce, he should be impeached. It is the duty of grand juries to recommend impeachment in such cases, without fear or favor.

There is no possible excuse for any man, or set of men, to seek to trample the law underfoot or take the law into their own hands today. I know that you gentlemen will agree with me fully on this.

There is a rumor in this State that you have such an organization in this county. Whether that is true or not, I don't know, and it is none of my affair except that under my oath I am bound to do what I can to see that our laws are enforced. I am told that these men who compose this organization are gentlemen; that some of them are gentlemen of the old school; that they are law-abiding citizens trying to do their duty to enforce the law, as they see that duty. If that be true, then I, in the name of law and order, invite every one of them to act as a gentleman, to act the part of a law-abiding citizen, and come into this court and confess his wrong, plead guilty, and assist us in enforcing the law as the law says it should be enforced, and we will welcome each addition to the ranks of good government. But we cannot for an instant consider any compromise with this thing if it is here. There is no longer any occasion whatever that such an organization be allowed to exist in Alabama. Our citizenship must throw this thing off, and, gentlemen, it is squarely up to you in your deliberations this week to think of your sworn duty; to think of the oath you have taken; to diligently inquire and true presentment make of all indictable offenses given you in charge by the court, or which may come to your knowledge.

Gentlemen of the grand jury, I charge you that if there is any organization in Greene County, where two or more men have met together for the purpose of violating the law in any way, this is, of itself, without more, a violation of the law, and it is your duty to indict them. Furthermore, where any man, or group of men, commits an assault and battery on another, that is another violation of the law. Where any two or more men threaten, or whip another, and invite or order him to leave the county, and so obtain his promise to do so, that is another violation of the law. Then there is the law against mayhem, if the activities of any man, or body of men, work such injuries to the person of another. So you see the law covers and prohibits the meetings of any organization such as sanction the doings of the modern Ku Klux Klan prove it to be as well as a good many of its activities. This thing which was here conceived, no doubt, with good intentions, is really an organized embodiment of a spirit of lawlessness. It breathes defiance to constituted authority, authority which the members of this organization themselves helped to constitute, no doubt. Its mission is to administer laws not written upon the statute books of Alabama, but written according to the dictates of its own desires upon the winds of its passion and prejudice. The only authority this organization has or claims, is the rule of do it. They do not play the game of government by the rules of our forefathers, as handed down to us, and as they exist in the constitution and laws of the State of Alabama.

The Constitution of Alabama guarantees to every citizen (no matter how poor or humble, no matter how grave a charge may be made against him) that his life, liberty, and person shall be respected; that he have a copy of the accusation against him; that he be not accused or arrested, or detained, except in cases ascertained by law, and according to the form which the same has prescribed; and that the right of trial by jury shall remain inviolate. The new Ku Klux Klan says that no man shall have any of these rights if the Klan chooses to deny them. Like the Kaiser, they regard the Constitution merely as a "scrap of paper." Gentlemen, we can't stand for it. If it can't be handled intelligently and firmly by your body by reason of failure to produce witnesses who know the truth and will tell it, then we possibly can get some indictments and convictions which will enable us to get Ku Klux indictments next week, and if not then, the week after, and if not then, the next week, and if not then, the week after that, for this thing is going to be rooted out of Greene County, no matter what it takes in men, in money, or in time. This thing has got to go. Not because I say it: but because the law says it.

Do any of you envy Russia? I know you do not, because you have looked me in the eye and sworn here that you believed in the enforcement of all the laws of this land. They don't believe in that in Russia. They believe in what they call a pure democracy. The only thing pure about it is the purity of the blood and gold ground from those poor, misguided people, and the only reason it exists today is because of the spirit which, in a small degree, is being manifested in your county. Lenin and Trotzky would joyously endorse and praise this sort of thing, with all their hearts. They would ask no better than to be able to lead this so-called crusade. I don't say that all these men are like them; there may be some misguided gentlemen who have become involved in this thing without a full sense of the enormity of what they were doing. I can't help believing that there are many members of this organization in this county that have been inveigled into it without thinking, and I invite all of them to do the thing which gentlemen ought to do under the circumstances. I invite them to accept this invitation by assisting in the vindication and enforcement of the law, and if they will but give one-half as much time to helping enforce the law as they have been giving to the Ku Klux Klan, every grievance of which they complain can be wiped out, to their entire satisfaction.

If I don't please these self-constituted regulators of society, they can do what they please with me, but this thing is going if it takes every dollar in the Treasury of this State, and every solicitor and every judge and takes the last man in the jury box.

Gentlemen, the law is and must be supreme; it must be enforced. You have sworn (and I know that you will keep your oath) to assist in doing it. You and those who from time to time constitute the grand jury of this court are the fountainhead of law enforcement in this county, and if you allow the fountainhead to become contaminated with this impurity, then it will be a sad day for Greene County; I don't believe that you are going to allow anything to stay your hand in the rigid enforcement of the law. Take the knife of the law, gentlemen, and cut this cancerous growth out of the body politic of Greene County before it goes too far.

Whether or not there have been any violations of the prohibition laws in your midst, I don't know. But I am told that there have been; that there are flagrant violations of them in Greene County. If this be true, that is a condition of affairs which threatens the bedrock upon which the structure of the good citizenship of this county stands. Common violation of any law, without adequate punishment, produces a disregard of all laws. So even if there were no better reason, we should enforce our prohibition laws. But there are any number of better reasons. These laws should be enforced for the sake of the blessings which they have brought—the money with which our savings banks are bulging, which would have been spent for grog; the happiness of many a home which had been cursed by liquor; the wonderful diminution in the number of crimes.

Over in Bibb County a few weeks ago we had one of the foulest crimes that was ever designed in hell. The evidence obtained by the solicitor in his investigation showed that this foul fiend had deliberately cleared off a spot where the crime was to be committed; that he went there the evening before and waylaid that little girl as she was returning from a singing school, but lost his nerve, and that it was only when a white man sold him a quart of whisky the next morning that he was enabled to nerve himself up to do that crime. How would you like to be that white man?

Gentlemen, this mean liquor breeds crime just as a mosquito bite breeds malaria. One drink, as one bite, may be a small and trivial thing, but it may mean death. One violation of this law may be harmless, or freighted with awful consequences. This summer I was told of a young man who bought a quart of liquor at Calera and was dead when his train reached Birmingham. It is not only dangerous in its collateral consequences, but per se, and so the only safe course, as well as the only honorable course under our oaths, is to enforce this law rigidly and impartially.

Gentlemen, don't let our young men, and God save the mark, our young ladies, too, be contaminated by this accursed traffic. Say to yourself, I am going to do my duty no matter if it is my brother who should be indicted, for this traffic in poison has got to go. And the minute you say it, the perfume of your resolution will make the atmosphere sweeter and cleaner, human life will be safer in Greene County.

Let me tell you this: There is no other conceivable reason why our land values down here are not as high as they are in Illinois or Indiana than that the people up there don't realize that their lives would be safe in Alabama. Those people talk as if we are so bloodthirsty that we can't get up an appetite for breakfast until we have killed a man. They have circulated such rumors about the South, and while churches and schools and good roads have much to do with land values, yet the fact which makes the greatest difference in values is that the people, deep down in their hearts, are afraid to come here. They think the Negro is as good as the white man and that they will be treated the way they believe the Negroes are treated down here. Gentlemen, we must make human life safe in Greene County, and when you do, then you have started on the road to prosperity. So, even when we pitch our thinking upon the lower plane of dollars and cents, leaving out of consideration the higher moral values, it certainly behooves us to throw every safeguard around the priceless gift of human life, and do all that we possibly can to make its sanctity felt and respected.

Gentlemen of the grand jury, I could go on at length discussing the various violations of the law; I will probably have something more to say to you later in the week, as there are other violations of the law which I am required to give you in charge, but I want to be sure not to divert your attention from these three things which I have tried to stress in this charge. I hope that you will concentrate upon them and stay with them, and "fight it out along this line, if it takes all summer."

It is my pleasure to be with you gentlemen and serve your county in any way that I can. If I can be of any assistance to you, either day or night, I hope that you will command me. Mr. Thompson will be with you. He also is anxious to be of service. I hope that you will esteem him almost as much as we do when you have come to know him. Retire to your room, gentlemen, and begin your work, and I hope that you may accomplish the things that need to be accomplished in Greene County.

The Saga of John R. Foster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a speech recently made by the noted radio commentator Cedric Foster as reported in an article by the Clinton Daily Item.

Mr. Foster's brilliant speech was delivered at the centennial banquet celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of my home town of Clinton, Mass., an event which marked the beginning of a celebration which will continue the week of May 28.

The article follows:

THE BOSS OF JOHN R. FOSTER IS RECOVERED BY HIS DISCIPLINE IN BRILLIANT ADDRESS AT THE CENTENNIAL BANQUET

The Item regrets that the manuscript of the appropriate address delivered by Cedric Foster, internationally known Yankee network commentator, in responding to the toast, "Fond Recollections," at the centennial banquet, Tuesday night, failed to reach this office in time for its insertion in the Wednesday edition.

Mr. Foster held the undivided attention of the more than 700 guests, all of whom wished he might have extended his address as it revealed an unusual story that needed to be told to this generation, covering the life work of one of Clinton's philanthropists in a most intimate way.

The speaker's fine personality and his diction so typical of leading commentators over the air networks combined to present one of the highlights of the program.

The advantage of having in high places men such as Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN and Presidential Secretary Matthew J. Connelly was again demonstrated as, lacking the presence of these two distinguished Clintonians in Washington, the banqueters probably would never have been favored by Mr. Foster's presence here to pay tribute to the town and to his famous relative, the late John R. Foster.

It was while the speaker was in Washington that he came in contact with Secretary Connelly and Congressman PHILBIN whom he knew hailed from Clinton, a town that held deep interest to him and when they casually informed him that a centennial banquet would be served March 14 and asked him if he would be interested in attending the event he immediately and eagerly accepted the invitation.

In presenting Mr. Foster, Toastmaster PHILBIN said:

"The name of the next speaker is known throughout the Nation and in many parts of the world.

"It is particularly well known in Clinton but only because of the fame and success of our speaker—though that is gratifying—but also because it was closely and prominently identified with and indicative of the industrial progress, the civic spirit and benevolence of the town.

"His antecedents—one in particular, the late John R. Foster was a prominent citizen of Clinton during the last generation. It was he who donated to the town the beautiful water fountain which in resplendence and grace stood for years in Central Park until it was demolished by the hurricane of 1938.

"Our speaker is well versed in Clinton as you will now observe. Though not born and raised here he has caught the spirit of Clinton so completely that he is like a native son. And we are proud to claim him.

"Famed writer, lecturer, and noted radio commentator, he stands at the very top of his profession. It is very kind of him to be with us. I am highly honored to be present to respond to the toast, 'Fond recollections,' the distinguished and noted radio commentator and publicist—Cedric Foster."

BELONGING TO OUR TOWN

In his response to the toast, Mr. Foster said:

"I am delighted to be with you this evening here in Clinton, Mass. I don't suppose that I have been in Clinton more than 3 or 4 times in my life. With the exception of your distinguished Congressman, PHILBIN and Secretary Matthew J. Connelly, I don't suppose that I know any people from Clinton. Yet Clinton, Mass., holds a most affectionate place in my heart.

"Here in Clinton it was that my grandfather's brother, John R. Foster, came shortly after the Civil War, to settle and to start the beginnings of what I believe to be the first chain store system in the United States. Certainly that holds true of the clothing business to which he devoted his life and it may well be true of all types of business.

"Here it was that my father Arthur L. Foster, came to stay with his uncle, John R. Foster three-quarters of a century ago. My father, at that time was a lad in his early teens. He came down from the farm at Moretown, Vt., the same farm, incidentally, on which John R. Foster was born, at the request of his uncle.

"Here it was that John R. Foster afforded my father, his nephew, the opportunity of obtaining an education in the Clinton high school. There was no quid pro quo involved in that opportunity."

NO EXCEPTION FROM WORK

"John R. Foster, like so many of his contemporaries, was a rigid, and at times a hard taskmaster. The quid pro quo was not motivated, however, entirely by these qualities in his nature.

"John R. Foster believed that a boy should earn his keep and he was determined that my father, his nephew, should be no exception.

"The result was that in exchange for room and board and education, if you had been walking through the streets of Clinton 75 years ago, you might have seen in the wee hours of the morning, a tall, slender lad making his way to his uncle's barn there to water and curry and comb the horses and clean the stables.

"When these tasks were finished he would return to the house to carry in the fuel from the woodshed and to polish brightly his uncle's boots, left methodically by 'John R.' as he was known to his intimates to his face and as he was called behind his back by those who did not know him as well, or stood in awe of him, outside of his bedroom door."

TRAINING APPRECIATED

"In his later life my father, who died in 1922, often referred to his days in Clinton and he impressed upon me that it was the training that he received from the hands of his uncle which more than any other, contributed to his success in mercantile business.

"John R. Foster was born on a farm in Moretown, Vt., about the year 1830. He died in Clinton as I recall it, in the nineties. As a boy he was sickly and anemic. His father, who was my great-grandfather, had died when he was only 42 years old and John R. Foster's mother married a second time.

"John R. didn't like his step-father and the feeling was mutual, so my grandfather, Charles A. Foster, took the young boy—his youthful brother—to live on the paternal farm while the mother and step-father lived on in Middlesex, Vt."

JOHN R. FOSTER GETS $600 LOAN

"Farm work was too difficult for John R., and one day he came to his older brother, my grandfather, and told him he was going to get a job in the dry-goods business, in Waterbury, Vt., 4 miles to the north on the Winooski River. He worked there for 2 years or so and then he came to my grandfather asking whether he had any money.

"My grandfather told this brother of his that he had $600; that he had saved it from the money he earned hauling wood to the sheds of the Vermont Central Railroad, which used wood-burning engines in those days.

"He had hauled that wood for $2 a cord and that, by simple arithmetic, was 300 cords.

"John R. wanted that money to start in the clothing business himself and my grandfather loaned it to him."

CLINTON STORE STARTED

"John R. Foster came to Clinton and started the first store of what later developed into the Foster system and which, after that, developed an off-shoot known as the Besse system.

"Eight years later, John R. Foster returned to the farm in Vermont to visit his brother. He had already paid him the borrowed $600. He figured that the stock and good-will of the Clinton store was worth $10,000, and he had $8,000 in the bank.

"He wanted to sell the Clinton store and remove to Boston."

BUSINESS JUST WAITING FOR A SUCKER

"His brother, my grandfather, remonstrated, 'Nope, John,' he said, 'I won't let you do it. Boston is a big city and they're just waiting for a sucker like you. Tell you what to do. You already have more money than you would have had if you had stayed on the farm all your life. You take $6,000 out of the $8,000 and start another store. If that doesn't make good you still have money in the bank and the store in Clinton.'

"That was the beginning of the first chain store in America and it started behind the barn in Moretown, Vt., where my great-uncle from Clinton and his brother, my grandfather, sat on a log, to discuss the financial future."

TAKES BROTHERS OFF THE FARM

"In gratitude, John R. Foster took his brothers off the farm and my father was one, to start them in the clothing business. In Bridgeport, Conn., where John R. Foster started his second store, my father, John E. Foster, my father's older brother, who was named after John R., and Lyman W. Besse were all working as clerks.

"About 1878, John R. Foster loaned my father and Mr. Besse $4,000 to start the first store of what turned out to be the Besse System.

"It was in Westfield, Mass., that my father started his first store and to that store he brought his brother, Charles F. Foster, whose widow is here at this dinner tonight.

"The store was sold, in Westfield, in 1884. Mr. Besse went to Springfield, my father went to Hartford, Conn., and my Uncle Charles went to Taunton. There they lived out their lives and there they died."

FORTY NEW ENGLAND CLOTHING STORES

"From the goodness and the largess of John R. Foster, who adopted Clinton as his home more than 40 clothing stores came into being in New England. They were individually owned and they were operated by men who lived in the communities they served. Yet they bought their merchandise as a unit and thus saved scores of thousands of dollars through wholesale purchases in large volume.

"Now you know my interest in Clinton, Mass. You know why I specifically asked your distinguished Congressman, PHILIP J. PHILBIN, that I be invited to this dinner and that I be permitted to speak.

"During the past 2 years I have traveled 80,000 miles in this country broadcasting each day and lecturing before civic organizations, schools, and colleges."

WORLD TRAVELER

"I have traveled 26,000 miles, in Europe, during the past year, from north of the Arctic Circle, in Finland, to the Grammos Mountains on the Greek-Albanian frontier, with the Greek Army in its campaign against the bandit-guerrillas. Two weeks ago, I was in England covering the British election.

"But I wanted to come to Clinton because my roots are deep. They are even in the soil of Clinton because my roots are deep here.

"To this son of Clinton I owe much as he gave my father the opportunity to go into business and to hand on to me the opportunity for an education."

AIM OF SPEAKER'S CAREER

"In this day and age, when so many people are searching for a substitute for work (when there is none), my father's description of the horses in that Clinton barn, the wood in the wood pile, and the boots outside the bedroom door is an inspiration to me to continue my chosen career.

"The air of that career is to protect the free enterprise system and to fight tooth and nail against centralization of power. Thank you for listening to me."

The Federal Snoops Are After Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post carries a story written by Robinson McIlvaine which sounds a clarion call to all since the ever-increasing tendency toward nationalization of industry and the regimentation of the small-business man. Mr. McIlvaine is the editor of my home-town newspaper and it is with appreciation of his honesty and integrity that I commend this article to your attention:

THE FEDERAL SNOOPS ARE AFTER ME

(By Robinson McIlvaine)

I am owner, editor, publisher, advertising manager, and janitor of a country weekly newspaper called the Archive, in Downingtown, Pa., a town of 5,000 people 22 miles from Philadelphia.

I acquired this impressive string of titles in 1946 when, after nearly 5 years in the Navy, I bought the paper and a supposed 1,750 subscribers with every cent I had, plus a small assist from the local bank.

The fact that all but 60 subscribers had died and that newsstand sales ran to a total of 5 copies per week—as I learned after the deal was closed—was discouraging at first. But with the help of my wife, who shares all my titles except that of janitor—she has two children and the house to clean—we managed to build up circulation to 2,800. In order to do this, we have worked from 12 to 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for the past 3½ years at varying degrees of deficits.

We were just about beginning to eat regularly when the roof caved in, literally, on the plant where the Archive was being printed, and we were forced to find ourselves a building and the necessary printing equipment to put out the paper ourselves. Luckily, we found another ex-sailor, named Ed Russell, who had some printing experience and a few dollars, and together we hunted up the equipment and converted an old livery stable into a print shop.

With another assist from the bank and some ancient machinery, we incorporated as the Chester Valley Press, Inc., and began printing the Archive ourselves in November 1948. I became president, my wife vice president, and Russell secretary-treasurer. I still kept my other titles, including janitor.

For 6 months the printing concern operated in the red. Hardly a week passed when we didn't have to buy a new part or replace a broken machine. The fellow who came in to set up our books called this capital outlay. But to us it was losing money that we didn't have. In the summer of 1949 things stopped breaking down, and we acquired more job-printing work to keep the boys—both of them—in the back shop busy Thursdays and Fridays after the paper was out. Day-to-day operations went into the black, and we began paying off the long-suffering suppliers with whom we had run up bills.

Recently we produced the biggest edition in the paper's 75-year history. It was a Tuesday, and we were getting three runs off our 40-year-old press. In the midst of all the clanking, grinding, and whirring of typewriters, saws, and the press, a tall man with a face like a peaked eagle and with a bulging brief case under his arm, edged in through the door and, as he approached the long board table we call the city desk, whipped out a card case and thrust it under my nose.

I was doing the lead story and, as I had already been interrupted 15 times, only half listened when he explained that he was from the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor and wanted to make a routine check.

"Fine," I answered absently; "help yourself."

I introduced him to Mr. Peters, the retired railroad agent who works part time at our books, and went back to the typewriter.

When I finished the story, I noticed our visitor poring over the books, taking notes avidly. I was out in the shop, making up the next run, when he appeared at my side and said that he had a few questions to ask.

"I notice," he said, "that neither you nor president nor Mrs. McIlvaine as vice president of the Chester Valley Press have drawn any salary."

"No," I laughed. "Sad, isn't it? But as you have noticed by the books, when we finish paying our compositor and linotype operator, our suppliers and the interest owed the bank, there isn't anything left over for us except a deficit. But," I added, hopefully, "the day may come soon when we can take out a few dollars."

"The law says," our Government man intoned without the trace of a smile, "that anyone working for a corporation must receive a minimum of forty cents an hour and time and a half for overtime."

I decided he had misunderstood the situation and hurried to explain that my wife and I were not employees, but officers of the company and, since we owned 75 percent of the stock, could make up our own minds what we were paid. I should have saved my breath.

"The law says," he repeated, "that everyone who works for a corporation is an employee and therefore subject to the Wages and Hours Act."

By this time I had forgotten the forms waiting to be put on the press.

"Do you mean to tell me," my voice cracked, "that we have to pay ourselves even though we don't have the money? That we must go to the bank and borrow enough to pay this minimum salary and then take it back, losing 6 percent on the way? That is, if I could persuade the bank to give me an added loan, in view of what I already owe?"

"I didn't say that," he replied with a shrug. "I merely interpret the law. I don't attempt to tell you how to run your business."

He left me sputtering like a Roman candle and returned to the outer office and our books. It was some time before I could pick up a stick of type.

In a few minutes he was back. "Do you have any business outside the State of Pennsylvania?" he asked at my elbow.

"No, we don't," I answered. "But if someone from New York, Chicago, or Timbuktu walked in now and asked us to print something for them, we certainly wouldn't turn them down."

He thought this over for a minute. Then, pointing his pencil at me, he continued, "Do you print any stationery or envelopes for Downingtown firms?"

I fell into a trap headfirst. "Sure, just as much as we can lay our hands on—after all, we are in the printing business."

I was completely unprepared for what came next.

"Would you have any way of knowing"—he let the words drop slowly, speculatively—"whether any of these envelopes you print for local firms are mailed out of the State?"

Surely he's joking, I thought, but a glance at his thin lips and narrowed eyes indicated otherwise.

"After all," I said, trying to keep my voice steady, "when we print a thousand envelopes for someone, we don't ask them whether they plan to use them for interstate love letters or wiping the floor. Our only concern is when their check comes in. Look," I said desperately, "if you're trying to establish the fact that we're under the heading of interstate commerce, why do we have to beat around the bush like that? We have a job pending that is from Connecticut. If that puts us in interstate commerce, then O. K."

When I finished, he just looked up and said calmly, "I never argue. I just interpret the law. The law says you are in interstate commerce."

Just then the office door crashed open, and in roared 26 kids ranging from 10 years down to 7. Our Government man almost swallowed his pencil as they whizzed past him shouting, "Hey, Bob, can we fold any papers today?"

Recovering slowly, our man asked, "What are these?"

I started to tell him how we could print only two newspaper pages at a time and then this meant folding and inserting each section by hand. While the men in the shop did the bulk of the job, a gang from the high school always dropped in after school, and we usually let five or six join the folding party and gave them cider, cookies, radio programs and lots of chatter for 2 or 3 hours, 2 days a week.

"It's sort of a private youth movement," my wife explained. "When they're not in here, many of them are running loose in the streets, getting into all kinds of trouble. Here they earn some money and, judging by applications, seem to have a good time."

But our investigator wasn't listening. He had already cornered the nearest kid and had begun to cross-examine him. The others tried to edge out the door, but he held up a warning finger, and they stood squirming, waiting their turns. As he began filling out detailed forms with names, ages, parents' names, and so on, I asked him why he was doing this. "They've all told you their ages, so why do you have to scare them?"

"It is illegal," he murmured, writing busily, "to employ children under 16. I have to check their ages and make sure they are telling me the truth."

I started to protest that the 2 or 3 hours a week they spent in our place could hardly be called oppressive or even employment.

He cut in, "I didn't say it was oppressive. I said it was illegal. In fact, it would be perfectly all right for them to fold papers out there," and he gestured toward the parking lot.

By this time I had been away from my work for an hour, which on that particular day so tied up production in the back shop that we ran into 4 hours of overtime. Aside from the wear and tear on my disposition, this "routine" check by Uncle Sam's man had cost me $25. It was only the beginning.

One of the children, a 14-year-old, was standing there with his lower lip going up and down like a loose piece of blubber. He had no father, and his mother had died a month before. His aunt, who worked for us evenings as a press feeder, was struggling to support him, and he came with her the three evenings she worked. He saw the older boys there folding and asked if he, too, could have a job. So we let him fold and also had him in Saturdays to sweep out the shop. For the first time in his life he had real spending money and now it was all over.

Outside, in the parking lot, the others were standing around in little groups, kicking at stones and glancing furtively at the door.

Once more I approached the inquisitor. "If it's illegal for the ones under 16 to work here, then we'll stop it. So why take down all their names?"

"But," he answered, "I must verify their statements by interviews at the school and at their homes."

Two days later I had a frantic call from the supervising principal. "What on earth are you doing down there?" he demanded. "Some character from the Government has been up here all day wanting to see the records of every kid who ever went to school. I had to dig them all out, and then he insisted on calling the pupils out of class for interviews."

This phase of the investigation took two full days and lost nobody knows how many man-hours to the school staff, not to mention the time the children spent away from their lessons.

It did keep him out of our hair for those 2 days, but he returned. This time he went through the petty-cash slips and came up with a fistful which he took to Ed Russell for an explanation. They were a bit cryptic. One read, "$3—Butch," another "75c—Red," and so on in that vein. There were 20 or 30 of them, and the wage-and-hour man obviously thought he had stumbled on the firm's private betting records. Ed, who was rushing to get a church program printed, replied quite simply: "Oh, those are chits for various guys who have folded papers."

It opened up a whole new line of investigation, and it was a honey because none of us knew the names of the individuals who at one time or another over the year had dropped in for a chat with a buddy and had ended up doing an hour or so's work. Most of them had long since graduated from school and were working, or were in the Army or Navy.

However, nothing was too much trouble for Uncle Sam's man. By reinterviewing most of the children he had already seen, he was able to tag full names onto "Butch," "Red" and most of the other names on the chits. Those he couldn't locate for personal interviews received mimeographed questionnaires marked: "Confidential. Do not show to your employer."

I first learned of the questionnaire one evening as I was walking home past the drugstore, where a group of the boys were hanging around holding up the wall.

"Hey, Bob, what am I supposed to do with this?" came a voice from the doorway. As I approached, the same lad who had been chalked up for 75 cents in the petty-cash box handed me the questionnaire. There were more than 40 questions, and they covered such essential data as date and place of birth, mother's maiden name, hours worked, when and by whom hired.

Putting our heads together, Red and I figured out his vital statistics, including his mother's name before she had married. The question of who had hired him and when he had worked was tougher. As he recalled it, Nancy, the president of the senior class, had passed him on the street and yelled out, "Come on over to the firehouse and fold papers awhile." Since he worked 5 nights a week in the drugstore, and we only folded papers on Wednesday, he figured it must have been a Wednesday when he was off, and it was either because there was snow on the ground. "Rate of pay" we knew to be 75 cents because that was what the chit said, but he couldn't remember how long he had been there. He said he was quite surprised to get paid at all, because he had spent a half hour in a corner rehashing a basketball game, and by the time he got to the folding table there was a terrific argument going on about how many light-years it was to the moon, and he couldn't remember doing any work at all, though he supposed he must have folded a few papers. I bought him a soda while we threshed these fine points out, and finally arrived home exactly 1 hour late for supper.

That evening, and several thereafter, the rest of them dropped in at the office for help on their blanks. According to law, I was then serving at time and a half, or 60 cents an hour, and on that basis my advice ran to a little over $6. I still haven't paid myself.

Early in the second week of our routine check by the Wage and Hour Division of the Labor Department we stood charged with operating in interstate commerce, running some sort of a sweatshop for kids under 16 and discriminating against corporation executives. I couldn't help wondering when our man would get down to brass tacks and look into our four regular employees.

I didn't have to wait long. I returned to the office one afternoon late, after being out at a farm demonstration. The investigator had been there most of the time I was gone and had taken each employee off into a corner for cross-examination. According to the men, or rather, the boys—their average age is 24—he found something sinister in the fact that the 19-year-old linotype operator made as much as $110 a week. He showed great distress when he learned we didn't have a time clock, but just paid the men whatever they said we owed them at the end of the week. There was also something irregular about the fact that we paid the foreman a salary and gave him paid vacations, a practice we have since abandoned.

Very little work was done on the day of these interviews. Not that the actual questioning took so long, but by the time everybody had compared notes and told what he said and they said, it was about quitting time, so, rather than run into overtime, we closed up, and I stuck around till 2 or 3 in the morning to get the work finished and, incidentally, get myself some more overtime.

The chief result, to date, of the wage-and-hour visit is that we had to go out and get an automatic newspaper press that folds as it prints, thus eliminating all the part-time workers and the lady who fed the old press. Although we had hoped to put one in eventually, we were in no position financially to do it at this time. Even though we took it apart, moved it, and put it together ourselves, it had cost us $8,000 so far, despite the fact that it is at least 45 years old.

I don't know what the verdict of the wage-and-hour people will be, once all the data is filed. I suppose the three of us could go to the penitentiary or go broke. In talking about it with other small-business men around town, I am encouraged to believe we shall somehow survive. Most of them claim to have had more harassing experiences, and they are still operating at the old stand. Furthermore, they assure me that this is only the beginning, as I can expect another man from wage-and-hour along any day to check on the first one, and ultimately a third to check on the second; and, after all, I haven't been checked out by the State department of labor or the unemployment-compensation people, not to mention the income-tax man and the FBI.

There is, of course, one possible solution: We can close the paper.

Voyage of Ferdinand Magellan to the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave granted me, I include as part of my remarks the statement issued recently by Maximiano Marmito Villareal:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE EPIC VOYAGE OF FERDINAND MAGELLAN TO THE PHILIPPINES, MARCH 16, 1521

(By Maximiano M. Villareal, chairman, publicity committee, Club de las Americas, Washington, D. C.)

March 16, 1950, is the four hundred and twenty-ninth anniversary of the epic and adventurous voyage that brought Ferdinand Magellan and his fleet to Philippine soil. The greatest contribution was the bringing of Christianity and opening another part of the world to western man.

It is fitting that everyone and all unbiased thinking people everywhere, regardless of creed and race, should for a moment pay tribute to Ferdinand Magellan for his great service to the world in displaying his unusual courage and determination in crossing and passing the many unknown oceans and seas.

Magellan's voyage to the Philippines has greatly contributed to the present ideas of modern world travel, transportation, trade, and commerce, and economic problems of both the eastern and western worlds. It was unfortunate that Magellan was unable to return to Europe with his fleet. But Capt. Sebastian Elcano, his able companion, completed the round trip and back to Europe.

The great explorer was unfortunate that he was killed during an encounter against Lapolapo and his men, who were defending the island of Mactan, of which Lapolapo was the chief. The heroism and bravery of the defending natives led by Lapolapo marks the Philippines' heroism which became a legend and a tradition that inspired the generation to generation defense of the native soil which led to the establishment of the Philippine Republic.

Like the ancient Inca civilization of pre-Spanish Peru, the Mayan of Central America, and the Aztecs of Mexico, the Philippines had its advance culture and civilization many years before the arrival of Magellan and other Europeans.

Historic accounts show that about the year 700 A. D. the people of the Philippines had already been in regular contact with other civilized countries of the Orient in trade and commerce.

The Philippines was at one time a part of the ancient great Hindu Empire known as Bari-Visaya. Today the Philippines is one of the early members of the world organization, the United Nations.

The Spiritual Heritage of St. Patrick in the Modern Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Hibernian Society of Baltimore held its one hundred and forty-seventh anniversary banquet in that city on last Saturday night, March 18. This organization was founded in 1803 by leading citizens of Maryland of Irish ancestry. Like many similar organizations established in the early days of the United States, and even before the Revolutionary War, it was entirely nonsectarian and nonpolitical, its only object being to assist emigrants from Ireland to establish themselves in the New World.

One of its early presidents, Mr. John Oliver, who served from 1818 to 1823, bequeathed $20,000 to the society for the establishment of the Oliver Hibernian Free School. This example of promoting education has been followed by the society which now uses its investment income to provide scholarships for higher education to worthy boys and girls of Irish ancestry.

At the banquet last Saturday evening, grace was offered by the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther Enders, pastor of the First English Evangelical Lutheran Church of Baltimore. At the speakers' table were seated the Very Reverend Francis X. Talbot, S. J., president of Loyola College, Baltimore, and the Right Reverend Msgr. John F. Eckenrode, pastor of St. Patrick's Church of Baltimore. The benediction was pronounced by Rev. Joseph P. Bradley, chaplain of the Hibernian Society.

Presiding at the occasion was a distinguished citizen of Baltimore, Mr. Martin J. Welsh, Jr., president of the Hibernian Society. Present also at the speaker's table was Mr. Edward A. Smith, president, St. Georges Society; Mr. Jones, of the Welsh Society; Mr. Lewis Kurtz, president, German Society; and Mr. William M. Patterson, president of St. Andrews Society.

The able senior Senator from Maryland, Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS, responded to the toast to the President of the United States. The Honorable Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr. mayor of the city of Baltimore, gave the customary response on behalf of the city of Baltimore, and the Honorable James J. Lacy, comptroller for the State of Maryland, spoke for the State.

The Government of Ireland was represented by Hon. Brendan Corish, T. D., parliamentary secretary for the minister of local government in the Republic of Ireland. I felt very much complimented that in this company I was permitted to respond to the toast, The Day We Celebrate. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this response may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SPIRITUAL HERITAGE OF ST. PATRICK IN THE MODERN CRISIS

When St. Patrick died in Ireland almost 1,500 years ago all western Europe was plunging into chaos. The old Roman Empire had been wrecked. Pagan barbarians who had swarmed everywhere over the frontiers had assailed even the impregnable city of the emperors and Christianity itself was under attack. Freedom and religion had reached their lowest ebb since first Christianity had won the minds of civilized men.

Tonight I venture to compare the condition of Europe in 493 A. D., the year the Apostle of Ireland was laid to rest, with the condition now existing throughout the whole world. I venture to point out the challenge the modern crisis presents to men and women of Irish blood and lineage to justify the tributes of loyalty, devotion, and praise they pay annually to the memory of St. Patrick, for the same threat to civilization against which he fought confronts us now.

We are part of a world-wide struggle between the spiritual and the materialistic. Freedom and religion once more hang in the balance. The dictators of a new tyranny who respect neither God nor man would enslave mankind. The Irishmen who honors Patrick tonight can look back with pride upon the contributions made by Irishmen during seven centuries following the death of their patron saint to the reestablishment of freedom and Christianity in Europe, but he must ask himself what part he is willing to play in the modern crisis between God and mammon.

THE APOSTLE OF FAITH AND FREEDOM

It is not for us to retell the well-known story of St. Patrick's life, but rather to consider the meaning of the heritage which he bestowed upon the world and particularly upon men and women of the Irish race. He began his career in Ireland as a slave. He ended it there a bishop. He was an apostle of Christianity; of necessity, he was also a defender of freedom. He knew, as many in our time have forgotten, that the concept of freedom is inseparable from Christianity. Like St. Paul, he preached the "liberty wherewith Christ made us free," and he implanted this knowledge so deeply in Irish character that during the fifteen centuries since his death Irishmen have been distinguished chiefly throughout the world for their unswerving devotion both to the religion St. Patrick taught and to the ideals of human freedom he never ceased to proclaim.

We have the record not only in his own writings, but in the writings of some who walked and talked with him. Throughout his life Patrick engaged in a constant intellectual attack upon the pagan philosophy, trusting in Divine Providence to preserve his life and his strength and to deliver him from persecution. Mindful of his own sufferings when he had been made a captive in his youth, it was his practice to ransom captives with whatever money he had. He constantly urged the pagan to accept the gospels and he always exhorted his people to join him in a common endeavor to achieve justice and freedom for everyone.

This spirit of the great Apostle of Ireland was recognized with wonder and surprise by his contemporaries. One of them whom we know as St. Secundinus wrote a hymn during the lifetime of the saint extolling Patrick for these qualities. Translated into English, it may perhaps lack poetic quality, but its meaning is plain, as may be judged from the following stanza:

"Christ chose him for Himself to be His vicar on earth,
Who from twofold slavery doth set captives free;
Of whom very many he redeems from slavery to men, and
Countless numbers he releases from the dominion of the Devil."

We have, however, Patrick's own words to confirm this judgment of his purpose. There has been handed down to us with complete authenticity not only St. Patrick's Confession, but also a letter which, in the manner of St. Paul, the Irish saint wrote to the British chieftain, Coroticus. The latter, whose name would indicate a Roman origin, had raided Ireland, had slain many of the inhabitants at the spot where he landed, and had carried others off to slavery. St. Patrick's letter, though addressed to Coroticus in the hope that it would in due course reach him, was also directed to his own flock. He told them how the Christian inhabitants of France labored to convert the heathen and release the captive.

"This is the custom of the Roman Gauls," he wrote. "They send holy and fit men to the Franks and other heathen with many thousands in coin to redeem baptised captives. * * * Thou rather slayest and sellest them to a foreign nation which knows not God.

"What manner of hope in God hast thou, or has he who consents with thee, or who holds converse with thee in words of flattery? God will judge; for it is written, not only those who commit evil, but those who consent with them shall be damned."

This is a stern and affirmative Christianity. No man has a right to rest when his fellow men are enslaved, for every man is a member of Christ and must help keep his brother free. Money, good will, prosperity, culture, human skills, all the qualities of mind and body are simply means to carry on the fight for freedom and spiritual redemption against the "foreign nation which knows not God."

So seriously did St. Patrick feel this responsibility which he accepted for himself and which he believed every man should bear to every other, and so completely was it understood by his contemporaries and his followers that it was recognized in the legend handed down to us in one of the early lives of the great saint. We are told that as he approached his death an angel appeared to him to grant four petitions. The last and most important of these was bestowed by the angel in these words:

"That all the Irish shall be judged by thee in the day of judgment, as was said to the Apostles, 'And ye shall sit and judge the 12 tribes of Israel,' that thou mayest be the judge of those to whom thou wast an apostle."

The legend may, indeed, have been the fond fancy of an ancient follower of Patrick who was urging the Irishmen of his time to remain loyal to the ideals of faith and freedom that Patrick taught. We, however, who live now in the middle of the twentieth century, almost 1,500 years after Patrick went to his reward, facing as we do the same threat to religion and freedom that he faced, may well ask ourselves on St. Patrick's Day, "Are we willing upon the day of judgment to have Patrick pass upon our service to the ideals he preached?" Surely it must be clear that if this generation spurns the spiritual heritage Patrick left, materialism will engulf the globe and dictatorship, not freedom, will take over the world.

It is not mere chance that in our time we have seen slavery in a most repulsive and cruel form reappear in the nations which know not God, for the cynical repudiation of religion is likewise the repudiation of freedom.

So, tonight we look to the past, but only as a guide to the future. Let us remind ourselves of what our ancestors did, not to shine in their reflected glory, but rather to strengthen our own determination to emulate their devotion and to make a new record of loyalty to faith and freedom which perhaps some future generation may be willing to cite to our credit.

SEVEN CENTURIES OF IRISH TEACHERS

It will be remembered that the Roman conquest of Europe never extended to Ireland. It was always beyond both the military and political sway of the Empire. The Roman legions penetrated Britain and remnants are still there of the old military roads they built. The ancient Roman ruled in Britain before Christianity came, but Patrick took it to Ireland before Augustine became the Apostle of Britain. The inspiration of his teachings was so potent that thousands of Irishmen, fired with his zeal, made Ireland in very truth the island of saints and scholars in the years that followed Patrick's death. To the abbeys and schools founded by the saint's followers in the Land of the Shamrock there flocked in the sixth and seventh centuries thousands of eager students who could not satisfy their search for knowledge and religion on the continent where the barbarian had almost destroyed the foundations of both civilization and Christianity.

In these same centuries and in the centuries that followed, including the twelfth, the saints and scholars of Ireland returned to the continent everywhere preaching and teaching and reestablishing the structure of faith and freedom which had been laid in ruins. To a demoralized Europe, the missionaries and teachers of Ireland, heirs of

St. Patrick, carried back the flame of faith and freedom that had been almost stamped out by pagan barbarians not unlike Attila the Hun, who dared call himself the Scourge of God.

This brilliant record, covering a period of seven centuries of intellectual and religious labors, has been obscured and almost obliterated in recent times by the sorry story of the seven centuries of Ireland's bitter, but unremitting struggle against British conquest. Throughout that struggle the Irishman's will to freedom remained indomitable. He knew, that since God Himself had made man free, no earthly agent can deprive him of that gift. The military power of Britain is no longer a threat to the political integrity of Ireland. It is now at last a really free nation even though six counties are still excluded from the essential unity of the island. All of Ireland, like all Britain, all Wales, all Scotland, all western Europe, indeed, the whole world now faces another threat to basic human liberty from a foreign nation which knows not God. Thus once again, there is presented to the followers of St. Patrick the opportunity to place their intellectual capacity, their will to freedom and their devotion to religion in the forefront of the spiritual struggle against an advancing materialism more diabolical even than that which overwhelmed the Roman Empire in the fifth century.

Does the missionary zeal of Patrick survive among the Irish of our time? Patrick felt that all Christians were closely bound together and that they should burn with his own zeal for peace and freedom, a zeal which was doubled in him by the efforts of the pagan barbarians of his time to dominate and enslave the free Christians of Europe. The sons and daughters of Ireland have migrated throughout the world, but wherever they are, in whatever land they serve, they are, like us tonight, paying honor to the memory of St. Patrick.

AMERICA THE LAST REFUGE OF LIBERTY

To Americans of Irish lineage, however, I speak not alone of Patrick's message, but of the message of human freedom handed on year after year by Irish leaders wherever fate had cast them. I am thinking particularly tonight of one great Irish leader, a non-Catholic leader who was imbued with the eternal devotion of the Irish heart to freedom. He was one of the greatest orators of the old Irish Parliament, the dissolutionment of which was decreed by the British Act of Union. Resenting this depredation of the right of Irishmen to legislate for all Ireland, he turned his eyes westward across the Atlantic and in 1783, 4 years before the Constitution of the United States was drafted, he referred to this country as "the only hope of Ireland and the last refuge of the liberties of mankind." These were the prophetic words of Henry Grattan, patriot and orator. He died without knowing how accurate his vision of the future was.

America is, in very truth, the last refuge of the liberties of mankind. If here in America we should falter, if we should fail to see that communism is sweeping now across the face of the earth in a more tumultuous current even than that which engulfed the Roman Empire, if Americans should be lulled into a false concept that the danger is not real, then be sure that totalitarianism, armed with all the scientific improvements of our time, will suppress the human soul in a degradation deeper than that to which it has ever sunk before.

We are drifting with terrible speed toward economic disaster and a third world war because we do not seem to realize how vital and necessary the heritage of St. Patrick is in our time.

We shall successfully defend faith and freedom, not with armies and with bombs, but with the conviction of our souls and the determination of our wills, accepting the message of Christianity and dedicating ourselves, in the spirit of St. Patrick, to the demonstration that all men are free, that none can rightfully be enslaved, that all are brothers and the children of God.

Surely the world has learned that there can be no triumph in war. In the competition of destruction, there can be no victor. We thoughtlessly call ourselves the winners of World War II, but we have not paid for that war yet. It will leave its marks upon us all for generations to come. The United States gave more than 300,000 lives in that conflict. More than a million men were maimed in body and spirit and are living victims of the war. Peace and prosperity for the whole free world were undermined by that war and too many now are giving way to the futile and dangerous thought that free men, by living to themselves alone, can somehow hide from the struggle that is here, or are entertaining the more terrible thought that a new and more destructive war should be launched. Even without the will to war we are already involved in an armament race that inevitably turns us from the paths of peace and may easily transform us into a garrison state and eventually bring on a war more appalling in scientific destruction than even World War II, the peace treaties of which have not yet been written.

There is no spot upon the whole face of the earth in which a free man can protect himself from the totalitarian purpose to destroy religion and to make gross materialism the ruling passion of man. There is no hope for mankind in resort to force. Science has released to us the awful secrets of nature which must be used in the spirit of Christianity for the purpose of ennobling men, or they will be used to plunge us all once more into the depths of misery and confusion. Total war can result only in total destruction, and we are faced with a dilemma from which only religion and democracy can set us free.

ECONOMIC FREEDOM IS ESSENTIAL

When I speak of democracy, I mean economic democracy as well as political democracy. I mean the right of the individual to the free use of his own abilities to support himself and to govern himself. In no company can one with more propriety plead the cause of political and economic freedom than in a gathering which has assembled to pay honor to St. Patrick.

It will be remembered that the youthful Patrick while only a boy of 16 was captured and taken to Ireland in slavery. He escaped to the continent of Europe, but he had made up his mind that he would return with the message of Christianity to the people among whom he had been a bondsman.

I have often thought he must have found something in the character and spirit of those ancient Irish that convinced him they were ready to accept his message of freedom. We are told that he codified the ancient Brehon laws. An examination of this code shows that in early Ireland economic and social justice for all was recognized as the basis of society. No man under those laws could retain in idleness any land which another member of his community could use. In other words, no vested interest could restrain opportunity for the ancient Gael. Land was the means of production, and we shall best learn the lesson of economic freedom that Patrick taught if we realize that the principal cause of modern social and economic turmoil is that we have not learned that men cannot be economically free unless there is free access for every single individual to the modern means of production.

The totalitarian fears that there is not enough to go around. Filled with the determination that he and his group shall survive, he seeks to dominate the world and exclude from opportunity all but those he chooses to admit to his society. Murder and slavery for those outside his circle is the logical program of the dictator, who is driven by fear.

Our task is to demonstrate to all, even to those behind the iron curtain, that there is enough to go around, that in a free and Christian society when men live like brothers one to another they can by cooperation and by constructive use of the achievements of science in an atmosphere of liberty raise the standard of living for all to a higher level than has ever before been achieved.

The Communist dictators are convinced that religion and democracy are dead. They are dead—if the world receive not the spiritual heritage of St. Patrick. We who call ourselves his followers, we who know the cause to which he dedicated his life, we who know as he knew that God Himself is the Author of Liberty, we know that the forces of materialism cannot overcome Christianity if only we have the courage in our own lives to accept the stern responsibility of every man to the spiritual virtues of faith and freedom that St. Patrick taught and lived.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have recently received from Mr. Joseph Weston, of Tacoma, Wash., be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD. Mr. Weston states nothing new in his views, but they are well stated and the example he uses is so typical of the results of continuing Federal rent controls in peacetime that I wish to bring the letter to the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TACOMA, WASH., *March 14, 1950.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You are reported to be opposed to a continuation of rent controls, for which we fervently say, "Thank you for these efforts to rid us of this instrument which can be explained only by political expediency." It may be that you will need some added ammunition for your debates. This letter, then, is to supply some material which may have been overlooked and to give you an example of the injustice of the rent-control laws.

We own a house in southern California. Hard work over a 10-year period cleared it. Our intention was to use this as a source of income when I can work no longer.

About 3 years ago I was transferred to Tacoma. The question arose as to whether to sell or rent the house we were leaving. At that time it was not under rent control, so we decided to hold on to it, although this decision meant careful economy of living on our part. We were offered $14,000 for the place, and could have used the money to reestablish ourselves in Tacoma.

Good people came to us asking to lease the place, and two figures were discussed—$90 with owner to care for the yard; $75 with the tenant to assume this responsibility.

(Incidentally, the house is on a 100 by 200 corner lot and was adjudged one year by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and the Los Angeles Times as the outstanding half-acre ranch-type place in Los Angeles and Orange Counties. This was contingent on the garden more than the house. So naturally we were concerned with having the place maintained.)

The tenant was happy—so were we.

Then last year the rules were changed. In itself an imposition, and I considered it a breaking of faith. Many people, like us, decided to rent instead of sell at the top of the market. Now where are we? Sales value has dropped and the rent is reduced one-third.

The rent, now set at $50—after maintenances, taxes, and depreciation—nets us less than nothing. (We have spent $198 so far this year on the sewage-disposal system.)

Aside from the fact that we are hurt personally, the larger phases of the subject are of profound importance.

Is it American justice—is it moral—for the Government to take from one man to give to another?

Why is every man's dollar except that of the person who has been thrifty enough to clear off a place for rental allowed to become inflated?

Per capita income has increased because of the lessened value of the dollar. Should the owner of a small rental place be discriminated against in this inflationary period?

Last year the American public is reported to have spent $9,000,000,000 on automobiles. This, in round figures, is two billion more than the total spent for new housing. I have no objections to people's buying automobiles. I quote the figures to prove the point that a rental subsidy particularly at the expense of individual American citizens cannot be justified on the grounds of inability to pay.

The people who own rental property pay taxes to support the local community as well as the broader taxes of State and the Federal establishment. Schools (for the renters' children), roads, library, police, and all the rest. Why is it the owner of a house which he rents is not permitted to bargain for his income? The law allows this to most everyone else.

In my case the tenant was well satisfied with our original agreement, and insofar as he is concerned his vote has not been purchased by the Rent Control Act. He wrote me this: "It is not difficult to understand your irritation over the Government restrictions. If our positions were reversed, I am quite sure that I would be extremely angry over the rent regulations."

I pay taxes to support the very rent-control people who tell me what I can and cannot do with a piece of property I worked for and bought and paid for with no help from any agency. How can any man accept such a control without anger and resentment?

It should be noted, too, that in my dealings with this governmental bureau I have found the most incredible inefficiency that can be imagined. Every step of the way has been filled with error from start to finish.

In April last year, trying to obey the law, I wrote from Iowa (I travel most of the time) and asked that instructions as to my procedure in filing the property be mailed to my Tacoma address.

Some time later a letter was forwarded to me which had been sent to me in Iowa. Guess what it said? "The rent regulations recognize only a lease under section (4), which provides for a 15-percent increase."

And so it went, back and forth, with docket numbers and forms that were impossible to understand clearly. Finally my son made trips to the rental headquarters in Los Angeles. He was told the place was only worth $35, but they would (out of the goodness of their heart) allow $45. Finally they settled on $50.

I am proud of the fact that I have had forbears in every war the United States has fought for governmental respect of the individual. I was in War I, my son was in War II. I am accustomed to standing on my own feet.

What bothers me terribly is that I cannot be proud of a legislative body that follows an administration which demands imposition of politically expedient regulations like those contained in the rent-control laws.

I wish you, sir, the best of good heart in your stand against such practices.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH WESTON.

Reorganization of the Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Maritime Shuffle," from the Washington Post of March 16, 1950.

The editorial points out that it is not enough to reorganize the Maritime Commission and consolidate it with the Department of Commerce, but that it is highly important that correct and proper personnel be selected for the new authority. The editorial calls attention to the fact that the Maritime Commission, according to the report of the Comptroller General, has flouted the law in granting excessive subsidies and that its flouting of the law has been confirmed by a report of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The editorial says:

If the reorganization plan is accepted, the President has a great opportunity to get rid of the Commission members who have abused their offices. This gain would be nullified, however, if the President (as is now reported to be his intention) were to appoint as Undersecretary of Commerce for Transportation the present Maritime Commission chairman who has sided with the majority. By the same token it would be unfair to jettison Commissioner Raymond S. McKeough, who has fought a losing battle to administer the law as written.

Mr. President, I may say that Commissioner McKeough served with distinction in the House of Representatives for many years. At times we have been political associates, and at other times we have been opponents, but no one has ever questioned his great integrity and his great competence, and I believe the people of the United States owe him a debt of gratitude for the magnificent fight which he has been making to keep ship construction and shipping board subsidies down within the bounds of reason.

I renew my request that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARITIME SHUFFLE

President Truman's long-heralded reorganization of the Maritime Commission is both drastic and plausible in many ways. The danger is that the President may be misled into believing that the trouble in the Maritime Commission will be cured by a mere reshuffling of authority. Whatever the administrative defects of the present commission, and they are many, the basic difficulty has been in the outlook of its members.

What the President proposes is to abolish the Commission and divide its duties functionally as recommended by the Hoover Commission and other studies. Replacing the present 5-member body, a 3-man Maritime Board would be set up in the Department of Commerce to handle regulatory and subsidy functions. With respect to ship construction and operating subsidy determination, this board would be subject to policy guidance from the Secretary of Commerce; but its decisions, once made, would be conclusive. In such regulatory matters as approval of rates the board would act as an independent agency.

To carry out other duties of the Maritime Commission—administration of subsidies, management of the Government-owned merchant fleet, and similar functions aggregating $162,000,000 yearly—the plan would establish a separate Maritime Administration in the Department of Commerce. Separate, that is, except for the fact that the chairman of the Maritime Board would serve in a dual capacity as Maritime Administrator. In addition, the plan calls for the appointment of a new Undersecretary of Commerce for Transportation.

Insofar as it would bring about policy accountability on subsidy awards, the proposal would be a distinct improvement. The granting of subsidies is basically an executive function, and when this function is carried out by an independent agency, great abuse is possible. The plan would permit supervision to insure that presidential subsidy policy and maritime policy were not operating at cross purposes. Moreover, the plan recognizes the overlap of many maritime functions by providing for the use of the same staff by the Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration.

The question remains, however: How many ways can the same man be divided? Can an administrator responsible to the Secretary of Commerce in some matters remain genuinely independent in others? For that matter, would not the dual Maritime Board-Administration head be in a position to thwart other Board members, since all employees except personal staffs would be responsible to him alone? That has been one of the major complaints under the most recent reorganization of the Maritime Commission. Finally, if a Department of Transportation is the President's aim, ought not this issue to be met head-on? Should the already unyielding Department of Commerce be made more so?

Although the President's message does not mention it, undoubtedly a major factor in the shift was the report last summer by the Comptroller General dealing with the way the Maritime Commission majority had flouted the law in granting excessive subsidies—a report confirmed by the House Executive Expenditures Committee. If the reorganization plan is accepted, the President has a great opportunity to get rid of the Commission members who have abused their offices. This gain would be nullified, however, if the President (as is now reported to be his intention) were to appoint as Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation the present Maritime Commission chairman who has sided with the majority. By the same token it would be unfair to jettison Commissioner Raymond S. McKeough, who has fought a losing battle to administer the law as written.

No reorganization plan can be stronger than the men chosen to administer it. In peculiar measure the chaos in the Maritime Commission is the result of incompetence. Far more important than the details of the reorganization plan, if it goes through, will be for the President to name as Under Secretary of Commerce a man specially qualified in the field of transportation and to appoint as Maritime Administrator and Board members men who have demonstrated that they can distinguish public from private interest.

Address of Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson at Dedication of New Sinai Temple in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the district in Illinois which I have the honor to represent the event in the month of March which held the general interest of my constituents of all faiths was the dedication of New Sinai Temple at Fifty-fourth Street and South Shore Drive in Chicago.

The name of Dr. Louis Mann, the present rabbi of the Sinai Congregation is known not only in Chicago but throughout the Nation, as were those of his brilliant and consecrated predecessors, Dr. Kauffmann Kohler and Dr. Emil G. Hirsch.

The late Hon. Henry Horner, the first governor of Jewish faith in our State and beloved by everyone, was a member of the Sinai Congregation and on the occasion of the dedication of the new temple our present Governor, The Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, appeared to address the large gathering numbering many who during the years had worshipped in the old temple with his illustrious and revered predecessor, Governor Horner.

The address of Governor Stevenson, which I am including in my remarks, is a noteworthy contribution to the literature of religion in its relation to social consciousness. The masterful address of Governor Stevenson follows:

Sometimes, in the day to day activities of my office, I feel an oppressive sense of futility. So it is gratifying to be able to participate in something that is of more than fleeting significance—that holds promise of lasting, worthwhile values for a very long time to come.

I am grateful, then, for the opportunity to be here today, to see and to participate in the dedication of this splendid modern temple which will house the years to come an ancient religious heritage and our oldest scholarship. Dr. Mann reminds me that for 150 years the commencement address at Harvard was in Hebrew and for a hundred years at Yale, and I think I will have a little research done on this at my college, Princeton. And I am grateful for this opportunity to pay my respects to you, the Sinai Congregation who made this beautiful blending of the old and new possible, and to my esteemed friend, Dr. Louis Mann, who has stood fast for so much that is good in ethical and social life of this community.

This ultra-modern temple is in keeping with the history of this Jewish congregation which for 90 years has never been afraid to venture into new fields, even as five Jews were not afraid to sail westward with Christopher Columbus' little band so long ago.

Yours was the first reform congregation established in this country. You were the first to sponsor public lectures for people of all faiths. You pioneered in adult education and in progressive methods of religious instruction. Your congregation was the first to employ a psychologist on its counseling staff. Even more important, you have squarely faced the social challenge of each succeeding generation.

As in all human affairs, spiritual as well as temporal, your greatness as a congregation has been due to leadership—to a sense of the connection between the values of the past and the problems of the present. You have treasured the rich heritage of your fathers, but you have realized that this heritage can be preserved only if it lives in the present and serves the present. A temple must not be just a museum to house the dead relics of a bygone civilization, but a spring from which men and women of today receive spiritual replenishment.

And again your congregation has recognized that religion is not an air-tight compartment shut off from the rest of life, but that it encompasses all human activity. Perhaps this explains, at least partially, why so many enlightened men, including my own illustrious predecessor, the beloved Henry Horner, have been members of Sinai Temple, and why the effective ministry of your religious leaders like Dr. Kohler, Dr. Hirsch, and Dr. Mann, has not been limited to your congregation but has extended to all Chicago and beyond. It explains also why this congregation is known everywhere for its emphasis upon prophetic Judaism, and its social consciousness.

As Dr. Mann has recently pointed out, a religious organization needs more than a temple. It is significant that you have erected here not only a house of worship, but also a house of study and a house of assembly. By making this a house of assembly, a community center serving members of all races and creeds, you have given concrete expression to your conviction that a religious organization must serve not only its own members, but all mankind.

We live in a time of torment, trial, and challenge—a time in which the Jews have been the worst sufferers. In the tense struggle for peace on which rests peace itself, the mighty, and mightily neglected, power of religious faith is peculiarly our western weapon. We need that power, that weapon, on the battlefields of peace now just as surely as we need it on the battlefields of war.

I sometimes wonder if the chief cause of discord in our troubled world is not so much the undesirable nature of beliefs as it is the prevalence of competitive indoctrination among them. Alfred Adler once offered the opinion that "it is easier to fight for one's beliefs than to live up to them." In effect this is what we have across the entire fabric of human affairs: rents and tears caused by the constant vendettas carried on by competing faiths, religious, economic, social, and ideological.

If there is anything that the whole idea of liberalism militates against it is the notion of competitive indoctrination. And therein lies our potential strength in this current era of grace. When we start with the premise that we want human brotherhood to spread and increase until it makes life safe and sane, we must also be certain that there is no one true faith or path by which it may spread. We must forever banish the notion that there can be universal brotherhood just as soon as everyone gives up his faith and accepts ours. That day will never come. The richness of human diversity cannot be abolished. It can be resented and fought, but only at what an appalling cost. Difference is in the nature of life. It is part of our moral universe. It should be gladly and enthusiastically welcomed. There is nothing wrong with the fact of difference. What is wrong are our futile efforts to abolish it, futile as abolishing Mars or Jupiter.

To convince ourselves and others that there is nothing to fear in difference; that difference, in fact, is one of the healthiest and most invigorating of human characteristics, without which life would become lifeless, is a great task. Here lies the power of the liberal way—not in making the whole world Catholic, Jewish or, if I may even suggest it, Unitarian; but in helping ourselves and others to see some of the possibilities inherent in viewpoints other than one's own; in encouraging the free interchange of ideas; in welcoming fresh approaches to the problems of life; in urging the fullest, most vigorous use of critical self-examination.

I have said nothing that is new here, because this is a liberal congregation that knows the world was peopled by a compassionate God who loves us all. And so, upon the dedication of this new temple, I congratulate you, not only for your past achievements but also for the increased opportunities for service that today open before you.

United States Ban on German Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Von Wiegand Hits United States Ban on German Science," which was published in recent issues of the Hearst newspapers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA, WAKE UP

VON WIEGAND HITS UNITED STATES BAN ON GERMAN SCIENCE

(By Karl H. Von Wiegand, dean of American foreign correspondents)

ROME, March 15.—Western policy under the leadership of Secretary of State Dean Acheson, commanding the sun of modern progress to stand still in Germany by forbidding scientific research in that defeated country, is strengthening the war and industrial potential of Communist Soviet Russia with some of the best brains in German science.

Freedom of research into every branch of science and scientific development, which has made this the greatest age of discovery and invention in history, is to the scientist what freedom of religion, press, thought, opinion, and human rights are to western democracy.

Soviet offer

The policy of America, Britain, and France toward Germany and its scientists of commanding the sun to stand still in that country is having the foreseeable consequence.

Moscow has made a new and wider "grand offer" in its bid to get a large number of German scientists, specialists, and trained men in every branch of science, research professors and teachers to come to Russia, according to reliable information which has reached Rome.

Inquiries which I have made in scientific circles in Germany have confirmed this information.

Moscow offers good pay, good living quarters, laboratories, research institutes, experimental stations and posts in institutes of technology with the fullest freedom of research and unlimited financial support.

Duty in China

Some of the German scientists sought by Russia are evidently wanted for duties in connection with China's reconstruction program which was agreed upon recently in Moscow between Stalin and Mao Tse-tung.

Private reports from Germany say many German scientists, professors, technologists, and specialists, intensely embittered by America, Britain, and France forbidding research, have accepted Soviet offers and that others are preparing to do so.

Even such great scientists as Prof. Otto Hahn, of Stuttgart, works under the strictest supervision and control of the western occupation authorities.

Science in Germany had in part been driven underground, but more largely is now being driven into the service of Soviet Russia.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "FEPC," published in the March 16, 1950, issue of The State, of Columbia, S. C.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEPC

The Saturday Evening Post, which by the greatest stretch of imagination could not be termed "a southern organ," yet indeed has been fair, had an editorial last month on FEPC which escaped our attention at the time. A friend kindly has forwarded it to us. The comment was occasioned by the celebration of Brotherhood Week.

We take the liberty of quoting the Post in part:

"The late Dr. George Washington Carver, Jackie Robinson, and Levi Jackson have done more to change attitudes contributing to discrimination than all the FEPC laws on the statute books. Force is always a tempting device, but in the long run the results of persuasion are sounder. The lengths to which the there-ought-to-be-a-law attitude can go was recently illustrated by the ill-advised effort of New York's Attorney General Goldstein to prohibit a bowling tournament because the bowling league which was holding the tournament restricted membership to white males. Perhaps bowling ought to be invariably interracial, but an effort to compel people to make it so runs into what Donald Richberg once called one of the most essential freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution—that is to say, 'freedom to choose one's associates because of personal liking and confidence or individual judgment, whether rational or irrational.'

"The truth is that even in areas where legal compulsion has some justification, it is usually the case that the public conscience and sense of justice have changed before the adoption of laws whose sponsors claim all the credit. Thus antilynching laws become a possibility after lynching has all but disappeared, and laws to protect the rights of minorities in jobs or housing come along when the prejudice which was behind discrimination in these fields has been largely liquidated. Indeed, it is quite possible that FEPC laws, which carry with them the danger of creating special privileges for groups at present regarded as the victims of discrimination, will set the clock back. In any case, such laws hardly promote brotherhood any more than religious unity would be promoted by forcing a Presbyterian into the college of cardinals."

If our readers will recall, the State has argued all along that FEPC will harm, instead of help, those whom professional vote lurers proclaim it would help. The Post, you will note, says FEPC would set the clock back.

Lions International—The Lions Code of Ethics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the March 1950 issue of Governmental News, a national publication for public officials, there is an excellent article by Mr. Melvin Jones, secretary general of Lions International. In this article, Mr. Jones cites the magnificent record of this great service organization in national and international activities.

He reports that the Lions Clubs performed a total of 101,736 separate and distinct activities for the betterment of their individual communities during the 1949 fiscal year, and he cites many other excellent statistics, as well as interesting illustrations of their concrete work.

I had previously called attention to the splendid articles published in Governmental News, which is issued by George P. Breitbach and Sons, in Milwaukee, Wis.

I believe that Governmental News has performed a real public service in carrying Mr. Jones' article. Naturally every member of Lions Clubs throughout my State of Wisconsin and wherever Lions Clubs exist will feel a deep and justified sense of pride in the achievement of Lions International. But individuals who are members of other service groups, or who, for that matter, are not members of any service club at all, will also be proud, as Americans, of the outstanding record of civic contributions of Lions International.

These Lions Clubs prove that in the American way it is not necessary for government to attempt to do everything. On the contrary, it is infinitely preferable that wherever possible, private civic groups meet local needs because they are best acquainted with those needs.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from Mr. Jones' article, followed by the Lions code of ethics.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM MELVIN JONES' ARTICLE

Describing what Lionism seeks to do in the fewest possible words, it might be said that its fundamental purpose is to make each club's home town, or community, a better place in which to live. This objective automatically puts the Lions into everything that goes on around town. It also points up a distinguishing characteristic of the Lions. No job is too small for them. This may explain why they have accomplished so many big ones.

Lions are international in scope, and international in interests, particularly in the promotion of good will and understanding among nations. International good will has a direct bearing on world peace and security under which civilization progresses, and thus the first object of lionism, as set forth in our international constitution, pledges Lions Clubs to create and foster a spirit of generous consideration among the peoples of the world, through a study of the problems of international relationships.

Closely correlated with this primary object are the other five objects of Lions Clubs:

"2. To promote the theory and practice of the principles of good government and good citizenship.

"3. To take an active interest in the civic, commercial, social, and moral welfare of the community.

"4. To unite the members in the bonds of friendship, good fellowship and mutual understanding.

"5. To provide a forum for the full and free discussion of all matters of public interest, partisan politics, and sectarian religion alone excepted.

"6. To encourage efficiency and promote high ethical standards in business and professions; provided that no club shall hold out as one of its objects financial benefits to its members."

FOUNDED IN 1917

This high aspiration to serve, in the fullest sense of the meaning, has been the guiding light of lionism through the 34 years of its phenomenal growth and expansion through 27 countries of the world.

LIONS CODE OF ETHICS

To show my faith in the worthiness of my vocation by industrious application to the end that I may merit a reputation for quality of service.

To seek success and to demand all fair remuneration or profit as my just due, but to accept no profit or success at the price of my own self-respect lost because of unfair advantage taken or because of questionable acts on my part.

To remember that in building up my business it is not necessary to tear down another's; to be loyal to my clients or customers and true to myself.

Whenever a doubt arises as to the right or ethics of my position or action toward my fellow men, to resolve such doubt against myself.

To hold friendship as an end and not a means. To hold that true friendship exists not on account of the service performed by one to another, but that true friendship demands nothing but accepts service in the spirit in which it is given.

Always to bear in mind my obligations as a citizen to my Nation, my State, and my community and to give to them my unswerving loyalty in word, act, and deed. To give them freely of my time, labor, and means.

To aid my fellow men by giving my sympathy to those in distress, my aid to the weak, and my substance to the needy.

To be careful with my criticisms and liberal with my praise; to build up and not destroy.

Middle-Income Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Set-back for Socialism," published in the Boston Traveler of March 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUT-BACK FOR SOCIALISM

The so-called middle-income housing bill that the Senate passed is a victory for sound and traditional financing, a defeat for the socialistic experimenters. There will be no disguised subsidies for the few at the expense of the many, no interest rates for housing cooperatives set low enough to knock out all competition from the Nation's banks. What was passed comprised an extension of present housing aids, chiefly administered by the Federal Housing Administration, with something new in the form of a loan fund for college housing.

The victory was mainly a defensive one and its margin was close but socialism has suffered a set-back. The taxpayers will not have to underwrite dream houses for people who can afford to finance their homes at the going rate.

In Search of Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all the Members of the House know of the views of the FBI on the question of security checks and clearances under the National Science Foundation bill. I should like to call to the attention of the Members the following editorial from yesterday's New York Times which is an excellent contribution to the debate which is raging about security measures:

IN SEARCH OF SECURITY

Two and one-half years ago the President's Committee on Civil Rights, under the chairmanship of Charles E. Wilson, drew attention to two possible dangers in any governmental loyalty program. One was that "the standards by which the loyalty of an individual or an organization is to be determined may not be clearly defined." The other was that "the procedure by which the loyalty of accused Federal employes is determined may not accord with our traditions of due process of law." We do not believe these dangers have been avoided under the pending Federal loyalty program. The antics of Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, in his current attack on the State Department have been prominent in the news. But behind the McCarthy episode is the difficult question, bound to be long-enduring in this time of cold war, as to how we can be wholly secure.

How difficult this question is can be seen from the current controversy over the House amendments to the National Science Foundation bill. One of these amendments would give the FBI authority to pass on the loyalty of candidates for Foundation employment of scholarships. The FBI, correctly foreseeing that such a measure would be a long step toward a "police state," does not want this authority. Unless we desire to turn our governmental employees into a set of identical wooden Indians, made to order for the purpose, we had better steer clear of this particular trap.

There can be no question that Russia will put her spies into the so-called sensitive departments of government if she can. In a few cases, in Canada and Britain as well as here, she apparently has done this. So long as our safety depends on keeping certain secrets we must do all we can to frustrate such spies. We must also do all we can to eliminate "poor security risks" who may not be consciously disloyal but who for one reason or another allow information to leak out to people who should not have it. It seems doubtful, after the experience we have had so far with the loyalty program, that the skilled, professional spy can be caught by any such network. Such a professional, for example, is not likely to join Communist-front organizations. He will probably present a seemingly flawless record and an unimpeachably respectable aspect. We have to keep an eye out for him—or her. But we cannot eliminate the spy by setting up foolish and unworkable standards of association or by turning a Congressional committee room into a circus for the display of private animus or personal lust for publicity. Surely this great Nation, fertile in political as well as scientific inventiveness, can do better than that.

If we cannot do better, if every Federal appointee to any important office is tried like a suspected criminal before he takes up his work and is thereafter likely at any moment to be assailed and denounced like an escaped convict, what sort of persons may we expect to have in public employment? Certainly they will not be the courageous, plain-spoken and intelligent men and women whom the urgency of our times demands. They are more likely to be weak mediocrities whose principal concern, like that of the minor functionary in far-away Russia, is to keep out of trouble. And democracy will become a pitiful mockery if its affairs are administered by people whose loftiest ambition is to make no mistakes.

There is a security inherent in democracy itself which may be lost, if we lose faith in free institutions. There is a security in the existence of intelligent men and women willing to make their own moral and intellectual decisions and abide by the consequences. There is a security in the fact that such men and women will not permit any agency of government, executive or legislative, to dictate such decisions to them. There is a security in the faith that does not shiver at every shadow or at the whistle of every wind. We must certainly devise a machinery, if we can, that will keep our essential secrets safe, but it would be far better for a few secrets to leak out than for this Nation to imitate the Communist of Fascist pattern and suppress, in the private citizen or the officeholder, the right of private conscience.

A Misguided Economist

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. POLK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday, March 13, our colleague, Mr. WOODRUFF, of Michigan, criticized President Truman's facilities for travel, vacationing, and entertaining. These criticisms have been completely and conclusively answered by a young Ohio newspaperwoman, Miss Jean Roberts, editor of the Clermont Sun, of Batavia, Ohio.

On March 16, 1950, Miss Roberts wrote an editorial entitled "A Misguided Economist," which is as follows:

A MISGUIDED ECONOMIST

(By Jean Roberts)

There are several Republican Congressmen in Washington whose screams of economy have turned them to attacking President Truman and some of the accoutrements of his office he holds.

Representative WOODRUFF, of Michigan, says that Truman is probably the best-paid man in the world, and seems to be complaining of the fact. Undoubtedly this same gentleman, in pointing out the glories of the democratic way of life, has stated that the American people are the best paid in the world. But he seems to draw the line at our top official having the same privilege.

In addition to the Presidential salary, he objects to the Presidential yacht, pullman car, automobiles, and planes. What he fails to mention, however, is that these are not the personal property of Harry S. Truman, private citizen, but Harry S. Truman, President, for only so long as he holds that office. He will not be taking all of them back home to Missouri when a new man takes his place.

Because of his position, any President is more or less required to have all of these things. A special vacation hideaway, as Representative Woodruff terms it, is necessary to the Chief Executive because of the insatiable curiosity of all Americans. You and I and John Doe next door can take our few days or week's vacation anywhere, and no one but our close friends are interested or concerned. What rest would President Truman get if he attempted to get a few days of much-needed rest at any of the more common vacation spots? Autograph hunters, newspaper and magazine reporters and photographers, crackpots with all sorts of ideas for solving the world situation, job seekers, politicians, and just plain citizens would be crowding around him all the time, requesting this, asking that, and demanding the other. Who could rest under such an atmosphere?

What happens when the President has a hurry-up call for a conference in some far-off spot in the world, or even in this country? A private plane, in this age of speed, is the only answer, not only for himself but for the use of members of his staff as well. A private pullman car is equally necessary, for both afford the privacy that is so vital to any serious undertaking.

A fleet of automobiles answers the same purpose for shorter trips. Since few Presidential decisions are made by the Chief Executive alone, he needs numerous vehicles to carry the people with whom he must constantly confer—Cabinet members, advisers, Congressmen, Secret Service men are always in attendance, and after the assassination of such Presidents as Lincoln and McKinley, and the attacks on many others, including Roosevelt, few can deny that their protection is needed.

For many, many years it has been a major complaint in America that that salary for high offices is so meager that the caliber of men so badly required are not attracted. They can do far better for themselves in private business, and not be open to the constant criticism and ridicule that accompany public office. President Roosevelt's death was more or less directly the cause of the position he held and the tremendous pressure of work. Who can say that a yearly salary of $110,000 was too much in such a case? Would you settile for a mediocre man who would be willing to work for less?

Congressmen recently voted themselves a raise in salary, feeling that they were underpaid for the work they did. Like the President, much of their entertaining and other expenses came out of their own salaries, most of them necessary expenses that could be cut only slightly. Public relations is vital for anyone in the public eye, and one good form of public relations is entertainment of visiting firemen, whether they come from your own voting district or State, or from another country.

A reduction of expenses made by cutting the Presidential salary, or whittling down the staff he maintains, or his transportation, would be merely a drop in the bucket. It strikes us that Representative WOODRUFF could accomplish much more if he would

attempt to talk some of his fellow Congressmen out of their pet projects instead. The consensus of opinion of Capitol Hill seems to be, "By all means let's put some economy measures into effect, but we can't possibly sacrifice the new Federal project in Podunk Center, I might lose a few votes there because some jobs would be lost. Let's abolish the construction in the neighboring State instead."

Less logrolling and more long-range thinking could accomplish wonders.

Matthew Connelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item, relating to the presence at the centennial banquet of Presidential Secretary Matthew Connelly, illustrates in some degree the high regard and real pride with which the people of his home town look upon Matt.

That he should have taken time out of such a very busy life to attend its centennial banquet will long be remembered by the people of Clinton.

OUTSTANDING FEATURE OF CENTENNIAL BANQUET WAS SECRETARY CONNELLY'S PRESENCE AT THE BIG EVENT

One of the outstanding features of the centennial banquet still being generally commented upon around town was the presence of Presidential Secretary Matthew J. Connelly.

Everyone in Clinton, especially officials of the centennial committee, were extremely appreciative of his attendance.

Secretary Connelly was hoping that his heavy responsibilities, in Washington, would permit him to get away for the Clinton event. President Truman's sojourn, in the South, apparently gave him the opportunity he was seeking.

Instead of taking the sea trip from Washington to Key West, Secretary Connelly came Clinton way post haste, thereby gracing the banquet table with the presence of a loyal Clinton boy very highly esteemed here and thus, from his standpoint, avoiding the seasickness pills and even more uncomfortable characteristics of the presidential cruise to Florida.

Because of his frequent talk about his home town, Clinton is often the subject matter of discussion and banter among the White House staff and in close Presidential circles.

On the night of the banquet, too late to be mentioned, a telegram was received from Washington pointing up Matt's presence in Clinton and concluding "Connelly for President."

After leaving here Wednesday, Secretary Connelly left Boston, by air, for Washington, to attend some businesses briefly at the White House and then took a plane for Key West, where he arrived in time to greet the Presidential party as it disembarked from its memorable trip through the storm-tossed seas off Cape Hatteras and other Southern waters, this morning. When the President and the boys saw Matt greeting them at the dock, somebody's face was red. And it wasn't Matt's.

Truly his presence here was a fine demonstration of his warm feeling for the old home town and was deeply appreciated by all. When he returns, in June, it is hoped he can persuade President Truman to come with him. A warm welcome awaits the President.

Food Is America's Greatest Bargain—To Further Reduce Farm Prices Endangers Our Country's Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, at the last session of this House during the week just passed we discussed a bill to correct certain inequities in existing acreage allotments for cotton and peanuts. Although this bill did not involve the problem of price support for agricultural products except in an indirect manner, certain representatives of urban constituencies took advantage of the occasion to renew their insinuations that American farmers are enjoying unwarranted and unfair prosperity at the expense of American consumers.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the record. What are the facts?

Fact No. 1 is that food is relatively cheaper here than elsewhere in the world. Nowhere else in the world today can an industrial or office worker supply his family with such abundant and nutritious food for so small a percent of his weekly wage or for so few hours of his labor. In this connection, I submit the following tabulation prepared by the United States Department of Labor and published in the November 1949 issue of Labor Review, volume 6, No. 5:

Minutes of working time required to buy 1 pound of food (or 1 dozen eggs)

	Flour	Rice	Bread	Beef ex-tongue	Ham	Fish	Butter	Cheese	Milk	Eggs	Apples	Potatoes	Coffee	Tea	Lard	Oleo	Sugar
United States	4	8	8	30	38	19	32	30	9	37	7	2	33	48	3	14	4
Australia	8		5	33			34	35	10	52		4		43			8
Austria	15	37	14	92			104	120	33	204		12	300	630	108	65	30
Canada	4		6	42			45	30	9	33		2	30	54	21		4
Chile	12	19	18				162	108	28	153		6	66	261	132		15
Czechoslovakia:																	
Official	8	14	7	34	93		118	22	14	123	35	3	167	290	73	81	22
Black market	35	300	15	300	330		800	51	41	472	55	3	1,900	1,800	600	411	100
Denmark	6		11	63		14	86	36	8	108	9	2	57	141		30	4
Finland	9		5		78	32	108	78	12	108		2	234		60	78	26
France	25	60	10		80	41	140	122	23	156		3	124		96	78	27
Germany	17		8				120	85		204	51	4	800			37	27
Great Britain	5	17	5		44		34	25	36	51		3	78	77	22	11	19
Hungary	7	30	8	70			220	105	26	180		4			180	64	30
Ireland	7		8	77		46	47	60	20	170		4		87	18	27	11
Israel	10	12	6	78		60	41	32	22	77	19	5				31	8
Italy	33	31	17	136	300	78	222	181	26	112		6	197		180		46
Norway	6	22	5	41		15	61	25	10	79		3	80	122		10	6
Sweden	8		11	55	65	19	36	36	8	55	36	3	62			19	9
Switzerland	19	21	7		118		120	36	12	93	9	4	96	186	63		12
U. S. S. R.	32	145	26	254		254	643		50	158	111	6	700	1,300			111

To me, these facts prove conclusively that the American farmer is providing the American people with the lowest-cost food on earth.

As for the percentage of national income spent on food, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has this morning advised me that, according to their latest calculations, the people of the United States spend about 22 percent of their national income for food, outside of restaurants, and of this 22 percent the farmers get only about one-half, or 11 percent. At the same time, the people of Great Britain spend about 27 percent of their income for food, and the people of France spend approximately one-third of their income. There are no figures for countries like India and Haiti, but the percentage must approach two-thirds of their national income. Surely, in view of these facts, one cannot very seriously argue that American farmers are taking an unfair advantage of their city brothers or that they are enjoying an unfair share of our national income.

In fact, in 1949 the average net farm income, including the net return to the great corporate farms of California, including the income of the pullman car wheat barons and cattle raisers of the Plains, including the income of cotton plantations of the Delta, and including the income of the corn and livestock growers of the Middle West was only $1,765 per individual, including owner, renter, and day laborer, who actually worked in agricultural production, as compared with an average income of $3,250 per year wage paid to the men who work in the Ford plant.

Fact No. 2 is that farm income has dropped materially. In spite of the statement on this floor by a distinguished representative from one of our greatest cities that, "Food prices have just about doubled, whereas all other prices have not," the price of food over the past 2 years, the period then under discussion, has not only not "just about doubled." On the contrary, it has gone

down—probably it has gone down further and faster than the price of any other major item in the family budget.

From the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, I learn that the farm price of all foods dropped 30 percent during the years 1948 and 1949. The total drop in net farm income during this period was 24 percent. It would have been much larger had a kindly Providence not blessed our land with especially bountiful harvests during this period. If the critics of our farmers object to a discussion of the farm price of food and suggest that their quarrel is with retail prices in the large cities, I would suggest that in the spirit of fair play, it might be interesting to note who gets the consumer's dollar. The man who delivers milk in the city of New York charges 30 cents per quart. The New York farmer who produced that milk got 10 cents at his milk room, and the man who produces similar milk in Wisconsin gets only 6.7 cents per quart. I am advised that the delivery costs within the city itself are actually greater than the Wisconsin farmer's entire return on his investment and his labor combined. Need I cite other cases? They all show that the man who works with a food for only a few minutes takes more for his labor from the consumer than the farmer who has spent hours producing the same food. Most of these costs go for the physical handling or processing of the foods, as distinguished from the profits of retailers, and most of these costs are paid to urban people. In other words, a large part of the retail cost of food in our large cities is paid to the residents of those cities, not to the farmers.

Fact No. 3 is that the price of food has declined and is still declining. During the recent debate there were some unfair intimations that the price of food was rising and that the acreage adjustment legislation then under consideration would in some unexplained manner further raise the price of food. The very day this discussion took place, the Washington Star carried an advertisement of a large retail grocery institution comparing many present day prices with their prices of last year. The next morning the Washington Post carried a similar advertisement. I know of no more conclusive answer to the question of whether food prices are advancing or declining in urban centers than the actual offers to sell—here they are as shown by an actual ad in the Washington Post:

	Price Mar. 16, 1949	Today's price
Evaporated milk:		
Cherub, 14½-ounce can	4 cans 49 cents	4 cans 45 cents.
Borden's, 14½-ounce can	3 cans 27 cents	4 cans 45 cents.
Carnation, 14½-ounce can	do	Do.
Pet, 14½-ounce can	do	Do.
Baker Rods, 22-ounce package	Package 30 cents	Package 26 cents.
Ivory Flakes, 12½-ounce package	do	Do.
Ivory Snow, 12½-ounce package	do	Do.
Lux Flakes, 12½-ounce package	do	Do.
Tide, 24-ounce package	do	Do.
Rinso, 24-ounce package	do	Do.
Fab, 16-ounce package	do	Do.
Tide, 12½-ounce package	do	Do.
Dreft, 12-ounce package	Package 29 cents	Do.
Vel, 12-ounce package	do	Do.
Swan soap:		
Medium	2 cakes 19 cents	3 cakes 23 cents.
Large	Cake 10 cents	2 cakes 25 cents.
Fels Naptha soap	3 cakes 25 cents	Cake 7 cents.
F. & G. soap, laundry	do	2 cakes 20 cents.
Ivory soap:		
Medium	2 cakes 19 cents	1 cake 21 cents.
Large	Cake 10 cents	1 cake 25 cents.
Sweetheart, soap:		
Regular	2 cakes 17 cents	1 cake 22 cents.
Bath	Cake 13 cents	1 cake 21 cents.
Palmolive soap:		
Regular	2 cakes 17 cents	1 cake 22 cents.
Bath	Cake 13 cents	1 cake 21 cents.
Lifebuoy soap	2 cakes 17 cents	2 cakes 22 cents.
Camay soap, regular	do	4 cakes 25 cents.
Lux soap, regular	do	3 cakes 22 cents.
Ivory soap, personal	4 cakes 25 cents	4 cakes 19 cents.
Cashmere Bouquet soap	Cake 9 cents	2 cakes 22 cents.
Lux soap, bath	Cake 13 cents	2 cakes 21 cents.
Camay soap, bath	Cake 13 cents	1 cake 21 cents.
Pork and beans, Heinz, 16-ounce can	2 cans 31 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Heinz vegetarian beans, 14-ounce can	2 cans 31 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Bitter's Pork and Beans, 15½-ounce jar	3 jars 29 cents	2 jars 23 cents.
Beans, Badger Kidney, 20-ounce can	2 cans 25 cents	1 can 23 cents.
Tomatoes:		
Gardenvale, 19-ounce can	2 cans 25 cents	2 cans 23 cents.
Hardesdale, 2-ounce can	Can 19 cents	2 cans 33 cents.
Highway, 19-ounce can	2 cans 29 cents	2 cans 27 cents.
Silver Run, 19-ounce can	2 cans 25 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Tomato juice, Del Monte, 46-ounce can	Can 27 cents	Can 25 cents.
Syrup, Cary Maple, 12-ounce bottle	Bottle 60 cents	Bottle 58 cents.
Napkins, Grace Dinner, package of 60	Package 21 cents	1 package 21 cents.
Towels, Hudson, package	1 package 29 cents	1 package 27 cents.
Corn, Del Monte White Cream, 17-ounce can.	2 cans 37 cents	2 cans 31 cents.
Flour:		
Aunt Jemima pancake, 40-ounce package.	Package 33 cents	Package 29 cents.
Pillsbury pancake, 20-ounce package	Package 17 cents	Package 15 cents.
Pillsbury pancake, 40-ounce package	Package 31 cents	Package 29 cents.
Suzanne pancake, 20-ounce package	1 package 27 cents	2 packages 26 cents.
Bisquick:		
Twenty-ounce package	Package 26 cents	Package 25 cents.
40-ounce package	Package 47 cents	Package 43 cents.
Cake mix, Betty Crocker ginger, 16½-ounce package.	Package 29 cents	Package 27 cents.
Sauer waffels, Dutch Maid, 8-ounce package.	Package 19 cents	Package 17 cents.
Hydrox, Sunshine, 7¼-ounce package	Package 25 cents	Package 23 cents.
Pretzels, Beckman, 6-ounce package	Package 19 cents	Package 17 cents.
Devil food squares, F. F. V., 6-ounce package.	Package 27 cents	Package 25 cents.
Kremos, Educator chocolate cookies, 8½-ounce package.	Package 21 cents	Package 20 cents.
Cookies, Weston butterscotch, 8-ounce package.	Package 21 cents	Package 19 cents.
Book matches, carton	Carton 17 cents	1 carton 28 cents.
Reynolds foil wrap, 25-foot roll	Package 31 cents	Package 25 cents.
Calsoap, Bobbie's, 14-ounce bottle	Bottle 16 cents	Bottle 14 cents.
Corn meal:		
Indian Head, 2-pound package	Package 15 cents	Package 14 cents.
Mammy Lou, yellow, 20-ounce package.	Package 17 cents	Package 17 cents.

	Price Mar. 16, 1949	Today's price
Flour, Harvest Blossom, 5-pound bag	Bag 38 cents	Bag 37 cents.
Macaroni:		
Mueller's, 8-ounce package	2 packages 29 cents	2 packages 21 cents.
Mueller's elbow, 8-ounce package	do	Do.
Spaghetti:		
Mueller's, 8-ounce package	do	Do.
Mueller's thin, 8-ounce package	do	Do.
Noodles:		
Mueller's fine, 8-ounce package	2 packages 27 cents	2 packages 25 cents.
Mueller's wide, 8-ounce package	do	Do.
Macaroni, Mueller's elbow, 16-ounce package	2 packages 36 cents	2 packages 31 cents.
Spaghetti, Mueller's thin, 16-ounce package.	2 16-ounce packages 35 cents	Do.
Noodles, Mueller's wide, 12-ounce package.	Package 21 cents	Package 20 cents.
Hormel's Spam, 12-ounce can	Can 45 cents	Can 39 cents.
Swift's Prem, 12-ounce can	Can 43 cents	Do.
Corned beef, Angle, 12-ounce can	Can 47 cents	Can 43 cents.
Libby's corned-beef hash, 16-ounce can	Can 35 cents	Can 34 cents.
Armour's potted meat, 5½-ounce can	2 cans 29 cents	2 cans 27 cents.
Libby's:		
Potted meat, 5½-ounce can	2 cans 29 cents	2 cans 27 cents.
Deviled ham, 3-ounce can	3 cans 37 cents	2 cans 35 cents.
Armour's Dried Beef, 2½-ounce glass	Glass 33 cents	Glass 31 cents.
Armour's Treet, 12-ounce can	Can 43 cents	Can 39 cents.
Wieners, Oscar Mayer, 12-ounce can	Can 49 cents	Can 47 cents.
Chicken, R. & R. boned, 5-ounce can	Can 79 cents	Can 75 cents.
Hamburgers, Claridge, 16-ounce can	Can 57 cents	Can 49 cents.
Mushrooms, Brandywine Button, 4-ounce can.	Can 30 cents	Can 37 cents.
Olive oil:		
Pompeian, 3-ounce bottle	Bottle 15 cents	Bottle 11 cents.
Pompeian, 4-ounce bottle	Bottle 27 cents	Bottle 18 cents.
Pompeian, 8-ounce bottle	Bottle 52 cents	Bottle 35 cents.
Wesson oil, 16-ounce bottle	Bottle 35 cents	Bottle 33 cents.
Pineapple, Dole crushed, 9-ounce can	2 cans 31 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Noodle soup, Lipton's mix, package	Package 33 cents	Package 27 cents.
Apple juice, Mott's, 32-ounce bottle	Bottle 23 cents	Bottle 29 cents.
Juice:		
Del Monte pineapple, 18-ounce can	2 cans 33 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Del Monte pineapple, 46-ounce can	Can 36 cents	Can 35 cents.
Dole pineapple, 46-ounce can	do	Do.
Honey, Lake Shore, 16-ounce bottle	Bottle 33 cents	Bottle 31 cents.
Clothespins, Ideal, package of 30	Package 15 cents	2 packages 25 cents.
Catsup, Del Monte, 14-ounce bottle	Bottle 19 cents	Bottle 17 cents.
Kidney beans, S. Hills Red, pound package.	Package 17 cents	Package 15 cents.
Salmon:		
Prince Leo Pink, 16-ounce can	Can 57 cents	Can 35 cents.
Gold Cove Chum, 16-ounce can	Can 49 cents	Can 45 cents.
Sardines:		
Tempest Oil, 3¼-ounce can	2 cans 21 cents	2 cans 19 cents.
Star Boat Natural, 15-ounce can	Can 19 cents	2 cans 27 cents.
Star Boat Tomato Sauce, 15-ounce can.	Can 23 cents	Can 17 cents.
Tuna fish:		
White Star Light Meat, 7-ounce can	Can 41 cents	Can 39 cents.
Bumble Bee White Meat, 7-ounce can.	Can 55 cents	Can 43 cents.
Star Kist Grated, 6½-ounce can	Can 37 cents	Can 33 cents.
White Star Grated, 6½-ounce can	Can 37 cents	Can 33 cents.
Star Kist Light Meat, 7-ounce can	Can 41 cents	Can 39 cents.
Mackerel, Gorton's Salt Fillets, 12-ounce can.	Can 31 cents	Can 27 cents.
Herring, Plum Point, 15-ounce can	Can 17 cents	Can 13 cents.
Codfish Cakes, Gorton's, 10-ounce can	Can 23 cents	2 cans 35 cents.
Broth, R. & R. Chicken, 13½-ounce can	2 cans 31 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Beef soup, Heinz, with vegetable 10¾-ounce can.	2 cans 37 cents	2 cans 35 cents.
Soup:		
Heinz chicken noodle, 10¾-ounce can	do	Do.
Heinz tomato, 11-ounce can	3 cans 35 cents	3 cans 32 cents.
Heinz vegetable, 11-ounce can	2 cans 29 cents	2 cans 25 cents.
Heinz mushroom, 11-ounce can	2 cans 37 cents	2 cans 33 cents.
Heinz chicken, 10¾-ounce can	do	Do.
Shortening, Crisco, 3-pound can	Can 99 cents	Can 79 cents.
Nectar, Highway apricot, 12-ounce can	2 cans 21 cents	2 cans 21 cents.
Vinegar:		
Old Mill, pint bottle	Bottle 10 cents	Bottle 9 cents

	Price Mar. 16, 1949	Today's price
Vinegar—Continued		
Old Mill, quart bottle	Bottle 18 cents	Quart 17 cents.
Old Mill, ½ gallon	Jug 35 cents	Jug 33 cents.
Old Mill, gallon	Jug 65 cents	Jug 59 cents.
Old Mill, white, pint bottle	Bottle 9 cents	Bottle 8 cents.
Shortening:		
Royal Satin, pound can	Can 31 cents	Can 25 cents.
Royal Satin, 3-pound can	Can 85 cents	Can 69 cents.
Spry, pound can	Can 35 cents	Can 29 cents.
Spry, 3-pound can	Can 99 cents	Can 79 cents.
Crisco, pound can	Can 35 cents	Can 29 cents.
Olives:		
Grandee Giant Queen Thrown, 19¾-ounce jar.	Jar 3 cents	Jar 49 cents.
Grandee Queen, 4½-ounce glass	Glass 27 cents	Glass 25 cents.
Grandee Stuffed Manz, 4½-ounce glass.	Quart 35 cents	Glass 33 cents.
Grandee Spanish Stuffed, 6-ounce glass.	Glass 55 cents	Glass 4 cents.
Grandee Spanish Stuffed, 3-ounce glass.	Glass 31 cents	Glass 25 cents.
Jelly, Schimmel's Currant, 12-ounce glass	Glass 27 cents	Glass 25 cents.
Preserves, Schimmel's Pineapple, 16-glass.	Glass 31 cents	Glass 29 cents.
Marmalade, Chivor's Old English, 16-ounce glass.	Glass 30 cents	Glass 29 cents.
Morsels, Nestle's, 6-ounce package	Package 23 cents	Package 19 cents.
Flour:		
Aunt Jemima Buckwheat, 20-ounce package.	Package 18 cents	Package 16 cents.
Aunt Jemima Buckwheat, 40-ounce package.	Package 35 cents	Package 31 cents.
Aunt Jemima Pancake, 20-ounce package.	2 packages 35 cents	Package 15 cents.
Corn meal, Indian Head, 10-pound bag	Bag 63 cents	Bag 57 cents.
Juice, Del Monte Tomato, 18-ounce can	2 cans 25 cents	2 cans 23 cents.
Corn:		
Del Monte Golden Bantam, cream style, 17-ounce can.	2 cans 33 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Country Home W. K. Golden Bantam, 12-ounce can.	3 cans 31 cents	2 cans 27 cents.
Del Monte W. K. Golden Bantam, 12-ounce can.	2 cans 35 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Highway G. B., cream style, 20-ounce can.	2 cans 29 cents	Can 19 cents.
Niblets corn, 12-ounce can	2 cans 33 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Niblets, Mexicorn, 12-ounce can	2 cans 30 cents	2 cans 25 cents.
Corn, Mitchell shoe peg, 20-ounce can	2 cans 37 cents	2 cans 31 cents.
Green beans, Brigade cut, 20-ounce can	Can 29 cents	2 cans 39 cents.
Beans, Gardenside, cut green, 19-ounce can.	2 cans 27 cents	2 cans 31 cents.
Lima beans, Highway G. & W., 20-ounce can.	Can 23 cents	Can 15 cents.
Butterbeans, Seaside, 20-ounce can	2 cans 31 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Limagrands, Superfine, 20-ounce can	Can 17 cents	2 cans 27 cents.
Spinach:		
Emerald Bay, 27-ounce can	Can 19 cents	2 cans 31 cents.
Emerald Bay, 18-ounce can	2 cans 29 cents	2 cans 25 cents.
Hominy, Van Camp's, 29-ounce can	Can 15 cents	2 cans 27 cents.
Sauerkraut:		
Libby's, 19-ounce can	2 cans 23 cents	2 cans 21 cents.
Libby's, 29-ounce can	2 cans 29 cents	2 cans 27 cents.
Green Giant peas, 17-ounce can	2 cans 41 cents	2 cans 39 cents.
Potato sticks, O & C, 2¼-ounce can	2 cans 33 cents	2 cans 31 cents.
Potatoes, Dulany Irish, 19-ounce can	2 cans 25 cents	2 cans 23 cents.
Kraft macaroni dinner, 7½-ounce package.	Package 15 cents	Package 14 cents.
Apricots:		
Valley Gold, halves unpeeled, 30-ounce can.	Can 31 cents	Can 25 cents.
Del Monte, halves unpeeled, 17-ounce can.	2 cans 43 cents	2 cans 39 cents.
Sauce, Ocean Spray cranberry, 16-ounce can.	2 cans 32 cents	2 cans 31 cents.
Cherries:		
Del Monte dark sweet, 17-ounce can	Can 37 cents	Can 29 cents.
Del Monte light sweet, 17-ounce can.	Can 37 cents	Can 29 cents.
Fruit cocktail:		
Hostess Delight, 20-ounce can	Can 36 cents	Can 31 cents.
Del Monte, 17-ounce can	2 cans 45 cents	2 cans 39 cents.
Del Monte, 30-ounce can	Can 37 cents	Can 33 cents.
Del Monte fruits for salad, 20-ounce jar	Jar 49 cents	Jar 45 cents.
Peaches:		
Del Monte YC, halves or sliced, 29-ounce can.	Can 33 cents	2 cans 47 cents.
Del Monte yellow clingstone sliced, 1¾-ounce can.	Can 21 cents	2 cans 25 cents.
Del Monte yellow freestone halves, 29-ounce can.	Can 41 cents	Can 37 cents.
Castle Crest sliced or halves, 29-ounce can.	Can 31 cents	2 cans 45 cents.
Highway sliced or halves, 29-ounce can.	Can 29 cents	2 cans 39 cents.
Pears:		
Del Monte Bartlett halves, 29-ounce can.	Can 45 cents	Can 41 cents.
Harper House Bartlett halves, 29-ounce can.	Can 44 cents	Can 31 cents.
Pineapple, Dole crushed, 20-ounce can	Can 29 cents	2 cans 51 cents.
Prunes, Del Monte prepared, 29-ounce jar.	Jar 31 cents	Jar 27 cents.
White Rice:		
Show Boat Zenith, pound package	Package 15 cents	Package 13 cents.
Show Boat Zenith, 2-pound package	Package 29 cents	Package 25 cents.
Show Boat Long Grain, pound package.	Package 19 cents	Package 15 cents.
Show Boat Long Grain, 2-pound package.	Package 37 cents	Package 29 cents.

	Price Mar. 16, 1949	Today's price
Lima Beans:		
Sunny Hills large, pound package	Package 27 cents	Package 16 cents.
Sunny Hills large, 2-pound package	Package 53 cents	Package 31 cents.
Sunny Hills baby, pound package	Package 16 cents	Package 15 cents.
Sunny Hills baby, 2-pound package	Package 30 cents	Package 29 cents.
Navy beans, Sunny Hills, pound package	Package 15 cents	Package 14 cents.
Split peas, Sunny Hills green, pound package.	do	Package 13 cents.
Wesson oil, 32-ounce bottle	Bottle 60 cents	Bottle 61 cents.
Salad oil, Mayday, 16-ounce bottle	Bottle 32 cents	Bottle 31 cents.
Cherries:		
Maraschino, 8-ounce bottle	Bottle 27 cents	Bottle 25 cents.
Maraschino with stems, 8-ounce bottle.	Bottle 33 cents	Bottle 31 cents.
Heinz, Chili sauce, 12-ounce bottle	Bottle 33 cents	Bottle 31 cents.
McCormick, Parsley flakes, ½-ounce can	Can 13 cents	Can 11 cents.
M. & M. candy, 7-ounce package	Package 22 cents	Package 21 cents.
Cheese:		
Dutch Mill American, 8-ounce package.	Package 28 cents	Package 26 cents.
Kraft American grated, 3-ounce can	Can 15 cents	Can 14 cents.
Kraft relish spread, 5-ounce glass	Glass 25 cents	Glass 21 cents.
Kraft pimiento spread, 5-ounce glass	Glass 25 cents	Glass 21 cents.
Kraft olive pimiento, 5-ounce glass	Glass 25 cents	Glass 21 cents.
Kraft pineapple spread, 5-ounce glass	Glass 25 cents	Glass 21 cents.
Kraft Old English spread, 5-ounce glass.	Glass 29 cents	Glass 25 cents.
Kraft Roka spread, 5-ounce glass	Glass 29 cents	Glass 25 cents.
Kraft smokelle spread, 5-ounce glass	Glass 29 cents	Glass 25 cents.
Kraft cheese and bacon spread, 5-ounce glass.	Glass 36 cents	Glass 35 cents.
Cheese food:		
Kraft Velveeta, 8-ounce package	Package 29 cents	Package 27 cents.
Fabst Ett, 6½-ounce package	Package 27 cents	Package 24 cents.
Mayonnaise:		
Nu Made, 8-ounce jar	Jar 38 cents	Jar 31 cents.
Nu Made, 16-ounce jar	Jar 43 cents	Jar 37 cents.
Piedmont, 16-ounce jar	Jar 37 cents	Jar 33 cents.
Piedmont, 32-ounce jar	Jar 59 cents	Jar 59 cents.
Dukes, 16-ounce jar	Jar 45 cents	Jar 39 cents.
McCormick, 16-ounce jar	Jar 39 cents	Jar 37 cents.
Kraft, 8-ounce jar	Jar 25 cents	Jar 22 cents.
Kraft, 16-ounce jar	Jar 45 cents	Jar 39 cents.
Duchess:		
Salad dressing, 8-ounce jar	Jar 35 cents	Jar 29 cents.
Salad dressing, 16-ounce jar	Jar 53 cents	Jar 46 cents.
Salad dressing, 32-ounce jar	Jar 89 cents	Jar 81 cents.
Miracle Whip:		
Kraft, 8-ounce jar	Jar 21 cents	Jar 20 cents.
Kraft, 16-ounce jar	Jar 35 cents	Jar 32 cents.
Cascade:		
Salad dressing, 16-ounce jar	Jar 37 cents	Jar 31 cents.
Salad dressing, 32-ounce jar	Jar 45 cents	Jar 35 cents.
Miracle Whip:		
Sandwich spread, 8-ounce jar	Jar 21 cents	Jar 20 cents.
Sandwich spread, 16-ounce jar	Jar 35 cents	Jar 32 cents.
Lunch box:		
Sandwich spread, 8-ounce jar	Jar 20 cents	Jar 19 cents.
Sandwich spread, 16-ounce jar	Jar 33 cents	Jar 30 cents.
Cheese, smoked Kaukauna, 6-ounce package.	Package 41 cents	Jar 35 cents.
Cream cheese, Kraft, Philadelphia, 8-ounce package.	Package 18 cents	2 packages 33 cents.
Cheese:		
Kaukauna plain American, 6-ounce package.	Package 41 cents	Package 35 cents.
Kaukauna garlic, 6-ounce package	Package 41 cents	Package 35 cents.
Raisins, Del Monte seeded, 15-ounce package.	Package 25 cents	Package 23 cents.
Margarine:		
Parkay, color quick, pound	Package 36 cents	Package 31 cents.
Oakwood, pound	Package 33 cents	Package 31 cents.
Blue Bonnet yellow quick, pound	Package 36 cents	Package 31 cents.
Mrs. Filbert's colored, pound	Package 45 cents	Package 39 cents.
Pure lard, pound	2 pounds 35 cents	2 pounds 29 cents.
Fluffo, pound	Package 35 cents	Package 27 cents.
Walnuts, Large Diamond, pound package.	Package 65 cents	Package 58 cents.
Eggs:		
Extra large grade A, Cream o' the Crop, dozen.	Dozen 65 cents	Dozen 53 cents.
Large grade A, Breakfast Gems, dozen.	Dozen 63 cents	Dozen 51 cents.
Cheese:		
Dutch Maid limburger, 8-ounce package.	Package 41 cents	Package 37 cents.
Borden's Roquefort, 1¼-ounce package.	Package 23 cents	Package 19 cents.
Borden's Roquefort, 3-ounce package	Package 45 cents	Package 39 cents.
Beans, with pork, Campbell's, 16-ounce can.	2 cans 25 cents	2 cans 23 cents.
Kidney beans, Van Camp's, 17-ounce can.	Can 16 cents	2 cans 25 cents.
Tomato juice, Del Monte, 18-ounce can	2 cans 25 cents	2 cans 23 cents.
Hominy, Banjou, 20-ounce can	2 cans 21 cents	2 cans 19 cents.
Spaghetti, Heinz Cooked, 15¼-ounce can	2 cans 21 cents	2 cans 19 cents.
Apricots, Del Monte, halves unpeeled, 29-ounce can.	Can 33 cents	Can 31 cents.
FROZEN FOODS		
Rolls, Clover Leaf, 10-ounce package	Package 25 cents	Package 21 cents.
Asparagus spears, Birds Eye, 12-ounce package.	Package 57 cents	Package 51 cents.
Lima beans:		
Birds Eye, baby, 12-ounce package	Package 51 cents	Package 31 cents.
Birds Eye, fordhook, 12-ounce package.	Package 41 cents	Package 33 cents.

	Price Mar. 18, 1940	Today's price
FROZEN FOODS—continued		
Lima beans—Continued		
Snow Crop, lowlands, 12-ounce package	Package 41 cents	Package 34 cents.
Green beans:		
Birds Eye, cut, 10-ounce package	Package 29 cents	2 packages 49 cents.
Birds Eye, french, 10-ounce package	Package 31 cents	Do.
Birds Eye, wax, 10-ounce package	Package 30 cents	Do.
Broccoli spears, Snow Crop, 10-ounce package	Package 47 cents	Package 39 cents.
Cauliflower, Snow Crop, 10-ounce package	Package 33 cents	Do.
Corn on cob, Snow Crop, 2 ears	Package 29 cents	Package 23 cents.
Cut corn, Birds Eye, 10-ounce package	Package 27 cents	Package 23 cents.
Birds Eye:		
Mixed vegetables, 12-ounce package	Package 31 cents	2 packages 49 cents.
Peas, 12-ounce package	2 packages 53 cents	Do.
Potatoes, Birds Eye, french fries, 10-ounce package	Package 31 cents	Do.
Spinach, Birds Eye, 14-ounce package	do	Do.
Succotash, Birds Eye, 11-ounce package	Package 30 cents	Package 25 cents.
SAFEWAY GUARANTEED MEATS		
Pork chops:		
Ends	Pound 45 cents	Pound 41 cents.
Center	Pound 45 cents	Pound 39 cents.
Pork roast:		
Whole or half loin	Pound 51 cents	Pound 47 cents.
Rib end up to 3 pounds	Pound 41 cents	Pound 33 cents.
Loin end up to 3 pounds	Pound 49 cents	Pound 39 cents.
Fresh picnics, whole, bone in	Pound 39 cents	Pound 33 cents.
Spareribs, small meaty	Pound 45 cents	Pound 39 cents.

	Price Mar. 18, 1940	Today's price
SAFEWAY GUARANTEED MEATS—con.		
Hams:		
Ready-to-eat, whole or shank half	Pound 65 cents	Pound 59 cents.
Smoked skinned, whole or shank half	Pound 63 cents	Pound 55 cents.
Picnics, regular smoked, whole—bone in	Pound 45 cents	Pound 39 cents.
Sliced bacon:		
Webster	Pound 45 cents	Pound 39 cents.
Swift's	Pound 73 cents	Pound 62 cents.
Sausage meat, Briggs' all-pork	Pound 37 cents	Pound 33 cents.
Frankfurters, Briggs' skinless	Pound 47 cents	Pound 43 cents.
SAFEWAY FARM-FRESH PRODUCE		
Apples:		
York's	2 pounds 25 cents	2 pounds 25 cents.
Western Winesaps	2 pounds 31 cents	2 pounds 25 cents.
Beets	2 bunches 25 cents	2 bunches 19 cents.
Cabbage, new	Pound 7 cents	Pound 5 cents.
Pascal celery	Pound 17 cents	Pound 9 cents.
White celery	Pound 13 cents	Pound 8 cents.
Chicory	Pound 19 cents	2 pounds 25 cents.
Cucumbers	Pound 29 cents	Pound 19 cents.
Cellophane kale	Package 19 cents	Package 17 cents.
Lettuce	Pound 21 cents	Pound 14 cents.
Onions, boiling	2 pounds 29 cents	2 pounds 25 cents.
Potatoes:		
Maine white	5 pounds 29 cents	2 pounds 9 cents.
Do	10-pound bag 55 cents.	10-pound bag 51 cents.
New white	5 pounds 35 cents	Pound 8 cents.
New York White	10-pound bag 51 cents.	10-pound bag 39 cents.
Squash, yellow	Pound 19 cents	Pound 15 cents.
Tomatoes, cellophane package	Package 25 cents	2 packages 29 cents.

In view of these facts, is there anyone who will still contend that food prices are rising? If food prices are not rising, how can agricultural income do anything but fall even faster than the volume of production falls? In view of the fact that many basic farm products are now under marketing quotas and many more are evidently soon going under such control, the total volume of production is surely headed downward. The peanut acreage allowed in my State this year, even with the extra adjustment granted by the House last week, is nearly 40 percent less than that actually planted 2 years ago. The cotton acreage in Texas in 1950 is approximately three-fourths what we grew in 1949. The same is true of other crops and of other States. Do the gentlemen from industrial areas believe that it is possible to thus drastically reduce the volume of agricultural production and at the same time further reduce the price of farm products and still maintain enough purchasing power on our farms to buy the products of their mills and their factories? Do these gentlemen believe that it will profit the worker for International Harvester, or General Motors, anything to bring the price of eggs down to 10 cents per dozen if in so doing they place that industrial worker in the ranks of the unemployed? Of course, there are those who will suggest that with such low food prices the family could live on unemployment insurance—to which the farmer must contribute but in which he does not share—or even on direct relief. Doubtless there are those who will look no further than this, but surely the Members of this House must know that our Nation cannot survive under such a policy. The fact is that the industrial worker cannot afford to allow farm income to drop much further.

Fact No. 4 is that farmers are not now maintaining their relative economic position. Farmers have never throughout the long history of the world enjoyed rewards for their labors which were equal to the rewards enjoyed by urban people. I referred to this discrepancy a moment ago when I called attention to the fact that the laborer in the Ford plant with no capital investment makes more per year than the average farmer gets both for his labor and as a return on his investment. When the comparison is placed on the basis of hourly income, the difference is even more striking. No one can say just exactly what hours a farmer works, or just what he produces for sale within a given hour. We cannot, therefore, be too certain as to the farmers' returns for an hour of labor. I am rather familiar with the methods of producing cotton. I realize that there has been some increase in the efficiency of production in recent years, but I know that any student of the problem would agree that one and one-half times the price per pound for cotton will reflect a very generous estimate of the return or wage per hour the farmer receives for his labor. The present parity price of cotton is just about 30 cents per pound; one and one-half times that amount is 45 cents. The market price is about 10 percent lower. Cotton has always been considered as one of the most profitable crops. Therefore, it cannot be contended that the farmers' average hourly wage exceeds 50 cents. How many of the urban consumers in whose behalf complaint is made earn as little as 50 cents per hour? Frankly, I don't believe that most of these people want our farmers to work for less—at least so long as city people continue to enjoy wage scales far in excess of this.

The truth is many urban workers are even today asking for more pay for shorter hours. Today the official publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Trainmen News, carries a banner headline reading, "Shorter Work Week Held Vital, No Pay Cut Either." It has been but a few days ago that the soft coal miners received a new and more favorable contract. A little earlier the steel workers got an increase. I am not raising the question of the justice of these increases, or of the righteousness of the demands of most Government employees that their wages be increased and their work be reduced, but I know and you know that all of these demands are, if granted, bound to be reflected in the cost of the things farmers buy. The truth is that while urban wages continue to climb, farm income is going down, and the difference between the purchasing power of the two groups widens. Actually, each group is dependent on the other for full markets. Both groups can sell freely and enjoy maximum prosperity only when both have sufficient income to buy freely. The maximum opportunity to exchange goods and services is evidently reached when farm prices are at parity. Parity may be difficult of exact definition. Doubtless, our existing legal formula results in some inaccurate determination, but it approaches as nearly to the exact as our imperfect knowledge enables us to approach. Are we then to excuse our failure to use the knowledge we have on the theory that if we cannot be perfect, we won't try to approach a fair relationship between the price of the things farmers buy and the price of things farmers sell?

To listen to the complaints of some of our colleagues one might think that they do not want our farmers to be able to buy the products of their own cities' shops. We hear violent protests, for instance, against the support price of eggs. Right now the farmers of central Texas are taking from 23 to 30 cents per dozen for their eggs. This is only 90 percent of parity adjusted—cut down—for time and place. Does the housewife of any city ask the farmer to take less than 23 cents for eggs? The truth is the support prices provided by our agricultural program do not hold the price of any food up to even a fair price. No feed is supported above 90 percent of a fair price. The farm price support program never has and does not now compel any consumer to pay more than a fair price for food. Any time the farm price gets above 90 percent of equality, the Government quits supporting that price. Any time the farmer is able to get above 90 percent of a fair price, it is due to causes other than the price support program. The program does help farmers get 90 percent of a fair price. It does not force any consumer to pay more than a fair price.

Do the city dwellers expect to be able to cut farm prices lower and keep enough farmers in business to enable them to always buy cheap food? Mr. Speaker, such a thought is twin brother to the ever recurrent but always disappointing belief on the part of some people that if we would but allow great trusts and monopolies to destroy all small business, the consumer would profit. Of course, he would enjoy the low prices resulting from the effort of the small-business man to compete with the monopoly, but as soon as the independent business is done in, the monopoly always raises the price higher than it was to begin with; and as soon as enough farmers are put out of business, the city worker is going to feel not only the added competition of the displaced farmer for his job, but he is going to find that the man who succeeded in staying on the farm will no longer sell his products at less than cost.

All our farmers ask is parity or equality in the price structure. I have never come before this House asking more. The so-called farm bloc, to which our distinguished colleague scornfully referred, asks for no more—but we do ask for justice. We do ask that we be allowed to continue to provide the market for industrial goods which is so essential to the welfare of our city people. We do ask the opportunity to continue to furnish the American people with the cheapest and best food yet available in this whole world. We do ask our city brothers not to pull the house down on all of us. We know all America can prosper together. We know no one segment of our society can long prosper at the expense of other segments. We know there is no such thing as the "free" lunch. We are ready to do a full day's intelligent work, but we don't like to be branded as leaches or Shylocks when we ask something short of a fair price for the products of that labor. We are willing to sell our produce for less if you are willing to sell the things we must buy for less. You set the wage and price pattern for the Nation. We are willing for you to set it high if you wish, but we insist that you cannot maintain high wages, high profits, and high industrial prices if you depress farm prices far below their present level.

Snooping Bureaucrats Versus Small Business

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "The Federal Snoopers Are After Me" has placed my home town of Downingtown, Pa., in the forefront of the news and has emphasized in graphic manner the extent to which the Federal Government has proceeded in its harassment of the small-business man. Robinson McIlvaine, the author of the article referred to, is the editor of the Downingtown Archive and, incidentally, is the great-grandson of Abraham Robinson McIlvaine, who represented our district in Congress from 1843 to 1849. In the Post story Mr. McIlvaine recites a set of circumstances which would be extremely funny were it not for the fact they recount the ends to which bureaucracy will go to coerce its own citizens into obedience to governmental directives which Congress certainly never anticipated when it passed the wage and hour law. The pay-off in the story is found in the editor's conclusion that in order to comply with the governmental ukase he will either have to borrow from his local bank the funds necessary to pay his own salary or face the alternative of suing himself and going through bankruptcy. Nationalization—brother, it is closer than you think. The following news item is taken from the Coatesville (Pa.) Record and explores in more detail the incidents leading to the Post story:

GOVERNMENT OBLIGES DOWNINGTOWN MAN TO PAY HIMSELF $562 BACK WAGES

An investigator for the Wages and Hours Division of the United States Department of Agriculture has just discovered that Robinson McIlvaine, editor of the Downingtown Archive, has violated the wages and hours law by not paying himself enough money.

Accordingly the Downingtown man has been ordered by the Labor Department to pay himself $562 back wages that his books show he owes himself. When McIlvaine pleaded that he did not have the money he was told to get it for the law must be served no matter how wacky it is interpreted.

As matters stand today, McIlvaine appears to have a choice of one or two ways out of his dilemma. He can go to the bank and borrow the money, pay himself and then put the money back in bank, but this will involve some interest expense. Or he can sue himself, get judgment, then go through bankruptcy proceedings.

Just how the Government investigator arrived at the amount of wages that McIlvaine owes himself is rather involved. It seems that the investigator spent many hours in the newspaper office going over the books. Under the law McIlvaine was supposed to pay himself a minimum of 40 cents an hour for 8 hours each day up to 40 hours a week and time and half time for all additional hours.

Considering the amount of time that McIlvaine spent working for himself he had underpaid himself to the extent of $562 at the minimum rate. The investigator also found that he had not complied with the law when he called a number of people to help him fold papers on press days, and he owed these people more than he had paid them for an hour or two of work once a week. But this matter was easily and quickly adjusted.

Ordinarily weekly newspapers with circulations under 4,000 copies are exempt from the provisions of the Wages and Hours Act, and because of this McIlvaine thought he was complying with the law. His troubles grew out of the fact that his newspaper and his printing plant are two different corporate entities and although he operates both his right hand is not supposed, according to Government investigators, to know what his left hand is doing.

He solved the paper folding problem by installing a folding machine and firing all of his part-time helpers who were quite satisfied to get some pin money for a few hours work each week. He is now trying to figure out how to solve his own problem by firing himself but he hasn't been able to come up with the answer yet.

According to reports the investigators are now busy going over the books of some other Downingtown industries with good prospects of making some more brilliant discoveries. Already it is said they made some discoveries in Kennett Square and Honey Brook that caused employers to feel the heavy hand of the law. And since the minimum wage has now been raised from 40 to 75 cents an hour there may be worse troubles ahead.

Electric Light and Power Companies Versus REA Loans

REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the big electric light and power companies have banded together and are on the march to destroy the rural electrification program. They are spending millions of dollars on radio programs and newspaper advertisements to spread misleading propaganda concerning the REA. The high-salaried executives of light and power companies have propagandized the public and have misinformed their employees and stockholders to believe that they will lose their employment or investments if the rural electrification program is successfully continued.

From the beginning of the development of our great country the farmer was the pioneer who cleared the wilderness and led the way for the cities and towns that followed. For many years the people living in cities have enjoyed modern conveniences provided by electricity. But the farmer and his family were compelled to continue to do without electricity and undergo the inconveniences and drudgery of the pioneer. Electric power companies could not make enough or as much profit in the rural areas because of the cost and distance of transmitting electricity to the farmer,

and their charges or rates were too high for the farmer's needs. Hence the rural areas were not served. For many years cities and towns have successfully owned and operated their own municipal light and power plants at great savings to the taxpaying citizens of such cities and towns. In the year of 1935 a similar plan was conceived to provide electricity for the farmers and rural areas. The Federal Government established the Rural Electrification Administration, generally known as the REA. Congress authorized this agency, the REA, to loan money to groups of farmers and people in the rural areas, who were not being served with electricity, and who organized and incorporated themselves into a legal company, generally known as electric co-ops, as and if authorized by State laws, for the purpose of generating and supplying electricity for their own use. Following the acts of the President and the Congress of the United States, the State Legislature of Missouri passed laws authorizing and controlling the incorporation of electric co-ops for the benefit of the farmers and the people residing in the rural areas who desired to provide and serve themselves with electricity.

The Rural Electrification Administration Act was enacted by Congress in the year of 1935 and it empowers the Administrator of the REA to make loans for the construction of power plants and transmission lines to serve rural areas. Before any loan is made to a rural REA cooperative, clear proof must be presented to show that the project will be self-liquidating, that there is need for the project, and that the Government will incur no loss. No loan is authorized for a project which would directly compete with any existing facilities, furthermore, the State and Federal laws so protect the private power companies.

You will recall the bitter opposition of the great power trusts against the beginning of the rural-electrification program in the years of 1935–36. The big power companies would not serve all the farmers and rural areas with electricity—but, like the dog in the manger, they did not want the farmers and the people in the rural areas to provide electricity for themselves. Why? They wanted to control and monopolize the supply of electricity and take "the cream of the business" by serving only a small percentage of the farmers in or near thickly populated areas. Neither did the power companies want the people to generally know that electricity could be produced and sold in sparsely settled rural areas at a price equal to or less than the power companies charged in the densely populated cities and towns.

Recently I have received numerous letters, the majority of which were from stockholders and employees of the Kansas City Light & Power Co. protesting against the REA loans to the Central Missouri Power Cooperative, of Missouri, and the Northwest Electric Power Cooperative, of Missouri, for construction of a steam electric power plant by each cooperative for generating electricity for sale and use by their members and consumers only. I know that the persons who wrote the letters complaining and opposing the REA loans for construction of the steam power plants, were and are sincere, but I firmly believe that they have been generally and specifically misinformed of the facts and misled into fright psychology by the power companies' use of the scare word "socialism." The letters complain against the false allegations that the taxpayers are paying for the steam plants; that the Kansas City Light & Power Co. paid taxes and the farmers' electric co-ops did not pay taxes; that the SPA transmission lines and rural cooperative steam plants would be a wasteful duplication of existing facilities owned by power companies; that the proposed steam plants would destroy free enterprise, and were socialistic.

I believe that the persons who wrote such letters to me will give my explanation and argument in favor of the REA loans as much unbiased consideration as they and others gave to the representations made by the executives and managers of the power and light companies, who, in fact, grossly misrepresented the facts with prejudicial propaganda to arouse feelings of opposition, which is in accord with the selfish propaganda program planned by the power trusts to control or destroy the rural electrification program.

I am not a stockholder nor an employee of a power and light company. I am not a stockholder nor an employee or member of a rural electric cooperative power and light company. Therefore, I have no selfish personal interests which could influence my judgment or opinion on the controversy between the power companies and the REA. I have carefully investigated and considered all of the facts surrounding and in connection with the power companies' fight against the REA. I will not straddle the fence on the issue, but will give you an honest answer and statement of my opinions and arguments concerning this controversy.

Almost everyone agrees that the farmers and people residing in the rural areas should have the opportunity of the advantages and conveniences provided and served by electricity. The farmer, especially, has as much or more use and practical need for electricity than most other people. He needs electricity not only for providing lights and conveniences for his home, barns, and storehouses, but he also needs electricity to provide power for his use in the many productive activities on the farm.

Now let us examine and consider some of the contentions and misrepresentations presented by the power companies, and being used as propaganda to prejudice the public against the REA program and the REA loans for the construction of the steam-generating plants which I have mentioned.

REA LOANS ARE NOT GIFTS AT THE EXPENSE OF TAXPAYERS

The loans by the REA for the construction of the two steam-power plants in Missouri, to be connected and integrated with the SPA's hydroelectric transmission lines to serve the farmers and rural areas, positively are not grants or gifts. The money is loaned by the REA to the Central Missouri Power Cooperative and the Northwest Electric Power Cooperative, both of Missouri, for construction of steam plants, and the loans will be repaid quarterly, with interest, and will not cost the taxpayers one cent. In connection with the subject of loans, I mention the activity of the RFC—Reconstruction Finance Corporation—a Federal finance agency, which was established and supported by the Federal Government. This agency was established during the period following the depression, and it loaned billions to big business corporations, such as banks, utilities, railroads, factories, and other business industries, to preserve our capitalistic system and encourage free, competitive enterprise. It was a worthy program of great benefit to the stability and resources of our country. But many of such big-business industries so saved and nourished back to health are now so strong and prosperous that they spread propaganda condemning and branding REA Government loans as socialism.

Again I emphatically state that the Rural Electrification Administration of the Federal Government loans the money to the farmers' electric cooperatives for the construction of the two steam-generating plants. They are sound loans and will be paid when the quarterly payments are due, with interest. Ninety-nine and nine-tenths percent of all installment payments due on the principal of all REA loans made in Missouri have been paid when due, and in addition, as of December 31, 1949, the farmers' electric cooperatives in Missouri have also paid all interest due on the loans, amounting to a total of $4,403,000. No bank has a better collection record, and no borrower has a better credit record of payments.

TAXES

The properties of the REA co-ops are taxable. The Federal Government does not have authority to exempt cooperative property from State or local taxes. It is true that the electric-power companies pay taxes into the treasury of the county wherein their property and transmission lines are located—so do you and every farmer and businessman in the county—but bear in mind that the electric-power company conducting business in your county also takes hundreds of thousands of dollars out of the county, too, in return for its services and electricity sold. There is nothing wrong about that—but no other business concern or industry demands or expects to monopolize all of a certain business because they pay their share of taxes. It is true that most of the REA co-ops do not pay income taxes because they have not and do not earn a net income profit. No person, corporation, or business concern, pays an income tax when they do not make or earn a profit or income over and above operating costs. However, generating plants, transmission lines, and all other properties owned by the REA co-ops are subject to taxation in Missouri to the same extent as any commercial power company. Such assessment, levy, and collection of taxes are provided for, controlled and executed by the laws and officials of the State of Missouri. Again, I emphatically reiterate and emphasize the fact that there is no law, State or Federal, which exempts the REA co-ops from payment of taxes, and they are subject to the laws of taxation to the same extent as any other property owner.

DUPLICATION OF ELECTRIC FACILITIES

The Federal Government, in its efforts and program to control floods, constructed flood-control dams in different sections of the country. Some of the dams are designed and equipped to generate electricity. Several years ago the Government constructed the Norfork Dam and the Bull Shoals Dam in Arkansas primarily for flood-control purposes, and in order not to waste the power and to liquidate and pay part of the costs of the construction of such flood-control dams, they were designed to also generate electricity. The Southwestern Power Administration, generally referred to as SPA, is an agency established by Congress for the purpose of constructing and operating transmission lines to transmit and sell the hydroelectric power, so developed, to REA cooperatives, municipal power and light plants, and commercial power and light companies.

It is generally admitted that additional generation and transmission facilities must be constructed if the growing electrical power needs are provided for. The rural-cooperative companies should have the right to construct those facilities which are necessary to properly serve their members. To do so cannot be considered a duplication of existing facilities any more than it would be a duplication to build a road where none exists, or to build a four-lane highway where an existing two-lane highway cannot carry the traffic.

Electrical engineers recommend and it is generally conceded that the greatest efficiency and economic benefits can be derived from hydroelectric power when integrated with steam plants, to firm the supply of electricity. The SPA's hydroelectric power is largely used to serve peak loads, and steam-electric power is utilized to serve part of the peak and much of the off-peak loads. Half, or less, of the SPA electric power will be firmed, the rest must be firmed up with fuel generating steam plants. The REA loan to the Central Missouri Power Cooperative, for the construction of a steam plant in Cole County, will be connected and integrated with the SPA transmission lines from the hydroelectric dams in Arkansas, and, likewise, the same arrangement is proposed in connection with the steam-generating plant to be constructed by the Northwest Electric Power Cooperative at Missouri City.

Power companies have always actively opposed the rural-electrification program and also definitely refused to contract with the SPA for use of the hydroelectric power from the Government dams in connection with their steam-generating plants to serve the rural electric cooperatives at their load centers. The power companies refused to do so even though they were offered a monopoly contract for the hydroelectric power from SPA—Southwestern Power Administration. Interchange of power and pooling of electric facilities arrangements are common practice and important devices widely used in the electric industry to reduce construction, reduce investment, operating expenses, and power costs. That is the proposed arrangement by and between the Southwestern Power Administration and the rural electric cooperatives of Missouri. As a result of this arrangement in the REA loans for the construction of the steam plants, thousands of farmers, still without electric service in the rural areas, especially in our Second Congressional District, will get electric service for the first time, and thousands already served by the rural electric co-ops will get better service at lower cost. That is the arrangement the big power companies object to—they want the rural electric cooperatives to be entirely dependent upon and at the mercy of the power companies for electric power. There is absolutely no reason or justification for singling out rural electric cooperatives and denying them the benefits and advantages of interchange of power and integration of such facilities arrangements, as practiced by the power companies.

And, again I reiterate that the rural electric cooperatives program of constructing two steam plants in Missouri, and the interchange of power and integration of facilities arrangements, by contract with the SPA—Southwestern Power Administration—will in no way whatsoever interfere or compete with the Kansas City Light & Power Co., or with any other commercial power company. As I have stated, Federal and State laws protect the power companies by prohibiting such interference or competition.

FREE ENTERPRISE AND SOCIALISM

We all agree on the principle and need for freedom of enterprise, but like the freedom of the individual, it should not be abused to injure the rights and free enterprise of others. I am unalterably in favor of free enterprise—not for just a privileged few—but an opportunity for honest free enterprise to all. The electric light and power corporations demand and are on a concerted march to monopolize free enterprise and to control all generation of electricity and the supply of electric light and power business. They are spending millions of dollars on radio programs and newspaper advertisements to propagandize and prejudice the public against the REA program. They and their high-salaried executives and lobbyists brand and condemn all efforts of the Federal Government to aid and raise the standard of living for the farmer and laboring man as socialism. They lobby and fight against the REA, farm price-support program, labor-union laws, unemployment insurance, old-age pensions, and other programs which have contributed so much to our economic stability. Yet they, the electric light and power corporations, have enjoyed special and privileged protection of a price-support program for many, many years. That price-support program for the power companies is provided for by State laws which, first, prohibits competition in any area served by the electric power companies; and second, establishes and enforces the collection rates and charges for electricity based upon investment and cost of operation to assure a substantial profit for the power companies. They are also empowered by law to condemn and appropriate private property for use in the operation of their business, and they use the public highways or road rights-of-way for erection of poles and transmission lines without payment for such valuable and specific use. Those are a few of the special privileges which the power companies enjoy, and I ask the electric power companies, Is that socialism, or is it free enterprise?

During the Coolidge and Hoover administrations the big electric light and power companies were entrenched with great power and authority—they were eating high up on the hog. They were not satisfied with a good profit and the many special privileges and monopolies they enjoyed, but were so greedy and grasping for money and political power that they formed and set up holding companies, sold stock to the innocent public for millions of dollars, then manipulated and exploited the companies, leaving the stockholder holding an empty sack. During that same period the electric power companies set up huge "slush funds" which they used to bribe and influence public officers and control elections. The Union Electric Co. of St. Louis, Mo., was one of such companies which had a big slush fund, amounting to several hundred thousand dollars, which was used by its executives and officers to elect and control State and county officers and to control courts and juries. Now, I ask the light and power companies was that free enterprise? However, that condition and practice was eliminated by laws passed by Congress known as the Corrupt Practices Act, and some of the light and power company executives who indulged in such infamous and fraudulent practice were indicted, convicted, and sentenced to the Federal penitentiary.

Many small towns and cities own and successfully operate their own municipal light and power plants at a great saving to the taxpayers of such towns and cities. I have never heard anyone refer to a municipal power and light plant as socialism. Why do the power companies attack a similar plan for rural light and power plants as socialism? In fact, no one ever referred to the REA program as being socialistic until the big electric light and power companies decided to move in to control and monopolize the source of supply of electricity for use in the rural areas. How would you, as a businessman, or as a member of any company or organization, like to be compelled to buy your supplies from one concern, and be deprived of the right to provide your own supplies or commodities, or the right to provide or buy such supply or commodity at the lowest price source available? The farmers and the people residing in rural areas were and are confronted with this situation. They are in a servitude position so far as the wholesale supply of electric power is available, because commercial power companies insist upon contracts, in the supply of electricity to the rural co-ops, which are

prohibitive and restrictive for resale and use of such electric power. In many cases, the power companies' suppliers imposed such restrictions on their sale of power to the farmers' co-ops which made it practically impossible for them to render full service in the rural areas. Thus, the power companies have exploited and abused their monopolized electric power supply so as to deprive the electric co-ops of electricity necessary to enable them to accomplish a real rural area coverage. In addition to the problem of adequate wholesale electric power supply in some rural areas, the high wholesale price or charge by the power companies for electric power has created difficult problems for the farmers' co-ops. As one example, the Boone County Electric Cooperative paid during the month of December 1949, 30.97 mills per kilowatt-hour for all power purchased from one commercial power company on two contracts operating on a 30-day cancellation clause. The records show that this cooperative is not only paying an exorbitant wholesale price, but adequate power is not available at any price. It is reliably estimated that the steam plants and integration of power facilities' arrangements with SPA, which I have mentioned and explained, will provide electric power to the rural cooperatives in Missouri at a wholesale price of 7 mills per kilowatt-hour, or less, which is approximately one-third of the wholesale price or rate paid by the Boone County Electric Co-op.

If the rural electrification program is to reach its objective, electric power must be available to the farmers and people of rural areas at a price that they can afford to pay and in quantities whereby they will not be limited in its usage. Electricity has many uses on the farm and it will be utilized if the farmer, who is a hard working businessman, is given the opportunity to have and use the electricity at a reasonable price.

The REA cooperative is a private enterprise engaged in transmitting and supplying electricity to its members, and is an electric cooperative company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Missouri, and to deprive such company or organization of rural people of the right to borrow money from the REA to construct a steam power plant to generate electric power for sale and distribution to its own members or rural consumers would actually violate and obstruct free enterprise.

ELECTRICAL WORKERS AND RURAL BUSINESS

Executives and managers of power companies have organized meetings of electrical workers and power company employees to prejudice them with concern for their employment. Nothing could be more unfair and unjust to the electrical workers and employees than such propaganda. In the first place, as I have stated, the REA program does not conflict nor interfere with the power companies' business. The construction of proposed REA transmission lines and steam power plants are let by contract to the lowest bidder, and the contractor will employ labor and electrical workers as he would employ labor in such construction work for a power company.

Furthermore, the providing of electric power to farmers and people in rural areas has and will continue to create a greater demand and market for many electrical devices and machinery, such as electric refrigerators, electric motors and machinery, electric stoves, heaters, and miscellaneous electrical equipment, thereby creating additional business and employment in the wiring of rural homes and buildings, and in the manufacture, retail sales, installation, and maintenance of such electrical facilities.

Therefore, I cannot understand electrical workers union opposition, if any, to the REA program, unless they are being coerced and wrongfully influenced by the power companies. Surely the electrical workers union know that the power companies have always opposed organized labor unions and laws for the benefit of the worker.

The REA rural electrification program will attract industries to rural areas where the raw product of such industries are available and we all know that a substantial part of the merchants and retail dealers' business depends upon the prosperity and standard of living enjoyed by the farmers and people in the rural area. I hope and believe that the merchants, bankers, retail dealers, and electrical workers, will join with the farmer and rural people in their fight for a successful rural electrification program.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SECURITY

In addition to the great benefits which the REA program and steam-generating plants will provide for the rural areas, our national economy, defense, and security will also be improved.

An abundant and decentralized source of supply of electrical power is essential for our national security. In the present period of world strife and tension we must strengthen our national defense and security wherever possible. Such destructive explosives as the atomic and hydrogen bombs and the terrible mechanisms of warfare make necessary the decentralization of additional development of electric-power supply, so that, in the event of war and destruction of one or more power plants, we will have sufficient electric power from other sources to keep our industries producing. The widely separated steam-power plants and transmission lines of the REA program will provide this essential need for our security and defense of America.

Moviegoer To Get Full Amusement-Tax-Cut Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, one of the major issues before the Congress this year is the possibility of reducing those excise taxes which now represent a greater liability than an asset in the national economy. In the past month I have received several thousand letters from small-business men and other constituents in my district, urging the reduction or repeal of excise taxes, particularly on low-priced furs and jewelry products and on movie-theater admissions. These requests, it seems to me, have a great deal of merit, since the bulk of consumers in these fields are in the middle- and low-income groups.

One consideration in my decisions on any particular excise-tax reduction is the extent to which the benefits will go directly to the consumer in the form of lower prices. I know that many other Members share this view. For their information, I should like to present the following pledges by six motion-picture-theater executives. Almost all of the 18,000 movie theaters in the country are represented in the groups for which these men speak. Almost all of the 70,000,000 weekly movie admissions sold are in theaters covered by these groups. I have already turned these pledges over to the Committee on Ways and Means, and I urge other Members of the House to take them into consideration in connection with excise-tax reductions:

DEAR FRANKLIN: Replying to your letter of February 23, TOA has adopted the policy that any saving through the repeal of the Federal admission tax will be passed on to movie patrons.

In other words, if the present admission price is 50 cents, plus 10 cents Federal tax, or a total charge of 60 cents to the ticket purchaser, the moviegoer will be able to attend the same theater for 50 cents and save the extra 10 cents he now pays in Federal taxes.

Furthermore, we feel that the lower net admission will result in increased theater attendance and enable nearly all of the 8,000 marginal theaters threatened with closure to stay in business. Most of these marginal theaters are in small towns and villages where the average admission price ranges from 25 to 40 cents.

We are very happy to have you on our side in this fight, and I hope you will call upon me whenever I can be helpful.

All the best,

GAEL SULLIVAN,
Executive Director, Theater Owners of America, Inc.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your inquiry of the 23d as to whether the theater owners, in case the 20-percent admission tax is repealed, will pass on the savings to their patrons or pocket it themselves by increasing their admission prices.

When I accepted the chairmanship of this committee I stipulated that it must be understood that the public would be given the benefit of the saving resulting from repeal. I did this because I know from experience that that question invariably is asked by the Ways and Means Committee and I wanted to be prepared with the proper answer.

All the great theater circuits promptly announced that it would be their policy to pass on the saving to the public. In addition, all the independent theater associations have assured this Committee that their members also will give their patrons the benefit of the saving.

In some territories the theaters have signed individual pledges to this effect. For example, Allied Theater Owners of Texas, a theater association in that State, has sent us the separate pledges of over 700 theaters.

More compelling than all that, to my mind, is the fact that the trailers, posters, and other advertising accessories used by the theaters in reminding their audiences of the tax have stressed the fact that they pay the tax and that they will reap the benefit of its repeal. In view of this it would be a hardy exhibitor who would try to pocket the difference.

Let me say for myself that I have not the slightest doubt that the equivalent of the tax will be passed on to the theater-goers. Neither the theaters nor their customers like to handle pennies and the theaters, in collecting the tax, have generally adjusted their admission prices so as to arrive at a multiple of five. With the tax removed, I should expect the exhibitors to move their admission prices up or down to the nearest nickel break. For example, a 50-cent ticket today represents a 42-cent admission plus 8 cents tax. In that case, I should expect the exhibitor to drop to 40 cents. But a 70-cent ticket is made up of a 58-cent admission plus 12 cents tax and in that case the exhibitor may go up to 60 cents.

Assuming that this course is followed the increases and decreases in admission prices will pretty nearly balance and the moviegoers as a class will reap the full benefit of the repeal.

May I say in behalf of my New York associates that we have noted with deep satisfaction that you favor repeal of the tax. In addition, we greatly appreciate your interest in this subject as shown by your thoughtful inquiry. I am going to presume on this to the extent of enclosing a copy of the brief which we filed with the Ways and Means Committee last Tuesday. This is a comprehensive statement of our case for repeal.

With highest regard.

Yours very truly,

ABRAM F. MYERS,
Chairman, Committee on Taxation and Legislation, Council of Motion Picture Organizations.

(For Allied States Association of Motion Picture Exhibitors; Loew's Inc.; Motion Picture Industry Council; Variety Clubs International; Theater Owners of America; Motion Picture Association of America; Metropolitan Motion Picture Theaters Association; Trade Press Publishers; Society of Independent Motion Picture Producers; Pacific Coast Conference of Independent Theater Owners; Independent Theater Owners Association.)

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: The delay in answering your letter was occasioned by my absence from the city.

It is my position that the benefit from the repeal of the admission taxes should be passed along to the patrons of the theater.

The position of the Theater Owners of America which is in the forefront in the advocacy of the repeal of admission taxes can be obtained from Mr. Gael Sullivan, executive director of that organization which has its office at 1501 Broadway, New York.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES P. SKOURAS,
President, National Theatres Amusement Co., Inc.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: We have put ourselves on record that if the amusement tax is eliminated, we will pass the benefits on to our customers. It may be that an attempt will be made to eliminate pennies; in some instances by cutting the admission price which accrues to the theater, and in other instances by adding a cent or two to try to eliminate the necessity of using pennies, which we have found to be an annoyance to patrons, and a difficult problem for us. These increases and decreases will practically balance, so that the movie-going public will receive full benefit of the cut in taxes.

May I express my appreciation to you for your kind help in the matter.

Very truly yours,

J. R. VOEBEL,
Vice President, Loew's Inc.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: I have your letter with respect to whether it is our intention to have the admission price, if the tax is reduced or eliminated, reduced in accordance with the previous amount of the tax. The answer is yes. We intend to pass the benefits on to the public.

I want to thank you for your inquiry and if at any time we can be of service in helping you to arrive at any conclusions in this respect or any other, do not hesitate to call on us.

I was always a great admirer of your father and have watched with a great deal of interest the progress you have made in the public field. Keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

LEONARD H. GOLDENSON,
President, United Paramount Theatres, Inc.

DEAR FRANK: Thanks for your inquiry of February 23. One hundred percent of the admission tax as it is reduced will be passed on to the benefit of our patrons.

I want to thank you for the cooperation you are giving me, but then you and your family have always fought the fight of the poor man, so that this fight becomes traditional with you.

Sincere warm regards.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY BRANDT,
BRANDT THEATRES.

Labor's Role in Shaping Home-Building Policy and the Future of Cooperative Housing in America

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an address delivered by the Honorable Herman T. Stichman, New York State housing commissioner, at the meeting of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor at Miami Beach, January 31, 1950, entitled "Labor's Role in Shaping Home-Building Policy, and the Future of Cooperative Housing in America."

In this address Mr. Stichman discusses in part the defects of the pending Federal cooperative housing bill now before the House and contrasts the provisions thereof with the New York State housing laws. He also shows the progress which has been made in New York in connection with housing.

I regard Mr. Stichman as one of the best-informed men in this country on cooperative housing.

The address follows:

LABOR'S ROLE IN SHAPING HOME-BUILDING POLICY AND THE FUTURE OF COOPERATIVE HOUSING IN AMERICA

You, representing workers in the building trades, and I and my associates in the New York State division of housing as the persons to whom the task of bringing about the building of more housing in the State of New York has been delegated, have completely mutual interests in the field of home building. You are interested in having employment for your men that will be steady in volume over the years; that will support a living wage for the man and his family; that will provide him with decent, safe, and sanitary working conditions; you are interested in home building as an industry that will furnish Americans with good homes at prices they can afford, that will give builders a fair but not an exorbitant profit, that will keep on a steady keel so that not only will your members be employed, but also those who work in the forests, in the mines, in the mills, in the factories, on the freight trains and trucks that produce and transport the materials that go into the final product of the home. We are working to attain the same objectives.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR STABILIZING THE HOME-BUILDING INDUSTRY

However, the home-building industry has never functioned on a basis that would produce the beneficial results which I have mentioned. One reason why it has not, and I think it is a challenge to everyone here, is that labor has never taken its proper place as one of the forces that should have a part in shaping policy. Up to this time, you have been largely content to have that policy controlled by realtors, mortgage lenders, developers, builders, and the Government, and you have been satisfied to be heard from solely in connection with wages and working conditions. That might be all right if the results of the control by these other interested parties had been satisfactory to most of those concerned, but not only has the history of the home-building industry not been beneficial to labor, it has not even been beneficial to the other forces which have formulated policy.

The history of the industry, as long as you or I can remember, has been one of booms and busts, and that was its record even before we came on the scene. Let us just go back to 1920. The number of new permanent nonfarm housing starts has varied thus widely since then, including the war period: 1920, 247,000; 1922, 716,000; 1925, 937,000; 1931, 254,000; 1933, 93,000; 1934, 126,000; 1935, 221,000; 1937, 336,000; 1940, 602,600; 1943, 191,000; 1945, 209,300; 1947, 849,000; 1949, over 1,500,000.

You know the effect this erratic course had on your own members. You know that about 90 percent of the workers employed in building the 937,000 homes in 1925 must have been out of work in 1933, when only 93,000 homes were begun, and similar conditions existed for a number of years before and after.

This affected not only your members. It adversely affected many others as well. Let us consider the workers employed in producing the materials used in those 937,000 dwelling units in 1925. What were they doing in 1933 when the construction of only 10 percent as many homes was begun? Who was supporting all these workers and their families?

You were still experiencing the results of the unstabilized building economy in 1946, 1947 and 1948. You felt it particularly at the cessation of hostilities when demands were suddenly made on you to produce in a few months enough trained workers to build, in a year or two, all the homes that hadn't been built in the 1930's, all the homes that hadn't been built during the war years, all the homes that were wanted by families who had doubled up during the 15 years of economic distress, all the homes that were needed by boys who had gone off to war leaving wives with in-laws, by boys who came

back from war years older and then wanted to marry, and you were asked to build them—right away—fast.

You barely felt the results of this unsound planning in the public press, when you were unfairly accused by some persons of having failed to train sufficient apprentices and of irresponsibility for inadequate production because the average age of building-trades workers was over 56. No attention was paid to the fact that this had to be true because your workers were in their prime in the building boom of 1925, in their thirties and forties, and that, of course, no apprentices were trained during the 1930's because no young man in his right mind would seek training as an apprentice in an industry where no jobs for journeymen existed. So, at the cessation of hostilities, necessarily the average age of the workers was 20 years more than it had been at the peak of the boom in 1928, since the bulk of them in the building trades were the same men who had built those houses in the 1920's and who had managed to survive the depression years.

And, as I say, labor is not the only group hit by this unbalanced home-building economy. The lender too is affected by it. If he feels that there is a ready market for mortgage loans only 3 or 4 years out of 10, and that then there is bound to be a bust, he will try to get a sufficiently high rate of interest on his money during those 3 or 4 years to compensate for the other years when he is taking money on deposit but can't lend it out. It has its effect on the realtor and the builder who will try to make a high speculative profit in boom times to carry them along during the depressed years. It has its effect on our railroad workers, on the men who drive the trucks, and on everyone whose living is dependent in any degree on there being a considerable amount of home building in every year if they are to have steady employment in a feeder industry.

But most vitally it has its effect on the public and on you, as representatives of building trades workers. Therefore, I believe that, for your own protection if no more, you must take a vital part in shaping home-building economy. But I do think your efforts to bring about stabilization will help all others concerned.

WHAT NEW YORK STATE HAS DONE TO SPUR STABILIZATION

I believe that New York State's program of cooperative housing is one of the keys to the solution of the long-continued problem. But first, let's consider more recent history which led to our developing a laboratory of cooperative home-building in our State.

As we look back over the years since the war, we see that the national housing economy is not improving. At the cessation of hostilities, there was no effective way to meet the tremendous demands for housing throughout the country from families who had been doubled up, from veterans who wanted homes of their own, as well as from young people who sought to marry, and this was not due to the results of the war alone.

Of course, materials were in short supply, but this was not merely because stock piles had been used up during the war. It was also due to the fact that the factories which had been producing them during the boom 1928's had turned to producing other things during the 1930's when the building bust was on. Factories were revived to produce building materials, but some producers and distributors sought to take advantage of the unsatisfied demand, or permitted others to do so, and the products went into the black market, which held back home building.

Although money was in plentiful supply, efforts were made, even by the Federal Government, to force mortgage interest rates up to a figure that was unrealistic under existing conditions. Drastic measures had to be taken—it became necessary to provide make-shift shelter, but we thought it was for only a few years.

The State of New York was the first to adopt an effective emergency housing program. When we saw that we could not get the number of permanent homes that we needed, our legislature, at Governor Thomas E. Dewey's request, made available a fund of $69,800,000 with which we provided emergency housing and educational facilities. We built 75 temporary projects in 40 municipalities in New York State, and about 60,000 veterans and their families have been housed in about 11,000 temporary apartments and over 13,000 college-dormitory accommodations which were provided as part of our program. In addition, we furnished hundreds of other facilities, including classrooms, laboratories, and libraries to aid the colleges take care of the great enrollment of veterans. The Federal Government had a somewhat similar program.

The State of New York also has leadership in clearing slums and replacing them with decent homes for low-income families for whom private enterprise has not been able, over the years, to provide with adequate housing at rents which they can afford. Our rentals are about $8.95 per room, on the average, in these public-housing developments. We have a $735,000,000 loan fund for those purposes, coupled with permissive annual cash payments of up to $25,000,000 to help keep rentals low. Today our permanent public-housing program under contract includes 51 projects in the State, of which 17 are in New York City. Of these projects 21 have been completed, 16 are under construction with some of them partly occupied, and 14 are under contract or in the planning stage. Eventually this phase of our program will provide homes for about 300,000 persons in the lowest income-earning groups. The Federal Government has a new similar program.

So far as middle- and lower-middle income families are concerned, there still is something radically wrong. There are still, in this fifth year since the cessation of hostilities, about 1,000,000 persons living in converted barracks, in Quonset huts, and in other temporary shelter throughout the country.

The Federal Government has tried several programs which have not produced homes at reasonable costs or rentals within the means of families of average income, and yet it has not profited by experience, as its newest bills, those pertaining to cooperating housing, make clear. It seems to be continually playing into the hands of speculative builders, instead of devising means to limit the speculators and so help labor and the public.

If you will glance at one of New York City's Sunday papers of the last 2 weeks, you will see advertisements such as these for new housing: One and one-half rooms, $78 monthly; one-bedroom apartments, $85 per month; two rooms, $70 and $80; two and one-half rooms, $90; three rooms, $95; three and one-half rooms, from $145; four and one-half rooms with varying rates, one advertisement listing $120 to $135, another $122 and up, still another $105. Of course, this is not the top quality—that is much higher. Does that help the average man looking for a home? The Government insured billions of dollars of loans for new housing built under its FHA program. But most of the housing developed under this program has had rentals, so far as our metropolitan centers are concerned at least, of $25 and $35 per room monthly, and more, which is far beyond the reach of the average wage earner. And so, of course, it has had no discernible effect competitively in bringing about any reduction in rentals for other new housing.

So far as the Federal Veterans' Administration housing loan program is concerned, you are familiar with the criticism of the sales prices and quality of materials in a number of homes constructed under it.

No really effective control was exercised by the Federal Government, under its programs, over the profits of the developers with the result that some speculative builders skimmed the cream and gouged the public with high rentals while labor was given an unfair share of the responsibility.

Now, let me contrast what the Federal Government proposes to do with what the State of New York, under Governor Dewey, for some time has been doing to help stabilize the home-building industry, help show what true building costs are, prove that it is not labor that is responsible for excessive housing prices, and provide good homes for lower middle-income families.

We have a law in our State called the limited dividend housing law under which, lower middle-income families seeking to build housing for themselves, and sponsors of rental housing for such families who are willing to limit their earnings on equity invested to 6 percent, may obtain a waiver of all State taxes and exemption from municipal taxation on the value of the new housing, but not on the land. We wanted to show true building costs—to prove who was and who was not responsible for the excessive prices demanded for housing—to make clear to the public that good homes could be built for lower middle-income families by private enterprise at reasonable cost. We developed a cooperatively owned housing program under that law. But we adopted a number of safeguards. These included prohibition against unreasonable mark-ups in the price of land; initial limitation of profits to 5½ percent in builders' contracts with all profits between 5½ and 7½ percent being shared equally by the builders and cooperators, and all over 7½ percent going to the cooperators; audit by the State of the contractors' books, and State supervision of the management of the housing developments after they are built. I conferred with the heads of more than a dozen of our building trades unions and they endorsed the proposal enthusiastically. Every cooperation was forthcoming.

Using that law, we organized a number of cooperative housing projects in which the participants make down payments of about $250 a room and become mutual home owners with carrying charges of about $14 per room, which includes amortization and interest on the mortgage, heat, repairs, and full maintenance.

Although mortgage lenders were requiring 4 or 4½ percent interest in the prevailing market, we persuaded the Bowery Savings Bank to lend over $7,000,000 for our first 800 family garden-type development, Bell Park Gardens in New York City, at 3½ percent, a good saving. That institution believes in our program and is cooperating in connection with other similar developments. Other savings banks are following its leadership. The insurance companies have not yet done so. Most of the 800 families are occupying apartments in the development now, and they all say that it is much better than they expected.

So productive was labor at Bell Park, and so efficient the contractors, that there will be a dividend of about $400,000 for the cooperators, in connection with building construction of about $7,500,000, equivalent to reducing their down payments to about $140 per room. Or it can be used to reduce carrying charges. We have found that most builders are willing to accept limitations of their profits to reasonable figures under our program and that they are anxious to participate. We have also, as part of the same program and with the same profit limitation, authorized the construction of rental apartments with rentals of less than $15 a room monthly. Altogether, we have approved the

construction of more than 6,000 home units at about these charges, including one for 2,000 families sponsored by local No. 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and employers of its members, and one for 288 families sponsored by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union in New York City. A third for almost 800 families with a smaller mortgage and higher participation payments is sponsored by persons affiliated with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. I anticipate the approval in the next few months of many more home units in the State to be cooperatively owned or rented at the figures I have mentioned.

This contrasts with the $25 to $35 and more per room monthly rentals and high sales prices demanded for housing built under FHA and Federal Veterans' Administration programs without the protective provisions found in the State programs. The reason for the difference is readily apparent. The State of New York has been seeking to help those who need homes, as well as labor. The Federal program seems designed to help the builder primarily. And many of those builders perform not a great deal more than the role of managers and takers of bids from subcontractors—with the actual job of building being handled by the latter. Profit is charged on profit and labor unfairly blamed for the result.

New York State's program proves that the responsibility for high costs has not been that of labor, because we have used the same workingmen, the same materials, paid the same prices for land, and used the same private lenders, but we have been watchful, we have required efficient building methods and we have eliminated speculative demands and have allowed fair and reasonable profits only. But the builders we have used have been more than satisfied—they are looking for more similar jobs.

DEFECTS THAT MUST BE CURED IN THE PROPOSED FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Now the Federal Government, despite the example of the State of New York, is continuing to play into the hands of the speculative builders. The Maybank-Sparkman cooperative housing bills will prove to be a $2,000,000,000 boon to some speculators rather than a benefit to labor and to lower middle-income families in need of housing, unless the profits of building promoters are specifically limited by Congress and the program made into a laboratory to determine true building costs, just as we have done.

There is room for Federal aid to cooperative housing and in reducing home building costs, but it should be such as will really help in those essential fields, and not of the kind that will really only aid speculative builders. The present Federal bills give no real help. They have no effective provisions for encouraging efficiency, reducing costs or lessening total financing charges. Instead, they seek to reduce annual carrying charges by providing for the lending of mortgage money by the Federal Government, through the device of a Federal guaranty, with an annual interest rate which it appears may be 2½ percent or somewhat more and lengthening the mortgage period to 50 years, or, in the event of refinancing, to 60 years, with provision for extending these periods three more years. This would increase the aggregate of carrying charges and merely spread the heavier burden over a longer period of years. So far as supposed savings are concerned, there is shadow through the device of a Government guaranty which would bring a lower annual interest rate but would carry with it greater aggregate outlays and obvious inflationary possibilities today. But there is no substance, no effort to cut real costs by spurning technological advances, encouraging efficient building practices and definitely limiting builders' profits, in return for the low interest rate, so as to eliminate a continuation of unfair and excessive builders' demands.

Indeed, the Maybank-Sparkman bills will in fact hurt the idea of cooperative housing as a laboratory to reduce costs by glossing over the present deficiencies in the home-building industry and concealing its speculative demands behind a curtain of extended amortization and interest payments.

It is as though the clothing or the radio, television, or automobile industries, instead of introducing efficient mass-production methods to lower true costs and meet competition, had asked that the Government provide purchasers with direct long-term loans or long-term Government guaranteed loans at a similarly devised lower interest rate to enable such consumers to buy their products and then offered the result as an example of cost savings. That would be a subsidization of inefficient methods in those industries—just as the present Federal bills would constitute a subsidization of present day builders' inefficiencies and their excessive demands. The price would not be cut, the monthly payments would be lowered but the purchaser would be paying more in the long run because of the higher aggregate of interest over a longer period of years.

Increasing the mortgage period from 34½ years to 60 years, under the Maybank-Sparkman permissive refinancing provisions which would undoubtedly be availed of, would increase total interest payments by 90.9 percent, almost double. That is, it would increase total interest payments by $5,510.62 on a loan in the principal amount of $10,000 at a 3-percent interest rate, and would effect only a 22.8-percent reduction in the amount of monthly carrying payment. Total interest payments over a 60-year period on such a loan would amount to $11,574.21, so that the borrower would be paying $21,574.21 to pay off a $10,000 loan. Whom would that help? Is that cutting costs? Increasing the mortgage period to 50 years would increase the aggregate of interest payments by 53.7 percent, that is, by $3,255.07 on a similar loan, and reduce monthly carrying charges only 17 percent.

The Federal bills, as I say, would demonstrate nothing to the country at large—the only people who would receive the benefits, questionable as they are in view of the increase in total carrying charges—would be those living in housing built under the Federal program. What we need instead in every State is an open laboratory, just as we have in New York, to demonstrate how all building costs can be reduced—whether built with Federal financing or private financing, unless it is proposed to have the Federal Government finance all the housing needed now and in the future.

I recommend that you take an active part in shaping any new legislation, and in seeing to it that the proper safeguards are inserted, instead of leaving it to building promoters and mortgage lenders.

The advantages and disadvantages of the pending Federal bills should be carefully considered by you so that you can determine whether they are really helpful to the home-needing public and to labor. While a reasonable rate of interest is advantageous and is a welcome contrast with Federal efforts in the past to increase the interest rates on mortgage loans, let's consider other possible disadvantages.

Direct Government lending at a rate too far below what savings bank depositors would like to get on their deposits, and below the amount of return life-insurance companies calculate on their investments in determining premiums, may adversely affect the loan market for saving companies and insurance companies. This, therefore, might decrease the amount of interest which savings bank depositors would receive as well as increase the premiums on life-insurance policies.

If the intent is not to reduce the interest rate substantially, then the proposed legislation is entirely unnecessary, since simply lengthening the mortgage period unduly would be disadvantageous. For such lengthening of the mortgage period to 50 and 60 and even 63 years, as is proposed, not only greatly increases the total amount of interest paid over such a long span of years, as I have indicated, but it abolishes, for all practical purposes, any ownership feature, even though the present bills purport to provide the basis for cooperative home ownership. If one bought at the age of 28 or 30, the executors of his estate would get the deed, provided he left enough to pay what is still owing. The Federal proposals would mean that 99 out of 100 so-called cooperators would never pay off their mortgages in their lifetime, but would die in debt. In reality, they would be renters throughout their lives, and their children would have to take over the mortgage debt or be left without the family home they thought was theirs.

The Federal cooperative housing bills can be justified only if the public is given benefits that at least balance the possible disadvantages to which I have referred. They can be justified only if excessive demands are eliminated and builders' profits are limited to a reasonable figure as we have done. They can be supported only if the Federal cooperative housing program is made into a great national laboratory to examine true building costs, which should have beneficial results in bringing down the cost of all housing. Builders should be willing to accept such a limitation of excessive demands if the program really is to aid them in the long run, as it must be supposed to do. They should not expect all other groups in the economy to make sacrifices for their sole benefit.

Of course, some will say that there is at least token recognition of what I have been urging by the language used in the bills that the proposed legislation is to be administered so as to assure that its benefits are not dissipated through speculative devices. That is not enough. A builder's profit of 20 percent may not be regarded by Federal personnel as speculative; certainly nothing in past performance indicates activity to curb profits that were even larger. A reasonable profit limitation should be written specifically into the bill if the public is really to benefit and learn who has been really getting rich. And the administrator of the cooperative housing program might well be appointed directly by the President so that the program can function as a true laboratory.

Otherwise, the Federal cooperative housing bills, which have mistakenly been called socialistic by some, will prove to be feudalistic instead. Socialism at least purports, no matter how it may fail in actual performance, to take from those who have and to divide it equally among those who have not, while the Federal bills would take, over a too long period of years in the form of high aggregate of interest payments, from those seeking home ownership, from savings-bank depositors and from those holding insurance policies, from labor in the form of an unbalanced building economy, and give to those who already have plenty—namely, speculative developers and builders.

New York State's program of cooperative housing brought clearly into focus before the public gaze all the facts which prove that we can get good housing for lower middle-income groups—the forgotten families with incomes just too high for public housing and too low to be able to afford rents and prices demanded by speculative builders—at costs within their means by using the same forces of private enterprise that have been used in the past, and that all that was needed was to eliminate abuses. We have proved that it was not necessary to substitute Government

for any factor of private enterprise, provided there is the proper control.

The Federal legislation, on the other hand, does nothing specifically to curb abuses and it, instead, all that it does is to spread costs over a longer period of years without materially reducing them. It will not help what you, as representatives of labor, and I are trying to accomplish: That is, to get building costs down to the minimum by eliminating speculative abuses and profits so that we can have a sufficient amount of housebuilding in every year to stabilize employment and the entire industry.

BENEFITS UNDER THE STATE PROGRAM

Every resident in the State of New York benefits by our nonpromotion cooperative housing. Let me recapitulate the benefits to the various groups:

1. Lower middle-income families who need housing and cannot pay current rentals or purchase prices.

Rents in cooperatives become about $14 to $15 per room monthly, including amortization, heat, interest, light, repairs, and maintenance, plus down payments of about $250 per room, with rentals of about $15 per room monthly, instead of $25 to $35 and more monthly. This is even less than New York City is charging in housing projects which it is building under its own so-called nonprofit subsidized program, and at least 40 percent less than other equivalent housing.

2. All those who need or may need homes.

While New York States recommends that only 5 to 10 percent of the homes needed be built under its nonpromotion plan with partial tax exemption, the results will aid others as well. The monthly savings of about $11 and more per room are not due solely to the value of the municipal tax exemption on the value of the improvement for a period of years, and the waiver of State taxes. This may be worth up to $2.75 per room monthly. The other savings of more than $7 per room monthly are becoming available to all families as builders reduce their prices to the public to reflect the actual costs, rather than speculative mark-ups, publicly demonstrated to be true by our projects is working laboratories. Our savings are achieved by:

A. Limiting the profit of the builder to 5½ to 7½ percent. In other building operations, builders' profits are twice as much or more.

B. Maximum production given by labor on these projects, since it is aware that an increased rate of production will not merely increase a builder's already large speculative profits.

C. Owner-supervised management of the developments, with maximum tenant cooperation and limited but reasonable dividends, results in reduced repair and maintenance costs.

D. Reduced interest charges on mortgage loans.

3. Builders and building-trades workers.

I have pointed out the booms and busts of our housing cycle. Elimination of speculative profits will make possible building even in so-called lean years, similar to the early 1930's, since costs will always be within the means of a major portion of the public. This will stabilize building and employment conditions, eliminate booms and busts, encourage sound apprentice training programs, and make possible a continuous flow of adequately trained workers.

4. All the public.

Demonstration that private enterprise, with cooperation from government at proper levels, can provide lower middle-income groups with good housing, is an answer to demands from certain quarters that Government must take over and build housing for practically all the people at public expense. Our program aids democracy by helping people to help themselves.

New York State's program proves that what we need is less Government interference and control but more public aid. If some of the forces in the field of private enterprise are abusing their prerogatives they should be controlled, but I do not think that Government should take over. That is the policy we have followed in New York State.

Not long ago, I visited a number of European countries and studied their housing and economic policies. Where the people, in order to correct abuses by private enterprise, allowed the pendulum to swing too far the other way and put government into business in competition with its people, we find economic distress. Let us not follow the same course here; instead, let us correct the abuses.

One way to make certain that we get that correction is for you to assert yourselves and take over your rightful place in the leadership of those who draft our housing policy. That is my first recommendation.

I also recommend that your member unions throughout the country take steps to have each State initiate a cooperative-housing program similar to ours, and, as I said before, that you see to it that our controls are made part of any Federal program. Indeed, the proposed Federal legislation might well be changed so as to provide matching benefits which would induce all the States to adopt nonpromotion cooperative-housing programs, and thus to ascertain true home-building costs. There then would be yardsticks to eliminate excessive speculative demands in the various parts of the country. If each State does what New York State is doing, I think we will soon produce enough housing at sufficiently reasonable costs and rentals to meet the needs of our lower middle-income families and all the public. We will also aid in stabilizing our home-building industry, with consequent benefit to you, to the employer, the developer, the builder, the lender, and to all America.

Alaska Statehood and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to quote below an article appearing in the March 19 issue of the New York Journal-American written by Gov. Ernest Gruening of Alaska:

GOVERNOR GRUENING TELLS WHY ALASKA STATEHOOD DELAY INVITES INVASION BY REDS

(By Gov. Ernest Gruening of Alaska)

WASHINGTON, MARCH 18.—"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide in the strife of truth with falsehood for the good or evil side."

Thus wrote the great American poet James Russell Lowell.

His poem, The Present Crisis, dealt with the impending Civil War. Its great issue was clearly stated by Abraham Lincoln. Our Nation, he said, "could not endure half slave and half free." The American people decided that issue for the Nation.

Today the issue is no less clear. It is whether all mankind shall be slave or free.

DECISION UP TO PEOPLE

Again the American people—through no choice of their own—are called upon to decide, this time for the whole human race.

In the present crisis, the greatest civilization has ever known, the leadership is ours whether we will it or not.

We can only go forward to victory or face the extinction of every freedom Americans cherish and that man has achieved in his age-long struggle upward from darkness toward light.

Today in a far deeper and more terrible sense than when our forefathers created government by consent of the governed, the alternatives are liberty or death.

We face today the most ruthless, unscrupulous, and fanatical enemy the world has ever known. His are the instincts of the brute, the cunning of Satan, and the weapons of modern science.

We are now engaged in the cold war.

FREE SOCIETY NEITHER OFF

This is a struggle just short of shooting war to persuade the neutral, the apprehensive, the wavering peoples of the world that a free society is better than a fettered one.

We must win the cold war in order to avert a shooting war with the horror of the H-bomb.

Two parallel policies are imperative for victory:

1. Our defense must be strong. The stronger, the less the likelihood of attack.

2. We must live up to our professions of democracy. Deeds, not declamations, are required. We must be strong in our faith.

The challenge is here and now. It lies before the Senate of the United States. It rests in the Senate's opportunity to grant statehood to Alaska.

ALASKA DEFENSELESS

Alaska lies within naked eye view of Soviet Siberia.

Alaska is today defenseless.

Alaska could be taken in a few hours by two air-borne divisions.

They could overwhelm the 8,000 men who are all Uncle Sam has provided to defend an area one-fifth as large as the United States with its long fronts on the Bering Sea and the Arctic Ocean.

Our Alaskan airfields would then become the enemy bases from which every point in the United States could be bombed.

For years the Territorial Americans of Alaska have pled for adequate defenses for Alaska in vain.

For years before World War II, Alaska's voteless Delegate in Congress prophesied what would happen unless Alaska were defended.

And Alaska was the only portion of America invaded and for a time held by the enemy.

That enemy was driven out. Driving out a far more powerful enemy trained from the cradle in Arctic living and know-how and supplied from adjacent terrain would be a far different matter.

The cities of the 48 States could be destroyed while we are deliberating how to expel him.

Gen. "Hap" Arnold, the great commander and creator of the United States Air Force, shortly before his death wrote in his book Global Mission:

"Through to this day, Alaska has never received the attention in national defense planning that it deserves * * * but we were never able to get the money or allocations for the Air Force that we really needed there to give us the kind of bases we required then, and need more than ever now."

Alaskans know why. They know that as long as Alaska remains a Territory it will not be adequately defended. Not merely Alaska but the whole Nation and all mankind will pay the price.

BILLIONS FOR DEFENSE

In the last 3 years since the menace of a Soviet-enslaved world became crystal clear, Uncle Sam has poured billions of dollars into the still free countries of Europe to prevent the Soviet advance on an eastern front 4,000 miles from our shores.

It has undoubtedly been a good, calculated risk, and so far at least seems to have held back the Red tide over there.

The first session of this Eighty-first Congress unhesitatingly added $5,700,000,000 for economic aid and $1,400,000,000 for military aid to the billions voted in previous sessions. Virtually the full amounts requested were almost unhesitatingly voted.

But meanwhile the Communist hordes have overrun China and hold most of Asia.

On our western front neither a broad ocean nor free nations lie between them and us.

Yet the House of Representatives almost adjourned without action on the modest request for a mere authorization of $137,000,000 for Alaskan defenses. The decision to do so was announced last August.

HOUSE YIELDS

Finally, in response to the desperate outcry of Alaskans to secure a faint equivalent for our own national back door to that accorded the European front door, the House yielded.

However, it cut the requested authorization by one-third to $96,000,000.

If this pitiful fraction were immediately appropriated as well as the balance that was cut off and its expenditure speeded, it would be at least 2 years before Alaska could achieve a radar screen and the 25,000 ground troops which alone are contemplated as the Alaska defenses.

But action still lags.

It is now March and our principal construction season in Alaska is at hand.

We are in grave peril of losing another year. We are inviting attack through our back door left conspicuously ajar.

It is left ajar for invasion by an enemy who does not acknowledge the validity of the sale of Alaska by the Tsar.

It is from the Soviet standpoint still "Russian-America." They mean, if we will let them, to hold that part of America physically, permanently.

ALASKA'S ANSWER

Statehood—the full incorporation of Alaska into the Union—is the one clear answer America can make to this oft-uttered threat of annexation following invasion.

The people of Alaska 4 years ago requested statehood on referendum.

After 83 years under the American flag they are entitled to the equality of full citizenship. They are entitled to self-government on the established American pattern.

Can America continue to be concerned—convincingly—about the lack of democracy behind the iron curtain when it denies the simplest measure thereof to its citizens?

Can America lead the world effectively—toward its principle of government by consent of the governed, when it retains its own obsolete colonialism in Alaska and Hawaii against the expressed wishes of its citizens there?

Can we in America effectively preach to the whole world what we do not practice at home?

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide."

The moment is here and now.

The Senate of the United States can decide by an affirmative vote on statehood at this session of Congress that America will continue to fight the good fight and keep the faith.

International Trade Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following letter by a business leader on ITO should serve to refute the confusion which its opponents are trying to create. This letter should make it clear that ITO means what it says, that is, that it proposes to open up the channels of trade of the world now hampered by many avoidable restrictions. ITO does not deprive the United States of any freedom of action in our national interest; on the contrary, it is in the best interests of the United States because it is one of the greatest single means of attaining world recovery:

FEDERATED DEPARTMENT STORES, INC.,
Cincinnati, Ohio, January 19, 1950.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: I wish to urge ratification of the proposed Charter of the International Trade Organization which is scheduled for early hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. In its broader aspects, the Charter, in my opinion, lays the foundation for the establishment of a more rational world-trading system and thereby can strengthen our own economy and implement this country's foreign policy.

It seems to me that as a matter of practical self-interest, we are obliged to support measures which will stimulate the foreign trade of those nations we are seeking to help. If they are to become self-sustaining, the world's markets, including ours, must be opened to their export products. The alternative is that we shall be compelled to continue direct financial assistance and tax ourselves accordingly to pay for it.

As between these two choices, I believe that our course is clear. The European recovery program is essentially a stopgap measure and one that is intolerable for the long pull. There can be no lasting stability for any country in an economy which is based on American gratuities and our own economy cannot indefinitely stand the strain which this aid imposes on it.

I believe that the ITO Charter is a necessary adjunct of the European recovery program. By leveling the artificial trade barriers which now interfere with the export business of nations dependent on our help, it can serve to lighten our tax burden and protect the present American investment in European recovery.

I favor the charter for the following additional reasons:

1. It strengthens the free-enterprise system by substituting competition in international trade for artificial government controls. By helping the economy of participating nations, it will promote prosperity which is essential to the survival of the free-enterprise system.

2. The Charter is a logical extension of our foreign policy which is seeking to contain Communist expansion. The restoration of the world's economy through the encouragement of international trade can be the strongest bulwark against that dangerous irresistible.

3. The Charter gives wider scope to the reciprocal trade agreements program. It applies to a larger number of nations and covers many more aspects of international trade relationships such as commodity agreements, cartels, full employment, and economic development.

4. It supplements the functions of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Neither the fund nor the bank can operate with maximum efficiency in improving world financial conditions unless there is a free flow of goods from one country to another and unless each country can export enough to pay for its imports.

5. The Charter simplifies customs practices which at present set up a maze of conflicting regulations, all different for different nations. These have become in effect invisible trade barriers which hamper international trade.

6. It seeks to prevent discrimination by one nation against the trade of another.

7. The Charter enables foreign nations to remedy their dollar shortage by use of quotas to keep imports within their means of payment. But, at the same time, it provides an orderly procedure for applying these quotas and for their termination when a country's balance of payment difficulties are ended.

There are only two articles of the Charter to which I would take exception. These are Nos. 11 and 12, relating to international investment. Their purpose is of the highest importance—to stimulate private international investment. But I believe they are ambiguously stated and can be eliminated without weakening the main body of the Charter.

Although the Charter is not a perfect instrument, I believe it represents a notable start toward remedying some of the serious economic illnesses of the world. To reject it because it includes compromises which are essential in the drafting of any multilateral agreement would be a mistake. It provides, at least, a framework in which improvements can be sought and is flexible enough to permit such improvements to be made.

With the International Trade Organization, we shall have a code of rules which eliminates or controls many of the most harmful trading practices. We shall have a mechanism for interpreting, enforcing, and improving these rules and a forum in which trade problems may be handled in a spirit of international cooperation. Without the ITO, it is to be feared that we shall face a progressive stagnation of world trade.

It seems to me that our political and economic supremacy among the family of democratic nations obligates us to take the leadership in making the ITO a functioning body.

Yours very truly,

FRED LAZARUS, JR.

Library Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a copy of a letter I am sending today to Mr. Joseph D. Keenan, director of the League Reporter. It refers to a completely erroneous and apparently intentionally deceptive article at page 3 of the issue for March 20. I am confident that all readers of this paper will be interested in the clear facts which led a

majority of 196 Members of Congress to vote against the passage of this bill.

March 18, 1950.

Mr. JOSEPH D. KENNEDY,
Director, League Reporter,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: I have just read your analysis of the vote on H. R. 874. I am sure you realize that the author of the article deliberately overlooks the convincing argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, that "There is no State in the Union that cannot afford to pay $40,000 a year for library services." His conclusion that those of us who agreed with Mr. KENNEDY were against furnishing library services to farm families completely ignores the fact that Massachusetts has realized that objective without calling upon the Federal Government to contribute one cent. Moreover, you must know that all Federal funds are collected, sent here, and then a substantial administrative fee is deducted before returning these funds to the sources from which they came. Probably the author does not yet know that Massachusetts has accomplished this result at a local expenditure of $1.21 per capita, while West Virginia was represented vigorously by its Representatives as being in need of Federal assistance but contributed only 13 cents per capita, and the great, rich State of Texas, also begging for this Federal grant, has contributed only 16 cents per capita.

I realize that you will not print this letter in the report. Consequently, I shall make it available, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that members of organized labor can compare the facts with the conclusions you seek to draw.

Sincerely yours,

Clinton Opens Centennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item of March 13, 1950:

CLINTON OPENS CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION—BANQUET IN THE FALLON MEMORIAL AUDITORIUM, TUESDAY NIGHT, WITH GOVERNOR DEVER, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR SULLIVAN, CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN, AND OTHERS, RESPONDING TO TOASTS IN HONOR OF THE OLD HOMEBOIS ANNIVERSARY OF THE INCORPORATION OF THE TOWN—BRILLIANT SOCIAL EVENT IS ATTENDED BY APPROXIMATELY 700 GUESTS WITH THE PROGRAM INCLUDING VOCAL AND INSTRUMENTAL SELECTIONS BY GROUP OF THE TOWN'S TALENTED ARTISTS

Graced by the presence of the two highest officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, His Excellency, Gov. Paul A. Dever and His Honor, Lt. Gov. Charles F. Jeff Sullivan, of Clinton's favorite son, Congressman Philip J. Philbin, and other distinguished speakers, approximately 700 guests at the centennial banquet held in the Fallon Memorial Auditorium and the banquet hall, of the municipal building, Tuesday night, will cherish the memory of a delightful event until their dying day.

In as brilliant a social function as the auditorium has witnessed since it was dedicated 41 years next November, the event went into history as a fitting opening of the 100th observance of the incorporation of the town by the Massachusetts Legislature, March 14, 1850.

The appropriate decorations, the tables resplendent with silver and china, many of the guests in evening dress, the appetizing dinner professionally served, the unique menu cards typical of two plants of Clinton's "beehive of industry"—the Miron Mills, Inc., and the Colonial Press, Inc.—coupled with the presence of many former Clintonians who joined with their relatives and friends in recounting bygone days, the fine civic spirit dominating the event, the stellar addresses and the voices of the town's outstanding vocalists and instrumentalists, all provided a setting that will long abide with all so fortunate as to have had a part in it.

FIFTY VERSUS ONE HUNDRED YEARS

The banquet was in marked contrast to a similar event of 50 years ago at the time the town observed its semicentennial when a diversity of opinion militated against that feature of the celebration.

The memorial volume issued following the fiftieth anniversary of the incorporation of the town said:

"No feature of the semicentennial gave rise to more discussion than the banquet. To what degree should it be self-supporting? Where and when should it be held? What should be the price of tickets? Who should be the caterer? Should the speakers be distinguished men from abroad, or would it be better to rely on home talent?

"The subcommittee originally appointed grappled with these questions and after they had settled them in accordance with their own judgment and obtained the sanction of the general committee, tickets were offered for sale."

EVENT WAS ONCE ABANDONED

"One hundred and seventy-five seats were engaged at $2.75 per plate, but as a guaranty of 300 was required by the caterer, the committee did not feel justified in going further and reported that it seemed inexpedient to hold a banquet on the lines proposed.

"It seemed best, however, to the general committee that another attempt should be made, so a new committee was appointed to lead the forlorn hope.

"This committee, after a careful investigation, decided to follow the plans proposed by the original committee.

"The sense of responsibility for the banquet was so awakened among the members of the general committee, and the semicentennial in all its phases was finding such growing favor among the citizens, that this part of the celebration was carried to a successful issue by the new committee. Considerably more than the 300 tickets required for a guaranty were sold and the Town Hall was none too large to accommodate those who were anxious to attend."

ENCHANTING SCENE

"It was decided that it would be wise to set the banquet at an early hour, so that people might come with fresh appetites. By 6:30, Bigelow Hall, which had been tastefully decorated for the occasion, began to be filled by the arriving guests. There was a half hour of merry greetings and of conversation, with pleasing reminiscence as its central theme.

"Meanwhile, the Salem Cadet Band added to the cheer by its excellent music. Shortly after 7, those assembled marched to the hall above. The scene was one of enchantment. Through the art of the decorators, the ceiling and walls, with their flowing streamers and graceful folds were one mass of glowing color, in which red, white, and blue, with their emblematic significance, predominated, while touches of yellow and green were tastefully intermingled. From the center hung a great bell. To the illumination of the incandescent lights above was added that of the candelabra, with fairy lights on the tables below."

HARMONY IN 1950

Happily, this year, the preliminary arrangements were conducted with the utmost harmony and lack of criticism, perhaps indicating that Clintonians of the present generation are more united and more civic-minded than were some of the citizens of 5 decades ago.

From the very outset of the initial announcements of the centennial banquet a spirit of full cooperation by residents was in evidence and where, 50 years ago, only about 300 guests attended the semi-centennial event the 1950 program was participated in by almost twice that total, all imbued with the thought that the one hundredth anniversary of opening event must attain the heights as a harbinger of the main program, May 28 to June 4, next, which will conclude the anniversary.

PERFECT SETTING

Then again, the 1950 event was staged in one of the handsomest auditoriums in this Commonwealth, as contrasted with the 1900 banquet which was served in the old Town Hall, later destroyed by fire, on the site of which progressive Clinton erected ere the end of the first decade of the twentieth century one of the finest municipal buildings to be found in the Bay State.

Many of the out-of-town guests, Tuesday night, glimpsed their first view of the architectural beauty of the auditorium as they had removed from town before the new structure was built.

The horseshoe balcony where guests were seated who had been served the menu in the banquet hall, is vastly more attractive than was the gallery at the south end of the old town hall.

EVENT REPLACED BALL

Fifty years ago the semicentennial banquet was held the night of June 18, the fiftieth anniversary program having been opened with a concert and ball, in the old town hall, the night of March 14, 1900, as the initial event of the program, but this year, the date of incorporation fell in the Lenten season and the centennial committee wisely decided that it would be imprudent and would adversely affect the observance if dancing should be included and in its place the 1950 banquet was substituted, a decision that was heartily approved by all citizens of the town.

During the serving of the menu music was featured by Paul Redmond's orchestra and artists, Lilia Shaughnessy, violinist, and Mrs. Walter Shaughnessy at the piano.

After the diners finished the last course Chairman Kittredge announced that Patrick Henry Lynskey of New York City, native of Clinton would render the Star Spangled Banner, to open the fine program.

PROCESSION

At 7:45 the procession of speakers and special guests marched down the center aisle and included:

Judge and Mrs. Austin J. Kittredge, Governor Paul A. Dever, Congressman Philip J. Philbin, Lieutenant Governor and Mrs. C. F. "Jeff" Sullivan, Representative Henry W. Pickford, Matthew J. Connelly, Rev. James S. Barry, D. D., Patrick Henry Lynskey, Cedric Foster, Joseph M. Duffy, John Redmond Lynskey, Rev. and Mrs. E. Maurice Bussey, Rabbi Aaron Twersky, Paul P. Lavelle, Judge and Mrs. Morton C. Jaquith, Mr. and Mrs. Roy A. Freitag, Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Freel, and Mr. and Mrs. John J. Mitchell.

INVOCATION

The invocation by Rev. E. Maurice Bussey, pastor of the First Congregational Church, was as follows:

"Our Father and our God, Thou great unseen spirit, eternal and majestic, ruler of the heavens and the earth, before whom a thousand years pass as a watch in the night, yet who art mindful of each one of us, we invoke Thy blessing upon us as we inaugurate our centennial anniversary.

"We are grateful for those sturdy pioneers whose imagination and devotion built bridges over which this generation is now passing—bridges of good government, churches, schools, industry.

"May we never be unmindful of their efforts and, building upon the foundations they layed, move on to greater accomplishments in the years ahead.

"Give us strong vision and a will for hard work that we may wisely weave from the patterns set before us, products of character and industry that shall endure.

"We, thy people, stemming from differing races, religion, and languages, would pause in humble acknowledgment of every gift which thou hast so graciously bestowed—peace in a world of conflict, liberty and justice within our borders, a beloved democracy rooted in our common life and kept secure through blood, labor, and tears.

"May the spirit of cooperation; unity of purpose; community pride and confidence in thy guidance, be our watchwords as we enter the years of mystery in the century we now face.

"May we be always aware of our spiritual and moral responsibilities and dedicated to every principle that shall enable us to remain strong as individuals and as a people.

"Lord God of Hosts, whose stewards we are, thy name be praised for ever and ever. Amen."

Judge Kittredge presented John Redmond Lynskey, of Hackensack, N. J., another native of the town, as master of ceremonies and the famous composer was given a tumultuous welcome.

Chairman Kittredge expressed the pleasure of the guests in having Matthew J. Connelly, secretary to President Harry S. Truman, present at the head table and asked the modest Clinton native to take a bow.

Next came one of the high lights of the program when the personable and popular John Redmond Lynskey stepped to the microphone to render, for the first time, in public, the Clinton Centennial Song, which he composed, with the recording by Carroll Gibbons, another native of the town and his famous Hotel Savoy (London) Orchestra, which has been the featured attraction in Great Britain's leading hostelry for more than a decade.

Never before in the history of Clinton have two musicians collaborated in presenting in the town of their nativity a composition which will be sung and hummed by the present and succeeding generations and which formed one of the high lights of the banquet.

CLINTON CENTENNIAL SONG

Mr. Lynskey dedicated the composition with these appropriate words: "Affectionately dedicated to the good folks of my old home town on its one hundredth anniversary. Sincerely, John Redmond Lynskey."

On the title page are the words, printed in blue, Clinton Centennial Song, words and music by John Redmond Lynskey, and the seal of Clinton, with 1850 at the left and 1950 at the right. The town seal, as almost everybody knows reads "Town of Clinton, Massachusetts, Incorporated 1850" with a picture of the old town hall building forming the center.

Mr. Lynskey has set the words to music that provide not only a catchy composition that in coming days will become Clinton's theme song, but one that will inspire marching feet wherever it is heard.

The offering is all inclusive in that it stresses the popular nicknames of sections of Clinton that have been familiar to every Clintonian since the town came into being.

Listen to the words he sang for the first time in public:

"You won't find a better town,
Than this seven-letter town,
C-l-i-n-t-o-n,
Visit once you'll call again.
Clinton! Clinton!
Happy anniversary!
Proud of you and should be,
Good old Clinton, Mass.
Cheerful, friendly,
Show me any city,
That is half as pretty,
Clinton has the class,
Cal-l-for-nia, the Acre,
Burditt Hill, and Germantown,
Duck Harbor, the North-End.
The prettiest town for miles around.
Clinton, Clinton!
I have been a rover,
Roamed the whole world over and say,
'You're the capital of the U. S. A.'"

SURPRISE SPRUNG

Next came the surprise number of the program when it was announced that Chairman Kittredge would talk with Carroll Gibbons, director of the Hotel Savoy orchestra, London, England, who had made the recording of the theme song which was repeated instrumentally. Stepping to a telephone at the left of the stage Judge Kittredge called London and in a comparatively few seconds he and Mr. Gibbons were talking over 5,000 miles of wire.

The chairman said, "This is Austin Kittredge, Carroll, how are you?" "Hello, Austin, I'm all right, how are you?" with the words clearly heard by all at the head table and by many seated near that area.

"I'm fine, Carroll," replied Judge Kittredge and then came the inquiry, "Where are you, Austin?" "In the Clinton town hall, Carroll, where we have just presented your recording of John Redmond's Centennial Song and we want to thank you for what you have done to make this great occasion memorable in the annals of Clinton."

Asking to speak with Congressman PHILBIN the toastmaster stepped to the phone and said: "Hello, Carroll, this is PHIL PHILBIN." Came the clear reply, "Hello, PHIL, how are you?"

Then Mr. Gibbons asked if he might speak to Mr. Redmond and the latter seized the phone and said, "Hello, Carroll, this is John Redmond Lynskey Korsakov," a sally that brought laughter and applause from the audience.

Mr. Gibbons said, "I am sorry I can't be with you, tonight, but I hope to be back in Clinton sometime in the near future."

Mr. Redmond asked the audience to send its greetings to the orchestra leader which it did by rising and expressing its appreciation of the hands-across-the-sea telephone conversation which will long be remembered by the banqueters as a novel and unexpected feature of the program.

FOSTER ADDRESS HERE

George Connors, for many years one of Clinton's popular vocalists, rendered One Hundred Years From Now, and Miss Dolores Baldyga was heard in a selection.

Mr. Redmond announced that when he learned that Secretary Connelly would attend the banquet he immediately composed a song which he hoped the President's right-hand man would sing, but learning that he was in good voice he would attempt to render it himself and out came the words, "I am wondering about Harry?" a bon mot apropos to the President's rough sea voyage to Key West, Fla.

Musical reveries of the past and present which included spiritual, classical, and popular numbers followed the speaking program. Miss Mary Cassidy sang The Last Rose of Summer; Will You Remember, was rendered by Miss Barbara Mooney; The World Is Mine, by Miss Jean O'Brien; Galway Bay, by Edward J. Walsh; Somewhere a Voice Is Calling, by Mrs. John E. O'Malley; Dear Hearts and Gentle People, by Joseph E. Fontana, Jr.; Thine Alone, by Miss Ethel Hester, concluded with Ave Maria, composed by Rev. Father Tracey and arranged by Mrs. T. Frank McDonald.

The benediction was pronounced by Rabbi Aaron Twersky, of Congregation Shaarei Zedeck, as follows:

Rabbi Aaron Twersky, in pronouncing the benediction spoke in both Hebrew and English, as follows:

"And concerning all the people that dwell in this community, Blessed art Thou O Lord our God, King of the Universe who has kept us in life and hast preserved us and enabled us to reach this hundredth historical anniversary.

"O Heavenly Father, as we leave this auspicious banquet of our beloved community, bless, keep, and safeguard the duly elected officers and inhabitants that live herein.

"Bless our Governor, Congressman, and all who are guiding us in the development and furtherance of the bastion of democracy of our country and our community. As we conclude our brilliant program instill in our hearts, O God, a love of Thy teaching, help us to live in peace and contentment as brothers under one flag.

"Raise aloft our country so that it shall shine as a beacon of light to a tottering, unstable world.

"Give us this day new inspiration to work for the greater glory and progress of our community.

"May it reach its two hundredth anniversary in freedom from fear, want, hate, and destruction.

"May we derive great civic pride in our accomplishment.

"Lead us, Heavenly Father, in Thy faith of righteousness and goodness forever. Amen."

With the stage darkened and a spotlight playing on the American flag, the chorus and audience joined in singing Auld Lang Syne and America.

The program came to an end at 12:30 o'clock this morning and even then many of the guests were reluctant to leave the auditorium. Hundreds lingered to meet out-of-town patrons, all of whom were former residents and whose love for the old home town made them eager to join with its citizens of today in the memorable event that marked the initial observance of century-old Clinton.

THE DECORATIONS

When the diners entered the auditorium they were greeted by a striking decorative motif. Draped on the balcony railings were festoons of the national colors, with the stage the center of attraction.

At the left were the figures "1850" in 2-foot high silver numerals and at the right, "1950," while in front of a green velvet drop extending the width of the stage was a silver motto, "1850—Our Centennial—1950."

Mounds of ferns, spring flowers, and potted plants marked the "1850," "1950" figures and the area surrounding a staff carrying a silken American flag spotlighted and waved by an electric fan.

The head table which filled the entire area between the east and west doors leading to the stage was ornamented with three large mounds of spring flowers and tapers in silver candelabra, while on all tables where the guests were seated were vases of jonquils.

A basket of artificial red roses made by Mrs. John F. Flannagan was a feature of the stage design. Giant palms reared their leaves at either side of the stage, all presenting a picture that will be long remembered by the guests.

Immediately after the serving of the menu scores of guests rushed to the head table where they kept Governor Dever, Lieutenant Governor Sullivan, Congressmen Philbin, John Redmond, and other dignitaries busy for 15 minutes attaching their autographs to the menu cards.

SENT OF GRATITUDE

Every resident of Clinton owes a deep gratitude to Chairman Austin J. Kittredge for the herculean work he performed in carrying to a successful and brilliant conclusion the most appropriate program. He was the motivating power of the big event and it was he who conceived the unusual features including the recording of the theme song by Carroll Gibbons, the toasts, and all of the countless angles of the banquet.

Paul Redmond's Orchestra provided the dinner musical program and Mrs. T. Frank McDonald and George Connors served as musical directors.

The hostesses, in evening gowns, included the Misses Margaret M. O'Malley, Bette Ann Kittredge, Mary Jaquith, Mary E. Freel, Shirley Coccione, Bamby Philbin, Gretta Nordstrom, Carrole Nordstrom, Joan Perla, and Janice O'Malley, all daughters of members of the general committee.

The menu included fruit cocktail, sweet mixed pickles, hearts of celery, roast tenderloin of beef, mushroom sauce, baked potatoes, frosted peas, banana and pineapple fritters, with wine sauce, chef's salad with French dressing, assorted cake, macaroons, assorted ice creams, frozen pudding, rolls, butter, and coffee.

Special Justice Austin J. Kittredge served as general chairman of the notable event.

The banquet committee included Austin J. Kittredge, chairman; Matthew J. Connelly, vice chairman, Congressman Philip J. Philbin, Representative Henry W. Pickford, Rev. James S. Barry, D. D., Wesley J. Officer, Paul J. Lynskey, Francis J. Coleman, Mrs. Hawley E. Morton, William J. Schott, Mrs. David E. Gallagher, Leo J. DeBlois, Dante F. Coccione, and Mrs. John T. Flanagan.

The executive committee was composed of Congressman Philip J. Philbin, honorary chairman, Member of Congress; Roy A. Freitag, honorary vice chairman; Dr. Charles E. Abbott, vice chairman; Miss Sarah L. O'Toole, vice chairman; Joseph T. Peters, treasurer; Mrs. Harold J. Mason, secretary; Robert E. Freel, Attorney Morton C. Jaquith, and John J. Mitchell.

The general committee includes Rev. James S. Barry, D. D., Rev. E. Maurice Hussey, Orsata J. Fontana, Selectman Paul F. Lasala, Mrs. Edward H. Malkay, Joseph F. McCaffrey, Attorney John F. McGrail, Axel F. Nordstrom, Joseph R. O'Malley, Daniel Paul, Mrs. George V. Raymford, David E. Reisner, Deputy Sheriff Hugh F. Hanks, Ora L. Stone, and Walter E. Sparks.

The reception committee included members of the general committee.

Subcommittee on banquet in charge of following arrangements:

Dinner: Dante Coccione, Francis Coleman.

Tickets: William Schott.

Decorating: Mrs. David Gallagher, Mrs. Hawley Morton.

Stage settings: Leo DeBlois, Dante Coccione.

Arranging menus: Wesley J. Officer, Representative Henry W. Pickford, assisted by Henry M. O'Toole.

Public address: under direction of Fred Vorspatel.

Decorating interior town hall: Paul Foley, Worchester, assisted by decorating committee.

Floral decorating: A. W. Schneider, florist. One hundred red roses were made by Mrs. John Flanagan.

Entertainment: Francis Coleman, Paul J. Lynskey.

Major Parties and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended two editorials from the Chicago Defender bearing on the outlook of American Negroes on the prospects for civil-rights legislation, when taken together, bear out a fundamental principle which I have been advocating. It is that civil-rights legislation, if it is to pass, must be bipartisan and that the administration must lay it aside as a partisan issue. This was again illustrated by the inability to muster on the House floor the necessary votes to pass an FEPC with enforcement powers, many votes of Representatives from the border States being lost on the Democratic side and many Republican votes for northern and western areas which should have supported such a measure being also lost. Dissatisfaction with both major political parties is a most unsatisfactory state of mind as far as both major parties are concerned to be driving the American Negro into. I urge most thoughtful reading of these two editorials by every Member:

[From the Chicago Defender of February 18, 1950]

THE REPUBLICANS STATE THEIR CASE

Of all the comment in the Nation's press on the new statement of aims and principles released by the Republican Party last week, the report of W. H. Lawrence, of the New York Times, seems most interesting.

Mr. Lawrence reported that:

"The proposal on the civil rights issue stirred considerable controversy and brought protests from Senator LODGE and Representative JAVITS. The party pledge as approved read: 'The right of equal opportunity to work, to vote, to advance in life and to be protected under the law should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. Therefore, we shall continue to sponsor legislation to protect the rights of minorities.'

"Senator LODGE wanted the party to declare its 'forthright determination' to enact civil rights legislation at the present congressional session 'and to break a filibuster if necessary,' but he was overruled. Republicans have often found common ground with southern Democrats in blocking administration bills.

"Since the party had picked a Lincoln Day rally to unveil its 1950 manifesto, Representative JAVITS said he regretted that the statement 'did not declare unequivocally for FEPC, antilynching, and anti-poll-tax legislation in the best Lincoln tradition'."

Reporter Lawrence goes on to point out that Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, "asserted that the platform was filled with vague generalities which would appeal to persons who voted Republican anyway, but which would have no special appeal to the 'rank-and-file of the people who win elections'." The gracious Republican lady from Maine took the words out of our mouth.

[From the Chicago Defender of March 11, 1950]

PROMISES VERSUS PERFORMANCE

As we enter the 1950 election campaign the Democrats, both locally and nationally, should do a little soul searching.

Locally there seems to be a growing conviction on the part of Boss Jack Arvey and company that the Negro vote is "in the bag" for the Democratic Party. As the song goes, they seem to think that they have the world "in a jug" and the stopper in their hands.

We would like to remind them of the delightful tune from Porgy and Bess, It Ain't Necessarily So.

The Democrats here have, as we pointed out some weeks ago, ignored the wishes of the people in the first and fifth senatorial districts by putting up hand-picked "hacks." They have shown similar stupidity by refusing to give Judge Wendell Green the designation for the superior court.

As a matter of fact, the Democratic Party as a whole seems to be suffering from indigestion. They have apparently been eating too high on the hog, and now they are sleeping on a full stomach. The Democrats in Illinois and in the Nation have been and are now in a position to live up to their promises.

Here are some of the questions in the minds of the voters:

1. When will the people see some leadership in breaking the bottleneck on Mayor Kennelly's housing program?

2. Can Governor Stevenson compare his record to date with past administrations?

3. What happened to the administration's leaders in Congress in the fight for a strong FEPC?

4. How did it happen that Chairman Boyle of the Democratic National Committee stated that Congressman DAWSON was vice chairman of the committee, and now nobody in Washington is quite sure what position DAWSON has on the committee?

5. Why were the qualified Negro candidates overlooked in the appointment of the new Governor for the Virgin Islands?

The action promised by the Democrats in 1948 caught the imagination of the people. Now, 2 years later, we have more promises and few accomplishments. This lack of action is cause for grave concern among voters who turned the tide in 1948 and who may turn the tide again.

The wishes of the people have been ignored and forgotten for the benefit of a small group of selfish men concerned only in maintaining their own little selfish political interests.

They have forgotten the people, but the people have yet to be heard.

Performances, not promises, will set the course.

Acheson, a Belated Convert to Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article by George Sokolsky, noted columnist, who directs attention to the record of Secretary Acheson's in the China situation and his change of attitude. I commend it to the attention of all Members:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Dean Acheson is now a convert to reality. After a career of error, beginning in 1941 and ending a week ago, he has finally come to a realization of the errors, but not to a recognition of his responsibility for them. His last gamble with destiny was a bad throw. He had fantastically assumed that reality was at fault and he played to lose on Mao Tse-Tung.

In any country other than ours, any man who had been so consistently and obstinately wrong would have been driven from public life. He would long since have been forced to resign.

All he seems to do here is to announce a change of policy, not even confessing his errors, and we are expected to accept his conversion without scrutiny or even wonder.

Acheson asks us all to unite in a total diplomacy against Soviet Russia, but how can we unite with him? From 1941 until last week, he and his teammate, Alger Hiss, were responsible for the appeasement of Russian policy. The record is clear.

Dean Acheson, graduate of the Harvard Law School, like so many others of the confused employees of our Government, entered upon his career in the Treasury, where he did not agree with Mr. Roosevelt's fantastic fiscal conceptions and was dropped.

In 1941 he entered the State Department as Assistant Secretary of State; then he became Under Secretary of State, a position he held until 1947 when he resigned. He returned as Secretary of State in 1949.

The Acheson influence in the State Department has been enormous. He was the smart man. His principal adjutant was Alger Hiss.

Alger's brother, Donald, became a partner in Acheson's law firm, which specialized in representing foreign countries in Washington, particularly such as had special relations with the State and Treasury Departments, Colombia, Greece, Iran, Denmark, Pakistan and Soviet Poland.

We must now go back a step to the Harold Ware Communist cell organized in 1934. That cell was organized to penetrate high levels of administration and it is clear from the evidence at both Hiss trials that Alger Hiss was of this cell.

At any rate, in 1939 Dr. J. B. Matthews, of the Dies committee gave to the Department of Justice the names of the members of the Ware cell. Among those names was that of Alger Hiss. Matthews showed me the list at the time.

Also in that year, Whittaker Chambers and Isaac Don Levine discussed most of the evidence that was brought out at both Hiss trials with Adolf A. Berle, then of the State Department.

Berle has testified under oath that as early as 1941, he had warned Acheson that the loyalty of both Alger and Donald Hiss was doubtful. In 1944, Berle, then security officer of the State Department, warned Acheson and others in the State Department that their pro-Russian policy was wrong.

The Acheson group, with Alger Hiss as Acheson's principal assistant, fought Berle, had him transferred to Brazil, and as Berle said: "That ended my diplomatic career."

Subsequent to Berle's reports on Alger Hiss, Acheson had his friend transferred from the Far Eastern Affairs Division, where he had no business to be as he knew nothing about the subject, to the Office of Special Political Affairs which Acheson ran and which had to do with all the peace efforts of the Government.

This was no place for a man whose loyalty was in doubt and who could have an affiliation with a foreign government that might imperil the negotiating power of the United States.

Acheson cannot plead that he did not know about Hiss; he can only say that he did not believe what he was told. But in his position, could he risk a doubtful personality as executive secretary of Dumbarton Oaks or as President Roosevelt's adviser at Yalta, or as secretary general of the San Francisco Conference setting up the United Nations?

Dean Acheson succeeded Joseph C. Grew as Under Secretary of State after Grew insisted upon prosecuting the spies in the Amerasia case. What power in our Government drove Grew out and put Acheson in his place?

Freedom or Bondage—That's the Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a letter that appeared in the Racine Journal-Times recently and in which the writer calls attention to the important choice that confronts this Nation. It carries a message that every citizen should fully understand:

[From the Racine Journal-Times of March 14, 1950]

FREEDOM OR BONDAGE, CHOICE OF AMERICANS

DEAR TED: The constitution of the former American slave States generally specified that the masters must provide their slaves with adequate housing, sufficient food, medical care and old-age benefits. The Mississippi constitution also contained this sentence "The legislature shall have no power to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves expect where the slaves shall have rendered some distinguished service to their country." The greatest reward a slave could get was freedom.

Slaveholders then, like Government now, believed that they knew what was best for their charges. Proof of the error of their belief is that personal responsibility for one's own welfare brings increased material well-being.

Consider the remarkable progress of the Negroes who in 1862 were almost 100 percent slaves, and who today are about as self-supporting as any other American citizens. Compare their progress to that of the American Indians who were made wards of the Government and given State-guaranteed security instead of freedom. They have become less self-supporting and more dependent upon aid from "The Great White Father in Washington." There appears to be no scientific basis for belief that Indians are an inferior race. Those left to their own responsibility have proved as great a capacity for understanding and advancement as the Negro. Yet, there are 12,000 Federal employees directly taking care of 233,000 Indians at the present time.

GOOD INTENTIONS

Apparently most of the planners and advocates of government paternalism honestly desire to help the people, but their efforts always result in some form of bondage. For example, leaders of England's labor government never dreamed of bringing compulsory labor to England, but that's what happened. Lenin and Stalin probably never intended to bring slavery into Russia. Their expressed plan was to free Russia from the Czarist government. But look what happened.

Our ancestors knew that electing or appointing a man to office did not endow him with wisdom, only with power. Government can and should use force to create kindness, charity, to make people work, to solve their medical problems, to make them live in specific houses.

IT'S NOTHING NEW

State-guaranteed security is nothing new. It was written in the code of Hammurabi over 4,000 years ago. In one form or another, it has been tried without success throughout history. The Romans called it bread and now we call it New Deal or Square Deal.

It is not too late to turn away from government-insured security.

The choice is ours. When one chooses freedom—that is, personal responsibility—he should understand the decision is not a popular one, immediately. He will be called vile names while attempting to explain ultimate results of Government-insured security, housing, free medicine, compulsory security, and guaranteed jobs. The choice of freedom never has been easy. Freedom can only be held by the strong, not the weak whose character has been snapped, whose principles have been lowered, and who has lost the God-given right to help himself and exercise his own free will.

ALBERT LEITH.

P. S.—Any expression in favor of government-secured security is an expression against our form of government. The two clash in principle.

Equal Perils—Not Equal Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Daily Compass of March 17, 1950:

AMENDMENT REPRESENTS NEITHER SOUND LAW NOR SOUND BEHAVIOR

(By Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, New York)

Although I could not—dare not— pretend to be an authority on women, I do believe this choice will provide a fascinating challenge to most American women. They have a well-developed spirit of adventure, liberally mixed with common sense, imagination, intuition and humor—a delightful, charming combination. American women are regarded everywhere as the most beautiful, intelligent and capable in the world. Since she won the right to franchise, she has made tremendous strides in business, in politics, and in the professions. She is the motivating force in every community, the impetus, usually, to all forms of civic betterment and progress. The American male is justly proud of his mate, her talents and her achievements in a multitude of endeavors.

It is interesting to note that while the colonel's lady and Judy O'Grady are sisters under the skin, fundamentally indivisible, they not only have "fashions" in clothes but in attitudes. Females have run the gamut from the Amazon to the clinging vine. If we should succumb to the allurements of a study of social organization, anthropology or archeology, we are piqued by references to former thriving civilizations in which matriarchies flourished.

One conjures up a picture of ancient man quite content with his lot of peeling what served them for potatoes, bustling around with the pots, dusting and polishing the lares and penates, firmly convincing junior of the general utility of the them current equivalent of hat, shoes, and overcoat in the middle of a cloudburst.

To bring it even closer to home, there are definite quivverings along my spinal column as I read the undoubted reports of the ambidextrous efficiency of the picturesque Carrie Nation and her hatchet. As an ardent foe of prohibition, waves of gratitude roll over my soul that the formidable Carrie "came, saw and conquered" in an era other than my own. I mumble prayers of thanksgiving that I shall never be exposed to the hazards of a personal encounter with that colorful creature!

Then, too, we have the recent advertising slogan, "Never underestimate the power of a

"Queen," and believe me, I don't. I've been married for 34 years.

With such heartfelt compliments, I optimistically hope that I have succeeded in riveting the attention of the fair sex. I have taken a verbal pounding, comparable to an artillery barrage, from representatives of various groups who have espoused the cause of the equal-rights amendment. I seem to recall an ill-found or perhaps idle rumor attributing to me sole responsibility for the tabling of the resolution in the House Judiciary Committee of which I am chairman. Actually, however, at the suggestion of my very charming, distinguished and able colleague, Representative KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, for whom I have the highest regard, I referred the bill to a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee.

Several years ago the House was adorned by the eminent and able former Representative from Connecticut, the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce. She would utter lively yet biting complaint because women were judged as a different kind of people. Quoting from her own experience, she emphasized that her femaleness was always underlined; that more attention was paid to what she wore than what she said. She urged women in all walks of life to fight for the right to be judged equally with men.

Needless to say, Mrs. Luce found a willing and able audience. It is, then, in a mood of quiet desperation, staunchly clinging to whatever may be left of my legislative courage, that I am again sticking my neck out in the hope of compelling the women of the United States to give deeper consideration to the implications of the momentous innovations involved in the equal-rights amendment, which contains many economic and political pitfalls; yes, even social ones. These provisions can ensnare the unwary, possibly uninformed, too busy women of today. If their futures alone were involved, perhaps one would be tempted to place this fateful legislation in the laps of the legislative gods and await its destiny with equanimity and with the poised and casual air of seeing sophistication.

The proposed amendment, however, would erase from the statute books laws relating to widows' pensions, the right of dependent wives and children to the support of the husband and father, alimony, and guardianship. Having washed away the protective legislation for wives, mothers, and widows, the so-called equal-rights amendment offers no alternative safeguarding measures.

We cannot deny that discrimination against women is present. Some States still have laws which forbid women to serve on juries, to hold certain offices, to handle their property without the consent of their husbands, etc. It is not defense of these laws that makes for opposition to the proposed amendment. It is the method that is decried. Using the Constitution for a broom with which to sweep away indiscriminately the good with the bad is neither sound law nor sane behavior.

Surplus Foods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the executive secretary of the International Convention of Disciples of Christ and the resolution adopted by the Council of Agencies:

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION
OF DISCIPLES OF CHRIST,
Indianapolis, Ind., March 7, 1950.

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HESELTON: We are pleased to enclose a copy of a resolution adopted by the Council of Agencies of the Disciples of Christ, a Protestant communion representing 1,900,000 members. This resolution is a petition for the United States Government to distribute surplus foods to hungry peoples of the world rather than destroying the same.

We understand that you have introduced measures somewhat along this line and we think that it would be of interest and value to you and to us if it could be known that this representative group of the Disciples of Christ has gone on record in support of such legislation. If we can be of any help to you in your efforts, aside from commending you for introducing such humanitarian proposals, we will be glad to help if within our power.

Cordially,

GAINES M. COOK,
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTION CONCERNING DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS FOOD BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT TO HUNGRY PEOPLES OF THE WORLD

Whereas there is continuing widespread hunger, poverty, and suffering throughout our world, resulting largely from a global war, to which America contributed a significant part, and thereby is implicated deeply in bringing about the tragic conditions of our time; and

Whereas the Disciples of Christ have set for themselves the goal of $1,500,000 for relief to be raised during the week of compassion, March 5–12, 1950; and

Whereas the Christian people of America are being called upon to participate sacrificially in the "one great hour of sharing" on Sunday, March 12, 1950, in order to bring relief to suffering and destitute peoples; and

Whereas there are great stores of food of various kinds being held by the Government of the United States that could be used to supply the needs of millions of hungry people around the earth; and

Whereas all the Christian people of America are also loyal citizens of our country whose Government holds in storage a vast quantity of food which has been purchased in part by the expenditure of tax money which these Christian citizens have paid into the Government; and

Whereas the gift of these large quantities of food to needy peoples in various areas of the world would show that America has the deep desire to aid all peoples in their distress; and also might lessen greatly the tensions created by fear, greed, hatred, and suspicion which lead to the increase of armaments and the preparation for war; and by such aid give greater hopes for peace and release energies for constructive purposes: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of Agencies of Disciples of Christ through the international convention, That we appeal to all other religious bodies in America to join in an immediate petition to the Congress of the United States to promptly take the necessary action to give and to deliver to the peoples of the world the surplus food supplies which the Government now holds in storage, where and to whom, it will bring the greatest good to the health and happiness of mankind.

Adopted, Indianapolis, Ind., February 7, 1950.

Questions and Answers on Housing Act of 1950—H. R. 7402, Eighty-first Congress, as Reported February 23, 1950—Housing for Middle-Income Families (Cooperative Housing)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following questions and answers on the Housing Act of 1950, H. R. 7402, Eighty-first Congress, as reported February 23, 1950:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE HOUSING ACT OF 1950, H. R. 7402, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, AS REPORTED FEBRUARY 23, 1950—HOUSING FOR MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILIES (COOPERATIVE HOUSING)

1. Question. What is the purpose of this title?

Answer. The purpose of this title is to provide a means whereby good housing of adequate size for families with children can be produced for families of middle income. (1) By furnishing technical assistance to cooperative or other nonprofit housing corporations; (2) by making financial assistance available to such corporations for housing which will promote economy both in construction and in operation and maintenance; and (3) by facilitating the investment of private capital in the development of such housing.

The title would carry out the recommendations made by the President in his State of the Union message when he said: "To aid middle-income families, I recommend that the Congress enact new legislation authorizing a vigorous program to help cooperatives and other nonprofit groups building housing which these families can afford."

2. Question. What organizations are eligible for assistance under this title?

Answer. The two types of organizations eligible for assistance under this title are: (1) private, cooperative ownership corporations which will provide housing the permanent occupancy of which is restricted to the members of the corporations; and (2) any other private, nonprofit corporation authorized to provide dwellings either for sale to a corporation of the character described above or for rent to the families which will occupy the housing.

3. Question. Why are other organizations not eligible?

Answer. The basic purpose of this title is to provide a means whereby adequate housing is produced and made available at monthly costs which middle-income families can afford. The problem is essentially one of further cost reductions in construction, financing, and operation. Cooperative housing and other nonprofit housing offer the greatest promise of achieving such cost reductions and are the only forms of private enterprise capable of translating every possible economy directly into corresponding reductions in the monthly charges which the individual consumer must pay for the housing. Housing operated for profit (even though the profits or dividends are limited) necessarily involves additional charges which are passed on to the consumer. To that extent, if such housing were made eligible for assistance under this title, the purpose of the title would correspondingly tend to be defeated. It should be noted, too, that limited dividend or other corporations which are not eligible for aid under this title I may have recourse to government aids provided in other legislation, such as the mortgage insurance aids administered by the FHA.

4. Question. What type of housing can be built under this title?

Answer. The housing built under this title must be of sound design and construction; located in well planned neighborhoods; and designed for economy and efficiency in construction and operation. It may not be of elaborate or extravagant design, but must be of adequate size for family living. These requirements are designed to carry out the basic purpose of the title to provide good housing which middle-income families with children can afford. Within these limitations, the cooperatives and nonprofit corporations would be free to build whatever type of housing is best suited to the needs of their members and is acceptable in the community where it is located. Projects aided under the bill are not restricted to particular materials or types of construction. Masonry, wood, or other construction materials may be used if sound standards of design and construction are met. The projects may consist of large multiple dwelling structures, garden apartments, or two-family houses, and may also consist of single-family dwellings, including row houses and detached or semi-detached houses. Well designed projects combining several structural types would also be permitted.

5. Question. Who are the "middle-income" families?

Answer. The middle-income housing market for urban families in the country as a whole can be taken as comprising those urban families of two or more persons whose cash incomes were between $2,800 and $4,400 a year. One-third of the urban families in this country had annual incomes within that range during 1948, according to the latest Census Bureau study. Of course, the actual income range which defines middle-income families in any given community will vary considerably from the national average range. Thus, in cities with a population of 1,000,000 or more, one-third of the families in such cities had incomes within the range of $3,135 to $4,841. In smaller communities the income range for the middle third of the population dropped somewhat, until in communities of 2,500 to 10,000 population, the range was $2,451 to $3,820. Further variations will, of course, be found among communities within each population class.

6. Question. Is this title proposed as the single or major solution to the problem of housing middle-income families?

Answer. No. The statement has been made by an opponent of this title that the program authorized by the title is intended to serve all middle-income families, that there are about 8,000,000 such families; and that there is danger, that, once started, the program will snowball into huge proportions. However, the fact is that it is merely a supplementary program to aid additional, middle-income families obtain good housing they can afford. The great proportion of middle-income families will continue to be served by existing housing which they find satisfactory, and many others will be served by new FHA sales and rental housing which is coming on to the market at prices and rents which a considerable number of middle-income families can afford. Indeed, aids provided under title I of this bill are intended to supplement aids for moderate cost housing which are contained in existing legislation or which would be provided by amendments to existing legislation, particularly the amendments to the National Housing Act contained in title II of this bill and in H. R. 6070 passed by the House last August and now pending before the Senate. Thus, the program under title I was never intended to, nor can it, furnish a single answer to the housing problems of middle-income families. It does represent a very important and necessary means of rounding out our efforts in this field.

7. Question. What monthly charges for housing are middle-income families able to afford?

Answer. On the basis of the usually accepted rule that monthly expenditures for shelter should not exceed 20 percent of income, housing for middle-income families should be available at shelter rents ranging from $47 per month to $75 per month, or at a median shelter rent of approximately $60 per month. This range is for the country as a whole, and, of course, the ranges would differ for different communities. Gross rents, that is to say, rents which include utility costs, would run about $8.50 per month higher.

8. Question. Is sufficient housing being produced within the rents or charges which families of middle income can afford?

Answer. No. Various attempts have been made recently to prove that the middle-income housing market is being served adequately and that therefore the additional aids which would be provided by this title are not necessary. In each instance the arguments involved a misuse of national averages. The arguments were based on data purporting to prove that a given percentage of all the housing produced in the country during 1948 or 1949 was sold or rented at prices or rentals which were within the means of a given percentage—and it was always stated as a substantial percentage—of all American families. The fallacy inherent in such statements is that it balances off the low-cost homes, most of which are produced in the South and in parts of other sections where prevailing construction costs and income levels are lower or where savings in home construction are possible because the climate is milder, against the housing needs of middle-income families in higher-cost areas, such as New York, Chicago, or Detroit.

Another misuse of statistics to support the attempted proof that all middle-income families are being served adequately arises from the fact that so many of the houses and apartments coming on to the market, especially those which sell or rent at charges low enough to be within the means of middle-income families, are not large enough for families with children.

A detailed discussion of this misuse of statistics, and a summary of the actual facts concerning prices, rents, and room counts for new construction in many different localities may be found in the section of the committee report devoted to this title of the bill. These facts prove conclusively that a considerable number of middle-income families have been priced out of the market in most areas and that a wide range of such families have been priced out of the market in high-cost areas. Similarly, the Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, testified how, in a number of cities visited by him, builders tried to convince him that they were meeting the needs of middle-income families, but how an actual inspection of the houses which middle-income families in that locality could afford showed that they were too small for families with children.

9. Question. Is financial assistance to cooperative organizations new?

Answer. No. For example, in 1921 the War Finance Corporation was authorized by the Congress to make advances to any bank or trust company or "to any cooperative association of producers in the United States which may have made advances for agricultural purposes." The Federal intermediate credit banks were established in 1923 to make loans to cooperative associations. The Federal Farm Board was created in 1929 to make loans to cooperative associations of farmers to promote the establishment and financing of a farm marketing system. The Home Loan Bank System was established in 1932 to provide a credit reserve for member home financing institutions, chiefly mutual savings and loan associations. The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 authorized loans to cooperative nonprofit, or limited-dividend associations for financing the construction and operation of generating plants.

10. Question. To what extent can rents or charges for housing under this bill be attained below rents for new housing now being produced?

Answer. Taking full advantage of the provisions of this title, it should be possible for cooperatives to provide housing at a monthly cost about 25 percent below the rents charged for comparable conventionally financed housing. For example, a 4½-room apartment costing $8,000 to build will bring a rent of about $60 a month (thereby permitting a normal profit to the owners) if it is financed under section 608 of the National Housing Act. In contrast, the same unit, if built as part of a cooperative housing project aided under this title, could be made available at about $45 a month.

11. Question. What items which enter into the monthly cost of housing will be reduced under this bill to make such lower charges possible?

Answer. Cooperatives aided under this title will be able to provide housing at charges 25 percent below conventionally built and operated rental project rents because they will be able to:

(1) Eliminate promoter's profits (as distinguished from the profits of the building contractor) and profits on investment. This follows from the nonprofit nature of the enterprise. Also, cooperatives will not inflate their initial investment by carrying their land investment on their books at a sum higher than was actually paid or by allowing for the standard 5 percent of project cost for architect's fees when actually less was paid.

(2) Reduce operating and maintenance costs through self-help and better care by the occupants. This follows from the fact that the occupants as owners will be in a position to do a great deal of the maintenance work, particularly painting and redecorating, themselves. Experience has also shown that families living in cooperative housing will, as a matter of common prudence, as well as because of natural pride of ownership, take the best possible care of the housing in which they live and which they themselves own.

(3) Minimize vacancy and uncollectable rent losses. This assumption is based on a large body of actual experience in the field of rental housing and on a lesser—but nevertheless very substantial—body of experience gained since 1927 under New York State limited-dividend legislation. Smaller vacancy losses for housing built under this title will follow not only from its nonspeculative nature, but also from the fact that vacancy losses always tend to be much lower—particularly when economic conditions are less favorable—in moderate-cost housing than in higher-cost housing.

(4) Demonstrate greater stability in values hence permitting a longer amortization period. This follows from the fact that nonspeculative housing is designed to fill a long-range need, and that moderate-cost housing will serve a more stable market. Speculative housing, on the other hand, is often designed, constructed, and operated so as to obtain a quick profit rather than for long-range stability of value. Also, higher-cost housing fluctuates more in value than lower-cost housing.

(3) Obtain financing at a lower interest rate estimated to be about 3¼ percent as opposed to a 4-percent rate (plus a one-half of 1 percent premium) for 608 projects. This follows from the aids provided by the bill, particularly the guaranty by the Government of the debentures issued by the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives, and from the greater stability of value.

12. Question. What groups support this title?

Answer. The following national groups have endorsed this title to the Congress: American Association of Social Workers, American Federation of Labor, American Legion, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Cooperative League of the United States of America, Jewish War Veterans, National Conference of Catholic Charities, National Cooperative Mutual Housing Association, National Housing Conference, National Negro Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

There are no doubt other groups who will support the title (many have supported similar proposals in the past) but who have not yet had time to obtain an expression of opinion from their memberships.

13. Question. What forms of technical aid would be made available to cooperatives under the title?

Answer. The Cooperative Housing Commissioner would be authorized to furnish plans and methods for the sound organization of housing cooperatives, including technical advice and assistance in their formation and in the planning, financing, construction, and operation of their projects.

The following excerpt from a statement by Mr. William A. Clarke of the Mortgage Bankers Association gives a concrete example of the type of aid needed. Mr. Clarke is chairman of a committee of the American Friends Service Committee which is now engaged in setting up a housing cooperative in Philadelphia.

There is really very little in the form of literature or very little in the form of proposed corporate set-ups and what-not on which we can draw. I confess that many of us are feeling our way along with it. It would be, in our opinion, helpful to have some spot in the Government where that kind of thing could be done.

* * * * * * *

"We think the cooperatives are fine and I think the matter of giving assistance in the formation of them by advice, counsel, and planning is excellent."

14. Question. Are there precedents for such technical aid by the Federal Government?

Answer. Yes. There are numerous precedents. For example, the technical aid would be similar to the professional guidance furnished to agricultural production and marketing cooperatives and to rural electric utility cooperatives by various agencies of the Department of Agriculture. It is also comparable to the variety of services rendered to the building industry, land developers, mortgage lenders, and individuals by the Federal Housing Administration. Similar assistance was given to Federal (mutual) savings and loan associations by the Federal home loan bank system, particularly in the early years following the creation of the system in 1932.

15. Question. Will the Federal Government build or operate this housing?

Answer. No. The Federal Government will neither build nor operate the housing. The housing will be built and operated by private cooperative or other private nonprofit corporations. These corporations may either enter into contracts with private builders who will do the actual construction work or they may act as their own general contractors. In some cases, the members of a cooperative may wish to do some of the construction work themselves on a mutual self-help basis. The corporations will also operate and manage the projects themselves.

The Government will exercise certain limited controls as a condition of giving financial assistance under the title. These controls will assure the soundness of the mortgage loan; that the borrower is a bona fide cooperative or nonprofit corporation; that the housing is of sound and economical construction and of adequate size for families with children; that the location and planning will afford reasonable assurance of a stable neighborhood; and that the housing will serve families of moderate income. Similarly, under the mortgage-insurance programs, the FHA now approves construction plans and specifications, passes on the location of the housing, inspects the construction, and passes on the credit rating of the mortgagor. These functions and the final approval of the insured mortgage amount are performed by the FHA to assure that the housing is well designed, well built, and well located, and that the insured mortgage is economically sound or represents an acceptable risk.

16. Question. How would preliminary planning of projects aided by the title be financed?

Answer. The Cooperative Housing Commissioner would be authorized to make preliminary advances of funds to soundly organized cooperative and other nonprofit housing corporations to enable them to formulate specific plans for the projects they proposed to undertake. The advances would be limited to the amount required for necessary work preliminary to construction. They would not exceed 5 percent of the estimated development cost of the projects, would bear interest at the going Federal rate plus one-half of 1 percent, and would be repaid out of any subsequent loans for the projects. It is probable that the maximum authorized advance loan would be required only in the case of relatively small projects, and that on larger projects the advances would run to about 3 percent of estimated project cost. The advances would be paid out only as actual progress was made in the formulation of the project and in the actual preparation of plans, thus reducing the risk involved in making them. Excessive fees, salaries, or charges in connection with a housing project would not be permitted.

17. Question. How much money would be authorized for preliminary advances?

Answer. A revolving fund of $25,000,000 would be authorized.

18. Question. Why are preliminary advance loans essential to the program under this title?

Answer. Experience has demonstrated the extreme difficulty which cooperatives have encountered in their efforts to obtain funds from normal lending sources for preliminary planning and development of specifications. Indeed, very few banks and other lenders have had any experience in making any type of loans to housing cooperatives. Without provision for some small preliminary advances to enable cooperatives to undertake and pay for the complicated job of formulating a housing project, the proposed program to aid cooperatives, which are a relatively new form of private enterprise in the field of housing, may well be seriously impaired. Also, with the aid of preliminary advances, cooperatives will not be in a position where they are forced to turn for help to promoters who will perform planning services in the hope of later gaining an excessive profit in connection with a construction contract or with the sale of land to the cooperative. Similarly, the preliminary advances may make it possible for the cooperative to purchase architectural and other technical services on a more economical basis than normally results when such services are purchased on a contingent-fee basis.

19. Question. Will advance loans lead to speculation?

Answer. No. Ample safeguards have been provided in the title to prevent speculation. Preliminary advances of funds cannot be made until the Commissioner has determined that the borrower is a bona fide cooperative housing corporation or other nonprofit housing corporation; that the borrower will undertake a housing project which will meet a need for housing families of moderate income in the locality; and that there will not be excessive fees, salaries, or charges in connection with the project. Also, as explained in the answer to the previous question, preliminary loans will enable the cooperative to purchase necessary planning, architectural, and other technical services on a sound economic basis. Without such advances, the cooperative might be forced either to purchase such services at greater cost on a contingent-fee basis, or else to turn for planning help to speculators who are interested primarily in selling land to the cooperative or obtaining a highly profitable building contract. Thus, the advance loans will tend to eliminate rather than to encourage speculation.

20. Question. What provisions of the title are designed to assure that the mortgage loans will be made available only to bona fide cooperatives and nonprofit corporations for housing within the financial reach of families of moderate income?

Answer. Before a mortgage loan could be made under the title the Cooperative Housing Commissioner would be required to certify to the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives that: (1) the borrower is a bona fide nonprofit cooperative housing corporation or a private nonprofit corporation authorized to provide housing, (2) the proposed housing project will meet a need for housing for families of moderate income, (3) the proposed project will meet sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life, and (4) the development and management of the project will be such as to promote the economies contemplated under the title. Elaborate or extravagant construction would not be eligible for aid under the title.

The borrower would also agree not to pay any excessive fees, salaries, or charges and to establish and maintain schedules of rents or charges, satisfactory to the Corporation, which will permit the dwellings to be made available to families of moderate income. The title would also provide that the mortgage loan may not exceed the development cost of the housing project nor the amount which the Commissioner determines to be the upper limit within which housing can be provided for families of moderate income in the locality at rentals or other charges within their means. In the case of a loan to a cooperative corporation, the borrower would be required to have, to the extent permitted by State and local law, a priority in the purchase of the interest of each of its members in the event of sale of such interest. It should be noted too that a cooperative would be required to have 50 percent of the members proposed to be served by the housing at the time of making an application for a mortgage loan and at least 80 percent prior to receipt of any proceeds from such a loan. These provisions, plus provisions for democratic voting, would likewise assure that the cooperatives served would be bona fide cooperatives.

Penalties are provided for false statements or misrepresentations made to obtain benefits under the title.

21. Question. What are the major functions of the Cooperative Housing Commissioner under this title?

Answer. The major functions of the Cooperative Housing Commissioner would be to give technical advice and assistance to housing cooperatives and other nonprofit housing corporations, to make advance loans to them for preliminary planning of their projects, and to supervise the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives. These functions would be required to be administered in a manner which will encourage the development by housing cooperatives and other nonprofit housing corporations (individually or through joint undertakings) of sufficient skills and services so that the technical advice and assistance by the Government may be gradually reduced and terminated.

22. Question. What functions would be performed by the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives under this title?

Answer. This proposed Corporation would make and service loans to private cooperative and nonprofit housing corporations in order to enable such corporations to provide housing for families of moderate income. In accomplishing this primary objective, the Corporation would perform such incidental functions as are authorized by the provisions of the title, including the issuing of obligations to obtain funds with which to make loans, over and above those which may be made from capital-stock funds.

23. Question. What is the nature of this Corporation?

Answer. This Corporation would be a mixed-ownership corporation and would carry out its functions under the supervision of the Cooperative Housing Commissioner. The Corporation would be managed by a board of five directors appointed by the Commissioner. Eventually two of the directors would be appointed from among members of stock-holding corporations or other persons representative of housing cooperatives.

Initially the capital stock of the Corporation would be subscribed for and purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury on behalf of the United States. But as loans are made to cooperative and nonprofit housing corporations, these borrowers would subscribe to capital stock of the Corporation in an amount equal to a designated percentage of any particular loan. From the capital stock paid in by private borrowers, all of the stock held by the Secretary of the Treasury would eventually be retired.

24. Question. Is there any precedent for this type of mixed-ownership corporation?

Answer. Yes. The Federal home-loan banks, the Central Bank for Cooperatives, and the regional banks for cooperatives are among such precedents. The Federal home-loan banks, for example, were established in 1932 and began lending operations with $125,000,000 invested by the Government. Member lending institutions were required by statute to subscribe to stock in an amount equal to 1½ percent of their home-mortgage loans. The home-loan banks have gradually retired $50,000,000 of the stock investment of the Federal Government, and member lending institutions now hold stock in excess of $138,000,000.

25. Question. Who would subscribe to the capital stock of the Corporation?

Answer. A portion of the capital stock of the Corporation would be subscribed for by the Secretary of the Treasury. The balance would be subscribed by nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporations and nonprofit corporations borrowing funds from the Corporation.

26. Question. How much capital stock would the Government purchase?

Answer. The maximum amount of capital stock of this Corporation which the Federal Government would be authorized to hold at any one time is $100,000,000.

27. Question. How much stock would be subscribed by cooperative and nonprofit housing corporations?

Answer. The maximum amount of capital stock of the Corporation which could be purchased by borrowing cooperative and nonprofit housing corporations is not prescribed in the title. The title does provide that a participating cooperative or nonprofit housing corporation shall, as a condition of obtaining a loan, subscribe for capital stock to be purchased over a period of time in an amount at least equal to 10 percent of the particular loan involved. Cooperatives would be required to purchase for cash 2½ percent when applying for the loan, 2½ percent when the project is completed, and 5 percent in installments within 20 years. Nonprofit corporations would be permitted to pay for their stock in installments over a 20-year period.

28. Question. What return would be paid on capital stock subscribed to by the Secretary of the Treasury?

Answer. The capital stock of the Corporation purchased by the Federal Government would be preferred as to dividends and assets; also, it would be entitled to cumulative dividends at a rate determined each year by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the probable period of the stock investment and the current rate on outstanding obligations of the United States.

29. Question. What provision is made for returning the Government's investment in the stock of the Corporation?

Answer. The Government's investment in the capital stock of the Corporation would be returned to the Government in this manner: After the paid-in capital stock from participating cooperative and nonprofit housing corporations equals $50,000,000, the Corporation would begin to retire dollar for dollar, out of privately paid capital, the stock held by the Secretary of the Treasury at par plus accrued dividends. Retirement of such stock would not be authorized, however, if the net capital, reserves, and surplus of the Corporation would thereby be reduced to an amount less than $150,000,000.

30. Question. What would be the terms of mortgage loans made by the Corporation to cooperatives?

Answer. Mortgage loans to cooperatives and nonprofit housing corporations could not exceed the development cost of the housing project involved nor an amount determined by the Cooperative Housing Commissioner to be the upper limit within which housing can be provided for families of moderate income in the locality at rentals, prices or charges within their means.

Complete amortization of these loans would occur within 50 years by periodic payments. This period could be extended by the Corporation up to 60 years if the project should be refinanced at a higher interest rate (made necessary by increased cost to the Corporation of its borrowings in the private market). However, such an extension could only be made if the increased interest rate would otherwise result in increased rents or charges which would adversely affect the stability of the project.

Interest on these loans would be at a fixed rate on unpaid balances, which is determined on the basis of the cost to the Corporation of its capital and borrowings, plus its costs of operation and its reserves. See also the answer to question 41 which explains in greater detail how the interest would be arrived at.

Provisions could be made in the loan for deferment of principal and interest payments provided that the deferments did not extend the loan maturity for over 3 years.

31. Question. Is the maximum mortgage maturity permitted under this title too long?

Answer. No. In the case of conventional sales and rental housing, mortgage maturities are generally established at periods which are far less than they would be if they were based on the anticipated physical life of the buildings. These maturities are generally related to the shortest anticipated economic life of the structures. In the case of one- and two-family homes, particularly, maximum allowance is made for the possible encroachment of inharmonious and blighting uses of land in the neighborhood. In the case of rental housing, further allowance is necessarily made for the fact that business investors in such housing are often motivated by a desire to obtain the highest possible yield during the early life of the project. For this purpose, corners are often cut in the design, construction, and maintenance of rental housing. This fact and factors such as depreciation schedules for tax purposes or the mere traditional practice of lending institutions often lead to shorter maturities in the case of rental housing.

Experience has shown, however, that residents of an area, if motivated and combined by a common purpose, can successfully prevent the encroachment of undesired uses or blight, and that conservative operation of rental housing can prolong the economic life of such housing for periods far longer than customary mortgage maturities. These facts are particularly true of cooperative projects, in which the occupants form a closely organized group from the outset, and in which first choice of purchase of a member's interest is required to be given to the cooperative. It should be noted, too, that, under this title, a mortgage loan would be approved only after a determination that the "location and physical planning of the housing project will afford reasonable assurance as to the stability of the neighborhood." Furthermore, the cooperative and other nonprofit corporations eligible for mortgage loans under this title will not be motivated by desire for profit and will not attempt (as business investors often do) to obtain a maximum financial yield by "milking" the project during the early years. Instead, they will be motivated, in their planning, construction, and maintenance, by the desire to obtain maximum usefulness and stability of the projects during the entire period of their physical life.

32. Question. Is mortgage credit presently available to housing cooperatives from private sources?

Answer. No. The evidence presented to the Banking and Currency Committee established overwhelmingly that mortgage credit is not generally available from private lending sources to this relatively new form of private enterprise. Even where FHA mortgage insurance is available, many lenders are reluctant to enter into a transaction which may prove somewhat troublesome to them merely because it is, for the time being, unfamiliar.

33. Question. How would the title permit private capital from other sources to be invested in construction loans to cooperatives in place of construction loans by the Corporation?

Answer. The title would expressly permit a borrowing cooperative or nonprofit housing corporation, with the consent of the Corporation, to pledge the contract or commitment of the Corporation that it will make a mortgage loan as security for a construction loan to be obtained by the borrower from a private lender. Thus, where construction credit is available from other private sources, the title would encourage reliance on such sources, rather than on the Corporation.

34. Question. How would the Corporation raise the money to make the loans, apart from subscription to capital stock?

Answer. The Corporation would be authorized to issue and have outstanding on and after July 1, 1950, obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, in an amount not to exceed $300,000,000. One year later this amount could be

increased, with the approval of the President, by additional amounts aggregating not more than $1,750,000,000. In no event would the total outstanding obligations of the Corporation exceed $2,500,000,000, or 15 times its capital stock and surplus; or the amount of the unpaid balance of the mortgages contracted for or held by it, plus its investments and cash on hand and on deposit.

35. Question. Would there be any loss in connection with the Corporation's construction loans because of the cost of inspections or other services?

Answer. No. The cost of inspection and other services during construction of a project is to be borne by the borrower, as is customary in the case of construction loans. In addition to interest on the mortgage loan, the Corporation may charge up to 2½ percent of the loan principal for this purpose.

36. Question. What provisions are made for reserves of the Corporation to cover possible losses on mortgage loans made by it?

Answer. The Corporation would be required to establish a reserve for losses into which one-fourth of 1 percent per year on the outstanding balance of mortgage loans would be paid in semiannual installments. The Cooperative Housing Commissioner would also be authorized to require the Corporation to establish and maintain such other reserves as he deems to be necessary, and to make appropriate charge-offs for depreciation or impairment of assets. Dividends would be declared only from net earnings after such reserves and charges, and with the prior approval of the Commissioner.

37. Question. How does the Corporation's reserve for losses compare with FHA mortgage insurance experience?

Answer. Cumulative FHA losses from its inception to November 30, 1949, have amounted to approximately three one-hundredths of 1 percent of the face amount of mortgages insured. The one-fourth percent per year reserve against mortgage loans is thus eight times as great per year as the cumulative FHA loss over a 15-year period. While it is true that the FHA experience has covered a favorable economic period, the one-fourth percent per year provision is believed reasonable, in combination with additional reserve requirements which the Cooperative Housing Commissioner may impose if needed and with cumulative stock investments in the Corporation which borrowers are required to make, equal to 10 percent of their borrowings.

One further comparison between the Corporation and FHA is of interest. In the FHA system, insurance reserves are built up by the collection of annual mortgage insurance premiums. Under this title, a similar type of protection against loss would result from the requirement for a special loss reserve, to be built up at the minimum rate of one-fourth percent per annum of outstanding loans, plus the additional reserves which the Commissioner may require. Of the amounts received by FHA from premiums, it is estimated that an amount equal to one-fourth percent of insured loans has had to be allocated for administrative and operating expenses in connection with the mortgage insurance programs, leaving about one-fourth percent for reserves for losses. Finally, in the case of the Corporation, there would also be the additional protection resulting from the required stock investment by borrowers, which is analogous both to premium assessments in FHA and down payment requirements on FHA insured mortgages.

38. Question. What is the expected interest rate on the debentures to be issued by this new Corporation?

Answer. About 2½ percent at the present time, in view of the fact that the debentures of the Corporation would be guaranteed by the Federal Government. The current rate for long-term Federal obligations is now about 2¼ percent.

39. Question. If the Corporation can obtain the investment of private funds in its guaranteed obligations at about 2¼ percent interest, why is it necessary for VA and FHA-guaranteed or insured mortgages to have an interest rate of 4 or 4½ percent?

Answer. The 2½ percent interest rate and the 4 or 4½ percent interest rate are rates charged on basically different kinds of investments. The 4 or 4½ percent rate is the gross rate charged to the mortgagor, from which must be deducted the costs of acquiring the loans, of servicing, of losses, and of operating a mortgage loan portfolio. On the basis of the published experience of four insurance companies, these costs bring the gross rate down to a net rate of slightly above 3 percent for 4½ percent loans and slightly above 2½ percent for 4 percent loans of average size. These costs, it should be noted, are different among different lenders, depending upon the size of the lender and the scale of its mortgage lending, tending to be lower for larger volume and also for larger size loans. Therefore, insurance companies studied had the advantage of geographical distribution, and probably better balanced portfolios in terms of type and size of mortgages than many small local lenders. Those lenders would have an even smaller net return on mortgage loans. The return on debentures to be issued by the Corporation will involve no such costs as are involved in mortgage loans. It is therefore comparable to the net rate on mortgage loans, rather than the gross rate. Also the Corporation's debentures will have greater liquidity.

40. Question. Why is provision made for the Government to guarantee the obligations of the Corporation?

Answer. The obligations of the Corporation would be unconditionally guaranteed by the United States (as are those issued by the FHA to mortgagees in case of foreclosures under the insured mortgage system). This guaranty serves to reduce the cost to the Corporation of borrowing money and thereby permits the Corporation to make lower interest charges to the cooperative and other nonprofit corporations which borrow from the Corporation. The guaranty is justified on at least two principal grounds. First, this program is designed to operate in such a way that soundly conceived cooperative-housing projects will be able to attain the low-cost financing essential to reduced monthly charges, and the benefits and savings thereby achieved are, in a cooperative or nonprofit operation, automatically translated into direct benefits to consumers in the form of reduced monthly charges. In other words, in an operation of this type, there can be no diversion into speculative profits of the financing economies made possible by the guaranty.

The second justification for the application of a guaranty to the obligations of the Corporation may be illustrated by analogy to the FHA insured mortgage system. Through that system the Federal Government has for almost 16 years underwritten mortgage loans which met certain predetermined standards and objectives. So far the Federal Government has not been called upon to make good the guaranty of those mortgage loans, since the system operates on a fully self-supporting and self-sufficient basis from the premiums and other income which the FHA receives. Nonetheless, the Government has assumed a contingent liability in that program under which there is no question that it would have to make good in the unlikely event that defaults exhausted insurance reserves. Thus, the Government guaranty has thereby effectively protected the private lender from any loss of principal or interest on his insured loans. A large share of the credit for the heavy current production of housing by the building industry, and the proportion of its for-sale product within the reach of moderate-income families in many parts of the country is due to this effective aid by a self-supporting governmental activity.

This title contemplates a program, largely new in actual operation but based on sound financing experience, in which housing projects of cooperatives and other nonprofit organizations can be financed through reliance on Government-guaranteed obligations. But if the projects are soundly conceived and soundly operated, there is no more reason why the income from interest charges, the investment of private stock in the corporation (as explained in the answer to question No. 27 and the build-up of reserves for losses (as explained in the answer to question No. 36) should not enable this financing operation to pay its way than is the case in the FHA insured mortgage operation.

It is true that under this title the contingent liability of the Government will be fixed in terms of a guaranty of the Corporation's debentures, rather than in the underwriting of the mortgages backing those debentures. Since, upon default on an insured mortgage, the FHA issues to the mortgagee its debentures which are fully and unconditionally guaranteed by the United States, the principle involved is the same, and the result, insofar as Government risk is concerned, should be as good. In the case of the FHA insured mortgage system, the contingent liability to the Government is, in the final analysis, protected by the value inherent in the properties underlying insured mortgages. Under this title the contingent liability of the Government in terms of its guaranty of the debentures of the Corporation is also protected, in the final analysis, by the value inherent in the properties securing the mortgage loans which the Corporation makes.

41. Question. What interest rate will be paid to the Corporation on mortgage loans made by it?

Answer. No specific interest rate on the mortgage loans is set forth in the bill. It is provided that the rate would be determined by taking into account the following factors: first, the cost of money to the Corporation; second, an amount adequate to defray the operating expenses of the Corporation; and third, an amount equal at least to one-fourth of 1 percent of the loans which is to be specifically set aside as a reserve for losses on mortgage loans plus such other reserves as the Cooperative Housing Commissioner may deem necessary. At the present time, it is estimated that this would mean mortgage loans (so far as initial loans are concerned) written at the approximate rate of 3½ percent. However, if this estimate should prove too conservative, the Corporation would, of course, be authorized to charge a higher interest rate. It should be noted that the presently contemplated differential between the cost of money to the Corporation and the interest rate charged by it is consistent with the loss and expense experience gained by larger insurance companies in their mortgage lending activities.

42. Question. Are the obligations issued by the corporation exempt from Federal taxes?

Answer. No. The title itself does not purport to exempt such obligations from Federal taxation and there is no other statute or principle of law which would exempt them. Actually, interest on or gain from the sale of obligations issued by the Corporation would be subject to Federal taxation under section 4 (a) of the Public Debt Act of 1941.

43. Question. Are obligations issued by the Corporation exempt from State and local taxes?

Answer. Yes. Obligations of the Corporation (as well as the Corporation's franchise and intangible assets) would be exempt from State and local taxes. The title expressly provides that the Corporation and its obligations shall be exempt from taxes (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) by any State or local taxing authority. This is fully consistent with the law as applied to other mixed ownership corporations. For example obligations of the Federal home loan banks are similarly exempted by express provisions of law.

44. Question. Is real property or tangible personal property of the Corporation exempt from State and local taxes?

Answer. No. Such property is expressly made subject to State and local taxation and assessments to the same extent as other similar property.

45. Question. Would the housing of the cooperative and other nonprofit corporations aided by the title be exempt from local taxation and special assessments for local improvements?

Answer. There is nothing in this title that would in any way exempt housing provided under its provisions from State and local taxation or special assessments for local improvements. Neither is it true that buildings provided under the provisions of this title would be exempt from real estate taxes under the laws of the States in which they would be built.

Existing consumers' cooperative laws of the various States do not exempt real estate of cooperatives from taxation. In the absence of express exemption provisions, the general taxing laws apply to the real property of cooperatives in the same manner that they apply to real property owned by other private corporations. Even the property of rural electric cooperatives is subject to taxes in the majority of the States that have enacted special laws in regard to such cooperatives.

It may be noted in connection with this question that several States have adopted limited dividend housing corporation laws to encourage the provision of housing for persons of moderate income. It may be that some housing cooperatives aided under this title would be created in such a manner as to come within the provisions of some of these laws. These State statutes extend certain benefits, but only three States (New York, New Jersey, and Delaware) purport to grant partial tax exemption from normal real estate taxes. In each of these three States, of course, the partial exemption is designed to carry out specific policies which the State itself, acting through its legislature, has adopted.

46. Question. Are housing cooperatives un-American or socialistic?

Answer. No. Our earliest settlers used the cooperative device for their mutual defense, for building their homes, and in agriculture. Even in recent times, "barn raisings" and "house raisings" have been common in rural areas in this country.

Private enterprise has long used the cooperative device for accomplishing its purpose. It exists in many fields of business endeavor. The Associated Press is a cooperative. Savings and loan associations are mutual organizations, as are many life insurance companies. Independent retail merchants frequently unite in cooperative associations for buying, advertising, and other purposes, and farmers frequently unite in production or marketing cooperatives. Cooperatives are themselves a form of private enterprise. They are formed for the economic advantage of their members. The benefits of a cooperative accrue to its members, while in a commercial enterprise they accrue to those who have invested their money in the business. In the case of consumers' cooperatives, the benefits take the form of cost reductions in consumer goods or services.

Both Mr. William A. Beckman, representing the American Bankers Association, and Mr. William A. Clarke, representing the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, made it clear in their testimony on this title that their opposition to the title was not based on opposition to the cooperative form of organization for the construction or operation of housing.

47. Question. Is this title inflationary and will it tend to increase housing construction costs?

Answer. No. By stimulating an increased production of housing within the reach of middle-income families, the program should help to reduce the inflationary pressures on the price of both new and used homes and on rents. These pressures have arisen because of unmet housing needs which have accumulated over a period of years. A portion of these needs will be met by housing produced under this title.

The title would provide about 250,000 dwelling units over a period of several years. The peak volume in any 1 year could hardly equal 75,000 units. In the light of the 1948 production level of over 1,000,000 housing units, and in the light of an ample supply of construction materials and sufficient construction labor to attain a very much higher level of production, it is clear that this title is not inflationary from a housing viewpoint. This is particularly true now that a major share of the backlog of demand for higher priced homes and apartments has been met. The market which has been served by section 608 rental housing designed to rent at between $80 and $125 per month, to choose but one example, is about exhausted, and should be replaced by other markets if last year's volume of residential construction is to be maintained.

With respect to the availability of construction labor and materials the following is of interest. At the Senate hearings on middle-income housing, Senator BENNETT asked:

"Is there plenty of labor, plenty of material, plenty of ability in the country to build a million and a half units as well as a million units a year?"

Mr. John C. Thompson, representing the National Association of Real Estate Boards, answered that there was. Senator SPARKMAN later questioned Mr. Thompson as follows:

"Senator SPARKMAN. Let me review it a little bit. You did say, did you not, that money was available, and labor and material were available?

"Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

"Senator SPARKMAN. To build a million and a half units a year?

"Mr. THOMPSON. Precisely."

Neither is the title inflationary from a credit viewpoint. The guaranteed obligations of the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives would be sold over a period of years. The contingent liability of the Government on account of these obligations is no different in principle than that under the FHA mortgage insurance program, and the cushion against such liability would be even greater than in the case of the FHA program. Under this title, the cushion against ultimate liability on the part of the Government consists of the Corporation's required reserves and the borrowers' required purchases of stock in the Corporation. Added safety features result from the type of housing projects which are the ultimate security for the obligations of the Corporation. These projects will benefit from careful planning and supervision, from ownership characteristics of the cooperative housing, and from the fact that the housing will serve a much more stable market than higher priced housing.

Finally it should be noted that cutbacks in all housing programs are provided for when economic conditions make such cutbacks desirable, by the provisions of section 301 of the bill. That section would permit the President to reduce the maximum authorized principal amounts of any housing loans made, insured, or guaranteed by any Government agency or mixed ownership corporation, where such action is necessary or desirable in the light of general economic conditions.

48. Question. Would this title provide an unfair advantage to particular groups?

Answer. No. This program supplements a number of other Federal housing programs and should be viewed in the context of all existing Federal housing legislation. Thus, aids for public-low-rent housing to serve the lowest income groups, for farm housing, and for slum clearance were enacted during the last session. Existing programs of the Home Loan Bank Board and of the Federal Housing Administration have succeeded in producing adequate housing (both sales and rental) to serve the upper-income third of our families as well as many families, particularly in some regions, who fall within the middle-income third of our population. However, some middle-income families in all regions and a large range of such families in higher cost areas are not now being served by any of these programs. They can neither find existing housing nor afford new housing adequate for their needs.

This title (along with other provisions of the bill) are designed to aid such middle-income families in obtaining housing which they can afford and which is large enough for families with children. The cooperative or nonprofit organization is aided under this title because it is the only form of private enterprise through which the savings achieved in financing, in construction, and in management are automatically translated into direct benefits to the consumer in the form of corresponding reductions in the monthly costs which he must pay for his housing. Thus, the title is a supplementary means of serving additional middle-income families and will fill a gap which now exists in our present housing programs. The title gives no discriminatory advantage to any group. On the contrary, discrimination against middle-income families would result if the gap which now exists in our housing legislation were to be left unfilled.

Finally, it should be noted that any middle-income family is eligible to join with other such families in forming a housing cooperative which will receive the assistance proposed by this title.

49. Question. Will the program under this title deter other forms of private enterprise from building?

Answer. There is no justification for the apprehension that enactment of this title will deter other forms of private enterprise from building. It is clear that only a relatively small segment of the approximately 9,000,000 middle-income families will need or desire to take advantage of the cooperative housing formula. Rather, this title is designed to add one additional string to our bow. It is to be just one additional incentive and aid to private enterprise to capture another segment of the market which it would otherwise be unable to do. This program will increase the total market for private housing rather than take any part of the market away from established builders and lenders. Housing is so important a factor in family living that we cannot overlook any device which can facilitate the provision of homes for those in need of it. In the future, as in the past, by far the bulk of the housing being built in this country will be provided by private enterprise using the conventional types of ownership and financing arrangements.

50. Question. Will the program under this title hurt builders?

Answer. No. This program will provide additional building activity since it will serve a market not now being reached. Many private builders will participate in this program as general contractors for cooperative and other nonprofit corporations. Indeed, a healthy cooperative housing movement will

aid the entire building industry to operate at a higher level of activity and will act as a cushion against depression in that industry when the present temporary market for high-priced housing has come to an end. In this connection it should be noted that during periods of lessened economic activity the building industry is one of the first to be affected adversely and is traditionally the hardest hit. The program under this title would help reverse that trend.

Al. Question. Will this title hurt the private-lending industry?

Answer. Mr. William A. Clarke, representing the Mortgage Bankers Association, testified in opposition to this title. He stated:

"I am perfectly willing to admit that we are now taking a selfish interest in connection with this matter. That comes about in this way: The life-insurance companies, the savings banks, the building and loan associations of the country are geared up and are now handling the mortgage loans of the so-called middle-income families. We feel they are doing a very competent job of it. This legislation, we believe, will remove from the market that type of mortgage for the so-called legitimate investor in mortgage loans. He is interested in the purchase of mortgages. Every one of these now has a portfolio that is almost full of Government bonds. What is proposed here would be a Government bond. We feel that this is class legislation which gives a chance for a rate of interest which will take away from us the opportunities to invest money in mortgages, which in turn will have its effect on the dividends paid by life-insurance companies, dividends paid by savings banks, building and loan associations, and others."

Mr. Clarke's statement involves two errors. First, the mortgage loans to be made in connection with housing aided by this title will not, as he believes, take away from lenders the opportunities to invest money in mortgages. This error made by Mr. Clarke results from the failure to realize that the housing aided under this title will reach a segment of the middle-income market which is not now being reached at all.

The second error involves the failure to recognize that the Government-guaranteed obligations of the Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives will in fact be a desirable investment for insurance companies, banks, and other lenders. The interest paid on such obligations will constitute a net return to investors fully as high as the net return on mortgage loans since the higher interest rate on a mortgage loan must cover the cost of acquiring the loan, of servicing it, and of losses. This also explains why Business Week, in its January 14 issue, stated, in referring to this title:

"If the plan goes through, it will offer a new top-grade outlet for the big-time investor, such as insurance companies."

21. Question. Does this title involve a Federal subsidy?

Answer. No. On the contrary this title has been carefully prepared to avoid any Federal subsidy. Interest charges for mortgage loans to cooperatives and nonprofit corporations must be sufficient to pay all costs of the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives. This includes the cost of the money which the Corporation borrows from the public, administrative expenses of the Corporation, special reserves sufficient to cover losses, and any general reserves which the Cooperative Housing Commissioner may require (question 41). The danger of any ultimate loss by the Federal Government is further reduced by required subscription to the Corporation's capital stock by borrowing cooperatives, as previously explained (questions 27 and 28). The specific reserves for losses of one-quarter of 1 percent (questions 36 and 37) and the private, capital-stock subscriptions by borrowers will build up an ample cushion against any possible future losses.

The basic security for any mortgage loan, of course, is the value of the property on which it is made and the economic stability of the borrower. Because of the required adherence to sound planning and construction standards by the cooperatives and the elimination of speculative profits in construction and management of their projects, the inherent value of these projects will offer much better mortgage security than is now found in many rental projects built and operated for profit. The income from cooperative projects also is likely to be more stable over the years because rents or monthly charges will be lower than otherwise available and the occupants will own the projects and thus have every incentive to keep them in first-class condition.

All of the administrative expenses of the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives will be met from the interest and fees charged borrowers. The interest charged must be high enough to cover the general administrative costs of the Corporation, and the costs for special services, such as inspections, will be met from fees paid by the borrowing cooperatives (question 35).

The initial stock investment in the Corporation to be made by the Government would be limited to $100,000,000; would bear cumulative dividends; would be preferred as to dividends and assets; and would be replaced over a period of time by stock investment made by private borrowers (questions 23 through 29).

The title authorizes the Cooperative Housing Commissioner to assist in the organization of housing cooperatives and in the planning, construction, and operation of their projects. Although this assistance naturally involves certain administrative expenses by the Federal Government, it is not a subsidy in any accepted meaning of the term. Rather, it is a public service comparable to many others furnished by the Federal Government. It is also designed to benefit the Government by protecting against losses on the mortgage loans to cooperatives. Many of those who oppose certain other features of the title agree that a program of technical assistance by the Government to housing cooperatives would serve a laudable public purpose and would be entirely justified (question 13). There are numerous precedents for such technical aid by the Government (question 14).

It should be noted, too, that the title would direct the cooperative Housing Commissioner to administer the program in such a manner that the cooperatives themselves, acting individually or through joint undertakings, would, as soon as feasible, supply their own technical advice and assistance and thereby gradually reduce and terminate such technical advice and assistance by the Commissioner.

The Cooperative Housing Commissioner would also be authorized to make preliminary advances to cooperatives to assist them in making plans for housing projects which are eligible for mortgage loans from the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives. This would in no sense be a subsidy program. The preliminary advances would have to be repaid out of the mortgage loans and the borrower would have to pay interest on the advances equal to the cost of money to the Treasury, plus one-half of 1 percent per annum. The sound initial guidance furnished through technical advice and assistance under the title would materially reduce the chance of losses on the advances. Before any advances could be made, the Cooperative Housing Commissioner would have to determine that the borrower is a bona fide cooperative or nonprofit corporation whose methods of operation are such as will avoid the use of funds for any speculative purpose or the payment of excessive fees, salaries, or charges (questions 16 through 20).

Dorothy Kenyon's Associations—She Is Judged by the Company She Keeps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a wise man once said that what we say is not important but it is what we do that really counts. When Senator McCARTHY called attention to the organizations she has joined in the past and charged that she was keeping such bad company that she was disqualified from being a United States delegate to the United Nations, Miss Kenyon was incensed and said that the Senator was a liar. But in view of her record the Senator was absolutely correct.

Mr. George Sokolsky has rendered a real public service by setting forth a bill of particulars showing the groups to which Miss Kenyon was identified. His article appeared in the Washington Times-Herald for Sunday March 19, 1950:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Guilt by association is an ugly doctrine. Among some primitive peoples, if one member of a family were accused of a crime, every member of the family is held accountable. In some schools, teachers still hold an entire class responsible for the conduct of one pupil, which is a form of socializing guilt repugnant to our way of life which is based on individual responsibility.

However, the term, "guilt by association," as it is currently being used, is something quite different. What we do is to follow the old adage, "Birds of a feather flock together."

We go back to the proved sociological postulate that where there is a community of kind, there is likely to be an association of those who have similar tastes. When, therefore a person appears on a large number of Communist or Communist-front activities, the assumption must be that that person has made a voluntary choice to associate with such people and their activities.

Take, for instance, the case of Dorothy Kenyon. The lady says that she is not a Communist and has never been one. We must take her word for that. But how shall this record be explained?

1. The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom petitioned to discontinue the Dies committee. This organization existed to defend Communists from investigation; Dorothy Kenyon appears among the signatories.

2. American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born has been officially declared subversive. This organization was established by the Communist Party and has been closely linked to the International Labor Defense (also listed as subversive); Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

3. In 1944 a number of American women of distinction sent greetings to the women of Soviet Russia. (We were then Allies in war.) Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

4. From 1934 to 1941, one of the principal transmission belts of communism in this country was the American Youth Congress. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

5. Earl Browder, testifying before the House Committee on un-American activities in September, 1939, described the Consumers

National Federation as a Communist transmission belt. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

6. The coordinating committee to lift the embargo was a Communist front organized to aid Soviet Russia's efforts in the Spanish civil war. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

7. The Council for Pan American Democracy was organized and supported publicly by the Communist parties of the United States, Canada, Mexico, Chile, Cuba, and Venezuela. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

8. The Descendants of the American Revolution was designed to be a left-wing organization to compete with and ridicule the Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

9. A group of organizations came into being to bring pressures on the motion-picture producers to produce pro-Russian and pro-Communist films. The most active was Film Audiences for Democracy. Dorothy Kenyon appeared on the advisory board.

10. Simon W. Gerson, an active and admitted Communist, was given public office by the borough president of Manhattan in New York City. This led to an active protest. A committee was formed to defend Gerson. Dorothy Kenyon appeared on that committee as representing the consumers' unions.

11. The Lawyers Committee on American Relations With Spain was on the Communist side of the Spanish Revolution. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

12. League of Women Shoppers has been declared a Communist-front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities after prolonged investigation. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

13. The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, successor to Friends of the Soviet Union, has been officially declared subversive. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

14. For many years Tom Mooney's imprisonment was used to raise money for the Communist Party. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared on the New York Tom Mooney Committee.

15. Political Prisoners Bail Fund Committee was organized to aid arrested Communists and left-wingers. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

16. Morris U. Schappes, an admitted Communist, was tried in a court for perjury and convicted. The Schappes Defense Committee was organized for him. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

I have cited these examples to show a pattern of activity. This pattern does not necessarily make Miss Kenyon a Communist, but it does, in my opinion, open to question her judgment and her associations. In the present war between this country and Soviet Russia the constant association, for whatever reason, must stimulate concern.

The Best Recipe for Bean Soup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, when I was a boy working in the timber camps of the Northwest, where the men were hearty eaters and the food was substantial, bean soup was a staple. In discussing the camp fare the loggers were prone to quote the French lumberjack's maxim, "The little white bean makes the best pea soup."

Bean soup has become an epicurean delight in the repasts of our Nation's lawmakers and is regularly served in both the House and Senate restaurants, thanks to the legislative forethought of Idaho's past great senatorial leader, Fred T. Dubois.

The cooking class in the home economics department of Idaho State University, like education throughout our country, is advancing and has brought out a new recipe for making better bean soup, included in a press release recently received, which is respectfully submitted to the culinary department of the House and Senate restaurants:

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO, MOSCOW, March 18.—When Author Kenneth Crawford recently criticised in the Saturday Evening Post the bean soup that has been served in the Senate restaurant at Washington since 1901 he really started things stirring in the home-economics department at the University of Idaho.

Crawford should have known better, for no one criticizes a bean—or potato—dish without causing a rattling of pots and pans by the Idaho home economists. Crawford innocently, however, said of the soup introduced to senatorial gourmets more than a half century ago by Senator Fred Dubois, of Idaho:

"Through all the years that I have covered the Senate, I have sustained myself in large part on this soup. It has got neither better nor worse, and still isn't too good, but will, as my continued existence proves, sustain a thin spark of life."

In Idaho, those were fighting words. Prof. Adah Lewis and her foods students, considered them not only a reflection on a former outstanding citizen of the State, but on beans, which are an important product of Idaho. Miss Lewis had her class first prepare soup according to the famed Dubois recipe, and then soups with variations. She reported today:

"Mr. Crawford's comments were unjustified. The Dubois recipe as given in the Post makes a fine soup. After sampling, we can understand why it has been served so long in the Senate restaurant. It is a heavy type of soup with high seasonings. Probably most of the Congressmen enjoy smoking, and, as this is inclined to dull the sense of taste, the high flavor of the Dubois recipe would be most acceptable.

"The majority of the class, however, felt that it was unfortunate that the excellent flavor of beans—particularly Idaho beans—is submerged in the Dubois recipe. A new recipe developed in the class by Margaret Weber, of Moscow, and Bernadean Reese, of Boise, keeps the bean flavor intact, and was voted superior even to the Dubois recipe which has stood the test of time."

In 1907, when the Dubois soup was dropped briefly from the Senate restaurant's menu, the Senate Rules Committee specifically ordered the restaurant manager to put it back quick. Now Miss Lewis would like the committee to order at least a trial of the new soup developed by the university students, which has been called Idaho bean soup.

The recipe (for 2 quarts): 2½ quarts of water, 5 ounces sliced ham hock or chunk of bacon or a mixture of the two, 1½ cups washed navy soup beans, 3 tablespoons diced onion, 1 cup mashed potatoes, 1 teaspoon chopped parsley, 2 tablespoons celery, 4 tablespoons butter, 1 teaspoon salt, pepper if desired. Braise onions in butter. Mix all ingredients in a heavy saucepan. Cover and simmer slowly for 2½ hours.

Mr. Truman Demagogues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include an editorial that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on Sunday, March 19, 1950:

THE DAY OF THE DEMAGOGUE

Mr. Truman took off for another vacation the other day, saying "I never felt better in my life or had less."

How he feels, we wouldn't know. But the other half of his crack is pure demagogic fraud.

Here is an oafarmer, a busted haberdashery dealer and ex-county judge, who came to Washington as a Senator in effect by appointment of a crook who was finally jailed for political criminality.

By a fluke Truman happened to be made chairman of a special committee on war contracts, which brought on a lot of publicity he could never in life have anticipated.

By another fluke, he was again in effect appointed to the Vice Presidency by the dying Roosevelt, who used Truman and his war made publicity status to duck a row between the Communists who wanted Henry Wallace again for Vice President in term IV of the Roosevelt dynasty, and the southern Democrats who wanted James Byrnes.

By yet another fluke, Truman succeeded to the Presidency of the United States just as the American Nation was winning the biggest and most expensive and most inexcusable war in history. The people promptly showed what they thought of him by electing an overwhelmingly opposition Congress.

That Eightieth Congress did a magnificent job of pulling things together out of chaos. Then, the Republican party laid down and took for granted that it could take over the Presidency in 1948 with less than nothing.

So still another fluke elected Truman to the Presidency. His campaign was a rackety-rax, disjointed, quarrelsome show. But it did at least have the juice of life, and that tells why he won against the Republican nonentity.

POWER BY ACCIDENT

Never had less? Today, this little man of little force is the most powerful individual in civilization. He gets a salary of staggering size. On top of that, he gets a whopping, tax-free expense account. He gets his rent free in the biggest house in town, the most famous in the Republic.

He gets to ride around, all still free, in airplanes, yachts, trains and automobiles furnished him by the taxpayers of this country. Generals and admirals bow and scrape before him. Senators grovel for his nod.

Human nature being what it is, this little man has ballooned to think he is a genius. He pounds the desk with his fist and demands of the taxpayers a whole galaxy of socialistic undertakings.

We are all supposed to permit destruction of this country's health and growth, just to keep feeding this two-bit Caesar with the meat that makes him think he's great.

For, in spite of all his present power, Truman is greedy for more. He would put the Federal Government in full command of farming, education, housing, medicine, banking, mining, manufacturing, and in the final analysis, even the local selling and use of goods.

He asks taxation that is confiscatory, discriminates against one citizen in favor of

another, and so weakens the practice of business that private enterprise fears every day for its life.

Then, to observe and channel his actual arrogant abuse of office, this typical demagogue of our day pretends a humility and love satiate with "I never did less."

Would you like to understand the conditions of affairs that made Truman and also twice it leads to the life of this Republic that all his kind be driven out of power?

Well, we can think of no quicker, simpler, easier outline of the whole story than you will find in a little book called the Revolt of the Masses, now some 20 years old, but as fresh and timely as tomorrow.

THE TALE OF OUR TIMES

The author is one Jose Ortega y Gasset, a Spaniard. You can get an excellent translation in English, 204 pages, for $3. As you read it, a philosopher's tract of 1930, you see forecast all the fierce demagogues of our day, Hitler, Stalin, Roosevelt, Mussolini—and finally Truman.

What they are, why they are, how they came and how they can go. Revolt is filled with wise words everybody knows to be true. For instance:

"This is the gravest danger that today threatens civilization: State intervention; the absorption of all spontaneous historical action, which in the long run sustains, nourishes and impels human destinies.

"Society will have to live for the State, man for the governmental machine. And so, after all, it is only a machine whose existence and maintenance depend on the vital supports around it; the State, after sucking out the very marrow of society, will be left bloodless, a skeleton, fired with the rusty death of machinery, more gruesome than the death of a living organism."

So wrote a witty, shrewd little Spaniard 20 years ago, as he charged in advance the rise of fascism and communism, damned them both and warned against the demagogue in command of total power, wherever found.

Well, the Spaniard is still alive and around. What does he see for us, now? The United States of America, once the freest and most independent Republic in the history of the world, has suffered the infliction of two demagogues in 20 years. How much more can we take, and live?

It is not the demagogue, Truman, who never had less. It is the United States of America.

Salaries of Postmasters and Postal Supervisors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement I have submitted to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in support of bills H. R. 4678 and H. R. 4757, which are intended to correct certain inequities in Public Law 134 by a proper and more equitable modification of salaries of postmasters and postal supervisors:

STATEMENT TO HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE SUBCOMMITTEE CONSIDERING H. R. 4678 AND H. R. 4757

Mr. Chairman, allow me to thank you and the members of your committee for granting me the opportunity to present my statement.

I am here today in support of H. R. 4678 and H. R. 4757, which are intended to correct certain inequities in Public Law 134 by a proper and more equitable modification of salaries of postmasters and postal supervisors. It is my earnest conviction that these postal officials, who are directly responsible for the proper functioning of our postal service, are grossly underpaid in relationship to their responsibilities and the duties they perform.

I happen to be quite well acquainted with the postal set-up in New York City, my home city, which has the largest postal service employing many thousands of people and serving the world's largest manufacturing and industrial area. It requires men of great experience and long years of devoted service to plan and direct this important phase of New York's economic activity. Can you picture for a moment the paralyzing effect on this great industrial center if the mail service should suddenly or for any length of time become disrupted because of inadequacy or inexperience?

The bills which your committee is now considering are in no way to be regarded as a new effort toward a salary increase for one group of officials over another. I prefer to regard these measures merely as an overdue adjustment of salaries, or putting them in balance to make them commensurate with the duties and the responsibilities we have entrusted to these officials in the postal service.

We have heard it said so often that the Government is losing so many of its ablest and trusted officials because it is not according them decent salaries. Private industry has long ago realized the importance of paying its officials and employees in a manner commensurate with their responsibilities, and the result has been that many of our most loyal and capable men have been attracted to private industry. Today, we all know that it is poor economy on the part of the Government to refuse to make the necessary adjustments, in order to retain those who have served so faithfully and from whose knowledge and vast experience we all benefit.

Here we have an excellent opportunity to correct an injustice by placing the salaries of postmasters and postal supervisors on a par with salaries paid to people who hold positions of high responsibility in other Government services or in private industry. In my estimation, these overdue adjustments are quite modest.

I regard these bills, H. R. 4678 and H. R. 4757, as meritorious legislation and strongly urge you to act favorably on them.

Relations Between Western Germany and Europe at Lowest Point Since War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson from the Washington Evening Star of March 16, 1950:

ON THE RECORD—RELATIONS BETWEEN WESTERN GERMANY AND EUROPE AT LOWEST POINT SINCE WAR

(By Dorothy Thompson)

A dispatch from Germany states "United States observers in Bonn and elsewhere in western Germany are surprised and, in some cases, alarmed at the bitterness that has been aroused" by the agreement concluded between the French Government and the Saar territory.

It is not the bitterness which is astonishing. It is the astonishment of the allied observers which astonishes. Weeks ago this column warned that the Saar proposals would shake the whole west European structure. This has now happened. Relations between western Germany and Europe are at the lowest point since the war.

This deterioration comes in a critical moment. Unemployment in western Germany has reached 2,000,000—and this figure does not include the large number of the partly employed. Popular discontent is rising, the continued dismantling of industries furnishing an additional focus of discontent, especially among workers.

CRISIS AND COMMUNISTS

The Communists are taking advantage of the triple crisis: Saar, dismantling, unemployment. The currency reform produced a boom, as it brought to a famished market long-hoarded goods and opened employment. But the economic structure is basically undermined by the vast augmentation to the population of penniless expellees from that part of Germany annexed by Poland and from the satellite states. These number 9,000,000, including a disproportionate number of women, children and aged who must be sustained by the labor of others.

Among displaced workers unemployment is far higher than in the indigenous population. Now in this threefold crisis, Communist Poland has decided to expel those Germans who survived the earlier purges. This will add another 200,000 to 400,000 unemployed, and further complicate the disastrous housing situation.

Although the Allies are protesting in Warsaw and have said they won't take more than 25,000, it is impossible to throw them back, or to refuse Germans asylum in their own country.

The Franco-Saar agreement can be understood from the viewpoint of the Saarlanders, who, under it, are much more prosperous than other Germans. But the repercussions in Germany are inevitable. The Saar becomes, for 50 years, a colony of France. It leases France its coal mines for that period; integrates its railway system with the French; and puts its foreign affairs, customs, monetary, and economic policies under French control.

GERMANY DISMEMBERED

The irony is that there is no limit to which the Adenauer government would not go to achieve economic and political integration of the whole of western Germany with France. But what no German government could accept—and remain in office—is further dismemberment of the gravely mutilated country. Neither will any truth-loving person swallow the argument that the disposition of the Saar is still left to the "peace treaty." The disposition of eastern Germany was "left to the peace treaty" in the Potsdam agreement—while the expulsion of its population was agreed to. Germany has been dismembered by faits accompli and no one will believe that the British and Americans have permitted France to take an action they intend later to reverse.

Thus, the most pro-western and pro-French government Germany is ever likely to have, has been slapped in the face and, in the dynamics of democracy, has suffered defeat.

Last week, Secretary of State Acheson said America must mobilize the whole of her diplomacy. At the same time, it was announced that we are bringing pressure on the French to give more freedom to the Bao Dai Government of Indo-China. Now, what sort of diplomacy is it that permits the French to make a colony in Europe—and to take from an extremely friendly German Government what they had granted Adolf Hitler?

The repeated warnings of the rebirth of German nationalism are really silly. For the German has only three political choices: To become a good European, go Communist, or revive nationalism. And while the Communists are uniting communism with nationalism, the western allies are systematically frustrating Europeanism.

Furthermore, it is a very weak France which is thus cutting ties with a friendly German Government with the consent of the British and Secretary Acheson. Communist east Germany has an army on its feet which is stronger now than the French—five fully equipped divisions to the French's two—and while French Communists are preventing the landing of American munitions in French ports.

One only can say that whom the gods would destroy, they first make feeble and then feeble-minded.

National Uniform System of Automobile Registration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives which will require Congress to take the initial step in encouraging the development of a nationally uniform system of automobile registration.

The bill was prompted by the fact that there is a wide variance among the laws of many of our States concerning automobile registration which often leads to injustice and uncertainty in commercial transactions involving automobiles, particularly in transactions which involve the movement of automobiles from one State to another.

According to the bill, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States courts is to be entrusted with the task of establishing a uniform procedure and appropriate fees for the registration of automobiles by clerks of the United States district courts. Automobiles are to be registered in the district where the owners reside or have their principal place of business.

As defined by my bill, the term automobile applies to all motor vehicles, including trucks, trailers, and motorcycles.

Registration forms will be supplied by United States district court clerks. Owners will have to enter their name and address; a description of the automobile, including manufacturer, type and model of vehicle, serial number and motor number; a statement of all prior transfers of title; and a statement of any liens against the automobile.

The bill prescribes a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both, for false statements knowingly and willfully made.

The clerk's certificate will be conclusive evidence of ownership of the vehicle but only presumptive evidence of the existence or nonexistence of liens.

If enacted into law it will be the first time a Federal law established a uniform system of registration of title of property.

It is hoped that because the law is permissive and not mandatory in term, it will be held constitutional if attacked in the courts.

It should be most effective, however, because of simplicity of the method established for proving ownership.

It is deserving of early consideration and speedy enactment.

Mr. Smith Locks a Barn Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Richmond News-Leader of Thursday, March 16, 1950:

MR. SMITH LOCKS A BARN DOOR

Every now and then we see in the press that some prophet of the political New Jerusalem is wagging a sorrowful head, full of the miseries that so many misguided sinners haven't found the true religion. The temptation, on reading these weep-easies, is to throw the newspaper at the cat and go for a long walk. Such a mood is upon us now, after reading Marquis Childs' lament at the Smith amendment to the National Science Foundation Act. Mr. Childs views this amendment heavily as a "chipping away of our freedoms," and he says lugubriously that it will "give the FBI the authority of a Gestapo and destroy a large area of academic freedom and the right of free inquiry."

What is the Smith amendment? It is a paragraph inserted in the Science Foundation Act by Virginia's Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, and it reads, in full:

"No person shall be employed by the Foundation and no scholarship shall be awarded to any person by the Foundation unless and until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have investigated the loyalty of such person and reported to the Foundation such person is loyal to the United States, believes in our system of government, and is not and has not at any time been a member of any organization declared subversive by the Attorney-General or (of) any organization that teaches or advocates the overthrow of our Government by force and violence."

The prohibition against paying out tax funds to any person who at any time may have been a member of an organization now declared subversive is perhaps a little sweeping. Mr. SMITH himself confessed that "I feel I have gone pretty far," but viewing the amendment as a whole he regarded it—and so do we—as squarely in the public interest. What it means is that employees of the national foundation, privy to the gravest secrets of our national defense—the secrets on which the very survival of this Nation may depend—must not have soft spots in their loyalty to our way of life.

Is that a chipping away of freedoms, or is it a reasonable shoring up of those freedoms? Mr. SMITH said his idea was to lock the barn door, and reflecting upon the treachery of the eminent Dr. Fuchs, we can't think offhand of a better idea. The foundation's appropriations are limited to $500,000 at the moment, with an outside top of $15,000,000 per year; this is the barest drop in the bucket now being spent for scientific research. When Mr. Childs finds in this amendment the destruction of a large area of academic freedom and the right of free inquiry, he is finding spooks and bogeymen that simply are not there.

Perhaps it is worth observing again that this Nation's beloved rights and freedoms are not unlimited in their scope. They never have been, legally, traditionally, constitutionally, or any other way. The right of free speech gives no man the right to patrol a neighborhood's streets at midnight, shouting obscenities through a loud speaker. And the right of free inquiry and the freedom of academic research have similar proscriptions in the public interest. Mr. Childs may not see it that way, but to any man who views the Communists warily as so many rattlesnakes, the Smith amendment will seem a desirable safeguard of our national security.

How Bad Can United States Foreign Policy Get?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to present to the Members of this body a thought-provoking editorial from the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman for Sunday, March 19. Editor Robert D. Lusk has been critically interested in the foreign policy of this country and has devoted a good deal of time studying problems in international relations. I recommend this clear, concise editorial to all Americans who, like myself, wonder at times just where our present diplomatic policy is taking us.

The editorial follows:

HOW BAD CAN UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY GET?

One of the most ridiculous assertions to be made by an administration official recently was that made Friday by a State Department official, John S. Peurifoy, when he charged that the current Senate investigation of possible communistic influences in the State Department is hurting United States foreign policy.

Peurifoy said that charges by Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, against State Department workers have caused damage "both in terms of the day to day conduct of the foreign relations of the United States Government and in terms of human relations."

This would be a serious thing if it were an established fact that United States foreign policy was something definite and constructive, and that it has been a success and beneficial to the citizens of the United States.

But has United States foreign policy the past 5 years been anything that it would be criminal to disrupt or harm?

Consider Yalta and Potsdam. The United States negotiated terms at those places with the Russians which gave Manchuria away, and set up the Chinese disaster, which gave

Russia a chattel mortgage on the millions of people in Central Europe, which committed an incredibly stupid blunder in putting the United States in Berlin to govern without any secure supply line to the city from the United States zone in Germany.

Consider the billions of dollars the United States had to spend on the Berlin airlift, a triumph of technology and airmanship made necessary by diplomatic stupidity.

Consider the Truman doctrine launched in February 1947, and how it took the United States away from the sincere support of the United Nations down the blind alley of unilateral action, with the United States trying to play Atlas and support the whole world single-handed. That doctrine put the United States into action in Greece and Turkey, destroyed its moral position of leadership, and marked an employment of force which the sad state of our armed forces converts into a bluff. It enabled Russia to employ force in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and China without the United States being able to criticize effectively because of its precedent in Greece with military action against Communist guerrillas.

Consider the Marshall plan. It performed the humanitarian miracle of feeding starved millions for 2 years but as a diplomatic weapon it has only perpetuated certain economic and political evils. Chief among them is the continuation of the illusion that France is a reliable western ally. Its only reason for existing now is to help western Europe integrate its economy and create the tools for its own satisfaction. There is no amount of proof that it is so succeeding.

Remember the Palestine muddle and how President Truman changed his attitude of the United States towards Palestine partition—during a congressional election time when New York votes apparently had priority over peace in Palestine—not once, but three times. This vacillation disgusted the British and other nations to a great degree.

Finally, consider how Marshall came back from China's civil war recommending a do-nothing policy and Acheson, the next Secretary of State, continued a hands-off and let's let the dust settle policy. The result was an easy victory for Mao Tse-Tung and his Communist armies and China and 450,000,000 more people came under the control of the Kremlin in Moscow. This was a terrible one for the western nations. It gave not only all of China to Red Russian control but set up the way for Communism to take over the Near East. Now Secretary of State Acheson now realizes that, for he said in his San Francisco speech March 18:

"We now face the prospect that the Communists may attempt to use China as a base for probing for other weak spots which they can move into and exploit."

Acheson's vision is remarkably clear after the fact. Almost as clear as the vision of many who saw and voiced irrevocable consequences of United States do-nothing failure in China before the collapse.

In the face of that eternal succession of failures, caused and perpetuated by decisions by President Truman, the Secretary of State, and their advisers, how can a State Department official have the intestinal fortitude to say that criticism of State Department is hurting foreign policy?

A review of United States foreign policy failures such as the foregoing strengthens agreement with the remark made by nationally known commentator Dorothy Thompson in Chicago last month that:

"We have found that policies have been made which are incomprehensible unless we assume that there were persons actively engaged in making them who wished to serve other than American interests."

A Blitz Against the Forces of Inaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to observe that the Massachusetts newspapers are alert to the outstanding service which our colleague, the Honorable JOHN W. HESELTON, is performing in his tenacious fight to see that surplus food commodities are distributed to those who need them rather than being destroyed. If newspapers throughout the country took up the cudgels in the same manner as the Holyoke Transcript and the North Adams Transcript, it might be possible to get action out of the Administration forces to bring about greater sanity in the handling of this program.

As one of the four Republican Members who first introduced bills on the subject, I am grateful to the gentleman from Massachusetts for his indefatigable efforts. When JOHN HESELTON tackles something, he never lets up so long as there remains a glimmer of hope for success. Although he has not received any satisfactory reply from the Secretary of Agriculture or from the President, vacationing in Key West, it is quite possible that the announcement by the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture that he would hold hearings next Wednesday on our bills designed to assist in the distribution of food to the needy and hungry is inspired by the campaign without let-up which our capable and industrious colleague has waged.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following recent editorials from the Holyoke Transcript and the North Adams Transcript:

[From the Holyoke Transcript of March 10, 1950]

Congressman HESELTON has hit the jackpot again with his probe of the $100-a-minute waste for charges of storing food commodities. Even President Truman can't snap out an answer for it, not even a wisecrack.

[From the North Adams Transcript of March 13, 1950]

JUST NOT INTERESTED

The Federal Government is spending millions of dollars for surplus potatoes, eggs, dried milk, and other foodstuffs. It is spending more millions to store what it is buying—and then is storing it so long that it is spoiling.

At the same time local communities are spending millions of dollars for food for welfare recipients—at full market prices.

Appalled at such a situation, Congressman JOHN W. HESELTON has put these two facts together and come up with a proposal that, instead of storing food and letting it rot, the Government see that as much as possible of it be diverted for local welfare use.

This would relieve the Federal Treasury of the terrific storage expense it is now carrying, would cut local welfare food bills, and would reduce the terrific loss represented by spoilage.

It would seem that such a simple and practical solution—one that would mean really important dollar savings both to the Federal Government and local welfare departments, and resultant savings on both Federal and local tax bills—would be welcomed and seized upon by those responsible for carrying out the agricultural policies of the Truman administration.

But such an assumption is wrong.

At first, when the potato scandal was hot, it looked as though Mr. HESELTON might be going to get somewhere. But Federal insistence that local communities would have to pay for the transportation, packaging, and storage of any surplus commodities distributed for welfare use discouraged most cities and towns from even applying for the food.

Accordingly, on February 2, Mr. HESELTON and three other Congressmen filed identical bills under which the Department of Agriculture would be permitted to assume these packing and storage costs, paying for them with funds that otherwise it would have to spend anyway for storing them until they rotted and had to be thrown away—a dead loss.

Up to now, absolutely nothing has been done toward getting this common-sense provision enacted. Mr. HESELTON has continued to bombard Secretary Brannan—and finally even President Truman—with demands for action. So far he hasn't even received an answer from either of them.

Since February 2, when the bills were filed, he estimates that the Federal Government has paid out approximately $2,160,000 in carrying charges on 16 food commodities—money that could have been used to pay transportation and other costs necessary to get these foodstuffs in the hands of needy people who could well use them.

And that $2,160,000 represents almost exactly the full tax payments of 40,000 taxpayers earning an average of $3,000 a year.

Meanwhile, these carrying costs continue to mount, more food continues to spoil, and local tax money continues to be spent to buy welfare food at top prices.

Mr. HESELTON's last move was a last-minute telegram asking President Truman to intervene before he left on his Key West vacation.

He didn't even get an answer.

So the President has gone fishing. The appalling waste continues. And the bill is being paid by all those who have been struggling the last few days to get their income-tax returns in by March 15.

It seems incredible, but apparently Mr. Truman and his administration just aren't interested in anything which offers a sensible and desirable chance of saving the taxpayers a few dollars.

The Tragic Situation of Jews in Iron Curtain Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have here an unusually interesting document which is highly revealing of the tragic

situation in which Jews find themselves in the countries behind the iron curtain. I want to recommend it to every Member of this House as "must" reading.

This document was prepared for the Labor Zionist Committee for Relief and Rehabilitation, whose main office is in New York. An emissary of this organization recently visited Europe, where he met with many people who had succeeded in coming out from behind the iron curtain through devious ways. For obvious reasons, names of certain individuals have been omitted.

Here is the true story about the treatment meted out to Jews in the so-called peoples' democracies of central and eastern Europe:

The information about the condition of Jews and of the campaign against Zionism and Israel in eastern Europe has been compiled from various sources, chiefly from discussions with tens of persons who have recently left those countries whom I saw in Paris, Zurich, and Vienna.

The situation in each country differs slightly. Yugoslavia generally is the exception to the rule because there is no antagonistic attitude toward Zionism and Israel in the main. The number of Jews who have remained there is small. There are about 5,000 Jews there. Bulgaria, too, is almost no problem. As you know, a sum of money had to be paid for each Jew who was taken out of the country. The other satellite countries follow, more or less, the "line" of Soviet Russia. Poland and Czechoslovakia are a bit more liberal, but Hungary and Rumania are as brutal as Soviet Russia itself.

Regarding Soviet Russia, we know from * * * that some time ago an elimination of Jews from all Government positions, the military, and diplomatic corps was started, the reasons for which are obvious. The campaign is not an open one, and the papers don't carry stories about it, but it is being conducted in systematic fashion. In the country, as well as outside the country, in one way or another way, all Jews are being recalled from their posts and in their places are assigned non-Jews. This is a result of the distrust that they have for Jews and their identification with communism and Soviet Russia is suspected.

They speak also of deportations of Jews from the large cities in central Russia to remote villages. This is also done with an excuse. The government which is the supplier of work for all citizens has started regulating the coincidence that actually for Jews who have lived their entire lives in Moscow and in other large cities, they find employment thousands of miles from any large center. This must have something to do with the secret war preparations of Soviet Russia generally. They do not want to have Jews in the centers of the country at a time of crisis.

From the aforementioned source, we also get the news that in Moscow there is now being prepared a large spectacle-trial, which will be a Jewish trial, although among the 120 accused—Jewish writers, poets, and composers—there will also be a number of non-Jews. The Jewish accused are guilty of causing the government embarrassment. For years they spoke, declared, and wrote that Jews identify themselves with the Soviet regime 100 percent and this has now been proven false, particularly after the recognition of the Jewish state. Those who have not yet paid dearly for this embarrassment will be punished legally. This will be a warning to all Jews on the one hand, and on the other, will be a quiet sort of justification for the present attitude of the government to Jews generally.

The situation is different in the satellite countries. In Poland there has started a dreadful campaign against Zionism and Israel and a wildfire is spreading against Jews who want to desert and become vassals of American imperialism. It is believed that those Jews who will not take steps immediately to leave this country, will meet more and more difficulty until the barriers will become entirely insurmountable and it will be too late.

Czechoslovakia which was, until recently, the most liberal country in eastern Europe as far as Jewish wanderers were concerned—and even for some time under the Communist rule—has also become unbearable. Escaped Jews from the neighboring countries are brutally returned and delivered into the hands of the special police from whose bestial hands the unfortunate victims can never twist themselves.

Generally, a certain amount of panic is quite evident in the Communist circles in all of the countries of eastern Europe. This is particularly true of Jewish Communist circles. Suspicion and insecurity have become an integral part of the mass psychology. Certainly there is not a single leading Communist in those countries who has the least bit of security and who does not constantly tremble in fear of the slightest mark on his record. This is also quite evident in the free countries where strong Communist Parties exist. In France, for example, the big name in Jewish Communist circles was Raisky, for years and years. He was also the editor of the daily New Press. During Gromyko's defense of the creation of a Jewish state in sessions of the United Nations, when all Communists understood the "go ahead" sign, Raisky excelled in editorials and impassioned speeches for the Jewish state and against Arab exploiters, former collaborationists of Hitler and Mussolini. Later, the "line" changed and Raisky had the misfortune not to follow it quickly enough and change to the new "line." Naturally, he spoke and wrote against Zionism and Israel, but not with the same conviction with which he had previously propagandized. So, a short while ago, he received orders from Poland to return with his family within 8 days. (Raisky, who came originally from Poland, had lived in France for more than 20 years). He begged for at least two more weeks so that he could sell his house and furniture. But a few days later, he received at his home the necessary funds for his house, furniture, and traveling expenses. He and his family left and it is already known (from Poland and France) that he and his family have disappeared.

The panic and the psychosis is even more pronounced in the satellite countries. Even in the highest positions in the regime there is great unrest and, consequently, political acrobatics are performed by everyone in order to be considered pure, even though this may often involve exposing another's impurity, may be a relative or friend. (This last is the fashion these days.)

But all of this does not compare with the brutality and violence of these countries toward Zionism and Israel. Let us remember that even in Soviet Russia there existed Zionist mass organizations only a few years ago, and they carried on broad activities. Today there is no sign left of them. In both countries, Hungary and Rumania, Zionism and Zionists are terribly persecuted.

The Hungarian Government approved the departure of 3,000 Jews to Israel. But the price that they exacted is well known. The foreign exchange or its equivalent worth in goods is taken ostensibly for the construction of a hospital in Budapest for sick Jews. But everyone knows that this is no more than pretense. The 3,000 souls who will be permitted to leave are persons aged 55 years and children under 16 years. At the same time they must have relatives like brothers, sisters, parents, or children in Israel. No others will be permitted to leave even if they meet this expensive price. Naturally, no possessions can be taken with the eventual fortunate emigrants. The clothing of each one who leaves may not exceed in value the sum of $100. How long it will take before the 3,000 Jews will be able to leave Hungary, and generally if further changes for the worse will be made, no one knows.

The hate of the Communist Party and especially of the Jewish Communists against Zionism and Zionists is actually wild. The secret police and the entire security apparatus of the government betrays Zionists with the most bitter vengeance. This is especially true when they deal with Socialist-Zionists, Poale Zion. The previous trials against leading Poale Zionists were only a drop in the bucket in comparison with the administrative action and punitive measures which are enacted daily.

How the trials were conducted does not have to be detailed here. It is enough to say that some of the veterans and respected Poale Zionists confessed at the trials that they were guilty of everything of which they were accused and they even admitted that the Israeli consul in Hungary is an agent of the American Government. But, as previously stated, this is only a small example of the bitterness and vehemence of the administration toward Zionism. Hundreds of young labor Zionists are now in various labor camps and prisons and only because they are Zionist; 10 months, 1 year, 2 years—these sentences for Zionist activity are normal occurrences. At the same time, accusations and imputations are made without any basis and no proof is necessary. The verdict is always guilty and the sentence is always incarceration for a lengthy period.

Of the approximately 130,000 Jews in Hungary, certainly 90 percent would want to leave the country. Even for the great majority of the Jewish Communists this may be an answer to their dilemma about a way of life and not because of ideological conviction. In Hungary communism was always in the minority. At the last free elections (3 years ago), the Communist Party received only 20 percent of the vote. The entire so-called left bloc—Communists, Social Democrats, and other Socialist groups—received a total of 40 percent of the vote. But soon there started the offensive of vacillation on one side and of split on the other side—in accordance with the Communist tactics—until they started using terroristic methods and under the discreet arm of a few Russian battalions, the well-known secret election, with the privilege given to the masses to vote openly—and even after all that, when the Communist regime was already sitting securely in the saddle, the masses rushed to enlist in the ranks of the Communist Party.

The brutality of the police forces can be felt most strongly in Hungary and Rumania in the question of Jewish emigration. The Hungarian-Austrian border is guarded most carefully. The number of Jewish victims who were shot while trying to cross the border is not small at all. Only recently (about a month ago) two members of our youth organization Bnillah were riddled by bullets when they were trying to cross the border. Jews who are caught and survive the tortures and incarceration, consider themselves fortunate. It is no secret that mines have been placed in various locations near the Hungarian-Austrian border, just as during the war they were used as protection against the enemy's invasion.

Just as Hitler is the situation surrounding Jewish emigration in Rumania. What spirit prevails among the Jewish masses in both countries? (In Hungary, there are 130,000 Jews and in Rumania, 350,000.) The majority is filled with defeatism. The terrible poverty, particularly in Rumania, has no

equal. The desire to go to Israel, which seems to many of them like an impossible dream, is still unswervingly strong. They are afraid to go to the offices of the Israel mission. Nevertheless, they brave it in the hope of a miracle. A short time ago, a transport of Jews left Czechoslovakia for Israel. It was arranged that the transport should leave via the Rumanian port city of Constanta. The Rumanian Government issued the necessary permits for the transport, eager probably for the financial profit involved. Rumanian Jews soon learned of the trainload of Jewish emigrants headed for Israel which was traversing many large and small cities and they waited for the train at the stations and forcefully pushed themselves into the cars, in an effort to save themselves.

Later, when a few more transports were expected, the Rumanian Jews hit on a new plan. A number of them, who knew that the transport was scheduled to arrive in Constanta, hid the night before its arrival in empty casks which were standing on the docks and later smuggled themselves onto the ship which was leaving for Israel. Lately, a tragedy occurred with a woman who was found hiding in a trunk. The entire port was immediately surrounded by the military and several hundred persons were arrested.

Whenever it has been possible of late to reach the heads of the governments of both countries and raise the question of emigration for Israel, the answer has always been that the Jews are needed in the countries in which they are living. An important government leader in Hungary spoke of the "5-year plan" of Hungary as the reason for forbidding emigration. He stated further, according to the same sources, that if the first 3 years of the 5-year plan prove successful, Jews will be permitted to leave. Contrariwise, it is clear that the entire switch in the attitude toward Zionism and the campaign against it in these countries, is influenced by Soviet Russia. In these countries, no change of a political nature is made without instructions from Moscow. Two days before the vote on Jerusalem in the United Nations, someone had a talk with the foreign minister of Czechoslovakia in Prague. The latter gave assurances that his delegation would vote against internationalization of Jerusalem. At the close of the conversation, the minister remarked: "If before the vote nothing happens." The Czechoslovakian delegation voted with the entire Soviet block for internationalization. And when later, the same person met with the Czechoslovakian foreign minister, and asked him: "Why?" the minister answered: "I told you 'if nothing happens.'"

Bricha (escape) still continues but with the greatest difficulty and high cost. At a conference in Vienna, I heard detailed reports of what has been done in the last few months with our funds in these countries and in getting people out of these countries. Figures and details need not be mentioned in this report now. But this has been a heroic work, full of enthusiasm which is incomparable. The greatest credit for this must go to * * *, who efficiently used our funds in the best way and at the best time. One of his accomplishments was to rescue at one time 20 souls from Kvotas Mahlor in Budapest and bring them to Vienna. In addition, he succeeded recently in bringing out a number of leading people, particularly of the youth section.

At this same conference, most of the time was devoted to the problem of our declassed friends, especially in Rumania. "Declassed" in this case means those who are known for their active Zionist past. For them, all doors are shut. If they hide out anywhere they can do so only as long as they have the means with which to live. In order to get work, they must regret their personal life and employment for the past few years. This is naturally connected with great danger and they must avoid it at all costs. In Transylvania alone, there are more than 500 persons in this category. Without help, they are doomed to actual death by starvation. The regime knows of this category of declassed persons who, according to the tenets of the regime, must perish as a destructive element, enemies of the people's democracy and burdensome to the state.

One of their proposals connected with our relief was actually that we should help support these people. Twenty dollars a month will enable a man and his family to live. In order to care for 500 in Transylvania, it would cost us $10,000 monthly. We must remember the tremendous moral, political, and Zionist aspect of this phase of our relief work.

The Communist Tactic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal American for March 19, 1950:

THE COMMUNIST TACTIC

(By E. F. Tompkins)

Senator MCCARTHY was entirely right in alleging that the State Department has been used as a nest of Communist espionage and treasonous intrigue.

If it were not so, Whittaker Chambers would not have had a bagful of stolen documents; Henry Julian Wadleigh would not have uttered his courtroom confession; and Alger Hiss would not have been convicted of perjury.

Yet, the New Deal's current investigation of itself can be easily distorted to discredit Senator MCCARTHY.

Travesties of this kind are made possible by common ignorance of the ramifications of Communist organization.

One thing that investigators of communism should understand is this—

Communism in this country is divided into two parts.

One part—the lesser of the two—is the Communist Party.

The larger part—and the more insidious one—is the Communist movement, which utilizes non-Communists as lackeys of the Communists.

The party does not have, and does not want, a great mass of dues-paying, card-holding members.

The party, in Nicolai Lenin's old language, exists and operates as the general staff of the Communist "class struggle"—as the cadre of the Communist revolution.

Hence the Communist Party is the hard core of the Communist movement, but the movement itself extends far beyond the party.

The Communists themselves establish fronts to obtain non-Communist support for Communist purposes.

They are trained to make use of respectable societies, such as church leagues and labor unions, to support their propaganda and to assist their "causes."

They know how to enroll the names of thousands of gullible or Marxist-minded educators, clergymen, and publicists to "endorse" their manifestos, to "sponsor" their rabble meetings, or to defend the "civil rights" of their agitators.

And they have the help of all kinds of fellow travelers.

By these means, literally millions of "joiners" are manipulated by the Communist Party, or by its accomplices, within the Communist movement.

One may thus be either a technical Communist, or a technical non-Communist; a "strategic nonmember" of the Party, or a genuinely deluded "innocent."

In these circumstances, when one's name appears upon an arrant piece of Communist propaganda, or as a supporter of a Communist enterprise, and one is called to a reckoning, one needs only to deny being a Communist, and may usually do so safely under oath.

If the outfit in question has been branded as subversive by the attorney general, one may simply plead ignorance or deception—and go right on posing as a humanitarian.

Take the case of Miss Dorothy Kenyon, who used to be a LaGuardia judge in New York and later had a State Department association.

Senator MCCARTHY said she had belonged to 28 Communist "fronts."

First Miss Kenyon called the Senator a "liar."

Then, on the witness stand confronted with the documents, she said she never was a Communist—but had been "a sucker."

This would seem to disqualify Miss Kenyon as a public leader.

For it is plain that the Communists have had the benefit of her "influence."

Granted that she was not a member of the Communist party—she was demonstrably a part of the Communist movement, whether she realized it or not.

The Insidious FEPC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following series of articles from the Staunton News Leader, written by Maj. Gen. E. W. Opie:

The proposed FEPC law would declare it to be the policy of Congress to prevent "the practice of discriminating in employment against properly qualified persons because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry" because such discrimination is contrary to the American principles of liberty and equality of opportunity.

"The right to employment," says the bill's introductory, "without discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is hereby recognized as and declared to be a civil right of all the people of the United States."

When hearings were held on the bill, proponents were of the unanimous opinion that it proceeds upon a theory and philosophy which assure its effective administration. They argued for the bill on humanitarian grounds and declared it to be an essential step for strengthening our democracy. Donald R. Richberg, the noted constitutional lawyer, has declared, however, that the declaration of the right to employment without discrimination "is a declaration quite beyond the power of the Congress of the United States." * * *

"If the employer * * * is to be regarded as a mere instrument of state policy who can be required to employ anyone whom a Government bureaucrat finds to be 'qualified' for a particular job, why should not all employments be made through a Government agency?"

Bureaucratic judgment inevitably would be substituted for employer judgment under a law such as this, in the opinion of many who have studied it. As to its constitutionality, various authorities agree with Mr. Richberg. * * *

But clear unconstitutionality will not deter those who propose this legislation, nor will it be a protection when the Court test comes, as the present Supreme Court has too often looked upon the Constitution as a scrap of paper.

The bill would make it "an unlawful practice for an employer—

1. "To refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry."

2. "To utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other source which discriminates against such individuals because of their race," etc.

It is also declared an unlawful practice for any labor organization to discriminate because of race, etc., or for an employer or labor organization "to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person, because he has opposed any unlawful practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding under this act."

Discrimination in employment on account of "race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry" clearly involves a probing of an employer's mind and intentions, which in most cases likely to arise under legislation such as the FEPC bill would be impossible. In some cases, evidence of expressions of dislike or hate, and of determination not to employ persons of a certain race, etc., might be obtained to prove discrimination. Generally, any accused employer would deny discrimination. Conviction would nearly always have to be based on presumptive evidence: failure of the complainant to obtain the job he sought, though he proves the requisite qualifications; the absence of any persons of the complainant's color or creed in the employ of the accused, etc. It would be impossible for any commission to read the mind of an employer and seldom could intent, the mandatory element in American criminal prosecution, be established. The Commission would substitute its judgment as to a complainant's fitness for employment which was denied him for that of an accused employer, who would then have to obey the bureaucratic edict or face prosecution.

In placing upon employers the responsibility for determining whether or not an employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other source of personnel discriminates because of race, creed, etc., the bill would impose the impossible. Again comes up the question of intent. Without close investigation, which would be burdensome and perhaps costly, how could an employer tell whether or not an agency was discriminating? If he listened to hearsay or the opinion of bureaucrats, he could do gross injustice to an employment agency or school. The Federal Commission and its underlings could put out of business almost any agency which happened to fall under their displeasure.

The opportunities for bureaucratic persecution under bill are legion, and those for extending its application through interpretation, rules, regulations, etc., are infinite. Under the wide-open interpretations of the commerce clause of the Constitution by the Supreme Court and by the National Labor Relations Board, the enforcement Commission could apply its powers everywhere. True, the bill exempts employers of 50 or fewer, but it would only be a question of time before this exemption was removed. No business, however small or local, would long be exempt from the officious attention of the horde of bureaucrats which would be necessary for enforcement.

The Federal Commission established by the bill would be empowered:

1. To investigate any written charge of discrimination in employment, either by a complainant or by a member of the Commission and to "endeavor to eliminate any such unlawful employment practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion."

2. To hold a formal hearing if persuasion fails.

3. To issue cease and desist orders including reinstatement or hiring of employees, with or without back pay.

4. To petition Federal courts to enforce its orders, the court petitioned being required to review the proceedings and issuing a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission. Court judgments and decrees would be final, except for review by a circuit court of appeals and the Supreme Court. Any person feeling aggrieved by a Commission order could appeal to a Federal court, but it would be a costly procedure.

In addition to penalties that might be imposed through appeal to the courts, there is a direct provision for fines of up to $500 and imprisonment up to 1 year for anyone who shall forcibly resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with a member, agent, or employee of the Commission.

It is easily seen from these powers and the procedures contemplated that the Commission could be accuser, investigator, and judge, a triumvirate of powers which led to the grossest injustices under the old Wagner (National Labor Relations) Act and the National Labor Relations Board. This bill would repeat the mistake of investing such three-way authority in a single Commission.

It is equally clear that the army of agents which this Commission would create, like professional labor agitators, would have to justify their jobs manufacturing cases, and that they could and would indulge in the persecution of employers. Accused businesses would be put to tremendous expense and great trouble answering discrimination charges, either by disgruntled persons who failed to obtain the jobs they sought, or by Federal agents. This Commission and its regional bureaus and underlings would be a perfect set-up for political persecution of any employer who didn't favor the party in power. It could readily become a Federal gestapo which under some unscrupulous President could be as relentless and as cruel as the secret police of dictators.

At best, a commission and its agents possessing such powers as the above would be constantly snooping into the affairs of employers and worrying them with charges, which however unjustified, would be onerous to resist. Since the charge of discrimination because of race, creed, etc., concerns what is in an employer's mind and heart, the tendency would be to convict on presumptive evidence, often of trivial nature. Administration and enforcement of FEPC would create more injustice, confusion, and race hatred than it would correct or prevent.

Let's take a look at the sort of rules and regulations which have been promulgated by the bureaucrats of New York, whose law was the pattern for the FEPC bill and whose practice undoubtedly would be aped by any Federal set-up:

It is an unlawful practice (in New York) to inquire into the original name of an applicant for employment whose name has been changed.

To inquire into the birthplace of an applicant, or birthplace of his parents, spouse, or other close relatives.

To require a birth or baptismal certificate.

To inquire into the religious denomination of an applicant, his religious affiliations, his church, parish pastor, or religious holidays observed or whether or not he is an atheist.

An applicant may not be told: This is a (Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish) organization."

An applicant for employment may not be told: "The following holidays will be observed by this firm and no others (naming holidays, i. e., Decoration Day, July Fourth, etc.)."

An applicant for employment may not be told: "Employees are required to work Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur."

Inquiry into the complexion of an applicant is forbidden.

A photograph may not be requested.

Inquiry may not be made as to whether an applicant is a naturalized or native-born citizen, the date applicant acquired citizenship, whether the applicant's parents or spouse are naturalized or native-born, or asked the date such parents or spouse acquired citizenship.

An applicant may not be required to produce his naturalization papers or first papers.

No inquiry may be made into the location (general) of places of business of relatives, nor inquiry into the places of residence of close relatives.

No inquiry may be made into the maiden name of the wife of a male applicant and/or the maiden name of the mother of an applicant.

Inquiry into the general military experience of an applicant is forbidden, into whereabouts during the First World War, or into organizations to which the applicant belongs.

Under the power of the President to write antidiscrimination rules and regulations into Government contracts, the contractor would have to obligate himself to waive a legal right of a free exercise of judgment in selection of his employees, points out one critic. Also such a contract might require a contractor to agree to compliance in all his operations although only a small force might be employed in fulfilling the Government contract.

In the hearings on the FEPC bill, Mr. Richberg offers this further argument against the bill: When a bill proposes to destroy the constitutional liberty essential to a free economy, and to provide Communists with a new and powerful leverage for disintegrating American industry, then any genuine liberal is obliged to say, "The alleged humanitarian and democratic purpose of this legislation is only a fraudulent cloak to conceal its communistic purposes—and its inevitable effect—to make a competitive system of private enterprise unworkable and to bring about industrial chaos and eventual collapse."

If the fair employment practice program had not been originally devised by Communist strategists they would have been ashamed of their stupidity. As a matter of fact it was a logical outgrowth of their orthodox plan. At the root of Communist ideology is the delusion of discrimination. A lot of people are miserable, they are told, not because of their own inherent or cultivated weaknesses, but because other men use their inherited or acquired power to oppress them. The remedy, they are told, is to have the State—a deceptive name for a tyrannical ruling class—control all power and divide up the proceeds of state enterprises without discrimination.

The program proceeds logically. The first step is to appeal to the least prosperous to fight discrimination. "Join the labor union and we will all fight the employers together and stop them from discriminating against anyone." But the old-line unions were very discriminatory themselves. The craft unions aimed at giving a preferred earning power to skilled workmen—and at preserving monopolies of skilled employments.

The Communists naturally directed their efforts to the establishment of industrial unions. The early IWW and "one big union" movements were clearly communistic. In recent developments the industrial unions have cleverly adopted the slogan of democracy. They open their doors to the lowest paid, unskilled workers. They preach anti-discrimination and so appeal to every element of society that suffers any disadvantage because of racial or religious prejudice. But the ultimate object of the Communist strategy is not to create a democratic equality of opportunity through the exercise of individual liberty, but to create a uniform subservience to the political oligarchy that must rule the all-powerful government of a totalitarian society.

Every demand of organized labor for management control and every demand for legislation to substitute political regulation for managerial discretion will be supported by Communist agencies as an aid to weakening the power of private enterprise to meet its obligation to produce necessities and to provide employment and earnings through which the masses of the workers can retain the high standard of living which competitive capitalism under democratic government has achieved.

Every such demand is, of course, popularized by alleging that its objectives are a humanitarian improvement in the living conditions of the less fortunate and underprivileged members of society and a "democratic" elimination of all discriminations and special privileges that may give unjust advantages to anyone by accident of birth.

1. The proposed legislation is Communist-inspired and would have the effect of undermining the security of the country and of giving aid and comfort to its enemies.

2. The enactment of such legislation would hamper and impede the operation of established businesses by undermining the authority and efficiency of business management, by promoting discord among the workers, and by subjecting employers to burdensome litigation and hearings.

3. The enactment of the bill would seriously curtail the development of private enterprise generally by undermining the basic freedoms upon which the development of such enterprise depends.

4. If enacted, the proposed legislation would prove to be administratively unworkable because it would tend to undermine established social patterns based on law and custom, it would disrupt present progress in the field of race relations, and it would be impossible for the proposed commission to decide all cases on their individual merit.

5. The administrative history of the State antidiscrimination laws of New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts, as well as that of the Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission, does not justify the enactment of Federal legislation in this field.

6. The proposed legislation is unconstitutional.

It is perfectly clear that enactment of so-called fair employment practices legislation would create more wrongs than it would correct. It would inspire widespread industrial troubles. It would cause racial dissension, undoing much of the progress that has been made in promoting good interracial relations. It would deny religious denominations the right to conduct schools and colleges for their own people or to give preference to employment of persons of their own faith in positions having to do with the propagation of that faith.

Such legislation would substitute the judgment of Government agents for the judgment of employers as to the fitness of an applicant for a job; it would deny American citizens the constitutional right of choosing their associates; it would create an immense Federal bureaucracy whose agents, in order to justify their jobs, would constantly stir up complaints, harassing employers on trivial charges, threatening them with prosecution, and placing upon them an intolerable burden of defense against charges which could generally be sustained only on presumptive, intangible evidence without establishing discriminatory intent.

The bill would place in the hands of an unscrupulous President a weapon for political persecution of any who dare to oppose him, his administration, or party. By disrupting private industry and playing into the hands of Communists, as shown in the article dealing with the Communist source of inspiration, this kind of legislation could easily become the basis of a Communist dictatorship, or of any other kind of dictatorship a power-hungry President desired.

It is idle to say that these dangers are figments of the imagination because nothing of the kind has resulted in New York, Massachusetts, or New Jersey. The governors of those States have not had the police power to enforce their antidiscrimination laws, and have been content with the gesture of enacting them to win the support of minorities. A President of the United States, however, would have the instrumentalities of the huge Federal enforcement agency which would be created, the FBI, and packed courts.

A good precept is to create no unrestricted power, however benevolent and American our Presidents have been, which could be used for tyranny, entrenchment, and absolutism.

Trygve Lie's Proposal To Accept Communists as Representatives of China Is Stab in Back for UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter appearing in the New York Times of March 14, 1950:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Friends of the United Nations are deeply shocked at the suggestion of Trygve Lie, Secretary General of that body, that the authorized representatives of the lawful government of China be repudiated and replaced by the designees of a group which through fraud and force of arms has imposed its will for the moment upon a large part, but not all, of the Chinese people and Chinese territory.

International law and order cannot exist unless founded upon elementary morals. Nor can any instrumentality of international law and order long survive the negation of elementary morals. Counsels of expediency wrecked the League of Nations. Trygve Lie's proposal in the name of expediency is a stab in the back of the United Nations.

His argument is simple enough: The United Nations in order to function as intended requires the cooperation of the five great powers. One nation, Soviet Russia, refuses to cooperate unless the existing and lawful government of one of the five—namely, China—is repudiated and a self-constituted, usurping government is accepted in its place. Therefore, says Mr. Lie, repudiate the lawful government, notwithstanding its great contributions to the United Nations, and accept a government which has demonstrated itself to be the very antithesis of international peace and good will.

Entirely apart from bad morals which condemn the suggestion on its face, what does Mr. Lie hope to gain as a matter of expediency? Had Russia cooperated in furthering the aims of the United Nations before this issue was raised? Is there any reason to suppose that if the free nations yield despite the resulting injustice any genuine cooperation could be expected from Russia? Having yielded in this case, could the free nations consistently decline to refuse a similar demand when the next country in Asia or elsewhere is partially overrun by Communist aggression?

It would be an incalculable tragedy if the United Nations were to fail the hopes and prayers of the peace-hungry peoples of the world. If that failure should flow from Russian contumacy, Russia will inevitably answer sooner or later for that result. If failure should come because the free nations sacrifice justice and morals to Russian contumacy, the United Nations would still fail, though it might simulate continuance, but only as a symbol of universal cynicism and cruel mockery of mankind's noblest aspirations, and the free nations could not evade responsibility for that result. It was not Italy in Abyssinia or Japan in Manchuria which wrecked the League of Nations. It was the weak-kneed, spineless reluctance of the other powers to take a resolute stand upon the ground of manifest morals and justice.

The indication that the United States of America refrain from defining its opinion of Mr. Lie's proposal until a majority of the Security Council had expressed itself is unworthy of the position of leadership which events have accorded to America.

The issue is clear and calls for forthright policy.

There is a lawful, constitutional government of China. In the critical years when our own fate was in the balance that government faithfully, loyally, and successfully defended the bastion of Asia against our mortal enemy—and Russia's. With our allies we entered into a solemn obligation to defend the integrity of China against aggression.

We have done badly enough in fulfilling that obligation without participating in this final fatal betrayal suggested by Mr. Lie.

HAROLD RIEGELMAN.

NEW YORK, *March 13, 1950.*

Congressional Sounding Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bakersfield Press, Bakersfield, Calif., of Thursday, November 17, 1949:

CONGRESSIONAL SOUNDING BOARD

Officials of the National Farm Labor Union were extremely successful in using the recent Bakersfield hearing of the congressional Subcommittee on Labor and Education as a sounding board.

They got a lot of pretty irrelevant testimony into the RECORD designed to show that the so-called corporation farmer is responsible for the migratory agricultural labor problem.

This testimony was intended as explanation of the union's pretensions of having maintained a strike at Di Giorgio farms for nearly 2 years.

NFLU has maintained a picket line—in a spotty and dispirited sort of way. But a visit to Di Giorgio will show you that some 1,300 fairly-contented workers are crossing that picket line every day. So just whom does the NFLU represent? Certainly not Di Giorgio employees.

If you select a few Di Giorgio workers at random and talk to them, you'll soon discover they have little interest in NFLU. Matter of fact, they have things better than any NFLU member we have seen or heard tell of.

For instance, there is truck driver—he appears to be nearing 50—who came here from the Middle West in the the mid-thirties. He arrived in Bakersfield with 45 cents and a pregnant wife and went to work for Di Giorgio. He has been there ever since.

His two sons have graduated from high school and are working for Di Giorgio now. His daughter attends school in nearby Arvin. One son is married and lives with his wife in a cottage on the Di Giorgio ranch—a clean, nicely furnished bungalow with running water and modern sanitation facilities, excellent heating and an attractive well-kept garden. It is rent-free, and water and garbage disposal are provided by the Di Giorgios.

The father has bought, and paid for, his own home a few miles from the ranch.

During peak harvest seasons the wife and daughter help out in the packing shed. At such times the family nets nearly $1,000 a month in take-home pay.

Unmarried workers live in three large dormitories, where their quarters are furnished free. They eat in three equally huge dining halls, where they pay a total of $1.60 a day for three copious meals.

The ranch maintains recreation halls, tennis courts, and swimming pools for employees.

For normal off-season operation Di Giorgio employs some 1,200 permanent workers. At the peak of the harvest and the wine-making operation the pay roll soars as high as 2,500. But families of permanent employees make up nearly 1,100 of the additional helpers. It is seldom necessary for the farm to hire more than 200 migrant laborers.

So, how does the National Farm Labor Union figure that the Di Giorgios are contributing to the sorry lot of the migrant agricultural worker?

It would seem that the Di Giorgios are setting an example which NFLU might well use as a pattern of ideal conditions for farm workers.

Truman's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Story City Herald, Story City, Iowa:

PAYING THEM OUT

There are 11,500,000 workers in factories in this country. They earn nearly $60 a week each. Yet, if they turned in all their wages to the National Government, President Truman wouldn't have much over half enough to meet his proposed expenditures the coming year.

Unification or Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, for the second time within recent weeks a high-ranking naval officer has been penalized because he dared to tell the truth as he saw it before a congressional committee. In reprisal against Rear Adm. Joel T. Boone for expressing an opinion contrary to that of his superiors in the Defense Establishment, a brilliant and distinguished officer has been summarily removed from his post as senior medical adviser to the Secretary of Defense.

This policy of reprisal on the part of the Secretary of Defense is an exceedingly dangerous. If witnesses before the Committee on Armed Services, or any other congressional committee, are to be punished for stating their honest opinions, Congress will be deprived of information essential in the interest of national defense.

In enacting the Unification Act, Congress did not intend to set up a military dictatorship in the Defense Establishment. The action taken in the cases of Admirals Denfeld and Boone would indicate, however, that such dictatorship has been assumed.

Under existing conditions officers in the military service must clear their opinions with the Secretary of Defense or risk their careers. This type of coercion is not only destructive of morale but threatens constitutional civilian control of the armed services. The security of the Nation is in jeopardy if Congress fails to meet this threat in time.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer of March 14, 1950:

ANOTHER DENFELD CASE?

Rear Adm. Joel T. Boone, one of the most able and distinguished medical officers in the United States Navy, has been unceremoniously booted out of his post as the senior medical officer in the Department of Defense. This came to light just after Admiral Boone had testified before the House Armed Service Committee that certain cutbacks in military hospital were short-sighted.

It looks like the Denfeld case, all over again. And, significantly, it comes just a week after the House Committee blasted the Navy and Defense Department heads for the firing of Admiral Denfeld, describing his dismissal as a reprisal.

The evidence is piling up. It seems clear that Secretary Louis Johnson, while taking the maximum credit for his economies, is inexorably pursuing a policy of intimidating witnesses who venture to testify against his party line when they are called by the House Armed Services Committee.

It is not a question of Mr. Johnson's authority over the Navy Department and other military departments. It is a struggle between Mr. Johnson and a committee of Congress. Some military officers, if they are to give honest answers to Congress, have to criticize Mr. Johnson's policies. If they are to be punished for this and their careers broken, the time soon will come when no congressional committee can hope to get the true facts from its service witnesses.

That is the real issue. It is a grave one, because it involves the power of Congress to control the armed forces. Civilian control of the military, accepted for 150 years in America, is challenged by the policy of reprisal which the Defense Secretary and a very confused Navy Secretary are pursuing. Congress will have to see this battle through, or else risk the break-down of its history authority over these executive departments which spend one-third of our total budget.

Acheson Sounded Warning to Asiatics of Pitfalls of Soviet Imperialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Constantine Brown from the Washington Star. What a different picture we would face today in Asia if the State Department had adopted several years ago, or even 1 year ago, the general attitude and policies which the Secretary of State announced in San Francisco. Perhaps the situation can still be retrieved if the statement is implemented vigorously.

The article follows:

ACHESON SOUNDED WARNING TO ASIATICS OF PITFALLS OF SOVIET IMPERIALISM

(By Constantine Brown)

Secretary of State Acheson spoke firmly in San Francisco Wednesday, for the benefit of hundreds of millions of Asiatics.

He warned them of the pitfalls of the thinly disguised Soviet imperialism. He pointed out that all nations which join with the U. S. S. R. become enslaved, in the real meaning of that word. Finally he described the Russians as genuine warmongers because "anybody who would violate the United Nations Charter would violate the peace of the world."

Moreover, Mr. Acheson amplified a statement, made earlier this month in Washington, that in our effort to stem aggression henceforth we will be moved by the realities of the situation in various threatened countries rather than by ideologies.

POLICY LAID DOWN

Mr. Acheson has announced that America is prepared to help any country which opposed the Kremlin dictators, regardless of the form of government in that country. According to this new policy, we are ready to assist Communists like Marshal Tito, dictators like General Franco, and even the remnants of the Chinese Nationalist regime on Formosa, which the State Department in the past has labeled a corrupt reactionary government, unworthy of our help.

Mr. Acheson promised Asiatic peoples who are willing to resist Moscow's penetration that they can count on "appropriate aid," which ranges from economic and cultural help to actual military assistance. He did not specify whether military assistance would

be given in the form of war materials or in actual physical intervention.

The Secretary of State unquestionably had in mind the situation in Indochina. The Russians and their Peiping satellite have pledged themselves to give full support to Ho Chi Minh, the leader of the Viet Nam Communists, against the newly established rule of former Emperor Bao Dai.

It is possible that some commitments may have been made by our Government to give other forms of active help besides arms and ammunition necessary for the French-Indochinese force of 150,000 men.

TASK FLEET VISITS PORTS

An American task fleet is now visiting Indochinese ports and it is possible that the presence of American men-of-war may put courage into the hearts of the forces which have been fighting the Communists for nearly 4 years.

The Secretary's speech is interpreted in Washington diplomatic circles as an indication that the United States no longer accepts passively Russian inroads in Asia.

In congressional quarters which have pleaded with the State Department—and even threatened it—since the fall of 1947 to consider the situation in China realistically rather than ideologically it is felt that Mr. Acheson is locking the stable after the horses have gone. If when Mr. Acheson took over as Secretary of State last year he had been as realistic as he is today, it is possible that the Russian-supported Chinese Communists might have been prevented from conquering the whole Chinese mainland.

If the State Department had sent military supplies to the Nationalists in keeping with appropriations voted by Congress, and if it had accepted the suggestions that we send some hard-headed military advisers to the Nationalist forces, we might have avoided the predicament in which we find ourselves today.

Twenty-eight Thousand Greek Children Victims of Communist Terrorism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the crimes committed by organized communism are so numerous that some of the worst ones go practically unnoticed in a world which has been shocked so much it sometimes seems to have become shock-proof. Very little has been heard about one of the most vicious mass crimes of all time. More notice should be taken of it, and I am wondering if our Government has done all it should have done about it.

I refer to the kidnaping of about 28,000 Greek children by Communist guerrilla forces. These children have been torn from their parents and forced into countries behind the iron curtain. They are the victims of a policy of communistic terrorism.

In perpetrating this crime against all civilized standards the guerrillas acted from three principal motives. In the first place, it is said these abductions are part of a campaign of terrorism, intended to swell the flood of refugees and so intensify the dislocation of Greek economic life. This, of course, would be designed to discredit and weaken the non-Communist Government of Greece.

In the second place, the abductions became an instrument of blackmail. The Communists hoped that by snatching these children away from their parents, they would be in a position to apply pressure upon the parents and persuade them to yield to the Communist demands. Finally, they regarded the abductions as a method of recruiting future cells for the Greek Communist Party. They hoped that by training these young minds in a strictly Communist environment they would have some active party adherents in the future. It is understood that the principal iron-curtain centers for the encampment of these children are Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary. But it is, of course, a part of the master plan of international communism; and some of the children may have been distributed elsewhere.

We are informed that the kidnaping procedure of the Communist guerrillas has been brutally simple. On entering a peasant village, the Communists would instruct the inhabitants to bring their children to the main square or to the well. The parents would then be told that by orders of the rebel government their children were to be taken away "for their own safety and to receive a democratic education." The resistance of the parents was beaten down by force, if necessary, and there have been reports that some parents who forcibly sought to prevent the abduction of their children were murdered.

It has been pointed out that the tragedy of the children is great, but that the tragedy of the parents is infinitely greater. While life is hard and rigorous in the peasant villages, the children have supplied the incentive and the courage to toil and fight on. Without the children, life becomes hopeless and a hollow mockery.

It is no wonder that the Greek Nation recently set aside a day of national mourning over this outrage against civilization. But does not such moral degradation call for international mourning? The abduction of these 28,000 children is much more than a tragedy for these children, their parents, and the Greek Nation. That such an outrage can happen and go unpunished is a blot upon the spiritual progress of mankind.

This crime brought forth the usual protests to the United Nations. We have been assured that the United States Government will continue to give utmost support to the efforts of the United Nations and the international Red Cross organizations to bring about the return of these thousands of children to Greece.

It is my concern, in bringing this matter to the attention of the House, that the perpetrators of this unprincipled and immoral action shall not be left with the impression that the protest of the United States is merely perfunctory. I hope they will not be deluded into the belief that this Nation regards this crime as no more than just another incident in a long list of Communist offenses, of no more importance than the rest. By any respectable international code of human ethics, the wrecking of homes and families is a crime of the first magnitude.

It warrants the full force of the moral influence of this great Nation and of all civilized peoples. Action already taken should be vigorously followed up by further strong protests, and notice should be served upon the guilty that this Nation considers they have committed a serious international crime for which they will be held in the contempt of the civilized world until they have purged themselves by returning these children safely to their homes and their parents.

I hope the Government of our country will assume an aggressive leadership in the use of every moral device within our command to right this despicable wrong.

Aid in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the New York Times, under date of March 11, 1950.

Will you please read it?

The concluding paragraph points up the necessity for prompt action.

The bill H. R. 7600 would extend the life of the Philippines Rehabilitation Commission and implement the procedure by which we can help a staunch and faithful ally:

AID IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

It seems to be agreed that if the United States is to make effective moves against the advance of communism in Asia some plans for stabilizing the situation in various countries must be initiated and adopted. Viet Nam wants military aid, at once, to meet the increased threat of the Communist-led forces of Ho Chi Minh. Burma has indicated a receptivity to American assistance, after having been somewhat fearful of foreign exploitation. Indonesia is seeking further rehabilitation loans. Discussions are in progress concerning the relation of American stock piling to Malaya's economy. A State Department mission is now in the field making a survey and a new Asiatic policy is predicted for sometime in the summer.

Meanwhile there is one danger point at which we can and should act without the need for further exploration. That is the Philippines. We have a direct military commitment and a strong moral commitment to the new republic's security and progress. It can be met, now, with concrete actions that will promote stability in the archipelago and at the same time give an earnest to the rest of Asia that we mean business. Here are some of the things that can be done:

1. The United States Congress should immediately make a further and final amendment to the War Damage Claims Act, appropriating the necessary $100,000,000 to bring the scale of payment up to the 75-percent level that was implicit in the original legislation. This is a matter of good faith, but it can be made also a matter of substantial economic gain for the Philippines by making some simple provisos. It can be stipulated, for example, that the additional payments to those whose claims have already been met in part must be used in projects designed to further rehabilitation and economic improvement in the Philippines. This would assure the channeling of the funds into productive enterprises.

2. The United States should extend to the Philippines, now, a currency stabilization credit similar to that which was extended to Mexico. An amount of about $100,000,000 should be adequate. This is imperative, since adverse trade balances have drained away too much of the country's gold reserve. The peso is not now as stable as it should be and there is a black market.

3. The United States should dispatch, immediately, a small, really top-level and nongovernmental mission to examine and report on the possibility of private investment of the sort envisaged in the point 4 program. Such a mission, and it should be good enough to inspire complete confidence, should advise the Philippine Government on the steps necessary to encourage investment. It should also advise Americans as to where and how investment could be made profitably. There are opportunities in abundance. In this category could be placed certain public operations that could be funded with private capital, such as the rebuilding of the water supply for Manila and Baguio, the construction of some key roads, and the development of dam projects that would be a source of both irrigation and power.

4. The United States should quickly resolve any further dispute about our military commitments by strengthening its Philippine establishments. If we are to hold Clark Field there ought to be a ground force to defend it and its fuel sources should be made independent of the haul from Manila. If Subic Bay is to be our major naval station its fueling capacity should be made adequate. If we have other and wider programs for a solid establishment in the archipelago they should be started now.

The Philippines is at the moment in a shaky economic position. It is in a vulnerable military position. It can be turned into a bastion of great strength, economically, politically, and militarily, by prompt action. We and the Filipinos are in basic accord and we need not fear that we will be misinterpreted. We can act jointly. The important thing is to act now.

The President Should Not Appoint Professional Military Persons on the Atomic Energy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention to H. R. 7601, a bill recently introduced that would require the appointment of one and, at the President's discretion, two professional military men to membership on the Atomic Energy Commission.

I feel strongly that this bill is ill-advised. I fear that it represents an attempt to attack, by indirection, the principle of civilian control over atomic energy, and that it seeks to create an entering wedge for military control.

Our problems will not be solved, our country will not be protected, and none of us will be relieved of responsibility simply by putting one man or two men in uniform upon the Atomic Energy Commission. This is an escapist path. This is a retreat from the philosophy which has always been the glory of our country—the philosophy that civilians must exercise basic direction and control of the great undertakings, military or otherwise, in our society.

We fought this battle 4 years ago when the McMahon bill for control of atomic energy was before us. At that time there were those who advocated military supremacy. But the public spoke up with a great voice and made it clear that America is still founded upon the civilian principle, and that civilians must direct our activities in the new and enormously threatening and enormously hopeful field of atomic energy.

Full provision is made in the law which we passed for consultation with the military. An unprecedented Military Liaison Committee was created to be composed of military people—and that committee was given the authority to appeal to the Secretary of Defense and, through him, to the President if any action or failure to act on the part of the commission is regarded as harmful to the responsibilities of the armed services.

This system has worked well. The Military Liaison Committee has not once felt obliged to exercise its special right of appeal to the Secretary of Defense and to the President. Former Secretary of Defense Forrestal expressed satisfaction, before his death, with the relationship existing between the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission. Secretary Johnson has just issued his annual report for the fiscal year 1949, and in that report there is not a hint of criticism directed at the present arrangement. On Thursday, March 9, the President of the United States again indicated his approval of a civilian commission and civilian direction of atomic energy—subject to the advice and counsel and knowledge of the military exercised through the Military Liaison Committee.

I want to express my emphatic agreement with the President that putting a military man on the Commission would be a mistake. I think that it would reflect panic, that it would promise no easy panacea for our problems. I think that, on the contrary, we will be safer and stronger from every viewpoint if we hold steadfast to the glorious American tradition of civilian direction.

Thirteenth Annual National Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, in February 1936 the late President Roosevelt called a conference of conservationists representing Federal, State, and private organizations to consider ways and means to restore our vanishing wildlife. At that time President Roosevelt said:

> It has long been my feeling that there has been a lack of a full and complete realization of our wildlife plight, of the urgency of it, and of the many social and economic values that wildlife has to our people.

The North American Wildlife Conference of 1936 was thus the father of our present National Wildlife Federation.

The National Wildlife Federation has made great strides since that month in 1936. Through its active membership it has done much toward reawakening the American people to the violent and destructive story of what has been done to our forests, grasslands, wildlife, and water sources. It had been a story of human energy that was unthinking and uncontrolled.

We can thank the National Wildlife Federation for their unselfish personal interest and their love of our national resources for bringing to light the unpleasant story of the need for conservation.

Our timber reserves had been reduced by 40 percent. More than one-fourth of our grazing lands, farm pasture lands, and croplands had been ruined or severely impoverished. We were and still are drawing upon our water resources with such lavishness that in a growing number of regions the water problem is becoming more acute.

Through the efforts of the National Wildlife Federation we have made real advances in the protection of wildlife but they are still endeavoring to make our people realize that innumerable forms of animal life, including even small mammals and beneficent insects, play their part in nature's economy. They have been sucessful in their long battle to obtain Federal recognition of the pollution problem. May their coming years be as successful.

Freedom and St. Patrick—George Washington Gave First Official Recognition to St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to review the part the Irish have played in the building of the United States, and I am not taking the time of the House today to recount the glorious history of Americans of Irish ancestry. This record is too well known.

It is doubtful we would be an independent Nation today had it not been for the Irish. More than half of George Washington's Army which brought America's freedom from British rule was made up of Irishmen. Many of his most competent officers were Irish. The pages of American history are filled with the part of the Irish in establishing a great nation here.

The Irish fought to build our Nation; they fought to preserve it in 1861; and they fought for its preservation again in World War I and World War II. On the battlefield in defense of their adopted land they were never found wanting. And of equal importance was their contribution to the progress of American industry, transportation, communication, and professional institutions. In every field the Irish have done their share and have much cause to look with pride upon their contribution to America's greatness.

We think of these things as we observe St. Patrick's Day each year.

It was an order from George Washington in 1776 that gave official recognition to St. Patrick's Day for the first time in the United States.

Maj. Wes McPherson, defense reporter on the Air Force Hour, told the story so well on the Air Force orchestra's fine broadcast over the Mutual radio network this past St. Patrick's Day, that I ask leave to insert his remarks in the RECORD. Major McPherson's remarks follow:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this is your defense reporter, Maj. Wes McPherson. Tonight I'd like to tell you a story which I think is a little on the unusual side. It has nothing to do with jet airplanes flying near the speed of sound, nor does it deal with continental decisions regarding the state of the Nation. It's a simple story. Its theme—freedom and St. Patrick. Perhaps the linking of the two seems a little far-fetched. Actually it isn't.

Little is known of St. Patrick, the date and place of his birth, but we do know that in his youth he was a slave. In his confessions which he wrote in the latter part of his life, he attributed his liberation to a number of apparitions which God used to show him the way to freedom. After living in a monastery for a while, he was sent to Ireland to minister to the people there. He died on March 17, A. D. 461. That briefly is the story of St. Patrick—a slave who found freedom and then dedicated his life to freeing the minds, souls, and bodies of other men.

Here in America, recognition of March 17 as St. Patrick's Day came about in a strange way; strange, yes, yet quite appropriate. The year was 1776. The place, Boston, Mass. The fate of a nation was at stake. Thirteen young, struggling American Colonies had united in a fight for freedom. For 7 months General Washington had laid siege to the city. With an army composed of New Englanders, militia and southern riflemen, he aimed and fortified Dorchester Heights, which the British had neglected after their dearly bought capture of Bunker Hill. On March 17 Washington decided it was time to finish up. As he placed his artillery in strategic positions and prepared to blast the enemy out of Boston, Gen. Sir William Howe suddenly decided to give up the city. With 11,000 troops he sailed out of Boston Harbor and Washington's men triumphantly marched into the city.

After Boston had been made secure, Washington issued several orders from his headquarters at Cambridge. One named an Irishman, General Sullivan, as brigadier of the day. Another authorized the countersign as "St. Patrick." Thus these orders officially recognized St. Patrick's Day for the first time in the United States. It was recognized in a moment of triumph, and freedom was just a little nearer. That freedom finally became a reality. It has endured through the years—often threatened, but never lost. And now on this St. Patrick's Day our pledge should be that that freedom never will be lost.

Rogers' Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I introduced H. Res. 450 to amend the rules of the House and providing "no bill or joint resolution of a public character making an appropriation shall be finally passed, and no amendment of the Senate to, or report of a committee of conference on, such a bill or resolution shall be agreed to, unless the vote of the House is determined by yeas and nays."

I have received from all over the Nation favorable comment on this resolution and a number of outstanding editors of the press have endorsed editorially the merits of this resolution. I was glad to have an editorial from my home paper, the Fort Lauderdale Daily News, and I am indeed grateful for the commendation contained in this editorial. I therefore am including the editorial as part of my remarks. The editorial follows:

ROGERS' RESOLUTION

The people of this Nation were given another sorry example last week of the loose and shoddy voting procedure in Congress which permits vast sums of money to be spent without those voting for the spending being listed on the record.

Last Wednesday the House considered an appropriation bill which would increase the pay roll of the Post Office Department by some $163,000,000 annually. The bill was a rank discriminatory measure. It put war veterans on a special-privilege basis and set them apart from other post-office employees by giving them a pay increase up to $500 a year which other employees, of equal value and equal service to the Department, would not receive.

Proponents of this special-privilege measure conceded that on a roll-call vote their measure would not have passed. So the bill was maneuvered through the House by the standing-vote technique. A thumping majority of House Members, knowing they would not go on the record as approving such a bill, stood up and let the bill slide by. The result opened the window to let another $163,000,000 of public funds go flying away.

If this were an isolated case it might be pardoned. But it isn't an isolated case. It is standard practice whereby Congressmen can pay lip service to Government economy and then spend billions of dollars without any record being made of their vote.

In the first session of the Eighty-first Congress over $29,000,000,000 in appropriations were passed on in this manner. This tremendous amount of money was authorized to be spent without a record vote in either the House or the Senate.

It is a shameful and disgraceful commentary on our democratic system of government that such a system is tolerated by the people. Congressmen are elected by the people. They are supposed to represent the people. But most of them forget about the people and start representing a wasteful Government soon after the campaigns are over and they take their seats in Congress.

Only a few Congressmen have dared to question the propriety of the system whereby the elected representatives of the people can shirk their responsibility for spending the peoples' money. One of these Congressmen is our own DWIGHT L. ROGERS. Only recently he introduced a resolution in the House which would require a record vote on any spending bill coming before the House.

ROGERS' resolution makes sense. It would protect the people by making available to them the voting records of their Representatives on money bills. But the resolution is anathema to politicians who don't want to stand up and be counted. The standing vote system gives them a refuge and a shield from public censure. Under this shield and this refuge they can spend billions and billions and no one can determine how any individual Congressman did or did not vote.

Real government economy under this system is only a mirage. It is a catchword and a phrase which is useful for campaign purposes, but which can be conveniently dropped later on with nobody the wiser, excepting perhaps the "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours" politicians who specialize in using the Public Treasury as a source of votes to stay in office.

Congressman ROGERS now seeks to force a change in this venal system. He seeks passage of a resolution which would make it compulsory for Congressmen to answer "yea" or "nay" and go on the record when voting on appropriations bills.

Congressman ROGERS isn't afraid to stand up and be counted because he believes in representing the people. It's a pity more of our elected Representatives do not share his viewpoint and his courage. If they did we would have a better government and an end to a system which sees billions of dollars of the people's money squandered away by politicians who can't be held answerable for their actions because there is no record of how they voted.

Greece Mourns for Her Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial entitled "Greece Mourns for Her Children," which appeared in the New York Journal-American of March 8, 1950.

The editorial is as follows:

GREECE MOURNS FOR HER CHILDREN

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Twenty-eight thousand innocent Greek children are held captive behind the iron curtain.

Twenty-eight thousand helpless Greek mothers are weeping for the return of their children.

Despite all appeals to the Communist satellites, not one child has been returned.

The Communists have flagrantly disregarded the two resolutions of the United Nations Assembly requesting the immediate repatriation of the Greek children.

The Communists scorn law and order.

They repudiate the authority of the UN.

They disregard every moral principle of justice.

The International Red Cross is currently in session in Geneva. It will seek to obliterate this stain upon modern civilization. It will seek to liberate these children from communistic bondage. It will seek to terminate this crime against mankind.

The forceful detention of these Greek children has aroused the bitter indignation of the people of every civilized nation.

For it violates every feeling of love. For it is tantamount to the horrible crime of genocide.

The monsters of Moscow have launched a new kind of warfare. They intend to train these children in the inhuman doctrines of communism. They intend to train these children as a fifth column in Greece. They intend to train these children with a hatred against their God, against their religion, against their country.

The Red devils will never succeed in converting the Greek children in their heathen, hellish ideology.

The mothers of Greece have always been faithful to the religion of the Nazarene and in the faith of their proud race.

They rocked their babes to sleep to the rhythm of patriotic songs.

They told their children the stories of the glories of Greece. They taught their children to defend with their lives their church and their country.

The church has always been the nation's arm.

We have witnessed the final sunset of such godless creatures as Hitler, Mussolini and their bloodthirsty followers. We will witness, in God's good time, the final sunset of Stalin and his fellow tyrants.

When a nation like Greece remains faithful to the ideals of freedom of the spirit, there is no final sunset for its people.

"The people of Greece and the Americans of Greek descent owe an eternal debt of gratitude to the Hearst newspapers for its crusade to free the 28,000 Greek children from communistic iniquity," declared former Senator Phelps Phelps, chairman of the American Committee for the Liberation of the Kidnaped Greek Children.

Let America take the lead. Let America heed the appeal of the mothers of Greece. Let America help to return these children to their mothers.

We shall not—we must not—we will not—let them down.

The Enthusiastic Irish Tribute to St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle on March 17. Once again the Sons of Aaron join with the Sons of Erin in enthusiastically helping them to commemorate the birthday of their patron saint:

THE ENTHUSIASTIC IRISH TRIBUTE TO ST. PATRICK

Throughout a national history marked quite consistently by tragedy and suffering, Ireland has had the advantages of an unfailing source of spiritual sustenance. Devastating wars have swept the little island. Generations of its people have known political oppression and the sufferings of famine. Leaders in the struggle for freedom have died before a firing squad or on the gallows. There have been times when the people of Ireland have had little but their faith.

Today the Irish at home and those who are scattered throughout the earth's broad surface pay their tribute to St. Patrick, who left the people of Ireland when he died in 461 a heritage which they have cherished faithfully over the centuries. History records few men whose beneficent influence has been sustained so long. In fact, it has been extended as the sons of Ireland have been carried by their free and adventurous spirits to distant places.

It is a tribute to the character of the Irish people that their gratitude has been undying, that the passing of time does not dull the edge of their enthusiasm for the proper observance of a day which holds such a rich symbolism.

This Nation of ours is richer and stronger by reason of the liberal mingling of the Irish among its people. They have been among the very best of citizens and have made their own distinctive and generous contribution to the strength and the ideals of the Nation. The heritage given them by St. Patrick has helped to make them what they are. It is natural that they should honor his memory so unfailingly.

More About Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Johnstown Tribune on March 15, 1950, entitled "More About Potatoes":

MORE ABOUT POTATOES

A conference committee working out differences between the Senate and the House on acreage controls for cotton and peanuts found time yesterday to work out a program for potatoes.

This plan would withhold price supports from the 1951 crop of potatoes unless potato growers accept rigid marketing quotas which prevent them from selling more than an allotted number of bushels. "Next year," said Senate Majority Leader LUCAS, "We will have marketing quotas, agreements, and orders on acreage, bushels, and bags. That," said Senator LUCAS, "will take care of potatoes."

The legislation the conference committee was discussing dealt with cotton and peanuts. Cotton planters have been bitter about the acreage allotments. Acreage was cut back from 27,000,000 acres last year to 21,000,000 acres this year, with the result that various "hardship cases" developed. The conference committee compromised that sharply political issue by adding 1,400,000 acres to the 21,000,000 which cotton producers have been allowed to plant.

In the matter of peanuts, the conference committee agreed to add 100,000 acres of peanuts to the allowed acreage for this crop in Texas and Alabama. However, if growers agree to devote that peanuts to the making of oil—which does not provide as great remuneration as selling peanuts for direct consumption—the conference committee agreed that all restrictions could be removed and the planters could grow as many peanuts as they desired. There is also to be a Government "peanut pool" to avoid shortages for candy makers.

In the name of Burbank, George Washington Carver, and all those other geniuses who devoted their lives to improving agricultural products and finding new uses for them, what goes on here?

Have we come to the time when a farmer must see his Senator, or at least his Congressman, in order to be permitted to plant and market the product of his labor? That seems to be the implication of this congressional addition of 1,400,000 acres to the land which may be devoted to cotton and 100,000 acres in two States to the land on which farmers may raise peanuts. By the way, the conference committee declined to add 4,500,000 acres to wheat land to take care of Colorado "hardship cases."

The principle of price supports to avert disastrous declines in the incomes of farmers has gradually been perverted to the point at which farmers must plead with Congress to be allowed to use their land economically. In some fields, notably tobacco, this business of acreage and marketing controls has reached the point where those who have "production records" have a virtual monopoly of the market, and few or no newcomers can put seed into the ground.

We begin to understand the Brannan plan more clearly. When the Government tells farmers what to plant and how much to sell, it is a short step to paying them out of the tax money and completing the subservience of this once, and we hope still, independent group of citizens. And so, a little at a time, independence vanishes and everything falls under the dominance of Washington.

An Honest Confession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Johnstown Tribune on March 15, 1950, entitled "An Honest Confession":

AN HONEST CONFESSION

A year ago there was sharp opposition by administration forces in Congress to the home-rule provision in the rent-control bill, under which communities, acting through their official governing bodies, could have ordered the decontrol of rents within their borders.

Last week, Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS told his colleagues in the Senate: "I should like to say in connection with rent control generally that, although I opposed the local option provision in last year's Rent Control Act at that time, I now keenly appreciate the fact that this provision furnishes us today with the safest rule-of-thumb measure we have for the still existing need of rent controls."

In other words, last year's outcry that this provision would ruin the rent-control law was somewhat exaggerated. As a matter of fact, Senator MYERS said the permission given communities to decontrol rents has not been exercised "to any marked extent." We congratulate Senator MYERS for his confession that he was wrong last year. And we suggest again, as we have many time before, that local government which is close to the people and their needs will ordinarily function more effectively than government on the Washington level.

The only reason big government seems sometimes to operate more efficiently than small government is that its mistakes are easier to hide and harder to uncover.

Haym Salomon's Loan to the American Revolution Should Be Repaid to His Heirs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is shocking to those who cherish thoughts of national gratitude to realize that this great Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to human dignity, has never formally recognized the claim of the descendants of Haym Salomon to reimbursement for the expenditure of his fortune in the American Revolution.

It is my purpose, in the very near future, to introduce and to press to passage a private bill which would authorize the payment of the amount of the claim to Haym Salomon's lineal descendants.

I must remind the House, Mr. Speaker, although it has often been said before, that this great patriot sacrificed his fortune, his health, and eventually his life on the altar of American freedom; he left destitute, at his death, a young wife and four children.

In addition to the sums loaned directly to the Revolutionary Government, Haym Salomon loaned or gave outright considerable amounts to individuals, including Thomas Jefferson and James Madison; but in all the years during which some effort has been made looking to the recognition of the debt, his heirs have never suggested reimbursement for anything except the principal amount of the loan to the Government itself, calculated at $658,007.43. It has never been suggested that his family should be reimbursed for the private loans and gifts, nor that any interest should be paid.

ETERNAL NATIONAL GRATITUDE

Time cannot dull the ache of the national conscience until this debt has been paid, however long it may have stood. There is no statute of limitations on a debt to freedom.

Every American is proud of Haym Salomon, and every Jew is proud of him and of his comrades in arms who created on this continent "a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

The payment now of this long-standing debt cannot help the young widow and her four children who survived revolution and the patriot's death; but it can cleanse the national honor and conscience.

HAYM SALOMON STORY TOLD IN AMERICAN WEEKLY

Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the RECORD the story of Haym Salomon as it appeared in the western editions of the American Weekly a few weeks ago, and undoubtedly will appear soon in the East. The story carries the byline of Terry Gibbons, which is a nom de plume of Miss Frances Spatz, the Washington correspondent of the American Weekly.

I should like to add that my introduction of the bill is not the result of any solicitation by the living heirs, but is the result solely of my own interest. Miss Spatz informs me that she has talked to two of the living heirs who live in Washington, Mrs. Barnard—Faye Salomon—Green and Mrs. Louis—Natalie Salomon—Mullitz, who is the daughter of the late Gustave Bier Salomon.

There follows the text of the story by Miss Spatz as published in the American Weekly; the text of a part of the Drew Pearson column of Saturday, March 18, as it appeared in the Washington Post; and the text of the bill I propose to introduce.

[From the American Weekly of January 8, 1950]

SIX MILLION WITH INTEREST—THE DESCENDANTS OF AMOS PLATT WANT TO COLLECT FROM THE GOVERNMENT—AND MAY, TOO—BECAUSE HIS AUNT LOANED MONEY TO THE COLONIES

(By Terry Gibbons)

"Goodness knows, we helped out the Government back in Revolutionary War days," Grandma Rhoda Ullom said. "We lent it money, didn't we? I mean the family did. Now all we want is the money back with interest. Six million dollars would come in quite handy."

Grandma Ullom, 78, was talking a while ago to her granddaughter, Mrs. Emerson O. Buchanan, of Bridgeport, Ohio, she told Mrs. Buchanan that a Buchanan ancestor named Amos Platt once had written about the loan, which she said had been chipped in some time in 1776. Mrs. Buchanan began to hunt around for ways to prove it.

An old trunk in the home of one of her husband's relatives helped her. It yielded a yellowed manuscript which appeared to have been dictated by Amos Platt, himself on his deathbed.

That manuscript is a leaf out of the past, a story of Indian massacre and colonists' endurance, and it is the basis of a formal claim, now, against the Government of today.

Amos Platt's aunt, Marie Preh, loaned the money to the colonists, the ancient document says, and the sum was to be repaid to him or his children. Mrs. Buchanan's husband, a salesman, is a great-great-grandson of Amos.

"We all came to America from France in 1774," Amos wrote. "General Lafayette was a first cousin of my aunt, Marie Preh, who loaned the money.

"I never had any sisters. I had only one brother, Robert, and he was killed by Indians one day in an Indian massacre. They killed my little brother before my mother's eyes.

"They burned our home down and all our things and burned all our papers up that we had to prove our right to Aunt Marie Preh's money. There should be $6,000,000 principal and compound interest coming to me and you 11 children. Since all our papers were burned, we thought we could not get it, so we never tried."

It was time some one did try, Mrs. Buchanan decided, and she brought the claim to the attention of the Government's General Accounting Office, to the United States Archives and to her representative in Congress. A search of records was begun, too, in New Jersey, and there it was easy to find references to Maj. Daniel Platt, Amos's father. One of them was an order from Gen. George Washington, directing Daniel to requisition 100 head of cattle near Morristown, N. J., and another was an order to associates to attend Daniel's funeral.

Proving the validity of the claim, which was said to amount to $6,000,000 back in 1848, when Amos died, is another matter.

It will take at least 6 months of intense research to determine the status of the claim, Mrs. Buchanan has learned, and the burden of proof and the expense of the inquiry rest with the claimant. The work will be handicapped by the fact that many revolutionary records were destroyed when the United States Capitol was burned by the British in the War of 1812 and others were lost later in a fire in the Treasury Department.

Eventually, if the claim should be deemed valid, a private bill would have to be introduced in Congress to authorize payment.

Nevertheless, it is possible today to collect such a claim. A bill providing for payment of $658,007.43 to heirs of another Revolutionary patriot, Haym Salomon, will be introduced in Congress soon.

Haym Salomon, colonist from Poland, spent his entire private fortune of nearly $1,000,000 in the cause of liberty, then died penniless in 1795, leaving a young wife and four children. He not only gave this financial aid, but also served as a spy and was imprisoned by the British when he was caught trying to sink a British ship. After his death, descendants sought to collect only the amount of the actual loans, $658,000, excluding all gifts to individuals, among whom were Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, and excluding any interest, which if compounded annually would bring the amount now to a total running into billions.

Previous bills in Congress, providing for payment, never came to a vote although committees of both Houses conceded the justice of the demands. Recently, Representative ARTHUR G. KLEIN, of New York, revived the matter and a private bill was prepared for the Eighty-first Congress, second session.

"Time cannot dull the ache of the national conscience until this debt is paid," KLEIN said. "I will press this bill for passage."

It is not only hard to get such a bill passed, but merely to bring up an old claim is not always feasible—as descendants of Robert Morris, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, recently found.

They asked a Congressman to look up the possibility that their illustrious ancestor had lent the Government money which had never been returned. The Congressman reported that it seemed to be the other way around. He said the Treasury Department long ago found that Morris owed it $93,313.63. The Department, however, gallantly concluded that "having no knowledge of the system of posting accounts or the reasons for certain ledger entries in those days, it is neither fair nor just to assume that the balance is really due to the Government."

Descendants of Francis Vigo, a merchant, had better luck. More than a 100 years after he lent $8,616 to the State of Virginia, they collected $51,539.10 from the Federal Government, which has assumed all State Revolutionary debts.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of March 18, 1950]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND—MONEY LENDER JOINS UNITED STATES HEROES

(By Drew Pearson)

A forgotten hero of the Revolutionary War, an unspectacular money lender, will soon be immortalized not far from Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson. He was Haym Salomon, the little Jewish patriot who raised the money to fight the Revolution but died penniless without ever receiving a dime back from the Government whose freedom he financed.

Now after all these years, a memorial is about to be erected in Salomon's honor. This was authorized by Congress 12 years ago upon a motion by GUY GILLETTE, then Congressman but now Senator from Iowa.

It was left up to private citizens, however, to raise the subscriptions, so the project lay

dormant until this year. Now a Haym Salomon Memorial Society has been formed to raise the money, and the chief thing remaining is to have the Commission of Fine Arts approve a design.

Note.—At one time George Washington pulled Salomon out of a synagogue to scrape up the cash to meet the Army pay roll. Salomon also paid Jefferson's and Madison's board bills so they could attend the first Continental Congress.

The following is the text of private bill to be introduced:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to the heirs of Haym Salomon the sum of $658,007.43, in full satisfaction of their claim for moneys loaned by Haym Salomon to the Government of the United States during the Revolutionary War.

Mississippi and Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered at the dedication of the Woolfolk State Office Building, Jackson, Miss., Thursday, March 16, 1950, to wit:

MISSISSIPPI AND PROGRESS

I am honored by the invitation that permits me to participate in the ceremonies of this auspicious occasion.

The State Office Building dedicated today is the majestic and lengthened shadow of a remarkable man whose name, by act of the legislature, it bears.

The people of Mississippi commended the members of the legislature who, on March 6, 1946, appropriated $3,000,000 with an additional appropriation of $870,000 by the legislature in 1948, for the construction of a much needed and adequate State office building.

The act providing for the building was passed under the leadership and during the administration of the late-lamented Governor Thomas L. Bailey.

The members of the State Building Commission, including the chairman, Gov. Fielding L. Wright, the able and capable ex-Gov. Hugh L. White, the Honorable Walter Sillers, speaker of the house of representatives, Senator John W. Kyle, and the Honorable W. A. Williams, a member of the house, are entitled to the gratitude of the people of Mississippi for the location, supervision, and construction of the most imposing and complete State office building in the South, if not in the United States.

The completion of the structure marks a high point in the outstanding administration of our distinguished Gov. Fielding L. Wright. It is a credit to the State of Mississippi.

ELLIS TRIGG WOOLFOLK

No one was more responsible for the State office building than the late Ellis Trigg Woolfolk, a Representative from Tunica County, and chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the house of representatives at the time the original appropriation was made.

This modern and lofty office building was appropriately named for our dear and devoted friend, Ellis Trigg Woolfolk, familiarly known as "Scrap" Woolfolk, who served his county and his State long, faithfully, and efficiently. Among other offices held by him, he was sheriff, State senator, and State representative.

I am gratified that this building was named for a former member of the legislature. Attention is thereby focused upon the importance of the position. There is no public office where the opportunity for constructive service is greater than in the legislature.

Ellis T. Woolfolk was well born. He inherited a good name. He was always jealous to preserve and transmit to his sons the good name inherited from his father.

He possessed a good mind. He took an active part in the improvement and development of his city and of his county. He was a a leader among men.

He was a successful planter, banker, and manufacturing executive. He was successful in his business life before he undertook to manage the public business. He was thus better prepared because of his personal success for handling the affairs of the people.

He was a politician in the best sense of that term, and that means that he was a constructive statesman. He exerted a wide influence in the political affairs of his county and State.

He always took pride in the financial condition of his home county. He had much to do with the deserved reputation of Tunica County as being one of the best-managed counties in the State. It was his boast that Tunica County was substantially without debt or bonds. While progressive, he insisted that the city in which he lived and the county where he resided should live within their income. He knew the courthouse before he became an outstanding figure in the statehouse. He gave his best thought and his unselfish service for some 20 years in both branches of the State legislature. He was a master of county and State government.

He was a devoted husband and a fond and a generous father. He loved his home and his family.

He had many friends. He knew that the best way to have friends was to be a friend. He was slow to make promises, but his word was his bond. He was loyal to every friend, and he was faithful to every trust.

He loved his State. He lived, and wrought, and died in the Yazoo Delta, most fertile of valleys, by the mighty Mississippi, the greatest of rivers and the father of waters and of floods.

Scrap Woolfolk was not perfect. None of us is. The sun gives us light, but it has its dark spots. He was human, but he was courageous and dependable.

He was a man of convictions. He had the courage of his convictions. He never sought an easy place for safety nor a soft place for retreat. He measured up to the best standards of public office. He was able, honest, and faithful to the end. He "never sold the truth to serve the hour." He was a patriot of Mississippi mold. He exemplified in his public life the sentiment: "Destroy not the ancient landmarks that our fathers set."

While Scrap Woolfolk was qualified to fill almost any political office within the gift of the people, his claim to fame rests upon his service in the legislature. The building we dedicate today is a tribute to his memory and a just reward for the service he rendered the people of Mississippi.

GOOD GOVERNMENT

This office building is to accommodate and promote good government in Mississippi. The officials and employees who occupy the offices will take pride in the efficient handling of public affairs. Convenient offices promote good work. State officials and employees are the spokesmen of the State in dealing with the public. At its best, government is one of the most difficult and perplexing problems of man. Sometimes there is strife among neighbors. Often there is discord among States. Frequently there are rivalries among nations. It is often difficult for man to live happily with man. The people appreciate good work in State offices. I trust courtesy and efficiency that promote good government will always obtain in this stately office building of which all Mississippians are justly proud.

PROGRESS

This structure, costing approximately four times as much as the Capitol building, is typical of the progress of our State. We are proud today to be citizens of Mississippi. We are gratified that Mississippi is in step with the march of progress. Our agricultural and industrial resources are inviting home seekers and investors. Long well-known for cotton and lumber, for its fertile valleys and magnificent forests, Mississippi is now one of the great oil-producing States of the Union. Livestock and dairying are profitable. Manufacturing is encouraged. We have the climate. We have the soil, and we have the people. No State has made greater strides in the development of its natural resources in providing for solid industries and in promoting substantial agriculture than Mississippi. As we hear of the alluring, if not enchanting distant scenes and of green pastures far away, we frequently overlook the opportunities of our own State. I am familiar with the cities, with the farms, with the plains, the valleys, the coasts, and the mountains of all the other States in the Union that lie between the two great oceans and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf. My thoughts, after traveling elsewhere, always fondly turn to my native State, and I am never so happy as when my feet are on Mississippi soil. I know of no State that offers better privileges or finer opportunities for a full and satisfying life than Mississippi.

Progress is on the march and our eyes are turned toward the future as we plan for a greater State and for a better civilization. We know that mere change is not progress. We know that progress means growth. We know that progress means development. We believe that changes in both society and in government should be tested by sound principles and by the experiences that have promoted happiness and freedom through the centuries. We believe that change that involves experiments, before it is called progress, should be tried. It should be tested before that change becomes permanent, and before mere change is called progress. History shows that experiments, in the test tube of reason and analysis, will often eliminate mistakes from mere changes which are not progress.

We know, too, that change is the law of life, that ideas and ideals change from century to century, but we also know that while concepts change, fundamental principles are constant and continued. Habits and customs and the values of concepts change from generation to generation. The Declaration of Independence enlarged the freedom of Magna Carta. We believe in a progress that is sound and constructive. As we behold the towering structure appropriately located near the magnificent capitol and the attractive capitol grounds, we are proud of the progress that our State is making today and we are determined that that progress shall increase with the passing years.

BALANCED ECONOMY

We must not, however, close our eyes to the facts of our economy. We must be realistic. When we mention agriculture we think of cotton. We believe in land ownership. We encourage tenants to become land owners. We promote the family farm, but we do not destroy or penalize the plantation. We stand for justice to all farmers, large and small. There should be no discrimination among citizens, and legislation

should be just to all alike. We are profoundly concerned that the exports of cotton for 1948 were substantially the lowest since the War Between the States. While they increased in 1949, this increase was largely from the use of Marshall Plan funds. The domestic consumption of cotton had decreased in 1948, but the consumption of rayon increased. Cotton, also, now has the competition of nylon. The rayon production in 1948 was equivalent to approximately 2,941,000 bales of cotton. The production of plastics and other synthetics, including nylon, is rapidly increasing. Paper today is cotton's second greatest competitor. We cannot overlook our competition, including foreign cotton. We cannot continue to overproduce cotton. There is no single answer to the cotton problem. We must not only compete, but we must balance our economy. We must encourage industries, and I do not mean fly-by-night but I mean solid industries. We must promote manufacturing. We must encourage cattle raising and dairying. We must diversify on a sound and solid basis. We must, in a word, balance our economy.

TOLERANCE

We believe in tolerance. Mississippians have their convictions, but we are constantly reexamining ourselves, and we believe in enlarging our vision and in improving our convictions. An individual, like a State, must grow or he will die. Growth or death is the law of life. We must be careful not to deserve to be called intolerant. We must continue to practice without malice or prejudice the political and economic tolerance that we accord to others. We respect the rights and views of others. We ask that our rights and our views have the consideration that we accord to others who differ with us. The attitudes respecting race, color, or creed were not created by law, and they cannot be changed by law. Customs and habits should always be in keeping with the best concepts of good living, but the legislature rather than the Congress is better qualified to consider improvements in racial or social relations. Any legislation dealing with the habits and customs of the people should always be supported by the majority of the people. I believe in the democracy of Jefferson and of Jackson with majority rule in government. An intolerant people will never enjoy the abundant life. Tolerance promotes understanding and cooperation.

THE SOUTH

The record of Mississippi and of the South in World War I and World War II is outstanding. Without making comparisons, we assert the record shows that the South more loyally unstintedly supported the two greatest of all wars than any other part of our common country. We mention this fact not in boast, but in proof of the devotion and loyalty of the South to our common country. We believe in preparedness. We stand for national defense. We support an adequate Army, Navy, and Air Force. We advocate better highways, improved rivers, progress in our schools, and the conservation of our soils. We are profoundly interested not only in growing but in selling our cotton and our cattle. We are interested not only in producing but in selling our oil and lumber. We are interested in cooperating in interstate and international commerce with the other States of the Union and with the other countries of the world. We believe in a strong America. We believe in the good neighbor policy. With us, partisanship stops at the waters' edge. I concur in the sentiment of the great English statesman of whom it was said: "In his loyalty to principle, he put to shame the brittle loyalties of party."

We are not selfish. We are interested in our own welfare. We have our convictions, but we accord to the citizens of other States with whom we like to cooperate, their convictions. We say to those who would like to change our habits or social relations and our way of life that unless it is to improve, and not impose: "Thou shalt not pass."

VETERANS

The United States and not the States wages wars. The Government and not the States supports the armies and navies. The Government calls to the colors. The aftermath of wars often is worse, if possible, than war itself. The disabled, the wounded, the widows, the dependents, and the orphans of those who made the supreme sacrifice, are entitled to a nation's bounty. Selfishness often supplants sacrifice, and greed is substituted for patriotism. Our veterans are determined that those who fought for their country shall have an opportunity to live for their country, and with them we are determined not only to maintain but to establish peace on earth.

REAL VOICE

The trend today is to listen to the voice from Washington, but progress in the States does not originate in Washington. Progress does not filter from the top down, but it results from fair opportunities and a good life for the people at the bottom. Real prosperity must grow from the bottom up. All must be treated alike. There is no place in our industrial life for selfish and greedy management, nor is there any place in our economy for the selfish labor leaders who are drunk with power. Regardless of what Washington thinks, the people in the States believe in justice to Capital and to Labor. They believe in collective bargaining, but they believe in the right to work. They oppose jurisdictional strikes. They oppose secondary boycotts. They assert that no man has a right to strike against his Government. The public welfare must be put above private welfare by both management and labor.

The true voice of America does not come from Washington, but the real voice of America comes from the farms, the factories, the schools and the churches. If we heed the voice of Washington, we become less self-reliant. We lose our initiative. We sacrifice our courage. We must not succumb to the voice from Washington for more spending and for an easy life.

It is not an accident that the United States is the most powerful nation in the world today. Those who founded America were sturdy and heroic souls. They had suffered persecution. They exchanged the tyranny of the Old World for the freedom of the New. They paid the price of freedom. Every generation must achieve its own liberty and freedom. We must rededicate ourselves to the old-fashioned virtues of self-reliance and initiative: "We must be guided by the stars and not by the lights of each passing ship."

STATES' RIGHTS

We believe in the rights of the States, and that all functions not delegated to the Congress in the Constitution are reserved to the States. We rely upon the Bill of Rights. We insist that the rights of the States be respected. For 50 years I have advocated the rights of the States. I have insisted that State functions should be respected. I speak frankly. Unfortunately many who advocate the rights of the States are among the loudest advocates of the Federal spending today that is undermining the Republic. They urge that the Federal Government appropriate for private and not public functions, and for functions that are primarily the functions of the States. When they do they are undermining the rights of the States. Whenever the Federal Government appropriates the Federal Government controls. Centralization and States' rights cannot exist together. I urge that the best way to promote States' rights is to promote State responsibility. That responsibility is for the discharge of obligations that are peculiarly the province of the State. Centralization, I repeat, in Washington carries with it control in Washington, and control in Washington impairs not only the local rights but the local responsibility. I assert that the best way to promote the real rights of the States is to support the local responsibility of the States.

Deficit spending today is a threat and a danger to the security of the United States. I maintain that a Government whose expenditures, in times of peace and in the period of the greatest prosperity that the Nation has ever known, exceed its revenues—whose spending exceeds its collecting—is in danger of destruction in the event of either war or unbridled inflation.

OPPORTUNITY

The United States with its great resources, with its unparalleled production, following victory in the greatest of all wars, has reached the highest pinnacle of power and majesty ever attained by any nation in civilized history. We have the greatest opportunity that ever came to any nation, if we conserve our natural resources, if we take advantage of our unsurpassed production in this atomic age, to make unprecedented progress in the United States in the next generation.

Progress, however, must be more than material. As Edith Cavell said: "I realize that patriotism is not enough. I must have no hatred for or bitterness toward anyone." The material must be accompanied by the intellectual and the spiritual. Science must be based upon morality. For Mississippians believe that science is the friend of man and that the greatest enemy of the human race is disobedience to moral law.

If we keep faith with the boys who went out in World War II, never to return, and if we put first things first, there will be a new era of progress in the United States. Our Government must be stable and our faith must be abiding—in man, country, and God. The material forces must be based upon moral forces, for moral forces have always determined the destiny of men and nations.

DANGERS

After the stress of war, there is always danger. The temptation is complacency. We think more and more of our rights and less and less of our responsibilities. We think more of security than sacrifices. We distort the meaning of public welfare. We overlook that there is a vast difference between public welfare and private welfare. The government is established to promote the public welfare, which involves doing for the people what they cannot do for themselves. I repeat, to emphasize, that the unbalanced budget is a danger today to stability and prosperity.

There are other dangers. The greed of organized minorities is a real danger. Measures to promote the public health are in order and hospitalization is to be promoted, but socialized medicine is a national danger. We believe in home owning and farm ownership, but we assert that socialized Federal housing will result in the socialistic, if not the communistic state advocated by those who first proposed public housing. Socialized farming will result in the regimentation of farmers and in the control of the food and farms of the Nation.

THE TREND

Following World War II, the trend was toward socialism, but the trend today is away from socialism and state control. In December 1949 New Zealand and Australia, where social democracy had advanced the furthest, turned away from socialism. In February 1950, the Socialists lost in Great Britain. Even though retained in power by a few votes, their tenure is uncertain. The moral in the trend is clear. Somebody has to

pay for the promises of socialism. Free medicine and free housing cannot be conjured out of the thin air. Somebody has got to pay for them. There is an end to the policy of robbing one citizen to pay another and of "robbing Peter to pay Paul".

I am sanguine enough and optimistic enough and patriotic enough to believe that the trend is also on the way out in Washington, and that Congress will repudiate the welfare state. There is no place in free America for subsidized agriculture and for socialized medicine.

STRONG AMERICA

We must be prepared for war, for there is still both chance and change in the world. Communism is on the march, but there is no occasion for fear of the destruction of the world in the event of another war.

The strength of America does not lie in the atom bomb or the hydrogen bomb or any other single weapon. The strength of America lies in the faith and spirit of the people.

It would be most unfortunate if America were dependent upon any weapon. We would relax and become soft. We would cease to be vigilant. We must profit by the examples of history. The French placed their confidence in the Maginot Line rather than in a strong and stable government. France lost. She was easily overrun and conquered in World War II.

I do not underestimate the effect of the atom bomb, but I recall that at the conclusion of the First World War, poisonous gasses were being brought into play and it was announced that their use in the next war would mean the destruction of civilization. But the scientists who compounded the poisonous gasses were confined to no one country. While at the beginning of World War II all nations had supplies of gasses, yet not one country made use of them.

Already the Russians have split the atom. I believe that in this atomic age the scientists who discovered the atom bomb can perfect a defense against the atom bomb. Atomic energy should be used to build, not destroy, civilization. The strength of America is in the tolerance and intelligence, the faith and the courage, of the people.

REHABILITATION

We are profoundly interested in the rehabilitation of our allies in Europe and in the rehabilitation of the destruction of war, but the Marshall Plan is burdensome to the taxpayers of America today. That plan must be followed by other plans. We know that taxes are at their peak today. They can only be increased by reducing standards of living. We are straining our production. The Marshall Plan must be followed by better plans. I believe that the best aid that we can render our former allies in World War II, and the oppressed peoples of the world today, is to exemplify that in the American way of life there is the only hope of freedom for the downtrodden of the earth. The best assistance that we can render in rehabilitating Europe and China is to set an example and demonstrate that in America there is the freedom to worship, to speak, and to work, with the highest standard of living and the best opportunity for a good life in all the world. The United States can help the underdeveloped nations of the world and provide for improving the lands and the peoples of the smaller and less fortunate nations of the earth by furnishing to them the scientists and the science to enable them to help themselves. If our churches send missionaries to foreign lands, I know of no better way of making good our advocacy of the good neighbor policy than by sending to foreign countries some of the brightest graduates of our colleges and of our universities who will find in those countries an opportunity to help humanity and to aid undeveloped lands and peoples.

YOUTH AND FRONTIERS

As we think of Mississippi and of our progress we are thinking of the youth of our State, for they are the best of our assets. There may be, in the future progress and development of our country, no new territorial frontiers to conquer, but there are frontiers available to the ambitious youth today that are probably greater than the physical frontiers that were available to our forefathers. We must use, without destroying, our lands. They are essential to our freedom. We must not waste our natural resources, for the conflict between progress and poverty is as old as the Biblical conflict between light and darkness, and it is as new as atomic energy. Scientists believe that as a result of the continued scientific researches in connection with atomic energy discoveries may be made that will enable the oceans and the gulfs to be farmed and food to be produced to provide for the expanding populations not only of the United States, but of the world. Scientists are optimistic enough to believe that, as a result of an invention whereby distilled waters may be available to the passengers of airplanes that may be stranded on the sea, these invention for distilling ocean water may be perfected so that waters of the ocean may be distilled and transported across the mountains for irrigating the great western plains to supplement the stored waters of the rivers so that the American desert may be as productive as our fertile valleys.

BUILDERS

As we improve our natural resources we must build our civilization. We can only build that civilization by supplementing the material forces with the more important moral forces. I would like for our generation to be constructive. I would like for us to build. "It is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness."

I can express the thought I have in mind no better than by these words from John Ruskin:

"When we build, let us think that we build forever. Let it not be for present delight nor for present use alone. Let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for, and let us think, as we lay stone on stone, that a time is to come when those stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them, and that men will say as they look upon the labor and wrought substance of them, 'See! This our Fathers did for us'."

I believe in progress, tolerance, intelligence, freedom, moral force, the dignity of the individual, science based on morality, and obedience to the laws of God and man. Therefor have I spoken.

I believe in adequate public buildings and in able public officials. People reflect their own image in the type of public buildings they construct and in the kind of men and women they elect to public office.

The greatness of any nation depends upon the character of its resources, the character of its institutions, and above all, upon the character of its people.

In the Middle Ages, great cathedrals were constructed with the gifts of the poor of Europe. They were more than architectural wonders. They were monuments to the ideals of the people who built toward the stars, as the lofty spires pointed to Heaven. They were symbolic of the faith and the hope of the great masses of the common people of Europe. From their foundations to their spires, they typified the dreams and the aspirations of the average man for a better life here and hereafter.

I recall that it is said that during the building of one of these cathedrals a visitor passed through the stoneyard and saw many masons at work hewing and shaping the granite blocks. He stopped and asked one of the men what he was doing. "I am shaping the face of this stone," was the reply. He asked another stonecutter the same question. The second man replied: "I am cutting the keystone of an arch." The third man was asked the same question. He replied, as he looked up with pride: "I am building a cathedral."

As we conserve our soils, as we construct our highways, as we build our cities, as we improve the countryside, as we build our levees along our rivers, as we construct our dams to prevent overflows and to protect the lives and property of the people, as we build schools and churches, as we erect structures to be the monuments of our civilization, we are building America. We are building the great cathedral of American freedom, not only for ourselves and our children, but for the hope of freedom to the oppressed peoples of all the world.

The danger of the United States today is not in any invading foreign foe. "We the people" are not only the first words of the Constitution of the United States, but "we the people" are its danger, its power, and its hope. Above all, "we the people" must preserve America.

Wartime Excise Taxes Should Be Repealed at This Session of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, a great majority of the American people desire the immediate repeal of the wartime imposed excise taxes. It is my opinion that a substantial majority of the Members of Congress desire that this be done. These taxes were imposed as an emergency war measure. They were believed by everybody to be temporary. Part of the purpose for the enactment of this law on many commodities that bear this sales tax was to prevent too much material and too many man hours of labor going into the manufacture of articles that were not necessary for the prosecution of the war.

The imposition of these taxes are very discriminatory. They have placed an undue burden upon certain of our American industries. The war has been over for several years. There is no longer a shortage of critical material and there is no longer a scarcity of labor. The unemployment rolls in America are now approaching 5,000,000. It has been definitely proven that the continuation of these excise taxes have been crippling to business; they have materially increased the cost of living, and they are constantly contributing to the increase in unemployment.

The amusement tax on the picture shows, which affords many American families the only recreation and amusement they have, has made it very burdensome and expensive upon the American people and has denied many people the opportunity to participate in this wholesome, educational, and uplifting recreation.

All tax measures, of course, must originate in the House of Representatives. The Ways and Means Committee of the

House of Representatives have, for the past several weeks, been holding hearings upon this subject. We are told that this great committee recently refused to vote out a straight bill calling for the repeal or the reduction of the excise taxes and that they are contemplating later on reporting a bill, including the repeal of some of these taxes and the reduction of others, but to be coupled with a tax bill in substance increasing the tax on some industries so as to have the tax measure in one package. It is my opinion that this is a mistake.

A bill should be brought before this session of Congress addressing itself solely and alone to the repeal of excise taxes. There has been much talk since the President's message to Congress that there would be an effort made to remove or decrease the depletion charges now allowed to the coal-mining industries and other mining industries including the oil industry.

While these things are being contemplated, you hear on every hand that the mining industry is a sick industry. We have recently had before this session of the Congress a bill which seeks in substance to grant subsidies to the mining industries. We do not believe that the present depletion charges allowed the mining and oil industries should be taken away from them. To do so will make sick and crippled industries in much worse condition.

Both the coal industry and the metal-mining industry as well as the oil industry are vital to the economic prosperity of the Nation. Many taxes are already imposed upon coal and oil and their products. They are bearing the full share of the tax load. To further discriminate against them and to adopt the theory contained in the excise-tax law that certain industries should be singled out from the American economy and unusual and unequal tax burdens placed upon them, is an unwise and unjust tax policy.

If the administration and this great committee that has the responsibility of writing a new tax bill undertakes to, in one package, repeal and reduce many of the war-imposed excise taxes, and at the same time single out the coal industry and oil industry for the equivalent of increasing taxes, the whole bill will be in danger and the much-needed relief that can be gained by repealing the excise taxes may be lost.

To take from either the coal industry or oil industry the depletion charges now allowed under the law will be the exact equivalent of imposing upon them a burdensome and new tax. To do so will put many companies out of business and will increase unemployment by many thousands. We hear on every hand that the Federal Government needs more taxes and more money. The remedy for this situation is for the Federal Government to stop passing new laws that spend so much money. Another remedy is to speedily enact several of the proposed bills and measures to reorganize the executive branch of the Government so that more economy and more efficiency can be obtained. There will be serious opposition to only a few of these plans to reorganize certain branches of the Federal Government.

These measures which will be sharply contested could be deferred for the time being and the vast majority of them will be supported and can be enacted almost immediately into law. By taking these two steps, to quit spending and to reduce the size of some of the departments of the executive branch of the Government and to eliminate waste, can and will meet the situation.

We could far better spend our time by repealing these excise taxes and thus greatly increase the business and employment over the United States thereby creating wealth and more wages to tax than we can by allowing this much-needed reform in our tax laws to become snarled up with an unjust attempt to impose new burdens upon coal and oil. We can again far better use our time to cut down the size of the Federal Government and curtail its spending than we would do if we sought to impose new and additional tax burdens upon the people and the people's business.

When it is considered that the American industries engaged in the manufacturing and production of jewelry, kodaks, luggage, some wearing apparel, and many other American businesses affected by this tax and the moving-picture industry already pays enormous income tax and indirect taxes, it is quite unfair to single them out and continue to impose a 20-percent excise tax which not only cripples their businesses but falls most directly upon the American public.

Depletion charges are allowed upon all manufacturing machinery and equipment and upon rental real estate, and there is no just reason why the basic industries producing oil and coal should not be allowed these depletion charges also.

When coal and oil is removed from the ground it is gone forever, and the owners of the property should certainly be allowed depletion charges. The present law allowing these deductions is realistic and fair and should not be disturbed insofar as oil and coal are concerned.

The drug stores of America sell many hundreds of articles used in the home by millions of people every day that bear this burdensome, unfair, nuisance tax.

On Saturdays, in America, the school children are out of school. Most of them look forward to going to a good picture show where they can enjoy wholesome recreation. Often the parents of these children go with them and take the whole family. To have an admission tax of 20 percent levied and collected upon the tickets of every member of the American family is quite unjust. While parents are having the expense of educating their children and putting them through school, along comes this tax that has been demanded and collected for more than 4 years after the war's end.

Competition is now keen. We have changed from a sellers' market to a buyers' market. Thousands of articles manufactured and produced in foreign lands are flowing into our country. These articles are produced by cheap labor; they have no excise tax on them and they are underselling our businessmen. These taxes have caused the closing of many American factories and businesses producing watches, jewelry, kodak supplies, furs, perfumes, toilet articles, and many other articles. As a result of this, business is beginning to dry up here in these industries and millions of men have been let off from work.

When anyone sends a telegram or puts through a long-distance call in the transaction of his business, or because of sickness or death in the family, the long, tax-gathering arm of Uncle Sam taps him on the shoulder for a 25-percent increase in the charges he pays for this service. When we travel by plane, train, or bus, the same thing occurs.

These excise taxes have a strangle hold on the American income and American business is crippled as a result.

The dam placed across the stream of American economy has made business stagnant and caused millions of men and women to become unemployed. We should open up the floodgates and allow a greater flow of work, money, and profit to reach our people. Then the increased earnings of business and working people will create a broader tax base and create more taxes that can be collected without discrimination, and this increased national income will produce as much, and possibly more, Federal taxes than to continue to hamper and strangle business with these excise taxes.

The same is true of coal and oil, that meet very strong competition, and some of it comes from abroad. These depletion charges should still be allowed so that these industries will not be discriminated against, and we should go along in the fair American way.

I sincerely hope that we may be able at the present session of Congress to bring out a bill and pass it, repealing the excise tax.

Grant Nonquota Status to Adopted Immigrant Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1950, I introduced a bill which seeks to provide nonquota immigration status for adopted children of American citizens or for children coming to this country for legal adoption by Americans.

The bill provides that an unmarried alien under the age of 21, who is coming to this country to be legally adopted by an American citizen, is to be admitted as a nonquota immigrant for a period of 1 year, if he meets the health requirements of the immigration laws and if the citizen in the United States is financially able and willing to care for such alien.

If the legal adoption does not take place within the period for which the alien was admitted, my bill prescribes that the alien is to leave the United States or may be deported, if he fails to do so.

United States citizens intending to adopt such alien children will have to furnish the Department of State with satisfactory evidence that they are legally and morally competent to adopt such children and financially able to care for them. They will also have to furnish to the Department of Justice and the immigration authorities a sufficient bond to assure that the alien child will not become a public charge.

The bill also provides for the entry on a nonquota basis of children adopted abroad by American citizens.

I hope the bill will receive early consideration and soon be enacted into law.

Arizona's Game of Tiddlywinks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a very fine editorial from the Los Angeles Daily News, of March 10, 1950. The editorial speaks for itself:

ARIZONA'S GAME OF TIDDLYWINKS

(By Manchester Boddy, editor and publisher)

A little group of Arizona men are playing tiddlywinks these days with a lot of jobs, a lot of homes, and a lot of businesses. It is not a pastime likely to amuse the people of southern California, however, for the jobs and homes and businesses involved are theirs, and they face the prospect of having their livelihood sold down the river—the Colorado River.

For these busy Arizonans have managed to finagle through the Senate a bill that would take away from California 1,200,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water to which the people of this State are entitled by legal contracts with the Federal Government. If they are similarly successful in the Congress, these Arizonans will have managed to infect California with a virulent case of creeping paralysis, to have put a definite ceiling on this State's development. The stake of the game, then, is our future, since new jobs, new homes, new businesses are possible only in direct ratio to the amount of water we have available.

The Arizona gimmick is a project, estimated to cost $800,000,000, to irrigate land in that State's Central Valley. As Arizona's seaport and supplier of much of the manufactured goods bought in that State, California would ordinarily be happy to get behind any deal that would promote Arizona's welfare and increased purchasing power, but the project proposed is just about as sensible as putting a $500 paint job on a $50 jalopy.

For that $800,000,000 necessary to put up and run the project is a sum greater than the assessed valuation of every inch of land in the entire State of Arizona. Further, having got in the mood for asking, the people of Arizona apparently decided they might as well shoot the works, so they have suggested the Federal Government fork over the money. The daily economics of the Arizona scheme are of concern to taxpayers throughout the United States, but the proposition really hits home in California.

For any approval of the project incidentally means giving Arizona water to run it—water for which Californians have legal contracts. It means, in short, benefiting some 4,000 Arizona farm families at the expense of 5,000,000 persons in this State.

Spokesmen for Arizona don't think much of this argument. That's too bad, they say, adding that the Government should never have entered into those contracts in the first place and that, in any event, the water rightfully belongs to Arizona. Such an argument could go on forever, and has, in fact, continued for three decades, a fact which seems to appeal to members of the Arizona water lobby, who may be short on logic but are plentifully supplied with wind.

For the argument could be settled—impartially and finally. It could, as spokesmen for California have repeatedly said, be taken to the United States Supreme Court. This is the fair and just way, and perhaps for that very reason finds little support in Phoenix. The Arizonans insist they are right, but they think it boorish of anyone to suggest that they prove it.

Instead, they say, let's pry $800,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury, let's put up the project, let's divert the water and make sure those 4,000 families are taken care of, and after all this is done maybe we can start talking business.

One gets the impression that putting the cart in front of the horse is chronic in Arizona.

Coal Miners in Standing Up for Principles Dramatized in Effective Way Iniquity of Taft-Hartley Law—Congress Should Act Now To Repeal Antilabor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the creators of the Taft-Hartley Act carefully selected quotes from Abraham Lincoln as they harangued Lincoln Day audiences recently—so carefully that they passed up all of the many words uttered by the great Lincoln on the rights of the Nation's workingmen.

Lincoln, in his time, said:

All that harms labor is treason to America. If any man says he loves America, yet hates labor, he is a liar. There is no America without labor.

Today, too many forget labor's importance to America—too many are too quick to condemn labor. The Taft-Hartley law is concrete evidence of this. Born in vindictiveness, it is nothing more than punitive legislation concocted to destroy organized labor.

The coal miners of America, at a tremendous sacrifice to themselves, have performed a great service for labor—they withstood the attempt to break their union. If they had failed in their fight, the Taft-Hartley club would have been extended elsewhere and there would be a general drive to break other unions.

The coal miners have proven that genuine collective bargaining remains the best remedy for labor-management strife.

Congress should act now to repeal the Taft-Hartley law.

Under leave to do so, I include herewith an editorial from the March 15, 1950, issue of the Trainmen News, official weekly publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen:

THEY WOULDN'T CRAWL

When rich and arrogant employers close their eyes to the human considerations of labor relations and instead seek to club workers into submission with weapons fashioned in offices of the National Association of Manufacturers, there's bound to be trouble.

That's what happened in the prolonged, bitter strike in our coal fields and it explains why so much money was needlessly wasted and why so many men, women and children suffered grievously.

The operators were determined to crush the United Mine Workers' union with tools provided by the Taft-Hartley Act and with propaganda distributed in newspapers only too anxious to help out, hoping that the miners' undoing would eventually result in the undoing of all organized labor.

It simply didn't work. And the reason it didn't work is that human consideration the operators overlooked. They were waiting for Taft-Hartley to settle the issues their way and for the miners to crawl back to work on their bellies, begging for their jobs back under any conditions.

That didn't happen and never will. Men who risk their lives every day in the bowels of the earth get very close to the basic requirements of life and the toughness of the coal veins runs into their own veins to give them moral fiber and strength to fight for the principles they believe in. The coal miner, with his native militancy, has provided the backbone for all organized labor.

During the long controversy, 7 months, the mine operators, like some railroad executives we know, sat back, looked out the windows and waited for the law to settle matters their way.

When the injunction failed to get the "slaves" back into the pits, the operators banked on the courts to find them guilty of contempt. When the miners were cleared of that charge, the owners began to get a little uneasy, but it remainded for a proposed seizure bill that didn't guarantee them their profits under Government operation to get a semblance of collective bargaining under way.

The history of the coal strike completely discredits the Taft-Hartley Act, and it should serve as a warning to antilabor spokesmen in Congress for big business who are clamoring for a bigger and better union-busting law than that monstrosity.

The New York Times, commenting editorially, said: "More than 7 months of bitter controversy—a controversy which in its later stages threatened to rupture the very economic and social fabric of the Nation—are terminated with the agreement between the major soft-coal operators and the United Mine Workers.

"And this agreement was finally reached in the manner in which it should have been reached in the first place—by direct labor-management bargaining. The pity is that it required the threat of Government seizure and what amounted to Government arbitration to bring the disputants together."

The Nation owes the miners a great debt, for in standing up for their principles they

have dramatized in the most effective way the iniquity of the Taft-Hartley concoction. They have shown how such laws are not designed to protect the public, or stop strikes, nor to correct inequities, but only to help unscrupulous employers crush labor.

The best remedy for labor-management strife remains as always—genuine collective bargaining. It's also the keynote of a free economy and a functioning democracy.

The Democratic Heritage of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a recent radio address, given at Springfield, Mass., by Prof. Frank Nowak, on the Justice for Poland program, sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress.

Dr. Nowak is a distinguished professor of history at Boston University and is also a member of the faculty at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy.

His address follows:

THE DEMOCRATIC HERITAGE OF POLAND

The drastic purges and renewed persecutions of recent date behind the iron curtain together with the appointment of a Soviet marshal, Rokossovsky, as virtual dictator of Poland are abundant proof of the complete bankruptcy of Stalin's Polish policy. Like Lenin in 1920 he has been compelled to admit, by deed if not by word, his false political reckoning that the Polish masses would welcome or even be reconciled to Muscovite tyranny and Communist slavery.

A cursory acquaintance with the history of Poland, her great western cultural heritage, and her extraordinary democratic achievements would have disabused both Lenin and Stalin of their oriental fantasy that a people imbued with democratic ideals for centuries could surrender that great heritage without a struggle, even in the face of overwhelming force.

Before the partitions of Poland in the eighteenth century by Russia, Prussia, and Austria the Polish Republic was the largest and freest federal republic in Europe created by the political genius of the Polish gentry. In the short space of 200 years, beginning with the pact of Kosnyce in 1374 and ending with control of the highest judicial tribunal in the state in 1576, the Polish gentry effectively limited the power of monarchy and established a democracy of nobles who enjoyed all the guaranties of due process of law, habeas corpus, freedom of press, speech, assembly, religion, and representative government characteristic of the contract theory of government. Indeed, the Polish nobility in two centuries gained more extensive rights and privileges than did the English nobility in the five centuries from the days of Magna Carta in 1215 to the glorious revolution of 1688. They gained control of the highest office in the state, elected their kings, voted all taxes through local and central parliaments, and proclaimed the sovereignty of the people.

In this gentry-democracy all nobles were brothers and equal before the law. Foreign titles were not recognized but specifically forbidden. It is significant, too, that the nobility of Poland were very numerous, constituting over a million persons in the eighteenth century or 12 percent of the population. They outnumbered the English nobility, who controlled the democratic institutions of that country by a ratio of 2 to 1.

Moreover, most of the Polish gentry were small landowners, farming their own lands and forming a kind of aristocratic-proletariat.

The peasantry also enjoyed an economic status higher than that enjoyed by the peasantry of any other continental country of comparable size, including Austria, Germany, and France. The democratic ideals, security, and higher standard of living of the people of old Poland, were a powerful magnet attracting numerous neighbors like Lithuania, Ruthenia, White Russia, and the Baltic States, who sought voluntary union with the Polish Republic.

In the eighteenth century, however, the whole structure of the Polish constitutional system was put in jeopardy by the rise of totalitarian states. The so-called enlightened despots of Russia, Prussia, and Austria, abhorring democratic republicanism and bent on aggression, intervened in Poland and by fifth-column activities succeeded in placing their own candidates on the Polish throne.

In opposing these puppet kings, the Polish gentry distorted the old constitution and adopted a policy of political obstruction that took the form of the filibuster, the liberum veto, the confederated diets, and reduction of the royal army to a paltry 24,000 men. Confusion and weakness invited further aggression by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

The violent shock of the first partition of Poland in 1772, however, aroused the nation which now gave heed to the wise counsels of the great political reformers, Karwicki, Konarski, and Leszczynski. In the next two decades the Polish people experienced a remarkable renaissance in almost every field of endeavor—intellectual, social, and political.

The crowning achievement of the great reforms was the adoption of a new constitution on May 3, 1791, which corrected the old abuses and established a modern parliamentary democracy. Peasants and townspeople received increased freedom of action under protection of the law. The executive power was strengthened. The Liberum Veto was abolished. Under new leaders, there was a return to the positive, progressive features of the old constitution. The Polish Nation demonstrated that the country was fundamentally sound and could undertake far-reaching social reforms without the violence characteristic of the contemporary French Revolution.

The phenomenal success of the Polish democracy in 1791 in putting its own house in order under most trying conditions brought consternation to the courts of St. Petersburg, Berlin, and Vienna. The so-called enlightened despots joined forces to crush this "hydra" of democracy and annihilated the Polish state in the partitions of 1793 and 1795.

The partitions of Poland were a fatal blow to international morality and inaugurated the era of might makes right in international affairs. Political thinkers and lovers of freedom the world over from Jean Jacques Rousseau and Edmund Burke to our own Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson have condemned this international crime. Liberals in Germany, Austria, and Russia also raised their voices against this baneful precedent which undermined the cause of liberty and civilization everywhere.

Convinced of the justice of their cause the Polish people continued the struggle for freedom against overwhelming odds. Insurrection followed insurrection throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries until freedom was again achieved in the First World War.

In 1939 the totalitarian despots of Germany and Russia again invaded and destroyed the Polish state but the Polish people continued the struggle on almost every battlefield of Europe. Their heroism in France, Scandinavia, North Africa, Italy, and in the battle of Britain was widely acclaimed yet when the victory was won it was apparent that Poland had been freed from the domination of one neighbor only to fall a prey to another. Once again the betrayal of Poland was a blow to international morality and ushered in chaos in international affairs.

Appeasement of Russia has strengthened the tyranny of communism over the Russian people themselves who seek release from slavery by enslaving the whole world. This is no new phenomenon in Russian history. It was noted 110 years ago by the French diplomat, the Marquis de Custine, when he stated, "An immense inordinate ambition of the kind which can take root only in the soil of an oppressed people and be nourished only on the misery of the entire country is now astir in the hearts of the Russians. This essentially aggressive nation lives in a state of submissiveness so degrading that it seems to be expiating in advance at home, its expectations of tyranny over other men. The glory and booty to which the Russian looks forward turn his thoughts from the shame to which he is being subjected. This kneeling slave fills his dreams with visions of world domination."

By contrast the undaunted courage and will to live of the Polish nation and its devotion to the cause of democracy and freedom are a moral and spiritual phenomenon that Stalin can not and never will understand. His crude response to this baffling challenge is more arrests, bigger concentration camps, more Marshall Rokossovskys on the theory that might will make right.

Poland will rise again, for today as in the past the world has belatedly discovered that the treatment meted out to Polish people has become the touchstone of international justice and morality. Nor can it be said that the worst terrors of communism can destroy the spiritual and cultural heritage of a thousand years of Polish history.

Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is becoming increasingly aware of the necessity for conservation of our natural resources. Knowledge of the tremendous growth of our population brings with it the realization that we are steadily approaching the point where our productive acreage will no longer be sufficient to provide the food that we need—unless steps are taken to restore lost acreage and to prevent the further destruction of the soil.

It is recognized that with our national conservation program there must also be conservation and restoration of our wildlife. It is an essential phase of the broad aspect of the conservation movement. It is significant that this important phase is recognized this week with the observance of the thirteenth annual National Wildlife Restoration Week.

The purpose of this observance is well set forth in the proclamation of my own governor, the Honorable Allan Shivers, of Texas, which follows:

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM

MARCH 7, 1950.

America's thirteenth annual National Wildlife Restoration Week, originally established by Presidential proclamation in 1938, will be observed this year during the week of March 19–25, under the sponsorship of the National Wildlife Federation.

Conservation of natural resources vitally affects every citizen. Life itself depends upon soil and water, which must be conserved as the basic step toward preserving our natural heritage. Broader understanding of the fundamental concepts of conservation will inevitably bring into the picture the conservation and protection of wildlife.

With a solid background of knowledge and understanding for a foundation, we will be able to expedite efforts to restore wildlife for Texans. The extent to which this is accomplished will be stimulated by the cooperation of every individual citizen, even in the most remote areas.

The increasing interest in water- and soil-saving programs is indicative of the growing alertness of the citizenry to our unmistakable obligation to perpetuate our natural resources for future welfare and prosperity.

Therefore, I, as Governor of the State of Texas, hereby designate the week of March 19–25 as Wildlife Restoration Week in Texas, and urge that Texans observe this week with appropriate programs in schools, sportsmen's clubs, civic clubs, garden clubs and other groups and meetings.

ALLAN SHIVERS.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over radio-television station WXEL at Cleveland, Ohio, March 17, 9:30 to 9:45 p. m.:

The pilot who flew me from London to Dublin on my short trip last September had never seen Ireland. As we approached Dublin, the pilot said: "I can understand now why they call Ireland the Emerald Isle."

It was indeed a garden of green, resplendent in the morning sun. We drove from Dublin to the west coast of Galway Bay and were fascinated by the beautiful countryside and the warm personality of the people. Everyone expressed great interest in the United States and faith in its world leadership. The Irish are cognizant of the unity amid diversity of the United States and look for spiritual help from us to bring to their nation unity out of its diversity. They want their country to be what we proclaim America to be when we recite the pledge of allegiance to our flag—"One Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

In a world in which the dominant ideological color is not black or white, but gray, there is nothing either indefinite or indefinable in Ireland's tragic story. The creative power of God brought it into being out of nothingness, and the burning zeal of Patrick brought it from darkness and superstition to make it an island of sanctity and learning.

From sea to sea—from the Bay of Belfast to the Cove of Cork—it is by nature one undivided entity. That oneness was sundered by the partition of 1920, which cut off its most sanctified and strategic segment, Ulster, where Patrick from the Hills of Tara, started Ireland on the high road to sanctification and where the intense struggle for freedom began. It was in Ulster that Theobold Wolfe Tone and his noble band of followers—not Catholics but Presbyterians—rallied to the cause to make Ireland and Irishmen throughout the world their everlasting debtors. Here was Ireland's Lexington and Concord, and this is the portion that is separated from independent Ireland by a line of demarcation that is an indictment of the natural law of boundaries, logic, and diplomacy.

One Nation under God was the prayer of Lincoln, and that prayer was answered after a hundred blood-drenched battlefields. A Mason and Dixon's line dividing our country today would present a parallel to Ireland as it is now partitioned. E pluribus unum, the mighty symbol of the United States of America, would be a folly and a myth had the Union not survived. President Lincoln said that by all means the Union must be preserved. Every nation today seeks its own unity. India, Indonesia, Pakistan, the Philippines, to mention a few, have sought and found their own freedom within recent years. Present-day Germany, divided into French, Russian, British, and American zones, seeks to regain its unity as a nation. The same may be said of Korea, partitioned at the thirty-eighth degree parallel, occupied by the Soviets in the north and by the United States in the south. I hope and pray that the time will come, consistent with the freedom and liberty of those within its borders, when every partitioned nation may again join the family of United Nations.

The morally indefensible partition of Ireland ought to evoke a protest not alone from a sympathetic world, but from an understanding world. To retain the partition of Ireland is foolhardy when she alone, in proximity to quaking Europe, is untouched by communism.

"Divide and rule" were the military tactics of the Caesars and in their wake lay strewn the remnants of once mighty powers and world empires.

Today the world is threatened with those same tactics by the Soviets who have spread their tenacious tentacles over most of eastern Europe and northern and central Asia.

Lovers of liberty and righteousness cannot afford to permit Ireland to be the latest victim of "divide and conquer." A united Ireland would be an impregnable fortress against the onslaughts of communism with all its insidious works and deceitful pomps. Ireland stands as a flaming torch of freedom in a world threatened with communism. If given its unity and freedom of action, Ireland will throw its beam of faith and determination over land and sea to enlighten this spiritually darkened world, sorely in need of guidance.

Throughout the free world people are gathered to refresh in their minds and hearts the memory of St. Patrick and of his labors, to catch if they can, some spark of the love and faith which produced such labors, such fidelity, such zeal, not only in the saint himself, but in those who followed his footsteps.

It is more than 1,500 years since Patrick, captured by pagan Irish, was brought to Ireland to work as a shepherd tending the flocks on the hillsides. The churches he built, the schools and monasteries that he founded, multiplied over the land until it seemed there was no longer room to contain them and they overflowed on to the Continent of Europe.

Hosts of Irish missionaries trained in the monasteries and the schools of Erin's isle took with them to distant shores the faith and the lore which filled the island. With knowledge secular and divine they became the counsellors of kings and emperors, teachers of whole nations. Even today, Irish priests go forth carrying the message of Christ and of Patrick to Africa, to China, to Iraq, to Australia. From the earliest of them venturing across the channel into continental Europe, to the latest young priest from Maynooth setting sail for a parish in some backlands, they are the fruit of Patrick's planting.

From the days of gentle St. Patrick, to our present time, the Irish have played a part in world history out of all proportion to their comparatively small numbers.

There was a time in history when Ireland remained outside the path of the conqueror, the Roman legions overran the Continent and dominated even Britain. They did not cross the Irish Sea and Ireland was left free to develop its own civilization, its own native culture, its own illustrious schools. After the downfall of Rome, it was to Ireland that the civilized world looked for spiritual and intellectual succor. And again when Christian civilization was all but destroyed by the barbarian invasions which brought on the real dark ages, Ireland became the sanctuary and refuge of learning and culture, when to know the Greek language was a sure indication that the scholar was either an Irishman or had had an Irish teacher.

And it became the historic role of Irishmen to bring back to the continent of Europe the light which had almost disappeared, to relight the lamps of civilization. Ireland, the land of saints and scholars may have to reassume her ancient role in these distracted times, when men are trying to substitute might for right, to substitute material goods for spiritual values. Strong forces are seeking to drive God out of the world and to set up in his stead the false gods of money and power.

The Irish have always had a genius for spiritual values. In their entire history they have opposed the false philosophies which have often distored men's sense of proportion.

Driven from their native heath, by conditions imposed upon them by an unjust aggressor, Irishman have spread throughout the world and carried with them the same love of liberty and justice, the same hatred of oppression, the same reckless pursuit of an ideal, the same love of culture and learning, characteristic of their entire history.

Millions of the faithful Irish laity as well as priests and missionaries have streamed out from that tiny island carrying with them into their new homes beyond the seas, the faith their fathers received from St. Patrick. They have gone, and the faith and the church and the school always went with them.

The Irish are not invaders, not greedy of others' territory but they have ever been willing despite the cost, to fight the battle of freedom for others as well as for themselves.

From the year 1000 down to our own times, Irishmen have fought in what seemed a hopeless cause and against terrific odds for the very principles of liberty and justice upon which the American Nation was founded. Theirs would have been a lost cause at home if it had not been for the fact that they kept aglow their love and enthusiasm for liberty, truth, and justice.

Despite the severest handicaps imposed by tyranny and persecution, Ireland has built, from its own blood and sweat and tears, a nation which today is among the most stable in the world. If you want testimony of this, you may find it in the fact that the United States recently raised our diplomatic mission to full ambassorial status.

On this feast of St. Patrick, every Irishman will acclaim with me this recognition by our Government that Ireland has found her place in the sun. One thing yet remains, however, before the full blooming of Ireland, and that, as I said before, is the reunion of the North and the South.

Resolution of Veterans of Foreign Wars of Atlanta, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Post Commander Charles D. Vocalis, of Greater Atlanta Post, No. 390, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, forwarding to me a copy of a resolution adopted by unanimous vote of the members at a meeting held on March 7, 1950.

This resolution relates to a proposed reduction of employees of the Veterans' Administration, to be effective April 11, 1950.

In order that Members may have the benefit of the views of this post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars regarding this important matter, I am inserting the resolution herewith:

TEXT OF RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE AT REGULAR MEETING OF GREATER ATLANTA POST, NO. 390, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, CONVENED ON MARCH 7, 1950

Whereas further reduction of number of employees of the Veterans' Administration has been ordered because of an alleged reduction in the budget; and

Whereas it has been alleged that this reduction is to be made effective April 11, 1950, to prevent a more drastic reduction in July 1950, indicating that a further reduction will be announced in June 1950; and

Whereas the reduction to be effective April 11, 1950, will result in a drastic reduction in the number of employees in the claims and medical services under the jurisdiction of the Georgia regional office while no reduction but, in fact, an increase in the number of employees, as distinguished from positions, will be effected in one or more other services, and it is assumed that the same will apply to other regional offices; and

Whereas it is believed that the sentiment of an overwhelming majority of veterans, as a whole, is that the most important services of the Veterans' Administration are those rendered by the claims and medical services; and

Whereas it is further believed that any reduction in the present staff of the Veterans' Administration claims and medical services will impair these important and essential functions; and

Whereas, these statements both have been heard with attentive ears: Now be it

Resolved by the members of Greater Atlanta Post, No. 390, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in regular meeting this, the 7th day of March in the year of our Lord, 1950, That—

1. A representative or representatives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States be called upon to personally inspect the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, chairman of the United States Senate Civil Service and Post Office Committee and chairman of the United States House of Representatives Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the purpose of preventing or attempting to prevent reduction in personnel of the Veterans' Administration claims and medical services.

2. The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States formulate and recommend any legislation to prevent or discourage future unwarranted reductions in the Veterans' Administration claims and medical services if it should be necessary and appropriate to do so: Be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be transmitted through customary channels for effectuating the purposes intended and that copies be mailed direct to all of Georgia's United States Senators and Representatives and the Veterans of Foreign Wars national rehabilitation director and legislative officer.

Certified:

JAMES G. HOOPER,
Post Adjutant.

Michigan State College—A Land-Grant College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herein a statement with particular reference to the Michigan State College, one of the finest educational institutions of the country.

I am particularly proud of the Michigan State College, located at East Lansing, in my congressional district. This college, under the leadership of President John A. Hannah, has established itself as one of the most progressive colleges of its type in America.

The legislature of 1855 passed an act which provided for the establishment of a State agricultural school, and appropriated $40,000 and 22 sections of salt spring lands for the purpose of purchasing land for the site of the new school, and for providing the necessary buildings and equipment.

The school was formally opened and dedicated May 13, 1857, at East Lansing, the site of the present college.

This was the first agricultural college in America and, largely as a result of its leadership, the Federal Congress in 1862 passed, and President Lincoln signed, the United States Land Grant College Act.

All income from the sale of the land appropriated to the college was to be invested by the State in safe securities yielding not less than 5 percent annually, and the State was "to keep the same invested, to constitute a perpetual fund, the capital of which shall remain forever undiminished; and the annual interest shall be regularly applied under the direction of the State board of agriculture, to the endowment, support, and maintenance of the State agricultural college, where the leading objective shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life."

In regulations issued by the Veterans' Administration early in 1946, it was provided that, where land-grant colleges submitted cost estimates for the adjusted tuition rate, land-grant funds received from the Federal Government for instruction or teaching should be deducted in figuring the cost of tuition to be paid by the Veterans' Administration for the training of veterans.

The land-grant colleges began a series of conferences with the Veterans' Administration, in order to have this regulation changed or amended in such a way as to no longer compel the deduction of such funds in determining the adjusted rate of tuition. However, the Veterans' Administration refused to amend or change its regulation. Therefore, in order to remove the injustice and inequity of the Veterans' Administration's ruling, H. R. 7057 was introduced in the House. This was a bill to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) with respect to computation of estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction in the case of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts and other nonprofit educational institutions.

It was self-evident that, if H. R. 7057 was not passed, the total deficit of the land-grant schools would have to be made up either by additional appropriations from the United States Congress, the State legislatures, or increase the future tuition under the GI bill; and failure to pass this bill would be taking money out of one pocket to put in the other, just robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Everybody concedes that the Michigan State College has done a fine job on behalf of the GI. This college has a claim filed against it by the Federal Government, of around $500,000. The claim has varied from $130,000 to $500,000. If H. R 7057 were not passed, the Michigan State College, its student body with its fine educational program, would suffer immeasurably. This bill would correct the inequities against State colleges that took the income on their endowment fund as a part of the tuition of the veterans.

I have watched the growth of the Michigan State College with particular interest. It is, as stated above, the first agricultural college established in America. It has grown remarkably in attendance and in efficiency, and stands today, under the leadership of President John A. Hannah, as one of the finest educational institutions in the country.

I was very happy when this bill passed the House yesterday by a vote of 245 yeas to 101 nays.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD a statement regarding rural electrification by Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, executive manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at its annual meeting in Chicago on March 6, 1950. I am advised by the Public Printer that the manuscript will make approximately 2¾ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $225.50.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CLYDE T. ELLIS, EXECUTIVE MANAGER, NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, ANNUAL MEETING, STEVENS HOTEL, CHICAGO, MARCH 6, 1950

Mr. President, members of NRECA, and guests, this convention will be unique. It is tailored in detail to your expressed preferences. In your resolutions, regional and national, and in your post-convention questionnaires of last year, you indicated your desire for more audience participation and fewer speeches. You indicated some of the topics you wanted discussed.

All of that is in store for you exactly as you ordered it. For instance, nearly half of the time will be devoted to actual audience or group participation.

Since our rural-electrification program is truly "of the people, by the people, and for the people," perhaps we should strive to be the most democratic of national organizations. All our efforts, singly and together, all our hopes of future years, are justified by the conviction that each of our more than 5,000,000 members makes his or her contribution beyond a mere apathetic acceptance of service. Thus alone can we succeed.

During the next 12 months, almost a million rural people will attend our nearly 1,000 annual meetings in 45 States, the Virgin Islands, and Alaska. Out of this meeting should come much that will be helpful to you in conducting those meetings.

RURAL TELEPHONES

At New York last year you decided in favor of an all-out drive to extend the REA principle into the field of rural telephones, because phones are necessary to report electric outages quickly and because not many more farmers had efficient telephone service than had electric service in 1935. Not only did Congress pass the bill, but it approved administrative funds and loan funds approved to start the program.

The farmers of our country are eternally indebted to every Member of the Congress who withstood strong pressure to inaugurate that new service. We are indebted particularly to those able statesmen who initiated the bills and led the fights in their respective Houses, Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and Congressman BOB POAGE, of Texas.

For the next fiscal year the Bureau of the Budget has requested Congress to provide for the REA telephone program administrative funds totaling $2,100,000, plus $175,000 Solicitor's funds, and $50,000,000 in loan funds. Your elected legislative committee appeared before the House committee a few days ago in support of those items.

NEEDS FOR RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

At New York you asked for an increase in the budget request for rural electrification administrative funds. It was approved.

Your legislative committee has now asked Congress to approve the budget requests for REA's electrification program next year, $7,425,000 for administrative funds, $550,400 for the Solicitor's office, and $400,000,000 for loan funds. Your recent annual survey of all systems indicates that you will need $4 3,000,000 in loan funds for next fiscal year. However, percentage-wise, the figures were so close that your committee, in supporting the loan item, told the House committee it was asking no increase over the budget request.

We provided the Congress with other valuable information from your survey questionnaires this year. You said you were serving 3,109,286 farms and other consumers on January 1. You said you expected to serve 1,823,675 more. Then our task of connecting the unserved in our areas is only 63 percent complete.

But note this. You connected 594,696 new consumers in 1949. Yet, you still planned to connect within 276,943 of as many as you planned to connect a year ago. Our systems are still growing in number and size, as our population increases.

But for some reason our loan applications are slowing down. Since we have undertaken to serve all who want service within our system areas, it would seem that we should endeavor to keep our construction programs speeded up until we are much nearer the goal.

You said in your survey that you would have to invest 23 percent of your total funds next year in heavying-up existing facilities. You said you would have to produce more of your own power.

Twenty-two percent of you reported a present power shortage. Twenty-six percent of you don't have enough power in sight. Forty-three percent say your present suppliers impose restrictions, involuntary servitude clauses, in your contracts prohibiting free use of the energy you buy from them. Thirty-four percent of you say your power costs went up in the past 12 months.

We told the committee this year, as we did last—and as you directed—that we will have to invest an increasingly higher percentage of whatever loan funds are available to us in our own generation and transmission facilities. In many areas further construction of distribution lines must await development of our own power sources. Either inadequate power is available or its high costs or restrictions are retarding area coverage.

VICIOUS POWER COMPANY ATTACKS

While the farmers' demands on REA for generation loans are and have been strong, the power-company pressures on REA against them have been stronger and often bitter.

We believe the recently introduced Thomas-Tackett bills to change the generation-transmission loan procedures would do great injury to the rural electrification program. While there is probably little danger of them being passed as independent bills, we have feared a possible move to tie them on as riders to the agriculture appropriation bill.

It is no secret that our generating program has been under fire in the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee in recent weeks. The hearings were closed, so we don't know much of what happened.

Your legislative committee and I ran into this trouble when we appeared before that committee. As we entered the room President Frank Wilkes, of Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., was sitting outside the door checking the transcript of testimony he had given. A few minutes later some of the committee members read to us statements which he and other power-company officials had made against us. Evidently they had thrown everything, plus the kitchen sink, at us. Five power-company presidents and vice presidents, accompanied by several others—for moral support, I suppose—had testified against us for between 2 and 3 hours. We had no way of knowing what they had said except for the few quotations which committee members read to us from the transcript. Under the House committee rule we are not permitted to even see the record until it is published sometime later. It hasn't been released yet. Nor is a witness permitted to reveal what he told the committee until the record is published.

We stayed much longer than we were scheduled, and when we had to go the committee gave us permission to file a supplemental statement answering what we knew of the power companies' charges. We spent the next 5 days and nights preparing our 51-page reply.

Well, your committee did know by then a little more about what the companies had told the House committee, for evidently Vice President Warren L. Porter, of Kansas City Power & Light Co., had promptly released his statement to the press, and the Kansas City Times had carried part of it. We got a copy.

I have that February 15 issue of the Kansas City Times here in my hand. I want to read you some of Mr. Porter's and other power company officials' quotations from it concerning one of the Missouri generation loans. What big, ugly words they used trying to frighten Congress into stopping this comparatively small farmers' generating plant: "misappropriation of funds"; "Government bureaus furthering their own ambitions"; "funds originally intended to build lines to farm homes are being diverted to build steam plants"; "distortion of the intent of Congress"; "the industry is in a fight for survival"; "a move intended to destroy the Kansas City company."

But that's not the worst Mr. Porter and others told the committee. They said there is not now and never has been any power shortage in the Missouri generation co-op areas. Testifying a few days earlier before the Interior subcommittee against the same northwestern Missouri Generating Co-op, of Savannah—that testimony has been released—Mr. Porter said, and I quote from page 1279 of the hearings:

"Kansas City Power & Light Co. and four other utilities have provided ample power for these seven distributing cooperatives since their inception."

Missouri farmers know how incorrect both of his statements were. They are typical of the way power companies distort the facts before congressional committees.

ATCHISON-HOLT CASE DISTORTED

Take the case of the farmers of Atchison-Holt Electric Cooperative, of Rock Port, Mo., one of the seven members of Northwestern Electric Power Co-op. Their co-op has never had enough power. It has spent several hundred thousand dollars following the power companies around with its own transmission lines to pick up any available kilowatts. Examples: 1. This same Kansas City Power & Light Co. and St. Joseph Light & Power Co. together sold it 300 kilowatts but the co-op had to build facilities to get it costing nearly $7,000. Ten months later, in November 1948, the co-op was ordered to quit taking power there and hasn't been able to use those facilities since.

2. St. Joseph Power & Light denied the co-op power late in 1947, claiming shortage. Finally, it sold the co-op a limited, inadequate amount subject to availability, to be delivered on the extreme edge of co-op's territory, provided co-op would agree to not buy power from anyone else. Co-op spent $400,000 building 40 miles of 33,000-volt transmission line—completed in December—to deliver the power to its own load centers, and when it got it there it wouldn't work. The voltages were too low because of the antiquated, overloaded power-company lines back of the pick-up point. Result: farmers' motors are burning out, radios won't play, and the farm wives are discarding their electric ranges for bottled gas.

3. Meanwhile, the power companies have been charging co-op 11 mills per kilowatt for power and spite lining its territory and taking its best potential consumers at the same time.

President John Buck and Manager Bruce Olden, of Atchison-Holt Electric Cooperative, are sitting here beside me. Stand up, fellows, and let the folks have a look at you. President Buck, have I correctly stated the fact about your power supply? He says, "You told the absolute truth."

Still, Mr. Porter says here:

"Kansas City Power & Light Co. and four other utilities have provided ample power for these seven distributing cooperatives since their inception."

Will Congress believe these selfish Power Trust distorters of the truth or will Congress believe the people who seek only a little power for use?

The newspapers say the St. Joseph Power & Light Co. got into Washington to testify for these farmers, too. I have here in my hand a clipping from the February 15 issue of the St. Joseph News-Press. It quotes Vice President Douglas Merrifield as telling Congress:

"* * * the companies feel that the farmer is as much a victim of this plan to subsidize the electric industry as the companies whose economic existence will be jeopardized by subsidized competition.

"In a very real sense I truly believe Administrator Wickard is guilty of what is tantamount to a betrayal of the great trust in which he is held by all farmers in permitting this slick and sly deal to be consummated."

Why didn't you tell Congress the facts, Mr. Merrifield, about how your company has been treating our several thousand farm members of Atchison-Holt Electric Cooperative? But then your trip would have been wasted.

BOONE ELECTRIC CASE DISTORTED

Now let's take the case of the farmers of Boone Electric Cooperative, of Columbia, Mo. It is a member of the Central Electric Power Cooperative, of Linn, Mo., another one which the power companies are trying to kill. Missouri Power & Light Co. is one of Boone Electric's two suppliers. The power company's assistant to the president, J. D. James, testified against the generating co-ops along with Wilkes, Porter, and Merrifield. Actually Mr. James did not say Boone Electric had had adequate power but other power company officials before and after him said it of the general area, and he sat there and didn't deny it.

Boone Electric has two contracts with Missouri Power & Light, both subject to cancellation on 30 days' notice. On one contract, for the month ending February 15, it had to pay the company almost 2 cents per kilowatt-hour for wholesale power, and on the other it had to pay 2.3 cents per kilowatt-hour. (Its power will cost it less than a third of that from the farmers' own generating co-op—about 29 percent to be exact.)

The power company limits the farmers at both co-op substations.

Boone Electric is supplying single-phase service to a rock-wool plant. The wool plant recently wanted three-phase service. The co-op figured out a way to provide it. The power company heard about it and told the co-op if it did the power company would cut the co-op off completely. The wool plant is still getting single-phase service.

Missouri Power & Light has indicated it would sell the co-op more power provided the co-op would agree to a 50-kilowatt load limitation, involuntary-servitude clause. The co-op has refused to sign it. Referring to this limitation, the president of Missouri Power & Light wrote Mr. Wickard on January 11, "We have no apology to make for this restriction."

So the co-op's power situation is desperate. Its farm wives even have an I Won't Wash on Monday Club out there and here is the certificate they use. Mr. James testified on a Monday, before the Interior Subcommittee. Don't you know these women would have enjoyed washing him that Monday?

Director Les Crews and Manager Joe Martin, of Boone Electric, are also sitting here beside me. Stand up fellows and make a bow. Director Crews, tell our people whether these things I've just said about your power supply situation are true.

Mr. Crews said, "That is the truth."

Is it possible that in this free country of ours Congress might believe those who would wreck our program when the tens of thousands of our relatively inarticulate farm people affected know the facts to be otherwise? If that happens it will surely shake the confidence of many of our best people.

POWER COMPANIES GET UNPRECEDENTED SENATE HEARING

The power company officials are also quoted here in the paper as saying they would take their fight against the farmers right on over to the Senate, if the House didn't stop these recent generation-transmission loans. I guess they did, for we have learned that a joint meeting of the Agriculture Subcommittee and the Interior Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee has been called for Thursday of next week, March 16, to hear the power-company complaints against these generating loans. They want stop orders on many loans already made to generating co-ops, and they want no more such loans made. Immediately affected would be the loans to generating co-ops in South Carolina, North Dakota, Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Michigan, and perhaps other States. Immediately affected also would be generation loan applications from Illinois, Louisiana, South Dakota, Georgia, Iowa, and Arkansas, and possibly other States.

We have asked to be heard at this hearing, and we hope the committee will place both the power companies and us under oath. The committees should find out who is telling the truth and who is not.

We all know, and we must somehow let the country know, what the facts are. We must let the people know that these examples are not isolated cases; that they are typical of what we are now confronted with. The power companies are being grossly unfair with the farmers, with Congress, and with their country.

MICHIGAN CASE DISTORTED

Here is another one. On that same February 15, there was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which had appeared in a magazine, written by James W. Parker, president of Detroit Edison Power Co. Here are a few of his classic lines:

"But with the farm job well over 85 percent accomplished, can anybody tell me why on earth the Rural Electrification Administration should still have unexpended appropriations of $1,350,000 at their disposal?"

Is that true, Mr. Wickard? The answer is "No." REA on that date had unloaned funds on hand totaling less than one-fifth of that amount.

"Money like that," says Mr. Parker, "never goes back unspent into the Treasury; it gets spent for something. And I'll tell you what they are trying to spend it on. They are going into the transmission business and coming up with the super co-op. It's cropping up in two places in Michigan right now. This is just plain competing with money that is already invested, with lines that are already in existence."

Our Michigan farmers in the area of which he speaks have long faced a desperate power situation similar to that of the Missouri farmers. If they could ever capture an extra kilowatt up in that country, they would probably put it on display and build a resort around it.

Mr. Parker, however, concludes with an optimistic note: "I'm not at all downhearted about this. It's good having a hand in trying to see to it that the public gets wise, and that's what we are out to do."

Well, if the public ever gets wise to who is making it wise and who is paying the bill, we won't be downhearted either.

It is quite obvious—even to the power companies—that the farmers are rapidly being driven to the conclusion that their electric co-ops which do not have a friendly source of power supply do not have a very long life expectancy. Is it surprising that the farmers who have seen the power companies juggle power supply to kill some of their electric co-ops already now conclude that they must either generate or perish?

If the time ever comes when the power monopoly can say to the American farmer, through Government or otherwise, that he cannot produce a product which he uses on his farm—and which he may not be able to get elsewhere—if that time ever comes, our freedom and our democracy will both be lost. That danger is a very real one this morning.

Our right to produce our own power is as sacred as any other right guaranteed to us in the Constitution. Whether we do produce it or not, the right provides us with our only bargaining position in negotiating power contracts. Actually we are producing only 6 percent of all the power we use.

TRANSMISSION LINE CASE DISTORTED

The transmission-line battle is the same fight. The issue is whether we shall have a reasonable power source or whether the power companies shall be permitted to monopolize the public's power too.

Last year at New York, you resolved vigorously and eloquently for the continuation of our Government's power policy, which embraces the development of our hydro-power potential and the delivery of that power over self-liquidating Government transmission lines for sale at wholesale, at the lowest possible rates, to the load centers of public bodies, cooperatives, and private companies.

The Interior Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, nevertheless, last year voted to eliminate most of the lines that would help us and to which the power companies objected. This was true of Reclamation, Bonneville, and SPA lines. The committee cut out Southeastern Power Marketing completely. The Senate committee added a North Dakota line, which both the local power company and we wanted.

But why did the Senate committee cut out all those lines? In each case the power companies assured the Senators that the lines were not needed; that they would deliver the hydro power to the agencies' preferred customers, including the farmers' co-ops and power districts. They led the Senators to believe they would deliver it to us at our load centers on a permanent basis without restrictions and without charge. The committee relied on their statements.

But the Senate felt otherwise. After an extended fight, it restored all of the lines but one, some of them on close votes.

However, some say there was an implied mandate in the Senate debates for Interior's power agencies to endeavor to negotiate reasonable wheeling arrangements with the power companies, in lieu of lines to be built.

But what happened then? The power companies evidently figured they could ignore their promises to Congress, that they could get the power of the dams anyway, and on their own terms. They reneged. For instance, the two big Oklahoma companies, both parties to the without-charge delivery promises, promptly demanded contracts of SPA to take the hydropower—but refused and still refuse to agree to deliver power to us at our load centers, even in their own areas. We understand great pressure is being brought on the Secretary of the Interior to approve the contracts which they have submitted to him with those refusals

in them. They are also demanding heavy tolls for letting SPA power pass over such lines as they have. If Congress is going to give the power companies a monopoly to haul us over their toll bridges, it ought to make them at least agree to deliver us all the way and not dump us in the river. The power companies are not keeping their word with Congress.

The Montana Power Co. is negotiating with both Bonneville and Reclamation and demanding a 50-percent toll, one kilowatt-hour out of every two that would pass over its toll bridges for delivery to us.

Representatives of our cooperatives and power districts in Reclamation, Bonneville, SPA, and Southeastern Power Administration areas have already been before the House Interior Subcommittee in support of the agencies' budget requests for power facilities. Most of the agencies' requests for next year are inadequate. Many power company officials have testified at length before that committee. Those hearings have been published and we have read what they said. They said Government power lines are not needed in Montana, Idaho, Colorado, Oklahoma, Missouri, and other places where we know we must have them.

However, the power companies have become more incensed over the fact that the farmers are discovering ways to effect further significant economies in their generating co-ops wherever they can integrate them with hydro power like the power companies do. The companies just can't stand the fact that some of our rates will then approximate Bonneville's. Shows them up.

You who are not familiar with the SPA area will be interested to know how the generating co-op Government hydro integration works. SPA does not have and will never have enough hydropower to go around, not even enough to serve its preferred customers. All of its power will never exceed 20 percent of the requirements of the area.

Knowing this, the farmers of each generating co-op area have been studying ways to generate their own power for years. Only when power-exchange agreements with SPA became possible did most of the half dozen generating co-ops become feasible.

The Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corp., of Fayetteville, will achieve the lowest rate, so note what happens there. The farmers employed one of the best electrical engineering firms in the country to make what has been a 3-year study. Here is the plan. The farmers will set their own generator right under SPA's backbone transmission line and right on top of the coal and gas fields; and, I might add, in an area where the power companies which are fighting us, Mr. Wilkes and his group, now restrict our use of the power they sell us. Co-op will use a 30,000 kilowatt unit because its loads will require that much in 10 years, and because there is efficiency in the larger unit. No stand-by will be required because of the integration with SPA, and this will be a tremendous saving. Co-op will operate its plant constantly, in practice selling its excess at a profit to SPA. (Technically, co-op sells all its power to SPA and buys back its requirements.) SPA needs the excess in order to store water in off-peak hours and seasons, thus firming up substantial blocks of its secondary power which would otherwise have to be sold to some big power system at dump prices. So SPA makes money on the deal too. Co-op then buys from SPA whatever power it needs, whether more or less than it generates.

To bring the cost down further, it was found that there would be savings in the farmers leasing their transmission lines to SPA to operate in connection with its other lines. The power exchange contracts are for 40 years. The lease is for 40 years. The estimated life of the lines is about 40 years. Therefore, the rents from the lines must amortize them in 40 years. SPA requested and got an option to purchase the lines for a nominal price when they are amortized—upon the approval of Congress, of course. Could anything be fairer than that?

The rate of the current to the distribution co-ops will be under 4 mills, delivered at the load centers, without restrictions on its use. This will be the lowest or one of the lowest rates to a co-op in the United States.

A study of one of the distribution co-ops, Arkansas Valley Electric at Ozark, shows that under the last best wholesale power offers of the power companies the co-op can never hope to reach all the farmers of its rugged territory, but under this plan it can do so and still be in the black.

The power companies charge that SPA would thus ultimately own lines which Congress has denied to it. That is not true. On the contrary, this arrangement will obviate SPA building some lines which Congress has approved. If Congress doesn't want SPA to take title to any of these lines when the time comes, all it need do is refuse the authority.

This power company drive against both the farmer's right to generate and his right to purchase Federal hydro power over self-liquidating Government transmission lines is no more nor less than an effort to make him purchase whatever power he would be able to get from the power companies on their own terms and conditions, and with all the deadly restrictions they would impose. If the power companies succeed in this effort, they will wreck America's rural electrification program.

Our farmers in each affected area are practically unanimous in their support of the requested Federal agency transmission facilities which would deliver the hydro power to our load centers. Just as the power companies have banded together to kill each line, we must fight side by side 3,000,000 strong to save it.

POWER PROJECTS

Our hydro-power project troubles are not with the transmission lines alone. Just last week we learned that the Chief of Army Engineers had eliminated the power facilities in four dams to be built on the Licking River in Kentucky—in another power desert, in the area of one of our new generating co-ops. We are advised that both the district office at Cincinnati and the Board of Engineers at Washington had approved 180,000 kilowatt capacity for the four dams. We hear that the power features were eliminated because there was opposition. The Hoover Commission recommended that the river-basin functions of the Army engineers be transferred to the Department of the Interior. I'm sure Interior would not have knocked the power out.

The prospects for the St. Lawrence project, I am happy to report, are looking a little better. Many industries of the Great Lakes region which once opposed it are now favorable. Meanwhile, the power situation in the Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and New England area is becoming relatively more critical. House hearings are scheduled for April. On the Senate side, an attempt will probably be made to add the St. Lawrence to the omnibus rivers and harbors bill when it comes up in a few weeks.

ORGANIZATION COUNTS

One thing is certain: We've got to stick together and help each other on all our power problems. It makes no difference whether the fight is over our right to generate, over a transmission line, or over a power project, it is the same issue. A battle lost anywhere will hurt all the rest, including TVA. No one of our power programs can be much more secure than all the others.

That voice of the power companies, Electrical World magazine, calls for the defeat of Congressmen who support the Government's power program. It says George Gallup has "found that only 24 percent of the people think that the United States Government should own the power companies." That is not and never has been an issue. The United States Government is not in the retail power business anywhere, not even in TVA, and no one that I know of is advocating that it get in. I don't believe 24 percent of our farmers, or even 5 percent, favor that. But that is the way Electrical World deducts that the majority is opposed to the Federal hydro-wholesale power program. We know that a great majority of the farmers, and we believe a substantial majority of all the people, favor the present power program.

Electrical World concludes its editorial of January 16 with the demand that "the Congressmen who now vote in opposition to the will of the majority must be defeated in future elections."

If the power companies force this issue they will be sorry.

PEOPLE ARE FRIGHTFULLY OVERCHARGED FOR POWER

In 1948, according to Federal Power Commission figures, the electric utilities overcharged the American people $2,097,071,724 by comparison with TVA rates—which also includes substantial taxes and income-tax equivalents.

The farmers' electric cooperatives and power districts paid the commercial power companies $20,681,759 for 3,191,543,216 kilowatt-hours of power last fiscal year, at an average cost of 9.8 mills. (I reckon we helped them some with their income taxes, too.) The average kilowatt-hour cost of all the power we purchased from the Federal agencies last year was 5 mills. If the 87 percent of our systems which purchased their power from the commercial companies last year had been able to buy their power at the average Federal rate, they would have saved $14,724,043.

CONCLUSION

These are but a few of the facts behind the one-sided cold war that is being waged against the farmers by the greedy power companies. The farmers don't want to fight anybody. They would like that war to end. They want to finish the rural-electrification job.

Like any democratic people, we desire peace. But we have no intention of forfeiting our freedom.

Our job of electrifying rural America is far from finished; the program is not yet safe from those who would destroy it; the enemy is making its most determined drive to eliminate us; and we must have the active participation of every farm leader and every farm family all the way from the meter box to the ballot box if necessary.

Accomplishments of the American Medical Profession and of Wisconsin Physicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the subject of the 12-point program of the American Medical Association and the accomplishments of physicians of the State of Wisconsin along each of the 12 lines. I also ask unanimous consent

to have printed in the RECORD, following my statement, the text of the program of the American Medical Association and the record of Wisconsin achievements as printed in the medical forum section of the Wisconsin Medical Journal in its issue of January 1950.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

PROGRESS OF WISCONSIN MEDICINE

Mr. President, throughout the public debate on the issue of the future health program of our Nation, I have emphasized that the medical profession of the United States is more than adequate and competent to meet the health needs of the American people without political systems—without socialized medicine.

I have emphasized that Great Britain's sorry experiences with socialized medicine underline the importance of our avoidance of European type political medicine. We here on this blessed continent have achieved the highest medical standards for our people in the world, thanks to America's private practitioners.

It is estimated that more than 60,000,000 persons now have hospital benefit insurance; 85,000,000 have surgical protection; 13,000,000 have medical benefit policies. It is with deep pride that I note that the State of Wisconsin has pioneered to provide prepaid health care. Nearly one million people in the Badger State are enrolled in various plans—the Blue Shield plan of the State Medical Society, the plan of the Milwaukee County Medical Society, Blue Cross, and so forth.

In the January 1950 issue of the Wisconsin Medical Journal published at Madison by the State medical society, there is an excellent statement on the 13-point program of the American Medical Association on such vital issues as research, insurance, mental hygiene, veterans medical care, and so forth. In this issue of this fine publication there is, moreover, a point-by-point analysis of the way by which the Wisconsin medical profession has pioneered along every single one of these dozen points recommended by the American Medical Association.

Not only is this an excellent commentary on the pioneering vision, the industry, the energy, the resourcefulness of Wisconsin practitioners, but it shows that the American Medical Association has not simply set up paper plans but rather that its program is based upon reality, upon active measures which it will dynamically continue.

This 13-point program certainly belies the unfounded charges which have been constantly hurled at the AMA by the political quacks who are seeking to foist socialized medicine on our country. If one were to believe these political quacks one would think that the doctors of America had no future program, no active interest in expanded medical services, no concern with the people's welfare, particularly of folks in the lower and middle brackets.

But let the record now speak for itself. Let the Wisconsin record and the AMA record demonstrate as I have previously demonstrated the utter falsity of the charges which the Socialist-minded Democratic administration and its adherents have hurled.

[From the Wisconsin Medical Journal of January 1950]

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION 13-POINT PROGRAM

WISCONSIN LEADS ACCOMPLISHMENTS ON MANY POINTS

A Federal Department of Health

1. Creation of a Federal Department of Health of cabinet status with a Secretary who is a doctor of medicine, and the coordination and integration of all Federal health activities under this Department, except for the military activities of the medical services of the armed forces.

Wisconsin: This is a national development, but one that has been recommended by the AMA since 1934.

Medical research

2. Promotion of medical research through a National Science Foundation with grants to private institutions which have facilities and personnel sufficient to carry on qualified research.

Wisconsin: Both the University of Wisconsin Medical School and Marquette University School of Medicine receive grants from the United States Public Health Service for medical research. Over $25,000 yearly from State funds goes to the University of Wisconsin for cancer research, $55,000 annually from the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation with added amounts to several departments for related research, and many thousands of dollars from trust funds and bequests are earmarked for various specific research. Similar amounts are available to Marquette University from the United States Public Health Service, bequests, and trust funds. County-wide research projects by local medical societies are encouraged by the State society.

Voluntary insurance

3. Further development and wider coverage by voluntary hospital and medical care plans to meet the costs of illness, with extension as rapidly as possible into rural areas. Aid through the States to the indigent and medically indigent by the utilization of voluntary hospital and medical care plans with local administration and local determination of needs.

Wisconsin: The State medical society began experiments with voluntary prepaid hospital and surgical care plans as early as 1937. Experience with these plans resulted in the formation of Wisconsin Physicians Service (Blue Shield) in 1946. On December 1, 1949, it provided surgical, maternity, and medical coverage to more than 160,000 persons. The Nation's first medical society sponsored voluntary plan operated through private insurance carriers was developed by the society. It is the Wisconsin plan, which now covers more than 225,000 persons. A local Milwaukee County Medical Society plan reports over 195,000 coverage in Milwaukee County. Both the Blue Shield plan and the Wisconsin plan make their coverage available to people in rural areas, single-family units, and individual subscribers.

Medical care authority with consumer representation

4. Establishment in each State of a medical-care authority to receive and administer funds with proper representation of medical and consumer interest.

Wisconsin: This concerns the establishment within each State government of an agency to receive and administer any funds coming to the State as the result of Federal legislation for the medical care of the medically indigent as part of an over-all program to provide comprehensive medical care for the American people on a locally administered basis.

New facilities

5. Encouragement of prompt development of diagnostic facilities, health centers, and hospital services, locally originated, for rural and other areas in which the need can be shown and with local administration and control as provided by the National Hospital Survey and Construction Act or by suitable private agencies.

Wisconsin: The Hospital Survey and Construction Act is administered in Wisconsin by the State board of health. At present 35 hospital projects are actually under way, mostly in rural areas, and a total of $6,000,000 in Federal aid has been allotted to these projects. The medical society has supported this program and legislation to improve its administration. It has also sponsored legislation for the development of diagnostic and convalescent facilities for rheumatic fever and cancer victims.

Public health

6. Establishment of local public-health units and services and incorporation in health centers and local public-health units of such services as communicable-disease control, vital statistics, environmental sanitation, control of venereal diseases, maternal and child hygiene, and public-health laboratory services. Remuneration of health officials commensurate with their responsibility.

Wisconsin: The efforts of the State board of health in the field of communicable disease control has made Wisconsin one of the healthiest States in the Nation. Small-pox, typhoid, and diphtheria are virtually nonexistent, the State has one of the lowest venereal-disease rates in the Nation and there is every prospect that tuberculosis may be completely eradicated in little more than a decade. A new State laboratory of hygiene to provide additional modern laboratory services to rural physicians was authorized by the legislature at the request of the State medical society. The society is continuously supporting the establishment of local health units in county and city-county areas, and legislation to insure adequate salaries for public-health officers has been sponsored by the society.

Mental hygiene

7. The development of a program of mental hygiene with aid to mental-hygiene clinics in suitable areas.

Wisconsin: Since 1941 a mental health and hygiene program has been underway in Wisconsin through the State board of health with the active support of the State medical society. Up to $75,000 a year in Federal funds are used to demonstrate what child-guidance clinics can do, and local initiative takes over to maintain the clinic thereafter. Twelve such clinics are now operated in the State as the result of this program.

Health education

8. Health-education programs administered through suitable State and local health and medical agencies to inform the people of the available facilities and of their own responsibilities in health care.

Wisconsin: The State board of health and the State medical society devote a majority of their efforts to educational programs to inform the people of available facilities and personal responsibility for health care. Health councils, health meetings, and school health programs, as well as weekly radio and newspaper presentations on health, have accomplished much in the better education of the State's citizens. The medical society's radio program, the March of Medicine, carries the health-education campaign to the people via 25 radio stations.

Chronic diseases and the aged

9. Provisions of facilities for care and rehabilitation of the aged and those with chronic disease and various other groups not covered by existing proposals.

Wisconsin: A detailed study of Wisconsin's needs for the chronically ill and aged has been conducted by the State medical society. The resulting publicity has created considerable public support for legislation offered in the current session by the society seeking permissive laws for the building of county infirmaries for the aged and chronically ill, and State aid for their maintenance. Many counties solved the problem on a local basis, but others need State aid, and the society is giving its support in every way possible.

Veterans' medical care

10. Maintenance of existing high standards of medical care for veterans, including extension of facilities where the need can be shown and, where practicable, care of the veteran in his own community by a physician of his own choice.

Wisconsin: The veterans' medical service agency of the State medical society has enabled thousands of Wisconsin veterans to obtain medical care at Government expense through the physicians of their choice. In the last 1½ years more than 21,000 Wisconsin veterans have been served through this agency. The veterans' hospitals in Wisconsin are closely affiliated with the medical schools of the University of Wisconsin and Marquette University, as well as private hospitals.

Industrial medicine

11. Greater emphasis on the program of industrial medicine, with increased safeguards against industrial hazards and prevention of accidents occurring on the highway, home, and on the farm.

Wisconsin: The State's industrial health program is one of the most outstanding in the Nation. Through cooperation between the State board of health's industrial hygiene unit, in-plan industrial health clinics are held for hundreds of workers and many employers. Great progress in safety and health education has been made as a result. The society's committee on rural health and accident prevention has carried on a constant campaign for safety on the farm, highway, and home. Through cooperation with the State workmen's compensation department, the society insures that most of the State's industrial workers have the benefit of free choice of physician in industrial accident cases.

Medical education and personnel

12. Adequate support with funds free from political control, domination, and regulation of the medical, dental, and nursing schools and other institutions necessary for the training of specialized personnel required in the provision and distribution of medical care.

Wisconsin: Better distribution of physicians through the preceptorship system of the University of Wisconsin medical school (which has resulted in many physicians locating in rural areas), a physician's location service of the State medical society to help bring physicians to communities needing them, and legislation for the appointment of "special medical officers" in sparsely populated areas to perform public-health duties and encourage them to establish a private practice in those areas.

Medical School at Yeshiva University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by the Honorable Paul E. Lockwood at the third annual dinner sponsored by the society for the establishment of a medical college at Yeshiva University, held in New York City on February 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is with pleasure and a feeling of privilege that I am here to greet you tonight. The task you have set of creating a medical school at Yeshiva University is a great contribution to our society. All men must recognize in it profound significance and a humanitarian value of a very high order.

The Jewish people down the centuries—as much as or perhaps more than any other group—have contributed richly to the development of the art of healing man's physical ills.

From the earliest times, from the earliest Biblical periods, we find a recognition amongst the Jews of the principle of a science of medicine based upon experience and the laws of nature. Of this we find ample evidence in the Bible and in that great body of religious literature known to all men as the Talmud. As the first in the Western World to carry to mankind the principles of mercy and charity, the Jewish people naturally have produced distinguished healers and leaders of medicine. In the Dark Ages when the natural sciences were undeveloped and man looked to magic and superstition for his bodily well-being, it was Jewish men of science who were bold enough to search out the secrets of life and to seek means of checking sickness and death. It is enough to mention the great name of Maimonides, physician, philosopher, and interpreter of the law, to exemplify the great role of the Jewish people as pioneers in medical science.

Throughout the Middle Ages, when the lot of Jewry was so tragic, even their detractors came to Jews—sometimes secretively—with their problems of health. Rulers and kings, lords of realms, whatever their attitude in secular affairs in regard to Jews, were constrained to confer privileges on physicians of the Jewish group out of their self-interest for the health of themselves and their people. Even in ancient Spain, it was the Jews and the Moors who carried the inspiration of the search for truth in the fields of the natural and physical sciences.

It is not, therefore, surprising to find that the Jewish people who have unfailingly demonstrated an instinct for learning, should have continued to make such valuable contributions in the cultural development of western civilization. Nor is it surprising that a group which has always been so keenly sensitive of social responsibilities, should have turned its love of learning for its own sake to the application of that learning to the conferring of benefactions upon its fellow men.

In modern times the contributions of Jewish physicians and scientists in the field of medical research have occurred and reoccurred with a frequency that is no less than astounding. The names of discoverers and developers of revolutionary approaches in the medical field, whose bearers are Jewish, are legion. It is enough to mention Dr. Paul Ehrlich, the discoverer of salvarsan; of August von Wasserman, of the famous test of that name; of Bela Schick, whose test for diphtheria has saved the lives of hundreds of thousands, to illustrate the role of the Jewish people in modern medicine.

Our own country has been blessed with a multitude of Jewish physicians and scientists. The position of the United States, at the forefront of the medical progress of the world, is undoubtedly due in large part to their contributions. Recently your university honored Dr. Selman Waksman, of Rutgers, for his outstanding discovery of streptomycin and his work in soil microbiology. He is but another link in the great company of Jewish scientists and doctors who in laboratory and hospital have unrelentingly attacked the evils of disease.

Your university, now in its fifth year as such, has already attained a high standing among the great institutions of learning in our State. Its mission and its achievements will not be complete without a school of medicine. For its sake and for the sake of all of us, we wish you well in this great venture. With your own traditions and with traditions of a great people to inspire it, the contribution that a medical school at Yeshiva University can make will be regarded in the years to come as one of the great landmarks in the history of medicine and health.

America stands today far above all other nations in matters of health and medicine. At the same time we suffer a lack of physicians. This is difficult to explain in a country of such great wealth, cultural achievement, and blessed with such great institutions of education. Nevertheless, the fact is clear that there is a great shortage of physicians—not only in the rural areas but in many of the greater cities—most particularly in the field of the general practitioner. It is most unfortunate that for many reasons, which we hope to see drastically change, our medical schools until now have not been in a position to train enough physicians to meet the needs of our people.

There have been a number of factors which have brought about this condition. Among those factors, I regret to say, has been that of discrimination, based upon race or creed. It is cheering, indeed, to realize that in a world beset with so many problems that might have diverted us from a solution of this one problem, we can now say that here is a factor that will surely be no more. Upon the recommendation of Governor Dewey, the Legislature of the State of New York has passed and put into effect laws to remove effectively such practices in the field of education. That law, I am happy to say, is already having its effect. The same progress that has been obtained by similar legislation in the field of employment we are now developing at an even more rapid rate in the field of education.

We must not forget that there are still other factors that have resulted in the curtailment of educational opportunities. One of them has been the decline of medical-school facilities during the past four decades. It is an astonishing fact that there are fewer medical schools in the United States today than there were at the turn of the century. Again, as a result of the efforts of Governor Dewey and the State administration, vigorous and direct steps have been and will continue to be taken to lift those limitations.

There has been created a great new State university. It has 11 teachers' colleges; a notable school of agriculture; the first school of labor and industrial relations in the Nation; schools of forestry, ceramics, veterinary medicine; 5 new technical institutes; a maritime college; and 6 agricultural technical institutes.

It is in the difficult field of medical education that the State university is making a great contribution. Two existing medical schools, one at Syracuse and one in Brooklyn, have been incorporated into the new university and their facilities expanded. The expansion now increases the number of medical students in the two schools by a number equal to that of an entire new medical school. So that we now have what is in number of students a new medical school, and this has been accomplished without the delays that would have been necessary in building and staffing one. These, of course, are the first few steps of a massive program upon which the State university is engaged. It is already seventh in size among the universities of the country and you rightly can be proud of it.

Government cannot solve all the problems of expanding medical education alone. The medical center of the twentieth century, with hospitals, clinics, teaching institutions, and related research programs, requires the vast endowment of private philanthropy.

The men who staff such centers, the men who impart their rich knowledge to the students, the devoted scholars who labor their lives away over the microscopes and test tubes of the laboratory do so not because they want jobs in an institution at so much a week. They dedicate themselves and their lives to an aspiration, to an ideal. They respond to leadership—not direction—and from their devotion and their dedication comes a great university.

That is the challenge that faces you who with countless other Americans aspire to create a Yeshiva university college of medicine.

Moreover, in the field of education, we will lose an invaluable tradition if we have failed to obtain a broad diversity of institution and outlook. Therefore, it is most essential that a great institution such as yours should directly make its contribution to the field of medical education. Its contribution could not—and we would not wish it to be—a total solution to the problems of discrimination and limitation of facilities in the field of medicine. By the same token, Government's contribution to that solution should not be the sole one. Our Nation and our people were built upon diversity. Our educational system should reflect that diversity and all the rich values that diversity can contribute to a culture. In this pattern Yeshiva University carries a unique responsibility and for that reason all of us have a unique responsibility to it.

Who does not feel a thrill at the prospect of a great medical center under the auspices of Yeshiva where miracles of modern science will come under the influence of a tradition of thousands of years. What entering student can fail to feel a rich spiritual exaltation in being admitted to an ancient learning—a learning that began when man in the desert cast out the idols of the barbarian—idols at whose feet the sick sought escape from death—men who, strengthened by a belief in an eternal God, sought to find for themselves the true causes of disease. What student can fail to dedicate himself in the tradition of the ancient Jewish physicians who, when the world was dark, gave treatment and even life itself to their oppressors, and did so because of their belief in the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

That is why Government sponsorship is not the answer. That is why it is up to you and to all of us to labor and to give to create this great institution. Then all of us may feel some of that inspiration. It is a great cause—let us all be worthy of it.

Decision of Hong Kong Court Awarding Certain Aircraft to Chinese Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in Time magazine, March 6, 1950, entitled "Hong Kong With His Majesty's Compliments."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONG KONG WITH HIS MAJESTY'S COMPLIMENTS

In Hong Kong last week a British colonial court decided that 71 United States-made planes, formerly the property of Nationalist China, now belong to the Chinese Communists. With the aircraft (including DC-3's, five Convairs, and five four-engined Skymasters) went 20,000 tons of maintenance equipment; altogether the property was worth $50,000,000.

The planes had been operated by Nationalist China's government-owned CNAC and CATC. As Communist armies overran the mainland, the lines retreated to Hong Kong's Kai Tak airfield. There, last November, most of their Chinese personnel declared allegiance to the Communists (Time, November 21) and shooed off Nationalist officials.

To get the planes out of Communist hands, the Nationalist Government sold the property to a United States corporation headed by its good friend of Flying Tiger fame, Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault, who operated Nationalist China's other air line (CAT). But when Chennault tried to take possession, Hong Kong authorities blocked him. There were reports of Communist threats to British business interests; one story was that the Communists threatened to confiscate one British business in Shanghai for every plane that went into Chennault's hands.

Meanwhile, there was an unexplained delay in a final court hearing. Then, in January, His Majesty's Government recognized Communist China. In last week's decision, Chief Justice Sir Leslie Gibson ruled that British recognition established Red ownership of the disputed planes. "Any question as to sovereignty * * * of a foreign state," he said, "is a question on which the court must be guided by the attitude of His Majesty's Government. * * * Our state cannot speak with two voices on such a matter, the judiciary saying one thing and the executive another."

At Kai Tak airfield, exultant Chinese Communist mechanics painted Red flags on 71 fuselages.

This Intellectual Potential Must Not Be Utterly Wasted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, we are all agreed that war is wasteful; and among the most tragic of all wastes, in war and the uneasy peace that follows war, is the terrible waste of brains—of intellectual potential of a very high order, already trained.

The Second World War, precipitated by mediocrity raised to absolute power, was, quite naturally, more than usually wasteful of the best brains, and the cold war following has continued that extravagance.

Under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD the appeal made to me and to other Members by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, president of Union Theological Seminary of New York, and also an authentic leader of the non-Marxist liberal movement in this country. Dr. Niebuhr describes the situation which exists in the European displaced-persons camps—those traps for wasted human energy which are the late fruit of Hitlerism—today as far as the intellectuals are concerned.

It is particularly distressing that the intellectuals of the United States, or as we would be more inclined to say, the body of professional practitioners, far from welcoming the new ideas and the new personalities of the Europeans, fear them, and are trying to make it more and more difficult for professional men of foreign birth, regardless of nationality or gifts, to practice their arts and sciences in this country.

Nevertheless, those of us who believe that a world can exist without war and without mass antagonisms must respond to Dr. Niebuhr's appeal as best we can.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
New York, N. Y., March 16, 1950.

The Honorable ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The ablest and best-trained men and women of Europe—30,000 of them—qualified practitioners in all the arts and sciences—are still rotting in the displaced persons camps of Europe today. While hundreds of thousands of their fellow refugees have gained acceptance for immigration as manual laborers, they have been passed over. The few who have found new homes did so often by acquiring new manual skills and trying to forget that they were once respected in their professions. This is the great tragedy of the present DP scene. Surely it is time that a solution to this tremendous human problem is sought out.

I am enclosing for your information the summary of a recent survey by the International Refugee Organization of the UN which indicates certain needed categories of professions which can be resettled in various countries. The International Rescue Committee, an organization with 18 years of experience in voluntary relief work, maintaining eight strategically located overseas field offices, is now preparing a campaign to aid the forgotten intellectuals and professionals of the DP camps.

Because I believe that this is a noble attempt by a responsible and well-equipped organization to eliminate this needless and costly suffering, I have agreed to act as general chairman of this rescue campaign.

With this letter I am asking you and other Americans prominent in the sciences and humanities to join me in this effort as a member of the national committee. The strongest possible leadership is vital if we are to arouse the American people to aid in saving these gifted European intellectuals and professionals from the corroding existence to which they are now doomed. We seek to restore them to a productive, satisfying existence in which they can contribute toward the enrichment of our civilization.

Will you please fill in and return the enclosed card indicating your willingness to serve as a member of the committee sponsoring this rescue work? I earnestly hope for your favorable and prompt response.

REINHOLD NIEBUHR.

MEMORANDUM ON FORGOTTEN INTELLECTUALS AND PROFESSIONALS

From: Reinhold Niebuhr.

To: The Honorable ARTHUR G. KLEIN.

In Europe today there are approximately 30,000 of the ablest, best-trained men and women of the continent—qualified practitioners of all the arts, sciences and professions, who at one time were leading citizens in their native countries. They are the forgotton intellectuals and professionals—now living in the most abysmal circumstances in the DP camps. They have been consistently passed over by most national missions selecting refugees for resettlement in favor of skilled and unskilled manual laborers.

Their talents cover virtually the entire range of human knowledge. There are musicians who have studied under some of music's greatest masters, distinguished historians, linguists who cannot only teach foreign languages but also, through first-hand experience, know the countries in which they are spoken. There are engineers who have been associated with some of Europe's best-known firms, doctors who have conducted original research and practiced in every field of specialized medicine, geologists who have led expeditions through some of the most remote parts of the world.

For example, among these refugee specialists is an agronomist who initiated work on the reclamation of arid wastelands in Macedonia and Serbia; the former prima ballerina of Latvia, a graduate of Moscow's famous ballet school; a doctor who has had extensive experience with tropical diseases in the Orient; a novelist whose second book won the Hungarian literary prize in 1947.

Their professional qualifications are established by close examination of their documents and special testing commissions, made up of recognized experts, who review their educational background, personally examine and interview persons who have lost their documents, audition musicians, view works of art, and evaluate levels of skill.

Most of these highly qualified professional and intellectual people need only to learn a new language to fit into a new land—and the majority of the refugee specialists already speak at least two foreign languages, one of which is frequently English. An appendicitis operation is the same in Prague as in Peru, the notes of a Beethoven symphony are the same in Belgrade as in Birmingham, a bridge is built fundamentally the same whether it is to cross the Danube or the Mississippi. And so long as there remain children to be taught, crops to be improved, sick to be healed, and bridges to be built, the world cannot afford to toss on the junk heap its teachers, doctors, agronomists, and engineers. A shocking waste of talent has already occurred as these refugees have had to wait in camps since the war while governments have hesitated to accept them as immigrants; yet there exist vast populations in dire need of the very services they have to offer in exchange for the right to freedom and citizenship in a new land. This short-sighted waste of human talent is the great tragedy of the postwar world.

There are, however, evidences that the world is beginning to recognize the contributions that these ably trained men and women can make. For example, Norway has recently chosen three dentists who have been trained for 6 months in Germany and found their methods perfectly adaptable. The Netherlands Ministry of Social Welfare recently made a spontaneous survey of Dutch farms, and obtained requests for 30 badly needed technicians and pharmaceutical chemists. A group of 58 refugee doctors were resettled in Pakistan last month. A recent world-wide canvass for specialists in professional jobs which was carried out by the International Refugee Organization under the leadership of J. Donald Kingley, Director General, indicates that there are certain needed categories in various countries throughout the world which could be filled by such DP specialists. A recent survey in the United States indicates that here also there are categories for professionals in which resettlement would be possible—e. g., top level mathematicians, clinical psychologists, etc.

There have been a few attempts to deal with this problem by American agencies. Of them all, the International Rescue Committee has had the greatest success. Last year IRC resettled 250 intellectual DP's—over 30 percent of its total DP program. Further, by its very nature IRC has experience in dealing with intellectuals. During the early days of the Nazi rise its work was primarily concerned with the rescue and care of anti-Fascist intellectuals. Consequently, of all the relief agencies, IRC is perhaps best equipped to handle such an effort. Through its field offices in eight European countries and its headquarters in New York City, this organization is prepared to begin the work of resettlement of the forgotten intellectuals in the DP camps of Europe. After thorough study of the problem it is estimated that resettlement would be possible for the sum of $500 per case. After conference with both IRO and UNESCO offices in Washington, who have pledged their full support for this effort, the International Rescue Committee is ready to begin work.

This project deserves the support of every American. The responsibility is ours. Only we have the material resources and the spiritual strength to sustain those who are able to contribute so much to the enrichment of our civilization. History is not only passing judgment on the totalitarian evil, it will also pass judgment on us if we fail to help in this gigantic tragedy.

In order to arouse the American people to action, I am calling on distinguished and representative men and women from the sciences and humanities to lend their support by endorsing this project.

R. N.

[From the New York Times]

BARRIER AGAINST BRAINS

On the day after Christmas an airplane took off from an Italian field, bound for Pakistan. In the plane were 54 men and women of various nationalities, religions, and professions. There were Latvians and Hungarians, Mohammedans and Protestants, doctors, and at least one entomologist of international reputation. These Europeans, who had been living in DP camps, were now seeking a new life and a new usefulness in distant Asia. Officials of the International Refugee Organization pointed out that the flight was particularly noteworthy as an outstanding example of our efforts to resettle specialists.

The man from Mars might indeed be excused if he thought that the easiest of all refugees to resettle in new homes would obviously be those whose training and experience were of particular value to humanity—the doctors, surgeons, and nurses; the chemists, physicists, and engineers; the teachers, artists, and writers. But in this most contrary of all worlds such is not the case. It is the height of irony that these specialists, the cream of Europe's displaced persons, are virtually as hard to place as the physically disabled, the totally blind, the hopeless invalids. Some of the scientists—more power to them—turn themselves into manual laborers in order to gain admission to new lands. In one country an agronomist and an industrial chemist are mining coal. In another a research chemist is handling a rock drill. But not all of them can do that; and right now there are some 25,000 of these specialists wasting away in the DP camps of Italy, Austria, and western Germany.

Partial IRO list of professionals and intellectuals still idle in the DP camps of Europe

Accountants	704
Agronomists	1,024
Architects	356
Artist	470
Chemists	471
Dentists	474
Engineers (civil)	766
Engineers (electrical)	353
Engineers (industrial)	173
Engineers (mechanical)	565
Engineers (mining)	80
Engineers (sanitary)	13
Physicians (general practitioners)	969
Physicians (specialists)	656
Musicians	962
Nurses (graduate)	789
Pharmacists	454
Sculptors	57
Singers	118
Teachers (arts and crafts)	279
Professors (academic)	4,325
Professors (technical)	496
Veterinarians	114
Writers	181
Other professionals	1,254

Besides these, it is estimated that 30 percent of the escapees from behind the iron curtain are professionals and intellectuals of standing.

Red China May Get an Air Force and Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News, March 17, 1950, by Clyde Farnsworth entitled "Red China May Get an Air Force and Navy."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED CHINA MAY GET AN AIR FORCE AND NAVY WITH RUSSIAN AND BRITISH HELP

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

HONG KONG, March 17.—There are good reasons to believe that with Russian and British help Red China will turn up with an air force and navy of sorts when and if she attacks Formosa, or even earlier.

Russia's help will be in technical personnel mainly, Britain's will be mainly in supplies.

Heavy Nationalist bombing of Red-held airfields at Shanghai and Canton, together with preparation for black-outs in Formosa suggest that Chinese Nationalist Government is aware of an air threat.

Shanghai and Canton would be likely bases for air assaults on Formosa and Hainan. It's authoritatively estimated the Reds have about 50 war planes and 20 warships. Planes include American-made B-24 heavy bombers, B-25 medium bombers and P-51 fighters.

Warships run no heavier than mine layers. The Reds probably also are trying to arm fishing boats and even large junks. Most of the Red fleet is reported in the lower Yangtse. Nanking is especially mentioned as a concentration point.

Preparation of naval support for the Red's Formosa planning would account for tight security measures taken by Nationalist picket boats enforcing a blockade of the Yangtse. The Nationalists intend to keep the Red fleet bottled up.

PROPAGANDA AND PLANES

The Communists will try for propaganda purposes to preserve the paultry character of its air force and navy and still try to use them in an effective manner at sea. Their greatest chance would come if Britain ordered her fleet to crack the Chinese Nationalist blockade.

It would be much better for the Reds if they could score first with an air force entirely composed of American-made planes—theirs by capture or desertion from the Nationalists.

To make an air force out of 50 old American bombers and fighters is where the Russians would come in, certainly as technicians and possibly also as fliers.

Behind a front of 50 American-made planes the Russians could draw on their own wartime lend-lease receipts of American aircraft and equipment—and maybe send in whole planes. It probably will be the most indestructible 50-plane air force the world ever saw.

HOUSES FOR RUSSIANS

Recent arrivals in Hong Kong say the Reds in Shanghai requisitioned 100 houses in the vicinity of the Hungjao airfield, one of a cluster of four Shanghai airfields. These travelers said the houses were being taken over for a Russian airforce.

Even if the Russians are planning a substantial air advisory group, they wouldn't need hundreds of houses, so it's more likely that Shanghai is making room for many Russian civil administrators as well as airmen.

It's probable that the Chinese Red air force already has run one mission, an attack a few weeks ago on Haichang, one of the principal cities of Sikang Province held by Nationalist Gen. Hu Tsung-nan's army.

Just where the Reds will get aviation gasoline is an interesting question. Russia could provide it—and may have done so—but an easier way would be to take it out of Hong Kong.

WATCH HONG KONG?

If the United States embargo of critical items needed by the Chinese Reds is too effective, somebody's going to have to watch Hong Kong. The United States consulate says there have been no shipments of American aviation gasoline to Reds through Hong Kong, but it relies upon British reporting of Hong Kong's trading.

There have been considerable shipments of other motor fuels and Chinese Nationalist airmen have set up some bright fires in a Red China fuel dump at Shumchun just across the frontier from this crown colony.

Britain's greatest lift to the air-minded Communists, however, probably was the court turn-over of two former Nationalist air lines. The 71 planes still are here, but thousands of tons of spare parts, engines, instruments and other equipment are reported being shipped to north China while litigation still is pending on the appeal from the Hong Kong Supreme Court decision.

The Reds probably would have planes also by this time if they had qualified fliers. The easiest way to get them would be for the British to grant Hong Kong visas to Russian ferry pilots.

Earle D. Willey, of Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, yesterday I attended the funeral in Dover, Del., of one of the most outstanding men in my State. I was amazed at the number of persons from every section of Delaware and from every walk of life who came to pay their respects to their friend who truly had lived in his house by the side of the road and been a friend to man—for 83 years.

Without warning the Grim Reaper knocked at the door of Hon. Earle D. Willey as he sat in his home in the early evening of Friday, March 17, chatting with a friend.

Judge Willey, as he was respectfully and popularly known, had held many honorable public and private positions in the State of Delaware. Included in these were judge of common pleas and juvenile court, secretary of state, and Representative in the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Earle Willey was a man of great kindness and friendliness, profoundly conscious of his obligations to all the people of his State and Nation. In these exacting and trying times such men are sorely needed. His passing leaves a void that cannot easily be filled.

Our Nation has lost a faithful and efficient leader. Our State has lost an outstanding citizen and public servant. I have lost a cherished friend.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial in the Journal-Every Evening, Wilmington, Del., Saturday, March 18, 1950, entitled "Earle D. Willey."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening of March 18, 1950]

EARLE D. WILLEY

Delaware was shocked and saddened this morning by the sudden death last night of Earle D. Willey. It was only a little more than a year ago that the gentle and kindly judge resumed the private practice of the law in Dover after a long and useful career in public service. He was only 60 when he died—an age at which he might have expected many more active and useful years.

Last year Mr. Willey received the first citizenship award of the Department of Delaware, American Legion, in recognition of his services to the community, State, and Nation.

Those services were varied and many indeed. They began ago ago as 1915 in Washington, where Mr. Willey was pursuing his studies in the law. He was secretary then to Representative Thomas W. Miller, of Delaware; 27 years later he returned to Washington as Congressman in his own right. Among the many other offices he held were those of State librarian; judge of the court of common pleas for Kent County; deputy attorney general for Kent; and head of the Legislative Reference Bureau.

Throughout his long career he was a loyal Republican and son of Kent County. He will be missed both by the party and the county he served long and well and also by the host of Delawareans who claimed him as a friend.

"As a Layman, I Am Awed by the Incredible Advances in Medical Techniques"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there are always some men in any community who attract civic burdens as a lightning rod attracts a charge of static electricity; and such a man, in our great and teeming community of New York, is Charles H. Silver, philanthropist, businessman, humanitarian, good citizen.

Many men would find being vice president of the American Woolen Co., a large and successful business, a full-time job; not Charlie Silver.

With indefatigable energy, he pursues a multitude of private charities and benevolent enterprises, of which the most important is to occupy the presidency of Beth Israel Hospital. It gives me pleasure, under leave, to insert in the RECORD the text of an address by Mr. Silver which he delivered to the graduating class of nurses of the School of Nursing, Beth Israel Hospital, on March 8, 1950, and to associate myself with his tribute to the profession of nursing:

Nearly 50 years ago, a great neurologist and writer, Dr. S. Weir Mitchel, who made his home in Philadelphia, came to this city and delivered an address at the graduation exercises of the school of nursing of a hospital. Dr. Mitchel was one of the outstanding physicians of his time and I would like to quote just one statement from his address which, I think, has some relationship to the occasion this evening. He said:

"The better the woman the better the nurse. I want you to feel how noble is the life before you. I foresee for you that, which to me, has been a source of happiness, the satisfaction of work well done, of success where hope seemed dead, the pleasure of watching the return of health, of seeing the rose replace the lily."

Here are expressed thoughts that are timeless. As I was reading this address recently, I could not help wondering how Dr. Mitchel would feel and think and talk if he came back to earth and saw the tremendous and almost incredible strides that have been made in the field of medicine. Perhaps he would have, with his gift for expression, uttered words of exultation and joy that progress has been so sure and rapid.

Tonight, however, we are concerned with the human phase that enters into the conduct of a hospital; we have gathered to mark the attainment of a noble objective by a group of ladies in white. As a writer once said, they are the "supreme servants of humanity."

It has been my privilege to have been associated with Beth Israel over a quarter of a century. And as president of the hospital, I am in a somewhat better position than most people to observe the daily life and activities of this fine institution. I shall never cease to wonder at the powerful forces which combine every hour of the day, every minute of the hour, to give solace and healing to the sick and ailing.

As a layman I am awed by the incredible advances in medical techniques; it is overwhelming to note the almost daily progress that is being made; to read of the miracle drugs, all of which have brought about not only relief from pain and dreadful misery, but also longer life.

But what has always fascinated and enthralled me has been the smooth efficiency of the nurses, their silent devotion to duty, their constant attention of the patient. For no matter how breathtaking has been the advance in medical techniques, the nurse remains an indispensable factor in the work of the hospital. To her both doctor and patient turn for help and consolation. She is at the right hand of the doctor and at the bedside of the patient.

Patients see the doctor at certain intervals, friends of the family visit them at stated hours, but the nurse is with them almost constantly. You become part of their lives at the hospital: You are their friend and companion, you are the one to whom they turn at a moment of pain and anguish when neither the doctor nor the family is with them. You supplement the work of the doctor and the compassionate attention of their families. And it certainly is true that you are the supreme servants of humanity by virtue of your skill and sympathetic understanding.

You who are about to receive your diplomas must realize that there is no blueprint for compassion; there is no chart for understanding and sympathy. The emotions lodged in the human breast are as old as life itself and in going about your work must have the strong inner necessity to come to the aid of fellow humans in distress.

You have seen much suffering and misery while in training; it is not pleasant to see people suffer pain. I am sure that you have not become hardened or callous for I have the feeling that what you have experienced in your training period has challenged you to give the best in you in following through in your chosen career.

We at Beth Israel—and I am sure I reflect the feeling of all who are identified with the hospital—are proud of you and we rejoice with you in the completion of your training period. Your garment of white is the symbol of a noble purpose and the realization of an ideal. For the women in white, and the men in white make up the backbone of a great hospital.

I must say a word of tribute to a lady of great personal charm who is held in deep affection by those in the profession of nursing. I refer to the head of the nursing department, Miss Claire Casey. I want to add that she is not only loved and respected by her immediate associates but by all of us at Beth Israel. It has been my pleasure and privilege to observe her at her work, and I want to say for the record that her competence is beyond praise. She has not only a true conception of her duties, but she has blended this knowledge of techniques with the humane approach to the difficult problems that arise almost hourly.

Tonight, my friends, we are indeed fortunate to have with us Dean McEwen of the Medical School of New York University with which Beth Israel is affiliated. When we received word that Dean McEwen would join us this evening at these exercises, we felt highly pleased and complimented.

It may interest you to know that when he became Dean in 1937, at the age of 35, he was the youngest dean of a medical college in the country. His medical interests, besides medical education in general, are principally arthritis and rheumatic fever. When he was at Rockefeller Institute, I believe he made extensive studies in connection with these diseases.

It is especially appropriate to have Dean McEwen with us because of his deep interest in the profession of nursing. He has been active for many years in helping to improve the standards of nursing and I am sure that under his guidance and advice nursing education has made definite and encouraging strides.

His interest in connection with research in rheumatic diseases has been very keen. Since the introduction of the so-called "wonder drugs," Dean McEwen has manifested an even greater interest in the treatment of arthritis and kindred diseases through the application of these new drugs. Dean McEwen is a credit to the medical profession, but above all is a highly useful and able member of our community.

And a final word of thanks from me to our graduates—not only thanks but a heartfelt wish that the years will bring you the health and happiness to satisfy that inner necessity to help your fellow human beings.

I have attended many graduations in the past, and it is always a genuine pleasure to be present. It gives me great personal satisfaction to know that Beth Israel is contributing, through you, to the well-being of the people of our great city. Congratulations and more power to you.

What Are Taxes Worth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, just now when we have all felt the pinch of the tax gatherer, I think it is well for us to consider why we pay taxes, and what privileges we buy with those payments. Malvina Lindsay discussed this subject in a recent column in the Washington Post. Her discussion is as usual both sparkling and profound. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include her column What Are Taxes Worth? in the RECORD, and call your particular attention to her quotation from the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, that taxes are our "investment in civilization":

WHAT ARE TAXES WORTH?

(By Malvina Lindsay)

THE FATHER'S INVENTORY

Well, here you are again writing a check to support a lot of loafers and grafters—now, now wait. You sound like old Snortle on the bus, always griping about the bunch that's running something—anything. And he works for the Government.

Anyway, you're fed up with taxes and you're going to grouse all you please. Doesn't everybody? Didn't even our faultless forefathers when they grudgingly paid as much as $2 per capita over a period of 8 years to help finance the Revolution and the Continental Congress?

Still, you loathe bellyaching—at least in other persons. Put up or shut up, you think, when you hear the annual March 15 whining. Offer a better system (or a better country) or pay through the nose cheerfully.

Then what about yourself? Are you just vaporously crabbing or do you know where your tax dollar goes?

Oh, yes. Three-fourths to national defense, to pay the costs of past wars, to prepare for or prevent future ones. You think of all the money going directly for armament—weapons, ships, planes, men in uniform—between thirteen and fourteen billion out of a $44,000,000,000 budget; of the twelve billion for veterans' programs and for interest on the war debt; four billion to arm and feed foreign allies; eight hundred million for atomic energy; other millions for minor war costs.

What a change in your tax bill if the world were only at peace—or even without a cold war. But there's nothing you can do about that. Or can you?

You think of all the other calls on your tax dollar, flood control and reclamation, highways, education, research, postal deficit, housing, Government administration, farm price supports—

Ah, that's it. The farmer. Living off your tax dollar. Yet, if the farmer goes broke and can't buy, what happens to your job? You think of the 1920's when business got the lift and the farmer didn't. You think of 1929.

Anyway there are the bureaucrats. They're what's wrong with your tax dollar. They're what keeps your nose to the grindstone. Those loafers. You look at the budget. Their cost is around one thousand two hundred million. A little over 2½ cents out of your tax dollar.

Still it's the penny saved that counts. Why aren't all these things run at less cost? Then there are these income-tax inequities. Why isn't something done about them? Yet what are you doing—except grousing? How much do you know about how your tax dollar's being invested or squandered? Or about who's handling it?

Well, from now on you're going to look into things more. You've as good a right as anybody to do something—nose around, go to tax hearings, call a meeting, circulate a petition, get out a pamphlet, mount a soap box, run for office. That's one thing about this country. Anybody can raise a big fog about anything he doesn't like.

Yes, that is one thing about this country. Maybe, it's one of the biggest things you buy with your tax check.

You've never thought of the other side of it—what you get when you pay taxes. You've always thought of yourself as charitably and nobly bestowing a hand-out on a groveling Uncle Sam. You think of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes—what he said when he heard his young secretary grumbling about a tax bill. "Young man, I like to pay taxes. They're my investment in civilization."

What are you getting out of your investment? At least a lot more than the first taxpayers, the early serfs who had to give everything, including themselves, to the top boss. And more now than taxpayers in most other countries. Certainly more than taxpayers behind iron curtains.

And now it looks as if you were going to be paying big taxes for a long, long time. Even if you and other righteous citizens were to bring about a Utopia of efficiency and economy in Government there'd still be the cold-war world. Still 74 cents out of your dollar on defense.

So maybe it might make things easier in future to have a different attitude toward your taxes. Not to be so pinched in spirit about them. To write your check or open your pocketbook with the grand air of one making an investment in civilization. To think of the order, opportunity, comfort, civilized living, personal freedom they were buying you. Even to feel they might be buying a little more of these things for people everywhere.

ECA and the International Monetary Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a timely address delivered last September by Mr. Eugene R. Black, president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. It has considerable bearing upon a subject which this House will debate within the next week:

ADDRESS BY MR. EUGENE R. BLACK, PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, IN PRESENTING THE FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

This is the third meeting of the Board of Governors that it has been my privilege to attend, and my first as president of the bank.

I am deeply aware of the important responsibilities of this new post, and of the high standards of achievement set by my predecessor, Mr. McCloy. But the sound policies and cooperative relations established under his leadership provide a firm foundation on which we can build the bank's future. I welcome the opportunity to work with you in this task.

The past year has been, I think, a period of substantial progress and accomplishment for the bank. Our activities are summarized at some length in the fourth annual report, and I shall not repeat what is said there. But I do want to touch briefly on a few high spots of our recent operations, and to suggest some possible implications for the bank of broader currents in the world economy.

Most of our loans during the past 12 months have been for projects designed to increase the output of useful goods and services in less developed countries. These development loans make up a considerable total and, as is indicated in the annual report, negotiations for the financing of a number of other development projects are well advanced. But I must say frankly that the volume of development loans granted to date has not come up to our earlier expectations.

This gap between hopes and performance is partly the result of overoptimism about the length of time it would take to get the bank fully organized—to bring together a competent staff, to define our policies and procedures, and make them clear to our member countries, and to gather the economic and technical data necessary for sound decisions. The accumulation of our activity during the past year shows, I think, that this preliminary phase is largely behind us.

More important at present are the difficulties which are more or less universal in underdeveloped countries—the lack of economic data, of experienced personnel, of well-organized projects, of local capital, and all the other deficiencies that are both the cause and the consequence of underdevelopment. It is no accident that the development loans we have made thus far have been mainly to countries where considerable economic and technical advance has already taken place, and to enterprises with a substantial record of experience behind them. The greater the progress a country has already made in development the easier it is for it to progress further; and by the same token it is almost always easier to expand a going concern than to start a new one from scratch.

Yet, the essence of successful economic development, and therefore the essential task of the bank, is precisely to bring new enterprises into being and new techniques into effective use in economically retarded areas—and the more retarded the country the more urgent and challenging is our task.

I believe we have made good progress in overcoming some of the special difficulties of economic development which are analyzed in the annual report. Through missions to most of our less developed member countries we have greatly enlarged our knowledge of their economic problems and needs, their capacity to absorb and service external loans, and the merits of particular development projects. A better understanding now prevails, I think, of the bank's policies and methods; and more and more governments are eliminating legal or procedural obstacles to loans from the bank by taking appropriate action to enable them to incur or guarantee such loans.

Perhaps most important, through our surveys and discussions with member governments, we are better able to assist the less developed countries in diagnosing and solving their own problems. Giving advice is not, of course, our primary function. But we have an immediate and vital concern in trying to promote conditions favorable to the success of our loans and to the increase of productive investment from other sources. I believe that one of the most constructive contributions we can make to the progress of development, especially in the least advanced countries, is to help make available to them the experience of other nations. Moreover, the resulting close and continuous relationship with our members helps to speed up the preparation of development plans and the execution of projects for which bank financing is appropriate.

The initial cultivation of the seeds of development has, therefore, been a somewhat longer task than at first we had hoped. I am confident, however, that we may look forward to an abundant harvest. The first fruits—the loans granted during the past year—are to me the source of considerable satisfaction.

It is also a source of satisfaction that the bank has been able during the past year to make its first loan to one of its members in eastern Europe. The difficulties and uncertainties cited in the third annual report still exist, and have hampered further loans by the bank in this region. But these difficulties have been lessened somewhat by economic developments—notably the increasing availability of manufactured goods in western Europe urgently needed by eastern Europe and the similar availability of essential materials in eastern Europe which are required by the western countries. If these trends continue and political tensions are relaxed, the possibilities for constructive assistance by the bank to its eastern European members should expand considerably.

I am also happy to report that during the past month we have been able to conclude our first loan to one of our Asian member States, and I feel confident that this financing will be followed by other transactions by the bank in that great region of the world. In the Middle East we have not yet consummated any loan, but, as the annual report shows, we have been examining a number of projects in various Middle Eastern countries, some of which I hope will qualify for bank financing in the relatively near future.

On the other side of the balance sheet for the year, I am sorry to say that we have not succeeded to the extent we had hoped in broadening the international character of the financial resources at the disposal of the bank. I refer in particular to our efforts to obtain additional consents to the use in our lending operations of the 18 percent local currency part of the bank's capital. Apart from the United States, which has made the full amount of its 18-percent currency available, some releases have been made by Belgium, Canada, Denmark, and the United Kingdom. They amount in the aggregate, however, to only slightly more than the equivalent of $12,000,000.

In my judgment, it is extremely important that the bank receive greater help from its members in this connection. The strength of the bank is that it is an international cooperative institution. Its ownership, its purposes and its responsibilities are shared by all its member nations. We who are familiar with the bank and its basic concepts appreciate, of course, that the international character of the bank's resources is best demonstrated by the fact that no matter in which capital market the bank may borrow, each member country pledges its credit that the bank will meet its obligations. This real but subtle point unfortunately tends to be overlooked by the world at large and there is an increasing disposition to cite the bank's reliance on dollars for lending purposes as evidence that it has only limited international participation.

My experience has been that the most effective answer to these criticisms is to show that the bank is making use of other resources besides dollars and in particular of the 18-percent currencies of members other than the United States. Accepting the reality that the United States must remain the chief potential source of lending capital for the bank for some time to come, I still believe that it is possible for a number of other member governments to make a substantial amount of their 13-percent capital subscription available for lending.

I do not make this plea for larger releases from the 18-percent subscriptions merely to underline the word international in our title. We have a definite use for these currencies. So long as inconvertibility continues many countries will be able to repay indebtedness in other currencies although they may not be able to service dollar loans.

It is true that most of the countries from which we would like consent to use their 18 percent subscriptions have pressing investment needs at home and are actually net importers of capital. But many of them still invest substantial sums abroad. I do not think I am asking too much if I call on these countries to make a part of their foreign investment through the medium of the bank.

There is another method by which many of our member countries can add to the international character of the bank's resources and that is to increase the eligibility for investment of the bank's bonds. Through legislative or administrative action in a number of countries, a substantial contribution can be made by our members to the creation of a broader market for those bonds. I attach importance to this matter and I propose to discuss it with you in more detail at a later stage of the meeting.

I should like to turn now to a matter much wider in scope than the bank's own operations but which nevertheless profoundly affects the bank and is of vital concern to all the countries represented at this table. I am speaking of the problem of European recovery.

As was foreshadowed in the bank's annual report a year ago, problems of development have increasingly occupied our attention. Since the last Governors' meeting we have made only two small loans to western European countries. Necessarily the principal role in assisting European reconstruction is being played by ECA.

Nevertheless European recovery is of vital importance to the operations of the bank because of the pivotal part played by the great trading nations of Europe in the functioning of the world economy. European purchases and sales abroad have long been a decisive factor in balancing international trade. Unless the European economies can be reestablished on a stable basis the economic position of almost every country, even of those in the dollar area, will be insecure. In passing upon loan applications, whether from countries in Latin America, Asia, the Middle East, or elsewhere, we always come face to face with the necessity for appraising whether the customary trade of these countries with Europe can be reestablished on a satisfactory basis. It is, therefore, no exaggeration to state that the soundness of all our loans is affected by the outcome of the European recovery efforts.

The first objectives of the European recovery program—to expand production and restore financial stability in the participating countries—have been achieved to an impressive extent. But we must face the fact that, though prewar levels of output have been reached and surpassed and though the menace of inflation has been curbed, progress along these lines alone is no longer enough. It has become plain, I think, that the time has now arrived for making fundamental readjustments in present patterns of trade and production. And if these necessary readjustments are to be made successfully, they must

include complementary action by both the European countries and the United States.

So far as concerns the European countries, the most urgent requirement is obviously to sell more of their production abroad, and particularly in dollar markets. In order to accomplish this, many things are necessary—but to my mind the most important are to reduce export costs and to make exports to the dollar area at least as attractive to individual producers as sales either in the domestic market or in other foreign areas.

In my judgment there are several lines of action which must be followed to achieve these objectives. The first, which I need not elaborate before this audience, and which is appropriately dealt with at some length in the annual report of the International Monetary Fund, is the establishment of a system of exchange rates which will assist the dollar-deficit countries to compete effectively in world markets, will furnish an incentive to exporters to increase their sales in the dollar area and will encourage importers to buy, to the extent possible, in countries whose currencies they can best afford. I do not underestimate either the complexities or the far-reaching consequences of such action, but I fail to see how it can be avoided.

The second line of approach must be to reduce the domestic costs of production, both by increasing the efficiency of management and labor and by limiting the burden of indirect costs, principally government expenditures, which must be borne by producers. In most countries the level of productivity has already risen substantially since the war, but they still lag far behind the United States and Canada.

It has been pretty well demonstrated, I think, that productive efficiency cannot be brought about merely through governmental edict or exhortation. To make the most effective use of existing productive facilities, real incentives are required, and perhaps most important, the pressure of competition. To my mind, one of the most essential steps toward solution of the dollar problem is for the dollar-deficit countries to start clearing away the wilderness of bilateral arrangements, special currency controls, quotas and similar restrictions, both internal and external, which have grown up over the past 20 years to protect inefficient production and trade practices. I don't suggest that this can or should be done overnight. The important thing is to begin now to move—and to move rapidly—toward a freer, more competitive exchange of goods.

The problem of reducing the burden of governmental costs on production is a difficult one, particularly susceptible to controversy and misunderstanding. Since World War II many governments have committed themselves to extensive programs of social welfare. No one can dispute their right to follow this course, if they have the means to undertake it. Unfortunately, however, it has become apparent that many countries cannot now afford ambitious programs of social services without either reducing their living standards in other respects or cutting back their productive investments designed to make possible a better standard of living in the future.

In addition to the necessary reduction in costs, it is important that the European countries undertake vigorous, concentrated measures to broaden their market in the United States and Canada. What is required, I believe, is not only the offer of a greater variety of goods adapted to American tastes and priced attractively, but also a wider and more forceful attack on the attention of the American consuming public.

If the European countries take energetic action along these lines in the months ahead, they should with continued ECA aid be able to make additional significant progress toward true recovery. I regard the continuance of ECA aid essential, but I believe it important that the aid should be so allocated as to give the participating countries the greatest possible incentive to pursue this new course of action. However useful the present method of ERP programing has been to date, I think the time has come when it, too, calls for review. I therefore welcome the announcement by Mr. Hoffman that allocation of ECA aid during the second half of the current fiscal year will be directly related to the performance of the participating countries, acting both individually and collectively through the OEEC, in effectively using the aid and realizing the objectives of the recovery program.

Up to the present time assistance from ECA has been allocated primarily on the basis of the anticipated dollar deficit of the respective countries—the largest shares going to those having the biggest deficits. It is true that, in estimating the deficits, it has been assumed that the countries concerned would take effective action to reduce the dollar gap. Nevertheless, the incentive has tended to be a negative one since the greater the gap, the greater the claim for aid, while the smaller the deficit, the less assistance was likely to be anticipated. Furthermore, so long as ECA dollars cannot be saved, but only used for current imports, the ERP countries have difficulty in building up adequate foreign exchange reserves, without which they cannot relax their trade and currency controls or face with confidence the difficult years after 1952.

I know that ECA is fully conscious of this problem and is doing all within its power to encourage the participating countries to carry out the necessary readjustments. I am nevertheless troubled about the situation because I believe that the basic difficulties may not be as readily susceptible of solution if dealt with only within the terms of the powers now available to ECA.

Specifically, I suggest that careful thought be given to the following approach: First, that the share of ECA aid to each participating country be defined as clearly as possible for the remainder of the recovery program, and each country be given assurance that its share will not be reduced if it earns or saves more dollars than had been expected, nor increased if its dollar deficit grows larger; and second, that all restrictions be removed from the use to which ECA dollars may be put so that such dollars will cease to be soft dollars and each country will have the opportunity to make the most economic use of the aid provided.

If this approach should prove feasible, it may have most salutary effects. Each country would know how much dollar aid it could count on and, knowing that no further aid could be anticipated, would be encouraged to husband it carefully. Responsibility would be squarely placed upon the participating nations to take the measures necessary for their own recovery.

I should like to emphasize one further point. Action by the dollar-deficit countries, however soundly conceived and vigorously executed, will not suffice to solve the dollar problem unless the United States takes complementary measures. For despite a rather remarkable shift in the attitude of the United States in recent years, some of its policies are still basically inconsistent with its position as the great creditor nation of the world. Modifications of these policies, like those that are necessary in Europe, may injure particular groups or interests within this country, but in my judgment such modifications are essential both to restore the health of the world economy and to maintain America's own prosperity.

United States tariffs provide the most important case in point. Their over-all level has been greatly reduced since the early thirties, but at certain crucial points they remain a barrier to the import of foreign goods. Moreover, producers in other countries fear, with some justification, that if they should succeed in establishing a market for their goods in the United States, their efforts would be negated by new or higher protective tariffs. Even where the level of duties does not exclude foreign goods, they are frequently kept out by unduly complex customs procedures and regulations.

In addition to tariff barriers there are also a number of other types of restrictions designed to protect American companies against foreign competition, which are hardly consistent with the expressed policy and long-range interests of the United States. In my judgment, it does not make good sense for America to encourage the production of goods for the domestic market which could more economically be imported, and certainly all attempts to use the aid programs as a vehicle for dumping surplus goods abroad should be strongly resisted.

I would like to close on a note of guarded optimism. When rationing stopped after the war, there was a shortage of many classes of goods. In some cases the shortage was so acute as to drive people to extraordinary lengths to obtain the goods they wanted. It is astonishing how quickly some of these acute shortages disappeared when there was a moderately increased flow to the market. To suggest that the dollar shortage can be compared with that of butter would be wishful thinking, but I do believe the world is somewhat in the grip of a shortage psychosis. If only—and it is no small "if"—if only we can start on the way toward equilibrium, we may find the effects of returning confidence highly cumulative and our difficulties dispelled more quickly than we dared hope.

Our Surpluses Meet Europe's Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7797, the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950, was voted out of our committee today, containing the Vorys amendment cutting the ECA appropriation $1,000,000,000 and substituting $1,000,000,000 in surplus agricultural commodities. While everyone knows that we have billions in farm surplus acquired in price-support programs, the question has been raised whether Europe's specific needs could be met by our surpluses.

The following table, furnished by ECA answers this question.

It compares $1,122,900,000 of requested food and agricultural imports from the United States with Commodity Credit Corporation stocks and loans on January 31, 1950. It shows that far more than $1,000,000,000 of surpluses are available now of the precise items needed by Europe; that of the whole $1,122,900,000 listed, all but $3,600,000 of dried fruit can be furnished out of surpluses which will be on hand before the new fiscal year begins, July 1, 1950. Of course, my

[illegible] leaves $1,950,000,000 of appropriations in the bill, of which $396,-[illegible] is programed for food and agricultural products, in addition to the billion furnished in kind.

We can meet Europe's precise needs by using a billion of our surpluses, and still leave plenty of flexibility in the ECA program.

The table follows:

Comparison of CCC stocks and loans, Jan. 31, 1950, with ECA-financed 1950–51 import estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	ECA-financed imports (FAS)	CCC stocks, Jan. 31, 1950 [illegible]		CCC loans, Jan. 31, 1950		Loan due date
Cotton	474.7	614.5		382.5		June 30.
Wheat (and rye)	[illegible]	[1] 382.9	−74.3	585.0		Apr. 30.
Coarse grains	[illegible]	309.7		648.0		Apr. 30–Aug. 31.
Soybeans	[illegible]	[illegible]	−5.1	15.0		May 31.
Linseed and linseed oil	[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]		Apr. 30.
Cheese	5.0	[illegible]				
Peanuts	7.5	[illegible]		17.6		June 1.
Rice	[illegible]	[illegible]				
Wool	7.0	40.1				
Rosin	[illegible]	17.1		12.3		Mar. 31.
Turpentine	1.5	[illegible]	−.5	1.3		Do.
Dried Fruit	[illegible]	[illegible]	−3.6	(2)	−3.6	
Total	1,122.9	1,595.3	−83.5	1,692.2	−3.6	

[1] Jan. 31, 1950, stocks less than estimated ECA-financed requirements for fiscal year 1951.
[2] Jan. 31, 1950, stocks plus loans (if any) less than estimated ECA-financed requirements.

The New York Feis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following remarks:

THE NEW YORK FEIS

Every year during the month of June, millions of Americans have their attention drawn to the Irish feis, which is held by the United Irish Counties Association of New York, Inc., on the beautiful and spacious campus of Fordham University in New York City.

This successful Irish festival has not only become an established cultural event in the hearts and minds of all New Yorkers, but as a result of its success in New York it has also sown its cultural seeds in the form of other similar Irish festivals held annually in the States of Illinois, California, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and New Jersey. These festivals are patterned after the feis of New York. At present, there is located in New York an organization known as the National Feis Council of America, which gives expert advice and guidance to those contemplating the holding of a feis.

A brief outline of the background of the feis in Ireland is necessary at this point. The word "feis" (pronounced fesh) is a Gaelic word meaning festival; entertainment; convention, conference; parliament. Its plural is feisanna.

Historically, the roots of the feis in Ireland extend beyond 1,000 B. C. It was founded by King Ollamh Fodhla at Tara (now in the county Meath), which was then the seat of the Ard-Righ or High King of Ireland. The name Ollamh (pronounced Ollav) in those days meant philosopher; consequently, King Ollamh was known as the sage King of Ireland.

Tara, located near the center of Ireland, witnessed the arrival at the feis of the learned men who lived in Ireland 1,000 years before the coming of the Christian era. These were the kings, poets, philosophers, judges, doctors, antiquaries, bards, scribes, and minstrels who came to compete at the feis of Tara in poetry and literature, law and medicine, history and genealogy, philology and archaeology, musical composition and instrumental music, elocution and story telling, and singing and dancing.

Following the invasion of Ireland by the English in the twelfth century, the feis of Tara was suppressed by the invaders. After seven centuries of such suppression, the feis was revived in many Irish towns and villages. Today, it is held in nearly all of the towns in Ireland and in populous rural areas. The biggest feis of all in Ireland is called the Feis Ceol which is held annually in Dublin.

The feis of Tara had a profound intellectual influence in its time upon the Celtic peoples of Wales, Scotland, and of Brittany in France. The effect of this influence is still felt; for even today, we see the Welsh, Scots, and Bretons participating in the Irish feis at Fordham.

The feis of New York is truly a revival along modern lines of the feis of Tara. It is a cultural institution which brings before the American people the ancient arts, customs, and traditions practiced in Ireland a thousand years or more before the birth of Christ; it is an instrument of good will which transfers a highly desirable cultural legacy to the American people.

Many feisanna, of course, have been held by Irish societies in several parts of the United States throughout the past 100 years; therefore, the modern feis is not a relatively new arrival in America. However, the most successful feis in America is the one that has been organized, developed, and sustained by the United Irish Counties Association of New York; and which is held under its auspices each year at Fordham University in New York City.

The United Irish Counties Association is an organization composed of 32 associations; each bearing the name of one of the historic counties of Ireland. It is nonsectarian, has a membership of over 90,000 dues-paying members, and maintains a full-time headquarters for welfare, educational, and cultural purposes.

The feis of New York has been designed for all Americans. Nothing better can explain this aspect of the feis than the following quotation taken from the foreword of the 1950 feis syllabus, and carried over the signatures of the chairman of the feis committee, James J. Comerford, and of the president of the United Irish Counties Association, Thomas J. Ayers. It says:

"This syllabus, to a great extent, explains itself. It offers over 100 competitions; nearly all of them are traditionally Irish in their origin and growth.

"However, for the benefit of those not fully acquainted with our program, we wish to point out that each competition is open to all Americans.

"A survey of feis prize winners indicates clearly that neither national origin, nor color, nor race, nor creed has ever hindered any of the competitors from winning top honors in their respective competitions on the day of the feis.

"Many persons have contributed to the preparation of this syllabus. Their birthplaces reveal that collectively they reflect a wide geographical sphere of Celtic influence; for Wales, Scotland, Bretagne, as well as Ireland and the United States have provided us with contributors who are well trained and experienced in their respective fields. All are Americans. Yet, each one loves the traditional culture of the Celt."

Like most major, successful cultural events in America, the feis sponsored by the United Irish Counties Association of New York had small beginnings; it went through a relatively long period of planning and experimenting before it actually became that dynamic institution which it is today. Many distinguished Americans, active in Irish societies, contributed to its organization and development.

In August 1933, the first actual step toward the feis was taken by the United Irish Counties Association, when it held a very successful festival in New York. Each year, from then on, the feis grew in scope and in prestige, until it outgrew available facilities for its presentation.

In 1941, the feis moved into Fordham University at the invitation of the Reverend Robert I. Gannon, S. J., president of this world-renowned Jesuit university.

Here the beautiful campus and spacious buildings of Fordham offered ample facilities for the accommodation of the 2,500 competitors and the 35,000 spectators who by 1947 began to participate in this greatest of Irish festivals in America.

On June 18, 1950, the feis of the United Irish Counties Association will be held as usual at Fordham through the generosity of the present president of Fordham University, the Reverend Laurence J. McGinley, S. J., who is honorary chairman of the Feis, and is also a great admirer of its educational potentialities as well as of its cultural gift to Americans.

The 1950 feis syllabus provides for 107 competitions embracing drama, elocution, essays, book reviews, recitations, arts, crafts, costumes, design, music, singing, including operatic and choral, dancing, both solo and figure, and many other events including Gaelic sports. Over 25 percent of the total program has its competitions carried out through the medium of the Gaelic language.

An important aspect about the New York feis is the fact that organizations representing the Celtic peoples of Wales, Scotland, Brittany in France, Isle of Man, and Cornwall send large contingents not only to see the feis but to participate actively in its competitions and exhibitions. Here at the feis on Fordham campus, in a true American way, the Irish, Welsh, Scotch, Bretons, Cornish, and Manx, together with other Americans of many national and racial origins pay a tribute to the ancient culture of the Celt.

The contributions of the Irish feis to the cultural life of America are many. In particular, it can be said that the feis has given to thousands of young Americans, regardless of religion, race, or color a magnificent opportunity to participate as competitors in some of the great and ancient

traditional cultural activities of the Irish people.

Many young Americans now ranking high as famous singers, dancers, musicians and performers in the entertainment field of our time, obtained the first start in their careers through recognition received for their talent after having the attention of talent scouts brought to them by virtue of winning top prizes at the Irish feis.

In addition, the Irish feis of New York together with the numerous feisanna in the several other States have made it possible for hundreds of thousands of Americans to witness the various types of competitions in cultural events whose origin goes back over 3,000 years; and to see for themselves the age-old culture of the Celt being brought forward from the land of the Gael and transplanted in America where it impresses itself upon the customs of Americans with such an effect that eventually it becomes part of the warp and woof of modern American civilization.

However, we must remember that knowledge of the feis is not a relatively recent acquisition by Americans. Its origin was known to them in colonial days. Ezra Stile, president of Yale College in 1777 and one of the learned men of his time in the American Colonies, in a lecture delivered in May 1783 at Hartford, Conn., on the Future Glory of the United States, said in part:

"That great and wise monarch, Ollamh Fodhla, the Alfred of Ireland, 1,000 years before Christ, instituted an annual review and examination of all the achievements and illustrious characters in the realm; and, being approved by himself and the annual assembly of the nobles, he ordered their names and achievements to be enrolled in a public register of merit. This continued 2,000 years, to the time of that illustrious chieftain, Brian Boru.

"This had an amazing effect. By this animation, the heroic, military, and political virtues, with civilization, and I add, science and literature, ascended to an almost unexampled and incredible perfection in Ireland ages before they figured in other parts of Europe, not excepting even Athens and Rome. I have a great opinion of Hibernian merit, literary as well as civil and military, even in the ages before St. Patrick."

The present day Irish feis in America is far removed in space from its Tara site in Ireland and also far removed in time from the year 1,000 B. C. However, its dynamic cultural traditions are much closer in the United States today than we may think. The Feis of Tara still influences many Americans; for its offspring, the Irish feis of New York, affects the cultural environment of many Americans whose ancestors were other than Celtic.

Worth the Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of March 22, 1950:

WORTH THE MONEY

If Congress follows the advice of the House Appropriations Committee almost all Federal agencies will get less spending money than President Truman asked for them.

There is one notable exception—the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The committee says the FBI should have the full $57,400,000 proposed in Mr. Truman's budget, although that will be almost $5,000,000 more than it's spending this fiscal year.

The increase will enable FBI to hire more agents and other employees, and few even among the firmest advocates of economy are likely to object to this particular expansion of bureaucracy.

As the committee observes, "conditions at home and abroad" make it unsafe to save money at the expense of an agency which bears such heavy responsibility for national security.

Of course, Communists and their sympathizers hate the FBI. They call it a "police-state" organization. And, undeniably, in the wrong hands it might become something dangerously like that.

But we believe the FBI has, and deserves, the admiring confidence of most Americans. If so, great credit is due to the character of the man who has been its director for 26 years.

Under J. Edgar Hoover the FBI has won a reputation for high efficiency. More important, it has maintained a reputation for high integrity. He has insisted on keeping it what its name implies—a bureau of investigation, an objective fact finder, not a judge of such things as loyalty, not a state police agency or prosecution or persecution. He understands and practices the true American concept of justice and democratic government.

So we're glad that the FBI's appropriation includes a $4,000 salary increase for Director Hoover, to $20,000 a year. He'll be worth far more than that as long as he heads the FBI, and we hope that will be a long time.

Five-Cent Hike in Natural Gas Would Cost $145,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Five-Cent Hike in Natural Gas Would Cost $145,000,000," which appeared in the March 13, 1950, issue of the League Reporter:

FIVE-CENT HIKE IN NATURAL GAS WOULD COST $145,000,000

What is the natural-gas bill which the Senate will consider soon? Why should you be concerned with it?

The measure seriously would weaken Federal regulation of natural-gas rates. That means only one thing to you: Higher prices for natural gas.

Senator GUY GILLETTE, Democrat, of Iowa, has obtained figures from the Federal Power Commission which show how many millions of dollars are involved in this fight between the people and a handful of wealthy oil companies.

If the Senate approves the House-passed legislation, natural gas companies will be able to increase their rates almost at will. Immediate increases of from 1 to 5 cents for 1,000 cubic feet of gas could be expected.

The American Gas Association estimates that a family heating a two-bedroom home with natural gas in New York State would use about 150,000 cubic feet of gas annually.

Based on 1948 figures, a 5-cent increase would mean that gas bills would go up $6,500,000 each year in Pennsylvania alone. Ohio consumers would have to pay $11,-400,000 more for natural gas than they did in 1948. In Illinois the increase would cost consumers about $4,800,000 yearly.

Throughout the Nation the added cost to natural gas bills would total close to $145,-000,000.

In the past 2 years there has been tremendous expansion of natural-gas lines in New England and the Carolinas. Natural-gas consumption also has increased greatly in the 33 States where it was being used in 1948. So the figures are conservative.

FPC now can regulate the price of natural gas from the time it is taken from the southwestern fields until it reaches your city. To be effective, rate regulation must begin in the fields and continue until you use the gas for heating and cooking.

Natural gas interests want to take from FPC the power to regulate the initial sale of gas from the producer to the pipe-line company. Then all rates could be determined by the prices the big concerns decide to charge in the fields.

Last year 24,000,000 consumers used natural gas. And 33 big companies produced 86 percent of the gas sent over interstate pipe lines.

Are your Senators going to vote for the interests of 24,000,000 Americans or for the interests of 33 large businesses?

The table below shows what 1-cent and 5-cent increases per 1,000 cubic feet would cost the 33 States where natural gas was used in 1948, the last year for which figures are available. The statistics are from the FPC.

[In thousands of dollars]

State	1-cent increase	5-cent increase
Alabama	598	2,988
Arizona	328	1,641
Arkansas	859	4,293
California	4,227	21,137
Colorado	557	2,753
Florida	88	439
Georgia	458	2,288
Illinois	954	4,769
Indiana	389	1,944
Iowa	330	1,508
Kansas	1,504	7,522
Kentucky	268	1,340
Louisiana	2,168	10,842
Maryland	42	212
Michigan	749	3,745
Minnesota	430	2,149
Mississippi	478	2,392
Missouri	731	3,655
Montana	288	1,441
Nebraska	468	2,338
New Mexico	270	1,349
New York	299	1,496
North Dakota	29	145
Ohio	2,288	11,441
Oklahoma	1,469	7,346
Pennsylvania	1,711	8,558
South Dakota	88	440
Tennessee	353	1,766
Texas	5,192	25,959
Utah	222	1,108
Virginia	37	183
West Virginia	811	4,053
Wyoming	213	1,053
Total [1]	28,963	[illegible]

[1] Discrepancies due to rounding.

The State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I

desire to have included the following article by Mr. George Sokolsky appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of March 21, 1950:

THREE DATS

(By George Sokolsky)

Never before has the State Department been attacked as violently as during the past 10 years. The attacks did not begin with Senator McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, nor will they end with his current reports.

The attacks began really in 1933 when we recognized Soviet Russia. They were intensified with the startling Amerasia case, in which 100 files from the State and other departments were found in the offices of this left-wing magazine in which was also situated photographing equipment.

That case was hushed up.

Those interested in the infiltration of the highest level of Government by known Communists, whose party membership could not be proved without their consent, continued to dig into the record. While much was discovered, little could be established, for what these men were engaged in was a conspiracy, internationally directed.

Their trail might be uncovered, but it could not be established by the rules of evidence applicable in a court of law. Only when they fumbled, or when one of them broke from the crowd, and stated facts under oath, was it possible to publish the already known facts.

The principals in this business, such men as George ALLEN, J. Peters, Gerhart Eisler, and others whom even now I cannot name with provable evidence, were clever, trained men.

The most damaging contribution to the subject has thus far been made by John Peurifoy, Deputy Under Secretary of State in charge of administration. His statement should have shocked this Nation.

When Maximilian Harden, the German journalist, called attention to a similar scandal in the Kaiser's court, involving Prince Eulenburg, it shocked and astonished the world.

Yet, in this generation, in the United States, a charge that 91 employees of the State Department were dismissed for being homosexuals passes with little excitement.

Perhaps the reason is that the word, homosexual, is considered bad. It is not the word that is bad; it is the consequences of the deed that lay the individual open to blackmail. He is ashamed; he is frightened; he has become accustomed to secrecy, conspiracy, lying. He is always subject to blackmail.

Mr. Peurifoy said, in giving the figure 91:

"Most of them were homosexuals. In fact, I would say all of them were."

Of course, Mr. Peurifoy withheld the names of these persons and therefore it is not known what positions they held. For instance, if a homosexual held such a position as Under Secretary of State or in a sensitive bureau itself, the menace to the United States would be that if the espionage services of a foreign power or of a world-wide conspiracy got at him, he would have three alternatives:

1. To resign yet to risk exposure. 2. To submit to blackmail and become a spy for a foreign power; or 3, to commit suicide.

I am dealing with this problem not from a moral but from a practical standpoint. There are some persons who excuse the homosexual on the ground that he was born that way. Others become involved in Freudian jargon and explain this phenomenon as due to a variety of causes. From our standpoint, it is merely a question as to whether a person whose conduct lays him open to blackmail is a good security risk.

Now, in all the arguments on the subject, those who defend the State Department and attack Senator McCARTHY raise two points:

1. Our foreign policy has been wrong since 1944 (Teheran) because it was controlled by a foreign power, Soviet Russia. Dean Acheson's speeches in San Francisco must be read as a condemnation of these policies; otherwise they have no meaning.

What part did these homosexuals, subject to blackmail, play in the formulation and conduct of those erroneous policies?

2. Whereas some of the rest of us may be as black at heart as Al Capone, those in the State Department must be as pure in mind and purpose as driven snow, for that Department gathers the data, formulates the policies, lay down the techniques, short of war, for the defense of our country in times of peace and war.

A liar, advantageously stationed; a blackmailed creature in a sensitive spot; a frightened soul, caught in the web of conspiracy, can produce such a result as the conquest of China by Soviet Russia by consent. There is the menace.

Let's Eliminate Waste and Duplication in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, as Congress begins consideration of a $43,000,000,000 budget, we are faced with a deficit which may exceed $5,000,000,000. Only twice since 1932 has this Nation had a balanced budget. How long are we going to continue spending more each year than we collect in taxes?

We have before us the Hoover Commission report, which if adopted, would save from $3,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000 annually simply by reorganizing the National Government and eliminating overlapping functions of the various bureaus and agencies. That amount could be saved, the Commission estimates, simply by eliminating waste and without curtailing any services now rendered by the Government.

There are some 1,800 Government bureaus, divisions, agencies, and commissions—all rushing to and fro on their own projects, knowing or caring little what other agencies of the Government are doing. They are fighting fiercely to protect their jobs, their departments, their red tape and their right to spend the taxpayers' money.

There are 38 different Government agencies that lend money; 16 different Government agencies are engaged in wildlife preservation, 34 agencies are engaged in obtaining land, 10 in Government construction, 9 in credit and finance, 4 in bank examinations, 65 in gathering statistics, 14 in forestry matters, 28 in welfare matters, 12 in home and community planning, and 25 dealing with the Nation's mineral resources.

A farmer wrote a letter to the Department of Agriculture seeking advice on the best type of fertiliser to use on his soil. He received answers from five separate offices in the Department and all the answers were different and contradictory.

The Army tore down a $16,000,000 camp in Alaska and shipped the lumber to Seattle, where it was acquired by the Department of the Interior, which shipped it back to a point less than 10 miles from the original camp site.

The Federal Government owns 848,567 typewriters, or better than 3½ typewriters for every stenographer and typist on the pay roll. Some bureaus and divisions have enough office supplies on hand to last them more than 100 years.

We often hesitate to make any cuts in the national defense budget, yet $7,000,000 annually could be saved if the Army, Navy, and Air Force could agree on uniform underwear for their personnel.

In the past 20 years the cost of the Federal Government has skyrocketed from $28 to $317 per capita. Just think of that. The per capita cost has gone up more than 1,000 percent.

To bring home what a $43,000,000,000 budget means to the people of my own State of Washington, consider this. Washington's State's share of the administration's proposed 1951 budget is $700,243,500. If we put into effect the Hoover Commission recommendations and save $4,000,000,000, it will save the taxpayers of Washington State nearly $100,000,000—nearly $30 saved for every man, woman, and child in the State.

It is time that we acted on the Hoover report—not next week, next month, or next session—but now. Every day we delay millions of dollars are being wasted. I believe some sections of the Hoover report should have further study, but the bulk of its recommendations should be adopted immediately.

We have reached a crisis in Government. If Congress is now unable to put through an honest, widespread, and effective reorganization, they and the taxpayers might as well surrender. If the bureaucrats win again, as they have before, we might as well concede defeat.

But I am convinced that governmental affairs can be conducted on a business-like basis, that we can set up efficient operating systems, eliminate red tape and promptly discharge department heads who put their own interests above those of the taxpayers. If we really want efficiency and economy in Government, now is the time to act.

Macy Asks Probe of Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to set forth in the RECORD a news article from the Washington Star of March 15, 1950, in connection with the introduction of House Resolution 509 by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACY]:

MACY ASKS SPECIAL HOUSE UNIT TO PROBE UNITED STATES ORGANIZED CRIME

(By Robert K. Walsh)

Representative MACY, advocating complete investigation of organized crime, believes Congress must meet the challenge of rackets that take in three times as much money as the Government now gives in foreign aid.

The New York Republican yesterday introduced a House resolution for a seven-member House committee to probe criminal activities on a country-wide basis.

But, he said today, he seeks neither glory nor more work for himself. He declared he "would be perfectly willing to suppress myself" in order to get immediate congressional action.

A somewhat similar Senate resolution, sponsored by Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, won Senate Judiciary Committee approval February 28. It has been in the Rules Committee since then. On a comparatively limited scale, a House District Subcommittee headed by Representative DAVIS, Democrat, of Georgia, is looking into crime, punishment and enforcement methods in the District.

NEW RESOLUTION SEEMED

"I have been planning for a long time to propose a congressional investigation," Mr. MACY explained. "I withheld my resolution in the hope that the Senate resolution would make progress. I finally decided to put mine in, and I hope it will stimulate action all along the line, especially since mine is broader than the Senate measure."

Disavowing pride of authorship, and denying partisan motives, the 51-year-old legislator said he would have no objection if his resolution finally wound up with Senator KEFAUVER's to make a joint congressional committee investigation.

Prominence in investigative activities, however, would be nothing new to Mr. MACY, a former New York State legislator. More than 20 years ago he took a leading part in an investigation of the New York State Banking Department. Disclosures led to conviction and imprisonment of the then superintendent of banking.

A few years later, Mr. MACY joined in the Seabury inquiry that resulted in the resignation of the late Mayor James J. Walker.

One of his major assignments since he came to Congress in 1947 was to head a House Public Works Subcommittee that last year investigated a reported gray market in automobiles and steel.

Although not a lawyer, Mr. MACY is especially interested in law enforcement aspects that would be examined by the investigating committee he proposes.

"Naturally the subject of law enforcement would be an important phase of any thorough investigation of organized crime throughout the United States," he said. "I said many years ago in New York, and I still say, that it's not enough to make laws. If laws can't be enforced, they aren't worth enacting.

"Legislative bodies have a duty not only to make good laws but to look closely from time to time to see if they are enforced and if they can be enforced."

The Macy resolution would authorize the speaker to appoint a special committee of seven Representatives with power to hold public hearings, hire expert assistance, subpena witnesses and records, and recommend possible changes to tighten Federal laws.

BITTER KILLING TERRIFY

Associates of Mr. MACY estimated that at least $100,000 would be necessary to assure an adequate investigation. Mr. MACY himself set no figure in his bill, but he remarked today:

"We have been told repeatedly that organized rackets, crime syndicates, and other criminal operations in interstate activities alone are costing the American people and the Government something like $15,000,000,000. That is three times the amount we are giving to help foreign countries. Surely, it is more necessary than ever at this time to try to cut down at least a part of the heavy cost of crime."

And from a Federal Treasury standpoint, he added, a comprehensive, hard-hitting congressional investigation of organized crime should sharply reduce tax evasion and hidden profits.

Others supporting the Macy resolution said they believed a prime purpose of the committee would be to find out who gets the big pay-offs for big-time crime and who really supports huge rackets.

The Kefauver resolution, as enlarged by the Senate Judiciary Committee last month, would allot $100,000 for an investigating committee project. Originally the resolution centered largely on an investigation of interstate gambling operations.

It now would also cover interstate prostitution, narcotics, loan-shark rackets, swindling schemes, organized murder and extortion, and preying on legitimate business and labor.

Address of Hon. Brendan Corish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Mr. Brendan Corish, parliamentary secretary to the Minister for Local Government of the Republic of Ireland, at the annual St. Patrick's Day banquet of the Irish American Association, Panthervalley, Pa., March 16, 1950:

Before commencing my address to you tonight, I feel I must tell you what an honor it is to me to be here as your guest. The warmth and friendliness of the atmosphere in which I find myself almost wipes out the distance that lies between us and Ireland, for here is Irish hospitality, here are Irish people, and here I am among friends. On this eve of the feast of St. Patrick it is no wonder that distances should lessen, that ties of friendship should be stronger, and that Ireland should be seen, not as a small island but as a shining thread of green woven through the tapestry of the great nations. I feel this more strongly because, as one of the younger generation, it had not yet been impressed on me how strong is our "Nation beyond the seas." I knew the help that had always come to us at home whenever it was needed. I know how unfailingly the great weight of the influence of the Irish in America has always been thrown behind the cause of Irish freedom and how in the continuance of that influence there lies one of our greatest hopes for eventual unity. But it is not until now, when I am among you, that I realize to the full how closely you are bound to the motherland by a thousand links that can never be broken. I am here firstly as a member of the Irish Government. In that capacity it is my pleasant duty to bring you their greetings and those of the people of Ireland. No more welcome duty could ever be given to me. I must, however, as a member of the Irish Labor Party, add to it a special greeting to the forces of organized labor which I know to be in this district. Even in this we are in your debt. It is not yet 6 months since American organized labor came to the fore with a forthright statement on Ireland's claim to unity. The passing of a resolution at the annual conventions of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations condemning the partition of our country and calling upon the President, the State Department, and the Congress of the United States to do all in their power to end it is still fresh in our minds and is evidence of the burning desire for justice which is always to be found among the working men and women of the great democracies. Representing as they do over 14,000,000 American workers, the gesture of these two great organizations has been one of the features of the relations between the two countries during the past year.

Significant too has been the action of the State Department in raising the status of their representation in Ireland to that of an embassy. It has long been felt, and we are proud that it has been finally acknowledged, that the special ties between the two countries call for the highest diplomatic representation that can be accorded.

If I were asked then my impression of how it is with the Irish in America I should not hesitate to say, "It is well." Everything I have seen since I arrived here serves to confirm that impression. You may ask me in return, "How is it with them at home?" and my answer would be the same. Ireland, like many another small nation, has vast problems before her today—problems of reconstruction, of economic recovery, of nation-wide improvement. But the existence of such problems does not mean that we have admitted their presence and failed to tackle them. With unity of purpose and with faith in our ability we have set about their solution. Here again the ever-present help of America is evident. The loans made available by Marshall aid under the Economic Cooperation Administration have helped us in a great industrial and agricultural drive to bridge the dollar gap which yawns between us and prosperity. Our investments abroad are being called home and placed in sound schemes for the development of the country. A vast land rehabilitation program is in course of operation—for we realize that we are primarily an agricultural country and that in a healthy soil and a careful and skilled agricultural economy lies our surest guaranty of future prosperity. Land drainage, reafforestation, turf development—all are part of the over-all scheme of improvement.

As far as is possible we are developing our industrial resources, particularly in those spheres in which our excellence is acknowledged. Our tourist trade, the most valuable of our dollar-earning industries, is gradually assuming more satisfying proportions and, what is more important to those of you who, we hope, will come and visit Ireland, more satisfying standards of excellence. Housing for our people is being provided in a vast housing scheme, and our hospital system, always a source of pride to us, is being enlarged and expanded by the provision of new modern sanatoria in several parts of the country. The life of the rural worker will, it is hoped, be lightened by the system of rural electrification which has been planned and which has already begun to operate in some places. I could continue to give you examples of the various avenues into which the energies of the people have been directed, but suffice it to say that they are all part of an over-all pattern of energy, of new life, and of concentrated effort. Ireland is building, Ireland is developing, but, above all, Ireland is working. We are content to be so. As a race we have never shirked our duty; we have never sought to avoid honest toil when it was for the benefit of our people and our country, and the Ireland of 1950 is determined to prove no less worthy of respect and honor than the Ireland of other generations.

We are facing our problems, and we think we are achieving a large measure of success. In this again I repeat that we owe a vast debt of gratitude to your Government and to the broad statesmanlike plan which made available at a crucial time the aid which

Europe needed. We can repay the debt in kind, but we can never repay sufficiently in warmth of feeling or in gratitude what we owe to you.

There is one problem, however, which remains before us as a challenge to our endeavors. For 30 years it has been the main object of every national effort, for 30 years we have striven to find a solution for it—and today we can only hope that the great desire for peace in the world will soon help us to solve it. You know what the problem is before I mention it—it is the division of our country. Today, as never before, the light of publicity has at least begun to make this problem one in which all peace-loving nations should concern themselves. It is difficult, I know, for us to realize this, to many people the facts of the case have never been presented. If we are to succeed we must make the problem known, we must give the facts to the world and determine that justice shall be brought about finally.

The history of partition and its accomplishment and the story of its maintenance is a sad and sordid one. Nowhere in her long history does the perfidy of Britain show clearer than in her relationship with Ireland and nowhere in that relationship is the evidence more damning than in the story of partition.

If I ask you to examine that evidence it is not with any spirit of rancour and bitterness; it is, rather, to secure that you will continue to play your part now, as ever, to remove any cause of quarrel between Britain and Ireland and so aid the solution of a problem, which we feel is vital to world peace. Claims have been made by Britain that partition is an Irish problem but we maintain that Britain created partition, is responsible for its maintenance and has a responsibility to the world to secure its early removal.

In 1920, in defiance of the wishes of the elected representatives of the Irish Nation, an act of the British Parliament imposed partition and divided the six northeastern counties from the rest of Ireland. No Irishman voted for the partitioning act. The area thus cut off from the remainder had no basis in history, or geography. It was so designed that a majority could be found therein, who were opposed to home rule for Ireland and who since have been prepared to defy the will of the vast majority of the nation for a United Ireland. A boundary was drawn between the six counties and their southern brethren and this boundary has since been manned by British customs officers. Meanwhile, in the 26 counties, control of affairs passed into the hands of Irishmen and successive governments proceeded to take steps to remove, step by step any constitutional limitations on their sovereignty—at one and the same time repugnant to Irish national sentiment and a bar to good relations with Great Britain. The bringing into operation of the Republic Act, 1949, last year marked the last step in that phase and left only one bar to true friendship with Britain—partition. On Easter Monday 1949, the Irish Nation rejoiced in seeing for the first time an Irish Republic internationally recognized. A partial rejoicing it must be admitted, for there remained yet one final step in the road to the achievement of its national objective, the reunion under its national flag of its fellow countrymen in the six northeastern counties. On that day the Irish Republic took its formal place among the nations of the world, sent world-wide messages of good will, and called on the world to assist in the removal of the last barrier to true friendship with Great Britain. Alas, in May 1949, the latter took a step, which can only be regarded as a measure of ill will. In that month the British House of Commons under a Labor government passed the Ireland Act, which contained a clause injurious to the heart of any true Irishman, handing over the right to decide the destiny of the area, known as Northern Ireland to the Northern Ireland Parliament for decision. No time was lost in voicing the protest of Ireland against this flagrant violation of democratic rule. Both Houses of Parliament met in special assembly, registered a protest in no uncertain terms and called on the British Government and people to end the present occupation of our six northeastern counties, and thereby enable the unity of Ireland to be restored and the age-long differences between the two countries brought to an end.

We regret sincerely that such an element should have been introduced into our relations with Britain. It adds to our sorrow when we recall that at the time of the imposition of partition the members of the party, who introduced and secured the passage of the Ireland Act, pledged themselves at the time to recognize fully Ireland's right to decide her own destiny as one nation. By the passage of that act one further chapter was added to the wrongs committed by Britain toward our nation and a flagrant violation of the democratic ideal! Irishmen cannot be blamed for feeling that Britain by that step has no true feeling for the democratic ideal when one considers the history of the Parliament to which she has committed the destiny of six counties of our national territory.

Is it not ironical to recall that as a result of the recent elections for the British Parliament 10 out of 12 representatives from the sundered area of Northern Ireland threaten the majority of the British Government, which passed the Ireland Act?

I have already referred to the area of jurisdiction of that Parliament, showing that it was deliberately designed that a majority could be found therein opposed at the time to the idea of home rule for Ireland and who have since ranged themselves as opposed to the unity of Ireland. Facts and figures as regard subsequent elections to it have demonstrated the success of its author's designs under a system of election, contrary to any democratic principle, the Tory party has always succeeded over an area, comprising one-third of the total area, of securing a majority even against the will of the people of the remaining two-thirds. By a process of gerrymandering worthy of any totalitarian state, large areas with a majority in favor of Ireland's unity have been deprived of representation in the Parliament, which under Britain's latest law, is to decide the destiny of the territory. Derry City, one of the oldest in the motherland, has 29,000 to 18,000 in favor of unity of the country. To deny representation to that majority in Parliament the city electoral division was rearranged. Part of the city was omitted altogether. Then the city boundaries, for Parliamentary elections only, were stretched 3 miles into the country to gather enough opposing votes to eclipse the will of the majority in the city as regards representation in Parliament.

Fired with repugnance for such a system and such examples of the violation of the democratic ideal, the vast majority of the motherland appeal to the sons and daughters all over the world to help them to bring this unhappy state of affairs to an end. It does so in no spirit of hostility to those of our fellow countrymen in its separated counties who are opposed to the ideal of a 32-county republic. On the contrary, our spokesmen have several times declared that we are prepared to afford them any constitutional guarantee that may be reasonably required to allay any fears, real or imaginary, that they may have. We recognize their finer qualities, such as doggedness, firm purpose and industry, and yearn for the time that these qualities will be brought to play under the banner of a 32-county Republic of Ireland. We in the liberated part of the motherland can point to a fine tradition of liberty, toleration, and respect for the human person among all sections of our people.

Accordingly we call on the citizens of this great democracy of yours, a democracy which has met and surmounted the ugly threat of partition, to assist us in our great task and we know that all sons and daughters of the motherland in this great country will do their utmost to insure that a 32-county republic of Ireland, united in territory and bonds of good will, will take its place among the nations of the world.

A Congressional Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Tuesday, March 21, 1950:

A CONGRESSIONAL BLUNDER

In one of those acts of impromptu statesmanship that occasionally crop up in Congress, the House Foreign Affairs Committee voted yesterday to slash cash funds for the third Marshall plan year by a round billion dollars and to substitute an equivalent amount in American farm surplus commodities. The administration has asked for new authorization of $2,950,000,000 as an absolute minimum needed to continue the Marshall plan in full effectiveness. But the House committee decided to disregard this request, as well as all objections to its own plan, and by a vote that cut across party lines adopted a proposal by Republican Representative VORYS, of Ohio, which would reduce actual Marshall plan funds to $1,950,000,000 and authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to supply $1,000,000,000 worth of agricultural surplus goods as required.

No doubt Representative VORYS and the committee majority are inclined to regard their action as a clever piece of work. They are presumably prepared to claim credit simultaneously for a billion-dollar reduction in a deficit budget and for facilitating the disposal of American farm surpluses now carried by the Government at a cost of four billions. Both the budget deficit and the farm surpluses pose serious problems, but the committee's way is not the way to solve them. For, as Representative KEE, the chairman of the committee, warned, the VORYS plan, if adopted, would be certain to have a crippling effect both on the European recovery program and on the administration's farm support program, in which both parties have an interest.

It is bound to have a crippling effect on the European recovery program, because that program is not a relief program, as the committee majority seems to think, but a reconstruction program in which the supply of American food has been decreasing steadily in favor of raw materials, semifinished goods, and machinery to increase Europe's own productive ability. As a result, not only has western Europe's industrial production risen considerably above prewar levels but its agricultural production has also recovered so thoroughly that in some countries and some items the problem may soon be one of food surpluses. It is the present purpose of the Marshall plan to enable Europe to continue its recovery and to put itself in shape to sustain the new productive levels by its own strength, through an integration which would break down trade barriers and enable the surpluses of individual nations to move across present frontiers to areas where they may be needed.

The House committee now proposes to interrupt this process by methods which would not only imperil the results attained but also give a semblance of justification to the charges of our opponents that the Marshall plan is merely a vast program for subsidizing our own production at the expense of those we profess to aid. Communists everywhere could be depended upon to exploit to the utmost this misrepresentation of our aims.

As for the farm surpluses, it will be noted that the Economic Cooperation Administration has supplemented the Government support program by buying foods in the open market and usually at lower prices than paid by the Government under the parity principle. The committee's action would thus merely foist upon ECA commodities at higher prices than it has paid before—a maneuver that would increase the dollar gap which the Marshall plan is supposed to bridge, while at the same time forcing the Government to buy that much more in its support program at an additional expense to the taxpayers. Even as a farm-support measure, therefore, the VORYS plan is of more than doubtful value. Its enactment would be both a poor economy and a formidable blow to our whole foreign policy, giving aid and comfort to our opponents in the cold war. It must be hoped that either the committee or the House as a whole will reconsider this action and correct a blunder that could have serious consequences.

Television Revolution Will Be Digested, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting editorial resolves the currently much-discussed problem of television, children, and school or home work. Because of its timeliness, I commend it to my colleagues. May I also, Mr. Speaker, mention my opposition to an imposition of a tax on television sets now under consideration by the Ways and Means Committee to offset some wartime taxes that should be removed. The television industry in its infancy needs encouragement, not a tax burden to retard the progress.

The editorial, from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Sunday Herald of March 19, 1950, follows:

TELEVISION REVOLUTION WILL BE DIGESTED, TOO

The capacity of the American parent to be surprised and concerned over the activities of his offspring is exceeded only by the capacity of the American genius to provide newer and more stimulating things for that offspring to do.

Radio, the movies, comic books—all have had their day with the small fry, and all have taken their turn at being lambasted by parents and educators as pernicious influences on the young.

And years ago, before the advent of these modern delights, even the good books that are now esteemed so highly because fewer and fewer children read them, were the object of plenty of parental exaltation. In his time, the lad who kept his nose in a book to the exclusion of other interests, including home work, was the object of parental concern even as is today's devotee of Howdy Doody.

Now it's television's turn. All of a sudden everybody is concerned over the number of hours the kids spend before the screen. A survey of television habits among junior high school students in Stamford last week seems to have touched off a small explosion and, to mix a metaphor, everybody's getting into the act.

Why the results of the survey should be as surprising to so many is in itself matter for surprise. It should have been perfectly obvious from the time the first program appeared on the first television set that here was an innovation that was going to turn American family life upside down.

Moreover, results of surveys made so far, including the one in Stamford, have not attempted to correlate scholastic standing with television watching.

The kids claim that television doesn't interfere with homework, except in a few honest instances. And until such times as it has been proved that there is a definite relationship between slipping grades and increased video viewing, why become alarmed over a phenomenon that is only demonstrating the charm of novelty in the usual fashion?

While television is new and wonderful, practically everyone spends most of his free time watching it. And children, the least selective of enthusiasts, spend more time than anybody else, in part because they have more free time.

But those who have had television sets in their homes long enough for the novelty to wear off, report that in time television takes its place as only another adjunct to a full life. Selectivity returns, even to children, and the youngster who once would not have missed a radio mystery story only to become colossally indifferent to it after the arrival of the television set, finds that after a time Howdy Doody palls and even Milton Berle is much the same.

And at that point, he may even read a book.—N. H.

Near Eastern Armaments Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1950, I inserted in the RECORD a copy of my letter to the Secretary of State, in which I protested the participation by the United States in the arms race in the Middle East. I have since received a reply from the Secretary, which is not a satisfactory explanation of the role being played by us in the Middle East, nor does it assuage my fears for the security of Israel. I do not intend to wait until a shooting war starts before we take action.

If the rearmament of the Arab states is truly for defense purposes against aggressor nations, then certainly Israel is an important ally and should be included in the defense plans.

Because of the widespread interest in this crisis, I am including in the RECORD the letter sent me by the Secretary of State on March 13, and my answer:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 13, 1950.

The Honorable ISIDORE DOLLINGER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DOLLINGER: I acknowledge the receipt of your letter of March 7 concerning the near-eastern armaments situation. Since you have been following this matter closely, you are aware of the great importance which this Government attaches to the question of the establishment of peace and the maintenance of stability in the Near East, and of the Department's desire not to see an arms race take place in the area. I need not reiterate here those elements underlying the United States Government's position on the problem which were set forth in the Secretary's letter to Representative JAVITS, since you are doubtless familiar with the contents of that communication.

In considering the situation, it is useful to recall that on August 11 the Security Council, in view of the cessation of hostilities in the Near East and the tranquil conditions existing there, lifted the embargo which it had placed upon the shipment of arms to the Palestine area. In deciding thus, the Council took into consideration the important fact that the relations between Israel and the neighboring Arab States are governed by valid armistice agreements, under the terms of which the parties are committed not to resort to hostilities. The execution of the provisions of these agreements is being effectively supervised on the spot in Palestine by United Nations observers. It is a matter of satisfaction that these observers report that the situation in Palestine continues tranquil and that no serious preparations are being made to resume hostilities. Should a threat to the peace arise in the area, it would be the duty of the United Nations observers on the scene, or of the states themselves, to report this development to the Security Council, the body which remains seized of the matter of the preservation of peace in Palestine.

An analysis of reports and information available to the Department leads to the conclusion, I am glad to say, that the trend in the Palestine area is away from war towards peace. Indications of this trend are the peace talks reportedly taking place between Israel and Jordan, various recent high level official Arab declarations categorically denying any intention of resuming hostilities in Palestine, the recent lifting by Egypt of restrictions involving foreigners whose passports bear Israeli visas, the agreement signed between Israeli and Egyptian representatives on February 22 involving the disposition of certain no-man's-land areas near the Gaza region, and a recent agreement between Jordan and Israel limiting the heavy arms to be located on the armistice lines between the two countries. The Department considers these developments encouraging and believes they represent a hopeful change in the previous attitude of the Arab States toward reaching agreements involving Israel. In connection with the general attitude of the Arabs and Israelis toward one another, it should be recalled that passions were raised to a high pitch during the Palestine conflict, and that a relatively short time has passed since the hostilities ended.

At the time the Security Council lifted the Palestine arms embargo, the United States and Great Britain stated that they did not wish to see an arms race develop in the Near East. The United States stands by this policy, and has been permitting the exportation to both the Arab States and Israel of military equipment which has been considered necessary for the maintenance of internal order and to provide for legitimate defense requirements. The United States will continue to receive applications from

all governments in the Near East for the exportation of military equipment and will consider these applications within the framework of the above policy.

The United Kingdom, which to the best of the Department's knowledge is guided in its near-eastern arms export policy by the same general principles as those underlying American policy, has been supplying to certain Arab states, notably those with which it has treaty arrangements, military material to enable them to provide for defense needs. You will be interested to learn that the mutual defense assistance program for the fiscal year 1950 does not provide to the United Kingdom any items of the kinds being furnished to Arab states. Neither does the mutual defense assistance program furnish to the United Kingdom replacement items for items thus supplied by the United Kingdom.

With respect to your reference to the release by the Department of news concerning the recent Israeli note on Israel's arms requirements, I can assure you that the Department had no intention of making public the Israeli request. However, the Department has no choice but to confirm the receipt of the note after correspondents learned from sources outside the Department that it had been sent.

You will be interested to learn that it had been previously agreed with the Ambassador of Israel that, if questioned by the press, the Department and the Israeli Embassy would confine their comments to a confirmation that the Israeli request had been made.

I assure you that the Department will continue to keep very careful watch on developments affecting the Palestine situation and that should information be received indicating that serious measures were being taken in preparation for the resumption of hostilities in the Near East, the United States Government would be quick to use all of its influence in an attempt to frustrate such plans. Happily, as I have said, the present trend in the area seems to be toward conditions of peace and stability.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

MARCH 21, 1950.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: This will acknowledge your letter of March 13, in reply to mine of March 7, in which I protested the participation by the United States in the arms race in the Middle East, to the detriment of Israel.

Your reply does not give me the feeling of complacency that you intended, nor do I consider it a fitting explanation of the role being played by the United States in the Middle East at this time.

In your reply, you acknowledge the vast shipments of arms by Great Britain to the Arab States, and imply that this heavy rearming of the Arab States has the approval of our State Department. You discount any ensuing danger to Israel by saying that the present trend in the Middle East is away from war toward peace.

In my opinion, the State Department takes too bright a view of the situation, and I cannot share its optimism. It chooses to believe that the existing armistice agreements will be lived up to by the Arab States, and therefore, there is no danger of a renewed attack upon Israel. This in blind faith, when we consider the threats being made by Arab statesmen, press, and radio, that they are looking forward to the "second round" against Israel, and that there will be a war of revenge. In reality—there is a smoldering resentment toward Israel, which at any moment can burst into the flame of war. What assurances are there that the threats constantly being made by Arab States will not be carried out?

You state that the United Kingdom has been supplying military material to the Arab States to enable them to provide for defense needs. As I pointed out to you in my letter of the 7th, the military supplies and money being furnished the Arab States are far beyond the amounts necessary for ordinary defense purposes in peacetime. They are so far beyond normal needs that they constitute an invitation to conquest by the disgruntled losers, of their less prepared intended victim—Israel.

When you say: "Should a threat to the peace arise, it would be the duty of the United Nations observers to report the matter to the Security Council, the body which remains seized of the matter of the preservation of peace in Palestine"—you state an interesting fact. But, Mr. Secretary, by then the shooting war would be under way; bloodshed would have begun; Israel, not equipped for war by great nations in the meantime, would be put to another supreme test to preserve her liberty. This is what we do not want, this is what must be avoided.

Again I repeat—Israel wants peace. If her bitter and sworn enemies are to be armed by Britain, and indirectly by the United States, then in all fairness, Israel must be given the opportunity to acquire arms to the extent that a balance of arms will be established between her and the Arab States. If it is true that the rearmament of the Arab States is based upon a policy of security for the Middle East against possible invasion by a third power, then Israel should be equally included with every other nation, in that policy. In fact, if the eastern Mediterranean is considered so important in our world plans, Israel must also be a link in the chain, as strong as any other. Israel is a new nation, recognized by us and included in the United Nations. Therefore, it is our duty to treat Israel accordingly, and to give her the same consideration as any other nation, in defense plans.

Our aim is to preserve peace. On this ground, we can insist that Britain strengthen Israel as well as the Arab States if she persists in her present program which she calls defense. If this fails, it is our duty to give Israel all the help she needs to make her equally strong with the Arab States. But we must take a stand, and let it be known that the security of Israel is our concern; that we respect Israel's national integrity and expect other nations to do the same. If we continue with our do-nothing policy, we break faith with Israel and the world.

I urge again that the State Department fulfill its obligations under the authority vested in it, to take all necessary steps to avert the threatened war in the Middle East, and to give Israel the support to which she is entitled.

I, and all others interested in the preservation of the peace, and our integrity as a leading nation of the world, await your reply.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES DOLLINGER,
Member of Congress.

Revision of the Tax Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Monday, March 20, 1950:

COUDERT TO ASK NONPARTISAN STUDY OF TAXES—SEEKS SWEEPING REVISION, DECLARES ENCROACHMENTS THREATEN AMERICAN SYSTEM

(By Tom O'Hara)

Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., of the Seventeenth Congressional District, said yesterday in an interview that he will introduce this week in the House a resolution calling for a nonpartisan commission to study and recommend a sweeping plan to revise the Federal tax structure.

The plan, Mr. COUDERT said, will serve to carry out the recommendation of the section on the national economy in the declaration of policy of the Republican Party as adopted last February 5 and to push the same idea as recommended by the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch, headed by former President Herbert Hoover.

"If we continue to go on as we are at present," Mr. COUDERT said of the mounting Federal encroachment in the field of taxes, "then the whole system of life in the United States will go overboard, the Federal Union will disappear, and we will inevitably break the treasury of the States and the Nation and have some sort of totalitarian set-up."

URGES STATES' TAX RIGHTS

Of necessity, Mr. COUDERT said, any study of the Federal tax structure must include the relation of it to the State and local governments. "Someone must get the ball rolling," he observed, "and I'd like to start it." He especially urged that the States should regain their right to certain taxes to erase a drain of some $5,000,000,000 now lost because so much handling is involved before the Federal tax moneys finally arrive back in local communities.

In the current Federal budget some $2,420,000,000 was handed back to the States and for the coming fiscal year some $3,265,000,000 will be given back, Mr. COUDERT said, and yet the total income of all the States was $7,000,000,000, indicating the Federal control over the State economies.

In 1948, he continued, the Federal Government took $600,000,000 in gasoline and oil taxes and yet only $315,000,000 of it came back to the States. The question was, he said, "Where did the money go?" New York State, he said, gave $100,000,000 in admission taxes on amusements to the Federal Government which took in a total of $509,000,000 in that category, a total more than enough to take care of the $300,000,000 Federal plan for Federal aid-to-education, a program which he said could best be done by the States.

FAVORS LOCAL CONTROLS

The chief virtue of returning taxes and therefore government functions to the States, he said, was that services performed locally under the eye of the voter and the taxpayer, and under local supervision are bound to be more effectively administered.

"The surest way to socialism," he warned, "is excessive expenditure and destructive taxation."

Mr. COUDERT said taxes are not dramatic but they are of vital importance to the domestic situation, and a good domestic situation determines the strength of the Nation in its dealings abroad. Enough public interest, he said, would force Congress to act, particularly on a nonpartisan basis.

Under the present administration, he said, nothing is done to aid business and industrial expansion, such as by reduction in taxes or diversion of taxing powers to the States to reduce costs. Nevertheless, the corollary is true that some 750,000 new potential wage earners enter the labor market each year and no place can be found for them in production.

Middle-Income Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith the following statement from the national housing director of the American Veterans Committee in regard to the middle-income housing bill:

MARCH 20, 1950.

The Honorable CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE,
Congresswoman from Connecticut,
House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. WOODHOUSE: In common cause with all other major veterans organizations, the American Veterans Committee (AVC) has warmly endorsed the provisions of the Housing Act of 1950 relating to middle-income housing.

Charges made that this legislation discriminates against the veteran are completely without foundation on fact. Statistically, a greater proportion of veterans of World War II are in the middle-income group, as defined by current legislation, than any other major segment of our population. Veterans stand to gain more proportionately from this legislation than any other group. Every year this legislation is delayed will cut into the ability of veterans to obtain benefits from it. In addition, veterans are widely organized in social groups that easily lend themselves to setting up bona fide housing cooperatives or nonprofit corporations.

We sincerely trust that the middle-income housing provisions are adopted by the House of Representatives as an essential step toward the elimination of the current housing shortage.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. HAWKINS,
National Housing Director, American Veterans Committee.

Lawyer's Reference Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the editor of the New Orleans States, Mr. W. H. Fitzpatrick, on his editorial of March 13 entitled "A Way To Beat Socialized Law," which I am incorporating herein.

The editor commends a constructive program of the American Bar Association which seeks to meet a definite need. His approach is affirmative. Agitation for Government programs seldom arises without some need or some abuse.

By recognizing such needs through intelligent action the pressure for Government intervention dies a-borning and the good are not punished with the bad as so often happens in reform measures adopted as a result of public demand.

The editorial follows:

LAWYER'S REFERENCE PLAN—A WAY TO BEAT SOCIALIZED LAW

The legal profession in many places has begun a far-seeing service to eliminate any possible need for socialized law. The medical profession, coping with its problem of possible socialization, could profit from a clinical study of what the lawyers are doing.

Sponsored by the American Bar Association, the service being initiated by many local bar associations is called the lawyer-reference plan. It seeks to make available to persons of moderate means legal advice and services at fees stipulated in advance. The leaders of the plan feel that the profession ought to supply such aid, and feel that if it is not done adequately and promptly by private initiative, a demand may arise for Government services similar to the demand faced by the medical profession.

As outlined by the president of the American Bar Association in an article reprinted by this newspaper Saturday, the plan works like this: The local bar association sets up a reference list of lawyers who wish to participate in the plan. A person of moderate means who feels the need of legal service goes to the association's headquarters, pays a small registration fee, consults with an experienced attorney in charge of the list, and then is sent by the consultant to an appropriate listed attorney. The listed lawyers agree to charge a flat fee, usually $3 or $5, for the first conference. Any other fees for further work are discussed before the work is done. Consequently, costs to the client are known in advance.

For developing the lawyer-reference plan, the legal profession deserves praise. The move represents the sort of initiative that characterizes the American way of doing things. It's an example of individual men, not government, working out a solution to the problems that give rise to socialization. The plan provides needed public service and at the same time preserves professional independence. The State and city bar associations here would do well to adopt this plan.

In contrast, the situation in the medical profession—as described by its own members—seems to lack the planned approach being taken by the lawyers. A view of the medical profession's difficulties was presented here last week at the Thirteenth Annual New Orleans Graduate Medical Assembly by the oldest physician attending. He was Dr. G. E. Cannon, of Hope, Ark., a general practitioner and surgeon for more than 50 years. He said:

"It's ridiculous to think of Government in medicine. It just won't work. But these socialized medicine people are encouraged by excessive charges being made by some practitioners."

He urged the medical men to "clean house" as the best way to fight socialized medicine.

"The medical profession is not without sin, but socialized medicine is not the answer," he said.

Dr. Cannon has made what seems to us an accurate diagnosis of the medical profession's case. The profession itself ought to move to remedy the situation that is encouraging the trend toward socialization.

The lawyers are taking preventive measures to block such a trend in their profession. If the doctors could take similar and appropriate action that would not leave room for an argument in behalf of socialized medicine, they would be doing the public and the medical profession a great service. They would preserve the necessary traditional independence of the profession. They would help block the spread of Federal domination into new fields. That domination looms as a threat to all phases of our lives.

Voting Machines for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. NOLAND

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch.

At the present time 18 State legislatures throughout the United States use an electrical roll-call system and save many wasted hours.

Practical objections to the automatic system of voting can easily be met with proper adaptation of such a system to the rules of the House.

The editorial follows:

VOTING MACHINES FOR CONGRESS

"I thank heaven for the voting machine," said Speaker Blackburn Moore, of the Virginia House of Delegates, recently. "I don't see how we ever got anything done without it."

Such, no doubt, is the opinion of everybody else in both branches of the State legislature. A machine was first installed in the house in 1929 and the senate in 1930, and these devices make it possible for the general assembly to transact in 60 days business that would take nobody knows how long if old-fashioned roll calls had to be resorted to.

Yet the Senate and House of Representatives in Washington, with much larger memberships, still cling to time-consuming roll calls. The situations in Richmond and Washington are not identical, it is true, and there are certain things that would have to be worked out in Congress in order for voting machines to fit snugly into the congressional system, but the obstacles seem far from insuperable.

An article in Collier's for March 4 by James C. Derieux, chief of its Washington bureau, calls attention to the clumsy and outmoded voting machinery which continues to function on both sides of our Nation's Capitol. Mr. Derieux says the cost of installing electric voting devices in both houses probably would be between $300,000 and $400,000, "which is not even piggy-bank change in these days of billions."

He feels that in addition to the great amount of time which would be saved in Washington by the use of voting machines, there would also be counteraction of the impression that Congress transacts its business in a clumsy and antiquated manner. Such an impression, if sufficiently widespread, could seriously injure the people's faith in our institutions.

Certain objections are raised to voting machines by members of the national legislature, although Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, has declared that antiquated voting procedure reduces congressional efficiency more than any other single practice.

It is contended that since Members are off the floor in Congress much more than in the State legislatures, and properly so, they would not be in their seats when a roll call by machine was completed in a matter of seconds. It seems reasonable, and feasible, to arrange for notice of 10 minutes, or even more, before the taking of a roll call. If this would mean wasting 10 minutes, at least it wouldn't waste from 40 to 45 minutes, which is the time consumed in calling the roll of the 435 House Members.

Mr. Derieux points to certain objections to mechanical voting which are not wholly

respectable. "The Member who waits to learn how the vote is going before throwing his yea or nay would be discomfited. Also, the Member who likes to avoid putting his vote on record except on assorted bills would suffer political pains, too. If the machine is used on all calls, he could not count on the anonymity of the unrecorded voice vote," he says.

The House of Representatives would benefit more than the Senate by the installation of voting machines. Most roll calls take so much longer there, because of the lengthy roll. It is argued that Members of the Senate and House necessarily spend much of their time off the floor in committee meetings, or in their offices. The present slow system gives them time to get to the floor after a roll call begins, but why cannot the same system of warning bells which is now operative, tell them that a roll call will begin within a specific period? This and other details can be worked out, if the Members really want to work them out.

Electing a President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a series of three articles by Mr. Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune the week of March 6, 1950:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 6, 1950]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

ELECTING A PRESIDENT—I

The proposed amendment would make several changes in the method of electing the President and the Vice President. One would abolish the electoral college and the presidential electors. But this does not mean that the President would be elected directly by popular vote. The essence of the existing system is retained: The choice would still be made by electoral votes, each State being entitled as now to as many electoral votes as it has Representatives and Senators combined.

Standing by itself, this change is of little importance.

A second provision would make the election definitive if a candidate has a plurality of at least 40 percent of the total electoral vote. At present, under the twelfth amendment, there is no election unless the candidate has a majority, and the choice is then thrown into the House.

The proposed amendment would reduce to an acceptable minimum the chance that the choice would not be decided in the popular election, and that the country would face the risk of a prolonged uncertainty while the House of Representatives decided a President.

The third provision deals with the situation that would arise if no candidate had a plurality of 40 percent and the election were thrown into the House. Under the twelfth amendment the vote in the House is by the unit rule. That is to say, each State casts one vote. This is obviously unfair to the larger States. The Lodge-Gossett amendment would have the President and the Vice President chosen from the two leading candidates by a majority of the two Houses sitting in a joint session.

This is an improvement on the twelfth amendment and, so far as we know, no serious objection to it has been raised by anyone. It should be noted, however, that no provision is made for the case where two candidates are tied with more than 40 percent of the electoral vote.

But the fourth provision, which is the heart of the amendment, is very important and very controversial.

Under the existing system, which rests on State laws and on custom but not on the Constitution itself, all the electoral votes in each State are cast for the candidate who obtains a plurality of the popular vote in that State. This arrangement is known as the general ticket system. It was almost certainly never contemplated by the men who framed the Constitution. It was introduced by political leaders in some of the States to increase their own power, and as early as 1824 Senator Benton attacked it, saying that it was contrary to the intent of the Constitution that each State should have a consolidated vote rather than each elector a separate vote.

The disadvantages of the general ticket system are many and they are serious. The Lodge-Gossett amendment is designed to remedy them. We believe, however, that the remedy is not the right remedy—that it has disadvantages at least as great, and probably greater, than those which it would remove, and that there is a better remedy. We dislike having to differ with Senator LODGE, since we are in complete sympathy with his purposes. The reason we have to differ with him is that we are opposed to any recognition of the principle of proportional representation in the American system of government. We believe that it is the fatal error of European democratic constitutions, the great cause of their worst difficulties, and we think it no exaggeration to say that if the principle of proportional representation were introduced here, it would end by destroying the stability of the Government.

Senator LODGE would, we know, object as strongly as we do to proportional representation in the legislative branch of the Government. But he believes, and we do not, that it could be introduced into the system of electing the President without any serious danger that it would then spread to the legislature.

In our succeeding articles we shall go into this more precisely in order to show, first, why Senator LODGE is right that the present general ticket system should be reformed—and second, why we think proportional representation is the wrong remedy and what the better remedy is.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 7, 1950]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

ELECTING A PRESIDENT—II

We shall now discuss the disadvantages of the present general ticket system—that is to say the system by which all the electoral votes of the State are cast as a unit for the candidate who obtains a plurality of the popular vote.

This system allows a much greater weight to the pluralities in large States than they are entitled to on the basis of numbers. Suppose, to make the mathematics simple, that the Union consisted of only two States, New York with 47 electoral votes and Mississippi with 9. Suppose further that if the votes were cast by districts—in the same manner that Representatives are chosen—the Democrat got 28 in New York and 8 in Mississippi, the Republican 24 in New York and 1 in Mississippi. In such a case it would be quite clear that the majority of the people in the two States combined had elected the Democrat by a vote of 31 to 25. Yet under the general ticket system the Republican would be declared President by a vote of 47 to 9. This cannot be fair.

Furthermore, the system permits the most important event in our political process—the election of a President—to be determined by small and local caucuses. It puts a premium on accident. It puts a premium on fraud. It exaggerates the power of splinter parties. It exaggerates the power of special interests. It makes it possible for a State minority, rather than a State majority, to capture the whole vote of the State, and so perhaps to swing the whole election.

The system puts a premium on accident because any casual event—a rainy day in the rural districts, for example—may keep the voters of the State majority at home and swing the whole vote of the State to the voters of the minority. It is well known that bad weather affects urban voters less than rural voters and the two are commonly in different political parties.

The system puts a premium on fraud because by purchasing or fabricating a comparatively few votes in order to turn a popular minority into an apparent plurality, the whole electoral vote of the State can be had. In close elections in big States the temptation is very great.

Thus to use an example which will not offend any one at the moment, we know that in 1868 Boss Tweed manufactured a Democratic majority for the whole State of New York by fraud in the city of New York. This gave Seymour instead of Grant the 33 electoral votes of New York State. A local fraud determined the position of the whole State. In 1868 this fraud did not decide the choice of the President. In a close election it could have done that.

The present system exaggerates beyond all reason the power of splinter parties. Thus in the 1948 election the supporters of Henry Wallace held the balance of power in New York State between Truman and Dewey, and they were able to throw 47 electoral votes to Dewey. Wallace polled 509,000 votes. Dewey's plurality over Truman was 61,000 votes.

The system also exaggerates most undesirably the power of special interests in that a small shift of votes makes such a big difference in the electoral vote. In the election of 1888 Harrison carried the large States by small pluralities and lost the small States by large pluralities. Due to the mechanism of the system, a deficit of 96,000 popular votes was turned into a winning surplus of 65 electoral votes.

The present system, moreover, exercises a strong tendency to limit effective participation in democratic elections to the doubtful States—to make a considerable number of States—that is to say the sure States—so politically inactive that in fact the two-party system does not really operate. In the selection of presidential candidates, in the appeal to public opinion, political managers fix their attention on the large and doubtful States, ignoring those which are small or sure.

In the solid South few Republicans bother to vote. For they know that their votes will be lost. Nor do many Democrats go to the polls. For they know that their votes are not needed. In these States a very considerable number of electoral votes are controlled by a very few persons. Such an abdication of individual political power and responsibility by the voters cannot be a good thing in a democratic society. But it is the consequence of politics played under the rules of the game set by the general ticket system.

At first blush it might seem that the obvious remedy would be to abolish the whole electoral voting system and to leave the choice to a plurality of the people voting at large. But such a reform could not pass the Senate.

It could not pass the Senate because the present electoral voting system, by giving to each State a bonus of two votes regardless of size, works to the advantage of the small States. They will never renounce this advantage, which they regard as a genuine and

desirable element of the Constitution in its intention to protect them from the absolute power of the large States.

It ought not to pass because it is a sounder rule that the relative weight of communities in the electoral process should be proportional to their total population—voters and nonvoters alike—rather than to the number of their actual voters.

Furthermore, if the President were elected by the people at large all the evils which we have mentioned in connection with the general ticket system—accident, fraud, and so forth—would appear in aggravated form because they would not stop at the State lines. In addition, States would be under an inducement to compete with each other in lowering their voting qualifications. In Georgia, for example, children of 18 can vote; other States would soon follow or better the example. And in the end the Federal Government would have to step in and fix uniform voting qualifications, itself an undesirable result.

Yet the disadvantages and evils of the general ticket system ought to be dealt with. The question is how.

To the founding fathers and to many of the statesmen who came after them—to Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, Gallatin, James A. Bayard, John Quincy Adams, Van Buren, Benton, Webster, Story, and many others—the district system was clearly the most satisfactory remedy. This is the system supported by Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr., of New York, which he is offering as a substitute to the Lodge-Gossett amendment.

This district system, in the form which Mr. COUDERT seems to have in mind, would divide each State into as many similar districts as there are Representatives in the House. In addition, there would be two State-wide districts. The choice of a plurality of the people of each district would count as one electoral vote for the President. The choice of the people of the State as a whole would determine the other two electoral votes of the State. Thus, all but two of the electors of each State would be chosen by pluralities in a district and would be unaffected by the pluralities elsewhere in the State.

The district system, as we learn from Madison, was mostly, if not exclusively, in view when the Constitution was framed and adopted. It was supplanted by the general ticket system now in use as the only expedient for baffling the policy of the particular States which had set the example, that is to say, had adopted the general ticket system. It was a case of a bad system driving out a better one. For the district system in one State cannot exist in competition with the general ticket in another State. The State which operates under a general ticket system will then exercise more weight in the electoral vote than it deserves. Therefore, the only way that the district system can be restored is by constitutional amendment which would prevent any State from adopting the general ticket system.

In our view the district system is a better remedy than the Lodge amendment and it should be restored. Our reason for preferring this system, which is contemplated in the Coudert substitute for the Lodge-Gossett amendment, rests on our objection to the principle of proportional representation. We shall discuss that in the third and concluding article of this series.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

ELECTING A PRESIDENT—III

We shall now discuss that part of the Lodge-Gossett amendment which employs the principle of proportional representation showing why we believe that the district system, as intended by the framers of the Constitution, is preferable. We realize that not for many years has the district system been considered seriously in Congress. But the reason, we think, is that American reformers were so strongly influenced after the middle of the nineteenth century by John Stuart Mill's advocacy of proportional representation. The apparent fairness of the principle of proportional representation hid the grave dangers and defects of that principle. The Lodge-Gossett amendment is based on that principle.

It does away with the State electoral colleges but it keeps the State electoral votes. These it distributes among the several candidates for President on the principle of proportion. Thus a candidate who receives 42.5 percent of the popular vote of a State would earn 42.5 percent of its electoral vote, etc., etc. The calculations in the Lodge-Gossett amendment are to be carried to three decimal places in an attempt to achieve mathematical accuracy.

The merits of this system are very easy to see. It gives to every political grouping of voters in the national election a weight as nearly proportional to its mass as the present unequal electoral weighting of the States permits. It avoids the seizure of minority votes by majorities. That is to say the arrangement, for example, by which in 1948 the 2,780,000 votes cast for Truman in New York were counted in the electoral college for Dewey, and the 1,960,000 votes cast for Dewey in Illinois were counted for Truman in the electoral college.

Moreover, the proposed method reduces the size of the electoral swings which may be caused by accident, fraud, or the power of minor parties. In large measure it destroys the political advantages of the large doubtful States. It would revive political activity in the sure States.

Its demerits are not so obvious. And yet we think they exist. They can best be brought out by comparing the Lodge-Gossett amendment with its alternative—the district system.

Let us consider how the two systems would probably work in practice. Under the district system accidents will generally have no effect upon the result of a national election. Bad weather keeps voters home in one district; local issues bring them out in another. But Democrats and Republicans are equally affected by the accidents; district results as a whole are not substantially changed. Each district casts its single vote just as it would have cast it had the weather been clear and the issues normal. Under the proportional system the accident is reflected in the distribution of the State's electoral vote and eventually in the Nation-wide electoral vote. So with fraud. Under the district system a manufactured vote can affect only the district in which it is cast. If the candidate on whose behalf it was manufactured carries the district without its help or if he fails to carry the district, the effect is nil; in other cases, the fraud will swing one electoral vote. But under the proportional system, a manufactured vote is always reflected in the distribution of the electoral vote and its effect is limited only by the size of the fraud.

This brings us to our main objection to the Lodge-Gossett amendment, to our main reason for preferring the district system amendment. We believe that if the system of proportional representation is applied to the presidential electors or, what comes to the same thing to the presidential electoral vote, that it will eventually be applied to the Representatives in Congress. And such a result is, we think, to be avoided at all costs—even at that of retaining the obnoxious general ticket system which we now have.

For by applying the principle of proportional representation to electoral votes the Lodge-Gossett amendment would provide a precedent, and, as Senator PASTORE has remarked, no one needs to be told the importance of precedent in democratic government. It will be difficult to explain to a vigorous minority why it is entitled to a third, let us say, of a State's electoral votes and yet is not entitled to a third of its votes in the House of Representatives. In the 1948 election, for example, Wallace got 2.4 percent of the popular vote. Under the Lodge-Gossett amendment he would have been credited with 1.9 percent of the electoral vote. If such a system were in effect, it would be very difficult to explain to the followers of a Wallace that their votes were entitled to proportional representation in the electoral vote but that they were not entitled to proportional representation in the House.

This is more than a theoretical danger. The establishment of proportional representation in the congressional delegations might come about in one of two ways. It could be introduced piecemeal by the legislatures of the several States. Section 5 of the Apportionment Act of 1911, prescribing that Representatives in all States shall be elected on the single-member district system, is no longer on the statute books. It was declared by the Supreme Court in 1932 to have expired by its own limitation with the apportionment to which it related. Congress has never reenacted the provision.

Proportional representation might also be introduced in the House of Representatives by Congress itself. Suppose that the general ticket system for Representatives should come to be established by the State legislatures as the ordinary method of choosing Representatives—that is to say suppose Congressmen came to be elected at large rather than by districts. The evils following on this change would soon give rise to a movement for reform. Congress would be called upon to exercise its original and concurrent power to make or alter the State regulations in regard to the manner of holding elections for Representatives. With the example of the Lodge-Gossett amendment before it, it might plump for the system of proportional representation.

This contingency is not so remote as it might seem. Some States now use the general ticket system to choose Representatives and others have experimented with it from time to time.

The evils of proportional representation are, one, that it destroys the two-party system and substitutes for it a many-party system. This has happened everywhere that the principle has been applied and is one of the chief causes of the instability of democratic government in countries like France.

The second evil is closely related to it. The effect of proportional representation is to fill the legislature with men who are immoderate and uncompromising. For under proportional representation the constituents of a Representative are not the people living in a geographical area but an abstract group of voters who all think alike. A Representative does not have to consider those who may differ with him. He is merely the delegate of those who think alike. Therefore, he is not predisposed to moderate views and to compromises but to irreconcilability and extremism.

Moreover, under the proportional system the constituency of each Representative is mathematical rather than geographical, abstract rather than personal. The Representative does not know what actual persons he represents. Thereafter his election is controlled by the party managers who really appoint him to represent the mathematical constituencies that the principle of proportional representation creates. And what the party managers will, therefore, look for in him is not thought but obedience. Anyone who has observed parliamentary government

in a country where proportional representation seems will realize how in practice this works out.

We regard these objections to the Lodge-Dossett amendment as sufficient to justify its rejection. We believe that the district system, as contemplated in the Coudert substitute, is not open to these objections and that it will cure all the evils of the present system quite as well as the Lodge-Dossett amendment.

Discrimination Against North Dakota Processed Grain Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Cart Blasts North Dakota Bulk, Processed Freight Variance," from the Bismarck Tribune for March 7, 1950. Mr. Cart was formerly president of the Public Service Commission of North Dakota, and is now a member, elected by the people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CART BLASTS NORTH DAKOTA BULK, PROCESSED FREIGHT VARIANCE

North Dakota's processed-grain manufacturers are suffering discrimination in favor of bulk shippers through the Great Lakes region.

Public Service Commissioner Elmer W. Cart, in a statement prepared for delivery before the United States Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, said:

"At the present time and, in fact, since the summer of 1942, there has been no water transportation available to transport these products on account of lack of package freight service from Superior to eastern lake ports such as Buffalo, New York, Cleveland, etc.

"Today, in practical effect, this useful and important water route is limited to the transportation of bulk freight. This should not be tolerated any more than having a railroad limited to hauling only bulk freight," Cart said.

Commissioner Cart noted that the state of rail service compared to lake transportation was a costly discrimination against the processed-grain dealers in North Dakota:

"During the shipping season of 1949, the contract rate for the movement of wheat as a bulk cargo from Duluth to Buffalo, N. Y., was approximately 11 cents per hundredweight. The all-rail rate, which processed-grain shippers used, was 33½ cents—a difference of 22½ cents."

Cart said that North Dakota was one of the Nation's great producers of grain—amounting to 1,284,000,000 bushels of wheat alone during the 1941-1949 period. And a good share of that grain was processed here.

"Therefore," Cart said, "I urge your favorable consideration of shipping legislation which we believe will bring about restoration of package freight service on the Great Lakes."

Cart said restoration of lake service would not correct all the problems of rate increases plaguing the North Dakota processors, since rates are up on the lakes. But he said great progress would be made.

Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, Backed by Labor in Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Mr. Gould Lincoln, a well-known veteran political analyst of the Washington Evening Star, appearing in the Evening Star for March 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL—SENATOR ELBERT D. THOMAS BACKED BY LABOR IN RACE—LAWMAKER FACES HARD FIGHT; NOW CAMPAIGNING IN UTAH

(By Gould Lincoln)

Organized labor is expected to fight just as hard to reelect Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, Utah Democrat, as it is planning to fight against the reelection of Senator "BOB" TAFT, of Ohio. Should it fail in Utah, it will be almost as much of a black eye for political labor as it will be if Mr. TAFT is reelected in Ohio.

Senator THOMAS, so far as the labor leaders are concerned, is the direct antithesis of Senator TAFT. It was Senator THOMAS who sat successfully on the lid—as chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor—when the House passed bill after bill seeking to curtail the dictatorial actions of organized labor from 1940 on. Never, while Senator THOMAS was on the job, were any of these measures allowed to come up for consideration.

Next to former Senator WAGNER of New York, whose name was attached to the National Labor Relations Act superseded by the Taft-Hartley Act, Senator THOMAS has been more prominently identified with the labor group in Congress than any other. And labor, according to reports, will throw into the campaign all the funds that are necessary.

BACKED BY ORGANIZATION

Utah Democrats insist that Senator THOMAS will be renominated and reelected beyond doubt. They point out that he will have not only the active support of organized labor but that he will have all the school teachers—who favor Federal aid to education—back of him. Also, they say, the Democratic organization in the State will be strongly back of Senator THOMAS.

Senator THOMAS, however, is back in the State now, campaigning vigorously, long before the State conventions and primary elections—something which he has not felt essential for a long time. He has gone back there, it is believed, to head off a possible race for the Democratic senatorial nomination by former Governor Maw. If Mr. Maw made a contest, it might split the Democrats wide open and leave scars which might not heal before the election next November. Mr. Maw, politically ambitious, was twice elected governor—and failed in 1948, when he ran some fifty thousand votes behind the Democratic ticket.

Senator THOMAS, however, remembers that in 1946 the Republicans elected Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS when no one believed they had a chance for victory, and he remembers, too, that the Republicans in 1948 elected a governor, J. Bracken Lee. So he is out there beating the bushes and mending his political fences.

STRIKES AMONG FARMERS

Labor support is not entirely an unmitigated advantage for Mr. THOMAS. The coal strike made a lot of Utah farmers and other citizens angry, for example, and, on the other hand, despite his firm stand for everything labor has wanted, Senator THOMAS has not been able to deliver; he was entirely unable to lead the Democratic Senate last year to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, and when the Thomas labor bill did pass it had been entirely rewritten to fit the idea of Senator TAFT himself. So there might be a slight lack of enthusiasm on the part of some labor leaders for Mr. THOMAS.

Also, although Mr. THOMAS has fathered bills for Federal aid to education time and again, he was never able to get one through the Senate, and it was Senator TAFT, in the Republican Eightieth Congress, who put such a measure through. This measure was repassed in the Eighty-first Congress, with Senator TAFT's aid.

The GOP has a number of available candidates for the senatorial nomination to run against Senator THOMAS—among them Wallace Bennett, recently president of the National Association of Manufacturers; Brig. Gen. Franklin Riter, a Salt Lake City attorney who saw service in the last war; former Representative William A. Dawson; State Senator Rue L. Clegg, of Salt Lake City; and Preston D. Richards, an attorney, also in Salt Lake City. Utah has the convention-primary system for senatorial nominations. The conventions are held first and select two candidates—no more—who fight it out for the party nomination in a primary.

Republicans insist that Senator THOMAS is vulnerable—as was Republican Senator Smoot whom Senator THOMAS defeated in 1932—because he has given his time and attention to national and international affairs rather than to legislation which was of particular interest to Utah. Senator WATKINS, on the other hand, was involved in reclamation and irrigation projects for a number of years before he came to the Senate and has concentrated on getting things done for the State. Further, the Republicans claim that they have an even better chance to defeat Senator THOMAS than they had to elect Senator WATKINS 4 years ago.

Broadcast by Hon. James P. Kem, of Missouri, on the Work of the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by me, over 26 stations in Missouri, on the work of the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hello, everyone. This is JIM KEM, in Washington, reporting to the people of Missouri on the work of the United States Senate.

Several days ago the Senate began debate on the so-called Kerr bill to amend the Natural Gas Act. If this bill becomes law, it will almost certainly lead to a boost in the cost of living for millions of families in Missouri and other States. Farm folks will be affected, too, as well as consumers of natural gas in cities and towns. One of the sponsors

of the bill, is Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma. Usually he is a consistent supporter of the administration's program. Senator KERR freely admitted that the purpose of his proposal is to raise the price of natural gas in the gas fields, including those in Oklahoma.

The Kerr bill would take away from the Federal Power Commission its authority to regulate the price paid by pipe-line companies for gas sold them by so-called independent gas producers. These independent producers are, most of them, big companies that produce 70 to 80 percent of all the natural gas in the United States.

I opposed the Kerr bill when it came before the Senate. I spent practically all one afternoon telling the Senate just why I thought it was an unsound, unfair proposal.

For that is exactly what the Kerr bill is, unsound and unfair.

Here's why. Enactment of the bill would be a breach of faith with untold thousands of American gas consumers.

More and more families these days are using natural gas to cook their meals and heat their homes. Consumers have long had the benefit of gas manufactured from coal and other products. Now natural gas; that is, gas piped directly from nature's great underground storehouses, is rapidly being made available to cities and communities not previously enjoying its advantages. Since the end of World War II scores of huge pipe lines have fanned out from the vast bubble of gas underlying the old Kansas, Texas, and Oklahoma dust bowl, and from other areas.

As a result, millions of American households and thousands of factories are now being, or soon will be, served with this most convenient of all fuels. Natural gas now costs much less than manufactured gas—it is cleaner—and it yields twice as much heat.

St. Louis has just recently been converted to straight natural gas. There, and in other cities and communities that are being served for the first time, gas-burning equipment has been either installed or converted at great expense to the consumer.

Now, after all this has been done, Congress has been asked to make it possible for the price of gas to be pushed up without regard to public interest. The National Institute of Municipal Law Officers estimates that the Kerr bill would cost consumers more than $200,000,000 a year.

While those living in our cities and towns would probably be hit hardest by the Kerr bill, our farm folks, too, would be hurt by this ill-advised legislation. Many farm families now enjoy the benefits of so-called bottled gas. Two-thirds of the supply of bottled gas is made from natural gas. So if the price of natural gas rises, an increase in the price of bottled gas will likely follow. Then, too, farmers buy many products manufactured by companies using natural gas as fuel. It has been said that natural gas is the "hot breath of life" for the cement industry. If the price of natural gas rises, it doesn't take a magician to figure out that the price of cement will also go up. And so it goes.

We who oppose the Kerr bill are charged by some of those favoring it as being enemies of free enterprise. I shall always stand for free enterprise. I stand on my record since I have been a member of the United States Senate.

For a hundred years or so it has been recognized that in order to make the free-enterprise system work, monopolies must be regulated. Monopolies must be restricted in the public interest.

From a consumer's standpoint, natural gas is a monopoly. If you want to buy a ton of coal, you can choose any 1 of 50 or so dealers in the telephone book. But, if you live in town and want to buy gas—there is just one place to go—and that is to the gas company that has constructed a gas line along the public street in front of your home under a public franchise.

Since the distribution of gas is a monopoly it should be regulated by public authority in the public interest. It is sometimes said that regulation should be on a State level. But when gas is consumed in one State, regulation by another State does not meet the situation. When the supply of gas is produced in Oklahoma and consumed in Missouri, the regulation must be interstate—the regulation must be by Federal authority.

If the Federal Power Commission is to do an effective job protecting Missouri gas consumers it must have the authority to regulate the price paid for gas from the first time it passes into the pipe line until it is sold to the local gas company. It cannot do this if the producers of the gas in the field are free to boost prices as they please.

The producer of natural gas isn't compelled to enter the public-utility market. He has other outlets for his product. He may sell his gas to a carbon-black plant, or to a chemical plant, or for other similar uses. But, if the producer decides to sell his gas to a pipe-line company supplying Missouri cities, he has entered the public-utility business. If he wants to play the game he should follow the rules. He should accept the responsibility to the public which becomes his when he sells to a public-utility market.

It's only fair that the gas producer receive a reasonable and just profit on the gas he sells. If a price increase becomes necessary in order to obtain a fair profit it should come only after full and open hearings before the Federal Power Commission.

We need not shed any crocodile tears for the condition of the natural-gas industry. The price of gas in the field is from 6 to 15 times higher than it was only a few short years ago. Very few other industries have enjoyed such price increases for their products or such a tremendous demand from buyers.

It is said that the policies of the Federal Power Commission have been confused and inconsistent. That may be true. This is partially due to the fact that some unwise appointments have been made to the Commission. It may be that certain changes are needed in the law to make the wishes of the Congress clear. If this be true, they should be made. But you don't knock out the windowpane just because dirt or frost makes it hard to see through. Neither should we scrap regulation of the gas monopoly because of confusion among the members of the Federal Power Commission.

The Federal regulation of gas rates has been effective and in the public interest. Since the passage of the Natural Gas Act in 1938, the Federal Power Commission has obtained reductions of more than $37,000,000 per year. This activity in the public interest should continue—it should continue unhampered. A bill similar to the Kerr bill didn't even get out of the Senate committee in the Eightieth Congress.

Let's take a closer look at how the Kerr bill would affect Missouri. Kansas City has had more than 50 years experience with the problem of a fair price for natural gas. All of the gas consumed in Kansas City is produced in Kansas and Oklahoma.

When the Kerr bill was before the Senate committee, David M. Proctor, city counselor of Kansas City, came to Washington to testify against it. Mr. Proctor told the committee that if the bill becomes law an additional cost and burden would be passed on from the gas fields to 100,000 defenseless consumers in Kansas City alone. When the Kerr bill came before the Senate, Mr. Proctor sent me a telegram opposing the bill. He said it would undoubtedly permit unjust and unwarranted increases in the price of gas to consumers.

A number of other city officials in Missouri sent telegrams opposing the Kerr bill.

Mayor Joseph Darst, of St. Louis, wired that many thousand householders, as well as important industries in his city, would be harmed by enactment of the bill.

Julian Bagby, mayor of Sedalia, said that in his opinion passage of the bill would be a major disaster to our communities.

Ronald Reed, city counselor of St. Joseph, also sent a wire. He said his city strongly feels that recent natural-gas rate reductions would be nullified if the Federal Power Commission is stripped of its authority to regulate gas prices in the field.

Mayor William Kemp, of Kansas City, sent a telegram opposing Senator KERR's bill, as did Mayor L. Russell McKee, of Joplin, and Otis L. Barbarick, mayor of Springfield.

I called these telegrams to the attention of the Senate.

In addition, I have received a very large number of letters from people all over Missouri—practically all of them opposing the Kerr bill.

Here's a typical letter from G. M. Ray, of Springfield. He writes: "If the Kerr bill passes, consumers will be forced to pay triple the present price for natural gas. Is it fair for working people to be 'held up' by another unjust deal?"

A similar bill has already passed the House. If cleared by the Senate, the bill will then go to President Truman—for his approval or disapproval. Last year Mr. Truman officially opposed the bill that was then pending. There are rumors in Washington that the President for some reason is ready to change his position. I hope these reports are unfounded.

The Kerr bill is a hodgepodge, piecemeal, special-interest proposal. It is a sorry example of the thinking of some of our leaders—they seem to be willing to have everybody regulated, or competed with, or interfered with by the Federal Government, except, of course, everybody but themselves.

High-pressure politics should not be permitted to influence a decision vitally affecting the welfare of 40,000,000 American gas consumers.

We should carry on by reasonable regulation of monopoly our earnest efforts to make the free-enterprise system work.

This is your Senator, JIM KEM, reporting from the Senate Office Building in Washington. Thank you for listening. I hope you will be listening at this same time, same station, next week.

Proposed Reduction of Personnel at Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY DARBY

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. DARBY. Mr. President, in connection with the Veterans' Administration's recent decision to reduce personnel at veterans' hospitals throughout the country, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this time an excellent editorial entitled "The Heart of the Matter," from the March 11 issue of the Topeka State Journal, an outstanding daily newspaper published at Topeka, Kans.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HEART OF THE MATTER

Amid all the confusing, ill-informed, and contradictory reports about the VA's attempted cut-back at Winter Hospital here, one truth seems to us to have come clear.

That is, there is room aplenty for economy and more efficiency in the total Veterans' Administration set-up, but in the way improvement is sometimes sought in the wrong way, the cutting is being ordered in exactly the service that shouldn't be cut—the medical service—while the real overgrowth is neglected.

Winter VA Hospital is described by the VA's own neuropsychiatry chief in Washington in these words: "We regard it as the best hospital in the world. It is a major training center and has been the force in the psychiatric training and treatment program."

The background for such an estimate is familiar to many of us. The VA came here a few years ago smarting under justified criticism directed at the old regime. It wanted to make a fresh start. Under the new leadership of Gen. Omar Bradley it took over Winter Hospital from the Army. Because the world-famed Menninger Psychiatric Center was located here, VA under General Bradley determined to get the Menninger Foundation's aid to create a model, a pilot institution that would become a pivotal VA medical center and show the way to others. Winter was not only to be a treatment but a training center. Physicians were to be trained in the modern psychiatric approach to mental and emotional ills. That was done, magnificently. Results and their recognition came. Several of the most influential national magazines sent their best writers here and told the story to the Nation of something that had never been done before. Hundreds of specialists from all over the world visited Winter, carrying away with them the vision and the inspiration not only of a great hospital, but of a new kind of hospital. We have talked to a great many of these rare-hardened observers, know what they say and how they feel. As an interested member of the laity, we have seen Winter inside and out, lived with it here all these postwar years. This newspaper thinks Winter VA Hospital is something unique and vital nationally, medically, humanly. We believe in Winter Hospital and in all that is being done there for sick veterans of our wars.

Now, saying that, let us tell you that we have also studied the Hoover Commission reports on the VA, and its recommendations about what should be done. We found what the National Citizens Committee for the Hoover report found, and concur in its statement, to wit, "At no place in the Commission's reports were there made any recommendations for the increase or curtailment of medical benefits or other services to veterans. Its recommendations covered only the better management of existing programs." Policy decisions as to what the people owe to veterans are clearly with as strictly the affair of Congress, which has laid down the principles for existing programs. Everything in the Hoover report is geared to the question of how many veterans may be given the best of medical care. Economies are sought that would not impair essential, needed services.

The VA should be trimming, as we stated at the outset, fat the hospitals, particularly the best, the pilot, the model hospitals of which Winter is the foremost, should be approached with the utmost care and caution, not the heavy hand of the present order. It is in VA's paper administration, principally in Washington, and at employee's desks, that savings could and should be made, not at the bedsides of sick men. The Hoover Commission Task Force on Veterans' Affairs estimated that there could be annual savings of 70 millions in handling veterans' affairs, particularly as relating to insurance, claims, overcomplicated procedures, printing, schooling payments, overpayments (totaling 179 millions to date, of which 50 millions have not been recovered), and so on.

Most of the cuts ordered for Winter would cripple medical services to ailing veterans now in the hospital, and waiting to get in. The cuts would cripple the program of physician-training by reducing the staff, staff hours, and human facilities for training, by which many other VA hospitals have benefited and are benefiting in receiving doctors and specialists trained here. A training hospital needs more staff than others. We believe VA and the taxpayers are really getting their money's worth, and much more, at the hospital here.

The VA is well advised in its indication Friday that the order respecting Winter will be reexamined and reevaluated, in its recognition that Winter is a unique situation within the total medical set-up. Let VA trim the unessentials of administrative and bureaucratic falderal, of which it has been drawn a picture, and VA will earn the gratitude of veteran and nonveteran alike. But let VA hold on to its greatest psychiatric hospital, and to the way that has been pointed here, as to the heart of the matter, which in fact the Winter meaning is.

Hawaii and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a compelling editorial for the case of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of March 21. The editorial is reproduced in full text:

HAWAII AND ALASKA

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs owes the public interest an early and extensive hearing on bills proposing statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

Both proposals have passed the House in recent days. And in the Senate there are pending a number of bills dealing with each case. But the Interior Committee, of which Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming is chairman, has not yet put any of them down for hearing.

There are a number of puzzlers in this situation. The logic of statehood for these important and increasingly sensitive American territories, is unshakable on its face.

Each is inextricably a part of our national survival. Each is tied to us by economic, strategical and political necessity.

Each suffers, in its present condition, from the oppressions of bureaucracy that are inevitably a part of Territorial administration by the Federal Government.

The necessities which bind these Territories to us are not going to get any weaker as time goes by, but instead will intensify. In a military way, alone, Hawaii and Alaska must be American to the core, for this Nation's well-being.

And just as the basic reasons for Hawaii and Alaska to be American grow in importance as time goes by, so does the necessity for them to shed the feeble status of Territories.

WHY IS THERE OPPOSITION?

They cannot ever really grow up as long as the Federal Government is running them as branch offices of the Interior Department and general playgrounds for bureaucrats on the make. And the longer that growing up is delayed, the harder it is to grow up at all.

Yet obvious as all the foregoing is, still there runs somewhere in both Alaska and Hawaii a current of opposition to statehood. We are frank to admit we don't know why there is opposition or who operates it, but we do sense it is there.

The earliest possible Senate hearings are indicated therefore, in order to get the opposition out in the open, examine it, understand it and demonstrate it's weakness.

Undoubtedly there are possible arguments against statehood for these two Territories, but none as important to the United States as the reasons for it.

The House has voted for statehood. The Senate owes the country some action on its own part. Now.

National Boys' Club Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we recognize the youth of today as the leaders of tomorrow, it is fitting that we pay tribute to the National Boys' Clubs which are being honored this week throughout the country. These clubs are doing for our young boys exactly what we who are interested in the spread of democracy would like to do on an international scale. Here is a marvelous opportunity for our children—learning to work, play, and live together; developing a comradeship, a sense of fair play, a will to share. Boys become united in these clubs even though there may be many dividing factors present. Race, color, creed—what do those words mean to the 300,000 members of boys' clubs? Not very much, I am sure. Those factors are relegated to a back seat and supplanted by a genuine admiration for good timing at the bat or "a fast curve." That is how it should be—appreciate talents and forget differences.

Boys' clubs which are nonsectarian were first organized on a national basis in 1906. There are now 325 clubs with over 300,000 members, aged 8 to 20. Although more attention is attracted to the work done with delinquents and underprivileged groups, the boys on the whole are average normal youngsters. The need for such organizations is only too apparent. Herbert Hoover who has been chairman of the national board since 1936 once estimated that over 3,000,000 boys would never find outdoor living except in crowded city areas. No wonder they all flock to the club where every possible chance is given them for wholesome recreation, physical development, and friendship.

Mr. David W. Armstrong is the executive director of the Boys' Clubs of America, Inc. In a recent article appearing in Coronet, Mr. Armstrong said that there seems to be a chain reaction. Many boys who found fun and guidance through the boys' clubs have now become leaders. Armstrong, himself, belonged to a one-room club in Pittsfield, Mass. He did part-time work at the club and later became director of the club in Worcester from 1907 to 1941. His feelings for boys and the clubs are expressed simply:

Children are the most important of our natural resources. Most of them will grow up into useful citizens, but there is a minority that needs guidance. More important, there is the opportunity for making even the best of the crop more tolerant, more cooperative and more democratic.

The work of these clubs should never be underestimated. A glance at the lists of alumni reveals many leaders, clergymen, physicians, athletes, and such, that we acclaim. I would like to praise the boys today who are now members and extend my congratulations to the boys' clubs this week.

Reform in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of March 21, entitled "Reform in Connecticut." I think other States could well follow, as the editorial suggests, the excellent example set by this program initiated by Gov. Chester Bowles.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFORM IN CONNECTICUT

Following the example of the Hoover Commission, Connecticut is making a heroic effort to modernize its governmental system. Its commission on State government organization has issued a series of reports indicating that the task of shaping State institutions to the needs of the present day is no less urgent than in the case of the Federal Government. Since the obsolescence that is plaguing Connecticut is typical of conditions to be found in many other States, the example that Gov. Chester Bowles is setting may well prove to be contagious.

At an early stage in the Connecticut study it became apparent that one major millstone around the neck of good government is the State constitution itself. Connecticut has amended her constitution 47 times. The investigators found that it is no longer "fairly intelligible to lay readers." The only way to understand it is, quite literally, to read it backwards. Only a complete redrafting will make it a useful and reliable charter of modern government, and that is what the commission has recommended. Incidentally, the commission thinks it is feasible to avoid calling a constitutional convention—a method that has produced negative results in the past—and to have a new constitution prepared by a legislative commission for submission to the voters.

Much of the streamlining visualized by the commission would be accomplished by means of constitutional charges. Among the changes recommended are the short ballot, concentrating public interest in the election of the Governor, Lieutenant Governor and members of the general assembly; automatic and periodic redistricting of the senate; reduction in the size of the house of representatives; annual sessions of the assembly, with no fixed adjournment date; prohibition of dual office-holding; elimination of elected sheriffs and probate judges; home rule for towns and cities, with no special local legislation; and a better method of effecting constitutional amendments and revisions. The reorganizers also suggest that provision be made for the recall of elected officers, direct primaries, the initiative and referendum, and an enlarged declaration of rights.

It is a mistake, as the report itself acknowledges, to place too much reliance on the recall, initiative, and referendum. The recall is likely to result in mere political harassment, and the initiative and referendum seem scarcely in keeping with the principle of the short ballot, although all three can doubtless be used to advantage in some situations if abuses can be avoided. What is really important is that Connecticut is moving to modify its governmental machinery and its organic law in accord with present-day requirements. The District of Columbia and other areas that are engaged in a similar struggle can only wish Connecticut well in its undertaking.

Dennis J. McMahon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the January issue of Marine News honoring the Honorable Denis J. McMahon, recently appointed collector of internal revenue of the second district of New York:

MEET DENIS J. MCMAHON, THE SHIPPING WORLD'S NEW COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

From Wall Street runner to runner-up for the top-flight office of collector of internal revenue for the second New York district in but a very few years, and to be appointed to this important post in the world's greatest port by President Truman—that is Denis J. McMahon. He has held only two jobs in his brief span of life so far, being probably the youngest collector of internal revenue New York ever had.

A Yorkville, Manhattan, boy, when he finished high school he went to work for the distinguished old Wall Street brokerage house of Clark, Dodge & Co. as a runner. Then he worked on the floor of the New York Stock Exchange.

When the 1929 crash came he had to look for another job. In less time than it takes to say, "Who killed cock robin?" he landed one in the upper West Side office of the collector of internal revenue, New York district. Soon after Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected to the Presidency for his first term Denis McMahon was appointed deputy collector.

As chief deputy, he supervised the other deputies charged with the enforcement of the collection of various Federal taxes, investigation of delinquent taxpayers, serving liens and levies, and assisting taxpayers who called at the office.

He's was a big job, though one little heard of and about by the people of the metropolis. The tax work of the Bureau of Internal Revenue is divided up into different branches—three main divisions in New York: The special agents, who investigate all criminal fraud cases; the revenue agents, who are primarily auditors, and are responsible for uncovering much additional tax; and the collectors, whose job it is to see that the Government's tax money is collected. The special agents and the internal revenue agents work directly under the Bureau of Internal Revenue in Washington, D. C.

Denis McMahon could regale everyone in the shipping world with laughter relating some of his experiences—only he just hasn't got the time. However, if you want to get a big laugh out of him, just ask him about the batch of rabbit fur he had to confiscate for nonpayment of taxes that smelled up the whole building for weeks—until it was auctioned off. Then, there was the deputy who got his face slapped because he told a nice old lady she was delinquent.

McMahon learned all about taxes and such things by hurdling four civil service promotions to his job before being made collector. He's been a tax man for 16 years.

As a matter of choice, though, he prefers to use his talent for collecting money to help about a dozen outfits like the Poor Boys Priesthood Association, Beth Israel, or the Yeshiva Et Torah. He's been doing that for about 10 years. Of course, it doesn't quite add up to the $30,000,000,000 a year in taxes from a million reluctant citizens that will fall to his lot now as collector of internal revenue.

Hanging on the walls of the collector's office in the United States Customs House overlooking Battery Park and New York Bay is a recognition from the Pope for work done with poor boys desiring to enter the priesthood; an honorary membership certificate he received in 1945 from the Internal Revenue Post 1255, American Legion, for meritorious service, and numerous other fine testimonials.

Young, alert, in every sense a good fellow; friendly, dynamic, with an infectious smile and a happy, wholesome countenance—that's Denis McMahon, collector of internal revenue for the greatest port in the world, New York.

Marine News takes this pleasurable opportunity to welcome, as well as congratulate him in his new high office, and to wish him everything this beginning of the New Year of 1950 can hold forth, and so to continue for many more years to come.

The Growing Protest Against Excessive Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, there is a steadily growing volume of protest against present excessive tax burdens. One of the most articulate of these comes in a "grass roots" protest from the editor of the Casey (Ill.) Daily Reporter. Mr. B. F. Morgan, the editor, chose the week of income-tax payments to focus the attention of his readers on the steadily growing costs of Government. Under permission granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including the text

of his editorial, which, I might add, has attracted much attention and comment from his readers:

CHEER AT BAT

(By B. F.)

Good news last week. Naturally.

Or is March 15th one of good news?

Nine people out of ten wholeheartedly agree that the day has no significance but strongly indicates utter ruin if it continues a law of the land, nor is it one to produce even good thoughts. It is a day made so by man himself in which he discourages youth from thrift; in which he has caused more liars in America than any one law ever passed. This income tax law which was conceived and born below hades is one that is heart-rendering to one of ambition. The payment of such a tax is causing one who was or is possessed of ambition to lose courage, to give up in despair and policy or to accept teaching that thriftiness pays. It is causing apathy in ambition because you pay out something with no value received. You pay out sums that have taken months and toil to financially produce. What's the use of working to accumulate for old age or what's the use of being ambitious, just to see your savings go out in taxes that nobody knows where they go other than to see one group living handsomely on the profits of another group who works diligently to save to be thrifty, to have something someday so they too may live in better circumstances.

What good does it do to work hard and then give it away. What accomplishment is there at the year's end to have to part with savings that have been laboriously made. Isn't it about time to halt such an idiotic tax?

Our hats off to Vivian Kellems in Connecticut who is even opposing collection of withholding taxes. She thinks she is entitled to compensation if this is a requirement. She has other things to do during the day besides collect such taxes, the use of such taxes for what purpose.

We need some more Vivians in this country to lead the way. If one will lead, then people are similar to sheep and the rest will follow. We have become so apathetic that today if somebody says "No" they are classed as radical. You can call the column a radical or whatever you want to but we like the idea of saying "No" when it seems necessary to do. Right here even in Casey we have become so used to never hearing the word "no" that most all walks of life question an item that "Oh well, it may be all right. Why oppose it. Maybe it's all right." We know in one service club that attitude has taken place, we know other groups who follow suit. It's time to wake up. And if we don't wake up soon, you won't even have a ragged shirt to wear. You'll have a chain and serial number. This logic isn't hearsay. It's not fantastic. It's the way we're going, for all signs so indicate.

In the name of God and humanity, give us some men to run this country who can keep their heads cool and their feet on the ground. Give us some men who can implore the Almighty for guidance of the Nation rather than a bunch of poker-playing maniacs. Give us some men who cannot fathom pussyfooting but who are possessed of common sense rather than a Harvard education; men who are for whom they serve instead of some foreign alliance; men who know the faith of their fathers, who built this country on private enterprise, rugged individualism, built on a better-mouse-trap idea; people who are free instead of burdened with taxes, for what? You; God, give us men. We are making life hard to live.

We send men to Washington and State legislatures who are no more fit to be there than a man in the moon. In Illinois the latest blunder coming out of Springfield is the school situation which was legislated similar to a cart before the horse. In Washington we send men there to govern affairs, but all they do is meet in committee and argue on some insignificant matter that doesn't amount to a whoop, whereas time is ill-spent. They squander but know nothing of how the money is made, by whom, and care little where it goes.

If we couldn't take a half-dozen ordinary citizens at random from this town and do a better job, then we'd come home with the tail under the hind legs; and the first thing, if we would ever be there, would be to let the people know that America comes first, the use of common sense so much outmoded would return pronto, and there'd be no excise tax, income tax, and all this other tomfoolery taxation. If a man made a dime, it would be his to spend, even for a glass of beer, and before we got this done we'd send Congress home and let the country have a major rest from legislation. There are so many laws now on the books and so many being passed and so many being written for approval that it's worse than nauseating, and the funny part—it's really comical—nobody knows what they're about, including the authors.

Let's wake up. Accumulation of grains of sand, though small, will soon build a sand bar, and try moving that in an hour. Let's wake up—get America back for Americans. Let's wake up with some common sense and practical knowledge rather than theory. Let's wake up and—it's not too late—enjoy life more abundantly with a free dollar, for with the present trend we are making life a burden.

It's time to wake up; it's time to rid ourselves of additional laws and taxes; and it's time to rid ourselves of such a deplorable, fraudulent tax as the income tax.

What do you think?

Presidential Electors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. J. Harvie Williams which appeared in the New York Times of March 6, 1950:

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS—AMENDMENT PROVIDING FOR DISTRICT ELECTION SYSTEM ADVOCATED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Although the Lodge-Gossett amendment to change the method of electing the President passed the Senate by the necessary two-thirds majority, it has no chance of approval by this House of Representatives. If there is to be any electoral reform by this Congress, the opponents of the present highly unsatisfactory system must turn to the proposed amendment by Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., of New York, which provides:

"Each State shall choose a number of electors of the President and Vice President, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress, in the same manner as its Senators and Representatives are chosen."

It further provides that when no candidate receives a majority of the electoral vote the final choice will be made from among the persons having the three highest numbers by a joint session of the House and Senate voting as a body, with three-fourths of the combined membership necessary for a quorum. Election will be by plurality on the first roll call.

The Lodge-Gossett amendment would abolish Presidential electors, retain the present basis for allotting electoral votes to the States and divide the electoral vote in each State among the candidates for President in direct proportion to the popular vote they receive therein, calculated to the third decimal place and farther if necessary to resolve a tie. Should no candidate win 40 percent of all the electoral votes, the final choice would be made by a joint session of the Congress voting by the head.

DIFFERING PLANS

Both of these electoral reform plans are as different from the present system as they are different from each other. The Coudert amendment is really the plan of the founding fathers before it was violated by the States in the rise of parties. It will be offered as a substitute for the Lodge plan.

The structure of our general government is based on a mixture of Federal and National principles. The Senate, in which each State has equal representation, is the Federal body, while the House of Representatives, being based on population, is the national body. The Congress of the United States, in every action, expresses the Federal and National principle.

The founding fathers regarded the electoral college as a counterpart body to the whole Congress in joint session for the single purpose of choosing the President and the Vice President. To each State they gave electoral power equal to the congressional power. The electoral college was and still is necessary to articulate the Federal and National basis of the Presidency. It was and still is necessary to maintain the separation of executive and legislative powers, an essential element in the structure of our Government. There is no way to bring about the direct popular election of the President without destroying our dual sovereignty. By abolishing the electoral college the Lodge amendment would be a long first step in that direction.

The problem sought to be solved springs from the State-wide election of all of a State's presidential electors, so that a plurality of a single vote may elect 47 electors of one party in the State of New York without a commensurate shift in congressional power. A balancing of electoral and congressional power can be had by electing all Representatives on State-wide tickets, as Senators and electors are now elected, or merely by electing those electors corresponding to Representatives in congressional districts. That is one of the essential features of the Coudert plan of electoral reform.

EFFECTS OF ADOPTION

Adoption of the Coudert amendment would have these effects:

Division of each State's electoral power among the political parties on the same basis as its congressional power is divided among them, thus giving national parties (merely aggregations of State parties) Presidential power commensurate with their congressional power—an ideal situation.

Give the Presidency to any party winning the equivalent of a bare majority in the House (218) and a bare majority of the States (25 with 50 electors).

Give the President and the Congress as a body the same constituency, cast up in the same form, thus ending the basis of the ideological conflict inherent in the present imbalance of electoral and congressional power.

Reduce to proper proportions States now having large blocs of doubtful electoral votes and make able men from other States available for presidential nominations

Besides, proportional representation would create a greater disparity in the States and sections between the electoral power and congressional power of the parties—certainly no basis for party government. For instance, the Republicans would lose electoral power in the Northern States, where their congressional power rests, and gain electoral power in the South, where they have no congressional power.

The Coudert amendment will solve our electoral problem within the framework of the established structure of our Government simply and effectively. It should be adopted.

The freakishness of the Lodge-Gossett amendment should condemn it.

J. HARVIE WILLIAMS.

NEW YORK, *March 2, 1950.*

For Want of a Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial titled "For Want of a Code," which appeared in today's Washington Post, March 22, 1950:

FOR WANT OF A CODE

Much of the hullabaloo that Senator McCARTHY has aroused with his trumped-up charges might have been avoided by a code of fair procedure for congressional investigations. Acting without any such code, the Tydings subcommittee made a sincere effort to restrict Mr. McCARTHY to presentation of facts and to give equal prominence to the denials of persons recklessly accused of Communist sympathies. But its efforts have not prevented the broadcasting of irresponsible charges from the committee room. Nor have they prevented the spread of confusion and loose suspicions relating to our foreign policy. The primary responsibility falls, of course, on Senator McCARTHY, but his tirades could and would have been shortcircuited by proper investigative procedures.

The best investigators of our time have worked quietly until they assembled substantial facts to go on. This means careful staff work before open hearings are held. It is the business of the staff to separate flimsy and groundless charges from charges that have some evidence behind them. Then when the open hearing goes forward, a consistent and well-rounded picture can be presented, without releasing any trial balloons filled with hot air or poison gas. Experience has shown that when individual reputations are at stake such preliminary investigative work and screening is imperative if the rudiments of fairness are to be observed.

At the beginning of the present inquiry Senator TYDINGS made extraordinary efforts to be fair. He insisted on bringing immediately into the record relevant facts about each case—facts that Senator McCARTHY had ignored. In this way he exposed the hollowness of the McCarthy accusations. But the result was to fill the air with a bedlam of charges and countercharges highly damaging to our national unity and to the conduct of our foreign policy. As a practical matter, we doubt that any committee can be prepared to give immediate refutation to wild charges, and, if it could, a great deal of harm would nevertheless be done by officially airing mere rumor and disconnected bits of information that add up to nothing.

What has been lacking here is careful staff work. Only on Monday did the subcommittee get from Senator McCARTHY in confidence a list of 81 cases of alleged Communist infiltration in the State Department. Obviously the subcommittee should have had this list and should have done extensive checking as to the facts before any hearings were held. Then it could have given the public facts instead of Mr. McCARTHY's inflamed imaginings. With members of both parties and a competent staff on hand to see that the facts were properly sifted, there would have been no danger of a whitewashing. And the Senate could have saved itself from an orgy of mud throwing.

Apparently the committee now intends to sift the evidence carefully and check it against State Department records before any further hearings are held. That is all to the good. But the fact remains that, in the hearings to date, Senator McCARTHY has succeeded in taking the ball and running wild with it. This seems to us greatly to strengthen the case for adoption of a code of fair procedure for all congressional investigations. Two years ago we printed a series of editorials pointing to the need for such a code, and outlining what it should contain. The pertinence of the rules we suggested, and perhaps additional ones, looms even larger today. For Congress is falling in the esteem of the people, and that decline is likely to continue until it curbs the misuse of its vast investigative power to serve petty, mean, and partisan ends.

Cooperative Housing for Middle-Income Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by President Green, of the A. F. of L., in behalf of H. R. 7402:

The American Federation of Labor is wholeheartedly supporting H. R. 7402, the cooperative-housing bill for middle-income families.

There can be no doubt that additional legislation is needed to meet the acute housing needs of this group whose incomes are too high to qualify them for public housing and too low to afford the new homes being constructed by private builders. Discussion of this bill has developed an unusual amount of confusion. Yet the reasons why you should vote for it are essentially very simple.

The only way the housing needs of this middle-income group can be met without an outright Government subsidy is through a cooperative-housing program. In order for cooperative-housing projects to get underway they will need proper private financing. The bill provides this, without any increase in the public debt, by allowing private funds to purchase certain Government-backed debentures. The proceeds from the sale of these debentures would in turn be loaned to cooperatives.

Strict requirements have been included covering allowances for reserves (one-quarter of 1 percent) and administration (one-half of 1 percent). The cooperative-housing projects will be sound business enterprises, with a 10-percent equity required for all participants. Ample safeguards against speculation are also in the bill.

The results of utilizing the cooperative techniques together with the financing arrangements in the bill are the only way to make possible monthly payments of $60-$70 a month on units now renting for $85-$95 a month.

In behalf of 8,500,000 members of the American Federation of Labor, I specifically request that you vote for H. R. 7402, as reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee.

New Iron-Ore Fields Found in Northwest Central Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, new discoveries of iron ore in northwest central Minnesota may bring new prosperity to a section of my own district, the Ninth of Minnesota, and may help solve the problem of finding needed iron ore for our Nation.

An interesting story of the discovery of iron-ore deposits was reported in the St. Paul Dispatch for March 7, 1950. I am sure the article will be of interest to Members of the Congress.

It follows:

NEW IRON-ORE FIELD INDICATED IN BECKER-OTTER TAIL COUNTIES

Location of a huge magnetic field with definite possibilities of commercial iron ore development in Becker and Otter Tail Counties was announced today by the University of Minnesota.

Dr. C. H. Schwartz, geology professor and director of the Minnesota geological survey, said he is very optimistic about the field uncovered by the aerial doodle-bug survey.

The doodle bug, or magnetometer detector unit, is slung from a specially equipped airplane by a long cable. It is used to locate, not ore itself, but the type of glacial drift known to contain iron ore.

"Locating the ore itself is like finding the plums in a pudding," Dr. Schwartz said today. "In this case I think experimental drilling by the iron-ore companies may be extremely rewarding.

"The glacial drift is between 190 and 300 feet deep, and drilling will be admittedly expensive but I feel strongly that it would be worth it. With the search for new ore fields extending to remote parts of the world, a new discovery in a strategic location like Minnesota would be invaluable."

The newly discovered magnetic field is in the shape of a rough letter "E," 50 to 30 miles wide, lying partly in Otter Tail and partly in Becker Counties.

Some exploratory core drilling was done in Otter Tail County in 1910, Dr. Schwartz says, and developed an ore-bearing rock formation at 350 feet. Because the glacial drift at this point was at 394 feet, work was abandoned as being too expensive.

Dr. Schwartz feels that the area should be systematically reexamined. He doesn't promise another Mesabi range, but he says, "You never can tell what you will find."

A Post Mortem on the Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial titled "A Post Mortem on the Coal Strike," which appeared in the St. Louis Labor Tribune on Thursday, March 16, 1950:

A POST MORTEM ON THE COAL STRIKE

The current issue of Labor, organ of the national railroad unions, stated that the new coal mine agreement signed last week was a triumph for both President Truman and John L. Lewis, and a stunning defeat for the Taft-Hartley Act.

That is a factual summation. As the article points out, President Truman "carefully calculated his moves, never lost his head, and paved the way for a peaceful settlement."

It also stressed the strongest link in the successful chain of events, namely the undaunted determination of the rank-and-file miners. Without belittling Lewis, the article declared, the rank-and-file in the last analysis won the battle.

As a characteristic index of this determination, the article quotes a Cloverdale, Pa., miner who said: "We went on strike for a new contract, we went hungry for a new contract—and we won."

However, the one single individual who played the decisive role and served as the fulcrum which ended this stalemate, was Federal Judge Richmond B. Keech. The Taft-Hartley law encouraged the coal operators to resist collective bargaining on a reasonable basis because they thought the injunctive weapon provided by the Taft-Hartley Act would win the battle for them and force the miners back to the pits.

But unlike another Federal judge, Alan Goldsborough, who 2 years ago levied a seven-figure fine against the union for ignoring the court order, Judge Keech showed he was made of sterner stuff. He refused to play dog-in-the-manger for the mine owners. That forced them to quickly change their tactics and for the first time they bargained in good faith as they could have done any time during the previous 8 months after the old contract expired.

Labor owes Judge Keech a profound debt of gratitude, not only for allowing that this injunctive phase of the Taft-Hartley Act is unenforceable and that you can't compel free American workers to work against their will; but because a contrary unjust ruling would not only have broken the mine workers' union but laid the ground work for the busting of all big industrial unions.

As one distinguished Senator, in close touch with the situation, said, "I have no doubt that the big financiers and industrialists, who are back of the coal operators, tried to block a settlement except on their own terms, because they thought that under the Taft-Hartley Act they had Lewis over a barrel. Furthermore, they figured that if they could break Lewis, they could go ahead and break other unions too. Fortunately for the country, the plot failed."

It was indeed a great labor victory. But to make it a lasting one, Congress should heed President Truman's request to set up a fact-finding committee to make an exhaustive long-range study of this obviously unstable, sick industry, and find ways and means to stabilize it and prevent needless future labor-management clashes and contests for power like the one just closed.

Middle-Class Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore obtained, I include herein an editorial from the St. Louis Labor Tribune of Thursday, March 16, 1950, entitled "What the Middle-Class Housing Bill Could Do."

The housing shortage is an evil that cuts across income lines.

It has as little respect for the family whose earnings total $3,000 a year as it has for the family bringing in half that.

The bald fact is that rents are high—and rents on the few dwellings that do become available are completely out of reach of low-income groups, and well out of range of our middle-income families—those whose earnings amount to between $2,700 to $4,400 a year.

In the past week, for example, the flats and apartments advertised for rent in St. Louis newspapers show rents far above the ability to pay of our middle-income groups.

Here is an efficiency apartment, for example—a small apartment—to rent for $90 a month. Here is a one-bedroom place for $105. Here are dwellings upon dwellings that specifically declare "no children."

We are often told by real-estate men that a family's rent should not exceed one-fourth of its income. At that rate, our middle-income groups can afford payments for housing of only $50 to not more than $85 a month.

But we know too well that because of our national income structure, more of the group we seek to help can afford closer to $50 a month than $85.

Can these families buy homes? Most of those who write me can't even afford the down payments. Yet they are in desperate need of housing. They are potential buyers, but not at present high levels. They need lower prices, and they need lower down payments.

They need lower rents. They need rents they can afford, payments which will not be so high as to be met only by doing without other necessities.

In this program to spur housing for the middle-income group, we will be doing more than providing the means for many of our people to have decent and adequate dwellings.

We will be helping to provide jobs, and income, for many; we will be aiding business; we will be helping our own general national economic situation.

There are some who may claim that these middle-income citizens can help themselves. But can they? I maintain not. And I insist they are getting far less than value received for the dwellings in which they must live because of this national housing shortage.

We have talked about some of the places that are coming open now. But what of those already rented? Here in my St. Louis district is a family paying $90 a month for four inadequate rooms over a garage. The father—the only breadwinner in the group—brings home $65 a week.

Here in my district is another family, a man, his wife, and three children, paying $16 a week for three rooms—with an outdoor toilet. This is $70 a month rent for a family whose income is $45 a week.

This is not just a question of excessive rents. It is a question of providing housing for people who can afford to pay the rate provided by this bill—providing better housing and through it, better health, better sanitation, better living conditions.

It is a question of whether we are willing to meet our responsibility to responsible citizens. Our path is clear.

The editorial follows:

WHAT THE MIDDLE CLASS HOUSING BILL COULD DO

There are millions of lower-income families who can't afford to buy a home under current inflated speculative prices. They, along with other millions of families are compelled to pay more for rent than many of them can afford. Still other income groups, who have been forced to move to suburban and rural areas to find a place to live, have to spend more for additional transportation than what they often save in rent.

This means that excessive rent just leaves the average tenant with so much less for everyday needs such as clothing, food, medical care, and a lot of other things which also help our dwindling retail trades.

It therefore does seem logical to assume that a Federal law which promotes needed cooperative housing for middle-income groups on easy terms would be a boon to the Nation's commerce. It would make more jobs for building mechanics; stimulate the demand for building materials and supplies which provide work for millions of persons. It would give these middle-income groups more money to buy the products of the farmer, manufactured goods, various forms of services including medical and dental treatment.

In other words, the present proposed middle-income housing bill, if passed by Congress, will put more money in more people's pockets to spend at a time when there is a great need for greater consumer spending power.

Let's hope that Congress, which is now considering this bill, does not fall down on this opportunity to provide a powerful needed vitamin to the Nation's economy.

Housing Cost Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1950.

To: All members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Subject: Housing cost survey, March 6, 1950.

When the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, Jr., appeared before your committee to present

ADA's views on the subject of middle-income housing, he was requested to ask the national ADA to conduct a housing cost survey and to send the findings of this survey on to the committee. The national ADA through its local chapters has conducted such a study in 20 cities in 16 States. In each city, the best source of information was used: i. e., FHA, real estate board, local building and loan companies, etc.

The findings of this survey are indicated in the attached table. All cost figures are current as of March 6, 1950.

JOHN J. GUNTHER,
Legislative Representative.

State and city	2-bedroom frame			2-bedroom brick			3-bedroom frame			3-bedroom brick		
	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average
Connecticut (State-wide)	$7,500	$12,000	$9,300	$8,000	$15,000	$9,600	$8,900	$16,000	$10,500	$8,900	$25,000	$11,000
Illinois: Chicago (⅔ of homes costing less $12,000 were 4-room units)	11,200	14,500	12,600	11,700	18,000	13,300	12,600	[1] 23,000	15,600	13,000	[1] 30,000	15,600
Indiana:												
Gary			8,900			11,500			12,000			13,000
Indianapolis	7,500	12,000	8,900	8,100	15,750	11,000	8,300	15,300	13,000	8,100	30,000	13,700
South Bend	7,900	12,200	9,400	8,300	18,000	11,500	8,500	15,800	12,750	9,500	[1] 25,000	12,900
Kansas: Lawrence	7,000	11,300	9,000	8,200	15,000	11,000	9,000	15,000	12,500	10,000	Up	13,300
Maryland: Baltimore	7,700	11,800		9,000	14,500		9,000	14,000		10,500	Up	
Michigan: Lansing	7,500	11,000	9,000	9,000	[1] 12,000	11,000	11,000	18,000	18,000	12,000	[1] 20,000	17,000
Minnesota: St. Paul							12,000	18,000	15,000	15,500	[1] 20,000	16,500
Nebraska: Lincoln	7,800	Up	10,500	10,000	15,000	13,000	12,000	Up	13,000	13,500	Up	15,000
New Jersey: Newark				10,500	16,000	14,000				14,000	Up	18,000
New York:												
New York	10,000	20,000	12,500	11,000	25,000	15,000	12,000	20,000	16,500	12,000	50,000	19,000
Rochester	8,000	Up	10,000				9,500	Up	12,500			
Utica	8,000	Up	10,500				9,000	Up	13,000			
North Carolina: Durham	8,100	Up	9,200	9,000	12,500	11,000	9,700	Up	12,000	11,500	Up	13,500
Ohio: Cleveland	9,000	Up	11,000	9,500	Up	11,750	10,000	Up	12,000	11,700	Up	13,200
Oregon: Portland	8,300	12,000	10,000	8,750	13,500	11,500	8,900	Up	12,600	10,000	Up	12,600
Pennsylvania:												
Philadelphia (row)				8,900	Up	11,000				10,500	Up	12,000
Pittsburgh	10,000	13,500	11,000	11,000	15,000	12,000	11,500	18,000	13,300	12,500	[1] 16,500	12,900
Washington: Seattle	8,000	12,000	9,700	10,000	13,000	11,500	8,500	[1] 13,000	10,000	10,500	[1] 16,000	12,000
Wisconsin: Madison	8,000	Up	10,500				10,800	Up	12,000			

[1] Over.

Triennial National Convention of B'nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by Secretary-General Trygve Lie at the triennial national convention banquet of B'nai B'rith at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., on Tuesday evening, March 21, 1950, and also the address of introduction of the Secretary General of the United Nations by Mr. Frank Goldman, president of B'nai B'rith:

INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS BY MR. FRANK GOLDMAN, PRESIDENT OF B'NAI B'RITH

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of B'nai B'rith, I welcome you who are present at this dinner, as well as you who are our radio listeners throughout the United States and elsewhere in the world.

A handful of men in New York in 1843 established B'nai B'rith. B'nai B'rith has now grown to a membership of over 350,000 men and women of the Jewish faith.

It is the oldest and largest Jewish service organization in the world, and engages in a wide range of humanitarian activities. For more than a century it has sought to play an active, constructive role here and abroad to protect the freedom of individuals and institutions.

Last year, as the American constituent of the Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations, we became a consultant to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. As a result, B'nai B'rith has had the privilege to participate in the work of the United Nations and especially in the field of protecting human rights.

We feel it most fitting that this dinner meeting during B'nai B'rith's Triennial Convention here in Washington should be dedicated to freedom and democracy. We are honored at the presence here of the Vice President of the United States, members of the Cabinet, the Congress, and the Supreme Court, and many other high officials of our Government and foreign governments and of the United Nations. There are present B'nai B'rith delegates from the United States, Canada, and other countries. We are delighted also to have with us a member of B'nai B'rith who has served so effectively and so selflessly on behalf of Jewish causes. I refer to Mr. Eddie Jacobson, of Kansas City, whom we will have occasion to honor later in our program.

We live in a world tragically divided and tragically insecure. Governments must devise policies premised on the continued existence of peace. The United Nations represents the most hopeful means of securing peace, of protecting the economic and social achievements of all peoples, and of building a world where people will practice tolerance and respect for one another.

Macaulay said: "Men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely."

Especially in the field of human rights has the United Nations already registered great accomplishments. We who lost one-third of our coreligionists as a result of the Nazi scourge hail the progress made in the protection of human rights since President Roosevelt enunciated the four freedoms.

To help carry out the program for the protection of human rights, B'nai B'rith has urged on the United Nations a modest two-point proposal.

First, the United Nations should ask each member state to establish a National Commission on Human Rights.

Second, the United Nations should establish fact-finding commissions to provide for world-wide surveys regarding the observance and protection of human rights.

We believe that a most effective means to eliminate undesirable conditions is continually to expose the facts in responsible forums. It is for that reason that we have made our suggestions to the United Nations.

B'nai B'rith is honored that the Secretary General of the United Nations should make his first public speech in Washington from the platform of our convention.

His life history has marked points of resemblance to the life history of many great Americans and further indicates the true democratic tradition of Norway.

He was born in Oslo in 1896. While still in high school he was elected president of the Norwegian Labor Party's branch in a suburb of Oslo. Later he became legal adviser to the Labor Party and a member of its national council. He was active in settling controversies between labor and management.

He served Norway as Minister of Justice, as Minister of Commerce, and as Minister of Foreign Affairs. He headed the Norwegian delegation to the San Francisco Conference on the United Nations in 1945 and served as chairman of the commission which drafted the Charter for the Security Council. When the first meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations was held in London he was elected the first Secretary General of the United Nations.

The prodigious work of the Secretary General is well known to the world. He has devoted himself untiringly and with great skill and intense sincerity to accomplishing the purposes of the United Nations. He has made a great contribution to the peace and well-being of the world.

We are especially indebted to him and to the United Nations for assisting so effectively in bringing peace to Palestine, and Israel into the family of nations.

On behalf of B'nai B'rith I am privileged to present one who has aptly been called the world's first citizen, the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Trygve Lie.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY GENERAL TRYGVE LIE

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am happy to be able to accept your invitation to speak at the triennial convention of B'nai B'rith.

I feel it is especially appropriate for the Secretary General of the United Nations to talk with the members of an organization that is working for better human relations and is helping to make the community a better place in which to live.

Just as B'nai B'rith is working for these results in the American community and the American Nation, so the United Nations is working for the same objectives in the whole world.

International peace and security, friendly relations, respect for equal rights, self-determination, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, and religion, harmonizing the actions of nations—these words of the United Nations Charter express the most deeply felt desires of peoples all over the world. They are words that express the desires of people of every religious faith, every political belief, every social order, every cultural tradition, and every stage of economic development from the most backward to the most advanced.

You will agree that these are great words. But, you have the right to ask, what effect is being given to them—or can be given to them by the United Nations?

Some people think that the United Nations has not done much about these goals and will not be able to do much about them. Some fear that the United Nations is impotent because of the veto, that it has been paralyzed by the great power conflict and that it has been consigned to the deep freeze by the cold war.

This is a natural impression for people to get. The destructive effects of conflict between nations rather than the constructive effort toward harmonizing the actions of nations has held the spotlight of attention during the past 3 years.

Nobody should underestimate the dangers and difficulties created for the world and for the United Nations by the cold war. Nevertheless, this impression of the weakness of the United Nations, natural as it is, is very wrong. It is a mistake that must be corrected if the world is to succeed in bringing the cold war to a peaceful end.

It was only 5 years ago this coming June that the Charter of the United Nations was signed in San Francisco. That is an extremely brief period of time by any measurement of history.

Yet during that brief span of 5 years the words of the United Nations Charter on human rights and freedoms for individuals and on equal rights and self-determination for nations have been proved by events to reflect more accurately the most fundamental forces actually at work in the world than any of the slogans of the cold war.

In my fourth annual report to the General Assembly on the work of the Organization I referred to these events when I said:

"If the importance of these developments were correctly assessed, I believe that the world would find it possible to approach the present east-west difficulties with less hysteria, for they would be more easily seen in their true perspective. I believe that the rise of dependent peoples and the human-rights movement will, in the long run, have far more significance and give rise to greater events in the second half of the twentieth century than will the present ideological struggle."

As time passes, I think that more and more people will come to agree with that appraisal. We who live in these times are both witnessing and participating in some of the greatest changes in the history of the world.

Since the United Nations Charter was signed at San Francisco the following countries of Asia have gained their independence: The Philippines, India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Jordan, Israel, Korea, Nepal, and the United States of Indonesia. All these countries are now either members of the United Nations or they have called to be admitted. Together these countries have a population of over 650,000,000, four times the population of the United States and over one-quarter the entire population of the world.

The mere existence of the United Nations, with its Charter pledging human rights for people and equal rights for nations, has helped along this movement.

In Africa the United Nations, by the action of the General Assembly last fall, has become the liberator of former colonies. Libya will become independent in 1952 and Somaliland in 1960. At this moment a United Nations commission is consulting the people in a third former colony—Eritrea—in order to determine their wishes as to their future.

Elsewhere in Africa the national movements toward freedom and equality are not so far advanced. But here, too, the United Nations plays a significant role through its trusteeship system and through the application of those provisions of the Charter that establish for the first time in history a degree of international responsibility for all dependent peoples.

The human-rights provisions of the United Nations Charter were greatly strengthened in San Francisco by the influence of nongovernmental organizations like B'nai B'rith, who were there as consultants or observers. Besides its general pledges to promote observances of human rights, the Charter specifically provided for the creation of a commission on human rights.

Under the distinguished chairmanship of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt that commission worked for 2 years on drafting the universal declaration of human rights. The General Assembly of the United Nations adopted this declaration without a single negative vote—although there were some abstentions—in Paris on December 10, 1948, a little more than 1 year ago.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights goes beyond previous declaration of human rights in two ways. In the first place it is international. It is the first declaration of human rights for the whole world in all history. In the second place it includes not only the traditional rights to political and religious freedoms. It is also an expression of economic and social rights—such rights as the right to work, the right to social security, and the right to a decent standard of living.

Like its great predecessors in the Western World—Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, and the Declaration of the Rights of Man—the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is not in itself a law. Like them, however, it is a source of law. It raises a standard to which all men everywhere can make appeal and by which they can measure the conduct of their Government.

Most of the rights proclaimed in this declaration are not yet enjoyed by most of the peoples of the world. Millions do not enjoy freedom of speech and religion. Millions are denied equal opportunity because of the color of their skin or their beliefs. Still greater millions have not yet won security from poverty and hunger.

Judging by what has begun to happen within a few months after it was first proclaimed, the Declaration of Human Rights is going to have a tremendous influence in helping people to win wider and more faithful observance of these rights from their governments.

Decades passed before more than a few dozen copies of the Magna Carta were made. Years passed before more than a few thousand copies of the Declaration of Independence were printed.

In only 12 months something like 2,000,000 copies of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights have been printed. Already it has been, or is being, translated into 30 languages. It has been put on film and on posters and repeated in radio broadcasts. And this is only the beginning.

I prophesy that the time is not far distant when there will be not 2,000,000, but 200,000,000 copies of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and it will be translated not only in 30 languages, but in 60 languages. If we work faithfully for it the time will come when there will be a copy for every schoolroom and every public bulletin board in the world.

Already the new Republics of Israel and Indonesia have borrowed from the Declaration in the drafting of the constitutional provisions for the human rights of their peoples. It has been cited in court cases in this and other countries. Meanwhile the Declaration is helping greater numbers of people all the time to be more articulate and effective in demanding and securing observance of these rights from their governments.

The United Nations is both influencing and being influenced by the rise of dependent people and the human rights movement in many ways. All the economic and social programs of the United Nations and the 12 specialized agencies associated with it are directed at winning more equal opportunity and wider enjoyment of human rights and freedoms.

The United Nations new and expanded program of technical assistance for economic development, which owes so much to the United States Government, and is slowly getting under way, is a case in point. The present financial scope of this program is modest. The possible ultimate results of the program, in terms of higher living standards, are immense, provided that technical assistance is accompanied and followed by capital investment over the next 10 to 20 years on a bold and creative scale.

Economic assistance programs carried out through the United Nations and the specialized agencies offer advantages to both lending and receiving countries and to the world as a whole. For the lending countries the United Nations offers such protection against charges of imperialism or of using economic aid for purposes of political pressure. To the recipient countries United Nations programs offer the opportunity to join on a basis of equality in planning and executing programs that are of benefit to lending and recipient countries alike. For the world as a whole every United Nations program of economic assistance offers another chance to ease the tensions of the cold war.

I was glad to note that your Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, declared in his speech at San Francisco last Wednesday that the United States in its financial, economic and technical assistance to countries in Asia would "work in the spirit and within the framework of the United Nations." I am certain that such a policy of working through the United Nations will be of benefit to the United States, to the countries of Asia and to the cause of world peace.

Another point should be made about the role of the United Nations in this vast movement of peoples toward equality in the world and toward a fuller realization of human rights and freedoms. The United Nations is also exerting constant influence to keep it within peaceful bounds. Such great changes as have occurred since the end of the war could not have taken place without far more violence and bloodshed if the United Nations had not existed.

I wish now to turn briefly to the great political issues before the United Nations.

One of these is the question of which government should represent China in the United Nations as a result of the civil war.

As you know, the world is strongly divided on the question of Chinese recognition and representation.

Of the countries with great power privileges in the United Nations, two—Great Britain and the Soviet Union—have recognized the new People's Republic Government in Peking. The other great powers, France and the United States, continue to recognize the Nationalist Government now on the island of Formosa.

Diplomatic recognition has been extended to the Peking government by 24 countries, 13 of which are member states. They include Asiatic countries like the neighboring states of Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, India, and Pakistan, and such European states besides the United Kingdom, as the Nordic countries, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Norway, besides Switzerland and others.

The Nationalist Government at Formosa continues to have diplomatic relations with a somewhat larger number of governments, among them most of the American Republics. Finally, there is a third and smaller group of countries which do not have regular diplomatic relations with either government.

You will note that this division among the nations of the world does not at all follow the so-called usual lines.

I have been trying to help the member governments settle the question of who is to represent China in the United Nations. I am not doing this because the Soviet Union and its neighbors have refused to attend meetings at which China is represented by Nationalist delegates. I have never thought walking out of meetings and staying away from meetings was a good way to settle differences of opinion.

It is a serious matter to have the Soviet Union staying away from United Nations meetings, but that is not the first consideration. The first consideration is the people of China. There are 450,000,000 people in that country—the greatest in the world and in the United Nations in terms of population alone.

The 450,000,000 people of China are collectively original members of the United Nations by the terms of the Charter itself. They have a right to be represented in the United Nations by whatever government has the power to "employ the resources and direct the people of the state in fulfillment of the obligations of membership" in the United Nations. I repeat—whatever government is thus qualified, regardless of its ideology.

Before I conclude I wish to say just a word about the role of the United Nations in the cold war.

Can the United Nations do anything about the cold war?

I think it can.

United Nations programs of economic assistance and social welfare will help to reduce cold-war tensions, provided such programs are carried out on a nonpolitical basis.

The United Nations has demonstrated its capacity for mediation and conciliation of bitter conflicts in Palestine, Indonesia, and Kashmir.

The United Nations has been able to keep within peaceful bounds every other dispute between nations that has been brought before it. The great power veto has not prevented the Security Council most of the time from performing its conciliating and mediating role. The General Assembly, where there is no veto, has full power to supplement this pacific work of the Security Council and has done so with success in a number of instances.

It is true that no progress has been made for the last 2 years and a half toward getting agreement on the control of atomic energy, or on reducing other armaments, or on providing military forces to the Security Council to enforce its decisions.

Nevertheless, the United Nations has the great advantage of being able to apply to conflicts of power those moderating controls and conciliating influences that are the result of the principles of universality and sovereign equality among nations.

There are many resources for peace in the United Nations Charter and in the Organization that are either untapped or have been only partially used so far.

For example, the Charter calls for special periodic meetings of the Security Council at which the members can be represented by the foreign ministers or even the heads of government. Under the rules the Council should hold such meetings twice a year but so far there have not been any.

If such special meetings were to be held as a regular thing they should be devoted to a periodic review of outstanding issues before the United Nations, accompanied by quiet and private consultations on these issues among the foreign ministers.

Great results should not be expected from any one of these meetings. Their success or failure should not be measured in terms of decisions reached, but in terms of a step-by-step progress toward better understanding and the restoration of an atmosphere of mutual confidence more favorable to the peaceful settlement of outstanding issues.

Besides the opportunity for progress offered by high-level periodic meetings of the Security Council, the United Nations offers many other possibilities as well.

I think we should use all these resources in order to try to bring the cold war to an end.

I do not believe in political miracles. It will take a long series of steps to reduce the tensions of the conflict and bring the great powers together.

Equally I do not think the world can safely delay taking the first steps on this road of negotiation and conciliation. The danger of an indefinite continuation of the cold war in this age of the atom bomb, the hydrogen bomb, and bacteriological weapons is too great.

I want to make certain that I am not misunderstood when I speak for negotiation among the great powers. I do not mean by negotiation surrender or appeasement by either side. I mean negotiation—which requires honest give-and-take by both sides.

I have been encouraged by the recent reaffirmations from the two leading great powers—the United States and the Soviet Union—about the possibilities of peaceful coexistence between them and between the different economic and political systems they represent. The United Nations was founded upon that belief and the hope of world peace depends upon its validity.

What we need, what the world needs, is a 20-year program to win peace through the United Nations.

I believe that most people everywhere in the world will join me in the desire and hope that member governments of the United Nations will make renewed efforts to get together on the first steps of such a United Nations peace program without delay.

Andrew Jackson—Great in War, Great in Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in including herein an editorial by Harry H. Schlacht, which appeared on March 15, 1950, in the New York Journal-American. The editorial follows:

ANDREW JACKSON—GREAT IN WAR, GREAT IN PEACE

History is the mirror of the past. It is the guide of the present. It is the beacon of the future.

Affection has no greater theme, wisdom has no nobler counsel, than the living actions of our sainted sires.

Today is the one hundred and eighty-third anniversary of the birth of Andrew Jackson. He was the son of destiny. He was the seventh President of the United States.

He was the great warrior in the Battle of New Orleans. He is in a class by himself in the history of Presidents.

He was the foe of oppression. He was the lover of justice. He was the friend of humanity.

The story of Old Hickory is always inspiring, is always new. His life sprang from the dark valley of obscurity like the peak of his favorite Alleghenies—rough, rugged, sublime, piercing every cloud till its summits bathed in the sunlight of heaven.

Like Niagara Falls or Mount Washington, his character more deeply impresses us the more it is contemplated.

Symmetrical, massive, and grand, it challenges admiration. It prompts high ideals. It excites wonder.

Washington was the Father of his Country. Jefferson was the philosopher of democracy. Jackson was its defender.

In what age did Jackson live? Where in the records of history is to be found an era in which the human race made mightier movements? Where is to be found an era in which occurred the formation and dissolution of European governments and the triumph of the American system?

Today our country is at the crossroads of destiny. Today we are engaged in world-wide ideological conflict testing whether or not our form of government shall continue to endure. We are engaged in a desperate struggle with enemies within our gates who would destroy our sacred institutions, who would impose on us an alien system that would mean the end of everything that is dear to us.

Here on this continent Andrew Jackson helped to perpetuate a way of living which has proved to be the world's greatest contribution to the dignity of man.

It is civilization's brightest promise. It is civilization's strongest hope.

Here in America the poorest lad can learn from the career of Andrew Jackson—an orphan at birth—that poverty is no bar to the strength of the free spirit.

Here in America the avenues of the citadel of our strength and the posts of honor are open to universal competition.

Here in America the freedom-giving institutions of our land call to the highest honors her children from the workshop, from the farm, from the city.

The ranks of American statesmen have come from the humblest origin. In life, Jackson's career was like the blaze of the sun in the fierceness of its noonday glory. In death, Jackson was as lovely as the mildest sunset of a summer evening when the sun descends in cloudless, tranquil beauty. Let us serve our country as he served it. Let us serve our God as he served Him.

God grant us the wisdom, the courage to protect and preserve America.

Selected Statistics on Corporate Profits and National Income, 1929–49

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statistics:

Selected statistics on corporate profits and national income, 1929–49

[Millions of dollars]

Year	National income	Corporate profits before tax	Corporate profits after tax	Corporate profits after tax as percent of national income
1929	87,205	9,618	6,421	8.9
1930	75,018	5,465	3,653	5.1
1931	58,850	−780	−520	−2.2
1932	41,980	−3,042	−2,028	−8.2
1933	39,504	563	563	−.9
1934	48,613	1,732	873	2.0
1935	55,730	3,258	2,257	4.0
1936	64,713	5,064	3,573	5.5
1937	73,027	6,197	4,085	5.6
1938	67,274	3,329	2,296	3.4
1939	71,910	6,467	4,615	6.4
1940	81,347	9,325	6,667	7.9
1941	103,904	17,222	9,238	8.9
1942	127,119	23,408	9,525	8.3
1943	139,498	25,052	10,646	8.2
1944	143,678	24,353	10,888	8.0
1945	142,964	19,717	8,308	4.7
1946	170,562	25,583	15,000	7.6
1947	201,709	31,820	18,000	8.8
1948	229,364	34,765	21,174	9.4
1949	221,500	[1] 28,800	[1] 17,300	7.8

[1] Estimated by the Department of Commerce on the basis of a projection of the profits of the first 3 quarters. Recent corporate reports indicate that this method may underestimate the recovery of the last months of the year.

Source: Survey of Current Business, published by Department of Commerce.

Earnings of insured commercial banks, 1941–48

Year	Net profit before taxes	Net profit after taxes	Amount per 100 percent total capital accounts: Net current operating earnings	Net profit before income taxes	Net profit after income taxes
	Thousands	Thousands			
1941	$504,522	$454,522	7.68	7.47	6.72
1942	535,195	449,851	8.18	7.48	6.34
1943	595,426	497,961	9.71	10.57	8.92
1944	954,059	751,249	11.12	12.96	9.72
1945	1,204,707	946,942	11.51	14.46	10.87
1946	1,225,674	962,346	12.23	13.66	10.01
1947	1,064,835	793,297	11.71	11.37	8.20
1948	1,020,758	745,536	12.46	10.96	7.69

Source: Annual Report, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Dec. 31, 1948, pp. 109, 110.

Earnings of a selected group of corporations for 1948 and 1949

Name of corporation	Amount earned 1948	Amount earned 1949	Earnings per share of common 1948	Earnings per share of common 1949	Date 1949 earnings released
	Thous.	Thous.			1950
Allied Chemical & Dye Corp.	$31,771	$37,151	16.38	15.78	Mar. 9
American Smelting & Refining Co.	38,927	25,107	13.47	8.22	Mar. 13
Borden Co.	18,179	21,990	4.46	5.10	Mar. 14
Burroughs Adding Machine Co.	12,382	7,480	2.52	1.50	Mar. 8
Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.	8,023	8,039	2.99	3.06	Mar. 15
Duke Power Co.	8,190	10,378	2.48	3.36	Mar. 9
du Pont E. I. de Nemours & Co.	137,480	124,672	5.78	4.52	Mar. 9
Eastman Kodak Co.	51,323	49,771	4.11	3.99	Mar. 8
General Electric Co.	125,850	125,638	4.26	4.26	Mar. 10
General Motors Corp.	940,448	836,494	8.72	14.04	Mar. 14
General Tire & Rubber Co.	4,784	1,015	7.33	.94	Mar. 2
Hudson Motor Car Co.	15,256	16,111	7.28	8.31	Mar. 15
Kennecott Copper Corp.	86,807	95,136	8.67	4.45	Mar. 9
Lehigh Portland Cement Co.	5,668	6,357	5.96	6.67	Mar. 14
Le Tourneau, R. G., Inc.	2,748	820	------	1.47	Mar. 6
Marlin-Rockwell Corp.	3,301	2,629	9.92	7.73	Mar. 6
National Cash Register Co.	14,076	15,395	7.62	3.92	Mar. 10
National Lead Co.	12,304	14,749	2.62	3.88	Mar. 15
Packard Motor Car Co.	15,109	7,706	1.01	.51	Mar. 10
Peoples Gas, Light & Coke Co.	6,117	8,282	8.33	10.21	Feb. 28
Phelps Dodge Corp.	32,287	34,723	10.50	6.85	Mar. 10
Staley, A. E., Manufacturing Co.	6,623	4,330	7.49	4.90	Mar. 13
Stromberg-Carlson Co.	878	475	2.74	------	Feb. 23
Studebaker Corp.	19,115	27,969	8.11	11.70	Mar. 9
Union Tank Car Co.	6,062	5,968	3.77	3.11	Mar. 15
United Engineering & Foundry Co.	5,098	9,654	8.98	8.58	Mar. 15
Westinghouse Electric Corp.	55,656	52,794	4.11	4.16	Feb. 28
White Motor Co.	3,420	971	4.88	1.41	Mar. 13

Sources: Wall Street Journal and New York Times.

Young Newspaperman Points Up Difficulty in Reducing Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the Members of the House an extension of remarks which I inserted in the RECORD on February 21. It will be found on page A1305 of the Appendix and it is entitled "Weekly Newspaper Editor Points Up Difficulty in Reducing Appropriations."

This is an article written by a young man on the staff of the Warren Sheaf, published at Warren, Minn., in my congressional district. His name is Victor Aalbu, who each week does a fine job of turning out an interesting column for this outstanding weekly newspaper. His column is entitled "Chips Off the Block."

On February 21, in calling attention to the column which I had inserted into the RECORD, I had mentioned that it was written by Neil Mattson. Mr. Mattson since has called to my attention the fact that it was Mr. Aalbu who wrote it. I take this opportunity to make this correction and to again call your attention to this interesting article showing how difficult it is to reduce appropriations.

Birthday of Thomas Alva Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the memory of one of America's greatest sons was honored when the Nation, from coast to coast and Lakes to Gulf, combined in a spontaneous observance of February 11, 1950, as the one hundred and third anniversary of the birth of the late Thomas Alva Edison. Edison's genius, which gave the world the electric light, the phonograph, the motion picture, and numerous greater inventions, was memorialized throughout the Nation and by persons from all walks of life. Annually throughout the country, Thomas Alva Edison is memorialized and I want to include the very fine address delivered by George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., before the Rotary Club of Paterson, N. J., memorializing the great inventor:

THERE IS THE RISING SUN

To your eye and imagination, and to mine, nothing, I suppose, is more impressive than the rising sun; increasing the light slowly, yet with marvelous speed, from the faintest beginnings to the full splendor of a brilliant morning.

This planet of ours was a dreadful place in the old days before the sun had done its work. Monsters such as flying lizards and giant dinosaurs, bigger than 10 elephants, infested the earth. The air was so heavy, so filled with poison gases, that no creature now living could possibly have breathed.

But the sun has been working a long time to improve things, and we have a planet now upon which we can live and upon which we have made at least some start toward looking on nature's better side. In short, nature does not frighten us. It was not always so.

Solomon was called wise. But when the thunder roared, and the lightning flashed, and his conscience troubled him, King Solomon you recall, turned away from his thousand wives and his numerous other doubtful associates.

He ran to bed and put his head under an embroidered pillow. He just lay there and shivered. Sheba could do nothing for him. Poor Solomon.

It did not enter his mind that the lightning could be tamed and put to work.

So this is the story of the man who did it. I refer, of course, to Thomas Alva Edison. Edison was born February 11, 1847. You know much about his successes. Let me tell you before I finish something about his failures.

For it is by their failures and what they did in the face of their failures and misfortunes that we can know most about our

great men, and learn most that will help us all.

Edison, who lived to be 84, and whose formal education, as you recall, was limited to 3 months in the public school at Port Huron, Mich., insisted all his life that he could not have succeeded without the lessons of his misfortunes and failures. In fact, Edison always emphasized that even the misfortune of deafness, from which he never recovered, was a constant asset.

When young Edison, known as "Al" in his home town of Port Huron, was 12 years old he was working as a train butcher and newsboy on the Grand Trunk Railroad. He had a run between Port Huron, Mount Clemens, and Detroit. One of the way stations was called Smith's Creek. It was there the happening occurred which made Edison deaf.

Now we should see what were the facts.

There are many vivid and contrary versions of the origin of Edison's affliction, but what actually happened may be told in his own words: "My train was standing by the platform at Smith's Creek station. I was trying to climb into the freight car with both arms full of papers when the conductor took me by the ears and lifted me. I felt something snap inside my head. My deafness started from that time and has ever since progressed."

Here is a boy 12 years old, seized by a man and lifted by his ears; to be made deaf to the end of his days. A word of complaint? Never, throughout his long life. Bitterness toward the man—for this was the act of a man, not an act of nature. A feeling of self-pity, frustration, rancor: "Why did this have to happen to me?" Well, hardly. Look at the consequences.

Edison speaks of his deafness much as Helen Keller always speaks of her blindness.

Said Edison: "My deafness has been not a handicap but a help to me. From the very start, after the earache pain ceased, deafness probably drove me to reading."

He was, in his energy, courage, compassion, and sincerity even thankful for the necessity of adapting his experiments to his affliction. He attributed at least two important developments to that necessity: the telephone as civilization knows it today, and the phonograph.

"In experimenting on the telephone," he explained, "I had to improve the transmitter so I could hear it. This made the telephone commercial, as the magneto telephone receiver of Bell was too weak to be used as a transmitter commercially.

"It was the same with the phonograph. The great defect of that instrument was the rendering of the overtones in the music, and the hissing consonants in speech. I worked over 1 year, 20 hours a day, Sundays and all, to get the word 'specie' perfectly recorded. When this was done I knew that everything else could be done—which was a fact."

This greatest inventor of all time was never discouraged by his small knowledge of anything. It wasn't so much what he knew that helped him, but what he tried to know. He was a genius, true. But once when he was pressed for a definition of a genius, he coined the famous adage: "Genius is 1 percent inspiration and 99 percent perspiration." For he knew that freedom and progress for an individual or a nation—or even for a genius—does not mean: "I do not have to work." He knew the future belongs to those who prepare for it. And he knew that the commonest form of opportunity and the most neglected is the opportunity for harder work and better work.

He knew that the heavy ball of progress needs a great deal of pushing. Said Edison: "I recall that after we had conducted thousands of experiments on a certain project without solving the problem, one of my associates expressed discouragement and disgust over having failed 'to find out anything.' But we had learned something. We had learned for a certainty that we couldn't do it that way, and that we would have to try some other way."

Further, with a full brimming measure of friendliness and goodwill, he consistently expressed gratitude to those who saw him through, and never stopped crediting the American free-opportunity system as an essential factor in what he was able to do for all mankind.

Into America's low-cost products, created by enterprises without which these products would not exist except for the rich and powerful, Edison realized that the industry, science, art, geography, commerce, and learning of the whole human race are assembled. He saw this an an asset for neighbors everywhere in our land like the assets flowing from the sun. "We live in a cooperative commonwealth," he said.

Time and again he pointed back to a date: October 24, 1878. This was the date on which 13 enterprising men who had resources and believed in Edison delivered to the New York County clerk's office the papers for incorporation of an undertaking to support and develop his work. Edison was one of the incorporators.

They called it the Edison Electric Light Co. To the public it sounded as strange as if you or I today were to form the Atomic Household Products Co.

This group was risking $300,000 in an enterprise that had as its only real asset the 31-year-old brain of young Edison.

But this brain, alive and humming with effort and imagination, was on a search for a filament that would glow brilliantly in a glass bulb when electricity passed through the filament. This was a problem of discovery which was buried deep in the mysteries of electric incandescence. In 4 days less than 1 year, with the support of his business associates, Edison produced a light which would light the world.

Actually, the lamp itself was only a fraction of what Edison needed to accomplish if the light was to be useful to people, on streets, in homes, in workplaces, and if the thousands of future tasks of electricity were to be born, in short, if men and women were to have an electrical age, electricity must be produced and distributed so effectively, so inexpensively, and so safely that people could afford to use it.

While the glowing lamp was the symbol of Edison's success, Edison had to develop, and his associates had to finance, an entire generating and distributing system including the invention and construction of giant dynamos, conduits, power lines, wires, insulators, sockets, meters, fuses—everything.

Of Edison's 1,097 patents, 360 dealt with the generation and distribution of power, viz. the hidden needs behind the glow in that little lamp which could light the country, light the world, and take up the task of light where the sun left off.

Edison's genius alone wasn't enough for the final result, the ultimate gift to humanity. While Edison overcame the scientific difficulties in the delivery of power and the defeat of darkness, he himself always pointed out that it was the cooperation, vitality, and risk-taking willingness of American business enterprise that sustained him on his job and brought his results within reach of all.

It was this enterprise, and the American opportunity for free enterprises, that left him free to develop his wonderful talents of invention and development. It ran the risk and supplied the vast capital needed to translate his inventions into tools for human advancement. In short, American enterprise made the inventions widely useful to average people, and at a low cost to all. And this is the essence of human progress.

But Edison's risks were not over. I spoke of failures a while earlier. This is what I meant.

About 1890, 11 years after the first success of his electric light, Edison set out to devise a system of mining and milling low-grade iron ore that would be economically sound. He was convinced that the country's known deposits of iron ore were disappearing. In short, he was now going beyond, and even deeper than the wires in the bulb, the power stations, dynamos. He was going to the problem of the supply of the iron ore itself.

His supporters stayed with him. Through his tremendous effort and what was for them an enormous expenditure of $3,000,000, Edison invented and put into operation a revolutionary method of reclaiming iron ore through ore refinement. It was called the magnetic ore separator.

But the undertaking did not work out. After 6 years, unforeseen developments left Edison and his backers with a terrible failure on their hands. New and immensely rich iron ore deposits were discovered by other men of imagination, working in other progressive undertakings. Edison's refining methods just could not compete.

Looking back on this period, Edison said: "For a good many years I worried about my pay roll; didn't know how I was always going to meet it. My trouble had been that I always had too much ambition and tried to do things that were financially too big for me. If I had not had so much ambition and had not tried to do so many things, I probably would have been much happier, but less useful."

Here, then, is a good example of what is meant by the profit and loss system in our country, a term which should always be used in referring to the way enterprises live instead of merely saying the profit system. For losses, you know, occur even more frequently than profits in business life. And they can occur even when an enterprise has in it a Thomas Edison. But there's a happier ending to this instance of loss. It ended in general wonderment and jubilation.

Instead of being discouraged and accepting failure, the great man redesigned the machinery and added new ideas. His backers stayed with him, and finally they substituted the making of cement for his original plan of reclaiming low-grade iron-ore reserves. I believe it's hardly remembered, but Edison's ideas and the faithfulness of his business associates revolutionized the Portland cement industry in our country.

And in this way, a wonderfully American way, what had been a great loss, a tremendous mental and financial burden on Edison and his associates, was changed to a success.

Human progress is endless and continuous as the rising of the sun. Much has happened to the whole planet since the monsters disappeared. But more good things have happened to us than to men and women any place in the world. Further, as living Americans we are infinitely better off than we've ever been before on this earth. Look around your town, your home, your living room, your boy's school, your workplace, your parks and streets, your stores. And the greatest opportunities lie ahead.

The great days of America are by no means done. We have only touched the border of our achievement. If you and I did not believe this, we would not be believers in America. Because that faith is America.

Unlimited possibilities are ahead through the new Edisons being born today; the men and women of imagination and character who are each in their own way helping us today and will help us even more tomorrow in this wonderland of the world.

Rogers Bill Calls for Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it appears that my House Resolution 450 is receiving unanimous acclaim by the press of my State. As a part of my remarks on the merits of this bill, I am including herewith an editorial from the Miami Herald, Miami, Fla., in the issue of March 14. May I state that the Miami Herald is one of the leading and outstanding newspapers, not only of Florida but of the South, and I am gratified to know that through the editorial columns they endorse the principle of this resolution and believe that the Congress should give it favorable consideration. The editorial is as follows:

ROGERS BILL CALLS FOR RESPONSIBILITY

Sixth District Representative DWIGHT L. ROGERS, of Fort Lauderdale, believes that Congress would be acutely economy-minded if a yea-and-nay vote were made mandatory on all appropriations of a public nature.

Representative ROGERS would "magnify the responsibility of each Member" by getting his name on the record for every money measure.

ROGERS would implement the conviction of every taxpayer that there would be a tremendous reduction in governmental waste, extravagance, and duplication if every Representative knew that his vote would be a matter available.

ROGERS' resolution is simple. It would insert this amendment in the rules of the House:

"No bill or joint resolution of a public character making an appropriation shall be finally passed, and no amendment of the Senate to, or report of a committee of conference on, such bill or resolution shall be agreed to, unless the vote of the House is determined by yeas and nays."

The need for such an amendment is pressing in the current national financial status—a time when we are better than $256,000,000,000 in debt and going daily into the red for an anticipated $5,050,000,000 deficit at the end of the current fiscal period.

Last year the first session of the Eighty-first Congress appropriated some $29,000,000 with no record whatsoever as to how the individual Congressmen voted.

During the same session bills appropriating better than $6,000,000,000 were passed where a yea and a nay vote was taken in one house but not in the other.

Billions of dollars have been appropriated in the House, where appropriations are initiated, without any vote of record. In some instances these billions of dollars were appropriated without a majority of the House being present.

It is one thing to appropriate money when all that is required is to shout "Yea." It's something else when a Congressman's vote is known.

Get the individual votes of the money-spenders down for all to see and the country will at once be benefited with magnified responsibility. Chairman CANNON of the Appropriations Committee endorses.

The resulting economies would be substantially below those of the President—and that without injuring our domestic economy or investigating our foreign commitments.

Shipbuilding and Ship Repair on the Pacific Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, at a convention of the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council, recently assembled in Portland, Oreg., on January 16, 1950, two resolutions were adopted which merit the attention of the Members of the House.

In times of war emergencies, approximately one-half of the war-built tonnage of ships is built on the west coast. West-coast ship-repair facilities are virtually indispensable if war damage occurs to ships in the Pacific Ocean. Four years were required, from 1939 to 1943, to bring the shipyards of the Pacific coast States from a condition of inactivity to full production. The skills which were needed had been largely lost due to years of inactivity. Unless appropriate action by the Congress is taken soon, the period of inactivity which the west-coast yards have again entered may endure until the men who have the skills have again disappeared with lapse of time.

The resolutions referred to read as follows:

Resolution 1

(Submitted by Shipyard & Marine Shop Laborers Local 886, Oakland, Calif.)

West coast shipbuilding

Whereas the wartime records of the Pacific coast shipyards and their workers, both in the building and repairing of ships, was a vital factor in the winning of World War II; and

Whereas since the conclusion of hostilities, shipbuilding, ship repair, and conversion have been awarded almost exclusively to eastern yards; and

Whereas shipbuilding facilities in the Pacific coast are largely unused, and many experienced shipyard workers are either unemployed or have turned to other work for their livelihood; and

Whereas facilities which are unused deteriorate with the passage of time, necessitating the expenditure of large sums in their replacement, and personnel losses involve large and costly training programs not to be accomplished overnight; and

Whereas the concentration of our Nation's shipbuilding in limited area along the eastern seaboard leaves the industry vulnerable to destructive attack; and

Whereas, in testimony before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, a prominent Government official contended that there was only enough shipbuilding to keep a few yards going, and he favored the more efficient eastern yards; and

Whereas the favored few yards of the East, controlled by Big Steel, have obtained a monopoly on shipbuilding: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this tenth annual convention of the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council, meeting in Portland, Oreg., on January 16, 1950, affirms that we are opposed to this eastern monopoly on the basis of (1) national defense, (2) deterioration of facilities, (3) loss of skilled shipbuilding personnel, and (4) unemployment resulting therefrom; and be it further

Resolved, That failing to secure this allocation through either the President of the United States or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, legislation be initiated before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives to compel the allocation of work to our west coast yards; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President John P. Frey, of the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor; President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor; the President of the United States; Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense; the Chairman of the Maritime Commission; and all United States Senators and Congressmen from the States of Washington, Oregon, and California.

Resolution 5

(Submitted by Drydock, Marine Wayamen, and Stage Riggers Local 3116)

Twenty-five million dollars for Maritime Commission Reserve Fleet reactivation

Whereas the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission Ship Plans Committee recommended appropriation of $25,000,000 to reactivate merchant fleet ships; and

Whereas the Maritime Commission, cooperating with our Nation's military leaders, inserted an item of $25,000,000 in their budget for 1949–50 to accomplish this work; and

Whereas the Bureau of the Budget deleted the requested appropriation; and

Whereas our Pacific coast shipyards lie idle, facilities deteriorating and personnel unemployed, constituting a grave danger to national defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Tenth Annual Convention of the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council, meeting in Portland, Oreg., on January 16, 1950, call upon the Congress of the United States to restore the $25,000,000 to the budget of the Maritime Commission for this reserve fleet reactivation work in the interest of national defense; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President John P. Frey, of the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor; President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor; the President of the United States; Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense; the Chairman of the Maritime Commission; and all United States Senators and Congressmen from the States of Washington, Oregon, and California.

Statement of W. R. New, Executive Secretary, Idaho Small Mine Operators Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Idaho is a State of vast undeveloped natural resources. Most of these resources are in public ownership. In fact, the lands in Idaho are 72 percent federally owned.

Idaho has vast potential resources of water power and minerals, together with large stands of timber, much of it white pine, the most valuable species of timber found in the national forests. Idaho also contains large areas of range land that support many herds of cattle and sheep.

Traversing Idaho north and south we have two great arterial highways, No. 93 on the east side of the State, and No. 95 on the west side of the State. Steady progress has been made in standardizing these arterial highways, but much construction work remains to be done.

There is submitted for the consideration of my colleagues the statement made before the Committee on Public Works by William R. New, executive secretary of the Idaho Small Mine Operators and Prospectors Association, of Hailey, Idaho:

STATEMENT BEFORE HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE ON H. R. 7393, FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT, BY WILLIAM R. NEW

My name is William R. New, of Hailey, Idaho. I am executive secretary of the Idaho Small Mine Operators Association.

If you would take time to look at the course of Highway 93, you will note that it runs through the central part of Idaho from Montana south to Nevada.

The principal interest my group has in this highway is that it would open up a great storehouse of undeveloped mineral resources; but that is only one of the many reasons why this committee should give special consideration to this highway.

This is one of the few north and south arterial highways from Canada to Mexico. As I have said, it passes through some of the richest undeveloped natural resources of our Nation which will many times pay the cost of its construction.

It is one of the most beautiful scenic highways of our Nation and would give millions of tourists an opportunity to see the Salmon River country and many other beautiful spots that only our western country offers.

Modern warfare necessitates that the areas such as this highway traverses be opened; and you cannot afford to put it off many more years if the reports that I read in the papers are correct.

I trust and hope that the committee will give due consideration to this important project.

City Without a Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I offer for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 22, 1950:

CITY WITHOUT A VOTE

Imagine a city of 900,000 which works, pays taxes, lives and thinks like any other American community, and yet fails to enjoy local self-government. This is Washington, where citizenship carries only an abstract meaning. The questions of policy and administration, police and fire protection, schools and parks, traffic and transit, culture and civic development, and all the intensely local details of any city large or small apply equally to Washington. But the people who live in the capital, for all the interest they may feel in the real estate tax rate or the quality of schools, streets, and sanitation, have nothing to say. The government of the District of Columbia rests in Congress, down to regulation of barber shops, weed removal, street naming and shooing off the starlings. This is the height of government without representation, control of local affairs by committee and commission. The Washington citizen, if he may be called such, is helpless because he is a nobody nowhere.

Now it seems reasonable that Washington, for all its national proprietorship, is entitled to home rule in essentially local matters. The taxpayer, without a vote, is an empty voice. If a city manager appears economically desirable, this is a choice and responsibility for those who pay the bills. Parents who send children to school have a right to elect the school board. The arguments have been hashed over and over, and are simply these: Washington deserves the same responsive home rule as any other American city, and Congress has more to do than act as Washington's nursemaid.

The United States Senate passed the Kefauver bill by voice vote on May 30, 1949. This legislation provides all the home rule that is feasible without constitutional amendment. It is a good bill, but the House of Representatives still fails to join approval because the District of Columbia committee has other ideas. This committee is weighted with southerners who apparently fear for racial segregation if Washington, with its 30 percent Negro population, should gain even the local ballot. The Kefauver bill is decidedly not a civil rights measure; it merely provides for a measure of local self-government. But the committee is determined on suppression, and the only hope for Washington home rule is to get the bill on to the floor by discharge petition. Of the required 218 signers, forty-four are still lacking. We hope that the rest will cross the line. Both parties support home rule; there is no sensible ground for objection. The vote should be taken. Washington, after all, also has a right to govern itself.

The Spirit of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an editorial from the Polish American Journal of Scranton, Pa.

The article is well worth the attention of the American people because it typifies the real spirit of Poland and the Polish people. Everyone knows the heartaches and hardships which have been the lot of the Polish people over the centuries and the hardiness and perseverance of that great race have been an inspiration to the world. Despite the greatest of difficulties and the terrible loss of life in the last war, Poland is once again rising out of, and building on, its ruins.

As one who has seen at first-hand the results of war's destruction on Poland and its people, I want to commend the article and to say that, come what may, Poland will again resurrect and her people will once again achieve the freedom and independence which is every Pole's birthright.

Poland may be down, for the moment, but nothing can ever hold back the aspirations of this great people in their search for freedom and independence. The Americans of Polish ancestry are joined by all America in their desire to see the arrival of that day and we all look forward, with confidence, to the achieving of that objective.

I predict that the alien yoke now so evident in Poland will be thrown off and Poland itself, will be free from all outside influences. The Marshal Rossakowsky plan for Poland may be imposed on the country for the time being, but the day is not too far distant when Poland will be governed by Poles and that country will once again hold up its head and take its rightful place as an equal and sovereign partner in the family of nations.

The editorial follows:

THE SPIRIT OF POLAND

After the Warsaw Insurrection of August 1944, when the Nazis systematically bombed the Polish capital, block by block and building by building, Hitler's generals reported that "Warsaw is destroyed forever."

The report was made on these facts: 700,000 of the city's 1,360,000 citizens were dead. Of 16,300 buildings, 9,100 were destroyed or beyond repair. Of 900 churches and historical sites, 810 were gone. Of 2,800 factories, 2,520 were destroyed. Of 940 schools and universities, 658 were demolished. Of 440 hospitals, clinics and infirmaries, 352 were destroyed. There was no water, no electricity, no gas, no fuel, no transportation, no food, no tools, nothing—just rubble and corpses.

That was the situation when Warsaw was liberated on January 17, 1945.

But what of Warsaw today? Despite lack of materials and machinery the capital is fast being rebuilt. The inhabitants with their hands are digging out of the ruins, and erecting modern buildings. Churches and sacred places are being restored wherever possible. A total of 2,000 new homes were built in 1949.

But why are the Poles rebuilding Warsaw? It would have been much easier to erect the capital city a few miles north or a few miles south.

The answer is obvious to every Pole and to every American of Polish descent.

Warsaw represents the very heart of Poland, of all that is Polish. Warsaw is the crucified and martyred city. It is a holy shrine and it must be rebuilt, it must rise again.

And the tenacity with which the people are rebuilding their beloved Warsaw represents the very spirit of Poland. It represents a people who will labor beyond any imagination for that in which they believe; it represents a people who will endure limitless suffering and hardship for their ideals; it represents a people who will never give up, no matter the odds.

And the spirit behind the rebuilding of Warsaw is the same spirit in every American of Polish extraction. It is one of Poland's great contributions to this Nation. Despite hardships in this country, despite discriminations and prejudices, the first Polish immigrants and later their sons and daughters have become and are an important part of this great Nation. In war and peace, they have shouldered the responsibilities of good citizenship.

Path to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended an eloquent resolution adopted at the annual meeting at Jacksonville, Fla., of the bishops' council of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, as proposed by the distinguished Bishop D. Ward Nichols, of New York. The solicitude of the churches for the path to peace is one of the more auspicious activities in favor of peace taking place in our country:

Resolution to President Harry S. Truman, White House, Washington, D. C., from annual meeting of the bishops' council, Jacksonville, Fla., February 15, 16, 17

While we are ever mindful of the continuing need for protecting our shores from any enemy aggressors, the African Methodist Episcopal Church must stand in condemnation of the philosophy of power as a path to peace. The African Methodist Episcopal Church was founded in 1787 in Philadelphia by one Richard Allen, whose philosophy of life has been adopted as the motto of this world-wide organization: "God our Father, Christ our Redeemer, man our brother."

We must reaffirm the historic position of our revered founder and urge your implementation of the doctrines of democracy by calling upon the citizenry of America and the entire God-fearing world to defeat the rise of any political religion with a resistance of the principles of Christendom.

Taking due cognizance of the gap between the tenets of true democracy and its malpractice here in America, we urge you to use your high office in behalf of the following:

1. International control over the manufacture and distribution of the atomic A and H bombs with which mankind now threatens to destroy himself.

2. Speedy enactment of fair-employment-practices legislation.

3. Rightful exercise of your authority as Commander in Chief of our armed forces to speedily end all quotas and policies based on race.

4. Enactment of Federal legislation to equalize educational facilities for all children regardless of race or creed.

5. A forthright foreign policy designed to promote the brotherhood of all mankind and to end all forms of colonialism.

Robbie Conlin, Student in Covington Community Elementary School, Author of Prize-Winning Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the House an article which recently appeared in my home-town newspaper, the Covington Republican. The article, which follows, includes an essay "What Citizenship Means to Me," written by one of Covington's adopted sons, 11-year-old Robbie Conlin, foster son of Frank D. Conlin, principal of the Covington Community Elementary School:

ROBBIE CONLIN, STUDENT IN COVINGTON COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, AUTHOR OF PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY

Robbie Conlin, foster son of Frank D. Conlin, principal of the Covington Community Elementary School, was this week listed as a winner in an essay contest sponsored by radio station WLS. Robbie's prize for the winning essay was two GE radios, one for himself and the other for his classroom. His name was announced last Monday over WLS.

Robbie wrote his essay on the subject, "What Citizenship Means to Me," and is herewith published:

"Just 7 months ago I was a citizen of France, but on the 24th of June of the past year I had the great honor of becoming a citizen of the United States.

"I was born in 1939 in the city of Metz, in Lorraine, France.

"As early as I can remember, German soldiers occupied the city in which I lived. We were horrified when the Americans dropped bombs and strafed the streets with machine gun fire. Many of our innocent people were killed or wounded and my own brother was a victim of the war. While trying to escape being run over by tanks, he fell on the icy streets and broke his hip. This fall crippled him for life.

"In 1946 I was adopted by my foster father who was an officer in the American Army. Then I was brought to the United States and to my new home.

"I was eager to become an American citizen but the law required me to wait for 2 years before applying for naturalization.

"United States citizenship gives me a feeling of safety from falling bombs and machine gun fire. It also means plenty of food, clothing and security.

"The Constitution, which is the basis of the laws of the United States, promises many things that I could not have had if I had stayed in France. Citizenship guarantees me free speech and equal opportunities. When I am old enough I shall have a chance to take part in electing Government officials, a right to own property, and I shall have protection for myself and my property.

"Above all, citizenship means that I may now claim the United States of America as my country, the Star-Spangled Banner as my flag, and my neighbors as my fellow citizens. Citizenship, too, means that, in case of war when I am a man, I may offer my services to my country, the United States.

False Editorial Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1950, Mr. Walter Leckrone, editor of the Indianapolis Times, carried in his editorial columns an unfair, untrue, and intentionally misleading editorial. This editorial was supposed to be an answer to a speech which I made on the floor of the House March 4 concerning the settlement of the coal strike.

On March 10 I sent the letter following these remarks to Mr. Leckrone, asking that it be reprinted in his editorial column in order to correct the misleading, false, and prejudicial statements he made regarding my speech. Up to now he has refused to print my answer or to give the readers the true facts concerning the unfortunate editorial. Mr. Leckrone has sunk to a new low in a campaign to resell the Taft-Hartley law. Why does he refuse to print recorded facts concerning this law?

A free press contemplates a fair press. Evidently Mr. Leckrone is one of the few editors in this country who believes a public official should be a natural victim for malicious attacks regardless of the truth or facts involved. Fortunately, there are but a few editors of the Leckrone type employed by the newspapers in this country. In refusing his newspaper columns to me for the purpose of answering his false and unjust editorial, he is merely continuing his past reputation as a hit-and-run editor.

I hereby submit my letter in answer to his editorial which he refused to place in his columns:

MARCH 10, 1950.

Mr. WALTER LECKRONE,
Editor, the Indianapolis Times,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MR. LECKRONE: My attention has been called to an editorial in the Indianapolis Times of Monday, March 6, 1950.

The first line of this editorial refers to my speech in Congress on last Saturday regarding the coal strike as "demagogic double-talk." The last line says, and I quote "we do feel a Member of Congress has an obligation to tell the truth about matters of plain recorded fact." This line is merely a diplomatic inference that I was lying to the Members of Congress and to the American public regarding my two statements set out therein.

Enclosed you will find page 2823 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contains the speech I made, to which you referred.

One of my statements was that "during the last 18 months, there have been more serious strikes than any year in our history." You conveniently omitted the next line of my speech which said "the only exception might be the first year after the war, when thousands of labor contracts that had been status quo for 5 years during the war period came up for renewal." As a proof that I was not telling an untruth in that statement, I am hereby submitting for your readers, plain recorded facts, taken from the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor, covering the last 15 years with the exception of the war years when union labor and management did not negotiate work contracts.

Number of man-days lost by strikes and work stoppages between 1936 and 1940, 16,900,000 (average per year).

Omitting the war years, we come to 1946 which was the first year after the war: 1946, approximately 116,000,000 man-days lost; 1947, approximately 34,000,000 man-days lost; 1948, approximately 34,000,000 man-days lost; and 1949, approximately 53,000,000 man-days lost.

Before 1935, the man-days lost by strikes in any year in our history, does not rank even close to the years 1946 or 1949. So, Mr. Editor, the plain recorded fact is that I was not untruthful in my charge that the Taft-Hartley law has caused more labor disputes than any year in our history with the exception of 1946.

Your second charge that I did not tell the truth about matters of plain recorded fact that the Taft-Hartley law failed 100 percent in the coal strike:

In my speech, which you failed to include in your editorial, I stated that Cyrus S. Ching, Federal Mediator and former rubber executive, publicly stated several weeks ago that there had not been any honest effort at collective bargaining since contract discussions started last summer. The response of the coal operators to all collective-bargaining proposals was an emphatic "No."

I further stated that powerful interests in this country wanted the Taft-Hartley injunction tested. When President Truman proceeded with the injunction, 450,000 miners refused to go back to work in spite of the injunction, and I further stated that when the operators discovered the monumental failure of the Taft-Hartley law injunction, they proceeded to collective bargain with the union.

When good-faith collective bargaining was engaged in, the strike was settled in a few days. Furthermore, in your editorial, you stated that I failed to say what caused the coal strike the year before the Taft-Hartley law was passed or the year before that and the others previously.

You are correct on that statement, but you failed to also mention that there has been four separate coal strikes and work stoppages since the Taft-Hartley Act was passed in the summer of 1947.

I am sure that your sense of justice and fair play as the editor of a newspaper, will prompt you to give this letter the same space in your editorial column as the editorial of Monday, March 6, 1950.

Very truly yours,

RAY J. MADDEN,
Member of Congress.

Development of Peat Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of the industrial progress of the great Midwest, I would like to join my friend and colleague from Minnesota, Hon. FRED MARSHALL, in calling to the attention of this House the importance of legislation to encourage the development and utilization of our peat resources.

I think we ought to give serious consideration to the bills which he has introduced, H. R. 7330 and H. R. 7574. The first of these authorizes vitally needed research and preliminary development and the second would authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to private business for better utilization of peat and its numerous byproducts.

The tremendous untapped peat resources of my own State and of other States throughout the country, if properly utilized, can bring industrial growth to many areas seriously retarded because peat lands were considered waste lands. Short-haul fuel and low-cost power will bring new industries into these areas and will create new jobs for our labor force.

As my colleague from northern Minnesota, Hon. JOHN BLATNIK, has already pointed out in support of this legislation, the effective development of our taconite deposits has been hampered for lack of a nearby fuel and power supply. If we can make use of the scientific advances which have been made in the production of peat, it will be a decided stimulus to effective use of our low-grade iron ore.

In considering the effect of such legislation in promoting industrial progress we must not overlook the many byproducts which have been discovered in the production of peat fuels. And its importance does not depend only upon its use as a fuel in the usual sense, but as a fuel to provide electric power for nearby industry and small business.

This importance is heightened in the case of Minnesota because of its geographical location which makes it dependent upon long overland and over-water hauls of fuel and raw materials. This strategic vulnerability can be reduced by development of nearby resources and can make possible sorely needed decentralization of industry and population in the interest of national defense and national security.

Minnesota's deposits of 7,000,000,000 tons of peat constitute half of the Nation's supply and on the basis of preliminary research have been found to be of good quality and easy access. Other large deposits are found in a number of States in every section of the country in what have come to be underdeveloped areas. A good peat-production program will be a boost to the local economy and will be a strengthening factor in the national economy.

Peat as a basic material could make possible low-cost production of such byproducts as alcohol, acetic acid, ammonia, ammonium sulfate, fertilizers, paraffin wax, phenol, asphalt, tars, oils, gases, and allied chemical products for American manufacturers. Because they would be byproducts of peat processing, they would be available at less cost than original production.

Because of their own economic needs, other countries with large peat deposits have made greater technological advances in development of this resource, but the impetus provided in this legislation can well bring us up to date and open even new roads to progress.

Peat deposits are found in about half of the States, and our total deposits are estimated to be about 14,000,000,000 tons. Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan combined contain 75 percent of the reserves; 14 percent of the country's total is in Florida; and the rest is distributed through the New England and Pacific coast States.

Unfortunately, those very areas in which the best quality deposits are found are the areas now considered underdeveloped because these co-called wastelands have hampered both industrial and agricultural development. To turn these lands into sources of productive wealth for both industry and agriculture will bolster the backward economy of these areas and make new jobs without taking away existing jobs.

It is because of these factors, that I ask those who are interested in maintaining healthy employment rolls for our labor force to consider the effect the proposed legislation will have in bringing new industry and new jobs to the underdeveloped areas of our country.

Census Bureau Should Not Be Permitted To Make Inquiry Concerning Private Income and Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to prohibit officials and other representatives of the Census Bureau from making inquiry with respect to the income of private individuals.

The amount of the income and property of every man and woman in their own individual business and does not belong to the public. Folks just do not like to have census enumerators in their own communities inquiring as to how much money they make or how much property they own. It just does not set well.

Furthermore, the whole thing is absolutely unnecessary. If for some particular reason the Government deems it necessary to check the income of private individuals it can be done through the Income Tax Department of Internal Revenue. To permit census enumerators to pry into the private affairs of individuals is carrying things too far.

It should be observed there is no law requiring this information. It is just an unnecessary regulation of the Census Bureau. It appears the only way to prevent this intrusion is through the approval of this legislation.

Middle-Income Housing Bill a Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, buying votes with promises is a profession. Those who do it skillfully can keep themselves in office indefinitely. The art is to keep new promises before the voters while making them forget unfulfilled past ones. Better yet, keep a few promises, and create the impression that all have been kept. The administration's program of houses for all is just such a political illusion.

One trick in stirring the emotions of people of good will is to give the impression that the Central Government is the only power that can remove slums and dry up disease, by itself building houses. But the Government propagandists do not show how this forces the tenants to vote for the political party which builds the houses, and charges the costs of all municipal services and deficits to the folks across the street from the political housing. Thus, it creates more slums than it clears.

There is another trick which has worked well from the beginning of all

time. Obviously, there are more renters than landlords. So, all Socialist governments force landlords to subsidize their tenants. This scares any future landlord, and creates a housing shortage. Then the government can rush in to meet the need. It can build some houses, lend money for others, and insure loans for the rest. In short order, it controls the nation's housing. Then those who want to enjoy government low-rent subsidies must vote to retain the party in power. It is all a blindfolding fraud, which causes us to surrender the freedom our forefathers cherished so much.

First, an appearance of a housing shortage must be created. Rent control did this by forcing landlords to sell their property. The total number of new dwelling units in the United States increased 4,050,000 from 1940 to 1947. Yet the number for rent actually decreased by 2,000,000. This meant a shortage for those who wanted to rent.

Most of the postwar housing was built by Government loans or insurance but only one-fifth of it was built for rent. The cost was such that many families could not afford brand new homes. Few people wanted to move from bargain rents in the old houses under rent control.

The cunning politicians rushed in, and promised "cheap" public housing for the low-income families. They posed as the saviors of those whose distress they had caused. After much talking and promising, the Eighty-First Congress, last year, passed a public-housing bill. The politicians felt they had delivered the goods for the low-income families. With scarcely a pause, they next advanced a Government plan for housing the middle-income groups.

This promise of Government aid for middle-income families is built on several frauds. First it assumes the Government has already taken care of the lower third. And, second, it claims that middle-income families cannot now afford to house themselves. Both of these premises are clearly false.

The Public Housing Act of last year provides for housing less than one out of every ten low-income families. Even so, homes for this tenth will not be completed for at least 6 years and not until local communities agree to grant tax exemptions and free education for the children. So, it would take 60 years or more and many more billions before the lower third was housed.

As to middle-income families not being able to house themselves, we need only look at the Department of Labor's cost-of-living index. Since 1929, this index for all items has gone up more than 38 percent. Yet, the rent item has actually dropped almost 15 percent. So, rent is certainly not the reason for our high cost of living. Perhaps it is taxes. They have gone up 1,000 percent.

Administration leaders admit that shelter rent, not including heat and utilities, should be about 20 percent of a family's budget. Last year the Labor Department studied budgets in three typical cities, Houston, Denver, and Detroit. It found that families with incomes from $3,000 to $4,000 a year were spending only 12.1 percent, 13.9 percent, and 16.3 percent for rent, including heat, light, and refrigeration. The Federal Reserve Board, in its 1949 consumer survey, shows that home-owning families, with incomes of $2,000 to $5,000 a year, paid only 17 percent of their 1948 incomes for housing while those who rented paid a bare 13 percent.

This indicates that housing is available at prices middle-income families can well afford. The idea that middle-income families, the Nation's largest taxpayers, need a housing subsidy is a fraud. The bills now before Congress would not aid more than one in every 32 middle-income families. But it sounds nice. Before election most middle-income families will think they are going to be helped. They will not wake up until they get their next tax bill. And that can be blamed on the cold war.

Politics is a great game. Unfortunately, it is played for keeps. Ask any European who listened to deceptive promises like those being made by our own Fair Deal and do-gooder politicians of both parties.

Acheson's San Francisco Speech Impressive, but Main China Issue Still Undecided

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

ACHESON'S SAN FRANCISCO SPEECH IMPRESSIVE, BUT MAIN CHINA ISSUE STILL UNDECIDED

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The Secretary of State's speech in San Francisco last week is public confirmation that the administration is developing a scheme for saving non-Communist Asia.

As revealed by Mr. Acheson, this policy consists of help—military or political or economic—to Japan, free Korea, the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, and to the Bao Dai régime in Indochina.

It includes some first class political warfare against the Chinese Communists in the form of statements to the Chinese people. The Secretary pointed out how the Russians are plundering their Chinese allies, and how food has gone from China to Russia at a time when China faces the worst famine in history. To be sure, he fell into a contradiction when he first stated that the Chinese Nationalist Government had fallen because the people abandoned it and then insisted that their present unhappy status within the orbit of the Soviet Union is not the fault of the Chinese people but has been forced upon them by the Soviet Union.

Mr. Acheson cannot have it both ways. He answered himself when he forcefully invited the people of Asia to recognize that "the major threat to their freedom and to their social and economic progress is the attempted penetration of Asia by Soviet Communist imperialism and by the colonialism which that penetration attempts to conceal."

PRIVATE INTERESTS GRATIFIED

This is God's truth. It was, however, just as true 4 years ago when Gen. George Marshall tried to compel the Chinese Nationalist Government to collaborate with the Chinese Communists and stopped all American aid to China when Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek refused. Had the American administration spoken in 1946 as Secretary Acheson speaks now, China might never have been lost.

The weakest part of the Secretary's speech was his offer to trade with Communist China on decent terms. This was honey to any American traders who might put personal profit above their country's welfare. It may tempt the Chinese Communist leaders who are responsible for their country's famine. It was a kick in the teeth for the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa and Hainan Islands who are bravely carrying on the fight. It implied that the United States will help break the Nationalists' blockade.

But the famine in China and rising discontent, plus the Nationalists' resistance on the islands, offers just a chance of overthrowing the Chinese Communists. The United States ought not to overlook any opportunity, however slight. The Chinese Communists should be compelled to stew unaided in the ruin they created.

AID PLENIE WEAK

Another weak point in the Secretary's new policy for Asia is the half-hearted way in which he interprets the Truman doctrine. of aid to Indochina. He promised Bao Dai not the kind of effective aid we gave to Greece, but aid within the prudent capabilities of our resources.

Obviously, if strictly limited aid is enough, well and good. It is not likely to impress the Russians or their Indochinese stooges.

It just happened that the Secretary's speech coincides with the report that Ho Chi-minh had gone to Peiping to sign a military alliance with the U. S. S. R. and with Communist China. Should this be exact, Ho will come back with a promise of something more than the prudent assistance promised Bao Dai by Secretary Acheson.

Apparently, too, Secretary Acheson has not yet made up his mind whether to support or not to support the Southeast Asia Union so sturdily championed by President Epidio Quirino of the Philippines.

INDIA NEEDS SPUR

From recent remarks by External Minister Spender of Australia, that country is now ready to discuss such a scheme. Australia is one of the two bastions of strength in the area.

The other potential bastion, India, is still being kept in "neutrality" by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. Mr. Nehru has again refused President Quirino's invitation to a conference to discuss measures for meeting the Communist menace. Thereby he has again demonstrated how a distinguished fighter for freedom may turn out to be an inadequate statesman once freedom has been obtained. Mr. Nehru is still looking back at the imperialism his country has escaped from. If in the process he should be hit by the Soviet Russian truck it will be his own fault. Secretary Acheson might have reminded him that India's failure to cooperate with the other Asiatic nations could be taken as a sign that India does not properly qualify for aid under the Truman doctrine.

The San Francisco speech makes me think that the American administration has not yet faced the issue whether to defend southeastern Asia by all possible means or to let it go.

Electoral Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more important to the maintenance of a healthy democracy than a fair, honest, and accurate system of electing Presidents. Senate Joint Resolution 2, which passed the Senate recently by a vote of 64 to 27, and House Joint Resolution 2, now pending in the House, provide such a system.

In the current issue of ADA World, Mr. Bertram Gross has written an excellent article in support of this amendment. I offer his article for reproduction here in the RECORD:

LODGE-GOSSETT AMENDMENT—ELECTORAL CHANGE IS HAILED AS DEMOCRATIC

(By Bertram Gross)

Most liberals have long supported the Lodge-Gossett constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral college and split the electoral vote of each State among presidential candidates in proportion of their popular vote.

This is evidenced by the fact that men like Senators ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama; WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon; and Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, were active in the campaign that led to the recent 64 to 27 favorable vote in the Senate and to a favorable report by the House Judiciary Committee. It is borne out by the support given the measure on the floor of the Senate by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and every other liberal Member of the Senate.

It has recently been suggested, however, that these liberals have been hoxxed and that the Lodge-Gossett amendment is a "dangerous sleeper."

A case is made that a division of electoral votes among rival presidential candidates would give southern Democrats more power in the Democratic Party and thereby make the Democratic Party more conservative. Those who argue in this fashion have no objection to abolishing the electoral college as such. But they believe in keeping—at least for the present—the unit system of giving a State's total electoral vote to the candidate who obtains a plurality within the State.

To appraise the validity of this argument, let's take a look at the probable effects of dividing the electoral votes of the States among candidates in proportion to the popular vote.

The first effect would be—in the words used by Senator HUMPHREY on the floor of the Senate, February 1, 1950—"a definitive step in the direction of greater democratization of our electoral process."

Under the present system, the votes cast within any State for the candidate who receives less than a plurality are simply not counted in the final tabulation. Thus, Truman in 1948 got no credit for the millions of votes cast for him in the State of New York. Because he nosed out Truman by a slight margin, Dewey won all of New York's 47 electoral votes. Likewise, Dewey got no credit in the final count for the Republican votes in Virginia, although these votes amounted to 46 percent of the total.

Under the more democratic method of proportional allocation, the same number of popular votes would have given Truman 31 electoral votes in New York and Dewey 4.5 electoral votes in Virginia.

From a strictly theoretical viewpoint, it would be better to have a direct popular election of the President or else to base the electoral vote of each State on the number of its voters rather than its population. But both of these theoretical remedies would go so far in reducing the power of the small States as to make it impossible, in the judgment of congressional liberals, to obtain a two-thirds vote in Congress and ratification by 36 States.

The Lodge-Gossett amendment provides the only attainable method of democratizing Presidential elections.

Second, it would promote active campaigning by both major political parties in those one-party States that are customarily regarded as safe or solid.

At present the Republican organizations in the solid South and the Democratic organizations in the rock-ribbed Republican northern States like Maine and Vermont and others, never really put up a fight in presidential elections. This is one of the reasons why the popular vote is so small in these areas.

It is also one of the reasons why congressional candidates in these areas have little interest in, and often directly oppose the national platforms of their parties. It is one of the keys—but not the only one—to the great riddle of American politics: "Why is it that a President can be elected on a liberal program but at the same election a Congress can be elected which does not have a liberal majority?"

The pending amendment would promote active political competion in the now "solid" Democratic South and the now "solid" Republican Northern States. Both parties in these areas would find a direct and immediate interest in wooing additional votes.

In the South this would mean a rapid stepping-up of the present trend toward more Negro voting. The written and unwritten barriers to Negro voting would be pushed aside as both parties actively campaigned for Negro votes. The labor vote would also get increasing attention, since the votes of southern workers, together with the Negro votes, would provide the largest increments in future elections.

As a result, southern liberalism—already beginning to flower—would grow more rapidly. Southern conservatives would gravitate toward the Republicans. Both political parties would be more capable of delivering upon campaign promises.

Third, there would be a wider geographical distribution of political power and prestige.

It follows from the previous points that there would be less sectionalism in American politics, more emphasis on national issues.

There would be less emphasis on selecting presidential candidates on the basis of their ability to carry some large State, more political opportunities for men and women in every section of the country.

These things, in turn, mean more attention in presidential politics to the economic and social needs of both the South and the rock-ribbed Republican Northern States.

But the 404 electoral votes outside the South would still be more important than the South's 127 electoral votes. Southern politics would by no means, as some have contended, dominate the national scene.

Fourth, and finally, the balance-of-power positions now enjoyed by many small groups in the most populous States would be weakened.

At present when a few thousand votes on one side or the other may throw a whole block of electoral votes—like New York's 47 votes—to one candidate or the other, many small organizations are in highly strategic balance-of-power positions. They wield power out of all proportion to their voting strength.

Under the Lodge-Gossett amendment these strategic positions would be weakened. This goes for liberal organizations as well as for conservative, reactionary, and radical ones.

The greatest losses, however, would be felt by those organizations with little voting strength. The least losses would be felt by large mass organizations such as labor unions.

Although the four propositions underlined above can be fully substantiated, reasonable people—including reasonable liberals—can readily differ on how much value is to be placed on each of them.

It's like the dilemma faced by the man who is thinking of marrying a girl who is beautiful and intelligent, but simply can't cook. If home-cooked meals are more important to him than anything else in life, then it makes sense for him to restrain his natural impulses and remain a bachelor until he finds a better candidate.

In the same way, if a liberal places more value upon a restricted area of political competition and the maintenance of certain balance-of-power positions, or if he takes a defeatist attitude toward the chances of winning the votes of the majority of the American people under a more democratic electoral system, then it makes sense for him to oppose the Lodge-Gossett amendment.

If a liberal is more interested in winning pleasant campaign promises from both parties than in building a truly liberal party that can keep its promises, then he should oppose the Lodge-Gossett amendment.

I might add that if these are what he values most highly, then it also makes sense to oppose a direct popular election of the President.

On the other hand, if a liberal places greater value upon steps toward more democracy and toward developing genuine two-party politics in one-party areas, then he should support the Lodge-Gossett amendment.

If any liberal refuses to decide where he stands on this matter until he sees a mathematical demonstration that the amendment will help the liberals rather than the conservatives, then he had better get a nice comfortable cushion and prepare himself to sit on the fence the rest of his life.

Statistics cannot tell you whether it will help liberals or conservatives, Democrats or Republicans. Or rather, one can develop equally elaborate statistical stories on either side. Further, statistics cannot tell exactly how many new votes would be brought to the polls under the Lodge-Gossett amendment, or how soon.

The key reason that statistics cannot supply the answer is that the constitutional amendment by itself would not shift the balance one way or another. It would merely change the rules of the game so as to provide new opportunities for both sides.

The conservative camp in America will unquestionably gain under this constitutional amendment if the liberals fail to adjust to the new situation and develop their political strategy in a dynamic fashion.

But the liberal camp will most certainly gain if:

(1) Negro leaders will realize that this provides the first great opportunity for the organization and political awakening of Negroes in the South;

(2) Labor organizations intensify their organizational campaigns in the South; and

(3) At long last a liberal program were developed for greater industrialization and higher living standards throughout the South.

Those few liberals who have voiced objections to the Lodge-Gossett amendment have performed a valuable service.

The debate they have initiated underscores the fact that American liberalism faces crucial problems of political dynamics.

When this debate is resolved in favor of the Lodge-Gossett amendment—as I am sure it will be—the country will have benefited from a more open discussion of the issues. And the liberal movement will have benefited from a more widespread appreciation of the fact that the adoption of the Lodge-Gossett amendment will call for a new strategy of liberal politics.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we will find that 95 percent of our political scientists and serious students of government endorse the so-called Lodge-Gossett amendment as the best possible reform in our cumbersome and undemocratic electoral machinery. I wish to offer here for the RECORD a letter from the chairman of a committee of the American Political Science Association, in which he discusses and endorses the aforesaid amendment:

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY,
MAXWELL GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF CITIZENSHIP AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
Syracuse, N. Y., February 27, 1950.

Hon. ED GOSSETT,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GOSSETT: I am very much interested in the proposed amendment to the United States Constitution, sponsored by you and by Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, to revise certain provisions of the Constitution concerning the electoral college. It seems to me that your proposal is a major contribution to the perfection of democratic institutions in the United States. The principle involved in the proposed amendment is sound democratic theory, the idea that the electoral vote ought to reflect as fairly and accurately as possible the sentiments of the people themselves. Because it is solidly grounded in good democratic principles it is also a sound measure around which to develop our political institutions, institutions which are likely to function best when they implement the will of the people.

As a political scientist I have had a life-long interest in American political parties, organizations without which a democratic government in a nation of 150,000,000 people is inconceivable. I feel that your proposal is very likely to have a good effect on the party system. It seems to me that the existing constitutional provisions governing the counting of the electoral vote make the development of an effective and responsible party system excessively difficult. The present system produces an electoral vote so unrepresentative of public opinion that it invites undemocratic, disruptive, and obstructive political practices. It places an undue premium on the votes of a few States and on the influence of certain minority and special interest blocs of voters in these States. One consequence of the adoption of your amendment would probably be to reduce political tension in a few States but to increase popular participation in Presidential elections throughout the country. In view of the fact that only a little more than 50 percent of the potential electorate has participated in recent Presidential elections it seems to me that broadening effects of the amendment would be beneficial. In general I should think that the tendency of the amendment would be to reduce sectional antagonism because it invites increased political participation by the whole Nation. Similarly, since it would make the electoral college vote reflect the popular vote as accurately as possible it might tend to reduce conflict between the President and Congress by keeping both branches of the Government close to the people. Finally, the existing system has stood for a number of reasons, to discriminate more and more strongly against the defeated major party and to exaggerate the vote of the successful party so drastically that it has become something of a menace to the survival of the two-party system.

A committee of the American Political Science Association, of which I am chairman, has given your amendment a good deal of thought in course of recent years. While the report of the committee is not now ready for release and I am not authorized to speak for the members of the committee in this matter, I can say that the general trend of the opinion of the committee is similar to mine.

The questions raised by your proposal are so important that I hope that, regardless of the outcome of the present debate in the House, public discussion of the subject may be continued until the issues are clarified.

Sincerely,

E. E. SCHATTSCHNEIDER.

Extension of Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution memorializing Congress in favor of extending the effective period of the rent-control provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to provide by legislation that the rent-control provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 shall continue in effect until February 28, 1951; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted, March 13, 1950.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 16, 1950.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Revival of Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a copyrighted story from the Christian Science Monitor of Monday, March 20, which the Christian Science Monitor Washington bureau has kindly given me permission to insert in the RECORD.

This story is challenging and seems to me to offer a possible solution to the overproduction in the coal industry. I think it is worthy of wide circulation, if it does nothing more than cause discussion of the various processes for the extraction of oil and other byproducts from coal. If the Federal Government is suppressing this process, as charged in the article, I think that looking into the matter would be one of the most profitable investigations that Congress could make.

The article follows:

COAL INDUSTRY REVIVAL FORETOLD IN OIL DISTILLED FROM UNMINED SEAMS—ECONOMIC GAINS OF KARRICK PROCESS CITED IN MONITOR WRITER'S SIFTING OF EVIDENCE—DELAYS SEEN KEYED TO PETROLEUM FIRMS

(By Harlan Trott)

If a process existed which would—

End the Nation's domestic oil shortage permanently.

Provide abundant high-grade oil at lower cost.

Open up a vast new demand for coal.

Keep John L. Lewis' coal miners working full time.

Produce a cheap, smokeless fuel to solve the soot and smog problem of cities like Los Angeles, St. Louis, and Boston.

Produce 3,000 cubic feet of high-value fuel gas and 100 kilowatt-hours of electricity as additional products out of every ton of coal.

Justify building and operating coal-oil plants—three times cheaper in capital investment than present methods—as utilities in most cities and towns and at coal mines.

Then presumably this would create a lot of public interest.

If this coal-treating process really worked, then the Nation could have oil for nearly 2,000 years at its present rate of consumption. There is that much coal available, according to the Department of the Interior.

Such a process does exist.

The public is not being told about it.

For simplification, it is called in this article the Karrick process after the man who developed it. It is a low-temperature method of distilling oil from ordinary soft coal. It is radically different from a three-to-four-times more expensive process of obtaining oil from shale by a German method, which is favored and now is being developed by the United States Bureau of Mines.

The oil-shale method now being operated at Rifle, Colo., never could meet the Nation's oil and coal needs, the Bureau of Mines concedes. It yields only oil and a shale rock residue which has to be thrown away.

Indeed, the German processes, the Bergius and the Fischer-Tropsch, now being developed by the Bureau of Mines in Louisiana, Mo., were purchased by Standard Oil and associated major oil companies of the United States from the I. G. Farben Trust in 1929.

SHALE PROCESS TERMED INADEQUATE

The Karrick process, on the other hand, could mean just as much to the coal industry as to oil. It yields both oil and gas of the same heating value as natural gas, also a superior solid smokeless fuel. The latter is much superior in heat yield and usability to ordinary soft coal. It is completely smokeless, however burned, with all that that could mean to sooty American cities.

This process, in addition to costing barely one-third of the German methods for the same oil-producing capacity, solves the enormously wasteful present system of burning soft coal and sending its valuable oil content up the chimney in the form of soot to plague cities and housewives. It extracts the oil to solve the Nation's domestic oil shortage, and sends an improved and smokeless coal to household furnaces, fireplaces, kitchen or parlor stoves, factories, power plants, and railroads.

Despite these apparent advantages of the Karrick or coal-distilling process, the Interior Department's top synthetic fuel experts, who are busy improving the shale-distilling process and are using a $60,000,000 appropriation from Congress for this and the costly German-Standard Oil methods, are opposing developing oil by a coal-distilling industry.

Bureau of Mines officials are reluctant to explain the reasons for this.

When pressed, their explanation boils down to the following: They grant the essential technological claims—and even the cost figures—for the coal distillation process. But in administering the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act, they consider it the Bureau of Mines business to produce oil. They do not consider it the bureau's business to get involved in the production of oil and a smokeless fuel by-product, even though it is a superior fuel for making synthetic gas.

Laboratory tests—backed up by the operation of four commercial-size coal-distillation plants—have proved that a plant processing only 50 tons a day of ordinary soft coal would be economically profitable. Such a plant could supply all the electric power, gas, and inexpensive oil for a community of 1,000 inhabitants.

At the same time the solid, smokeless, coke-like by-product fuel would supply 1,000 coal-burning facilities several times over.

EXTREMELY LOW OPERATING COST

The operating cost of such a project is so low, according to these Government-pioneered studies, that the sale of smokeless fuel at the same market price as for raw coal would permit the oil from coal to sell for practically nothing and yield a profit.

These carefully checked facts about the Nation's long-range fuel outlook are being bypassed by Interior Department officials. Meanwhile the public is being told that the country must depend increasingly on foreign oil supplies. It is being told, too, that there will be progressively fewer jobs for coal miners in the near future because of markets lost to oil and natural gas.

According to unpublished Government engineering data, if the Nation's raw, smoky bituminous coal were displaced by this distilled (de-smoked) oil-free coal, 80 to 100 percent more raw coal necessarily would be mined in order to meet the new supply of oil, gas, and electricity obtained from coal.

Reduced to simplest terms, there is one question to resolve: Is the process commercially practical or not? Everything else hinges on that.

Top Government experts assert that the question is beyond the layman's ability to assess. They contend that only the Interior Department's experts are qualified to judge how the Bureau of Mines shall spend the $60,000,000 Congress granted it under the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act to further Government research and development of oil-from-coal technology.

There are four points to establish as a prelude to any appraisal of the questions of public policy raised by the Government's failure to do anything about it:

1. What, in brief, is the process and what results are claimed for it?

2. Who developed the process and what are his qualifications?

3. Is documentary evidence available to support the claims?

4. Can other individuals who either are engineers or are competent in appraising coal and oil problems corroborate the evidence?

Answers to these questions will suggest whether the process is to be taken seriously and whether the Interior Department is at fault in not backing the process.

HIGH VALUE BY PRODUCED FUELS

First, the so-called Karrick process, named for Lewis C. Karrick who developed it, uses low-pressure steam to distill ordinary soft coal. The process is known as low-temperature carbonization of coal. The basic process did not originate with Mr. Karrick. Indeed, prior to the discovery of the first petroleum oil well in Pennsylvania, the city of Boston had no less than five coal-oil plants, making kerosene, gas, smokeless fuel, lubricating oil, paraffin wax candles, and axle grease from coal; and there were 58 such plants in the United States.

Mr. Karrick has extended the process and introduced refinements for special coal uses including complete gasification, all of which are covered in his 20 patents.

The products obtainable from a ton of ordinary, noncoking Ohio bituminous coal by the Karrick process are:

Smokeless fuel, pounds	1,500
Fuel gas, cubic feet	3,500
Cresols, gallons	10
Electricity, kilowatt-hours	100
Crude oil, gallons	26

The break-down in terms of corresponding revenues—based on commercial processing of Ohio coal shipped to the St. Paul-Minneapolis area—is equally startling:

Smokeless fuel at $14 a ton	$10.50
Fuel gas at 10 cents per 1,000 cubic feet	.35
Cresols at 30 cents a gallon	3.00
Electricity at one-half cent a kilowatt-hour	.50
Crude oil at 6 cents a gallon	1.56
Total revenues	15.91

The combined cost of raw coal, freight, and processing is estimated at $10.80 a ton, leaving a net profit of $5.11.

Leaving out the crude oil and cresols, the net profit on a ton of processed coal would be 55 cents. Actually, therefore, the manufacturer could give away the oil products and still make 10 percent on the invested capital in his plant since the end-product of crude oil costs him nothing.

Second, who developed the process and what are his qualifications? Mr. Karrick is recognized as one of the Nation's leading oil-from-coal technologists. He has held the Government positions of chemist, petroleum-refinery engineer, oil-shale and coal technologist, and consulting engineer in the synthetic liquid-oils studies by the United States Bureau of Mines in Utah and Colorado, and in the Pittsburgh station while holding a research fellowship at Carnegie Institute of Technology. He is author of several Government papers.

Mr. Karrick also supervised coal-product researches at the University of Utah from 1930 to 1938. In 1943 he worked on the Alaska and Rocky Mountain coals for the United States Geological Survey, and showed them to be cheaper and better sources of oils than the shales of the naval oil-shale reserves. The following year he was given charge of new oil-source investigations for the Navy Department.

More recently, Mr. Karrick was hired by the State of Ohio to core drill and test the oil shales, discovering vast, apparently unknown oil resources in both oil shales and the coals.

Two years ago Mr. Karrick said in the opening address before the Ohio Society of Professional Engineers that on the basis of his studies of Ohio shales and coals there is enough oil in the oil shales and coals of southeastern Ohio to supply the entire United States with oil at the present rate of consumption for 2,000 to 10,000 years.

TESTED IN COMMERCIAL SIZE PLANTS

Third, what documentary evidence is available on this process? Mr. Karrick has built and operated a semi-commercial-sized plant in Utah, Colorado, and Pennsylvania, while making oil-from-coal studies for the United States Bureau of Mines.

He built and briefly operated a pilot two-unit commercial-sized plant in Ohio. He also built and ran a commercial scale, single-unit for the Navy.

Complete data on these operations and on the research behind them is both in his possession and that of the Government.

Fourth, what corroboration from competent sources? Mr. Karrick has a signed analysis attesting the high quality and value of the oil from his Ohio plant by Dr. Cecil E. Boord, head of the Department of Organic Chemistry at the Ohio State University.

He has a report by Dean S. B. Ketchum, of the University of Utah School of Mines and Engineering, surveying the Karrick process and recommending that the citizens of Salt Lake City adopt it both for its economic usefulness and to cope with the city's serious smoke problem.

Dr. Gustav Egloff, a former president of the American Institute of Chemists, and director of research for the Universal Oil Co., said in an address before the World Power Conference in London that the antiknock quality of the gasoline produced in Mr. Karrick's coal distilling plant in Pittsburgh, using Utah's cheap, noncoking coals, is one-third better than the best commercial antiknock gasoline.

The Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey offered to buy and to contract for the development and use of the Karrick patents.

Finally, this correspondent has checked the essential facts and cost figures of the Karrick process with those Government oil-from-coal experts who decline to recommend it, or to spend any of their congressional appropriation to further it. The chief among them, as will be reported below, has conceded their basic accuracy.

Mr. Karrick asserts that the Interior Department never has published his original Government-supported research data. Neither has it permitted him to write up an official summary of his studies covering the technology and economics of his oil-from-coal process as is customary on the completion of basic research of this kind.

Mr. Karrick said that Government employees are not authorized to publish original Government data privately. For that reason, he said, he undertook to release the facts about his startling discoveries after he left the Government by becoming a research director at the University of Utah from 1930 to 1938.

THESIS CLAIMS VERIFIED IN THESIS

The stupendous nature of Mr. Karrick's Government-suppressed discoveries are verified in a thesis on low-temperature carbonization by Myron W. Mellor and Robert C. Woodhead, candidate for bachelor of science degrees. Their thesis bears the signed endorsement of Dr. E. A. Bechstrand, head of the Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Utah.

In formal acknowledgments prefacing their work, it is stated: "The authors wish to express their sincere appreciation to Mr. L. C. Karrick, fuels engineer, and formerly refinery engineer, for the United States Bureau of Mines. Mr. Karrick directed the research; the methods and processes used were largely those worked out by him, and his excellent cooperation and advice, as well as material assistance, were most valuable."

Under the heading, "Conclusions," the work states:

"In 1935, a low-temperature carbonization plant was built in the coal-research laboratory at the University of Utah large enough to be classed as a pilot plant. From this plant sufficient data were taken to further verify previous research on the subject and to base the calculations for a large commercial plant. Enough byproducts, smokeless fuel, crude oil, and gas were obtained to permit ample testing and use of them.

"The tests made on the byproducts were focused mainly on the smokeless fuel because of the very thorough studies that were already made by Mr. L. C. Karrick.

"The conclusions made on the testing of this smokeless fuel versus raw coal are as follows:

"1. The smokeless fuel is positively smokeless, no matter how fired.

"2. A fire can be started as easily with the smokeless fuel as with the raw coal in any of the common forms of domestic heating appliances.

"3. The rate of combustion of smokeless fuel can be controlled more easily than the rate of combustion of raw coal.

"4. The efficiency of combustion of smokeless fuel is much higher and is much more constant over a wide range of firing rates than with raw coal.

"5. The combustion of smokeless fuel is from 4.14 percent more efficient in a cook stove to 65.9 percent more efficient in a fireplace than raw coal."

HANDS NOT STAINED AFTER HANDLING FUEL

"6. Smokeless fuels differ from most of the Utah coals leaves no stain or dirty dust on one's hands after handling it.

"7. This coal can be classified as an artificial anthracite coal, but with free-burning properties.

"8. There is no need for anyone to purchase new house-heating equipment in order to make Salt Lake City, or like towns troubled with excessive smoke, smokeless before this new fuel is placed on the market.

"The conclusions regarding economic feasibility of the construction and operation of a commercial low-temperature carbonization plant for processing Utah coals, are as follows:

"1. It is economically feasible to construct a low-temperature carbonization plant the process tested in this thesis.

"2. It is economically feasible to construct a low-temperature carbonization plant using this process in series with a steam-generated power plant, and use the off-peak and exhaust steam for coal processing, while producing the power at a rate equivalent to the cost of maintaining the power-generating equipment.

"3. The low-temperature carbonization of Utah coals will save a large economic loss of fuel, and damage to property and health in our cities.

"4. The establishment of a low-temperature carbonization industry in Utah will expand the coal production from the Utah mines by supplying the heat energy consumed in the processing plants and by producing from Utah coal the oil products and the necessary city and industrial fuel gas. The coal mines will then operate at a more uniform rate throughout the year, and be a great boon to labor and to the inhabitants in the coal mining areas of our State.

The conclusions reached from the oil studies are as follows:

"1. High quality crude oil can be economically produced from Utah coals as a byproduct of a smokeless fuel industry. The studies have demonstrated that the coal oil can be cracked and refined into excellent yields and quality motor fuels and that the new liquid motor fuels are the equivalent of the best standard products.

"2. Many smokeless fuel demonstrations were made in our fuel laboratories throughout the winter of 1935-36 before representatives of all of the women's clubs of Salt Lake City. Luncheons were prepared on cooking ranges fired with various screen sizes of the smokeless fuels.

"The many visitors were permitted to light and care for the fires. The visitors were uniformly agreed that the fuel was perfect in its ignitability, easy to regulate, exceptionally good in holding a fire, completely free of smoke under all conditions of firing, there was no soiling of the inner surfaces of stove lids, the amount of ash was small, the fuel heated the ovens ready for baking more quickly than either natural gas or electricity, the fuel gave much more heat. They would gladly pay several dollars more per ton for this smokeless fuel than for any other solid fuel."

In 1930 a Standard Oil of New Jersey development company drew up a charter for a subsidiary development company tendering Mr. Karrick the position of vice president and chief engineer and one-third of the stock if he would turn over his patents and supporting research data. A contract was offered to him on these terms. Mr. Karrick declined the offer, preferring, he explained, that his patents be safeguarded in a way that would best insure their "broadest public use."

The phrase "broadest public service" harks back to 1926, when the late Senator Reed Smoot, of Utah, and Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, urged Mr. Karrick to take out those patents and to see that they were used in a way to render "the broadest public service." Mr. Karrick attributes these words to Mr. Hoover. Mr. Karrick recalls Mr. Hoover as saying that only in that way, too, would full credit ever be accorded the Government and its researchers.

Certain officials in the Interior Department, interviewed by this reporter, are familiar with the Karrick process and its documented history.

SUPPORT HELD DENIED UNJUSTIFIABLY

They believe Mr. Karrick has been denied, without justification, adequate support in his efforts to use his process, which was developed by the taxpayers' money for the broadest public good. They are officials whose experience, competence, and opinion should not be lightly dismissed. They must remain nameless.

Certain Government lawyers, who likewise must remain nameless, have told this reporter that in their judgment, the Karrick process has been allowed to go unused because big oil companies and their friends in Government have preferred to buy it or see it exploited independently if at all—with all the risks of establishing a new process in a field dominated by big and financially powerful companies which are ranked as tough competitors.

Back in 1944, when the question of spending Federal funds to develop foreign oil reserves was a serious wartime issue, Harold Ickes, then Secretary of the Interior, told a Town Meeting radio audience that it is possible to make synthetic gasoline from the shale and coal of Utah, but at a great deal more expense than natural oil.

"If the American people want to pay more for their gasoline, why we can give you synthetic oil."

The Secretary of the Interior apparently was not aware of the data secreted in his own files contradicting this still prevalent assumption that oil from coal is more costly.

The high-cost oil-from-coal process mentioned by Mr. Ickes—the process favored by the Bureau of Mines—stems from patents owned by large oil interests, including Standard Oil and I. G. Farben.

In 1943, Dr. R. R. Sayers, then chief of the United States Bureau of Mines, told the Senate Public Lands Committee:

"Because of the huge stake which the public has in this matter, it is up to the Government to undertake the development work—to perfect the known processes, to design and establish new processes, to work out the engineering details, and otherwise as well to demonstrate satisfactorily the practical worth of synthetic fuel production so that industry would be willing to take reasonable risks.

"The Bureau of Mines is equipped to undertake this public trust."

At the same time, Dr. Sayers avoided mentioning Bureau of Mines data relating to Mr. Karrick's studies.

On the contrary, later testimony made it clear that patent rights to methods the Bureau of Mines is spending millions of dollars to develop were acquired by the Standard Oil Co. in 1929.

These methods involve conversion of coal to oil by the hydrogenation process. The Karrick process extracts oil from coal by low-temperature carbonization, that is, by distillation as applied in distilling oil from oil shales.

The president of the Standard Oil Co. testified that the cost of making gasoline by the methods for which the company holds the patent rights runs from 14.7 to 15.9 cents a gallon.

SEES PLENTY OF WORK AHEAD FOR MINERS

In 1944, the United States consumed 1,650,000,000 barrels of crude oil and 650,000,000 tons of coal. If all this raw coal were replaced on the market by the smokeless byproduct of low-temperature carbonization, the miners would have to dig 1,000,000,000 tons of coal, since a ton of raw coal only produces on an average two-thirds of a ton of smokeless solid fuel. Also it would take an additional 250,000,000 tons of raw coal to supply the fuel used in converting the coal to smokeless fuel, oil, gas, and electric power.

Processing 1,000,000,000 tons of coal would yield about 825,000,000 barrels of crude oil, or half the Nation's yearly requirements based on the abnormally high 1944 figures.

If this oil distilled from coal were hydrogenated in its refining, as is done in England, Germany, and in the United States to heavy petroleum residuums, the volume of crude oil would be raised to 60 percent of the national oil need, Mr. Karrick asserts.

As far back as 1924, he and his associates both in the Government and at the universities of Utah and Colorado had developed enough data to show that:

1. Crude oil could be obtained from Rocky Mountain oil shales, by several types of processing plants, for $1.50 to $2 a barrel.

2. That if distilled underground, oil could be extracted from shale for 65 cents a barrel.

3. That bituminous coals also could produce oils in similar plants at $1.50 to $2 a barrel without any credit for the sales value of the gas and smokeless solid-fuel residue.

4. That if solid smokeless fuel was sold wholesale at raw smoky coal prices, then the oil would cost nothing. One could afford to give it away.

The simpler Karrick type of plant is estimated to require $2,000 of invested capital a ton of daily treating capacity. The German processes of converting oil from coal require four times as much invested capital a ton of daily treating capacity, according to information supplied Congress by Standard Oil Co. officials.

Is this oil-for-nothing prospect the underlying cause of the road block which is holding back oil-from-coal development and confusing the public about its commercial feasibility?

The few informed Washington officials who secretly decry the situation believe the desire within the Government to conceal the facts about this economical oil-from-coal process stems from the unwillingness of private oil interests to start people thinking in terms of all the oil the Nation needs for "nothing a barrel."

In order to check the facts with the Interior Department as carefully as possible, this reporter questioned Dr. James Boyd, director of the United States Bureau of Mines; Dr. Arno C. Fieldner, chief of the fuels and explosives branch of the Bureau of Mines; and Dr. Schroeder, the Bureau's leading specialist on synthetic liquid fuels.

Asked what in his opinion was wrong with the Karrick oil-from-coal process, Dr. Schroeder said the oil distilled from coal is tar.

According to Dr. Boord's previously mentioned analysis of oil actually distilled, by Mr. Karrick from Ohio coal, by his process, the oil may be evaluated three ways, namely:

1. As coal tar it will vary from $3.50 to $4.20 a barrel.

2. On the basis of the cresylic acid and neutral oils, it is worth $5.80 a barrel.

3. Separating and refining the low-boiling cresylic acids, it is worth $6.50 a barrel.

Domestic crude oil currently is selling for $2.53 a barrel.

Asked about Mr. Karrick's smokeless coal, Dr. Schroeder replied, "Where's Karrick going to find any market for it?"

ADMITS HIGH DEVELOPMENT TECHNICALLY

Asked what's wrong with the Karrick process, Dr. Fieldner said, "Technically it's pretty good." He went on to say it was workable. He said there are quite a number of patented processes in the field of low-temperature carbonization of coal and that "Karrick's compares favorably with the rest."

Dr. Fieldner explained that in evaluating the Karrick process, it is essential to consider two things, "technology and economics." He said Mr. Karrick's process was "not any worse than any of the others."

Asked what about the tabulated list of fuel products obtainable by the Karrick process (printed earlier in this article), Dr. Fieldner said the figures are "about right."

The tabulated break-down of revenues obtainable from a ton of ordinary Ohio coal by the Karrick process (also printed earlier in this article) was called to his attention. Dr. Fieldner remarked that these figures "are fair enough."

Asked to check Mr. Karrick's claim that his oil-from-coal process is four times cheaper in terms of capital investment than the costly German-pioneered process controlled by Standard Oil, Dr. Fieldner said the Karrick investment cost was not four times cheaper. "I think nearer three."

Dr. Fieldner was asked that that being so, would not the public want to know why doesn't the Bureau spend all its millions of dollars of public funds in developing the three-times-cheaper process? Dr. Fieldner replied he thought the public naturally would.

"What is the answer?" he was asked.

"That's one of those things you cannot give an answer to," Dr. Fieldner replied.

When this reporter insisted that there surely must be an answer, Dr. Fieldner explained that the Bureau of Mines' Administration of the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act discards coal distillation because under the Karrick process oil is a byproduct.

Dr. Fieldner said the Bureau wants gasoline from coal. It isn't interested in backing an oil-from-coal process where the main product is smokeless solid fuel, and the oil is a byproduct.

He said it boils down to a simple economic matter of where is the market for smokeless fuel?

AIMS TO SALT WASTEFUL METHODS

What about the users of raw smoky coal? Dr. Fieldner was asked. It was pointed out that, according to Mr. Karrick's tabulations of products obtainable from a ton of ordinary bituminous coal, which Dr. Fieldner confirmed, we waste nearly a barrel of oil in every ton of raw coal. Last year the Nation squandered 300,000,000 barrels of crude oil in the form of smoke up the flue.

Dr. Fieldner said that was true but that was something for industry to take over and develop, not the Bureau of Mines, which is interested in converting coal to gasoline without any byproducts.

Asked why his Government branch did not publish Mr. Karrick's original research data relating to his oil-from-coal while employed in the Bureau of Mines, Dr. Fieldner said it was news to him that any of Mr. Karrick's Government research data was lying around unpublished.

Dr. Boyd became head of the Bureau in 1947, and consequently came into this controversy at a late date. However, he has reviewed it and stands on the recommendation of the Bureau's experts. His comments assume responsibility for the Bureau's actions, but indicate that the decision lay with Dr. Fieldner, Dr. Schroeder, and their fellow technologists.

Substantially the following colloquy took place between Dr. Boyd and this reporter:

"Question. Dr. Boyd, what do you know about Lewis C. Karrick?

"Answer. Mr. Karrick is a very competent engineer. We've had him in here two or three times and he has wasted hours of our time. We've examined his case thoroughly, and we don't think his process is worth pushing. That's not just my opinion but the opinion of some 30 experts in the Bureau.

"Question. What's wrong with Mr. Karrick's process?

"Answer. I suggest you talk with our experts, Dr. Arno Fieldner, a very outstanding engineer, and Dr. Schroeder.

"Question. What other strides has the Bureau of Mines made in the field of oil-from-coal development that outstrips the Karrick process?

"Answer. I suggest you talk with our experts.

"Question. Why was not the Bureau of Mines interested enough in the Karrick process to publish the original research data gained at the Government's expense? Why has the Bureau not published this data?

"Answer. I don't know. You'll have to ask Dr. Fieldner.

"Question. What about that exchange of letters between you and Mr. Karrick which he has in his possession and in which you informed him 2 years ago that a bulletin was being written on the subject? That was 2 years ago, and apparently nothing has been done to bring Mr. Karrick's process to the public's attention.

"Answer. I don't remember. Possibly Dr. Fieldner has not been able to find anyone competent to assemble it.

"Question. What about Mr. Karrick?

"Answer. That would be up to Dr. Fieldner. Bear in mind that it would cost money. Our funds are outlined by Congress. The money has to be available before we can undertake it.

"Question. But you spent millions of dollars for oil-from-coal methods admittedly three times more expensive than the Karrick process.

"Answer. You must realize that this matter was decided by the best Government experts.

"Question. Like Dr. Fieldner and Dr. Schroeder?

"Answer. Yes, they are extremely competent men."

BUREAUCRATIC PROTOCOL STILLS TONGUES

A few informed officials have been concerned about the Bureau of Mines' suppression of Mr. Karrick's original Government data since long before Senator O'MAHONEY's oil investigating committee warned in 1947 that "this country cannot fight another war if it has to rely on its own oil supply." But they dare not violate the unwritten rules of bureaucratic protocol by speaking out.

The only basis on which Mr. Karrick is willing to dispose of those patents is to license them to whoever will (a) agree to develop them on the widest possible commercial scale, and (b) pay a nominal royalty on the processed tonnage for the maintenance of a coal research foundation, to aid the coal miners and support vocational schools for labor.

Mr. Karrick declares that he never has felt reasonably certain that disposing of his patents to large private oil interests would insure their commercial development in the near future and at the same time safeguard his public trusteeship. He believes that the position of the major oil companies, particularly at this time, is not advantageous to his public-spirited purpose.

With domestic crude oil selling currently for about $2.53 a barrel, private companies naturally are interested in keeping up crude oil imports, it is pointed out, since crude oil can be obtained abroad for about 34 cents a barrel and shipped to the United States at a tanker cost of about 80 cents a barrel, and sold at a heavy profit.

Consequently, Mr. Karrick believes, the merits of his cheap domestic oil-from-coal process are unlikely to interest private oil companies, or the Interior Department for that matter, until the companies run out of sources of cheap foreign crude oil. But in the interests of his public trusteeship he is hopeful of persuading Congress to reappraise the Interior Department's administration of the synthetic fuels development program.

Central Arizona Reclamation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a resolution adopted by the assembly and senate of the State of California. It refers to the proposed central Arizona reclamation project, now under consideration by a committee of this House and gives information which I hope will be read thoughtfully by all Members. The joint resolution follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 1

Joint resolution relative to the central Arizona project

Whereas Senate bill 75 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session, which would authorize the central Arizona project, is now before the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States for consideration; and

Whereas the proposed central Arizona project is economically unsound and would benefit an estimated 36,000 residents in Arizona at an estimated cost of $750,000,000 to the taxpayers of all the States and Territories of the United States; and

Whereas sufficient water for the proposed central Arizona project can be secured only by diverting, to that project, some water now needed to maintain authorized and existing projects on the Colorado River; and

Whereas the diversion of water from existing projects will jeopardize the water supply of 5,500,000 residents of California, who, relying on their contracts for water with the Federal Government, have invested more than $500,000,000 to provide facilities to enable them to use their share of the water from the Colorado River; and

Whereas the passage of Senate bill 75, while benefiting a few thousand landowners in Arizona, will bring irreparable injury to 5,500,000 residents of California, and will increase the tax burden of the taxpayers of all the States and Territories of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the House of Representatives of Congress of the United States be memorialized to refuse the passage of Senate bill 75 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted in assembly March 8, 1950.

Adopted in senate March 16, 1950.

Let's Strengthen Navy Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., March 19, 1950:

NAVAL POLICY TAKING RISKS—POWER OF SHIPS AND PLANES ARE TO COVER WORLD NEEDED TO MEET RUSSIAN THREAT

[By Lester Allen]

With the ocean washing its shores, New England operates navy yards, ship- and submarine-building plants, plants to provide power for planes and ships, a concentrated and feasible target for attack in an atomic age, but apparently cares little about the calculated risk being taken with national security by defense plans that whittle down our naval power to an absolute minimum.

Capt. Ernest M. Eller, USN, in the 1950 prize essay of United States Naval Institute Proceedings, sums up the attitude of the people of the country by saying, "Although the sea is the very tide of her life, America has never believed in it. Some leaders have proclaimed its importance, the greatest being Washington, who, in an hour of crisis, declared that, however important armies are, in a war like the Revolution a navy must cast the deciding vote. Power on the sea—and in this twentieth century above it—has helped to save us through many great dangers, but the sea itself has never become a part of the heart of America."

BITTER TRUTHS

It is a unusual essay—one which should be quoted in its entirety if space permitted, for it contains bitter truths important to the Navy brass as well as the civilian who foots the bills. He points out that with great lack of tact the Navy annoyed the national crowing for a cheap war (in ships and measures) and said bluntly that this was "weak-minded nonsense before the facts of life."

"Having learned the hard way that nothing is easy, the Navy as a whole thus did not participate in the brief golden hallucination when America had the world in her grasp," he asserts. "For a space the United States was God and Fate. We could have had the Atomic It was terrifying to hear the man in the street throughout this Christian country of ours declare that we should go drop bombs on all their big cities. When we had blasted enough families and cowed the rest, then the world would be safe for democracy."

FAIL TO SEE NEED

In conclusion, he says: "Anyone who looks impartially at the events of 1949 must come to the conclusion that the American public has accepted a progressive reduction of its Navy below a minimum safe level because it does not see the need for it.

"This occurs at the moment the United States has become the first power in the world, at a moment when she is champion, leader, and most of the strength of western civilization, with growing obligations in all the seven seas. It occurs at a time when the United States, and only the United States, in this generation, at least, has the power to give all peoples that constant freedom of the sea necessary for world peace and progress."

SHOULD BE BUILT UP

Navy power should be built up under the sea and in the air. Even the bitterest antagonists of the Navy admit that it is in these categories that the Soviet Union is making the greatest progress toward the kind of strength needed for global expansion.

New England has a major role in such a build-up of the kind of naval power required to meet the threat of Soviet expansion. The Red navy has 270 submarines, including 30 German-type 21's, which can easily do 17 knots submerged. We have built two submarine hunter-destroyers, the U. S. S. *Carpenter* and the U. S. S. *Owens*, and are building the K-1, 2, and 3, small killer subs as a countermeasure. Vice Adm. Francis S. Low is the head of a special program of anti-submarine warfare for the Navy.

New England yards should be turning out killer subs, killer destroyers, and other anti-submarine weapons if Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson's estimate of the situation is right.

MUST SHIP SUPPLIES

He has declared that we would retaliate instantly if attacked. He means atomic bombardment. That means from overseas bases. Overseas bases mean an immense tonnage of supplies and the 964 question is how the supplies are going to move overseas if the Navy doesn't see that they get there.

The fact is that the Navy won't get them there if Russian snorkel submarines are on the loose, because a snorkel is much harder to find and kill—even with radar at its present high development—than an old type submarine that came up for air and recharging batteries.

NAVY CAN CURB REDS

Even the build-up of the strength of the Atlantic Pact nations requires a Navy at a much higher ratio of strength than it is today. It's a Navy job to get the stuff across to Europe—once the shooting starts. With a Navy ranging around the coastal frontiers of the Soviet Union the immense numerical strength of the Red fighting forces is whittled down to a size than can be handled by the United States because they have to spread their forces around to meet the threat of coastal incursions.

New England's concern should be over the fact that the yards and the plants used to build ships and power plants for ships and planes are not being utilized in the way that they should be if the plan is to undertake a rapid expansion in the event of war. But, just how rapid could that expansion be? If the experience after Pearl Harbor means anything, it will be at least a year before the plants are turning out even the minimum required amounts of material.

A great many people shudder to contemplate the possibility of war. They would shudder more if they contemplated the possibility of quick defeat and what it would mean.

POLAR ATTACK NOT LOGICAL

Armchair strategists declare that if the Russians launch an attack it will be over the pole and that Arctic operations are of paramount importance. Just why the Russians should select the Polar approach with all its difficulties when, with a submarine fleet, western European harbors and an air force of its present strength, they could wreak incalculably greater damage, is difficult to understand. The Polar approach can be checkmated by a build-up of Alaskan defenses. The European approach can only be stopped cold by the existence of a strong United States Navy.

The fact is that there are too many calculated risks being taken. As long as the Soviet Union can be confined to land operations in Eurasia there is every chance of rolling them back to where they came from. But, let them get their feet into the Atlantic, or the Pacific, and it would be a tough, long, and probably futile effort to keep them from global mastery.

Too many people sell short the ability of the Russians to create a sea fighting force. They can't imagine what would happen if by any chance the Russians should possess carrier forces to attack our coasts and we had none. The fact is that we soon will have none unless naval aviation is beefed up.

NEED WORLD-RANGING FORCE

An offensive and defensive power capable of ranging around the world will contain the Soviet Union in its land mass until the international chaos precipitated by World War II and the expansionist policies of the Soviet Union is resolved.

Carrier strength has been cut from 12 to 8 to 6 to 4. Soon, because the Soviet Union has not announced the building of any carriers, we may have no flat tops in commission. They will all be tied up rusting out as any New Englander can see by looking down Boston Harbor. There is this warning to be taken to heart—tied-up carriers cannot be used. They have to have planes, men, training—lots of it. Otherwise they might as well be a pile of iron ore still in the ground at Hibbing, Minn.

ANTIRUS WEAPONS ESSENTIAL

Whether the supercarrier that Navy planned to build is the answer or not is beside the point. But, Navy building of anti-submarine weapons is imperative because the Red navy has plenty of submarines, has the German submarine yards and German know-how and is building more.

The Russians are not building a submarine flotilla to operate in the Polar seas. They are building it to operate in the Atlantic and the Pacific—and if the crisis of war ever comes that's where they will have to be hunted down.

If we are attacked, our best hope is to roll the Russians back out of Europe and the start would have to be made on European soil. In order to apply power of the order needed, men and material would have to be transported not only to Europe but across the Pacific as well. All the atomic bombing won't alter that fact.

TIME TO SEE CONVERSE

The sea may never become a part of the heart of America, but New England has lived beside and off the sea for more than three centuries. It's about time that the New England delegation in Congress awoke to the fact that there's work to be done—that the Navy is New England's concern.

"The American public particularly does not understand," says Captain Eller, "that the trident navy of today requires strength to fight in the air even though no probable opponent may have carriers. This attitude is incredible but it exists.

"No man, except the few who deliberately seek to destroy our Nation from within, would advocate that if Uncle Sam had a club and a pistol, and his opponent in a dark alley had only a club, that Uncle Sam should discard the pistol. No man would imagine that the way to defeat a Goliath is by making ourselves weak where he is weak.

"Yet, if we clip the powerful wings of the Navy that gave us enduring strength over the oceans of the world, we restrict ourselves to meeting our probable enemy in the area of his own choice. The airplanes of the Navy, combined with the ships that provide mutual protection and that transport them across oceans, give us freedom to attack where we chose, forcing the opponent into an uneasy defensive on all his frontiers."

Thomas B. Feeney's Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., of recent date:

STORY OF IRELAND'S FIGHT FOR FAITH AND FREEDOM TOLD—GLORIOUS STRUGGLE PENNED BY FEENEY—NATIVE OF IRELAND, FATHER OF THREE PRIESTS, TRACES HISTORY BEFORE ST. PATRICK'S COMING TO CONVERT PEOPLE—PLEADS FOR ONE IRELAND

My friends asked me to write a little bit about Ireland for St. Patrick's Day 1950. There has been so much written about my native land, yet so much remains to be written to do justice to the Irish. This would be no small task.

There are many questions a student could ask about the customs and mode of living of the race of people who inhabited Ireland long before St. Patrick came to convert them.

Exactly 1,080 years before America was discovered by Columbus, Patrick, the Apostle, landed in Ireland. The nation to which he came was a most ancient race, derived from one of the primeval races that peopled the earth—from the great Phoenician family of the east. These ancient peoples landed in the remote mists of prehistoric times upon a green isle in the western ocean. They populated it, colonized it, established laws, opened schools, had their philosophy, their learning, and science and art, equal to that of any other civilization of the day.

They were a people well known to the ancient Greeks and Egyptians. The name of the island as it is known today—Eire—is only a name that came after the more ancient name, for the Greeks hundreds of years before the birth of Christ called the island Oggis; or the most ancient land. The most ancient Greek writers spoke of Ireland as the far distant ocean and as a place of wonderful beauty, as an island rising out of the sea, the fairest and most beautiful of all the sea's productions.

LAND OF DESTINY

Then the Milesians landed on an island they called Inisfail, their land of destiny. They brought with them an advanced degree of civilization. So the original inhabitants intermingled their race with the Milesians, and in that intermingling was formed the Celtic Constitution which divided Ireland into four kingdoms, all under one King (Ard-righ), the high king. The palace of this high king was built almost in the center of Ireland, a hill top, rich in verdure, crowned with a lovely wood on every side. It is the plain of Royal Meath. In this palace for centuries Ireland's kings lived. It was called in the language of the people Tara.

There on Easter Sunday morning in the year 432 early in the fifth century of the Christian era, a most singular sight presented itself, Ireland's monarch sat upon his throne, in high council, around him were the sovereign kings and chieftains of the nation. Also around him again in their rank were the pagan priests—the druids of the old fire worship, and around him again were the ancient minstrels of Ireland with snow-white flowing beards with their harps playing and filling the air with glorious melodies of Irish music pouring out upon the wings of song the time honored story of Ireland's heroes and their glorious kings.

Suddenly a man appeared with mitre on head, cape on shoulders and a crozier in his hand with the Cross of Christ upon it, and this man was Patrick who came from Rome, to preach Christianity to the Irish kings, chieftains, and people.

ST. PATRICK CAME

They received him and became a civilized and enlightened people. They did not stand like other nations in a wild hubbub of barbarism to denounce the truth, as soon as they heard it and put the truth teller to death. No, they sat down—these Kings—these minstrels—these judges of the land, these learned philosophers. They disputed with Patrick, they brought the keen weapons of human wisdom and human intellect to bear against that sword which Patrick wielded.

IRELAND'S CONVERSION

Oh, it was the sword of the spirit, the word of God, the Lord Jesus Christ, until at length that King and those chieftains, all these druids and bards found that Patrick preached a reasonable religion, that he brought conviction into their minds.

Up rose the head of all the bards, and that of Ireland's minstrels, the man next in authority to the King, and lifting up his harp in his hand he said:

"Hear one, oh high King and chieftains of the land, I now declare that this man who comes to us speaks from God, and so long as I live this harp of mine shall never sound again save to the praises of Christianity and its God."

And the King and chieftains and bards and warriors and the judges and all the people alike rose promptly, and never in the history of the world was there a people that so embraced the light and took it into their minds and hearts as the Irish people did on the day of their conversion.

Ireland took the message from Patrick's lips, surrounded him with honor, and before he died he received the singular grace distinct from all other saints—that he alone among all the other apostles that ever preached the Gospel found a people entirely pagan and left them entirely Christian.

This then briefly is the story of Ireland's conversion to Christianity.

STRUGGLE FOR FAITH

Ireland's faith was easy at first to keep, but, Lord, how they struggled later to keep it. For 300 years after Patrick preached the gospel Ireland was the holiest, most learned, most enlightened, the most glorious country to Christendom. From the ends of the earth students came to study in Irish schools. They came by tens of thousands, and they brought back to every nation in Europe the wondrous tale of Ireland's sanctity, of Ireland's peace, of Ireland's music, and above all the devotion of her priesthood, Ireland's love for the Blessed Mother of God, and the immaculate purity and wonderful beauty of the womanhood of Ireland. Ireland was then very quiet and very happy, but she was not destined to remain so long.

The Danes invaded Ireland and for 300 years every year saw fresh arrivals of armies, and for 300 years Ireland was challenged to fight in defense of her faith, and to prove to the world that until the Irish race and the Irish character were utterly destroyed the Catholic faith never would cease to exist in the land.

The nation (for thank God it was a nation in that day) drew the sword for their priests, for their altars, and for God. Think of 300 years of continuous war, look back if you will on our two World Wars, about 8 years duration for both; think of 300 years of slaughter. Every valley in Ireland tells the tale.

MORE IN IRELAND

There are many like myself, born in Ireland, who can remember the "rath," or mound, sometimes in the middle of the field, sometimes on the hilltop. The old people of Ireland will tell you that Ireland is full of them, and they will tell you that when the day of battle was over and the Danes were conquered and their bodies were strewn on the field, the Irish gathered the bodies together, made a big hole into which to put them, and covered them high with dirt and sods.

In every part of Ireland are found "raths," or mounds, and what do they tell? They tell this: That never until the day of judgment no man will be able to estimate the hundreds of thousands of Danish invaders that came to conquer Ireland only to find a place in the grave. This war with the Danes lasted over 300 years.

Well, we read of how the Danes were banished from Ireland by Brian Boru. Then came the Saxon, and another 700 years of war. The sword of Ireland was drawn against the Saxon at the beginning of the ninth century, and it is still out of its scabbard against the Saxon until all of Ireland will come under one head, one government doing business peacefully with the world.

DEVOTION TO MARY

The Irish people for 1,500 years fought for something they had never seen. They never saw Christ in the Blessed Eucharist. They never saw Our Blessed Mother and yet for all these 1,500 or more years they fought for that Christ on the Cross, for that Saviour in the Tabernacle and for Our Blessed Mother of Christ whose protection caressed the Irish people, not only in Ireland but scattered all over the world. The Irish always implore Mary's help and assistance. She is the Gateway to Heaven. St. Patrick taught them that God came to earth through Mary and that man can get into Heaven only through Her. Mary is the way to Christ and this is what Christ taught—belief in this divinely revealed truth, and all the other truths given to His Apostles.

St. Patrick spoke with no compromise to the Irish people. This is the reason that after all the persecutions the people of Ireland are able to keep the Catholic faith. St. Patrick brought them the joy of their redemption, the Catholic Apostolic Church, the acceptance of whose doctrine given us by God is the one and only way of protection against Satan and the wickedness of men. Christ is the sure road to salvation from all real harm in this world, and the one and only way of salvation in the world to come.

SPIRITUAL JOY

This great Saint gave the Irish people all these wonderful things, and sure delights for their souls. He also gave them St. Patrick's Day, the day of gladness we celebrate. There is something mystical about the gladness of those who celebrate St. Patrick's Day. It is a gladness that is over and beyond anything racial or local. It is a merriment of heart that transcends the sweetness of Irish music or the lovableness of the Irish character. It is a gladness that seems to come from the very heart of Paradise.

One famous Irish poet has caught some of the spirit of it in these delightful lines in which he tells us that St. Patrick gave all the Irish a holiday in the middle of Lent:

And so in March gray
To drive troubles away,
God sends to the Irish
The saint and the day.

The late Reverend Father P. J. Carroll echoes the pride of the day in these beautiful words to St. Patrick:

Called son by many lands,
Thou art a father unto one.
Of all these mothers claiming thee,
By honored titles naming thee
We ask: Where is thy priceless birthright gone?
That blessed faith of China,
They mothering thee have told
But she, thy daughter dutiful
Has kept thy treasure beautiful
Through many sorrows in her heart of gold.

Criminal Penalties of the Sherman Antitrust Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to the thorough and extensive hearings conducted by the Temporary National Economic Committee from 1938 to 1941, inclusive, and to the conclusions and recommendations reached by that committee, composed of the ablest Members of Congress and leaders of the executive agencies, after its inquiry into concentrations of economic power in the United States. More specifically, I wish to point out the unanimous recommendation of the Temporary National Economic Committee regarding increasing the criminal penalties of the Sherman antitrust law from $5,000 to $50,000. I am thereby including in the RECORD the unanimous recommendation of that committee regarding anti-trust-law penalties.

4. PENALTIES

In its preliminary report to the Congress this committee pointed out the inadequacy of existing civil remedies under the antitrust laws, as well as the inappropriateness of the criminal remedies in many cases. The committee then recommended the enactment of legislation which would subject corporations and corporate officers violating the antitrust laws to more stringent civil penalties than exist at the present time. The committee is still convinced of the validity of its earlier recommendation, and again urges the enactment of such legislation. A bill introduced in the Senate on June 20, 1939 (S. 2719) would, if enacted into law, carry into effect the recommendations here made. The committee also points out that the maximum criminal penalty, by way of fine (and the courts are reluctant to punish a criminal violation by imprisonment) is $5,000. This amount is clearly inadequate as a deterrent to businessmen or to groups of businessmen whose incomes are in the millions, and the committee therefore recommends that the maximum limit for fines be raised to at least $50,000, leaving discretion with the COURT to assess the penalty according to the means and circumstances of the defendant and according to the extent to which it has profited by the violation of the act.

(Approved with objection.) (Investigation of concentration of economic power, final report and recommendations of Temporary National Economic Committee, 77th Cong., 1st sess. (1941), p. 10.)

Grass-Roots Support for Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me most fitting that I should take this occasion to make public acknowledgment of a very commendable activity which recently was undertaken in the city of Alhambra, Calif., located in the district which I represent.

The Junior Chamber of Commerce of Alhambra and the Alhambra Post-Advocate jointly sponsored an educational campaign to acquaint the people of that city with the provisions of the Hoover Commission report. The project had the further purpose of urging the people of Alhambra to let their representatives in the House of Representatives, and in the other body, know that they are wholeheartedly in favor of the adoption of the Hoover Commission's recommendations, in the interests of eliminating waste and extravagance in the operations of the Federal Government and thereby reducing expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

Yesterday the fruits of this commendable endeavor were brought to my attention in a most graphic manner. Mr. Clifford Cooper, who is not only a member of the Alhambra Junior Chamber of Commerce, but is also president of the National Junior Chamber of Commerce, came to my office and presented me with petitions, and coupons clipped from the Alhambra Post-Advocate, containing the names of more than 3,000 people urging the adoption of the Hoover Commission report.

Mr. Speaker, a recent Gallup poll indicated that more than 65 percent of the American people who were interviewed had no knowledge at all of the Hoover Commission's recommendations. This seemed to me a very startling revelation because of the great importance these recommendations hold for every taxpayer in the country. In Alhambra, the people of the junior chamber and the Post-Advocate determined to tell the whole story of the Hoover Report in detailed form in a series of articles in the Post-Advocate. The success of this endeavor to inform the people is apparent in the response that I received yesterday.

Divide and Conquer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1949, I addressed the House and stated in part that in an effort to combat false and malicious propaganda, as well as the whispering campaign which was employed against me during the 1948 campaign regarding my voting record, that I would periodically submit a factual report from the record how I had voted on every issue which would come before us during the coming session.

In keeping with this declaration I issued on August 15, 1949, a complete detailed record of how I had voted on each and every measure which had come before us up to that time, as well as a brief statement as to why I had so voted on each measure. I concluded this report by saying that—

During the next year we will see in operation the most highly organized propaganda machine ever devised in America.

Well, Mr. Speaker, now being thwarted in their plan to misrepresent my voting record, they have resorted to a new technique which I would like to describe herein.

According to the official registration poll books the congressional district which I have the honor to represent has a majority of 12,000 registered Democrats. The fact that I, a Republican, have been elected to represent the district four terms, should serve as ample proof that the majority of my Democratic constituents are of the true Jeffersonian variety and approve most of the votes which I have cast.

As every Member of this House knows, I am a "middle of the road Republican," leaning toward the conservative. Personally I feel that I am still young enough to recognize and accept progress, yet old enough to know that we must cling to our basic American concepts of government if we are to progress safely.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, since a majority of both Democrats and Republicans voting in the Eleventh Congressional District evidently approved, at least a majority of the votes which I have cast, the same opposition which was so unscrupulous in their 1948 technique conceived the idea of trying to divide members of my own Republican Party in an effort to defeat me in the primary. Acting in accordance with this planned strategy, they set up the following program:

Knowing that most Americans are headline readers, they decided to put misleading headlines on various statements which I had made. They were smart enough not to misquote me completely in the body of their articles, because charges could be preferred against them. However, there is no law to prevent their putting any title to an article which they claim to be their interpretation of the remarks. Let me briefly illustrate what I mean.

Shortly after the last election I stated, in part:

You know I sometimes feel like giving President Truman everything he asks for. Perhaps if those who supported him really could see what would happen if his entire program were enacted they would become so sick of their bargain that they never again would vote that way.

The headlines appearing on that article were: "Representative BREHM willing to give President Truman everything he asks for."

On another occasion I was being interviewed regarding the Taft-Hartley Act. I stated, in part:

I am willing to vote to amend the act as recommended by the joint nonpartisan congressional committee which we set up to study and observe the law. I would also be willing to change the name or title if by so doing we would have some guaranty that labor leaders would cooperate for the best interest of their members, of industry, and for the country in general. This I think would be a small concession to make in exchange for industrial peace and production.

This time the headlines rang out: "Congressman BREHM will vote to repeal Taft-Hartley if that is what labor leaders want, because it will guarantee full production." Clever, are they not?

Still another time I was asked what I thought about the $100 per month pension for the miners. I replied:

Well, I have no way of knowing whether $100 is enough, not enough, or too much. In my opinion, all assistance should be on a basis of need. A person flat on his back might need twice that amount, while a fellow who had some other income might not need that much. This much I do know, with their dangerous assignment they are entitled to all they can get by bona fide collective bargaining.

Do you know what the headline was this time? "Representative BREHM says $100 too much pension for miners."

At another time I remarked that "I am not only interested in mine safety, but all types of safety which protect human life." I further stated that I intended to protect States' rights in mine safety legislation. This time, just because I did not agree to go along with the Federal position, with no questions asked, I received headlines which said: "Congressman BREHM Opposes Mine Safety Legislation." The article then went on to quote exactly the remarks which I had made. However, some of my supposedly good friends took this article and went among the miners, showing them only the headlines in an attempt to give them the impression that I was opposed to mine safety and wanted them all killed in some mine disaster.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some may wonder why I am putting this particular speech in the RECORD. Well, the reason is quite obvious. If I did not put it in the RECORD the same unscrupulous individuals who are now attempting to divide the Republicans by their misstatements regarding President Truman's program, the Taft-Hartley Act, the National Cemetery, my office personnel, positions in the Post Office Department, over which I have no say, statements to the effect that I go back to the district and visit labor leaders, but do not call on my own committeemen, and all the rest of the tommyrot, could and in all probability would say that these were untrue statements. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am simply using the public record in order that all may know the truth and that the light of day may shine upon their false accusations.

If I were asked to name the most unpleasant feature of serving in Congress, it would be that we do not have enough free time to go back into our districts and renew old friendships and make new ones. As everyone knows, during the war we were in almost continuous session. Last year it was late October before we adjourned and as a consequence there was no time to get over the district and visit with those to whom I owe so much.

Now of course anyone who is interested in how or why I voted on any measure, has only to look at a copy of the public record which I sent out at the close of the last session. After all, that is the test of my position and not some newspaper article which can be slanted or interpreted any way some particular writer might want it to appear.

It is the privilege of anyone to work against me, vote against me, or run against me, but I intend to insist that he keep the record straight. Oppose me for my vote on some issue, O. K. Oppose me because they do not like me, O. K. In fact oppose me for any legitimate reason they choose, but let no one dare give as his reason that I am not loyal to the principles of my party. The public record as well as our Republican leadership in Congress readily disproves any such charges.

It seems to me that before anyone goes gallivanting over the country putting out half-truths against those of us who have been waging an incessant fight to preserve our beloved Republic, he should first be able to show some battle scars in his encounter with the enemy. If a person is sincere he does not sleep in the same bed with our enemies.

I may say in closing that one reason it is becoming more and more difficult to induce good Christian men and women to run for public office, is because they refuse to subject themselves to the unscrupulous and downright lying propaganda which has apparently become standard equipment in recent years of those who seem determined to rule or ruin.

More Federal Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most startling and dangerous proposals which has been made in recent years is the suggestion that a Federal bureau should be set up for the purpose of licensing the motion-picture industry. Even actors and actresses would be required to take out licenses with the Government before they could appear in pictures. The ostensible purpose of this proposal is to improve the standard and quality of motion pictures. The ultimate effect of it, however, can be not only censorship of motion pictures themselves but also complete control of the individual lives of those who appear in and produce the pictures.

But the greatest threat inherent in this proposal is the precedent that would be established. It would open the way toward licensing everybody who engages in interstate commerce. This, in the final analysis, gives the Federal Government the power to deny a license to anybody whose business standards and personal behavior it does not approve. Right now we should be giving more thought to reducing the power of the Federal Government to control our individual lives and fortunes rather than considering proposals to increase that power.

The motion-picture industry has established its own governing body to enforce a code of morals and ethics. Under this procedure, the industry has been eminently successful in raising the moral standards of the films it produces. True, under this self-regulation, the code governs only the productions themselves and does not apply to the private lives of those who appear in the pictures. But I see no more reason for the Federal Government to set itself up as the arbitrator of the moral conduct of individuals in the motion-picture field than I do in any other field of private employment.

An excellent analysis of the proposal and the dangers inherent in it appeared in an editorial in the Washington Daily News of March 16. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a copy of the editorial:

WRONG REMEDY

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Colorado, wants Congress to impose a strict Federal licensing system on the movie industry—on the actors and actresses, the producers, the distributors, and the films.

Persons convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude, or who admitted acts "constituting the essential elements" of such crimes, would be denied licenses. They would be barred from acting, in directing, producing, or distributing movies.

Films "tending" to promote crime and juvenile delinquency also would be denied licenses. They would be barred from shipment across State lines.

Among other things, Senator JOHNSON is outraged by the recently published amours of Ingrid Bergman and Rita Hayworth, whom he denounces as "Hollywood's apostles of degradation."

He accuses RKO Pictures and Roberto Rossellini, director of Miss Bergman's latest film, Stromboli, and father of her child, of "shameless exploitation" and of "deliberately exhibiting the moral turpitude of the leading lady to pack their theaters."

And he says that these and other matters of movie morals will be explored in hearings by his Senate Interstate Commerce Committee next month.

There's a great deal to be said for the movie industry's contention, that films should be judged by their contents, not by the private lives of the persons who make them. It must be admitted, however, that the publicly paraded private affairs of some persons who make movies has an influence on young and impressionable people that cannot be described as wholesome or uplifting.

But the remedy, in our opinion, is not Federal licensing—a dangerous proposal of doubtful constitutionality.

Part of the remedy can be applied by the movie industry, through the making of better films and through disciplines rather than rewards for actors, actresses, directors, producers, and distributors who transgress. And the industry, now asking the United States Supreme Court to outlaw State and local censorships, had better give thought to its responsibility if it wishes to head off Federal controls.

The other part of the remedy can be applied by decent American people, as Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, points out. Let them express their disapproval of objectionable films of errant Hollywood plays by refusing to go to see them.

UN as Bridge to One World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by Carlos P. Romulo, President, fourth session, United Nations General Assembly, at the New York Herald Tribune's High School Forum held in New York City on March 4.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLIC ENVISIONS UN AS BRIDGE TO ONE WORLD—CALLS AMERICAN MORAL LEADERSHIP BEST HOPE FOR PEACE; BACKS STRONGER UN

A free world, at peace and governed by just law—that is the world we want, the world we are trying to build through the United Nations. Lasting world peace and a durable world order presuppose some form of a limited world government. The alternatives are international anarchy, a state of perpetual conflict in a succession of cold wars each more dangerous than the last, or the ultimate catastrophe: a new world war fought with the weapons of mass destruction—atomic bombs, biological poisons and perhaps even hydrogen bombs.

There is no going back to national isolation. Such is the interdependence of nations today that no country—however great, powerful or prosperous—can stand insulated from its neighbors and oblivious of the plight and the problems of the rest of the world. It is not rhetoric but a simple statement of fact to say that peace and order are indeed indivisible, in the sense that only universal peace can really be effective, and only a system of law applicable to all nations can insure a just order in modern society.

World government, however cannot be established by fiat. We cannot have an effective world government until we have evolved a viable world community. This is precisely the function of the United Nations. Through a continual exchange of views, through declarations, agreements and covenants and—most important of all—through cooperative action by the member states, the United Nations is gradually building up a viable international body politic.

THE FACTOR FOR PEACE

The cold war has obscured the achievements of the United Nations in this most important task. The United Nations Charter itself is a milestone of the greatest significance in the evolution of human society toward a better and more stable order. By renouncing war and providing the means for the amicable settlement of international disputes, the charter has been a powerful factor for peace. It reaffirms faith in fundamental human rights and liberty serves as a bulwark against the perversion or denial of these rights. By pledging the member states to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, it has cleared the way for an unprecedented advance in these fields on a globe scale.

In pursuance of the principles and purposes of the Charter, the United Nations has produced the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and is now drawing up an International Convention on Human Rights which will add legal sanction to the moral force of the declaration. The General Assembly in 1948 adopted unanimously the International Convention on Genocide. The Trusteeship Council has established the principle that the well-being of dependent peoples is a responsibility of the international community, and has rendered invaluable service in helping to prepare them for self-government.

The Economic and Social Council has achieved great progress in dealing with the problems of health, labor, trade, relief, and reconstruction through international action. In the political field, the mediation or intervention of the United Nations has facilitated the peaceful solution of conflicts involving some 500,000,000 men, women, and children, comprising about one-fourth of mankind.

BRIDGE TO ONE WORLD

Even under the stress of the cold war the United Nations has succeeded, to an extent not generally realized, in laying the foundations of international understanding and international cooperation in coping with problems of hunger, freedom, rehabilitation, security, and social progress. The United Nations is our bridge to one world, to that living community of nations without which we cannot hope to have effective world government.

We must not destroy this bridge in our impatience to get to the promised land on the other side. Rather must we strengthen it the better to enable it to fulfill its function of spanning the gap between the world as it is and the world as we want it to be.

I have myself been one of the most ardent advocates of a stronger United Nations. On more than one occasion I have argued publicly that the United Nations to be fully effective must be given more power and authority. During the San Francisco Conference, I opposed the grant of the veto power to the Big Five. After the conference, in the committees of the United Nations and elsewhere, I strongly and repeatedly urged the modification of the Charter to pave the way for the organization of limited world government.

At one time I suggested the conversion of the General Assembly, which now can only make recommendations to member states, into a genuine parliamentary body with legislative powers sufficient to prevent war. Such powers would include the authority to prohibit all weapons of mass destruction, to maintain an adequate international police force, to apply the necessary sanctions, and to establish world tribunals. Under such a scheme, the Security Council would become the executive agent of the General Assembly, and in that capacity would be freed of the incubus of the veto which has often rendered it completely helpless in moments of crisis.

The proposal would include such other features as the establishment, in place of the one-nation-one-vote rule, of a system of weighted representation whereby each member state would have a voice in the General Assembly commensurate with its actual position in the world, taking into consideration such factors as population, industrial power, and resources, literacy, military strength, and others. Representatives to the United Nations would, accordingly, be elected by popular vote.

Such was the main outline of my plan for turning the United Nations into a limited world government. Obviously, under such a scheme, every member state would be obliged to surrender a more substantial portion of its national sovereignty than it had hitherto yielded under the United Nations Charter. Matters of domestic concern would remain under the jurisdiction of the national states. The result would be a judicious compromise between the traditional concept of national sovereignty and the newer concept of international order, enabling the nations to establish a world government with strictly delimited authority, operating under the fundamental principle that, while it would have all the powers required for mutual preservation, all other powers would be reserved to the member states.

In the present state of the world, any plan which aims at the establishment of even a limited world government must appear to be impractical. It is a fact that the world today is divided into hostile camps actively engaged in a cold war which has so far precluded agreement on such vital problems as disarmament and the control of atomic energy. International relations have deteriorated to such an extent that our main preoccupation has been reduced from the building of one world to the establishment of a modus vivendi between the contending camps. Whatever the distractions and difficulties of the moment, however, we must never lose sight of our ultimate goal—a world community secure in its rights and freedoms under some kind of world government.

In the meantime we must foster all the influences for conciliation, understanding, and cooperation that will enable us to avert war and establish lasting peace. Nowhere is the need for tolerance as the key to peace more keenly felt and appreciated than in Asia today. Since the end of the war, there has been a strong movement among the free states of Asia for a union or association dedicated to peace. In 1947, the Asian Relations Conference, held in New Delhi, defined Asia's role in world affairs as an exponent of the moral factor, a mediator between embattled ideologies, a firm and consistent advocate of amity and understanding in a world divided into hostile factions.

The New Delhi conference envisaged an association of Asian states dedicated to peace and pledged to use their combined influence in support of freedom and justice. Since then the need for taking further positive steps has been felt by the free nations of Asia. In response to this need, President Elpidio Quirino, of the Philippines, has taken the initiative in proposing a new conference to provide the peoples of Asia with an opportunity to discuss their common problems, strengthen their economic and cultural ties, and take counsel together on how they could most effectively help to preserve the peace of the world.

Asia comprises a region which in size, population, resources, and strategic situation ranks with the most important in the world. The free states of Asia have no desire to enter into any hostile combinations or to aggravate in any way the tensions and conflicts that divide the world. All that they wish to do is exert their combined influence in behalf of peace. And they propose to act, as they have done in the past, strictly within the framework of the United Nations.

More than any other nation, America understands the importance of the moral factor in dealing with the problems of war and peace. America's moral leadership, more than her material power, constitutes the greatest hope that peace will be preserved in our time and maintained in the time to come.

CONFIDENT OF FUTURE

The task of securing the peace now centers on the issue of the control of atomic energy and other means of mass destruction. In this as in other equally vital problems, I am confident that America's moral leadership will assert itself and produce a solution which will not only be effective but unassailable from the standpoint of justice. I am confident that the nation which possesses the genius and the ingenuity to harness the power of the atom, and is even now on the threshold of mastering the energy of the sun itself, will eventually work out a system of control acceptable not only to the great majority but to all of the member states of the United Nations.

An agreement on the control of the means and weapons of mass destruction would be the first major step toward the free, peaceful, and progressive world which all men and nations of good will desire.

Eighty-third Anniversary of Admission of Nebraska to the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on March 21, 1950, there was held in Lincoln, Nebr., a celebration of the eighty-third anniversary of the admission of Nebraska to the Union. I had the privilege of making an address at the founders' day celebration in the Cornhusker Hotel, in Lincoln, on that day, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Nebraskans, we love and honor our great State of Nebraska. It is true blue and truly American in principles and spirit. On this eighty-third anniversary of its statehood, we eagerly pay tribute to those sturdy men and women, those pioneers, who founded this land of opportunity.

God grant that America continues to find inspiration in the spirit of four Nebraska founders. They met their problems with courage and fortitude. They were not spoon-fed by bureaucrats. They were not promised security and a life of ease. They did not settle here and build Nebraska communities, under directives from a paternalistic Government at Washington.

They depended upon their own initiative, frugality, and enterprise to pioneer this flowering garden spot of the Nation. The incentive of reward spurred them. And, when they got their reward, they were satisfied and happy. There were no strings attached to it.

In their day, Government bosses did not take it away from them. These founders and the unbroken line of builders of Nebraska enriched themselves and the Nation. They did it the free enterprise way.

Today, all that we hold dear is in jeopardy. The fateful issues are: Whether we shall preserve in America, human liberty, the dignity of the individual, and freedom of choice, or surrender them to all-powerful Government, which seeks to control our lives and all our activities; and whether, in foreign affairs, we shall restore constitutional procedures, with even-handed justice, or continue to see the peace frittered away by secret agreements, incompetence, and drift.

The American people face the hard fact, that though they won the war nearly 5 years ago, they have not yet won the peace. They see we are losing the cold war. They are alarmed by the mounting cost of Government, deficit spending and administration demands for more and more taxes.

The American people are calling, indeed, praying for leadership along the road to lasting peace, prosperity, and contentment, and most of all, for a leadership that will keep open the doors of opportunity for their children and posterity.

The Republican Party has just adopted a platform that gives the people a clean-cut choice on these issues. It is now our job, and the job of all Republicans everywhere, to fight for the never-dying principles that protect human liberty and individual dignity, as pledged in this platform.

It is also our job, and the job of all Republicans, to see that candidates are nominated who stand foursquare for those principles.

Let those who believe in free competition, and the right of the individual to make the most of his skill, initiative, and enterprise, come into our corner. And, let those who are for spendthrift socialism, get into President Truman's corner. Let's fight it out. Let's have the show-down in the 1950 elections.

Ah; don't be fooled. There are those who say President Truman does not want Congress to pass his socialistic proposals, that he is simply trying to lure the votes of pressure groups, with promises and more promises. Well, if that is true, he is insincere; he is a demagog, a hypocrite, and such tactics should be repudiated.

For my part, I think the President is sincere. He believes in spendthrift socialism. That is his official record. And, if he succeeds in getting elected to Congress men and women who believe in his left-wing, radical proposals, America will be legislated into strait-jacket socialism.

The present session of the Eighty-first Congress, has been under way 2½ months, traveling on a treadmill and getting nowhere.

President Truman who was unable to get along with the Democrat Seventy-ninth Congress, the Republican Eightieth Congress, and now the Democrat Eighty-first Congress, is using his promises again for this fall's election campaigns.

And, we Republicans must get out and fight, or he will get away with his phony panaceas once again.

This time, we Republicans are going to fight on clear-cut issues, and this time, we are going to win.

Before the adjournment bells for the present session of Congress ring, there will be battles over appropriations and tax bills.

The Republican Eightieth Congress cut taxes five billion, cut the national debt seven billion, and left a Treasury surplus of $8,500,000,000. But now the President is trying to blame others for squandering this surplus and running up a tremendous deficit. He says the present deficit has been caused by the cut in taxes made by the Republican Eightieth Congress, and by expenditures necessary to pay for past and possible future wars. On these two counts the President is dead wrong.

Anyone who will examine the budget will find the present deficit situation is the result of increasing expenditures, $9,000,000,000 over what they were 2 years ago; and that is four billion more than the tax cut voted by the Republican Eightieth Congress.

The situation is not due to tax reduction. And, furthermore, fellow Nebraskans, of that nine billion increase, six billion is for non-war-connected domestic civilian spending. It is not for national defense. It is not for foreign recovery. It is for spending here at home. The Truman administration is simply using national defense as a smoke screen to hide its extravagant expenditures here at home.

Of the forty-three billion four hundred million of estimated spending in the proposed 1951 budget, only nine billion four hundred million, or 22 percent, represents fixed charges not subject to reduction by Congress, the largest item of which is interest on the national debt of five billion six hundred million.

We Republicans have also worked to repeal excise taxes. And now that we have made great headway, the President comes forth with a "me too" proposal to reduce some of them, but at the same time increase corporation levies, so that there will be a net increase in the tax burden of $1,000,000,000.

All of this increase would eventually be paid by the people in their cost of living. The punitive, sky-high wartime excise taxes are killing business. The sensible course is to repeal them and give business a chance to operate. That will move goods and services, and the Government will receive more revenue.

Taxes can and should be cut by cutting the outrageously high cost of Government; balancing the budget; getting on a pay-as-you-go basis like we have in Nebraska; stopping the inflationary deficit spending; and cutting the national debt.

That is what the Republican Party stands for, and that is what the American people want.

The Truman approach, and that of his fellow travelers in Congress, revolves around the motto: Tax and spend, tax and spend, charge it to the public debt, and manufacture money for inflationary deficit spending.

Fellow Americans, elect a Republican Congress next November and put an end to this Saturnalia of incompetence, inefficiency, and waste.

If the constructive work of the Republican Eightieth Congress had been vigorously presented to the people in 1948, there would be a Republican President in the White House today. And there would be no Achesons undermining our national economy and losing the peace.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson is the most powerful man in the Government today. The voice is the voice of President Truman, but the hand is the hand of Dean Acheson. Apparently he has become so powerful, as the idol of the left-wing appease-Russia agitators, that President Truman is fearful, should he fire Mr. Acheson, he will lose the support of this radical, socialistic, pressure group in the coming elections and in 1952.

In the most vital fields of governmental activity is the hand of Secretary Acheson and the Hisses. Dean Acheson and the Alger Hiss clique have been close collaborators in the State Department for many years. They have been joint architects of many schemes that have run our foreign relations into the ditch until today even little countries like Bulgaria and Hungary trample upon our rights, and the United States of America is reduced to the ignominy of futile daily protests.

China falls under the heel of Moscow-directed Communists, and all Asia trembles in fear that the Red tide will engulf it.

Through power politics, with China as a springboard, all Asia is now dominated by the God-hating dictators of Russia.

Who sat at the side of our ailing late President, and prompted him with the answers at Yalta, when China was betrayed to Russia along with Poland, Czechoslovakia, and all those other countries of eastern Europe? Why, of course, Mr. Acheson's pal, Hiss. When China pleaded for aid to resist the Red armies, who turned the cold shoulder on our faithful war ally and friend through the years? You know it was Mr. Acheson.

While he and the Hiss crowd have been calling the signals in the State Department, 14 men in the Moscow Politburo have captured control of one-fifth of the globe's land surface, 15,000,000 square miles, and one-third of all mankind, 800,000,000 human beings.

His belated warning in California last week, against further expansion by Red Russia, has a mighty hollow ring in the light of his appeasement record and total failure to win the peace.

If history repeats itself, Mr. Acheson is getting ready to further concessions to Russia, because each time he has issued a belatedly warning, it usually has been accompanied by further appeasement.

Is he about ready to have President Truman officially recognize the Communist regime in China? Is his vacillation over admission of the Communists of China to the Security Council of the United Nations, a prelude to taking them into this powerful world organization? Why, recognition of the Red usurpers of China would compound the betrayal of the people of China. And freedom-loving people around the world would hang their heads in shame.

The United Nations Charter condemns territorial acquisition by aggression. Moscow directed the conquest of China. If the United Nations takes these Red usurpers into its highest governing body, it will stultify itself, and Mr. Acheson should now be in the foremost opposing such action.

Stung by the fingers of wrath that are pointing at Dean Acheson, and the administration, participants in the infamous, secret agreements at Yalta and Potsdam, have been hedging books and magazine articles giving their slide for being bedevilled by Stalin.

Now, they beg sympathy with protests that Stalin has not kept his agreements. They point to provisions for free elections, freedom of speech, and freedom of press in the countries handed over to Stalin.

Were they so naive as to believe that the tyrants of Russia would keep these pledges? No, no, fellow Americans; these alibis won't stick.

The overt act that opened the world to infiltration of communism culminating in the present cold war was committed in 1933, when the New Deal Democrat administration officially recognized the Soviet regime and welcomed Soviet Russia to the family of nations.

Republican Presidents, before 1921, had refused to recognize Soviet Russia, because her dictators would give no dependable assurance against spreading their propaganda to undermine and destroy our Republic.

Unfortunately, no such guaranty was demanded, and none was given in 1933, when Soviet Russia was officially recognized by the United States. That is when the seed of softness toward communism was sown.

Adolf Berle has testified before a congressional committee that when he was an Assistant Secretary of State in 1944, Acheson and Hiss headed a pro-Russia clique, while he (Berle) opposed appeasement of Russia. Berle said that eventually he was forced out of the State Department and appointed Ambassador to Brazil.

And we see the almost daily evidence of how these Russian appeasers are still running through the State Department.

Dean Acheson isn't content to just run the State Department, he reaches out into all branches of government. Within the last few days, the country witnessed the shocking action of Secretary Acheson in pressuring upon us United States court in New York City, to free a convicted Russian spy, Valentine Gubitchev, on condition he would leave the country.

When Gubitchev was arrested, for his conspiracy with Judith Coplon, to steal security secrets from Government files, Russia protested that Gubitchev was a Russian diplomatic officer and immune from punishment for spying.

Mr. Acheson rejected Russia's claim and asserted Gubitchev was subject to prosecution and punishment upon conviction. Having so determined at the outset of the case, Mr. Acheson should have let the law take its course.

Instead, after the jury of American citizens had found Gubitchev guilty, Mr. Acheson prevailed upon the Attorney General to tell the court Gubitchev must be given a suspended sentence of 15 years on condition he leave the country.

The State Department issued a statement that this leniency was necessary in the interest of good will between Russia and the United States. And it was suggested that by freeing Gubitchev, life would be made easier for Americans behind the iron curtain. Ah, but fellow Americans, friendship of Russia cannot be won by the bribery of turning loose her spies in the United States. We live in a country of law and order, and Mr. Acheson should keep his hands off the processes of justice, and not try to influence the courts.

In the national defense planning today, you will find Mr. Acheson in the center of the picture, just as Alger Hiss participated in the political agreements at Yalta, which have brought so much woe to the world.

In ECA and other schemes to siphon the cash and goods of the American people to foreign countries, including bolstering for the socialistic government of Great Britain, Mr. Acheson is a prime architect. ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman is merely an errand boy for Mr. Busy-Body, Mr. Acheson.

Yes, indeed, Mr. Acheson is a busy man, busy tearing down our national economy, through slashes in tariff protection for one example.

It is Mr. Acheson, with the blessing of President Truman, who has conducted the postwar international tariff conferences under the misnamed Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Under its provisions, the President has absolute power to slash tariff rates, but it is Mr. Acheson who wields the ax.

President Truman, Secretary Acheson, and ECA Administrator Hoffman are begging foreign countries to dump their goods into our domestic markets. They are helping foreigners find ways to capture markets here in competition with American producers. And, now, the tide of imports is rapidly overtaking America's exports.

According to the Bureau of the Census, January exports were valued at $743,600,000. Imports were valued at $622,700,000. This reduced the trade gap from $337,800,000 in December, and a monthly average of $447,800,000 for 1949, to only $120,900,000 in January. Just think of it, exports in January were 21 percent below the December value of $943,900,000.

But general imports of $622,700,000 in January, were higher than the $605,100,000 in December, and substantially higher than the 1949 monthly average of $552,200,000.

Farmers are being hit by the administration's tariff give-away policy along with other segments of our population.

For example, imports of animal and vegetable products in January 1950, were valued at $254,600,000, whereas our exports of these commodities were valued at only $168,200,000.

And, you livestock producers hear this: Imports of animal products in January amounted to $53,400,000, while our exports of the same products totaled only $27,100,000.

But this is not the only blot on our foreign policy picture.

American tourists and institutions are giving and spending abroad at the rate of about $107,000,000 each month. Subtract this $107,000,000 from the $120,900,000 for January, and the dollar gap is cut to $13,900,000 for the month.

Included in the Census Bureau figures on exports are ECA shipments, goods paid for by the American taxpayers and given to Great Britain, France, Italy, and the other ECA receiving countries. Eliminate the ECA shipments in January and the result is an unfavorable trade balance—more dollars going out than came in.

The pay off—in closed American factories, curtailment in oil production, and blows to agriculture—from the tariff give-away policy of the Truman administration and its global planner, Mr. Acheson, has just begun.

If the present trend continues, within a few months another 1,000,000 American jobs will be exported. Mr. Acheson admits that American industries are being hit. He proposes that the crippled industries be taken care of by subsidies out of the Federal Treasury.

ECA Administrator Hoffman suggests putting workers thrown out of jobs by tariff slashing on to expanded unemployment-insurance rolls.

All of this is the kind of cracked economics and disregard of the right to protection of American industry, agriculture, and labor, that runs through all of the socialistic planning of the Truman administration.

No wonder the Legislatures of Texas and Mississippi have petitioned Congress to thoroughly investigate the State Department and purge it of its pro-Communists and underminers of American prosperity and security.

Mr. Acheson must go. He is a bad security risk. But cleansing the State Department alone will not get our country on the highway of peace, prosperity, and happiness, the road so clearly marked by the founders of Nebraska.

On a thousand fronts alien-minded schemers and plotters are boring from within our borders. There are more than a half million Communists in the United States, according to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover.

The Republican Party must meet this challenge. It is the only safe party to effectuate good government. Your job is to see that the people never lose sight of the truth that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Go forward as modern Paul Reveres and minutemen. Carry the facts to the people in your business, the shops, the homes, the forms, and into every voting precinct. Ring the doorbells.

We Republicans offer a new leadership untaunted by communism. We Republicans insist that the United States shall not be bound to any course of action unless the spirit and letter of constitutional procedure are followed; and that means no secret agreements bartering away our rights and liberty.

We Republicans favor aid to other countries resisting communism only if it is essential to our national security, if it is within the total limits which the American economy can afford, if it will be effective, and if there is a well-conceived program for progressive reduction.

We Republicans favor the promotion of world trade on the basis of fair competition, within the Republican principle that American industry, agriculture, and labor must be protected against ruinous importations.

We Republicans always have and will continue to insist upon national defenses adequate to any emergency. We Republicans are for the Taft-Hartley labor law because it guarantees the right of collective bargaining and recognizes unions and the right to strike, while protecting the rights of union members and the public.

Under this law union membership has increased to new highs and wages have risen to record levels. We Republicans favor amending the law in the light of experience

and denounce the Truman administration for blocking enactment of improvements in the act voted by the Senate last year.

And we won't stand for any bypassing of the law, as President Truman has done. His refusal to enforce the Taft-Hartley Act for months and months in the face of the mounting coal crisis, while the Nation's economy moved inevitably toward complete collapse, we Republicans condemn as playing politics with human misery.

We Republicans believe agriculture is fundamental to a prosperous America. We favor fair prices for the farmers' products in the market place, aided by Government price-support loans until that need is made no longer necessary through enlightened adoption of programs that will utilize, not destroy, surplus crops. We Republicans denounce the so-called Brannan plan as a means to sovietize the farmers and rob them of their birthright of independence.

Fellow Americans, all of these Republican principles and objectives square with the American way of life. Upon these principles and with these objectives America will grow and be strong—strong economically, strong financially, and strong spiritually as the lighthouse for freedom-loving people everywhere.

The overwhelming majority of Americans cherish the heritage of freedom and opportunity handed down by the founders of Nebraska and their fellow pioneers across the land.

Let us here and now resolve to go forward in this crusade to see that the heritage handed down from our founding ancestors shall not perish. America is the custodian of human liberty. Let us be worthy of its guardianship.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, annually the Philadelphia Bulletin, a very outstanding newspaper, holds a forum, at which men of distinction from all over the Nation discuss subjects of interest to the people. At the forum held last night, the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] delivered an address, which I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, fellow Americans, in this day of the airplane and the atom, we must face the fact that both peace and war are global in character. If we are to help maintain a free world of free men we cannot achieve our objective by closing the door to Communist aggression in Europe while the door is left wide open in Asia.

Coalition with communism is no more workable in China or Korea than it is in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, or Rumania. Communism is destructive of human liberty everywhere in the world. Last November in Changkiang a Chinese official clearly put it in this way: "Senator, there can be no coalition with a tiger unless you are inside the beast."

During the 5 years I have been a Member of the United States Senate I have supported our foreign policy in Europe and been critical of it in the Far East.

The general objectives of our foreign policy have been clear to the American people and to the Congress. We have sought to establish a system of international law and order so that the peace of the world will be secure for this and future generations. Yet with this worth-while objective in mind we were not so naive as to believe that all nations would forego the use of military power to enforce their will on others.

The United Nations, it was hoped, would not only be a world forum for discussion but would also be an effective instrument for collective security.

It has not yet been put to the test of acting against an overt aggression of armed troops of one nation crossing the borders of another. That test may come this year or next in Yugoslavia, Iran, Viet Nam, or Burma. We do know that the Soviet Union, by its abuse of the veto in the Security Council, has put the world on notice that there will be no hesitation in blocking effective United Nations collective security action against aggression by another veto.

It was for this reason that our Government and those of western Europe clearly recognized that Marshall plan economic aid to help rehabilitate war-torn Europe was not sufficient in and of itself. The fear of aggression restricted the recovery so necessary if the free way of life was to have a fair chance for survival against totalitarian pressures.

Within the United Nations Charter the Atlantic Pact came into being. By its terms an attack against one of the North Atlantic nations would be recognized as an attack against all of them.

Outside of the North Atlantic Pact, by resolute action, Greece was saved from being engulfed by communism, Turkey, Iran, and Korea were given the tools with which their independence might be preserved.

In China our policy has contributed to the debacle in that area of the world. For more than half a century our historic policy had been to encourage and support a free and independent China. Today's realities clearly mean that this must also be a non-Communist China.

Yet at Yalta without consulting with China, our wartime ally and friend, we gave the Soviet Union a stranglehold on Manchuria. It was done without consultation with the American Congress or the American people.

Our State Department urged a coalition with the Communists. The government of the Republic of China quite properly refused. The United States placed an embargo against the shipment of arms and ammunition to the legal government of China while the Soviet army of occupation in Manchuria was turning over captured Japanese stocks of arms and ammunition to the Chinese Communist forces.

In July 1947 Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer was sent out to China on a mission. He wrote a significant report dated September 19, 1947, which contained a constructive program to save China from communism. That report, containing information of great import, was suppressed for 3 years.

Until quite recently some of those who helped shape our China policy were speaking of Mao Tse-tung's followers as "agrarian liberals." It makes little difference whether this fatal miscalculation was because of design or ignorance. The end result is no less damaging to the future peace of the world and the security of the United States.

Our China policy has helped to undermine the Republic of China. While the Government was with its back to the wall the State Department issued the China white paper. Never before had we struck such an almost fatal blow at a historic friend during its darkest hour.

During the last 2 years the help that the Congress voted has been delayed or nullified. This can be and has been amply documented. Even purchases, military and civilian, with Chinese funds have been obstructed.

On January 5 the President announced that no further military assistance would be given to the Republic of China. We now know that this had been preceded on December 23 by a State Department memo to its officials overseas stating that the island of Formosa had no strategic value.

The interesting thing about that memo is that the State Department had no such advice from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from Admiral Radford, commander in chief of our naval forces in the Pacific, or from Gen. Douglas MacArthur, our supreme commander in the Far East.

In fact the statement ran directly counter to a State Department bulletin of June 3, 1945, which stated with reference to Formosa that "with the exception of Singapore, no location in the Far East occupies such a controlling position."

The difficulty with the State Department is that they have been more interested in China in saving face than saving freedom.

However, I do not want to spend too much time on the past.

Where do we go from here?

Last week in my State of California, Secretary of State Dean Acheson made two significant speeches. If implemented, they furnish the basis of having a policy in Asia that will be consistent with our policy in Europe.

Those who favor a temporary respite by a Munich type of agreement that would divide the world into spheres of influence whereby communism could digest its gains in Europe and Asia and sacrifice human freedom in the process, will get no satisfaction from these talks.

While the door to negotiation is left open the Soviet Union must reestablish its diplomatic credit standing. There are too many pieces of paper floating around to warrant reliance on a new one until the others have been redeemed.

It is clearly underscored that aggression in Asia is of no less concern to the law abiding nations of the world than it is in Europe or the middle east.

The nations of Asia are given hope that those who are willing to help themselves to maintain their freedom will be eligible to apply for and receive various types of assistance from us.

Standing by itself the speech of Secretary Marshall at Harvard on June 5, 1947, without congressional implementation, bipartisan in character, would not have bolstered for long a single tottering war-weary government of Europe.

Nor will Secretary Acheson's speeches be more than a temporary whiff of oxygen until and unless implemented by the Congress.

Up to now there has not been the consultation with the majority and minority parties on far-eastern policy that there has been in recent years on our European policy.

To the administration I would respectfully state: It is not too late to begin such consultations but it is later than you think. As has been pointed out before such consultations must be on the "take-off" and not merely on the "crash landings."

If an attempt is made to circumvent Congress by use of loans from already established agencies rather than by congressional appropriations, I predict an amendment will be added to some essential legislation that will close that loophole.

There is one great void in the speech of the Secretary of State dealing with our Asia policy. He treats the islands of Formosa, Hainan, Kinmen, Chosun, and the Pescadores

with their 8,000,000 people under the jurisdiction of the legal Government of the Republic of China as though they were ships which had been sunk beneath the waves of the China Sea and the Pacific.

Since Formosa alone has more population than either Australia or Canada, this is hardly realistic. Formosa is closer to the Philippines than the island of Luzon is to the island of Mindanao. It is hardly conceivable that this Government can view with unconcern the moving of international communism off the Asiatic land mass on its first major island-hopping venture.

An American diplomatist with years of experience in China recently said to me: "Senator, I cannot understand how Chiang Kai-shek can be the No. 1 target in the Far East of international communism and at the same time be the No. 1 target of the Far Eastern Division of our own State Department."

From my own observations in China last November and from recent communications from people still there and those who have just returned, I believe that the Republic of China has passed her darkest hour of Dunkerque and Valley Forge. There has been a new rebirth of morale that is of tremendous significance to those who are not so blind that they will not see.

The Benedict Arnolds, the Quislings, and the fair-weather friends have long since departed. The new Cabinet of President Chiang Kai-shek contains many young and able administrators who are men of integrity.

The civilian Governor of Formosa is K. C. Wu, graduate of Princeton with an outstanding record as wartime mayor of Chungking. The Premier is Chen Cheng, a man of life-long integrity and one regarding whom most Americans, including the late General Stilwell, have spoken most highly. The commander of the ground forces is Gen. Sun Leh-jen, graduate of the Virginia Military Institute and a fighting soldier of the first rank.

Time does not permit me to name them all but I can assure you that they are as determined to maintain a China outside of the Communist orbit as we are to maintain our own freedom.

In developing a program for the economic and military assistance to the free nations of Asia, the non-Communist Republic of China should not and must not be overlooked.

To permit our tried and true friends of more than 50 years' standing to go down the drain of communism while we concentrate on new Asiatic continental countries that have many more internal problems than free China has today, can hardly be the basis of a policy warranting the support of the Congress and the Nation.

It is not realistic to ignore the fact that the Republic of China has approximately 600,000 men under arms, 325,000 of whom are excellent soldiers. This total number is greater than the combined troop strength of Korea, the Philippine Republic, the United States of Indonesia, Siam, Viet Nam, Burma, Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong, and the United States forces in Japan.

The island of Formosa is not needed by the United States as either an air or naval base. In the friendly hands of the Republic of China, it presents no problem to our own defenses.

In the hands of international communism the many Japanese-built air strips and the excellent harbors would drive a wedge into our Pacific defense line that runs from Japan through Okinawa to the Philippines. In unfriendly hands it would be a strategic loss that no competent military, naval or air commander would or has overlooked.

There are no simple solutions to the complex problems we face in Asia or in Europe. But out of the discussions and debate in forums such as this, on the floor of the Senate and the House, in the press and over the radio there will develop an informed public opinion without which no foreign policy can succeed.

Our secret weapon against any potential totalitarian aggressor is not the plutonium bomb or the hydrogen bomb. These secrets can be stolen from us by a Dr. Fuchs. Our real strength is that which communism dares not steal to take to the Soviet Union or its European or Asiatic satellites. I refer to liberty and the determination of a self-reliant people to be informed, make their own judgments, choose their own leaders and having the ability to rally overnight if their free institutions are threatened from within or without.

This priceless ingredient, which we possess, the dictators understand less than they do the intricate blueprints of a super weapon. In itself our free way of life is a time bomb that will destroy any dictatorship once their people know the truth. This may explain the frantic lowering and sealing of the iron curtain from the Elbe to the China Sea. It should renew our determination, through the Voice of America and otherwise, to penetrate the darkness.

National Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a proclamation issued by Gov. Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, in observance of National Wildlife Restoration Week.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR BOWLES' PROCLAMATION FOR WILDLIFE WEEK IN CONNECTICUT

Conservation of our natural resources is one of the foremost problems facing Connecticut, as well as the United States. The fertility of our soil, our water supplies, our food and our wildlife are dependent on measures taken to conserve the land. And a green and flourishing countryside has always been a great source of enjoyment and wholesome recreation to the citizens of Connecticut.

In our State and elsewhere in the country, land has in the past been abundant. Men in those days were able to ravage the land and move on to more virgin territory. This led to abuse by uneconomic cutting of forests; denuding much other land of both vegetation and fertility; reducing our water resources, and leaving eroded, dry, unsightly landscapes.

Most of these blighted and barren areas can be made green and beautiful if all citizens fully realize their moral obligations to others in the ownership of private, civic, or State land. Our forests, our farms, our cities, our roadsides, our church and school properties, our home and factory grounds should be planted with trees, shrubs, and grasses wherever the need exists. In our cities, trees and shrubs can filter dust, absorb noise, temper climate, provide better and more natural living.

Much of the future progress of our State, and its rare natural beauty rests upon the extent to which we replant and care for all the land. Our State can produce more if we strive to make and keep it beautiful. Everyone will benefit, in equal measure.

Therefore, as Governor of the State of Connecticut, I hereby proclaim a program and urge that each man, woman, and child throughout the State assume individual responsibility to conserve the natural resources of our State whether they be private or public property, and that, wherever possible bare land be planted with vegetation.

I also urge local governments, chambers of commerce, farm organizations, garden clubs, and other civic groups, the churches and schools, and the press, radio, motion-picture and other industries to cooperate fully in observance of the plant-Connecticut-to-help-plant-America program as soon as possible by means of local committees and permanent, planned cooperative endeavors based upon local needs.

I urge that the proper agencies of the State assist in informing the public of the urgent need for conserving our natural resources by planting Connecticut wherever the need exists, and to give guidance and counsel to the public on this subject.

Housing for Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on housing for Indians which appeared in the February 1950 issue of the North Dakota Welfare News and Views under the heading "Across the director's desk." The article was written by Carlyle D. Onsrud, director of the North Dakota State Welfare Board.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACROSS THE DIRECTOR'S DESK

(By Carlyle D. Onsrud)

"Why should American soldiers live like pigs?" is the shocking question posed as well as the title of an article by Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor of the Christian Herald magazine, writing in the February 14 Look. It just happens that the February 4 Saturday Evening Post has as a lead article a contribution by Sally Carrighar entitled "The Reds Are Rapping at Our Arctic Door."

From the standpoint of current concern about our Alaskan frontier—just 3 miles of water separate our American Eskimos from Siberia at one spot—there seems to be a clear call for line-of-action concentration in this area in these times. This would mean better Alaskan defenses and better treatment of those expected to do the defending. Quite apart from this, however, is the shocking exposé recorded by Dr. Poling in connection with how American soldiers live in Alaska.

Apparently, there is little excuse for what exists. Dr. Poling points his finger in a steady, accusing way at the United States Congress. He points out that Japan signed final surrender papers on September 2, 1945. This is February 1950. A picture accompanying the article shows a one-room shack with no running water or plumbing which rents at $140 a month to a sergeant, his wife, and two children. This and many more cases like them causes Dr. Poling to state

that "living conditions in Anchorage and Fairbanks are worse than those in shack towns on city dumps."

He has high praise for the post commanders, the American Red Cross, and the chaplains in the area who are trying to create some sort of comfort in the searing shame that is the Alaskan environment of the American soldier. Dr. Poling is less kind with the Congress, which finally got around to appropriating some money for Alaskan purposes last October—too late and too little. He also criticizes quite severely American home-front organizations and their apparent unconcern about the situation even with knowledge of the fact from people like the doctor and others who have been shocked into a high state of indignation about twentieth-century care of American soldiers.

All we have to do here in North Dakota is to substitute Indians for soldiers and we have essentially the same situation. The American Indians, like the American soldier, in comparison with the attention we give to organized labor, organized business, and organized farming, are America's forgotten people. They have had little choice in doing something about their situation. The American soldier who is drafted or who gives in peacetime from a deep sense of patriotism, and the American Indian who was here before the white man, seem to be relegated in many instances to the worst housing, the least attention, and to the greatest inequities of any of our people. And they have the least to say about this situation themselves.

This is not to say that there is not evidenced in America a lip service concern, replete with resolutions and committees and slogans. Resolutions and committees and slogans do not put food into people's mouths, nor do they improve housing conditions unless there is purposeful, continuing implementation.

The State welfare board has failed. After three intensely cold and snow-filled winters in trying, together with the counties in North Dakota, to get adequate general assistance money for our North Dakota Indians, being so acutely aware of the minimum-minimum standards set up for general assistance Indians, it is disillusioned, disheartened, and administratively disheveled. Where do we go from here?

As readers probably know, the Federal Government, through the social-security programs, the State, and the counties in North Dakota, take care of the Indian who is over 65, the Indian mother with dependent children, or the Indian blind person in the same manner and with the same standards as it does the white. There is left the great area of general assistance to be attended to. This is the area where, in the case of whites, the county government provides assistance. Furthermore, if an Indian citizen is a resident of the county, he receives general assistance from the county welfare board with county funds also. In the reservation counties and in the case of the ward Indians, the Federal Government, through the Office of Indian Affairs, has been attempting these many, many decades to take care of these people when in need. The counties in North Dakota on which are Indian reservations are not financially able to take over this assistance burden which has been assumed and for which the Federal Government is overwhelmingly responsible. The State has never assumed a responsibility for the Indian in need of general assistance.

In December 1947, a crisis developed on the Indian reservations in North Dakota. Indian funds were inadequate. Lethargy and apathy seemed to be the rule. The country governments were unable to provide assistance. The State welfare board, together with the counties, put on an intensive campaign for Federal allocations during the winter of 1947-48. It is true that inadequacy had been prevalent in the granting of this type of assistance for many years. What made it worse in 1947 was the booming high cost of living, the diminishing resources of the Indian people, accentuated by a cold and snow-bound winter.

In the winter of 1948-49, the State welfare board set a precedent by allocating several thousand dollars as pinch-hit money to relieve suffering out of its general assistance appropriation. Most States do not have anything to do with Indian general assistance, not even to the extent of joining in with the counties in rapping at the Federal door. North Dakota has been singular in its State concern with the problem.

The State legislature in 1949 appropriated $100,000 to the State welfare board for the purpose of aiding Indians in need of general assistance if Federal funds ceased to flow and suffering had to be alleviated. This means only $50,000 a year. It is available to all Indians in need of general assistance in counties upon which there are North Dakota Indian reservations. When it is considered that one reservation estimated a winter need of $50,000 for 1 month it can be seen that the State welfare board appropriation, quite apart from the reason for which it was given for disbursement, must be used as pinch-hit money only to insure against suffering if Federal dollars do not flow and to insure that Indians on all reservations have equity assured.

That means, therefore, that it is with a good deal of frustration that the State welfare board and the county welfare boards watch the administration of general assistance by the Federal Government. We know that our whites or Indians on old-age assistance, aid to the blind, or aid to dependent children would not want to live on the standards that their neighbors must receive when they are in need. We know of the money it would take to relieve the shack-town type of housing that these people receive. We know that the unacquainted or the careless will say that some Indians are not good workers, that they are poor managers, etc., even though we know that the same can be said about many white people, who, nevertheless, when in need receive at least minimum standards for care for themselves and their children.

Knowing that the State welfare board did not have the resources to do much more than stand by with pinch-hit money, we traveled to Washington last June in the interest of seeing whether a House appropriation bill could be increased in the Senate. We were fortified with estimates as to what would be needed this winter for these people. Needless to say, nothing happened. There is no blame attached to our North Dakota Congressmen, who, we must remember, are only a few of many in Washington. We are not interested in who gets the credit and who gets the blame. We are, however, disturbed by and apprehensive of a system which creates an immovable apathy, a hard, cold inaction in which everyone, apparently, subscribes to the need, but no one gets the results.

This writer has been told that the Office of Indian Affairs does not ask for enough money. We have been told that the Office of Indian Affairs is not vigorous enough in its representations. We have been told that even though enough was asked for and vigorous presentation was the technique used, nevertheless, it is the custom of Congress to only appropriate a token amount and rely on deficiency appropriations. The whole thing adds up to medieval treatment of a human problem. We are talking quite apart from the ramifications of self-support, good or poor management, or rehabilitation—rehabilitation: that sunshine word that is talked about like the weather but about which nothing is done. The fact remains that American citizens—North Dakota people—are depending on an erratic allocation system out of insufficient appropriations, and, if enough heat is turned on upon the ill-timed inadequacy of deficiency appropriations, made sometimes after cold weather is over. This all for a bare, frugal living. To add to disillusionment is the fact that nothing seems to be able to change the course of man-made action.

We are not speaking as crusaders or as going overboard for any certain class of people. We think that the person in need, no matter what the sex, age, or creed, should have a decent standard for the basic necessities. The American Indian, like the American Alaskan soldier, is not getting it.

Government Spokesmen Confused on Home Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on confusion by Garrett Winter, which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun of March 22 be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD. It is to be hoped that some Government spokesman will undertake the difficult and perhaps impossible but interesting task of reconciling the contradictions stated by other Government spokesmen.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT SPOKESMEN CONFUSED ON HOME NEED

(By Garrett Winter)

Confusion among Government agencies as to the Nation's housing needs was highlighted today with a Department of Commerce report that the postwar boom will end after 1952, unless builders widen the market for replacing old houses.

Only last Friday Commissioner Ewan Clague, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, contended that it will take several years more at the million-a-year pace to catch up with anticipated requirements.

A month ago at the National Association of Home Builders convention in Chicago, Administrator Raymond M. Foley, of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, warned that more than a million new dwellings will be needed for many years to come, especially in rental housing and in larger houses priced below $8,000.

Last November, Leon H. Keyserling, acting chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, before the National Association of Housing Officials in Boston, called for an average annual output of 2,000,000 homes for the next 5 years.

The Commerce Department predicted today according to the Associated Press, that "three more years of building at the record pace of the last 3 years will exhaust the backlog of demand for an expansion of dwelling facilities." This will be followed, it continued, by a big construction slow-down, unless a lively demand appears for replacing old homes.

Commissioner Clague contends that American households have been increasing a lot faster than new dwellings for two decades. The problem, in his opinion, will be to find

enough three- and four-bedroom houses for an increasing number of families with three or four children, as long as builders continue to concentrate on four- and five-room dwellings.

The National Association of Real Estate Boards this week predicted that 1950 home building will at least equal the 1949 peak and that about half the units will sell for $8,000 or less, while rental housing, despite continued rent control, will approach last year's ratio of 21 percent of all residential building.

The Investigation of the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article regarding the present investigation of the State Department, by Constantine Brown, published in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHARGES WERE—FIFTEEN THOUSAND LETTERS AND WIRES RECEIVED BY McCARTHY SEVEN PAGES STARTED

(By Constantine Brown)

Senator "Bull" McCARTHY has received no less than 15,000 letters and telegrams since the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee started hearings on his charges against officials of the State Department.

The overwhelming number of these communications approve the investigation which was prompted by his accusations. It appears from the tone of the letters that the writers are less worried over the ideological tendencies of State Department officers who are involved than they are by their nasty moral habits.

Criticism, with few exceptions, is directed at the method of the investigation by the subcommittee, which so far neither has proved nor discredited entirely some of the charges vented at the public hearings.

REFERENCE TO DR. JESSUP

For instance, Dr. Philip C. Jessup, American Ambassador at Large, made a masterful presentation of his own case by reading a carefully prepared document setting forth not only the services he has rendered the Government of the United States, but also his impressive background of Americanism.

Yet it must be said, without prejudicing Dr. Jessup's statement in the least, careful analysis of his presentation shows that it was superficial. The fault is not his but is that of the subcommittee, which did not permit Senator McCARTHY to ask pertinent questions.

If Senator McCARTHY's request had been granted it is very probable that the last shred of suspicion would have been eradicated and Dr. Jessup would have been completely cleared during last Monday's hearing. As it was the Republican member of the subcommittee asked him some vague and perfunctory questions, leaving doubts in the minds of those who followed the hearings, particularly with reference to the Hiss case in which Dr. Jessup testified as a character witness for the defendant.

The Democrats followed by giving him a clean bill of health without going into the files on which Senator McCARTHY's allegations of "affinity" for pinkos were based. This was much more unfair and harmful to Dr. Jessup than to his accuser.

The insertion into the testimony of letters of commendation and trust from two outstanding Americans such as Gen. George C. Marshall and Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower was more impressive than convincing. Neither of these personalities have had the time or opportunity to look into the files which Senator McCARTHY collected and which now have been handed over to the subcommittee. It is recalled that two outstanding judges of the Supreme Court—Justices Frankfurter and Reed—took the stand in the Hiss trial and gave him their full endorsement.

ANCESTRY IS NO HELP

The fact that a person can trace his American ancestry back to the Eighteenth century—or even farther—does not necessarily place him beyond suspicion. Nor do his official activities and statements "on the record."

This is not intended, it must be emphasized, to cast any reflection on Dr. Jessup's statement that he has no affinity for any kind of subversive, Reds and pinkos. Alger Hiss testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities that his loyalty should not be questioned, since he had served as a policy-maker at Yalta and was proud of his achievements there, and since he had come from a very old American family.

If Senator TYDINGS, the subcommittee chairman, had not acted on the spur of the moment he would have realized that he was rendering a real disservice to Dr. Jessup by refusing to permit Senator McCARTHY—the only man in the room who is supposed to have had pertinent questions to ask—to cross-examine the witness, whose character and discretion as a Government official were impugned.

Dr. Jessup unquestionably wanted to dispose of all such doubts once and for all when he eagerly offered himself for a searching cross-examination by his accuser.

The Indian as an Undeveloped Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article appearing in the February issue of North Dakota Welfare News and Views, by Carl F. Fryhling, State director of the North Dakota State Employment Service, entitled "An Undeveloped Resource—The Indian."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN UNDEVELOPED RESOURCE—THE INDIAN

(By Carl F. Fryhling, State director, North Dakota State Employment Service)

A Nation, State, or local community cannot prosper unless all of its resources are utilized to the fullest extent. Manpower, as a resource, will be a damper on progress unless its real and latent abilities are fully developed and utilized. The Indian, a native American, is such a source which has much to contribute to our economic well being if he is properly located and utilized.

World War II brought out numerous resources, material and labor, and utilized them very effectively in the successful winning of the war. We found on many reservations the percentage of enlistments among the Indians was much higher than among the whites. Hundreds more were employed in war plants. The war demonstrated that we fail to utilize this resource to its fullest extent during peace.

The North Dakota State Employment Service has, during the past 2 years, made a special study to determine the employability of Indians and has made a special effort to place Indians in employment off the reservation. Our experience has brought out the following factors: (1) the employer objects to hiring an Indian, not because he is unable to do the work, but because he is an Indian; (2) the Indian is hesitant in accepting employment off the reservation in fear of racial discrimination, (3) the employer, when he does hire an Indian, does not give him the same opportunity as a white man; the Indian makes one mistake and he is fired; (4) the Indian lacks aggressiveness and is easily discouraged; (5) many Indians lack dependability. He usually stays away from his job to help in caring for his child rather than to hire temporary help and thus enable him to keep his job.

Our experience indicated a need of a broad educational program. The employer needs training in the supervision of an Indian worker. The community needs training in accepting the Indian as an American citizen and in assisting him to improve his standard of living. The Indian needs training in assuming his responsibility to himself, his employer, his neighbors, and his community.

Let us get back to the actual experience of placing Indians in jobs. During the month of September the employment service placed 127 Turtle Mountain Indians in the potato harvest. Many of them earned up to $15 per day with this employment, lasting 3 weeks to a month. No trouble was encountered and many employers expressed satisfaction. From this program we stepped into a program providing broader utilization of Indians in more permanent jobs. The employment service accepted a challenge to find off-reservation jobs for 100 Indians during the months of October and November. We accepted this challenge during that time of the year when jobs were becoming more scarce and workers more plentiful. We did not place 100 Indians but we did find jobs for close to 70. This program demonstrated to us that employers will hire Indians if properly approached and the Indian is placed on a job for which he qualifies. The Indian's ability must be sold and not the Indian.

Drowning Out the Nation's Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Drowning Out the Nation's Voice," which appeared in the Washington Post on March 23, 1950. In my

opinion, it is an excellent editorial, which will provoke much thought. I believe we should think much on the question raised by the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DROWNING OUT THE NATION'S VOICE

Never in recent times has such a miasma settled upon the Washington scene. Doubt, distrust, lack of confidence—they are rampant. Even those with mud on their hands can throw mud with impunity. To foreigners the American scene must look as if our major concern is to breed a race of informers and intellectual eunuchs. The reason for the malaise, it seems to us, is that leadership is not measuring up to the potential followership. There is a rending conflict between the President and the opposition. But this cannot be resolved till Presidential leadership has been filled.

And in this latter respect there is nobody but the President who can assume the responsibility. The President and his Secretary of State have been playing Alphonse and Gaston. Mr. Truman wants to give Mr. Acheson his head, but Mr. Acheson simply hasn't the party or popular standing to sustain him. The speeches he gave on the west coast came back to the Capital with a hollow echo, whatever may have been their effect upon the country at large. It may be that the wild and whirring McCARTHY might yet make Acheson a national figure. But the stated purpose of the Republican chiefs, speaking while the Tydings inquiry is still on, is to destroy him. This is hardly a promising curtain raiser for the April meeting of the Foreign Ministers. In any event the fact remains that the President as well as Mr. Acheson must get into the act.

Actually Mr. Acheson never wanted the role of substantive responsibility that Mr. Truman seems to be thrusting upon him. He has rigid ideas about the leadership function of the White House in foreign relations. He saw in the Secretaryship of Mr. Byrnes what he thinks was a bad example of a Secretary who seemed to be out in front of the President. And on taking office he determined to lean over backward in deferring to the President's primacy. In strange silence the President has handed him a role that must be as uncongenial as it is uncomfortable and unrewarding.

The President, however, is the primate, and nobody else. He is the elected choice of all the people—not as an administrative chief, but as a voice, as custodian and cement and driving force of their unity. Under our system he can be as big, as Wilson said, as he makes his office. It is in the nature of the institutions of this Republic that drift in the White House leaves the country rudderless. The Presidency is the fixed point in our corporate life—we dare to say, in the life of the entire free world. A Frenchman said the other day that American power must be on the side of the people's hopes. No other member of the free world has the moral let alone the material resources to demonstrate any strong faith in its destiny. Europeans are living for the day only; Asiatics from hand to mouth. Only the United States can furnish the battering ram against a condition which is a historical great panic. The future has to be challenged if the present is to be saved.

Yet there is this void at the top in the Capital, and the Capital, in consequence, is given over to the raucous spirit of faction against which George Washington issued his last warning. It is not a situation of normal party division. A progressive debility is seizing the body politic. The reaction in the country is bound to be felt sooner or later in the same day-to-day outlook that has captured the Old World. It is enough of a drain on human nature to bear the silent conflict in the world without having to go without inspiration from the Nation's leaders. In time this moral passivity at the summit is sure to trickle down through the layers of society till nothing seems worth while. "The vigor of civilized societies," said A. N. Whitehead, the philosopher, "is preserved by the widespread sense that high aims are worth while."

Evidence of neglect at the top in upholding morale started with the shattering emptiness of the H-bomb announcement. You can't do this to a democracy. The State Department line is that the ending of our atomic monopoly failed by any manner of means to change power relationships. It is a singular attitude. Few Americans seem to share it, and all Europe has a contrary opinion, for it is since the recent atomic events that the idea of a neutral Europe has grown in Europe. Even the belated start in shipping arms under the military-aid program has not sufficed to offset that reaction. And it is bound to gather strength from the exhibition of the current jitters and hysteria. So, on top of Asiatic strife, there is European disintegration and defeatism to cope with.

Truly the burden is cast upon America to show not only cohesion but example to nations which are themselves tearing their unity apart on issues which are irrelevant to the master issue of survival and the assertion of common values.

Yet the President is not altogether to blame for the impasse in leadership. He is a modest man with no sense of missionary. But looking at his record, nobody can say he lacks courage. If he is given a program to expound, and it appeals to him, he is not afraid to assume the responsibility. He showed leadership on the Truman doctrine. It was his own jogging of the introverted State Department that laid the train for the Marshall plan. When the diplomats seemed to have run out of ideas, he turned to his immediate advisers, and they suggested point IV, and he adopted it over the head of the diplomats. Instinctively, the President wants to use American power for the common good. But around him there is a lack of that creative imagination which must always be at the elbow of the President to inspire as well as to spur.

So the need on the Executive side, as we see it, is twofold.

1. Reassertion of continuing Executive leadership in our world affairs.

2. More dynamic staff work in the White House and State Department to keep that leadership primed for the carrying out of the critical assignment that history has put on the American doorstep.

In these events there might be some chance of mending and expanding the bipartisan approach to foreign affairs. In these times there must be some biparty respect for the water's edge. The Executive has never been continuously loyal to bipartisanship. It is chiefly Senator VANDENBERG that the country must thank for what success has been achieved so far in bipartisanship. Now VANDENBERG is ill, and the yawning rift testifies to the loss of his disinterested services. Nevertheless there is a responsible Republican leadership, and the President must invite its cooperation. For you can never have total diplomacy in the sense advocated by Mr. Acheson when the two parties are clawing at each other's throat.

It is surely apparent that ranks can be closed in the country only when there is evidence that they are closed in the Capital. This is no plea for any coalition, for there is plenty of room for partisanship. The trouble is that there is so much of it around nowadays that patriotism is being crowded out. More of it and this country will begin to look to the people of another planet like a blinded Samson pulling down the pillars on which the house standeth.

Extension of Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on H. R. 6000, regarding proposed extension and improvements in the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance system, made by the National Brotherhood of Packing House Workers, before the Senate Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our union, the National Brotherhood of Packinghouse Workers, CUA, approves in principle, extension and improvements to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, to amend the public assistance and child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes as set forth in H. R. 6000. We feel that in one respect, at least, especially with reference to temporarily or permanently and totally disabled workers the bill (H. R. 6000) does not make ample provision. The effective date should be immediately after passage. Since the cruel effects on those afflicted with polio and heart disease, or permanently disabled by industrial or other accidents, is a matter that should no longer be ignored.

All statistics on the permanently and totally disabled in our population are estimates subject to a very large chance of error. No census of the disabled has ever been taken. As the disabled are not entitled to any special benefits in this country, there also is nothing resembling automatic registration of these people.

The estimate of 750,000 as the total number of all people who are under 65 and permanently and totally disabled comes from the Social Security Administration. It is based upon sample surveys made in the year 1945. This figure includes only people permanently and totally disabled who are in the employable ages, that is, from 16 to 65. Permanent total disability, as used in this estimate, takes account only of disabilities which have lasted more than 6 months. H. R. 6000 will provide benefits for only a small percentage of all of the people who are permanently and totally disabled. To qualify for benefits, not only must the disability be of such nature as to completely prevent employment and have already lasted at least 6 months, but the claimant must be able to establish that he was fully or currently insured. In most cases this will mean that only people who have had pretty regular employment up to the time that they become permanently and totally disabled will be able to get any benefits. Many disease conditions, however, are of such a character that disability comes on very gradually. Many such people will not be able to attain or maintain the status of being currently and fully insured as that involves at least employment in covered industries in half of quarter years. Workers who are newly brought under coverage by the amendments to the Social Security Act made in H. R. 6000 will not be eligible to any total and permanent disability benefits until 1956 at the earliest.

Approximately how many people will be able to get permanent and total disability benefits should H. R. 6000 become law is even more of a guess than the total number of permanently and totally disabled persons. The best guesses on this point are those given in the report of the Advisory Council on Social Security on permanent and total disability insurance which was made to the Senate Committee on Finance in May 1948. On pages 15 and 16 of that report occurs the following estimate regarding the proposal for including permanent and total disability benefits in old-age-insurance benefits which was made by the advisory council:

"After the program has been in operation for a few years, the number of new disability claims arising annually will range from 20,000 to 30,000, although after perhaps a decade or so, when the full effect of the extension of coverage has made itself felt, this number will rise to perhaps 40,000 to 100,000. Eventually the total number of disabled persons who are on the benefit roll and who are under age 65 will number roughly 300,000 to 800,000. The eventual annual cost of the proposed permanent and total disability benefits as a percentage of pay roll will probably range from somewhat more than 0.1 to possibly as much as 0.3 percent of the pay roll, in terms of dollars this corresponds to about two hundred to five hundred million dollars a year."

The recommendations of this council were more liberal in this respect than H. R. 6000 but, in general, will also serve as an estimate of how many people will get benefits under H. R. 6000.

Another estimate relates to H. R. 6000 as passed by the House of Representatives. This was published last October by the House Ways and Means Committee as a separate document and is entitled "Actuarial Cost Estimates for Expanded Coverage and Liberalized Benefits Proposed for the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System by H. R. 6000." These actuarial cost estimates were prepared for the use of the Ways and Means Committee by Robert J. Myers, actuary to the committee. As appears on page 7 of this report, the total number of beneficiaries who are expected to qualify for disability benefits under H. R. 6000 by the year 1955 is 190,000 to 354,000. Totals will increase in future years. The very wide range in the possible numbers is explained on the basis of varying assumptions, but it is made clear that the lower estimate is the more likely. From the same report it appears on page 9 that by 1955 the cost of permanent and total disability allowances will range from 0.12 percent of pay roll to 0.24 percent. The ultimate costs (by the year 2030) are estimated at 0.36 to 0.99 percent.

At the present time approximately 2,500,000 persons, aged 14 to 64, who would otherwise be gainfully employed, are affected with serious disabilities which have continued for more than 6 months. It has been estimated that the chief causes of disabilities lasting more than 45 days fall into the following classifications:

	Percent
Respiratory diseases	18.8
Degenerative diseases	17.0
Accidental injuries	13.4
Digestive diseases	11.8
Communicable diseases	9.0
Parasitic diseases	6.3
Nervous diseases	6.1

Latest available figures from the National Office of Vital Statistics show deaths from cardiovascular diseases and congenital malformation of the cardiovascular system in United States in 1947 between ages of 25 and 64 were 211,758, according to Edward Rubinow, national labor representative of the American Heart Association.

When disability strikes a wage earner it may be economically more disastrous for him and his family than unemployment, death, or forced retirement, for, in addition to the loss of wages, there are the costs of medical care, hospitalization, special diets, the expense of moving to a more favorable climate, etc.

The problem is being met, to a minor extent, in a number of ways. In some cases the workers receive payments from the workmen's compensation funds of his State. However, such payments are possible only where the disability has arisen out of the worker's employment. There are also some companies which make payments to their disabled employees. In some instances the worker carries insurance against disability either as an individual or in combination with his fellow workers. In recent years a few States have provided by statute for disability insurance.

However, these various methods provide protection for only about 27 percent of the workers who are covered by unemployment-compensation laws. The only adequate solution of the problem is the establishment of a national plan. Only a national plan can give country-wide coverage and lifetime protection. There is a constantly occurring mobility between both industries and States. After disability occurs it may be necessary or desirable for the disabled person to change his place of residence. A national system would allow this mobility much more easily than other plans. Under a national plan the cost burden in the case of varying rates of disability between localities, due to epidemics, catastrophes, varying age, sex, and occupational characteristics would be equalized.

This national system should be operated in conjunction with the present old-age survivors insurance plan. The existing facilities of this plan, with its wage-record system and field organization could be used in the administration of disability benefits. Employers would have to keep only one set of records. Contributions could be kept in a single trust fund which would provide greater flexibility in financing. There would be no overlapping of functions and the number of administrators would be kept at a minimum.

However, the provisions of the proposed H. R. 6000 relating to disability benefits do not go far enough. The proposed bill provides disability benefits for only those workers who are totally and permanently disabled. The problem of the temporarily disabled worker is also of large proportions. Each day about 2,000,000 persons are kept from their jobs by disability which has lasted less than 6 months. In addition, there are large numbers of workers whose physical condition is such that they should not be at work, but who are there because they cannot afford the loss of wages. It has been estimated that the annual wage loss to the labor force through temporary disability is between three and four billion dollars. In addition to this wage loss the labor force also is subject to a medical cost of $3,500,000,000.

Temporary disability also means a loss in productivity which is a vital loss to the Nation. It has been estimated that this loss of productivity equals the total of the wage loss and the medical costs. This hidden loss must be deducted from profits or passed on to the consumer in the form of higher prices.

In addition to the economic loss which the worker suffers as a result of temporary disability, he also suffers indirect losses. Among these are impairment of occupational efficiency, risk of permanent disability, lowering of the standard of living, and the psychological effect of want.

The bitter fight which is being made on permanent and total disability benefits in connection with the old-age insurance system centers around the possibility that the provisions for benefits may be greatly liberalized in future years. Under the restrictive conditions of H. R. 6000 both the total number of people who will get benefits and the cost of these benefits will not be great. The private insurance companies, however, do not want the Government to pay any permanent and total disability benefits although this is a feature of the old-age insurance systems in practically all other countries. Logically also a man who is permanently and totally disabled before 65 is from an economic point of view in substantially the same position as the person who is unable to work by reason of old age. Old age is itself for many people a condition of invalidity. Those who do not want us to get a decent old-age and survivors insurance system, however, oppose the logical step of providing benefits for people who are permanently and totally disabled before they reach old age.

DON MAHON,
President, National Brotherhood of Packinghouse Workers; Vice President, Confederated Unions of America.

Dental Operations on Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to call attention of Members of Congress to the following article:

Massachusetts' Health Commissioner Vlado A. Getting's precedent-breaking program permitting nonregistered dentists to perform dental operations on children is sharply rebuked in the current March issue of the Journal of the American Dental Association, the official organ of the American Dental Association, representing the Nation's 68,000 dentists.

While the American Dental Association went on record in a recent San Francisco conference as opposed to the Massachusetts federally-financed "training program," authorizing 2-year trainees to perform dental restorative work on children, the ADA Journal editorially suggests that Commissioner Getting "reconsider the program in the interests of achieving the broad objectives of his department."

With the Massachusetts dentists' committee, representing the State dental profession and backed by leading dental authorities throughout the Nation opposing the program as a danger to children's dental-health standards, the Journal declares:

"The commissioner might give some contemplated moments to a full and studied reconsideration in the interests of achieving the broad objectives, to which his department, and the American Dental Association, as a voluntary organization of the Nation's dentists are dedicated."

Commenting on Getting's program, which was originally identified as a "research project," the Journal declares:

"There is good evidence that the commissioner's 'research project' was handled * * * subtly and without full and free discussion.

"The association does not," the editorial continues, "object to the type of research mentioned (in the Getting program) provided that it is really research and not just curious tinkering masked in the prestige of research."

This "curious tinkering" alluded to by the Journal, is a 5-year program financed through the Federal Security Agency with $250,000 whereby female hygienists are being given 2 years' training and then will be permitted to perform highly specialized dental work on children—work formerly entrusted to a registered dentist with 8 years qualifying training, according to Dr. Richard D. Cunningham, chairman of the Massachusetts dentists' committee for repeal of the program.

"Meanwhile," Cunningham continues, "Massachusetts has become the first State in the Nation to lower her dental standards where they should be the highest—in the treatment of children.

"The problem of combating greatly increasing tooth decay," he adds, "will not be solved by training an inferior group to take over highly specialized professional work. This problem can be solved only by training more qualified dentists, to give competent treatment under rigid professional standards."

Meantime, the Massachusetts dentists' committee, backed by the New York Dental Society, whose president, E. Harold Gale, wired the Governor and legislative leaders urging repeal, has mobilized dentists throughout the State to press for repeal. The repeal bill sponsored by the dentists' committee is now pending in the State legislature and will be acted on soon.

Dewey Proclaims Wildlife Restoration Week for New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to set forth the proclamation of the distinguished Governor of New York State, Hon. Thomas E. Dewey, proclaiming the period from March 19 through 25 as Wildlife Restoration Week:

PROCLAMATION
STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany.

The increase of our wildlife population in New York State is a goal of great public value. It is a valuable and integral part of the urgent problem of conservation of our natural resources.

The movement to add to the number of our wild birds and mammals goes far beyond the pastime of people who like to hunt and fish. This recreation has built up a vast industry in terms of dollars alone. It is estimated that sportsmen throughout the country spend more than $4,000,000,000 a year on equipment, clothes, gasoline, boats, and other paraphernalia. It is reasonable to calculate that in our State alone, hunting and fishing represent a $500,000,000-a-year industry. Moreover, these sportsmen bring in 450,000,000 pounds dressed weight of food in game animals and fish every year.

But the urgency of the matter goes far beyond this practical side. There is also an esthetic aspect which is immeasurable. Furthermore, it is necessary to remember that all life depends upon soil and water. If we allow the balance of our wildlife to be destroyed, we lower the productive capacity of our soil and water and this quickly decreases the quantity of products available to us. Our wildlife population, accordingly, affects the interests of every individual in the State, no matter whether he ever fires a gun or wets a fishing line.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the period of March 19 through 25 as Wildlife Restoration Week in New York State and I hope the people of New York and particularly the students in all schools will observe this week by making a special effort to acquaint themselves with the problems of providing and maintaining suitable habitat for wildlife and take positive action to restore and improve this habitat by planting and other conservative measures.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 16th day of March A. D. 1950.

THOMAS E. DEWEY, *Governor.*

Coast Guard Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely interested in the Reserve program of the Coast Guard. The limited extent to which it now exists depends entirely upon voluntary participation of civilians who are motivated solely by a sense of patriotic duty. These people receive no compensation. In spite of recommendations from the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense, the Appropriations Committee has thus far refused to include funds for this program in appropriations measures. At present the Coast Guard Reserve exists in name only. The Congress should provide funds for the training of these people upon whom we must rely for port security in the event of another national emergency. Should another war occur the protection of our ports would be of prime importance. We are running serious risks if we refuse to appropriate the relatively small amount needed for this program. When the appropriations bill is up for consideration I shall support an amendment to provide funds for the Coast Guard Reserve.

Perhaps I am more conscious of this need than many of my colleagues because of the geographical location of my district. The security of the Nation's ports is, however, of importance to our entire Nation. A recent editorial in the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch, one of the leading newspapers in my district, clearly tells the story of the importance of a well-organized Coast Guard Reserve. I am inserting this editorial in the RECORD and I commend it to your thoughtful reading.

WHAT PRICE PORT SECURITY?

The United States Coast Guard is the only one of the comparable groups in the armed forces which is not supported by a Federal appropriation for its Reserve organization. Its Reserve component operates now entirely on a voluntary basis, without the kinds of compensation which other reserve bodies enjoy, and in consequence without some of the inducements which attract men of experience to maintain their knowledge of coast-guard work and to familiarize themselves with the techniques and the tools which they would use if they were called into active duty.

The result is an obvious handicap. President Truman has recognized the need for lifting this handicap in his recommendation last year for a small appropriation for the training of a Coast Guard Reserve, but Congress—for reasons which are not clear—would have none of it. An item of $4,100,000 was in the congressional works this year. It would lead eventually to the expenditure of about $8,000,000 a year. An Appropriations Committee subcommittee has now turned this item down, the full committee is described as likely to sustain this refusal, and the only hope appears to be a floor fight.

If it does not win approval, the Coast Guard Reserve will continue to have an existence (to quote George Fielding Eliot) "only on paper"; and the situation will continue to be that which the Seattle Times—published in a port—described in these words: "Coast Guard reservists by the hundreds have flocked to other reserve organizations, and no program whatever has been set up to train those who remain on the Reserve list in their port-security functions."

Note the emphasis on "port-security functions." The issue is national. But it is also peculiarly a Norfolk and a Tidewater issue. In an emergency the Coast Guard would be responsible for their port security—the safety of their water fronts, their harbors, their shipping, their ship and boat facilities of many types, even (since explosives are heavily involved) their whole safety. The Reserves would be thrown immediately into this work. In the late war, as Norfolk knows well, this was a major responsibility. The Coast Guard met it with high effectiveness.

All these functions, important as they have been in the past, are raised to a new level of significance in the atomic age.

The sum required to make the Coast Guard Reserve a real reliance, by enlargement from the small size to which its lack of financial support condemns it, and to keep it up to date, is no barrier in a $42,000,000,000 budget. If a reserve organization is worth having at all—and who questions that?—it is worth having on a realistic basis. In an era when the highest military leaders think that another war would hit hard from the start, this kind of training is surely essential.

Repeal of Children's Dental Experiment Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to call attention of Members of Congress to the following article:

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF HOUSE BILL 2034, REPEAL OF CHILDREN'S DENTAL EXPERIMENT LAW

The Massachusetts dentists' committee, sponsoring a bill in the State legislature to prohibit nondentists from performing dental operations on children, recently conducted a poll which revealed that 2,700 of the State's 2,800 dentists are opposed to the 1949 act which permits hygienists with 2 years' training to do restorative dental work on children.

Massachusetts was the first State to adopt this federally financed program, which lowers dental health standards and uses our children as guinea pigs.

DENTAL PROFESSION OBJECTS TO THIS PROGRAM

Under authorization of the 1949 act, the Massachusetts Department of Public Health is currently supervising a 5-year program at the Forsyth Dental Clinic in Boston, where hygienists are being given 2-year courses and

then authorized to do the work which was formerly entrusted to a registered dentist with 8 years' training.

Passage of this act came without the full approval of the Massachusetts Dental Society, even although certain of its officers spoke in favor of this act in 1948.

Passage of the act came without the full knowledge or consent of the dental profession in this State.

Passage of the act has been deplored and condemned by the American Dental Society by a vote of its house of delegates at the recent conference in San Francisco.

It is the opinion of the American Dental Association that restorative work on children's teeth cannot be entrusted to any person other than a fully qualified registered dentist. It is also the association's opinion that 2-year courses do not prepare trainees or hygienists for such highly specialized work.

It is the opinion of the Massachusetts dentists' committee and its members that the program undertaken by the Department of Public Health creates a dangerous new trend by establishing a substandard program in a field in which the highest possible standards should be maintained at all times.

We feel that Massachusetts has taken a dangerous step backward and that the dental health standards for the children of this State have received a serious setback, and that now is the time to cure the evil.

HOUSE BILL 3978 AS A PROBATE BILL

This bill may also be considered a protest from the heretofore disunited majority of the dental profession. The Massachusetts dentists' committee feels that it was completely ignored during consideration of the 1949 act. The first information the dental profession received of the existence of the act and the program it authorized, did not come until October 1949, 4 months after the passage of the act, and this information came through a notice in the New England Dental Journal.

We would also like to call attention to the fact that at no time did the governing body of the Massachusetts Dental Society, the house of delegates, approve this program.

We would also like to remind that only certain officers of the Massachusetts Dental Society approved this program, while the vast majority of 2,800 registered dentists were never polled nor given the opportunity to present their opinions on this far-reaching program.

The dental profession bases its opposition strictly on public health standards. We feel that if the filling of a tooth is isolated completely, as a mechanical technique, and has no bearing upon the general physical health of the child, the program instituted by the department of public health is liable seriously to restrict treatment in child dentistry. However, this is exactly what is proposed in the public health program.

A SOLUTION

Every member of the dental profession is interested in stopping the increasing rate of tooth decay in Massachusetts. However, we feel that this cannot be done by giving 2 years training to practitioners. The problem cannot be solved by training amateurs in this highly specialized field. The results of the program of the department of health would be likely to provide second-rate, substandard treatment to the children of the needy.

We would find that these children who require the highest quality treatment would probably receive the lowest, and it would probably provide a type of treatment which may have serious repercussion in the later lives of these children.

We feel that this problem can be solved by increasing the facilities for the education of trained, competent dental students. More qualified dentists are needed, not 2-year trainees. Ultimately, we feel, the problem will be solved by graduating from our dental schools increasing numbers of competent, fully-trained, registered dentists with 8 years qualifying training.

Formation of a separate group of mechanical technicians is not the answer.

RICHARD D. CUNNINGHAM,
Chairman, the Massachusetts Dentists' Committee for Repeal of the Children's Dental Experiment Law.

Tax Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from Atlanta's Suburban Reporter of March 20, 1950, and also one from the Atlanta Constitution of March 8, 1950:

[From Atlanta's Suburban Reporter of March 20, 1950]

THIS WEEK

(By Hubert Lee)

Our good friend, Congressman A. SIDNEY CAMP, of Newnan, who has represented the Fourth Congressional District since 1939, served as guest columnist for Editor Ralph McGill in the March 8, 1950, issue of the Atlanta Constitution.

Representative CAMP is a member of the powerful Ways and Means Committee, headed by North Carolina's Representative ROBERT L. DOUGHTON. Representative DOUGHTON was elected to the Sixty-second Congress and has served with distinction ever since.

The Ways and Means Committee calls for great ability and leadership and southerners on the committee measure up. In addition to Representatives DOUGHTON and CAMP, southerners include Representatives JERE COOPER (Tennessee); WILBUR D. MILLS (Arkansas); NOBLE J. GREGORY (Kentucky); J. M. COMBS (Texas); HALE BOGGS (Louisiana).

Taxes is one of the many problems of the Nation demanding the attention of the 25-member Ways and Means Committee. Here are some quotes from Congressman CAMP's guest column:

"I am more familiar with what is being done on my committee, which has been in daily session for more than a month in an effort to bring about tax adjustments to ease some of the worst pain now being suffered by our patient taxpayers, and at the same time, not endanger the integrity of the Federal revenues, nor further increase the Federal budget. * * *

"Some wag in the House once said that ours was not the Committee on Ways and Means but the committee on woes and moans.

"We suggest that anyone who missed reading the Constitution dig up the March 8 issue and clip out Congressman CAMP's guest column. It is worth reading and rereading.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of March 8, 1950]

THE ADJUSTMENT IS A TOUGH JOB

(Ralph McGill is in Palestine. In his absence members of the Georgia House of Representatives will write guest columns. Today's is by A. SIDNEY CAMP, of the fourth district of Georgia.)

I am honored to be asked to write this column for Ralph McGill, but feel very humble in doing so, for no one in our State is more able or better loved than he.

I am more familiar with what is being done on my committee, which has been in daily session for more than a month in an effort to bring about tax adjustments to ease some of the worst pain now being suffered by our patient taxpayers, and at the same time not endanger the integrity of the Federal revenues, nor further increase the Federal deficit.

MOANS

The job is a hard one. If you could sit with us and hear the various groups and classes relate their particular problems and assure us that no other group is carrying so weighty a burden, you would then understand why some wag in the house once said that ours was not the Committee on Ways and Means but the committee on woes and moans.

And we cannot laugh off these moans of our people over their tax woes. They are entitled to as much relief as it is possible to give them. Most every group has appeared before us except the consumers of tobacco and alcoholic beverages. These groups pay the highest tax of all—the Federal tax on a pack of cigarettes is 7 cents, and most States impose an additional tax. The tobacco costs 3 cents, or less than half of the Federal tax, while the Federal tax on a gallon of whisky is $10. Consumers seem to think these products cheap at any price.

LOOPHOLES

The President suggested that excise taxes be lowered in the same amount as we might recoup for the Treasury by closing of loopholes and making adjustments.

Some of the loopholes mentioned were collapsible corporations, such as those set up by moving picture producers for the production of only one picture and its liquidation after finishing the picture and before receipts from its distribution start, and some in the construction business where liquidation takes place before the houses are sold, so as to permit the tax to be recovered on a capital-gains basis rather than from direct income.

Selling business property by going concerns, and some sales of livestock by cattlemen and dairymen, so as to deduct losses from income rather than to reflect them in capital-gains accounts are similar practices in the reverse.

The Treasury urges a change in the law relating to those organizations now enjoying a tax-exempt status under section 101 (12) and suggests that the regular corporation tax rate be applied to business activities engaged in by religious, educational, charitable, and eleemosynary organizations which are wholly unrelated to the ordinary functions of the organization.

Thus if an agricultural college operated a farm or a bookstore, neither would be taxed, but if it owned and operated a watch factory the profits of the latter venture would be taxed.

They have also urged our attention to a growing system of lease-backs, an example being where a manufacturing company sells or gives its plant to a college which makes an addition, then leases it back to the company who continue to operate it. The college collects tax-free rents which are more than enough to pay for the additions.

Some cooperatives and charitable trusts that do not pay out virtually all of their income each year for charitable purposes and are not supported by the public generally, are other organizations under study.

ALLOWANCES

Other suggestions are to reduce the depletion allowance against gross profits now permitted to operators of oil and gas wells, coal, iron, and other metallic as well as some nonmetallic mines. These depletion allowances were made for the purpose of covering

the exhaustion of their resources and to encourage the discovery of new mines and wells, but it is claimed the allowances are far too much, and suggests that the oil- and gas-depletion allowances be reduced from 27½ to 15 percent, sulfur from 23 to 15 percent, and others to remain at 15 percent, coal at 5 percent, and all nonmetallics at 5 percent.

Suggestions for changes in the law concerning short selling on stock and commodity exchanges were made.

Any revenue we thus gain is to be used in reducing excise taxes.

Some of these excise taxes are collected at the manufacturing level—like tobacco, cigars and cigarettes, alcoholic beverages, automobile tires and parts, etc., while others are collected at the retail level—like jewelry, cosmetics, furs, railroad tickets, etc. I think some of those which should be reduced first are the taxes on ladies' handbags of the medium and lower prices, toilet articles, telephone and telegraph messages, railroad and transportation, motion picture and other admission taxes.

BALANCE

I think the most important need in Government today is a balanced budget. Our tax rates are high enough, and now produce over $40,000,000,000 a year.

Federal spending should be cut now. It is the only way our budget can be balanced, but it cannot be done without the cooperation of our people.

When cuts are proposed here, the people back home begin to howl and form pressure groups, send telegrams, write letters, pass resolutions—mostly beginning like this: "We know the budget should be balanced, but—." In 1948 the House cut the appropriations some $2,000,000,000, but before those bills came back to us from the conference committees most of it had been restored. It was the same story in 1949 and may be the same in 1950.

The Federal Government is carrying too great a portion of the local program, and we could cut expenditures for national defense and European and world recovery if everybody pulls together.

I am going to vote for such reductions.

Perhaps I have heard too many moans and listened to too many tales of woe.

Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the State of Montana this week is celebrating Wildlife Restoration Week. Mindful of this event the Governor of our State has issued a proclamation, as follows:

A PROCLAMATION

STATE OF MONTANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

Whereas we who have the privilege of calling ourselves citizens of Montana because of our nearness to the many bounties which nature has bestowed upon this State and our daily contact the multitude of natural blessings which we enjoy sometimes have to be reminded of the benefits and opportunities at hand. In constantly rubbing elbows with unlimited natural assets, we tend to lose sight of the fact that they are ours to enjoy. Were we not reminded of them from time to time, we would forget and start taking them for granted; and

Whereas the grandeur of the Treasure State and the abundant wildlife found here were recently set forth in the nationally circulated magazine Sports Afield, in an article written and prepared by Ken Thompson. Through descriptive text and highly illustrated photographs, Thompson unfolded for the whole United States to see just what we have within our borders; and

Whereas Montanans should be reawakened to the prizes within our borders. The magnificent mountain ranges, trout-filled streams, and the wild game that abounds should once again be called to our attention. We should take careful stock and, once again, we should be filled with a great appreciation;

Now, therefore, I, John W. Bonner, Governor of Montana, proclaim the period March 19–25 to be Wildlife Restoration Week in Montana and call upon all sportsmen's groups and conservation agencies to carry on a concerted campaign of education designed to reawaken public interest in the continuing need for a long-range wildlife-restoration program in Montana.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State to be affixed. Done at the city of Helena, the capital, this the 13th day of March A. D. 1950.

JOHN W. BONNER, *Governor.*

Another Distinction for the Sunflower State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT A. MEYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, Kansans as a rule are not boastful folks. They know that their State is the breadbasket of the world and that its many natural resources, its rolling plains, its salubrious climate make Kansas one of the great States of the Union. These blessings they modestly take in stride.

Recently, however, a new distinction has come to the Sunflower State which, with pardonable pride, I bring to the attention of my colleagues by quoting the following editorial from the Arkansas City Traveler:

ANOTHER DISTINCTION

Kansas picked up another distinction this week in the announcement by Head G-Man J. Edgar Hoover that the Sunflower State is home to only six card-carrying Communists. This probably is one of the lowest proportionate figures in the country.

Although the scarcity of the comrades in Kansas is just cause for satisfaction, in a way it is a bit surprising that even six of the tribe can be found in the State.

Kansans just aren't the sort of folks who go in for communism and similar crackpot theories. For one thing they are 100-percent-loyal Americans who don't believe in looking overseas for inspiration. They also are pretty thorough realists, who aren't a bit fooled by the fancy propaganda that comes out of Moscow. On the whole they are solid, hard-working people with a touch of rugged individualism in their nature and a high regard for personal liberty.

Kansas also doesn't have either the closely defined gulf between rich and poor or the high degree of class consciousness that exists in many places. The great middle class which dominates the State is a bulwark of good citizenship. Social lines are extremely loosely drawn. A real grass-roots democracy prevails in fact as well as in theory.

In such sturdy environment, communism offers no appeal whatsoever. The six exceptions to whom Mr. Hoover refers must be temporary importations from other areas.

Congress Spends Thirty-five Billions Without Record Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include therein an article from the Miami Herald, Miami, Fla., contained in John Pennekamp's column entitled "Behind the Front Page." May I say that Mr. Pennekamp is one of the leading and influential civic leaders of our State. His views and his judgment are highly respected by the citizens of Florida. He has been a great force in bringing to a realization and fruition the present Everglades National Park. He is associate editor of the Miami Herald.

CONGRESS SPENDS THIRTY-FIVE BILLIONS WITHOUT RECORD VOTE

(By John Pennekamp)

During its first session the Eighty-first Congress authorized the expenditure of $51,000,000,000.

Should you undertake to find out how your Senators or Representatives voted on these expenditures, here is what you would learn:

There is no recorded vote in either the House or Senate as to $28,969,126,980 of this gigantic expenditure. That is considerably more than half of the total that was voted.

As to the next $6,500,000,000, only one or other of the two Houses took a record vote.

So, more than two-thirds of the whole amount was appropriated without a record that will show you how your Congressman voted.

How much is $51,000,000,000? Dr. Christopher Daniels, of London, who has been visiting in Miami, recently figured it in terms of time.

If a man—say President Truman—stood on the shore of the Atlantic Ocean and tossed dollars into the water at the rate of 1 a second he could dispose of only $1,536,000 in 1 year.

Had he begun throwing the dollars into the ocean, at the rate of 50 a minute at the beginning of the Christian era, and continued so doing every minute around the clock through the years, right up to the end of 1950 he would have then disposed of $51,256,000,000.

That means he would have left on the shore something like $500,000,000 of the total that was appropriated by the first session of Congress.

Largest of the items appropriated without a record vote in either House was the $12,949,562,495 for the Military Establishment.

And the smallest was $16,000,000 for the United Nations for Palestine refugees.

Other items included, for independent offices, $7,617,739,261; for Treasury and Post Office Departments, $4,090,528,903; for Labor-Federal Security, $2,387,779,825; and to cover a second deficiency, $364,838,710.

There was a Senate vote but none in the House, on $3,638,990,000 for foreign aid, and House votes but none in the Senate on $100,000,000 to authorize public-works planning and $654,178,190 for Army civil functions.

Fort Lauderdale's Representative Dwight L. Rogers has offered a bill to cure this situation. It will have a tortuous course to adoption, but most certainly it should become a law.

It would make mandatory a yea-and-nay vote on all appropriations of a public nature.

"I think," he says, "this bill would be a step toward economy and would possibly bring about a reduction in governmental waste, extravagance, and duplication.

"The light of public opinion would cause some of the Congressmen to think before going on record for too many appropriations."

He continued:

"They would become appropriation conscious and certainly no appropriation could be passed without a majority of the House Members being present which has not been the history of appropriations this far in the Congress."

In the light of the size of the figures involved it is safe to assume that few, if any, Congressmen have even a reasonable comprehensive knowledge of where the money is going. As a matter of fact, committee members directly interested in the appropriations would be unable to study their particular budget and digest it to the point where they could give intelligent, detailed information as to it.

I wonder why more department heads aren't finding it possible to economize—to return unexpended balances.

It looks like some of them are given so much money they don't have time to spend all of it.

Open Letter to DAR

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial printed on March 16, 1950, in the Trenton Times entitled "Open Letter to DAR." This editorial stresses the position which this historic organization can choose to play in support of the principle of freedom and justice under law by espousing the cause of limited world government. The editorial follows:

OPEN LETTER TO DAR

Ladies of the New Jersey Society, Daughters of the American Revolution:

As you convene today for your annual conference at the State house, we make bold to express the hope that you will chart a course in harmony with the free and revolutionary spirit of those ancestors whom, as an organization, you so proudly and justly venerate.

New Jersey, in recent years, has assumed the lead in many moves designed to spread and accentuate the ideals of freedom.

It has come boldly to the defense of civil liberties.

It has taken a strong stand against racial segregation.

It has endorsed fair-employment practices.

And many of its Representatives in Congress, as well as thousands of its citizens, are lending their support to a type of world unity that offers the only promise of enduring peace and security.

In this latter connection, your New Jersey Society, if we may be permitted to say so, has a great and inspiring opportunity to break away from the narrow isolationism that has come to befog the thoughts and actions of your national organization.

We ask this: Do you have the courage to support the principle of freedom and justice under law on a world-wide basis?

The fathers of our country, implicitly and in general principle, did so when they conceived and gave governmental expression to the Federal doctrine of E Pluribus Unum (Out of Many, One).

Your society has vast potentialities for good. It can and we think should take a position of leadership in the quest for liberty, not only here in America but everywhere throughout the world.

We pray that you will join hands with the forces of progress and come out vigorously and unequivocally in affirmation of international freedom under law, of world government for all mankind.

As devotees of a revolutionary tradition, can you, at this critical moment, afford to follow the jingoistic, reactionary line?

Export Market for Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, unless this country can maintain a substantial export market for wheat, it will be necessary for a tremendous reduction to be made in wheat acreage in the years ahead. Last year the Secretary of Agriculture put into effect acreage allotments on wheat and farmers were asked to reduce their acreage for 1950 11.7 percent below the planted acreage for 1949. For 1951 acreage allotments will again be proclaimed and the Department of Agriculture is tentatively considering a further reduction of 16 percent in wheat acreage. With a continuation of normal yields still further reductions will be forced unless exports can be continued on a substantial basis.

Because of the light which they shed upon the present situation and because of the constructive criticism of the present policies of the Department of Agriculture with respect to wheat which they contain, I am submitting herewith as a part of my remarks, first, a letter from Mr. Elmer W. Reed, executive vice president of the Flour Mills of America, Inc., Kansas City, Mo., dated February 20, 1950, and addressed to me; and second, a copy of a letter from Mr. M. F. Mulroy, chairman of the agriculture committee of the Millers' National Federation, dated February 15, 1950, and addressed to Mr. Elmer Kruse, Assistant Administrator of Commodity Operations, Production and Marketing Administration.

FLOUR MILLS OF AMERICA, INC.,
Kansas City, Mo., February 20, 1950.

Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLIFF: As a matter of information I am enclosing a copy of a letter addressed to Mr. Elmer Kruse, Assistant Administrator of Commodity Operations, P. and M. A., who is the actual manager of CCC, as I understand it. It is a letter from Mr. M. F. Mulroy, of the Russell-Miller Milling Co., and chairman of the Agricultural Committee of the Millers' National Federation. It is completely self-explanatory, but it does touch on a question that it seems to me is vital and which also seems to me is in danger of being kicked around among the departments of Government until too late.

As pointed out in a previous letter, what we are doing is sitting on a stock of wheat which includes an exportable surplus of at least 375,000,000 on the present crop, and to maintain our normal carry-over, it should be 75,000,000 more than that—we are doing a lot of worrying about a lot of burdensome surpluses, and yet we are making no move whatsoever to make a sufficient distinction as between our support price in domestic markets and the world price to permit the moving of that surplus grain into world channels. It is indeed unfortunate that that should be so, but I think you will readily realize it is actually the case.

It is all right for us to become independent in our marketing proposals so long as we are supplying the funds with which the commodity is to be purchased, but so long as the other major exporters, and particularly Canada, is daily aggressively pushing the sale of strictly top-quality wheat at prices ranging as much as 40 cents to 45 cents under our price, there obviously is little or no chance for trading so long as the buyer has complete freedom of choice in what he purchases.

Frankly, this is a red flag which the industry is waving being extremely fearful, in fact completely convinced, that unless drastic action is taken immediately to permit the moving of wheat into world channels at competitive prices, we are building surpluses that must inevitably create an even worse situation in wheat than now prevails in some of the other commodities.

I wonder if it is not time for the Congress to take cognizance of that fact?

Yours very truly,

ELMER.

FEBRUARY 15, 1950.

Mr. ELMER KRUSE,
Assistant Administrator of Commodity Operations, Production and Marketing Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KRUSE: Your absence from Washington last week prevented me from answering your letter of February 3 in person. Mr. Smith, Mr. Borton, Mr. Benidt, and Menzies listened to the presentation of our problems.

We are not only interested in an increase of flour exports by an establishment of a wheat price that will permit us to sell in competition with other exporters; we are also interested in the movement of wheat and flour in quantities that will prevent piling up of a burdensome surplus. You can sell wheat to countries receiving ECA funds and to occupied countries without equalizing the price with other exporting countries. You can sell some wheat and flour at premiums over the prices offered by other exporting countries. You cannot, however, sell our wheat and flour in sufficient volume to prevent piling up a burdensome surplus unless our prices, quality considered, are competitive with the prices offered by other exporting countries.

We are going through a period where Canada is gradually taking the export business away from us and this will continue until they will have the major share of the export volume unless we are able to compete with them in all importing countries. It is very important that the subsidy be widened to cover countries not participating in the international wheat agreement and also to cover countries who complete their quotas under the international wheat agreement. Now when a country completes its quota, Canada only increases their price from $1.80 to $1.96 or 16 cents a bushel while we have to advance our price 53 cents per bushel to Latin-American countries. We are, therefore, practically excluded from all countries not covered by the international wheat agreement and are excluded from countries who complete their international wheat agreement quotas.

All of this means that Canada will build up their export trade at our expense and we will be eliminated from countries who have been accustomed to buying American flour for generations. Your present handling of export under the international wheat agreement is causing a loss of volume on American flour in all countries. We are just too high in price to compete with Canada and they are making headway in every country.

Your policy of basing your computation of the subsidy on the price you can secure from countries using ECA funds or on the price you can secure from countries that will buy limited quantities of American wheat mixtures that probably are reduced as much as possible by including any cheap wheat available is giving Canada the opportunity to increase their export volume.

This year we were sure of a definite volume of exports to ECA countries and occupied countries and next year this volume will be reduced by the amount ECA funds are reduced and by the amount occupied countries can produce at home. Your own figures indicate an increase in the carry-over that is very alarming and if allowed to continue, we will have a repetition of the situation that existed in the early thirties. Two years ago, the carry-over was 196,000,000 bushels, last year it was 307,000,000 bushels, and we are headed for a carry-over of 385,000,000 bushels this year.

The increase of about 24.8 percent in Canadian exports while our exports decreased 37.8 percent must have some significance. Canadian flour exports decreased about 7.5 percent while our flour exports decreased 73.8 percent. I do not have Canadian official figures, but the above figures are very close to what the official figures will show. The difference of 62.6 percent between our loss in total exports and the Canadian record, and the difference of 66.3 percent in the loss on flour exports surely proves that we are right in worrying about Canada gradually taking over our export volume.

Acreage reduction can take care of part of the loss in exports, but it would take a large acreage reduction to compensate for the loss in volume that we are facing. As long as you maintain a support price away above world price levels, you have to use some method to reduce the high domestic prices to a basis that will permit the export of our wheat and flour. Otherwise, you will pile up surplus stocks that will become very burdensome.

Additional storage space is not the answer because we do not need a carry-over of 350,000,000 to 500,000,000 bushels of wheat. Reducing acreage will not reduce the volume of the crop as far as the acreage is reduced. Farmers will first eliminate marginal land and as long as they can get over $2 per bushel for their wheat, they will do a better job of farming which will mean more bushels per acre. There will be more bushels per acre in good years and more bushels per acre in drought years when good farming will be more noticeable.

We would like to set down a basis that we think would be workable and would stop the loss of the export of American flour to all countries:

1. Broaden the base of the subsidy to include all countries. Base the subsidy, outside of IWA countries, on the world price for wheat which is now Class 2 price for Canadian wheat and is about $0.15 higher than the $1.80 IWA price for No. 1 Manitoba at Fort William.

2. Use realistic quality differentials based on the price that can be secured for No. 1 Hard Winter 10 protein as compared to No. 1 Manitoba 13.50 protein. Base the quality differentials on No. 1 Red and No. 1 Soft on the differentials necessary to move these wheats when there is a surplus. When and if these wheats get in short supply, the differentials, of course, would change.

3. Apply price differentials between ports based on general rates and not on distress cargo rates.

4. Base wheat prices on the cost of round lots of wheat at seaboard and not on the price of single-car lots from areas that can only supply very limited quantities.

5. Base the subsidy on prices that can be secured from countries that are not dependent on ECA funds.

6. Base the subsidy on the price that can be secured for enough wheat and flour to prevent piling up a burdensome surplus.

7. Change the subsidy on market changes each day. Avoid the temptation of staying behind the market on upswings and ahead of the market on downswings. Flour and wheat have to be sold on the market price each day and if we are not on the market, then our competitors from other exporting countries will get the business.

Yours very truly,

M. F. MULROY,
Chairman, Agricultural Committee, Millers' National Federation.

Grasping at Straws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, a little more clear thinking such as is exhibited in the appended editorial from a recent issue of the Vineland Times-Journal, will save us many future headaches and many millions, if not billions of dollars. I am including it for the information of the membership of the House:

GRASPING AT STRAWS

How a large portion of the world's population is mired in ancient thinking is illustrated by a brief news article we spotted over the week end, buried far inside one of the metropolitan newspapers.

Says the headline on this article: "Sweden rearming as a buffer state"—and the article itself contains: "Sweden, standing between Soviet Russia and the Atlantic Pact nations, is building up its small Army, Navy, and Air Force into a strong defense. * * * The Swedish Navy has contracted for the construction of two destroyers at about $16,000,000 each. They will displace 2,350 tons and will have heavier armament than earlier types of Swedish destroyers. * * * The Army is reorganizing its infantry units and giving them several new weapons, including two highly effective antitank guns and a rocket rifle."

In this world of atom and hydrogen bombs, guided missiles, supersonic planes, and the other modern creations of man's warped mind, is there any longer such a thing as a buffer state? We don't think so. Scientists have repeatedly warned there is no defense against the super bombs, yet a news story would have us believe that a couple of comparatively small warships, two antitank guns, and a rocket rifle constitute a strong defense. Even if Sweden's current armed force were multiplied tenfold, it could offer about as much resistance to concentrated Soviet might as the average lawn offers to a smoothly functioning power mower.

No criticism of Sweden, particularly, is here intended, for that Scandinavian nation is only a small arc in a circle of folly in which the United States is the largest segment. America, a few days ago, officially began what is known as arms aid to Europe. The cost will be a billion dollars or more this year, with the aim of creating barriers against further Communist expansion. If one Swedish destroyer costs $16,000,000, it stands to reason that a billion or two billion or even five billion dollars doesn't buy very much strength, spread out over 15 European nations. The average businessman understands the meaning of depreciation, and since nothing depreciates quicker than tools of war, it's an easy matter to visualize how this year's billion must be followed by more billions of dollars of American-arms aid in years to come. Today's bomber is obsolete tomorrow. Today's tank is a sitting pigeon tomorrow. Today's radar may be only false security tomorrow.

In attempting to combat communism by feverishly shipping arms to Europe, the United States is only grasping at straws. When we open our hands to see what we grabbed, all we find is a skyrocketing budget—and Russia just as strong and threatening as ever.

A second news story appearing the same day reported how the United States is using far more effective means than armaments to contain communism. Said the second news article:

"Paul G. Hoffman said today that Britain stood to lose $150,000,000 in Marshall-plan aid unless she joined with other European nations in a plan to lower trade barriers."

The United States Economic Cooperation Administration, under Hoffman, has blueprinted a European payments union, which would function as a currency clearing house for all Marshall-plan nations. Backbone of the project is $600,000,000 in Marshall-plan funds allotted exclusively to the currency pool.

In aiding Europe with food, raw materials, and machinery, and by trying to create freer world trade, the United States is employing the only effective means of halting Russian expansion. This aid, plus propaganda beamed on the Voice of America, reaches the people of Europe. Mere arms aid only the junk heaps.

What Chance Has Small Business?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it was with considerable consternation and alarm that I read the article, The Federal Snoops Are After Me, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20. The article was placed in the RECORD by our colleague the Honorable PAUL DAGUE, and appears on page A2029.

A careful reading of the article, which I commend to the attention of all my colleagues, will indicate the extent to

which misguided zealots in the Federal agencies are going to hamper, hinder, and hamstring the small-business men of this country. The Federal statutes are being so badly misinterpreted in so many instances that I wonder how any free young American citizen has the courage to start out building up a business of his own.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if incidents such as those described in the article are occurring in my district—or yours—or any of the other congressional districts in the United States. If they are, I feel that they should be promptly reported and investigated by the Congress. If the bureaucrats are wrong, let us fire them. If the laws are wrong, let us change them.

Acheson Walks Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. WALSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks our distinguished Secretary of State, Dean G. Acheson, has been subjected to a serious attack by Senator McCARTHY. I feel at this time that I must speak out in Secretary Acheson's defense. Senator McCARTHY has had ample opportunity to present to the Senate committee evidence of Communistic activities within the State Department, if any exists, and it has become very apparent that he is unable to produce this evidence.

The attack upon Dean G. Acheson and the Department of State seriously affects the entire Nation and this Government. I think the article by Joseph C. Harsch, chief of the Washington News Bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "Acheson Walks Alone," presents a very clear statement of the situation, and I commend this article to the House of Representatives.

The article is as follows:

STATE OF THE NATION—ACHESON WALKS ALONE

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—On January 25, over 6 weeks ago, Dean G. Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States, made his much-discussed declaration that he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss.

On February 28, 3 weeks ago, Mr. Acheson, in response to urgings from Democrats in the Senate and House of Representatives, explained that his action was not intended to condone any of the deeds of which Alger Hiss was accused and convicted.

But not once in these past 6 weeks has any Democrat in the House or Senate got up on his feet in the Halls of Congress and defended vigorously or prominently the man who holds the highest post in the Cabinet of the United States against the attacks which have continued to come from Republicans against Mr. Acheson's personal position on the Hiss case.

Nor has any Democrat stood up in either Chamber of the Congress and defended the Secretary of State against the implied attacks on him and his policies which are involved in the McCarthy charges of alleged disloyalty cases in the State Department.

Diplomats from overseas watch this proceeding with amazement and bewilderment. They do not understand what it means. Here is the second highest official in the executive branch of the Government—the man who stands next under the President himself. Daily, for weeks, he and his policies have been the target of direct and indirect political attack. Yet the leaders of his own party in the Congress behave just as though he and his policies had nothing to do with them or their party.

This is a condition which no foreign diplomat in Washington can understand in terms of his own homeland. Such diplomats come from one of two kinds of countries—a dictatorship or a parliamentary democracy. In either case this condition would be impossible. Under a dictatorship such an attack on the foreign minister and his policies would be an attack on the dictator, and, therefore inconceivable. In a parliamentary democracy it would be an attack on a leader of the party in power who could be defended by himself in person in the parliament and by all of his colleagues. The whole party would have to stand or fall with the foreign minister.

The situation is already dangerous. No foreign government can possibly know whether Mr. Acheson does actually represent the foreign policy of the party in power. They hesitate to do business with him. They question the permanence of policies which are daily attacked and daily left undefended. It is not overstating the case one iota to say that today the foreign policies of the United States are crippled and ineffective. The State Department is not able to function effectively as a foreign office. It will not be able to function as a foreign office unless or until one of two things happens: either Mr. Truman finds himself a new Secretary of State who will be defended in the Congress by his own partisans against all attack, or Mr. Truman succeeds in obtaining a vote of some kind which would amount to an expression of congressional confidence in Mr. Acheson.

This situation also raises a most serious question—whether any man can function effectively as Secretary of State who is not a political figure in his own right. There are three men in the Cabinet who have political strength in their own right—Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense; J. Howard McGrath, attorney general, and Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor. These men are frequently attacked, but they are also always defended. They are defended because they are in politics and have political friends and associates.

Mr. Acheson is a Democrat, but not a politician. He took office as a diplomatic craftsman to Mr. Truman. He has no power to defend himself politically nor to claim defenders in the Congress. If he is to be defended, Mr. Truman must either do it, or arrange for it to be done.

If Mr. Acheson were the diplomatic craftsman of the Department serving under a political Secretary of State the story would be quite different. No politician ever dared attack Cordell Hull or any of his assistants as they now attack Mr. Acheson and his. They never attacked James F. Byrnes as they now attack Mr. Acheson, although the big house cleaning of "security risks" has taken place since Mr. Byrnes left the State Department. A Secretary of State without a political shield is helpless in such a situation as this. It seems axiomatic that Mr. Truman must either be a shield for Mr. Acheson, or find a Secretary of State with the political power to shield himself.

McCloy Must Now Carry Out Nuremberg Sentences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, further delay in the execution of the death sentences imposed by the Nuremberg courts on the top Nazi war criminals will completely destroy any faith the world may still have in American justice. We will be subject to the derision and contempt of all people who remember well the crimes against humanity committed by these Nazi fiends.

Believing that action should be taken at once, I wrote John J. McCloy, the United States High Commissioner for Germany, on February 1, urging that he carry out the sentences immediately. I received a reply from him dated March 7, in which he gave his excuses for the delay. Upon investigation, I found that, on March 9, official notification was sent by the State Department to Commissioner McCloy informing him that he, as High Commissioner, has complete and absolute authority to execute the death sentences. I am accordingly writing Mr. McCloy today pointing out that it is his duty to obey the mandate given him forthwith. I am inserting in the RECORD copies of our correspondence, so that my colleagues may know of the action I have taken.

We must stop coddling these Nazi criminals; we must countenance no further clever delays; we must insist that Commissioner McCloy fulfill the trust placed in him and rid the world of these death-dealing Nazis. I repeat what Telford Taylor, the Army prosecutor at Nuremberg, said:

We have shown these Nazis far greater mercy than any convicted American murderer ever enjoyed. It is time they were hanged.

The letters follow:

MARCH 7, 1950.

Hon. ISIDORE DOLLINGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DOLLINGER: This will acknowledge your letter of February 1, 1950, concerning the execution of the death sentences imposed by the Nuremberg courts. I have read the excerpt, which you enclosed, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 31, 1950, containing an article by John Rohenberg.

In addition to the 16 prisoners sentenced at Nuremberg who are the responsibility of the United States High Commissioner for Germany, acting under the Department of State, there are a number of prisoners who were also sentenced to death for war crimes by military commissions, acting under the authority of the military commander at Dachau. Execution of these latter sentences is the responsibility of the Department of the Army.

Congressional inquiries concerning the sentences awarded by war-criminal tribunals, particularly those of the military commission referred to above, resulted in a stay of execution of all capital sentences pending the results of investigation of the trials by committees of Congress. Although congressional interest centered in the trials conducted by the military commissions, it was not thought desirable to carry out any death sentences imposed for war crimes by courts for which the United States Government is responsible in Germany, whether at Nuremberg or under the jurisdiction of the Army, at a time when Congress was actively investigating the propriety and validity of the proceedings in any of these cases. Accordingly, both the Department of the Army and the Department of State joined in issuing a stay of execution of all capital sentences.

An additional reason justifying the stay was the impropriety of executing the sentences at a time when petitions were pending for review of decisions of the Nuremberg courts by the Supreme Court of the United States.

At such time as I receive notification that the stay of execution of these sentences has been lifted, I will take such action as is appropriate in the light of the circumstances surrounding each individual case. I am fully aware of the enormity of the crimes for which certain of the defendants at Nuremberg were tried and found guilty. Full consideration will be given to the nature of these crimes in any determination which I am called upon to make as to whether the death sentences will be carried out.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. MCCLOY,
United States High Commissioner for Germany.

MARCH 23, 1950.

Hon. JOHN J. MCCLOY,
United States High Commissioner for Germany, Frankfurt, Germany.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of March 7 is before me, explaining your reasons for the delay in execution of the death sentences imposed upon Nazi war criminals by the Nuremberg courts.

I am informed that on March 9 official notification was sent you by the State Department, that you, as High Commissioner for Germany, have complete and absolute authority to execute the death sentences imposed by the Nuremberg courts. The responsibility is now fixed, and rests upon you.

Any further delay on your part will be not only unconscionable, but a violation of your duty, and a betrayal of justice.

In accordance with our democratic principles, the condemned prisoners have had every opportunity to protect their legal rights. They failed to demonstrate their innocence in the Nuremberg court; appeals to the United States Supreme Court have been denied—the Court refusing to review the verdict of the International tribunal. Proceedings brought in the Federal Court of the District of Columbia, the Court of Appeals, have had the same negative results. Congressional investigations have long since been completed—and after months of delays, court actions brought to stall the carrying out of just punishment, and extensive hearings, not one sentence has been changed, and these death-dealing Nazi criminals stand guilty as ever.

I quote Telford Taylor, the Army prosecutor who fought the case before the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg: "We have shown these Nazis far greater mercy than any convicted American murderer ever enjoyed. It is time they were hanged."

We know, Mr. Commissioner, that the condemned, or persons in their behalf, can keep trying to delay execution by filing writ after writ in our courts. The time has come when you must ignore such futile attempts at delay—every legal avenue has now been closed to such petitioners. If you continue to delay, these men will still be alive many years from now, should you permit the filing of these useless petitions in our courts to take precedence over the mandate given you.

Our coddling and petting of the worst war criminals in history is losing us the respect of the world. Former top Nazis take it as evidence that "all is forgiven" and grow bolder in their efforts to push their way to the top spots in industry and government in Germany. Our entire denazification program has floundered—and we are fast losing our reputation as a Nation which keeps its commitments and covenants, and has the courage to carry out its decrees.

By speedily executing the sentences imposed at Nuremberg, you can help our Nation regain some of its lost prestige. Justice, American justice, will again be respected, and not looked upon with derision and contempt.

You have a duty to perform. Let it be done forthwith, for there are now no justifiable excuses for delay.

Sincerely yours,

ISIDORE DOLLINGER,
Member of Congress.

Hoover Commission Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a copy of a resolution recently adopted by the New England section of the Society of American Foresters relative to that part of the Hoover Commission recommendations which deals with the grouping of all major land functions dealing with soil, forests and grazing, including upstream water management, in the Department of Agriculture:

Whereas the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (popularly known as the Hoover Commission), a nonpartisan body of 12 top-ranking men, gave expert and thorough study to Government structure and functions, and concluded that there has been and is now, wasteful overlapping and duplication in certain conservation, forest, range, and allied functions in the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior; and

Whereas the Commission's task forces which studied these phases of Government administration, all recommended the consolidation of these activities and services as has been urged by students of government for many years; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission itself, as did its task force on Agriculture and task force on Public Works, believes it is logical and the best public policy to require that major land functions dealing with soil, forests and grazing, including upstream water management, be grouped in the Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas this New England section, Society of American Foresters, is intensely interested in forestry and forest research, and recognizes that 75 percent of the commercial timber-growing land lies east of the Great Plains and largely in private ownership; that 50 percent of all commercial forest land is in farm woodlots and intermingling small forest holdings; that these lands, when properly managed, yield a harvest as regular and dependable as any other crop; that forest and range activities are based on the biological sciences which have been historically the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New England section, Society of American Foresters, at its thirtieth annual winter meeting held in Boston February 23-24, 1950, urges the adoption of the Hoover Commission's recommendations that forest and range land activities be retained in the Department of Agriculture, and that similar functions of the Department of the Interior, particularly those concerned with administering crop-producing lands of the public domain and the Oregon and California revested lands, be transferred to the Department of Agriculture; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the executive council, Society of American Foresters, requesting that similar action be taken in behalf of the society at the earliest possible date, and that copies of this action and parent society resolutions be sent to Dr. Robert L. Johnson, chairman, Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, 15 West Forty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y.; to Fred Pace, Jr., Director of the Budget, Washington, D. C.; the members of the congressional delegations of the New England States, and to members of congressional committees concerned.

Low-Income People Pay the Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, when the day comes that the millions of Americans whose earnings are too low to pay much, if any, direct taxes, come to realize that, by a clever system of hidden taxes it is they that are really paying for the extravagant cost of government, then, and only then, will we stop this incredible Washington waste.

I know of nothing more important than to give the people the truth on how they are being victimized. "Know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

With the consent of the House, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent public statement that I made on this subject. I intend doing everything I can to make every man and woman in my district aware of this tax trickery. The statement follows:

WASHINGTON.—"If more Americans realized how much they pay in taxes—direct and hidden—each year, their clamor would force real economy in government," Congressman T. MILLET HAND (Republican, New Jersey) declared today in commenting on a tax study recently released by the American Taxpayers' Association, of Washington.

"Much spending at all levels of government has been permitted simply because too many people feel that they don't pay taxes because they do not own their own homes or make sufficient income to put them in the income-tax brackets," HAND said.

"This is the greatest fallacy of modern times. There isn't an item that any of us buy that isn't loaded to the hilt with hidden taxes. You don't have to be in the income-tax brackets or own a home to be a direct taxpayer. Every time you pay a nickel for a newspaper, every time you buy a loaf of bread, you are paying high taxes, pyramided through every level of government.

"The old saying about death and taxes was never more true than it is today, and whether you know it or not, you're helping to pay for all the multi-billion-dollar spending schemes that government in all levels concocts," Congressman Hays declared.

Citing the recent study by the American Taxpayers' Association, Hays said that actual case studies of people earning $960, $1,920, and $3,400 a year were made, and that itemized accounts showed that a man earning $960 a year paid $123.08 annually in hidden taxes; a man earning $1,920 paid $243; and a man with a $3,400 income paid $314.76 in taxes.

The hidden taxes were included in rent, excise taxes, licenses, import duties, and taxes included in freight costs.

The association traced various things everyone buys from the first step to the point of sale. It found 78 different taxes on a quart of milk, 151 taxes on a loaf of bread, 100 taxes on an egg; 125 taxes on a woman's cotton dress, 118 taxes on a MAN'S suit of clothes, 156 taxes on a cake of soap, 201 taxes on a gallon of gasoline.

"The study showed that hidden taxes take $18 on every $30 of rent, nearly $7 a year on every telephone, one-third of all normal day-to-day living expenses," Congressman Hays continued.

"On a cotton dress costing $7.85 it was found there were $2.20 in hidden taxes, 206 taxes on a new automobile amounting to from $352 to $406 on an automobile that costs $1,600 to $2,000. One tax study was done on a woman's hat, and it was found that it carried 65 Federal taxes, 43 State taxes, and 41 local taxes.

"Until the majority of Americans fully realize the huge slice that taxes take from their annual incomes, until they realize that no one escapes hidden taxes, there can be but little hope for genuine economy in government. It is too easy to hide taxes on the things everyone buys in order to give the public all the services and things that so many people think they get for nothing from the Government.

"Surveys have shown that, if all the money of the wealthy were confiscated, it would operate the National Government for only 21 days, which shows clearly that it is the average man and the low-income groups that pay the bulk of the tax bill," the Congressman said.

"Not until people generally become truly tax conscious will there be sufficient pressure to effect substantial Government economies," he predicted.

Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Raleigh.

STATEMENT FROM THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE

The forests, fields, and streams of North Carolina are capable of producing enough wildlife to supply the recreational desires of every citizen. Nature, if assisted by man, will repopulate areas where wild living creatures once abounded but which are now an depleted state.

Coming at a season of the year when there is evidence of renewed life on every hand, North Carolina Wildlife Restoration Week and National Wildlife Restoration Week present a challenge for every citizen to actively participate in some constructive measure which will assist our wildlife in regaining its former population. This, of course, offers opportunities for men, women, and children to use a portion of their time and energy in making plantings which will provide food, shelter, and a nesting place where wild animals can reproduce and prosper.

The interest of sportsmen, women's clubs, and all nature lovers in conservation has been encouraging and should be an inspiration to others for furthering the principles of proper management and wise use of this natural resource. It is a pleasure, therefore, to call attention to the period of March 19 through March 25, 1950, as Restoration Week for Wildlife in our State and Nation and to urge that these days be appropriately observed by planting suitable areas for wildlife, and through group and community programs stressing the value and importance of this natural resource. School officials and teachers, together with their pupils, may profitably devote a measure of their time and study to wildlife restoration problems.

The Need for Total Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today, more than at any previous time in our Nation's history, the United States is called upon to play a prominent and decisive role in the determination of international affairs. The condition of the world is in a very critical stage, and upon our foreign policy may depend the future, even the survival, of the entire western civilization.

In crucial times like these, it is imperative that the free nations of the world pursue a forthright and determined course. Being fully cognizant of the demands of our times, the United States has formed and adopted a sound and constant foreign policy, a policy difficult to pursue because it not only requires patience, steady nerves, and persistent effort, but because, above all, it is based in its entirety upon the confidence, support, and attitude of the American people.

Our foreign policy, endeavoring to effect world peace, is exposed to persistent and unrelenting pressure from outside sources, whose aims are contradictory to those that we intend to realise. In order that it may not waver and crumble under this pressure, it needs the wholehearted backing of every American.

It is, indeed, tragic, therefore, that, for political and other unknown reasons, our foreign policy is also being subjected to internal pressure, instigated by persons who perhaps do not realize the irreparable harm that their actions are causing. Through untimely and indiscriminate accusations hurled at responsible leaders of our foreign policy, they, perhaps unwittingly, undermine that basic confidence which the American people must place in our foreign policy.

The following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 17 casts a timely light upon the gravity of today's crucial state of affairs, and for that reason I believe that it merits serious and sincere consideration of all the Members of this body:

WHAT THE UNITED STATES IS TRYING TO DO

The United States has a definite foreign policy. It is a sound one. Its ultimate aim is to bring world peace. But this does not mean peace at any price. The United States policy is difficult to pursue, because it requires patience, steady nerves, persistent effort.

Most of all, it needs the understanding and support of the American people.

This was the message of Secretary of State Acheson in his major foreign-policy speech at Berkeley, Calif., on Thursday.

This address was directed to the people of this country, even more than to the overseas world. Mr. Acheson was speaking to the "grass roots" of the Nation.

There has been some confusion in recent months about American foreign policy, more at home than abroad. There are many reasons for this. Americans have a long tradition of disinterest in foreign affairs; foreign policy has been a distant and mysterious thing to be dealt with by the President and the Secretary of State.

More serious elements of confusion have entered the picture of late. Worried Americans, disturbed deeply at the horrible possibilities of atomic warfare, unacquainted with the over-all aims of our foreign policy, have advanced demands for disarmament conferences, new peace meetings, high-level conferences with the Russians.

The State Department and its personnel have been under fire on various grounds. Men who should be first in line to support the Nation's strong policy against communism have been weakening the Department's position by continual assaults on the basis of personalities and details.

Senator MCCARTHY's wild and wholesale charges, as yet unproved, that there are Communists in the State Department, exemplify these tactics—tactics which, in many cases, have resulted in furthering the Communist policy of creating confusion.

As a result of this disturbing situation—one that weakens our international efforts—Secretary Acheson has felt it necessary to "go to the people" in an effort to turn their eyes and minds back to the important things and away from irrelevancies.

He is telling the American people what they must realize unless all is to be lost—that they are the center of opposition to world communism and, as such, are going to be under unrelenting pressure for a long time. He is telling them that agreement with Russia will be reached only after we have built up "situations of strength" which the Russians will respect.

He is telling the American people that in this crisis period of "total diplomacy" they must be steady and patient and must always know the goals ahead. The people must, in fact, realize that they themselves are the greatest "situation of strength" in the free world and that if they falter the democratic world will quickly be submerged.

Mr. Acheson explains, as he has before, that this country is always ready to discuss, to negotiate, to agree with the Russians. We ask only that they agree to the simplest proposals (he listed seven) to lessen world tensions. We ask that they meet us in good faith and that they carry out agreements made.

Mr. Acheson says frankly that he does not think the Russians will bargain in such good faith at this time and expresses hope that if

this country holds to its present policies the time will eventually come when the Russians will be willing to do so. In the meantime, he says, this country does not intend to play any role of "international sucker."

Mr. Acheson is indeed wise to bring his story to the people in language that all can understand. Perhaps it would have been wise to do so before this. The time is past when our foreign policy can be conducted from the mountaintop. Today it must be based firmly in the people—understood by them and supported by them.

We have the utmost confidence that the American people, once they understand completely the policy that we are following in world affairs, will give it their utmost backing. We believe that they have the courage and moral stamina to hold to that course, whatever may be the machinations of our foreign enemies—or the unfortunate undermining policies of peanut politicians at home.

In further reflection upon the irreparable damage caused our foreign policy and the persons responsible for its conduct by the indiscriminate accusations cast upon them, I wish to add at this point another editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 21, which, I believe, needs no additional comment:

THE DAMAGE MCCARTHY IS DOING

Ambassador Philip C. Jessup flew back from halfway round the world to answer Senator MCCARTHY's charges that he had an "affinity" for communism. It seems to us that Mr. Jessup proved the falsity of the charges pretty conclusively in his testimony before the Tydings investigating committee.

The Ambassador did not need the enthusiastic letters of confidence that he presented from two outstanding Americans, Gen. George C. Marshall and Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, whose loyalty has not thus far been questioned by Wisconsin's junior Senator.

The damage done by the McCarthy charges will not be corrected this simply, however. Throughout the world, the name of Ambassador Jessup has been clouded with suspicion. As he explained, declarations he made for this country while in the Far East will undoubtedly now be questioned. "It is impossible," he declared, "for anyone to estimate the harmful effect that the McCarthy innuendoes have had on the success of my mission and the foreign policy of the country."

In this connection, it must be remembered that Ambassador Jessup is but one individual named by MCCARTHY. The Senator has cast a cloud of suspicion over all of the thousands of State Department employees. He started his present campaign by saying that there were 205 "security risks" in the Department. He then revised this to 57 card-carrying Communists. Later, on the Senate floor, he charged that there were 81 "unsafe" employees in the Department. He has had a month to prove these charges and, to date, has offered no convincing evidence in even one case.

All over the world, the representatives of this country are under this cloud of doubt.

Wisconsin's junior Senator has harmed a number of individuals and this alone is a serious matter. But even more serious is the damage he has done, with his irresponsible and sweeping charges, to the State Department, its morale and its influence the world over. This strikes at the very heart of this country's position and its strength in the world.

It will take a long time to repair the damage that Senator MCCARTHY has done. At a time when our international situation is so grave, the burden on the Senator's conscience should be a heavy one—no matter what, if any evidence of communism in the State Department he still may eventually bring to light.

Resolutions Adopted by the Kansas Livestock Association at Its Annual Meeting, Topeka, Kans., March 16, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas Livestock Association is a State-wide organization which speaks with authority for the livestock producers of the State. I am sure that the resolutions adopted at its recent annual meeting accurately express the views of its members. Because I believe these resolutions are of interest to the Members of Congress, I include the same herewith under leave to extend my remarks:

RESOLUTIONS

HOLDING TO FREEDOM

There impends today a stupendous threat which so menacingly overshadows the future of our country that we Kansas stockmen, of all shades of political belief, feel it our duty to speak out in unmistakable terms.

This threat lies in the fact that our country, without opportunity for conscious choice on the part of its people, is rapidly drifting toward the consummation of a false concept, contemptible to freedom, the socialized state.

Tokens of this danger are everywhere and undeniable: the growing power and expansion of a wasteful Government; the colossal public debt; the heavy burden of taxation, designed in large part to redistribute the wealth of the people; the ridiculous attempt—by dictating wages, hours of labor, prices, etc., and by innumerable other false expedients—to substitute an artificial economy for the natural economy which alone can function in freedom; the gradual assumption by the state of financial responsibility for every hazard incident to the life, labor, infirmity, and old age of all—hazards which must be personally met and borne by every human being who has the instinctive will to survive and the inherent impulse to be free; the arraignment of economic and social groups, one against the other, in denial of the obvious fact that their interests are identical and can be logically promoted only by application of the Golden Rule; and numerous other kindred concepts, similarly inspired and equally false.

Government produces nothing and has no means by which to support these false and destructive policies except by exacting from its citizens the fruits of their labor. The present semblance of prosperity is only the byproduct of the most terrible and destructive war that ever afflicted the world and is now maintained only by artifice implemented by folly, fear, and dire forebodings.

The course our Government is now taking, unless it is promptly reversed, will inevitably lead to national bankruptcy. In a vain effort to prolong a specious sense of security, more similar expedients will be applied until we all become mere numbers in a completely socialized state: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Kansas Live Stock Association, in convention assembled at Topeka, Kan., March 16, 1950, deplore the fallacious policies that are beguiling our country into socialism, that we censure and condemn those in public office who support or tolerate these policies and that we call on all patriotic Americans to denounce them and to work energetically and courageously for the reestablishment and maintenance of free and competitive enterprise and the restoration of the Republic.

Our decision to take this stand is supported by the firm conviction that the policies we here and now condemn are unrighteous and immoral in that they proceed in shameful denial of the inherent nature of man and in impious contempt of nature's eternal laws.

BRANNAN PLAN

Whereas the farm program proposed by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan to the Eighty-first Congress would promote low market prices for all agricultural products, would subsidize consumers, rich and poor alike, and would eventually necessitate Federal control of all agriculture; and

Whereas the livestock industry cannot be successfully operated by governmental bureau: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we are opposed to the proposed program. We consider it unsound economically and entirely impractical, and we urge Congress to reject it.

DAMS

This association objects to further Federal appropriations to inundate good productive Kansas land by the construction of outsized and unneeded dams until it is proven that soil-conservation methods are ineffective in flood control.

GREAT ATLANTIC & PACIFIC TEA CO.

The Kansas Livestock Association wishes to emphasize its interest in the efficient distribution of beef through retail channels. We oppose action by the Department of Justice against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. as contrary to the intent and purpose of the antitrust laws of the United States. Such unwarranted action against the A. & P., other chain organizations, or independent merchants could seriously hamper efficient retail distribution of beef and be detrimental to the common good.

TAXES

That this association sponsor a program of education to demonstrate the disproportionate share of personal property and ad valorem taxes paid by the farmers and stockmen of this State.

FREIGHT RATES

This association wishes to commend the stand taken by the Kansas Corporation Commission in resisting the efforts of the ICC to increase the intrastate livestock freight rates, and urge the corporation commission to continue the fight to prevent further Federal encroachment on rights of the people of this State.

FEEDING-IN-TRANSIT RATE

The railroads have reduced the cattle feeding in transit charge to $7 per car, but tariff routes are so restricted that the privilege is impractical for many feeders or pasture men.

Railroads should liberalize the tariff routes so as to protect the through rate from point of origin to ultimate destination via the feed-in-transit point.

SLAUGHTER-IN-TRANSIT RATES

To facilitate more economical distribution of meat products to the large consuming centers from the vast producing areas, the railroads should recognize the fact that rail shipments of livestock into the slaughtering center is an integral part of the out-bound rail meat shipment.

We recommend the railroad publish slaughter-in-transit rates in lieu of the present system of assessing local rates on livestock into the slaughtering center plus the local rate on meat products to the consuming center.

BEEF GRADING

In the interest of better utilizing the present grade classifications used in grading beef, and a better distribution of our beef within those grades, and with more descriptive

[illegible] for the lower grades of beef, the following recommendations are made:

That a substantial percentage of present top Choice be graded in Prime; a corresponding percentage of top Good be graded Choice; and that good-quality beef which is now being graded Commercial be graded Good. As the grades Commercial and Utility have no appeal to the consuming public, we urge that these two grade names be changed to descriptive words that would help the consumer recognize the type of beef that would indicate value and economy.

We also recommend that useful beef produced on rations of grass and grain which has a yellow cast be graded according to its merit and not discounted on account of color.

TRUCK TRANSPORTATION

Whereas there is a definite variation in laws and rules governing the regulation of truck transportation in the several States surrounding Kansas; and

Whereas such lack of uniformity is not to the best interests of the shippers of commodities by truck: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the laws and regulations affecting truck transportation be so unified with those of surrounding States as to provide free and economical movement of commodities by truck between the several States.

TRUCK TRANSPORTATION

Whereas the laws governing truck transportation of commodities in the State of Kansas are an accumulation of statutes passed over many years and are therefore not well coordinated; and

Whereas the State has embarked upon a comprehensive highway program, the success of which may be damaged by overweight and overlength vehicles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the legislative council and the legislative committee of the Kansas Livestock Association should institute a thorough investigation to assure that the statutes will be revised to insure a full protection of the interests of the shipper of commodities, particularly of livestock, and to insure that our tremendous investment in highways will not be jeopardized.

PREDATORY ANIMALS

Whereas the loss to livestock interests from predatory animals is on the increase; and

Whereas the poison known as formula 1080 is effective: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the use of poison 1080 be permitted any place in the State of Kansas where approved by the Predatory Animal Division of the United States Biological Survey, Department of the Interior, and requested by the majority of land occupiers in the area.

GOVERNMENTAL REPORTS

Resolved, That the Department of Agriculture be urged to publish monthly statistical reports on matters pertinent to the livestock industry and that daily market reports be continued and expanded at all principal commodity markets.

LEGISLATION

That the legislative committee of the Kansas Livestock Association be commended for its vigilance in supporting legislation in the best interest of the livestock industry and that it be urged to continue its efforts in this direction.

DR. A. D. WEBER

Among those persons now being considered for the presidency of Kansas State College is Dr. A. D. Weber, associate dean of the School of Agriculture.

Stockmen and farmers throughout the State of Kansas know from personal experience that "Dad" Weber is a scientist, an administrator, and an educator, who with language that every farmer and student understands has pointed the way to practical application of progressive research to the agricultural industry. He has been recognized for his accomplishments both nationally and internationally, bringing honor to his State, his school, and himself.

We know that Dr. Weber, a native of Kansas, a product of Kansas State College, can bring to the entire college of agriculture and applied science the outstanding leadership he has demonstrated in the field of agriculture.

It is the sincere hope of this association that Dr. A. D. Weber be the next president of Kansas State College.

APPRECIATION

Whereas our president, vice president, and directors of the association have spent much time and effort in the interests of our association, without compensation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we extend to each of them our sincere thanks and appreciation for their efforts in our behalf; and

Whereas the office force has been untiring in its efforts to further the interests of our association: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we extend to them our thanks and appreciation for their loyalty and devotion to their work.

We wish to thank the city of Topeka, Mayor Frank Warren, and other officials for their hearty welcome and willing assistance; to John Morrell & Co., Manager R. M. Cwthwaite for the courtesy dinner for our executive committeemen, officers, and friends; to the three national banks of Topeka—the Central National Bank, the Merchants National Bank, and National Bank of Topeka, for the courtesy breakfast to convention visitors; and to the Producers Commission Association for the courtesy breakfast served Wednesday morning, the fifteenth.

We also wish to express our thanks and appreciation to each of those who contributed so much to our program in their talks and discussion, and who gave so generously of their time and efforts to be with us and to help make our thirty-seventh annual convention the success it proved to be.

Also, we wish to thank the Topeka Chamber of Commerce, Mr. John Miller, the Agricultural Commissioner; the Topeka Daily Capital, the Topeka State Journal for the publicity given our convention; and the Capper Publications for sponsoring our dance.

Respectfully submitted.

Richard Robbins, Pratt, Chairman; George Andrews, Kanopolis; Herb Barr, Leoti; J. W. Birney, Bucklin; W. J. Brown, Fall River; C. O. Heidebrecht, Inman; Dan Jackson, Coldwater; Earl Kiehlborn, Cambridge; O. W. Lynam, Burdett; J. Willard Olander, Kansas City; Wayne Rogler, Matfield Green; Conlee Smith, Wichita, Resolutions Committee.

Harbor Projects Are Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the construction of coastal harbors long has been recognized as one of the basic obligations of our Government toward its people. The continued development of such harbors along the north coast of California is vital to the fishing industry of our State. Such a need is explained admirably in an editorial which appears in the Press Democrat of Santa Rosa, Calif., for March 15, 1950. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this editorial:

HARBOR PROJECTS WOULD SPEED EMPIRE'S PROGRESS

Since he came to this region about a year ago Col. F. S. Tandy, district engineer of the Corps of Army Engineers, has covered thousands of miles studying the Redwood Empire at first hand and has become well acquainted with its major needs.

Thus, his keen interest in a proposed string of shallow-draft harbors along the north coast indicates their importance to the future development of the empire.

Surveys of harbor sites have been authorized by Congress, and the Army engineers are rushing the surveys ahead at full speed. One result of the harbors would be to open up new fishing grounds, stimulating both commercial and sports fishing.

This is the problem Bodega Bay fishermen, for instance, face at the present time:

Their best fishing grounds lie between the Russian River's mouth and Fort Ross, 19 nautical miles north of Bodega Bay. Good fishing continues northward from Fort Ross.

But to reach Fort Ross from Bodega Bay requires between 3 and 4 hours. Then, at the end of the day, fishermen generally must return to Bodega Bay, losing 6 to 8 hours just in getting to their destination and back.

The daily round trip is made necessary because boats can't enter the mouth of the Russian River, and Fort Ross Cove offers no protection from off-shore winds which prevail during warm months. Furthermore, dangerous rocks ring the cove. A fishing boat can anchor overnight only at serious risk.

The proposed harbors project would clear the rocks from Fort Ross Cove and throw up a protective jetty against off-shore winds. It would also make the mouth of the Russian River an important recreational harbor and harbor of refuge for commercial and sports craft.

Fishermen would be able to fish the waters off northern Sonoma County for weeks at a time, returning each night to Fort Ross Cove to unload the day's catch onto trucks, which would carry the fish to market or to processing plants.

If the projects are approved by the district engineer's office, they will go to the division engineer and then to the Chief of Engineers for final recommendation to Congress.

The many benefits offered by the harbors make their approval by Congress and the authorization of funds to construct them a high-priority goal for the Redwood Empire.

Congratulations, President Benjamin G. Browdy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1950, I called the attention of this House to the untimely passing of Daniel Frisch the day before. In addition to the tremendous void created by his

death to American public life, the office he held as president of the Zionist Organization of America also became vacant.

We are grateful to providence that the next in command of the Zionist Organization of America was Benjamin G. Browdy, who, during Mr. Frisch's absence from the country and during his illness, performed so ably in his place. On March 19, 1950, the national administrative council of the organization met in special session and unanimously elected Mr. Browdy as president.

Mr. Browdy is not only one of my neighbors, but one of my dear and intimate friends. He has long been an outstanding leader in every worth-while community endeavor. His leadership and abilities are of an extremely high order.

Mr. Browdy, who is also president of the Palestine Foundation Fund, in accepting the presidency of the Zionist Organization of America, pledged himself to support the programs and policies of his predecessor in order to continue to maintain unity in the Zionism movement. His intent to carry on in that way was confirmed by his statement that he would look for advice and guidance to such great leaders in the Zionist organization as Louis Lipsky, chairman of the American Zionist Council; Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, former chairman of the American section of the Jewish Agency; and Dr. Emanuel Neumann, former president of the Zionist Organization of America.

The affairs of the Zionist Organization of America are in good hands. Under the leadership of its new president it will go forward to new and greater accomplishments.

Your Job Is Being Sold Wholesale by the Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I make further reference to the seriousness of the one-way trade system established by the State Department with the blessing and connivance of a Democratic Congress. We now find that groups of employees are banding together in an effort to stem the flood of imports from slave-labor countries which deprive American workers of employment. Prominent in this movement is Matthew Woll, of the American Federation of Labor, who is alert to the dangers of indiscriminate trade policies. A disproportionate share of the burden is being borne by workers and management of a few industries. Many are facing complete disruption through lessening of their markets. Nothing could be more nonsensical than the advice of free-traders to seek other means of livelihood and to completely abandon American markets in rubber footwear, hats, pottery, watches, and many other lines of endeavor. Complete communities oftentimes depend upon one industry for their survival. Prominent examples in Connecticut are the United States Rubber footwear plant in Naugatuck, which employs more than 3,000 in a town of approximately 18,000 population, and the city of Danbury, which depends largely upon hat manufacturing for the support of its citizens. This problem is real and pressing to our people, and will not be solved by the fallacious and unreasoning policy of granting further trade concessions to foreign countries. I might paraphrase the famous statement of Winston Churchill and say that I did not come to Congress for the purpose of liquidating the jobs of the people residing in Connecticut's Fifth Congressional District. Furthermore, I refuse to stand idly by and watch a Democratic administration pursue this policy of industrial destruction.

I cite as example of the awareness of the results of such a program a resolution forwarded me by the Beacon Falls (Conn.) Republican Town Committee and a news story from the Wednesday, March 22 issue of the Bridgeport Post:

Congressman JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: At a meeting of the Republican Town Committee of the town of Beacon Falls held Thursday, March 16, it was unanimously voted to write to our Senators and Congressmen asking them to exert their efforts pertaining to tariff changes that will vitally affect and curtail the rubber and canvas footwear industry in which our town is economically interested.

Many of our townspeople earn their livelihood in this industry and tariff changes that are being considered will cause unemployment by allowing similar types of footwear made in foreign countries at very low rates to undersell items made in this country.

Your assistance in this matter will be greatly appreciated. Please feel free to call upon us for further information if necessary. Thanking you for anything that you can do for us, we remain,

Respectfully yours,
BEACON FALLS (CONN.) REPUBLICAN TOWN COMMITTEE,
F. G. MORGAN, *Secretary.*

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of March 22, 1950]

CZECH IMPORTS HIT HAT CITIES, TARIFF URGED—SLAVE LABOR THREATENS TO MAKE DANBURY GHOST TOWN, AFL CHARGES—PROTEST PLANNED—IMPORTS UP 300 PERCENT FROM BEHIND IRON CURTAIN SINCE WAR

Iron curtain slave labor is threatening to reduce the hat manufacturing city of Danbury to a ghost town, it was charged by an AFL spokesman in Washington today.

With 62 percent of its employment depending on the hat industry and allied trades, the city is being crippled by a wave of imports from Communist-dominated Czechoslovakia, it was charged by Mark Lewis, general secretary of the United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers International Union.

Citing Danbury as an example, Lewis said the American hat worker cannot compete with slave labor and survive. He was in Washington as a member of the executive committee of the National Labor-Management Committee on Foreign Trade Policy.

Labor and management have combined in a demand for tariff walls against foreign imports of long felts for women's millinery which increased 300 percent in 1949.

In Norwalk, where the hat trade is also the largest single industry, Thomas J. Wall, president of the Norwalk Hat Co., asserted that the Czech imports were the largest in 1949 for any single year in more than 15 years and were affecting industry in an alarming manner.

Mr. Wall protested sending good American dollars behind the iron curtain to compete with our workers.

It could not be determined immediately how seriously Czech imports had hit employment in Norwalk, but in Danbury short work schedules were in effect in several plants during an ordinarily busy season.

The American market has been flooded with long felts—now used in women's millinery—from overseas, with many manufacturers finding themselves overstocked with domestic material of short felt type, it was said.

In Washington, the labor-management committee, representing nearly a score of industries which feel they are being unfairly affected by foreign imports, met in closed session to discuss the problems raised by America's foreign-trade policy.

Representing the hat industry with Mr. Lewis is David Harshaw, president of the Hat Institute, Inc., and president of the John B. Stetson Co., whose main plant is in Philadelphia.

"The position of the hat industry," Mr. Lewis said, "is similar to that of the other industries represented in the National Labor-Management Committee on Foreign Trade Policies. It's this," he said:

"A billion dollars' worth of imports won't seriously affect the American economy. But if only a few industries, and especially smaller industries, are made to assume a disproportionate share of the burden caused by such imports, then the situation can be ruinous."

He said it is planned to present the hat industry's problem to a House labor subcommittee set up to study the effect imports are having on American labor and employment.

"Meanwhile," he said, "the United States Tariff Commission is conducting a preliminary survey of the hat industry's problems.

"If that survey shows what we are certain it will show, we shall demand a thoroughgoing investigation," he said.

"It has been suggested by some Government spokesmen that hat workers and others similarly affected try training for other types of work," Mr. Lewis said, and added:

"It won't work. Hat workers have been in the industry too long to be retrained for other work."

National Negro Newspaper Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the vigor and enlightenment of the Negro press is well exemplified by the appended editorial from the New York Amsterdam News of March 4, 1950, on the event of National Negro Newspaper Week. It is

the most eloquent testimony of the reliance by Negroes upon the validity of our constitutional process, and the sense of justice and fair play of the American people that they are placing their greatest efforts behind the winning of public support through disclosure of the facts and discussion of their implications, the particular function of newspapers.

The editorial is as follows:

OUR MAJOR CHALLENGES

This year's observance of National Negro Newspaper Week, February 26 to March 4, marks the one hundred twenty-third anniversary of the founding of the Negro press by John Brown Russwurm. Newspapers founded, published, and edited by Negroes more than 100 years ago served similar purposes in their time as the minority newspapers do today. They were and are largely organs of protest, watchdogs of civil and citizenship rights, and reporters of life and activities of their communities. Each Negro newspaper has had to meet the challenge of its own era and attempt to solve the problems of its own time, region, and needs.

The history and service of the Negro press, like those of other institutions, are praised by some and blamed by others. But it is not easy to find another institution in the United States that has given and achieved so much with so little material support from those whom it has served. In the meantime, however, the Negro press has grown in influence, power, and service. Today, its circulation runs into millions of printed copies and many millions of readers, drawn from every walk and activity of life.

President TRUMAN cited the Negro press as a vigorous champion of minorities, and declared: "In recent years it has become increasingly a reporter of the condition of human rights the world over." Gov. James Duff, of Pennsylvania, praised the Negro press as a guardian of constitutional rights. The Negro press can claim with pride the praises and honors bestowed upon it by Presidents and governors; it can also claim much more than they have mentioned.

Champion, guardian, defender of rights, liberties, and privileges, the Negro press has also served as leader, reporter, interpreter, of the cause of Negro progress and the democratic way of life. Its responsibilities are to race, community, Nation, way of life, and to the world. In these days, when the future and welfare of minority groups are so closely related to the welfare of larger groups throughout the world, the Negro press would do well to prepare itself for a larger and more important role in shaping the thoughts and directing the actions and lives of its community of readers.

The decline of Europe, the rise of the United States, the Soviet Union, and the nations of Asia and the Pacific have placed Africa and the peoples of African descent in a new setting and given them a new importance in the economy, government, and defense plans of the world.

A new and larger world view of human problems, their implications and relationships must now take a more important place in the scheme of the Negro press than they have ever taken in the 123 years since the publication of Freedom's Journal.

The so-called Negro problem in the United States is not what it was even 10 years ago. It has lengthened into only one of many vexing problems which a growing Nation of all races, colors, creeds, and nationalities must face courageously.

The role, then, of the Negro press is becoming more and more one of devotion to principals, accurate knowledge of issues and problems, and courageous leadership on local, national, and international levels. Dissatisfaction of the right purpose will justify and vindicate the names and purposes for which the Negro press was founded.

Revenue Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I am introducing today is a revenue revision bill representing the accumulated recommendations of many years of the American Bar Association, acting after exhaustive analysis and study by its tax section, which is composed of several thousand members of the bar of the country who are particularly interested in the field of taxation.

The purpose of this bill is to correct a great many of the inequities, largely of a technical nature, which presently exist in our vast tax system. The bill is identical with H. R. 7738, introduced on March 16, 1950, by my distinguished colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. CAMP. Mr. CAMP and I both feel that this legislation is and should remain nonpartisan because it is drawn with a view toward eliminating inequities and promoting a fair and better-administered tax system.

The tax section of the American Bar Association deserves the highest praise for its constructive work in this field. These distinguished lawyers have devoted themselves unselfishly to this task, not in the interest of their clients but in the general public interest of making our tax laws equitable in their application and better in their administration.

Unfortunately, there has been no general tax revision since the Revenue Act of 1942, and as a result there are a great many technical problems which have accumulated during the past 8 years which should be remedied with all possible dispatch. It is unfortunate indeed that these inequities and discrepancies, which are bound to develop in any tax structure as complicated as ours, have had to await correction for so long a period.

The provisions of this legislation do not primarily affect the revenue. The inequities dealt with are not social or economic in their nature, such as, for example, whether one particular group of taxpayers should be taxed more or less than another group, but are technical in character and are generally recognized as inequities by persons familiar with the practical operation of our tax laws.

A detailed explanation of the individual provisions of the bill prepared by the tax section of the American Bar Association was included in the extension of remarks by my colleague, Mr. CAMP, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 16, 1950, in pages A1978–1985 of the Appendix. This clear and excellent statement will be of inestimable value to the Ways and Means Committee and to the Congress, and it reflects the high caliber of work which these gentlemen have done.

It is a distinct pleasure to me to join my distinguished colleague, Mr. CAMP, in introducing this nonpartisan legislation embodying the tax recommendations of the American Bar Association. These highly meritorious recommendations deserve the most careful consideration, and favorable action should be taken by the Congress without delay.

United States Urged To Avoid Reds' Smear Tactics in Fighting Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Russell Barnes that appeared in the Detroit News of March 20, 1950:

UNITED STATES URGED TO AVOID REDS' SMEAR TACTICS IN FIGHTING COMMUNISM

(By Russell Barnes)

Japan used thought police to stifle political opposition.

Communists and Fascists destroy enemies of their reigns of terror with anything from death to massive doses of castor oil.

Totalitarian governments generally deal with political foes in special courts, where defendants are stripped of normal legal protections.

While communism is a dangerous menace, extremely difficult to combat in a democracy, such attacks as the one Senator McCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, has been making on the State Department, raise these questions:

Are we beginning to copy Communist and Fascist tactics in this country?

Is it good American policy to sacrifice traditional freedoms and rights, legal procedures evolved over centuries to protect the individual, and the principle of competition in ideas as well as business, under the guise of fighting communism?

If we continue to smear persons in congressional investigations—where they have no legal protection—condemn people because of associations with individuals or organizations which may or may not be subversive, and see a Communist in anybody who has ever read Marx, is it possible we may destroy the traditional American system and end up with a kind of totalitarianism not too different from communism or fascism?

What chance is there of getting competent public servants when they are made targets for political abuse not based on concrete evidence of misconduct?

QUESTION OF POLICY

Unquestionably there have been—may still be—Communists who occupy strategic positions in Government.

But is it good public policy to destroy American freedoms and rights—debase our system to the deplorable standards of communism and fascism—to capture a few culprits?

Is there any real evidence that Communist subversion handicapped our war effort, or has prevented us from maintaining a decent national standard of living since the war?

Is there any good reason to believe that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the police, and regular courts are incapable of dealing with the internal Communist menace?

The difficult problem of combating a subversive opposition without sacrificing traditional American freedoms and rights is not new. We were faced with the same problem when the Nazis and Fascists before the war attempted to build up fifth columns inside the United States.

HUMAN DECENCY

One of the great modern tragedies has been the extent to which democracies have had to cheapen themselves—drop their standards of human decency—to fight totalitarianism.

But how far should methods necessary in war be carried over into the peace, and applied against American people?

In his book Leaves From a Russian Diary, Pitirim A. Sorokin, the Harvard sociologist, comments that one of communism's biggest successes is that it has changed even its implacable enemies into its own image.

"Fighting the revolution, these enemies introduced into their group many traits of the revolution which they are fighting against," declared Sorokin.

The big American problem is obviously how to fight communism, and still preserve traditional freedoms and rights inherent in the American system.

Republican Headline Hunters on a Fishing Expedition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial entitled "Fishing in the Records," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 22, 1950:

FISHING IN THE RECORDS

The demand that he open the loyalty files of the State Department people accused by Senator McCARTHY compels the President to make a very difficult decision.

The State Department urges that the files be made available to the Senate subcommittee investigating the complaints. Presumably it feels that the files contain nothing detrimental to the accused individuals, and that the best way to silence Senator McCARTHY is to let the subcommittee members look at the records.

The Department of Justice and the FBI are strongly opposed to this. They are afraid of the precedent that might be established. They think that if one committee is allowed to see confidential loyalty files it will be very difficult to deny the same privilege to other committees. There is also the problem of leaks. No matter what precautions are taken, there is always a danger that some committee member will tell what he has seen. If this should happen, the FBI fears that its sources of information would dry up, that its effectiveness in counterespionage work would be seriously impaired.

In this dilemma, there is talk that the President is thinking in terms of compromise—that he may let the subcommittee see some or all of the State Department records, but not the FBI files. There is small chance that this would do any good. For Senator McCARTHY and his supporters would say—and it would seem plausible—that the investigators had been permitted to see only the meaningless files, that the real evidence was in the still-secret files of the FBI. It is worth remembering in this connection that State Department critics already have hinted that incriminating material may have been removed from the State files.

There is still another aspect of this matter which deserves some consideration. The demand that the files be opened is not coming from persons charged with disloyalty. The situation is not that of an accused man demanding to be confronted with his accusers and the evidence against him. It is Senator McCARTHY, a third party to the relationship between the State Department and its employees, who is calling for the production of the records. And Senator McCARTHY is in the strange position of saying, in effect: I have made certain charges against these people. The proof of those charges is in the secret files, which I have not seen. But if the subcommittee will insist on having access to the files it will find the evidence.

In other words, this business looks very much like a fishing expedition. And it is hard to see why any one should be permitted to fish in the Government's loyalty files—files which presumably contain everything from valid evidence, pro and con, to the rankest sort of unevaluated rumor and gossip, all collected and filed on the understanding that it would not be made public. The Star has never believed that the Federal loyalty program, properly conducted, was a threat to the reputations of innocent people. But this threat can become a very real one if the files are to be opened at the behest of every Tom, Dick, and Harry who may decide to sound off with sensational accusations and little or no supporting evidence of his own.

Address of Hon. Adlai E. Stevenson, Governor of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, before the Illinois Housing Day banquet in Chicago:

The principal task that confronts every public administrator is attracting and keeping in public service enough talented and disinterested men and women to carry on effectively the many activities that comprise government. But I have not, I am happy to say, had to concern myself with the State's responsibility in the all-important field of housing, thanks to Mr. McFayden, the State housing board, and to many of you who are numbered among the 600 Illinois citizens serving without compensation on the 118 local housing authority boards in our State.

And I am glad to have this opportunity, while welcoming our distinguished guests from Washington, to give thanks for you, the soldiers of the line, who have given so generously of your time and energy without pay. I'm proud that Illinois has more local housing boards in active operation than any other State to lead the attack against our hardy, stubborn twin enemies—bad housing and no housing.

And we are thankful to the leaders of the private building industry who have participated in this conference and helped so extensively to break the building blockade during these trying postwar years.

The efforts and devotion to this important task of all you people and of the many public officials working with you is the only assurance we have that one day soon we will be able to substantially overcome the housing shortage that still plagues our State. You are the best hope for promoting and perfecting the teamwork between Government and private builders that long and frustrating experience has shown us is the only ultimate solution of our housing needs.

I'm told we are getting better teamwork and better understanding between public and private efforts. Last year the figures for private-housing construction broke the record. And now the Federal Housing Act of 1949 presents a great opportunity to correct many of the worst conditions throughout the country, and especially in populous States like Illinois, which are prepared to take advantage of its provisions.

I'm proud, too, that not since the passage of that act has any State attempted to do what we have tried to do here at this housing conference today. This is a pioneering effort to mass our forces, to enlarge our resources, to organize, to educate. Why? Because everyone in this room knows that in spite of all the accomplishments and all the selfless good citizenship and effort, the job has not been done and we have not yet provided housing that thousands of our people can afford to build or rent.

And so tonight we hand out no prizes, we distribute no rewards. It is too early. The fight has just begun, and the people will get no comfort out of self-congratulations here tonight.

Rather, let this meeting give evidence that we recognize that there is still an acute housing shortage in Illinois; that we have learned long since that no single group, public or private, can do the job; that only a direct, bold, and sustained drive by all segments of the public, by all agencies of the local community, the State, and the Federal Government can do it.

The formula is so obvious, the tools and weapons now so many and powerful, that such a drive by men of good will and sincere purpose cannot fail.

I could imagine no better earnest of ultimate success in our frontal attack on the menace of slums and bad housing in Illinois than this meeting itself. When public housers and antipublic housers, community leaders, bankers, labor leaders, private citizens, and public officials all sit down together to concert their power and purpose to search out the cause and cure of a widespread public malady, I think we are on the way. That it is a public malady none can deny.

Even a king of England said about 30 years ago: "It is not too much to say that an adequate solution to the housing question is the foundation of all social progress." Since the turn of the century criminologists and penologists have been directing their attention to bad housing as a spawning ground for juvenile delinquency and crime. Wherever housing is substandard, with inadequate sanitation and overcrowded living conditions, families doubled up or divided, normal family life is impossible and the juvenile delinquent and adult criminal are a natural product. The result is that a disproportionately large percentage of the inmates of our penal institutions are drawn from the slum communities of America. Only last Saturday I spent the day visiting the prisons at Joliet and I have most vividly in my mind this disastrous consequence of slum living.

In one section of the city of Chicago, 200,000 people are crowded together into three square miles. From among these 200,000 people, a mere one-twentieth of Chicago's population, come one-fourth of the total homicide and rape offenders and one-eighth

of all reported robberies. The direct relationship between crime and environment is all too common in American cities. The slums of Detroit produce five times as many crimes, and fifteen times as many criminals per 1,000 of population as do areas with adequate housing facilities.

These experiences are repeated with monotonous regularity in the criminal statistics of a score of other American cities. The total effect reveals a sordid pattern of slum-bred crime for the Nation as a whole. Every town and every city which has a blighted area is supporting a hidden subsidy all the time.

Just as the relation between bad housing and crime is definitely established, so has the beneficial effect of adequate housing become evident in many cases. The rates of juvenile delinquency and adult crime show marked decreases where good housing has been developed on former slum sites. The juvenile delinquency rate for the area now occupied by the Jane Addams public housing project in Chicago, for example, was cut in half when the slum dwellings were replaced by decent housing.

I believe there is no dispute among the sociologists that one of the greatest obstacles in the reduction of delinquency and crime in America is the slum, and that its eradication and replacement with a wholesome community is the most effective positive step we can take.

In short, the housing problem is a tremendous social problem. That is why I believe the money and effort we put into better housing are a sound investment. The housing shortage is not a political issue; its shame is the shame of all of us; its correction is the duty and the obligation of all of us.

Last year, as I have said, more housing units were started than in any previous year. Yet it cannot be overlooked that nearly all of this new supply of housing is outside the reach of a large portion of our population. And it must be remembered also that since the record year of 1925 our population has grown by many millions and the annual production of our economy is several times larger. So we can only conclude that 1949 was but the beginning of our effort to house America properly and here in Illinois there is much yet to be done. In the poetic prose of the late Justice Cardozo: "The inn that shelters for the night is not the journey's end."

Hence, it is proper on this day, which has been set aside as Illinois housing day, that we consider our position and where we can go from here. The simple fact is that the housing shortage has been with us too long. The highest legislative bodies of the Nation, the State, and even of this very city have long ago formally recognized that it cannot be cured without governmental aid. We have the legal equipment, we have the organization machinery, we have an unrefilled enumeration in our local housing boards, we have city money, State money, and now we have this huge Federal assistance program. If we have the will, the heart and the common horse sense, we can do the job without much more debate, consideration and recommendation.

The aim, as I understand it, of the Federal Housing Act is to encourage, not compete with private housing. It seeks to encourage home ownership, which has been one of the strongest planks of American life. It provides for the elimination of slums and for making these sites available to private builders. It allows local communities to decide if and how they wish to participate. It provides for an industry-wide study of building costs to find out how the expense of home building can be reduced.

These are all sound objectives which I believe most people approve. But there is widespread objection to the public housing features. You don't have to approve the principle of public housing or the idea of Government subsidies for some at the expense of everyone, to recognize that without public housing, it is generally conceded that only a limited and unsatisfactory answer to the slum problem can be expected. What's more we all realize that the new Federal act, or any Government subsidy, can never be the whole answer—that the housing deficiency can only be met in the final analysis by full-scale private building.

So it would seem to me that the public housing debate is over; that it is an essential step to slum eradication and better and low-cost housing. Our task, then, is to see that every local community in Illinois which wishes to take advantage of the public housing provisions of the Federal law has the opportunity to do so. Seeing that they do have this opportunity is the responsibility of each local housing board and each city administration. Some local housing authorities in Illinois already are taking steps to get projects under way. I hope that every community at least has the opportunity to consider the question fully in the light of its own needs.

I know that there are sharp differences of opinion among the many interests involved in the total housing problem—real estate men, private builders, mortgage bankers, labor, public officials, and housing officials. I know that there are differences of opinion, sincere differences, about the merits and even the need of public housing, about the selection of sites for housing projects and slum clearance. I don't decry such differences. These are an inherent, essential process of public policy formulation. But propaganda attacks against public housing on the one hand, and the private building industry on the other, serve no good purpose; nor do prejudice, hate, and selfishness. Rather, they destroy public confidence in the sincerity and ability of all these groups and agencies to work together.

I am not unmindful of the danger of over-simplification in a matter so complex. And I hope you don't think me one of that not uncommon breed who seems to believe that, to be facetious, by just being voluble the problem at hand is at once rendered soluble. I don't presume to say or know how the money should be spent; what types of dwellings should be built, where projects should be located and slum clearance undertaken.

But I do say that all these differences and all these considerations have been before us for a long time—as long as the housing shortage we are here to solve. The men, the machinery, and the money are at hand. And I feel that I can urge the responsible representatives of the various aspects of the housing field to seek more areas of agreement on a sound and constructive critical plane in keeping with the dignity of the industry they represent and the urgency of the problem they confront. Nothing will be accomplished by name calling, prejudice, superstition, political selfishness, and emotional exhibitionism.

It should be our purpose to encourage the contribution of what is called private or free enterprise in the solution of the housing problem. It should be no less our purpose to encourage the solution of this stubborn social and economic ill by the use of public authority and assistance in those areas where private enterprise cannot or will not reach. There is room for a great and purposeful partnership of which the people of Illinois will be the beneficiary.

For my part I hope we never hear again that grim jest: "America, the land of the free and no homes for the brave." May this day mark the resolution of Illinois to solve its slum and housing problem, to penetrate new frontiers of living, not in spite of one another, but together.

Pacific Northwest, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Chemical Engineering for September 1949:

PACIFIC NORTHWEST—1960

(By Ivan Bloch)

If the table above is anywhere near right, the Pacific Northwest is going to be quite a chemical center by 1960. Look at some of the minimum predictions: triple superphosphate to go from 60,000 tons in 1946 to 350,000 tons in 1960; that is a hike of 580 percent. Aluminum to jump from 148,000 tons to 1,300,000; up 780 percent; sulfuric acid up 380 percent; acetylene up 580 percent. And these are minimum predictions.

Such expansion seems fantastic, but it's all in the cards according to a report issued last October by the Army engineers. (Editor's Note: "Review Report on Columbia River and Tributaries," a many-volumed work released only for technical review and prepared to justify further hydroelectric development of the Columbia Basin. Its industrial sections were compiled for the Army by a group of technicians and economists under the author's direction while he was with Bonneville. For 2 years, 1945–47, they studied the industrial potential of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and western Montana. Their forecasts are based on three assumptions: That full employment and full production continue; that no major depressions or wars intervene; that power development is not allowed to lag industrial demand. Incidentally, power shortage has already turned away some would-be manufacturers during the 2 years since the report was written.)

Here is what the report has to say about the future of the chemical process industries in the Northwest, together with some comments on developments since the report was written. These are the high lights.

Aluminum: The report's almost unbelievable estimate for 1960 aluminum production, one and three-tenths to one and eight-tenths million tons, is based on a thorough analysis of potential United States markets. (See aluminum table.) Most of the potential market was allocated to the Northwest on the assumption that adequate power resources will not likely be developed anywhere else.

To match this aluminum reduction capacity the Northwest could use an annual one and nine-tenths to two and nine-tenths million tons of alumina production. Alumina now comes by rail from southeastern plants at Hurricane Creek, Baton Rouge, and East St. Louis. The Northwest could save as much as half the freight bill by building its own alumina capacity, figuring 15 to 25 years to amortize the new plants.

The Northwest has several possible sources of raw material for alumina production: It is feasible to import foreign bauxite. Clays of relatively high alumina content are abundant in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. There are billions of tons of anorthosite in Wyoming along the Union Pacific Railroad. And perhaps most interesting of all, there are the now well-known laterites (ferruginous bauxites) of northwest Oregon and southwest Washington. These deposits are estimated at 10,000,000 to 20,000,000 tons, averaging 31 percent alumina, 23 percent iron, and 11 percent silica. For the past 4 years Alcoa has been working on the laterites: Exploring, blocking ore, and ostensibly making metallurgical and chemical tests.

There appear to be at least two ways to process laterite ores: (1) A modified Pederson process where ore is smelted in electric furnaces to a high silica pig iron and a calcium aluminate slag; the slag could then be treated by lime-soda-sinter process prior to utilization in a Bayer plant; (2) treatment of the ores as red mud involving lime-soda-sinter processing prior to Bayer processing, with high iron and silica residues providing a possible source of iron for a Northwest iron industry. As to clays, the experimental ammonium sulfate process plant at Salem, Oreg., apparently demonstrated that alumina could be made from Northwest clays, but as far as the experiment was carried, costs were not competitive with bauxite.

Production of these enormous quantities of alumina from bauxite or laterite would require enormous quantities of chemicals like sodium hydroxide, sodium carbonate—and pure calcium oxide; 3 or 4 years ago Alcoa started extensive exploration of some extremely pure limestone a barge haul away in southeastern Alaska.

Magnesium: The future for Northwest magnesium doesn't look as rosy as for aluminum. Compared with Dow's Gulf Coast plant, a seawater electrolytic plant in the Northwest would pay more for fuel and raw materials (like limestone, chlorine or salt, sulfur). On the other hand, electric power and other operating expenses would be less. The report concludes that 1960 might find a modest six-to-twenty-five-thousand ton annual production in the Northwest—if, as the report expects, the 1960 market for magnesium reaches the peak wartime demand.

Phosphorous industry: Sixty percent of United States phosphate rock reserves lie in a belt in southeastern Idaho, western Wyoming, northern Utah and parts of Montana. Yet in 1946 only 8 percent of our mined rock came from there. Two things account for this neglect. First, the extent of western reserves is not altogether known, though estimated at 8,000,000,000 tons of better than 40 percent tricalcium phosphate. And second, the industry and its thinking are focused on eastern markets and eastern deposits; the "distant" west is somewhat terra incognita.

The picture is clearing though. Soil nutrient deficiencies of the 17 Western States were studied and estimated at about 500,000 tons a year of P_2O_5, with which western phosphates began to look more interesting to the fertilizer companies. To meet the interest, the Interior Department has for 3 years been promoting geological exploration, mining development work, research on rock beneficiation, investigation of markets and freight rates, and the revision of certain laws relating to public domain on which most of the western reserves are located. As a result new plants have been established or are being built and many more are in the wind. The report predicts tremendous expansion. (See big table and small phosphates table.)

The report goes into detail on phosphate cost factors. Mining costs would be about the same as in Tennessee, somewhat higher than Florida. Some areas might be strip-mined but most would have to be underground. High-grade rock lies in veins 4 to 7 feet thick and ranges from 30 to 34 percent P_2O_5, or 65 to 80 percent tricalcium phosphate. In these, the rock usually contains less than 2 percent iron and aluminum combined; it contains less silica than Florida rock. Some of the lower-grade rocks (30 to 50 percent tricalcium phosphate) are 75 to 100 feet thick. In certain locations the rock contains vanadium fractions, as V_2O_5, ranging from 0.1 to 0.5 percent. Experimental work by Federal agencies seems to indicate the need for nodulizing prior to charging in the electric furnace. On the other hand, recovery of vanadium fractions may yield juicy byproduct credits.

Estimators vary on the cost of producing elemental, electric furnace phosphorus in the western phosphate area. The report figures $140 a ton, based on 1946 costs and assuming 3 mills per kilowatt-hour for power. Coke costs to a western plant would be somewhat higher than to one in Tennessee; silica rock or gravel (for fluxing) would be about the same; 3-mill power, if it gets down to the phosphate area, would be under Tennessee and much less than Florida.

Phosphoric acid, the report says, could be made in the West by the combustion of elemental phosphorus for $39 a ton for 75-percent acid, or $26 a ton for 50-percent acid.

Triple superphosphate (48 percent available P_2O_5) could be made by electric furnace methods for $31 a ton in bulk, $34.50 bagged (which amounts to $64.50 and $72 per ton of equivalent P_2O_5). Into these costs the report has figured plant investment, labor, power, raw materials and all other costs, except selling and distribution. There is little future for production of ordinary superphosphate or sulfuric acid methods; the long haul from the Northwest to consuming markets precludes all but highly concentrated products. Best bet, says the report, is elemental phosphorus, shipped by tank car to consuming areas and there converted to phosphoric acid and on to fertilizer.

Some angles of the fertilizer story weren't hit by the report: There is a good chance that ammonia production, based on Wyoming natural gas, will come to pass in the near future. Production of concentrated fertilizer by the wet process may come if they recover sulfur from this same Wyoming gas.

Sulfuric acid in 1945, according to the report, the Northwest's two sulfuric acid plants—one at Anaconda, Mont., the other at Du Pont, Wash.—contributed less than 1 percent to the national total (see big table). A growing Northwest chemical industry will push the demand up considerably (see sulfuric acid table) and some expansion has already started. American Smelting & Refining is building an acid plant to recover smelter gas at Tacoma, and Kennecott Copper is expanding its acid plant at Garfield, Utah. Wyoming's natural gas is being developed as a local source of sulfur. Stanolind recovers some 75 tons a day from its unitized gasoline operation at Powell, and Texas Gulf Sulphur is reportedly getting set at Worland to produce 300 tons a day by 1950. Up to now the west had had to rely on imported Gulf sulfur or on smelter gas.

Calcium carbide: Analyzing the markets for calcium carbide, the report finds that over 60 percent of the acetylene made from calcium carbide in the United States in recent years has been used to make synthetic chemicals; in the West the bulk goes for cutting and welding metals. There's no reason, as the report sees it, why the West cannot get into the acetylene chemicals act and push its carbide production up to seventy to one hundred and forty thousands tons a year in or around 1960. (See small calcium carbide table.)

Northwest carbide producers—there are two of them, in Portland—pay more for raw materials than other areas; but on the plus side of the ledger are an important saving on power and, quite recently, discovery of chemical grade limestone near Baker, Oreg. Looking at potential markets for acetylene, the report sees promise for the production of acetic acid and anhydride—these for the rayon industry that could take root in the Northwest's cellulose resources.

Rayon: At present the Northwest sends dissolving wood pulp to the East and brings back finished rayon products. The report thinks the West could now support its own rayon industry; population is growing by leaps and bounds; Los Angeles is the Nation's second largest tire-producing center; and California's textile industry is growing rapidly. California's markets and cotton linters would probably bring the rayon producers there, except that California has a water problem. So rayon will presumably go next door to the Northwest, where there is plenty of pure water, plenty of pulp, and plenty of all other raw materials either on hand or potentially available. The report looks for 68,000–88,000 tons a year from the Northwest by 1960 or so; it even names possible plant locations. (See rayon table.)

Carbon bisulphide: If rayon does go to the Northwest, it will almost certainly create local carbon bisulphide production—around 25,000 tons a year, says the report. (And carbon tetrachloride, dyes, solvents, and insecticides might easily follow carbon bisulphide.) Wood waste for charcoal will be an important asset to Northwest bisulphide producers.

Chlorine and caustic: These are already well established in the Northwest; two plants were built at Tacoma in 1928 and a third went up during the war at Portland. Pulp and paper will continue to be the major outlet but there is a good potential in chlorinated solvents, DDT, rayon, and chlorates. (See chlorine table.) In fact, since the report was written, DDT production started in the Northwest.

Cements: The report's estimated increase in cement production, 60 to 80 percent over 1946, is probably overconservative. (See Portland cement table.) Numerous big new dams will require large quantities of cement, and so will settlement of some 600,000 acres of new irrigated land in the Columbia Basin project in Washington. To meet these demands by dams and population, cement capacity in the Northwest should be increased from 6,500,000 barrels at present to nearly 11,000,000 barrels a year by 1950, according to a recent estimate by a Portland consulting engineer (K. E. Hamblen, before the annual AIME meeting in San Francisco, February 1949).

Two factors may play a part in this potential increase. One is the possible use of Lepol kilns; they seem to save fuel, and transportation of fuel oil is a heavy production expense in the Northwest. The other factor is the possible use of laterites (ferruginous bauxite) to make quick-setting cements; recent work in the chemical engineering department of the University of Washington makes it look feasible. And the competition in aluminous cement is not stiff; there is only one producer in the United States—which may encourage cement people to try another plant of this type in the Pacific Northwest.

Manganese: The report sees a reasonably favorable prospect for electrolytic manganese

production in the Northwest. Counting chiefly on a growing demand for ferrous and nonferrous manganese alloys it estimates electrolytic production at seven to fifteen thousand tons a year by 1960.

Since the report was written, however, Manganese Products, Inc., of Seattle, has stirred up interest in the production of manganese oxide by a sulfurous-sulfuric acid leaching process. This company's chemists have turned in good laboratory results; and plans are now afoot to give the process a whirl on a commercial scale at the Salem experimental alumina plant. They would convert the plant for the treatment of stock-piled manganese ores from Nevada and possibly some of the siliceous manganese ores of the Olympic Peninsula in Washington. If the new process pans out, the manganese oxide it produces could spur ferromanganese production at existing plants and stimulate a variety of important manganese chemicals, for batteries in particular.

Artificial abrasives: The report forecasts a sizable installation of abrasives capacity in the Northwest—eight to twelve thousand tons a year of silicon carbide and ten to twenty thousand tons of fused alumina. Reasons for this optimism are cheap hydroelectric energy and a rapidly growing market in the metal-manufacturing industries. Since the report was written, Carborundum Co. started its big new silicon carbide plant at Vancouver, Wash., and rumor has it that other producers have been exploring around in the Northwest.

Ten years ago, Pacific Northwest basic chemical industries were generally limited to those for the production of chlorine and caustic, synthetic resins, nonferrous metals, some fertilizer, and a few somewhat isolated products primarily related to agriculture and the forest industries. Since then, startling strides have been made, largely related to the rapid development of very large sources of low-priced electrical energy from the Federal dams at Bonneville and Grand Coulee on the Columbia River. Today the region produces over one-third of the Nation's supply of aluminum; it has expanded its position in the production of copper, lead and zinc; it has three major ferroalloy plants, two calcium carbide plants, a powdered-metal plant, several phosphate fertilizer units, more chlorine and caustic capacity, and many other new plants in both metallic and chemical fields. The region's population has grown by leaps and bounds: Since 1940 it has increased 37 percent as compared with 11 percent for the United States as a whole. Its hydroelectric supplies, once derisively viewed as economic monstrosities, are now unable to meet growing power demands of industry, home, and farm.

In general, the outlook for Pacific Northwest industrial development is decidedly favorable, even though it is to be expected that short-term readjustments will occur in line with seasonal trends. However, the relatively undeveloped status of the region's resources—many of which are unique in their importance to national security and prosperity—provide a foundation for wide expansion of industrial and agricultural production through the establishment of new processing and manufacturing plants. These cannot avoid reflecting the most advanced of techniques, ultimately giving the area a highly competitive structure and a lack of aging plant obsolescence. The growing consciousness of the area's industrial and business leaders toward research is another factor which bodes well for future development of the magnitude described.

PRODUCTION PROSPECTS

By 1960 the percent column on the far right should look a lot better.

Doubled production, or better, is expected of all but 6 of these items.

	1960, estimated Northwest production (thousand tons)		1946, estimated or actual Northwest production	
	Minimum	Maximum	Thousand tons	Percent of all United States
Phosphate rock mined	1,338	2,258	641	7.98
Phosphorus	110	187	----	----
Phosphoric acid	400	625	63	7.38
Phosphates	30	40	----	----
Triple superphosphate	330	550	60	18.62
Ordinary superphosphate	135	225	100	1.27
Sulfuric acid	225	380	60	.70
Calcium carbide	70	140	27	4.74
Acetylene (million cubic feet)	290	630	50	1.03
Acetic acid	4	15	1	.66
Chlorine	85	122	40	3.43
Caustic soda	109	158	46	2.46
Chlorates and perchlorates	4.6	7	4.5	20.45
Carbon bisulfide	25	27	----	----
Rayon	67.5	87.5	----	----
Wood pulp	1,635	2,344	1,740	16.4
Cement	1,560	1,700	927	3.01
Artificial abrasives	18	32	----	----
Aluminum, primary	1,300	1,800	148	36.10
Magnesium, primary	6	25	----	----
Zinc, primary slab	265	340	[1] 212	27.77
Lead, primary refined	130	180	70	20.70
Copper, primary refined	125	175	75	9.54
Antimony, primary	3	5	2.4	13.57
Electrolytic iron	5.4	36	7.9	22.5
Electrolytic manganese	7	15	----	----
Rolled steel	400	480	[1] 290	.48
Rolled stainless steel	5	20	----	----
Steel castings	40	50	22	1.53
Gray iron castings including pipe	140	190	75	.73
Malleable iron castings	6	8	----	----
Ferro-alloys	65	100	[2] 30	1.76

[1] 1945.
[2] 1947.

NOTE.—In making 1960 estimates it has been assumed that the differential between minimum and maximum represents the range under conditions of moderate employment.

Phosphates, 1960.—Power demand and phosphorus production

ELECTRIC FURNACE PRODUCTION OF PHOSPHORUS IN NORTHWEST

Consuming industry	Estimated 1960 production (net tons)	
	Minimum	Maximum
Phosphoric acid	800	1,600
Phosphates	15,000	45,000
Phosphate fertilizer	83,000	140,000
Total	100,800	186,600

POWER CONSUMPTION BY PHOSPHATE INDUSTRY IN NORTHWEST

Consuming industry	Estimated 1960 kilowatt-demand	
	Minimum	Maximum
Phosphate rock mining:		
Phosphoric acid	(1)	(1)
Phosphates	1,000	2,000
Phosphate fertilizer	8,000	12,000
Electric furnace operation:		
Phosphoric acid	1,500	2,000
Phosphates	24,000	73,000
Phosphate fertilizer	140,000	220,000
Other operations:		
Phosphoric acid	(1)	(1)
Phosphates	1,000	2,000
Phosphate fertilizer	19,400	22,900
Total	195,900	333,900

[1] Small amount is included in electric furnace operations.

Chlorine, 1960.—Markets accessible to Pacific Northwest producers

	Estimated 1960 demand (thousand tons)	
	Minimum	Maximum
Pulp bleaching:		
Pacific Northwest	45	[illegible]
British Columbia	15	[illegible]
Alaska	[illegible]	5
Chlorinated solvents, other chemicals	[illegible]	[illegible]
Water treatment, sanitation	[illegible]	5
Liquid bleach	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total	85	[illegible]

Sulfuric acid, 1960.—Markets in Northwest, exclusive of Utah and southern Idaho

For use in production of—	Estimated 1960 demand (thousand tons) (100 percent basis)	
	Minimum	Maximum
Superphosphate:		
Northern Idaho	12	28
Western Montana	[illegible]	57
Along Pacific Northwest coast	12	24
Ammonium sulfate fertilizer at Salem	----	61
Rayon at Tidewater	100	125
Sugar refining	----	7
Alcohol from wood waste	5	[illegible]
Chlorine and caustic soda	2	[illegible]
Aluminum sulfate	11	14
Explosives	12	15
Others	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total	[illegible]	[illegible]

Calcium carbide, 1960.—Markets accessible to Pacific Northwest producers

Use	Estimated 1960 demand (thousand tons)	
	Minimum	Maximum
Synthetic chemicals:		
Pacific Northwest	18	[illegible]
California	----	[illegible]
Cutting and welding metals:		
Bottled acetylene, Pacific Northwest	[illegible]	11
Shop-generated acetylene, Pacific Northwest	7	10
Bottled and shop-generated acetylene, other western States	[illegible]	[illegible]
Exports	4	[illegible]
Total	70	140

Aluminum, 1960.—Outlook for feasible markets in the United States

	Estimated 1960 aluminum requirements (million pounds)	
	Minimum	Maximum
Building products	[illegible]	700
Automobiles	285	1,280
Displacement of copper, mostly in wire and cable [1]	250	[illegible]
Trucks	211	968
Busses	[illegible]	55
Railroad cars	51	98
Aircraft	51	[illegible]
Displacement of zinc die castings [1]	14	[illegible]
All other uses	2,500	2,500
Total	3,772	[illegible]

[1] There is some duplication of figures representing displacement of copper and zinc because of the use of these metals in automobiles, trucks, and busses for which aluminum estimates were made without an analysis of metals displaced.

Rayon, 1960.—Annual production of viscose and acetate in Pacific Northwest

	Estimated 1960 production (million pounds)	
	Minimum	Maximum
Eugene, Oreg. (viscose)	[illegible]	50
Longview, Wash. (viscose)	[illegible]	80
Puget Sound area, Washington (viscose)	45	50
Willamette Valley, Oreg. (acetate)	----	25
Total	[illegible]	175

Portland cement, 1960.—Annual production rates by area in the Pacific Northwest

	Estimated 1960 production (thousand barrels)	
	Minimum	Maximum
Southwestern Oregon	[illegible]	[illegible]
Northeastern Oregon	375	430
Lower Columbia River area	[illegible]	[illegible]
Eastern Washington	5,000	1,470
Puget Sound area	4,000	5,130
Southern Idaho	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total	[illegible]	[illegible]

House Lobbying-Activities Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

AGENDA FOR OPENING SERIES OF PUBLIC HEARINGS IN HOUSE LOBBYING-ACTIVITIES INVESTIGATION

Chairman FRANK BUCHANAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, today made public the agenda for the first three public hearings, beginning next Monday morning, in the investigation of all lobbying activities, including those of Government agencies, intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation.

Four college teachers and two specialists of the Library of Congress legislative reference service will participate Monday and Tuesday in sessions devoted to "The Role of Lobbying in Representative Self-Government." Budget Director Frank Pace, Jr., and Comptroller General Lindsay Warren will appear Thursday morning to discuss "The Role of Government Agencies in Influencing Legislation."

In addition to the chairman the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities includes Representatives HENDERSON LANHAM, Democrat, of Georgia; CLYDE DOYLE, Democrat, of California; CARL ALBERT, Democrat, of Oklahoma; CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican, of Indiana; CLARENCE BROWN, Republican, of Ohio; and JOSEPH P. O'HARA, Republican, of Minnesota.

The agenda for the first three sessions, all scheduled for 10 a. m. in the House caucus room, is as follows:

HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES—OPEN SERIES OF HEARINGS

1. The Role of Lobbying in Representative Self-Government.

Monday, March 27, 10 a. m., House caucus room.

Witnesses

Dr. Hadley Cantril, professor of psychology and director of the office of public opinion research, department of psychology, Princeton, N. J.; author of the Psychology of Radio, 1936; Invasion from Mars, 1941; Psychology of Social Movements, 1941; Gaging Public Opinion, 1944; Psychology of Ego-Involvements, 1947; Understanding Man's Social Behavior, 1947.

On the principle that Members of Congress by and large seek to represent public opinion in their districts as they interpret it, Dr. Cantril will discuss the factors which shape public opinion and thus, presumably, may influence the legislative process.

Dr. Stephen Kemp Bailey, assistant professor of government at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., author of Congress Makes a Law, 1950.

In the preparation of his book, which traces the birth, evolution, and metamorphosis of an idea for maintaining full employment into the Employment Act of 1946, Dr. Bailey interviewed hundreds of persons in the Congress, in Government agencies, and in various pressure groups for the story of the pulling and hauling which accompanied the development of this single piece of legislation. He will discuss the lobbying process in action on all fronts in that legislative battle in the Seventy-ninth Congress, occurring before the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act containing the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946.

Tuesday, March 28, 10 a. m., House caucus room.

A round-table or panel discussion in which the following experts, after making short, individual presentations on the specific phases of the subject as indicated, will then join informally with members of the committee in further discussion of the general theme of "The Theory of Identification and/or Regulation of Lobbyists by Legislative Bodies in the United States":

Dr. Edgar Lane, instructor in politics, Princeton University: Past Congressional Investigation of Lobbying.

Dr. Belle Zeller, professor of political science, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N. Y., author of Pressure Politics in New York (1937) and of numerous articles on State lobbying laws and on the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act: "How the States Have Approached the Lobbying Issue."

Dr. George Galloway, senior specialist in American Government for the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and formerly staff director of the LaFollette-Monroney Joint Committe on the Reorganization of Congress: "The Thinking Behind the Inclusion of Title III (the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act) in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946."

Dr. W. Brooke Graves, specialist in American Government and Public Administration for the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress; author of a special study for the Legislative Reference Service on the Administration of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act; now on loan to the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments as staff director of its Reorganization Subcommittee: "Operation of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act."

2. The Role of Government Agencies in Influencing Legislation.

Thursday, March 30, 10 a. m., House Caucus Room.

Witnesses

Frank Pace, Jr., Director of the Bureau of the Budget: The Budget Director will discuss the necessity in a Democracy for the Executive branch of Government to make policy recommendations to Congress in the fields of activity of the various agencies and departments; the machinery established for transmitting these recommendations to Congress, and indicating their conformance to the President's program.

Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General of the United States. The Comptroller General will report on the work of the General Accounting Office, as an arm of Congress, in investigating improper expenditures by Executive agencies or departments, including any designed to influence Congress in violation of the Criminal Code.

"My Country 'Tis of Thee, Sweet Land of Liberty"

REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Declaration of Independence was a firm and courageous expression of the people of the Thirteen Original Colonies against oppressive, unnecessary, and burdensome taxes, and the unjust, unfair, and arrogant administration of Great Britain under the reign of King George III and his governor generals and power-drunk bureaucrats.

We fought a long and bloody war to prove to Great Britain that we meant what we said in that Declaration of Independence. It made us a respected and a free nation—free from the domination of all foreign powers—free of all the rest of the world, except ourselves.

Our freedom, our liberty, and our independence have made us a great and glorious nation, but the very Government which we have formed, which we have fashioned ourselves to protect us from foreign domination, has been fast becoming our greatest burden, our greatest threat to freedom; yes, our greatest enemy to the liberty and independence we fought for more than 160 years ago.

What have we been doing to ourselves? Where is this freedom and independence we fought so hard to preserve, the freedom and independence in which we took so much pride, which made this Nation so great and glorious both at home and abroad?

Have we allowed the Government of the United States to become greater than the people who created it? Has it become the master instead of the servant of the people?

Are we allowing this power to rise in our midst without realizing it, greater than the power that Great Britain wielded over us under King George III which demanded a Declaration of Independence 160 years ago?

Wheeler McMillen wrote in a recent issue of the Pathfinder:

> The powers of government everywhere tend to revert to their ancient uses for oppression. In Russia estimates report seven to twelve million people subjected to forced labor. In the United States everyone is forced to work about 1 week out of every month for government. The difference is only one of degree.
>
> If in our Government the influence of one pressure group or another continues to push spending and taxes upward, the number of slave day per citizen must likewise move upward.

This is what is happening now; this is not ancient history nor is it a fanciful prophecy of some crackpot. It is a sound and logical appraisal of the condition of our Government today with a public debt of two hundred and fifty-six billion and an annual deficit of five and five-tenths billion we are spending ourselves into subjection of an all-powerful government centralized in Washington.

Have we forgotten the wisdom of Grover Cleveland who said:

The lessons of paternalism ought to be unlearned and the hard lesson taught that while the people should patriotically and cheerfully support their Government, its functions do not include the support of the people.

How different is the trend today with the demands for paternalism of all kinds from pressure groups from the Government with no thought of the loss of freedom and independence of the individual.

Even before the Declaration of Independence Benjamin Franklin said, "They that give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety. He who sacrifices his freedom for security loses both."

Many of those who look to the Government to do for them too many of the things they should do for themselves should heed the sound advice of Thomas Jefferson who said in a message to Congress in 1801:

Agriculture, manufactures, commerce, and navigation, the four pillars of our prosperity, are the most thriving when left most free to individual enterprise.

False propaganda and deception can delude and frustrate the people of this Nation just the same as it can and does the people of any other nation. Apt slogans and deft smears often carry more weight than sound common sense and logic in political campaigns.

The people of this Nation have withstood many a severe shock which has threatened our freedom and independence and unity in the past. Are we now to become the victims of our own folly? Is it not time to free ourselves from a rapidly growing trend in government that is sapping away our freedom and independence?

James F. Byrnes, a distinguished Democrat and former Secretary of State, said in a recent address at Washington and Lee University:

We are going down the road to serfdom. Where we will wind up no one can tell. But if some of the new programs seriously proposed should be adopted, there is danger that the individual, whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor, soon will be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state.

Are we so blind to our present danger that we will allow our Government to get so much out of the control of the people that it will be too late to correct or remedy the situation?

I believe the American people when thoroughly aroused to the present dangers will fight for freedom and independence rather than submit to servitude of an all-powerful government.

The abuse of power by the Government over the people can always be checked and controlled by the people in the United States because the powers delegated to the Government comes only from and with the consent of the governed. We must be alert to our responsibilities. We must not allow the Government to become greater than the people. We must cherish and guard our liberty and remember that liberty does not come from government. Liberty comes from the limitations of governmental power, not from the increase of its power over the people.

Address by Hon. Lewis Preston Collins, Lieutenant Governor of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 22, 1950, at 8:15 p. m., the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission, recognizing the tremendously vital role of music in our Nation's quest for freedom, in cooperation with the Army Band presented one in a long series of gala special events to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia.

A series of concerts are being presented by the United States Army Band, each being dedicated to one of the Original Thirteen States in the order of their admittance to the Union. The concert last night was dedicated to Virginia. The Honorable Lewis Preston Collins, Lieutenant Governor of Virginia, representing the Commonwealth of Virginia, was called upon to address the audience and, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including the address of Lieutenant Governor Collins on this occasion:

Down through the ages man's freedom has come, gone, and then come back again, to evolve a bit higher in its approach to the ideal—always limited, however, in its ascent by the realism of mundane values. It is this eternal quest which is man's supreme epic, clothed at times, in the misery of poverty, war, pestilence, servitude, and all of the repressions, natural and contrived, which have served to retard and to stifle this greatest of human adventures.

The dedication of this freedom-sings program to Virginia is an honor for which Virginia is grateful. It may be said with prideful modesty, I hope, that Virginia, with her Washington, Madison, Jefferson, Mason, Henry, Marshall, and countless others strove worthily in the establishment of a representative democracy with a constitution guaranteeing freedom as defined by a bill of rights indigenous to Virginia. This concept of our forefathers has more nearly provided the guaranty of individual freedom and therefore collective freedom, than any other concept birthed in all history. Thus our Nation, the greatest ever established, has come to live and play its historic part in man's epic quest for self-dignity and divine liberty.

From across the seas and here in our own land the fundamentals which insure freedom are being attacked, the fundamentals which are traditional, historic, and a part of the soul of Virginia. Virginia will not surrender them easily during interims of political pot-valiancy or expediency. We in Virginia yet subscribe to the philosophy that it is the function of Government to protect the individual in his basic liberties from all forms of tyranny and to provide for the individual equal opportunity under Government, striving as best we can honestly through evolutionary processes to solve our economic, social, ethnological, and traditional problems among ourselves in a peaceful manner.

It is not a part of us to lose freedom and liberty by creating a paternalism in government which tomorrow will be the tyrant to destroy the freedom of which we sing.

The motto: "Sic semper tyrannis" is ever appropriate in man's epic quest for freedom, and it is Virginia's motto in the truest and deepest sense, today as always.

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to speak on a matter that may come up for action in this House during this session, one on whom the other body has recently acted. I refer to the so-called equal rights amendment. In the form in which this measure was first brought to the floor of the Senate 2 months ago, it read:

Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

The Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

This proposal has been before the country almost 30 years, since the suffrage amendment was adopted. Some women have been consistently for it, others as consistently against it. I believe that those on both sides of this argument are women of good intention. They have all, in one way or another, in the past 30 years worked valiantly to promote the participation of women at all levels of government, to open up to women full opportunities for education and for jobs that fit their talents regardless of sex, to establish their dignity as persons and permit equal partnership with men in the complicated industrial society in which we live.

But the women who have worked for these goals are sharply divided on the question of how to reach them. They disagree on the consequences of putting into our Constitution a clause which says that "equality of rights" may not be abridged by law on account of sex.

Those who oppose this amendment, in the form in which it first came to the floor of the other body, and as I have quoted it above, are not opposed to "equality" and "equal rights in law" for women. But they do not want to lose for the working women what has been fought for and so painfully secured over the past 75 years—decent hours, minimum wages, sanitary working conditions, and so forth.

On one side, in favor of the original amendment, there is, for example, Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller and the present Minister to Luxemburg, Mrs. Pearl Mesta, both prominent Democrats. Distinguished Republican women also support it, the Honorable Senator from Maine, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, and my distinguished House colleague, Mrs. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE. But just as strongly against the original amendment are Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt, about whose championship of women's advancement there can be no shadow of doubt; Frances Perkins, former Secretary of Labor and now a member of the Civil Service Commission, both Democrats; Dr. Alice Hamilton, the pioneer in the conquest of industrial disease; Maybeth Paige, long a Republican member of the Minnesota State Legislature; and Anna Lord Strauss, president of the League of Women Voters. The Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor, which was set up by Congress to promote the welfare of women, has always been against this amendment, and the Labor Department itself, through both Republican and Democratic regimes, has held firmly to the position that the amendment would create new disadvantages and disabilities for women, instead of new opportunities.

For like reasons to those which have decided Mrs. Roosevelt, Frances Perkins, Alice Hamilton, and their colleagues, I, myself cannot endorse the equal rights amendment as I have quoted it. I believe it will destroy the protections for working women—there are now 18 million of them—that have been put on the statute books over the past 75 years. The struggle has been long and hard to get their hours of work shortened from 13 to 8 a day, and, through minimum-wage legislation, to raise their status from sweated labor to decent wage levels, particularly in industries where wages have been notoriously low. These measures have actually created for women workers something like an equal bargaining position with men in industry. As a matter of fact, raising the working standard for women has in many cases given impetus to raising the standard for men. No Federal wage and hour law, for example, was even attempted until the Supreme Court declared minimum wages constitutional for women. These laws have raised women out of the class of drudges whose work could be bought for almost nothing to a place that promises a level of health and decency.

Working women do not want these hard-won rights taken away from them. Their unions are firm on this point. The labor movement, through it two great national organizations, has consistently fought against the damage to working women's rights that would result if this amendment were passed. The amendment would also wipe out differences built up over the years to favor women as wives, mothers, and widows—the right of a widow to live in her husband's house, recognition of a mother's special interest in the guardianship of her children, the primary obligations of the husband and father for family support.

I myself am unwilling to see the hard-won gains of working women taken away from them, and I shall not vote for an amendment which legal experts say will do just this. My own record in this Congress shows my aggressive and consistent interest in the advancement of women. I have worked for equal pay for women—I have introduced a bill to establish this principle under Federal law; I have testified in favor of it before congressional committees. I have stanchly supported all efforts to keep down the cost of living, a subject near to the hearts of all women. I have introduced a bill which would permit working mothers to deduct the cost of a housekeeper from their income tax.

I have, in the interest of removing the remaining discriminations against women, sponsored a bill, the status of women bill, H. R. 2936, to determine where inequalities still exist, and to work out ways of getting rid of these inequalities. The remedy for these things is not in abstract feminist theory, based on the notion that identity of treatment with men is the solution to the special problems of women. The solution is, rather, in a rational and discriminating analysis of where the role of the sexes is the same and where differential treatment is required to create the genuine equality for women for which we are all striving.

The Senate recently debated the equal-rights amendment in the form I have quoted. Many Senators felt as I do, that they were unwilling to risk the loss of women's protections as wives and mothers and workers for the sake of the words "equal rights." The Honorable Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] then acted to guarantee that these rights would not be lost. He moved to amend the Senate resolution by adding the words:

The provisions of this article shall not be construed to impair any rights, benefits, or exemptions now or hereafter conferred by law upon persons of the female sex.

The Senate showed its understanding of the fundamentals of this argument when it voted to support Senator HAYDEN's amendment and attach it to the original resolution. The equal-rights amendment, as amended, passed the Senate by a vote of 63–19. If that measure comes before the House, I shall support it, secure in the conviction that women will not be stripped of the rights and benefits that not only protect them as individuals, but that create, for our whole society, a modus operandi based on reason and a genuine understanding of the complementary functions of men and women in our modern world.

Repatriation of Greek Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I am again calling the attention of Members of Congress to the plight of thousands of Greek children who have been abducted from their homes.

I include herewith the resolution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

Resolutions memorializing Congress relative to the repatriation of the children of Greece, who have been removed from their homes in Greece and detained in certain countries.

Whereas the General Assembly of the United Nations has formally announced that 28,000 Greek children have been removed from their homes in guerrilla camps in Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, and were forced to fight for guerrilla forces, and were finally sent by said guerrillas to the Communist countries of eastern Europe; and

Whereas the General Assembly of the United Nations has unanimously recommended the return of the children to Greece, has invited all member states and other states in whose territory said children may be found to take measures necessary to implement such recommendation, and has requested the national Red Cross organizations to assist in executing such recommendations and to aid these innocent victims in returning to their homes and their loved ones; and

Whereas some of these communistic countries within whose borders these children are held captive have opposed, with flat refusal, any cooperation with the Red Cross organizations, while others have temporized or given evasive answers in stating their intentions relative to the return of these children to Greece; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts, firmly believing in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human being, and in the equal rights of men and women, and of nations large and small, raises its voice in protest at the injustice and inhumanity perpetrated in the abduction and forcible detention, in lands outside their mother country, of these 28,000 children of the Hellenic nation and registers its indignation at the detention of these children under such conditions as evidence a complete disregard of every humane principle concerning family rights and the sanctity of the home; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges and petitions the Congress to reaffirm the tenets of the United Nations Charter, and to advocate most strongly that the United Nations General Assembly by rightful and lawful action implement its resolution adopted on November 18, 1949, relative to the repatriation of Greek children, so that these children of Greece may be saved from forcible detention and degradation, and be reunited with their people in Greece, thus insuring unto the people of all small nations the rights and privileges set forth in the Charter of the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth and to the representatives of the United States to the United Nations General Assembly.

The Reporter States the Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, this new magazine has been making a distinguished reputation in the field of helping our Nation plan for and implement its responsibility of world leadership, brought to it by the accident of powerful industrial and social organization rather than by design. Two significant contributions of the Reporter under the editorship of the distinguished Prof. Max Ascoli, are found in the appended excerpts from the January issue. The first is a juxtaposition of Soviet promises and Soviet fulfillment, the second is a timely warning about one of the most dire threats which faces not only world peace and security but the fundamental moral basis of all mankind. It discusses the grave danger of a new variation of the Molotov-Ribbentrop alliance of 1939 which signified the start of World War II, in a new alliance between a united Germany and an aggressively imperialistic U. S. S. R. arising out of the present stalemate and the revival of ultranationalism and former Nazi influence in the western German zones which the United States, Great Britain, and France now occupy:

PROGRESS OF A "PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY"

THE PROMISE

Yalta, February 11, 1945: "The provisional government which is now functioning in Poland should * * * be reorganized on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad. * * * This Polish provisional government of national unity shall be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot. In these elections all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part. * * *"

Potsdam, August 2, 1945: "We have taken note with pleasure of the agreement reached among representative Poles from Poland and abroad which has made possible the formation, in accordance with the decisions reached at the Crimea Conference, of a Polish provisional government of national unity recognized by the Three Powers. * * * The Three Powers note that the Polish provisional government of national unity * * * has agreed to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot in which all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates, and that representatives of the allied press shall enjoy full freedom to report * * * upon developments in Poland before and during elections."

THE FULFILLMENT

June 21, 1945: A Moscow court convicts 12 of 16 Polish leaders on charges of underground activity against the U. S. S. R.

August 29, 1946: A United States note charges the Government with curtailing democratic activity and with irregularity in a referendum held on June 30.

November 22, 1946: Poland receives separate notes from the United States and Britain recalling the Yalta pledge of "free and unfettered" elections.

January 19, 1947: A general election is held. Results: Government bloc, 394 seats; Peasant Party, 28; Catholic Work Party, 12; others, 10.

January 28, 1947: The United States State Department issues a press release stating that the Polish Government employed coercion against democratic elements, and that the Yalta and Potsdam agreements have not been fulfilled.

October 24, 1947: Peasant Party leader Mikolajczyk escapes from Poland.

February 7, 1948: The Peasant Party joins the Communist coalition.

March 18, 1948: Socialist leader announces proposed merger of Socialist Party into a single party with the Communists.

November 7, 1949: Russian Marshal Rokossovsky named Marshal of Poland and Minister of National Defense.

December 9, 1949: Boleslaw Bierut, chairman of the central committee, United Workers' Party of Poland, writes in the Cominform newspaper: "It is necessary to end rotten liberalism and to be more strict, morally and ideologically. * * * Our conception of a people's front has always been that the working class and its party are the guiding force. Any other conception of a people's front is detrimental and opportunist."

DEUTSCHLAND—THE KREMLIN'S RED HOPE

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

In the days immediately after the war, when the Soviet Union was building up its empire of satellites to the deadpan tune of anti-imperialist propaganda, most United States representatives in eastern Europe were acting like innocents abroad. The Communists charged that they were hatching an imperialist plot; reactionaries at home said they were conspiring with the Communists. Both accusations were, of course, pure nonsense. What really gave Russia a clear field was the naiveté of many American liberals, and the defeatism (often expressed in the theory of "inevitable" war) of many American conservatives. The effect of that mixture was the paralysis of American initiative and an easy victory for Russia in what otherwise might have been a very difficult undertaking.

The American innocents started with the supposition that the magic word "democracy" would fight its own battle. They believed that the promise of free speech and free elections—and an account of the possessions of United States workers and farmers—would be enough to make Democrats of any people and to defeat the totalitarian Communists. Actually, of course, such propaganda offered no remedies for the immediate problems of eastern Europe and no guaranties against its most immediate fear, which remained Germany.

The innocents failed to consider that the word "democracy" could be exploited unscrupulously by others. At Yalta the Russians merely asked that the eastern countries be turned into democracies friendly to the Soviet Union. When the western powers agreed, the U. S. S. R. proceeded to make these nations friendly—i. e., satellité. It did not, however, occur to the United States Government that these countries could well be expected to be friendly toward the west at the same time, and so the United States did not bother actively to court such friendliness.

Active courtship would have included the immediate support of all democratic elements against all totalitarian influences, including the respectable antidemocrats of the prewar days. It would also have involved vigorous backing of essential social reforms. It would, above all, have meant offering eastern Europe security against political, military, and economic domination by Germany. Instead, James F. Byrnes, our Secretary of State, made a public speech in Stuttgart, which, rightly or not, was interpreted by east and west alike to mean that the United States favored the restoration of Germany as the center of European gravity. Liberal elements in the United States Government, meanwhile, ducked out of the problem of abetting social reform in eastern Europe, on the ground that, since the people there had never known a democratic regime anyway, the Soviets might as well do the job.

In those days an American correspondent returning from any of the satellite countries was in a curious position. If he reported that there was still a chance for cooperation with the democratic parties in Poland or Czechoslovakia (before the February 1948 coup in the latter) he was the object of suspicious glances. The iron curtain had been drawn, he was told, and everyone in a responsible position behind it was either a Communist or a fellow traveler.

A vocal minority, powerfully represented in the American press, publicized this viewpoint. These defeatists imagined the iron curtain before it really existed. They gave Russia a green light in eastern Europe by saying in effect that democracy had been written off before it had actually died. The theory of an inevitable iron curtain helped make the iron curtain inevitable, just as the theory of inevitable war helps make war inevitable. Anyone who suggested measures of peaceful cooperation in eastern Europe—even with anti-Communist, democratic elements—ran the risk of being charged with appeasement.

Actually Prague and, to a lesser extent, Warsaw were then still free cities. In Warsaw, I obtained interviews with Socialist and agrarian members of the government, although the Communists had tried to prevent them from talking.

If the United States had attempted democratic infiltration at that stage, it still would have been comparatively easy, and might have been fruitful.

But many United States diplomats objected to dealing with any eastern European party whose political views were to the left of Herbert Hoover's. When Dr. Eduard Benes, confronted by the treason of his own cabinet, was blackmailed into signing away Czech democracy, he was actually the victim of a squeeze-play between Russia and America. If he resisted the demands of the Communists—as he said in a secret address to the Communist ministers—he would have run a real risk of civil war. The Communists were, of course, assured of active support by the Red Army; Dr. Benes had nobody to rely on, except his own party of National Socialists, for the prevalent American formula was "Socialist equals Communist."

Thus the United States, by its lack of realism, made it easier for the Soviet Union to take over the satellites. But the lion's share of the credit must, of course, be conceded to the planning and plotting of the Russian leaders. In their master plan, Germany played the central role from the outset. The tipoff was Russia's violent opposition to the inclusion of France among the occupying powers. At Yalta the Soviet leaders again and again made it plain that they did not want to replace a strong Germany with a strong France. Since no continental power except a strong France could ever hope to neutralize Germany, it is evident that Russia even then was determined to use a satellite Germany as the most direct means of ensuring Russian control of Europe.

Obviously the small nations of Europe, including the eastern satellites, were going to object to any such project. But Stalin and Molotov made it quite plain at Yalta that the small nations would not be asked what they wanted, nor be told what Russia

planned. (Indeed, Molotov once suggested irritably that the representatives of the United States stop worrying about public opinion and start telling the people what they were to do.) It was not surprising when eastern purges, arrests, and sentences soon began to thin the ranks of the democratic leaders in eastern Europe: They were labeled "Fascists," although most of them were members of the various anti-Communist socialist parties that Americans mistakenly lumped together with the Reds.

All this time—while they were steadily working for the creation of a satellite Germany—the Russians carefully exploited the small nations' fear of Germany and the obvious failure of the Americans to democratize their zone. In spite of the memory of Nazi-Soviet collaboration, this propaganda tune was effective, largely because the German record in eastern Europe was so horrible, the scars left there by the Germans so bloody and painful, and the blackout of Russia's real intentions toward Germany so tightly drawn. But by autumn of 1948 some light began to fall on the Russian intrigue to tilt the power balance.

Reports began to drift in from eastern Germany that the Russians were quietly sponsoring a movement for a strong and unified German nation. To do this without creating suspicion and hostility in the satellite belt, the USSR had to pursue a two-faced, two-voiced policy. Satellite newspapers continued to be fed material which portrayed Russia as the protector of eastern Europe against Germany; simultaneously, Russian-licensed papers in Germany were campaigning for revision of the German frontiers. They were quiet about the eastern Oder-neisse line, but they emphatically supported German claims to the Saar, and at every opportunity demanded the withdrawal of the Western powers, particularly the French.

In the course of 1949 it became increasingly clear that Germany—the eastern part at first, the rest later—was being groomed for the role of satellite No. 1. Nazis began to be reinstated in their old positions and promoted to better ones, provided they made no fuss about switching from one dictatorship to another. The people's police became the nucleus for an armed force, and the banners it carried around the cities documented the suspicions of many that the difference between national socialism and national communism was mostly a matter of nomenclature.

While Dr. Benes was being given a state funeral by the Communist government in Prague, newspapers in the Soviet zone of Germany referred to him as a murderer of innocent Sudeten Germans. Apparently the Soviet authorities agreed with those German sentiments. Some well-informed Germans, on the other hand, had noted that Karl Kretbich, chief ideologist for the present Czech régime, used to be a Sudeten German senator; that Evzen Erban, currently Minister of Social Welfare, was at one time secretary-general of a German-sponsored labor movement; and that Vaclav Kopecky, the Minister of Information, had on February 23, 1938, reproached Hitler for his failure to liberate the Sudeten Germans from the Czech republic. (Kopecky had spoken then for the small nations' right of self-determination, a slogan still used widely by Soviet propagandists, although Soviet leaders at Yalta opposed the small countries' rights in the United Nations.) Even within Czechoslovakia, the Communist hierarchy prepared for things to come by admitting into the party so many persons who had collaborated with the Germans that the Communists became popularly known as the immunists.

To explain away the speed-up in the satellization of eastern Germany, the Soviets began to pepper the satellite countries with alarmist diatribes against the west German government. Actually that speed-up became inevitable when the Communist timetable in France and Italy was upset, and especially when the whole structure of satellite solidarity was shaken by Tito's desertion. Tito's attractiveness to satellite Communists who feared Russo-German collaboration became a serious factor for the Politburo to contend with. One way it contended with it was by promoting German aims even more vigorously.

In a gigantic power-political game of this sort, an open switch of strategy calls for new security measures, particularly the protection of the rear. The Kremlin promptly charged Red Army Marshal Konstantin K. Rokossovsky with the defense of Poland. Polish territory thereby became little more than a zone of communications between Russia and Germany, ready to function as such whenever the Russians decide to withdraw from eastern Germany. Few would be surprised if by that time the German "army of liberation" should show up again (it and its commander, General von Paulus, have been missing since Stalingrad) to supplement the people's police with its elite Bereitschaften.

The only reason why no official change of command has taken place in Prague is that the Czech armies were placed under Moscow-dominated leadership in 1948, when practically the entire RAF-trained air force was discharged. It has become an open secret, too, that a young Russian colonel has taken over the intelligence.

The stage was set for the Russians' final move in the maneuvering that started at Yalta with their stand against France. Under Stalin's portrait Otto Grotewohl addressed the east German people as the new chancellor. A personal message from Stalin underlining the special status of the new member of the family was read. An amnesty restored full political rights to almost all Nazis and ex-officers. The Communist press, which had formerly attacked west German reconstruction, now fit into the dismantling program. The peoples' police intensified its recruiting drive, and staged Berlin's first post-Hitler torchlight parade.

By now it was time to tell the satellites and the people of Russia what had taken place; for now the double-face and double-talk had lost usefulness. Those who had flocked around the Kremlin for protection against a reconstructed Germany were told, on November 6, 1949, that their fears were no longer fashionable. "There can be no doubt," said Georgi M. Malenkov, secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, "that with the peaceful policy of the German democratic republic and the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union—peace in Europe can be regarded as secured." The new protector of the small satellites therefore was—Germany.

Unquestionably, the satellites have a fair idea of the meaning of this line-up. The Germans announced almost at once that they were about to send trade missions to Czechoslovakia and Poland, and they added promptly that the Kremlin had suggested such action. Unless Prague and Warsaw want to run the risk of being labeled "reactionary" and "fascist" they had better roll out the red carpet.

The eastern countries look with fear on Germany as a rival satellite, but Germany will not regard itself as a satellite at all. Although the new government may speak under the Soviet banner, it will see new opportunity in the role of pawn-turned-master. To German professional soldiers, an army is an army, even if it may call itself temporarily the People's Police. To German industrialists the market of eastern Europe is attractive; the prospect of economic domination there is far more promising than in the Marshall plan area, where the emphasis is on cooperation rather than on supremacy. The war has brought home to Germans the superiority of American industrial power, but they still feel technically ahead of the Russians.

Henceforth the lesser satellites will have more and more occasion to think of the Molotov-Ribbentrop alliance, and what it meant to Poland in 1939. The question remains whether they will also realize that American policy has undergone a rather remarkable change since the early postwar days of bungling. Dr. Benes' Socialists were abandoned to the Russians as unreliable "radicals," but Tito has not been denied American aid despite the fact he plainly calls himself a Communist. Land reforms in Italy have finally been given American approval. Economic "infiltration" into the eastern countries has just been recommended by Marshall plan officials. There are real indications that American policy planners are shedding both impractical idealism and pliant defeatism.

These are vital developments; for if the Polish Socialist and the Czech National Socialist begin to realize that a new link—perhaps an underground alliance—with the west is not a tie-in sale with laissez-faire capitalism, he may at last see an alternative. The United States this time did not insist that Tito hold free elections and declare democracy overnight. Our Government apparently is learning that white and black are unusual colors in the spectrum of European power politics; that various shades of gray must be tolerated to prevent them from turning darker.

Development of the Snake River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest developments remaining to be undertaken by our Government is improvement of Snake River between its junctions with Columbia River at Pasco, Wash., and the confluence of the Clearwater and the Snake River at Lewiston, Idaho. For years the Snake River has been navigated during the high-water season between Portland, Oreg., and Lewiston, Idaho. Congress in its wisdom has authorized the construction of a series of multipurpose dams on the Snake River navigable the year round up to Lewiston, Idaho.

Recently I appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee in support of the appropriation to construct the Snake River Dam at Ice Harbor. My statement made before the Appropriations Committee is submitted herewith for the consideration of my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO, BEFORE THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 22, 1950

ICE HARBOR DAM AND LOCK, LOWER SNAKE RIVER

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to speak before this committee. We have an empire to make in the Columbia and Snake Rivers in the Northwest, that needs the irrigation water, electric power, and building material of all kinds in the Columbia Basin.

Chairman McKELLAR. You said a multiple-purpose project; is that it?

Mr. WHITE. Multiple-purpose dam.

Before proceeding further, I would like to present for the record a statement covering this subject.

Chairman McKELLAR. Without objection, it will be placed into the record at this point.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

"Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this statement is made in behalf of the Ice Harbor dam and lock on the lower Snake River, and is the first of four dams authorized by Public Law 14 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, approved March 2, 1945. It has been approved by the United States engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and is the only authorized multipurpose self-liquidating project in the entire Northwest for which appropriations have not yet been made and construction started.

"As I understand it, the principal objective of rivers and harbors legislation is to improve navigation and prevent floods; and the Snake River dams meet those qualifications more perfectly than any project in the Pacific Northwest, in addition to supplying sufficient power to liquidate the entire cost.

"FLOOD LOSS IN COLUMBIA RIVER

"The annual estimated flood loss in the Columbia River is $18,000,000, and in the severe flood of 1948 the property damage was estimated at $180,000,000 in addition to taking approximately 50 lives. Nothing has been done since that tragic flood to give any assurance that such a flood would not recur.

"The Snake River is the largest tributary of the Columbia, supplying slightly more than one-fifth of the main annual run-off of the Columbia River. It rises in northwestern Wyoming, traverses the entire State of Idaho, irrigating some 2,000,000 acres on the way, and before joining the Columbia is joined by the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers of Idaho. The confluence of the Snake and Columbia Rivers is 140 miles below Lewiston, Idaho, and it is often the floodwaters of the Snake which created flood hazards in the lower Columbia River in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver and Longview, Wash.

"LOCATION OF LOWER ICE HARBOR DAMS

"The four authorized dams and locks on the Snake River are between the confluence of these two rivers and Lewiston, and will contribute materially toward controlling these floodwaters. These dams would also contribute greatly to navigation by providing slack water between Lewiston, Idaho, and the Columbia River and on down to the mouth of the Columbia River at Astoria, Oreg., a distance of 465 miles.

"This is not an entirely new navigation project, but merely the authorization to finish a project which is already 90 percent completed, because navigation between the Pacific Ocean and Lewiston has been carried on for exactly 100 years. We merely want channel improvements that will remove some of the hazards so that navigation for this entire 465 miles can be carried on at all seasons of the year with a greater degree of safety and economy.

"River navigation from the Pacific Ocean to Umatilla Landing, Oreg., is already a reality and the completion of the McNary Dam will provide slack-water navigation to the mouth of the Snake River and the four authorized dams on the Snake River, of which Ice Harbor is the first to be constructed, will provide slack-water navigation for the 140 miles from the mouth of Snake River to Lewiston, Idaho.

"The savings to farmers and businessmen by the reduction of freight rates on the Columbia River from Umatilla Landing (site of McNary Dam) are already tremendous, and since 75 percent of the potential river tonnage in and out of this inland empire is above McNary Dam, these four Snake River dams will increase the potential tonnage 300 percent. Fully 90 percent of this potential tonnage would not, under any circumstances, move over the railroads because freight rates would be prohibitive. Much of this would be in the shape of Government-owned timber, low-grade ores, lime, and phosphate from Government-owned land on which the Federal Government would receive substantial returns.

"NEED FOR RAW MATERIALS SHIPPED BY RIVER

"Most of these raw materials will be needed to improve the farms and build the towns which will spring up on the nearby Columbia Basin project where the Bureau of Reclamation is preparing to irrigate 1,250,000 acres with waters from the Grand Coulee Dam.

"In addition to contributions to flood control, navigation, irrigation, and reclamation, Ice Harbor dam and lock, upon completion, will produce 260,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power so sorely needed in the Pacific Northwest, and also increase the firm power at down-river projects like McNary Dam and Bonneville Dam by smoothing out and keeping uniform the river flow.

"I will leave it to the United States engineers and others to explain the details of this project, and to assure you that the fishing industry will be adequately protected by fish ladders similar to those which operate so successfully to carry salmon over the Bonneville Dam on the way to their spawning waters. But I want to say to this committee that no other project under consideration so perfectly combines flood control, navigation, irrigation, and reclamation as the Ice Harbor Dam and lock.

"While the benefits to navigation, reclamation, and flood control would alone justify this development, the hydroelectric power developed at Ice Harbor will return to the United States Treasury 85 percent of the entire cost of this project.

"AN EMPIRE IN THE MAKING

"We have an empire in the making on the Columbia and Snake Rivers in the Northwest that needs irrigation waters, electric power, and building materials of all kinds. In the area around the confluence of the Columbia and Snake Rivers at Pasco, Wash., and the immense territory where the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers flow into the Snake River at and near Lewiston, Idaho, we have between the main lines of the transcontinental railroads, the Northern Pacific Railway on the south and the main line of the Great Northern Railway on the north, there are 1,125,000 acres of fertile land in the Columbia Basin that is soon to be watered by the construction of a reclamation project. This project has cost our Government for the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam, the storage reservoirs, and diversion canals over $200,000,000.

"Thousands of farm families are eagerly awaiting the completion of this project to move into the sagebrush land and add another western empire to the fast-growing western communities. Productive farms, towns, and cities will spring up, prosper, and grow in this new farming area.

"Up river from Pasco and Lewiston in a drainage of the Snake, Clearwater, and Salmon Rivers there is a vast area containing a great abundance of undeveloped natural resources, mostly in Government ownership, potential waterpower, timber, lime, building stone, iron, copper, lead, zinc, and antimony—all awaiting development and cheap water transportation to market.

"Complementary to the Columbia Basin development now nearing completion, our Government has spent vast sums to improve the lower Columbia River for navigation by constructing locks at Bonneville, Celio Canal at The Dalles, and the McNary Dam near Umatilla Landing. The completion of the McNary Dam will open the Columbia for navigation to the mouth of the Snake River at Pasco. This will give an outlet to the wheat and farm products of the Walla Walla and Pasco countries, but the wheat and farm products of the rich Camas Prairie and large farming country surrounding Lewiston, together with all the vast industrial resources of central Idaho and eastern Oregon above Lewiston, is still awaiting development and cheap water transportation to market.

"Congress has recognized the need for the utilization of this natural river highway to float the building materials so abundant in central Idaho to where it can be used in building the towns, cities, and farmsteads down river on the Columbia Basin project; and the transportation of the farm and manufactured products to coastal markets, by authorizing the construction of the necessary navigation and multipurpose dam on the Snake River between the mouth of the Snake River at Pasco and the confluence of the Clearwater at Lewiston.

"Money, $12,000,000, for the construction of the first of these dams at Ice Harbor has been authorized but has been left out of the appropriation bill now under consideration.

"I most earnestly urge that the item for the construction of Ice Harbor Dam be restored and the appropriation be made so that construction work can be started without further delay."

EXPANDING DEVELOPMENT OF SNAKE RIVER BASIN

Mr. WHITE. In supplement of what my good neighbor and friend, Senator MAGNUSON, said about the use of power, the need of power in this country, in the first place, we have two of the greatest atomic-energy plants in the United States, one at Hanford, and the other one building now in Idaho. They are going to be great consumers of power.

Now, as to the need for aluminum, the power generated on the Columbia River and its tributaries in the Northwest is the main dependence of our Government in processing aluminum for national defense. You will recall that during the war, bauxite, the raw material from which aluminum is made, was brought from South America to concentrating plants located in Alabama and Louisiana, where it was reduced to alumina (aluminum-oxide), and then these concentrates had to be shipped all the way across the United States to plants in the Northwest where the needed hydroelectric power was available.

We have been all through that in wartime, and we know that it is absolutely essential that we have power and plenty of power to manufacture aluminum for our airplanes and supply the atomic-energy plants in Idaho and Washington State.

We are now dealing with one of the best means in the United States to bring power supply for the defense of our country.

In addition to that, I want to point out to you gentlemen on this map, which embraces half the State of Montana, the whole State of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, what the Columbia River means to our great country. We are now finishing up a $200,000,000 development in the Columbia Basin. We built first the Grand Coulee Dam to supply the power, and then we constructed the storage reservoirs. We constructed the diversion dams or canal, reservoirs to bring water to this Columbia Basin on 1,200,000 acres of land.

It is just a start in the development. There will be cities, towns, farmsteads, roads, and streets that must have material. We have that material close at hand.

A little way up the Snake River we have, at Lewiston, Idaho, the biggest sawmill in the world. The Government owns this vast area of national forests that is full of mineral deposits, and I have taken the trouble to indicate to you on this map the kind of metals or minerals we have. They include

gold, silver, lead, copper, zinc, antimony, tungsten, mercury, molybdenum, cobalt, manganese, phosphate, iron, and portland cement.

We had just above Lewiston a cement plant that is making commercial cement. We have limestone, building stone, and timber. Everything in central Idaho is mostly in Government ownership. The outlet to this treasure house, this storehouse of the Nation's wealth is down the Snake River and on down the Columbia.

We have made a wonderful improvement in the Columbia River for navigation. We built the locks at Bonneville. We have improved that rugged place where the salmon are having so much trouble getting over the dam.

UMATILLA LOCK, M'NARY DAM, COLUMBIA RIVER

We are now building a lock at Umatilla, at the McNary Dam. This is nearing completion, which would bring transportation all the way up to the confluence of the Snake River and the Columbia at Lewiston. That would drain all that vast area of timber country, mining country.

And there we have also the wonderful Kansas prairie with all the wheat.

We need this dam. It is the greatest development to come to our country, to be built in this country. This series of dams in the Ice Harbor project will open up the country, as has been done in the Southern and Northern States.

I have here a picture of a drawbridge showing you that at Lewiston in high water they navigate all the way up to Lewiston. Boats have already gone up that river. It is nothing new, but we simply want to make it a year-round proposition.

Then we also have here a picture of a barge taking off up the river and bringing back wheat. Then we have here a picture of grain elevators that run wheat down to the boats.

We are right in the initial period of development in the Northwest. With the people flocking out here to settle on this land, with the 1,200,000 acres now just in the eve of settlement, we need this Ice Harbor Dam for power, for navigation, and also to supply water to the thirsty land.

I am not going into the details of what has been done. Ice Harbor is the only authorized dam in the United States for which no appropriation has been made. The money was dropped out of the appropriation bill and we are asking you at this time to restore it. If it is restored, we will be on our way with one of the best projects in the United States, in my opinion.

I thank you.

Chairman McKELLAR. Are there any questions, gentlemen?

We are very much obliged to you, sir.

Behind the False Front of the Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, an experienced buyer takes nothing for granted. He ignores window dressing and gingerbread, and he looks behind false fronts. Whether his contemplated purchase is a horse, a house, or an irrigation project he applies this principle of operation.

I have gone behind the scenes of the proposed central Arizona project, H. R. 934, and what I have discovered, Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to describe as astounding, for that is an inadequate word.

The concealed facts of this proposed project are nothing short of alarming. They present a serious threat to the stability of our national economy.

The State of Arizona has asked us, the Congress, to buy the largest reclamation rescue project ever proposed. The original cost would be somewhere close to a billion and a half dollars. When I say that the State of Arizona has asked us to buy this project, I mean just that, because we would be spending Federal tax money for it, and there would be no chance that this Government might ever be reimbursed.

However, Mr. Speaker, I shall not deal here with either the technical or financial infeasibility of this proposed project. That already has been done to a great extent, and it will be done to a greater extent in the near future.

Today I propose to take this House of Representatives on a short tour behind the scenes of the Central Arizona Project and to recount the shocking facts I have uncovered in my investigation.

I intend to charge, and to prove my charges, that:

First, the proposed central Arizona project is a land speculator's heaven on earth.

Second, that water is wanted in the project area primarily to save thousands of acres that were rushed into production during the war.

Third, that these thousands of acres were irrigated only to take advantage of high wartime prices; that it was known then that the water being used would soon be exhausted; and that these lands could have no adequate water supply without depriving other lands long developed.

Fourth, that hundreds of pumps were installed to take out underground water when warnings already had been issued that such mining of water would place established irrigation areas in dire jeopardy.

Fifth, that for years a wanton waste of underground water continued, but even so only a wartime shortage of materials prevented the installation of hundreds of additional pumps.

Sixth, that the entire project is designed to bring fortunes to big landowners.

Seventh, that these big landowners and speculators will not pay any of the cost of the project, but would receive it as a gift.

Eighth, that there is no water in the Colorado River available for the proposed Arizona project. That the Arizona promoters are attempting, not only to raid the National Treasury but to take water for their nefarious scheme from California's legal share of the Colorado River. They are seeking to have this Congress repudiate contracts between the United States Government and the State of California, contracts which years ago awarded to California the share of Colorado River water upon which the economic security of 5,000,000 persons now depends.

The term "rescue project" as I have used it here is not mine. It is Arizona's own description of the proposed project. The Arizona promoters are deceitful in their use of the term. They do not tell the whole story of the "rescue." They have dressed up their plan and given it a fine glossy coat. But when one lifts the hood and looks inside the truth is revealed.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that the central Arizona project is designed to "rescue" wartime speculators, to continue their fortune making, and to make it possible for more speculation, all at the expense of other States.

For some time now we have been drenched in the propaganda of the Arizona promoters. We have heard their pitiful plea that unless they get their project civilization will be set back. We have been given terrible pictures of ragged and hungry men, women, and children trudging desert roads, their once charming homes and fruitful acres turned bleak with the curse of devastating drought. The tragic plight of Europe's displaced persons was not to be compared with the terrible conditions of Arizona's homeless, driven to wandering because they had used up all water God had given them.

That, gentlemen, is all unadulterated hog wash.

Now, what was this desert land worth before the speculators began "mining" water for it, for the purpose of making millions during the war?

Well, in 1940, ordinary unirrigated farm land adjacent to an established Arizona reclamation project was worth at the most about $50 an acre. With water on it the value of this land immediately rose to $300 an acre.

This was land outside established projects but within the area of the potential central Arizona project. Land more remote from a known, dependable underground water source was worth less.

To get water on this desert land, underground wells and pumps had to be installed. What did one of these installations cost? It cost all the way from $18,000 to $30,000.

Well you might ask right here how a farmer could afford such investments? I shall tell you. He could afford them, and the banks would help him, because the return on the money invested was swift and certain. Crops grow the year round in this area, and with wartime prices for agricultural products the investment was quickly paid off.

This was no long-time gamble. This was sure money, and big, certain profit.

But what was happening meanwhile to the underground water table? It was going down steadily, and there was no supply to replace it.

Who cared? Who cared about the immediate years to come? Not the Arizona speculators. Not the Arizona banks. Not even the Arizona government, which sold State lands willy-nilly, cashing in while the sun of inflation brightly shone.

There was no law in Arizona governing the taking of water from underground basins. Anybody could sink wells and pump water out, and the State did not care. Sink the wells and pump out the water, get the cash, and to hell with the future. That was the program.

All during the war, when they were cashing in and getting rich by spending their capital water, the Arizona promoters, the State officials and the big landowners had a slick idea up their collective sleeve. Even as they drove down more wells they were working out the plans for the so-called central Arizona project.

"Don't worry, boys," they said. "Sink all the wells you want. Don't think about the future. We've got that all worked out. What we've worked out is a dilly of a scheme. It'll be like shooting sitting ducks.

"Now, listen close. Here's the racket. We're going to take the water we need away from California. We'll be desperate, see. We'll be drowning in a sea of sand, not water. Our land is going back to desert. That's what we'll yell. Save us. Save our kiddies from this awful fate. The Congress will go for that. You know, people in distress. The dry well and the dust in the eyes stuff. Never mind about what California will do. We'll get the water, because California ain't using it all right now, and water should go where it can be used right now, not in years to come. Never mind that California has built projects to use this water in the future. Didn't we tell you what to do with the future?

"What an idea, eh? So go ahead and pump, boys. Pump day and night. California and the United States Treasury will pay the bill."

In some respects the psychology of the Arizona schemers must be commended. For instance, they joined up with the Bureau of Reclamation, each putting out some money, to concoct a report on the proposed project. This was just dandy with the Bureau.

Today in the Bureau of Reclamation we find a group of men who have one paramount idea in mind. That is to perpetuate themselves and their policies. To do this they must have immense, long-range projects, projects that will take a generation to construct, and they must have absolute control of those projects. For, by controlling these projects they control the people, their lives, and their economy.

What happened? The Bureau of Reclamation issued a report advocating the Arizona project, but despite its craving for power the Bureau found it necessary to leave open a hatch door or two for a possible escape. Using a weasel's pen, the Bureau buried some qualifying phrases and statements deep in its report. The Bureau admitted there might be no water for the proposed Arizona project because California challenged Arizona's claims to the Colorado River water. If the contentions of California were correct, said the Bureau, there would be no dependable water for the Arizona diversion.

That fact did not stop either the Bureau or the Arizona promoters from asking Congress for more than a billion dollars to build a project for which there might be no water. Not at all. The Bureau and Arizona went right ahead.

Get the water first, and then let California squawk.

During the period of wild expansion and wanton pumping Arizona had no law governing the taking of water from underground basins. Anybody who had some land could sink wells and pump all the water they wanted, and the State did not care a hang. Sink the wells and pump the water, get the cash. That was the program.

Let us look at the record:

In the Bureau of Reclamation report on the Arizona project we find this on page R-6:

> There being no statute to control pumping from the ground-water basins in the State of Arizona, exploitation of the ground-water resources followed with increasing rapidity. * * * As a result of district and private drilling operations, the number of irrigation wells in the central Arizona project area increased from about 400 in 1920 to 750 in 1930, and to more than 1,100 in 1940. Since then, intensive drilling has taken place and by 1946 about 1,700 wells were used as a source of irrigation water.
>
> * * * during the period of 1940–44 the average annual pumpage exceeded the safe annual yield of the ground-water basins by an estimated 468,400 acre-feet a year.

In the Bureau's report History of Reclamation the following statement may be read:

> Beginning in about 1935 pumping over the entire area increased at an alarming rate.
>
> Soon after 1935, concern was being expressed over the gradual but continual lowering of the water table. It had become apparent that the ground-water supply was not inexhaustible. This seems only to have stimulated competition and the race was on for the water stored in the several underground reservoirs. Irrigation wells were drilled and pumps installed in all districts.
>
> * * * individuals and irrigation organizations vied during and after the war for the services of the limited number of well-drilling outfits.

A. L. Bartlett, president of the Pinal County Farm Bureau, told the Eightieth Congress in 1947:

> During the last 6 years the yearly draft on ground water has increased to such an extent that water requirements for the area now under cultivation are drawn from reserves in ground-water supply, the draft being greatly in excess of the amount recharged into the ground-water reservoir.
>
> About 1940 it became apparent that the safe yield of the basin was being overdrawn. With the beginning of the recent war period the bringing in of new land continued at an increased rate and with the intensive crop program practiced during the past 6 years the yearly draft on ground water has increased to such an extent that water requirements for the area now under cultivation are drawn from reserves in ground-water supply.

J. H. Moeur, president of the Arizona Reclamation Association, and an official of the National Reclamation Association, told the Seventy-eighth Congress in 1944:

> The underground water now being pumped for irrigation is largely in excess of the recharge to the different underground basins, and hence the underground-water supply is being rapidly depleted. If present practices are continued, serious difficulties will be encountered.

At the same hearings Ray Killian, secretary of the Roosevelt Water Conservation District, said:

> During the past 5 years the water table has lowered an additional 20 feet on the average throughout the district.

And J. H. Sossamon, of the Queen Creek irrigation district, testified in the past 6 years the underground-water level in his area had dropped over 20 feet, and that this "shows we are drawing water in that district beyond replacement of the underground flow. If it is to be continued, some of the land will have to go out of cultivation."

John W. White, a grower of the Eloy area, stated:

> All I have to say is our water level is dropping very rapidly * * * and if we keep on pumping water out in my estimate there won't be any there in a couple of years.

I might cite many more statements of this kind, but these will serve to illustrate that Arizona well knew what was being done, and that Arizona continued to plunder her own water treasury without abatement.

The State government of Arizona knew, too, and cooperated in the plundering.

In substantiation of this charge, I shall refer to the records of the Eloy and Maricopa areas in the Pinal unit outside the San Carlos project.

The certificates of purchase issued by the State land office in Phoenix for these sections were inspected. From these certificates a compilation was made of all land purchased from the State by private parties during the years 1939 to 1947, inclusive.

From the county assessor's office of Pinal County data were obtained that showed which of these lands were irrigated by pumps during these same years.

Let us look at the totals.

In the year 1939, in these areas, 32,532 acres were irrigated by pumping underground water.

In the year 1940 a total of 24,054 additional acres were brought under pump water.

In the year 1941, when we entered the war, 18,446 new acres were brought in.

The new acreage brought under pump water in 1942 was 17,087.

New materials for wells and pumps, as well as well-drilling labor, became scarce, and in 1943 only 7,029 new acres could be added, irrigated from underground wells. The new acreage for 1944, for these reasons, was only 6,388.

But in 1945, the year the war ended, material and labor became more available, and the dream of the central Arizona project was forming in the minds of the speculators and big landowners. In 1945 a total of 25,566 new acres were cultivated by pumps. The total of new acreage increased even more in 1946—to 28,067 new acres.

I have already presented evidence to show that this reckless expansion and profiteering was carried on in the face of knowledge that the underground water would soon be exhausted. That, as I have said, did not stop either the speculators or the State government from continuing their program of destruction.

So, in the years 1939 to 1946, a total of 159,149 acres were added to the draft on a constantly diminishing reserve. This was done deliberately, with knowledge that there were no surface streams to replace the accumulations of geological ages that were being mined by the pumps put down in these 7 years to irrigate that 159,000 acres of desert. A hundred and fifty-nine thousand acres were thus brought into irrigation in just this one unit of the project to take advantage of high prices and with no regard for the future.

But this Eloy-Maricopa unit is just a small part of the story.

Let me read a few words about Pinal County expansion from Arizona's own propaganda book on the central Arizona project. It is called Presenting the Central Arizona Project to You, and on page 67 the Pinal County Research Committee states that in 1936 only 75,000 acres were irrigated in that county, and continues:

> In 1941 there were 110,000 acres of land irrigated, and in 1946 approximately 300,000 acres were under cultivation and irrigated principally by pumped water. * * * Water was withdrawn from underground reservoirs at a rate of 188 percent of the 1940 withdrawal.

On Arizona's own figures, the expansion from 1941 to 1946 was thus 190,000 acres. This was desert land, known to have no surface water supply. Until 1948 there was no State statute which might effect control over the sinking of new irrigation wells. A landowner could install as many pumps as he needed, regardless of the fact he might be contributing to the destruction of the underground basin beneath an entire area. Underground basins must be replenished the same as water in the radiator of an automobile; otherwise production stops.

The Arizona speculators and big landowners are continuing to destroy their underground reserves. Now this is where the central Arizona project steps in to save them.

They want 1,200,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River that does not belong to Arizona, that belongs to California. They are demanding this water admittedly to "rescue" their lands.

No, they do not want to stop pumping. They have invested immense amounts of money in pumps costing all the way from $18,000 to $30,000 each, and they have invested money in lines and stations to bring power to those pumps. They do not want to abandon this huge investment, even if they made it to make a killing in the wartime boom, and even though many of them have got back their investment several times over.

This is what they want:

They want the Colorado River water primarily to replenish the underground basins that they deliberately overdrew for wartime profits. They want this water in other areas to supplement the pumped water by flowing to their fields on the surface, and then going into the underground basins.

They want this water to "rescue" their wartime speculations.

Mr. Speaker, they want water that belongs to California to perpetuate a scheme born of the vicissitudes of war and nutured on wanton destruction and plundering.

Years ago the water Arizona seeks from the Colorado River was awarded to California by Federal contracts. And believing in the sanctity of these contracts, the people of California have obligated themselves to pay debts amounting to more than half a billion dollars for projects to bring Colorado River water to their cities and farms.

These Federal contracts are instruments of Federal law. Are we—the Congress—going to repudiate these instruments which we once sanctioned? Are we going to destroy these contracts to give water to a group of land sharks and water brigands?

Are we going to condone a gigantic project that is conceived of misrepresentation and humbug?

Are we going to take from 5,000,000 people in southern California the economic security we once gave to them? Are we going to jeopardize the future of millions of people, billions of dollars' worth of industrial developments, and more billions of dollars' worth of agriculture in California, for a handful of landowners in Arizona?

Are we going to hand these Arizona despoilers $1,500,000,000?

I ask you, look into this rescue project as I have done. I know that you will close the glossy book of Arizona propaganda and say, as I have said:

"This fantastic scheme will be defeated."

Mr. Lie Forgets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington News of yesterday, March 22, 1950, I find reduced to its simplest and understandable language a classic example of straight thinking at its best, by Ludwell Denny.

The eloquence of Trygve Lie addressing the B'nai B'rith delegates was so impressive as to confound the average listener and even lead him to believe that a solution was being offered for the Russo-American deadlock.

It required the penetrating and analytical mind of Ludwell Denny to point out the obvious fallacies of the United Nations Secretary. Mr. Denny most ably points the way, and the only way, to an understanding rather than appeasement.

The article reprinted herewith speaks for itself and I commend it to the membership of this House, especially the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

MR. LIE FORGETS

(By Ludwell Denny)

Nothing will come of United Nations Secretary-General Trygve Lie's proposed 20-year program for American-Russian conciliation, in the judgment of diplomats here.

In suggesting negotiation which requires honest give-and-take by both sides, Mr. Lie specified "I do not mean by negotiation surrender or appeasement by either side." But it is pointed out here that unless Russia surrenders on her policies of aggression, subversion, and obstruction, any settlement would involve appeasement.

Mr. Lie distorts rather than clarifies the situation. His premise that the struggle is between the United States and Russia, and that they are both at fault, is fallacious. Doubtless Mr. Lie thinks this is a sign of his nonpartisanship or neutrality. But, regardless of his intent, this helps Russian propaganda.

The conflict is not essentially between the United States and Russia, but between the UN—the entire non-Soviet world—and Russia. The United States, as the major democratic power, carries most of the burden of defense. But our Nation, being farther away and stronger, is in less danger than weaker Europe and Asia.

The issue is not that Stalin is in conflict with some exclusive American policy, but rather that he is violating all the major allied agreements and treaties.

Mr. Lie in asking the United States to negotiate with Russia on a basis of honest give-and-take, apparently is forgetting three things:

In the allied agreements, in the satellite treaties, and in the UN Charter—all of which Stalin is now breaking—the western powers did the giving and he did the taking. In effect they gave Russia most of eastern Europe and the strategic points of China. They gave him extra representation in the UN; they gave him veto power with which to paralyze or kill that body.

There is nothing left which the United States can honestly give Stalin, even though it got something in return. Any such deal between Washington and Moscow would inevitably be at the expense of others. Washington has neither the lawful authority nor the moral right to legalize Stalin's violations of international agreements. Washington lacks the power—as well as the will—to sanctify Stalin's aggressions.

For legitimate negotiations there is no need of a Lie plan or any other. The facilities already exist in abundance. There are American and allied representatives in Moscow, and Soviet diplomats in the allied capitals. There is the UN, which is directly involved, as the proper seat of negotiations.

It is Russia that has walked out on the UN—not the United States nor its allies.

Housing Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was a great disappointment to me to have the House of Representatives, by a vote of 155 to 108, wipe out of the Housing Act of 1950, title I, or the new cooperative section. This was accomplished by the combined vote of the Republicans and the southern Democrats. The final vote on the bill, shorn of this new feature, was 361 to 19. Disregarding a special appeal from President Truman, from the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and organized labor, the bill's objectors did not waiver in their opposition. The Republicans and southern Democrats voted title I out of the bill. It is important to note that they offered no substitute nor any provision that would afford housing for the middle-income families. Are there no middle-income families in their

districts? Or could it be that their desire to kill every Administration bill transcends their responsibility to their districts?

The President, in his 1950 State of the Union message, wisely asked Congress to pass a Housing bill designed to supplement existing housing legislation in order to provide relief and assistance for the forgotten class of our citizenry, the middle-income group—those who earn between $2,200 and $4,400. This group comprises one-third of the national population, the backbone of the Nation. What benefits them, benefits our Nation.

By the use of housing cooperatives and similar nonprofit organizations, title I would have provided good housing for middle-income families at a monthly cost which such families could afford to pay. These cooperatives or similar nonprofit organizations would have made possible a savings in management and operation not generally attainable in the case of rental projects operated for profit. Opponents of this bill claimed it was socialistic. They overlooked the fact that cooperatives are widely used by those in the high income brackets and this they do not consider socialistic. Title I was an endeavor to encourage free enterprise to invest capital, guaranteed by the Federal Government. No subsidy was involved. Safeguards were provided against the use of cooperatives for speculative purposes. They combined the best features gained in the course of 15 years of experience in two of our successful agencies administering governmental assistance to private enterprise and to housing—the Federal Home Loan Banks and the Federal Housing Administration.

The action of the House of Representatives in destroying the cooperative housing feature of this bill was a blow, not to the Administration, but to the people of the United States who rightfully looked to Congress for a solution to their housing problems.

Study Indicates Mail, Pets, Milk Ride Rails at Expense of Passengers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal, Pacific coast edition, for July 6, 1949:

[illegible]

(By M. M. [illegible])

WASHINGTON.—The man in the parlor car may be paying part of the fare for the pet dog, the can of milk, and the bag of letters in the head end of his passenger train.

The head end is the front section of railroad cars separating the locomotive from coaches and pullmans. It carries mail, express, packages, pets, milk, and cream—everything but people.

Interstate Commerce Commission economists believe the head-end load is dead beating on passenger fares. If they're right, it means train passengers are bearing more than their share of the costs of running these trains.

Preliminary findings of a confidential study now under way at the ICC bear out the theory that charges for nonpassenger items don't always cover costs of carrying them. If the finished study shows people are more than paying their way at today's passenger rates, it will have far-reaching effects on the costs of sending anything by rail—either in freight cars or faster passenger trains.

WOULD AFFECT ICC DECISION

Immediately, confirmation of these thoughts would dampen the likelihood that 60 eastern railroads will get the 12.5 percent increase in passenger fares that they're seeking. But all railroads might get more mail pay from the Government.

The ICC's Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics expects to finish its study on the costs of carrying people and things on passenger trains before hearings begin in Brooklyn July 13, on the eastern roads' fare rise proposal. These railroads do more than half the Nation's passenger-train business.

The ICC study is the first ever to be made to break down passenger train costs for the 132 class I railroads—those doing a gross business of $1,000,000 or more annually. Though the roads report fully on revenues receive from each of 20 types of services offered on passenger trains, they make no effort to allocate the costs of each of these.

When its study is completed the ICC hopes to be able to pin point, at least for its own purposes, the comparative cost of carrying a person, a truck, a letter, or a can of milk on a passenger train. There is no plan at present for making the findings public.

But with such ammunition, the ICC experts, who approve all rail charges, can decide what part of the traffic should bear added costs of running the railroads.

PASSENGER SERVICE DEFICIT

In 1948, the railroads said their passenger train services ran $560,000,000 into the red—a record deficit. Though passenger-train revenues more than paid current operating expenses, there wasn't enough to pay the passenger service share of the general overhead expenses of running a railroad—roughly 24 percent of the total.

Head-end traffic makes up about one-fourth of total passenger-train income. The ICC study is expected to show that the costs of these services are more than a fourth of total expenses.

In 1948, for instance, the Nation's passenger-train services took in $1,435,000,000. Train tickets for passengers accounted for $962,600,000. Head-end income ran approximately $336,400,000 with mail service bringing in $196,500,000; express $116,000,000; milk delivery $14,500,000; baggage $2,600,000; and freight $3,835,000.

The rest of the income is from dining-car and buffet services, operation of hotels, restaurants, parcel rooms and baggage storage, telephone and telegraph services, and similar miscellaneous items.

In only 3 years out of the past 13 has the passenger-train service turned up a profit for the Nation's railroads. These were the peak war years 1942 through 1944, when passenger service made an average annual profit of $250,000,000. In the following 2 years, passenger trains paid their way but failed to turn a profit. The $560,000,000 deficit reported for 1948 is more than double the stiffest loss for the six prewar years from 1936 through 1941.

BEARING ON FOUR PROBLEMS

The cost figures now being worked up by the ICC are expected to have significant bearing on at least four problems now being mulled by the regulatory agency. These are:

Railroad mail pay: The railroads are asking for an 80-percent increase over the 1946 mail-pay rates. ICC in December 1947, granted a 25-percent temporary mail-pay hike, effective retroactively to February 1947 and continued to study further rises. It agreed to make its final adjustment also retroactive to February 1947.

If the full 80-percent requested boost had been in effect during 1948, passenger-train revenues would have been $139,000,000 more—and the deficit about one-fourth less. In 1948, mail revenues accounted for a little less than 14 percent of passenger-train income. If ICC finds carrying the mail accounts for more than 14 percent of operating expenses, it may order the Post Office Department—and it has the authority to do this—to pay the railroad more—up to the 80-percent increase—for the job.

Freight rates: Shippers protest that freight is bearing more than its share of the burden of supporting the railroads. They oppose the carriers' current plea for a new 13-percent hike in general freight rates over the 1948 level.

These shippers say their freight rates are being raised to help offset losses on passenger-train service. The ICC is now completing its report on this 13-percent freight rate boost; the findings of the passenger-train cost study are expected to have a hearing on the freight-rate decision, especially if ICC experts find some passenger-fare services aren't returning their share of costs.

WANT HIGHER FARES IN EAST

Passenger fares: The eastern railroads want to boost their fares from the present 3 cents per mile in coaches and 4 cents per mile in parlor and sleeping cars to 3.375 cents and 4.5 cents, respectively. The fares east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio are already a half cent higher than those charged on western and southern roads.

An ICC expert points out that if the cost-study proves to ICC's satisfaction that passengers are already paying their share of the expenses, the rate-setting agency won't burden the traveling public with increased fares to pay for the losing head-end services. Passenger revenues this year are already expected to be 12.8 percent below the 1948 level, due to a slow-down in train travel. ICC thinks higher fares, if not fully justified, may divert more travelers to other forms of transportation.

Express rates: The Railway Express Agency's dilemma is certain to be affected by the cost study's conclusions, say ICC insiders. In the wake of three rate rises since December 1946, express volume has more than halved, dropping from 231,000,000 shipments in 1946 to an estimated 100,000,000 shipments this year and 38,000 REA workers have lost their jobs.

Now the railroad-owned-and-operated agency is asking for another 10 percent increase in rates. At the same time REA claims it will be forced out of business unless the Post Office Department puts much stiffer rates on parcel post and cuts back drastically the 70-pound maximum weight for parcel post to the 11-pound maximum set by Congress in 1913. Their argument is that the Government is handling a large part of the package-carrying business which should go to the Railway Express Agency.

Volunteer Firemen Risk Their Lives To Serve Others Unselfishly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, from the floor of this House during the past 2 years I have frequently spoken on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of volunteer firemen throughout America.

On those occasions I have directed attention to the unselfish services which the volunteer firemen render in their respective communities. I have repeatedly called attention to the fact that volunteer firemen serve the public without remuneration and with great inconvenience to themselves. I have pointed out that they answer the call of the fire siren at all hours of the day and night and in all types of weather. I have also stated, Mr. Speaker, that in order to protect the property and save the lives of others they consistenly endanger their own lives in their devotion to duty.

As a single example of the foregoing, Mr. Speaker, I direct attention of the Members to the sacrifice and suffering of my personal friend, Guy H. Bowdle. Mr. Bowdle is an independent businessman in Dover, Del., and is a member of the Robbins Hose Co., of which I am also proud to be a member.

As a volunteer fireman Guy Bowdle recently responded promptly to the call of the fire siren in Dover. As the speeding fire engine on which he was riding swerved sharply around the corner he was thrown to the roadbed. Almost miraculously he avoided death but suffered a broken vertebra. This painful and serious injury has incapacitated Guy Bowdle for some time to come.

Mr. Bowdle is a young married man with two children. He is an overseas veteran of World War II. He is an active participant in public and community affairs. He typifies, Mr. Speaker, the hundreds of thousands of American citizens throughout this country who unselfishly serve as volunteer firemen.

As a part of my remarks I include the following editorial from the March 9, 1950, issue of the Index, which is published in Dover, Del.:

"GREATER LOVE HATH NO MAN"

Guy H. Bowdle, Dover industrialist, lies in bed at his home, suffering from a broken vertebra caused by his falling from a fire truck en route to a burning building. Guy, a much-liked man in this community, was not receiving, or hoping for, any remuneration whatever for his efforts when the accident occurred. He was acting in his capacity as a volunteer fireman in the organization here, known as Robbins Hose Company.

That the fireman is not dead, instead of suffering from such a painful injury, is due to a miracle. He fell as the truck, in which he was rushing to the blaze, swerved around a corner at a street intersection, and it would have been no extraordinary occurrence for him to find himself beneath the wheels of a fast-traveling motor vehicle, which would have crushed the life from his body.

It is our opinion that Guy Bowdle is a martyr to one of the noblest of causes—volunteer fire fighting for the protection of the life, limb, and property of our citizens—and we call upon all of our hero-admirers to write to him, or, better still, call upon him at his bedside and let him know that we really and truly appreciate the efforts of one who becomes critically injured while endeavoring to help his neighbors and friends.

Guy Bowdle didn't actually die for his friends, but he didn't miss doing so very much, and we would like to quote this biblical verse in giving this daring young man his just dues: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend."

Maybe, after a great deal of seeing with our own eyes the hardships they suffer, all of us will more fully appreciate the efforts of our fire-fighting young men. We sincerely hope so.

Should We Dye Farmers Blue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues in this House an editorial appearing in the current issue of the Farm Journal. The editorial further explains the Farm Journal's recommendations for a new, long-range agricultural program for this Nation. I commend it to the attention of every Member. The editorial follows:

SHOULD WE DYE FARMERS BLUE?

No permanent solutions to the farm-surplus questions are going to be found by passing laws about surpluses. Man-made laws cannot change nature's laws.

Permanent solutions will come with new crops, with new uses for farm products, with feeding more of these products to livestock, with better methods, and with a larger buying population. But they do, naturally, come slowly.

Meanwhile nothing will stop Government from trying still further stopgap measures. It has been trying them for 20 years. They have varied from killing pigs and plowing under cotton to coloring potatoes blue. Some farmers have benefited from some of these temporary measures; and there is still the widespread illusion that Government can find all answers.

Many of these patchwork programs have tended to guarantee that more surpluses will be produced.

The best good sense in agriculture, it seems to us, ought now to turn resolutely toward two purposes. After 20 years of expediencies, farmers surely must be ready to demand more aggressive action toward ways to stop creating surpluses. That is number one.

Number two is to look for the least harmful and dangerous of the expediencies yet to be tried. If we are determined to patch with more baling wire, let's at least use the best wire.

Every sign indicates that a determined effort will be made to turn the Brannan plan into a major 1950 campaign issue, both in farm and city districts. Whether or not the plan wins votes, such strategy will push agricultural policy further than ever into the political mire. We don't think farmers want that to happen.

The farm program which Farm Journal supports calls for no miracles to be passed by Congress. We have proposed—and have supported by a series of how-to-do-it articles—a vigorous tightening up in feed and livestock production methods, so that animals can eat and store some of the surpluses; and then can be sold at prices which will bring farmers profits, but permit consumers to buy meat, milk, eggs. Promotional campaigns should then persuade consumers to eat more animal products.

We have urged that research funds be multiplied, so that new crops and new uses can step up the profitable opportunities in the farming business. We have urged cutting government down to the size the country needs, so that incentives to improve will survive.

We shall gladly support other measures when we find others that make sense, if they are needed, even though they may be temporary expediencies. But not the kind that clearly will lead to worse expediencies, and to perpetual surpluses.

We believe that agriculture in America can lead rather than lean; that it can influence labor and industry to produce more rather than less; that it can support a reasonable government, rather than have to be supported by government; and that it will not be necessary to dye farmers blue to accomplish these things.

The Aspiration for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a talk entitled "The Aspiration for Freedom," delivered by Mr. Beardsley Ruml before the American Association of School Administrators in Atlantic City, N. J., on February 28, 1950. Mr. Ruml is famous throughout the country as psychologist, educator, financial authority, businessman, and philosopher. He and I have been associated in many common interests and enterprises, among others the Committee for Economic Development which he is now serving so notably as vice chairman of the research and policy committee. In this speech Mr. Ruml gives us important new insight into the meaning of the word "freedom." This is indeed the most important word of our times. The attainment of freedom is the principal goal of the world's peoples. In this brilliant discussion Mr. Ruml calls upon his lifetime of experience as scholar and social scientist and as an active leader among men of affairs to provide us with a better understanding of the requirements of freedom and how our social institutions can contribute increasingly to the supreme ideal of promoting its attainment.

I am informed that the manuscript will exceed the two printed pages allowed under the rule without a statement of

cost, and that the estimate is 2¾ pages at a cost of $125.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ASPIRATION FOR FREEDOM

For us in the United States, but not for us alone, the word "freedom" comes down the years as a symbol of ends and means, as a rallying cry for effort and sacrifice, as an organizing principle of human faith and aspiration.

From time to time, freedom has been the central issue in conflicts about religious worship, governmental forms, political parties, industrial organization, education, race, the pressures which make the family in institution. Freedom appears as "liberty" in the Declaration of Independence. The battle cry of freedom was raised in our Civil War in the last century. The four freedoms—freedom of worship, freedom of expression, freedom from fear, and freedom from want—set the elementary goals of the freedom-loving nations everywhere in the world.

The power in the insistent demand for freedom has cracked open religious institutions, upset dynasties, inspired revolutions, and armed tens of millions of men and women in its defense.

Yet for a long time in our ordinary everyday affairs, human freedom had been somewhat taken for granted in the land of the free. In principle, the dignity of the individual was accepted as a matter of course. But word of mouth acceptance of doctrines pertaining to human freedom and the relegation of its protection to the courts left us insensitive to practices by which these doctrines were being undermined. World War II aroused us to the dangers in this neglect, and the doctrines on which human freedom rests have taken on new strength and new meaning.

The freedom-loving nations were as little prepared for the moral struggle of World War II as they were to withstand the sharp edges of the blitz. They reached back into their memorable traditions and found good doctrines which they have put to use. These doctrines were dusty but in excellent condition, and they proved to have the power to inspire men to effort and sacrifice.

The cynics of the amoralistic and explicit blasphemies of the Axis turned out to be the affirmation of insights of great antiquity, and of the human doctrines of the American and the French Revolutions. The ambiguities and contradictions of World War I and of the political struggles of the 1920's dropped into place before the sweep and clarity of this new conflict for the possession of the human soul.

The ancient doctrines of freedom were proclaimed by the leaders of the freedom-loving nations. The heat-of-war violence and the early searchings of doubt as to victory gave to these doctrines a life and urgency which transcended to easuitry of political and literary formalism. Today, faced with the impact of Soviet imperialism, the conditions of men in the freedom-loving nations are being tested again in terms of these ancient and new-living doctrines. Many obvious and easy reforms are being made, others more difficult are being projected.

Whatever the future may bring, the humane ideals of personal freedom have become active official doctrine. The people will continue to believe that the true road leads forward freedom; and, with ups and downs, the people will follow according to their understanding and their institutions.

What is freedom? Why is freedom so much desired?

The meaning of freedom has varied from time to time and the stated purposes of freedom have changed with the objectives of those who have invoked it. For some, freedom has meant the condition of man in a state of nature. For others, at the opposite pole, it has meant a range of human activity guided strictly by the dictates of reason. At times, freedom seems to imply mere equality under the law. At other times, freedom asserts the elevation of human rights to a position above man-made statutes.

Today we have our contemporary concept of what freedom is and what it is for.

Today what people want when they demand freedom is a condition under which they can realize with reasonable completeness the potentialities as persons that inhere in their capacities as individuals. The demand for freedom is a demand for fulfillment, for survival, for growth, for life, not in the material or biological area alone, but also in the realm of mind and spirit.

Within an accepted system of values, the individual human will fight for his freedom as he would fight for his life, indeed, it is his life for which he fights. Whether the protest against restraint be directed toward religious orthodoxy, hereditary autocracy, unequal suffrage, industrial decisionism, or bureaucratic regimentation, the emotional fury and the reckless disregard of material welfare reveal the struggle for what it is—a fight for survival in which no price is too great to pay to save what has been embraced as the essential core of freedom.

Just as plants and animals of the same species have common, irreducible necessities for their growth, so too do human beings have in common minimal conditions for the realization of the fullness of themselves as persons. These minimal conditions define the common content of freedom, and as our knowledge of what is useful and good for human development grows, our conception of what freedom requires grows along with it. And just as different animals and different plants require different foods and temperatures and ways of movement for their unfolding, so different individuals find different circumstances helpful for the meeting of their needs.

Since the demand for freedom is a demand for conditions that favor the achievement of full richness of personality and individuality, the specifications necessarily change from time to time and from person to person. It becomes clear why so little is required by many, and so much by a few. The demand for freedom reflects the culture of time and place and person, the things that seem worthwhile, and prevailing notions as to the nature of the personality.

In general terms it is therefore apparent that there exists the most intimate relation of dependency between freedom and education. But recognition of this relationship in general terms takes us only part way in giving to citizens, professional educators or laymen, who are deeply concerned with education, the perspective and the intuitions necessary to make substantive contributions in shaping today's education to respond to today's requirements in the preservation and advancement of freedom.

Accordingly, the balance of this paper will be devoted to a detailed analysis of certain aspects of the problem of freedom, which I hope may be of some practical use.

This analysis, which does not pretend to be comprehensive, falls into three parts. (1) The feeling of freedom; (2) the fact or freedom; and (3) order and consent as related to freedom.

No attempt will be made to make specific application to educational policies or to school practices although certain general inferences will be obvious.

THE FEELING OF FREEDOM

The will for survival is the impulse to freedom. But to understand freedom itself we must go beyond mere recognition of the impulse. When we go deeper we find that freedom has two distinguishable phases, the feeling of freedom and the fact of freedom. We shall observe that the feeling and the fact of freedom may exist independently one of the other. This separability of fact and feeling causes many misunderstandings about the problem of freedom, since, to satisfy our aspiration for responsible individuality, we must have both. One alone is not enough.

The feeling of freedom is a state of mind. It is a sense of power to make a choice between alternatives. It is a feeling of power to impose one's own will on the direction of events. The individual feels that his own uncoerced act has made events what they have become, and that he might have made them different had he decided differently.

The basis for the individual's feeling of power lies in his prevision of the consequences for the future that reside in his yet-to-be-taken choice between alternative actions. And it is in the feeling of power and in the feeling of the possibility of power over the course of events that we find the source of awareness of one's own personal dignity and worth-whileness. In this wareness we have the feeling of freedom.

Three conditions are required for the existence of the feeling of freedom. First, in the period of choice the future must enter into the conscious present as an influence on a decision yet to be made. Second, at the time the decision is being made the individual must be aware that the decision is being made, and the degree of the feeling of freedom is related in some degree to the keenness of this awareness. Third, the feeling of freedom depends on whether the area of choice is felt by the individual to be adequate for the act. To put it another way, it depends on whether the act is felt to be coerced by circumstances or by the laws of man or of nature.

Let us examine these three conditions for the feeling of freedom in more detail.

The first condition requires that, in the period of choice, the future must enter into the conscious present as being formative with respect to a decision yet to be made.

To feel free we must be able to see the consequences of what we are about to do. There is no feeling of freedom in blind choice, nor in decisions made merely to get on from one moment to the next. If we see the future which we are about to influence as a long one, our feeling of freedom has more significance to us than if that future is short. If we can see the consequences of our choice clearly, our feeling of power is greater than if the outcome is uncertain or unclear. If the events we determine seem important to us, we feel our free act to be more important than if the events seem trivial. In any case, we cannot feel free unless we are aware of a possible future which our present decision is intended to influence.

The second requirement for a feeling of freedom is that, at the time a decision is being made, the individual must be aware that a decision is being made.

People make decisions with varying sense of the imminent act of will. The sense of the act of will must be keen if the feeling of freedom is to be strong. The degree of keenness is lowered by fatigue and by the stress of emotion. It is lowered also by habit; by repetitive decisions, no matter how important, on questions which are familiar and the solution of which has become more or less routine. The human animal would have a hard time making his way in the world if every free decision were accompanied by acute consciousness of the act of choice. On the other hand, the dark of unconscious adaptation and of depersonalized judgments, expressed under conditions of fatigue or routine, must be illuminated by occasional moments of explicit awareness of responsible choice. Without such moments there can be no feeling of power and no individual dignity. Clarity of apprehension of the act of will in the moment of decision is necessary if we are to have the feeling of freedom.

Finally, the feeling of freedom depends on whether the area of choice is felt adequate for the act; that is, whether the act is felt to be coerced. All decisions are made within

a frame of order. As we shall point out, this frame of order is determined by the laws of nature, by habit and custom, and by man-made rules. As long as the desired objective can be attained by the choice of alternatives within this structure, the individual feels uninhibited by coercive restraint. The feeling of freedom will, therefore, exist when the area of choice is wide enough to permit achievement if the correct decisions are made.

The feeling of freedom does not require unlimited discretion. Indeed, without a structure of order, the system of decision becomes amorphous and freedom vanishes. Decision involves a choice of alternatives within a system of pressures that gives rewards and imposes penalties. These pressures give significance to the act, but the act itself remains free. The pressures not only do not limit the sense of individual power, but they define the scope of risk, reward, and penalty. Accordingly, they give meaning to effort, success, and failure in determinations made freely by the personal will.

It follows from these three conditions that the feeling of freedom may exist under conditions of extreme regimentation and restraint. Once an individual accepts for himself the inevitability and propriety of the human and natural laws that bind him, once he limits his aspirations to achievements that can be had by successful decisions among alternatives within this frame, his feeling of freedom may be complete. All that is needed beyond this is present awareness of a future which is attainable, and clear consciousness in the moment of decision.

For this reason the feeling of freedom is not enough. Unless the fact of freedom is associated with it, the feeling of freedom can become, in the hands of the ambitious, an instrument for the degradation of their race. The illusion of freedom without the reality will be unstable, since, sooner or later, new leadership will arise to release the basic impulse to freedom. If such leadership does not arise from within, it will penetrate from without—today more easily and rapidly than ever before. Then, through education, compromise, or revolution, the march toward freedom will be resumed.

THE FACT OF FREEDOM

The feeling of freedom, being a state of mind, is largely determined by inner, subjective influences. The feeling of freedom exists authentically for one person under circumstances that would cause another to feel enslaved.

The fact of freedom, on the contrary, exists in the relations of the external world of things, persons, and events to the individual. As we have said, freedom is a condition in which people can realize with reasonable completeness the potentialities as persons that are inherent in their capacities as individuals. Obviously, these conditions are not the feeling which an individual may have about his world, satisfied or dissatisfied though he may be.

The individual cannot know completely the conditions that are necessary to assure him the fact of freedom. He may know, in part, the range of potentialities that are inherent in his capacities, and he may have some notion as to the circumstances that are required in order that he may achieve them. But he does not know all, nor can he. Nor are there experts who can specify the extent of possible human advancement. The science of physiology and psychology are incomplete and, in spite of great progress which can be expected in the future, they will doubtless remain so. The best that can be done is to draw on the intuitive and scientific wisdom that is at hand, and to establish in our society the institutions and practices which will give the known conditions for the fact of freedom. As our wisdom grows, the established conditions for the fact of freedom must grow as well.

Three conditions determine the extent to which the fact of freedom exists.

The first condition is a healthy and developed body and mind to serve as instruments of the will. The second requirement is the opportunity for responsible choice, for making the decisions through which the unfolding of the personality can in fact be achieved. And the third requirement is that the individual must have access in large measure to the natural world, to climates, soils, minerals, and seas, and to a normal human society of which he is a part.

First of all, a healthy and developed body and mind are indispensable if the will is to be well served. Many of the essential conditions for proper development of body and mind must be established in infancy and early childhood. The individual must learn to eat what is good for him, and he must have the opportunity to do so. Useful habits and skills must be acquired. He must be able to use a language, to speak, to write, and to read. A man who is illiterate cannot realize his potentialities, and therefore he is not free. A man who knows only one language is less free than one who knows more. He must have facility with the use of numbers. He must be at ease with ordinary social usage so that he can manage the conventionalities that will give him access to the social world which he needs to become a person fully himself.

The requirement of a healthy and developed body means the protection of the individual from accident and disease. It means access for all to resources for the repair of bodily injury and the treatment of sickness. It means a minimum of food and shelter, particularly for growing children.

The requirement of a healthy and developed mind is no less important than that of a healthy body. Here the influence of the home, the school, and the church will be crucial. The role of the political party, the social club, and the trade union will also be important in enlarging or limiting the mind of the individual as an instrument for his freedom. As citizens, we want each of these agencies to promote reason and to reduce ignorance on the part of the people over whom they have influence.

Our second condition for the fact of freedom is that of presenting the individual with events and issues where there is both opportunity and necessity for responsible choice.

Let us see what this condition has to do with the fact of freedom. Clearly, a healthy body and a mind of reason are nothing more than the instruments which make freedom attainable. Freedom itself resides in the act of will; and the value in freedom is the growth of the individual person through acts of will in moments of decision involving responsible choice. The fact of freedom is not attainable in a world in which there are no decisions to be made. The opportunity for full realization of what is potential in a personality depends vitally on the nature and scope of the situations in which the individual acts responsibly.

Acts of decision, to be of value for the growth of character, need not be important acts in a public or historic sense. Many authentic choices of a minor character are more fruitful for personal development than are the grand decisions in which the pressure of events and the numbness of conscience produce an automatic and meaningless response. The decisions that count are those in which the individual feels himself free, and for which he is prepared to be judged.

Not only must the individual feel free, his act being consciously his own, but the consequences of the act must be subject to moral, intellectual, or aesthetic evaluation. Was the act good or evil, wise or foolish, beautiful or ugly? These questions make decision difficult, and, as a result, freedom is sometimes a burden.

The third condition for the fact of freedom is access to the natural world. Given all the other conditions, unless the richness of nature is at hand within the area of choice, the unfolding of human talents will be restricted. The material and social world, as it presently exists, sets the boundaries of external stimulus and inspiration.

No one person, to be sure, will have the full measure of his contemporary world at his disposal. But most people could have more of it than they do have if it seemed to them important to make the effort to get it. Everyone can share vicariously in a world larger than his own through the medium of the arts. The arts, the sciences, and commerce have opened doors which for our fathers were closed. In this fact, our generation has an unparalleled opportunity for freedom, but even this opportunity will seem meager to the generations which follow us.

Why should the fact of freedom be set beside the feeling of freedom, equal with it and indispensable? What importance has the fact of freedom to one who feels himself free? Whose business is it? Why should people—why should I—carry an unwelcome burden in the fact of freedom if I can feel free within whatever binds me? And, particularly, if others do not want for themselves the fact of freedom, why should I assume any responsibility for them or for the conditions of their voluntary life?

There are two answers to these questions. First, no man can be free in a company of slaves, however well-contented they may be. He cannot be free because they will not permit him to be free. His words and acts will be a constant irritation to the easy conventions and superstitions of the mob and of its leaders. Having no conscience and no faith in human dignity, the unfree will restrain the free by violence if they are powerful enough to do so. Accordingly, the choice for the free is either to assume responsibility for securing the fact of freedom for all or to amass the force necessary to defend his own freedom against the unfree.

In the second place, it is good that other men should be able to achieve, for themselves, the fullness of personal development and responsibility which one desires for oneself. It is good that they should have this opportunity, whether they wish it or not; and they must not prevent others from enjoying it, even by persuading them that they do not want it. The justification of our aspiration for freedom lies, in part, in our purpose to bring freedom to others and to contribute, in the measure of our own capacity, to the emancipation of the human spirit everywhere.

ORDER AND CONSENT

We live in an orderly universe. The only unorderly element in it is the human will. There are some who do not believe in human responsibility or in the possibility of freedom. They include the human will with the rest of the universe, as determined exclusively by the impersonal laws of nature. For them there is no freedom, only order; only the illusion of freedom; no men, only animals. We must act on belief in human responsibility and the possibility of freedom in a world of order.

The order of the universe comes from three sources—(1) natural law, (2) habit, and (3) the rules of governments.

1. Natural law gives us day and night, the four seasons, rain in summer and snow in winter, the energy in oil and the nutriment in grain. It gives us the generations of men and the instincts of men, the compulsions of anatomy and physiology. It gives us the possibility of habit.

2. Habit is order imposed on protoplasm. The capacity of protoplasm to acquire habits comes from its nature, from natural law. The habits which it acquires, it acquires from its environment.

Habits may be acquired by plants, animals, and men. Wind, rain, and sun will affect the pattern of movement of branches and leaves. The training of horses for work and for amusement is the adaptation by habit of the inner animal to the outer world.

The habits of a man, like those of an animal, are order imposed on an already ordered protoplasm. Note the structure of man with legs and arms and neither tail nor wings; the tensions, hungers, and sluggishness of his body; the sense organs he has, and those he has not; the endowment of organization in nerve, bone, and muscle, resulting in reflexes, instincts, and special talents and sensitivities. These are the orderings and the limitations of his nature.

Habit follows nature, superimposing order upon order. From the moment of birth, and before it, adaptation to the outer world begins. As adaptation continues, as the same situations occur over and over again, the response becomes certain, efficient, and unconscious.

Our behavior is ordered in part by our natural endowments, in part by habit, and in part by conscious choice, according to the uniformity and the frequency of particular experiences. But, fortunately for us, we are not required to pass attentively over the same ground, over and over again. Habit steps in to relieve us of that burden.

2. After natural law and habit, the rules of the rule makers give additional form and certainty to our expectations. When rules are wise, they are consistent with natural law. After rules have been operative for some time, they are assimilated and made effective as habits. When they have become habits, they seem as natural as natural law itself.

Rules differ from habits in that they always have their origin, at some time—perhaps long ago—in the decision of a rule-making agency. Rules are the pronouncements of the human will for the control of the human will. They display the insight and blindness, the generosity and greed, the care and carelessness of the human source from which they came.

The order arising from natural law, habit, and the rules of rule-makers gives us such certainty as we possess concerning expectation of the future. Certainty of expectation is indispensable to the full exercise of freedom. Our decisions and our choices always relate to actions whose outcome is in the future. We must have some assurance that if we decide one way, the outcome will be so; if we decide the other way, the outcome will be another. Without order in the universe, there could be no such assurance; and without assurance, without provision of the consequences of choice, freedom of choice is meaningless. Freedom and chaos are incompatible.

The fact of order in the universe does not, therefore, preclude freedom, it gives freedom its moral significance.

The operations of natural law are generally accepted as limitations to which we must accommodate ourselves. But we need not conform to these limitations with complete docility. We can fight natural law with natural law. A lens can help us see, an electric current can help us hear. We have no wings, and yet we fly. We have quinine, and the recurrent chills and fever of malaria do not recur. For most of us, the limitations arising from natural law appear necessary and valid, and we do not raise the futile question whether they are desirable or not. The intrepid and disembodied scientist and inventor sees in these limitations a challenge and solves the problem, using natural law to his purpose. We all gain by this extension of our area of choice, not necessarily in the feeling of freedom, but in the fact of it—since through activity and experience we can become what otherwise we might never have been.

Consent to the existing structure of order is necessary to the feeling of freedom; and without the feeling of freedom, choice is irresponsible and the growth of individuality inconceivable.

Most people accept the order of the world that comes from natural law and habit. But the rules of the rule makers, if they are unwelcome, seem less necessary. They are man-made orders for the ordering of men. To be acceptable when they are imposed, they must be valid; they must be imposed with the consent of the governed. Minorities must concur, at least for the time being, in the decision of majorities. Otherwise, even though the laws of men be necessary and desirable in the building of order and certainty, they are unacceptable in a free society since they have been imposed by one will upon another will, without the latter's consent and without acquiescence in their essential validity.

The consent of the governed is sometimes consent to the rule itself, but, more often, it is consent to the rule making of some recognized authority which decides what seems best. Ordinarily, we cannot know enough about the complicated issues and essential facts to know, for ourselves, whether or not a rule is proper. We must depend on those who make the rules to study the whole situation and to legislate and to administer fairly in the best interests of all. Rule by consent is usually consent to the rule maker's authority, and from this follows, naturally, acquiescence in the rules themselves.

THE ATTAINMENT OF FREEDOM

In the United States the national state is committed fundamentally to the ideal of human freedom. It is committed by the declaration of its independence, and by the bill of human rights which reserve to the individual liberties which even the dominant governing power may not infringe. Its history, its internal dissensions, its conflicts with external national powers—all confirm the constant, if irregular, march toward the goal which inspired its beginning. The ideal of freedom is not merely a statement expressed in various forms in declaration, constitution, and the speeches of public leaders; but it is deeply embedded in the mind and culture of the people. The obvious imperfections in our attainment of this standard are overwhelmingly regarded as deviations from a norm, and not as the repudiation of the ideal. And, generally speaking, the country is committed to the elimination of these imperfections as rapidly as education, insight, and the orderly processes of rule by consent permit.

Now, in our own time, although common moral objectives have not yet been generally accepted, the moral issues of freedom have been drawn again. The issues are old ones, centuries old. Are human beings, all human beings, human? Are they created equal in their rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

Are they entitled to achieve freedom? Do they stand, as persons, above race, sex, creed, and nationality? Are the governments which are instituted among men—governments public and private—ends for themselves alone? Or are they the means of providing a frame of order within which the dignity and worth of each human personality may be actualized through responsible freedom of choice?

It is clear that human freedom in an absolute sense can never be attained. Freedom will always be relative, a matter of more or less. The life impulse to freedom will constantly drive toward more and away from less, even though it be toward a goal which constantly recedes as it is approached and is better understood. There can be no day when it will be said that human freedom has been finally won. Accordingly, we strike, not for a moment of victory that will divide the past from the future, the dark from the bright, but for an expanding opportunity for each and all of us to grow over the years in human stature. The obstacles along the way are ignorance, superstition, and the love of arbitrary power. These obstacles can be minimized by science and education, by spiritual insight revealing the worth and dignity of man, and by a rule of order established and administered with the consent of the governed.

In a country like the United States, so deeply committed to the ideal of human freedom, the various organizations and agencies—public and private—must safeguard and advance the ideal of human freedom. Imperfections and inadequacies are tolerated, but they are not excused. Repudiation of the ideal of freedom is neither tolerated nor excused. Governments may not legally infringe the rights of the people. Church, family, trade union, business, and education will be judged more and more explicitly by the aid they gave to the struggle for freedom.

And as the requirements for freedom are better understood, our social institutions will be tested against increasingly severe standards for individual growth and development; and each institution, according to its own nature, will contribute increasingly to the supreme ideal in promoting the attainment of human freedom.

A Salute to the Salvation Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "A Salute to the Salvation Army," written by my old friend, Mr. Harry H. Schlacht, which appeared in the New York Journal-American of March 10. This editorial was printed on the seventieth anniversary of the Salvation Army, that fine organization which for the past 70 years has been exerting its efforts in behalf of the poor and the friendless. I think Mr. Schlacht's editorial is a well-phrased tribute to this organization.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SALUTE TO THE SALVATION ARMY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Anniversaries have a threefold meaning. They speak of the past with its inspiration. They speak of the present with its challenge. They speak of the future with its possibilities.

Today we salute the Salvation Army. It is 70 years young. It is an army of peace. It is an army of salvation. It is everybody's army.

It is salvation to all whom it serves. It is salvation to all who serve through it.

They are in the truest sense good Samaritans. They do not pass on the other side of the street when there is someone who needs a helping hand within sight or sound.

They do their Godly work without regard to race, color, or creed.

This uniformed army of salvation is not only ceaselessly fighting to succor hungry and shelterless bodies but they fight for the souls in these bodies as well.

Where there's need—there is the Salvation Army.

It preaches the fatherhood of God. It preaches the reward of righteousness. It preaches the spiritual truths of the Scriptures.

It teaches God is love.

The Salvation Army is a living monument to the thousands of the most devoted and consecrated humanitarians the world has ever known.

They proclaim and exemplify through songs, word, and deeds the revitalizing message of the Scriptures.

They go out after the people. They go out into the streets. They go out into the darkest places. They go out with drums and tambourines. They search out the fallen, the homeless, those in need—for "a man may be down but never out."

The Salvation Army has achieved immortality in the practice of the spirit of Christianity.

It is a spiritual lighthouse. Its lights never go out. Its workers serve 'round the clock. Its workers serve through the calendar.

In times of war and in times of peace, they have served us well.

No sacrifice is too great.

Their welfare work among our fighting men has aroused the highest commendation of our Nation.

We are the army behind the Salvation Army. We must answer their appeal for funds. We must subscribe to their appeal for $1,292,000.

May our response be quick and generous.

May we remember today Gen. William Booth, the founder of the Salvation Army.

May we help to build today a stronger foundation for our civilization of tomorrow.

May the seventieth year of the Salvation Army prove to be only one of the many milestones on the road of its blessed service to fallen humans.

Wildlife Restoration Proclamation by the Governor of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a wildlife restoration proclamation issued on the 7th of this month by the Honorable Okey L. Patteson, Governor of the State of West Virginia.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Charleston.

A PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR

Whereas a national observance of Wildlife Restoration Week was inaugurated 11 years ago by Presidential proclamation; and

Whereas various citizens, individually and through their organizations interested in conserving our country's soil and minerals, its forests, waters, and wildlife, have continued such an observance from year to year; and

Whereas West Virginia, more than many other States of the Nation, has been abundantly blessed with these resources, a consideration which renders this program worthy of our most serious attention:

Now, therefore, I, Okey L. Patteson, Governor of the State of West Virginia, do proclaim the week beginning March 19, 1950, to be Wildlife Restoration Week in this State. I deem it my duty, furthermore, to advocate the education of our people in every way open to us to the vital necessity of preserving and increasing our wildlife, through proper use of the soil and through the enforcement of the conservation laws, and to urge public cooperation with all State agencies charged with this most important phase of our program for living.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State to be affixed.

Done at the capitol in the city of Charlestown, State of West Virginia, this the 7th day of March, in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and fifty, and in the eighty-seventh year of the State.

OKEY L. PATTESON,
Governor.

The Individual Rights and Liberties of Workingmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to have included therein the remarks of Robert N. Denham, General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, before Town Hall at Los Angeles, Calif., on February 6, 1950, which remarks were based on his familiarity with the operation of the Taft-Hartley Act since it was enacted into law by the Eightieth Congress. His views, spoken on this occasion, present to many uninformed persons the efficient operation of the act since its inception, and the protection it affords the workers who are covered under it.

His remarks follow:

During the past 2½ years, the outpouring of words concerning the Taft-Hartley Act probably has been exceeded by no other single topic—public, political, or private—in the memory of any of us. We've heard the law condemned as vicious, as a union-busting device, as the slave labor law, and as a general menace to the welfare of organized labor. Then, too, we've heard it hailed—and I've done my share of it—as a great balance wheel in our structure of labor and industrial relations, and as one of the things that protects our national economy by its influence on, and stabilization of industrial peace, but we've heard little on the topic of what the Taft-Hartley Act means to the individuals of the Nation, both those who are immediately and directly touched by its operations, and those who feel its impact only indirectly.

Those in the first class are the workers who, according to the critics of the law, are enslaved by it. Those in the second class are the farmers, and most of the public who pay for and consume the products that this enslaved American labor turns out; and, believe me, when that labor fails to produce, the impact of such loss of production can indeed be tragic to those who are indirectly affected by it. It is then that this second group of individuals comes into the foreground. When things are going along smoothly, and production is uninterrupted, and prices are within reasonable reach of most people, little thought is given to this second group, to whom the Taft-Hartley Act probably is little more than a name until some sort of industrial wreck occurs, and then it is expected to serve as a rescue squad.

But the relation of the Taft-Hartley Act to the individuals who are the employees described in the act, are naturally the first ones we think about when we begin to attempt to appraise the relationship between the individual and the Taft-Hartley Act.

To get a fair picture of this relationship, it probably is desirable to make a short backtrack in the area of labor relations, searching for a clear concept of the reason for the things we have before us. Of course, labor relations in some form, have existed almost since the beginning of time, when one man was a boss, and the other was a slave or a servant. I don't think we have to go back that far. Let's confine ourselves to our own life span, or reasonably near it. Strikes are not new. We had them here, I think, in Philadelphia in the latter part of the eighteenth century. History gives us little as to the form or type of labor organization of that time, but there definitely was something, for the strikes seemed to be well timed and intelligently led.

A few weeks ago, I happened to come across some old copies of Frank Leslie's Illustrated Weekly Newspaper, published, I think, in 1883. The papers were rather startlingly illustrated with what seemed to be wood cuts, and I was interested to note that the disorders in the field of labor in those days were just about the same kind of things we have to contend with now. There were pictures of strikers emptying milk out of wagons and letting it flow down the gutters; there were pictures of strikers overturning and burning streetcars (they used horse cars then, you know); there were illustrations of mob scenes during the then-current coal strike; there were empty and idle machine shops, and companies of militia acting as escorts or guards for the horse cars that were the subject of the dispute—all were reminiscent of some of the things that we've seen here in these United States during our lifetimes. Of course, the organizations of labor at that were sketchy, where they existed at all, but they at least reflected the thing that labor now has found, that in unity there is strength. They began to learn the lesson of the application of economic force in support of their demands, the hard way, because then there was no protection for the workingman who was unwilling, quietly and meekly, to just take anything the employer handed out.

From the late eighties of the last century up to the late twenties of this century, the whole history of the United States was one of rapid, prosperous industrial growth, unprincipled competition, and political domination by a not too scrupulous class of capitalistic entrepreneurs, who wielded their powers ruthlessly and without regard to the human, economic, or social rights of anyone else. Those were the days of laissez faire, and of the public be damned.

In those days the workingman had no legal and but very little economic protection. Organizations of workingmen were successfully prosecuted as conspiracies. Federal injunctions against concerted activities by labor organizations or groups of workingmen appear to have been available to employers almost for the asking. The social chasm between the employer and the workingman became progressively wider and deeper, and seemed to be more and more impossible of being bridged. It was because of these conditions that the Norris-LaGuardia Act that banned injunctions against labor organizations was placed upon the books in the early

thirties of this century, and other legislation was passed to protect labor organizations from prosecution as conspiracies. It was at about this time that a general realization began to assert itself among the American people that the individuals who have to work for their living have basic freedoms that are entitled to protection. The core of this freedom is the right of each person freely and without restraint to join openly with his fellow men in concerted efforts to protect his economic conditions and to improve them. One of the important aims of this freedom is the right of the workingman, individually or collectively, to withhold his services in support of his efforts to obtain adequate pay for what he does, and to be furnished with appropriate working conditions. Just as surely, of course, that freedom means that, while these rights exist, the exercise of them will be protected, and that there also exists the right to refrain from doing these things and to be protected in so refraining.

By 1935 these freedoms were not only being withheld by all too many employers, but attempts to exercise them were heavily penalized. To be sure employees are not the only ones who have these freedoms and rights, for employers had and have their basic rights and freedoms also, and are equally entitled to protection in the exercise of them. However, in both cases, these basic rights are never unqualified. In exercising them, they must be accommodated to the basic rights of the rest of society and to the national welfare. When these rights and their exercise are not fairly balanced, they become menaces, but so long as they are reasonably balanced and honestly exercised, they become the fundamentals of the economic freedoms of the workingman and his employer as well.

The possession of these basic rights and freedoms by an individual is meaningless, unless there exists a way of halting violations of those rights by forces that are superior to the individual himself. One of the primary functions of our Government is to protect the individual against such violations of his rights.

It was because these rights were being invaded or denied by all too many employers, that the Wagner Act was passed in 1935. I hardly need point out that the basic principle of the Wagner Act was that the employee must be protected in his exercise of the right freely to join with other employees to set up labor organizations for the purpose of collective bargaining with their employers. It was designed to protect no one except the workingman, and in doing so, to promote the principle of collective bargaining.

To implement those principles, that act pointed out what we now know as unfair labor practices, as the means most frequently adopted by employers to defeat them; and authorized the National Labor Relations Board to prevent the commission of such unfair labor practices by the issuance of cease and desist orders directed to the employers involved. These are of the nature of injunctions, but may not go beyond the unfair labor practices as described by the law.

It's perfectly obvious, after observing how large a segment of the American people fall within the statutory definition of employees, that the collective bargaining contemplated by the law would have to be carried on by the organizations of employees that would exist for the benefit of and be controlled by the employees whom they represented. Certainly that was the indicated intent of Congress in framing the Wagner Act.

However, after the Wagner Act became firmly established, it took only a short time to reverse that concept, and to develop in the field of labor organizations, the philosophy that employers existed for the benefit of the labor organizations, and that the labor organizations had a vested interest in them. While an employee was protected against unfair labor practices perpetrated by the employer, he was afforded no protection against being imposed upon from any other quarter, including his own labor union, and, realistically, he had little freedom of action in many of the unions that sprang up under those new circumstances.

The Wagner Act gave the individual employee no protection, for instance, against coercion on the part of so-called representatives of labor organizations, who sought to force him to become a member, or to cooperate in strikes and other similar activities. The closed shop, which made membership in a union a condition precedent to getting employment, was an accepted instrumentality of the labor organization, under the Wagner Act, by which it forced employees into their unions, and was another form of coercion. Early in the game, the general attitude of too many of these organizations toward those who did not care to join the union, or to participate in the union activities, became progressively more arrogant and, in many instances, impossible.

I know of numerous cases where windows were broken, where bottles filled with paint were thrown through windows into homes, there to spatter their contents over walls. It is a common technique among some of the more lawless elements, and it still is practiced. Of course, these things may not have been done by the unions, but it is interesting to note that it is always a nonunion man, or the fellow who wants to work while the other fellows are striking for whatever cause it may be, who is on the receiving end of this type of conduct. Men have been beaten up because they wouldn't support the union; their families have been intimidated, and that, too, is going on even today, although some progress has been made to stop it. In short, the employee under the Wagner Act was in a position where, if the union decided it wanted to make it tough for him it could do anything it wanted to, and he had no recourse except to look to the civil authorities. The Government offered him no protection under the labor laws.

Under the Wagner Act the employee never had a chance, by virtue of any of the election processes, to rid himself of an unwanted union. If, at an election, the majority of those who voted, voted in favor of the union, then the only way the employees could get it out of the picture was to induce another union to come in and file a petition for an election, and then either vote for no union or switch from the old one to the new one, which, too frequently, was a case of going from the frying pan into the fire. In other words, he was stuck with it. If he sought to get out—if he sought to clean house in the union—if he sought to do any of the things which were, or at least should have been, his rights in this so-called democratic organization, he frequently found himself in the bad graces of the controlling officers of the union, and generally it was not very long then before some excuse was found to deprive him of his good standing in the union and of his job. He had no protection in that, either.

To be sure, the individual working under the Wagner Act was protected against being fired or otherwise mistreated by his employer because of association with, or membership in, a labor organization, or because of his efforts to bring about the introduction of such an organization into the plant. He was likewise protected in making his free choice of an organization for purposes of collective bargaining; and was protected in the right to insist that the employer freely and in good faith bargain with that representative on matters pertaining to wages, hours, rates of pay, and other conditions of employment. But he wasn't protected against being called out on a sympathy strike because his employer happened to do business with somebody down the line who was engaged in a dispute with the union. And he wasn't protected against long and expensive days of idleness growing out of strikes that were the result of some interunion dispute as to whether this union or that union had jurisdiction over a certain piece or type of work, and one of these unions was forcing strike idleness on all the workers, by putting up a picket line to force the employer to assign that work to the picketing union. There wasn't any way by which he could be protected against that terribly wasteful procedure, for, believe me, when those situations occurred, and the picket lines went up, he just couldn't go through, because if he did it would mean his membership standing or his being blacklisted, possibly forever, in his trade. Those are some of the things that the individual had to take under the Wagner Act. Neither the labor organizations nor their members seemed to realize there was another and better way to accomplish their economic independence. They still were living in the recollection of the old jungle warfare in which they had been raised.

The Wagner Act was practically a blank check to every labor organization to indulge itself without restriction or restraint, under the protection of a Board which gave every appearance of operating under a mandate to administer it in such fashion as to give the labor organizations all the breaks and to hold the feet of the employers to the fire on all possible occasions.

At any rate, that's the way the thing worked out, and as a natural result, the labor organizations became more and more demanding for their own account, and more and more audacious; and less and less considerate of the rights of society as a whole, and of the rights of individuals, in particular.

The next result was inevitable, for just as public opinion demanded the passage of the Wagner Act in 1935, in order to curb the conduct of the employers that had become progressively less and less excusable, so, in 1947, public opinion swung in the other direction, and demanded, not that employers be released from their obligations and responsibilities under the Wagner Act, but that the labor organizations, also, be forced and required to accept and recognize responsibilities on their part, for their misconduct that had been playing just as much a role, during the past 12 years, in the creation of industrial unrest, as the conduct of employers had done during the preceding time. Conscientious employers were demanding that the basic rights and freedoms of their employees be recognized and that the abuses of the unions be restrained. After many weeks of hearings, to which, I might add, the labor organizations of the United States contributed little or nothing, the Eightieth Congress put together a law which represents the first effort to bring about a balancing of the economic forces of industry and organized labor, and an equalization of the relations of the individual workman, the organization representing him, and the employer, one to the other.

The Taft-Hartley Act is built around the rights of the individual. It is not social legislation. It is purely regulatory legislation, growing out of abuses in the past, and out of the lessons taught by the fact that legislation, designed to protect one class or group at the expense of another, is bound to create only more turmoil, when its beneficiary is allowed to treat that legislation as his personal license to disregard the rules and conventions of society and the ordinary things which govern our relations, one with another, throughout this democratic Nation of ours.

I want to give you one little illustration of what this represents. In 1945, when the Wagner Act was the controlling legislation, three workers of a small plant in Kentucky were active in attempting to bring a labor organization into that plant. The other employees apparently did not want a union, so, when these persons approached the plant the next morning, they were met by a group of employees who told them they could not

enter the plant and work there. One of the three attempted to go in, regardless, was pushed around a good deal, and received some minor injuries, and, with this show of force, all three left the plant and quit their jobs. A charge was filed with the Board against the company for violation of the law and the company was required to reinstate those three persons into their jobs, and pay them whatever loss of pay they had incurred. The theory was that the employer owed a duty to these three union sympathizers to protect them against their fellow workers in the exercise of their statutory privilege to attempt to join or form a labor organization.

In 1947, after the Taft-Hartley Act had been passed, an almost identical episode occurred at Hagerstown, Md., except that in the second case, the gang that beat up the fellows that wanted to go to work were striking union employees. The victims were nonunion people who had no sympathy with the strike and wanted to work. Under the Wagner Act, there would have been no protection whatsoever for those nonunion people. Under the Taft-Hartley Act there is, and the union was held responsible. In other words, the basic right not to join a labor organization is as fully recognized and protected under the Taft-Hartley Act as is the right to participate in union activities. To take the labor picture back to the Wagner Act days, would take away from the individual many of the valuable rights he has today.

I want to run down, then, as fast as I can, some of the things that the Taft-Hartley Act means to the individual; things that he never had before the Taft-Hartley Act came on the books; things that were denied to him under the Wagner Act.

As I indicated a moment ago, the present law recognizes that the individual must have the right, not only freely to choose a labor organization to represent him, but the right to refrain from making such a choice, and also the right to get rid of that labor organization if its representation proves to be unsatisfactory. Under the Wagner Act, he could do none of these, but under the present law, the employees themselves may petition the Board for what we call a decertification election, and unless there is a valid contract in effect which would be a bar to any election, the Board normally will hold an election at which all the employees represented by that union in that plant will have the privilege of either confirming their selection of the union involved, or repudiating it. If they repudiate it, the union loses all representative authority, and the employees and the employer will neither be permitted nor required to hold another election in that plant for a period of 12 months.

I have pointed out that if a union, in the course of an organizational program, attempts to coerce an employee to become a member, the general counsel will entertain a charge to enjoin the union from continuance of such conduct. This extends to threats during a union organizational campaign as to what the union can and will do to persons who do not support them, after they succeed to getting into the plant.

I have spoken of the closed shop. Under the Wagner Act, the individual had little to say about this. The negotiators almost invariably demanded it from the employer—and usually got it. Thereafter, the employees joined the union and made sure they kept in the good graces of its leaders, for it was easy to merit their disfavor, and that often resulted in being expelled from the union—and fired from the job. Now, that is not possible. Now there is no closed shop—the most that can legitimately be found in any contract is provision for a union shop, and then, one can't be fired if he loses his good standing in the union for anything beyond his failure to pay dues. He doesn't have to be a union member in order to get a job. He does not have to go near a hiring hall, and the employer, who tries to require a union clearance, is himself guilty of an unfair labor practice. No; once again, the individual has acquired his basic rights and freedoms. He has been freed of his fear of the union bosses, for—at the very most—his only duty to them is to keep his dues paid. So long as he does that, they can't touch him—now. In fact, if he is expelled from the union for some cause other than nonpayment of dues, the employer not only is not required to fire him at the request of the union, but, if the employer should do so, both he and the union are guilty of an unfair labor practice, and the individual affected is entitled to come to the Board and file a charge which would be processed in regular order against both of them. All of which means that while the employee has, and did have under the Wagner Act, the right to file charges against an employer if he has been discriminatorily treated because of his membership or nonmembership in a union, he now can also file similar charges against the union if the union has exerted pressure upon the employer, as a result of which he has received discriminatory treatment, and require that such treatment be stopped in both directions.

Under the Wagner Act, it was entirely possible, and in fact in many places it was the practice, to incorporate in contracts, provisions for an automatic check-off. In such cases, very frequently, the employer and the union members had little to say about it at all; the contract provided for the check-off, and that was that. That provision was often a standard one found in many contracts, and the result was that the individual had his dues checked off and paid in whether he liked it or not. Many of the contracts would provide for check-off of assessments, fines, and other financial obligations, as well as the regular periodic dues. Today, the individual is protected and no check-off of any sort will be permitted without the written authority of the employee. He may make it as broad as he likes, to include all financial obligations, but no check-off may be made to be irrevocable for a longer period than 1 year. In other words, a check-off authorization may recite that it is irrevocable, but at any time after the end of a year from the time that it is signed, the employee may ask to have it revoked, and thereafter further check-off deductions may not be made. None of these rights and protections are found in the Wagner Act.

In the secondary boycott that I told you about, where an individual's employer may find his place picketed because he refuses to stop doing business with some person down the line who has a direct quarrel with the union, such an employee has no alternative. He must observe the picket line or lose his membership. Before the Taft-Hartley Act, there was no way he could avoid this loss of working time, but, under the Taft-Hartley Act, such a secondary boycott is prohibited. On the filing of a charge, the general counsel is required to seek an injunction to avoid such losses, both to the employer and the individual.

Under the Wagner Act, jurisdictional strikes, where one union was claiming the right to a job and the other was contesting that right, were regular performances that cost the working men of the country millions of dollars in lost wages each year. Today the Taft-Hartley Act provides machinery for the prompt and efficacious determination of those disputes, and provides, also, where circumstances warrant, that the general counsel may seek, and the courts may issue, injunctions to restrain picket lines or other media for obtaining the stoppage of work while the dispute is being determined. Again, the individual is being protected.

To be sure, labor organizations don't like this law because it requires them to recognize and adhere to the ordinary tenets of a highly civilized society. They say that the Taft-Hartley Act restricts their liberty. It doesn't restrict their liberty; it expands their liberty but restricts their license, and is, I think, an outstanding example of the propriety of wholesome regulation as defined in a statement by Daniel Webster that "Liberty exists in proportion to wholesome restraint."

In opening these remarks, I commented upon the fact that there are two types of individuals whose relationship to the Taft-Hartley Act will bear analysis. I've only been able to mention a few of the high spots that reflect the influence—beneficial influence, if you please—of the Taft-Hartley Act on the individuals who are directly affected by it. I may say I have found no one who has yet been able to point to any detrimental influences of that act upon individuals or on unions. It may have restricted indefensible license, but it has placed additional safeguards around the basic rights of both of them.

The individuals that are the public are entitled to even more thoughtful consideration. The power of a labor organization and the opportunity it has, by exercising that power, to cripple or destroy a segment of our economic structure is tremendous. The Taft-Hartley Act contains a number of elements that are designed to protect the individuals who make up the general public against these abuses.

The Norris-LaGuardia Act was designed to protect labor organizations from the harassment of employer-sought injunctions. I agree heartily with the general principles of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, but the Taft-Hartley Act has recognized the fact that, in many instances, labor's power has grown to the point where an abuse of it can bring about widespread loss, damage, and public distress, and that provision must be made to prevent abuse of this power where such abuse takes on the form of unfair labor practices that are set out in the statute. In short, that there still are destructive abuses that should be stopped at the threshold of their practice.

I am not going to dwell on the coal dispute. It has already received enough publicity so that I believe the general public, if they do not know what it is all about, at least have some decided opinions on it. But I do want to point out one other thing that is currently in the picture.

One of the things that the Taft-Hartley Act does not tolerate is violence and misconduct on the picket line. It does not permit mass picketing, or interference in any way with the exercise by employees or officials or the public, of the right to go and come from the premises of any employer, or the stoppage of the conduct of that employer's business, even though the union may be conducting a strike and having a picket line to advertise it.

Down in Carlsbad, N. Mex., are three potash mines. Those three mines are the source of 85 percent of all the potash that is used in the United States of America, and the demands for potash are such that by working 24 hours a day these mines have been just able to keep abreast of the current consumption. As you know, potash is one of the vital component parts of commercial fertilizer. Because production is restricted in such a fashion, there is no stock pile. When the potash production ceases, the manufacture and mixing of fertilizer is stopped, and 60 percent, I am told, of all of the plantings in the United States depends upon fertilizer; and 70 percent of all the fertilizer used in the United States is consumed between the first of January and the middle or latter part of April of each year. That means 700,000 tons, incidentally.

On the 18th of November of last year, the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union, which represents the employees in these three mines, went on strike as a result of being refused a 25¢ pay increase. They shut down the mines and they formed mass lines of pickets at the gates of the plant so that

even the maintenance men, belonging to two different unions, who wanted to go through, were turned back and not allowed to get into the mines. Needless to say, all others were turned back too. The matter went on, and eventually came to our attention. About 3 weeks ago, we obtained an injunction from the Federal court to prevent mass picketing or other interference with any of those persons who desired to go to work, or otherwise do business with the company. At first, there wasn't a great rush to go back on the job, because the production workers were the strikers, but maintenance men returned immediately, and within 10 days or so, production had been resumed, with potash coming out at about 50 percent of the normal rate, or maybe a little better. Many of the strikers had returned, and after the injunction had been in effect 2 weeks, the company advised the union and the strikers that a certain date which, if I recall correctly, was 2 weeks ago today, would be the time when other persons would be hired to replace the striking production men. I was advised just the evening before I left Washington that during that day the striking union had offered to return to work en masse if the company would just stop hiring replacements and would put those men who had been replaced on a preferential hiring list so that they could go to work in the next vacancies that should occur. By now, I take it, the mines are in full production. The injunction's efficacy was excellent. Potash is again being produced, and the farmers of the United States, solely because of the existence of the Taft-Hartley Act and its injunction provisions, stand a reasonable chance of getting their supplies of fertilizer again this year. Had there been no Taft-Hartley Act, and had the Wagner Act continued on the books as it was, the mines would still be closed unless, of course, the operators had surrendered to the union and met their demands. Had this happened, 60 percent of the agriculture of the United States for 1950 would have had to be planted without benefit of fertilizer. But the law has pulled us over that hump, we hope. I use that one illustration of the relation of the Taft-Hartley Act to the farmer and to the public at large—there are many others, but time does not permit. In short, the individual that makes up the public finds protection here.

I wish I could go on and on and on. I like the Taft-Hartley Act. I think it is, basically, the biggest step forward this Nation has ever made in doing something to insure stability of labor relations. But it must be understood, and the individuals must understand, that they are the people who are affected by it. The individuals, in the main, who stop and think, are not complaining. The labor leaders are, and it is they who are making the noise about it, but the benefits to the individuals who work and to the public cannot be brushed off lightly.

But, best of all, our great American public and our labor of the country are made up of sane, intelligent, sound, loyal persons, who, I have all the confidence in the world, will do the right thing in the end. The Taft-Hartley Act has given them an opportunity now to clean house; it has given them an opportunity to throw out the Communists who have infiltrated into so much of our labor movement as well as into other places throughout the structure of the Nation. That's another thing that the individual has gained. The chance to throw them out. Thank God, we now have procedure that make the Commies who are officers of the labor organizations stand up and be counted, and as that happens, a great house cleaning is going on.

The individual has a tremendous stake in this law, more than he has ever had in any current law. I just hope he will protect it.

Thank you.

Social Security Versus Railroad Retirement Tax Rates and Monthly Benefits—A Comparison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as exhibit E a table presenting a comparison of social security and railroad retirement taxes and benefits under present and proposed legislation. On several previous occasions I have presented comparative statements on this subject. This table summarizes and picks out the high spots from the other exhibits I have previously presented.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT E

FOUR TIMES 1½ PERCENT EQUALS 6 PERCENT

One rail worker pays 6-percent railroad-retirement tax. One industrial worker pays 1½-percent social-security tax. Therefore, one rail worker pays as much tax as the combined tax of four industrial workers.

Social security provides four industrial workers and their families with retirement and survivor benefits as compared to railroad-retirement benefits received by one rail worker, for whom there are no family benefits until after his death.

Social security versus railroad retirement tax rates and monthly benefits—a comparison

	Social security, 1950	H. R. 6000 social security, proposed	Railroad retirement, 1950
Tax rate (percent)	[1] 1½	[2] 1½	6
Cost per month	$3.75	$6.50	$15.00
Cost per year	45.00	54.00	216.00
Maximum retirement benefits possible to 1 worker and his family:			
Old age	$45.00	$64.40	
Wife	22.50	32.20	
Husband and wife	68.40	96.60	
Dependent children	[3] 16.80	[3] 25.40	
Total	85.00	150.00	$144.00
Maximum retirement benefits possible to 4 workers and their families	85.00 85.00 85.00 85.00	150.00 150.00 150.00 150.00	
Total	340.00	600.00	
Maximum survivor benefits possible: Widow and 3 or more children or for more children, of 1 deceased worker	85.00	150.00	101.25
Maximum survivor benefits possible to 4 families of 4 deceased workers [4]	85.00 85.00 85.00 85.00	150.00 150.00 150.00 150.00	
Total	340.00	600.00	

[1] On $250 maximum earnings per month.
[2] On $300 maximum earnings per month.
[3] Prorated equally.
[4] 4 widows and 12 or more children, or 16 or more children.

Source: Rail Pension News, published by the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

The above exhibit E has been submitted to the Senate Finance Committee now holding hearings on H. R. 6000 for their study and consideration that rail workers should receive the same ratio of increases in benefits now proposed for those covered by social security and has been submitted by Mr. Thomas G. Stack, president of the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc. (a voluntary organization of union and nonunion rail workers), March 1950.

Mysterious Disease, Multiple Sclerosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, several days ago I made an appeal to the Senate Appropriations Committee to authorize funds for research on one of the most dreaded of all diseases, multiple sclerosis.

Much too little is yet known as to what this disease is and what it does to its victims. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mrs. Amy Nichols, of Dedham, Mass., a victim of this disease. This story tells, vividly, what multiple sclerosis is and what it does to its victims numbering more than 250,000 in this country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Let's keep it quiet," were the whispered words of the well-meaning friend who helped me from the office of the doctor who first diagnosed my puzzling, paralyzed condition. I was too dazed then to question her advice, as she continued, "Don't talk about it or you'll only get false notions."

I staggered home, with the voice of the doctor ringing in my ears as he reluctantly told me I had a disease that would probably trouble me all my life and was incurable. To console me he pointed out that it was not fatal. "A person can live with it as long as can the present-day diabetic, that is, a normal life span," he said. While I was fearfully considering his words, I was aware that he had not yet pronounced the name of the malady. Perhaps it was like leprosy or some other unthinkable disease. When the doctor finally said, "Multiple sclerosis," it sounded harmless. Little did I then know that I was afflicted by a disease that strikes twice as many as does polio.

Yet I was soon to note that, just as at the mention of leprosy, tuberculosis, and cancer so, also, at the mention of multiple sclerosis suddenly would fall a hush-hush atmosphere as though this disease were unclean or bore a moral stigma, it was a secret.

Against this fact of secrecy I rebelled, almost as much as against the disease itself. I didn't want to keep it quiet as my friend advised. False notions or not, I wanted to cry out to the world against this insidious crippler that fells so many of us early in life. Like all the many thousands of us, victims of multiple sclerosis, I was aghast that everyone seemed to be conspiring to keep it a secret.

It may be multiple sclerosis that has struck that young man or woman within a few blocks of you who is forced to spend the remainder of a long life within the confines of four walls. To all appearances there is no deformity; there is no evidence, such as misshapen limbs, to indicate the victim's inability to ambulate in a proper manner. Yet, at best, there is a dragging of leg after leg as though each were attached to a leaden weight. And there is disturbance of the sense of balance that produces a wavering in the laboring gait. There is likely, also, to be distorted vision, faulty and uncertain manipulation of the fingers, and slurring speech. Was this prospect confronting me?

With dogged determination I found and observed many fellow victims. I discovered that among the men discharged from the armed services following World War II were some who were suffering from the initial attacks of this crippling disease. They survived a war only to be stricken by this tragedy. Many were married or were about to be married when this cruel development changed all that. For, except in rare cases, a victim of multiple sclerosis cannot expect to be able to earn a livelihood. I say "expect" because the instability that is part of multiple sclerosis is not compatible with the usual forms of regular employment.

There is nothing static about multiple sclerosis, as is the case of an amputated or ordinary paralyzed arm or leg. Today might be the end of a remission, as periods of alleviated symptoms are called, and tomorrow might be the beginning of an exacerbation, when the symptoms are aggravated. No one can tell when or why these irregular, erratic cycles occur nor how much deterioration takes place.

Several factors beside the name difficulty may account for the public being so long unaware of this disease. Multiple sclerosis, is not usually considered fatal. Though the victim may lose, gradually and insidiously, his power of locomotion, his sense of equilibrium, his control over the direction of his limbs, the dexterity of his fingers, his sense of touch, his continence, his good vision, his clear speech, his strength; or any or all of these; yet it isn't considered fatal.

Another factor which may account for the public's ignorance of multiple sclerosis is that there is usually no pain, as pain is usually described. The mental anguish at the loss of the powers described above does not constitute pain, it is true; but, oh, what suffering. The mental anguish felt when one learns that she failed to recognize, with her faulty vision, a friend who greeted her, or when made conscious of one's weaving gait, by a whispered "She must have had one too many," does not constitute pain, it is true; but oh, what suffering. The mental anguish felt when one sees that very little is being done to delve into the mysteries of this disease, does not constitute pain, it is true; but oh, what suffering. As you know, the sensation from being pinched is pain. One does not seriously object to a playful pinching, however vigorous, but if that same pinching were to continue, for an hour, a day, a month, ad infinitum, would you not cry out as if in pain? If you sit too long in one position and a leg or an arm goes to sleep, you voice a complaint. If that feeling were to last interminably, wouldn't you complain more loudly? When one of your fingers or a toe feels numb, or it calls attention to itself by the sensation commonly described as "pins and needles," is that not painful? When that sensation involves all of the fingers, and all of the toes, and if it were moreover to continue with scarcely a let-up, would it not make you miserable and cry out in pain? Just suppose you attached to each of your shoes a heavy weight; would you be happy to drag yourself about with these handicaps for life?

There is in addition to such discomforts described above an unrelenting fatigue, heaviness of body, extreme exhaustion, that tortures the multiple sclerosis victim. Despite all of these symptoms there is a desperate compulsion to keep afloat in the face of an increasing erratic paralysis.

This is the mysterious disease—multiple sclerosis. These are the tortures that over 250,000 of us are enduring today in this country.

Sumner Pike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, one of Maine's most illustrious sons is Hon. Sumner Pike, of Lubec, Maine, who is now the Acting Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The Portland Press-Herald in an editorial has stated a very good case for changing his acting status as Chairman to that of permanent Chairman. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PIKE'S PEAK

When we suggested a month ago that Sumner Pike of Lubec would make an excellent chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, of which he is now acting chairman, we did not do so on the basis of his Maine nativity.

Two strong arguments support this recommendation. First, Commissioner Pike is the only holdover from the original five, and therefore the group's only link between its important formative years and current operations.

Secondly, the Maine man has a rare knack for imparting atomic data in a manner to be understood by the nonscientist. Furthermore, his good humor and sharp wit make his impartations palatable, but we don't seriously commend these to the President for consideration.

At Harvard University last week end we were privileged to spend a number of hours in conference with Pike, Dr. Shields Warren, biochemist of the AEC and others connected with the Commission. Newsmen from a number of New England papers heard Pike do what he is so good at, heard him bring a very difficult subject down to the level of a layman's mind.

Pike, for instance, in describing a rather complicated atomic process, would say that it was like "winnowing blueberries." At another time he discussed a certain type of explosion, saying that so many units of something-or-other were released "per unit of bang." And so on, for several entertaining and educational hours.

Those who heard him were once again impressed by his abilities to understand and to explain, his nonpartisan approach, his enthusiasm for his job. His listeners couldn't learn all there was to know in one night, but they learned enough to give them a better grasp of the problem when writing about it in New England newspapers.

The Lubec man has served the Government in several capacities, but never before has he served so brilliantly. He has now reached a peak which has brought great satisfaction to his home State and certainly a measure of satisfaction to the man himself. In naming a chairman for the all-important Atomic Energy Commission, President Truman would do well to select a man with Sumner Pike's variety of qualifications.

What if Mills Produced Billions in Surplus Goods?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What if Mills Produced Billions in Surplus Goods?" written by Herman A. Lowe, and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IF MILLS PRODUCED BILLIONS IN SURPLUS GOODS?

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, March 23.—Picture, if you can, Pennsylvania's factories turning out far more goods than they know the public will buy.

Picture them striving to increase production, knowing that the Government will guarantee them a profit for any surplus above what the public absorbs.

Picture Congress building warehouses to hold this surplus and giving it away free to foreign countries. And picture you, the public, being taxed for the cost.

Absurd? Ridiculous? Impossible?

Then add this final absurdity—Congress voting more money to build more factories to produce more surpluses to sell to the Government at a profit—with you being taxed for that, too.

Unfortunately, it is not impossible at all. Not only can it happen here; it is happening here. Just substitute the farm-support program for Pennsylvania's factories and you have the whole picture.

Citing chapter, verse, and United States Government statistics, JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, told his colleagues in the Senate the other day that in 18 months "we have produced in this country approximately $7,500,000,000 worth of agricultural commodities more than we have consumed, all of which have been purchased with the taxpayers' money."

"Of that amount," continued Senator WILLIAMS, "nearly $3,500,000,000 worth of agricultural commodities have been given away at home and abroad, while the remaining $4,000,000,000 worth are at the present time deteriorating in our bulging warehouses and caves."

Senator WILLIAMS quoted sober fact and backed it up with the black and white figures. Congress is thoroughly familiar with the situation.

Yet, on the same day that WILLIAMS was making his statement, this headline appeared on page 1 of a Washington newspaper: "Farmers fail to cut crops as United States asks. Report on plantings indicates big yields under price props."

The article went on to explain that farmers were disregarding the Federal request for smaller crops of price-supported crops and were heading for another year of huge surpluses in potatoes, grains, peanuts and other things. Thanks to the law which guarantees them price supports, the farmers will be able to sell their surpluses to the Government at a profit.

Thus you have the absurdity under which farmers now grow crops not for use—but merely to sell to their Government to store,

or destroy, or dump in Europe. With the taxpayers picking up the check, of course.

That is the situation which would be so ridiculous if it were to happen to Pennsylvania's factories.

And your Government has been constructing additional bins and warehouses in which to keep the unwanted surpluses it is required by law to buy.

What is more, Congress is now in the process of making a law to give the Commodity Credit Corporation another $1,000,000,000 so that it can buy and hoard or dump still more surpluses in the next couple of years.

But then there is the ultimate absurdity referred to above. The Government has more than $1,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money already tied up in surplus cotton—a full year's supply of the stuff. The Department of Agriculture has ordered acreage restrictions to hold down production this year. Congress is now making them restrictions.

It is making a law to increase this cotton acreage by 1,200,000 acres. Everybody in Congress knows the cotton grown on this land will be surplus cotton which must be purchased by the Government and hidden in a warehouse.

There is a huge surplus of peanuts. The Government is stuck with $25,000,000 worth which it was required to buy and hold off the market. The Department of Agriculture sought to restrict peanut acreage to hold down that growing surplus.

Congress is pushing through a law to permit the rise to an additional 100,000 acres this year to grow whole peanuts, plus an unlimited amount of land for peanuts to be crushed for oil.

It is equivalent to the Government building extra factories in Pennsylvania to manufacture surplus goods.

That's what's going on in Washington with the Nation $250,000,000,000 in the red, with a multibillion dollar deficit for this year, and with another multibillion dollar deficit already predicted for next year.

But, really, the factory owners of Pennsylvania shouldn't worry. They ought to rip out their machinery and rent the buildings to the Government as storage space for surplus persimmons and artichokes.

Hon. Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the New York Times of this morning carries an editorial which expresses the hope that ARTHUR VANDENBERG will soon return to take his seat in the Senate. The Times wishes to have the Nation hear again from the missing voice. I think this is a wish which is shared by most of us at home and abroad. I join with all Senators in compliment to the Times for its reference to one of the great Americans of his day. The Senate will benefit in every way when ARTHUR VANDENBERG answers again to his name. May everybody's good wishes add speed and strength to his recovery.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MISSING VOICE

It is devoutly to be hoped that Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG will soon be well enough to resume his seat in the Senate. The size of the place he occupied in that body, and his immense usefulness to his party and his country, were never so evident as in his absence in a time of critical debate. Without him the Republicans seem leaderless and uncertain. Even the Democrats miss the clear, authoritative voice that rises above the buzz of party politics to define American policy to the world. For Senator VANDENBERG's distinction is that he has given leadership to both parties in the development of foreign policy, and more than any other American has lined up behind it the massive popular support that has been our greatest asset in the postwar years.

This leadership is lacking today. There is no real question of continued support of the bipartisan policy sponsored by the Senator from Michigan. This is, after all, American policy; it is safe because it grows out of our basic interests and involves our national honor and good faith. Congress will grumble and try to pare down, but our commitments under the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact and other international engagements will be fulfilled. But we have to go forward from there, and where the vision, experience, and good-tempered statesmanship of Senator VANDENBERG are needed is in hard transitions like the present, when new issues arise and policy has to evolve to meet fresh tests and changing conditions. The wish for his speedy recovery is a wish not for him alone but for the country he serves so well.

Czechoslovakia Way Ahead in the Hat Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post is performing an excellent service in calling public attention to the damage being done to domestic industries through excessive importation of finished products. A striking example is the hat industry, which employs almost 6,000 people in two cities in Connecticut—Danbury and Norwalk. The Danbury concerns are now on a 3-day week, and spokesmen for the Norwalk industry state that they "wonder where the next year's business is coming from." Indicative of the Democratic administration's callous disregard for the workers' welfare is the remark attributed to ECA spokesmen before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that "the American worker is fortunate in that he may receive unemployment-compensation benefits." That is typical of the attitude which this group has. They are far more interested in helping foreign nations, and in the process, dragging the American standard of living down to correspond with that of other countries less fortunate.

I predict that the American citizens earning good wages and the ones with great amounts of capital invested in domestic industries will not look kindly upon those who foster this program.

Editorial and news excerpts from the Bridgeport Post follow:

HAT INDUSTRY SPEAKS UP

An American Federation of Labor official has made the charge in Washington that slave labor behind Czechoslovakia's iron curtain is threatening to turn Danbury into a ghost town. Norwalk feels the same way.

Imports from the Communist country are crippling the hat city's industries, declared Marx Lewis, general secretary of the Hatters' International Union and a member of the executive committee of the national labor-management committee on foreign-trade policy. This committee now in session represents nearly a score of industries which feel they are being unfairly treated by the amount of foreign goods being allowed to come into the United States.

The union spokesman said that American hat workers cannot possibly survive against slave-labor competition. And of course they can't, with foreign wages and transportation costs so low. What labor and management want in this case is a tariff wall against foreign imports of felts which 300 percent in 1949.

Thomas J. Wall of the Norwalk Hat Co. says last year's imports from Czechoslovakia exceeded any year's importation for more than 15 years, affecting the industry in an alarming manner. In other words, United States dollars are being sent beyond the communistic iron curtain to provide competition for United States industries, an unexpected version of communism versus capitalism.

This is an amazing revelation. Czechoslovakia is today nothing more than a puppet state, a satellite taking its orders from Moscow. Soviet Russia has been trying openly, for at least 5 years, to cripple our economy. There is every reason to believe that Czechoslovakia is playing its part in the Kremlin's attempt to injure American industry.

Within the year, it is fully expected in Washington, that Czechoslovakia, with the other puppets, will be incorporated into the Soviet empire, to become provinces of the totalitarian domain. Are we going to continue to do business with such a nation to the detriment of our own people, our own industries?

There are other industries similarly affected, among them the shoe and leather industry, which has already complained of the dumping of cheap Czech shoes into the American market. These United States industries have a real fight on their hands to convince Congress and the Tariff Commission of the dire need for protection against the old bugbear, cheap production from abroad. And this time it is cheap production from a nation which is forced by its rulers to be an economic and political enemy.

IMPORTS CREATING HAT TRADE SLUMP—DANBURY HAT PRODUCTION CUT TO 3,000 DOZEN IN 3-DAY WEEK

The combined impact of Czech iron-curtain importations and a general decline in business has tumbled Danbury's hat-making production from a capacity of 30,000 dozen for a 5-day week to 3,000 dozen for a current 3-day a week schedule, it was reported today.

Approximately 3,000 hat workers are employed in 14 main plants in Danbury and lack of business has forced the 3-day a week program, according to available statistics.

Union and plant officials who describe the situation as "very serious" declare that a hatless fad in various sections of the country is accentuating the critical situation in the hat industry.

In Norwalk, second largest hat-producing community in Fairfield County, a total of approximately 2,750 persons are employed in

13 companies. That does not include those employed in fur companies which provide hat materials.

Plant officials report business prospects are "not healthy" and that the imports from Czechoslovakia plus a decline in domestic sales are causing great concern.

"We are beginning to wonder where our next year's business is coming from," one official declared.

Warren S. Smith, secretary of the hat institute, trade association for America's hat industry, declared that the hat industry has dropped 1,500,000 man-hours since 1942 and that 1,300 workers have been forced out of the trade in the past 5 years.

He attacked the State Department's policy of insisting on imports at the price of the hat industry, but maintained that many other industries in Connecticut are being hurt by the trade-exchange program under the Marshall plan.

"Traditionally, we have imported a great deal of raw material from abroad," Mr. Smith said. "Now we are being forced to accept the finished product in competition with our own workers."

He declared that Czechoslovakia and Italy are the major competitors who have been fed ECA dollars to drive American firms out of business.

"Let them furnish the raw material," he asserted. "Let us provide the finished job."

Sacrifice of a city like Danbury "is a pretty steep price to pay on the altar of helping countries abroad," he declared.

SHOE MANUFACTURERS HIT CZECHOSLOVAKIAN IMPORTS

BOSTON, March 23.—The New England Shoe and Leather Association charged today that some 1,000,000 pairs of shoes will be imported from Communist-dominated Czechoslovakia into the United States this year.

Executive Vice President Maxwell Field reported that the association has asked the Treasury Department to investigate so-called dumping of the shoes in violation of the Antidumping Act of 1921.

Field added that the State Department also has been requested to advise the association of its policy permitting importation of the shoes from the iron-curtain country.

The association official stated that in the month of January alone 58,018 pairs of shoes were imported from Czechoslovakia. This, he said, was more than half of the total brought to the United States during the entire year of 1949.

Preservation of Wildlife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement relating to preservation of wildlife, made by Gov. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania, on March 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Many people think of the woods, the waters, and the wildlife of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania solely from the viewpoint of pleasure and recreation, but these resources have a much deeper significance.

Barren hillsides cause a rapid run-off of waters producing destructive floods. This, naturally, leads to complete dislocation of the industrial economy so necessary to the interests of the Commonwealth.

In Pennsylvania, our reforestation program is outstanding. This program must continue in an effort to lessen the destruction caused by floods, and by replanting our barren hillsides to slow up the run-off of water.

To increase our awareness of these great natural heritages, and of the part they play in our daily lives, Pennsylvania has set aside for special observance various weeks of the year when conservation is uppermost in the minds of all of its citizens.

Beginning March 19, in conjunction with the National Wildlife Restoration Week, we will again observe Pennsylvania Wildlife Restoration Week.

This observance should have the wholehearted support of conservationists, nature lovers, sportsmen, farmers, schools, and all civic-minded organizations by stressing the value and importance of restoration of forests, waters, and wildlife to the Commonwealth.

One of the ways that this can be done is for each of us to rededicate himself to the national conservation pledge: "I give my pledge as an American to save and faithfully to defend from waste the natural resources of my country, its soil and minerals, its forests, waters, and wildlife."

Tangled Economics, Dangerous Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tangled Economics, Dangerous Politics," published in the Christian Science Monitor of March 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TANGLED ECONOMICS, DANGEROUS POLITICS

As economics, the United States present farm program makes no sense. As politics, it can be understood but not supported.

As economics, the aim is for Government to help prevent waste and distress due to vagaries of weather and the farmer's inability to stabilize output as other producers do. Unstable agriculture can spell food shortages and lack of markets for the rest of the community.

But today the program as operated has produced such weird economic effects as these:

The Government, already holding $4,000,000,000 worth of farm products for which it can find no market, is asking authority to throw in $2,000,000,000 more.

The best chance of saving any of this is through one or more major crop failures—normally a disaster.

Citizens are paying millions to have surplus food destroyed so they will be unable to buy the rest of the crop at lower prices.

Government asks the farmer to cut production and pays him for surpluses; it urges diversification and rewards resistance to diversification.

What was intended as a floor to prevent disaster has become a cushion even for inefficient farmers.

These are some of the reasons the program makes no sense as economics. Here are some of the factors which make it understandable politically:

Both parties believe the farm vote can decide the next election, as they feel it did the last. Few Congressmen are independent of the farm vote.

Politicians are aware that American farmers have suffered a 20-percent loss in income since 1947 and expect the loss to be greater this year. For many individuals this average involves heavier losses.

A vested interest in Government aid has been created. And, as with tariff protection, conditions quite adequate for efficient producers spell distress to the inefficient or unfortunate.

Congress has been trying to taper off crop subsidies by setting dates in advance for curtailing payments or restricting acreages—restrictions that become delusive if per-acre production can be doubled. Indeed, the whole process is delusive. For when a date approaches, a new one safely farther away is substituted. So the old mañana game goes on.

Department of Agriculture experts figure what acreages will produce adequate supplies, but in the end politics decides what the farmer can plant. Acreages are increased according to the strength of voting blocs—and skill in logrolling. Wheat Congressmen help peanut Congressmen, and both help cotton Congressmen, so all get their acreages—and surpluses—increased.

As economics, it doesn't make sense. As politics, it is understandable, but deeply dangerous. For it permits special interests to override the welfare of the Nation as a whole. It is an abuse of representative self-government which weakens and discredits democracy at a time when democracy needs strength and prestige to meet totalitarian competition.

How shall Americans find a way out of this jungle of tangled economics and dangerous politics? Let special-interest groups recognize that their own larger interest depends on the welfare of the whole Nation. The good of one must be related to the good of all. In addition, let the ordinary citizen recognize that he has a large-enough stake in the general welfare to insist on this basic rule.

Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is very necessary that all of our State governments exert every effort to preserve our fast-dwindling natural resources upon which the future of America's soils, waters, and wildlife depends.

The following is a proclamation issued by Gov. Henry F. Schricker, of Indiana:

PROCLAMATION—WILDLIFE RESTORATION WEEK, MARCH 19 THROUGH 25, 1950

To All to Whom These Presents May Come, Greeting:

Whereas the fact that all life is dependent on soil and water cannot be stressed too much or too often; and

Whereas nature has perfected a marvelous system for building productive soils and for maintaining them, and man can work with this system and keep soil and water productive while utilizing the products for his use.

We cannot abuse these resources without destroying productivity and quickly decreasing the quantity of products available to him; and

Whereas productivity of our soils and water has been reduced at an exceedingly rapid rate. Vast areas of land have been and are still being ruined of their fertility which can only be slowly regained by natural processes; and

Whereas there is great need for more intelligent planning of developments to secure the greatest possible values from all resources; and

Whereas the National Wildlife Federation in sponsoring Wildlife Restoration Week is doing much to teach the fundamentals upon which the future of America's soils, waters, and wildlife depends. The continued growth of human population in this country forces us to give increasing attention to conservation of all natural resources as human utilization places increased demands upon them. Until every American is aware of his vital dependence upon natural resources and acts intelligently to manage them, there will be need of such educational efforts:

Now, therefore, I, Henry F. Schricker, Governor of the State of Indiana, do hereby proclaim and designate the week of March 19 through 25, 1950, as Wildlife Restoration Week in Indiana, and do earnestly appeal to all of our citizens to recognize the importance of the problems of conservation of these assets in wildlife and to work with one accord for their proper protection and preservation, and to reflect upon America's riches of natural resources and the importance to our future well-being of perpetuating them.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Indiana, at the capitol, in the city of Indianapolis, this 6th day of March 1950.

HENRY F. SCHRICKER,
Governor.

Robespierre From Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Marquis Childs, from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 22, 1950:

ROBESPIERRE FROM WISCONSIN

(By Marquis Childs)

Under the glow of the television lights Senator McCARTHY is beginning to look pale and a little frightened. The material he is offering as evidence of his charges is so very thin that even he himself seems to lack confidence in it.

His strategy is to spread it out for as long as possible so that it will reap the largest harvest of headlines. It probably contributes to the campaign to remove Dean Acheson from the office of Secretary of State. And certainly it contributes to the uncertainty, the fear, and the suspicion that undermine the hopes for a positive, constructive American foreign policy both at home and abroad.

But, in my opinion, that is not the greatest disservice McCARTHY is performing. What he is doing that is most dangerous and most reckless is to extend and confirm the technique of the indictment by association and smear.

You don't have to watch the process very long to understand what it is. It is the technique of the revolutionary tribunal, those fantastic mock courts that came into being in the holocaust of the French Revolution. It bears some relation to the methods of the purge trials in Soviet Russia. The whole approach could hardly be more directly at variance with the Anglo-Saxon concept of equal justice under law that has slowly and painfully evolved through the centuries.

A TALE OF TWO CITIES

Rereading Charles Dickens' thrilling novel, A Tale of Two Cities, you get some idea of what those revolutionary tribunals were like. Victims by the thousands were hauled before so-called courts. If it could be shown in any remote way that the individual had had contact with any aristocrat for whatever reason, the clamor for his blood went up and he was carted off to the guillotine.

Whether this 10-cent store Robespierre from Wisconsin knows it or not, what he is helping to do is break down law and order. The Senator can reply, of course, with the easy and cynical good humor that is natural to him that his victims are, after all, not guillotined.

But the smear can destroy, too. Denials rarely catch up with the original accusation. They are usually found back among the want ads while the charge itself has blossomed in big headlines on page 1. Few victims have the aggressiveness, the spunk, and the resources of Judge Dorothy Kenyon.

The investigation committee itself has a lot to answer for. The method of procedure should have been carefully mapped out before any evidence was presented. It is difficult to see why Chairman MILLARD TYDINGS should at the outset have given McCARTHY his choice of presenting the charges in public or in closed session since this opened the way for public accusation with the accuser hiding under the cloak of legal immunity.

HICKENLOOPER RECALLED

A precedent existed for orderly procedure. That was in the inquiry conducted by the Joint Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee into the charges brought by Senator HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa.

HICKENLOOPER had a list of 27 employees of the Atomic Energy Commission whom he considered in the doubtful category. The names of those individuals were not spread across the front pages. Under Chairman BRIEN MCMAHON they were thoroughly reviewed in closed session.

Long before the last case was reached, it was apparent to virtually all committee members that the charges raised were insubstantial. Attendance at the closed sessions fell away to the chairman and one or two others.

But the important point is that reputations were not subjected to lynch law. Elemental justice was observed. If at any time the Atomic Committee had agreed that an individual case warranted a public hearing, then the hearing would have been held. There was no inclination to keep back information to which the public was entitled.

SECOND-HAND EVIDENCE

It was too much to expect that McCARTHY himself would show a sense of responsibility. Virtually all the material he has produced thus far has come out of the files of other investigating committees, including the notoriously irresponsible California Un-American Activities Committee. Or it is read out of newspapers and magazines.

This seems to me to call for something more than a mere political exchange between Republicans and Democrats. The Senate, under the Constitution, has the power to make its own rules of conduct and to compel its members to live up to those rules. This would be a good time to try to define senatorial responsibility by a new rule.

Wartime Excise Taxes Should Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H. R. 7382 which has for its purpose the repeal of the wartime excise nuisance taxes. These taxes were levied during the emergency of the war in order to secure funds for financing the war as well as to utilize to the fullest for the prosecution of the war the materials and the manpower of the Nation. A commitment was made at the time that at the ending of the war these taxes would be repealed. The war has now been over for nearly 5 years and the administration refuses to give the green light for the repeal of these taxes. They are a brake on the wheels of industry and are slowing down our productive enterprises and are one of the causes for the heavy unemployment we now have, which approximates five million.

I include as part of these remarks an excellent article showing the need for the repeal of these taxes, entitled "Struggle for Tax Reform," written by Beardsley Ruml, of New York, which appears in the Washington Post of this date:

STRUGGLE FOR TAX REFORM—
A CONTRADICTION

The intense struggle for wartime excise-tax repeal should have been unnecessary. The wartime excises were designed to check specific kinds of consumption in wartime, with resulting reduction of production and employment. These taxes have no place in time of peace.

Except for the uninformed opposition of the Treasury and the support of the Treasury by the President, the wartime excises would have been repealed long ago. Not only are they punitive and discriminatory; they are harmful to specific industries and communities and weigh heavily on the general level of employment. The continuance of the wartime excise taxes is inconsistent with the clear mandate given by Congress to the administration in the Employment Act of 1946 to use its powers to maintain a high level of production and of employment.

But the struggle for the repeal of these taxes, unnecessary though it should have been, has served a useful purpose. It has developed economic research under the sponsorship of the National Committee for Wartime Excise Tax Repeal. In this research, Leon Henderson and his associates have shown that the net loss of revenue to the Government as a result of repeal will be far less than the country and Congress has been led to believe. These economic studies demonstrate that the net loss from the repeal of all wartime excise taxes and tax rates, except on gasoline, tobacco, and alcoholic beverages, will not be more than $1,150,000,000, and it may be substantially less.

The Committee for Economic Development, working entirely independently, has shown how wartime excises can be repealed, and how, without any new sources of revenue and with only moderate reductions in projected expenditures, the budget will be balanced with high levels of productive employment and will show a surplus besides.

These exhaustive studies of the National Committee and the CED, when taken together, give to the public a way of judging the merits of over-all wartime excise-tax repeal. The conclusion is inescapable that over-all repeal is possible and desirable. No evidence has been made available to the public, by the Treasury or otherwise, to convert this conclusion.

The struggle has therefore resulted in demonstrating that both justice and prudence argue for over-all repeal.

Beyond the urgent and specific necessity for wartime excise-tax repeal, the struggle has brought sharply to public attention three reforms in basic fiscal policy that are long overdue. These three reforms when they are at last adopted will have an importance for the country's economic welfare even greater than excise-tax repeal itself.

The three reforms to which I refer are the following:

1. Let the Federal deficit or surplus be measured by the cash-consolidated budget instead of the administrative-control budget.

2. Let tax rates be set to balance this budget at agreed levels of high productive employment instead of by guessing what national income is likely to be a year or more ahead.

3. Let Federal disbursements for capital items that pay income to the Federal Government be funded instead of causing needless and burdensome tax levies on consumption, investment, and employment.

These reforms mean a basic change in Federal fiscal policy. They are a first long step in attaining built-in stabilizing fiscal measures at points where they will do great good. They bring debt management back into the economic picture so that it can be used as in the war as a stabilizing force for high employment. They eliminate the hocus-pocus of impossible business forecasting from the crucial job of setting tax rates. Above all, they make the test of surplus and deficit in terms of the hard realities of cash intake and cash outgo instead of the esoteric and inconsistent definitions of the administrative-control budget.

I have heard these reforms characterized as bookkeeping reforms—implying that they are of negligible importance. The importance resides in the ideas that underlie the bookkeeping and in the new and impersonal influence on high production and high employment these stabilizing reforms will bring.

The struggle for excise-tax repeal has been necessary to get excise-tax repeal. But it has served a deeper purpose in bringing out of the library and laboratory for public understanding fiscal reforms which, when adopted, will serve the people well for years to come.

BEARDSLEY RUML.

NEW YORK.

Operation of Price-Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan which appeared in this morning's New York Herald Tribune.

I think this article is very timely right now due to the action taken by the House yesterday when considering H. R. 6567, regardless of political parties. This bill requesting $2,000,000,000 more to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation went through with such apparent ease that those of us from the East, who likewise have a good many farmers who need assistance, become very much alarmed. Unless I am misinformed, we already have a couple of years' crops of grain in storage bins throughout the Grain Belt. This extra money gives the Commodity Credit Corporation the privilege of continuing what has been going on in the past, which is the building of more grain-storage bins and again filling them with this year's grain crop. I should think some effort should be made to force the Commodity Credit Corporation to move these old crops, turn the stored grain into cash so the present funds they have would be revolving funds, like they were originally supposed to be. If this were the practice, of course, grain prices would break and our farmers in the East would, for a change, have the advantage of some cheaper grains to feed our cattle and poultry. This, in turn, would give the consumer a break on poultry products and milk. If our Western and Southern Representatives gave a little more consideration to this very important agricultural segment in the East, it would help considerably in reducing the grief we presently have here with both our farmers and our consumers. I personally know enough about grain, especially corn, to realize that it cannot be carried over indefinitely without considerable waste.

Mr. Sullivan's article gives you some idea of what the Department of Agriculture is costing the American taxpayers in personnel alone. Add to this the dollars involved from the support-price program, it is most discouraging to those of us who represent a large segment of the taxpayers who are bearing the brunt of this ever-increasing program. All we need now is something like the Brannan plan which would call for a staff in the Department of Agriculture probably twice as large as the present staff, along with the billions of dollars involved, and the farmers would be under complete control of the Federal Government and the backs of the taxpayers would be broken.

The article is as follows:

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT IS POSTRAYED AS "AT EVERY UNITED STATES DINNER TABLE"—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS OPERATION OF PRICE-SUPPORT MAKES IT GOVERNMENT WITHIN GOVERNMENT

(By Mark Sullivan)

The Department of Agriculture is a government within the Government. It enters every home in the country, stands beside every citizen as he eats his meals, and every member of his family. It determines or conclusively influences the price of nearly every form of food. In doing this the Department goes a second time into the home of a large class of citizens, the farmers. To them it in many cases pays large amounts of money to buy large quantities of their crops and keep them off the market, in order to support the price. Or for the same purpose, it makes nonrecourse loans to farmers. In a great many cases, and increasingly lately, the Department enters farmers' homes for a different kind of purpose, to inform them of the number of acres it has allotted to them for planting various crops.

A RECENT DEVELOPMENT

Such extensive control over such a fundamental aspect of the people's lives as food, is an immense exercise of the power of government. In the United States until recent years, such exercise of the power of government has not been practiced except in time of war. Introduction of it here in peacetime, during the 1930's parallels the practice of totalitarian governments such as Communist Russia, and during the last five years Socialist Britain.

The extent of the part played by the Department of Agriculture in Government and the lives of the people is suggested by the widespread scope of the operations and the number of its employees, not merely in Washington but throughout the country. Not all the employees are engaged in the function of price support; a large portion work in such activities as soils and seeds, insect and plant-disease prevention, and the like. But price support is a very large activity of the department, and the most dynamic one; and introduction of it has paralleled an immense increase in the number of employees.

The Department of Agriculture has branch offices in States and in hundreds of county seats. A recent report of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, cited results of a sampling inquiry. It showed in one cotton county in Georgia 47 employees of field services of the department working with 1,500 farmers. In a fruit and grazing county in Washington State, 184 employees of the department were working with some 6,700 farmers. A dairy county in Maryland had 88 employees attached to field services working with fewer than 3,400 farmers. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recently, Representative HOFFMAN, of Iowa, gave the total number of employees of the department:

"A full-time staff of 59,556 employees and 12,274 part-time employees, or a total of 71,830. * * * In addition there are 137,037 people serving as State and county committeemen either on a per diem basis or at no salary * * * thus in all there are 208,867."

HOW THE RECORD STANDS

That number of employees is an enormous increase. The Hoover Commission report says that the number 20 years ago was only 23,000. And this expansion in the number of employees goes parallel with, and is almost wholly caused by, expansion of the Department's functions and activities. In this is potent significance.

A characteristic of such a government function as price support, is automatic expansion having almost the force of a law of nature. When price support was begun in 1933, the number of crops supported was six, called basic—wheat, corn, cotton, rice, tobacco, peanuts. By additions from time to time the number of crops supported either in their original form or as prepared for market is today nearly everything produced on a farm.

With price support practiced about nearly all crops, large power is conferred by Congress on the Department of Agriculture. In recent laws and pending proposals, the Secretary of Agriculture is given discretion about the figure at which price support may be extended to a crop and whether or not to support a crop under given conditions. Expansion in cost of price support is shown by the Department's recent request to Congress for authority to borrow $2,000,000,000 from the Federal Treasury, additional to the some $6,000,000,000 which originally was supposed to be enough.

The Ellen Knauff Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, I placed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times on the civil liberties implications of the case of Ellen Knauff. This morning, the publisher of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch continued his praiseworthy efforts to awaken the Nation's conscience about this matter. The Post-Dispatch editorial, which was carried as an advertisement in the Washington Post today is an excellent summary of the developments in the Knauff case. Moreover, our esteemed colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the House Judiciary Committee, has just announced that his group will hold hearings on the Knauff case, beginning Monday morning. His action is indeed gratifying to all those concerned about protecting our civil liberties. What may be most important about this case is the emergence of what we may hope will be a growth of congressional action in defense of civil liberties. We have, perhaps, tended to place too much reliance for that on the executive and judicial branches of the Government. Congress, which is closest to the people, ought properly to lead the fight against arbitrary action by administrative officials.

Following is the text of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial in the Washington Post of March 23, 1950:

(For the information of official Washington the St. Louis Post-Dispatch publishes, in the form of an advertisement, an editorial from its issue of yesterday, March 23:)

FOR A REVIEW OF THE ELLEN KNAUFF CASE

This editorial has to do with the perplexing case of Ellen Knauff to which the Post-Dispatch has devoted many news articles, editorials, and cartoons in the past 2 months. The case of this German war bride of an American GI[illegible] veteran is as important as it is puzzling.

The Attorney General's summary order to exclude and deport Mrs. Knauff, who is held at Ellis Island as a risk to this country, puts her rights as a human being into head-on conflict with what the Department of Justice says is national security.

The question is: Under the Bill of Rights, which protects aliens as well as citizens, does not this little woman, many of whose relatives were killed in Hitler's persecution of Jews, deserve to know the specific charge against her?

Is she not entitled to a fair hearing on that charge? Should not this former employee of the RAF in England and the American Army of Occupation in Germany be confronted with specific accusations? And cannot these constitutional guarantees be accorded to her without disclosing really vital sources of information, and without endangering the Nation?

This conflict embraces a basic issue in democratic government. It is also an issue full of human emotions. For if Ellen Knauff succeeds be admitted to the United States, then her husband, Kurt Knauff, must give up his country in order to live with his wife. How could a choice be harder?

WHAT A COMMISSION COULD DO

Because we think this case deserves more attention than it has received, the Post-Dispatch herewith reviews the case step by step and recommends the appointment of a commission of perhaps three distinguished citizens to look into the facts—in secret, should that be necessary. If the Attorney General is justified in excluding Mrs. Knauff without holding a hearing and without telling her why, such a commission could check the circumstances and report this conclusion to the country as a considered judgment.

So far the necessity for excluding Mrs. Knauff has not been made clear. Unless it is made clear, there will always remain the strong possibility that the exclusion was not necessary to national security, but was a cover-up to hide a bureaucratic mistake.

The Post-Dispatch does not say that the Department of Justice may not have facts which make it unsafe to admit Mrs. Knauff. There may be in her past an act which would prove her to be untrustworthy. But the haste with which the immigration officials tried to get her on a boat and started back to Germany suggests also the possibility that she may be the victim of a system which is trying to avoid a confession of error.

TWISTS AND TURNS OF 2 MONTHS

Here are the twists and turns of the case in the last 2 months:

January 16: The Supreme Court, by vote of 4 to 3, upheld the exclusion order, in a decision by Justices Vinson, Reed, Burton, and Minton. Justices Jackson, Black, and Frankfurter dissented vigorously. Justice Jackson denounced the plea of the Attorney General that evidence must be secret as abhorrent to freemen. Describing the procedure as dangerously wrong in principle, he said: "I should direct the Attorney General either to produce his evidence justifying exclusion or to admit Mrs. Knauff to the country." Justice Frankfurter, alarmed by the greater hazards of the informer's tale, without any opportunity for its refutation, said that "considerations of national security, insofar as they are pertinent, can be protected by a hearing in camera."

January 18: The Post-Dispatch printed a leading editorial, entitled "The Case of Ellen Knauff." The editorial predicted that this ruling will some day be reversed. It described the spectacle of Justice Jackson severely criticising the conduct of one of his successors in the office of Attorney General, Tom Clark, now a Justice, as one of the most unusual in Supreme Court history.

February 8: Senator WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota Republican, introduced a bill proposing that the Attorney General be directed to cancel any outstanding order of exclusion. The bill also proposed that Mrs. Knauff be permitted immediate entry into the United States. In accordance with custom, it was expected that hearings would be held before any further steps were taken to return Mrs. Knauff to Germany.

REVERSAL BY IMMIGRATION OFFICIALS

February 10: Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., New York Democrat, made public a letter to Attorney General McGrath expressing concern over the grave civil-liberties questions involved. Representative ROOSEVELT said that he was disturbed because Mrs. Knauff was denied a hearing before a board of special inquiry to which she might have presented evidence which would have cleared her of whatever charges there are against her. Representative ROOSEVELT, who is vice president of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights, proposed that the Attorney General reconsider the wartime Executive regulation under which aliens may be barred without hearings.

February 15: William Farrell, Immigration Service Director of Information, said that Mrs. Knauff's deportation was being stayed in accordance with practice as a courtesy to Congress. This was a recognition of the bill introduced by Senator LANGER. It also seemed an assurance that no hasty attempt would be made to return Mrs. Knauff to Germany before hearings on pending legislation.

February 23: Immigration authorities arrested Mrs. Knauff in New York and returned her to Ellis Island where she had been held for 8 months before release on bond. Prior to this, the immigration officials had brought pressure on Senator LANGER to persuade him to withdraw his bill. Senator LANGER agreed to withdraw.

DEPORTATION STAYED BY COURT

February 27: Watson B. Miller, Commissioner of Immigration, announced that Mrs. Knauff would be deported on the following day. Asked why there was this break with the custom of staying deportation until action on a bill, Commissioner Miller said exceptions were made "in cases we believe may involve internal security or espionage." Mrs. Knauff was ordered to the Army Transport *Gen. Maurice Rose* in New York, Senator LANGER changed his mind and announced that he would not withdraw his bill. This followed a conference with Representative ROOSEVELT who told Senator LANGER that if LANGER withdrew his bill, he (ROOSEVELT) would introduce a bill to the same purpose.

February 28: New York District Director of Immigration Edward J. Shaughnessy declared: "There has to be a finality in every case. This one has dragged on long enough. She is not the type of person wanted in this country. And that is all there is to it." With Judge Learned Hand presiding, the United States Court of Appeals at New York stayed Mrs. Knauff's deportation until further court action March 6. The Immigration Service returned Mrs. Knauff from the pier to Ellis Island. The ship sailed without her. President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson were presented with Post-Dispatch editorials and news articles on the case.

March 1: Representative ROOSEVELT announced the introduction of an amendment to the passport laws to guarantee a hearing for "any alien who has arrived in this country." He asked Attorney General McGrath and Immigration Commissioner Miller to postpone deportation of Mrs. Knauff until his measure could be considered. He told the Department of Justice he was deeply concerned with the fundamental issue of "securing the most protection for our civil-liberties tradition that is consistent with national security."

March 5: Presiding Judge Hand and Judges Frank and Swan of the Federal Court of Appeals at New York, agreed to review the Attorney General's deportation order. In agreeing to this review, the court rejected the vigorous arguments of David McKibbon, chief of the civil division of the United States Attorney's office in New York. This review was expected to halt deportation proceedings for several weeks.

A THIRD BILL IS INTRODUCED

March 7: Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, introduced a private bill to require the Attorney General to cancel the exclusion order. Representative ROOSEVELT told the House that the Knauff case raised a civil liberties question that is "serious and immediate." He commended the Post-Dispatch, the New York Times, and the New York Post for their interest in the case.

March 16: Mrs. Knauff's lawyer, Gunther Jacobson, proposed to the House Judiciary

Subcommittee, through a letter to Representative WALTER, that she be subpenaed for a hearing. He wrote that he is "convinced the Government has no evidence against this young woman and that she is entirely innocent of any political activities."

Such is the confused and contradictory record of the perplexing case of Ellen Knauff in the 2 months since the Supreme Court's narrow decision against her admission as a war bride. From this record, no ordinary citizen can be sure that national security is at stake. Neither can the citizen be sure that human rights are not being ignored.

LET THE FACTS BE REVIEWED

The Post-Dispatch, therefore, proposes the appointment of a commission of eminent citizens to investigate the facts and report to the country. We do not presume to nominate the panel from which such a commission might be chosen. However, we believe it would be reassuring if the commission contained men of the stature of former President Hoover, General Eisenhower, and General Bradley, former Secretary of State Marshall, former Secretary of War Stimson, President Conant of Harvard, Bishop Oxnam, and Cardinal Spellman.

We believe that a commission of citizens of this distinction, if called on to review the facts, would take the assignment for the important civic responsibility which it would be.

If the Department of Justice has a convincing case against Mrs. Knauff, let that be made plain, let the case be ended, and let her be returned to Germany.

But if there is no convincing case, let the country be so informed, the exclusion proceedings stopped, and Mrs. Knauff admitted to the United States as the wife of a former GI under the War Brides Act.

The Post-Dispatch urges the President, whose executive authority is involved throughout this case, to lift the issue to its highest level. We urge him to say, in effect, with all the prestige of his great office, that Ellen Knauff deserves better than star-chamber treatment at the hands of the United States Government.

Many Americans would applaud Mr. Truman were he to do so. It would be an act characteristic of the President's best qualities.

Can We Learn From the British?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article appeared recently in the New York Times magazine dealing with the British health service. I believe that the British medical program offers many lessons to those of us who are interested in improving the quality and availability of medical care in this country. The author of the article, David M. Heyman, is president of three medical-care organizations—the New York Foundation, Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, and Public Health Research Institute of New York City. He recently returned from a study of Britain's health service. The article is as follows:

BRITAIN'S HEALTH PLAN: THE LESSON FOR US

(By David M. Heyman)

England has now had socialized medicine for 18 months. The most ambitious and far-reaching phase of the Labor Government's entire program, the health plan is a critical testing ground of the viability of the welfare state. Few programs today are so keenly observed by the rest of the world as this historic effort to make the medical care of a people a national rather than an individual responsibility.

Is the plan working? If so, how successfully? Where lie its weaknesses and its merits? Can we in America profit from the experiment?

To find the answers to these questions I spent almost a month in England last fall. As a frank advocate of some form of prepaid—although not compulsory—health care for our own citizens, I surveyed the British plan with sympathy, if not, in many instances, with enthusiasm. I talked with interested officials, from Aneurin Bevan, Minister of Health, who directs the program, down to general practitioners and patients. In what follows I shall give what I believe to be the merits of the system, the faults, and the extent to which we in this country can learn from Britain in formulating a health program to meet our own needs.

Before discussing the plan, I should like to point out that its lessons for us come at a psychologically propitious time.

President Truman's compulsory health insurance plan demonstrates, regardless of its faults, that the problem of the Nation's health is becoming increasingly a matter of public concern. One need not agree with the President's plan to admit that health security is as important as social security; that good health is no less a concern of the Government than good schools and good housing. The issue is how best to achieve this objective within the framework of the American democratic tradition. England—despite her mistakes—can teach us much.

THE ADVANTAGES

To understand the drastic measures which the British Government took when it launched its national health service in July 1948, one must know something of the problems involved. The Labor Government inherited a population that had suffered from inadequate medical care, by and large, for a generation. The war, with its great need for physicians and existing health facilities, its austerities and disruption of personal habits, and the depression years which preceded it, bequeathed a vast backlog of persons in need of everything from new teeth to new stomachs.

The Minister of Health launched a full-scale attack on this problem along the entire front. Overnight, the British people found themselves embarked on a revolutionary cradle to grave program. If food and clothing were short and taxes high, good health could be had. Moreover, it was free—or so it seemed.

The enthusiasm with which the plan was greeted is illustrated by the story of a working man stumping his district for a Labor candidate in a recent by-election. "Why, if it hadn't been for 'Nye' Bevan," he said, yanking a set of dentures out of his mouth and waving them proudly before his audience, "I wouldn't have had these yet."

The most positive aspect of the program is its impact on the mind of the man in the street. The average person has lost his former anxiety about payment of medical bills, and there is no longer a financial barrier which deters people from seeking medical advice when needed. The net result is that people do not wait until they are seriously ill before going to a physician, and many diseases are nipped before they advance beyond medical aid. Given time, this will raise the level of physical well-being of the English people higher than it has ever been. The ambitious nature of the act has created many weaknesses, but they are mainly administrative and financial. Psychologically, it has been an unmitigated success.

A second great advantage of the act is its gradual redistribution of physicians geographically. As in the United States, many sections of the country were poorly served in terms of the ratio of medical personnel to population. At best, England's national average of one doctor to 2,200 persons (compared to 1 to 1,500 in the United States) stretched medical care very thin. Today, by refusing licenses to new physicians in areas that are declared overdoctored, the Ministry of Health is indirectly forcing doctors into counties and towns that need them.

This is undeniably hard on many physicians, but the Government argues that it is also undeniably good for the underdoctored areas. Young physicians have swallowed this bitter pill and made the best of it.

The third point in favor of the plan is its direct subsidies to medical schools, research groups and local health authorities. The British Medical Research Council, which was organized in 1913 and operates under the protection of the Privy Council, has always had an excellent reputation. The new plan has offered no political interference, while strengthening the research work financially. Nor have medical schools undergone any modification, with one exception. Before the war, about half of the students were from medical families and the remainder came from other sections of the upper classes. Today more and more students are applying from the middle- and lower-income groups. For the first time medical schools can afford to take them in substantial numbers without loss of quality. Local health organizations likewise no longer find it necessary to scrimp. John Bull is footing the bill.

THE DISADVANTAGES

Except from the doctors themselves, one hears few complaints about the operation of the act. Nevertheless, it is obvious to a visitor—and it is becoming evident to the Government—that the health plan has many defects. The main ones are these:

The plan has attempted to do too much too fast. The Government is in the paradoxical position of having made good too literally on one of its chief campaign promises. It is immersed in a gigantic cooperative effort without the necessary period of preliminary trial and error by which such movements usually succeed. The doctors, generally speaking, are overworked and underpaid.

Their patients, in many cases, do not get the individual attention they should have. A physician may take up to 4,000 persons on his panel; far too many, medical authorities say, to permit him to give the best service. This situation will be corrected as the country turns out a higher proportion of doctors to the population, but such a solution is years away. In the meantime, the plan runs the risk of foundering on the shoals of its own ambitiousness.

The plan has proved too expensive. The original estimate for the first year was £153,000,000. It has actually cost more than twice that—well over £300,000,000, or about 10 percent of Britain's total budget. One reason for this is that the average Briton is under the impression that the service is free. Because he pays for his share in general, rather than specific, taxes he has no idea of its costliness. As a consequence, malingerers and hypochondriacs have abused the system by needlessly taking up the doctor's time. Common sense in minor complaints has given way to demands for treatment. Since drugs were also free until the Government began charging a partial payment last October, the chronic pill takers enjoyed

an unprecedented field day. "I am appalled," Aneurin Bevan has said, "at the amount of medicine going down British throats."

The plan is too complex and unwieldy. At the local level, for example, there are four distinct administrative units: teaching hospitals, regional hospital boards, local executive councils, and local health authorities. Each unit administers a different phase of the program and there is frequently a lack of coordination among them. The preventive and curative aspects of medicine, for instance, are separated, although they are actually part of one over-all problem.

The effect, moreover, has been to create an enormous amount of paper work for the doctor. He finds himself in a baffling new world of regulations, previously reserved for members of the armed forces and civil servants. And it is slowly dawning on him that he is a civil servant with very little local authority. At best, he finds it hard to keep up his traditional relationship with patients.

A further result of this administrative complexity has been to create an organization far too complicated for efficient operation. Medicine, unlike insurance and social security, is not merely a bookkeeping operation but a skilled form of personal service. Whether public or private, it will always be expensive. Efficiency, therefore, is a paramount factor in holding down costs.

In England the incentive for the participants in the program to make it efficient is largely lost. Instead of following an already established pattern that existed in the fields of public housing and health—Government subsidies to locally administered groups—the plan sets up a cumbersome apparatus which has made for considerable waste.

The plan has inequities, both for the doctor and the patient. Dentists, who are paid on a "fee for service" basis, have profited beyond expectations; in fact, the Minister of Health has twice reduced dental fees. Physicians, on the other hand, receive a "capitation" fee or annual retainer of 18 shillings a year—$2.52 at the present rate of exchange—for each patient on their panel. Although this is a much sounder method, the rate at present is too low for the average doctor, compelling him to accept more patients than he can satisfactorily serve.

One result of this difference in method of payment is that as much money has been spent by the Government for the care of eyes and teeth as for general medicine. Obviously this is quite out of balance and should be corrected.

But a more serious fault of the plan has been its consolidation of an already dangerous trend—the overspecialization of medical practice. Previously the general practitioner held appointments in rural hospitals. With the nationalization of hospitals he has been pushed out and his morale has sunk correspondingly.

I believe it would have been better to have left the hospitals, both voluntary and public, in the hands of the local health authorities. Not only would local administrative units have been more careful of costs—since they provide part of their own funds through local taxes—but there would be a closer relationship between the curative and preventive services. Also, the Government would have been wise to encourage group practice—specialists and general practitioners working together. Instead, it has further compartmentalized an already specialized profession.

In fairness, it should be said that many of the foregoing drawbacks can, and no doubt will, be corrected. Nevertheless, they compel serious consideration by any nation contemplating a public-health program.

THE LESSONS FOR US

Any attempt to set up a prepaid health plan in the United States must begin with the realization that Americans show no indication of favoring outright socialization of medicine. The British, obviously, wanted such a plan. No program can be enacted—let alone succeed—until it has the support of those whom it is intended to help.

My inferences, therefore, are based on the assumption that we in the United States do not wish to take the drastic step that Britain has. On the other hand, I believe equally that Americans want some change, and that this is toward voluntary prepaid medical care. To put it bluntly, medicine in this country—especially its specialized branches—is gradually pricing itself out of the market. Some way must be found to make the great resources of modern medicine available to all, and at a minimum cost.

The fundamental lesson that we can learn from Britain is that some form of prepaid health program can equalize the disaster of sickness, just as insurance equalizes the disaster of fire, theft, and accident. Whatever we may think of the details of the system, it has proved that the old private-fee doctor relationship is not sacrosanct. None of the dire things predicted by opponents of this act has come to pass; British medical research and teaching are as good as ever, and medical care as good as it can be considering the structural weaknesses of the plan. Were the Conservatives to come into office, I am convinced that they would not abolish it, although some modification would undoubtedly be made.

A second important lesson is that whatever we do, it should be done only after thorough study of our specific problems, and with adequate preparation for meeting them. It would have been better for England to have proceeded in a series of coordinated moves over a period of time rather than to go forward on all fronts at once. Britons are paying the price of a program that in too many respects was hastily conceived and inadequately planned. We must not make the mistake of trying to do too much too quickly.

A third lesson is that a federally administered plan would be insufficient and virtually unworkable. If the program is unwieldy in Great Britain with its 50,000,000 population, how much more true this would be here. Federal support—financial and technical—of local or area-wide groups is distinctly feasible. A national program, controlled from Washington, is not.

Already we have ample precedent for the kind of Federal-local partnership I have in mind. Public housing, financed jointly by National and city governments, yet autonomously administered by local authorities, is one example. Public-health grants to States are another. The Rural Electrification Administration, with its aid to farmers' cooperatives, is a third. In all these cases, localities participate by paying part of the costs, and assuming most of the responsibilities. Only in areas that are too poor to take part should the Government step in directly, and then only for a period long enough to get the program under way.

One final lesson which we may draw from England is her failure to encourage group practice. National health centers, which might have represented a step in this direction, have had to be postponed for financial reasons. In the United States, the inertia of the medical profession is much the same as in England. Doctors are individualists. Local health authorities, by providing clinics or centers, can overcome this by making group practice attractive. Moreover, since the physician's earnings under a prepaid-care system would in no way be adversely affected by group practice, and should even be improved, he would have every incentive to cooperate.

I am not underestimating the resistance that a majority of physicians and many laymen will offer to prepaid medical care. Yet when such plans are actually gotten under way, it is surprising how unimportant most of the objections become. In New York City the health-insurance plan—a community-sponsored nonprofit institution which I helped organize in 1946—has enrolled almost a quarter of a million members.

At first we had difficulty recruiting enough doctors to serve our patients. County medical societies were actively hostile, and one society refused to let its members participate on penalty of dismissal. Such blind opposition has largely evaporated, and at present there is a waiting list of physicians who would like to join.

Why? Except for the high-priced specialists, they make as much money as they could in private practice, and without the trouble of having to render a single bill. Members, likewise, have discovered that the care they receive is just as good as that which they enjoyed at the hands of a private practitioner. In fact, except for the method of payment, the relationship between doctor and patient is virtually the same, for the member may take his choice of physicians from among the panel serving his group. And the cost is within the range of virtually every family—$103.68 a year if the insured pays the entire premium; $51.84 if (as is the case with members presently enrolled) his employer pays at least half. This covers every type of medical care except long continued care of tuberculosis and mental patients.

Whether other communities copy the exact structure of this plan is not important. What is important is that our health security be based on workable, democratic principles, fair to doctor and patient; that it continue to encourage initiative among doctors and not interfere with the advances in medicine that have given us a fuller and longer life. Government and the medical profession must become partners in achieving this aim.

Although our Government is now doing a good job in financing medical research through grants-in-aid to both private and quasi-public institutions, substantial Federal aid is required in other areas—particularly in medical education. Many of our teaching hospitals operate at a loss. Facilities for training physicians are badly distributed and in some sections of the country inadequate. The national Government should make direct subsidies to improve the quality of medical education, and also perhaps in the form of scholarships to promising students.

A second area in which governmental aid is needed is that normally served by local health agencies. The United States Public Health Service already does this to a degree, but there are still many sections—particularly rural—insufficiently covered by this program. Federally built health centers and clinics in "underdoctored" regions would do much to attract young physicians who normally resist settling in areas where the facilities are as poor as most of the patients.

The final step—perhaps the most critical of all—should meet the necessity of encouraging, through the lending of technical assistance and funds, the formation of organization to give medical care on a prepaid, group practice basis. As in the health insurance plan described above, the operation of such a plan would be financed by the participants. Nevertheless, the sizable sums needed to get the system going will in most cases have to come from outside.

Experimentation along these lines, I am convinced, will in time help us arrive at a national program, locally controlled, that will suit the needs of the American people as individuals. The alternative is a costly and unnecessary depletion of our human resources, unthinkable in a Nation as prosperous and great as ours.

The Lull Before the Storm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, last year, I made the statement to this body that the advocates of socialization will not long confine themselves to the field of medicine should they conquer it; that all professions had best prepare for attack.

Developments during the intervening months have certainly borne out the statement, which, at the time, was really a platitude. We have met and temporarily repulsed some of these schemes.

A couple of weeks ago, this body rejected the bill that would have been a start toward the socialization of libraries by the narrow vote of 164 to 161.

Resistance to the bill, which would have meant Federal aid for mining, the following week, was a little stronger. It was voted down 167 to 144.

Last Wednesday the defeat of the cooperative middle-income-housing measure by a margin of 63 votes was a decided reverse to the advocates of statism.

But, Mr. Speaker, we must not be lulled into a sense of false security by recent successes.

The reversal of the trend may be only temporary. Certainly the socialistic planners are neither discouraged nor idle. They are quietly marshalling their forces for an all-out drive at the most favorable time for their next major objective—socialized medicine.

Mr. Oscar R. Ewing and his ilk are plugging away tirelessly toward their goal. It is to be regretted that taxpayers foot the bill for much of this propaganda. Let us not forget that the drive for compulsory health insurance got under way in Europe away back in 1883. In England, Lloyd George started it for a small group of low-income manual workers as long ago as 1912. These people are patient and tenacious. Look where they are today in Britain.

I understand that now medical personnel there are paid upon a per capita basis. In other words they get a certain set amount per annum for each patient, the maximum number of patients limited, of course, by the Government. The dental profession, I am informed, balked at this basis of payment and held out for a time for what is known as a grant-in-aid. That is a system whereby the government sets a fee for each kind of service but the dentist is permitted to make his regular charge and the patient pays the difference between the government rate and the dentist's bill. This system is now in operation in several countries but the British Government refused to go along and forced their dentists to take a fixed rate for each type of operation. That represents a long advance since 1912. We must be alert or we will find too late that something of the sort has happened here. If the American medical profession loses its freedom, so will their patients and so will those who follow other trades and professions. As of yore, we cannot long endure part slave and part free.

Unemployment Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from the March 18 issue of the Poughkeepsie New Yorker.

Mr. Speaker, the unemployment picture surely does not look too rosy with some 4,700,000 persons presently out of work. President Truman's economic advisers believe we can still maintain a healthy economy should that figure increase to 5,500,000. Many are predicting that by late fall, we will have at least a million added to the present list of unemployed. In the face of this situation, I can see no reason for the delay in reducing our war emergency excise taxes. The idea taken by some that before reducing these taxes we must make up this loss in revenue by increasing other taxes to me seems beside the point. Previous experiences in our country and more recent experiences in Canada prove quite definitely that a fair decrease in taxes results in a greater increase in business, which would more than offset the loss of excise taxes. Now is the time to come to the rescue of business. Day after day we read of many leading retail stores having considerable decline in sales due largely to the excise taxes. We must work not only to keep employment up to at least the present figure, but we must do everything to encourage business expansion to take care of the approximate 600,000 new workers coming into the labor market each year.

Prof. Joseph S. Davis, of Stanford University, recently forecast a population growth of 50,000,000 in the United States within the next 50 years. I understand his estimate is a very conservative one. Our present population is close to 152,000,000, and, therefore, according to Professor Davis, our population will exceed 200,000,000 by the year 2000. This all goes to show that the United States is still a vigorously growing Nation. Our strength is in our people and the quality of our people. This growth of population means we must look ahead to take care of larger school enrollments and an expansion in business to take care of the increase in labor.

The editorial referred to follows:

GROWTH NECESSARY

Heavy unemployment used to be considered one of the hallmarks of depression, but that day seems to be passing.

According to Government figures, some 4,700,000 persons were out of work in mid-February. Offhand that sounds like a pretty sizable pool of jobless, but the economists don't view it too seriously.

For the whole country the unemployed represent around 7 percent of the labor force. Less than half the total have been out of work for as long as 2 months. Most of these are people moving from job to job.

The picture isn't so rosy, of course, in certain specific areas. Latest Federal data show 43 distress regions where unemployment is at least 12 percent. Only 29 were in this category the previous month.

Yet despite these black spots and the rather high national total of jobless, the outlook for business is not bleak. Most experts today are predicting prosperous activity for the remainder of 1950 and perhaps throughout 1951, too.

President Truman's economic advisers maintain their general optimism even though they believe United States unemployment may go to 5,500,000 this summer and possibly keep on rising into the fall and winter.

They are banking on the continuance of heavy demand in many basic fields. Market studies support their confidence. Not the least encouraging factor is the uninterrupted rise in the United States population. It is on this that many businessmen found their plans for expansion.

This very gain in population, however, accounts in part for the paradox of swelling unemployment in the midst of prosperity. Every year about 600,000 new workers start hunting for jobs. Industry must grow at least as fast as the population to absorb this steady stream.

To aggravate this problem, industry now is stepping up its productivity. That is, the output per man. Productivity rose pretty constantly in the decades up to World War II, but then slacked off. In the first postwar years, it was down below prewar levels. But in 1949 it picked up again. About 3 percent fewer workers were needed to turn out approximately the same goods and services as were produced in 1948.

If this productivity trend continues, and that is considered both likely and desirable, then more and more goods will be made by fewer and fewer workers in the years ahead. Obviously that can only add to unemployed rolls unless industrial expansion offsets this factor.

So, while economists are cheerful, they are also keenly aware of the need for promoting industrial growth to make job room for the millions of new workers and technologically unemployed.

And there is even talk of restoring some kind of pump-priming WPA at an early date, to cushion the effect of the often painful adjustments necessary. We have only recently been introduced to the idea of unbalanced budgets in prosperous times, now we may see a job-making WPA side by side with an industry producing at record rates and employing more people than ever in history.

Government Personnel Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House knows that the Federal Government has more than 2,000,000 employees on the pay roll today. Their salaries alone cost the taxpayers more than $5,000,000,000 annually.

Now every single one of these agencies has a personnel office. I want to call the attention of the House to some startling facts in this connection.

A survey of major agencies which employ 1,800,000 persons, showed that they had a total of 23,430 employees in their personnel offices alone. The annual salaries of these 23,430 personnel workers amounted to $76,000,000.

This means that there is one personnel worker for every 78 employees and that the average cost is $42 per employee served. Even more ridiculous is the fact that in some cases there is 1 personnel worker for every 28 employees.

Now listen to this—the total annual salary costs of personnel workers in all departments is now six times what it was in 1940. Where do we stop? Next we will have superpersonnel experts to take care of the personnel experts who take care of the pampered Government employees who in many cases do nothing more than draw their salaries.

And all costing the taxpayers millions yearly.

Arming of the Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MARCH 22, 1950.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For some time I have been concerned about the arming of the Arab states, especially Egypt, Iraq, and Jordan, by the British Government, and I have also been receiving hundreds of protests in this connection from my constituents.

I am not at all surprised at the growing apprehension at this alarming situation. Last autumn I had the privilege of visiting several countries in the Middle East. I talked with many well informed persons there. I spent considerable time in Israel, and also traveled in Egypt, Syria, and Lebanon.

It is no secret that the Arab states, smarting from the humiliating military defeat in their conflict with Israel, are preparing for another series of invasions into Israel, and the starting of a second war. British airplanes, tanks, rifles, are flowing into Arab states in large numbers. Arab newspapers carried stories of the importation of these military weapons, and of the ultimate sinister use of these munitions of war.

It is sheer nonsense to offer as an alibi that these Arab countries need these weapons for security. Security against whom? Russia? Does anyone in his senses believe that these Arabs, who were defeated on the battlefield by tiny Israel, could resist invasion by Russian forces, if such invasion occurred? It doesn't make sense.

Are the allies, and Britain in particular, arming Arab states as a bulwark against communism? Have we forgotten that the Arab leaders were wined and dined and financed by Hitler, in plotting against the allies, and especially against Britain, when England was facing disaster? Israel, alone, of the Middle East countries can be depended upon to thwart the expansion of communism.

Arming the Arabs has naturally stimulated a competitive military race. The Israeli Government is forced to spend a larger portion of its budget for military defense against the possible second invasion by Arab troops. The Arab States, too, are thus encouraged to make excessive expenditures on military weapons, money which could better be spent to improve the standard of living of the poor natives.

Worst of all, Mr. Secretary, is the danger that this foolish policy of arming the Arabs might very well lead to a conflagration in the Middle East. Once started, that flame might spread and naturally provide the Communists with an opportunity to aid in overthrowing orderly government. Communists thrive on war, distress, and confusion. Witness China's disintegration and surrender to Communist influence.

It is no sound answer to say that Israel can also import arms. Even if licenses were more freely granted to export arms from the United States, it still is no answer. The United States should use its influence directly upon the British Government to cease her policy of arming the Arabs. If England refuses to listen to reason, then our Government should use its influence in the United Nations to prohibit such shipment of arms. It is the duty of the United Nations to thwart such sinister policies; and it is our obligation to make presentation to the British Government, indicating our desire to preserve peaceful relations in the Middle East. We owe it to Israel to be freed from the constant fear of attack.

I hope I may have a reply from you on this subject as courageous and constructive as was your recent San Francisco speech.

Respectfully yours,

ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
Member of Congress.

State Department Representatives Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "I Don't Like Drunks and Fools Representing Me," written by Robert C. Ruark, and published in the Washington Daily News of March 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I DON'T LIKE DRUNKS AND FOOLS REPRESENTING ME

(By Robert C. Ruark)

NEW YORK, March 24.—Sometime back I got a boat for Africa and found it loaded with various State Department appointees to positions of delicate trust in the Near East—the oil country on which our future rests.

The boat was also loaded with the Arabs and Egyptians with whom our people must work. The Arabs and the Egyptians almost died laughing at our people.

One executive was an alcoholic. Another, a military attaché, was so flagrantly homosexual that he regaled strangers at the ship's bar with teary tales about his inability to write his boy friend everyday. Still another was so stupid that he made obvious love to an obvious floozie in the deck chairs—and him with a wife and two children aboard.

When a drunk is in charge of one set of papers and a homosexual is in charge of another and the fool reigns over still another, you don't need spies. Any half-stupid private detective, for 10 bucks a day, can catch any or all in compromise, and sock him for whatever you wish.

Later on I visited one legation that was a beaut. The military attaché was just about charming enough to wear a hostess gown in public. The head man was married to a French woman in a place where French are despised. Nearly everybody I met seemed to be either drunk or worse.

The cultural attaché was married to one of the most pathetic of women. She was a violent alcoholic. She was known to have got drunkenly ill at table at a state function. She hung around bars and picked up strangers—sailors, soldiers, and the natives. She was a joke with whatever ship went port.

This is pitiful. This is pathetic. But she was, to my knowledge, laundered for over 2 years, although the time came when she was no longer asked to state functions. But her husband hung onto his job as our public representative abroad. For all I know he still has it.

I do not blame this poor dame, nor censure her husband, nor place any personal fault on the drunk, the fool, or the homosexuals. But I sure don't like the idea of having them represent me abroad. Especially in places that swarm with spies. The blame is on the permission of one man to rig a whole hierarchy of misfits in the State Department, and on our failure to recognize the rottenness and cut it out after the big sinner was caught and fired by President Roosevelt—a long, long time ago.

The State Department is largely a lip-service organization—much front, for advertising, and deeply involved in the welfare of our world. It seems awful dumb to put up with drunks and perverts and the husbands of town characters and fools and knaves when all espionage and checkmate diplomacy turns automatically to the weak link.

Indiana's Ku Klux Klan Disgrace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, of the Gary Post-Tribune, reveals the sentiment throughout the State of Indiana regarding the almost extinct Ku Klux Klan. All of the officials, politicians, and persons identified with the Indiana Ku Klux Klan of the 1920's were convicted of crimes or have been reduced to disgrace in their respective communities or have disappeared to parts unknown.

AN UGLY CHAPTER COMPLETED

Release of D. C. Stephenson from the Michigan City penitentiary and his departure from the State will close the record on one of the most disgraceful periods in Indiana history—the era of the Klan.

The period of the Klan's rule in Indiana was brief, though the hooded order left its mark on the State for many years. A quarter of a century after Stephenson's conviction, a Governor is able to release him from

prison without setting off a major political scandal. That could not have happened even a few years ago. It has taken 25 years to eliminate the Klan as an ugly factor in our political life.

There have been many unsavory stories about Stephenson's trial and conviction. The prisoner was never able to establish them satisfactorily in a court of appeal. His release comes presumably on the basis of time served in the penitentiary and his record as a convict.

Recently there have been reports of a resurgence of the Klan in some of the Southern States, notably Georgia and Alabama. There have been incidents of night riding and violence. But also, and quite contrary to the situation a quarter century ago, there has been stern action against the night riders. There are State laws now to curb the Klan, and there is enforcement, even if it's not all that it should be.

We doubt that there will be any Klan revival in Indiana. Hoosiers certainly should have learned their lesson in the twenties. And the release of Stephenson now, bringing back to mind the disgraceful political events of 25 years ago, should increase our resolution that it shall not happen again.

The parole of Stephenson should write the last line in the record of Indiana and the Klan. But though the record is completed, it should not be forgotten.

Rearmament of the Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL,
WASHINGTON BUREAU,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are enclosing herewith a copy of a letter from the Department of State, received by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., of Massachusetts, relative to the rearmament of the Arab states by Great Britain, with the sanction of the Department of State.

It is interesting to note that said letter from the Department of State confirms the shipment of arms to the Arabs. However, it assumes an optimistic view of the situation.

Mr. McFall places complete reliance on the existing armistice agreements between Israel and its Arab neighbors. He, therefore, excludes the possibility of a violation on the part of the Arabs. The views of the Department of State, as stated by Mr. McFall, represent a manifestation of a naive faith in face of the existing tension in such an unpredictable section of the world as the middle eastern area, where nothing should be taken for granted.

One does not have to be a trained diplomat to appreciate that, should the Arab states resolve to carry out their military threats against Israel and begin a "second round," the damage will be done and it may too late for the Security Council to stop the conflagration. It may even ignite other sections of the world. No guarantee is offered by the Department of State against the renewal of the war by the Arabs; there is no pledge that, should a war of revenge against Israel break out, the United States would offer immediate military aid. At best, the views of the Department of State are speculative; it is a gamble with the lives of a people who have already suffered so much.

Verily, one should regard as dangerous the placing of a revolver in the hands of a potential murderer. Israel, against whom threats are constantly being made by the Arabs, is entitled, at least, to the opportunity of being placed in a position of complete preparedness for self-defense. Israel is anxious to avoid an arms race when the country is faced with so many internal financial burdens, but such an arms race is being forced upon Israel by the unprecedented shipments of arms to the Arabs, with the approval of the Department of State.

It is alleged that the middle eastern region is strategically important for the West in its cold war and, therefore, the rearmament of the Arab states is the logical sequence of that policy. If this be true, then it appears rather strange that the State of Israel, which is also a part of the middle east, is excluded from that policy. Israel is the outpost of democracy in that section of the world and, in case of an invasion by a third power, Israel, indeed, can be relied upon even in a much broader sense than the Arabs, as a faithful and cooperative ally of the West.

An equitable and realistic approach to the situation seems to dictate a course of action, on the part of the United States and Great Britain, whereby arms would be made available to Israel in the same manner as they are being made available to the Arab states. Thus, a balance of armament between Israel and its Arab neighbors will be established.

This is the basic issue.

There is tremendous concern about this question, and it is not limited to Americans of the Jewish faith. You will recall that recently, Messrs. William Green, president of the A. F. of L., and Philip Murray, president of the CIO, visited President Truman, protesting the rearmament of the Arab states.

As you well know, American Jewry is raising millions of dollars through the United Jewish Appeal, for the immigration and rehabilitation of the tens of thousands of DP's who are entering Israel, where they come in search for peace and security.

Israel needs peace even as one needs the oxygen of the air.

We sincerely trust, Congressman, that, consistent with your official duties, you will deem it proper to follow up this issue on the floor of the House. It is a principle which is in perfect harmony with the American policy of the pursuit of peace among the nations of the earth.

Please accept our deep appreciation for your sympathetic cooperation.

Cordially,

ELMER D. SPOON,
National Vice President,
Zionist Organization of America.

P. S.—We are also enclosing a reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD giving all the information on this problem by the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

High-School Essays on World Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an editorial from the Lyons Daily News, published at Lyons, Kans., which contains a copy of a letter from Mrs. J. L. Blair Buck, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs of Washington, D. C., to Mr. S. H. Jones, managing editor of the News, together with Mr. Jones' reply. I especially commend Mr. Jones' reply to the attention of Members of Congress.

PERMANENT PEACE

This writer several times recently has criticized the assignment of the theme subject World Citizenship to high-school youngsters by the Federated Women's Clubs. His comments have been relayed through federation channels to Mrs. J. L. Blair Buck, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, D. C., and from her today we receive a letter.

In the belief that the letter may be of interest to a good many local persons, both members of Federated Clubs and individuals otherwise concerned, we print it, herewith, together with an open letter in reply:

"DEAR MR. JONES: Several recent editorials from your newspaper have been sent to me. They have criticized severely the program of women's clubs in providing essay contests among our high-school children on the subject of world citizenship.

"You have evidently been too busy locally to care about what is taking place in other parts of the United States or you would know that many highly intelligent and patriotic Americans are attempting to find some way of preventing the cold war that we are at present fighting with Russia from turning into a hot war. So many thinking people have considered that a third world war might be prevented by strengthening the United Nations and developing it into a form of limited world government that there are now before our Congress six resolutions on the subject of world organization.

"The General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled in 1948 adopted a resolution on the subject of world federation. Since that time an active program of education has been carried on in our member clubs, urging the study of the various proposals for world organizations as a method of preventing a third world war. We are naturally interested in having our children aware of what it would mean to be a world citizen should any of the proposals for world government be adopted. We want our young people, as well as our members to make up their own minds on the basis of knowledge of the subject and not on the basis of ignorance. We are not interested in what you call 'packaged thinking.'

"Very sincerely yours,

"MRS. J. L. BLAIR BUCK."

"DEAR MRS. BUCK: I am happy to have your letter, and equally happy to reply. It gives me an opportunity to explain the difference between what I stand for and what those two words 'world citizenship' stand for.

"In the first place, I note with considerable interest your reference to wide interest in a limited world government. It is unfortunate, if that is what the federated clubs meant for youngsters to consider, that they did not assign that as the subject of the theme. There is a world of difference.

"For some years, as a newspaper man, I have been much in sympathy with the programs of various organizations embracing theme writing by youngsters on the subject of American citizenship. I would have been in sympathy with efforts to instill in our children a greater consciousness of the benefits of world mindedness or even a world alliance. But world citizenship, never. And for these reasons.

"Actual world citizenship cannot be had without actual world government. Anything

else would be a more alliance of nations, or world tolerance, or world mindedness. An actual world government would necessitate the subjugation of all the governments, including this grand one of ours, to the will of the majority.

"I can think of no quicker, no more certain way of surrendering our American heritage than that.

"America right now is pouring out billions of dollars of its wealth and substance to the other nations of the globe. The American people, including myself, are going along on the idea. Because we are doing it willingly we are proving that we are the most world-minded, most generous people the world has ever known. Surely nothing of the kind has ever been done in all of world history.

"But should we become part of a world government this would all be changed. We would be doing it, no doubt, but it would no longer be on a voluntary basis. The part we play would be dictated by the will of a majority, and it might or might not be our will.

"I think it is most unfortunate—or was it by design?—that the word 'limited' was not made a part of the theme subject on world citizenship. My daughter might then have written a theme based upon the limitations that could be imposed, to protect her American heritage. As it was, she was given no such choice, if she was to write favorably upon the subject assigned.

"In assuming that I have been too busy locally to know everything that is going on in America, I fear you were entirely right. I further fear there are quite a number of things going on which, if I knew about them, would disturb me a great deal. Any movement to trade my own, or my daughter's American birthright for a mess of pottage would be one of them.

"I hope, Mrs. Buck, that you are, as you say, not interested in packaged thinking. I hope, more than that, that you have not helped to package this brick.

"Quite sincerely,

"S. H. J."

State and Municipal Employees and Teachers Should Be Excluded From Federal Social Security

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days of the last session of Congress, the House passed H. R. 6000 which is known as the social security bill.

The policy of the Social Security Board as set forth by the word and action of Mr. Altmeyer and those who dictate policy has been to bend every energy to bring under Federal social security all workers wherever they are and whatever they do. They want to socialize every worker in the country if they can.

Following this policy they did all they could to bring under Federal social security all State employees and all county and municipal employees such as courthouse employees and policemen and firemen and also school teachers.

I opposed this policy as vigorously as I could when the bill was before the Ways and Means Committee and before the House. With the help of those on the committee who agreed with me we were able to prevent a complete blanketing under the Federal social security of these groups which I have just mentioned. However, we are not able to strike out of the bill all reference to these employees as I should have liked to do. The bill when passed contained a provision that if a State through the proper authority petitioned the Social Security Administration to have any or all of these groups included under Federal social security, the Federal Board would have authority to enter into an agreement with such State to extent social security to such groups.

This cannot be done, however, until after the Governor certifies that a written referendum vote has been taken at which all affected workers have had a chance to vote and that not less than two-thirds of the voters in such referendum vote in favor of including their positions and services under the Federal social security. In other words, if one-third or more of the workers involved voted not to be included under Federal social security then they would be excluded.

One of the principal objections to this system is that mayors and governors and others wielding political pressure should they be in league with the Social Security Board might pressure these groups into giving up the retirement systems that they have built up and of which they are justly proud.

This bill, H. R. 6000, is now pending in the Senate of the United States. I understand that there is a strong sentiment in the Senate in favor of eliminating these objectionable provisions from the bill. Interested groups such as State, county and municipal employees, and school teachers should let their wishes be known to their Senators.

I hope the Senate strikes these objectionable provisions from the bill.

Your Government at Work in the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the United States Philippine War Damage Commission has done an outstanding job in carrying out the expressed will of the Congress in its work of rehabilitation in the Philippine Islands.

The Philippines are a long way from Washington. The Republic of the Philippines, our staunchest of allies, is without the same caliber of representation in Washington as is evidenced by the staffs of experts representing European countries that come here to ask our help and favor. One good and sufficient reason for this is that the war-ravaged Philippine Republic cannot afford the luxuries of missions to America. They choose to conserve what funds they now have and to use them in an effort to rebuild their country and their economy.

Mr. John A. O'Donnell, who has done a fine job as a member of the War Damage Commission, recently delivered an address, Your Government at Work in the Orient. In this he tells you some of the problems that confronted the War Damage Commission and some of the stubborn problems that confronted the Philippine Republic.

This document should be preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I commend it to your reading.

YOUR GOVERNMENT AT WORK IN THE ORIENT

Imagine yourself confronted with the problem of establishing the headquarters of a large Federal agency, 11,000 miles from Washington, D. C., in a foreign country and with a staff which numbered only 16 percent citizens of the United States. What would you do and how would you do it?

The problem was a real one to the three commissioners of the United States Philippine War Damage Commission, an independent Government agency. Its headquarters are in Manila, with regional offices strategically located throughout the Philippine archipelago. It maintains a staff of over 900 employees, only about one-sixth of which are American citizens.

Created by the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, this Commission is performing a function unique in history. Its purpose is the adjudication and payment of private and public claims for war damage caused in World War II and it is the first time that the United States or any other country has paid the citizens of another nation war damage remuneration on such a scale.

This act was intended as a manifestation of good will on the part of the United States toward the people of the Philippine Republic to whom we gave independence on July 4, 1946. Not only had friendly relations existed between the two countries for nearly half a century, but this was the only American territory that suffered heavy damage during the war. The Filipinos remained steadfastly loyal and underwent great suffering during the Japanese occupation. With the end of the war and the granting of independence to the Philippines, it was vital that this struggling republic received aid to rehabilitate itself in order that it might assume the position it deserves among the nations of the world.

As required by the act, two Americans and one Filipino were appointed as members of the Commission. The Americans were Frank A. Waring, the chairman, and John A. O'Donnell. The Filipino member appointed was Judge Fancisco A. Delgado.

The first problem facing these men was to arrange housing for the American personnel being brought to the Philippines and office space for the staff to be recruited. Anyone involved in the deployment of nonwar agencies from Washington before and during the war is aware of the problems involved in uprooting and transferring personnel, even for just a city to city move within the United States. Magnify these problems a thousand times and you have some idea of the task confronting the Commission. According to General Eisenhower, Manila was one of the most war-devastated cities in the world, second only to Warsaw. In the closing months of 1946, housing was next to impossible to locate. Office space was extremely scarce. Food was far below American standards. The country was in the throes of severe inflation and prices were several hundred percent above prewar level. There was no public transportation. Communications were exasperatingly slow and the electric power system temperamental to say the least.

Arrangements were made with the Manila Hotel to provide housing in temporary barrack buildings in the hotel compound. The barracks were originally constructed by the Navy, and while extensive alterations were made, to put it simply, they were still barracks. A special rate for food was agreed upon and while neither the quarters nor the food could be called homelike the first obstacle had been hurdled.

The American personnel began arriving in November 1946. Nearly a hundred persons were flown to Manila in three flights through a charter arrangement with Pacific Overseas Airline. The cost per person, Washington, D. C., to Manila, was less than the minimum first class steamship fare from San Francisco to Manila, without taking into account rail fares, time in transit, per diems, and other expenses which would have been involved in rail and water transportation.

Meanwhile, plans were under way for the construction of a housing compound in Quezon City, a suburb of Manila. Upon the completion of this project, the majority of the married personnel were moved there. This compound is not only attractive, but provides safe play space for children, adequate room for adult recreation and a dust-free, cool retreat after the noise, heat, and dust of the average Manila workday. Two new downtown apartment houses were also leased upon their completion and these provide accommodations for the unmarried personnel and those with grown children. Employees received these quarters in lieu of the rental allowance provided under Bureau of the Budget regulations.

Next came the problem of office space. Fully 90 percent of the prewar offices and Government buildings were partially or completely destroyed. The Commission was faced with the task of competing with thousands of others who were looking for space. The Aguinaldo Building in downtown Manila was finally rented but the facilities and location were not good. Later, a compound containing eight two-story steel Navy buildings was obtained. These buildings provide large offices with good lighting and ventilation. There is a modern cafeteria where relatively low-cost food is served. A former Navy nurse operates a first-aid room. The facilities of the cafeteria and the dispensary are available to all employees.

Originally, the Commission borrowed an old Army bus to transport its employees to and from work. It had definitely been through the war and was not a very reliable means of transportation. It frequently broke down and the problem of getting employees to work was constantly arising. As soon as possible, busses were purchased and now handle the transportation of the American personnel.

Naturally, unemployment was at a peak never before seen in the Philippines. The Commission received 10,000 applications for approximately 1,000 openings. Among its first decisions was the determination that veterans, both Filipino and American, would be given preferential consideration for employment. Physical handicaps were not to bar applicants if their qualifications were otherwise satisfactory. Furthermore, the civil-service lists of the Philippine Government were to be studied to find eligible candidates for positions.

As soon as the first Americans reached Manila, the Commission began the recruitment of Philippine personnel. These employees have performed creditably and with a high degree of initiative and intelligence. To cite one example, the head of the division responsible for the recording of all incoming claims arrived at his desk one morning to find that his staff had been at work all night. They did it on their own initiative to catch up on the backlog of tabulation that had occurred, not through any fault of their own, but because the tabulating machines could not keep up with the load. This and considerable other overtime has been performed on a strictly voluntary basis.

A willingness to place Filipino personnel in key positions has been demonstrated and they hold such positions. The Commission maintains an internal promotion policy and considers all current employees whenever a better position is to be filled before it employs anyone from the outside. It has been interesting to note the keen competitive spirit of the Filipino employees—always striving to move ahead, yet never sacrificing quality for quantity.

In drafting the Philippine Rehabilitation Act, the Congress wisely recognized the economic problem which confronted the Commission with respect to personnel and exempted it from the obligations of the Civil Commission regulations and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Commission has sought to adhere closely to the civil service regulations insofar as they may be made to apply efficiently and economically. It has adopted several measures for the betterment of personnel and has been able to maintain most satisfactory employee relations.

As might be expected in such an overseas operation, there has been some turn-over of personnel, but the percentage has been relatively small. Several American employees have resigned and returned to the States but this was to be expected, for no one who has not lived and worked in a foreign country, especially the tropics, can visualize in advance what his reaction will be. On the whole, the Commission has been most fortunate in the choice of its American personnel.

Living allowances are paid under the same regulations as those which provide for rental allowances. The salary scale is relatively high, for both Philippine and American personnel. It was arrived at by the Commission after an exhaustive survey had been made of the Philippine Government agencies, business firms, etc., and living costs were found to be four and five times higher than before the war. Also, the agency is a temporary one, its life being definitely limited under the act which created it. Many of the American staff made personal sacrifices to go overseas and help the Commission do the job assigned by Congress. The payment of adequate salaries to Filipino personnel has instilled in them a sense of pride and has tended to remove temptation to succumb to pressures from those seeking favored treatment on claims. The Commission believes that decent incomes reduce temptation by relieving employees of the normal possibility of financial straits.

A grievance procedure that permits an employee to take his complaint to the Commissioners themselves has been adopted. The procedure for involuntary separations provides a complete safeguard for the employee. Charges of unfitness must be reduced to writing and forwarded to the employee through the Personnel Division. The employee has five working days in which to answer the charges and if his answers are not satisfactory to his office director, the employee may appeal in person to the Commission.

Numerous other measures have been adopted for the promotion of harmony among the employees. Among them is the fact that Philippine holidays as well as those celebrated in the United States are observed.

The Commission is now in the sundown of its existence and is required by law to complete its work by April 30, 1951. There is no question but that this goal will be attained. The task has not been an easy one but the Commission is justly proud of the record it has made. Over 1,250,000 private-property claims were filed and approximately 1,200,000 have already been liquidated. Funds have been allocated for the rehabilitation of schools, hospitals, government buildings, waterworks and irrigation systems. This record has been achieved only through teamwork and the splendid employee-employee relationship which has been established and maintained.

House Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington News on March 21, 1950, on the subject of Home Rule for the District of Columbia. The editorial follows:

HOME RULE HOAX

Hypocrisy is fast becoming a Government policy here as it has in varying degrees in other countries. In its campaign against the Kefauver bill for home rule in the National Capital, the Washington Board of Trade has issued a pamphlet briefly emphasizing palpable frauds the bill contains. The principal one is:

"Sec. 404. The Congress of the United States reserves the right, at any time, to exercise its constitutional authority as legislature for the District of Columbia by enacting legislation for the District on any subject, whether within or without the scope of legislative power granted to the District council by this act including, without limitation, legislation to amend or repeal any law in force in the District of Columbia prior to or after the enactment of this act or any provision of this act."

The pamphlet asks: "Is that home rule?" It proceeds to remind Washingtonians that the bill permits the District to elect nine members of the proposed council, but lets the President appoint the other two; and that it lets persons temporarily living here, but retaining citizenship elsewhere, to vote here as well as in their own cities upon all municipal questions, including throwing the District into bonded debt to the extent of $60,000,000.

When the same measure was called the Auchincloss bill in the last Congress, the newspaper pointed out that, as a home-rule instrument, it was a fake. It still is. Its real purpose is to reorganize the municipal government under the domination of a city manager. But it would surrender no fraction of the present Federal control of our home community.

The pamphlet also stresses that the Kefauver bill would not give either the national franchise or national representation to the District. It still would leave our people helpless on national issues and candidates.

Many opponents of the bill favor national representation but object to local suffrage. That is not our position. We believe Washington should be fully enfranchised both nationally and locally—in the American tradition. But national representation is not home rule. The News believes thoroughly in genuine home rule, but insists that a home-rule bill which would impose a form of local government dictated by Congress is a sham.

We first should be given that autonomy and then be permitted to decide for ourselves whether we want a city manager or a mayor and city council like other large cities in the United States.

Mission in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an eloquent sermon entitled "Mission in Washington," by the Reverend Franklin D. Loehr, of Florence, Mass.:

MISSION IN WASHINGTON

Scripture: Luke 10: 25-37; Hebrews 11: 1-40.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Dev. FRANKLIN D. LOEHR,

Florence, Mass.

House Foreign Affairs Committee planning meet privately January 19 to decide action on resolution on Atlantic Union resolution. Senate leaders, administration also, formulating policy now. Urgently need you in delegation seeing congressional leaders, State Department, White House, January 17 to 23, inclusive. Committee tentatively planning anniversary dinner 23d. Could you be present any or preferably all these days? Please wire our Washington office, 1111 Seventeenth Street NW.

OWEN J. ROBERTS.

For 10½ years I've been waiting for that telegram.

Ten and one-half years ago—in the summer of 1939—I first came across Clarence Streit's book, Union Now. That's the year it was first published, and I thank a kind providence for bringing me to it immediately.

For I had been bothered, for years even before that, with the evident inadequacy and deterioration of the peace-keeping machinery of the world. The League of Nations was going utterly to pieces, and Hitler was becoming daily that serious threat to history that he turned out to be. I was wondering, with all the radical urgency of youth, wondering if it were possible to build a peace that would be strong and good—or if, perhaps, peace were impossible of human attainment, and war a permanent curse on the human race.

By an act of will and instinct I refused to believe such a pessimistic fatalism; and even, with the help of the Naperville Youth Council, worked out an ambitious idea of our own—the Fellowship of the Fourth Circle. We had stenciled armbands for our meetings, a silhouette cross with five circles on it, and a special salute—hand up and then out: "We love God, and the Samaritan is our neighbor." We signed up members, wrote cards to our Congressmen, and did what we could. But we were so few and small and far away, and the problem was so big.

Then Clarence Streit's book appeared, called Union Now. (It became later a book-of-the-month.) Here was a modest mind, one of the most brilliant political thinkers of this or any generation. Moreover, he had had a ringside seat: Mr. Streit was New York Times newspaper correspondent covering the League of Nations for 10 years, 1929 to early 1939. Here was the depth of historical analysis, the wisdom of man's political past, applied with stark realism to the practical need of our generation's growing world community. Here was the answer, in sweeping outline, tying past and future together in challenge to the fluid present; in practical detail outlining with compelling logic, the course of promise, and the start we could make right now.

It was only a book, but it stirred people. There were others who felt even as I, as they read it. Within 10 days of its publication a group of early readers, mysteriously drawn together by the magic of that book, met in New York City and founded an organization. It was a small group, and most of them had never seen each other before; but then and there they united, with the purpose of federating the free peoples of the world defensively, economically, culturally. The well-tested pattern to start with is our American Federal Union which united 48 States and brought us the strength, the peace, and the prosperity which we have known.

This was to be a nucleus for full world government as soon as possible. The plain facts of life in 1939 (and in 1950) said it was impossible to unite all nations immediately into a real world government, for some nations were on the rampage, and the last thing they wanted was effective government on the world level, because that was the one thing that could check and hold them—1939 wasn't too different from 1950 in this respect, was it? But a dozen or so plain citizens met in New York City that day in April 1939 and formed there—as disciples of Clarence Streit's idea—an organization to save the world. Such was the beginning of Federal Unionists, Inc., that movement which, though never enrolling millions, has permeated every State in our Union, every democratic nation of this globe. The Federal Union concept has so guided and established the thinking of practical men about freedom and peace that its humble leader, Clarence Streit, in this year nominated to receive the Nobel Peace Prize. (That's a bit of inside news which isn't out yet to the general public—that Mr. Streit, who spoke from this pulpit on Sunday morning, March 27, 1949, has been put up this year for the Nobel Peace Prize.)

I joined the movement as soon as I found out about it, sometime in the summer of 1939—and I've been working for it ever since. The summer of 1941 I was asked by the Federal Unionists in the Chicago area to set up the Chicago office, really the midwest regional office of Federal Union; my Naperville church granted me a 4-month leave of absence, June through September, to do so. We made the front page of the Chicago Tribune, and were even picketed on one occasion by We, the Mothers, Mobilize for America, Inc. I preached the first Federal Union convention sermon in Cleveland in 1941; and traveled from Westover Field to Chicago in 1942 to preach the fourth convention sermon.

During the war I gave out upward perhaps to 400 copies of that famous book, Union Now. When soldiers came in with that most poignant of all the questions they asked the chaplain: "Chaplain, what's the use? Will we have to do it all over again? Will my little boy have to go to war?" I did not send them empty-handed away. I had an answer: "No, we don't have to do it all over again—your little boy need not be condemned to go to another war, in his day; there is a way." And I put in their hands this solid, constructive book, Union Now.

And civilians wanted to know, too, as well as soldiers, if there is any real hope for peace—any practical way to establish law and order among nations, government in the world community, adequate to cope with problems and situations and persons like Hitler and Stalin, before they plunged us all into war. So I was asked to speak, again and again—more than 300 times, on this topic, an average of better than twice a month for all these 10½ years since first I found and read the book. And a dozen, a hundred, a thousand others were doing likewise.

And all the time we were planting seeds, idea seeds, to grow in the minds of thoughtful people. Streit resigned his good job as ace foreign correspondent for the New York Times, and without any backing but God and his own faith, set out to bring to the world this gospel for its twentieth century economic and political salvation. And I watched him, and prayed, and did the little things I could in the little corners where I found people willing to listen. And I met a lady in the Washington delegation this week, a lady from Chicago who looked at me and said, "You're the man who spoke on Federal Union at a tea party in Evanston one afternoon back in 1941. I was there, and I came up afterward and said, 'What can I do about it? Have you a membership blank? You'll need people, and you'll need money for this,' and I've been in it ever since. Just because of that talk you gave at a tea party in 1941." And then she introduced me to her husband, who was a colonel in the Marines during the South Pacific action.

So finally, Federal Union began to get places. Prominent people, people who could do something about it, began to listen seriously. And postwar events have built up tremendous pressure. The end of the war did not bring peace. The atomic bomb suddenly hung over us. Russia continually prods us to do something ourselves to make this a united free world, as we would have it, or to be absorbed in the dark night of her united slave world. Men in positions of leadership found world events crowding them, and their conscience pushing them, and the old props they'd leaned on going out from under them. Federal Union was growing, quietly gathering strength.

Then came a letter, a confidential letter, to only a few of us, from Federal Union headquarters. A new attack was in the making to carry this Federal Union idea at last into the arena of political action. Big names would general the attack, men whose very presence would make those who guide this Nation sit up and listen. Owen J. Roberts, Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States of America, head of the American legal section at the Nazi War Crimes Court in Nuremberg. Owen J. Roberts would come back and be active chairman of the political action group, for he felt that in Federal Union could be built an era of law and peace among nations.

Will Clayton, former Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, would be a vice chairman; Robert Patterson, former Secretary of War in the President's Cabinet, would be another vice chairman, perfectly representing how Federal Union is the greatest and logical answer to both our national defense and to our economic problems. Elmo Roper would be treasurer, and men of national prominence would form the national council.

We were now moving into political action, with a powerfully led Atlantic Union Committee introducing a resolution into Congress. Influential members in both the House and the Senate, Walter Judd, of Minnesota, Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, Raymond Baldwin, of Connecticut, and several dozen more—would request the President of the United States to invite the other nations who had signed the North Atlantic Pact with us, to send representatives to explore the forming of an actual union—of these North Atlantic Pact countries and such other countries as the convention might invite—to form a union of free peoples, to safeguard our liberties, and unleash our economic powers, raise the standard of living, and bring about that enlargement of

citizenship whereby we can claim and establish the world as our common free human habitation.

Two weeks ago, this telegram came. The first blows have been struck. The resolutions have been introduced into both Houses of Congress. The preliminary hearings are coming up. We'll have a chance to talk to some high officials in the State Department, and in Congress and Senate. We'll have a few minutes with the President. Will you come to help us? Brother, would I? This was the telegram I'd been waiting for, working for, 10½ years.

The next question was primarily a local one, asked only at the parsonage: How much money was in the tithe account? The telegram didn't ask that. We asked it. For this trip had to be at our own expense. Delegates came from 17 States—Oregon, Mississippi, Florida, Illinois—most of them farther away than Massachusetts. All of us had given money to Federal Union and to the Atlantic Union Committee—had given again and again, to support its offices, spread the good word of peace and prosperity through the federation of the free. Now we were asked to dig down again—for we must pay our own way to Washington.

Here is where a tithe account comes in so handy. If you deliberately set aside 10 percent of your income to use for religious and charitable purposes, and keep books on it, then it is not a question of "Do we have the money?" for something that comes up like this, but rather "Shall we use the tithe this month this way instead of sending off to those other good causes on the list?" With us, the Federal Union work for a better world has always been at the top of the list in the tithe account, right alongside the church. It might use up the balance for January, and for February, too, and even March. But when you have a tithe account the money is there. So I went to Washington.

It would have been interesting, this mission in Washington, even if I had not had 10½ years back of it. Tuesday morning our delegation saw Congressman KEE, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I missed that—didn't arrive until Tuesday noon—but the delegates who were there "did well by our little Nell," and Congressman KEE has scheduled full hearing for the Atlantic Union resolution, probably in February.

At the luncheon Tuesday noon we were briefed by experts on ways of approaching our Congressmen and Senators. I saw both Congressman PUCCOLO and Congressman HESELTON Tuesday afternoon, and both listened with interest. Both knew something of the proposition, wanted to know more about it, and expressed themselves as in sympathy with its purpose and essence. I believe both Congressman PUCCOLO and Congressman HESELTON will stand up to be counted for the Atlantic Union resolution when the time comes to stand up and be counted.

I saw about a dozen Congressmen and Senators during my 3 days in Washington, and talked with the secretaries and assistants of over a dozen more, for whenever there wasn't anything else scheduled we delegates were calling on Representatives and Senators. Some of the Federal Union delegates were influential, like Ed Orgill, Tennessee publisher; he gave a special luncheon for all his State's Congressmen, and had a powerful Atlantic Union talk for them. Others had enough prestige and weight to command attitude by their very presence: Mrs. Robert Low Bacon, for instance, whose chauffeur on Friday could drive her right up to the White House steps. Me? I just walked in anyway, into office after office up there on Capitol Hill; walked in and said that the people back home had sort of a sad feeling of betrayal, a sad feeling that the persons we'd entrusted with the peace had somehow muffed the job so far, and what was the use of this new hydrogen-helium atomic bomb, which will only bring us a few more years of time at best; what's the use of it if we don't do anything with the time it brings? And, after all, wasn't that what the war was for, to bring us another chance at making peace? And what had we done with that chance? It takes billions of dollars to buy time. It takes millions of lives to buy another chance. Let's do something about it.

And let's do it now—now—this session of Congress. For look at the deterioration of the political situation this past year—all assisting communism: (1) The devaluation of money in European countries has wiped out $25,000,000,000 and more in private capital. That's just $25,000,000,000 closer to communism—for communism is trying to wipe out private capital, too; (2) the incredible loss of all China—a historic bungle of the first magnitude, which history will charge squarely against America; (3) the atomic bomb in Russian hands. All these underscore the urgency of the need, and the fact that, as Mr. Streit has been patiently pointing out for 10½ years, anything short of union is not enough.

I told Senator SALTONSTALL it would mean so much if he'd come out now for the measure. I thanked Congressman CHESHIRE HARRIS, who has come out publicly for it. I had 5 minutes with Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, cover man and feature of Time magazine for January 16 (I broke into politics working for him, 8 years ago—and his first wife came from Northampton)—and he, too, is deeply worried about the loss of China, and the Russian bomb, and the currency devaluation. I spent 20 minutes with the administrative assistant to Senator TAFT, pointing out two things: (1) that Atlantic Union is the finest answer anyone has come up with to our international political and economic problems; and (2) that if ROB TAFT came out for Atlantic Union now, he would plug the greatest gap in the public opinion of him—his lack of an adequate, effective foreign policy. And when I rose to go Senator TAFT's assistant kept me there and asked more questions, and said "You have convinced me." (I think he was very nearly convinced before I came.) * * * That isn't TAFT, of course, but it is someone very close to him.

I walked in offices of Congressmen from Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, New York, and several more, spreading the Gospel. I found a Congressman of North Dakota whose daughter I had met 21 years ago in my high-school days, and I used that, too, to open a door for Atlantic Union. I talked with secretaries and left literature in the offices of "the distinguished Senator"—(that's what they call each other)—from Michigan, Iowa, Maryland, Florida, Arkansas, Rhode Island, Georgia, New Jersey, Wisconsin, and TEXAS.

It was all very presumptuous of me, you. But everywhere I was well received—partly because I was the pastor of the Florence Congregational Church of Northampton, as I proudly announced to each one I called on—and partly because I spoke for the Justice Roberts and Clarence Streit Atlantic Union resolution about which they wanted to know more. I gave them Mr. Streit's article showing how the various world government resolutions, now before the Congress, can be brought together into one—and why to insist on every nation being in it at the start is unrealistic, for Russia is veto-ing and walking out on United Nations doings just as it is. If we try to force the United Nations into effective world government we'll probably not strengthen it, but rather blow it to pieces, thus destroying the one bridge we do have between the Russian and the non-Russian worlds.

Yes, we of the Atlantic Union delegation rang up quite a mileage total, tramping those lovely marble floors of the Capital buildings in Washington, D. C.; and it is a beautiful capital, and we Americans may well be proud of it.

And in between the personal calls came the exciting events—Press conference in the Capitol Building itself Wednesday morning, with Senators and Congressmen and Mr. Justice Roberts. And a Washington cocktail party Wednesday afternoon from 4 to 7 in the Metropolitan Club. * * * I've never before in my life invited people to a cocktail party. But every Congressman and Senator that was talked to Tuesday and Wednesday, by arrangement of our Atlantic Union delegation, got an invitation to this cocktail party—and if Atlantic Union goes over, I figure the Lord will forgive me.

You've heard of those Washington cocktail parties, haven't you? Well, they're just about what you've read. They have all sorts of fish eggs on little crackers to eat, and a dozen different things to drink. How did I make out? Well, I had one ginger ale—with nothing in it—and one coca-cola with a cherry, a green olive, and two bits of lemon peel in it. And the conversation I best remember was with Anatole Visson, who is head of the Time-Life Diplomatic Bureau in Washington, and who said that the only thing worse than a ginger ale was the second ginger ale. (That's why I switched to coca-cola the second time up.) One admiral, one Senator's young wife, and several others got just slightly happy—which made me feel that I'd really seen a Washington cocktail party, now.

Then everybody was invited out to the Streit's apartment, to fill up on sauerkraut, frankfurters, and potato salad—and review the events of the day. Mr. Justice Roberts told of his conference that afternoon with JOE MARTIN, Republican leader in the House, who is very worried about the world situation, and very interested in Atlantic Union, and who kept Mr. Roberts there a full hour talking it through. Then each of us in turn reported his bit.

Well, that's about all there was to it, excepting that Wednesday noon, just because I happened to be standing around the right place after the press conference, I was one of four that went along with Mr. Justice Roberts and Mr. Streit to luncheon. And Thursday we all as a delegation had 20 minutes, with Senator ELBERT THOMAS of Utah, head of the special subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (he did most of the talking, but Justice Roberts smoothly placed him down about the full hearing for Atlantic Union, soon). And Friday we all went to the White House and shook hands with the President, and heard him tell us that he saw "nothing but good" in the Atlantic Union proposal, "nothing but good." And if you want your hand to shake the hand that shook hands with the hand of the President, just come through the west aisle after church. And if you're a Democrat, you may shake it twice.

MISSION IN WASHINGTON

You know, I was grumbling, about 20 minutes to 4 Tuesday morning as the alarm clock rank and I had to get up, after 3 hours' sleep, and drive to Springfield to catch that 4:55 early morning train. I wondered why anyone was fool enough to leave a warm bed at that ungodly hour, and spend a good chunk of his own money to go on a mission like that.

And then I remembered how the young men I served as chaplain just four short years ago, were called out of bed at 20 minutes to 4, and at 20 minutes to 5, and at any time during the night or day. And their mission was not to ride a warm, safe train for 8 hours, but to fly a cold, dangerous bomber for 8, 10, 12 hours—to fly it in the 60-below-zero

weld of 20,000 feet altitude, and to fight their way through enemy skies to perform their mission. And then I thought of how the eleventh chapter of Hebrews—we read it in our Scripture today—applies not only to Noah and Abraham and Moses and the rest of the Old Testament heroes of the faith, but also to our boys in the war. They, too, "obtained a good report through faith"—they did their part, kept the faith—but "received not the promise." All that our boys could achieve was not peace but another chance for us. "God having provided some better thing for us"—not better as being more virtuous than what they did, but as being the finishing half of the job—"that they without us should not be made perfect."

And thinking of my boys, our boys, and of the unfinished half of the job, which is ours to do, my grumbling ceased. And I went my way, accompanied, perhaps, on my mission to Washington, by the prayers and blessings of those whose missions of danger bought for Washington and for America, the chance, the mission, we have today.

Great Seal of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Mr. George J. Hulme, of Boston, Mass., asking that attention be called to the fact that the great seal of our country is officially mistreated. His communication reads as follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Inasmuch as our national ensign—Old Glory—has seven red stripes and six white, I submit there can be no real warrant ever to reverse the order of said stripes on the shield part of that great seal.

As a designer and engraver of wide experience, I have engraved that insignia on various articles, notably, among others, a dozen silver cigarette boxes given to Harvard professors by United States Navy officers taking communications instruction during the war. Even commercial interests seem more concerned about being correct than does official Washington, although the State seal of Illinois shows the shield striped correctly, as also do the figureheads of Admiral Dewey's *Olympia*, the sunken *Maine*, and other United States ships of that type.

If you will examine the seal on the reverse of a $1 bill, you will notice the shield is striped: six red and seven white. This is perhaps the most glaring fault. Of course, I am aware of a general public indifference regarding heraldic design, but since we do use such things they should be correct.

Many times I had stumbered writing our late President, but deferred because of succeeding crises of larger importance demanding his constant attention. Now I am prompted to try again because of the multiplying and, to me, somewhat irritating examples of official recruiting posters, painted tanks, etc., displayed hereabout.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE J. HULME.

P. S.—When President Franklin D. Roosevelt was here for the wedding of his son, John, I noticed the seal emblazoned on his official automobile was wrongly striped. The eagle's head was turned left (sinister) too. You may recall the late Secretary Knox having that head—with much ado—turned right (dexter).

Hold on to Your Hats!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, competition is a wonderful thing and it has unquestionably resulted in more and better goods for more people. Our higher standard of living was brought into being in just this manner. It cannot be denied that we wish to maintain this high standard. Certainly we desire to have others attain the same degree of success in theirs. But, by no stretch of the imagination can we accept a situation which would compel our adopting a course leading to a lowering of our standard of living at a level comparable to other countries. A free flow of trade makes a joke of the meaning of competition. What good is that type of trade when it begins to displace our own workers? How can we compete with cheap labor and still keep our workers on the job?

We are only in the early stages of the suffering to come from the effects of growing imports. The threatening shadow of increasing unemployment looms larger with each foreign product coming to this country. We cannot lightly dismiss this danger. Connecticut industries and industries throughout the Nation are beginning to feel the pinch resulting from the injurious trade policies which can be laid directly at the door of the State Department.

Particularly affected at this time is the hat industry of Connecticut and to bring this matter into sharper focus for the attention of all who are concerned about employment of our workers and our standard of living, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the columns of the Bridgeport Post of March 23, 1950:

IMPORTS CREATING HAT-TRADE SLUMP—DANBURY HAT PRODUCTION CUT TO 3,000 DOZEN IN 3-DAY WEEK

The combined impact of Czech iron-curtain importations and a general decline in business has tumbled Danbury's hat-making production from a capacity of 30,000 dozen for a 5-day week to 3,000 dozen for a current 3-day-a-week schedule, it was reported today.

Approximately 3,000 hat workers are employed in 14 main plants in Danbury and lack of business has forced the 3-day-a-week program, according to available statistics.

Union and plant officials who describe the situation as very serious declare that a hatless fad in various sections of the country is accentuating the critical situation in the hat industry.

In Norwalk, second largest hat-producing community in Fairfield County, a total of approximately 2,750 persons are employed in 12 companies. That does not include those employed in fur companies which provide hat materials.

Plant officials report business prospects are not healthy and that the imports from Czechoslovakia plus a decline in domestic sales are causing great concern.

"We are beginning to wonder where our next year's business is coming from," one official declared.

Warren S. Smith, secretary of the Hat Institute, trade association for America's hat industry, declared that the hat industry has dropped 1,500,000 man-hours since 1942 and that 1,300 workers have been forced out of the trade in the past 5 years.

He attacked the State Department's policy of insisting on imports at the price of the hat industry, but maintained that many other industries in Connecticut are being hurt by the trade exchange program under the Marshall plan.

"Traditionally, we have imported a great deal of raw material from abroad," Mr. Smith said. "Now we are being forced to accept the finished product in competition with our own workers."

He declared that Czechoslovakia and Italy are the major competitors who have been fed ECA dollars to drive American firms out of business.

"Let them furnish the raw material," he asserted. "Let us provide the finished job."

Sacrifice of a city like Danbury is a pretty steep price to pay on the altar of helping countries abroad," he declared.

SHOE MANUFACTURERS HIT CZECHOSLOVAKIAN IMPORTS

BOSTON, March 23.—The New England Shoe and Leather Association charged today that some 1,000,000 pairs of shoes will be imported from Communist-dominated Czechoslovakia into the United States this year.

Executive Vice President Maxwell Field reported that the association has asked the Treasury Department to investigate so-called dumping of the shoes in violation of the antidumping act of 1921.

Field added that the State Department also has been requested to advise the association of its policy permitting importation of the shoes from the iron-curtain country.

The association official stated that in the month of January alone 58,018 pairs of shoes were imported from Czechoslovakia. This, he said, was more than half of the total brought to the United States during the entire year of 1949.

Granting of Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii Is Simple Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district and the Northwest generally are very much in favor of granting statehood to the Hawaiian Islands and to Alaska in the interest of simple justice. I include in these remarks a leading editorial entitled "In Simple Justice," which appeared in the Oregon Journal in its issue of March 19, which is an excellent presentation of the merits of this proposal:

IN SIMPLE JUSTICE

This is a plea to the Senate of the United States of America.

It is a plea for simple justice for more than 60,000 second-class citizens, who are first-class people, the American residents of the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

It is a plea for fulfillment of solemn promises made by the people of the United States 38 and 52 years ago, respectively, to the

people of Alaska and Hawaii—promises conditioned upon attainment of economic and political maturity; promises that have been violated for at least 30 years.

It is a plea for action at this session of the Congress—action that will be a telling demonstration to the world that the United States of America means what it says when it subscribes to the doctrine of self-determination—for its people as well as for the peoples of other lands.

The House of Representatives has already acted. In rapid succession, it has approved statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. It has said in effect that the foremost exponent of democracy, the United States of America, can no longer afford to cling to the outmoded system of colonialism. It can no longer subscribe to a system of taxation without representation. It has shown a willingness to give congressional recognition to plebiscites in both Territories expressing an overwhelming desire for statehood. It has finally accepted the fact, brought out repeatedly by congressional investigating committees, that both Alaska and Hawaii have met all the conditions of statehood.

NOW UP TO SENATE

The House has been actuated by enlightened self-interest, it is true. It has acted belatedly, but it has acted. And the Senate of the United States, in all fairness, can do no less.

The arguments for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii are so overwhelming that further congressional delay is inexcusable.

Let's take Alaska first.

This vast land, one-fifth the size of the United States, twice the size of Texas, the Union's largest State, was acquired from Russia in 1867 for $7,200,000 in gold. There was considerable outcry against Secretary of State William H. Seward who negotiated the deal. Alaska was called Seward's folly.

No one could foresee then, that the United States had acquired one of the richest and most strategic regions on earth for 2 cents an acre. But recognition came when gold was discovered in the adjoining Klondike 30 years later—gold that was to bring great wealth to America—almost $1,000,000,000 worth to date, in fact.

What is more important, Alaska has almost limitless wealth-producing resources that while scarcely touched to date are nevertheless producing approximately $150,000,000 every year or 30 times Alaska's original purchase price.

Alaska's fishing industry has produced $1,900,000,000 to date. Its annual salmon pack alone is valued at approximately $75,000,000. Its mines produce $15,000,000 a year. Its infant lumber industry is taking out $5,000,000 worth of timber annually. Its tourist business is running $35,000,000 a year. Its agriculture is considerable and growing.

Alaska has great deposits of coal, oil, tin, copper, lead, silver, and platinum. Its fur industry is third in importance. It has some of the greatest hydroelectric streams in the world. One site is said to be as good as Grand Coulee, mightiest power plant on earth. And its great spruce and hemlock forests are said to be capable of producing 1,000,000 tons of newsprint a year.

Alaska is not only one of the key bastions of national defense, it may soon become the air crossroads of the world in these days of transpolar flight.

And how has this great rich land fared politically?

Since it attained Territorial status in 1912 it has fared very badly indeed. Its repeated petitions for statehood and the long succession of bills providing statehood have been kicked around by the Congress, ignored or buried in committee. The answer has been either an outright "no," or "not yet" or "wait until you can afford it."

NO POLITICAL POWER

Alaska has a Territorial legislature. True, but its powers are greatly limited. It can be overruled by the Congress or by the Territorial Governor, who is appointed by the President of the United States. Its judges are appointed. Its Delegate to the Congress has no vote. It is ruled in large measure by Federal regulations, promulgated by Federal agencies operating in the Territory. Ninety-eight percent of its land is federally owned.

Thus Alaska's 95,000 people—about 25,000 of them Eskimos and Indians—have to pay Federal income taxes like residents of the United States (about $20,000,000 a year now), but they cannot vote for President, they cannot vote for Congressmen. They are dependent upon a Federal Congress and a Federal bureaucracy 5,000 miles away. They are disfranchised.

Alaskans are in no better position than were the American Revolutionaries who fought a war over taxation without representation. They have been neglected, frustrated, exploited by absentee owners. They have borne the brunt of war, bought bonds to help pay for it, without having a word to say about it.

To be blunt, they have been getting a raw deal.

Now take Hawaii.

It's ironic, when you come to think of it. But statehood has been the ambition of the Hawaiian islands (formerly the Sandwich islands) for almost a century—since 1853 when the Hawaiian monarch Kamehameha III participated in the negotiation of a treaty under which the islands were to be admitted to the American Union as a state.

Statehood was requested by the commission through which annexation of the islands was brought about in 1898. And statehood has been petitioned at least 30 times since then and is again petitioned by half a million residents.

Like Alaska, Hawaii is one of the richest most desirable bits of territory on earth. Now, since the war its eight inhabited islands export $180,000,000 worth of agricultural products annually—including approximately $100,000,000 worth of sugar and $75,000,000 worth of pineapple.

The islands produce almost every type of tropical fruit, vegetables, and plants, including bananas, sisal and coffee. They boast one of the largest cattle ranches on earth—a 500,000-acre spread.

The islands also constitute one of the choicest tourist spots on earth, attracting about $40,000,000 worth of travel business a year.

Hawaii, crossroads of the Pacific by sea and air, is also one of America's principal military outposts, one that bore the brunt of the first treacherous Japanese attack of World War II.

FULL LOYALTY PROVED

For the record, the Territory of Hawaii sent 33,144 of her sons to war among them two Japanese outfits which helped win the tough Italian campaign and became the most decorated outfit in the American armed forces. And Hawaiians bought more E bonds during the war than did residents of any State—$531 per capita as compared with Oregon's $430, Washington's $407, and California's $385. Yet some have had the nerve to charge that Hawaii's polyglot population—36 percent Caucasian, 23 percent Japanese, 15 percent Hawaiians and the rest Chinese, Filipinos, and Puerto Ricans—has no sense of patriotism or loyalty to the United States.

Why have these people of Alaska and Hawaii been denied full citizenship? Why is statehood withheld?

We have heard all the stock arguments and frankly we don't know.

These arguments go something like this:

Both Territories lack contiguity, the diehards say.

Think of allowing Alaska with fewer than 100,000 people and Hawaii with only fewer than 500,000 people 2 Senators each, as many as New York and California have with their 20,000,000 people, not to mention 1 Representative for Alaska and at least 2 for Hawaii. Taint right, they say.

If you give statehood to Alaska those Eskimos and Indians will run it. What about that? they ask. And if you give statehood to Hawaii, those Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos will run it. Either that or Harry Bridges will run it or the Communists will run it or the big bad sugar and pineapple kings will run it.

There is this, however: While certain well-entrenched business people in Hawaii have given lip service to statehood, their hearts are against it. At one time their objection was to possible local domination of the islands by people of Japanese ancestry, lately, with the long longshore strike fresh in mind, it is fear of the infiltration of those in labor circles who have ideas in common with Harry Bridges.

To be quite frank, these arguments are very thin indeed. They are the arguments of cheap politics, special interests, and intolerance. The facts belie them.

The charge of bloc voting by racial groups is not sustained by on-the-ground congressional investigators such as Senator GUY CORDON, of Oregon, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Territories and Possessions, and Representative JOHN ANNUNZIO, ranking member of the corresponding House committee.

ECONOMIC MATURITY SHOWN

The contiguity argument is meaningless in these days of fast transportation and in light of the strong ties of tradition and trade with the mainland.

Both territories have demonstrated their political and economic maturity.

They have shouldered the responsibilities of statehood without receiving the benefits of statehood.

They have met the crucial test of loyalty in war.

Despite their cosmopolitan make-up, they are unified American communities in the best American tradition.

Hawaii, for example, pays more Federal taxes than any one of 14 of the States—around $100,000,000 a year. It has more people than Arizona, Nevada, Vermont, or Wyoming.

Alaska has more people today than had most of the other 26 American Territories when the were admitted to the Union. Oregon, for example, had only 52,465 people when it was admitted in 1859.

Who, besides the people of Alaska and Hawaii, wants to see them given statehood?

Well, almost everyone, it appears.

OFFICIALS FAVOR STATEHOOD

The President of the United States, for example. The last three Secretaries of the Interior, Messrs. Ickes, Krug, and Chapman, Governor Gruening of Alaska and Governor Stainback of Hawaii, too. Every congressional investigating committee since 1937. The governors of every State, by resolution at national conference. Almost every editor in the country, from the smallest weekly to the Oregon Journal and the New York Times. The people of the United States in national polls. The House of Representatives in 1947 and 1948.

Let's put it this way.

No responsible person acquainted with Alaska and Hawaii doubts that in size, population, economic resources, political history, and experience and in the loyalty and caliber of their peoples these great Territories are ready and qualified for admission as the forty-ninth and fiftieth States of the Union.

No one, that is, with the possible exception of certain eastern and southern Senators

who for reasons obscure still hold out on almost 700,000 of their fellow Americans.

There is hope, nevertheless, that even they may now come to the conclusion that Alaska and Hawaii have served their apprenticeship.

In simple truth, our Alaskan and Hawaiian neighbors have been second-class citizens too long.

National Grange Opposes Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received from the legislative counsel of the National Grange which certainly speaks for itself:

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1950.

Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POULSON: This letter is written in response to telephone requests by members of the Committee on Public Lands for the views of the National Grange on the proposed Bridge Canyon project of the Colorado River.

It is our judgment that the authorization of this project at the present time is unjustified for the following reasons:

1. Since the President by Executive order January 3, 1950, has set up a Water Resources Policy Committee to study the problems and suggest policies of the Federal Government's part in watershed planning, priority of water usages, methods of testing economic feasibility, needed changes in legislative policies, and means of preventing past shameful duplication and waste in watershed development, we believe decisions on all major plans, and especially the Central Arizona project, should be held up pending the report of this Commission December 1, 1950.

2. There is no other major watershed in the United States where the uses of water for irrigation, power and other purposes is as important to the welfare of the watershed as in the Colorado watershed. As yet there hasn't even been a pretense of a careful, over-all study of the comparative economic uses of water of the Colorado River in all its possible alternative uses. Until a careful study of the best potential use of the water resources of the river is made, no one will be able to judge soundly and wisely on such a piecemeal project as is proposed for the Bridge Canyon. Such a project, if built, or if construction is begun, would establish irrevocable priority of water use that may or may not be the best possible use of the water. From the evidence presented, the Bridge Canyon irrigation use appears to be indeed among the most wasteful of possible uses of the resources of the river.

The National Grange at its last annual session stated that "We recognize the urgent need for coordinated development and use of resources on major watershed areas"; and "We recommended that a watershed board be set up for each major watershed to coordinate the watershed planning and development and thus forestall just such uncoordinated, wasteful projects as the proposed irrigation portion of the Bridge Canyon project appears to be. We therefore believe that this project should not be authorized until it can be adequately studied and fitted into its rightful position in an over-all watershed plan of development for the Colorado.

3. We are also opposed to authorizing this project involving the fixing of water usage rights between States which is still in bitter controversy. In our 1948 annual session we passed a resolution opposing the assignment of the use of water in controversy between States until the dispute had been referred to the Federal courts and adjudicated by them. In stating this we are aware of the amended provisions of the bill but fear that if the bill were passed appropriations might also be passed and irretrievable commitment of water might be made or wasteful construction might be started.

4. We are also opposed to authorizing the irrigation portion of the Bridge Canyon project because it is reported that the actual cost of putting the irrigation water on the land would be over $1,700 per acre. If this is true, it is in violation of our policy as passed by the last annual session of the National Grange, that we are opposed to "approving any project for expenditure of funds unless a sound appraisal shows benefits in excess of costs." This applies both to a project as a unit and any integral part of a project. We are quite certain that the irrigation portion of this project does not meet this important policy of requiring that benefits from the proposed works must exceed the cost of them.

We would like to see both new authorizations and new construction of such major resources development held to a minimum pending an effective balancing of the Federal Budget and pending the development of an over-all plan of watershed development and administration that will prevent such uncoordinated authorization or commitments of vast sums as are involved in the Bridge Canyon project.

Very sincerely yours,

J. T. SANDERS,
Legislative Counsel.

Does the Kefauver Bill Really Provide for Home Rule?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Board of Trade, which is made up of the hundreds of businessmen in Washington, D. C., has prepared a booklet regarding the present home-rule controversy which has periodically presented itself to the Congress. I believe serious consideration should be given to the arguments of these businessmen in their opposition to the Kefauver bill, as certainly the individual businessman of a city has the interest of his community at heart. These men are not trying to inject any racial or other issues in this matter, but are simply stating the facts as they see them, and as they concern Washington, D. C.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the booklet entitled "Does the Kefauver Bill Really Provide for Home Rule?"

DOES THE KEFAUVER BILL REALLY PROVIDE FOR HOME RULE?

HAVE YOU READ THE 119-PAGE KEFAUVER BILL? (S. 1527, 81ST CONG.)

It is entitled "An act to provide home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia." It is hailed by some as a sort of present-day bill of rights for local citizens.

DOES IT PROVIDE HOME RULE?

The board of trade and many other citizen groups think not. For example, this home-rule bill clearly states that Congress can enact, repeal, or amend any law affecting the District no matter what the proposed city council or the citizens decide to do. Is that home rule?

NO REAL HOME RULE IS POSSIBLE UNDER THIS SECTION OF THE KEFAUVER BILL

"Reservation of congressional authority

"SEC. 404. The Congress of the United States reserves the right, at any time, to exercise its constitutional authority as Legislature for the District of Columbia, by enacting legislation for the District on any subject, whether within or without the scope of legislative power granted to the District Council by this act, including without limitation legislation to amend or repeal any law in force in the District of Columbia prior to or after the enactment of this act or any provision of this act."

DOES IT CONFER AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP RIGHTS ON PERMANENT DISTRICT RESIDENTS?

No—emphatically no. Proponents of the bill promise much but actually the bill proposes nothing in this respect. District residents are given neither a vote for President and Vice President, no representation in the Congress. These rights are definite prerequisites to workable home rule. Without them, this and other so-called home-rule bills are meaningless delusions likely to be detrimental to permanent District of Columbia residents.

This pamphlet lists a few of the many objections to the Kefauver bill. The Washington Board of Trade hopes it will stimulate careful thinking by many citizens.

The Kefauver bill provides that registered voters in other places may vote in the District if they have lived here 1 year.

This means that thousands upon thousands of people voting and giving primary allegiance elsewhere would vote in the District. This group might well be the deciding factor in any election or referendum. The board of trade does not believe this provision is conducive to good government or fair to permanent citizens? Do you?

The Kefauver bill provides for an 11-person District Council; 9 elected at large, 2 designated by the President of the United States.

The two members appointed by the President would not be responsible to the voters. This clearly provides the means whereby the President and the Senate could affect the action of the District Council, despite the retention of absolute power over the District as noted in section 404. This provision waters down even the negligible amount of self-government offered to the people of the District. The board of trade does not construe this to be a reasonable feature of home rule. Do you?

The Kefauver bill provides that the District Council may only propose laws which would be subject to acceptance by the Congress and the President.

In other words, the District Council would exercise no more power essentially to legislate for the District than the present Board of Commissioners. The Kefauver bill does not provide for District Representatives in Congress who would protect our interests. Therefore the board of trade believes this offers only hope of confusion and bickering

and certainly no more home rule than there is today. Do you?

The Kefauver bill provides for appointment by the Council of a District Manager.

While many smaller cities have and like the city-manager system, it has never been tried in a city of Washington's size. There are compelling reasons for believing it would not work here. The board of trade objects to this unwarranted experimentation. Do you?

The Kefauver bill provides that the District Manager may reorganize or abolish many agencies of the District government, shall appoint or dismiss department heads and shall possess extensive other powers.

The board believes this concentrates an undesirable amount of power in one person—the Manager. The bill abolishes the job of practically every important District official. New department heads would be selected by the Manager who would not even be required to consult the Council in many cases. We believe this is unwise, unfair to present efficient officials, and dangerous in its implications. Do you?

The Kefauver bill provides that bonded indebtedness up to 5 percent (approximately $80,000,000) of the assessed value of property may be incurred when approved by a majority vote in a referendum.

First, the District has been debt-free for many years. There is a serious question as to whether the cash basis of operating should be dropped in favor of a system of deferring costs and paying interest. Second, the board of trade looks with grave misgivings on any proposal by which 1-year resident voters in other jurisdictions, intending to leave the District, could participate in creating such debts knowing they would not be required to help pay them. We do not believe permanent citizens should be responsible for an $80,000,000 debt voted by others. Do you?

The Kefauver bill provides for the elimination of many boards and commissions such as the Recreation Board, the Board of Public Welfare and places the power now exercised by them in one person.

While some streamlining and reorganization of the District government is needed, this bill goes too far. The board of trade believes it would actually lessen citizen participation in some agencies, and abolish some boards and commissions which have been established after lengthy experience clearly shows the necessity for them. Do you?

The Kefauver bill provides for a Federal payment amounting to 30 percent of local revenues.

On the surface this appears to be wonderful. But remember that actions of one Congress are not binding on those which follow. Many experts on the District of Columbia-congressional relationship confidently forecast rapid reduction if not elimination of the Federal payment if Congress passes this bill and appears to divest itself of control, hence responsibility to the Nation's Capital. The board of trade believes that it is a valid forecast. It is clear that this city cannot cover all its expenses with more than 50 percent of its property tax-exempt. We believe passage of the Kefauver bill will mean lessening or elimination of the Federal payment, and higher taxes for local residents. Do you?

One of the principal arguments used by many in support of the Kefauver bill is that it would relieve the Congress of much petty work and permit its Members to give additional time to pressing national and international issues. This is pure speculation and is no more valid than the belief of many others that Congress will spend just as much time on District affairs if the Kefauver bill is passed as it does now. Remember, every legislative proposal passed by the District Council must be referred to the Senate and House District Committees. If it be true that the past is prologue, then it may be expected that each proposal will be reviewed and debated in detail as bills are now. There is no valid reason for concluding that if the Kefauver bill is passed Congress will cease investigating education, crime, hospitals, parking, and other activities of the District. The board of trade believes that passage of this bill would not save much, if any, congressional time but that it would cause endless argument and bickering about the relative responsibilities of Congress and the Council which would necessarily be injurious to the welfare and progress of the city and harmful to its residents. Do you?

HOME RULE AS OPPOSED TO THE KEFAUVER BILL PROVISIONS

It is evident that S. 1527 contains no real home rule. The board of trade reaffirms its position that there can be no home rule for the District of Columbia until its residents are first accorded representation in the Congress and a vote for President.

Congressional lawmaking for the Federal District is a full and proper exercise of powers stipulated in article 1, section 8, paragraph 17[1] of the Constitution of the United States. This will always be, although the process may be camouflaged in the Kefauver bill and others. While the constitutional provision will not be changed, a supplemental provision can be enacted which will give the citizens of the District of Columbia these fundamental rights: Representation in the Congress; the right to vote for President and Vice President. This will be accomplished by the Neely and Teague joint resolutions. The board of trade supports these. Do you?

Modern Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of March 19, 1950, although brief, contains a sad commentary on the state of diplomacy and international relations in our day. The story speaks for itself and needs no extensive comments or observations. It reads as follows:

NONSECRET DIPLOMACY—AN AMERICAN IN MOSCOW CAN'T EVEN GET CONFIDENTIAL, SAFELY, WITH WIFE

WASHINGTON.—Suppose you were a second secretary at the American Embassy in Moscow. You could tell your wife what was going on at the office only if you did one of two things:

1. You could motion her into the bathroom, turn on the water full force, and then tell her what you wanted to say.

2. You could go for a walk, wait until you hit a broad place in the street, make sure no one was directly on her heels, then tell her. The precautions would be necessary because of listening devices in your home. Besides that, there would be Russian guards at the doors of your office and your apartment. They would report on when you left and entered, and where you went. They would report on who called on you, whether Russian (practically never) or people of other nations.

In Moscow you take for granted that the Government has tapped all your phone lines. Usually when you dial your number you get nothing. You hang up, dial your number again, and get it right away. The American joke is that it takes the Russians that long to hook up their recording machines.

Your servants would be secret police. You have to hire Russians because someone who speaks Russian has to get to the markets at the crack of dawn before all the food runs out. The Government sends your servants to you, and they are all trained as spies, fingerprint experts, and rifiers of desk drawers.

That's what Americans are up against when they are assigned to Moscow, or the satellite nations, by either the government or by business concerns.

There is little room any more on such a job for a pair of striped pants. Today's diplomat is much better prepared if he knows how to write code, how to duck a bullet, and, if need be, how to send one. Diplomats have become the front-line men in the cold war.

Restrictions differ, country by country, in the nations that the Communists have grabbed, but they are all slowly approaching the Russian pattern of espionage.

In Rumania, for example, restrictions have not gone so far as in Moscow—but there is an added worry for that reason. Americans have tried to keep up friendships with decent, democratic Rumanians. But now that is beginning to mean that these Rumanians finally disappear.

Congress and the Hoover Commission Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including therewith an address entitled "Congress and the Hoover Commission Reports" delivered March 16, 1950, before the Society for the Advancement of Management by my distinguished and able colleague on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, of California.

I am sure it is encouraging to all to see the progress that is being made toward the adoption of the Hoover Commission reports. Mr. HOLIFIELD, as chairman of the subcommittee on executive and legislative reorganization, has himself given a long and exhaustive study to the whole problem posed by the Hoover Commission reports. Moreover, he has had a very able staff constantly at work on the problem. His report on the progress toward the adoption of the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission, I am sure, will be of interest to all readers of the COMMUNICATIONS RECORD.

Personally I am very much interested in adopting all of these reports that after careful study seem to promise a more

[1] (The Congress) shall exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession by particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of Government of the United States.

responsive, a more efficient, and a more economical executive department.

CONGRESS AND THE HOOVER COMMISSION REPORTS

In discussing the subject of Congress and the Hoover Commission reports, I propose to confine myself to a very brief survey of what has been accomplished up to this time, to an enumeration and brief discussion of the results which it seems to me Congress has a right to expect from the work of the Hoover Commission and the publication of its report, and finally, to a few concluding remarks on the outlook for the future of executive reorganization in the Federal Government.

In consideration of the fact that the members of this organization are already quite familiar with the story of the establishment and functioning of the Hoover Commission, it is unnecessary to dwell upon this background material. Suffice it to say that, according to the best available analysis, there were 331 recommendations contained in the entire series of reports. Some of these were of very great importance, while others would be regarded as of relatively minor significance. The Bureau of the Budget estimated that, out of the total number of 331 recommendations, 122 could be made effective by administrative action, and 82 by reorganization plan; 106 would require substantive legislation, while the remaining 22 could be put in effect by appropriation legislation. Thus approximately two-thirds of the recommendations fell within the field of executive action, one-third in the field of legislative action.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO DATE

During the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, substantial progress was made in translating these recommendations into governmental policy, and I predict that much more will be accomplished along this line before the adjournment of the second session. More actual reorganization has been accomplished already than has ever been achieved before in any like period of time in the history of the United States. Testifying before the Senate Expenditures Committee last week, former President Hoover, in response to a question from Senator O'Conor, stated that in view of the tremendous demands made upon the time and energy of the Members of the Congress, it was his feeling that "astonishing progress has been made up to date." In transmitting his 21 reorganization plans to the Congress earlier this week, President Truman took occasion to remark that, "when these plans become effective, we shall have acted on almost half the proposals made by the Commission on Organization."

The measures adopted during the first session included a number of major pieces of legislation and six reorganization plans. (Of the eight plans originally submitted, one was disapproved and one was superseded by legislation.) Together these actions affected nine different principal functions or agencies of the Federal Government. When one adds to this the very significant actions of the Executive branch in making the recommendations of the Hoover Commission effective, it is clear that there is a good deal of reason for optimism regarding the final result. Substantial progress has been made in reconstructing the Federal budget along the lines of a performance budget, as recommended by the Commission. The President's Advisory Committee on Management Improvement has been set up. The Administrative Management Division of the Bureau of the Budget is now hard at work on a program involving the cooperation of all departments and agencies of the government, in this field of management improvement.

General management: Definite progress has been made with regard to a number of specific problems in the field of general management. First and foremost among these comes the Reorganization Act of 1949, Public Law No. 109, which directs the President to prepare and transmit to the Congress reorganization plans by which agencies may be regrouped, coordinated, consolidated, or otherwise altered—with certain limitations—to promote economical and efficient administration. This basic enabling legislation permits the exercise of Presidential initiative in reorganization activities; under it, plans may be submitted by the President at any time when Congress is in session, up to April 1, 1955. Each such plan will have the effect of law after 60 days unless a constitutional majority of either House of the Congress disapproves.

Reference has already been made to improvements in budgeting and to the management improvement program. In this same general area, mention should be made of the progress achieved in carrying out the Hoover Commission's recommendations regarding the centering of responsibility for top management in the heads of departments and the chairmen of commissions, and for the establishment of administrative under secretaries in all major departments. A beginning was made last year when by legislation, provision was made for an Under Secretary of Defense and for four additional assistant secretaries in the Department of State. By reorganization plans, administrative responsibility was centered for the first time in the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission and the United States Maritime Commission. Of the plans submitted earlier this week, Nos. 1–6, inclusive, transfer to the heads of six departments the functions and powers now conferred by law on subordinate officials, while Nos. 7–13, inclusive, fix responsibility for the day-to-day administration of seven regulatory boards and commissions in the chairmen of these bodies rather than in the members collectively.

Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1949 was designed to improve the staff assistance to the President by transferring the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President. The first of these agencies assesses and appraises the objectives, commitments and risks of the United States from a national security point of view, and considers policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies concerned with national security, while the latter was established to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial and civilian mobilization. As President Truman stated when he submitted this plan to Congress, it is highly desirable that these agencies created for the purpose of advising and assisting the President in his work should be located in the Executive Office of the President, under his immediate supervision—as the Hoover Commission recommended.

General services: The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law No. 152, established in the Executive branch of the Government an agency called the General Services Administration—again in accordance with a specific recommendation of the Hoover Commission. This law deals with the housekeeping functions of the Federal Government, including the purchase, utilization, storage, and disposal of property, the keeping of official records, the management of buildings, and performing other internal services, all of which are now for the first time brought together under one central management. The new agency absorbed a number of previously existing and widely scattered organizations, some previously enjoying an independent status, others attached to one or another of the executive departments and agencies.

Although this agency has been in existence for a period of less than 9 months, it has already made real progress not only in organization, but in the development of plans for the more effective discharge of its responsibilities in the future. In its report covering the first 6 months of its existence, the GSA stated:

"During the period covered by this report, efforts of the Administration have been concentrated upon developing an effective organization and comprehensive program for accomplishing basic objectives. Progress made in merging the functions of the constituent agencies, in defining new functions, and in developing policies, plans and programs are set forth herein."

Aside from the problem of organization and carrying on prescribed immediate duties, the main tasks of this period consisted of making plans and initiating studies and surveys.

There are, as you know, 21 reorganization plans that were transmitted to the Congress by the President early this week. Although the plans recently proposed will not become effective for almost 2 months, it is worth noting that plans Nos. 15 to 18, inclusive, and plan No. 20, relate to the General Services Administration. I merely wish to point out that the submission of these plans shows the desire of the administration to cooperate with the Congress, using the instrumentalities at hand, to develop and perfect the organization and powers of the General Services Administration. At the same time, the Congress itself is proceeding to strengthen and improve this legislation by proposing the insertion of additional titles dealing with the subjects of traffic management and records management. From the point of view of both the application of sound principles of management, and economy in the transaction of the public business, no more important step has been taken in recent years than the establishment of this government-wide service agency.

Personnel management: Mention has already been made of improvements in budgeting and in departmental management, as well as in the procurement and property management field. Significant improvements have also been made in the field of personnel management. The first of these was the enactment, very early in the first session, of legislation designed to increase the salaries of the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives (Public Law No. 2). This was followed later by the Executive Pay Raise Act of 1949 (Public Law No. 359), which increased the rate of basic compensation of the heads of executive departments to $22,500 with corresponding increases for other top-ranking executive officials.

These measures proved to be but the initial steps in a comprehensive program of salary adjustments covering all major divisions of the Federal service. The Classification Act of 1923 was completely revised and rewritten in the form of the Classification Act of 1949 (Public Law No. 429). Further pay raise legislation included Public Law No. 167, creating professional and scientific positions at increased rates of pay; the Career Compensation Act of 1949, providing pay increases for members of the armed services; and an act providing annual pay increases for postal employees (Public Law No. 428).

The substance of Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1949 which made effective another important Hoover Commission recommendation has already been referred to—namely, that in Federal administrative boards and commissions, the Chairman should be vested with executive and administrative responsibility. This step would result in a significant improvement in administration without interfering in any way with the bipartisan character of these boards when dealing with regulatory problems of a judicial or quasi-judicial nature. Plan No. 5 provides that the President shall from time to time designate one of the Civil Service Commissioners as presiding head of the Commission with the title of Chairman. The Chairman shall, in turn, appoint an executive director under the classified civil service. The old titles of President of the Commission, Secretary of the Commission, and Executive Director and Chief Examiner were abolished.

National defense: At least two important laws were enacted relating to the Department of National Defense. The first of these, Public Law No. 36, provides for the Office of Under Secretary of Defense as a first step toward a better organization of the armed forces. This is in line with the general recomendation of the Hoover Commission that there should be an under secretary in all departments, to function in the place of the head of the department when the latter is absent, and to assist him when he is present in the handling of a vast quantity of administrative detail which centers in the office of the head of any large department or agency.

Another act, Public Law No. 216, changed the designation of the National Military Establishment to the Department of Defense, and toward the end that the unification of the services might in fact become a reality, to clarify and strengthen the responsibility and authority of the Secretary of Defense, giving him full control over the organization and administration of the Department and authorizing him to delegate authority to subordinates. Included in this legislation were important provisions designed to improve the budgetary and fiscal practices of the armed services.

Commerce: Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1949 provided for the transfer of the Public Roads Administration from the General Services Administration to the Department of Commerce, thereby carrying out a specific recommendation of the Hoover Commission. There were three major reasons advanced in support of this change: the fact that the Department of Commerce is charged by its organic law with the responsibility for promoting transportation; the fact that the General Services Administration would have been handicapped in the servicing of executive departments and agencies by the responsibility for the performance of an irrelevant function; and the fact that neither the Federal Works Agency which had previously had supervision of the Public Roads Administration, nor its successor, the General Services Administration was the major Federal agency for the carrying on of construction work or for the administration of grant-in-aid programs affecting State and local governments.

Among the new plans just submitted, at least two have an important bearing on the Department of Commerce. Under plan No. 5, this Department, along with five others, is given a new Administrative Assistant Secretary. Under plan No. 21, the functions of the Maritime Commission are transferred to the Department, where they are reconstituted in a Federal Maritime Board and a Maritime Administrator. This action is significant because it moves one step further in the direction of centering responsibility for national transportation policy in the Department of Commerce—a move which the Hoover Commission strongly recommended.

Foreign affairs: Public Law No. 73, designed to strengthen and improve the organization and administration of the Department of State, centralizes in the Secretary of State responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs. It laid the groundwork for the integration of the Foreign Service and other personnel in the State Department, and for the complete internal reorganization of the Department, both of which are in accordance with specific recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Through administrative action within the Department, this reorganization is now far advanced.

Labor: Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1949 was intended to strengthen the Department of Labor by transferring to it two, if not three, major labor programs—the administration of the public employment offices, of the unemployment compensation system, and of the veterans' placement program. The Bureau of Employment Security is responsible for two of these functions, while the third was partly in the Department of Labor. The transfer of this Bureau, long located in the Federal Security Agency, brought together in the Department of Labor two closely related functions, neither of which—by common agreement—can be fully and effectively administered except in cooperation with the other.

This move toward the rebuilding of the Department of Labor is carried further under the terms of Reorganization Plans Nos. 14 and 19 of the 1950 series. The first of these, for the purpose of coordinating the administration of labor standards under various statutes relating to Federal construction and public works or to construction with federally financed assistance or guaranties, authorizes the Secretary of Labor to prescribe appropriate standards, regulations, and procedures with respect to these matters and to make such investigations concerning compliance with and enforcement of labor standards as he deems advisable and desirable. The purpose is to assure consistent and effective enforcement of such standards.

Plan No. 19 carries out a specific recommendation of the Hoover Commission by transferring from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor the Bureau of Employees' Compensation and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board and their functions. In support of this plan, the President says that it "is a further step in achieving the general objective of the Commission to strengthen the Department of Labor by bringing within it labor functions which over many years have been scattered throughout the executive branch."

Post office: In addition to the postal salary bill previously mentioned, the Congress enacted Public Law No. 91 providing for a research and development program in the Post Office Department. This, too, is in line with the Hoover Commission recommendations. The post office is a business undertaking of gigantic proportions. Its methods of operation have not kept pace with its own requirements; it has usually operated at a deficit. This legislation will make possible the development of new methods and procedures which should, in time, greatly improve the efficiency of the service and enable it to operate on a sound financial basis.

Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1949 represented one more step in the direction of centering authority and responsibility in the head of a department or agency. This plan transferred to the Postmaster General the functions of all subordinate offices and agencies of the Post Office Department, and authorized him to delegate appropriate functions to subordinate officers within his organization.

Regulatory commissions: Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1949, based upon the same principle of centralizing administrative authority and responsibility, applied the Hoover Commission recommendation to still another agency, the United States Maritime Commission. The plan makes the Chairman of the Commission the executive and administrative officer of the Commission and vests in him responsibility for the appointment of its personnel, as well as for the supervision and direction of the activities of such personnel. This plan had also the effect of restoring an arrangement that had existed from 1942 to the end of the war when, under the First War Powers Act, the Chairman of the Commission had been vested with this authority.

In trying to consider these plans both from the point of view of the basic administrative problems involved and of the Government agencies concerned, one encounters certain difficulties. A given plan may have to be mentioned, for instance, in two or three different places. Such is the case with plan No. 21 of 1950, which transfers the functions of the Maritime Commission to the Department of Commerce. On the basis of this section, it appears that plan No. 6 of 1949 was but a preliminary move, planned to prepare the way for the more important change now proposed. Both plans, however, have been in harmony with the Hoover Commission recommendations.

Under the heading of regulatory agencies, there arises also the question of the establishing of authority in the Chairman, in each individual agency, as distinguished from having the authority over day to day operations dispersed among the members of the board or commission. Reference is made again to Reorganization Plans Nos. 7–15, inclusive, in the 1950 series, under the terms of which this change is provided for in seven agencies, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

WHAT CONGRESS EXPECTS

I have been asked specifically to comment on what the Congress expects from the Hoover Commission report. Of course, I cannot speak for the Congress as a whole. In the presence of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, I can at most reflect the point of view of the House. Even there, I am reluctant to assume that the suggestions I am about to make reflect more than my own personal views.

As I see the situation, Congress may well expect six specific results, some immediate, some long range, some of major importance, others less so, as a definite result of the Hoover Commission report and the widespread public discussion which this report has aroused.

1. I expect that all of the recommendations contained in the Hoover Commission report will in time be carefully studied and evaluated, and that those which as a result of such examination and analysis are found to be in the public interest will, by appropriate means, be adopted and put into effect. This, in itself, will be a great accomplishment, and one which has never before been possible in the whole history of the American Government. The significance of this fact should not be overlooked or underestimated. The report is of such comprehensive character that a careful study of all of its recommendations must of necessity involve an examination of the structure of the entire executive branch of the Federal Government.

2. Since this examination and modernization of the structural machinery of the Federal Government will be completed within a reasonably short space of time, I assume that insofar as the decisions made are wise and are supported by the facts, we will have a far more efficient and orderly governmental structure by—let us say, 1953—than we had in 1947 when the resolution creating the Hoover Commission was passed by Congress.

3. In the consideration of the Hoover Commission recommendations in both Houses of the Congress, every effort has been and is being made to obtain the views of the executive agencies concerned before final decisions are made and legislation is enacted. On the basis of this cooperative procedure with regard to legislation, the Congress expects—and I believe it has a right to expect—the full and complete cooperation of the executive departments and agencies in the enforcement of the legislation growing out of the Hoover Commission recommendations. It is up to the agencies to put forth a sincere

effort to carry out the will of the Congress and to make the legislation work.

4. I believe that, over the years, financial savings in substantial amounts will be realized as a result of structural and procedural improvements growing out of reorganization. While I do not accept second place to any man in my desire to have public funds spent honestly, economically, and in the best interests of the citizens who pay the taxes, I assert again now, as I have done on many occasions in the past, that economy, as such, is not the major purpose of reorganization. Economy is a byproduct, but an almost certain byproduct of better organization and of more efficient administrative practices and procedures. No one has expressed this point of view better than Prof. Rowland Egger, of the University of Virginia, who said a few months ago in an address before the National Tax Association in Boston:

"The attempt to sell administrative reorganization legislation on the basis of tax reduction, however honorable the motives and however laudable the hopes of those who support administrative reorganization for this reason, is a snare and a delusion; the venality of the American people has been grossly overestimated. It has, of course, established relationships and provided managerial equipment which in the routine operation of the Government has permitted the Executive to reduce unit costs, to increase efficiency, and to raise administrative standards."

"But," he continues, "the legal basis for the systematic planning of revenues and expenditures, as well as the continuous reappraisal of operations has been on the books since 1921, and the machinery of executive management has been in existence since 1939."

5. Even if this particular effort at reorganization had not already accomplished so much, and if it did not bid fair to accomplish so much more, it would still have made a significant contribution in arousing a widespread interest in and discussion of the problems of executive reorganization. For the first time in our history, there appears to be some comprehension of the fact that reorganization is a continuous process. We cannot reorganize the Government now and proceed to forget about the problem. However well we may succeed in doing the job now, there must be constant vigilance if we are to keep our reorganized Government reorganized. This may now be possible, with Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments established in both Houses of the Congress, and with a sustained effort to maintain, and to guide and direct the widespread popular interest in the subject which now exists.

6. Finally, this effort at reorganization of the executive branch of the Federal Government has stimulated a great deal of activity at the State and local levels. There have been established so-called "little Hoover commissions," in more than half of the States and Territories. The excellent reports of the Puerto Rican commission and of the Connecticut commission have already been published; the latter is now before a special session of the State legislature for consideration and action. The reports of many of these groups will be considered at the regular sessions of the legislatures in 1951.

CONCLUSIONS

Many bills relating to reorganization are now before the several committees of the Congress. Speaking for the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and for my own subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, I can say that we have bills on traffic management and records management which will receive careful attention, and a revised bill to establish a temporary commission to study the entire field of intergovernmental relations in the United States, all in accord with Hoover Commission recommendations. The final approval of this legislation and of the 21 reorganization plans recently submitted by the President—for I am confident that all or nearly all of them will be approved—will pretty well complete the action necessary to carry out the Hoover Commission recommendations relating to over-all management in the Federal Government.

Nevertheless, our task of reorganization will not be complete. There are still a number of important matters of a highly controversial nature upon which no action has yet been taken. It is well to remember that, in a government as large as ours, the task of reorganization cannot be completed in a few months, or in a year or two. It is a continuous and never-ending task, requiring the constant and long-term effort on the part of both the administration and the Congress. So far as the Congress is concerned, this task is the particular responsibility of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and I can assure you that these committees intend to carry through in the discharge of this responsibility.

As a matter of procedure, it has seemed reasonable to clear out of the way first those aspects of the reorganization recommendations on which there already existed a basis for general agreement. There has been no disposition to "duck" the controversial issues, although obviously their solution will require more time. The Hoover Commission itself was faced with a limited period of existence, and with a definite obligation to make recommendations regarding most of the important questions which came before it. Its members were not always able to agree among themselves; its reports are in fact heavily loaded with dissents and qualifying or interpretative notes and comments inserted by its members. The Commission had not continuing responsibility for carrying out its recommendations and making them work in the day to day process of administration. The Congress and the administration do have this responsibility.

The controversial issues will be taken up, each in due time, for the Congress is now alert to the importance of a comprehensive reorganization and, I believe, is in a disposition to follow through. On the basis of the record up to this time, there is already substantial evidence of an intention on the part of both the administration and the Congress to follow through on reorganization. When the President's reorganization plans of 1950 are considered in relation to those submitted in 1949, it is plain that he is moving farther in the direction of a sound administrative organization, and building on the foundation that has already been laid. Similarly, the measures now before the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization will, when enacted, strengthen and improve the legislative basis of the Federal administrative structure and encourage sound management practices.

Time was when the science of management was largely the intellectual property of groups such as the Society for the Advancement of Managment. Gradually its principles came to be applied in the actual conduct of affairs, at first in private affairs, later in the public business, although because of differing major objectives, the application is not always the same. I believe that you now have, on the basis of what has happened during the last 12 months since the Hoover Commission reports were made public, substantial evidence that these questions of administrative structure and scientific management are now understood and acted upon by Government people, in both the executive and legislative branches. I am convinced that this concerns with problems of administration in Government will increase.

Your organization and others like it will view with satisfaction and pride these developments in the management field, a field in which you have been pioneer. Few pioneers live to see the fruition of the plans for which they worked. You, I believe, will have that experience. I am happy to participate on the legislative level with you in proving to the world that democracy can be efficient, that democracy can solve its administrative problems without endangering its basic freedoms.

Repeal of Wartime Excise and Amusement Taxes Requested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks I have received messages from approximately 8,000 citizens of the State of Delaware, requesting the repeal of the amusement tax on movie admissions.

I have, of course, received a considerable volume of correspondence from residents of Delaware requesting that early action be taken to repeal most of the other war-imposed excise taxes.

On several occasions during the past few months I have publicly stated that I favor the reduction or elimination of such excise taxes.

Mr. Speaker, with special reference to the approximately 8,000 messages I received pertaining to the repeal of the amusement tax on movie admissions, I wish to state that I had hoped and intended to answer each of these requests with an individual letter. As a matter of fact, I started to do so and more than 500 personal letters were sent by me to those who had requested repeal of the amusement tax. By that time, however, the volume of such requests had become so great that it was no longer possible for me to write individual letters at this time because of the pressure and volume of other congressional work. Consequently, I am taking this means to let all of those to whom I could not at this time write know that their messages have been received and that the matter of repealing the amusement tax is receiving my careful attention and support.

Especially for their information I wish to include at this point the letter which I did send to some 500 Delaware citizens and which I had intended to send to all of the others. This letter follows:

This will acknowledge with thanks the card which you recently signed, requesting that every effort be made to repeal the amusement tax on movie admissions.

I am glad to have this expression of your views and to say that I have publicly recommended on several occasions the reduction or elimination of wartime excise taxes, of which the amusement tax is one. Furthermore, members of my party in the Congress have made serious efforts to amend the excise tax laws but have thus far been unsuccessful because of opposition from the party in power.

I shall continue to do all that I can to obtain action on this matter. However, with our Government running more and more in the red, I am sure you will agree that any reduction in taxes should be accompanied by substantial reductions in Federal spending.

Also as a part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the letter which I sent pertaining to this matter to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. That letter follows:

MARCH 23, 1950.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thus far I have received approximately 8,000 messages from citizens of Delaware urging that the amusement tax on movie admissions be repealed.

On several occasions I have publicly recommended the reduction or elimination of wartime excise taxes, of which the amusement tax is one.

In an extension of remarks in the House of Representatives on February 14, 1950, I stated in part, "I urge that in the interest of small businesses and of continued employment that final action on the subject of excise-tax adjustments be brought about at the earliest possible moment."

It is reasonable to assume that in addition to the approximately 8,000 citizens of Delaware who have sent messages requesting the repeal of the amusement tax on movie admissions, there are other thousands within the State holding the same point of view. Consequently, on behalf of all of those citizens whom I have the privilege to represent, I again urge that remedial action on the matter of wartime excise taxes, including the amusement tax, be taken at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely,

J. CALEB BOGGS.

I wish to state again, Mr. Speaker, that I sincerely hope that favorable and conclusive action will be taken on this matter at the earliest possible date.

A Farewell to Sean Nunan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on this day, the Honorable Sean Nunan, who is retiring as Minister of Ireland to the United States, departs from New York homeward bound. Mr. Nunan first arrived in this country 31 years ago, and with short interruptions, has served Ireland and her people in various capacities during all that time. Seldom has it been possible for a foreign diplomat to know and understand the American people so intimately and so completely as did Sean Nunan.

As a young man, Mr. Nunan played an active part in the historic Rising of 1916 in Ireland, when Irish patriots rebelled against British tyranny and proclaimed an Irish Republic, which today has become a reality after more than seven centuries of struggle. For his part in the Rising of 1916, Mr. Nunan was sentenced to penal servitude for life by the British, but was subsequently released as a result of the general amnesty of 1918.

In the general elections of 1918, when the candidates for Parliament campaigned on a platform calling for an independent republic, 79 seats were won by the full self-government candidates as against 26 for the opposition. The popular vote was 1,211,516 for self-government against 315,394, making it almost a 4 to 1 choice on the part of the people. As a consequence of this vote, the Irish members of Parliament assembled in Dublin and created the Dail, the first Irish Parliament to sit since 1800, when Great Britain abolished the Irish Parliament. Mr. Nunan was appointed clerk of the Dail, having served as director of elections at this time.

Seeking funds for the new republic, Eamon De Valera came to the United States in an effort to finance a $6,000,000 loan through the sale of Irish bonds. Mr. Nunan served as secretary to Mr. De Valera and aided in making successful this sale of bonds throughout the country. Since Mr. Nunan could not obtain a passport from the British to travel here, but would have been returned to prison instead, it was necessary for him to work his way over in the stokehold of a ship. These Irish Republic bonds all bore the signatures of Mr. De Valera and of Mr. Nunan. In later years these bonds were paid off in full, together with interest in the total sum of 25 percent.

During 1922 Mr. Nunan returned to Ireland where he participated in the treaty discussions and served in the ministry of home affairs. The following year he returned to the United States where he was later joined by Miss Nan Ryan, a native of Tipperary, who came over to be his bride. The Nunans have one son, Dr. Seamus Nunan, who is a graduate of the Georgetown University school of medicine, and who is at present a resident physician at Providence Hospital here in Washington. Dr. Nunan is remaining in America and will become an American citizen.

Over a period of 10 years, Mr. Nunan engaged in various activities, principally the brokerage business in New York, until he was appointed to the Irish Foreign Service as Consul in New York in 1932. In 1938 his government called him to serve as First Secretary of the Irish Office in London, which post he held until 1941. He then returned to the United States along with Mr. Frank Aiken, Irish Minister for Defense, on a mission to obtain arms and munitions for Ireland. Mr. Nunan remained as counsellor in the Irish Legation in Washington until 1946, when he was appointed Consul General for Ireland in New York. The following year, 1947, Mr. Nunan was named Minister of Ireland to the United States and has remained here in that capacity until this time. Sailing today for Ireland, Mr. Nunan will assume the post of Assistant Secretary of the Department of External Affairs in Dublin, where he will head the divisions of political affairs and public relations.

Throughout his years of service in this country, Mr. Nunan has traveled extensively and has acquired countless friends for Ireland in almost every State in the Union. His kindly disposition, sincerity of purpose, and loyalty to his friends has endeared him to all who have had contact with him. His unswerving devotion to the cause of Ireland has made him an outstanding champion in the fight to regain for Ireland her sovereignty over all 32 counties of the Emerald Isle. He has constantly denounced the continuing occupation of the six Northeastern counties of Ireland by the British and toiled and labored unceasingly for the day when this last hallowed spot in Ireland, whence came so many of Ireland's great heroes and patriots, may at last be joined with the rest of Ireland and the fictitious border be removed. Few causes have had a greater champion than has the Irish question in Sean Nunan, for he has never failed to call attention to the partition imposed but 30 years ago by the British Parliament in London, nor to demand vigorously the elimination of this unwanted and unasked-for boundary.

In leaving, Mr. Nunan bids farewell to hosts of friends throughout the United States, friends who will long cherish their association with him and, as a result of his gentle influence, continue to carry on for him his determined fight for the freedom and independence of all Ireland—from our distant shores. In returning to Ireland, Mr. Nunan brings back to his people a knowledge of the American people which is both thorough and unique, and I am sure that his vast experience in the United States will be helpful in expanding the close ties which have held our two countries throughout the years. Moreover he can convey directly to the Irish people the assurance that the freedom-loving people of the United States will cooperate fully in Ireland's efforts to end the partition of their country and reestablish throughout all 32 counties the democratic principles of liberty and justice for all. We wish Mr. Sean Nunan every success in his new position and bid him godspeed on his journey.

Justice Down South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the charge is often made that whenever an act of intolerance or injustice is committed in any of the Southern States it is immediately brought to public attention in order to embarrass the South. My view is that wherever bigotry and intolerance of our fellow men is practiced, in any part of our country, it should be exposed. Every effort should be made to eliminate the cancerous growth of hatred and prejudice wherever it shows its ugly head.

It is deplorable that some of those who claim to represent the South encourage intolerance and bigotry by their words

or deeds, thus further inflaming the situation. These people fail to realize that there is a stirring of new ideas in the South which are making gradual, though slow, progress in the practice of the true principles of brotherhood.

I am happy today to bring to the attention of the Members of this House, and through them to that of the American people, that it is not all prejudice and injustice in our Southern States. There are forces there—and these forces are growing stronger from day to day—who are teaching by example a better understanding of our problems and their solution. The South is no longer stagnant, it is moving forward.

I am glad to commend to you the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 20, 1950, which compliments two of our Southern States for a new chapter in justice there:

JUSTICE DOWN SOUTH

Let us, for a change, speak well of Mississippi. An all-white jury convicted a white man last Thursday of the murder of three Negro children. The bestial crime was committed in January, and justice moved with utmost speed. The jury deliberated only an hour and a half; the punishment was a mandatory sentence to life imprisonment. The district attorney's persuasion included these words: "Mississippi is coming out from the dark shadows of yesterday. Do your duty as Mississippians." This the jury did, in solemn awareness that all men, black or white, are entitled to exactly the same protection of law. Mississippi has done an excellent job, and the rest of the country applauds.

More light is also breaking over Georgia. On the same day that the Mississippi jury acted on stern duty, a Federal judge in Atlanta demonstrated that Negroes have the same rights as any other Georgians. A sheriff and his deputy were each sentenced to 12 months in prison and fined $1,000 for delivering seven Negroes to a masked mob for beating. The crime was that the Negroes had been deprived of their constitutional right of equal protection under law. The course of prosecution was admittedly difficult; Federal entry into such cases has been seldom attempted. The current case was first tried last year at Moultrie, Ga., and ended in mistrial when the jury deliberated without result for 50 hours. But the government returned to the civil rights assault, and this time the jury convicted 2 of the 10 defendants. Appeal to the Supreme Court is in prospect. But meanwhile it is perfectly evident, on the basis of 1 week's news from Mississippi and Georgia, that something vital and different is stirring through the South.

Address of Hon. Clifford P. Case of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted to me to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in inserting the following remarks of Representative CLIFFORD P. CASE of New Jersey at a presentation of the Myth That Threatens the World, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, Sunday evening, March 19, 1950:

To discover more effective ways to establish and maintain a peaceful world is the deepest concern of Congressmen as it is of all thinking people.

Among many proposals that have been made in Congress is House Concurrent Resolution 64. It was introduced on June 7, 1949. It is sponsored by 112 Members of the House.

It reads as follows:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

The resolution, you will have noted, does not say what specific steps should be taken to reach its objective. Nor does it fix a time for its accomplishment. Some people, therefore, may think it of little consequence. Believe me, they would be quite wrong. It is not a little thing to say—and mean—that a world federation with power adequate to preserve peace through the enforcement of world law should be a fundamental objective of American foreign policy.

If that objective is realized, in certain areas at least, we would be subject to a government in which we would not have a controlling voice. It has many other implications, not all of them desirable. Among them, I believe, would be a tendency to freeze the status quo. For example, those nations which suffer under totalitarian rule would find it harder to throw off the yoke, for any revolt would have to be undertaken without help from outside.

These are not little things.

Individual liberty and the institutions essential to it are very precious. To preserve them scarcely any price is too high to pay. Before we risk them there is scarcely any other risk we ought not to take first. For myself, only the belief that another war would unleash forces capable of destroying all life on this earth justifies my urging world federation as an ultimate objective of our foreign policy.

And no one ought to buy the world federation idea lightly or on the ground that those who doubt or oppose it can do so only on selfish or stupidly chauvinistic grounds.

No one ought to buy it with the idea that it will be a quick short cut to lower taxes or a lessening of Government controls over certain areas of business enterprise.

It would be far better that the idea of world federation should be stopped dead in its tracks than that it should be accepted by the American people on any false basis.

We do believe, of course, that our proposal will, at least, increase the hope of avoiding either surrender or a total war in which our smallest concern would be confiscatory taxes and total controls. But there is no cheap, quick, or easy way to win the fight for peace in a decent world. And anyone who believes that such a way exists deludes himself. Anyone who persuades another that such a way exists weakens, by so much, our will and stamina for the long, tough, expensive fight.

It may seem strange that one who believes that world federation should be a fundamental objective of our foreign policy should speak as I have just spoken. But I could not do otherwise. For if the American people should embrace the idea of world federation lightly, and without clearly understanding its implications, they will not really have accepted it at all. And it would be disastrous if the American people should become so dazzled by the prospect of an easy way to peace, through world federation or any other big solution, that they falter in the steady support which our Government must have in the struggle which we face.

All, or at least the great majority, of the sponsors of our resolution have been and still are strong supporters of the major elements of our foreign policy.

We support our Government in its support of the United Nations. Our resolution declares expressly that the United Nations should be supported and strengthened. Indeed, it is the United Nations which we would seek ultimately to develop into the World Federation.

We support, also, the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Alliance, and the point-four program. We recognize how essential all these and many other specific measures are for the creation, in the words of Mr. Acheson, of a state of facts or a situation upon which international agreements with real meaning can be based. Specifically, we recognize the need for such measures for the creation of that state of facts or situation on which the greatest of all international agreements, that of World Federation, can be based.

But we feel most strongly that all such measures and others like them, useful and necessary as they are, are not enough. We feel that even Mr. Acheson's recently announced "total diplomacy," as we understand it, is not enough. No combination of military, economic, or political measures will of itself suffice. A great moral objective is also necessary. We know that we have such an objective. But we believe that the idea of World Federation under law will give that objective increased strength and meaning.

Leadership in this matter must come from outside the Department of State.

To my regret, the Department, up to now, is opposed to our resolution and to the other related proposals which have been made. Its opposition to our resolution is based, as I understand it, on two broad grounds. First, it fears that overemphasis on a single institutional change would detract from the steady efforts for peace which must be made in many fields and on many fronts. Second, it doubts whether the American people understand the idea and its implications and whether, if they did understand it, they would support it.

I fully appreciate both of these points as I think I have already made quite clear. And the Department is right in its position that we can have no foreign policy which is not the product of the thinking and the desires of the American people themselves.

But it does not follow that these and all similar proposals should be dropped. It follows, rather, that they should be most fully and vigorously discussed throughout the length and breadth of the land so that our people can reach, and then register, a fully informed opinion upon them. And I am confident that when the American people make up their minds we can safely accept their decision.

But leadership in this matter must come from somewhere. And one of our major purposes in introducing the resolution was to stimulate public discussion and to attract public support. We are encouraged by the progress which has been made thus far.

The sponsors of the resolution in the House are the largest bloc ever to sponsor any foreign policy measure. They include a majority of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is entirely likely that the resolution will be favorably reported to the House during this session.

In the Senate, a companion resolution was sponsored by 22 Senators and the Foreign Relations Committee established a special

subcommittee to study it and other proposals having related objectives. This subcommittee held several days of hearings in February and plans to hold further hearings soon.

These activities have already attracted substantial attention on the part of the public. We hope this will be greatly increased as we move further along in the legislative process. And in all this the help of United World Federalists and other Nation-wide organizations has been, and will continue to be, of enormous value.

I emphasize again that our resolution would not interfere with or hinder the continued prosecution of any aspect of our foreign policy of which I am aware. It would in no way weaken our efforts or dissipate our energies.

On the contrary, we deeply believe it would give our foreign policy added vigor and effectiveness. It can help provide, here at home, the sustaining power which the American people must have for the accomplishment of the task which confronts us. It can add to our efforts everywhere an increased strength of moral purpose which is essential if the forces of democracy are to succeed in the struggle for the minds of men.

That is why, after long and very serious thought, I have made the basic decision to support the resolution, urging the development of the United Nations into a world federation open to all nations with powers, limited, but adequate to preserve peace.

Effect of Taxation on Our Mineral Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, in February of this year at the New York meeting of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, Mr. Granville S. Borden presented a paper entitled "Effect of Taxation on Our Mineral Resources." While the complete paper is too extensive to be fully included here, I felt that the ideas contained in it were of sufficient importance to ask Mr. Borden to prepare a more condensed version. He has done so in the form of a legal brief called A Suit for Delineation of Boundaries Between the Plaintiff, Taxation, against the Defendant, Mineral Resources, and presents the case as follows:

I. NATURE OF THE CONTROVERSY

In the Constitution of the United States and in the constitutions of the several States, the people have delegated to their legislators the powers to levy taxes upon them. Notwithstanding certain constitutional limitations upon these powers, such as due process clauses, and equal protection clauses, the power to tax is the power to destroy. These legislators, in whom these powers to tax are vested, can aggravate inflation; they can cause depressions; they regulate our standards of living; they can destroy free enterprise; they can tax special groups and give the proceeds to other groups or foreigners; they can levy excises which will regulate any type of activity; they can, by devious means, confiscate and expropriate; they can, through discriminatory taxes, engender civil strife; they can make us vulnerable to foreign aggression; and last but not least, as shown later, they can convert our mineral resources into waste.

Who are these artisans of our destiny? They are our fellow citizens, whom we elect to make our tax laws. They secure these jobs by your vote and mine except when our votes are neutralized by fraudulent stuffing, purchasing and miscounting by political machines.

What guaranties do we have that these lawmakers will represent us honestly and intelligently? We have merely the right to petition, remonstrate and to strive to educate. Under our representative form of Government, it is our privilege and duty to howl and complain if we feel that our destinies and security are not being developed properly. If this is done collectively, the activity may be called lobbying, but this is our only recourse and it is one of the main adits into democracy. Correspondingly, as members of this institute, as men who can qualify as experts in the sciences dealing with mineral resources, it is our privilege and duty to petition, remonstrate and attempt to educate our lawmakers when we demur to the policies of taxing mineral deposits which we believe are discriminatory and unsound.

Every legislator, whether serving in the Federal or a State Congress, has among many other duties two conflicting duties. On the one hand, there is the obligation to impose nondiscriminatory tax burdens on our mineral resources; on the other hand, there is the obligation to encourage, stimulate and even in certain instances subsidize exploration, development and production. The performance of each task contravenes the obligations to perform the other task. Where is there a satisfactory compromise?

This is the crux of our problem. There are broad differences of opinion. The answers should not be derived by guesswork nor from pure political considerations. The answers should be distilled out of a knowledge of the profound complex factors involved.

Bear in mind that there are only a few of our lawmakers who have had the opportunity to learn how men prospect and explore; how they meet with disappointment; how infrequently they hit the jackpot. Only a few of these lawmakers know about the impact of tax increases on our mineral resources. Nevertheless it is their tax votes that spell prosperity or depression for the mineral producer; it is their tax votes which can change prosperous mining communities into ghost towns or vice versa.

Although many of our legislators have had no experience in the business of finding, developing and producing our fuels and our basic natural raw materials from the earth, the presumption seems sound that they are curious and interested in these activities; that they welcome instruction, especially from qualified experts when given in good faith and with the intent to promote justice and equality for all of our people.

II. QUESTION PRESENTED

Now in the light of all these circumstances, what should our membership do? Certainly we can not afford to be apathetic. We should complain to our legislators and demand equality when taxes jeopardize our vitality; we should commend them for wisdom and integrity when they are worthy of such commendations. We should strive to instruct them in the impact of taxation upon our mineral resources to the end that they, through their votes, can construct barriers inside our mineral resources to prevent irreparable damage from trespassing by taxation. We can as individual citizens offer instructions and training to our tax-law makers. If our institute should sanction the practice, the membership can act through the committees of the Institute.

There are many facts which every lawmaker should know as he surveys the traverse of taxation through our mineral resources. Some are of broad general import; others relate to current specific problems. Some seem elementary; others are quite complex and technical. Some of these facts are recorded herein where they may be available for assignment to our tax-law makers.

The balance of this brief is a discussion of 12 points that every tax-law maker should know.

III. WHAT EVERY TAX-LAW MAKER SHOULD KNOW

A. General principles

1. Every tax-law maker should know that the magnitude of our mineral resources varies inversely with the magnitude of the taxes levied upon them.

Mineral resources are natural deposits containing valuable ingredients which can be exploited profitably. When the proceeds from the disposition of the valuable ingredients of any deposit are inadequate to meet the costs of production, the deposit loses its label as a mineral resource. It is converted into waste. As taxes on mineral resources are increased, more marginal deposits are converted into waste. For example, if the recoverable grade of ore is $10 per ton and the production cost is $9.50 per ton, this ore becomes waste if the State imposes a severance tax of $1 per ton.

2. Every tax-law maker should know that many additional levies on our mineral resources have effected net losses in revenue to the Government which imposed them.

As the tax rates increase, mineral resources decline. When the burden becomes too heavy, mines and quarries are shut down; ghosts invade our mining camp; men lose their jobs; suppliers lose their trade; stockholders lose their dividends; processors and refiners lose their raw material; and Uncle Sam and the State lose their taxes on the profits of the operator, the wages of labor, the royalties of the owner, the profits of the tradesmen. Furthermore, there is a loss of potential revenue from the discoveries which would have been made under thriving operations.

Not only does the loss of revenue ensue from the reduction in yield of income tax, but every increase in tax on the mineral resources effects some reduction in the fair market value of the deposit. With this decline in value there are proportional declines in the yield of: (a) the ad valorem tax of the State, and (b) the State's inheritance and gift taxes and (c) the Federal estate and gift taxes. Thus, although the tax rates have been increased, there frequently is a net decline in the flow of revenue.

3. Every tax-law maker should know that tax increases on our mineral resources reduce the number of discoveries of new mineral resources.

Exploration is an expensive, speculative activity. Every tax increase tends to evaporate the funds available for exploration, and every tax increase tends to impair the incentives to enter or continue in this speculative, expensive exploration business.

4. Every tax-law maker should know that every discovery of a new mineral resource creates new sources of revenue for the Federal and State Governments, new sources of employment, new stimulants to trade, new sources of funds for more exploratory ventures, and new barriers against poverty and foreign aggression.

5. Every tax-law maker should know that as additional taxes dry up the source of taxes, more taxes are imposed to meet the deficit. The merry-go-round of depression is accelerated and the geese that lay the golden, silver, copper, lead, zinc, and other metallic and nonmetallic eggs die.

B. Income taxes

6. Every tax-law maker should know that the producers of minerals, oil, and gas have not had a fair deal in the evolution of the Federal income-tax law; that the income-tax burden levied upon them is, in many instances, discriminatory and unjust.

This discrimination arises primarily from the failure of Congress to recognize that a producer of minerals is in substance and reality engaged in two business enterprises. First, he is selling his mineral deposit. Secondly, he is in the business of mining. The over-all profits from both businesses are taxed as ordinary income at the normal and surtax rates; but if he sold the deposit to you and you mined the deposit, he would be taxed at the long-term capital-gain rates on the difference between the sales price (value in place) and the cost.

We can concede for the purpose of discussion that the profits derived from the second business, i. e., the mining activity, should be taxed as ordinary income but the profit derived from the sale of the deposit should not be taxed more than profit derived from the sale of any capital assets.

Thus, if we grant that a producer is really selling his deposit as he mines the deposit, the conclusion seems clear that he should pay only long-term capital-gain rates on this portion of his income; that Congress by its failure to recognize this situation is effectively discriminating against our mineral producers.

It is noteworthy that Congress has granted taxpayers who cut timber the privilege of having their profits taxed at the rates applied to gains from the sale of capital assets.

7. Every tax-law maker should know the facts which justify the allowances of depletion deduction on percentages of income.

Percentage depletion is a complex subject, but some of the principal reasons for the allowances are briefly stated:

Generally, percentage depletion fails to set off the discrimination against producers discussed in point 6 above. As a rule, if A mines his deposit he will pay more income taxes, even with percentage depletion allowances, than A and B would collectively pay, if A should sell to B and B should mine the deposit—a case where no percentage depletion would be allowed.

But this gesture of percentage depletion toward equality is not all the story.

Statistics will prove that the tax savings which flow from percentage depletion are generally added to other funds and appropriated to determine where Mother Nature has hidden other deposits. These hunting expeditions are expensive and all of the ventures speculative. The cost of finding new reserves is higher than the cost of finding the reserves which are being depleted. This is true not only because of general inflation, but also because of the gradual decline in the quality and quantity of prospects. The merchant can replenish his inventory by purchasing new goods, but the miner replenishes his underground inventory by speculating and wildcatting. For example, to maintain our present domestic crude oil reserves the prospectors and explorers must find 2,-[illegible],000,000 additional barrels annually and this task requires a lot of fortitude whether you are speculating with your own funds or the funds of your stockholders.

Many of the important discoveries of the past would not have been made had there been no percentage depletion. In the first place, the funds in reserve available for prospecting would not have been adequate to support the more speculative type of ventures. In the second place, without some tax incentives the long-shot plays would never have been taken.

Even admitting solely for the purpose of argument that the Government is in the gambling business, a review of the past will prove that the producers have repaid these percentage depletion grubstakes with thousands of percent interest. The loss of revenue to Uncle Sam from percentage depletion is in reality a capital investment to serve all the people through the promotion of their security and their prosperity. The net results of the percentage depletion allowances are stupendous gains to the Government. The yield to our Government from new oil fields, such as Cuyama in California, and North Snyder in Texas, will set off all of the revenue losses from percentage depletion for a very substantial period. From the standpoint of insurance for prosperity, percentage depletion outranks any subsidies, loans, exemptions, aids, or benefits which are granted by our Government.

Finally, have our people forgotten the contributions of the mining prospectors and oil and gas wildcatters toward winning World War II? Had there been no long-shot wildcat discoveries in the prewar days of World War II of oil, gas, copper, lead, zinc, and strategic metals, we would be paying for a much longer war. Do they remember OPA; the "A," "B," "R," and "T" gasoline rationing tickets? Do they remember allocating metals and the hysterical search for strategic minerals? If their memories fail, let them refer to our current stock-piling programs.

After this narrow escape from disaster (wars cannot be won without adequate domestic mineral resources), can we afford to smother the enthusiasm of our prospectors and wildcatters, to the end that our underground stock piles will become exhausted from ordinary peacetime consumption so that we will be caught short of these indispensable sinews of war when the next sneak attack occurs?

As shown in the prior discussion of general principles, the inevitable result of a heavier tax load on the mineral producers will be a net loss in national wealth and national income, an impairment of our security from poverty and our power to defend ourselves against foreign aggression.

If the parties who insist that percentage depletion is a loophole should review the record carefully, they will undoubtedly reach the inevitable conclusion that any revenue which flows out of this loophole returns to our Government with a floodtide of accessions.

8. Every tax-law maker should know that the rules governing exploration and development expenditures by mining and oil and gas companies effects inequitable and unjust results. He should know the technical reasons for these unfair results. He should know how remedies can be procured.

There are regulations relating to the Internal Revenue Code which deprive, in certain cases, taxpayers who explore for minerals, oil, and gas, any tax benefit from the right to deduct these expenditures from income. The loss of these tax benefits arises: (a) If the deduction must be taken as an expense in a year when there is not sufficient gross income to absorb the deduction (or used as a carry-back or carry-forward deduction), or (b) if the expenditure must be capitalized to be recovered through depletion deductions in years when the depletion deductions are based upon a percentage of income.

The rules are extremely complicated, and there are no just reasons for this confusion. Clearly, every taxpayer should be entitled to deduct the money which he has spent for exploration and development either as a loss if no discovery is made, or as a deferred expense of exploiting the mines which have discovered and developed. The law should provide rules which will grant a tax benefit for every cent expended for finding new mineral deposits.

9. Every tax-law maker should know that the mineral producer is particularly vulnerable to hardships from an unjust rule relating to the recovery of depreciable capital established by the Supreme Court of the United States, commonly known as the Virginia Hotel rule. He should know the remedy.

10. Every tax-law maker should know that there is an obscure provision in section 122 of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with carry-back and carry-forward net loss deductions which has unjustly cost the producers millions of dollars and will continue to levy indirectly terrific unjust burden on our mineral resources.

The provisions to which reference is made are section 23 (s) and section 112 (a), (b), (c), and (d) of the Internal Revenue Code. Hidden obscurely away in these confusing and bewildering sentences is the rule that the net loss of any year when carried backward or carried forward to serve as a deduction from gross income of another year, must be reduced by the percentage depletion allowances in excess of cost depletion for the year to which the net loss is carried.

The mineral producer falls in the category of feast or famine taxpayers who are vulnerable to wide fluctuations of income and losses over a series of taxable years. No other group of taxpayers are more equitably entitled to net loss carry-over and carry-back deductions. Nevertheless, these taxpayers, because of these obscure provisions in section 122 of the Internal Revenue Code, can seldom procure any tax benefits from these provisions. The gold producers who sustained losses from War Production Board Order L-208 were the first group to lose refunds of prior year taxes because the losses sustained while operations were shut down were absorbed by the percentage depletion allowances of the year to which the carry-back loss would have applied. Next on the list of victims were the operators who mined strategic minerals at a profit during the war followed by an era of heavy losses in the postwar period.

The point is noteworthy that the relatively small producers are the taxpayers most vulnerable to this inequity.

11. Every tax-law maker should know that income taxes can be assessed on the proceeds of new ventures before the operator has assurances that his investment will be redeemed.

12. Every tax-law maker should know that an investor in the share of a corporation engaged in producing minerals, oil, or gas may be assessed income taxes on dividends even though the amounts received are in fact redemption of the cost of his shares.

IV. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is submitted:

(1) The health and vitality of our mineral resources are in jeopardy from trespassing by taxes.

(2) The duty and the power to delineate the boundaries and construct the barriers against this invasion has been delegated to our tax-law makers.

(3) There are both elementary and complex facts pertaining to the taxation of minerals which every designer of mineral tax law should know.

(4) Every member of this institute owes a duty to his profession and his country to help in this chore of teaching our tax-law makers facts about our mineral resources to the end that they shall design and construct our tax laws intelligently—laws which will engender benefits for capital, labor, consumers, our State government, our Federal Government, and every citizen of the United States.

Thank you.

Submitted by:

GRANVILLE S. BORDEN,
San Francisco, Calif.

Let's Not Belittle Ourselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, on other occasions I have discussed the relative strengths of the United States and the Soviet Union; the appended editorial bears importantly on this subject. Complacency would be the worst thing possible for our efforts to withstand and win over the Communist drive, but a mature estimate of relative capabilities bears very importantly on the extent of the effort we must expend at any particular point and the confidence with which we may proceed:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 20, 1950]

LET'S NOT BELITTLE OURSELVES

The collapse of the Soviet-backed mark in eastern Germany serves to point up a fact that a lot of people of the West seem to have forgotten in recent weeks. The fact is simply this: That Russia, although it presents a formidable front and snarls ferociously, is not really a tremendously strong power in relation to the United States or the free world as a whole.

Currency is merely one measure of strength, but it is a pretty good measure, and the fact that the Germans greatly prefer the American-backed mark speaks for itself as an incidental commentary on their evaluation of Soviet power. They have little or no confidence in the Kremlin's money; they have little or no respect for it; and that in turn reflects a low opinion of Russia in general.

Americans would do well to give a little thought to this matter. Within the past few months, all too many of us have been acting and speaking—especially in connection with proposals for "new starts" on peace talks with the Kremlin—as if Russia were in a position to command a great deal of supplication from us. Actually, there are no supermen over there and no supersystem. On the contrary, as indicated by the currency situation in eastern Germany and by numerous other evidences of serious stresses and strains behind the iron curtain, there is more than a little reason to believe that the Stalin dictatorship—both at home and in the satellite countries—has good cause to be worried by its weaknesses.

True enough, of course, the Russians have a big fleet of submarines, a lot of planes and the largest of all land armies. But what else have they got? How much staying power can they put behind their armed forces in being? Politically, economically, and militarily, what are their reserves for the long pull? The answer to these and similar questions seems fairly clear, namely, that they have a long way to go before they can hope even to come close to matching the immense spiritual and material resources that can be mobilized by the free world. To understand this, we have only to keep in mind that their steel production is Lilliputian compared to ours, that their standard of living is miserably low, and that they sit on a volcano of oppressed peoples whose loyalty the Kremlin can never count upon.

In other words, although the Soviet facade looks impressive, the reality hidden behind it—the reality behind the iron curtain—adds up to a situation in which Russian power today, in a basic sense, runs a poor second to the power of the West particularly American power. This is an all-important fact that we ought to keep constantly in mind. We have lately been belittling ourselves much too much, and the effect on public opinion abroad has not been a good one.

Although the Red technique of infiltration and subversion constitutes a serious threat, the heartening truth is that the United States and the West as a whole have such overwhelmingly superior strength—actually and potentially—that they can be certain of victory in the cold war if they use that strength wisely and well, in unison. Among other things, as far as our own country is concerned, that means that Congress must guard against the kind of false economy that would slow down such vital projects as the Marshall plan.

Certainly, this is no time for slowing down. With all the power that we and our friends abroad now have, we ought to move forward with the greatest possible vigor on every key front in the cold war—militantly, confidently, not on a note of defensiveness, self-doubt, or vacillation, as if we were less strong than we really are.

Farm Surpluses and the ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of Wednesday, March 22, 1950:

FARM SURPLUSES AND THE ECA

Despite some overexcited comment to the contrary, the effectiveness of the Marshall plan is not likely to be undermined if Congress as a whole goes along with the House Foreign Affairs Committee in voting for the amendment offered by Representative VORYS, of Ohio.

Under the amendment, instead of authorizing the $2,950,000,000 in new funds requested by the Economic Cooperation Administration—an authorization approved by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—Congress would reduce the total to $1,950,-000,000. But this cash cut would be offset by a provision under which the ECA countries, in accordance with their needs, would be able to acquire $1,000,000,000 worth of American agricultural surpluses from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. VORYS' proposal is designed primarily to put pressure on all parties concerned, including the Secretary of Agriculture, to force the use of unsalable surpluses now held by the CCC. It also is aimed—in a bookkeeping sense—at lightening the budget deficit. In both these respects, its wisdom and practicality have been sharply challenged. Nevertheless, although it might make the ECA's operations less flexible, it does not deserve to be branded as a mere dumping idea threatening to do serious injury to the Marshall plan by narrowing the scope of our vital aid to Europe.

This is so for the simple reason that the ECA itself, in requesting $2,950,000,000, has estimated that approximately half of that sum is needed to cover assistance in the form of food and agricultural commodities. In effect, therefore, the Vorys amendment, by balancing out its cash cut with a provision enabling the participating countries to acquire the equivalent of $1,000,000,000 in farm surpluses, would not really be changing the scope of the minimum aid deemed essential by the ECA's own careful calculations.

What the amendment would change would be the procurement procedures that have characterized the Marshall plan up to now. Under those procedures, the ECA has acted as a kind of banker extending credits with which the participating countries have acquired farm items chiefly through private American channels at open-market prices. Under the Vorys plan, their food and agricultural needs would be taken care of out of the surplus held by the CCC, with value calculated on the basis of figures no higher than prices prevailing in the open market. As for cases where the CCC might not have a commodity required by one country or another, the need would be met through private channels, with the ECA footing the bill out of the money appropriated for it by Congress.

On closer inspection, of course, enough "bugs" may be found in the Vorys amendment to persuade Congress—as the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is already persuaded—to reject it as a device likely to have little or no practical effect on either the Federal deficit or the problem of farm surpluses. Whether or not that proves to be the case, however, the fact remains that it is hard to see just how the proposal threatens to "cripple" the Marshall plan.

Actually, though it would be happier with present procedures, the ECA itself seems to be satisfied that it could operate effectively with something like the Vorys proposal. Certainly, if Congress votes for amendments no more restrictive than that, we can be reasonably confident that the Marshall plan's third year will win important additional ground for the free world in the cold war.

A Quick and Easy Plan To Make Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, no doubt Americans lead the world in ingenuity. Besides all of our other inventions, we find that during the emergency of the Civil War when this country found itself without cash and low in credit, when Government non-interest-bearing notes—greenbacks—were of little value, the American bankers came forward with a revolutionary monetary invention—national-bank notes—paper money secured by the national credit. This kind of paper money was brought into circulation by the passing of the National Bank Act of 1863.

This monetary invention was so profitable to the banks of this country that it soon spread to the rest of the civilized world with the result that first the use of silver money was greatly reduced and finally the use of gold as money was discontinued.

The Federal Reserve paper-money system was an improvement (?) on the national-bank notes monetary plan. The Federal Reserve bank money scheme came into flower with the amendment of the Federal Reserve Act that made Government obligations—bonds—eligible as security for the issuance of Federal Reserve notes by the Federal Reserve bank.

The plan that is being followed by the banks in creating money is presented in a contribution recently made to a western newspaper which is reprinted here for the consideration of my colleagues:

[From Seattle (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of March 12, 1950]

LEGISLATOR EYES "CUTOUT" SCHEME—MARSHALL PLAN FIRST—SECRET FOR TAXPAYERS, IDAHOAN AVERS

[By COMPTON I. WHITE, Member of Congress from First District of Idaho]

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SPOKESMAN-REVIEW:

We've got the cutest little plan for making (creating) money. It's a scheme so cute that it's clever.

Uncle Sam, to get money to finance Government business, goes to the banks and puts up his notes (bonds) that bear interest, and then the bank makes a swap. They take Uncle Sam's notes, put them in their vaults and give him, in return, their notes, which do not pay any interest.

The notes of the banks (Federal Reserve notes) Uncle Sam gets in this financial trade are printed by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and are legal tender money, while Uncle Sam keeps on paying interest on his notes (the bonds in the bank vaults). Uncle Sam is really using his own credit, but he doesn't seem to know it.

Then he takes these Federal Reserve notes (money) he gets from the banks and goes out and buys wheat and things from the farmers and farm machinery and things from the factories, and he gives all this food and machinery he has bought to the poor governments in Europe, and these governments sell the stuff they get from Uncle Sam to their own people and get money to put in their treasuries.

These European governments have a lot of debts, and when the interest on their debts (bonds) comes due, the money for all this stuff Uncle Sam gives England and these Marshall-plan governments helps a lot in keeping all their government notes (bonds) good by paying the interest on time.

So this Marshall plan makes good times for everybody. For our banks, because they are using their credit and making a lot of loans to the Government and getting the interest, and the farmers and factories are making money on their wheat and things that they sell to our Government.

All the things we are buying and giving these European governments is making business good all around. The stores, railroads, factories, and everybody is prosperous in this country and business is getting better in the European countries. The bondholders in Europe are getting their interest on time and everybody seems to be happy—except maybe the taxpayers in this country. But then you've got to take off your hat to the people who thought up this Marshall plan. It may have come from Europe. They say that some people over there are smarter than we are.

Merchant Marine Cadets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of Saturday, March 18:

MERCHANT MARINE CADETS

One of the most effective ways of supplying our merchant fleet with competent deck and engine room officers has been the training of qualified men at the Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y. Approximately 1,100 cadets are in attendance on a 4-year course, the completion of which qualifies them for berths in the cargo ships, tankers, and passenger liners flying the American flag. These men have been as carefully selected, and go through as strenuous a course of study, as do the men who attend West Point or Annapolis.

Admission to the Academy is contingent upon the passing of a difficult entrance examination. The next 4 years are spent both ashore and afloat learing the rudiments of a skill which is important to the trading life of our country. At the moment this program is being imperiled by a congressional proposal to eliminate the modest allowances made to the merchant marine cadets to cover the costs of uniforms, textbooks, and minor personal expenses. If this proposal were to take effect, many of the cadets now in attendance would be forced to leave the Academy, while others would have to depend on allowances from home to guarantee the completion of their courses.

This same proposal has not been made concerning the cadets in training at the other military and naval institutions operated by the Government. It seems unfair to create hardships for a group of men who choose to serve their country effectively in a civilian capacity and who are Naval Reserve Officers on graduation, when their opposite numbers in the other services are not affected at all.

Food for Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial appearing on March 7, 1950, in the Daily Tribune, of Royal Oak, Mich., my home city.

This editorial presents some solid thinking, the kind of thinking people should do when they go to the ballot box and express their opinions. I commend it to my colleagues in the House for their reading:

PERSONALLY SPEAKING

(By Floyd J. Miller)

SOME MIDGET EDITORIALS

Here are some news stories I thought important, and the comment that could be stretched into a full column for every one. Lucky for both of us that time and space prevent.

1. The National Labor Relations Board orders John L. Lewis to give up the provision in the mine workers' contract that provided they should work under the agreed-on conditions when able and willing.

Imagine the mine operators saying they would pay a certain scale when able or willing. Or try to borrow somebody else's money from a bank on a promise that you will pay it back as agreed, if able and willing.

2. General Motors earned more profits—over $600,000,000—in 1949 than any other company ever made in a similar period.

Although it certainly doesn't look so now, the stockholders are still risking. Nobody promises them anything. In any year when the company has big earnings the rest of the country benefits even more than the stockholders. Last year the Government (that's we, the people, or our representatives) received $400,000,000 in excise and other taxes from G. M. before there were profits. The company had to sell $5,000,000,000 worth of goods, compared with $2,500,000,000 in 1936, which meant billions in wages and purchases. Of the $1,100,000,000 gross profits, the Government took another cut of $500,000,000 in corporation income taxes and individual income taxes. That left $600,000,000 in spendable income for the owners, many thousands in number.

3. Phil Spitalny, on tour and on the air with his all-girl band, reports that a large share of his big fan mail is from soldiers and sailors thanking him for the hymns on the program.

Our boys have souls and minds and a love for home in peace as well as wartime.

4. The United States Government has decided it will try to get back some of the $37,500,000 it lent the Lustron Corp. to build prefabricated metal houses. It figures it will be lucky to get back 5 cents on the dollar.

That's your money the man is talking about; remember, income tax, cigarette tax, movie tax, luggage tax, etc., etc., etc.? Men with little or no experience in the matters on which they pass judgment hand out this money. It is loaned too often because somebody thinks it would be a good thing. But that somebody risks your money, never his own.

5. Most doctors cure disease, but some make it worse, a University of Colorado psychiatrist contends. The offenders have not grown up; they inflict their immaturity on their patients.

Another complication society has been too busy to attend to. The medical profession itself could pay some attention to it. If our more successful citizens would help remedy defects in our system there would be less attempt by the Government boys to take it all over.

6. An Australian publication comments on President Truman's point 4 program for assisting the undeveloped regions of the world. It asks, "How far is today's American equipped and adjusted to live happily outside of America?"

Most Americans are childlike in their ignorance on this point. They assume that the rest of the world thinks and reacts as they do. It doesn't. Any adventures abroad should be preceded by a study of the target and of one's ability to adjust himself to new living conditions and a different way of acting. People do not always think Americans are pure and simple-minded.

Taxation Without Representation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening and refreshing to find an area which is wide-awake to the rights and welfare of peoples far distant but supposedly living under the same way of life and the same protective laws of the land. So that the residents of Washington, D. C., and the Territories of our Nation may know how the people of my district feel about such problems as home rule for the District of Columbia and statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a recent editorial from the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel, one of the leading daily newspapers of the West:

TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION

One of the injustices against which the early American colonists revolted was taxation without representation. Yet today there are under our flag many peoples—on both home and colonial soil—paying tribute in taxes to our Federal Government who have no representation in that Government.

The most flagrant and inconsistent example of this un-American practice is found, of all places, in our Nation's capital, where supposedly Americans not only preach but exemplify democracy. The citizens of Washington, D. C., have no more direct voice in their municipal government than the people of Czechoslovakia now have in their national government. Instead, the affairs of Washington are directed by Congress through three commissioners of its choosing. In other words outsiders govern the people of Washington who can not even vote for the Members of Congress who rule them—and also tax them.

This policy of taxation without representation is also followed in dealing with our Territories. Hawaii and Alaska, both of which are now seeking statehood. Each of these pay huge amounts in taxes to the Federal Government each year yet have no real representation in Congress, only delegates without a vote. Debates on the current statehood bills revealed that last year Hawaii paid into our Federal Treasury $90,824,693, which was more than any one of 11 States paid in; yet Hawaiians paying these taxes, after 50 years of colonial or Territorial status, have had and still have no representation in the Congress that taxes them.

No wonder peoples of the recently born republics say they cannot adopt the American system because it is so "theoretical and paradoxical." We gained our own independence in revolt against taxation without representation; yet expect these present colonials to remain loyal to us while we practice against them what we held was rank injustice when it was practiced against us. To the credit of the House of Representatives it has approved statehood measures for Alaska and Hawaii, though the Senate may delay—if not refuse—approval, as has been the case in granting home rule to Washington, D. C.

Tribute to the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 23, 1950:

TRIBUTE TO FBI

When an economy-minded House Appropriations Committee gives a Government agency all the additional money it asks for and recommends a salary raise for its head besides, there must be a reason. Beneficiaries of this extraordinary treatment by a group which has not hesitated to wield the ax on many other agencies were the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its long-time Director, J. Edgar Hoover. The reason for the committee's attitude is not hard to find. It lies in the FBI's remarkable record as a protector of the Nation's security in this cold-war era of spying and counterspying.

The committee, without a quibble, approved Mr. Hoover's request for $4,800,000 in additional funds with which to hire 700 more employees, including 325 new agents. In granting the full $57,400,000 asked by the FBI for the next fiscal year, the committee said it "does not feel justified in reducing the estimates of this Bureau in view of conditions at home and abroad." The new employees will help the FBI to reduce the backlog of nearly 14,000 pending security investigations. The committee agreed that such cases are too important to suffer any delay in searching out the facts.

The action of the committee is indicative of the high esteem in which the FBI is held at the Capitol and elsewhere as a result of its effective warfare on potential fifth columnists in the Government and outside of it. It has waged this difficult warfare without resort to witch-hunting tactics, without any semblance of police-state tendencies and without succumbing to political or other pressures. The FBI and Mr. Hoover well deserve the tribute implicit in the House committee's recommendation that both the Bureau and its Director be given more money for their outstanding work.

Money for Social Security Safe as Rock of Gibraltar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the newspaper Labor of Saturday, February 18, 1950:

MONEY FOR SOCIAL SECURITY SAFE AS ROCK OF GIBRALTAR—FINANCIAL PAPER EXPOSES FALSE PROPAGANDA WHICH MAKE BENEFICIARIES UNEASY—INTERESTS RAIL WORKERS — UNCLE SAM HAS INVESTED PRECIOUS RESERVES IN BEST SECURITIES IN THE WORLD

Labor takes its hat off to the Wall Street Journal. That newspaper's views differ widely from Labor's on many subjects, but the "WSJ" rendered a great public service by presenting conspicuously, on its editorial page, a devastating exposure of a hoary old propaganda fake which has worried millions of railroaders, other workers and their wives.

That fake is the vicious "yarn" that Uncle Sam has made off with the money workers contribute to the social security and railroad retirement "reserve funds," so the money won't be there to pay the workers' pensions in old age.

Of course, Labor has exposed the falsity of that propaganda a hundred times, but the old fake continued to spread its slimy trail in newspapers from coast to coast. Finally outraged and "fed up," the Wall Street paper let loose its blast.

SAME WITH RAIL FUND

The Journal discussed only the social security old-age and survivors insurance pension system, or OASI, but its remarks are equally true of the railroad retirement system, which has the same sort of reserve fund, handled in exactly the same way.

"Letters to this newspaper," the Journal says, "show that misunderstanding of the OASI reserve fund is still widespread.

"Many persons still believe what some insurance company officials asserted in the middle 1930's, that the reserve fund, invested in United States bonds, was a fiction, and could result in the cost of pensions being paid twice over."

The insurance officials made that charge because they were then trying to prevent passage of the Social Security Act, by hook or crook. But, the Journal continues:

"Those insurance company men have long since realized their error." In 1945, a committee representing the three principal associations of life-insurance companies recanted and publicly took the fake charge back.

The Journal quotes the insurance men's lengthy confession, but points out that it is in too heavy language for the average person to understand.

The truth, the Wall Street paper declares, was put in clearer terms by the Senate Finance Committee's advisory council on social security, composed of 17 businessmen, economics professors, labor union representatives and insurance company executives. In 1948, this council said:

"INSURANCE FIRMS BUY UNITED STATES BONDS

"We do not agree with those who criticize investment of the OASI reserve in Government bonds. Actually, such investment is as reasonable and proper as the investment by life-insurance companies of their own reserve funds in Government securities.

"The investment of old-age-insurance funds in Government securities does not mean that people will be taxed twice for the same benefits, as has been charged."

The council then gave a mathematical example showing that if the social-security or railroad-retirement fund did not own the Government bonds, the bonds would be owned by somebody else, bankers or private investors, who would get the interest on the bonds if the pension reserve funds did not.

Hence the cost to general taxpayers would be the same, and workers would lose the Government-bond interest which now helps to increase the fund to pay their pensions.

REPEATS STALE ERRORS

Then the Journal says the Brookings Institution, a Washington research organization financed by big business interests, recently published a book which repeats the stale errors about the OASI trust fund. Its authors make the following untrue statement:

"The OASI trust fund is invested in Federal Government securities. Since the money is used by the Government in meeting its regular expenditure requirements, no real reserve is created. The obligations of the Government do not represent assets. The trust fund is thus a fiction."

In other words, the Wall Street Journal points out, the Brookings book makes one of both of two assertions.

One is that the bonds in the OASI reserve fund have no value, and hence are different from all other Government bonds. The second is that all Government bonds are worthless.

The first assertion is ridiculous, the Journal explains, because all Government bonds are the same. Either all "represent real assets," or all are worthless.

As a matter of fact, the Journal continues, if it were possible to divide Government bonds into two categories, the bonds in the pension reserve funds would have to be assigned a superior rating as assets.

BACKED BY UNCLE SAM

"They are the property of many millions of citizens, most of whom have little or nothing else to protect them from destitution in their old age.

"If this portion of the (Government) debt has no existence as stocks, the remainder of the $252,000,000,000 debt doesn't exist either."

For these reasons, the Journal concludes, the Brookings book's propaganda that the Government bonds in the pension reserve have less value than fresh toilet paper is wholly false.

"The value of these bonds, like that of all other Government bonds, is assured by the Government's power to assess all the trade and industry of the country. For whatever it takes to pay the obligations.

"It is impossible to assert rationally that part of the national debt is rubbish and the rest is prime investments."

Of course, all that is known to life-insurance companies and bankers and other private investors. They would be delighted to pay more than par for the 3 percent interest bonds Uncle Sam puts in the social security and railroad retirement reserve funds. But no private investor can get Government bonds paying that much interest. Such extraordinary Government bonds are sold only to the social security and railroad retirement reserves.

Labor repeats the Wall Street Journal is entitled to a resounding pat on the back for having printed this splendid exposé of a most despicable piece of propaganda.

Uncle Sam Doesn't Fumble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial appearing in the Mt. Vernon (Ohio) News which shows the United States is paying more than its share of various expenses of the organizations to which it belongs. If we carefully study this editorial we will find one of numerous reasons why our taxes are so high and why our debt is so great.

The editorial follows:

UNCLE SAM DOESN'T FUMBLE

Uncle Sam doesn't do any fumbling when it comes to picking up the check for the expenses of the numerous organizations to which he belongs.

He pays—expects to and is expected to by other nations which are fellow members.

For instance, the United States pays $22,316,227 yearly for its membership in the United Nations and various allied organizations. That is 25 percent of the total cost; the rest of the world foots the bill for the remainder.

And this country's annual assessment for the cost of maintaining the International Children's Emergency Fund is $35,000,000, or 13 percent of the total.

Participation in the Palestine refugee relief effort costs this country $8,000,000 annually, or 8 percent of the total.

The cost of membership in the inter-American organizations to which the United States belongs is $8,000,000 a year, or 65 percent of the total.

And this policy is maintained in all of the international organizations to which the United States has a part and there are 47 of them. This country pays 47 percent of the expenses of these 47 organizations. And the United States is considering joining three more.

The bill for our share of the expenses of these 47 activities is more than $114,000,000 a year.

In addition there are the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund to which this country has pledged nearly $6,000,000,000.

Of course, the role of the United States in world affairs has increased tremendously since World War II; of course, the American people want to meet their responsibilities, and, of course, they want to pay their share, in any movement designed for world betterment.

But, doesn't it appear as though we are doing more than our share?

The American people—some 150,000,000 in number—are paying almost half of the expenses of maintaining 47 organizations; the more than two billion in the rest of the world take care of the remainder.

And there is the probability that we are not getting the best possible result from use of these millions of dollars.

The Hoover Commission report says that, because of the great increase in this country's participation in world affairs, at least 46 of the 50 major departments and agencies in the executive branch have been drawn into foreign affairs to some extent, whereas foreign affairs used to be almost exclusively a State Department function.

A Senate subcommittee has said this change has resulted in "interdepartmental jealousies and rivalries" which have produced a lack of coordination.

This committee reported that there is "no single crystallized process for securing interdepartmental coordination in the formulation of presentation of United States policy with respect to international organizations."

Part of the blame was placed on the White House, the committee charging that the executive office of the President has failed to define the relative roles and authority of the State Department and other agencies.

The amount of money spent in these international activities is unimportant; the fact that the United States is paying much more than its share is neither of any great importance but results are important.

And results are far from satisfactory, as is indicated by the state the world is in today.

Possibly at least some of the lack of results is to be accounted for in the manner in which the money is spent and in which the activities are handled.

The mere spending of money rarely does any good; to make the spending worth while, to accomplish beneficial results, expenditures must be intelligently made and with a definite aim in view.

Shipyard Unemployment and a Neglected Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-fourth Congress and the President, some 14 years ago, established a merchant marine policy for the United States. The wisdom of this policy was proven beyond the remotest doubt and demonstrated to an extent that is realized by few long-range governmental decisions. This policy stood the test of an unprecedented war that encircled the earth and probably placed more demands in 4 years upon the United States merchant marine than had been imposed during the entire previous maritime history of the United States.

This great, forward-looking policy was the fundamental principle upon which the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was based. It was embodied in the opening declaration of that act and implemented by its subsequent provisions. Therefore, I believe it is most appropriate at this time to read and insert here the declaration of United States merchant marine policy, formulated and adopted by Congress, which is the very basis for our discussion here. I quote from the Merchant Marine Act of 1936:

TITLE I. DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 101. It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States, and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times, (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, (c) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States, and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine.

The principles I have just quoted had as much to do with the winning the Second World War as any other single factor. The implementation of the policy by ship-construction programs and adequate appropriations resulted in placing 60,000,000 tons of United States merchant shipping in operation and in extending to the remote corners of the earth vast supply lines to battle areas in every continent and in every climate. We would have been practically incapable of waging total war without this gigantic merchant marine which not only supplied our armed forces, but brought back essential strategic raw materials for the fabrication of the highly complex sinews of modern war.

It is for us to be rededicated to this wise policy; I say rededicated because our Government seems to have forgotten too soon the lessons of the immediate past.

The present condition of our entire merchant marine, beginning with the ship-building industry, indicates neglect. Most of our yards have been closed down, while an indispensable army of trained ship builders are unemployed. These men have been compelled to seek employment elsewhere and, unless Congress takes action immediately, their skills may be lost to this basic industry.

In the absence of a substantial long-range new-construction program, we should keep in the best possible condition the ships in our laid-up merchant fleet upon which we must rely in event of an emergency.

There are 2,000 of such reserve ships which need overhauling and reconditioning from time to time. Congress should appropriate sufficient money to provide for this work. No money could be better spent. A vital factor in our peaceful commerce and security would be preserved while the essential organization of shipbuilding trades would be kept intact and not scattered, as it is now, so widely as to impair seriously our well-being.

In my district and all along the east and west coasts, the shipbuilding industry is at a standstill while the men who trained over 1,750,000 shipyard workers to build 60,000,000 tons of war merchant shipping are experiencing unemployment and hardships.

It should and will be our objective, not only to provide for repairs to the land-up fleet, but to plan a long-range new-construction program of modern, fast, cargo ships.

We who were first in world shipping are losing our coveted place. We have only a little over a million of the 10,000,000 tons of new-ship construction now under way or on order among the maritime nations of the world.

It behooves us to look back upon the tragic year of 1940 when Hitler overran Europe and almost conquered Britain. Our security then hung upon a slender thread for if Britain had been conquered by Hitler, the shipbuilding capacity of our enemies would have outweighed our resources by 6 to 1.

For this reason we must be aware constantly of our merchane marine. If we neglect it, experience has shown in years just past we will place ourselves in great jeopardy. Wisdom counsels us to keep prepared eternally.

Federal Subsidies Are Varied, Widespread, and Costly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, in a talk before the Rotary Club of Wilmington, Del., a few weeks ago the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware, the Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS, presented one of the finest discussions of Federal Government subsidies which it has ever been my pleasure to hear or to read.

So that all Members of the Congress and citizens throughout the Nation may have the opportunity to study and analyze this serious and critical situation, I am including the full text of Senator WILLIAMS' talk as a part of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, as the Senator so ably pointed out, we have witnessed during recent years a growing tendency on the part of the American people to expect the Federal Government to underwrite functions which previously were recognized as individual or local responsibilities. Now, however, there is striking evidence that the American people are seriously alarmed and have come to recognize this principle of subsidization as a threat to our established economic system.

Although attention has recently been focused principally on agricultural subsidies, Senator WILLIAMS has emphasized the fact that Federal subsidies are varied, widespread and costly. He has pointed up the fact that Federal subsidies are going not only to farmers and agricultural interests, but also to air lines, railroads, newspapers, corporations, maritime enterprises, mining industries, banking institutions, State and local governments and others.

By reason of certain bookkeeping methods and the shuffling of accounts from one Government agency to another, the total and tremendous cost of Federal subsidies has been largely concealed from those who pay this cost—the Nation's overburdened taxpayers. Senator WILLIAMS has pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that during the past 14 years Federal grants and subsidies to States, municipalities, corporations, and individuals have totaled approximately $43,000,000,000. So that the taxpayers may more clearly and more easily understand this cost, the Senator has further stated that this represents about $1,250 for each family in the country.

In view of this situation, Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the most serious thought, attention and consideration of the Congress and of the people must be given to the matter of Federal grants and subsidies.

The text of Senator WILLIAMS' talk follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR JOHN J. WILLIAMS, OF DELAWARE, AT THE ROTARY CLUB, WILMINGTON, DEL., FEBRUARY 9, 1950

During recent years there has been a growing tendency on the part of us, the American people, to expect the Government to underwrite those functions which were once recognized as our individual responsibilities.

This trend has expanded until today a substantial percentage of our annual expenditures can be attributed to the cost of these subsidies.

With our Government confronted as it is today with another huge deficit and the threat of a greatly increased tax rate, the American people are at last becoming alarmed and are beginning to recognize this principle of subsidizing as a threat to our economic system.

As evidence of this, we in Congress are being approached on the streets back home and are receiving volumes of letters urging a drastic reduction in government expenditures and a balanced budget. Practically all of these letters express criticism of some form of government subsidy.

If we were to conduct a poll of the American citizens, asking the question as to whether or not we should eliminate government subsidies, I think that the overwhelming response would be in the affirmative. I venture to say that if we were to conduct a poll of the members of the Rotary Club here today, we would receive an even more enthusiastic vote to abolish them.

Yet I wonder if we are not overlooking the fact that during the recent years this principle of government subsidies has expanded until today it has become an accepted part of our economic system.

The question is often raised as to whether or not, in a show-down, the American people would back up their representatives in Congress for an abolishment of this principle.

Sure—everybody would agree that all Government subsidy or support programs should be repealed—all except those which directly affect them.

The cost of this criticism against Government subsidies is leveled against the Government farm-support program. The reason for this is that the Government's support of agricultural products directly affects not only the American farmer but also the budget of the millions of American homewives.

It is this program and its operations which I wish to discuss briefly here today. I have never been a supporter of the Administration's existing program of high farm supports; yet I want it made very clear that I do not consider the farm-support program any more threatening to our economic system than any other form of government subsidy. I shall merely discuss it here today since its operations do so vitally affect everyone.

Unfortunately, during the recent years this principle of Government subsidies has expanded in various fields until today practically everybody is affected, and I call your attention to the fact that in many instances those who are most vocal in their criticism of the farm-support program are themselves recipients of some form of Government subsidies.

As an example of how this principle has expanded to embrace many segments of our economic system, I cite a few examples.

For instance, the owners and officials of the air lines in this country would no doubt agree that the principle of Government subsidies is vicious; yet they are perfectly willing to accept subsidies from the Government amounting to many millions of dollars annually—subsidies which, in effect, guarantee their operations against loss.

Our American railroads were built and developed years ago under the principle of Government subsidies. Large grants of land were given to the promoters in the early stages of development. Today these same railroad lines are still accepting their subsidies for carrying mail.

Our American newspaper system has been rather critical of the principle of Government subsidies in general, particularly the subsidy as related to the farm-support program. Yet I do not recall a single instance where the members of the press have objected to their own subsidy in the form of low postage rates, nor do they object to the special earmarking of over $100,000,000 of the ECA funds to be used to subsidize the distribution of American newspapers in continental Europe.

If we were to conduct a poll of the leading corporations in this country—a group which surely believes in the principle of free enterprise—I venture to say that almost without exception they would express opposition to the principle of Government support prices. Still we find that a large number of this same group have endorsed President Truman's point 4 program which is merely a plan to let the American taxpayer guarantee the investments of the American corporations in foreign countries.

We find that our merchant marine—another division of our free-enterprise system—is perfectly willing to have the Government continue underwriting a large percentage of the cost of the construction of its ships, nor do they object to our Government's annual contribution of several million dollars to subsidize the operations of these same vessels.

We hear a lot of discussion among prominent men, many of whom are identified with our State and local governments, expressing grave concern over the encroachment of the Federal Government upon the rights of the individual States; yet in many instances we find that these same officials are clamoring for more and more Federal aid for the construction of our State highways, our public schools, our hospitals, and in many other fields which were formerly recognized as inherent State functions.

Our western mining industry has been successful during the past 2 years, following a rather bitter fight on the floor of the Senate, in having legislation passed whereby the Government will support the price of their products. This subsidy, amounting to several million dollars annually, is also at the expense of the taxpayers.

Even our children, from the day they enter the public schools, become recipients of Government subsidies by virtue of the fact that our Federal Government makes annual contributions of several millions to the school-lunch programs.

One of the most conservative groups in this country is the American bankers; yet they have no objection to the policy of the Government guaranteeing a support at par under all Government bonds, thereby protecting their huge investments.

These are not all, but I have cited them as examples in order that while I discuss the farm support program here this afternoon, you will realize that farm subsidies are only a small part of the over-all subsidy picture.

In order that the administration's farm program might be appraised in its true light from the standpoints of the three most interested parties, namely, the farmer, the consumer, and the ever-loyal taxpayer, I shall outline as briefly as possible a few pertinent facts regarding its operations.

First of all from the standpoint of a taxpayer I want to explode completely the fantastic claims of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, that this program is not costing the taxpayers any money.

While the Secretary of Agriculture will now admit that this program might be costing a little money, it was only last year that he issued this statement:

"Support prices do cost money sometimes, even though it is true that CCC at present has a lifetime profit rather than loss on this type of operation."

(The Commodity Credit Corporation is the Government corporation which finances the farm support program. It is also the Government corporation which is now asking for an additional $2,000,000,000 without having rendered to Congress its annual audit reports for 1946, 1947, 1948, or 1949, as is required by law. It is also the Government corporation which was charged last year, in the Comptroller General's annual audit report for the period ended June 30, 1948, with having spent $388,-[illegible] for which no accounting was available, and which is still unaccounted.)

Knowing full well that this fantastic claim could not possibly be true, I directed a letter to the Bureau of the Budget on February 1 of last year, asking this simple question:

"Would you please furnish me at the earliest possible date the net results, from a taxpayer's standpoint, of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation since its inception in 1933?"

On February 9, 1949, I received a reply from Mr. F. J. Lawton, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in which he completely denied that the Commodity Credit Corporation had made a profit and stated that the net loss sustained by the Corporation since its organization in October 1933, was $3,[illegible],176.

In this same letter Mr. Lawton pointed out that the only way the Commodity Credit Corporation was able to show a surplus of $35,-[illegible] in its operations was by including as income the nearly $4,000,[illegible] appropriations it had received from Congress.

I might say that the farm support program is not the only subsidy program in which an attempt is made to conceal the true cost from the taxpayers. This erroneous practice of concealing losses by shuffling accounts from one Government agency to another seems to be the rule rather than the exception.

We are only kidding ourselves when we claim that the farm program or any of the other subsidy programs is not being operated at the expense of the taxpayers.

It has always been my contention that high support prices under agricultural commodities will not solve the long-range problem of the American farmer. On the contrary, a continuation of high support prices under Agriculture will inevitably lead to disaster.

A lot of oratory has been wasted on the question of whether the farmers are entitled to 60 percent, 75 percent, or 90 percent of parity, with some politicians advocating 100 percent.

What is the meaning of this sacred word "parity?" I question that there is a single Member of Congress who can define this term without referring to the law, and I doubt very much that there is a single individual in either the Congress or in the Department of Agriculture who can twice figure the same parity on any agricultural commodity.

If you will read the definition of parity as written in the law today, you will find that it has taken almost as many words for the Department of Agriculture to define this little word as it did for our forefathers to write the entire Declaration of Independence. Still no one can understand it.

So instead of discussing this program in terms of the unknown factor "parity," I propose to reduce it to language we all understand—dollars and cents.

I shall quote a few facts from two charts which I have with me. The first chart shows the total investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in all commodities as of December 31, 1949, including inventories and those under loan. The second chart shows the price at which these commodities are being supported and gives a comparison of the support price with the average 10-year price received by the farmer for the same commodities.

CCC inventories loan commitments as of Dec. 31, 1949

Commodity	Quantity	Value
Tobacco ..... pounds	367,238,280	$181,891,829
Cotton ..... bales	6,026,588	805,109,372
Wheat ..... bushels	462,205,944	980,719,028
Linseed oil ..... pounds	304,527,630	111,337,600
Flaxseed ..... bushels	12,943,222	98,244,327
Corn ..... do	110,454,862	712,128,735
Dried eggs (290,898,888 dozen) ..... pounds	88,036,267	88,917,253
Dry edible beans ..... hundredweight	8,850,796	42,838,326
Barley ..... bushels	28,028,019	32,098,088
Dried milk (750,000,000 quarts) ..... pounds	215,790,300	27,300,460
Butter ..... do	38,202,000	59,518,797
Wool ..... do	18,402,900	56,310,067
Other		120,994,449
Total		3,645,129,317

Support levels and 10-year average prices received by farmers on commodities now being supported by the Commodity Credit Corporation

Commodity	Support price (actual price)[1]	10-year average price received by farmers 1940–49
Corn ..... bushels	$1.40	$1.16
Peanuts ..... pounds	.105	.0718
Wheat ..... bushels	1.90	1.49
Potatoes ..... do	.96	1.38
Cotton ..... pounds	.272	.235
Wool, shorn ..... do	.423	.406
Tobacco, flue-cured ..... do	.435	[illegible]
Barley ..... bushels	1.00	.98
Butter ..... pounds	.80	.668
Eggs ..... dozen	.37	.368
Hogs, March new ..... hundredweight	16.20	14.30

[1] Support levels listed are those most recently announced. 1949 support prices listed if 1950 program not yet announced.

[2] 1939–48 average.

No one can dispute the fact that if the Government continues this policy of maintaining artificially high prices on certain agricultural commodities, it inevitably is going to lead to a choice of one of two things:

1. Either we must launch a program of wholesale destruction of food such as the world has never known; or

2. We must place the farmers of this Nation under strict controls of a bureaucracy with adequate powers to enforce acreage and marketing quotas.

To attempt the former would be such a wanton waste of the taxpayers' money that the Federal Treasury could not stand the pressure.

To attempt the second would mean the complete regimentation and socialization of American agriculture.

During the past 14 years our country has given away in grants and subsidies to States, municipalities, corporations, and individuals a sum total of $43,000,000,000. That means more than $1,250 for each family.

Now, whenever any individual or political entity accepts from the Federal Government such financial assistance in the form of grants, gratuities, or subsidies, then that individual or political entity must of necessity relinquish to the Federal Government many freedoms guaranteed under our Constitution.

We are selling our birthright for the proverbial mess of pottage. And unfortunately, this price, this tremendous price, given in exchange for Federal assistance, is ofttimes not recognized by the recipient until it is too late. Then the recipient suddenly realizes that the cost of this assistance is the loss of our original American freedom and the substitution therefor of a socialistic form of government.

If we continue the destruction of a sound fiscal policy for political expediency by complying with the requests of every pressure group in our own country and the requests of every foreign country, we shall soon find ourselves in the same category as those countries in the past—countries which were rich and prosperous and powerful, but which have now passed into oblivion. And then the last hope of civilization shall have perished.

This country of ours was established and developed into its greatness by our forefathers who operated under the principle that it was their duty to support the Government and not the duty of the Government to support the people.

As a result of their hard work and sacrifices they have handed down to us our birthright of freedom.

Let us never forget the wise words of Benjamin Franklin who said, "He who trades freedom for security will lose both."

Home Rule for North Atlantic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Association of Highway Officials of the North Atlantic States:

HOME RULE

Whereas the member States of the Association of Highway Officials of the North Atlantic States recognize their responsibilities in administering the highway obligations; and

Whereas the highway officials of the respective 11 States and the District of Columbia have proved their ability to handle their jobs properly over the many years of their existence; and

Whereas the member States have men with extensive training in the fundamental and advanced problems of technical and administrative procedures who have proved their qualifications to expend Federal and State funds in the best interests of the highway users; and

Whereas the trend has been definitely indicated for increased Federal expansion and participation in the administration of State highway problems as reflected by the increase in the Federal Government's overhead cost for the administration of the highway program, particularly in the face of increased highway production which should normally reflect lower percentages of overhead cost: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Association of Highway Officials of the North Atlantic States record itself as of the definite opinion that the member States' highway problems can best be solved at the State levels with a minimum of regulation from the Federal Government.

The foregoing is a true copy of a resolution unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Association of Highway Officials of the North Atlantic States held in New York City on February 23, 1950.

A. LEE GROVER,
Secretary, Association of Highway Officials of the North Atlantic States.

Significance of the Changing Characteristics of Agriculture to Farm Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Tyrus R. Timm, extension economist and professor of agricultural economics, Texas A. & M. College, at conference of directors and secretary-treasurers of Production Credit Associations of Texas, January 23–25, 1950, Houston, Tex.:

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CHANGING CHARACTERISTICS OF AGRICULTURE TO FARM FINANCE

(By Dr. Tyrus R. Timm)

A person's figure changes through the years, requiring at intervals new styles, new materials, and different accessories to bring out its best points. Agriculture's figure changes too, and must be clothed at different stages of its growth and development with the style which will bring out its best points.

Thus today and in the years ahead agriculture may need drastically different accessories and aids to maintain good incomes and good standards of living upon the farms and ranches of Texas than was true in 1934, when the production credit associations were first organized.

You who are farmer-directors now take over the full reins of the 36 production credit associations in Texas. In my opinion, then, it is imperative that you understand and appreciate the terrific changes which have taken place in agriculture between the years of 1934, when the Government stepped in, and 1950, when you take over.

It is significant also that Federal production controls and price supports on a large scale are reentering the economic scene at the same time you assume complete command of your associations. The original entrance of these controls was about the same time that the federally sponsored production credit associations made their appearance. But their second debut may have vastly greater implications in the present farm economy, and consequently are of particular significance to farm credit leaders.

Let us examine these contrasts and developments to note their importance to you directors, both as lenders and borrowers, and particularly as farm leaders tremendously interested in the economic, political, and social welfare of farm and ranch families of this State.

1. THE RAPID INCREASE IN THE COMMERCIALIZATION OF AGRICULTURE

One of the really significant developments in the figure of agriculture since 1934 has been its growing commercialization. Agriculture is currently characterized by bigger investments, greatly increased cash production and living costs, and much more dependency upon the market place than was the case 16 years ago.

An example will indicate the magnitude of this trend toward greater commercialization. The costs in farming last year were higher than the gross farm income of farmers and ranchmen across this country for any year up to 1942. Of course, gross incomes, too, have risen considerably during this 16-year period and up until a couple of years ago, rose faster than costs. Therefore, the impact of these high costs on the whole has not caused serious financial difficulties. However, it will probably do so if prices of farm products continue to settle faster than prices of things farmers buy—and they are expected to do just that.

In the case of cash operating expenses, farmers and ranchmen spent some $5,000,-000,000 in 1934, in contrast with an expenditure of nearly 13 billions in 1949. So, for every $5 on the average spent in 1934 for feed, fertilizer, and other operating items, $18 was being spent in 1949. Particularly significant is the fact that these costs have continued upward since the war. While net farm incomes for the Nation as a whole reached a peak in 1947, and has been dropping since, cash operating expenses the past 2 years increased by $1,000,000,000.

This is a matter of basic consideration for leaders in farm finance. Most farming systems now are set up for a high degree of commercialization, and it would be very difficult to rearrange their operations without substantial loss to the producers. With fixed costs and production costs running at record levels, the shift from intensive to more extensive operations, which will be required under acreage controls, may result in a serious increase in unit costs unless equally profitable alternatives can be found. Volume is a very important cost factor.

Credit leaders must also recognize that on many units there continues a situation which economists call capital rationing. That is to say, full use is not being made of the resources on these farms. Thus through a better balance and a fuller utilization of the farming system an additional income, more than offsetting the interest charges, is still possible. The needs of these units must not be overlooked in our current policy of growing cautiousness regarding the extension of credit.

2. THE GROWING INTERDEPENDENCE OF BUSINESS AND AGRICULTURE

Naturally, this growing commercialization which has brought about a decrease in the number of farms and ranches and an increase in the size of operations as well as an increase in items purchased in town for better living and better production, has also resulted in a closer interdependence of business and agriculture; in fact, of town and country as a whole.

A glance around the square or down the main street of your home town will prove to you the growing commercialization of agriculture and its attendant relationships with business. As you look around, compare what you see with 1934. How many more feed stores are there? How many more farm-equipment dealers? To what extent have veterinary supplies and insecticides become an important part of the local drug store's business? What has been the increase in electrical supplies sold in the surrounding rural areas? The changes which have taken place are nothing short of amazing when you think about them.

Producers, in 1934, spent about $973,000,-000 for farm equipment used on farms and ranches. By 1949 the annual bill had risen to $1,200,000,000; in fact, $150,000,000 more than the outlay in 1947. In other words, farmers today average spending $1,200 for farm equipment for each $972 they spent in 1934.

Many people do not realize that this is the only country in the world in which farmers can go into small towns of two and three thousand population with the opportunity to take their choice among different makes of tractors, combines, and other farm equipment. Perhaps you can remember, after the First World War, and in some places as late as 1934, farm-equipment dealers were found only in the larger towns.

Volume purchases by farmers, brought about by changes in agriculture's figure, have made it possible and profitable for dealers to locate in the smaller towns. If the commercialization of agriculture should halt, the result will hurt these small-town dealers as well as the farmers; fewer dollars to spend by the farmer would mean the drying up of business for the dealers.

3. THE CHANGES IN FOREIGN-TRADE OUTLETS

Since the early nineteen thirties, foreign trade in agricultural commodities has increased substantially and the amount of trading by commodities has varied greatly.

In terms of physical volume, agricultural exports from this country are about 50 percent higher today than they were in the middle thirties. In dollar volume, largely as a result of much higher prices, current exports of agricultural commodities are 4½ times those of the same period.

An immensely significant trend to leaders in farm finance is the change in the export market for some of the crops which are extremely important in this State. As an illustration: Today cotton exports are less than two-thirds of those of the early thirties; on the other hand, wheat exports are running six times the 1930–38 average.

To production credit leaders, the share of the market for particular commodities which depends largely on the whims of foreign governments, is important. This share of the market is certainly more speculative than domestic use. Farm leaders must keep their eyes on international relations affecting these commodities. In the case of other products, such as beef, the story is a little different. Less than 1 percent of the beef produced in this country is exported; therefore, the important consideration (at least, in the short run), is more on the domestic supply-demand conditions and involves domestic policies.

4. A GREATER DEPENDENCY UPON THE MARKET PLACE

The points discussed so far point out that one of the accompanying results of the growing commercialization of agriculture has been a greater and greater dependency upon the market. This is just another way of saying that gross production per person in agriculture has increased, but that a very small share of the increased production has been used at home by farm families.

In fact, in 1947, the production per person in agriculture had increased 57 percent since 1934. In the last 2 years, the production rate

per person in agriculture has continued upward and now is 71 percent above 1924.

A significant trend to watch is that gross production per person in industry has made less gain during that period and has shown no gain during the last 3 years.

We often hear that a higher standard of living, in terms of material goods, such as bathtubs, food products, automobiles, etc., cannot be ours unless we produce more per person. This is true for the country as a whole, but it is also true that one segment of the economy may gain an advantage over other segments by producing at a less favorable rate. The degree to which one group—for instance, industry—might gain an advantage over others in the economy depends upon the relationship of its prices to those of other groups as the production rate is slowed down.

In other words, if industries outside of agriculture reduce their production of items which farmers buy thereby continuing to hold the lid on output per person, and at the same time, if agriculture continues to increase its rate of production per person, the overflow may result in a serious parity disadvantage for agricultural products. If this happens, farmers very likely will not reap the higher standard of living which should be the result of their increased per capita production.

5. AN OUTLOOK FOR LOWER NET FARM INCOMES FOR THE NEXT FEW YEARS

From 1934 to 1948, the outlook generally was for gradually rising net farm incomes. The outlook now is for gradually decreasing net farm incomes. No major depression of the intensity witnessed after World War I or in the early thirties is expected, but rather a general settling of prices and costs, with farm prices going down faster than the prices of products which farmers must buy.

On a number of products, the present supply and demand situation is much different from that of the period after World War I or in the depression which followed the economic collapse of 1929. For example, many producers, remembering other periods, have expected a steep drop in beef prices; each year, however, beef prices have continued good.

A major factor in this development has been the current favorable ratio of beef cattle numbers to the human population. At the end of World War I, there were about 600 head of beef cattle per 1,000 persons in this country. Today there are only 269 head per 1,000 persons.

In 1948, the net income to farmers in the country as a whole is expected to be down for the third straight year. Actually, if the further decrease expected occurs, net farm income in 1950 will be more than 25 percent lower than it was in 1947. Even at this level, net farm incomes will still double incomes of the period 1935–39.

In Texas in 1949, producers as a whole probably received their highest net farm income, significantly, possibly due to the tremendous cotton crop produced in 1949. If this is true, and if it is also true that the reason for it is due to the increased cotton production over 1948, the acreage adjustment problem is even more serious to us than to producers in other States.

Another indication of the seriousness of approaching farm economic problems worthy of consideration by leaders in farm finance is that in December 1949, the parity price index dipped below 120 for the first time since November 1941. It is presently rating at 96 percent of parity. As you know, this is the broad indicator used for comparing prices farmers receive with prices they have to pay.

6. MORE AND MORE DIRECT KINDS OF GOVERNMENT CONTROLS

In 1934, direct Federal controls upon the production and marketing patterns of individual farmers were just beginning. As you take over full control of the production credit associations in 1950, these controls are being reinstated and broadened on a larger scale.

Believe it or not, while Texas farmers are enjoying incomes substantially above those of prewar years, there are more support-price programs in effect than in the past. In addition, there is the necessity of diverting some 5,000,000 acres to other uses, under the acreage allotment program of 1950. This is not in criticism of such action, for we realize that even though the general income position of farmers may be good, thousands of farmers need help. The 64 question is: How many programs of this sort can farmers stand as farm incomes begin to suffer more? This is something for each one of us to think about.

Another Government-control program of interest to farmers is that of the income tax. In my opinion, no relief is in sight. The President's budget of some $43,000,000,000 for next year means that a reduction in taxes will not be forthcoming soon. Billions are difficult for me to understand, but here is an idea of how much $43,000,000,000 is: If you had that much money, you could buy all the machinery and equipment, livestock, and crops stored on all the farms and ranches in the United States; in addition, you would have enough money left over to be able to spend more than $1,000 an hour for every hour that has elapsed from the birth of Christ to the present time. Government is not only big business; it is serious business.

7. CHANGED VALUES IN OUR STANDARD OF LIVING

So far, the contrasts given have centered on important economic developments since 1934, when the production credit associations began. There have also been social and political developments that must be taken into consideration in appraising possible demands upon future production credit programs.

A terrifically important social consideration is that the standard of living of a farm family also changes slowly through the years. I think of a standard of living as a pattern of attitudes of people toward certain things at any given time. For example, when production credit associations got underway in 1934, only 11 percent of our farms had electric lights. Farmers were anxious to have lights in those days, but I think you will agree with me that they would be even more anxious today if, as a result of lower incomes, they would have to consider doing without electricity. With more than 78 percent of farms with electricity, it has become accepted as standard equipment. My observation leads me to believe that farmers intend to keep electric lights, regardless of income trouble.

There are other significant standard of living trends which have taken place during this period of PCA's existence. How about the attitude on prices? If farmers' vote on various referendums and policies of farm organizations are true reflections of the general feeling of farm people, then this sort of "attitude pattern" seems valid for the present: If the marketplace fails to maintain a fair relationship between prices of things farmers sell and buy, it is right, they rationalize, for the Government to use what the economists call "distributive justice," such as taxation, price supports, or similar aids, to bring about a fair distribution of the national income to the farmer.

The important point here is that the desire of farm people for what they believe to be a fair share of the national income is a tremendous factor in shaping Government policy. Their wishes in the future will have an important bearing upon the nature and extent of Government participation. In analyzing the outcome of certain combinations of enterprises on any farm, the possible effects of these direct Government programs must be appraised carefully.

On the other hand, farm people today are not accepting Government ideas nearly so quickly as they were in 1934. Controversies are more widespread and deepseated. Production payments directly to the farmer asked last year by Secretary Brannan is a tremendously controversial issue today. It is an example of a new issue which may or may not become a part of the farmers' standard of living. The implications are deeply embedded in our entire society and the consequences are difficult to ascertain. As you all know, separating the tinsel from the gold in all of these Government issues is a very difficult and delicate process.

8. GROUP ACTION IN AGRICULTURE

The growth of group action among farmers in the last 16 years—ranging from special group efforts to general farm organizations—has been little short of phenomenal and a significant trend. Your associations have been an integral part of the development.

In 1934, there were 945,000 farmers in the three big farm organizations—the Farm Bureau, the Grange, and the Farmers Union. Today, an estimated 2,722,000 farmers belong to these organizations.

Other "special interest" groups are better organized, too. One has difficulty in recalling, for example, that only a few years ago, industrial labor was not too well organized, with only 3,249,000 members in 1934. Today, the membership is indicated at 15,500,000.

Organized agriculture, industry, labor and other segments of the economy are playing a vital role in the political life of our democracy. These forces must be reckoned with, too, in appraising the extent and nature of Government participation to be expected in agriculture.

9. OTHER STIRRINGS ON THE NATIONAL POLITICAL SCENE

An interesting development in the "political institutions" relating to agriculture may be found also in Secretary Brannan's 1949 proposal. And that is the manner by which the proposal was developed and presented to the people.

Apparently very few farm organization and congressional leaders had an opportunity to discuss the proposal with the Secretary before it was released to the general public. In refraining from the usual practice of reviewing proposals with these leaders, the Secretary apparently had the full backing of the President, as evidenced by the fact that he spoke for the plan in his recent message to Congress.

The interesting aspect is that here we have the executive branch of the Government competing with the legislative branch for the starring role in leading farmers through the postwar economic wilderness. This approach is even more surprising when one remembers that in recent years there has been a definite tendency throughout the Government toward advisory committees of all sorts to analyze proposals, particularly before they reached the finished stage. The Brannan approach is a distinct departure from that procedure. I am not arguing the merits of the procedure, but merely pointing it out as one of those interesting political developments on the agricultural scene which will bear watching.

Other trends could be discussed and further interpretations made about the never-ending changes in agriculture's figure. More could be said about the kinds of accessories which will be needed to bring out the "best" in the figure from here on. But certainly, the increased commercialization of agriculture, the growing interdependence of agriculture and business, the changes in foreign trade outlets, the greater dependency upon the market place, the outlook for lower net farm incomes in the years ahead, and the fact that more and different kinds of Government control are already on the scene are important economic considerations, the

effect of which must be looked into as you plan your program ahead. They are not, however, any more important than the social and political contrasts which have been mentioned also.

It all adds up in the next decade, as I see it, to (1) somewhat lower farm profits but at levels considerably above those we had before World War II; (2) a highly commercialized agriculture which can't wait very long for needed price and cost adjustments to work themselves out. This means an agriculture that can go broke faster even though farmers have more money in the bank than before the war. Today's net worth, when compared with that of several years past, has little meaning, actually, in terms of security; (3) an agriculture that is more closely than ever related with Government power and with the other segments of the economy. In this last respect a delicate balance must be maintained in order to maintain freedom and encourage private enterprise.

This all means, too, that production credit-association leaders in the years ahead must assume even greater stature in the economic, social, and political struggles of the Nation. The appraisal of a livestock loan even today is only partly finished when the fieldman has completed his check on kinds and numbers of livestock and feed conditions on a man's ranch. Economic, social, and political issues affecting livestock transactions and originating outside of the farm fences may be very significant in the payment of the loan. Certainly these outside influences will continue to play an important role in the total picture.

I've talked about contrasts and significant changes, but I'm glad to report that one tremendously important factor affecting your associations has remained constant—and that is your leadership. Your earnestness, unity of purpose, and hard work has been evident throughout the 36 production credit associations of Texas and the Production Credit Corp. of Houston. Your success thus far may be best explained by the Chinese proverb: "Behind an able man there are always other able men."

I am very proud of the fine records compiled by our credit institutions in Texas—your associations, the commercial banks, the Federal land bank, and others. As a member of the Texas A. & M. College extension staff I look forward in our educational program to working closely with you and these other groups toward better farm-family living in our great State.

Let's Remember the Sea Gulls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial written by Jack Gore, editor of the Fort Lauderdale Daily News, the largest newspaper in Broward County, Fla.

The moral of this editorial might serve a purpose to evaluate the fundamental principles of thrift, self-reliance, and self-dependability.

The editorial is as follows:

LET'S REMEMBER THE SEA GULLS

We wonder if there isn't something of a moral for the American people in the story of what is happening to the sea gulls up in St. Augustine now that the shrimp fleet has left that area for Key West.

It seems the sea gulls up that way have forgotten how to catch fish for themselves. For many years they have been depending for their food on the scraps and waste thrown overboard from the shrimping fleet. It was a sort of super welfare state for the birds, and the free dinners made it unnecessary for the gulls to depend on their own talents to secure food.

But suddenly the shrimp fleet went away. New and more productive fishing grounds were located off Key West, and the shrimp boats deserted St. Augustine.

The sea gulls haven't been able to adjust themselves to the new situation. According to an INS report, the reefs and the shores around St. Augustine are lined with long silent rows of gulls with their dark eyes turned prayerfully out to sea—waiting for the shrimp fleet and the free meals that won't return.

Nature has played the sea gulls a dirty trick. As generation after generation of gulls learned to depend on the shrimp fleet instead of their own resources to obtain food, parent gulls apparently forgot to teach their little ones their age-old methods of catching fish. So today the gulls are starving. They are no different in physical makeup than the sea gulls of Fort Lauderdale. But whereas our gulls can exist through their own efforts, the gulls of St. Augustine are starving by the hundreds because their welfare state suddenly disappeared and with it went their ability to fend for themselves.

The people of St. Augustine are trying desperately to save the gulls that are left. A city-wide effort is being made to round up table scraps and movie popcorn to tide the birds over until they can once more learn to feed themselves.

But naturalists aren't too sure what will happen. They are puzzled over the apparent complete loss of the sea gulls' natural fishing instincts. Some believe the cycle will be completed without the gulls ever recovering their natural fishing ability.

It's a strange paradox that nature thus gives us. Here we have some of the most independent creatures of the universe, who were given marvelous talents to take care of themselves, victimized because they succumbed to the "something for nothing" lure. They became dependent on unnatural conditions to such an extent that parents apparently forgot to teach their offspring how to get along otherwise. Now with the free food gone, the offspring of these indolent parents are paying the penalty.

We wonder if people aren't a great deal like the sea gulls of St. Augustine. We wonder how many Americans have swallowed the idea of the welfare state to the point where they think it is no longer necessary to teach their offspring that the day of Government hand-outs and security for all may sometime draw to a close. And we wonder then how many Americans may be left like the gulls—puzzled and bewildered because their sustenance has disappeared and they have no resources of their own to fall back on.

Americans don't have to look far to see the sea-gull story translated over into human behavior. We have in England a living example of a "something for nothing" theory gobbled up by the people. Like the sea gulls of St. Augustine, the people of Great Britain have accepted unnatural conditions as a substitute for depending upon themselves. The English Government is the "shrimp fleet" which provides the people of Britain with food, clothing, and shelter. As long as this Government is firm and strong and as long as there are shrimp—meaning taxes—enough to keep it in business, the people will be safe.

But let the shrimp be exhausted, as is now happening, then the Government must seek new beds. It must, of necessity, move on and leave in its wake a mass of miserable people totally unaccustomed to using their own God-given talents and resources to exist.

There is the moral in the story of the sea gulls of St. Augustine. It's a pungent moral and one that every voting American should well consider. Nature has a way of exacting a heavy toll from those who look upon her gifts as unnecessary. As a Nation, we here in America have been singularly blessed with a tremendous capacity for using our skills and our ingenuity to ever improve our way of living. But we have earned our "keep" by wresting it out of the ground, the sea, and the air, through the exercise of our own talents.

We will keep those talents only by continuing to use them. The minute we cast them aside as no longer necessary we will forfeit them as surely as the sea gulls of St. Augustine forfeited their talent to provide themselves with food.

Let's not be that foolish. Let's remember what happened to the sea gulls whenever we are tempted by the Washington "shrimpers" to leave our own board and dine at the Government scrap table of false security.

Old Dame Nature is a wise, though sometimes cruel, teacher. She might have used the sea gulls of St. Augustine as a red flag of warning to the American people. Let's heed it while we still have time.

It Always Bobs Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News under date of March 22. This editorial relative to Federal aid to education brings out the fear many of us have—that Federal aid to our educational program will take power from the State and local authorities in operating our schools and will bring interference from the Federal Government.

Your attention is called to the statement in this article made by Congressman LESINSKI, chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and one of the spokesmen for this administration. I quote Congressman LESINSKI:

It is impossible to draft a general Federal-aid-to-education bill which will not contain a degree of control over local school systems.

Mr. Speaker, the entire editorial is herewith submitted:

IT ALWAYS BOBS UP

The Mount Vernon teachers' association recently adopted a resolution favoring Federal aid to education without the imposition of Federal controls over the schools.

If a provision for an absolute guarantee against Washington bureaucrats dictating on public-school policies could be written into an education aid bill, nearly all of the opposition to appropriation of Federal money for school purposes would be eliminated.

But no one ever has been able to word a Federal school bill in a manner that meets the objections of those who are bitterly opposed to the Federal Government telling every community in the land how its schools should be operated.

And one doubts if such assurance can ever be given.

The House Education and Labor Committee just recently voted against recommending a Federal school aid bill for passage by Congress.

And when the committee's decision was announced, the group's chairman made this statement:

"It is impossible to draft a general Federal aid to education bill which will not contain a degree of control over local school systems."

A number of Federal aid bills have been drafted in the past year or two since the demand for financial help to the schools became widespread and insistent.

Some have been written by Members of Congress who are opposed to increasing the power of the Washington bureaucracy over the activities of the American people. Therefore, it goes without saying that these did everything in their power to eliminate control features from their proposals.

But still none of the bills submitted to Congress has been able to satisfy the committee, which have examined them closely, that they do not provide means for some Federal bureau to take over control of the schools as soon as the Government starts contributing money to their support.

It is history that wherever there is use of Federal money you have Federal control.

If Federal money helps build a road in Ohio, a Federal bureau says how, when and where the road shall be constructed.

The same principle applies to any other undertaking in which Federal money is involved. You do it the bureaucratic way if you use Federal money, or you lose the Federal help.

That's the way it would be with the schools. If Federal aid is supplied, control of the schools will be transferred from local communities to Washington.

Calumet-Sag Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. BUCKLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to acquaint the House with what I believe to be one of the finest industrial projects ever to be introduced for the development of natural resources, that of the proposed Calumet-Sag waterway. I have backed this, not only for the furthering of trade and industry in Chicago and Illinois, but I have made an intensive study of this project in relation to its benefit to the Nation, and so feel that I am offering a great opportunity to the honored Members of the House of Representatives to work with me for increased appropriations to continue work on the Calumet-Sag project, as vital as part of the Great Lakes and Gulf waterways, noting that, with completion of this project, oceangoing vessels will carry cargo into Calumet Harbor, providing cheaper transportation to that point for millions of tons of freight, from there to be transferred to railroads and motor carriers for inland destination over the vast interior of some of our most productive regions of America.

This appropriation will save Federal money. It will hasten development and improvement for interchange of traffic between lake vessels, river barges, railroad, and motor carriers. Commercial and industrial advancement cannot be underrated should this appropriation be authorized by the Congress. The Calumet-Sag project, when completed, will be one of the most important in the United States. For instance, I have learned that in this district alone, there are more tons of steel produced each year than in the entire country of England. This waterway has been developing rapidly in tonnage of steel, ore, and grain. It is my conviction, when and if it is completed, the tonnage will raise from 2,000,000 to 30,000,000 tons a year. It, in reality, will pay for itself.

It has been approved by Army engineers, labor and material are available. It awaits only the appropriation of the additional funds to complete this great waterway. Gentlemen, at this point, in order that you may be thoroughly informed, I wish to include an address delivered before the businessmen of the Calumet industrial region on February 21, 1950 by Donald O'Toole, vice president, Pullman Trust and Savings Bank, entitled, "The Calumet Industrial Region Today." It is most inclusive and comprehensive, and I hope will open to you the vast possibilities contained within the Calumet-Sag project.

The address follows:

The Calumet industrial region is usually considered to be that concentration of heavy industries lying along the southern end of Lake Michigan from Chicago's south side to Gary. The great leaders in the industries of this area—around whom most of the others have been grouped as suppliers or consumers—have been the huge steel mills of South Chicago and Gary, the great oil refineries of Whiting and East Chicago, the tall grain elevators of the Calumet River, and the enormous railroad industry which shuttles ceaselessly between all of them and rushes the region's wealth of products out to the rest of the world.

This is indeed a vast center of industrial production—too vast certainly for a speaker of my limited comprehension. I'd like to confine that area somewhat to a smaller portion of it with which all of us are somewhat more familiar.

The smaller Calumet industrial area—in which most of us operate as businessmen—may be defined as the group of industries clustered about Lake Calumet and the Calumet River. This area lies between about Seventy-first Street in Chicago on the north, Lake Michigan on the east, and the limits of Cook County on the west and south.

Most of the industries in this smaller Calumet industrial area are—as in the larger Calumet industrial region—related to the big steel mills, oil refineries, grain elevators, and railroads as suppliers or consumers. Most of the people living in this area are employed by these industries.

It behooves us as businessmen to appraise the industries of the Calumet industrial area, for upon their success depends our own profits and our ability to survive as businessmen. Their success—as far as we are concerned—consists entirely of their ability to remain in production and continue to pay wages and salaries. We are not generally owners of these businesses, and we are, therefore, interested in their profits and general financial conditions only as indications of their continuing good business health. Of course, it stands to reason that fine profits and sound financial conditions are almost always evidences of good business prospects, but our analysis of these industries proceeds along this narrower line: Are they going to be able to produce economically, meet all competition for their product, and thus continue to provide employment for the people we serve?

Not long ago a few of us who are keenly interested in this subject chartered an airplane and flew over the area. What we saw was amazing—for businessmen of the area like you and me, it was positively thrilling. I am going to ask you to imagine yourselves in that airplane with me, while I tell you what we saw.

The land below us is flat, as far as the eye can see. No high mountain ranges confine us. No steep hills force railroads and highways through narrow, twisting, and costly passes. Traffic moves freely over our flat lands, and we expand outward at will whenever we need more space. Everywhere you can see new homes, new industries being added to the fringes of the areas already developed.

On literally thousands of transportation routes you see traffic pouring in and out of the area. Railroad trains come in from the West, from the South, and from the East with raw materials, and chug out again, hauling our finished products to the people in other sections of the country; highways, many of them built just within the past 15 years, carry thousands of trucks hauling millions of dollars of raw materials and finished products in and out of the area; freighters bring ore and grain down from the Northwest across the blue waters of Lake Michigan; barges bring grain, building materials, and other products up the Calumet-Sag Channel and haul gasoline and steel and other products back. Unseen pipe lines pour millions of gallons of oil into the Whiting refineries and millions of cubic feet of gas into our furnaces. Railroad trains, barges, and trucks move ceaselessly from plant to plant in the area, hauling products around from one to the other in the complex process of completing our manufactures from raw materials to finished products.

If you had been up in an airplane over this area 20 years ago, you would discover that vast changes have taken place in the past 20 years—changes of which we have been almost unaware and which have served to modernize our vast industrial plant and make it certainly efficient enough to compete with any industrial-producing region. To mention a few we know, Doty Road, the four-lane highway skirting Lake Calumet, built in the middle thirties; the straightening of the Little Calumet River just south of Lake Calumet which has aided barge traffic; the deepening of Lake Calumet at its south end and the construction there of docks and other facilities to handle ocean vessels; new bridges over the river on Torrence Avenue and on One Hundred and Thirtieth Street; widened and speedier highways on One Hundred and Eleventh Street, Torrence Avenue, One Hundred and Thirtieth Street, One Hundred and Third Street, and Stony Island Avenue. In fact, the pattern of highways and waterways and streets that we see in 1950 scarcely resemble at all what was visible in 1930.

And, as you look down upon these arteries so important to the efficiency of the Calumet industrial area, think of the things that are still being done: the Tri-State Highway which will soon be completed from One Hundred and Thirtieth Street south and will provide a wide and flat express route to Detroit; the widening and deepening of the Calumet Sag Channel which will step up the already tremendous shipments now taking place on this waterway—it seems almost unbelievable that the tonnage carried by the Calumet-Sag Channel has grown in 10 years, from 1939 to

1948, from 822,125 to 2,092,773 tons; the construction of the shipyard at the south end of Lake Calumet, and its recent acquisition by Calumet Harbor Terminals, where it is now operating, full-fledged, as a splendid terminal where oceangoing vessels, river barges, railroad freight cars, and trucks all meet and exchange their goods for shipment all over the world. The Calumet Harbor Terminals represents the first actual realization of the dream of the development of Lake Calumet as an industrial harbor, and we are indeed fortunate that its management is in the hands of men who thoroughly understand every modern means of transportation—trucks, railroads, barges, and steamships.

And, as we continue to cruise over the area, look at what has been happening to our industry. New manufacturing centers have developed at Eighty-seventh Street and the Illinois Central tracks, at Ninety-fifth Street and Cottage Grove Avenue, at One Hundred and Thirty-seventh and Indiana, and at countless other points. The vast former Pullman freight car shops at One Hundred and Third Street and Cottage Grove Avenue, idle for many years, are now fully engaged in the production of that most necessary and most modern machine—the Diesel electric locomotive. The new Republic Steel Co. mills in South Chicago is the most modern steel-making plant in the world. Thousands of small industries, operated by especially keen and aggressive men who are determined to keep their products successfully meeting all competition, have come into the area and have given our employment a far broader and more dependable base than the days when we were all dependent upon a handful of large manufacturing plants.

Before returning to the ground, let's see if we can picture the magnificent middle-western country beyond our horizon, in which we hold such a fortunate central position. We can visualize the mountain ranges of northern Michigan from whose mines iron ore is shipped by lake vessels to our hungry steel mills; we can visualize the rich Southern Illinois coal mines whose coal moves so economically over the Illinois waterway and the Calumet-Sag Channel, and over our railroad systems; we can picture the rolling wheat fields of Kansas and of the great Northwest whose corn and wheat are poured into our grain elevators to await shipment to other parts of a hungry world. We can see the stock cars on the railroads drawing corn-fed cattle and hogs from rich farms in Iowa, Illinois, and Wisconsin to be processed in the stockyards just north of the Calumet industrial area.

Yes, it's obvious that we are still the great processing and marketing center for the rich midwestern United States, and it seems also that we have worked successfully to keep our transportation system modern and up-to-date, providing better and better waterways, highways, and railroads so that products can move more swiftly and easily in and out of our great processing factories.

The peculiar position we occupy is that we are close to both sources of raw materials and to the rich, heavily populated markets of the East and the Middle West. Thus, it is the most economical of all systems to ship raw materials here in low-cost bulk transportation units like lake steamships and barges, process them into finished products, and then speed those products on by trains and trucks to the big nearby markets. And, we know, before returning to land, that we must at all times spare no cost in maintaining the transportation system that keeps our area great.

There are two other resources which we have. One is fresh water with Lake Michigan providing a vast and unlimited reservoir for us at all times. Many an industry now located in an area dependent upon wells may very well wish that it had the access to Lake Michigan enjoyed by the industries of the Calumet industrial area.

The other resource is our manpower. This is most important of all because it is within the capacity of our manpower to drag down or make even greater the magnificent situation with which nature and civilization have blessed this great industrial area.

Men must guide this industrial machine. They must operate its individual machines, they must plan its destinies, they must meet its competitors in the markets of the world, and they must work closely with each other to keep the whole machine in operation. What have we done about our manpower?

First, we have provided technical educational facilities. Our industries, ever hungry for skilled mechanics, are assured of a splendid annual supply from the magnificent new Chicago Vocational School and from the other technical high schools of Chicago. We earnestly hope that the Pullman Free School of Manual Training will somehow be able to continue to perform its job in the training of young mechanics. From the nearby great engineering colleges—Illinois Institute of Technology, University of Illinois, Marquette University, Purdue University, and University of Notre Dame—we receive a splendid annual supply of college-trained technicians.

There is ample room for housing all of our working people—laborers, mechanics, technicians, and executives alike. All we need to do when we need more housing is to build further out on our flat plains.

The only thing that can hamper us in achieving and retaining full employment conditions is the inability of men to get along with each other. This is a condition which all of us businessmen in this area must strive constantly to prevent. It would indeed be pathetic if such a great modern industrial plant, constituting our entire Calumet industrial area, should find it impossible to produce for a market hungry for our products, simply because of the inability of its men to settle differences as to working conditions and wages.

What can we do to prevent these work stoppages from overtaking us? Fortunately, we here have not yet been too seriously affected by local strikes, but I suppose the same thing can happen to us that has happened to others if we fail to face the situation fairly.

First, we can seek to know the problems of our factories in their labor relations, and attempt to help them to adjust misunderstandings with their employees. To do this, we must learn more about our industries—just how they operate and how they earn the money with which they pay wages and other operating expenses. Then, when we know the facts, we can take advantage of opportunities to counsel with our own customers who are employees in these plants. In many cases, they look to us, as their businessmen friends, for impartial advice. If we know that demands made by one side or the other are unreasonable, let's not be hesitant about expressing our viewpoints so that we can help to get differences settled quickly. We must be prepared to make real personal sacrifices of our own time in order to keep this industrial machine going.

Secondly, we must understand thoroughly the role of legislation in controlling the relations between labor and management. We must take a keen interest in every bill introduced in our own State legislature and in the National Legislature which will make it more difficult for our factories to operate. It is certain that the more difficult it is for them to operate, the more we lose our competitive advantage in marketing our goods to the rest of the world and the more we have thrown a wrench into the works of the great transportation system we have just viewed from the air.

Fortunately, the employers and labor leaders of our area have been relatively reasonable in dealing with each other. Perhaps it is because we went through our own period of adjusting to unionism before most other sections of this country, and our general labor relations are, therefore, rather mature. Moreover, both our employers and labor leaders have recently taken a considerable interest in our community affairs and have indicated a genuine willingness to have us understand their problems. We should take advantage of every invitation they extend to us to visit their plants and offices and to learn about their problems. It is an old American principle that teamwork solves problems better than individual heads. We always have one very strong interest in looking into their affairs, and that is to see to it that they keep working, and that wages and salaries continue to be paid to the people we serve.

From our experience as a bank, we know that the employers of this area are among the most enlightened, fair-minded, and aggressive in the United States. Their record of accomplishment in the field of industrial production is matched by their record for securing good legislation, good civic improvements, and sound living benefits for their employees. And it is really significant and to the credit of the labor leaders and working people of our community that we have had very few serious strikes that are purely local in character.

I think it may be presumed, therefore, that this vast industrial region, more modern and necessary today than it ever was before, is led by men who are intelligent and inherently resolved to get along with each other. Under such circumstances, I think that the future for many years is a very bright one for the Calumet industrial area.

Addresses of Col. Bradley Dewey and James R. Killian, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, recently two distinguished citizens of my State made outstanding speeches when the 1949 award for chemical engineering achievement was presented to the Celanese Corp. of America. Col. Bradley Dewey, president of the Dewey & Almy Chemical Co., in Cambridge, Mass., and wartime rubber director of the United States, chose to defend bigness in business—particularly in its relations to the national defense. James R. Killian, Jr., president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, spoke of the present-day threats to higher education and particularly the relations these bear to the economic strength and security of our country. Every thinking American ought to have the opportunity of reading these two splendid addresses, which I quote herewith:

SHOW DEFENDING BIGNESS IN BUSINESS; PREACH IT—IT IS THE JOB OF EVERY MAN AND WOMAN IN THE PROCESS INDUSTRIES TO PREACH THE FACTS: IN PEACETIME, BIGNESS HAS A VITAL PLACE IN THE AMERICAN SYSTEM; IN WAR IT IS OUR SALVATION

(By Bradley Dewey)

It was the great companies of America's industry that provided the arms and equipment with which our soldiers, our sailors,

and our stream von World War II. And it is to these same big companies that the United States must turn if she is called upon to defend herself again.

Our big process companies teamed with the Government to furnish the technical brains, the know-how and the sheer power to produce in tremendous volume such industrial miracles as synthetic rubber, high octane aviation gasoline, butanes, magnesium, rocket powders, and the atomic bomb.

Teamwork won the war—and it was primarily big business that furnished the teams. Chemists and physicists—chemical, mechanical, and electrical engineers—production men and skilled workers—all trained by industry and its engineering consultants, made up the elaborate structure of the process industry teams that fought the war behind the lines.

If—and God forbid—we must again defend ourselves, then again we will have to call upon great and strong units of industry to provide us with what we need. Yet today we have the strange sight, the frightening sight, of the defense branches of Government spending billions of dollars for our defense, while other arms of the same Government seek to pull down and destroy our greatest defense asset—the bigness of the companies upon which we must rely in war.

I am not going to defend bigness in industry. I am tired of hearing it defended as though bigness in itself were wicked or immoral or criminal. Far from defending bigness in business, I assert its necessity; its necessity in peace and particularly, its necessity in war.

General Vandenberg, Air Force Chief of Staff, is only one of numerous military men to declare that we cannot hope to match Russia in masses of men, and that we must, therefore, rely upon technical superiority which must come from technically superior industry.

We in the process industries know that technical progress is, as a rule, directly related to size. No process company can grow except by constant effort toward technical superiority; and bigness is the inevitable long-term result of technical improvement and superiority.

Trying to measure bigness in modern day industry is like trying to say how long is a piece of string. The biggest of corporations has competitors aplenty in order to stay strong and healthy and give the rivals constant battle, striving daily to improve its own products and its own methods. Large, medium, and small companies are a necessary part of the American economy. All prosper together.

Should war come tomorrow—and again I say, may God forbid it ever come—there would be available to the Government not only the physical products of our industry's bigness, but there would also be available big industry's teams of scientists, engineers and skilled workers.

America amazed herself, and the world as well, by mass-producing synthetic rubber in World War II. But, as Rubber Director in World War II, I can testify that synthetic rubber in the quantities and of the quality required for the successful conduct of that war, could not have been produced if the rubber companies and the mighty process industries and their construction and engineering affiliates had not provided the teams of chemists, physicists, engineers, production specialists, administrators, and trained workers.

However it may have appeared to some outsider, it was not the Government that developed the processes, built the plants, or turned out the rubber. Government merely supervised, steered, advised. Men of the rubber, chemical, and petroleum industries and their construction associates and engineering consultants—they are the men who did the job.

It was the technical prowess of these companies, so competitive in time of peace but pooled in time of war, which gave to the Nation the technical superiority it had to have to produce rubber after our enemies cut us off from our supplies of the natural product.

This, I submit, is the fruit of bigness—the bigness General Vandenberg and the other military leaders have in mind when they say our success in war will rest on technical superiority. Dr. Vannevar Bush points this up very succinctly in two sentences of his great new book, Modern Arms and Free Men, when he says, "Modern science has utterly changed the nature of war and is still changing it. * * * The combination of science, engineering, industry, and organization during the last decade created a new framework that rendered conventional military practice obsolete."

How quickly we can lose technical superiority if we permit misguided zealots to whittle down industry or to stunt wholesome, healthy growth to bigness. It is up to all to encourage bigness as long as it obeys the laws that govern us all. How can we hope to maintain modern science, upon which technical superiority is based, unless we give engineers and technologists elbow room in time of peace to team with our scientists and continue to build to the unlimited horizons of our democratic country?

If there was any one lesson more outstanding than another learned in the last war it was the absolute dependence of the armed forces upon the teams of industry and business for the development of new arms and weapons.

Among these teams were the ones who in prewar peacetimes had been able to work on problems which then had little hope of being used for a decade ahead. Among them were ones who sent teams of investigators to Germany to bring back the techniques which let us more quickly make butadiene and styrene for synthetic rubber. Among them are those who can afford to work on ideas and to pay for dreaming for the future.

The cry which we now hear that bigness in business is bad is a false cry and a dangerous one. It is as false to say that all big things are bad as it is to say that all little things are good. We have laws against big and little sinners and we should employ them against the big as well as the little in business. But in bigness itself there is no sin.

Now let me talk for a minute about a giant of industry. This one is so great that the Government turned to it to handle its top secret wartime atomic project construction and operation at Hanford, Wash. I refer, of course, to the du Pont Co. Today the same Government which disbursed more than $1,000,000,000 through du Pont during the war is attacking du Pont on the ground that it is too big. Yet it was the bigness of du Pont which led the Government to its door in time of national peril. The fact is that du Pont paid out to other companies 86 percent of all the money the Government paid to it and that although du Pont had the lion's share of the vast responsibility imposed by the Government, it shared profits with thousands of subcontractors, big and little. And after all operating costs were paid, wages and salaries eating up 44 percent, the du Pont Co. had left as its own profit to stockholders, after taxes, about one-fifteenth of a cent of dollar cost.

I did not single out the du Pont Co. for special mention. The Government did that. The Government which leaned so hard upon the du Pont Co. for help in the war now singles it out as being wicked because it is big. And if this attack were successful, misguided and misinformed zealots might single out other companies and blast them for the crime of bigness. But let us look at other companies.

What company except a big company like Monsanto could have replaced the Texas City styrene plant and its 34 top administrative, supervisory, and technical men in less than a year after an explosion had wreaked its havoc? Could any company less than the size of Monsanto have carried on five separate vital, large, wartime projects?

Consider Union Carbide and Carbon's power when it brought to the war effort the experience and abilities of more than 3,000 technically trained people—1,400 of whom were engineers and technicians working in 23 research laboratories spread through 185 plants. Carbide and Carbon made the butadiene from alcohol that was so vitally needed at the start of the rubber program. When we had to build the enormous butadiene plants (and reactions had to be piloted even while the plants were still under construction), where could we have turned except to the big oil companies like Standard of New Jersey, Humble, Standard of California, Gulf, Texas, Shell, Sun, Socony-Vacuum, Cities Service, Phillips, Pure Oil, Sinclair, Standard of Indiana, Imperial Oil, and Atlantic.

Only a great chemical company could do what Dow did when it not only supervised the construction but staffed the enormous styrene plants at Velasco, Los Angeles, and Sarnia, and, remember, it did this while designing and building the facilities for a giant magnesium program. Only a great company could have contributed the hundreds of top-flight executives, supervisors, engineers, and designers for such a prodigious undertaking.

Who but the great rubber companies could have taken on not only the polymerization of synthetic rubber, but at the same time largely redesigned tires and the machinery, processes, and factories necessary to fabricate new materials into tires to win the war?

Earlier I spoke of misguided and misinformed zealots because I believe that many of those who attack business because of its size have no idea what constitutes size or how modern business really operates. I think they honestly do not know that big and little business could not exist in our great democratic economy without each other any more than labor and capital or farmer and merchant could exist only for themselves and by themselves.

As a rather small-business man, I am well aware that my company could not exist if it did not have big as well as small customers to which to sell its products. As one who buys from, sells to, and competes with businesses as big as his own and also much bigger, I think I am in a position to understand how big and little businesses are dependent upon each other and how necessary both are to the American way of life.

But there is one more thing I have to say. How can misguided critics learn the truths about our process industries unless we who are in the industry tell these facts? How can the American public, upon whose passions and emotions misguided zealots are now playing with their incessant criticism of size in business, learn the facts unless we who know the facts talk about them?

It is the job of every man and woman connected with the process industries to marshal the facts and to preach the facts. Let us cease mere passive defense of bigness and let us start preaching aggressively the necessity of bigness for the salvation of the Nation in time of war.

We all know that only big companies can mass produce such products as automobiles and that only mass production can bring the automobile price within the range of most American incomes. But too many of our fellow citizens do not know that national defense in the future will depend almost entirely upon the quick mobilization of industrial teams and their integration into war teams. Bigness is a vital national asset in war and we can no more risk limiting this

bigness than we can risk giving the secrets of atom bomb construction or the blueprints of our newest guided missile to potential enemies.

We honor the Celanese Corp. of America tonight because it successfully risked millions of venture capital on research. Only a big company could do this. Let us now do what we can to put an end to loose and reckless talk of the badness of bigness. Let us make clear to all that in peace and in war bigness has a vital place in the American system. It insures our future. If we make our story heard by the American people, I for one have no fear of the outcome. The American people are not deaf to an appeal to reason as powerful as this appeal we make for our preservation as a nation.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND THE UNIVERSITY—A MISSION IN PERIL

(By James R. Killian, Jr.)

THE UNIVERSITY HAS A TWOFOLD MISSION: STRENGTHEN OUR MORAL FIBER, STRENGTHEN OUR ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

In these parlous times of cold war and hot issues, what are the special responsibilities of our universities in serving our national security?

When considering the relationship of education to national welfare we must first separate out certain basic elements of our national strength. Most basic of all the fiber of our people—their spirit, their moral integrity, their maturity, and their capacity to govern themselves. We must have the kind of education which engenders and strengthens these qualities. Our colleges must give our students, who are tomorrow's leaders, an understanding of our American heritage and of the sacredness of individual liberty in a free society. They must help to create this common bond of our democracy. As President Sproul of the University of California recently said, "How necessary it is that the universities of America should constitute an affirmative force—the chief advocates of our traditions, our institutions, our way of life—that they should not only inquire fearlessly into the defects of our system, but also highlight and extol its advantages and aggressively clarify and strengthen the ideas upon which it rests." I submit that this function of our universities is vital to our national welfare.

Our universities must also do more than they are now doing to aid our young people to grow in moral and spiritual stature. Our people not only must be literate; they must harness literacy to ideals and to a sense of the first rate. Whitehead once said that, "Moral education is impossible without the habitual vision of greatness." Better than any other agencies, our colleges can provide this vision of greatness. In a democracy it is vital that they do so.

Universities, if they are to serve our free society, must not only train men who can do the complex specialized work of society; they must also cultivate in these men a reverence for the dignity of the individual. Someone has said that democracy is most effective when it tries to make all of its citizens aristocrats. It might also be said that education for the protection of democracy is most effective when it strengthens the aristocratic virtues of personal dignity, self-reliance, and self-understanding. Men with these qualifications are more likely to resist all forms of statism and Stalinist communism that regiment and depreciate the individual and therefore weaken democracy.

Next to the fiber of the people as a component of national strength stands the health and wealth of our people. A healthy people, a prosperous economy, and ample natural resources are three of our main defensive lines, and all three of these now depend upon the endless frontier of basic science. Our universities must educate the men and conduct the research to keep this frontier endless.

In our dynamic economy we must constantly create more jobs for more people. We must steadily increase our output per man-hour, if we are to have better and cheaper consumer goods along with higher wages. To do these things requires a steady increase in our fundamental knowledge of nature. Research must also provide us with replacements and substitutes for depleted natural resources. In fact one of the major tasks of science in the universities and in industry in the years ahead will be the conservation of natural resources and the replacement of scarce materials by equally good or better substitutes. As the wellsprings of basic science, our universities are vital factors in meeting all of these requirements for a prosperous economy. They are also essential for educating men for the refinement and management of our industrial machine. The record seems to be clear that engineers have demonstrated an extraordinary capacity to manage great enterprises. I believe that in part this reflects the kind of training they have had, and that it points up the opportunities in our universities to train men still more effectively for management responsibilities. If we are to do this, we must educate men of professional competence who have a cultural reach beyond the techniques of their profession.

Let me mention one reason why a broader education is of practical importance to industry. Industry more and more is looking to technological schools for potential leaders, for the men who must be the managers, the industrial leaders of tomorrow. Graduates of engineering schools often enter industry through a specialized technical channel, with the result that only those few individuals with superior natural endowments rise to top-level posts in management. Industry, because of sound organizational requirements, must insist on specialization among its young scientists and engineers, and is therefore handicapped in increasing the quantity of potential leaders at a time when they are at an impressionable age. When technical education is too narrow, it tends to restrict the supply and development of leaders. By further broadening their teaching programs, our engineering schools have an opportunity to contribute to the solution of this problem, so essential to the management of our highly technical private enterprise system.

BUT IT FACES A TRIPLE THREAT: DEVELOPMENT AT THE EXPENSE OF RESEARCH, SECRECY, DEPOPULATION

As our educational institutions strive to nurture these elements of our national strength, they encounter today certain hazards which are inherent in the cold war.

Today, for example, we are under constant temptation to divert scientists and engineers in our colleges away from fundamental research by bending their interest too much toward development. If allowed to happen on a large scale, this could dry up the wellspring of new knowledge with ultimate disaster to our national security. Not even the knowledge that an atomic explosion has occurred in Russia can justify our weakening basic research by the diversion of undue numbers of our first-team scientists to development work or to crash programs. I believe that the national defense establishment can continue to work on the development of new weapons essential to our defense without aborting our basic research and educational programs by shifting the emphasis from long-term research to short-term objectives. If ever we are forced or deluded into such a program in peacetime, then we have cut the taproot of our future security and our industrial advance.

A second hazard to our universities resides in the imposition of restrictions on the free exchange and communication of information. Only under very special and urgent circumstances should secret work be brought into our universities. It is incompatible with the basic concept of an educational institution as a source and distributor of knowledge.

Both within and without our universities I believe that scientific advances are being retarded today by too much secrecy. In the public mind secrecy is mistakenly considered synonymous with security; actually secrecy and scientific progress are mutually inimical. I am not one of those who believe we should have no secrets—that is obviously absurd in a period of cold war. I do believe that we can achieve a better balance between secrecy and free exchange of information for the purpose of accelerating our scientific advance. If there were fewer secrets in our atomic-energy program, for example, we could forge ahead more rapidly in atomic physics. There would be more cross-fertilization, more mutual stimulation of active minds.

"It would be better," as Dr. Karl T. Compton recently pointed out, "to take the calculated risk of allowing some confidential information to get out of our hands, if such a policy would enable us to advance our own science and art at a more rapid rate which a competitor cannot hope to equal, than it would be to impose by regulation or public opinion a condition which seriously handicaps progress by rendering employment in these pursuits definitely unattractive to top-flight scientists and engineers."

A third hazard to universities as components of our national defense is their impoverishment. Prof. Seymour Harris recently pointed out that in 1933 our colleges and universities spent 1 percent of our national income. By 1949 this had fallen to less than one-half of 1 percent. Over this same period the enrollment of our universities had doubled. The situation is even worse if we examine the private institutions which are the pace setters of our educational system. Their share of the national income has suffered a greater reduction than the system as a whole. Implicit in this declining support of our privately endowed institutions is the danger of their losing their private status by being forced to accept Government subsidy and control. I suggest that this would be a major calamity. If the private universities come under Federal control, then one of the bulwarks of free enterprise will have been destroyed. The solution, I believe, lies in diversified support for these institutions, with industry, foundations, and Government joining together, and all recognizing the vital importance of these institutions remaining free of any kind of control. I submit, however, that we must adequately finance all of our universities, whatever the source of funds, if our system of higher education is to continue adequately to serve our democracy. Our universities, if they are strong and powerful, are a striking force that can be thrown into immediate action if needed, as was demonstrated in the last war. We must be sure to have in these institutions this kind of reserve strength.

Such are some of the responsibilities, obligations, and problems of education in this critical period. I believe that the symbiotic relationships between industry and education must be further strengthened if our educational institutions are to remain strong. I believe that industry has a responsibility to see that they do. I believe that our free institutions can continue as potent pillars of our national strength, if they are not diverted from their primary responsibilities, and if we can circumvent the hazards of these parlous times.

Article From Wall Street Journal of February 9, 1950, Answering Fallacious Attack on Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of February 9, 1950:

BONDS IN UNITED STATES PENSION RESERVE—THE STALE FALLACY THAT THE TRUST FUND IS A FICTION SELL, CROPS UP DESPITE AUTHORITATIVE REPUTATION

(By A. F. Kersnowski)

Letters to this newspaper from subscribers, among other things, show that misunderstanding of the reserve fund of the old-age and survivors' insurance of the Social Security Act is still widespread. Many persons still believe what some insurance company officials asserted in the middle 1930's, that the accumulation of a pension-reserve fund invested in United States bonds was purposeless, that the reserve was a fiction and that it could actually result in the cost of pensions being paid twice over. Those insurance-company men have long since realized their error; a sort of vindication came in 1946 from a committee representing the three principal associations of life companies. The committee said, in part:

"The first step in understanding this problem is to agree that pay-roll taxes are collected so that workers may currently make a contribution to the support of the OASI system from which they hope later to benefit. The money might conceivably be held in the form of cash to be used when needed. However, the Government does not currently borrow large sums, and will later need large amounts for refinancing at least some of its rapidly maturing obligations. It is reasonable for the OASI system, if it has funds available, to take advantage of this opportunity to earn interest on its money by purchasing Government bonds.

"Furthermore the apparent double taxation does not involve an undesirable burden if it can be assumed that the excess of income over outgo is used by the Government for some essential purpose and does not by its existence and availability stimulate unnecessary expenditures. The purchasing of bonds by the OASI system means that, later on, when it needs money in excess of pay-roll receipts in order to pay benefits, the interest on the bonds (raised, of course, by general taxation) will be available to meet the additional benefit load. However, if the bonds had not been bought by the system but were in the hands of the public, then not only would the interest on the bonds have to be raised by general taxation but additional general taxes would have to be levied to cover the deficit in OASI operations. Current pay-roll taxation to create a reserve fund, therefore, makes possible the use of interest which the Government has to raise by taxation anyway for a purpose which would otherwise require further general taxation on its own account."

SAME THING IN COMMON TERMS

This heavy language is not much easier to understand than the erudite chatter of an insurance agent trying to write another policy. A report from the Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Committee on Finance, rendered in April of 1948, stated its like conclusions in clearer terms. This council was composed of 17 businessmen, economics professors, labor-union representatives, insurance-company executives, and scientists. Its report said, in part:

"We do not agree with those who criticize this form of investment of the OASI reserve in Government bonds on the ground that the Government spends for general purposes the money received from the sale of securities to that fund. Actually such investment is as reasonable and proper as is the investment by life-insurance companies of their own reserve funds in Government securities. * * *

"The investment of the old-age and survivors insurance funds in Government securities does not mean that people have been or will be taxed twice for the same benefits, as has been charged. The following example illustrates this point: Suppose some year in the future the out-go under the old-age and survivors insurance system should exceed pay-roll tax receipts by $100,000,000. If there were then $5,000,000,000 of United States 2-percent bonds in the trust fund, they would produce interest amounting to $100,000,000 a year. This interest would, of course, have to be raised by taxation. But suppose there were no bonds in the trust fund. In that event, $100,000,000 to cover the deficit in the old-age and survivors insurance system would have to be raised by taxation; and, in addition, another $100,000,000 would have to be raised by taxation to pay interest on $5,000,000,000 of Government bonds owned by somebody else."

GOVERNMENT'S "USE" OF PENSION REVENUE

Some correspondents of this newspaper stumble over the Government's "use" of its borrowings from the OSAI, reserve for general purposes, which they fail to distinguish from the alleged but nonexistent "use" for such purposes of the age-pension pay-roll tax revenue. The distinction is supremely important. Without it, the Government would be merely appropriating such revenue without compensation to those for whose present or ultimate benefit the revenue is collected. But the Government makes the distinction, and makes it effectively, by issuing Treasury obligations for the moneys it borrows from the reserve.

Lately, the Brookings Institution of Washington has published a work entitled "The Cost of Financing of Social Security," which, along with a considerable amount of useful information about other sections of the Social Security Act, unfortunately repeats the now stale errors about the alleged illusion of an OASI trust fund. Its several authors—for whose conclusions a foreword disclaims the institution's responsibility—make on page 155 the following weirdly unfortie statement:

"The OASI trust fund is invested in Federal Government securities. Since the money is used by the Government in meeting its regular expenditure requirements, no real reserve is created. The obligations of the Government (liabilities) deposited in a trust account do not represent assets; they merely record future obligations which can be fulfilled only through the levy of future taxes upon the economy in general. The trust fund is thus a fiction—serving only to confuse."

Here the authors make one or both of two assertions. One is that the Government bonds in the OASI fund are different from all other parts of the national debt in having no value as assets. The other is that all the Government's obligations are worthless. If the second reading were correct, the first would, of course, follow.

DEBT IS ALL GOOD OR ALL BAD

Now it is impossible to divide the national debt into two categories on any such (or any other) basis of distinction. If any segregation of the debt were imaginable, the bonds in the OASI reserve would have to be assigned a superior rating as assets. They are the property of many millions of citizens, most of whom have little or nothing else to protect them from destitution in the feebleness of their old age. If this portion of the debt has no existence as assets in the ownership of OASI beneficiaries, the remainder of a debt which the daily Treasury statement says is now more than $252,000,000,000, doesn't exist either.

The authors do not support their assertion that the Government bonds in the pension reserve have less value than fresh toilet paper. Their statement that the investment of funds in Government bonds is not procreative in character is true but has nothing to do with the asset value of the bonds in the pension reserve. Their value, like that of all Government issues, is assured by the power of the issuer to assess all the trade and industry of the country (including the procreative investments of the life companies and others) for whatever it takes to pay the issuer's obligations. The issuer, of course, will do that, without regard for their ownership in or outside of the reserve fund.

There is much that is open to criticism in OASI and the changes therein proposed by pending bills. But it is impossible to assert rationally that part of the national debt is rubbish and the rest is prime investment.

Broadcast by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, to People of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by me over Pennsylvania radio stations on the week end of March 17 to 19, inclusive. This is No. 22 in a biweekly series of broadcasts.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF TRANSCRIPTION BY HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, OVER PENNSYLVANIA RADIO STATIONS, WEEK END OF MARCH 17–19, INCLUSIVE

(No. 22 in biweekly series)

Thoughts of springtime usually bring to mind things that carry us out of doors—perhaps working around the yard, or making plans for long drives on Sundays, or any of a great many other pleasant activities. The world in springtime is commonly regarded as a pretty nice place—and where most people have spring fever most of the time.

That's the picture, at least, that our poets and song writers and story tellers usually paint for us. But when our spring fever isn't too bad most of us realize that we have just about as many serious things to do this time of year as any other. There's still a living to be earned. There's still a family to be fed.

And for the housewife, in addition to her regular duties, there's generally the semi-annual job of turning the house upside down to air it and get things back in order.

Springtime often brings with it as well the first distant rumbles of the coming election campaigns. Now, perhaps, it's because of spring fever—or something—but for some reason not many people seem to hear these early political murmurs, and in all frankness this does bother me.

I'm bothered about this because, under our representative, democratic form of government, these beginning political activities are perhaps the most important of all in determining the kind of people we ultimately get to represent us in every level of government.

I'm speaking here of the events leading up to the primary elections where the voters of each party go to the polls to select—from a list of candidates—the particular candidate whose name will appear on the party ballot for each office at the time of the general elections in November. And I think it goes without saying that the interests of good government demand that each party have the best possible candidates on its slate.

Now, it may surprise some of you, but as a matter of fact, the primary election is something that wasn't even contemplated by our founding fathers when they drew up our Constitution, and for the first 60 or 70 years that the American Republic existed we got along on a single general election in any particular campaign.

About a hundred years ago machine politics developed to the point that the average voter was being pretty badly abused. It happened in this way: As you know, we've always had basically a two-party system in this country, but by the 1850's political machines in many parts of the country were so completely in control of both parties that voters on election day frequently found themselves confronted with no real choice between the candidates of the two parties. All too often the candidates on both tickets were merely corrupt and incompetent tools of the respective political organizations.

This is why the primary was born. It was felt that the voters rightfully had something to say about the selection of the candidates themselves on each party slate, thereby making it possible to overthrow the political hacks and putting in their places party candidates of integrity and ability. Pennsylvania was among the earliest States to adopt a primary election law.

Now, the way the primary worked was this: Any person who wished to be considered as a candidate on a particular ticket could get his name on the primary ballot as a Democrat or a Republican by having a group of eligible voters sign a nominating petition on his behalf, and usually it was necessary to post a nominal fee at the time the petition was filed.

The purpose of the nominating petitions was primarily to keep the ballots from becoming overburdened with a hopeless number of names of people who stood no chance of capturing a significant portion of the vote, and thus, by requiring a reasonable number of signatures on the nominating petitions, those who were without any support were discouraged from seeking the party nomination.

The earliest primary laws—for all their good intentions—had some pretty serious faults that weren't contemplated by those who proposed them. I won't go into these troubles in any detail except to explain briefly how it came about that you now must register as a Democrat in order to vote in a Democratic primary, and as a Republican to be entitled to participate in a Republican primary. There were no such requirements in the first primary laws.

Thus, it frequently happened that one party would raid the primary of the opposition party by turning out its organization to vote for the weakest candidate on the opposing primary ballot. These raids by one party upon the other usually resulted in an easy victory for the raiding party because such a weak opponent had been selected for the opponent's slate. It was to do away with party raiding that the primary laws were later changed to limit participation in primaries to voters who were registered as members of a particular party.

So much for history.

Primary elections will be held in Pennsylvania this year on May 16. At this time registered Republican voters will determine their choice of candidates for some two-hundred and seventy-odd State and Federal elective offices, and so will the registered Democrats. It is frequently true that there are instances on party primary ballots where, for a given office, a particular candidate may be without opposition. This was so in my own case in 1944 when I was unopposed in the Democratic primary as the candidate for the United States Senate.

I wish to make it clear, however, that the mere fact that one or more candidates on a primary ballot are unopposed in no way lessens the need to have registered voters of each political party participate in the primary elections to select the slate. There will be on the Republican and Democratic ballots alike this year office after office for which there will be strongly competing candidates, and, as I've said, it is certainly necessary in the interest of good government for the voters of each party to exercise the greatest care in the selection of the candidates they wish to represent them on their party's ballot.

I want to list for you—in outline form, at least—the various elective offices for which the people of Pennsylvania will select party candidates in the May 16 primaries. It will be necessary to select a party candidate for United States Senator, for 33 United States Congressional Representatives, for governor, lieutenant governor, State secretary of internal affairs, judges of the supreme and superior courts of Pennsylvania, 25 State senators, and 208 State representatives for the State general assembly. These, as I say, are for State and Federal elective offices only. In addition to this, selection of candidates must be made by both parties for various county and local political committees which must be filled in the coming fall elections.

Now, actually, the task of any particular voter isn't as complicated as I have made it appear. A primary voter doesn't select all 33 candidates for the United States House of Representatives; instead, he selects only the candidate from the congressional district in which he votes. This is also true insofar as the selection of the 25 State senators and the 208 State representatives, where, again, the individual voter selects only one candidate each for his particular district for the offices of State senator and State representative.

On the other hand, everyone who votes in the Republican or Democratic primary elections on May 16 will have to decide upon his choice of the party candidate for United States Senator, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of internal affairs, and the judges for the supreme and superior courts of Pennsylvania.

It is not yet clear how many candidates will be listed on each party ballot for these various offices in the coming primary, because it will be possible to file nominating petitions until March 27.

There is the background of the coming primary elections. Now I have a question for you to ask yourself. Are you registered to vote in the May 16 primaries?

If you aren't registered at all, here are the qualifications you must meet: You must be over 21 years of age by the day following the election in which you wish to vote. You must have been a United States citizen for at least 1 month. You must have resided in Pennsylvania for at least a year preceding the election—unless, of course, you previously resided in Pennsylvania for more than a year, then moved away and came back—and if this is the case, you must have resided in Pennsylvania for at least 6 months prior to the election after reestablishing your residence here. In addition, you must have resided in the precinct or election district in which you intend to vote for at least 2 months prior to the election. Finally—and this is essential if you haven't already registered to vote—you must register by March 26 if you otherwise meet the qualifications and intend to vote in the May 16 primaries.

Now, I am sure most of you are familiar with the fact that our voting registration in Pennsylvania is permanent—but in order to stay permanently registered, you must have voted at least once during the 2-year period preceding an election. So if you haven't voted in the past 2 years—even though you have been registered previously, you will have to register again in order to vote in the May 16 primary or in the general election next November 7.

Of course, if you're registered as a nonpartisan voter, you aren't entitled to vote in the party primary elections—and thus your participation is limited to the November general elections.

I do want to suggest to you, however, that you can change your registration if you haven't already changed your registration since the last general election. Thus, if you've previously registered as nonpartisan, you still have time to change over to a partisan registration and vote in the coming primaries. If you live in one of our cities of the first class, you have until March 25 to change your registration—or you have until March 27 if you live elsewhere than in a city of the first class.

Of course, as all of you know, your party registration—while it does affect the way you can participate in a primary—has no effect when you vote in the November general elections. Thus, a nonpartisan voter may cast his ballot in favor of either party, and a partisan voter may, if he wishes, cast his vote for candidates of the other party in the general election itself—though he is not eligible to do so in the primary.

I wish to say a bit now about the voting turn-out in Pennsylvania in recent years. The first great truth is the fact that people tend to neglect the primary elections pretty badly—there being a far smaller primary turn-out than occurs in the general elections. And this is especially true in the primaries for local candidates. Let me illustrate this by pointing out that less than one-third of the registered voters participated in Pennsylvania primaries in 1948—whereas two-thirds of the registered voters participated in the general elections * * * or in other words, twice as many voters turned out for the general elections in that year than voted in the primaries.

Another great truth is the fact that a far larger percentage of the registered voting population participates in presidential years than turn out in the off-year elections when the voting is for congressional and State offices. As I've already said, two-thirds of the registered voters engaged in the 1948 off-year elections, as compared to almost four-fifths of the registered voters who showed up for the presidential election of 1948.

There is one further truth to be found in the fact that not nearly all of our people eligible to vote are actually registered to

do so. For example, in 1948 there were over 7,000,000 Pennsylvanians old enough to vote—though it is true that some of these seven million were not yet American citizens, or were otherwise disqualified because they had not resided in Pennsylvania a sufficient length of time. The important point is, however, that only 4,750,000 Pennsylvanians out of that seven million were registered to vote in 1948.

Good government is everybody's business—and the extent to which our Government is good or bad reflects directly the degree to which our people show an interest in it, informs themselves on issues and candidates, and when the chips go down, engage in that most important duty of citizenship—the privilege of voting.

I am, indeed, gratified that voting registration in Pennsylvania increased by almost 250,000 in 1949 over the previous year. I believe this is a very healthy sign, and I want to encourage this sort of thing in every way.

So if you're not registered to vote—but otherwise eligible to do so, I can't urge you too strongly to get your name on the voting register by March 26 to participate in the May 16 primaries—or by September 16 to vote in the general election November 7.

Salary and Privileges of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for some time now there has been in progress a deliberate effort on the part of the Republican Party to set itself up as the great champion of economy and to portray the Democrats in the contrasting light of extravagance.

In line with this political-campaign propaganda, my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] recently presented a survey, carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13, under the title "Salary and Privileges of the President."

He began this presentation with the remark:

Mr. Speaker, a survey into the resources and privileges of President Truman discloses that in addition to being one of the best, if not the best-paid man in the world today, he also enjoys services undreamed of by his predecessors.

And the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] concluded with this statement:

Mr. Speaker, everyone should agree that economy in every walk of life is a most admirable thing. In these days of wild-eyed and reckless public spending for almost every conceivable thing, good or bad, it is my opinion that those in high office should be the first to set an example for the people throughout the country. The above facts disclose beyond peradventure that economy has become a lost art in the highest office of the land.

Then the gentleman from Michigan proceeded to add all of the expenses of the President, as head of the State, into what the Congressman was pleased to call the President's real salary.

Such items as the cost of carrying on the State functions of the office of the President were included, the cost of Secret Service protection, the cost of maintaining and building destroyers and plane and such like items.

The tortuous statistical method used to gain the distinguished Representative's point is like adding the pro rata cost of operating the Congress onto his own salary to indicate that the real salary of the Congressman from Michigan is not $12,500 plus a tax-free expense allowance but in the nature of $100,000 or $150,000, per year.

For political purposes the distinguished Republican Member from Michigan has made his figures very plausible.

The Republicans in their self-appointed role of guardians of the public purse acted as prosecutor, judge, and jury of President Truman's expense account—and their verdict was "guilty."

But whom did they convict? Not President Truman; not the Democratic Party.

The ironic facts are that the legislation increasing the salary and the emoluments of the President was Republican in origin, was first studied and proposed in the Republican Eightieth Congress, and that an overwhelming majority of Republicans in the Eighty-first Congress voted for it.

Under the circumstances, therefore, our Republican colleagues will understand when I say that we, on this side of the aisle, in common with the public at large, regard to our colleague's fulminations on economy—at least in this instance, with a certain amount of skepticism. We can even go further and with complete safety in view of the facts of the case, and label this attack upon the President for what it really is: A completely unjustified and unwarranted political campaign libel based upon misrepresentation by omission.

In his statement—obligingly released to the press on the morning before its insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the gentleman from Michigan first of all omitted the fact that the subject was first brought under study in July 1947 by a subcommittee of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

You will recall that at that time the Republicans were in the majority in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. You will recall also that Republican hopes were then high for the election of a Republican President the following year and, presumably, it was for the purpose of making the office of President more lucrative for the expected Republican incumbent rather than for President Truman.

At any rate, the result of the study by the Senate subcommittee on the whole subject of top-bracket salaries in the Government resulted in the introduction of a bill, S. 1537, by Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, of Vermont, who was chairman of the subcommittee. This bill was reported favorably in the Senate on April 1, 1948, but title III, the portion dealing with top-bracket salaries, was subsequently stricken from the bill.

However, the report on S. 103, which did become law in this Congress—and of which our colleague now, a year later belatedly complains—adopted the Flanders subcommittee report in toto explaining that, with certain minor exceptions, "the bill, as reported, is identical with the bill recommended by the subcommittee." The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] did not tell you that—another grave omission of fact.

Neither did Mr. WOODRUFF recall to this House that former President Herbert Hoover—a former Republican President—testified before the subcommittee of the Eightieth Congress on December 14, 1948, in favor of increasing the allowances to the President.

At that time Mr. Hoover, who testified along with other members of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, of which he was chairman, said:

> I should think the American people would be perfectly willing, and perfectly willing and glad, to see the Government give board and lodging to the President. He does not get it now for he must pay his own board and that of numerous other people. He gets his lodging free, but even there he has to pay part of the upkeep cost. * * *
>
> He must receive a great many guests that he cannot charge to his allowance account, and so forth. We want the White House to be the leading and gracious home of the Nation. At least, I feel the American people would want that to be.

In his improper castigation of President Truman for accepting additional compensation which he himself did not seek but which was freely given by this Congress, the gentleman also omitted to remind you that this legislation was approved in the Senate January 13, 1949, by a vote of 66 to 9.

Almost three times as many Republicans voted for this measure as opposed it. The Republican vote was 26 ayes and 9 nays.

In the House this bill did not even come to a roll-call vote. It was passed January 17, 1949, under suspension of rules agreed to by voice vote of more than two-thirds of the membership.

In the face of such virtual unanimity on the part of this Congress in enacting a law giving the President the additional compensation he now receives, there seems to be no other explanation for the gentleman's recent diatribe on the subject than a desire to spread political propaganda.

Certainly the record of the House debate on the legislation at the time of its passage fails to disclose that the gentleman had any interest in the matter at all then. He did not even comment. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is bare of any utterance from him.

And finally, what other purpose than partisan politics could such a statement by the gentleman from Michigan serve? He does not ask that the Congress reverse its action. He does not propose reduction of the President's compensation to its former figure. He has not introduced any legislation to change the situation of which he complains.

I believe the public will rightfully mark down his present agitation of the subject—and similar transparent protestations to be expected the closer we get to election day—for what it is, pure a campaign utterance, completely unsupported by the facts.

Loyalty in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter to the editor of the New York Times, published in the March 27 issue of that newspaper. Written by Henry L. Stimson, who has served his country both as Secretary of State and Secretary of War, this letter reaches to the heart of the current so-called loyalty investigation in the Senate and presents a very clear exposition of the dangers involved by unfounded accusations against those in public service, both to the persons who are unjustly accused and besmirched and to the Nation as a whole because our foreign policy is dangerously impeded.

I congratulate Mr. Stimson on his masterful presentation of this difficult subject and present his letter in full for the benefit of those of my colleagues who may not have read it. I wish to add that I fully subscribe to the contents of the letter, which is entitled "Loyalty in Washington":

LOYALTY IN WASHINGTON—METHODS AND MOTIVES OF ATTACK ON STATE DEPARTMENT QUESTIONED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The present charges against the Department of State have not in my view deserved much attention. But the very widespread notice they have received prompts me to make certain comments.

First, this is most emphatically not the proper way in which to insure loyalty of Government employees. If that had been the real purpose of the accuser, he would have used the fully developed and tested procedure of the executive branch of the Government, under which charges are investigated and weighed by men of both parties and unimpeachable integrity. Any constructive result which may eventuate from the present charges would have been achieved far more surely and effectively by use of the existing procedures. The fact that the accuser has wholly ignored this well-established method indicates that his interest is of a different character.

Second, no matter what else may occur, the present charges have already spattered mud upon individuals of the highest integrity, and in the present state of the world the denial cannot always overtake the accusation. It should by now be wholly clear that indiscriminate accusations of this sort are doubly offensive; they damage the innocent, and they help protect the guilty. For if the accuser is so stupid as to connect a man like Ambassador Jessup with communism, are not all such accusations made suspect?

REACTION ABROAD

Third, and more important by far, the method of the present charges directly and dangerously impedes the conduct of the foreign affairs of our Government. It creates abroad a feeling that we are frightened and suspicious of each other; it diverts our attention, at home, from the genuine and pressing problems of our foreign affairs; it requires of many high officials that they desert their proper duties in order to prepare and deliver such extensive replies as that of Mr. Jessup. Not one of these effects would have resulted from a disinterested study of the loyalty of any suspected State Department employee; each of them is the direct result of the manner in which these charges have been made.

Fourth, it seems to me quite clear that the real motive of the accuser in this case is to cast discredit upon the Secretary of State of the United States. This man is not trying to get rid of known Communists in the State Department; he is hoping against hope that he will find some. Fortunately, the Secretary of State needs no defense from me. No one who knows his extraordinary record of able and disinterested public service can believe that he is in any danger from these little men. It is already obvious that in any test of personal confidence the men of honor, in both parties, will choose to stand with the Secretary.

But there is more at stake in this matter than the rise or fall of individuals. What is at stake is the effective conduct of our foreign policy.

RESPONSIBILITY OF OFFICE

Every Secretary of State, second only to his President, and alone among appointive officers of the Government, stands before the world as the representative of the United States of America. No man who holds this office can fail to feel the extraordinary responsibility he carries for service to the country and its peace. No man has a greater right to ask the sympathetic support and the cooperation of his fellow citizens, and none is more properly exempt from the ordinary trials of politics. The man who seeks to gain political advantage from personal attack on a Secretary of State is a man who seeks political advantage from damage to his country.

The American Government, led by the President and the Secretary of State, is currently engaged in a major effort to give leadership to the country in a time of changing international conditions and grave world tension. This effort will require as part of our democratic process widespread and earnest public consideration of the great problems now before us, so that the ultimate decision will surely reflect the basic steadiness and faith of our people. In such public consideration there is always room for honest differences, but now, as for many years past, the formulation of foreign policy most urgently demands an adjournment of mere partisanship.

This is no time to let the noisy antics of a few upset the steady purpose of our country or distract our leaders from their proper tasks. This is rather a time for stern rebuke of such antics and outspoken support of the distinguished public servants against whom they are directed.

HENRY L. STIMSON.

HUNTINGTON, LONG ISLAND, *March 24, 1950.*

Address by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, Before Philadelphia Federation of Greek-American Societies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me before the Philadelphia Federation of Greek-American Societies, in Philadelphia, March 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are few American schoolboys who cannot tell you that the origins of the democracy under which we live are found in the ancient city states that flourished in Greece more than two millenniums ago. And the schoolboy can tell you too that the democratic institutions of the western world also trace their beginnings to the great days in the Golden Age of Greece.

I don't think, however, that this debt owed by the American Republic to those democratic beginnings so long ago completely explains the close bonds of friendship which have united the Greek and American people in modern times. Let us look for a moment, for example, at the struggles of a valiant Greek people about a century and a quarter ago to achieve national independence. In that era the young American Republic which had achieved its own freedom only a few years before, heeded the calls for help of the Greek people in their efforts to throw off the shackles imposed by the Ottoman Empire. Famous names in American history are found on the honor roll of those who made American aid possible. Thus we find on that roll such men as President Monroe, Daniel Webster, Henry Clark, Samuel Gridley Howe, and others, who lent their energies to aid the Greek people in giving a real meaning to the national independence they had declared in 1822.

The friendship between our peoples has been a deep and enduring one.

World War II brought home more keenly than ever the realization that freedom is everybody's business. Every American, aware of the bestial treatment visited upon so many of the Greek people by the Nazis during the long years of German occupation, could not help thinking that "there but for the grace of God see my family and my children." This thought explains in part—though there are many other reasons as well—why the American people have insisted that others the world over have the right to live in freedom under a government of their own choosing which safeguards their liberty and guarantees their opportunities for a secure future.

Europe emerged from World War II terribly shattered, terribly tired, and terribly hungry. The defeat of the Nazi and Fascist dictaterships was a great sign of hope for the future that democracy could be kept alive and permitted to flourish. But there were other forces at work amid this chaos.

Despite the fact that three-fifths of the prewar industry in Greece failed to survive the war, and despite the fact that her agricultural resources were then hopelessly inadequate to feed her people, there were nonetheless two free elections held in Greece during 1946. In the spring of that year, representatives to the Greek Parliament were selected in democratic general elections. Later, in September of the same year, once more in a free election, a majority of the Greek people chose to reestablish their monarchy. That was where the trouble started.

The Communist threats to Greece were part of a huge world-wide strategy to dominate the planet. The events which characterized the year or two immediately following the end of World War II furnish us with abundant evidence as to Communist designs for control of the world. Elsewhere in Europe in that period, the economic outlook for most of the people was just about as grim as that which confronted the people of Greece. The Russians, of course, had made pledges regarding Poland and the other independent states of eastern Europe, in which they agreed to cooperate in permitting the people to choose their governments through democratic elections. One by one, these pledges were broken. By 1948 the iron

curtain was a reality. Government after government behind the curtain tumbled into the Soviet orbit.

The people of Greece at least did not have to contend with the presence of a Red army which had refused to go home, and in this respect their situation differed from that faced by the people of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, of Hungary, of Bulgaria, Rumania, and others behind the curtain. As a result, the Communist efforts to dominate Greece appeared in the form of an effort to stir up a civil war. Guerrilla forces, fed and armed by supplies which flowed across the borders from countries securely within Communist control, roamed at large through the mountain fastness of Greece, descending upon village after village to plunder and destroy them and ultimately to overthrow the Government chosen by a majority of the Greek people.

Turkey too was feeling the heat of Russian demands and was militarily unprepared to withstand any serious threat to its independence.

The democracies of the west used every possible means available in the United Nations to hold the Communists to their pledges, but they were inevitably confronted by a veto on the Security Council or by the walkout of Communist representatives in the UN General Assembly. By early 1947 it became clear that the Communist tactics would pay off in terms of selling out the free governments of Greece and Turkey unless someone acted, and acted at once. America's answer to this challenge was the Truman doctrine.

The Truman doctrine was a bold step, but judging it now in the light of hindsight, it is all the more remarkable that such a step was conceived and taken. Under that program, $300,000,000 was earmarked for immediate assistance to the Governments of Greece and Turkey. The bold step was a tremendous success.

In September of 1949, the Government of Greece was able to announce that the last guerrilla warfare had been stamped out. It was able to announce that civil order had once more been restored, that the guerrillas had either surrendered or fled from the country.

Then only a few short weeks ago, free elections were once more held in Greece. From the election returns we can draw one conclusive observation. The Communists have lost their political significance in Greece.

I do not pretend for a moment, however, that the troubles of the Greek people have all been solved. The people there are eating now, though to be sure, their diet is not one of abundance. There is enough food to go around, and enough to keep the people healthy and give them energy to carry out the big job which lies ahead of them. Agricultural production is larger than it was before the war, and industrial production has more than doubled in the past 4 years. This has not been enough to put the country on a self-sustaining basis. The progress that we have seen has resulted largely from the Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine, and of course, the hard work and ready cooperation of the Greek people themselves to improve their lot and bring to them the full measure of greatness which they so richly deserve.

In all likelihood that day is some time away. I am confident that the goal will be achieved under a free and democratic Greek Government. I say this because I know how sincerely the Greek people seek this goal, and I know, too, that America will do everything in her power, just as it has done in the past, to assist them.

The answer, ultimately will lie, of course, in a greatly expanded industrial capacity for Greece, and in the achievement of a unified economy among the democratic nations of Europe.

The Marshall plan, as all of you know, has done a great deal to bring about economic recovery in Europe. The success obtained by the Marshall plan to date is almost miraculous when you consider that it has been in operation less than 2 years. In that brief time, representatives of the free, democratic nations of Europe have found an opportunity to sit down together and map out long-range plans for creating a balanced economy among the nations participating in the Marshall plan program.

This economic unification of the democracies is, of course, nowhere near complete. Mr. Paul Hoffman estimates that three billion American dollars are absolutely necessary this coming year to assure the ultimate success of the recovery program. That is a tremendous amount of money, and Mr. Hoffman is certainly the first one to appreciate that fact. However, I am in complete agreement with him that a cut made in the Marshall plan program at this time would cause a serious setback in the recovery efforts, and might very well hurl us back to the critical days of 3 years ago when we were faced with the alarming prospect that the Communists might control all of the continent of Europe, simply as a result of economic collapse in the democracies. The Marshall plan is our investment in a free world at peace, and quite apart from the horrors of another war, we have been assured by all our military advisers that we would be spending $30,000,000,000 or $35,000,000,000 annually for our national defense alone at this time if the Communists were in control of Europe and its productive capacity.

As I have indicated, the Marshall plan plays a key role in our efforts to achieve world peace. But we cannot confine our efforts to that program alone. I am hopeful that within the next 10 days or so the Senate will complete its action on the long overdue changes in our displaced persons law. Every delaying tactic in the book has been used up to now by the handful of Senators who have for one reason or another, objected to passage of a decent DP law. I am satisfied now, however, that we are on the last lap, and that the Senate will pass a new law which will offer some genuine relief to almost 150,000 victims of political oppression brought about largely as a consequence of World War II. I might add the thought here that the pending provisions in the Senate open the doors of America to 10,000 Greek refugees who, up to the present time, have had no opportunity to take advantage of the displaced persons program.

I would not feel that my remarks to you this evening would be complete without some reference to the thousands of Greek children who were abducted during the guerrilla warfare, and who are still being held captive in the Communist-controlled countries north of the Greek border. This cruel and inhumane kidnapping has received the condemnation of every free nation in the world. The agencies of the United Nations are continuing to bring pressure on the nations now holding these children. President Truman and many Members of the Congress have been in close contact with His Grace, Michael, Orthodox Archbishop of North and South America, and we have followed closely every development thus far. I am sure most of you are familiar with the fact that a strongly worded resolution of protest against these abductions was passed by the House of Representatives last Wednesday, and a similar resolution is now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I give you my full assurance that I shall support the resolution when it is brought before us for a vote, and that I shall continue my own efforts to make certain that these children are returned to their families and friends in their native land.

I have attempted to summarize, briefly, it's true, some of the more significant landmarks in recent history. My emphasis, as you can certainly understand, has served to highlight those aspects of American foreign policy which reflect the deep friendship between the American people and the people of Greece. I feel, however, that all of you can appreciate the international overtones of these acts of friendship. I am certain that you appreciate—and I'm certain that the American people as a whole appreciate—that the cold war is world-wide in its scope. The Communist aims at world domination present themselves to us along a whole, broad front of our foreign policy. It is quite apparent, I think, that the Communists will use every effort to create division and disagreement among the democratic nations, and to stir up difficulty in the internal affairs of the democracies.

I am absolutely convinced that America is now winning the cold war. Such programs as the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact and military assistance program, have served as an affirmative attack on Soviet schemes to catch us off guard. Successful as we have been to date, it is nonetheless apparent that we cannot relax our vigilance for a moment. We must move confidently ahead by projecting our existing programs to meet new situations as they arise, and we must adopt such proposals as the point 4 program recommended last year by President Truman as a means of assisting economically backward countries in lifting their living standards and strengthening themselves against the threat of communism.

As I say, our stakes in the future are tremendous. If we are to give a real meaning to our great dream of peace on earth under democratic forms of government, we will have to make use of every bit of intelligence we can muster. We will have to judge our moves rationally, thoroughly, and in an atmosphere of clear-headed cooperation. We can destroy our chances for achieving peace if we permit our foreign policy to become embroiled in cheap and petty political partisanship. We can also destroy our hopes for the future if we lose confidence in ourselves and in our ability to handle this admittedly difficult world situation.

As an American I am proud that our postwar foreign policy has been conducted on a high plane, and that it has enjoyed the overwhelming support of our people. We have not been stampeded by fear, and we have met our responsibilities of world leadership head-on and realistically. So long as we continue to do so, and I am sure we will continue to do so, I have no fear for our future. A world at peace, a world in which the full dignity of every man is recognized through the existence of democratic forms of government, is our goal. We have made real progress toward this, and I, for one, am sure that we possess both the ability and the will to succeed.

Dependence and Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Dependence and Independence" from the March 18, 1950, issue of the Oelwein Daily Register. This thought-provoking and timely article was written by my good friend and constituent, Mr. O. P. Larson, Oelwein, Iowa, and appeared first in a recent issue of the Construction Bulletin:

DEPENDENCE AND INDEPENDENCE

There are two words in our English language of particular and peculiar importance at the present time. Perhaps they are of greater importance right now than at any other time in our history.

The two words are dependence, which Webster defines as "a state of being subject to direction or disposal of others. Inability to provide for one's self. Reduced to a servile state"; and the other word is independence, which is defined thus, "Freedom from the control of others. Direction of one's own affairs without interference."

Obviously they are exact opposites in their meaning and equally obvious is the fact that one cannot have both.

Our great war for freedom in 1776 has been called the war of independence and our great national holiday on July 4 is designated as Independence Day all over the land.

To be independent of others, to be free from their control, to be able to operate without interference, to shake off the yoke of servility to an oppressive king were the reasons for that great struggle.

Now are we a people clamoring for dependence? Do we wish to exchange the freedom for the bondage, the dependence on government for all of our securities and our daily lives?

Yet, there is no choice. We must be one or the other, for Government control of prices, labor, agriculture, old-age pensions, medicine, and such will permit no other course. The loss of independence is the price of these things. And, whether they will admit it or not, the loss of independence and the right to independent action has been and is the price which the rank and file of union members have paid for their leadership.

The state of dependence is the goal of every type of dictatorship too. The pattern of their development has always followed the submission of the people to their plans. To steal away their independence of thought and action by assuming their normal responsibilities and developing a servility born of dependence is the first step.

The thinking person knows how impossible it is for the Government to guarantee the responsibilities of the individual, to assume his task of providing for his own welfare, to maintain prices of commodities and labor and other paternalistic provisions without complete control of the individual. But there are too many who dream and do not think.

Will we awaken too late to these things? Will the moral fiber of the rank and file of our citizens be too far weakened before the end is discernible to revolt against this trend in Government? Is it already too late? Those are serious questions—infinitely serious questions. They involve the present as much as the future. They also involve every principle of our treasured independence.

For 16 long years the people of this Nation have been fed a diet of fabulous promises. Promises upon promises. Bigger promises to hide the ones impossible to fulfill. And they are still being fed the same pap of impossible attainments. Attainments impossible so long as there is a shred of independence left in the land.

The wicked wax fat on their promises even as they did in Biblical times, but let us hope that the divinity that shapes our ends will assert itself in our God-given intelligence and we of this Nation assert our rightful heritage and return to man's rightful character of independence and self-provision, for the Maker designed it so.

Deficit Spending a Threat to American Freedom, a Comfort to Collectivism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement presented to the New England congressional delegation by the Smaller Business Association of New England on March 27, 1950, at Washington, D. C., by John H. Campbell:

DEFICIT SPENDING—A THREAT TO AMERICAN FREEDOM—COMFORT TO COLLECTIVISM

"Democracy and freedom here and throughout the world depend upon the preservation of our solvency which is being jeopardized by growing debt and chronic deficits," from a statement by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat of Virginia, dated February 22, 1950. This is not the alarmist cackling of an uninformed crank. It is the considered statement of your colleague, a member of the important Senate Finance and Armed Services Committees, and chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The SBANE has had for several years as one of its major planks the urging of a reduction in Federal expenditures. In our daily tasks of providing tools to employ nearly half of our national army of workers, we have to face economic facts. We direct the creation of that wealth from which taxes may be collected. But we must operate with a credit balance in the bank. If we have a bad year, we know that redoubled efforts must be started the next year or we will be forced out of business. And so it is with genuine alarm that we observe our National Government has been in the red since 1930, excepting for 1947-48. President Roosevelt used to tell us that we would balance the budget when we got out of the depression and President Truman tells us we'll do it when prosperity is greater.

We are alarmed that economic theorists are replacing recognized economic leaders in advising the President. We are alarmed by contradictory positions taken by the President on tax matters during the past 5 years. We are alarmed when the President says a reduction in Federal expenditures cannot be made, whereas only 2 years ago in 1948 the Government operated successfully on $8,200,000,000 less than he asks you Members of Congress to authorize for 1951.

We are alarmed when Government propaganda implies the blame for this increase is due to wars and foreign aid, when actually $5,300,000,000 is an increase in domestic civilian projects, exclusive of interest and defense and veterans' aid.

We are alarmed when Congress after having unanimously authorized the study of the reorganization of the executive department, fails to pass on the vital parts of the Hoover report. This report, completely nonpartisan, acclaimed as an outstanding public service by hundreds of outstanding citizens, is being made a political football. We realize it is not easy for you Members of Congress to vote changes that will disrupt the even tenor of bureaucratic existences. It is, however, just as patriotic a necessity as it was for millions of our young men and women to disrupt the even tenor of their lives in World Wars I and II.

In closing we are mindful that we were requested last year to be specific in our recommendations. To that end we are attaching to this statement a copy of Senator Byrd's $36,000,000,000 budget taken from his statement of February 22, 1950, and urge its adoption. Incidentally, we urge that this entire statement entitled "A Reply to Mr. Truman" be reexamined by each of you. It is startling to note that if this $36,000,000,000 budget be passed instead of the $42,400,000,000 asked by the President, the estimated savings to the taxpayers of Massachusetts would practically equal the total State budget for 1949. We also urge the prompt adoption of the report of the Hoover Committee on the Reorganization of the Executive Department. This is urged in order that the citizens of the United States receive the improved services possible under the reorganization plan. This promises both better service and reduced costs.

The hosts of collectivism are eager for a bankrupt America. Our personal freedom will then be in peril. A national debt of a quarter of a trillion dollars, and local, State, and Federal taxes that take nearly one-third of our national income, are warning signs. Heed them.

Finally we extend to you, our Representatives in Congress, the pledge to render every assistance in our power as citizens. It will not be an easy task to reduce Federal spending with the active opposition of the President. The fate of the Nation is as truly in your hands today as it was in the hands of the military during the war. Unfortunately we have glamorized wartime heroism almost to the exclusion of heroism in the line of peacetime duty. You have the opportunity and power to perform heroic service. May God give you strength to serve your country well in an hour of need.

A $36,000,000,000 budget for progress, in tabular form, with comparisons

[In billions of dollars]

Expenditure categories	Fiscal year 1949 (ended June 30, 1949), actual	Fiscal year 1950 (will end next June 30), estimated	Fiscal year 1951 (begins next July 1) Byrd 36 "billion" dollar budget	Fiscal year 1951 (begins next July 1) President's 42 billion budget
I. Domestic-civilian (exclusive of veterans and interest)	6.9	11.4	8.9	12.2
Social welfare, health, and security	1.9	2.2	1.9	2.7
Housing and community facilities (including RFC secondary mortgage)	.1	1.0	1.0	1.0
Education and general research	.1	.1	.1	.0
Agriculture and agricultural resources (including CCC)	.6	2.2	2.2	2.2
Natural resources	1.7	1.8	1.3	2.2
Transportation and communication (including postal deficit)	1.3	1.0	1.2	1.1
Finance, commerce, and industry	.3	.2	.1	.2
Labor	.2	.2	.1	.2
General government	1.0	1.2	1.0	1.0
II. National defense	11.0	11.1	11.1	13.1
III. Veterans	6.0	6.0	5.7	6.1
IV. Foreign	4.0	6.0	4.0	4.7
V. Interest on Federal debt	5.5	5.7	5.7	5.4
Total expenditure budget [2]	33.2	40.2	36.0	42.1
Revenue [3]	42.2	37.5	37.5	37.1
Deficit (surplus) [4]	+9.0	+2.8	+1.5	+5.0

[1] Jan. 9, 1950, revision.
[2] Detailed figures may not add precisely to totals due to rounding and omission of reserves.
[3] Actual.
[4] Maximum estimate.
[5] Minimum estimate.

Washington News Letter From Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, to People of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record two news letters by me to the people of Pennsylvania, the first dated March 9, 1950, the second March 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

MARCH 9, 1950.

A $28,800,000 water bill for Pennsylvania in 1951 is pending in the Appropriations Committees of Congress. You pay a different kind of water bill at home monthly, but these Federal funds for water management by Army engineers are just as important to you.

Flood-control projects save lives and cut down on millions lost annually through property damage, disaster relief, and reduced incomes in flooded areas. Flood control starts on the land itself by planting cover crops and developing forests that absorb water and retard run-off. Dikes and levees keep streams within their banks and prevent overflow. And huge storage reservoirs like Conemaugh Dam near Pittsburgh hold back winter water surpluses and drain them off gradually in the dry summer months.

River-channel improvements permit shipments of vast tonnages of steel, coal, petroleum, and others along rivers like the Ohio and Delaware.

Harbor developments keep open the Port of Philadelphia and our other vital gateways to world trade.

We're flood conscious in Pennsylvania. The terrain of our State is a flood maker, and with our high rainfall, downpours often add their burden to melting snows, causing flood damage to our communities.

Every section of Pennsylvania will be affected by the proposed Federal appropriations.

Planning funds: $285,000 to draw up flood-control specifications for reservoirs at Prompton, Bear Creek, along the Allegheny, the Shenango, and at Uniontown, Johnsonburg, Swoyerville, and Forty Fort.

Flood-control construction: $13,499,100 for work at Monongahela, Sunbury, Clarion, York, and Williamsport.

Flood-control maintenance: $294,500 to maintain and operate existing projects at Johnstown, Punxsutawney, Tionesta, Crooked Creek, Loyalhanna, York, Youghiogheny River Reservoir, and the Mahoning Creek Reservoir.

Construction on rivers: $4,530,250 for locks and dams on the Ohio and Monongahela. And $4,000,000 is proposed for Federal clean-up of the grimy Schuylkill between Norristown and Philadelphia. Government work is possible now that the State has reached the half-way point on this $52,000,000 Federal-State program for culm removal from the Schuylkill, a program made possible by the 1946 act of Congress which I sponsored.

River and harbor maintenance: $6,012,000 to dredge and maintain channels of the Monongahela, the Allegheny, the Youghiogheny, and the Delaware—and for work on the harbor at Erie and in the Port of Philadelphia.

Federal water bills are big. Congress balances carefully the individual need and merit of each project against our limited ability to pay for it. No projects can be approved unless the benefits achieved will be greater in value than the construction costs.

From idea stage to completed project, every step requires one or more separate laws. Thus Congress must satisfy itself over and over again in approving the various steps. So bear in mind that each stage indicated below calls for one or more new acts of Congress:

Authorization for initial study to determine benefits and costs.

Appropriation of funds for the study.

Authorization of funds for construction when benefits exceed costs.

Appropriation of planning funds.

Appropriation of construction funds on a yearly basis (so each year the work is reviewed before new funds are allowed).

These safeguards against waste explain why necessary projects often take 10 years to complete. But it is foolhardy to drag out the work too long. Water-control projects do little good until completed—so during construction benefits are few. And construction cost generally rise when a job is tackled piecemeal. Thus, across-the-board reductions in funds delay all projects indiscriminately—and are poor economy in the long run.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER — A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

MARCH 23, 1950.

More Government efficiency is on the way. President Truman sent 21 new reorganization plans to Congress March 13, 1950, to carry out Hoover Commission recommendations by clarifying chain of command—tying responsibility down to a single person for doing a given job by holding one individual accountable and giving him the proper authority to do his work (the Commission cited many instances in which it was impossible to determine who was responsible for what simply because of overlapping authority and conflicting jurisdictions); putting related jobs under the same roof—wiping out the inefficiency of having numerous "independent" agencies hacking at a small part of a big job.

Twenty percent of the Commission recommendations were put in effect in 1949. An estimated $1,250,000,000 will be saved annually by the 1949 changes. Major reorganization plans went through last year for the State and Defense Departments, and General Services Administration was formed to handle Government "housekeeping" affairs. Some changes were also made in the Departments of Commerce, Post Office, Labor, and in the Executive Office of the President.

The 21 new plans will take us almost to the halfway point on the job of reorganizing the executive branch along lines recommended by the Commission report.

Plans 1 through 6 clarify the chain of command for the Secretaries of Labor, Treasury, Justice, Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce. Similar changes were made last year in the State and Post Office Departments. These plans also propose to create Administrative Assistant Secretaries to provide top-level assistance to each of the six Cabinet officers.

Plans 7 through 13 also affect chain of command by placing administrative responsibility and authority in the Board Chairmen of seven Federal regulatory agencies: Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Power Commission, National Labor Relations Board, Securities and Exchange Commission, and Federal Communications Commission. This will leave Commission and Board members free to handle rule-making and adjudicative duties without being bogged down with administrative details. Plan 12 also abolishes the statutory office of the NLRB General Counsel. A similar proposal was made in the Taft-Hartley Act amendments passed by the Senate June 30, 1949.

Plans 14 through 21 propose to bring related jobs under the same roof. Five plans deal with "housekeeping" by the new General Services Administration. Two plans transfer to the Labor Department certain wage-hour duties and unemployment-compensation matters presently handled by other agencies. And plan 21 takes a big step toward consolidating all Government transportation agencies by transferring the duties of the now-independent Maritime Commission to the Department of Commerce and creates the new office of Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

Opposition faces some of the 21 new plans. Recall that the least controversial changes were made last year—and at that Congress rejected one of the seven reorganization plans submitted by President Truman when it voted down the proposal to establish a Cabinet-level Department of Welfare as recommended by the Commission. Either the Senate or House may reject one or more of the new plans by voting against it prior to May 12, 1950—but plans not voted against by either House or Senate become effective on that date. No one can argue against efficiency in Government, but disagreement is expected to some phases of reorganization as to what is the most efficient course to follow.

Bipartisan efforts to carry out Government reorganization must continue. In addition to the 21 new plans, hearings are scheduled on all-important legislation to modernize the accounting and personnel practices of Government and on a bill to complete reorganization of the Post Office Department. I'm hopeful of early action on all these measures because efficiency in Government is above politics—and, as I've done since the Commission was first proposed 3 years ago, I intend to give my full support to this important work.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Let Us Have Peace in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the continued shipment of arms to the Arab States by Great Britain in excess of the armament actually necessary to maintain internal law and order within those states constitutes a serious threat to world peace in which the United States is vitally concerned.

Unless further shipments of arms to the Arab States are halted, there might conceivably be a break in the truce between Israel and the Arab States which could ignite the holocaust of a third world war, and immediate action to prevent such a catastrophe is imperative.

The embargo on the arms shipments to the Arab States was lifted by the Security Council of the United Nations in August of 1949.

In view of the threatening attitude of the Arab States at the present, in my opinion our State Department should immediately instruct our delegates to the Security Council of the United Nations to act to bring the issue of arms shipments by Great Britain to the Arab States up for reconsideration by the Council, and to make every effort to impose new controls on such shipments which would restrict them to armaments actually necessary for the maintenance of internal law and order.

Constituents in my district have written to me concerning this vital issue, and from Mr. Aaron Richie and Mr. Gustave L. Goldstein both letters are so similar I am submitting only one:

MARCH 10, 1950.

DEAR MR. MCDONOUGH: I am taking the liberty of writing to you today about two matters which are causing me grave concern and which have to do with the attitude of our Government toward the State of Israel.

The first concerns the continued shipment of arms by Great Britain to the various Arab States in the Middle East, and which was recently called to the Secretary of State's attention by Congressman JAVITS, of New York. Unfortunately, Mr. Acheson's reply that Britain is shipping arms to the Arab States in fulfillment of treaty obligations with the sole purpose of ensuring internal law and order, is wholly unsatisfactory and does not stand up against the real facts of the situation, well-authenticated reports indicate that the Arab States are accumulating heavy arms such as jet planes, submarines, tanks, and destroyers which far exceed those necessary for the purpose of maintaining internal security.

The Jewish people of this country together with other large segments of the public, see in the rearming of the Arab States a threat to the work of reconstruction and rehabilitation now being carried out in Israel. It would involve the new State of Israel in an armament race which would divert manpower and capital into defense purposes and it constitutes a definite threat to the hard-won truce with the Arab States.

The second matter concerns the present discussions in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations regarding the internationalization of Jerusalem. A new scheme has been proposed by the Chairman of the Trusteeship Council, presented as a compromise but which retains all the objectionable features of the original plan adopted by the last General Assembly and strongly opposed by our own Government and also by both interested parties, namely, the State of Israel and the Kingdom of Jordan. It is of the utmost importance that our Government take the initiative to change the unfavorable climate prevailing in the Trusteeship Council so as to settle this problem of Jerusalem before it comes to the spring session of the United Nations General Assembly.

Because I know that you have always been willing to help in situations such as these, I urge you personally to intervene with the President and the Secretary of State in these two matters. Our Government should tell Great Britain to stop immediately these arms shipments to the Arab States which jeopardize the peace of the Middle East. We should use our influence in the United Nations to work for a just and equitable solution of the Jerusalem program and a reversal of the impractical decision of the last General Assembly.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

AARON RICHIE.

I have responded to these appeals by writing the following letter to President Truman and to Secretary of State Dean Acheson:

MARCH 13, 1950.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It has been brought to my attention that the continued shipment of arms by Great Britain to the various Arab States in the Middle East in excess of the necessary armament for maintaining internal law and order constitutes a serious threat to world peace in which the United States is vitally concerned.

I, therefore, urge that you take whatever steps are necessary to protest this action by Great Britain which, if not halted, might conceivably result in a break in the truce between Israel and the Arab States.

It has also been brought to my attention that the compromise proposal of Monsieur Garreau, chairman of the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, relative to the internationalization of Jerusalem actually retains all of the objectionable features of the original plan which was opposed by the representatives of the United States to the United Nations.

I, therefore, urge that our representatives to the United Nations be instructed to work for a just and equitable solution of the Jerusalem problem, and for the defeat of the Garreau proposal as well as a reversal of the impractical decision of the last General Assembly of the United Nations on this problem.

Very truly yours,

GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
Member of Congress.

It is my hope that the good offices of the President of the United States through the Secretary of State will be used to convince the Security Council of the United Nations that the potential danger of war in the Middle East may be the spark to set off world war III. The controversy over the administration of the holy places in Jerusalem should also be settled in a peaceful and conclusive manner.

Editorial Comment on Foreign-Policy Speech of Hon. William Benton, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of March 26 an editorial referring to the address on this floor of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] last week. It is an excellent editorial, and I think it would be of interest to those who read the RECORD to have it appear. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENDING THE WORLD

It is high time the United States tried to capture leadership in the world of ideas in the manner Senator BENTON has suggested. The holder foreign information effort he calls for, in a resolution introduced in company with ten other Senators, is affirmative action of the right sort. Reports from southeast Asia, one of the crucial areas, tell of the lag in knowledge of America and American aims. The riot in Saigon was a prime example of misunderstanding about American purposes. In this case, perhaps, the Voice of America cannot be blamed, for policy in Indochina still remains in semiclouded. It is basic that America be known as on the side of the hopes of the common people, not as the country whose arms are strewn all over the world.

India is another and even greater example of a land in darkness about America. Our editor, on his recent visit, noted three urgent requirements from America: more American library facilities, a steady stream of documentary films, competition with the British press ascendancy so that American news could have ready access to the Indian market. A tremendous need exists in a subcontinent which is in the throes of revolutionary change to show the people how America handled or is handling similar problems. Aside from being a vast country, India is one of many countries in the world which are in the grip of misconceptions about America produced by years and years of Communist propaganda. High and low the people speak the Moscowite patter about America. As an example, it took the representative of the Free Trade Union Committee of the AFL, Mr. Richard Deverall, about a year to live down the suspicion that he must be a Wall Street stooge. There are three excellent American libraries operated by American men and women with a sense of dedication, but they are simply scratching the surface, and the American investment is less than that of the British, let alone the Russian. Throughout the world the United States spends in total $94,000,000 in the information program, and this sum includes items that do not properly belong in that budget.

It is our experience in several other countries as well as India that the United States could profit from a thorough study of the methods pursued by other operators in this field of information. We can absorb a few lessons from the greatest propagandist in the world, viz, Russia. The Russians in this realm are supreme technicians. In India they keep in the background and work through such instrumentalities as Czech-Indian cultural institutions, the money seeming to come from the proceeds of Czech trade with India. The British Council, in its quiet and thorough way, provides splendid service in the field of education—night classes, library work—in such countries as Mexico and makes every penny count. Italians and French maintain institutes in far-away places which spread respect for the values of Latin civilization. All these operations, manned by intelligent and sympathetic persons, have provided true and rewarding mirrors of the sponsoring countries, and in the case of slave-ridden Russia even a vision of a fantastic workers' paradise. America, on the contrary, is seen in vast areas of this world through a glass way, very darkly as an ogre of a money-mad imperialist.

Senator BENTON would move ahead on many fronts—radio stations capable of reaching every receiver in the world; more aggressive efforts in the United Nations for freedom of information; support of the UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; promotion of democratic education; a conference of non-Communist countries on information programs. We ourselves would pick out libraries and documentary films, a diplomatic crusade for freedom of the press, personal contact through American students and American teachers abroad, and radio stations—in that order. As to press freedom, it is our experience that the censor is beating out the newspapermen almost everywhere. Yet press freedom is a "value" the free world must treasure and must proselyte. Time was when Lord Bewsbury could write to

Bonaparte that "the King of England will make no concession to a foreign power at the expense of the liberty of the press" and when Alexander I could ask as soon as he arrived in Paris that the gags on press freedom should be removed. We applaud Senator BUCKNER for his initiative. Here is something affirmative, something truly fundamental.

Opposition of Labor to Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written for the Trainmen News by Alvaine Hamilton entitled "Labor Fights Bill To Boost Natural Gas Cost to Public."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR FIGHTS BILL TO BOOST NATURAL GAS COST TO PUBLIC

(By Alvaine Hamilton)

WASHINGTON.—A lot of Senators are watching their mail carefully these days, to see how to vote on the natural gas bill proposed by ROBERT KERR, Democrat of Oklahoma. This measure would increase the gas bills in every major city using natural gas to heat its homes and fuel its industries.

With the amount of natural gas used at least doubling between 1947 and 1952, and with expansion of the pipe lines carrying gas from the oil fields of Texas and six adjacent States going on apace, the issue of whether the Federal Government can regulate the rates charged by gas producers who don't own their own pipe lines is a crucial one.

A 1-cent increase in the price of natural gas, probable if Federal regulation is lifted by passage of the Kerr bill, could cost gas users in Ohio $11,441,000 a year; in Pennsylvania $8,850,250 a year; in Illinois $4,752,800 a year; and in Michigan $3,744,300.

This money would be paid by household users and industries in those States, and it would go to swell the coffers of a small group of powerful companies—Standard Oil, Phillips Petroleum, Shell Oil, Continental, and Gulf—which made fabulous profits equal to about one-quarter of their assets in 1948 alone.

MAKE MORE PROFITS

The 24 large producers whose gas sales would be subject to no Federal controls if the Kerr bill passes are among the most spectacularly profitable entities in the country. In 1948, they had total assets of $14,000,000,000, and income of $12,500,000,000. They now enjoy special Federal tax provisions which allow them to charge off to depletion each year 27½ percent of their income, a loophole which every recent President has asked Congress to plug, but which is still wide open. Treasury statistics show the big companies are escaping taxes on about half a billion dollars a year in profits from this provision alone.

The Kerr bill, already passed by the House, will be fought by a group of Senators including DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois; MYERS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee; HUMPHREY, Democrat-Farmer-Labor, of Minnesota; GILLETTE, Democrat, of Iowa; AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont. It is expected to come to the floor soon.

The bill's supporters claim that, if passed, the bill will receive President Truman's signature. However, opponents point to the expression of disapproval of the original Kerr bill by the President's bureau of budget in hearings on the measure and claim that any changes since then have not changed its big steel character.

Federal controls over nontransmitting producers of this basic natural resource have been challenged on several occasions in the past. These efforts were largely unsuccessful because of the able battle by Leland Olds, then chairman of the Federal Power Commission, who saw how essential to consumers of gas was some effective regulation of rates in the public interest. It was this issue which led to the unsuccessful fight to secure his confirmation for another FPC term last summer.

Nothing but Federal controls on prices charged by nontransmitting producers will protect the public, opponents of the Kerr bill insist. They point out that the pipe lines which carry the gas are expensive; once a line is established from a producing field to a city like Cleveland, or an area like upstate New York, the city's consumers and the pipe-line owner are at the mercy of the producer. If they don't like his prices, they can't pick up their pipe line and move to another field where a competitor will sell at a lower price.

MAYORS OPPOSE BILL

And city officials and consumer spokesmen including the unions look with deep suspicion on the claims by Kerr and others that State price regulation will prove effective. The gas is highly concentrated in seven States—Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Kansas, and New Mexico. The oil producers in most cases virtually elect and run the legislatures in these States.

Twelve big companies, out of the 600 producers, who would be affected by this bill, sell over half of the natural gas in the United States.

The Panhandle and Hugoton fields in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas produce one-quarter of all the natural gas.

The United States Conference of Mayors and the Municipal Law Officers Association both are fighting hard against this bill, because they know what it will mean in terms of higher gas bills for the people of the big cities. Both CIO and AFL are working nationally and locally against the measure, to get Senators committed to oppose it.

Middle-Income Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Sound Housing Decision," appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 24.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SOUND HOUSING DECISION

Rejection by the House of Representatives of President Truman's plan for a $2,000,000,000 agency to assist middle-income housing cooperatives seals the fate of another administration attempt to edge the Government still further into a field that should be left to private enterprise.

Our disapproval of this phase of Mr. Truman's program is not founded on the notion that there are ample homes available for families with incomes ranging from $2,800 to $4,400 annually. There is, in fact, an acute shortage of such homes.

The issues are whether it is sound public policy for the Government to invade an area in which private financing appears to be able to fill the need and whether, had Congress authorized the experiment, the housing shortage would have been materially relieved. The answer in each case is "No."

The most ardent believers in the aid-to-cooperatives plan say only 50,000 homes a year would result and that in 5 years less than 4 percent of the need would be met. This estimate should be compared to the 950,000 homes that will be started this year without benefit of the proposed program.

In the field of low-cost housing, where it is manifestly impossible for builders to produce homes within the reach of the lowest income group, the Federal Government has quite properly accepted responsibility. It is in this area of the greatest need that Federal assistance should be concentrated.

Criticism by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, of Proposed Reduction in ECA Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me regarding the proposed reduction in the ECA appropriations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MYERS SAYS ECA REDUCTION WOULD MAKE PROGRAM DOLE

ERIE, PA., March 11.—United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, insisted tonight that a reduction of 1951 ECA funds below levels recommended by Marshall plan Administrator Paul G. Hoffman, would "convert that program from one of recovery into a high-price dole—or worse still, jar Europe's economy so badly that Communist domination would be inevitable."

The Pennsylvania senior Senator addressed members and guests of the Erie County Bar Association here tonight.

"Economic stability," MYERS said, "is being accomplished in Europe today. By this I mean that recovery is a dynamic thing. The Marshall plan is not merely shoring up employment and providing the people of western Europe with a minimum diet. American aid thus far has permitted the democracies to make steady progress to a greater production—and in fact, industrial output today is well above the prewar level.

"Translated in terms of economic stability this means that western Europe is now finding it possible to reinvest 20 percent of its total product for the enlargement of its production facilities. Progress of this sort is the kind of guaranty required if Europe

is to close the dollar gap and become an effective, self-supporting working partner in our efforts to bring about world peace.

"The Marshall plan is perhaps the greatest cooperative adventure ever undertaken by man. It owes its birth to the proposal outlined by our great soldier-statesman George C. Marshall, and without any doubt whatsoever, the brilliant leadership of Paul Hoffman has played a major part in the success the program has thus far achieved in bringing the democratic nations together as a team.

"As we look into the coming year, I am convinced that future world peace stands at the crossroads. Those whose duty it has been to administer the European recovery program have been completely honest in giving us the facts of the case—the bad right along with the good. When Mr. Hoffman and those who work with him have come to the Congress to request funds for the program, they have not overstated the case. They have not asked for more than they needed to bluff the Congress into furnishing what they really required. They have requested the minimum funds absolutely necessary to assure success of the recovery plan.

"For the coming year, Mr. Hoffman has asked the Congress to underwrite an appropriation amounting to $2,950,000,000. This is not a number pulled out of the air. This figure represents the realistic best estimate of men who are at once aware of America's ability to foot this kind of bill, and who, at the same time, keenly appreciate the alternative we face if the Marshall plan fails to accomplish its purpose.

"There are two ways we can meet this situation. We can stick with the job until western Europe can stand on its own feet without the need for extraordinary dollar assistance. To do this we must make adequate funds available to assure the continued expansion of Europe's economy to the point that it balances its trade under conditions of high-level employment. Mr. Hoffman has told us what this will cost during the coming year.

"But as I say, there is another way to handle the matter. We can reduce Marshall-plan funds below the level recommended for the coming year. By doing this—depending upon the size of the slice we whack off—we can slow down or halt economic expansion. If we merely slow it down, we postpone the day that Europe can become self-sufficient. Necessarily that will require American aid over a much longer period than we now plan, and we will wind up spending much more in the long run. If we halt expansion completely, we will leave western Europe with a still existing dollar gap, a still existing bare minimum level of subsistence. At such a point American aid will cease to promote recovery and will become no more than a hand-out to keep people from starving to death. It will not solve the problem. It will merely guarantee that the problem will remain.

"If European aid is cut too far or withdrawn altogether in the coming year, the situation will become far worse than this. We would, in effect, pull the rug out from under everything we've achieved to date. Unemployment will skyrocket. People will once more be starving, and Communist hopes of domination over the western democracies as a result of economic collapse will become a reality.

"America cannot afford the consequences of this. If the Communists controlled western Europe today, we would be planning a defense budget for 1951 in terms of twenty-five or thirty billion dollars at least—instead of the twelve or thirteen billion dollars we are presently considering. I do not, however, intend to justify the Marshall plan on the materialistic dollar savings it represents to us, though I think it quite obvious that such an argument is on economically sound grounds.

"Success of the Marshall plan is spelled out in two words—cooperation and hope. Without both, there can be no success. Cooperation faced tremendous obstacles when the recovery program was inaugurated 2 years ago. Traditional national jealousies, economic, political, and social, have divided the nations of Europe, built tariff walls and trade barriers between them, and have, in effect, been the very opposite of cooperation. But the nations of Europe have come a long way since 1948. Cooperation is steadily gaining greater meaning. But it's slow, and efforts cannot be relaxed. Curtailment of American participation in this cooperative venture would spell disaster.

"Psychologically, the recovery program has given Europe hope that its problems may be worked out together—hope that a bright future can be achieved if the present mighty efforts are continued. Perhaps hope is, in and of itself, our most effective cold war weapon.

"The Marshall plan is achieving a miracle. It is a model of what can be achieved internationally when men of idealism and ability can find the chance to join hands and work together in good faith for a common aim—the aim of peace in this world for all time to come. None of those who so deeply desire peace in a free and democratic world underestimate the size of the task that confronts us. The job will strain every ability we have. It will require steady nerves. It will require resolute insistence upon the basic premises of freedom. The stake in the future is huge. And so is the need for peace. The American people have a grave responsibility on their own shoulders to play a realistic part in the joint efforts of free people to reach this sought-after peace. I know we will come through."

Communists in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The McCarthy Rampage," published in the New York Herald Tribune of recent date, and excerpts from the sermon by Rev. Powell Davies, at All Souls' Unitarian Church, on March 19, 1950, relative to the inquiry being made by the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the editorial and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MCCARTHY RAMPAGE

The promise of at least a week-end lull in the McCarthy uproar gives a chance to ask, with some soberness, what this is all about, anyway. It was early last month that Senator MCCARTHY suddenly broke out on his shotgun rampage against Communists in the State Department. Just what he was talking about has never been wholly clear, since he has seldom paused long enough to say; his specific allegations have been, altered, dropped, shifted in a bewildering torrent of words, but the general charge appears to be that the State Department is honeycombed with Communists and Communist sympathizers, all sheltered by Secretary Acheson himself.

At least a preliminary review of the resultant furor and fireworks now seems possible. The Senator has scored a point or two. He has forced an investigation, which is only just showing signs of struggling up through the party politics (prominent on all sides of this curious affair) and possibly doing some real investigating. He has trapped the State Department into an absurdly anomalous position in the John S. Service case. On the other hand, he caught a Tartar in Miss Dorothy Kenyon, whose description of the Senator as an "unmitigated liar" has not so far been widely challenged. His methods have been immeasurably reckless, irresponsible, and patently unfair; and they have called prominent attention to his own past, in which his record for balance, judiciousness and probity is far from invulnerable.

Nor has he begun even remotely to prove what seems to be the major thesis of widespread Communist infiltration in the State Department. He has not produced a single actual Communist, card-carrying or otherwise. What he has mainly done so far is to drag up a good deal of past history, most of it well known, to present it in the most invidious possible light. Most of the nine persons as yet actually named fall into a few familiar categories. The most important—it includes Messrs. Lattimore, Service, and Hanson—are the survivors of the State Department group which was impressed by the Chinese Red leaders (not by the Soviet leaders in Moscow), who were convinced that the Reds were going to win China (as they have done) and whose influence was generally in favor of basing American far-eastern policy on the Red movement. This group was undoubtedly influential; it may have been short-sighted and its influence misdirected, but it was certainly not motivated by treason to the United States or hidden loyalty to the Kremlin. And to assail it now on such ground is certainly not the way in which to correct any defects it may have introduced into American foreign policy.

Around this group the Senator, by lavish use of the technique of guilt by association, has been weaving a wider net. Those who, like Miss Kenyon, may have been careless about Communist exploitation of their names; figures like Professor Shapley and Schuman who have lent repeated support to Communist attitudes or propaganda, fellow-traveling types of one sort or another—any of these who can be connected, however remotely, with State Department encouragement, are cited to show Communist infiltration of our foreign affairs. Elements in the Department may have been too gullible in such cases; it is again no proof of Communist domination and this reckless assault is again an extremely dangerous and useless way of correcting whatever real defects may exist.

The Senator may really have more than all this to bring out, and the proceedings are at least to be got on a somewhat sounder footing. So far, one can only say that if there is anything wrong with the Department it is not what the Senator implies that it is, while his method of remedy is the equivalent of burning down the whole house in order to roast a pig. We are in too deadly serious a world to permit of that way of conducting our foreign relations.

DR. DAVIES DEFENDS ACHESON—URGES "QUIET" LOYALTY PLEA

The Reverend Dr. Powell Davies yesterday defended Secretary of State Acheson.

In a sermon at All Souls' Unitarian Church, Sixteenth and Harvard Streets NW., Dr. Davies declared that Acheson is "desperately trying to arouse the Nation to a full recognition of its peril and * * * to unite us behind a policy that combines strength and resolve with a high sense of moral aim and worthy purpose."

Yet, he said, Acheson is "sniped at, whispered about, and badgered by the same paltry men who have done the same paltry things to every other man of stature in the Government."

He charged that political opportunists are sowing "suspicion and mistrust * * * pretending that they do it as patriots seeking to uncover disloyalty."

Searching out treason, Dr. Davies said, is a "delicate business, to be undertaken quietly, responsibly, and soberly by people who understand that business."

It is necessary, he continued, to identify efficiently "whatever traitors there are in the Government and then to deal with them to our advantage.

"This cannot be done by turning a Senate hearing into a sideshow at a circus," he declared.

"Mental balance and emotional maturity," he said, "are necessary if we are to defeat the Communists.

"The Communists are smart. Much too smart for Senator McCARTHY, because he is doing exactly what they want him to do," he said. Wisconsin Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY's charges of communism in the State Department were aired before the Senate last week.

America is giving Stalin what he wants "not through disloyalty but through stupidity," Dr. Davies said.

Political Investigations

REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMAN C. CROOK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, observing with microscopic acuity the tactics used by some Members of both Houses of this Congress, I am stimulated to wonder whether or not this is the second session of the Eighty-first Congress or just the curtain raiser of the current political campaign.

Seemingly, a few Republicans have resorted to every conceivable method to discredit the Democratic Party and some agencies of Government. If we have Communists holding responsible positions in our Government I advocate their discharge immediately, if not sooner, but when we make charges against any man or woman let us be certain we have adequate reasons and proof to justify said charges. False accusations clothed in legalized immunity are dangerous weapons before the eyes of Americans and a gross handicap to the peace and respect of the world.

It is a rather strange situation when Republican leaders constantly desire to institute investigations of the Democratic Party when they themselves are not living far in the annals of time from the Fall and Doheney caravan that goose-stepped across the United States to the tune of the sizzling Teapot Dome and many other similar escapades that left a trace of shame on our esteemed Commonwealth, including attempts of monopolistic exploitation of the American people in this Congress.

The party that has always been guilty of instituting investigations, and a few other individuals closely affiliated with it, have, in their rancor, reached the stage where I deem it expedient that an investigation committee be appointed to investigate those instrumental in giving inception to the original investigating committees. Those that live in glass houses should always refrain from throwing stones.

All the angels are not in any one political party, as some would gladly have you believe. This is true in the Nation and all the States of the constellation of States. The Republican Party has reason to hang its head in shame. And when I say this, I remember one of its governors in the State of Indiana that served time in the penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga., and another one of its governors of the same State that pleaded the statute of limitations to keep from serving a similar term. What a record they established in their greed for wealth and power at the expense and exploitation of the common man.

Our Navy

REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, 156 years ago today President Washington signed a measure creating our Navy. This was on March 27, 1794. The glorious history of our Navy and its part in preserving our early Republic needs no recounting. It would be appropriate today, however, to pause and recognize what a great debt we owe to our Navy.

There are those who—though I do not question their sincerity—would reduce this component of our armed services to minor proportions, and in so doing would seriously jeopardize our security.

At this time I wish to congratulate our Navy upon its birthday and wish for it a continuation of its long and glorious history.

Indiana has had an impressive part in our Navy, and at this time I include a list of some outstanding naval officers and recipients of the Navy Cross, who were from Indiana:

Rear Adm. M. K. Fleming, United States Navy (retired), was born December 6, 1906, in Winchester. He holds two Legion(s) of Merit awards as well as other medals. Was an aviator, commander of several attack groups during the war. Retired October 1, 1949.

Vice Adm. John H. Cassady, United States Navy, was born April 3, 1896, in Spencer. He is presently the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (air) and is a naval aviator. He commanded the carrier U. S. S. *Saratoga* operating with a Pacific task force. He has commanded a carrier division and holds three Legion(s) of Merit, honorary commander of the Military Division of the most Excellent Order of the British Empire awarded him by the Government of Great Britain, as well as other medals.

Read Adm. Howard H. Good, United States Navy, was born August 12, 1888, in Warren. He served on many warships prior to the entrance of the United States into World War II. He was in command of the cruiser U. S. S. *New Orleans* at Pearl Harbor during the initial bombing of that base by the Japanese. The ship under his command later served with distinction during the Battle of Coral Sea. Besides the Legion of Merit, the admiral holds the Mexican Service Medal, the China Service Medal, and many others. He is now commandant, Thirteenth Naval District, Seattle, Wash.

Rear Adm. Robert E. Blick, United States Navy, was born July 8, 1899, in Peru. A naval aviator, he also holds a master of science degree in aeronautical engineering from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He commanded carriers during the war and his ships participated with distinction in many campaigns. He holds the Navy Cross, the Legion of Merit with Gold Star, the Presidential Unit Citation, and many other medals. He is now in command of Carrier Division 14.

Rear Adm. Morton D. Willcutts, Medical Corps, United States Navy, was born March 10, 1889, in Carthage. He saw much action in World War I as a medical officer and gained world renown in the Second World War when he was commanding officer of the naval hospital at San Diego. He holds medals awarded him by the Governments of China and Haiti as well as the Legion of Merit, and many other medals. He is now commanding officer, National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md.

Vice Adm. Russell S. Berkey, United States Navy, was born August 4, 1893, in Goshen. Prior to World War II he served in China and Iceland and elsewhere on warships. During the war he commanded the cruiser U. S. S. *Santa Fe* in Alaskan waters, then became commander of Cruiser Division 15 which saw much action in the Pacific. He won the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, three Legion(s) of Merit, and many other medals. He is now in command of the Seventh Task Fleet with orders to report as Chief of Information, Navy Department.

Commander Richard N. Antrim, United State Navy, born December 17, 1907, in Peru. He is one of three Navy men from Indiana who won the Medal of Honor, highest award in the United States presented to him by President Truman at ceremonies in the White House January 30, 1947, for conspicuous gallantry at the risk of his own life while a prisoner of the Japanese. He also holds the Navy Cross, the Bronze Star Medal, and many other awards.

Rear Adm. Norman Scott, United States Navy, was born August 10, 1889, at Indianapolis. Served on destroyers during World War I, and as naval aide to the President in 1918. He was killed in action during the Battle of Guadalcanal November 23, 1942, while in command of a task force. On December 9, 1942, the President presented the Medal of Honor to Rear Admiral Scott's family. The medal was "for extraordinary heroism and conspicuous intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty."

Col. David M. Shoup, United States Marine Corps, was born December 20, 1904, at Battle Ground. He served in the Philippines, China, and many marine stations within the United States. In the Pacific war he was wounded during the fight for New Georgia Island in the Solomons, and again at Tarawa. During the latter engagement, though shocked by an exploding shell and severely wounded by enemy fire, he continued to rally and lead his men until the entire Japanese invasion was annihilated. For this he was awarded the Medal of Honor.

Rear Adm. John B. Heffernan, United States Navy (retired), born October 21, 1894, in Washington; he is now director naval records and history. He served on destroyers in both world wars. He commanded a transport division in the assault and recapture of

Guam and later commanded the battleship *Tennessee*. He was awarded the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal with three gold stars, the Navy Unit Commendation, as well as many other decorations. His usual residence is 14 George Street, Washington, Ind.

Rear Adm. Royal Rodney Ingersoll, United States Navy (deceased), was born December 4, 1847, in Michigan, retiring from the naval service in 1919 to live in LaPorte, Ind., where he died in 1931. The admiral was the father of Admiral Royal Eason Ingersoll, United States Navy, and grandfather of the late Lt. Royal Rodney Ingersoll II. The destroyer U. S. S. *Ingersoll* is named for the late rear admiral and his grandson.

Admiral Raymond Ames Spruance, United States Navy (retired), was born July 3, 1886, in Maryland, attended high school in Indianapolis and was appointed to the Naval Academy from Indiana. He served on many warships during his naval career and in both World Wars. In addition to the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal with two gold stars, the Distinguished Service Medal-Army, and the Presidential Unit Citation, Admiral Spruance also was presented medals by the governments of Greece, Belgium, and Great Britain. His wife is the former Margaret V. Dean, of Indianapolis. Official address: care of Monterey Country Club, Del Monte, Calif.

Admiral Jonas H. Ingram, United States Navy (retired), was born October 15, 1886, in Jeffersonville, Ind. For gallantry in battle at Vera Cruz, Mexico, in April 1914, he was awarded the Medal of Honor. He commanded battleships, destroyers, destroyer divisions, and battle fleets, as well as task forces during World War II. Besides the Medal of Honor, Admiral Ingram holds the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal with two Gold Stars, Purple Heart, and awards from the governments of Brazil, Belgium, and Great Britain.

Vice Adm. Arthur B. Cook, United States Navy (retired), was born December 11, 1881, in Evansville, Ind. He served in World War I, qualified as a naval aviator in 1928 and served in aviation billets from thence on. He served as commanding officer of the carriers *Lexington* and *Langley*. He served in the Bureau of Aeronautics and as Chief of Air Operational Training and as Commandant, Tenth Naval District, during the late war. He retired December 1, 1944. His usual residence is Evansville, Ind.

Vice Adm. William S. Farber, United States Navy (retired), was born in Frankfort, Ind., on March 16, 1885. He served on or as commanding officer of many warships in his distinguished career. During the late war he served as head of the Fleet Maintenance Division, as Assistant Chief of Naval Operations for both Matériel and Maintenance, and as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations. He has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, and many other decorations, including one from the Government of France. Official address: Breesland, RFD No. 3, Casenovia, N. Y.

Rear Adm. Edward J. Marquart, United States Navy (retired), was born March 11, 1880, in Valparaiso, Ind. He was an ordnance expert during his career and served at the Naval Gun Factory in Washington during all of World War I, for which work he was awarded a special letter of commendation. He served as Commandant of both the Navy Yard, New York, and the Third Naval District during World War II before retiring April 1, 1944. Besides the Legion of Merit, he holds the Spanish Campaign Medal, China Service Medal, Philippine Campaign Medal, and others. Official address: 755 South El Molina, Pasadena, Calif.

Rear Adm. Robert W. Hayler, United States Navy, was born June 7, 1891, in Ohio, and attended schools in Muncie, Ind., before entering the Academy in 1910, appointed from the Eighth Indiana District. He won the Navy Cross for heroism while commanding the cruiser *Honolulu* in August 1942, and a second Navy Cross a year later. His ships won the Navy unit commendation for action against the Japs. While Commander Cruiser Division Twelve, he won a third Navy Cross. In addition to his Navy crosses, he also was awarded the Silver Star Medal, Legion of Merit twice, Bronze Star twice, and many other decorations. Official address: 800 East Washington Street, Muncie, Ind.

OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY BORN IN THE STATE OF INDIANA AWARDED THE NAVY CROSS, DECEMBER 7, 1941–AUGUST 1, 1945

Commander Richard Nott Antrim, United States Navy; born December 17, 1907, Peru, Ind.; home, 109 North Fremont Street, Peru, Ind.

Lt. James W. Barnitz,[1] United States Naval Reserve; born May 10, 1920, Indianapolis, Ind.; home, Indianapolis, Ind.

Lt. James Henry Bell, United States Naval Reserve (deceased); born December 19, 1918, Pennville, Ind.; home, 1521 North A Street, Elwood, Ind.

Rear Adm. Russell Stanley Berkey, United States Navy; born August 4, 1893, Goshen, Ind.; home, 1620 South Elwood Avenue, Tulsa, Okla.

Ensign Norman Burns Bitsagaio, United State Naval Reserve (deceased); born January 20, 1921, Osumont, Ind.; next of kin, 340 Prospect Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

Capt. Robert E. Blick, United States Navy; born July 8, 1899, Peru, Ind.; home, 716 Spring Street, Michigan City, Ind.

Lt. Comdr. John Randolph Bowen, United States Navy; born March 8, 1917, Wiona Lake, Ind.; home, 6146 Primrose Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind.

Capt. Maurice E. Browder, United States Navy; born October 23, 1897, Indianapolis, Ind.; home, Indianapolis, Ind.

Capt. Charles A. Buchanan, United States Navy; born October 28, 1904, Brookville, Ind.; home, 1132 Isabella Avenue, Coronado, Calif.

Lt. Philip W. Cobb, United States Naval Reserve; born March 24, 1918, Indianapolis, Ind.; home, 1014 Throop Street, Saginaw, Mich.

Lt. Comdr. James W. Coe, United States Navy; born June 13, 1909, Richmond, Ind.; home, 211 North Fifteenth Street, Richmond, Ind.

Lt. Comdr. Albert Joseph Corsi, United States Naval Reserve; born May 12, 1911, Richmond, Ind.; home, 201 North Walnut Street, East Orange, N. J.

Lt. Comdr. Clement M. Craig,[1] United States Naval Reserve; born December 4, 1914, Indianapolis, Ind.; home, P. O. Box 276, Los Gatos, Calif.

Commander Robert W. Denbo, United States Navy; born August 3, 1906, Orleans, Ind.; home, 435 West Jefferson, Orleans, Ind.

Lt. (jr. gr.) Charles Hall H. Dickey, United States Naval Reserve; born November 25, 1920, Aurora, Ind.; home, 202 First Street, Morristown, Tenn.

Lt. Charles Owen Dodson, Jr., United States Naval Reserve; born November 17, 1920, Hammond, Ind.; home, National Carbon Co., Niagara Falls, N. Y.

Ernest Willard Downey, boatswain, United States Navy; born November 3, 1908, Loogootee, Ind.; home, 822 East Whitman Avenue, Pocatello, Idaho.

Ensign William Robinson Evans, United States Naval Reserve (deceased); born August 11, 1918, Indianapolis, Ind.; next of kin, 5019 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

Commander James Louis Fuelling, Medical Corps, United States Navy; born July 16, 1913, Allen, Ind.; home, 1730 North Bosert Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind.

Lt. Ronald Paul Gift, United States Naval Reserve; born February 20, 1919, Indianapolis, Ind.; home, Marlette, Mich.

[1] Gold Star in lieu of second Navy Cross.

Commander Irvin S. Hartman, United States Navy; born, September 14, 1911, Columbia City, Ind.; home, route 7, Columbia City, Ind.

Commodore Samuel P. Jenkins, United States Navy; born, June 3, 1899, Evansville, Ind.; home, 1145 Twenty-first Street, San Diego, Calif.

Lt. (jg) Robert L. Klingler, United States Naval Reserve; born, January 28, 1921, Clay City, Ind.; home, Clay City, Ind.

Lt. Robert D. Kunkel, United States Naval Reserve; born, November 2, 1918, Peru, Ind.; home, Dallas, Tex.

Commander Frank D. Latta, United States Naval Reserve (deceased); born, January 10, 1909, Indianapolis, Ind.; next of kin, 545 South Central Avenue, Burlington, Iowa.

Lt. John C. Livesay, United States Navy (deceased); born, February 12, 1909, New Castle, Ind.; next of kin, 6 Hawthorne Terrace, Leonia, N. J.

Lt. (jg) James Harold Livingston, United States Naval Reserve; born, August 11, 1922, Marble Rock, Ind.; home, 629 Washington Street, Monroe, Mich.

Lt. Carl F. Luedemann, United States Naval Reserve; born, June 11, 1918, Indianapolis, Ind.; home, 1009 Villa Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind.

Ensign Charles O. McDaniel, United States Naval Reserve; born, February 6, 1923, Rushville, Ind.; home, 217 North Spencer Street, Rushville, Ind.

Lt. Clark William Miller, United States Naval Reserve; born, December 15, 1919, Lebanon, Ind.; home, 212 East Washington, Lebanon, Ind.

Ensign James B. Miller, United States Naval Reserve; born, May 12, 1922, Howard County, Ind.; home, 7925 North Main Street, Dayton, Ohio.

Lt. Robert A. Morris, United States Naval Reserve; born, October 11, 1918, Muncie, Ind.; home, rural route No. 1, Farmland, Ind.

Capt. Allen Prather Mullinnix, United States Navy; born, December 12, 1898, Attica, Ind.; home, 2714 Thirty-fifth Place NW., Washington, D. C.

Lt. Comdr. Hugh W. Nicholson,[1] United States Naval Reserve; born, February 28, 1912, Campbellsburg, Ind.; home, Campbellsburg, Ind.

Lt. Jerome John O'Dowd, United States Naval Reserve; born, October 15, 1918, Fort Wayne, Ind.; home, 1808 Kingsington Boulevard, Fort Wayne, Ind.

Lt. Comdr. Robert William Ramage, United States Navy; born, October 25, 1918, Indianapolis, Ind.; home, 202 West Forty-fourth Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

Lt. Robert D. Reed, United States Naval Reserve; born, March 8, 1920, Muncie, Ind.; home, 709 Fifth Avenue, Venice, Calif.

Lt. (jg) Robert "G" Riley, United States Naval Reserve; born, January 10, 1921, Buckcreek, Ind.; home, rural route No. 2, Lafayette, Ind.

Commander Joseph Wayne Runyan, United States Naval Reserve; born, November 22, 1913, Terre Haute, Ind.; home, Los Angeles, Calif.

Commander William R. Staggs, United States Naval Reserve; born, November 11, 1912, Valparaiso, Ind.; home, Chicago, Ill.

Lt. Comdr. Alexander Vraciu, United States Naval Reserve; born, November 2, 1918, East Chicago, Ind.; home, 1604 One Hundred and Forty-second Street, East Chicago, Ind.

Lt. Comdr. William Thomas Williams, United States Naval Reserve; born, August 14, 1919, Rockville, Ind.; home, box 209, Robstown, Tex.

Hual Selen Wilson, MM1c, United States Navy; born, December 24, 1912, Shelburn, Ind.; home, Granite City, Ill.

Lt. John L. Wirth, United States Navy (deceased); born, April 25, 1917, North Vernon, Ind.; home, box 316, route 4, Pensacola, Fla.

[1] Gold Star in lieu of second Navy Cross.

Lt. (jg.) Charles Edward Young, United States Naval Reserve; born, August 5, 1921, Perry County, Ind.; home, rural route No. 2, box 230, New Albany, Ind.

Lt. Owen DeWitt Young, United States Naval Reserve; born, May 29, 1920, Fort Wayne, Ind.; home, 20 Westervelt, Tenafly, N. J.

America Symbol of Fair Play and Freedom Among Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by me from radio station WHAM in Rochester, N. Y., February 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For more than 100 years now the American Nation has been a symbol throughout the world of fair play and freedom among men. No belief is more deeply rooted among our people than this. Yet, as a Nation, we are not perfect, and the efforts to enlarge the freedom of opportunity of our people are continuing.

All of us are aware that not all of our people have achieved the status of full-fledged citizenship with opportunities equal to those enjoyed by other Americans. We realize this from our own experience in our own communities.

Much as I wish this were not true, I believe every American realizes that full and equal opportunity for all, vitally important though it is, cannot be achieved overnight. The problems which give rise to substandard citizenship result from misunderstanding—misunderstanding of the hopes and aspirations of others—misunderstandings that come about because our own experience has never afforded us an opportunity to know the personal problems and difficulties encountered by those whose beliefs differ from our own—those who are a different color—or who have grown up in another part of the world.

So basically, our problem boils down to enlarging our experiences and developing our understanding. We have in this twentieth-century world of ours an almost unbelievable number of means at our disposal by which we can enlarge the knowledge we have of others, and the knowledge they have of us. The newspaper, the radio, and more recently, television—the huge presses which turn out our books, magazines, and newspapers—our churches and pulpits, the hundreds of thousands of neighborhood clubs, parent-teachers' associations, school boards, and other gatherings where we may come to know one another better, exchange our thoughts, and reconcile our differences—these are but a few of the many opportunities we have for getting at the heart of misunderstanding.

We have, of course, other avenues along which we may approach the development of greater individual freedom. One primary avenue is available to us in the form of the laws under which we live. All of us recognize, for example, our constitutional liberties of free speech, freedom of press, freedom to worship as we choose, the right to trial by jury, the right to be secure in our homes against unwarranted invasion by our Government, and all the other commandments contained in our Bill of Rights. We believe in these laws and we live by them.

The growing maturity of our people under our Constitution has steadily rounded out and given deeper meaning to our constitutional liberties. But we have as yet to give these rights their fullest meaning. Last week the House of Representatives fought out another round in the long struggle to give our Constitution the same meaning to all our people. The decision by the House on a law that would give many more Americans equal opportunities in their work was not the decision many of us had hoped the House would achieve. The House, by its vote, has seriously qualified the right to equal opportunity of employment.

In a short time this same issue will confront the United States Senate, and there, too, a great battle will ensue. I do not know what the outcome will be, but I will do everything in my power to see that we get a Federal law which will guarantee fair practices of employment in all channels of commerce between the States.

This week the Senate is debating another measure which also involves the issue of freedom in the form of the displaced-persons bill. For nearly 2 years it has been the policy of the American Government to offer our country as a haven to thousands of homeless people who have been exiled from their own countries by the forces of war. We are seeking now to enlarge that law in order that the exiled victims of Communist oppression in eastern Europe may now find new hope in the New World.

The strength of our country has immemorially been somewhat dependent on a continuing supply of new blood brought into our life stream by those who have fought for freedom in their own countries, and having failed in their efforts to liberate their people, have turned to join hands with us.

The Senate will have a fight on its hands this week over the displaced-persons bill, but I am satisfied that we will be successful in this small but important way in achieving another victory for the dignity of man.

These are but isolated attacks along the whole battle line for human freedom. This does not mean that they are unimportant, but it does mean that we must maintain constant vigilance and a readiness to do battle with the forces of oppression, tyranny, and misunderstanding wherever they appear. We are going forward to greater understanding every day, and despite the big job still to be done, we should take tremendous pride in each success as we achieve it.

Address of Hon. William E. Warne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOBY MORRIS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address by the Honorable William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, at a meeting of the New Mexico Indian Affairs Association in Santa Fe on March 10.

I make this request because this address, in my opinion, summarizes the serious problems which confront those of us who are deeply interested in the welfare of our Indian citizens. It reviews the progress which has been made, and outlines the steps which must still be taken before the Indians can participate fully in our national life. While it makes particular reference to the programs in our great Southwest area, such as the long-range Navajo rehabilitation bill recently passed by the House, I believe that the comprehensive policies which Assistant Secretary Warne advocates will provide a sound pattern for action throughout the Nation.

The address follows:

During the recent drought in New York City there appeared on the front page of a great New York newspaper an account of discussions between officials of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Interior Department on the problem of water rights for the Pueblo Indians living in Jemez and Zia and the water needs of the Los Alamos atomic energy plant, where many Pueblo Indians are now working.

There is no need to discuss this matter further at this time, except to say that the Atomic Energy Commission officials have publicly stated that they do not wish to do anything that will deprive Indians, or others living in the Jemez Valley, of life-giving water. My purpose in mentioning the incident is to emphasize again the fact that the Indians in the Southwest as well as their neighbors find themselves propelled rapidly into the atomic age. What this will mean to all of us, Indians and non-Indians alike, can now be but dimly seen. But one thing is clear. We shall have to adapt ourselves to the portentous problems of the future in order to survive. We shall have to adapt or perish, Indian and non-Indian alike. This necessity may give some of our citizens a more tolerant attitude toward the struggle of the Indians to adapt themselves to our intensely competitive, industrial society.

Throughout our still young and vigorous Nation today, each of us everywhere is reacting almost daily to problems of adjustment brought about by the changes taking place in the economy of our country, and, indeed, of the world. You in the Southwest must see these things in a dramatic way, in the adjustments that are being made by the Indians to fit themselves into our modern world. In the merging of modern and primitive cultures, the line between integration and disintegration of human values is formed. In this situation it is the duty of all of us to invest in an almost infinite patience in our dealings with the human problems involved in the passage of the Indians from their ancient culture to one whose customs and values are not yet finally fixed.

The Pueblos have shown a historic capacity to adopt certain non-Indian attributes while retaining an inherently Indian culture. They have been more successful than many other tribes in avoiding some of the less favorable aspects of our modern life. A new and particularly important development in the relations between the two cultures is represented by the Bernalillo County Hospital project. The construction and successful operation of the hospital will be a lasting monument to the cooperation of this community, the larger non-Indian community, the State, and the Federal Government. Negotiations for the construction of the hospital were begun in February 1949; in August of that year a bill was introduced in Congress, and in October President Truman signed it. At that time the President said:

"I wish to express my full approval of the basic objective of this legislation, which is to encourage the integration of hospital facilities for the care of Indians and non-Indians in the same community. * * * assurances have been received from county officials to the effect that no forms of discrimination or segregated services were ever intended, nor will they be permitted, in the operation or maintenance of the hospital."

To me the most significant thing in the history of the new hospital is the constant give-and-take, the modifications, adaptations of methods by all of those who are involved. Representatives of the various pueblos took an important part in the discussions and negotiations. Meetings between Indians and non-Indians were held frequently. The all-pueblo council met three times to discuss the project. And this is significant because in the process of working together for a common cause, Indians and non-Indians come to understand each other better, to realize that each faces common necessities of life and common methods of meeting them.

All Indians have been citizens in the strictly legal sense since 1924. The privilege of voting, of course, is not automatically conferred with citizenship. Citizenship is governed by the Congress; voting is determined by State law. Today every State has granted the right of reservation Indians to vote.

At present, Federal courts in New Mexico are affording Indians an opportunity to sit on Federal juries. This is another instance in which Indians will participate in the educational processes of political democracy. It will be meaningful to them. As one Indian said: "This will give us an opportunity we have long been seeking, an opportunity to assist juries in understanding more adequately Indian cases that come before them."

We are making real progress. I have said before, but I think it worth repeating, that our unthinking impatience is perhaps the greatest enemy of the Indian today. We must remember that our major objective is not simply to be done with the so-called Indian problem, but to prepare these people for full and equal participation in the highly competitive society that we have developed on the continent that used to be theirs. We need not trace the dismal history of our efforts to break and subdue this continent and its 500,000 original inhabitants. But we can remind ourselves that it has hardly been 80 years since a Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs reported to Congress:

"No one will certainly rejoice more heartily than the present Commissioner when the Indians of this country cease to be in a position to dictate, in any form or degree, to the Government; when, in fact, the last hostile tribe becomes reduced to the condition of suppliants for charity. This is, indeed, the only hope of salvation for the aborigines of this continent. If they stand up against the progress of civilization and industry, they must be relentlessly crushed * * * they must yield or perish."

We have moved a long way since then.

I do not need to add that Dr. John R. Nichols, our present Commissioner, whom many of you know, and who asked me to give you his personal greeting and best wishes, shares no such view. A policy of self-determination has replaced the old one of extermination.

If a general picture of the Indians today remains one of poverty and of limited opportunity, still we can see measurable progress if we put the picture in perspective. I have mentioned two instances of what I believe to be progress; let me cite a few more:

1. The shrinkage of the land holdings of the Indians which, between 1887 and 1932, were reduced from 142,000,000 acres to 52,000,000 acres, has been arrested and the land base increase to 56,000,000 acres.

2. Almost 200 Indian tribal corporations, corporate business enterprises, cooperatives, and credit unions have been organized and are transacting their business effectively.

3. During the past 10 years, Indians have taken the lead in applying conservation practices on their eroding lands.

4. Trachoma, a scourge of Indians as well as of many other races, can now be successfully attacked among American Indians since a cure for this disease has been given to the world by its discoverer, Dr. Fred Leo, an Indian Service physician.

5. Indian accredited senior high schools have increased from 2 to 28 during the past two decades. Also during this period of time more than 2,500 Indian boys and girls have attended college with Federal assistance. Academic retardation of Indian children has been cut in half and normal progress through the grades established.

6. During the past two decades, Indians have increased their cultivated area by more than 300,000 acres and have withdrawn from leaseholders some seven million acres of range land for their own use.

7. During this same period, Indian-owned cattle have increased in number from 170,000 to more than 400,000.

8. In the 8 years between 1940 and 1948, agricultural income to Indians has more than quadrupled.

The principal source of agricultural income to Indians is from their livestock industry. Although the increase in numbers is remarkable, the improvement in quality is even more so. During the early thirties, Indian cattle were a drug on the market. Buyers simply did not want them. As a result of the livestock improvement program conducted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Indian cattle sales in most areas now attract buyers from all over the country. Often Indian cattle sales top the market.

9. The Indian Reorganization Act and the Oklahoma General Welfare Act authorized a total appropriation for the revolving credit fund of $12,000,000. At the close of fiscal year 1950, a total of $9,500,000 had been appropriated; of this amount, $3,000,000 was for the fiscal year 1950. The fund has actually revolved two times at the close of fiscal year 1949. Of the amount due, 97.8 percent of all repayments were met promptly. Only 1.3 percent was extended, only one-half of 1 percent was canceled, and less than 1 percent was delinquent.

The amount of the fund is far from adequate. At the time the original amount was authorized, less than half of the Indians were eligible for loans; now all are eligible. In 1935, the National Resources Board estimated that a credit fund of some $66,000,000 was needed. Today the amount required is necessarily larger.

10. One other thing should be mentioned. At the turn of the century, the Indian population was somewhere around two hundred thousand. Today's best estimates place the number around four hundred thousand. They are the fastest growing segment of our population. At one time it appeared as if a technologically superior group would completely wipe out the American Indians. Here again, as I am informed by sociologists, their increase in population is a sign of adaptation on the part of Indians to our modern world.

All this is about Indians in general. But what about those Indians close to you here in New Mexico? Let us take population figures here also. Prior to 1930, the Pueblo Indians were growing at only one-fourth of 1 percent a year. Since that time they have been increasing at a rate of around 2½ percent a year. In total figures, the population increase was from 9,235 in 1930 to some sixteen thousand in 1950.

Eighteen of the nineteen pueblos, all but Jemez, voted to accept the Indian Reorganization Act. Three pueblos, Isleta, Santa Clara, and Laguna, have written their own constitutions.

In 1930 school attendance in the pueblos was 69 percent of all those of school age. It was 90 percent in the last fiscal year. In New Mexico as a whole it has increased among Indians from 44 percent in 1930 to some 66 percent now.

Increasing attention is being given to public health. In 1930 there were only seven nurses for all Pueblo Indians. Today there are 38. Of course, this is not nearly enough, but when the Bernalillo Hospital has been completed, the situation will be greatly improved.

In New Mexico in 1933, lands held in trust for Indians totaled slightly more than 6,000,000 acres. This has grown to 8,000,000 acres. Congress recognized the necessity for an adequate land base for the New Mexico Indians when it passed last August a bill to add over 600,000 acres to the Indian holdings.

There has been a 26 percent increase in Pueblo cultivated areas, from 14,000 to 26,000 acres, since 1933. Acreage under constructed irrigation works has increased greatly. Storage facilities for the Pueblos have increased 6,900 acre-feet. Stock water development has increased from 177 separate units in 1935 to 259 units. Domestic supply has increased from 3.2 miles to 13.8 miles in supply lines.

But the answer to the Indian problem generally, I think, lies largely in the pattern set for the Navajos and Hopis. Both Houses of Congress have now passed a bill, S. 2734, to authorize the long-range program of rehabilitation for these two tribes. This bill was introduced after a previous bill, S. 1407, was reluctantly vetoed by the President because it had been amended to include provisions which, with some qualifications would have extended State criminal and civil laws to the two reservations. In accordance with the President's desires expressed in his veto message, appropriation requests to carry out the first year of the long-range program are included in the budget for the fiscal year 1951, beginning July 1 of this year. These requests amount to approximately $14,000,000 in cash and $5,000,000 in contract authorizations.

I do not want to go into all the details of the proposed $88,000,000 Navajo-Hopi 10-year rehabilitation program, but, in general, it includes:

Development of small irrigation projects on the reservation, and survey costs of the Shiprock-San Juan project;

Transfer of colonists to the irrigable lands on the Colorado River Reservation;

Industrial developments on the Navajo Reservation;

Seasonal or part-time employment away from the reservation; and

New school, road, and hospital construction.

Lest I be misunderstood, let me say that this 10-year program is not an end-all plan.

It will have to be followed by other constructive measures, because the situation on the Navajo Reservation today does not even provide a good base upon which to build. This program should provide that base, the foundation. It will succeed in accordance with our expectations if it does. Please keep that in mind. This is the starting point, not the last lap in the grind to rehabilitate our largest and most impoverished tribe.

The next rehabilitation program being considered is the $23,000,000 program for the 7,000 Indians living on the Papago Reservation. As in the case of the Navajo, this program would call for irrigation, stock water development, soil and moisture conservation, construction of education and health facilities, roads and community facilities, and relocation projects.

This, then, is the pattern of Indian development and rehabilitation, one that fits in with an Indian policy that has been reasonably consistent since the Meriam report of two decades ago. That policy includes:

The maximum utilization of Indian resources by Indians so that they may become self-supporting. To reach this end they must have education, health, credit, and other facilities, as well as an adequate land base.

Increasing participation by State and local governmental units in programs, services,

and operations, in order that they may integrate Indians in normal civic functions with their fellow Americans.

At a recent hearing before a congressional committee, Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman spoke of the need for a reevaluation of our Indian policies. As an Assistant Secretary, and later as Under Secretary, Mr. Chapman has had long and sympathetic experience with these problems. In tracing this experience, he pointed out the tremendous progress which has been achieved in recent years, and said he felt we were ready to move ahead with new policies which could further achieve the aim of enabling the Indians to achieve full participation in our national life.

This is not a task for the Secretary alone, or even for the Interior Department and its Bureau of Indian Affairs. The groups like your own which have given valuable service to Indian affairs and who rightly share the credit for the progress that has been made, must enter into these considerations.

Rehabilitation bills may provide some of these answers. Other problems exist—lack of resources, lack of training, health deficiencies—combine to make it difficult for Indians to survive either on or off their reservations. Communities where Indians seek to live and labor are often sympathetic in words but not deeds. The people in these communities retain some traditional suspicion of the Indian that they acquired in childhood, or they persist in giving life to some unreal myth or stereotype about the habits and responsibility of the Indian that show little insight or understanding of him as a human being, or as an American citizen, or as a veteran of the recent war. Every American in his own home and town can help the attack on this problem, because largely it is the individual problem of each of us.

Let me conclude by saying that the old policy of denying civil and religious liberty to the Indians has been reversed and the constitutional rights of this, the oldest of our minority groups, have been completely avowed, with the result that the spiritual aspirations of the Indians as a group have revived and have reached a new high level. This has been accomplished by the recognition of the rights of Indians as American citizens, while, at the same time, protection has been afforded their property rights and their economic assets. The credit for this result does not belong to one individual or group. This has been accomplished by many, by you here, by the Indians themselves, by those of us who are working steadily on the problem in State offices, in Washington bureaus, and in the halls of Congress. Much more remains to be done, but in the spirit that now prevails of live and help live, I am confident we will realize the goal that Jefferson saw for the Indians and the non-Indians long ago:

"The ultimate point of rest and happiness for them (the Indians) is to let our settlements and theirs meet and blend together, to intermix, and become one people."

The Postmaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to submit an article by Mr. W. H. McWilliams, who writes for the Martins Perry and other Ohio newspapers, under the pen name of Hi Waters. I believe this column of Mr. McWilliams could apply to many areas in this country. Mr. McWilliams writes with a down-to-earth viewpoint and expresses the sentiments of the average man better than anyone I know.

The article follows:

HI WATERS—RIGHT AROUND HOME

(By W. H. McWilliams)

Outside of a doctor and a school teacher, the most important person in our lives is a postmaster.

At least, we have more to do with a postmaster than most any other guy. A doctor escorts us into this world and therefore we kinda hang around him out of self-protection.

A school teacher trains us to use sense for the first 12 years of our lives so we kinda string along with them, in second place.

But a postmaster stands behind the little windows with the iron bars over them and keeps us in touch with the rest of the world. A postmaster is the go-between with us and our neighbors no matter whether they live next door or on the other side of the world.

Who's the most pleasant postmaster you ever dealt with?

Well, here's a list of the 15 most pleasant postmasters in eastern Ohio as I have dealt with them. As you look into the eyes of these 15 master postmasters you feel yourself bein' lifted up and you leave feelin' good like you had just been given a shot of hard cider on an empty stomach.

1. Edithe Glass, Short Creek.
2. L. E. Buffington, Morristown.
3. Silvio Zanzanella, Adena.
4. Alice Wilson, Jerusalem.
5. Kenneth L. Burley, Bridgeport.
6. Stella E. Dickerson, Glencoe.
7. Rolland Jackson, Neffs.
8. Mrs. Delude P. Levi, Connorsville.
9. Enoch Carman, Belmont.
10. Harry C. Stratton, Piney Fork.
11. L. E. Fowler, Hendrysburg.
12. W. P. Mock, Powhatan.
13. P. M. Keyser, Shadyside.
14. Mary I. Timko, Barton.
15. Pearl Calovini, Lafferty.

Now, of course, there are other postmasters who could almost qualify for membership in this team. But they just didn't quite make the grade. Take Frank Vannelle, of Bellaire, who has just been there for a short time. Frank tries to grin, out of habit of being a politician for so long but he hasn't had the length of time behind the windows that would test him out.

I know some postmasters who, if you would walk up and say, "Any mail for me today?" would look at you as sour as a pint of green Damsel plums before breakfast, and makes you feel like a dried bread crumb on the table of Belshazzar, last king of Babylon.

But the 15 I selected, every one of 'em—smilingly handle the cares of countless people and grin sweeter than a bride when the preacher says, "I now pronounce you man and wife" and her husband turns around quiverin' like a jar of raspberry Jello and kisses her on the cheek.

I respectfully request all of you to watch carefully the next time you walk into the post offices of any one of my 15 and see for yourself. Watch that sly smile that sweeps like a summer shadow over a field of ripening grain as he, or she, caresses the letters and hands them lovingly through the bars to us. Ah, such postmasters are the honey on the bread of life or horseradish on the bacon of existence.

They have a hard job to fill in this life. Most everybody jumps on a postmaster because some erring relative, or friend, fails to write when they should. They get the devil when a money order ain't enough and Sears, Roebuck sends a cheaper article. They are criticised when the weather report says rain or when it don't.

I know some unthinking people who deny a postmaster even the small satisfaction of readin' the post cards that come through the mails—imagine that.

But what a service they perform for us. You can send a letter for 5,000 miles for 3 cents. That's the cheapest thing in the United States—except what the Government pays the postmasters.

Yes, sir, a postmaster is the No. 3 person in our lives in importance. He is outranked only by the doctor and the school teacher. Instead of conkin' him over the head when the mail didn't come, you ought to go up and shake hands with him and say, "Listen, friend—you can't do everything."

So, the next time you go to the post office for the mail, look at your postmaster and see if, in his eye, lurks the smile that you have a right to expect and a grin that warms your skin and makes you feel glad you ordered that last catalog of the seeds that never fail.

Yes, postmasters—my 15 most pleasant ones in eastern Ohio.

The Congressional Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me broadcast from radio station WHAM in Rochester, N. Y., on March 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Most of you, I think, are aware that if you visit Washington while the Congress is in session, it is usually possible to obtain a seat in the visitors' galleries of the House or the Senate, and thus you may witness and listen to the debate then taking place.

If you are observant, you may notice one of the stenographers whose job it is to make shorthand notes of every word uttered by the Members of each body while it is in session. The stenographers are men, and I imagine they are frequently mistaken for a Senator or Representative, because they usually seat themselves in a vacant chair nearby the Member who is then speaking. You can usually spot the stenographers scribbling away in their long notebooks, and occasionally, when the debate shifts from one side of the Chamber to the other, you'll notice a stenographer rise, and still writing as he walks, move closer to the Member then speaking.

The stenographic record made during each daily session of the Congress is printed in its entirety during the course of the night and appears by 9 o'clock the following morning in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a remarkable document. As I've already indicated, it contains in writing every word spoken in the Senate and the House during the preceding day, and thus it furnishes a permanent account of all the legislative proceedings in Congress.

These day-to-day issues of the RECORD make it possible for the Members of Congress to reexamine more carefully the points raised

in previous debate, and, of course, the RECORD makes it possible for any Member to discover what has taken place during the period he may necessarily have been absent. Furthermore, the RECORD lists the names of those who favor or oppose a particular issue at the time a vote was taken.

Last year the Eighty-first Congress was in session from January 3 until October 19, a total of more than 10 months and a half. During that first session, 198 issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were published. The combined proceedings of the Senate and the House during that time filled 15,386 pages of small print. In addition, the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, containing letters, speeches delivered elsewhere, and other material of general interest, totaled another 7,180 pages.

These pages cover the official legislative record of 96 Senators and 435 Representatives over the 10½-month period, a record more than 22,000 pages long. Neglecting the cost of the paper, it cost the Government $65 a page to set up the type for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in other words, more than $1,750,000. This is a lot of money, but I would certainly be the last to recommend that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be abolished.

By and large the material contained in these 22,000 pages of small print is worthwhile and useful information. But this is not completely true by a long shot. I believe, and I think anyone familiar with the proceedings of Congress would agree with me, that oftimes the proceedings of the Congress are filled with useless repetition of the same old thoughts and the same old arguments. Now, heaven knows, it is very often necessary to say something over and over again in order to convince others that what you say is true.

It might be argued that endless repetition doesn't contribute any new facts that aren't already known and understood. On the other hand, repetition of the same thought can be, and has been, used constructively to prevent injustice and to broaden general understanding of an issue.

Repetition can be misused. When talk is no longer confined to the merits of an issue, when the talk serves no other purpose than delay, delay, delay on the part of a handful of willful opponents of a particular measure, a serious threat to our representative democratic government presents itself.

Free speech is one of the fundamental and absolutely necessary requirements of the democratic process. Under dictatorships, no one dares voice his opposition, and that is certainly the last thing we want here. Our important problem legislatively, a problem we still haven't solved completely, is to draw a line which on the one hand, permits unlimited opportunity to criticize and to speak with the intention of influencing others—and which, on the other side of the line, puts a stop to the kind of talk which is not intended to inform or influence, but which has for its purpose instead the obstruction of the majority will on matters which in no way violate the fundamental rights of minorities. There's our problem.

In trying last year to draw up that kind of law by changing the filibuster rules of the Senate, our efforts failed. We are still confronted with the situation in which a willful minority may overrule the majority simply because the minority doesn't like a measure which in no way invades its constitutional rights. So the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does more than keep us posted on legislative events. The 22,000 pages in the 1949 RECORD provide us with documentary evidence for the need of bringing filibusters under control. Filibusters are still with us in the Senate, and until we've found the answer, the full measure of democracy will never be available to all our people.

Why Farm Groups Hit ECA's Use of Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I have requested permission to insert in the Appendix the following article from the March 24, 1950, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, which, in my opinion, sets forth the most convincing reasons why Congress should not give its approval to the idea of using the Marshall plan as a device for unloading surplus farm products:

WHY FARM GROUPS HIT ECA'S USE OF SURPLUSES

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—When the four farm organizations get together on anything, it makes news. When they get together in opposition to some one thing done in the Congress, it also shows that several Members of that legislative group failed to do the usual pre-legislation reconnaissance.

The four farm organizations are together today, for the second time in modern history. They—the Grange, Farm Bureau Federation, Farmers Union, and Council of Farmer Cooperatives—are opposed as one to the idea of using the Marshall plan as a device for unloading some of the mountains of surplus farm products cluttering up the United States.

It seemed like such a good idea to Congressmen when they were sitting around in the committee room figuring out what to do with the third-year appropriation for the Marshall plan. The ECA expects to need $1,400,000,000 of United States farm products for export to Marshall-plan-receiving countries during the upcoming third year of the plan. The Commodity Credit Corporation has that much in surplus farm products on hand—and more, too. Why not get rid of some of the surplus and save money on ECA?

Put that away, it sounds like quite an appealing idea.

However, there is one trouble with it which the promoters of the idea do not seem to have thought of in advance. If ECA gets most of the United States farm products it ships to Europe through the CCC, there will be that much less buying of farm products through the ordinary marketing channels. It means that the wholesalers and commission merchants who have been handling this business in the past will cease handling it. The deal would have taken $1,000,000,000 worth of business out of the hands of free enterprisers.

Also, there is another objection in the minds of the farm organizations. If the ECA supplies are taken from the existing mountains of surplus, there is going to be a fresh accumulation of surplus in the markets where ECA normally does its buying.

Out of this springs one of those episodes which make American politics so confusing to visitors. The man who proposed the plan of getting ECA supplies out of the surpluses on Government hands is Representative JOHN M. VORYS, of Ohio. Mr. VORYS is a Republican. Mr. VORYS is also a solid believer in free enterprise. The two biggest of the farm organizations which oppose the Vorys plan are generally regarded as conservative—the Grange and the Farm Bureau Federation. Also, the dominant political coloration of those organizations is Republican. In the joint letter which the four farm groups have mailed to every Member of Congress, they assert that the Vorys plan would inject more government operations quite fruitlessly into the Marshall-plan operation.

So, in effect, we have a plan proposed by a Republican legislator in the interest of economy being rejected unanimously by the farm organizations on the ground that it would narrow the area of free enterprise and expand the area of Government operations in the United States.

The farm groups have other objections, too. They point out that to take ECA supplies from surpluses would play into the hands of Russian propaganda which alleges that the Marshall plan is just a device for dumping United States surpluses overseas. They also object that the plan would make the farm price-support program bear the cost of ECA supplies and thereby make the farm program appear to cost $1,000,000,000 more than it actually does. This, of course, would be a political liability for the farm program.

But the real, basic objection of the farm groups is that the plan would take $1,000,000,000 worth of ECA business out of the regular market and put it into the Government market, which would be bad for farm business.

It is not always easy for a legislator to be sure these days which side of an issue is the free-enterprise side and which the Government-in-business side.

Give Harry the Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of Saturday, March 25, 1950:

GIVE HARRY THE BYRD

The House Appropriations Committee has just nicked Truman's 1951 domestic budget by $1,500,000,000. And the House Foreign Affairs Committee has slashed another billion from the foreign-aid funds demanded by "Handout" Harry.

For all of which we give thanks. However, it still leaves the country faced with a $4,000,000,000 deficit. So when the big appropriation bill comes up on the floor next Monday the Republicans are going to try to cut another three billion off the total. We wish them luck.

But we believe Senator BYRD, of Virginia, a member of Truman's own party, has a better idea. BYRD announced last December that he thought the 1951 budget should be kept down to thirty-six billions.

This would be six and one-half billions below Truman's estimates but higher than the budget allowed in 1948 when it was balanced.

It was the Republican Eightieth Congress that balanced that 1948 budget by spending only thirty-four billions.

The action of the House Appropriations Committee, which is dominated by the administration, shows how utterly foolish is TRUMAN's contention that you can't cut the budget.

LET'S PAY OUR BILLS

We hope the House will honestly take another whack at the big bill when it hits the floor and that the Senate will complete the job when it gets on its side of the Capitol.

The budget should be cut back to where it not only balances but to where it produces a surplus to pay off some of the huge national debt that is hanging over the country.

Chairman Spence Introduces Bill To Extend Rent Control in Cities Like Chicago

REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion on previous occasions to call the attention of the House to the situation in Chicago which would result if rent controls ended June 30 of this year. I do not wish any Member of this House to consider my statements as being even slightly on the exaggerated line. I am, therefore, calling the attention of my colleagues to an article on page 16 of part I of the Chicago Sunday Tribune of yesterday. The headline of this article reads: "High-rent flat easier to get; few low ones," and the subhead reads "Want-ad survey shows housing situation."

This article states that—

> A survey yesterday of the rental situation in the Chicago metropolitan area disclosed that * * * the ads of those seeking apartments are more than double the supply and still rising.

The article further states that—

> Comparative figures taken from Sunday want ads, the largest offering of any day shows that * * * the lineage of "wanted to rent" ads has risen this year from 953 lines on January 8 to 1,096 on February 12 and 1,120 on March 12.

The situation, briefly, as stated in the Republican and conservative Chicago Tribune of yesterday is that people with money now have "considerably greater opportunities to find apartments in the upper rental bracket," but that it is becoming increasingly difficult for people in ordinary circumstances to find homes within their means.

If rent controls are ended on June 30 of this year an immediate increase in rents above the ability of tenants to pay is inevitable. I say inevitable because of the law of supply and demand which must operate in such a situation.

As the only Chicago member of the Banking and Currency Committee I have felt keenly my responsibility not only to the tenants of Chicago, but to the general welfare of my city, which would suffer if after June 30 we had no protection for a considerable number of our workers who would be forced on the streets with their families because of their inability to meet rental demands.

Feeling this responsibility, I remained in Washington during the early weeks of December, working on the problem and with such results that I was able to give to the press a statement which was widely printed throughout the country stating that the administration, in my opinion, would not permit rent control to die until the housing shortage had been removed to such an extent that the relaxing of the rent controls could be effected without forcing many thousands of tenants to face an impossible housing situation.

During the present session I have been in constant touch with the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], the chairman of our committee, with other Members of the House and with the distinguished gentlemen who represent Illinois in the other branch, Senator LUCAS and Senator DOUGLAS. I can assure the House and the country that there is no disposition to let down Chicago and the other cities similarly situated. The time is fast running, and with June 30 only approximately 3 months away there is naturally great uneasiness prevailing among the people of Chicago and of other large cities in a similar situation. Meanwhile, I understand that one or two or perhaps other Members of the House are preparing bills for the extension of rent control. It would be unfortunate if the publicity attending the introduction of such bills should lead the people, not familiar with the procedures that obtain in this House, to false expectations.

As we know, but unfortunately the country is not as well informed, it is the bill introduced by the chairman of the committee that receives serious consideration. Thus the Housing bill was the Spence bill, and the rent-control bill which will be considered and brought before the committee and the House will be the Spence bill.

I am authorized to say by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], the chairman of my committee, that at the proper time a bill will be introduced by him to continue rent control in those urban centers like Chicago where at this time the termination of controls would have such serious repercussions as is suggested by the statements in the article in the Chicago Sunday Tribune of yesterday to which I have referred.

Fortunately, and as we had all hoped, the need for rent control in a number of States and in many localities has ended. I hope it will be a matter of only another year until the need of such controls has been ended in my city of Chicago and in other cities in similar situation. Until that time arrives I bespeak the cooperation with us in protecting the people of Chicago and of other like cities of those Members who no longer have the immediate interest in the subject which they did in the time when their constituencies were in need of the controls.

I am further authorized to state that when the bill is introduced by Chairman SPENCE and public hearings are started by the House Banking and Currency Committee, that the mayors of a number of the large cities in need of continuing rent control will personally appear to testify as to the actual conditions existing in their respective cities.

Farm Plan of Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture

REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a telegram from the president of the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture in regard to the farm plan adopted by the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture on December 10 at their meeting in Atlanta, Ga., as follows:

ATLANTA, GA., *March 25, 1950.*

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I note AP story from Washington your splendid effort to get into the RECORD plan adopted by southern commissioners of agriculture and kindly referred to as the Linder plan. This is actually now the plan of the commissioners of agriculture of most of the cotton-growing States.

It seems obvious that minimum labor wage makes it imperative to have minimum raw-commodity prices to keep our economy in balance. Otherwise, it will continually be necessary to appropriate tax money in large and larger amounts to keep a prop under raw commodities, especially farm crops.

Under the proposed plan, taking cotton, for example: Each farmer would have allotment in bales or pounds, eliminating all necessity for measuring or allotting his acres. He would be issued certificates covering his number of bales which would entitle their sale in the domestic market at or above minimum price. Any cotton grown in excess of his allotment could be carried over another year, could be sold for export at world prices, could be sold to another producer having excess certificates, but no appropriation would be required.

The southern commissioners desire at later date to present their plan to Congress through proper committees, and we hope that numbers of Congressmen and Senators from the Cotton Belt and other farm States will see fit to take up this fight and champion this plan. I note your intention to pursue this matter and want you to know that other sponsoring commissioners and I appreciate the splendid job you are doing.

TOM LINDER,
President, Association Southern Commissioners of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, this telegram refers to an effort on my part, at the request of Hon. W. E. Anderson, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Louisiana, to present the farm plan of the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture and to have the same included in the record of the House Committee on Agriculture. This was refused. However, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture did state that at some later date the committee would consent to the inclusion of this proposed program in the hearings of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, this matter was presented by me when my bill, H. R. 7134, and House Joint Resolution 430 was being considered by the committee, and inasmuch as my bills dealt with the question of farm surpluses, support prices, and the farm program generally, it was

and is my opinion that it is proper to have this proposed plan of the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture printed in the hearings of the Committee on Agriculture in order that the committee, the Congress, and the citizens of this country might be acquainted with the program proposed by this informed and patriotic group. Mr. Speaker, I do not presume to be an expert on agricultural problems; however, in view of the discussions in the Congress and throughout the Nation in regard to proposed changes in our farm policies, I think that any and all plans presented should have fair and reasonable consideration, and while I do not know that the plan proposed by the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture is the best plan, I do believe that the same is worthy of consideration, and, therefore, I desire to read the proposed plan into the record at this point in order that the same may be brought to the attention of our people:

A SUBSTITUTE FARM PLAN

(By W. E. Anderson, commissioner, agriculture and immigration, State of Louisiana)

The main trouble with so-called agricultural plans, price supports, etc., has been that they have been dictated by political expedience rather than by statesmanship.

Let's analyze the situation calmly and honestly and let the chips fall where they will.

In the first place, it is wrong for the Government to use the taxpayers' money to subsidize any group. Therefore, any plan which involves the expenditure of tax money either to raise prices or to lower prices is contrary to the spirit of the Constitution of the United States.

Congress and the President have no right to make any plan for the special benefit of the farmers, for the special benefit of labor, for the special benefit of the consumer nor for the special benefit of industry or business.

The Congress of the United States and the President do have a right and it is their constitutional duty to take such action within the Constitution as will best serve the general welfare of the whole public.

Due to our tremendous national debt, and other debts, it is imperative that the Nation's income be maintained at a level of not less than $250,000,000,000. It is also necessary that the income of unorganized groups shall be on an equality with organized groups. This is necessary for the benefit of all the people—not for the benefit of any group.

It is most essential that prices of raw products, including agricultural products, be maintained at a figure which will provide a national income of $250,000,000,000, or more. This is not to be done for the special benefit of the farmers or other raw material men. It is to be done in the interest of the entire people.

If maintaining high prices for farmers would benefit farmers only, then it would be wrong for Congress and the President to do it. If maintaining high farm prices will benefit all the people, including the farmer, then it is right for Congress to maintain those prices provided it is not often done by subsidizing from the taxpayers' money.

It is now generally recognized that the national income will be seven times the amount received by the farmers. It is also generally recognized that the national income will be five times the amount received by farmers and all other producers of raw materials.

It therefore follows that, in order to have a national income of $250,000,000,000, the income of farmers and other raw-material men must be maintained at $50,000,000,000. The income of the farmers alone must be maintained at $36,000,000,000. This means cash income and cannot include any other income such as food and feed consumed on the farm or other benefits from the farm.

When organized labor asked Congress for a minimum price for labor, Congress did not deem it necessary to guarantee a job for all labor at the minimum price. Congress did not deem it necessary to make loans to labor to maintain a minimum price. Congress simply passed an act making it unlawful to buy a man's labor, if he came within the definition, at less than the minimum price.

If Congress had subsidized labor and paid a part of labor's wages out of the tax money, that would have been a Brannan plan for labor. I think most everyone would agree that it would have been ridiculous for the Government to subsidize labor and then have said to industry we are going to see that labor gets a fair wage, but we are also going to see that industrial management gets cheap labor.

It is equally ridiculous for the Government to say we are going to see that the farmers get a fair price, but we are also going to see that the general public gets cheap farm products.

Since Congress and the President were able to provide a minimum wage for labor without a subsidy from the taxpayers' money, it should not be any more difficult for Congress to see that the farmer gets a fair price for his crops, which is his labor, without giving the farmer a subsidy out of the taxpayers' money.

Since cotton is still our main cash crop in the South, let's see how this plan would work with cotton. If it works with cotton, then with proper adjustments it can be made to work with other major crops.

Suppose that when Congress meets in January, it would enact a law on the same principle as the minimum wage which law would require that cotton could not be purchased for less than parity. No subsidy, but simply make it unlawful to purchase cotton for less than 100 percent of the parity price.

I mean, of course, actual parity based on present conditions and not some fake parity as we have been having, based on conditions that ceased to exist in 1914. Let's assume for the purposes of this statement that actual parity for middling fifteen-sixteenth inch staple is 35 cents per pound. There is no more reason why a farmer should get 90 percent of parity or 80 percent of parity than there is why the laborer should receive 90 percent of the minimum wage or 80 percent of the minimum wage. The farmer should receive 100 percent of parity as a minimum price. This minimum price, of course, would have to be limited to the number of bales of cotton consumed in our domestic market.

If our domestic market in the past 12 months has consumed 9,000,000 bales of cotton, then we would assume that 9,000,000 bales would be required for the next 12 months for our domestic market. Instead of going out and measuring each farmer's land and giving him an acreage allotment, each farmer would receive certificates qualifying him to market the number of bales which he is entitled to produce for the domestic market—one certificate for one bale of cotton.

Each farmer would get the same number of certificates as the number of bales of cotton he was entitled to sell for domestic consumption at not less than the minimum price. On an average this would give the cotton farmer an income of $1,575,000,000. This, when translated in the seven-time turn-over, would contribute to the national income, $11,025,000,000.

Now let's take an individual cotton grower and see how this plan would operate on his farm: John Jones is a farmer who now has or will have an allotment of 15 acres for cotton. He is given this allotment on the supposition that 15 acres of his land will produce 10 bales of cotton. Therefore, John Jones will receive 10 certificates enabling him to market 10 bales of cotton at not less than the minimum price in the domestic market.

Suppose that Jones plants 15 acres and has an extra good year, making 12 bales of cotton instead of 10. Or, suppose that Jones decides to plant 20 acres instead of 15 and that he makes 16 bales of cotton. In either case he will have produced more cotton that he will have certificates to enable him to sell for domestic consumption. In the one case he would have 2 extra bales—in the other case he would have 6 extra bales. What can he do with these extra bales?

Before answering that question, let's consider Bill Smith, a neighbor of John Jones. Bill Smith has certificates also for 10 bales of cotton, but he only produces 4 bales due to a bad year or to the fact that Smith decided not to plant very much cotton that year. In that case, Smith has 6 certificates more than the number of bales of cotton he has produced.

Smith has 6 certificates which he does not need—Jones has 6 bales of cotton for which he has no certificates. If Jones and Smith can agree on a transfer of Smith's certificates to Jones, then Jones can sell all his cotton for domestic consumption and Smith can also sell all his cotton for domestic consumption.

Suppose, though, that Jones is unable to find a neighbor who has extra certificates, or who is willing to transfer his certificates, then Jones can do one of two things: Jones can simply keep his 6 bales of cotton until the next year and reduce his cotton crop the next year or Jones can sell those 6 bales of cotton to an exporter at the export price. Cotton sold to an exporter would have to be exported because the exporter would have no certificates to enable him to sell into the domestic market.

On the other hand, there would be no importer of foreign cotton because the importer would have no certificates to enable him to sell imported cotton into the domestic market. The farmer producing cotton would have the minimum price on all domestically consumed cotton just as labor has a minimum price on a day's work.

This would give the American market to the American producer of cotton. The American producer would be protected against competition from foreign cotton. His income would be protected by a minimum price.

It would be necessary to apply the same rule to competitors of cotton and to fix a minimum price on each competitor which would prevent such competitive material from having an advantage in the domestic market over cotton.

This, of course, is a two-price system. It is an American price for domestically consumed cotton and a world price for cotton that is exported. Under this plan no cotton farmer would be forced to compete with the world market. At the same time, any farmer who believed that he could produce cotton at a price that would enable him to sell in world markets would be at liberty to produce all the cotton he wished to produce.

Such a law, would of course, defeat the so-called reciprocal trade agreements. It would give the farmer in the United States the same protection against cheap foreign products that protective tariffs have given to industry and labor against cheap foreign labor and cheap foreign products. It would give the farmer parity—it would give him equality. It would adjust the domestic supply of cotton to the domestic demand for cotton without the necessity of going yet surveying and measuring each farmers' acres, and without the necessity of ploughing up and destroying any crops because the farmer happened to overplant.

It would make the farmers politically independent because they would receive parity as a matter of law and would not be dependent upon changing administrations and changing pressure groups to get appropriations of tax funds to maintain the price.

No patriotic, intelligent American wants American labor's wages on a level with foreign labor's wages. No patriotic, intelligent American wants salaries in America on a level with salaries in foreign countries. No patriotic, intelligent American wants American farm prices on a level with foreign farm prices. To equalize our wages, salaries, and farm prices with foreign countries would mean the lowering of the American standard of living to that of foreign countries.

The only possible way to maintain the American wage standard, the American salary standard, and the standard of living in America is to maintain a minimum price on the raw materials so that the five times turnover of all raw materials and the seven times turn-over of agricultural products will maintain a national income of not less than $250,000,000,000.

The fixing and maintaining therefore of a minimum price at parity on farm products is for the benefit of the entire population of the United States and is not for the benefit of the farmers only. The farmers will not benefit any more than all the rest of the population regardless of the economic group to which they belong.

The farmers cannot continue to operate if the Government continues to reduce cotton acreage, to reduce peanut acreage, to reduce tobacco acreage, to reduce the acreage of wheat and other crops. The farmer must plant his land in order to continue to exist and to feed and clothe the Nation.

It is bad enough for the farmer to have to compete with foreign production in world markets. It is intolerable for the farmer to be forced to compete with foreign production in the American market, whether such foreign competition is brought in under the cloak of so-called reciprocal trade agreements or otherwise. Think this over.

The American Manufacturers' Association says the farmer must produce cotton cheaper. The International-minded Committee for Economic Development says the farmer must produce cotton cheaper. Some farm leaders and some farm Congressmen, parrot-like, repeat, "The farmer must produce cotton cheaper." Anyone who wants the farmer to produce cotton for less than 100 percent of parity is no friend of the farmer.

Everyone who has given even casual thought to the subject is bound to know that we must maintain a high economic level, a high monetary level, and a high standard of living in the United States. To do less will necessarily result in the complete disintegration of our national economy. It might even result in the disintegration of our Government itself.

Also, anyone who has given study to the subject must know that the income from the sale of raw materials, including agricultural products, determines the level of our economy and the level of our standards of living.

For 15 years we have had some form of Government support for the price of basic crops. At present, the sentiment in Washington is between the different variations of the plans heretofore tried out and the so-called Brannan plan.

The so-called Brannan plan would have most farm crops to sell for whatever they would bring without any legal support of prices. The Government would then make up the difference between what the farmer received and what the Secretary of Agriculture determined was a fair price by a subsidy from the Federal Treasury.

Let's analyze the prospects of the farmer if the so-called Brannan plan were enacted into law.

The first long range price support law was enacted in 1938 and provided for 52 to 75 percent of parity for wheat, cotton, tobacco, corn, rice, and peanuts.

From 1938, to the enactment of the Steagall amendment, loans were made to the farmers on these basic commodities. Another part of the program was very similar to the proposals of the so-called Brannan plan. Through this legislation Congress authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to make parity payments. These payments were supposed to amount to the difference between what the farmer actually received at the market place and the price that the Secretary of Agriculture fixed as parity. While Congress made large appropriations for this purpose, it failed to appropriate enough money to make full compensation to the farmers except in 1 year. This program was in effect during the years 1938 to 1942 inclusive, a 5-year period; 1942 was the only year when Congress appropriated enough money to make up the difference in price to the farmer. The only reason that the appropriation in 1942 was enough was because of rising farm prices incident to the war.

The first year 1938, Congress appropriated $311,743,000, whereas $666,601,631 would have been required if the farmer had received parity. Thus the farmer lost $454,859,631 in the deal of 1938. The amount appropriated was 31.8 percent of the amount the farmer was entitled to receive.

In 1939, the appropriation was $196,761,000, whereas $598,550,956 would have been required. This left the farmer a net loss in his parity payment of $401,789,956. In 1939, Congress appropriated 32.9 percent as much money as the farmer was entitled to receive.

In 1940, the appropriation was $196,908,000, whereas the farmer was entitled to receive $584,042,337. The farmer was short-changed $387,134,337 in 1940. The appropriation that year was 33.7 percent of the amount the farmer was entitled to receive.

In 1941, even after farm prices had made considerable advances, the appropriation was $10,453,137 less than the farmer was entitled to receive. The appropriation in 1941 was 95.1 percent of what the farmer was entitled to receive.

As stated above, 1942 was the only year that sufficient money was appropriated to make the parity payment to farmers.

It is most important that we keep in mind the fact that when the farmer most needed the parity payments was the time that Congress appropriated the least.

It is important that we impress these figures on our mind in order to visualize what would happen to the farmers if they were dependent on a Government subsidy and congressional appropriation to give them a decent income.

If the price of agricultural crops were allowed to go unsupported and forced to compete with imports under the so-called reciprocal-trade agreements, then it is certain that present farm prices would drop not less than 33⅓ to 50 percent. That would mean that in order for the farmer to get substantially present prices Congress would have to appropriate each year around $10,000,000,000 for farm subsidies.

Is there any reasonable-thinking person, farmer or otherwise, who believes that Congress would appropriate $10,000,000,000 to subsidize the farmers? Is there any reasonable person who believes that $10,000,000,000 could be appropriated annually for farm subsidies without creating a revolution among the consumers of the Nation whose lack of understanding of national economics makes them easy prey to newspapers and radio agitators?

Liquor Ads Are Degrading and Flaunt Temptation in the Faces of Our Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, there are companion bills before Congress to bar liquor advertisements. Senate bill 1847 and House bill 2428 which have my unqualified support, as I have stated in the hearing before the Senate committee in charge of the legislation which is inserted here for the consideration of my colleagues H. R. 2428:

STATEMENT OF HON. COMPTON I. WHITE IN HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of the record, I am COMPTON I. WHITE, Member of Congress from the First District of Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much opposed to our magazines, and publications, and radio carrying liquor advertisements. I am in full support of the bill under consideration by this committee.

One of the most distressing and discouraging things you find in our civilization today, particularly in our everyday life, is to find some fine young man whose father is taking great pains in raising and educating him, and he is ready to go into business, and probably gets married, becoming a liquor addict and is unable to control his appetite that is fastened upon him.

I want to commend the good work that is being done by the Alcoholics Anonymous, the AA, to assist these men, young folks, and immature people, to overcome that habit. They cooperate and lend their support, and they are doing a wonderful work, and I do not see why we should permit advertising to induce people and lure people to become addicts of liquor. There is temptation enough without having these luring advertisements we find in the magazines—expensive advertisements, I may say, that appear in these national periodicals and on the radios. I think that this bill is a step in the right direction, that we should curtail and eliminate those advertisements.

If you and I had a constructive project to finance, if we wanted to advertise, if we needed venture capital to develop a mine or to develop any industry, the SEC would step in and under their present rules in effect today absolutely make it impossible for you to make any public announcement, or advertise, in any way obtain capital to employ people and build a worth-while industry. Try it if you want to see.

The SEC will tell me "If you want to put any advertisements out you must print your whole prospectus." You must use two or three sheets of the newspaper to advertise, if advertise at all.

But when you come to liquor you can go out and put in these attractive illustrated advertisements, these allurements, if you please, to fasten this destructive habit on the people, and I am opposed to it.

I think if we are going to enforce regulations that prevent people from advertising constructive industry and constructive projects, as the Securities and Exchange Commission is doing, certainly we cannot permit

these breweries and these distilleries to advertise a product that fastens degrading habits on the people such as it does. For that reason I am very much in favor of this legislation.

I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Congressman.

New England Workers Pay the Price in Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly apparent with each passing day that the cut-throat foreign competition provided by the importation of goods manufactured abroad is costing us a pretty price. As the alarming aspects of our foreign-trade policy begin to open the eyes of the American worker the fact is brought conspicuously to the forefront that the inevitable injury caused by growing imports is not confined to just a few industries. It is definitely encroaching on other areas of our economy.

The oft-repeated, yet unassailable truth is that American workers cannot compete with the low wages paid in other countries. Excessive imports can mean only one thing. The administration prefers to risk the closing of our factories. It seemingly remains unconcerned about the much-dreaded picture of men without jobs, a condition it is now in the process of creating.

Connecticut and New England with its concentration of industries are faced with the paying of a terrific toll in jobs lost, if the flow of foreign-made products continues unchecked. The indiscriminate, ill-conceived administration foreign-trade program is doing one thing that is definite. It is starting American workers on a discouraging march for jobs that will soon be nowhere available.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New Haven Register of March 24, 1950, which gives some indication of the damaging effect upon one of New England's great industries by low-wage foreign competition:

CHEAP IMPORTS HELD HARMFUL TO JEWELRY TRADE

PROVIDENCE, R. I., March 24.—An official of the New England Manufacturing Jewelers' and Silversmith's Association says "a flood of foreign merchandise produced by low paid, substandard workers" is pouring into this country.

George R. Frankovitch, executive secretary of the association, told the New England council's committee on economic research last night the United States is encouraging import of merchandise from prewar competitors.

Frankovitch declared:

"Produced under conditions unthinkable in Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, the pearl industry of Japan is again sweeping away the jobs of pearl workers in New England.

"Slave or nearly slave labor in Czechoslovakia is again producing a cheap-type jewelry that is slowly stilling the machines of the New England plants."

Frankovitch described New England as one of the greatest jewelry manufacturing centers the world over.

He said that more than half of the industry's 80,000 workers in the United States are employed in New England. Most of the others he said work in the New York-New Jersey area.

He reported that Rhode Island is the greatest jewelry producing State in the country, while entire communities southeast of Massachusetts are totally dependent on the manufacturing jewelry industry for their livelihood.

Frankovitch attacked the 20 percent luxury tax on jewelry and declared that it has been the greatest detriment to full employment, greater stability, and general prosperity in the jewelry industry.

Small Businesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the following statement of Mr. S. Abbott Smith, of the Thomas Strahan Co., manufacturers of fine wall decorations, Chelsea, Mass., presented in behalf of the Small Business Association of New England, Inc., before a meeting of the New England Senators and Congressmen, and officers and principal committee chairmen of that organization held in room 18 in the Capitol Building on Monday, March 27, 1950.

This statement is most interesting, enlightening, and helpful, as a step in the right direction to assist and improve small business in New England and to help and relieve the serious unemployment situation in that section of the country:

Gentlemen, we very much appreciate your coming here this morning and giving us this opportunity to present our views on these important problems facing small business. At the same time, we hope these meetings may be profitable to you also in obtaining a boiled-down picture of the feelings of many of your constituents.

My subject is the great need of small businesses all over the country for adequate long-term and equity capital financing. That this need is increasing all the time is evidenced by the increasing number of applications to the RFC, by the hundreds of applications to the American Research and Development Corp. in Boston, and by our own personal contacts. I do not doubt but what your own mail tells you the story directly. All this is still further corroborated by the statement of Senator O'MAHONEY, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, that the burden of the testimony before the Investment Subcommittee was that while private savings are at record-breaking levels, our private-enterprise system is starving for lack of debt and equity capital. The pressure is building up for supplying this capital from Government funds. Most of us, however, feel that such moves are unsound and will probably not be satisfactory.

Our banks seem to be adequately taking care of the short-term financing needs of our businesses but most of them stop there. The Bank of America is apparently doing an outstanding job on the west coast, going much farther. Some individual banks in New England are doing a good job, too, but in general all too many of our banks have become repositories for their depositors' money rather than performing what used to be considered full-banking functions. They are quite right when they say it is not the job of a commercial bank to supply equity capital; there is a very real question as to how long maturities they ought to allow on loans and what security should be required. All this merely accentuates the wide gap between the financing needed by business and what is being supplied by the banks.

The RFC has been of help to some small businesses but its loaning abilities are restricted, its purpose is not to lend equity capital and it very obviously is not filling the need. Furthermore, if it can possibly be done, we should prefer to see this financing come from private sources rather than be done with Government money.

Just why do we have this paradox of the greatest accumulation of savings in history and yet the dearth of long-term and equity capital for small businesses? The answer lies fundamentally, I believe, in our present tax structure. The quickest and best solution to the financing problem would be to reduce taxes, let companies plow back their earnings, eliminate the double tax on dividends. If you want hosts of new small businesses, just eliminate all taxes on profits and dividends from new small businesses for say the first 5 or 10 years.

If the reward is proportionate to the risk, you will no longer have to worry about a lack of equity capital.

Obviously, in view of our present budgetary situation, the above steps cannot be taken all at once anyway so instead of attacking the root of our trouble, we have to find some way, in spite of the present tax structure, to provide at least partially the long-term and equity financing needed by our New England small businesses—and preferably from private sources.

Last year, you will remember, we suggested that a capital bank might be one of the answers. It has been amazing and pleasing to see the swing of sentiment in many quarters in favor of such a plan. All this sentiment was crystallized a few weeks ago when Senator O'MAHONEY introduced in the Senate, S. 2975.

This bill would amend the Federal Reserve Act and authorize the creation of the 36 such banks, 1 in each Federal Reserve or Federal Reserve branch district. No Federal appropriations or guaranties are involved but this bill would provide a means for channeling some of the funds of the commercial banks, savings banks, life insurance companies and other financial institutions, as well as those of individuals, into local small businesses. All of these sources are expected to supply the initial capital by buying the original stock.

The capital banks would be a part of the Federal Reserve System and under the general supervision of the Federal Reserve Board. Each bank would have a board of directors of nine men, three appointed by the Federal Reserve bank in the district from the public and six by the stockholders.

The general powers of the capital banks would be to:

1. Insure loans by banks to small businesses up to $10,000 each and 5 years maturity.

3. Make loans direct to small businesses or buy obligations of small businesses from banks and other institutions.

3. Purchase equity or other securities of small businesses.

4. Purchase shares of local industrial development corporations which specialize in furnishing venture capital for new businesses. Such purchases would be limited to 5 percent of the capital, surplus, and authorized indebtedness of such corporation.

There are various other qualifications of the above powers, but there is no need to go into more detail now.

Applications to the capital bank for financing would be initiated through the local banks and other cooperating institutions. In this way the usual local bank-customer relationship which is so desirable will not be disrupted. Furthermore you will observe that the capital bank picks up where the local commercial bank generally stops, i. e., at long-term and equity financing, thus filling that gap which has become so glaringly apparent.

Personally I believe that a capital bank can and will be profitable if properly managed. However, Senator CHAMBERLAIN offers an additional inducement to the investors in this bank: It and its income will be exempt from Federal, State, and municipal taxes (except on real property) for a period of 15 years. Parenthetically it seems to me this provision backs up my original suggestion as to how to really supply small business with plenty of equity capital.

The bill also provides that the capital banks shall use the facilities of the Federal Reserve System and the Department of Commerce and shall provide consulting and advising services on a fee basis.

That, gentlemen, is a very brief statement of a very big subject. We hope each of you will study this bill carefully because, although not perfect by any means, we do think it along the right lines. Considerable discretion and latitude must be left to the directors of such banks because experience will undoubtedly show the need for changes in new ventures. The main thing is to get started.

This subject is of particular importance to us in New England. New England money financed the development of a great deal of the United States in many fields, yet today our own little businesses cannot obtain the financing they need. Money is today being pumped out of New England pockets by Federal taxes to irrigate western sands to produce more of what, in many cases, we already have too much of. Our money is being used to develop other parts of the country which at the same time are enticing our men and businesses away from us.

Last Friday I participated in a panel discussion at the New England Council quarterly meeting in Providence on the subject of community industrial financing. Other parts of the country are way ahead of us. We must wake up and mobilize our resources to see to it that our New England businesses get the financing they need, the new equipment and buildings they must have to compete successfully. We must encourage our young men and develop new ideas, not just must cling to ideas which have now grown old.

The development of New England has always gone in cycles. When the clipper-ship era passed, we pioneered and developed textiles, shoes, and other industrial enterprises. Now these are slipping, but new ideas are flowing in streams from our research factories along the Charles River as well as from our thousands of businesses throughout New England. We must see to it that those ideas do not die aborning or move elsewhere just for lack of financing here.

We need a capital bank run by men of vision and keen financial judgment, cognizant of and sympathetic with the needs of small businesses. Such men with these facilities will put new vigor into our New England businesses and New England communities. Therefore, we hope that a bill similar to S. 2975, perhaps better, will be introduced in the House.

We urge you to study this bill. Improve it if you can. Give it your whole-hearted support. We must have long-term and equity financing.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen Oppose St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, representing employees of the Pennsylvania Railroad lines west, is opposed to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

For the benefit of Members of Congress, I am inserting a resolution adopted March 21, 1950, and outlining the reasons why the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen oppose the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The resolution is as follows:

GENERAL GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE,
BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Richmond, Ind., March 21, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President, White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At a recent session of the Full General Committee of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Pennsylvania Railroad, Lines West, the following resolution was adopted:

"COLONIAL HOTEL,
"*Cleveland, Ohio, March 14, 1950.*

"*To Officers and Members, General Grievance Committee, Pennsylvania Railroad, Lines West, in Special Session at Cleveland, March 14, 1950:*

"Whereas there are in the United States and Canada, selfish business interests who are attempting to influence the governments of both nations to reconstruct the channels of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River to provide a channel for the maritime traffic of the world; and

"Whereas these selfish interests have caused legislation to be introduced in the Congress of the United States to provide for the construction and maintenance of the project, to be known as the St. Lawrence Seaway; and

"Whereas such proposed seaway could only be used a few months each year, due to the subzero temperatures which causes the lakes and the river to be frozen over during the winter months; and

"Whereas the cost of the proposed seaway of several hundreds of millions of dollars is to be paid by the taxpayers of the United States, with little or no benefit to the people; and

"Whereas the selfish interests promoting the proposed seaway hope to benefit from its operation through lower transportation rates, without any reduction whatever in the prices of commodities to the consumers; and

"Whereas the territory in the United States to be served by the proposed seaway is now adequately served by transportation facilities which were able to efficiently handle all of the military, industrial, and civilian transportation needs of the world wars, and will be able to meet the needs of our peacetime expansions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the general committee of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen on the Pennsylvania Railroad, Lines West, in meeting assembled in Cleveland, Ohio, March 14, 1950, go on record opposing the legislation to provide for the construction and maintenance of the St. Lawrence seaway; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the governors, United States Senators and Representatives in Congress of all States served by the Pennsylvania Railroad, and the president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

"G. H. GATES (421),
"J. N. NORROW (141),
"J. B. PHILLIPS (200),
"*Resolutions Committee.*

"Moved by McGrath (225) and Sandilla (198) that the resolution be adopted.

"Motion carried unanimously."

Hoping that you will not concur in this proposed wasteful enterprise, which will only make the rich richer and the poor poorer, I am,

Sincerely yours,

U. D. HARTMAN,
General Chairman, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Pennsylvania, Lines West.

Protection on Import Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, imports of foreign commodities under our reciprocal trade agreements policy have in many instances been injurious to domestic industry. Many plants have either closed down or curtailed their operations, throwing many thousands of workers out of employment. Representatives of labor and management in affected industries have formed an organization known as the National Labor Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy. Their position on import competition has been well stated by Mr. O. Strackbein, chairman of the organization, in a letter appearing in the Washington Post on March 27, 1950. I trust that Members of the House will read it and give consideration to what Mr. Strackbein has said.

PROTECTION ON IMPORT COMPETITION

As chairman of the newly organized National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, may I express to you the position taken by the labor and management groups which make up the council in regard to the impact on certain American industries of the Administration's import policy.

Lower wages than those prevailing in the United States create the principal competitive advantage enjoyed by foreign countries when they ship dutiable merchandise into our domestic market. These lower wage rates often result in lower foreign costs and confer a price advantage upon the shipper to our shores, since his productivity is not generally so far below our own as to offset the lower wages. With the exception of a few products, such as automobiles, that are mass-produced by us, other countries are not very far behind us in productivity and are rapidly catching up in many lines because of the spread of mechanization.

In the meantime, however, and contrary to the theory of classical economists and free-trade advocates, the competitive advantages of imported dutiable goods in our domestic market are not generally reducible to superiority of natural resources, soil, climate, or greater efficiency in the countries of origin. Unfortunately they are attributable in some cases to simple exploitation of labor.

Competitive goods that derive their cheapness from this source therefore enter higher-standard countries with a spurious economic advantage rather than a fair one. Instead of spreading the economic benefits often attributed to trade, they undermine the living standards in the higher-standard importing countries.

In order to prevent the destruction of high-labor standards and to maintain the possibility of reasonable business profits, a high-standard country is therefore fully justified in taking measures to prevent the economic erosion that may result from unimpeded importation of competitive, as distinguished from complementary, goods from lower-wage countries.

Protective measures that are designed thus simply to place competitive foreign products on a fair competitive level in the market of a high-standard country cannot properly be described as trade barriers or obstacles to the flow of healthy trade. The United States is unique in the world of trade because all other countries operate on a lower-wage standard. Nevertheless approximately 60 percent of our imports are now free of duty, consisting largely of noncompetitive items and raw materials. The economic conditions of their production overseas cannot directly undermine our standards and our consumers can enjoy the lower prices without hurting domestic production.

However, the claim of consumers to the enjoyment of lower prices on the 40 percent remainder of our imports, which are competitive goods, is not valid if the lower prices of the latter merely reflect lower-wage levels abroad, since such a claim would be based on the destruction of our economic standards.

The postwar economic situation, characterized by an unprecedentedly high national debt, calls for the continuance of an unusually high annual national income, or one of well over $200,000,000,000. This requirement binds us, however, unwillingly, to a high-price level.

The interests not only of labor and management but also of the public therefore make it imperative that they seek reasonable safeguards against unfair and deflationary foreign competition.

O. STRACKBEIN,
Chairman, National Labor-Management Committee on Foreign Trade Policy.

WASHINGTON.

Unemployment Classified by Usual Occupations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statistics on unemployed persons in the United States on January 1950, classified by usual occupation:

Major occupation group:	Number of persons
Professional and semi-professional workers	124,000
Farmers and farm managers	25,000
Proprietors, managers, and officials, except farm	146,000
Clerical and kindred workers	348,000
Salesmen and salespersons	218,000
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	728,000
Operatives and kindred workers	1,153,000
Domestic service workers	135,000
Service workers, except domestic	377,000
Farm laborers and foremen	316,000
Laborers, except farm and mine	771,000
Never had a job	141,000
Total unemployed persons	4,480,000

Admiral Cook in Formosa as Adviser on Strategy to Chinese Nationalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown which appeared in the March 25 issue of the Washington Star with respect to the naval adviser to the Chinese Nationalist Government, Vice Adm. S. C. Cook:

THE CHANGING WORLD—ADMIRAL COOK IN FORMOSA AS ADVISER ON STRATEGY TO CHINESE NATIONALISTS

(By Constantine Brown)

Vice Adm. S. C. Cook, former commander of the Seventh Fleet in the Pacific, is in Formosa in the capacity of naval adviser to the Nationalist Government.

Admiral Cook, who retired from the Navy about 2 years ago, agreed to go to Formosa to help the Nationalists continue their struggle without any specific authorization from the United States Government.

The arrival of Admiral Cook has put some new life in the defenders of that island. So long as the Chinese Communists do not have the necessary landing craft and a powerful air force, it will be difficult for them to cross the nearly 100-mile stretch of water which separates the island from the mainland.

DEFECTION CHIEF FEAR

The possible defection of the Nationalist navy and air force was more feared by their government than an actual invasion. American observers on the spot have reported since last December that so long as these two branches of the Nationalist force remained loyal, the chances of a successful Communist landing remained slim. Communist propagandists have urged the air and naval personnel of the Nationalists to give up, since the United States and Britain had written them off.

The fact that the British Government broke diplomatic relations with the Nationalists and recognized the Peiping puppets did not worry the defenders of Formosa very much. Britain's prestige had been at a low ebb for some time.

But the Nationalists' abandonment by the United States was an entirely different story. The Chinese know that we stood by them ever since the Japanese invaded Manchuria in 1931, and considered us their only friends. Our attitude in recent years has severely undermined the morale of the Nationalist forces. It was more recently reflected in the doubtful loyalty of the personnel of the naval and air forces gathered in Formosa for a last stand.

PRESENCE ACTS LIKE TONIC

The mere presence of an American retired admiral, well known to the Chinese because of his previous associations with them, has acted like a tonic. Within a few weeks after he assumed the position of adviser to the Nationalist naval forces, a daring commando raid was staged on the mainland. On March 15, the town of Sugmen was occupied for a few days. After executing a number of Communist officials in that area, the raiding party split in two: one group went into the interior to join the guerrillas whose number is increasing rapidly; the other returned on board the raiding vessels and had a triumphal reception at the Keelung naval base in Formosa.

From a military standpoint the raid was of no consequence. But from a psychological warfare view it was more important than almost anything the Nationalists have done in the last 2 years. It raised the morale of the Nationalist armies which had suffered only defeats since 1947; it impressed the subjugated Chinese peoples who saw for the first time since the fall of Canton and Chungking regular troops on the mainland and it compelled the Communist army to detach two divisions from the south to prevent another possible incursion.

The rank and file of the civilians and military on Formosa probably are not aware that Admiral Cook is a civilian so far as the American Government is concerned. They look upon him as a representative of the American Navy and rejoice that Washington has finally decided to give them some assistance. The moral effect of Admiral Cook's presence on Formosa in terms of stiffening the resistance of the Nationalists is worth more than the ECA assistance we are giving their government sparingly.

Crucial Data

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the following article from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., of recent date:

TELLTALE CONGRESSMEN

Congressmen are always complaining that they don't get the truth, or at least all of it, from such important arms of Government as the State and Defense Departments. But they themselves are partly to blame, because few of them know how to keep a secret. They're undoubtedly right that they don't get the full story.

Of course some of the information they don't learn is too vital to security to be passed around, even within the departments. We're not thinking about rigidly classified material.

But lots of other data Congress could wisely lean upon for intelligent lawmaking it never gets. What it does find out about the state of our defense or political and

diplomatic conditions stirred is too often not distinguished either for accuracy or clarity.

The departments, to be sure, can't be whitewashed of responsibility for their part in this. Many Government officials have a generous contempt for the people's representatives and are predisposed to tell them as little as possible, just on general principles.

The thing is further complicated by the departments' dependence on Congress for money. Department officials come to Capitol Hill as bargainers, trying to put the best conceivable case for the granting of the funds they seek. Understandably, some inconvenient truths may not get told.

But there's another side of it. Congressmen as a rule are among the poorest guardians of a confidence to be found in Washington. Tell them something confidential and, like as not, it'll find its way into print in record time.

The average Congressman fairly bursts with self-importance when he's lugging a big secret around in his brief case. He can hardly wait to fish out a shiny photostat fresh from Government files and show it to a colleague, a visiting constituent, or a reporter.

The information usually is passed on with appropriate warnings not to disclose it. Yet few who relay such data to reporters can have any illusions about where the material will ultimately wind up.

The plain fact is the Congressmen want it known that they have important information. It increases their stature, they believe.

Actually, their stature would be a lot greater if they showed more responsibility in preserving confidences. They can't expect to be entrusted with crucial data so long as they spill the contents of their brief cases to every good listener who hits their offices.

There'll be more points to their demand for important facts when they learn to curb their schoolgirlish eagerness to command attention.

The Faith That Created America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial from the Everett (Mass.) Evening News-Gazette. This editorial brings a hopeful message to all Americans who believe in preserving our ancient landmarks. The editorial follows:

THE FAITH THAT CREATED AMERICA

John W. McPherrin, editor of the American Druggist, recently spent 6 weeks in England studying socialized medicine. He said that Britons seem to have accepted the "take doctrine" that the state alone can bring security, though, he added, "I don't think they really believe it deep down in their hearts." He quoted the British health minister, Aneurin Bevan, as saying in a private interview, "The method we are using to provide health for all the people will spread throughout the world. Such a change is inevitable. America must come to it."

Then he gave his own view in these words: "After 6 weeks in Great Britain I came home with a new reverence for the faith in mankind that created America. The same faith did not create the welfare state."

The main importance of socialized medicine—and of the compulsory Government health-insurance scheme now being proposed for this country—is that it is not a thing complete in itself, but part of an infinitely larger plan to give Government either ownership or absolute control over the people's resources and the people as individuals. According to the classic Communist dogma, socialized medicine is one of the most important steps in this direction. If it cannot be achieved all at once, an attempt is made to bring it on by degrees. To take a current example, Congress now has before it two bills, one of which would authorize Federal handouts to medical schools, and another which would make the Government responsible for the medical care of children within certain age groups. The obvious purpose is piecemeal socialization.

The welfare state, in all its many facets, is the antithesis of what we have believed to be the American tradition. Sooner or later, it would destroy that tradition totally.

Farmers Union Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, in these troublesome times, the farming situation in the Northwest is growing more troublesome, and from month to month it becomes even worse. The decline in prices of farm products steadily lowers the buying power of the great food-producing sections of our country. Looking backward to other such depressions, many are brought to a realization that hard times in rural sections frequently have been the forerunner of a national decline in prosperity.

Temporarily, Government expenditures may seem to protect the industrial centers, but loss of the purchasing power of the rural centers, in which reside nearly half our population, is a warning to all people. The number of the unemployed has mounted steadily in the past few months. It now is in excess of 4,000,000 workers, one of the unfavorable indications which quickly follows a decline in agriculture.

At the annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, in Eau Claire, there was brought together a large group of practical men as representatives of their great and growing organization. Most of these delegates come from the big dairy centers, from the dairy farms which produce such a large percentage of the milk and milk products which supply the Nation's industrial and commercial centers. These able men are students of economic conditions, as well as the details of dairy farm and home life. They speak from the wisdom born of long experience and observation. They know whereof they speak, and they speak not because of a love of vocal expression, but because they know and feel the difficulties with which all our people are confronted. Their thoughts are well worthy of the consideration of all people who recognize the gravity of the problem, and the necessity of a solution.

The debates of this big and important convention are in part embodied in a series of resolutions adopted at the convention. They were as follows:

RESOLUTIONS

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FHA

Whereas the Wisconsin Farmers Union is basically concerned with the welfare of all Wisconsin farmers, especially those operating family sized farming units and who are in need of financial assistance, and farm and home management guidance; and

Whereas many farmers in Wisconsin, both veterans and nonveterans with good agricultural backgrounds and experience lack the necessary land, livestock and equipment to be successful as farmers; and

Whereas the Farmers Home Administration, as an established agency in the United States Department of Agriculture, has for many years demonstrated its ability to give such financial aid, farm and home management guidance to needy veterans and other farmers, through its supervised credit program; and

Whereas this agency does not compete with any other agency by making loans only to worthy and qualified farmers, who are unable to get money through banks or other loaning institutions, and gives guidance not provided by other loaning sources; and

Whereas the funds annually appropriated for the use of the agency are entirely inadequate to meet the needs of eligible farm families; and

Whereas the need of eligible nonveteran farmers is particularly apparent at this time to be as great or greater than veterans, because many veterans have received the excellent service rendered by the FHA in recent years; and

Whereas prices of farm products, especially poultry and dairy products have dropped sharply this past year and continue downward with practically no reduction in farm supplies; and

Whereas the current drastic drop in farm income has been accompanied by a very pronounced tightening of local agricultural credit: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates attending the Twentieth Annual Convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, which is being held in Eau Claire, Wis., February 17–20, 1950, do favor the Farmers Home Administration being given the continued active support of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, and that our national office take such steps as are needed to inform Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture of the need for more appropriations so as to enable the FHA to meet the needs of eligible farm families; and be it further

Resolved, That our national office review the appropriation and the needs of this agency, and to inform Congress of the need of a deficiency appropriation if advisable in the light of current agricultural conditions; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY and all Wisconsin Congressmen.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Whereas years of effort have been devoted to the proposition of developing the St. Lawrence River as a joint seaway and hydroelectric power project by the Governments of the United States and Canada; and

Whereas the Canadian Government has completed a considerable part of its commitments with respect to developing the St. Lawrence River as a joint project of the two nations, and is now waiting for the United States to take decisive action; and

Whereas dairy, grain, and livestock farmers in central and midwestern United States have a definite stake in the development of the St. Lawrence seaway as a means of gaining access to foreign markets for the products; and

Whereas freight rates and handling costs have increased more than 50 percent in the last few years and these costs must be borne by consumers in our eastern cities in higher food prices: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Farmers Union delegates attending the organization's twentieth annual convention in Eau Claire, Wis., February 17–20, 1950, do hereby reaffirm our previous stand that the St. Lawrence seaway be developed as a means of giving the landlocked central and midwestern farmers an ocean gateway; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of the resolution be forwarded to Wisconsin's congressional representatives with the request that they push for action on this project.

THE BRANNAN PLAN

Whereas the American farmer has done a wonderful job producing food and fiber to meet the needs of the whole world; and

Whereas it is unfair to any group of society not to be insured of a decent standard of living, especially after having contributed so wholeheartedly of their sweat and toil to feed the world; and

Whereas the present agricultural program is inadequate in that it concerns itself primarily with the prices of individual farm products. With the program now in, there are no funds for the Secretary of Agriculture to use, so it means nothing to the price-support program; and

Whereas the Brannan plan program is designed to provide the American farmers with a sounder and more effective farm program than is now available to them. At the time it aims to assure consumers of plentiful and steady supplies of agricultural products at reasonable prices; and

Whereas the proposed program carries a definite and realistic income objective and uses price support as a means to that end: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates attending the twentieth annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, which is being held in Eau Claire, Wis., February 17 to 20, 1950, go on record supporting the Brannan plan; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our Congressmen and Senators.

ABOLITION OF ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Whereas our present system of an electoral college for the purpose of electing a President and Vice President of the United States is not only outmoded but also undemocratic: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Farmers Union, by action of the delegates attending the twentieth annual convention of the organization, held at Eau Claire, Wis., February 17–20, 1950, do favor the abolition of the electoral college and instead favor the direct election by popular vote of the President and Vice President of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our congressional Representatives with the petition that they initiate legislation to accomplish this object.

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

Whereas competent studies show that the United States will need school buildings for at least six and a half million additional children during the next 6 years; and

Whereas at least 2,000,000 American children of school age are not attending any school; and

Whereas hundreds of rural communities in the United States are unable to finance a sound system of rural education; and

Whereas we contend that education is the keystone of our representative form of government and a cardinal requisite for the preservation of our democratic way of life; and

Whereas in both the Eighth and Eighty-first Congresses the United States Senate passed a bill to provide Federal aid for the Nation's schools, but twice the reactionaries in the House of Representatives killed this legislation; and

Whereas the President of the United States in his budget message to Congress last month requested an appropriation of $400,000,000 for education and general research; and

Whereas we believe that this sum is insufficient when contrasted to the $13,600,000,000 requested for national defense: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates attending the Twentieth Annual Convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, which is being held in Eau Claire, Wis., February 17 to 20, 1950, do hereby go on record in favor of reducing the request for defense funds and increasing funds for educational aid; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Wisconsin congressional representatives as an expression of our views with the request that they support our proposals with their votes.

John M. Cashman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the following eulogies that appeared in the newspapers in the city of Lynn, Mass., following the passing of one of the outstanding members of the bar of that city.

This lovable member of the profession, Attorney John M. Cashman, had served with honor and distinction as the assistant city solicitor of that city for a number of years.

The statement "Cashman files brief" appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News on Thursday, March 23, 1950. The other article entitled "John M. Cashman" appeared in the Lynn Daily Item of that city. The entire city of Lynn and members of the legal fraternity, friends, and associates outside of that city respectfully mourn his passing:

CASHMAN FILES BRIEF

Assistant City Solicitor John M. Cashman presented the final and most important brief of his brilliant career early Tuesday morning as he faced the supreme judge of all—St. Peter.

It couldn't have been too lengthy a summation since John had received little notice of the assignment. It must have been something he hastily composed when the angels of death began to hover about him in his lonely hospital room at the Palmer House. But then John was never one for literary hemorrhages, he had a penchant for saying things as speedily as possible and his success in the legal field was attended by that reputation that he was a man who came to the point early in a discussion.

John could have told St. Peter many things the other morning, that he had always been a devoted husband and companion, a doting father, a man who had not the time to belabor his fellowmen with criticism, a churchman who had always taken his religion seriously, but knowing him as they did his friends are certain his summation went something like this: "You've been keeping the books. What's the verdict?"

John M. Cashman won the game of life, for he never allowed it to become too important to him. In death he is even greater than in life, for only now may the populace truly appraise the exemplary existence of this man. There is no great sorrow over the death of John Cashman, for death is inevitable and it meant nothing to him. He could have met it as a boy or as a young man, but a kind Providence allowed him to round out a full and complete life before separating from his loved ones. That was how John looked at it. He never at any time during his mortal span ever stopped being thankful for his blessings.

True, Lynn has lost an outstanding citizen, the city an able servant, the bar an insatiable student, and his loved ones a devoted companion, but balancing all of these things is the lesson of the life he lived; that man is not important upon his earth, that his reward, if there is to be one, must come in still another sphere. There is no doubting the fact that John Cashman enjoys that rich reward today, the pains gone from his chest, his stiff knee strong and new, the multiple correspondence he signed for the rotary machine a memory, legal opinion and briefs a hazy item of the past.

John M. Cashman, virile, strong, brilliant, wealthy, chose to live with the Almighty for the greater portion of his life. Were legal opinions necessary in his new domain, no doubt he'd command a dozen of the most talented stenographers in Heaven.

JOHN M. CASHMAN

Lynn has lost one of the most brilliant members of the legal fraternity and a public servant of the highest integrity in the death of Attorney John M. Cashman, assistant city solicitor for the past 29 years.

John Cashman loved his profession and brought to it an ardor that never waned. He was thoroughly versed in the intricacies of the law, particularly in municipal law, a field in which he won recognition throughout the Commonwealth. His private practice was large and fruitful.

The respect and esteem in which he was held by his professional colleagues was best attested by the fact that he was chosen by them to serve 15 years as president of the Lynn Bar Association, an honor not to be regarded lightly in a community plentifully supplied with legal talent of a rich order.

Mr. Cashman was a man of unimpeachable personal character, devoted to his home and family and to various civic causes to which he brought the same enthusiasm and industry that he demonstrated in his professional duties. His sense of humor, his keen intellectual background, his inquiring mind and his genial amiability won him countless, enduring friends in many circles. Lynn is the poorer in his passing.

Putting the Votes on Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., appearing in their issue of March 25.

This editorial endorses and favors my House Resolution 452 which would require a record vote—yes and nay—on

all appropriation bills of public funds or of a public nature.

The editorial is as follows:

FORCING THE VOTES ON RECORD

Representative ROGERS of Florida wants to have the House of Representatives do a very sensible thing—require a yea-and-nay vote (which becomes a matter of public record) on every bill or resolution that appropriates public funds. He has introduced a resolution to that effect and has asked the Rules Committee to approve it, so that it can be brought before the House.

Mr. ROGERS points out the interesting fact that last year Congress authorized and appropriated upward of $26,000,000,000 without a record vote in either House or Senate to show how individual members voted. Record votes were taken on some measures in the Senate, omitted on others. Mr. ROGERS believes that when the people's representatives vote to spend the people's money, their votes should be taken down. He is right. It should be required. His proposal merely establishes a rule that no one can quarrel with: That the people are entitled to know who voted for and against that spending.

The Propaganda War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Propaganda War," published in the Bridgeport Post of March 24. It is the judgment of my community of Fairfield, Conn., that Mr. George Waldo, Editor of the Post, wields one of the manliest and wisest pens in the newspaper world. Of course, I am most happy to submit for the RECORD this particular editorial entitled "The Propaganda War," because it indicates the support of this eloquent writer and this influential newspaper for the greatly enlarged campaign of ideas which I advocated last week on the floor of the Senate. I know such support will make its influence felt in Congress, in the administration, and in the State Department.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROPAGANDA WAR

Senator WILLIAM BENTON, of Connecticut, is the only Member of the Senate with actual State Department experience—in his case, as a former Assistant Secretary of State. When he took the floor the other day and uttered a plea for Secretary Dean Acheson, asking Congress to be his advisor on foreign policy but not his executioner, he had the advantage of being able to delineate State Department problems, not from hearsay, but from direct knowledge. His plea was an effective one.

But the important part of Senator BENTON's speech was not his defense of the present Secretary of State, but his offering of a resolution, supported by a group of his colleagues, which would vastly extend our activities in giving the rest of the world the truth about American policies, American officials, and American institutions.

Senator BENTON made his point most effectively. He proved that Communist infiltration depends upon propaganda, not upon war or force, and that in the propaganda war the Communists thus far have marshalled forces far exceeding our own.

They are telling the rest of the world that the United States is headed for an economic crash, that its rulers are Fascists and warmongers, that the rich are getting richer but that everybody else is getting poorer, that starvation is rampant, that our ideal of freedom is a fraud, that we practice racial and religious discrimination, and that we are culturally barbarous, money-mad, lawless, and crime-ridden.

Propaganda of this nature is pumped forth from Moscow every day. It reaches every Russian and it probably reaches most of the people in the satellite countries, not to mention a great many others beyond the borders who hear the Russian radio blasts or read the Russian periodicals.

A great part of the world is completely puzzled regarding the United States because our counteroffensive in the propaganda line has been weak and ineffective. It isn't enough that we in America know the utter absurdity of Russia's lying charges against us. The rest of the world does not know. To tell the world is our foremost duty if we would win the cold war.

As Senator BENTON well says, this is not merely a struggle for territory, it is a struggle for the minds, the hearts and the imagination of the rest of the world. He proposes a propaganda offensive on three fronts, by radio, the movies, and the printed word, and on a scale in keeping with our size and resources and the importance of this issue. He admits that this would cost money. Some might call it big money, he says, as compared with the appropriation for the Library of Congress, but it is small money as compared with the cost of the Navy or the hydrogen bomb.

We hope Senator BENTON's idea will receive the most serious consideration. Russia's admitted victories in the propaganda war have been injurious to our prestige, harmful to our pride, and costly to our pocketbooks, in the sense that we have tried to gain good will solely by dumping dollars. It doesn't work.

Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the proclamation of the distinguished Governor of Michigan, the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, expressing his interest in the conservation of wildlife during this fitting period of National Wildlife Restoration Week:

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Lansing,

PROCLAMATION—NATIONAL WILDLIFE RESTORATION WEEK

Michigan's citizens are becoming increasingly aware of their obligation to coming generations to help in conserving our natural resources.

Michigan has held a position of acknowledged leadership since the inception of the conservation movement in this Nation. Michigan is a leader now in a movement to teach conservation principles in the State's public schools and to take boys and girls into the outdoors where they can learn first-hand about soil, water, trees, minerals, and wildlife, and all the God-given natural resources on which our well-being and prosperity are dependent.

Prudent management of our natural resources, including water, soil, trees, and all other plant as well as animal life, is imperative if we are to continue to prosper as a State and as a Nation. To this end it is essential that we enlist the interest and cooperation of every citizen in the carrying out of good conservation measures.

It is fitting, therefore, that Michigan should play a leading part in the observance of America's thirteenth annual National Wildlife Restoration Week, and that each individual should dedicate himself to the conservation pledge which states:

"I give my pledge as an American to save and faithfully to defend from waste the natural resources of my country—its soil and minerals, its forests, waters, and wildlife."

Therefore, I, G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim the week of March 19 to 26 as National Wildlife Restoration Week, and urge the participation of all Michigan citizens in the observance of the week and in public programs which will emphasize the importance of conservation to us and to future generations.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Michigan this 26th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1950, and of the Commonwealth the one hundred and fourteenth.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

Something to Think About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial which recently appeared in the Somerville (Mass.) Journal. This editorial reflects, I am sure, an attitude on the part of our people which is steadily becoming more pronounced and more vocal. The editorial follows:

SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT

Socialism versus capitalism has become the biggest peacetime issue in this country. And yet voters have never had an opportunity at the polls to express a clear-cut preference. Everyone appears to be against socialism, European style. At the same time its physical manifestation here in our own land is steadily growing.

At present, the Federal Government costs us close to $50,000,000,000 a year out of our total income of about $200,000,000,000. The Federal, State, and local governments, combined, take about one-third of everything we produce. We work for ourselves only 2 out of every 3 days. With a 40-hour workweek, we have less than 27 hours, or about 3½ days per week to produce our food, clothing, and shelter, and to maintain our health and education.

Government already owns one-fourth of all the land in the United States. It has also become the biggest employer in the world. It now has more than 2,000,000 civilian employees. They receive a half billion dollars per month.

Many more million citizens have become dependent upon payments, benefits, subsidies, and hand-outs. One out of every six adult Americans receives checks regularly from Washington. A United Press report sets the figures at 15,830,899. If each check went to a different family, that would mean that 42.7 percent or nearly half of the American families now balance their budgets with money from Washington.

Each year our tax burdens increase. Each year others join the ever-increasing ranks of the 15,830,899 who are directly dependent on Washington's management of their lives, either in whole or in part.

No one has a greater stake in the issue of socialism in the United States than each one of us as an individual. It is an issue which goes to the very roots of representative government. It is an issue about which we must think intelligently and constructively. We must become vocal in our opposition to the socialistic trend, sugar-coated though it is, and we must vote for those who still believe that as this country became great under a representative governmental system with regulated capitalism, so it can continue to be great and to grow stronger and greater under that same system.

Editorials From the Progressive Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Progressive Farmer, an outstanding farm magazine, there appeared two editorials which I think will be of interest to the Members. I include them herewith:

YES; FARMERS NEED SOCIAL SECURITY PROTECTION

"Aren't there any old-age benefits for farm workers or benefits for his widow and children—like there are for town workers?"

This question was put to us by a farm hand a few months ago. And our answer, of course, had to be, "No." Thus far Congress has done nothing to provide payments for farmers, farm tenants, and farm hands such as are provided for industrial workers when they reach 65, or if they become permanently disabled at an earlier age.

We believe the time has come when Congress should make such provision. Three reasons why stand out clearly in our viewpoint:

1. Every day farm people are paying to provide such benefits for other classes, but getting no such benefits themselves.

2. Unless capable farm tenants and farm hands get such benefits soon, they are more likely to get town and city work where such benefits are provided.

3. Any right-hearted farmer would hate to fire a man because of age or disability, yet he may feel that he cannot afford to support such a man by paying him regular wages. Under the social-security plan, employer and employee both pay into an insurance fund that takes care of such payments.

Some further questions commonly asked about this program and the correct answers, according to the best information we can get, are as follows:

"What classes of benefits would be given farmers under the social-security program and how much?"

There are three classes of monthly payment benefits as follows:

1. Old-age or retirement payments at age 65.

2. Total disability payments.

3. Payments to widow and children in case of the death of the farmer, farm tenant, or farm laborer.

"Suppose I am a farmer or farm tenant or farm worker, with net income of $200 a month; how would these payments work out?"

1. If you should become totally and permanently disabled at any age, you would receive $62 a month as long as disabled.

2. If you should retire at 65 (or later) you would receive $62 a month the rest of your life; your wife, $31 a month after reaching age 65; and any child under 18 would receive $46 a month till he or she reached age 18.

3. If you should die leaving a wife and children, your widow would receive $46 a month until your youngest child becomes 18 and continuously after reaching age 65. Each child would receive $31 a month until reaching age 18.

So much for monthly payments to persons who have paid premiums based on a net income of $200 a month. If your income has been $100 a month, you would receive about 80 percent as much; if $300 a month, about one-sixth more than the amounts just given. Corresponding amounts will be given for larger or smaller incomes.

"How much would it cost the farm people to be thus included for social-security benefits?"

The farm operator and tenant farmer would each pay a premium of 2¼ percent on the first $3,600 of his net (not gross) farm income per year—such a net income as your income tax would show after all deductions are made. This would be $45 a year on a net income of $2,000. The premium rate would gradually increase until 1969, when it would be 4⅞ percent. The farm hand would pay 1½ percent of his wages to begin with, and after 1969, 3⅛ percent. The employer and employee contribute an equal amount to provide protection for the farm hand and his family.

"What reports will the farm operator have to make?"

The farm operator and tenant farmer would each report annually with their income-tax returns, and pay the premiums indicated. The reports of farm hands would be handled either on a quarterly return or a stamp-plan system.

We repeat our belief that farmers, farm tenants, and farm workers should write our Congressmen and Senators and ask to be included in this social-security program. It will make farm tenants and workers and their families more contented and therefore more efficient and stable. It will save farm owners from the ever-present threat of having to look after disabled workers or needy widows and children, or else see them suffer.

Furthermore, these important facts should never be forgotten: (1) All manufacturers now pay to provide social security for town and factory workers; (2) manufacturers add these social-security payments to their production costs when fixing the prices of manufactured products we buy and pass these costs on to consumers; (3) therefore, farmers, farm workers, and farm tenants are every day paying large amounts to provide social-security benefits for industrial workers while farmers and farm workers have no such protection.

WE ARE LOSING PATIENCE

American Government is big business. Able men of unquestioned honesty and integrity are required in its administration for the public. Yet, no sooner does an able, courageous man accept an important post in public service than he becomes a target for the sharpshooters. No matter how honest he may be, no matter how capable in carrying out the duties of his post, the villainous crew starts tearing him apart.

There's always room for difference of opinion. Difference of opinion invites argument. But an argument, even though it be heated, does not justify vilification.

We are losing patience with those who differ with others just for the sake of being different. We have long since lost patience with those who, in their effort to win an argument, stoop to vilification of the person with whom they differ.

We hold no brief for those few who seek public post with selfish intent. These few are soon unmasked and made to pay the penalty. Such persons should be exposed, and we honor those who bring their shame to light. But in seeking out these few, why crucify the far greater number who are working diligently, earnestly, and ably in behalf of the public good?

How can any man in position of public trust render best service when he is forced to spend much of his time in parrying personal slander? How can any man, feeling the dejection that comes from unjust attacks, be expected to render top service? How can any able businessman, one who enjoyed the accomplishment of building up and directing a successful business, one who has enjoyed the prestige that comes from such accomplishment, have the courage to accept a high position in Government, where he will be the target for all types and classes of vicious snipers? The ablest among us sometimes are the most sensitive.

We have many, many able men who have been in public service over a long period of years. These men continue to flinch when hit by the barbs cast their way. These men still have feelings. But their appreciation of the importance of the work they are doing, their feeling of responsibility for the proper performance of this work goads them on, dulls the pain from the uncalled-for attacks. We feel for these men who have the courage to remain in public service. We are losing patience with those who can see no good, those who can think nothing but evil.

What Oleo Can Do That Butter Can't

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by a constituent to the editor of the Des Moines Register:

WHAT OLEO CAN DO THAT BUTTER CAN'T

To the EDITOR:

A short time ago Hoard's Dairyman outlined six things that oleo can do that butter cannot do, and seldom has any editorial message been so widely reprinted.

Here is what it said:

"If you think the oleo monopoly has been misrepresented, read these advantages:

"1. Oleo can use benzoate of soda as a preservative.

"2. Oleo can use glycerides to change melting point.

"3. Oleo can bleach their natural greenish-gray product to a more desirable white.

"4. Oleo can hydrogenate and clean up oils going into its manufacture.

"5. Oleo can fortify its product with synthetic vitamins.

"6. Oleo can use the drug diacetyl to correct and imitate flavor.

"7. Oleo can use any color in the rainbow except yellow by Ohio law (before the November referendum).

"Butter would be branded as adulterated if it did any of the above. Don't you think oleo has gone far enough?"

By the way, in his opening campaign speech at Adel in 1948, it seems that Harry Truman said something about somebody sticking a pitchfork in the farmer's back. In signing the new oleo bill, I wonder who is wielding the pitchfork now on the dairy farmers.

F. W. PETERSEN.

WILLIAMS, IOWA.

The Day We Celebrate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech, delivered in Rhode Island on St. Patrick's Day by the majority leader of the House, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK:

THE DAY WE CELEBRATE

I am honored and happy to be with you tonight on this festive occasion, particularly to be on the same speaking program with my close friend of years in Washington, Vice President BARKLEY, and my very close and valued friend, Father Shaven, president of Providence College.

The quaint mixture of Irish fancy and grim realism may well serve to remind us that one of the most important qualities which the world needs today is a willingness to face facts—no matter how unpleasant—and at the same time remain steadfast to high ideals and principles.

I mention this quality—not to the exclusion of others equally praiseworthy—but to emphasize it as an Irish characteristic peculiarly applicable to the saint whose day we celebrate.

It was approximately 1,500 years ago that the mortal remains of St. Patrick were wrapped in the shroud said to have been woven by St. Brigid, and laid to rest in the soil of the land that he had won to the heart and love of God.

Over the span of those centuries, perhaps no individual in the calendar of the saints has grown larger in stature, won greater popular affection and devotion, or wielded greater influence for good.

The secret of that growth and popularity and influence is found in the name of your society. For all the adjectives which might be chosen to describe him, none is so apt as "friendly." The secret of the success of his mission in Ireland is discovered in his friendliness to all of God's creatures. In one of his biographies we are told that "he could never look unmoved on the sorrows and sufferings of the unfriendly," and he is described as "full of compassion and sympathy for the poor and suffering"—a man "whose charitableness in his own regard was completed by a great generosity toward others." Such is the saint whose name and fame we honor and in whom we may, with just pride, rejoice as his "friendly sons."

Patron of the land where he labored, revered by Christians and religious-minded persons everywhere, an illustrious example of religious zeal and patriotic fervor to all men in all ages, the slave boy who became a saint is universally acknowledged as one of the great figures in all recorded history.

Because he had experienced the degradation of slavery and fought so fiercely against the horrible slave system of pagan Ireland, St. Patrick's interest in the Irish people was marked by strong emphasis upon the virtue of freedom and the inherent dignity of man. So well did he labor, so indelible was his teaching, that ever since, the Irish people have been foremost in the world in their burning love of independence and in their positive declaration of the natural rights of man.

Modern diplomacy might well take heed from the example of St. Patrick. In fact, the history of the conversion of Ireland to Christianity should be required reading for all who aspire to the role of statesman. For of all of his great accomplishments, none distinguished the missionary bishop to Ireland more than his political acumen and his astute diplomacy.

As a Roman provincial from Britain undertaking a mission in a pagan land, St. Patrick might easily have courted failure and disaster. His passionate love for the Irish people, however, and his sympathy and respect for native culture and traditions assured his success.

While his primary motive was the winning of souls to God, his way was that of the mild, sincere, and persuasive diplomat. He made friends and converts among Irish lawyers, poets, and chiefs of clans, and with their help, he strove to conform native legislation with Christian ethics. St. Patrick respected Irish social conventions, and Irish manners and customs insofar as they did not conflict with the principles of the spiritual truths and the philosophy which he preached.

As a result, while he met with trying difficulties, St. Patrick enjoys the unique distinction of converting a whole people without strife, persecution, or bloodshed. At the same time, so deep was the impress of his Christian thought on the matter of government that as late as 1938, when the present Irish constitution was adopted, the Irish people formulated their organic charter in the name of the Most Holy Trinity and in profound acknowledgment of their obligations to the Saviour of mankind. Parenthetically, I might here pose a question: Is it not significant that the one country in modern Europe which boldly acclaims God and His Divine Son as the beginning and the end of all things is also the one country where the evil doctrine of communism has no chance of acceptance or survival?

Indeed, the work and the teaching of St. Patrick has stood the test of time. He came to the people of Ireland, not as a disdainful representative of a foreign culture, not as a dictator to enforce his mission by coercion, but as a friend bearing the gift of his friendship, the hope of his doctrine, and the sublime faith of a religion which has endured to this day as the bulwark of the land and its people.

We well know, as students of history, that the tribal nation to which he had come as a missionary was a land of warlike people. The Ireland—a united Ireland—to whose embracing soil he was committed at his death was already known to the then civilized world as the isle of saints and scholars. This tremendous and significant change had been brought about by the heroic life and labors of a single man of intense faith—St. Patrick, Ambassador of God to Ireland.

On the day we celebrate, 15 centuries after his death, the fruits of his ministry are still being harvested in an ever-widening garden.

His seed was the grain of truth—the divinely revealed truths of the Christian religion—and the natural truths of freedom, charity, and justice.

His granary was the fold of the faith—faith in God, faith in the idea of Christian brotherhood, and faith in the supernatural dignity of man as a creature of his maker.

It is this faith which is today the living legacy of St. Patrick.

Its Ireland itself, the preservation of that faith has been the paradox of history.

Some ascribe it to a natural antipathy to England and everything English.

The English, in turn, have been want to ascribe it to a natural obstinacy which they claim to be inherent in the Irish.

Others are inclined to ascribe it to a native conservatism and the Irish love for antiquity.

All of these reasons may have in them the germ of truth, but none of them, nor all of them together, can explain the moral miracle and supernatural fact that a whole people for many generations chose confiscation, extermination, degradation, exile, and death rather than give up their faith.

The true reason is that the light of their faith, so fully revealed to them by St. Patrick, fired their intelligence, steeled their will, fortified their character, and endowed them with grace and strength to the extent that hell itself could not prevail against them.

Truly, indeed, have the Irish people and their descendants "fought the good fight and kept the faith." Our generation has witnessed their triumph.

When St. Patrick, in defiance of the high king's edict, lighted the Paschal fire on Slane Hill, it is recorded that the Druid priest said to the king:

"Unless yonder fire be this night extinguished, he who lighted it will, together with his followers, reign over the whole island."

That fire was dimmed only by the brilliant glory of the dawn of Easter, and its flame was exceeded in intensity only by the passionate faith of the man who ignited it.

St. Patrick conquered—and he still reigns over the whole island.

To us, and to the legion of other spiritual descendants of St. Patrick all over the world, with his spirit inspiring us, and with God and his infinite wisdom guiding and directing us, that fire will never die out.

To the troubled world of today—it is the fire of hope and of success.

The fire of St. Patrick lit centuries ago and which still burns with strength and splendor is the fire of God and his law; the fire of true and firm faith; and is the fire of the way of life we believe in which has its origin in God, Himself.

It is the fire of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Appropriation for Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of increasing—and in many instances justifiable—clamor within the Nation for economy, it is my thought that when additional funds are appropriated for purposes as controversial as the House Un-American Activities Committee has been in the past, some remarks of justification are in order.

I must admit that when I accepted membership on this committee a year ago, it was with some misgivings. It was far more unpopular than popular. Since serving for more than a year now as ranking member, under the most able chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] I feel that the many hours spent in committee have enabled me to make good use of the main privilege afforded me as a Representative in Congress—that of serving the interests of not just a few at a time, but of the entire Nation at one and the same time. I do not think it can be denied that the record of the House Un-American Activities Committee in the Eighty-first Congress proves that the comportment of the committee has greatly changed under the leadership of the gentleman from Georgia. While we have been successful in making new disclosures of activities dangerous to the security of our country and of machinations aimed at the destruction of our form of government, not the least of our accomplishments has been our effort—and I feel a successful one—to protect those whose reputations might be irrevocably impaired by the hasty release of uninvestigated or unsubstantiated reports or information.

Our chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, is sparing no time or effort to review for the benefit not only of the individuals concerned, but for the preservation of the very basis of our system of Anglo-Saxon democratic jurisprudence, an enormous volume of information trying to preserve the rights of individuals, to protect the innocent or innocently involved and to expose the real culprits.

It is both an honor and a pleasure to serve under the chairmanship of a man who understands all that is at stake in the important work of the House Un-American Activities Committee. I am taking this opportunity to add to the remarks already on record that I deem it a privilege to serve on the House Un-American Activities Committee and I wish to commend our chairman and my colleagues on this committee for excellent service at the not most savory of tasks.

Tribute to J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tribute to the FBI," from the Washington Star of a few days ago, which pays a highly deserved tribute to J. Edgar Hoover.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE FBI

When an economy-minded House Appropriations Committee gives a Government agency all the additional money it asks for and recommends a salary raise for its head besides, there must be a reason. Beneficiaries of this extraordinary treatment by a group which has not hesitated to wield the ax on many other agencies were the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its long-time Director, J. Edgar Hoover. The reason for the committee's attitude is not hard to find. It lies in the FBI's remarkable record as a protector of the Nation's security in this "cold war" era of spying and counterspying.

The committee, without a quibble, approved Mr. Hoover's request for $4,900,000 in additional funds with which to hire 709 more employees, including 225 new agents. In granting the full $57,400,000 asked by the FBI for the next fiscal year, the committee said it "does not feel justified in reducing the estimates of this Bureau in view of conditions at home and abroad." The new employees will help the FBI to reduce the backlog of nearly 14,000 pending security investigations. The committee agreed that such cases are too important to suffer any delay in searching out the facts.

The action of the committee is indicative of the high esteem in which the FBI is held at the Capitol and elsewhere as a result of its effective warfare on potential fifth columnists in the Government and outside of it. It has waged this difficult warfare without resort to witch-hunting tactics, without any semblance of police-state tendencies and without succumbing to political or other pressures. The FBI and Mr. Hoover well deserve the tribute implicit in the House committee's recommendation that both the Bureau and its Director be given more money for their outstanding work.

Startled by Reaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I was much struck with the sound reasoning of Doris Fleeson in her recent column in the Washington Star headed "Startled by Reaction." It appeared to me to be an excellent analysis of the dilemma facing the reactionary group in the Republican Party in its effort to repudiate the civil-rights principles in the Republican Party national platform. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert it in the RECORD:

STARTLED BY REACTION—GABRIELSON NIBBLES AT FORBIDDEN APPLE OF DIXIECRAT-GOP COALITION

(By Doris Fleeson)

Republican National Chairman Guy Gabrielson has been nibbling at the forbidden apple of a Dixiecrat-GOP coalition. The reaction in the form of protests from Negro organizations and others has proved somewhat startling to the politically naive chairman and more embarrassing than somewhat to those who manage his public relations.

In an interview Mr. Gabrielson offhandedly mentioned that he had recently discussed with States rights leaders a trial marriage at the top between them and the GOP.

ELEMENTS OF STRATEGY

The elements of this strategy which could defeat President Truman in 1952 are:

The Republicans meet first and nominate their candidates. The States rights men convene and nominate the same men. The invention of the Alabama State chairman, Gessner McCorvey, this scheme is guaranteed by the Dixiecrats to produce twice as many southern electoral votes as they got in 1948. Many Democrats agree and are heartily afraid of it.

The gimmick, however, is that such an arrangement necessarily implies that the Republicans and States rights men have a preconvention understanding on acceptable candidates. At the least it would give the States' rights a veto power over the GOP slate.

It also suggests a veto power for them over civil-rights legislation, as many people are briskly pointing out to Republican headquarters. The difficulty of making a direct answer without pulling the rug out from under a very important person is obvious. It is probable, however, that the national chairman will be more careful in the future both of his conferences and confidences.

REPLIES TO NEGRO REPORTER

Mr. Gabrielson has had difficulties in matters of this kind before. In reply to a Negro reporter's question about whether he favored FEPC, he told a press conference that you could not legislate human relations. An aide swiftly struck in with a reminder that his own State of New Jersey had an anti-discrimination law often praised by Republican Governor Driscoll. The chairman gulped and clambered safe to shore with fuller explanations that FEPC was a fine thing.

It is not too hard to understand that Republicans are greatly tempted by devices that after 20 years may put them back in power. The conservatives, of whom Mr. Gabrielson is one, are especially restive and in a mood to try anything once.

But to accept the Dixiecrat proffer involves sacrifice of the civil-rights principle by the party of Abraham Lincoln, southern newspapers which are editorializing widely on the Gabrielson-Dixiecrat discussions, warn that Republicans cannot get the South without abandoning civil rights enforced by the Federal Government.

Republican sentiment on this question will be tested in the Senate soon when Majority Leader Lucas calls up the FEPC bill and asks that cloture be applied to the inevitable southern filibuster.

Meanwhile Republicans are shopping harder than ever for an astute press agent for the national committee and Mr. Gabrielson.

Guy George Gabrielson, Republican National Chairman, May Not Realize It But He Gives Aid and Comfort to Moscow and Follows Communist Party Line in His Attack on American Foreign Policy; if Gabrielson's Efforts Were To Succeed, Kremlin Would Rejoice and Danger of War Would Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith timely views as expressed in excerpts from a radio broadcast by Mr. Elmer Davis over the American Broadcasting Co. network on March 22, 1950. Mr. Davis' remarks, heard locally over Station WMAL, follow:

It has been clear for some time that Senator MCCARTHY's real target is not the minor figures he has been talking about, in the State Department or formerly in the State Department or never in the State Department. The man he is trying to get is the Secretary of State. Until last night he had

little help from his fellow Republicans. To put it in military terms, McCARTHY seemed to be an expendable advance guard pushed out to make a reconnaissance in force. If he found anything the main body would move forward and back him up; if he didn't find anything, McCARTHY would be left out on his limb.

The main body has not yet moved; but last night two strong forces came up to support him—Mr. Gabrielson, chairman of the Republican National Committee, and Senator WHERRY, the floor leader. Speaking in Omaha, Mr. WHERRY said the Secretary of State must go; he is a bad security risk. He is, said Mr. WHERRY, the tool of the left-wing Appease-Russia agitators. This idea would never occur to anybody who reads the papers, but Mr. WHERRY is apparently too busy to do that. Acheson and the Reds crowd, he says, have been calling the signals in the State Department, thus betraying China, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and all the countries of eastern Europe. Mr. Gabrielson doesn't quite say that Acheson is a Communist; he merely implies it, and supports Senator McCARTHY's story that the Government is infested with Communists. The attack on Acheson is not yet a formal Republican policy; but two eminent Republican leaders have now joined McCARTHY in demanding that Acheson must go.

Well, Acheson is not going to go. He has not the slightest intention of resigning, nor has the President the slightest intention of removing him. But it might be worth while seeing what would be the consequences if this McCarthy-Wherry-Gabrielson crusade did succeed. Mr. Acheson has lately laid down the policy of the United States for dealing with Russia—to get not merely solutions but satisfactory solutions of seven problems, before we could live in the same world with the Russians in reasonable security; and to do so by building up situations of strength which the Russians must recognize. That is a tough and a bleakly realistic policy. It offers no comfort to the appeasers or the let's-hope-for-the-better; it is already being attacked by the people who either still trust Russian promises, or else are simply scared. It is a policy which will take time, and cost money, and will entail some danger. Any policy entails some danger; this in my judgment entails less than any other, but it does entail some danger so far and still more to our European allies who are nearer to Russia. Nevertheless, it looks like the policy that offers the best hope of preserving a just and honorable peace.

If Acheson were thrown out, that policy would be thrown out with him. You are not going to make foreign nations believe he is a Communist; they know better. And they are never likely to understand the motives of the Gabrielsons and the Wherrys. If Acheson were thrown out every foreign nation—the Russians, and our allies, and the nations of northern Asia that were still on the fence—they would all conclude that the United States had repudiated the Acheson policy. And our allies, if they take Mr. Gabrielson seriously, would conclude that we had repudiated them too. For he says that socialism is just about as bad as communism, and leads to the police state; he says the third force on the continent of Europe is bad—communism, though everybody with the slightest knowledge of current history is aware, it is the most active and most effective opposition to communism. Beyond England, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, France where the third force is keeping the Communists down—these nations are now our allies. But if they thought that Guy George Gabrielson spoke for the American people every one of them might reasonably look around now and pick out the nearest exit, see what terms they could make with the Russians. For if his crusade and his ideas should prevail they could well conclude that the United States was ready to run out on them; ready to turn either to appeasement or to isolationism.

If Acheson were thrown out, no man who might succeed him could pick up his policy—that tough and bleak but realistic policy—and make it work; for you could never persuade either our enemies or our friends, after that, that the policy had the support of the American people. That would mean an end to any hope of stopping the Russian advance by a vigorous and intelligent diplomacy; it would leave us no way to stop it but by war, and a war which we might have to fight alone, since Mr. Gabrielson has repudiated our allies.

Now Mr. WHERRY and Mr. Gabrielson of course do not intend to work this vast injury to the interests of the United States; they mean well, they simply don't know. They have no idea that if their crusade against American foreign policy were successful, it would greatly increase the danger of war, and would also greatly increase the danger that we would lose the war. Fortunately there are Republicans who do know. Congressman NIXON, while reserving his judgment about the personnel of the State Department, says that its policies need united support during the cold war. There must be other Republicans who share his concern on that point; and who might reassure our European allies that when Mr. Gabrielson writes them all off as no better than Communists, he doesn't speak for his party.

In the meantime there is this reassurance; the Secretary of State is not going to resign.

Economizing at Expense of Veterans' Hospital Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Vet-Times newspaper continues to accurately report to day-to-day happenings in Washington and throughout the 48 States which affect our veterans. I especially want to call to the attention of the House of Representatives an editorial concerning the recent action which will result in the firing of several thousand medical employees.

With new Federal hospitals to be opened in the remainder of this fiscal year and in 1951 our veterans' hospital program should be an expanding one with the addition of medical employees to properly staff the new installations. The Congress should not aggravate this situation by providing a further cut in Veterans' Administration medical appropriations and those of us who are concerned about a well-balanced veteran program regret to learn that the House Committee on Appropriations has recommended a cut in the 1951 Veterans' Administration budget of $7,500,000. I trust that we will be successful in having this amendment restored in the Appropriation Act.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the editorial that appeared in Vet-Times on March 25, 1950, entitled "Inhuman Economy":

INHUMAN ECONOMY

A "penny-wise and pound-foolish" Congress—which annually squanders billions of dollars on nonessential political programs—is now, by its gesture toward economy, endangering the entire medical-care program of the Veterans' Administration.

The medical-care program of the VA, elevated from a "third-rate" status in 1945 to a "second to none" status in 1950, is the victim of a senseless and unreasonable attempt to save a paltry few millions of dollars.

The situation has now become so acute that Chief Medical Director Paul B. Magnuson soon must choose between closing additional hospital beds or letting the standard of medical care revert to the status of 1945.

In order to save peanuts at the expense of the ill and disabled of World War II, Congress is destroying the morale of VA's entire medical staff and, according to a confidential survey made in VA's neuropsychiatric hospitals, may be dooming thousands of mentally ill veterans to permanent insanity.

The situation now existing in regard to operating funds for VA's medical program is a shame and a disgrace, both to the Congress and to the veterans' organizations which are supposed to protect the ill and disabled from such threats to their well-being and security.

The senselessness of the phony attempts at economy was never better illustrated than this week.

On Monday, the House of Representatives passed a bill which virtually hands some 70 land-grant colleges in the United States a gift of $12,000,000 in GI bill funds—despite the fact that, in many cases, it represents double payment for veterans' tuition.

On Tuesday, the House Committee on Appropriations recommended that Congress cut the 1951 budget for VA's medical-care program $7,500,000 below the minimum figure requested by the tight-fisted Budget Bureau—this in face of the fact that VA's medical-care staff already is being reduced by almost 5,000 employees.

Dr. Magnuson, who has waged a relentless fight to prevent influences—both inside and outside VA—from diluting the medical-care program, is virtually sick at heart over the penny-ante tactics of Congress. He is faced by a threat of wholesale resignations of his top medical men; he already has had to intercede personally to prevent one of his chief aides from resigning; and he is now being urged to close down additional hospital beds, in a desperate attempt to save the quality of VA medicine.

According to the confidential survey made of conditions in VA's mental hospitals, the necessity for reducing present activities may mean the difference between sanity and insanity for large numbers of mental patients.

The survey stresses that forced reduction of personnel in the medical care program will necessitate limited activities programs; will require VA to curtail leukotomies (brain operations), whereby one-third of the mental patients operated on have been able to go home afterward; will require curtailment of the shock therapy program, which demands the services of highly trained personnel; will force VA to use more physical and chemical restraints on mentally ill patients; and offers a serious indirect threat to VA's entire residency program.

Ever since the end of World War II, the Vet Times has given generous support to Federal Government programs requiring billions of dollars in American aid to the war-devastated areas of the world, and we have urged and supported the expenditure of vast sums of American money to contain communism in Europe and Asia.

We have supported such programs because we felt they were tied in closely with the welfare of the United States, and because we felt that Congress was being reasonably generous in its treatment of our war veterans, and particularly generous and concerned over the quality of medical care provided for veterans.

Now, however, it appears that this supposed generosity was merely temporary and that Congress is too lazy and unconcerned to investigate the inhuman effects that its picayunish attempts at economy have cost the ill and disabled.

The Vet-Times demands that steps be taken forthwith to assure adequate money and manpower for VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery. This is not the area in which to economize at the cost of untold human misery.

The Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by the Honorable ED GOSSETT, of Texas, before the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Convention on March 15, 1950:

THE COLD WAR

First, gentlemen, I want to congratulate your organization and your membership for your rugged individualism and for your adherence to what many of us believe to be sound American principles. About 1 year ago your president, Mr. Bryant Edwards, testified before the House Committee on Agriculture in opposition to the so-called Brannan Plan. He startled a good many people in Washington when he put your membership on record as being opposed to subsidies and controls for the cattle raisers. He pleased most adherents to American democratic principles by reaffirming your faith in a comparatively free and competitive economy.

In response to repeated requests for the subject of my today's remarks, I announced that I would speak on the cold war. That subject just about covers the entire field of domestic and foreign affairs. Our magazines, our radios, our newspapers, our pulpits, and our public forums have of late been filled with little else than a discussion of the cold war. Congressional mail has been filled with overtures and appeals and suggestions as to what this country can do and must do in the current crisis.

On one thing I think most everyone can agree: Unless we survive the cold war, we will not be able to survive the hot one. Win or lose, another great conflict would doubtless be the end of American democracy, and would wipe us out as a Nation of free people. Instead of two cars in every garage, we would probably have two Russians in every home and would be lucky if permitted to live in the garage.

Among the nostrums, panaceas and expedients now being urged upon this country is the Atlantic Pact, world government, or a world federation, offensive and defensive alliances of various kinds, a 4-point program to bring competence and teach democracy to the people of the world, etc.

Perhaps the three most notable speeches delivered in the United States Senate during the current session of the Congress have been one by Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, in which he appealed for universal reduction and control of armaments, and the two other such speeches have been by Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee of the Congress. The Senator with grave and sincere eloquence is crying out for world control of atomic weapons and of the most recent prospective hydrogen bomb.

Amidst all of this excitement and near hysteria it might be well for us to consider calmly just what we are going to do. Since I was 15 years old I have been making speeches on world peace. My first intercollegiate debate was on the subject: Resolved That America Should Join the League of Nations. I was a youthful idealist. However, my idealism has been tempered with realism. I am somewhat of a "reformed reformer." It is my contention that if the cold war is to be won it must be won in the hearts and minds of the American people and on the homefront. Many of us are convinced that such security as we may have must in the last analysis rest in the strength of American institutions and in the integrity and devotion of the average American citizen to sound political and economic principles. Leagues, alliances and treaties have been futile in the past to preserve the peace and will probably be of equal futility in the future. If our country drives or is driven into national socialism we lose. If we preserve a healthy democracy we win, regardless of all other considerations. Isolation and appeasement are, of course, discredited doctrines, and we know we cannot live unto ourselves. We know equally well that we cannot buy friends. A brief panoramic view of history should convince us that we must in the last analysis rely upon our own strength, and that if such strength be dissipated in grandiose schemes to create utopias we shall have destroyed our hope of survival.

A hundred years prior to World War I the victorious allies under the leadership of Czar Nicholas set up the Holy Alliance. In the preamble to its constitution it declared its purpose to be to perpetuate the truths of the holy religion and to preserve the peace. In a few years it became a conspiracy to destroy free governments and a free press. Prior to World War I numerous alliances were made and balances of power set up for the purpose of avoiding war. Following World War I we know what happened to the League of Nations. The Kellogg Peace Pact, which we negotiated, was always a scrap of paper. We got into World War I and II largely because our potential enemies thought first they could bluff us, or if bluffing failed they could whip us. Regardless of cost we must be sure that no potential enemy again makes such a mistake.

Finally, the two greatest eras of world peace since the birth of Christ have rested upon the strength and integrity of some major dominant power. First there was Pax Romana. It lasted 100 years and rested upon the strength of Roman arms and the justice of Roman administration. For almost 100 years prior to World War I there was an era of comparative peace which might be designated the Pax Britannica. It rested upon the strength of the British Fleet and the intelligence and justice of British administration. If we are to have a Pax Americana it must rest upon the strength of the American Nation and the intelligence and integrity of American democracy. If this Nation marches into national socialism we immediately dissipate this strength and integrity and we immediately become a prey to barbaric hordes which unquestionably would devour us. It is well, of course, for us to promote world brotherhood and Christian principles, but to surrender sovereignty to those one cannot trust or to our questionable friends who may become avowed enemies is a stupid and futile thing.

Excluding Russia, we are spending twice as much on armaments as is all of the rest of the world combined. Yet we must know that a million miles of superhighways, a multibillion-dollar radar screen around our border, thousands of planes that can circle the globe at 1,500 miles an hour or more, mountains of hydrogen bombs and atom bombs will avail us nothing if spiritual and material decay robs us of internal strength and integrity.

Approach this problem from any direction and one comes back to the one big question: Preserving American democracy against the corroding influence of national socialism. In other words, the cold war is more a domestic problem than a foreign problem.

One brief look at the national socialism of England should make Americans recoil in horror and should place every honest man on guard.

Mr. Strachey, the gentleman who has just become War Minister in the British Cabinet, has recently boasted that under national socialism there are now only 250 persons in England who have incomes of as much as $14,000 per year after taxes. In other words, in the whole British Isles there are not as many individuals as I now address who have incomes equal to your own. In taking over the railroads British socialism boasted they would make $250,000,000 per year for the Government. On the contrary rail service deteriorated and the first year's operations cost the Government $118,500,000. On taking over the mines British socialism spent $170,000,000 on mechanization. Still production failed, per man-hour output decreased and the National Coal Board lost $95,000,000 on the first year's operations. Last week hundreds of Britain's doctors were striking against the regimentation of socialized medicine. Socialized medicine in its first year of operation cost the British Government $500,000,000 above estimates, or so exceed $1,000,000,000. Public housing under national socialism has built fewer homes than were being constructed prior to the war, to say nothing of the cost. Furthermore, in that great country which gave to the world the Magna Carta and the bill of rights all men between the ages of 18 and 50 can now be ordered to take any job anywhere, i. e., compulsory labor is legal.

Many years ago the great William Pitt, in a speech on the excise bill, declared that:

"The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the force of the Crown.

"It may be frail, its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storms may enter, the rain may enter, but the King of England cannot enter.

"All his forces dare not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement."

Now the agents of 17 ministries can ransack an Englishman's home from cellar to attic without even a letter of introduction, to say nothing of a search warrant. National socialism has made austerity to deprivation and poverty the perpetual and common lot of all Englishmen.

On the other hand, what have the incentives of capitalism, the practices of the free-enterprise system, and adherence to democratic principles done for America. With a little more than 6 percent of the world's people, and a little more than 6 percent of the world's land, we possess more than one-half of the world's material wealth. We have 78 percent of the world's automobiles, 62 percent of the world's trucks, 60 percent of the world's telephones, 51 percent of the world's radios, and so on ad infinitum.

Notwithstanding these graphic comparisons we now stand in danger of embracing national socialism and losing the cold war.

The road into national socialism, like the road into hell, is paved with good intentions.

At the danger of oversimplification and confusion let's briefly put our finger on the five interrelating reasons why we may march into national socialism and thence into oblivion. Let's call these five conditions, or states of mind, perils.

Peril No. 1 we call ignorance and confusion. Great masses of good people simply do not know or do not understand social, political, and economic problems. They do not understand that money of itself is worthless, that it gets its value from goods and material produced. The average man looks at our tremendous national wealth and assumes that we are immune to poverty. He doesn't know that the total assessed value of all the property in the United States of America is approximately $[illegible], while our national debt is now $[illegible]. In other words, in terms of money we are broke. Our wealth consists in manpower and production capacity. Our mass production techniques could easily be destroyed and our economy go to pot overnight once public credit is impaired and public confidence destroyed. We are rich in human resources alone and intangible and spiritual things, the basics of which we need to understand. Again, ignorance and confusion is preyed upon by propagandists of various hues. The average American must learn to understand the campaigns that are put on by those who wish to sell him on Utopias and supposedly humanitarian objectives. The average citizen of today must be above average.

A second peril we might call indifference. There is an old saying that there is one generation between shirt sleeves and shirt sleeves. This means that the son of a wealthy father too often dissipates his inheritance. A prosperous civilization usually destroys itself because of the contentment of the individuals who refuse to stay on guard. In my early youth I was puzzled and distressed to discover that few happy people ever wrote a book. Most books, I discovered, were written by those who had an ax to grind, who wanted to dynamite some entrenching institution, revolutionists, agitators, and impractical theorists who wanted to sell their generation on something, people who wanted to start a crusade, folks who wanted to shock their conventional contemporaries—these are the people who write books, as a rule. The great tranquil stream of humanity lulled into indifference refuses to take note of, or to be alarmed because of these movements. The proponents of national socialism, through aggressive and militant activity, wring compromise after compromise from their less militant brothers. Indifference, therefore, becomes a sin, which too often lulls people into disaster.

A third peril we might call big government or expanding bureaucracy. In the first 150 years of our national life, or down to 1940, our Government spent $[illegible], since then war, or from 1940 to 1949 inclusive, our expenditures have amounted to $[illegible]. In other words, we have spent more money since the war than we spent during our entire national life prior to the war. Even though our national income during the last several years has amounted to more than $[illegible] a year, we find ourselves now operating on a $[illegible] national deficit. Even a school boy could look at these figures and readily understand that all is not well. If we spend $[illegible] more than we make in times of great prosperity, what are we going to do when national income falls. Prior to the war we thought ourselves in great danger when operating on a $9,000,000,000 budget. Now we take a $[illegible] budget as a matter of course. We create a temporary bureau, and it becomes permanent. We establish a small bureau and it becomes a large one. The bureaucrat is an ordinary American businessman who is placed at the head of an agency; with typical promotional ingenuity he begins to reach out for more authority and more money and begins to enlarge his activities. It is obvious that this sort of thing, unless curtailed, will continue to grow until the national economy is completely destroyed.

A fourth peril we might call security psychosis, or a mania for security. Too many people now imagine that through Government planning and programs the individual citizen can be given absolute security against all the hazards of life. Such, of course, is utterly impossible. The only absolute security of which I know is the security of the grave and the security of the jailhouse. The slave is secure only so long as his master is kind and solvent. Striving for security, of course, is a virtue, but when supposedly obtained it generally defeats its own ends. Imagine what effect it would have upon the character of youth to know that if he were unable to earn a livelihood or to own a home that such would be furnished him by his Government. The illusion of security eats out of the individual his primary attributes of good citizenship. Of course, the antithesis of the indolence which comes from security is the madness which comes from fear. Both extremes are to be avoided. Fear dethrones reason and induces madness. It is not quite as simple as Mr. Roosevelt's pronouncement, borrowed, I believe, from Bacon, that "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." Individually and collectively we, of course, must continue to strive for better standards of living and better security. But we must not delude ourselves into thinking that we can get something for nothing, that everybody can live off of everybody else and nobody work. I personally subscribe to Emerson's philosophy that everything is paid for at some time or other in some way or other. The books must be and will be eventually balanced. Someone has said, "A grafter is one whose income exceeds his service to society." Governments must make the ways of grafters and transgressors uninviting. Governments should protect the weak against the avariciousness of the strong. Government should write the rules of fair play, and enforce such rules, but Government should never undertake to extend to its citizens the illusion of complete security. Governments should not do for the individual what he can do for himself.

People grow strong through discipline and denial. People grow great through sacrifice and service. England never rose to greater spiritual heights than when that distinguished statesman, the Right Honorable Winston Churchill, on coming to power said, "I promise you nothing but blood, sweat, toil, and tears." It was this great man, too, who said he did not become the King's Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. His declining years must be sad indeed as he witnesses his successor, who apparently did become the King's Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire by illusory promises of security to the British people.

A fifth peril we might call political apostasy. Even when the average good citizen becomes concerned with the issues of government, under the political machinery and the political practices of our country he often feels futile and helpless. We elect our Presidents, the most important official in the world, through a hocus-pocus system called the electoral college. Under the electoral college the Presidential candidate who gets more votes than any of his opponents in a particular State gets all of the electoral votes of that State. For example, in the last campaign Mr. Dewey, with 45 percent of the vote in New York State, received all 47 electoral votes of New York State. Under this system powerful organized minority pressure groups in the big States of the Union have become dominant. They write the platforms of both of our major parties, and to a large extent dictate national policy. More and more the great American public is victimized by the selfish and unfair demands of these organized minority pressure groups. There is now pending in the Congress an amendment to our Constitution which would abolish the electoral college and provide that each person vote directly for President and that the vote be counted for the person for whom he votes. This has been called the Lodge-Gossett amendment, and is now my major legislative objective in the Congress. In my judgment, to abolish the electoral college and to divide the electoral vote of each State in exact ratio with the popular vote will go a long way toward saving this country from eventual national socialism.

We must evolve a system of electing Presidents in this country under which the people can vote on honest issues and make their voices heard. Platforms and policies must be written on the basis of the general welfare and not on the basis of political expediency.

To summarize, gentlemen, we cannot win the cold war through misguided zeal. We can lose the cold war through ignorance and confusion, through indifference and complacency, through a dissipation of resources by our Government in its efforts to serve ourselves and to serve others, through a mania for security, or through stifling the honest political expression of a majority of our people in a surrender to minority domination. Truly democracy is on trial for its life. Upon this generation of Americans depends the hope of the world for the next 1,000 years. Devotion to the principles and the ideals that have built this country and that have made us a great people is our only hope of survival.

"Tax the Co-ops," Moley Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. WALSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, a full-page article by Raymond Moley, appearing in a January issue of Newsweek magazine, harped another old tune to an old song—Tax the Co-ops.

The Moley article was answered in a masterly fashion by my good friend, Von O. Pinkerton, of Marion, Ind., editor of the Farm News, one of Indiana's outstanding farm publications.

The Farm News is printed and published in Marion, Ind., a different issue being prepared each month for each of eighty-odd Indiana counties. Scores of thousands of Hoosier farmers receive and read this publication and it may certainly be considered an accurate spokesman of their views and opinions.

Von Pinkerton is a real Hoosier pioneer in the co-op movement and has built his personal prestige and fortune, in the typical American manner, having commenced, I understand, with one old printing press, hope in his heart, and faith in his soul. What he writes is not for political effect, but are the words of an earnest and sincere man, written to be read by equally earnest and sincere people.

Therefore, I desire at this time to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Von Pinkerton's answer to the Moley attack, as published in the Farm News, of Grant County, on March 17, 1950:

"TAX THE CO-OPS," MOLEY SAYS

Jim, who lives on a well situated 40 out on Route 6, came into our office this week to tell us he's worried because some of the big shots are advocating "tax the co-ops." "Did you see where Raymond Moley had an article on that subject in the January Newsweek?" Jim asked.

We had seen the article—we had read it. But we didn't get enthused or worried. It was like chewing on some Thanksgiving turkey hash in January. Mr. Moley may have some new ideas on the subject, but, if so, he was careful not to divulge any of them.

You know many of the high-priced magazines are getting so many high-priced hard-liquor advertisements that it is a question what to do with the white space they use to separate the advertisements. They are just likely to slap in anything to fill the space. That's certainly the only reason for Mr. Moley's article.

The ex-New Dealer starts his misleading tirade with a nice soothing sentence intended to lull the reader into complacency. He says, "Of course, no one wants to destroy the cooperatives." How any feature writer or otherwise can use a sentence like that and then expect his readers to believe any of his other sentences is beyond us. He didn't believe that remark, and the publishers of the magazine don't believe it. The publishers know they could have filled that page with the names of organizations that would like to destroy the co-ops.

Then as he goes into his next two paragraphs to prove why the co-ops should be eliminated he breaks down and weeps because the co-ops have gone far beyond their humble beginnings. That means, of course, that so long as the co-ops didn't offer any competition there was nothing to worry about, but now that they are getting a lot of business because of rendering a real service we ought to stop 'em dead in their tracks.

He unintentionally or deliberately misleads his readers when he attempts to point out how much revenue the Government is losing by not taxing the co-ops, like some organizations would like to have them taxed. He bases his figures not on the amount of business the co-ops are doing but upon the amount a Congressman says they will be doing 5 years from now. If a reader can find any Congressman who knows what he (the Congressman) is doing today and not what somebody else will be doing 5 years from today he is lucky.

He says the co-ops did $13,000,000,000 worth of business in 1948, and NOAH MASON (the Congressman) estimates their gross business will reach $25,000,000,000 in 5 years.

We have read considerable literature on both sides of this proposition, including official estimates wherein co-ops attempt to project their thinking into the future. Not a single co-op official has said he expects to have the dollar volume of their business doubled by 1955. But why do the co-op officials figure and worry over the subject? All they have to do is ask Raymond Moley and NOAH MASON. They know the answers.

Anyone who has read anything on the subject of tax the co-ops will immediately recognize where Moley got all his information. In fact, his article is a disappointment, because one really expects him to inject at least one thought, but he didn't. It's just NTEA literature with Moley's name on it.

The tenseness engendered by the article is relieved by the stock NTEA joke with which the article is concluded. Our readers have heard it many times, but as it gets funnier every time it is told we will repeat it here in NTEA Moley's words:

"With heavy taxes and a Government drive against big business there will be a great incentive to private business to reorganize as cooperatives. John Hartford, head of the A. & P., said some weeks ago 'that if the Government won its suit against the company, he would convert the business into a huge tax-free cooperative. This shift would cost the Treasury about $15,000,000 a year. There is no reason why many other companies would not follow the same course.' "

After you get through laughing, reread the punch line at the end which says, "There is no reason why many other companies would not follow the same course." If Raymond Moley believes that, he is totally ignorant of the whole subject of cooperatives.

The truth is, any individual, any association, any organization, including A. & P. can legally avoid paying the Federal income tax exactly like the cooperatives. All they have to do is to avoid having a net income. That can easily be done by cutting prices so there won't be any profit, or legally obligate the organization at the beginning of the year to return all the overcharges (profit) to the purchaser, like the cooperatives. Do you expect A. & P. or any other profit organization to do that?

The difference is, A. & P. knows, even if Moley doesn't, that the United States Treasury Department has said, "The exclusion of patronage dividends from corporate gross income is not the exclusive privilege of cooperative associations. Any corporation making payments to its customers under the conditions prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the courts is granted the same treatment." It has also said, "It is held to be immaterial whether refunds are distributed in the form of cash, stock, certificates of indebtedness, or credit notices."

In addition, even the bonuses paid by A. & P. to Mr. Hartford for doing a good job as head of the organization or for any other reason are subtracted, before the company figures its Federal net income tax.

Sometime when we have a quarter inch of space left we will print the names of all the profit companies that have or seriously contemplate converting to the cooperative method of doing business.

Can a "One Package" Appropriations Bill Succeed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am for a single consolidated appropriation bill provided we can make it work without abandoning the basic principles we must follow if we are to have an intelligent method of spending the taxpayers' money. I want it to work. I shall do everything within my power to make it work. I will not, however, under any condition waive or give up the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to originate appropriations; neither will I give up the right of the House of Representatives and of the Appropriations Committee as the servant of the House to make and control appropriations.

I shall oppose any move to delegate that power directly or indirectly to a few men whether in the executive or legislative branch of the Government. I want no czars in our financial set-up, whether they be in the executive, legislative, or committee branch of the Government. That is what the proposed system will ultimately lead to if followed. I repeat, I want the single consolidated appropriations bill to work. It is not working under the system proposed here. I believe it can be made to work without sacrificing any of the principles referred to.

Before we discuss this so-called one-package bill we are trying to adopt, let us compare it with the system we have been operating under in past years. Prior to this year, we had as now a number of subcommittees. A bill was assigned to each subcommittee. These subcommittees commenced hearings on their bills sometimes as early as December. After the hearings which took sometimes as much as 10 or 12 weeks, depending on the size of the bill and on the number of departments or agencies in the bill, the bill was reported to the full committee. Only the members of the subcommittee which handled the bill knew anything about that bill up to that point. Acting on the repeated instructions from the House and of the members of the Appropriations Committee, several days were permitted to elapse after the bill was reported out and before it was brought before the full committee. The Members of the House and particularly of the full committee had an opportunity of studying the hearings and report, and examining the bill before it was considered by the full committee. I recall that on several occasions strenuous objections were made when a bill was considered by the full committee the day after it was reported out.

When the bill came before the full committee, the chairman of the subcommittee explained the bill in detail, answering questions as he went along. When he finished his presentation the bill was open to amendment. Arguments were sometimes vehement and questions rather revealing. The full committee usually devoted from 1½ to 2½ hours to the consideration of each bill before it and took a vote on reporting it to the House. The members had an opportunity of informing themselves and did inform themselves on each bill and usually knew what they were voting on. Each subcommittee had the benefit of the criticism of the other members of the full committee which often proved very valuable and sometimes avoided making serious errors.

Under this system the Members had from 3 to 4 days as a rule to read the hearings on each bill, read the bill, and examine the report. The bills as a rule were presented to the committee and the House at intervals of approximately one a week which gave ample time for careful consideration before the bill came before the full committee. Each bill was carefully explained and members were informed so they could ask intelligent questions from the subcommittee reporting the bill. All this was done before the members including those reporting

the bill were asked to vote on the question of reporting the bill out of committee and to the House with the recommendation that it do pass. The recommendation of the committee meant something because it was based on facts and information of all the members of the full committee.

Bills began going through the House sometimes as early as February 1 and committee hearings were often held in December by the subcommittees. Bills usually had all passed the House before May 1 and sometimes much earlier. The last 1950 appropriation bill passed the House on April 13, 1949.

HOW DOES THE NEW SYSTEM WORK?

Now let us examine the new system of operation:

First. The full Appropriations Committee consists of 45 members which is divided into 9 subcommittees and 2 special subcommittees.

Second. The nine regular subcommittees consist of five members each, three of the majority and two of the minority party. They handle all appropriations with the exception of the legislative. The special subcommittees appointed so far are the legislative subcommittee handling the legislative appropriations bill of approximately $56,000,000 and the so-called central committee. What I say here applies only to the nine regular subcommittees.

Third. Each regular subcommittee handles one bill designated as a title in the consolidated bill covering one or more departments and agencies. It holds hearings on this bill, drafts the bill, and presents it to the full committee as heretofore. Hearings are released as printed. The hearings on all titles this year covered 14,723 printed pages. These subcommittees as usual did a magnificent job on their particular bill or title this year. The subcommittees worked hard and many of them felt as I did that we were crowded too much to be able to give the bill the careful consideration we would like to have given it. However, I have never been fully satisfied with any bill that came out of my subcommittee, whether under my chairmanship or under the chairmanship of three other members who served during my 14 years on the subcommittee.

While the hearings were sent out as published, each of the 45 members was so busy preparing his own bill that he had very little time to read these hearings. Furthermore, the hearings as a rule were so large that the usual custom was to examine the report, select the doubtful items, and read those parts of the hearings in which there was some doubt in the mind of the members or in which he or his district was particularly interested. This was impossible, inasmuch as the report was not then available.

The members, and particularly the older members who had served some time on the committee, had a fairly good understanding of each bill as it came up. On Friday night, March 17, the 425-page consolidated bill and the 337-page consolidated report, covering 11 titles of this [illegible] consolidated appropriation bill, arrived at my office. The same mail brought me a notice that the full committee would meet Monday morning at 10 a. m. to consider the bill. Trying to handle this 425-page consolidated bill and the 337-page consolidated report, based on 14,723 pages of hearings within that time, was an impossible and hopeless task.

Monday at 10:05 a. m. the committee was called to order by the chairman. There were nine titles, not including the small legislative bill and general provisions. As each title came up, the only members who had any information as to that title were the five who were on that particular subcommittee and who had reported that bill or title to the full committee. The other 40 members knew practically nothing about that title or bill. No statements were made explaining the bill to the full committee, and questions asked were confined as a rule to items of particular interest to the member asking the question or to his district. When the vote came to report this consolidated bill to the House of Representatives with a recommendation that it pass, there was not a member who had adequate information to act or vote intelligently on any of the eight titles other than the one he had considered in his subcommittee. This $27,000,000,000 bill was reported out on the judgment of the five men on each subcommittee, and not on the combined judgment of the 45-man committee, as it should have been and was under the old system. Because of this reason, I voted "no" in committee.

The recommendation of the full forty-five-man committee to the House of Representatives that the bill pass means very little, if anything, as it is not based on information as to the facts involved and the Members know very little, if anything, about the bill itself as a whole. Not even the chairman of the committee with all his help and certainly not the gentleman from Michigan who is now speaking to you, could ask or answer many intelligent questions as to the bill now before the House for consideration.

Surely the framers of our Constitution did not have such a method in mind when they wrote into the Constitution that all revenue bills—which included appropriations as well as taxation bills—must originate in the House of Representatives. A further examination of the facts will, I believe, verify this statement.

Let us look at the record and see just how much consideration was given to and how much time was spent by the full committee, not only on each title, but on the entire consolidated bill appropriating more than $27,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money before a vote was taken on each title and on the motion to report the bill to the House of Representatives with a recommendation that it pass. I kept a careful and accurate record of the time when each title was taken up in committee, when it was approved and when the motion to report the bill was passed. Here is the record according to the committee clock:

Monday, January 30, 1950, the full committee was called to order at 10:05 a. m. by Chairman CANNON. At 10:12 a. m. the committee had approved—

Title I, making an appropriation for the District of Columbia for $12,000,000.

Title II, making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for $56,822,450.

Title III, making appropriations for the Department of State, Commerce, Justice and Judiciary for $1,110,870,462. Total titles I, II, and III appropriations aggregating $1,179,692,912 were approved by the full committee in exactly 7 minutes.

At 10:12 a. m. the committee took up title IV, making appropriations for Department of Treasury and Post Office for $1,131,155,600. In exactly 8 minutes the full committee had approved this $1,131,155,600 appropriation bill.

At 10: 20 a. m., the committee took up title V, the Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation for $2,271,099,614. It took exactly 7 minutes to approve this bill.

At 10: 27 a. m. the committee took up title VI, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, for $764,032,761. In exactly 12 minutes the committee had approved this bill.

At 10:39 a. m. the committee took up title VII, making an appropriation for the Department of the Interior for $621,634,130. Within 71 minutes, 55 of which was spent in arguing four amendments which were turned down and again without explanation of the bill title VII was approved.

At 11:50 a. m. the committee took up title VIII, making appropriations for the independent offices, including Veterans' Affairs, for $8,024,877,007. The bill was approved after spending exactly 20 minutes or an average of 2½ minutes per billion dollars.

At 12:10 p. m. the committee took up title IX, the $632,620,000 civil-functions bill. This bill covers rivers and harbors, flood control, both maintenance and construction, Panama Canal, and so forth. The budget recommended $534,867,500. The subcommittee cut it $202,247,500 or approximately 25 percent. This bill reaches into nearly every congressional district in the United States. It was this bill which was in conference last year for 121 days. The full committee took it up at 12:10 p. m. and after careful consideration without explanation approved it in exactly 21 minutes.

At 12:31 p. m. the full committee adjourned until 10 a. m. Tuesday, March 21, 1950.

Tuesday, March 21, 1950, at 10:05 a. m., Chairman CANNON called the full Appropriations Committee to order and title X was taken up. This was the $13,000,000,000 national defense appropriation bill and at 11:06 a. m., in exactly 61 minutes, and after spending less than 5 minutes per billion dollars, the bill was approved.

At 11:06 a. m. the committee took up title XI, consisting of 14 pages of general provisions of law. After careful consideration for 3 minutes and without reading the provisions, title XI was approved at 11:09 a. m. A motion was passed on a purely partisan vote to report the entire one-package bill to the House with a recommendation that it pass.

Under the old system we would have taken 20 or more hours for the consideration of this bill in full committee. The record shows that we took exactly 206 minutes to put this $27,000,000,000 appropriation bill through the full committee. When we deduct 55 minutes devoted to 4 amendments to the Interior bill which did not pass and 3 minutes we devoted to general provisions of law which we did not read, we find that we devoted exactly 152 minutes to the consideration of the subcommittee recommendations of the entire bill of 10 titles. In other words, the appropriation went through the full committee at the rate of $180,000,000 a minute or $3,000,000 a second. That is putting appropriations through the full committee at what we would call in Air Force language a supersonic speed.

It cannot be argued successfully that the full committee could act intelligently on this bill under this method and according to this record. If this system is continued it will mean that the Congress will soon accept the Budget Director's figures and will have lost it power of regulating and controlling expenditures of the various departments or bureaus. I am very much afraid that under this system the one-package bill is doomed to failure.

I have given this matter a great deal of thought. The solution of this problem is not too difficult. I believe it can be made to succeed. I believe that we can have the so-called one-package appropriation bill without taking power away from the full committee and without sacrificing everything we did in the past to inform our membership on every bill. Here is my suggestion:

First. Proceed with each appropriation bill just as we have done heretofore. Have each subcommittee commence hearings at the earliest moment; start some in December if possible.

Second. Consider each bill, report it out to the full committee, explain it to the membership of the full committee as it is reported out, giving the Members of the House and of the committee at least 3 or 4 days before the bill is brought before the full committee, so they may study the bill, report, and hearings.

Third. Report each bill to the full committee, just as heretofore, taking it up in the House and considering it in the Committee of the Whole up to but not including the third reading.

Fourth. Hold each bill in the House until all of the bills have been passed up to the third reading. Offer a consolidated bill as a substitute for the individual bills. Then, if the consolidated bill is still too high, offer a motion to recommit the consolidated bill to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to reduce it by the amount desired. If it is reduced, it will be the House and not a few men on the committee who will do the reducing. We will know what our income is and what total appropriations will be before we pass the bill. The recommendation of the full committee will mean something because it will be based upon information as to all titles contained in the consolidated bill.

Claims Adoption of Hoover Report Would Destroy Veteran Preference in VA Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A1945, I extended my remarks to include a letter and the contents of a booklet by Herman W. Steinkraus, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. The extension carried the title, "A Veteran Explains the Hoover Reports."

In response to this extension I have received a letter from Mr. Francis M. Sullivan, national legislative director for the Disabled American War Veterans, in which he points out a glaring weakness in at least one of the arguments presented by Mr. Steinkraus—pointing out that under the recommendation the merit system and veterans' preference in Federal employment would be destroyed.

Because of the importance of Mr. Sullivan's observations I herewith include the text of his letter in these remarks:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1950.

The Honorable PAUL W. SHAFER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHAFER: In the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, beginning on page A1945, you quote a letter written by Herman W. Steinkraus, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, together with the content of a booklet published by the chamber entitled "A Veteran Explains the Hoover Reports." The DAV would like the opportunity to reply to this letter and to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The DAV is surprised to note the admissions made by Mr. Steinkraus relative to the subject of personnel management as it affects veterans' preference. We feel that these admissions certainly bear out the position of the veteran organizations in opposing the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

In answer to the question, "What was the chief feature of the Commission's proposals for Government personnel?" Mr. Steinkraus states, "The main recommendation was that the heads of Federal departments and agencies be permitted to do their own hiring instead of relying on the slow, cumbersome Civil Service Commission procedure."

This answer is proof positive that the proposed recommendations would destroy the merit system, and with it the long-established policy, since 1883, of veterans' preference in Federal employment. By recommending such freedom of personnel selection, every Government agency would become a little kingdom within itself, free to hire and fire whomsoever it chose, setting up its own standards, giving only lip service to veterans' preference and render the Civil Service Commission impotent to enforce the laws of the United States with respect to the merit system.

The next question in Mr. Steinkraus' letter is, "Would this mean setting up thousands of independent hiring boards to replace the single Civil Service Commission?" and is answered, "Not at all. It would simply enable the executive of the Federal agency to hire the right man for the right job at the right time. The present system sets up all sorts of barriers against hiring the best man, against promoting the best man, and against firing the worst man. Veterans on the civil service register for junior professional assistant have found out all too well how slow and uncertain the Civil Service Commission system works."

Here again the answer by one of the foremost proponents of the Hoover Commission recommendations indicates that the worst fears of veterans with respect to complete abolition of veterans' preference in the civil service is confirmed. It is admitted that at times the merit system of hiring and firing veterans is slow and cumbersome, but it is fair, and whenever complied with by agency heads free from arbitrary abuse. I feel certain that the Members of Congress do not wish to endorse a system that would permit agency heads to hire and fire without regard to the civil-service laws and without regard to other safeguards designed to allocate Federal positions equally among the citizens of the 48 States.

That an executive head of any Federal agency could hire, promote, and fire at will, without regard to an open, competitive hiring and firing process would result in a complete return to the spoils system. Mr. Steinkraus' answer to this second question removes every shadow of doubt that adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendations would destroy the long-established principle of veterans' preference.

We would appreciate having the same publicity given to this partial reply to Mr. Steinkraus' letter as he in turn enjoyed.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director.

Reaffirmation of Support for House Concurrent Resolution 64

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the ideological counterpoint to the Communist drive is the establishment by the United States as the objective of its foreign policy of a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation and enforcement of world law. If we are to avoid the martial threat to all civilization inherent in beginning production of the hydrogen bomb, we must bring an end to the very real competitive arms race now going on between us and the Soviet Union. A realistic and practical hope for the resolution of this cold war struggle is the development of the United Nations into a world federation. In this way with the guaranties inherent in a world legislature, executive and judiciary, and with a fundamental world law governing all and control of military means in the hands of the world collectively we can give what ought to be acceptable assurances to the minority, and it is clear in this case that the minority is the Soviet Union and the countries within its orbit. It is for this reason that utilization of the United Nations machinery alone is

inadequate, as there is no way to give the minority guarantee under the United Nations except of our good faith; and yet the minority—to wit, the Soviet Union—has by its veto the power to block any constructive action for peace and security. In view of the fact that communism worships lack of good faith, we can hardly believe that it will ever depend on it in others, regardless of how often we in the United States and others of the world's democracies may have manifested it.

What we lack now is an adequate rallying cry by which the peoples outside the Communist orbit can express their faith and their aspirations. Thus far, the United States, leading the democracies, has depended upon the worth of our cause in preserving freedom with much blood and treasure, in giving peoples rights of self-determination and in the great program of self-help and mutual cooperation to save peoples from economic anarchy and to raise their living standards. The next step is to adopt as the objective of our policy, world federation, and in this way to give eloquent voice to a program which can evoke the evangelical zeal that communism evokes from its disciples and yet be infinitely superior to it in terms of the material and spiritual values which it can deliver. It is for this reason that 142 Representatives and 22 Senators introduced House Concurrent Resolution 64 stating that—

It is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law.

So far the European recovery program has been our most positive ideological response to the Communist ideology. ERP is fundamentally grounded on regional organization in the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. Should we adopt as the objective of our foreign policy world federation, these regional organizations become the necessary precedent step by which the free world can organize itself in units greater than national units and yet not as great as world federation but in preparation for world federation. The program of those interested in world federation therefore should be to promote all such regional organizations and primarily for mutual economic development but also for mutual security. There has been great activity in this regard in Europe with the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the Atlantic Pact, and the Council and Consultative Assembly of Europe, but we need now to move into Asia with a Far East recovery program urgently required as an ideological response to the Communist challenge in China, into an African program for the purpose of developing the vast resources and the vast markets which can be attained through greatly increased economic development and through raising the standard of living, education, and health of the African people and finally into a program for the Americas, themselves, a vastly underdeveloped area, all for the benefit of the economic and moral strength of the free world.

House Concurrent Resolution 64 should be considered when the question of military appropriations is brought before this body; it should be considered when veterans' benefits are before us; it should be considered along with the military defense assistance program—for all this legislation is necessary because we live in a world where we are neighbors to all but where not all are friendly. The unarmed peace we enjoy with Canada has saved us untold amounts that would have been spent in fortification on our long borders shared with the Dominion, the world's second largest nation. What the United States and Canada have done—even after a history replete with mutual invasions—the rest of the world must do if it is to save itself.

Two Hoosier Philosophers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. WALSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, in Marion, Ind., in the heart of my district, we are fortunate enough to have at least two Hoosier philosophers in the grand tradition of Riley, Ade, and Nicholson. Each, one in the prose and one in verse, can make us take a moment from the busy workaday world to smile awhile at ourself and our foibles or even to shed an abashed tear for things, events, or people of an earlier and perhaps happier day.

Paul L. Hillsamer, publisher and editor of the News-Herald of Marion, is the prose expert and his recent article on the old-fashioned threshing ring tugged a string in my heart. I am sure that at least two-thirds of the Members of this House, myself included, know from experience exactly what Mr. Hillsamer was talking about when he wrote in the March 17 issue of News-Herald the following article:

OH, THE VIRTUES WE'LL SING

It is time for someone to write about it, for soon the last rig will be junked and then, not so much later, the last participant will die and who will sing the joys of the old Indiana threshing ring?

The "ring" was a group of farmers living fairly close together with roughly the same amount of wheat and oats to separate from the straw, which is why the threshing machine was also called the separator. These complicated machines, powered originally by steam engines and later by ordinary tractors, were fed by two huskies, one on each side, unloading the sheaves of grain—always one at a time, head in and straight. To throw in a sheaf sideways or butt first was to incur the wrath of the captain, a solitary, stern individual who paced the top of the separator much as the Ancient Mariner may have strode the deck of his trusty vessel. Now he stooped to oil a vital part, now to guide the blower in the blowing of a perfect stack, now to bellow words of jollification, advice, or rebuke into the ear of one of the unloaders. When an unloader left his post or one finished ahead of the other the captain grabbed a fork and pitched in, and when the machine clogged it was he who gave the signal to stop and then plunged his arm in (up to the neck) the straw, string, dirt, and chaff which had stopped the works.

Steam engines were before our time. We only dimly remember Cordia Shimholt's ancient rig. On the tractor-powered outfits a lanky, half-grown, half-naked boy usually sat on the tractor seat, more or less (mostly less) alert to the captain's signal to stop or start.

Two grain wagons handled the grain on small rings. The separated grain poured like a cascade from a reversible tin trough approximately every 20 seconds. Three pourings filled a sack and getting the full sack out of the way and the empty sack over the mouth of the trough before a bushel of wheat or oats came charging out was no feat for amateurs. For some reason older men usually operated the grain wagons, possibly because unloading them was such an easy task. All that one needed do in unloading was to pick up the 130-pound sack, hoist it 3 or 4 feet above one's head, and dump it over the wall of the granary, that's all.

Also no mean feat was loading one's wagon to haul to the separator. Wheat and oats were shocked 12 or 15 sheaves to the shock, with two caps—sheaves spread out and put on top as a roof. Thirty-five shocks made a nice load, though show-offs took 40 and smart men 30. One loaded by laying a ring of sheaves around the wagon, butts out and heads in, and then filling the center with alternating bundles, first reaching one way and then the other. All very simple when the top of the load was the bottom of the wagon, but rather complicated when the top was 12 feet in the air. Racks tapering off at a 90° angle; in other words, 6 feet high to nothing, fitted on the sides and 6-foot high ends, to the ends of the wagon, thus saving, one fondly hoped, the whole load from sliding down to mother earth.

About 8:30 you commenced to sweat. From then on in you never ceased. The huge dinner and its accompanying quantities of iced tea or lemonade did nothing to halt the phenomena.

Your editor always maintained a small local reputation, out in Washington Township, as a sweater. Looking at labor, much less doing it, always caused us to break into profuse perspiration until we looked as though we had been dipped in a horse trough. But the harvest field sweat was a healthy one which did not harm, all of us fat men could well afford to pay $20 a day for the privilege now.

In the old days not feeding every man threshing at her home would have been sacrilege to a housewife. With the advent of the automobile many wives started delivering their husband's dinner in person and gradually the mass feeding became extinct.

Just what did feeding the threshers entail? Eight bundle haulers, four grain wagon men, the captain, the tractor man, two or three boys, the housewife and perhaps three assisting neighbor women constituted the crowd. For these 20 or 22 people, a gracious old Washington Township lady-friend assures us that the following menu is, if in error, on the light side:

(Editorial note, 1950—"Aunt Annie" Hillsamer since passed away.)

Eight fried chickens, half a bushel of mashed potatoes, 2 gallons of gravy, 1 gallon of coffee, 5 gallons of lemonade (though this was to last all afternoon), 10 pounds of green beans, cream corn, lettuce, turnips, three or four kinds of pudding, 10 home made loaves of bread, 3 pounds of butter, 3 pies, 5 cakes.

That was before the war. Either one of them.

In the early days fights were common but as the Civil War veterans died off, so did the scraps. Most disputes centered around who should be threshed next; occasionally trouble flared if a stack were built too near a neighbor's line fence—threshing spread a lot of weed seeds.

Every year a new host entertained at the settling up—an involved process in which everyone paid everyone else 30 or 40 cents an hour and the women gossiped and the little kids played hide-and-go-seek and everyone ate ice cream and cake until they were in sweet misery. To the sharp-eyed reader who observed the omission of those—neither man, woman, nor kid, but sweet sixteen—well what did you do when you were that age?

When we started this article we aimed to paint a picture of the old-time threshing ring—an institution which has taken a mortal beating during the past 15 years. Now we find, we haven't, our vocabulary can't paint a picture of the scene, can't make you smell the wheat and straw and grease and dirt and sweat and fried chicken. We cannot reproduce the taste of the cold drink from the harvest jug, the feeling of comradeship of the wheatfield. Neither can our poor words describe the feeling of the thresher, wending homeward his weary way, or the peaceful spectacle of a new stack silhouetted against a Hoosier sky. You who have experienced all this know what we want to say. You who haven't don't know what we're talking about. So let's let well enough alone.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. John J. Kolher, also of Marion, has, during the past few years attained recognition as one of Indiana's finest poets. I particularly desire, at this time, to call attention of the Members to one which I consider really outstanding:

INDIANA

It could be her gentle, kindly folk,
Who share their smiles and tears,
And warm you with a welcome,
That allays all doubts and fears.

Or the air perfumed by flowers,
That fill her fields in spring;
Or music from each tree and hedge,
Where a million warblers sing.

The matchless scenic grandeur
Of lake and stream and plain,
Her dark majestic forests, or
Her fields of ripening grain.

Her roads like magic ribbons,
Through an endless holiday,
Where blue skies like to visit,
And warm breezes seem to pray.

In the lore of primal legend,
Every milepost is enshrined.
Romance, drama, set to capture
And enslave the heart and mind.

Could be the regal pheasant,
Who struts before his mate;
Or tense moments in a blind, where
Migrant mallards keep a date.

The great bass in the rushes
And a shower of silvery fry,
As he breaks for open water,
Where we cast our feathered fly.

Could be her crystal fairyland,
Seen through the silent snow;
And a million other wonders,
But this one fact we know.

There's a strange and subtle something,
The enigma of these parts,
That reaches out and gently takes
A hold of human hearts.

They lost nostalgic yearnings,
Settle down to work or play,
And vow they'll be good Hoosiers,
'Till the dawn of judgment day.

—John Kolher.

Fame and Infamy—Communism in Hollywood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Committee on Un-American Activities investigated communism in Hollywood.

It found Hollywood literally reeking with communism and using the moving-picture industry to spread its poisonous propaganda.

They were not only attempting to spread their atheistic propaganda throughout the Nation, undermine this Government, and destroy our American way of life, but they were attempting to destroy the moral fabric of America by poisoning the minds of the children of the Nation.

It is about time the Christian people of this country, the conscientious, decent, moral men and women throughout the Nation, joined in the battle now being waged by such men as Lloyd T. Binford, chairman of the Board of Censors of the City of Memphis, Tenn.

At this point I am inserting a statement issued by Mr. Binford a few days ago against the filthy, loathsome pictures of Ingrid Bergman, which I hope every Member of Congress, in both Houses, as well as every Christian mother and father in America, will read.

The matter referred to follows:

FAME AND INFAMY

One of the primary requirements of worldly fame is virtue. Without virtue, fame becomes infamy.

The most infamous example of the manner in which the motion-picture industry flaunts its devilish disdain of Christian ethics and principles is the Rossellini-Bergman case. Not only have these people defied the laws of man; they have defied God's laws; not only have they attempted to glorify their perfidy; they are now attempting to entice millions of theatergoers to pay them, through the box office, high wages for their widely publicized sin.

It is the considered opinion of the Memphis and Shelby County Board of Censors that it would be inimical to the public morals and welfare to permit the public exhibition of a motion picture starring a woman who is universally known to be living in open and notorious adultery.

RKO Radio Pictures, Inc., is releasing the picture Stromboli, which stars Ingrid Bergman and was directed by her paramour, Roberto Rossellini. In RKO's advertisements there appear running headlines in prominent letters that read: "Raging Island; raging passions."

The star of this production with its crude manner of commercializing vice is a reminder of all the impurities of sexual abnormalities of lust-driven delinquents.

Stromboli itself is a sordid tale of marriage; a marriage consummated without love as its basis. It is a story which, while carrying the unborn child of her husband, she engaged in a clandestine affair with another man. It is a story in which the husband beats her while she is pregnant—the witnessing of which would have effect of degradation even upon the minds of the callousmed adults.

Sadistic, immoral, immoral, and featuring a woman who deserted her own husband and daughter and became the mother of an illegitimate son by a rotse, already married to another woman whose children he had fathered—such is the picture of Stromboli, from which the vendors of vice expect to make millions. In truth, it is the picture that should make millions turn away nauseated from all the box offices and motion picture theaters until the producers of motion pictures have come to their senses and will not attempt to abort and corrupt motion-picture screens of the world with indecent, godless, communistic filth.

When Ingrid Bergman came to America she was greeted with open arms by all motion-picture fans, young and old. Seeing in her all the beauties and virtues of divine womanhood, they gave her their affections and contributed dollars to assist her in rising high on the ladder of success. Now, Ingrid Bergman has given birth to an illegitimate child, conceived in illegitimacy, who will bear the brand of his parents' disgrace as long as he lives.

Not only has this alien now proved herself unworthy of the love and respect she was given and the trust that placed in her, Ingrid Bergman has cast a shadow of shame upon the entire world of women. She has disgraced her own homeland. She has deserted her own young, innocent, legitimate daughter of her legitimate marriage and both she and Rossellini have heaped coals of shame upon her little girl's head.

The Memphis Board of Censors does not undertake to judge Ingrid Bergman, for her conduct as exposed by her, is between her and her God; and while she has violated the laws of God and man she has evidenced no regret or repentance and the word of God makes it very plain that the repentance must precede forgiveness.

There is not an instance in the Bible where Jesus condoned or pardoned any sin without evidence of repentance. The much quoted reference to the woman taken in adultery (John 8: 1-8), we must confess that we hardly see a trace of analogy. There, the woman had been caught in the act of adultery and was on trial for her life by stoning, a penalty that was justified in the light of ancient laws of Judaism (see Deut. 22: 22-23) and (Lev. 20: 10). The point is, Jesus did not condemn her to death by stoning as her accusers wanted him to do. On the other hand, He did "condemn" her sin, the sin of adultery, as the words, "henceforth, sin no more" reveal. It is unfortunate that so many well-meaning persons have distorted so grievously this ancient passage of scripture through their sheer ignorance of its true contents.

This is not a matter of "who hath no sin amongst you, let him cast the first stone at her" (John 8: 7). For it should be remembered that the woman did not approach the Savior bragging of her "pure love" but, rather approached Him truly repentant, asking that she be forgiven.

As long as millions of unthinking, maudlin, sentimentalists condone the acts of those who commercialize vice by attending theaters in which it is displayed at so much a seat, just so long will virtue live in rags, and, finally crushed by poverty and lack of appreciation, sell itself for riches and become vice.

Those who attain worldly fame have an obligation to all humanity. It is their God given duty to uphold the morals of the land without which society cannot safely and happily exist. It is their duty having been blessed with worldly wealth and affection, to show their appreciation by living exemplary lives. It is their duty (especially for those who admire them and look up to them as the very acme of all that is noble and

good) to set an example of such fitness and fidelity that never will they cheats disillusionment with its tender cynicisms, distrust, discouragement and—even despair.

Dr. Fosdick said: "There is bound to be a reaction against this flaunting of promiscuous sensuality; this glorifying of adultery, this flippant deriding of love, which contributes to the demoralization of the social life."

We want no more of Stromboli, the Raging Island of raging passions, for it is indeed regrettable that there are producers of stage and screen players so disinterested in the welfare of the physical and spiritual health of the American people—especially their boys and girls of impressionable age, that makes boards of censorship necessary.

LLOYD T. EDWARDS,
Chairman of the Board of Censors of the City of Memphis, Tenn.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a radio address recently made by Hon. J. Howard McGrath, the Attorney General of the United States, "Justice for Poland," including the introductory remarks made by former State Representative Stanley Borsa, made on a radio program sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress:

INTRODUCTION BY MR. STANLEY BORSA

It was only a few short years ago that people thought and dreamed of one world. Today everyone talks in terms of two worlds. The difference between the Soviet Union and the western democracies has proved too deep to be ignored. There are some who believe the main difference is a conflict between socialism and capitalism—economic structures. Others think it is a political problem between freedom and tyranny. The common denominator of these differences can probably be summed up in terms of morals. The division of the world has been profoundly accomplished by the religion of immorality invented by Marx, preached fervently by Lenin and carried to unimagined extremes by Stalin. Marx dismissed God as a hoax, Lenin accepted this belief and advanced toward sowing hate, revolution and scorn and Stalin has accepted the doctrine of both to completely stifle freedom in Russia and suppress any movement toward it. Religion, poetry, art, education, scholarship and even pure science are twisted to the momentary needs of the tyrant. These things are not only true in Russia but wherever the influence of the Communist conspiracy extends. Poland and other satellite countries furnish us a shocking example. Communism deprived them of independence and are crucifying their religious beliefs. "No compromise with immorality" should become the battle cry and guiding principle of every individual in every still uncorrupted government in the world. Only upon the upholding and teaching of Christian moral standards can civilized life be maintained. The Honorable J. Howard McGrath is the outstanding Attorney General of the United States. He was born in Woonsocket, R. I., and after graduation from college was admitted to the bar. From his early college days, Mr. McGrath has been interested in the law, politics and the science of government, devoting the past 20 years to public service. In 1934 President Roosevelt appointed him as United States district attorney for Rhode Island. He has served his State as governor and Senator and his Nation as solicitor general, Cabinet head of the Department of Justice as Attorney General. From President of the Young Men's Democratic League of Rhode Island in 1934 he advanced step by step to become chairman of the Democratic National Committee in 1947, serving in that job until his elevation to the office of Attorney General. His career has been marked with his vigorous defense of human rights and the American way of life. It gives me pleasure to present a recorded address by Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States.

JUSTICE FOR POLAND

(By Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General)

I deeply appreciate the opportunity afforded me by the Polish-American Congress of Western Massachusetts to broadcast a 1950 message on the Polish devotion to freedom and justice.

Throughout the centuries freedom-loving humanity all over the earth has been inspired by the historic battle of the Polish people for liberty—the God-given right of all men.

Their thousand-year record is emblazoned with struggle, suffering, and sacrifice in freedom's cause. Year after year, despite defeat and tribulations that would have broken the spirit of the less faithful, they have ever fought on and on toward the coveted goal.

Centuries of partition and enslavement by powerful and ruthless neighbors have failed to quench the Polish thirst for liberty. Time and again they have ripped off the shackles of their oppressors to enjoy for brief intervals the blessings of a free people. One such period followed the First World War, when our own Nation helped to restore their independence.

But that independence was all too short-lived. For in 1939 Hitler's Nazi madmen overran Poland's sacred soil. Notwithstanding the fact that she was outnumbered and militarily unprepared to meet that vicious attack, she was the first nation to battle Hitler. There were no quislings in Poland.

The Communist grip on Poland is a warning to the democratic world. The democratic world is learning that communistic ideology denies the inalienable rights of man, suppresses freedom of expression, prohibits the participation of the people in the affairs of their own government, and substitutes the rule of a minority for the rule of a majority. Yes, the rule by a controlled few for the rule by free millions.

We know this wicked doctrine takes away man's most precious possession—the right to religious worship in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience. We do not forget the bitter lessons of history vividly reminding us of nation after nation crumbling in the dust, never to rise again, whose people have turned away from God.

Founded on faith in God, never wavering; established on the rock of religion, unshakable against all the winds of adversity, our country has developed and grown into the most prosperous and most powerful Nation on the face of the globe.

We do not say this in the spirit of exultation, but with deep humility as we strive to carry out the eternal mandate to do good—"To love thy neighbor as thyself, to feed the hungry and heal the sick."

The bond of friendship between the Polish people and the American people has continued since the days the courageous Polish pioneers helped to found the Jamestown colony, the first English settlement on American soil. In the new year of 1950 it is particularly gratifying and inspiring for us to reflect that many distinguished Polish names have enriched the story of America from the days of our independence to the present hour.

Americans will ever remember those fearless Polish pioneers of the Jamestown colony. Records show that the Polish pilgrims of that day and time, artisans in glass and soap making, demanded political rights—the right to vote.

The attainment of this privilege is considered by some as the first victory in America for the right of suffrage. Immense strides in liberty's cause have been made since then. Renowned Poles have graced the Halls of Congress, honored governors' chairs, and embellished other places.

Nearly a million American boys with Polish blood in their veins valiantly fought in two world wars that we were forced to wage in defense of our democracy in a single generation.

One of the first to enlist in our country's Revolution for democracy—for human liberty—was Gen. Casimir Pulaski. Selfless and heroically he fought in our war of liberation and gave his life in the siege of Savannah, Ga. General Pulaski was not an American, but he was a fighting exponent of freedom and he came from a country that cherished freedom above all else. No nationality, no race, no creed has exclusive ownership of liberty. Liberty is indivisible, it is universal, it is the birthright of every human being. God meant it so to be.

As I have said on other occasions, Poland has furnished us with more than a great national hero. She has steeped our country in her culture and ideals. Her musicians and writers, her artists and singers, her missionaries, teachers and inventors, her gallant fighters, aviators, and seamen have added, year after year, to the grandeur of General Pulaski's supreme gift. For a thousand years Poland has been stanchly devoted to her Christian ideal of religious tolerance and democracy.

Pulaski is a symbol of that democracy. In these tense and uncertain times it is both fitting and vital that we reemphasize the ideals for which Pulaski gave his life. While a United States Senator, I had the privilege and honor to introduce a bill in Congress to provide a permanent memorial in honor of General Pulaski—a national memorial which would serve to perpetuate the lofty ideals for which he laid down his life. As in the past, displaced persons coming from Poland will add to the fullness of our way of life.

Would that the rulers all over the world heed the terrible lessons of the past and learn once and for all that the flame of liberty cannot be forever extinguished in the hearts and souls of men. The torch of liberty must be kept ever burning to light the way to a better world.

War has not been and never will be the final solution to mankind's problems. It is not civilization's answer. War does not eliminate lust for power, greed, suspicion, intolerance, and tyranny. Such discords in life can only be conquered by education, mutual understanding, and brotherhood through peaceful processes.

As President Truman has so aptly said:

"The world today needs the spiritual guidance of inspired leaders, who can rise above creed or class, who can help humanity gain security.

"If civilization intends to avoid destruction, nations must learn to live together in harmony with each other."

With the aid of divine providence, we are determined to go forward until we reach the peak of freedom and security, peace, and happiness, for peoples everywhere.

Address by Rev. James S. Barry, D. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a recent excerpt from the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item containing the text of a speech by the Rev. James S. Barry, D. D., pastor of St. John's Church in that community.

Father Barry traced the history of the churches in Clinton in an outstanding address given at the centennial banquet March 14 in honor of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of Clinton.

In introducing Rev. Father James S. Barry, D. D., pastor of St. John's Church, Congressman PHILBIN said:

"Clinton has long been noted for the religious life of its people, the strength and fervor of their faith, the broad toleration of their outlook, the sincere spirit of their brotherhood, the large number of its sons and daughters who have been called to vocations. The free religious worship guaranteed by our Constitution has found strong, profound rock upon which our community is built.

"There is no man among us better equipped to discuss our religious life than the fine Christian gentleman I am about to call upon.

"Scholar, devoted spiritual leader, of keen penetrating mind, broad and unselfish, highly honored in the new diocese of Worcester, always gracious, kind, and considerate, beloved by all, I am happy and proud to present to respond to the toast, 'Our Churches,' the Reverend James S. Barry, D. D., pastor of St. John's Church, Father Barry."

Rev. James S. Barry, D. D., pastor of St. John's Church, in responding to the toast, "Our Churches," said:

"Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, today we celebrate the centenary of the beginning of the town of Clinton. To appreciate what that really means, we must needs go back over the history of those hundred years. The religious history of the town logically divides itself into two equal periods: before the year 1900 and since that year."

THE FIRST CHURCH

"The first church in point of view of origin, in Clinton, was the Congregational, whose parent parish recently suffered a heavy loss in Lancaster. In 1840, Sabbath school was held, in Clintonville, with Congregationalists, Baptists, and Methodists worshipping there.

"The first Congregational was formally organized in 1844 and a chapel was built near the foot of Water Street on Main Street where religious services were held for 2 years.

"The first pastor was Rev. J. M. Eaton. A new church was erected on Walnut Street in 1847. This church was remodeled and rededicated February 22, 1869.

"This church was replaced by the present edifice, erected on the same site, and dedicated May 29, 1890.

"Thus, briefly, the history of Clinton's oldest parish whose present pastor is Rev. E. Maurice Bussey."

THE BAPTIST PARISH

"Baptists: During the first quarter of the nineteenth century there lived within the present limits of Clinton several earnest Baptists. In 1816, when the New Brick Church was being built, in Lancaster, a new Baptist society was formed and meetings were held in private homes; such as those of Charles Chace, John Burditt, and Levi Howard.

"When the Congregationalists determined to build, on Walnut Street, they urged the Baptists to begin worship in the chapel, on Main Street. Rev. Charles M. Bowers became the first resident pastor in 1847. This chapel soon proved too small, and, in 1849, the new church on Walnut Street was dedicated January 10. Before Clinton became a town the parish numbered 90 members.

"A new Baptist Church was dedicated February 1868. This was later moved back to become the chapel of the large brick church.

"March 23, 1894, the brick edifice, with the chapel in the rear, was dedicated. On the night of January 20, 1934, this beautiful brick church was destroyed by fire.

"But with characteristic enthusiasm a new church was pledged and dedicated in 1936. The present pastor has been in charge for 11 years, including a leave of absence in the Army. He is Rev. Donald B. Weymouth."

THE METHODIST CHURCH

"Methodist: In 1842, the Methodists secured the use of the brick school house, on Main Street, for their Sunday services and then later in private houses. The building of the church was completed in 1852, during the pastorate of Rev. T. Willard Lewis. Several pastors have served this church. During the year 1860, the first regular preaching began, under Rev. Philip Toque. In 1867, the church was raised and during the next 2 years extensive repairs were made. Later, in 1897, extensive repairs were made. In 1900, the Methodist Church was on High Street, then later, property on Walnut Street was purchased where the present church was erected. A new unit of a community hall and Sunday school was dedicated in 1927. This community hall now has been made into the auditorium. The present pastor is Rev. Andrew R. Eickhoff."

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

"Episcopal: The Church of the Good Shepherd is a development of All Saints Parish, Worcester, and Christ Church, Fitchburg. In February and March 1874, services were held in Bigelow Hall and it was decided to hold regular services, beginning with the first Sunday after Easter, Rev. L. Gorham Stevens, a deacon, took charge of the mission.

"In March 1875, Rev. J. C. Hewlett became the regular pastor. Plans for a church building developed, and at the suggestion of Rev. Dr. Bowers, the old library building site was acquired.

"The church was completed and consecrated April 17, 1877, when Rev. Henry Foote became the first settled director. In January 1884 a fire did some damage to the church and Rev. George F. Pratt became the first rector. In December 1889 the church was enlarged and later, June 10, 1892, the chancel was dedicated.

"Gradually the parish developed along the lines forecast by the early founders. The name, the Good Shepherd, was suggested by one of our distinguished townspeople, Miss Ellen K. Stevens. Since 1900, there have been seven rectors, who have left pleasant memories behind them.

"In November 1948 the seventy-fifth anniversary of the parish was celebrated, when Bishop Henry Lawrence presided. The present rector is Rev. T. Frederick Cooper."

THE GERMAN CHURCH

"German Evangelical Church: This parish was organized in 1887 with 52 members. The church building was erected in 1888, and, with many improvements and additions to the original structure, is still in use. In the course of the years, eight pastors have served, beginning with Rev. F. S. F. Scherf, and the present pastor is Rev. Harold S. Winship. Three members of the parish have entered the Christian ministry. Since 1944, all services of the church have been in English."

THE UNITARIAN PARISH

"Unitarian: The Unitarian Church was originally dedicated in February 1853 and enlarged in 1873 when practically a new building was erected. Since then the church has remained practically the same.

"Rev. L. J. Livermore was the first official pastor but during the formative period Rev. George M. Bartol, of the mother church in Lancaster, was truly the guiding director.

"Rev. James C. Duncan became pastor in June 1886 and his remarkable career, as pastor, ended with his death, in 1937, having been the pastor over 50 years.

"Judge Jonathan Smith took a very keen interest in the early years of the parish and was active in the life of the parish. The parish observed the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of the church, in July 1925.

"In November, of that year, a memorial tablet commemorating this event was unveiled and, after extensive repairs, the church was rededicated.

"October 19, 1936, Rev. James Cameron Duncan, D. D., completed 50 years in the ministry when four of the five young men who had entered the ministry were present. Dr. Duncan lived 4 months more, when he died. The present pastor, Rev. John H. Taylor, began his ministry here, September 1, 1948."

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

"Presbyterian: The First United Presbyterian Church, in Clinton, was organized February 6, 1893. Ground was purchased, on Chestnut Street, from the Bigelow estate and an edifice erected which was dedicated May 8, 1894. This proved too small and a new church was dedicated, January 27, 1901.

"This is the present building with some later alterations and improvements. The present pastor is Rev. Robert C. Shaub who has proved to be a good neighbor to St. John's for the last 2 years."

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC PARISHES

"Catholics: The history of the Catholics, in Clinton, naturally revolves around the history of St. John's Parish. Irish people slowly arrived, in Clintonville, and, in 1848, several were engaged in the construction of the Clinton O's.

"From the expanding parish of St. John's, in Worcester, a mission was established in Clinton. As early as 1845, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass was offered here by Father Matthew Gibson. Services were held in private homes for some time.

"In 1847, Father John Boyce came and after considerable difficulty construction of the first church began and was dedicated under the patronage of St. John the Evangelist.

"Clinton's first resident priest in charge of the parish was Father John Connolly. During the years, several pastors have served at St. John's, and I would like to mention these: Most Rev. William A. Hickey, D. D., who later became Bishop of Providence. It was he who started the present parochial school; Most Rev. Patrick T. O'Reilly, D. D., once an assistant at St. John's, later called to become the first bishop of the new Springfield Diocese; Rev. Michael H. Kittredge, who was the only native of Clinton to serve here as pastor; Rev. Richard J. Patterson, who began the longest career that any priest had as a pastor in the year 1888, which was ended the last day of the past century.

"His pastorate was most notable, especially because during the time there came the dedication of the present—third church—in 1906.

"The present pastor, Rev. James S. Barry, D. D., has had the honor of serving both as a curate and as pastor which he shares with

Father John O'Keefe and with Bishop Hickey.

"The parish celebrated the centennial year of the first church here, in 1948.

"During this centennial year of Clinton's history, the Catholics of Clinton joined with those of all Worcester County in acclaiming Most Rev. John J. Wright, D. D., as he became the first bishop of the newly created Diocese of Worcester."

THE ROSARY CHURCH

"The parish of Our Lady of the Rosary was founded in 1929, a division of St. John's. It was fortunate in having as its first pastor, Rev. Edward J. Fitzgerald, long and favorably known to Clinton people as the trusted assistant of Father O'Keefe. He erected the striking school and rectory which overlook Clinton from the south.

"The school hall serves as the place of divine worship. Father Fitzgerald was a well-known orator and delivered a stirring address on the occasion of Clinton's fiftieth anniversary. The present pastor, Rev. James B. Kennedy, has served with great success over 6 years."

ST. MARY'S PARISH

"In recent years the Poles came to Clinton in numbers sufficient to justify a new parish in 1918, under Father Fox. For some years they attended St. John's Church, and later Our Lady of the Rosary where Monsignor Cyran was then an assistant.

"Father Bloom built St. Mary's School. The first church was destroyed by fire.

"But with characteristic energy, the parishioners rallied to the task and a satisfactory emergency building was erected.

"Rev. John Ossajca is the present pastor of St. Mary's, where he has presided for some years, guiding his flock in the way of the Lord."

TRINITY LUTHERAN CHURCH

"We can begin the second half of Clinton's life by recording the history of Trinity Lutheran Church which had its origin at the turn of the century. Pastor Kaestner, of Worcester, came here at first to hold services at the request of a number of Lutherans in Clinton. These were held in a private home.

"Increased numbers necessitated renting a large room in the Pierce Block, on High Street. Various pastors continued the work but, in 1913, Pastor Rademacher became the first full-time pastor. The church building, on Chase Street, was dedicated in April 1915. Shortly after, in 1919, certain services were conducted in English, and now both German and English are in use. The congregation was incorporated in 1925. The present pastor is Rev. Theodore Martin.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE CHURCH

"First Church of Christ Scientist: Although Christian Science services were held in Clinton as early as 1892, regular services began in 1908, and were held in GAR Hall, in the Bank Block. The organization became a regularly recognized society in October 1909, with readers chosen from its own membership. During May 1911 the meeting place was changed to Music Hall, in the municipal building.

"The society constructed its church home at the corner of Water and Redmond Streets, ground being broken in September 1921, with completion in January 1923.

"The society was recognized by the Mother Church in Boston as a branch church, and is now known as First Church of Christ Scientist, December 13, 1923. The present president is Ella Sirollier."

ST. NICHOLAS CHURCH

"Greek: We have an original group in Clinton, who form the Greek Orthodox parish whose church is dedicated to St. Nicholas. The church was first established in 1918, with Reverend Thaddeus as the first priest. Many of the charter members still reside in Clinton.

"Two years after the first mass, the parishioners purchased the property on School Street, which is now the site of the present church. The building has been used as a hospital and served as a church until 1926. Then with an enlarged population the present church was erected.

"In 1941 a fine choir was formed, considered one of the best a capella choirs in New England. January 1, 1947, a young group of directors took over the management of the church and were sworn in by Rev. Constantine J. Polymeros, who is the present priest in charge of the church. Daniel J. Paul, at present, presides as president of the various officers."

OTHER DENOMINATIONS

"In this short review we should not forget the Congregation Shaarei Zedeck, which has an imposing synagogue on Water Street where Rabbi Aaron Twersky officiates. He has received definite marks of distinction this very year.

"The Free Methodist Church of Clinton had its beginning in 1906, at which time the congregation worshiped in the Coulter Building. The first pastor was E. H. Wyeth. The church was built in 1923 under the pastorship of Rev. Charles E. Ross. The present pastor is Rev. M. A. Parker.

"Let us one and all thank Almighty God for the sufferings and privations endured by the early pioneers of the various parishes in Clinton, through which they have left to us of today the noble edifices that distinguish our town, which can rightfully be named the town of churches. May a true religious spirit ennoble its citizens always."

Aid in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Saturday, March 11, 1950:

AID IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

It seems to be agreed that if the United States is to make effective moves against the advance of communism in Asia some plans for stabilizing the situation in various countries must be initiated and adopted. Viet Nam wants military aid at once to meet the increased threat of the Communist-led forces of Ho Chi Minh. Burma has indicated a receptivity to American assistance, after having been somewhat fearful of foreign exploitation. Indonesia is seeking further rehabilitation loans. Discussions are in progress concerning the relation of American stockpiling to Malaya's economy. A State Department mission is now in the field making a survey and a new Asiatic policy is predicted for sometime in the summer.

Meanwhile there is one danger point at which we can and should act without the need for further exploration. That is the Philippines. We have a direct military commitment and a strong moral commitment to the new Republic's security and progress. It can be met now with concrete actions that will promote stability in the archipelago and at the same time give an earnest to the rest of Asia that we mean business. Here are some of the things that can be done:

1. The United States Congress should immediately make a further and final amendment to the War Damage Claims Act, appropriating the necessary $100,000,000 to bring the scale of payment up to the 75-percent level that was implicit in the original legislation. This is a matter of good faith, but it can be made also a matter of substantial economic gain for the Philippines by making some simple provisos. It can be stipulated, for example, that the additional payments to those whose claims have already been met in part must be used in projects designed to further rehabilitation and economic improvement in the Philippines. This would assure the channeling of the funds into productive enterprises.

2. The United States should extend to the Philippines, now, a currency stabilization credit similar to that which was extended to Mexico. An amount of about $100,000,000 should be adequate. This is imperative, since adverse trade balances have drained away too much of the country's gold reserve. The peso is not now as stable as it should be and there is a black market.

3. The United States should dispatch, immediately, a small, really top-level and nongovernmental mission to examine and report on the possibility of private investment of the sort envisaged in the point-four program. Such a mission, and it should be good enough to inspire complete confidence, should advise the Philippine Government on the steps necessary to encourage investment. It should also advise Americans as to where and how investment could be made profitably. There are opportunities in abundance. In this category could be placed certain public operations that could be funded with private capital, such as the rebuilding of the water supply for Manila and Baguio, the construction of some key roads, and the development of dam projects that would be a source of both irrigation and power.

4. The United States should quickly resolve any further dispute about our military commitments by strengthening its Philippine establishments. If we are to hold Clark Field there ought to be a ground force to defend it and its fuel sources should be made independent of the haul from Manila. If Subic Bay is to be our major naval station its fueling capacity should be made adequate. If we have other and wider programs for a solid establishment in the archipelago they should be started now.

The Philippines is at the moment in a shaky economic position. It is in a vulnerable military position. It can be turned into a bastion of great strength, economically, politically, and militarily by prompt action. We and the Filipinos are in basic accord and we need not fear that we will be misinterpreted. We can act jointly. The important thing is to act now.

Long Island Railroad Debacle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to set forth the telegram I have this date sent to the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission:

MARCH 23, 1950.

Mr. J. MONROE JOHNSON,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.:

Request immediate action toward directing installation of automatic tripping safety devices on Long Island Railroad to insure safety of Long Island commuters and prevent repetition of recent catastrophe costing many lives. This matter is urgent and will not wait for lengthy investigations or red taps. This railroad is floundering in a confusion of bankruptcy, investigations, lawsuits, low-employee morale, and poor management. The public must be given this minimum protection at once.

Congressman HENRY J. LATHAM,
Third District, New York.

Address of Hon. Joseph M. Duffy, Chairman of the Clinton (Mass.) Board of Selectmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of my address at the centennial banquet March 14 commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of my home town of Clinton, Mass., and the address of welcome delivered by the Honorable Joseph M. Duffy, chairman of the Clinton Board of Selectmen, both of which appeared in a recent issue of the Clinton Daily Item:

Chairman Joseph M. Duffy, of the board of selectmen, in extending the welcome to the audience, said:

"Mr. Chairman, honored and distinguished guests, fellow townspeople, it is indeed a rare pleasure for the board of selectmen to extend to each and every one of you a hearty welcome, as we join in celebrating this one hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of our town.

"This welcome, from the board of selectmen, extends to those assembled here tonight and to the great family of Clintonians, and friends of Clinton, wherever they might be.

"To our visiting dignitaries, the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth, and to the many visitors from our neighboring cities and towns, who will be with us on this memorable anniversary, we extend our warmest greetings.

"As I stand here this evening, I am aware of the deep feeling, intense love, and tender memories that are part of our Clinton heritage, nor am I unaware of the many trials and hardships our townspeople endured down through the years in the growth of our splendid town.

"And so it is with profound respect for the passing of the past 100 years, and with abiding faith in the future, that we gather here tonight to memorialize this centennial year.

"And as we look into the uncertain future, with its inevitable changes, we ask Almighty God for His loving guidance for this, our town, which we so deeply cherish. Thank you."

In responding to the toast, Clinton and the United States, Congressman PHILBIN said:

"Judge Kittredge, Reverend Clergy, Your Excellency Governor Dever, Your Honor Lieutenant Governor Sullivan, my friend Matt Connelly, distinguished guests at the head table, fellow Clintonians, and friends, I am exceedingly thankful to Judge Kittredge for his very kind personal allusions but fear they are far more generous than I could possibly deserve.

"Let me say of him, however, at the very threshold of this program that our town is deeply indebted to Judge Kittredge for most able leadership in arranging such an impressive, interesting, entertaining, and epoch-making program. To him and all his assistants I am happy to make earnest acknowledgment and render the warm thanks of our fellow townspeople for a difficult job magnificently done.

"Let me also express my genuine appreciation for the honor which the committee has conferred upon me this evening in selecting me to preside over the speaking program and to respond to the toast, 'Clinton and the United States.'

"Within the bounds of propriety applicable to an event which mingles solemnity and festive joy and to be sure in keeping with the dispositions of the several very eminent men who will address you whom it is not my desire or intention to inhibit in any respect, I will endeavor, so far as I am concerned, to carry out the program expeditiously enough to satisfy even an impatient listener.

"If, as the poet once said, 'brevity is the soul of wit,' I shall hope to leave the wit to John Redmond and, insofar as is possible and seemly, strive for brevity.

"Reflection, reminiscence, contemplation, and rededication must be ours tonight. Surely we cannot hope to face and conquer the grave problems of this atomic, mechanized age without recourse to the great fountainhead of tradition and heritage and inspiration which nourishes and guides us from our honored past. No more than we can solve these problems without actively adapting ourselves to the new needs, new demands, and new techniques which are so much a part of our current life and the contemporary world. Thus, if we are wise, we would seek to adjust our thinking and our acting so as best to utilize at once the sound invaluable lessons of the past and to modulate to the swift motion of our dynamic progress in this rapidly changing, constantly shifting, and very uncertain, confused, and bewildered cycle of human history.

"It comes as somewhat of a redundancy for any of its native sons to praise the town of Clinton and the magnificent achievements of its people during the century we observe. The fame of Clinton has spread far and wide to the far corners of the earth. From distant Australia whose one-time Premier was a person with Clinton blood in his veins to the magnificence of the Hotel Savoy in London, where talented Carroll Gibbons holds sway, yet and leaving Congress out of it, to the innermost sanctum sanctorum of the White House itself where our own Matt Connelly so ably serves as the right arm of the great President of the United States, the name and fame, good deeds, accomplishments, and humanities of Clinton boys and girls are known and felt in many places. This has given a universal and global quality to the town which is reflected in the essentially rare and distinctive atmosphere in which Clinton lives.

"On this memorable anniversary we must recall that Clinton is part of an area settled by pioneer colonists in very earliest American days. Its tradition, its history, its lofty psychological approach, its high moral tone, its burning patriotism date back to the days of John Prescott whose courageous band of undaunted men and women literally carved a civilization out of a wilderness and established the basic institutions of government, religion, economics, and sociology by which in steadily and greatly expanded and enriched form since that very time we have lived as a municipal and social organism.

"It is to this strain of early American blood, 'Yankee' if you will, which in fierce struggle and bitter sacrifices forged the early history of this community that we owe so much that we express our profound gratitude here tonight. We of the present as well as our posterity can note with benefit and profit their faith, their dedication to freedom, their attachment to fundamental values.

"As the history of the Nation unfolded, as we grew in population, in strength and in the development and implementation of our democratic institutions, may races and many peoples, often the victims of cruel persecution in foreign lands, seeking the opportunities of free activity which America afforded came to our shores and settled here. These peoples were of different national origins and racial stock and embraced practically every people of Europe. The rich infusion of their blood, the happy admixture of their ancient cultures, their passionate love of liberty; their devotion to religious and moral law has proved an incredible boon and a momentous contribution to the progress of our town and Nation.

"To a degree almost unbelievable these various strains of peoples of entirely diverse and dissimilar national and cultural backgrounds in the course of time and with relatively negligible friction and discord merged into a compact, friendly, cooperating political and social unit characterized by the zeal, industry, thrift, and loyalty of its members and were able to forge here the splendid, free, prosperous, healthy and patriotic community to which and for which we pay our most heartfelt tribute of glory and gratitude here this evening. They kept their eyes fixed on the stars but their feet on the ground and trusting God they built wisely and soundly upon the solid rock of a government and a community based upon the rights of the individual.

"This is a one hundredth anniversary and the people we most honor and thank on this occasion are not alone those of the present generation but for the most part those of past generations to which I have alluded whose steadfast fidelity, indomitable will and tenacious purpose overcame the great obstacles of distance, political dissension and almost every conceivable economic and social deficiency to establish and preserve the dynamic, progressive and colorful town of which we are all so proud.

"Theirs was no easy lot. They grappled and struggled with the stark, bleak facts of mere existence. They clung tenaciously to their ideals of freedom and morality. Their service was not for themselves alone, although they fully recognized and practiced the democratic American doctrine of self-help. But they sought in their very thought, word, and deed to serve the community, the State, and the Nation with unselfish and zealous devotion.

"Their labors and efforts were not confined to times of peace. Perhaps their more glorious contributions, excepting those in the spiritual realm, took place in time of conflict and war. It should be noted that the men of this political subdivision of which Clinton is a part, sons of who were born and raised within a stone's throw of this very hall, fought in the Revolutionary War, in the War of 1812, in the Indian wars, in the great struggle to preserve the Union and to establish the principle, once and, I hope, forever, that all men are equal; that all men are first class American citizens regardless of their race, their color, their national origin, or their condition in life.

"Men of Clinton fought in the Spanish-American War, and while the line is drawn thin now many of those heroes still remain with us and are among our finest citizens. Clintonians fought for the Nation in World War I. Their deeds of heroism and gallantry resounded around the earth at the Marne, at Chateau Thierry, at Belleau Woods, at Verdun, and on the high seas and in the air. In 1941, when the Nation called once again to its citizenry to rally to its defense, there was a spontaneous response from the boys and girls of Clinton and again they fought in every corner of the world to protect our free institutions, and in every branch of the

service they achieved a record second to none.

"Yes, my friends, in the defense and service of the United States of America and the ideals which it represents, the men and women of Clinton have ever offered themselves willingly and conducted themselves courageously and achieved gloriously in the preservation of our cherished freedoms. Their blood saturates every battlefield of our Nation since the time of the struggle for independence. It drenches and enriches the fields of Europe, the South Pacific and Asia. The lives of Clinton heroes were sacrificed in almost every clime, on every sea, in every airway of the world to keep alive the great and immortal spark of human liberty which has been so zealously guarded in this community.

"I cannot possibly recite in this brief time the sum total of Clinton's contributions to the United States. It has been emphasized time and time again in civil, professional, and business life. Thousands of Clinton boys here and elsewhere have risen to positions of great importance, influence and power in the affairs of the Nation and have reflected undying glory upon our town—outstanding lawyers and judges, some of them adorning this gathering tonight, doctors, scientists, writers, composers, captains of industry, teachers, journalists and distinguished churchmen and many others.

"We have sent outstanding representatives to the National Capital, boys who were born, educated, and brought up in this town or to whom Clinton was their real home. We have had several Members of Congress, the Honorable Edward Kenny, of late and lamented memory, a Clinton boy who served with great distinction for many years in Congress from the State of New Jersey, my own brilliant predecessor and distinguished friend and colleague, our neighbor, and an outstanding son of Clinton, the Honorable Joseph E. Casey, whose record in Congress and reputation as a lawyer has given luster to our town.

"I have already mentioned the superlative service of Matt Connelly, one of Clinton's greatest sons. We are all proud of him.

"As the crowning glory to all these contributions of our sons in the public service at Washington stands those of the distinguished and unforgettable Senator David I. Walsh, of revered memory, one of the Nation's truly great statesmen, a man fired by birth and nature with unsurpassed patriotism, motivated by noblest principles, gifted with great eloquence, and extraordinary talents and ability. The principles he courageously fought for, the vision and foresight he displayed, the lessons in fundamental Americanism he proclaimed will long exert powerful influence in this land. He was Clinton's most illustrious son. Massachusetts' outstanding statesman and one of the great national figures of our times and generation.

"Clinton can feel proud, indeed, of these great men it has given to the Nation and of the faithful service of its sons and daughters and mothers and fathers in war and in peace.

"In this same spot in the old town hall 50 years ago on a similar occasion our people gathered to celebrate their fiftieth anniversary and to express rededication to the purposes of our free Government and to the aspirations of our people. In the same devout spirit, with strengthened will to meet every test of our Americanism that may come, it is fitting tonight that we, too, as the living embodiment of the Clinton of the present should pause to hail and thank those of the past to whom we owe so much. Let us resolve that, inspired by their example and sacrifice, their patriotism and their willingness to give and serve, yes, inspired by their determination to cling to the paths of righteousness of virtue, of freedom, we, too, will face the future with fortitude and confidence that this community will continue, God willing, to grow and develop and give of itself unselfishly to the great cause of preserving our heritage and building a greater, stronger, more prosperous, happy, and peaceful Nation.

"In these fateful days we shall need something more than passive citizenship. We shall need a united and determined Nation—a people free from the fetters of provincialism and intolerance, a people keenly aware of our responsibilities to the Nation and mankind, a people aroused to the urgency of preserving their liberties in a world tattered and torn with dissension and hostility to democracy.

"The future is in the hands of unsurpassed and splendid youth who must and will, I know, courageously take up the burdens and responsibilities of conducting and advancing our town and our Nation. They have a precious legacy. We all have a precious legacy. If we heed its lessons, those gathered here on the hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Clinton will be able to proclaim to the world that we of this generation have faithfully and successfully achieved our great mission and that Clinton and the United States having overcome and solved the problems of the present are walking humbly, but majestically, in the sacred pathways of freedom, tolerance, security and peace."

Mr. Lie Oversteps Bounds of His UN Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the correspondence columns of the Washington Star for March 14, 1950:

TO THE EDITOR:

The United Nations Secretary General, Trygve Lie, seems to put his own interpretation on the extent of his duties. The result brings discredit to the very important office that he holds. Through the issuance of private memoranda and public utterances, he deliberately uses his influence to unseat the delegates of a member nation, the Nationalist Government of China.

Mr. Lie indicates the direction of his efforts through attempts to shape our thinking with respect to the repeated Soviet walkouts from almost every Council and Committee of the UN. Moreover, he has no inhibitions in bypassing the proper UN organs when he speaks as the sole authority about what should be done concerning the "A" and "H" bombs or the methods the member nations should follow to reduce the production of conventional armaments. High lighting all of Mr. Lie's words and actions is a theme that has a familiar ring: In order for the UN to carry on its work, the Soviet Union must be persuaded to return to the council tables, and to do this we must set aside our silly moral principles.

Mr. Lie is the UN's chief administrative officer and is supposed to act in that capacity and nothing more. He is not supposed to take over the functions of the various Councils, but to keep a record of their findings and report to the General Assembly. He is not supposed to express his own political opinions nor act like a party politician in lining up one power or group of powers against another as he now tries to do.

As an individual, Mr. Lie has all the rights and privileges of self-expression. However, his position, as Secretary-General of the UN, is so important that anything he says may mislead the American public immediately and influence the opinion and even the policy of other governments in a manner that could prove detrimental to the best interests of the United States and the UN members in general.

In this critical period of world relations, the Secretary-General should be made aware that his present actions contribute in no small way to a rising dissatisfaction over the bald-faced attempts by the Soviet Union to use the UN as a forum.

HAROLD J. THOMPSON.

One Hundredth Anniversary of University of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on February 28, 1950, the University of Utah celebrated its centennial. Alumni gatherings all over the United States were held and on the campus a series of meetings, lectures, and various types of gatherings took place.

The University of Utah, established as it was in the first year of our Territorial government, reflects one of the American ideals in regard to education. That is, that the State and its educational institutions should grow up together. The fact that this has occurred especially in many of our Western States, is responsible for America's basic belief that democracy can only properly function where there is a trained citizenry. Utah has never been without trained leaders as a result of her university. The university, in very deed, has been a light that shineth on a hill and has been the sun to the youth of Utah throughout the hundred years of our State's and Territory's existence.

During one of the meetings of the centennial, Dr. H. L. Marshall, dean of the medical college, an alumnus of the class of 1908, and a nationally recognized leader in his field of study and endeavor, on behalf of the faculty saluted the university on its one hundredth anniversary. Because of the State-wide and national interest in Utah's centennial, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Marshall's remarks be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor Lee, Mr. President, and friends, the faculty salutes the university on its one hundredth anniversary.

While affirming its own youth and vigor, this faculty in frankness acknowledges that it is almost as old as the university. But not quite so old, however. The institution was framed and fashioned 100 years ago today.

But the snow of the following November had whitened the Wasatch before we the faculty was born. The "we" is used in the editorial sense, for this was a single, not a multiple birth. During the first semester there was only one of us; he was listed under the rather confusing academic title of Dr. Cyrus W. Collins, M. A. Have no misgivings, however; this faculty of one was directed and carefully supervised—as we are now—by 13 solicitous regents.

By the end of the fourth semester, we the faculty had multiplied to three. And then we did an unusual thing—for a faculty, a most astonishing thing—we disappeared. When the legislature cut $5,000 from the university's annual appropriation—i. e., changed the appropriation from $5,000 a year to zero—sensitive and naturally reticent, we vanished from shock.

It took 15 years before there were any signs of quickening, and 2 years later, with John R. Park, M. D., officiating, we were born again. More durable and resistant this time, we grew steadily, but slowly, for 60 years. Lately, of course, we have expanded like an umbrella. According to current count, we number about 500.

It is my personal good fortune to have been associated with the university as a student and as a teacher during one-half of its existence. Possibly my selection here today is due to realization that this situation will not likely be duplicated at the next centennial celebration.

In defense of my own youth, however, let me explain that half a century ago the university was a very small college and also a sizable high school as well. Some of us were admitted in those days at a very tender age. I taught my first class in 1908, became a professor during my twenties, and have served under five presidents. Except during various leaves of absence, I have known all members of the faculty intimately—until the last few years. Now it is necessary for us to wear labels at our infrequent meetings.

While the faculty has lost much of its intimacy and perhaps some of its solidarity, it is now less provincial, and a more restless and competitive scholarship is evident—particularly in the area of investigation and research. The high tempo of the new college of medicine and the graduate school has added candlepower to the night lights of the laboratories.

In days when the faculty was small and intimate, questions both trivial and grave were debated in faculty meetings with eloquence and oratory suggestive of the late Daniel Webster. One of the graver questions, as I remember, was whether to wear or not to wear the cap and gown on ceremonial occasions like this. As sure as the buttercups blossomed each springtime, that subject was debated.

Spearhead for the affirmative was George M. Marshall, professor of English, who pointed out that the academic robe and tasseled hat would bring to our callow hails an echo of the solemnity and dignity of the English cathedrals. For the negative, George Q. Coray and Joshua Paul denounced the garb as monkish—smacking of popery and monasticism.

Through many years this issue raged, until practical William G. Roylance calmly pointed out that the academic robe is inexpensive and also concealing. Adopting it, therefore, could easily save the price of a new suit or a new dress at every commencement.

Our attire here today attests the persuasiveness of the Roylance logic.

Mr. President and friends of the university, this occasion calls for more than levity, or repetition of that which now seems humorous. In attempting to represent the faculty of today, may I also presume, in some measure, to represent the faculty of yesterday—Joseph T. Kingsbury, James E. Talmadge, Joseph B. Toronto, Joshua R. Paul, George Q. Coray, William G. Roylance, William M. Stewart, George M. Marshall, Robert Lindsay McGhie, Benjamin Rogers Howell, Jacob Bolin, J. L. Gibson, Frederick W. Reynolds, and many many others whom I knew.

In their name and in the name of the faculty of today, we salute our 100-year-old university, and we pledge to it anew our loyalty and our effort.

Fraternal Order of Eagles Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously commented on the Senate floor on the outstanding organization of which we in Wisconsin are particularly proud—the Fraternal Order of Eagles. I discussed the great record of civic contributions of the FOE particularly in connection with emblem-day legislation which we in the Senate passed last year on May 23, and which has since been pending before the House Judiciary Committee. I had been glad to introduce the emblem day bill, Senate Joint Resolution 62, to honor on June 30 of each year the American Bald Eagle—symbol of the FOE and symbol of our American Republic. In the House of Representatives, my colleague, the Honorable FRANK KEEFE, of Oshkosh, who has had a long and distinguished record of service in the fraternal order, sponsored a companion measure.

We are all familiar with the fact that the Fraternal Order of Eagles has literally been in the vanguard of sponsoring a tremendous amount of social legislation. Its magazine, Eagle, whose editorial offices I am proud to say are located in Milwaukee, has constantly brought to the attention of its devoted readership the frontiers still existing for social pioneering. It is fitting that the home of this editorial pioneering should be Milwaukee, which possesses the largest aerie in the world and which has as its headquarters a magnificent building with wonderful facilities.

I have in my hand a copy of the January 1950 issue of Eagle. On its very last page is a brief statement of belief and policy excerpted from the official committee reports and resolutions adopted at recent Grand Aerie conventions. These excerpts indicate that the great pioneering crusade which led to workmen's compensation, widows' pensions, old-age security, and other safeguards, particularly for the low-income American wage-earner, continues. While there might be differences of opinion in some quarters on some of the elements of the Eagle program, there has never been, and undoubtedly never will be, any difference of opinion on the patriotic zeal, the humanitarian sympathy, the stirring enterprise of the FOE.

We are proud of the Aeries of Wisconsin and of their members, and I ask unanimous consent now that the excerpts of their position, as stated in resolutions and reports, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THIS WE BELIEVE

We believe in the democratic way of life, where all can live and work and worship in freedom and security as befits the God-given dignity of man; that we best protect that way of life by positively presenting its advantages and by buttressing the home and family as the bulwark of society against destructive forces.

We believe that there is no substitute for the protective guidance and influence of true, religious homes; that handicaps faced by parents and children in large- and low-income families should be lessened; that the challenging task of guiding boys and girls toward good citizenship is everybody's job.

We believe that full employment, with jobs for all who are willing and able to work, should be the goal of industry, labor, agriculture, and Government; that the annual wage is a practical and attainable economic objective; that out of a just division of the profits of industry will come a new recognition of the role that management and labor must play in our society.

We believe that social security must be extended to include all employed workers not now protected by an adequate retirement system; that all self-employed persons should have the opportunity to participate on a voluntary basis; that social-security benefits must be adequate to provide a decent standard of living, adjusted to most violent fluctuations in living costs.

We believe that handicapped persons are a good labor investment; that disabled war veterans are entitled to assistance and employment; that victims of industrial accidents should be given training and guidance to help them help themselves.

We believe that the threat of decreased income and increased expenses during periods of ill health should be met by disability benefits similar to those provided for workers during time of unemployment; that wage earners be reimbursed for major medical, surgical, and hospital expenses on a schedule basis for the family unit; that the relationship of doctor and patient should be untouched, and no new relationship of Government and medical practitioner created.

We believe that people-to-people understanding must be the basis for national progress and international cooperation; that our military defenses must be adequate to back up our foreign policy and safeguard our national security; that citizen interest in world affairs and support for the principles of liberty, truth, justice, and equality must be the foundation for enduring peace.

We believe in democracy as a way of life, where rights and responsibility walk hand in hand, where the least well off among us shall find some measure of opportunity and security; where men are free to live as friends and neighbors and to work as partners for the common good.

Unfair Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I

include the following editorial entitled "Unfair Legislation" from the Shreveport Times of March 15, 1950:

UNFAIR LEGISLATION

In an effort to offset Post Office Department deficits created mainly in large part through creaky, tangled, political and outmoded operational structure dating back to the ox team days, the House of Representatives has passed a bill including hikes in the postage rates for large newspapers and most nationally circulated magazines.

The bill now is pending in the Senate where it seems to be the intent to bring it to floor consideration without further committee hearings on the ground that the Senate, after committee hearings, previously passed a postal rate increase bill and that committee hearings would be mere repetition.

That is incorrect. Committee hearings certainly should be held on this measure, which is quite different in several major factors from the original Senate bill. The House bill is filled with discrimination in its provisions on second class postal rates for newspapers and magazines. The ultimate effect of this discrimination will be to increase the cost of circulation of large daily papers and most national magazines in rural areas. Thus the cost of distributing large newspapers with full coverage of news, entertainment, educational and/or other features to rural residents will be hiked by a special postal assessment from which smaller publications, lacking both the quantity and the quality of the larger publications, will be exempted. In addition to exemptions on smaller weekly and daily publications, the bill would exempt farm publications and also publications with a small proportion of advertising no matter how big they might be.

Here are examples of the thoroughly unfair and needless discrimination in the House postal-rate bill as it affects second-class rates on publications:

A weekly newspaper of 5,000 or less circulation is exempt from the rate increases but a weekly of 5,100 circulation must accept the hikes, while the very prosperous Country Gentleman and the Farm Journal, each with more than 1,000,000 circulation, also are exempt. So is the great Reader's Digest, with its tremendous circulation,—because less than 5 percent of its content is advertising.

The effect of these exemptions is to exclude from postal-rate increases 975 of the Nation's 1,776 dailies, and 5,956 of the Nation's 8,700 weeklies.

In other words, the whole thing is comparable to selling cosmetics at one price for blondes and another for brunettes.

The larger publications of the Nation are not objecting to an increase in postal rates. But, they do believe that any rate increase should be equitable all along the line and not set up in a manner to provide what amounts to a tax-paid subsidy for one group and special assessments for others.

Under the present system, the larger daily newspapers do most of the work involved in distributing their issues by mail. In most instances, they deliver the publications, at their own expense, to rural post offices in their circulatory territory and the post office has only the job of redelivery along established rural routes. The cost of transportation from city to city and of sorting at both ends of the journey does not fall under the Post Office Department, as with bulk other mail, but is carried by the publisher.

The remedy for Post Office Department deficits does not lie with discriminatory postal-rate assessment of one group while granting special favors to another group.

It rests, according to the Hoover Commission task force reports, in complete rejuvenation and regeneration of operation of the Department, which now has virtually the same operational structure that was established in 1836—nearly 115 years ago.

According to the Hoover Commission task-force reports, the Post Office Department has had no basic organizational change in that time, although just about every other organizational form in either Government or private business has changed completely. The reports state that 80 percent of the mail-sorting operations could be performed more quickly with the help of mechanical devices—that it costs the Department (meaning us the taxpayers) 2½ cents for every post card delivered—that 1,000,000,000 pieces of mail are carried free each year (including political documents for Congressmen now planning discriminatory rates on publications)—that the Post Office Department is so loosely organized that it takes 58 separate congressional appropriations each year to operate it, ranging from $500 to $500,000,000 each—that the Department actually subsidizes certain types of mail for far more than its books show and that no one actually knows how much tax money is paid out in subsidies to air lines, steamship lines, and other carriers.

None of these things are attributed to operational personnel of the Department—from Postmaster General Donaldson on down. Their causes lie in the weak and toppling organizational structure. It is there that Congress—and Congress alone—can act. It is there it should act—not in setting up special penalties for one group of users of postal facilities and special favors for other groups. Under the House bill—as usual—the poor farmer will get it in the neck through higher rural mail increases or complete discontinuance of delivery by publications. En passant, who is going to pay for the recent coal miner increases? The mine companies or the consuming public? You guess.

Address by Thomas R. Callahan, Member of Speakers' Bureau, Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very enlightening address delivered by Thomas R. Callahan, of Somerville, Mass., member of the speakers' bureau of the Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies, to the members of the Holy Name Society of St. Pius' Roman Catholic Church, Lynn, Mass., on Sunday, March 12, 1950:

Why are we here?

Why is it necessary for you and me to discuss the question of separation of church and state?

Why are we, as a group of Catholic laymen, discussing a controversial issue which directly concerns the Catholic Church?

The answer to these questions lies in the circumstance that the issue has been publicly raised by Protestant laymen, and it should be publicly answered by Catholic laymen.

You and I know, as Catholics, that many questions concerning the relationship of our church to our Government are propounded to us in our daily association with those who are not members of our faith. We know too, that while some of these questions are asked in a spirit of honest inquiry, many times they are prompted by motives far less worthy.

We know also that some of the people who ask those questions have no direct contact with Catholic priests, and that many of them do not want such contact. Can you conceive of a more dangerous weapon, to be placed in the hands of those who are antagonistic to the Catholic Church, than the admission that, as individual Catholics, we are unable, without first obtaining the advice of a priest, to answer a simple question concerning the relationship between the Catholic Church, as such, and that organization of our fellow citizens which we know as our Government?

A current book, which is critical of the Catholic Church, is receiving considerable notoriety. This book, which I will not further advertise by announcing its title, was the subject of a recent debate between a Catholic priest and the author of the book, which unfortunately, is now going into its twelfth printing. In this book we find this statement:

"Every Catholic is forbidden, in general, to explain or defend the truths of his faith publicly."

That was the man whom a consecrated Catholic priest was obliged to answer in a public forum while you and I and other indolent Catholics sat comfortably in our homes watching the wrestling matches on the television. If you shall say to me that the priest did not have to debate with the author, then I shall ask you are we, as intelligent Catholic laymen, going to permit these published attacks on our holy church, to remain unchallenged while there is now pending in the Legislature of this Commonwealth, and in our national Congress, legislation the consideration, and the disposition, of which cannot help but be affected by such distorted concepts of the responsibilities of Catholic laymen in our State and national Government.

We are assembled here with the consent and approbation of the brilliant and militant archbishop of this diocese because one of the constitutional precepts of the founders of this country, which was originally intended as a shield for the protection of all religions, is now, through the forces of bigotry and political expediency, being converted into a sword, which is aimed directly at the heart of the Catholic Church.

Reference to our history books will show that one of the results of the Revolutionary War was a wave of bitter resentment against the Church of England, the Episcopal Church, the official church of our enemy during the war.

A member of that church, James Madison by name, in order to defeat the possibility of that church, or any other one religious denomination, being recognized and maintained as the official church of this country, presented to a constitutional convention, the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States; the first amendment provides, and I quote:

"Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

There, my friends, is the only time the word "religion" appears in the Constitution of the United States. Let me repeat that for emphasis, there is the only time the word "religion" appears in the Constitution of the United States.

The fourteenth amendment which had for its purpose the extension to the several States of the provisions of the first amendment which applied only to the Federal Government, reads in its pertinent part as follows, and I quote:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or the immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

There you have before you the two constitutional provisions which we so often hear cited as the enunciation of the doctrine of the separation of the church and state.

Can anyone show you where, in those quotations from the Constitution of these United States, it says that a child going to attend a parochial school may not ride in a school bus going in the same direction and carrying children who attend a public school? Can anyone show you in those portions of our National Constitution any prohibition that a parochial school which relieves the State of the tremendous financial burden of providing education for children shall have no right to look to that State, or to the Federal Government, for financial assistance in its efforts to discharge what is legally the obligation of each of the States and of the Federal Government?

In order that we may know that we have grave reason to be concerned and that we are not just crying "wolf" because of imaginary dangers, let me read to you please, from the Boston Pilot, issue of February 12, 1950:

"MASSACHUSETTS COMMISSION UPHOLDS LEGALITY OF BUS PETITION

"Legality of an initiative petition aimed at repealing a State law which allows parochial and private school pupils to ride on State-financed busses was upheld here by the Massachusetts State ballot law commission.

"In rejecting a protest by Chairman John C. Carr of the State Democratic committee, the commission held unanimously that at least the required 20,000 of 21,183 signatures on the petition were valid.

"Carr said an appeal to the State supreme judicial court against the commission ruling would be considered. Unless the court reverses the decision, Massachusetts voters will find the issue on the ballot in the November elections."

And on the reverse side of that news item we find the following item with a Washington date line, reading as follows:

"'NOT ONE PENNY' FOR CHURCH SCHOOLS, SAYS NEW BARDEN PROPOSAL

"WASHINGTON, February 9.—Representative GRAHAM A. BARDEN, of North Carolina, took the occasion of the annual meeting here of Protestants and other Americans united for separation of church and state to unveil partly the 1950 model of his Federal aid-to-education bill. * * *

"But Representative BARDEN, whose 1949 measure aroused Nation-wide protest from Catholics, also avowed that 'not one penny' of Federal funds would go to parochial and other private school pupils under the provisions of his bill."

And in the Boston Globe issue of February 14, 1950 we find the following:

"In a tense atmosphere that flared with denunciation at times, some Protestant spokesmen yesterday demanded the legislature permit voters to decide whether parochial school pupils should continue to ride on publicly supported busses.

"Catholic doctrines and tactics of * * * leaders in seeking to invalidate the proposed referendum both came under fire during an all-day hearing on the issue at the State house. * * *

"A committee member, Representative Maurice A. Donahue, Democrat, of Holyoke, demanded that one speaker declare whether he was implying that parochial schools were 'un-American' when the individual referred to the Catholic Church's doctrines as 'authoritarian.'

"I say that what they teach is un-American replied the speaker, Carl Haartz, of Andover."

Before we go any further, let us see just how un-American the instruction that parochial school children receive really is.

(Mentions local boys from St. Pius.)

Would Mr. Haartz and his playmates care to challenge the Americanism of those boys.

Let us look a little closer at the un-American activities of boys who attended parochial schools in the city of Lynn.

The honor roll of St. Mary's boys high school, Lynn, Mass., shows:

John Perkins, class of 1935, killed in action.

Myles Hannify, class of 1938, killed in action.

Hugh Noonan, class of 1938, killed in action.

Ralph Cormier, class of 1939, killed in action.

Joseph Flynn, class of 1939, killed in action.

Robert Riley, class of 1940, killed in action.

In the class of 1935 there were 38 graduates, 26 went into service.

In the class of 1936 there were 40 graduates, 22 went into service.

In the class of 1937 there were 36 graduates, 19 went into service.

In the class of 1938 there were 41 graduates, 30 went into service.

In the class of 1939 there were 46 graduates, 32 went into service.

At this point we have 208 parochial school graduates of which number, 135, or 66.5 percent, went to the defense of our Nation.

Let us continue this analysis of the un-Americanism taught in parochial schools:

In the class of 1940 there were 48 graduates, 36 went into service.

In the class of 1941 there were 62 graduates, 48 went into service.

In the class of 1942 there were 68 graduates, 56 went into service.

In the class of 1943 there were 87 graduates, 57 went into service.

In the class of 1944 there were 82 graduates, 61 went into service.

At this point we have 347 more graduates of parochial schools of which number 258, or 74.3 percent, went to the defense of our Nation.

Hurling facts such as these back into the teeth of those who calumniate our parochial school system is not a job for the priest alone. It is your job and the job of every intelligent Catholic layman.

In the Boston Post issue of January 31, 1950, we find the following:

"Attorney Thomas W. Vinson, of Winchester, a former Republican Member of the House and a supporter of the Batchelder petition which would bar parochial school children from riding free on school busses. * * * said: 'The issue * * * is whether public money shall be used for the benefit of private institutions. It is going further than anybody ever dreamed of. It opens the door not only to free transportation, but to supplying rubbers to youngsters so they won't get their feet wet, free textbooks, lunches, and for everything else parochial-school officials want the public to pay for.'"

So the boys want to play on a dollars-and-cents basis. O. K. Let's play it their way:

Suppose tomorrow morning Father O'Kane should say to Sister Mercita, "Take the 295 pupils from our parochial school down to the school committee for the city of Lynn and tell them that I have found another use for the school building and that, since the parents of all of these children are paying taxes in the city of Lynn, it is up to the school committee to arrange for their education in the Lynn public schools, as they are legally bound to do." Then the pastor of St. Jean Baptiste should send down to the school committee the 362 pupils of his elementary school and the 157 pupils in his high school and the pastor of St. Joseph's should send down his 773 pupils in his elementary school, and the pastor of St. Mary's should send down the 1,000 pupils in his high school and the 996 pupils in his elementary school, and the pastor of St. Michael's should send down his 338 pupils and the pastor of the Sacred Heart Parish should send down his 400 pupils. Add up the cost of educating these 4,562 children in the public schools, Mr. Vinson, and see how many pairs of rubbers that sum will buy.

In the year 1948 it cost the cities and towns of Massachusetts for public schools $112,300,662, toward this sum the State paid to the cities and towns, in reimbursement, $17,293,603.59, of which the sum of $1,485,070.86 represented reimbursement for bus transportation provided school children. That same bus transportation on which it now appears likely you will be called upon to vote in the next general election in this State.

In the Commonwealth of Massachusetts the number of children attending parochial schools during the year 1948 was 162,741. The Massachusetts Department of Education has set the cost of educating a child in the public schools as $191.46 per pupil. That is what the State is willing to pay for a State ward.

Multiplying the number of pupils attending parochial schools by the per capita figure provided by the State we find that in this Commonwealth alone during 1 year there was saved to the taxpayers through the maintenance of parochial schools the sum of $33,069,163.66. I wish you would try to keep that figure in mind when someone asks you how or why they should vote on the bus referendum which, so far as we know now, will appear on the ballot at the next State election.

Remember that figure, $33,069,163.66.

And now let us bring that figuring a little closer to home: I am informed that the estimated annual cost of educating a child in the public schools of the city of Lynn is as follows: Elementary $178 and high school $312.

In this parish 295 pupils attend St. Pius' Elementary School. If we multiply the number of those pupils by the per capita figure of $178. We arrive at a figure of $52,510.

If we engage in the same multiplication with regard to the 2,409 pupils enrolled in the seven elementary parochial schools in Lynn and the 1,153 pupils enrolled in the parochial high schools in this city, the mathematical result will be elementary schools $606,802 and high schools $359,736.

These two figures combined will show that the Catholic Church in this city is saving the city of Lynn, and in turn the taxpayers of the State of Massachusetts, the sum of $1,019,988 every year by maintaining parochial schools at the personal expense of the members of the several parishes.

It has been suggested to me that my figures may be inflated. In a spirit of fairness let us consider their argument in that regard: In general it goes substantially like this:

In Lynn we have some classrooms which could take care of additional pupils and in other instances we have empty classrooms and all that is necessary is a teacher. The increase in numbers of students in a school does not necessarily increase the cost to the city by $178 because there may be vacant seats in certain rooms to which these additions may be assigned.

In other words, the cost per pupil does not increase by $178 unless there is no vacancy in any room assigned to a certain grade. If, however, a new room has to be newly opened, then $178 may be the proper

cost, but as soon as it is 50-percent filled this cost does not increase because any additional pupil uses the same teacher, room and supplies.

Conceding for purposes of this discussion, that there may be some merit in this argument, would it stand up if tomorrow morning the city of Lynn was required to provide school buildings, teachers and equipment for the 4,363 pupils now attending parochial schools in this city?

On a national scale the sum so saved by the maintenance of parochial schools is in excess of $200,000,000,000 and the capital outlay for buildings and equipment is in excess of $400,000,000,000.

The Catholic Church has at no time in the past, and does not now, insist that parochial schools be supported by the Federal Government. The Catholic parents in this country stand willing, as always, to contribute by the payment of taxes, to the support and maintenance of public schools, while at the same time they are paying additional money out of their own pockets, in order that they may continue to exercise their God-given privilege, their constitutional prerogative, and their inalienable legal right, to send their children to a school of their own choosing.

The Federal aid which it is expected shall be extended by our Federal Government to all school children of America may be set out in a few simple sentences:

First. Bus transportation to and from whatever school they may be attending.

Second. Periodic medical examinations.

Third. Text books.

The Burden bill as originally presented to the Congress contemplated that $20,000,000 should be paid to the several States for Federal aid to education.

As we have seen from recent newspaper items, opponents of the Burden bill insist that it should contain a proviso that not one dollar should be spent for bus transportation, medical examinations, or textbooks for those children who are attending parochial schools, because such a payment, so they say, would be an indirect contribution to the support and maintenance of the Catholic Church, as such, and would therefore be in violation of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

We are told that a child who attends a parochial school may not ride in a school bus because, under Federal aid, the bus would be maintained in part by Federal funds, and that if such bus should bring a child to a parochial school the Federal Government would thereby be helping the Catholic Church, which action, so they say, would be unconstitutional and in violation of the so-called principle of separation of church and state.

If that same child walks to a parochial school he must use the sidewalk. Is there, in any city or town of any State in these United States, a sidewalk on any one of the principal streets of any community which has not been paid for in whole or in part by Federal funds made available under the ERA or the WPA programs? Have you ever seen a policeman order a parochial-school child to get off a sidewalk?

In the decision by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Everson case (67 Sup. Ct. 504, Feb. 15, 1947) Mr. Justice Jackson admitted that if a parochial school should catch fire, a fireman, paid from public funds, could save those children from the burning building which is, admittedly, owned and maintained by, and for, the Catholic Church. Common sense will tell us that the fireman, under those circumstances, would not be helping the Catholic Church, as such. He would be performing a humane act, in the interest of the public welfare, for the common good of all school children, and that is precisely what the proponents of Federal aid to parochial-school children are asking the Federal Government to do. That is, to make available to all school children, public and parochial, whatever money is appropriated as Federal aid for the health and welfare of all of the school children of America.

There is abundant proof that those who would deprive a school child of such aid, simply because the child attends a parochial school, do not want to approach this question in a sane, logical, sympathetic manner.

If they would stop imitating the ostrich and would withdraw their eyes, and their minds, from beneath the sands of bigotry and prejudice, they would see that the Federal Government, on many occasions, has actually paid money to Catholic schools and colleges.

Ever since the inception of our Government, and more particularly during time of war, the Federal Government has provided chaplains to care for the spiritual needs of the men in the Army and Navy. The Government has not only provided these chaplains with food, lodging, and transportation, but in addition they have paid each one of them a salary as a commissioned officer in the armed forces. Do you doubt, for one moment, that those people who now so vigorously challenge the proposed Federal aid to little school children are not fully aware that the money so paid to Catholic chaplains found its way into the treasury of the Catholic Church, and that they also know, in the case of those priests who are members of religious orders, and who have taken a vow of poverty, that the entire sum so paid, after deducting their ordinary personal expenses, was turned over, by them, to the head of their particular religious order.

Have you ever heard anyone challenge the constitutionality of a chaplain in the armed forces?

When, in 1935, there was widespread unemployment and restlessness and our Nation found itself with 3,000,000 young people between the ages of 16 and 25 on the relief rolls, did not the Federal Government say to more than 600,000 of those young people, enroll yourself in the National Youth Administration, go to any school you choose, obtain part-time employment in that school, and we will pay your tuition whether the school you may select is Protestant, or Catholic, or nonsectarian.

Have you ever heard anyone challenge the constitutionality of the National Youth Administration?

And now let us see if we can make the comparison a little more direct. The Federal Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 provided in section 243-a that the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives should arrange with the board of education in the District of Columbia for the education of the young boys who act as pages, messengers, in both of the Houses of Congress. Let me read, please, and I quote:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) said page or pages may elect to attend a private or parochial school of their own choice: *Provided, however*, That such private or parochial school shall be reimbursed by the Senate and the House of Representatives only in the same amount as would be paid if the page or pages were attending a public school under the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section."

Can anyone show you a more direct contribution to the support and maintenance of a parochial school? No one has ever questioned the constitutionality of the Federal Legislative Reorganization Act.

And today tens of thousands of veterans of World War II are being educated at the expense of the Federal Government under the so-called GI bill of rights, in schools of their very own choosing, Protestant and Catholic, including those conducted by Catholic religious teaching orders. Have you ever heard of anyone challenging the constitutionality of the GI bill?

Perhaps some of our Protestant brethren are not wholly convinced of the adequacy of the education which is made available in parochial schools. Let me submit to you, please, the opinions of a leading American figure concerning the relative merits of the public schools, and also the inherent character of parochial schools:

In a message to the National Conference of Church-Related Colleges, an interdenominational association, the then President Franklin Delano Roosevelt had this to say, and I quote:

"If the Catholic schools prepare youth for better citizenship; if our country will be immensely benefited by a character formation built on the eternal principles of religion and morality, then they are rendering a public service, and since these schools are not operated for profit, they are in reality public schools."

My friends, I believe, as you do, that Christ told Peter that He had founded his church upon a rock, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it.

I also believe, as you do, that the juggernaut of religious prejudice has been grinding against that rock for more than 1,500 years.

I also know, as you do, that the process of the friction of the metal of prejudice against the rock of eternal truth causes the sparks of controversy to shoot forth. In today's discussion I have attempted to capture one of those sparks. Through intelligent discussion that spark of prejudice can be converted into a flame with which we can bring the light of our own faith to those who are still lost in the darkness of misunderstanding and intolerance, until ultimately there will shine forth the eternal truth of God's justice and of his plans for the welfare of all mankind.

If each one of you will try, as I have tried, by reading Catholic books and magazines, to equip yourself for the battle that lies ahead, the battle against bigotry and misunderstanding, we will then be able to answer questions concerning the manner in which, and the purpose for which, we devote our efforts to the betterment of our Nation and the glory of our God. If each one of us will make a sincere effort to do this, then we will indeed be paying homage to Him in whose holy name we have banded ourselves together.

Unification, Not Duplication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a misconception in some quarters with respect to the role assigned to the Coast Guard in time of war.

One of the most important missions of the Coast Guard, under present plans, has to do with harbor protection, and is in no sense a duplication of any job given to the Navy. It would indeed be unfortunate were this mistaken idea to result in curtailing appropriations for the program for training Coast Guard Reserves. In the hurried expansion that would be incident to any real emergency the Coast Guard would have immediate

need of trained Reserves, just as would the other armed services.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith part of an illuminating article on this subject by John G. Norris that appeared in today's Washington Post:

Several military experts recently have warned against the danger of a Communist tramp slipping atomic bombs into United States harbors, or of subversive forces destroying ships and piers by setting fires or other sabotage activity.

The Government agency charged with port security is the Coast Guard—a Treasury Department force which becomes part of the Navy in wartime. But active Coast Guard personnel and boats assigned to such work are barely adequate for normal peacetime harbor control.

To answer emergency needs and give some protection against the tramp steamer-sabotage threat, the Nation's war plans rely on having a trained Coast Guard Reserve ready. But though Federal law provides for such a Reserve, and some 4,000 officers and 500 enlisted men are on the rolls, the force has never received any funds for training.

The President's budget calls for spending $4,100,000 for initiating a Coast Guard Reserve training program. Training of 1,900 officers and 6,000 men is planned, the bulk of whom would be assigned to port security duty. Ultimately an Organized Reserve of 2,469 officers and 26,645 men is desired.

Despite strong support of the proposal from the Department of Defense, however, the money was knocked out by the House Appropriations Committee. The movement to restore the funds will be backed by some members of the group, as well as members of the House Armed Services Committee.

"The proposed reactivation of the Coast Guard Reserves is a matter of strong concern to the Department of Defense," states Secretary Louis Johnson.

"It is vital to national defense that a modest but highly trained force be in being to detect sabotage, supervise explosives loading, prevent water-front fires and explosions, control the identity of water-front personnel, etc."

Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, in a recent letter to Senator HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, of Washington, emphasized that the Coast Guard Reserve training program did not duplicate training now being given to the Naval Reserve.

While the Navy and its Reserve have a harbor-defense function, as reported in the Washington Post yesterday, under a division of effort the Navy handles antisubmarine nets, electronic devices, etc., to prevent enemy craft from sneaking into harbors, and the Coast Guard the job of protection against subversive activity of ships and persons lawfully permitted to enter.

Another Industry Protests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made on March 27, 1950, and an editorial from the Bridgeport Telegram of Bridgeport, Conn., dated March 27, 1950:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN DAVIS LODGE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FOURTH DISTRICT, FAIRFIELD COUNTY, CONN., ON MARCH 27, 1950, WITH RESPECT TO THE IMPORTATION OF HATS AND HAT BODIES FROM ABROAD

Once again the policies of the Democrat administration are resulting in dire economic distress in New England.

A short time ago, the administration sponsored the move of the Chance Vought Aircraft plant at Stratford to Dallas, Tex. This has resulted in widespread unemployment and displacement of Connecticut workers.

Now, the welfare of our hat makers in Danbury and in Norwalk is being seriously threatened by the import of hats and hat bodies from abroad.

This matter demands immediate attention on the part of responsible officials in the Department of State. The Committee for Reciprocity Information, as well as the Tariff Commission, should take action without delay.

It is impossible for American industry and labor to compete in a market flooded with goods manufactured in iron curtain countries with slave labor. Moreover it is not in our national interest.

The situation facing our domestic hat industry is cause for grave alarm. In the light of these conditions it is particularly to be regretted that the Eighty-first Congress eliminated the peril-point clause in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

There is no excuse for prejudicing American industry and the working men and women of our country in order to provide dollars for iron-curtain countries. We cannot base a successful foreign policy upon any proposition which calls for helping our self-styled enemies in the great east-west conflict in which we are involved. Surely there is no obligation to provide dollars to those who are seeking to destroy us. This is a self-defeating policy which we can ill afford.

If we are to continue aid to Europe, a strong and healthy American economy is an essential pillar not only of our national security but of world peace.

An immediate solution is necessary if Connecticut workers are to be protected and employment opportunities continued.

I shall continue my efforts to expedite action on this matter. I shall insist that appropriate officials of the Department of State and of the Tariff Commission take the steps which are necessary to protect our own citizens from such cut-throat competition.

[From the Bridgeport Telegram March 27, 1950]

ANOTHER INDUSTRY PROTESTS

The domestic hat industry, following a tremendous increase in importations from the Communist satellite, Czechoslovakia, has entered a vigorous protest with the Government against the effects of reciprocal-trade agreements. The Federal Tariff Commission has promised an inquiry into the situation, although some Government spokesmen have been credited with giving the absurd advice that Norwalk and Danbury hatters "should learn another trade."

The hat industry is not the only industry affected by imports from the iron-curtain country. The New England Shoe and Leather Association has asked the Treasury Department to investigate the importation of cheap shoes from Czechoslovakia, estimating that a million pairs may be imported this year, to the detriment of American manufacturers and workers.

In January alone, 88,000 pairs of women's shoes, equal to more than half the importations of 1949, came into the United States. The lowest price of a Czech shoe, compared with similar American-made footwear, the Treasury has been informed, is a sandal priced at $1.30, to retail at $1.95 to $2 a pair. The comparable American-made shoe would sell at $4 the pair.

It is obvious that United States manufacturers and shoe workers cannot compete with such products. It is equally obvious that something must be done to remedy a situation which is so detrimental to American industry. It will not solve any part of the problem either, if administration officials tell the shoe workers to go and learn another trade. New England shoe workers, like the hatters in Danbury and Norwalk, have been employed in their industries too long to start looking for different occupations.

Shirt makers are also beginning to worry about imports. They say they are not yet alarmed, but they don't like the prospects. While only 1,900 dozen Japanese shirts have come in, which can be sold for between $8 and $9 cents apiece, United States manufacturers fear the effects of a deluge of such cheaply made products in the domestic market.

The situation is serious and cannot be brushed off by Washington officialdom. "Go learn a new trade" is by no means the answer to the import problem.

Extension of Borrowing Power of Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have the opportunity of inserting an excellent editorial from the Olean (N. Y.) Times-Herald of March 24, referring to the unanswerable arguments made by our colleague, the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, on the floor of the House during the consideration of the extension of borrowing power by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This editorial emphasizes the indefensible situation in which the House found itself when it approved a conference report containing provisions identical with the measures introduced by Mr. KEATING, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., and myself, and then reversed its position within a few short hours upon the specious and untenable argument that these bills were loosely drawn and badly worded. Coming, as it did, from the gentleman whose committee had framed the conference report and who had supported vigorously the identical language taken from section 416 of the Agriculture Act of 1949, it had a most hollow ring. It is regrettable indeed that so many of our colleagues seem to have forgotten the action they took earlier that afternoon and permitted themselves to be maneuvered into this illogical position.

Our colleague from New York has been consistently urging prompt remedial action and I am sure that his logical and common sense arguments will eventually prevail in this body. It is gratifying indeed that a newspaper in New York should clearly recognize the mess in which we find ourselves and come to the support of a solution which cannot be ignored indefinitely. The appalling waste, not only of the taxpayers' hard-earned money, but of wholesome food,

will sooner or later become apparent to the people of America. This is particularly so since many more newspapers have analyzed this situation and have written strong editorials demanding action. There have been a series of striking cartoons published throughout the country which should have excellent effect. I only hope that more and more newspapers will lend their support to a solution of this matter and will join in creating an overwhelming public demand for action. I suggest that if the readers of these newspapers would take it upon themselves to send messages to the President at Key West, insisting upon his action under existing law, he could not continue to ignore the situation or resist the overwhelming public demand for action.

The editorial follows:

STILL ANOTHER PHASE

We'd hate to spoil your evening completely; but while we are on the subject of surplus farm crops you might just as well absorb another phase of the matter, which was described in detail to the House Agriculture Committee this week by Representative KEARNS, of Kingston, N. Y.

We all recognize, of course, that the surplus foods bought by the Government have cost not only millions but billions of the public's money, and have also had the effect of compelling the public to pay more for their eats than otherwise would have been the case.

What most of us may have never even thought of, but on which Representative KEARNS dwelt most effectively, is the fact that the carrying charges on these surplus foods purchased by the Government, and which are now in storage, are costing the American taxpayers $400 each minute of every 24 hours.

"These charges," the Rochester legislator declared to his colleagues, "include storage, insurance, transportation, and handling, and they constitute a staggering percentage of our present outlay for supporting agricultural prices.

"They amount to $105,000,000 for just the first 6 months of this fiscal year—the period from July 1 last to December 31, 1949.

"That means $25,000 an hour, or $400 a minute; and I understand that these carrying charges are running at an even higher rate now."

Representative KEARNS happened to be speaking in support of identical bills introduced by himself and Representatives JOHN W. HERTEL, of Massachusetts, and ROBERT J. CORBETT and EVERS D. SCOTT, Jr., both of Pennsylvania.

These measures would authorize the Government to pay transportation costs for all surplus foods delivered to welfare agencies.

Mr. KEARNS pointed out that the conference report on cotton-peanut acreage included a provision authorizing such payments on surplus potatoes. The new package appropriations bill, he added, also authorizes transportation to public agencies.

And he contended that the provision should be extended to apply to private and international agencies and to nonprofit hospitals.

We cordially agree with him.

Every effort should be made to unload these surplus foods to the best possible advantage, and thus save storage charges on the one hand or dumping on the other.

In the meantime, it won't do any of us any harm to realize just how costly this whole, inefficient set-up is—and why it is that Federal taxation, direct and hidden, is so high and so burdensome to the rank and file of American citizens.

Socialized Medicine: What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I have prepared for broadcast on the subject Socialized Medicine—What It Means.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE—WHAT IT MEANS

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE FOR YOU

Socialized medicine may be a term of uncertain meaning to some of my Idaho constituents. Briefly, under socialized medicine, doctors, dentists, nurses, and hospitals would be employed or managed by the Government. You, as a citizen, would obtain all of your medical and dental service from the Government and you would pay for that service in some way whether you need it or not. Right now you select your own doctor or hospital and you pay for services rendered.

That complete choice of doctors would not continue under socialized medicine. Every citizen or patient would tend to lose his identity and become a number. The doctor would work more for the Government and less for the patient. Red tape and delays would increase. Doctors would tend to lose that personal interest in patients. They would work by the hour instead of for the patient, and, under socialized medicine, the incentive for research and improved medical service would greatly diminish. The Fair Dealers advocate socialized medicine mainly as a means of providing them more control over the people. They are concerned only with obtaining control of the people by means of socialized medicine, and, to me, such deceit and intent are not a new deal or a fair deal, but a raw deal.

But let us look into the history of socialized medicine. Where did the idea come from and why is it advocated at all? Why is the present administration of your Government so anxious to thrust socialized medicine upon the American people? I shall give you some information about this problem and let you decide for yourself whether or not you want socialized medicine in Idaho.

WHERE IT CAME FROM

Following the Russian Revolution of 1917, Lenin, the father and founder of modern communism, set up in Russia a welfare scheme to which he gave the name socialized medicine. He considered this program of such great importance that he called it the keystone of the Socialist state.

Perhaps it may be somewhat confusing to find that the father of communism claimed his political schemes were socialistic, but communism and socialism have always had similar aims and purposes. The Socialists and the Communists both want government ownership and complete control of all means of production, distribution, and communication. The Socialists seek to gain these ends by a so-called process of nationalization based on elections and ballots, while the Communists take the more direct method of bullets and bayonets in order to carry out the communization of any country. In either system the citizen ends up as the property and the slave of the state.

Both Socialists and Communists conceal their real purposes by talking in terms of "public welfare," "planned economy," and "social security." These words do not have the unpleasant meanings that are attached to socialism and communism. But no one need be deceived about any scheme which looks to Federal ownership or Federal control of the resources, industries, farms, homes, and lives of the people in any State of our Union. Such a scheme inevitably involves either socialism or communism.

Having in mind the common aims and purposes of these two political systems, you can see why Lenin considered himself a Socialist, why he named his most important scheme socialized medicine, why the Russian Communists call themselves Socialists, and why Russia itself is officially named the "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Returning to the subject of socialized medicine, I want to point out that as long ago as 1930 one of the present Communist leaders, named Dmitri Manuilsky, said to the Communist Congress of Moscow:

"In the United States, for instance, the Communists must launch a powerful movement for social insurance. They must place themselves at the head of this movement and lead it to victory."

HOW IT SPREAD

Since 1930 the red tide of communism has swept over Europe, then into Britain, and finally across the Atlantic to North and South America. Five years ago the Communists allied themselves with British Socialists and Laborites to defeat Winston Churchill and win political control of the United Kingdom. Since then Britain has been ruled by the Communist Socialist-Labor Government of Prime Minister Clement Attlee. Between 1945 and 1950 the British Empire has been liquidated and nearly everything for which millions of Englishmen spent billions of dollars in the last 350 years has been destroyed. The national economy of Great Britain is now dangerously near complete ruin; but what is worse, informed British opinion predicts that the people may accept complete communization, including pure paganism in place of Christianity.

Long ago in one country after another the Communists and their fellow travelers launched a powerful movement for socialized medicine, or compulsory health insurance. In July 1948 the process of socialisation by an act to nationalize medicine became effective in Great Britain; and here in America we now have a bill pending in Congress which closely follows the British socialistic pattern. This bill is named for Senator MURRAY, of Montana, and Representative DINGELL, of Michigan, as they are two of its sponsors. So when you hear of the Murray-Dingell bill, you will know that it provides for socialized medicine, or compulsory health insurance.

POWER OVER PEOPLE

There is an old saying that the human hunger for power is like a cannibal whose appetite is never satisfied. It is a sober fact that our bureaucrats in Washington are always reaching for more and more power over the industry, the business, the agriculture, the resources, and the people of the United States. If the Murray-Dingell bill becomes a law, the Federal Security Administration will carry out its provisions, and in so doing this agency of our Federal Government will inevitably exert a large measure of control over your home, your occupation, your life, your living, and the lives of those you love.

The socialized-medicine program will compel practically all salary and wage earners to allow deductions from their pay checks and wages; and employers will also have to contribute their share to the support of another army of Federal workers who will be put on the pay roll. No official figures as to the cost of this latest socialistic scheme are available, although unofficial estimates fix the figure at $15,000,000,000 a year. Pay-roll deductions and employer contributions may, possibly, produce about $6,000,000,000 of the required amount; but this leaves an estimated annual deficit of some $9,000,000,000 to be made up by boosting our taxes again. Those who think they are going to get something for nothing in socialized medicine are going to have an expensive experience.

WHAT IT COSTS

The socialized medicine or compulsory health insurance program in Great Britain has cost twice the amount of money estimated for it, and it has been a fraud and a failure. Hundreds of bald-headed men have been able to get wigs for nothing; thousands of old folks have obtained ill-fitting sets of false teeth, as well as spectacles, supposedly free. Then, too, more thousands of people with minor ailments or imaginary ills have been given medical attention and pounds of free pills they probably did not need. But those who have been injured or who have been seriously sick have been unable to obtain prompt or adequate surgical, hospital, and other services.

American reporters who visited Britain and surveyed the situation found that injured and dangerously ill persons, as well as those who needed surgery, have had to wait for weeks, or even as long as 15 months for medical care. British doctors, nurses, and dentists are so overworked that they attempt to serve each office patient in 4 or 5 minutes and each home call in 10. The human body, however, is far too complicated to be repaired by such crude or careless efforts. The tragic increase in British deaths has therefore been the result of neglect, and the inferior medical care given to the sick and suffering.

SOMETHING FOR NOTHING?

Many British doctors, dentists, and specialists refused to join in the socialization of medicine, and some hospitals made the same decision. A like condition will occur here if the Murray-Dingell bill ever becomes law; and if your doctor, dentist, or hospital is one of those who are wise enough to stay out of this program, you will probably not be able to obtain their services under the socialized-medicine scheme. You may still have the free choice of a doctor, dentist, or hospital that the Murray-Dingell bill promises you, but you will pay double for medical, hospital, and dental services, because the regular deductions will continue to be made from your salary or wages, even though you pay your own privately employed doctor, dentist, or hospital. This is just what is being done in England by all who can afford good medical services. The British now know that they cannot obtain high-quality care at bargain-basement prices.

Our leading doctors have warned us, just as the doctors in Britain warned the people there, that schemes of compulsory health insurance, or socialized medicine, will ruin the standards and the quality of medical and dental care. The predictions of the British doctors have already come true; and a like disaster for us can be seen in the similarity of the provisions contained in the British act and our Murray-Dingell bill.

WE HAVE BEST MEDICAL CARE

We now have the best system of medical care in the world. There are some 56,000,000 American citizens who have voluntarily provided themselves with prepaid hospitalization. About 28,000,000 have surgical benefits in advance of any actual need, and 12,000,000 have obtained extra medical care beyond hospitalization and surgery. Group insurance and other plans give health insurance protection to more than 62,000,000 of us and this number is constantly increasing.

In the industrial field medical care is provided for more than 30,000,000 American workers, and this service includes doctors, nurses, and other experts in some 18,000 factories. We have State, county, and city hospitals that are staffed with doctors, nurses, and other personnel. Church and nonprofit hospitals, as well as those operated for profit, must be added to the available hospital facilities. We have more than 170,000 physicians, 45,000 specialists, 98,000 dentists, and 400,000 nurses.

This information does not give a complete picture of our resources and facilities for medical care, but I offer them in response to the propaganda of falsehoods and half-truths with which the Communists, Socialists, radicals, and others have flooded the country.

American medicine is based on freedom and private enterprise, and so possesses all the vigor and vitality that competition, ambition, and human hope give to human affairs. The slavery of socialized medicine has not produced in Russia a system that can compare with ours; but in less than 2 years, socialism has wrecked and ruined the practice of medicine, surgery, and dentistry in Great Britain.

THINK IT OVER

Your future health and freedom, and even your life, will eventually depend upon the quality of medical care available to you. I am most anxious that you decide whether you want a free system of medicine, such as we now have, or socialized medicine with its destroyed freedoms and its medical monopoly in the hands of the Federal bureaucrats.

That is the picture of socialized medicine. But perhaps there is another side to the problem. I have heard much of it. Before New Zealand and Australia threw their socialistic governments overboard, we heard lavish praise of socialized medicine in those countries. But the fact that the citizens of these countries have tried and discarded these schemes should make us think carefully before accepting the socialized-medicine program now being advocated for our Nation. Think it over, my friends. Decide for yourselves what you want. This is the American way, and I am anxious that we continue this American way. It is what has made our Nation great and strong. Let's continue it so.

Should Communists Be Denied Federal Appointments?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, at the request of the editor of the Daily Compass, which is published in New York City, I prepared an 800-word statement delineating the true scope and purpose of the subversive activities control bill of 1950, S. 2311, which has been introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and myself, and which has been approved by the Committee on the Judiciary by a 12-to-1 vote. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD THE MUNDT BILL BECOME LAW?

(By Senator KARL E. MUNDT, sponsor of the subversive activities control bill)

The so-called Mundt bill (S. 2311, subversive activities control bill of 1950) is not the result of any sudden impulse nor is it the product of hasty or careless consideration. It has been slowly but steadily evolving into its present form for approximately 3 years.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I first introduced a bill about 3 years ago to control subversive activities in this country by processes of registration, identification, and exposure rather than by punitive measures such as outlawing the Communist Party by name or denying it use of the ballot, the mails, and the radio. That legislation was known as the Mundt-Nixon bill; it passed the House by a 319 to 58 roll call vote. Before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee could approve it, that session of Congress expired. Now Senators FERGUSON of Michigan and JOHNSTON of South Carolina have joined with me in sponsoring a modified and more clear-cut version of this legislation. This new measure about 2 weeks ago was approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee by the highly significant vote of 12 to 1. Only Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, voted against it.

In their frantic efforts to discredit this Mundt bill and to recruit support against it the spokesmen for the Communist Party in this country have determined upon the strategy of charging everything against it in the desperate hope everybody will believe something and that by one device or another opposition to the bill may be aroused, organized, and be made articulate. The Communists have called it a thought-control bill—an antilabor bill—a bill of attainder and they have hurled equally false and misleading charges against it. They have made full use of the stock Communist formula of trying to smear those who oppose it; they have even called it an antipeace bill but they have stubbornly and sullenly refused to print its full text, to analyze the printed provisions of the bill, or to base their criticisms upon its actual contents.

Such totalitarian tactics may make sense to Communists and some of their willing and witless dupes, but they have little influence in Washington and add even less to the general level of public information. The end result of these Communist-inspired and directed tirades are sometimes ludicrous in the extreme. Last week for example a New York lady wrote me, "I am violently opposed to the Mundt thought-control bill. It is very bad legislation. Please send me a copy of the bill so that I can read what is in it." Naturally such artless and artificial opposition is something less than influential.

Here, in brief, is what the so-called Mundt bill would actually do: In section 4 it would make it unlawful "knowingly to combine, conspire, or agree with any other persons to perform an act which would substantially contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship, the direction and control of which is to be vested in, or exercised by or under the domination or control of any foreign government, foreign organization, or foreign individual."

Only that, and nothing more. Just a clear-cut statement making it illegal to "substantially contribute" to the destruction of our cherished American freedoms here by subjecting the United States to the dictatorship of a foreign ruler. Judging from the manner in which the Communists clamor that "this would outlaw communism," they are suffering from a guilt complex or a bad case of jitters. The words "communism" or "the Communist Party" are not even mentioned

in that prohibitive provision. Apparently the Communists by their frantic cries of alarm now admit what they have long tried to keep secret—that their efforts and their program are determined and dictated by men in Moscow. If that is established in the courts and if the Communist Party does not cut the umbilical cord by which it is forcefed from Russia, the provision will of course apply to it. Otherwise, it will not. However, it would have applied equally to the German-American Bund in 1936 and to the Japanese Black Dragon Society. Informed students of totalitarian movements realize that communism and fascism have much in common; they are in fact the Siamese Twins of human slavery.

Not by the wildest stretch of imagination by an orderly mind could such groups as labor unions, so-called liberal (sic) groups, the Socialist Party of Norman Thomas, or other organizations advocating change by American methods ever be affected by this provision.

Additionally, the Mundt bill makes peacetime espionage a crime; it denies Communists two privileges accorded loyal citizens by barring them from Federal appointive positions and from securing Government passports; it requires the Communists to label and identify their printed propaganda and radio programs, much as the Republican and Democratic Parties must; it requires them to make an annual public financial report; and it makes them identify their false fronts—organizations operated by them but concealing their true identity.

None of these are police-state methods, but all of them are necessary to protect this free Republic against the alien agents who by stealth and conspiratorial tactics would destroy our American freedoms by delivering us to the police-state dictators of Fascist-Communist regimes. In this era of the cold war to do less than this would be a policy of appeasement of treachery which by comparison would make Chamberlain at Munich look like Horatius at the bridge.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN,

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio broadcast by me on March 27, 1950, entitled "Happenings in Washington." I may say it is program No. 21 of a series.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 21)

This is ED MARTIN speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another installment of happenings in Washington.

In this broadcast I want to tell you about recent developments in Congress that have a direct bearing on the principles for which I have been fighting since I came to Washington a little more than 3 years ago.

You know I have battled every step of the way for less Government spending to put an end to deficit financing, and to cut down the mountain of debt which is a tremendous burden on the back of every taxpayer.

I have fought against the growing centralization of power in the Federal bureaucracy at Washington which robs local and State governments of their rightful functions and authority.

I have opposed Federal controls and regimentation by which big government attempts to regulate the lives of the people and destroys freedom of the individual.

Those of us in Congress who have fought for these principles believe they are the only course by which the United States can be saved from national bankruptcy and a socialistic form of government.

Because you pay the bill out of your earnings, recent events in Congress have been extremely important to you, the people, both financially and spiritually.

Singly these things may not mean very much. But collectively they add up to the beginnings, just the faint beginnings, of a turning aside from the helter-skelter drive down the road to economic collapse and socialism. Not a revolt, mind you, but just a step or two in the right direction.

Ten days ago the House Committee on Education and Labor finally rejected the highly controversial Federal aid to education program, at least for the remainder of the session.

You will remember that I opposed this program for two reasons:

First, because it would have injected increasing Federal control into the operation of State boards of education and the local school districts.

Second, because the $300,000,000 price tag for the first year of the bill was only a drop in the bucket compared to its vastly increased cost when in full swing.

Even supporters of the bill told me frankly that within a very few years the annual appropriations from Washington would have to climb well above a billion dollars annually.

What interested me especially was the comment of one committee member. From the very beginning he had strongly and eloquently favored the Federal aid-to-education plan. He had fought for it and voted for it and worked hard to influence his fellow Members of Congress in its behalf.

But as he gave the proposal more intense study and heard the arguments presented by supporters and opponents, his mind filled with doubt. Then his views changed.

Finally, the other day, this Congressman admitted—and it was not an easy admission for him to make—that he had been wrong.

This is what he said, and I quote him:

"I am now convinced that we can't have Federal funds without Federal control. Children are the greatest collateral that the United States has. Politics must be kept out of the school system if we are to preserve the future of the Republic.

"We are dealing here with human minds, not public roads. This is in many ways the most serious issue before the Congress. Once we take the step down the road to Federal control, we can never retreat."

The Congressman who made that statement is a former teacher and former superintendent of schools in his home community.

That action and those words, my fellow Pennsylvanians, constitute the first straw in the wind to which I want to call your attention.

A few days earlier the House voted down a new project which would have cost $36,400,000 the first year and increasing millions in subsequent years. Under it the Federal Government would have gone into the business of financing a rural-library service for the States.

This was a second action in which economy was achieved despite determined administration pressure.

The third happened last week in the Senate. There the administration forces turned on the heat to force through Mr. Truman's so-called middle-income-housing plan.

This was a scheme under which the Government would lend up to $1,000,000,000 of your money at interest rates of 2 or 3¼ percent to provide housing for those earning from $2,700 to $4,400 a year. They would be able to borrow this money, to be repaid in 50 to 60 years, by forming housing cooperatives.

That was highly discriminatory. It would benefit only a small group at the expense of every taxpayer. It would put the individual home owner who did not join a cooperative at a competitive disadvantage. He would have to pay a higher rate of interest and amortize his mortgage in 20 to 25 years. And in addition he would be taxed to support the gravy-train group.

If a man happened to make $4,500 a year instead of $4,400 a year, he would be unable to benefit from the plan. Yet, part of the money he pays in taxes would be used to support the scheme.

And, of course, the easy credit provided would be highly inflationary.

Well, despite all the heat and all the whip-cracking the administration forces could command, the Senate, under the leadership of the able Senator from Ohio, JOHN W. BRICKER, defeated the scheme.

I find that a third straw in the wind.

These, my friends, may be relatively small things. But there is a fourth in the making. Together with this beginning of a curb on spending, there seems to be the beginning of a curb on taxing.

In the last 20 years the American people have seen their taxes go up and up—becoming a heavier and heavier burden. Only once in all that time did the people get a tax reduction. Do you know who gave it to them? It was the Republican Eightieth Congress.

Yes, in an entire generation the only tax relief the American people have gotten came from the Eightieth Congress which has been denounced and ridiculed by President Truman and his cohorts.

Well, this year, there may be another break—a reduction in excise taxes. The economy-minded Members of Congress are fighting to wipe out or reduce the heavy wartime excises.

We battled for this cut all during 1949, the first year of the Eighty-first Congress. Finally, this year, the demands of the people became so strong that the administration is being forced to do something about it.

Most of these taxes were imposed during the war, not to raise revenue but to curb as far as possible the use of critical materials and services.

Today the people are demanding elimination of these taxes. You are going to get some relief—though not all the relief I believe you should have. Because the administration insists that for every dollar of excise tax it lifts, it must get another dollar through another form of taxation. So, while they plan to put some of this excise-tax money back in one of your pockets, they will be reaching into another pocket to take it away from you again.

You know, Mr. Truman asked Congress last January for a number of brand new spending programs which he said would help the people. The cost of his proposals would have been $375,000,000 for the first year and progressively more in subsequent years.

But now the administration makes it clear that you can't have these things unless Congress will levy new taxes to pay for them.

That should convince you that there is no such thing as "Government money." The only way the Government gets money is to tax every worker, every farmer, and every businessman.

Unlike a lot of these deep thinkers here in Washington, I don't believe the Government should tax all your earnings away from you so that it can spend it for you.

I believe in the kind of government which permits the people to keep most of their own

money, to spend, to save, or invest in any way that they see fit.

I am sure that nearly all of my fellow Americans believe in that, too.

I have been attacked many times and criticized because of my fight against the insidious, crawling socialism which has been spreading in our land. But I shall keep on fighting.

There have been dark days. However, I know now that it can be a winning fight if you keep up your fighting spirit and let your Congressman know you mean business.

More and more the American people—yes, and the American Congress—are becoming aroused about the danger of a government which wants to take care of everybody from the cradle to the grave.

We are having some success, but it does not mean that victory has been attained. It simply means that we must fight harder.

Let me quote some great truths from a recent writing about Abraham Lincoln. See if you don't agree with me about them. I quote:

"The unused hand withers.

"The unused brain ceases to function.

"The unused heart hardens.

"Where there are no calls for courage, for sacrifice, these do not come forth.

"The chief thought, even of those sincerely seeking a better social order today, seems to be that of putting props under people. A state which becomes the universal provider, policeman, and employer necessarily becomes also the breeding ground of weaklings and of slaves."

Those, my fellow Pennsylvanians, are great words. I ask you to give them some thought.

If we permit a central government to do everything for us, we shall become weaklings. Our unused hands shall wither and lose their skill and our unused brains shall cease to function.

If we permit the all-powerful central Government to step in and take over all the functions of charity and welfare, then, as the writer has so well declared, our unused hearts shall harden.

Through history, from the very beginning, wherever this has happened, the people, their nation and their government have gone down to destruction.

Under the American system of Government, our people have enjoyed more of the good things of life than any other people in the history of the world. It has given every citizen equal opportunity to improve his station in life.

Under our system the American people have achieved the highest living standards and the highest cultural and spiritual attainments.

This system has been our pride. It has become known to the whole world as the American way of life. It has been the envy of the rest of the globe.

I don't want it to be transformed and swallowed up by a creeping socialism.

I don't want our people to be robbed of their courage, their initiative, their self-reliance.

There has been a great deal of discussion as to the policies of the two opposing political parties.

I am proud to be a member of the group fighting to preserve the solvency of our Republic.

That is the paramount issue confronting the people of the United States. An insolvent nation cannot long retain its freedom.

Government spending must be reduced. We must halt deficit financing. We must not assume obligations that we cannot afford. We must return to a pay-as-you-go basis. In prosperous times we should cut down the national debt.

In the long run, this will make our country stronger and keep it stronger. The heritage of freedom and opportunity we pass on to our children and grandchildren will be as sound and as solid as that handed down to us.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

REA and Public Power Record of Hon. Elmer Thomas, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a personal statement prepared by me covering my REA and public-power record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REA AND PUBLIC POWER RECORD OF HON. ELMER THOMAS, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM OKLAHOMA

When I first entered the Senate in 1927 due to the fact that Oklahoma is a farm State, I requested assignment to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

After more than 20 years' service on the committee, I gravitated to the top and now am its chairman.

The jurisdiction of my committee extends to all matters pertaining to farms and farming.

JURISDICTION OVER FARM POWER

Under the law, the distribution of power to farms and rural areas comes under the jurisdiction of my Committee on Agriculture.

In the Congress, where appropriations are involved, it requires two laws to get the job done.

With respect to the development of hydroelectric power from flood-control dams, and this is the only kind we have in Oklahoma, the first law that must be passed is one approving and authorizing the construction of the project.

Such legislation is handled by the Committee on Public Works, of which Committee my colleague, Senator ROBERT S. KERR, is a member.

APPROPRIATIONS NECESSARY

After the project is approved and authorized, it requires an appropriation to construct the dam and reservoir.

On the Appropriations Committee of 21 Senators, I am second from the top.

MY ACCOMPLISHMENTS FOR OKLAHOMA

My high position on this committee has given me the opportunity of securing funds to build the many flood-control and power dams in Oklahoma.

The question naturally arises, what have I been able to accomplish by reason of my being Chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and being second from the top of the Senate Committee on Appropriations?

In 1933, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I helped develop and pass the law creating the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Since 1933, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have supported liberal appropriations to develop the said TVA.

In 1936, as a member of the Agriculture Committee, I helped develop and pass the law creating the Rural Electrification Administration and, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have supported liberal appropriations to develop and expand the REA system.

I am now a member of the Cotton Electric Cooperative with headquarters at Walters, Okla.

In 1935, in cooperation with Congressman W. R. Disney, I introduced a bill in the Senate and thereby secured funds for the construction of the Grand River Dam and hydroelectric power plant located in northeastern Oklahoma.

This dam and its connected hydroelectric works, together with the steam power plant at the Chouteau-Pryor Ordnance Works, form the basis of the Oklahoma State public power development.

As a supporter of the REA and as a co-op member, I want plenty of firm power at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I am securing all the funds possible to construct flood-control projects and where water is available I am demanding the development of hydroelectric power.

We now have plans for the development of hydroelectric power in Oklahoma and Arkansas to the extent of doubling the amount of power that is now being produced by all existing power plants in the two States.

I want our farmers and rural citizens to have all of this power that they can use at low rates and at the same time I want such power produced as cheaply as possible to the end that the surplus may be used to attract industries to Oklahoma and the Southwest.

OKLAHOMA HAS CHEAP ELECTRICITY

Electric rates are based upon the cost of the production and distribution of the energy or power; hence, to secure cheap electricity we must keep costs down.

Under the Oklahoma-Arkansas plan only that part of the cost of any dam assigned to the production of power is charged to power.

To date a relatively small amount of money has been used for the building of transmission lines; hence, we now have the second lowest electric or power rates to be found in the entire United States.

Only in the Columbia River Valley, where the flow of water is fairly constant, do we find a lower power rate.

FLOOD CONTROL COMES FIRST

The plan for the control of floods by contour farming, terracing, and farm ponds upon the headwaters of streams and then by large dams and reservoirs on the main stems of the streams and rivers was placed in operation in Oklahoma by Congressman PHIL FERGUSON and myself.

At that time, 1935, Congressman FERGUSON, from the Eighth District, was a member of the House Committee on Flood Control and thereby he was able to secure approval and authorization of the first flood-control projects in Oklahoma.

Of the flood-control projects authorized to date, with the help of our Oklahoma House Members I have been able to get funds to construct the following:

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS COMPLETED OR UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Fort Supply, on the North Canadian River in northwestern Oklahoma.

Great Salt Plains on Salt Fork River in northern Oklahoma.

Lake Texoma, on Red River between Oklahoma and Texas.

Grand Lake, on Grand River in northeast Oklahoma.

Wister, on Poteau River in southeastern Oklahoma.

Hulah, on Caney River in northern Oklahoma.

Clinton, on North Canadian River in western Oklahoma.

W. C. Austin, on North Fork River in southwestern Oklahoma.

Fort Gibson, on Grand River in eastern Oklahoma.

Tenkiller Ferry, on Illinois River in eastern Oklahoma.

Heyburn, on Polecat Creek at Sapulpa.

The following flood-control projects have been authorized and some funds have been appropriated to start construction:

PROJECTS READY FOR CONSTRUCTION

Ologah, on Verdigris River in northeastern Oklahoma.

Boswell, on Clear Boggy River in southeastern Oklahoma.

Optima, on Canadian River in Panhandle of Oklahoma.

Eufaula, on South Canadian River in eastern Oklahoma.

Additional projects are being surveyed and made ready for approval and authorization:

PROJECTS UNDER CONSIDERATION

Keystone, on Arkansas River in central Oklahoma.

Hugo, on Kiamichi River in southeastern Oklahoma.

Mustang-Union City, on North Canadian River in southwestern Oklahoma.

Markham's Ferry, on Grand River in eastern Oklahoma.

Short Mountain, on the Arkansas River in eastern Oklahoma.

Webbers Falls, on the Arkansas River in eastern Oklahoma.

It is the policy of the Government to build flood-control projects only where the residents in the area are favorable to such public improvements.

In our State of Oklahoma the flood-control dams and connected hydroelectric facilities already completed and the others now under construction will necessitate a total expenditure of over $750,000,000.

The construction of other dams and power facilities now planned and being planned will cost another quarter of a billion dollars, so that the total cost of controlling Oklahoma floods and developing a million kilowatts of electric power will be approximately one-half billion dollars.

Through this program hundreds of thousands of acres of our richest lands will be reclaimed and at the same time electric-power development will be doubled in Oklahoma.

When this power is developed it will be used and the result will be a duplication of industrial activity now found in the Tennessee Valley and in the Columbia River Basin in the Pacific Northwest.

Oklahoma's dream of industrialization is already coming true.

Pitfalls of a Fallacious Political-Economic Fiscal Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the term "expanding economy" is coming into more common use and acceptance in this country because it reflects that dynamic spirit which has made America great. The President played upon that acceptance when in his state of the Union message he painted the economic future of the United States for the next half century in terms of glowing optimism. An expanding economy, bringing with it greater well-being for all people, is a legitimate and greatly desired goal of all American activity. Sober thinking, however, impresses one with the undeniable fact that an expanding economy must rest on solid foundations of bedrock. Careless thinking, reckless practice and political optimism in the fields of economics and fiscal policy lead not to the desired goal but to ruin.

A correspondent has sent me an article from the Brooklyn Eagle which quotes two distinguished Americans, James A. Farley and Dr. Edward G. Nourse, on the pitfalls and fallacies of a political-economic fiscal policy which can offer only bogus security and prosperity. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEFFERNAN SAYS, "POLITICAL HAY AND A 10-CENT DOLLAR"

When at the recent hundred dollar a plate campaign fund reimbursement banquet the well-rounded periods of the grand cavalier of the Democratic action left wing got a meager Chautauqua salute, while the unterrified from Park Avenue to the Battery roared their applause at the mention of James A. Farley's name, some political writers jumped at conclusions. Mr. Farley was candidating himself for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination.

However, on Friday night at Syracuse, Mr. Farley made an address which had no apparent voter bait in it. There's a little classic the former Postmaster General wrote some time ago, about as long as a famous Gettysburg speech. It was on the making of a good politician. Summed up it is that he must first be a good American. "This problem," said Mr. Farley on Friday night, "is not a political issue. It is an American issue."

Here are a few paragraphs from Mr. Farley's address:

"In an address early in January, President Truman said that on the basis of the growth of this country over the past 50 years, we would in another 50 years have a national income of a trillion dollars. I have no doubt about his figures nor his expectations, but we can reach some frightening conclusions when we take the past 50 years as a measure of the increase of the next 50 years.

"One of those conclusions is that if we take the cost of government for 1900 and compare it with the cost of government for 1950 and then figure the same rate of increase for the next 50 years, our Government would cost $6,000,000,000,000, or six times as much as the whole national income. On that basis, we would also have working for the Federal Government alone 30,000,000 men and women. The lesson of these simple figures is that unless we find some way to reducing the cost of government it will soon grow so great as to consume not only everything that we all earn, but everything that we have all saved, and ultimately everything that we call property, which is owned by all of us."

Almost as an echo of Mr. Farley's warning is an article by Dr. Edward G. Nourse in the January Tax Review. There's room for one paragraph only:

"We shall find that this beautiful theory of 'managed inflation' means we get on a fractious horse and we run the grave risk that we can't control it. When the rate of inflation begins to accelerate and the people begin to discount the future value of the dollar, then we are going to be in for trouble. I was impressed recently in a meeting of top-drawer executives, that when they got to talking in rather loose terms about some of these elements of danger, they begin to talk about the possibility of a 10-cent dollar. When people even speak of this as a possibility, then we get a long way from the idea of a healthy stimulative effect of deficit financing and a mildly inflationary trend which would give us confidence that people and business will spend vigorously. The next step moves away from the stimulus and the incentive stage to the fear stage. This is the natural consequence if we pursue this bland policy—and I characterize it again as a political-economic fiscal policy—of deficits as a way of life, or inflation as the means to full employment."

The eminent economist who recently headed the President's Economic Council is not happy over the prospect of 10-cent dollars. Sympathetic as he was with the principle of making hay while the sun shines against the day of rain, he does not like the political hay that is sure to get all wet when comes the deluge.

Ireland's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Boston Herald entitled "Ireland's Day" with which I am in complete agreement.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRELAND'S DAY

Now that the tumult and shouting has died it is possible to give attention to some of the profounder thoughts expressed in connection with St. Patrick's Day. Thoughts, we said, but really there is only one thought on the minds of most Irishmen these days. And that is ending partition.

The only St. Patrick's Day card we received was from the Irish Legation in Washington. It showed a map of the Emerald Isle with 26 counties in green, and 6 in orange. "On this St. Patrick's Day," it urged, "pledge yourself to help undo the dismemberment of St. Patrick's Island."

The desire of the people of Ireland for national union is an entirely natural one. History, geography, cultural associations, and economics all point to island unity. And there can be no doubt that the action of the British Government in arbitrarily partitioning the northeastern Ulster Counties after World War I disregarded the expressed desire of the great majority of Irish people.

Remedying the evil now is not so simple, however. The people of Ulster, or a substantial part of them, now favor continuation of their British tie, but perhaps because they have been treated better than other Irish by the British. Shall their view prevail or shall the views of the Irish people as a whole? It is a question for a Solomon, and one suspects that only an Irish Solomon can safely render a verdict.

And yet the answer profoundly affects the rest of the world. In this cold war between West and East, it is vital that all on our side work together. Yet the bitterness engendered by the partition controversy is deeply affecting western unity. Ireland remains outside the United Nations because of Russian opposition to her membership. But she refused to join the Atlantic Pact in protest against partition. And harmony within the Council of Europe and OEEC is jeopardized by Anglo-Irish friction over the same issue. Conceivably, a united Ireland might even return to the British Commonwealth.

Perhaps Ireland makes too much of the dismemberment issue. But a restoration of good feeling between the two parts of Ireland and between the free Ireland and Britain is urgently necessary. Settlement of the partition feud appears to be an unavoidable prerequisite.

The democratic solution would be for Ireland to win a sufficient number of Ulstermen to its side in the antipartition fight to force the issue in the six counties themselves. And there is evidence that a concerted effort to this end is now in progress. In a recent speech, Irish Internal Affairs Minister Sean MacBride reiterated his government's guaranty of complete religious and democratic freedom for Protestant Ulstermen under a proposed united Ireland and offered to give them "any (other) reasonable safeguards that may be necessary to allay any fears, real or imaginary, that they may have."

In the past the industrial North has had an economic incentive to keep aloof from the poorer South, but the association with Socialist Britain also has its drawbacks and the tide of opinion may well be changing for this reason, too.

We join our good wishes to the hopes of the Irish orators. We have taken the pledge.

The Nation Needs the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an article written by Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy, retired, former Chief of Naval Operations, entitled "The Nation Needs the Navy," appearing in Collier's of April 1, 1950.

In the light of the existing world conditions, the opinions of Admiral Denfeld, one of the great Americans of this era, a distinguished gentleman and an experienced officer, are worthy of the serious consideration by all Americans. His opinions should be of particular interest to all officials entrusted with responsibility for our national defense and to Members of the Congress.

The article follows:

THE NATION NEEDS THE NAVY

(By Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, former Chief of Naval Operations)

We can win a world war of the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb—yes; we may be able to prevent it—if we prepare for it now. I believe the country today neither realizes the problem nor is properly equipped to meet it. So far as the strength of our defense as a whole is concerned, the trend is downward. So far as the Navy is concerned, the intent of the Pentagon administration is apparently to reduce it to a minor role.

The Navy has been plagued by having its strategy dictated by nonprofessionals who are ignorant of the conduct of warfare in general, and by others who know nothing of the Navy or its use of air power.

The country's chief mental hazard just now is overreliance on one concept—the Air Force idea of intercontinental bombing, which is the most expensive way, and perhaps the most ineffective, to get explosives to an enemy's vitals. The closer you get to a target the cheaper and more efficient is the delivery of a weapon, whether from a bomber, a field piece, or a fleet. We need to operate from bases as near the enemy as possible, be they land airfields or the floating bases of the Navy's task forces.

Another mental hazard is too great reliance on the bomb itself. Suppose we do manage to transport concentrated explosives in $5,000,000 airplanes across the polar ice cap. We can't win a war by terror. The Russians die readily, but they don't scare readily. To defeat the Soviet Union, if it brings war on us, we shall have to overcome the will of the Russian people—to convince them that they would be better off in a world where our ideas prevail than in one ruled by the Kremlin philosophy. We shall not do that merely by obliterating their chief cities and killing their people.

Nor can we protect our friends in Europe solely by dropping bombs, no matter how awful their effect.

Look at the geography of our potential enemy. The Soviet Union occupies a great land mass. On the north the coastal waters are shallow, and closed by ice several months of the year. Most Russian ports and harbors are on enclosed bodies of water. The entrances to the Baltic and Black Seas are controlled by other nations. This explains the Russian drive to become self-sufficient and virtually independent of outside commerce.

Suppose we bomb her principal cities and her principal ports. That does not mean that she is crippled politically, industrially, or militarily. Under intercontinental bombing she can and will decentralize further, and expand into western Europe, all of Asia, and Africa, until she gets ready to move into the Western Hemisphere.

We cannot win a war on foreign soil by staying at home. A powerful Navy will be an effective partner of the Army and Air Force, carrying the war to the enemy and keeping it there. It can capture and hold bases near the enemy's homeland, and deliver the GI's without whom victory is never complete.

The Air Force was perfectly justified in developing the B-36, the plane on which it would rely for intercontinental bombing. As provided in the functions paper written after the meeting of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at Key West, each service should have the right to carry a new weapon up through the prototype stage. But I don't believe the Air Force was justified in investing $1,000,000,000 in the B-36 before that bomber had been thoroughly tested.

I was removed as Chief of Naval Operations last October for criticising, among other things, this heavy-bomber thinking.

The original order for 100 B-36's, placed during the war and later reduced to 95, surely gave the Air Force enough latitude, and enough money. With the changes the total cost per plane exceeds $6,000,000. In January 1949, although we in the Navy understood that the Air Force intended to cut back the B-36 program, more were ordered without consultation with us. In April, about the time the Navy was denied its own new weapon, the flush-deck carrier, still more B-36's were ordered, and in accordance with what I conceived to be the spirit of unification, I did not protest when the matter came before the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The whole B-36 program, as laid before Congress, will cost between $808,500,000 and $1,022,000,000 for 170 planes, or about $5,800,000 each. Even disregarding the doubt about intercontinental bombing, this is too large a piece of the country's military dollar to spend on a weapon that may be highly vulnerable.

The House Armed Services Committee asked for a test of the B-36 against the Navy's fast fighter, the Banshee. Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, in testimony before the committee, made much of the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, over my signature as senior officer, unanimously opposed the test. We did oppose a public test, but by all means the Banshee and every other available fast fighter should be tried against the B-36 in secret.

The Weapons Systems Evaluation Group is the proper agency for this test. This group is headed by Lt. Gen. John E. Hull, who was my Army commander when I was commander in chief in the Pacific, and in whom I have the highest confidence. To the extent its conclusions would not reveal information of value to a potential enemy, they should be made public.

The Air Force is tied to a single weapon, the airplane. The Navy is tied to a function, command of the sea, and its weapons change.

The Navy must be kept a flexible and mobile force, for a democracy such as ours is forced to fight at a time and place that a totalitarian enemy chooses, and we must be ready to wage any kind of war in any part of the world. Who knows where a war will start or at what time of year? Control of the seas means that we, not our enemies, dictate strategy.

An atomic war will bring changes both in defense and offense. We are being warned by scientists and others that if Russia attacks us she will attempt, by exploding hydrogen or atomic bombs, to cripple our great ports on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Atomic bombs could be dropped from the air, discharged from a surface ship or submarine at sea, or smuggled in by merchant vessel. Loss of life would be tremendous, ships present would be rendered useless, and the harbor would be poisoned until fresh river water cleansed it.

But naval strategy takes account of this danger. No great concentration of warships can be permitted in any one port. As proved in the last war, our task forces can be fully supplied at sea. If our ports are actually choked by bombs, supplies can be sent out and received over beachheads, as they were in our invasion operations during World War II.

The answer to superbombs, which take their greatest toll against large cities and their masses of population, is dispersion and mobility; and the Navy provides dispersion and mobility at sea through its task forces.

MINES MORE DEADLY THAN BOMBS

As a matter of fact, mines constitute a greater danger to ports than do atomic bombs because they last longer. The Russians are known to be mine-minded. Whereas an American likes to blow something up while he can see it, a Russian is content to sow an area with death and let it flower when it will.

Army spokesmen have claimed that large-scale amphibious operations such as we knew in World War II are no longer possible because of the atomic bomb. This is a dangerous philosophy and can only mean rigidity of plans and abandonment of one of the great arts of warfare in which we lead. As Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower said recently in answer to a question as to whether amphibious operation will be a part of warfare of the future, "We would be very foolish today to allow to die in our services the very great knowledge we have of that type of operation. We are ahead of everybody in amphibious operations. * * * It would be foolish of us to drop back. We should keep pushing ahead. I would be very much against letting that type of warfare be neglected."

Another way in which world war III will differ from previous conflicts is in the field of blast. It has been said that a Russian idea captured certain Chinese and that those Chinese then captured China. Last time nazism and fascism had little appeal for our people. We know only too well that communism does appeal to some Americans. And one man possessed by an idea can destroy a city, by pulling powder, germs, or gas in his water or his air.

The question is often asked: "Why do we need a powerful Navy when no potential enemy has sizable naval forces, and when we have British, French, and Dutch Navies between us and the enemy anyhow?" Even Gen. Omar N. Bradley has been troubled by this thinking.

In his memorandum to Secretary Johnson opposing the Navy's proposed flush-deck carrier, he advanced this as one argument: "The U. S. S. R., except possibly in the field of submarine warfare, is not a naval power of consequence. Further, the U. S. S. R. is not dependent on maritime shipping to reach sources of raw materials. Thus, the vast preponderance of Allied naval power—which in addition to the United States Fleet, overwhelmingly the largest in the world, includes the second naval power, the British Empire, and the additional naval forces of other potential allies—will have but little opportunity to operate against Russian surface vessels and should be more than adequate to cope with the major naval threat, the hostile submarine."

We need a fleet not merely to match the Russian Navy, but to overcome it. We need the kind of Navy that can go after the Russians, not merely meet them halfway or off our own coasts. Furthermore, the uninformed seem to think that defeating an enemy's navy is an end in itself. They get this from the Army concept of forcing the surrender of an enemy's army, which means the war is won.

Our great fleet, to which General Bradley referred, is largely "a moth ball. On the other hand, the U. S. S. R., besides maintaining great land armies and building a large air force, now has a navy greater than Germany's was in 1939, and is developing stronger naval forces suited to its particular geography. In terms of ships in commission, the Russian Navy has more cruisers and battleships than we have, and many times more submarines.

In combat ships, we outnumber Russia only in carriers and destroyers. As time goes on, unless the attrition of our Navy is stopped, the weight will shift further in the Soviets' favor.

It is common knowledge that the Russians have from 200 to 300 submarines, some of which are of the high-speed snorkel type that can breathe without surfacing. It is well to remember that the Germans, starting with not many more than 30 U-boats, were almost victorious in the early stages of two World Wars. The Russians can start with six or seven times that number.

Jane's Fighting Ships, the recognized private authority on the world's navies, puts the number of Russian submarines now in existence at 360 and reports that the U. S. S. R. hopes to have 1,000 by 1951. In addition, Russia is said to be completing two or three battleships with towers for firing radio-controlled aerial torpedoes. Our only battleship in commission is the *Missouri*—and that perhaps not for long.

Certainly if Russia sees our fleet deteriorating she will expedite her own shipbuilding in inverse ratio and bring the war to us on the sea, under the sea, and over the sea. And if the Russian high command can send against us anything like 1,000 submarines of the improved type that the Germans used at the end of World War II we must expect terrible losses, and still need not only a big Navy but a big merchant fleet.

Russia realizes the importance of sea power to us. She knows that unless the United States Navy can keep command of those sea areas which must be used to support an overseas campaign all of our armed forces will remain in this country biting their nails and reading news of the overrunning of the homelands of our friends and allies.

In case of war, Russia will try by any means to deny us command of those sea areas, not by submarines alone. She will use her land-based air against our ships, both merchant and naval, in European and Asiatic waters. She may use guided missiles. In short, the idea advanced by critics of the Navy that we can go where we please when we please is dangerously fallacious. We're going to have to fight our way through, as always.

Only the Navy can provide immediate fighting power to protect our ships at sea, and it must be given the means and skill to do the job. It can have these only if it remains effective in peacetime, because a Navy is not something that can be built overnight.

It would be easier to guess the nature of a world war III if we knew when it was coming, because the concept of warfare changes so fast. If it should come in the not distant future, an educated guess is that the fighting at sea would be intense from the outset. While Russia's ground troops marched westward and her air force bombed the Allied strong points, the Russian navy would try to launch attacks on our coastal cities with atomic-headed missiles from submarines or surface ships.

BRIDGE TO WESTERN EUROPE

The bulk of her navy, operating under land-based air cover, might try to sweep around Europe from the Baltic and northern waters and to control the vital coastal areas which we would need in aiding the beleaguered countries of western Europe.

Both in land and sea strategy the Soviet commanders would take full advantage of the Communist fifth columns that exist in the industrial centers of Europe.

The encircling naval movement would threaten our lines of communication through the Mediterranean to the important oil sources in the Near East. They would also threaten Allied control of Africa. Whether or not through our neglect, the bulk of Asia has been communized. We should not repeat the error by letting the poison spread through Africa. Russian soldiers might not be far behind any successful Communist Party missionaries.

We have the job also of supporting our occupation troops, both in Europe and Japan. Their capture would make Bataan look like a minor disaster.

The Atlantic sea lanes would have to be kept open for strategic and critical materials—uranium, for example—as well as for munitions needed by our European allies. On this side of the ocean, we have treaty obligations with Latin America and Canada which mean defense of the whole Western Hemisphere. In the early stages this would fall primarily on the Navy. Our great ports must be kept open and coastal shipping must be protected. Venezuelan oil must not be cut off. There must be free access to and passage through the Panama Canal.

In the Pacific, Russia has about 70 submarines—as many as we shall have in operation, in all oceans under the budget proposed for the fiscal year to begin next July 1. She is able to ship the parts over the Trans-Siberian Railroad and assemble them in Pacific ports.

The outlook for our defenses in the Pacific will grow gloomier if our naval forces are allowed to shrink further. The spread of communism through China assures Russia the ice-free ports on the Pacific which she has long coveted.

We must keep unbroken our present chain of defense from Japan to Okinawa, the Philippines and Guam, backed up by the islands of the trust territories (the Marianas, Carolines, Marshalls, and Palaus) and Hawaii. Guam has been built into a powerful base and should be kept powerful.

The island of Formosa is a destabilizing link in the chain. I cannot forget that Jap planes from airfields in Formosa, and others ferrying through Formosa from Japan, caused us a lot of trouble in retaking the Philippines.

There is grave danger of communism spreading not only throughout the Asiatic mainland but to Indonesia. The Philippines must be defended against infiltration, or direct attack by airborne landings. We must keep naval bases and airfields in those areas, and enough men, ships, and planes to strike an immediate blow anywhere in the far Pacific. The lessons of Pearl Harbor and Guam, the capture of our troops in the Philippines, and the long, hard fight back across the Pacific must not be forgotten. This time our outposts are even closer to the Asiatic mainland—in Japan—and supply lines from the United States would be even longer.

Army and Air Force spokesmen are fond of saying there will be no island-hopping in the next war, and that therefore the Navy's emphasis on its aviation needs is overdone. But if we do not keep up our guard in the far Pacific we may have to hop islands all over again someday. Let's not get "caught in the bight" a second time.

The northern end of our defense chain rests on our bases in the Aleutians and Alaska, and a weak anchor it is. On a clear day the Siberian mainland can be seen from a hill on the Alaskan side, 55 statute miles away; indeed an American island in the Bering Strait is less than 3 miles from one owned by Russia. Our country is belatedly coming to realize the danger there.

In the Pacific Northwest, needless alarm was created by Air Force reference to the relative vulnerability of that section in explaining the transfer of certain production from Seattle to Kansas. Russia's copies of the B-29 doubtless can reach Puget Sound, but many other sections of the country are equally vulnerable. Indeed, no part of the country is really safe.

Greenland, whose strategic value we have long overlooked, offers a stepping stone to the United States almost as convenient as Alaska. It is an easy jump from the Soviet air and naval bases in Franz Joef Land and from Spitsbergen, where Russia has a suspiciously large number of "miners" behind a local iron curtain.

Peary Land, the extreme northern part of Greenland, has snow-free areas usable for landing fields. Even the névé of central Greenland will support planes, troops, and mechanized units. It is certain that if we do not use it the Russians will.

SOVIET AIR POWER IN ARCTIC

The Russians are an arctic people, much more skilled than we at polar operations. They have ringed the Arctic Ocean with airfields from which to launch attacks on us in case of war. They have about 60 arctic research establishments comparable to small American colleges. During the warmer months they can now go by ship from Archangel to Siberia via the Arctic Ocean. We are prone to think of that ocean as impassable, but a powerful ice breaker such as the Russians are known to possess could plow right across it, making way for a convoy.

Even now our largest ships cannot go through the Panama Canal, and if it should be closed by a bomb the route around the Horn would assume great importance. To protect that route, we would have to keep the enemy out of the islands that lie between Antarctica's Palmer Land Peninsula and the tip of South America. Russian exploring ships and planes have recently been reported in that area. The Navy's Operation High Jump II, which would have increased our

knowledge of Antarctica and given our men needed training under conditions like Greenland's was canceled last summer for reasons of economy. We couldn't train in Greenland itself for diplomatic reasons.

The country cannot afford in peacetime the forces which its military leaders feel it otherwise should have. This economic ceiling is inescapable, but beneath it come the allotment of available funds between the services, and the designation of how each service shall spend its allotment.

In my opinion, the 1951 budget proposals throw the defense structure out of balance heavily in favor of the Air Force. The Air Force retains its 48 groups and 13 separate squadrons, totaling 416,000 men, little changed from this year. The Navy and Army are cut.

The Navy has been told it can have for fiscal 1951 a total of 238 major combatant ships of specified types, and reduced numbers of air squadrons. When I was Chief of Naval Operations I protested against the practice of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff in telling each service what it could do with its money, contending that it should be permitted to decide how best to use the funds. I still hope the system will be changed.

How the consistent use of such restrictions can throttle a service is shown in the case of the Marines, who find their fears of relegation to guard duty being realized by indirection. In 1946 the Army proposed that "it be recognized that the land aspect of major amphibious operations in the future will be undertaken by the Army, and consequently the Marine forces will not be appreciably expanded in time of war"; and that "it be agreed that the Navy will not develop a land army or a so-called amphibious army. Marine units to be limited in size to the equivalent of the regiment, and the total size of the Marine Corps therefore limited to some 50,000 or 60,000 men."

By the end of fiscal year 1951 the Marines will have been cut to 62,000 enlisted personnel, not far above the figure proposed by the Army. Worse, they have been told that they may have only six infantry battalions. The funds are almost sufficient to maintain a peacetime division on each coast, each with six battalions of infantry, which the Marine Corps wants to do. Now it is expected still to maintain two divisions. But a three-battalion division is really only a regiment, and is inefficient both for peacetime employment and as a basis for quick wartime expansion.

The Navy has several weaknesses: It is short of combat carriers, it is short of modern airplanes, and it needs funds to install the latest equipment on destroyers, destroyer escorts (the slower kind used for escort duty), and submarines. The needed equipment, which is mostly electronic, is expensive. The minimum number of combat carriers in operation should be 10. As to the number of planes, the recommendation of the President's Air Policy Commission (Finletter Board) made 2 years ago seems reasonable: This was for 5,788 front-line planes, and 5,100 in support, a total of 10,888. The 1951 budget figure is 8,415, including 1,944 for the Naval and Marine Reserves.

More of our submarines should be modernized into the snorkel type, with their high submerged speed. The Navy should also be permitted to build its flush-deck carrier, construction of which was canceled by Secretary Johnson. It will take 4 years to build under peace conditions.

Time is of the essence in warfare. In peace we have plenty of time but limited funds. In war we have unlimited funds but no time. A war is fought with weapons that are in the prototype stage when hostilities begin.

All three services should be at work on new weapons, sacrificing numbers of personnel if necessary during peace to concentrate on equipment. Men can be recruited and trained much faster than weapons can be designed and manufactured.

I have been accused obliquely of neglecting antisubmarine warfare. The statement is made that although that is a primary naval mission only bout 8 percent of naval appropriations was devoted to that heading. This is an absurd charge. Antisubmarine warfare is a mission of the whole Navy.

Furthermore, antisubmarine warfare is not a mere matter of finding the submarines on and under the high seas and bombing them to death. That, in fact, is the least efficient means of combating them. The best way to get submarines is in the shipyards where they are being built and fitted, in the submarine docks and pens where they are being refueled, rearmed, and supplied with trained crews. Effective attacks on such targets have to be made by low-level bombing, which is only emphasized in this country by naval and marine aviation. The flush-deck carrier was designed to be an essential tool for that operation.

A submarine on the high seas will always be, to a certain extent, a menace.

The antisubmarine is one device developed during my tour as Chief of Naval Operations. This is a small interceptor sub that can lie in wait along the sea lanes. Other submarines—able to surface quickly, fire guided missiles, and submerge again speedily—are part of the Navy's program.

I brought to Washington a top submarine expert, Rear Adm. Charles B. Momsen, inventor of the Momsen lung and other devices, and put him in complete charge of antisubmarine warfare preparation. I highly approve of the recent appointment of Vice Adm. Francis S. "Frog" Low, another submarine expert, as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Logistics.

We have a tremendous fleet in moth balls. Under grease a recent count showed 87 carriers, 59 cruisers, 14 battleships, 204 destroyers, 92 submarines, and about 1,500 other vessels. They are surveyed now and then to eliminate those that wouldn't be useful in a future war.

But it would take, under present conditions, from 3 to 9 months to unwrap ships of the moth-ball fleet. As they increase in age and need up-to-date improvements, the process will be longer. The carriers might have to be modernized, chiefly through the strengthening of their decks, and this would take from a year to 18 months even on wartime schedules with the mechanics working around the clock.

After these ships left the moth-ball fleet and put to sea it would take in some cases months for them to become efficient fighting ships. The training required to weld a carrier and its embarked air squadrons into an effective unit is a long, exacting job.

The modern Navy is a carrier Navy. We have three of the Midway (45,000-ton) class, and are allowed to keep four of the smaller (27,000-ton) Essex class. In setting up a task force, the Commander in Chief of the Atlantic or Pacific Fleet assigns cruisers and destroyers (and sometimes submarines) to support the carriers. A hunter-killer group used in antisubmarine warfare usually consists of a light carrier and half a dozen destroyers. In any expansion of the fleet for war, numerous hunter-killer groups will be formed as soon as flat tops and destroyers are out of moth balls and their crews have been trained. Other destroyers will be used for convoy work.

Air Force leaders have taken fright at mention of the fact that the Navy, too, could use the atomic bomb, fearing that the Navy is encroaching on their field of strategic bombing. Far from envying that role, the Navy questions the effectiveness of the atomic bitts.

I believe that in time atomic weapons for tactical use against military targets—airfields, troop concentrations, ships—will be perfected for all three services. There are many fields in which the Navy could use them, such as against submarine-building yards and submarine bases. Sub pens were hard nuts to crack in both World Wars.

At the present stage of development, atomic bombs are too costly for tactical use, especially against moving targets such as ships. The effects of radioactivity have been exaggerated. The experiments at Bikini were against ships huddled together as targets in an enclosed body of water, but a convoy in the open ocean would be far less vulnerable and would quickly leave contaminated waters behind.

THE FLEET'S MOST VITAL TASK

My policy as Chief of Naval Operations was to try to build a fleet, and maintain one, that could keep the sea lanes open for the unmolested importation of vital materials without which our industry would have to bank its fires, and for the safe transportation of air power, manpower, and industrial power to the enemy's coast. That kind of Navy is not measured by tonnage alone, but by application and efficiency. And from bitter experience I do not believe that the Army, the Air Force, or the budget manipulators know as well how to tackle the problem as we of the Navy do.

The Navy is in danger of losing one of its greatest assets—its spirit. I am gravely concerned to see such great naval fighting men as Admirals Blandy and Bogan discouraged and choosing retirement, and an attempt being made to withhold promotion from Capt. Arleigh A. Burke. Our Navy selection system has stood the test of 30 years and two World Wars. It would be a pity, indeed, if promotions should be awarded through pressure and influence rather than merit.

I am concerned also at the prospect set before young officers entering the service. They have the inspiring example of the five Crommelin brothers, all naval officers, two of whom gave their lives in World War II. But they see one with a particularly distinguished career—Capt. John G. Crommelin—so alarmed at the Defense Department's conduct of naval matters that he gives up his chance of promotion to make public protest.

Encroachments on the Marine Corps have disillusioned its leaders and disturbed its entire personnel. Gen. Merritt A. Edson, the Medal of Honor man who made the Tarawa landing possible, retired in disgust. The Marines are our emergency fighting force, ready to go anywhere without notice, whose claim to honor, in the words of their commandant, Gen. Clifton B. Cates, is that they "have sought for themselves little more than a life of hardship and the most hazardous assignments in battle." The efforts to cut their amphibious and air activities and reduce them to guard duty are indeed disgraceful.

The Navy has always emphasized decentralization of authority. The nature of warfare at sea dictates this. The commander of even the smallest yar vessel is pretty much on his own. Efforts to impose on the Navy, in the unification process, a centralized system such as is embodied in the Army's General Staff organization have not only increased overhead costs but have resulted in loss of initiative and feelings of frustration.

Morale and fighting spirit demand that every American in uniform must feel that his own is the best service in the world. He is entitled to and must have the respect not only of his superiors but of the men in all the other military services. This pride of service is being replaced by growing disillusionment. The trend can be stopped by more enlightened leadership in the Defense Department, and the active encouragement of self-reliance in all ranks.

I believe that the hearings in Congress which resulted in my removal as Chief of Naval Operations have greatly improved public understanding of national security. My recompense for the treatment I have received lies in the belief that, once informed, the American people will act wisely.

Swiss Cheese Land in Wisconsin—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including the second of two extensions on the subject of the Swiss-cheese industry in my district as reported by Mr. Emery A. Odell, publisher of the Monroe (Wis.) Evening Times:

WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP REMAINS THRIFTY REGION

Washington is a township unit by itself, having no corporate village. It is wholly rural, the sole occupation being dairy farming.

Of average size in land area, 22,871 acres, it has 12,541 acres in farms averaging 127 acres. Cows being milked are reported at 3,156, with average production per 100 acres of 97,352 pounds of milk. Thus, Washington ranks with Monroe, Clarno, Sylvester, and Jefferson as one of the five leading milk-production townships in Green County. The population, however, is only 872.

The way in which the various branches of the Little Sugar River reach out over the township has made highway bridges a costly public problem. This has been overcome largely by modern improvements in construction. Substantial steel and concrete structures now cope with the meandering streams.

All highways have been widened and hard-surfaced for modern motor traffic. Except for the two western corners, however, the township is without permanent pavement.

Native rock quarried from the hillsides, in addition to being crushed for the hard-surfacing of roads, now is pulverized to add to the fertility of the soil in the modern farming methods, contributing an effective step in overcoming erosion and loss of valuable soil.

Highways and bridges were always controversial issues on the county board and the interest of Washington Township figured in the forefront. Supervisors recognized the national situation and regularly conceded the road and bridge chairmanship to the Washington member. Washington Township chairman, C. W. Loveland, now holds chairmanship of the Green County board.

The oldest Green County cheese factory still operating is the Wittenwyler-Burgy, located in the southeastern corner of the township. It was started by Nick Gerber in 1876 as the third of his factory enterprises and has been in continuous operation since.

The factory was in Bilten territory, although that main settlement was further to the north and west of Monticello. Highway changes removed the old surviving Gerber plant to the side road nearly 10 years ago.

The part of Washington township in Informing since as early as 1847 it was settled by people of English descent, some from New England and others from the South. Interest of the settlement was represented in a rural community surrounding Center Methodist Church erected in 1871. Names well remembered with many of the families still represented in Green County life include Holloway, Loveland, Lemon, Harper, Simmons, Fessenden, Crouch, Smith, Perrin, Clayton, Confer, Norton, Gill, and Grinnell.

Center Church was closed and moved away to the Loveland farm a few years ago eliminating the once active community center.

Bilten settlement organized the Bilten Swiss Reformed Church, the structure dedicated in 1876 resembling the house of worship in the Old World. This church, now known as Washington Reformed, remains active today with a pastor supplied from Monticello.

The old Gerber factory, Wittenwyler-Burgy, always has made Limburger. American farmers at first complained of the odor but when Gerber began shipping cheese east they took note of the checks which came back. It did not take them long to join in the cheese production as a community industry.

Gerber first bought the milk outright and then in 1873 John Boss bought the milk and conducted the factory. It became a farmer cooperative in 1893 under the name of Wittenwyler-Burgy. Jacob Burgy, now 80, who has lived on the adjoining farm since he was 3 years old, has been secretary-treasurer of the factory since 1893 and has figured the milk payments to the farmers for those 56 years.

His grandparents and their son, Jacob, Jr., came by sailboat from Switzerland in 1847. They first located on a farm north of New Glarus. They moved in 1870 to Washington township, acquiring the Frank Parkin farm. The Burgy farm now consists of 410 acres and is operated by Mr. Burgy and his son, Fred T. Mr. Burgy makes his residence in Monticello.

The township has one public building, the town hall, located at the intersection of county trunk highways C and N, west of Monticello.

Close by on the east-west highway is the Town Hall streamlined Swiss cheese factory, newest of the farm plants within the township boundaries.

Town Hall factory is owned and in complete control of the cooperative with 30 patrons delivering milk. The plant has been successful beyond expectation after a year of operation.

GERBER WAS CASUALTY OF EARLY CHEESE BATTLE

There has been nothing spontaneous about the development of the Swiss cheese industry in Green County. The infant, fathered by Nick Gerber, had to battle for its life almost from the cradle.

For 20 years the settlers had been raising wheat with notable lack of success. Milk was skimmed for butter, and the skim milk went into cheese for home use. Identity as to type was completely lacking until Gerber founded the first factories in 1868 and 1869.

Consumers were tiring of skim-milk cheese and the demand was for Cheddar or American type. Some even went abroad to London, but heavy expense and losses cut off this market.

Swiss and Limburger cheese were new, and demand had to be created. Curiously enough, it was New Glarus, center of the first Swiss settlement, which almost struck the death blow to the struggling industry. In 1870 an American cheese factory was opened in the village which never had a Swiss cheese plant. The factory was supplied by 600 cows.

Dayton began manufacturing American cheese with 180 cows, and American factories also were started in Mount Pleasant Township, York, and Albany. By 1873 there were 4,260 cows in the American cheese-production picture, as compared with 1,300 cows supplying Gerber's factories.

Gradually, however, the arguments of Gerber for foreign-type cheesemaking began to gain notice. He claimed 250 pounds of Swiss cheese to the cow and that his four Limburger factories averaged about 300 pounds.

"Still we are not happy," he admitted as he argued with the farmers being influenced against his venture.

He gained further support, however, from Farmers Grove, Adams Township, where Jacob Karlen, Monroe, began opening Limburger plants. The size of the checks Gerber was receiving from buyers in the East also began to interest the farmers.

Gerber's Green County factories numbered eight, including one in Mount Pleasant where he made cheese and resided with his family. He bought the milk from farmers and had his own cheese outlets. As new factories appeared, he also bought cheese and the industry was considered to be fairly launched on a basis helpful to farmers.

Gerber met with financial reverses. He spent 10 years in pioneering before a serious market slump and new competition caught up with him. His resources were swept away and his Green County Cheese Manufacturing Co. failed. He went to eastern Iowa to make a new start but after a second unfortunate ending in 1882 he retired from the cheese business and returned to Monroe where he died May 9, 1903.

Karlen, John Boss, Jacob Heges, and the many others who followed went on to promote and foster growth of the foreign-type industry which now has Monroe for the trading center.

New Glarus later lost its only factory when the condensery business came into flower. Condenseries now operating at New Glarus, Albany, and Browntown have had the effect of pressing inward on cheese factory milk sources, as well as moving outward to take the milk of adjacent counties.

In 1948, these condenseries produced 45,548,000 pounds of evaporated milk, 2,255,000 pounds of powdered skim milk, and 2,043,000 of powdered whole milk. Butter production was 3,329,000 pounds.

There was some indication last year, however, that cheese factories were more than holding their own.

While the condenseries and butter plants showed declines from the total of 58,600,000 pounds for the former and from the 4,067,000-pound butter output in 1945, cheese production made a healthy gain from 1945 to 1948.

Green County factories had set a new high in Swiss production in 1945 of 13,095,000. The total had climbed to another record of 14,569,000 in 1948.

Limburger production in 1945, however, of 2,538,000 pounds was above last year's 2,265,000. Brick was up slightly from 1945's 255,000 pounds to 266,000 in 1948. Green County American output in 1948 was only 822,000 pounds.

The soaring Swiss production has resulted despite the dwindling number of factories. There were 152 plants in Green County 20 years ago producing 16,000,000 pounds of all types of cheese, half of it Swiss.

The factory figure had dropped to 125, 10 years ago but Swiss output climbed to 10,655,000 pounds. Last year 80 factories produced a total of 17,903,000 pounds of all types of cheese, including 14,569,000 pounds of Swiss. This is 33.7 percent of the total Swiss output in Wisconsin.

This bespeaks constant improvement of factory efficiency and techniques, more modern plants, improved herds, and farm practices. The higher production came from fewer factories, a narrowing milk land area due to inroads of other dairy products plants and in some cases fewer but more productive cows.

These changes, including streamlined factories, however, have not entirely erased the marks left over by pioneers of Bilten area who had the strongest faith in the cheese industry.

MODERNIZATION OF FACTORIES ASSURES FUTURE OF INDUSTRY

Probably the most startling development in eight decades of Swiss cheesemaking in Green County has occurred in the last 2 years or more.

Most residents, in and out of the industry, have been aware of some part of it. Others, but only a few, have realized its full extent. Everyone, however, should benefit in the future from the all-inclusive scope of the program.

This change for the better concerns the widespread rebuilding, remodeling and in some cases replacement of farmer factories which have been the background of the cheese enterprise.

A. J. Reppen, State inspector of factories for the Department of Agriculture, is authority for the report that 63 of the 78 licensed plants in the county had shared in this modernization project by October 1, 1949.

His report becomes all the more impressive by revealing that Franklin Swiss factory, 4½ miles southwest of Monroe, was the first to complete remodeling, having started late in 1946 and finishing in 1947.

These projects stemmed from many sources of stimulation: urging of the State for improved sanitation conditions, a desire to advance quality of cheese and make manufacturing less hazardous, and a realization that only through modern making methods and practices could factories compete on markets in the favored position won through decades of fine Green County foreign type cheese.

The projects have involved new making rooms, in stainless steel fittings, stainless steel intake tanks, larger automatic boilers to supply heat at constant temperature levels and steam for cleaning fittings and filters, gleaming white tiled walls for making rooms, curing and holding cellars, full control refrigeration systems, automatic can washing machines and even special lights for suppression of unwanted bacteria action.

Modern truck loading and unloading platforms are common features. Septic tanks and underground systems for disposal of wastes and a general brightening of factory exteriors and premises are featured on every hand.

Investment has ranged from $35,000 to well above $100,000. Making capacity has been expanded by additional kettles and storage facilities increased. Many times this has meant closing of antiquated factories or plants which no longer fitted into the economic planning of the cooperatives and their patrons.

In addition to the 63 factories already modernized, Reppen reports several others were ready to begin work late in 1949 or early in 1950. A few more factories may drop by the wayside but there will be no slackening of production capacity in view of the general increase in operating facilities by the more modern units.

The trend to improved plants began as early as 1928 when the number of factories had declined to a total of 152 after decades of continued increase. Production that year was 16,000,000 pounds, half of it Swiss. Ten years later, the number of factories was down to 125 but Swiss production had moved up to 10,655,000 pounds.

Last year there were 83 factories producing a total of 17,903,000 pounds, 14,569,000 of it Swiss.

It is impossible to pick out factory projects as particularly outstanding. There are too many of them and each represents some special enterprise which makes it almost unique.

We can, however, call attention to the pace-setting Franklin factory, the streamlined Town Hall plant which replaced four other units in a merging operation, and the large Jefferson Center factory at Twin Grove, planned for expansion to at least 24 kettles, as prime examples of new Swiss plants.

The largest of the new Limburger plants is the Wyss co-op factory on county trunk N 5 miles north of Monroe, operating under lease to the Kraft Foods Co. The latter two plants have adopted exterior architecture of Swiss lines, making them colorful additions to the rural scene.

Following in alphabetical order are the Green County factories which have modernized in the last 2 years:

Swiss: Advance, route 3, Monroe; Apple Grove, route 1, Argyle; Balls Mill, route 2, Monroe; Bidlingmaier-Isely, route 4, Monroe; Biggs Co-op, northeast of Argyle; Brager, northeast of Blanchardville; Burkhalter, route 2, Monroe; Davis, Browntown; Decatur, west of Brodhead; Dill, west of Browntown.

Fairview, route 1, Monroe; Farmers Grove, route 1, New Glarus; Five Corners, southeast of Monroe; Flanagan-Olson, east of Argyle; Franklin, route 1, Monroe; Giese, southwest of Brodhead; Green County Co-op, Monroe; Gutzmer, east of Woodford; Hay Hollow, east of Blanchardville; Health Valley, near Juda; Holstein Prairie, west of Monticello; Casper Jaggi, Brodhead; Jefferson Center, Twin Grove; Jordan Center, northwest of Monroe.

Jordan Prairie, northwest of Brodhead; Klondike, northwest of Monroe; Krauss, route 4, Monroe; Kubly, route 1, Monroe; Maple Grove, southeast of Juda; Maple Leaf, route 1, Albany; Monroe Co-op, Monroe; Monticello North Side; Newman, southeast of Juda; Pleasant Valley, route 3, Monroe; Poplar Grove, west of New Glarus (not making Swiss in 1949 but licensed); Prairie Hill, route 5, Monroe; Priewe, route 1, Monroe; Puddle Dock, east of Argyle; Ridge, northwest of Monroe.

Rock Hill, route 2, Brodhead; Saw Mill, east of Blanchardville (licensed but not making Swiss in 1949); Specs, west of Browntown; Speich, route 2, Monroe; Spring Creek, route 2, Brodhead; F. L. Stauffacher, route 4, Monroe; Strommen, near Blanchardville; Town Hall, route 2, Monticello; Twin Gable, Martintown; Union Hill, route 1, Juda; Walnut Grove, east of Blanchardville; West Clarno, route 1, Monroe.

Whitehead, route 1, Monroe; White Oak, route 2, Monroe; York Center, east of Blanchardville, and York Prairie, northeast of Blanchardville.

Limburger: Clarno Center, route 5, Monroe (also licensed but not making Swiss); Grinnell, north of Monroe; Wyss (Kraft Foods license), north of Monroe; Milwaukee Cheese, Monroe (also licensed but not making Swiss—producing brick type special cheese); Pioneer, route 2, Monticello; Silver and Lewis, east of Monticello; Spring Cheese, route 1, Monticello; Wittenwyler-Burgy, southwest of Monticello; Wuetrich (Four Corners), 6 miles northeast of Monroe.

There were 63 factories in Green County making Swiss October 1, not including four others licensed but producing other types. One Swiss factory license north of Browntown was withdrawn shortly before the list was compiled. Eleven factories are licensed for Limburger and 10 hold American permits. One factory, Poplar Grove, is licensed for brick muenster.

Lakeshire-Marty Co. holds the only processed cheese license for Swiss gruyere. One firm, Paul Grossenbacher, New Glarus, holds a cheese food compound license.

Three factories have butter-plant licenses and there are condensery permits at New Glarus, Albany, and Brownstown, the latter also holding a powdered-milk permit. Frautschy and Herbert Clarno, have the only milk-receiving-station license.

That completes the present day report on Green County's foreign-type cheese industry, except for the number of kettles in the Swiss plants. This figure has changed so rapidly since 1947 that a definite total would be good only as of the moment. It is believed, however, that more than 450 kettles are now set up in various plants with more installed.

With this report, the series on Swiss cheese's 80 years of production development comes to a close. The Green County cheese story, however, will remain an unending history with bright pages in the future.

It will have that encouraging prospect if today's heirs of nineteenth century tradition contribute their share to continued advancement of dairy farming, and to an industry which has premium appeal throughout the Nation.

STEINMAN DAIRY TOLD STORY OF PIONEERING

Green County historians of the future owe a great debt to the memory and diary of J. C. Steinman who in his twilight years answered a question too long unasked:

"Where would one go to establish the exact location of the first Green County cheese factory turning out a product having a cash value in an outside market so a tablet could be erected to honor the men whose vision launched Green County's dairy business?"

The question was asked by Emery A. Odell, publisher of the Monroe Evening Times. Mr. Steinman who had kept a daily diary for 40 years had the answers. As a boy of 14 he had worked on the J. C. Blum farm and delivered milk to the first Limburger factory a mile away on the Albert Babler (now Meadow Valley) farm.

His diary also supplied the location of the first Swiss cheese factory on the Dietrich Freitag farm.

Mr. Steinman was 13 when he went to work at $6 a month. His mother brought him to Monroe on his seventh birthday from New York after 57 days on the ocean. They learned his father had enlisted in the Civil War for what he thought was a short term of service while awaiting his family. He was killed in action. The mother and son joined an uncle in Monroe, Dietland Thomm, and then located later in Washington township.

When Mr. Steinman was 20 he became a Limburger-cheese maker for Jacob Karlen at Farmers Grove. Later he was in business in Monticello and an influential citizen. He served 12 years on the county board, 9 as county supervisor of assessment and bank director and was active in the Swiss Reformed Church at Monticello. He died in 1942 at the age of 88.

The boulders placed in 1939 at the two factory sites by the Green County Historical Society and Mr. Odell presented a problem. Native stone was sought but since the site of the first Limburger factory was in the unglaciated area, a boulder finally had to be brought from Monticello Woolen mill site.

Nazism is Still a Dominant Factor in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we hear all sorts of perturbing reports on conditions in Germany which make us wonder whether continued neglect of the situation may not prove to be tragic in the years to come. We hear reports about the revival of nazism and anti-Semitism, reports on the trend toward dictatorship, the failure of our denazification policy, the lack of a sense of guilt and shame on the part of Germans

for the horrible crimes committed during the recent war, and the ridiculous efforts to pin the blame for starting the war on the Allies or anyone but the Germans.

Dr. Saul K. Padover, a noted American author and historian, who knows conditions in Germany well and has served with the American military government there immediately after the war, has gathered some pertinent information on the trend of thinking in Germany today. Dr. Padover, who is dean of the School of Politics of the New School for Social Research in New York and the author of several books on Thomas Jefferson and on the European politics and history, draws some interesting conclusions on the basis of the information gathered.

Following is a brief article written by him entitled "Nazi Domination of the German Mind," published in Hadassah Newsletter, March 1950:

NAZI DOMINATION OF THE GERMAN MIND

(By Saul K. Padover)

Public-opinion surveys of Germany add up to a pretty discouraging picture. They show that in 1949 the Germans are much the same as they were 10 years ago. In some respects, indeed, they are worse.

Perhaps it was too much to expect that a defeated people would alter its ways and thought under the rule of conquerors; but the data contained in the surveys are almost too overwhelming as evidence of the nearly total failure of the occupation.

NO FAITH IN RADIO OR PRESS

The Germans believe in less and are distrustful of more. Nearly half of them do not listen to the radio, and only a little more than half, 56 percent, read newspapers, compared with 75 percent 4 years ago. Many have stopped reading the press because they have no confidence in its veracity or impartiality.

A large segment of the population is convinced that the occupying powers are a hindrance to German recovery. Shortly after the war, well over half of those interviewed thought that the Allies were there for the good of Germany. Today fewer than one-fourth (22 percent) think so.

There is no grass-roots political movement. Germans are still apathetic to politics in general and to politicians in particular. Political parties are viewed with skepticism and political officeholders with disrespect. Two out of three Germans say they would turn down a responsible political post if one were offered them. Sixty-four percent admit they are in no way interested in politics. During elections they vote in great numbers, but mainly because they are ordered to do so.

RACE HATE AND NATIONALISTIC PRIDE

Race prejudice has always been disturbing. While anti-Semitism has declined slightly, racist and other hate has increased. Nineteen percent are still outspokenly anti-Semitic, despite the fact that the Jewish population has been reduced to a mere 20,000 (as against 500,000 in 1933). Intense nationalist and racist feelings are stronger than ever.

An illuminating survey has been made on Hitler's Mein Kampf, which was in effect the bible of the Third Reich. But who really read it?

We now have exact information on the subject, and it tells us much about the German mind, politics, and social structure. The following data, to be sure, relates only to the American zone and Berlin, but it is a safe assumption that it reflects the rest of Germany.

To begin with, an astonishingly large number of Germans—19 percent—say that they have read all or part of Mein Kampf. On the basis of population of some 70,000,000, this means more than 13,000,000 readers. Of these, 5 percent, or 2,500,000, claim to have read the whole book.

Who were these readers? Forty-four percent of them were Nazi Party members. Three-fourths of them had nine or more years of education. Well over half (54 percent) belonged to the upper and upper-middle income groups. The majority of readers were professional men, businessmen and government officials.

TREND TO DICTATORSHIP, NOT DEMOCRACY

While Mein Kampf is not being read today, at least not openly, nazism is still very much alive. In November 1945, 42 percent of those interviewed said that Hitlerism was a bad thing. Today, only 38 percent consider it bad.

Democracy—its principles and outlook—is an alien mode of life to most Germans. Sixty percent express the opinion that, if they had to choose between a democratic government that did not guarantee economic security, and a dictatorship that did, they would prefer the dictatorship. A year ago only 56 percent gave dictatorship as their preference.

There is no vigorous intellectual life, no soul searching, and no desire to examine what ails the nation. The overwhelming majority of Germans vehemently reject the charge, or even the suggestion, that the German people are responsible for the war or guilty of any crimes. If anybody is guilty, they say, it is a few Nazis and the Allies—for having allowed the Nazis to come to power. The Nazis, of course, say that the Allies are the criminals. Every trend indicates that most, if not all, Germans are ripe for a new dictator. What hope there is lies in the young people, and we are now, belatedly, trying to do something about them.

EAST-WEST STRIFE REINVIGORATES THE NAZIS

What makes the situation more tragic is that both the Anglo-Americans and the Russians are now wooing the Germans. In the struggle between the East and the West, the enemy of a few years ago has suddenly become a desired object to be won and cherished. Denazification has been abandoned. The Americans are pinning their hopes for the success of the Marshall plan on a restored Germany. Nazi leadership, in business and in public life, is rapidly coming back. The Nazis are now winning the war.

The present Government of western Germany is not Nazi, but it is rigidly conservative. As such, it is not the kind of government that can democratize Germany.

An Eminent Scientist Analyzes the National Science Foundation Bill as Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, among the scientists and educators of the Nation, as I have remarked on other occasions, there is a strong feeling that the great promise held forth both to our industrial development and our security by the National Science Foundation bill is sadly dimmed by the Smith amendment. This feeling is growing, and I am sure my colleagues would wish to give the subject further study in the light of the intelligent and well-considered objections raised in so many quarters of unquestioned loyalty.

Among the many letters on the matter received by me from my district, which includes the great University of Chicago, is the following from Joseph E. Mayer, of the faculty of the Institute for Nuclear Studies of the University of Chicago:

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
INSTITUTE FOR NUCLEAR STUDIES,
Chicago, Ill., March 27, 1950.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: The passage by both Houses of Congress of a bill establishing a National Science Research Foundation has been a source of great gratification to those interested in the strengthening of fundamental science of this country. We look forward with satisfaction to what we hope will become great benefits from this bill. Nevertheless, there are certain features of the bill which may not be ideal. In particular, some changes have been made by the House in the original bill, H. R. 4846, at least one of which, if retained, would be so undesirable as to be considered completely crippling.

I find section 14 (1), which requires FBI investigation and certification of loyalty by the FBI for recipients of scholarships and all persons employed by the foundation, to be incredibly bad as written at the present. The objections to this section are various.

(1) The broadening of the requirement of FBI investigation to recipients of scholarships independently of the eventual employment of these recipients in any classified work is a completely undesirable extension toward the methods of a police state, and is in direct opposition to our American democratic way of life.

(2) The extension of the duties of the FBI to include the investigation of a large number of people not connected with classified information necessarily reduces the effectiveness of the FBI in fulfilling its useful function of investigating persons who have access to secret information.

(3) The extension of the function of the FBI beyond that of investigation, to give certification of loyalty, will necessarily further reduce the usefulness of the FBI and at the same time is a completely undesirable unification of two different functions into the hands of one organization which smacks of the methods of totalitarian governments.

(4) The particular requirement placed on the FBI to declare disloyal any person who has at any time been a member of an organization declared subversive is an incredible extension of the definition of disloyalty. Many individuals have mistakenly and innocently joined such organizations either before or after they had been declared subversive. Indeed, in many cases these organizations, which sometimes had the highest aims, were in no sense subversive in their original inception and individuals who joined at that time and later resigned should not be penalized for the later changes in the conceptions of the organization.

I find that section 14 (m), which requires FBI investigation of any national of a foreign country who shall be associated with the Foundation in any capacity, to be very undesirable. It is probably not extremely important that National Science Foundation money shall be used to support the researches of foreign nationals in this country. However, the inclusion of this section would greatly complicate the operation of a university research project supported by the Foundation. The United States has profited greatly from foreign scientists who have come to this country either permanently or as temporary visitors. The temporary visitors bring to our research projects a knowledge of the methods used abroad and furnished tremendous stimulation to our own progress. There is no reason why fundamental research projects in this country should be excluded from availing themselves of this benefit. Section 14 (m), if retained in the bill, would have only this effect.

Section 15 (a), which has been amended to limit the annual appropriation to the Foundation to $15,000,000, appears to me to be unwise. I would not look forward to having the dominant source of funds for science in this country coming from the Federal Government. I would doubt if the Foundation appropriation should exceed $15,000,000 in the first few years. However, the writing of this limitation into the law presumably excludes larger appropriations at later times. I believe that considerably larger appropriations will be eventually desirable. The present budget of the Office of Naval Research, spent largely on fundamental scientific research without any appropriation for scholarships, is approximately half this figure. I would believe that the Science Foundation should eventually support the great majority of these projects now supported by the ONR, which are in a field of science much more limited than that of the Science Foundation. The effect of the limitation to $15,000,000 may well be to decrease the total Government support for research in the fundamental portions of physics and chemistry.

Section 10 (b), which requires a loyalty oath for any recipient for a scholarship or fellowship, appears to me to be undesirable. I do not believe that loyalty oaths play any role other than that of irritant. I do not find this amendment in any way crippling to the fundmental purposes of the bill, but I would oppose its retention.

Finally I find it undesirable that any provision is made for the National Science Foundation to support classified research. I believe that classified research should be supported by the appropriate division of the Secretary of National Defense and by the Atomic Energy Commission. The inclusion of support for classified research in the National Science Foundation in times of peace weakens and complicates the operation of that Foundation. I would prefer to have a scientific foundation even if it includes classified research than to have none at all, but I would prefer to see all reference to classified research eliminated from the bill.

Very sincerely yours,

JOSEPH E. MAYER.

Swiss Cheese Land in Wisconsin—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the dairy industry is Wisconsin's biggest business. It is composed of thousands of farmers who own and operate their farms.

Green County, Mr. Speaker, is in my congressional district, and I am very proud of it. Recently Mr. Emery A. Odell, publisher of the Monroe Evening Times, published a booklet entitled "Eighty Years of Swiss Cheese in Green County, 1869–1949." In a masterful way he has pointed out the development of this Swiss cheese industry in our State. He calls attention to the fact that dairying history appears to have reached the point where the past is more dependent upon the record in keeping alive the story of the origin of our unique cheese enterprise. He said, "Links between the living and the past are steadily reduced with the passing years."

Mr. Speaker, this story deserves perpetuation in the archives of our Government and with leave to extend my remarks, I am including the first installment herein:

SWISS CHEESE LAND—No. 1

GERBER'S FACTORY LAUNCHED INDUSTRY IN COUNTY IN 1869

This year marks the eightieth anniversary of the most significant event in Green County history, the opening of the first farmer factory for the manufacture of Swiss cheese.

It was the start of the factory system and the pioneering step in production of regular Swiss and Limburger types in Wisconsin.

Changes have come with the years and the old frontiers have been driven back in places but the general geographical locale, with Monticello and Monroe as concentration points, gives promise of holding firm as the greatest centralization for specialized cheese production in dairy history.

The steadfast resistance to encroachments is a tribute first to the vision of Nick Gerber, who founded the first Swiss factory in 1869, and to the dairy-minded settlers from Switzerland who occupied the area which became known as Bilten, a district without definite limits but settled by people of unlimited capacity for knowing how to put the land to work.

Nick Gerber introduced manufacture of Limburger in the Mohawk Valley of New York State before coming here. He never realized upon the enterprise he fostered in Green County, but the residents of Bilten and the contiguous area, with Monroe as its hub, went on to build an industry to which the county owes much of its comfortable condition of today.

Mr. Gerber's first Limburger factory in Green County on the former Albert Babler farm, New Glarus Township, and the first Swiss factory on the Dietrich Freitag (now the Nick Freitag) farm in Washington Township, disappeared long ago. Nothing remains today except a portion of the latter building, now a machine shed, and two markers erected by the Green County Historical Society 10 years ago.

His third factory, however, started in 1870 in Washington Township for Limburger making flourishes today as the Wittenwyler-Burgy factory, producing a delicate brand in a greatly improved plant.

Best picture of Green County's old Swiss-cheese frontier is found in a 25-mile radius north of Monroe, including Monticello, Washington, New Glarus, and Monroe Townships. Anyone who has an interest in what has been happening amid these hills for the last 80 years can see the story of Swiss cheese, of Bilten settlement, and the modern-day perfection of dairying and factory production in a brief afternoon's ride in the colorful countryside.

It will be a ride revealing in striking contrasts with methods of the past and yet giving full evidence of the unchanged strength of the people and the system which made the Swiss and Limburger industry flourish.

Driving north from Monroe, one finds that Monticello is the threshold for entry into the land of cheese. It is a village which, as a center for the immediate cheese-making area, reflects the character and enterprise of the families who came from Switzerland more than a century ago.

In that century the lands have been farmed diligently but with care. There are no signs of neglect or deterioration. Everywhere in the farm lands and in the village there is a Swiss air of prosperity.

In 1847 Monticello was unnamed and not recognized as a stopping place by the Government mail carrier between Monroe and Madison. Now it has all the indications of modern community progress, meanwhile retaining architecture of foreign derivation.

On the village's main street are two structures of rough stone exterior with rounded line and tower effect. The names "chateau" and "chalet" further suggest Switzerland. These buildings are of native limestone quarried from the hills from the same underlying bedrock known to impart desired qualities to milk products.

Monticello was dependent on stage coach transportation until the Illinois Central was built through from Monroe to Madison in 1888, the same year that the Milwaukee road extended the Brodhead branch connecting Monticello and New Glarus.

The first brick building block was erected in 1888 by J. C. Steinman who was long an influential citizen of Monticello and a county official. He was familiar with the cheese industry from its infancy. His sons and grandsons followed in the building profession with advanced ideas of architecture in home, business structures, and modern cheese factories.

On reaching the end of the main street, the tourist may turn briefly to the right to see the Monticello northside Swiss factory, one of the larger producing units in the area.

But it is to the left from the main street that the threshold to the pioneering cheese county lies. A modern hard surfaced road leads out of the village in a sweeping turn cutting through pasture lands into the valley known as lange where Brown Swiss cattle have grazed these many years. The silver tones of their bells can be heard throughout the outdoor grazing season as they welcome the tourist into the land of the Swiss.

A mile or so off Monticello's main street is the Nick Freitag farm. It is identified by buildings on both sides of the road.

And one of these buildings on the right was the cradle of the Swiss cheese industry in Green County. A stone marker with a bronze plate, on the left almost at the driveway to the house, tells the story.

FIVE PATRONS SOLD MILK TO FIRST SWISS FACTORY

What is left of that first Swiss cheese factory in Green County still stands as a landmark on the Nick Freitag farm just north out of Monticello on the Madison road.

A portion of the old building, on the right side of the road, is used as a machine shed. It still houses some of the early cheese-making equipment. The brick chimney marks where the stone boxed walls contained the wood fire for the boiler.

The large kettle was supported on an iron arm and was swung into place over the wood fire bed for forming the curd. Revolutionary changes mark the present-day operations, but the fundamental manufacturing process is the same.

Nick Gerber started the factory in 1869 with five patrons, Dietrich Freitag (father of the present farm owner), Jost Voegeli, Dietrich Stauffacher, Jans Blumer, and Meichior Schlittler. He operated it until 1875 when it was taken over by the farm patrons.

The Freitag farm dates back to Hiram Washington Bane, who obtained the Government grant in 1844. Bane conveyed the original 40 acres to Fridolin Streiff, one of the New Glarus founders, in 1848, and Streiff made cheese there in 1850. Streiff and J. Jacob Tschudy had been the leaders sent out from Switzerland to locate and lead the original colonists to their new home. Dietrich Freitag bought the land in 1869, the year that saw the Swiss cheese industry launched on his land. His son Nick, born there nearly 78 years ago, holds the original Government patents of conveyance.

Hatt farm around the bend in the road is the Voegeli Valley Grove farm in possession of the family since Jean Voegeli located there in 1854. It is one of the show places of Wisconsin and famed far and wide as an outstanding Brown Swiss breeding farm.

Three generations of the family made brick and Limburger there, and the old copper kettles are retained as antiques. Jacob, son of Jost, erected a large barn, 144 by 42, and one of Green County's largest, as Voegeli's Brown Swiss hotel in 1917. He also erected the fine home which, combined with hillside setting of the striking barn, offers one of the outstanding rural vistas of the Bilten as seen from the road.

To the north, the highway knifes through the Stauffacher brothers' property, now run by Conrad Stauffacher, Jr., as another of the outstanding examples of modern farming. The residence on the right towers at the edge of a bend in the road. The huge barns and dairy buildings, all electrified and kept in immaculate condition, attract many touring dairy industry groups annually.

Conrad Stauffacher, Sr., who came to this country from Switzerland in 1871, built up the 600-acre property. His sons, the late Fred H. and Conrad, Jr., took over in 1923 and pioneered in strip cropping and contour farming.

Continuing north, the entrance of New Glarus Woods State Park is reached. There a turn to the left is made, past the marker designating the road as the Old Lead Trail, reminder of the lead-mining days in Exeter.

Driving west, the first break in the woods to the north reveals a brief glimpse of New Glarus in typical Swiss valley setting. After passing the intersection with county trunk N the next turn to the left off the trail onto an unmarked road is the gateway to the Bilten settlement movement.

Houses and barns are secluded, almost hidden from view in the valleys.

The white-frame Meadow Valley School is seen at the bottom of a long hill. Directly ahead is Meadow Valley farm, home the Albert Babler place, with its huge barn and scenic, wide valley.

Here another historical society marker designates the site of the first Green County Limburger cheese factory, established by Nick Gerber in 1862.

The country road presents unending surprises as the journey continues. It follows a branch of Little Sugar River which becomes a lively stream at this point, a lure for trout fans.

The pleasing panoramic page of history is graphically illustrated with the variety of dairy barns, all of double doors, stone-masonary foundations, and foreign-type grillwork mow ventilators.

Entering Washington Township, the traveler comes upon the Fred K. Hefty farm which has been in the family a century. The buildings are landmarks of early dairying, offering some of the best examples of Swiss rural design. The gable of the white-frame barn, which is of unusual lay-out, bears the date 1848.

The large barn's stone basement houses a large Holstein herd and the double doors provide ventilation. A driveway opens into the upper level barn loft.

Across the road is the quaint stone barn, built in 1881, with overlapping brick ventilators, the work of Swiss stonemasons in faithful reproductions of an Old World design. It is a prized landmark.

Mrs. Hefty, widow of Fred K., still lives on the farm which comprises more than 400 acres.

The large, fine farm properties representing a century of ownership in the Freitag, Hefty, and Voegeli families were linked in a lyric wedding in 1898. The son and daughter of Dietrich Freitag married a son and daughter of Friedolin Hefty, while another family daughter married a son of Jacob Voegeli. Nick Freitag still lives on the farm where he was born on Christmas Day, 1871, and his sister, Mrs. Fred K. Hefty, resides at the Hefty farm. The other bride, Mrs. Albert Voegeli, resides in Sylvester, and conducts her own farm.

From the Hefty farm, the tour winds east to the intersection with county trunk N where the cheese student can turn south. A short drive beyond is the Town Hall Swiss factory at the intersection of country trunk C.

This fine new Swiss plant, served by 30 patrons, was opened in July 1948, and stands out as one of the best of modern white-tile factories—a perfect example of the enterprising industry founded on the farmer-patron system by Nick Gerber.

Further south, halfway to Monroe on county trunk N is the new Wyss Limburger factory, completed in May 1948, and operated as a Kraft Foods Co. producing unit with cooperative ownership. Here again is a modern example of Swiss architecture, combining the Old World atmosphere on the exterior with the gleaming, stainless-steel efficiency of the modern day inside.

Five miles south, the tour turns back to Monroe on Highway 81, the Argyle Road. That completes the visit to the frontiers of the Swiss industry which have shifted slightly to the south in the last 80 years but continue to hold firm with Monticello and Monroe as the anchor points of the concentration.

BILTEN SETTLEMENT FACES MODERN DAIRYING INDUSTRY

Green County's distinctive cheese industry originated in the fertile valleys of Little Sugar River.

Imported from Switzerland the now important dairy business did not come all at once. The unfolding took 20 years before the cheese factories came.

Original colonists of 1845 founding New Glarus were industrial people engaged in textile weaving in the province oppressed at the time by war. Because of their fear of hard times and famine they felt forced to look elsewhere for livelihood. They came here in Wisconsin seeking homes in new country.

A second sizable group, 70 at one time, came from the town of Bilten, off in a corner of Canton Glarus in Alpine lowlands. Bilten was more agricultural for it had pasture lands. The new group knew cows and was experienced in their care. The journey was by ocean-sailing vessel, the lake route to Milwaukee and overland to New Glarus. Arriving in New Glarus in 1847, they set out at once for the country where they might have land, timber, and stone. The few artisans among Swiss settlers were masons, which accounts for the general prevalence of stone in the old time building of homes, barns, stable basements, school houses. Many of the structures still mark the landscape, especially the barn basements and spring houses.

Land around New Glarus had been taken up and their search took them into Washington Township south of New Glarus and north of Monroe. Government land was available at low price. They established homes as a community group and named it Bilten settlement.

New Glarus township was absorbing the in-pouring population previous to 1847 but the years immediately following the movement was greatly increased. Green County's population in 1840 was 863 and during the decade from 1840 to 1850, the period covered by rapid settlement due to increased immigration, it rose to 6,566. Swiss participation amounted to 304. This means that only 4 percent of the total population at the time were to stamp their habits and characteristics so indelibly on the history and industry of Green County.

Bilten settlement of 12 families soon proved important far beyond its number in its immediate influence on countrymen back in the old homeland, as shown by later marked penetration by Swiss people. The years immediately following 1847 saw population boundaries extended to unoccupied Washington Township valleys to the west and south.

The first cows, one to a family, and selling at $12, were received at New Glarus in 1846.

Nick Gerber, also a Glarner (born 1836, died 1903), came to America in 1857 and located at Booneville, N. Y., where he opened the first cheese factory, introducing Limburger in the Mohawk Valley. He spent 11 years there, and in 1868, informed of the successful start being made in raising cattle in Green County, he came here to investigate.

He met Albert Babler at New Glarus and toured the Bilten area, where he found just what he was looking for in a new country. He at once arranged with farmers to take their milk, opening a Limburger factory in a log building on the Albert Babler farm in New Glarus Township.

He made the cheese himself and had outlet for his product in the East. Six farmers delivering milk to the first Limburger factory had less than 80 cows—Albert Babler, 15; George Legler, 10; J. C. Blum, Andrew Hoesly, Balthasar Kundert, and Christopher Babler, the remaining 25.

What was then known as Long Valley extended across the top of Washington Township to Monticello. Bilten settlers claimed the valley and others of the smaller tributaries of Little Sugar River. Another valley to the south and west was left for the arrivals from Bern. They came from the valley of Emmen River, Emmenthal, where Swiss cheese made in the form of large wheels originated.

A few cheesemakers applied their skill and took rightful place in what was to become Green County's basic industry. Beginning the making of regular Swiss in 1869, the industry was developed in both Swiss and Limburger.

Nick Gerber had the necessary contacts for sale of his products in the East. They now are staple cheese items on counters of food markets the country over. Thus, the development marked the beginning of factory manufacture of Swiss and Limburger cheese here and in Wisconsin.

BILTEN DISTRICT PIONEERS CLEARED HEAVY TIMBERLAND

Mention of Bilten settlement after 100 years is apt to sound legendary to most present-day readers. Those familiar with the history of the region and the institution of dairying when the country was mostly timber, however, do not hesitate to credit Bilten as the stimulus of early-day cheesemaking.

Adam Blumer, 1737 Fourteenth Street, this city, was born in Bilten settlement. His grandfather, also Adam Blumer, came from the old town of Bilten with his wife and five children. The grandfather was reared on a dairy farm where he was familiar with cows and cheesemaking.

Arriving in Green County he entered 240 acres of land from the Government in Washington Township, west of Monticello. The year following he bought five cows and was making butter and the farm variety of cheese from skim milk.

The land was heavily timbered. He bought two ox teams and started clearing and building with logs. Ten to twenty acres of land had to be broken every year in addition to the farming duties. The son, Adam Blumer, later head of the Monroe brewery, the youngest of the family, was 5 years old when he came here. The father died in 1855.

Adam Blumer, the grandson now retired and living here, became master brewer. The Blumers moved to Monroe in 1891. In recalling his farm experience, he said as a boy he had the care of three spans of horses and milked 12 cows morning and evening when his father had 101 cows on the Blumer farm.

The Blumer farm was the dividing point between the north and south valley of the Little Sugar River west of Monticello. Because the settlers were from Bilten, it became known as Bilten Thasle (Bilton Valley). They were Glarners, among them the families of Frick Becker, Henry Hefty, three Bontley brothers, Andrew, Casper, and John; Adam Blumer, three Blum brothers, Werner, Fred, and Jacob; John Schuler, Gottlieb Wittwer, Jacob Schlittler, Alex Tschabold, Henry Aebly.

The west end of the Little Sugar Valley in Washington Township was known as Berner Thasle, the settlers coming from Canton Bern. Among them were Jacob Zimmerman and sons, Jacob and John, Christ Loertscher, Christ Theller, Jacob Theller and Jacob Weissmiller.

Werner Blum, grandfather of the Monroe family, came in 1848 and took up land at the extreme west edge. This area was known as Fox Hollow because it appeared to be the favorite haunt of fox. Blum in his later years became one of the founders of the present Washington Reformed Church. His son, the late Werner, was the first American-born Limburger maker in the township.

During early building, the newcomers managed to hold together as a group insofar as possible, for the old ties of their fatherland held firm. Settlers who came later had to spread out into new country, but identity as to Canton and community of origin was fairly established by their countrymen here.

Bilten descendants have been proud of their connection with the original expedition because of the success attained in their venture after failure of wheat growing. Family names and dates of establishment in new world homes were enlightening and meant much to their countrymen. Thomas Hefty, Rudolph Blum, Casper Becker, J. Jacob Zwickey, all came in 1847; Emmanuel Weissmiller and Anton Baumgartner in 1848; Adam Blumer 1849, David Benkert 1851, Martin Zumbrunnen 1852.

Americans had settled in central Washington after Bilten settlement was established. Recorded dates of arrivals include Linus Hare, Eldridge Cheesebro, Hames Confer 1854; John Naughton, Silas Moore, 1856.

Glarners and Berners settling in the northern section of Washington Township had the Little Sugar River fork separating the two valleys.

The Freitag, Stauffacher and Voegeli farms to the east on the main Monticello and New Glarus highway are in the big valley sloping to the east where the Little Sugar tributary in Mount Pleasant takes its course eastward to main Sugar River and eventually to Rock River.

The Glarners and Berners got along harmoniously. They finally joined in bringing Swiss cheese to Green County and the old divisions have disappeared in the promotion of common interest in the industry.

Oscar Ewing Reports on Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, some very interesting observations were recently made at the midwinter conference of Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization in this country which is doing such fine humanitarian and medical work in Israel, by Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing. He had visited Israel several months ago. His impressions and sentiments indicate how quickly he grasped an understanding of the state and its people, the problems facing them, and their determination to settle these problems in a democratic fashion as understood in the western sense.

I am glad to place in the RECORD excerpts from his address at the Hadassah conference, as they appear in the Hadassah Newsletter, in the issue of March 1950:

HADASSAH'S WORK IN NOBLE AMERICAN TRADITION

(By Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator)

Even if I had never visited Israel I would have been delighted to come to this meeting of Hadassah. But I have just returned and the impact of my first-hand impressions is so great that nothing could have kept me away today. For 36 years the women of Hadassah have been engaged in a great humanitarian program. Those of us who have seen the end product of that program know how well you have wrought. I congratulate you for the good that you have done, for the idealism which inspires you, and for the determination with which you are facing the future.

The people of Israel are supremely sure that they can solve their problems. I share their confidence. I know that they are building for the centuries. They have had the courage and the imagination to pluck from the disasters of our generation the victory of hope and of fulfillment.

PROUD OF UNITED STATES ROLE IN HELPING ISRAEL

I am proud of the part played by the American Government, during the vicissitudes of the past several years, in ultimately making it possible for the new State of Israel to be born. I am equally proud of the voluntary role played by American citizens, including especially the members of Hadassah, in helping to bring success to Israel.

But more than this, I am proud that there are among my fellow humans people who have been able to live through the centuries of European persecution, through the concentrated poison of the Hitler terror, without succumbing to the pitfalls of self-pity or vindictiveness.

The people of Israel, as I saw them, had no time to worry about the past. They are too busy building the future.

Everywhere I went—along the roadsides, in the towns, in the villages, on the farms—there was construction. New buildings were going up, new houses, new shops and mills, new lands being surveyed for farming improvements. The real national song of Israel is played with the plow and the saw.

Yet I do not believe it will be possible for Israel to achieve success unless there is continued help from its friends abroad; and by that I mean principally in America. Every citizen of the United States ought to be proud of the voluntary assistance that has been rendered by you and by many other American organizations toward the upbuilding of Israel.

MORE DRAMA IN PEACEFUL CONSTRUCTION

This work must continue. It is only half done. The melodrama of past battles, the headline urgency of past suffering, may have gone. But they are replaced by an even more dramatic and an even more urgent need today.

I think there is more glamor in bringing up a nation of healthy children than in fighting a battle in the desert. I think there is more drama in establishing a stronghold of peaceful, constructive, democratic civilization along the Mediterranean than in the battle for international recognition, however important this may have been in the past.

Some people in this country seem to be concerned about the question of dual loyalty among American citizens who take an earnest interest in the future of Israel. I think such fears are silly. It is part of the American nature to help other people. It is part of the American tradition for us to hold strong sentimental attachments to others abroad.

KIN TO OTHERS IN AMERICAN INTEREST

My ancestry is a Scotch-Irish mixture, and I am not ashamed of the fact that, during my recent trip abroad, I felt an especially warm feeling when I was in Ireland and in Scotland. I do not see that this is, in any fundamental way, any different from the feeling that many American Jews have for Israel.

I will go beyond that, I believe that the American influence—in its proper interpretation—is a healthy thing everywhere in the world. Wherever we let our own spirit of individual liberty, of human dignity, of democratic methods, of equal opportunity, make itself felt, we are striking a blow for freedom everywhere and for the fundamental interests of the American people.

Israel is a stronghold of democracy in the western sense. If we reinforce the country's economy, if we bolster its faith in western democratic ideas, we are not only helping the people of Israel but we are also acting in the highest interests of the people of America.

That is the way I see the work of Hadassah. I salute you as stanch Americans precisely because of the magnificent work your organization has done for Israel. I know you will go forward with courage, with imagination, and with determination.

Methodist Church Backs Point 4 of President Truman's Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the debate on the ECA bill I stressed the importance of title 3 which aims at building a world of contentment and of good will through the use of our capital, our skill and our know-how in the development of other lands under point 4 of President Truman's inaugural address plan.

I was happy this morning to receive a telegram from Charles F. Boss, Jr., of Chicago, who is the executive secretary of the Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church, which gives us assurance that the great Methodist Church, and its large membership in all the States of the Union, are behind President Truman in this most important point 4. The telegram follows:

MARCH 27, 1950.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In annual session November 8 and 9 the Commission on World Peace of the Methodist

Church unanimously adopted the following statement: "We rejoice in the point 4 proposals of President Truman's inaugural address. To make the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas, and calls for the further implementation of these proposals, by such public and private funds and other resources as may be needed." I, therefore, wish to urge your hearty support in the adoption of title 3 of omnibus bill 7797, act for International Development, calling for the appropriation of $45,000,000 to be used in both the United Nations and the United States technical assistance program.

CHARLES P. BOSS, Jr.,
Executive Secretary.

International Trade Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there must be an end to the fear which seems to be paralyzing action by the administration to call up for hearings the resolution providing for United States membership in the International Trade Organization and approval of its charter. The evidence is cumulative and very strong, particularly from business leaders in the best position to know that the International Trade Organization is of the most vital importance to our Nation's effort as the leader in world trade. The appended letter brilliantly analyzing the implications of ITO to the prosperity of the private economy of the United States from the vice president in charge of foreign operations of the Ford Motor Co., one of America's great corporations, speaks eloquently on this point:

FORD MOTOR CO.,
New York, N. Y., March 17, 1950.

Hon. JOHN KEE,
Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KEE: As head of Ford International, I should like to advise you of my hearty endorsement of House Joint Resolution 236 and to urge congressional approval of the Havana Charter. From 30 years of active experience in selling American products in the foreign markets, I have learned on a day-to-day basis the problems of foreign trade. Today, as always, there are a number of people who speak authoritatively on the subject without personal experience with these problems. It is easy to sit back in the comfortable quiet of the study and think up criticisms and theoretical solutions. It is something else again to have to face the interesting obstructions to foreign trade and work out corrections that will make possible the survival of the trade in which we Americans believe.

Anyone who has to deal with this problem every day knows that without some concerted attack on the mounting road blocks that impede competitive private trade today, we American businessmen are going to lose our foreign markets.

We, in America, stand before all the world for freedom, individual initiative, the benefits that result from industrial democracy, free enterprise, and advanced technology. The decisions we take, particularly on foreign legislation, have decisive influence on the economic and political decisions in almost all other countries. We have provided the initiative for the restoration of multilateral trading—principally because our economy and our business way of life cannot survive without it. The Habana charter offers a vehicle for the restoration of multilateral trading.

We, in the United States, have taken the initiative for the restoration of international trade because of the wide area of free trade within the United States. It would be unfortunate—politically as well as economically—if we were to walk out on the deal just when there seems to be a chance of putting it over. We, as a Nation, have a keen appreciation of the fact that the economic progress of the world, including the United States, can be exactly measured by the progress which is made in the exchange of goods and services. Among nations, of course, this exchange is nothing other than international trade. I believe that world peace will result only from a combination of three factors, namely, sound diplomatic policy, sound military policy and a sound basis for the conduct of international trade. These are the keystones which are fundamental to peace and to the orderly development of the United Nations.

The practical solution to the present barriers to international trade requires (and the ITO provides) a concerted attack on all trade barriers, including our own, without delay. Four years have passed since the end of the war, and 2 years have passed since the Habana charter was drawn up. If the trend toward Government controls, State trading, and economic nationalism is to be reversed, further delay will make the job almost impossible. Vested interests grow rapidly around Government controls, making them difficult to shake off when they are long established. Even in countries where controls have been imposed as emergency measures, this is the case. If these controls and barriers are not rooted out soon, American hope for closer economic and political relationship with the non-Communist world will be seriously retarded.

The December 1949 issue of Fortune magazine contained an interesting article on the United States tariff and made the important point that, if the United States really intended to take the lead in promoting international trade, we should not only consider lower tariff rates but should give particular attention to procedural tariff reform which are often referred to as the invisible tariffs. Such are the complexities of the law and the regulations that it has become a specialized branch of the law and there has developed a large group (expert in its intricacies) known as custom brokers. Briefly, administrative and procedural reforms in the customs law and practice are even more important than a reduction in tariff rates.

When the need for action is so apparent, it seems only common sense to pick the best available plan or plans to improve international trade and go to work. The Habana charter drafted after months of arduous negotiation, under the able and patient leadership of William L. Clayton, chief of the United States delegation to the Habana Conference, within the framework of the United Nations provides a practical method to launch an orderly attack on governmental controls and trade barriers. Only a large number of trading nations, such as that grouped in the ITO, can even hope to tackle the restrictions now preventing restoration of multilateral trade. It is easy for individual nations to set up trade barriers, but they almost never take them down unless they are sure other countries will do the same. The Habana charter is the contract of 54 nations to do just that. Without an overall agreement of this sort, hope for reversing the present trend toward more and more trade barriers and government controls seems dim indeed. With the ITO, backed by energetic American support, we would have our best chance of sustaining the United States exports, encouraging private enterprise, and at the same time, we would contribute greatly to the important task of bolstering economic recovery abroad. Unless international trade is stimulated and encouraged, the important gains made in European recovery through ECA and other American assistance will be lost and the money contributed by the United States will be completely dissipated.

Of course, the charter can be criticized. It can be criticized both for its omissions and its commissions. In other words, some essentials have been left out; on the other hand there are certain things in the charter on which we may have reservations or which are not phrased strongly enough, having been watered-down or overqualified in the process of negotiation.

But—the essential considerations are these:

First, the charter does present after years of negotiations the best practicable compromise arrived in democratic fashion among the freedom-loving nations;

Secondly, the charter provides that indispensable element in the whole United Nations scheme of things; namely, an agency which has for its broad mission the purpose of dealing with problems dealing with international trade and providing a forum for their discussion and solution.

Since the initiative for the creation of this agency came from the United States and since without it the United Nations is incomplete, I strongly recommend that the charter be adopted by the Congress with any such reservations as in its opinion it feels essential to the preservation of American principles and interests.

Very truly yours,

GRAEME K. HOWARD.

The Isolationist Come-Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a column by the eminent student of foreign affairs, Mr. Walter Lippmann. Twenty years from now may be too late, and by that time saying "I told you so" will not do any good to the millions who may have lost their lives if we stupidly annihilate any opportunity to carry forward an intelligent foreign policy. The entire future of the world, as well as this country, is at stake, and to stoop to partisan politics at this time may be to bring on mass destruction of our civilian population a few years hence.

The article follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE ISOLATIONIST COME-BACK
(By Walter Lippmann)

At the week end the true character of the McCarthy affair became much clearer. Senator VANDENBERG's statement and Mr. Stimson's letter brought out the critical fact that the Republican opposition in Congress is now in open rebellion against the men who have led the Republican Party since Pearl Harbor.

VANDENBERG and Stimson represent, and indeed played the leading part in forming, the bipartisan policy of national unity for war and peace. But whereas once they spoke with authority for the Republican Party, they are now on the outside appealing and protesting against the men who have captured the leadership of the party.

The men who have captured the leadership of the Republican Party are the old isolationists, that hard core of irreconcilable and unreconstructed isolationists who dominated the party from the Harding administration until Pearl Harbor. During the war and for a few years after it they deferred to the other Republicans. But now they have recovered their power. Though McCARTHY himself is small potatoes, Senator BRIDGES, and above all Senator TAFT, are not. In the collapse of the bipartisan policy the old isolationists have once again taken over the party.

That is why Senator TAFT and Senator BRIDGES are not troubled by the fact that the method of the assault on Secretary Acheson, on Ambassador Jessup, and on the State Department in general is paralyzing the conduct of our foreign policy and is undermining the prestige of the United States throughout the world. In the last analysis McCARTHY and the more important Republicans who are backing him do not believe in a foreign policy in which the United States plays a responsible and cooperative role in the world. They do not really care how much they injure American policy because they do not like the foreign policy which, since Pearl Harbor, they have been compelled to support. They would not regret, they would be very much pleased, to see the whole national effort of the United States in war and peace cease to be a matter of popular pride. For then their own records in war and peace, which have been embarrassing to them, would be vindicated.

This isolationist come-back was not at first clearly recognizable because the leading figures in it have been so ardent for intervention in China. Moreover, some of the leading crusaders for intervention in China, notably Senator KNOWLAND and Senator SMITH of New Jersey, are not isolationists and have not meant to throw the country back into the position it was in from Harding to Pearl Harbor. But the acid test of isolationism has never been mere withdrawal within the 3-mile limits. Some isolationists have been pacifists. But most of them have been men who, in any action abroad, wished to act alone and unilaterally, or not at all.

The real isolationism is a dislike of collaboration with other powers, and especially with European powers. Even Senator TAFT, who is a good deal of a pacifist, was willing to use the American Navy in Formosa in an American adventure. But the formation of a common policy in Asia with the other leading and friendly Asiatic powers—notably with Britain and India—has not interested him. In fact, the Republican position on China is essentially a veto on any change of American policy which would permit us to work with Britain and India, in the United Nations and elsewhere, on Asiatic problems.

It is not a debating point, but the deep truth of the matter is that the isolationist campaign which began with Formosa and went on to the McCarthy business is playing straight into Russia's hands. I believe that every informed and serious observer would agree that the great objective of Soviet foreign policy is to push the United States out of Europe and Asia and back into the Western Hemisphere. Everything that happens here which renders it impossible for the United States Government to work with our allies and partners brings the Soviet Government nearer to this objective.

The Republican campaign about China, though it cannot possibly restore Chiang Kai-shek, has made it impossible for this Government to take any of the necessary measures of an Asiatic policy. As long as we are entangled with Chiang and indirectly at war with Red China, we are not only in conflict with Russia, but we are divided from Britain and India, and we are denied the possibility of dealing with the situation in southeast Asia through the United Nations. It is perhaps no accident that the Harding Republicans who made the League of Nations unworkable should now be making the United Nations unworkable. The details of the story in 1950 are different from the details of the story of 1920. But the results are very similar.

Those who know the story of 1920 and of how the isolationists defeated Wilson will remember that the first isolationists did not begin their campaign by demanding that we withdraw from Europe. Though they ended by making a separate peace with Germany, they began with a furious assault on what they regarded as Wilson's softness in dealing with Germany. The original attack was very like the Knowland-Smith, or the MacArthur, attack on the softness of the administration's China policy. Then, as now, isolationism evolved from a campaign for a super-hard policy into a general rejection of all policy—much as the immediate result of the Formosa crusade against communism was the vote in the House to refuse aid to Korea.

Then, as now, it should also be noted, isolationism grew as the Wilson administration adhered rigidly, stubbornly, and unimaginatively to its own policy. In the end, the Wilsonian peace was broken down and then rejected because Wilson, who was a sick man, was too inflexible to work with his critics or to rally his supporters. Mr. Acheson would do well to ponder that experience.

Army Engineers Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present an editorial appearing in the March 23, 1950, edition of the Shreveport Journal regarding the splendid work of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. It reads, as follows:

ARMY ENGINEERS COMMENDED

Under the caption, "Army engineers earn praise," the Journal some time ago commended the long-time service of these engineering authorities for their record in planning and having charge of flood control and other waterways projects.

Congressman OVERTON BROOKS, who recognizes the value of the Army engineering corps, had the editorial in question inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This fact was noted with interest by George E. Palmer, president and publisher of the Marine News, New York, who in a letter to the Journal advised that its published comment had come to his publication's attention, and continued on the subject, which is of special interest to Red River Valley residents:

"It always gratifies us to see that distinctive organization, the Army engineers, commended and defended. Some of the things that have been said about them lately border on puerility and asininity.

"An editorial in the Engineering News-Record in September 1935, titled 'An Enviable Record,' said: 'For more than a century, Congress, in planning for the Nation's waterways, has laid upon the Corps of Engineers of the Army the responsibility of investigating proposed work and of carrying on work that it authorized. This year, seemingly in acknowledgment of that long service, Congress named the corps as the permanent agency to carry forward such work. The service record thus recognized is one of which any body of men may well be proud. Scandal, graft, undue respect for political influence—these stains that frequently mar the record of so many public bodies—are peculiarly absent from this one. Year after year the multitude of schemes for river improvements, harbors, and waterways that are pressed upon Congress by their enthusiastic promoters have been referred to the Army engineers under whose supervision they have been carefully analyzed, made the subject of public hearings, and, ultimately, the subject of a favorable or unfavorable report to Congress. And not infrequently unfavorable reports have been made in defiance of the demands of politically strong individuals. Though difficult at the time for the officers concerned, this firm adherence to the conclusions drawn from an engineering study has benefited the corps by building up in the minds of Congressmen full confidence in the inherent honesty of that organization. Congress now has written its acknowledgment of that confidence into the law of the land. Engineers in civil life will gladly add their approval, for though they may at times disagree with the Army engineers' conclusions or may rebel against their occasional displays of arbitrariness, yet they recognize that in the long run the record of the Corps of Engineers is one that does honor to the whole profession.'

"Two years later in August 1937 the late Gen. Hugh Johnson said in the press that:

"'The United States Corps of Engineers mapped the West, laid out the great transcontinental rail routes, improved all our harbors and inland waterways, harnessed the rivers, created the Great Lakes navigation system—by all odds the most efficient waterway development in human history—and built the Panama Canal after many attempts had failed. Through more than a century that corps has built for itself, in the confidence of Congress and the country, an almost incredible something that exists nowhere else in this or any other government—absolute assurance of impartial, completely nonpolitical, nonbiased, efficient, and incorruptible planning and administration.'

"A large part of the present strength and wealth of America is its harbors and waterways and its flood-protection works, vital both in peace and in war. Growing strength and added wealth depend largely upon their continued development. With their distinctive record and accumulated experience who is better qualified than the Corps of Engineers to plan and supervise this investment in the building of a nation?"

The Army engineers have been tried and proved to be efficient in handling flood and other waterway problems, which affect the entire Nation. A sensible move for the Government is to let the set-up go undisturbed instead of trying something new as a sort of experiment.

Throughout the Red River Valley, and the valleys of the Mississippi and other streams of this and other sections of the country, the service rendered by the Army engineers is regarded as the best possible service of the kind to be had. There have been efforts, some not in the distant past, to have Army engineers replaced with others to be politically chosen, but these efforts have failed to get the results desired by those wishing them put in effect. In the Red River Valley especially the Army engineers' work is appreciated. Repeatedly waterway leaders of this section have commended the Army corps, and justifiably. Only recently their efforts contributed to control of the swollen Mississippi and its tributaries.

For Federal Regulation of Life-Insurance Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, of paramount importance in the news is the announcement of a new plan whereby the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States states that it would buy new freight cars and lease them to the railroads.

The Committee on the Study of Monopoly Power of the House Judiciary Committee examined to some extent the assets and operations of life-insurance companies. It was ascertained that assets are now between fifty-five and sixty billion dollars and that the companies have been finding it more and more difficult to invest these huge assets profitably and efficiently.

We now find that the Equitable Life Assurance Society has a new plan to buy and lease freight cars to the railroads. Standing by itself, this proposal appears sound and should be most helpful to the railroads, most of which are in financial difficulties. It points up, however, the need for thorough exploration of the ever-growing magnitude of the assets of life-insurance companies and the lack of proper and organized supervision of same by State agencies.

The preliminary investigation made by our committee showed that with few exceptions, regulation of the disposition of these assets was negligible. The larger of these companies are practically laws unto themselves. Their combined power is incalculable. Today, the Equitable Life Insurance Co. buys and rents freight cars. Another of the so-called Big Five—Metropolitan, Prudential, New York Life, Equitable, and Mutual—may possibly next buy and rent locomotives or Diesel engines, and the third, passenger cars, the fourth, parlor cars, while the fifth might propose to electrify railroads. Many railroads are down at the heel and need help, and the insurance companies can be a source of great aid. However, what are the end results? These insurance companies would practically control the railroads—and this is not looking for ghosts under the bed.

The insurance companies are already involved in numerous types of business. They construct housing projects: they build commercial and industrial structures and rent them for short or long periods. They are in the banking business and make loans to all manner and kinds of business. There is neither floor nor ceiling to their financial activities, save that they may only invest in capital stock to a limited degree.

The admitted assets, according to Dunne's International Insurance Reports, as of December 31, 1947, of the big five insurance companies, were: Metropolitan, $8,348,472,801; Prudential, $7,321,488,722; Equitable Life Assurance, $4,504,971,753; New York Life, $4,234,184,506, and Mutual Life of New York, $1,942,722,347. Since 1947, the figures have gone considerably higher. They are permitted to throw their financial weight around for good or ill with little or no outside supervision. It is for good, when men like Thomas I. Parkinson, president of Equitable are in control, but what of his successors? What guaranty has the policyholder and the public that efficient and just management will always be present?

We cannot leave such power to chance.

Although the companies are usually mutual, the policyholders have neither control nor voice in the management. The State laws make it impossible. The officers and boards of directors are self-perpetuating.

I am personally convinced that Federal regulation is necessary. Insurance is interstate commerce. It is not, of course, my thought to superimpose Federal regulations upon State regulations which would result in 49 regulatory bodies. Rather, the solution lies in Federal regulations which would govern in any conflict between State and Federal law. What the shape and stringency of that regulation should be, I cannot now say. Further inquiry is needed.

Our inquiry clearly indicated that there is no greater safety in big insurance companies than there is in small insurance companies, and the premium rates are no lower.

If Arizona Is Not To "Die on the Vine," Congress Must Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the fact is generally recognized that Arizona desperately needs water which is now flowing in the Colorado River within her own limits for 300 miles across the State and 400 miles along her border. It is a less-known fact that if Arizona is to get her legal quota of that water, there must be—because of Arizona's unique circumstances—an authorizing act of Congress as the necessary first step.

Ah, you may say, since diverting Colorado River water into Arizona is too expensive for Arizona to do, of course, it requires an authorization for the Federal Government to do it, and that is the reason why an act of Congress is the first step. That is true, but that is not the reason to which I now refer. There is another more compelling reason why authorization by Congress is absolutely necessary to enable Arizona to get her own water, or any other benefits, from the Colorado River. Please get this explanation: Arizona's Colorado River problem presents a unique case because of a certain legal fact which does not apply to any other Colorado River Basin State nor to any other State in our Union. It applies to Arizona alone. Congress walled Arizona off from the Colorado River in 1910.

No, I am not thinking now of the physical features or handicaps which must be overcome to put Colorado River water on Arizona land, but I am thinking of this legal fact—the shutting off of Arizona from the benefits of the Colorado River—which fact must be known and understood for any appreciation of Arizona's peculiar problem. This great handicap imposed on Arizona—to which I have recently referred in committee and on the floor of the House—was originally imposed by Congress, and it can only be overcome by Congress. This hampering condition is a provision which Congress wrote into Arizona's Enabling Act of June 20, 1910, as found in section 28 thereof. The provision reserved to the United States, and caused to be withdrawn, all power dam sites and lands bordering the Colorado River. Arizona was required to accept the provision and to incorporate it into her State constitution. It is found today in section 6 of article 10 of the Arizona Constitution.

Now the effect of this provision of the enabling act, passed by Congress and required of the new State in her constitution is to legally fence Arizona away from the Colorado River so that Arizona can build no dams or power plants on the Colorado and can divert no water from the Colorado River without an authorizing act of Congress, even though the legal right to her use of the water is absolutely clear.

Am I, a layman, the only authority pointing out Arizona's situation on account of this enabling act provision? Certainly not. Able lawyers have done so, and the Supreme Court has done so in the case of *Arizona* v. *California* (283 U. S. 423). Quoting the Supreme Court in that case:

> Arizona has, of course, no constitutional right to use, in aid of appropriation, any land of the United States, and it cannot complain of the provision conditioning the use of such public land.

What the Court was referring to was the fact that Arizona was required by its enabling act to disclaim all right and title to the unappropriated and ungranted public lands lying within its boundaries. Furthermore, reserved to the United States, and expressly excepted from any and all grants made to the State, was "all land actually or prospectively valuable for the development of water power or power for hydroelectric use or transmission" which might be designated by the Secretary of the Interior within 5 years after the admission of the State. Thereafter, all power sites and public lands along the river were so designated by the Secretary of the Interior. Thus Arizona was fenced off from the great Colorado River which flows 300 miles across the State and 400 miles along her border, although the Colorado River is Arizona's greatest resource. Let me repeat: These conditions were not imposed upon any other Colorado River Basin State. Congressional action brought about this condition. As a Member of Congress, I say that it is the duty of Congress to see that Arizona

receives her due share of that water from which she was fenced off, and to which she is otherwise legally entitled.

Granted all that is said above, it may be said and it has been said, "There should be a decision by the Supreme Court clearing Arizona's title to the Colorado River water she seeks before the irrigation project is authorized." I have frequently said that nobody is more anxious than I for an immediate and definite decision by the highest Court of the land, as to Arizona's legal rights on the Colorado River. However, the ablest lawyers in the West, including some of the ablest lawyers in the United States Senate, have declared that such an authorization act which passed the Senate February 21, 1950, by a vote of 55 to 28, is the one and only method of getting this water controversy squarely before the Supreme Court. The method of litigation has been proposed during the last 4 years, and suit resolutions were considered by four different committees, two in both Houses of Congress in the Eightieth Congress and in the Eighty-first Congress, but none of the suit resolutions were favorably acted upon. Thus the many lawyers on these committees must have agreed with what able water lawyers in the West say is a legal fact—that an authorization by Congress is a necessary first step before there can be final litigation of Arizona's rights in the Colorado River.

Senator Paul Douglas Versus Natural Gas Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, no one in the Nation has done more to make the issues clear in the attempt to take the independent producers of natural gas out from under Federal regulation than has the Senator from Illinois, Hon. PAUL DOUGLAS.

As one who opposed this legislation when it was considered in the House in the first session of the present Congress, I give every ounce of moral support possible to PAUL DOUGLAS in his gallant fight in behalf of the millions of American consumers who would be victims of increased rates if the so-called Kerr bill becomes law.

In this connection I include with my remarks an article by Marquis Childs which appeared in the Washington Post, of this morning. Mr. Childs' article follows:

DOUGLAS AND THE KERR BILL—GAS MONOPOLY FIGHT

(By Marquis Childs)

Being a United States Senator is really tough these days if you take your job at all seriously. In an earlier day, some high-falutin' oratory got you over the rough places.

But in the face of an issue as that presented by Senator ROBERT KERR's bill to take the independent producers of natural gas out from under Federal regulation, oratory is not enough. It takes hard, thorough, conscientious digging into the facts and figures that spell out certain basic economic relationships in this country.

That hard, thorough, conscientious digging is what Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, has supplied in the controversy now moving toward a climax. His initial speech and the part he is playing in the give and take of debate constitute a remarkable performance.

DOUGLAS has got down to the hardpan of the argument so that no one can fail to see what the realities are if they choose to.

In the background knowledge he has brought to the fore and in the way he marshals it, DOUGLAS makes old-timers think of Senator George Norris at his best. For one thing, DOUGLAS' presentation is completely in the American tradition. It owes nothing to any alien ideology.

The Senator from Illinois went back to the early attempts of State governments to regulate private monopoly in the gas and electric industry. Here, as he pointed out, was none of the vital force of competition which can and does under our system act to bring prices down and give the consumer value and quality.

"This was not," said DOUGLAS, "public ownership. It was an attempt to avoid public ownership by providing for private ownership and operation but with public regulation to protect consumers and also investors. It was not socialism as some may imply, but America's answer to socialism."

In this last there is good American common sense. It is a sound and valid answer to the distorters who cry socialism at every form of Government activity.

But the States found themselves deberred from regulating the sale of natural gas transported from one State to another. Only the Federal Government has the power to regulate interstate commerce. For that reason, as DOUGLAS develops the argument, Congress adopted in 1938 a law giving the Federal Government through the Federal Power Commission authority over the sale and transmission of natural gas.

In the course of the debate the Senator has presented a remarkable array of figures, statistical tables, and supporting data. They show in a way difficult or impossible to refute that the so-called independent producers are, for the most part, the big oil companies. These companies, which in past years have shown exceedingly generous profits, would be in a position to make an extraordinary killing on the basis of the gas reserves they own and the contracts now in existence, if Congress gives them a go sign.

DOUGLAS has thoroughly analyzed these contracts and he seems to me to knock down one of Senator KERR's chief arguments, which is that they provide for a fixed price over a long period of years. Even if the companies were freed from regulation, that is to say, they could not hike the price. But DOUGLAS points out that most of these contracts have favored-nation clauses providing an increase for the company if it can be shown that a higher price is being paid to another producer.

And, incidentally, throughout the debate the Senator from Illinois has kept away from name calling. He has not felt it necessary to impugn Senator KERR's motives. Consistently he has pounded in facts and figures and always he's come back to the main theme—that the choice is between unreasonable profits for a few producers with drastically increased prices to northern consumers and, on the other hand, reasonable profits and comparatively low prices benefiting millions of citizens.

The vote on the Kerr bill will be closely scanned in a great many States, and one reason is because Senator DOUGLAS has contributed so much toward making the issue crystal clear. He got his preparation years ago when the jerry-built utility empire of Samuel Insull was crashing into ruin in Illinois.

They say that PAUL DOUGLAS is running for President, or anyhow, Vice President. He puts this aside, sternly saying that all he wants to do is be a good Senator. And that, in my opinion, is one of the best possible ways to run for President.

Best Highway Route Through the Rocky Mountains Neglected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, when the uncompleted section of the Lewis and Clark Highway between Missoula, Mont., and Lewiston, Idaho, is finished, we will have an arterial road between Chicago and Portland, a short route traversing the lowest pass through the Bitter Root Mountain range that makes the boundary line between Montana and Idaho.

Inserted herewith for the information of my colleagues are the facts presented to the members of the Public Works Committee in my statement concerning this road, when the public-roads bill was under consideration by that committee:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE COMPTON I. WHITE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO, BEFORE THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

The CHAIRMAN. Please state your name for the reporter.

Mr. WHITE. COMPTON I. WHITE, Congressman representing the First District of Idaho.

I want to talk to you about one of the most important transcontinental roads across the country.

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to have you with us, Mr. WHITE, as always.

Mr. WHITE. For the purpose of the record, and for the information of the committee I would like to use two maps.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk to the committee a few minutes about an arterial road under construction across the State of Idaho.

I want to call the attention of the committee to a peculiar situation that between U. S. No. 20, which crosses the southern part of Idaho, and U. S. No. 10 which crosses the northern part of Idaho we have a blank space here in the great United States of 330 miles. There are 330 miles in Idaho between Wallace, Idaho, on U. S. No. 10, and Gooding, Idaho, on U. S. No. 30, where there is no way of crossing that country, right across Idaho, which is the route traveled by Lewis and Clark on their famous expedition when they made an exploration of the Columbia Valley and the Pacific Northwest in 1805.

They came to where Missoula, Mont., is now and from there across the Bitter Root Mountains, and got down to the Salmon River but had to retrace their steps back to the Lolo and found a route, the lowest pass through the Bitter Root and went on down through that pass to the confluence of the Snake and Clearwater Rivers and on to the mouth of the Columbia at Astoria.

Later when General Howe, in his campaign against the Indians thought that he had Chief Joseph surrounded, Chief Joseph and his Indians got away, got through the Bitter Root Mountains by the pass followed by Lewis and Clark, and got out on highway of

the plains of eastern Montana, and got almost to Canada.

The CHAIRMAN. What year was that?

Mr. WHITE. That was back in 1877. 1805 was the time Lewis and Clark made their famous expedition to the Northwest. When Chief Joseph stalled General Howe and took his horses, his squaws, and his people with him he went through this famous Lolo Pass which is traversed by the Lewis and Clark Highway. This road is now under construction and has been for a long time but if you look at the map here (indicating) you will see that there is a dead end to it on both sides. This arterial highway is almost completed. There is about a 40-mile stretch of it remaining to be built. This road extends down from U S 10 down to Lolo Pass, and it ends there, a dead end. It is built up along the Clearwater River, up to a point in the mountains, and there it ends.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. And for 30 years we have been trying to induce the Forest Service and the United States Bureau of Roads to complete that highway project.

They have spent up to now over $4,000,000 on it, and I will get the exact figures, and it is being left neglected and uncompleted. We have $4,000,000 invested in that road, and we do not get a nickel out of this road investment that has been made. We do not get any gasoline tax, and we do not get much in the way of service. It is just a dead investment. We need a little more money to complete that road. It is on the Federal aid system. It will be a short cut from the East down through Lewiston and Walla Walla down along the Columbia River into Portland and to the Pacific at Astoria. It is one of the most important roads that we have that remains to be built. I have the figures from the Bureau of Public Roads showing that there has been $2,934,826.82 invested in that road, in addition to over $2,000,000 in other road money, and it is still a dead end.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not mean to interrupt the continuity of your very excellent presentation, but let me ask you this, Mr. WHITE: Has your State highway commission selected that road for construction?

Mr. WHITE. I think some years ago it was put on the Federal aid system. It should be built, as other roads in the national forests are with funds allocated to the national forests. Yes, the State is going the limit with their limited means in matching Federal-aid money.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right, the commission has recommended that as a priority road.

Mr. WHITE. They are building short sections. The Forest Service seems to be bypassing the thing. The Forest Service let a small clearing contract about 2 years ago. I asked them what they were going to do about it this year, and they said we will carry that little $500,000 clearing and a mile and a half construction contract over until next year. This highway project is being stymied and blocked. It is one of the most important roads for military defense and for the development of our resources and the use of travelers and tourists to go through the country. It is a short cut, if you please, between Chicago and all of the big cities beyond there, to Portland, Oregon, and Pacific coast cities.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you are absolutely sound. As you know, this committee makes a lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It is up to the Bureau of Public Roads and the highway authorities of Idaho to spend that money where they think it ought to be spent.

Mr. WHITE. It is up chiefly to the Forest Service. Lewiston is one of our biggest Idaho cities, and it is dependent on the development of that road for its natural growth. The representatives of the chamber of commerce went to the Forest Service when Fred Morrell was regional forester some years ago, to their headquarters at Missoula, to work out some plan for completion of the road. They were promised some forest-road money would be spent to finish the road each year.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. WHITE. I want to tell you just a little more about this road, and then I will yield.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; go right ahead.

Mr. WHITE. They went over there to the regional headquarters of the Forest Service and saw Mr. Morrell and he told these people that they could not build this 45 miles as one project, but that each year they would put some money on the project. The Forest Service kept their agreement for a few years, and then the money previously allocated for this project was transferred somewhere else, and that road is still standing there incomplete. Four million dollars' investment made on which we are getting nothing at all.

I wanted the committee to know something about it. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. We are mighty glad to have that information and we thank you very much, Mr. White. We are always glad to have you appear before us. You always bring a map with you when you come, and if you do not bring a map you bring photographs, and you always put on a good show.

Tax Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, Congressman DANIEL A. REED, Republican of New York, ranking minority member of the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee charged today that the Bureau of Internal Revenue's recent ruling exempting from the 20-percent amusement tax the proceeds of the Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day Rally was a shocking example of taxation by political connivance and political favoritism and that the Federal Government had been cheated out of over $100,000.

Congressman REED declared:

In view of the position of the Bureau of Internal Revenue that the $1 paid to attend the Republican Lincoln Day box-supper rally at the Uline Arena in Washington was subject to the 20 percent amusement tax, I requested on February 20 the Bureau to advise me whether a similar tax was payable on the $100 per person Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day rally held in the Armory in Washington on February 10.

After more than 1 month's delay I have just received the Commissioner's reply that the approximately $580,000 proceeds from the Democratic spree is not subject to either the admission or cabaret tax in the same manner that the proceeds from the Republican rally were held taxable. In view of the basic similarity of the two events, both of which included professional entertainment and political speeches, this ruling is a shocking example of taxation by political connivance and political favoritism. Although the Presidential henchmen hunger for the pennies paid by even our children in the form of the amusement tax on their movies, museums, playgrounds, county fairs, and many other simple pleasures, they avoid applying the amusement tax to any fund destined for the Democratic coffers for use in fostering their socialistic program.

As a result of the Bureau's ruling, the Federal Government has been cheated out of over $100,000 in revenue. Even more significant than this is the revealing fact that the Democratic Party is unwilling to help the working men and women of America shoulder their tremendous tax burden.

This type of tax discrimination and favoritism is indeed a new low in politics.

Discrimination in the City College of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I feel quite sure that Members will agree with me that loyalty to this Nation and to its democratic institutions and traditions should be a prime consideration in the selection of the teaching staff of any school, college, or university; and, with a choice of proved loyal Americans, that the designation should be made to the candidates considered best qualified, without regard to race, religion, or national derivation.

In the City College of New York an anomalous situation has been uncovered in which it would appear at this stage of the investigation that a certain Prof. William Knickerbocker has been able to force the promotion of two individuals of less than unquestionable loyalty to the United States, and not alone to its institutions; and that in the process he has been able to bypass qualified candidates who happen to be Jews or Negroes.

Under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD a statement from the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League of 165 West Forty-sixth Street, New York; a news article from the Herald Tribune of Sunday, March 26; and miscellaneous clippings on the subject from the New York Post-Home News:

NONSECTARIAN ANTI-NAZI LEAGUE
TO CHAMPION HUMAN RIGHTS, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 17, 1950.

Hon. FRANCIS T. SPAULDING,
Commissioner of Education of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: In view of continued and very widespread public concern as to whether practices detrimental to the rights of religious and racial minorities in the City College of New York have been effectively terminated, the directors of the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League consider it imperative that the office of commissioner of education should institute a sweeping independent investigation of antidemocratic practices within the administration of the

City College, including a general review of background educational attitudes, promotion practices, and public policies with respect to intergroup relationships.

Such a study ought to give consideration to general civic and educational values, rather than to narrowly circumscribed academic regulations concerning primarily administrative matters.

Without impugning the methods or motives in your disposal of the City College case recently before you, we feel that we should point out that your action was based solely upon narrow technical grounds, and only upon the papers submitted to you from below, without any independent investigation whatsoever on the part of your office, and in spite of formal recommendations on this subject made in a unanimous report of a special committee of the City Council of New York.

We are especially disturbed by a generally understood custom with respect to current faculty appointments at City College, pursuant to which City College graduates are in effect discriminated against for appointment to the faculty of their own institution. Such a procedure, while defended by the City College administration as an attempt to prevent "academic inbreeding," when practiced to the considerable extent apparently prevailing, actually works a discrimination against graduates of City College, and particularly against the great majority of those graduates who happen to be of the Jewish faith, as well as the smaller group which happens to belong to the Negro race.

At present it is estimated that between 80 and 85 percent of the City College student body is of the Jewish faith, and that only 22 to 27 percent of the faculty of full professorial rank is of the Jewish faith. It is obvious that the general pursuit of the principle of "no inbreeding" means that the majority of City College graduates who are of Jewish faith have vastly less possibility to develop academic careers than is the case for the average Gentile college graduate.

"No inbreeding" thus becomes nothing but a new name for the numerus clausus and other time-worn devices of religious and racial discrimination.

This peculiar and all but unique inversion of the feeling of academic self-confidence which seems to have now developed at the City College is, in the opinion of a considerable portion of the academic community, strongly suspect of being a mere camouflage for a much more sinister purpose—a purpose which has at other times and places been cloaked by the phrase "quota system," or openly practiced according to dictates of agitators of the John Elliott Rankin stripe. In the particular case of Prof. William Knickerbocker, the chairman of the romance language department at City College, this lack of institutional self-confidence in the college's own academic products has been carried to a further extreme, as may be observed by even a casual study of appointment and promotion policies, with the result that not only have City College graduates—and particularly those who happen to be of the Jewish faith or the Negro race—been subject to discrimination, but in an effort to avoid granting promotions in this group, definite preference has been given, on important occasions, to teachers whose personal histories should have led them to be held in doubt as to their qualifications for advancement in an institution founded on democratic traditions.

Without meaning to imply that a specialist in a field of art or literature should be compelled to adhere to any specific doctrine, it is nevertheless established American practice to contend that, particularly on the undergraduate level, a devotion to civic principles, including democracy and Americanism, is at least highly desirable.

It is noteworthy that during the administration of Professor Knickerbocker two very important promotions were made where the instructors had earned considerable portions of their academic standing as a result of activities carried on, with Professor Knickerbocker's knowledge or possible advice, in countries and institutions at the time clearly and openly at variance with democratic traditions.

The first is the case of Prof. Guido Errante, who joined the City College staff as an instructor in 1932. During the ensuing years from 1932 to 1938, while serving as an instructor, Errante was also a featured New York correspondent for Il Giornale d'Italia, of Rome, a newspaper at that time edited by Virginio Gayda and internationally notorious as the most quoted Roman press outlet of Benito Mussolini's Fascist regime.

Errante, however, was strongly recommended by Professor Knickerbocker for promotion to an assistant professorship in 1944—this recommendation being made over the heads of at least four other instructors possessing similar or greater seniority and academic attainments. Of these four, whose availability was thus ignored, three were Jews and all were City College alumni. Yet, in advancing Errante's claims, Knickerbocker justified his action in a meeting of members of the department, on the ground that Errante's journalistic experience was of a character to merit his promotion. Thus, service as a correspondent for Il Giornale d'Italia during the critical period 1932-38 became a basis for credit toward promotion in the romance languages department. Errante, in 1947, thus became an assistant professor.

In 1949, Knickerbocker again recommended Errante for further advancement—this time to the rank of associate professor—a recommendation which is still pending.

If experience in Italian journalism had been a sine qua non at this time, it is scarcely necessary to remind you that there were in the United States a considerable number of exiled scholars who had been forced to leave Italian universities as a result of the totalitarian policies of Mussolini, and many of these scholars were then securing appointments at institutions of the first rank, including Columbia, Harvard, Yale, the University of Chicago, and other schools of similar rating.

To give preference under such circumstances to a man, one of whose claims for promotion included his service as a New York correspondent to the outstanding newspaper of Mussolini's Fascist regime, at the expense of relegating qualified City College graduates (sometimes with the suspicion that such action might have been related to the fact that they were of Jewish faith) further down the promotion ladder, would cast grave doubt upon the conduct of this particular department's business.

A parallel example is to be found in the case of Dr. Gaston Gille, who, after serving for several years as a lecturer or instructor at City College, was given leave of absence to complete his doctorate at the University of Paris in 1941, at a time when Paris was under the jurisdiction of a puppet regime established by Adolf Hitler—the head of which regime was subsequently imprisoned for life by decree of the French Republic.

It is entirely possible that Dr. Gille (who also served for a time in the French Army) may have completed his study of the French language at Paris in 1941 without becoming seriously infected with any of the doctrines of anti-Semitism which so characterized official Paris of that day. Yet, it would seem to cast considerable doubt upon the conduct of the romance languages department—in which a majority of the students were and are of that particular religious groups against whom the then-existing regime in Paris had directed its most hateful venom—that such a leave should have been granted at that particular time, and have been immediately followed by recommendation for and promotion to an assistant professorship, over the heads of at least three Jewish members of the department with equal or greater seniority, and at least equal academic attainments. This promotion—as also in Errante's case—was soon followed, by Professor Knickerbocker, with a recommendation for a second advancement, to the rank of associate professor—again over the heads of three or more equally qualified Jewish members of the department.

It would appear that much of the doubt that the public continues to feel with regard to the loyalty of the City College administration to established practices of American democracy cannot be wholly allayed until these and other instances of similar type have been fully and publicly investigated.

We commend to your attention therefore an immediate investigation of the entire promotion policy at City College under the no inbreeding rule of the present administration, and with particular reference to the romance languages department.

Such an investigation should consider not only the question of dubious advancements or advancements out-of-turn, as in the instances just cited, but also the circumstances under which at least four members of the faculty in this department were apparently penalized for having spoken out against certain openly anti-Semitic utterances made by the department's chairman.

The equally urgent issues of Negro segregation and inadequate faculty representation, which were partly raised, but never fully investigated, in the case of Dr. William C. Davis, should also be adequately dealt with by your office.

In view of the above considerations, and in view of the record, the League's board of directors, following 3 weeks of intensive review of the whole situation, therefore urgently requests that you institute a complete investigation, on your own, of the entire question of appointment and promotion policies within the faculty of City College, together with instruction or administration policies which tend to limit or affect the basic rights of Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Only in this way will it be possible to meet the grave questions which have already brought our city's largest educational institution into an embarrassing degree of public obloquy.

The world's largest city cannot afford to maintain an educational institution which is even suspected of having succumbed to those practices which have from time to time irreparably harmed other American educational centers, as notably in the instance of the University of Louisiana during the administration of the late Huey Long. These are practices and customs which do not belong in our community, and the traces of which we hope your office will be able to eradicate.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES H. BRIDGER,
Administrative Chairman.
HERMAN HOFFMAN,
Chairman, Board of Directors.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 26, 1950]

INQUIRY SOUGHT IN ALLEGED BIAS AT CITY COLLEGE—ANTI-NAZI LEAGUE CONTENDS MINORITY GROUPS SUFFER IN FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

(By Judith Crist)

A request for a searching independent investigation of anti-democratic practices within the administration of City College has been submitted to State Education Commissioner Francis T. Spaulding by the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League, 165 West Forty-sixth Street, it was learned yesterday.

In a letter to Dr. Spaulding, James H. Sheldon, administrative chairman of the League, asked also for a general review of background educational attitudes, promoting practices, and public policies with respect to intergroup relationships.

The investigation, which Mr. Sheldon said yesterday should be conducted "by a half dozen first-rate educational authorities from out of State," would revolve around two major complaints. Neither of these, Mr. Sheldon said, had been brought before the commissioner in previous cases involving City College.

KNICKERBOCKER INVOLVED

The first has to do with what was termed the discriminatory effect of the college's policy against "inbreeding" on its faculty. The second is concerned with the appointment and subsequent promotion of two members of the numerous languages department by Prof. William E. Knickerbocker, Dr. Spaulding recently cleared Professor Knickerbocker of long-pending charges that he had already made anti-Semitic statements, but his specific actions in the two faculty cases, Mr. Sheldon said, had not been examined by the commissioner.

The college's professed policy of preventing "academic inbreeding" by appointing few City College graduates to its faculty, Mr. Sheldon said, "actually works a discrimination against graduates of City College and particularly against the great majority of those graduates who happen to be of the Jewish faith, as well as the smaller group which happens to belong to the Negro race."

He said that between 80 and 85 percent of the student body is Jewish, while less than 20 percent of the faculty is of that faith. "It is obvious," he said, "that the general pursuit of the principle of 'no inbreeding' means that the majority of City College graduates who are of Jewish faith have vastly less possibility to develop academic careers than is the case for the average Gentile college graduate."

A preliminary inquiry revealed, he said, that in the last year in the chemistry department, 21 persons were recommended by the department for tenure, of whom 14 were Jewish. All 7 of the non-Jews were given tenure but only 6 of the 14 Jews received it from the higher nondepartmental faculty committees that passed on departmental recommendations. In another situation, he said, 8 men, including 6 Jews who were City College graduates, were recommended for tenure. Two Jews—and the two Gentiles—got it.

In the electrical engineering department last year, Mr. Sheldon said, seven tutors who were City College graduates were recommended under the "no inbreeding" policy, he said, five of the tutors, who were Jews, were dismissed by the department for retention. Instead, the two non-Jewish tutors were retained. "That is too large a number," he said, "so be pure accident."

"The 'no-inbreeding' clause," Mr. Sheldon said, "thus becomes nothing but a new name for the 'numerus clausus' [quota system] and other time-worn devices of religious and racial discrimination."

Not only have City College graduates, particularly Jews and Negroes, been discriminated against in appointments and promotions, Mr. Sheldon said, "but in an effort to avoid granting promotions in this group, definite preference has been given, on important occasions, to teachers whose personal histories should have led them to be held in doubt as to their qualifications for advancement in an institution founded on democratic tradition."

CASE OF REPORTER NOTED

Two cases Mr. Sheldon cited to the commissioner were in Professor Knickerbocker's department. The first was of Professor Guido Errante, who was a correspondent from 1932 to 1939 for Il Giornale d'Italia, Virginio Gayda's newspaper that was regarded as a press outlet for Benito Mussolini's regime. Mr. Sheldon said Professor Knickerbocker subsequently had successfully urged Professor Errante's promotion on the ground that his journalistic experience added merit to his case.

The second case was that of Dr. Gaston Gille, whose promotion has also been successfully urged by Professor Knickerbocker. Mr. Sheldon said that Dr. Gille completed his doctorate studies at the University of Paris in 1941 with the full approval of the Vichy regime.

Both men, Mr. Sheldon said, had been promoted over the heads of three or more equally qualified Jewish members of the department.

"It would appear," Mr. Sheldon told the commissioner, "that much of the doubt that the public continues to feel with regard to the loyalty of the City College administration to established practices of American democracy cannot be wholly allayed until these and other instances of similar type have been fully and publicly investigated."

[From the New York Post of March 20, 1950]

ANTI-NAZI GROUP ASKS CCNY PROBE

The long-smouldering controversy over alleged discriminatory teaching at City College was fanned into a new flame today when the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League demanded a sweeping independent investigation of anti-democratic practices within the CCNY administration.

Charging that the officially backed no inbreeding policy in faculty appointments and promotions is but a device for religious and racial discrimination, the League said:

"One result of this policy has been the promotion to a professorship of a man who, while an instructor on the City College staff, served as a correspondent for Mussolini's leading Fascist newspaper, Il Giornale d'Italia.

"Another result has been granting a leave of absence to a second instructor to complete a French doctorate at a university then under the jurisdiction of Hitler's Vichy regime."

The League said the office of New York State commissioner of education Spaulding has so far conducted no investigation of its own into charges of anti-Semitic policies by Prof. William Knickerbocker of CCNY and anti-Negro acts by Dr. William C. Davis.

[From the New York Post of March 23, 1950]

ALLEGAROO AND BIGOTRY, TOO?

I was happy to see that the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League insists on Mr. Spaulding making a genuine investigation into the question of discrimination at City College. I think it is just about time that we brought into light of day exactly what goes on in City College and why it is permitted. At least in New York City, the people have reason to believe that discrimination just won't be tolerated.

STEPHEN A. MARKS.

[From the New York Post of March 27, 1950]

TEACHER QUOTA?

As a graduate of City College, I am glad that the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League is at last trying to bring out the facts concerning the use of "no inbreeding" policy with respect to appointments at the institution. Before I graduated, I had hoped to follow an academic career, but everyone from whom I sought advice advised me against it, pointing out that out-of-town appointments for members of a minority group were violently restricted and that the policy in city institutions was such that only a fraction of those who belonged to a minority group could ever hope to be appointed. With the situation such as it is in out-of-town schools, where does an aspirant for such a career look if not to the colleges maintained by the city of New York? If the people really find out what goes on, the situation will certainly be corrected.

SIDNEY BERNSTEIN.

Informational Broadcasts by Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter addressed to Mr. Robert J. Coar, coordinator, Joint Senate and House Recording Facility, by the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Wayne Coy.

It is my opinion that this communication clarifies the policy of the Commission to a great extent, and is helpful in ascertaining procedure to be followed with respect to informational broadcasts by Members of Congress.

Mr. Coy's letter follows:

FEBRUARY 17, 1950.

Mr. ROBERT J. COAR,
Coordinator, Joint Senate and House Recording Facility,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COAR: I have your letter of February 2, 1950, in which you ask for information concerning the Commission's position with respect to certain transcribed radio programs regularly furnished to local radio stations by Members of Congress. You set out in your letter a quotation of a statement of a station licensee who quotes his Washington attorney as reporting to him certain statements allegedly made with respect to these programs by the enforcement section of the Commission, to the effect that they have always been considered as political broadcasts. The Commission has no enforcement section, and to the best of our information no such general statement which disregards the decisive importance of the specific factual circumstances relevant to each situation has ever been made by any member of the Commission's staff. If you should furnish us with the names of the station licensees and the Washington attorneys quoted, we would be pleased to look into the matter further to ascertain the facts.

We have summarized below the Commission's position with respect to the questions raised by your letter, to the extent that they can be definitely answered on the basis of applicable law and in the absence of specific factual circumstances.

Under the Communications Act of 1934, the selection and presentation of radio program material are generally the responsibility of the individual radio station licensees, subject only to their obligation to conform the operation of their stations to the statutory standard of the public interest, convenience, and necessity. Section 315 of the act provides that where a station allows its facilities to be used by a legally qualified candidate for public office at any election, it must provide equal opportunities for all other legally qualified candidates for that office to use its facilities. But regular broadcasts by Members of Congress to their constituents under circumstances which establish that they are not in connection with an election campaign would not appear to come within section 315, and this provision of the Communications Act does not expressly require that licensees provide equal time to representatives of opposing views in connection with any other types of programs except those covered by section 315. It is important to note, however, that the ascertainment of when an election campaign begins and who is a legally qualified candidate for public office presents questions of fact, which, in all cases, must be resolved by reference to the particular facts and circumstances as well as pertinent State and local statutes. It will depend, therefore, on the particular circumstances involved, whether the broadcast of transcribed speeches by Members of Congress will bring into operation the requirements of section 315. In the light of these problems, the Commission has consistently followed a policy of determining whether a particular case falls within the provisions of section 315 only when the complete facts in an individual case are presented to it.

Moreover, it should be pointed out that the Commission does not determine the programs or persons to be presented by any radio station, and is specifically prohibited by section 326 of the act from exercising any powers of censorship over radio-program material. Its duty to insure that operation of stations is in the public interest, as required by the Communications Act, is performed by periodic review of the over-all applications for renewal of station licenses. The Commission has consistently held that one of the important elements of such operation in the public interest is the presentation of a balanced, well-rounded program service including the expression of representative opposing viewpoints on controversial public issues of interest and importance to the community served by the particular station. At the time of such review, however, we are not concerned with whether a particular station was correct or incorrect in presenting or refusing to present any particular program or person, except as it is one factor in our determination of whether the station's over-all program service demonstrates its ability to serve the public interest. In this connection your attention is called to the Commission's report in the matter of editorializing by broadcast licensees, a copy of which is enclosed.

It is hoped that the foregoing discussion will serve to illuminate the problems covered in your letter. For your information there is enclosed a copy of section 315 of the Communications Act as well as a copy of section 3.190 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations which deal with the question of political broadcasts. If there is any additional information concerning this matter which we can furnish you, please do not hesitate to let us know.

By direction of the Commission:

WAYNE COY, *Chairman.*

Bad Security Risks on the Federal Pay Roll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish every Congressman could find the time and opportunity to read the discussions carried on inside the committee rooms, and especially when the subcommittees of House are considering various issues on current legislation.

Since we are all concerned with foreign affairs and rightly so, an article in the New York Daily News of March 24, 1950, wherein our colleague and personal friend, Representative CLEVENGER, of Ohio, asks some very pertinent questions of Bernard L. Gladieux, executive assistant to Secretary of Commerce Sawyer, this will interest every one of us. You will notice in this discussion that even the Democratic Chairman ROONEY of the subcommittee was quite disgusted with the testimony of Mr. Gladieux.

In considering the employment by the State and Commerce Departments of bad security risks, who is to blame for the employing of this type of person in the first place? Whether they are soft-shouldered on Russia, believe in appeasement, or are homosexuals, the question in my mind is why is such a type of citizen considered for these top positions when there are so many good Americans that we could employ. It would be interesting to know who promotes the hiring of such misfits.

The article follows:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 23.—That secret session of the House Appropriations Committee last February 27 high lights the tremendous problem confronting Americans of both parties when it comes to stamping out bad security risks and traitors who have bored deep into our Government. In particular, a reading of the transcript of the testimony (still with much supersecret data stricken out) reveals a situation we have long complained about.

This is it:

You can kick out a bad security risk from the State Department, for example, and find that he has popped up again on some other Government pay roll. That is particularly true of sex perverts, homosexuals, and those with twisted emotional aberrations. They are susceptible of being blackmailed for national secrets or capable of an emotional attachment for a foreign representative or a cold war opponent.

Back when the shooting war ended, the phonies, the privileged draft dodgers, and the rest of the trash which riddled the Moscow-praising Office of War Information, the UNRRA, civilian aids to Lend-Lease, etc., were, according to public declaration, washed off the public pay roll.

But many of those old familiar names popped up again on the State Department pay roll or overseas in some branch of the civilian government of surrendered Germany or as aids at the various war crimes trials. All strictly phonies; all on the pay roll. And it still goes on.

When the competent Under Secretary of State, John Peurifoy, a month ago told a Senate committee that his security board had fired 91 State Department employees for flagrant sex perversion, he could assure the questioning Senator, STYLES BRIDGES (Republican, New Hampshire) that none of them had slipped back into the State Department, but he had no way of being sure that they hadn't got into some other Federal set-up.

That was testimony on the Senate side of Capitol Hill. Now it's revealed that over on the House side, at the same time, the problem of the security danger of homosexuals in Government was being taken up by a subcommittee headed by JOHN J. ROONEY, of New York. This time, the investigation was directed not at State but at Commerce—where a foreign spy could find a ripe field of operation in Commerce's National Bureau of Standards, in Foreign Trade, in Civil Aeronautics, the Weather Bureau, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Bernard L. Gladieux, executive assistant to Secretary of Commerce Sawyer, and in charge of security, was in the witness chair. When the unhappy Gladieux stepped down from the stand, he had been hauled over the coals by Democratic Chairman ROONEY and Republican KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska, and CLIFF CLEVENGER, of Ohio.

CALLS COMMERCE STORY INCREDIBLE

ROONEY had kicked the administration's security expert in Commerce brutally—and stated bluntly that in his view Gladieux's testimony was incredible when he said that his operations had failed to uncover a single sex pervert risk among the 46,000 employees.

But it was the tough CLEVENGER who hauled out for the record the fact that because of the directive issued by President Truman, which impounds in secrecy evidence on security dug up by department investigators, the bad security risks kicked out of one department can get another job in the Government—and have.

We quote from the record:

CLEVENGER. "The reason I am asking this (whether you would put other departments on notice in the cases of individuals dropped for sex perversion) is this: It is the third year I have gone through this situation. The identical situation came up a year ago. My question as to whether that was done (notifying other Government departments) is on the record. The forthright reply by the officer was that the President's directive was that this should not be done."

RED HERRING OR DEAD MACKEREL?

"Now, I want to say this, I am not so sure that the Chief Executive in the White House knows the difference between a red herring and a long-dead mackerel, lying in the moonlight, shining and stinking and stinking and shining.

"But I do want to make sure that if we find any more of this sort of tripe in our Government employment that they do not go back on the pay roll in any Government department. After the security effort has been made and these persons are discovered and admit their guilt, I do not think there is any right to whitewash them and let them be reemployed in some other department that has not checked up on them. I'm sticking my neck out, but it's about time somebody did because these people are fooling with the security of our country."

The unhappy Gladieux muttered something about thoroughly agreeing with the Chinaman's sentiments and said his outfit had taken every reasonable precaution to warn other departments about homosexual risks, when the Republican broke in:

"So did this fine officer from this other department. All respect to him, but by presidential directive he was forbidden to do so. I sympathize with him, but I also sympathize with my country when all of us are trying to bolster up its security."

Gladieux got little sympathy from the chairman, ROONEY. When Sawyer's assistant insisted that he had been diligent and cautious in investigating loyalty in the Commerce Department and wound up with a flowery defense and praise of Congress, ROONEY snapped at him:

"That is so much nice language, and to me it doesn't mean a thing. You came up here to acquaint us with the situation in the Department of Commerce. The results are nil. We have not had the cooperation from you that we had from the State Department. You refused to take us into your confidence. I have tried to handle it in an amicable way. You reacted in the other direction. Now we are far apart and will stay that way. They speak of communism in the Department of State. I think the Communist situation is in the Department of Commerce."

Flood Control and River and Harbor Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following table:

List of projects showing 1951 budget estimates, House committee allowance, and congressional district

FLOOD CONTROL, GENERAL

Project	Approved budget estimate	House committee allowance	Congressional district
Arizona: Tucson	[illegible]	[illegible]	2.
Arkansas:			
Blakely Mountain Reservoir	3,300,000	2,300,000	4 and 6.
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo.	18,000,000	14,000,000	8.
Narrows Reservoir	1,730,000	1,730,000	4.
Nimrod Reservoir	130,000	----------	8.
Norfork Reservoir, Ark. and Mo.	175,000	130,000	3, Arkansas; 7, Missouri.
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La.	700,000	500,000	4 and 7, Arkansas; 1, Texas; 4 and 5, Louisiana.
West of Morrilton	500,000	----------	8.
California:			
Cherry Valley Reservoir	300,000	450,000	8.
Farmington Reservoir	1,624,000	800,000	8.
Folsom Reservoir	6,500,000	6,000,000	3.
Isabella Reservoir	2,500,000	2,000,000	10.
Los Angeles County drainage area (exclusive of Whittier Narrows Reservoir).	9,500,000	7,500,000	21.
Merced County stream group	254,000	380,000	9 and 11.
Pine Flat Reservoir	12,500,000	10,000,000	9.
Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries.	1,000,000	750,000	1, 2, and 3.
Whittier Narrows Reservoir	5,800,000	5,000,000	21.
Connecticut:			
Mansfield Hollow Reservoir	2,800,000	2,800,000	2.
Winsted	88,000	[1] 80,000	5.
Florida: Central and southern Florida.	7,500,000	5,000,000	6 and 4.
Georgia: Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C.	22,000,000	18,000,000	10, Georgia; 3, South Carolina.
Idaho: Lucky Peak Reservoir	5,000,000	3,750,000	2.
Illinois:			
Columbia drainage and levee district.	170,000	100,000	20.
Choctaw, Nameoki, and Venice drainage and levee district.	80,000	[1] 20,000	23.
Decorah and Fountain Bluff drainage and levee district.	130,000	80,000	20.
East Cape Girardeau and Chalk Level drainage district.	420,000	400,000	20.
East St. Louis and vicinity	300,000	300,000	22.
Farm Creek Reservoir	1,000,000	800,000	18.
Galena	296,000	[1] 280,000	16.
Grand tower drainage and levee district.	300,000	300,000	20.
Miller Pond drainage and levee district.	117,700	110,000	20.
Prairie du Rocher and vicinity	200,000	[1] 100,000	20.
Rosiclare	385,000	[1] 350,000	24.
Wood River drainage and levee district.	300,000	350,000	22.
Indiana:			
Cagles Mill Reservoir	2,000,000	1,400,000	6 and 7.
Cannelton	140,000	115,000	8.
Evansville	300,000	300,000	8.
Indianapolis	335,000	400,000	11.
Lawrenceburg	300,000	340,000	8.
New Albany	2,300,000	2,000,000	8.
Iowa:			
Coralville Reservoir	4,500,000	3,500,000	1 and 2.
Little Sioux River	300,000	250,000	7 and 8.
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska. (See Kansas.)			
Chariton River, Iowa and Mo. (See Missouri.)			
Kansas:			
Fall River Reservoir	80,000	(2)	4.
Hutchinson	750,000	600,000	5.
Kansas City, Mo. and Kans.	7,000,000	3,000,000	3, 4, and 5, Missouri; 3, Kansas.
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska.	5,000,000	5,000,000	7 and 8, Iowa; 1 and 2, Kansas; 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, and 12, Missouri; 1, 2, and 3, Nebraska.
Wichita and Valley Center	800,000	100,000	4.
Hulah Reservoir, Okla. and Kans. (See Oklahoma.)			

See footnotes at end of table.

Project	Approved budget estimate	House committee allowance	Congressional district
Kentucky:			
Ashland	$1,733,000	$1,100,000	8.
Covington	2,300,000	1,500,000	5.
Dewey Reservoir	1,340,500	(2)	7.
Louisville	4,500,000	3,500,000	3.
Maysville	800,000	600,000	8.
Newport	733,000	[1] 700,000	5.
Wolf Creek Reservoir	22,100,000	[1] 19,000,000	9.
Louisiana:			
Bayou Teche and Vermilion River.	428,000	[1] 375,000	3 and 7.
Mermentau River	1,000,000	800,000	Do.
Shreveport	150,000	[1] 120,000	4.
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La. (See Arkansas.)			
Maryland:			
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va.	1,500,000	1,080,000	6, Maryland; 2, West Virginia.
Savage River Reservoir	1,029,000	[1] 950,000	6.
Massachusetts:			
Adams	300,000	250,000	1.
Knightville Reservoir	50,000	[1] 45,000	1.
North Adams	500,000	350,000	1.
Michigan: Red Run	505,000	[1] 490,000	7 and 17.
Minnesota:			
Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers.	1,482,100	[1] 1,350,000	9.
Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn.	1,800,000	1,000,000	9.
Missouri:			
Chariton River, Iowa and Mo. (See Kansas.)	1,461,000	(2)	1 and 2.
Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans. (See Kansas.)			
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska. (See Kansas.)			
Perry County levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 3.	405,000	300,000	8, Missouri; 26, Illinois.
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.)			
Norfork Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.)			
Nebraska:			
Harlan County Reservoir	18,000,000	12,000,000	1.
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska. (See Kansas.)			
New Mexico: Jemez Canyon Reservoir.	1,000,000	500,000	1 and 2 (at large).
New York:			
Hoosick Falls	500,000	[1] 500,000	33.
Hornell	500,000	450,000	38.
Montour Falls	370,000	[1] 340,000	29.
Olean	1,300,000	800,000	45.
Portville	1,300,000	[1] 850,000	43.
North Carolina: Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C.	30,000,000	27,000,000	4 and 5, Virginia; 3, 4, and 5, North Carolina.
North Dakota:			
Baldhill Reservoir	400,000	(2)	1 and 2 (at large).
Garrison Reservoir	35,000,000	27,000,000	Do.
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)			
Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota.)			
Ohio:			
Dillon Reservoir	2,500,000	1,000,000	15 and 17.
Massillon	624,000	(2)	16.
Muskingum River Reservoirs	1,000,000	800,000	11, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18.
West Fork of Mill Creek Reservoir.	1,900,000	800,000	2.
Oklahoma:			
Canton Reservoir	275,000	[1] 118,000	6.
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla.	1,100,000	[1] 300,000	3, Oklahoma; 4 and 13, Texas.
Fort Gibson Reservoir	9,000,000	5,000,000	1 and 2.
Great Salt Plains Reservoir	45,000	[1] 40,000	8.
Hulah Reservoir, Okla. and Kans.	1,200,000	[1] 600,000	1, Oklahoma; 2, Kan-

List of projects showing 1951 budget estimates, House committee allowance, and congressional district—Continued

FLOOD CONTROL, GENERAL—continued

Project	Approved budget estimate	House committee allowance	Congressional district
Oklahoma—Continued			
Kaw	$125,400	[1] $125,000	8.
Oklahoma City floodway	300,000	----------	5.
Oologah Reservoir	900,000	----------	1.
Polecat Creek	150,000	[1] 100,000	4.
Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir	5,000,000	5,000,000	2.
Winter Reservoir	411,300	(2)	3.
Oregon:			
Detroit Reservoir	10,000,000	13,000,000	1 and 4.
Dorena Reservoir	800,000	720,000	4.
Fern Ridge Reservoir	50,000	50,000	4.
Lookout Point Reservoir	12,000,000	10,000,000	4.
Umpqua River and tributaries	55,400	50,000	4.
Willamette River (bank protection).	500,000	200,000	1 and 4.
Pennsylvania:			
Conemaugh River Reservoir	8,000,000	7,000,000	26 and 27.
East Branch Clarion River Reservoir.	2,000,000	1,500,000	15 and 19.
Sunbury	1,200,000	850,000	12.
Williamsport	1,200,000	900,000	12.
York	90,100	80,000	21.
South Carolina: Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C. (See Georgia.)			
South Dakota:			
Fall River Basin	500,000	400,000	2.
Fort Randall Reservoir	37,500,000	22,000,000	1 and 2.
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.	8,000,000	5,000,000	Do.
Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota.)			
Total, construction	467,877,000	327,326,000	

RIVER AND HARBOR

Project	Approved budget estimate	House committee allowance	Congressional district
Alabama: Demopolis lock and dam	$4,000,000	$[illegible]	1 and 6.
Alaska:			
Nome Harbor	1,196,000	800,000	Delegate.
Wrangell Narrows	750,000	350,000	Do.
Arkansas: Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma.	850,000	500,000	3 and 6.
California:			
Crescent City Harbor	1,000,000	770,000	1.
Sacramento River 30-foot ship channel.	2,500,000	1,800,000	3, 4, and 8.
San Diego River and Mission Bay.	3,500,000	1,400,000	23.
District of Columbia: Potomac River, north side of Washington Channel.	100,000	75,000	
Florida:			
Jim Woodruff lock and dam	3,000,000	3,500,000	3, Florida; 8, Alabama; 2, Georgia.
Jacksonville Harbor	822,000	700,000	4.
Tampa Harbor	200,000	100,000	1.
Georgia:			
Savannah Harbor	500,000	400,000	1.
Buford Dam	1,000,000	400,000	8.
Illinois:			
Illinois waterway mile 0 to 291	1,000,000	700,000	1 through 20.
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers:			
Chain of Rocks	8,000,000	5,000,000	25 and 28, Illinois; 10, 11, 12, 13, Missouri.
Regulating works	800,000	750,000	
St. Anthony Falls, Minn.	1,500,000	900,000	3 and 4, Minnesota.
Keokuk Lock, Iowa	1,300,000	----------	1, Iowa; 20, Illinois; 1, Missouri.
Other work	858,000	800,000	2, Iowa; 19, Illinois; 9, Missouri.
Ohio River locks and dams (exclusive of New Cumberland locks and dams, Ohio).	500,000	450,000	8, Indiana; 2, Kentucky.
Ohio River open-channel work	300,200	200,000	1 and 4, West Virginia; 10, 15, 18, and 19, Ohio.
Iowa: Missouri River, Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa.	4,000,000	3,000,000	3, Missouri; 2 and 3, Nebraska; 7 and 8, Iowa.
Kentucky: Cheatham lock and dam, Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.	3,600,000	1,900,000	6 and 7, Tennessee; 1, Kentucky.
Louisiana:			
Calcasieu River and Pass	780,000	600,000	7, Louisiana.
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the Mexican border (New Orleans district): Algiers cut-off.	8,000,000	3,000,000	1 and 2.
Pearl River, La. and Miss.	750,000	600,000	6, Louisiana; 4, Mississippi.
Waterway from Empire to the Gulf of Mexico.	116,000	80,000	1.
Maine: Portland Harbor	94,000	80,000	1.
Maryland: Baltimore Harbor and channels.	800,000	800,000	1 through 8.
Massachusetts:			
Boston Harbor	250,000	200,000	8 and 10 through 12.
Fall River Harbor	250,000	(2)	10.
Michigan:			
Port Sanilac Harbor	150,700	300,000	7.
St. Marys River	1,300,000	1,200,000	11.
Missouri: Missouri River, Kansas City to the mouth.	15,500,000	18,200,000	2, 4, 5, and 6.
Montana: Fort Peck, Missouri River.	1,775,000	1,200,000	2.
New Jersey:			
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers.	1,300,000	1,000,000	5 through 11, New Jersey; 2 through 28, New York.
New York and New Jersey Channels.	5,000,000	2,200,000	3 and 5 through 14, New Jersey; 2 through 28, New York.
New York:			
Buffalo Harbor	1,000,000	500,000	42 through 44.
Great Lakes to Hudson River waterway.	1,000,000	750,000	31 through 44.
Hudson River channel	530,000	250,000	3 and 5 through 14, New Jersey; 2 through 28, New York.
New York Harbor, entrance channels and anchorage areas.	400,000	800,000	Do.
Ohio:			
Cleveland Harbor	3,000,000	2,500,000	20, 21, and 22.
Lorain Harbor	50,000	[1] 50,000	14.
Oregon:			
Columbia River and tributaries above Celilo Falls to Kennewick, Wash.	256,000	[1] 225,000	2 and 3, Oregon; 3 and 4, Washington.
Columbia River at Bonneville	500,000	500,000	3, Oregon; 3, Washington.
Coos Bay	1,600,000	750,000	4, Oregon.
McNary lock and dam	15,000,000	16,000,000	2, Oregon; 4, Washington.
Pennsylvania:			
Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va.:			
Lock 2, Pennsylvania	4,750,000	3,750,000	38 to 38, Pennsylvania.
Morgantown lock and dam, West Virginia.	2,000,000	1,800,000	1 and 2, West Virginia.
Schuylkill River (mine removal)	4,000,000	2,500,000	1 through 7.
South Carolina: Georgetown Harbor	600,000	[2] 440,000	6.
Texas:			
Houston Ship Channel	500,000	750,000	8 and 9.
Intracoastal Waterway between Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the Mexican border (Galveston district).	2,000,000	1,500,000	2, 5, 9, 14, and 15.
Sabine-Neches waterway	1,000,000	1,000,000	9.
Trinity River Channel to Liberty	1,000,000	750,000	2.
Virginia:			
Norfolk Harbor	1,472,000	800,000	1, 2, and 4.
York Spit Channel	450,000	300,000	1 through 4, Maryland.
Virgin Islands: St. Thomas Harbor	1,000,000	----------	Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.
Washington:			
Chief Joseph Dam	17,000,000	13,000,000	5.
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River	971,000	750,000	2.
Total, construction	150,704,000	105,886,000	

[1] House committee report indicates project should be completed with amount recommended in bill.
[2] House committee report indicates project should be completed with funds heretofore appropriated.

Lobbying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an article by Norman J. Futor, which recently appeared in 10 Federal Bar Journal 366, with slight revisions. In general, Mr. Futor's position is that:

First. Section 307 is a section which broadens and amplifies section 305 rather than restricting or limiting it.

Second. In cases in which applicability is predicated on expenditures, section 307 has no bearing on section 305.

Third. The distinctions between section 305 and section 308 are "distinctions without a difference"—differences in form rather than differences of substance.

Fourth. Sections 305 and 308 have concurrent applicability but have virtually identical reporting requirements.

Fifth. Neither section 305 nor 308 are limited in any way by any "principal purpose" concept—the only limitation on the applicability of either section is the doctrine of "de minimis non curat lex."

Sixth. The act is constitutional.

Seventh. Section 308 is not affected in any way by section 307.

It is interesting to note that the constitutionality of the act was sustained on March 14, 1950. In the case of *United States* v. *Roger C. Slaughter* (Criminal No. 1433–1448), defendant had filed a motion to dismiss the indictment on the ground that, inter alia, the Lobbying Act is unconstitutional as being so vague and uncertain as to violate the fifth and sixth amendments to the Constitution and that it offends the first amendment "because it deprives the people of civil liberties thereby protected." In dismissing defendant's motion, and sustaining the indictment—charging defendant with violating section 308 of the act—Judge Schweinhaut rejected the defendant's attack on the constitutionality of the statute.

The judge said that section 308—may stand alone and apart from other provisions and * * * is not on its face unconstitutional. * * * The section does not abridge constitutionally guaranteed privileges (freedom of speech, press, petition, etc.) since it leaves everyone free to exercise those rights, calling upon him only to say for whom he is speaking, who pays him, how much, and the scope in general of his activity with regard to legislation. This, the Congress should and, in the court's opinion, does have the right to demand.

The article follows:

AN ANALYSIS OF THE FEDERAL LOBBYING ACT[1]

(By Norman J. Futor[2])

INTRODUCTION

A basic legislative problem is the adjustment of the conflicting interests represented by the divers State and National organizations of interest groups: teachers organizations, labor organizations, farm organizations, religious organizations, veterans organizations, pension organizations, business organizations, real-estate organizations, public utilities, and so forth.

A legislator knows: (1) That any interest group believes that its program is meritorious and in the public interest; and (2) That an interest group may oppose him at the next election if he does not vote in accord with its views. In the light of these considerations, it is difficult to make any sense out of those State statutes which purport to require that discussion of legislation with a legislator shall be limited to discussion on the merits.

In the course of gaining election and reelection to office, a legislator has occasion to acquaint himself with the legislative programs of the various interest groups and to appraise the degree of concern which is manifested in such programs by the voters of his district. Unless voters of a legislator's own district display serious concern as to a particular legislative issue, the legislator will not be seriously concerned with the attitude of a particular interest group on that issue. For that reason, the State and national organizations of many interest groups devote considerable effort to stimulating their members (as well as members of the general public) to display a serious and intense interest in the sponsored legislation, so that the legislators may become aware of such interest. Such organizations undertake direct mail campaigns, advertising campaigns, and other campaigns calculated to stimulate activity at the local level.

"Lobbying" is a word which may conveniently be used to designate the processes used by organizations to stimulate such activity by their members (and by the general public) as will impress legislators with their serious interest in the sponsored legislation. "Lobbyist" is a word which may conveniently be used to designate such organizations and to designate their employees (who may be individuals, firms, or corporations). No good purpose is served by those State statutes which define "lobbying" as an attempt to influence legislation by unlawful activities. Since unlawful activities are already covered by other statutes, the word "lobbying" had best be reserved for attempts to influence legislation by lawful means.

In drafting a statute to deal with lobbying, it is not possible to distinguish between good organizations and bad organizations, or good legislation and bad legislation, or good lobbyists and bad lobbyists. Such distinctions can be made only on a subjective basis; there are no objective criteria on which such distinctions can be made. And for a statute, objective criteria are required.

The constructive approach to the problem is to make available, to the legislators and to the general public, statements as to the receipts and expenditures of the interest groups (and their organizations and employees) in connection with their attempts to influence legislation. Statements as to receipts (and sources thereof) and expenditures—and recipients thereof—will give some indication as to what the organizations actually do. It was to require such statements that the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act was enacted.

I. NATURE, SCOPE, AND VALIDITY OF REQUIREMENTS

A. Reports and identifying data: The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act requires the filing of reports in connection with the financing of attempts to influence legislation. It is well for all reports to include such identifying data as name and address, nature of business—and name of employer, if any—as well as data on legislative interests, anticipated duration thereof, and publications issued in connection therewith. Some but not all of such identifying data are expressly required by statute, but, by reason of the subject matter of the statute, all of such data serve to meet the requirement of adequate identification—a requirement inherent in the concept of reporting. The act requires that organizations and individuals shall—before beginning activities—register by filing a preliminary report (section 308); and that—after beginning activities—they shall file, for each calendar quarter, a quarterly report (secs. 305 and 308):[3]

(1) The preliminary report states the nature of the anticipated expenses, and (if for an employee) states what the reimbursement is to be for services and for expenses.

(2) The quarterly report is required by both sections 305 and 308 to contain certain financial data; i. e., data as to receipts[4] (in-

[1] Trial attorney, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice; formerly assistant attorney general of Oklahoma. For a short time the author assisted in the lobbying investigation conducted by Irving R. Kaufman (then special assistant to the Attorney General), now United States district judge (Southern District of New York), and is indebted to Judge Kaufman for acquainting him with many of the problems discussed in this article; however, the views expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily represent either the views of Judge Kaufman or the position of the Department of Justice.

[1] Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (60 Stat. 839; 2 U. S. C., ch. 8A):

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 302. When used in this title—

(a) The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution.

(b) The term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure.

(c) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons.

(d) The term "Clerk" means the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States.

(e) The term "legislation" means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House.

DETAILED ACCOUNTS OF CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 303. (a) It shall be the duty of every person who shall in any manner solicit or receive a contribution to any organization or fund for the purposes hereinafter designated to keep a detailed and exact account of—

(1) all contributions of any amount or of any value whatsoever;

(2) the name and address of every person making any such contribution of $500 or more and the date thereof;

(3) all expenditures made by or on behalf of such organization or fund; and

(4) the name and address of every person to whom any such expenditure is made and the date thereof.

(b) It shall be the duty of such person to obtain and keep a receipted bill, stating the particulars, for every expenditure of such funds exceeding $10 in amount, and to preserve all receipted bills and accounts required to be kept by this section for a period of at least 2 years from the date of the filing of the statement containing such items.

RECEIPTS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 304. Every individual who receives a contribution of $500 or more for any of the purposes hereinafter designated shall within 5 days after receipt thereof rendered to the person or organization for which such contribution was received a detailed account thereof, including the name and address of the person making such contribution and the date on which received.

STATEMENTS TO BE FILED WITH CLERK OF HOUSE

SEC. 305. (a) Every person receiving any contributions or expending any money for the purposes designated in subparagraphs (a) or (b) of section 307 shall file with the Clerk between the first and tenth day of each calendar quarter a statement containing complete as of the day next preceding the date of filing—

(1) the name and address of each person who has made a contribution of $500 or more not mentioned in the preceding report; except that the first report filed pursuant to this title shall contain the name and address of each person who has made any contribution of $500 or more to such person since the effective date of this title;

(2) the total sum of the contributions made to or for such person during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (1);

(3) the total sum of all contributions made to or for such person during the calendar year;

(4) the name and address of each person to whom an expenditure in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $10 or more has been made by or on behalf of such person, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

(5) the total sum of all expenditures made by or on behalf of such person during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (4);

(6) the total sum of expenditures made by or on behalf of such person during the calendar year.

(b) The statements required to be filed by subsection (a) shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous statement only the amount need be carried forward.

STATEMENT PRESERVED FOR 2 YEARS

SEC. 306. A statement required by this title to be filed with the Clerk—

(a) shall be deemed properly filed when deposited in an established post office within the prescribed time, duly stamped, registered, and directed to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, Washington, District of Columbia, but in the event it is not received, a duplicate of such statement shall be promptly filed upon notice by the Clerk of its nonreceipt;

(b) shall be preserved by the Clerk for a period of 2 years from the date of filing, shall constitute part of the public records of his office, and shall be open to public inspection.

PERSONS TO WHOM APPLICABLE

SEC. 307. The provisions of this title shall apply to any person (except a political committee as defined in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and duly organized State or local committees of a political party), who by himself, or through any agent or employee or other persons in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, solicits, collects, or receives money or any other thing of value to be used principally to aid, or the principal purpose of which person is to aid, in the accomplishment of any of the following purposes:

(a) The passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States.

(b) To influence, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States.

REGISTRATION WITH SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND CLERK OF THE HOUSE

SEC. 308. (a) Any person who shall engage himself for pay or for any consideration for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States shall, before doing anything in furtherance of such object, register with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate and shall give to those officers in writing and under oath, his name and business address, the name and address of the person by whom he is employed, and in whose interest he appears or works, the duration of such employment, how much he is paid and is to receive, by whom he is paid or is to be paid, how much he is to be paid for expenses, and what expenses are to be included. Each such person so registering shall, between the first and tenth day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk and Secretary a detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter in carrying on his work; to whom paid; for what purposes; and the names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials; and the proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any person who merely appears before a committee of the Congress of the United States in support of or opposition to legislation; nor to any public official acting in his official capacity; nor in the case of any newspaper or other regularly published periodical (including any individual who owns, publishes, or is employed by any such newspaper or periodical) which in the ordinary course of business publishes news items, editorials, or other comments, or paid advertisements, which directly or indirectly urge the passage or defeat of legislation, if such newspaper, periodical, or individual, engages in no further or other activities in connection with the passage or defeat of such legislation, other than to appear before a committee of the Congress of the United States in support of or in opposition to such legislation.

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REPORTS AND STATEMENTS TO BE MADE UNDER OATH

SEC. 309. All reports and statements required under this title shall be made under oath, before an officer authorized by law to administer oaths.

PENALTIES

SEC. 310. (a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this title, shall, upon conviction, be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(b) In addition to the penalties provided for in subsection (a), any person convicted of the misdemeanor specified therein is prohibited, for a period of 3 years from the date of such conviction, from attempting to influence, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any proposed legislation or from appearing before a committee of the Congress in support of or opposition to proposed legislation; and any person who violates any provision of this subsection shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a felony, and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

EXEMPTION

SEC. 311. The provisions of this title shall not apply to practices or activities regulated by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act nor be construed as repealing any portion of said Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

(Sec. 1 (b) of Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Aug. 2, 1946, ch. 753, 60 Stat. 812) is a separability clause applicable to all titles of that act. The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act is title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.)

[2] Particularly in parts II and III of this article, considerable attention will be given to secs. 306, 307, and 308. Detailed treatment does not appear necessary in the case of secs. 303 and 304, and the following statement should suffice:

Sec. 303 requires the keeping of a record of certain data as to receipts and expenditures. Without the keeping of an adequate record, it would not be possible to file adequate quarterly reports.

Sec. 304 requires that, within 5 days after receipt of a $500 contribution, an agent must notify his principal of: (a) amount received; (b) date of receipt; (c) name and address of contributor. Were it not for sec. 304, a principal might prefer that the agent not give formal notice of the contributors' names; then the principal could file its quarterly reports without giving the names, and if a question were ever raised, the principal could plead that it had assumed that the lump sum which had been turned over by the agent had been received in the form of small contributions; and, in such a case, the agent could obligingly admit that he had failed to communicate full data to the principal. By penalizing an agent who delays more than 5 days in giving notice of all the data in question, sec. 304 serves to discourage such maneuvering.

[4] Receipts: In this context the terms "receipts" and "contributions" may be used interchangeably. "Contribution" is defined as "that which is contributed" and "contribute" is defined as: "to give (money or other aid) for a special object" (Webster's New International Dictionary; 18 C. J. S. 1318). "'Contribution' * * * may be employed as equivalent to, or synonymous with 'assessment' * * * and 'dues' * * *" (18 C. J. S. 1 citing *Jones* v. *Loosen Mut. Ben. Assn.*, 109 NE 254, 258, 237 Ill. 431, and *Mueller* v. *Grand Cons. U. A. O. D.*, 72 NW 48, 69 Minn. 326). Thus, things of value con-

cluding contributions and loans[1]), sources[2] thereof, expenditures[3] (including loans[4]),

tributed to organizations and individuals may be considered as having been paid to or received by them and include such items as fees, salaries, and commissions received by them. The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, including printed or duplicated matter. When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual, for such printed or duplicated matter, is a contribution. Sec. 302 (a) of the act, dealing with "contribution," does not purport to limit the definition of the term, but extends its application as follows:

Sec. 302 (a): "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution."

Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes. (See note 5.)

[4] Loans received are to be reported. (See note 3.) But since repayment will be involved, loan transactions are to be kept separate from other items of receipt or expenditure. In order that there may be a coherent running account in the quarterly report, the following are to be indicated: (1) Total now owed to others on account of loans; (2) borrowed from others during this quarter; (3) repaid to others during this quarter.

[5] Sources of receipts: It is required that the report identify each contributor whose contributions, from January 1 through the current quarter, total $500 or more.

Salary, commission, or fee can be considered a contribution for personal services, but identification in such case is accomplished when the contributor is named as employer.

An employee is to file, each quarter, as many reports as he has employers; except that: (1) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, by all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (2) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single report—naming both persons as employers—is to be filed each quarter.

[6] Sec. 302 (b): "The term 'expenditures' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure."

Expenditures involve such items as public relations and advertising services; wages, salaries, commissions, and fees; contributions to other persons; printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost; office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.); telephone and telegraph; travel and taxi; lodging, food, and entertainment.

[7] Loans made to other persons are to be reported. (See note 6.) But since repayment will be involved, loan transactions are to be kept separate from other items of expenditure or receipt. In order that there may be a coherent running account in the quarterly report, the following are to be indicated: (1) Total now owed to person filing; (2) lent to others during this quarter; (3) repayment received during this quarter.

[8] Recipients of expenditures: The report is to specify name and address of each recipient of an expenditure (including loans), and the date, amount, and purpose thereof. Section 305 provides a $10 limitation while section 308 provides no express limitation. But under the maxim de minimis non curat lex, no express limitation is necessary in the case of a person receiving less than $10 in the entire calendar year—such an item is too inconsequential to require identification.

[9] The term "person" as used in the Lobbying Act includes organizations as well as individuals. For the statutory definition of "person," see sec. 302 (c) of the act, set forth in note 1. For the statutory definition of "legislation," see sec. 302 (e) of the act, set forth in note 1.

[10] The distinctions to be made between secs. 305 and 308 are "distinctions without a difference"—see part II of this article, particularly subdivisions "C" and "D" thereof. See also note 64.

[11] *Bristol-Myers Co.* v. *Lit Bros.* (336 Pa. 81, 6A. 2d 843, 848 (1939)): "The court is not bound to a strictness at once harsh and pedantic in the application of statutes. The law permits the qualification implied in the ancient maxim, de minimis non curat lex. Where there are irregularities of very slight consequence, it does not intend that the infliction of penalties should be inflexibly severe. If the deviation were a mere trifle, which, if continued in practice would weigh little or nothing in the public interest, it might properly be overlooked."

[12] *United States* v. *Hocking Valley Ry. Co.* (194 Fed. 234, 249, 250 (N. D. Ohio 1911)).

[13] *Natl. Labor Relations Bd.* v. *Cowell Portland C. Co.* (108 F. 2d 198, 201 (CCA 9th, 1939)): "The quantity of cement shipped out of State was not de minimis merely because it is but a small percentage of respondent's total sales. Otherwise, we would have the anomaly of one plant under Federal regulation because exporting its entire product of 14,000 barrels while alongside it another competing plant under State regulation because, though shipping the same amount of 14,000 barrels, they constituted, say, but 4 percent of its product."

and recipients[8] thereof[9]. Compliance with both sections 305 and 308 can be accomplished by a single report.[10]

B. De minimis non curat lex: By reason of the de minimis doctrine, there can be no prosecution under the Lobbying Act for failure to file reports, in case only trivial amounts are involved in the attempt to influence legislation[11]—just as there can be no prosecution under the Interstate Commerce Act in the case of discrimination in rates, when the amount involved is trivial. In *United States* v. *Hocking Valley Ry. Co.*,[12] the court sustained an indictment charging a discrimination in rates in violation of the Interstate Commerce Act. The indictment had been attacked on the ground that the Interstate Commerce Act was too broad in scope, in that "mazes of complaints, involving matters of little consequence," could arise. But the court held that this fact presented no "occasion for alarm," since—

"Criminal law, as well as civil, honors the maxim 'De minimis non curat lex' which has controlling application to the enforcement of [such] a statute."

It has been held that the value of 14,000 barrels of cement could not be considered de minimis merely because it constituted only 4 percent of the manufacturer's product.[13] On the other hand, it has been held that a $150 loss, resulting from a trustee's erroneous extension of credit, should be considered de minimis in view of the fact that the trustee supervised a vast amount of funds.[14]

C. Definiteness: The Lobbying Act would appear to be sufficiently definite. In the *Hocking Valley* case, supra, the Interstate Commerce Act was also attacked on the ground that it was "void for indefiniteness" because "the law leaves it to each jury to determine the scope of its operation, and makes possible that in the same state of facts one jury may find an offense and another nothing reprehensible, and therefore one engaging in practices susceptible [of being characterized as unlawful] * * * cannot know in advance whether he is violating the law."

But the court held that such a contention "overlooks the function of the court in an attempt to enforce the law criminally. It is for the court to first pass upon the application of the law to the facts which a prosecution offers against a defendant. The proper performance of this duty leaves to the jury no latitude for speculation on the question which is the court's alone."

D. Constitutionality: It can reasonably be asserted that the Lobbying Act is constitutional. But because it embraced a field which had not theretofore been the subject of Federal legislation, there are those who have looked on the act with suspicion. For some people, "unfamiliar" tends to be synonymous with "void for indefiniteness" and "unconstitutional." Until the newness had worn off, Workmen's Compensation statutes were held unconstitutional in many jurisdictions.

For many years, a large number of States have had statutes requiring registration by those attempting to influence legislation, and none of such statutes has ever been held unconstitutional. The Kentucky statute was held constitutional in the following language:

"The Bill of Rights declares it to be an inherent and inalienable right of all men to apply to those invested with the power of government for all proper purposes by petition, address, or remonstrance. There is no attempt in this law to restrict the legitimate exercise of that right. * * *

"To protect its members, and for its own information, the legislature undoubtedly had the right to require the registration of special interests and to regulate their activities."[15]

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act[16]—on which the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act was patterned[17]—has been held constitutional.[18]

E. Income-tax exemption: An income-tax exemption is (by 26 U. S. C., sec. 101 (6)) granted to certain types of organizations, "no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation." The mere act—of filing reports pursuant to the Lobbying Act—does not, per se, indicate that the activity of attempting to influence legislation is such a substantial part of such organization's activities as to deprive such organization of the tax exemption.

[14] *Wilson* v. *Kable* (177 Va. 668, 15 S. E. 2d 56 (1941)), eighth syllabus: "Under the de minimis doctrine that trustee who supervised vast amounts of funds for military school erroneously authorized extension of credit to instructor, resulting in loss of $150 of school funds, would not constitute a breach of trust which would authorise trustee's removal or liability against trustee for such loss."

[15] *Campbell* v. *Commonwealth* (229 Ky. 264, 271, 17 S. W. 2d 227, 230 (1929)).

[16] 43 Stat. 1070 et seq.; 2 U. S. C., ch. 8.

[17] See part II (A) of this article.

[18] *Burroughs* v. *United States*, (290 U. S. 534 (1934)). See also *ex parte Yarborough* (110 U. S. 651 (1884)).

II. ORIGINS AND APPLICABILITY OF THE ACT

A. Origins and applicability in general[19]

Introductory: An inquiry into the origins of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act requires that attention be given to an adaptation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, which was introduced as H. R. 11223 (74th Cong.), February 17, 1936. The nine sections of H. R. 11223 were combined with a section adapted from S. 2512 (74th Cong.) to form H. R. 11663 (74th Cong.) introduced March 6, 1936. Two significantly different versions of H. R. 11663 came to a vote in the House of Representatives in the Seventy-fourth Congress: The original version of H. R. 11663 (hereinafter referred to as "narrow 11663") had narrow applicability provisions, while the amended version of H. R. 11663 (hereinafter referred to as "broad 11663") had broad applicability provisions. "Narrow 11663" was passed by the House (March 27, 1936), while "broad 11663" was defeated by the House (June 17, 1936) by a vote of more than three to one. But the Lobbying Act was patterned after "broad 11663" rather than "narrow 11663." A more detailed treatment is set forth below.

H. R. 11223, S. 2512, H. R. 11663: All nine sections of H. R. 11223 (introduced February 17, 1936) were carried virtually unchanged into H. R. 11663 (introduced March 6, 1936):

(a) Sections 1–6 of H. R. 11223 became sections 1–6 of H. R. 11663. (It was from these sections that secs. 302–307 of the Lobbying Act were derived.)

(b) Sections 7, 8, 9 of H. R. 11223 were carried into H. R. 11663 as sections 8, 9, 10, in order that the designation of section 7 in H. R. 11663 could be given to a section patterned after S. 2512 (which had been passed by the Senate April 28, 1935); thus, there was brought before the House a measure which did not altogether ignore the views of the Senate.[20] (It was from sec. 7 of H. R. 11663 that sec. 308 of the Lobbying Act was derived.)

The two versions of H. R. 11663: Although "narrow 11663" had passed the House on March 27, 1936, "broad 11663" which had been broadened by a conference committee[21] came to a vote and was defeated by more than three to one on June 17, 1936. The significant differences between "narrow 11663" and "broad 11663" were in sections 4 and 7, as follows:

(a) Section 4 of "narrow 11663" did not authorize predication of applicability on expenditures. In "broad 11663," section 4 was broadened to authorize predication of applicability on expenditures.

(b) Section 7 of "narrow 11663" was applicable only to those who "accept employment." In "broad 11663," section 7 was broadened so as to be applicable to those who "engage" themselves.

Difference in attitude: Seventy-fourth and Seventy-ninth Congresses: The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress, would have been defeated in the House in the Seventy-fourth Congress. The Lobbying Act is patterned after "broad 11663" which, because of its broad coverage, had been defeated by the House in the Seventy-fourth Congress by a vote of more than three to one, scarcely more than 2 months after the House had passed "narrow 11663":

(a) Section 305 of the Lobbying Act follows section 4 of "broad 11663" in authorizing predication of applicability on expenditures. In section 4 of "narrow 11663," predication of applicability was limited to contributions.

(b) Section 308 of the Lobbying Act follows section 7 of "broad 11663" in being applicable to those who "engage" themselves, rather than those who "accept employment" (as in section 7 of "narrow 11663").

B. Origins and applicability of section 305 and section 307

"Expenditures" dropped. As stated above, sections 4 and 6 of "narrow 11663" had been taken from H. R. 11223 without even a change of section numbers. Section 4 had been adapted from section 305 of the Corrupt Practices Act,[22] which authorizes predication of applicability on "expenditures" as well as "contributions," but section 4 dropped "expenditures" as a category on which applicability could be predicated.[23] Thus, under section 4, predication of applicability was expressly authorized only on contributions received directly, which were to be used "in whole" for (or for the "sole purpose" of) influencing legislation. It was for that reason that section 6 was added—making explicit the applicability of section 4 to "indirect,"[24] "Multipurpose,"[25] and "Other purposes"[26] contributions.[27]

"Expenditures" restored: Section 4 of "broad 11663" returned to the provisions of section 305 of the Corrupt Practices Act[28] in authorizing the predication of applicability on expenditures as well as on contributions, and those provisions were carried into section 305 of the Lobbying Act. And the provisions

[19] Derivation of form of Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act:

	Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act	H. R. 11663[a] "Broad"	H. R. 11663[a] "Narrow"	H. R. 11223	Federal Corrupt Practices Act
Short title	Sec. 301				Sec. 301.
Definitions	Sec. 302a-h(e)			Sec. 1(sbd)	Sec. 302(e)g.
Records required	Sec. 302a (1-4) b.			Sec. 2 (1-4) (5) c.	Sec. 302b (1-4)
Recording contributions	Sec. 304.			Sec. 3.	Sec. 304.
Applicability provisions	Sec. 305a.			Sec. 4.	Sec. 305a.
Reporting requirements	(1-6).			(1-6).	(1-6).
Cumulative requirement	b.			(7) b.	b.
Manner of filing	Sec. 306(b)			Sec. 5bc.	Sec. 305bc.
Amplifying applicability	Sec. 307.			Sec. 6.	
Requirements rephrased	Sec. 308.	Sec. 7.	Sec. 7 (from S. 2512).		
Oath required	Sec. 309.	Sec. 9.	(Sec. 5a)	(Sec. 5a)	(Sec. 305a).
Penalties	Sec. 310.	Sec. 10.	Sec. 8.	Sec. 7.	Sec. 314.
Separability clause[b]		Sec. 12.	Sec. 9.	Sec. 8.	Sec. 317.
Excepts activities covered by Corrupt Practices Act.	Sec. 311.	Sec. 13.	Sec. 10.	Sec. 9.	

[a] Secs. 1–6 of H. R. 11663 were taken from Secs. 1–6 of H. R. 11223 without change in form.

[b] Sec. 1 (b) of Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Aug. 2, 1946, ch. 753, 60 Stat. 812) is a separability clause applicable to all titles of that act.

[20] S. 2512 was introduced April 4, 1935, passed by the Senate April 28, 1935, and referred to the House Judiciary Committee June 5, 1935. H. R. 11223 was introduced Feb. 17, 1936. H. R. 11663 was introduced Mar. 6, 1936, and reported out by the House Judiciary Committee Mar. 19, 1936.

[21] Appointment of the conference committee had resulted from the action of the Senate in striking all after the enacting clause, substituting other language, and passing H. R. 11663 as so amended.

[22] Sec. 305 of the Corrupt Practices Act makes the requirements of paragraphs 1 through 6 applicable to a "political committee" which is defined by sec. 302 (c) of the Corrupt Practices Act to include "any * * * organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence [etc.]."

[23] The six numbered paragraphs setting forth the reporting requirements of sec. 4 (from which the paragraphs of sec. 305 of the Lobbying Act were derived) could not be used to extend the range of the applicability provisions which precede them. Thus—even though a numbered paragraph in sec. 4 required the reporting of expenditures—applicability could not be predicated on expenditures, as long as the first sentence of sec. 4 did not contain the phrase "or expending any money." If, because of contributions received, sec. 4 became applicable to a person, then it was required that expenditures as well as contributions be reported.

[24] "Indirect" contributions: In the case of receiving contributions indirectly, sec. 6 serves to give sec. 4 the same applicability as sec. 4 has in the case of direct receipt of contributions.

[25] "Multi-purpose" contributions: Just before "narrow 11663" was passed by the House, sec. 6 was amended by substituting the word "principally" for the words "in whole or in part." The result of the amendment was as follows: In the case of contributions—to be used principally to aid in influencing legislation but partly for other purposes—sec. 6 serves to give sec. 4 the same explicit applicability which sec. 4 has in the case of a contribution to be used wholly to aid in influencing legislation. Before the amendment: sec. 6 served to make sec. 4 applicable in the case of any contribution to be used partly to aid in influencing legislation and partly for other purposes.

[26] "Other purposes" contributions: In the case of persons whose principal purpose is to aid in influencing legislation, sec. 6 makes it possible for the applicability of sec. 4 to be predicated on the receipt of contributions which are allegedly received for "other purposes" than influencing legislation.

[27] The significant parts of secs. 4 and 6 of "narrow 11663" are quoted below. The great difference between sec. 4 and sec. 305 of the Lobbying Act is the inclusion of "expenditures" in sec. 305 as a category on which applicability can be predicated. There is no material difference between sec. 307 and sec. 6 as quoted below.

Sec. 4: "Every * * * person receiving any contributions * * * for the (purpose of influencing legislation) * * * shall file * * * a statement (etc.)."

Sec. 6: "The provisions * * * shall apply to any (person) * * * (except a political committee (etc.) * * *) * * * who * * * directly or indirectly * * * receive(s) money or other thing of value (1) to be used principally to aid, or (2) the principal purpose of which person is * * * to aid(,) in (influencing legislation) * * *."

Since alternatives "(1)" and "(2)" are separated by the disjunctive "or," they may be stated separately, as follows:

(1) "The provisions * * * shall apply to any (person) * * * who * * * directly or indirectly * * * receive(s) money or other thing of value to be used principally to aid * * * in (influencing legislation),

(2) "The provisions * * * shall apply to any (person) * * * who * * * directly or indirectly * * * receive(s) money or other thing of value(,) the principal purpose of which person is * * * to aid in (influencing legislation."

In alternative "(2)" above, the word "is" appears to be an unfortunate usage—"being" would have been better.

[28] See note 22.

of section 6 of "narrow 11663" were carried into "broad 11663" and thence into section 307 of the Lobbying Act; however, the Lobbying Act and "broad 11663" had no more need for such provisions than did the Corrupt Practices Act. Since section 4 of "broad 11663," section 305 of the Lobbying Act, and section 305 of the Corrupt Practices Act authorize predication of applicability on expenditures as well as on contributions—contributions (in the case of these measures)—are of no practical consequence in determining applicability: (1) The purpose of an expenditure is easier to establish; (2) expenditures are less subject to ambiguities.

Effect of headnote: As above stated, provisions carried from section 6 of H. R. 11223 into "narrow 11663" and "broad 11663" finally became section 307 of the Lobbying Act, with the headnote "To whom applicable." But section 305 (with the headnote "Statements to be filed with the Clerk of the House") contains the basic applicability provision, as follows: "Every person receiving any contributions or expending any money for the purposes designated * * * shall file a statement * * * [etc.]." The headnote of section 307 cannot alter the fact that the section itself merely makes explicit the applicability of section 305 to "multipurpose," "indirect," and "other purposes" contributions.[a] In *United States* v. *Bische*,[b] Mr. Justice Holmes said, in an opinion for the Court, reversing judgment for defendant in a smuggling case:

"There is no canon against making explicit what is implied and adding a little emphasis to the endeavors to make the proposition broad."

Section 307 contains language extending and amplifying the applicability of section 305 rather than language of restriction or limitation.[c] In the case cited, supra, Mr. Justice Holmes said that there was no canon requiring that the words of a statute be interpreted restrictively when—

"The words on their face indicate rather an extension than a restriction * * *. It is a most unnatural way of saying that henceforth * * * [such statute] shall not include something that otherwise might have been included."

No ambiguity results from any headnote in the Lobbying Act, but—even if it did—"resort may not be had to a headnote to a section to create an ambiguity."[a]

[a] See notes 24 through 27.

[b] 202 U. S. 155, 162, 169.

[c] Observe how differently a restriction would read:

(1) A restriction could have been modeled on sec. 311: "The provisions of this title shall not apply to persons who do not have as their principal purpose, etc."

(2) A restriction could have been modeled on the parenthetical exception contained in sec. 307 itself: "The provisions of this title shall apply to any person (except persons who do not have as their principal purpose, etc.)."

(3) Still another method of imposing a restriction would have been as follows: "The provisions of this title shall apply only to those persons whose principal purpose, etc."

[d] "Whatever ambiguity there may be grows out of the language of the headnotes to the section. They might indicate that, at some time during the progress of the bill through the houses of the legislature, there was in the body of the section a provision extending the term for another year in case of default in giving notice. * * * A headnote is, in no proper sense, a title. In some sense it is an index. Plainly, where the language of the act itself is clear and unambiguous, resort may not be had to a headnote to a section to create an ambiguity, and thereby to furnish a reason for supplying an alleged omission." (*Trader* v. *Jester* (40 Del. 66, 1 A. 2d 609, 613 [1938]).)

"The general revenue bill of 1925 * * *, in fixing privilege taxes, contains the following:

"Mineral water dealers: Each person, firm, or corporation, selling either distilled water or water from springs or wells, or mineral water for drinking or other commercial purposes shall pay a tax as follows.'

* * * * * *

"It is argued that the subtitle 'Mineral water dealers' indicates that it was not the intention of the legislature * * * to include one dealing in plain drinking water, containing no mineral or medicinal properties, and for this reason it is insisted complainant is not liable for this tax.

"'Mineral water dealers' is, however, only a subtitle. It is not the caption of the act, and in no wise, therefore, restricts the scope of the act. The section of the act above set out clearly imposes the tax upon one engaged in the business of selling 'either distilled water or water from springs or well or mineral water,' thus clearly including such a business as that of complainant." (*Seven Springs Water Co.* v. *Kennedy* (156 Tenn. 1, 299 S. W. 792, 793 [1927]).)

[e] It is stated in sec. 308 that "the provisions of this section shall not apply" in certain instances. It is interesting to note that public officials and newspaper owners and employees are the only occupational categories given special consideration—lawyers are not included:

(1) Newspaper owners or employees: When the owners or employees (of a regularly published newspaper or other periodical) make committee appearances—or in the ordinary course of business, publish comments, news items, or advertisements which may tend to influence legislation—receipts and expenditures occurring in the ordinary course of such publishing business are not receipts and expenditures to which the provisions of sec. 308 apply. But if the attempt to influence legislation involves receipts or expenditures outside the ordinary course of such publishing business, the provisions of sec. 308 would appear to apply.

(2) Public officials: When a public official, acting in his official capacity, makes committee appearances—or otherwise attempts to influence legislation—his official receipts and expenditures are not receipts and expenditures to which the provisions of sec. 308 apply.

(3) Other persons: For the average citizen, appearing before a congressional committee would mean a loss of earnings—it would involve taking time out from gainful employment. Sec. 308 provides that "* * * this section shall not apply to any person who merely appears [etc.]." The use of the word "merely," restricts the exemption so that it includes the average citizen but would seem to exclude persons who make committee appearances in connection with their gainful employment. In the case of those lawyers, economists, and others—who make committee appearances tending to further the interests of those whom they are paid to serve—their appearances would seem to be in the category of gainful employment, regardless of whether such appearances are expressly required by their contracts of employment.

C. Origins and applicability of section 308

Section 308 of the Lobbying Act was patterned after section 7 of broad 11663 rather than section 7 of narrow 11663. Section 308 requires the filing of reports by "any person who shall engage himself for pay or for any consideration for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation."[a] Section 308 may be considered applicable to organizations[b] as well as individuals and to employers as well as employees. The language of section 308 means that reports are required of any organization or individual which shall engage itself for pay or for any cause "for the purpose of attempting to influence * * * legislation." According to 14 Words and Phrases 592,[c] the judicial construction of "engage" is that: "It does not import that the person so employed must be in the employ of another." And, according to 3 Words and Phrases 563,[d] the phrase "for any consideration" is judicially construed to be synonymous with "any motive" or "for any cause."[e]

D. Concurrent applicability of sections 305 and 308

Upon analysis it will be found that the distinctions to be made between sections 305 and 308 are distinctions without a difference. The differences which exist are differences in phraseology rather than differences in substance—differences in form rather than differences in function.[a] In the case of requiring a report as to receipts and expenditures, it is doubtful that any meaningful distinction can be drawn between different categories of persons, regardless of how the statute is drafted. Receipts and expenditures will still be receipts and expenditures, whether the amounts are large or small, and whether reported by an employer or an employee. Since sections 305 and 308 have substantially the same requirements, it is practically as simple for the quarterly report to accomplish compliance with both sections as with a single section. Thus, the fact that sections 305 and 308 have concurrent applicability (in the sense that each covers the entire field) does not add to the reporting burden. It is true that section 308 requires a person to register by filing a preliminary report, but this (aside from identifying data) need only state the nature of the anticipated expenses, and (if for an employee) state what the reimbursement is to be for services and for expenses.[b]

[a] See note 9.

[b] Stating the holding in *Carpenter* v. *Strickland* (20 S. C. 1, 5), as follows: "In General Statutes, chapter 2397, giving a mortgage lien to persons making advances to any person or persons who are 'employed' or about to engage in the cultivation of the soil, 'employed' is synonymous with the word 'engaged,' and includes those who are already engaged, as well as those about to engage, in the cultivation of the soil. It does not import that the person so employed must be in the employ of another. The statute does not authorize a mere employee to give a lien."

[c] Sixth syllabus: "Under Revised Penal Code, section 616, making it an offense to buy or receive in any manner upon 'any consideration,' property knowing that it has been stolen, the gist of the offense is the buying or receiving with such knowledge, and an information is not bad for omitting to allege that the property was bought or received 'upon any consideration'; that phrase being synonymous with 'any motive' or 'for any cause.'" *State* v. *Pirkey* (118 NW 1042, 22 S. D. 550, 18 Ann. Cas. 192 (1908)).

[d] If this were a section applicable to employees only:

(1) It would have followed "Narrow 11663" instead of "Broad 11663," by using the expression "accept employment" instead of "engage himself." In debate on "Narrow 11663" the expression "accept employment" had been criticized because it did not cover those who—although "engaged" in lobbying—could not be said to have "accepted employment" in connection with lobbying (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4515, 4518).

(2) Instead of repeating the preposition "for," to make a second prepositional phrase ("for pay or for any consideration"), section 308 would have used a single phrase (for pay or any other consideration), in order that the rule of ejusdem generis could limit the word "consideration" to a contractual connotation.

[e] Comparison of secs. 305 and 308:

(1) Sec. 308 (but not sec. 305) requires identification of employers, while sec. 305 (but not sec. 308) requires identification of contributors of $500 or more. But the result is simply that persons having no employers to identify or contributors to identify will state in their reports that they have none. (See note 5.)

(2) In the matter of identifying recipients of expenditures, sec. 305 provides a $10 limitation while sec. 308 provides no express limitation. But under the maxim de minimis non curat lex, no express limitation is necessary in the case of a person receiving less than $10 during an entire calendar year—such an item is too unconsequential to require identification.

(3) Section 308 specifies both House and Senate as repositories for reports, while sec. 305 specifies only the House. But since secs. 305 and 308 have substantially the same requirements, it is practically as simple for the quarterly report to accomplish compliance with both sections as with a single section. Thus, for one section (sec. 308) to require the filing of such report with the Secretary of the Senate, has the same result in practice as if both sections required such filing, since secs. 305 and 308 have concurrent applicability. (See notes 10 and 64.)

(4) Section 305, but not sec. 308, requires that the report shall be cumulative for the calendar year. But this merely involves copying the totals from the preceding report into the current report and adding them to the figures for the current quarter.

(5) The instrument which is to be filed each quarter is termed a "statement" by sec. 305 while it is termed a "report" by sec. 308. But this is obviously a distinction without a difference.

(6) In the matter of reporting income, sec. 305 requires a report of contributions while sec. 308 requires a report of receipts. This is another distinction without a difference. (See note 3.)

[a] See notes 10 and 64.

[b] For certain aspects of the congressional debate which are not considered here, see Putor, An Analysis of the Federal Lobbying Act (1949), 10 Fed. B. J. 366 at 381.

would be necessary to identify each dues-payer because section 6 of "narrow 11663", as taken from H. R. 11223, extended the applicability of section 4 to contributions made even in part for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation.)[a] But the $5 amendment was defeated.[b]

(b) "'Principally' amendment": After defeating the "$5 amendment," the House passed the "'principally' amendment."[c] This amendment substituted the word "principally" for the words "in whole or in part" in section 6.[d]

Effect of "'principally' amendment": Before adoption of the amendment, some concern was expressed, by Members of the House, as to the effect which "narrow 11663" would have on a large number of organizations.[e] But little criticism of "narrow 11663" was voiced after adoption of the amendment,[f] and the bill was passed by the House on March 27, 1936.[g] After all, "narrow 11663" did not authorize predication of applicability on expenditures—applicability could be predicated only on contributions. And, while the contributions could be partly for other purposes, it was necessary that they be principally to aid in influencing legislation (unless the principal purpose of the organization was to influence legislation). This meant a very narrow coverage.

B. Debate on "broad 11663"

Introductory. In part II-A, supra, entitled "Origins and Applicability in General" is a paragraph entitled "The Two Versions of H. R. 11663," in which it is pointed out that: (a) Section 4 of "narrow 11663" did not authorize predication of applicability on expenditures; whereas, in "broad 11663," section 4 was broadened to authorize predication of applicability on expenditures; (b) section 7 of "narrow 11663" was applicable only to those who "accept employment"; whereas, in "broad 11663," section 7 was broadened so as to be applicable to those who "engage" themselves.

In part III-A, supra, entitled "Debate on 'narrow 11663'" is a paragraph entitled "Effect of 'principally' amendment." That paragraph deals with the adoption by the House of an amendment to section 6, substituting the word "principally" for the words "in whole or in part." Adoption of this amendment may be considered an acknowledgment by the House that the words "principal purpose" (in sec. 6) did not effect an exemption for organization "not organized for the principal purpose of influencing legislation"; because—had such organizations been so exempt—questions as to the use of their receipts would have been irrelevant; i. e., whether their receipts were used "in whole," "in part," or "principally" for influencing legislation, such organizations would still have been exempt.

Proponents of "broad 11663." When "broad 11663" was before the House in the Seventy-fourth Congress, one of the three Members who spoke in favor of the bill said: "Someone has said this will not affect the utilities. That is exactly what it is intended to affect." He also said: "The American Federation of Labor is not affected * * * because [it] * * * is not organized for the principal purpose of affecting legislation."[a] Another of these three Members said: "* * * This bill does reach * * * the American Federation of Labor."[b]

Opponents of "broad 11663." Thirteen Members of the House spoke against "broad 11663." One of them—after referring to the American Federation of Labor, United States Chamber of Commerce, and National Association of Manufacturers—warned that: "In this debate it will be insisted that this legislation will not affect these organizations." He insisted that "broad 11663" was applicable to them and went on to say:

"Indeed, it does not end there. The law would be applicable to all farm organizations, all patriotic organizations, all women's clubs, all peace societies—in fact, to every group or organization which might, directly or indirectly, be interested in the passage or in preventing the passage of any given legislation. The Members of this body will realize the magnitude and far-reaching effect of any such proposition. * * *

* * * * * *

"I think I speak for the Judiciary Committee when I say that no one doubted but that these various organizations would be included."[c]

The other 12 Members who spoke against "broad 11663" in the House indicated accord with the views above quoted.[d] The bill was defeated in the House by a vote of more than 3 to 1,[e] apparently because of its broad coverage.[f]

C. Debate on the Lobbying Act[a]

When the bill which became the Lobbying Act was considered in the House four Members spoke on the measure. The first discussed sections 307 and 308 but not section 305, and advocated passage of the measure.[b] The second and the third opposed the measure in language which is quoted, in part, below. And the fourth Member expressed accord with the views of the third.[c]

The second Member who spoke on the measure said:

"Mr. Chairman, with the centralization of Government which has grown up in the past number of years, it is almost necessary for organizations like the Grange and the Farm Bureau Federation to have their representatives here practically all the time * * *

"I am not in favor of corrupt lobbyists, yet * * * if you stop the people of this country from being able to come down here in decent form and under the Constitution petition this Congress you are doing a great disservice to this country."[d]

[a] See notes 25, 27.

[b] 80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 4534.

[c] Id. at 4535.

[d] See notes 25, 27.

[e] 80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 4518, 4519–4522, 4530–4534.

[f] Id. at 4535.

[g] Id. at 4541.

[a] Id. at 9751.

[b] Id. at 9748.

[c] Id. at 9746–9748.

[d] Id. at 9432–9434, 9743, 9747–9750.

[e] Id. at 9752.

[f] The following statement, made by a proponent of the measure, clearly explains why it has such broad coverage:

"We could not write a bill here and say that it shall apply to the utility companies, but that the bill shall not apply to the Townsend plan or the Coughlin plan or some other plan * * *. Are gentlemen prepared to say that we want a bill that will apply to the utilities and yet will not apply to somebody else who is doing the same kind of thing? * * *" (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 9751).

[a] As has been pointed out earlier, the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act was patterned after "broad 11663"—the version which the House, in the 74th Cong., had defeated by a vote of more than 3 to 1, because of its broad coverage.

[b] 93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 10088–10089.

[c] Id. at 10091.

[d] Id. at 10090.

The third Member who spoke on the measure said:

"Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, we are violating the Constitution. It is directly implied in the Constitution that we have no right to intimidate people * * * so that they cannot petition the Congress. What is this but intimidation? It is the same sort of curb you put on enemy agents during the war.

* * * * *

"How have the damaging bills that have come through this Congress heretofore been brought up? They have been brought here by a group of financiers in New York who see somebody down here in the bureaucracy and start these things like Bretton Woods, the British loan, and all of these other things that are unconstitutional. The bureaucracy sees all these CIO's, women's clubs, business groups, and so forth, and lines them up; then day after day we are bombarded with letters * * *

"What does this bill do? It says that if the man whose business is going to be taken by the OPA or the Bretton Woods agreement or the British loan or some of the rest of this [illegible] legislation hires a lawyer, the lawyer has to register exactly the same as an enemy agent registered during the war.

"Mr. Chairman, the people are going to soon rise up and stop this totalitarian way into which this Government has fallen recently."[a]

The following colloquy in the Senate is of particular interest because of the fact that Senator LaFollette was coauthor of the measure:

"Mr. HAWKES. Some of the finest organizations in the United States are somewhat concerned lest the provision against lobbying be constructed to apply to institutions such as the United States Chamber of Commerce, for instance. Does not the bill contain language to the effect 'if they are organized to do a business of lobbying principally'? Is not the word 'principally' used in the bill? And does that not mean something to the Senator?

"Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It will all depend on the type of activity that is carried on. I cannot give the Senator a blanket interpretation.

* * * * *

"Mr. TOBEY. As I understand, there is no exemption of the Chamber of Commerce from the provisions of the measure.

"Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Nor any other organization."[b]

Also of interest is the following statement made in the Senate:

"Mr. McMAHON. The Senator [MCCLELLAN] spoke of the CIO, the PAC, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and other organizations. I want the RECORD to show that personally I should like to have them all come under the provisions of this bill, together with 500 or more others that ought to come under it also."[c]

Thus, in the case of the measure which became the Lobbying Act, its broad coverage was considered by some Members of Congress as a reason for an affirmative vote and by others as a reason for opposition.

CONCLUSION

Whether the courts will sustain the Lobbying Act, and whether they will construe it broadly or construe it narrowly, remains to be seen. In the meantime, the cautious and conservative position would be to recognize that the Lobbying Act may receive a broad construction. Persons who act on the assumption that the Lobbying Act will be invalidated or construed narrowly, may of course be making a sound assumption—but that remains to be seen.

If the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act be approached without preconceptions, and without antagonism toward its purposes—the act will be found to be reasonably simple and unambiguous. It would appear that support for this conclusion is found in the legislative history of the act, when carefully examined.[d] In falling short of perfection in draftsmanship, the Lobbying Act is not unique. Of the legislation which has been sustained by the courts, only a small part has been free of rhetorical deficiencies.

The Lobbying Act does not interfere in the least with activities engaged in for the purpose of influencing legislation. Such activities are, of course, of numerous categories and of varying degrees of importance. The most highly publicized activity is that of the professional lobbyist who undertakes to "buttonhole" Congressmen, but this is probably the least important category within the purview of the Lobbying Act. Of primary importance, on the other hand, is the activity which consists of encouraging members of an organization—or members of the general public—to write or speak to their Congressmen in behalf of a particular point of view.

When reports filed pursuant to the Lobbying Act: (1) Disclose that thousands of dollars have been expended in order to develop a "grass roots" pressure campaign and (2) Identify the persons who have contributed $500 or more to such campaign—then the Congress, and the public, can know that the campaign was something less than spontaneous. By causing information of this type to be made available, the act would appear to serve a worth-while purpose.

Appended to this article is a suggested reporting form which would accommodate all data required by sections 305 and 308 for either a preliminary or a quarterly report.[e]

[a] Id. at 10694.

[b] Id. at 10151-10152.

[c] Id. at 6241-6272.

[d] The Lobbying Act has been the subject of an article and of notes as follows: Zeller, the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (1948) 42 Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. 239–271; notes (1947) 56 Yale L. J. 304–332; (1947) 47 Col. L. Rev. 98–109; (1947) 15 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 455–463. These are of some interest insofar as they discuss (1) the considerations which make some type of reporting requirements desirable and (2) State legislation relating to lobbying. However, their approach to the Lobbying Act leaves something to be desired. All of them attempt to use legislative history in construing the act, but they do not appear to have been thorough in their investigation. They make reference to H. R. 11663 and S. 2512 but are apparently unaware of the following: (1) That H. R. 11663 was a consolidation of two earlier bills: (a) sec. 7 was adapted from S. 2512; (b) secs. 4 and 6 (along with the other sections) were derived from H. R. 11223, which was an adaptation of the Corrupt Practices Act; (2) That, in adapting sec. 4 of H. R. 11223 from sec. 305 of the Corrupt Practices Act, "expenditures" (as a category on which applicability could be predicated) was dropped, and sec. 6 was therefore added, in order to extend applicability rather than to restrict or limit it; (3) that in "narrow 11663:" (a) sec. 4 did not authorize the predication of applicability on expenditures; (b) sec. 7 was limited to persons who accept employment; (4) that in "broad 11663;" (a) sec. 4 was broadened to authorize predication of applicability on expenditures; (b) sec. 7 was broadened to apply to persons who "engage" themselves; (5) that secs. 305 and 307 of the Lobbying Act were patterned after "broad 11663," which, because of its broad coverage, had been defeated by the House in the 74th Con. by a vote of more than 3 to 1, scarcely more than 2 months after the House had passed "narrow 11663." (See pt. II of this article.)

In the matter of congressional debate, they accept uncritically certain statements of dubious value, while neglecting statements which would seem to have more significance. (See pt. III of this article.)

[e] File 3 copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and file 3 copies with the Secretary of the Senate:

1. For each set of 3 copies execute the affidavit on 1 copy and type in the blanks in the affidavits on the other 2 copies.

2. This page (p. 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

3. Circle a letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:

(a) "Preliminary" report: To "register," circle the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

(b) "Quarterly" report: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this report, circle the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. Such additional pages should be of plain paper, the size of this page. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the act.

REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

Organization or individual filing: State name, business address, and nature of business:

Employer: State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "none." (If the employee is paid by "A" to work in behalf of "B," list both "A" and "B" as employers.)

Legislative interests, and publications in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If legislative interests have terminated with the current quarter: Please explain, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the specific legislative interests by reciting: (a) Citations of statutes; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills; (c) short titles of such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of each publication which the person filing has issued or caused to be issued in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) description, (b) quantity published, (c) date of publication, (d) name of printer.

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

NOTE.—If this is a "preliminary" report: In addition to the other data required in the space above, state the nature of the anticipated expenses; and (if an employee) state what the reimbursement is to be for services and for expenses.

_____ }
_____ } ss:

Affidavit

The undersigned affiant, being duly sworn, says:

1. That he has examined the attached report, numbered consecutively from page 1 through page —, and the same is true, correct, and complete as he verily believes.

2. That he is _____, of the above-named organization for whom such report is filed, and that he is authorized to make this affidavit for and on behalf of such person. [If the report is for an individual, strike out paragraph "2".]

[Print or type name below signature.]

(Signed) _____ Affiant.
(Typed)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this ____ day of _____, 19__.

_____
(Official authorized to administer oaths.)

Receipts (including contributions and loans from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in connection with legislative interests)

Receipts (other than loans):

1. $____ Dues and assessments.
2. $____ Gifts of money.
3. $____ Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift.
4. $____ Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter.
5. $____ Received for services, i. e., salary, fee, per diem, etc.
6. $____ Other contributions received.
7. $____ Total for this quarter (Add items 1 through 6).
8. $____ Received during previous quarters of calendar year.
9. $____ Total from Jan. 1, through this quarter (add 7 and 8).

Loans received:

10. $____ Total now owed to others on account of loans.
11. $____ Borrowed from others during this quarter.
12. $____ Repaid to others during this quarter.

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this quarter):

13. Have there been such contributors? Please answer "Yes" or "No": ____
14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from Jan. 1 through the last day of this quarter, total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page; tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and address of contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is Mar. 31, June 30, Sept. 30, or Dec. 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amounts	*Name and address of contributor (period from Jan. 1 through _____, 19..)*
$1,250.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
3,285.00	Total.

Expenditures (including loans) in connection with legislative interests

Expenditures (other than loans):

1. $____ Public relations and advertising services.
2. $____ Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item 1).
3. $____ Gifts or contributions made during quarter.
4. $____ Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost.
5. $____ Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.).
6. $____ Telephone and telegraph.
7. $____ Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment.
8. $____ All other expenditures.
9. $____ Total for this quarter (add 1 through 8).
10. $____ Expended during previous quarters of calendar year.
11. $____ Total from Jan. 1 through this quarter (add 9 and 10).

Loans made to others:

12. $____ Total now owed to person filing.
13. $____ Lent to others during this quarter.
14. $____ Repayments received during this quarter.
15. $____ If there is an employer, state what amount of the expenditures for this quarter has been or will be defrayed by such employer.
16. Recipients of expenditures: In the case of expenditures made during this quarter be, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following headings: "Amount," "Date or dates," "Name and address of recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amounts	*Date or dates—Name and address of recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks bill."
2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten and Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800 per month.
4,150.00	Total

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Ohio State Journal of February 3, 1950:

SENATE ACTION ON EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT DISAPPOINTS BACKERS, BUT THEY'LL FIGHT ON

(By Sarah Mills, State Journal women's editor)

Ohio's most ardent backers of the equal rights amendment to the Constitution are anything but happy about its fate in the Senate. But they're not despairing either.

Shocked and disappointed are the words Clara Snell Wolfe, 1841 Roxbury Road, chairman of the Ohio branch of the National Woman's Party, used yesterday to describe her group's reaction.

They were echoed by Ernestine Breisch Powell of Worthington, State second vice president, and Dr. Mary Alice Price, chairman of the Columbus chapter. Dr. Price is on the faculty of the bureau of educational research at Ohio State University.

The Columbus branch has a membership of about 125.

Passage of the proposed amendment was a triumph. It declares in part: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

But the rub comes in the Senate's approval of the Hayden rider which preserves female protective legislation now on the books.

"The days of Lady Bountiful and the poor working girl are over," Mrs. Powell, an attorney and mother of 3 children observed. "The women involved should be permitted to determine their own working conditions."

Contrary to some belief, outright equal rights would have no adverse bearing on such things as another's pensions and maternity legislation, she added.

"There's a difference between bred legislation and sex legislation," Dr. Price observed.

The National Woman's Party was founded in 1913 to obtain by constitutional amendment, the right for women to vote. That won, since 1921 it has had as its goal enactment of the equal rights amendment, to remove "all remaining discriminations against women in the United States."

It has had the amendment introduced at every session of Congress since 1923. But not until 1950 could the necessary two-thirds vote be mustered in the Senate. The amendment has never been voted on in the House.

The task now, Mrs. Wolfe, an original member of the party said, is to defeat the "protectionists" forces when the amendment goes before the House. It is now in the hands of that body's Judiciary Committee.

"We just want the plain amendment, without riders submitted to the States," she declared.

Slight, soft-spoken Mrs. Wolfe, has been militantly concerned with women's rights for almost 40 years. The wife of A. B. Wolfe, retired Ohio State University professor, she's a one-time suffragist who went to jail for her convictions.

She entered the political arena in 1912 at the request of Judge Florence E. Allen of the United States circuit court of appeals at Cleveland. The jurist then was a student at Western Reserve University and Mrs. Wolfe was just out of Oberlin College.

They took to the soap boxes on street corners in a referendum campaign to give Ohio women the vote. Their cause was "moved under." Undaunted, they moved into Wisconsin, with the same results.

By 1918, the suffragist strategy had changed, and Mrs. Wolfe was in Washington, picketing the White House. She landed in jail the day the pickets, under the leadership of famed Alice Paul, burned "President Wilson's words."

"That was during the First World War," Mrs. Wolfe recalled. "We were saving the world for democracy, but we didn't have it at home."

She was held in jail several hours then released. The courts later ruled the arrests illegal. By June 1920, that portion of the fight was over. Women had the vote.

"It took us 73 years to get it," Mrs. Wolfe said in her quiet way, "and the arguments against that were just as silly as those being offered today against equal rights."

United Europe Is Our Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the Indianapolis Star is a Republican newspaper published in my district. Since I am of opposite political faith I am not always in agreement with its views although I must acknowledge that it has always been very fair and generous with me personally.

The March 17 issue carried an editorial which I consider a particularly

enlightened discussion of that problem with which we are concerned today. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the RECORD for the consideration of all the Members of this body:

UNITED EUROPE IS OUR BUSINESS

Two World Wars have convinced most Americans that they have a big stake in a free and peaceful western Europe. Otherwise Americans would not be willing to give many billions of dollars in European recovery aid. Nor would they be willing to commit themselves to go to war again in event of an attack on any Atlantic nation.

But many Americans don't fully appreciate today's need for a practical unification of European nations which can secure the peace and freedom for which American lives and wealth have been given in such abundance. Too many people still look on a union of the states of Europe as the business of Europeans but not of ours. But if a free and peaceful Europe is our business, so is a united Europe. Russian imperialism makes it increasingly improbable that the former can long exist without the latter.

On Wednesday three noted world figures came to Indianapolis to campaign for the growing movement for European unity. One was Paul Reynaud, former premier of France and a leading spirit in the Council of Europe. Another was Lord Layton, British economic authority. The third was Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, who now is giving his time and talents to the chairmanship of the American Committee on United Europe, a private group dedicated to the support of the unity movement.

There are many ways Americans can help Europe to unite. General Donovan's committee is one way. Civic, educational and other groups can get behind the movement and help spread an understanding of it among American citizens. The Federal Government can help the most by putting pressure on European governments through the recovery program. Such pressure could force timid governments to rise above the ancient, petty interests which have always blocked the way to real European unity. United Europe is no longer a dream, but a practical opportunity. It also is a virtual necessity in securing the peace and freedom of Europeans and Americans alike. That makes all of us partners in the effort.

A Way for the World to Live Without the Cold War Becoming a Hot One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in these days when so many people do not know which way to turn, when so many are tempted to say there is no way out but war—and in the same breath say that war will destroy victor and vanquished—it is refreshing to find an article by a thoughtful, respected observer of world affairs that offers a positive, constructive approach to the troubles that beset the world.

Mr. Walter Lippmann for many years has been one of the most consistently constructive writers on world affairs. In my opinion he has never made a more valuable contribution to the common welfare than in an article in the current number of the Atlantic Monthly, entitled "Break-Up of the Two-Power World." With his permission and the consent granted by the House notwithstanding its slight excess over the customary space, I place it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Atlantic Monthly of April 1950]

BREAK-UP OF THE TWO-POWER WORLD

(By Walter Lippmann)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In late September, shortly after the announcement that the Russians had the atomic bomb, Walter Lippmann left Washington on an extended trip to western Germany, France, the Middle East, and South Asia. On his return he felt under the increasing necessity of redefining the Atlantic community in the face of present realities. This he has done in a series of talks, the first at the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences, again on the occasion of the Newton D. Baker Memorial Lecture in Cleveland, and still more recently at the American Council of Foreign Relations in Chicago. The article which follows is the development of his main points.)

It is my very good fortune to have worked under Newton D. Baker—very far under him, I hasten to add, and in a quite humble capacity, but yet near to him personally—in a time when he was facing grave and momentous decisions. I remember one hot evening in July 1917, when he called me into his office in the War Department, saying he had finished for that day, but would I stay a little longer and just listen to him while he put his feet up on the desk and talked out loud and tried to clear his mind.

He was deeply troubled and puzzled, he said, by something which he had never in all his public experience come face to face with before. He had lived in the conviction that any problem could and should be taken to the American people, and that after they had heard the whole story argued out publicly, they would come to the right decision.

THE CRISIS OF OUR BEGINNING

But knowing, as Secretary of War, what I know about the power of Germany, the weakness of the Allies, and our own unpreparedness, he said, I don't know whether I dare to tell the people how badly the war is going that they are just beginning to take part in. If they were told the whole truth, if they knew all that I know, would the Germans not learn where to strike at our weakest points, and would not our people be so discouraged and confused that they would not do what will have to be done to prevent a disaster? And yet if our people do not know the whole truth, will they believe us when we ask for their sons and send them to the battlefields in Europe?

And if we fail in the war, will our people ever forgive us, and ought they ever to forgive us, when we did not trust them in the crisis of their destiny?

I wish Newton Baker were with us now. For the question that he raised that night in Washington, nearly 35 years ago, is with us now, is with anyone who undertakes to talk about the crisis—the indubitable and immense crisis—in which we and all the world are involved.

When we look at the Far East, at southeast Asia, at Germany, at the United Nations, and at the race of armaments in which we are engaged, the facts are grim.

But the raw facts will seem more desperate and more hopeless than they really are, only, I believe, if we interpret them and measure them in the light of the outdated theories, the doctrines, and the conceptions which were popular during the past 3 or 4 years. I am referring to the ideas, expectations, and plans which are based on the Truman doctrine and its corollary, the policy of the military containment of Russian communism.

FAILURE OF THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

The mounting crisis in our foreign relations marks the failure of the Truman doctrine, and if we cling to the ideas of the Truman doctrine, the collapse of our influence in China will be followed by the collapse of our influence in the whole of Asia and in central Europe. But I believe that this menacing movement of events can be stopped if we are able to brace and nerve ourselves to reconsider and to revise our policy in the light of a fresh, objective analysis of what is actually happening.

Let me begin by naming six developments which are of critical significance.

The first is that the American monopoly of atomic weapons ended sooner than the State Department, the Pentagon, and the Congress and the public expected.

The second is that Mac Tse-tung has succeeded in capturing the leadership of the Chinese revolution in the whole of continental China.

The third is that in southern Asia the British Empire and the Dutch Empire have been dissolved and have been succeeded by the independent Asiatic states of India, Pakistan, and Indonesia.

The fourth is that in the rich colonial area of southeast Asia, in Indochina, Malaya, and Burma there are civil war and anarchy because the authority and power of the European empires have been undermined, but no native independent states capable of governing themselves have emerged.

The fifth is the secession of Marshal Tito from the Soviet orbit in eastern Europe and the tendency of Titoism to spread to Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

The sixth is the revival of Germany as a power in Europe.

All of these developments have come to a head within the past year. None of them was, of course, entirely unforeseen. Yet it is the combination of these events which has, I believe, created a radically new situation that will compel all the governments to reexamine their estimates of the cold war and their calculations and their policies.

I venture to suggest that the net effect of all these developments combined marks the beginning of the end of the idea that the world must, and that the world will, aline itself in two camps, the one directed from Moscow and the other from Washington. That idea has been at the root of Soviet policy, and also of American policy. It is the one idea which the Communist world and the non-Communist world agreed upon. Both have said it was a true prediction of what would happen.

The orthodox Communists regard this doctrine of the division of the world into two camps as the guarantee of a beautiful hope. They believe that if the world can be divided into two camps, the non-Communist camp will break up because it is not united by a common doctrine, because it is not ruled with an iron hand, and because it represents all stages of political development from advanced democracy to the most reactionary, corrupt feudal and imperial regimes.

The Western World, on the other hand, has regarded this division as an ugly necessity forced upon it by the unity of the Communist world, which compels it to organize in one grand coalition all the non-Communist states. In every doctrine of the Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist creed we have challenged the basic principles except in this one. We too have said that the world would be, could be, and had to be divided into two camps.

I believe the time has come when we have a right to ask ourselves whether the theory is in fact true.

We have a duty to ask ourselves whether in fact our minds have not become infiltrated and misled by the basic dogma of the very creed against which we think we are fighting. And I believe that if we examine the

facts of the world as they are, rather than the Communist theory, if we look at what is really happening and what is most probably developing in Asia and in Europe, we shall find the strongest reasons for doubting whether mankind can be or will be organized into two and only two coalitions.

Even before the events of this past year the two coalitions were by no means complete and they were far from solid. We know to what lengths of suppression and terror and purging the Cominform has had to go in the satellite countries in order to keep them subordinated to the Kremlin. And we know from our own experience how complicated has been the task of achieving unity of action in western Europe under the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Security Pact.

Everywhere on both sides of the iron curtain nationalist and separatist forces have interfered with the organization of the world into two great alliances.

II

If we look more closely at the six big developments which I named before, leaving aside for the moment what has happened in the field of atomic energy, I should like to point out that there is a common denominator in five of these developments—namely, the rebellion of Tito; the Chinese revolution; the independence of India, Pakistan, and Indonesia; the break down of authority in southeast Asia; and the revival of Germany. In each case one or both of the two coalitions has lost or is losing control of an important region. But in no case is it at all certain that the one coalition has won the region that the other has lost.

TITOISM AT WORK ELSEWHERE

Russia has lost control of Yugoslavia.

It by no means follows that Tito could or would aline himself wholly and reliably with the western powers. The tendency which we know as Titoism is manifestly at work in Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia. We know that from the purges conducted against Communists who have devoted their lives to the movement.

On the other hand, it would certainly be a delusion to suppose that Communists who rebel against the domination of the Kremlin have become intellectually and morally converted to the ideology of the western democracies.

There is strong evidence that a similar tendency is at work in Germany.

It manifests itself in the concessions which the Soviets are making to the east Germans in order to appease and to seduce the German nationalists inside the Christian Democratic Party, the Social Democratic Party, and the parties of the right. There is, on the other hand, growing evidence that even the west German Republic is more and more disinclined to accept the position of a docile and subordinate member of the western coalition.

GERMANS TO MAKE SOVIET POLICY

I think it is no exaggeration to say of Germany that with the establishment of the government at Bonn and its unmistakable growth in political and economic power we are in the process of relinquishing our control over the future of Germany.

I think no one can go to Germany today and continue to believe that Mr. McCloy and his colleagues, the British and French High Commissioners, have it in their power any longer to determine the future of Germany. They are in fact liquidating the power of the western allies over Germany, and are being drawn into negotiations about a series of demands made by the Germans.

No doubt the United States, Britain, and France still have a certain discretion as to the rate at which the Germans shall recover their sovereignty. But the time is already clearly in sight when the Germans will recover it and when the Germans will make German policy.

I shall not dwell at any length upon the developments in southern Asia, except to point to the well-known fact that there are seven new independent states in southern Asia, namely, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon, India, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Israel. Of these the biggest and most influential is India.

As these states have achieved their national independence, they have declared that they will not enter into the military and political coalition of the Western Powers or of the Soviet Union.

NEHRU SPEAKS PLAINLY

Pandit Nehru was quite explicit on that issue when he was in the United States, and I have no doubt myself that here he reflects the purpose of all the new national governments of Asia. They have decided, as this country did 150 years ago when it was new and weak, to avoid a policy of entangling alliances. There is little reason to think that anything but an overt military invasion of southern Asia by Soviet or Chinese Communist armies could alter their decision.

When we turn to the Far East there is, of course, the obvious fact that the Chinese government which we backed has been defeated. The victorious leaders of the Chinese civil war are Communists. They have declared that they are the allies of the Soviet Union. They have turned their backs on Washington. They have gone first to Moscow.

But it is by no means certain that the marriage of the two Communist revolutions is indissoluble. For many generations the imperial interests of Russia and the national and imperial interests of China have been in conflict all the way from the Sea of Japan to the Pamir Mountains along a borderland that extends 4,000 miles into the heart of Asia.

Moreover, over the larger part of that immense borderland the peoples on both sides of the political frontier are neither Russian nor Chinese but are peoples of various tribes and nationalities of Asia over whom both China and Russia assert power and influence.

While it is true that we have lost our power and, for the time being, most of our influence in China, it by no means follows that Russia has won control of China or has achieved an enduring alliance with China.

It is not wishful thinking, but common sense informed by historical experience, to say that if Russia finds it difficult to maintain its domination over small countries in the Balkans, there is no reason to jump to the conclusion that she can consolidate her dominion over this much vaster and more complicated region of the world.

Turning to Japan, it is clear, I think, that our position has been seriously weakened by what has happened in China. The main economic connections with Japan are on the mainland of Asia. There lie the most important sources of Japanese imports. There lie the principal markets of Japan. Nor can it be denied that the strategic security of Japan has been greatly affected by the fact that the whole mainland of east Asia—all the ports and airfields and the whole hinterland—is in Communist and anti-American hands.

III

I have left until the last the event which was announced by the President on September 23: that there had been an atomic explosion inside the Soviet Union.

This event marked the end of the short-lived American monopoly of atomic weapons.

Let us make the most favorable assumptions: Let us assume that we can make more bombs and bigger bombs than the Russians, that we can build faster planes with longer range, and that we can organize better defenses to detect, to warn, and to intercept.

Even on these dangerously optimistic assumptions no one can doubt, it seems to me, that the military situation has become radically different from what it was when we had the monopoly of atomic weapons. The difference will, I believe, be felt soonest in Germany and in Japan.

During the period of our monopoly there existed a military stalemate between the Red army and the American strategic air force armed with its atomic weapons. The one was a deterrent upon the other. The military defense of western Europe and of western Germany rested on our capacity to bombard the vital centers of eastern Europe and of Russia. The American atomic bomb pinned down the Red army. It acted as a military shield behind which western Europe could attempt to organize itself to revive its military defenses and to carry on its economic reconstruction.

On the other hand, the American monopoly of the atomic bomb, though sufficient for defensive purposes, was not sufficient for any policy which required direct military pressure upon the Soviet Union. The capacity of the Red army to occupy the vital centers of Germany and of Belgium and of France excluded from the consideration of any reasonable man the idea of preventive war or of a diplomacy which aimed to compel the Russians to accept western terms for the settlement of Europe.

CHANGED BALANCE OF POWER

The Soviet achievement of the atomic bomb, even if relative to us the Russians have only a few bombs, has changed the balance of military power. It has changed it most radically and critically, and first of all, in western Germany and Japan. The question now is no longer how they are to be defended against the Red army alone but how they are to be defended also against atomic bombardment.

Until a few months ago that question had not been faced. It did not enter into the calculations and the plans of the North American Security Pact, or of the American military-aid program.

It was believed until September that, while some day no doubt the Russians would achieve atomic weapons, that day was still in the future.

Therefore the question of how the countries adjacent to the Soviet Union were to be defended against atomic weapons was hypothetical and could be passed by.

But now it is an actual and urgent problem.

Both Germany and Japan are small countries containing highly concentrated industrial areas. The ultimate defenses against air attack—namely, dispersion and space—are not available to Germany and Japan.

Germany and Japan are in fact the ideal targets of atomic warfare.

Even if it is technologically possible to create an effective aerial defense against atomic bombardment, the difficulties of doing that are peculiarly great in western Germany and in Japan, and the cost would be, I believe, prohibitive.

We are compelled, therefore, to reexamine the strategic situation.

For the strategic formula on which we have operated from the proclamation of the Truman doctrine in the spring of 1947 to the signature of the Atlantic Pact in the spring of 1949 had as its major premise the American monopoly of the atomic bomb. Working on this premise, our chief military problem was to design and construct aircraft capable of penetrating the Soviet defenses in order to deliver the bomb.

But now we have the additional problem of creating defenses in a large number of countries which we have guaranteed, and in two countries, Germany and Japan, which we occupy and have disarmed—defenses that cannot be penetrated by the Soviet air force carrying atomic bombs and by the Soviet navy carrying atomic bombs.

Until recently there has been almost no public discussion of this problem in the United States. But it is being discussed anxiously abroad, and beneath the surface the reaction is profound.

The effects of the new strategic situation in the countries I have just visited are unmistakable to anyone who looks beneath the official appearance of things.

IV

In the exposed and vulnerable countries along the periphery of the Soviet Union the effect, I believe, has been to reinforce decisively their natural impulse to dissociate themselves from the two coalitions and to seek such security as they can find by recovering their independence from both.

For in this new strategic situation neither the U. S. S. R. nor the United States can offer the vulnerable countries any guaranty, or even any reasonable hope, of security against the fearful devastation of atomic warfare.

The Russians cannot offer that security to the Germans or the Japanese if they join the Soviet Union in an alliance, and we cannot offer these countries security if they join us in an alliance. These countries have neither the offensive power of retaliation nor the power of defense. They are caught between two lines of fire, and whichever side they turn to can offer them nothing but the prospect of devastation from the other side.

The Germans cannot once again become the allies of Russia, as they have so often in the past, because Russia cannot defend them and they cannot defend themselves against American air power. But by the same token western Germany cannot become the military ally of the west, as Field Marshal Montgomery and some of the French generals so fondly hope, because Britain and America cannot with certainty and effectiveness promise to defend western Germany against Russian aerial attack.

NO ONE WANTS TO BE BATTLEGROUND

The Germans are a highly intelligent people, especially in military matters, when they are not befuddled by demagogs like Hitler. They are confronted with a dilemma, and they know it, and there is only one way out of it open to them which offers them any prospect—even if it is not a certain prospect—of security.

The Germans will take that way out because there is no other way out.

They will recognize that they lie between two armed coalitions, each attempting to win them over to it. They will exploit this middle position to recover their national independence by making demands and gaining concessions from both sides. They will by this method restore their unity. They will shake off the controls of the occupying powers. They will get rid of the military occupation. Then they will develop their middle position in the heart of Europe outside either alliance, and in between both alliances, to regain their power and influence in Europe.

This policy will reflect the realities of their military position and their own vital interests.

The Germans may call it a policy to neutralize Germany, or a policy of independence and isolation, or a policy of liberation, or conceivably a policy designed to make them equal members of a European federation of nations, which is not part of either the Russian or the American military system. But whatever the Germans choose to call their policy, the course they are most likely to take—unless there is a general collapse and a civil and international war—is similar to the course which more and more of the leading nations in the borderland all around the Soviet Union are also trying to take.

It is the policy of avoiding entangling alliances in a two-power world.

That is the course which India, Pakistan, and Indonesia have already decided to take.

It is the course which Tito in effect is trying to take.

It is the course which Austria is bound to take.

It is the course which every country in the Soviet orbit would take if it could disentangle itself from the grip of the Red army.

It is the course they will all be taking if the Germans succeed in putting an end to the occupation of Germany and, therefore, to the presence of the Red army on the Stettin-Trieste line.

The logic of the German situation is also, I believe, the logic of the Japanese. Because General MacArthur cannot guarantee Japan against atomic attack from the Asiatic mainland, the Japanese struggle to survive must take the form of a struggle to make Japan independent of both military systems.

V

This vast and complicated process, which is well begun but far from completed, is in fact the disintegration of the military alliances envisaged by those who have believed that the world could be organized into two military coalitions.

Can this process of disintegration be stopped and reversed?

I believe that in practice it will prove to be impossible for the United States to reverse this process in the countries immediately adjacent to the Soviet Union.

That is to say, it cannot any longer be the object of our policy to meet the Soviet expansion by organizing a military coalition in which western Germany, Japan, and China are to be, as we once conceived it, the principal outer bastions—in which the United States, Great Britain, and France would be the arsenal, the citadel, and the headquarters.

That was a conceivable arrangement in the days when General Clay appeared to be supreme in western Germany, when General MacArthur appeared to be supreme in Japan, and when Gen. Chiang Kai-shek was still the chief war lord of the greater part of China.

It was just conceivable then because the United States had the monopoly of atomic weapons and could strike the Soviet Union without the prospect that the Soviet Union could strike back at the United States or at Great Britain or at France.

It is not conceivable now.

My own view is, therefore, that the paramount object of our policy cannot be to contain Soviet expansion by organizing a global coalition. The paramount object of our policy from now on will have to be to frustrate and to disorganize and to disintegrate any Soviet attempt to form a global coalition.

OUR AIR POWER IS STRATEGIC

The critical areas in which such a policy must operate are Germany, eastern Europe, China, and Japan. We should prevent Germany, as she recovers, from making an alliance with Russia. That can be done. And the strategic air power we possess should be the perfect instrument of that policy.

It should be plain to the Germans, even without the necessity of our making it plainer than it obviously is, that if they ally themselves with Russia they become the first target in case of a war with Russia. But since, if they ally themselves with us, they will become the first target of the Russian attack, we cannot ask the Germans, and we must not expect the Germans, to ally themselves with us.

Therefore we should influence and encourage the Germans to do what so many Germans already want to do: namely, to identify German nationalism and German patriotism with German unity and with German independence.

We should help the Germans to neutralize themselves in order to end the military occupation and the partition.

We should clear our minds of the fallacy that neutrality is altogether obsolete because so many neutral countries from Belgium in 1914 to Denmark and Norway in 1940 have been unable to maintain their neutrality. The fact is that, while some countries could not pursue the neutrality that they desired, others did manage to achieve it. In Europe, Sweden, Switzerland, Ireland, Turkey, and Spain managed in the second war to remain nonbelligerent. And it will, I believe, be increasingly difficult to convince a growing number of Europeans that the risks of attempting neutrality and disentanglement are greater than the alternative.

We must not misunderstand or minimize how people feel who know themselves to be disarmed, who know they cannot be guaranteed against invasion or bombardment, when they are expected to commit themselves irretrievably to participation in war in which their allies and their enemies can offer them only the certainty of devastation.

They know as well as we do that there is no certainty in a policy of neutrality.

It may well be, they know, that they will be overrun, occupied, and destroyed. But on the other hand they know also that as members of either alliance they are certain to be fought over. As neutrals they might have a chance of staying out of the havoc.

I believe therefore that we cannot ignore these feelings; that we shall fail if we try to override them. We should regard every country around the Soviet Union—which seeks by diplomacy and by its own forces to preserve its independence—as a military asset in the defense of the free world, as one less liability against our overextended military and economic commitments.

WE MUST NOT DRIVE NATIONS INTO ALLIANCE WITH MOSCOW

Within the framework of this new policy we, the British, and the French, as the leading members of the Atlantic community, should support Titoism in eastern Europe by taking a firm and unequivocal stand, as in fact we have, not against communism as such, but against Russian imperialism and Russian aggression. But in encouraging Tito to remain independent of Moscow we should not ask or expect him to become our ally.

In China we should do what Secretary Acheson has indicated that he wishes to do. We should offer China what we have offered all Chinese Governments since the time of John Hay 50 years ago: our support, which the Chinese will eventually need, against dismemberment and imperialist aggression. They should be made to feel that they have an alternative to submitting to the demands of Moscow, that they can turn to Washington and London, that they are not imprisoned in the Soviet system, that they are not limited to the economic help which can be drawn from it, that when they feel they need support and seek it, the doors will not be slammed in their face and they will not be driven back into the arms of the Russians.

We should base our policy in Japan on a recognition of the vital interests of Japan. We should make it plain to the Japanese that we know as well as they do that they must trade with the Asiatic mainland, and that therefore they must be allowed to have diplomatic relations with their two Asiatic neighbors.

Japan cannot be expected to join our alliance because we cannot defend Japan against Soviet atomic attack; but we can prevent Japan from joining the Russian alliance because we have the power to attack Japan if she does.

I am quite well aware that I cannot possibly have answered all questions and resolved all doubts. I do not know all the answers, nor have I resolved all my own doubts. I feel sure that the basic conception of our foreign policy will have to be reconsidered, and in important respects revised, in view of what is happening in Germany and in eastern Europe, in the Far East, and southern Asia, and in the field of atomic energy.

I think that our best course from now on is to work toward the general objective of disintegrating the Soviet coalition.

That would mean that we put our influence and power behind the general tendency toward national independence, toward military neutrality, and toward diplomatic disentanglement—a tendency which is manifest in almost all of Asia, and in much at least of central and eastern Europe. I believe that in the last analysis the matter reduces itself to this: that since we cannot encircle the Soviet Union by a military coalition, we should cultivate and exploit all the national forces, all the human impulses to escape from the havoc of war, in order to prevent the Soviet Union from forming its coalition and in order to disintegrate its military alliances in eastern Europe and those which it hopes to achieve in Asia.

WE ARE NOT A BIG LAND POWER

I believe we can never afford to forget—as we form our policy—the true nature and the essential limitations of our power in the world. We are a continental island, separated by the oceans from the great land mass of the Eurasian continent. Inside that great land mass we have and can develop great striking power exerted at long range. But our power to occupy, to fortify, and to hold secure large land areas on the other side of the two oceans is limited.

We are not and will never be a great land power on either continent.

We can base no policy on the assumption that we might be. Nor can we base any policy on the assumption that the heterogeneous peoples of Europe and of Asia can be united, consolidated, armed, and defended in one military system.

We cannot organize military coalitions inside the Eurasian continent which require the presence or the immediate availability of large American land forces.

The kind of naval and air power that we have and that we can exert will not support a policy which seeks to organize such a coalition. Our kind of power can be used, however, to support a policy which seeks to deter aggression by the Soviet Union by the threat of retaliation. Our power will support a policy which seeks to disorganize that coalition by encouraging the natural and almost universal human impulse, the national and personal search for an escape and for a refuge from the ravages of war.

In taking this new line, we may look back, recalling how the dream of one world was shattered, and then how the nightmare of a two-power world is breaking down. But now there is opening up the prospect of a world of many powers associated in the universal society of the United Nations, but not allied irretrievably and not committed to the monstrous heresy and fallacy which we have inadvertently adopted from Communist doctrinaires, that all mankind can be divided into two and only two camps.

Mr. Speaker, it was my very great privilege in the fall of 1947, as a member of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid to spend 2 days at the home of our then Ambassador to Czechoslovakia, Mr. Laurence Steinhardt, in Prague. Mr. Lippmann was with us at that time. I shall always recall some of the things those two outstanding men of our times said about the problems confronting us in the reconstruction of Europe and the rebuilding of faith in the world.

Today, the papers carry the word of the tragic death of Mr. Steinhardt in a plane crash near Ottawa, Canada, where he has been our Ambassador. We can ill afford to lose the experience, the knowledge, and the forthright skill of Laurence Steinhardt, in the diplomatic world. But in presenting this paper by Mr. Lippmann, I feel that I can safely say some of the thinking and insight of Laurence Steinhardt have been preserved for us.

Mr. Speaker, these are fateful days for the world; they are fateful days for the people, the common people of every land. May God grant us the wisdom to choose the right course for humanity's sake and the courage to carry out our part of the task.

ECA for a Third Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the very important consideration of the continuance of the European recovery program is now in progress, I believe it apropos and timely to insert an editorial appearing in the March 26 issue of the Milwaukee Journal entitled "ECA for a Third Year." The editorial adequately and thoroughly analyzes the Marshall-aid program and, in truth, is a résumé of that program and the arguments in favor of it being continued.

ECA FOR A THIRD YEAR

Measures authorizing the third year operation of the Marshall plan at a $3,100,000,000 level have won approval of House and Senate foreign affairs committees.

Attempts to slash the amount asked by Paul Hoffman, Marshall-plan chief, failed. They will undoubtedly be renewed in the appropriations committee and on floors of the two houses, but it seems evident that the final appropriation will be around this $3,100,000,000 mark. Of this, $150,000,000 is left over from this year's funds and would simply be reappropriated.

The 1949 Marshall plan spending totaled $5,695,000,000 and the spending in 1950 is estimated at $3,778,000,000. No estimates have yet been made on the need for 1952, last year of the ECA program, but it should be substantially less than in 1951.

Failure of Marshall-plan opponents to dent appropriations requests indicates the faith of Congress and of the American people in the Marshall program as one of the chief weapons in our campaign to secure peace and fight communism.

There can be no question about the almost phenomenal success of the ECA. In 2 years, it has helped Europe to build overall industrial production up to 20 percent above prewar levels, to curb inflation, stabilize prices, restore agricultural production, increase dollar earnings and bring intra-European trade almost to prewar levels. Thus the job of re-toring western Europe as a stable economic and political entity is well started.

Two provisions in the House version of the ECA measure deserve some scrutiny. The first proposes that $1,000,000,000 of the 1951 aid be in American surplus farm products. This seems a plan of our agricultural politicians to dump on the Europeans a lot of farm products they may not want or need. Mr. Hoffman has said he would not want to be in "that kind of a strait-jacket" and his desires should be respected. The four major farm organizations have also opposed this amendment, pointing out wisely that it would only provide grist for Russian propaganda against the ECA.

The second proposal restricts $600,000,000 for financing of a European payments union. It says, in effect, that if the western European countries can't agree on such a union, then they will lose the $600,000,000. Western Europe needs such a union, in some form, as a major step toward unifying continental economy. Mr. Hoffman and the ECA organization are working toward it.

Their chances of success would seem better if they could depend on argument rather than clubbing tactics, even of a financial nature.

The Role of Labor as Seen by Philip Murray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the president of the CIO, Mr. Philip Murray, has just given us the benefit of his views on the role of labor in the world today, its quest for peace and freedom and its contributions to economic progress. He sets forth some interesting observations and conclusions which should be helpful toward a better understanding of labor's position and labor's aim at the present time.

Mr. Murray's article, What Union Labor Wants, appeared in the New Republic, March 27, 1950, as part of a series which that publication is currently running on certain aspects of western civilization at the halfway mark of the twentieth century. The article is as follows:

WHAT UNION LABOR WANTS

(By Philip Murray)

More than 300 reporters were in attendance at the convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations in November 1949, and they telegraphed nearly a million words to their respective newspapers and magazines. Their presence, and the tremendous bulk of their journalistic endeavor, is proof—if proof is needed—of the widespread public interest in the policies and actions of organized labor, the CIO in particular.

In the press and on the radio the public is treated to a daily fare of speculation concerning both the short-term and long-range aims of our American trade unions. The attitude is expressed in the often voiced question: "What does labor really want?" The question carries with it a certain connotation of concern and alarm—as if to indicate that our unions and their leadership are hiding deep within their hearts a secret to which the public has no right of access. It is a question I have heard not only from

liberals who are warmly sympathetic to labor, but from conservatives who watch the progress of unionism with undisguised dismay.

Nevertheless, that interest in labor's goals and aspirations is natural, healthy, and historic.

Foster Rhea Dulles, in his excellent Labor in America—A History, gives us a constant reminder that labor's role in our society has been a matter of concern since the colonial period. While it may be no secret for workers encumbered with the restrictions of the Taft-Hartley Act, there is room for gratitude for our progress since 1630, when the Massachusetts General Court set a wage ceiling of two shillings a day and proclaimed as law a measure providing that "all workmen shall works the whole day, allowing convenient tyme for food and rest." There is a marked similarity between the look-with-horror advertisements which McGraw-Hill and other corporations have directed at organized labor, and Alexander Hamilton's complaint that incentives to engage in manufacturing are impracticable in the face of "scarcity of hands, dearness of labor, want of capital."

Clearly, the issues that today embroil us in disputes between labor and industry, or that engage the Members of Congress in extended debate, have deep roots in the history of our country. The issues are neither novel nor superficial. They involve each and every one of us, since our society is more closely interdependent than at any time since the first colonists established their little communities and went to work to create a new life in a new land.

The questions that were being put to the infant labor organizations of a century ago are still being asked to our unions today. And the answers, too, remain much the same. What labor really wants is to give its members, and the general public, a consistently rising standard of living in a democratic society which will protect the rights of each citizen while making possible his maximum contribution to the general good.

The history of labor in America—and particularly the history of labor since the birth of the CIO in 1935—offers ready proof that our unions have made a major contribution to the national well-being. I see no indication that labor's role, or labor's contribution to the general welfare, will diminish in the decades ahead.

The 1949 convention of the CIO was a step toward ensuring the continuance of labor's effective dedication to the development of our democratic society. The CIO, at that meeting in Cleveland, took drastic and necessary steps to eliminate Communist influence in the American labor movement. Some cartoonists, in the shorthand vocabulary of their craft, have sought to picture the CIO, prior to our 1949 convention, as a bewildered gentleman at the crossroads, uncertain whether to take the rocky road to communism or the more appealing path of democracy. Yet the CIO was never confronted with such a limited choice; never for a moment has the CIO been in doubt whether to maintain its independent status as a free trade-union or to place itself under the dominance of the Communist Party and its Kremlin policy makers. Rather, the CIO was faced with a condition that became more grave with the passing of each postwar year. We faced the practical alternative of either taking no policy position on major issues, in order to placate the handful of Communist-dominated union officials, or to adopt policies in which we sincerely believed, only to have our course of action sabotaged by this same obstructionist group.

In my report to the CIO convention at Cleveland, I commented that—

"The Communist program for American labor is a program of destruction. Couched in terms of pseudomilitancy, it invites defeat for labor, rupture of our organizations, failure of attainment of even our most modest goals. * * * The program of the left wing would enslave us to the aims and aspirations of a party whose interests are not those of American labor but are directed toward the establishment of a retrogressive dictatorship in our life. * * * We are committed to broadening of our democratic structure, not to its destruction. We are committed to orderly and constructive progress by labor in America; we are not and never will be committed to a policy that makes our movement the slave a dictatorial state apparatus."

That statement of position is in accord with the sentiments of millions of workers in this country who have read with increasing concern of the sacrifice of liberty and human dignity in the dictatorship nations or who, in the framework of their own experience, have seen efforts to paralyze the effectiveness of their own union organizations by cliques of financial totalitarians.

By eliminating the practical influence of the totalitarians, the CIO is freeing itself of a cumbersome dead weight. Freed of internal obstructionism based on adherence to a faulty ideology, the CIO has opened the way for accelerated organizational campaigns, for even stronger campaigns in behalf of civil rights, and for a political-action program of expanding dimensions. Let no one doubt that in casting off the influence of Communist puppets in a few unions, the CIO is destined to become more active and more successful in attaining its objectives.

Nevertheless, there have been expressions of concern by some liberal newspapers and magazines lest the decisive series of actions which the CIO took to rid itself of Communist obstructionism result in a diminution of labor's militancy, its efforts to improve civil liberties, its basic devotion to the democratic process. These are groundless fears. They spring, I think, from the erroneous belief that the Communists have a monopoly on the capacity to stir the heart or brain, or to activate the legs of the picket or the finger of the doorbell ringer. The Communists have energy, but they have no monopoly on energy. That was proved during the 1948 elections. The so-called left wing was completely energized over the candidacy of Henry Wallace—but millions of union members in both the CIO and AFL paid little attention to the misguided fanaticism of the Wallacites.

In 1946, to cite another example, Communist groups in some of the northern cities energetically passed resolutions and staged parades against discrimination in Dixie at the time the CIO was launching its southern organizing drive—but it was a group of loyal, democratically minded CIO workers who were—and still are—carrying on the long, hard, often dangerous job of bringing unionism and attendant civil liberties to backward industrial areas of the Southern States.

A second overdrawn conclusion has been made since our convention: that in removing Communist influence, the CIO is acting to silence all internal differences of opinion. That is a most unlikely possibility. An organization whose leadership embraces such diverse personalities as Joe Curran, Jim Carey, Walter Reuther, Jack Potofsky—to name a very few of my associates—faces no foreseeable danger of hardening of its cerebral arteries. No organization the size of the CIO could try for long to smother the thinking of its constituents without complete paralysis and disintegration.

What the responsible CIO leaders have objected to during these past few years is not the statement of diverse or unpopular ideas, but the all-or-nothing series of demands through which a small minority of party liners sought to hamstring a great organization and render it impotent and ineffectual in relation to some of the great issues of our day—the European recovery program, the 1948 election, the achievement of a Fair Deal legislative program.

The CIO has put its own house in order through the actions of its 1949 convention. It is ready now, in a more effective way than at any other time in the recent past, to devote itself to the important problems that we as Americans and as workers must face.

What, then, is labor's program in terms of economic advancement, legislative activity, and political action? Obviously, millions of workers and their families are interested in improving their standard of living, of achieving security—not only from unemployment, but from the crisis of illness and accident and from the financial burdens that so tragically haunt the lives of millions of our older citizens. They are insisting upon a strengthened structure of civil rights and democratic liberties. They seek the abundant life which America can produce for all of us, and they are determined to use their unions and their Government to achieve it. They want an intelligent, constructive militance from their union; they want a government devoted wholeheartedly to a Fair Deal program that will act in the general public welfare; and they are interested in the creation of political-action mechanisms which will insure the election of legislative bodies capable of overcoming the stand-pat complexes of entrenched minorities.

There is, in truth, nothing new about such a program. The same plan was in the minds of the people in the early years of our Republic, when they insisted upon the inclusion of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution. It is a program of liberalism and instinctive desire for economic progress which has been handed down from one American generation to the next. Our problem, in a world of breath-taking scientific progress and life-taking dictatorship, is to shape that program into practical form for application to the needs of our citizens today.

Freedom and liberty are not abstractions to the man whose right to picket has been abridged by a Taft-Hartley injunction or whose right of assembly and speech has been repealed by the owner of a factory-controlled southern village.

To workers and their unions, whose legitimate struggles have constantly met with repression and hostility from employers and sections of the governmental structure, civil liberties are an immediate and pragmatic problem. Having seen the practical effects of the deprivation of those basic rights, they have little use for the highly theoretical "viewing with alarm" that emanates from corporation front offices and from corporation front organizations. American workers will pay scant attention to the views of economic reactionaries who hold that our labor organizations or our Government cannot embark on economic or welfare programs because such a course of action does not jibe with the writings of eighteenth-century British theorists. A union member requires no unusual economic insight to realize that $20,000,000,000 in corporation profits constitutes a shameless maladjustment in our economy. They know that mass unemployment is a needless waste of human resources and economic strength. The benefits of a TVA or the merits of eliminating sweatshop conditions can be appreciated without a Ph. D. in economics.

There exists in our country a vast backlog of unfinished legislative business. It is spelled out both in President Truman's Fair Deal program and in the legislative program of organized labor. Indeed, our own CIO program lists 26 major points on which action is necessary and desirable as soon as possible. Since 1938 Congress has taken a leave of absence from social-welfare legislation. Perhaps, although it is by no means certain, the lapse was excusable during the war years. The fact remains that action is now long overdue.

We must get ahead with the legislative job. The atrocious Taft-Hartley Act must be repealed. The minimum-wage law, though improved in 1949, still needs considerable broadening of its coverage. There can be no further delay in modernizing our obsolete social-security law; in getting to work on great public-power projects in the river valleys; in providing real protection against unemployment; in removing from our tax laws the loopholes which big business is using for a horde of nefarious fiscal practices; for putting sharper teeth into our anti-monopoly statutes.

Congress must soon come to grips with the expensive and not particularly effective method by which the average American receives medical care. It must have the courage and the imagination to realize that our civil rights need strengthening.

There is no need to enumerate each item on the list of unfinished legislative business. The demand for enactment of this program lies in the hearts of our people—within and without the labor movement—and they have made clear their sentiments at the polls.

Labor's program promises no blueprint for utopia, and accordingly it is subject to criticism by the utopians. We in the labor movement are constantly being asked to appraise and endorse schemes that are guaranteed to end all human woes, or to provide easy answers to some of our outstanding problems. Many of the proposals that come to us have merit; many of them could be successfully managed if the American labor movement had even a small fraction of the financial resources of the great corporations; and almost all of them are offered in good faith by their proponents. But practical considerations rule out most of these proposals. And American workers do not want their unions to leap into the unknown with schemes that may sacrifice the solid gains of the past in the quest for future successes.

The Fair Deal program enunciated by President Truman in his 1949 state of the Union message and the legislative programs adopted by organized labor in recent years point the way toward attainable objectives. They are solidly based on our legislative history during both the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, and their enactment would produce a definite strengthening of our national levels of economic stability, civil rights, and social welfare.

The adoption of such a program—and I feel confident that it will be enacted within the foreseeable future—will solidify our Government's determination to provide at least minimum protection for the needs of our people. To many critics of forward-looking governmental policies, the concept of the "welfare state"—in fact, even the most primary elements of President Roosevelt's New Deal—has appeared as a form of dictatorial "statism" that would force every section of the population, organized labor included, to submit to the whim of an all-powerful government. But American workers have too much faith in the validity of their democratic institutions to accept uncritically any such type of horror propaganda.

Nevertheless, the expansion of governmental activity into many new fields will require, on the part of organized labor, a continuous reexamination of its own functions, and of its relations with government. There was a time when leaders of labor opposed any government move toward social insurance as a threat to the effective operation of labor unions. That attitude, though admittedly shortsighted, had an understandable background in the type of government that we tolerated during most of the first three decades of this century. Today, we can visualize far broader areas of cooperation between the labor movement and the Federal Government.

However favorable the administration we enjoy in Washington or in the State capitals, labor has no intention of surrendering its functions to Government. Nor does organized labor in this country intend to become a mechanism of Government by yielding its power to make decisions or policy to the State machinery. Looking about our world today, we are more than ever convinced of the correctness of our traditional policy of labor independence. The European labor movements are, of course, acting within the framework of their own traditions, and they are well serving the democratic needs of their own people. But our own labor tradition, which increasingly recognizes the need for effective political action, gives full value to the pioneering experimentation of the collective-bargaining process. I visualize organized labor as a great stimulant to governmental action, and in carrying out this process we help to retain the self-reliance of our people.

Thus, it seems clear to me that labor's economic activity has been primarily responsible for the recent increase in the Federal minimum wage. That legislative improvement was attributable directly to the wage increases that labor has won through the collective-bargaining process. Proposals for the modernization of the social-security structure languished for years until organized labor, in the course of negotiations with industry, began to emphasize its demands for contractual security provisions. In both these cases, the efforts of an independent labor movement provide effective, if indirect, stimulus to legislative action. I want to see organized labor in America keep this leverage.

Labor, it is obvious, can contribute most effectively to the welfare of its own membership and of the general public by acting in concert with an administration of liberal political attitudes. The Taft-Hartley Act confirmed a lesson that we in the CIO had realized many years before—that labor cannot concentrate its attention on collective-bargaining problems without regard to the rules under which collective bargaining functions. Taft-Hartley was the final proof that labor must, if only for self-preservation, take an active part in the political-action process. Our political successes have been considerable during the last decade and I feel confident that labor's political action is our best guaranty of continued liberal government.

Labor has helped the two-party system, which for a time had lost much of its meaning, by giving such concentrated attention to issues as to force most officeholders and candidates to declare their positions in terms of liberalism or conservatism. In the North, that process is far along; in the South, it still lags. But the steady union organizational progress in the Southern States will certainly produce a change, over the long run, in the attitudes of the men and women who serve in Southern legislatures and congressional delegations.

As labor's political influence grows, and the political parties respond to expressions of the people's will, the clamor for a third party is almost certain to diminish. Where the people cannot beat a reactionary candidate with one liberal opponent, I am not sanguine about their ability to defeat reaction with a divided opposition. And in those sections of the South where we are saddled with the equivalent of one-party rule, we must look not toward a third party but toward a second one. A militant program, such as the Democratic Party adopted in 1948, and a slate of candidates pledged to its enactment are our best guaranty of legislative progress. With labor more politically conscious than ever before, it is difficult to visualize the surrender of both major parties to the outright control of reactionary industrial and financial interests; and it is only in such an event that a third party could win public acceptance.

With labor at the crest of power and influence—and responsibility—in America, the way is open for long-range programs of social and economic reform. I have already mentioned the social-welfare program which labor regards as desirable and necessary. We must also come to grips with the problem of monopoly control of our Nation's industry and natural resources. The staggering accumulation of financial power accruing to the great corporations in recent years threatens a serious lack of balance in our national life. The Federal Trade Commission reports that in 13 major industries, three or fewer corporations maintain more than 60-percent control; three steel corporations own 40.2 percent of that industry's net capital assets and 58.9 percent of its steel-ingot capacity. Government statistics show that the rich are expanding their control over our national wealth and savings while millions of families live at submarginal levels.

More effective checks and balances over the distribution of wealth and economic power are in order, both for our own domestic welfare and for the preservation and strengthening of America's democratic influence throughout the world. Tremendous masses of privately controlled financial power can rock our Nation—and in fact our world—as effectively as a cannon rolling loose in a ship's hold. Unsocial investments, at home or overseas, can create stresses and tensions from which all of us will suffer. I believe firmly in free enterprise, but I also am firmly convinced that the business community has no license to act without responsibility for the public welfare.

These are problems of great dimensions, but they will certainly be solved within the framework of our capabilities as a democratic Nation. During a lifetime devoted to the labor movement, I have witnessed advances in the status of our workers and of the entire population which exceed the most optimistic forecasts of my youth. During these decades our social and economic institutions have become more complex, but we have progressed steadfastly toward the better life which is the aim of all men and women of good will. The intelligence, common sense and courage of the American people have carried them through two wars and a series of economic crises. Today, as we stand at the threshold of the atomic, electronic era, I remain optimistic that the qualities which have inspired labor and the Nation in the past will enable us to continue a role of world leadership in humanity's quest for peace, freedom and economic progress.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Brewing Boom," which appeared in Newsday, Hempstead, N. Y., on February 23, 1950, and an editorial entitled "It Looks Like Farley," which appeared in the Riverhead New York County Review, March 2, 1950.

My good friend, Jim Farley, has been one of the most outstanding members of the Democratic Party of the entire Nation. He has always been a friend of

Queens County, and, more particularly, a friend of the Democrats.

[From Newsday, Hempstead, N. Y., of Feb. 22, 1950]

THE BARON'S HOME

Particularly in Queens County and in upstate rural districts, a boom has begun to have former Postmaster General James A. Farley nominated as Democratic candidate for Governor of New York in the election next fall. The trend was first noticed when Farley got a rip-snorting warm reception from 2,400 party leaders at a dinner in New York last month. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., was set to star that evening, but his star flickered. Genial Jim was the man most cordially received.

The Farley-for-governor boom makes sense. Here is a straight party man for the Democrats to promote, a superlative politician, an experienced administrator. Hopeful Junior has still to win his spurs. But Farley manipulated the first two of Franklin Roosevelt's Presidential nominations and deserves more of the high-riding Democrats than a testimonial vote of gratitude. He would probably rate White House backing if he chose to run, for he supported Truman in 1948 when lesser New York Democrats had fled.

When Republican county chairmen meet in Albany next week they will be trying to figure out what Governor Dewey intends to do. If he chooses to run again, a Dewey-Farley race would be an interesting spectacle, one FDR, Sr., hoped to see in 1938. Whichever man, the State would be in safe hands for another gubernatorial term.

A master of politics, Farley is straightforward in telling the public how politics operates. "I am perfectly unconscious," he once wrote, "that when political organizations begin thinking about jobs and nothing else, when they forget that the public business should come first, they have begun their own death chant without realizing it. * * * The protest of the public is the best way to discipline an organization against that sort of thing."

Come to think of it, Jim Farley is one of our favorite Democrats. We hope the Democratic leaders have the good sense to tap him for that nomination. This third man is our vote! Walnfest learns big.

[From the Riverhead (N. Y.) County Review of March 2, 1950]

IF LOOKS LIKE FARLEY

Although the gubernatorial campaign of 1950 is still a long ways off, it now looks as though James A. Farley sentiment is daily growing and as though nothing but a sharp reversal of Democratic opinion or Mr. Farley's personal refusal to run can head off his nomination as the Democratic candidate. The wind is blowing so definitely in Mr. Farley's direction, in fact, that Leo Egan, eminent political writer of the New York Times, dwelt upon the subject at considerable length in a recent issue of the Times.

This is gratifying to the County Review, for if it cannot be credited with launching the present Farley drive, it must, at least, be credited with being the first newspaper to go all-out in advocacy of his candidacy. In a first-page editorial of its issue of January 12, it came out unreservedly for the "Genial Jim," and gave its reasons for doing so. The response to that editorial has been pronounced and it has convinced us that countless New York State citizens were only waiting for someone to say what the County Review said.

If the subject has to be discussed on a purely political basis, it is our opinion that Mr. Farley, if picked as the Democratic candidate, would have more than a reasonable chance of victory at the polls. Our advocacy of him, however, is not based on his strength as a vote getter. We base it on more practical grounds.

Every taxpayer in the country must know by this time that indiscriminate spending is becoming the fixed rule of government. Those who by virtue of their position can reach into the public purse do so without reserve, always consoling themselves by the thought that "there is more where that comes from." Now and then, we discover some of the unwarranted leaks which prove costly to us, but not yet have we learned how much of our money is going down the drain without rhyme or reason.

One reason why this is so is that we feel politicians alone are to be trusted with our affairs. We get the politicians regularly but we seldom get real statesmanship and it is even rarer that we get good business management. We will never get away from this sort of thing until we start electing businessmen who will run our business as they would run their own business and who will spend our money with some such consideration as they would their own. "That is purely elementary," as Sherlock Holmes used to say to his friend, Dr. Watson.

Mr. Farley is a good businessman. He has proved that in some fairly big-sized jobs. If sent to Albany, it is certain that he would put the State's business on a solid, sane business foundation and teach those under him that the taxpayers' money is to be respected. Jim might not discuss money matters in such flamboyant phraseology as we often have handed out to us, but he can be counted upon to apply the rules of simple arithmetic and to reach the proper conclusion through the process of sane reasoning. Jim has a goodly amount of that good, old-fashioned gumption which has pretty much gone into the discard in recent years but which is just as valuable today as it ever was.

Jim Farley would make a good governor. He would cut red tape of the fantastic order down to a minimum. He would face any issue and face it speedily—with fewer round-table discussions and less time lost in squabbling over irrelevant phrases of the question.

As we said in our editorial January 12, Farley is our man. We think, after giving due thought to the matter, that the average man will make up his mind that Farley is also his man.

This Is Your Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Louis Bromfield:

THIS IS YOUR COUNTRY

(By Louis Bromfield)

Watching the country, it seems to me that the chances favoring the Republican Party are increasing apace, indeed more rapidly than the Republicans are taking advantage of the situation. Issue after issue is being made for them by the assertions and actions of the Truman-Boyle Democratic machine, while the Republican general staff and the congressional leaders in Washington go off into vague and grandiose statements of policy or on investigations of this or that which may or may not produce pay dirt and all too frequently backfire. Unless the Republicans can uncover some really serious cases of spying and Soviet sympathy, they are wasting time from a political point of view.

The Hiss case and the Coplon case both proved how much treachery was going on inside our Government during the long years of a Democratic administration and their exposures were immensely valuable to the Nation as a whole.

They also make excellent political capital especially, insofar as both trials revealed the indifference and carelessness of a desperate situation which President Truman airily referred to as "a red herring."

There was plenty of evidence as well that there were efforts made from within the administration to block or at least confuse the issues.

But the Communists as a whole have never been held in such contempt and their stock has never been so low as at the present time. They are only secondarily an issue.

The issues which can win the vote of the majority of honest American citizens are lower taxes, more jobs, lower living costs, and the cleaning up and reorganization of our Federal Government upon some plan which makes sense. Every day from farm-subsidy programs to the administration of veterans' funds, the issue becomes more obvious.

BECOMING A TIRED PEOPLE

The American people (the most vigorous people in the world) are becoming a tired people. They are living in a distracting and worried world, bad enough in itself, but the Truman administration brings them no confidence or relief from anxiety.

It merely operates from day to day on a crisis basis, constantly accentuating and playing for political advantage on all the fears already harassing the American people.

It harps upon the declining income of the farmer, upon the increasing unemployment, upon the impossibility of coming to any terms with Russia, upon the desperate need for a state-managed security in which the Government takes your money, spends it for you and adds to the expense many times through the burden of bureaucratic administration.

In no case whatever does the administration attempt to encourage or strengthen the natural optimism and vitality of the American people and their confidence in themselves and their system. It merely tries to sell the socialistic state so that no one need ever worry, or, presumably in the end, even work.

Meanwhile, every workingman labors approximately 47 days for the Government, every skilled workman works approximately 67 days. Professional people and people in small businesses work as much as 3 or 4 months a year for the Government.

Some of our ablest citizens, the ones whose brains and energy largely provide prosperity and jobs for the rest of us, work sometimes as much as 7 and 8 months a year merely to sustain in part a vast and increasing bureaucracy which constantly becomes more burdensome and expensive and constantly muddles up the biggest and worst-run business in the world—the United States Government.

KEEP ON MORE TAXES

In the face of this, Mr. Truman and his machine keep repeating that we must have higher taxes, that it is impossible to make any cuts in expenditure.

He keeps repeating with the silly air of the ward politician, "Show me where any cuts can be made," and when perfectly obvious cuts are proposed by the Hoover Commission or by other men of unqualified ability and integrity, he and his friends pretend that they did not hear and go on increasing the number of Government employees for whom you and I have to pay more taxes every year.

It is like the caginess of Secretary Brannan in refusing ever to give any estimated figure of the billions which his solve-all farm plan would cost the average citizen in added taxes.

The Republicans might add that when you build a house you pay about 600 different taxes, that every time you take a ride in your car, you pay about one-fourth of the cost to

Government in gasoline taxes, that you could afford that train trip or afford to send that telegram if Government were not taking a fat share in taxes which just makes the difference, that you could afford to go to the theater or the movies more often if the Government did not take 20 percent of what you pay directly out of your pocket in addition to a fat income tax.

The Republicans might also add that all of this makes your dollar buy less each year and causes the value of your Government bonds to decline sharply while, in time of great prosperity, Mr. Truman cannot balance his budget and wants constantly to borrow money or increase taxes.

The Republicans might ask "What happens when we hit hard times?" The Republicans might suggest a good long look at Britain where panacea plans are already in operation.

These are issues every man in the street understands and the Democrats have no defense whatever against them. They only say "We need more taxes and more money to hire more bureaucrats to make life more miserable for you." I suspect that after 20 years of it, government by crisis and improvisation is beginning to wear thin with the tired American people. They'd like to see some sensible action.

Government Gets Bigger, but Politics Keeps Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD an editorial from the March 23 issue of the Louisville Courier-Journal. Since it pertains to the appropriations bill soon to be considered, I am sure it will be of value to all Members.

GOVERNMENT GETS BIGGER, BUT POLITICS KEEPS UP

The constant efforts of Congress to cope with problems of Government in a world of many complications has brought forth a new wrinkle. It may be a sign of the times that are beginning to set in the human mind a fear of confusion. The appropriations bill just approved by the House committee wraps almost everything up in one massive package, around $29,000,000,000.

Previously there was a sheaf of separate bills for the departments, leading to interminable debates, log-rolling, and ragged, piecemeal adjustments. The new way sounds efficient, though one can hardly help asking how far streamlining and obstacle-jumping can go as a general proposition.

After this reflection one may turn to the bill itself. For all that it cuts a billion and a half dollars from the President's budget requests, it is still the administration bill in policy and purposes. It will still be the target for attacks on the floors of Congress, with Republicans oiling up their larynxes to win whatever virtue comes from economy preachments in an election year.

But the Democrat regulars have pretty well fortified the bill against radical operations. They have applied the cuts in the committee chamber, as if to get the jump on the inevitable. They take their stand on the proposition that they have done their best and that as the world goes today, anything more would be dangerous. Members of the opposition freely admit they will have plenty to say on that point.

You can just bet your life they will, and many a Democrat besides. They will be out in the open then, for all to hear. Sweet are the uses of economy, as a catchword as well as an intrinsic virtue. The Members with fire in their eyes insist that $1,500,000,000 isn't nearly enough to cut, and that they will fight to lop off $3,000,000,000 more, if it takes them right down to election day.

The amount is incidental, but the idea is the best in the world. We only wish we could resist the temptation to point out the catches in it. One of them is that this is 1950, when everybody in the House and one-third of the Senators will be running for reelection. It is never too soon for a candidate to start building a record to which to point with pride on the hustings. But he probably knows the score—let's say, last year's score. There was the same cry, bipartisan and furious. There was the promise to lay a meat ax to the budget. And there was, in the end, actually more money appropriated than even Mr. Truman had asked for.

The average economy shouter knows that the difficulty of saying no to appropriations is even greater in election year than ever. Let's take, for example, the announced plan of the committee members to cut the request of $634,000,000 for river-harbor-flood-control work down to $675,000,000. This is the local project, like floodwalls here and up and down the Ohio. Last year a diligent effort was made by honest economisers to cut this item from $751,000,000 to $450,000,000. As it came out of the works at last, it was even bigger than it had started. And nobody was running in 1949.

To be sure, the main consideration is far more serious than this one of the pork-barrel bill. It touches on the situation in the world, and the enormous obligations thrust upon America. But for this there would be no debate at all about the need of economy, about the utter folly of running Government deficits in times of the highest prosperity. As it is, the principal wish of the American citizen is that when and if the cutting is done—and we don't doubt there are plenty of spots for it—it will be done with discrimination and with an eye on the facts of global life.

Statement Supporting the Habana Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT SUPPORTING THE HABANA CHARTER

Manufacturers of medicinal products have a large stake in the maintenance of a high level of export trade. They have a direct interest, therefore, in any practical program for eliminating the multitude of restrictive controls and barriers that restrain profitable trade, or make it burdensomely complicated, in many parts of the world. The Habana Charter provides such a program and also the means of carrying it out through the International Trade Organization. It is important to this industry, therefore, that Congress approve House Joint Resolution 236 and thereby enable the United States to give its full and active support to the ITO.

The export of drugs and pharmaceutical products has grown phenomenally since the war; few industries have shown such expansion. Whereas the normal prewar exports of the industry were only about $18,000,000 annually, today exports average $200,000,000. The exports of Eli Lilly & Co. have increased five times, thus contributing to the continuous high level of employment in Indianapolis and to the well-being of not only our employees but also the many professional people and tradesmen who furnish them with goods and services. All of them have a direct stake in the continuance of our export markets.

Because of the fact that the need for drugs is sufficiently great that even countries with a meager supply of dollars give drugs a high priority in allocating their foreign exchange, drug exports have held up well while American exports in general have declined considerably in the last 6 months. The relatively favored position of our industry, however, does not blind us to the fact that the welfare of United States exports as a whole is of real concern to us. The same factors that would expand world trade in general will help sustain our exports and the factors now restricting foreign trade are a threat to our own trade.

Exporters are increasingly distressed by the malignant growth of barriers and controls imposed on international trade since the war. If not checked these barriers will eventually force trade to such low levels that our own domestic prosperity will be adversely affected. Further loss of exports may well be accompanied by unemployment in important sectors of our economy and by the retrenchment of formerly profitable and taxpaying industries. As foreign aid under the ERP is reduced and eventually eliminated in 1952, the present downward trend in exports could snowball with disastrous results unless some active measures are taken to restore the fabric of world trade. Other countries need our export products and we need their business if we want to retain our economic health. The important thing is to provide a means for them to pay for our goods. This can only be done by increasing world trade and, more specifically, by stimulating multilateral trade.

I am in favor of the International Trade Organization because it is the best available means for attacking existing trade barriers and controls that prevent restoration of multilateral trade. It is important that the Habana Charter obtained the agreement of 54 nations; without an agreement of such scope there is no practical possibility of dealing with the problem. It is also important that the charter covers the entire range of trade barriers, from import quotas to cartels. It is important that these restrictions are dealt with in detail and cover the interests of all industries engaged in trade. For example, my industry is benefited by the requirement (art. 45 (a) (ii) and (iii)) that countries cannot use import restrictions under the guise of health regulations without showing legitimate cause. If this is done today we have no recourse. With the ITO we shall be able to register effective complaints and have our Government follow it with action if necessary.

Without such detail the charter would be loose and meaningless. It is also important that the ITO would provide a source of detailed information on existing and projected trade restrictions and trade statistics. Finally, it is important that a mechanism would be established which would permit trade disputes to be settled peacefully.

I am aware that there have been some sharp criticisms of the charter for the ITO. Some of these criticisms have a certain amount of justification. Certainly the charter does not constitute an ideal document from an American point of view. However, by the same token, it does not constitute an ideal document from the point

ed view of many other countries which differ considerably from us in economic conditions and thinking. To anyone who has a real stake in foreign trade, however, criticisms of the present charter must be examined in a practical light. Do the critics have anything better to offer? To the best of my observation, the answer is no. In fact, I have yet to hear one constructive suggestion on the part of opponents to the ITO. The interests of the United States and American foreign trade are not served by abstract debate which leads to no constructive results. We must deal in realities. We badly need an International Trade Organization, and only one practical charter for such an organization exists. We should approve it without delay if we hope to advance American interests in foreign trade.

FORNEY TEN,
President, Eli Lilly International Corp.

General Eisenhower Voices Warning Against Further Disarmament by This Country in Face of International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, a warning which is voiced by a person of preeminent qualifications to speak is one which should not be ignored and should be heeded as an expression of utmost authority.

General Eisenhower has recently voiced the grave warning to our country against the eventuality that we may fail to maintain our defense establishment at the level of security and in this connection I desire to have included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials in comment on General Eisenhower's recent statement which have appeared in the Nashville Tennessean, of March 24, last, and the Nashville Banner, of the same date:

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean of March 24, 1950]

WE CAN'T AFFORD WEAKNESS

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's warning that this country cannot go further in reducing its armed strength without the gravest kind of danger is justified by his accompanying statement that when even one power "builds and maintains a military machine beyond recognized needs of reasonable security, a war of aggression remains a constant threat to peaceful nations."

Although the former commander in chief of the Allies in Europe is a military man, he is not an advocate of militaristic diplomacy. On the contrary, he is one of the most effective spokesmen for peaceful understanding among nations.

We accept as genuine his concern lest the United States, having hastily demobilized most of its strength at the war's end, should reduce its armed strength to a point that would invite attack. He was one of the engineers of the current military program and he is alarmed lest economies guide the defense organization below the danger point.

It is an American ambition to lead the way to peace, but in seeking the goal it is necessary to keep in mind General Eisenhower's declaration that "America can do nothing unless she is strong."

[From the Nashville Banner of March 24, 1950]

EISENHOWER SAYS "DON'T DISARM"

General Eisenhower's warning against disarmament in the face of a Soviet threat which no intelligent nation can ignore, is the word of a man who knows the score. He speaks from no impulse of hysteria, and from no position of one who is uninformed.

As soldier and citizen, his opinion carries weight, and the Senate Military Affairs Committee properly has called him for an outline of his views—bearing as they do on security matters now before it.

To a great extent, America has disarmed. It has dismantled much of the defense machinery, has put much of its fleet in mothballs, disposed one way or another of much air strength, allowed supercarrier construction to be canceled, et cetera. The battle of the Pentagon was allowed to jeopardize the Navy. Now a program of heavier spending is being undertaken to make some repairs.

Of late, the State Department has stressed that the only persuasive influence which the Communists understand and respect is force, which is another way of saying that physical weakness invites attack; also that where this enemy is concerned, the convincing argument is superior strength. In the face of that fact, it is no time to be frittering away our substance, or demobilizing might.

As General Eisenhower observes, Russia knows the disarmament status and capitalizes on it. Nothing less than physical strength will deter Moscow, or compel her to come to taw on policies which could convert the cold war to a hot war.

Congress needs all the light it can get on the matters before it, having to do with the initial steps of preparedness, and Eisenhower can furnish some light. He isn't an amateur in the business of national defense. He isn't a warmonger. He is a soldier and citizen concerned for the security of the United States of America.

Verifying his statement, it certainly isn't a time to disarm when a hostile power is arming to its utmost with the precise objective of conquering by war if need be.

Partition of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the act of the English Parliament in detaching by its legislation six Counties of Ireland on the ground that they are pro-British has no more foundation in law or common sense than would be the act of the English Parliament in detaching the six States of the so-called New England States of the United States on the ground that they are pro-British.

In the ECA legislation the United States is providing huge sums with a view to breaking down customs and monetary barriers between the nations of western Europe and in the same bill we are providing funds to England whereby directly or indirectly England is enabled to maintain an artificial, unnecessary, and expensive customs barrier separating six Counties of Ireland from the rest of the Nation.

Ireland is our oldest friend. Ireland was our friend when England was our enemy. Our voice is raised loud in proclaiming that we are interested in freedom and justice all over the world and in raising economic standards all over the world; and that we must be so interested in order to frustrate world-wide communism. Ireland has not threatened to go Communist and participates but meagerly in Marshall plan aid. What she does ask us is that the United States, her friend, do not participate directly or indirectly in imposing on her the yoke of partition.

An Appeal for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for printing in the RECORD a letter received from Mr. Robert Gemmer, a minister of the gospel residing in my district. This letter was written to me after he had visited Hiroshima, and incorporated in it is a letter from the orphans of Hiroshima, appealing to the leaders of the world not to make of it another Hiroshima.

I realize that the accomplishment of an answer to their prayer is not so simple as these children might suppose, but the goal to be attained thereby is so precious that no effort should be spared in our endeavors to attain it.

The following is the English translation given us of the original text which was written in Japanese by the senior high girls of Hiroshima. The letter was sent to President Truman, Premier Stalin, and the United Nations. Each of the 600 girls in the school signed the letters personally as well as a fourth copy they planned to send to India, asking her to use India's influence as a neutral nation to bring the major powers together. Each of the girls and the 850 junior high girls also decided to write personally some world leader.

No adult or teacher met with the students. Classes waited. They took seriously our challenge to translate their prayers for peace into work for peace. Some of the girls told us about their meeting later:

"We decided to pray, and as we prayed something wonderful happened. We really felt God was helping us. All the girls whose parents had died in the bomb stood and prayed. We didn't want anyone else to have the experience we had.

"On the World Day of Prayer we bring to mind the horrible experience at the time of the atomic bomb, and we feel deeply the urgent need of a world peace for the sake of the welfare of all people.

"That day on which our dear fathers, mothers, brothers, and sisters, and friends were taken from us. On that day tens of thousands of people in Hiroshima lost their lives as victims of the atomic bomb, and the city, full of life until that morning, was burned to ashes in but a few seconds. And it was thought that never again would we be able to stand up. The grievous calls for help which came from under the fallen buildings lying within the devouring fire which had wrapped the completely destroyed city, are still calling us and pushing us into the road to peace.

"We do not want others to suffer this piteous tragedy which war has brought to us. No matter how science may prosper, man cannot make man. When we think how important each individual is, and of how lightly they were treated in the war, we firmly pray that such a thing will never happen again.

"But even if everyone had gone through the terrible experience, people are still preparing for war.

"The leaders of each country say that they will use weapons as a means to peace. But as long as weapons exist, we firmly believe that we cannot hope for true peace. We pray that the large sums used for armaments will be turned to render services for the happiness of mankind.

"We want you to listen to our prayers which we are shouting from the bottom of our hearts.

"We pray from the bottom of our hearts that you, the great leaders of Russia and America, who have the greatest strength, will take the leadership and work wholeheartedly for the purpose of world peace."

In further discussion that evening, one of the girls summed it up saying: "Today our school did something really good, and we're all so happy we can hardly stand it, but we still have to study and go to school, so we say: 'Please everyone do something too!'"

ROBERT GEMMER.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to include an editorial from the Okmulgee Daily Times, Okmulgee, Okla., of March 10 endorsing statehood for Alaska and Hawaii:

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

The House of Representatives has passed bills providing for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. It is up to the Senate now to say whether the forty-ninth and fiftieth States shall be added to the Union. President Truman is on record in favor of statehood for both.

We can think of no sound reason why they should not be admitted to the Union. Though the population of both is small—Alaska about 100,000 and Hawaii 530,000—it is our conviction the people of both can govern themselves better through state governments than the Federal government can through territorial administration.

There has been a lot of shameful exploitation of Alaska, much of it with the knowledge if not the actual connivance of Federal agencies. This probably could and would be stopped if the Alaskans were to find themselves in the position of governing themselves and being responsible for the conservation of their own resources.

Hawaii, if admitted to statehood, will be the first offshore State in the Union. Some consideration from a military standpoint has been given to that aspect of the situation; but it need not greatly concern us, because our responsibility for the protection of Hawaii is the same whether it is a Territory or State.

We hope the Senate will not dilly-dally with the statehood bills now that they have reached their present status after long years of fighting on the part of Alaska and Hawaii.

Toward Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I want to include the speech which won the New Jersey State Oratorical Contest for high school students, conducted this year in Morristown, N. J. The speech was written and delivered by Wellington D. Kohl, a student at Central High School in Trenton. The speech itself is an outstanding achievement, and the boy who wrote and delivered it is truly representative of American tradition. An orphan, Wellington Kohl is a ward of the State of New Jersey. He earns his spending money by working after school, and is an honor student in his class. This young Negro boy is an outstanding American—I believe, with his teachers, that he shows strong promise of becoming one of our Nation's leaders. I am proud of the opportunity to present herewith the speech with which he won our State's oratorical contest for 1950:

TOWARD DEMOCRACY

(By Wellington D. Kohl)

I speak as an American Negro. I speak with pride, for my racial heritage is a worthy one. When the 13 colonies wrested their freedom from the hands of the British tyranny, free men of African descent laid down their lives along with their white comrades at Saratoga, at Monmouth, at Yorktown. Even in the dark days of slavery when the leaders of the South defied the Union, the wealth, the power on which their defiance relied, came from the toil of Negro men and women. And what of more recent years? What have we achieved since emancipation freed us from the profitless toil of slavery? In art, in literature, in science, in statesmanship our record is no cause for shame. I am proud to be of the same race as Marian Anderson, as James Weldon Johnson, as George Washington Carver, as Ralph J. Bunche.

So to the members of my race I say: Take pride in your racial heritage. Be too proud to ask or accept special consideration because yours is a race that has been grievously wronged in the past. Be too proud of your race to attribute any failures of your own to the fact that you belong to it. Devote your life to proving again what has already been proved in the past—that the American Negro can stand on his own feet, living valiantly in a way that adds to the glory of our country.

And now for my friends whose skin is white. There are two expressions I wish you would strike from your vocabularies and thinking. The first of these is the phrase "typical Negro." Who can be typical of a whole race? Just as you have, we have our cultured and our crude, our virtuous and our vicious. I do not ask you to forget our race. I ask only that you judge us as individual members by the standards that apply to all Americans. The second expression to forget is "tolerance." I think it is a misnomer for what is really meant, but it is an offensive misnomer. Tolerance implies condescension. We do not tolerate our friends and equals. We like them or we dislike them—and active dislike is better than tolerance that says, "Make allowances. Not too much can be expected of him."

Then what can you do? All that we ask is that you go on doing what many of you have already been doing. Treat us as individual, responsible human beings. Judge each individual by what he is and by what he does. Respect the worthy. Censure the unworthy—but keep in mind the fact that our members include both.

And finally to my friends of both races. There is no sense in denying the existence of a racial problem. It is here. It is not as ugly and vicious as it once was, but it still exists, kept alive by irresponsible members of both races—members of whom both groups are properly ashamed. But it is diminishing. Great strides toward its elimination have been made, and they have been made not through conflict, but through cooperation. The disappearance of segregation in our public schools, the adoption of the fair employment practices law in New Jersey, the lessening of Jim Crowism everywhere—have not been the result of the efforts of one race. Fair-minded men and women of both races have worked together, have planned together to bring to all people the freedoms that are the rightful heritage of every American.

We of the Negro race are grateful to our white friends who have helped us to win these advances. Indeed, without their aid most of the progress would have been impossible, for we are in the minority. But their task is drawing to a close. Every step forward that we take adds to the share of the load that we of Negro ancestry must bear ourselves, for growth in freedom means growth in responsibility. And that is democracy—a society in which each individual can be measured not by what he is born with but by what he is—not by his race, his religion, his ancestry, but by himself. That is true democracy.

The Personal Equation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "The Personal Equation," which appeared in today's Washington Post, March 28, 1950:

THE PERSONAL EQUATION

Reckless drivers like Senator MCCARTHY seem to forget that the people they knock about in their mad careenings are live, flesh-and-blood individuals. A reminder of this has come from Haldore Hanson, a State Department employee, one of the Senator's hapless victims. In a letter to Senator Tydings, he reported that neighbors near a farm he owns in Loudoun County, Va., have begun referring to him as a Communist and a Russian spy, and that a petition has been circulated calling his family undesirable and urging their expulsion from

the community. Much the same harassment was reported by Mrs. Esther Brunauer in testimony before the Tydings subcommittee yesterday. Neighborhood communities are liable to believe what they are told by a United States Senator—even when what they are told is unsupported by any evidence whatever.

Senator McCARTHY has not hitherto displayed a sensitivity that could lead one to expect him to show much concern about these collateral consequences of his recklessness. But there ought to be real concern on the part of his colleagues in the Senate. For it is on that body that the darkest shadow of the Senator's conduct falls. The American people, for all their anxiety about communism, have not lost their sense of fair play. It is still considered profoundly un-American to hit a man who has no means of hitting back. Senator McCARTHY has been using the immunity conferred on him by his membership in the Senate to hit men like Haldore Hanson who have no chance to return the blow. The spectacle is an unedifying one.

Light on Lobbying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of March 27, 1950, entitled "Light on Lobbying":

LIGHT ON LOBBYING

The House investigation into lobbying opens today with the promise of being a very enlightening inquiry. Representative BUCHANAN, chairman of the investigators, wants to know why only 300 of an estimated 1,500 lobbying groups have complied with the act of 1946 requiring the registration of lobbyists. The committee also has a keen eye open for any underhanded schemes to influence congressional legislation. Yet these are more be less side issues. What the committee is basically interested in, as we understand it, is probing to the bottom of the lobbying process. It insists on knowing not only how lobbyists work but where they get their strength, how the ideas sponsored by lobbyists originate, and what is the effect of lobbying on representative government.

As the first witness the committee is calling Dr. Hadley Cantril, professor of psychology and director of the office of public opinion research at Princeton, who will discuss the factors that shape public opinion and thus influence the legislative process. The committee realizes that lobbying begins at the grass roots. Perhaps the most effective lobbying is done, not directly with Members of Congress, but with their constituents. This is true in the case of lobbyists in the Government service as well as those working for private interests. If an idea takes hold among a large number of people, it is usually not very difficult to get Congress to accept it.

From the committee's agenda it appears that it intends to make a scientific study of how public opinion is developed and finally reflected in legislation. This can be an immensely useful study; for, as we have often pointed out, lobbying is an essential part of the democratic process. It becomes vicious only when special interests—outside or inside the Government—bring undue pressure to bear upon the representatives of the people. Out of this proposed comprehensive survey should come not only a better understanding of lobbying but also clearer ideas as to the efficacy of the present law and how it can be improved.

The Man at the Top

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial titled "The Man at the Top," which appeared in today's Washington (D. C.) Post, March 28, 1950:

THE MAN AT THE TOP

So Senator McCARTHY's top Soviet spy in the United States—the man on whose case the Senator stands or falls—is Owen Lattimore, director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations at Johns Hopkins. An analysis of the file about him has now been shown the Tydings subcommittee. In addition, Mr. Lattimore is hurrying back home, presumably to demand a hearing, with the possibility, also, that he may prefer a slander suit against Senator McCARTHY. It is clear that his usefulness in his present work in Afghanistan has been impaired, if not undermined; he has been on a mission there for the United Nations.

Mr. Lattimore happens to be perhaps the leading American authority on Inner Asia. He has written a round dozen books on that huge arc of land stretching from the Yellow Sea through Manchuria, Mongolia, Sinkiang along to the northwestern frontier of India. For his work he has the esteem of literati on both sides of the Atlantic. If his volumes are merely fronts for Soviet Russia, hundreds of scholars will be rated as dunces, Johns Hopkins, the haven of sedition, and organizations throughout this country and most of the important newspapers carriers of propaganda. A further detail about Mr. Lattimore's work in inner Asia was provided in Mr. Drew Pearson's statement on Sunday that Mr. Lattimore had provided an asylum in Baltimore for two Mongol princes and the high priest of Mongolia who were in danger of their lives from the Russians. Guilt by association, indeed.

At times we have been at variance with some of Mr. Lattimore's conclusions. But whatever sections may be torn out of the context of his writings, whatever joining he has indulged in, we feel confident that he will be able to divest himself of the atrocious label that Mr. McCARTHY has pinned on him. The Russians are not so silly as Senator McCARTHY makes out. On analogy the top Soviet spy in this country would be somebody now occupying a seat near or with the mighty, someone who is a rabid anti-Communist engaged in keeping the animals stirred up. That, at any rate, is the sort of activity that would fall under the head of strategy of terror. As Mr. Edmond Taylor explained that strategy in the book by that name, the technique in France was to get the master minds in Nazi expansion in France to join anti-Nazi groups. In Japan there was the case of the Soviet spy, Sorge, who actually became the Emperor's counselor—perhaps the leading illustration of planting a spy in the least obvious place. The only safeguard against this kind of thing is to keep the national eye on the ball and to rely upon the FBI.

The Hickenlooper charges, says Dr. Frederick Seitz, in the latest issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, have "probably done as much to impede the progress of that organization (the AEC) as could a number of well-placed Russian agents." As much could be said of the McCarthy charges. The fantastic nature of these charges is already clear in the record. Mr. Lattimore's name is being used to expose the State Department, but he has nothing to do with the State Department. Senator McCARTHY says that he still has a desk in the Department, yet nobody else seems to have seen it. Five years ago he was on the Department's pay roll as an expert attached to the Pauley reparation mission to Japan. Whether the selection was Mr. Pauley's or the State Department's is immaterial; his experience and his knowledge would entitle him to consideration on any mission of such a nature. Before his work on the Pauley mission Mr. Lattimore was in the Office of War Information and prior to that was adviser to Chiang Kai-shek on White House recommendation. The most conspicuous item in his record at Chungking was his opposition, in behalf of Chiang, to Secretary Hull's trial balloon for a limited accord with Japan in an effort to stave off hostilities. What this record has to do with the McCarthy charge is as much of a mystery as how Mr. Lattimore's extracurricular activities bear out that charge.

Facts in Colorado River Dispute Should Be Known

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, this editorial from the Los Angeles Daily News of March 24, offers a good deal of food for thought:

FACTS IN COLORADO RIVER DISPUTE SHOULD BE KNOWN

One reason why Congress has given California the worst of the deal in our dispute with Arizona over Colorado River water is that people in the States east of here have not been familiar enough with the facts.

Our natural tendency as a people is to favor the under dog. Arizona is smaller, less populous, and less wealthy than California. Hence, to millions of Americans, any argument between the two States would seem, in the absence of information, to be a fight between a pygmy and a giant.

This may be a commendable spirit as between individuals, but even then it is possible for small persons to be wrong and large persons to be right.

As far as Arizona is concerned there is a way to offset the feeling that California is wrong because it is large. That is to tell people the facts. When San Francisco was preparing for her 1915 Panama Pacific Exposition she sent emissaries to eastern legislatures to get them to adopt resolutions to hold exhibits at the exposition.

California could very well send emissaries to Midwestern and Eastern States to tell them the truth about the Colorado. One of the first and largest truths to be told is that California's size is an argument in her favor. Under riparian laws everywhere population, or the need of people for water, is what counts above everything else.

Increasing Antitrust Penalties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7827, a bill by Mr. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, proposes to increase the maximum criminal penalties which may be imposed under the Sherman Act from $5,000 to $50,000. Witness after witness appearing recently before the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power has stressed the utter inadequacy and impotence of the present paltry penalty as a deterrent to some of the major violators of the antitrust laws. The great General Electric Co., for example, for six fines imposed in the last 12 years, paid a grand total of $30,000. No wonder the Department of Justice has concluded that a violation of the Sherman Act is frequently considered as a sound business risk. Under unanimous consent, I wish to place in the RECORD an excerpt from a report by the Department of Justice to a congressional committee, wherein it expressed this conclusion and emphasized the inadequacy of the present penalties under the antitrust laws.

Congress has noted in several instances the extremely small penalties that are imposed on individuals and corporations for a violation of the antitrust laws. In some respects the penalties are so low that violation is regarded by businessmen as a good business risk. The ineffectiveness of the small penalties to create a proper sense of responsibility in corporate officials is shown by a statement of an official of the Hartford-Empire Co.; in a memorandum written in 1925 regarding a future antitrust case against the illegal combination, he said (ex. 76, Hartford Empire Record, pp. 12573–12574):

"It may be well to consider here, also, what would be the result should any or all of these matters be upset by Government action, as follows:

"O'NEILL

"* * * Meanwhile the O'Neill organization and business—as a going concern would have been irrevocably disposed of. We might be forced to put our O'Neill United States patents up for auction and sell them for a song and perhaps lose a few thousand dollars this way, but I cannot see that anything serious can happen in any event as to this transaction.

"FEDERAL

"Under similar circumstances, a dissolution here might be much more serious, depending upon the nature of the decree. It could hardly force us to give up any patents taken out in our name. We might conceivably be forced to dispose of patents practically taken out in the name of T. R. & B. and assigned to us. By the time, however, that such decree would become final, we would hope that the situation would be such that those Federal patents would not be worth much to anybody. We might lose whatever value we paid for them, but that would be all.

"Of course, the court might order that we transfer the entire Federal licensing business to some other party and turn over to that party the Federal patents. This, of course, would simply restore to a certain extent the existing situation and establish a competitor. It would have either one of two results—either that competitor would be in a reasonably strong position, in which case we could probably dispose of all these assets as a going concern for somewhere near what we paid for them and take our chances with competition, or by that time the situation would be such that it would be practically impossible to restore the old Federal competition even if it had all the Federal patents; in which case we wouldn't get much for the sale of these assets, but, on the other hand, the competition wouldn't be serious.

"Meantime, we would have gotten out our own patents; probably had the income from Federal licenses for several years; and very possibly also, as a result of the Federal and the other deals, we might have brought in Hazel-Atlas under license.

"I therefore do not see much danger of having any of these deals upset, as set forth. If they are upset, I still believe that by that time we will be in a better position even with such dissolution than we would be otherwise; and I see no danger whatsoever of any criminal liability, because the cases are necessarily so doubtful in the matter of law that they could never get any jury to convict, and I doubt if any prosecuting officer would ever attempt any criminal action. Criminal action in cases of this sort so far has practically been nonexistent."

The TNEC recommended a sharp increase in penalties in criminal cases as well as civil cases so that fines, etc., would be more commensurate with the damage to the public interest done when a large industrial corporation violates the antitrust laws. One recommendation not made by TNEC which the committee may wish to consider is to provide for mandatory increased criminal penalties for repeated violations of the antitrust laws.

Lesson in Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. H. LICHTENWALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am submitting an editorial which appeared in the Allentown (Pa.) Evening Chronicle, on March 10, 1950. There has been a wave of protest throughout the Nation against the tremendous waste and extravagance in the purchase of foodstuffs under the Government subsidy program. This has been particularly true in recent weeks in the case of potatoes, with the threat that many millions of bushels would be destroyed because Uncle Sam was to become the best customer of our farmers. Lehigh County, in the Eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, has thousands of acres cultivated for the growing of potatoes; in fact, on numerous occasions it has ranked No. 1 in Pennsylvania on the yield per acre and always has been one of the leading potato-growing counties in the State. However, I am very pleased and happy that the potato farmers in Lehigh County see fit to market their own products at a price less than that granted by the Government under the price-support program because of their desire to be independent of Government controls and regimentation. The editorial referred to is as follows:

IN THE WAKE OF THE NEWS

LESSON IN AMERICANISM

As refreshing as those breezes that are calendared for next month was one of this morning's headlines which read: "Lehigh County potato growers protest United States support program."

It is a declaration of independence that does eternal credit to our local farmers and serves notice to the administration in Washington that at least their votes are not to be bought by Government hand-outs.

They make it clear that Lehigh County growers have taken little, if any, part in piling up the huge potato surplus, millions of bushels of which are now being dumped, for which farmers elsewhere in the country have been paid more than $80,000,000 of the taxpayers' money.

In fact, they say the results of a price-support program that was supposed to help them out of their postwar marketing difficulties has destroyed that very market by imposing upon them an infiltration of out-of-State potatoes. They fear that by the end of the normal marketing season many of them will be out of business because of the Government's interference in the natural law of the land, the law of supply and demand.

Only 2 to 4 percent of the locally grown potatoes have been sold to the Government under its price-support program, most of the local growers having sold their crop through regular channels and at a lower price than support figures, rather than become dependent upon a nationalized control of their produce.

The Nation's welfare would be served immeasurably if this example of the kind of American independence that made this country great were followed by farmers in every section of the land.

St. Louis Banker Says Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Restored Public Confidence in Nation's Banks and Bankers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a very interesting letter from a St. Louis, Mo. banker which I think should be read by every Member of Congress. As a former chief national bank examiner at St. Louis from 1920 to 1930 and later as chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, this man, Mr. John S. Wood, chairman of the board, Manchester Bank of St. Louis, certainly is in a position to speak with authority on banking matters.

Mr. Wood recites that from 1921 to 1933 he saw the number of commercial banks in the United States decrease from approximately 30,000 unit banks to fewer than 14,000 banks. He saw the loss of public confidence in both banks and bankers. It took the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to restore that confidence, Mr. Wood states in his letter.

Now, Mr. Wood warns it would be "gambling with fate to, in any degree, diminish the fund that enables the FDIC to promptly take care of the depositors of any insured bank that may get into an unsafe condition."

The letter which I received from Mr. Wood follows:

MANCHESTER BANK OF ST. LOUIS,
St. Louis, Mo., March 24, 1948.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The leaflet, containing your statement to Congress relative to the record of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in preventing any loss to a depositor in an insured bank during the past 6 years, has just come to my attention.

I congratulate you on making such a clear-cut presentation of this fine record of the FDIC. It is a sentiment of the management of this bank that there should be no reduction in the present rate of assessment.

I was chief national bank examiner at St. Louis from 1920 to 1930. During 1930 I became chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, and, in that capacity, directed the operations of the examining department of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.

From 1921 to 1933, I saw the number of commercial banks in the United States decrease from approximately 30,000 unit banks to fewer than 14,000 banks. The public lost confidence both in banks and bankers. The FDIC restored public confidence both in banks and bankers. It is gambling with fate to, in any degree, diminish the fund that enables the FDIC to promptly take care of the depositors of any insured bank that may get into an unsafe condition.

I hope that your statement to Congress has as deeply impressed your fellow Members of Congress as it has impressed me.

Very truly yours,
JOHN S. WOOD,
Chairman of the Board.

The Price of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy, retired, former Chief of Naval Operations, on March 12, 1950, in South Boston, Mass., on the occasion of the one hundred and seventy-fourth celebration of the evacuation of Boston by the British:

THE PRICE OF FREEDOM

My friends and fellow countrymen, it is a great honor for me to meet here with you to celebrate an event of imperial significance in the history of our Nation. Your presence, your great love of country moves me deeply, for so long as our citizens pay tribute to the past they will guarantee the future. In this era of world unrest, at this moment when all men of honorable intentions yearn for peace and yet have just cause to view tomorrow with apprehension, it is fitting that we look back to the days when we were struggling to become a nation. Even a glimpse of that period increases our spirits, renews our confidence and sheds light to guide our way ahead.

But as dark as our course in world affairs sometimes now seems, as futile as our national efforts for peace often appear, I still feel that the clouds hanging over us are not nearly as dismal as those endured by our forefathers.

This event that we mark each year—Evacuation Day—was not the end of the war for the embattled colonists—on the contrary, they still faced 5 years of bitter strife. But that victory in 1776 was of enormous portent. Out of it flowed increased determination, proof that our military leaders were competent, and assurance that our sacrifices would lead to final and complete victory.

Such an event is worthy of closer examination; let us, therefore, review briefly the circumstances which led up to and brought about Evacuation Day—March 17, 1776.

As a result of the Boston Tea Party, the British Crown denied Massachusetts Colony the right of self-government. And as if this were not punishment enough, 8,000 troops under General Howe held the city of Boston in bondage. A fleet of British ships manned by 2,000 men filled the harbor thus closing the port. Our people were cut off from the outside world and in this beleaguered state the colony was slowly strangling.

From the summer of 1775 until January of 1776, the economic choking of Boston and the surrounding area continued. It seemed to be only a matter of time until the colonists would be forced to surrender. This was the condition when General Washington took command in Cambridge on July 3, 1775. Because of lack of artillery, Washington could do little to relieve the situation until Colonel Knox arrived on January 18, 1776, with 55 pieces of artillery seized by Ethan Allen the previous May at Fort Ticonderoga.

The placing of the guns on Cobble Hill, Lechmere's Point, and Lamb's Dam, and the subsequent seizure and fortification of these heights by General Thomas and his 2,000 troops brought about General Howe's decision to evacuate Boston. I have omitted many of the details, heroic deeds, which contributed much to the freeing of our beloved city and State—but I have done so purposely.

The one detail that I do wish to impress upon you is the strong and steady courage displayed by our forefathers during those terrible months of siege. Had they lacked that courage, they would never have forced the invader to leave. Without that valor of heart and soul they could not have struggled on to survive Valley Forge. Courage of purpose sustained those patriots from Boston to Yorktown—and after the last battle was fought, courage emerged as the basic ingredient holding us together as an infant Nation.

Since that memorable day of March 17, 1776, we have faced many enemies and fought many wars. The events bringing about those conflicts have been varied—but fundamentally, the evil common to all has been tyranny.

Now we hear the rumble of trouble once again—but this time the specter of war rides two horses—tyranny and godlessness. This latter evil is at work in our land, being spread by individuals who would have us believe that our way of life has outlived its usefulness. They attack every institution that has helped to make America strong and a decent place in which to live. They deny every high motive written into our Constitution and Bill of Rights. They impugn our right to be a nation because under our system a man has religious as well as political freedom—neither of which are tolerated in the slightest degree by the ideology they teach.

We need have no physical fear of such people. The only real harm that can come to us will be of our own doing. We must never permit ourselves to be persuaded, under one guise or another, to willingly give up even one of the many liberties we have fought to preserve.

And when we leave here today, let us go forward with renewed faith and confidence. Let us also prove that the calm courage of our forefathers has not been diluted by the passing of years—rather let us show all mankind that we are the worthy heirs of our freedom, ready and capable of extending it for the generations to come.

The World's Largest Oasis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1923, a group of surveyors and engineers, led by the late William Mulholland, made a weary trek across the burning, empty desert of southern Nevada. Their goal was the Colorado River, a wild and treacherous stream that tore its way through immense canyons few people had ever seen.

There were no roads through the desert. Because of this the men had come out from Los Angeles by train to Las Vegas, Nev., and then had set out overland for the river.

The men were not gold prospectors, but they were looking for something that would bring untold riches to the cities and towns on the Pacific coast, 400 miles behind them. They were looking for a new source of water to meet the steadily increasing demands of southern California.

The water they wanted was there in the Colorado River, and specifically their mission was to find a route for an aqueduct that would carry that water over hundreds of miles of uninhabitable desert, over mountain ranges and high rock mesas to the people who needed it.

Doubtless few persons visiting southern California think of it as an oasis. It is unlikely that the easterner especially realizes that the luxuriant groves, vineyards and fields, the miles of homes, parks, gardens, factories, and mills between Los Angeles and San Diego stand on land that was once inhabited mainly by lizards and cactus. Southern California, from the Tehachapi Range to the Mexican border, is the world's largest oasis. More than that, it is a man-made oasis and its existence depends on a few comparatively small sources of water. A person familiar with great rivers of the Midwest, the East and South, would look upon any of southern California's main water supplies as a mere trickle. It is hardly conceivable to the traveler, seeing southern California's development for the first time, that the water which made it possible was imported for hundreds of miles.

The extent to which southern California depends on imported water can be realized when it is understood that a few well-placed bombs, atomic or old-fashioned, could bring all human activity to a grinding halt. Destruction of the Owens River and the Colorado River aqueducts, for instance, would place the lives of more than 6,000,000 persons in

peril, and would result in an unimaginable exodus from the Pacific coast.

These aqueducts are the lifelines of southern California, and during the war, when victory depended so greatly on Pacific coast production of matériel and trained personnel, the United States took adequate precautions to see that these vital water supplies were not interrupted. Constantly, for hundreds of miles across the deserts to the east and northeast, they were patrolled by soldiers. Never was vigilance slackened, for a break in these lines would have threatened the great national defense plants with a shut-down, and would have forced the removal of hundreds of thousands of troops from desert-training areas.

As vital as these aqueducts were during the war period, they are no less vital to the immediate future of southern California. One of them, the thin line of concrete from the Colorado River, is the only means with which southern California can meet its ever-growing demands of the present, and the demands which may be expected to come.

Serious threats to this vital supply now exist. They are based on the demands of the State of Arizona in H. R. 934 and S. 75 for an immense portion of the Colorado River water which years ago was awarded to California by contracts with the Federal Government. The controversy now rages in Congress.

Los Angeles, although the metropolis of the Pacific coast, typifies the struggle southern California cities and towns have had in defeating their greatest enemy, a dry water hole.

In 1877, the year Engineer Mulholland arrived in Los Angeles, the city had a population of 9,000. Its water supply was an open ditch, and the ditch was also used for washing clothes, watering stock, and bathing.

The source of the water in the ditch was what is laughingly called the Los Angeles River, a rocky wash that was occasionally a flood, but mostly a dance floor for dust spouts. With what water could be diverted from the uncertain river into storage, and with water pumped from underground wells, the city managed to survive and to grow. By the turn of the century the handwriting on the water table was clearly visible. Upstream the city was taking all the water which came into the river, and downstream the city was taking all it could from underground. There was not any more to be taken upstream, and the wells were going dry. That was because the water which normally would have flowed into the underground reservoirs from the river was being used before it got there.

Meanwhile the population of Los Angeles had passed the hundred thousand mark, and there were no indications it would not grow even faster. The city fathers, if not the people, were alarmed. More water had to be secured.

Out into the desert went City Engineer Mulholland and his crew. It was in 1904 they reported an accessible and dependable source had been found on the eastern slope of the towering Sierra Nevada Mountains, about 250 miles from the city. The people of the city readily dug down for the necessary cash. By a vote of 10 to 1 they approved a $23,000,000 bond issue for purchase of a right-of-way and construction of the Owens River aqueduct. It was completed in 1913.

Los Angeles thought it had solved its water problem for years to come. Only a short period passed before the fallacy of this belief became clear.

The growth of Los Angeles continued with increasing speed. A dry cycle struck southern California, and the aqueduct flow fell below the danger point. Once more engineers understood the city would soon face another crisis, and they began to look around for another source of dependable water.

This time they looked even farther away, out across the hundreds of miles of desert to a river that ran unchecked through a little known land. They looked to the Colorado whose towering canyon walls mark the boundary between Arizona and California.

By this time virtually all the cities of southern California were facing problems akin to that of Los Angeles. They joined forces and they all looked eastward to the river of hope.

Out once more into the desert went Engineer Mulholland, but this time he was accompanied by colleagues from various sections of southern California. The plan to bring Colorado River water to the desperate coastal areas was a southern California plan, for it was clear that with an overdraft on all sources new water must be imported for the entire southern California metropolitan area, not only the city of Los Angeles.

The route for the Colorado River aqueduct was found. This, too, was to be a people's project, and once more the people opened their pocketbooks. They mortgaged their homes and lands with a bond issue, and construction was begun in the last week of 1932. The project cost was set at $220,000,000.

The work was started none too soon. In the district which the aqueduct would serve lived 2,000,000 persons. Many cities were scraping the bottom of their water barrel. Los Angeles could see the exhaustion of its water supplies, but no end to new population.

For 9 years thousands of men toiled in the burning California desert on the Colorado River aqueduct, and the first purified water was delivered through it in June 1941, only 5 months before Pearl Harbor.

What this comparatively small line of concrete has meant to the oasis of southern California has been suggested above in this story. What it means to the future of the world's largest oasis has not been as fully stated.

The Colorado River aqueduct is southern California's life insurance. It was completed just in time to avert serious situations in many cities and their surrounding areas. All future development in southern California depends on an uninterrupted flow of water through it. Water from other sources would not by any means meet present needs. Already many cities, such as San Diego, Santa Monica, and Long Beach, depend for more than half of their water supply on this aqueduct.

The Colorado River aqueduct was constructed, not only on a sound concrete base, but on what was believed to be a sound legal base. Under the Boulder Canyon Project Act the water stored by Hoover Dam can be used only under contracts made with the Federal Government. The Federal Government approved the aqueduct and signed contracts with the metropolitan water district to supply it, subject to the Colorado River compact, for the water which was to flow through the aqueduct in the years to come.

It was on that foundation, the contracts with the United States, that the people of southern California invested their money in the aqueduct. They had every reason to believe in the sanctity of contracts with their Government, every reason to believe these contracts would never be repudiated.

Now the people of southern California are not so sure. The State of Arizona says the Government never had the right to permit California to take so much water from the Colorado River. Now Arizona wants an enormous part of California's Colorado River water, and has asked Congress for it, to be used in a gigantic Arizona project.

California says let us take the whole problem before the United States Supreme Court for final settlement, but Arizona will not agree to that, except on condition that Congress first authorize a fantastic billion-dollar project for central Arizona. Arizona wants Congress to repudiate its contracts with California, and give Arizona the water.

The people of southern California have demonstrated their concern. The water Arizona wants is water which the world's largest oasis must have to survive. The Colorado River aqueduct is southern California's last waterhole. If it dries up, all progress and development abruptly stop, and disintegration and retrogression start.

That is why California is asking the defeat of S. 75 and H. R. 934.

Using Hoover as a Cat's-Paw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very pertinent and timely observation by Willford I. King, nationally known and respected commentator. This article appeared in the biweekly news letter issued by the Committee for Constitutional Government:

USING HERBERT HOOVER AS A CAT'S-PAW
(By Willford I. King)

When fate brought Harry S. Truman to the White House, many felt a sort of pity for the naive little man from Missouri who was suddenly called upon to step into the shoes of the most adroit politician ever serving as

President of the United States. Largely forgotten was the fact that Truman had trained under Pendergast—a man who was no amateur in the game of politics. Hence, there was great surprise throughout the Nation when, on the evening of November 2, 1948, the returns showed that Truman had turned into victory an election which all the pollsters had predicted would be a walk-away for Governor Dewey. And, since that day, he has shown so much political astuteness that his erstwhile critics are beginning to wonder whether, as a politician, he is really inferior to the great Franklin Delano Roosevelt himself.

One example of his cleverness is the way in which he has used the FEPC issue to keep the Republicans and the Dixiecrats from forming an alliance against him—an alliance which, if consummated, might be a great menace to his future political career. Another example is his handling of the coal strike. He carefully avoided intervention until the fuel shortage became acute. He then used the threat of seizure as a whip to force the employers to grant most of the miners' demands. By refraining from seizure, he avoided open conflict with the mine owners; by settling the strike before most areas actually ran out of coal, he escaped bearing down upon himself the dire wrath of the general public; and, by securing higher wage rates and more pension money for the coal miners, he intensified the loyalty of his most dependable group of supporters—the members of labor organizations.

But, for thoroughgoing political adroitness, his labors more probably eclipses any of his previous political maneuvers. He is actually attempting to use the prestige of Herbert Hoover to unlock the hold of Harry S. Truman upon the labor unions. Here is what is asked for in the message which he sent to Congress on March 13, 1950. It requests Congress to adopt 21 plans for reorganizing various agencies of the executive branch of Government, thus ostensibly merely carrying out the recommendations outlined in the monumental report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government—a report which was prepared under the direction of Herbert Hoover, and which has received almost universal acclaim for its unbiased and scholarly analyses and discussions of ways and means to secure greater efficiency and economy in governmental administration. All this seems highly laudable.

But, hidden away in the middle of the message is the seemingly innocuous plan No. 12, through which, according to President Truman, unified responsibility is once more established in the National Labor Relations Board by transferring to the Board and its chairman the functions of the general counsel, and by abolishing the statutory office of the general counsel. This plan will bring to an end the confusion which has resulted from the divided responsibility.

Evidently, by this explanation, the President hoped to lead Congress and the public to look upon this step as being merely a move to systematize the operations of a bureau.

In reality, however, the National Labor Relations Board has little resemblance to an administrative bureau. For all practical purposes, it is a court, the chief function of which is to adjudicate disputes between employers and employees. Under the Wagner Act, it really operated merely as an arm of the CIO. Following the Russian model, the functions of prosecutor and judge were combined, and, in most instances, regardless of the evidence, the case was decided in favor of the labor organization involved.

One of the main reasons for repealing the Wagner Act and adopting the Taft-Hartley law was to get rid of this un-American set-up. In the new statute, the functions of the prosecutor were separated from those of the court. As general counsel, Robert N. Denham, by his fair and unbiased enforcement of the law—neither employers nor employees being shown any favoritism—has gained the respect of all parties, not only for himself, but for the Taft-Hartley law as well. And now President Truman proposes to eliminate from the picture both Denham and his office and go back to the iniquitous system prevailing under the Wagner Act.

But the super-ironical twist to this scheme is that it is proposed under the guise of carrying out a mandate of the Commission headed by Herbert Hoover. And, to add insult to injury, under the general reorganization act passed by Congress, this plan will automatically go into effect unless it is specifically repudiated by a positive vote of at least one branch of Congress. Does a "doubting Thomas" still remain who is unwilling to concede that Harry S. Truman is a past master of political strategy?

If you are opposed to having the President usurp the constitutional powers of Congress in order to secure the financial support and votes of labor monopolists, tell your Congressman and Senator that section 12 of the President's message reorganizing the National Labor Relations Board should be voted down.

Reorganization Plan for Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 21 the Washington Post carried an editorial in unstinted praise of the reorganization plan for Connecticut. Its appraisal was based upon general rather than specific knowledge, and its eager, though illogical, advocacy of change for change's sake alone.

Many months were required for the commission to complete its survey which recommended sweeping changes in the form of Connecticut's State government. With "government by emergency" the vogue since January 1949, the Governor summoned the general assembly in special session slightly more than a week after the commission's final report was made public. Thus the legislators are asked to pass immediately upon extensive reforms, including a completely revised State constitution, without ample time for careful study and thought. This—though our citizens have managed their public affairs adequately under the present constitution for 130 years.

My knowledge of the proposed changes is sketchy because of my multitudinous duties here in Washington; but I fear that an acceptance of all the recommendations, based upon haste and possible political advantage, would do irreparable harm.

Many public-service groups have now realized the danger inherent in adoption of many of the proposals, and are performing their public duty by calling to the attention of the legislature imperfections which may well lead to partisan political control of many State functions which have hitherto been outside that sphere.

The letters-to-the-editor column of the March 26 Washington Post contained the following pertinent comment on that score by Edgar Fuller of the National Council of Chief State School Officers:

REFORM IN CONNECTICUT

Your March 21 editorial comment that a little Hoover Commission is making a heroic effort to modernize Connecticut's State government is probably true in regard to a large part of Connecticut's State Constitution, but your indorsement is too sweeping. The commission would make the Governor a dictator. In some parts of the State government, the commission would go far enough toward totalitarianism to endanger democracy itself.

If the Connecticut commission has its way, the Governor will be given complete authority to appoint all department heads to serve at his pleasure and to fix their salaries at his discretion below a statutory maximum. He could veto the general assembly on any appropriation or any portion of any appropriation. He could transfer, consolidate, or abolish any State function or governmental organization by executive order, unless both senate and house affirmatively disapproved by a majority vote of their entire membership within 30 days of continuous session.

Connecticut's little Hoover Commission would strip the State board of education of its powers, abolish the trustees of the university, and place all public education directly under the Governor.

The commission's proposals do particular violence to the principle that a State agency for education must be organized and administered on a politically nonpartisan basis. It is impossible to teach effectively in a political atmosphere.

Similar principles of operation apply to the official agencies through which the people govern their system of education. Partisan politics has no place in local boards of education, where board members are as close to the people as any political officer. Neither does it have a proper function in the State board of education, for here is the State's quasi-judicial and rule-making source of professional decision. Only as the general assembly makes high general policy for the State system of public education along with all the other functions of State government should public education and our system of politics merge.

As a practical matter, no governor could give the time and attention required to perform the policy-making functions now performed by the State board of education, even if he should be qualified and inclined to do so. The commissioner of education would be forced to become an educational dictator, safe in his dictatorship as long as he remained in the good graces of the Governor.

We should keep the schools close to the people and at the same time free to operate on a professional basis and without partisan political interference. Our system of education in local communities is a State system. Local board members are legally State officials locally selected. If the State agency for education is organized and conducted on a political basis with its potentially great powers of supervision over local schools the entire system will inevitably become political. It is a fundamental principle that the practical problem of policy development for education must be one for laymen selected on a nonpartisan basis rather than for either politicians or professional educators.

The same principles apply to the operation of teachers' colleges, vocational schools, the State department of education, and the university. The Governor cannot take the place of a lay State board of education in formu-

lating policies and evaluating programs in these areas of State school administration, if for no other reason than the Governor's insecure tenure and his lack of personal time to develop educational policies. Experience in many States proves that a governor's bad record in education becomes evident too late to protect the schools and colleges.

If the little Hoover Commission in Connecticut has its way, partisan politics will interfere with the best aspects of the present administration of education, undermine both the State and local school systems, and reduce the quality of all the public schools and colleges of Connecticut.

EDGAR FULLER,
National Council of Chief State School Officers.
WASHINGTON.

Impartial Study of Steel Industry Asked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement released by me for the press yesterday, as follows:

I am deeply disturbed by the recommendations and the implications contained in the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. They sound like a blueprint for socialism, and are suspiciously close to the arguments advanced by the British Labor-Socialist Party in England in the late 1930's advocating the nationalization of industries. It is shocking to find that a philosophy so alien to the American system of free enterprise, the system that has made us the greatest Nation in the history of the world, has obtained so strong a foothold in the Halls of Congress. It is apparent from a study of this report that unless the American people assert themselves immediately, the days of reward for personal initiative and private enterprise will be lost beyond recall. Fortunately, there is still time to rebel against being made to walk the plank into the stagnant, enervating waters of socialism.

The vicousness of the report lies more in its portentousness than in its immediate recommendations. The thinly veiled plan of things to come is easily discernible. In the name of "free enterprise" the report seeks to lay the ground work for nationalized industry by instilling in the minds of the people a distrust and an antagonism toward what has come to be known as big business. Starting with the preconceived notion that the steel industry is an enemy of the people and of free enterprise, the report proceeds to set up a future program which, if the committee's most recent effort is any indication, will merely serve as a sounding board for advocates of the socialized state.

It is admitted in the report that the steel industry is the backbone of our economy. It is also generally conceded that the strength of this industry is one of our greatest bulwarks against aggression. Does it not, therefore, seem ridiculous that we should be continually hammering at its foundation and seeking to sap its vitality? No more effective way could be devised to undermine the faith of the people of this country in the American way of life then these irresponsible political investigations which spread seeds of hate in the mind of the public with the apparent sanction of the Congress. Investigations of this sort should be curbed immediately.

For more than a quarter of a century, we have been conducting periodic investigations of the steel industry. (Currently we have three separate investigating committees digging in this field at the same time.) The findings of some of these committees has been such as to raise a serious question as to their value. The report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report is a glaring example of this. For one thing, it seeks to make it appear that, in condemning the December 1949 price rise in steel, its conclusions are based on investigation. However, as the minority report points out, the chairman of the committee had the temerity to announce his conclusions more than 3 weeks before the investigation began. Such predetermination might meet with approval in the satellite countries, but it does violence to our notions of justice. Parenthetically, I might add that such conduct does much to bring all congressional investigations into disrepute.

The committee's report characterizes the December 1949 price rise in steel as unwarranted. It also intimates that it constituted price gouging resulting from monopolistic practices, and was a studied act in derogation of the business and economic interests of the country. If this be true, then the policy of the steel industry has suffered a complete about-face during the past 12 months. Throughout 1948, the Committee to Investigate Questionable Trade Practices, of which I was chairman, conducted an intensive investigation of the "gray market" in steel. We did not limit ourselves to a 4-day public hearing as did the joint committee, but instead spent 12 months investigating the sales policies and practices of every major steel producer and most of the smaller steel producers in this country. And we double-checked our findings by tracing the steel through hundreds of distributors and warehousemen into the hands of the manufacturers.

The evidence disclosed that the major steel producers, those responsible for 90 percent of our steel production, were making an honest effort to prevent inflation by holding the price line in steel during the months of extreme shortages following World War II. There was no evidence that any attempt was made by the major steel producers to take advantage of the fact that steel was in short supply. I believe that this policy of the steel companies was perhaps the largest single factor in preventing runaway inflation during that period. I am not a champion of the steel industry, and I am not blind to its faults. But I do believe in being fair and giving credit where due.

The joint committee's report suggests that further study be made of the steel industry and to this extent at least I concur in its recommendations. Since competition is the very life-blood of our system of free enterprise, I believe it would be desirable to have a continuing check against monopolistic practices. But for any such study to command respect, it would have to be conducted on an impartial basis. Every step should be taken to eliminate the possibility that any charge of "political bias" could be legitimately leveled. I, therefore, propose to introduce a resolution calling for the establishment of a bipartisan commission to carry on this work and report its findings to the Congress from time to time. I feel that this is the best way to insure that the Congress will receive correct information for its guidance in regard to this basic industry.

I have no pride of authorship in such a resolution and will welcome any suggestion or will cooperate with anyone wishing to assist in the drafting. My only suggestion is that such action be taken without delay.

Here's a Business Poll Congress Might Ponder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal for March 23, 1950, is so enlightening upon the subject now under debate that I desire to have it printed in the RECORD. I hope every Member of this body will read it:

HERE'S A BUSINESS POLL CONGRESS MIGHT PONDER

Europe must trade with us or go under. And trade is a two-way proposition. If the Europeans cannot sell in American markets, the only way they can be kept going is through outright American subsidy, whether we call it a gift or a loan, knowing in the case of the latter that it cannot be repaid until and unless the debtor does have greater access to our markets.

That simple but hard fact is acknowledged by expert economists and hard-headed businessmen alike. Businessmen in the ECA, for instance, calculate that the Marshall plan will have meant almost nothing unless the nations of western Europe are permitted to sell us an additional one and a half to two billion dollars worth of their goods and services each year. Priming the pump of European production, in other words, is a waste of time and money and false hope unless we are prepared to offer a market to some of that production. And since all but the blindest of us are aware that we desperately need a strong and stable and prosperous western Europe as our ally in a cold war that could go hot, many Americans consider opening our markets to increased competition of European goods a small sacrifice indeed for the cause of world peace and the certainty of stronger western defense against possible aggression.

There has been much evidence, however, that individual businessmen are willing to welcome increased foreign competition for the other man—but not for themselves. Tariffs are the wall that keeps out foreign goods. Every time a lowering of these protective tariffs is considered, Congress is deluged by lobbyists determined to keep their own particular market protected.

It is highly encouraging, therefore, to discover that many of the most practical businessmen in this country—purchasing executives—face the prospect of greater foreign competition with good cheer, and, more important, believe that we must run the risks involved in tariff reductions so that European nations can achieve greater dollar earnings in American trade and thereby spend more here for American goods.

This discovery was made by the magazine Purchasing in a Nation-wide poll of purchasing agents, and we hope every Congressman has a good look at its detailed findings before he accepts the stuck-pig arguments of a few protection-obsessed lobbyists as gospel for all business. Seventy percent of Purchasing's pollees said that "no harm would come to their companies' domestic sales by downward revision of present tariff rates," and a healthy 57 percent agreed that, in any case, "we must run the risks involved" in opening our markets to increased foreign competition.

No businessman is more vitally interested in the problem of supply and competition than the purchasing agent. That makes

some of these survey respondents well worth the attention of other businessmen. "Since When," asked one, "has American business really feared competition?" And one, quite aware that whether it actually feared competition or not, some segments of it had shown great tariff-law ingenuity in killing it, observed:

"Quite often protective tariffs subsidize inefficiency and lack of vision and initiative on the part of management (and labor). Welfare 'from the cradle to the grave' is for me the tariff as applied to the businessman."

There is a greater welfare involved now, and more and more Americans are coming to see it. More, too, are seeing the hard, common sense in the curt reaction of still another executive: "If we are going to send them money, let's let them work for it." And they can't do that if we wall out the products of their work.

The Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mt. Vernon (Ohio) News:

It's Time Now

Budget requests made by President Truman were trimmed more than a billion dollars by the House Appropriations Committee which prepared an omnibus measure to finance various Federal agencies for the fiscal year beginning next July 1.

Despite the lopping of such a huge sum from the total of Mr. Truman's spending plan, however, the budget, if adopted by Congress without further reductions, will mean a deficit of more than $4,000,000,000 during that year.

That is striking evidence of the enormity of the spending program which Mr. Truman has outlined for the 12-month period.

Budget deficits are unavoidable in time of real emergencies, such as wars and great depressions. Spending in such times of stress cannot possibly be held within income without running danger of losses that would far exceed the amount of debt that is accumulated in combating such emergencies.

However, great budget deficits are indefensible when emergencies are not to be contended with and when income is high as a result of prosperous conditions. They are not only indefensible, they are dangerous.

Just about everybody in the country, outside of those in charge of the Government, realizes the danger contained in our fiscal policies.

But President Truman and his advisers who dictate the Government's spending policies take a strange view of financial policies.

They apparently see no danger in piling up deficit after deficit, each one raising the level of the national debt a few notches higher.

With Government revenues at an all-time high, some of the money rolling into the Government Treasury should be applied toward reduction of the debt, for sound financing policies call for repaying during lush times the debt accumulated during years when extraordinary situations are to be dealt with by Government revenues drop to low levels.

Such policies have been consistently ignored during the Truman administration.

In fact Mr. Truman is going into the records as the greatest spender in the history of the United States Government.

Total expenditures by the United States Government during the administrations of 32 Presidents, including the late President Roosevelt's first two terms, were $176,620,115,545.

In five years, the Truman administration has managed to disburse $191,081,394,191 of the people's money. Thus, under the Truman policies, the Federal Government has spent in 5 years about $15,000,000,000 more than was expended in all the previous years there was a United States of America.

But that does not tell the whole story.

Government spending would be much higher than it is if all of Mr. Truman's proposals were put into effect.

He has a long list of domestic projects, the cost of which has never been accurately estimated, but which would run many billions of dollars a year. And then there is his proposal that the American people assume the cost of raising the living standards of all countries in the globe.

If all these had been adopted our forty-odd-billion-dollar budgets we now have would look small in comparison with the amounts of money the taxpayers would be called upon to provide every year.

And the danger of this happening has not been dispelled by Congress' coolness toward most of the Truman projects.

If the administration should gain control of Congress at this year's elections, at least some of these tremendously costly ideas would be enacted into law, maybe all of them.

That puts it up to the people when they go to the polls next November. Only the election of a Congress dominated by sound men, who have sane ideas on Government spending can protect the public from extravagance that would out-rival anything in history.

Consecration of Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, it was a great pleasure for me to be a guest at an awe-inspiring service conducted in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City, last Friday, March 24, 1950, consecrating His Excellency Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon, bishop of the diocese of Springfield, Mass. The bishop was installed in his new diocese this morning at St. Michael's Cathedral, Springfield, Mass., with the solemn service of the Catholic Church.

Bishop Weldon was born in New York City, September 6, 1905, the son of Patrick and Mary Dwyer Weldon. He attended Montreal College, Montreal, and St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N. Y., and was ordained September 21, 1939, by the late Patrick Cardinal Hayes. After ordination he took special studies in philosophy at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. Between various parish assignments in the New York archdiocese, he taught from 1931 to 1935 at the Newman School, Lakewood, N. J. He was named a papal chamberlain with title of Very Reverend Monsignor, on October 29, 1947, and a Domestic Prelate in December 1948.

After 4 years' service as a Navy chaplain, he served as master of ceremonies to His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York, in 1946 and 1947. He has been executive director of Catholic Charities of the archdiocese since 1948.

The bishop will be the spiritual leader of 300,000 Catholics of the four western counties of Massachusetts. To this position he brings a demonstration of capacity for leadership and organization as a curate, an educator, a naval chaplain, and executive director of the Catholic charities of the archdiocese of New York.

In the name of the residents of the Second Congressional District, the entire area of which is included in Bishop Weldon's diocese, I address to the new bishop a sincere "ad multos annos."

The Abducted Greek Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday western Massachusetts, together with other sections of the country, commemorated Greek Independence Day and also took occasion to call the world's attention to the tragic plight of the 28,000 abducted children.

The demonstration in Springfield was an inspiring one and I know it has been helpful to the cause.

You all well know of my long interest in this matter so I do not intend to again speak on the subject at this time. But I wish to call your attention to the resolution that was unanimously adopted at the Springfield meeting. I urge you to give it your full support with as much spirit and courage and will to succeed as you would if your own children were among those who had been abducted. This is not a Greek problem—it is a problem for all of us because it is a matter of justice, decency, and humanity. I will read the resolution to you:

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION ON ABDUCTED CHILDREN

Whereas the abduction of approximately 28,000 children from their homes in Greece and their forcible detention in countries alien to their natures, customs, and birthright has profoundly shocked the civilized world; and

Whereas the countries of Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet occupation zone in Germany have ignored unanimous resolutions adopted by the United Nations Assembly on November 27, 1948, and on November 17, 1949, and refused to cooperate in securing the release of these children and their return to the arms and hearts of their parents, and the comfort and security of their homes; and

Whereas forcible detention of these children and the attempted severance of all their ties of family, home, and country is tantamount to the horrible crime of genocide and an abominable crime against humanity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized to take appropriate steps and to enact such legislation and adopt such measures as may be necessary and expedient to bring to the attention of the afore-mentioned countries the feeling of the world-wide revulsion at this infamous crime and to demand the liberation of these children and their prompt repatriation; and it is further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress, and that the latter be urged to do all in their power to accomplish the purpose of this resolution.

The Late Honorable J. F. T. O'Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by Secretary Snyder at unveiling of portrait of J. F. T. O'Connor, February 18, 1950:

It was my good fortune to have enjoyed the friendship of J. F. T. O'Connor and to have worked with him during the banking crisis of the 1930's when, as Comptroller of the Currency he was called upon to perform duties which had a profound effect upon the future of the American banking system.

Before coming to the Treasury Department as Comptroller on May 11, 1933, Mr. O'Connor had achieved prominence as a teacher, lecturer, legislator, and attorney. During 5 years in the office which today receives his portrait—years which amply tested his varied qualities—he met the grave challenges of the times with courage and intelligence.

People in the Treasury remember him best for the leadership he gave in expediting the termination of bank receiverships. In the realization that great hardship had been visited upon millions of individuals whose money was tied up in insolvent banks, Mr. O'Connor from the beginning of his services as Comptroller lent untiring energy and understanding to this major problem which came in the wake of the "banking holiday."

Through the application of time-saving procedures instituted by him, the liquidation of 1,417 banks which remained closed at the end of the "banking holiday" was carried out in record time. Some idea of the effectiveness of this program can be gleaned from the fact that by December 31, 1937, $1,600,000,000 of the $1,900,000,000 impounded in insolvent banks had been released.

As one of the original members of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Mr. O'Connor was active in the organization of this agency, particularly in helping to build up a force of competent examiners to inspect the accounts of thousands of banks before FDIC insurance could be effective.

The closing chapter of Mr. O'Connor's interesting life was written on the Federal bench, where the former Comptroller of the Currency served with characteristic distinction for the 9 years prior to his death last fall.

I believe it was Bacon who said that "the mould of a man's fortune is in his own hands." Thus measured, it may be truly said that "Jeffy" O'Connor made much of his life.

The Master Planners and Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last, March 25, I was privileged to address 150 members and guests of the Dane County Dental Society at Madison, Wisconsin's capital city.

With modesty, but with the hope that my remarks may contain information of usefulness to those who read them, I present the text of my address for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE MASTER PLANNERS AND COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE

Chairman Dr. Simley, members of the Dane County Dental Society, and guests, I am pleased to be able to meet with you here today. I cannot come to you as a member of your profession, but my position as a dentist's husband more closely approximates that of your wives who have accompanied you here.

If I were a minister, I suppose I should have a text, and if I were to quote a text it would be this: "America is being spent and planned into socialism."

If it was shocking for you to realize (and I hope it was) that our Federal Government went in the hole almost $2,000,000,000 in the last fiscal year ending June 30—a year of high prices, high employment, and high taxes—it should be more shocking to recall that the deficit for the current fiscal year will exceed $5,000,000,000 and that the President's proposed budget for the next fiscal year, beginning July 1, contemplates a deficit of a similar amount. By the end of the next fiscal year our Federal debt will have climbed to $265,000,000,000.

What attitude should we take toward this deficit policy—the immoral policy of passing on the financial responsibility of this generation to succeeding generations of Americans?

There are three current attitudes. One is simply to not worry about it—to consider deficit financing as the normal thing in these times. That is the attitude of the President, who so stated over a Nation-wide radio hookup. Evidently there are a large number of Members of Congress who agree with him. At least there are many who continue to vote for all the appropriations but refuse to consider the sources of revenue that are necessary to meet the deficits caused by those appropriations. There seem to be a number of them who feel that the best way for them to stay in office is to vote for all appropriations and against all taxes. Evidently that is a good way to be reelected, but it is a darn poor way to run the Government of the United States.

A second attitude is that we should meet the deficit by increasing taxes. Most leading economists agree, however, that this is a poor time to burden a rather unsettled economy with increased taxation. Chairman GEORGE, of the Senate Finance Committee, and Chairman DOUGHTON, of the House Ways and Means Committee maintained that attitude during 1949. Now, in 1950, attempts to increase the total Federal revenue are meeting with stiff opposition. For the most part, I think you will find that those who have been most zealous in the advocacy of increased taxation have been those who seek not to balance the budget by that means, but rather who see in the increased revenues the wherewithal for financing a large additional number of projects on which they would like to see the Federal Government embark.

The third attitude, and the one which sounds the most reasonable to me, is to reduce the spending so as to bring it in line with the level of income. Most people heartily approve of this verbally, but too few of them are willing to take the action which is necessary to conform to their words.

WHAT ABOUT THE HOOVER REPORT?

A common state of mind these days is to point to the reports of the Hoover Commission as the answer to the problem of duplication and waste and overspending, the answer to Federal deficits. Plainly speaking, the reports of the Hoover Commission will not solve our deficit dilemma for two reasons: First, they will not be put into effect in a wholehearted manner; and second, even if they were put into effect 100 percent our Government would still be operating at a deficit. The most optimistic estimate of saving under the Hoover Commission reports was from three to four billion dollars. Quite obviously, as important as this saving would be, it could not erase our existing rate of deficit. We could total up the salaries of all Federal employees and we would still come far from accounting for all of the Federal spending. After these salaries have been added up, and the foreign spending and the interest on the public debt, and the veterans' benefits have all been totaled, there still remains a large portion of the Federal budget that is unaccounted for. The answer is that large sums of money are being paid out to all sections of the country and to all classes of people in the forms of various grants, subsidies and Federal aid programs. By these means we have reversed the normal relationship of the levels of government. Their proper relationship, it seems to me, can be illustrated by a triangle, the broad base which represents our local units of government, the governmental units which are closest to the people, most responsible to the people, and can in most cases most effectively deal with their problems. As the triangle narrows from the broad base we reach the legitimate area of the operation of the State government. This area of problems includes those which cannot be adequately handled at the local levels. Then as we approach the apex we reach the legitimate area of the operation of the Federal Government in dealing with our domestic problems.

We have, however, completely reversed this traditional relationship. Under our current practices, the broad base of the triangle now represents the enveloping field of activities of the Federal Government. The triangle then narrows into the area of the State government with a closely confined area of local responsibility in the region adjacent to the apex. Our tax moneys are being poured in at the top of this inverted triangle, the largest portion taken by the Federal Government, and then what is left trickles down into the area of the State and local governments. Thus have the legitimate areas of taxation of the State and local governments been usurped. Thus has the Federal Government made it impossible for these units of Government to meet the responsibilities which are rightfully theirs. I think we can attribute no small portion of the general lack of, and the break-down of,

civic responsibility and civic morale to the fact that State and local governments have been placed in a completely dependent and subservient position with relation to the Government in Washington.

The greater the amount of Federal spending and Federal taxation, the more that local and State units of government are rendered incapable to perform their legitimate functions, the easier becomes the task of those in high places who are waging a persistent and relentless campaign to governmentalize the American people, to fit us all to a pattern so that we shall conform to the master plan. It is time that we begin to recognize who these people are and what they plan to do. It is fit and proper that we should be meeting here today, for we are fighting in the same conflict—a conflict with battle fronts extending from Washington, D. C., to Madison, Wis., to San Francisco, and back across the Nation again. You are in the front line of battle here. It is my high honor and it is my dedication to be in the front line of our common fight in Washington.

THREE BILLS BEFORE THE PLAN

The picture in Washington today of the efforts of those planners to slip the noose of governmental controls over our heads is as sinister as it is dangerous to the future of this Nation. This effort can be exemplified, but is by no means limited to, three legislative proposals.

One is the proposed Economic Stability Act of 1949, H. R. 2766, better known as the Spence bill. The second is the proposed S. 1971, better known as the Brannan plan. The third, and the one with which you are least familiar, takes the form of S. 1679 and H. R. 4313, the Thomas-Pepper-Taylor-Humphrey-Dingell-Biemiller bills.

These three, while ostensibly separately sponsored and wrapped in separate legislative packages, are part and parcel of the same legislative program. They are brain children of the same group of planners who have examined the President and through him the Government of the United States—the Ewing-Keyserling-Brannan-Altmeyer cabal. Shrewd, scheming, ambitious, and not too scrupulous, these men are the brain trust of the Fair Deal. These are the men to whom, in his confusion in mid-1948, the President turned in desperation, and then, incredibly, Harry Truman, mouthing the words that they prepared for him, won the Presidency in his own right. This was a windfall which placed the Ewing cabal in the driver's seat. They are now playing the tune to which the Missouri peasant dances. Unfortunately for them, but fortunately for America, the Eighty-first Congress has balked at implementing their grand plans. There have been serious set-backs. None of the aforementioned big three of their legislative program has been or will be enacted into law by this Congress. The disappointment of the planners has been expressed by leaders of the Farmers Union which usually faithfully follows the Ewing-Brannan line. In their issue of March 3 National Farmers' Union in Washington said: "It became apparent this week that President Truman's Eighty-first Congress may be worse than the Eightieth in many respects. Observers here are calling this Congress the Eighty-worst."

SIMILAR WOLVES IN MADISON

Similar wails of anguish have frequently come from the ivory towers of the local Ewing-Keyserling-Brannan-Altmeyer mouthpiece—and I don't mean the Wisconsin State Journal.

But what of the Eighty-second Congress? What if the American people permit themselves to be bought with their own money, let themselves be sidetracked away by the promises of the planners? What if the majority of the Americans look only at that part of the Spence bill which promises "maximum production and supply," "improved distribution of essential materials and facilities," and "prevention of price movements which inflict serious hardships or impede economic stability"? What if they look only at the portion of the bill to implement the Brannan plan which says: "Stabilize farm income and farm prices"; and "provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in commerce"?

What if in 1950 the people read only that portion of the Biemiller bill which promises: Adequate health services to all our people regardless of residence, race, creed, color, or economic status?

What if the Esaus of 1950 are captivated by the slogans: "A job for everyone." "High prices for farmers—low prices for consumers." "Free medical care"? What if they should select a Congress which gives ear to the planners' palaver and enacts the Ewing-Brannan-Keyserling-Altmeyer program for planned employment, planned farming, and planned medicine? The answer is as plain as the handwriting on the wall, or rather as plain as the printing on the paper.

SPENCE BILL DRAFTED BY BUREAUCRATS

First and briefly, let's take a look at the Spence bill, a copy of which I now hold, the proposed Economic Stability Act.

Mr. SPENCE, of Kentucky, is the elderly chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee. He is a Fair Dealer but lacks the crusading zeal of the Ewing cabal. It is obvious that the bill was drafted and presented by the planners in a Federal agency.

Purely on his own motion, and under conditions of which he is the sole judge, the President would be empowered to (and remember these are peacetime powers):

1. Establish compulsory quotas for production.
2. Establish Federal programs to supplement private enterprise.
3. Construct and operate new plants or factories, open and operate new mines.
4. Regulate imports and exports.
5. Fix maximum prices.
6. Establish compulsory allocations and priorities of materials (this provision alone gives the power of life or death over every private enterprise in the Nation).

These powers are based on no emergency. They simply and brazenly provide the blueprint for a planned economy for industry—an economy to be absolutely controlled by the President and those to whom he delegates his powers in accordance with the terms of the bill. Obviously, a planned economy and a controlled economy are one and the same. They have to be. Which of the great planners would be satisfied to plan without the authority to compel adherence to it? How futile indeed would such a plan be.

STRAIT-JACKET FOR OUR FARMERS

The Spence strait-jacket plan for industry is paralleled by the Brannan strait-jacket plan for farming. This plan, evidently for lack of a sponsor, has never been introduced in legislative form in the House. Chairman THOMAS, of Oklahoma, of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee is its sponsor in the Senate. It is the slickest and most fundamentally dishonest political scheme the planners have yet devised. In its full-blown form it spelled out the end of farm price supports. The farmer was simply to sell his produce in the open market at whatever price he could get. But he could continue to get farm-support prices since the Federal Government would step in to pay him the difference between his guaranteed price and his selling price. Thus everybody should be happy—the farmer to get high prices, the housewife to buy at low prices. How simple—it's a wonder someone didn't think of it before. As a matter of fact, someone did. It has been kicking around in the Department of Agriculture for about 10 years, since a fellow whose first name was Henry and whose last name I shall not mention, was Secretary of Agriculture. That in itself ought to be enough to put us and the farmers on guard.

BRANNAN DOESN'T KNOW COST

What about the poor people who make up that differential in price—the taxpayers, who include the consumers as well as the farmers? And what about the thousands of Government employees who will need to check on the millions of farmers and ascertain the payments due? What about the duplicate or triplicate copies of reports every farmer will need to make every time he sells a dozen eggs or a peck of potatoes? What about the army of inspectors who will decide whether a farmer keeps within the production unit quotas allotted? What would such a plan cost? No one, not even Mr. Brannan himself, will hazard a guess, and Mr. Brannan and his fellow planners apparently do not care.

The plan itself has undergone considerable change. It is almost impossible to know just what is in the so-called Brannan plan at this particular moment. The attempt to apply it generally to all agricultural products has long since been forgotten. The cotton, peanut, and tobacco growers will take their present 90 percent of parity—thank you, suh—and Mr. Brannan has bade them welcome. The 1,800 units of production limitation, heralded as giving the benefits to the so-called small farmer—that, too, has long since disappeared, which makes poppycock of the claim that this plan is to help the family-sized farmer.

If there is any farmer who is attracted by the glow of the current administration plan, I'd like to have him take a look at the ready-made form-fitting strait-jacket which Super-schemer Brannan has prepared for him—15 solid printed pages of penalties contained in the Senate-introduced version of the Brannan plan.

SOCIALIZED HEALTH BILL NOT NEW

Today's third example of the efforts of the master planners is the one with which you of the medical and dental professions are most familiar—the Ewing-Altmeyer compulsory national health-insurance program. Like its country cousin from the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Security Administration's plan is not entirely new. The current Thomas-Pepper-Taylor-Humphreys-Dingell-Biemiller bills are simply revised and refined versions of proposals which Isadore Falk and Wilbur Cohen have been preparing at taxpayers' expense for several years. Never before, however, have they been able to get a President of the United States to make it a major political issue. Never before have the left-wing planners been so strong in the executive department of the Government. Perhaps it is because never before have they had as their spokesman and figurehead so shrewd a political manipulator as the former vice chairman of the Democratic Party who now serves as Federal Security Administrator.

In May of 1948 Ewing called the Second National Health Assembly. Some 800 representatives of the healing professions were invited to go to Washington for this conference. Ewing purported to be seeking advice and recommendations for his report on the Nation's health, which President Truman had in January requested him to make. Actually, the drafting was already well along, and Ewing's real purpose was to attempt to force a recommendation for his compulsory health-insurance scheme through the assembly. You see, the assembly had been disproportionately loaded with members of the two "front" organizations sponsored by the planners in the Federal Security Administration and their friends—the Committee for the Nation's Health and the Physicians' Forum. But the scheme miscarried. While the assembly approved the statement that

the Americans are not receiving adequate care, that medical science has advanced beyond the present general application, and the economy can support more medical care, it did not approve of compulsory health insurance. But Oscar Ewing is not one to be bothered with such a set-back. His report, entitled "The Nation's Health—A Ten-Year Program," issued in September 1948, blithely ignored the health assembly and recommended a Government medicine program. This election-year campaign document of 1948 has become the bible of the advocates of Federal medicine.

EWING REPORT FILLED WITH ERRORS

As every physician, dentist, nurse, or hospital manager who has read the report knows, it is filled with misrepresentations and inconsistencies. The figures have obviously been cut to fit the cloth. They have already been too well exposed to require further attention.

It is rather interesting, if not amusing, to note that while in one place Mr. Ewing states, "The Government plan would ultimately cover everyone in every State," at another point he says, "Full freedom of choice should be left to doctors, hospitals, and other instrumentalities of health as to whether they will participate."

This is indeed in keeping with the planners' idea of a free choice—the choice of members of the health professions to stay outside and starve; the choice of the patients to pay dearly for medical services they do not use.

Knowing well that the American people are instinctively repelled by socialized medicine, the planners deny that their program amounts to that. They like to use the terms "prepaid medical care" and "national health insurance." Their smooth persuasion is: "Why, everything would be just the same as it is now; the only difference would be that the Government would pay the bill instead of the patient having to do so at the time the service is rendered."

I believe Senator TAFT answered that quite well when he said: "The fact is that this is not insurance. It is a plan for Government administration of all medical care, supported by tax on pay rolls. There is no difference between a pay-roll tax and any other tax. This can't be insurance if a man has no option except to pay for it."

Spokesmen for both the Committee for the Nation's Health and the Physicians' Forum have admitted that the fee-for-service method of payment could not be used. Dr. Ernest T. Boas, head of the Physicians' Forum, said: "Insurance guaranteeing complete medical coverage cannot be set up, except at a prohibitive cost, if the fee-for-service principle is retained."

MIGHT FOLLOW BRITISH COURSE

The other alternatives are putting members of the healing professions on a capitation or panel basis, such as now is frequently used in Great Britain, or on a straight-salary basis. Does that sound to you as if "everything would be the same as it is now"? You, as members of the medical and dental professions, and we, as your patients, know that things would not be the same. I do not doubt but what in dollars and cents you might be better off at least until after some Government official decided you should make less money, but you would live, just as the physicians, dentists, and nurses of today in Great Britain are living, in fear—fear for your professional positions, fear for the quality of the work being done, fear of what is to come. For my part, as a patient, I would not relish the prospect of competing with the inevitable malingerers and hypochondriacs for 3 minutes of the time of a harried, harassed, overworked, form-swamped, government practitioner. British patients are putting up with that today.

These are the obvious and immediate trappings of compulsory medicine, but the issue is more basic and fundamental. Allen O. Gruebbel, executive secretary of the Council on Dental Health of the American Dental Association summed up the case very well when he said: "A federalized system of health care would affect the life of every citizen of this country. It would affect his initiative and his sense of responsibility to himself, his family, his community and his government. It would affect the health service he would receive from his dentist, physician and nurse. It would affect the advancement of the health sciences. And finally, but by no means least, it would affect our social structure by greatly increasing the power of the Central Government.

"These are the risks that must be weighed carefully by every citizen who has a stake in the welfare of this and succeeding generations. These are the risks that form the core of the issue."

THEY WOULD SOCIALIZE AMERICA

A few minutes ago I expressed to you my belief that this program to fasten a system of compulsory health insurance on America is part of a master plan to concentrate vastly expanded powers of government in the hands of a tightly knit group of planners in Washington. To put it bluntly—the scheme is to socialize America. The American people must realize, they must wake up to the fact, that while each of these proposals is presented as if it were a single reform for the benefit of the American people, the proposals are all related. I have used three of them, the Spence plan, the Brannan plan, the Ewing plan as illustrations here today. I hope I have been able to demonstrate the common motive of these three. There is little doubt but that their sponsorship interlocks. I have not been able to find anyone who will admit the authorship of the Spence bill, but I do know that Ewing approves of the Brannan plan, and that Brannan sent a letter to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce recommending the passage of the Dingell-Biemiller bill.

LEADERS ON DANE COUNTY FRONT

The Washington master planners have their satellites and cohorts on the Dane County front, where the leading advocates of the Brannan plan are the Farmers' Union, the CIO Council and those three Madison dirt farmers, Gaylord Nelson, Horace Wilkie and Miles McMillan. I would assume from other experiences with these related plans that you would also find them in the forefront of the fight for compulsory health insurance along with these three others:

1. Thomas R. Amlie, the former radical Congressman from Wisconsin's First District who appeared before the committee in support of the Biemiller bill, and now gives Madison as his place of residence.

2. Margaret Stein Frankel, who until recently was closely and actively associated in Washington with both the Physicians' Forum and the Committee for the Nation's Health—the leading front organizations of the planners for Federal medicine. I have learned that she has recently transferred her activities to Wisconsin and if I don't miss my guess she will be popping up in Madison soon.

3. Representative ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, the most active legislative sponsor of the Ewing-Altmeyer compulsory health plan. Representative BIEMILLER must be contended with on the Dane County front, as well as on the Washington front, because of his proximity, influence, and coworkers here.

JOIN IN FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

These plans and these people—these are the instruments which endanger the freedom and the effectiveness of your great professions, endanger the service to humanity which you can give, and endanger the freedom of the American people. But if you will join ranks with the businessmen and the workingmen who are fighting against the threat of the Spence plan and the farmers who are fighting to keep their freedom from the Brannan strait-jacket, the good fight can yet be won. The majority of Americans are not yet ready to capitulate to the master planners in Washington. They need only the assurance, just as you need it, that they do not fight on alone.

Close ranks, then, and march together with all men who fight for freedom on their own soil. Individual stimulating freedom or planned stagnating socialism? It's up to us—in Washington, in Dane County, in all America.

Central Arizona Project Would Give Millions Free to Hundreds of Landholders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, nothing in reclamation history can equal the economic tragedy that is proposed in the plan of the central Arizona project, now awaiting action before the House Public Lands Committee.

All the spectacular financial schemes of the past fade into insignificance before this reclamation development proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation and State of Arizona.

One need not be a financial wizard to analyze the scheme of the central Arizona project. All that is needed is simple arithmetic.

First, let it be understood that the Arizona landholders who would benefit from the project would pay none of the irrigation construction costs. I repeat: None.

Yet, the Government would be spending at the rate of $1,280,000 per 160-acre farm. This would be a gift from the Nation's taxpayers. I repeat: A gift.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on page R-12 of the Bureau of Reclamation report on the project, this statement is to be found:

> The largest individual farm in terms of irrigated acreage averaged 10,430 acres under irrigation during the period 1940–44.

With even a dull pencil it may be easily figured that if the Government spends at the rate of $1,280,000 per 160-acre farm, it would spend at the rate of $83,440,000 for a 10,430-acre farm.

Perhaps I should repeat that latter figure: $83,440,000.

That would be a gift from the taxpayers of the Nation to one Arizona farmer.

Now, of course, Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of farms containing more than 160 acres each in the project area. In one section of the project area alone, Pinal County, there are nearly 200 farms larger than 160 acres. In this section there is 1 farm of more than 6,800 acres; 1 of more than 5,800 acres; 1 of more than 4,200 acres; 6 of nearly 3,000 acres; 19 between 1,000 and 2,000 acres; 10 over 900 acres; 7 over 800 acres; 3 over

100 acres; 27 over 600 acres. These are merely example from one section of the proposed project area.

Under the project plan the Government would spend at the following rate for these farms:

Acres:	
6,800	$54,400,000
5,800	46,400,000
3,000	24,000,000
4,200	33,600,000
2,000	16,000,000
1,000	8,000,000

This is, indeed, incredible. There was never anything like it offered the Congress before, nor was there any such fantastic scheme I know of ever seriously proposed by a responsible Government agency.

The proof, however, that such a scheme is now being proposed to this Congress is easily demonstrated.

And here is the proof:

Cost of construction for irrigation features of the project would amount to $392,000,000. This would be paid for by consumers who buy electric power produced by the project. It is a hidden sales tax on public power to subsidize private landowners.

Interest during the construction period would amount to $56,000,000.

Interest during the repayment period would amount to $276,000,000.

Adding these two interest figures together brings a total of $372,000,000. This interest would be paid by the Nation's taxpayers.

Now, adding together the irrigation construction cost and the interest total we have $764,000,000.

But that is not all. The project bill authorizes the construction of an additional 80-mile tunnel and appurtenant works which would bring the total cost up to $1,790,000,000.

That is the amount the taxpayers and power users, almost entirely outside the State of Arizona, would pay.

The project farmers who would benefit would pay none of these costs. And let me repeat again the word "None."

There, Mr. Speaker, you have the uncontrovertible facts about the most fantastic project ever conceived—at no cost to the Arizona farmers, but as a gift from the great, generous American taxpayers in every other State of the Union.

Famed Smyrna Air Force Base Dedicated to Memory of Valiant Tennessee Airman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, last, the famed Air Force Base at Smyrna, Tenn., located in Rutherford County, in the Fifth District, was the scene of impressive ceremonies marking the renaming of this military establishment in memory of Maj. Allan J. Sewart, Jr., gallant Tennessee boy, who was killed in action in an air engagement over the Solomon Islands in the Pacific theater of action in November 1942.

This was a most solemn and impressive occasion which assembled not only the family of this brave soldier and airman, but his many friends in Rutherford County and Tennessee and officials of the United States Air Force including the distinguished Assistant Secretary for Air, Hon. Harold Stuart. The name of Smyrna Air Force Base, one of the permanent installations of our military and defense establishment, is honored and famed. As Sewart Air Force Base, this establishment will carry on the same fine tradition of service which has characterized it in the past and be a fitting tribute to this brave and valiant young Tennessean who was lost in the performance of his duty to his country.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to have included in my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials—one from the Nashville Banner and another from the Nashville Tennessean of the issues of Sunday, March 26, last, marking this dedication ceremony and paying tribute to Major Sewart. Also, I should like to have included a copy of the excellent and appropriate address which was delivered on that occasion by Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Stuart.

The editorials and speech are as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean]

ASSERT'S MEMORIAL

Sewart Air Force Base. In memory of Maj. Allan J. Sewart, Jr., United States Air Force, who was killed in action November 1942 in the Pacific theater of operations during World War II.

Thus has the memory of a heroic Nashville bomber pilot been perpetuated at the former Smyrna Air Force Base.

It is a fitting honor to this warrior who died while fighting against heavy odds in the early part of the war for which we were not adequately prepared.

But it was a graceful act for Assistant Secretary for Air Harold Stuart to remind us that in honoring this individual the Air Force and Nation were also paying tribute to all of the 63 airmen from Davidson and Rutherford Counties who were killed in the war. All of these were actuated by the same high motives, and all freely gave their lives for their country.

Major Sewart and his associates represent the spirit of the American fighting men, of whatever branch of service, and their valiant service reminds that the courage and the patriotism from which this country was born flames as brightly as ever.

The family of the man whose name has been so signally honored, the high officials and distinguished guests who attended the dedication ceremonies, but share the sentiment of pride and homage that exists in this county and region from which the heroes went forth to battle, thinking only in terms of victory for their homeland and its ideals.

[From the Nashville Banner]

SEWART AIR FORCE BASE

Allan J. Sewart, Jr., of Murfreesboro lost his life in the Solomon Islands while performing valiantly his duty to the United States of America. His name, chosen by the Air Force from a list of heroes, today was officially given to the Air Force base near Smyrna.

Major Sewart was no candidate for any such distinction when he set out on the mission which brought his death over Buin. He was doing a grim job which he and millions of fellow Americans had been called upon to do when their country was in peril. Others shared his fate, and—as his memory is honored at Smyrna today—the memories of other fallen heroes are honored likewise. His name stands for his comrades, too.

It is entirely fitting, and truly American, that the Air Force has established a policy of renaming its bases in honor of men who died in service. The people of the United States are grateful for men like Major Sewart. To them, the tragic consequences of war impart an abiding sorrow which accompanies pride and thankfulness, for Americans are people with individual hearts even in times of collective necessity.

Sewart Air Force Base it now is. The brilliant ceremonies conducted there today are in keeping with the obligations all of us have for Major Sewart and all of those other Americans—up and down the ranks—who brought us out of the worst of all struggles for national existence.

REMARKS BY HON. HAROLD STUART, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, AT DEDICATION OF SEWART AIR FORCE BASE, TENNESSEE, SATURDAY, MARCH 25, 1950

Distinguished guests, officers, and men of Sewart Air Force Base, this is a day of great honor to Smyrna, to the State of Tennesseee, to the United States Air Force, and to the Nation.

Today we gather in tribute to a man who died heroically on a far-flung battlefield of the air during World War II.

We gather to honor him. In truth, it is he who has honored us.

Maj. Allen J. Sewart, Jr., gave his life so that the American way of life might be preserved.

The freedom we now share in a world still shorn of freedom was achieved in mortal conflict, bitterly contested, bitterly won. Major Sewart was a representative and a symbol of the spirit and the courage and the heroism that made such victory possible.

We now take occasion to memorialize his contribution to his country—his full sacrifice in our behalf:

It is fitting that this Air Force installation at Smyrna—in the heart of his own great State—exists to perpetuate the memory of this valiant son of Tennessee. Sewart Air Force Base is well named—proudly named. I consider it a privilege to be with you today, as the representative of the United States Air Force, to participate in its dedication.

Your civic committee, which recommended the man for whom this base is named, summed up its task with the statement, and I quote from the committee's report: "This was a serious and sacred duty."

Allan Sewart was one of 63 Air Force men from Davidson and Rutherford Counties who made the supreme sacrifice in World War II.

As your committee stated, and I quote: "Each of them is entitled to the status of an American hero."

Allan Sewart represents all of these heroes. In the Air Force we know of him as the kind of man they would have chosen to represent them.

We can all take pride in the fact that the man in whose honor this base is named was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, second highest decoration it is within the power of this Government to bestow.

As we now strive to maintain the peace—and with it the freedom gained in battle—it may be well for us to remember the manner in which Allan Sewart—and all these combat heroes—carried out their tasks of war.

These men made no claim of being supermen. They faced the problems of war as average Americans, most of them with little concept of the huge task they would be called upon to perform, or of the far corners of the world in which they would be called upon to fight. In many instances, the odds were against them and they knew it. But they stood up to their obligations. They had missions to perform and they performed them.

To Allan Sewart a mission was a sacred trust. I spoke recently with an Air Force veteran who accompanied him on one of his many long and grueling bomber missions in the South Pacific. On this occasion the target was an enemy aircraft carrier, a rich target in this theater of operations. Our weak forces in the South Pacific during these early days of the war could bring only four Flying Fortresses to bear against this target. The carrier was well protected by enemy fighters. Two of our four bombers never returned from this mission. Allan Sewart approached the carrier at dangerously low altitude. He was reaching his maximum radius of action. But he flew on. He made the bombing run with enemy fighters all around him, firing bullets into his plane. The bomb run didn't satisfy him. He wanted to be sure of his bombing accuracy, so he circled and came back again over target—using up more gasoline and exposing his plane to more bullets. A crewman suggested they had taken about all the damage they could stand. But he flew on, over the target, until he had scored direct hits on the enemy vessel. His comment to his crew was crisp and to the point. "We didn't come this far to miss," he said.

Allan Sewart fought his war—our war—just that way.

It was a backyard war waged in the far reaches of the South Pacific, in support of the invasion of Guadalcanal and eventually from Guadalcanal itself. It was a hard, driving war, in which air crews were called upon to fly tiring and difficult missions day after day, with no rest because there were no replacements. Allan Stewart and his fellow crewmen had been assigned to hold the fort. It was a highly vulnerable fort, but it had to be held until our nation could mobilize and industrialize for war.

These were the first few months after Pearl Harbor. As a nation, we had been caught napping. The Eleventh Bombardment Group, in which Allan Sewart served as a squadron commander, was one of the few units we could pit against the enemy. And always the enemy was vastly superior in numbers and equipment—superior in everything except that quality which Allan Sewart and others with him possessed—the will to accomplish a mission.

Brigadier General Laverne G.—popularly known as "Blondy"—Saunders was in command of all heavy bombardment units in the South Pacific at the time. One of our great Air Force leaders, Blondy Saunders was at one time a football star and a football coach at West Point. Later in the war, he commanded B-29's in India, and lost his leg in an airplane accident there. In the South Pacific, General Saunders knew his subordinate commanders personally and well.

"Al Sewart," General Saunders said recently, "was the best commander I ever had."

In Air Force circles that is high tribute. And General Saunders added this—"Major Sewart had all the qualifications for a general officer."

General Saunders, who is now retired and living in Aberdeen, S. Dak., had hoped to be with us today. He has asked me to express his regret at being unable to attend this dedication.

A week before his death, Allan Sewart and other pilots of his bomber group were called in to the commander's tent to discuss a bombing mission they had just completed. Their claims of Japanese fighter planes destroyed on the mission added up to 30—before Allan Sewart was asked for his evaluation. Then they asked him about it. "Divide that 30 by 3," he replied. Allan Sewart looked life and death straight in the eye.

His death, during the mission which won for him the Distinguished Service Cross, came during one of the most vicious combat missions of the war. It is described in the official citation as follows, and I quote:

"Major Sewart, as flight leader of a formation of five heavy bombardment airplanes, proceeded on a mission to bomb enemy objectives near Buin, Solomons Islands. Reaching the target, Major Sewart's flight immediately launched a bombing run over enemy surface vessels of Kahili Airfield, choosing a stationary vessel as target. Due to mechanical difficulties, the bombs did not release and a second run was made through heavy antiaircraft fire and fighter opposition. On this run a number of 1,000-pound bombs were dropped on the cargo vessel from all airplanes of the flight except that of Major Sewart. In the face of continuous and close attack by approximately 18 enemy land-based and float-type fighters, Major Sewart did not turn away from the attack even though he could not release his bombs. Shortly following this action, Major Sewart lost his life and his copilot was mortally wounded during a frontal attack by an enemy fighter pilot."

Allan Sewart, as this citation testifies, never turned away from an attack—never turned away from his mission, from his responsibilities.

This ability to stand up to a mission and carry it through to completion despite all odds is a human resource which must be placed at the top of all our vast national resources. It cannot be built and it cannot be purchased at any price. It is born and bred into a man—into men like Allan Sewart.

Today, as we engage in a vital mission to maintain the peace—and it is a mission for each of us—the odds often appear to be overwhelming, the objective unattainable. But we must not—if only in their memory—ever turn back from our mission. It is our obligation to Allan Sewart and to the thousands of war dead who helped win the peace.

In Allan Sewart we find another lesson for the Nation. It is not an easy lesson to face, but we cannot escape it, nor should we try.

We asked Allan Sewart to hold the fort while we made ready our defenses, to do the job of 10—20—30 men while we as a Nation caught up with the world in military strength. He and his fellow fighters held that fort, but he paid the price, and as a Nation we paid the price. We feel the need of Allan Sewart's courage and leadership today.

In our search for peace we have twice, in our time, tried unpreparedness and found it wanting. In a world of new and terrible weapons which narrows the margin, perhaps eliminates altogether, the period for holding the fort—indeed, which for the first time in history, may bring the fortress into our own back yards—we cannot afford to risk unpreparedness again.

This Air Force base we dedicate today in Allan Sewart's name—a vital training center for bomber pilots during the war—and today an equally vital center of troop-carrier operations—gives evidence that we intend to keep the peace with the strength and courage that it deserves.

To the mother and father of Allan Sewart, to his widow and daughter, who are with us today, the United States Air Force bows in humble tribute. We join the citizens of Smyrna and all of Tennessee in this proud salute. We dedicate Sewart Air Force Base as a living monument to the spirit and deeds of Maj. Allan J. Sewart, Jr.

Resolutions of the Indiana General Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the other day, during debate on the library extension bill, I stated that our 1947 Indiana General Assembly passed a resolution stating Indiana wanted no Federal funds.

I stated also that immediately following—in fact the very next resolution—the same general assembly, with the same Republican majority in membership, passed a resolution asking for Federal funds for flood control and soil conservation.

Now, since some folks thought I was mistaken, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD both resolutions, with reference to their pages in the official acts of the eighty-fifth general assembly:

ACTS, 1947, INDIANA, EIGHTY-FIFTH SESSION

CHAPTER XIV

(H. Con. Res. 2, approved January 20, 1947)

Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Indiana needs no guardian and intends to have none. We Hoosiers—like the people of our sister States—were fooled for quite a spell with the magician's trick that a dollar taxed out of our pockets and sent to Washington, will be bigger when it comes back to us. We have taken a good look at said dollar. We find that it lost weight in its journey to Washington and back. The political brokerage of the bureaucrats has been deducted. We have decided that there is no such thing as Federal aid. We know that there is no wealth to tax that is not already within the boundaries of the 48 States.

So we propose henceforward to tax ourselves and take care of ourselves. We are fed up with subsidies, doles, and paternalism. We are no one's stepchild. We have grown up. We serve notice that we will resist Washington, D. C., adopting us.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, the senate concurring: That we respectfully petition and urge Indiana's Congressmen and Senators to vote to fetch our county courthouse and city halls back from Pennsylvania Avenue. We want government to come home.

Resolved further, That we call upon the legislatures of our sister States and on good citizens everywhere who believe in the basic principles of Lincoln and Jefferson to join with us, and we with them to restore the American Republic and our 48 States to the foundations built by our fathers.

CHAPTER XVI

(H. Con. Res. 3, approved March 1, 1947)

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact effective legislation providing for flood control and soil conservation in the Ohio River watershed area and tributaries thereto.

Whereas farming and grazing land of the State of Indiana is one of the basic assets of the State and the preservation of such land and the produce gained therefrom is necessary to protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the people of the State and Nation; that the breaking of

natural grass, plant and litter cover has interfered with the natural factors of soil stabilization; that there has been an accelerated washing of sloping fields; that these processes of erosion facilitate dissipation of valuable top soil, causing exposure of less fertile and more erosive subsoil; and

Whereas the consequences of such soil erosion are: silting and sedimentation of stream channels, reservoirs, lakes, ditches, and harbors; loss of soil and water which causes destruction of food and cover for wildlife; an increase in the speed and volume of rainfall run-off, causing severe and increasing floods which bring suffering, disease, and death, impoverishment of families, damage to roads, highways, railways, buildings, and other property from floods; and losses in navigation, hydroelectric power, municipal water supply, and underground water reserve; and

Whereas similar conditions exist the entire length of the Ohio River from its source at the juncture point of the mighty Monongahela and Allegheny Rivers, all in defiance of the efforts and ingenuity of man to cope with nature run rampant and bent upon destruction of life, property, and resources as aforesaid: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the senate concurring)—

SECTION 1. That the Eighty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Indiana does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to enact effective legislation for the control of floods and the prevention of soil erosion, to preserve natural resources, prevent impairment of dams and reservoirs, assist in maintaining the navigability of rivers, protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the people, and to appropriate sufficient funds for the execution of such legislation.

SEC. 2. The principal clerk of this house is directed to forward copies of this resolution (2) the secretary of the United States Senate, to the Clerk of the National House of Representatives and to each United States Senator and Congressman from Indiana.

Speaker Rayburn Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MONROE M. REDDEN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night, March 25, you honored my district by speaking to the North Carolina Young Democratic Clubs at Asheville. The overflow audience of more than 2,000 people applauded you frequently, and it was common talk after the meeting that we had heard one of the greatest democratic speeches to be delivered in that section in many years.

Your speech was commented on editorially by the Asheville Citizen in Monday morning's issue of this week. I hope that this editorial may be read on a wide scale. It points up some of the thoughts which you so eloquently expressed.

The editorial follows:

SPEAKER RAYBURN SPEAKS OUT

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, 17 summers a Texas Congressman and Presiding Officer of the House of Representatives for more years than any man in history save Henry Clay, brought his eloquence and the wisdom of his long experience to an audience of western North Carolinians Saturday night.

A Speaker rarely speaks and never votes except in case of a tie. Tar Heel Young Democrats who heard Mr. RAYBURN Saturday, however, must have been impressed with the candor and logic of the Speaker as a platform debater. He put the case vigorously for the Democratic Party in the Nation and for democracy in the world. In the course of his address he made two telling points:

1. The indiscriminate practice of pinning the Communist label on innocent persons is both irresponsible and dangerous. In obvious reference to reckless JOE MCCARTHY, Speaker RAYBURN predicted that "in the long run that gentleman is going to get what those of his kind deserve."

2. A strong America is an America which must maintain leadership in world affairs through the Marshall plan and other foreign-aid programs. Mr. RAYBURN is a Woodrow Wilson Democrat, both in theory and practice. "I want to help keep the friends we've got in other parts of the world," he said.

SAM RAYBURN has been around Washington for more than a generation. He entered Congress on the March day in 1913 when President Wilson, perhaps glimpsing the war clouds, first took his oath of office and told Americans: "Men's hearts wait upon us; men's lives hang in the balance; men's hopes call upon us to say what we will do. Who shall live up to the great trust? Who dares fail to try?"

During these 37 years and during the distinguished period of his war service as Speaker, SAM RAYBURN measured up to the trust and never grew faint of heart.

He saw Woodrow Wilson die a prophet among men yet maligned for the daring of his vision. In the atmosphere of Washington, then, he puts little stock in label-pinning and name-calling. And out of devoted service to his country and to the cause of democracy, he has little patience with the isolationists and their clamor to turn the clock back on issues and men.

All of this was a strong breath of clear air in a region where there is cause to be proud of—and no cause to apologize for—the world leadership which the Democratic Party has maintained with the help of enlightened Republicans such as Senator VANDENBERG, to whom Mr. RAYBURN paid tribute.

It should help to focus our thoughts not on negative things but upon the positive values in national issues which are before the American democracy and the Democratic Party.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I suppose that it's just about impossible for some people to believe that anyone who has spent a dozen years in Congress can lay aside temporarily his mantle of political-party affiliation and speak as just one more American addressing his fellow citizens.

But in the few minutes I have on the air this evening I'd like to attempt just that.

I am sure all of you know that America today enjoys the highest standard of living in the world—and what is more, the highest living standard in our history.

We have, during the past 17 years, risen from the pit of the worst depression we ever had. The American economy—in addition to underwriting our own gigantic military effort in World War II—turned out a significant part of the fighting equipment, food, clothing, and money needed by our wartime Allies to make victory possible.

And America has emerged as the only Nation which today is in a position to help the free nations bolster their economic foundations against the forces of Communist oppression that now threatens the peace.

Now, without any question, the achievement of world peace is the central issue of our time, and the problems which confront America in this year of 1950 differ in many important respects from those of the depression paralysis of the early thirties.

Where our task 17 years ago was to put people to work and get our economy back on its feet, we find today that our free-enterprise system is humming along with record-breaking production, big profits, and high levels of employment.

Our greatest energies in this postwar period have been directed at this issue of peace. The Communists have hurled a challenge at the democratic institutions of the world, and the democracies have answered the challenge in terms of affirmative measures which meet the Communist threat head-on. America has played a leading role both in the formation of the anti-Communist policies, and has, as well, underwritten in terms of billions of dollars the costs of these programs.

In recent weeks American foreign policy has been vigorously attacked on new fronts. In the first instance, the criticism comes not from the Communist Party, but has been hurled by a handful of public figures who charge that our State Department is infested with card-carrying Communists, and, furthermore, they infer that our American foreign policy has been shaped by those same communistically inclined people. It is interesting to note that shortly after the first of these attacks was made the Kremlin had something to say about our foreign policy. Mr. Stalin issued a blast at Secretary of State Acheson and the American State Department, charging them with drawing up a Fascist scheme to plunge everyone into a third world war in order to destroy communism.

In this broadcast I want to dig back into a little recent history. At the outset I want to make clear my firm belief that there are few Americans today who underestimate the task before us if world peace is to be attained under democratic forms of government. In this atomic age in which man, for the first time in his history, has devised a means of destroying civilization altogether, the stakes in the future are simply enormous. If the democracies are to win the cold war, there is a duty upon the people of the free world to make use of every bit of intelligence they possess, if we are to meet head-on the Communist challenge to freedom. Our policies must be designed clearheadedly by the best minds in the democratic world. We cannot afford to be stampeded by fear or hysteria. If

Broadcast of Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, to the People of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by me to the people of Pennsylvania, over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co., Monday evening, March 27, 1950.

division is stirred up among the democratic nations themselves, or if serious differences develop internally in the democracies, we will play squarely into the hands of the Communists.

There is no question at all about this. The Communists are pegging their success upon what they regard as the essential weakness of democracy. They are relying heavily upon economic collapse in the free nations—the economic collapse which the Communists have predicted for so long.

In the years which immediately followed World War II, the Russians fully expected to gain control of all of Europe because they believed the democracies too weak economically to get back on their feet in time to avert disaster.

The Communists have realized fully that social chaos and economic despair have turned more people over to dictatorship than have all the copies of all the Communist propaganda ever printed. The Russians realize full well that a man who sees his family hungry, and cold, and frightened may frequently be willing to sell his freedom to a dictator who rashly promises security in the future.

Democracies, in bending their efforts behind the Marshall plan, have come up with an affirmative answer to the chaos which threatened Europe 3 years ago. The best military minds we have in this country assure us that all of Europe would be under the domination of the Communists if it had not been for the inauguration of the Marshall plan in 1948. These same military experts tell us that our national defense budget for the coming year would be two or three times as large if Russia had the entire productive capacity of Europe at its disposal today. Said another way, this would mean that we would be called upon to spend $30,000,000,000 or $35,000,000,000 this year for national defense instead of $13,000,000,000.

Mr. Paul Hoffman, the Marshall plan Administrator, has estimated that we should spend $3,000,000,000 on European aid during the next year. In doing so, we are investing in a secure future for the people of Europe. This is just as important to us as it is to operate the FBI or to maintain our armed forces.

Mr. Hoffman knows the value of a dollar—and he knows the value of $3,000,000,000. The evidence submitted by Mr. Hoffman shows clearly that a reduction in Marshall plan funds would convert the European cooperation program into a dole instead of one to bring about recovery. If that were to happen, we would no longer be building the peace. We would simply be keeping the people of Europe on the charity list, incapable of going forward to economic self-sufficiency without the continuing need for American funds to keep them going.

Within the past few days the first shipments of American military aid have started to flow across the Atlantic to bolster the defenses of the European democracies, and thus make it possible to give real meaning to the North Atlantic Defense Pact, signed last year.

We have pending now in both Houses of Congress another program which takes an affirmative approach to the factors which cause war. President Truman's point 4 proposal is primarily intended to help economically backward nations build up their own standards of living in order to ward off the forces of communism which threaten them internally.

Altogether, our international programs will cost us close to $5,000,000,000 in the coming year. In addition to this, as I have already indicated, we will spend some $13,000,000,000 for our national defense. I would like to point out that a national defense budget, whether it costs us $13,000,000,000 or $35,000,000,000 a year, does absolutely nothing toward eliminating the causes of war. Military protection is police protection. But it does nothing at all to eradicate the economic conditions in which communism so quickly flourishes.

The Marshall plan has stopped the Communists cold in Europe. But the Marshall plan has not completed its work, and if we interrupt the miraculous progress it is now making, there is a grave likelihood that Europe would fall back into the same sort of peril which faced it only 2 years ago when the Communists were so busy exploiting the impending economic crisis.

As I've already said, American participation in world peace making is costing us billions of dollars a year. These costs, however, are small by comparison with the dollar costs of another war. I feel there are those who too often fail to see any relation between our foreign and domestic policies. It is, I think, instantly clear when we stop to think about it that another depression in America would cause our peace-making efforts to fall completely. Another depression would force us to abandon the Marshall plan, give up point 4, and our other programs to promote peace.

This is, of course, exactly what the Communists have predicted, and it is what they are expecting will happen.

If America is to bear the burden of affirmative peace making, our free enterprise economy must stay healthy, and continue to expand. It is true, as I said earlier, that American business today is in sounder shape than ever before in its history. Employment is still close to record levels, but there are more people unemployed because there are not enough new jobs being created to take care of our growing population. To meet our international responsibilities, we must make the fullest use possible of our economy by setting ever higher production records and by having ever larger numbers of people at work. We must continue our efforts here at home to assist our free enterprise economy in such an expansion, and we must go forward with this important work.

We have, in the past few years, accomplished a tremendous amount in blocking the expansion of communism. We, nonetheless, have ahead of us a huge task in continuing to shape policies which will assure our victory in the cold war. To do this, we must above all retain our confidence in ourselves and in our future. We must, as I said earlier, use every bit of intelligence we possess in drafting policies which will assure that victory. And it is equally important that these policies be carried out by people who are unswervingly loyal to America and the democratic way of life.

If we are to meet our responsibilities, every problem which faces us must be considered squarely on its merits. We cannot, in these crucial times, afford the luxury of cheap political partisanship which destroys our confidence in ourselves and in the people we have charged with the responsibility of administering our policies. There is a vast difference between criticism directed to the facts on the one hand, and criticism which has no support in fact whatsoever. This business of shooting from the hip irresponsibly, in complete disregard of personal reputations, in disregard of confidence in ourselves and our policies, could, if it got out of hand, immobilize our efforts to bring about world peace and destroy any hope that democracy can survive in the world.

As all of you know, charges of the gravest nature were leveled at the State Department a month and a half ago. It was flatly charged that 205 known card-carrying Communists were then at work in the Department of State. The charges have been altered a lot since that time—81 card-carrying Communists, 57 card-carrying Communists, or what have you.

A unanimous Senate moved at once to investigate. The charges at the outset looked like the smear campaigns which have cropped up in election years in the past, but the Senate, recognizing that the charges, if true, were serious, insisted on getting the facts, and ordered its Foreign Relations Committee to conduct an immediate investigation. You may be sure that the investigation will leave no stone unturned. If there are Communists or Communist sympathizers in the Department of State, they will be exposed.

The Senate investigating committee has been in almost continuous session for nearly 3 weeks, but as of this very hour the record does not contain one shred of evidence to prove or substantiate these political charges.

On the contrary, the evidence thus far is most reassuring. It demonstrates that we have every right to place confidence in the loyalty of those carrying out our foreign policy.

I am proud that our press and our people have not been stampeded into fear. The Nation-wide reaction seems simply to be that our vigilance must be maintained, just as we are doing at present, and that we must keep a cool head and a steady hand if our great stake in the future is to be attained.

In closing I repeat that I am proud of the mature fashion in which we, as a nation, are facing our world responsibilities. Charges of socialism in our program at home or of card-carrying Communists in our State Department must be decided on the facts, just as we are doing now. There is no place in this picture for irresponsible fear mongering. So long as we continue to insist upon the facts, to examine them clearheadedly and confidently, and guide our actions realistically, I have no fear for the future.

Address of Archie H. Cohen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, beloved among his fellow citizens in the city of Chicago because of his long-standing interest and active participation in the city's great communal activities is Archie H. Cohen. A distinguished lawyer, a master in chancery, a former referee in bankruptcy, for many years he has been a leader in the city's charitable and civic organizations. He has been a long-time member of the Republican Party in the State of Illinois, and has done much to bring credit upon his political organization because of his wisdom, his ability, and his refusal to be bound by adherence to sterile, hidebound conservatism. I would certainly describe him as a Republican with Democratic leanings.

Archie Cohen is a brilliant speaker. One of his great addresses was made during the American appreciation program sponsored by the Milwaukee B'nai B'rith conference on February 22, 1950, in Milwaukee, Wis., an address of particular significance because of its reference to four great chaplains of the last war.

On March 27, I introduced House Joint Resolution 443, a bill to commemorate the heroic acts of the four chaplains, Clark V. Poling, George L. Fox, John Patrick Washington, and Alexander D. Goode, in making the supreme sacrifice in order that their comrades in arms might live. My bill requests that February 3 of each year be designated as Dorchester Day in observance of their heroism on the Army transport *Dorchester*, which was torpedoed on that day.

I am incorporating House Joint Resolution 443 with my remarks and the address of Mr. Cohen. I believe they should be read together as significant contributions to our goal in seeking to achieve our great American democratic ideal of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

House Joint Resolution 443

Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 3 of each year as Dorchester Day for the observance and commemoration of the deaths and the heroic acts of Chaplains Clark V. Poling, George L. Fox, John Patrick Washington, and Alexander D. Goode

Whereas on February 3, 1943, at 12:30 antemeridian, when the Army transport *Dorchester* sank following a torpedo attack, United States Army Chaplains Clark V. Poling, George L. Fox, John Patrick Washington, and Alexander D. Goode, symbolized both ministerial faithfulness and supreme human courage by giving their lives that others might live and doing so in such a way as to indicate the element of brotherhood common to their Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths; and

Whereas this event symbolizes the courage and hope humanity can gain from a spirit of brotherhood among these creeds; and

Whereas no other single event has so moved men to think on the elements of unity in these three great traditions and creeds: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States is authorized and directed to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on the 3d day of February of each year, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the deaths and the heroic acts of the four praying chaplains.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY ABRAM H. COHEN AT STEUBEN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, AUDITORIUM, MILWAUKEE, WIS., FEBRUARY 22, 1950, ON AMERICAN APPRECIATION PROGRAM SPONSORED BY THE MILWAUKEE PUBLIC HEALTH COMMISSION

To my way of thinking, America is more than an aggregation of 150,000,000 people. It symbolizes the hopes, the dreams, and the prayers of those who, by accident of birth, were born here and those who came here seeking a haven of refuge from political and religious oppression, to build kindlier lives that spell true brotherhood.

Unfortunately, bigotry and intolerance need no passports to come into this country. The jealous, petty, arrogant, mean, and little people of the world have always wondered at the American way of life. They fail to understand that, in America, laws are enacted to point a way by which men shall live, and not as the edicts, decrees, and manifestoes of the dictators by which men shall die.

Carved in the stone on the outside of the Supreme Court Building in our Nation's Capital are the words: "Equal justice under law," which assures justice to every citizen regardless of race, creed, or color. America has been made safe for differences by the Declaration of Independence. The Constitution of the United States of America guarantees to every citizen, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I hold these truths to be self-evident: that man was made to be happy; that happiness is attainable only through useful effort. You will find, as you look back upon life, that the moments that stand out are those moments when you have done something for somebody else without any hope of reward. I strongly feel that life is an opportunity given to us to learn how to live; that the world is a schoolroom, not a playground; that life is an education, not a holiday; that life is a measure to be filled, not a cup to be drained; that we come into this world without being asked and that we go without being considered; therefore, it behooves us to live useful, purposeful, and intelligent lives.

Surely you will agree with me that selfishness is a disease that should be labeled a crime. If we try to be in tune with the Infinite, we will strive to avoid wars that bring misery, destruction, heartaches, and untold sufferings to innocent men, women, and children, and create, as an aftermath, more serious problems than those that existed before men engaged in slaughter on the battlefields. We do not all look alike, act alike, talk alike, or think alike, but that is no reason for hating one another. The history of the progress of mankind clearly establishes the fact that nothing constructive has ever grown out of hatred. Bigotry and intolerance have no place under the cross of a cathedral, the spire of a church, or within the walls of a temple or synagogue. Any man who incites strife between different classes and different creeds is a menace to America and a disgrace to his faith.

The heart of America is sound. Its sense of justice is universal. You can trust it. You can appeal to it. But you must never betray it. I am not so much concerned with the insurrection of the ignorant as I am with the indifference of the intelligent. The real American, whether he be a Christian or a Jew, is he who brings comfort where before there was wretchedness, who feeds the hungry, who clothes the naked, who enlightens the ignorant, and who does justice, and by his words and actions inspires a love for God and for man. I cling to the belief that God is my friend and every man my brother.

No one can gainsay the fact that equality and freedom build human dignity in man and nation. We add to our moral strength when we concern ourselves with the preservation of all those values which make life worth living. As decent men and women, we must ever be vigilant to protect the civil and political immunities of every American regardless of his race, color, creed, and social or economic status. No sacrifice is too dear if only freedom prevails.

America must be intellectually immune to the virus of hate. Every person should realize that his highest good requires the observance of the commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

We should constantly strive to make America so good that to be a private citizen in the United States will be greater than to be a king in any other nation.

By our devotion to American ideals, we emphasize that we live in deeds, not years; in thoughts, not breaths; in feelings, not in figures on a dial. We count time by heart throbs. We cling to the belief that he most lives who thinks most, feels the noblest, acts the best. The rights and privileges that we enjoy as American citizens must not be taken for granted. We must be mindful of the duties and responsibilities of citizenship and should remember that, next to God, is country, and next to religion is patriotism. The duty of patriotism is the duty of justice and of gratitude, and it is just as important to be patriotic in time of peace as in time of war. We should ever be loyal to the life and welfare of our Nation, strong in our love of, and devotion to, the institutions of America. Anyone trying to sow distrust and hatred in this blessed land is carrying out the mandate of the enemies of this country and is guilty of conduct that is most despicable and unworthy of a true American. Such bigoted individuals who loudly shout that America has failed them, have in truth failed America.

Thoughtful Americans must take to heart the indisputable fact that victories won on the battlefields are all in vain unless in peace we prevent the hatreds that start wars all over again. America's destiny is to point out to the world the force of an idea, rather than the idea of force, and to spread the idea of human dignity so that everywhere there will be strengthened the conviction in the minds of the leaders of the people throughout the world that human rights must be respected.

Ours is a land of peace and faith. This is a government of the people, not of kings, princes, or dictators. This is a country of citizens, not of military captains. Our leaders represent peace and religion. My fervent plea is that instead of ignorance, let there be truth; instead of weakness, let there be strength; instead of fear, let there be courage; instead of hatred, let there be love.

An event that took place during World War II stands out vividly in my memory. It occurred during the month of February 1943, on the U. S. troop ship *Dorchester* which was struck by a torpedo fired from a Nazi submarine in mid-Atlantic. The boys in uniform who were being transported to European shores to battle against the Nazis, were rushing about frantically seeking to procure life belts. The ship was listing heavily, doomed to a watery grave, when four Army chaplains—a priest, a rabbi, and two Protestant ministers—observing the frightened lads, took off their life belts and gave them to four soldiers. Then, placing their arms around one another's shoulders, they looked heavenward and prayed to Almighty God, each in his own way, as these Americans, representing the three great faiths, faced death together unafraid. From this true account of the last moments of these brave chaplains of the United States Army, can we not find inspiration and courage to face life together unafraid and in true brotherhood?

I urge that we strive to make this world as good a place for others as we would want it to be for ourselves. To me, America is all that the submerged races of the world wish to be and cannot. To me, America is the concrete realization of what the ages have hoped for and labored for. It is a definition. It is a creed. It is a challenge. God built a continent of glory and filled it with treasures untold. He carpeted it with soft rolling prairies and pillared it with thundering mountains. He studied it with soft flowing fountains and traced it with long winding streams. He graced it with deep shadowed forests and filled them with song. Then he called unto a thousand peoples and summoned the bravest among them. They came from the ends of the earth, each bearing a gift and a hope. The glory of adventure was in their eyes and the glory of hope within their souls, and out of the labor of man and the bounty of earth, out of the prayers of man and the hopes of the world, God fashioned a nation in love, blessed it with a purpose sublime, and called it America.

Schism in the NLRB

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I read with a great deal of interest the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, March 26, entitled "Schism in the NLRB." I have been deeply concerned about the President's plan No. 12 to abolish the post of general counsel and to transfer his functions to the NLRB. I have been deeply concerned because I believe in the separation of the function of prosecution from the judicial function in all cases where it is practicable. And if functions of the NLRB were predominantly judicial and if the general counsel's duties were predominantly that of a prosecutor, I would oppose the President's plan No. 12.

However, I agree with the Post editorial that the schism by the Board and the counsel has created more problems than it has solved.

The editorial to which I refer is as follows:

SCHISM IN THE NLRB

No effective case has been made, in our opinion, against President Truman's reorganization plan to end the schism between the National Labor Relations Board and its general counsel. Certainly the President had authority to take this step. The NLRB was not exempted from the reorganization powers conditionally delegated to the President. Since this change was effected in one of a series of orders designed to improve the working machinery of the independent regulatory commissions, it would have been strange for the President to have exempted so obvious a defect as the separation of the NLRB counsel from the Board itself, has proved to be.

The NLRB was thus divided against itself in the Taft-Hartley Act in a laudable effort to separate the prosecuting and judging functions of that body. To many it seemed an experiment worth making. But in practice it has proved a failure because of the continued friction between General Counsel Denham and the Board. The Board members are now unanimous in saying that the division should not continue; for it has resulted in two NLRB policies instead of one and placed the Board in the anomalous position of having to rely upon an antagonistic counsel to carry its cases before the courts. In short, the schism has created more problems than it has solved.

Under the new plan the general counsel would be subject to supervision by the Board, while still exercising a large degree of independence in his prosecuting activities. Investigative and judging functions would not be entrusted to the same persons. This seems to us to satisfy the requirements of fairness if unbiased personnel is chosen. There is less argument today for keeping the prosecuting arm outside the Board than there was under the Wagner Act, when the Board's sole function was to foster the interests of labor and deal with unfair labor practices on the part of employers. Today it is concerned with unfair labor practices by both employers and unions. It must assume an impartial attitude if it is to serve its function properly. The same is true of the prosecuting arm. There seems to be a dangerous tendency on the part of some groups to regard the general counsel as partial to employers and the Board as favoring unions. Perhaps that is an inevitable consequence of the separation. In any event, the aim must be for high-minded and impartial service on the part of both, and we suspect that this can be most readily attained if the present invitation to friction is removed.

Principles of National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR-MANAGEMENT COUNCIL ON FOREIGN TRADE POLICY, MARCH 21, 1950

Lower wages than those prevailing in the United States create the principal competitive advantage enjoyed by foreign countries when they ship dutiable merchandise into our domestic market.

These lower wage rates often result in lower foreign costs and confer a price advantage upon the shipper to our shores, since his productivity is not generally so far below our own as to offset the lower wages. With the exception of a few products, such as automobiles, that are mass-produced by us, other countries are not very far behind us in productivity and are rapidly catching up in many lines because of the spread of mechanization.

In the meantime, however, and contrary to the theory of classical economists and free trade advocates, the competitive advantages of imported dutiable goods in our domestic market are not generally reducible to superiority of natural resources, soil, climate, or greater efficiency in the countries of origin. Unfortunately they are attributable in some cases to simple exploitation of labor.

Competitive goods that derive their cheapness from this source therefore enter higher-standard countries with a spurious economic advantage rather than a fair one.

Instead of spreading the economic benefits often attributed to trade, they undermine the living standards in the higher-standard importing countries. Only if the imports are economically complementary to production in the importing countries rather than competitive is the injury avoided.

In order to prevent the destruction of high labor standards and to maintain the possibility of reasonable business profits, a high-standard country is therefore fully justified in taking measures to prevent the economic erosion that may result from unimpeded importation of competitive, as distinguished from complementary, goods from lower-wage countries. Just as bad money drives out good money, goods produced at unfair wages tend to drive out of the market those produced at fair wages when the two are in open, unobstructed competition. Recognition of this fact led this country to adopt national minimum-wage legislation to prevent the destruction of labor standards from within its own borders.

Protective measures that are designed thus simply to place competitive foreign products on a fair competitive level in the market of a high-standard country cannot properly be described as trade barriers or obstacles to the flow of healthy trade. The United States is unique in the world of trade because all other countries operate on a lower wage standard. Nevertheless, approximately 60 percent of our imports are now free of duty, consisting largely of noncompetitive items and raw materials. The economic conditions of their production overseas cannot directly undermine our standards, and our consumers can enjoy the lower prices without hurting domestic production.

However, the claim of consumers to the enjoyment of lower prices on the 40-percent remainder of our imports, which are competitive goods, is not valid if the lower prices of the latter merely reflect lower wage levels abroad, since such a claim would be based on the destruction of our economic standards.

The postwar economic situation, characterized by an unprecedentedly high national debt, calls for the continuance of an unusually high annual national income, or one of well over $200,000,000,000. This requirement binds us, however unwillingly, to a high price level. The increase in statutory minimum wages by Congress and the maintenance of high support prices for farm products have put the stamp of governmental recognition on this view.

The interests not only of labor and management but also of the public, therefore, make it imperative that they seek reasonable safeguards against unfair and deflationary foreign competition. Their interests are mutual in maintaining high standards of employment, production, and wages, and in the prevention of action that would undermine such standards. Such reasonable safeguards will not materially reduce imports but would remove from the dutiable ones the threat to our employment that they would otherwise carry.

To avoid the maintenance or imposition of unsound, while assuring proper, measures of protection, the following principle should be honored:

Any legitimate industry in the United States that pays prevailing wages and that is able to market its products at prices returning a reasonable profit under fair competitive conditions and succeed in setting aside reserves for research and development is not only economically justified but is entitled to protection. The degree of protection should be roughly equal to the advantage of foreign producers in this market as a result of their lower labor standards, modified by relative productivity.

How Taxes Have Mounted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article mailed me by a constituent. When writing to me, this constituent states that this article tells more than she could write.

I hope the Members have the opportunity to read this article as it shows very clearly how taxes have increased, not only for the rich, but also for the not so rich. The Democrats will do well to take heed too for this article points out that the tax reduction put through by

the Eightieth Congress is being appreciated and the people have not forgotten which Congress made this possible.

The article follows:

HOW TAXES HAVE MOUNTED

EDITOR THE CATHOLIC NEWS:

Every year at income-tax time, I recall what was told me in the 1930's when I expressed alarm at the greatly increased Government spending, viz, "What are you worrying about; only the rich will get soaked." How untrue that remark was is partially revealed by the comparison of pay-roll taxes which follows:

Yearly salary	1939	1948
$1,440 (married)	No tax	$147.36
$2,000 (married)	do	226.00
$3,000 (married)	do	366.00
$1,440 (single)	do	117.40

This comparison, unfortunately, illustrates only to a minor extent how the "not so rich" also are being soaked, since a much greater portion of taxes of people in the low-income bracket are, as FDR said, "paid indirectly in the cost of things they buy."

These hidden taxes include corporate income taxes (increased from 11 to 38 percent), taxes paid by business on pay rolls, oils, transportation, telephone, telegraph, electricity, liquor, playing cards, tobacco, etc., excise taxes on autos, tires, tubes and parts, on electric, gas, and oil appliances, on light bulbs, refrigerators, gasoline, musical instruments, photographic materials, sporting goods, radios, etc., also luxury taxes on furs, jewelry, luggage, toilet preparations, admissions, etc.

I have estimated that a single woman earning $2,340 a year paid over $600 a year in taxes including Federal, State, city, and the above hidden taxes, and although it is about $100 less now, thanks to the reduction given by the previous Congress, it's still terrific.

Despite all the publicity given in newspapers regarding wasteful Government spending and inefficiency, and their effect on taxpayers' ever-increasing debt burden and high taxes, too many taxpayers are too busy having fun to take a few minutes time to write their Congressman telling them (1) to repeal all war taxes, (2) to balance our budget immediately, and (3) to stop wasting their money.

That is why Government spending, the cause of taxation and debt, has gone steadily from bad to worse.

O. PETERMAN.

Jacob Henry's Battle for Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to read a proof copy prepared by Philip Slomovitz, the distinguished editor of the Jewish News, and which appropriately enough is to appear in the Passover issue of March 31. The article is captioned "Jacob Henry's battle for civil rights."

JACOB HENRY'S BATTLE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Philip Slomovitz)

JEWISH FESTIVAL OF FREEDOM.—The Passover—is a glorious occasion on which to recall important battles for justice on the American Continent. There are numerous instances of heroic efforts, dating back to colonial times, when high-minded Christians fought for the right of man to worship—or not to worship—as he pleased.

Thus far, the triumphs of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and scores of others, who have succeeded in writing into our Constitution the basic principles of religious liberty, remain the pride and the cornerstone of our American heritage.

There are some lesser-known names whose contributions to the cause of justice and untrammeled freedom have helped build a strong foundation for this great Republic. Among them was Jacob Henry, who was elected to the North Carolina House of Commons in 1808, served for a year and upon his reelection in 1809 faced the challenge as to his right to hold office on religious grounds.

At that time the North Carolina constitution prohibited non-Protestants from holding civil offices. Henry, who was elected to the North Carolina State Legislature from Carteret County, became the center of a political issue. Many of the State's leaders came to his support and Roman Catholics, who were similarly affected by the law barring non-Protestants from holding civil positions, were on his side.

Henry won an overwhelming victory to retain his seat after delivering an address which has won such wide acclaim that it has been included in the famous collection, "The American Orator." Henry's triumph, however, was only partial. While he was permitted to retain his seat in the legislature, the discriminatory North Carolina clause remained on the State's statutes. It was interpreted to mean that legislative offices were not necessarily civil, that Catholics and Jews could participate in making laws although they were prohibited from interpreting and executing them.

After the Civil War, when Southern States began to liberalize their constitutions, North Carolina granted full religious liberty to all its constituents in 1868.

Jacob Henry was born in Philadelphia in 1776. His activities after his rise to fame in the battle for religious equality in 1809, when he delivered his great oration, the date and place of his death, are unknown. His name at birth was Jacob Gratz, and it is believed he was the brother of the Philadelphia merchant Michael Gratz. Jacob changed his last name to Henry when he moved to the South.

In his powerful book on the battle for liberty for all faiths, "Cornerstone of Religious Freedom in America" (Beacon Press), Joseph L. Blau reprints in full the famous oration by Henry and makes this interesting reference to Henry in a chapter on "The Affirmation of Civil Rights for Religious Minorities":

"North Carolina, whose constitution required its officials to accept the divine authority of the New Testament, but whose declaration of rights granted religious freedom, was faced with the necessity in 1809 of deciding between these two instruments.

"Jacob Henry, a Jew, was elected to the house of commons by the voters of Carteret County. It was, of course, impossible for Mr. Henry to affirm the divine authority of the New Testament. His right to his seat was, therefore, challenged. Mr. Henry was granted the privilege of speaking in defense of his right to retain the seat, and did so in a brief speech which was long considered one of the gems of American oratory. There has been some question raised as to his authorship of the speech; it is reported by one of the historians of North Carolina to have been written for him by Chief Justice Taylor, of the State supreme court. This attribution was solely on the basis of hearsay, and we are justified in attaching the name of Jacob Henry to this speech until trustworthy evidence of other authorship is furnished.

"The speech itself, though brief, is a ringing reiteration of the view that religion is a personal matter between the individual and his Maker, and that no one has the right to challenge or question this personal relation. As long as one does not hold religious opinions dangerous to the state, the state has no power to exclude him from any privilege or obligation of citizenship. The statement was clear-cut and incisive—and it is a pleasure to report that it was decisive. Mr. Henry was overwhelmingly granted the right to his seat in the commons, and some years later the constitutional provisions were changed."

In 1818, in the heat of debate over a similar issue in the Maryland Assembly, while discussing the so-called Jew bill which was aimed at the repeal of a test act that prevented Jews from entering the legal profession and public office, the Honorable H. M. Brackenridge spoke of Jacob Henry's speech as being "a part of our education as Americans to love and cherish the sentiments uttered by him."

The Maryland battle, which began in 1797, when the Baltimore Jew Solomon Etting first petitioned the Maryland House of Commons against the restrictions on Jews seeking office or entrance in the legal profession, the part played in it by Thomas Kennedy, "ardent Jeffersonian and a persistent fighter," Col. W. G. D. Worthington, and H. M. Brackenridge, form another glorious chapter in the struggle for religious freedom in this country. The "Jew bill" was adopted by the Maryland House of Delegates on the last day of the session, February 26, 1825, and was confirmed, as required by law, in the following session of the house, on January 5, 1826. Mr. Blau, whose book also contains the complete text of Mr. Brackenridge's historic address, comments that "the Jeffersonian principle was vindicated and sustained in Maryland just 6 months before the death of Jefferson himself."

Brackenridge's speech on the Maryland "Jew bill," delivered in 1819, has gone down in history with the greatest orations in defense of civil rights. Brackenridge had this to say on the question of tolerance:

"Sir, I abhor intolerance, whether it be political or religious; and yet, I can scarcely regard religious tolerance as a virtue. What has weak and erring man, a right to give permission to his fellow mortal, to offer his adorations to the Supreme Being, after his own manner? Did I not feel myself somehow restrained from pursuing this subject, I would endeavor to demonstrate, that the idea of such permission, or toleration, is not better than impiety. But I content myself, with calling your attention to what has been the effect, in this country, at least, of leaving religion to be taught from the pulpit, or to be instilled by early education."

Is this a Christian land? Brackenridge had something to say, also, on this score in his famous speech. To quote him again:

"But, we are told, that this is a Christian land, and that we are Christians. I rejoice to hear it, and I hope we will prove ourselves worthy of the name, by acting on this, and on every other occasion, with Christian spirit. But this is a Christian land. And let me inquire of the page of history, by what means it became so? Was it through the instrumentality of peace and good will to our fellow men? * * * No, sir, the soil we inhabit yields its fruit to the just and to the unjust; the sun which gives us life, sheds his glorious beams impartially on all. But the great majority of the dwellers of this land are Christians; therefore it is a Christian land. For the same reason, it might be a Catholic, Episcopal, or Presbyterian land. Our political compacts are not entered into as brethren of the Christian faith—but as men, as members of a civilized society. In looking back to our struggle for independence, I find that we engaged in that bloody conflict, for the rights of man, and not for the purpose of enforcing or defending any particular religious creed. If the accidental circumstance, of our being for the greater part Christians, could justify us in proscribing other religions, the same reason would justify any one of the sects of Christianity, in persecuting the rest. But, sir, all persecution for the sake of opinions, is tyranny—and the first speck of it that may appear, should be eradicated, as the commencement of a deadly gangrene, whose ultimate tendency, is, to convert the body politic, into a corrupt and putrid mass."

This is the stuff of which the ideals of freedom and democracy were made in this great land of liberty. We pause on the Passover Festival of Freedom to pay tribute to the molders of free expression and free living and thinking in our great land.

TEXT OF HENRY'S GREAT ORATION IN CAROLINA HOUSE OF DELEGATES IN 1809

I certainly, Mr. Speaker, know not the design of the Declaration of Rights made by the people of this State in the year 1776, if it was not to consecrate certain great and fundamental rights and principles which even the Constitution cannot impair; for the forty-fourth section of the latter instrument declares that the Declaration of Rights ought never to be violated, on any pretense whatever; if there is any apparent difference between the two instruments, they ought, if possible, to be reconciled; but if there is a final repugnance between them, the Declaration of Rights must be considered paramount; for I believe it is to the Constitution, as the Constitution is to law; it controls and directs it absolutely and conclusively. If, then, a belief in the Protestant religion is required by the Constitution, to qualify a man for a seat in this house, and such qualification is dispensed with by the Declaration of Rights, the provision of the Constitution must be altogether inoperative; as the language of the Bill of Rights is, "that all men have a natural and inalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences." It is undoubtedly a natural right, and when it is declared to be an inalienable one by the people in their sovereign and original capacity, any attempt to alienate either by the Constitution or by law, must be vain and fruitless.

It is difficult to conceive how such a provision crept into the Constitution, unless it is from the difficulty the human mind feels in suddenly emancipating itself from fetters by which it has long been enchained: and how adverse it is to the feelings and manners of the people of the present day every gentleman may satisfy himself by glancing at the religious belief of the persons who fill the various offices in this State: there are Presbyterians, Lutherans, Calvinists, Mennonists, Baptists, Trinitarians, and Unitarians. But, as far as my observation extends, there are fewer Protestants, in the strict sense of the word, used by the Constitution, than of any other persuasion; for I suppose that they meant by it, the Protestant religion as established by the law in England.

For other persuasions we see houses of worship in almost every part of the State, but very few of the Protestant; so few, that indeed I fear that the people of this State would for some time remain unrepresented in this house, if that clause of the Constitution is supposed to be in force. So far from believing in the 39 articles, I will venture to assert that a majority of the people never have read them.

If a man should hold religious principles incompatible with the freedom and safety of the state, I do not hesitate to pronounce that he should be excluded from the public councils of the same; and I trust if I know myself, no one would be more ready to aid and assist than myself. But I should really be at a loss to specify any known religious principles which are thus dangerous.

It is surely a question between a man and his Maker, and requires more than human attributes to pronounce which of the numerous sects prevailing in the world is more acceptable to the Deity. If a man fulfills the duties of that religion, which his education or his conscience has pointed to him as the true one, no person, I hold, in this our land of liberty, has a right to arraign him at the bar of any inquisition; and the day, I trust, has long passed, when principles merely speculative were propagated by force; when the sincere and pious were made victims, and the light-minded bribed into hypocrites.

The purest homage man could render to the Almighty was the sacrifice of his passions and the performance of his duties. That the ruler of the universe would receive with equal benignity the various offers of man's adoration, if they proceeded from the heart. Governments only concern the actions and conduct of man, and not his speculative notions. Who among us feels himself so exalted above his fellows as to have a right to dictate to them any mode of belief? Will you bind the conscience in chains, and fasten conviction upon the mind in spite of the conclusions of reason and of those ties and habitudes which are blended with every pulsation of the heart? Are you prepared to plunge at once from the sublime heights of moral legislation into the dark and gloomy caverns of superstitious ignorance? Will you drive from your shores and from the shelter of your Constitution, all who do not lay their obiations on the same altar, observe the same ritual, and subscribe to the same dogmas? If so, which, among the various sects into which we are divided, shall be the favored one?

I should insult the understanding of this House to suppose it possible that they could ever assent to such absurdities; for all know that persecution in all its shapes and modifications, is contrary to the genius of our Government and the spirit of our laws, and that it can never produce any other effect than to render men hypocrites or martyrs.

When Charles V, Emperor of Germany, tired of the cares of government, resigned his crown to his son, he retired to a monastery, where he amused the evening of his life in regulating the movements of watches, endeavoring to make a number keep the same time; but, not being able to make any two go exactly alike, it led him to reflect upon the folly and crimes he had committed, in attempting the impossibility of making men think alike.

Nothing is more easily demonstrated than that the conduct alone is the subject of human laws, and that man ought to suffer civil disqualification for what he does, and not for what he thinks. The mind can receive laws only from Him, of whose divine essence it is a portion; He alone can punish disobedience; for who else can know its movements, or estimate their merits? The religion I profess, inculcates every duty which man owes to his fellow men; it enjoins upon its votaries the practice of every virtue, and the detestation of every vice; it teaches them to hope for the favor of heaven exactly in proportion as their lives have been directed by just, honorable, and beneficent maxims. This, then, gentlemen, is my creed—it was impressed upon my infant mind; it has been the director of my youth, the monitor of my manhood, and will, I trust, be the consolation of my old age. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you cannot see anything in this religion to deprive me of my seat in this House. So far as relates to my life and conduct, the examination of these I submit with cheerfulness to your candid and liberal construction. What may be the religion of him who made this objection against me, or whether he has any religion or not, I am unable to say. I have never considered it my duty to pry into the belief of other Members of this House. If their actions are upright and conduct just, the rest is for their own consideration, not for mine.

I do not seek to make converts to my faith, whatever it may be esteemed in the eyes of my officious friend, nor do I exclude any one from my esteem or friendship, because he and I differ in that respect. The same charity, therefore, it is not unreasonable to expect, will be extended to myself, because in all things that relate to the State and to the duties of civil life, I am bound by the same obligations with my fellow-citizens, nor does any man subscribe more sincerely than myself to the maxim, "whatever ye would that men should do unto you do ye so even unto them, for such is the law and the prophets."

Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Welfare State, delivered by me at the Harvard Law School Forum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., on March 24, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELFARE STATE

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Dullea, and friends of the Harvard community, I appreciate the opportunity to be your guest this evening. I do consider it a privilege to be here. Harvard has a high reputation among those of us who hail from the University of Minnesota. I remember that one of my professors was accustomed to repeating in his class a statement by President Lowell, of Harvard. President Lowell, he used to say, claimed there was a great deal of knowledge at Harvard because the freshmen always brought a little bit in and the seniors seldom took any of it out.

The subject of our discussion this evening is the welfare state. Frankly, I am amused to find that it is still an issue. I recall reading not so very long ago that Gov. Thomas E. Dewey delivered a lecture at (if I may be so bold as to mention) Princeton University. The New York Herald Tribune in reporting that lecture, given under the auspices of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, said, "The battle-frayed welfare-state issue of New York's 1949 Senate campaign was publicly jettisoned here tonight by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, who said it must have been 'some very clumsy Republican' who tried to pin that label on the Truman administration." Governor Dewey went on to say, "The man who first used the phrase against our present Government did his cause no good, to put it mildly."

Nevertheless, the welfare state remains an issue, and defines clearly the distinction between the Fair Deal program and those who would oppose that program.

Former Supreme Court Justice Stone once advised a group of law students, "If you are strong on the facts but weak on the law, discuss the facts. If you are strong on the law but weak on the facts, discuss the law. If you are weak on the law and the facts, bang the table." These sharp observations of Justice Stone come to mind readily as I observe the Republican Party banging

the table and using the welfare-state slogan. I might also say that I consider the use of the slogan "socialism" by the Republican Party to be in the same category of ghost-haunting and irresponsible politics.

For many years now those of us who call ourselves liberals or New Dealers or Fair Dealers have been accused of trying to change our form of government and our form of society. Our critics say we are trying to create a welfare state or a Socialist state. In my opinion, the use of these slogans is an attempt to confuse the issues and to escape facing the issue. I hope this evening that our debate will raise the level of political discussion so that the issues rather than the slogans—so that the realities rather than the ghosts—are discussed.

I would not deny that there is some merit to the Republican claim that the Fair Deal program seeks the welfare state as an objective. The welfare state is a legitimate objective: one that is perfectly consistent with our traditions and with the current wishes of the American people. A state which is devoted to the welfare of its members, a state which looks upon man and his welfare as an end in itself, is one I support and urge you to support.

The United States began as a welfare state when its Constitution charged the Government with the responsibility of the general welfare of its people. In a sense this was one of the great differences between this new country which was born and the tired nations of Europe in the eighteenth century.

From that day until this day the history of the American development has been a history of providing greater welfare for its people.

As early as 1806 Thomas Jefferson as President of the United States asked Congress to approve a donation of lands for a National Establishment for Education. In a measure I think it is fair to characterize this step as one of the earliest forms of Government subsidy, since land was a clear financial asset. The use of land during that early period played an important role in developing the concept of Government subsidies. Our Government eventually granted 350,000,000 acres of land for various welfare purposes: for education; for wagon roads so that everyone, not only the rich, could travel easily; for canals and levees; for public buildings; for railroads.

Let us not forget too the significant role played by the Homestead Act of 1862 in developing our Nation and in bringing it to a position of power and responsibility in the world. For those who were not able to make an adequate living in the industrial areas of the East, Congress gave away vast areas of public lands to individual families. Today the Federal Government no longer gives land grants. The modern expression of that program, however, is legislation in behalf of unemployment insurance and social security. Today the method of payment is changed. But land or money, income-producing property or income, there is no change in principle.

To provide financial assistance for welfare programs has always been a part of America's tradition. Furthermore, I issue the challenge tonight that it is an American tradition which even the opponents of the welfare state want to preserve. The only question which remains at least in the question of whose welfare.

As early as 1791 Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton—the symbol of conservatism—made a plea before the House of Representatives for Federal subsidies to manufacturers.

During the nineteenth century the United States Government gave to the railroads a total of 179,000,000 acres of land.

At the very moment the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Export-Import Bank assist private industry financially, I suggest that Mr. Guy Gabrielson, himself one of the leading exponents of reaction in America and spokesman for the Republican Party, is in favor of continuing that form of Government subsidy, since the Carthage Hydrocol Corp., which he heads, has received the total of more than $18,000,000 in loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In this connection, I have one further observation to make. I am a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. In our committee is a bill to raise postal rates. The same magazine and newspaper publishers who daily attack the Fair Deal as a welfare state and oppose Government subsidies for the American people are daily in my office and before our committee, insisting the Government postal subsidy to their business be maintained. Last year the newspaper and magazine publishers of America received a subsidy upward of $200,000,000.

Many of these Government subsidies to business are desirable. But if they are desirable to help profits, they are desirable to help people.

Those of us who would advance proposals for welfare legislation do so because we are striving for a more perfect democracy in which the American people through their Government can build a constantly improving society.

Abraham Lincoln said in 1854, "The purpose of government is to do for the people what they cannot do for themselves, or cannot do so well for themselves." That is philosophy which the New Deal and the Fair Deal represent, and which I today represent.

What we strive for can best be put in the phrase "economic democracy." That phrase means a system which preserves the political fabric of democracy and the freedoms traditionally associated with it at the same time as it searches for increased economic freedoms.

A wise man once said, "Hungry stomachs do not make good political advisers." It is our objective to use the great wealth, the greater resources, and the great genius which is ours toward strengthening the establishment of a society free from economic insecurity.

We are moving into the second half of the Twentieth Century, a century which has seen America's productive strength grow beyond the dreams of even the most visionary of our national founders. Today we have the natural resources and the technical knowledge to open up a new vista. President Truman's recent messages to Congress have demonstrated the possibilities that are open to us. Merely by continuing our past rate of growth we can within 5 years increase in production 20 percent, which would mean increasing the average family income by about $1,000 a year. Within our grasp in the next 50 years we can treble today's standard of living which would mean average family incomes of $12,000 a year.

We have an opportunity for the first time in the world's history to establish a society in which every family can have a decent standard of living and in which luxury living will be available to an increasing number of our citizens. It can be a society in which all have enough without unduly limiting the rewards available for the more industrious and the more able.

Yet as these possibilities come to mind, there also comes to mind the increasing complexity of our society.

In the not too distant past opportunity was open to all. If a man was willing to make the effort he could have the richest land and the richest resources for the asking.

Today millions of families are dependent on jobs that may disappear tomorrow with no others available. Millions of families live on tiny worn out farms eking out a bare subsistence.

In this the land of plenty—in this the century of progress—we in America still have almost 10,000,000 families, or about one-quarter of our population, trying to get along on less than $2,000 a year.

Here is the crisis we face. Here is why we need a Fair Deal program, working toward an increasing welfare program, working toward greater economic democracy.

There are some who feel that the realization of the dream which is before our eyes cannot be achieved without sacrificing the free enterprise system—and they prefer the free enterprise system.

They are of little faith. I believe in the free enterprise system—I am not a Socialist. No other system could have made the progress we have made in the past 150 years. But the free enterprise system in America as we have seen it has always been one receiving encouragement, stimulation, and protection from Government activity—from Government welfare programs.

Let us not forget that the protective tariff, the darling of big business for so many years, was one of the most flagrant examples of Government interference in behalf of business.

The greatest threat to the free enterprise system in America is not social security, minimum wage, aid to education, rural electrical programs, and the like. The greatest threat to free enterprise in America is growing monopoly in America.

There are those who would have us believe that an unbalanced budget spells the end of free enterprise in America. That is nonsense. I am more concerned about the fact that the Federal Trade Commission recently reported to Congress another half a dozen industries which are dominated by four to six companies making a total of 19 highly concentrated industries out of 26 studied. I am more concerned that three companies control 95.3 percent of the tin cans and other tinware industry; that three companies control 92.1 percent of the linoleum industry; that another three companies control 88.5 percent of the copper smelting and refining industry. In this connection, Anaconda Copper alone controls almost half the capital assets of the whole industry and another quarter of the capital assets of the copper industry is controlled by Kennecott Copper Corp.

I am concerned about the future of the free-enterprise system when I learn from the Federal Trade Commission reports that 113 companies, all with assets of more than $100,000,000, own almost half of the manufacturing plant and equipment in the whole of our United States.

The free-enterprise system is in danger but the danger does not arise from welfare programs. The danger arises from the fact that from 1940 through 1948, according to the Federal Trade Commission, more than 2,450 formerly independent firms in the manufacturing and mining industries alone disappeared as a result of merger and acquisitions. The asset value of these firms amounted to about $5,200,000,000 or nearly 5 percent of the total asset value of our manufacturing corporations in America. Moreover, nearly one-third of the companies merged were absorbed by the very largest corporations, those with assets exceeding $50,000,000.

It is monopoly which threatens a free America. I do not consider unbalanced budgets to be desirable objectives. Unbalanced national budgets however are no indication of the basic health of the American economy. The Republicans would balance the budget but they would do so, I suggest, at the expense of unbalancing the American economy. I remember well the days of the balanced budget under Ogden Mills, Andrew Mellon, and Herbert Hoover, and I remember that those balanced budgets spelled unbalanced family life for millions of Americans. I am more concerned with balancing the daily lives of Americans and their families so that they have full employment; so that they can enjoy the fruits of their labor; so that they can participate in the good life which is possible in our society.

If the Republican Party should succeed in its program of opposition to social-welfare legislation, if it should succeed in its efforts to curtail Government expenditures at the expense of the middle- and low-income families of America, if it continues to advocate a favor-the-rich tax program such as the one it enacted when it was in power during the Eightieth Congress and which incidentally was primarily responsible for the unbalanced budget of the last 3 years—the Republican Party will be the threat to free enterprise in America.

I recall the prophetic vision of Theodore Roosevelt when he said, "If socialism ever comes to America the Republican Party will bring it."

I realize this sounds like a facetious statement to many but to me the only real safeguard for America, its freedoms and its economy, is a welfare program for America—a state which is concerned with real protection of free enterprise to the point of controlling monopoly, and a state which protects the American citizen from being governed by private corporations. We must have a government which wants to raise the standard of living for everyone not just increase the wealth of the industrialists and financiers. We must have recognition of a man's right to work at a living wage.

In the dark days of 1938 President Franklin Delano Roosevelt warned the American people. He said: "Democracy has disappeared in several other great nations, not because the people of those nations disliked democracy, but because they had grown tired of unemployment and insecurity. * * * In desperation they chose to sacrifice liberty in the hope of getting something to eat. We in America know that our democratic institutions can be preserved and made to work. But in order to preserve them we need * * * to prove that the practical operation of democratic government is equal to the task of protecting the security of the people."

Yes, this program and these principles which I state have international implications as well. America must prove to the peoples of the world that political democracy and political freedom is not synonomous, as the Communists would have them believe, with industrial anarchy, growing unemployment, and the monopoly state. American democracy must prove that political freedom and political democracy can bring about an economy which is a healthy economy—one which is concerned for the welfare of the people. In fact, political democracy and economic oligarchy are incompatible and there can be no lasting political freedoms so long as economic control is in the hands of the few and so long as economic security is missing in our society.

The philosophy of the welfare state which I have been asked to represent aims to satisfy at least five major objectives:

1. A comprehensive social-insurance program including insurance and provision against the hazards of old age, disability, unemployment, and costs of medical care.

2. Prevention or mitigation of unemployment through public works planning and monetary and fiscal policies.

3. Improvement of the standard of living through such programs as slum clearance and public housing and by providing better facilities and opportunities for education.

4. Limitations on the growth of powerful corporate enterprise with a view to protecting the interests of small business firms and less privileged elements within our society.

5. The extension and guaranty of political liberty and economic opportunity to all persons regardless of race, creed, or national origin.

This issue of welfare state brings a vision to my mind. This vision symbolizes the choice which the American people face. On the one hand are those who would judge America and its accomplishments in terms of balance sheets and accounting records. On the other hand are those who judge America by its concrete accomplishments and by the happiness of its people. Those who oppose the welfare state remind me of the frightened men toting up their balances while the American people continue to go forward, build dams and houses and electric and telephone lines.

In conclusion my friends I make a plea for a rational rather than an emotional approach to the problems of government. I make a plea that we respect the facts.

It is difficult for the American people to understand when Mr. Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., head of the board of General Motors, makes a statement on January 18, 1950: "In recent years economic incentive has been weakened by the ever-increasing take of Government. I fear the effect is beginning to be felt on the economy." And then for General Motors to announce that it had earned $600,000,000 profits in 1948—more than any other company has ever made in the history of American industry. I suggest this is not a rational approach to discussing political issues.

Since the war American big business according to the Federal Trade Commission has been making approximately 20 percent profit on its invested capital after taxes. This compares with about half that figure before the war.

If our political opponents wish to label the program we stand for as a welfare state—then let it be so. Call it what you will—one fact, however, stands out in bold relief. This program has raised the living standards of American people. It has given a modicum of security to all areas of our population. It has provided a floor on living standards. It is furnishing relief from the apprehensions and anxieties which lead men to surrender their freedom. It is providing minimum protection against the hazard of old age and unemployment. It will provide prevention from catastrophe of sickness and disease. It is giving decent shelter to more and more of our people. It is putting a floor under wages. It will provide Federal aid to education so as to give every boy and girl equal educational opportunities so that none will remain the slaves of ignorance.

These programs are strengthening the ring of freedom that centuries of struggle has drawn around swinon man.

These programs are providing the incentive and will set the example which will undermine totalitarianism wherever it may be.

Electrical Voting Conduits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a resolution has been introduced which would provide for electrical conduits in the floor of the House. It would be a great disservice to future Congresses to fail to make provision that an electrical conduit system be installed when the House floor is reconstructed this summer.

I hope that action will be taken on one of the appropriate resolutions by the House Administration Committee, and that it will soon be reported to the floor.

The following is an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch:

ELECTRICAL VOTING CONDUITS

During the first 2 months of the 1949 session of Congress, we are advised by Editorial Research Reports, 77 roll calls were taken in the House of Representatives. Each of them required at least 30 minutes—and the 38½ hours thus consumed is more than one-fourth of all the hours the House has been in session since January 3. This sorry record of wasted time and lost efficiency prompts us to suggest again that Congress drop one of its horse-and-buggy habits and install electrical voting machines. Every observer is aware that voting conditions in Congress are not exactly comparable to those in the Virginia General Assembly, but the advantages in electrical equipment more than outweigh any inconvenience that might be caused in changing a leisurely and expensive custom. At our own State Capital electrical equipment has become clearly indispensable. The mechanical roll calls, tabulating the vote of 100 men in a matter of seconds, provide permanent records that are fast, accurate, and easy to understand. Indiana's Representative JAMES E. NOLAND has sponsored a fresh resolution aimed at the installation of electric conduits when the House is further remodeled this summer. His resolution may not pass—congressional customs being the ironbound things they are—but surely it deserves wholehearted support from those who believe in conducting legislative business in a businesslike way.

Election of President and Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extremely interesting letter by Mr. Charles H. Porter, who is professor of accounting, emeritus, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Professor Porter in his letter clearly shows a defect in the Coudert proposal for counting electoral votes by districts, which is that it is impossible for a district not to be gerrymandered. Therefore the Lodge-Gossett amendment is the best way to effectuate electoral reform.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING EVERY VOTE COUNT—COUDERT ELECTORAL PROPOSAL CALLED BAD HERESIES TO DELAY REFORM; LODGE-GOSSETT PLAN PREFERRED

To the New York Herald Tribune:

In the Herald Tribune of March 19 you printed a communication from Prof. Hugh A. Bone pointing out difficulties in fixing fair district boundaries if the Coudert proposal for presidential elections is adopted. I would go farther and maintain that fair district boundaries are impossible.

Consider a State where 55 percent of the voters are Democrats and 45 percent are Republicans. If the State were so districted that each district contained 55 percent Democrats and 45 percent Republicans, the entire electoral vote of the State would be counted for the Democratic candidate as at present. Whether the Republicans had 45

percent of the popular vote or only 5 percent would not be reflected in the electoral college vote.

Or if an all-wise and completely neutral individual could be found to gerrymander the districts so as to balance exactly the inequities on one side against inequities on the other side, he would also need to be a prophet, because the distribution of voters in 1952 will not duplicate the distribution of voters in 1948. The opinions of some voters change and a new generation of voters replaces those voters who have passed on. What any system of basing the electoral college vote on districts really does is to substitute 100 smaller inequities for the 48 larger inequities of the present system, the total inequity being of the same order of magnitude in either case. The counting of Republican votes in Texas for a Democratic candidate and of Democratic votes in Vermont for a Republican candidate is an inequity.

A fallacy in much of the argument about electoral systems is the assumption that the popular vote will be national, regardless of the system. This is not the case. There are a substantial number of voters in Louisiana who would vote for a Republican candidate for President if they knew that the system made their votes effective but who do not trouble to vote for President under the present system. I have just spent a month in Louisiana and did not hear a single person say a good word for Truman.

Unless the President can be elected by a total popular vote, the Lodge-Gossett amendment is the only proposal which makes the ballot of every Republican and every Democrat effective.

By making every State a battleground, we would stimulate a greater and much needed interest in politics. The Coudert proposal is a red herring to postpone a vital reform.

CHESTER H. POWELL,
Professor of Accounting Emeritus of Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

TRYON, N. C., *March 21, 1950.*

Death of Dr. Francis T. Spaulding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the people of the State of New York have been saddened by the untimely death of the State commissioner of education, Dr. Francis Trow Spaulding.

Under Dr. Spaulding's direction, the State of New York has pursued an unusually vigorous policy in education. Dr. Spaulding was particularly effective in improving the administration and curricula of our high schools. He was a man of high idealism and of complete integrity. It will be very difficult for any man adequately to fill his place.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial which appeared on March 28 in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANCIS TROW SPAULDING

Dr. Spaulding took office less than 4 years ago as State commissioner of education. His death at the age of 59 deprives the State and the Nation of an able and useful leader. He had served the armed forces in an educational capacity in two world wars. Among the high posts he held was that of dean of the Graduate School of Education at Harvard. Many States benefited from his experience and writings. When he became commissioner on July 1, 1946, by unanimous election by the board of regents, he was already familiar with New York State's school system from earlier studies.

During Dr. Spaulding's tenure a general reorganization of the department of education was undertaken. New and higher minimum salaries for public school teachers were mandated by State law, the State University of New York was created, a more vigorous policy of informing the public on educational problems was initiated, and new emphasis was directed to improving the high school. The commissioner was an advocate of generous State financial aid to education, and on occasion came into conflict with other high officials on the extent of such aid. His decisions on several controversial issues reflected a policy of avoiding interference with local school authorities when possible. Confronted with the task of implementing legislative orders under the Feinberg antisubversive law, he issued a memorandum admirable in its concern for safeguarding the conscientious and the innocent.

Dr. Spaulding leaves a vacancy hard to fill. The area of jurisdiction is large and varied, the powers great. The commissioner must be an educator from the top drawer. He must also be a man of courage and highest integrity. The commissioner of education is always on the firing line, both from within and outside the school system.

Mr. Acheson's Ordeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Acheson's Ordeal," which was published in the London Times of yesterday. This editorial was the "leader," as the phrase goes. The London Times leader exercises vast influence throughout the Empire and the world. This editorial substantiates the misgivings recently expressed by Mr. Stimson, the distinguished former Secretary of War and Secretary of State, when he said that the current attacks upon our State Department are creating a feeling abroad which can only hamper the effective conduct of our foreign policy. The London Times observes that the attacks on Mr. Acheson have caused both bewilderment and alarm abroad and have weakened the foreign policy of the United States at a critical moment.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. ACHESON'S ORDEAL

The campaign in the American Congress and press against Mr. Acheson, the United States Secretary of State, has caused both bewilderment and alarm abroad. When Mr. Acheson was chosen to succeed Mr. Marshall the choice was felt to be singularly happy and likely not only to shed luster on the administration but also to provide international leadership of a high order. Mr. Acheson had been closely associated with the unfolding of a creative American foreign policy to meet the challenge presented by communism and the disruption caused by the war. In office he has demonstrated a notable capacity to illuminate the real issues in foreign affairs.

His second speech in California a fortnight ago, for example, made it clear that the United States was prepared at any time to enter into negotiations with the Russians, but insisted that fundamental and far-reaching changes in Russian policy must precede any agreement that would be worth the paper it was written on. It is Mr. Acheson's view that at present agreements are likely only in specific situations where sufficient strength can be mobilized by the democracies to command Russian respect.

Nothing could be farther than this from appeasing Russia. Yet in Congress, Senator WHERRY, the Republican floor leader, has presumed to call Mr. Acheson a "bad security risk" and his resignation is demanded by a number of Republicans on the ground that he is tolerant of Communist sympathisers in his Department. Senator MCCARTHY, a Wisconsin Republican, has not the official backing of his party for his wild and so far quite unproved charges that the presence of untrustworthy officials in the State Department accounts for recent American diplomatic defeats in the Far East. But his party has done nothing to restrain him and there is no doubt that if any single item in Senator MCCARTHY'S barrage of indictments should prove to have some substance, however small, it would be exploited to the full in the autumn elections. It has long been a favorite Republican thesis that the Democrats are "soft" toward communism. It is proof of Mr. Acheson's courage, if not his discretion, that he went out of his way after the conviction of Mr. Alger Hiss, a former State Department official, to announce that, while he abhorred the crime, he would not turn his back upon the man. Such open defiance of the Republican lightning had the effect of leaving Mr. Acheson in temporary political isolation. Unlike some of his predecessors, such as Mr. Hull and Mr. Byrnes, he had no political machine of his own; he has never been a member of the Senate. Democrats who normally would have rallied to his defense took refuge in silence, believing they could not afford to increase their political liabilities in an election year.

This is a critical week in Mr. Acheson's ordeal. The Republicans threaten a parade of anti-Acheson speakers. The President, himself engaged in a tussle with Senator MCCARTHY, has come to the defense of the Secretary of State, denying widespread rumors that he is to be replaced. Mr. Jessup, United States ambassador-at-large and himself accused of an "affinity for Communist causes," has counterattacked, charging Mr. MCCARTHY with a "shocking disregard for the public interest." Senator BENTON, newly appointed by Governor Bowles of Connecticut and a former colleague of Mr. Acheson, is the first Democrat bold enough to take his place by the side of the Secretary of State and the President.

The realization is growing that irresponsible partisan attacks weaken not only the State Department, but the foreign policy of the United States at a critical moment. Mr. Acheson's lack of a constructive policy for Asia, by which they mean his refusal to allow the United States to cling any longer to the sinking ship of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, is the chief Republican grievance against him. Yet their attacks have robbed the Secretary of State of the time and energy that should have been available for urgent decisions on aid to southeast Asia and for mobilizing support for new approaches to Europe's problems.

The first stage, to which Mr. Acheson's California speech was directed, is to convince the American public that there are no short cuts in the struggle between democracy and communism. Any illusions on this score sap the will to support the efforts already being made, through the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact, and make Congress and the public less inclined for fresh endeavors.

Congress, quite apart from the campaign against the State Department, is struggling to reduce the $5,000,000,000 deficit in the budget, and foreign spending is likely to feel the sharp edge of the pruning shears, for cuts here offend directly no domestic interest. Even the bill for technical assistance to underdeveloped countries is regarded as having doubtful prospects, modest though its scale is. The only increased spending that can be looked for is on defense. Here presidential economy has aroused congressional alarm. The fact-finding mission of Mr. Jessup to the Far East and other reviews of American policy provide the basis, however, for the limited economic and military assistance that Mr. Acheson forecast for the countries of southeast Asia, the details of which are likely to be made known this week. A plan for helping to close the dollar gap in the trading accounts of friends and allies is, as Mr. Webb, the Under Secretary of State, declared last week, probably the largest single contribution which the United States can make toward strengthening the free world. It is a hopeful sign that Senator VANDENBERG, whose illness has crippled the foreign-affairs leadership of the Senate, has suggested the creation of an unpartisan commission to consider solutions of this problem, much as the Harriman committee's investigations laid the foundations of the Marshall plan. As Mr. Webb noted, the difficulty is to stabilize world trade at a sufficiently high level. Recent reductions in the dollar gap are due to the decline in American exports as well as increases in imports; if this went on damage would be done, not only to recovery abroad, but to stability and employment in the United States.

In September there will be another opportunity for the President to use his powers to reduce tariffs further, on manufactured articles as well as raw materials. But the deliberate organization of a higher level of American imports is politically far more difficult than the passage of foreign-aid programs. There is room for expansion; imports now represent a much smaller proportion of the American gross national product than they did in 1929. Yet even the very moderate increases that have already taken place have brought bitter complaints in the watch and textile trades, not only from managements but from trade-unions as well. Neither of the political parties is free from this kind of pressure. It has even been tentatively suggested by both Mr. Acheson and Mr. Hoffman that industries badly affected by foreign competition, in the national interest, might be given Government assistance. This is the kind of proposal that might with advantage be entrusted to the commission which Senator VANDENBERG believes should study the new responsibilities of the world's greatest creditor Nation. With problems of such import and complexity in hand, it is matter for universal concern and disquiet that the conduct of American foreign affairs should be subjected to irresponsible political attacks.

Mr. BENTON. In addition and as a postscript, Mr. President, it is interesting to note that the London Communist Daily Worker of yesterday at the opposite end of the pole in reputability from the London Times, published the following comment:

Short of starting a third world war next week, it is difficult to see how Mr. Dean Acheson, the United States Secretary of State, could manifest more hostility to communism than he has done.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from George D. Stoddard, former commissioner of education of New York, now president of the University of Illinois, and chairman of the National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Dr. Stoddard is world famous as psychologist and educator. His courageous leadership and great contribution to UNESCO and to the United States National Commission for UNESCO are well known not only in this country, but throughout the world. He speaks with authority as well as wisdom on the need for immediate consideration by the Senate of the resolution which I and 12 other Senators submitted a week ago today.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMPAIGN, ILL., *March 27, 1950.*

Senator WILLIAM S. BENTON,
Senate Office Building:

Have now read in detail your proposed six-point resolution and supporting speech of March 22. Congratulations on your logical analysis, courage, and imagination. It restores to the American people what they have relied upon in all crisis from Revolutionary War onward, namely faith in the power of ideas, the power of ethical principles. Arms we must have but military preparedness alone is not enough. We need plans for banding together like-minded people in defense of freedom. We need action, programs based on such plans. Your resolution shows the way and the relative cost is small. This is the true answer to communism.

GEORGE D. STODDARD,
President, University of Illinois.

Death of Francis T. Spaulding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Francis T. Spaulding," published in the New York Herald Tribune on Tuesday, March 28, 1950. In his untimely death the State of New York and the United States have lost a distinguished public servant, a great educator, and a great American.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANCIS T. SPAULDING

Francis T. Spaulding, State commissioner of education since 1946, was a career educator of marked attainments. His sudden death at age 58 is a serious loss to the State. New York's education system is intricate and many-faceted. The commissioner is the executive head, named to carry out policies laid down by the board of regents to guide all schools in the State from the elementary to university and adult education levels; he is also president of that vague entity, the University of the State of New York. Direction is exercised through the regents' powers to inspect and require reports, to conduct entrance examinations, to confer and evaluate degrees, and to incorporate educational institutions.

Before the State university was established, the regents administered upward of 30 teachers, and technical colleges. Dr. Spaulding himself served on the Young commission, which drew up the university plans, and had undertaken a reorganization of his department following the transfer of actual administration of these colleges to the university trustees. The department is called upon to interpret the State law in knotty personnel cases. It fell to the commissioner, as the executive of the board of regents, to make the regulations for carrying out the Feinberg law to deal with subversive teachers.

Dr. Spaulding, formerly dean of education at Harvard, served with distinction during the war as head of the Armed Forces Institute, organizing educational opportunities wherever United States military forces were stationed. He has fought for adequate appropriations for the schools and for construction to meet future needs. Commissioner Spaulding's expert knowledge of the complexities of New York's education system and his level-headedness in handling them will be hard to duplicate.

American Dairy Association Award to the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was glad to note in the newspapers the news that the American Dairy Association representing 5,000,000 dairy farmers has presented its annual distinguished service award to the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. The news of this award supplements information which has come to me from many dairy leaders and organizations in Wisconsin, pointing out their excellent experiences with the A. & P. as a purchaser of a tremendous amount of wholesome, nutritious dairy products.

In these days when there is so much criticism in so many quarters against so many companies and groups, it is heart-warming to note evidence of praise and appreciation of notable contributions rendered.

The American Dairy Association is, of course, tremendously well represented in America's dairyland. Our Wisconsin Dairy Association has always been to the

fare whenever an issue was involved relating to the income, the welfare, of the 175,000 farms of the Badger State.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of a news release describing the dairy award to the A. & P. be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN DAIRY ASSOCIATION SERVICE AWARD VOTED TO A. & P.—CONTRIBUTION TO BETTER LIVING WINS CITATION

CHICAGO, ILL., March 27.—The American Dairy Association, representing 5,000,000 dairy farmers, presented its annual distinguished service award to the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., here tonight.

The award, made at the Seventh annual ADA banquet at the Morrison Hotel, was voted to the 91-year-old food chain for "advancing the Nation toward an ever better standard of living." George W. Diehl, director of A. & P.'s national butter and cheese department, received the plaque on behalf of the company.

The citation was presented by Owen M. Richards, manager of the dairy association, who said the award was a means of recognizing the friends of the dairy industry who are joined with the dairy farmers in providing an ever-improving diet and nutrition for the American people.

The award read as follows:

"A. & P. food stores long since has proved its worthiness to the American people in making available good food and good service at low prices, with its operating efficiency a hallmark of the American way of initiative and enterprise.

"A. & P. food stores, in advancing the Nation toward an ever better standard of living, has always stressed the wider use of the good things of life, including the foods produced on the Nation's millions of dairy farms—the milk, butter, cheese, evaporated and dry milk—all the dairy products that are such good foods for a better life for all mankind.

"For these contributions to the welfare of the Nation and its dairy farmers, the American Dairy Association, with its membership in 41 States producing more than 90 percent of the Nation's milk supply, is happy and proud to present this distinguished service award for 1950 to A. & P. food stores," the citation concluded.

During the past year, A. & P. cooperated with the dairy farmers all over the country in finding a larger market for their products.

GI Educational and Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by a veteran from my district. There has been so much talk and publicity concerning abuses and rackets under the GI educational and training program that at times the great amount of good accomplished has been overshadowed and not fully appreciated. The veteran's letter expresses his gratitude for the benefits which he has received. The letter speaks for itself. It presents a picture in striking contrast to the one which is most frequently publicized. I desire to pass it on to my colleagues.

The letter follows:

CHIEF, EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION REGIONAL OFFICE,
Roanoke, Va.

DEAR SIR: With the hope that this letter might in some way facilitate the closing of my scholastic records at your office, it is with great pleasure that I inform you of the successful completion of my legal training at the T. C. Williams Law School of the University of Richmond. My course ended as of February 6, 1950, and on that date I was recommended for bachelor of laws degree to be given in June. Thus, I am no longer entitled to subsistence or tuition from the VA.

At this time I should like to express my thanks and appreciation to the VA and United States Government for the splendid educational opportunities which have been afforded me. But for the program your office administers, and the finest Government in the world, it would have been exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for hopes to have become realized. A Government never owes its citizens for the services they render as such, and with this fact in mind, it is even now difficult to realize that one nation has seen fit to do so much for so many.

For your information if necessary, my company number is C-9221237. I remain

Respectfully,

WALLACE B. STOCKDON.

Wasteful Federal Construction Methods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Berkeley, Calif., March 27, 1950.

HON. BEN JENSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: There is enclosed a copy of a letter recently addressed to President Truman by Mr. Ray B. Wiser, president of the California Farm Bureau Federation, dealing with the wasteful construction methods of the Bureau of Reclamation. As you well know, this is not the only example of the senseless squandering propensities of this agency but I thought it would serve the public interest to record with you one more item of that nature. This is the reason I am bothering you about troubles in California when I know you probably have plenty of your own.

It is extremely galling to encounter such costly bureaucratic oppression in connection with a facility which in itself, from a public interest standpoint, can never serve any useful purpose and can only be a financial drain on the entire project and an unnecessary charge against the water users supposed to benefit from the project.

If there is any way you can help correct this situation you will be rendering a signal service not only to the Federal Treasury but also to the unfortunate victims of Bureau caprice and oppression directly involved in this complaint.

Very truly yours,

ERNOW ABBT,
Assistant Director,
Public Utilities Department.

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Berkeley, Calif., March 10, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States, White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter is addressed to you on account of the urgency of the complaint which it presents. This complaint was filed with the Bureau of Reclamation officials of region II to no avail. A letter was addressed to Mr. Richard L. Boke, under date of February 7, 1950. He replied under date of February 9, 1950, to the effect that he hoped to "be able to give * * * a full reply within a few days." To date he has made no reply but on February 16, 1950, the Government filed a condemnation action covering the properties involved in this complaint. Perhaps this is the reply he had in mind. In any event, he has never replied. On February 20, 1950, a letter was received from Mr. Carl H. Kadie, Jr., district manager. It evaded the real issues which are the downright squandering and sheer waste of public moneys and arbitrary, unnecessary, and unwarranted oppression of citizens involved in the construction of high-voltage transmission lines on the west side of the Sacramento Valley in the Central Valley project.

A map is attached to give you a clear picture of what the Bureau of Reclamation proposes to do. In building the so-called west side transmission line of the Central Valley project, the Bureau has to construct a line between the two points marked with a red "X." Instead of going in a straight line as indicated by the broken line on the map and traversing what is mostly grazing land of little comparative value, it insists on taking an out-of-line route into intensively developed agricultural land.

The route which it insists on taking is shown on map and takes a right-angle jog at its upper end into good, irrigable land which it traverses for a little over 20 miles, passes into the hills for some 15 miles, and then debouches into intensively cultivated lands for the remainder of the distance. On the other hand, by selecting the direct route, it would shorten the over-all length of the line by 3 miles and would traverse for the most part only low, hilly grazing lands which are not now and never will be susceptible of intensive agriculture.

The map attached is a section of an official publication of the United States Department of Agriculture delineating the irrigated and unirrigated areas of California. The areas in lighter shades are unirrigated and here are mainly grazing lands. The areas of darker shade are irrigated and consequently more intensively developed. No adequate reason has been given by the Bureau of Reclamation for this unnecessary lengthening of the transmission line with its consequent and unnecessary invasion of highly developed agricultural lands.

The arbitrary action complained of is aggravated by the fact that actually the forcing of this right-of-way as proposed effectively takes out of production a much greater acreage than the Bureau of Reclamation has told anybody about. The land affected is peculiarly adapted to rice culture and is not much good for anything else. Economic rice culture, whether on 10-acre plots or large acreages, requires the use of airplanes for planting, fertilizing, and other cultural practices of a preharvest nature. Farmers not using airplanes are at a complete disadvantage which cannot be overcome.

The route selected by the Bureau of Reclamation parallels that of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. high-voltage transmission lines 1,400 feet to the east. The areas between the two transmission lines cannot be served by airplanes because of the danger to the plane operators. This is the statement of plane operators customarily working in that area. As a result of this complication, instead of the 15 acres per mile which the Bureau estimates will be taken out of service, nearly 200 acres per mile is affected in that manner. The severance and loss-of-use damages on this route will be far in excess of any estimate made by the Bureau.

According to the estimates of the Bureau of Reclamation, the 12 miles or more of right-of-way in the more intensively developed section are to cost the Federal Treasury $50,000. This on the basis that 198.5 acres are to be taken. This is a gross underestimate, as that many acres per mile will be taken out of production and the value of the property interests to be taken in this one stretch will be more in the order of $500,000 rather than the mere $50,000 estimated by the Bureau.

As stated before, this matter was taken up with the Bureau of Reclamation officials here. They pretended to make a study of the direct route but we are quite skeptical of their good faith in the matter as we know that they had already advised the Department of Justice the route they had selected for condemnation purposes and had already let a contract for the steel towers to be used in constructing the line. In fact, they had advertised for these towers even before the authorization legislation had been approved by the Congress.

The over-all result of this arbitrary abuse of its powers by the Bureau is that the economy of a highly developed agricultural area is disrupted and the Federal Treasury is mulcted to the tune of over a half million dollars. This may be only peanuts in these lavish days but if it can be saved we submit it should.

We respectfully request that you have an investigation made of this profligate waste of Federal funds when the need for economy is so great. Such an investigation will convince you that the direct line route is the one which is most consistent with the public interest, and the one which the Bureau of Reclamation should be required to follow.

Very truly yours,

RAY B. WISER,
President.

MARCH 20, 1950.

Mr. ERNOW ABBT,
Assistant Director,
California Farm Bureau Federation,
Berkeley, Calif.

DEAR MR. ABBT: I am pleased to acknowledge your letter of March 27 along with copy of Mr. Wiser's letter to President Truman.

I am sure you know that for several years Congress defeated the building of the west side line, because of the fact that this huge expenditure of the American peoples' tax dollars could by no stretch of the imagination be justified. However, Congress did make the initial appropriation for this line last year, since it was a part and parcel of the President's Federal socialized electric power program, which in due time is designed to take over all electric power in America, as has already been done in England.

I have decided to place your letter and this reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to read, in the hope that the American people and their Congress will awaken to the dangers before it is too late.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

Death of Laurence Steinhardt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Nation was shocked yesterday to learn of the tragic and untimely death of our Ambassador to Canada, Mr. Laurence Steinhardt.

For many years I was honored by Laurence Steinhardt's friendship. I knew him as a successful young lawyer and later as a highly respected and beloved member of the diplomatic corps. He served his country with great distinction in six top diplomatic posts. He brought to each one of them indefatigable effort, firmness, tact, and courage. His untimely passing is a great loss not only to his family and host of friends, but to the foreign service in which he served so long and so usefully.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD editorials carried this morning in the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 30, 1950]

LAURENCE STEINHARDT

At 57, Laurence Steinhardt was the most widely experienced diplomat in the service of the American people. He had held no fewer than six top-ranking posts as Ambassador, and in all but the last of these he was confronted with special circumstances which were a test of his ability and good judgment. He was our representative in Sweden and then Peru when these nations were struggling to recover from an international depression which had dealt them particularly heavy blows. He was our Ambassador in Russia in the days when Molotov and Ribbentrop were negotiating secretly to divide the spoils of a European war. He was our Ambassador in Turkey when Soviet pressure was brought to bear on that country in the maneuver which led to the formulation of the Truman doctrine. He was our Ambassador to Czechoslovakia when Communist carpetbaggers took over control of that nation under the protection of Russian military power. Only in his last post, as Ambassador to Canada, did he find relief from particularly harassing problems and a task as pleasant as that of drawing still more firmly together the already close relations of two good neighbors.

This remarkably varied experience made Mr. Steinhardt one of the most valued members of the American diplomatic service. It gave him an opportunity to bring into full play his natural alertness, courage, and vigor. His tragic death yesterday in an accident along the well-traveled air road from Ottawa to Washington is a cause of deep sorrow to his many friends and a real loss to his country.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 30, 1950]

LAURENCE A. STEINHARDT

Laurence A. Steinhardt entered upon diplomacy after a successful career in the law, bringing with him a conviction that most differences can be settled by understanding and mediation. His time of service was cast amid great events, and the posts he held called him to places of utmost stress. Moscow, Ankara, and Prague tell by themselves a story of forces in delicate balance and issues of fateful import. In Russia before the last war Mr. Steinhardt saw and communicated to his Government the coming of the Hitler-Stalin pact; a year later he was able to advise of the complete reversal which was to bring Germany and Russia into deadly grapple. Turkey, his next post, was crucial in determining our prestige throughout the Near East; and Czechoslovakia, where Mr. Steinhardt went in 1945, was an ill-fated testing ground of democracy's ability to survive within the Communist orbit.

His most recent post was of a different kind. Our relations with Canada have moved in stable channels over the years, and Mr. Steinhardt's distinction and experience served as a witness to the importance we attach to Canada's friendship rather than as qualities necessary to the solution of vexing problems. His death, in an airplane accident in the midst of his duties, comes as a shock to the country he had represented with single-mindedness and skill.

Reduction in VA Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of March 29, 1950:

SHARP VA PERSONNEL REDUCTIONS CALLED BLOW TO MEDICAL MORALE—SOME HOSPITAL BEDS MAY HAVE TO BE CLOSED AND BACKLOGS AT MENTAL CLINICS WILL INCREASE

(By George Beveridge)

Sharp personnel reductions are expected to cut seriously into the Veterans' Administration's vast medical program, and already have dealt "a terrific blow" to morale of medical leaders supporting it, the Star learned today.

About 7,800 jobs are slated to be lopped off the VA pay roll April 19.

More than 4,800 of them, including some doctors, nurses, and dentists, will be cut from the agency's often-praised medical service. In addition, it was reported:

1. VA officials knew 9 months ago they were exceeding medical personnel provided by the 1950 budget, but on instructions from Veterans' Administrator Gray did not cut jobs off.

2. In the cut-back next month, some hospital beds may have to be closed.

3. Backlogs of patients at mental hygiene clinics will increase, and some veterans may have to be routed to neuropsychiatric hospitals for treatment at increased expense.

The cuts, it was learned, have raised concern at VA over whether present standards of medical care can be maintained.

Asked about specific effects, Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, medical director, said medical divisions now are reviewing tentative cuts in terms of beds and patients. Preliminary estimates for the different divisions, he added, may be adjusted.

"It's hard to tell at this time just what the effect will be on the whole program," he said. "But it looks bad."

Dr. Magnuson said one of his greatest concerns is the terrible reaction coming in from the non-VA doctors who have helped develop the agency's medical training and treatment program throughout the country.

"There is the feeling among the medical profession," he declared, "that you can't trust the Government because there's no assurance of security or continuity of programs."

An official who asked that his name not be used said the abrupt cut-back announcement has the effect of shoving it down the profession's throat.

"This sort of squeeze," he added, "throws us out of balance with some of their projects."

He said the blow could have been eased last fall, if VA had dropped some medical workers and refused to replace most of those who left jobs later in the year. At that time, he said the medical department was about 2,000 personnel above its budget limits.

General Gray is reported to have told medical officials to keep employees if they were needed.

PLANNED TO AVOID PRINCE

There were rumors last September of a sizable personnel cut, but VA officially announced its intention then to cut down on expenses without resorting to firings.

Officials stressed that Congress provided personnel they asked for this year, but that VA personnel requests had been trimmed sharply by the Budget Bureau.

Actually, they explained, they received more medical personnel than in fiscal 1949. But the additional workers were earmarked to staff new hospitals in VA's expansion program.

The April 10 cut of more than 4,800 medical personnel will save only about $2,500,000, it was reported. Because most workers have accrued annual leave, many will be carried on the rolls until the early part of May.

Present budget estimates for the year starting July 1, moreover, would not replace personnel lost by the 4,800 cut, officials said.

"Me-Too-ism" Socialism Lures in England Just As It Lost in United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting an article which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News of March 3, 1950:

"ME-TOOISM" SOCIALISM LOSES IN ENGLAND JUST AS IT LOST IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

After sleeping on the subject a few nights, one gets a clearer understanding of the reasons for the defeat of the Conservatives or victory of the Socialists, however, you prefer it, in the British parliamentary election.

There were those who forecast the result before the votes were counted, based upon the me-too campaign of Winston Churchill and his running mates. Some of those who did so were unkind enough to make a comparison between the British election campaign and an earlier contest between Messrs. Truman and Dewey in which the result was most unexpected.

There still are lots of folks who say that in order to win a conservative victory, or at least win a victory that will call for a halt on the spending, deficits and other policies that are watering down the purchasing value of the United States dollar, you have to go along with most of what the New Deal-Fair Deal boys promise.

They proclaim this in spite of the concern felt in this country not only for security but for the value of the money in which we are paid for our day's labors and to buy our daily bread. They say it in spite of the fact that the women of America, like those of Australia and New Zealand, simply are waiting for a leader to tell them the plain and blunt truth about our political and economic fallacies, which mean that the Government buys potatoes for dollars and sells them back to the grower for cents, even while there is need in the land.

"What has all this to do with the British election?" you may be asking by this time, and it is just this: If Winston Churchill and his party leaders had followed the lesson taught by the Australian election, they would have stopped shilly-shallying. They would, in that admirable British term, have faced up to it, and told the naked truth rather than have attempted to buy the election with nice promises that nobody was going to be disturbed in his enjoyment of the pap which the Socialists had handed out at the expense of the solvency of what once was mighty Britannia.

This ceases to be theory; it readily can be documented. Early in January the News published a splendid series of articles on the reasons for the repudiation of the Socialist Governments in Australia and New Zealand. Written by Morley Cassidy, they left no doubt of the strategy employed by the opposition to the Socialists. His dispatch, appearing in the News January 16, told that there was money in every pocket; wages were high and everybody had a job, but the people were disturbed about the Socialist tendencies, and in fighting them, Mr. Cassidy said:

"Seldom has any party, anywhere, stated its purposes more clearly and with less mumbo-jumbo and 'bait' to unthinking voters, than the combined Liberal and Country Parties in the election just past.

"Every voter was told, in the firmest possible language, that a vote for the Liberty-Country Party ticket would be a vote for free enterprise against the Socialist state. * * *

"He would be voting for a firmer hand in dealing with unjustified strikes which have crippled Australian industry. * * * He would be voting finally to 'desocialize' much that has been done in the past 8 years—to fight side by side with the banks—imagine—in repealing the legislation aimed at creating a state banking monopoly; to restore competition between national and private air lines and shipping companies; to wipe out the government monopoly in FM broadcasting and television."

The closeness of the result in Britain suggests that Mr. Churchill, had he followed such a course based upon sound principle and statesmanlike leadership, might have won another victory instead, perchance, of snatching defeat out of the mouth of victory. Indeed, does not the decision of Prime Minister Attlee to call a halt on nationalization strongly indicate that the Conservatives could have won the election if they had boldly faced up to the issue? Mr. Churchill never lacked the courage to stand up to the Nazis, but somehow he lacked the sagacity to sense that the British people in this time of crisis might readily have responded to candor.

Neglected City Folk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial titled "Neglected City Folk" which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post of March 26, 1950. This editorial points out that the great forgotten class in America is the middle-income families whose problems have been almost wholly overlooked. The editorial calls attention to the inconsistency of those Members of Congress who label as socialistic and inflationary a modest proposal in behalf of our city dwellers and at the same time advocate much more expensive programs for other groups of citizens.

NEGLECTED CITY FOLK

In closing debate on the bill that would have provided for low-interest FHA loans to cooperative middle-income groups seeking cheaper housing, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK put his finger on one of the greatest weaknesses of the Republican Party—failure to do anything for the city-dwelling middle-income group.

One paragraph of his speech in the Congress illuminates this neglect of the sound core of any political movement—the middle income—middle-class individual. He said: "When it comes to something for the middle class and the middle-income group in this country, when it comes to trying to put through a cooperative plan so that they can build little homes for themselves then it is socialism—it is dangerous—then it is everything that is bad."

The measure under consideration contained no subsidy—even as the question of increasing the borrowing capacity of Commodity Credit Corporation by $2,000,000,000 impended. The difference was that the CCC measure was for farmers—and the cooperative-housing-loan measure was for city dwellers.

Plans for Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times of March 27, 1950, entitled "Plans for Southeast Asia":

PLANS FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA

With the appearance of roving Ambassador Jessup before congressional committees this week after his extensive Asiatic trip, we should have some concrete suggestions as to how our help can be effectively given to the threatened areas of southeast Asia. The Secretary of State has already declared that it will be our policy to furnish such assistance subject to the limitations of our ability and the ability of the recipients to profit by our aid. The framework of that limitation is large and there should be room for forthright and substantial action.

Dr. Jessup will certainly be expected to state, also, that this action should be prompt. The situation in some areas is critical and delay at this stage may mean the loss of the chance to do a job that needs doing. Fortunately, not all the plans have to wait for some master program in strategy. In the case of Burma, for example, the British commonwealths have already moved to put badly needed resources at the disposal of the hard-pressed government. It should be a relatively simple matter for the United States to associate itself with that action, either in adding to the amount to be given or in making it easier for the commonwealths to make their resources available.

The United States has funds already appropriated that can be used for many purposes in the critical area. There is a large residue of the economic-aid funds. There is the President's discretionary fund. These can be put into action now. Moreover, there is legislation already before Congress, such as aid for Korea and further funds for the Philippines, that can be adopted speedily. Surveys are now being made that will make the beginning of the point 4 program easier and quicker as soon as it receives the green light—all the more reason why Congress should act affirmatively and speedily.

It is recognized that there is one grave danger to all of southeast Asia, but the ways of meeting it can and should be varied and flexible. Indochina, for example, needs military aid right now; it should be given and then backed up with a long-range program of assistance in the development of the economy of the country, the amelioration of living conditions, and the raising of standards. The Philippines need a prompt strengthening of their military position and a program of investment for profit and advancement. Indonesia needs further credit for the rehabilitation of production and trade, and we can support them. Some changes in our stock-piling program would have an instantly helpful effect in Malaya, and they should be studied at once.

Many persons in this country have been critical of our past policies because of their hesitation and overcaution. Likewise, many of our friends in Asia are timid and worried because of the fear that we will not act with our full forces and act in time. Those two factors in our present relative weakness can be overcome by bold and imaginative decisions. We can inspire confidence by regaining it ourselves. We do not have to wait for a Marshall plan for Asia or for a new federation, or for a defensive alliance.

The Hat Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on March 28 on the retirement of Mr. Max Zaritsky as president of the United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers Union of the A. F. of L., and the nomination of Mr. Alex Rose to succeed Mr. Zaritsky.

My good friend, Max Zaritsky, has been an able and enlightened leader who not only won substantial gains for the members of his union, but who demonstrated a rare understanding of the economic and political complexities of the times.

His union has stood firm against reactionary forces of both the left and the right, and has long recognized that the interests of American labor and those of the American public are inseparable.

I am very happy to know that Mr. Zaritsky's post as president of the union will be filled by Mr. Alex Rose, whose talent and courage are so well known both in the labor movement and throughout the State of New York. I know that the fine tradition of the hatters' union will be preserved under the guidance and leadership of Mr. Rose.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HAT UNION

The rise of mammoth unions in the mass-production industries has taken the spotlight away from such long-established organizations as the United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers International Union. There are single locals in the automobile and steel unions that have more members than all the hat locals put together. Even in the needle trades the United Hatters is dwarfed by its "big brothers," the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. But the salutary influence of the hat union on the American labor movement is not measured by its size. Here is an organization, once steeped in the traditions of revolutionary socialism, that was among the first to recognize that the welfare of its members depended on the well-being of the industry in which they worked. It fought off the encroachment of Communists and underworld elements. It stamped out jurisdictional strife in its industry. It tried unsuccessfully to ward off the split between the AFL and the CIO.

Max Zaritsky, who is about to retire from the union presidency on reaching the age of 65, was a principal architect of the enlightened policies that have made the hatters a force for good in the country's social and economic life. Alex Rose, who has been nominated by the union's executive board to succeed Mr. Zaritsky, has been equally conspicuous in his efforts to promote industrial peace. Mr. Rose is even better known to the public for his mobilization of labor's political forces in municipal, State, and national elections. He refused to continue in the American Labor Party when he and others of its founders were convinced that it had been captured by Communists. We have not always seen eye to eye with Mr. Rose in the candidates he has supported as a leader in the Liberal Party, but we respect him as a sincere American whose views are rooted in a recognition that labor is part of the community and must assume the responsibilities, as well as the benefits, that go with such a position.

Rural Electrification Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an address delivered by Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, at the annual meeting of the National Rural Cooperative Association, in Chicago, March 6, 1950.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, may I add that Administrator Wickard is giving the department one of the ablest and most effective administrations in the history of the service.

His administration has been marked by strict adherence to the letter of the law in the interpretation of the statutory duties and functions of his agency and by exceptional service to the consuming public in whose behalf the agency operates.

He has established a record for efficiency which might well be taken as a model by both public and private executives.

Mr. Wickard's address follows:

TODAY'S CHALLENGE TO RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

It is a privilege and a pleasure to come again before your great convention to tell you of the accomplishments of the past year and to discuss with you plans for future years.

During the last year the REA program reached new and greater heights of accomplishments. Over a half million consumers were added to REA lines. The lines which were energized on REA systems last year would circle the earth seven times. During recent weeks the three millionth consumer received REA service. REA passed the $1,000,000,000 loan mark shortly after the first of this year. Today 88 percent of the farms in the country have central station electric service.

In my estimation, the REA program also reached a new height in popularity and acclaim during the last year. This occurred despite strong and concerted attacks by its enemies. Some of these attacks are as skillful as they are malicious. They are perpetrated by organizations which operate at every level. They lobby in Washington and in the halls of State legislatures. They talk and appeal to local business and civic groups. Their propaganda is carried by newspaper advertisements and radio commentators, endeavoring to leave the impression that the work you are doing is unethical, unfair, and even un-American.

I am glad to see a meeting of this kind held in a large city like Chicago, in order that city people and the metropolitan press may see at first hand the character and the earnestness of you people who are responsible for this program, which means so much to those who produce the food, the fiber, and—yes, the new blood—without all of which this great city could not exist.

It is not necessary for me to take the time of you people, who come from the rural areas, to tell you how much electricity means to your health, happiness, and prosperity. If the people in the cities would stop to think how deplorable it would be if they had to do without electric lights and electric power in their homes and offices and factories, and how chaotic it would be to have to do without essential things like running water and refrigeration, they might have a better idea of what electricity means to people in rural communities. City people don't know that you are receiving electric service through a program which is founded on the soundest of governmental theories, and which is being developed in keeping with the very best traditions of democracy, and within the framework of our private competitive enterprise system. It is of vital importance to the future of the program that the American people understand this fact.

The responsibility for getting this fact recognized and fully understood rests squarely on you, the electric co-op leaders in the Nation's rural communities. Unless you are convinced of it yourselves, you cannot provide the leadership needed to assure that this vast program will continue to develop along sound lines and with sincere adherence to the democratic process on which our Nation's greatness is based. If we fail to understand the REA pattern clearly, or if we fail to do our utmost to have the rural people understand it and make it work, the program will fail to achieve the full benefits it should hold for rural people and for the Nation as a whole. In fact, failure to get recognition and acceptance of the principles underlying the REA program might well mean the end of the program, something disastrous to the welfare of rural America and detrimental to the national welfare.

The relationship between the Government, as represented by REA, and the organizations of rural people which you represent, is founded upon a very sound governmental principle stated by Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln's theory of the function of government was that it should provide things which people cannot provide for themselves, but which are essential to their welfare and to the Nation's welfare.

As you know, after half a century of urban electric power development, about 90 percent of our farm families were still denied electric service by the commercial power industry. Only then did the Government step in to help rural people obtain this service through their own efforts by extending credit and by providing a multitude of technical assistance which they could not obtain in any other practical manner.

I want to emphasize that the financial aid was in the form of credit—not in the form of a dole or grant. Farm people believe in paying their debts and they are paying back their rural electrification loans in a most laudable manner. You leaders, beginning with little or no experience in electrification, have made a great financial success of an operation which the spokesmen for the commercial power companies said was sure to fail. Today, the percentage of delinquency on REA loans amounts to only four-tenths of 1 percent, the lowest in any recent year. You have now paid back into the Federal Government almost $225,000,000 in principal and interest. You have assumed the burden of management and you have provided your own technical assistance in ever-increasing amounts. This is proven by the fact that despite the most rapid expansion of this great program since the end of World War II, the number of REA employees has increased only slightly. This is again proof of the fact that the Government is extending only the help which rural people cannot themselves provide.

There is a great deal of discussion today about how much public ownership is necessary or essential. I believe that Lincoln's theory on the function of government can be used very well as a test on this question. All of us must accept the fact that government ownership of some things is necessary and proper. In the early history of this country there was considerable difference of opinion as to whether the mail should be government or privately operated. I believe that everyone will agree that it was wise to adopt Benjamin Franklin's advice in this matter.

In early years many of the roads of this country were privately owned. I can well remember the old toll road which traversed my State of Indiana from one end to the other. I lived near that road, and I know how much better it was when the ownership was taken out of private hands.

I give these two examples to indicate that there is need of public ownership of some things which are essential to our national welfare. It is sound policy for the Government to own and operate those facilities which cannot be provided satisfactorily through private ownership and operation.

Let us take the development of our rivers. Private capital could never be expected to do the things that have been done in the Tennessee Valley, the Columbia Valley, and on the Colorado, Missouri, and rivers of the near Southwest, and the things that ought to be done on other great rivers, particularly on the St. Lawrence. It is too bad that big corporations have opposed, and are continuing to oppose these developments by the Federal Government which are so essential to our national welfare. I would like to remind the people of Chicago, Detroit, and other large industrial cities in this area, that their industrial future depends on the development of the St. Lawrence.

It is most vital that the development of these rivers by the Federal Government be for the benefit of the public. For instance, the electric power from these developments should be distributed widely, at low cost, and free from restrictions of monopoly. This does not mean that the Federal Government operation must go so far as the selling of power at retail. I believe the ideal arrangement, both from the standpoint of sound Government practice and public benefit is exemplified in the loans which REA has made during the last year to the privately owned free-enterprise REA cooperatives of this country to put in the facilities which will enable their patrons to receive full benefit from the power developed by the Federal Government on some of these great rivers. I refer to the generation and transmission loans which we have made to help REA co-ops get the full benefit of the preference which they have under the Flood Control Act of 1944 for the hydroelectric power that has been or will be developed from the multipurpose dams on the Missouri, on the Roanoke, on the Red, the Brazos, the Arkansas, the White, and other great rivers. No one can deny that REA cooperatives do have preference under the law. However, REA co-ops can't serve their members with preference. In other words, they have to use their preference to get the power.

Now, all these dams have two kinds of power. One is firm—the kind or the amount generated all the time. Another kind or amount, because of uneven stream flow, is available only a part of the time even though it may be most of the time. It is much cheaper. It is called secondary. If someone has a fuel plant whose power can be used when this secondary power is not available he can make this secondary power firm power. If the commercial power companies firm up the secondary power they get the benefit. If the cooperatives have the fuel plants, and the required transmission lines are available, they benefit. They are the ones under the law which should benefit. That is why we have been making loans for the necessary fuel plants and transmission lines.

The benefits which the REA members will receive through these generation and transmission loans mean that the cooperatives involved will have an assurance of more power delivered in a more reliable manner, and at a much lower cost. To put it in another way, these loans decide the difference between a full development and a limited development of the REA program in the territories involved. Those are the facts and you and I must do everything we can to see that the people are aware of them so they will not be misled by the power company representatives who make statements to the contrary.

Making this type of loan is in keeping with long-established REA policy. That policy was established during the first few months of REA by its first Administrator. It was discussed by Senator Norris on the floor of the Senate in the debate of the passage of the REA Act in 1936. It has been discussed many times in Congress since then. It is written in REA's book on policy, and I quote it:

"1. The Rural Electrification Administration will make loans to finance the initial construction of generation facilities and transmission facilities only under the following conditions:

(a) Where no adequate and dependable source of power is available in the area to meet the borrower's needs, or

(b) Where the rates offered by existing power sources would result in a higher cost of power to the borrowers than the cost from facilities financed by REA."

I want everyone to know that I will conscientiously follow this policy until it is changed by Congress. I believe this policy is sound, in that it is in keeping with Lincoln's theory of the proper function of the government. If commercial power companies can and will make available better sources of power at lower costs than can be obtained through the use of Government financing or generation and transmission facilities, I believe the REA cooperatives should obtain their power through the commercial power companies. Now, I recognize that there are times when we differ as to what may be better or cheaper. However, that does not mean that the policy is wrong.

I also want to make it plain that the loans we have made for the integration of REA-financed facilities with those of the facilities belonging to either private or public agencies is not at all new so far as REA is concerned. One of the first loans made for generation provided for the integration of REA generation facilities with those of the Bull Run Power Co. at Manassas, Va., in 1936. The same kind of integration is provided with commercial power companies in the loans made for the installation of facilities in North Dakota and Iowa. Several loans have been made which provide for integration of REA facilities with those of public agencies such as Bonneville and the Bureau of Reclamation. None of these loans has ever been made without their legality being approved by the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, and in appropriate cases by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. I am assured by the Agriculture solicitor's office that the loans are in keeping with the intent of Congress so far as that office is able to determine. In view of the law and the long-established REA policies, and the precedents which have been set over a period of years for integration of REA facilities with those of other power suppliers, it is difficult for me to see why there is such violent objection to the loans we have made recently for the integration of REA-financed facilities with those of public agencies such as the Southwest Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation. This is especially true when these very same loans, on the basis of the latest power company offers, mean an annual saving of over $3,000,000 to the members of the cooperatives involved. These loans make it possible to proceed immediately with our complete area coverage program in the areas involved on a self-liquidating loan basis. They mean the difference between uncertain service and satisfactory service. In fact, they assure greater benefits from REA service in every respect.

Speaking of savings, I know a great many of you people, who are not going to get your power directly from any of these loans, realize the amount of savings annually that is coming to your cooperative through the authority which REA has to make loans for generation and transmission. This authority has been most helpful to many of you in negotiating power contracts during recent months, which will mean an annual saving of another $200,500,000 or more. Thus it can be seen that the annual savings to which I just referred amount to over $5,500,000 a year. This is not taking into consideration the annual savings and benefits which accrue to other cooperatives which are benefiting directly or indirectly from REA's authority to make loans for generation and transmission, amounting to several more million dollars each year.

Perhaps you can see now why the commercial power companies of this country are so insistent upon restricting ECA's authority to make generation and transmission loans. I think you can take it for granted that if it were not for this authority the commercial power companies' wholesale rates would go up to all REA cooperatives as they have been going up to other consumers. This is especially apparent when we note the advances in wholesale power rates offered to REA cooperatives in New England and New York States, which are not in a position to install their own generation facilities.

Now, I have taken this much of your time to describe what REA is doing in the making of loans for generation and transmission facilities in the hope that you may better know what your interests are and what action you should pursue to protect them.

In the beginning I made reference to the fact that the REA program was being conducted in accordance with the best traditions of free, private enterprise and democracy. There are many other facts which bear out my contention. My time will only permit me to briefly mention a few of those which I consider the most important.

One of them is the effort that you are making to give your members good, reliable service in the most efficient and economical manner. With but few exceptions I hear the highest compliments being paid to the kind of service REA cooperatives are giving to their members. Let us resolve that there will be even fewer exceptions in the years to come. This is easier now, when more plentiful supplies of power and materials are available than has been true in the past.

More attention must be given to the maintenance programs than we have had time to give during these recent years of rapid expansion of REA-financed facilities.

The cost of operation must be kept at a minimum and commensurate with good, reliable service. After all, REA cooperatives are established for service, and there are many sound reasons why REA cooperative service is and should be better than the service offered by any other type of supplier.

REA cooperatives have established an area coverage policy in rural areas which has never even been approached or challenged by any other type of supplier. I am happy that the REA cooperatives throughout the Nation are, with but a few exceptions, very earnestly trying to complete their area-coverage program as soon as possible. That kind of a program is in keeping with the true neighborly spirit. It is in keeping with the mandate of Congress. If cooperative officials fail to do everything possible to complete their area-coverage program they are betraying their trust to the public, to the Congress, and to their neighbors.

It is too bad that in many cases the policies and the tactics of commercial power companies are making it impossible for rural people in their service areas to receive central station electric service without exorbitant, and sometimes prohibitory, costs. We have many letters in our files from rural people who are in this situation and I am indeed sorry that it is impossible for us to do anything for them. Their helplessness in this situation makes me even more anxious that every REA cooperative in this country faithfully carries out its area-coverage program.

I realize that some cooperatives may be fearful that the feasibility requirements of the law interfere with area coverage. If you have that fear, tell us about it. I believe we can prove to you, without exception, that you can keep your projects feasible and at the same time see that everyone in your service area receives the benefit from this great program.

It is sometimes pretty hard to make people see that REA cooperatives are member-owned and member-controlled. I sometimes hear it said that when these cooperatives will have paid their debts the facilities will then belong to the members. It should be emphasized that the co-ops' facilities belong to their members from the day they are installed. People own their farms or their homes even though they have not fully paid for them.

One of the best ways to drive home this fact is for your organization to adopt the capital credits plan and notify each member just how much credit is being given him for the paying off of the debt to the Federal Government. I see more reasons all the time why some such plan should be adopted by every cooperative and I hope that those of you who have not adopted this plan will give it your early and earnest consideration.

It is hard for REA co-op members to realize, if they are not given full information and full freedom of expression, that they are in full ownership and control of their own cooperative. Everything about the REA program, whether it be in Washington or in your cooperative office, must be open to the closest examination and scrutiny. We must account for our every effort and expenditure. If anyone has doubts, let him be given full opportunity to ascertain the facts.

As you are all aware, my organization has been under congressional studies and investigations. In some cases complaints and investigations have been made concerning the conduct of the affairs of REA cooperatives. I am sure that you, like we in REA, do not object to anyone's making a study of our operations or offering constructive suggestions as to how we may be more effective or more efficient in carrying out our responsibilities. If there is anything which in any way seems to be unethical or not in keeping with the public interest, we want it eliminated as soon as possible.

It is very important that everyone realizes that REA co-ops are organized to function in keeping with democratic principles. This means, among other things, keeping members informed about every phase of the REA program and encouraging them to fully participate in the affairs of the cooperative. Such things as favoritism, proxy voting, and candidate slates are not conducive to democracy or confidence in the cooperative. News letters, reports, and well-attended and open annual meetings are in keeping with democratic processes.

About 4 months ago the organization which I head was given the responsibility of helping rural people obtain another essential service—telephones—which service had been denied them partially or wholly in many areas of our country. We have been doing all we can to expedite the development of this program. Above all, we want to see it developed in accordance with sound principles.

There are many inherent difficulties in the development of this program which we do not have in the rural electrification program. To us in REA it is more apparent all the time that your help is essential if this program is to be of maximum benefit to rural people. I am glad to know that we are going to have a panel for discussion of the telephone program later in this meeting, and I will not take any more of your time now to talk about it.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize that the leaders in these programs must endeavor at all times to discharge their responsibilities in keeping with sound policies and procedures, in keeping with the best traditions of our great Nation. This is very important to the welfare of rural people. It is even more important to demonstrate that citizens and their Government can work together effectively for the benefit of the people; that democracy, in action, provides opportunity, security, and freedom for all its citizens—things that are as precious as life itself.

Let's Remember the Sea Gulls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, even the world of nature has fallen victim to the lure of the "something for nothing" state, and with the same unfortunate results. I am indebted to a former mayor of my home city of Paris, Ill., now wintering in Florida, for a particularly effective editorial on this issue I believe will be of interest to all Members of Congress. Mr. E. P. Huston, now living at Fort Lauderdale, has called my attention to the editorial, Let's Remember the Sea Gulls, published in the Fort Lauderdale Daily News. In modern parable form, it points up the situation in a revealing manner. Under permission granted to extend my remarks, I am including it in the RECORD. It follows:

LET'S REMEMBER THE SEA GULLS

We wonder if there isn't something of a moral for the American people in the story of what is happening to the sea gulls up in St. Augustine now that the shrimp fleet has left that area for Key West.

It seems the sea gulls up that way have forgotten how to catch fish for themselves. For many years they have been depending for their food on the scraps and waste thrown overboard from the shrimping fleet. It was a sort of super welfare state for the birds, and the free dinners made it unnecessary for the gulls to depend on their own talents to secure food.

But suddenly the shrimp fleet went away. New and more productive fishing grounds were located off Key West and the shrimp boats deserted St. Augustine.

The sea gulls haven't been able to adjust themselves to the new situation. According to an INS report, the reefs and the shores around St. Augustine are lined with long, silent rows of gulls with their dark eyes turned prayerfully out to sea—waiting for the shrimp fleet and the free meals that won't return.

Nature has played the sea gulls a dirty trick. As generation after generation of gulls learned to depend on the shrimp fleet instead of their own resources to obtain food, parent gulls apparently forgot to teach their little ones their age-old methods of catching fish. So today the gulls are starving. They are no different in physical make-up than the sea gulls of Fort Lauderdale. But whereas our gulls can exist through their own efforts, the gulls of St. Augustine are starving by the hundreds because their welfare state suddenly disappeared and with it went their ability to feed for themselves.

The people of St. Augustine are trying desperately to save the gulls that are left. A city-wide effort is being made to round up table scraps and movie popcorn to tide the birds over until they can once more learn to feed themselves.

But naturalists aren't too sure what will happen. They are puzzled over the apparent complete loss of the sea gulls' natural fishing instincts. Some believe the cycle will be completed without the gulls ever recovering their natural fishing ability.

It's a strange paradox that Nature thus gives us. Here we have some of the most independent creatures of the universe, who were given marvelous talents to take care of themselves, victimized because they succumbed to the something-for-nothing lure. They became dependent on unnatural conditions to such an extent that parents apparently forgot to teach their offspring how to get along otherwise. Now with the free food gone, the offspring of these indolent parents are paying the penalty.

We wonder if people aren't a great deal like the sea gulls of St. Augustine. We wonder how many Americans have swallowed the idea of the welfare state to the point where they think it is no longer necessary to teach their offspring that the day of Government hand-outs and security for all may

sometime draw to a close. And we wonder then how many Americans may be left like the gullet-punched and bewildered beasties their sustenance has disappeared and they have no resources of their own to fall back on.

Americans don't have to look far to see the sea gull story translated over into human behavior. We have in England a living example of a something-for-nothing theory gobbled up by the people. Like the sea gulls of St. Augustine, the people of Great Britain have accepted unnatural conditions as a substitute for depending upon themselves. The English Government is the shrimp fleet which provides the people of Britain with food, clothing, and shelter. As long as this Government is firm and strong and as long as there are shrimp (meaning taxes) enough to keep it in business, the people will be safe.

But let the shrimp be exhausted, as is now happening, then the Government must seek new beds. It must of necessity, move on and leave in its wake a mass of miserable people totally unaccustomed to using their own God-given talents and resources to exist.

There is the moral in the story of the sea gulls of St. Augustine. It's a pungent moral and one that every voting American should well consider. Nature has a way of exacting a heavy toll from those who look upon her gifts as unnecessary. As a nation, we here in America have been singularly blessed with a tremendous capacity for using our skills and our ingenuity to ever improve our way of living. But we have earned our keep by wresting it out of the ground, the sea and the air, through the exercise of our own talents.

We will keep those talents only by continuing to use them. The minute we cast them aside as no longer necessary we will forfeit them as surely as the sea gulls of St. Augustine forfeited their talent to provide themselves with food.

Let's not be that foolish. Let's remember what happened to the sea gulls whenever we are tempted by the Washington "Shrimpers" to leave our own board and dine at the Government scrap table of false security.

Old dame Nature is a wise though sometimes cruel teacher. She might have used the sea gulls of St. Augustine as a red flag of warning to the American people. Let's heed it while we still have time.

Conservation Month in Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. BURKE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proclamation of the Governor of Ohio:

STATE OF OHIO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbus.

PROCLAMATION—CONSERVATION MONTH, CONSERVATION WEEK, AND ARBOR DAY, APRIL 14, 1950

Whereas the citizens of the State of Ohio must continue to recognize the importance of the conservation and restoration of our natural resources of soil, water, forests, minerals, and wildlife; and

Whereas the people of Ohio must depend year after year upon the rich heritage of fertile topsoil, unlimited deposits of minerals, vast acres of forests, unlimited sources of usable water and an abundance of wildlife and the recreational facilities provided by these resources; and

Whereas these natural resources with which Ohio is so richly endowed cannot fail to meet the demands of progressive people in industry, business, agriculture, and labor; and

Whereas the annual observance of Conservation Month tends to remind our citizens of the importance of these resources in preserving our principles of free enterprise and democracy through a program of conservation education in our schools and community activities sponsored jointly by the State department of education and the department of natural resources in cooperation with other State and community agencies and organizations;

Now, therefore, I, Frank J. Lausche, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby proclaim and designate the week of April 10 through April 14, 1950, as Conservation Week in the schools of Ohio, and Friday, April 14 as Arbor and Bird Day, and ask a general observance by all the citizens of the State of the entire month of April as Conservation Month.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the great seal of the State of Ohio to be affixed at Columbus, this 8th day of March, 1950.

FRANK J. LAUSCHE, *Governor.*

A Thin White Line Through the Desert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, gazing with squinted eyes across the vast distances of the California desert, many west-bound travelers have caught sight of what appears to be a thin white line threaded through barren red hills and across burning yellow flats.

"What's that?" they ask. "Look, it goes right through that mountain."

Perhaps another day passes before the full answer is known. Then the travelers have reached the luxuriant coastal plain of southern California—the groves of the valleys, the towns and cities that spread their streets and highways for miles along the Pacific shore.

The newcomers learn then the significance of the thin white line they glimpsed in the desert. It is the Colorado River aqueduct, the longest domestic water-supply line in the Nation. It is the life line of the world's largest oasis, unromantically called the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

Yet, there is romance in the aqueduct, in the story of its building and in the life and progress and security it makes possible. Today this life line is seriously threatened by H. R. 934 and S. 75, bills introduced by Arizona to take away the aqueduct water.

The clear, pure water it brings from a remote land goes into millions of kitchens and bathtubs. It gives sustenance to the little backyard garden and the country estate. It bubbles from corner drinking fountains, and it puts out fires. It feeds steel mills and breweries, automobile plants and pie factories, oil refineries and soda fountains. It made possible the great national defense plants and military and naval establishments that made southern California a fountainhead of production during the war. A vast, empty hot area was needed for the training of troops for the vital campaigns in Africa and Europe. The area was found in the southern California desert, and making possible its use was the thin line of concrete that might be tapped for the necessary millions of gallons of good water. There was no water there before the aqueduct was built, and there is no other water there today.

It was in the early twenties that the coastal area of southern California, which included the swiftly growing cities of Los Angeles, Long Beach and San Diego, became sharply aware that a large and dependable supply of additional water would soon be necessary. For instance, Los Angeles, already a city and port of major importance, twice before had weathered a similar crisis. First, the meager supplies of local water, including rainfall and underground supplies, had been carefully conserved and developed. When it was realized that these sources would soon be inadequate, Los Angeles had gone more than 200 miles northeast into the Owens Valley, bought land and water, and at great expense brought it to the city's homes and industries. Only a few years went by before it was seen that another new source of water must be secured to meet the ever-increasing demands.

Engineers looked far eastward to a comparatively skinny river that boiled and tore its wild way through the great canyons that mark California's eastern boundary—the Colorado, known to the Spanish explorers, the Forty-Niners and the emigrants that conquered the West as a treacherous, mad river of death.

But to the people of southern California in the twenties the Colorado was seen in an entirely different guise. It was a river of life.

Now other cities and areas joined with Los Angeles to bring the Colorado's life-giving water, upon which all future development and progress depended, some 400 miles across uninhabitable deserts and mountain ranges. This was a project of the people. They mortgaged their homes and farms to underwrite the bonds that would make construction of the aqueduct possible.

The Colorado River aqueduct costs approximately $220,000,000. When engineers first began to survey its route from the river to the coast, there were about a million persons living in the district it was to serve. Actual construction took about 10 years, and when the first scientificially purified Colorado River water was delivered to Pasadena in 1941, there were more than 2,250,000 people in the aqueduct service area.

Many times it has been recorded what has happened in California since the war started in Europe in 1939. The greatest migration in American history has moved over the roads to the Pacific coast in that period.

Today in the area served by the thin white line of concrete live more than 3,500,000 persons. The migration has not halted. The southern California oasis is still the mecca of thousands of other Americans each month.

In all, the population of the southern California coastal plain, a narrow strip less than 200 miles long and a quarter that distance in width, has passed the 5,000,000 mark.

What of the future? Will there be another water crisis like those of the past?

Not only hydrological engineers are asking these questions. The people of southern California are asking them, and with good reason.

The Colorado River is southern California's last waterhole. This is not a new realization. It was fully recognized when the plans for the aqueduct were drawn, and due to this foresight the aqueduct was built, not for the present, but for the future.

Before the people could be asked to invest millions of dollars, the builders of the aqueduct; that is, the local governments sponsoring the projects, had to make certain that water was assured for years to come. No one, no government body or group, can simply take what water they need out of an interstate stream. The basin of the Colorado River contains parts of seven immense States, and these States must share the water under an agreement approved by the Congress. This is the Colorado River compact, and since the waters are stored by Hoover Dam, Congress, before building that dam, directed that no one should use these stored waters except under contracts made with the United States.

The aqueduct builders of California, therefore, got their water under contracts with the Federal Government. Under the law, the Secretary of the Interior is empowered to make such contracts.

This was done, and the metropolitan water district of southern California received a legal right to take 1,212,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River, and distribute this water through its aqueduct to the cities and towns of the coastal plain. The then Secretary of the Interior, Ray Lyman Wilbur, signed the contracts for the United States Government.

Then, why are the people of southern California concerned about their future water supply? They have contracts with the Federal Government for their aqueduct water, and certainly these contracts will always be honored. Certainly the Government would not repudiate these contracts, and leave the aqueduct standing empty, a monument to broken faith, as the desert sands sift into its canals and tunnels.

Nevertheless, the people of southern California, as stated by their government officials, have reason for concern. Powerful forces in Arizona want the water upon which California's progress and security depend and are seeking congressional authorization to take it for an immense Arizona project. They claim the Federal Government had no right to give so much Colorado River water to California.

The battle rages in Congress. California says the controversy is one for the United States Supreme Court to settle.

Meanwhile, the thin white line continues to bring the water to the cities and towns of southern California. Many of them, such as the urban centers of San Diego, Long Beach, Pasadena, and Santa Monica, depend for their existence on this lifeline that is woven for hundreds of miles through the California deserts. Many other smaller cities receive half or more of the water they use through the aqueduct's single vein. All future growth in the great city of Los Angeles must depend upon this single source of water.

For no area as large and as thickly populated in the world depends so much on a thin line of concrete for the water that makes life possible. And the new travelers to southern California, seeing the thread of the Colorado River aqueduct stitched through the burning red mountains and barren valleys of the desert, must likewise look to it for their own security, and that of their children, if they would live in southern California.

That is why California is asking that Senate bill 75 and House bill 934 be defeated.

Statement by Broughton Lamberth on Pending Social-Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on pending Federal social-security legislation made to the Committee on Finance, United States Senate on January 23, 1950, by Broughton Lamberth, commissioner, Alabama State Department of Public Welfare:

I come before this committee today as Commissioner of Public Welfare for the State of Alabama. Although I have been in this position only a few months, my interest in social security and human well-being is deep-rooted. From 1947 until my appointment as commissioner last November, I was vice chairman of the Alabama State Board of Public Welfare, of which the Governor is chairman. My appointment as commissioner was made by the State board of public welfare. During the last two sessions of the Alabama Legislature I represented two counties in the Alabama State Senate. In that legislative body it was my privilege and responsibility to serve as chairman of the Standing Committee on Public Welfare and Correctional Institutions and also as chairman of the legislative interim committee which reviewed welfare problems throughout our State of Alabama for a period of 2 months.

I should like to say, too, that one of my first requests as commissioner was to ask that I be heard before this committee if and when hearings should be conducted on amendments to the Social Security Act. We do not now have any real security in Alabama for our needy people. We think that more security could be provided if there were changes in the Federal social-security law. That is why I am here today. I want to confine my remarks, however, to those areas of greatest need and to those aspects of the present and proposed legislation which I think are most important for Alabama.

All of you well know that Alabama is a farming State. Our farm population of 47 percent in 1940 was more than twice the figure—23 percent—for the Nation as a whole. We are also a State where per capita income payments over a period of years have been among the lowest for the Nation. Our 1948 average of $691 was far under the $1,410 national average. In fact, payments are less in only three States than they are in Alabama. The States are South Carolina, Arkansas, and Mississippi. This means that most of our people farm and that they have very little in our world's goods. They do not make enough to save for a rainy day or for old age or for any long period when they are unable to work. The result is that we have today in Alabama a large number of farmers who have grown old and, through no fault of their own, must face the present and the future without security.

Therefore, the first thing I would like to talk about to this committee is our Alabama farmers who have grown old and can no longer make a crop. For most of them their only recourse is old-age assistance. In 1935 under the original Social Security Act they were excluded from the benefits of old-age and survivors insurance. They still are excluded. Yet, when they come to the welfare department and ask for old-age assistance, even though they are eligible under the law, they cannot receive enough for a decent living. Our old-age payments are a little more than $20 a month on the average for the State as a whole. Even where two members of a family might qualify, two payments at $20 each would not mean security.

You may ask why Alabama cannot pay more. Briefly, there appear to be two reasons. We have larger and larger numbers of needy old people and correspondingly smaller numbers within the population who can earn and pay taxes. Not only do we have an increasing number of old people, but we are a State with an unusually high proportion of children. This, obviously, narrows considerably the number within the total population who are in their working years. Thus, it throws our whole economy out of balance. And, in the light of our continuous low per capita income, a large percentage of the people who get old are needy when their working days are over. It all sounds very well to say that people should practice thrift and lay something aside each year. I certainly agree—when there is something to save. Alabama had an average per capita income of $154 in 1933. This had risen to $242 by 1936, to $644 by 1943, and to $691 by 1948. Could you live decently on $154 or even on $691? And yet this was an average figure—many Alabamians never had that much. They not only had nothing to save—they had too little to eat. That is, both young and old.

It is consequently easy to understand why we have a high old-age assistance recipient rate—456 per 1,000 as compared with 231 for the Nation. Our rate of applications for aid also continues to be high as there is less and less demand for unskilled and older workers. Right now, too, I would like to make one point clear. Alabama has one of the most restrictive old-age programs in the Nation. We have this high recipient rate in the face of a $480 income-limitation clause written into our Old-Age Assistance Act. In other words, no one can qualify for aid by State law in Alabama who has income amounting to as much as $40 a month. By administrative regulation, we also have added to this a property limitation. Ownership of real property with a net value of $2,000 excludes a person from assistance. Thus, you can see that when persons qualify for aid under the Alabama Old-Age Assistance Act and present State regulations, they are needy by anybody's definition.

When some States are easily securing sufficient money to pay old people $40 and $50 and even $75 a month, we in Alabama are

having a hard time getting up the $5 it takes to match Federal money for a $30 old-age payment. Yet, not only do we keep on having a high rate of applications for aid, but we also find about three-fourths of the applicants eligible to receive a check. We do not know where the money is coming from to grant them aid. But they need it, and old-age assistance is their human right and just right.

You are now considering H. R. 6000 to amend the Federal Social Security Act. The formula this bill includes for increasing Federal grants-in-aid for old-age assistance and other assistance programs is of vital concern to States like Alabama. As our welfare budget now stands, this formula would enable us to increase average old-age payments by about $3. We still could not pay anything like the $48 national average or the $72 average paid in Colorado, but we would like for people not to suffer because they live in Alabama and grow old there. We think that the bill's formula is an immediate answer to the problem of getting more Federal money quickly into the low-income States where assistance payments are also low. Nevertheless, we would hope that at some future date a formula can be devised that would allocate Federal funds to States on the basis of relative need and fiscal ability. This principle has been applied in relation to funds for the school-lunch program and hospital construction and might well be considered in regard to grants-in-aid for assistance to those unfortunate people who need it.

Also, in the light of these facts, I hope you will give consideration to developing a plan for providing old-age and survivors insurance benefits for farmers. Our people want the kind of security that comes to them without a means test. They want a monthly check when they are too old to work and they want to pay in to get that check while they work. They do not earn enough to pay for an individual annuity plan. But they could contribute to old-age and survivors insurance. And they want an opportunity to do so. Farmers are frequenting old-age and survivors insurance offices throughout Alabama with the query, "Why can't I qualify?"

Of course, I realize that changes in the law today still would not take care of the thousands of needy people we already have with us. That's why I want to see the public-assistance provisions of the Social Security Act changed so that we can help those already too old to work now. But I hope the insurance can be extended to farmers with a clause to provide coverage at an early date for many of those who are now approaching the time in life when they can no longer earn a living.

It is not within my province to suggest administrative procedures for farm coverage. It is my understanding, however, that the Social Security Administration has developed what appears to be a feasible plan. I would hope that this committee would examine those proposals and give favorable consideration to incorporating them into the social-security amendments.

In considering extension of coverage of old-age and survivors insurance, I hope you will also bear in mind that many farmers work off and on in covered employment. In this way they may contribute to old-age and survivors insurance yet never achieve coverage. Estimates of the number so affected throughout the country have been fixed at 81 percent of farm operators and 88 percent of farm workers. For example, there are farm laborers who work in sawmills and textile mills during part of every year. There are farmers who worked in industry during the war years. Their contributions to old-age and survivors insurance are actually a loss to them. Also, our farmers help pay for the cost of old-age and survivors insurance in much of the goods they buy. For example, an employer rightly considers his contribution for employees as a cost of operation. He is going to get that cost back in the price of the product he sells. So, while technically the farmer and his tenant might not contribute, actually they do. Is it fair to exclude them from the program and its benefits?

H. R. 6000 extends coverage to many workers not now included. It also makes benefit provisions more adequate. These proposals I would support insofar as they go. Alabama's coverage under H. R. 6000, however, would be no more extensive than present national coverage of 60 percent of employed persons. The original Social Security Act anticipated that old-age insurance would carry the major load, supplemented by old-age assistance for a smaller number of people who did not or could not earn benefits during their working years. Unfortunately, the reverse has proved true. Alabama has less than 19,000 aged old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries now and over 77,000 recipients of old-age assistance. Only a small proportion—less than 2 percent—receive a small old-age and survivors insurance benefit supplemented by old-age assistance.

Old-age assistance has had to carry the load for two primary reasons: too few people have been covered, and benefits have not been related to living costs. Average payments in Alabama over the past several years illustrate what I mean. There has been relatively no rise in average old-age and survivors insurance payments—they still range close to $15 a month in Alabama.

While old-age assistance has not kept up with changing prices, payments are more than double what they used to be. Policies in regard to determination of need have kept up with living costs—but funds have been the limiting factor. Likewise, old-age and survivors insurance maximums have held rigid while ceilings have been raised on assistance payments.

Thus, I would hope that this committee would support amendments which would implement the social-insurance program and make it possible for the majority of our people to reach old age secure in the knowledge that they would have an income for the rest of their days. And by income I do not mean an assistance check based on a means test. I refer to a benefit check earned by individual contributions.

I have already said that while insurance needs to be extended there must be provision for the needy now. We are especially troubled in Alabama over one group whose sufferings are acute and for whom almost no provision is made. I am talking about a group we call the totally and permanently handicapped. We have in Alabama nearly 3,000 individuals who are too young for old-age assistance and too old for aid to dependent children. They are not blind, yet their handicaps are so great that they cannot work now and can have no hope of ever becoming self-supporting in the future. We have very limited State and local money even for matching Federal funds in the social-security categories. We have still less for this group who are wholly dependent on money from the State and its political subdivisions. Average payments today for aid to the handicapped in Alabama are about $13 a month, yet most of these people need nursing care, special diets, medical attention, and other special provisions which are related to long-time illness. Their needs are far from met on $13 a month.

I would hope, therefore, that this committee would consider favorably the provisions in H. R. 6000 for setting up a new category of assistance—aid to the permanently and totally disabled. We at least could increase our payments to about the level paid for aid to the blind and old-age assistance if this category were set up.

Because time is limited, I will not go into the other aspects of H. R. 6000 or other areas of social security where changes might well be made. In Alabama we have long limited public-assistance payments to the unemployable. We see no prospect for changing this. Our State, nevertheless, has done fairly well by its people. Welfare appropriations have increased materially since the department was set up. Expenditures from State funds in the 1948-49 fiscal year were about four times the amount spent in 1936-37 from this source. Despite Federal grants-in-aid, however, funds have never been sufficient to meet need. There has been no real security even for old people, the children, and the disabled who have been eligible for aid from the agency.

In spite of limited money, however, we have provided child welfare services and social services in an attempt to prevent dependency. Such services predate the assistance program in Alabama, where we have long recognized that prevention is as much a welfare job as relief. We knew that as we could provide social service, we often could help a person to help himself. Furthermore, we have long been aware of the effects of one program for human betterment upon another. Thus, we recognize clearly that the whole Social Security Act is important, that all the programs it provides are necessary. We believe in legislation to safeguard maternal and child health, for instance, as much as we do proposals for increasing grants for aid to dependent children. I would, therefore, like to indicate here my support for the over-all social-security legislation.

I do not want this committee to consider my interests narrow although I have confined my remarks chiefly to the need for old-age insurance for farmers and for increases in Federal grants-in-aid for assistance payments. These are merely the points that need greatest emphasis if the welfare of Alabama's people is to be improved because most of Alabama's needy people are old and most of them have lived on farms. We now issue more than 100,000 assistance payments monthly in behalf of more than 150,000 persons in Alabama. One reason for this large volume is the small number of old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries in the State, presently about 27,000. It is clear that low coverage and inadequate benefits have contributed to dependency. I think we recognize together that the welfare of each child and each old person is important to the welfare of us all. I would urge you to consider this as you consider revising social-security legislation.

The Real Work of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News:

THE REAL WORK OF CONGRESS

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a journal of the proceedings and debates of the Eighty-first Congress, printed in Washington every night after adjournment and delivered to Members each morning at the Senate and House Office Buildings.

The RECORD for Thursday, March 23 reached Paddale by mail on Saturday morning. It devoted 124 pages to a stenographic report of everything said and done on Senate and House floors and 38 pages to an Appendix containing the undelivered speeches of

Members, which Congress had neither time nor the wish to hear.

What happens on the floor and what the RECORD reports each day represents only a small part of the work of Congress. Members get an enormous amount of mail which requires personal attention. Visitors from home must be welcomed. Requests for help are many, such as straightening out GI Joe's difficulties with the Veterans' Bureau and seeing the immigration people about Uncle Herman, who's sweating it out in Frankfurt.

It is in the morning hours, when neither house is in session, and sometimes in the afternoon that Members get the real work of Congress done—in committee. Ray Tucker's Washington column describes today how the Appropriations Committee has been whittling down items in the administration's big bill for 1950 Government spending, a bill which accounts for the income and excise taxes you pay. Republicans have the sharper knives, naturally, but many Members of Mr. Truman's party, who are in the majority on all committees, join in the paring process.

Contrary to popular belief, Congressmen aren't pompous people who spend all their time making speeches. Some are brilliant, others dull. Sensible and conscientious men far outnumber the demagogues, especially in the lower house. Those who are on the job earn their pay. Except those who were well off before election to Congress, few die rich.

Ownership of Lands and Resources Beneath Navigable Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a concurrent resolution adopted by the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York, memorializing Congress to confirm ownership in the States of lands and resources within and beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States:

Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly, memorializing Congress to confirm ownership in the States of lands and resources within and beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States

Whereas since its inception, the State of New York, a free and independent sovereignty and one of the original 13 States, has claimed and exercised ownership, dominion, and jurisdiction over the lands under the ocean seaward for a distance of 3 miles and the lands under all tidal and navigable waters within its boundaries; and

Whereas the State's title to these lands, in common with all unappropriated lands, was and is based upon the sovereign character of the people of the State of New York as successors to the sovereign rights of the Crown of England; and

Whereas, as sovereign, the people of the State of New York own approximately 5,600 square miles of submerged lands in the Atlantic Ocean, and in New York Harbor, Long Island Sound, the Hudson River, and the Mohawk River, including vital stretches of the State barge canal, the Niagara River, the St. Lawrence River, the Great Lakes, and other inland streams and waters, and

Whereas all of the private improvements on the New York side of New York Harbor, with the exception of the lower end of Manhattan Island and others elsewhere, have been built on what was formerly State-owned lands, and all these improvements were built and have been enjoyed by their owners in reliance upon their source of title in the State of New York, and no disquieting claims against that source should be made, no matter how baseless or trivial, by any agency of the United States Government, and

Whereas, as a result of these improvements, there has been an incalculable increase in assessed valuation of these lands, upon which municipalities and the State rely as a basis of taxation and great revenue, and

Whereas the title of the people of the State of New York to these lands and the title of those holding the lands by grant from the people of the State of New York has been upheld by numerous decisions of the New York courts and the Supreme Court of the United States, as well as by the assertion and actions of the Federal Government, its various departments and divisions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York favors continued State ownership and control, subject only to the Federal powers over navigation, interstate commerce, and national defense, of lands and resources within and beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and requests Congress to pass suitable legislation to that end; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the Members of the Congress are hereby requested to give their active support to legislation which would recognize and confirm State ownership of such property; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the Members of the Congress are hereby requested to give their active opposition to all pending and proposed measures which would create Federal ownership or control of lands, fish, or other resources beneath navigable waters within State boundaries; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress of the United States.

In senate, February 28, 1950. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the senate:

WILLIAM S. King,
Secretary.

By order of the assembly:

ASHLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

The Late Ellis A. Gimbel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of March 18, 1950, upon the passing of a distinguished citizen of Philadelphia, a great merchant and outstanding philanthropist, Mr. Ellis A. Gimbel. This eulogy is as follows:

ELLIS A. GIMBEL

Few distinguished citizens of Philadelphia have known and loved so many of their neighbors as Ellis A. Gimbel. Not alone by his many benefactions, but by personal greeting and his genuine interest in others he made a host of them his friends.

Many were customers of an outstanding American merchant, a pioneer in modern storekeeping and salesmanship, but they knew him better as a kindly gentleman, sensitive and thoughtful and something of a philosopher, who might well have made himself a public figure if his career had carried him no farther than the keeping of a country store.

In the latter part of his life, alert and vigorous beyond his years, he made it a faithful custom to greet all gatherings held within his great business establishment, which he made an important center of his city's social and cultural life. Two thoughts were always included in his messages.

Simply and earnestly he spoke of his country, almost in the phrases of a prayer of gratitude. Simply and sincerely he said, "God bless you," to his friends. He left warmth and the true spirit of fellowship with his guests, as he has left to Philadelphia the gracious memory of a loving and lovable man.

Blind Men on Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial titled "Blind Men on Parade," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on March 28, 1950:

BLIND MEN ON PARADE

Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, has said that a number of Republican Senators are going after Secretary Acheson. This will take the form of a series of public attacks, and the parade, he says, will begin this week.

The New Hampshire Senator has not named those who will march in his parade. Perhaps it does not matter, for the marchers, whatever their names, will be easily recognized as the blind following the blind.

These Republicans do not see that in going after Mr. Acheson they are tearing down the foundations of our national security. There is no doubt that they see a political issue from which it may be possible to torture some partisan advantage. But they cannot or will not see the larger picture; they do not understand that the hopes of freemen everywhere are linked inseparably to the prestige of the United States, and that they can chip away at that prestige only at the price of crippling this country's capacity for leadership in the decisive struggle now under way throughout the world.

If they cannot see this, it is not for lack of evidence. Here in Washington, the capital of the free world, a woman is loosely accused, without proof, of disloyalty. And she is immediately assailed in her home with anonymous phone calls, with threats, and with demands that she move out of the neighborhood or be carried out in a box. If it has come to this in our own city, what are we to expect in other parts of the world? How can we suppose that our friends in other

lands, constantly exposed as they are to a substantial threat of Communist aggression, will be able to sift the real from the unreal, to know where the line should be drawn in our performance between true and shabby political fiction? Can we blame them—will Senator BUSHES and his followers be able to disclaim responsibility—if in the end our friends abroad should conclude that the men in charge of our foreign relations are, at best, incompetents; at worst, Communist sympathizers, and that it is not safe to follow their lead?

There are some Republicans who will not be found marching in Senator BUSHES' parade. Senator VANDENBERG will not be there. Nor will Henry L. Stimson, one of the party's distinguished elder statesmen, who has served his country well both as Secretary of State and as Secretary of War. It is not likely that Senators KNOWLAND and SMITH will be among the marchers. Another who will not be there is Representative NIXON, who had a big part in turning up the facts in the Alger Hiss case.

These men, and there are others like them in the Republican Party, do not believe that Mr. Acheson is infallible. In their various ways they have differed with him—strongly on some issues: But they realize that one of the surest ways to bring on another war is for the Republican Party to lapse into a role of negative opposition, a role in which partisan advantage has a higher priority than the security of the Nation.

The hope is that the number of this company will grow, that more Republicans will stand up and say that they refuse to join Senator BUSHES' parade. This will not come about if the President and other ranking Democrats fail to do their share. But if Mr. Truman and his aides will refrain from cheap politics in the forthcoming campaign speeches, and if a few more prominent Republicans will assemble under the standard which has been raised by Senator VANDENBERG and his associates, the parade of the blind may yet turn out to be an unimpressive spectacle.

Port Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 29, 1950:

PORT SECURITY

Although Congress has been unusually solicitous to meet matters of military defense, the security of American seaports—a responsibility of the Coast Guard—has received short shrift. Adequate patrolling of harbors and piers and inspection of vessels in wartime would require a great expansion in the Coast Guard's 21,000-man force. Yet the COAST GUARD Reserve, which would be the backbone for such expansion, has received no funds for training.

Actually the denial probably is due more to the anomalous status of the Coast Guard than to any deliberate effort to deprive it of funds. In wartime the Coast Guard becomes a part of the Navy, but in peacetime it is under the Treasury. Thus the $4,100,000 for Reserve training recommended in the President's 1951 budget came under the jurisdiction of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. But since the full committee had laid down a rule against new appropriations, the funds were knocked out of the omnibus bill. Similar misfortune befell the request in the 1949 and 1950 budgets, though last year the Senate did pass a $3,500,000 deficiency appropriation which was eliminated in conference.

Whatever the reasons for the oversight, it is apparent that here is a defect in defense which must be remedied. Both Defense Secretary Johnson and the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Sherman, have attested to the need. An adequately trained Coast Guard would be imperative in an atomic war, when an innocent-appearing freighter might blow up a harbor and a city.

Propaganda and the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House, I am, of course, interested in good labor relations throughout the country. Since coming to Congress I have been reading reports about the Di Giorgio Farms in California, and allegations regarding treatment of agricultural labor there.

It is gratifying, therefore, to get the whole truth about this situation in the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, and I want to commend the Congressmen who prepared the statement, based on personal observation at the Di Giorgio Farms.

I take pleasure in inserting in the RECORD with these remarks an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle of March 15 upon this subject. It should be of interest to every Member.

The editorial follows:

PROPAGANDA AND THE FACTS

The findings of a congressional subcommittee as to the merits of the strike against the Di Giorgio Farms in Kern County should prove of interest and concern to American labor generally.

Di Giorgio has under cultivation some 11,000 acres of farm land, nearly all of which the corporation has converted, by scientific methods, from barren wasteland. The farms employ about 1,200 permanent workers, which rises to 2,500 in harvest time.

Two and a half years ago the National Farm Labor Union undertook to organize the workers. When the corporation refused to recognize the union as exclusive bargaining agent, a picket line was set up and the long strike got under way.

There ensued a campaign of propaganda by the union leaders purporting to show that working conditions at the farms were pitifully substandard; that living conditions were frightful; that the management exploited its workers at every opportunity. Climax of the campaign was the production of a film, Poverty in the Valley of Plenty, which undertook to give substance to these assertions.

The House subcommittee, after an extensive, first-hand investigation, has now found that the charges made by the union were almost wholly unsupported. It found the corporation's wage levels are, if not the highest, at least as high as any in the area. It found that housing conditions at Di Giorgio Farms are at least as good as any to be found on similar property in agriculture. And as to the motion picture, which was shown widely throughout the country, it had this to say:

"The National Farm Labor Union film, Poverty in the Valley of Plenty, insofar as it purports to represent conditions existing on Di Giorgio Farms is a shocking collection of falsehoods, almost wholly unrelieved by any regard whatever for the truth and the facts. The subcommittee believes that responsible labor leaders will join with it in decrying the attempt of the National Farm Labor Union's organizers to win their case by dishonest presentation. The cause of organized labor is not aided when one group of union organizers are willing to besmirch the public reputation of labor as a whole in order to advance their own interests."

We would go one step further.

Regardless of whether the local leadership of the National Farm Labor Union was Communist-inspired—and there is no evidence that it was—the fact remains that the tactics employed by the union in this instance are tried and true Communist tactics. The reckless attachment to expediency—the philosophy that the end justifies any means—is the very essence of Communist dogma and in utter violation of the American doctrines of integrity, sincerity, and fair play.

We do not question the right of unions to campaign for organization of workers. But that right by no means embraces the right of vilification, of distortion, and misrepresentation of facts. And as to the union's demand for legislation to correct the abuses of corporation farmers and their lobbies, the union's own tactics have rendered its position ridiculous. The inescapable conclusion arising from the subcommittee's report is that such laws as now exist curtailing the right of labor leaders to achieve their ends by coercion and misrepresentation have found precise justification in the Di Giorgio strike.

Cities and Atomic Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger of March 19, 1950:

CITIES AND ATOMIC DEFENSE

Mayor Fletcher Bowron, of Los Angeles, complains before a congressional committee that the cities of the United States have no idea of what they should do to protect their people in the event of atomic warfare. All other mayors, we believe, will agree with his complaint.

The cities, as a matter of fact, are virtually incapable of planning atomic defense by themselves. If we consider the position of Newark, Jersey City, or any other of our New Jersey cities, it is readily apparent that a regional agency is needed to coordinate atomic defense.

These cities are, in the light of present conditions, nothing more than fragments of the real communities created by modern

transportation. The prospect of atomic warfare serves only to magnify the need for regional civic organization.

The effects of an atomic bomb would radiate around the point of the strike in ever widening circles, with the heaviest degree of destruction in the center and a gradual lessening of severity toward the outer limits. Even the smallest circle of destruction, that of the most intense degree, would embrace more than the map of Newark or of any other of the New Jersey cities.

It is obviously true, therefore, that the cities do not know what to do and cannot possibly know what to do unless they are embraced in regional units of a size sufficient to encompass commuting areas and the destructive range of the atomic bomb.

Vocational Education for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein a letter received by me from the Honorable Andrew V. Ruckman, director of veterans education and training, State of West Virginia, relative to operation of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act in connection with vocational education.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Charleston, March 23, 1950.

Hon. ROBERT L. RAMSAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RAMSAY: My attention has been directed to a chart appearing in the Report on Education and Training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, from the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, pertaining to the percent of profit vocational and trade schools which were established subsequent to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. This chart shows West Virginia to be one of two States in the Union with 100 percent of its profit vocational and trade schools established subsequent to enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

What the chart fails to explain is that only six profit vocational and trade schools have been approved in the entire State of West Virginia since the GI bill became law, an extremely low figure when compared with some other States. Approval for most of the six schools was granted by this office at the behest of the Veterans' Administration. Typical of the pressure applied by the Veterans' Administration for the establishment of private trade schools in West Virginia is the following copy of a letter written to this office by an official of the Veterans' Administration in Huntington:

"VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
"REGIONAL OFFICE,
"*Huntington, W. Va., April 3, 1947.*

"Mr. H. L. DUNCAN,
"*Director of Veterans' Education,*
"*State Department of Education,*
"*Charleston, W. Va.*

"DEAR Mr. DUNCAN: In reply to your letter of March 31, 1947, concerning the Martin School of Watchmaking, Clarksburg, W. Va., it is noted that you state they have no school, equipment or students. This office was advised by the school through our field officer that they were ready to begin operations. However, the Veterans' Administration in accordance with paragraph 14, Veterans' Administration Instruction No. 2, title II, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, may not permit enrollment of any veterans in an institution unless the institution has the prior approval of the State Approving Agency.

"Therefore when you consider the fact that this school is being established at the request of the Veterans' Administration to furnish training in watchmaking to a number of veterans, who are unable to enroll elsewhere due to a lack of facilities, it is desired that this school, if they meet the State's requirements in regard to facilities, be approved to start their course of training prior to the enrollment of any students.

"It is requested that you have your field representative in that area contact Mr. J. S. Lunsford, at the Veterans' Administration contact office, Clarksburg, W. Va., at your earliest convenience, in order that this facility may be established without further delay if at all possible.

"Very truly yours."

The name of the writer of the above letter has been left blank by this office because he is now connected with the Veterans' Administration in Washington and we have no desire to cause him embarrassment.

Relations with the Veterans' Administration in West Virginia have generally been harmonious, and we have worked together to prevent abuses under the GI bill. We are making this explanation, however, because we feel that the chart mentioned above gives an erroneous impression of the approval agency in this State. We believe that West Virginia has done a better than adequate job of restraining fly-by-night schools in West Virginia and that you have no apologies to make for the manner in which the GI bill of rights has been administered.

One of the weaknesses in the present bill is the fact that while the approval agency is charged with the responsibility of approving institutions for the education and training of veterans, no funds have been provided for the supervision of such institutions once they are approved. In our opinion, legislation now pending before Congress, which would provide the States with funds to enable them to perform the required services, should be enacted.

Yours very truly,

ANDREW V. RUCKMAN,
Director of Veterans' Education and Training.

Hon. John S. Wood, Chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming vote here March 23 for the necessary funds to continue the invaluable work of the Committee on Un-American Activities is a vote of confidence in that committee and its work. It is more than that, it is a vote of confidence in, and appreciation of, its able chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman JOHN S. WOOD.

Mr. Speaker, ever since I returned from a 2 months' study of European conditions, as chairman of the Post War Economic Policy and Planning Committee, some 5 years ago, I have stressed upon the Congress and the country that the real danger of communism was not in the danger of a shooting war with Russia, but rather the danger of infiltration by Communists in this country. I still adhere to that assertion. The Committee on Un-American Activities has rendered an invaluable service in alerting public opinion in this country to that danger.

Under the able leadership of Chairman WOOD this committee is continuing that great service to this country. Congressman WOOD enjoys the confidence and respect, not only of his fellow committee members both Democrats and Republicans, but of the Members on both sides of the aisle generally. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine appreciation that I add my humble words of commendation, not only to the committee, but to its distinguished and able chairman. More power to you, Chairman WOOD, and your colleagues on the committee.

United States Did Not Turn Its Back Upon the Rest of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, those readers of the public press who believe in fair play, even in the field of politics, are under obligations to Mr. Constantine Brown, the noted international writer, for revealing the unjust, inaccurate, partisan statement made by the President of the United States in his recent letter to Chairman KEE of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that:

The United States turned its back upon the rest of the world after the First World War.

Under consent heretofore granted, I am inserting an article by Mr. Constantine Brown that appeared in the Evening Star under date of March 28, 1950, in which he presents the facts clearly and conclusively that the United States Government did not turn its back upon the rest of the world after the First World War.

The article follows:

THE CHANGING WORLD—FACTS SHOW UNITED STATES DID NOT TURN BACK ON REST OF WORLD AS TRUMAN REMARKS.

(By Constantine Brown)

Whoever drafted President Truman's letter to Chairman KEE of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, warning the American people that any slicing of Marshall-plan appropriations by Congress would create the risk of a new world war, slipped badly in his facts about what this country did for Europe between World Wars I and II.

"The United States turned its back upon the rest of the world after the First World War," the President's letter stated. "Some

20 years later we found that we had to fight another war."

The facts contradict this assertion. Soon after the end of World War I we invited the major European nations, together with Japan and China, to a conference in Washington and as a result of that conference two treaties were concluded dealing with China and the political situation in the Pacific.

FEAR OF JAPAN UNFOUNDED

The Washington conference grew out of the fear that Japan might try to expand territorially by aggression, and the limited international parley initiated by the United States was supposed to establish peace in the Pacific.

While it is true that we did not join the League of Nations and made a separate peace with Germany at the conclusion of World War I, it is equally true that at no time during the 31 years of truce did the United States relax its efforts to maintain world peace and did what it could to help its wartime associates.

American private capital flowed into Europe throughout that period. Two prominent Americans, Charles G. Dawes and Owen D. Young, headed committees which were asked to settle the German reparations question when it became obvious that the Germans could not live up to the economic provisions of the treaty of Versailles. Both men took part in this work with the tacit approval of the American Government.

NEARLY $3,000,000,000 LOST

Between 1921 and 1931 American money poured into Germany. It was a speculative investment for American money lenders and the speculators lost nearly $3,000,000,000. This investment in Germany cost American capitalists no more than UNRRA cost American taxpayers after World War II and the results were about the same. The difference was that loans to Germany hurt only those who could afford to get hurt while UNRRA hit the pocketbooks of all American taxpayers.

When in the spring of 1925 the French Government, headed by Edouard Herriot, came to the verge of bankruptcy and the French treasury was unable to meet its current obligations, New York banks came to the rescue and advanced the bank of France $500,000,000. It was a strictly commercial transaction—with the approval of the State Department—and the money was repaid after Raymond Poincare succeeded Herriot and stabilized the franc.

In 1931, when the European financial structure showed signs of collapse after the French had bankrupted the Austrian and German banks, the United States intervened immediately and President Hoover obtained a moratorium on all war-debt payments.

REFUSAL TO BE ACCEPTED

The effect of the moratorium was negligible, it is true, because France delayed too long in accepting, but it is not correct to say that America "turned its back" on Europe in those days of stress. Finally we settled the war debts of our associates, incurred both before we entered the war and afterwards, at 10 cents on the dollar. All of them—except Finland—managed to pay most of even this small sum. We philosophically accepted their refusal to pay.

In the political field, although we did not become a member of the League of Nations, the American Government initiated and sponsored more than a dozen disarmament conferences. They all failed because the nations of Europe refused to accept honest and genuine disarmament at a time when Russia was still a weak military power and Hitler had not yet taken over in Germany.

When the British began to worry about our naval potential we met with them, the Japanese, the French and the Italians in London in 1931 and agreed to naval parity with Great Britain in the hope that such a commitment might smooth the path to peace.

PARIS PACT SIGNED IN 1928

Finally, it was on the initiative of the American Government in 1928 that the Paris conference was held and concluded the pact which was to outlaw war forever as an instrument of national policy. The Kellogg-Brian Pact—also known as the Pact of Paris—was signed at Versailles in August 1928 by all the civilized nations.

On the basis of the solemn pledges contained in that pact we further reduced our armed forces, while the others increased theirs. When the Japanese invaded Manchuria in September 1931, we brought the matter before the League of Nations in an effort to prevent growing military aggression. The League did nothing effective, merely deciding to investigate the matter on the spot. But we earnestly endeavored to collaborate with the world powers, at least to attempt to prevent the actual beginning of World War II.

This is the record of American cooperation with the rest of the world. The facts disproved President Truman's statement that "the United States turned its back upon the rest of the world after the First World War."

Congress Running Out of Old-Style Orators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I have requested permission to insert in the Appendix the following article from the March 27, 1950 issue of the Chicago Daily News written by Paul R. Leach, entitled "Congress Running Out of Old-Style Orators." I believe every Member will be greatly interested in reading this article.

CONGRESS RUNNING OUT OF OLD-STYLE ORATORS—CRISES OF DAY RULE OUT POINTLESS SPELLBINDING

(By Paul R. Leach)

WASHINGTON.—They're disappearing from Congress, more's the pity—the old-style, free-wheeling, self-starting, welkin-ringing orators.

Time was when a man would run all the way to the Capitol to hear Jim Reed, of Missouri, tie into Jim "Ham" Lewis, of Illinois, in the Senate; or to see Borah, of Idaho, shake his flowing locks. Or somewhat further back, John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi.

What they talked about did not matter; how they said it was what counted. And Congress was packed with their like.

Today you can number on the fingers of one hand the Senate's spellbinders—Republican VANDENBERG, of Michigan, Democrat PEPPER, of Florida; Republican MILLIKIN, of Colorado, especially if he's in a story-telling mood; the brash young Democrat HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Democrat PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, when he gets worked up.

You can't overlook ALBEN BARKLEY, of Kentucky, but he has been silenced by the Vice Presidency. You have to hear him outside.

In the memory of House old-timers, Uncle Joe Cannon, of Illinois, with his dry stogie; shaggy, deep-eyed Finley Gray, of Indiana, and debonair Nick Longworth, of Ohio, best lived up to the traditions of Clay and Calhoun. There were many more like them 20 years ago.

As in the Senate, they're now few on the House side. FRANK KEEFE, Republican, Wisconsin, does the home-and-mother theme well, and GENE COX, Democrat, Georgia, has an old-style, appealing way about him.

JOHN RANKIN, Democrat, Mississippi, is the best fire-and-brimstone haranguer while JOHN TABER, Republican, New York, is tops when it comes to telling the Truman administration on spending.

The real champion in the House today for all-around, long-or-short-range Fourth of July type of public speaking is DEWEY SHORT, Republican, Missouri. He can and does talk on almost any subject—without having a written manuscript before him.

Why are the old-style flowery orators disappearing?

For one reason, since the depression began, we've had a crisis every other day about something or other. In the days of Tom Marshall's 5-cent "seegars" big issues were few, and political infighting was a national pastime.

Today our Congressmen must be hard-headed, factual to the point. They are more like tired corporation lawyers arguing a case in court.

Because they have so much to do in committees and on the floor, most of their long speeches, read without gestures, are prepared by executive assistants, something the old-timers never heard of.

The campaigning microphone that they've had to learn to use, with precisely timed radio speeches, has slowed them down, too. Maybe television will bring back some of the fireworks.

They're interesting, but they don't raise the hair on the back of your head as the old masters did.

There was, for instance, some years ago, the famous oration by Senator Henry Fountain Ashurst of Arizona. He had been called to account for changing his mind. After a moment's reflection, Ashurst delivered a half-hour talk on "The Virtues of Inconsistency." It was a classic.

Jim Reed and Jim Lewis, both self-starters in oratory, tangled one day on the Senate floor back in the 1920's. Reed flayed Lewis in one of his bitterest speeches, but when he finished Lewis flabbergasted him with this:

"I always enjoy an encounter with my esteemed colleague from Missouri, but when I draw my trusty blade against his saber I always tip it with a rose."

Many Members have fought with the man in the White House, whether they were of the same party or not. One of these epic rows occurred only 6 years ago. ALBEN BARKLEY was the speaker.

He was then Democratic leader. President Roosevelt had vetoed a tax bill with the words, "it is not a tax bill, but a tax relief bill providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy."

BARKLEY not only had sponsored the bill, but had steered it through the Senate.

"That statement," he said on the floor, "is a calculated, deliberate assault upon the legislative integrity of every Member of Congress. Other Members may do as they please, but as for me, I do not propose to take this unjustifiable assault lying down."

He tore into F. D. R. for 15 minutes, and never repeated a word. He wound up by announcing that the next morning he would present his resignation as majority leader to the Democratic caucus.

Both Houses overrode Roosevelt's veto, and BARKLEY's resignation was hooted down.

Real-Estate Lobby Again an Election Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, from the heavy correspondence which is reaching me it is clear that a deep wave of resentment is sweeping the country in the wake of the defeat of the administration's bill to bring decent housing within the reach of the large segment of our population in the so-called middle income bracket.

The bill which was defeated by the mortgage bankers and the real-estate lobby would have reduced the monthly shelter cost from $90 a month to $64 a month on a $8,000 home.

It was opposed by the real-estate lobby because it would have ended the housing shortage. A housing shortage is meat and gravy to the real-estate lobby.

It was opposed by the mortgage bankers because it cut into interest profits even though all that it did in that line was to give the buyers of homes the same 3-percent interest rate on home mortgage loans as the farmers enjoy in their CCC price-support loans.

The real-estate lobby and the mortgage bankers now face the impossible job of defending before the people of America in November of this year the action of their friends in the Congress in depriving one-third of the families of our country—those with incomes of from $2,000 to $4,600 a year—of even an honest opportunity of finding decent homes within their financial ability to buy.

The political repercussions to the victory last week of the real-estate lobby and the mortgage bankers are discussed in an article by Thomas L. Stokes in the Washington Evening Star of March 27, 1950, which I am including in my remarks. The article follows:

AGAIN THE WHISTLE STOP—TRUMAN VERSUS CONGRESS TO BE ISSUE IN PRESIDENT'S CROSS-COUNTRY TOUR

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

President Truman undoubtedly hoped to swing some votes and perhaps eke out a slim victory when he sent a telegram to the House last week urging adoption of the loans to cooperatives in the housing bill which subsequently was defeated.

But he had another and long-range objective, as was clearly revealed in the detailed and rather specific case he presented on behalf of this provision which, he argued, is the only way people in $2,000 to $4,000 income brackets can get decent homes. He was making a record for the congressional election campaign. His party floor leader, Representative MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, frankly told the House this would be an election issue.

SAME ISSUE AGAIN

One can almost hear HARRY TRUMAN at one after another not-to-be-forgotten whistle stop on his forthcoming May cross-country tour and that which is to follow in the fall:

"There was a bill in Congress to give you folks decent homes. And what happened? The Senate cut out a provision that would help you. Then it went over to the House. And I thought that body might show some sense. But to make sure I sent them a telegram asking them to put that provision back in to help you folks. What did they do? They beat it, too. Just remember that. They'll all be out here asking you to send them back to Congress. Just look up the record on your Representative. Don't let him fool you. That's all I ask you to do. You can do the rest."

Toot toot. Off to the next stop.

The issue again, as in 1948, will be Truman versus Congress.

With, of course, a difference which may not make much difference in the end. The difference is that it was a Republican Congress against which he railed in 1948. The Eighty-first Congress is a Democratic Congress, organized and run by the Democratic Party at least nominally, and its failures would normally be charged to the Democratic Party, and Mr. Truman would be charged with failure of leadership.

HARD TO MAKE IT STICK

He will undoubtely be so charged, but it will be harder than it once was to make it stick, even though it is an element of his own party that has defeated or held back social-welfare measures in which so many voters are interested and about which the President will pitch the domestic phase of the congressional campaign.

On such issues, the votes of southern conservative Democrats have been decisive by being thrown in with Republicans in that now familiar coalition which, on such issues, controls Congress and has become in effect, the second major party time after time.

Millions of voters interested in social-welfare measures, particularly well-organized labor and progressive groups, have become educated to the attitudes and the continuous repeat performances of this coalition and have ceased to identify the southern Democrats with President Truman, or blame him for this blockade. They identify the President with what might be called the Truman Democratic Party.

He has helped along this educational process himself by seeking to divorce himself from the southern conservatives of Dixiecrat tendencies. Practically, as a matter of political preservation, he is seeking to offset its defection, which cost him four States in 1948, by forming a new alliance of labor, so influential in urban voting, and Midwest farmers. Such a loose alliance was responsible for his 1948 victory.

This he will promote in his whistle-stop campaigns this spring and fall, immediately to elect, if possible, for progressive Democrats outside the South to offset southern conservatives in Congress, and beyond that, to strengthen this farm-labor alinement for the 1952 Presidential contest.

Point 4 Nonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the March 27 issue of the Shamokin News-Dispatch, Shamokin, Pa.:

POINT 4 NONSENSE

Just when a cut in foreign spending appeared as a likely aid to balancing the national budget in 1952, along comes a new scheme, point 4. The bureaucrats and superidealists are at it again. Heaven help the poor American taxpayer.

What are the merits of this new plan to pour American billions out abroad? Its advocates say it is designed to aid backward nations by showing them American know-how and technical skills. That will increase world markets and world trade, and thus the United States will benefit, runs the argument. The idea is a good economic theory, but economics do not hew to set patterns because of wars and the human element in governments. We might build up all sorts of trade areas and be cut off from them ourselves by restrictive trade barriers, quotas, and other means.

Another thought on this subject is worthwhile. While we are going about demonstrating our technical skills to the tune of billions of American dollars in undeveloped areas of the world, what are our own underdeveloped areas supposed to do? We have plenty of undeveloped areas in the United States. And it's high time somebody pulled the idealists down from their soft chairs and pointed that out to them. Charity might well begin at home in this case.

We could spend billions developing our country, its potentials, education, skill, power projects, and industries. We still have a long way to go in the United States. The Government now doesn't even have money to build post offices and hospitals where they are badly needed. Yet we are talking about a point 4 program for the world—its undeveloped areas.

The American people must not be led down the sucker route on this issue. They must learn the facts in time. Talk about it, meet about it, and tell your politicians about it.

Taxation of Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter to the Honorable Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture; also Mr. Raymond Moley's article entitled "Taxing Co-ops," which appeared in the Monday, March 27, 1950, issue of the Chicago Journal of Commerce:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1950.

AN OPEN LETTER

HON. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have read with much interest the statement opposing taxation of cooperatives which you submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee on March 8. The committee is now holding executive sessions, seeking particularly to determine what excise taxes should be reduced, what loopholes in the present law should be closed, and how much additional revenue would derive from the taxation of certain tax-exempts. Since your stated opinions are at considerable variance with

those expressed by the general counsel of the American Farm Bureau Federation and other recent witnesses before the committee, I should greatly appreciate an explanation of certain points that you made in your statement. I am sure that other members of the committee, as well as myself, would be grateful to you for whatever further help you might give us in this matter.

I would like you to clear up the following points:

1. You say that the real objective of those who propose "a change in the tax status of cooperatives" is "to destroy cooperatives." Taking such specific examples as the Cooperative Grange-League-Federation Exchange of Ithaca, N. Y., the Consumers' Cooperative Association of Kansas City, Mo. and the California & Hawaii Sugar Refining Co. of San Francisco, will you demonstrate by actual computation of the corporation tax on all earnings in 1949, including patronage dividends, how payment of tax at the regular corporate tax of 38 percent would destroy these cooperative corporations. (I have included CCA because its published earnings in 1949 amounted to only $86,234, though it had earned $8,330,208 in 1948.)

2. You quote co-op theory that patronage dividends are not taxable to the cooperative corporation because they belong to farmer members who have been underpaid for products marketed or who have overpaid for supplies or service. Will you take one practical case, say the sale of grain by a Minnesota farmer through the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, of St. Paul, and explain how profits made by the cooperative corporation in such extraneous operations as lending money, storing grain, or speculating in the commodity markets can legally or morally be deemed an adjustment of an underpayment for the farmer's wheat? How would you have solved the problem faced by the Indian Farm Bureau Cooperatives, about 1947, when $1,000,000 untaxed capital gain was made in selling a group of oil wells? Would you divide such a profit among members and call it the refund of their overpayment for feed or fertilizer?

3. You speak of cooperatives as "an effective force for combating monopolies." But I am sure you remember the case, here in Washington a couple of years ago, in which a judge of the district court dismissed prosecution of the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers Cooperative for price fixing and other monopolistic practices when the co-op attorney quoted the Capper-Volstead Act and said "Elimination of competition is a perfect legal right of a cooperative and the very end and purpose of a cooperative. It is our right to become a monopoly." Do you consider a co-op monopoly an effective force to combat other monopolies? Would you support an amendment to the Capper-Volstead Act, such as I introduced in the present Congress, to give the Attorney General, instead of the Secretary of Agriculture, the power to prosecute cooperative monopolies such as now exist in the marketing of oranges, lemons, cranberries, walnuts, avocados, and other products?

4. Corporation taxes in 1948 amounted to about $11,000,000,000, which contributed to the Department of Agriculture's appropriation of nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars. In line with your quotation from the Treasury's document apparently granting regular corporations permission to avoid income taxes by adopting the cooperative method of distributing earnings to customers, would you recommend the adoption of this method of operation, knowing that it might seriously reduce the Government's revenue and result in heavy curtailment of your Department's activities?

5. British city consumer cooperatives are known to own farms which they produce livestock, vegetables, fruits, and so forth, for low-price sale to city workers. The growing movement of labor-owned consumer co-ops in the United States is reported to have similar ideas for the future. Inspiration for all this is the cooperative tax escape. Would it be advantageous for the farmer, do you think, to hold on to the cooperative tax subsidy at the cost of provoking new competition by labor-owned farms?

6. On page 1 of your filed statement you say that taxation of the cooperatives "would result in only a little additional revenue." On page 4 you say that taxation might "detrimentally affect the financial structure of many farmer cooperatives." Will you justify those two statements, and tell me, please, if the amount of money involved would be so insignificant, why do you object so strenuously to the cooperatives paying their share of the high cost of government?

The committee is engaged this week in a study of loopholes. Your answers to the above questions will therefore be especially valuable at this time.

Thanking you in advance for any clarification you may make that will help our committee in its attempt to spread the tax load equitably, I remain

Yours sincerely,

N. M. MASON,
Member of Congress.

[From the Chinese Journal of Commerce of March 27, 1950]

MOLEY—TAXING CO-OPS

Like many other good words appropriated by socialistic-minded politicians, "cooperative" covers a multitude of sins. Congress seems to have finally killed the President's scheme to bribe middle-income people with what is called cooperative housing.

This proposal will serve to illustrate the basic difference between a policy in which Government takes measures to prevent any individual or group from falling below a minimum subsistence level and a policy of Government hand-outs to all classes, irrespective of proven means and need. The latter is called by the British Labor Party fair shares. It really means equal shares. And it is socialism, no matter what fine verbal plumage it may wear.

In this instance, it was a shrewdly calculated political move to induce support for the Fair Deal by offering housing to what might be called our middle classes on terms that would not only have expanded the bureaucracy and raised the burden of Government expense, but would have added new thousands to those dependent on Government aid. The coalition in Congress saw the nature and purpose of this measure and killed it.

It will not be so easy to penetrate the defenses of another form of vested interest which is hidden in the fine word "cooperative." For many big businesses in competition with taxpaying private enterprises enjoy immunity from the obligation to support the Government from which they receive unmeasured services and benefits.

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, who is rapidly achieving the distinction of being the most socialistic of all important members of the Truman family, presented on March 3 a plea to the Ways and Means Committee against the taxation of cooperatives. Congressman NOAH MASON has offered a powerful reply in a letter to the Secretary.

After disposing of the Secretary's argument that fair taxation would destroy cooperatives, the Congressman moved to the very heart of the argument for a fair measure of taxation on operations that are extraneous to the original purpose of cooperatives.

Since Brannan claimed exemption for farmers on the ground that they have been underpaid for their products and have overpaid for supplies or service, MASON cited in reply the case of a Minnesota co-op which made large profits in such operations as lending money, storing grain, and speculating in the commodity markets. He also cited the case of an Indiana co-op which has an untaxed capital gain of $1,000,000 from the sale of a group of oil wells.

As is often the case in Secretary Brannan's methods of argument, he succeeded in this case in contradicting himself. On the one hand he declared that taxing co-ops would result in only a little additional revenue, and on the other that taxation would destroy these lusty children of privilege.

This suggests the Secretary's claim that on the one hand his farm plan would not cost more than present farm supports, and that on the other his proposed subsidies would bring new prosperity to the farmer and lower the cost of living to the consumer.

Brannan cannot have it both ways, and neither can the co-op.

Black Diamonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, those of us who live in the bituminous coal fields of Pennsylvania are much concerned about the future of the soft-coal industry.

Much has been said and will be said as to the remedy necessary to stabilize the industry and which must include new uses for soft coal.

Mr. Herman Reifsnyder, editor of the Altoona Mirror, Altoona, Pa., located in my congressional district, had the following to say on the subject:

BLACK DIAMONDS

At the turn of the century if you were to have suggested to grandma a new stove replacing her wood- or coal-burning kitchen range by a stove whose fuel gas was piped clear across the Nation from Texas, she undoubtedly would have believed her offspring a little "teched." At least too far ahead of the times.

Now, what for years has been a commonplace in transmission of gas as fuel, not to mention the flood of oil, a relatively short period in the past was regarded as fantastic, impossible.

At present we are talking about a trip to the moon, a vacation on Venus via space ships. We hear, too, quite a lot about flying saucers, little men from Mars. Does that sound ridiculous? Don't answer that one just now. Better wait a little while.

And so it goes. But let's take a little time out to enter the realm of fantasy, if you will, and consider something that, while it may sound a little farfetched, may have in it real possibilities and at a not too distant future.

In casting about for development of new industry to bolster a sagging economy, it might be well to consider revitalizing an old industry which has been hard hit by competition, by work stoppages, by antiquated methods of production, and by lack of modern methods of marketing its products.

Altoona is within one of the greatest soft-coal fields. Other fuels, largely the class called laborless fuels, are rapidly displacing coal, so much so that mine owners are beginning to wonder a little nervously about the future. That future takes in Altoona.

Recently a central Pennsylvania coal-mining company called attention to some very pertinent facts that are spelling doom to the coal trade. Coal is a sleeping giant; it is being rocked to sleep by oil and gas, chiefly. Once it gets awake and its power is handled

on a competitive basis with oil and gas, there will be a lot of coalmen much happier than they are today. And yet, there will be plenty of room for all three, gas, oil, and coal.

Sometimes one waxes enthusiastic about the wonders of modern development in machinery and utilities that make daily life a bit easier on the physical side. But perhaps the greatest wonder is that people have had to wait so long for our present-day improvements in many categories.

Since the days of Benjamin Franklin and his improved stove, little real progress is noted in the use of coal as a fuel. You still have ashes and all that goes with a coal burner. There are many types of central heating plants on the market, too—many of them complex gadgets and costly—employing coal.

Wouldn't it be like a dream to have push-button heating? It need not be a mammoth job to switch over from coal-burning heat equipment to heat units employing electricity. It could be very simple, if it were made that way.

To come right to the point: Why handle soft coal half a dozen times in its travel from mine to consumer? Why not convert the coal to electrical energy right in the coal field and transmit the power by less expensive and antiquated methods to do the same heating job? Coal also could be converted into gas or oil and similarly transported to where it will be used.

Wholesale use of electrical energy for heating would not need to be prohibitive in price. Maybe in the long run it would be cheaper than the present methods of employing coal. Keep in mind that electricity, somewhat like gas and oil, can be distributed over fairly long distances to an untapped market of customers.

What about the thousands of people in the countryside who still rely on wood for heating because their soft coal as the present time costs them $18 to $22 a ton in some localities? Wouldn't these thousands of customers provide a great market for coal once turned into a product like electricity, gas, or oil and piped to them?

A ton of coal contains a certain number of British thermal units, measurement of heat. A kilowatt of electricity has a certain heat value. At current electrical rates home heating hereabouts would be fantastic, but a good conversion job for a waiting market would handle the price angle at the proper time. It should not cost near so much to transfer the heat in a ton of coal over a certain distance, as it costs to transport the coal and then extract its heat energy.

Changeover into such a radical new utilization of coal naturally would not be overnight. It would cause, indeed, disruptions in other lines of business. That always happens as business and commerce evolve new methods.

Take China as an example. As much as we look upon railroads as great factor in civilization's progress, the introduction of railroads in China threw countless thousands of men out of work who had depended on the old methods of transport to make a living. The result was many turned to banditry to survive. The same thing happens in countries more advanced than China, but the "banditry" is more subtle and refined; no less effective in the long run.

There are some electrically heated homes now, but for full utilization of coal use of this type of heat would have to be expanded a lot. We use electricity to heat hen houses, why not our own houses? Nothing could be cleaner and safer. There is always the inherent danger of being asphyxiated by coal gas; there is danger of fire, and sometimes even having your home blown up. There are, of course, dangers connected with other fuels, too. But electric power would seem to be the acme of safety and convenience bar none.

Consider one other phase of home heating that would tie in very closely with the use of electricity. Take the ordinary five- or seven-room house. The central heating plant keeps each of those rooms warm (theoretically at least) 24 hours of the day. If, during the night one used but two rooms, why waste heat on the other three or five rooms; reduce it and save fuel. Also, in daytime, if only one or two rooms are used, why heat all the rest? It could be perfectly simple to push a switch and reduce heat in various parts of the home if electricity were used.

When something new strikes the market there are usually a lot of gadgets that are worthless and expensive. That goes for a transformation from customary heating methods to home heating by electricity. It might be made a very simple transformation whether one employed hot-air heat, hot water, or steam. It certainly could be a more compact heating unit and also the necessary size wire to carry your heat energy need not cost what pipe sells for at present.

There are already on the market many models of small room electric heaters. Some are good, some not so good. There are even steam radiators, of portable type, employing an electric element. A British firm has been turning out a radiator filled with oil instead of water—nothing to freeze up if you decided to turn the current off in the dead of winter.

These instances just mentioned point to the fact that there is an evolutionary process toward quicker, cleaner, safer home heating. But how long will it take to go the whole way? How long will it take to turn the black diamond field into a modern market for transmission of its worth to the cities and the countryside where it will be used in almost unlimited quantities?

This might all be, as was said, a little farfetched, but at the same time those who are apt to scoff at such schemes better keep in mind that someday, somebody is likely to come along with a heating scheme that will knock out once and for all not only coal but gas and oil as well.

Unquestionably if the dream of home heating by electricity were to come true there still will be for many years to come industrial uses for coal, for gas and oil. But it seems there is a great market for coal if it were transformed into a modern laborless product.

It is a question whether householders convert from coal to gas and oil heat because of so-called work stoppages. Rather they act because of the convenience involved, even though it may cost a little more. In some cases it costs less. However, installation costs are pretty high, costing many hundreds of dollars, a cost that certainly could not be jutified in a transformation to electrical heat.

It may be that the afore-mentioned scheme is going a little too far, but if the coal business cannot find a market for its products, it may eventually find itself in the same category as the canal boat, the stage coach, hoop skirts and many other things we read about nowadays in history books.

Alaska and Hawaii Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following editorial from the March 23 issue of the Minneapolis Morning Tribune which answers so cogently the indefensible argument made to the admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union as the forty-ninth and fiftieth States that these two areas should not have equal representation in the Senate along with the present 48 States:

THE STATES ARE EQUAL

Senators resisting admission of Hawaii and Alaska as States have been using some pretty feeble arguments. Take the one about disproportionate representation the forty-ninth and fiftieth States would have in Congress. It goes like this: Why let Alaska's 100,000 people and Hawaii's 530,000 have as many Senate votes as New York with a population of more than 13,000,000?

Surely those who ask this question realize that it is entirely beside the point.

Senate representation never was intended to be in proportion to population. The upper House was created to preserve the identity of the Original Thirteen States. Some critics hold regional representation responsible for the Senate's tendency to parochialism. This may be true, but it is unreasonable to blame Hawaii and Alaska. As Delegate JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, of Hawaii, has said, neither Hawaii nor Alaska asked for two Senators. That is determined by the form of government under which we live.

As a matter of fact, 1,404,234 people living in 18 States in 1940 could outvote New York's 13,478,142 in the Senate by 36 to 2. On the other hand, New York now has 45 Representatives, or 10 percent of the membership of the lower House of Congress.

If it is bad for each State to have two Senate votes, the thing to do is amend the Constitution. Why discriminate against Hawaii and Alaska when 35 other States have already been admitted to the Union with all the rights and privileges of the Original Thirteen?

The United States grew to its present geographical proportions under a wise colonial expansion policy laid down in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. That policy provided that whenever a Territory could boast a population of at least 60,000 people it could be considered for statehood on a basis of equality under the Constitution.

Aside from Texas, which came in as an independent republic; Maine and West Virginia, which were separated from other States; and Vermont and Kentucky, admitted without previous Territorial status, all other new States were accepted on terms inspired by the ordinance.

Frank Buck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, millions of people in America and around the world were saddened by the announcement on last Saturday of the death of Frank Buck. The "bring 'em back alive" animal authority thrilled multiplied millions by his jungle exploits, his magazine stories, his radio and screen appearances, his lectures, and his devotion to the great outdoors.

Frank Buck, whose name is known in nearly every household in this country,

movement of labor-owned consumer co-ops case of an Indiana co-op which has an un-

Once it gets awake and its power is handled

began his career as a big game hunter back in 1911 when he made his first trip in South America—the first of a series in search of rare animals and reptiles that built his "bring 'em back alive" reputation.

From the time he was 18 years old, Buck roamed the earth, making repeated expeditions into the wilds of Malaya, India, Borneo, New Guinea, Siam, and Africa—to mention but a few. He loved his work, risked his life many times, and in his quiet, unassuming and modest way liked to recount his experiences in danger spots of distant lands where the average person would not dare go and would probably not return alive if he did. Buck possessed the finer qualities admired so much by Americans—courage, character, energy, ambition, and an insatiable love for adventure.

I have known Frank Buck many years, and like so many others, enjoyed the warmth of his friendship, his pleasing personality and his interesting conversation. He lived in my home town of San Angelo, Tex., where he often went to rest and visit with his family and friends between his journeys into the world's darkest spots. He belonged to Texas, to America, and he was a citizen of the whole world. His inspiration and influence will be felt for generations.

Frank Buck left his mark and has turned in his hunting togs. In Singapore, in Cape Town, in Borneo, in those far-away places, as well as at home, folks are mourning the passing of this great and distinguished American. I am honored to be privileged to pay this tribute to his memory.

Job Shortage Causes Worry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of March 27, 1950:

JOB SHORTAGE CAUSES WORRY; MANY ARE ELIGIBLE BENEFITS—OFFICIALS FEAR WEEK OF INDUSTRIES AND NOT INCREASING ENOUGH TO COPE FOR THOSE AT YOUTH AND AGE ENDS OF SCALE

(By A. H. Raskin)

One hundred and sixty thousand New Yorkers have drawn all the State unemployment insurance checks they are eligible to receive in the present "benefit year." Two million workers in various parts of the country exhausted their insurance rights last year and 400,000 of them wound up the year still out of work. Massachusetts and Rhode Island are looking to the Federal Government to bail out their depleted job-insurance funds. One-fifth of Oregon's labor force is on the insurance rolls.

These are symptoms of a national unemployment situation that is giving increasing concern to Federal, State and municipal officials in all sections. The Census Bureau reported 4,604,000 idle workers in mid-February out of a total civilian work force of 61,687,000. This meant that 1 worker in every 14 was without work at a time when demand for steel, automobiles and many other products was at near-record levels.

Officials do not expect any dramatic worsening in the unemployment picture. On the contrary, they expect a modest improvement in the next month or two. What worries them most is the evidence that employment opportunities are not increasing fast enough to provide jobs for those at both ends of the age scale—the young and the old.

They are afraid that the unemployment statistics will not show what is happening in sufficiently graphic form to produce any national will to do something about the problem. The March census report may show a slight rise in unemployment as a hangover from the coal strike, but most Government economists expect a considerable improvement in April and May.

SCHOOLS TO ADD TO LISTS

Jobless lists will go up again in June as schools and colleges throw hundreds of thousands of new recruits into the job market. But by the end of the year, the unemployment total will be no higher and perhaps somewhat lower than the February figure, according to Federal forecasts.

Another factor likely to stir complacency about the volume of unemployment is that job-insurance payments, which set a record high in January, will probably taper off as older workers use up their benefit rights and disappear from the insurance rolls. Workers looking for their first job do not show up on the rolls at all because they have built up no eligibility credits.

When unemployment lasts long enough, relief rolls start to soar but there is usually a considerable time lag between exhaustion of insurance rights and application for relief on the basis of need. As a result, officials foresee a period in which most indicators will point to a downturn in joblessness without any real improvement in the basic situation.

With a congressional election coming up in November, the administration is not disposed to put too much accent on the extent of idleness and the permanent character of the problem it presents. That is why economists in closest touch with the situation feel the economy is suffering a particularly pernicious form of unemployment.

When business is on the skids and wholesale lay-offs are being made, every one is concerned. Demands for action come from all sides. When unemployment piles up slowly through the failure of the economy to absorb the increased labor force that comes with a growing population and a longer life expectancy, the pressure for action is much less instant.

EXPANSION OF ECONOMY URGED

Leon H. Keyserling, acting chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers, warned a Chicago audience earlier this month that the number of jobless workers might rise to 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 4 years hence unless ways were found to expand our economy sufficiently to provide new jobs.

All economists stress that they have little worry over the prospect of any abrupt collapse in our present employment situation. New applications for unemployment insurance, the most sensitive barometer the Government has of idleness due to lay-offs, dropped from a weekly average of 378,100 in January to 290,100 last month.

In New York State the volume of new and continued claims for insurance reached a high level of 567,937 in the week ended January 13. In the week ended March 17 the figure was down to 418,451. However, part of the decline was accounted for by the elimination of workers who had drawn all the benefits for which they were eligible. Nearly 7,000 workers a week fall into this category.

Under the law a worker may receive not more than 26 weekly checks in the 12-month period from June of one year to June of the next. This means that none of the 160,000 New Yorkers who have exhausted their benefit rights for this year may apply for benefits again until next June. Those who had some work in 1949 will be eligible for additional payments at that time if they are still out of work.

However, many of the workers who have been dropped this year will have no benefits to look forward to next year. A substantial percentage lost their jobs in the industrial slump of 1948 and have not worked since.

GROUP OVER 45 HARD HIT

Persons over the age of 45 make up a large part of the group that is using up its benefits without being able to find new jobs, according to samplings made by State officials. Older workers are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain placements. This applies not only to those 65 and over, for whom old-age assistance and industrial pension plans are available, but also to those 20 years younger. Two-thirds of the men who exhausted their benefit rights in December were in the over-45 group.

Federal officials report that the situation for aging workers is the same in most parts of the country. When they have jobs, they usually are among the most valued workers. But when they lose their jobs, they are almost impossible to place. The spread of industrial pension systems and the attendant increase in premiums an employer must assume when he hires an older worker have aggravated this problem in many industries, officials say.

Consideration is being given in Washington to the formulation of special employment programs for the young and the old. Officials feel special attention is needed for those trying unsuccessfully to break into the job market for the first time and also for those trying to hold onto opportunities for useful employment after industry has labeled them too old.

EARLY LEGISLATION UNLIKELY

Administration thinking on programs has not advanced to a point that makes it appear anything will be sent to Congress this session. It is recognized that public works or construction programs would be of little value, especially in meeting the needs of the aged. It is also recognized that made-work programs would meet wide opposition in and out of Congress unless they met a clear-cut public need.

All Government experts agree that the unemployment insurance program does not represent a basic answer to the kind of unemployment the country now has. The insurance program is calculated to meet the first impact of unemployment but not to carry a worker for a period of more than 26 weeks. It helps bolster purchasing power in period of large-scale lay-offs but other devices are necessary to bring new jobs into being.

Co-op Housing Defeat May Be Campaign Issue—Democrats See in It an Appeal to Many Voters in Middle-Income Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article which appeared in the New York Times of March 26, 1950, written by Clayton Knowles, entitled "Co-op Housing Defeat May Be Campaign Issue":

CO-OP HOUSING DEFEAT MAY BE CAMPAIGN ISSUE—DEMOCRATS SEE IN IT AN APPEAL TO MANY VOTERS IN MIDDLE-INCOME GROUPS

(By Clayton Knowles)

WASHINGTON, March 25.—The one fresh proposal for attacking the national housing shortage died, and a political issue was born last week, when the House administered the coup de grace to the Administration's program for cooperative home building.

This program was designed specifically to meet the needs of the middle-income third of the Nation. In this bracket are the families in smaller communities earning between $2,450 and $4,000 and those in the big cities making between $3,100 and $4,800 a year. Eight million families fall in this category.

These 8,000,000 families, who cast about 15,000,000 votes, come election day, would have been eligible for 40- to 50 year, 3- to 3¼-percent loans for home building, if the program had cleared Congress. With its defeat, the best Government-facilitated financing they can get is 4½ percent, under Federal Housing Administration programs, or 4 percent GI loans, if they happen to be veterans.

DEMOCRATS' ADVANTAGE

Out of such situations campaign issues are born, and the Democrats seeking to retain control of Congress this fall can be counted upon to make political capital out of the defeat of this program, which was engineered by the Republican Party.

Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democratic leader of the House, left no doubt of his party's intentions when, trying to crack the almost solid Republican opposition to the administration bill, he warned of inevitable political repercussions.

"You may fool the public today but not next November," he cried. "This is going to be a live issue—an issue which I hope will be used advantageously next fall."

LOANS FOR CONSTRUCTION

This program, incorporated in an omnibus housing bill authorizing a $4,100,000,000 Federal commitment for other forms of assistance to private building, would have set up a new corporation empowered to sell Government-guaranteed debentures on the open market. From the proceeds of these sales, the corporation would have made loans to cooperatives and other nonprofit organizations for home construction.

The administration was certain that the program would take hold and make a substantial dent in the housing shortage. President Truman thought so much of it that he sent a special message from Key West to the House urging that it be passed.

The administration's concern over the fate of the co-op feature of the housing bill, however, had a broader basis than the Nation's housing needs alone. It dealt with the important part a high rate of home construction played in national prosperity.

An unprecedented number of new housing units—1,000,000—were built in the United States last year. It is estimated that the country needs that much new construction each year just to stay abreast of the housing demands created by new families and obsolescence.

Against this background testimony gathered during long congressional hearings indicated that construction in 1950 would not exceed 900,000. This is not only too little to avoid losing ground in housing accommodations, but also—and more importantly, according to high administration spokesmen—dangerous to the Nation's economy.

Should actual construction in 1950 fall below this estimate to, say 800,000 units, economists to whom the administration pays heed believe a recession might ensue, the equal, perhaps, of the recession of 1937.

Sixteen-Percent-More-Wheat Bread Sweeping Kansas Like Wildfire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Members of the House and Senate had an opportunity to try out a new bread recently developed in Kansas which uses 16 percent more wheat than the loaf put out by the ordinary baker. Many Members of the House have told me how much they enjoyed the flavor and taste of this new bread and have expressed the hope that it might be made available here in Washington.

In that connection I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an article from a recent issue of the Hutchinson (Kans.) News-Herald which tells of the tremendous demand for this new bread on the part of Kansas people.

The bread which was served in the House and Senate restaurants last week was baked in the bakery of J. S. Dillon Sons, which organization operates a large number of food stores in the State of Kansas. As a part of this extension I desire to submit the formula which was used by the Dillon bakery in making this new bread and also the old formula which was supplanted by the new. This formula is available to any bakery anywhere and in view of the marvelous reception which has been given this bread wherever placed on sale, it is believed that bakeries everywhere will want to use this new formula.

The matter referred to follows:

TASTE OF NEW LOAF SELLS IT

A new kind of wildfire is sweeping Kansas.

This time it is the 16-percent-more-wheat bread, the brainchild of Kinsley wheat farmer Morris Coover and later developed and produced by J. S. Dillon and C. O. Mammel bakeries in Hutchinson.

"We are working overtime to keep stores supplied with the new 'farm' bread," said Fred Beeman, head of Dillon's bakery.

"We have had to put on an extra bread shift and will have to enlarge the entire baking set-up if orders continue at the present rate," said Lee Scott, Mammel's bakery chief.

Neither the bakers or the store managers can explain the unexpected rush of customers for the new-type bread. At first they thought it might be a momentary fad but instead of leveling off or decreasing, the orders continue to climb.

"My store managers have only one thing to say these days," said Scott, "and that is a plea for more bread."

Orders for the new bread at the Dillon's bakery for next Saturday alone top by 1,000 loaves the entire output of bread by the bakery for last week.

Stores in the Dillon's organization which formerly ordered 100 to 150 loaves on Saturday are now ordering 800 to 1,000 loaves of the new-type bread, Beeman said.

Scott said the enriched bread is outselling any other type which has ever been sold over a Mammel's counter.

Beeman believes the better taste of the new bread accounts for the unbelievable sales.

In addition to containing 16 percent more flour, the Dillon bread has a high milk content. "It sounds corny but it does taste like the bread which mother used to make," said Beeman.

Dillon store managers are equally sold on the new bread.

Dale Jaye, Fifth and Adams: "The store has run out of Farm bread several times during the day but customers wait until a truck can arrive with more of the new bread rather than take some of the older type."

Al Puls, B and Main: "We have had to reorder the new bread several times a day."

John Graham, Great Bend: "Bread sales over the week end were four times normal. We sold 2,600 loaves which equals the normal week-end sales of all bread."

Scott said one of Mammel's managers carries a loaf of the bread around with him during the day and offers each customer a slice. He said Mammel managers complain that they cannot keep enough new bread on their counters.

The factor which makes the new bread better for toast is that it's less elastic and spongy than the older type bread, said Beeman. As toast, it breaks easier than the old formula.

Because of the new quality, customers will now have to use something beside the squeeze test in buying bread, said Beeman.

Formerly a customer went into the store and pinched loaves of bread until one was found which squeezed the easiest. The belief was that the fresh bread was softer. To make a loaf which would squeeze, bakers had to give up some good eating qualities.

The new type is more substantial and will not give as easily when pinched, so customers will have to buy on a taste test, said Beeman.

Beeman said he has been told by persons who never ate bread before that the new type bread has converted them into eaters of bakery bread.

The new type bread has to cost more money because it costs more to produce, said Beeman. Extra material in each loaf costs an additional 1 cent and 10 percent more baking time, said Beeman.

The wheat farmers who, through the Western Kansas Development Association, were the first to get into the more-wheat-in-bread movement are all in favor of the new bread.

Beeman has received many letters from wheat farmers.

C. M. Patmon, Hoxman, wrote: "Thanks from a wheat farmer. Your bread is a step in the right direction."

An example of how the wheat farmers feel was shown by a man who walked into a bank here Thursday.

"What kind of bread do you eat now," he asked the teller?

"That new type bread," was the answer.

"It is a good thing," the farmer replied.

"This is one time the farmers have an opportunity to put something good over and we will see now how the city folks stand behind us."

DILLON'S FARM BREAD

Dillon's Farm bread was developed by the following procedure:

Original formula of Dillon's enriched bread:

White flour, 100 pounds.
Water, 63 pounds.
Yeast, 2 pounds.
Salt, 2 pounds.
Powdered skim milk, 6 pounds.
Sugar, 5 pounds.
Shortening, 4 pounds.
Yeast food, 8 ounces.
Mycoban enrichment tablet, 3 ounces.

New formula on Dillon's Farm bread:

One hundred percent fine-ground whole wheat flour, 6 pounds.
White flour, 110 pounds.
Water, 63 pounds.
Yeast, 2 pounds 5 ounces

Salt, 3 pounds 6 ounces.
Powdered skim milk, 6 pounds.
Sugar, 3 pounds.
S-vitamins, 4 grams.
Yeast food, none.
Mycoban enrichment table, 2 ounces.

You will note that we have added 16 percent more flour—4 pounds whole wheat fine ground, and 12 pounds white flour. The moisture or absorption then drops from 68 percent of the flour to about 64 percent.

This makes a more solid loaf, a more nutritious loaf for two reasons: First, there is more of the outer part of the wheat berry and, also, there is more flour in the bread.

You will note we have a bread with a high content of milk solids. This also makes the loaf more nutritious.

Mycoban is a product of du Pont. It prevents mold.

The baker can run either the straight dough or sponge method, using about his normal methods, varying if necessary to fit his shop conditions.

Canadian Wheat Purchases Under ECA Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by the Economic Cooperation Administration in September 1949 in regard to the purchase of Canadian wheat by Great Britain under the ECA program. This statement should serve to answer the many questions asked on the floor of the House during the debate in reference to this matter. Also in connection with the same subject, I include copies of letters exchanged at that time between the Honorable Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Honorable Paul G. Hoffman, Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, which letters were attached to and a part of the statement above-mentioned. They follow:

WASHINGTON, September 15, 1949.—The Economic Cooperation Administration agreed today to permit Great Britain to use ECA funds to purchase $175,000,000 worth of Canadian wheat in an effort to alleviate the critical drain on British gold and dollar holdings.

The agreement came after consultations between ECA Administrator Paul G. Hoffman and Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan on the British dollar crisis and the effect of the proposed action on the agricultural economy of the United States.

The Secretary said he believed Mr. Hoffman's proposed action was fully warranted. He has issued the following statement:

"The effect of ECA's decision will be beneficial to United States farmers as a whole, including wheat producers, because it will increase our foreign markets for a number of agricultural products and help to maintain a traditional pattern of international trade with England, Canada, and other countries which has been beneficial and can continue to be beneficial to farmers of this country.

"To wheat farmers it should mean as large, if not a larger market for exportable wheat this year. What ECA has done is help England pay for wheat which they had contracted to take from Canada during the last year of the 4-year British-Canadian wheat pact. However, England has agreed to buy 630,000,000 of wheat (about 15,000,000 bushels) from the United States which had not been previously planned. This has been made possible by the relief to British dollar resources resulting from Administrator Hoffman's action.

"Under the international wheat agreement, Canada has an export quota of about 200,000,000 bushels of wheat. Any sales under the British-Canadian contract count on that quota. If the British were to shift purchases from Canada to the United States this would entitle Canada to claim other outlets under the wheat agreement which we expect and prefer to fulfill.

"Due to the relief being granted by ECA, the United Kingdom will also buy $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 worth of United States perishable surplus agricultural commodities that had not been planned. These purchases will help relieve our growing surplus of these commodities.

"Finally, Canada will reexamine restrictions on import of fruits and vegetables with the view of giving relief where possible from restrictions that are especially burdensome to United States producers.

"In the final analysis, the action taken by Administrator Hoffman, which I believe was fully warranted under the circumstances, will enhance our export marketing not only for the American wheat farmer but for the entire agricultural economy."

Since March 1949, ECA has not financed the purchase of wheat from any source other than the United States. As a result, Great Britain has been spending its free dollar reserves to meet the deficit in its Canadian accounts, a substantial element of which consists of Canadian wheat.

The ECA action permits Marshall-plan financing for a little more than half of the $309,000,000 worth of wheat which Great Britain will purchase from Canada during the current fiscal year under British-Canadian wheat buying programs.

Greater flexibility in the use of Marshall-plan dollars by Great Britain was one of seven measures adopted during the Anglo-American-Canadian monetary conference to relieve the British dollar crisis.

In addition to authorizing the use of ECA funds to pay for part of the United Kingdom's Canadian wheat purchases, ECA also agreed to finance certain "vessel disbursements" by the United Kingdom which were heretofore ineligible for ECA payment. The "vessel disbursements" are for bunker fuel purchases which require payment in dollars and port and harbor expenses which can be documented. They amount to about $30,000,000.

ECA said it is exploring the possibility of making other nonagricultural commodities and services, which are causing a drain on Britain's dollar reserves, eligible for ECA financing. ECA emphasized that while the agreements broaden the use of Marshall-plan dollars they do not increase the amount of dollar aid for the United Kingdom.

Administrator Hoffman and Secretary Brannan, in an exchange of letters concerning the proposal to finance a portion of the British purchases of Canadian wheat, agreed on the importance of checking the drain on British dollar holdings.

"Recently, there has been a very severe drain on United Kingdom gold and dollar reserves," Mr. Hoffman said. "This drain, if not halted, would quite certainly vitiate the progress toward economic rehabilitation and recovery which the United Kingdom has made and remove all prospects of achieving the objectives of the Foreign Assistance Act, not only in the United Kingdom but in all probability in the other countries participating in the European recovery program."

Secretary Brannan, in reply to Hoffman, said the interest of his Department centers about the effect of the proposed action on the agricultural economy of the United States.

"We believe, as stated in your letter, that the financing by ECA of a portion of the wheat moving under the United Kingdom-Canada agreement will not diminish the over-all exports of United States wheat but may even result in a slight increase, and, in view of the other measures which you point out will be taken, the proposed action will facilitate an increase of United States exports of other agricultural commodities to Canada and the United Kingdom," Mr. Brannan said. "The Department's statutory responsibility in this matter is to determine whether our supply of wheat is in excess of domestic requirements. The determination that such a surplus exists presents a situation for the consideration by you of your discretionary authority under the Foreign Assistance Act. The combination of the circumstances recited in your letter and in this response we believe fully warrants the action which you propose to take in facilitating the purchase by the United Kingdom of Canadian wheat."

Mr. Hoffman said that as a part of the general arrangements the United Kingdom has agreed to purchase directly from the United States about $30,000,000 worth of United States wheat. In addition, the United Kingdom has agreed to purchase $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 worth of perishable surplus agricultural commodities in the United States.

During the discussions leading to the decision to finance with ECA funds a portion of the United Kingdom purchases of Canadian wheat, the Canadian Government reaffirmed its policy to keep under constant review its restrictions on the import into Canada of United States fruits and vegetables. It is understood that in the process special consideration will be given to those instances where such restrictions are especially burdensome to United States producers.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., September 13, 1949

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, one of the measures proposed by the United Kingdom during the three-power financial conferences was the financing with Economic Cooperation Administration grant funds of the British requirements for wheat from Canada.

The facts, with which you are familiar, are these:

The United Kingdom is the traditional and normal outlet for the major portion of wheat exported by Canada. Three years ago these countries entered into an agreement under which the United Kingdom was to purchase 140,000,000 to 160,000,000 bushels of wheat annually from Canada. The quantity of wheat involved for 1949–50, the final year covered by the agreement, is 140,000,000 bushels at an agreed price of $2 a bushel, in store Fort William. The total dollar f. a. a. cost of the wheat involved for 1949–50 amounts to $309,000,000.

You have on several occasions advised us that wheat is a surplus agricultural commodity under the provisions of section 112 (d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, and it is my understanding that this condition still prevails. Effective with deliveries after the first calendar quarter of 1949, the ECA discontinued authorizing the use of its funds for the purchase of Canadian wheat, and as a consequence, the United Kingdom has been using its free dollar reserves to meet the deficit in its Canadian accounts, a substantial element of which consists of Canadian wheat.

Recently, there has been a very severe drain on United Kingdom gold and dollar reserves. This drain, if not halted, would quite certainly vitiate the progress toward economic rehabilitation and recovery which the United Kingdom has made and remove all prospects of achieving the objectives of the Foreign Assistance Act, not only in the United Kingdom but in all probability in the other countries participating in the European recovery program. It is, therefore, a vital necessity to take all steps possible to end the drain on British gold and dollar reserves.

In an effort to avoid this grave contingency and to extend such help as is within our power, we propose, under the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act, to agree in part to the British proposal and authorize the use of $175,000,000 of ECA grant funds to finance a portion of this year's purchases of Canadian wheat by the United Kingdom. Aside from the vital importance of such action to European recovery, we believe that the proposed action is also in the interests of agricultural producers in this country in that it will not result in any over-all decrease in United States wheat exports and will facilitate additional exports of other agricultural commodities, both to Canada and the United Kingdom.

As part of the general arrangements under which it is proposed that ECA funds be used to finance part of the United Kingdom purchases of Canadian wheat, the United Kingdom has agreed to purchase directly from the United States some $30,000,000 worth of United States wheat. Consequently, net exports of United States wheat may be slightly larger as a result of the proposed action. Furthermore, the United Kingdom has agreed to purchase $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 worth of perishable surplus agricultural commodities in the United States. Without the contribution which the financing of $175,000,000 worth of Canadian wheat will make to the British dollar position, it would be difficult if not impossible, for the United Kingdom to purchase there commodities.

The Canadian Government reaffirmed its policy to keep under constant review its restrictions on the import into Canada of fruits and vegetables from the United States. It is my understanding that in reviewing these restrictions the Canadian Government will give special consideration to those instances where the import restrictions are especially burdensome to United States producers.

In view of the above considerations, it will be appreciated if you would advise us whether you have any objection to the proposed ECA financing of the purchase by the United Kingdom of $175,000,000 worth of Canadian wheat during the current fiscal year.

Sincerely yours,
PAUL G. HOFFMAN,
Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., September 14, 1949.

Hon. PAUL G. HOFFMAN,
Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: This is in reference to your letter of September 13, 1949, in which you discuss the proposal that the Economic Cooperation Administration authorize the use of $175,000,000 of grant funds to finance purchases of approximately 80,000,000 bushels of wheat by the United Kingdom from Canada during the year 1949–50.

You are correct in your understanding that wheat at this time is surplus to our domestic requirements and, therefore, is a surplus agricultural commodity under the provisions of section 112 (d) of the Foreign Assistance Act. Your letter, however, sets forth the disruptive effect upon the economic recovery of the participating nations that would flow from a failure to adopt the proposal. You propose, therefore, to exercise your authority under the act to arrange for the financing referred to above, and you request our comments on the proposed action.

We are, of course, familiar with the importance of the proposal to the furtherance of European recovery; however, the interest of this Department naturally centers about the effect of the proposed action on the agricultural economy of this country.

As you state, Great Britain is a traditional outlet for much of Canada's wheat and is under agreement with Canada covering purchases of 140,000,000 to 160,000,000 bushels annually. The failure by the United Kingdom to take the 80,000,000 bushels from Canada would result in a very large Canadian excess. Canada would, of necessity, be forced to use every means at its command, including price reductions, to dispose of these stocks in other markets, which would be largely those now supplied in whole or in part by the United States. Moreover, as an exporting country under the International Wheat Agreement, Canada, like the United States, is assured of a market for its guaranteed sales of wheat. These purchases by the United Kingdom would be chargeable to the guaranteed sales of the exporting country. If the United States were to sell any part of this quantity of wheat under question to the United Kingdom, Canada would, therefore, have the right to sell a similar quantity to other importing countries under the International Wheat Agreement. Many of these other countries are our traditional markets which we desire to retain.

Thus, the only net result of a switch from Canada to the United States of any sizable portion of the United Kingdom requirements for wheat would be a compensating shift of Canadian exports to markets which the United States would otherwise supply. There would, in consequence, be no net advantage to American wheat producers.

We believe, as stated in your letter, that the financing by ECA of a portion of the wheat moving under the United Kingdom-Canada agreement will not diminish the over-all exports of United States wheat but may even result in a slight increase, and, in view of the other measures which you point out will be taken, the proposed action will facilitate an increase of United States exports of other agricultural commodities to Canada and the United Kingdom. It is observed also that, as part of the general arrangements, the United Kingdom has agreed to purchase directly from the United States some $30,000,000 worth of our wheat and also to purchase from the United States from $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 worth of perishable agricultural commodities.

The Department's statutory responsibility in this matter is to determine whether our supply of wheat is in excess of domestic requirements. The determination that such a surplus exists presents a situation for the consideration by you of your discretionary authority under the Foreign Assistance Act. The combination of the circumstances recited in your letter and in this response we believe fully warrants the action which you propose to take in facilitating the purchase by the United Kingdom of Canadian wheat.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

Fifth Annual Report of the Harrison Soil Conservation District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the Fifth Anual Report of the Harrison County (Ohio) Soil Conservation District. My farm is located in this county, and I am a cooperator in this district, which is doing a good job in one of the most important phases of farm life, that of soil conservation. I am proud to be a member of this soil-conservation district and hope that I can do my part to promote its ideals and objectives.

The report follows:

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT, HARRISON SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT, FOR THE YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1949

Progress has been made in the Harrison district during 1949. On the part of the farmer there is a better understanding of the purpose and program of the district. Technical progress is evidenced by the location of several closely knit neighborhood groups.

The beginning of 1949 found the Harrison district in the low point of the cycle. The district was organized in 1945. Don Hover at the request of the board of supervisors, was assigned to the district as farm planner. Don was familiar with the district, having worked in the CCC camp. Don took up where he had left off when called for military duty and succeeded in developing plans for 65 farms in 1948. Harry Bell reported as assistant farm planner in June. January 1, 1947, Hover was promoted to district conservationist and Bell assumed the duties of farm planner. During 1947, 45 farm plans were developed. In February 1948, Bell resigned to accept a scholarship in the graduate school of Rutgers University. In April 1948, John Foisley was assigned to the district as farm planner. The combination of circumstances which left the district without a farm planner for a few months during lay-out season and then with a planner who knew no one in the district resulted in greatly reduced interest in soil conservation. The board was not successful in reviving that interest at least until the new farm planner had won the confidence of the farmers of the district. Accordingly for 1949 the assistance of an aide was requested only part time.

Some of the details of the achievements for 1949 are presented in the appendix of this report in table form.

The year 1950 opens with much brighter prospects. Mr. Feisley has made very creditable progress in winning the confidence of the people of the district. I trust this process has been speeded up by the activities of the various members of the board as well as those of the board.

The board is very much encouraged with the progress in neighborhood group planning. The principles back of neighborhood activities seem sound. Neighbors do work together and enjoy it. A degree of success had been achieved in working with neighbor groups in previous years. During the past year a dozen groups were located and the spokesman for each identified. One group completed the planning process and appeared

before the board for approval of their farm plan. The remarks made by various members of the group were sufficient to convince one of the advantage of neighborhood activities in complete farm-conservation planning.

The educational activities of the past year include field days, tours, and participating in State plowing match, in addition to the usual press articles and radio broadcasts.

A field day on the Jewett School farm in April provided a demonstration of trash-mulch seeding. Dr. H. L. Borst, of the experiment station, was present to supervise line work and answer questions. The late V. G. Applegate, extension agent; Elias Lewis, vocational agriculture instructor at Jewett; and John Peisley planned the program for the day. Approximately 5 acres of broomsedge land was thoroughly disked, limed, fertilized, and seeded. Reverend Rothel donated the use of equipment and the Hanna Limestone Co. the limestone. The vocational agriculture boys demonstrated the methods of tree planting. Seventy people attended.

A result demonstration tour, including the Jewett School farm, was held in August. The program was planned by the newly appointed county agent, Larry Sarbaugh, and John Peisley. Dr. H. L. Borst represented the Extension Service; Mark White, fish management agent, seined the two ponds on the farm to demonstrate the method and discussed the balance between fish species which give the best results in farm ponds.

Dr. Borst discussed the method used in making the trash-mulch seeding. The seeding has succeeded beyond expectation. The tour included the Taylor Addy farm. Lunch was eaten at the Pleasant Valley Church near the Addy farm. The ladies of the church furnished coffee and served ice cream furnished by Mr. Addy and the district. Through the cooperation of the neighbors, wagons were furnished for touring the farm. Trash-mulch seeding, improved pastures, and dense alfalfa meadows were noted. Forest Dean, of the Extension Service, called attention to forestry practices as observed in the farm woods. The 75 farmers in attendance seemed to be sold on the idea of soil conservation.

In June the district was represented at the Belmont County experiment farm field day. The entire farm is operated under a complete soil-conservation plan for a grassland farm.

Harrison district was represented at the State plowing match by four tour leaders and many others who took advantage of the program.

The second air tour for the district was held October 16 and 17. It was made possible through the management of the local airport. A course was chartered over the western part of the district and included 12 marked farms, 8 of which belong to district supervisors. Forty-four people and twenty-eight farmers were briefed and flew the course.

The first tree farms in the district were dedicated November 23. The Donald Baker farm of Jewett was dedicated as No. 93 in the State. The Charles Standiford farm of Prosport as No. 94. Tree and multiflora rose planting were demonstrated by the vocational agriculture boys of the respective schools. Power-saw demonstrations were by Rethel and Slagle.

The annual meeting was one of the high lights of the year and did much to develop a favorable attitude toward the district. This event held at Asbury Chapel was attended by 120. A fish dinner was the feature of the occasion. The idea of a fish dinner was obtained by one of the present members of the board at the district supervisors' 1948 school, sponsored by the Mississippi Valley Association, and had much to do with the enthusiasm which went into the meeting. T. C. Kennard, State conservationist, was the main speaker of the evening. Glenn Rockwell, of the Belmont district, showed slides and explained the trip to Litchfield Park, Ariz., as winner of the Goodyear contest. Clarence McKnight presented several novelty musical numbers on a set of bottles.

Through the cooperation of the county bankers' association, Elias Lewis, vocational agriculture teacher of the Jewett and the Scio Schools, was sent to the conservation laboratory at Leesville for the summer term. He reported to the board of supervisors and showed pictures illustrating the work of the course. The report was also given before various other groups and thus helped to bring the conservation message to more people.

The Harrison district recognizes the advantage of united effort and has worked with other districts in numerous ways in addition to those mentioned above. The district was represented at the annual meeting of the State federation. One of the members of the board served on the federation strip-mine law committee. Another member served part of the year as member of the State federation executive committee. The district was well represented at the annual work group district supervisors' meeting. Dues to the State federation and national association were paid.

The board wishes to express gratitude for the contribution which the late V. G. Applegate made during his long service as county extension agent. He met an accidental death during the year while carrying out the duties of his office. He played an important part in the organization of the district and assisted in getting the conservation program under way.

The board welcomes Lawrence Sarbaugh as county extension agent, and appreciates his cooperation in pushing forward the soil-conservation program. His contributions are indispensable.

The board takes pleasure in acknowledging the contribution which many others have made toward the soil-conservation program. Among those are the schools, including vocational and veteran instructors, churches, the Farm Bureau councils, granges, chambers of commerce, other Federal agencies, the airport, the bankers, and other businessmen, all who contributed to the promotion of the soil-conservation program by mentioning soil conservation in their advertising or by talking soil conservation. Special mention must be made of the press and radio. Both are very effective in promoting the program.

The experience of the past 2 years has demonstrated beyond doubt (if there were any) the vital part which the trained personnel and the efficient organization of the Soil Conservation Service are making toward the soil-conservation movement. The district takes this occasion to express gratitude for that cooperation.

As we start the new year, 1950, the district board earnestly solicits the continued cooperation of every individual and of every group and agency who are in position to help promote this program. It is a task that challenges the united effort of all of us. The values at stake involve the welfare not only of our own families and our descendants but of our Nation as well.

Achievements, 1949

Contour strip cropping (acres)	662
Trash mulch seeding (acres)	62
Wildlife area planted (acres)	34
Thinning of woodland (acres)	8
Tree planting (acres)	40.5
Farm ponds (each)	1
Diversion terraces (mile)	0.2
Prevention of grazing damage (acres)	229
Multiflora rose planted	4,500
Neighborhood groups located	12
Number of families	155
Applications received	53
Acres	6,619
Complete conservation plans developed	26
Acres	3,516
Active conservation plans at present	143
Acres	21,334

The board of supervisors of the Harrison Soil Conservation District are Raymond Galbraith, chairman, Tippecanoe, Ohio; Emerson Miner, vice chairman, Cadiz, Ohio; J. R. Blackwell, secretary-treasurer, Cadiz, Ohio; John Bardall, Freeport, Ohio, M. W. McKiveen, Scio, Ohio, members.

Paradox: Unemployment During Good Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, among the many and complex problems that confront a Nation none is more distasteful than the subject of unemployment. The word in itself is a veritable storehouse of meaning. The tie-in of words like poverty, hunger, despondency, and economic break-down, to cite a few, is immediately recognizable. Is it any wonder that the mention of unemployment causes a feeling of dejection and prompts a reaction of fear? Since it is a recurring problem, a tough nut to crack, that cannot be ignored or set aside in favor of a less challenging one, it is, by all means, the fortitudinous thing to do to look the matter squarely in the eye whenever it rears its ugly head.

However, there are many searching questions to be tossed at the contention that unemployment ranks are increasing the while the Nation is supposedly enjoying good times. Closer examination of the facts are surely desirable in so paradoxical a situation. Who is right and who is wrong? Are we already embarked upon discomforting days of depression or are we actually wallowing in prosperity?

Concern over this somewhat confusing state of affairs is indicated from two sources to which I should like to invite attention by including, under permission to extend my remarks, a paragraph from Labor's Monthly Survey of March 1950, published by the American Federation of Labor, and a special report which is the result of extensive research by United States News and World Report under date of March 31, 1950, entitled "Needed By '55: 12,000,000 Jobs":

[From Labor's Monthly Survey, American Federation of Labor, for March 1950]

CHECK UNEMPLOYMENT NOW

Unemployment, creeping slowly upward, has reached proportions which call for action. Thus far in 1950, 2,000,000 more workers have been unemployed than in the corresponding months of 1947 and 1948. The number of areas reporting 12 percent or more of their

labor force out of work has risen from 59 in December 1949 to 43 in January 1950. In more than half the other important industrial centers from 7 to 12 percent of the labor force are unemployed; only a small part of this unemployment is seasonal. These reports are disturbing because there is at present no prospect that business activity will increase enough in 1950 to restore "full employment." Meanwhile, new workers coming into the labor force increase the number out of work.

[From U. S. News and World Report of March 31, 1950]

NEEDED BY 1955: 12,000,000 JOBS—GROWING LABOR FORCE OFFSETS BUSINESS RISE

Despite good times, nearly 5,000,000 are out of work and the number is growing. Unemployment is beginning to look permanent.

Trouble is growth of the labor force. Jobs cannot open up fast enough to keep abreast, at present business levels.

How to meet the future is the problem. Public works, earlier and bigger pensions, shorter work week, all are suggested remedies.

Five years from now, unless business activity rises steadily from the present high level, there may be 12,000,000 unemployed in this country. If business should fail to hold as high as it is now, the number of unemployed will go above the 12,000,000 mark.

The returning problem of unemployment may be here to stay. It is coming back because of two main factors: (1) the steady flow of new workers into the ranks of job seekers, and (2) the year-by-year gain in man-hour output as industry's huge postwar investment in new and more efficient plant and equipment pays off.

The resulting problem, essentially, is this: Out of jobs and seeking jobs today are about 4,700,000 individuals. That is about 1,500,000 more than the number of unemployed a year ago. Number of unemployed will shrink seasonally in the period just ahead, but will be greater a year from now unless the general level of business activity rises.

New workers will add 2,900,000 people to the labor force in the years 1950 through 1954. That is the net increase to be expected after allowing for older workers who will drop out of the labor force. The rise in labor force in this year alone will approach 700,000.

Jobs to be affected by more efficient use of labor total about 4,400,000 from 1950 through 1954. That assumes an annual increase of 2 to 2.5 percent in man-hour output—a gain that is in line with normal experience. Rising hourly wage rates add to pressure on management to find ways to reduce the use of labor.

Added up, as the chart on page 39 shows, the prospect is 4,700,000 unemployed now, plus 2,900,000 to be added to the labor force, plus 4,400,000 to be displaced by improved efficiency—a total of 12,000,000. This number will be unable to find jobs in 1954 if business activity fails to rise above the present level and if efficiency in use of labor increases at the normal rate.

The 5-year solution to the problem of growing unemployment, if there is to be one, is this:

Total employment will have to climb from the present 57,000,000 civilian jobs to 67,000,000 jobs, if unemployment is to be held below 3,000,000.

Business activity—total spending, called gross product—will have to expand from the present level of $260,000,000,000 a year to $300,000,000,000 in 1954 to provide the needed additional jobs.

This is the total amount that will have to be spent for goods and services to keep the population fully employed. The 300,000,000,000 figure assumes that prices will stay where they are today. In that figure are the total outlays of consumers, home builders, business investors in plant and equipment, and Government spending at all levels, Federal, State, and local.

This need for expansion is beginning to worry officials even now. Recent increases in unemployment are not due to a slackening of business activity but to a growth in the labor force. The number of people wanting jobs is increasing faster than the economy is expanding to provide those jobs. At the same time, output per hour is starting to rise again.

The experience of the last year shows what is happening. Total output today is almost as large as it was a year ago. Total civilian employment also is almost as large. The labor force, however, is larger by almost 1,500,000. Result is that unemployment increased by the amount that the labor force increased. At 4,700,000, unemployment is at a postwar high.

If this trend continues, unemployment will exceed 5,000,000 within a year. And unemployment at above 5,000,000 is recognized as a political problem.

Actually, there are only two developments that can prevent a rise in unemployment. Either private industry must expand, providing more jobs in factories, in construction, in trade and services, or the Government must move in.

Business expansion at the rate necessary to provide full employment appears to be a difficult task. High employment in all past periods has been sparked by a high level of investment in plant and equipment and in construction. At present, investment in new plant is falling off, although orders for new equipment recently have increased. The construction industry has been in a boom for 2 years and is headed for a third year of boom in 1950. It seems unlikely that this industry will expand much more.

Most other industries appear to be able to produce as much as people want. The automobile industry expects to meet most of the demand for new cars by the end of this year. There appears to be no urgent demand to expand output of such things as refrigerators, household appliances, or other hard goods. The soft-goods industries already have been producing surpluses. The steel industry apparently is able to satisfy all customers and the coal industry is plagued with too much capacity.

Moderate expansion can be expected through population growth and family growth. The population is likely to increase by 7,000,000 by 1954 and the number of families probably will grow by about 4,000,000. That will add to the demand for the products of industry, but even with the probable growth ahead, the increase in job seekers may readily outpace the expansion. Any recession in business activity would result in rapid expansion in the number of unemployed.

To provide employment for ten to twelve million more workers by 1955—to reach a $300,000,000,000 output by that time—means that private business investment must continue at a higher rate than in 1948. That expansion also must be steady. In past periods, business expansion never has been steadily upward, its rise has been marked by periodic spurts and setbacks.

However, if private business expansion fails to check the rise in unemployment, political pressure will grow for a Government program to accomplish the same result. In fact, agitation for Government action can be expected if unemployment exceeds 5,000,000 by this time next year.

The outline of a Government program already is beginning to take shape in official planning.

Public-works expansion is under study now. The Federal Government is aiding States and cities with public-works planning. On the shelf are Federal projects for river-valley developments, public-power expansion, and land reclamation. President Truman's proposal for a New England power program is an example. New England is one of the areas hardest hit by current unemployment.

The experience of the New Deal suggests, however, that public works cannot provide the complete answer to the employment problem. It is unlikely that Mr. Truman's Fair Deal will be content with public works alone.

Higher old-age pensions are being offered as one way to draw older workers out of the labor force to make way for newcomers. Experience suggests, however, that, as jobs become harder to find, persons with jobs are reluctant to give them up. Union contracts, moreover, usually stress seniority that gives older workers a first claim on the jobs that are available.

A shorter workweek is another suggestion that is stirring in Government and union circles as a solution for unemployment. Agitation for a 30-hour week was intense in the early days of the New Deal, and a 40-hour week finally was established through the wage-and-hour law. A shorter workweek could be established by an amendment to the present law. That law already has been amended to push the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour.

Reduction of the standard workweek from 40 to 35 hours would mean a cut-back of one-eighth in total hours of labor for one worker. Applied to a working force of 60,000,000, a 35-hour week would mean an additional 8,000,000 jobs to produce the same volume of output. The appeal of such a device could become important in a period of rising unemployment.

At present, proposals for treating unemployment are still in the discussion stage. The official hope is that the rising trend will be reversed in the months ahead and the problem may solve itself. But, if unemployment is higher a year from now, proposals for a shorter workweek promise to become a political issue.

Mr. Voorhees Resigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, March 26, 1950, which pays a deserving tribute to a distinguished Brooklynite who will shortly leave Government service:

MR. VOORHEES RESIGNS

A large part of the American people will share the particular reluctance with which President Truman accepted the resignation of Tracy S. Voorhees as Under Secretary of the Army. The loss of so diligent a public servant at this time will be deeply felt. It is additionally grievous, since it comes upon the heels of the resignation of the Army Secretary, Gordon Gray. Thus, at one time, our defense establishment loses two of its top-ranking civilians and two of its most competent and conscientious officials.

The public, nevertheless, will be sympathetic toward the reasons that have prompted the resignation of Mr. Voorhees. His service has been long and strenuous. It has

had a wide variety of ramifications that have entailed grave responsibilities. He letter to the President mentioned the "intensity and continuity" of these, noting that they seemed "endless and inescapable." There is modesty as well as truth in that last statement. These responsibilities were inescapable as far as Mr. Vorhees was concerned because of his own appraisal of the gravity of the tasks with which this country was faced and his determination to meet that gravity with the most earnest and ceaseless endeavor. If now he pleads guilty to some degree of fatigue he has every right to do so. If he can get some degree of rest he has most richly earned it.

This case again brings up the difficulty of finding enough men of high enough caliber to meet the complex demands of our constantly increasing affairs. Those men whose civilian training and experiences have given them the capacity for first-class public service can undertake that service only at very great sacrifices. Those sacrifices are not merely monetary. They are the sacrifices entailed in accepting work that demands almost inexhaustible energy and virtually limitless patience. The man in high office must be able, not merely to do a competent job, but to endure a multiplicity of little irritations and frustrations that cannot help but have, in time, an eroding effect.

The replacement of a man such as Mr. Vorhees, therefore, is not easy. It is not merely his technical shoes that have to be filled. What must be found is another competent person equally willing to give his services, his strength, his personality, over far above the call of duty.

Death of a Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Evanston Review, Evanston, Ill., in connection with the death of our beloved colleague, the Honorable Ralph E. Church:

DEATH OF A CONGRESSMAN

The sudden death this week of Congressman Ralph E. Church struck home closely to a vast number of Evanstonians and other residents of this area. Almost continuously since 1918 he had served the interests of the north shore in legislative halls, State and National. He had become almost an institution—a tradition.

From the standpoint of personal attention to the needs and perplexities of his constituents he was close to being the ideal representative. His campaigns for office were invariably conducted on a personal basis. He consistently refused to rely to any great extent on party organization support and insisted on meeting the voters of his district man to man.

In the National Capital, amid the intricacies of Government machinery, he was in a very true sense the personal friend and representative of his constituents. No reasonable request for information, advice or active assistance was ever refused. He never became too important to listen to the plea of the humblest citizen, and hundreds in this city and this district will testify to his helpful personal assistance, at times when dealing with a complex bureaucracy has grown most difficult for the private citizen.

Although his loyalty to his party's welfare never wavered, Mr. Church could not be classed correctly as an organization man. He was an independent within the ranks and as often as not won elections despite organization opposition. Even in the hottest debates, his personal honesty and rectitude were never questioned.

Naturally, many differed with Mr. Church's views, but the fact that he was returned again and again to Congress even in years when his party met severe national defeat, is eloquent testimony that he faithfully represented the political and social philosophy of this large district.

His seat in the public interest was the cause of his fatal heart attack.

Uncle Sam's Untapped Tax Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Reader's Digest of April 1950:

UNCLE SAM'S UNTAPPED TAX MILLIONS

(Condensed from the American magazine)

(By NOAH M. MASON, Member of the House of Representatives, Ways and Means Committee)

Administration leaders today are frantically searching for new ways to raise revenue. I maintain we can raise at least $1,000,000,000 in new revenue merely by plugging the loopholes in our present tax laws that permit United States businesses to hide behind tax-exempt fronts. And we can raise this revenue without adding a single cent to the bill of the regular taxpayers.

Our tax laws, as now written, exempt charitable, educational, and religious organizations, cooperatives, labor unions, and many others. When these exemptions were granted, many years ago, our lawmakers did not dream that they would be used to shield vast corporate, profit-making enterprises. But that is precisely what has happened. By various means—all perfectly legal—thousands of organizations are escaping the normal 38-percent tax on their business profits, forcing numberless conscientious taxpaying businessmen to the wall and shrinking the pool of taxable United States wealth.

Here are the five devices widely used to escape taxes:

THE CHARITY TRUST DEVICE

There are many conscientious trusts and foundations dedicated to public service. But thousands have sprung up in recent years that are little more than pawns in the game of outsmarting the tax collector. The Russell Sage Foundation, a conscientious organization, has made a study of some of the newcomers. Its report states: "A disturbing number of such 'foundations' appear to have no headquarters other than the office of a law firm, to be modest to the point of complete silence about any program for social or public welfare, and indeed to be making no present contributions of any sort from their accumulated and accumulating wealth."

The fabulous 95,000-acre Montana wheat ranch of Tom Campbell, America's largest wheat farmer, has been sold to a "charitable" trust in Omaha for $2,600,000. Its earnings, which have been subject to a 38-percent tax, now go tax-free. Mr. Campbell continues to manage his ranch at a handsome income.

An enterprising young Omaha lawyer named Gordon Diesing bought the ranch of behalf of the United States Wheat Corp., which Diesing set up last April "exclusively for charitable purposes." This corporation's profits, after paying Diesing's salary, expenses, etc., go to another charitable corporation, the Sacred Heart Foundation Fund, which is capitalized at $10.

Mr. Diesing is listed as its president, secretary, treasurer, chairman of the trustees, general counsel, and resident agent. In effect, his second corporation, capitalized at $10, bought control of a $2,000,000 ranch. Evidently not much money changed hands.

Mr. Diesing also has bought for $4,800,000 the 35,000 acres of cotton land in the San Joaquin Valley run by California's cotton king, Russell Giffen. For this he set up another "charitable, nonprofit corporation," which he heads. Giffen remains as manager.

A significant aspect of these deals is that the two ranches in the past year have drawn almost $5,000,000 in United States Government farm loans. Thus, in effect, the United States Government guarantees that they make a profit, while not being able to tax those profits.

Then there are the six tax-exempt "charitable" trusts set up by President Royal Little and his aides in the $60,000,000 Textron Corp. To these trusts was given title to much of the Textron empire. A Senate subcommittee which investigated this set-up reported: "Many millions of dollars have been received by the trusts and but an infinitesimal portion thereof has been paid to the beneficiaries. * * * It is clear that [Textron] has made wide use of so-called charitable trusts as a means of providing risk capital to itself. * * * These trusts have never paid a cent of income tax."

THE EDUCATIONAL DEVICE

Our founding fathers decided, properly, that education should not be burdened with taxes. But they had no notion that universities would go into business in direct competition with taxpaying companies, as several dozen have done.

The University of Michigan now owns Willow Run airport. Wittenberg College in Springfield, Ohio, has purchased a $200,000 supermarket. Girard College, Philadelphia, through a trustee foundation, operates coal mines. Oberlin College owns 5-and-10-cent stores. Washington University in St. Louis has money invested in 51 business buildings, a railroad freight station and a switching yard. The University of Louisville is in the horse-racing business. A tax-free foundation which will have the university as a beneficiary has bought the famous Churchill Downs track, the profits of which no longer will be taxible.

Yale University (through a subsidiary called Connecticut Boola, Inc.) recently bought a new $4,5000,000 department-store building which R. H. Macy & Co. had built for itself in San Francisco. Then Yale leased the building back to Macy's for 31 years, at an average annual rental of $240,000. This sale-and-lease-back procedure is today fairly common. Both sides win: the business firm involved gets cash for expansion; the educational institution gets a tax-free real-estate investment. The United States Treasury, of course, loses.

The C. F. Mueller Co., macaroni manufacturer, sold out to a nonprofit foundation acting in behalf of New York University. New York University and its affiliated foundations own and operate, in addition to the macaroni factory, a $3,000,000 pistoning factory in Missouri, a $3,300,000 pottery factory and a vast $35,000,000 leather-goods company. A spokesman for the university has admitted that these four companies would have to pay $1,500,000 in United States taxes each year if they were not under the university's protective wing.

THE RELIGIOUS DEVICE

Churches are taking millions of dollars' worth of property off the tax rolls with their investments. Father Divine has bought a large hotel in Newark, N. J., giving it tax-free status. It is estimated that Milwaukee is losing $2,500,000 a year in real-estate taxes because churches and fraternal organizations have become such large property owners. Methodist officials are disturbed over the untaxed profits some of their churches are making on properties which have such nonreligious tenants as taverns and pool halls. Samuel Cardinal Stritch, of Chicago, denied permission to the Catholic order that sought to purchase real estate in Lake County near the city; one factor in his decision was that the county already was seriously burdened by tax-exempt properties.

It is my belief that churches should be taxed on all profits from nonreligious enterprises. The Mormon Church engages in a great variety of commercial businesses, yet has always insisted on paying its full share of taxes on profits.

THE COOPERATIVE DEVICE

Co-ops were given their privileged tax-exempt status in 1916, when they were merely small groups of neighboring farmers trying to get a better return on their crops. The Federal tax then was only 1 percent. Today, however, the tax concession is 38 percent, and many co-ops are monster corporations performing multi-million-dollar transactions in fierce competition with taxpaying businessmen.

A spectacular example is the California & Hawaii Sugar Refining Co., which operates the biggest sugar refinery in the world at Crockett, Calif. Dominated by businessmen who also operate plantations, department stores, etc., in Hawaii, C. & H. makes millions of dollars in profits but hasn't paid a Federal income tax since 1927. In that year it became a farmers' cooperative, simply by changing its corporate structure. It remained, however, a corporation, with many of the same stockholders.

Independent oil jobbers in the Midwest have had a desperate time surviving in the face of a great upsurge of tax-free co-ops, which are buying up hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of oil wells, pipe lines, and refineries. One single co-op owns 805 wells.

Co-ops run vast machine-assembly factories, chemical plants, phosphate mines. They handle 75 percent of the Nation's fluid milk, operate vast feed mills, and the biggest grain elevators in America.

One of the so-called farmer co-ops is the California Fruit Growers Exchange, which did a $300,000,000 business last year. Its markets the famous Sunkist orange and 65 percent of America's lemons. One of its subsidiaries, the Fruit Growers Supply Co., in 1947 bought the entire lumbering town of Westwood, Calif., for $11,000,000. The purchase included lumber mills, veneer mills, box factories, and valuable timber.

There are today at least a dozen co-ops that would have to pay the Treasury an average of a million dollars each per year if they were taxed on the same basis as their competitors. Yet they escape most taxes because they claim to be nonprofit. When co-ops split a melon at the end of a year they say they are handing out a "rebate" or a "refund" or a "final payment due."

The labor union device. When tax exemption was granted to labor unions, I'm sure the lawmakers did not anticipate that unions would branch out into commercial enterprises having no relation to union needs. In many cities unions receive rentals on store and office buildings they own, and pay no tax on the income. In LaSalle, Ill., a local union is even in the saloon-renting business.

Our biggest unions are planning to operate giant co-op supermarkets in union towns throughout America, in competition with taxpaying grocers. CIO's United Automobile Workers already has a dozen co-op stores in the Detroit area, selling groceries, appliances, clothing, etc. Their announced aim is to capture 50 percent of all local retail trade.

Some small progress is being made in getting tax-exempt organizations to pay their fair share of taxes. The Treasury Department has finally forced a showdown with the Mueller macaroni firm, contending that there is nothing "charitable, scientific, literary or educational" in noodle making, even though the profits go to New York University. The issue is now in the courts. Also, a few States are taking action. Indiana, for example, has a law taxing business income of all churches, colleges, foundations, co-ops, etc. The law has produced no noticeable hardship. And—partly because of public outcry—a few farm co-ops are now voluntarily paying some taxes.

Isolated State laws and voluntary acts, however, are not enough. What is needed is an overhauling of our national tax laws to eliminate tax inequalities. Such a change would not in the least hinder schools, churches, unions and charitable institutions in their primary functions. It would, however, cut the props out from under most of the legal tax dodging by commercial profit makers.

The Wilder Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, by request, I am inserting in the RECORD, as an extension of remarks, a letter from Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN to Gov. Harold J. Arthur, of Vermont, concerning a resolution on the Senate Calendar relative to the Wilder Dam and a letter from Governor Arthur in reply thereto.

The letters follow:

JANUARY 23, 1950.

Hon. HAROLD J. ARTHUR,
Governor of Vermont,
Montpelier, Vt.

DEAR HAROLD: As you know, the landowners in Newbury have made a settlement with the power company. There is on the Senate Calendar, however, a resolution which would require the Federal Power Commission to reopen the Wilder Dam case. This resolution failed to pass the Senate last fall only because unanimous consent was required and one Member of the Senate objected.

I have, however, had communications urging the Congress to pass this resolution in order that the State might take an appeal to the courts if the Federal Power Commission is required to reopen the matter.

There is no question in my mind but what the land which would be rendered unusable by reason of raising the dam to the 385-foot level instead of the 360-foot level is of much more value for agricultural purposes than for power production. An annual output of only 12 to 14,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity is involved as compared with a large acreage of class I meadowland.

Before urging the adoption of this resolution by the Congress, however, I should know whether the State of Vermont intends to appeal the FPC decision. If there is an opportunity to do so. As the final determination rests with you, I would like to know your decision. If you desire to go ahead with the appeal, I will do all I can to get the resolution through the Congress. There is still an opportunity to save the land for the State even though the landowners have made a settlement with the power company.

With best regards,
Sincerely,

GEORGE D. AIKEN.

MARCH 13, 1950.

The Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: I have your letter of January 23 advising me of the present status of the Wilder Dam resolution and also advising me that you have had communications urging passage of the resolution "in order that the State might take an appeal to the courts if the Federal Power Commission is required to reopen the matter." You ask if the State of Vermont intends to appeal the Federal Power Commission decision, if there is an opportunity to do so.

Your letter and your question seem to assume that the decision in the reopened case would be the same as when the case was reopened before at the request of the State and further hearing had and brief filed by the State. That decision was rendered October 31, 1946, and there was no appeal to the courts by the State or anyone else. I append to this letter a brief synopsis of the whole Wilder Dam history in order that you may have it before you. I also append a copy of the opinion of Attorney General Clifton G. Parker.

I have carefully reviewed the history of the Wilder Dam case and have read the decisions of the Vermont Public Service Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the claims of the parties and much of the important evidence on both sides, as well as the decision of the Vermont Supreme Court in the matter, and the United States Supreme Court decisions which under existing Federal statutes place the control of the use of water of the Connecticut River exclusively in the Federal Government. I have consulted with Attorney General Clifton Parker and with Senator Walter B. Renfrew, Judge Frank N. Brock, Representative William J. Talsey, Vermont farm leaders, and other interested parties.

I have constantly tried to promote the best interests of the Vermont farmer because the prosperity of the whole State is closely related to that of our great agricultural community. My illustrious predecessors as governors have opposed all unwarranted infringements upon our farm land whether the infringements were for power dam or other purposes. I heartily approve the actions taken by them. You have done all that you could to prevent such infringements. You are aware of my sympathies toward the cause espoused by the landowners involved. You may recall that I appeared before the Senate Agriculture Committee as master of the State Grange in regard to the Wilder redevelopment on which that committee, at your instigation, conducted extensive hearings.

I find that there has been great exaggeration of the damage to tillable farm land to be anticipated from the proposed redevelopment. For instance, Joint Resolution No. 56, adopted by the General Assembly in 1943, set forth in the preamble that the license of the Federal Power Commission for the redevelopment of Wilder "will result in flooding or otherwise rendering useless for agricultural purposes over 8,000 acres of fertile valley land in the 40-mile area extending north along the river from Wilder to Wells River, Vt."

The commission appointed by authority of this resolution and which was headed by our good friend, Stanley C. Judd (now commissioner of agriculture), reported, however, that the land in Vermont to be permanently flooded would not be over 540 acres. No classification of the land was stated. At

the trial before the public service commission the undisputed evidence was that the dam at elevation 385 feet would flood in Vermont 508 acres of land—classified as river bank, 220 acres; nonfillable meadow land, 139 acres; and tillable land, 149 acres. If we add to this 149 acres that will be flooded all of the 224 acres of tillable land in the area between elevations 385 feet and 393 feet and which will not be flooded but will be somewhat damaged, though still usable to some extent for agriculture, we have only 413 acres of tillable land to be flooded or damaged by Wilder. There seems to be no evidence available to show anything more than minor damage on a very small acreage above elevation 390 feet. This figure is far from the 3,000 acres we were first told about.

From a legal standpoint, I am forced to the conclusion that the State of Vermont is not in position to hope to overturn the decision of the Federal Power Commission by which it granted its license for a redevelopment of Wilder to elevation 385 feet. The Federal Power Commission at the request of the State reopened the case in 1946 and permitted the State to present any evidence it desired and which was available in opposition to the redevelopment. To present evidence covering the same ground again would be very unusual.

It must be borne in mind that the situation has now changed materially. Every Vermont land owner affected by the proposed raising of the water level has sold to the power company the flowage rights desired. In other words, their damages have been paid and the power company owns the rights in all land affected in Vermont by the proposed dam and if we should seek to prevent the company from using its own property, we must stand on very strong ground. My discussions with Senator Renfrew and other interested individuals indicate that no new favorable evidence is available.

Moreover, the power company, in compliance with the order of the Federal Power Commission, has raised the money for the redevelopment and has been engaged for a long time in the construction of the proposed new dam and plant. This morning when I drove past the site, the construction appeared to be well advanced toward the final stages when a large additional amount of badly needed electric power can be supplied from there. I am informed that next October is the date scheduled for putting the completed plant into operation. We are fully aware of the great need for more and cheaper electricity in Vermont, especially for agricultural purposes.

It seems to me, therefore, that the State of Vermont should not proceed further in opposition to the Wilder redevelopment. The legal phases are res judicata. The damage claims of our people have been settled and paid.

To seek a reversal of the Wilder redevelopment order under existing conditions would be asking something contrary to all rules of equity and fair dealing. We would be asking that these landowners or former landowners be permitted to keep both their land and the money they have received for it or for damages to it.

Moreover, the millions of dollars spent by the power company toward carrying out the order of the Federal Power Commission to supply the much-needed electric power would be lost and the new dam at Wilder would stand as a memorial that people cannot safely rely upon the unappealed-from actions of State and Federal authorities. Whether or not we believe the decisions were right, we cannot afford this lack of confidence in Vermont and Vermont ideals of justice and fair dealing.

I am confident that when appraised of all of the facts, the people will support these same conclusions.

With kindest personal regards and assuring you of our confidence in your continued interests in behalf of the State of Vermont, I am,

Cordially and respectfully yours,
HAROLD J. ARTHUR,
Governor.

The People's Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from three addresses prepared by me for delivery in Vermont; one at Barre, Vt., to the Vermont Dairymen's Association on the occasion of their annual banquet on February 10, 1950; one at Montpelier, to the Women's Republican Club on the occasion of their Lincoln Day dinner on February 13, 1950; and one at St. Albans, to the St. Albans Chamber of Commerce on the occasion of their annual dinner on February 14, 1950:

ADDRESS TO THE VERMONT DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION, BARRE, VT.

I speak nonpartisanly tonight, my friends, to tell Vermonters—

1. That the administration is very much alarmed at the fall of farm-price averages below parity.

2. That the Brannan plan is considered by a present majority of the Members of Congress as both dangerous and altogether socialistic.

3. That the public debt presently is $257,000,000,000—billions, I said, and will be $264,000,000,000 by June next year.

4. That we will have a $5,000,000,000 deficit looking toward next year.

5. That the end is not in sight but those who realize what is going on appreciate the fact that the spending program must stop now.

6. That millions of people share the illusion that Government can, by passing laws, accomplish results which are beyond the powers of any government to accomplish.

7. That President Truman believes this illusion as evidenced by the fact his message to Congress proposed high expenditures, high taxes, and continuing to spend more than the Treasury takes in. Each and all of these are a threat to freedom. Spending means high taxes; high taxes deprive the citizens of freedom to undertake to decide how to use their earnings; that lowers everybody's scale of living; deficit spending reduces the value of the dollar.

8. That the Brannan plan, the proposals for Federal housing, the continuation of rent control, the Federal power projects, all also are threats to freedom. When the Government becomes able to tell us, the people, who can buy electric power, how much, and from whom, it will be able to control the location of the industry, say where you and I may work and live, and what we may produce; that is intolerable to Vermonters.

9. That Federal aid, as such, always invades the rights and reduces the responsibilities of the States as it limits the opportunity of the people.

10. That we common folks have an inalienable right to manage our own lives; to spend our own money we earn as we see fit, subject only to paying our debts and our just share of the cost of a wise and frugal government, with noninterference with the rights of our neighbors, or by the Federal Government.

11. That we realize the door opener to socialism is Federal aid for services which citizens could and can as well or better perform for themselves, for which, in the long run, they themselves must pay.

12. We agree with the statement once made by one of Vermont's most distinguished sons, one Calvin Coolidge, while President, to the effect that no complicated scheme of relief, no plan for Government fixing of prices, no resort to the Public Treasury, will be of any permanent value in establishing agriculture.

13. That social security, as such, comprehensive in nature, rests with the individual, in the ultimate and as the source, who, in the long run, will have to pay all the bills and who, therefore should know just where every cent he pays in taxes goes, or has some idea in order to secure to and for him the social security he seeks and of right should have.

14. That the proposals advanced by the administration for the great extension of the Social Security System embracing compulsory health insurance; permanent and temporary disability benefits; a broadening of Federal participation in public assistance; etc. etc., ultimately will have to be paid for by the people. They should not be fooled by the promises and a confident attitude not warranted by unstable conditions of the world in which we live, which gives no security guaranty either of safety or of sustenance today.

ADDRESS TO THE WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB OF VERMONT AT MONTPELIER, VT.

Abraham Lincoln might not like it, but I have a sneaky notion he would not object to my saying that up to now I have almost consistently voted for such contribution financially to our friends across the seas as they have been able to satisfy the powers that be that they should have. Frankly, I am through with such generous attempts to give away our liberty and to bankrupt America and incidentally and indirectly to impose heavier and heavier burdens on the taxpayers of the United States.

If that be treason, make the most of it.

I am at last satisfied it has not only been a costly but a tragic and fantastic venture, as well as a mistake for our leadership to undertake to impose on or to sustain American democracy in sections of the world where I feel and am satisfied conditions not only do not justify such an attempt, but demand an entirely different form of government.

Until and unless some of these people show evidence of a purpose and of an intent to save themselves by going to work and to stop living off us taxpayers, I shall be very cautious concerning my vote of interference with their internal policies backed by the hard-earned American dollars of hard-working citizens.

It has been well said, and I have come to agree that it is stupid, as a matter of policy, as well as morally wrong for us to fight abroad by way of dollars for the support and establishment of a democracy in any section of the world where the economy of that particular section will not itself promote and support the democracy we know.

For us, democracy is a natural, as well as the greatest of all political ideals. To them it means a source of supply of dollars.

We should not let our misguided enthusiasm for democracy destroy it here by bankrupting it.

Charity begins at home.

Those who undertook to save against old age by buying bonds and insurance for beneficiaries as of and prior to 1933 are confronted by the fact that the dollar, which cost them 100 cents they said is worth but 43 cents today. Those in power are responsible against our protest for the situation which obtains and can neither evade nor avoid.

In 1934 they devalued the dollar by act of Congress. They cheapened the dollar by reducing its value in gold by 41 percent.

They increased the Nation's money supply with printing-press money—and gave us what Gov. Al Smith called the baloney dollar.

They quadrupled the number of bureaucrats and increased the cost of government for nonmilitary purposes from $4,000,000,000 in 1932 to $19,000,000,000 in 1948 and the end is not yet.

They planned high prices, forced up wages, and caused the never-ending race between wages and prices.

They taxed industry to the point that new plants cannot be built nor old ones enlarged. So goods are in short supply.

They deliberately adopted policies which discourage work, curtail production, and destroy savings.

Business taxes are so high that one-third of our food bill consists of taxes. When we pay 15 cents for a can of beans we pay 10 cents for the beans and 5 cents for taxes—taxes paid by the farmer, canner, wholesaler, and retailer, but passed on to us because this tax cost must be added to the price we pay.

Food which cost you $1 in 1933 now costs $2.63. This is the price we now pay for 16 years of incompetent, irresponsible New Deal government, which its supporters are attempting to revive as a Fair Deal for a welfare state.

Unless the people of Vermont and of the United States wake up they may say farewell to the State, as such.

Your insurance and savings protection has decreased from the 100-cent dollar of 1933 to the 38-cent dollar of today. Think that over, and weep and vote as you should.

While I have talked in dollars, as you count those 38-cent dollars for which you paid 100 cents in sweat and blood and tears, which bear the slogan "In God We Trust," ask yourselves the question—How long will God help those who will not help themselves?

ADDRESS TO THE ST. ALBANS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ST. ALBANS, VT.

In the first place, because of some things said in your county lately, I would like to pay my respects to our Governor. I have known Harold Arthur before and ever since he was a page in the Vermont Legislature. Just don't let anybody tell you or try to fool you into thinking that anybody is going to boss this man Arthur, or that he is going to be Governor by indirect control.

As a boy and as a man, he has demonstrated that he has the independent qualifications of which real governors are made. I speak as one who has known governors for 50 years, good and bad. If you ask me, he has the stuff.

Now let's get to something national.

First, the orgy of national spending must stop. How many times have I said it? What ever has been done about it? Nothing. We are almost out of soap. I am voting as I talk to save the money of the taxpayers for them.

We are getting bankrupt. The time has come when we must limit our contributions to others measured by what is going to happen to us. Charity begins at home. It will have to do so pretty soon, God save us, or we will all be on the Franklin County poor farm, if there is any such place now. I know there used to be such a place. I always thought that if worst came to worst, I could always take up my residence in Franklin County and get a living off you folks at that refuge. Incidentally, I remember hearing about it as it once was.

Now, seriously, and while this issue of the spending of the taxpayers' money is not to be dodged, yet the most dangerous enemy which confronts us in Vermont and Nationwide is the American counterpart of the British Fabian Socialist. If you don't know what I mean, you had better find out before it is too late. These Fabians (they love to be called that) deny they are Socialists. They operate behind a mask which they call national planning or some other name equally as repulsive to you and me, as they ask for power controls, and hundreds of other things which, on their face, are attractive but from the top down lead us into a mire and the quicksands of socialism, from which we can never wade.

These folks have led the countries overseas, to whom we are contributing our hard-earned dollars, down the dark road which has led England, at least, and others, to their doom. God save us from them. We must save ourselves.

Had it not been for the rugged individualism of the Vermonters who represented their several towns in the State of Vermont in the legislature for the State of Vermont of late years, they would have made more progress toward socializing the State of Vermont than they already have made, which is too much. You know—these folks have a soft and soapy way of undertaking to "show" those who think this is a good country in which to live so long as they can live off it, that if the plan which they offer is adopted or could be adopted, the State of Vermont would engage in flood control, in navigation control, and in the manufacture and distribution of electrical power and energy; we would have a power control board; we would have about every weapon necessary for their undertaking to destroy individual enterprise and to turn everything over to the socialized State. We would tell the farmers what to plant and how much.

These folks should be stopped in their tracks now.

You and I and all the American people face the hard fact that though we won the war, we have not won the peace. We should not permit these socialistic Americans to dictate our policy.

Basic American principles are threatened by the program which they offer for a planned economy. It includes price and wage control and rationing, socialized medicine and regional authorities, etc., ad infinitum, ad nauseum, all of which proposals are wholly out of accord with the true wishes of workers and farmers and businessmen of Vermont and the Nation.

Capital Must Reflect Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Martins Ferry (Ohio) Times Leader, one of the leading newspapers in my congressional district.

This editorial appeared on Monday, March 27, and I think it is one of the shortest and most effective arguments for home rule that I have yet read.

The editorial follows:

CAPITAL MUST REFLECT IDEALS

Of all the burdens saddled upon Congress, acting as a city council for Washington seems the silliest. Long hours are devoted to details of municipal government that are admittedly tiresome to most of the lawmakers involved.

Actually no one likes the arrangement. Washington's residents want to govern themselves just as do citizens everywhere else.

Both major parties went on record in their 1948 platforms as favoring home rule for the Capital.

Despite all this, action on home rule legislation is stymied in Congress.

Why has the home-rule proposal been blocked when so many appear to favor it?

The answer is simple. Between a fourth and a third of the Capital's population is Negro. Some people say that to enfranchise Washington voters will mean giving this minority more than its proportionate strength at the polls.

There can be no defense of such a viewpoint in this country.

Certainly Washington is the last place democratic America should wish to see barriers raised against use of the voting privilege.

The fact is Washington is a Capital first and a border city second. As the Nation's Capital it must reflect in daily practice the country's loftiest ideals.

How can a city symbolize democracy if it doesn't live it?

Cooperation in the Development of Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a notable address delivered by the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Oscar L. Chapman, at the annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, in Chicago, Ill., March 7, 1950. Secretary Chapman spoke on the subject Cooperation in the Development of Public Power.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC POWER

I want to express my great appreciation for the invitation extended to me to participate in this annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

A review of your magnificent efforts in the name of the people, and of your achievements, would convince any observer that this meeting is an example of democracy at work. You have come from all sections of the country, and you represent the labors of men and women who have moved with determination and intelligence to create a better way of living for themselves and their fellow-citizens.

It is particularly gratifying to be here today, because the work of the Department of the Interior has both a direct and an indirect bearing on problems which confront many of your member organizations. The Department is now operating and marketing the largest aggregate of hydroelectric capacity in the world, under policies which make it inevitable that there must be many points of contact between us.

You may rest assured of the wholehearted cooperation of the Department of the Interior, through its various power agencies, in efforts to work out our mutual problems. We are partners in a common cause.

I am deeply interested in the progress of rural electrification cooperatives. The bringing of electricity into the farm homes of America has been one of the outstanding accomplishments of the first half of the twentieth century. In 1935, when the Rural Electrification Administration was established, only 11 percent of our farms had electric current. By the middle of 1949, almost 80 percent of these farms had been electrified, and the program is continuing to grow.

I am certain that the rural people of America will never forget that the 843,000 miles of lines energized in the last 12 years have come into being because of the vision and energetic action of two great Presidents, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

President Roosevelt believed that the benefits to be derived through the proper development of our resources should not be turned over to individuals or corporations for their own financial enrichment, and that they should rightly go to the people themselves as the owners of these resources.

President Truman continues to maintain the leadership of this great movement to safeguard and develop our natural resources for the benefit of all the people, rather than for a privileged few. His courageous and determined stand has won Nation-wide approval. And he realizes with a strong conviction what the development of these resources means to the people of this country, and to the increasing strength of our national economy.

The cause of rural electrification is being well served, and its support by the present administration will continue.

As the second half of the twentieth century approaches, we are a growing and thriving Nation. The evidences of our prosperity are all about us, and our country experiences a sense of internal well-being.

We are moving forward today to make our economy even stronger and to plan an even greater security for the people of America. Only recently the President outlined the objectives we should set for ourselves. He told us that our present national income of $225,000,000,000 can be increased greatly, that we can soon achieve a national output of $300,000,000,000. And that family income during the second half of this century can reach a level three times that we now know.

The prodigious effort and the steady production needed to achieve such a goal is obvious to all of us. And along with the human energy we shall devote to this effort, we shall have to develop and utilize most wisely, and with great efficiency, the natural resources which belong to us as a people and which promise to serve our needs well.

Your organization knows, and the Department of the Interior is well aware, that the importance of power in our expanding economy cannot be overestimated. It has become as essential to farm and city, and it is, in fact, the lifeblood of our Nation.

The generation of electrical energy is now at an all-time peak, but its production by all agencies, public and private, cannot keep abreast of demands. Fortunately for our country, we have been blessed with vast natural resources which can be developed to make available to us a tremendous amount of electrical power.

It is particularly important that we recognize the national need for low-cost electricity, for here is a key to thriving farms and industries. It is precisely this low-cost power which the development of our water resources is making possible and will continue to produce. The reclamation programs in the West and the power developments in the Tennessee Valley and the Southwest are demonstrating that power can be made available to satisfy national demands, and that power can be produced at lowered costs.

It is here and elsewhere that the interests of people served by rural electric cooperatives tie in closely with the efforts now being made, and to be made in the future, to harness the water in our rivers. Recognizing this very close relationship, I want to talk briefly about some of the things we have accomplished by working together, and of some of the problems still to be solved.

As you know, the Congress long ago laid down the policy that public bodies and cooperatives shall have preference in the distribution of power from Federal plants in order that its advantages may be as widespread as possible. This advantage for consumers, as the objective of national policy, has not always been simple of accomplishment. After power is generated, there remains the problem of delivering it to the public agency, the cooperative, and the consumer.

In many cases, this has meant that the building of power projects, made possible after long and strenuous effort by the people, has been but the first step in the delivery of low-cost power to homes, farms, and cities. The transmission of this power is all-important, and it has been the subject of much conflicting debate, and of frequently bitter conflict. Even today, those who would deny the right of the people to own and manage their resources continue to exert pressures aimed to prevent your Government from transmitting power to you over lines you build.

The right of the people to transmit their power to the places where it is needed has been established in our national policy, but the unending and vigilant cooperation of all of us will continue to be needed to safeguard this right.

In the meantime, the Department of the Interior is moving ahead at a record rate in setting up facilities for the trunk-line transmission of energy from power plants now operating or under construction. At the same time, it is making numerous cooperative arrangements with rural electric groups to insure to them power distribution at low rates as rapidly as possible.

The power policy of the Department of the Interior, based on several acts of Congress, is aimed at the accomplishment of certain specific objectives, and I want to repeat them at this point. Federal dams shall include, where feasible, facilities for generating electrical energy. Preference in power sales shall be given to public agencies and cooperatives. Power disposal shall be for the particular benefit of domestic and rural consumers. Power shall be sold at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles. Disposal shall be such as to encourage widespread use, and to prevent monopolization.

The Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Southwestern Power Administration are all vitally concerned with rural electrification, and are working closely with many of your component cooperatives in furthering this power policy. This same vital concern will characterize, I am sure, other power agencies which may be established in the future.

Here are some examples of our cooperative relationship: The Kerr-Anaconda and the Havre-Shelby lines in Montana, the west side lines in California, and the Flatiron-Brighton line in Colorado have all been approved after considerable controversy. The Havre-Shelby line is particularly significant and illustrative of the objective I have been discussing.

Although Fort Peck power has been available since 1946 for marketing by the Department of the Interior, only limited transmission facilities have been available for wheeling this power to some cooperatives. Other cooperatives were starved out or received the small amounts that were offered from other sources. The Havre-Shelby line was fought bitterly every step of the way, but, with last year's authorization the poles are going up, the wire is being strung, and we are well on our way to serving four cooperatives in the Havre-Shelby area.

We have been successful also in removing the restriction on installation of generating units at the Canyon Ferry power plant in Montana. As the matter now stands, the Bureau of Reclamation can install and operate its own generating units instead of providing space for the installation of units by a private utility for its exclusive benefit from this public construction.

These two examples of our efforts to serve cooperatives in Montana are not unique, and have been mentioned to indicate the direction of our efforts to work closely with your member groups. There are many other examples.

The Southwestern Power Administration has recently entered into contracts with four generation and transmission cooperatives within the area it serves. These contracts provide that the Southwestern Power Administration will lease and operate high-voltage transmission lines constructed by the cooperatives, that it will purchase the entire output of steam generating plants they construct, and that it will supply the entire power requirements of the cooperatives at substantially reduced rates.

Such contracts as these will be mutually beneficial to the Government and the cooperatives. The steam power from cooperative plants will firm up the Government's hydroelectric power. The entire facilities of the Government will be made available to the cooperatives, which will give them a more dependable lower-cost power supply. Finally, the cost of generation in the cooperative plants will be reduced by higher load-factor operation as a result of the contracts.

Results like these are but another indication of the interrelationship of rural electric cooperatives and the federally constructed projects already at work in this country. This mutual interdependency will increase as we strive to satisfy more of our national power needs.

The speed and the completeness we shall achieve in this effort to feed electric energy to the Nation will be determined by the clarity with which we envision our common goal and by the support we continue to secure from the people. If the programs of the Department of the Interior and the Rural Electrification Administration are to be maintained in all their strength and potentiality, the work of such public-spirited organizations as your own will be very much needed.

It is through such organizations that the Administration and the Congress find support in combating those forces which would subordinate public power to their own personal profit. If we continue to work together toward our mutually understood objectives, we shall be able to achieve great progress for the welfare of the Nation's people.

What are the things we can accomplish in the future?

During the 17 years in which I have been with the Department of the Interior, I have seen 86 percent of the present 3,000,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric capacity installed on western rivers and streams. Our 6-year program for the Bureau of Reclamation alone has for its objective nearly doubling this capacity of public plants, and we have planned the installation of 2,300,000 additional kilowatts.

To this amount will be added 650,000 kilowatts of installed capacity in plants under construction by the Corps of Engineers, which will be marketed by our Bureau of Reclamation. Approximately 500,000 more

kilowatts will be brought into the Columbia Valley by the Engineers, to be marketed by the department through the Bonneville Power Administration. About 300,000 kilowatts will be marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration.

But even these figures are dwarfed by the ultimate possible production from the hydroelectric development of our water resources. The Federal Power Commission has estimated this potential at 77,000,000 kilowatts. With our country living in peace, and with our economy expanding, we should certainly be able to install 25,000,000 kilowatts of capacity within the next 15 years.

The thought of such an achievement ought to stir the imagination of all of us who are concerned with the electrifying of rural America. With REA lines tied into such a system, worries about the extent of the next fuel bill for individual plants, or about keeping the current flowing if the fuel supply is not available, will be a matter of much less significance. At the same time, the problems of fluctuating rates will be solved, and your cooperatives can move forward with a sense of security now too often lacking.

Our scientists speak occasionally of the possibility that the rays of the sun may some day be put to work. But right now the water which is deposited on our high mountains is being captured and put to work as it falls away to the sea, and it is the one great source of power we have which does not expend some of our valuable natural resources.

By constructing great storage reservoirs, we are able to regulate the flow of a river and ensure a water supply for power, and for irrigation in dry seasons, through holding back water near its source and by preventing floods as rain comes too heavily.

The benefits other than power production which come from our vast reclamation projects may, at first glance, lack immediate interest to rural electric cooperatives who are your members. But I urge you to study them closely for your objectives are closely related to their purposes.

The building of dams was begun for the purpose of irrigating arid areas. The public-power program got its start in 1905 as a very incidental phase of reclamation when a 1,000-kilowatt generator was constructed on an irrigation project in Arizona. Since that time, the Federal reclamation program has brought irrigation water to more than 5,000,000 acres of arid western land.

For each of the last 4 years, the gross crop production from this federally irrigated acreage has totaled more than a half-billion dollars. Those of you from the Western States know what your land would be like today without irrigation.

It is from these projects to water our dry land, by the building of dams and reservoirs, that our great hydroelectric production has sprung. The separate benefits of irrigation, or flood control, or power production are valuable to the Nation in themselves. Taken together, they constitute an integrated program of water-resources utilization, multipurpose in nature, from which there will continue to flow profits to our economy large in their potentialities for the people's enrichment.

At the present time, of course, the area served by these projects for which the Department of the Interior is responsible lies within the Western States. I am glad to report that a sizable share of the additional kilowatt capacity the Government is already developing will be in an area which we all have recognized as needing special emphasis. This is the great Missouri River Basin where the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army are pushing forward with the greatest program of river development in the history of mankind. And in the development of our great river basins, I am aware of and cannot overlook the other values that must be safeguarded.

The Congress determined in 1944 that something should be done about bringing the Missouri under control. Since the end of the war, we have been making great strides in this program, which will permit the development of an estimated 2,500,000 kilowatts of installed power capacity, the irrigation of some 5,000,000 acres of land now subject to the hazards of uncertain weather, and the achievement of other multiple benefits of modern resource development.

Power production and transmission are being firmly and carefully related to the physical and financial structure of this program. The initial power plant will be placed in operation during this summer at Kortes Dam on the North Platte River in Wyoming. Additional capacity will be added rapidly with the completion of two dams on the Missouri in 1954.

There has been an unprecedented demand for the initial block of power, and applications for it have far exceeded available capacity. We have many reasons to believe that the needs of cooperatives within a 150-mile radius of these big dams will be cared for. In order to avoid needless duplication of transmission lines by generating cooperatives, we are already proceeding with an advance construction program of transmission lines in North Dakota, and we are studying the possibility of a similar program in South Dakota. We expect to be able to meet REA needs well in advance of the availability of power from the two dams I have mentioned by wheeling REA-generated power over federally owned lines.

This is another example of the kind of cooperative arrangement between our Department and cooperatives which can result in a substantial saving to both. Others could be described if time permitted.

The operating agencies responsible for marketing power in the Department of the Interior have been negotiating wheeling contracts with private utilities as well as with public agencies. I want to assure you that there is no arrangement, present or contemplated, which will affect the preference status of rural cooperatives. These wheeling arrangements represent a sincere effort on our part to make power available to cooperatives at the earliest possible date, and at the lowest rates consistent with repayment requirements as provided by applicable Federal laws and sound-business practices. Contracts will be made only when the rights of preference customers are protected.

Cooperation in the development and use of public power has been close between the Department of the Interior and the groups you represent. I hope that it will be increasingly a practice of the future. We shall make it our business to understand your needs, and to give them careful consideration in the execution of our programs.

I urge your members, in turn, to make it their business to study the meaning and the impact of water-resource development, and to grasp clearly what it will mean to them in its future.

We are all joined in a mighty national movement to develop our natural resources, and to put them to use for the benefit of all our people. As our farms and industries grow in production to expand our national economy, the need for low-cost power from our rivers will continue to increase. Considerable attention is already being directed toward the study of water and power potentialities in some of our eastern areas, particularly in the New England States.

President Truman, recognizing the impressive importance of an adequate water supply, recently appointed a commission to make a thorough study of the problem. This Commission is already at work, and considerable progress toward a final report has been made.

Two New England governors have recently gone on record as favoring river development for the production of electric power from their rivers.

The people in New England, awakening to the realization that rates for electric energy are higher in that area than in any other part of the country, are discovering that less is being done in their homes, on their farms, and in their factories by electrical methods than elsewhere in the Nation. The present Congress will soon consider an amendment to the flood-control bill, by Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, which would establish a New England commission of Federal and State representatives to make investigations and survey resources available.

We are presently organizing in the Department of the Interior the Southeastern Power Administration to market power from Army projects in the 10 Southeastern States. This organization, like others in the Department, will give preference in the marketing, over a 6-year period, of 1,500,000 kilowatts to cooperatives and public bodies. Since the projects in the Southeast are widely distributed, we hope and expect to be able to serve many of the REA groups either directly or through the generating and transmission cooperatives now being formed.

There is abundant evidence that the people of our country are becoming fully awake to the importance of their natural resources, and to the potentialities for human betterment which they promise. It is the intention of the Department of the Interior to continue our cooperation with your organization and other groups to make sure that these potentialities are fully realized.

We know, as you know, that the campaigns by selfish interests to defeat the people's will can be expected to continue. Legislation to sell power only at the bus bar, or the point of origin, will be pressed by those who would profit by such an arrangement. The development of public power will be called socialistic, and a threat to free enterprise.

But if we never falter in our devotion to the democratic principle that free men can direct their own affairs for their own greatest welfare, such campaigns will not succeed. Our Department, and your organization, will go on strengthening the democratic patterns which guide us to our common objectives.

Girl on a Train

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Girl on a Train," published in the New Hampshire Sunday News of March 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIRL ON A TRAIN

Mavis Benjamin of Nashua, the whilom apple blossom queen of Hillsborough County, is off to the National Capital this week, as the guest of the New Hampshire Sunday News and the New Hampshire Society of Washington. She will appear in the Capital's annual Cherry Blossom Festival, and may win the title of "National Cherry Blossom Queen."

Miss Benjamin—who placed near the top in last year's Miss New Hampshire contest—was chosen for the Washington trip by the

Bulletin News on extremely short notice, after an urgent telephonic appeal from the New Hampshire Society. This newspaper considers itself a most excellent, as well as totally disinterested judge of feminine pulchritude and charm. We will back Miss Benjamin against the field, and feel certain she would win the national title if only the choice were left to a board of flesh-and-blood experts instead—as it happens—to the decree of pure chance involved in the spinning of a wheel.

Whether or not fortune brings her the title, Miss Benjamin will remain queen of the Hillsborough apple orchards. A small anecdote will illustrate why we think her freshness and lack of sophistication, as well as her good looks, entitle her to this claim. It had been our plan to send her on to Washington by herself, to be met there by a chaperone furnished by the New Hampshire Society. Miss Benjamin demurred. She felt she should get her chaperone at this end, and make the trip with her. Questioning developed that Merta, who is 23 and a professional model had never spent a night away from home—except with relatives—and had never gone even so far as New York on a train.

We were glad to accede to her wishes, and glad to send her to Washington as the glamorous but unspoiled symbol of all the nice New Hampshire girls who spend most of their nights at home, and seldom get the chance to go anywhere on trains.

Letter From James K. Knudson to Hon. Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter sent to me under date of March 24, 1950, by Mr. James K. Knudson, who has recently been nominated to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The letter is in the form of questions and Mr. Knudson's answers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 24, 1950.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: It was my privilege Wednesday March 22 to appear before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which you are a member, in connection with Senate consideration of my appointment by the President to the Interstate Commerce Commission. During the hearing acting chairman Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut, suggested that it would be in keeping with your informal request if I submitted to you answers to certain questions which, I understand, you would have propounded had you been present at the hearing. The acting chairman handed to me two sets consisting of five pages of such questions, and I propose herein to answer them to the best of my present ability. I am sure you will realize that I am not presently acquainted with all of the problems implied by the questions to the extent that I hope to be as a commissioner, and that, therefore, some of my answers must be somewhat tentative. I shall answer the questions in the order in which they appear:

1. "What is your theory as to desirable rate making in the field of domestic transportation?"

I can truthfully say that I have no theories or predilections concerning this matter. I believe that the Commissioners and the Interstate Commerce Commission staff should be governed by the rate-making principles set forth by the Congress in the several parts of the Interstate Commerce Act, and particularly by the National Transportation Policy and section 15a of part I, and similar sections in other parts of the act.

2. "Do you believe that the free play of economic forces alone should govern in the transportation field?"

The answer to this question is obviously "No," for a "Yes" answer, as I understand the question, would suggest the desirability of no regulation whatsoever. Again, I refer to, and propose to be governed by, the intention of Congress in the National Transportation Policy, as it relates to this question.

3. "Do you believe that 'lowest possible cost of transportation' is always the cheapest form of transportation, and do you believe that such a standard must preserve a fair, compensatory return to the carriers?"

I do not believe that the lowest possible cost transportation is always the cheapest, in the long run. Unless competition is preserved in a balanced form there is always the possibility that the cheapest form of transportation will overcome other forms and be left as a monopoly in the field. Obviously, no carrier can operate long in the public interest without a fair compensatory return.

4. "Do you believe that one form of transportation, in competition with other and weaker forms, should be tolerated to make rates which either are noncompensatory, or made at no higher than 'out-of-pocket' cost levels?"

Noncompensatory rates are not lawful under the Interstate Commerce Act. But the zone of reasonableness in rate making is flexible, and depends to a large extent on the judgment of regulatory agencies. Such agencies should be governed in the exercise of that judgment by the intention of the framers of the act to prevent "destructive competitive practices."

5. "Do you agree that by such rate-making practices the stronger of the competing forms must inevitably drive the weaker forms out of business?"

Pursuant to the national transportation policy, it is incumbent upon the Commission to so administer the act as to develop, coordinate, and preserve the national transportation system by water, highway, and rail, as well as by other means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense. So long as the Commission keeps this congressional mandate in mind there should be no danger of one form of transportation driving another form out of business.

6. "Are you acquainted with the highly essential role played in the war, at a time of high urgency, by the seagoing vessels of the coastwise and intercoastal fleets of the United States?"

This question calls for a "Yes" or "No" answer, and the answer is "Yes." This affirmative answer should be implemented by the recognition of the need for coastwise and intercoastal transportation media, both for purposes of national defense and in the interest of a balanced transportation system. I think it is only fair to add that I am also cognizant of the vital role played by motor carriers, pipe lines, freight forwarders, and railroads in the war effort.

7. "Are you familiar with the serious difficulties being experienced in preserving these vital facilities, or forms of water transportation because of the intensive competition of rival forms?"

This question also calls for a "Yes" or "No" answer, and the answer is "Yes," but perhaps I should add: Domestic coastwise and intercoastal water transportation is presently undergoing severe operating difficulties. Even though the national transportation policy has fully observed, other steps may prove to be necessary to preserve their vitality as a national defense transportation medium. It is to be hoped that new and more efficient operating methods will be discovered and employed by domestic water carriers that will offset the burden of some of their rising costs of operation.

8. "Were such evidence placed before you, would you not be disposed, as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to act affirmatively and to the fullest extent of the powers conferred on the Commission in the direction of safeguarding against the elimination or crippling of these forms of domestic water transportation?"

Yes, as a Commissioner, I would, of course, be bound by the terms of the Interstate Commerce Act as a whole, but it may well be that further study of this problem would convince even the most objective thinker that the Interstate Commerce Commission, acting by itself, cannot solve the problem in its totality.

9. "Are you acquainted with the extent to which the Interstate Commerce Commission has admonished one particular form of competition against rate-making practices calculated to destroy other forms?"

I am partially acquainted with the extent to which the Commission has admonished carriers to cease destructive competition. Where the threat of destruction is real and has been proved of record, it may well be that mere admonition is not sufficient. Again, I refer to the binding provision of the national transportation policy.

10. "Are you acquainted with what has been identified as 'judicial restraint,' whereby the judiciary has liberally construed the powers of administrative and regulatory bodies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission?"

If by "judicial restraint" is meant the reluctance of Federal courts to overturn the administrative findings of fact of regulatory bodies, I am acquainted with the doctrine. It has been otherwise identified as the doctrine of administrative finality. The courts have gone a long way in the direction of honoring findings of fact made by administrative tribunals. The extent to which this doctrine has become rooted makes it ultra important for such agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission to decide issues only on the basis of fair and complete showings of the facts. The enactment of the administrative Procedure Act reflects an added intention of Congress that the findings of regulatory agencies be made on the basis of substantial evidence, and affords the reviewing court a wider discretion to review facts than formerly declared.

11. "Conceding that the great values of such bodies, as viewed by the courts, turn on ability to cope with the highly technical and complex character of the business to be administered or regulated, would you agree with the suggestion that when such bodies, thought of as possessing a quasi-judicial status, move too far in their judicial procedures and concepts, they tend to destroy their effectiveness, and frustrate the purposes for which they were designed and created?"

It is my understanding that the Interstate Commerce Commission possesses three powers incident to the will of Congress: (1) a quasi-legislative power, pursuant to which it makes rates for the future, among other things, (2) an administrative power, pursuant to which it handles its day-to-day business, and administers such legislation as that requiring boiler inspection, prescription of safety measures, etc., and (3) a quasi-judicial power, pursuant to which it can, inter alia, award reparations on a basis similar to that of a Federal court. Obviously, the Commission could destroy its effectiveness by moving farther than the law allows in any of these fields.

12. "In the light of the highly technical field of transportation and of the complexities of our present economic environment, do you believe that the primary functions of such administrative and regulatory bodies are effectively performed by the assumption of a status of an umpire?"

Formerly, it could be said that the Commission was, in a way, only an umpire in the field of transportation because of limitations in the law, but since 1920, when the original act was amended to broaden the Commission's powers, and particularly since the water carrier, motor carrier, pipe line, and freight forwarder parts have been added, the Commission acts in fact as a regulatory agency, and no longer "simply calls strikes-outs and foul balls."

The questions answered below are from the second list submitted by you to the acting chairman, and I have used the same numbering as appears therein:

1. "Do you believe the maintenance and development in full vigor of common carriers by water, operating self-propelled vessels in the domestic trades, is necessary to the national economy and the national defense?" (This is a paraphrase of the statement of policy in the Merchant Marine Act, 1946.)

I am familiar with the declaration of policy in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The question is not a complete paraphrase of that policy. But I do believe the Interstate Commerce Commission should be constantly aware of all declarations of congressional policy that have an effect upon the administration of the Interstate Commerce Act. Stated otherwise, there should be proper correlation and enforcement of all laws enacted by Congress. I observe, again, however, that the Interstate Commerce Commission is primarily bound by the statement of national transportation policy given as a prelude to the Interstate Commerce Act. In all of this legislation, common carriers by water are assured the right of healthy existence.

2. "Are you familiar with the postwar problems and difficulties of water carriers operating self-propelled vessels in the domestic trades?"

The answer is "Yes," but I would expect to become even more fully informed through Commission channels and otherwise concerning problems that might arise of which I should take cognizance.

3. "What do you understand to be such problems and difficulties?"

So far as I am presently informed, the root of the water-carrier problem is increased operating costs. Whether such costs have been increased disproportionately with the operating costs of other forms of transportation is a question that will have to be decided on the basis of established comparative facts. It certainly is not a matter that I would care to prejudge. Allegations of unduly depressed rates, noncompensatory rates, and destructive competitive practices, regardless of what transportation agency they are directed against, should have the most painstaking scrutiny of any regulatory agency sifting the charges. The Commission has ample powers under the Interstate Commerce Act to deal with these problems.

4. "Are you familiar with the decline in number and capacity of self-propelled vessels operated in the domestic trades under Commission regulation?"

The answer is "No," except in a very general way, my understanding being that fewer vessels are now operating in intercoastal and coastwise trades than prior to the war.

5. "What is your position on the question whether the railroads should be allowed to maintain depressed rates on a level lower than normal rates where the principal object of such rate-making practice is to destroy or impair competitive water service?"

I believe I have already answered this question in my answers to questions No. 4 and No. 8 above, in the first set of questions:

6. "The Commission has from time to time in connection with general rate increases admonished rail carriers to adjust unnecessarily depressed rates. What has the Commission done to see that its admonitions have been followed? If nothing, why not?"

I regret that I cannot answer this question, because I do not know fully what the Commission has done, nor would I know its reasons for any action or inaction.

7. "You recognize that it is the duty of the Commission to maintain and develop a healthy and adequate coordinated system of transportation for the Nation. Indeed, was this not the plea of the Commission to Congress at the time it sought and successfully obtained jurisdiction over domestic water carriers? The foregoing being the case what if any affirmative rather than passive action has the Commission taken to fulfill its obligation?"

I believe I have fully covered my intended approach to these problems in the answers I have given above under the first set of questions Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 9.

8. "Since you recognize that restoration of the domestic trades is important to the national defense and national economy, would you please tell us what you or the Commission have done or propose to do to restore such services to their proper position in the national transportation picture?"

It would be manifestly impossible for me to foretell what the Commission proposes to do with respect to the matters contemplated by this question. I can only pledge that my actions vis-à-vis water carriers will be governed by the context and intent of the laws, by the factual records that are made by the parties of interest, and with a view to protecting the public interest in the premises.

9. "Do you believe the Interstate Commerce Commission should take the initiative in attempting to solve the problems and difficulties of water carriers in the domestic trades, or do you feel that it should merely await some action by those carriers?"

I am not adverse to the Interstate Commerce Commission's taking action on its own motion whenever circumstances warrant. The Commission has undertaken many investigations on its own initiative and, it is my understanding, has been handicapped in this field, in part, by budgetary limitations. In view of the Commission's heavy case load, I believe it is not inappropriate to suggest that there is a responsibility resting upon the various transportation agencies to keep the Commission acquainted fully with their problems. Although the Commission has an affirmative duty to maintain and preserve a national transportation system, this duty should not encompass the proper functions of the private managers of the Nation's transportation properties.

10. "A proceeding entitled 'Pacific Coastwise Rates' (Docs. No. 29722) is pending before the Commission. Following the release of an interim report, further hearings were held in February 1949, and the case was argued before and submitted to the full Commission in July 1949. The water carriers in Pacific coastwise trade have repeatedly advised the Commission they could not plan adequate resumption of service until that case had been decided, yet it is still pending. Can you offer some explanation for the reason for the delay in deciding that proceeding?"

I can offer no explanation for the Commission's not having decided the issues involved in this proceeding.

11. "Is there any Commissioner in the Interstate Commerce Commission who has had any experience in or familiarity with water transportation and its problems?"

I do not know.

12. "Do you believe that some member or group of members of the Commission should be delegated the prime responsibility of familiarizing themselves with the operation and problems of water carriers?"

I think that all Commissioners should become familiar with the operations and problems of water carriers and other transportation agencies as well. At present writing, I would not know whether water carrier matters within the Commission are sufficient to warrant the establishment of additional units for purposes of giving such matters expedited considerations.

13. "How many members of the Commission's staff have had actual experience in the field of water transportation?"

I do not know.

14. "Do you believe that the problem of competitive rates as between rail and water carriers is a pressing problem confronting the Commission at this time?"

Yes.

15. "Has the Commission done anything, other than deciding cases presented by complaining parties, a case-by-case approach to the problem, to resolve the problem of rate relationships as between competing types of carriers?"

I do not believe that the Commission's approach has been on the limited basis suggested by the question. If there are areas needing additional exploration, the Commission might well take the initiative within the limitations of its resources.

16. "What explanation do you have for the Commission's failure to attempt to work out some general policy covering the intercarrier competitive rates?"

I do not believe it would be appropriate for me to be either an exponent or an apologist for the Commission.

17. "The Transportation Act has been operated to abolish coastwise and intercoastal trade. Do you interpret the Commission's responsibilities under the act to accomplish and continue such abolition of competition?"

The first sentence of the question rests on an unsupported assumption. It is my understanding that considerable coastwise and intercoastal trade is now developing. The Commission should foster and protect this development to the extent authorized and directed by the national transportation policy and under the other terms of the Interstate Commerce Act affecting all carriers involved.

I trust that the foregoing answers reflect my earnest desire to be fair and impartial, and, to the best of my human ability, to administer and interpret the law without fear or favor.

I am returning herewith the two sets of questions handed to me.

Respectfully,

JAMES K. KNUDSON.

Loyalty Hysteria Boon to United States Foes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the Record a constructive and incisive commentary on the current headlining of loyalty charges, written by John A. Kennedy, editor and publisher of the San Diego (Calif.) Journal of March 25, 1950. Mr. Kennedy's article is entitled "Loyalty Hysteria Boon To United States Foes."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

From the Publisher's Desk—Loyalty Hysteria Boon to United States Foes

These are troublesome times in Washington.

Anyone in Government who has ever been known to have had a liberal thought or an acquaintance of liberal leanings—no matter how long ago—is considered by some politicians to be fair game in the latest klieg-light headline hunt in Washington.

The easiest way to explain away this new development of hysteria on the Potomac is to say that a brash young Senator with an inflated ego (Joseph McCarthy, Republican, Wisconsin) is trying to smear the State Department in particular and the administration in general for his own selfish political motives. Unfortunately that is not the whole story.

There is an uneasy feeling that this is an inspired fishing expedition type of smear campaign. It goes like this:

Fill the air with charges, even though there is not a scrap of evidence to substantiate them, with the hope that some kind of case, even though a weak one, may be made to stick in one instance. Then the cry: "See! Washington is filled with Reds."

In a more serene period of history, this whole thing could be dismissed as a crazy political side show. But in a period when our Government is trying desperately to mobilize its full moral, economic, and political strength to stave off another world war, these antics give a great measure of comfort to our enemies.

The men in the Politburo may not have outlined the pattern for this campaign, but certainly it is doing for them what they have been unable to do for themselves. It is creating confusion and even distrust, not alone among some Americans, but also among some of our friends abroad.

It is easy to shrug off a charge that our Secretary of State is a "bad security risk" as just another political maneuver. But think what this charge means to the propagandists in the Politburo. It is not difficult to picture them gleefully congratulating each other on "our new allies in Washington" who have joined in the campaign to discredit democracy everywhere.

Can the loyalty program be divorced from politics?

The answer will in a large measure determine how Congress, as well as the country, will survive this latest subversive onslaught from those who, in the words of The President Harry Truman, see in "every fingle worm a spreading adder."

Political issues can be debated—and debated fully, and any and all so-called bad security risks can be weeded out of the Government, without the whole structure of Federal Government being held up to ridicule and scorn before the entire world. Anyone who rejects this reasonable assumption shows little faith in American processes.

President Truman acted wisely, in our opinion, when he established the Loyalty Review Board and named as its chairman Seth Richardson, an outstanding Republican lawyer. We think Mr. Richardson and the Board have performed a valuable public service, despite the noisy attacks from the far left and the far right.

The country is growing tired of the way many of the congressional hearings are conducted. Remember the Howard Hughes fiasco? That hearing, strangely enough, was conducted by the same body, the War Investigating Committee, that won such a great reputation for fairness during the war. The reason lies in the method of conducting the hearing.

The work of the War Investigating Committee was so outstanding that the then Senator Truman was given the Democratic nomination for Vice President in 1944.

That committee conducted its investigations on a nonpolitical basis. It heard witnesses in executive session; only when the facts seemed to warrant public action did it present the matter before public hearings. Witnesses were told that charges had been made against them and they were given ample opportunity to present their cases in advance—before it was hauled before the klieg lights. As a result, the committee performed a great public service.

Remember the Pearl Harbor investigation? Almost endless testimony and political bickering resulting in 39 volumes that have been read by few people. This was due, at least in part, to the method of conducting the hearing as well as the political climate prevailing at the time.

Contrast that investigation with the work of the Hoover Commission. The work of this Commission largely has been kept out of the realm of partisan politics—and we feel one of the major restraining influences has been the presence on the Commission of a group of outstanding private citizens.

We regret that the work of the Loyalty Review Board, composed of the same high-type Americans, has not been supported with similar vigor by more Members of Congress. Possibly this is due to the fact that some feel it is an administrative agency far removed from Congress.

If this is true, the problem could be rectified by the establishment of a joint commission, composed of Members of Congress as well as outstanding private citizens, to hear and investigate loyalty charges against prominent officials and to review cases that proceed through the normal agency—loyalty board channels.

And in addition, Congress should give serious thought to the promulgation of certain rules of fair play, to assure basic rights to every person under attack.

As Senator Lucas has suggested, these might well include: (1) the right to compel the committee to subpena at least a limited number of defense witnesses; (2) the right to appear personally before the committee, before any charges are publicly aired; (3) the right to cross-examine witnesses, personally or through counsel. We believe too that Congress might well reexamine its privilege of immunity.

If Congress is to turn on the klieg lights every time some politically ambitious individual hauls out a blunderbuss and aims it at a public official, then Congress, for its own good, should give the most careful consideration to the overhauling of its investigating machinery. If it fails to act in that direction, it may seriously damage its own prestige.

Every American has the duty as well as the right to insist that Government officials be competent, honest, and loyal. But if loyalty probes are not conducted on a more sensible, honorable basis, our Nation's prestige will suffer in the eyes of the world. This we can ill afford.

JOHN A. KENNEDY,
Editor and Publisher.

Alaska's Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very excellent article entitled "Alaska's Defenses," written by Marquis Childs and published in today's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ALASKA'S DEFENSES—DANGER POINT IN ECONOMICS

(By Marquis Childs)

A decision has been taken by the Joint Chiefs of Staff which illustrates all the problems of the Defense Establishment in relation to that much-debated word, "economy." Military installation of the United States in the Aleutian Islands off Alaska are, with one or two exceptions to be abandoned.

This is certain to cause both public and bureaucratic clamor. The decision was taken with a full realization of the risks involved, including the risk of public controversy.

The Aleutian chain extends for about 900 miles into the North Pacific. The islands are, for the most part, barren and fog-shrouded. The most important base to be given up is on Shimya, which is one of the few in the outer chain that is so flat planes can come in for a landing over water without difficulty.

Northwest Airlines uses Shimya as a base on the route to Japan. If this stop is abandoned, Northwest in all probability will have to change to a route on which another line is already operating. The Civil Aeronautics Board is expected to protest the abandonment of Shimya.

During World War II the Navy developed at Adak in the Aleutian chain a fairly large base. According to present plan, this will be maintained as a naval base, if only on a stand-by basis.

In the lengthy debate by the Joint Chiefs the decision on the Aleutians was based finally on the following reasoning. Possession of the outer Aleutians is of little value militarily either to the United States or to its potential enemy, the Soviet Union. The islands are extremely difficult to supply and the persistent fog greatly reduces their value as operational air bases.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff were fully aware of the public reaction should the islands be taken by the Russians in the event of war. An immediate demand would arise that they be retaken. The Joint Chiefs of Staff would resist that demand on the ground that they would be more of a liability than an asset to the enemy.

In World War II United States troops recaptured Attu and Kiska in the Aleutian chain from the Japs. The assault operations were badly bungled and unnecessarily costly.

As to the savings, one estimate is as high as $30,000,000. This is believed, however, to include savings to be made on the mainland of Alaska as well as in the island chain. The defense line for the mainland is based on Fairbanks and Anchorage in the belief that the wild and almost empty terrain to the west would be little use to an invader.

Gov. Ernest Gruening of Alaska has publicly expressed his deep concern over the safety of Alaska, suggesting as others have that it might become the Pearl Harbor of another war. Total request in the 1951 budget for Alaskan defenses was $137,000,000. House economizers have cut this to $66,000,000. Gruening believes that not less than a billion dollars should be spent on Alaska's defenses during the coming fiscal year.

Gruening is an ardent advocate of statehood for the Territory, believing that only in this way can Alaska obtain funds sufficient for its defenses. The House already has approved a statehood bill and a Senate committee is expected to start hearings. Certain Senators have been using delaying tactics to prevent a vote on statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

This is, of course, a political question with which the Joint Chiefs cannot concern themselves. On a related issue they are conducting a debate with the Bureau of the Budget.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have asked for $100,000,000 for housing desperately needed for troops in Alaska. Present facilities are woefully inadequate for the approximately 8,000 stationed there and an expansion program is essential to take care of the 25,000 now planned for the defense of the Anchorage-Fairbanks line.

The Budget Bureau has suggested that only $75,000,000 of this could at the most be spent in one fiscal year. The Joint Chiefs of Staff argue that construction must be speeded up and the full amount spent in a 12-month period if Alaskan defenses are to be put on a stable basis.

A somewhat similar argument is going on over whether $60,000,000 or $35,000,000 can be spent in 1 year for construction of the radar warning network around North America. The network is also vital to Alaskan defenses.

The outsider has no means of judging the merits of these individual arguments. But the belief is growing that when economies originally made by military men themselves are compounded first by committees of Congress and then by the House and Senate, the danger line has in fact been reached or passed.

Peace of Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very timely and thought-provoking editorial, entitled "Peace of Mind," which appeared in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram edition of March 28, 1950. The editorial follows:

PEACE OF MIND

Future historians and philosophers may, as Dr. George Gallup suggests, look back on this present period of man's experience as a time when men and women were sorely troubled—not by physical discomforts, but by an uneasy frame of mind, unhappiness and a seeking after a peace of mind that so often seems so elusive.

For extremely high percentages of the American people have confided to Dr. Gallup's pollsters that inner happiness and peace of mind are definitely getting worse for them, while their health and knowledge have been improving.

This seems, at first glance, a rather queer commentary on a civilization which has brought man more material comforts and luxuries than the richest and most powerful kings had a generation or so ago. American families have their automobiles, radios, televisions, and electric refrigerators, yet the indications are that happiness—real peace of mind—is somehow eluding them.

There is considerable verification for Dr. Gallup's findings, too. There has been a rising interest in psychiatry, and the psychiatrists' offices are crowded. Books—one of them in fact was called Peace of Mind—on attaining happiness and spiritual satisfaction have been selling at a phenomenal rate.

It is true, of course, that there have been powerful forces to destroy anyone's peace of mind. The atomic bomb, the world wars, the depression and the prevailing uncertainties of the age have all added up to inner conflict for many people. Yet Dr. Gallup's poll figures show, perhaps, one of the fundamental reasons for many cases of unhappiness. The American people say moral conduct and faith in religion have suffered severe setbacks in recent years. They have declined in about the same percentage as has man's peace of mind, according to those questioned by Dr. Gallup. There does seem to be a connection between the declining faith in religion and human unhappiness.

Centennial of Clinton, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I desire to include a recent excerpt from the Clinton Daily Item containing the address of State Representative Henry W. Pickford at the Clinton, Mass., centennial banquet on March 14:

"The next speaker is known to everyone in this hall," said Congressman Philip J. Philbin, the toastmaster, in introducing State Representative Henry W. Pickford.

"Born in Clinton, educated in our local schools where he distinguished himself not only as a student but as an athlete, able, prominent and successful lawyer, honest and courageous in his convictions, he has represented this district in the general court for several years. He has served our district with marked ability, earnestness and distinction.

"I am happy to present to respond to the toast 'Clinton and the general court,' Clinton's distinguished member of that body, the Honorable Henry W. Pickford."

Representative Henry W. Pickford, in responding to the toast, "Clinton and our general court," said:

"Congressman Philbin, Your Excellency, members of the clergy, Judge Buttrick, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

"To participate in a birthday party observing the one hundredth anniversary of a birth is indeed a rare privilege. It is also an occasion for joy and happiness which I am sure we all appreciate to the utmost.

"Commonly when marking an important milestone in the life of an individual one becomes retrospective and reminiscent about the days when the child was born. And it is none the less interesting to do so when observing the centennial of our municipality."

PETITIONS SIGNED BY 342 CITIZENS

"In January of 1850 eight petitions endorsing the idea of dividing Clintonville from Lancaster were signed by 342 citizens of Lancaster and through Representative E. W. Eldbrook of West Boylston, with a bill were filed with the General Court of Massachusetts on the 17th and 23d days of January in that year. Some of the petitioners were Charles G. Stevens, Seward H. Fiske, Andrew L. Fuller, Alanson Chace, Levi Harris, Nathaniel Hastings, E. W. Goodale, Franklin Forbes, James A. Weeks, Charles Paine, C. L. Swan, J. C. Howe, James C. Kittredge, and Nathaniel Rice."

THE REASONS

"The reasons for the establishment of the town of Clinton, as set forth in these petitions, were 'that a manufacturing village called Clintonville has recently sprung up in the south part of said town, containing already a population of nearly 1,000 persons, whilst its favorable location, with the amount of capital invested in manufacturers gives assurance of a large increase. That the inhabitants of Lancaster proper and of Clintonville have separate and distinct interests and wholly different business associations; that the distance from the center of the town renders it expensive, while their occupations make it highly inconvenient for citizens of Clintonville to meet with other citizens of Lancaster, as they are now required to do, to hold elections, and for other municipal purposes.'"

LANCASTER ACTS

"Following the filing of these papers, legal notice of the same was served upon the elected officials of the town of Lancaster. Thereafter, on February 15, 1850, Lancaster held a town meeting to take action on this question.

"At this meeting it was voted 'that a nominating committee be appointed by the chair to report a committee of five persons who are to confer with a like committee from Clintonville, and report as soon as may be, what terms, in their opinion ought to satisfy the town of Lancaster, to consent and not to oppose a division of the town and said committee reported the following: John G. Thurston, Silas Thurston, Jacob Fisher, Henry Lincoln, and Nathaniel Warner.'

"The meeting was adjourned for 40 minutes, after which time this committee reported to the meeting the terms desired and they were accepted by the voters. A committee of three, consisting of Henry Wilder, Benjamin Whittemore, and John G. Thurston, was then appointed to ensure the inclusion of these terms in the act of incorporation."

OPPOSING REVISIONS

"The birth of this child, Clinton, however, was not accomplished without protest. Then, as now, differences of opinion existed and divergent views prevailed. Seventy-six residents of Lancaster proper and forty-seven residents of the part to be set off filed remonstrances with the legislature protesting the proposal of separation. The former group asserted 'we do not believe that this ancient town of the Commonwealth ought to be dismembered'—and 'the difficulty of making any just division the increased expense which another town organization will require' justify the remonstrance. While one element of the second group thought that the distance between Clintonville and the center village was not enough to cause a division as it was 'but 3½ miles over a good road, level nearly the whole distance with railroad accommodations in addition; that the territory of the

new town is too small.' And another faction in Clintonville, apparently concerned about taxes, set forth as their objection that 'a very costly town hall has been erected for the accommodation of the whole town for their public business.'"

BILL ENACTED

"However, the bill to incorporate the town of Clinton was enacted into law and approved 100 years ago this date on Thursday, March 14, 1850, and emerged as chapter 72 of the acts of 1850. This act set forth the area of Clinton, its tax obligation, requirement to care for paupers, imposed the necessity of paying Lancaster $10,000 in six equal annual installments with interest as its share of any obligation due from Lancaster and provided the manner of holding the first municipal election.

"It is interesting to observe the matters of public concern considered by the legislature 100 years ago when Clinton was being incorporated."

SUBJECT BILLS IN 1850

"These include a petition to grant some aid to a blind Indian of the Dudley Tribe; another petition that persons coming into the Commonwealth from those States in which colored seamen are imprisoned on account of their color may be required to give bonds to keep the peace while in this Commonwealth, especially toward its colored citizens; a bill relating to the carrying of sling shots; one to prevent the adulteration of spirituous liquors and several bills for the abolition of capital punishment.

PROPHECY FULFILLED

"Thus, tonight, we of Clinton revel in the fulfillment of the prophecy of our forebears made 100 years ago in their assurance for the town of a large increase and congratulate all of our citizens who have in the past century contributed to the present development of the town of Clinton. And in the present-day atmosphere of public thought, even as 100 years ago, of regard for our distressed citizens, concern with racial questions and public welfare generally we hope the birthday anniversary 100 years hence will find a still greater, more forceful and outstanding town of Clinton.

"In conclusion we raise and hail Clinton on this anniversary and say, 'Happy birthday.'"

Moslems Enjoy Full Rights in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, reports from the little State of Israel show how to teach democracy by practicing it. Its citizens of the Moslem faith are receiving a full voice in running their own affairs as well as the affairs of the state. This is a most encouraging development in view of the many problems still facing the countries of the Near East, which at times appear to us to be insurmountable. Courts, schools, community councils, and settlements are being operated by and for the Moslem Arabs, who number in Israel, 120,000 people. Moslem tribunals are already functioning at Nazareth, Acre, Haifa, and Majdal, and a fifth tribunal will soon open in Jaffa. Moslem committees are cooperating with the Israel Ministry of Religious Affairs in providing care for orphans and the aged, and for religious libraries and mosques.

There are now reported to be 150 Moslem officials in the Israel Government, the highest of these being Sheik Taher el-Tabari who is Israel's first district judge for civil and religious matters. That freedom of worship and cultural autonomy are not merely paper ideals is attested by the fact that Moslem religious rites now are conducted in more than 70 mosques in Israel, and the Arabic language is being taught in 27 schools. The Government has also appropriated substantial funds for the development of Arab villages and farming.

These and many other facts indicate that the Moslem population of Israel is accorded and is enjoying the same privileges as all other citizens of this newest democratic state. I have long urged that if there was a minimum of interference on the part of outside forces, the Israeli and the Arabs would come to an early and complete understanding creating a better relationship between them and a lasting peace in that troubled area.

A Shameful Trick

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, we all know about a month ago the Republicans put on a great Lincoln Day celebration in Washington. Twelve or fourteen thousand attended this celebration and the price of admission was only $1.20 per person. The Government, through the tax on admissions, took 20 cents of that amount. A few days later the other party, whatever it may be called, Democrats or New Dealers, or a combination of both, put on a great show at a hundred dollars a plate, and paid absolutely nothing. They should have paid a tax of at least $100,000. When the President talks about closing loopholes he should not lose sight of this $100,000. He need not worry that he would be doing an injustice to persons earning small wages. Any person who can afford to pay $100 for a seat at one of these New Deal banquets surely can afford to comply with the law and pay the tax that he should pay.

Our distinguished and beloved colleague the gentleman from New York, Mr. DANIEL A. REED, has put out a very positive and pungent release with reference to that situation involving the legality of the action of the Treasury Department.

Mr. REED's statement is as follows:

Congressman DANIEL A. REED, Republican, of New York, ranking minority member of the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee, charged today that the Bureau of Internal Revenue's recent ruling exempting from the 20 percent amusement tax the proceeds of the Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day Rally was a shocking example of taxation by political connivance and political favoritism and that the Federal Government had been cheated out of over $100,000.

Congressman REED declared:

"In view of the position of the Bureau of Internal Revenue that the $1 paid to attend the Republican Lincoln Day Box Supper Rally at the Uline Arena in Washington was subject to the 20 percent amusement tax, I requested on February 20 the Bureau to advise me whether a similar tax was payable on the $100-per-person Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day Rally held in the Armory in Washington on February 10.

"After more than 1 month's delay I have just received the Commissioner's reply that the approximately $530,000 proceeds from the Democratic spree is not subject to either the admission or cabaret tax in the same manner that the proceeds from the Republican rally were held taxable. In view of the basic similarity of the two events, both of which included professional entertainment and political speeches, this ruling is a shocking example of taxation by political connivance and political favoritism. Although the Presidential henchmen hunger for the pennies paid by even our children in the form of the amusement tax on their movies, museums, playgrounds, county fairs, and many other simple pleasures, they avoid applying the amusement tax to any fund destined for the Democratic coffers for use in fostering their socialistic program.

"As a result of the Bureau's ruling, the Federal Government has been cheated out of over $100,000 in revenue. Even more significant than this is the revealing fact that the Democratic Party is unwilling to help the working men and women of America shoulder their tremendous tax burden.

"This type of tax discrimination and favoritism is indeed a new low in politics."

St. Patrick's Day Address by Hon. John Cashmore, President of the Borough of Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1950, the Honorable John Cashmore, president of the Borough of Brooklyn of the city of New York, delivered an inspiring address at the one hundred and first annual St. Patrick's Day banquet of the St. Patrick Society of Brooklyn. Under permission of the House heretofore granted me by unanimous consent, I include the text of Borough President Cashmore's address:

President Cronin, Father Flynn, distinguished guests, and members of the St. Patrick Society of Brooklyn, I feel, tonight, you are paying me a twofold honor.

To be your guest at this first annual dinner in your second century of progress is a rare distinction. But you have also given me the privilege to speak at your first annual gathering since that day last April—a day that will live in history—when Ireland threw off the yoke of bondage and became once more a free and independent nation.

So, I am grateful to your president, your officers, and to each and every one of you for this heart-warming act of friendship toward me.

The preceding speakers—and Father Flynn especially—have spoken this evening with great eloquence. I am sure that St. Patrick, looking down on this happy gathering, must be pleased. In fact, I would not be at all surprised, nor would some of you, if St. Patrick were to enter here and extend his blessing. Certainly the spirit is here, and I am not referring to the other kind of spirits which seem to go with an occasion of this kind.

Now, like many of you, I have never been fortunate enough to see the lakes of Killarney. Neither have I been privileged to visit where the River Shannon flows.

But, I am sure, I can find in my veins at least the one drop of Irish blood which, I know, your society requires for membership. I know, too, I can gain admittance in one other way. And that is by mentioning just two magic words, St. Patrick, that same password the American patriots used over 150 years ago—on the night of St. Patrick—when the British were evacuating the port of Boston.

That password, St. Patrick, is but one example, I think, of the manner in which the patriotism of the Irish has been interwoven in the whole history of America. To honor their patron saint, we, of America, need only to glance at the heroic deeds of the sons of St. Patrick in our own land. They are many and historic. And it is in the achievements of his sons that the true greatness of a good and loving father can be seen and appreciated.

From our earliest days, our Nation in its struggle for independence, had one of its greatest bulwarks in the Irish. Ireland set the example. In their own native land, and down through the centuries, the Irish laid down their lives in thousands to resist oppression. With such a history, is it any wonder that Irish immigrants should have played such a vital part in the founding and making of America?

The hopes, ambitions, and strivings of the Irish have always been for freedom. The principle upon which the American Nation was founded, the end to which it was dedicated, is that same freedom. Easy to explain, then, is the fact that the Irish immigrant has never found it difficult to be a faithful son of St. Patrick and a loyal citizen of the United States.

In rich full measure we have seen that American loyalty of the Irish immigrant. During the Revolution, more than one-half the soldiers in General's Washington's Continental Armies were Irish. Our own beloved Brooklyn was defended against the redcoats of Cornwallis by General Sullivan.

Indeed, if you gentlemen are willing to take the word of a statesman in the British House of Lords, with regard to the Revolution, I offer you the classical remark of Lord Mountjoy. In explaining the British disaster in America's War of Independence, he readily admitted England was defeated by "Irish emigrants."

So it is that in this year of 1950, Irishmen and the sons of Irishmen find no need to protest their American loyalty. For the Sons of St. Patrick have marched beneath the Stars and Stripes for a century and a half. Their bones lie beneath our every battlefield, their blood illuminates our history's every page. And the true measure of their greatness lies not merely in what they have done, but in that which they have not done. Comb the pages of America's history as you will. No traitor to this Nation will you find among them. Commodore Barrys, General Sullivans, Father Duffys you will find in profusion, but an Aaron Burr or a Benedict Arnold—never.

Yes; the Irish have given much to America—and to the world. And more than mere loyalty was theirs to give.

To France and Germany they brought Christianity and the love of God even as they brought liberty and the love of freedom to America. But the civilization they brought, the way of life they preached, was always taught—never imposed. It was a culture carried, not by the weapons of warriors—but borne on the lips of poets and scholars, who came to sing and teach of God and peace.

Throughout her long history, that same deep spirituality, that same love of peace remained the keynotes of Ireland's international conduct.

By a happy coincidence, it was one whose memory we honor tonight—the great John Boyle O'Reilly, who set forth in words undying the splendid record of Erin's peaceful statesmanship. O'Reilly's proud boast is one that few nations can equal and none can surpass:

"We have wronged no race, we have robbed no land,
We have never oppressed the weak;
And this to the face of Heaven is the noblest thing to speak."

Much of our own American credo of peace we see contained in that poetic statement of a nation's peaceful past. And happy, indeed, we in America should be, that this ancient and honorable race has been reborn this year in the family of free nations.

Ireland that has given so much to so many nations of the world in the past, today, like all other nations, needs the world. And the world needs Ireland—because a people that believes in peace and works for peace is sorely wanted in the councils of nations.

A world in agony cries out for men of faith and principle who will die if need be in defense of their faith and their principles.

With whole races enslaved by an alien Godless tyrant, oppressed people everywhere need the spark of hope and courage that can come only from men who have freely offered life and fortune for God and freedom.

If the races enslaved in Europe are ever to rise—and rise they must—they will need the inspiration of nations that have overcome a despot's rule.

Significant it is that the slave master of Europe and Asia has thrice vetoed the application of the Irish Nation for admission to the world forum we call United Nations. Eire can wear those three Russian rejections as medals of honor. For the world knows now that those medals of honor are the symbols of freedom and liberty. They are the credentials of free men who believe in the fatherhood of God and the dignity of man.

It is also significant, I think, that only 2 days ago the first American envoy of ambassadorial rank, ever to represent this Nation in the capital of the new Irish Republic, left for Dublin. By that gesture we acknowledge, we emphasize, that America stands on the side of men of principle, lovers of liberty, and defenders of freedom. By our action we indicate to a world seeking vainly in its councils for peace, that we Americans can commend to it the example of this brave and ancient Celtic nation, free at last after 700 years.

And in commending to the world this Irish Nation, we act in the hope that side by side with America she may help bring peace to a troubled universe.

God grant that Ireland and America whose destinies have been so long interwoven in struggles for lasting peace and freedom, may achieve together their hope of centuries.

And may Ireland whose brave sons gave their lives to fulfill the American dream of independence, may this glorious Ireland achieve her ambition of the ages, to be like America, one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Depletion—Parallel Cases in the Lumber and Mining Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, much consideration is being given at this time to depletion allowances made to mining companies for taxation purposes. To make a comparison between depletion allowance made to a small lumbering operation and a small mining operation, and ascertain the method by which depletion is computed in taxing these two basic industries by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, I have submitted parallel hypothetical cases to the Bureau and insert my letter and the Bureau's reply for the information of my colleagues:

MARCH 18, 1950.

Mr. GEORGE J. SCHOENEMAN,
Commissioner, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: With reference to the plan of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in making depletion allowances, I would be very pleased to have a statement concerning the depletion that would be allowed in the following case.

The Ale Co. owned a timber stand of 18,000,000 feet valued at $1 per thousand. Under their operating program, one-fourth or 1,000,000 feet would be cut and manufactured each year; and at the end of 18 years, this timber stand would be completely exhausted. What depletion is this company allowed annually?

And I would be very pleased to have a statement concerning the depletion that would be allowed in the following case:

The Byron Co. owns a lead-silver mine with an indeterminate quantity of ore. The company, by their mine operation program, will extract and process 10,000 tons of ore, valued at $10 per ton, that will be marketed annually. There is an indication that the ore deposits in the mine will be completely exhausted in 10 years. What depletion will be allowed annually to this company?

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 22, 1950.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WHITE: Reference is made to your letter dated March 10, 1950, relating to the depletion allowance provided by the Internal Revenue Code in the case of taxpayers who are in the timber business and the mining business.

With respect to the timber allowance in the case of the Ale Co., if the adjusted basis of this timber under section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code is $1 per thousand feet, then the annual depletion would ordinarily be computed by multiplying the number of thousands of board feet cut in

any year by $1. Of course, if exactly 1,000,000 feet were cut each year the annual allowance would be $1,000 or 10 percent of the total basis. Although depletion may be determined on the basis of the percentage of the total stand cut, as a rule it is simpler to multiply the units cut by the proper unit rate.

It may be noted, that if the taxpayer so elects in his return, the provisions of section 117 (k) (1) of the code are applicable. That is, the difference between the adjusted basis for depletion and the fair market value as of the first of the year for the timber cut during the year may be treated as a long term capital gain, provided the timber has been owned for more than 6 months prior to the beginning of the taxable year.

In the example cited, if the fair market value as of the first of the taxable year is $3 per thousand feet, then the difference between this figure and the adjusted basis may be treated as a long term capital gain under section 117 (j) as follows:

Fair market value of timber cut (1,000 at $3)	$3,000
Adjusted basis of timber cut (1,000 at $1)	1,000
Capital gain	1,000

If an election is made under section 117 (k) (1) then the fair market value of the timber cut during the year shall be considered to be the cost of the timber which was cut, in lieu of the actual cost or other basis of such timber, for all purposes for which such cost is a necessary factor.

With respect to the Byron Co. the percentage depletion would be 15 percent of $100,000 (10,000 tons at $10 per ton) gross annual income from the property, or $15,000, provided that the net income from the property before depletion was at least $30,000. If the net income from the property before depletion was less than $30,000 the allowable depletion would be 50 percent of such net income as provided in section 114 (b) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code. However, section 114 (b) (4) also provides that in no case shall the depletion allowance be less than it would be if computed with respect to the adjusted basis. Section 114 (b) (1). The depletion computed on the adjusted basis might be substantially greater than the percentage of income depletion.

Since information as to the cost or adjusted basis of the property under section 117 (b) (1) (B) is not available, and you state that the reserve of minerals is indeterminate, it is impossible for this office to compute the alternative allowance for depletion provided in the Internal Revenue Code. It would be highly desirable, however, for the taxpayer to make some reasonable estimate of the mineral reserves and determine the depletion allowable on the adjusted basis since the statute provides that the larger of the two computations is allowable in each year and that the basis shall be reduced by such amount. It might be necessary in some future year for this taxpayer to determine the correct adjusted basis for the purpose of determining gain or loss in the event of sale. Under such circumstances it would not be permissible to compute the adjusted basis on the theory that the reserves of mineral are indeterminate. Hence, some determination of the reserve should be made in the light of the facts which are known by the taxpayer even though such a determination of the reserve of mineral may be only a rough approximation.

If any further correspondence is necessary in connection with this matter, you are requested to refer to the symbols TP:EV:HRLPA.

Very truly yours,

GEO. J. SCHIEFELBEIN,
Commissioner.

Crop Insurance Is Here Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present the editorial from the March edition of the Louisiana Farm Bureau News entitled "Crop Insurance Is Here Again." This reads as follows:

CROP INSURANCE IS HERE AGAIN

Many Louisianians have noted with interest the fact that crop insurance, once killed by Congress because of heavy losses suffered by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, is on its way back. The experimental program authorized by Congress has proven much more successful and crop insurance once again promises to be an important part of the national farm program. This year, cotton crop insurance is being offered in Bienville, Richland, East Carroll, Catahoula, Washington, Caddo and Natchitoches Parishes. Combined insurance on cotton, corn, sweet potatoes and rice will be offered in St. Landry Parish and combined insurance on these crops plus sugarcane in Lafayette Parish.

The new program differs from the old in several ways. First, it is intended not to assure the grower of any particular percentage of a regular crop, but rather of his investment in his crop. It offers protection against complete disaster and provides the insured grower with money to pay his costs or put in another crop next year. Secondly, premium payments and indemnity payments are figured in dollars and cents rather than in pounds of cotton.

But the most interesting difference, perhaps, is the combined insurance plan, which makes crop insurance available in general farming areas and not just in cotton areas, or wheat areas, as the case might be. The general farmer takes insurance on his investment in his entire crop, not just one of his crops. Since he has several opportunities for hitting, so to speak, his rates are lower than the rates for insurance on a specific crop.

Since the coverage for both cotton insurance and combined insurance is on a different basis from the old cotton crop insurance program, rates in general are lower and the program appears to be on a somewhat sounder basis.

Address by Hon. Austin J. Kittredge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the text of an address delivered by the Honorable Austin J. Kittredge at the centennial banquet on March 14 in honor of the founding of my home town of Clinton, Mass. The remarks of Judge Kittredge, chairman of the centennial committee, appeared in the columns of the Clinton Daily Item of March 15, as follows:

(In his introductory remarks and in presenting the toastmaster Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Chairman Kittredge said:)

His Excellency, Lieutenant Governor, Congressman Philbin, Reverend Clergy, Representative Pickford, Honorable Judges, Mr. Foster, distinguished guests and ladies and gentlemen:

No birthday party would be complete without song and music and it becomes my happy privilege at this time to present our master of ceremonies, one whose accomplishments and success in that field gives assurance of a pleasant and enjoyable evening.

His life has been one of song; his profession a noble one; his purpose in life is to spread cheer and happiness, to gladden the heart music, to stir the imagination, to bring a sparkle of the eye and laughter to the lips. All this he has accomplished by his many compositions which have won for him a place high in the ranks of his profession.

During the last war he gave freely and generously of his time and talents to brighten the lives of his fellow servicemen in the camps and in the hospitals.

Honored by the members of his profession by being elected to high office in the American Society of Composers and Publishers, he has come home to be with us tonight.

He has given to us our centennial song which you will hear tonight for the first time.

It is with profound pleasure that I give you our genial, talented and lovable master of ceremonies John Redmond Lynskey.

On behalf of your committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, I extend to you, one and all, a very cordial welcome and wish to thank you for your very generous response to our invitation to be with us tonight.

On March 14, 1850, just 100 years ago today, an act of the legislature incorporating our town of Clinton was approved by the Governor. Tonight we celebrate her anniversary.

The story of her growth and development, the achievements and success of her distinguished sons and daughters, I leave in more capable hands and to more eloquent tongue than mine.

(Chairman Kittredge read the following letters:)

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 11, 1950.

DEAR MR. KITTREDGE: The foresight of the citizens in establishing Clinton as a town a hundred years ago is amply justified by the things accomplished during the last 10 decades.

Clinton had the advantage in sharing in the historic traditions of the fine old town of Lancaster and thus came into being under happy circumstances. It also has had the advantage of superior location, rich natural resources, and a diversity of industries.

Great as are all of these assets, I am one who thinks that any community's chief wealth is in its men and women. And Clinton has raised up a very large number of able citizens who have enriched the life of the State of Massachusetts and the Nation.

I have in mind one citizen, a Clinton boy born and bred. I wish it were possible for me to be with you next Tuesday evening so that I might acknowledge to the community the debt of gratitude and appreciation I owe to Matt Connelly for his invaluable service to me through many years. Wise, resourceful, industrious, and always tactful, he is one of those faithful and efficient public servants without whom government could not function.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

AUSTIN J. KITTREDGE,
Chairman, Clinton Centennial Committee, Clinton, Mass.:

Many congratulations to the town of Clinton for having completed its first century. Deeply regret that my necessary presence in Washington in connection with the current investigation of the State Department makes it impossible for me to leave the Capital. Otherwise I would certainly be present to extend my warm personal greetings. As a Senator from Massachusetts, I am always proud to refer to Clinton as a particularly progressive American community. May the next 100 years be prosperous for you all. Please call on me for any service that I can render.

HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
March 13, 1950.

AUSTIN J. KITTREDGE, Esq.,
General Chairman, One Hundredth Anniversary Committee, Holder Memorial, Clinton, Mass.

DEAR MR. KITTREDGE: It is a great pleasure and a real privilege for me to convey to the good citizens of Clinton my hearty congratulations and sincere good wishes on the occasion of the Clinton centennial banquet. An event such as this, celebrating 100 years of achievement, is one in which you all can take great pride and in which the Commonwealth and Nation can properly join.

Since that faraway day in 1654, when John Prescott began grinding corn in his mill on South Meadow brook, the growth of this town we know and love today as Clinton has been steady and sound. Although a full century has passed now since Clinton came to maturity as an incorporated town, there has been not a single year in which it has not made an important add ted contribution to Massachusetts and to New England. In business, in industry, in education, in Government, and in religion, the town of Clinton played a valued and vigorous role always. We all salute the town with pride and with enthusiasm. May this centennial year have many happy returns.

Sincerely yours,

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senator.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
THE SUPREME COURT, BOSTON,
March 11, 1950.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am very much distressed at my inability to be present at the centennial of the town of Clinton, but it is impossible for me to attend.

It will be 53 years the 10th of the coming September since I started the practice of law in the town of Clinton, and it seems like yesterday. I owe a great deal to the people of Clinton, and I wish for them the following: health, prosperity, and an enriched cycle onward to through the next century.

It is a great privilege, to assemble to observe a centennial to pay our respects, and honor a town so rich in heritage. Clinton is the birthplace of many famous men and women, folks who have left their mark and their influence felt in the far corners of the earth.

Clinton has kept abreast of the times with her pioneer spirit, always at the front, ready for a new day in industry, and modern methods. We have come a long way within a hundred years. The mother town of Lancaster has every right to be proud of her offspring. We can count on Clinton to keep faith in the twentieth century and to forge ahead as successfully as in the past. We shall continue to improve our living conditions, and overcome hardships, as in the past.

Mr John Prescott, our founder, would be proud to see the vast changes which have come to pass here in the Nashua Valley during the past 300 years.

Yours truly,

ALLAN G. BUTTRICK.

Under an article in the warrant for town meeting held on October 17, 1949, a committee of 25 was appointed to make all arrangements and to conduct a celebration worthy of the occasion. Tonight we officially open the celebration. The general celebration will begin Sunday, May 28, and continue up to and including June 3 of this year. If hard work and careful planning mean the success of any undertaking, I know that your celebration will be a huge success.

I wish at this time to sincerely thank the members of the general and executive committees and all subcommittees and organizations for their generous and wholehearted cooperation. I further desire to thank the press for their liberal donation of time and space in their papers. To each and every one who have given of their time and ability, I extend my sincere thanks. I thank all our distinguished guests for their kind acceptance of our invitation to be with us tonight.

To his excellency, the Governor of our Commonwealth, who has honored us by being with us, I give my sincere and grateful thanks.

The chairman of every committee has its compensations as well as its worries, and tonight I feel fully compensated in having the honor and pleasure in presenting Clinton's most distinguished citizen, a man who has never failed to answer the call of civic duty, many times at a great personal sacrifice; a man who has, and always will, acquit himself with credit and distinction wherever he may go, be it in the halls of Congress or elsewhere; a man who will continue to bring still greater honor to himself and to his town, your Congressman, my Congressman, the people's Congressman, our Toastmaster, PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

False Social-Security Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the continental Foundry and Machine Co.—Chicago works—circulate the following unfair and false propaganda to its employees. It is fortunate that the employees today are informed and cannot be mislead or intimidated. Twenty years ago this propaganda might have been effective:

JANUARY 11, 1950.

FELLOW EMPLOYEE: Why the pay cut? You may find a little less than you expected in this pay. It isn't our idea. This year, because of the failure of Congress to postpone the evil day, your and the company's social-security taxes were increased from 1 to 1½ percent, beginning with the first pay roll in 1950. This means that this year we are compelled by law to hold back from your earned pay one-half again as much as we did last year (up to $45 a year) and turn this part of your pay over to the Federal Government, together with an equal amount from the company.

You get nothing more for this increase in your taxes. It is simply that the cost of the original social-security program has naturally gone up as more and more of us are reaching 65, and Uncle Sam has no sources of revenue to pay the cost of this or any other Government program except what you and we, as taxpayers, provide. This pay cut is the way the Government collects from you its increasing cost of operating this one program.

If the cost of social security continues to go up, and it probably will as more and more people retire, these taxes are almost bound to be increased again. In fact, if the Senate this year follows the lead of the House of Representatives and passes a proposed amendment of the social-security law, your social-security bill will go up to 2 percent of your regular pay next year and will keep on going up.

No matter what the cost, you and we, as taxpayers, will have to pay the bill for whatever social-welfare programs we adopt. Unlike some other countries, Uncle Sam has nowhere else to turn when he needs money except to us.

So, for 1950, your social-security tax will be 1½ percent of your pay. Where it will go from there is partly up to you. Think it over.

CONTINENTAL FOUNDRY & MACHINE CO.

A Measure of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, published in the April 11 issue of Look, is "must" reading for every good American. The author, Arnold Forster, is the civil rights director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. The league annually surveys the status of civil rights in the United States. Its chairman is New York State Supreme Court Justice Meier Steinbrink.

In sending this article to me the director of Look magazine states:

We believe this is the strongest blow to bigotry and intolerance ever published by any magazine. I am sure you will want to read it and hope you will bring it to the attention of other Representatives.

I agree completely with what he says about this article, and I am glad to call it to the attention of my colleagues.

Listed in the article are the big-time bigots who use anti-Semitism as a means to fill their purses and to undermine democracy. Here, too, you will find the answer to the question, "Are our colleges really democratic?"

The article is as follows:

A MEASURE OF FREEDOM
(By Arnold Forster)

How far can a rabble-rouser go in inciting an audience in a public hall against a religious group? In deciding this issue, the nine Justices of the United States Supreme Court felt compelled last May to write four separate opinions.

The case was that of the *City of Chicago v. Arthur Terminiello*. The constitutional principle involved was that of free speech. Did Terminiello have the unlimited right to stand up in a Chicago auditorium and make an inflammatory speech against a religious group?

The majority position of the court can be summed up in the phrase: "Let them get it off their chests." This view is supported by such a liberal group as the American Civil Liberties Union.

ANOTHER VIEWPOINT

But there is another section of opinion, equally concerned with the preservation of democracy, which asks the question: "Haven't we learned from the tragedies of Nazism that you must protect the people against the dissemination of completely false and vicious appeals to religious hatred?"

This is no mere academic dispute. It reaches directly into our daily lives.

The majority opinion of the Court rejected a concept of law which would prohibit such acts of incitement as Terminiello's speech. It declared that one function of free speech is to invite dispute. "It may indeed best serve its high purpose when it induces a condition of unrest, creates dissatisfaction with conditions as they are, or even stirs people to anger." Deciding that the case at hand evidenced no "clear and present danger of a serious substantive evil that rises far above public inconvenience, annoyance, or unrest," the majority held that Terminiello's speech was protected from censorship.

LIBERTY OR ANARCHY?

Against this majority view, Mr. Justice Jackson, speaking for himself and Mr. Justice Burton, wrote: "This Court has gone far toward accepting the doctrine that civil liberty means the removal of all restraints from * * * crowds and that all local attempts to maintain order are impairments of the liberty of the citizen. The choice is not between order and liberty. It is between liberty with order and anarchy without either. There is danger that, if the Court does not temper its doctrinaire logic with a little practical wisdom, it will convert the constitutional Bill of Rights into a suicide pact."

Freedom to speak, or freedom to destroy a religious or racial group? Can we protect the 1st and stop short of the second?

This much can be said with certainty: Only an antidemocrat can espouse serious restriction upon the rights of free speech, assembly, press, religion, and the other guarantees of the Bill of Rights. But unlicensed license to say and do as one pleases does not limit the right of others to condemn what is said or done as a threat to the country's welfare.

If Gerald Smith has the absolute right to label the Jews, before an audience of a thousand Americans, as a menace to the country, Jews have the right to label him an anti-Semite and declare it from the rooftops. If the KKK has the right to condemn Catholics for allegiance to the Vatican, Catholics have a right to label the hooded order un-American. If Congressman JOHN RANKIN proposes that American Negroes be deported to Africa, it is right for these Negroes to label him as a racist.

THE FREE SPEECH ISSUE

Some freedom-minded men are reluctant to label any viewpoint un-American. To condemn a viewpoint as antidemocratic may be to shrink it forever. And there, once again, we are confronted by the same clash over free speech.

Until the questions arising from this issue can be resolved within a democratic framework, one must use the weapon of public condemnation intelligently and cautiously. But there can be little argument today about the wisdom of exposing democracy's enemies. No wall can keep the facts of prejudice from democracy's citizens.

We now realize, too, that no group or class is safe from corrosive prejudice so long as any single one among them is insecure. When a United States Supreme Court judgment declares that restrictive covenants in real estate are unenforceable, it protects not only the Jew or the Negro in the free right to choose his home; it also prevents the development of slum ghettos.

JEW HATING IS BIG BUSINESS

One responsibility falls upon all interested in preserving democracy—to encourage those who are helping the Nation and to expose those who are trying to destroy it with racial or religious hatred.

Organized bigotry seeks to undermine the security and welfare of minority groups. It is the "white supremacy" and anti-Catholicism of Klan groups; the distorted theology preached by hypocrite "reverends."

Money is the inspiration of organized hatred. A handful of promoters who make Jew hating a business enjoy a comfortable income. But for the bulk of the bigots the pickings are slim—a fact which explains the disappearance in the last year of at least 35 once-active groups.

In 1949, 57 organizations, 23 of them newcomers or reactivated groups, were engaged in spreading anti-Semitism in the United States. Nine other propaganda outfits, while not directly involved in such activity, were controlled by known anti-Semites. These groups used an assortment of façades in search of respectability; 36 disguised themselves as politico-economic groups; 16 others used religion as a front; 2 posed as educational organizations; 12 boldly publicized themselves as out-and-out racist groups.

There are 49 anti-Semitic periodicals. Their format varies from crudely mimeographed throw-aways to expensively printed magazines. The basic anti-Jewish themes they embrace are monotonously repetitious.

THE LEADERS AND THE LINE

The petty hate merchants take their cues from a handful of top propagandists. These leaders, wittingly or otherwise, interpret current events in the light of their own prejudices and issue a line which is promptly absorbed by a mass of followers.

These leaders include:

Gerald L. K. Smith: Bigotry is big business with Gerald Lyman Kenneth Smith. He makes it pay substantial dividends. In 1949, his total "take" exceeded $150,000. Though making a very good living, he fails to win any serious following for his crackpot Christian Nationalist Crusade.

Attendance at Smith's meetings varies from 50 to 2,000, depending upon locality and the intensity of his planned publicity. In 1949, he concentrated in the Los Angeles area, where he spoke before several overflow audiences of 2,000. In other sections of the country, he drew an average of less than 200.

The 1949 convention of his Christian Nationalist Crusade, held at the St. Louis Kiel Auditorium, was sparsely attended; audiences were as small as 30 and never exceeded 150. But the virulence of his program was undiminished.

Circulation of Smith's monthly magazine, the Cross and the Flag, remains virtually constant at about 25,000. He also continues to issue his usual quota of pamphlets and newsletters.

Hardly a year passes without Smith's becoming involved in the creation of some veterans' organization. Last year was no exception. In the fall, he lent a hand in the formation of a National Veterans of America, whose offices were established in the St. Louis headquarters of the Christian Nationalist Party. The charter aims of this enterprise include: the preservation of America as a white Christian nation, and the limitation of immigration to European white Christians.

Smith depicts himself as the archenemy of the Reds. Despite the preposterous exaggeration about the number of his followers—more than 3,000,000—Smith undoubtedly makes some impact upon the more unstable elements in some communities in which he appears.

Joseph P. Kamp: In one respect the suave Joseph P. Kamp is a greater nuisance than the crude Gerald L. K. Smith; Kamp has succeeded in deceiving a greater number of important people regarding his real nature and true purpose.

As this is written, Kamp faces a possible prison term. Indicted in December 1944 by a Federal grand jury for self-righteously refusing to reveal the officers and contributors to his Constitutional Educational League, Kamp has thus far avoided serving his 4-month sentence by a series of legal maneuvers. A petition to the Supreme Court for a review of his case is now pending.

While preoccupied all through 1949 with an impending jail term, Kamp found ample opportunity for his propaganda work as acting chairman of the Constitutional Educational League.

HITLER'S APPROVAL

His record of antidemocratic propaganda began in 1933. Some of his early efforts earned him the approval of World Service, an official Nazi news bureau. Join the CIO and Help Build a Soviet America, which he wrote in 1936, was recommended by the Hitler news agency in 1938; it was also sold at the German-American Bund's Aryan bookstore in Los Angeles.

In the early days of World War II, Kamp's destructive propaganda concerning this country's war effort finally got him into difficulties. In July 1942 and again in January 1943, his Constitutional Educational League was named as an organization used as a tool by groups indicted by Federal grand juries for conspiring to undermine the morale of the armed forces.

Walter Winchell, who publicly branded Kamp a Fascist, was the subject of a vicious pamphlet in which much space was devoted to a discussion of the columnist's alleged real name (originally pinned on him as a joke by humorist Harry Hershfield and then maliciously spread by Fritz Kuhn). Actually, Winchell is his real name.

A substantial part of the league's income comes from subsidies and contributions which Kamp promotes from large industrial organizations and wealthy individuals interested in his antilabor, antidemocratic propaganda. Kamp has a list of 500 such contributors.

Upton Close: In a banquet speech on October 29, 1949, Upton Close, the former radio-network news analyst, accused Roosevelt and the Jews of having caused his removal from the NBC network in 1944.

Close's career, which began in the early 1920's, gave no clues in its formative years to the role he eventually was to play. An obscure author who had traveled widely in the Orient, Close eked out a living during that period by speaking before ladies' clubs on such innocuous topics as Cherry Blossoms and Pear Orchards. Twenty years later the same Upton Close, by then a national network news analyst, was being denounced as a Fascist and anti-Semite.

CLOSE BLAMED THE JEWS

The commentator's metamorphosis became evident in the early forties. He was one of those who minimized the threat of Hitler and Japan. At the same time, he developed an antagonism toward Jews, who, he claimed, were pushing the United States into war.

In 1941, in a San Francisco speech, Close declared: "There will be no more democracies ever again in Europe until the Island Empire and its umbilical protégés outside cease interfering in Europe, and I have an idea that that is what many of you still think while the Anglophiles and the Jewish people on the umbilical coast east of the Hudson River lose their heads. * * * I can quite understand how those two groups

can be taken for a ride in the taxicab of sympathy for England or hatred for Hitler."

In 1945 Close revealed his attitude toward the so-called Jewish problem in an open letter to Nathan M. Ohrbach, the department-store owner: "I wonder if four million or forty million dollars' worth of hired agents can buy or wheedle the love of people. I wonder if there is any solution at all to the problem of keeping the majority from regarding with some reservations a minority which makes its basic principle that of maintaining its own peculiar identity."

In 1946 Close attacked Chicago's Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, and the Catholic prelate blasted Close's "untruthful statements, unjust implications, despicable insinuations and utter intellectual dishonesty."

Close climaxed his checkered career as a network commentator by appearing over the Mutual network under the sponsorship of Merwin Hart's National Economic Council. Beginning in February 1948, these broadcasts ended abruptly on February 11, 1947.

There followed a period of hard times for Close. For a while he turned to Mexican stations. Late in 1949, however, he began to stage a comeback. In November he reported to his subscribers that his transcribed propaganda was being carried by more than 100 stations.

Close maintains that he is neither antidemocratic nor anti-Semitic. He once made an offer of a $1,000 war bond "to any person who will produce anything I have ever written or said in public that is anti-Jewish."

But his record belies the denial. He incorporates thinly veiled attacks against Jews or sly innuendoes aimed at them, as when he stated: "We have just passed through Brotherhood Week, a very skillful promoters named the week of collecting for a program of racial tolerance under the National Committee of Jews and Christians. * * * The idea of brotherhood is very often twisted. Some one faction, or element, wants to be the big brother and boss all the rest * * *."

His fundamental distrust of democracy was made evident in his radio broadcast of March 20, 1949: "The Government of our Nation is a representative Republic," he said. "All the wise men who won independence and founded it agreed that it should be a representative republic, not a democracy."

Merwin K. Hart: Anti-Semitism such as Merwin K. Hart exhibits is never a sudden acquisition. It takes years to develop. Hart's antidemocratic roots lie deep. But as president of the National Economic Council, the Harvard-bred propagandist likes to pose as a high-minded patriot whose organization is "dedicated to the preservation of human liberty, including maintenance and invigorating of private enterprise, rights of property and American independence." His record hardly fits this high-sounding description.

Hart never reveals his anti-Semitism in a vulgar way. His attacks upon Jews are cloaked in opposition to opinions among different groups of Jews. If the group does not exist, he creates it.

Hart repeatedly disavows anti-Jewish prejudice; his record makes it necessary.

After Roosevelt's death, Hart immediately issued one of his council letters on America's destiny, and used the opportunity to attack Jews in American life. He captioned his piece: "Shall alien minds determine America's future?" and then listed 81 men and women in American life (most of them persons whose loyalty and distinguished service to the Nation are universally esteemed). Of the 81, no less than 73 are Jewish. Included were the late Stephen S. Wise, Henry Morgenthau, James P. Warburg, Paul M. Warburg, Albert Einstein, Nathan Straus, Abba Hillel Silver, Albert D. Lasker, Felix Frankfurter, Benjamin V. Cohen, Walter Winchell, Leonard Lyons, Adolph Sabath, David E. Lilienthal, Bennett Cerf, and Ben Hecht.

THE GIESEKING CASE

Rarely does Hart miss an opportunity to inject his prejudices into a public controversy. When the United States Government refused to approve the visit of Walter Gieseking, the German pianist, to this country in 1949, the Economic Council Letter reported: "Jewish Communist influence dictated this high-handed procedure. It is clear this influence overruled agencies of the Government of the United States."

Anti-Semitism is not Merwin Hart's sole activity. He devotes much of his attention to pro-Franco propaganda. He pleads the cause of the Spanish dictator with every means at his command.

In 1944 Walter Winchell exposed a particularly unsavory aspect of Hart's pro-Franco operations. The columnist discovered that Hart was cooperating with Jane Anderson, an active Spanish agent who later broadcast Axis propaganda over the Berlin radio.

Hart's Franco sympathies, like his anti-Semitic attitude, stem from an anti-democratic bias. In 1940, he publicly proclaimed his fundamental distrust of American democracy. Speaking before the Nassau Club in Princeton, N. J., he declared that democracy is the rallying cry under which the American system is being prepared for despotism.

The same year, a distinguished New York Union League Club gathering heard him declare: "It is time to brush aside this word 'democracy'."

Hart is a shrewd fund-raiser. Last year the National Economic Council's "take" was at least $140,000. Most of this came from a small group of prominent industrial leaders who see Hart as an ardent champion of their narrow concept of the American way of life. A current list of contributors reads like a section of Who's Who in American industry. One wonders whether the officials of these great businesses know him for what he is—one of the Nation's key bigots.

Now let us see how much prejudice there really is in America.

Fortunately, there seems to be little deliberate anti-Semitism in responsible quarters. The basic democratic ideal is violated from two sources: first, prejudices which have led to deeply imbedded discriminatory practices; second, community tension or controversial public issues which bring hatreds to the surface.

In Congress, for instance, there were fewer anti-Semitic remarks in 1949 than in 1948. Representative EDWIN WILLIS, Democrat of Texas, used the displaced persons problem as the lever for his expression of anti-Jewish bias. He told a Washington, D. C., audience of the American Association of University Women that the admission of Jewish DP's was "an injection of virus into our bloodstream which is already becoming polluted."

In connection with the same DP issue, Senator PAT MCCARRAN demonstrated his essential hostility toward Jews. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, he refused to allow any testimony at the hearings to amend the DP Act of 1948, concerning the plight of European Jews. Ironically he agreed to schedule hearings on displaced Pakistanians, Arabs, and Germans.

THE QUOTA SYSTEM

When we come to the realm of unspoken prejudice which exists in deeply imbedded practices, however, we have another problem. Such a problem is the racial and religious quota system used in admission to colleges.

Theoretically, the doors of American colleges and professional schools are open to all students who have the necessary financial resources and scholastic ability. In practice, however, many institutions exclude or limit Jews, Negroes, Italians, and in some cases Catholics and others.

The discrimination suffered by Negroes who seek higher education differs from that of members of other minority groups. Segregation of the races is established by law in 17 States and the District of Columbia. Negroes cannot share the same classrooms with white students in these jurisdictions. Segregation and exclusion of Negroes in the South is, of course, a publicly avowed policy. No college or professional school, however, publicly admits using a quota system to restrict the admission of minorities.

ADMINISTRATORS CONFESS IT

Administrators of 140 liberal arts colleges, questioned by the Anti-Defamation League on their policies of admission, were remarkably unanimous in condemning the quota system: "I think it would be a fine policy if all higher institutions would admit students irrespective of race or religious creed. * * * I am in hearty accord with your efforts to eliminate discriminatory practices in the field of college admissions. * * * We do not tolerate quota ideas. * * * Our admissions policy is based purely on a student's school record. * * * I am not interested in whether a student is a Jew or a Negro."

And yet discrimination does exist. In November 1949, Dr. Floyd W. Reeves, chairman of the Committee on Discrimination of the American Council on Education, provided a conference of educators meeting in Chicago with the following facts:

1. All researchers agree that there exist racial, religious, economic barriers to higher education.

2. For many youths, restricted curricula and inadequate educational facilities present formidable obstacles to education.

3. Many institutions employ techniques in the admission of students which lend themselves to discriminatory practices and appear to serve no purpose other than that of discriminating against youths from certain minority groups.

The Anti-Defamation League in 1949 made a study of the application forms of 518 liberal arts colleges and found that over 92 percent contained at least one question which could lead to discrimination (such as race, religion, or parents' nationality).

One additional research project deserves mention. In October 1949 two letters were sent to each accredited liberal arts college in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut. One letter was signed with an apparently Jewish name, and the other with an apparently non-Jewish name.

DISTINCTION IN BLACK

Both requested application blanks for entrance in the fall term of 1950. No qualifications were given by the "applicants."

Of the total of 108, 41 responded differently to the non-Jewish letter. This distinction in handling was revealed in any number of ways. In some instances, the "Jewish" applicant received only an acknowledgement, while the "non-Jewish" applicant received an application form; or the "Jew" received no response whatever, while the "non-Jew" did; or the "Jew" received only a primary application form while the "non-Jew" received a final application form.

To prevent any unfair conclusions from this survey, these 41 institutions were tested again in November with another apparently Jewish and another apparently non-Jewish letter. The final codification of the two surveys disclosed that only four institutions in both instances gave apparently preferential treatment to the non-Jewish names.

Strangely enough, on the campus itself, the students show less anti-Jewish prejudice than their elders. College students are overwhelmingly opposed to quota systems and other discriminatory admissions policies.

In an AIL survey just completed, only 1 out of 16 seniors expressed a preference for colleges which discriminate. By contrast, almost one-third of the general adult population—including college graduates and non-graduates—are so inclined.

To determine how much prejudice college students feel toward Jews, Negroes and other minorities, researchers asked a series of key questions which probed such sensitive areas as education, social contacts, housing, employment and intermarriage.

AN ENCOURAGING PICTURE

An encouraging number of students did not want to set any limits, short of actual intermarriage, to their association with minorities. Almost 80 percent of the non-Jewish seniors said it would make no difference to them if a member of a minority group worked beside them, and almost 75 percent would be willing to entertain any of them in their home. When it was proposed to move a minority group member into the neighborhood, the issue really began to pinch—but even here 57 percent said they would not object.

Although the college seniors were overwhelmingly outspoken against barring minorities from college admission, they were slightly more prejudiced about admitting Jews to fraternities and sororities. There was still an over-all majority opposed to any discrimination even here, although not a majority of fraternity members.

Since the exclusion of Jews from Gentile fraternities and Gentiles from Jewish fraternities is the usual rule on American campuses, it is encouraging that this rule finds so few defenders who frankly admit they prefer it that way. When the Phi Kappa Psi chapter at Amherst recently put up a fight for its right to pledge a minority group member, it was rebuking a growing preference among college students.

The low index of prejudice on the campus is apparently, however, not the result of a college education. The incidence of prejudice among seniors is largely the same as that for freshmen.

YOUTHFUL IDEALISM

It is difficult to say why American colleges have made no significant contribution in reducing anti-Semitism. Perhaps the major job of education in fighting prejudice is being done in high schools, and the only prejudiced students left are bitter-enders with whom education has already proved ineffective.

Actually, the absence of prejudice among many college students may be due to the idealism of youth. Perhaps in 10 or 20 years, these same students may be considerably more narrow-minded and prejudiced.

In all of this, we, as citizens, have a democratic responsibility. Unfortunately racial and religious prejudice and discrimination in the United States are blemishes on an otherwise healthy body politic.

The strengthening of democratic life in America is the job not of any single group or individual, but of every citizen who would enjoy the benefits and the freedom that America gives. Men and women in the conduct of their daily affairs must at all times be aware of the need to protect their democratic heritage.

A BACKWARD GLANCE

Wholesome attitudes must be instilled into the hearts and minds of all the people. Attention must be focused on flagrant violations of justice and fair play, and public opinion must mobilize behind the forces struggling to shape this Nation into a better likeness of the ideals upon which it was founded.

The sorry failure in the last year to obtain the passage of even one Federal civil-rights law in Congress was not just a matter of standing still; it was a step backward.

By comparison with other years, the enactment of civil-rights legislation on the State level indicates true progress; the overall picture is heartening.

At the beginning of 1949, only four States had fair employment practice laws. Today, there are eight such States. The enactment of fair employment practice acts has also begun. Legislation forcing the Ku Klux Klan to unmask is spreading throughout the South.

There are three fundamental forces which can be used to fight prejudice—law, education, and community action. Education may prod a community to action and lead to the enactment of legislation. At the same time, legislation itself is frequently a potent educative force.

AIMING AT TARGET

In the use of these forces, it is not enough to rest with the expression of well-meaning generalities. It is necessary to deal with realities. The targets must be pointed out clearly. Lip service to the concept of equality is not enough. There must be an insistence upon such steps as elimination of discriminatory practices in housing, in education, in employment, in voting, and in the use of public accommodations.

A secure and free people who have adequate opportunity to lead happy lives will reject those who spread hatred. On the other hand, exhortations will have little effect in breaking down racial and religious hostility while men are frustrated or while they are afraid.

There can be no freedom from discrimination in employment until there is full employment. There can be no freedom from discrimination in higher education until there are adequate facilities for all persons capable of higher education. There can be no freedom from discrimination in housing until there are ample housing facilities for all. Where there is scarcity, and men compete desperately for the basic necessities of life, the minorities—and eventually the majority—will be at the mercy of those who stir up hatred and fear.

Racial and religious bigotry cannot thrive in an economically and democratically healthy society.

Planes Over Shanghai Raise a Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I enclose copy of an article entitled "Planes Over Shanghai Raise a Question." This article was forwarded to me by Maj. Gen. Claire Lee Chennault, retired, a former resident of the State of Louisiana who is now in China. It is worthy of consideration, thought, and study by the Congress. The article is as follows:

PLANES OVER SHANGHAI RAISE A QUESTION

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

TAIPEH, FORMOSA, March 21.—Appearance of strange fighter planes over Shanghai, as reported by the Chinese Nationalist Air Force, raises the question of how far Russia will go to clinch the final victory of communism in China.

If these were fighters of the new Chinese Red Air Force or of a Russian or international volunteer group—and there is no other possible explanation—they mark a new phase of Russian intervention.

Three blunt-nosed planes diving out of the Monday morning sun over Shanghai's Lunghwa airfield while Nationalist P-51s reconnoitered there probably mean Russia will go as far as she can without openly assuming a belligerent role in China.

She would not want to precipitate American help to the Nationalists whom the United States State Department has repeatedly written off as ineffective champions of a lost cause. Yet, that "lost cause" has become an increasing threat to the China Red regime and the Russians are aware of it.

The Communists will never be secure in China so long as Chiang Kai-shek and his followers continue their stand in Formosa and Hainan and keep needling the Reds by sea, air, and occasionally by land, with a view to a mainland come-back.

(A United Press dispatch from Hong Kong reports that between 5,000 and 10,000 Russian troops are taking an active part in China's civil war. These troops reportedly are (1) helping bolster Chinese Red resistance against increased Nationalist air attacks, (2) may be used to discourage uprising against the Red regime by starving Chinese and (3) may be used to insure the pro-Kremlin faction of China's Communists against nationalist Communists.)

Nationalist air attacks on strategic targets in China's largest city, Shanghai, seem to be forcing Russia's hand. The three strange planes probably are part of a 50-plane fighter force which the Russians are said to have furnished Red China, along with technical and probably flying personnel.

Recent bombing of Shanghai's airfields and the former air training center near Hangchow were intended to wreck that fighter force before it could be uncrated or assembled, it was disclosed here. Perhaps the fighters were of the group previously reported ordered from Czechoslovakia.

The P-51 scouts who reported the Red planes said they were of a kind not used by the Nationalists. They looked something like Japanese Zeroes. Indeed they could have been Zeros if the Russians have taken the trouble to preserve those captured in Manchuria in 1945.

Significantly, Red China's air arm seems to be making ready with non-American planes rather than with the American-made fighters and bombers that fell into their hands.

Appearance of the new type in this way tips Russia's hand both as to planes and pilots.

New fighter types probably mean that Russians or other experienced foreigners are flying them or that Chinese pilots were trained in such craft long ago in Manchuria. Fighter pilots cannot be produced overnight and readily transferred from a known kind of plane to an unknown.

It is possible, of course, that every plane in Red China will be used eventually. But it has been generally accepted that the Reds would first take the air in P-51's, B-25's, and B-24's, if for no other reason than to foster the fiction that the Chinese Reds armed themselves largely from American-made equipment captured from or surrendered by the Chinese Nationalists.

Since there was no shooting in yesterday's encounter over Lunghwa, it could be assumed the Reds' new fighters were merely being tested.

This Is the Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said that is misrepresentative concerning the central Arizona project that I feel impelled, as one of the authors, to state briefly just what the project is, that all may read and check my statement.

The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands held lengthy hearings on H. R. 934 and H. R. 935 in March, April, May, and early June of last year. The record of those hearings has been printed and is available.

H. R. 934 and H. R. 935 are bills authorizing the central Arizona project and the construction, operation and maintenance of the Bridge Canyon Dam together with appurtenant dams and canals, to generate power and take badly needed water from the Colorado River into central Arizona for lands that are now irrigated but with an inadequate supply of water. The project will make available greatly needed hydroelectric power and the water to be diverted to central Arizona will save the economy of that entire State.

The testimony and evidence presented at the hearings clearly establishes: (a) the need for the project. It is clear from the testimony and the evidence that without additional water on lands now cultivated in central Arizona the economy of the sovereign State of Arizona will enter a period of decline ending in chaos and disaster to the great detriment of the entire Southwest and of the United States.

The need for the project and the need for the water in Arizona is admitted by the few opponents of the authorizing legislation.

(b) It is clearly established by the evidence that the water is available in the Colorado River for the proposed diversion to central Arizona of 1,200,000 acre-feet per annum. All the engineers agree that the water is physically available in the river.

(c) The plan of the development to serve the needs as outlined above is clearly established by the evidence to be the best possible plan and to establish the fact that the works to be authorized by the authorizing legislation will serve the need.

(d) It is clearly established by the evidence that the project is feasible and that the cost of construction will be repaid with revenue derived from the sale of power and from the delivery of water and it is clearly established that all of the cost, except approximately 1½ percent made nonreimbursable for benefits to flood control and fish and wildlife conservation, will be repaid in full within a period of 73 years.

The economic feasibility is clearly established by the report of the Bureau of Reclamation and the independent economic analysis of the Doane Agricultural Service of St. Louis, Mo., and by the testimony of many men who are thoroughly familiar with the area and the people involved.

Companion and identical bills were introduced in the Senate of the United States at the same time that H. R. 934 and H. R. 935 were introduced in the House. Lengthy hearings were held before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and that committee made certain amendments and reported the bills as thus amended to the Senate of the United States as S. 75.

Other amendments were made on the floor of the Senate and the Senate on February 21, 1950, passed the bill as thus amended by a vote of 55 to 28. The act as passed by the Senate has come to the House in due course and the Senate amendments are acceptable to me and my colleague as the sponsors of H. R. 934 and H. R. 935 and therefore we urge passage of S. 75 by the House.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Senate amended the bill as originally introduced to provide for the protection of Indian rights with provisions which were accepted by and are acceptable to the tribal councils of the Indians involved, and to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and further amended the bill to make reimbursable costs of benefits, which in the original bill as introduced were made nonreimbursable and to prohibit the construction of any steam plants for the production of electrical energy, none of which were ever contemplated at any time and also to remove any possible objection from the National Park Service by limiting the height of the dam to a height which was and is acceptable to the National Park Service.

All of these matters are fully and clearly set forth in the Senate debates on the floor on February 6, 17, and 21, 1950, and the positions of the Federal agencies and departments are clearly set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS for those days or in the record of the hearings. The Senate further amended the bill as originally introduced in order to permit suit to be brought by any State which might allege that the use of water for the central Arizona project would in any manner interfere with or jeopardize any of its uses or rights.

Arizona, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Interior, the Colorado River Basin States Committee, representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and the Senate of the United States are firmly of the opinion that the water for the proposed central Arizona project for use in Arizona is clearly within the legally established right of the State of Arizona and that the use of that water does not in any manner jeopardize or interfere with the use of water or the right to the use of water of any other State in the Colorado River Basin.

Their opinion is based upon the law of the river, the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the California self-limitation statute and the Arizona water delivery contract of 1944 between the United States and the State of Arizona under which the United States undertook to deliver water from the Colorado River to permit the beneficial consumptive use to the maximum gross quantity of 2,800,000 acre-feet per annum. The water for the central Arizona project is certainly within Arizona's share of the water. Arizona has the right to rely upon the Congress of the United States to see that the State of California respects and lives within its solemn agreement and covenant with the United States which was made expressly for the benefit of the State of Arizona and the other basin States forever and unconditionally limiting the use of the waters of the Colorado River in California. The law of the river is clearly established and under it Arizona is clearly entitled to the water for the proposed project.

Certain special interests in southern California dispute that belief and accordingly provision is granted by S. 75 as passed by the Senate to the joinder of the United States in any suit brought by any State to challenge Arizona's right to the use of the water and it is provided in the authorizing legislation as passed by the Senate and as now before this House that works to be used solely for the diversion of water from the Colorado River into central Arizona shall not be commenced until the termination of such a suit if one is brought.

The works authorized by the bill to be thus deferred until the conclusion of such a suit if one is brought, are by the Bureau estimated to cost some $267,000,000. The works about which there is no dispute and which it is admitted are all badly needed in the Southwest are estimated by the Bureau to cost approximately $440,000,000. All of these figures are from the estimates of the Bureau of Reclamation based on costs as of July 1, 1947. Actually costs are now declining and contracts have been let by the Bureau of Reclamation for much less than their estimates. In recent months the Bureau of Reclamation has let contracts 15 to 42 percent below the estimates of July 1, 1947. The construction of the works authorized by the authorizing legislation will necessarily extend over many years and it is apparent at this time that the cost of the works authorized by this legislation when built will be much less than the estimate of July 1, 1947, of the Bureau of Reclamation.

This Congress in the act admitting Arizona to the Union as a sovereign State, imposed a condition reserving to the United States all the dam sites on

the Colorado River and lands across which transmission lines or canals could carry either power or water from the Colorado River into Arizona and in the enabling act required that the State of Arizona agree to such conditions in its constitution, and Arizona did so.

The Congress therefore by such act, effectively walled off Arizona from power and from water from the Colorado River unless there be later authorization by the Congress of the United States. The Supreme Court of the United States—Two Hundred and Eighty-third United States Reports, page 423—has held that Arizona cannot utilize any of the water of the Colorado River without the consent of Congress.

The Supreme Court of the United States has held—Two Hundred and Eighty-third United States Reports, page 423, and in Two Hundred and Ninety-eighth United States Reports, page 553—that there does not now exist any controversy over the use of water for the proposed project within the jurisdiction of the Court and that the Court cannot take jurisdiction in any such matter unless and until Arizona is authorized by the Congress to divert water from the Colorado River. Then and then only can any State that might feel injured or that might allege that it was injured by the authorized diversion bring an effective action to enjoin such diversion.

Such court action is authorized in S. 75 as passed by the Senate and as now before the House, so that any State that feels a grievance will be given its day in court and in the meantime no construction of any works which might be involved in such action could be undertaken.

Authorizing legislation is therefore essential now in order that a controversy within the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court might be started, if any State feels endangered, in order that the Supreme Court might by final and definite judgment end the controversy and the dispute which has delayed many years the development of the natural resources of the whole Colorado River Basin to the detriment of the people of that region and of the United States as a whole.

In no other way can the matter be authoritatively and finally settled. Every possible safeguard of the national interest and of all the States and of each of the States of the Colorado River Basin has been written into and is contained in Senate bill 75 as passed by the Senate of the United States. With the passage of that measure by the House of Representatives and the approval of the measure by the President of the United States, peace will come to the Colorado River Basin and the full benefits of that great natural resource will be made available to the people of all the States of the Colorado River Basin and to the great benefit of the whole of the United States.

Such, briefly stated, is the legislative case of the central Arizona project now before the Public Lands Committee of the House.

Is Holy Writ a Traitor's Bible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting the following article which appeared in Destiny magazine, Haverhill, Mass., for March 1950:

IS HOLY WRIT A TRAITOR'S BIBLE?

ACHESON QUOTES THE BIBLE

The jury has convicted Alger Hiss of perjury and he has been sentenced to a prison term. His lawyers have appealed the case to a higher court and, in the meantime, he is out on bail. Without awaiting the outcome of this appeal, Secretary of State Dean Acheson has stated that, regardless of the action of the jury and the courts, he will not turn his back on Alger Hiss. He then cited certain verses in Matthew, chapter 25, as a precedent for his expression of loyalty to his friend.

In the chapter of Matthew's gospel in the New Testament referred to, Jesus Christ was instructing His disciples concerning those nations who were to enter into the blessings of the Kingdom of God. He stated that when the Son of Man comes, all nations will be gathered before Him and He will separate the goat nations from the sheep nations. The sheep nations in the parable questioned Him as to what they had done to give Him meat to eat and water to drink, or when did they see Him as a stranger and take Him in? Jesus replied that insofar as they had done these things unto one of the least of His brethren, they had done them unto Him.

TRAITOR IS A CRIMINAL

Mr. Acheson should read these passages over again and carefully note that our Lord did not say criminals were to be given this aid and comfort; rather, it was His brethren who were to receive such succor. By no stretch of the imagination can Alger Hiss, a traitor to his country, be placed in this group. He has not shown himself to be a righteous man, nor can he be numbered among those who have suffered because of service to the Lord in faithfulness to Christian standards.

In its actual setting, this parable is national in aspect and the goat nations are those who have demonstrated their propensity toward evil aggression and tyranny against the peaceable. The sheep nations are those who have desired peace and abhorred war, yet have been willing to become involved in war to go to the assistance of those who are downtrodden and persecuted. The Secretary of State has overlooked the real intent of the parable, and also that Jesus said it was the stranger or foreigner suffering unjustly whom the sheep nations were helping and for which they were to be rewarded.

ACHESON REWRITES BIBLE

When Mr. Acheson undertakes to construe our Lord's instructions to mean that individuals should be loyal to persons convicted of crimes, and that they should defend them regardless of the evil acts committed by them, he is giving voice to the criminal's code of conduct, not the high ethical standards and teachings of the Scriptures.

Alger Hiss was convicted of perjury. Under the righteousness of the law of the Lord perjury is a serious crime, even carrying the death penalty in certain cases. Treason to the Government is punishable by death. In stating that he would support Alger Hiss regardless of the facts, Secretary of State Dean Acheson has violated the Scriptural injunction that, upon conviction for a crime, the criminal must pay the just penalty. No official may forgive or forget a crime committed against the state, but must mete out true and impartial justice, making the punishment fit the crime.

BIBLE A BOOK OF JUSTICE

"The law, 'Life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe,' is a rule governing the administration of justice, demanding that the punishment fit the crime and that there be no excessive punishment in any case. If a hungry man steals a loaf of bread, he should not be punished as the thief would be who robs his neighbor of all his goods.

"Jesus referred to this law and declared it was the law, but He counseled individuals not to conduct their personal relations, one with another, in accord with this rule of law governing the judges who must make the punishment fit the crime. Individuals can forgive and forget all manner of trespasses committed against each other, but the judge cannot forgive and must administer the law in justice." (Digest of the Divine Law, p. 143.)

CRIME AGAINST THE STATE

This principle is equally applicable to all officials in Government. Mr. Acheson has a definite duty in his official capacity, for the crime was committed in the department of the Government of which he is today the head.

When the commandments, statutes, and judgments of the law of the Lord were originally given, the people of the nation were instructed concerning what their attitude must be when a criminal is convicted of a crime against the welfare of the state:

"Thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him; neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him." (Deuteronomy 13: 8.)

WHAT OF HUMAN SLAVERY?

If Mr. Acheson is so desirous to keep the requirements laid down by our Lord concerning help for the oppressed, setting the prisoners free, and liberating the slaves, as well as visiting those in prison, let him, as the head of our Department of State, set in motion ways and means to aid the millions in prison behind the iron curtain. God-fearing men and women are suffering and dying, and many are even now languishing in prison who have committed no crime other than to desire personal freedom.

What of the unfortunate Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians, whose nations we allowed to be enslaved by the tyrants in the Kremlin with hardly a protest? What of the millions of unfortunate human beings in China being thrown by our State Department to the Red wolves of Moscow? They are strangers it is true, but it was the stranger, not criminals, we were to help.

DARE ACHESON TURN ON HISS?

Can it be that Mr. Acheson is trying to hide something and actually dares not turn his back on Hiss? His defense of a convicted criminal leads one to wonder if he is not serving notice that, in case Hiss should talk later, he, Mr. Acheson, is remaining loyal to him, thus notifying Hiss to refrain from implicating him in any way with previous questionable activities within the State Department? If Hiss finally faces no alternative but a prison term and should decide to talk, the revelations would very likely have all the force of a bombshell explosion in their implications. Could this fear be one of the reasons why Mr. Acheson has experienced some sleepless nights since the conviction of Alger Hiss for perjury?

Why a Coast Guard Reserve?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present the article entitled "Why a Coast Guard Reserve?" by Lt. Walter K. Handy, Jr., United States Coast Guard Reserve. The article is excellently written and presents in a strong manner the reason for a Coast Guard Reserve. I invite the attention of all the Members of Congress who are interested in the preservation of this country to read it carefully. The article is as follows:

[From the Reserve Officer of October 1949]

WHY A COAST GUARD RESERVE?

(By Lt. Walter K. Handy, Jr., USCGR, president of the ROA Coast Guard Headquarters Chapter, Washington, D. C.)

It requires only about 20,000 to 25,000 officers and men to perform the peacetime duties of the Coast Guard, but another 150,000 are necessary to carry out its wartime functions. And for these the Coast Guard must rely on its Reserve.

In peacetime the Coast Guard, which is the smallest of the military services, operates under the Treasury Department as a law-enforcing, life-saving, life-protecting agency. It regulates and supervises the loading of dangerous cargoes, inspects vessels and enforces maritime safety regulations, and maintains search and rescue services, aids to navigation, weather stations, iceberg patrols and many other services for the safety of persons at sea and the protection of both lives and property in normal times and in time of disaster.

But the Coast Guard must always be prepared to undergo a rapid transformation, expanding to many times its peacetime size in order to fulfill its roles as a specialized service within the Navy in time of war. The key to this rapid expansion for wartime service is the Coast Guard Reserve. The experience during World War II is a vivid illustration of the importance of the reserve in wartime expansion. Prior to our entrance into the war the Coast Guard numbered less than 20,000 officers and men. By VJ-day the military strength of the Coast Guard exceeded 172,000 persons, of which about 144,000 were reservists. In short, it requires only about 20,000 to 25,000 officers and men to perform the peacetime duties of the Coast Guard, but another 150,000 are necessary to carry out its wartime functions. And for these the Coast Guard must rely on its reserve.

But the whole story is by no means told in terms of numbers. The United States code specifies that "the Coast Guard Reserve, as established on June 23, 1939, is a military organization and a component part of the Coast Guard for the purpose of providing a trained force of officers and enlisted persons which, added to the personnel of the regular Coast Guard, will be adequate to enable the Coast Guard to perform its functions and duties at all times."

The reference to "trained personnel" adequate for the performance of the Coast Guard's functions and duties at all times is significant. In meeting the responsibility for manning vessels assigned to the Coast Guard, the maintenance of aids to navigation, search and rescue services, merchant marine inspection, and similar functions, the Coast Guard can utilize the training and background of its regular personnel augmented by reservists trained or experienced in these fields. Many reservists with the proper training and background will be required to augment present crews and to man vessels of all types. Others will operate high-frequency direction-finding stations used to locate distressed vessels and aircraft. The inspection of merchant vessels for safety, the examining and licensing of merchant marine officers and the investigation of merchant marine disciplinary cases both in the United States ports and overseas will require additional reserve personnel in wartime. Pilots and crews for rescue craft will also be required by the expanded necessity for search and rescue services. In addition, the increased requirements of wartime communications, the administration of personnel and maintenance of records will all necessitate the rapid availability of reserves to supplement the regular personnel.

In addition to the expansion of normal activities, however, the functions of the Coast Guard expand greatly in time of war, and the performance of many of these specialized functions requires the special training or experience of reservists in fields not normally stressed in the training and experience of the regular personnel. Most of these specialized functions fall within the field known as port security, which includes all of the measures necessary for the protection of ports and vessels in port from sabotage, fire, explosion, or other danger.

One of the greatest dangers in the operation of a port during wartime is the ever-present danger involved in the loading and unloading of tremendous quantities of explosives. Unless proper precautions are observed and proper care taken in the handling of these explosives, many lives, many ships, and vital port facilities may be destroyed through explosion. The Coast Guard reserves are the men relied upon to prevent such catastrophes. They must have a thorough background of training in the nature and properties of various types of explosives, the precautions to be observed in handling and stowing them, the operation of ships handling gear, stevedoring equipment, fire fighting where explosives are involved, dangerous combinations of explosives or explosive chemicals and acids, and many other detailed and specialized factors in providing safety from explosion, not only in port but after the ship has put to sea. This is obviously a specialist's responsibility, and the Coast Guard must rely on its reserve to provide such specialists. It is significant that not one explosion occurred in the loading of any vessel supervised by the Coast Guard during World War II, although over 29,000,000,000 pounds of explosives were loaded under their supervision.

The prevention of fire at port facilities is another highly specialized field in which trained and experienced reserves are required. This specialty involves the determination of proper preventive measures against both the start and the spread of fire. It requires a knowledge of the design, construction, and alteration of buildings, warehouses, piers and other water-front facilities for the maximum protection against fire. These specialists must be able to appraise the probability of fire originating in any particular water-front facility, the extent to which it might spread, the structural, operational or other modifications which will reduce the probability of fire, and the fire-fighting facilities which should be provided for the best protection against fire.

Closely related to fire protection is fire fighting, which requires thorough training in the tactics used in fighting fires of all types on vessels, piers, or other water-front facilities. Personnel trained and experienced in fire fighting under all conditions will be needed promptly for proper protection of the ports. This need can be met adequately only by the maintenance of a Reserve which includes fire fighters trained thoroughly in combating all types of fires ashore and afloat and under unusual conditions, as in cases where explosives are involved.

In addition to these specialties, the protection of port facilities requires large numbers of personnel with an adequate background of training in all of these specialties to provide adequate inspections and patrols of vessels and water-front facilities. These men must also be trained in the detection and prevention of sabotage, evacuation procedures for endangered water-front areas, law enforcement, general police duties, and must have a thorough knowledge of Coast Guard regulations for the security of vessels and water-front facilities.

Any adequate program for the protection of our ports must also make provision for well-trained and organized identification specialists to screen and control the personnel having access to vessels and water-front facilities.

Our ports are the bottlenecks through which supplies and men must flow in time of war. The destruction or impairment of any of these ports, whether accidentally or by sabotage, would seriously disrupt the flow of essential men and material. Therefore, it is obvious that all possible precautions must be taken to protect them and the ships which use them from any damage; otherwise all of our other defense preparations may be jeopardized or to a great extent nullified.

In order to give our ports this protection, the Coast Guard must be prepared to place on duty within a matter of hours sufficient numbers of men, thoroughly trained in all of the aspects of port security, to assure the complete safety of all port facilities and vessels from sabotage or accidental damage by fire or explosion. The Coast Guard can meet this responsibility only if it has promptly available a well-trained Reserve which is prepared to assume its role in fulfilling the Coast Guard's responsibility at a moment's notice.

Point 4, Corn, and Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Point 4, Corn, and Mexico," published in the Des Moines Register of March 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POINT 4, CORN, AND MEXICO

Corn is far and away the most important crop in the United States, in total value, in

number of women, in number of farmers who grow it, in its widespread adaptability (it is grown in nearly every county of the United States).

But corn is relatively unimportant to the United States in comparison with Mexico and other Latin-American countries.

The Latin Americans almost literally live on corn. Mexico, for example, devotes about 60 percent of its cropland to this crop, and corn is the predominant food. South of the Rio Grande little corn is fed to livestock, because the people cannot afford such luxury. They must consume the grain directly, supplementing it with beans as the most important source of protein.

Clearly, the first step toward higher living standards in these corn-bean diet countries is to increase the production of corn. That would provide an excess that could be fed to livestock, thus improving diets with meat and milk. It would release manpower to make industrial goods (or to produce excess agricultural products which could be traded abroad for industrial products).

Mexico averages only about 12 bushels of corn to the acre. If that yield could be doubled, Mexican living standards would rise rapidly. Mexicans would no longer have to import corn and could begin to expand their livestock production.

What would this mean to the United States?

It would mean the loss of a tiny export market for corn. In the past we have exported somewhere around 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 bushels of corn and 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 pounds of corn meal annually to Mexico. This is considerably less than the production of one Iowa county.

In return for this insignificant loss, we would get a large increase in exports of industrial products which would in turn mean more industrial employment and greater demand for farm products in the United States.

Mexico, like all Latin-American countries, has such a small production per man today that it is unable to contribute much to world trade and world prosperity. One of the easiest ways to keep our own economy prosperous and expanding is to find new markets, and one of the easiest ways to find new markets is to create them by helping the world's poor people toward higher living standards.

This is the idea behind President Truman's proposed point-4 program of technical aid to backward areas: Help ourselves by helping others.

The Rockefeller Foundation already is applying this idea with a considerable degree of success in Mexico. Since 1943 it has been carrying on a research and educational program designed to increase Mexican agricultural production. So far, 24 improved varieties of corn have been released to Mexican farmers. The Rockefeller scientists have not waited until they could develop hybrids suitable to Mexico; they have distributed open-pollinated seed from selected better varieties.

Last year about two-thirds of a million acres were planted to these improved varieties. This program already has begun to have an impact on total Mexican output. In 1948, Mexico did not import corn for the first time in 25 years.

The Rockefeller people are also making progress with new varieties of wheat, beans, and other crops. Most important, they are training hundreds of Mexicans how to conduct their own research and educational programs.

This is point 4 at work—in a field that Iowans know well. Corn gave us the start in our chain reaction of economic progress, too.

The Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me, affecting the Federal Communications Commission.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

When Congress established the Federal Communications Commission in 1934, it set up a bipartisan board to regulate the radio industry. It was clearly intended that the Commission would operate for the benefit of the people of the Nation. The Commissioners were given wide authority. They were entrusted with broad discretionary powers. It was not presumed that they would use such powers to any narrow partisan ends.

I am sure no Senator in this Chamber has any desire that the Commission should now abuse its powers to accomplish unauthorized ends. Particularly, no Senator would desire to condone the operation of this board for purely partisan purposes.

Surely it would be a serious abuse of authority if the Commission, in granting or withholding a license to operate a radio station, were motivated by partisan considerations.

It has been suggested to me that a case now pending before the Commission may have some political motivation behind it.

Therefore, I am going to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado that he direct the attention of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to hearings now being held on the renewal of radio station licenses granted to stations KMPC (Los Angeles), WJR (Detroit) and WGAR (Cleveland).

Reference to these hearings already has been made in the Senate by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan who has raised the issue of fairness in these proceedings. I wish to join the Senator from Michigan in insisting that these Commission proceedings be scheduled and handled in a dignified and impartial manner without political bias.

Certainly there are some aspects of the present hearings which suggest that some of the parties concerned are acting in a narrowly partisan spirit. I do not suggest that the Commission itself or its Chairman are conducting these hearings for political purposes.

I ask, however, that the Senate committee take cognisance of this case so as to make certain that a majority of this bipartisan Commission does not abuse its authority to control political thinking. It would be outrageously un-American if any radio station were denied an extension of its license merely because the management of that station did not subscribe to the political opinions of the present administration.

The hearings to which I refer were brought about under the following circumstances.

I am told that James Roosevelt, a candidate for Governor of California, wrote a letter on stationery of the Democratic State Committee of California. Mr. Roosevelt supported a complaint against the issuance of a license to the stations I have listed. The principal stockholder in these stations is Mr. George A. Richards who, I understand, has been very critical in his personal expressions of more than one member of the Roosevelt family.

I am not acquainted with Mr. Richards. I have never met him. I know nothing personally of his views. I am told that he is a former New Deal supporter who broke with the party in 1940 and has since been a strong critic of the administration. I am told that the complaint against Mr. Richards is that he allowed his personal political views to slant or distort news reports.

If it is true that these stations are distorting the news, it is a serious charge, and I certainly, for one, do not condone it. I hope the Commission is always vigilant against such distortion in presenting the news to the general public which relies on the impartiality of the broadcaster.

Every Member of the Senate is aware, however, that such distortion is affected by radio stations. I am of the opinion that much of the distortion in news reports that go out over the radio has been done in favor of the administration. This is only an opinion.

It is interesting that the Federal Communications Commission, at the request of James Roosevelt, has invoked seldom-used powers. The case should be considered on its merits. I hope the Senate committee will explore this matter.

I hope it will explore also the question of whether this operator is being singled out while other station operators are given complete freedom to support the party line of the administration in violation of the Communications Act.

The power to regulate can be distorted to become the power to censor. This must not be allowed to happen in the United States.

I want the Commission to enforce the Communications Act fairly and aggressively against any violator. It should make no difference whether a violation is committed by a member of the Democratic or Republican Party.

Surely, however, the Commission should not penalize any loyal American citizen for his personal views if his radio station is properly operated in conformance with the Communications Act. The three stations concerned here have a long history of public service, I am informed, that never was questioned prior to 1940 when the owner broke with the party of the administration. This case may be important to any American who cherishes our heritage of civil liberties.

The Commission must be supported in any attempt to carry out the communications regulations which bar the use of radio news broadcasts as a propaganda medium. However, we want to be assured that the Commission does not become an instrument of thought control seeking to put out of the communications business any station because of this control by a loyal American citizen because of that individual's personal views and expressions.

I am sending to the Senator from Colorado documents which have been sent me concerning this case.

The Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from a speech in Lincoln, Nebr., on March 21 by Guy George Gabrielson, chairman of the Republican National Committee.

A part of Mr. Gabrielson's speech concerns itself with the Brannan plan and some of the left-wing connections with that program. It particularly recites that the head of the northeastern division of the Farmers Union, one of the principal advocates of this so-called Brannan plan, was accused in 1945 of being a Communist, and when he sued for libel the jury found in favor of the defendant.

This man, Archie Wright, is still one of the leaders of the Farmers Union, which says, "the Brannan plan is our plan."

With the Communist front boring into every segment of American life, it is important that they be exposed. This is particularly true when the Secretary of Agriculture consorts with radicals and adopts their program for attempting to lure the American farmer into the trap of Government control of their farms.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have discussed tonight the Communists and the Socialists in the Truman administration. There is another group in the Government who would destroy the opportunity, the freedom, of the American people.

They are the men who serve only political gods. All they want is to win elections even if in the process they destroy the American system. They are the men who operate on the principle of the big city political bosses that the American people—the farmer included—can be bought into slavery if they offer enough Government money. They are the people who are willing to accept the support and even defend the treasonable Communists so long as they retain their political support. They are the people who do the front work for the Trojan-horse Socialists while giving lip service to free enterprise.

In all charity for them, I say that perhaps they, from President Truman downward, do not understand what they do or the dangerous effects of the course which they pursue. They want only votes, votes, votes.

And now I want to discuss with you one of the high apostles of this latter group. One of those who serves only political masters and who, I trust, only ignorantly and not willingly, follows the designs of those who would entrap the farmer into Government control and eventual slavery.

I refer to Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan and his so-called Brannan plan. I shall not attempt to go into an economic discussion of the Brannan plan. Mr. Brannan does not attempt to do that in trying to sell it to the farmers.

Actually the Brannan plan exists in a sort of never-never land of what is it. Mr. Brannan himself dashes frantically up and down the land (at your expense, incidentally) making speeches. He denounces your great farm leader, Allan Kline. He speaks glibly of how the Brannan plan would give higher prices to the farmer and lower prices to the consumer. But he refuses to even estimate what the plan would cost. And, of course, he never mentions that the farmer and the consumer whom he would buy with Government money are the very people who pay this money into the Federal Treasury with back-breaking taxes.

I have analyzed Mr. Brannan's speeches carefully trying to make some sense out of what he says. My analysis boils down to the following conclusions:

1. The Brannan plan is like the old shell game that the suckers used to play at county fairs—now you see it, now you don't.

2. Still using the country fair parallel, it is like the medicine man's bottled remedy—good for man or beast and will cure anything that ails you. Just 50 cents and we throw in a bottle of the best perfume direct from Paris for the little wife.

3. This plan was not written by farmers to help farmers make a better livelihood, but is an instrument for the destruction of free farmers, framed by the radicals who surround your Secretary of Agriculture.

In analyzing Mr. Brannan and his plan you folks out here in Nebraska will want to remember where the Brannan plan came from. And, equally important, who are the friends of the Brannan plan and the friends of Mr. Brannan himself; also those who are against it.

There is an easy answer to the question who is against the plan. The free farmers of America. But let's look further. I have examined into this subject. I find the American Farm Bureau Federation, speaking through its board of directors, denouncing the Brannan plan. I find Mr. Goss, head of the National Grange, speaking out against it, and also leaders of your own Nebraska Farmer's Union. I find Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, a recent Democratic Secretary of Agriculture. Two of the great agricultural publications, the Farm Journal and Country Gentleman. I find Representative CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas, former chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. He did a masterful job of revealing its origin when we held the Republican Farm Conference in Sioux City, Iowa, last year. Representative HOPE pointed out that the Brannan plan, so-called, had its origin in a resolution adopted by the national convention of the CIO in Portland, Oreg., more than 1 year ago. The idea was taken up by various labor papers and publicized rather extensively before Mr. Brannan thought to affix his name to it. And, I find your two great and influential legislators in Washington, Senators WHERRY and BUTLER, and your able Nebraska Republican Members of the House of Representatives stating publicly that the Brannan plan is a vote trap for the farmer, which would eventually take away the farmer's right to run his own farm.

Now let's take a look at who are the supporters of this Brannan plan.

One of the most insistent spokesmen for the Brannan plan is that hybrid big city voice of the New Deal bureaucrats, avowedly political in nature, the Americans for Democratic Action.

Then the political organization of the CIO chants repeatedly on the dual subject of the Brannan plan and the farmer-labor groups.

Finally, we come to the only national farm organization supporting the Brannan plan and that is the Farmer's Union, which boasts over and over again that "it is our plan."

I wish time permitted to examine with you intimately some of the activities and public statements of the Farmer's Union and its president, Mr. Patton. I do not mean to imply that Mr. Brannan or Mr. Patton are Communists. I do charge now, however, that the company in which these two gentlemen, Messrs. Brannan and Patton, travel lays them open to the suspicion of being taken for a hay ride, knowingly or not.

I do not make this charge lightly; I expect to have more to say on the subject in the future. But I wish here to recite just one example of the type of company Messrs. Brannan and Patton keep; where some of the support for the Brannan plan comes from.

Six years ago the Farm Journal carried an article in which it publicly accused one Archie Wright of being a card-carrying Communist.

And who is Mr. Wright? He was at that time, and still is, the president of the northeast division of the Farmers Union. He was called a card-carrying Communist.

After this article was printed by the Farm Journal Mr. Wright sued for libel, apparently thinking his tracks had been so well covered that it could not be proven. Like so many of these Communists who are exposed he issued an immediate denial and attacked his accuser. But the Farm Journal writer had done his work well.

The case went to a jury in the Federal court in New York. The jury heard the evidence that Mr. Wright was a Communist. It heard Mr. Wright's defence evidence. Then it returned a verdict exonerating the Farm Journal and Mr. Robert McManus, the author, of libel in calling this Farmers Union official a Communist.

Mr. Patton knows this. Mr. Brannan, who works intimately with Mr. Patton, also knows it. Patton says the Brannan plan is "our plan." Yet Archie Wright continues as the head of the Farmers Union in the whole northeast area.

In the face of this evidence, don't we have the right to ask again, "What are the influences back of this Brannan plan?" "Are there other Archie Wright's working among the farmers all over the United States—in Nebraska—attempting to lead and propagandize them into eventual slavery to a Government machine?"

I ask you to remember that the farmer was the first object of Communist mass murders in Russia because they would not bow their necks.

I ask you to remember that in 1920 the Communist leader Lenin wrote to his comrades in New York, urging a survey of revolutionary prospects here, and inquiring: "Have you no farmers in America?"

I ask you to remember that in 1923 Moscow sent $100,000 to this country to aid in the organization of a Farmer-Labor Party.

Middle-Income Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have a report telling how homes can be and are being built on a large scale by the so-called middle-income group in the private enterprise way, by which our country has become great and strong, and without the paralyzing hand of Federal socialism.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement received from Ted Baldwin, of New York, who is director of a campaign in several cities in connection with the good American home program, which is sponsored by the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association and the United States Savings and Loan League.

Mr. Baldwin's report indicates that private initiative and private industry are more than willing to provide all the homes potential home owners of the

middle-income group are interested in purchasing.

Furthermore, the cost of these homes is within the reach of the middle-income group, as the price range of homes in the good American home program extends from $7,500 to $12,000, and can be purchased by prospective home owners whose annual take-home pay is from $3,000 to $4,800, the middle-income range.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BALDWIN, INC.,
New York, N. Y., February 11, 1950.

To the Honorable Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY:

When you and your colleagues in both Houses of Congress weigh merits of proposed new housing legislation I feel sure you will be interested in the good-American-home program, which is demonstrating two things.

1. People in the modest and middle income brackets can afford to buy good homes at today's prices on their present income. They are doing it.

2. The building industry is erecting homes to meet the needs of this modest and middle income group.

The good-American-home program is a public educational effort to prove by actual demonstration that the above facts are true and that proper use of the family budget permits home ownership. It is sponsored nationally by the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association and the United States Savings and Loan League. Local demonstrations all over the country are being sponsored by local and regional builders associations, individual private builders, dealers in construction materials and financial institutions. All types of public-service groups are cooperating.

Homes built under the program must be within the price range of from $7,500 or less to a maximum of $12,000. Such homes can be purchased on take-home pay of from $3,000 a year to $4,800—the middle income range.

Official designs, prepared by the noted New York architects, Chapman, Evans & Delehanty, permit building under the money-saving principles of modular construction. This means that mass-production economies can be made at the building site without the use of stereotyped prefabricated homes.

The first demonstration homes were opened in Detroit January 22 and still are being viewed. They were built by members of the local sponsoring group, the Builders Association of Metropolitan Detroit. Because of the public-service feature, press, radio and television, theaters, business, and public officials all cooperated to bring the demonstration to the attention of the public.

For each demonstration house, a model budget was worked out, based on Detroit price levels and checked through the cooperation of Wayne University, Detroit businesses, and financial institutions. People are buying the houses—proof of satisfaction with the price and quality. One builder sold 20 the first day.

The Home Builders Association of Greater Cleveland is starting a similar demonstration. So is the Long Island Home Builders Institute in the New York area and the New Jersey Home Builders Association. Other demonstrations are being arranged in New England, in the Middle Atlantic States, South, and far West.

The good-American-home program is not a plan to build homes. It merely brings together people in the middle and modest income group who want homes and the large number of private builders who are putting up good homes for this group at prices it can afford. It is proving that people of modest means do not need charity and that private industry is meeting their needs and that both sides like it that way—the good American way.

Respectfully submitted.

THE BALDWIN.

The Biggest Swindle in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which is to be published in the April 11, 1950, edition of Look magazine.

This is an exceptionally interesting and informative article, written by an outstanding American businessman, Mr. L. C. Hart. Mr. Hart is vice president of Johns-Manville Corp. and is an authority in the field of management and human relations. He is an experienced businessman and it is evident that he is an expert in public relations.

Mr. Hart shows accurately and vividly the wide difference between what Communists promise and what they actually deliver when they gain power. He discloses that the rulers of Soviet Russia are the greatest confidence men in history; that they have sold the Russian people a gigantic gold brick.

Mr. Hart makes it clear that no sincere liberal can support this swindle which becomes a slave state.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since the end of the war, when Stalin made it clear that he prefers two worlds to one, I—like most Americans—have become increasingly alarmed about what the Communists are up to. Recently I decided to read again some of the Communist writings to get a better idea of what their philosophy really is. So I studied an anthology of extracts from Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Joseph Stalin himself.

I won't pretend that it was easy reading. Nor will I attempt to expose here the economic fallacies which Communist theorists, writing in and about a world that no longer exists, believed. Anyone who looks at the standard of living and the great political power of labor in democratic countries today, under systems of private property, must surely realize that they do not bear the faintest resemblance to the starvation, misery, terror, and helplessness which Marx and Lenin predicted were the inevitable lot of the working man. At least that is what some of our best informed labor leaders tell us.

What I do want to write about is something that struck me so hard I haven't been able to put it out of mind: the amazing difference between what Communists preach, and what they do, once they get a chance to put their theories into practice. I am convinced that only people hypnotized by their own imaginings, only people psychologically incapable of looking at facts, can possibly support both communism and Soviet Russia.

Here are some basic principles of communism; let's compare them to the facts about the Soviet Union.

1. The power of the state must be reduced until the state itself withers away. But the state in Soviet Russia is more powerful than any state in history. The men who run the Soviet Union have made the state more and more absolute since the day they took power. (Even the Czars, operating one of the most corrupt and brutal regimes on record, did not liquidate, exile, or terrorize one-tenth as many people as the Communists have done and are doing.) That the gigantic power of the state in Russia today will be reduced, much less wither away, is something only fools can believe. In fact, the very idea is verboten now, in the writings of the faithful.

2. All the means of production will be owned by the people. The people in Russia are told they own the means of production; but the men in the Kremlin use the resources and manpower of the Soviet Union as they wish. There is no way for the Russian people to assert their ownership—to protest against the Kremlin's actions or the Communist Party's program, or vote the elite out of power, or even put up a candidate for a local school board who has not been handpicked by the regime. Own the means of production? Why, any large American corporation is owned by its stockholders (who have the power to vote, criticize management, throw out directors, influence policy, collect dividends) in a way the Russians dare not even dream of. Would men in a prison be better off if they were told they own the prison?

3. Monopoly, and all its evils, will be abolished. But the Soviet regime is itself the biggest monopoly on the face of the globe. The Kremlin exercises absolute monopoly control over every single phase of life—wages, prices, supply, agriculture, politics, law, the courts, education, the press. * * * No capitalist trust or international cartel ever had one-thousandth of the monopoly power exercised by the leaders of the Soviet Union.

4. A Communist regime represents the dictatorship of the proletariat. Communism certainly is a dictatorship—but not of the proletariat. It is a dictatorship over the proletariat. Do workers dictate policy or action in Russia today? The Soviet Union is, in fact, privately owned—lock, stock, and barrel—by a handful of men. They are self-appointed and self-perpetuating.

5. The rights of workers will be expanded. But even Communists admit that the worker in Soviet Russia does not have the right to change his job or strike or move about freely or speak his mind or protest against low wages or high prices or factory speed-ups or piecework—rights that every American worker takes for granted.

6. Communism will bring true democracy into the world. But the Soviet Union has abolished the most elementary human rights, freedoms, and civil liberties. Soviet Russia is actually a caste state. And the men at the top have more power, privileges, security, and status than any group of capitalists in the world.

7. Science, thought, and art will flower into real freedom under communism. Then why the repeated purges of writers, teachers, artists, and scientists in all countries under Communist control? No intelligent person can maintain that thought in Soviet Russia is free. The record clearly proves that the Kremlin's preferences, in everything from the ballet to comic books, are imposed on all those subjected to Communist rule. This is true even in the sciences; consider the official glorification of the unscientific genetics expounded by Lysenko, whom Julian Huxley, the distinguished English scientist, has just exposed.

8. Since all workers will become Communists, the Communist Party will represent all the workers. But according to their own figures, out of 200,000,000 people in the Soviet Union, only about 2½ percent are in the Communist Party. It is a well-known fact that no one gets into the Communist Party who isn't completely subservient to the top officials, and that no one stays in the party who doesn't toe the party line.

Conclusion: What other conclusion is possible, to anyone with eyes to see and a brain to use, than this: Any sincere believer in the theory of communism ought to be passionately anti-Soviet today. For the Soviet Union, according to the writings and creed of its own founders and leaders, is the biggest swindle in history.

Address by P. S. Marthakis Commemorating Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on March 22, 1950, the Honorable P. S. Marthakis, a senator from the county of Salt Lake, in the Legislature in the State of Utah, delivered an address commemorating Greek independence. Because of its timely interest and because all citizens of America who have Greek ancestry will be interested in reading the words of Mr. Marthakis, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Throughout the civilized world this week, the people of Greek descent will recall with honor and pride that memorable March 25 of 1821 when Greece threw off the yoke of Turkish Empire and proclaimed its independence. Like those thrilling days of 1776, when the Continental Congress ratified and signed the Declaration of Independence, so did the members of the Greek First National Congress bravely set forth the standards of the cross and proclaim the freedom of the fatherland to all the world.

It was the same indomitable courage and spirit that had brought laurels to the Hellenic standards at Marathon and Salamis, the victory to the campaigns of Alexander the Great and the battle between the holy cross of Greece and the crescent of the Turks at Constantinople. This was the culmination of over four long centuries of oppression and suffering under the heel of a tyrant who sought not only to destroy the glorious past that belonged to Greece but to bury in the ashes of time the spirit of her brave people.

But just as democracy, with its free enterprise and opportunities for all, triumphed here in America, so did the same principles win out over tremendous odds in the 7-year struggle for the establishment of a democracy in Greece.

It is fitting and proper as we approach another milestone along freedom's pathway, that we again recall the splendid spirit of cooperation, both spiritual and material, which has been extended by the peoples of this great America to their compatriots across the seas.

When word was first received of the beginning of the Greek struggle for independence, President James Monroe, in his message to Congress, said, "The name of Greece fills the mind with the highest ideals and arouses in us the most exalted emotions which exist in the human nature. Superior skill and refinement in arts, heroic gallantry in action, and devotion to liberty are connected with our memories of ancient Greece. It is natural, therefore, that their conquest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States."

That sympathy was first manifested on December 11, 1823, in the city of Philadelphia, when a committee was appointed to give aid to the people of Greece.

Since those early days, millions of American dollars, tons of foodstuffs and clothing and military supplies have gone from the United States to the aid of the Greek Republic. And today, that tiny republic, nestled on the shores of the Aegean Sea, stands as one of the last outposts of democracy in the Old World. There has been little time down through the years for the people of Greece to enjoy immunity from the torments of war. Enemies on all sides have sought to destroy the fruits of long labor; two world wars have cast their shadows across the Greek homeland to bring more suffering and chaos. And now the forces of communism and democracy are engaged in a death struggle on Greek soil.

We have but to harken to the immortal words of Abraham Lincoln, in paraphrase: We are met upon a great battlefield in a struggle to determine whether this Nation or any nation under God shall long endure. That pattern is repeating itself today in the cold war of nerves which we pray shall never erupt into another holocaust more terrible than man has ever witnessed or can long survive. We can gain some ray of comfort from the established fact that the people of Greece, in their continued struggle for freedom will exhibit a persevering courage, a spirit of enterprise, and a contempt of danger and suffering worthy of the best days of ancient Greece. They are determined to stand up manfully and perish before they submit.

This same spirit is the symbol of America, and we of Greek descent who have made our homes in this glorious land can only hope fervently that our peoples will emerge once again from the darkness to the light of the dawn of peace over a troubled world. Let us hope that the torch of freedom which still burns on the frontiers of democracy will continue to shine as a beacon of hope and courage to all who place country above self, free enterprise above socialism, religious freedom above bigotry, and the pursuit of happiness for all mankind.

Status of the Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a short article appearing in the News Letter published in Lawrence, Kans., by the Home Missions Council. The program of this council is to establish and to foster a unity of spirit and service among Indian missionaries, mission board members, Government employees, and other friends of the Indian; to affirm their group consciousness; to share their experiences, and to establish orderly means to discuss any matters affecting the welfare of Indians and Indian missions.

The article is entitled "Are Indians No Longer Wards of the Government?" The author of the article is Mr. G. E. E. Lindquist.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE INDIANS NO LONGER WARDS OF THE GOVERNMENT?

(By G. E. E. Lindquist)

In the American Magazine for January 1950 appears an article entitled "How We Scalp the Indians" by Don Eddy who, after one trip to the Indian country, "a good 9,000 mile buggy ride," "to get the facts about the Indians" reports, among other alleged "facts" that "Indians are no longer wards of the Government." Continuing, this self-constituted analyst says (p. 58), "Every native-born American Indian has been a citizen since Congress gave him that status in 1924 as a gesture of gratitude to young braves who, although they were exempt from the draft, volunteered and served gallantly with our troops in World War I."

While the American Magazine writer insists that "Indians are no longer wards," he did bump into some "facts" which caused him to realize that the alleged citizenship might perhaps be dubbed as "second-hand" and not "full." "Confusion is the only word to describe our relations with the Indians and their thinking about us. They are confused because when they try to assume the initiative of citizens, they bump their noses on special rules and regulations set up by the bureaucracy which bosses them, the Bureau of Indian Affairs."

That the above-quoted author is not the only one confused on Indian citizenship status is evident from recent Washington news releases. For example, last June there appeared under a Washington headline the following: "On June 2, Indians will celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the date on which they gained full citizenship." No attempt was made to explain the limiting features of that citizenship. As early as 1916, the United States Court held (in the case of *U. S. v. Nice* (241 U. S. 591):

"Citizenship is not incompatible with tribal existence or continued guardianship and so may be conferred without completely emancipating the Indians or placing them beyond the reach of congressional regulations adopted for their protection."

In this and in other decisions the interpretation has been well established, that citizens can be subject to restrictions, exemptions, and special regulations based on the possession of Indian blood or the identification with some group designated as "Indian." (Quoted from Indian Wardship, revised copy. New York: Home Missions Council of North America, 1944; pp. 10–11.)

That Indians were citizens before 1924, by treaty, by the operation of allotment acts, etc., may come as a surprise to many Americans.

In one way or another, the majority of American Indians were already citizens of

the United States before 1924. The Handbook of Federal Indian Law (p. 153) estimates the proportion as approximately two-thirds. The remaining third were swept into citizenship by the act of June 2, 1924, which provides:

"That all noncitizen Indians, born within the territorial limits of the United States, be, and they are hereby declared to be, citizens of the United States."

But the citizenship thus granted was not incompatible with continued guardianship and trusteeship on the part of the Federal Government through the Interior Department or the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Indeed, this very law went on to declare, as many another law concerning the Indian has done:

"Provided, That the granting of such citizenship shall not in any manner impair or otherwise affect the right of any Indian to tribal or other property."

Citizen or not, he would find the trust remaining upon lands held for him; his name upon a tribal roll would still entitle him to share in any distribution of funds or land which other members of the tribe might receive. (Op. cit., pp. 10–11.)

After 450 years of contacts with the dominant race, of which 100 have been spent under a Government bureau, some pertinent questions may very well be asked concerning our first Americans, known to us since Columbus as the Indians. One such question was asked in the Halls of Congress not many years ago by the Senator from South Dakota: "Why aren't the American Indians free?" (Reader's Digest for August 1953: Set the American Indians Free, by O. K. Armstrong.) Others have raised similar questions: "How can Indian Bureau construction of every aspect of Indian life be reconciled with the basic principles of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution? How can such devices as Indian reservations, Indian segregation, rations, and wardship be reconciled with full citizenship?" (See One America, edited by Francis J. Brown and Joseph S. Roucek, p. 420 ff.)

Does the Indian desire to be considered Uncle Sam's stepchild forever? The answer is "No." Wardship with all its paternalistic trappings is increasingly distasteful to him. Without going into detail, wardship may be summed up as the relation of the Indian to the Federal Government in matters regarding which the average citizen deals with State or local governments or acts on his own initiative. Obviously, no single sweeping enactment will wipe away in a moment the tangled mass of exemptions and restrictions accumulated during a century and a half. Old treaties, numbering at one time 388, have to be fulfilled; tribal claims have to be adjudicated; land problems must be worked out tribe by tribe, often on an individual basis. However, a definite goal should be set for the ultimate release of Indians from Federal wardship.

In this connection it is noteworthy that the term "wardship" has been soft-pedaled of late in bureaucratic circles, both in and out of Washington. Even the Hoover Commission Report on Indian Affairs (October 1948) does not mention wardship by name, although it does emphasize the importance of "target dates" in "the progressive transfer to State and local governments" of functions now exercised by the Indian Bureau.

While Bureau officials taboo the use of the word "wardship," presumably because of its unsavory connotations, or dismiss it as "a greatly overworked rationalization," there have been some indications in comparatively recent years that at least lip service has been paid to the possible withdrawal of Federal supervision of the American Indian. (See the Withdrawal of Federal Supervision of the American Indian, a paper presented at the National Conference of Social Work, April 18, 1947, by Assistant Commissioner John H. Provinse.) Hon. HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, calls attention to this in a speech in the United States Senate, October 7, 1949, when he states:

"It is interesting to note that William Zimmerman, the Acting Commissioner and now Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, on February 8, 1947, in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Civil Service, recommended that a group of 10 Indian tribes were then ready for freedom from the Indian Bureau and 19 Indian tribes would be ready to be released from Federal supervision 10 years from that time—February 8, 1947. None has been released, yet the Indian Bureau now comes asking that Congress appropriate millions of dollars for the rehabilitation of some of these same tribes.

"It is a tragic fact that during the past 15 years fewer Indians have escaped from the Indian Bureau into citizenship than have done so during any period of like length during the past 100 years. If now we enter upon a 50-year program of expenditure to establish the Indian Bureau on a grander scale than ever before, there will be fewer and fewer of them becoming real citizens. We must save the Indians from the Indian Bureau."

Congressional leaders have shown increasing concern toward making a start toward the goal of Indian equality before the law with other citizens. Some efforts have been made toward introducing legislation which would furnish an impetus toward the emergence of the present generation of Indian-Americans from what someone has characterized as "the clumsy and outgrown bureau and reservation system," but with no tangible results to date. However, as recently as October 17, 1949, Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, introduced into the United States Senate a bill (S. 2728) "to abolish the functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, to remove the guardianship over Indians and trusteeship over Indian lands, and to repeal the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended." In a statement describing the bill, Mr. MALONE contends, among other things, that—

"The Indian has never had the full rights of other American citizens even since 1924, when Congress declared him a citizen of the United States (43 Stat. 253). The only way he can get these rights is through removal of the two chief obstacles: (1) The Indian Bureau, and (2) the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934. The latter has had the effect of hiring the Indians with taxpayers' money to stick together in tribes and thus of separating them from the rest of American citizens. Originally organized with a well-meaning intention to protect both white man and Indian, the Indian Bureau has come to raise a needless and ruinous barrier between the two races for its own selfish purposes.

"The grip of the Indian Bureau has been tightened over the years by its multiplication of favors such as loans from the Government, appointments to lucrative positions, and by other influence. In fact, Government paternalism at its worst is strikingly exemplified in the Bureau relationship to the Indian. It has undermined the confidence of the Indian in himself and in his own resources. How can the moral fiber of new citizens be built up under such conditions?

"The only solution which will really cut the Gordian knot, so to speak, and it is a solution which only Congress can effectuate, is to tear up the Indian Bureau by the roots and set our fellow citizens of Indian descent free from the deathlike grip of this 'old man of the sea.' Only by the abolition of the Indian Bureau, coupled with the repeal of the Indian Reorganization Act, can the Federal Government remove a gross injustice and right an ancient wrong, once and for all.

"The Government of the United States should determine definitely what its debt to the Indians amounts to—individually and collectively—pay such debts and allow them to take their place in the communities of this Nation on an even basis with other citizens—they have been on probation long enough."

Coming back to the American Magazine correspondent one should not dismiss his story without recognizing that he has brought to light some facts which Americans will do well to ponder deeply and then act upon through their chosen representatives in Congress. He admits that finding the answers is not easy. However, his concluding statement is worthy of more than passing comment—

"Restitution for past wrongs is not so important to present-day Indians as the right to be treated as equal citizens. To accomplish that might necessitate vigorous reorganization of the Indian service, overhauling the five thousand-odd laws it is expected to administer, selection of administrators familiar with Indian psychology, and eviction of those old retainers who still consider themselves 'little white fathers.' Certainly it should give the Indians equal voice in shaping a new policy aimed at alert helpfulness and honest advice, rather than hypocritical chicanery.

"If and when this is done, we stand to create an immensely loyal, valuable body of citizens from a bewildered, distrustful people whose only past sin was protecting their homeland, and who are getting a thoroughly un-American raw deal."

Low-Cost Housing in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, first, a news story appearing in the Des Moines Register of Thursday, February 23, 1950, in which a young man, unwarrantedly, in my opinion, attacks the Governor of the State of Iowa for certain alleged actions in connection with housing at Drake University in Des Moines.

Following that I should like to have printed the reply of another young man, whose name is Keith E. McWilliams, a student at Drake University, who lives in a trailer camp with his wife, who answers the first young man by expressing his adherence to the doctrines of self-help in America, and his desire to assume the responsibilities for his own destiny.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Register of February 23, 1950]

STUDENTS ASK STATE ACTION ON HOUSING

The Young Democratic Club of Drake University Wednesday urged that Gov. William S. Beardsley call a special session of the legislature to obtain low-cost housing in Iowa.

About 50 club members voted when Neal E. Smith, senior law college student from Packwood, presented the motion. James Naughton, of Sioux City, seconded it.

The club's action followed a fire which February 15 destroyed the trailer home and belongings of J. Royer Seagren, 22, his wife, and infant son, in the Drake trailer court.

NEGATIVE ACTION

In a letter to Beardsley, Neil B. Little, of Hampton, president of the Drake Young Democrats, charged the Governor has taken "a weak, negative action by polling the member of the house and senate who could not possibly be as familiar with the present situation as you are."

Little declared Beardsley personally is standing between the the Federal Housing Act of the Eighty-first Congress and the opportunity for all Iowa families to have decent low-cost housing.

Under adverse weather conditions, a fire could destroy the whole trailer court, Little contended.

"It is your responsibility as chief executive to administer the affairs of the State of Iowa when the general assembly is not in session," Little wrote to Beardsley.

"YOUR DUTY"

"Your duty is to familiarize yourself with the seriousness of this condition [housing] and take positive action to call the general assembly to act.

"You should take positive action to call the assembly to Des Moines to pass an enabling act to make available to the Iowa taxpayer his fair share of low-cost housing units. Our tax dollar is being spent in 42 other States.

"Adequate housing in Des Moines will relieve the pressures so my friends will not be forced to live in shacks."

[From the Des Moines Register of February 23, 1950]

VOICE OF FREE AMERICA FROM DRAKE TRAILER CAMP

To the EDITOR:

I can assure you that this letter has considerable support from the residents of the Drake trailer camp and it is not my feelings alone.

In the February 23 edition of the Register an article appeared whereby "the (Drake) Young Democrats" were seeking to denounce Governor Beardsley's passive attitude concerning veterans' housing problems. To give rise to their "deep concern" of the housing problem, they utilized an unfortunate incident that took place in the Drake trailer camp, namely, the destruction of one of the trailers by fire, which incidentally was the second such fire in a period of almost 4 years since the formation of the camp.

It would seem that everyone has the idea that the veterans who live in the trailer camp are living in miserable piano boxes with little heat or comfort. This is far from the truth. True, we haven't the modern conveniences of running water in our trailers; nor do we have a great expanse of room. To be sure, we have our problems, but we don't need a hand-out to solve them. The trailers are insulated, compact, and for the most part cosy. Certainly we all dream of owning our own homes and having the modern conveniences of running water, owning our own furniture and washing machines, but we are willing to sacrifice now and obtain those things on our own.

GOVERNMENT HELP

Can this dependency on the Government continue forever? We get Government subsistence; the Government pays our tuition, books, etc., and when we get through school even makes it possible for us to obtain a loan to build a home. The State gave us a generous bonus—we don't seek more.

No doubt there are people who are in dire need of housing, but the Young Democrats need not use the Drake trailer camp as an example. The people who live here have enough fortitude to solve their problems. They don't need a politician to solve them for them. If we felt we were unduly abused, we would sell our cars and cash our savings so we might live in better quarters. For the large part we're happy where we are; the average couple who live here have enough of their own personal initiative to make out for themselves. Our country was founded on freedom and personal initiative; let's keep it that way.

The founder of the present Democratic policies, F. D. Roosevelt, once said, "Any government, like a family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that the continuance of that habit means the poorhouse." Either F. D. R. was mistaken or the country is headed for the poorhouse.

BUT LIKE ANIMALS

No politician need worry about the trailer-camp housing; having lived here for 3 years, I can assure you that we don't live like animals; we are comfortable to a reasonable extent and the majority of us are able to solve our own problems without the help of an insincere politician.

I assure Mr. Little we don't live in shacks. Ours is a temporary housing program. No one told us to live here or to go to school here. It is our own choice. Peddle your sympathy elsewhere; we don't want anyone feeling sorry for us; we don't; we are sincerely resentful that we should be used as a tool of a cheap political move that is meant to secure votes for the forthcoming election.

KEITH E. MCWILLIAMS.

DES MOINES.

Propaganda Affecting Proposed Basing-Point Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a most vicious, deceptive, and willfully misleading piece of lobbying propaganda, obviously intended to deceive retail druggists as to Senate bill 1008, the conference report on which I hope will soon be considered by the Senate.

I have received, as have other Senators, a number of letters from retail druggists opposing S. 1008. Since this bill has no effect upon them, I have been unable to understand the reason for those letters.

Now, Mr. President, I have, and want the Senate to know, the reason.

The National Association of Retail Druggists has sent a bulletin to their members urging them to deluge us with an avalanche of messages opposing the bill. It urges them to tell us what the elimination of the Robinson-Patman Act means to (their) business, and claims that before enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act small independents were being driven out of business by the thousands.

The association might just as well have told the druggists of the horrors of having all their homes burned, for it is as truthful to imply that the bill eliminates the Patman Act as it is to imply it will eliminate their homes.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[The National Association of Retail Druggists, Washington bulletin, vol. 7, No. 3, March 28, 1950]

THIS BILL, S. 1008, STILL PLAGUES US

It is an afflictive evil—it is a scourge—infestation. It not only harasses small business, but pierces the heart of the Robinson-Patman Act—the friend and protector of small business.

EXTREMELY URGENT

Most of the conferees authorized to work out an agreement on the highly controversial S. 1008, the bill cleverly written to emasculate the Robinson-Patman Act, did a swell job for monopoly. In reality they worked out on small business to a fare ye well. When monopoly plays—it doesn't play for marbles—it plays for keeps. If small business is killed off in the melee that's all right too.

The conference report is now back again in the Senate for consideration. It is minus the Kefauver and Carroll amendments—the amendments which at least would have softened the hurt to the Robinson-Patman Act.

EXTREMELY URGENT

There are many Senators who have not had time to thoroughly study S. 1008 because of other pressing duties. Consequently they rely on the advice of legislative colleagues. Here's where an avalanche of messages from the folks at home will have a telling effect. Let the Senators rely on you.

It is again time to telephone, wire or air mail your two Senators and tell them in your own words what the elimination of the Robinson-Patman Act will mean to your business. Get your friends and associates to do the same—your bread and butter is involved in this fight. Do you want big business to conspire—eliminate competition among themselves then divide the markets of the Nation among themselves?

EXTREMELY URGENT

Before enactment of the ROBINSON-PATMAN Act small independents were being driven out of business by the thousands—that's why NARD spearheaded and worked so hard for the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Small independent businessmen don't go crying to Government for subsidies—all they want is a fair shake of the dice. The Robinson-Patman Act gives them that—why invalidate it? S. 1008 is a bad bill to begin with—there is no need for it. The conference report without the amendments is worse still. S. 1008 does a disservice to the South and West.

EXTREMELY URGENT

You know that when one manufacturer sells cheaper to one merchant than he does to another the former has a distinct price advantage to be used as he sees fit. If S. 1008 is enacted all of us must ask the President to veto the bill. If organized pharmacy has what it takes, now—right now—is the time for urgent action. S. 1008 favors the biggies—it smites small business.

CORDIALLY,

CHARLES H. PETERS,
Washington Representative.

Mr. Lippmann and the Lodge-Gossett Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a paper entitled, "Mr. Lippman and the Lodge-Gossett Amendment," written by Mr. Joseph E. Kallenbach, associate professor of political science at the University of Michigan. This is an extremely impressive and valuable paper on the subject of reform in the electoral system.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. LIPPMANN AND THE LODGE-GOSSETT AMENDMENT

(By Joseph E. Kallenbach, associate professor of political science)

In this recent series of articles on the proposed Lodge-Gossett amendment (see issues of the Herald Tribune for March 6, 8, and 9) Mr. Walter Lippmann has presented a critical analysis of it which could have much influence upon popular and congressional thinking regarding the advisability of adopting this very desirable reform. Mr. Lippmann, while conceding that the Lodge-Gossett plan has numerous specific merits, concludes that it is not the right remedy for the present weaknesses in our presidential electoral system; that "it has disadvantages at least as great, and probably greater than those which it would remove"; and that there is a better remedy. The better remedy which Mr. Lippmann would hold out for, even apparently at the risk of perpetuating indefinitely the present illogical and dangerous electoral vote system, is a plan by which presidential electoral votes would be awarded automatically to candidates on a district plurality vote basis. An abandoned proposal of this nature has been advanced in Congress by Representative COOTSER, of New York, Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, and others.

The Lodge-Gossett amendment and one embracing the automatic district electoral vote idea, endorsed by Mr. Lippmann, are both infinitely preferable to the present system. I would heartily favor adoption of either one. I cannot, however, follow Mr. Lippmann in his argument for the superiority of the district vote plan over the Lodge-Gossett proposal. Much less can I follow him in his contention that the disadvantages of the Lodge-Gossett plan are so great that even the present system might be preferable to it. To oppose adoption of the Lodge-Gossett amendment solely on the ground of its failure to remove the district vote formula is to strain at a gnat while swallowing a camel; and if my understanding of Mr. Lippmann's line of reasoning is correct, an imaginary gnat at that.

Mr. Lippmann's reasons for favoring the district electoral vote system over what he mistakenly refers to as the Lodge-Gossett proportional representation formula in distributing a State's presidential electoral votes boil down to two: (1) The district vote plan will minimize the effects of accident or fraud in terms of the final electoral vote results; and (2) acceptance of the Lodge-Gossett formula might well lead to the adoption of proportional representation in the choice of Members of the House of Representatives.

With regard to the first point, the oversight in Mr. Lippmann's reasoning is quite obvious. His argument is that if some extraneous factor such as the state of the weather or interest in local contests affects the turnout of voters, the effects on the presidential vote will be confined to the electoral vote of the district or districts affected. Moreover, supporters of all party candidates for President will presumably be equally discouraged from or encouraged to turn out in these areas; consequently the result in terms of presidential electoral votes in such districts will not be altered. He goes on to maintain that if the actual popular vote in such cases is reflected in the distribution of the State's electoral votes among the various candidates, as would happen under the Lodge-Gossett plan, then the national electoral vote totals will reflect these vagaries in local election-day conditions. Similarly, he maintains, fraudulent popular votes will always be reflected in the national electoral vote totals; while under the district vote system they will not affect the final result unless these fraudulent votes constitute the critical element in a close popular vote in an electoral district.

The point which Mr. Lippmann overlooks in this line of thinking is that popular votes cast or not cast because of the vagaries of the weather or other such accidental factors, or popular votes obtained or lost through fraudulent practice, assume significance in the final election result only if, in their cumulative aspect nationally, they are preponderantly on one party's side, and if the margin of advantage gained by one party through such factors constitutes the difference between defeat and victory for that party's candidate in the national contest. Looking at the matter realistically, it would seem to me just as probable that the outcome of an election nationally might hinge upon factors of this nature operating at the district level preponderantly to the advantage of one party, as at the national level under the Lodge-Gossett formula. While a margin of a few hundred or even fewer popular votes at the district level may determine the party column in which that district's electoral vote is recorded under Mr. Lippmann's plan, it would, on the average, require about 100,000 such marginal votes to cause a difference of one electoral vote in the national vote totals.

Furthermore, while straining at this gnat of a possible miscarriage of the popular will under the Lodge-Gossett plan, Mr. Lippmann fails to note that his proposal to use congressional districts as electoral-vote districts opens the way to a distortion of the popular vote in terms of electoral votes in a way which the Lodge-Gossett plan obviates entirely. State legislatures in discharging their function of defining congressional district lines have notoriously been influenced by considerations of partisan and sectional advantage. Consequently it is not uncommon to find congressional districts of widely varying population in the same State. To cite one of the many horrible examples, the Fifth Ohio District has a population (1940 census) of 169,000 while the Twenty-second Ohio District has 686,000. The district vote system in Ohio would mean, therefore, that a voter in the down-State Fifth District would have a voting power more than four times as great as his fellow Ohioan in the Twenty-second District who happened to have the misfortune to live in the Cleveland area. Even the present system, with all its faults, has at least the merit of giving equal value to all the popular votes in a State for determining how that State's electoral votes shall be cast. It can be said, of course, that there could be included with the district vote plan a provision to insure, by national action if necessary, a fair and equitable system of districts within each State for congressional and presidential election purposes. Inclusion of such a feature, however, would be an additional handicap in securing ratification by the necessary number of State legislatures. Those bodies are not likely to surrender lightly and willingly the power which they now possess to define congressional district lines with a view to personal, partisan, and sectional advantage.

The second point Mr. Lippmann makes in his attack is wholly insupportable. It is based on a misconception of the true nature of the Lodge-Gossett proposal. Since the election of 1800 the principle has been accepted in this country that the choice of a President is actually made by the people. The electoral college system has been tolerated for so long only because it has been possible to modify and adapt it to this purpose. What the Lodge-Gossett plan proposes to do is to clear away the useless and potentially dangerous machinery of the electoral office, abolish the unwholesome general ticket system which has grown to be a part of the present system, and go as far as practical considerations will permit in the direction of bringing our method of choosing the President into harmony with political realities.

For cogent reasons, which Mr. Lippmann recognizes, the Lodge-Gossett plan does not propose to make the Nation one single constituency for election of the President by a simple direct popular vote; it proposes to keep for the States the present relative political weight which they have through Presidential electoral votes based on their respective number of seats in the Senate and House. To do this and at the same time to give appropriate effect to the expression of popular support for the various candidates, State by State, requires the use of the Presidential electoral-vote device for canvassing the results nationally. Popular votes are merely translated into presidential electoral votes at the State level for a national canvass of popular sentiment. Mr. Lippmann, as some others in and out of Congress have done, seizes on the concept of proportionality inherent in this process of equating the popular vote for a candidate in a given State to an electoral vote for him and brands it a scheme of proportional representation.

I have no inclination here to question Mr. Lippmann's views on the dangers to our political institutions inherent in schemes of proportional representation. He may well be right in this. But the proportional-representation argument is strictly a red herring as applied to the issue presented by the Lodge-Gossett plan. It is utterly impossible to have a scheme of proportional representation in electing a single officer, such as a President. A one-man office cannot be divided up among the various contestants. The nearest approach that could be managed would be to permit the various candidates to hold the office *for* that proportion of a year, or of a month, or of a week, to which their proportionate shares of the votes would entitle them. If the Lodge-Gossett plan is a scheme of proportional representation, or if it would give encouragement to adoption of proportional representation in the election of other officers, then we had better look to our present scheme of electing governors, Senators, Representatives, and the like. For do we not credit the candidates in the voting districts and counties with the exact proportion of the popular vote they received and carry these totals on through to the final canvass? That is just what the Lodge-Gossett plan proposes to do, except that the proportions of popular votes are translated into the common political coin of Presidential electoral votes at the State level before the Nation-wide canvass is made.

It is clear enough that the influence of certain key States, such as New York and Ohio, and of strategically situated organized minority groups in them, on party strategy, the shaping of party platforms, and the selection of candidates, would be diminished somewhat by the adoption of the Lodge-Gossett amendment. I can understand why some individuals oppose the amendment on such grounds, even though I cannot give decisive weight in my own thinking to objections of this sort which arise out of narrow personal, group, and sectional interest. It is unfortunate that Mr. Lippmann, by advancing objections to the Lodge-Gossett amendment purporting to be founded on considerations of wise public policy, has strengthened the hand of those whose reasons for accomplishing the defeat of this fundamentally sound proposal have merit only in terms of narrow self-interest.

The Awakening South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Awakening South," published in the Anniston (Ala.) Star of March 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AWAKENING SOUTH

Theme of a recent issue of the Reporter, fortnightly magazine of facts and ideas, was the South Moves Forward, and supplying one of the most illuminating articles for the issue in question was Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution. "The real reconstruction begins," is the heading of the article which makes a number of pertinent observations with respect to the improving South. Very much to the point, for example, is this sharp contrast between the old and the new on our farms:

"In the South 10 years ago, a green field in January was an oddity. Today all over the South are rich meadows on which cattle can graze the year around. The livestock population has more than tripled, and there is almost a distinct cult of farmers who favor the new grasses and legumes that keep fields green in winter: sericea, lespedeza, ladino, white Dutch, manganese and crimson clovers, Kentucky 31 fescue, and its rival from Oregon, kudzu—the miracle plant that heals land wounds that time alone will not heal, but worsen. Cattlemen from Nebraska, Kansas, and Illinois come to look, and some even stay. There is also a trend toward small grains. Many a farmer, quitting cotton, has started planting oats and wheat, and found them rewarding."

Mr. McGill brings out that along with the trend toward clovers, grasses, and grains, including hybrid corn, there are other evidences as well to indicate that a new era of progress and prosperity is at hand in southern agriculture. He mentions rural electrification, the marketing of millions of broilers each year, improved and expanded dairy herds, new cheese factories, and pumps in the wells and water in the houses of our farms today. Nor is progress confined to rural areas, since in towns and cities, too, growth and improvement are very much in evidence. The editor of the Constitution does not argue that all our ills have been remedied, but he makes the telling point that measured by the past, the South's gains have been dramatic.

"* * * The South today has a feeling it is out of the woods," he states factually. "It still has its frustrations, and its infections, like the Ku Klux Klan, and the demagoguery of some of its politicians, but even these plagues are not as virulent as they used to be. The talk today is not so much of the two lynchings last year, but of the more than 20 that were prevented by forthright action of local law-enforcement officers. As for the Klan, it is an almost impotent organization, unfeared save in the few remote rural regions where population is sparse and frustration and poverty worse. Even in such areas, the Klan is growing less resolute."

Listing education as the South's major problem, the article in the Reporter takes note of developments in two Southern States to show how great has been recent progress in this field. One concerns the recent action in the Dixiecrat State of Mississippi, where the Dixiecrat Governor took the lead in appropriating money to equalize educational facilities in that State, both as to equipment and pay. Meanwhile, in Mr. McGill's own State of Georgia, school appropriations have been increased by the Georgia Legislature from $14,457,132 in 1938 to $50,875,000 in 1950. Such increased budgets, Mr. McGill adds, are "more or less the rule all over the South."

Finally, he takes up in his encouraging article the matters of public health and per capita income in the South. And in both particulars the showing is one of great improvement. For instance, malaria, once the South's worst plagues, has been markedly reduced, and in many areas entirely eliminated. And whereas a study conducted by the University of Georgia in 1935 disclosed that the South's percentage of the Nation's industry in 1930 was almost exactly that of 1865, the period since 1930 has witnessed great industrial expansion in our part of the country. Mr. McGill cites all of this, and more, in support of his entirely tenable proposition that while the new South has not yet overcome all its handicaps, the birth pains are at last beginning.

Foreign Information and Education Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, in view of the plan of the House of Representatives to reduce the appropriation for the State Department, which contains the Voice of America item, I think it would be useful to have in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Whispering Voice," from the Washington Post of this morning. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHISPERING VOICE

Thirty-four million dollars is all the United States may be allowed to spend on its whole foreign information and education program during fiscal 1951. This, seemingly, is all that can be mustered for defense in the realm of ideas at a time when the country is laying out some $13,000,000,000 for the military aspects of its defense. Thirty-four million against thirteen billion. This dismal contrast comes as the Kremlin is increasing its propaganda efforts in critical areas, both in radio broadcasts and in pamphlets. Nor is this all. Perhaps the most formidable opponents of the United States, propagandawise, are the Communist Parties which receive untold support from Moscow. Indeed, practically every major country is spending proportionately more on its information program than the United States; impoverished Britain, for example, before devaluation was spending the equivalent of $27,000,000 for information services alone.

In cutting the foreign information appropriation from $36,500,000 to $34,000,000, the House Appropriations Committee stipulated that none of the cut should come out of Voice of America broadcasts. Yet these broadcasts are only a part of the program, and, as respects such areas as southeast Asia, perhaps not the most important part. Movies, libraries, personal contacts are essential there as means of reaching the people directly. To be sure, maximum expansion cannot come immediately, and perhaps not a great deal more money could be spent wisely at this time. But what is needed is a new and bold concept along the lines suggested by Senator BOWNER, a recognition of our tremendous stake in the battle for men's minds and plans to enlarge our operations accordingly. Surely the richest nation in the world can do better than the present piddling effort.

Fulton Lewis, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 6 I placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first two installments of a series of articles by Mr. Charles Van Devender, Washington correspondent for the New York Post, analyzing the career of Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr. In view of the deep interest in the series I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the two following installments of the article.

There being no objection, the two installments were ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[Installment No. 3]

(By Charles Van Devender)

WASHINGTON, December 7.—Six weeks before VJ-day the writers war board, consisting of top authors who had dedicated their talents to the war effort, took formal notice of the wartime broadcasts of Fulton Lewis, Jr., Mutual's 7 p. m. Washington news commentator.

The writers (Clifton Fadiman, Carl Carmer, Franklin P. Adams, Rex Stout, Russel Crouse, and others) called his radio period "a shockingly isolationist, intolerant, and divisive program."

Lewis' steady harassment throughout the war of the unpleasant, but essential, programs of rationing and price control thoroughly justifies the adjectives, "intolerant" and "divisive."

The charge of isolationism is based on less voluminous, but still convincing, data.

Lewis normally devotes his distractive radio talents to domestic affairs, in which he is a consistent foe of anything remotely connected with the New Deal or the Fair Deal. However, in the fall of 1939, immediately after Hitler plunged Europe into war with his attack on Poland, Lewis made a notable, if indirect, contribution to the debate then going on in the United States over what our foreign policy should be.

He was the friend and agent through whom the Charles Lindbergh arranged for two speeches over the Mutual system; broadcasts in which Lindbergh argued for complete and inviolate neutrality as between the cause of Hitler and that of England and France, including the prohibition of credit or arms shipments to the Allies.

A year later, with France fallen and England under the first hammer blows of the aerial blitz, Lewis joined the violent isolationists—Wheeler, Hye, Clark, and the rest—in opposing a bid for dictatorship in President Roosevelt's request for passage of a peacetime Selective Service Act.

NO NEED FOR DRAFT ACT

Lewis approvingly quoted Senator Wheeler's statement that there was no need for the draft act and his charge that "the real forces behind this draft bill are super patriots."

As to the convention that administration leaders were seeking to establish a dictatorship, Lewis told his Nation-wide radio audience on August 5, 1940, that he had done some independent checking and had, in effect verified that charge through admissions he obtained from Senator Pepper, an advocate of the draft act. (Pepper had told Lewis that he favored giving President Roosevelt full wartime powers to meet whatever emergency might arise.)

Throughout this period Lewis was on terms of close personal friendship with members of the German Embassy staff here. Their reports to Berlin, which were captured and are now in the possession of this Government, eventually will require some comment—in the form of denial or explanation—from Mutual's star Washington commentator.

The captured German documents are being issued in installments under an agreement among the Allied governments. Those relating to Lewis will be published in about a year.

In 1941 and 1942 Lewis was on the pay roll of the National Association of Manufacturers for a series of broadcasts from defense plants around the country. These programs were a glorification of industry's defense production effort, and were designed as a contribution to industrial morale. Lewis received a nominal salary of $250 a week from the NAM, in addition to the income from his regular broadcast.

His destructive attacks on gasoline and tire rationing, and on the Government officials in charge of those essential programs, started shortly after Pearl Harbor and continued into 1943.

In a typical broadcast in February 1943, he cited "common criticism" that "the economic professors in the OPA * * * apparently are rationing just for the sake of rationing."

"It's an orgy of Government regulations," he went on, "in which the economic theorists and the people who write Government pamphlets on dietetics and nutrition and such things are having a fine time making guinea-pig experiments on the helpless American people."

At the time of that broadcast Americans were fighting on Guadalcanal, Russians were killing Germans at Stalingrad, and President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill had just finished their momentous conference at Casablanca. The rubber and gasoline saved by the economic professors, with the hearty cooperation of most Americans, were useful in all of these endeavors.

Lewis, culminating his series of attacks on rationing, said:

"I hope that the gentlemen here in Washington who are involved will realize that I'm not indulging in any personalities. I'm merely trying to be constructive." * * *

Most of them had no such realization.

In 1944, with the war in full blast both in Europe and in the Pacific, Lewis began a similar campaign against price controls. His keynote, which he embellished with personal attacks on those Government officials who were attempting, against even more trying difficulties, to maintain economic stability, was this assurance to his millions of listeners:

It would be "perfectly safe (and this in 1944) to remove all price ceilings and let prices simmer down to their own level."

Two years later when ceilings finally were removed, prices "simmered" up through the roof—but Lewis was one of those who wasn't too badly inconvenienced.

LEWIS' AUTHORITY: PATRICK J. HURLEY

Since the end of the war Lewis appears to have tacitly accepted the bipartisan foreign policy. He has had little to say on the subject. Recently, however, he has revealed symptoms of itching to join in the Republican assault on the conduct of United States relations with unhappy and strife-torn China.

As a start, he has adopted as his authority Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, an amateur diplomat who was completely duped by both the Chinese Communists and the Chinese Nationalists during his spectacularly unsuccessful mission to China near the end of the war.

"If there is anybody in the world who should know what he is talking about (on China) it is General Hurley," Lewis observed a few evenings ago.

[Installment No. 4]

(By Charles Van Devander)

WASHINGTON, December 8.—Postwar restlessness was widespread in the United States in 1946.

The forces of greed and selfishness which had been under restraint since Pearl Harbor were bursting out of bounds on a dozen fronts. The meat-shortage hysteria which swept the country just before the congressional elections of that year was a symptom of national state of mind.

To some degree this restlessness was natural and inevitable, but it was exploited and aggravated by reckless men for their own ends. One of these was Fulton Lewis, Jr., Washington news commentator for the Mutual Broadcasting System, who generally plays hand-in-glove with the most reactionary elements in America.

Lewis selected for his special mission the destruction of any effective price control. Riding with the tide in his campaign against OPA, Lewis reached the peak of his popularity among confirmed antiadministration elements of the population—and with that the ultimate of his power to mobilize pressure against nervous Members of Congress.

At the same time, he established a new low for sustained misrepresentation and distortion of the facts by a supposedly responsible news broadcaster.

Occasionally, Lewis professed that he was only trying to correct the faults in the administration of price controls by Chester Bowles and his hard-pressed band, although his tactics of magnifying every small error was barely directed toward this end.

"I don't want to discontinue OPA, and have so stated over this program many times," he asserted. But on another occasion he declaimed:

"The truth is—the plain truth is—that the greatest single force in America today for inflating the cost of living and making you pay higher prices than you ever paid before is the OPA itself and the very price-control system which they say is your protection against inflation."

Stepping back into the disguise of a friend trying to save OPA from its own mistakes, he told the country—or as much of it as was tuned to his MBS program on May 3, 1946, that the Republican drive in Congress to amend the Price Control Act by cutting out its heart was only a case of corrective surgery.

"Don't be fooled by this stuff and nonsense, that this is a question of whether price is to be controlled or not," he said. "It is no such thing. It's a question of whether the slide rule quiz kids in OPA are going to be permitted to continue to run things just as they jolly well please, without any restraints, without any requirement that they straighten out the mess they've made."

This was the same Lewis who in 1943, when the fortunes of a world war were hanging delicately in the balance, told his radio audience that the "economics professors in OPA" were "rationing just for the sake of rationing," and who in 1944 said it would be "perfectly safe to remove all price ceilings."

Not many Americans had listened to his divisive pleas then, but now he was riding high on the tide of postwar discontent. Lewis rode it for all it was worth. In his sweeping condemnation of the OPA and his reckless assurances that prices would fall once controls were removed, he easily outdid the National Association of Manufacturers and Senator TAFT combined.

Throughout the campaign Lewis adroitly switched back and forth between the self-contradictory roles of a partisan advocate and an objective Washington news commentator.

Night after night he belabored OPA with the case of the three little Swiss. These pets of Lewis were owners of a San Francisco restaurant, who had unsuccessfully sought permission to increase their prices after remodeling the place. It is possible that the three little Swiss were victims of overzealousness—the case was at least questionable. But on the strength of this single case, Lewis condemned the OPA from top to bottom.

REMOTED LISTENERS TO WRITE CONGRESS

At the height of the battle in Congress Lewis begged for support from his listeners. He told them that Drew Pearson, Walter Winchell, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, the CIO and the Communist Party were stirring up OPA supporters to write to Congress.

"Let's show them what some writing is," Lewis countered. "Get your neighbors to write, too. Get the members of your family to write. * * * Don't delay this."

The response was tremendous. That one Lewis broadcast is credited by former price control officials with having changed the preponderance of congressional mail from pro- to anti-OPA. With the 1946 congressional elections only months away, the effect of this demonstration on nervous Members of Congress may well have tipped the balance toward adoption of the amendments which finally spelled the death of OPA.

TURNED HIS GUNS ON WOMEN'S GROUPS

Shortly after this incident, Lewis violently attacked the leaders of 23 women's organizations which joined in an appeal to the Senate Banking Committee to preserve OPA. The organizations included the American Association of University Women, the National Board of the YWCA, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Women's Trade Union League and the National Councils of Catholic Women, Jewish Women and Negro Women. Lewis assailed the officers of all of these groups for presuming to speak for all of their members.

A nasty scene ensued, in the Mutual studio and on the air, when Dr. Caroline Ware, who had presented the statement of the 23 organizations to the Senate Committee, appeared with Lewis on his program to answer his attack.

ASSURED LISTENERS PRICES WOULD DROP

Lewis had given her 3 minutes to present her reply. She ran over the allotted time by 50 seconds, and Lewis then spent the remaining few minutes of the program upbraiding her for taking an unfair advantage of his offer of free air time. He devoted his entire broadcast the following night to more of the same.

Lewis repeatedly assured his listeners that without price controls prices would go down, not up.

Official warnings to the contrary, he said, were panic-stricken and hysterical hugaboo tales * * * horrible ghosts and specters in the haunted house. He accused the OPA of resorting to thoroughly unprincipled and immoral methods * * * in their propaganda.

When all price controls temporarily lapsed July 1, 1946, following President Truman's veto of an unsatisfactory bill, newspapers from coast to coast reported immediate and startling increases in food prices. Lewis, speaking from Washington at 7 p. m. that night, accused OPA of having invented these stories as propaganda.

Butter prices were in every newspaper headline. Lewis asserted that actual shopping tests by himself and his staff proved that, in fact, butter still was selling in stores throughout Washington at the old ceiling price of 67 cents a pound—not at 97 cents, as reported in all of the local newspapers.

He was equally confident that prices of manufactured articles would not go up.

"I have talked to the top leaders of the automobile industry today," he said. "* * * Most of them told me that they have no intention of increasing the prices on their cars at all. * * * I have contacted top officials of the steel industry * * * and there is no indication that there will be any increase (in steel prices) at all."

HIGHER PRICES ENTIRELY TEMPORARY

During the fall, Lewis joined wholeheartedly in the hullabaloo over the meat shortage, dutifully echoing the antiprice control propaganda of the stock raisers. Chester Bowles warned that if meat price controls were abandoned, prices would jump 40 to 50 percent within 60 days. Lewis retorted that prices would go down, not up.

When controls actually were lifted in October, cattle and hog prices shot up even higher and more rapidly than the most pessimistic Government official had predicted. Lewis, however, was unshaken.

"These present prices are entirely temporary, indeed momentary," he asserted confidently, "and they'll last only a few days."

Prices, in fact, continued to hit new highs for months after the date of that broadcast, but by then Lewis had changed the subject. He had begun a campaign to destroy the so-called veterans' housing program and was regaling his radio listeners with invented fantasies and nonexistent scandals involving frantic young Mr. Wilson Wyatt and his hyperthyroid housing program.

Just last week, however, Lewis stirred some nostalgic twinges when he referred briefly to the coming 1950 battle over extension of rent control. He quoted the authorities on whom he relies as saying that "in reality rent control is holding rents up, not down. * * *"

"They said," Lewis droned on, "that when rent controls are dropped, as shown by actual experience in places where rent controls have been dropped, the increase in rental rates is negligible or nonexistent."

Hold onto your hats; here we go again.

Plight of Jews in Countries Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting document containing a description of the status of the people of the Jewish faith under the various iron-curtain regimes in eastern Europe, including the Soviet Union, which I have received from a highly reputable organization known as the Jewish Labor Committee.

Mr. President, in view of the claims sometimes made by apologists for the totalitarian regime of Soviet Russia regarding the alleged freedom of these areas from racial prejudices and alleged freedom from persecution of the so-called racial and religious minorities, I think this document should be required reading for anybody who is inclined to have any illusions in the matter of Soviet Russia. The organization sponsoring this report is headed by individuals of such repute as Mr. Adolph Held and Mr. David Dubinsky.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Excerpts from report on plight of Jews in countries behind the iron curtain, delivered at meeting of national executive committee of the Jewish Labor Committee, March 12, 1950]

In February 1949, at the national convention of the Jewish Labor Committee, a survey of the condition of Jews in countries behind the iron curtain was presented to the delegates. In that study we pointed out that liquidation threatened the Jewish communities in all the countries dominated by Soviet power. A year has gone by and we deem it advisable to bring to public attention a report of what has happened to Jewish life in the same countries since our original survey was published.

Our conclusion is: While for most of the people living under the Soviet regime that reign means impoverishment, slavery, and moral degradation, for the Jews and the Jewish groups it spells thorough spiritual annihilation as well. The national liquidation of the Jewish populations in Communist-dominated countries is now proceeding with an iron hand.

SOVIET RUSSIA

According to the last Soviet census of January 17, 1939, there were 3,020,141 Jews in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. With the incorporation of the Baltic republics, eastern Poland and Bessarabia into the Soviet Union in 1941, about 2,200,000 persons were added to the Soviet-Jewish population. Allowing for a slight natural increase, the grand total of Soviet Jews prior to Hitler's attack on Russia in 1941 amounted to 5,300,000. At present, after Hitler's mass extermination of Jews, the national strength of Jewry in Russia is estimated at 2,000,000 persons, which means that about 3,300,000 were exterminated by Nazi legions, died in Siberia, or were liquidated in concentration camps.

The campaign to exterminate Jewish national cultural life was officially launched by Ilya Ehrenburg, himself a Jew, on September 21, 1948, in the Communist newspaper, Pravda, in Moscow.

In January 1949, a pamphlet by the Soviet economist, T. A. Genin, proclaimed that the aims of Jewish nationalism and Zionism are similar to the aims of reactionary capitalism and American imperialism. In November 1948, Einikeit, the only Yiddish newspaper published in Russia, was liquidated.

During 1949, almost all Yiddish literary figures, even though they were members of the Communist Party, vanished. The most outstanding of these were Itzik Peffer, Peretz Markish, David Bergelson, I. Kvitko, S. Alkin, and Nistor. Inquiries by American-Jewish organizations at the Soviet Embassy concerning the fate of these Yiddish literary figures have met a stone wall of silence. When the Yiddish literary almanac, The Star, in the Ukraine, was closed, the reason given was that it "cultivated Jewish national consciousness."

Simultaneously, a drive started against all Jews who occupied important places in general Soviet life—the struggle against so-called cosmopolitanism. Of all the so-called followers of cosmopolitanism who were liquidated, about two-thirds were Jews. The most important of them were active in Soviet literature, science, philosophy, history, the theater, and included even special writers on sports matters. The Communist line was that Jews are landless, stateless, and are not an integral part of Russia and her people, and that they are devoted to abstract Jewish nationalism, which is basically Jewish chauvinism. Cosmopolitanism, which was largely identified with Jewish national culture, was harshly castigated. In particular, Jewish literary figures were pictured as lifeless corpses, renegades, men wearing traitor's masks and were accused of playing up the cosmopolitan idea of the existence of a world-wide Jewish literature and of putting Soviet writers on a par with burned-out businessmen of America and Palestine.

During the year, concrete signs of anti-Semitism emerged. In a very prominent position among those attacked were persons who had Jewish names, and who for years had been writing under Soviet pseudonyms. In numerous instances the Russian names were followed by the original Jewish names in parenthesis.

The worst, however, that the Jews had to go through in 1949 was the mass deportation to Siberia of Jews from the Ukraine, Eastern Galicia, Bukovina, Bessarabia, and the Baltic States. Some 30,000 Jews were deported from the city of Lemburg, alone. Very little information about this forced exodus has reached the outside world. American relatives of some of these victims have given up hope of locating them. Letters are returned with a notation that the whereabouts of the addressee were unknown.

During the course of the last 12 months, the Communist legend of a Jewish republic in Birobidshan has dissolved in thin air. The Birobidshan territory in the Far East has been completely cut off from Russia herself. Even non-Russian Communist journalists are not permitted to visit that territory. All hopes for Jewish settlement in Birobidshan have been destroyed. In all the years of its existence, only a small number of non-Soviet Jews, all together 784 persons, was reported to have come there. According to conservative estimates only about 28,000 Jews in all were present in the Birobidshan region in 1939. According to all available information the idea of Jewish mass settlement in Birobidshan was a complete failure.

In Soviet Russia today there is not a shred of Jewish cultural life remaining. All

Jewish institutions and organizations, including the Yiddish press and Jewish publishing houses, have been liquidated. The liquidation of the Jewish population has been carried out with an iron hand. All contact between Soviet Jews and Jews in the western world was destroyed. In Russia today Israel is considered an American-British colony, and sympathy for its constructive efforts is ruthlessly suppressed.

Very few Jews have remained in government employ. Needless to say, the emigration of Jews from Russia is strictly forbidden and correspondence with relatives abroad is most dangerous. The 2,000,000 Jews in present-day Russia are on the precipice of spiritual annihilation.

POLAND

Officially there are between 80,000 and 70,000 Jews in Poland today. Though their economic condition is not worse than the plight of the general Polish population, their natural cultural life has in 1949 been subjected to a savage liquidation similar in intensity and form to that in Soviet Russia. Though the destruction is not going on as brutally as in Russia, the direction is the same and we are rapidly approaching the complete liquidation of the Jewish community in Poland.

All Jewish economic institutions, cooperatives built mainly with American-Jewish financial resources, were taken over by the government. The Central Committee of Polish Jews, which included all Jewish groups—Zionists, Bundists, Communists, and religious Jews, was converted into a thoroughly communistic institution. The Jewish Central Committee of Poland, though formally still in existence, has been taken over by the Communists and has become a caricature of its former self. The Jewish district committees were dissolved.

Simultaneously, all Jewish political organizations were liquidated. On January 16, 1949, the Jewish Socialist Party, the Bund, was forced to merge with the Jewish section of the Communist Party. Following this, all Zionist groups and Jewish religious organizations were smashed, and many prominent Jewish religious leaders escaped from Poland.

The relief efforts of the American Joint Distribution Committee, ORT and partly of the ORT, were declared illegal.

The Yiddish schools were subjected to the same treatment. All classes above the fifth grade in the Jewish schools, may henceforth be conducted only in the Polish language. In the school year 1948-49, there were still 28 Jewish schools with an enrollment of 3,686 pupils. At the beginning of the school year 1949-50, these schools were taken over by the government. Similar treatment was accorded to all Hebrew schools. A few labor Jewish papers are still allowed to publish, at future remain. All libraries, all cultural clubs, and 6 Jewish orchestras in Poland, which are all on the verge of destruction.

At the beginning of 1950 the government announced that Polish Jews will be allowed to emigrate to Israel, and close to 30,000 Jews registered for immigration. The Jewish Communist press, however, simultaneously launched a vicious campaign against this exodus, describing the Jews who wanted to emigrate as traitors to Poland. This campaign of intimidation served to halt the registration and only a small number of Jews have to date succeeded in leaving the country.

In January of this year, leaders of the Jewish Communists, M. Minky and S. Zachariasz, declared at a Jewish meeting in the city of Lodz that "the Jews in Poland will not be misled by Jewish nationalism. They will not submit to the agitation to go to Israel whose cultural annihilation and unemployment awaits the."

Insecurity, loneliness, homelessness, and forced assimilation are the lot of the remaining tens of thousands of Jews who are compelled to remain under Soviet-Communist domination in Poland today.

RUMANIA

About 350,000 Jews are in Rumania today—this being the largest Jewish population in Europe, after Russia. The economic plight of the Jews in Rumania is most difficult, with 90 percent of them not being self-sustaining. Most of them are selling whatever possessions they have left in order to eke out a miserable existence. A few can find employment only upon joining the Jewish section of the Communist party. Most Jews in prewar Rumania were engaged in trade, and under the new regime have been completely declassed.

The destruction of Jewish communal life has been proceeding at a rapid pace. Jewish non-Communist communal leaders have been eliminated. In March 1949, the American Joint Distribution Committee office in Bukovina was ordered to close its doors. This was followed by similar orders to ORT and OZE. The possessions of these organizations were turned over to the so-called Federation of Religion Communities, which is fully controlled by the Communist Party.

In April 1949, 256 charity institutions were liquidated, including orphanages, children's homes, and 19 Jewish hospitals. At the beginning of 1949, 3,000 Jews were in prisons in Bukovina province. By the end of 1949 some 11,000 Jews had been incarcerated in Rumania on the so-called pretext of speculation and Zionist propaganda.

In June 1948, there were 69 Jewish elementary schools and 23 high schools, with a student body of 13,000 and a teaching personnel of 1,000. By August 1949, all these educational institutions had been taken over by the government. Opposition to the liquidation of the Jewish language in the schools was penalized as an act of sabotage against the state.

In order to abolish Jewish religious life, these institutions were turned over to Jewish Communists who overnight became the so-called religious leaders. The conduct of religious rituals was punished severely and Communist dogma took their place. In one instance, 25 Jews were arrested at a Jewish wedding because they sang Hatikvah, the Jewish national anthem. Under the leadership of a Communist, Marcelle Fisher, a Jewish organization to fight religious customs and ritual was organized. Young Jewish Communists were given instructions to invade synagogues and force the people to join them in singing the Rumanian national anthem.

The dream of Rumanian Jewry today is to leave their country of birth. In January 1949, the Rumanian Government agreed to permit 3,600 Jews to emigrate, and then withdrew this permission. All Zionist organizations were forced to go out of existence and immigration to Israel is considered by the government as an anti-national act. Illegal emigration through Hungary to the displaced persons camps in Austria is practically impossible, as the guards have orders to shoot on sight, anyone who attempts to flee the country.

Jewish communal life in Rumania is on the brink of physical and material extinction.

HUNGARY

The rapid nationalization of the economy in Hungary has actually brought Jewish economic life to catastrophe. Prior to the war, Jewish wealth in Hungary amounted to about one and a half billion dollars, which was confiscated by the Communist government. Many Jewish government employees were fired because of the general appeasement policy which the Communist government has been pursuing toward undemocratic and anti-Semitic elements in the country. Jews have now been eliminated from positions in the Communist Party.

A particularly notorious case of discrimination and injustice against Jews is the episode of the "gold train," a train loaded with gold, jewelry, and precious things which the Horthy government had shipped out of the country during the last days of its rule. American authorities in Germany seized this gold train and discovering that a rather important part of the precious cargo had been looted from the Jews, returned the whole property to the Hungarian Government, which promised to restore the valuables to their former owners.

The Communist government, however, kept the entire treasure. On January 26, 1949, Perenc Yeshensky, the director of the Hungarian National Bank, declared that the items in the train were not the property of Jews, as most of these items had Fascist inscriptions. We have since learned from former high Hungarian officials now in exile, that these Nazi inscriptions were made by the Communist government itself, in order to deny the valid Jewish claims.

The same pattern of destruction of Jewish religious and cultural life as observed in Russia, Poland, and Rumania repeated itself in Hungary. All Jewish schools under the direction of the Jewish community were nationalized and the teaching of Hebrew was outlawed. Non-Jewish Communists have replaced the Jewish teachers in the school system. Jewish pupils are forced to attend school on Saturday and the government ordered all Jewish shops and places of business to remain open on Saturday. Political spies and informers have been placed in synagogues and wherever Jewish ceremonies are held.

At the beginning of 1949, the Zionist organization was officially disbanded. Following this, some 60,000 Jews registered for immigration to Israel. By that time, however, the Hungarian Government had become hostile to Israel and proclaimed it an Anglo-American colony. A number of Zionist leaders who did not escape in time, were arrested and given prison terms of 6 months to 3 years.

Today, no Jew can emigrate from Hungary and we witness the complete national cultural destruction as well as the physical impoverishment of Hungarian Jewry.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Only 55,000 of a prewar Jewish population of 360,000 remained in Czechoslovakia after VE-day. By September 1949, there were only between 18,000 and 20,000 Jews residing there. Their economic plight is a difficult one. All hopes for restoration of their former possessions have been dissolved in thin air. Nationalization deprived the Jews of their former means of livelihood. Anti-Semitic excesses are not a rarity, the most violent having taken place on August 20, 1949, during a demonstration in Bratislava, in Slovakia.

Czechoslovakia, like Russia and the other satellites, had at the beginning given support to Israel. It should be underscored, however, that the Czech Government has, for its shipment of arms to Israel during the latter's war with the Arab, been well paid. The campaign against Israel was commenced about September 1948, and was followed by the liquidation of Zionist groups and the arrest of Zionist leaders.

At the beginning of 1948, an understanding was reached between Czechoslovakia and Israel to allow 20,000 Jews to immigrate to Israel within a period of 3 to 4 months. This agreement was not kept by the Czech Government and only a small group of Czech Jews succeeded in leaving the country. The Czech Government also halted the practice of issuing transit visas for Jewish refugees from Rumania.

The remaining Jewish population in Czechoslovakia is in agony, as their hopes for survival in their country of origin have been shattered. They are rapidly dying behind the bars of the iron curtain.

Surplus Farm Products and Activities of Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from Barron's, a weekly business and financial paper.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRAVO SENATOR!

It is always a pleasure, especially in the dreary realm of farm policy, to be able to pass some bouquets around.

Senator WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, deserves just that for his speech in the Senate last week wherein he advocated: (1) Defeat of the administration's request for an additional $2,000,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is already bulging with some $4,000,000,000 worth of surplus farm products, including prunes, turkeys, and rosin. (2) Repeal of the 90-percent parity props under the country's so-called basic commodities (wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, and peanuts).

Taken together, these two suggestions are radical enough to bring down on the Senator's head charges that he is trying to ruin the American farmer, pull the plug under the commodity markets, and plunge the Nation back into 1933 conditions.

Actually Mr. WILLIAMS has an eye on the interests of eastern poultry and dairy farmers who find themselves squeezed by the high price of feed grains. Beyond this his position is both courageous and temperate. In February he joined hands with Senators IVES, HENDRICKSON, and SALTONSTALL, in a vain attempt to have price supports lowered. Now he has returned to the fight for restoring some measure of sanity in a farm situation that daily grows both more serious and ludicrous.

Consider the news of last week on the agricultural front. At home the Department of Agriculture released figures which must come as a jolt to all those who believe that American farming can really be controlled in the interests of price maintenance. The figures showed that farmers this year will put 360,000,000 acres of land into cultivation as against a hoped-for cut to 340,000,000. Even where farmers have followed Government orders in some crops they have expanded operations in others—notably corn, oats, barley, sorghum, and soybeans.

While American production continues full blast world demand is definitely slackening. China is gripped by famine but cut off from even a give-away program. West Europe's output is on the rise. Two years ago France imported some 140,000,000 bushels of wheat in a year. Today, thanks in part to ECA, tractors and other aids, she is a net exporter. In addition, she is overburdened with output of butter and of meat. And Russia has offered export of grains to European countries.

Congress has no real answer to this shift in the economic weather. While attempting to deal with the American surplus of potatoes it last week actually increased acreage in peanuts and cotton. The House Foreign Affairs Committee came up with its dazzling economy plan for cutting ECA's appropriation by $1,000,000,000 while empowering the Secretary of Agriculture to give away $1,000,000,000 of farm products abroad. This would, of course, wreck such autonomy as is left to the ECA without saving the taxpayer a nickel. For as the Department gave supplies away it would be buying an equal amount in the market.

Most preposterous performance of the week was the Government's announcement that it had sold some 32,000,000 pounds of dried eggs to the British for $7,000,000, with the implication that this was a shrewd deal. But, when various domestic and foreign subsidies are taken into account, it turns out that the Government paid $1.26 per pound for the eggs, and sold them at around 3 cents per pound. This egg deal was only one of many examples offered by Senator WILLIAMS to illustrate the phoniness, if not downright dishonesty, of the Government's accounting. What happens is that the Commodity Credit Corporation buys products from farmers and then resells them to other agencies, including the ECA which gives them away.

Looking to the grand total Senator WILLIAMS was able to show not only that CCC has accumulated nearly $4,000,000,000 worth of commodities over the past 16 months, but that in the same period the United States has given away nearly $3,000,000,000 worth. The United States has thus produced approximately $7,500,000,000 of farm products more than it has consumed or sold.

This burden on the taxpayer is in Senator WILLIAMS' view intolerable. It is also intolerable that at a time when the United States needs to use its resources to best advantage it is in fact subsidizing waste on a gigantic scale. The cure is precisely where Senator WILLIAMS puts it—elimination or at least reduction of Federal price supports which encourage the over-production that no amount of acreage controls can possibly prevent.

For years it has been the fashion to believe that in some miraculous way the American farmer could be isolated from the action of the free market which is at the basis of America's economic life. Senator WILLIAMS' speech is a portent of an awakening common sense—doubly refreshing in view of the straddle which Republican politicians make on the issue. From this point of view the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 21 (pp. 3736–3740), makes exciting reading.

Results of McGregor Poll on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD the results of a poll I conducted among my constituents on various important issues facing the Members of Congress today. I regret I could not send a questionnaire to every citizen, but I believe the replies I have received are the opinions of the majority in the Seventeenth Ohio District.

In my district, the population is divided almost evenly between city and rural residents. Represented are nearly all of the labor and farm organizations of our Nation as well as large and small businesses, two colleges and two universities.

The questionnaire was sent to every occupational group: committeemen and women, both Democrats and Republicans; laborers; attorneys; barbers; housewives; public-office holders; salesmen, and educators. Also included were those engaged in business and industry, newspaper, radio, and professional work.

Over 3,000 blanks were mailed to individuals and replicas of the questionnaire were published in six daily and eight weekly newspapers in my district. The total number of returns, approximately 2,000, proves to me that the average citizen is interested in the important issues now before this legislative body and is anxious to express his views on them.

Attached to many completed questionnaires were letters and notes explaining why that particular person answered various questions as he did. I am very pleased they took the time to do so. It is not often that a Congressman can obtain a true picture of the feelings of the people of his district on important matters, but through the questionnaire method I feel I have gained an insight into the wishes of those I represent.

The questionnaire and the results are as follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE FROM HON. J. HARRY MCGREGOR, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SEVENTEENTH OHIO DISTRICT

1. Do you favor the continuation of the European recovery program as recommended by President Truman? (Giving or loaning to foreign countries for the next 12 months, including the giving or loaning of money, food, and military equipment direct to foreign governments.) Yes ____ No ____

2. If voting "yes" on question 1, should distribution be made direct to the people or to their governments? People ____ Governments ____

3. Do you favor the President's new program of giving assistance to the underdeveloped areas of the world (a program similar to our former WPA)? Yes ____ No ____

4. Do you favor:

(a) Outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law? Yes ____ No ____

(b) Amending the Taft-Hartley labor law? Yes ____ No ____

(c) A closed shop which requires an employee to be a union member in order to retain his job? Yes ____ No ____

(d) A requirement for both labor and industrial leaders, in contract negotiations, to sign a noncommunistic pledge? Yes ____ No ____

5. Do you favor legislation giving Federal aid to schools (allocation of Federal funds to assist in operation) even though it might threaten local control and jeopardize our teachers' retirement fund in Ohio? Yes ____ No ____

6. Do you favor any type of Federal legislation placing the medical and dental profession and operation of our hospitals under Federal control? Yes ____ No ____

7. Do you favor the President's demands that he have Federal control over production? Yes ____ No ____

8. Do you favor the President's demands that he have Federal control over wages? Yes ..... No .....

9. Do you favor Government-support prices regardless of supply and demand? Yes ..... No .....

10. Do you favor the repeal of the veto power in the United Nations even though it might mean severing our relations with Russia? Yes ..... No .....

11. Do you favor the admission into the United States of about 300,000 additional displaced persons? Yes ..... No .....

12. Do you favor the present policies of the administration attempting to place tax-free Government enterprises on a competitive level with private businesses confronted with threats of tax increases? Yes ..... No .....

Please write on the back of this page your comments on the above questions and any suggestions which you might give to aid me in better serving as your Congressman.

Signature.....

Address.....

Occupation.....

Please return this questionnaire to me, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that I asked my constituents to sign their names and give their occupations, and this information enabled me to secure the opinions of individuals according to occupation. Following is the percentage distribution of replies to the questions, according to occupational classification:

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

Question 1. Do you favor continuation of the European recovery program as recommended by President Truman? (Giving or loaning to foreign countries for the next 12 months, including the giving or loaning of money, food, and military equipment direct to foreign governments.)

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	33	67
Attorneys	57	43
Barbers	20	[illegible]
Business, industry, salesmen	31	69
Farmers	29	71
Housewives	20	80
Labor	[illegible]	74
Ministers	[illegible]	[illegible]
Newspaper and radio	37	63
Professionals	38	[illegible]
Public-office holders	25	75
Retired	49	[illegible]
School teachers	51	49
Occupations not given and unemployed	43	57

Question 2. If voting "yes" on question 1, should distribution be made direct to the people or to their governments?

	People	Governments
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	60	[illegible]
Attorneys	57	43
Barbers	[illegible]	[illegible]
Business, industry, salesmen	[illegible]	32
Farmers	81	19
Housewives	87	13
Labor	[illegible]	26
Ministers	[illegible]	25
Newspaper and radio	[illegible]	[illegible]
Professionals	73	27
Public-office holders	71	29
Retired	64	[illegible]
School teachers	55	45
Occupation not given and unemployed	55	45

Question 3. Do you favor the President's new program of giving assistance to the underdeveloped areas of the world? (A program similar to our former WPA.)

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	10	[illegible]
Attorneys	10	[illegible]
Barbers	.....	100
Business, industry, salesmen	7	93
Farmers	11	89
Housewives	6	94
Labor	8	[illegible]
Ministers	28	72
Newspaper and radio	.....	[illegible]
Professionals	10	90
Public-office holders	10	90
Retired	4	96
School teachers	27	73
Occupations not given and unemployed	16	84

Question 4. Do you favor (a) outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley law?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	[illegible]	[illegible]
Attorneys	4	[illegible]
Barbers	25	75
Business, industry, salesmen	2	98
Farmers	4	96
Housewives	4	96
Labor	12	88
Ministers	10	90
Newspaper and radio	.....	100
Professionals	.....	100
Public-office holders	5	95
Retired	3	97
School teachers	8	92
Occupation not given and unemployed	10	90

Question 4. (b) Amending the Taft-Hartley labor law?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	[illegible]	51
Attorneys	[illegible]	32
Barbers	33	[illegible]
Business, industry, salesmen	47	53
Farmers	47	53
Housewives	61	[illegible]
Labor	44	[illegible]
Ministers	67	33
Newspaper and radio	75	25
Professionals	40	60
Public-office holders	52	48
Retired	43	57
School teachers	[illegible]	[illegible]
Occupation not given and unemployed	66	34

Question 4. (c) A closed shop which requires an employee to be a union member in order to retain his job?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	7	[illegible]
Attorneys	9	[illegible]
Barbers	17	83
Business, industry, salesmen	4	[illegible]
Farmers	4	[illegible]
Housewives	4	96
Labor	17	83
Ministers	18	82
Newspaper and radio	.....	100
Professionals	1	[illegible]
Public-office holders	.....	100
Retired	3	97
School teachers	12	88
Occupation not given and unemployed	11	[illegible]

Question 4. (d) A requirement for both labor and industrial leaders, in contract negotiations, to sign a non-Communist pledge?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	91	[illegible]
Attorneys	[illegible]	14
Barbers	100	.....
Business, industry, salesmen	91	[illegible]
Farmers	[illegible]	7
Housewives	[illegible]	[illegible]
Labor	[illegible]	[illegible]
Ministers	[illegible]	17
Newspaper and radio	100	.....
Professionals	[illegible]	5
Public-office holders	100	.....
Retired	95	5
School teachers	[illegible]	29
Occupation not given and unemployed	84	[illegible]

Question 5. Do you favor legislation giving Federal aid to schools (allocation of Federal funds to assist in operation), even though it might threaten local control or jeopardize our teachers' retirement fund in Ohio?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	11	[illegible]
Attorneys	9	91
Barbers	.....	100
Business, industry, salesmen	7	93
Farmers	8	92
Housewives	8	92
Labor	10	90
Ministers	8	92
Newspaper and radio	13	87
Professionals	7	93
Public-office holders	4	96
Retired	2	98
School teachers	34	66
Occupation not given and unemployed	30	70

Question 6. Do you favor any type of Federal legislation placing the medical and dental professions and operation of our hospitals under Federal control?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	4	96
Attorneys	4	[illegible]
Barbers	.....	[illegible]
Business, industry, salesmen	1	99
Farmers	3	97
Housewives	2	98
Labor	6	[illegible]
Ministers	8	[illegible]
Newspaper and radio	.....	[illegible]
Professionals	1	[illegible]
Public-office holders	4	[illegible]
Retired	1	[illegible]
School teachers	12	88
Occupation not given and unemployed	8	[illegible]

Question 7. Do you favor the President's demands that he have Federal control over production?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	[illegible]	[illegible]
Attorneys	[illegible]	[illegible]
Barbers	.....	[illegible]
Business, industry, salesmen	1	[illegible]
Farmers	2	98
Housewives	1	[illegible]
Labor	4	96
Ministers	8	92
Newspaper and radio	.....	[illegible]
Professionals	1	[illegible]
Public-office holders	.....	[illegible]
Retired	.....	[illegible]
School teachers	5	[illegible]
Occupation not given and unemployed	6	[illegible]

Question 8. Do you favor the President's demands that he have Federal control over wages?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	3	97
Attorneys	7	[illegible]
Barbers	.....	100
Business, industry, salesmen	1	[illegible]
Farmers	2	[illegible]
Housewives	3	97
Labor	4	[illegible]
Ministers	3	[illegible]
Newspaper and radio	.....	[illegible]
Professionals	1	[illegible]
Public-office holders	4	[illegible]
Retired	.....	[illegible]
School teachers	2	[illegible]
Occupation not given and unemployed	8	[illegible]

Question 9. Do you favor Government support prices, regardless of supply and demand?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	[illegible]	[illegible]
Attorneys	[illegible]	[illegible]
Barbers	[illegible]	[illegible]
Business, industry, salesmen	1	[illegible]
Farmers	6	[illegible]
Housewives	3	97
Labor	5	[illegible]
Ministers	8	[illegible]
Newspaper and radio	.....	[illegible]
Professionals	1	[illegible]
Public-office holders	4	[illegible]
Retired	1	[illegible]
School teachers	8	[illegible]
Occupation not given and unemployed	6	[illegible]

Question 10. Do you favor the repeal of the veto power in the United Nations, even though it might mean severing our relations with Russia?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	[illegible]	77
Attorneys	43	57
Barbers	71	[illegible]
Business, industry, salesmen	77	[illegible]
Farmers	72	[illegible]
Housewives	78	[illegible]
Labor	74	[illegible]
Ministers	80	20
Newspaper and radio	[illegible]	25
Professionals	[illegible]	[illegible]
Public-office holders	83	17
Retired	71	[illegible]
School teachers	73	[illegible]
Occupation not given and unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]

Question 11. Do you favor the admission into the United States of about 300,000 additional displaced persons?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	24	[illegible]
Attorneys	[illegible]	64
Barbers	9	[illegible]
Business, industry, salesmen	25	75
Farmers	19	[illegible]
Housewives	23	77
Labor	15	[illegible]
Ministers	70	[illegible]
Newspaper and radio	[illegible]	[illegible]
Professionals	[illegible]	70
Public-office holders	14	[illegible]
Retired	27	73
School teachers	44	[illegible]
Occupation not given and unemployed	23	76

Question 12. Do you favor the present policies of the administration attempting to place tax-free Government enterprises on a competitive level with private businesses confronted with threats of tax increases?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	[illegible]	[illegible]
Attorneys	[illegible]	[illegible]
Barbers	.....	[illegible]
Business, industry, salesmen	[illegible]	[illegible]
Farmers	[illegible]	[illegible]
Housewives	[illegible]	17
Labor	[illegible]	94
Ministers	.....	[illegible]
Newspaper and radio	.....	100
Professionals	2	[illegible]
Public-office holders	.....	100
Retired	[illegible]	[illegible]
School teachers	[illegible]	[illegible]
Occupation not given and unemployed	16	[illegible]

Jewish Youth Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, March 24–31, 1950, has been designated as Jewish Youth Week in the United States by the National Jewish Youth Conference. The conference is a permanent Nation-wide youth body which represents local and regional youth and young adult councils and national Jewish youth organizations. The theme of the week, "Working Together—Jewish Youth Builds," is described in the editorial in the March edition of the National Jewish Welfare Board Circle. Our Jewish young men and women have willingly accepted their responsibility of citizenship and service and have given generously of their time and efforts in working for deserving community projects. They have accomplished much and will continue to work, with the vigor and inspiration of youth, to build a better world for all of us.

The editorial follows:

JEWISH YOUTH BUILDS

A world at peace does not mean a world in which nations think alike, feel alike, act alike. One world does not mean one mind. Neither does unity require uniformity. Differing opinions are, in fact, essential for the progress of humanity, provided, of course, they are accompanied by a mutual respect for the right to differ.

"Working Together — Jewish Youth Builds," the theme of this year's Jewish Youth Week, which the JWB-sponsored National Jewish Youth Conference has set for March 24–31, reveals significantly the fact that American Jewish youth have learned the art of working together around areas of common interest for a healthier, happier, more positive community. Through youth and young adult councils—which in the majority of cases, are representative of all organized Jewish youth in the community—they have been able to develop dynamic programs for a richer, vitrant Jewish life.

Reflected also in the theme is the recognition by Jewish youth of its role in the growth and development of the American Jewish community. Across the nation, young people have taken their seats on boards of Jewish community centers, Jewish community councils, Jewish welfare federations and on committees of national organizations such as the National Jewish Welfare Board itself. They have made such rapid strides that there now exists a Nation-wide Jewish youth body—the National Jewish Youth Conference—which is representative of 300 local and regional youth and young adult councils and most of the national Jewish youth organizations.

During Jewish Youth Week, the searchlight of the communities will be turned on the major advances which Jewish young men and women have been able to make by working together. Through such events as cultural festivals, Youth Sabbath services, exhibits, rallies, conferences, forums, inspirations, pageants, athletic and social events, Jewish youth will demonstrate its abilities, accomplishments, *with* and responsibilities, and needs. They will demonstrate the fruitful results of concentrated efforts to build together a better world.

These are the future leaders of American Jewry, and, for that very reason, the future of American Jewry looks bright. They are building on a solid foundation, a sound premise. There is indeed a way for people of varied interests and ideological differences to meet on common ground.

CIO Leader Condemns Partition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Philip Murray at the Knights of Equity banquet at the William Penn Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa., March 19, 1950:

I have engaged myself with you this evening briefly referring to the things which in passing our good friend, Father Duffy, talked about * * * the wit of the Irish. I know that meetings of this description have matters to consider that are more relevant to the issues of the day than the telling of stories. One which was pressed home for some consideration by our good friend, Mr. Hayden, the president of the Knights of Equity, this evening had to do with a united Ireland. Now every decent citizen, every honorable and upright citizen, every citizen possessed of integrity who believes in justice recognizes the prime need of the Irish people for unity, a united Ireland.

I am delighted as the president of an organization of some 6,000,000 organized workers to say to this group here this evening that my own union, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, at several of its recent conventions, particularly at its last convention held in the city of Cleveland November of last year, unanimously adopted a resolution against partition in Ireland. We authorized our duly accredited representatives, who participated in the formation of the new International Federation of Trade Unions—some 60,000,000 people being affiliated with that body, 60,000,000 organized workers from 57 countries—to secure approval of our CIO resolution at the London conference of trade-union workers held in the city of London last October, and that resolution has

been referred to the executive committee of the trade-union movements of the democratic free trade-union countries for their special consideration sometime during the coming summer; and it is the purpose of our organization here in the United States to give effect to that resolution by pressing not only for its consideration but its actual adoption by the trade-union internationals of these 57 countries presently affiliated with this world federation of trade-unions. It is a tremendously important subject. It has to do with the question of servitude, an issue which was fought out here in the battlefields of the United States of America where your forefathers and our forefathers fought for the freedom of this, the greatest nation of all. The people of the United States are wedded to the idea that there should be a united Ireland. There can be offered no justification for the maintenance of a situation in Ireland which provides disunity. The overwhelming majority of the people in Ireland seek freedom from the economic and political bondage of the British Empire. Their cause is a justifiable one and all right-thinking citizens, whether in the United States of America or not, should support the position of the Irish people in their fight for complete over-all independence.

Oh, I know that we here, although in the spirit of gaiety, and jollity and observance, regard this as a kind of a festive occasion; nevertheless, must needs give special consideration to the more important fundamental things which attach themselves to the observance of this great holiday.

Our Nation and the nations of the universe for the moment are greatly disturbed. The Irish people are disturbed because they are not accorded their rightful recognition as an independent state by the British Government. It should be the business of not only the British Government to seek and secure the unity of Ireland, but I dare say, it should also be the business of the great Republic of the United States of America to assist them in a very practical way toward the attaining of that goal. Our Federal Congress must needs direct its attention to the consideration of this very vexing problem. Our State Department must of necessity, if it seeks the abolition of colonial enterprises, also give consideration to the formation of a united Ireland.

So that no time could be more appropriate for proper consideration of this all-important subject than now. We all have a common understanding of the international travail and stress that prevails throughout the world right now—the danger of a hydrogen bomb, the ideological conflicts which are going on in almost every nation throughout the world, the unrest, the confusion, the disorder which prevails no matter where you go. But great organizations such as yours, Mr. Toastmaster, outstanding organizations such as yours can lend much toward the attainment of these great democratic goals to which we all achieve, all aspire. I oftentimes wonder if we who are living in the midst of this travail today here in the United States and in other countries, busy as we are rushing madly to do things that have to be done every day we live, if all the peoples throughout this universe, particularly those who are afflicted or who may be in danger of affliction, yes, even the United Nations itself, if these groupings and those peoples could only rest their bodies long enough to permit their souls to catch up with their bodies, we might then be able to solve many of the problems and solve satisfactorily many of the problems which our universe has confronting it today. The prayers, the meditations, the devotion, the advocacy, the intelligent constructive thoughts that proceed from a mind that is clear and has not designs lending comfort to the afflicted and lending solace and assistance to the nations that are dependent would lend much, lend a great deal toward the attainment of the lofty objectives to which we all aspire.

I'm happy to be one of you here tonight. Unfortunately, for me I do not have the opportunity to meet with too many of my townsfolk too often. Life is that way. It takes you from your hearthside, from your family and from your friends and from your community life because you have other things to do and do in so many places. I am doubly grateful therefore, that the opportunity has been provided me to break bread with you here tonight. I hope out of these associations, these St. Patrick Day celebrations, and other celebrations of a similar nature, we may be able to attain many of the things in the very near future to which we so logically and so constructively aspire. My good friend, Dennis Mulvihill, Jr., the toastmaster here, when I came to the head of the steelworkers in the city of Pittsburgh some 15 years ago, he together with Vince Sweeney did a lot of collaboration with me. Dennis used to come down to the steelworkers' office a good deal lending his spirit, his soul, his mighty intellect constructively and in a very cooperative fashion to another group of dependent people. They were not independent in those days. They suffered under the yoke of tyranny also here at home. They had economic millstones thrust around their necks and then they formed an organization. An organization dedicated in the name of God to serve, to render service to others unselfishly and self-sacrificingly and that organization in the course of the past 15 years has become a rather substantial segment of our community life here in the city of Pittsburgh. It has grown from no membership in 1936 to over 1,000,000 members today. It has brought more bread and more butter and more meat and more medicine and more clothing into the homes of the people than they ever had before. It has placed pictures on their walls, carpets on their floors, and music in their homes, and it has provided greater cultural and educational opportunities for the young than their fathers and mothers had, at least. So we have an organization like your organization that is an organization of service dedicated to the good of the community and the Nation. We are in the midst of some ideological conflicts for the moment with certain subversive influences who are bent upon the undermining and ultimate destruction of our form of government. I make particular reference now with a special significance to the Communist Party. Our organization of the CIO the United Steelworkers, and all of the affiliated organizations of the CIO presently, are fighting these despots, these atheistic people who would undermine not only the economic well-being of the people who inhabit our Nation, but undermine the principles of a true God-fearing people, destroy their souls and their characters and their homes and inject into the economic life-stream, blood-stream of the United States of America like they have done in other countries their despotic system of dictatorship. So, like you, we are engaging ourselves in the holy crusade on that front lending comfort and assistance to the peoples of the United States and to our Government in a fight against totalitarianism, against dictatorship, against atheistic communism, against any form of subversion which has for itself the purpose, the undermining of the peoples for the destruction of our Government.

Those are our ethics, those are our codes. That is our catechism. Those are the things in which we believe. And to you, worthy toastmaster, and to all the members of the Knights of Equity and to your many friends of many faiths who are here tonight, may God speed you in your blessed and your noble work.

What's Happening to Eggs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. DAVIES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. DAVIES of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Consumer Reports for March 1950:

WHAT'S HAPPENING TO EGGS?—A CASE STUDY IN FOOD PRICES AND THE BRANNAN PLAN

(By Edward M. Brecher)

(Consumers Union, for reasons set forth in the June 1949 Consumer Reports, favors the Brannan farm plan as the best proposal currently under consideration for maintaining farm income while permitting retail food prices paid by consumers to fall to reasonable levels. Secretary of Agriculture Brannan's proposals have in recent months been widely attacked. Many of the attacks, Consumers Union believes, are based on mistaken facts and false assumptions. To clarify the issues, Consumers Union here presents a study of one specific food—eggs—to show how present price-support laws are working, and how much better, from the point of view of both farmers and consumers, the production payments underlying the Brannan plan would work. While the study is limited to eggs, the same principles apply quite generally to other foods now being supported at high price levels under present laws.)

Housewives in Washington, D. C., who paid 75 cents a dozen for large grade A eggs last October were buying the same eggs early this year at 46 cents a dozen. Housewives in New York City who paid 95 cents a dozen for large grade A whites last September paid 55 cents or even less for the same eggs just 4 months later. In Minnesota and Wisconsin, eggs were selling at the farm for as little as 20 cents a dozen during January 1950. Throughout the country the same dramatic fall in egg prices affected both consumers and farmers.

Consumers asked three questions as they saw eggs fall to bargain prices from near-record highs in the space of a few short months.

First, why did prices fall?

Second, what held prices up before?

Third, isn't there something that can be done to prevent the price of eggs from shooting back up again?

Here are the best answers CU has been able to find, based on Department of Agriculture statistics and other sources:

First, prices fell in part because the Government lowered the support level at which it buys eggs to hold prices up. Increased production, consumer resistance to excessive prices, speculation on the egg exchanges, and seasonal factors may have contributed to the sharpness of the drop, but an anticipated change in the Government buying price was the immediate cause of the collapse in retail egg prices.

Second, just as Federal action caused the collapse, so it was Federal action—specifically the price measures of the Eightieth Congress—which held prices high throughout 1948 and 1949.

Third, there is a better way to manage prices than the Federal egg-buying program which kept prices too high for consumers for 2 years, and then let them fall to levels which mean distress for farmers at the moment. The better way was proposed by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan last year, and promptly rejected by Congress. Briefly,

the Brannan plan would not spend tens of millions of dollars to support the price of eggs, as in the past. It would let wholesale and retail eggs prices fall in accordance with the supply and demand situation. Farmers, however, would not suffer as a result. The hundreds of millions heretofore spent to hold egg prices up, or a part of them, would be spent to maintain farm income directly.

Conversely, the Brannan plan would prevent the wasteful accumulation of so-called surplus eggs. Currently, the Government has in storage, in caves and warehouses throughout the country, more than 2,500,000,000 eggs in powdered form. These were eggs which we didn't consume because the price was too high, and which the Government bought to keep prices high. Under the Brannan plan, such surpluses would not accumulate at all. We'd eat them up.

Meanwhile the present bargain prices for eggs at retail, in some stores and cities, are likely to prove short-lived. Already Congressmen from the poultry States are putting the heat on the Department of Agriculture. Additional Federal egg buying designed to raise prices again—though not to 1949 levels—has already begun. Thus, following a brief interlude in which farmers were getting too little for their eggs, we are likely to return to a situation where consumers are charged too much. To see just how we got into this jam, let's look at the egg record of the past 5 years.

1945

This was the year in which egg eating in the United States hit an all-time high. There was a meat shortage, and for the first time in history Americans consumed more than an egg per person per day. Even so, a small surplus developed, for American hens cooperated by laying more eggs per hen than ever before in history. But the British wanted all the eggs they could get under lend-lease, so the surplus was useful. Prices were controlled by OPA.

1946

The production of eggs exceeded the 1945 record by a wide margin, while prices rose when OPA controls were ended. Consumption declined. As a result, a 3,600,000,000 egg surplus—eggs which could not be sold domestically at prevailing prices—was purchased by the Government. Again the British were prepared to take the entire amount. Despite the enormous surplus, prices remained firm as a result of Government buying for the British.

1947

Almost as many eggs were purchased by the Government to hold prices up as in 1946. But by 1947 Lend-Lease was dead, and the British had dollars to buy only a small portion of the excess—even though eggs were offered them below the price which the American Government paid. Some of these 1947 eggs, in frozen form, remained in Government warehouses into 1949. Total cost to the Government of the 1947 program for acquiring and disposing of eggs: about $[illegible],000,000.

Despite the enormous unsalable 1947 surplus, average retail prices were actually kept higher through Federal purchases in 1947 than in 1946 by more than 11 cents a dozen. Thus, the net effect of the 1947 price-support program in which millions of dollars were spent was to raise the cost of eggs to consumers some $[illegible] over 1945 costs.

1948

For a variety of reasons, egg production dropped somewhat, and egg consumption rose, so that there was a much smaller 1948 surplus. Again the Government had to buy eggs to support prices, however, and again it bought enough to lift egg prices above the levels of the previous year. Many of the eggs purchased, in dried form, are still stored in caves and warehouses.

1949

Under the Agriculture Act of 1948, the Department of Agriculture was required to support egg prices at a level which would bring the farmer an average of 45 cents a dozen on the farm. This level was achieved by purchasing eggs in dried form. Purchase price of the eggs to the Government: about $80,000,000. Effect on consumers: prices of grade A whites rose as high as 96 cents a dozen.

At the end of 1949, the Government had on hand, in dried form, some 2,500,000,000 1948 and 1949 eggs. A small part of these eggs were being given away through the school-lunch program.

Surplus dried eggs were also being offered for export at less than half the price which the Government paid for them. This is a process known as dumping—selling abroad at less than the cost of production and less than the domestic price. It is a process on which the United States has frowned for many years when other countries attempted it. Dumping is likely to build unlimited ill will on the part of other countries which make a living in part by exporting the products we are trying to dump. But even at the equivalent of 14 cents a dozen—the present dumping price—there are few takers for dried American eggs.

Numerous proposals were made for avoiding the evils of dumping by turning unsalable surpluses over to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations, for distribution to countries where they are desperately needed. But according to Washington sources, the State Department has resolutely opposed such measures.

THE OUTLOOK FOR 1950

After years of holding egg prices high for the benefit of farmers, it began early this year to look as if the end of that road was at hand. Indeed, the pendulum swung to the other extreme, and it was farmers who were victimized by egg prices below the cost of production. Farmers, remembering the great depression, talked "strike." One poultry State congressman summarized the situation in mid-January:

"Eggs in the Midwest are 20 cents a dozen at this time. Eggs in the Midwest were 20 cents a dozen in November 1932 when Mr. Hoover was defeated for President. * * * Are the egg producers back where they started? Or further back yet?"[1]

Egg production per hen, at a record high in 1949, is expected to go higher yet in 1950. With enormous stocks of 1948 and 1949 eggs on hand, the Department obviously has no desire to buy up all the eggs in sight for a third straight year. Moreover, the money is not available. Congress seems determined to force the Department to hold farm prices up by wasteful purchase and storage of surpluses; but it has not so far shown its willingness to vote the billions of dollars such a program would cost.

Here is the way Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Knox T. Hutchinson sums up the situation:

"In the past 4 years the Government has spent an average of $85,000,000 a year to support the price of eggs. And consumers have paid out an estimated $125,000,000 to $200,000,000 more for eggs than they would have if the support program had not been in existence. Thus in reality the public has shelled out from $210,000,000 to $285,000,000 a year for egg support."

One way out of the egg-price conundrum, of course, would be to eliminate Federal concern with the level of farm prices altogether.

Such a policy is politically impossible, and—in Consumer's Union's opinion—unwise even from the point of view of the consumer who wants low-egg prices. For American farmers are an integral part of our total economy. When farm income falls so low that farmers are unable to buy the things they need, the entire economy suffers. Major depressions have frequently been ushered in by farm depressions, and there can be no doubt that a serious drop in farm income now would promptly be reflected in unemployment and depression for other groups as well. For better or worse, the United States is irrevocably committed to maintaining a reasonable level of farm income.

When steel production exceeds the demand for steel, the few companies which control the steel industry promptly curtail production. The same is true of other dominant industries. But farmers, by themselves, cannot adjust supply to demand in this way. There are too many of them. Indeed, when surpluses occur and income falls off, the average farmer is tempted to increase production of some crops, in order to maintain his personal income. The effect is to pile up still larger surpluses.

But while CU applauds the principle that a fair return to farmers is a proper concern of Government, the particular means for achieving that fair return—namely open market purchase and storage of surpluses—is an outrageous imposition on the consumer in many respects. It keeps retail prices too high. In this way, it discourages consumption and therefore leads to still further surpluses. It also opens the opportunity for commodity speculation at the expense of consumers. Egg speculators on the Chicago and New York egg exchanges, for example, can gamble on a price increase, and thereby drive prices up, without much risk of losing money if the price later falls. For if it does begin to fall, the Government is always standing by to purchase eggs and relieve the speculator of his risk. Finally, Federal purchasing of surpluses subsidizes the giant corporations which manage farm factories as well as the family farmer for whom the program is ostensibly designed.

A better way

Under the Brannan plan, instead of buying up surpluses, with all its attendant evils, the Government would permit wholesale and retail egg prices to fall to whatever level supply and demand might dictate. For 1950, that would probably mean an average retail price of grade A eggs in the vicinity, let us say, of 45 or 50 cents a dozen—or even less during months when the supply is large as at present.

Such a retail price might force farm prices down to bankruptcy levels. Accordingly, at the end of the year, the Government would use the funds it has heretofore used for buying surpluses to make production payments direct to farmers.

The Department of Agriculture estimates that, for the money we have been spending to buy surpluses during the past few years, production payments to farmers averaging 5 to 6 cents a dozen could be made. This payment would be enough to make up the difference between the farm price of eggs and a fair return to farmers.

The arguments against the plan

Four major arguments are being made against the Brannan plan. One is that it

[1] The 20-cent price has since risen to 23 cents or 25 cents. These prices apply, moreover, to eggs of low quality, produced in the Midwest where egg prices are traditionally lower. The 1950 support program is geared to provide farmers with a national annual average price of 37 cents a dozen after balancing out seasonal, regional, and quality variations. This means retail grade A egg prices lower than in 1949, but in all probability higher than the average consumers paid in January and February.

would cost the Federal Treasury too much—perhaps billions. But buying up the surpluses also costs billions; for eggs alone, the cost has been $345,000,000 over the past 4 years. Whether the Brannan plan would cost more or less for any given crop in any given year is difficult to calculate. In general, the same conditions which might make the Brannan plan very costly would also make the present farm program very costly. There is no reason whatever to believe that, on the average, the Brannan plan would cost more—and it might cost less. It would certainly cost much less when the savings to consumers in lower retail prices are included in the calculation.

Second, it is argued that the Brannan plan's production payments would make the farmer a recipient of Federal charity and that consumers would object to spending Federal funds to subsidize farmers. But the Brannan plan is no more charity than the present plan. And consumers, if they once learn the full facts, are much more likely to revolt against the spending of billions to hold prices up, as at present, than they are to revolt against a reasonable program for maintaining farm income while permitting retail prices to fall.

Third, it is urged that the Brannan plan means forced curtailment of production—a type of economic waste which rules both farmers and consumers. But production curtailment is an essential element in the present illogical system of price supports, and a number of crops are actually being curtailed this year. Under the Brannan plan, increased consumption because of lower prices would make curtailment unnecessary in many cases where it is necessary without the Brannan plan. Curtailment of production would be necessary, in fact, only where production exceeded the full amount that consumers would want at reasonable prices.

Finally, it is alleged that the Brannan plan is a two-faced "pie in the sky" scheme which promises low prices to consumers on the one hand and high income to farmers on the other. Clearly, say the plan's enemies, you can't both eat your eggs and have them, too, as Secretary Brannan promises. But actually there is nothing at all contradictory in the consumer and farmer aspects of the plan. There is a real saving from the plan, and it is this saving which benefits both farmers and consumers.

A part of the saving would come from middlemen and food processors. Under the present plan, the farmer gets only a portion of the Federal expenditure. Middlemen and processors, through whose hands the surpluses pass before the Government gets them, get the rest. Needless to say, the middlemen who would lose their cut in the Federal subsidy bitterly oppose the Brannan plan.

Another major saving would result from a reduction in wholesale and retail markups on the food which reaches consumers. These mark-ups are generally figures on a percentage basis. When farm prices go up, the wholesaler's and the retailer's margins go up proportionately. With eggs at 45 cents a dozen on the farm, for example, the average store price is likely to be around 75 cents. Knocking a dime off the farm price may knock 18 cents or more off the store price.

A third saving would come, under the Brannan plan, by limiting benefits to family farmers who need them. Production payments would be made only up to a cash farm income of about $20,000 per farmer. Farmers could continue to earn whatever they were able to earn, but they would participate in production payments on the first $20,000 of marketed crops only. The limitation would affect only a small percentage of the farmers, but it would save the Treasury millions now channeled into the profit ledgers of large farm corporations. The benefits from all these savings would be shared by consumers and farmers alike.

Perhaps most important of all, under the Brannan plan there would be no surpluses, so-called. Consumers would eat them up. For actually there is no surplus of eggs, or of many other crops. If all consumers ate as many eggs as the moderate and upper-income consumers now eat, there would be a shortage. The so-called surplus is simply an accumulation of eggs consumers can't afford to buy at Government-pegged prices. Under the Brannan plan, prices would fall to a level where consumption of eggs would equal production.

There are weaknesses in the Brannan plan—chiefly its limitation to a few crops and its failure to provide consumer representation on the administrative bodies which would make the basic price decisions. These and other shortcomings CU set forth last June. But compared with the folly of the surplus-purchasing program under legislation passed by the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, it would be a long, long step in the right direction.

Secretary Brannan is still fighting for at least a trial run of his plan. But he has received a cold shoulder from both Democrats and Republicans in Congress—with a few noteworthy exceptions. While such reactionary farm organizations as the National Farm Bureau Federation oppose even trying out the Brannan plan, an increasing number of farmers and at least one farm organization—the National Farmers Union—are in favor of the plan. CU believes that consumers would do well to join forces with such farm groups to demand a return to sanity in our national farm-price programs.

A look at the egg problem—and others

Tobacco	$151,891,629
Cotton	955,109,372
Wheat	996,719,026
Linseed oil	111,337,600
Flaxseed	88,344,527
Corn	713,128,735
Dried eggs (210,000,000 doz.)	89,317,233
Butter	59,518,797
Wool	53,510,467
Dry edible beans	42,859,926
Barley	35,088,096
Dried milk	27,399,460
Other	320,904,449
Total	3,645,129,317

Authors of Our Defeats Still Manage Our Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, George E. Sokolsky, noted columnist, has reviewed our foreign policy in a searching editorial. This is "must" reading for Members who are interested in the forces that are changing our lives. I include the article as a part of my remarks:

REVIEW OF OUR DESCENT IN POLICY OF DEFEATISM

(By George E. Sokolsky)

It is important for those who wish to think straight to get away from the headlines of the day and to consider the forces and movements that are rapidly changing our lives.

As one listens to the clack-clack on the radio or looks at the enormous headlines in the newspapers, the emphasis is on the unbelievable. Communists everywhere; a King upsetting Belgium; Great Britain in the hands of Socialists; the President sunning himself in Florida while his country is stunned by homosexuals and Communists in high places; a Nation frittering away its wealth while it loses battle after battle in what is called a cold war, which is neither cold nor a war, but a steam roller flattening out the world.

It would seem to be profligate and wasteful to worry about partisanship or about the careers of individuals in the face of our necessity to build a great strength to withstand the shock of the next few years—and we shall be shocked as every nation is that has lost a war.

Let us recapitulate:

In 1939, Europe went to war because Hitler sought to build an empire based on the destruction of the freedoms of man. The world did not know that the Hitler-Stalin alliance included the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact for the division of Europe and Asia between Germany and Russia.

In 1941, the United States entered that war on two fronts; one in Asia; the other in Europe. The United States stated its war objectives in the form of the Atlantic Charter, which set forth high ideals of human freedom and national independence, for friend and foe, for countries large and small.

By 1943, we had deserted those principles. At the Tehran Conference, arrangements were made which, for Europe, practically implemented the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact. By 1945, the Tehran principles were also applied to Asia.

The world was divided between the Russian and the Anglo-Saxon countries, at the River Elbe, with the thirty-eighth parallel as the dividing line in Asia.

The acceptance of this Byzantine concept of human bondage by the United States and Great Britain, a departure from the traditions of the race since Magna Carta, at the Potsdam Conference after the war, encouraged the Russians to believe that the western nations had shot their bolt and were hereafter to be regarded as decadent.

We now need to move from what we know to what we may presume; namely, that the Russians analyzed our weaknesses from their own experience with us. They established in each western country an effective Communist Party whose members despised their own country and willingly served Russia.

They found such persons not only among the proletariat, but in the upper intellectual circles, among old families of distinction, among the wealthy and within the Government. This has been as true in the United States as in France, Italy or Great Britain.

They also discovered a marked tendency for the intellectuals, particularly scientists, to forsake the basically Christian traditions of their civilization.

Therefore, they decided to move swiftly. In Europe, they resorted to Marxian propaganda; in Asia, they successfully went to war. In Europe, their influence has expanded beyond the Elbe, but they failed to take Italy, France and western Germany. They have, however, taken Czechoslovakia and Hungary, which were altogether in the Christian world.

The governmental resistance to this advance has been trifling. American diplomacy based itself entirely on dollars, which is not enough. Even in the expenditure of dollars so many subterfuges had to be employed that no rallying to a great set of principles of life appeared.

While such a concept as the Marshall plan can produce a statistical success, it has failed as a spiritual force. In Asia, China was deserted and became Russian by default.

Now this is the story and here is where we now are. And all the apologies of such a man as Dr. Philip Jessup and the strongly worded speeches of Dean Acheson will not help, because the map is what it is.

Denials do not prevent the lines on the map from moving and whenever they do move, it is to our disadvantage. Yet, this also is true: the authors of our defeats, the makers of our failures are still managing our affairs.

Housing Activity in the Nation and in 15 Metropolitan Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission of the House, I include in the RECORD a statement by Ewan Clague, Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor, dealing with housing activity in the Nation and in the 15 metropolitan areas:

HOUSING ACTIVITY IN THE NATION AND IN 15 METROPOLITAN AREAS

NATIONAL HOUSING VOLUME AND HOUSING DEMAND

With 80,000 new nonfarm dwelling units started in February the Nation has just completed the most spectacular winter home-building season in its history. Builders have been starting new dwellings at the rate of about 80,000 units a month since last December, a volume we would not normally expect until the spring. Still, this monthly volume represents a seasonal drop of 16 percent from the huge November figure of 95,500. Thus the usual seasonal pattern has been maintained, but with activity at a very high level.

The unexpectedly large volume of housing so far this year reflects assurance about costs, which most experts agree will probably change little over the year. Added to this has been uneasiness about credit after expiration on March 1 of the emergency mortgage insuring provisions of the National Housing Act. Unusually favorable weather in many parts of the country has also contributed to the winter's large volume. Housing demand continues virtually unabated, buoyed by high consumer income and the continuing high marriage and birth rates.

Accomplishment this year follows the home building record achieved in 1949 when, as latest estimates show, 1,025,000 new units were started, nearly 10 percent above the previous peak of 937,000 in 1925. Even without the 36,000 public units started, 1949 surpassed all other years in housing activity. What is more, while attention was centered on the boom in apartments (41 percent above 1948), builders started the largest number of one-family houses in any single year in history. About 790,000 single-family homes were begun last year, up 3 percent from 1948, when the previous record was established.

What inroads had we made in the housing shortage by the end of 1949? One way of answering this question is by comparing the number of new dwellings started with the increase in the number of households over the past few decades.

The number of new nonfarm dwellings started in the 1920's outnumbered by a million and a third the increase in the number of households (approximately the number of family units) between 1920 and 1929. This housing advantage, however, was completely wiped out in the thirties, when the increase in households outdistanced new housing volume by 1,840,000. The gap became wider still in the 1940's, when nearly 1,500,000 more nonfarm households were added than new dwellings started. The housing deficit, created largely during the depression and war years when new home building dropped sharply, exists primarily in urban areas. We do know that building of new rural nonfarm dwellings had exceeded the increase in rural nonfarm households by the end of 1949.

This discussion has so far been confined to provision of new housing units. For one thing, there is no accurate information about the volume of converted dwelling units—housing provided by conversion of nonresidential structures to residential use or by conversion of old residences to include additional apartments. A large proportion of converted units are in any case makeshift accommodations. In addition, if they are weighed against the units lost by change from housing to nonhousing use, it appears that conversions have provided a relatively small addition to the permanent housing supply.

Indications are that the new dwelling units started each year will have to exceed a million for several years to wipe out the backlog, as well as to meet current population increase and effective demand.

HOUSING IN 15 METROPOLITAN AREAS

Because of the backlog in urban places, the housing shortage is especially acute in the Nation's metropolitan areas. For this reason, the Bureau of Labor Statistics is now engaged in studying the volume and characteristics of the new housing started in 15 major metropolitan areas—Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington, D. C. We are comparing here for the first time the results of the surveys in these areas with respect to the volume of new housing started since the war. A little later this year we shall present the results of the Bureau's studies of the characteristics of the new housing provided in the 15 areas.

The Bureau's surveys show that New York and Los Angeles far outstripped all other metropolitan areas in home building since the war. The 293,260 new nonfarm dwelling units started in the New York-northeastern New Jersey metropolitan area, and the 277,325 started in the Los Angeles area, constituted 16 percent of the Nation's new housing units begun in the postwar years, 1946–49. No other area came within as much as 40 percent of the New York or Los Angeles achievement. Next in housing volume was Chicago with 95,660 units. Pittsburgh, among the first 6 metropolitan areas in the country in size and industrial importance, was one of the least active in home building among the 15 surveyed.

The reason for such wide variation in housing activity lies in differing rates of population growth as well as population size. In general, the metropolitan areas which were among the leaders in population increase from 1940 ranked high also in home-building rate (number of units started per 10,000 population). Of nine areas for which an estimate of 1949 population could be obtained, Miami, the smallest, ranked first in population increase from 1940 (53 percent) and greatly surpassed all the others in the number of postwar dwelling units started per 10,000 population. Miami held only seventh place, however, in the actual number of units started, but nevertheless ranked ahead of both Boston and Pittsburgh. This may be explained by the fact that the Boston and Pittsburgh areas held the last two places, respectively, in population growth, with less than a 10-percent increase between 1940 and 1949, compared with Miami's 53 percent.

The most urgent housing need in the metropolitan areas is for rental units. Home builders in these areas have responded variously to this need. Apartments were 7 percent of the total number of nonfarm dwelling units started in the Detroit area in 1949, and, at the other extreme, 69 percent in the Washington, D. C., area. In 1949, as compared with 1948, significant gains were made in the number of apartments started in the majority of the areas, but there were declines in Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, Miami, and Seattle. In the Boston area, the entire 1949 increase in rental-type units was in public housing; in New York, public housing accounted for nearly two-thirds of the rise in apartment construction.

In the majority of the 15 surveyed areas, the proportion of rental-type units to the total of nonfarm dwellings started was greater than the proportion in the United States as a whole (23 percent). This is to be expected, however, since rental housing is largely urban and is most common in the largest cities. It is more extraordinary that the ratio of rental-type units to the total started in 1949 was less than the United States ratio in the Cleveland, Chicago, Denver, and Detroit areas.

TABLE 1.—*Number of new nonfarm dwelling units started—1948, 1949, and 1950*

Period	
1948	931,500
January	58,900
February	59,100
March	76,400
April	99,500
May	100,300
June	97,800
July	96,000
August	86,600
September	82,300
October	73,400
November	69,600
December	63,900
1949	[2] 1,025,000
January	56,000
February	59,400
March	69,400
April	88,300
May	90,400
June	95,500
July	96,100
August	98,000
September	102,900
October	104,300
November	[1] 95,500
December	[1] 78,000
1950:	
January	[1] 80,000
February	[1] 80,000

[1] Revised.
[2] Preliminary.

TABLE 2.—*Postwar home-building rate and population change in 15 metropolitan areas*

Metropolitan area	New permanent nonfarm dwelling units started, 1946–49			Population change, 1940–49 [1]	
	Total number	Number per 10,000 population in 1940		Percent	Rank [2]
		Number	Rank		
United States	2,478,400	[illegible]		+11	
Miami	55,270	1,340	1	+53	1
Los Angeles	277,325	668	2	+41	2
Washington, D. C.	62,200	660	3	+15	3
San Francisco-Oakland	78,600	533	4	+26	4
New York-Northeastern New Jersey	293,260	290	5	+9	7
Philadelphia	66,540	192	6	+13	5
Chicago	95,660	177	7	+12	6
Boston	40,200	170	8	+8	8
Pittsburgh	30,600	104	9	+7	9

[1] Data for metropolitan areas are based on unofficial estimates. Data for the United States are from the U. S. Bureau of the Census.
[2] Ranks assigned before rounding.

How About America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Altoona Tribune, Altoona, Pa., in my congressional district, has the following to say about the state of our national defenses:

HOW ABOUT AMERICA?

While Congress wrangles over how many more millions of American public funds to hand Europe, and while the State Department urges that still more millions be solicited, and Mr. Truman refuses curtly to speak in anything except vagaries, and Russia single-mindedly builds up Russia and prepares to take over all of Asia, two of America's foremost military leaders sound a warning note.

Gen. Omar Bradley, Chief of Staff, on March 8, warned this country against any immediate lone-handed disarmament.

Last night, Thursday, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower declared America has slashed her armaments below the danger point in a world that has not yet attained peace.

These are warnings that should be heeded. In Washington today, much of our governmental operation is in charge of men who were not in positions of active leadership during the war. Both General Eisenhower and General Bradley were in such positions. And, as war ended, both made notable addresses in the cause of peace, General Eisenhower, in 1946, even urging that world leaders ignore the word "war," make no mention of it in the future.

Now, his words unheeded, General Eisenhower, Thursday, asserted that our weakness in the face of Soviet strength is "well nigh as criminal as war itself."

He declared, "America already has disarmed to the extent—in some directions even beyond the extent—that I, with deep concern, for her present safety, could possibly advise, until we have certain knowledge that all nations are doing likewise.

"Only by deliberate lies can the propagandist—foreign or domestic—stretch our arms program into more than reasonable posture for the defense which George Washington urged on his countrymen. And the heads of state everywhere, even the most suspicious and fearful, know that it is below that level."

At least two things are noteworthy in the general's address. His reference, in the latter paragraph, would appear to strike at recent statements by Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, who spoke of our adequate military strength, and how we "could lick hell out of Stalin."

And, secondly, the general obviously does not concur in the New Deal-Fair Deal tendency to relegate the wisdom of George Washington to the dead past.

It is the usual practice of administration spokesmen to answer opponents who quote Washington, Jefferson, or any of the founding fathers, by declaring that "things are different now."

But, they are not.

Europe offers the very same threats to America today that it offered when Americans rebelled against the others of King George in colonial times.

The only real savings made in a major Government department has been in that of national defense, at a time when Russia, the only world power besides ourselves, absolutely refuses to join with us for world peace.

Instead of reducing expenditures abroad, and of trying to reduce the mammoth bureaucracy at home, America's defenses are being whittled away for political purposes, and short-sighted leaders who already appear to have forgotten Pearl Harbor are centering our defenses in western Europe while Russia spreads across half the world.

Archduke Otto, of Austria, speaking in Pittsburgh the other day, said Soviet activities in central Europe are just a cover-up for Stalin's big push across Asia.

He declared America is losing the cold war because we are not considering the world as a whole, as Stalin does.

In other words, our internationalism ends in western Europe.

Russia is deliberately unfriendly. She is openly aggressive. She rejected insultingly the greatest peace move made by any nation—the United States offer to share the atomic bomb secret nearly 3 years ago, provided all nations would agree on controls and UN inspection of each nation.

Russia is now the predominant military power in the world.

It is time to forget western Europe for a while and to think about maintaining freedom in America, and defending it.

Letter to Editor of Oneida (N. Y.) Daily Dispatch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1950.

EDITOR, ONEIDA DAILY DISPATCH,
Oneida, N. Y.

SIR: I note that the battle you are leading against me is continuing in full swing and it is O. K. with me.

However, I take issue with you on the following. I note that you are emphasizing the fact that I have sent out material under the frank which is "a cost to us taxpayers of a minimum of a thousand dollars."

May I remind you that the Oneida Dispatch during 1949 franked its own propaganda which was likewise paid for by the taxpayers and which reached more than three times the tonnage I sent, according to official Post Office Department estimates.

While you are making such a to-do about my right to defend myself against your ruthless attacks, please also point out to your readers that you are fighting me with taxpayers' money.

It is no more than fair that the voters of Madison County should understand that your newspaper has used and is using as many tax-dollars to subsidize mailing out your papers as I use in like periods of time. I will continue sending to the voters remarks of mine which you refuse to print but which are nevertheless utterances by an elected representative of the people and should be made public by any patriotic local newspaper.

In other words, you are guilty of the same abuse you attribute to me, possibly on a more colossal scale.

In spite of the tremendous advantage you have over me from a financial standpoint, I expect to challenge any Goliath which attempts to put me in a bad light with the fellow-members of my party.

It is obvious that you do not want a man who is nominated by the Republicans of Madison County unless he answers to your beck and call and does what you want him to.

I repeat, my record is 93 percent Republican in Congress which is among the highest and your challenging a man on that record in a Republican primary is asinine, regardless of your petty personal dislike for me.

Sincerely,

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

Problems of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered on Monday, March 27, 1950, before the Conference of American Small Business Organizations at the Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

Chairman Virkus and members of the Conference of American Small Business Organizations, I appreciate the opportunity of speaking to you at this luncheon. I shall speak generally with reference to the problems of government, realizing that all problems and policies of government, and all legislation, whether in the foreign or domestic field, effects every small-business man in the Nation.

I know you realize the present serious condition of the state of the Nation. I should like for you to know that the majority of the Members of Congress are serious-minded men who probably realize more keenly than any other group of men in America the serious state of the Nation on both the domestic, and in the foreign field.

We are struggling with the problem from day to day in the hope of stabilizing the economy of the Nation, maintaining the financial solvency of the Government, and eventually bringing about more amicable relations with foreign countries which may lead to world peace.

I know of no single group in America who is cooperating in a finer spirit to this end than the small-business men of the Nation. National defense and financial solvency on the home front are the two main essentials for the preservation of our Government, and the contribution it can make toward world peace. Without a strong Government financially we cannot have adequate defense, we cannot preserve the American way of life, we cannot make our world contribution to peace. There is much to be done along this line on the home front.

Your Government needs your cooperation and effort on the home front as never before. I know you realize this need. And I know you are contributing to, and will continue to make your great contribution to this end. Throughout this land the over 5,000,000 small-business men who still represent the pioneer spirit that has made America great have been lending the Government your solid effort and contribution to preserve free enterprise, and a sound economy

in building a greater America. You have defied and resisted the poisonous virus of socialism.

You represent a great and powerful force in the business life of the Government that asks little or nothing from the Government except to be let alone. You want less meddling of the horde of bureaucrats in your private business affairs. You are against the expanding and building of a greater bureaucracy in Government. You are opposed to Government continuously entering the business field in competition with private business, paying little or no taxes to the support of the Government. You are concerned and opposed to present confiscatory taxes on small business and all of the people. We serious Members of Congress join with you in this same effort.

The time is here now when the small-business men who are the backbone of the economy of this Nation must greatly expand your organizations and make yourself felt as a mighty political force in the future to protect the ideals of government for which you stand.

You can be a mighty force in this effort as you employ 90 percent of the nearly 60,000,000 wage earners of the Nation. You furnish approximately 75 percent of the investment capital of the Nation. You are not only competitors of big business, but you are producers, fabricators, suppliers, and distributors for big business, rounding out and making possible the most dynamic economy the world has ever known. You furnish the greatest amount of risk capital necessary to the expansion of business throughout the Nation. Retail merchants complete the job of distribution.

You are opposed to the present socialistic trend of government, to governmental regimentation, to government waste and spending that threatens the destruction of free enterprise and representative government.

BIG GOVERNMENT

The greatest threat to the Nation today is big government, its expense to the taxpayers and the abuse of its power over the people. It carries the imminent threat of financial bankruptcy with the loss of freedom for all, and the death of our representative system of government that has preserved our liberty. Big government, through big bureaucracy, now in peacetime has 2,000,000 people employed on the Federal pay roll at a yearly cost approaching $5,000,000,000.

The Federal debt is $260,000,000,000. Our Government, in addition, has guaranteed loans, or obligations up to $93,000,000,000, much to which it may later have to pay.

FOREIGN COUNTRIES

We have given to foreign countries since the close of the war $28,000,000,000, and a bill is before the Congress today to give in aid to foreign countries another $5,000,000,000. All of this money has to be borrowed from the people.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The President has before the Congress a budget request for $42,500,000,000—the biggest budget ever requested to date. He admits that if this amount is granted that at the end of the coming fiscal year we may still have a 2-year total deficit of $10,000,000,000 which must be added to the national debt through deficit financing.

When you realize that your Federal Government, in years of the highest income the Nation has ever known, against which the highest taxes in peacetime have been levied, still spends each year $5,000,000,000 more than we take in, you must come to the conclusion that financial bankruptcy is imminent, unless drastic action is taken to reduce the cost of Government. No businessman can follow such a policy without going broke. The Government cannot follow such a policy without bringing about the same result.

Many of us Members of the Congress will attempt to reduce the budget by a minimum of $3,000,000,000. With the cooperation of the President it could be done and the business of the Nation would expand to a point where possibly more taxes would flow into the Treasury than the amount of the budget cut.

Unfortunately, in the face of this danger, the President has asked for new and unnecessary legislation that would possibly add $30,000,000,000 a year to the present budget request of $42,500,000,000. The Congress is stubbornly resisting the passing of such new legislation with its additional expense.

SOCIALISM

The small-business men of the Nation see the threat of socialism and are against it. Much socialistic legislation has already been passed. The Federal housing and slum clearance passed in the last session is a typical example. It will cost billions and billions in the future unless it can be repealed at a later date. The attempt of this administration to pass its companion bill last week, the Federal housing bill which the Congress soundly defeated is another example.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

The administration's effort to pass a socialized medicine bill which would increase medical cost to the people and bring them a lower type of medical care is another example.

BRANNAN FARM PLAN

Its support and agitation for the Brannan farm plan, socialistic to the core, that would regiment the farmers as never before, and add an extra cost of probably $10,000,000,000 a year to the Government, is another example of the present dangerous trend in Government.

HIGH TAXES

High taxes are a powerful force in bringing about the socialized state. It operates by taxing business until it dries up risk investment. Then the Government proclaims that business and free enterprise has failed and the Government must step in and take over. You may remember some months ago that the President threatened to put the Government into the manufacture of steel, claiming that the big steel organizations were failing to produce in sufficient quantities. It was a ridiculous statement, but illustrates the point.

The Federal Government, on an average, takes over six times as much in taxes out of the States as is collected in all taxes for State, county, municipal, and other subdivisions of Government.

Something must be done to stop the impoverishment of the States from the confiscatory tax load imposed upon the people by the Federal Government.

CORPORATIONS

Corporations are taxed from 36 to 40 percent in some instances, with individuals up to 85 percent, and the President asks that a heavier tax now be laid on corporations. Small-business men find present tax loads a great burden that makes it difficult to obtain new risk capital for expansion. Large corporations experience like difficulties. We are following too many of the socialistic policies that have wrecked the government of England and established the socialized state. It can happen here unless the small-business men and the thinking people of America rise up in mass and demand a drastic reduction of the cost of Government which is the only way to lower the present tax burdens.

THE THREAT OF BIG LABOR LEADERS

The No. 2 and serious threat to our Nation is the power and policy of the big labor leaders. They boldly boast through the press that they are raising millions of dollars to defeat the Members of Congress who will not take their dictation. If they can defeat 17 men in the House and 6 in the Senate, they can control the Congress.

If they can control the Congress, they can control the Government and bring about a Socialist labor government here like in England. That is their aim.

The coal strike is the best example of the chaos that would befall us Nation-wide if they are allowed to gain this power.

NO ONE GROUP SHOULD CONTROL THE GOVERNMENT

All legislation enacted should seek to bring about the best climatic atmosphere under which agriculture, labor, and business can operate as harmoniously as possible, bringing their great combined contribution to the welfare of the Nation. The 5,000,000 businessmen, of which you are a part, must keep up the fight to cut the cost of Government spending; stop waste, reduce taxes, balance the budget, and begin the reduction of the Federal debt. In this effort you will have the continued support of the serious Members of this Congress who realize that this must be done in the interest of all our people. Let's keep the faith and continue the fight together to save America.

Educational Program To Combat Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, in connection with Senate Resolution 243, favoring an increased educational program by the United States in combating communism in foreign countries, submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and other Senators, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD two editorials, one from the Boston Globe of March 24, 1950, entitled "Wanted: More Steam," and the other from the Boston Post of March 24, 1950, entitled "A Louder Voice."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Globe of March 24, 1950]

WANTED: MORE STEAM

Senator WILLIAM BENTON, of Connecticut, deserves hearty public support for his plea urging the institution of a Marshall plan of ideas. The former Under Secretary of State in charge of the Voice of America knows whereof he speaks. His complaint, that no adequate governmental program of affirmative news about this country is being directed toward the outside world, is amply justified.

Senator BENTON urges complete reorganization of our efforts toward this end. He wants better broadcasts, more thoroughly representative motion pictures, and an expansion of the foreign information service so as to meet and counter the distortions and plain falsehoods which are being disseminated abroad against America. Our opponents are sleeplessly on the job in this struggle for the minds of men. Thus far, we have been attempting to counter them half-heartedly and half in a dose.

[From the Boston Post of March 24, 1950]

A LONELY VOICE

The world, despite the jet-propelled illusion of diminishing distances, is still a big place, dotted with sinister watch-your-step signs at the crossroads and full of confused or fearing people who think that Santa Claus is a free-handed giver only because he has some racket which he wishes to work on the money.

The propaganda mills of the Kremlin have spared no expense nor effort to sow the suspicion from pole to pole that the little package marked "made in the United States of America," may contain a time-bomb instead of a pair of Argyle socks. People living in terror, past or present, naturally succumb to such shoddy and incendiaries.

Returning travelers tell the tale. They are alarmed by the antipathy held for America among people in countries we lifted literally out of the bottomless pit of communism by their galluses and made a part of the free world that looks to the gold star of hope instead of the red star of reaction.

The answer is simple. We have beaten the Russians in the Berlin airlift. We have defeated them at the polls in France and Italy. We have united the Europeans in the common defense of their ancestral acres and are implementing their will to battle for them with weapons to match those of the foe.

While nourishing their war-weakened bodies, giving them something more than their fists to fight with and making them more self-sufficient by restoring their factories and farms, many evidently are still unconvinced. We haven't got at their minds.

A freshman Senator would tackle that next. BENTON, of Connecticut, in his maiden speech in the Senate, backed by 14 colleagues, launched a plan to counteract the information programs of the world to combat communism.

In his own right, an able advertising man, with State Department experience added, he would gather the non-Communist countries together for conference in which they would pool their propaganda-making apparatus and battle the Reds in the field of thinking by a cooperative, concerted, and all-powerful effort.

The new Senator from Connecticut is not selling wooden nutmegs with that idea. It's sound. It would make the Voice of America the voice of free men everywhere. It would be fighting communism at its best—propagandizing.

Some Statistics We Must Never Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, those who harbor thoughts of world war III in which our Nation might become involved, should seriously consider the statistics of previous wars:

The following frightful figures are taken from data prepared by the United States Veterans' Administration:

War	Participants	In service deaths
Revolutionary War	200,000	4,000
War of 1812	500,000	2,000
Mexican War	130,000	13,000
Spanish-American War	392,000	11,000
Civil War	2,100,000	364,000
World War I	4,734,000	116,000
World War II	16,535,000	405,000

Our Global War on Narcotics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, during my years in government service, prior to my election to Congress, I was fortunate to serve with, and know, such outstanding men as Harry Anslinger, Malachi Harney, George White, and many others who exercise a constant vigil over narcotics consumption. These gentlemen, from Commissioner Anslinger down to the agents in the field, perform what is far too frequently an unobtrusive public service.

Due recognition has come their way in a Reader's Digest reprint of an article in American Mercury. Without fanfare the narcotics agent performs his duty, hazardous though it is. I am pleased to insert the above-mentioned article as part of my extended remarks:

OUR GLOBAL WAR ON NARCOTICS

(By Frederic Sondern, Jr.)

It was late afternoon in the ancient city of Istanbul. As street vendors, beggars, people of every race and dress jostled along the Rue Cabristan, no one paid much attention to a group of workmen digging a ditch outside a little cafe. Suddenly, at a window above the cafe, a shade jerked up. Immediately the ditch diggers dropped their tools, rushed into the cafe and up its stairs, pistols in hand. In a few moments four cursing men emerged from the building, prodded forward by an American seaman. Before a crowd could gather, police cars had whisked them off.

Within the hour Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger of the United States Treasury Department's Bureau of Narcotics received a cable from the American seaman—United States Narcotics Agent George White: "Able today to buy quantity pure heroin from biggest ring of dealers here and street same. Brilliant support from Turkish police who have seized refining plant and 900 ounces of narcotics, source large shipments to the United States."

Agent White's triumph in a city on the other side of the globe was not an unusual project for the Narcotics Bureau. A tightly knit organization of some 300 officers, the Bureau deals with one of today's most intricate law-enforcement problems.

With the end of World War II, habit-forming narcotics began to flow again to Europe and the United States from dope racketeers in the Far East, the Middle East, and South America. In the United States the drug traffic climbed rapidly back toward prewar levels. By 1949 more than 10 percent of the inmates of our Federal prisons were men and women convicted under the narcotics laws. Drug trafficking and addiction were contributing more and more to crime of all kinds—from gang warfare and murder to prostitution and larceny by addicts in need of money to satisfy their expensive craving.

Some months before the raid in the Rue Cabristan, field offices of the Bureau of Narcotics reported to Washington that heroin, most vicious of the opium derivatives, was getting into the illicit market from a new source. Examination showed it to be of Turkish manufacture. Narcotics-squad detectives of New York's police department ferreted out a Greek sailor and two friends who seemed to be doing most of the peddling. They were shadowed to their cache—a suitcase in the parcel room of a bus terminal. After arrest, the sailor told of a big heroin ring in Istanbul which sold to seamen.

Commissioner Anslinger decided to push right into the enemy's camp. A few years ago that would have been difficult. Owing to the work of the United Nations, however, new weapons have been put into the hands of the men who fight the illicit drug traffic. Anslinger telephoned the chief of the narcotics section of the Turkish police, then sent for Supervising Agent George White of the San Francisco field office.

A few days later, in Istanbul, the Turkish police welcomed their American colleague. They briefed him on persons in the Turkish underworld who might be involved, on their habits and headquarters, warning that undercover men had a way of being found in the Bosporus with their throats cut.

Disguised as an American merchant sailor, White began frequenting water-front bars. He dropped hints that he had money to spend, had connections in New York, and was open to business if the profits were right. The scouts of the dope syndicate reacted almost at once. For more than a week he was put through a grueling inquisition. Questioned and cross-questioned by Turks who seemed to know a great deal about our underworld, he was aware that one slip would mean a quick bullet or a knife in the back. White's answers, based on an encyclopedic knowledge of our criminal elements, passed muster. He was finally taken to the Rue Cabristan café where he met the four men he had come 5,000 miles to catch. They agreed to let him have $6,000 worth of heroin the next day.

The gangsters arrived at the appointed hour. White was to signal the ditch-digging police outside by raising the window shade when the deal was consummated. After endless delays and arguments the precious carton containing the drugs was produced. White said that he wanted to examine it in better light. And then—the shade stuck. White fought with it, too violently. The others reached for their guns but the agent managed to draw first. At that moment the disturbed shade flew up with a bang, and the police pounded up the stairs.

Other raiding squads converged on headquarters and plants of the gang in and near the city. It was a clean sweep, the biggest catch in Turkey in recent years.

Almost as soon as a gang in one of the drug capitals is knocked off, however, another takes its place. With heroin selling in New York or Paris for $300 to $500 an ounce, the returns for drug racketeers are high. A single shipment which United States customs inspectors found not long ago in the tail assembly of an airplane at LaGuardia Airport would have been worth over a million dollars in the underworld retail trade.

When Charles Luciania (Lucky Luciano), former New York racketeer, was deported to Italy in 1946, after serving 10 years in prison, he had big plans. In Rome he allied himself with the cream of Italian black marketeers and arranged for a flow of drugs from the eastern Mediterranean. Then he obtained an Italian passport and permission to visit Cuba. In Habana the suave Signor Luciania began to establish contact with correspondents in Miami, New York, and Chicago.

Actually the Narcotics Bureau knew his plans before he left Italy. They let him carry them out—up to a point—to see what contacts he would make. Then the Commissioner suggested to Cuban authorities that Luciania be deported. Just as Lucky saw his dream of another empire coming true, Habana detectives appeared at his door one morning and asked him to pack; his plane was leaving shortly.

This swift and silent international cooperation often results in underworld catastrophes. The steward known as Louis was nervous as the steamship *Santa Luisa* from South American ports steamed into Charleston harbor not long ago. He was carrying

a big load this trip. The customs men made their usual careful search, apparently found no contraband, and cleared the ship. Louis was relieved. The next day he decided that the coast was clear. His runner, a colored newsboy, had come aboard and the two sauntered to the cleverly concealed cache in the forepeak. No one was around except a steam fitter, who seemed absorbed in his work. Quickly Louis opened the cache, the boy slipped several small bags into his clothing and shuffled off. The steward had just closed the compartment when he felt a hand on his shoulder. It was the steam fitter but he had a badge. The newsboy found agents waiting for him at the foot of the gangplank.

Louis's cache had been under guard from the moment customs searchers had found it—not many minutes after they had come aboard. A message from narcotics men in a Latin-American country, who had been watching a big new syndicate that was building up a coastal trade, told Washington that the ship was "hot." They had not been able to identify the runner, however, and Anslinger wanted him. So, from the time the ship landed, narcotics and customs agents dressed as electricians, steam fitters, and longshoremen took turns staying in sight of the cache until their quarry sprung the trap.

A nemesis to many a narcotics trafficker has been the international list of narcotics violators, which is kept up to date by the Bureau of Narcotics from reports sent in by other nations. Besides names and descriptions of all known illicit drug traders, the international list describes every unusual smuggling trick tried in recent years. There are some classics. An Egyptian syndicate discovered a new method of concealing narcotics in the camel trains which they dispatched across the Sahara Desert to Casablanca and Tangier. Metal capsules containing morphine and heroin, fed to a camel, would lodge in one of the storage compartments of his peculiar digestive system. Each animal could carry tens of thousands of dollars' worth of drugs. At the end of the journey the camels were slaughtered and the capsules recovered. It was expensive transport, but the returns justified the investment.

Egyptian customs inspectors missed this trick until the price of camels went up sharply. Then an Egyptian officer investigating the phenomenon had a bright idea; he examined the camels by fluoroscope, and the syndicate had to look for a new transportation scheme.

It takes time, infinite patience, and ingenuity to build up an ironclad case against the shrewd operators cataloged in the international list. Take Joseph "Pip the Blind" Gagliano, who was until recently No. 121 in the book.

Several facts were known about Gagliano. His headquarters in New York were modest—the back room of a bar on East One Hundred and Seventh Street. His runners smuggled in opium from Mexico, brought it to his secret New York factory to be converted into heroin. From there dealers and peddlers fanned out across the country, did a huge business. Pip never handled dope himself and would discuss a deal only in his back room with no witnesses present.

A Bureau agent whom we'll call Jackson, after months of building himself up as a prosperous racketeer from the west coast, finally succeeded in developing an acquaintance with the gangster. But to obtain a conviction he had to get Pip the Blind to hand over narcotics and accept payment—or order one of his men to do so—before witnesses.

Jackson drove up to the gang's headquarters one morning and honked his horn. One of the boss' musclemen responded to the summons. "I've got to see Pip," said Jackson. "Big deal. But I've banged up my leg. Can't walk on it." He exhibited a foot swathed in bandages; crutches leaned against the seat. "Pip don't never talk to nobody on the street," the gunman replied. "But since it's you I'll see what he says." The agent held his breath. Behind his seat, in a reconstructed baggage compartment, crouched another agent with his eyes at a peep slot from which he could see and hear anyone who came to the side of the car. Across the street, in an innocent-looking truck, were more agents and a camera.

Pip the Blind walked toward the car with his chief henchman. What he said in the next few minutes and the orders he gave his assistant sealed his doom. The next day Jackson and his helpers repeated the process with his two principal lieutenants. Police traps snapped shut from New York to the Mexican border. Pip the Blind later hanged himself in his cell.

Narcotics Bureau agents thus concluded another case—with quiet satisfaction. For, as Commissioner Anslinger's executive officer, Malachi Harney, said to me: "When you break a narcotics case you not only nab some of the nastiest specimens in existence but you save a lot of people from a lot of misery. An ounce of cocaine sold in New York may account for a hop-headed hold-up man who kills a peaceful citizen in Dallas or a doped-up driver who rams a school bus in Ohio."

Men in Light Stetson Hats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there are those who believe that the first men to wear the light broad-brimmed hat came from south of the Rio Grande, who came into the southwest country to carve out a new empire. But we do know that the Texas Rangers, who for a hundred years protected the frontiers of Texas, wore the light-colored hats.

In that broad expanse of territory from Fort Worth, south to the Rio Grande, thence north to the Dakotas, and between this line and the Rocky Mountains, is the home of the stockman.

Seventy-five years ago, these cowmen, who trailed the cowherds from Texas to Wichita, Abilene, Ellsworth, Hays, and Dodge City, wore the light, broad-brimmed hats. The men who rode these trails—guardians of law and order—makers of peace—all wore the light, broad-brimmed hats. This hat in those distant days was a badge of courage. It also was, by reason of its workmanship and size, the most useful article of dress. It protected its wearer from the scorching heat of the high plains. It served as a useful dipper to water both man and his faithful horse. At night, it could be used as a pillow when sleeping under the star-studded heavens. So this hat had its utilitarian purposes as well as a badge of honor.

The descendants of these men of the light hats still live in this land known as the Great Plains area. They no longer ride the trails to Dodge City or Hays, but they are still cattlemen. They take their cattle to Fort Worth or Kansas City by truck or rail. They no longer worry about the quicksands of the Canadian, Cimarron, or the Arkansas Rivers.

They don't fear the drifting of their cattle into the dry beds of canyon breaks during the winters' driving snows. No longer do the cattle rustlers offer a menace to their herds.

Where do these cattlemen look for danger in these modern days? The prairies are peaceful; water tanks, fed by windmills and ponds, furnish the water. Cottonseed cake takes away the hazards of the wintertime. Now, where are the dangers for "the men of the light hats"?—in the Nation's Capital—Washington.

These men are still individuals. They survived the days of OPA, rationing, WPA. All they ask is to be let alone. They ask nothing from the great white father in Washington—except their freedom.

"These men of the light Stetson hats" just know these fundamental facts—that you cannot socialize the schools, mills, mines, farms, ranches, medicine, and money without socializing the people. They know the more we accept of Government hand-outs and doles in any form or by any name, from necessity we will be told what to do and when to do it. The net result—we lose our freedom and independence.

These men know also that socialism subsidizes inefficiency, and where inefficiency exists, there is no profit, and where there is no profit, there can be no welfare or security for anyone.

These men who now ride in automobiles still wear their "light Stetson hats" because to them it is a heritage of the past, of brave, fearless men who could and did buy a thousand head of cattle by only their word. Honesty to them was not just something taught in school, but was a matter of principle.

On these high plains of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, Montana, Wyoming, and the Dakotas, occurred the last conflicts between the westward movement of hardy pioneers and the Indians. The law of the Indian was the survival of the fittest. The Indian fought back for the land of his fathers. These men in "light colored hats" who have conquered the "great American desert," as it was called 150 years ago, were not descendants from the cast-offs and the riff-raff of more cultured eastern seaboard. They were hard, but they were gentlemen. They sought to mold from a raw material the finished product of a new country.

In recent years, the descendants of these men who forded through the quicksands of the Pecos, the Canadian, the Cimarron, the Arkansas, driving their cattle to the valleys and hills of the Smoky Hill for shipment to eastern markets, have been all over the world. They built bridges over the Rhine and the Danube, landed on the unheard islands of the Pacific. Some drove tanks up the beaches of Normandy on to the Siegfried Line and waded through the snows of Belgium during the Bulge.

Now these men are home. They wanted to live as their fathers had lived, as freemen in a free Nation, paying a fair share of taxes to help maintain a Government that belonged to them.

Maybe there is still to be a frontier—maybe in the scheme of things to come—this broad expanse of high-plains country will again be the last frontier of freemen who will continue to wear the "light Stetson hat" as the badge of courage.

To my colleagues, I commend to you a resolution recently passed by the Kansas Livestock Association. This resolution shows what the stockmen are thinking about. These men just know that there is no such thing as security in a bankrupt Nation.

The resolution is as follows:

HOLDING TO FREEDOM

There impends today a stupendous threat which so menacingly overshadows the future of our country that we Kansas stockmen, of all shades of political belief, feel it our duty to speak out in unmistakable terms.

The threat lies in the fact that our country—without opportunity for conscious choice on the part of its people—is rapidly drifting toward the consummation of a false concept—contemptible to free men—the socialized state.

Tokens of this danger are everywhere and undeniable. The growing power and expansion of a wasteful Government; the colossal public debt; the heavy burden of taxation, designed in large part to redistribute the wealth of the people; the ridiculous attempt—by dictating wages, hours of labor, prices, etc., and by innumerable other false expedients—to substitute an artificial economy for the natural economy which alone can function in freedom; the gradual assumption by the state of financial responsibility for every hazard incident to the life, labor, infirmity, and old age of all—hazards which must be personally met and borne by every human being who has the instinctive will to survive and the inherent impulse to be free; the arraignment of economic and social groups, one against the other, in denial of the obvious fact that their interests are identical and can be logically promoted only by application of the Golden Rule; and numerous other kindred concepts, similarly inspired and equally false.

Government produces nothing and has no means by which to support these false and destructive policies except by exacting from its citizens the fruits of their labor. The present semblance of "prosperity" is only the byproduct of the most terrible and destructive war that ever afflicted the world and is now maintained only by artifice implemented by folly, fear, and dire forebodings.

The course our Government is now taking, unless it is promptly reversed, will inevitably lead to national bankruptcy. In a vain effort to prolong a specious sense of security, more similar expedients will be applied until we all become mere numbers in a completely socialized state: therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Kansas Live Stock Association, in convention assembled at Topeka, Kans., March 16, 1950, deplore the fallacious policies that are beguiling our country into socialism, that we censure and condemn those in public office who support or tolerate these policies and that we call on all patriotic Americans to denounce them and to work energetically and courageously for the reestablishment and maintenance of free and competitive enterprise and the restoration of the Republic.

Our decision to take this stand is supported by the firm conviction that the policies we here and now condemn are unrighteous and immoral in that they proceed in shameful denial of the inherent nature of man and in impious contempt of nature's eternal laws.

Respectfully submitted.

Richard Robbins, Pratt, chairman; George Andrews, Kanopolis; Herb Barr, Leoti; J. W. Birney, Bucklin; W. J. Brown, Fall River; C. O. Heidebrecht, Inman; Dan Jackson, Coldwater; Earl Kielhorn, Cambridge; O. W. Lynam, Burdett; J. Willard Olander, Kansas City; Wayne Rogler, Matfield Green; Conlee Smith, Wichita; resolutions committee.

I also set out herewith an editorial by Mr. A. L. Shultz of Topeka State Journal. His comments on this resolution are most timely:

TOPEKA, KANS., MARCH 22.—Kansas stockmen in Topeka last week wrote a new Magna Carta that ought to be printed on the fly leaf of every text book in every classroom in America.

More than 600 men who produce beef steaks for hungry people around the world sat in a hall and cheered a pronouncement that "the course our Government is now taking, unless it is promptly reversed, will inevitably lead to national bankruptcy." One man in the hall voted "No."

Those men who take their winnings and their losings in the stride of pioneers who made America great, disdained the dole. They asked no favors. They wanted their chance—were willing to fight for it. They are not afraid of the elements. They have faith in the laws of God, but contempt for the laws of politicians who seek votes and self-glory.

That's the story of it all. Those cowmen, who are the bravest most rugged individuals, the most forthright characters to band together in these days of confusion and distress, took their stand without blinking an eye. Of paternalistic policies as presented from Washington, the stockmen almost held their stomachs as they wrote words of derision and contempt. For men in public place everywhere who subscribe to doctrines of a welfare state where man does not enjoy the fruits of his labor, those characters from the feed lots and pastures snorted holy condemnation.

"We call on all patriotic Americans to denounce them," those almost righteously indignant individuals declared in a resolution that was as refreshingly simple and honest as it was astoundingly bluff. Not a politician in all this big, broad land will fail to understand every word of it. Dan Casement, in his most rugged manner, never more daringly denounced regimentation of the people who feed the world.

Hundreds of conventions come to Topeka. Most of them sound off with words of glittering generalities. Not so these growers of beef steers and their cousins. They recited a principle and a policy that was as solemn and sincere and sacred as defined in the foundation laws of the land. Republicans and Democrats alike had given 2 days and 2 nights to the writing of that declaration of principles. The sponsors believed in it, were ready to fight for it. Somehow, it seems, the pronouncement should echo in the Halls of Congress.

There's none of the "me-toolam" of succeeding Republican national platforms in that resolution which keynoted the statement from the stockmen's meeting. There wasn't a word of pussyfooting, office-seeking applesauce in any line. It was a call to arms by a group of strong men of both major parties. Richard W. Robbins, of Pratt, a Republican leader, was chairman of the committee of 12 men. Herb J. Barr, former Wichita County legislator and candidate for the Democratic nomination for United States Senator, helped draft the resolutions. No member of the committee protested a line of the document. No stockman in the hall took the floor to challenge an utterance.

Nothing comparable in strong, concise indictment of a philosophy of government has come from any group of people assembled in Kansas in this generation. So this column is breaking a custom and a practice to present the text of the resolution. We hope it will afford guidance and inspiration to people everywhere who rebel against Government dictates for a life which defies the laws of nature. Try these words for comfort and solace:

"There impends today a stupendous threat which so menacingly overshadows the future of our country that we Kansas stockmen of all shades of political belief, feel it is our duty to speak out in unmistakable terms.

"This threat lies in the fact that our country—without opportunity for conscious choice on the part of its people—is rapidly drifting toward the consummation of a false concept—contemptible to freemen—the socialized state.

"Tokens of this danger are everywhere and undeniable. They include the growing power and expansion of a wasteful government, the colossal public debt, the heavy burden of taxation, designed in large part to redistribute the wealth of the people, the ridiculous attempt—by dictating wages, hours of labor, prices, etc.—and by innumerable other false expedients, to substitute an artificial economy for the natural economy which alone can function in freedom; the gradral assumption by the state of financial responsibility for every hazard incident to the life, labor, infirmity and old age of all—hazards which must be personally met and borne by every human being who has the instinctive will to survive and the inherent impulse to be free; the arraignment of economic and social groups, one against the other; in denial of the obvious fact that their interests are identical and can be logically promoted only by application of the Golden Rule; and other kindred concepts, similarly inspired and equally false.

"Government produces nothing and has no means by which to support these false and destructive policies except by exacting from its citizens the fruits of their labor. The present semblance of prosperity is only the byproduct of the most terrible and destructive war that ever afflicted the world; and is now maintained only by artifice implemented by folly, fear, and dire forebodings.

"The course our Government is now taking—unless it is promptly reversed—will inevitably lead to national bankruptcy. In a vain effort to prolong a specious sense of security, more similar expedients will be applied until we all become mere numbers in a completely socialized state.

"We deplore the fallacious policies that are beguiling our country into socialism. We censure and condemn those in public office who support or tolerate these policies and we call on all patriotic Americans to denounce them and to work energetically and courageously for the reestablishment and maintenance of free and competitive enterprise and the restoration of the Republic. Our decision to take this stand is supported by the firm conviction that the policies we here and now condemn are unrighteous and immoral in that they proceed in shameful denial to the inherent nature of man and in impious contempt of nature's eternal laws."

That intrepid band of cowmen harpooned the Federal Department of Justice for disruption of the free channels of marketing in beef through its antitrust suits against A. & P. store chains which annually distribute millions of pounds of meat. The Brannan plan was denounced as an attempt to "subsidize consumers, rich and poor alike, and eventually necessitate Federal control of all agriculture. We are opposed to the proposed program," is was asserted, and "we consider it unsound economically and entirely impractical, and we urge Congress to reject it."

Some of the State's most prominent and successful stockmen were on the committee with Robbins and Barr and aided in drafting the fearless pronouncement of principles. They included: George Andrews, Kanopolis; J. W. Birney, Bucklin; W. J. Brown, Fall River; C. O. Heidebrecht, Inman; Dan Jackson, Coldwater; Earl Kielhorn, Cambridge; O. W. Lynam, Burdett; J. Willard Olander, Kansas City; Wayne Rogler, Matfield Green; and Conlee Smith, Wichita.

Valley Forge General Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, to close Valley Forge General Hospital in Pennsylvania on July 1st, as anticipated, in my opinion would be a very grave mistake. I want to be recorded as vigorously opposed to such action.

Certainly, we cannot indorse the hasty withdrawal of needed medical facilities from servicemen, veterans, retired personnel, and dependents of servicemen, without any provision being made to meet these needs.

In particular, I wish to invite attention to the situation at Valley Forge General Hospital, located at a historic site just outside of Philadelphia, Pa. That hospital has a capacity of almost 2,000 beds and cost the taxpayers some $11,000,000 when it was built in 1942–43. To replace it at current costs would take from forty to sixty million dollars depending upon the location and type of construction. Valley Forge General Hospital has heretofore served the Army, Air Force, and veterans in the Philadelphia area, and is currently meeting a very real and substantial need. Yet it is proposed that this hospital be closed down, without replacement, and possibly before the new veterans' hospital in Philadelphia will be in operation. In addition to providing general hospital care for approximately 100,000 troops in this densely populated area, it is the principal center of ophthalmologic or eye surgery, and practically the only one providing specialized diagnosis and treatment for liver diseases. These programs might possibly be carried on elsewhere, if facilities were available; but such relocations would involve substantial delay and major costs before they could become fully effective. To close the Valley Forge General Hospital at this time, along with the others slated for inactivation, would leave the Army and Air Force with only one general hospital in the United States east of the Mississippi River; namely, Walter Reed, in Washington, D. C.; and this is already overcrowded. Inactivating Valley Forge General Hospital will mean that the Army and Air Force will lose substantially all of their existing facilities for treating hepatic-metabolic cases, over 90 percent of those for plastic surgery, and two-thirds of existing capacity for specialized eye surgery. These specialized programs, which are a necessary part of first-class medical and surgical care for personnel of the armed services, cannot be reestablished in small isolated hospitals, nor can the latter afford necessary training and experience in such specialties to young medical officers of the services.

In short, closing Valley Forge General Hospital at this time achieves economy only at the expense of necessary medical and surgical care for servicemen, veterans, and dependents. In reaching this result, it totally disregards the taxpayers' $11,000,000 investment in the facility, the specialized treatment and training programs carried on there, and the very real need of maintaining this installation in operation until more nearly adequate facilities are available for veterans' care in that area.

Unpartisan Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of March 27, 1950:

UNPARTISAN POLICY

The strong ebb tide of economy swirling through the House of Representatives which threatens to sluice away $500,000,000 from the funds requested by President Truman for the continuation of the Marshall plan had its beginning in a vacuum created for partisan political purposes while the chief spokesman for the bipartisan foreign policy, Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, has been away from the Senate Chamber because of illness.

The warning from President Truman that a slash in the Marshall plan funds would bring the peril of world war III closer may not be heeded by those who press for economies—regardless of prudence and foresight. It is no accident that Senator VANDENBERG has made an appeal to both parties to support the European recovery plan and to create an unpartisan commission to recommend a long-range economic and peace policy for the United States.

The Michigan Senator's warning that it would be unwise to lose sight of the forest of Soviet aggression because of the trees of incomplete achievement of the Marshall plan drives home the fact that 2 years ago a Republican Congress enacted the Marshall plan at a time when the United States was threatened with isolation in a communized world.

President Truman must of necessity consider foreign affairs from the standpoint of their effect on domestic policies. It is fortunate that a statesman of the breadth of vision and stability of character of Senator VANDENBERG has made the forthright declaration that we bought temporary security at a dark hour in our history and swept communism away from the western shores of Europe. Otherwise, the whole question of our present security might fall into an abyss created by a niggardly and imprudent economy of a bloc chiefly concerned with creating an issue for the congressional campaign of 1950.

The proposal of a commission to study and recommend an economic and peace policy to carry the gains of the Marshall plan beyond 1952 when our investment in European stability comes to an end is one of the most statesmanlike acts of Senator VANDENBERG'S long career. His choice of a title is particularly felicitous. Nonpartisan is generally less emphatic than unpartisan. Unpartisan means not partisan, and such a commission should be just that.

To trifle with our foreign affairs with baseless charges and partisan pleadings is dangerous at any time, but laden with dire peril today. The Marshall plan is a keystone of our present foreign policy. To chip away any part of it might bring the whole bastion against Communist expansionism down in a heap of rubble.

Pacific Mills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a radio address delivered by me over Station WLAW, Lawrence, Mass., upon the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the Pacific Mills of Lawrence, Mass.:

Two men stood on the banks of a New England river many years ago and they were thrilled by what they saw. In those days, the picture was that of the river, the forests, and meadows which stretched away from it as far as the eye could see, and a few scattered farmhouses.

It was hardly an exciting scene on the surface. But these two men were looking not only with the organs of physical "seeing" but with the superior foresight and vision of their "mind's" eyes.

And what they saw was a tremendous opportunity.

It would take effort and risk and persevering courage to bring the dream into being. It was fortunate that these men, Daniel Saunders and Abbott Lawrence, had the ability and the character to do the job. For their example was an inspiration to the long line of managers and workers who followed them and established our community as a leader in the world of textile manufacturing.

They saw not only the energy of a great river which could be utilized to power machines that would make cloth and provide jobs and earn profits for themselves. They were businessmen, but they were also men with a conscience. Although competition from foreign producers who had an established market in the United States was keen, and although they had to weather various

national economic crises, these men had a heart for their workers.

The Pacific Mills, which they founded, not only won ceremonial honors and exposition medals for the quality goods which it produced, Pacific saw, long before others, that something would have to be done for the mutual security of employer and employee.

With thousands of workers massed in this industrial community and dependent upon one major industry, many suffered whenever the wheels of production slowed down.

One of the finest tributes that can be paid to Pacific is that it faced these problems realistically. It is one of the few mass-production industries in which there is a minimum of labor-management strife. Long, long ago, before the days of labor unions and collective bargaining, the men who guided Pacific took a personal interest in their workers. That has paid extra dividends in understanding and teamwork.

In 1854, when such things were unheard of, and at a time when Pacific was fighting for its financial life, the company bought a 2,000-book library for the benefit of its employees.

Abbott Lawrence, worn out by his exertions, was dying. He called one of his associates to his bedside and gave him these orders, and I quote: "Remember, what I want is not only a mill that can make a profit for its owners and pay wages to its workers. I want to prove something more with Pacific Mills—that a business can afford to recognize the right of all men and women who work for it to better their own lives while they better the business, to buy homes and bring up their families in a decent atmosphere and educate themselves."

Pacific has stuck to that enlightened policy ever since.

In the intervening years, there have been difficult periods for management and workers alike. It is reasonable to say that these have been caused by economic forces beyond the control of anyone belonging to the corporate family known as Pacific Mills.

Several years ago we celebrated the one hundredth birthday of Lawrence as a city. Today we rejoice on the similar anniversary of its younger brother, the Pacific Mills. Both grew up together, and both will continue to help one another out of filial loyalty to the proud heritage which they share.

Such a long record of service is proof that Pacific advances with the times.

The new century of its life dawns with every promise that this humane and successful enterprise will still be catering to the needs of the people in A. D. 2050.

Construction of School Facilities on the Hoopa Indian Reservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced in the first session of this Congress a bill to authorize construction of school facilities on the Hoopa Indian Reservation in Humboldt County, Calif. This bill received the full support of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of the Budget. It was approved unanimously by both Houses and signed by the President.

An expenditure of $800,000 was provided in the 1951 budget, but the House Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to strike this sum from the omnibus appropriations bill, H. R. 7786. It has done so with the excuse that California has assumed the responsibility of educating all the children of the State. This tells but half the story. It is true that California assumes the expenses of education, but there is no provision whereby the State can construct a school building at Hoopa. The land of this reservation is tax-free, and there is no taxable property within miles. Present school conditions at Hoopa, serving a community of 3,700 Indians, are intolerable.

By failing to appropriate funds to construct these school facilities at Hoopa, this Congress would be shirking its responsibility toward the American Indians. It would thereby be abandoning a policy established years ago to provide for their welfare.

In today's mail I received a letter from a grade-school teacher at Hoopa describing conditions as they exist today. Its plain language tells the story of the needs so well that I wish to insert it in the RECORD for every Member of Congress to read. Following is the letter:

HOOPA, CALIF., *March 25, 1950.*

HUBERT SCUDDER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCUDDER: Please, Mr. SCUDDER, do all that you can to reinstate the bill which would give Hoopa school district, Humboldt County, Calif., money for a new schoolhouse which the community needs so badly.

The building that is being used at the present time is a three-story affair. Fourth-grade pupils are housed on the third floor and on north side of the building. Artificial lighting is necessary.

The eighth grade is housed in the basement; again artificial lights must be used. Nothing else to be done under the present conditions. The rooms are all overcrowded and in the beginning the building was not planned as a school building.

Trusting that this will receive your personal attention immediately,

I remain respectfully,

MARY E. HANNAH,
Fourth-Grade Teacher.

Interview With Carl Vinson on Military Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, as we become more deeply involved in a cold war more concern is expressed about our state of military readiness. It is reassuring to the Nation as a whole to know that our national defense affairs are constantly under the careful scrutiny of the far-sighted chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia.

A recent exclusive interview given Mr. John T. Carlton, outstanding journalist for the Cox newspapers, reflects Mr. VINSON's acute knowledge of our military affairs, and in an article written after this interview by Mr. Carlton, our distinguished chairman and great American sounded a very timely warning which should be called to the attention of Americans everywhere. The article is as follows:

"LAZY" UNITED STATES INVITING DANGER, VINSON SAYS—NATION MUST STAY READY TO KEEP PEACE—FIGHTING WAR WITH REDS NOT INEVITABLE, GEORGIAN DECLARES

(By John T. Carlton)

WASHINGTON, March 18.—Georgia's CARL VINSON, the congressional iron man of the Armed Services and probably the Nation's outstanding authority on the subject, spoke Saturday from his 35 years of experience to assure the Nation it has "acceptable" security and a formula for permanent peace.

In an exclusive formal interview with this reporter, the long-time House armed services leader discussed calmly and dispassionately the military aspects of international peace problems, professional disagreements among military leaders, the issue of civilian control of the military, and current requirements for national preparedness.

EXPERT ON SERVICE PROBLEMS

In incisive language born of his long-time service in Congress and his virtually judicial authority over the services for many years, he explained in everyday language the significance of problems which have stirred the Nation under postwar unification.

Mr. VINSON, a lawyer who has been a judge and Georgia House speaker pro tempore, has been in Congress since 1914 and is the fourth ranking Member of the National House, in years of service. Most of those years he has supervised the services. For 16 years he was naval affairs chairman and during World War II he directed the building of the greatest Navy the world has ever seen—the Navy which won the greatest of all victories. After World War II, he helped write the unification law and he has directed the shaping of congressional policies in legislation making the United States a force capable of supporting militarily the Nation's position of preeminence in world affairs.

"FAT AND LAZY" DANGER

Mr. Vinson believes unification of the services is here to stay—but he says professional differences such as those between the admirals of the air arm and the air generals will and should continue as "healthy," developing "soundest national defense." He does not believe war with Russia is in any sense imminent, or that it ever need develop, but he warns that Americans are in real danger—largely from themselves and temptations to the "fat and lazy" life.

He believes the Nation currently has "extremely able leadership" in the Pentagon, and he does not believe there is any desire in the military to duck civilian control. While foreseeing no war, he cannot visualize any early justification for substantially reducing armed services below present strength—and costs.

INTENT OF CONGRESS

He makes it unmistakably clear that Congress intends to remain in consultation on military matters at the earliest stages and at the highest echelons. Consultations on the White House-Pentagon-congressional level are everyday affairs but in a continual tug of war.

The Georgian does not dismiss as insignificant the recent displays of temper and questionable judgments in the Navy-Air Force fight over air power—a scrap which has captured the headlines more than possibly any other congressional subject during the past year. But he provides a salty summation which may be an epigram.

"The sad truth," he says, "is that no one knows which side is right."

Mr. Vinson was presented a series of questions relating to security and his opinion of the prospects of war.

ACCEPTABLE SECURITY

"Our present strength," he says, "with some areas of weakness that I would like to see corrected provides acceptable security."

He agrees with Defense Secretary Louis Johnson that, if attacked, the United States can strike back within the hour.

"I am not as sure as he," Mr. Vinson adds, "that we can strike back 'effectively'—for here we enter again into a series of variables. I am more interested in whether or not we can ward off effectively the first enemy attack than I am in whether or not we can strike back 'effectively' immediately. The ability to strike back at once is mainly for the purpose of keeping the enemy from starting a war; but should he go to war anyway, I want to be sure that his opening attack cannot disastrously cripple us and our allies."

REAL DANGERS

The real dangers for the United States in the world today?

"Most basically, I think we need a more vigorous foreign policy to carry the initiative in world affairs and to place Russia in a position of countering instead of keeping us eternally in that position. There is the danger that as a nation we may get tired of providing for defense—a real danger in this country, because we do not like the military very much.

"There is the danger of getting isolationist once again—and signs of this are multiplying in Congress and elsewhere. There is the danger of getting fat and lazy—refusing to put the requisite zeal and determination in our relations with the rest of the world, especially with those vital and vulnerable areas in Asia where the local governments are likely to go by default to a despotic, hostile system unless we do more than we are today.

"There is the danger of letting our guard down to the extent that we might once again be caught napping some Sunday morning by atomic bombardment of our industrial and governmental areas, by guided missile attacks from submarines on our ports and harbors and coastal cities, by sabotage, by sudden march into western Europe. Nothing truer was ever stated than 'Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.' The danger is that we will forget it."

Mr. VINSON says he sees no war in the near future—"a fighting war I mean." But—

"The Communists have been at war with capitalism for 30 years. We are at war now, in many respects—but not in a fighting war. I see many reasons why there is not likely to be a fighting war for several years at least—and if we are vigorous enough internationally I believe we can avoid war entirely."

WAR WITH RUSSIA?

Are there reasons why we should ever go to war with Russia?

"Yes, there could be reasons. * * * Should she start hostilities, for example, we would have to go to war. Moreover, I do not believe in peace at any price. The situation could arise that would demand armed resistance to excessive Russian pressure here or there in the world.

"But I do not think that Russia will intentionally begin a war—not soon, at least. So the only real possibility for war that I know of would be as the result of some rash act, unpremeditated, that might inflame passions on both sides.

"So long as we stay reasonably prepared for war, and so long as we stand firmly where we think, I see no reason for war to come that would require the use of direct military force.

"Some say war with Russia is inevitable; that we should attack before the Soviet can.

"I vigorously deny both statements. War is not inevitable—if we exert ourselves vigorously enough today—and we should not attack. Should we begin the war by a sneak attack, the moral fiber of our Nation would be destroyed.

"It is an academic subject anyway. The people would not permit it, and would respond violently toward any President who attempted it, in my opinion.

"The services now have a strength of about 1,500,000 men—630,000 in the army, 460,000 in the Navy and Marines, and 416,000 in the Air Force.

"I see little likelihood that the forces can be reduced to any important extent for some time into the future. The way things are going internationally, the converse looks to me to be more likely over the long haul."

CUT-BACKS CITED

But there already have been some cut-backs—and the 1951 budget reflects as a result augmenting of Reserve and National Guard training.

"This is even true in the Navy, where very sharp reductions have been imposed in nearly all areas. I should expect this process to continue, but not to accelerate, because the standing forces cannot be very markedly reduced."

About the training of the civilian components, a special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee is set up to study complaints of the Reservists and Guardsmen.

"It is likely that some inquiry will commence before this session of the Congress adjourns. I do not want to prejudice its problems or anticipate its conclusions."

But about the controversial proposal to merge the Army's National Guard and Reserves.

"The National Guard has traditionally had the edge over the Reserves in the Army, and now in the Air Force. Why? Because the Guard has political support in each State in the Union and can demand the right to be heard within the services. The services have had a 'federalized Reserve' for 30 years, but it has been a sad record. When you lay these two facts side by side, I fail to see any basis for the contention that the national defense would be benefited by the federalization of the National Guard. Quite the contrary, in my opinion."

With respect to unification and the multifaceted problems created, Mr. Vinson says discussion must be based upon definition.

WORKING REASONABLY

"No single Chief of Staff, no merger, no elimination of the Congress has yet occurred wholly; some would say that is success, some would say that is failure.

"If you mean by 'unification' a blending of effort of the three expert military services and a concentration of civilian control throughout the Military Establishment, then I would say that unification is working reasonably well. * * * It needs amending, in my opinion, to insure a properly balanced defense program and to keep the Congress properly a part of the national defense team.

"I think the Congress will never return to a loosely coordinated organization of the armed forces, and to that extent I believe that unification—whatever it means—is here to stay. It is less certain that the Congress will not at some future date do something to make a bit more certain that the Congress is kept in the picture on national defense problems and to keep joint planning among the services on a reasonably high level instead of trickling so far down that the uninformed are making vital decisions.

"I know of hardly any person in public life or in the services who opposes reasonable coordination and control of the three services. But the trouble is in deciding what is reasonable. That is a matter of judgment. I do not think this kind of difficulty will ever be eliminated; it should not be."

Will unification save money? And is it not actually a trifurcation instead?

EXPENSIVE LEADERS

"Unification will assuredly save money. It already has, and more savings will follow. Savings, however, are a byproduct—not the goal of unification. Unification's goal is an efficient national security program, soundly based—a blending of armed forces capabilities to give us the best defense possible. To the extent that this produces savings, to that extent we are better off; but security and not economy is our main objective.

"We have both unification and triplication under the unification act. Actually, I think there is a real question as to whether or not it will be more or less costly to operate the armed forces under the new organization than under the prewar system.

"All of the services are having to maintain vast overheads in Washington to effect all of the coordination required nowadays before decisions are reached. All of this is expensive and should be charged off against the claimed savings under unification."

Mr. VINSON denies unification resulted from the Air Force fight for a separate service.

"The air leaders of the Navy and Air Force are simply in complete disagreement on fundamentals of the art of warfare. That disagreement would have continued regardless of unification. Of course, extremists in the Navy and Air Force have complicated the problem—Air Force extremists doing all manner of things to diminish the public emphasis on the Air Force. But basically, the trouble grows out of a fundamental disagreement, honestly produced—inevitably produced because of different training—on the best way to fight a war.

"The sad truth is that no one knows which side is right."

EXCEPTION TO PRESS

Mr. VINSON takes exception to the popular headlines which informed the public of "revolt of the admirals" and interservice "bickering and quarreling."

The House Armed Services Committee was the aggressor in last October's sensational Capitol Hill clash between the service leaders.

"As to what happened before the hearings, however, you are at the old question of who comes first, the chicken or the egg, and which is the chicken and which is the egg. In my opinion, there were both defenders, both aggressors. Both right, both wrong. Probably the first stone was not cast by either side; I suspect it was the Italian duetto."

"The results of the public argument of the services have been extremely healthy, in my opinion. Again I say that a basic disagreement exists, no matter whether the waters are calm on the Potomac or not at any given time, and the disagreements cannot be removed by any fiat by someone. Things like this should not be resolved by someone issuing an order, so the public would get an idea of false agreement. The issues are too basic to the Nation's security to have them handled in this fashion.

"The more public information, the sounder public decisions. I have no doubt that the Department of Defense benefited a great deal from the committee's October hearings, and thus we will have a sounder national defense as a result."

About Admiral Louis Denfeld, removed as Chief of Naval Operations:

"Admiral Denfeld has not 'rebelled' against a law of Congress. He has criticized, as have many others, the administration of the law. Whether or not he would be subject to discipline on that score is not properly an area for comment. If someone should think so, I believe it would be most difficult to prove.

"Service disagreements must not be labeled 'bickering' and 'quarreling.' The disagreements are professional disagreements; the public interest requires that such disagreements must not be hushed up or forced into the underground, or stopped by edicts

ukase. There is wisdom in counsel, and I firmly believe that the soundest national defense will come from free expression of views."

The Name Without the Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the Times-Herald of Washington carried a news article yesterday, in which it quoted the Congressional Quarterly as reporting that scores of residents of the Washington area contributed thousands of dollars to the Democratic national campaign last year and that in contrast, only one person in this section was listed as giving a $1,000 donation to the Republicans.

Under such conditions one wonders how the propagandists are still able to persuade many that the GOP is dear to the hearts of the "special interests" and the group the late President Roosevelt used to characterize as the creatures of entrenched greed.

It grows more apparent each election that these "fat cats" have migrated, so far as their campaign contributions are concerned. About all the Republicans get from most of them is some lip service and token hand-outs, now and then.

But their memory lingers on, seemingly with nine lives in true feline tradition. The rabble-rousers still denounce the Republican Party for harboring economic royalists, but the royalists seem to have folded their tents and silently slipped over to the opposition.

Under leave, I include an editorial from yesterday's edition of the traditionally Democratic Baltimore Evening Sun:

THE OTHER HALF

Once upon a time, long, long ago, the Republicans had all the fat cats and the Democrats had the lean and hungry look. Now, of course, the GOP dines frugally on box lunches to raise cash and reflect the common touch while the Democrats eat high on the hog at $100 a plate to fill their war chest and celebrate victories achieved and hoped for in the future. To cap this state of affairs, the GOP comes through with an admission tax on their folksy little rallies while the party in power revels untaxed. O tempora. * * *

In 2,000 words which we may assume were well and carefully chosen, the chief counsel for the Internal Revenue Bureau has ruled that no Federal tax applies on the Jefferson-Jackson day dinner. This has caused the loyal sons of the elephant to become very angry indeed, and not without cause. Out of the paltry returns from their brave little box supper they gave Uncle Sam upward of $2,000. If the Democrats paid the same percentage on their opulent festival, the Treasury would be enriched by more than $100,000.

Internal Revenue officials have declined to make public the ruling which they handed down. It is undoubtedly ingenious in nature and may even be reasonable and right. It is, however, hard if not impossible not to sympathize with the box-lunching Republicans. Apart from kindly feelings for the mighty who have fallen, there is the practical point that it might do the Democrats some good to pay a full tax bite on their affair. It would remind them how the other half lives.

The Most Certain Things of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, if you should ask a southern Californian to name the most certain things of life, his reply might surprise you. It is unlikely that he would mention good weather. More likely, his answer would go something like this: "Death, taxes, and a water problem."

There is good reason for inclusion of the latter in such a statement. Water today is the greatest economic problem facing the soaring population and expanding industries of southern California. And today southern California's water supply is dangerously menaced by H. R. 934 and S. 75, now before Congress.

If you look at a topographical map you will see a narrow coastal plain along the southernmost coast of California. In this small area, which contains only 10 percent of the land area of the State, live approximately half of the State's population. It is estimated by the United States Census Bureau that close to 10,500,000 persons now call California their home. More than 5,000,000 of these Californians are crowded into the small area of the coastal plain along the southern coast.

An easterner might well be expected to take water for granted and might not think of it as he looks for the first time upon the luxuriant groves, vineyards, fields, parks, and gardens of southern California. The water problem of easterners too often takes the form of a fight to keep it from flooding their farms or cellers.

The southern Californian, however, has every good reason for including a water problem among the most certain things of life.

Although half the population of California live in the southern coastal plain area, this area has only 1.4 percent of the total water resources of the State. The other 5,000,000 Californians, scattered throughout the State, have available 98.6 percent of the State's water resources.

The southern California coastal area is the world's largest and most heavily populated oasis, and many years ago its natural local water resources were largely exhausted. Today, every drop of water to be used by new residents, new industries—every type and kind of expansion or development—must be imported.

Where is it to come from? It can only come from one place, and that is the Colorado River, a comparatively small stream that is the subject of the most serious water controversy in western history.

The Colorado River forms the border between California and Arizona, 250 to 350 miles eastward from the Pacific coast. Between it and the coast is the great Mojave Desert, an immense area of barren mountain ranges and alkaline valleys, with very little natural water.

From the days of the Spanish padres to the turn of the present century, southern California depended entirely on local water supplies. These included a few temperamental rivers, which for a great part of the year were dry washes, and underground water brought up with pumps.

But more than 40 years ago Los Angeles, for instance, was obliged to go far afield for water necessary to support it as a swiftly growing metropolis and Pacific port. The most available water at the time was found in the Owens Valley, 250 miles to the northeast, and the people of the city shelled out $23,000,000 to build the Owens River Aqueduct.

Only a few more years went by before it was realized that this supply would soon be insufficient. Now other cities and districts joined Los Angeles in a new search for water. The last available source was found in the Colorado River. Contracts were signed with the United States Government permitting southern California to take the needed water from the Colorado, and once more the people mortgaged their future to underwrite the building of an aqueduct. This time a bond issue for $220,000,000 was authorized, and the great Colorado River Aqueduct was built. It was completed just in time to prevent a chaotic state in southern California during the record-breaking wartime expansion.

Despite the continued influx of new people, now averaging 8,000 a month, southern California would have reason to feel sure of adequate water supplies if it were not for one thing.

That is the current attempts of the State of Arizona to take an enormous amount of water from the Colorado River for a gigantic Arizona project. According to the United States Bureau of Reclamation there already is a deficit in the Colorado River. That is, the projects already constructed or authorized by Congress will need more water than the quantity available to the States of the lower river basin. Therefore, any water Arizona takes in addition to her projects which are already built or under construction would have to come out of the share needed by projects that are already operating.

Arizona wants to take it from California, and has asked Congress to repudiate the contracts California has with the Federal Government for Colorado River water.

In a 1949 study of the State's water problems, the University of California said:

Most of the (water) resources are within the State. Southern California, however, must rely on the Colorado River, which supplies water originating mostly outside California. California has a limited share of Colorado River water.

It is not only the future that creates a water problem in southern California.

Despite the critical situation, the average daily consumption has sharply increased.

In 1940, residents of Los Angeles used an average of 120 gallons a day. Either they were much cleaner or much thirstier, perhaps both, in 1948, for in that year they averaged 135 to 140 gallons per day each. The people of Beverly Hills outbathed and outdrank the Los Angeles residents, however, by establishing a record daily consumption of 270 gallons for every man, woman, and child.

What is going to happen in southern California?

All future residents of southern California, all future development and progress, must depend entirely on water from the Colorado River, water awarded to southern California under contracts with the Federal Government. If Arizona should succeed in securing a large part of this water, southern California would face a desperate situation. Without the present allotment of Colorado River water no new residents could be sustained in southern California, no new industries could be built to create employment, and it is probable that a large percentage of the natural increase of the population would be forced to leave.

The southern Californian is not joking when he includes his water problem with death and taxes as sure things in life.

That is why California is asking for the defeat of H. R. 934.

United Labor Unions?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, of March 29, 1950, written by Robert M. Hallett:

LABOR PULLS TOGETHER

NEW YORK.—Periodically the question arises: Can the big American labor organizations come together under one roof again?

Several local, national, and international developments in recent months bring that question to the fore once more. Even if the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations do not reach the difficult goal of organic union there is growing evidence that they are headed towards closer cooperation on the political front at least.

Factors that have brought the big labor giants closer together have been:

1. The teamwork established between them in formation of the new anti-Communist International Federation of Labor in London.

2. The successful combination of political forces in New York City in the elections last fall. Labor was given much of the credit for the victories of Mayor William O'Dwyer, and Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN. This subsequently stimulated the labor groups to form a permanent joint political organization, and has stirred talk of national labor political unity.

3. The closer cooperation developed through their common opposition to the Taft-Hartley law.

4. The purge of Communists and pro-Communists in the CIO, making closer relations with the CIO more acceptable to the conservative AFL.

Particularly since passage of Taft-Hartley, labor has felt it must strengthen itself politically. Philip Murray, CIO president, recently declared: Labor will be hit by an economic H-bomb if congressional candidates it opposes are elected this fall.

He pleaded for backing of prolabor candidates by labor funds and assistance. He compared contributions of unions to the CIO's political action committee to union dues in importance. Both are necessary to protect the interest of the laboring people, and improve their living standards, he said.

In New York City the United Labor Committee has been set up to carry forward on a year-round basis the political alliance that was forged temporarily last year. The new committee has full jurisdiction over all political matters affecting the city, including the conduct of relations with city hall, the formulation of views on pending legislation, and the approval of candidates for public office.

The first target of the new political combine will be the State elections this fall. Should Gov. Thomas E. Dewey run, as is expected, the new group will oppose him bitterly. Labor spokesmen have indicated the line of their campaign. The issue, they say, will be between the "welfare state" which they endorse and the "special interest state" of the Republicans.

A somewhat parallel AFL–CIO political movement is under way in Connecticut. Organized labor there has agreed to join forces for next November's elections. It is no secret that the prime objective of the labor campaign will be the reelection of Gov. Chester Bowles and other Democratic officeholders.

From the New York experience it is apparent that while labor is tending toward political teamwork, unanimity is not and probably never will become total. Not long ago the New York Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York (AFL) removed a member of one of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union from its membership for not conforming to the political program of the council.

David Dubinsky, ILGWU president, appealed to the national AFL to rescind the council's action and his words sounded a note of rebellion against the imposition of political ideas from the top down in labor:

"The principle is whether a central labor union, or for that matter, the executive council (of the AFL) itself, has the power or the right to compel uniformity of political thought and action by all council members."

Furthermore, many left-wing former CIO unions will line up behind the Progressive Party.

For the most part these defections will be relatively minor and labor's growing political coalescence may greatly increase its political power.

The Missouri Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Missouri Basin: Growth and First Harvest," delivered by William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, at the Farmers' Day Celebration, held at Chamberlain, S. Dak., on February 28, 1950. The address exceeds the length of speeches generally authorized to be printed in the RECORD without a statement of cost. However, it is of such a vital character, setting forth the plan of the Department of the Interior, and its policy with regard to distribution of electricity and other benefits coming to a 10-State area by virtue of the development of the Missouri River program, that I ask that it be printed in full at this time. I wish to compliment the Assistant Secretary on his able address. I approve of the plan generally, as it has been outlined and specifically as herein set forth.

I am advised by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make 2½ pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $191.34.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to be with a Missouri River Basin audience tonight. I have met with groups like yours in the basin 19 times since I went to Valley City, N. Dak., in 1943 to explain the then forthcoming Missouri River development plan. Every meeting has been useful to me, because I have taken away from each additional understanding of the complex problems with which we wrestle in the vast region that the Missouri River drains.

The Missouri Basin's water resources problem was recognized some 55 years ago. But for half a century, very little was done about it, except in an inadequate, piece-meal way.

It took repeated catastrophes to open the way for us to get started. The great droughts of the 1930's devastated the Plains. And the disastrous floods of 1943 drowned people and ripped away vital parts of great states. The 1940 census figures showed that this region was slipping backward in population. These were the prices we were paying for 50 years of delay.

Against this background, the Federal agencies with major responsibilities brought their studies to conclusion and in 1944 put them together into a plan that the Congress adopted for prosecution by the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers.

Now, after more than 5 years right here in South Dakota, the Angostura Dam has been completed, the first major reclamation dam to be completed in the Missouri Basin project. I remember that I came out to help start Angostura Dam several years ago. I said it wasn't the mightiest dam in the world, but it would have a great place in the history of the West. It is the vanguard of the 100 or more dams on this biggest, most complex, and most significant construction project which our Government has ever undertaken in peacetime.

Today, we have 14 reclamation units under construction in the Missouri Basin, and 13 more being started this year and next. We have 4 major reclamation dams, either completed or substantially so. The whole project is accelerating with enormous speed.

This year, the Interior Department is spending over $80,000,000 on this project. For next fiscal year, the President is asking Congress for more than $100,000,000 for our part of the work.

The Army Corps of Engineers is moving forward with construction of Fort Randall, Oahe, and Garrison Dams, and other works primarily of a flood control or navigation type.

As these works rise, all over the basin, we can now see on the horizon the power, irrigation, flood control, and other benefits that

will change the future of your State and the other Basin States.

As the joint project is now [illegible], it will bring six and one-quarter million acres of new and supplemental irrigation, and ultimately more than 2,500,000 kilowatts of installed hydroelectric capacity to the people of these 10 Basin States. Further inventory of the vast potential power resources of the basin, including your State, from both hydro and fuel, are now being made.

The wealth and good living that you have already contributed to the Nation with the basic resources previously available to you are sign posts pointing to what you will do with these new resources.

The additional crops from the 53,000 farms to be irrigated by this project alone, will be worth an estimated $125,000,000 per year, even at present prices. They will be worth far more than that in the future.

Add to this the effects of great blocks of low-cost power, the protection from floods, and the other benefits, and you will have a terrific acceleration of your economy.

South Dakota is already feeling the impact of this program. It is commonplace to say that it will change the lives of every one of you. The changes will occur in many ways. They will occur gradually as unit after unit goes into operation. Younger generations coming along may not realize their full import. But you, whose toil and sweat, and sometimes tears, mark the road to where we stand today, will be able to measure the difference.

The Missouri River Basin project will bring both power and water. The two are inseparably bound. Power helps pay the costs; power moves the water. In this region, particularly, where a great part of the irrigation must be done by pumping, the water systems themselves require immense amounts of power.

Power is a mighty resource, in its own right. It is high on the list of national shortage items. Perhaps, it is highest of all on the South Dakota list.

For a long time, this State has ranked near the bottom in the amount of electricity used per person. It has ranked near the bottom in the percentage of farms with electricity. The Missouri River Basin project will help you change all that as within your borders there is a potential but undeveloped hydro capacity of over 1,000,000 kilowatts.

A moment ago I said that present plans already envisage more than 2,500,000 kilowatts of capacity as the present goal of the project. But with the work barely under way, we've already found out that ultimately the people of this great basin will require still more than that. No longer do we hear the critics say reclamation power plants will become "white elephants." The question, "Who, on earth, would buy all that power?" is as dead as the legendary "dodo."

We have learned that once the reclamation resources of an area are opened up for use by the people, we can set no limit to the possibilities and potentialities for expanding the economy. That will be true here in South Dakota, as in many other places where it has already been dramatically proved.

The Missouri River Basin project, as now authorized, provided for development only of the most advantageous power generating sites.

We have already expanded our original power goals. Now, it is obvious, that we must search out and develop every hydrokilowatt that can be beneficially used in the Missouri River basin. In addition to that, your huge fuel resources will ultimately supplement and extend your power supplies. But first we should develop the presently wasting water power.

Abundant power will help open the other natural resources of the region. Through the development of lignite and oil-shale beds, it may add vital new supplies to our Nation's stock of short resources.

The Department of the Interior has given some study and thought to the extensive beds of manganese ore here in the Chamberlain area. As you know, this manganese is too difficult to extract to be commercially useful now. But abundant cheap power may bring it nearer to the point where further studies of commercial development will be justified.

Manganese is one of the few items in which our Nation is not self-sufficient. It is conceivable that at some future time of restricted sources or national emergency, the studies we have made of these beds, and the measures we have taken to bring power into the area, may prove to have been of vital importance to our prosperity and security.

The Federal Power Commission estimates that by 1970, this area will need more than 9,500,000 kilowatts of capacity. This means that about 4,000,000 kilowatts will have to be added to the existing and presently planned fuel and hydro-generating capacity.

When 1970 comes, we will probably still be needing more power. Our industries, the development of our resources, and the enhancement of our daily living, all depend on having as much electricity as we need at our fingers' ends. Experience has taught us that bringing in power creates a demand for still more power.

Not only will your soaring power requirements require fullest scale development of new power generation, but there is another factor of paramount importance to the basin, and of direct concern to the individuals who will be served by this project.

Power is the paying partner of irrigation. Undoubtedly, you have heard that repeated many times. We cannot develop the basin's fullest measure of irrigation, unless the sale of power brings in enough revenue to defray the irrigation costs that exceed the farmers' ability to repay from the products of their fields.

And the Department is committed to complete financial as well as physical integration of the power generating and transmission facilities whether connected with Army or reclamation dam plants. We believe that is what the Congress intended when the Flood Control Act of 1944 was enacted.

Thus, the financial success, as well as the physical success of this vast project calls for maximum development of your power resources.

As a result of the Fort Peck Dam, some of your people in the northern part of South Dakota already are experiencing the initial benefits of low-cost Federal power. Two units are in operation at Fort Peck with a combined capacity of 50,000 kilowatts.

By October 1951, we expect to have a third unit of 25,000 kilowatts in operation. But the main sources of project power for this State will be Garrison and Fort Randall Dams, now under construction by the Army Corps of Engineers.

In accordance with the latest Corps of Engineers estimate, the first power from Fort Randall will be available in April 1954, when, according to plan, the initial 40,000 kilowatt unit will begin operation.

By the end of 1955, Fort Randall should have four units with 160,000 kilowatts capacity, and Garrison should have three units in operation with a combined capacity of 240,000 kilowatts. The ultimate capacities of these plants will be 400,000 kilowatts for Garrison and 320,000 kilowatts for Fort Randall.

This, combined with the Fort Peck capacity, will then give a total installed capacity on the main stem of the Missouri River of about 960,000 kilowatts with an average annual output of nearly 4,500,000,000 kilowatt hours, from facilities already in operation or under construction.

Construction of power plants at Gavins Point, Oahe, and Big Bend, all in your State, will add still more to the power which can and will be developed for the benefit of the Missouri Basin system.

Depending upon congressional appropriations, the Oahe site can begin delivering power in 1959 or earlier. Eventually it will provide 400,000 to 500,000 kilowatts capacity, and the proposed Big Bend plant will yield another 120,000 kilowatts.

Keep in mind this is not all firm power. However, as other power developments are brought into production in other parts of the system, and as the units are linked together and tied into the system as a whole, the proportion of firm power available to all areas will greatly increase. One of the startling things we have learned from the last World War is that pooling and coordination of power supplies greatly enhance the efficiency and reliability of power, especially water power.

You are aware of the copartnership of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers in the construction of the project. All of the project's power, though, is marketed by the Bureau of Reclamation. Power production and transmission are being firmly and intelligently integrated, basin-wide, into the physical and financial structure of the project. This was contemplated in the coordinated Reclamation-Army plan when the project was authorized by the Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944. The Department of the Interior adheres to this full integration.

Now, how about the distribution of this power? That concerns you quite pointedly.

The Bureau of Reclamation plans to build and operate the main transmission lines to carry power from the generating plants to the wholesale load centers. That means that we shall take it to the main points of wholesale distribution, where supplemental, or feeder lines, can carry it to the various localities for retail distribution.

In order to provide the basin with the maximum measure of firm, dependable power, the entire main transmission system will be welded into a single, interconnected grid. It is necessary for efficiency and reliability that this system be fully coordinated and integrated, and the operation be directed by a single dispatching organization.

The strong backbone of this grid will be a main 230,000-volt loop which will run generally north to south, from Garrison, N. Dak., to Sioux City, Omaha, or perhaps farther south. The return part of the loop will run north, generally along the eastern State lines of South Dakota and North Dakota. The two parts of the loop will be connected together through Fargo and Bismarck. A strong tie will also extend west from Garrison to Montana's Fort Peck power development.

There will be loops and radial lines of 115,000-volts capacity. There may be lines of even lower voltage in some localities.

You, of this audience, are directly interested as the consumers who will use and pay for this power—and as citizens of a State whose economic future will be greatly improved by the impact it will have upon your economy.

Let me restate for you, the five cardinal points of Federal policy, as laid down by the Congress in the distribution of this power. Undoubtedly you have heard them many times before. They are as follows:

1. Federal dams shall, where feasible, include facilities for generating electrical energy.
2. Preference in power sales shall be given to public agencies and cooperatives.
3. Power disposal shall be for the particular benefit of domestic and rural consumers.
4. Power shall be sold at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles.
5. Power disposal shall be such as to encourage widespread use and to prevent monopolization.

The Department of the Interior will adhere firmly to these principles.

The initial block of some 300,000 kilowatts of firm power will become available from Fort Randall Dam in 1955. That is not far

away, when measured by the time it requires to work out arrangements for distribution, build the transmission lines, and get ready to put the electricity into your farms, homes, and plants.

In South Dakota, you have some particularly knotty problems to be solved. Just recently, 21 of your South Dakota rural electrical cooperatives sent representatives to Washington to discuss these problems with your congressional delegation, the REA, and the Bureau of Reclamation. We are quite sympathetic with your needs, and are most happy to help you to meet them in every way we can.

As you know, the Bureau of Reclamation is now negotiating the contracts and is planning or building the transmission lines for distributing Missouri River Basin project power. South Dakota will share in the initial energy made available from Fort Randall, and in subsequent blocks of power as they come on the line.

The initial allocations of this power have not yet been made. But we have now on file with the Bureau of Reclamation, applications for power in 1954 in almost triple the amount of the block that will be made ready in 1955 at Fort Randall. Preference customers—cooperatives and public agencies—are asking for 638,000 kilowatts in 1954, and other applicants another 246,000.

Under the marketing criteria established last August by the Secretary of the Interior, contracts for firm power will be negotiated only for the delivery of this block of power within North Dakota and South Dakota, and within those portions of Nebraska, Iowa, and Minnesota lying within a 150-mile radius of the Fort Randall power plant.

One of the major problems involved in the distribution of this power in South Dakota is how to transport it from the Government lines to the rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, and other retailing distributors.

There are many transmission and subtransmission lines, both publicly and privately owned, in the area. Most of them are already carrying the maximum power loads possible. But some of them, I am told, are not used to capacity.

Again, some of REA's are considering the construction of transmission lines, backed up by generating facilities to firm up the secondary power. As cooperatively owned facilities, such lines would be given favorable consideration if they could offer service comparable to that provided by a wheeling arrangement.

The REA's and others in your State are concerned about the prospect that the Bureau of Reclamation may make contracts for the wheeling of project power over these feeder lines to points of ultimate consumption. Some of them have expressed fears that preference customers under the law will not be able to get all of the power coming to them if the Government uses lines of private power companies to deliver them power under so-called wheeling contracts.

It is the policy to make such wheeling contracts only when line capacity is available and when the rights of the preference customers are firmly protected by the contracts, both as to receipt of their full share of the power and to their enjoyment of the fullest measure of benefit from low power rates.

Furthermore, it will be our policy to see that such contracts protect in full the objectives and interests of the Missouri River Basin project, both in building up and stabilizing the basin economy, and in the repayment of project costs allocated to power revenue.

Where satisfactory agreements that fully discharge these responsibilities cannot be made, it will be necessary to place before the Congress the question of building feeder lines as a part of the required facilities of the project.

Our guiding principle is to make the arrangements which are most economical in the interest of the Government and the public, and which will not interfere with the orderly development of the public-power program. We could not justify a request for funds from the Congress on any other basis.

In Montana, and in some other places, we have "wheeling" arrangements in effect right now. In these areas we found that the number of preference customers was not large enough to justify building our own feeder lines, and the utility company would carry the current at a cost to the Government as low as could be obtained by any other arrangement. So we made the "wheeling" contracts, and they enabled us to get power to the irrigation loads and to the REA cooperatives much earlier than we could have by any other means. In some cases, under such an agreement, we were able to serve customers we could not otherwise have reached.

I have described the Montana arrangements. The wheeling contracts we have under consideration for South Dakota contain provisions giving still greater protection to the preference customers and to the irrigation pumping needs. Such contracts would serve to expand, rather than restrict, opportunities to serve and help the cooperatives and other public retailing distributors.

However, no contracts will be signed until there has been ample opportunity for all State interests concerned to make comment.

The Department of the Interior, through its Bureau of Reclamation, either has under initial construction, or is planning for future construction, "backbone" power-transmission facilities adequate to market all power from Federal plants in the basin. This construction is being scheduled so as to meet area requirements as the power becomes available at the generating plants.

If the Congress provides the necessary funds, we will start construction of the main tie line from Garrison Dam to Fort Randall in the next year. Thereafter, we plan to build transmission lines to the major load centers, when and as the funds are made available to us.

We have had proposals, from REA's in your State, to proceed with the construction of certain lines in South Dakota in advance of the time schedule we have established. These proposals look toward the possibility of obtaining temporary power from sources other than Fort Randall, prior to the time the generators at the dam go on the line. In view of the urgent need for more power and additional transmission facilities in your State, we are giving these proposals most careful consideration.

Now I would like to step back from this power question and glance for a moment at some of the other ways in which the Missouri Basin project may be important to you personally.

There is a big map of the Missouri River Basin in my office. That map has splotches of color all over it showing possible irrigable acreage. There is a liberal scattering of these oases of color around Chamberlain.

Northeast of here is the great Oahe unit with a potential 750,000 acres to be put under irrigation. This work is now on the drawing boards with $700,000 being spent on advance planning this year and $875,000 proposed for next year's budget. Construction of the irrigation work is geared to the completion of Oahe Dam and power plant, now scheduled for 1959.

To the west of Chamberlain, three tributaries flow into the Missouri River. Above you are the Cheyenne and Bad Rivers, and below you is the White River. On my map, their banks are liberally dotted with spots of color denoting numerous smaller areas which can be irrigated by pumping as soon as upstream storage dams are built and pumping power is available.

For example, along the White River there are 42,000 acres of potentially irrigable land. The Bureau of Reclamation is spending $150,000 this year and next in planning a multiple-purpose reservoir and a water-distribution system. We hope to get the work under way in fiscal year 1953, and to have water flowing to the first 10,000 acres of land by 1955 when power will be available from Garrison and Fort Randall for pumping purposes.

In the northern part of the State, preparation of design and plans for the Bixby Dam on the Moreau River is under way. This dam will catch the water from a drainage area of 1,585 square miles and level out the flow along the river below the dam so that a possible 11,000 acres may be irrigated.

Still further west is the Angostura Dam. Construction of an irrigation system will start there this spring, and water will be running down the ditches to a possible 16,000 acres of land by 1953.

At the same time, to the north and south of you on the main stem of the Missouri River, the dirt is flying as construction proceeds on Fort Randall and Garrison Dams. All this construction past, present, and future, ties in together.

In addition to the irrigation and power benefits, these units will enhance your recreational opportunities. People are already coming to Chamberlain from all over the country to shoot upland birds. With this resource—and that's what it is—augmented by the recreational facilities of the reservoirs and the improved river, vacationing can become a new and valuable industry for this region.

You are in the middle of the breadbasket of America. When conditions are right, the wheat almost jumps out of the ground. During the war years you helped to feed people all over the world, with some of the greatest crops the world has ever seen.

But what happens when conditions are not right? Mother Nature has been mighty kind to the high plains in recent years as far as growing conditions are concerned. It has not always been that way. There were the droughts of 1934 and 1936. There have been floods.

The Missouri River is a resource that is finally to be used as other rivers are being harnessed and put to work in other areas all over the Western States. It has the strength to smooth out the high hills and deep gullies of the weather nature has dealt this region.

Your Government, and the people of the United States, are staking billions of dollars on the future of the Missouri Basin. I am confident that they will reap rich returns for you and for those living afar, everywhere in the country. Just as the catastrophic drought that drove 300,000 from their homes in the Missouri Basin in the 1930's hurt the whole Nation, so the economic growth and stability that the Missouri Basin project will bring here will enrich all Americans in the future.

Let Every Schoolyard Become a Living Textbook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, Nebraska is the home of the late J. Sterling Morton, who was Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of President Grover Cleveland. Mr. Morton was the founder of Arbor Day which is now observed in every State of the Union and many foreign countries. Trees are of great importance to the prairie State of

Nebraska. One of the most progressive and widely read newspapers in my district is the Pierce County Leader, of Pierce, Nebr. Mr. William M. Cox is its editor and publisher. In a recent editorial, Mr. Cox makes a most important suggestion about planting trees in schoolyards. I believe that this is a very valuable contribution and effective plan to supplement the idea of J. Sterling Morton and also supplement the important shelter belt program in the Plains States. Because of the importance of this editorial, I include it herewith with my remarks:

ARBOR DAY, APRIL 22—LET EVERY SCHOOLYARD BECOME A LIVING TEXTBOOK

Why is it? There are trees available for many purposes from various tax-supported divisions. These trees in many instances can be obtained for specified purposes without charge or for a very nominal fee. Here is a fact that baffles all belief: Somewhere is an unwritten law that says not one tree available for a school yard.

School boards will buy a textbook that shows in a poor illustration the difference between an oak and an elm, but still all these tax-supported tree nurseries say don't let children see the beauty or enjoy one of these trees.

The Government spends much money to convince farmers that a row of trees on a farm will save soil, protect crops, etc. But these same agencies refuse to let a small school child watch a free tree grow in a school yard.

Why can't one of these tax-supported nursery divisions make up a package of five trees of each variety that are suitable for the area to be planted and send them to the school teacher or school board?

In a shelterbelt planting there are often as many as six to eight varieties of trees and shrubs—wouldn't each of these properly labeled be an education in each school yard?

No, that's not how it's done. Send a youngster to grade school for 8 years then high school for 4 years and then after he starts to farm is the time to start to tell him of the value of a tree.

Nebraska often points with pride as being the home of J. Sterling Morton, yet 50 percent of the school yards are barren land surrounding a school house.

This is the second year the leader has pounded on this subject; it may be just a weak sound, but this plea for trees for schools is more fitting for Nebraska than governmental hide-bound rules that say every tree must have a fence around it or no tree.

There will come a day when a school yard instead of a school book will be the source of teaching young folk about trees. So till that day when some agency will "spare a tree for a school," the children will have to look on page 210 for an elm and on page 213 for maple. To keep within the rules and regulations don't let the teacher take that youngster into the school yard and let him water a growing elm or maple that will furnish beauty and shade.

With the World Afire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an interesting editorial which appeared in the Arizona Republic on February 19, 1950. It should be read by all Members.

WITH THE WORLD ON FIRE

The President of the United States made a speech to the Nation Thursday night. He spoke via radio to millions of Americans who may be living on borrowed time, now that an avowed enemy is building weapons of atomic destruction aimed at America. The President spoke to a people who have been told that the even more fearful hydrogen bomb may wipe out civilization and all life on this planet in one flaming breath. At the moment he spoke, the red tide of communism that has engulfed almost all of the continent of Asia was pressing hard against the last friendly outposts in the Pacific. In captive Berlin the noose again was being tightened by a new blockade.

On the same night the President spoke, the fires were going out in basic industries all over America. Schools were being closed, and homes and hospitals were reaching into their last reserves of coal. Men by the thousands were being laid off their jobs, trains were being canceled, and the Nation was faced with suspension of vital telephone service. Food products bought with the taxes of the people were being piled up to rot while millions throughout the world went hungry to bed. As the President spoke, citizens all over the Nation were reflecting on the treachery of those in high positions of trust who had been found guilty of betraying their country. And all over the world desperate men were shoring up the hasty defenses of freedom.

Against this background of national peril and acute drama the President of the United States made a speech.

He said the only danger to the American Nation is the Republican Party.

In the name of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln we reverently ask: How much lower can the leadership in Washington descend?

Strengthening the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CLARK, BOGGS, PETERSON & BECKER,
Columbia, Mo., February 17, 1950.

In re House Concurrent Resolution No. 64.

Mr. MORGAN MOULDER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MORGAN: I would like to recommend that you vote for House Concurrent Resolution No. 64:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)* That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

I know you are interested in securing a condition of peace and in relieving the American people of the terrific tax burden of the cold war and the armament race, and I know you are interested in protecting our civilization from destruction by scientific weapons.

The United Nations was a step in the right direction but only a first step. Because it lacked attributes of government and the power to make and enforce world law in the fields necessary to preserve peace, it has failed. It was always the intention to preserve peace, it has failed. It was always the intention of the framers of the United Nations to gain the confidence of the people and to strengthen it from a multilateral treaty to an agency of government. We have been slow and hesitant about vesting in some authority the power to preserve the peace.

The State Department will always recommend against any foreign policy which would interfere with its balance of power politics and its power politics. Consequently, it is necessary that the people speak to the State Department in order that there can be no misunderstanding about the desires and hopes of the people.

This resolution is simply a statement to the State Department to get to work to strengthen the United Nations and to vest in it defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace. Other plans have been suggested, some of which involve bypassing the United Nations, but there is no good reason for not attempting to strengthen this agency already in existence.

There may not be much time to do something to prevent totally destructive warfare. I think a limited world federation will enable us to bring the cold war to an end, remove the fear which obsesses everyone, and give us some relief from the burden of a wartime Federal budget.

The following is a partial list of the United Federalists in Missouri who are backing the resolution: E. R. Windegger, chairman; E. E. Amick, insurance; H. Roe Bartle, Scout executive; Mrs. Marion C. Blossom; J. Lionberger Davis, banker; Dr. Geneva Drinkwater, educator; Hon. Raymond Elliott, Missouri legislator; Hon. Raymond Karst, Congressman; Dr. Charles Lee, professor of education; Hon. Arnold Leonard, attorney; Jay E. Minton, insurance; Stratford Lee Morton, insurance; Col. J. M. Sellers, Wentworth Military Academy; Hon. Murray Thompson, former Speaker, Missouri House of Representatives; Raymond Witteoff, manufacturer.

There is some opposition by some few people who call anyone with an idea a Communist, but I believe that the class of people backing this is sufficient to insure the integrity of the sponsors.

I suggest that you discuss this with RAYMOND KARST or Congressman BOLLING.

Your attention is also called to the editorial in the New York Times of February 6, where that paper which has no enthusiasm for world federation states: "We are compelled, in short, to accept the concept of a world government insofar as atomic weapons are concerned—or, indeed, so far as any manifestation of scientific war is concerned."

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. BECKER.

Hon. Louis B. Heller, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1950, Hon. LOUIS B. HELLER was honored by Sgt. Harry G. Rogovin

Post, Jewish War Veterans, in Brooklyn, N. Y., when Post Commander William Weinstein, in behalf of the post, presented the Congressman with a plaque in appreciation of his outstanding work in communal and civic affairs and his ardent advocacy of civil-rights legislation.

I am sure that many Members of this House are as pleased as I am that this recognition has been given our distinguished colleague. His sincerity and outstanding accomplishments in behalf of his constituents, have earned for him all the praise that can be given him.

The address delivered by the Congressman upon presentation of the plaque was so enthusiastically received by the audience, and so many persons who were prevented from attending have expressed their interest in it, that I am inserting it in the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am deeply honored by this very gracious act on the part of the Harry G. Rogovin Post, Jewish War Veterans, in presenting me with this beautiful plaque, and I assure you that this recognition coming to me from this great organization is something that I greatly appreciate.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States has now become a great institution, filling a large and worthy part in the American scene.

Possibly it is not generally realized that it is the oldest of all the veterans' organizations now active. It was first organized by veterans of the Jewish faith who had served in the Civil War. That was in 1896. The Grand Army of the Republic was at that time composed of vigorous men in middle life. Decade by decade since then, over more than half a century, the ranks of the Grand Army of the Republic became thinner and thinner until this last year a handful of survivors met in their last encampment to disband the organization. The great general veterans' organizations of the present day, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, for example, have all been inaugurated in more recent times, leaving the Jewish War Veterans as the senior extant organized group of those who have served in the armed forces of the United States in time of war.

This organization has been rapidly growing, and today comprises more than 110,000 members. It is operating in 40 States. It has over 630 separate posts. Such a body of patriotic and high-minded citizens can be a great force in the affairs of the Nation. Its size and the character of its membership bring prestige and influence. By the same token such an organization has a responsibility commensurate with its size and influence. It should represent the highest ideals. It should serve the community in the several ways which are open to it. Its weight in public discussions should always be on the side of the welfare of citizens and of the Nation as a whole, not exerted for partisan and selfish interests.

I am proud to say that the activity of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States has been and is, just this.

You are serving 5,800 persons a month in a specific way—veterans and dependents who need the specific guidance and assistance that such a powerful organization can bring to them. You advise the isolated or unschooled veteran of the benefits which our Government has so generously offered to him, in the various forms of pension and compensation, of disability relief, of hospitalization and domiciliary care, of vocational rehabilitation for the handicapped, of training in industry and on the farm, of higher education in the colleges and the universities, of loans and insurance, and other measures great and small. So generous are these provisions, comparable to nothing in all the long past history of warfare, which our democratic government offers to its citizens who have risked their lives in its defense, so varied and so complicated are the various types of need to which they minister, that the Government would be hard put to it to work out the details efficiently, and the veteran himself would be lost and bewildered, if it were not for the aid that organized veterans associations are giving to the official agencies. For this reason, the Veterans' Administration, welcoming this assistance, recognizes some veterans organizations and gives them responsibilities in this connection. The Jewish War Veterans of the United States is one of these recognized organizations, and is doing immense public service in this connection. Though organized frankly on a sectarian and racial basis, it is ready to extend its helping hand, and actually does lend its services, to all veterans without distinction of creed or race.

For this purpose a staff of professional counselor and guidance specialists is maintained.

Great attention has been given to those whom society so easily forgets because they are out of sight, the veterans who are in hospitals. Through the JWV and its splendid ladies auxiliary more than 80,000 hospitalized veterans of the two World Wars are sought out and assisted in their needs of welfare and recreation.

Yet perhaps most important of all is the contribution to American life which the Jewish War Veterans of the United States is making in the pressure which it is constantly exerting in the area of public opinion and legislation toward making this Nation of ours a better place for all its citizens. The stand which the organization takes is courageous, explicit, and forward-looking. It seeks the more liberal admission of displaced persons, victims of the war and the material for the finest future of citizenship, whose entry into this country is in the great tradition of America's past. It supports the Fair Employment Practices Act, which seeks to remove unjust discriminations which prevent many persons from earning a living on even terms with those who have been, by the accident of birth, more privileged. It supports a national health act for the future well-being of all citizens. It advocates that unpopular measure so important for our national defense, universal military training, a measure to which all veterans must be committed who have seen American boys die by the thousands unnecessarily, by being sent into warfare for which they have not been properly trained. Other measures, liberal and sensible but sometimes controversial, have been frankly backed by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

The question might arise, perhaps it has arisen here and there, why should there be a separate veterans' organization for Jewish veterans when there are already great national veterans' organizations occupying the field, organizations which make no distinctions of race and creed? Is this a piece of narrow-minded separatism, or is there good reason for it?

I might answer that question in several ways.

First, I would point out that it is not a matter of competition. All members of the JWV are urged to join one of the general organizations as well. In fact, 80 or 90 percent are actually members of other veteran groups of a more general character.

There are some functions, however, which the more general organizations cannot perform, or to which they can give little attention because of their size, and wider general interest. These hinge on the fact that the Jews in this country are a minority group with certain needs and interests and problems especially their own.

I deem it important that the tradition shall be kept which shall inform both the public and our own group of the part which Jews have taken in all the emergencies when men have been called to risk and yield their lives for the defense of the country. This is little known and easily overlooked. But the part men of Jewish blood have taken is a very large one.

I like to note that the story begins a long time ago—300 years ago in fact—and in our own city of New York. The first Jews in New Amsterdam came in the summer of 1654. They met with some prejudice and some difficulties. One was that they were exempt from general training and guard duty. There were dangers from Indians, and some threat of danger from other colonists, as well as from lawbreakers in general. All citizens had to do guard duty. It was a responsibility and also a badge of citizenship. But Jews, owing to the prejudice of the governor were not admitted to guard duty in defense of the colony (though they were expected to pay a certain sum each month in lieu of service). Under the leadership of Asser Levy, who has been called "the first fighting Jew in the New World," the issue was fought out with the governor, Peter Stuyvesant. The Jews won the right to do military service for the little city, and thereafter mounted guard on the stockades of Manhattan. They fought for the right to do military duty.

From that day to the present the Jew has done his full military duty to the Nation, and something over. It is the same story in every conflict—the Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Indian wars, and the First World War.

In the First World War about a quarter of a million Jews served in the armed forces of the United States. While the percentage of Jews in the whole population is estimated at 3.27 percent, the proportion of Jews in the armed forces was 5.73 percent. Three thousand five hundred were killed, 12,000 were wounded, 3 received the Congressional Medal of Honor, while 1,129 received other decorations and citations. Meanwhile on the home front, other Jews were meriting the thanks of the Nation for their organizing leadership. Of the seven members of the Advisory Council of National Defense, the body which organized the home front, three were Jews, and I cite the well-known names of Bernard Baruch, Samuel Gompers, and Julius Rosenwald.

I do not need to describe to you the part which Americans of Jewish identification took in the last war, because you were there and know for yourselves. Upward of 550,000 served, again a larger portion of the whole than the proportion of Jews to the whole population. Eleven thousand died in service and 40,000 were wounded. Fifty-two thousand received some kind of decoration, citation or award, including one Congressional Medal.

Notable features were that 60 percent of all Jewish physicians in the country who were under 45 years of age, entered the service. There were 35 Jewish families which sent 6 or more members into the armed forces.

The individual tales of heroism are touching and endless.

It is not right that the memory of these things should be allowed to lapse—not because of sectarian pride, but because here and there the voice of calumny is raised still, and the facts should be known, in the interest of the country as a whole.

Furthermore there are services which a Jewish organization can render to the Nation because of their peculiar position in the Nation's life. We face the threat of totalitarianism. Right now it is in the form of communism, but it might be also in the form of fascism, which is not totally extinct. The Jewish War Veterans of the United States are in a position to render a unique protection to the Nation. No group knows better what evils live in totalitarianism than do the Jews because no one has suffered more because of them.

Moreover, outside these more or less formal movements, communistic or fascistic, there is still in this country enough of ignorance or prejudice on the part of people who would be shocked to think they were talking the language of either German nazism or Russian communism—which seeks to blow up into flames all kinds of dissension—but who nevertheless have not eliminated from their minds all the things on which these movements feed. As President Truman has expressed it in his gentle but effective way:

"We have only recently completed a long and bitter war against intolerance and hatred in other lands. A cruel price in blood and suffering was paid by the American people in bringing that war to a successful conclusion. Yet in this country today there exists disturbing evidence of intolerance and prejudice similar in kind, though perhaps not in degree, to that against which we fought the war. Discrimination, like a disease, must be attacked wherever it appears."

As veterans, the members of this organization can work with other veterans' organizations, and with nonveterans' groups, toward the elimination of these prejudices, under conditions of exceptional advantage.

Not then in a narrow or sectarian or a vengeful spirit but with a firm resolution to purge American life of a destructive something; within it, the Jewish War Veterans will confront evil prejudice and in so doing will confer a benefit on the country at large.

The thought I would leave with you was never better expressed than by a chaplain, Roland Gittlesohn. The place was the island of Iwo Jima. The occasion was the dedication of a cemetery for the dead of the Fifth Marines who fell in battle there.

"This is perhaps the glimmest, and surely the holiest, task we have faced since D-day. Here before us lie the bodies of comrades and friends. Men who until yesterday or last week laughed with us, joked with us, trained with us. Men who were on the same ships with us, and went over the sides with us as we prepared to hit the beaches of this island. Men who fought with us and feared with us. Somewhere in this plot of ground there may lie the man who could have discovered the cure for cancer. Under one of these Christian crosses or beneath the Jewish Star of David there may rest now a man who was destined to be a great prophet—to find the way perhaps for all to live in plenty, with poverty and hardship for none. Now they lie here silently in this sacred soil, and we gather to consecrate this earth in their memory.

"We shall not foolishly suppose, as did the last generation of America's fighting men, that the victory on the battlefield will automatically guarantee the triumph of democracy at home. This war, with all its frightful heartache and suffering, is but the beginning of our generation's struggle for democracy. When the last bullet has been won there will be those at home, as there were last time, who will want us to turn our backs in selfish isolation on the rest of organized humanity and thus to sabotage the very peace for which we fight. We promise you who lie here to build the kind of world for which you died."

Halleck an Asset to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star of March 22, 1950:

HALLECK AN ASSET TO AMERICA

Among the leading lawmakers giving ardent support to the aims of the Hoover Commission is Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana. After The Star had exposed the padding of personnel rolls in the Post Office Department, Congressman HALLECK said last week the situation proved the Hoover group "knew what it was talking about when it recommended drastic reorganization of bureaucratic activities."

It is characteristic of CHARLIE HALLECK to back the Hoover report. Throughout his eight terms in Congress he has demonstrated an unfailing ability to distinguish between genuinely progressive legislation and socialistic, big-government proposals disguised as progressive legislation.

Congressman HALLECK is a liberal in the real American sense of that misused word. He has always championed sound progress and the changes required by changing times. But he has been an effective foe of pseudo-progressive measures aimed at the limitation of individual liberty. He was one of the first, for example, to detect the evil of the infamous court-packing plan of the 1930's and to speak out against it.

Mr. HALLECK'S objective approach to lawmaking after the voters of his district first sent him to Congress in 1935 helped the Republican Party to gain added prestige. It was inevitable that he should come to the attention of party leaders and be given new responsibilities which eventually made him House majority leader. In his present job as assistant minority leader he continues to give distinguished service to both country and party. As the man who single-handedly wrote the GOP congressional campaign platform in 1946, he recently was one of a committee of three which drafted a statement of principles for the 1950 campaign.

Representative HALLECK performs the same invaluable function in the House of Representatives that Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, performs in the Senate. Both are devoted servants of the areas which elect them and of their party, but both also give service which is national and international in scope. CHARLES A. HALLECK'S stature honors his district. His reelection in 1950 will give his district, his State, and his Nation another 2 years of high-principled congressional service.

Misuse of Hoover Label

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the manner in which the President, Harry S. Truman, is misusing the Hoover label, which many people construe as a guaranty of economy and efficiency, to further his own political interests and the political interests of his party, is disclosed by two statements of the Committee for Constitutional Government, dated March 21 and 23, and which read as follows:

MARCH 23, 1950.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: You—Members of the Congress—all citizens are confronted with an attempt to usurp the legislative powers vested exclusively in the Congress. The President's plan is to use the Herbert Hoover report as a "cat's-paw" to destroy an important provision of the Taft-Hartley law by turning over its execution to Presidential appointees. Thereby will be restored to the Labor Relations Board the function of prosecutor and judge—a dual power which was seriously abused before the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law.

Here is the background history: The President first tried to prevent the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law by his veto message. It was passed by substantial majorities of both Republicans and Democrats over his veto.

Then, in return for the financial and vote-getting help of the labor-union-monopoly leaders, the President obligated himself during the election campaign to do all he could to secure immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. In the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, a bill, prepared in the departments, was presented to the Congress in a most unique way. At the hearings of the subcommittee on this bill no amendments were allowed.

At the hearing when the bill was reported by the subcommittee to the full committee, it was not even read section by section to the full committee. The chairman of the Labor Committee of the House tried to secure a cloture rule from the Rules Committee of the House which would have denied to any and every Member of Congress an opportunity to offer any amendment to the Lesinski bill. When this measure came before the Congress on an open rule, Congress defeated it by substituting the Wood bill for it on May 3, 1949.

In September 1949 the President stated in a Labor Day address in Pittsburgh, that he planned to "rip the Taft-Hartley Act out of the statute books."

So, having failed in all of these efforts, he now tries through a fraudulent use of the Reorganization Act to do immeasurable injury to the Taft-Hartley Act by restoring investigatory functions to the National Labor Relations Board which had so abused these powers during the 13 years they held them that the Congress had insisted upon depriving the Board of investigating and prosecuting functions.

Please read the statement by Dr. Willford I. King, chairman of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., Using Herbert Hoover as a Cat's-Paw.

If Congress submits to this usurpation of legislative power granted by the Constitution solely to Congress, it will have permitted another long step toward one-man rule and executive dictatorship. A constitutional question of the gravest importance is involved. Shall the people through their control of Congress lay down the policies, make and uphold the laws? Or, will the Members of Congress who are trustees for the constitutional rights of all citizens allow these to be undermined and usurped by the Executive, to secure campaign money and votes from labor monopolists?

If you want to protect constitutional government from this insidious attack, you must take action and speak up now. Tell Congress section 12 of the President's recommendations reorganizing the National Labor Relations Board must be voted down.

Sincerely yours,

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT,
SUMNER GERARD, *Trustee.*

USING HERBERT HOOVER AS A CAT'S-PAW

(By Willford I. King)

When fate brought Harry S. Truman to the White House, many felt a sort of pity for the naive little man from Missouri who was suddenly called upon to step into the shoes of the most adroit politician ever serving as President of the United States. Largely forgotten was the fact that Truman had trained under Pendergast—a man who was no amateur in the game of politics.

Hence, there was great surprise throughout the Nation when, on the evening of November 2, 1948, the returns showed that Truman had turned into victory an election which all the pollsters had predicted would be a walkaway for Governor Dewey. And, since that day, he has shown so much political astuteness that his erstwhile critics are beginning to wonder whether, as a politician, he is really inferior to the great Franklin Delano Roosevelt, himself.

One example of his cleverness is the way in which he has used the FEPC issue to keep the Republicans and Dixiecrats from forming an alliance against him—an alliance which, if consummated, might be a great menace to his future political career. Another example is his handling of the coal strike. He carefully avoided intervention until the fuel shortage became acute. He then used the threat of seizure as a whip to force the employers to grant most the miners' demands. By refraining from seizure, he avoided open conflict with the mine owners; by settling the strike before most areas actually ran out of coal, he escaped calling down upon himself the dire wrath of the general public; and, by securing higher wage rates and more pension money for the coal miners, he intensified the loyalty of his most dependable group of supporters—the members of labor organizations.

But, for thoroughgoing political adroitness, his latest move probably eclipses any of his previous political maneuvers. He is actually arranging to use the prestige of Herbert Hoover to solidify the hold of Harry S. Truman upon the labor unions. Here is what is asked for in the message which he sent to Congress on March 13, 1950. It requests Congress to adopt 21 plans for reorganizing various agencies of the executive branch of Government, thus ostensibly merely carrying out the recommendations outlined in the monumental report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government—a report which was prepared under the direction of Herbert Hoover, and which has received almost universal acclaim for its unbiased and scholarly analyses and discussions of ways and means to secure greater efficiency and economy in governmental administration. All this seems highly laudable.

But, hidden away in the middle of the message is the seemingly innocuous plan No. 12 through which, according to President Truman, "unified responsibility is once more established in the National Labor Relations Board by transferring to the Board and its Chairman the functions of the general counsel and by abolishing the statutory Office of the General Counsel. This plan will bring to an end the confusion which has resulted from divided responsibility."

Evidently, by this explanation, the President hoped to lead Congress and the public to look upon this step as being merely a move to systematize the operations of a bureau.

In reality, however, the National Labor Relations Board has little resemblance to an administrative bureau. For all practical purposes, it is a court, the chief function of which is to adjudicate disputes between employers and employees. Under the Wagner Act, it really operated merely as an arm of the CIO. Following the Russian model, the functions of prosecutor and judge were combined, and, in most instances, regardless of the evidence, the case was decided in favor of the labor organization involved.

One of the main reasons for repealing the Wagner Act and adopting the Taft-Hartley law was to get rid of this un-American setup. In the new statute, the functions of the prosecutor were separated from those of the court. As general counsel, Robert N. Denham, by his fair and unbiased enforcement of the law—neither employers nor employees being shown any favoritism—has gained the respect of all parties, not only for himself, but for the Taft-Hartley law as well. And now President Truman proposes to eliminate from the picture both Denham and his office and go back to the iniquitous system prevailing under the Wagner Act.

But the superironical twist to this scheme is that it is proposed under the guise of carrying out a mandate of the Commission headed by Herbert Hoover. And, to add insult to injury, under the general reorganization act passed by Congress, this plan will automatically go into effect unless it is specifically repudiated by a positive vote of at least one branch of Congress. Does a "doubting Thomas" still remain who is unwilling to concede that Harry S. Truman is a past master of political strategy?

If you are opposed to having the President usurp the constitutional powers of Congress in order to secure the financial support and votes of labor monopolists tell your Congressman and Senator that section 12 of the President's message reorganizing the National Labor Relations Board should be voted down.

Great Lakes Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee, Washington, D. C., March 29, 1950:

GREAT LAKES SHIPPING

I am privileged to appear before your committee in support of legislation endorsed by so many of my colleagues who have a genuine interest in reviving package-freight service on the Great Lakes waterway.

You are undoubtedly familiar with the fact that, in the decade prior to the recent war, about 20 vessels were employed in the Lakes' package-cargo trade, and that most of these vessels were transferred by the Government, in the early years of the war, for service in salt water. Due to the high cost of replacement of suitable vessels, there is no package trade on the Lakes today, and no reasonable hope for its revival is foreseeable unless the Congress enacts legislation for the purpose expressed in these several bills before your committee.

Witnesses appearing before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on identical legislation have demonstrated the importance of package-freight service to my city, Buffalo, N. Y. It was pointed out that, prior to the war, 2,500 persons were employed in stevedoring and shoreside services connected with package trades, and today there are not more than 50 employed in these capacities.

We who support this legislation are aware that ship operators who bought war-built vessels for salt-water trades oppose our effort to revive the Lakes' package-freight service on the ground that it is inconsistent with the policy of the Ship Sales Act of 1946. We are, also, mindful of the fact that the salt-water operators have, under the Ship Sales Act, purchased war-built vessels to the limit of their needs, and that the 10 ships proposed to be converted for use on the Lakes would otherwise lie dormant in our reserve fleet. The sale of ships under this act, at admittedly favorable prices, has not allowed the purchase of a single vessel for operation on the Great Lakes.

There are many who view the Ship Sales Act as having been discriminatory against waterborne commerce on the Lakes. This legislation would, in some degree, overcome that objection. In addition, it will provide many millions of dollars of work for our shipyards and will afford jobs for seagoing personnel and those employed in the necessary shoreside trades.

In addition, it will rehabilitate a transportation medium that has, historically, been most valuable to the entire Lakes region.

Believe it or not, more tonnage is carried by American vessels each year on the Great Lakes than is carried by all United States flag ships engaged in foreign commerce. Before the war, water transportation on the Great Lakes included bulk carriers, package freight ships, and passenger steamers. Today our passenger tonnage has been reduced to but a fraction of its prewar level; our package freight vessels have been totally eliminated. These two classes of ships so necessary to service Great Lakes commerce have not been available since the Government requisitioned during the war and took them for use on the high seas.

High building costs for new vessels have discouraged private capital from returning to the Great Lakes package and passenger trades. Shipbuildings costs have risen tremendously over prewar construction figures, and operating costs have also climbed. It is impossible for private operators to pay the high costs of building new ships and still give service to Great Lakes commerce at rates low enough for their service to be attractive to shippers. If we must wait to build new ships, I doubt that the package freight and passenger trades on the Great Lakes can be revived in the foreseeable future.

Our Government owns thousands of ships which are presently rotting away in the laid-up fleets. Not only is no revenue received from these vessels, but their upkeep and maintenance costs the taxpayers many thousands of dollars each year. It seems ridiculous to me that these vessels should not be made available for use by the people of the Great Lakes States: After all, the people of the Great Lakes States contributed heavily in their taxes to the building of these ships. It is particularly ridiculous that our people should not be able to use these ships when the sole reason that they are unable to do so is because of a highly technical interpretation by the Maritime Commission of the word "reconvert" in the existing Ship Sales Act.

The essential purpose of the bills now before this committee are to permit allowances for the conversion of these war-built vessels for use on the Great Lakes in the same manner as allowances are presently granted for the reconversion of these same vessels for use on the ocean. Many purchasers today can buy vessels from the Maritime Commission and receive allowances up to 100 percent of the selling price of those vessels in order to reconvert them to a theoretically standard-type ship. There will be presented to this committee a table showing actual cases in which reconversion allowances granted by the Maritime Commission to people who bought these vessels for use on the ocean have exceeded 90 percent and in some cases have reached 99 percent of the total Ship Sales Act selling price.

But even though an allowance up to 90 percent were given to a Great Lakes purchaser for the reconversion of a vessel, that reconverted vessel would be of little value in the Lakes trades. These war-built vessels were constructed for use on the ocean; when reconverted back to a standard type they are suitable for ocean use but completely unsuitable for Lakes use. All this bill does is to say that the allowances similar in effect to those available to reconvert a vessel for an ocean purchaser shall be equally available to Great Lakes purchasers for the

conversion of the same vessels to Lakes use. As a matter of fact, these bills would provide less advantages to a Lakes operator than is presently granted to an ocean operator. For while the latter can get up to 100 percent of the Ship Sales Act selling price for his allowances, this bill would limit the allowances to a Lakes purchaser to 90 percent of the purchase price.

Several facts regarding this bill must be made clear to the committee. In the first place, enactment of this bill will not cost the United States Government one single penny. On the contrary, our Treasury will receive substantial payments under this bill. Lakes buyers will pay the same amount for ships sold under the terms of these bills as they would be required to pay for the same ships under the existing Ship Sales Act. It is particularly important to invite the attention of this Committee to the fact that purchasers who would buy vessels under this bill for use on the Great Lakes would pay exactly the same amount for the same type ship as a purchaser under the existing law would pay for that ship.

Under the bill now before this committee, presently useless Government-owned ships could be put to a useful purpose on the Great Lakes without a penny of cost to the Government and without a penny of reduction in the Ship Sales Act selling price. If this bill is enacted, I feel confident that vessels will be purchased from the Government for use on the Lakes. Jobs will result in seamen and longshoremen, taxes on wages and earnings will accrue to the Government, and manufacturers and consumers in the Great Lakes area will all benefit from lower freight rates. It seems to me that under these circumstances the Congress is almost duty bound to enact this legislation.

May I point out that section 4 of this bill merely extends the Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance Act to cover purchase of vessels under this bill for use on the Great Lakes.

Purchasers today who buy ships under the Ship Sales Act are required to pay only 25 percent down and are given a mortgage by the Maritime Commission for the remaining 75 percent. Because this will not be available to the Great Lakes purchaser who must pay high conversion costs and who must, therefore, borrow from private banks, it seems only fair that they can get the benefits of the mortgage insurance provisions up to 75 percent of the value of the vessels' cost and the costs of conversion. The principle involved is similar to that now in use in various housing acts.

In a recent communication on this bill, the Maritime Commission mentioned that certain clarifying language might be required. We certainly have no objection to such clarification if your committee feels that to be advisable. In its letter the Commission noted that the moving of these vessels to the lakes was hazardous and difficult. I am informed, however, that the engineering studies show the complete feasibility of this movement; moreover, all risks involved can be insured against.

The Great Lakes taxpayers have contributed much to the Maritime Commission's ocean shipping program. Our taxpayers have had large amounts of their taxes allocated to subsidize ocean shipping. Not one penny has been spent for Lakes water transportation. It seems to me to be a beautiful task for the Commission and ocean shipping owners to do otherwise than vehemently support this legislation.

In conclusion let me urge upon this committee the prompt enactment of this bill. It is necessary if Great Lakes package freight and passenger shipping is to be revived in our lifetime. Never has a more salutary objective been subject to accomplishment without cost to our Government.

Sneak Attack on the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Wednesday, March 29, 1950, entitled "Sneak Attack on the T-H Act":

SNEAK ATTACK ON THE T-H ACT

Because the Taft-Hartley Act, as passed by the Eightieth Congress, whittled the power of union leaders down to size, it was promptly denounced by them as a slave law. Mr. Truman, eager for election in 1948, promptly echoed the epithet.

Neither he nor the labor leaders bothered to explain why they considered the T-H Act a slave law. Presumably, they acted on the political principle of the late Herr Hitler, who said that people will believe a lie—if it is big enough and repeated often enough.

Ever since he became President in his own right, Mr. Truman has used every means at his disposal to maneuver Congress into killing the Taft-Hartley Act. When it became evident that even a Democratic Congress was unwilling to repeal the act Mr. Truman changed his tactics.

He abandoned the frontal attack on the law and tried end runs. He appointed his own fact-finding board, a three-man political instrument whose prejudices on the pension issue precluded an impartial recommendation.

In the coal strike Mr. Truman followed the same tactics. With both industry and Congress begging him to invoke Taft-Hartley injunctive powers to end a dangerous midwinter shortage of fuel, Mr. Truman again bypassed the law and named a personal board; but John L. Lewis spurned its good offices, and the President was finally forced to comply with the law of the land.

Now he has resorted to a sneak attack on the T-H Act—from the rear; he wants to abolish the office of the NLRB's general counsel, Robert H. Denham.

The maneuver was well timed. While the Nation was engrossed in the State Department sensation, he filed with Congress 21 reorganization plans. All of them were reported to have been recommended by the Hoover Commission.

One of the 21 demanded the abolition of the office of NLRB general counsel. Mr. Truman says he wants to abolish Mr. Denham's office "in the interest of economy." Yet this economy would hamstring the Taft-Hartley Act by destroying the balance of power between the Labor Board and its quasi-autonomous counsel. It was not recommended by the Hoover Commission.

It was recommended, urgently and in some cases profanely, by the bosses of the CIO, the AFL, and the UMW. Mr. Denham is cordially hated by union leaders. He has been nonpartisan and fair in the administration of his office.

Mr. Denham is a lawyer of the old school. He believes that a law, once passed, is automatically removed from the sphere of politics and should be enforced without fear or favor. We understand that he has initiated three times as many cases against employers as against unions, and that the first injunction he sought under the Taft-Hartley Act was against General Motors.

There had been no demand for his ouster until the Eighty-first and nominally Democratic Congress convened in January 1949, when Mr. Truman, still flushed with the heady wine of unexpected victory, told Congress that he and it had a mandate from the people.

Mr. Truman did indeed have a mandate, a mandate from a handful of union leaders who insisted that he bring about the demise of the Taft-Hartley Act as promptly and violently as possible.

But Congress withstood the union assault, and hostilities were desultory until last January when Mr. Denham, in a New York address, advised employers to go to the courts if they wanted fair play. The next day telegrams from CIO leaders deluged the White House, clamoring for Denham's scalp.

Last week the President once again yielded to union pressure. He smuggled the knife intended for Denham into an economy package endorsed by the Hoover Commission. The House Committee on Executive Expenditures approved the package as a whole.

The President must not be allowed to get away with this underhanded maneuver to emasculate a law which the Nation as a whole approves. It is of a piece with Senator HUMPHREY's attempt to kill the Byrd watchdog committee in the interest of economy.

Addresses Delivered at Fifteenth Annual Dinner of the Chicago Decalogue Society of Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, one of the distinguished bar associations of the city of Chicago is the Decalogue Society of Lawyers. With its membership of approximately 1,200 lawyers, it is the third largest association in the city and the fourteenth largest in the Nation.

Each year the Decalogue Society of Lawyers presents an award of merit to the person whom it considers to have made a most significant contribution to the community. Its award for the year 1949 was bestowed upon Col. Jacob M. Arvey, an outstanding lawyer of the city of Chicago and the chairman of the Cook County Democratic organization, at the fifteenth annual patriotic dinner of the Decalogue Society held on February 15, at the Palmer House in Chicago. Among those who received similar recognition in previous years were Rabbi Stephen M. Wise, Bartley Crum, Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, and Leo A. Lerner.

In tendering the award on behalf of the society to Colonel Arvey, Mr. Oscar M. Nudelman, of the Chicago bar and a past president of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, delivered a most inspiring address and set forth the reasons for which the society's award for 1949 was given to Colonel Arvey.

Col. Jacob M. Arvey's reply, I believe, is significant in setting forth the political philosophy of a truly able and successful political leader.

The addresses of Mr. Nudelman and Colonel Arvey follow:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY OSCAR M. NUDELMAN

Mr. Chairman, Colonel Arvey, honored guests, fellow members of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, ladies, and gentlemen, beckoned to our shores by an abundance of God-given natural resources and freedom and equality of opportunity, prevailing since the days of the founding fathers, sturdy men and women of all races and creeds, with willing hands and fertile brains, pioneers all, regardless of the time of their coming, and their descendants have made this the richest, freest, and most progressive country in all the world.

In this atmosphere of freedom and opportunity, firmly maintained, and defended to the death whenever threatened, it is natural that we should rear large numbers of that peculiarly American phenomenon which we call the self-made man.

Without benefit of aristocratic birth, inherited wealth or a system of nepotism, a great many of our citizens, often first-generation Americans and even immigrants have, through their own efforts, risen to places of eminence in business, finance, Government, the arts, and education.

Every such incident naturally evokes our warm admiration and applause. Upon reflection, however, we find that no successful man is really self-made. Most often he is a product of that society whose guiding principles of freedom of choice and opportunity constitute, in the main, the catalyst, in the absence of which his growth and development could never have begun.

Thus, while most of us are prone to admire and some to give unthinking adulation to mere success, many have become more exacting and apply certain standards to assess and measure the growth and stature of self-made men.

What such men ultimately do with their lives, their wealth, or their power, is, of course, the real criterion of whether they continue to grow or stagnate and to what extent, if any, their personal success is a boon to society. And because our annual award is given, for the most part, to encourage emulation by others, we, of the Decalogue Society, must be exceedingly careful in our selection of each recipient.

In our yearly search we find that there are some who, having grown only to the point of self-satisfaction, when, in their own eyes, they have reached their goal, arrest their own growth prematurely and spend the rest of their incomplete lives in the drab existence of self-complacency. Having no sense of obligation to society, they vigorously oppose all efforts at the expansion of opportunities for others lest their own positions thereby become insecure. Such men are, in reality, failures and do not merit our consideration.

Others, who have only a vague sense of obligation to society and to their own good fortune, may contribute, even generously to traditional philanthropies, and consider such giving as payment in full. They are, of course, to be commended for their generosity, but unless they do something more, something constructive, we may be certain that their growth has slowed down and will soon be completely stopped by the limitations of their own personalities. Nor do they merit our further consideration.

Then there are some who, in the process of growth, have attained power, power and ability to benefit large numbers of their fellow men by their continued efforts and activities. Too many among them, lacking confidence in the future and intimidated by criticism which comes to all who dare to be different, demonstrate their lack of vision and courage by retiring prematurely into the oblivion of private pursuits. They, too, are not counted among the truly great.

We find still others displaying none of these faults, but who, in the activities which we applaud, neglect the very people from whom they stem. In that event, they have misread American history and have failed to understand the American way of life.

Ours is a Nation comprised of many minorities, and no real American will criticize another for being counted, even conspicuously, among one or another of the minority groups. It is the very essence of our form of government and its underlying philosophy that each of us is expected to make his own peculiar contribution to American life in accordance with the religious, cultural, ethical, and esthetic concepts and heritage of his own group.

It is precisely because our Nation was founded on differences synthesized only by a common love for our country and its institutions that we refuse to become streotypes, all cut from the same pattern.

Our formula, therefore, becomes clear. In order to qualify for our annual award one must have made a significant contribution to American life. He must have vision and courage and a strong sense of responsibility to society. He must be a loyal member of his own group in order to be a better American. He must be strongly imbued with the ideal of the brotherhood of man and generous with his substance and his energy in the service of all mankind. Above all, his life must be such as to inspire others to emulation.

Such men are not easy to find. But this year's choice was inevitable by any standard.

The fourth of seven children, Jacob M. Arvey was born in Chicago, of good pioneer immigrant stock. He gave early evidence of loyalty, grit, and determination by working with his father delivering milk from a horse-drawn wagon in all sorts of weather.

He learned his Judaism and its heritage of the democratic way of life and firm adherence to social justice from his father who was a founder and officer of one of the first synagogues established in Chicago and from his mother who was a pious and saintly soul all her days.

He was only 13 when his father died and in order to assist in the support of the family, he worked in his mother's neighborhood candy store. When he was old enough, he got a job in a factory at $3 a week and was graduated from high school the hard way—by attending night classes. The same was true of law school and he was admitted to the practice of the law in 1916, when he was barely 21.

In the First World War, he was so impressive as a 4-minute man that in 1918 he was appointed as assistant State's attorney. Here he first demonstrated his love for justice by refusing to prosecute in any case unless he was fully convinced by the evidence that the defendant was guilty.

In 1923, he was elected alderman from one of the largest wards in our city. In that day, this district was inhabited principally by immigrants from eastern Europe where a governmental regime and public officials spelled tyranny and were best avoided. This was at once a challenge and an opportunity to assert his devotion to the lot of the common man; to awaken in the immigrant confidence in the American way of life and to instill respect for American institutions. In that task, he succeeded admirably, for soon, fear and distrust were replaced by devotion and love for American ideals and hearty cooperation in government.

In the council, too, he continued his growth and soon became chairman of the important finance committee, a position he held until his resignation to enter the armed forces.

During all this time, his heart responded generously to every plea for help from both public and private, religious and secular, and general and Jewish charitable organizations.

For many years he had been a member of the Illinois National Guard and in 1941 he held the rank of captain. When, after the enactment of the Selective Service Act, his regiment was about to be transferred to the United States Army, he was privileged to resign. He was beyond the draft age. With war imminent, many men younger and more robust than he would have welcomed the opportunity to remain at home—and many did. Not so with him. Although he could have rendered distinguished service in support of the war effort on the home front—service which would have satisfied almost any man's conscience, his convictions as to the rightness of the struggle against tyranny and oppression, his indignation at the Nazi efforts to brutalize all mankind, and his great love for America compelled him to remain with his regiment and the record of the quality of his service is part of our country's contemporary history.

Leaving his family, his friends, and his business, he served for almost 3 years, first giving inestimable guidance in the organization and administration of camp life in this country and then, distinguished himself by more than 2 years of duty in the Pacific theater. Discharged as a lieutenant colonel in late 1945, he is now a colonel in the Reserve Corps. Among other decorations, he is the holder of the Silver Star and the Legion of Merit.

Upon his return from the war, thin, to the point of emaciation, tired to the point of exhaustion from the rigors of severe campaigns, sick with the memory of human carnage and misery, his desire to retire from public life would have been understood and justified by all. But the very experiences of the war and profound meditation about its causes and effects, gave him a new vision of a better world and a better life for the common man, which, in turn, stimulated renewed vigor and courage to resist the temptation to seek isolation.

His associates sensed this new power and he was appointed a member of the Chicago Park District and soon thereafter elected chairman of the Cook County Democratic Central Committee.

The area of his efforts and influence was expanded. He could now make practical application on a broader scale of liberal and progressive ideas which he had always sought to put into practice. His influence began to be felt in national circles. Many of his ideas were incorporated in the national platform of his party. In this recent period, his genius, his energy, his foresight and his perseverance resulted in the crowning achievement of his career—the selection of the highest type of men, approved by the voters and the envy of the whole country, to govern in our city, our State, in the House of Representatives, and in the United States Senate.

Yes; he is the new liberal, the real liberal of the practical kind, with his eyes on the stars but his feet on the ground. It is of him that a Member of Congress from our own State wrote recently, "He played a much larger part than is generally known in getting to the floor of the House, and passed by the House, the social-security bill bringing under coverage 11,000,000 more men and women. His influence was behind the minimum-wage law, and I know it is a matter of pride to him that all the Congressmen from Illinois of the party of which he is the leader have gone all out in support of the Federal fair employment practices bill."

Nor did his loyalty to Judaism and his Jewish brethren ever diminish. His tact and diplomacy have often been called into play in the solution of purely Jewish problems. Only recently, he was selected to head a committee of three to represent Chicago Jewry in the settlement of a fund raising controversy which might otherwise have caused a serious rift in Jewish life in our community. Many such incidents could be related in addition to his being one of the founders of the YMHA in Chicago many years ago and more recently, being the sponsor of the Chicago Lawndale Lodge of B'nai B'rith, of which he remains honorary president, as well as his

membership, in most instances on the boards, in any worth while Jewish religious, charitable and educational organizations including several congregations.

But his outstanding contribution to Jewry and the remnant of Israel was the role he played in those critical days when Palestine was partitioned by the United Nations and Israel was recognized by the United States. With characteristic modesty he will decline to speak of his part in the establishment of a new democracy in the world. But when that chapter of history is written depicting America's participation in the establishment of Israel, his name will stand out in bold type as an illustrious American Jew.

It is of him that one of the leading Zionists of America said recently, "Very few know the significant role he has played in the emancipation of our people and in the restoration of our dispersed to nationhood."

It is of him that the recipient of last year's award, himself a lifelong Zionist leader, the late Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, of blessed memory, said, "No one will ever know how much he did to help the final decision on Israel."

Our choice for this year, therefore, meets all the requirements of our formula; he has made a significant contribution to American life by making us all conscious of our civic duty to participate in government and by demonstrating that such participation results in good government. He is a loyal member of his own minority group, the Jewish people, and is thereby a better American. He is generous with his substance and his energy in the service of his country and all mankind. He is imbued with a deep sense of responsibility to society and with the ideal of the brotherhood of man. He clings loyally to his friends and is well known never to break his word once given. He has vision and courage in abundance. He is kind and modest and humble. He inspires emulation by all of us. He has grown to full stature but his growth continues.

He is supremely qualified for our award of merit and I am honored to be the instrumentality through whom it is delivered. Colonel Arvey, on behalf of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers of which you yourself are a distinguished member, I take pleasure in presenting to you the award of merit for the year 1949, with our best wishes for a long healthy life of continued service to your people, your city, your State, your country, and all humanity.

(Reading from scroll accompanying award:)

"The Decalogue Society of Lawyers award of merit for the year 1949 presented to Col. Jacob M. Arvey for his distinguished service to his country as soldier, statesman, and civic leader; for his profound understanding of and unyielding devotion to the American ideal of equality of opportunity and justice for all; for his historic achievements in bringing good government to his city, his State and his country; for his leadership and fruitful labors on behalf of Israel and the Jewish people; for the high-minded humanitarianism manifest in his lifelong devotion to the realization of democratic principles.

"CHICAGO, ILL., *February 25, 1950.*"

ADDRESS OF COL. J. M. ARVEY

Few things that have happened to me in my career as a Chicago lawyer have moved me as deeply as this tribute you pay me tonight.

In accepting it, I realize fully that it is more than merely a tribute to me as an individual.

I am happy to accept the award, not as a personal honor, but rather as your recognition of the growing importance of a group which I—and many of you—represent—the lawyer in politics.

May I, therefore, express my gratitude not for myself alone, but in behalf of those frequently maligned, often misunderstood, yet indispensable leaders of our democracy—the lawyers in politics.

As members of the American bar as well as of the Decalogue Society, we men of law bear a twofold tradition. This tradition carries with it, I humbly believe, the solemn obligation to use our knowledge of law and legal methods to resolve the contentions which threaten our way of life and the peace of the world.

If there is to be any hope in the world for continued peace and justice, it must come through the development and application of legal concepts and legal mechanisms acceptable to all governments—and not from the use of the hydrogen bomb.

Ours is peculiarly a Government of law. As such it is to a large extent a Government by men of law. Three hundred of the 531 Members of Congress are lawyers. Perhaps this might be expected in a body of lawmakers. But 343 of our 1,600 top Federal officials also hold one or more law degrees. That is roughly 220 times as many lawyers in top Government positions as would be the case if we selected these officials by drawing straws out of a hat.

Certainly, in no other country in history, have legal and political ideas and methods been so closely connected as in the United States.

To the critics of the lawyer in politics—that is in party politics as well as in Government—let me simply remind them that of the 56 men who signed the Declaration of Independence 25 were lawyers. And that famous bill of particulars against George III was drafted by the greatest lawyer-politician of his day—Thomas Jefferson.

Of the 51 men who framed our Federal Constitution, 31 were lawyers.

This state of affairs has continued. Not only has the meaning of our Constitution always been interpreted by lawyers sitting on the Supreme Court bench, but of our 32 Presidents, 26 have been lawyers—or judges, if we include President Truman. Of our 54 Secretaries of State, 50 have been lawyers.

As a matter of fact, the chief objector to the lawyer in politics has usually been the man who feared democracy most—the tyrant.

There is a story to the effect that when Peter the Great of Russia was visiting London—that was long before the present spy scare, of course—he was surprised at the number of lawyers in Parliament. "I have only two lawyers in all my dominions," said Peter. "And I intend to hang one of them as soon as I get back."

Lawyers had little or no place in Mussolini's corporate state. They had little or none in Hitler's Nazi Reich. They have practically none in Soviet Russia or in any other country dominated by a dictator.

As long as America continues to be a Government of law, and as long as members of the bar remain free to talk and act according to legal processes, we have little to fear from tyranny—either from the left or the right.

As long as the lawyer continues to take the same active part in government and politics as did Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, James Otis, Samuel Adams, and our other first American lawyer-politicians, we shall remain a government of law.

I believe there is altogether too much of an attitude of looking down the nose at the politician by people who forget that politicians—and most of them lawyer-politicians—made the United States possible.

As a lawyer in politics, who is generally regarded as a practical party leader, I am as thoroughly convinced of the need of working in one or the other of our major political parties as were Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt—the greatest and most effective reformers of their times.

In saying this, I do not wish to belittle the importance of independent groups and minor parties working for definite reforms. I am merely pointing out that the main road to political goals, in our American political system, has always followed a major political party.

Only as a political-party worker or leader can you be fully effective—even if your goal is reforming the party itself. You can't clean a house from the outside. You can destroy it—working from without—but you've got to get inside to renovate.

As the titular head of my political party in this community since 1946, I have had a dual objective. I've tried to make democracy with a big "D" work outside the organization, and I've been trying to make democracy with a small "d" work within the organization.

I don't want to be the leader of a rubber-stamp organization. I want to be the leader of a dynamic group of men and women capable of challenging and improving every constructive idea I can promulgate for the good of the order. I feel that it would be foolhardy and presumptuous for anyone in my position to attempt to substitute his ideas, or those of a mere handful of men, for those of thousands of precinct and ward leaders and the millions of voters with whom they have contact.

On the other hand, of course, a ruthless party boss could clean out the deadwood in his organization. He could put go-getters in key positions. He could pick human dynamos for top administrative jobs, and intellectual wizards for top-drawer policy jobs.

Instead of letting members of the organization work out their problems and reach their own decisions in the precinct, the ward, the congressional district, and so on, by the slow, tiresome, wasteful democratic process of discussion, bargaining, and compromise, this political master mind could bypass all this. He could pick whom he considered the best candidates and officeholders, determine what he considered the most expedient policies—and save time, effort, and money.

But granted you could find the right kind of superman for your political boss—a man surpassing all his fellows in wisdom, astuteness, and political knowledge—one with the highest ethical standards and the greatest understanding of human problems—in turning over party rule to this single human being, you would be killing democracy and, of course, history discloses the existence of no such superman.

It is true there are political leaders, commonly called bosses, who do not believe as I do. There is no reason why they should, they are under no compulsion to adhere to the pattern I am employing unless it should turn out, after my theories have been fully tested that I am right and they are wrong. Frankly, some of my own very closest political associates disagree with my views, even though I, and not they, operate under the title that would permit such boss rule.

I realize old forms are always hard to break away from, but that is not, in my opinion, the best of reasons why they should be retained.

I think a bit of experimentation is called for. I believe the end result will be good for the party and its objectives and good for the community.

Now, as I see it, a party leader if he is to lead intelligently must inspire his fellow party members to recognize and embrace those measures and movements which spell not only party success but community progress.

He must encourage the leaders in the organization under him to accept ever greater responsibilities toward the party and its public relations. The broader the base of leadership, the stronger will be the party structure.

As a party politician, I believe our greatest strength as a Nation will come when both major parties are led by strong courageous men who represent the will of their party members, each party having a definite stand on great public issues.

I believe such an alinement would do away with the privilege and pressure groups which are afraid to submit their political ideas to the American people for their decision in the open, but work in the dark.

I have already paid my respects to the nonpartisan and independent groups. I have reason to be grateful to them. Within the past few years they helped the Democratic Party of Illinois and Chicago elect a great governor, a great United States Senator and a great mayor. I know that independent votes helped decide these contests.

Yet, while these independent groups exercise undoubted influence in naming candidates and electing them, they lack the discipline of party responsibility. Thus, when the candidates they help elect, come into office, with either no party responsibility, or a divided responsibility, the result is what we saw in the Eightieth Congress and what we see today in the Eighty-first Congress. Witness the fate of the displaced-persons bill, the civil-rights bill and other important issues.

Voters in a national election vote on issues. They vote on the basis of what they read in the party platforms. They have a right to believe that the parties mean what their platforms say. They have a right to believe that the candidates running for Congress are pledged to vote for the measures in their party platforms.

Without party responsibility, I see no way to hold a candidate to his pledge. I see no way to have party responsibility that means anything unless we have political parties strong enough to hold officials to their campaign pledges. Of course, resolutions help, public opinion helps, newspaper editorials help.

But in the final analysis, it is only the party, whose support means the difference between nomination and rejection, election and defeat, that can make a congressman and a congress toe the line.

At the local level, this question of party responsibility is not, generally speaking, nearly so important. Local candidates are not ordinarily elected on national issues, and do not have the same relation to the party as does a congressman or a United States senator.

The party's broader principles are not so deeply involved, so that mayors and even governors may properly consider themselves to be more or less on their own, accountable primarily to the personal platforms upon which they have been elected.

In Illinois, as in most States, the gubernatorial candidate's platform usually becomes the basis for the party platform.

Such officials, however, run certain risks in straying too far from party councils.

The danger of such a divorcement is that they fall into the hands of special-interest groups, or of self-serving individuals who owe allegiance to no one but themselves. More than one well-intentioned public official has been ruined by his friends.

Adherence to party associations provides, at the least, the safety that lies in numbers.

I would be the last to maintain that political organizations, including my own, are spotless and unsullied. But I do ask you to consider this—for every man in public life who is corrupt, there are plenty of men in private life who are corrupters.

On the whole our political organizations represent a fair cross section of the people of Cook County.

On the whole the average party member compares favorably with his nonpolitical neighbor. I mean in terms of honesty, ability, and interest in good government.

It is particularly fitting that this recognition of the lawyer's place in politics and government should come from this society.

We are told that the earliest concept of government by law, instead of by men, came from the Decalogue, handed down to Moses, our first lawgiver, on Mount Sinai.

In the Decalogue, in the sacred books and in the oral decisions, interpretations and commentaries later written down in the Talmud, we have the first written constitution and the first constitutional law in history.

By two great traditions—that of the American bar and that of the Decalogue—we men of law have a double obligations to American democracy.

It is the obligation to lead in the democratic processes of drafting our laws, administering our laws, and supporting the new legal concepts under which alone we may continue to expand as a government of the people.

Sholem aleichem—peace be with you—has come down to us from the days of the Decalogue as a common greeting. It expresses the age-old hope of peace. By establishing government by law—instead of by force—our forefathers laid a foundation for peace upon which we can build.

The foundation of government by law came to the new world long before the American Revolution. It was brought by the displaced persons of their day. I mean the Puritans and other religious dissenters who sought asylum here. For many years the Hebrew law, as it was interpreted by their spiritual leaders, ruled the first American colonies.

When the American Revolution broke, it was the spirit of law, interpreted largely by the lawyers of that day, the lawyers who became the first American politicians, which made possible the founding of our Republic.

It is the same spirit of law, of government by law, the same rule of reason and of conciliation, that alone can lead mankind out of his present wilderness.

Today, more than at any time in the entire history of mankind, we have need for those orderly processes to which legally trained minds turn instinctively. We are living in an era of chaos, a terrifying time in which our civilization is threatened by ideological conflict that persists even after two World Wars.

The fight for world peace—for those ideals toward which we have been groping through all the years of horror and holocaust—we can never abandon. In the end, we will win out through unity, and unity can only come through understanding. Ultimately, we must have understanding at universal levels, but that cannot be possible unless it exists at all of the lower levels, including the smallest unit of all—the precinct.

That is where a responsible political organization can play its part.

My profound conviction is that political enterprise operated through political organization can be instrumental—though the development of leadership and the promotion of good will—in attaining these high goals.

This I consider to be the most important part of my task, and that is the objective I have set for myself.

Allow me to again thank you for this memorable night. I take from it new encouragement to believe that what I am doing serves in at least a small way the welfare of my country and the world in which I live.

What About the Ex-Communists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article appeared in the New York Times of February 19, 1950, entitled "The Complex Issue of the Ex-Communist." It was written by Mr. Arthur Koestler, novelist and former foreign correspondent. It should be read by those Members who are interested in problems presented by the ex-Communist:

THE COMPLEX ISSUE OF THE EX-COMMUNISTS—WAS CHAMBERS THE REAL VILLAIN RATHER THAN HISS?—"NO," SAYS ARTHUR KOESTLER, AND HERE HE TELLS WHY

(By Arthur Koestler)

The second trial of Alger Hiss happened to coincide with the publication of a book in which several former Communists and Soviet sympathisers, including myself, relate their experiences. This explains the letter from which the following extract is taken. The writer is unknown to me—she is a woman obviously of German origin who now lives in a Latin-American country.

"Reading about Alger Hiss I always think: There but for the grace of God and the Communist Party, stand I. I belong to your generation, in age and in spirit. I was one of those who, had the party only asked for, would have spied on God Almighty without the least bit of a bad conscience. It is not my merit that they never did ask me things like that, because the only function I ever held was that of a dumb cashier of party dues and later on I was fortunately only a no-account typist in one of their organizations in Berlin, still later in Spain the same during the civil war, in a party office in Barcelona. It was around that time, summer 1937, when I changed my mind about our "Religion" and no doubt, had Alger Hiss gone through this school he would have changed his mind also. But Americans were rather a few years later in finding out, you know the political reasons for that very well, I suppose. It seems one has to be a European with a left-wing past to understand the Hiss story * * *".

"That is where the call for you comes in. Defend Alger Hiss on ground of his motives. I only know of the Hiss case what I have read * * *. Still, the story seems in a way very clear to me and though I believe he did what he is accused of, I see it in the light of his then decent motives. The question would rather be: have the United States really been harmed through him? I cannot believe that. It must be his difficult position and regard for his family that makes him insist on his innocence which, in a higher sense, is real. Come to think of it, for the American public the case is really a bit involved, but you could make it clear. Maybe, if you did, you would prevent a suicide. Could not this trial be brought around to the real issue: even if he did steal the documents, What were his motives? Probably, sometime between now and then, when Alger Hiss changed his mind as so many did who had been Communists in good faith, he was in no position to announce that change. It must have been like this and Whittaker Chambers is the real villain because he didn't keep his mouth shut about things past and done with."

I have quoted this long extract because I believe that it expresses, in an admittedly

exaggerated and overstrung manner, the vague feeling of uneasiness in a considerable section of the European and American public. The outstanding aspect of the trial was that it was not a case of the State or society calling a citizen to account for an alleged crime. It was a public and deadly duel between two individuals—one persecutor, one persecuted. Thus the abstract equation of justice between individual and society became transformed into a personal equation between two men, and the whole picture became distorted by the public's emotional reactions to these two so utterly different human types.

As far as personal impressions and the testimonies of high-standing witnesses go, the persecuted Hiss appeared as the prototype of the decent, modest, hard-working, well-spoken, happily married, idealistic American liberal who, even if assumed to be guilty, could not be suspected of having acted for any base reason or for personal gain. His persecutor on the other hand appeared as a man who unblushingly admitted having committed perjury, traveled with forged passports, lived with mistresses under false names and was described by some psychiatrist gents as a psychopath. To put the whole matter into a nutshell, from the spectator's point of view the casting of the parts was wrong—Chambers should have got the part of Hiss and Hiss the part of Chambers.

But the roles were only apparently miscast. For there is a tragic consistency and deep symbolism in both characters. Without doubting the verdict of the jury, there are many who agree that Hiss' innocence is "in a higher sense real," and that he kept passing those documents to the spy ring happily like a starry-eyed Boy Scout doing his one good deed every day. These people would feel that he is the classic type of well-meaning dupe who becomes addicted to the Soviet myth as if it were a drug and who never finds his way back from this lost week-end in utopia.

Hiss denied to the end and persisted stubbornly on his single track; Chambers confessed, recanted his past, and came out on the side of the angels. One would think that this after all decisive fact should tilt the balance of sympathy toward Chambers. Yet my correspondent expresses his impatience by his "difficult position" and calls Chambers the real villain because "he did not keep his mouth shut about things past." And here again she seems to lend a shrill voice to a vague public sentiment. For though it is said that 1 repentant sinner causes more rejoicing in heaven than 10 righteous men, people here on earth not unnaturally prefer the 10 righteous men; and the public spectacle of the repentant sinner causes at best a feeling of embarrassment, at worst a feeling of repugnance. And here, I believe, is the core of the whole problem.

I remember how at a New York cocktail party some time ago a lady journalist of obvious sincerity attacked me with some vehemence. I don't remember what exactly she said, but the gist of it was that people who had once been Communists should shut up and retire to a monastery or a desert island instead of going around "teaching other people lessons." She spoke with deep conviction, and what she said obviously reflected a widespread popular feeling: mankind's instinctive horror of the renegade.

This horror probably has its roots in the collective unconscious, in past loyalties to church, clan, or tribe which, even if apparently buried, remain potent emotional forces. Even those who in principle agree that there are considerations of a higher order which may force a man to override his loyalties and who accept the ethical justification of a given renegadism—even these feel aesthetically repelled by the spectacle of the act itself. In short, people don't mind if you betray humanity in the name of some particular cause; but if you betray your club or party they will turn from you in contempt.

This leads us to the curious fact that in our society most people are in the habit of manipulating two mutually exclusive sets of ethical rules without being conscious of the contradiction between them. The first is expressed by sayings like "right or wrong, my fatherland," or "if the party demands it, I will spy on God Almighty Himself," and by the value set on unconditional loyalty. The second demands that a man should have the courage to become a traitor, renegade, or apostate if the interests of humanity or of peace, justice, or freedom demand it.

Some of the war trials of the last years were good examples of the confusion created by the simultaneous application of these contradictory rules of ethical conduct. Even more startling is the example of France, where people were shot, imprisoned, or sentenced to national ignominy for having loyally obeyed the orders of their own legal government. I do not wish to plead the case of either the prosecution or the defense; I wish merely to point out that if you feel contempt for Kravchenko or Chambers, then you should feel sympathy for Laval or Schacht; and vice versa, if you condemn people for having collaborated with a totalitarian regime, then you must acquit those who have deserted such a regime.

But of the two coexistent and contradictory rules of ethical conduct, the first, which demands unquestioning loyalty to some flag, social body, or institution, is much older and deeper embedded in our unconscious psyche. This may be illustrated by comparing the public's attitude to a Catholic convert on the one hand, to a defrocked priest on the other. Everybody, including hardened atheists, respects the convert, but even atheists are embarrassed or repelled by a defrocked priest taking a girl out to a dance.

Now, in fact, both are renegades who have repudiated their former convictions. But the convert has only deserted the amorphous mass of unbelievers who do not represent a social institution and have no flags, emblems or party cards; whereas the priest has deserted a church with powerful binding symbols. Hence even those who agree on principle with his decision have an uneasy feeling that somehow he shouldn't have done it—or at least if he had to do it he should not take a girl out to a dance, though for everybody else this is a perfectly proper thing to do.

I think one must accept the fact that Chambers and Kravchenko and the rest of us who have once borne allegiance to the "god that failed" will always be looked upon somewhat like defrocked priests regardless of the differences in each individual's history and motives. It is no use to argue whether this attitude is justified or not. It should be recognized as a psychological fact. And the fact itself would be without much interest if it merely concerned the few individuals in question. In this case the simplest solution for these would be to follow the lady journalist's advice and satisfy the demands of good taste and discretion by retiring to a monastery or a desert island.

But if Chambers had followed this advice, his repentance would have become meaningless and the public would never have learned certain facts which it was essential for it to learn. And the same is true of Kravchenko and Barmine and Slone and the others. My correspondent asks why they can't "keep their mouth shut about things past and done with"; and people with esthetic sensibilities, repelled by this flood of renunciations, disclosures, and ringing mea culpas, ask with a shudder the same questions.

The answer is simply that these things are neither "past" nor "done with." The inner structure of a totalitarian regime and the physiology of its tentacles stretching abroad; the facts about the arctic subcontinent of slavery, about the servitude of satellite governments and the psychology of the Communist Parties of the West—all these data, essential for the ideological and strategical defense of our civilization, could never have been assembled if these men had had the discretion and good taste to keep their mouths shut. For only those who have worked inside the hermetically closed regime know its true character and are in a position to convey a comprehensive picture of it; and in this sense at least it is true that one repentant sinner is a more valuable asset than ten righteous men who have never swerved from the path of democratic virtue.

Obviously the decisive fact about Chambers is that he has performed a service of great social utility. It is equally obvious that not all acts of social utility curry favor with the public or make the man who performs them appear in a favorable light. But it is essential that these two facts, the first of an objective the second of an emotive character, should remain neatly separated; and that the emotional factor should not obscure political judgment or interfere with the discharge of justice.

It is not to be expected that the public should like the runaway "priest"—even if the "church" from which he has run away happens to be devoted to perverse idolatry. It is not even important that it should believe in the purity or otherwise of his motives to quit. The public is entitled to feel attracted or repelled by him, but it is not entitled to let its bias interfere with its judgment; to talk of betrayal where loyalty would mean persistence in crime; to talk of persecution mania when millions are persecuted; to defend an evil regime on the grounds that those who denounce it are no saints. The greatest danger to liberalism today lies in such starry-eyed confusion.

Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have ever before put into the RECORD a letter from a constituent but the following one is too good to keep to myself. This letter is from one of the outstanding real old-fashioned American citizens of northern New York. I thought it would be of interest to the Members of the House and I hope that the Ways and Means Committee will especially note its contents.

MASSENA, N. Y., *March 28, 1950.*

Hon. CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CLARENCE: I see where you boys have decided that you are going to dip into the dividends of the common man now, asking the corporations to withhold 10 percent, and turn it over to you boys, to be spent wisely, or otherwise. Don't you think it would be all right just to let the stockholder finger the thing a little bit before you take it away from him, so that he would know what it is like?

I know very well that you Congressmen never figured this thing out, but it is about time you started calculating a little on your own hook, before you start letting the fellow with the pompadour haircut and the possum bellied pipe, who probably has figures enough in his head, or handy by, to figure the devil right out of hell, and also us taxpayers out of all our money. You had better look into this a little, son, and see that it does not happen.

Kindest regards.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER F. WILLSON.

Final Solution of the DP Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there are still several hundred thousand people in the displaced persons camps who are under the care of the International Refugee Organization—IRO. This organization has done marvelous work in the past 3 years in resettling about 700,000 DP's and repatriating another 70,000 people.

But what about those who still remain in the camps? If sufficient funds are not made available to this organization, IRO will not be able to complete the task with which it was entrusted at the time it was established, that is, find homes for the DP's and resolve the DP question which has been such a burden since the end of the war.

We are nearer a solution of that question than we have ever been in the last 5 years. It can be completely solved and eliminated within the coming year or two if we undertake the following steps: First, speedy action to liberalize the present DP law by admitting a larger number of DP's; secondly, appropriation of the necessary funds for IRO to make it possible for this organization to complete its task of resettling the remaining DP's.

In connection with this matter, I direct your attention to an editorial from the New York Times of March 22, 1950, as follows:

CONGRESS AND IRO

The International Refugee Organization has been told by the State Department that no American funds will be forthcoming to continue its operational activities beyond the next 12 months. Since the United States pays nearly half IRO's annual budget, this is equivalent to informing IRO that it must plan definitely to close down. The background of the situation is this:

When IRO was set up in mid-1947 to take care of the gigantic refugee problem, it was thought that its purposes might be accomplished in 3 years, or by June 30, 1950. The Organization has performed splendid work, measured in figures by the resettlement in new homes of over 700,000 war-displaced human beings and by the repatriation of another 70,000. The miracle is not that the job is still unfinished after less than 3 years but that so much has been accomplished. In any case, a few hundred thousand refugees still remain; and the brutal facts of the situation required a decision last fall to prolong the life of IRO to March 31, 1951, by which time it was hoped that the World War refugee question really could be fairly well solved. To this end, the United States agreed to contribute $25,000,000, almost half the necessary sum, for the 9 months' extension. But in asking Congress for this amount the State Department has had to promise that it would make no more requests for IRO, whether the refugee problem is liquidated by this time next year or not. There is every reason to hope that Congress will approve this year's $25,000,000; but whatever the merits, there is no reason to hope that it will grant any more next year. This is what the representatives of the State Department are trying to make clear in Geneva now.

In these circumstances, much depends on whether the existing Displaced Persons Act is liberalized. If we do not do our part in receiving this wealth of human material, the mere abolition of IRO next year will prove nothing. The refugees will remain; they will have to be cared for; and inevitably the funds to care for them will come in good part from the United States. Congress cannot have it both ways. If it wants IRO to disappear, it must take positive action to remove the essential reason for IRO's existence.

Highway Post Offices May Provide Solution to Slow-Mail Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems affecting the life of the smaller communities and rural regions is the steadily dwindling transportation service for carrying the mails, resulting in slower deliveries and less frequent service in a large section of the country. It is a matter of common knowledge that economic conditions have resulted in the abandonment of hundreds of local trains, and the mail service further crippled thereby.

We must face realities in the problem of mail delivery, as in everything else. If local train service is a thing of the past, the Post Office Department must move into new forms of transportation, or another serious blow will be struck at the community life of America.

A constructive suggestion for meeting this situation comes from James W. Wells, Jr., editor and publisher of the Newton Press, located in the county seat of Jasper County. Mr. Wells suggests that highway post offices may provide the solution to the slow mail problem. As one of the Illinois members of the House Committee on Civil Service and Post Offices I am deeply interested in his suggestions. Through permission granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including his article on the matter:

HIGHWAY POST OFFICE MAY PROVIDE SOLUTION TO SLOW-MAIL PROBLEM

Newton is known far and wide for having one of the finest post offices and postal staffs to be found in all of southeastern Illinois.

Virtually all patrons concede that Postmaster John E. Nichols and all postal workers in Newton extend the best in courteous service. It is a well-known fact that they do everything they can do to please the public within the limits of Post Office Department regulations.

Mail received in Newton is delivered with unusual promptness, and material deposited here for dispatch to other cities is started on its way with like speed.

But it is a fact that the mail service here and in other towns and cities of this area has taken a backward step during the last few years due to the withdrawal of passenger trains on branch lines of the railroads. These trains carried mail cars which provided service to dozens of towns.

RELAYS ARE COMMON

Most of the mails now received at the Newton Post Office are redistributed at offices located at the terminus of a star route. Likewise, the mails dispatched from Newton are taken to an office at the terminus of a star route and there redistributed and dispatched to mail trains and other star routes.

This arrangement often results in serious delays.

For example, a letter mailed in a city less than 100 miles from Newton recently required 3 days to reach here. And newspapers mailed Saturday afternoon in a city 41 miles distant do not arrive until midmorning on Monday.

Letters mailed in still another city, approximately 40 miles away, frequently require 2 days on the road before landing in Newton.

Mail which must be sent from Newton to certain cities for redistribution more or less travels at its own risk as far as date of delivery is concerned. Two cities in this section are called upon to handle a large amount of redistribution mail, and postal staffs apparently cannot keep up with the load on frequent occasions.

For this reason, much mail sent out of Newton requires 48 hours to reach destinations within 20 miles of this city.

One solution for expediting the delivery is the establishment of highway post offices in areas where train service is not available.

These highway post offices are busses made especially to distribute mail in transit and are fitted inside with racks where mail sacks are hung and boxes where letter mail is distributed.

Vehicles thus far placed in use are 33 feet long and can accommodate 200 bags of mail. The interior arrangement is identical to that of a railroad mail car.

Mails are distributed in transit and made ready for dispatch at points where train service is available.

TRAINED CLERKS

Clerks employed on these mobile post offices are railway postal clerks who are specially trained in the distribution of mails in transit and required to take examinations every 6 months on the scope of their work.

Exams are on the postal laws and regulations, State schemes of post offices, changes in time schedules of mail trains, airplanes, star-route service, and other important points.

Mail busses are in great part owned by the Post Office Department, but some are owned and operated by private concerns and manned by the postal service.

The first highway post office was established in 1941 between Washington, D. C., and Harrisonburg, Va. As of January 1, 1950, a total of 64 had been established in the United States, principally in the East and Southeast.

NONE IN ILLINOIS

None has been established in Illinois, but Indiana has three in operation—one between South Bend and Indianapolis, another between Fort Wayne and Indianapolis, and the other between Indianapolis and Vincennes.

This type of service probably is more costly than star routes, but it is greatly preferred because it results in expediting the mails.

Regarding cost, it is widely known that the Post Office Department has been operating at a loss for years. However, it provides a service that reaches the rich and poor alike, and probably no other Government agency does this to as great an extent.

Revenue from the Post Office Department is turned into the United States Treasury and in turn paid out for the operation of the

Post Office Department. A large volume of the mail handled originates in other governmental departments which contribute no revenue, although it creates as much expense for the postal service as paid matter.

PEOPLE EXPECT BEST SERVICE

The public has grown to expect the best mail service obtainable and makes its desires known through proper channels.

Newton people point out that this city is on two excellent paved highways, and they believe that highway post office service could be obtained on either the Mattoon-Evansville or Effingham-Palestine routes, or both.

They also point out that United States Highway 40 from Effingham to Terre Haute should not be overlooked. While this famous route parallels the Pennsylvania Railroad, practically all the trains on this line are non-stop carriers.

Due to weather conditions and other factors, this is not a satisfactory service because of damage to mails delivered from fast-moving trains.

It also is common knowledge in Newton that mail sent from this city to places along the Pennsylvania frequently is carried to Terre Haute or Indianapolis before being returned to the proper town.

SHOULD BAND TOGETHER

Many people feel that towns in this area should band together and ask the Post Office Department to launch one or more highway post office routes.

Those who have investigated the subject declare that the Mattoon-Evansville route held No. 2 priority on Illinois plans drafted some time ago, and that the No. 1 route has since been found unnecessary. The same leaders feel that a movement should be launched at once in an effort to at least get this route established.

Crime Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article from the editorial page of the March 28, 1950, edition of the Framingham (Mass.) News. The crime statistics presented are a sharp reminder that we cannot afford to abandon any of our youthful guidance programs at national, State, or community levels.

The editorial follows:

CRIME INCREASES

A year ago an FBI spokesman was quoted as saying that it was improbable the high crime rate of the postwar period would continue in 1949. Actually the FBI's number of recorded crimes for the year totaled 1,763,280, an increase of 4½ percent over 1948.

As computed by Mr. Hoover's bureau, that total is at the rate of one crime every 18 seconds. But that is not as impressive as the fact that in the category of major crimes the figures add up to a daily average of 293 persons feloniously killed or sentenced, more than 1,200 burglaries and almost 3,000 robberies and other thefts. The thefts averaged $40 a day.

To be taken into account also are such offenses as embezzlement and fraud, forgery, commercialized vice, gambling, and sex offenses.

What consolation may be drawn from the fact that declines were noted in the number of murder, negligent manslaughter, and auto theft cases is more than offset by the showing that more than one-half of all crimes against property were committed by persons under 23. They numbered 54 percent of those charged with robbery, 59 percent of those charged with burglary, 67 percent of those charged with grand larceny, and 54 percent of those charged with rape.

That among the 792,039 persons arrested the predominant age was 21 years is even more cause for sober reflection, for it shows discouraging progress in the face of the mounting emphasis given the responsibility of the home and of society in general for youth training.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in many areas of this country today there is a growing fear that we are heading toward a premature termination of rent control which has given protection to millions of families during the crucial war and postwar years when we were faced with the terrific problem of lack of housing. Unfortunately, that problem is still with us. We are nearer a solution now than we were a year or 2 years ago, but there are still millions of families who urgently need the protection which this law affords them, and there are still hundreds of thousands of families who have to live doubled-up because of lack of sufficient housing.

On March 10, 1949, when we were considering a 15-month extension of the rent-control law, I stated on the floor of this House as follows:

> We have had rent control for a long time. We may have to have it for a long time to come. There is no man in this House who will stand on this floor and say that we want rent control or control of any kind as a permanent part of our free American Government and its institutions that are so dear to all of us. But so long as we are in an emergency period we are going to ask for emergency legislation. * * * But do not fool yourselves. We will not relieve the housing shortage in 90 days or a year or 15 months.

I am not seeking the plaudits of a prophet. But more than a year has gone by since then and the housing shortage still remains acute in various parts of the country. In view of the fact that rent has always been a basic factor in the cost of living for many millions of families, and in view of a slow but gradual increase in unemployment in many sections of the country, we should not be too hasty in suspending this means of protection which will unquestionably hurt the lower-income groups very severely.

I fear that if we allow the rent control law to lapse, that if we do not renew it for another year, our inaction or refusal to extend its protection to those millions of our citizenry who still need it, may lead to a chain of events which would seriously undermine the economic stability of many areas of the country. It would then be impossible for the country as a whole to escape the effects of economic turmoil.

We cannot take such chances at this time when we must maintain national unity and a high degree of national morale to bolster our position in the world. We dare not allow the forces of evil and corruption abroad to ridicule us before the world for failing our own people.

I hate to think of the effects of a sudden disruption of landlord-tenant relations which exist today in 43 of the 48 States. At last reports, effective rent protection for tenants was still extended to 12,000,000 rental housing units throughout the Nation, which means that 12,000,000 families were afforded this protection. It does not require a great deal of imagination to foresee the chaos and turmoil in many communities next June 30 if the present rent-control law is allowed to expire.

My State has taken itself out from under Federal control. It has, nevertheless, chosen to continue rent control on its statute books and to extend to the citizens of my State some form of protection. Extension of Federal rent control will not affect my State. I am not now talking for my constituents, but for yours. I believe rent control is still a vital need for the entire country. I believe that it is our duty to enact a Federal law to afford some form of rent control protection to those communities which are unable for one reason or another to establish any form of rent regulation of their own.

The housing shortage is by no means over. Not until that problem is fully solved can you relinquish that obligation to the people whom you represent here. Let us now encourage economic chaos; let us not contribute to economic instability. Rent control is still a matter of emergency legislation. It is absolutely necessary.

Hiss and the Liberals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article by William E. Bohn which appeared in the New Leader shortly after the conviction of Alger Hiss:

HISS AND THE "LIBERALS"

(By William E. Bohn)

From so-called liberals—many of them men of distinction—we have had a strange outpouring since the verdict was handed down in the Hiss trial. Most of those who have made statements openly or covertly impugning the verdict have not been in court during the progress of the case. How many of them have scanned the record I do not know. Probably none. But they all try to cast doubt on the jury's decision.

Now this, I submit, is a singular situation. A man has been found guilty by a jury after a long and obviously fair trial. The judge leaned over backward in admitting evidence. The defense attorneys were men of obvious ability. The prosecution limited itself to a rather dry and factual presentation of its evidence. Anyone who listened carefully to the testimony and examined the exhibits will agree that the case for conviction of perjury was overwhelming.

Yet we have had, since the trial ended, expressions from distinguished journalists directly saying or clearly implying that the whole thing is a mistake. Among them are Max Lerner, Marquis Childs, Frank Kingdon, and the Alsop brothers. Mr. Lerner implies that Hiss and Chambers are equally guilty and that from now on both will be victims of their consciences. Marquis Childs calls the whole thing "persecution—and persecution of men and women for the ideas they hold." Frank Kingdon does not go that far, but he is ready to excuse Alger Hiss as "an honorably intentioned man" who has been "distorted by the confusions of the times."

The statement by the brothers Alsop deals exclusively with Dean Acheson's declaration of friendship for Hiss. Mr. Acheson has been rather closely tied up with Alger Hiss. Donald Hiss was formerly his law partner. Mrs. Hiss testified that she joined the League of Women Shoppers at a meeting held in the Acheson home. The two men were simultaneously employed in the State Department. The Acheson statement, backed up by a passage from the New Testament, said that the Secretary of State will not turn his back on Alger Hiss; the Alsops' comment that Dean Acheson "insisted on his own high standards," and that in standing by a friend who is in deep trouble the Secretary set an example of Christian charity.

It did not occur to Joseph and Stewart Alsop that there was any reason why the Secretary of State either should have held his peace or should have made a two-pronged statement. The deeds which led to the conviction of Hiss were performed in the Department of which Mr. Acheson is now head. In the course of the trial, sworn evidence was submitted which showed that Alger Hiss was not the only disloyal man in that department. Stories are going the rounds that there are still men there who are more loyal to a foreign power than they are to the country which delivers their pay checks.

It is all very fine for the Secretary to stick to his friends and quote Scripture. But the people of the United States, who want to know what this trial means, are concerned about the possibility that others may at this moment be extracting papers from Government files and making them available to unauthorized persons. Yet neither Mr. Acheson nor the brothers Alsop have a word to spend on this public aspect of the case. Their attention is exclusively fixed on the nobility of personal friendship. It is an ideal of public service and comparative values which goes back to the days of Mark Hanna or to the later times of Warren G. Harding.

Even with regard to the friendship angle of the case, all of these men are curiously blind to the realities. Max Lerner and Marquis Childs seem to believe that Alger Hiss has been persecuted—that this is an American Dreyfus affair. Lerner goes to great length to show that the jury's verdict is the result of cold-war hysteria. Childs thinks, "We make ourselves over in the deformed image of what we profess to loathe." The Alsops are very sorry for Hiss without saying why they are sorry. Frank Kingdon is the only one of the lot who shows any consciousness of the real tragedy that lies at the bottom of the case. Hiss may have taken his course believing he was "serving the highest kind of patriotism." That such a brilliant young man with such a high future before him should make such a tragic mistake—that is something to shed tears over.

Anyone who followed the evidence as the jury did—and who did so with an open mind—will be convinced—as the jury was—that Alger Hiss is guilty as charged. Any man who has any sensitivity, any religion, any kindness, any decency, will be hurt deep down inside by being forced to this conclusion. But if his brain functions normally on what his ears and eyes take in, that is where he will land. Max Lerner was simply too soft-hearted—or soft-headed—to follow through. The other commentators whose thoughts I have criticized were not present at the trial and simply do not know what they are talking about.

Celler Asks Churchill's Intercession in Interest of Peace in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in a letter to Winston Churchill, receipt of which was formally acknowledged, I pointed to the distorted perspective of the present British Government which is blocking the peaceful development of both the Israeli and Arab areas. A copy of the text of the letter follows:

MARCH 8, 1950.

Rt. Hon. WINSTON S. CHURCHILL,
London, England.

SIR: I address myself to you because the event of the elections in your country clearly established you as England's most potent voice for peace. There can be no doubt now that in all external British areas of influence, yours will be the decisive leadership, and because of that fact, your interest, direct and immediate, should be brought to bear on the Middle East.

The distorted perspective of the present British Government with reference to this area has blocked and continued to block the peaceful development of both the Israeli and Arab areas. Just so long as the British Government continues to sell heavy arms to Arab countries, just so long will Arab leadership cherish the ambition to reopen the war with Israel. Torpedoes and tanks and jet planes and submarines are weapons of aggression. To speak of them as defense arms is to place great strain on adult logic. Do the English honestly believe they are arming the Arab countries against Russian aggression? If that is so, is it not pitiful that British leadership is convinced that such arms as the Arab countries can buy and do buy could withstand a Russian assault for even a day? The recent martial history of the Arab countries reduces such confidence in Arab ability to absurdity. Most certainly, the moneys used by the Arabs to buy such arms could more advantageously be used for the bettering of the economic life of the people, which is a far more effective weapon against communism than the arms they can buy.

But such arms as they can buy can be used against the small, young State of Israel. The peaceful development of Israel which gives the greatest promise for the economic and social stability of that whole area is retarded by this supplying of arms to the Arab countries. Moneys that should be spent for agricultural and industrial constructive uses must, of necessity, be diverted to military purposes. The Israelis are aware of the obvious if the British Government is not, that the Arab leaders are still smarting under the humiliation of the defeat. They are likewise aware that not only must these leaders recapture their lost prestige, but must distract their peoples from viewing the benefits of a democratic state in their own midst, lest the democratic ideology prove infectious.

You once remarked that the promulgation of the MacDonald white paper which closed the doors of Palestine, then a British mandate, to the Jews was the filing of a petition in moral bankruptcy. Is this arming of the Arab countries any less so when the use to which they can be put is apparent.

You clearly understand what a viable, stable Israel means in terms of peace and plenty for the whole area. You clearly understand how the blundering attitude of Britain toward Israel's struggle for independence has resulted in self-injury and humiliation both at home and abroad.

I do not exaggerate when I say that now you have the power to change the mischievous policy of your country toward Israel. In doing so, you will serve most effectively the cause of peace.

Respectfully yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Trade in Strategic Materials With Iron-Curtain Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following information in answer to questions put by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] during debate on H. R. 7797, a bill to provide foreign economic assistance.

First, as to trade in strategic materials with countries behind the iron curtain. It is hoped that the gentleman will appreciate that commerce in strategic items is, in some respects, a matter that must be kept confidential. Its delicate nature, from the standpoint of international relations, is obvious.

However, this much is apparent on the face of the record. Ten of the participating countries are parties with us under the North Atlantic Pact. These 10 are also recipients of assistance under the mutual defense assistance program. Under both undertakings they are engaged with us in the most solemn engagements of unity of policy and execution in regard to all strategic matters.

One of the countries, namely west Germany, is under occupation by this Nation and two of its allies, France and the United Kingdom. The same unity of policy and execution as affects our allies in the North Atlantic Pact and mutual defense undertaking applies in the administration of Germany.

Also, two of the recipient countries, namely, Greece and Turkey, are under obligations to us parallel to the obligations entered into in connection with the North Atlantic Pact.

It is their security just as much as ours, and even more immediately than ours—that is concerned in strategic economic policy toward the countries behind the iron curtain.

It would be a matter of personal satisfaction to be able to tell the gentleman the precise figures as to what is considered strategic material and what amounts of such material are concerned in trade between eastern and western Europe. It would be imprudent, however, to make such data public. I can assure the gentleman this: that all participants in the Marshall plan are obliged to establish the same policies as we apply respecting trade in strategic materials with the iron-curtain countries insofar as products derived from Marshall plan assistance are concerned.

The gentleman from Nebraska asked also about the use of dollars in the counterpart funds. There are no dollars in counterpart funds. There are local currencies which may be discussed in terms of dollar equivalents. Were these currencies employable in the dollar markets to obtain those things which only dollars can buy and which are essential to European recovery, then perhaps we should need no Marshall plan. Unfortunately, that is not the case. So the local currencies are impounded in proportion to the amount of aid we tender. They are used in such manner as agreed upon between the country and ECA as will best promote the purposes of the recovery program. In many instances, the best way to use them is not to use them at all—for the time being. To release all these funds in the markets of Europe would produce the most devastating inflation imaginable. I am sure that even the most severest critics of the Marshall plan would not want that.

Three Brilliant Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, J. C. Rich writing in the Hat Worker for February 15, 1950, cites the case of three brilliant men who have startled the world by their attachment to communism. The article is a most interesting one, and I recommend it to all Members:

THREE BRILLIANT CRIMINALS

Far be it from this correspondent to pull a Dr. Binger on unsuspecting customers, but in the circumstances he has no other recourse than to throw some long-distance psychiatry at the high-class delinquents in the current news. There is the snooty frat boy, Alger Hiss, for instance. Then there is the amazing Dr. Klaus Fuchs. And for accent and emphasis there is the no-less-distinguished Dr. Alan May.

All three are intelligent, cultivated persons of the highest intellectual rank. All three are either present or potential jailbirds. All three have either confessed or been found guilty of criminal betrayal of trust. They have been faithless with their country, faithless with their friends and associates, faithless with the missions entrusted to them. Each of them has divulged information of the utmost secrecy to agents of a foreign power when it was their official duty and moral obligation not to divulge such secrets.

Two things will disturb thoughtful observers in connection with these refined traitors. One is the capacity of intelligent and intellectually gifted persons to indulge in criminal perverseness. The other is the capacity of equally intelligent, but morally upright persons to indulge these offenders in their crimes and even give them aid and comfort when their criminal acts are exposed.

The example of Alger Hiss is a case in point. Here was a young man with grace, charm of manner and deportment, favored with a brilliant intellect and with privileges and associations such as few outside his category can hope to enjoy. Very likely he was spoiled by the ease with which he was able to charm people and bend them to his advantage. He was quite supercilious with the congressional committee which first broached a few hesitant questions as to his connections with the Communist Party in general and the former Soviet agent Whittaker Chambers in particular. Ridiculous. How could it ever occur to anyone that he could be a Communist? Deliver State Department papers to foreign spies? Preposterous. As for anyone named Whittaker Chambers, he did not know the man and had never heard the name before.

It was at this point that the lie Alger Hiss lived for many years entrapped him and the web of falsehood in which he willingly became ensnared as a Communist adherent tightened around him. Had he stated simply and candidly: Yes, I was a Communist once; Yes, I was misled by what I thought to be a movement of humanistic and idealistic aspirations; Yes, I did serve the Communists once even to a seeming betrayal of office and trust, he might have escaped not alone punishment for his offense but even the devastation to his fortunes and his career that followed when the threads of his falsehood were untwined. Instead he chose to depend on his wits, on his brilliance, on his pose of haughty and injured innocence. He denied everything until proof forced him to revise his denials. He admitted nothing that was not crammed down his throat by overwhelming evidence.

Two juries examined this evidence and found him guilty.

Now, this is no slight thing, this fact that two juries studied the evidence with meticulous care and both found him guilty, one by a score of 10-to-2 and the other unanimously. There can be no doubt that both juries were as dubious of Hiss' guilt and as inclined to favor the defendant as people had always favored Alger Hiss. They found him guilty because no other verdict was possible in the case. He did lie under oath. He did perjure himself when he said he had had no association with a Soviet agent. He did swear falsely when he said that he did not deliver State Department papers to agents of a foreign power. He did, he did, he did betray his trust and his country.

We come now to the second item in our present psychiatric study, the capacity of intelligent and morally upright persons to condone if not aid and abet such criminal perverseness as Alger Hiss demonstrated. Secretary of State Dean Acheson has stated that he would not turn his back on a friend in distress and even cited a Biblical reference to support his stand.

This hardened soul takes such pious references in stride and is not overly impressed when scripture is cited to support the devil. The chapter Acheson leaned on is a particularly unfortunate one, for it relates how the Lord was able to discriminate between the sheep and the goats, the saints and the sinners. By the test in Matthew xxv Hiss was no saint, for he was haughty, proud, and faithless. However, Acheson could still show Christian forbearance toward his friend, and justify his support of him, if by any indication he showed dismay at and condemnation of the crime his friend committed. This Acheson did not do at any stage of the long and fully illuminated proceedings. He did not do so, and this is the moral obtuseness which is so disturbing to anyone concerned with present-day concepts of ethics, morality, and social responsibility.

It seems that Acheson, a man of high-minded purpose, could not alone forgive but even condone falsehood and betrayal when perpetrated by one on his side of the tracks, one whom he accepts as a social equal, if that one committed his crime in favor of a Communist clique. It is this acceptance of the Communists, this tacit acknowledgment that treachery and falsehood are justified if sanctioned by the Communists, this granting of special dispensation to communism that is distressing to men who insist that truth, freedom, and human dignity must prevail as the basic verities of human society.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt showed a similar blind spot toward Alger Hiss. Mrs. Roosevelt, justly revered as one of the lofty-minded humanists of our generation, stated that while she believed that Hiss told a lie, she could not believe that he betrayed his trust and delivered Government documents to a foreign agent. This self-contradictory statement might be dismissed as the charming feminine nonsequitor of a charming and lovable lady. Obviously if she believes that Hiss lied, she must also believe that he betrayed his Government, for it is the act of betrayal that he lied about.

The only reasonable explanation of this attitude of practicing and semipro liberals is that in the first place they are defending themselves when they stand up for Hiss, and in the second, that communism is to them not so invidious a sin as it is to others. Acheson puts the mantle of his protection around Hiss not alone out of Christian charity, but also out of a sense of familial loyalty to him. Hiss is one of his kind; one of the family. He is a frat boy of the select Greek letter aristocracy, and not one of the barbarians who have invaded Washington as a result of the war. Hiss' association with the Communists was perhaps more far reaching and involved than that of others in the higher realms of pink society, but it is a peccadillo, an aberration that the exclusive set will readily excuse.

As for Mrs. Roosevelt who knew Hiss well and favorably, she cannot lead herself to believe that one so able, so intelligent, so brilliant can be guilty of crime, if, indeed, it is a crime to be a Communist fanatic.

But these brilliant, highly favored, highly gifted Communist fanatics are capable of crime. Here is this Dr. Klaus Fuchs. Here is this brilliant scientist who acknowledges that he was capable of lying to his friends, playing false with the land that gave him refuge, and betraying the trust invested in him when he was given the keys to the atomic Pandora's box. He opened the box and let evil and contagion escape, and he knew it was wrong and even accepted money not as a price for his services, but as a token, as pieces of silver, as acknowledgment that he was playing a Judas role.

And here also is Dr. Alan May, another British scientist, caught when the Soviet spy activities in Canada were disclosed. He is now serving a 10 year term in prison and there is no word from him, but his act and his crime speak for him and his like. Yes, he says, these educated, these gifted, these privileged people are capable of doltish surrender to an evil and conniving force.

Why did they do it?

Well, Hitler also had fanatic adherents, and some of them were in this country ensconced in high places. There was a time which they were in the America First group and one like Lindbergh could see a wave of the future in Nazi terrorism and Nazi dominance.

Can it be that these men of brilliant mind need to seek support in brute force for their essential weakness of character? Can it be that they respect the dictators because it is not necessary to think, not necessary to choose and make decisions under a dictatorship? Can it be that they who seek to rectify seeming wrongs welcome a panacea simply because it is offered in one package, so apt, so convenient, so fully packed? Is it a love of easy solutions and ready-made cure-alls that drives them to the snake oil of communism, Hitlerism, fascism, or Yogi hypnotism? How pleasant it must be to drink a heady elixir instead of striving to clear the fountains of social sustenance.

Whatever the case, it is time that these well-placed and privileged characters stop being so almighty superior about their capacities. They will do well to come down to earth and learn a few lessons from lowly working people. Surely the labor movement has done better in respect to the Communist (and Nazi and Fascist) delusion than have the snooty intellectual actors upstage. Surely labor has shown greater perspicacity, greater devotion and greater courage in the struggle for freedom, equality, and liberty, than has the class of brilliant but weak-minded intellectuals who presume to be our guides and mentors.

Integration Is Working Well in the Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's Committee on Equality and Opportunity in the Armed Forces has just issued its first report on how the program of racial integration in the Air Force is proceeding. The Air Force established a new racial policy last summer abolishing segregated units and prescribing equality of training and assignment for whites and Negroes.

Now, after its first survey of progress, the committee reports that this program of integration is "working well and without friction," and that 71 percent of the Negroes in this branch of our armed services are already "living and working in integrated conditions." Significant is the following statement in the report which refers to the views of the commanding officers on the new racial policy:

> Without any exception, they (i. e., the commanding officers) added that their fears had been completely groundless, and that they were amazed at the ease with which the new policy had been effected and the absence of trouble.

All of which proves that if we are really serious in our desires to solve this minority problem, to improve human relations in our own country, to afford all our citizens the full benefits of American democracy, and to bring about greater unity among the people of this Nation, we can really accomplish all this in a peaceful manner, with a minimum of loss of privileges to any part of our population and with great possibilities of acquiring additional prestige and leadership throughout the world.

Following is an article from the Washington Post of March 27 on the report of the President's committee:

AF REPORT PRAISES RACIAL INTEGRATION

(By John G. Norris)

Integration of Negroes and whites is "working well and without friction" in the Air Force, President Truman's Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Forces reports.

Last May the Air Force established a new racial policy, which called for breaking up of most segregated units and complete equality of assignment and training on an integrated basis. The President's committee, which had urged the change, has completed a first survey of how the program is working.

E. W. Kenworthy, executive secretary of the group, was sent on a tour of major Air Force bases for a first-hand look. He reports that 71 percent of the Negroes in the Air Force now are "living and working in integrated conditions."

"Almost without exception," his report states, "commanding officers stated frankly that, although they had recognized the merits of the new Air Force racial policy when it was announced, they had been apprehensive.

"Without any exception, they added that their fears had been completely groundless and that they were amazed at the ease with which the new policy had been effected and the absence of trouble."

Kenworthy views this "quiet social revolution" inside the armed forces as influencing racial relations throughout the Nation. Telling of his conversations with both white and Negro officers and enlisted men at seven USAF bases, he said:

"It was the opinion of some officers that this program could not but have an effect, eventually, on civilian attitudes; that it was impossible for a white boy to live and work beside a Negro in basic training and in the technical schools, without some real change taking place in his attitude toward race and racial equality."

The report attributes the success of the program largely to the "quality and resolution" of commanding officers to make it work.

"Unquestionably, however," it was added, "the almost total absence of opposition that had been anticipated in the enlisted man is a contributing factor in the success of the policy. The men apparently were more ready for equality of treatment and opportunity than the officer corps had realized."

Bolling Air Force Base was one of those inspected. The others were: Maxwell Base, Biloxi, Miss.; Lackland Base, San Antonio, Tex.; Davis-Monthan Base, Tucson, Ariz.; and Williams Base, St. Louis, Mo.

"At Bolling," he said in his only reference to the local base, "there has been virtually no Negro personnel prior to the new Air Force policy. Presently, there are Negroes at Bolling assigned to maintenance, refueling, transportation, food service, and medical squadrons."

Only at Maxwell was there still a segregated squadron. Of the 25,891 Negroes in the Air Force (as of December 31, 1949) 7,402 were still in separate units, with 11,456 in mixed units, and the remainder in "pipe lines"—mostly in integrated schools. Negroes, it was reported, make up 7.2 percent of the enlisted strength of the Air Force. At one technical training school, the percentage of Negro students was over 10 percent—well above the average.

Extracts from the report follow:

"Jobs—Wherever I went I saw Negro mechanics serving and repairing planes in the hangars and on the line. There were Negroes in radio repair. There were Negro instructors in classes. I saw Negroes in personnel work and in Air Police. There were Negro jet pilots."

"Housing and messing—with the exception of Maxwell Field, I saw no Negroes who were separately messed and housed. Nor was there any attempt at segregation within the individual barracks or at the table. Individual Negroes were interspersed with whites; there was no clustering at one end of the barracks or one end of the table."

"Recreational facilities and social functions—the Air Force policy was limited to military utilization and said nothing about recreational facilities or social life. The disposition of these matters has been left to the individual commander, and there was no fixed pattern in the arrangements and customs observed.

"At some bases there was complete integration of clubs, swimming pools and dances. At others there was a tacit, though incomplete and unenforced, segregation in service clubs and pools, and separate dances for white and colored enlisted personnel. * * *

"Prior to the adoption of the new Air Force policy, there were separate pools or certain days reserved for Negroes. Negroes are no longer prohibited from using any pool, though the local custom varies. * * *

"Dances at the officers clubs and some NCO clubs are attended freely by Negro officers and NCO's. As for dances in the airmen's and service clubs, the custom varies. In some stations there are no separate dances for whites and Negroes. In most camps, however, there continue to be dances for Negroes and for whites. However, Negro couples are not excluded and do attend, though in relatively small numbers.

"Movies and athletic contests are everywhere unsegregated, and Negroes are on service teams. In the South, where scholastic teams refuse to play against service teams with Negro players, the Air Force commanders are now generally taking the view that these schools must either play mixed service teams or be dropped from the schedule.

"Reaction—It was interesting to get the reaction of officers from the South. Some of them stated quite candidly that they did not like the new policy * * * but (they) were quick to add with equal candor that the new policy was working well and without friction.

"Most commanding officers remarked on the increased military efficiency of the new policy and the improved utilization of manpower. * * *

"If press comment is a reliable reflection of community attitudes, the Air Force policy and program are resented in the South. * * * Local commanders have taken the position that while the men under their command must obey laws off the station, the policy of the Air Force need not be attenuated on the station merely because of its geographical location * * *

"The difference between the attitude and treatment of Negroes on base and in civilian Biloxi is startling. The Negro airman who on the post, sleeps, eats, works, studies, plays side by side with his white fellows in uniform, finds when he goes off base that he is not permitted to walk on the main street of the town."

Liberals—What Would They Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Liberal is a paradox in the political life of this country.

Mr. Murray Baron asks a very interesting question about this phony. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his article:

WOULD BACKS BE TURNED IF HISS WERE FASCIST?

[By Murray Baron, chairman, New York County Liberal Party]

To this reader the widespread expression of sympathy for Hiss and admiration for Acheson's loyalty to him accentuates the double standard by which so many of our Liberals live.

Substitute for Hiss a Nazi or Fascist equivalent and for Acheson a Senator McCARRAN (perish the thought), would we sympathetically describe how the young, brilliant pro-Nazi State Department employee came by his Nazi ideology—how the depression years and growing international crisis contributed to his sincere conversion—to the Fascist ideology? We must assume that some pro-Nazis are possessed of intelligence, brilliance, culture, ambition, and even, even idealism. We must not fail to recognize that Nazis and Fascists may have been motivated by the sincerest conviction that the cure of social and international ills required the extermination of 6,000,000 Jews—that a happier world community would develop under the rule of pan Germania.

But are these personal attributes to be divorced from the moral and human frame of reference within which they are exercised? Would all Liberals concede that, in my hypothetical case, the mythical, I hope, pro-Fascist State Department prototype of Hiss and his assumed superior, "Secretary of State McCARRAN," may both be sincere in their fanaticism and bigotry?

The emotional and intellectual conditioning of many Liberals apparently does not yet enable them to evaluate the menace of the Communists and communism by the same criteria by which they judge the Fascist and fascism. This is likewise manifested by the double code of conduct when they oppose the recognition of the second-rate menace of Franco Spain and favor the recognition of the first-rate menace of Communist China. Both states crush religion, free trade-union democracy, and freedom. Both states repress Liberals and Democrats of all shades, both are the satellites and in part creatures of external aid from dictatorships.

Time, as we say, is of the essence. In this day of the H-bomb, the presumably anti-Communist Liberal had better open both eyes, the left and the right.

My sympathy, if any, in the Hiss-Chambers case goes out to Chambers. Socially ruined, bereft of a well-paying job, the subject of vicious rumor, spurned and pilloried by many so-called Liberals, he emerges as a tragic object lesson for any current member of the Communist Party who may contemplate escape from that sordid, pervasive, soul-destroying conspiracy. He will not be sheltered by that civilized, sophisticated, intellectualized Liberal community which never compromises with fascism and Fascists. Not he, but his exposed erstwhile Communist colleagues will be the objects of sympathy and understanding and benign tolerance.

The mentality which confuses liberalism with communism is scarcely not less confused when it comprehends this universal double-standard of morality which yet plagues so much of modern liberalism.

It is a similar category of mind which confuses intelligent conservatism with fascism. Because here, too, the irresponsible conservative fails to cultivate the same conditional reflexes vis-a-vis the Fascist as he does vis-a-vis the Communist. The great democratic liberal-conservative middle bloc in our democracy should be governed by one standard, unremitting and equal combat against the twin menaces of communism and fascism.

Application of Social-Security Bill to Wisconsin Retirement Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on the final day of the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee on amendments to old-age-security legislation, testimony was heard from the executive director of the Wisconsin retirement fund, Mr. Frederick N. McMillan. The director testified on behalf of the some 25,000 folks covered by this pioneering Wisconsin retirement fund—the largest retirement system for public employees in my State. I believe that his views on the unique background of the Wisconsin retirement fund and on the provisions which have been inserted in the Wisconsin statutes for integration for that fund with a broadened social security system, and his comments, will be of interest to my colleagues, particularly those who serve on the Senate Finance Committee. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of Mr. McMillan's statements be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO INTEGRATE EXISTING RETIREMENT SYSTEMS WITH SOCIAL SECURITY

I submit this testimony as the executive director of the Wisconsin retirement fund. This is the largest retirement system for public employees in the State of Wisconsin, and it has been constituted the basic retirement system by the Wisconsin Legislature. Ultimately, after legislative enactments have taken full effect, presumably the only other retirement systems for public employees in the State of Wisconsin, outside of systems for the city of Milwaukee and Milwaukee County, will be the State-wide teachers retirement plan.

The Wisconsin retirement fund now includes more than 25,000 active employees, and about 4,000 inactive accounts of persons who eventually may be eligible for a retirement annuity. Besides the State, 76 cities, 15 villages, 37 counties, and 33 other governmental units have voluntarily acted to include all eligible employees.

This presentation will be confined to a discussion of section 106 of H. R. 6000, which relates to the coverage of State and local employees.

OPPOSITION BASED ON FAULTY REASONING

It is difficult to understand the reason for the almost hysterical opposition to the inclusion of persons under existing public retirement systems which has emanated from certain quarters, and which has resulted in so much pressure being exerted on Members of Congress. I suggest that these persons have acted precipitously without fully thinking the matter through. There are sound reasons for concluding that a little less heat and more light on this matter would probably produce very different conclusions. I think it can be definitely established that if a little ingenuity is used, a way can be found to transform each retirement system into a supplementary system with the following results:

1. The aggregate annuities payable would be increased.

2. Valuable protection will be provided for dependents which is now largely lacking.

3. Survivors of annuitants will continue to have annuity income after the death of the participant, whereas under existing plans many survivors are left without an annuity.

4. There need not be any material change in the cost to either the employee or the governmental unit.

SIMILAR FEARS PREVIOUSLY PROVED UNFOUNDED

This is not the first time that there has been an atempt to stampede the Senate with a proposal for exclusion. In 1935 when the bill establishing the social-security system reached the Senate, an amendment by Senator Clark, of Missouri, was adopted to exclude those persons covered by existing retirement systems maintained by employers. However, this Senate amendment was eliminated by the conference committee.

This decision has proved to be a wise one. While exact statistics evidently are not available, it appears that there were about 650 private retirement systems in business and industry in 1939, covering approximately 2,000,000 persons. By 1949 this had increased to at least 13,000 private systems supplementing social security and covering at least 7,000,000 persons. It should be common knowledge by this time that the existence of social security has not operated to reduce the coverage of private systems, but rather the trend is exactly the opposite. There is no logical reason to assume that the experience would be any different with respect to public employees.

The Advisory Council on Social Security appointed by the Senate Committee on Finance in 1947 gave careful consideration to this matter, and their conclusion as contained in their official report to the Committee on Finance on April 8, 1948, concisely states the essentials:

"Many proposals previously advanced for covering these workers have advocated excluding, on either a permissive or a mandatory basis, various limited groups of State and local employees, apparently in fear that coverage under old-age and survivors insurance would weaken or even completely destroy their State and local retirement system. As pointed out in the Council's recommendations for coverage of Federal and railroad employees, retirement systems supplementary to old-age and survivors insurance perform a valuable and necessary function. When coverage is extended to State and local employees who are members of staff retirement systems, those systems can be adjusted to supplement the basic old-age and survivors insurance benefits. Private employers have demonstrated that such adjustments can be made satisfactorily and without any loss in total retirement protection. The Council believes that in light of (a) the incontrovertible merit of the retention and development of supplementary plans, (b) the fact that employees under industrial pension systems did not suffer losses in benefits attributable to adjustment to the old-age and survivors insurance program, and (c) the fact that State and local governments have recognized the need for, and taken action to provide, retirement protection for their employees, any fear that the availability of old-age and survivors insurance will lead Government units to reduce the total protection afforded their employees is unjustified."

WISCONSIN HAS A PLAN FOR INTEGRATION

The Wisconsin Legislature and the governing bodies of the 161 governmental units are specifically committed to the integration of the Wisconsin retirement fund with the old-age and survivors insurance system established by the Federal Government. From the very inception of this Wisconsin system there has been written into the law (sec. 66.903 (2) (f) of the Wisconsin Stat.) a provision whereby these public employees may also be given the advantage of inclusion under social security as soon as this is made possible by the Congress. Automatically the Wisconsin retirement fund will then be transformed into a plan providing supplementary benefits.

The practical result would be that the contributions of employees and governmental units to the Wisconsin retirement fund will be reduced by the amount of the respective contributions to social security. However, the employees will then receive the full benefits of social security, they will retain without change all accumulated credits under the Wisconsin retirement fund, and they will continue to build up additional credits under the Wisconsin retirement fund. Both employee groups and the fund staff have considered this carefully, and no one has yet been able to find any person who would not gain materially by obtaining the benefits to be derived both from social security and from the existing Wisconsin retirement fund.

In practice, integration would work out this way in Wisconsin: At present, for general employees, the employee contributes 5 percent of his earnings up to $350 per month and the governmental unit matches that with a current service contribution of 5 percent. (The governmental unit also pays all prior service, disability, death, and administration costs.) Under integration, beginning January 1, 1951, the employee would pay 2 percent to social security and only 3 percent to the Wisconsin retirement fund. In like manner, the governmental unit would pay 2 percent to social security and its matching current contribution to the Wisconsin retirement fund will be reduced by that amount. Thus, the contentions which have been advanced to the Committee on Finance that "there are grave doubts that many States and subdivisions thereof can afford to have both" and that such "would impose a double burden of contributions upon the underpaid public employee" are completely unfounded. There is no reason why every existing public employee retirement plan cannot be modified in the same manner as the Wisconsin retirement fund

REASONS WHY INTEGRATION IS DESIRABLE

Those who have opposed making it possible for persons under existing public employee retirement systems to procure the material benefits of social-security coverage also would do well to examine the advantages to be derived from dual coverage. Here are some of the reasons why such integration seems desirable:

1. Since there is a rapidly accelerating tendency to provide supplementary retirement plans for employees in business and industry, it would be grossly discriminatory to deny the same advantage to those in public employment.

2. Inasmuch as the old-age and survivors benefit system has fallen far short of being self-supporting when considered from an actuarial standpoint, and since the benefits paid are far in excess of what can be provided actuarially from the actual contributions, the system is sound only because taxpayers are liable to underwrite the cost differentials. It is unjust to require public employees to help underwrite this cost without being able to participate in the benefits to be derived therefrom.

3. As previously indicated, each participant would naturally benefit to the extent to which his annuity from two sources would exceed that to be derived only from the existing system. It is not possible to state the exact amount of the increase, since this would vary with length of service and the exact years when the service occurred. However, as an illustration consider a person earning $250 per month who contributed to the Wisconsin retirement fund from age 45 to age 65, and who would at age 65 receive a life annuity of $65 per month. (If he had begun work at age 30, the annuity would have been half-pay.) If the integration authorized under H. R. 6000 were to become effective, the combined annuity which he and his wife would receive, instead of being $65, would range from $130 to $161, depending upon when the service occurred.

4. The protection for dependents would be particularly valuable. Under most existing retirement systems, if an employee dies leaving a wife and minor children, ordinarily the only payment made is a modest death benefit or the refund of the employee's own contributions. Contrast that with the payment under H. R. 6000 where a widow with two minor children would receive $132 per month if her husband had earned only $200 per month and had been covered for only five years. This should provide considerable peace of mind for an employee who now worries about what will happen to his dependents in case of his death.

5. Of equal value is the provision for a surviving widow. Under most existing systems, the widow receives little or nothing unless the employee elects a substantial reduction in his own annuity. For example, of 1,279 now receiving annuities under the Wisconsin retirement fund, in 1,163 instances the widow would receive nothing, with possibly few exceptions. But H. R. 6000 makes substantial provision for a surviving widow which would relieve the worries of a retired employee with respect to the support of his wife after his death.

6. Existing retirement systems provide very limited protection for persons who have spent most of their working career in private employment and have entered public employment later in life. Many pathetic letters are received from old people in this category who find it impossible to live on the small amounts they receive. Yet it is unreasonable to expect the taxpayers of a municipal government to provide a full annuity for a person who had devoted only a few years to serving the public. It is, therefore, important that such persons shall be permitted to participate in the social-security program. This necessity can be shown by the following example:

Suppose that a man had worked in private employment from January 1, 1913, to January 1, 1946, and then would work for the State or a city from January 1, 1946, to January 1, 1956, at which time he would attain age 65. Assume that he earns $200 per month in public employment during the last 10 years of his working career. Since the Wisconsin retirement fund is devised to provide half-pay of $100 in this instance only where a person has worked from age 30 to age 65 at least, the annuity in this case would be about $25 per month, obviously too small to support himself, let alone a wife. Because he had been in covered employment for only 9 years since 1937, he would not have acquired any rights under social security. Thus this man and his wife would be denied any participation in the protection of this national program even though he had devoted the 33 best years of his working career to private employment.

It is difficult to understand how anyone can justify the continuation of any such unreasonable discrimination.

7. Integration is essential for those who leave public employment in the future to enter covered employment. Certainly there should be no disposition on the part of anyone to deny a public employee the free choice of employment by trying to chain him to his present job. In many existing systems, such a change in employment results in the loss of retirement rights. Therefore it is important that he be given full social-security protection. Such change of employment is not rare. In Wisconsin in 1949 those under the Wisconsin retirement fund who terminated public employment for reasons other than death or retirement equaled 13 percent in a single year, and this in a State where the spoils system has been virtually eliminated at both the State and local levels.

8. The fears that existing retirement systems will be abandoned seem to be entirely unfounded. The records of past years do not disclose that sound retirement systems for public employees have been abandoned. Since the trend is to constantly expand the benefits provided for those in private industry and business, there is no reason to anticipate a contrary trend in public employment. There is no reason why these retirement systems cannot be transformed into supplementary systems in the same manner as has been written into the Wisconsin retirement fund law.

9. The safeguard written into H. R. 6000 requiring a referendum in the case of existing public employee retirement systems should effectively allay any alarm that may exist. This means that a ballot must be submitted to each present participant under a public-retirement system to permit him by secret ballot to say whether he wants to integrate the system with social security. However, there appears to be no justification for requiring a two-thirds vote. The American tradition of majority rule should also be allowed to prevail in this instance.

It would be inexcusably selfish for the members of any retirement system which for any reason preferred to remain out of social security (which right they could protect by referendum) to try to prevent the members of another retirement system from being included when it was clearly to their advantage to be included.

10. If the State of Wisconsin and the municipalities under the Wisconsin retirement fund are absolutely barred from including public employees under the social-security system, this will result in impairing the recruitment of qualified employees as vacancies occur in positions covered by the retirement plan. Individuals will hesitate to accept such jobs when it will mean that their dependents and survivors are denied the full protection provided by social security. This will lower the quality of the public service, and may even increase the cost of government.

SPECIFIC CLASSES OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES SHOULD NOT BE EXCLUDED

It has also been suggested that specific classes of public employees be barred from participation in the old-age and survivors insurance plan—such as, for example, policemen and firemen. Under the Wisconsin system this would be very unfair to policemen and firemen. Under the Wisconsin law all policemen and firemen, outside of the city of Milwaukee, who are hired after January 1, 1948, and many other policemen and firemen, are included under the Wisconsin retirement fund which specifically provides for integration with social security. It would be very unfortunate if in any city the employees of the street department, the park department, etc., were given the additional social-security protection, while the policemen and firemen—working for the same employer—were compelled to be confined to the lesser benefits provided under the Wisconsin retirement fund. This would be entirely indefensible.

REFERENDUM PROVISION SHOULD BE CORRECTED

With respect to the referendum provision, it seems quite cruel to require that present annuitants participate in the referendum which is made mandatory for existing public-retirement systems. Such participation will only lead them to hope that their annuity will be increased because of such integration, when this would be wholly impossible under the proposed bill. This should be modified to exclude annuitants from the referendum.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS SHOULD BE UNIFORM

A final comment on the administrative proposal. There seems to be no logical basis for treating governmental employers any differently than private employers from an administrative viewpoint. State governments should not be required to assume the responsibility and the expense of administration which the Social Security Administration pays for private employers. Likewise, it is believed that municipal and county governments and their employees will have a more comfortable feeling if their payments and records are transmitted directly to the responsible Federal agency, rather than channeled through a third party, thus increasing the likelihood of errors and confusion.

CONCLUSION: OPPOSITION TO INTEGRATION ENTIRELY UNNECESSARY

It would appear that in reality all of the pressure which has been brought to bear upon the Congress to induce it to prohibit the integration of existing retirement systems for public employees with the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system is completely unnecessary. All that the Congress would do in H. R. 6000 would be to enact enabling legislation. The real choice as to what would be done in any State would be made within that State. This is entirely proper, since the Federal government should not try to dictate policies with respect to State and municipal employees.

Consequently, there is no logical reason why any State legislature should memorialize the Congress on this point. The final choice in that State will be made by the State legislature under H. R. 6000, not by Congress.

Likewise, there is no justifiable reason why the representatives or members of any retirement system for public employees should exert pressure on Members of Congress. These members of retirement systems will presently have ample opportunity to present their case to their State legislature. Then, even if the legislature should happen to disregard their wishes with respect to integration, these employees still have complete control, since they have the prerogative to reject integration when the referendum is held.

In view of this complete control by each State legislature and also by the members of each existing retirement system, it would seem to be utterly selfish to try to prevent integration in one State where integration is wanted, simply because it is not desired in another State.

American Information Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I was pleased to note that the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD for March 27, 1950, on page A2219, an editorial from the Washington Post of March 26 entitled "Informing the World." This editorial praises the position taken by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] in a recent speech to the Senate calling for a more aggressive American information policy through the Voice of America.

I have in my hand a letter published in the Washington Post on March 29, commending that editorial, and testifying to the vital importance of a revised and expanded American program to win the minds and loyalties of the peoples of the world. This letter is from Mr. J. Earnest Fisher, formerly chief adviser to the Bureau of Public Opinion of the American Military Government in Korea. Mr. Fisher pleads eloquently for the sending of "missionaries of democracy and Americanism" who can speak directly to the peoples of other nations in their own language. I commend the letter to the attention of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMING THE WORLD

Your March 26 editorial, Informing the World, emphasized the one feature of the cold war which will decide whether we win or lose it. Our Marshall plan, Atlantic Pact, point 4, and ECA are all well and good, and we will get more results for our dollars spent in a well-planned program of information and education than in all of these other programs combined. And without this sort of a program our economic- and military-aid programs will definitely not achieve their ends.

In this program of information and education of other people on the meaning of democracy and on America's attitudes and intentions, there is one type of activity that has had entirely too little attention. I refer to direct, personal propaganda by persons who know and love America, know democracy, and know the people and the conditions in a particular country. The suspicions regarding America's economic aid that are built up by clever Communist propaganda can be dispelled only by the personal impact of those who are known and respected by the people of the various countries in which such suspicions have taken hold.

Building up friendship for and confidence in America can be done satisfactorily only by those who have had years of experience to qualify and train them for this vitally important part of the program. Except in some rare cases, the men appointed to administer our various international programs do not have this background of experience. They are strangers in the countries to which they are sent, and it will taken them a long time to win the confidence of the people and secure their sympathetic cooperation in our efforts to help them. Meanwhile Communist agents are taking advantage of every mistake that our administrators and specialists make; their lack of understanding of native psychology, culture, and customs, and are building up in the minds of the nationals confusion, suspicion, and hatred.

Our regular diplomatic staffs—Ambassadors, Ministers, consuls, etc.—cannot adequately perform this function of making friends and influencing people. The very nature of their positions prevents the type of activity that is demanded. They are the official diplomatic representatives of America, and they are not supposed to identify themselves with local causes and organizations.

The people of the countries that we are helping are, for the most part, friendly and grateful, and they would like to know more about us, and why we are spending our money so freely all over the world. The explanations they usually get are too impersonal and foreign, in their language and nature, to really convince and reassure the masses of the people. The way is thus left open for the Communist propaganda agent to misinterpret and distort.

There are two general types of people who are qualified for this work of being "missionaries of democracy and Americanism" in foreign countries. There are the nationals of those countries, who have spent many years in America, have become naturalized citizens, have a knowledge of English, and have not forgotten their own native language. They must be familiar with the philosophy of democracy and also know the psychology and present-day attitudes of their mother country. Then there are Americans who have spent many years in a foreign country, as teachers, missionaries, business agents, or diplomatic representatives, and who have a wide circle of friends among the nationals of the country who know and trust them. There are undoubtedly persons of both the above-mentioned types who are available, and who would be glad to serve America and world democracy by going to the countries where they are known and where they would be welcomed.

In Asia at this time such people are desperately needed to prevent the rest of that vast area from going the way of China, and to win China back from the Soviet orbit, which is still possible. Gen. William J. Donovan, of OSS fame, who recently returned from a trip to southeast Asia and the Far East, says: "Non-Communist Asiatics want to be on this country's side, but only if we are safe to be with, if we can be relied upon to stick with them when the going gets bad." The countries he mentions are Burma, India, Thailand, Indochina, the Philippines, Formosa, Korea, Japan, but all countries outside the iron curtain might be included.

The only way that these countries can be convinced that we will stick with them when the going gets bad is by sending Americans to them who know the people and are trusted by them. To give economic, technical, and military assistance to these people without accompanying such assistance with an adequate staff of men who know and understand the people and are known and trusted by them is very likely to be an "operation rat hole."

J. EARNEST FISHER,
Formerly Chief Adviser, Bureau of Public Opinion, American Military Government in Korea.
WASHINGTON.

Basing-Point Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. W. K. Kelsey, which was published in the Detroit News on October 18, 1949. In the article Mr. Kelsey analyzes and criticizes the so-called basing-point bill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMENTATOR

(By W. K. Kelsey)

The small independent businessman took a wallop from the House of Representatives last Friday when that body adopted the basing point bill recommended by the conference committee of both branches of Congress. In effect, the House majority, after having licked the big-business lobby in the preliminary rounds, threw in the towel at the end, apparently on the peculiar theory that if it gave big business what it asked for, it would behave itself.

The result is that there is a sharp division between the legal staff of the Federal Trade Commission, whose powers are emasculated by the bill passed by the House, and the Department of Justice, whose spokesman in this matter is Assistant Attorney General Herbert A. Bergson. And that seems strange, for Attorney General McGrath, while still a Senator, voted for the Kefauver amendments which aimed at preserving the powers of the FTC, and which, along with the Carroll amendments adopted by the House, were stricken from the bill by the conference committee.

It is likewise extraordinary that the House, by adopting the conference report, acquiesced in the nullification of its action by that committee in tossing out the Carroll amendments, thereby acting contrary to the advice of its chief conferee, Chairman CELLER, of the Judiciary Committee. The crucial vote was 178 to 138, with 110 Representatives absent, paired, or not voting.

The only inference the Commentator can draw from these proceedings is that the House majority, composed in this case of members of both parties, didn't understand the conference report, or was so overwhelmed by the big-business lobby that it voted for the so-called "compromise" just to get the bill out of the way.

The fact is, there was no compromise at all. The object of big business was to kill the Kefauver and Carroll amendments, which stood in the way of its complete freedom of action in crushing competition. It abundantly accomplished what it set out to do, so far as the House is concerned.

FAVORING THE MONOPOLISTS

The bill as passed by the House legalizes the basing-point system of price fixing by sellers acting independently. That means, for instance, that a seller may adopt Detroit as a basing point for a district, including all of Michigan, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, and quote one price to any purchaser within that district—the price being the same to a purchaser in Detroit, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, or Rock Island. Necessarily, the delivered price includes the average freight rate, so that the purchaser in Detroit and points near Detroit helps pay the higher freight on purchases made by buyers in distant cities.

Court decisions have not outlawed this practice, provided it is carried on without combination, conspiracy, or collusive agreement, such as was proved in the famous Cement case. But the new bill goes on to say that it shall not be unlawful discrimination for a seller, acting independently, to sell at delivered prices if such prices are identical at different delivery points or if differences between such prices are not such that their effect upon competition may be prohibited by this section.

That looks fair enough, until one comes to this definition: "The term 'the effect may be' shall mean that there is reliable, probative, and substantial evidence of the specified effect."

That definition changes the meaning of the Robinson-Patman Act and knocks the ground from under the feet of the Federal Trade Commission.

Hitherto the FTC has been able to issue a cease-and-desist order if it saw "reasonable probability" that a discrimination in prices quoted to buyers tended to create a monopoly. That interpretation has been upheld by the courts. But under the bill passed by the House, the damage must be accomplished and proved before any action can be taken to remove it.

"Such a law as this," said opponents of this section, "might be compared to a traffic law which made it illegal for motorists to run through stop signs only if, after having run through a stop sign, the motorist found that this act had caused a substantial accident."

GOOD-FAITH DISCRIMINATION

But the House measure goes still further. It permits a seller to justify a price discrimination "by showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith or to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor, and this may include the maintenance, above or below the price of such competitor, of a differential in price which such seller customarily maintains," unless there is a combination, conspiracy, or collusive agreement to that end.

The Carroll amendment sought to outlaw such price discrimination if its apparent effect was to threaten or destroy competition. How, you may ask, could competition be threatened if one company cuts its price to meet the price cut of another company? It could happen thus:

A dealer supplied by X informs his regular supplier that another company, Y, has quoted him a lower price for a certain commodity. To keep his customer, X agrees to meet the price quoted by Y, but only in this particular dealer's case. Thus the dealer secures an advantage over his competitors who must continue to pay the regular price; and if the advantage is great enough he can in time force his competitors out of business.

If you don't think this practice has been fairly common, ask the various small independent dealers' associations. It is one way by which a large selling corporation can secure complete control of outlets in any territory, if it so desires, and thereafter maintain any price it may choose to fix, to the detriment of consumers.

The defense of X would be that he cut his price to the dealer in good faith, because Y had offered a lower price; and that defense, under the House enactment, would be complete unless there was positive proof that there had been collusion between X and Y.

FAVORING THE LARGE BUYERS

Say the opponents of the conference bill: "The tendency of sellers to grant special price concessions to large buyers is one of the most widely observed characteristics of business behavior. * * * The price discrimination which is philosophically indefensible on any grounds is that which goes beyond cost savings and permits large buyers to drive small buyers out of business. * * *

"When a large seller, with national sales outlets, makes a special low price in one particular territory, at least one other seller will usually meet this special price. In this case, the good-faith defense would exempt the discriminations from a cease-and-desist order, even though the result was to drive out of business small competing sellers having only local or regional sales outlets."

Enactment of this bill clips the powers of the FTC to enforce competition, and plays into the hands of monopolists. By a well-reasoned veto, President Truman could get himself a wonderful issue for his party in the next campaign.

Effect of Taxes on Workers' Incomes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Taxes Are Hijacking Workers," published in the Philadelphia Dispatch of March 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXES ARE HIJACKING WORKERS

More and more in the United States the thoughtful people are beginning to realize the gravity of our tax situation. Chief Justice Marshall once said that the power to tax is the power to destroy. Our taxes have now reached 25 percent of our national income. Great Britain has gone above the mark and we see what is happening over there. The people are in doubt about the future, as shown by the results of the recent elections, and there seems little doubt that the old stable, apparently unconquerable British Empire is passing out. There are indications that we are following the same route.

According to a survey prepared by the National Industrial Conference Board, our taxes in 1948 aggregated $56,300,000,000. Of this amount $39,500,000,000 were in Federal taxes and $16,800,000,000 in local taxes. This is a fraction more than 15 percent of our national income which indicates that we are now at the brink and apparently about to take the plunge that was made by Great Britain.

But this is not all the bad news. The rate of rise in taxes has been greater than the rise in the national income. In short, our national income has increased tenfold since 1902 while our taxes have increased 4 times as fast as our income. To go a little further, Federal taxes in 1948, the last year surveyed, were seven times as great as in 1939 and local and State taxes during the same years more than doubled.

Now what are we going to do about it? The sound Senators and Representatives in our National Congress are calling attention to the situation and the disposition is to check further tax increases. Whether the tendency will continue after the November election remains to be seen. But increasing taxes in the States seems to go on unheeded. Many people are lulled into a false sense of security by the belief that Uncle Sam is helping them. What they fail to take into consideration is that the money which Uncle Sam pays back to the States and to them comes from them in the first place.

President F. D. Roosevelt, who became an advocate of lavish spending, said while he was running for his first term that the taxes come from the sweat of the workingman's brow. But since he doesn't pay the money out through the tax collector's window the worker too often doesn't realize how he is being hijacked through rising living costs. Until he gets hep to himself, lowering taxes is going to be a slow and difficult job.

General Eisenhower Advocates Peace Measures Under a Strengthened United Nations

REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, one of the significant statements of this year is the marvelous address delivered by General Eisenhower at Columbia University on the evening of March 23. It would be unfortunate if

his treatment of defense needs should overshadow a remarkably fine statement on the development of a peace organization that must be built if we escape the burdens of armament that would wreck this and other nations. House Concurrent Resolution 64, which more than 100 Members are sponsoring, is designed to strengthen the United Nations and develop that agency into an effective instrument for peace. I do not know, of course, what General Eisenhower's judgment is on this subject, but his language indicates that he is thoroughly in sympathy with the resolution's purposes. He advocates a United Nations police of carefully defined powers and asserts that to such a police organization a nation would give up nothing beyond its equitable share in men and money. Included in his address is the further comment, "How this organization is to be constituted or how it is to be controlled, has yet to be worked out, but with the principles honestly accepted, the procedural problems would be easy of solution."

Such words from one of the world's distinguished leaders bolster hopes for a stronger United Nations.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpts from General Eisenhower's address:

It is possible, even probable, that hopelessness among a people can be a far more potent cause of war than greed. War—in such case—is a symptom, not the disease.

On the collective side of the coin, peace requires an international society liberated from the threat of aggression by neighbor on neighbor, a threat forever present when one or more nations are committed to the building or maintenance of gigantic military machines. No sane man will challenge, under present circumstances, the need for defensive strength designed to secure against internal or external attack the independence and sovereignty of a free state. But the continued existence of even one purely offensive force—a force for which there is no apparent need based in the logic of self-defense—denies enduring peace to the world. Those who have spawned such a force must either eventually destroy it by demobilization and find justification for the heavy cost already laid on their people; or use it, tacitly or actively, as a threat or as a weapon. There is no middle course. * * *

The two requisites to an enduring peace—the elimination of deep-seated incitements to strife and hopelessness, and the elimination of armament for aggression—are, or should be, within the realm of feasible attainment. But man can remake the face of his physical environment and can harness all the powers of the universe more easily, it seems, than he can learn control of his temper as a member of the international community. Nevertheless, those who term these twin requisites utopian and visionary are cut from the same bolt of cloth as those of an earlier day who claimed that epidemics were an inescapable companion to human existence, and denounced the preachers of sanitation as haters of God's will.

To prevent the crime of war, all nations and all ideologies can unite without sacrifice of principle. But lest self-interest in minor matters breed a carelessness toward the gravity of this problem, there is required unity of understanding concerning the facts of modern war. After the world-wide devastation that grows daily more possible, none may be able to distinguish between the victor and the vanquished of a future conflict. Confronted by that outcome to another world war, all of us—east and west—are in the same boat. The boat can be swamped in a series of atomic blasts; but, sustained by understanding of a common peril, it can also carry us through to final peace. Thus, the possibility of almost total destruction, terrible though it is, could be a blessing as all nations, great and small, for the first time in human history, are confronted by an inescapable physical proof of their common lot. Franklin's "If we don't all hang together, we shall each hang separately" has its international application today. * * *

In a disarmed world—should it be attained—there must be an effective United Nations, with a police power universally recognized and strong enough to earn universal respect. In it the individual nations can pool the power for policing the continents and the seas against international lawlessness—those acts which involve two or more nations in their external relations.

I do not subscribe to any idea that a world police force or a world organization should be permitted entrance to any nation for the purpose of settling disputes among its citizens, or for exercising any authority not specifically and voluntarily accorded by the affected nation. At this stage of civilization's progress any effort to push to this extreme the purpose of international law enforcement will defeat legitimate objectives. National sovereignty and independence have been won by most at too great cost to surrender to an external agency any such powers.

But by the establishment of a United Nations police of properly defined and restricted but effective powers, no nation would surrender one iota of its current national functions or authority, for none, by itself, now possesses a shred of responsibility to police the world. To an international peace organization, a nation would give up nothing beyond its equitable share in men and money. How this organization is to be constituted or how it is to be controlled, has yet to be worked out, but with the principles honestly accepted, the procedural problems would be easy of solution.

Evil Fruit

REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, it is recorded in the Book of Matthew that "a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit."

If modern proof of this eternal truth be needed, witness the treatment given to our overburdened taxpayers by the Truman administration earlier this week. The amount is $100,000—and the Truman administration decided not to pay. The American people, patient and forbearing as they are, cannot help but wonder at such behavior. The Bureau of Internal Revenue must have tongue in cheek after exempting from taxation the $100-a-plate festival held in honor of Jefferson and Jackson. This is the same Bureau of Internal Revenue that assessed a 20-percent tax on each $1 admission ticket to the Lincoln Day box supper held by the Republicans here in the Nation's Capital only a few days prior to the Democratic frolic.

Both of these functions were political in nature; both included professional entertainment, refreshments, and political speeches. The Democrats enriched their party coffers by more than half a million dollars without paying one cent of taxes. The Republicans, on the other hand, paid a 20-percent tax on their admission tickets, and contributed all of the profit from their box supper to charity.

I doubt that in the history of our Republic there is a like example of political favoritism in taxation. But this is only one aspect. Consider, if you will, the broader implications. Mr. Truman and his group have resisted all attempts made by the Republicans in Congress to lighten the tax burden upon our people. They, the so-called Fair Dealers, do not object to taxes on baby lotions, wedding rings, suitcases, telegrams, railroad tickets, and a thousand other items of every day use—but they refuse to pay an admission tax or entertainment tax on their own lavish feasts. A housewife must pay a 20-percent tax to attend a movie in her neighborhood theater; a schoolboy must pay a 20-percent tax for the privilege of cheering his team at a basketball game; a businessman must pay a 20-percent tax to entertain a business client; the Republicans must pay a 20-percent tax for admissions to their functions. But the Trumanites exempt themselves from tax liability on their gold-plated political shindigs. Is this equality under the law? Is this in line with the traditional American concept of fair play? Is this simple justice? Or is it a display of corrupt power?

Mr. Speaker, the next time any one of Mr. Truman's disciples rises to talk about plugging the tax loopholes, he should by all means be reminded of this fertile field in which to collect $100,000 of unpaid taxes. $100,000—this sum would pay the President's salary for 1 year. Of course, it would not defray his annual $90,000 tax-free expense accounts nor would it pay the upkeep on his yacht, or his fleet of automobiles, or his luxuriously appointed plane, or his retreat at Shangri-La. It would not pay for his expensive and frequent Florida vacations. Incidentally, newspaper reports indicate that Mr. Truman's staff is busily working in his Florida beach home on political speeches which he intends to use in a forthcoming tour of the Nation—a tour in his private railroad car, from which he will harangue our people about alleged special interests and special privileges of the Republican Party.

Special privilege. Has any administration in our political history been so clothed with it? Mr. Truman is the all-time arch-practitioner of special privilege. The luxury-loving gentleman from Missouri has put new meaning into the very words "special privilege."

Mr. Speaker, the masquerade of the Truman party as the champion of the common people now lies exposed for all to see. Abraham Lincoln said, "you can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time." Our people are not so gullible as Mr. Truman believes. They will not be misled by the same false prophets again, for they have learned the harsh truth that deeds not words are the measure of a man's integrity. Next election day they will heed the biblical admonition—"by their fruits ye shall know them."

Panama Sea-Level Project Apparently Ditched

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, for many months instructive articles, with clear-cut analyses and interpretations, by distinguished Members of the Congress, have effectively pointed out and exposed the many serious fallacies involved in the proposal for the construction of a new Panama Canal of so-called sea-level design. Congressional recognition of the results of this outcome may be said to have been taken in the interim report of the investigation of Panama Canal tolls, of August 23, 1949—House Report 1304, Eighty-first Congress. This report, adopted by the full committee of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, dismissed all consideration of the sea-level plan, and invited consideration of the completion (at comparatively low cost) of the authorized—and partially constructed—third locks project of the present lake-lock type canal, modified to include the principles of what is known as the terminal lake plan.

The investigation of Panama Canal tolls, under the able direction of Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, and the supervision of the late Representative Schuyler O. Bland, of Virginia, long-time chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, inevitably extended into the field of the management of the Panama Canal, and its organization; and subsequently was the subject of a communication from the President of the United States to the Speaker of the House, on January 31, 1950—House Document 460, Eighty-first Congress—forwarding a report made by Director Frank C. Pace, Jr., of the Bureau of the Budget.

The thanks of the entire country are due Representative THOMPSON, chairman of the special subcommittee for his highly important and tireless work in the premises—and to his subcommittee associates who, also, effectively aided, and cooperated with him. They have, indeed, performed a most difficult task with marked success.

The present status of the Canal situation was well described by Jim G. Lucas, the very capable, and always interesting, writer for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, as appeared March 29, 1950, in the Washington Daily News (noon edition), and other publications of the Scripps-Howard organization. In this article Mr. Lucas emphasizes the views of Budget Director Pace with respect to the supervision of the Panama Canal. The subsequent announcement, on the same day, of the selection, by the President, of Mr. Pace to be the Secretary of the Army, will support the President in his effort to reorganize the executive branches of the Federal Government, particularly the Panama Canal and its various activities. Secretary Pace will certainly support the recommendation of Director Pace, and the liberalization of the Panama Canal Government and organization, with their transfer from the supervision of the Secretary of the Army to that of the Secretary of Commerce, will, it is believed, be now assured. The transfer can be made by executive action, and enabling legislation to effect the other recommendations of Director Pace will shortly be introduced and considered in the Congress.

Under leave granted, I am including herewith the full text of the article by Mr. Lucas:

SEA-LEVEL CANAL APPARENTLY DITCHED

(By Jim G. Lucas)

President Truman apparently has given up hope Congress will approve * * * plans for a $2,500,000,000 sea-level Panama Canal.

The sea-level canal project originated with the Army engineers. The Army argued that it was the only kind of canal which could be defended from an atomic attack. They said the present lock canal could be knocked out by a single bomb.

Opponents of the sea-level canal protested it would cost closer to $7,500,000,000. They argued that no canal can be defended against atom bombs; that the safest defense was to shoot down enemy planes before they arrived over the target. They proposed to expand the present locks to accommodate bigger ships.

ARMY VERSUS SHIPPERS

Essentially, the argument was between the Army on one hand and commercial shipping interests on the other. The Budget Bureau apparently has sided with the shippers. It recently recommended to the President that he transfer control of the Panama Canal from the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Truman said he wanted to study the recommendation, but indications are that he will approve. If the shift is made, it apparently will eliminate the last remaining support for the sea-level canal project.

"It is essential that Panama Canal policies be coordinated with the objectives of national transportation policy and such coordination can best be achieved through supervision by the Secretary of Commerce," Budget Director Frank Pace wrote Mr. Truman. "Staff facilities already exist in the Department of Commerce which could be developed to furnish necessary assistance to the Secretary in fulfilling his responsibilities. Such facilities do not now exist in the Department of the Army or the Department of Defense and military staffs cannot satisfactorily be employed for this purpose."

Mr. Pace said the "historic reasons for placing the Panama Canal under the Secretary of the Army's supervision no longer apply. The construction phase of the Canal's operation long since has been completed. * * * In time of war, or when war is threatened, the Panama Canal could be placed under military supervision and control."

MILITARY IN TOP JOBS

By tradition, the Governor of the Canal Zone has always been a general in Army engineers. Since the Wilson administration, Army and Navy officers have held the majority of the important jobs. The Budget Bureau was critical of that practice.

"Under the present system," it said, "civilian employees may not aspire to a number of the top positions. Another important objection to the present system is that it unduly restricts the Governor in the selection of several of his chief assistants and tends to reduce his control over them. * * * The best policy for the Panama Canal would be one which permitted the selection of the most highly qualified personnel from whatever source available, military or civilian."

Currently, 71 Army and Navy officers hold important Canal jobs, the Budget Bureau said.

Mr. Pace said the Hoover Commission recommended that all major nonregulatory transportation activities be grouped in the Commerce Department. He insisted the recommendation included the Panama Canal.

Trend Toward Socialism May Be Halted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address which I delivered on March 19, 1950, over an Indiana station.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREND TOWARD SOCIALISM MAY BE HALTED

The congressional brakes have been applied to President Truman's program of forcing British socialism on the American people.

I expect to show in a review of the record of the Eighty-first Democrat Congress in nearly 90 days of its second session that it has joined the Republican Eightieth Congress in refusing to go along on this program.

Mr. Truman said in Madison Square Garden in New York City on October 28, 1948: "What a wonderful thing it was for the people of this United States that they didn't have a President that would go along with that good-for-nothing Eightieth Congress."

I can say right here there are a lot of people in this country who today are saying: "What a wonderful thing it has been for the people of this United States that neither the Republican nor Democrat Congress would go along with the President's program of socialism."

You are quite familiar with the record of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. It ran along for 10 months, 3 months beyond the legal limit, and yet not a single piece of Mr. Truman's socialistic legislation was adopted.

The second session of that same Democrat Congress has proceeded to pass only two major bills in nearly 3 months and neither of them is on Mr. Truman's socialistic program. Just two bills have been enacted into law in this session and both of them were half way through Congress when the session began.

First came the Korean aid bill calling for $150,000,000. That passed the Senate in the first session and the House voted it through on February 8 this year. Next came the oleo-tax repeal. It had passed the House in the first session and the Senate voted its approval on January 18 of this year. It was held in conference between the two Houses, however, until March 7 when the conference report was approved and Mr. Truman signed it into law on March 14.

These are the only two bills of any importance passed by the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Now, let's take a look at the progress report on some of the more sensational requests Mr. Truman asked the Eighty-first Congress to pass—either in the first or second session, or both. The Brannan farm plan, for example.

Mr. Truman asked for this program in his state of the Union message in January 1949, after he had flip-flopped back and forth between rigid and flexible price-support programs for a year. The Brannan farm plan, a blood cousin of the socialistic compulsory health-insurance plan, has had the brakes applied by the Congress and most farm organizations.

Hearings are going ahead on the farm problem in both Houses and Secretary of Agriculture Brannan is going ahead with his efforts to sell the program, but it appears to be certain there will be no Brannan plan in this session. After all, not a single elected official now holding a Federal office had the Brannan plan in his platform when elected, because the Brannan plan was not proposed until after the last election. It will definitely be an issue in the coming elections.

Since we have mentioned the blood cousin, socialized medicine, let's take a look at what is going on with it. The short report is: "No action." The long report is: "No action for a long time." Of course, committees continue to compile evidence from time to time because Director of Welfare Oscar Ewing has not given up the fight for this program.

He made no bones about his attitude when he went to England last fall to study England's socialized-medicine program. Mr. Ewing said in England and again when he returned that we were going to have the English medicine scheme—lock, stock, and barrel—or better still, we were going to have it—wigs, pills, and pains.

I can say rather optimistically that I think the socialized-medicine program will not be passed in this session of Congress, but will be offered again next year.

Mr. Truman would like to have this issue forgotten—just as he would his request for a tax increase a year ago—but nevertheless it is still his Congress and he did ask the Eighty-first Congress to give him stand-by authority to control prices and wages.

Remember that? Well, so does Congress and it isn't doing a thing about it either.

Another one he would like to have forgotten is his request for authority to build Government production facilities. This one grew out of a demand for steel, but was not limited to steel.

Today there is plenty of steel and Mr. Truman's fly-by-night legislative policy is safely—for the moment, that is—bottled up by Congressmen who are showing good judgment in this matter.

The same sensible consideration was given another request by the President. He had asked for universal military training. The draft which was voted proved useless to the armed services and the Congress has taken a somewhat distant view of forcing military training on all young men unless there appears to be a need for it. So, we haven't heard anything more about it and probably won't for.

Oh, yes, there was point 4. Mr. Truman first revealed this plan to develop all underdeveloped areas in the world in his inauguration speech in January of 1949. The Democratic Eighty-first Congress heard his request then for the first time. They heard it again later that same year and he included his request for authority to proceed with this global program in his 1950 message to the present session.

A long study has been carried on by committees in both Houses of Congress in the last session and this session on this subject but no action. The first step calls for some $35,000,000 to finance technical assistance to the underdeveloped areas. That, of course, is not the complete program.

However, on the specific point of technical assistance, a House committee, on February 21, ordered a favorable report made on the bill. That is the first action taken on point 4, which indicates this highly controversial program has a long road ahead before it gets through the legislative processes.

There are some requests by Mr. Truman which will receive congressional approval in this session. One of them may not be, however, his extension of Federal housing by creating a new Government corporation. This section of the housing bill, which was defeated in the Senate a few days ago, was a badly misrepresented section. It was classified as a middle-income housing bill. It was not that at all.

The only middle-income citizens who would benefit from it would be those who would form a cooperative to build houses or apartments. In addition, it offered a lower interest rate for a longer-term loan than is being given the war veterans and users of FHA loans. Its discriminatory features prompted the vote against that section.

Mr. Truman asked for extension of rent controls, but the home-rule system enacted in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress proved little need remains for such vast Federal controls over private property. I will be surprised if rent controls are continued this year beyond the expiration date of June 30.

There are other measures on Mr. Truman's Socialist list I would like to discuss in detail here today, but I would also like to use a portion of these 15 minutes to talk about what Mr. Truman's followers in the Congress try to do to the legislative program for political reasons. I also want to talk a moment about the spending habits of this administration. Mr. Truman is asking for a budget of $43,000,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1951.

That is $10,000,000,000 more than the Government spent in fiscal 1948 and is at least $6,000,000,000 more than will be collected in taxes. We hear many excuses given for the greater cost of Government in the coming year, but we do not hear good sound reasons for the $10,000,000,000 increase over 1948.

Did anybody in this country, or in any of the countries we are supporting suffer because the Government only spent $33,000,000,000 in 1948?

The Eighty-first Congress will not match the Eightieth Congress in effecting a balanced budget in this session, but I do believe some reductions in Mr. Truman's proposed expenditures will be accomplished. Continued spending beyond our income can be counted as one of the important steps leading toward socialism. The Eighty-first Congress, like the Eightieth Congress, is going to try to stop it.

Now I want to talk a bit about the Taft-Hartley Act. You know the Senate voted 28 good amendments to this act in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. Amendments favorable to unions.

You know, too, that Mr. Truman's followers in the House of Representatives Labor Committee have made a political football of this important piece of legislation. They have sat on the amended bill because they believe it will be politically advantageous to congressional candidates not to amend the Taft-Hartley Act. Mr. Truman's boys would rather have a campaign issue than fair and equitable labor-management relations.

The same attitude was displayed by Mr. Truman in the coal strike. He flaunted the law of the land. He played politics with human misery. He taught the strikers to ignore the law. Then, as Congress was about to take corrective measures, the strike was settled and Mr. Truman's followers in the Congress immediately whined that no further action was necessary.

Again they demonstrated they were willing to leave the people at the mercy of such political maneuvering. Remove Mr. Truman's New Dealers from their key positions in the Eighty-first Congress and you would have action in this very session of Congress that would protect the American people from the dangers of future sufferings such as occurred in the coal strike.

But what can you expect from an administration that first protects and coddles disloyal persons in its red herring bosom—then, trapped in its own mire, sends its Secretary of State around the country telling the people they do not understand the dangers of communism in this Nation?

Dean Acheson, the man who refused to turn his back on a convicted traitor in his own Department, is now calling upon the people of America to band together in the cold war against Russia. I can tell Mr. Acheson that the American people have fought a harder cold war against Russia than he has and for a lot longer time. They have paid their billions of dollars into the Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine to stop communism in other countries while it was permitted to infiltrate into the sacred halls of our own Government.

They have been helpless against the policy of pouring money into western Europe to stop communism while our own State Department policies are benevolent in nature to the Communists in the Far East.

I could discuss these issues at great length with you if time would permit, but in closing, let me say again that the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses—one controlled by Republicans, the other by Democrats—have put the brakes to Mr. Truman's Socialist bandwagon.

These two Congresses have also established another record of merit. It was during the Eightieth Congress that evidence was revealed of the subversive activities within our own Government. The Hiss case was brought to light—with some difficulty growing out of administrative agencies, I might add. Eleven Communists were brought to trial and convicted on the strength of evidence unearthed by congressional committees in the Eightieth Congress.

During the two sessions of the Eighty-first Congress we have seen congressional committees pierce further into the armor that has protected subversives for too long a time.

There will be some—and you can guess who one of them will be—who will say the Eighty-first Congress was another do-nothing Congress. When the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses stopped socialism and exposed communism in our country, they did a good day's work for the American people.

Wall Street Journal Predicts Many Ills Ahead for the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting article appeared in the March 21, 1950, issue of the Wall Street Journal concerning the coal industry. This article written by Philip Geyelin, staff correspondent of the Wall Street Journal, furnishes much food for thought.

The article is as follows:

COAL ILLS AHEAD—FEDERAL EXPERTS SEE BITUMINOUS PRICE WAR IN A FEW MONTHS—SAY MARGINAL MINES WILL BE FORCED OUT AS OPERATORS VIE FOR SHRINKING MARKET—WHAT WILL MR. LEWIS DO?

(By Philip Geyelin)

WASHINGTON.—President Truman's coal experts think the soft coal industry is going to be mighty sick before many months roll by.

At the moment it's benefiting from a palliative—demand for the fuel from strike-starved coal consumers. Last week prices were marked up 10 to 30 cents a ton.

But the experts are keeping an eye on such statistics as these: Week before last bituminous coal output soared to 13,200,000 tons. At that rate the miners would produce some 660,000,000 tons in a 50-week year. Such a total would top the record-breaking 630,000,000 tons mined in 1947. It would be almost half again as much as the 435,000,000 ton production of 1949, when supply managed to keep up with demand.

PRICE WAR AHEAD

"There's going to be a full-scale price war in the industry in a matter of months," says one top Government mine man. As soon as the operators start battling for the shrinking coal market, "hundreds of high cost, marginal mines are going to fall by the wayside," he adds.

That will mean a return of the industry's basic ailment: Overproduction in a dwindling market, from which fuel oil and gas are luring more and more customers.

Most coal experts believe the industry would have been faced with a severe postwar readjustment before this, had it not been for John L. Lewis' stabilization efforts with the 3-day week and his holidays for miners. By limiting output, the United Mine Workers chieftain spread production across the industry, kept prices up and enabled many high-cost mines to stay in operation.

Hostilities between the mine operators and Mr. Lewis stopped 2 weeks ago when a new wage agreement ended 8 months of costly wrangling over terms. The new agreement can't be opened until April 1951. But Federal officials take small comfort from this one-year peace treaty. They expect a different kind of warfare to break out—keen competition among operators.

COAL DEMAND FALLING

Coal demand has been falling sharply from war and postwar levels.

In 1947 exports to coal-short European countries and to Canada totaled 69,000,000 tons. Last year they were down to some twenty-seven million as European mines got back in full operation.

In this country 3 years ago, coal was supplying 50 percent of the energy for homes and industry. By last year its share was down to 38.9 percent.

The railroads have been taking less and less coal as they put in more oil-burning Diesel engines. In 1947 they bought 100,000,000 tons of coal. Last year they took less than 70,000,000 tons, a drop of 37 percent. More electric-utility companies are finding it's an economy to shift to oil, too. They consumed only 80,000,000 tons of coal last year, compared with ninety-five million in 1948.

Meanwhile, householders have been swinging to oil at a rapid clip. Last year oil-burner sales were up 39 percent over 1948, while factory shipments of warm-air coal furnaces dropped 47 percent. Where natural gas is available, this fuel is grabbing some coal customers, too.

These shifts to competitive fuels are expected to continue apace unless the coal industry can lower the price of its fuel, industry observers believe.

With the industry's capacity to produce still at war level, and Mr. Lewis' power to limit production curtailed in the new coal contract, Government experts are predicting several developments.

REFINEMENTS IN PROSPECT

Within 120 days, says one official, coal stocks will be at or near record proportions. Heavy buying will quickly replenish aboveground supplies. Then what?

Customers will start getting finicky, the experts believe; they'll buy only higher-grade coal. This will force many small open-face mines out of operation. Some marginal, less careful strip mines where the fuel is dug from the surface, produce a lower-grade bituminous than that extracted from the bigger, underground pits, or from modernized strip operations.

As customers get choosier, bigger mining enterprises will begin feeling the pinch. Deep-mine companies without far-flung sales organizations will be hit.

At this stage, the experts predict, price cutting will begin. As the mine owners vie for business by lowering prices, high-cost, inefficient mining operations will be forced out. They won't be able to stay in business and pay the $14.75-a-day wages to the miner and the 30-cents-a-ton welfare-fund royalties won by the United Mine Workers in its new coal contract.

A BACKWARD LOOK

How far will this process go? Federal officials note this statistical history: In 1915, before World War I, some 5,500 soft-coal mines were in operation. By 1923 wartime demand had upped this to 9,300. But the coal market fell off badly in the late twenties and early thirties. Consumption by 1932 reached a record low of 306,000,000 tons, compared with five hundred and eighteen million in 1923. By 1933 the mines in operation had shrunk to 5,500 again. Today the number is back over the 9,000 mark.

Comments one Bureau of Mines official: "It may be more than just the old cycle, with the way fuel oil and natural gas have been gobbling coal customers."

The Mines Bureau functionary thinks the number of coal mines in the United States could drop below the 5,000 figure in the years to come. This doesn't mean the industry's productive capacity would be cut proportionately. He explains that most mines shutting down would be small, and the big, heavily capitalized producers would probably weather the storm.

These Government mine experts base their views on the assumption that the mine owners will have a relatively free hand in the next 12 months. Either John L. Lewis or Congress could alter the outlook by stepping in with their own recovery programs. There's been talk of Federal price propping, a subsidy for coal or some other legislation to bolster the industry.

THE QUESTION OF MR. LEWIS

What Mr. Lewis may have in mind is, as always, a mystery. But the mine owners think their new contract puts strict limits on the union's power to control coal production. The operators succeeded in eliminating the controversial able-and-willing clause. This specified that the miners need work only when able or willing. When Mr. Lewis thought coal was too plentiful, the miners were conveniently unwilling to work. With this contract loophole, the union chieftain shut down the mines for 1 week last spring, put his coal diggers on a 3-day week much of the summer, and closed the mines completely for 52 days last fall and 1 month early this year.

This had the effect of spreading work among the UMW's 370,000 coal diggers. While coal consumption dropped some 30 percent from 1948 to 1949, the number of miners employed in the industry fell off only 7 percent. Coal was kept relatively scarce by Mr. Lewis' manipulations.

Says one Bureau of Mines official: "Economically there's no justification for the number of mines in operation today. The 3-day week was an artificial prop for inefficient mines that came in during the war. It succeeded in spreading the work but only delayed the day of reckoning."

Whether Mr. Lewis can continue to exercise any control over production without his able-and-willing proviso is a big question. It looks now as if he can't. But, as one Government official puts it, "You never can tell with John L.—he's always thinking."

COAL LAW COMING?

As for the chances of congressional action designed to help the industry, any coal legislation would be delayed at least a year if Congress sets up a commission to diagnose the ills of the industry, as President Truman has proposed. The commission would need that much time to study the problem and make its report.

At the moment, Mr. Truman's proposal for a commission is fast losing the enthusiasm of Congress. With the coal crisis over, lawmakers are turning to other issues. Mine operators insist any such commission should make a careful study of labor conditions in the industry, and Mr. Lewis is bringing quiet pressure to squelch the whole idea. If the plan collapses, it would clear the way for speedier action by Congress. But even so, new coal legislation in the near future isn't likely.

The administration isn't ready to push for a coal law now. Mr. Truman's aides aren't sure just what's needed. And coal experts in the Government are inclined to give the industry a chance to solve its own problem without interference.

"There's a lot to be said for normal forces of economics," comments one top official who recalls the Government's experiences in the late 1930's with the now defunct Guffey Coal Act. That law allowed the Government to fix minimum prices for bituminous fuel. Federal price propping enabled high-cost mines to stay in business. But it cost Uncle Sam millions of dollars and mountains of paper work to set some 400,000 price minimums for various grades of soft coal in different parts of the country.

Nonetheless, the administration and Congress might go into action if a wave of mine shut-downs created serious pockets of unemployment in coal-producing States. Smaller operators would press for congressional aid if their bigger brothers captured the bulk of the market at low prices which the small mines couldn't meet. The United Mine Workers would also be clamoring for aid, of course, if unemployment should grow in the coal fields.

Reduction in Flour Consumption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Unhappy Millers," written by

Edward Hughes, and published in the Wall Street Journal. I believe the article contains matters of special interest to wheat risers, flour millers, and those who are employed in the milling industry.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNHAPPY MILLERS—FLOUR GRINDING CLAN SHRINKS AS DEMAND FOR PRODUCT TAKES TUMBLE—HOME FRONT IS EATING MORE MEAT, VEGETABLES; SALES ABROAD SHARPLY LOWER—100 MILLS CLOSED SINCE 1947

(By Edward Hughes)

WASHINGTON.—Candidate for the title of today's least merry businessman: The flour miller.

A slow appetite for his product on the home front and a terrible tumble in foreign demand are making things rough for him.

Since 1947, more than 100 mills have bowed to shrinking profit margins and gone quietly out of business. A score more are on the ropes.

It's a sharp adjustment from the biggest boom in milling history. Just 3 years ago, production of flour was at a record annual volume of 36,000,000,000 pounds. This year, output will be at least 25 percent under that level.

THE FLOUR SLIDE

The big slump in export demand paces the downturn. Two years after the war, shipments of United States flour abroad had soared to nearly 10,000,000,000 pounds a year. That was in 1947. By last year, exports had dropped to about 3,000,000,000 pounds. And the slide continues into 1950. February shipments were only 30 percent of the year-ago level.

A fading American appetite for bread doesn't help matters. Domestic consumption of flour is sliding back to the prewar level—despite population growth. It was just over 20,000,000,000 pounds last year, near the 1942 level. It points a trend that has long caused anxiety among millers: Mr. and Mrs. America are eating less and less bread. At the turn of the century per capita consumption was 225 pounds of flour in a year. These days, with a greater zest for meats and vegetables, plus weight-reducing diets, per-person flour use is only about 135 pounds a year.

These statistics have tightened the noose around the neck of many a miller. In the late war and the immediate postwar years, every bit of idle plant capacity that could be found was put to work to furnish the greatest demand the industry has ever known.

DISCONTINUED SERVICES

According to the Northwestern Miller, flour-milling trade publication, there was a total of 2,571 flour mills, big and small, in the Nation at the end of 1945. At latest count, this number was down to 1,553 mills.

The Millers National Federation, which maintains an office in the national capital, can point up the trend among the bigger mills. It has a list of 101 sizable mills—with capacities of 40,000 pounds or more daily—which were going full blast in 1947 and which are now out of business.

Those that survive aren't happy about the way things are going. Pillsbury Mills, Inc., of Minneapolis, is an example. President Philip Pillsbury says his firm's earnings for 1949, at $3,274,155, were less than half its earnings in 1947.

DOWNTURN IN DENVER

Denver's Colorado Milling & Elevator Co. had an even greater drop in net income in those 2 years. After taxes, 1947 income was $4,016,778. Two years later, its net income was $1,451,611.

Another example: The net income of Commander Larabee Milling Co., of Minneapolis, slipped from over $3,500,000 in 1947 to just $238,000 in 1949. That's smaller than the company's 1939 return.

What's behind the export slump? European farm recovery is of course a big factor. But it doesn't tell the whole story. Milling industry spokesmen contend United States farm-price supports on wheat—the grain that goes into flour—are forcing millers to charge too much for their product in foreign countries.

"There's no doubt about it," says one. "We are simply pricing our flour out of the world market." Then he asks: "What can millers do about it? They're trapped by high wheat costs."

LATIN AMERICAN LOSSES

Shipments to Europe are off drastically. But that's not too surprising—United States millers haven't expected to hold onto their war-inflated European markets.

They've hoped to be able to keep some of the big buyers in Latin America, however. But take a look at what's happened down there: In 1947, Brazil took 836,000,000 pounds of our flour. Last year, Brazil bought only 131,000,000 pounds. More than 366,000,000 pounds of United States flour went to Cuba in 1947. That's been trimmed by more than 100,000,000 pounds in the last year or so. With minor exceptions, that's the picture for the whole Latin-American area.

It all stems from the old problem of the dollar. South Americans, and other good United States customers, have too few of them. So they skimp on purchases that require the hard currency. In some cases, they try to shift to nondollar sources like Australia.

WHERE CANADA COMES IN

But there's not enough nondollar flour to go around. So buying nations look for dollar-flour producers who can provide the least expensive product. That's where Canada comes in. With a much lower cost for wheat, flour millers in Canada can undersell—and have been underselling—this country in many markets.

Currently, say millers, United States export prices are a full 40 cents per bushel (wheat-price equivalent) above comparable Canadian flour for sale to South American countries. "That," says a flour man, "is why Canada's exports of flour in the last 2 years have decreased only 7 percent, while ours are off more than 70 percent."

On the home front, the statistics which food experts trot out on changing dinner table habits over the past three decades show why the flour man is losing ground. Folks are filling their stomachs with other foods.

Back around the First World War, the average American consumed an annual 188 pounds of fresh vegetables. Today, he eats about 250 pounds. Meat consumption: In 1930, per capita use averaged 128 pounds a year. Today the level is running around 146 pounds—and moving upward.

The United States citizen who ate an annual 35 pounds of eggs a generation ago consumes nearly 50 pounds today. He's eating more chicken and turkey, too.

Capehart Is Tough Foe of Isms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "CAPEHART IS Tough Foe of Isms," written by HAROLD CROSS, which was published in the Hammond (Ind.) Times on Sunday, March 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAIN, EVERYDAY AMERICAN—CAPEHART IS TOUGH FOE OF ISMS

(By Harold Cross)

INDIANAPOLIS.—There is an awfully good reason why United States Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART is battling at all times to retain the American way of life.

He is a symbol of that type of life.

The biographical trail left by Indiana's senior Senator in his 52 years on this earth spells America in great big letters. And he isn't forgetting what he found was possible in America as he goes about the State and Nation preaching against socialism, communism, or any other ism that might be dreamed up from time to time by those who seem to find things wrong with the American system.

You take a good long look at HOMER and then you say to yourself:

He isn't a politician.

He isn't a narrow-brained business tycoon.

He isn't a flowery orator with meaningless words.

He isn't a radical—nor a conservative.

So you just roll all these things around in your mind a bit and you come out with these deductions:

HOMER is just a plain, everyday American who is sincerely trying to save for America what he thinks is its greatest asset—its form of government.

In fact, the affable gent who went from a farm in Washington, Ind., to a Senate seat in Washington, D. C., makes a great talk entitled "Our Greatest Asset," and it's his gospel.

The man whose upturned grin and big cigar form a Capehart trade-mark has done a good many other things in his 5 years and more in Washington than just talk about our Government. But the American way of life is his basic philosophy and all other activities revolve around it.

Both the man and the philosophy were born near the little town of Algiers, Ind., on June 6, 1897, when Alvin and Susan Capehart had a son they called HOMER.

That start in life was not a glorious one, but typical of so many Americans. HOMER'S father was a tenant farmer and HOMER was the second of four children, there being two other sons and a daughter when the final roll was read.

The going is not easy for tenant farmers, but Alvin Capehart, whose ancestors came from Wales in colonial days, managed to provide for his family through hard work and economic management.

HOMER, as a boy, knew the feel of wheat stubbles on his bare feet. He knew the chill of 4 a. m. while donning his dungarees for the morning chores.

He also knew the need for the necessities of life at times.

Nevertheless, HOMER used his 16 wakeful hours of each day to mix schooling with farm chores and out of it came a high-school diploma and a respect for courage.

The diploma and World War I arrived at the same time and the strapping farm boy from Daviess County was the first enlistment in his home county at the age of 19.

From a buck private in the rear ranks he moved to sergeant in the army in the 2 years he served.

Then, endowed with the spirit and courage to make a success under the American system, he tackled the business world as a salesman. Up to this point HOMER CAPEHART had not sold anything except himself on the fact that under the free-enterprise system you can make a success from any beginning.

It was as ham to eggs that he took to selling plows. But later it was as milk to vinegar that he went into the advertising business. Nevertheless, he kept on eking out the necessaries of life, even though they were quite sparse at times. There were a few incidents in this part of his 52 years that were about as tough problems for him and his newly-acquired family responsibilities as you would want to meet up with.

The pickin's were pretty lean, but the chance was there under the American system and HOMER never knew the words "give up."

His indomitable spirit was made to order for salesmanship and he became sales manager for the Holcomb & Hoke Manufacturing Co. in Indianapolis.

In 1928 the name of CAPEHART first blazed across the business world of America when he organized the Capehart Corp. in Huntington, Ind.

The next year he moved his manufacturing operations to Fort Wayne, Ind. He was for many years associated with the Rudolph Wurlitzer Co., of Cincinnati, and North Tonawanda, N. Y. He founded the Packard Manufacturing Corp. in Indianapolis in 1940. HOMER, the farm boy, the poor boy, was on his way.

When World War II enveloped the United States the Packard plants turned to war production and won repeated awards for their excellence in producing tank parts, plane parts, and parts for 30-caliber carbine rifles.

Your reporter, who has been covering politics in Indiana for more years than he likes to admit, had reason to know CAPEHART long before this point in the career of America's No. 1 booster.

Back in 1938 on a hot August day I joined a good many thousands of other Hoosiers in a trek to the farm of CAPEHART near Washington, Ind. This was when CAPEHART'S name first appeared on the political horizon of Indiana.

He had seen the trend under the New Deal toward changing that system of government which he loved and cherished so much and the poor little successful boy decided to do something about it.

Those thousands of Republicans gathered at the Capehart farm and pledged to fight with all their might against New Deal efforts to change the American system.

It worked.

That very same year the Republicans elected a secretary of state. Two years later they carried the State for Wendell Willkie and reelected the secretary of state. In 1942 they won the legislature and all State offices except governor which was not subject to election.

From that huge gathering on CAPEHART'S farm which has become famous in Republican history as the "cornfield conference" the Republican Party surged forward in Indiana to complete landslides in 1944 and 1946.

Yes, in 1944 the Republicans won a landslide and into office with that landslide went HOMER E. CAPEHART—into the United States Senate. The farm boy, the salesman, the successful businessman, the American, the United States Senator, was now where he could do the most good for that philosophy of his.

To get into the Senate, CAPEHART faced in the general election the man who has been proclaimed in politics as the State's greatest vote-getter, Gov. Henry F. Schricker.

Schricker had just completed a 4-year term as governor and was hailed as a cinch to win the Senate seat on the strength of a complaint-free term in office.

Up and down the State went the man who was new to the game of politics. He shook 100,000 hands, he claims, and visited every nook and corner of Indiana and doggone near every grocery store and filling station. He won over the man they said couldn't be beat, but HOMER never did know the meaning of those words: "give up."

The same old push marked his way through the Senate. He wasn't in Washington long until he found his way around like a veteran.

Who Are "The People"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Who Are 'The People'?" published in the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star on March 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO ARE "THE PEOPLE"?

In a slashing attack on Senator HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana, the AFL's Political Education League has used the time-worn political trick of smearing an opponent by association. "CAPEHART," the weekly league reporter says, "has again lined up with the special interests and against the people. He is opposing the middle-income cooperative housing bill."

The implication is that anybody who opposes this piece of legislation is a tool of the National Association of Real Estate Boards and is against the people. Simply because Senator CAPEHART happens to have decided to vote against a bill which that organization opposes, he is charged with being a stooge for a special interest. That sort of attack is not only unfair, it is both vicious and untrue.

Who are the people for whom the AFL presumes to speak? Are they the 55 percent of all the people in all the United States in small-income groups who own their own homes; people who would have to pay off not only their own mortgages, but part of the mortgages of that specially privileged few who got Government subsidies for cooperative housing? Are they the people who are now living in rented homes and are satisfied with the rent they pay? Are they even the majority of the members of the AFL, few of whom would benefit from this middle-income housing bill, but all of whom would have to pay the taxes to support it? We doubt it.

The AFL's league reporter speaks only for those few political experts who edit it, and for the few labor leaders who control the AFL for their own political and personal purposes. It no more speaks for the people than does the National Association of Real Estate Boards. In a previous attack on GOP Congressmen on March 6 the reporter said that the McConnell FEPC bill keeps civil rights from being enforced. It implies AFL support for an FEPC with compulsory enforcement.

Yet the constitutions of many AFL unions today prohibit Negro membership and ban Negroes from being apprentices. How can the AFL political educators reconcile these two opposing actions? And how can the people have any confidence in the sincerity or the accuracy of the league reporter when it puts out such hypocritical opinions as these?

Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "United States Has Real Obligation To Accept Hawaii and Alaska Into Full Family Membership," which appeared in the Salt Lake Tribune on March 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES HAS REAL OBLIGATION TO ACCEPT HAWAII AND ALASKA INTO FULL FAMILY MEMBERSHIP

The lower House of Congress has approved bills to admit, Alaska and Hawaii, respectively, as the forty-ninth and fiftieth States of the Union. Although opposition is reported brewing in the Senate, it may be hoped that the upper chamber will act as forthrightly and intelligently.

The two States would be the only ones not contiguous to continental United States. However, modern transportation and communications facilities and some potent lessons from the Second World War eliminate distance as an argument against statehood. Petitions of the two Territories are correctly being considered separately and each on its own merits. However, there are many reasons for affirmative action, especially at this time. We need to bring all members of our American family closer together spiritually and practically.

Absentee Federal direction undoubtedly has hindered economic and population growth of both Territories. Though they both seem a long way from continental United States, the air lines and modern communication facilities have brought them much closer than were some of the "frontier" Territories in former days.

Hawaii has been ready for statehood a long time—socially, economically, and politically. The islands are a crossroads of the Pacific, a center of trade and cultural relations between all peoples of the Pacific area. Here is a good place to exhibit democracy at work. The argument that Communist strength on the islands should keep Hawaii out of the Union is a weak one. A government in which citizens participate to a greater degree should discourage residents from flirting with subversive ideologies. Eighty-three percent of Hawaii's citizens are American citizens.

Hawaii has been seeking admission to the Union since 1854. The island Territory has had constitutional government since 1840 and has been a Territory since 1900. Hawaii's present population of 540,000 exceeds that of six States and almost equals four others. The population is larger than that of any territory when it was admitted to statehood except Oklahoma. Hawaii's land area is larger than several eastern States. Its contribution to the Federal Treasury of $90,824,693 last year was more than was collected in United States taxes in any 1 of 11 States.

Alaska and Hawaii are vulnerable points in our national defense, it is true. Pearl Harbor proved, however, that an attack on a United States Territory or possession is as important to the rest of the country as if Oregon or Georgia were invaded. The Territories of Alaska and Hawaii cannot be secure

until they are admitted to statehood. They should have stronger voices and votes in the Congress.

Alaska remains largely underdeveloped and vulnerable to attack 83 years after the Territory was purchased from Russia. The proximity of the peninsula to Russia dramatizes the urgency of making it as strong as possible militarily, with a complete democratic government. Though much of it is a remote, icy wilderness, Alaska has tremendous natural resources, such as timber and minerals and open places for settling Americans in new homes. Its possibilities have hardly been tapped. Statehood no doubt would enhance stability settlement and development.

Admission of Alaska has been opposed on grounds it would be unfair for a State of 100,000 population to have the same representation in the Senate as States of several million people. If that argument is valid, then it is unfair for Utah and Nevada to have the same number of Senators as New York and California. This practical arrangement is the price that was paid for the Union in the first place.

Alaska has more population than 12 States boasted at the time they entered the Union. Population per square mile there is greater than that of Nevada, Minnesota, and Oregon at the time they became States. After an extensive investigation, the House Public Lands Committee has concluded that Alaska should be able to support itself financially under statehood.

Arguments against statehood for the two great Territorial outposts are almost a century late. The United States assumed a solemn obligation to accept them into full family membership and to defend them when the Nation acquired them.

Mental-Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand clippings reporting a horrible disaster in a mental hospital. Nine men were trapped by fire, and went to their deaths. It is reported that they were chained to their bunks.

It is hard to believe that such a tragedy could occur in this day, and yet I realize that the practice of restraining mental patients is mainly due to a lack of trained personnel.

Although this was a private mental institution, this practice of shackling patients goes on, I understand, in many tax-supported hospitals throughout the country.

Our veterans hospitals have made a notable advance in abolishing these restraints, and yet the recent veterans' cuts in personnel threaten to reduce the standard of care that is given. In a statement made by the American Psychiatric Association, which I would like to insert in the RECORD, it is stated:

One of the most serious threats of the cut-back is the reduction in training programs at VA hospitals, particularly for nurses and aides. It is inevitable that incidents of abuse of nervous and mentally disabled patients will increase. Moreover, decreases in supervisory personnel will inevitably encourage an increase in the use of physical and chemical restraints for disturbed patients.

I think it is not only necessary to stop these cut-backs in the Veterans' Administration, but it is clear that we must step up our whole mental health program in the country, as carried on by the Public Health Service.

Neither society nor the Congress can condone inhuman practices. Therefore, society at large, and the Congress in particular cannot afford to neglect any steps that can be taken to eradicate such medieval action in our mental hospitals.

When, by appropriating a small amount of money, we can find new treatments, train personnel to apply them, send patients home as soon as possible, and take care of their rehabilitation, Congress ought to find a way of providing that money.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a release by the American Psychiatric Association and a newspaper article entitled "Tragedy at Mental Hospital Near Philadelphia," published in the Washington Daily News of March 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the release and newspaper article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concrete evidence to support the American Psychiatric Association's warning that current cuts in Medical personnel in VA psychiatric hospitals and clinics would have disastrous results, was made public today by APA president, Dr. George S. Stevenson, New York City. On March 4 the association publicly declared that unless the personnel cut-back were prevented, "medical care of nervous and mentally disabled veterans would deteriorate below accepted adequate standards."

About 3,000 of the VA medical staff are involved, approximately 1,200 of them being doctors, dentists, psychologists, nurses, social workers, and aides in VA psychiatric hospitals and clinics.

Stating that his information was based on reports received from the VA hospitals and clinics in the past 2 weeks, Dr. Stevenson declared the evidence was all too clear that the VA's fifty-thousand-odd psychiatric veteran patients would be the ones to suffer from the lowering of standards and services necessitated by the personnel cut.

For example, he said, the VA hospital at Gulfport, Miss., will eliminate its vocational rehabilitation and education program. At American Lake, Wash., insulin therapy will be stopped. At Downey, Ill., the recreation program for TB patients will be cut out. At Port Lyon, Colo., the leukotomy (operation on frontal lobes of brain) program will be drastically limited. At Marion, Ind., the hydrotherapy program will be reduced. At Togus, Maine, one medical and one surgical ward will be closed.

Particularly distressing is the effect of the cut-back on the VA hospitals which care for tuberculous psychiatric patients, Dr. Stevenson said. They are asked to reduce their staffs by 5 to 50 people. Yet in a recent survey of four of them, not one was found to provide adequate medical care. The cut-back can only agitate already serious deficiencies.

One of the most serious threats of the cut-back is the reduction in training programs at Veterans' Administration hospitals, particularly for nurses and aides. It is inevitable that incidents of abuse of nervous and mentally disabled patients will increase. Moreover, decreases in supervisory personnel will inevitably encourage an increase in the use of physical and chemical restraints for disturbed patients.

The corrective therapy and vocational rehabilitation and education programs will be drastically curtailed, and in many hospitals eliminated altogether. Dr. Stevenson continued. These are crucial activities in preparing patients for release from the hospital and readjustment to community life.

The cut comes at a time when there are about 4,000 psychiatric beds unused in the Veterans' Administration hospitals for lack of personnel to staff them; and when there are about 5,000 "emergency beds" in use—crowded into sun porches and recreation rooms, over and above normal capacity. Yet 21 Veterans' Administration hospitals report they will have to close nearly 1,400 more beds as a result of the cut, and more would be closed if it were not for local community pressure to keep them open.

The situation is aggravated, Dr. Stevenson stressed, by the fact that the Veterans' Administration is asked to staff new hospitals being constructed within present personnel ceilings. In a program analysis approved recently by the Chief Medical Director of Veterans' Administration, it was estimated that the Veterans' Administration needed 4,000 more medical personnel to maintain its present psychiatric hospitals and provide for the new ones planned this year.

Turning to the Veterans' Administration mental-hygiene clinics, Dr. Stevenson described them as the first line of defense against hospitalization. About 25 percent of nearly 25,000 out-patients now being handled by the clinics would have to be hospitalized if clinic treatments were not available. All of these cases involve service-connected disabilities. Yet the personnel cut-back requires the clinics to reduce personnel by about 13 percent—foreshadowing a backlog og about 10,000 untreated service-connected cases by the end of 1950. The cut-back also will require the clinics to rely more on fee-basis physicians, which costs about a third again as much per treatment and results in less adequate medical care.

At present there are no clinic facilities in Alabama, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, North and South Dakota, and Wyoming, Dr. Stevenson said, and in general, large areas of the Midwest, South, and Southwest have few or no out-patient clinic facilities. There are 470,000 service-connected cases now eligible for clinic out-patient treatment. Only 25 percent of them have been cared for thus far, Dr. Stevenson stressed.

Dr. Stevenson expressed the hope that a widespread public protest to the Congress would result in a deficiency appropriation for the Veterans' Administration which would put a last-minute stop to the personnel cut-back.

THE EFFECTS OF VA PERSONNEL CUT ON INDIVIDUAL HOSPITALS

American Lake, Wash.: Can't close beds; stop insulin therapy; eliminate affiliate nursing program; reduce total push; less supervision of personal care; return to back wards.

Bedford, Mass.: Cannot eliminate 235 emergency beds; no social service on Sunday; hydrotherapy reduced from 16 hours to 1 hour 5 days a week; cannot do family care.

Augusta, Ga.: 280 patients to lose treatment; serious reduction in service; nursing service covers dietetics; need two more nurses for insulin therapy.

Canandaigua, N. Y.: Close 280 beds; eliminate insulin program; PMR (physical medicine and rehabilitation) for 200 patients reduced.

Chillicothe, Ohio: 39 emergency beds eliminated; no effect on patient care.

Coatesville, Pa.: Close one hospital building; have stopped admissions; total push decreased.

Danville, Ill.: Have to stop admissions for 5 months to reach standard capacity; cannot man all nursing stations; unsafe to operate wards; cold food served 1 hour before meals; 45 patients deprived of treatment; eliminate attendant training.

Downey, Ill.: Cannot operate additional tuberculosis ward; no recreation for TB patients; two vacancies for doctors canceled; professional people have to do administrative work.

Fort Custer, Mich.: Close 35 beds; eliminate VR & E (vocational rehabilitation and education program); reduce PMR program.

Fort Lyon, Colo.: Close 106 emergency beds; 225 patients to 1 doctor ratio; leukotomy program decreased.

Fort Meade, S. Dak.: Have only 146 aides; will reduce push program.

Gulfport, Miss.: 110 beds should be closed but cannot for the sake of serving community; eliminate VR & E; all MAT (manual arts therapy) but one shop eliminated; special training for 25 catatonics eliminated; habit training for 140 abolished; no hydrotherapy on acute service; lessen group psychotherapy; close staff dining room; lose five ward clerks (nurses to do administrative work); have to double up patients in day rooms; no aide training.

Knoxville, Iowa: Close 78 beds or eliminate the 38 beds for TB-NP patients.

Lebanon, Pa.: Are opening beds; need more staff for new beds—but can't hire in advance for training some reduction in PMR activities.

Lexington, Ky.: Inadequate coverage of wards due to lack of nurses and attendants.

Lyons, N. J.: Close 400 beds (have 288 emergency beds); 350 patients needing PMR not getting it; unless get more personnel, have to close beds; PMR activities somewhat reduced; inadequate coverage of wards.

Marion, Ind.: Cannot close beds—too crowded; cannot open new unit for infirm; 200 patients have no sports; movies for wards down 50 percent; stop night hydrotherapy; no PT for TB patients; curtail ward OT (occupational therapy); 4 buildings, no CT (corrective therapy); lessen dietetic ward service; special services activities reduced; hydrotherapy and physical therapy activities curtailed.

Murfreesboro, Tenn.: OT on wards curtailed, fewer activities off wards; shortage of psychiatrists and nurses continues.

North Little Rock, Ark.: Close 86 TB-NP beds and transfer patients; else eliminate 86 other beds.

Northport, Long Island, N. Y.: Stop new admissions, eliminate emergency beds; hydrotherapy reduced from 24 to 16 hours and 16 to 8 hours; off-ward activities for patients curtailed.

Palo Alto, Calif.: Can't reduce beds; must reduce programs, won't do lab work for annual physicals; reduction in ward coverage and ward activities, or increase use of restraint and sedation.

Perry Point, Md.: Patient care will suffer by curtailing program.

Roanoke, Va.: No emergency beds; increase waiting list; reduce lobotomy program (112 operations; one-third gone home); decrease shock program; residency training will suffer.

Roseburg, Oreg.: Ten emergency beds; diminish training for aides; eliminate ward OT; limit lobotomy retraining; need eight more medical jobs; reduce push programs; marked reduction of OT on wards; reduce off-ward activities; reduce lobotomy program.

Sheridan, Wyo.: Reduce extent of off-ward activities; coverage on wards in some cases reduced to danger point; hydrotherapy and other PMR activities reduced.

St. Cloud, Minn.: Need for additional physicians on acute intensive treatment service.

Togus, Maine: Close one medical and one surgical ward; NP hospital personnel never adequate.

Tomah, Wis.: Some reduction in off-ward activities; attendant ratio low.

Topeka, Kans.: Close 200 beds.

Tuscaloosa, Ala.: Cannot reduce beds; discontinue two VR & E jobs; lessen insulin and electric shock therapy; cut down lobotomies due to inadequate nursing; lessen push programs.

Tuskegee, Ala.: 200 beds closed by curtailing administrative; eliminate 5,000 program—2 jobs; eliminate two PMR programs.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 30, 1950]

TRAGEDY AT MENTAL HOSPITAL NEAR PHILADELPHIA—NINE DEAD IN FIRE WERE CHAINED TO THEIR BUNKS

PHILADELPHIA, March 30.—Nine men mental patients, tugging in terror at the chains which bound them to concrete slabs, died today in a fire in a private sanitarium.

The dense smoke which killed them, pouring into their barred cells from a basement fire, felled two other patients in the ward. They were in critical condition at Montgomery Hospital in Norristown, Pa.

A male nurse, George Lewis, 51, saved the lives of the four other inmates of the violent section. He groped through the smoke and unlocked the leather-bound chains which shackled them either by the wrist or ankle to an iron ring in their concrete beds.

When the dead were laid out on the rug-covered floor of the administration building, the cuts and bruises told the story of how they struggled futilely to break the shackles that held them.

THIRTY INJURED

About 30 other persons, including firemen and attendants, were overcome or sickened by the dense smoke from a rubbish fire.

Amid the confusion of smoke, the rescuing of 75 terror-stricken inmates and firemen battering at cell doors, there was heroism.

Mrs. Theresa Shaw, 33-year-old New York nurse, crawled on her stomach through the smoke to lead firemen to the locked doors of bed-ridden patients.

Heroic firemen carried other patients, naked or clad in night clothes or underwear, to safety down ladders in the chill early morning hours. Spectators, drawn to the scene by smoke and fire sirens, aided in the rescue work.

Mrs. Shaw had just returned to work at the Belle Vista Sanitarium in the exclusive Chestnut Hill section when the flames broke out.

BEARSKINS PATIENTS

Immediately, Mrs. Shaw went to help her patients.

"There was no way and no time to get at the ward records, so we could first rescue the most feeble," she said. "I just called on my memory. As each patient was led or carried to safety, I called her by name and assured her that everything was all right."

The blaze, confined to the basement, was discovered at 10:45 last night.

Most of the patients took the emergency calmly once they noticed the presence of the assuring attendants. Others, however, screamed and fought with their rescuers, flailing their arms violently.

One woman patient choked a fireman as he carried her from the L-shaped two-story stone building.

CHAINED TO SLABS

Fireman Walter Rohrbach of Flourtown said he rescued 12 women, carrying them down ladders 1 at a time.

The patients in the violent ward were chained to the concrete slabs on which they sleep shortly after the evening meal, about 5 hours before the fire broke out.

Straps encircling one arm and one leg of each patient were linked by chains to hooks embedded in the concrete, fireman said.

Other mental patients, not considered violent, were restrained to their beds by simple leather straps in the other wards of the institution. Senile and nervous cases were not restrained.

Opportunity and Justice for All America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Opportunity and Justice for All America," by Harold Cross, published in the Hammond (Ind.) Times, on Monday, March 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR CAPEHART'S CREED: OPPORTUNITY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL AMERICA

(By Harold Cross)

(Pt. II)

INDIANAPOLIS.—The name of Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART flashed around the world when he revealed that Japan had slipped a peace feeler to the United States through Russia. Our officials, who had become habitually secretive about matters of concern to the country, denied the Capehart assertion. But Indiana's then-junior Senator stuck to his guns and eventually his claim was confirmed.

Legislatively, Senator CAPEHART felt his way for the first 2 years, gaining experience and the appreciation of his colleagues as he went along.

In the 1946 campaign in Indiana Senator CAPEHART teamed with the Bill Jenners and the Ralph Gateses and the Tom Bathe and the Charley Halleckx and the Hobart Creightons and other big guns in the Republican ranks to swing a rousing Republican victory.

When he returned to the Senate for the Eightieth Congress, Senator CAPEHART was properly equipped to become Indiana's senior Senator. He lost no time in introducing a bill to clarify the portal-to-portal pay problem which was sweeping the country. It was at this same time, too, that labor-management developments in the Nation indicated corrective legislative measures were needed. Senator CAPEHART, whose practical experience as both a worker and employer served him well in his course of action, criticized the Wagner Act, but at the same time criticized the original Taft-Hartley Act, contending it should be amended in several respects.

His completely harmonious labor relations as an employer gave Senator CAPEHART access to sources within the ranks of organized labor which made possible constant discussions with those sources on the problems which arose on labor questions.

He also moved into important positions on the major Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Banking and Currency Committees.

Consistency is a jewel in anything, particularly politics, so Mr. CAPEHART can claim that jewel. In 1944, Mr. CAPEHART stressed in his campaign the dangers of foreign isms creeping into our Government through disloyal officials. Six years later the Alger Hiss conviction confirmed that danger.

Mr. CAPEHART also campaigned on a platform of economy in Government and a balanced peacetime budget. Six years later he finds need for the same platform.

The Eightieth Congress also formed a Small Business Committee and Senator CAPEHART became a member and was made chairman of the subcommittee of the Small Business Committee which had charge of

investigating the newsprint shortage. It was through his deft handling of this critical situation that the problem was solved without Government interference.

While many administration Senators clamored for GOVERNMENT control of newsprint, Senator CAPEHART calmly called a conference of publishers from throughout the country and a voluntary system of distribution of newsprint was adopted. Today, as a result of Senator CAPEHART's judgment, the press of America remains free from Government control.

FIGHTS FOR AMERICAN PRINCIPLES

When the Marshall plan was brought to the fore in the Eightieth Congress it came face to face with a man from Indiana who insisted American principles be applied to aid for Europe. As a member of an investigating Senate committee which had toured the war-torn nations of Europe near the end of World War II, Senator CAPEHART was familiar with the European problem. But he also was familiar with what American principles could do toward restoring prewar conditions there.

He opposed the system designed for the Marshall plan, but not before offering a substitute plan which won great support in the Senate although it was not adopted. Today there are many who originally supported the existing Marshall plan who openly admit Senator CAPEHART's plan would have succeeded in the restoration of Europe in less time and at far less expense to the American taxpayer.

When inflation loomed its ugly head in December of 1947 and President Truman first urged restoration of rationing and controls, Senator CAPEHART again stepped to the front with a 14-point plan for increasing production as a means of combating inflation. Again he was right. For it was greater production that finally defeated inflation.

In 1948 when the Republican Eightieth Congress worked toward a long-range farm program, the Indiana Senator who had grown up on a farm and who today actively operates one of Hoosierland's finest farms knew the course to take.

FLEXIBLE PRICE SUPPORT

He supported the flexible price-support plan for long-range use because in his farming experience he had learned the ups and downs of farming and felt qualified to work out the solution to them. Senator CAPEHART contends today that had the Hope-Aiken flexible price-support program been given a chance to operate it would have prevented the growing inequities that today threaten chaos in the farm program.

While we are on the subject of farming it is quite appropriate to mention something more about Senator CAPEHART's farm. It stretches for 1,800 acres over his beloved Daviess County just a few miles from Washington, Ind.

Consisting of some of the finest farmland in the State, the Capehart farm borders along the west fork of the White River. It is a farm efficiently operated with the actual supervision and as much of the actual work as possible being performed by the senior Senator himself.

The Capehart farm is not many miles from the Capehart birthplace and the Hoosier Senator expects to close his life on the farm he owns not far from the farm on which his life began so ruggedly.

His wife, Irma, who was a school teacher in Wisconsin before she became Mrs. Capehart, wife of a struggling sales manager, shares the Senator's love for his Indiana farm. So do his two sons and daughter.

Earl Capehart, the eldest son whose full names makes him a junior when the Senator is added, is a practicing attorney in Indianapolis. He won his degree from Harvard law school.

Tom, a graduate engineer from Purdue University, is now the president of his father's Packard Manufacturing Corp. in Indianapolis and carrying the full load of responsibility for continuing the success of the Capehart business reputation.

Both boys are also sharing their time and efforts toward making the Capehart farm tick.

The daughter, Patricia, youngest of the three children, is in her junior year at the University of Maryland. She is a pretty, dark-haired and vivacious girl who exemplified her illustrious father last summer when she took a job as waitress in a Maine resort to earn her own vacation the hard way.

WILL TOUR THE STATE

Well, that is the background of the man who will again be going up and down the State soon shaking another 100,000 hands and an upturned grin wrapped around a big cigar.

He'll be preaching Americanism at every turn just as he did last December when he toured the State for seven public debates with Representative ANDREW JACOBS, of Indianapolis, on the subject of British socialism.

The big and dynamic Senator has had a creed these many years and it pretty well sums up the American way of life that HOMER CAPEHART believes in so thoroughly and at the same time forms a short and effective biography of the man himself.

It goes like this:

"I want to retain that form of government under which the farm boy of today can become the farm owner of tomorrow; under which the worker of today can become the successful businessman of tomorrow; under which the poor immigrant of today can become the prominent citizen of tomorrow."

Russia's Portrait of Us Must Not Hang Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Russia's Portrait of Us Must Not Hang Alone," published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of March 30. The editorial relates to the joint resolution introduced a few days ago by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], which was jointly sponsored by himself and 10 other Senators, of whom I am proud to be one.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA'S PORTRAIT OF US MUST NOT HANG ALONE

In too many countries around the world too many people look upon the United States as a power-mad, money-mad, selfish, imperialistic ogre. Those same people, in most cases, have been sold and believe the vision of slave-state Russia as a worker's paradise. The cause, in both cases, is Russia's skillful, highly effective propaganda, open and disguised, promoted not only by the Kremlin but by its satellites and by converted native agents everywhere.

The United States has an obvious interest of the first importance in combating this Russian distortion of truth and in giving other peoples of the world a true mirror of itself. But on this battle for the minds and the possible allegiance of other peoples it now is spending the trifling sum of $34,000,000 a year—far less even than the British, much less the Russians.

Senator WILLIAM T. BENTON, properly alarmed by this situation, has with 10 other Senators introduced a resolution calling for affirmative action to right it. More money is necessary but incidental; the program is the thing. Senator BENTON, who helped to develop our present foreign information program, with its Voice of America broadcasts and its libraries and cultural missions abroad, wants greater American action on every propaganda front: radio stations capable of reaching every listener in the world, a renewed and more aggressive campaign in the United Nations for freedom of information, support of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, promotion of democratic education, a conference of non-Communist countries on information programs.

There are other activities that might be included, too, such as the export of more American teachers and students to friendly nations, more American libraries and well-chosen documentary films (with some sensible discouragement by Hollywood itself of those of its cheap distortions so helpful in promoting Soviet caricatures of us). But Senator BENTON is on the right track, and we hope that he will succeed in getting congressional action. A true picture of the United States can win us friends and influence the world, but if we do little to put it before the world we can hardly be surprised if Russia's venomous portrait of us, hanging alone, is accepted as the one and only.

The Kerr Natural-Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, Thomas L. Stokes is a distinguished American journalist. He is a winner of the Pulitzer prize and the Raymond Clapper memorial award, and has received other marks of distinction. I believe his views concerning the Kerr natural-gas bill recently passed by the Senate will be of interest.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by him entitled "On 'Special Interests'," published in today's Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON "SPECIAL INTERESTS"—FAILURE TO VETO KERR NATURAL-GAS BILL MAY EMBARRASS TRUMAN ON COMPROMISE

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

President Truman may find himself embarrassed in attacking the "special interests" in his projected cross-country "whistlestop" tour to begin early in May unless meanwhile he vetoes the Harris-Kerr-Thomas bill that frees independent natural-gas producers

from regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

It would cost the 40,000,000 natural-gas consumers millions of dollars annually.

The measure, which soon will be placed on his desk for decision, was sponsored by Democrats and put over in the Senate this week, as in the House last session, by Democratic votes in a Democratic Congress. A bill of similar purpose, though broader in scope, could not even get through that Eightieth Republican Congress which the President denounced in 1948 as the worst in history.

OIL COMPANIES TO BENEFIT

This was, indeed, a "special interest" coup. The result in the Senate is disturbing evidence of the weight now exerted by big oil in the Democratic Party. Big oil was behind the bill which will benefit handsomely a handful of the Nation's major oil companies. They own the bulk of natural-gas reserves in the Southwest and will enjoy virtually a monopoly status if it becomes law. Credit for the victory goes to Senator Bob KERR, of Oklahoma, former Governor of his State, who is, himself, a big oil and gas man, and has emerged as a powerful figure in Democratic politics. This victory may prove costly to his party.

On his way across the country the President will travel through States where consumers are vitally affected by this measure. A number of Republican Senators from that area, reflecting this consumer concern, fought bitterly against it and voted against it, so that it will become a lively political issue. Republicans supplied the majority of votes against the bill in the Senate, 22, with 16 Democrats voting with them. Twenty-eight Democrats voted for it, along with 16 Republicans.

At the western terminus of his tour the President is to dedicate a great public power project, Grand Coulee Dam in Washington State. There, it is presumed, he will say something, as he has in that area before, about the administration's policy of regulating utilities in the public interest. Natural gas is freed from regulation at the source under the Harris-Kerr-Thomas bill, so that the consumer cannot be protected properly by other regulation along the line in pipeline transmission and sale at the other end. Incidentally, it was while on a visit to Grand Coulee in his transcontinental tour in June of 1948 that the President made his crack about the Eightieth Republican Congress being "the worst in history."

The Democratic Party's leadership in Congress plainly defaulted on this issue, though a minority of individual Democrats in the ranks fought it. President Truman, who openly opposed it in the last session of Congress, was represented about the lobbies of the Senate during its consideration as now accepting it, though this was denied by aides at Key West. At the same time, Democratic National Chairman William Boyle, Jr., belatedly was reported as bestirring himself against it. Pressure from consumer and labor groups got very hot.

LEAD ASSUMED BY DOUGLAS

Senator LUCAS, Democrat, Illinois, the administration's Senate leader, walked out completely on the fight. Shortly after the Senate took up the bill he went back home to campaign for reelection, was absent during the debate, and did not even return for the final vote. Nor was it announced how he would have voted, had he been here, which is customary practice.

Leadership in the fight against the bill on behalf of the Democratic minority opposed to it was assumed by Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinois, who had thoroughly informed himself on the vital issues involved affecting the public interest. So effective was his direction of the battle, with the able help of a number of Republicans and a few other Democrats, that the reported overwhelming majority claimed for it at the outset was whittled down to a very thin majority ultimately.

The Democratic Party hasn't heard the last of this.

Appropriation for Veterans' Administration

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am reliably informed that General Gray will ask for more money so that some of the personnel of the Veterans' Administration hospitals will not be discharged. Apparently the Veterans' Administration realizes it made a mistake in not asking for more money than it did.

Dr. George S. Stevenson said that in reducing the personnel by 4,700 in the Veterans' Administration would result in special abuse not only to the patients but to the nervous and mentally disabled.

I am extremely glad that General Gray, as I am reliably told, will ask for more money and I hope that a mistake of that kind will not be made again.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks an article appearing in this morning's Washington Post by N. S. Haseltine:

HOSPITAL CUT FOUGHT BY PSYCHIATRIC BODY

(By N. S. Haseltine)

Preliminary success in relieving hemophilia, the inherited bleeding disease, with a relatively new plant food drug was reported here yesterday.

The new use of the drug, rutin, was reported at the fifteenth annual Chemurgic Council, at the Statler Hotel, by Dr. James F. Couch, of Philadelphia, an analytical chemist with the United States Department of Agriculture.

Rutin, which can be extracted from buckwheat, is already used widely by older persons to fortify themselves against "capillary fragility," or the tendency of the tiny bloodways to break down. The condition is frequently found in patients suffering from diabetes or high blood pressure.

OTHER ADVANCES REPORTED

Other chemurgists, the scientists who seek new uses for agricultural crops, told of developing a tough, varnish-like furniture coating from potato starches; of fattening livestock from the waste products of distilleries, and of making the hen a better egg factory.

Dr. Couch said that the first inkling that rutin might prove effective against hemophilia came in 1946 with a request for some of the drug from a California physician. Dr. Couch's laboratory, where the drug possibilities were being investigated, filled the order with the notation that there was no reason to believe it would do good, he said yesterday.

SIXTEEN CHILDREN HELPED

The patient, a prominent California businessman, was relieved of much of his suffering, Dr. Couch said. Since then, he added, some 16 hemophiliac children have been given rutin therapy, daily oral doses of the nontoxic drug. These children, he said, have received varying degrees of relief.

He emphasized that the drug, which he termed "really a food," does not cure the condition but relieves many of pain and apparently staves off many of the irregular sieges of suffering in hemophilia. Victims suffer severe hemorrhages, often from the slightest injury.

COATING RESISTS SCRATCHES

Dr. Frank L. Teuton of this city, a member of Agriculture Department's bureau of chemistry, told of the development of "allyl starch," a coating material that has proved highly resistant to heat, scratching, and "glass rings," the markings on furniture from beverage glasses.

The coating, which is painted on like varnish, can be made from many starch and sugar materials, such as potatoes, corn, and sugar.

Dr. Philip J. Schaible, of Cincinnati, Ohio, executive director of the Distillers Feed Research Council, told of the livestock food use of whisky-mash residue.

When the grain is processed only the starches are removed, he explained.

SUPERIOR CATTLE FEED

The rest, enriched in the distilling processes, with yeast, becomes a feed superior to the original grain, he said. Used in combination with natural grain and roughage for livestock and poultry feeds, the distiller feeds produce heavier animals in quicker time, he said.

Dr. H. J. Prebluda, of New York, a nutritionist with the United States Industrial Chemicals, Inc., traced the productivity of the hen back from horse-and-buggy days. Today's model, he pointed out, lays about twice as many eggs for each pound of feed as the 1900 hen.

Much of the increase, he said, can be attributed to the scientifically developed new feeds which provide concentrated egg-building substances.

The 3-day meeting is scheduled to end at a banquet tonight, with Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, the principal speaker.

The Veterans' Administration was warned yesterday that its plan to wipe out about 4,700 medical jobs by April 19 would seriously hamper the care and treatment of veterans, particularly nervous and mental cases.

The complaints were made by the American Psychiatric Association and the American Legion.

Legion Commander George N. Craig sent President Truman a telegram of protest and asked him to take emergency measures to keep the medical staff at its present strength until the full needs of the Veterans' Administration are determined and a more orderly process of adjustment effected.

APA president, Dr. George S. Stevenson, of New York, said reports from VA hospitals and clinics in the past 2 weeks made it all too clear that the VA's fifty-thousand-odd psychiatric veteran patients would be the ones to suffer from the lowering of standards and services necessitated by the personnel cut.

He cited specific hospitals where treatment of mental patients would have to be curtailed, and said a reduction in training programs for nurses and aides made it inevitable that incidents of abuse of nervous and mentally disabled patients will increase.

"Moreover, it will be necessary to increase the use of physical and chemical restraints for violent cases, since lack of supervisory personnel makes it impossible to do otherwise," he said.

Dr. Stevenson expressed hope that a widespread public protest would cause Congress to provide more money for the VA and put a last-minute stop to the proposed cut-back.

VA Administrator Paul B. Gray, Jr., has announced that he will lop off 7,800 VA jobs by April 10. VA officials said about 4,700 of

these would be in the medical program, but not all would be doctors and nurses.

They said the cut was necessary because the agency found it was going to be in the red about $83,000,000 on April 1 largely because Congress voted pay raises last year but didn't provide extra money to pay them.

A VA spokesman said it would be impossible to tell until the job has went through what the effect would be. He pointed out that the reduction will be in jobs, not actual employees. And he noted that some hospitals had not hired all the staff they were entitled to so in some cases there might be no firings at all.

The following is a letter sent to me by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and an article by Mr. Beveridge of the Washington Evening Star:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1950.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: So that the Members may have the information before them to answer letters that may be received from veterans about the recent hospital situation, I wish to call to your attention the fact that, when the Veterans' Administration appropriation was up, the Appropriations Committee and the Congress allowed and approved the full amount asked for hospitals.

This statement was made in the report:

"The reductions in this item arise principally from reduced needs in all programs other than medical and hospital care which are provided for in full as proposed in the estimates. The total cost of the medical program is $566,666,400. The committee has not reduced this sum by 1 penny and directs the Administrator not to reduce it."

General Gray has been before both the House and the Senate Committee twice since this bill was considered, once in the last session and once early in this session. No mention was made of the fact that they were short of money or that they would be obliged to discharge employees connected with and needed in hospitals.

Under all the circumstances I fail to see how it is possible that the Congress is responsible for the cut in employees of the veterans' hospitals.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN TABER.

DOCTORS SAY VA PLANS BIG CUT IN MENTAL CENTERS—PSYCHIATRISTS CHARGE 1,200 WILL BE FIRED, BEDS CUT BY 1,400

(By George Beveridge)

The Veterans' Administration plans to fire about 1,200 medical staff workers and do away with at least 1,400 beds in neuropsychiatric treatment centers as a result of its sudden personnel cut-back, the American Psychiatric Association charged today.

In some hospitals, veterans will be cut off from treatment, the APA declared, and programs of treatment in others will be drastically curtailed.

VA has announced it will lop off about 7,800 jobs on April 10. The association gave the first detailed public disclosure of its effect.

The Star 2 days ago revealed that more than 4,800 workers would be lost in the vast medical service alone, reporting that the cuts have dealt a terrific blow to medical backs supporting the program.

LOTS PERSONNEL AFFECTED

In its lengthy statement the APA said the firings involve 3,000 medical staff workers, about 1,200 of them being doctors, dentists, psychologists, nurses, social workers and aides in VA psychiatric hospitals and clinics.

Hundreds in service, APA declared, at some hospitals involve shock treatment, hydrotherapy, and vocational training programs.

"It is inevitable," it added, "that incidents of abuse of nervous and mentally disabled patients will increase. Moreover, it will be necessary to increase the use of physical and chemical restraints for violent cases, since lack of supervisory personnel makes it impossible to do otherwise."

The group's statement was based on official reports received from hospitals, estimating effects. VA officials here are studying the reports, it was learned, and may make some adjustments among various hospitals during the next several days.

LOOKS TO PUBLIC PROTEST

Dr. George S. Stevenson, APA president, said he hopes a "widespread public protest to the Congress would result in a deficiency appropriation for the VA, which would put a last-minute stop to the personnel cut-back."

Several Members of Congress already have taken the floor to protest the firings.

VA officials pointed out, however, that present VA budget estimates for the fiscal year beginning July 1 would not allow for reinstating workers lost in the cut-back. A deficiency appropriation, therefore, would provide the personnel only through June.

VA officials knew last fall they were exceeding personnel authorized by the budget, but firings were not announced until this month.

The APA said 4,000 psychiatric beds are unused because of lack of personnel in some hospitals, many of them in isolated areas, and that in others about 5,000 emergency beds have been crowded into sun porches and recreation rooms.

"Yet 21 VA hospitals report they will have to close nearly 1,400 more beds as a result of the cut—and more would be closed if it were not for local community pressure," it declared. In most of such cases, a VA official said, hospitals probably will close off beds as patients now occupying them leave.

WAITING LIST TO GROW

The APA said cuts would increase waiting lists of patients at mental hygiene clinics from 6,000, at present, to 10,000. The move will force some clinic patients to be treated on a fee basis by private doctors, at a cost increase from $7.50 to $12, it was reported.

The APA said only 25 percent of 470,000 eligible veterans with mental ills have been treated so far. VA medical heads have stressed the importance of the clinic program in the hope that early care would correct ailments before they require costly hospital treatment.

Of the 99,000 patients in VA hospitals, about 53,000 are in mental hospitals. About half the patients have service-connected ailments.

The psychiatric association said cuts at hospitals caring for tubercular psychiatric patients are particularly distressing. A recent survey showed not one of four of such hospitals gave adequate care and the cut can only agitate already serious deficiencies, it added.

SPECIFIC HOSPITALS CITED

To document its statement, the APA included effects on a large number of individual hospitals. Included were those located at:

Augusta, Ga.: "Two hundred and eighty patients to lose treatment; serious reduction in service; nursing service covers dietetics; need two more nurses for insulin therapy."

Canandaigua, N. Y.: "Close to 239 beds; eliminate insulin (shock) program; PMR (physical medicine and rehabilitation) for 200 patients reduced."

Coatesville, Pa.: "Close one hospital building; have stopped admissions; total psych decreased."

Perry Point, Md.: "Patient care will suffer by curtailing programs."

Tuscaloosa, Ala.: "Cannot reduce beds; discontinue two BRAE (rehabilitation) jobs; lessen insulin and electric shock therapy; cut down lobotomies (psychosurgery) due to inadequate nursing."

Bedford, Mass.: "Cannot eliminate 235 emergency beds; no social service on Sunday; hydrotherapy reduced from 16 to 1 hour, 5 days a week; cannot do family care."

A Policy of Life Insurance on Our Nation Can Be Written Only in the Hearts and Minds of the Boys and Girls Who, in the Public Schools of the Land, Are Training for Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, within the next few days the Committee on Education and Labor of the House will make another effort to agree upon a measure to authorize the appropriation of funds for Federal aid to the elementary and secondary schools of this country, to be administered by the school authorities of each State to which this aid is extended.

The promises on this subject made by both political parties have long been in default.

During the week ending March 4, 14,000 educators from all over the Nation meeting in Atlantic City made an intensive study of the public-school problem now confronting the people of this country. This meeting was the Seventy-sixth Annual Convention of the American Association of School Administrators. It is the most influential policy-making group in the public-school field. The theme of the meeting was Education, Dynamic of Democracy.

In all of the discussions the speakers emphasized the importance of creating a sound school system for the protection of the American way of life. They agreed that without good public schools the American tradition of freedom would be endangered. It was also generally agreed that the people of this country have not yet recognized the importance of our free education system.

The president of the association stated that the people of the United States still regard teachers as mass baby sitters. This charge was based upon the starvation diet that our free public schools are compelled to accept.

The United States Commissioner of Education and the classroom teachers in attendance all warned that our schools are in a critical condition. We need more elementary school teachers, more buildings, more equipment, more supplies—more of everything.

It is becoming more and more difficult to obtain sufficient money to meet the increasing demands of our schools. Resistance to increased school budgets is increasing. States, counties, and cities are beginning to say, "We gave you more money last year and the year before. Why do you come back for more?"

To the complaint that the schools are asking for too much money, Tennessee's Dr. Andrew D. Holt, president of the National Education Association, pointed out the unanswerable fact that the schools need more money because enrollment has increased to an unprecedented extent. More children are being born. President Holt predicted that within the next 5 years the enrollment of children in our elementary schools will increase 40 to 50 percent. This means these added millions of children will need more schoolrooms and more school facilities.

The educators estimated that to properly care for and instruct this increased number of our school children will require an additional 350,000 teachers.

In no other way can this tremendous increase in new children be cared for and taught.

This increase in the number of elementary-school children can only be properly housed by the construction of 500,000 new classrooms. The cost of these new school buildings will be in the neighborhood of $13,000,000,000. This cost is staggering unless the people understand the facts creating the necessity for additional school facilities. The vast sum of money necessary is disturbing to public officials and to the taxpayers. The school officials and those interested in an adequate system of education who do not wish to see this oncoming host of future citizens denied adequate training realize that education will have to compete with social security, national defense, the cost of our farm program, and all other Government needs.

The majority of those who considered these questions were convinced that the local and State governments alone could not solve the problem in many parts of the country. It was accordingly proposed that a Federal-aid-to-education bill and a bill to aid school construction are necessary if the need of school construction and additional teachers is met. Practically all of the school superintendents and other officials favored Federal aid.

There is nothing new about Federal aid to education. Land-grant colleges and other colleges throughout the country have for years received Federal aid. The principle of Federal aid is now taken for granted, and if our schools are to continue to afford the adequate and necessary education to the children of our people, the passage of a Federal-aid-to-education law by Congress is inevitable. Despite the reverses that have been suffered by Federal-aid-to-education bills now pending in Congress, it is by no means certain that Federal aid to education has been killed as some of its enemies are hoping and are proclaiming in the columns of the papers they control and in their editorial columns. Many friends of the school children of this country expect such legislation to be enacted before this session of Congress ends.

On the question of whether or not Federal aid should be confined to the free public schools of this Nation, a resolution adopted recited that the grant of public funds should be confined to free public schools. Only two of the 7,000 delegates who voted on this proposition voted in favor of the minority report. In this connection, one of the most encouraging developments in public education today is the growth of citizen school groups in all parts of the country. Parent-teacher associations, working hand in hand with the teachers and with the pupils themselves, will insure an adequate number of teachers thoroughly trained for the duties of their high calling at salaries which will attract and hold them in the teaching profession. The free school is the institution that will preserve us as a free people.

THE NEEDS OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS EXPAND AS OUR SCHOOL POPULATION INCREASES

Within the years 1949 to 1952, inclusive, more than 13,000,000 children of this country will enter the first grade and the greater number of them will graduate from our elementary schools. Within that same period more than six million will enter and millions of them will graduate from the high schools of this country.

Dr. Andrew D. Holt, executive secretary of the Tennessee Education Association, stated in a public address in Knoxville, Tenn., on Friday, March 24 of this year, that the birth rate in Tennessee is steadily increasing. In 1945 births numbered 66,620. In 1946 this number increased to 79,098. In 1947 it increased to 88,193. It is certain that Tennessee will have an enormous increase in school enrollments during the period from 1951 to 1953.

In our State, school attendance has increased 60,143 in the past 3 years.

If there is to be 1 teacher for each 30 pupils, the State will require an additional 2,000 teachers. Due to the lack of funds the school system in Tennessee has been enabled to add only 750 teachers. This shortage of teachers is responsible for the overcrowded classrooms in many localities.

The large Federal projects at Oak Ridge, Tullahoma, Memphis, and in other sections of the State will inevitably further increase our school population.

These increases in school population necessitate larger teaching forces and expanded facilities.

The vast majority of these young people will receive no other schooling than what they receive in the elementary and high schools. It is, therefore, of supreme importance that the teachers in these schools be loyal, competent Americans, able and fully equipped to instill in the minds and hearts of these future American citizens the inspiring truths of our great history and the opportunities this land affords to these boys and girls. The future of this country will be in the hands of these young Americans. They are America to the extent of their ability to influence its destiny for weal or for woe.

THE EDUCATION OF THIS NATION'S BOYS AND GIRLS IS OF TRANSCENDENT IMPORTANCE

Adequate salaries for their teachers should not be denied by penny-pinching.

The Federal funds made available by this program are paid by the people of the States. The beneficiaries are citizens of our common country.

The Federal Government is levying and collecting heavy taxes on the incomes and business of our people. The Federal tax collector takes his toll out of the clothes, the food, and the shelter of all our people.

The pennies and nickels of the school children do not escape the grasping hands of the Federal tax collector. When the boys and girls of our grade and high schools stage a school entertainment, a game of baseball, basketball, or football, the United States tax collector is there to take a heavy share of the admissions to such entertainments and games.

I have introduced a bill to repeal this unjust tax and have urged the Committee on Ways and Means to report this measure to the House for a vote.

Abraham Lincoln furnished us our best definition of a nation. He said:

> A nation may be said to consist of its people, its territory, and its laws.

Our country is endowed with varied and boundless natural resources, majestic and enchanting scenery. It is teeming with homes, schools and an industrial system that is the envy and admiration of the world.

Our Government, in the words of Lincoln, was "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Under this Government, "so conceived and so founded," the American people have enjoyed greater liberty and wider opportunities than have blessed any other people in all the 5,000 years of recorded history.

Under our system of free enterprise, private ownership of property, individual initiative, the right to earn, own, and enjoy the fruits of our labor, the American people are better housed, better fed and better clothed and have more of the good things of life than any other people on earth.

Can we keep this Republic and all that it means to our children and our children's children?

We live in a hostile and dangerous world.

There is no company on earth that can write a policy of insurance on the life of our Nation. There is but one institution where such a policy of insurance can be written and that is our system of free public schools.

Such a policy can be written only in the hearts and lives of the boys and girls who are training for citizenship in the public schools of the land.

Money invested in the education of our children will bear compound interest forever. The education of our children is a policy of insurance on the life of our country.

We spend billions that our youth may fight, and if need be die, all over the world. Why not spend $300,000,000 to teach them to live here at home?

The home is the unit of society. Man's greatest possession is his child. To rear, educate, and equip their children for the duties of life is the high calling of parents.

When the accounts of fathers and mothers are finally made up the greatest credit that will be given them will be the watchful care, the sacrifice, and devotion they have lavished on their children.

The most that the average parents can give their children is an education. When the two political parties promited the fathers and mothers to give their children better schools, they appealed to the finest qualities of their minds and hearts. The leaders of no political party have the right to trifle with a parent's love for his or her child.

Next in character-forming influence in the lives of our children are the school teachers.

Someone is said to have asked Demosthenes why he made speeches instead of writing books. The great Grecian orator replied, "I would rather write upon the hearts of the living than upon the hides of dead sheep."

If anyone on this earth writes upon the hearts of the living, it is the school teacher. Standing within the schoolroom, where wells the fountain of perpetual youth, dealing with the plastic, impressionable, unfolding minds of boys and girls, the teacher weaves into the warp and woof of his pupils' lives the very fiber of their thoughts and being. There is no more powerful, no higher calling on this earth than that of the teacher, save perhaps the Christian ministry.

We must give school teaching the dignity, the security, the income its importance deserves, and thus assure our boys and girls teachers of the highest ability and character.

The millions of young Americans now in our public schools, and who will pass through them within the next 4 years, have the fate of America in their hands.

For 5 years as a teacher in the public schools of my home county, Campbell, in Tennessee, in my 2 years as county superintendent of public instruction and in my years of service on county and city school boards, and down to this good day, I have seen young America on the march. In the hands of this precious host, in their enthusiasm, their optimism, their boundless energy, and dauntless courage is the unfolding future of this Nation. They will meet our enemies in the gates. They will build, protect, and defend this Nation. The men and women who teach them are the staff sergeants, the commissioned officers who are training the youth in whose hands is the future of this Nation. They are the seed corn of the Nation. There is nothing too good for them. We must not fail them, nor break faith with them.

Remember that in dealing with the parents, the teachers of these boys and girls, you are dealing with men and women of character and intelligence. Shadow-boxing, shifty-shallying, breaking faith with them will be known from ocean shore to ocean shore.

Let us redeem the promises made to fathers and mothers, the teachers of these boys and girls, and to the boys and girls.

I join with the friends of the public schools of this country in the hope that this Congress will enact into law an adequate Federal-aid-to-education measure.

Truman Seen as Using Hoover for Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gould Lincoln, from the Washington Evening Star of March 28, 1950:

THE POLITICAL MILL—TRUMAN SEEM AS USING HOOVER FOR POLITICS—GRAVE CONCERN EXPRESSED OVER CASE OF LABOR BOARD

(By Gould Lincoln)

The attitude of President Truman and his advisers is giving supporters of the report of the Hoover Commission, dealing with the reorganization of the Federal Government, grave concern. Instead of following the recommendations of this bipartisan and nonpartisan commission, Mr. Truman is seeking to use the report as a vehicle to put across political tricks.

A case in point is his proposal to do away with the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board and to transfer to the Chairman of the Board the functions of prosecutor. This is a palpable attempt to get by indirection what the President has tried to get from Congress—his own Democratic Congress—without success. That is the repeal or nullification of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act.

Under that act, Congress sought to separate the prosecuting function from the judicial, leaving the Board to exercise the judicial function as it properly should, and placing the prosecuting function in the hands of the general counsel. What Mr. Truman is now trying to do is to make the Board, and particularly its Chairman, both prosecutor and judge. That is going back to the old days of the Wagner Labor Relations Act—when the Board did the prosecuting; the judging, too. The result was a completely one-sided operation, since the Board was stacked with 100-percent supporters of organized labor.

DENHAM TARGET OF SPITE

The Hoover Commission, of course, never made any such proposal as that now submitted by Mr. Truman. The President has undertaken, however, through the authority vested in him by Congress last year to submit Government reorganization plans to insert this proposal. He has done it because organized labor hates Robert N. Denham, the present general counsel, and the members of the Board itself dislike Mr. Denham almost as much.

Whether Mr. Truman can get away with it is another question. Senator TAFT of Ohio has filed a resolution disapproving this particular reorganization plan—No. 12 in a list of 21 recently submitted by the President. Under the reorganization law, a recommendation by the President can be blocked and prevented by the action of one House of Congress. A House committee has approved the plan to do away with the general counsel—by a party vote. The Senate Committee on Expenditures, headed by Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, Democrat, plans hearings on the TAFT resolution to turn down the proposal. Provision is made in the law that reorganization recommendations, which are challenged in either House, must be voted upon. There is no way that a filibuster by administration supporters could delay a vote until enough time has elapsed to make these recommendations effective. Since the Senate has been entirely unwilling to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, the President's recommendation to do away with the general counsel will have a tough time.

MARITIME CHANGE PROPOSED

Mr. Truman stepped beyond the Hoover Commission report, too, when he proposed to abolish the Maritime Commission and set up a Maritime Board in the Commerce Department. What the Hoover Commission recommended was that that business operations of the Maritime Commission—like the charter of ships—be placed in the Commerce Department, but that the Maritime Commission retain its authority over rates, subsidies, and conditions of service.

Nearly all the rest of the President's reorganization recommendations are in line with the Hoover Commission report. However, Mr. Truman has not tackled yet the main money-saving proposals of the Hoover Commission, and there seems little prospect he will, certainly before the elections. These, for example, are the proposals to place the civil functions of the Army engineers under the Interior Department, along with the Reclamation Service, and to have the Agriculture Department take over certain functions relating to land now operated by the Interior Department.

There is a great mass of public opinion back of the Hoover Commission's recommendations, due to a desire for more efficient and more economical Government. It may be defeated, however, by exigencies of partisan politics, aided and abetted by the so-called vested interests, the interests of incumbent job holders.

President Truman's Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1950.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I attach hereto a statement issued by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor last month in regard to point 4, which is carried in section 3 of H. R. 7797 now under consideration by the House of Representatives.

The American Federation of Labor strongly urges the adoption of President Truman's point 4 program and reiterates the stand taken in the statement by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor above referred to.

Will you kindly read this letter and the attached statement into the RECORD at the proper time when point 4 is under consideration?

Very truly yours,

WM. GREEN,
President.

STATEMENT BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

After giving careful consideration to the report of Assistant Secretary of State Willard Thorpe on point 4, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor declares:

1. We reaffirm our support of the guiding lines and policies elaborated in the comprehensive resolution adopted by our sixty-eighth convention held at St. Paul in October 1949 dealing with President Truman's point 4 program.

2. In view of the disaster which has befallen the geat Chinese people through the overrunning of their country by the Russian-directed military forces and fifth column operating under the orders of the Cominform, the executive council underscores the great urgency of speeding up the application of point 4 policies in the non-Communist areas and countries of Asia.

3. In line with our convention declaration, we urge our Government to aid the Republic of India in overcoming its immediate food difficulties, in developing public education and in the improvement of her public health. We also urge American initiative in the World Bank for a loan to speed the development of an agricultural extension service in India. Vigorous and generous application of point 4 in Formosa, where encouraging economic achievements have already been obtained through the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction, will not only further improve the economic and social conditions on this very important island of resistance to Communist totalitarianism in China. It will also dramatize to the people of occupied China and to freedom-loving people everywhere that America has not turned its back on the struggle for liberty and national independence in this vast Asiatic country with which our Nation has always had the friendliest relations.

4. We cannot reaffirm too strongly our convention resolution which emphasizes that labor must have adequate representation in the formulation and application of specific plans and policies and that technical aid to underdeveloped areas in Asia and elsewhere should include provisions for the transmission of bona fide trade-union, cooperative, and farmers' know-how which will enable the workers and peasants of Asia to build effective democratic unions and self-help organizations. This will permit the toiling folks of Asia not only to secure their material betterment but also to enhance their appreciation of their dignity as human beings on a basis of equality with all other races and peoples of other continents. American aid to such moral and spiritual enhancement will far outweigh in importance and lasting value the generous dollar aid we have been providing for the conquest of poverty and tyranny and for overcoming the threat of war.

5. The successes attained to date, through the ERP, raising the levels of production in the countries aided, only underline the necessity of preparing now for the time when the Marshall plan as such will end. It is clear that in the interest of developing a sound and balanced economy in the free part of the world, the democratic nations must lose no time in combining the various measures taken under ERP and point 4. There can be no effective integration of the economy of democratic Europe unless its economic life becomes more closely related with that of Africa, the Western Hemisphere, and the democratic countries and areas of Asia. More and more western Europe should be able to find markets for its manufactured products in the underdeveloped countries. Given this common outlet, the various European national economies, which are competitive in many respects, would tend to integrate more easily. In return, these underdeveloped areas could provide western Europe with the raw materials which it needs for its manufacturing industries. By following such a policy, we would be able to eliminate any attempts to expand business relations with Russian-dominated areas and thus to prevent the feeling of appeasement generated by business-as-usual tactics. This business-as-usual attitude might prove catastrophic to the democratic cause in the event of German heavy industry producing for the Chinese market. The present Russian "baby" blockade of Berlin and the Communists' accelerated national unity campaign in Germany are no doubt part of the Kremlin's over-all strategy for wearing out and drawing Germany into Moscow's military-economic orbit. Thereby, Russia hopes to conquer Europe and Asia.

6. The urgency of gradually combining the basic features of ERP and point 4 is made all the more imperative by the fact that the increased productive capacities of Europe and America are operating in a much-reduced trade area. Totalitarian communism has torn out of the world market nearly half of the population and about one-quarter of the area of the entire globe. Because Russia and its satellites in Europe and Asia have militarized their economies and are gearing themselves solely for aggressive warfare, very little trade in the normal and peaceful sense of the word is possible for them.

7. In view of this critical situation, all efforts and energies of the democratic world should be bent toward raising the productive capacities of the free peoples and toward increasing the possibilities for mass consumption by improving their purchasing power and living standards. There is no other way of counteracting the effects of Russia's disruption of the world market. There is no better way of demonstrating the moral and material superiority, and assuring the triumph of the democratic over the totalitarian Communist world than by our creating and expanding these conditions of life and labor which will enable many additional millions of people to attain more liberty, greater material well-being, and spiritual happiness.

Easterners Have a Lot To Learn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Easterners Have a Lot To Learn," published in a recent issue of the Bedford Times-Mail, of Bedford, Ind

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EASTERNERS HAVE A LOT TO LEARN

Two things in the past few weeks have roused our anger. We took a West Indies cruise in February. Most of the people were from the eastern seaboard; all of those with whom we talked had been to Europe a few times and were taking their second or third cruise—but not one of these people had ever been west of Harrisburg, Pa.

Finally, we blew up at a couple who lived in Philadelphia, and said, "You ought to be ashamed of yourselves, Europe three times, Caribbean twice, but not a minute for Indiana, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Montana, or Arizona. There are some wonderful things to see out there—and what's more, they are yours, they are American, and they are worth seeing." They didn't talk to us after that.

This was a background for supreme anger at an article in Time magazine this week which listed eight Senators as being the most expendable. In the group was BILL JENNER, of Indiana. All eight had the same fault, according to Time, they were isolationists. They put the interests of their own country ahead of the interests of a lot of countries which are jealous of our prosperity, and want to tear us down to their level.

Senators JENNER and MCCARRAN were attacked for their opposition to the present bill to admit more displaced persons. In private conversation JENNER said, "Here we have 4,500,000 unemployed in the United States. There are 600,000 youngsters coming out of colleges and high schools every year, and most of them won't find jobs this year. Why should we bring in a lot of black marketeers, hoodlums, Communists, and yeggs from Europe? I don't see it." Neither do we.

Time and the folks we met on the cruise are typical of too much thinking from New England through Virginia. They look eastward across the Atlantic, not westward across America.

If the folks from Philadelphia would have listened we would like to have told them something like this:

Get in your car, drive out through Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa. Sure, the land is flat and not spectacular, but it is pushing up corn to feed people and animals all over the world. You sense the power of production, the joy of fertility, the thrill of growth. You feel America.

Then drive through northern Wisconsin and Michigan, with their thousands of wooded lakes full of fish, where a man can commune with nature and all the religious ecstasy that goes with the great outdoors.

Stop at Minneapolis, the most beautiful city in the world, and that counts Paris, too. Look at the lakes, feel the civic enthusiasm which has built a great industrial and retail center.

Go to Duluth, stop your car on the bridge just south of the city, survey the landscape, look at the great iron boats opening their mouths to the endless stream of ore cars from Mesabi, and appreciate the strength and greatness of steel, the sinews of America, your country. It's thrilling.

Drive through North and South Dakota, look at the flat country growing wheat that has put white bread on every table in America, and still had enough left over for any part of the world that will work hard enough to produce something to exchange for white bread.

Go to Montana; it's still sort of a frontier, where the men wear cowboy boots, use silver dollars, and play pinguimy in cigar store windows. Have breakfast on the balcony of Many Glaciers Hotel, in Glacier National Park. Nowhere, not even in Switzerland, is there a more majestic view, water, mountains, sunshine—America.

Drive along the Columbia River highway. For breath-taking vistas it has no equal.

Stop at Salt Lake City. Think about its history. A century ago, when Brigham Young came into the valley, there was one lone tree. He said, "Water will flow in the streets of the city we will build for our God." Today Salt Lake City is the cleanest of all American cities. Water flows down Temple Street.

Go to Los Angeles. Sure, it's gaudy, flamboyant, and overpriced—but only 50 years ago it was a desert. Today it is a wonderful collection of homes, boulevards, and industry—a tribute to American adventure,

willingness to take risks, to build, to overcome obstacles.

We could go on like this indefinitely. It all adds up to one thing—there is a lot to see in America, it's the most wonderful country in the world. It doesn't owe a thing to the Old World.

Our forefathers who came here were not the rich and well-born. They were the poor and downtrodden. The rich stayed home and got poor. The poor came to America and got rich.

Instead of being a term of scorn, "isolationist" is an expression of honor, of patriotism, of belief in your own land—of standing on Manhattan Island, looking west, not gazing with servile sentimentality toward a culture which has long since ceased to exist.

There is one bright spot, however. Such biased, slanted reporting as Time is putting out brought Newsweek into the field, and now Newsweek is threatening the circulation and advertising leadership of its older competitor. Isolationists like truth—and they like America. Count us in.

Fair Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Westbrook Pegler from the Washington Times-Herald of March 30, 1950:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

The unemployment figures always must be false where there is pay to be had for nothing in the guise of insurance or relief, but there is no doubt that the number of legitimately unemployed and needy workers is again formidable and growing.

Actually, there never has been an hour of substantial, valid recovery from the miscalled Hoover depression. Instead, for one long period, there was pump priming and made work, leaf raking and shovel leaning, which absorbed the more urgent clients and put a little money in their pockets.

It put a lot of money into the pockets of contractors and other deserving Democrats, too. This cost billions at a time when a billion still had a little prestige in the popular imagination, but those billions were forgotten as other expedients were tried in quick succession, all of them negative, all resulting in no substantial gain. We lost ground steadily.

When the war became inevitable in Europe, we were in the dumps again. Although the capitalists or tories are fiercely accused of promoting wars to profit in the agony of the working class, it is a prominent fact that the strongest opposition to war and to the economic underwriting of the war came from the capitalists of the United States, not the New Dealers.

The New Deal had turned out to be a mistake. It was unworkable. It could produce nothing but debt and deficit, and there we were again, after all this squandering.

Roosevelt's motives were whatever they were. Did he prepare for war because he honestly believed Hitler and the Japs were coming after us? Did he harass the Japs so that the Communists whom he fawned on so many ways could capture the Orient? Or did he seize this opportunity and provoke the Nazis and the Japs to create a war boom and put back to work the millions who were idle again?

The haste, the urgency, the clamorous propaganda for conversion and tooling up come back dimly out of memory. The New Deal had created unions and driven millions of citizens into them, and this was called a labor movement.

But it had not revived private industry. The rich magnates of the unions, grateful for the concession granted them freely to exploit these millions and to exploit the danger to democracy, spent money lavishly to whoop up the anger and fear of the people.

Remember the political action committee? The teamsters' dinner? Unemployment was big again in 1941, but as the war effort became not quite total but certainly predominant and overtime and mock work sent wages to inflationary heights, the debt went up and up until thought of the future and the reckoning was put out of mind except by a few practical individuals who seemed morose amid the excitement. Roosevelt haters, no doubt. Pro-Nazis, no doubt. Red baiters, spreading disunity.

After the fighting American industry continued to grind. Now it is producing for the relief and rehabilitation of Europe at American expense and without the slightest thought for the future.

American industry, the American economy, American labor became dependent on the necessity of the European countries, including even the late enemy.

Our biggest business was the manufacture of stuff—all kinds of stuff—to replace the stuff that had been destroyed and feed Europeans who couldn't feed themselves. They couldn't pay for it, so we loaned them the money.

How long had we been doing that, off and on, in various ways under successive plans? Ever since the twenties. God help America, if the Europeans ever got clothes on them, shoes on them, and wheels under them.

God help America because these charity cases were our only important customers. As for our own postponed wants caused by war shortages, they were intentionally postponed still further by strikes causing shortages of steel and hard products or we would have caught up with ourselves sooner.

Even with the strikes and all, we finally did get caught up, and now we are caught up in Europe. Our best customer—the customer on the cuff—has filled his needs and used up most of his credit, and so Americans, by the million, are out of work again.

Russia is not the gallant ally—the mighty democracy that we thought she was. Russia deceived us. The pity of it. So fool up again. Total diplomacy. (Dean Acheson.) War economy. (Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut.)

Hold your hats.

Arming of the Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, for some time there has been tremendous concern about the situation in the Middle East, and it has not been limited to Americans of the Jewish faith.

On Tuesday last, accompanied by a group of 34 Members of Congress, it was my privilege to call upon the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, with regard to the problem of the arming of the Arab states by Great Britain. Our delegation lodged a formal protest with the Secretary and urged that the United States, through the United Nations, prevail upon Great Britain to put a stop to the sale of such arms in the interest of peace.

I consider this issue so vitally important insofar as world peace is concerned that I am herewith presenting the State Department's account of our meeting for the information of the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

ACCOUNT OF CONVERSATION BETWEEN THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND OTHER DEPARTMENTAL OFFICIALS AND A GROUP OF CONGRESSMEN ON THE SUBJECT OF THE NEAR EAST ARMAMENTS SITUATION, ON MARCH 28, 1950

Secretary Acheson received a congressional group, headed by Congressman TAURIELLO, of New York, who as spokesman of the group began by saying that many Members of Congress had received letters and visits from their constituents in which the latter expressed their concern over the sale of arms by Great Britain to the Arab states, particularly Egypt. The Congressman added that he and his congressional friends who were present in the office were deeply interested in Israel and believed that anything that happens in Israel affects the United States. They feared that there might be a recurrence of the Palestine war. They also thought that Israel should not have to participate in an arms race at a time when it was so essential for Israel to devote all its energies to the tasks of peace, settlement of immigrants, and reconstruction. Representative TAURIELLO then asked if the Secretary could explain the Department's policy on the Near East armaments situation.

After additional comments by other Congressmen present, the Secretary began by stating that in the first place there was a great deal of misinformation on both sides in this question. The Department had seen reports emanating from Israeli and from Arab sources which gave exaggerated and inaccurate accounts of the armaments allegedly already possessed by, or on their way to, one side or the other.

The Secretary then briefly outlined our policy on the export of arms to the Near East, referring to the fact that as long as the UN Palestine arms embargo was in effect no arms were permitted to leave this country for the Near East, and that the British had adopted a similar course. After the arms embargo was lifted, the United States adopted the policy of permitting the export to the Near East of only such arms as we considered necessary for the preservation of internal security of the states concerned and for legitimate self-defense needs.

From the viewpoint of this Government, the Secretary said, there were two problems involved in the question: One was the relationship between the Arabs and the Israelis and the other was the defense of the eastern Mediterranean. The latter was of the greatest importance to the United States and the United Kingdom. The British, from their experience in two wars, well knew the strategic importance of the eastern Mediterranean, an area which contains the vital oil supplies of Iran and Iraq and Saudi Arabia, as well as the important and strategic Suez Canal, the route to India and the Far East. These elements were also of tremendous importance to the United States, and the United States as well as the United Kingdom considered it essential that the states in the area have some kind of defensive forces to enable them to assist in the protection of the area as much as possible. In these circumstances the United Kingdom had a military program of assisting the near-eastern states, particularly Egypt, to strengthen their defensive positions. The amount of arms involved did not appear excessive. The Secretary emphasized that there was close cooperation between the United States and the United Kingdom on this matter.

With regard to Arab-Israeli relations, the Secretary stated that the United States Government was following this matter very closely, and that the gist of information received from reliable sources was that the trend in the Near East continues to be away from war and toward peace. The Department had received categoric assurances from high Egyptian authorities to the effect that Egypt has no aggressive intentions toward Israel. At least one prominent Israel official had told the Secretary that he was not concerned by the military situation, but much more preoccupied with the present settlement and reconstruction problems facing Israel.

With regard to arms shipments from this country to the Near East, the Secretary said that since the lifting of the embargo we had permitted the shipment to the Arab states and to Israel of a certain amount of military equipment destined for defensive uses. The Israel Government had recently made application for permission to acquire a quantity of additional military equipment from commercial sources. The Department was discussing this request with the Defense Department, upon which the Department must necessarily rely for technical advice as regards the question of whether a particular request is justifiable within the legitimate defense needs of the state concerned.

The Israeli Embassy had also made a request for arms which were only available from the United States Government stocks. Here again there were important factors involved, the principal of which were our commitments to supply arms to other nations under mutual defense assistance legislation. The amount of surplus military equipment in Government stocks was limited, and as a matter of fact inadequate for complete fulfillment of these prior commitments. Here again the Department relied upon the opinions and findings of the Defense Department.

At this point, Mr. Rusk emphasized that what happened to north Africa and the Near East was of overriding importance in terms of the United States strategic position. The maintenance of communications with the Far East was particularly important. Moreover, the attitude of the peoples in the Near East toward the United States was a prime factor. We considered it very important that we be able to count on the friendship of these peoples in any future emergency in that area.

In response to a question concerning British policy toward the Palestine area, the Secretary said that the Department was of the opinion that the United Kingdom sincerely desired to see peace and stability reestablished in the Near East. It was to the advantage of the United States and the United Kingdom objectives in general in the Near East to assure that peace was maintained among the states in that area.

In response to another question, the Secretary said that he planned to discuss the Near East armaments situation with Mr. Bevin when they meet in early May. In order to illustrate the close watch which the United States is keeping on the situation, the Secretary added that he had talked to Mr. Bevin about Near East armaments four times in the last year.

A question was asked concerning whether it was possible that the United Kingdom was shipping to Egypt arms supplied by this Government to the United Kingdom. The Secretary responded that he was confident that this was not true, as the items being furnished Egypt were not of the kind being furnished the United Kingdom under MDAP. He added that Egypt was paying the British for the arms furnished.

In response to a question as to whether any of the funds being sent from the United States to Great Britain under the ECA program were being used to facilitate the manufacture in England of arms for the Arab states, the Secretary said that his impression was to the contrary.

The Secretary received us most graciously and afforded us every courtesy. From our conference, it could be seen that he is well-informed on the problems of the Middle East.

However, personally, I was not satisfied with the Secretary's explanation of this grave problem. The whole gist of his explanation was to minimize and gloss over the fact that arms have been and are still being sold by Great Britain to Egypt and the other Arab states. It is no secret that British airplanes, tanks, and rifles are flowing into Arab states in great numbers. Arab newspapers carry stories of the importation of these implements of war and of the ultimate sinister use for which they are intended.

The Secretary's explanation that these arms are being sold to Egypt and the other Arab states for the purpose of protection would seem to be misleading because if these states are fortifying themselves from any Communist attack then, certainly, Israel, which is the outpost of democracy in that part of the world, should be included in the defense plans against any aggressor and should be afforded the same opportunity.

It is a well-known fact that the Arab states are still festering under their recent military defeat and are only waiting for another chance to rise again against the Israeli Government. Everyone knows that there remains much ill feeling between the Arab states and Israel. This bitterness finds expression almost daily in the Arab newspapers and radio broadcasts.

A renewal of this conflict would be a tragic development which must not be allowed to take place. The very fact that the Arab states can obtain implements of war in great quantities makes the situation a tense and dangerous one which is very apt to start another conflagration in that part of the world.

The United States has been spending millions of dollars in its earnest and sincere desire to maintain peace. How can we in conscience condone this intolerable situation which might become the tinderbox of another war, causing the loss of thousands of lives and the destruction of property, and which might well spread throughout the globe?

Israel wants peace and needs peace. Whatever funds are at her disposal should be spent in peaceful economic development and reconstruction.

As the foremost bulwark of democratic principles, the United States owes it to the infant Republic of Israel to devote all its energies in helping this tiny country take her rightful place in the family of nations whose objective is permanent and lasting peace.

We must remain, consistently and unfalteringly, a guiding beacon to all small democracies, especially while some of them are now shrouded in darkness by totalitarian aggressors who seek to destroy our democratic beliefs and our very way of life.

Therefore, in the interests of democracy and justice, I again respectfully urge Secretary Acheson to keep this matter under his close personal supervision and I reiterate my earnest desire to have the United States immediately lodge a protest through the United Nations demanding that the sale of arms to the Arab states by Great Britain be stopped.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I herewith include a list of the Members of Congress who accompanied me to the State Department and I also include a letter which I have just received from Mr. Elihu D. Stone of the American Zionist Council dealing with this vital problem.

LIST OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS WHO MET WITH SECRETARY OF STATE ACHESON ON MARCH 28, 1950, TO PROTEST THE ARMING OF ARAB STATES BY GREAT BRITAIN

ADDONIZIO, HUGH J., New Jersey.
BARRETT, WILLIAM A., Pennsylvania.
BEMILLER, ANDREW J., Wisconsin.
BETS, EDWARD, Ohio.
CHESNEY, CHESTER A., Illinois.
CHUDOFF, EARL, Pennsylvania.
CLEMENTE, L. CARY, New York.
DAVENPORT, HARRY J., Pennsylvania.
DELANEY, JAMES J., New York.
DOLLINGER, ISIDORE, New York.
EBERHARTER, HERMAN P., Pennsylvania.
GRAHAHAN, WILLIAM T., Pennsylvania.
GREEN, WILLIAM J., Jr., Pennsylvania.
EEFFERNAN, JAMES J., New York.
HELLER, LOUIS B., New York.
JAVITS, JACOB K., New York.
KARST, RAYMOND W., Missouri.
KELLEY, AUGUSTINE B., Pennsylvania.
KELLY, MRS. EDNA F., New York.
KLEIN, ARTHUR G., New York.
LATHAM, HENRY, New York.
MCSWEENEY, JOHN, Ohio.
MCGRATH, CHRISTOPHER C., New York.
MULTER, ABRAHAM J., New York.
O'HARA, BARRATT, Illinois
O'NEILL, HARRY P., Pennsylvania.
QUINN, T. VINCENT, New York.
RODINO, PETER W., Jr., New Jersey.
ROONEY, JOHN J., New York.
ROOSEVELT, FRANKLIN D., Jr., New York.
TAURIELLO, ANTHONY F., New York.
YATES, SIDNEY R., Illinois.

The following Members were unable to attend because of previous engagements but went on record as supporting the action taken by the above Congressmen:

BYRNE, WILLIAM T., New York.
CELLER, EMANUEL, New York.
DAVIES, JOHN C., New York.
GARMATZ, EDWARD A., Maryland.
KEOGH, EUGENE J., New York.
MCCORMACK, JOHN, Massachusetts.

AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL,
WASHINGTON BUREAU,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We deeply appreciate your thoughtful cooperation in joining the delegation which called on the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, relative to the rearmament of the Arab states in the Near East, on March 28 current.

As spokesman of the delegation you have rendered a noble service in presenting the problem in its true light.

It is difficult to reconcile the optimism of Mr. Acheson as to the outlook for peace with the existing reality. A special dispatch to the New York Times of March 29, from Cairo, dated March 28, describes the pressure which the Arab League is bringing to bear on King Abdullah in order to prevent a peace agreement between Jordan and Israel. The former was even threatened with sanctions, should peace negotiations be resumed between Jordan and Israel. The aforesaid dispatch sums it up as follows:

"In any case, the chief result of the Arab League crisis of the past 4 days has been to reduce sharply the likelihood that some type of separate peace agreement will be concluded between Jordan and Israel and that other Arab states may then follow suit."

Moreover, the granting of a seat at the current sessions of the Arab League Conference in Cairo to the representative of the former Mufti of Jerusalem is hardly an indication of any improved attitude on the part of the Arab leaders toward Israel, as reported in the said dispatch to the New York Times. It must be remembered that the Mufti is a former collaborator of Hitler in Berlin during the war and that he is one of the intellectual authors of the extermination of European Jewry by the Nazis. Thus, for the first time, the notorious Mufti obtained an official voice in the Arab League. It is an evil omen, even though Mr. Acheson apparently disregards it.

The kind of arms, including jets, Sherman tanks, etc., which England is delivering to the Arabs may not be a direct part of the arms supplied by the United States to Great Britain. Nevertheless, in effect, the arms shipments to England from the United States constitutes a replacement, and, therefore, indirectly the American taxpayer is footing the bill. Thus, it appears clear that while the United States is supplying certain amounts of arms to both the Arabs and Israel, Great Britain is the additional source of supply of arms exclusively to the Arab states, giving them a preponderance of power. Hence, there is the danger that the Arab threats may be translated into violent action against Israel.

Who is there to guarantee that a "second round" will not take place? It is gambling with the lives of the Jews in Israel, who have already suffered so much.

The tragic experience of the last few decades clearly demonstrates that our statesmen, both American and British, were capable of making errors—errors for which mankind paid a terrible price in blood, and the Jews in particular were the most cruel victims.

Fateful events did come to pass in our own day and even very recently—events which our statesmen never anticipated.

Who, therefore, is there in the Department of State today who can speak with an absolute finality and with infinite wisdom as to what might come to pass tomorrow?

It is obvious, therefore, that Israel's fears and eagerness to be militarily prepared in case of a possible attack by the combined Arab states is human, reasonable, and justifiable.

We are grateful to you for your friendship, and we hope that you will continue your efforts in the direction of peace in the Near East.

The need of the hour is not an armament race between Israel and the Arab states, which is now in progress, but rather a disarmament race, so that Israel and its Arab neighbors may jointly enjoy the fruits of peace and jointly maintain the security of the Near East against any attack by a third power.

Your understanding and sympathetic cooperation will always be recalled with deep gratitude.

Respectfully,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Unemployment and Imports, One Caused by the Other

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have, on previous occasions, addressed myself to the ill effects of imports upon our national economy. Every day the disaster of this course is becoming more evident. We have an unemployed force of almost 5,000,000 now with the prospect of more at the end of the current school year in June. In the face of these figures, our State Department is contemplating further cuts in tariffs, thus enabling goods made by cheap labor to unfairly compete in the American market.

We all realize that the American dollar is today the most sought after commodity by the nations of Europe. ECA and other foreign relief programs aimed at expanding European recovery are aiding these nations to compete with our own citizens for our purchasing dollar. More consumer goods are being withheld from their own people by these countries so that production of goods can be exported and sold for dollars.

Ample evidence of the damage being done to industry is the continuing unemployment in a period of relative prosperity in this Nation.

Articles which illustrate this point follow:

[From the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of March 9, 1950]

TARIFF REDUCTIONS NO REMEDY FOR DOLLAR GAP

(By Richard H. Anthony, secretary, The American Tariff League)

(Asserting the tariff is not a tool with which international trade can be tinkered into balance, Mr. Anthony contends there are important American industries still dependent for survival on tariff protection. Cites case of Waltham Watch Co., and denounces proposal of ECA to lower tariffs so that Europe's exports to United States can be increased $2,000,000,000. Denies present United States tariff has any importance in current over-all international trade picture. An address by Mr. Anthony at a meeting of the export committee, American Paper and Pulp Association, New York City, February 22, 1950.)

The appearance of a Tariff League representative at a meeting of exporters might seem to be as perilous as the fly's acceptance of the spider's invitation to visit her parlor, but I assure you I anticipate no bodily harm. Indeed, I feel a community of interest for the league subscribes to the truth in that old cliche, "Trade is a two-way street." All we ask is that you recognize that two-way traffic requires a certain amount of regulation; that full freedom of traffic to wander where it will, although desirable perhaps as an ideal, is as unrealistic in practice as is free trade.

Is the exporter actually facing any problems fundamentally different from the salesman in the domestic market? Your domestic sales potential is not the sum total of demand for your and your competitors' products, but rather the demand of that segment of our population which is able to pay for them in dollars. By the same token, foreign demand for United States goods, unaccompanied by ability to pay in dollars, should not be taken as a true measure of sales potential abroad, unless you are in favor of continuing the present system of selling to foreign customers and sending the bill to the United States taxpayer. The fly in that ointment is that you are also a taxpayer and so are paying your customers' bills, at least in part.

When the exporter is thwarted from selling abroad all he thinks he should, he may become aggrieved and in his grief he is likely to forget that he has no inherent right to demand free access to any but the domestic market. Foreign sales are frosting on the cake. It's nice to have the frosting, but it is more important to have the cake.

However, there are some people, including Government officials, who will tell you that you can have the cake and the frosting and eat it all, too, by getting the United States to increase imports from foreign countries and so provide more dollars abroad with which to pay for your foreign sales.

Now, we in the league have no quarrel with that advice up to the point where they tell you that you should injure or even liquidate some domestic producers in order to buy more competitive products from abroad.

Our tariffs used to be set and revised in accordance with the needs of our domestic economy. Now they are talked of as expendable or, to be more exact, the American industries that depend on tariffs are now being treated as expendable, in the effort to foster imports and so balance our foreign trade at current abnormal export levels. Some of these industries are being marked for sacrifice and when they go, then lose jobs, investors lose money, suppliers lose customers, and the country loses some of the elements in a diversified economy

CASE OF WALTHAM WATCH CO.

Can we stand the loss of the Waltham Watch Co.? We have only two old-line watch manufacturers left. Who benefits from liquidating Waltham? Switzerland perhaps? That admirable, democratic country is worth having as a friend, but is she making reciprocal sacrifices on the alter of friendship?

Here is what Prof. Friedrich A. Lutz, of Princeton, said about the Swiss at the last annual meeting of the Academy of Political Science: "Switzerland has no shortage of dollars, and yet she adheres to a system of bilateral trade agreements, chiefly because she aims at preserving a certain structure of her exports by making the partner countries to these agreements import watches and other Swiss export goods and allow their citizens to travel in Switzerland. She has even gone so far as to make balances of Swiss francs accumulated by Argentina and the bizone of Germany inconvertible into dollars, so as to force these countries to use the balances for purchases or travel in Switzerland."

Perhaps Switzerland must resort to these measures to protect her economy and her democratic processes. Whatever the answer, these Swiss measures are restrictive and discriminatory, whereas our low-average tariffs are the mildest kind of trade regulation.

Let's get down to fundamentals. We need certain raw materials and we like certain finished products that come from abroad. In order to induce the foreigner to send them to us we must send him what we have that he needs or wants. You can disguise and complicate the problem ad infinitum by the introduction of currency, exchange, etc., but the basic fact is that our foreign trade starts with a deficiency on our part which must be paid for by transfer of a portion of our production. The latter-day idea that the amount of goods we can or want to ship abroad should be the measure of what we take in, even though some domestic producers go bankrupt in the process of balancing income and outgo, puts the cart half a mile ahead of the horse.

ECA PROPOSALS

The latest agency to urge that we should artificially foster our imports at the expense of certain of our domestic producers is the Economic Cooperation Administration.

The ECA had two jobs to do: (1) Geographical containment of communism, and (2) fostering economic recovery of foreign nations. In Europe both goals have been accomplished. Communism has made no further encroachment to the west; and the European ECA countries, except Germany, have either surpassed or achieved approximately their prewar production and export positions quantitatively.

Now ECA says, in effect: We are getting ready to pull out of Europe and when we go we want the incoming and outgoing elements in the United States-European trade to balance, and furthermore to balance at the current United States export level. Translated into figures, ECA's suggestion means that Europe must expand its exports to the United States by $3,500,000,000, an increase of 300 percent or more. Clearly, Europe is in no position to meet this extraordinary demand, no matter what inducements the United States may offer. Yet, ECA publishes a list of United States commodities on which there are individual tariffs of 25 percent or greater and says, in effect: Slash those and help close the gap.

We say it misleads the American public and lays the ground work for international ill-will to offer any such illusory hope that further slashing of our tariffs, which, at an average of 13 percent, are the lowest in our history, or even eliminating them entirely, will have any appreciable effect on closing the trade gap. Cutting tariffs in such an indiscriminate fashion can ruin individual companies or even whole industries in the United States, but it will not close the foreign-trade gap at the current export level.

The tariff has no measurable importance in the over-all trade picture anyway. Our imports rise and fall with our national income, despite the level of tariff at any particular time. Over the long years our imports have shown a general upward trend that echoes our increase in population.

It so happens that the amount necessary to balance the current ERP dollar deficit is roughly the same as the value of the products of the entire pulp and paper industry in the United States for 1947, i. e., $3,700,000,000. I assume you would not be willing to sacrifice your industry, employing 200,000 wage earners, in order to bring in imported commodities sufficient in value to equal that figure.

If you have any doubts about the misleading nature of the ECA recommendations, let me suggest that you read what the experts say and apply every statistical test of which you know. I have done both and the answer keeps staring me in the face—slashing tariffs is of no avail in tackling the trade-gap problem.

Here is what Prof. Seymour E. Harris, of Harvard, told that same Academy of Political Science meeting: "Despite the large reduction in tariffs here and increased restriction abroad, which should have facilitated European exports and depressed their imports, despite the widespread use of controls abroad to raise exports and reduce imports, despite the much larger rise in money wages here—despite all of these, the United States has been flooded with gold and the world is short of dollars."

Now, just a few figures to document the league's conclusions. The data are for 1948, but preliminary 1949 reports indicate no substantial change in the size of our foreign-trade gap. According to ECA's own figures, we imported from ERP countries in 1948, $2,400,000,000 of goods and services, of which $1,200,000,000 consisted of merchandise. We exported to those countries $5,900,000,000 of goods and services, resulting in an export-over-import imbalance of $3,500,000,000. That $3,500,000,000 is the gap. When people talk of cutting United States tariffs in order to bridge that gap they are suggesting that we expand $1,200,000,000 of merchandise imports from Europe to $4,700,000,000, a 300-percent increase. If they expect services, such as tourist expenditures abroad, to increase also, they may shave that merchandise figure, but still it is going to be close to 300 percent. Professor Harris says that should devaluation reduce dollar prices of western European products by a fifth, the required increase would be 400 percent. According to a year end International Monetary Fund report, such dollar prices are nearing that margin of decline.

I won't bore you further with figures provided you will take on faith that to ask a 300-400-percent increase in production for export in Europe is a fantastic demand, particularly when ECA is asking Europe to integrate its economy and step up its internal trade as well.

DANGER OF TARIFF TINKERING

Actually there is surprisingly little dispute over the figures or the facts. Practically everyone who has studied the trade-gap problem realizes that tinkering with the currently low-average United States tariff is not going to solve it, but what puzzles us in the League is why, with this general acceptance of the facts, there is the illogical demand to go ahead and cut tariffs across the board, anyway. We suspect that those who make this proposal are motivated not so much by a desire to close the trade gap as by a desire just to slash tariffs.

The favorite argument for tariff-cutting as a desirable operation per se, is that it will foster the importation of goods from low-labor-cost foreign countries and thus save money for the American consumer. Let me give you the latest illustration of how wrong this argument can be.

We have had a dwindling wool-raising industry in the United States for some years. During the war it was essential, if not vital, because hauling wool from Australia through submarine-infested waters was uncertain and dangerous. Since the war the argument that the wool tariff was adding pennies to the price of your winter suit came to the fore, and, despite the pleas of the American wool growers, the tariff on raw wool was cut at Geneva in 1947 for the benefit of Australia. Since then our western herds have dwindled still more and Australia has virtually cornered the market. Last month at the wool auction in Sydney, private buyers from the United States and Great Britain found themselves bidding against state trading company representatives from a number of countries for the wool clip, with the result that the price of wool has gone soaring and you may have to pay a little more for your next suit as a result, and despite the lower tariff.

While we are considering object lessons, I also would like to say that coffee, on which there is no wicked tariff whatsoever, is fast becoming a luxury in many households, indicating that free trade is not exactly a solution to the problem of the high cost of living.

The tariff still has a part to play in our economy. It is, by universal admission, the mildest and fairest regulatory measure in international trade and we need it to preserve competitive conditions in our domestic market as between foreign producers and certain of our industries with a high labor element in their total production costs. It is as unrealistic to demand the elimination of tariffs because most of those industries are not now being injured, as it is to demand the elimination of the fire department because the city's fire record has improved. There is nothing in the present state of affairs that gives us any confidence that the current abnormal level of domestic demand and production will continue in its present pattern. Indeed the pattern is beginning to change, and as it tends toward the normal situation, injuries due to unwise tariff slashing will come forcibly to public attention. Already a number of danger flags are fluttering.

Under a flexible tariff system we could vary our rates to match changing situations, but we have no flexible system at present. Our tariffs are being continuously cut by international agreement. Any move toward subsequent upward readjustment of a rate, however just, creates an international incident and so is avoided by our Government, although foreign governments can take such unilateral actions with impunity. We have also seen that the philosophy of downward revision only of tariffs has so permeated our Government departments and commissions that the trade agreements escape clause, which was supposed to safeguard our domestic producers from injurious duty cuts, has not once been invoked nor has any of the many showings of injury even been followed by recommendation that the clause be invoked. Some have not even been thoroughly investigated.

The tariff is important to certain domestic industries. It is not a tool with which you can tinker our international trade account into balance. I urge you to let the tariff perform the function for which it is best fitted, and to tackle the trade-gap problem with tools better adapted to the purpose.

SLAVE LABOR COMPETITION

[From the Ansonia (Conn.) Sentinel of March 29, 1950]

The Danbury News-Times has called attention to the fact that American imports of hats and hat bodies from Czechoslovakia increased 4,000 percent during 1949, while those from Italy rose 300 percent in dollar value. The figures were supplied by the Census Bureau.

Lowered tariffs on these products opened to foreign competition the world's richest market—the United States of America. In the case of the watch industry, similar tariff policies have been devastating even to such long established concerns as the Waltham Watch Co., where American craftsmen were thrown out of work by the hundreds and left to shift for themselves.

There are many strong arguments for a reasonable reciprocal trade program but when that program strikes at the very livelihood of American workmen it is only to be expected that there will be heightening demands for its reappraisal in the light of realistic comparisons of the living standards of the workers in the competing countries.

Generously giving foreign countries which are friendly to us a fair whack at the rich American market is a thing altogether different from giving them opportunity to put American industry out of business in the American market and American workmen out of jobs by lowering tariffs too much. One may well question the extent to which any serious effort is made to strike a fair balance that will give domestic manufacturers and their employees at least an even break.

But in the case of Czechoslovakia, taken over by the stooges of Moscow in a coup that replaced democracy by despotism, an altogether different factor enters the picture. The laborer in that country is not free. He works where his Red masters tell him to work and the government determines how long

he shall work and how much he shall be paid and how much his earnings shall buy. To put it plainly and simply, he is a slave laborer. Reciprocal trade policy which operates, at the cost of American livelihood, to enable Communist puppet regimes to consolidate their usurpations cannot be defended by any standard of fair play whatever. It is rather silly of our Government to tell Danbury's skilled hatters to go find other jobs because our high-policy makers in Washington persist in ignoring the fact that the Czechoslovakia with which we entered into a trade agreement was an altogether different Czechoslovakia from that Red puppet police state which today is using slave labor in a state owned and operated hat industry to do American workers out of their jobs.

[From the Torrington (Conn.) Register, March 27, 1950]

UNITED ACTION NEEDED

United action on the part of Connecticut's Senators and Congressmen is vitally necessary to protect Connecticut's hat industry, which is threatened by a startling rise in imports of hats and hat bodies from Czechoslovakia and Italian factories, under reciprocal trade agreements.

Imports from Czechoslovakia, where the hats are manufactured in State-owned, red-controlled factories, with the profits presumably going to the red regime, increased 43 times in dollar value during 1946 to 1949. Similar imports from Italy increased 300 percent in dollar value during the same period. And every hat imported here means that there will be less work for employes of the hat factories in Danbury, Norwalk, and other hatting centers.

There is pressure in some government circles for further reductions in tariff rates on imports of hats and hat bodies, which, if granted, would cause further harm to the Connecticut industry.

The Federal Tariff Commission has promised the domestic hat industry to investigate the situation, but The Danbury News-Times reports that the attitude of some administration spokesmen is, in effect: "Let American hatters learn another trade."

That seems to be a strange attitude for persons who are paid to look after the best interests of the American people. Connecticut's congressional delegation certainly should waste no time in making certain that the jobs of their constituents are given full protection.

Spring's Call to Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the membership of the House to a very splendidly written article concerning our great State of Kansas. It is especially well written by one of the leading editors of Kansas, Mr. Rollis A. Clymer, editor of the El Dorado Times, El Dorado, Kans. It portrays a very splendid description of springtime in Kansas. I commend your reading it.

SPRING'S CALL TO KANSAS

Today marks the birth of spring—even though madcap March shows some uncertainness of the fact—and all over Kansas land a surging stir is manifest. For this is the season of sowing, of awakening, and of renewed effort for sterling accomplishment here under the sign of the sunflower.

Kansas is not yet 90 years old, calculated by the date of her formal admission into the sisterhood of the States, yet has contrived to etch manifold achievements upon the consciousness of the Nation. She lies at that Nation's heart, her outline of the parallelogram sweeping upward and westerly from the valleys of the Missouri and the Kaw to the foothills of the Rockies.

Within her borders and from the wealth and variety of her soil a sturdy and self-reliant civilization has developed. Kansas has been endowed with a plentitude of what have aptly been called "plus factors," and these factors illumine the way as another vernal period dawns. Hearken to a partial list of them as buds burgeon on the branches of the cottonwood, the State tree, and while the meadow lark—the State's bird—begins to entertain first impulses toward her annual nesting.

Kansas long has been supreme as a grower of wheat. In other words, she produces sufficient of this grain to yield 50 loaves of bread a year for every American citizen. From her good earth spring two score agricultural products; she raises more cattle than 43 other States, and stands fourth in meat packing. No State mills as great a volume of wheat as she, while her bluestem pastures provide some of the finest grazing lands in the world. The big beef steer and his little red sister comprise her true animal aristocracy, and these specimens of royalty stand knee-deep in grass laced with the greatest variety of wild-flower life to be found anywhere in the Republic. The farm and orchard domain of Kansas covers the magnitude of 52,000,000 acres, and she excels in such widely separated particulars as growing 90 percent of all apple seedlings in the United States and having this country's largest market for broomcorn.

To this profuse agricultural array Kansas has welded a vigorous industrial empire from native resources—thereby bolstering her economy and assuring its long-time future. Thirty-one main types of products appear in her mineral field. The serried ranks of her oil derricks stretch away to the horizon in nearly two-thirds of her counties—and the State ranks fifth in production among the petroleum titans of the country. At Hugoton, she has the largest reserve of natural sweet gas in the world. Kansas stands third in zinc and sixth in lead output, and nearly two million tons of coal roll out annually from her mines. Cement plants feed plentifully from her lime deposits, millions of tons of building stone and ballast pour from her quarries and she has enough salt to savor the Nation's diet for half a million years. Kansas ranks second in the Nation in highway mileage and fifth in miles of railroads, a huge stream of electric power flows from her 27 privately owned and 71 municipal plants. She is a leading builder of aircraft, numbers more flying farmers than any other State, and provides more days suitable for flying than any other section of the country.

The most encouraging part of all this accounting is that Kansas keeps right on growing. While the percentage of increase of manufacturing workers in the United States during the period 1939–48 went up 53 percent, the Kansas portion rose 92 percent. When retail sales in the country gained 211 percent during those years, Kansas hiked its total 307 percent. Again, as the national value of minerals produced in those years showed an upthrust of 56 percent, the Kansas gain zoomed to 86 percent. Likewise, Kansas per capita income increased 237 percent, against the national 163 percent; and Kansas bank deposits swelled 312 percent against 151 percent.

All these attainments did not just happen, but came about both because of the richness of Kansas environment and the indomitable character of the State's people—many with pioneer background. Men and women are still living in Kansas today who saw the prairie broken—and who played important roles thereafter in the drama enacted upon its acres. They clearly perceived the challenge that was first laid down—and met it with courage and good will. Their course has been one of toil and perseverance—but they have seen it pay off with rich reward.

And now another spring smiles. All over Kansas the restful urge that has animated her true-hearted sons and daughters all the way sends forth its tremors anew. Kansas' achievement has been vast but much remains to be wrought. So the present stir of planting and dressing and garnishing moves with mighty purpose. In this year of the half century, Kansas has reached a milestone which signifies no goal attained, but which serves only as a marker ordaining redoubled energies. Her eager spirit—kindred with her sunshine and prairie grass, her sheltered valleys, and rolling high plains—shuts out complacency and self-content, because she "has no ruins grey that men revere; her time is now—her heritage is here."

That Amerasia Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News:

THAT AMERASIA CASE

Senator MCCARTHY, in his inconclusive speech yesterday before the Senate, touched on a matter which, in our opinion, could be mined for real gold—if it were tackled by an exhaustive pick-and-shovel investigation.

We refer to the Amerasia stolen documents case of 1945.

It is doubtful that there is any other case in recent American history whose mishandling has had such a decisive and cumulative effect on the trend of United States policy in Asia and subsequent world developments.

The case broke while our war with Japan was still going on. A large number of important military secrets had been purloined from the State Department, Navy, and Office of Strategic Services. More documents—and more important—than all those involved in the Hiss-Chambers case. Six persons were arrested. By some abracadabra, never fully explained, the case was taken out of the hands of one grand jury and turned over to another. The latter grand jury indicted only three of the arrested six.

One was permitted to plead guilty and assessed a small fine. Another pleaded nolo contendere and paid a still smaller fine. The charge against the third was dismissed.

There was never any public trial.

We have often wondered what would have happened had there been a public trial with all the evidence spread out.

Remember, this happened a year before General Marshall was sent to China with a directive to force the Chinese Nationalists to take the Communists into their government. It happened before General Marshall arbitrarily cut off all United States arms to Nationalist China. Before the Russians delivered the Japanese Kwantung army's great store of munitions to the Chinese Communists.

Of course, we can only guess at what might have happened had there been a public trial. But our guess is that the pro-Communists in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department probably would have been fired from the State Department. That General Marshall would never have been given the directive to form a coalition government in China. That Chiang Kai-shek instead of being battered back to the island of Formosa, might have driven Mao Tse-tung's Red army into the fastnesses of Siberia.

And China's mainland, whereon reside 450,000,000 people, might today be ruled by a government friendly to the United States, instead of by a Soviet satellite.

Sure, that's only speculation—but with good reasons behind it. And it's pleasant to contemplate that we might have been today one long step up in this cold war—if only the lid had been taken off that smelly Amerasia case.

Fleming's Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of Wednesday, March 29, entitled "Fleming's Letter":

FLEMING'S LETTER

A remarkable agglomerate of confusion has wound up the new hearings of the Hardy subcommittee on the subsidy excesses of the soon-to-be-abolished Maritime Commission. Perhaps the high light of a pretty shabby performance by the Maritime Commissioners was the introduction on Monday of a letter from Commission Chairman Fleming to the Attorney General, dated February 3, stating plainly that he supported the subsidy actions in question. This development came just after General Fleming had testified that the review of past subsidy determinations was still in progress—in other words, that he had not made up his mind.

Last fall a scorching report by the Comptroller General charged, among other things, that the Maritime Commission had lost some $25,000,000 in the granting of unjustified subsidies and national defense allowances on three contracts involving six ships. The Hardy subcommittee of the House Executive Expenditures Committee held extensive hearings on Commission practices with respect to ship construction subsidies, and its report, backing up the Comptroller General, was adopted unanimously by the full committee. As a result, President Truman called upon the Maritime Commission to review its actions and asked the Attorney General to investigate the interpretation of the Merchant Marine Act. General Fleming's letter to the Attorney General was offered in connection with this request.

Although he took a definite stand in the February 3 letter, General Fleming testified later that the matter was still under review. This was his position before the Thomas subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on February 6. On February 7 he testified that Commissioner Mellen's letter of last September attempting to rebut all the Comptroller General's charges was no longer the official line. Yet on February 24 he wrote Representative THOMAS agreeing with the Mellen letter and asserting that everything the Commission had done was legal and proper and required no amendment.

These inconsistencies are magnified by the curious manner in which General Fleming's letter to the Attorney General was composed. He stated, for example, that he usually consulted the full commission on policy matters. Certainly this was a major policy decision. Yet it was brought out in the hearing that General Fleming wrote this letter without consultation—surely a usurpation of authority. He stated that he had sent copies to all members of the Commission. Yet Commissioner McKeough (the one-man minority exonerated by the previous Hardy report) testified that he had to get his copy from the Attorney General's office; and even Commissioner Carson, though he agreed with the letter, admitted confusion over how he obtained his copy.

What all this shameful pulling and hauling demonstrates is, first, that the chairman of the Commission has associated himself definitely with the subsidy excesses on the part of the Commission majority that led to the Presidential reorganization; and second, that either General Fleming's memory is very poor or his testimony was deliberately at variance with the facts. Surely the President should require no more evidence that both he and the public have been poorly served by the men to whom the Maritime Commission has been entrusted, with the conspicuous exception of Mr. McKeough. It would be compounding the disgrace to carry such men over as members of the new Maritime Board.

Publications of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who has an abiding faith in today's young people. Through the years, it has been my privilege to speak to students in a great many schools. I have always found them eager to learn about representative government. And I have felt it a personal opportunity to point out to these young men and women, the blessing we possess in living under a government of law—a Republic.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I frequently have requests from students enrolled in civics and government classes asking for copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, bills, reports, and committee hearings.

The proceedings of this Congress, one of the last free legislative bodies in the world, should be available to the students of every school in the country, and I am always glad to comply with these requests because I feel such students are seeking first-hand knowledge in the procedures of representative government.

Such publications give valuable information on the issues facing the Nation and an added opportunity for those studying government to know the problems confronting our lawmakers.

It seems to me, that it is most important for our young men and women to become well acquainted with the operations of our Republic for it is they who soon will be the voting citizens that make the decisions of government.

Thus, in truth, we are providing the background for tomorrow's leadership.

Harold Russell, Both His Hands Gone, Learned of Man's Inner Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Daily Globe of March 29, 1950:

GUIDEPOSTS OF LIFE—TOUGH EXTERIOR OFTEN HID DEEP RELIGIOUS FEELING OF PARATROOPS—HAROLD RUSSELL, BOTH HIS HANDS GONE, LEARNED OF MAN'S INNER RESOURCES

(By Harold Russell)

It sometimes takes cold, black disaster to inspire one to achieve the heights of success.

But for my accident I would now be back at my prewar job as a butcher. Instead, I have been in motion pictures, on the radio, subject of magazine articles—but best of all, I have had a chance to show other disabled veterans like myself that it is possible to bounce back from utter despair to undreamed of success and happiness.

On that black June day in 1944 when I lay on a hospital bed looking down at two big bandages where my hands used to be, I frankly thought it meant the end of useful living for me. "What can I do now?" I asked myself bitterly. "Probably just live out my years on an Army pension."

This self-pity and despair didn't last very long though. There is something in most people that won't let them take defeat lying down. Call it anything you like, but to me it is faith—faith in God and in myself, faith that I can always rise from every set-back. A man is licked without this.

At Walter Reed Hospital there was no funeral atmosphere. Nobody pitied himself or anyone else. A guy with both legs gone was called "Shorty"; a man with but one leg "Limpy"; and a soldier with only one arm "Paperhanger." As for me—I was "Hooks." This may sound grim, but we had to develop a sense of humor, and this was the best way to do it.

My first reaction to the hooks which were to serve as my hands were one of dismay. The first day I tried them on, it was worse—it was torture. Unable to make them do anything, I was ready to give up. But the next day I tried again, and kept on trying until I made them work.

My first experiences out of the hospital were also trying ones. Those I met with a sense of humor were most helpful. Take the little old lady to whom I sold meat before the war. When she saw me, broke out with: "Oh, you poor boy."

Then, realizing that this was the wrong approach, she stopped and chuckled. "No wonder you lost your hands. Goodness knows you sold them to me often enough weighing my meat. They didn't belong to you anyway; I bought them many a time with my pot roasts."

I liked that reaction, frank and sassy.

Before my accident I recall during our combat training that religion never showed much on the surface, but was very much

there under the surface. All of us put up a tough front. We belonged to the school of realism. War was rough, so our attitude and talk had to be rough, we figured. And the paratroops, I can safely say, were the toughest bunch of all.

One man in our company, Big Joe, was the most awesome physical specimen I have ever known. Huge in stature, a calloused ball of muscle, Big Joe swore furiously, drank mightily, and was ready to fight at the drop of a hat. He might have been Satan himself as far as the others were concerned, but I knew different.

On our practice jumps I sat next to Big Joe in the plane and jumped right behind him. As the tense moment arrived just before we were to go spilling out into space, I could see Big Joe's face relax. It grew gentle, serene, and his lips moved in a quiet prayer.

At this moment I think he felt very close to God. But once on the ground, he was a man of fierce action again, ferocious, grim, the devil himself.

Not all soldiers concealed their religion with such camouflage. I know of one soldier—we'll call him Steve—who did just the opposite. He was friendly, brimming with good humor, a thoroughly extrovert in every sense. To appreciate this story, you must get the picture of the inside of an Army barracks. Bunks are lined up on either side, sometimes as many as 30 on one floor. Privacy simply doesn't exist.

In the evening, just before lights went out, there was always a terrific hubbub—men coming in from passes, loud arguing, singing, and constant traffic back and forth to the showers. Steve was always right in the middle of the loudest argument or the noisest singing—until he saw time running short. Then he would break away and hustle out of his clothes.

But just before he climbed into bed, he always knelt quietly with folded hands at the side of his bunk and prayed.

The noise, the bright lights, the confusion never bothered him. No one ever made fun of him or kidded him for it. In fact, underneath these hard-bitten men admired and respected him for his open faith. To them it represented real courage in the face of possible ridicule. But I actually believe that Steve never felt that he was being conspicuous. To him it was the right and natural thing to do.

I mention these few experiences because I have heard so many people say that the youth of today are turning away from religion. Nothing can be further from the truth. What many people consider irreverence on the part of youth is merely impatience—impatience with churchmen who won't take more initiative in working out some of the postwar problems.

Young Americans, especially veterans of the past war, want to see the men of God roll up their sleeves and tackle some problems like these same ex-servicemen tackled the problem, say, of demolishing an enemy pillbox. Just talk isn't enough. They want action.

My chance to act the part of Homer Parrish in The Best Years of Our Lives was one of the finest things that will ever happen to me. Not because it made me a Hollywood celebrity, but because it gave me a chance to show thousands of other disabled people that a handicap can give them the necessary impetus to achieve more than if their calamity had never happened.

I know this to be true with many others beside myself. A close friend of mine was a great athlete before he lost both legs. This blow changed the course of his life, and now he is a brilliant lawyer with a great future before him. He admits that but for this accident his present achievements would never have been realized.

There are hundreds, thousands of similar cases. And they were all able to rise from the depths, I feel sure, not only because they had courage, but because they also had a great source of inner power, religious faith.

Back to Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following thoughtful editorial, Back to Isolationism, appearing in the Newark Evening News of March 30, 1950:

BACK TO ISOLATIONISM

Appointment of John Sherman Cooper as his chief consultant represents a praiseworthy attempt by Secretary Acheson to arrest the disintegration of our bipartisan foreign policy. Mr. Cooper is, of course, a Republican. He is a former Senator from Kentucky who supported the administration's policies and program abroad, and he has served as John Foster Dulles' replacement on the United States delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

On the score of capacity, there can be no doubt that Mr. Cooper has it. Less certain, however, is the likelihood that his appointment will appease those Republicans in the Congress who are intent upon wrecking domestic unity in world affairs and leading their party back to isolationism.

Bipartisanship works, or should work, both ways and there are some indications that the administration has not fulfilled the terms of such a partnership. Complaint has been frequent that the administration first makes decisions on foreign policy and only then looks for Republican assent. But such indifference to the spirit of bipartisan collaboration is not the primary cause of the resurgence of Republican isolationism in the Congress.

Mr. Cooper's designation, which follows so closely upon Senator VANDENBERG's patriotic appeal for a united front against communism, is obviously intended to redress the bipartisan balance. Yet, it is extremely doubtful that Mr. Cooper's selection, of itself, can moderate the all-out assault on the State Department of which Senator MCCARTHY's charges, the "economy drive" against ECA aid, Senator STYLES BRIDGES' one-man declaration of war on Mr. Acheson are major manifestations.

Unhappily for the country, and incidentally for the Republican Party, there appears to be less and less willingness by the party's real leaders in the Congress to accept the wise counsel of Senator VANDENBERG. In the existing situation there is little evidence that they intend to encourage that "practical harmony" among the western nations which he says is essential "for the effectual defense of their mutual heritage."

This drive against effective collaboration abroad is reaching its climax at a time when military experts at The Hague are attempting to evolve "an integrated defense plan" for the North Atlantic Treaty nations. But of what use will such planning be if our allies, notably Italy and France, are suddenly deprived of the economic supports which have thus far kept them from plunging into communism?

Republican isolationists may think this retreat to their pre-Pearl Harbor position is the way to win the congressional election of 1950. On them the political history of the last 20 years is wasted. They are apparently willing to risk again the public anxiety and mistrust which have impelled the people to reject at election after election Republican claims to national and international leadership.

A Tragic Situation Faces the Citizens of Chicago if Rent Controls Are Ended June 30, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned on several occasions in the House the tragic situation in which the city of Chicago would find itself if the protection of all rent controls was removed on June 30 of this year. The fact is that at the present time the housing shortage is so acute that there are practically no residences available to and within the financial means of families in the middle-income bracket.

In order that my colleagues may understand that there is no exaggeration in what I have been saying and that my motivation has not been political, I am including in my remarks a letter just received from a prominent Chicago lawyer and a Republican of high standing, Eugene T. Devitt, brother of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, former Congressman Edward Devitt.

Mr. Devitt's letter follows:

CHICAGO, *March 29, 1950.*

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I have noted with interest your position on a compromise rent bill now pending before the House Banking Committee.

I am particularly interested in the rent proposal because I was a trial attorney for the Office of Price Administration and the Office of the Housing Expediter from 1943 to 1949. I followed the progress of those past measures particularly close when my brother, Edward J. Devitt, was a member of the Eightieth Congress from St. Paul, Minn. In addition, I am especially interested as I live in Elgin, Ill., which, as you know, is some 38 miles northwest of Chicago.

Although I am a registered Republican and a candidate for clerk of the Supreme Court in the primaries on April 11, 1950, I feel that some form of Federal rent control is absolutely necessary to prevent chaos, particularly in the Chicago metropolitan area. As the father of three children, I believe it would be absolutely impossible for me to rent any housing accommodations in the city of Elgin under $100 per month. As a matter of fact, I feel rental housing is tighter in the city of Elgin than in a goodly proportion of various neighborhoods in the city of Chicago, and I sincerely believe that any proposal to continue controls in the larger cities should most assuredly encompass the entire Chicago metropolitan area.

Would you be kind enough to send me a copy of your proposed bill to extend rent control? I do know that the problem of enforcing such a bill is, and would be relatively easy in all of the suburban areas.

Thank you kindly.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE T. DEVITT.

Mr. Speaker, from Mrs. John A. Renn, 3141 West Sixtieth Street, Chicago, I have received the following letter, which is similar to hundreds of others from Chicago housewives and heads of families:

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 23, 1950.*

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I need your help as do friends of mine all over the city of Chicago.

If rent controls are allowed to expire, we shall be caught in a trap. So will every person on a fixed income. You know my husband is a postal clerk, and his increases have never kept up with the rising cost of living. Like others, we have had to spend judiciously or go without, to build up a small savings toward old age. If rent controls die, we shall be drained of everything we can make, or have saved, to live. There will be nothing to prevent landlords from charging all the traffic will bear—and getting it, because housing is so scarce. In many cities and your own is one, the result will be chaos. Some form of rent control must exist for awhile, if thousands of people are to live, or want to keep on living. We have had a 15 percent rent increase since the war. Instead of rent control expiring entirely, another raise by percentages would be far better. A limit could be set on percentage raises according to the age and condition of the building, and services actually received by the tenants. When we must burn our gas oven and an electric heater, as we do all winter because of inadequate heat, (below 68°) then we have had, in effect, another rent raise. The same applies when we buy faucets, window shades, and new screening. For years most landlords have made their tenants put up with very little or no cleaning, and what we have done raises our rent higher.

We are trapped now by these circumstances, and submit to them because there is no place to move.

We beg of you, please do all that you can to help us, and thousands in a like plight.

Some form of rent control must remain—we must have help from Congress—or we face certain personal disaster.

Yours very truly,

ZORA E. RENN,
Mrs. JOHN A. RENN.

Foreign Economic Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7797, to provide foreign economic assistance has been debated over a period of several days. It has been debated with unusual vehemence on both sides and this debate has served to bring out the real points at issue. As I have said repeatedly, if the measure does not serve to help keep our Nation out of a third world war, its real purpose will not have been accomplished. As I have spent most of my legislative life on the old Military Affairs Committee and the present Armed Forces Committee, I am most sensitive to the danger of and the need for preventing the outbreak of a shooting war which will usher in the use of the frightful atom bomb. I have therefore gone to unusual lengths to prevent such an eventuality.

The measure calls for the expenditure of a large sum of money, however, and taking into consideration the state of our national finances, we must strain a point and make some reduction of this authorization. I think a half billion dollars could be taken off the bill without destroying the effect of the program. I hope the bill is reduced to this extent.

This measure is an authorization measure. I have learned in many other instances that changes and reductions may be effected when the appropriation bill comes to us for consideration. While I realize the financial plight of this Nation; should conditions change after the passage of this measure but before the appropriation bill has come to a vote, further reductions may be brought about.

Petitions on the Repeal of the Excise Tax on Entertainment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to bring to the attention of this body some additional petitions that have come to my office from movie patrons in my district urging that the 20 percent Federal excise tax on movie admissions be repealed.

These petitions have come from the RKO Hillstreet Theater, from the Paramount Downtown Theater, from the Metzger-Srere Theaters, from the Fox Westlake, Los Angeles and Cameo Theaters, and from the Bill Robinson Theater.

On February 16, 1950, I submitted for the RECORD petitions containing almost 4,000 names. To date that number has been increased by close to 13,000 names, making a grand total of approximately 17,000.

These petitions represent the feeling that is current not only among my own constituents in the Fourteenth Congressional District in California, but in the country as a whole—namely, that the tax is discriminatory, that it falls on those least able to bear it, and that the war emergency which engendered it has long since passed.

I should like to quote briefly from a letter sent by one theater manager, but expressing the feeling of all:

We feel sure that if you were to witness the eagerness with which these petitions were signed you would realize how much the elimination of this tax means to the working classes, especially the low-salaried working classes of people who attend theaters as their only means of entertainment.

Since 1947 I have introduced bills to repeal various wartime excise taxes. My most recent bill, H. R. 6151, introduced on August 26, 1949, would repeal all wartime excise taxes except those of a purely regulatory nature, such as the tax on tobacco, liquor, narcotics, sugar, coconut oil, and adulterated butter.

I feel, as my constituents do, that the continuance of wartime excise taxes on such items as movie admissions and baby oil are unnecessary and unfair.

As additional petitions are received from movie patrons in my district, I will ask permission that they also be recorded.

Russian Crab Imports

REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have called the attention of the House to the fact that 59,000 cases of Russian crab meat, valued at $3,000,000 have been landed in the United States during the past month.

Of these shipments, 15,000 cases were purchased by an American importer from Russia and were shipped into the United States direct from Russia. The other 44,000 cases were obtained from Russia by Great Britain and then were trans-shipped into the United States by the British.

I wrote letters on March 17 to both ECA Administrator Hoffman and to Secretary of State Dean Acheson protesting to these imports of Russian canned crab meat, which, I said, if continued, will ruin our Atlantic and Pacific coast crab-fishing industries.

Today I received a reply to one of my letters of protest from William Foster, Acting Administrator of ECA. In this reply Mr. Foster says:

Although we recognize general objections to the distribution of any canned crab produced in the U. S. S. R., we believe it quite difficult to protest the sales of this product by the British when United States interests are also importing the same thing directly from the U. S. S. R.

This put the question of what is to be done about Russian crab-meat imports squarely up to Secretary of State Dean Acheson to decide. It is for him to say whether the State Department will continue to permit Russian goods, produced by slave labor, to invade American domestic markets and thereby destroy the property, the jobs, and the livelihood of American workers in the American fishing industry.

The State Department in reply to my letter of March 17 said it would investigate the matter of Russian crab-meat imports and give me a statement as to the Department's policy in regard to

these Russian crab-meat imports. Up to this time, 2 weeks after my letter, I have not received the State Department's reply.

I append to this statement copies of the letter which I wrote to ECA Administrator Hoffman and the reply to it which I received this morning from the Acting Administrator of ECA:

MARCH 17, 1950.

Mr. PAUL G. HOFFMAN,
Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I am greatly disturbed, as have been many residents of the Pacific Coast, by recent announcements in the press that 50,000 cases of Russian canned crab, valued at approximately $2,500,000 have been landed at the ports of Seattle and Boston during the past month.

I cannot escape the conclusion that these imports of Russian crab are helpful to our cold-war enemy, Russia, and harmful to the economy of the United States.

Of the 96,000 cases of Russian canned crab imported, 44,000 cases came from Britain. The news reports said these 44,000 cases were part of a shipment of 60,000 cases secured by the British from the Russians in a barter deal.

I would like the ECA to obtain for me a statement from the British showing what goods the British gave the Russians in return for these 44,000 cases of Russian canned crab. I believe that the Congress and the country, because of our heavy American contributions to Britain through ECA programs, has a right to know what goods the British are supplying to Russia.

It is my understanding that the Russians did, with our consent, gain control and jurisdiction over most of the crabbing waters of Asia that were formerly fished by the Japanese. As a result, the Russians today have supplanted the Japanese as the great crab packing nation of the Far East. In prewar days Japan packed an average of 445,122 cases of canned crab annually and in some years as much as 600,000 cases. Russia, due to her new control over these crabbing waters, now, probably, is packing about 500,000 cases of crab annually.

Most of this Russian crab, caught and packed by slave labor, will, I fear, unless steps are taken to prevent it, be dumped into the American market. Should that happen our Atlantic and Pacific coast crabbing industry, in which millions of dollars are invested and by which thousands of workers are employed, soon will be ruined. Such a calamity certainly would weaken our economy by adding to its unemployment and make America less able to carry on our cold war against Russia and assist Russia to more effectively wage her cold war against us.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL V. MACK,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 20, 1950.

Hon. RUSSELL V. MACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MACK: This is in reply to your letter of March 17, 1950, in reference to Russian canned crab meat which the United Kingdom has been exporting to the United States.

We are assured by the British that the canned crab meat was not obtained from the U. S. S. R. as a part of the barter transaction whereby British goods were exchanged for the crab meat. However, there was a bilateral trade agreement between the two countries, signed in December of 1947, which included seafood as a permissive item. That is, in determining the balance of trade, any purchases of seafood by the British from the USSR would be counted. Any monetary settlement under that trade agreement was to be in pounds sterling.

Within the framework of that 1947 trade agreement the British negotiated for and purchased a quantity of canned salmon of U. S. S. R. production but, we are informed the Russians refused to sell the canned salmon unless an undisclosed quantity of canned crab meat was also purchased. Thus, the crab meat was obtained as a tie-in rather than through barter.

It is our understanding that none of the canned crab meat was intended for sale by the British Ministry of Food in England because the relatively high price would not fit into the food distribution program under the austere conditions prevailing there. It is our belief that the British, recognizing the dollar earning value of the canned crab meat, had planned that it would assist their economic recovery to a greater extent if sold for dollars than if sold for home consumption.

We have carefully examined the United Kingdom sales to the U. S. S. R. under the terms of the 1947 trade agreement and assure you that no items were sold which are considered to be critical or strategic materials. In general, the items were textiles, textile machinery, ceramics and similar goods.

Although we recognize general objection to the distribution of any canned crab meat produced in the U. S. S. R., we believe it quite difficult to protest the sales of this product by the British when United States interests are also importing the same product, apparently directly from the U. S. S. R. Any dollar earnings of the British reduce the need for economic assistance, and in estimating dollars to be available we are sure the British had contemplated the sale of the canned crab meat. One of the reasons the United Kingdom was willing to purchase United States canned fish, including salmon, last year was the anticipated dollar earnings from the sale of the crab meat.

We appreciate this opportunity to give you this information and to assure you we are satisfied that the crab meat was not obtained by the British from the U. S. S. R. either through barter or sale of goods to which the United States could object.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM FOSTER,
Acting Administrator.

Natural Gas and Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution of the New England Council, Boston, Mass.:

FUELS FOR NEW ENGLAND

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL, PROVIDENCE, R. I., MARCH 23, 1950

Natural gas

Whereas on March 19, 1948, the New England Council, at its ninetieth quarterly meeting sponsored the first public presentation of arguments for and against the introduction of natural gas into this region; and

Whereas while at that time no formal action was taken, it has become increasingly clear that the introduction of natural gas into this deficit fuel area would be not only desirable but immediately and importantly beneficial to a large proportion of the people of New England, both in their homes and in their economic activities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the directors of the New England Council assembled at Providence in their ninety-eighth quarterly meeting, desire to be recorded with the chairman and members of the Federal Power Commission, in connection with hearings now in progress before that body, as strongly in favor of action by the Commission, at the earliest possible date, favorable to the transmission of natural gas into New England under terms and conditions most suitable to New England and equitable to all the interests concerned.

Oil

Resolved, That approval by Congress of any measure designed to restrict or reduce oil imports into the United States will be contrary to the best interests of New England.

ICC Understaffed and Handicapped in Efforts To Promote Rail Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the New York World-Telegram is to be congratulated on a series of articles which it has published on the subject of rail safety. I invite the attention of the House membership to these articles and urge every Member to read them carefully.

There is now pending in the House rail-safety legislation. I hope that it soon gains the approval of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce so that it can be considered on the floor.

Under leave to do so, I include herewith three of the articles which appeared in the World-Telegram:

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of March 26, 1950]

JAPANESE BEETLES VERSUS COMMUTERS' LIVES—UNITED STATES AND STATE SKIMP ON RAIL SAFETY CHECKUPS—ONLY 22 ICC INSPECTORS ON JOB; PSC SHORN OF POWER

(Prompted by the recent disaster on the Long Island Rail Road, the World-Telegram and Sun conducted an exhaustive study of conditions on all of the railroads serving the metropolitan area. It found that maximum safety is nowhere to be found, that human errors can bring new tragedies and that Government supervision is almost a mockery. Staff writer Allan Keller reports on the findings today in the first of a series of articles of vital interest to every person who rides a train.)

(By Allan Keller)

There are more Federal employees looking for Japanese beetles than there are checking on signals that protect the lives of about 900,000 commuters riding trains in and out of New York City each day.

There are more officials worrying about insecticides for livestock than there are inspecting the locomotives that pull hundreds of commuter trains.

POWER IS VESTED IN ICC

The safety of the commuter on the railroads serving New York—and every other community of large size—rests largely on the railroads themselves. The Interstate Commerce Commission, vested by Congress and the courts with the duty of insuring that safety, is short-handed, slow moving, and hamstrung by tradition.

The Public Service Commission of New York State, although empowered by legislative mandate to insure "safe and adequate" service, actually is shorn of any such power where it involves signal and safety device systems. It is superseded by the ICC, whose 22 signal inspectors are responsible for the greatest trackage on earth—hundreds of thousands of miles.

The picture of Government supervision of railroad safety is one of incredible ineptness, of criminal failure to give it the importance it rates and of actual reliance, in the final instance, on the railroads themselves.

That death has not ridden the rails more frequently is due to the engineering skill of most of the carriers and the general high level of performance of the men operating the trains.

DEVOTE ENERGIES TO RATE FIXING

As a matter of practical truth the Federal and State regulatory bodies supervising common carriers devote hundreds of hours to the fixing of rates and tariffs to every hour invested in the protection of human life and limb.

On the wall behind the desk of Col. J. Monroe Johnson, chairman of the ICC in Washington, there is a map of the United States. In it are stuck pins for the inspectors who look after the signal and control systems of the Nation's railroads. There are very few pins.

One pin jabbed into the map at Rutherford, N. J., represents the ICC inspector of signals responsible for all the commuting railroads feeding thousands of workers into New York every morning and taking them home every evening. On his shoulders rests the ultimate onus for enforcing the rules of the commission.

Naturally, the commuters are not the only persons involved. The long-haul passengers are equally his responsibility when in his district.

LONG GAPS BETWEEN PINS

Colonel Johnson's map has wide open spaces where the inspector must watch the operations of railroads over thousands of square miles. It is an insuperable task. Between the colored pin at Washington, D. C., and the pin at Jacksonville, Fla., there is no other along the eastern seaboard. The nearest is inland at Atlanta.

It would be incorrect to assume that the ICC is unaware of this situation. A short time ago Colonel Johnson went before a congressional committee studying the ICC budget and told the members of his predicament.

ONLY 22 SIGNAL INSPECTORS

"I scarcely see how 65 locomotive inspectors * * * are able to inspect more than 40,000 locomotives, nor how the 131 employees in the railroad safety bureau are able to maintain close supervision of the countless safety devices that govern our rail operations," he said.

It should be pointed out here that the latter classification of inspectors includes not only those who guard the signals and control devices but also those who check on such things as the hand brakes of boxcars, the handles on cars of all types, steps, running boards atop freight cars and the like. Only 22 are primarily concerned with the signal devices that guard the right-of-way.

A FISCAL DILEMMA FOR ICC

Congress recently ordered the ICC to pay certain echelons of employees more money and advised that the pay increases must be absorbed from funds presently available.

"There seems to be no way in which this can be done other than by placing a great number of employees on furlough without pay or by separating a lesser number from the service," said the Chairman.

HOOVER COMMISSION'S VERDICT

It is no wonder that the Hoover Commission task force that studied the regulatory commissions cited the fact that the ICC is understaffed, has vacancies that need filling, and is having difficulty obtaining the proper type of employee to meet its needs.

The Hoover Commission was a hard-headed group seeking economies in government, but it sensed the dangers that are inherent in a situation where a commission with many added duties has seen its total employment drop from 2,649 in 1940 to 2,139 in 1949.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of March 27, 1950]

ONE-WAY TRESTLE OVER NEW JERSEY FLATS COULD MEAN DEATH A LA LONG ISLAND—TEMPORARY 3 YEARS, STRUCTURE SERVES TWO ROADS, HAS NO TRIPPERS

(By Allan Keller)

A commuter doesn't have to ride the Long Island Railroad to run the risk of death or injury on the railroads.

So much has been said about the Long Island Railroad many persons forget that the same lone inspector of the Interstate Commerce Commission who checks and approves signal and control devices for that line also is responsible for every other line running in and out of the metropolitan area.

FISCAL SHAMAL

Two of these are the Central Railroad of New Jersey and the Pennsylvania, which share the tracks of the New York & Long Branch Railroad, serving the Jersey seashore.

Over the waters of Matawan Creek, near Matawan, N. J., the line runs across a one-way wooden trestle built about 3 years ago to replace one that burned in 1946. Far beneath it are the tidal flats of an inlet from the Atlantic.

Although two railroads operate over this narrow trestle, with all the opportunities of such an operation for mistakes and errors, no automatic devices are installed to stop trains if the engineer ignores a visual signal.

LONG ISLAND PARALLEL

This is potentially such a death trap the engineers themselves slow the trains down before venturing across the temporary trestle. Riders on this line know, however, that the Rockville Centre gantlet track of the Long Island Railroad was also a dangerous spot. Nonetheless the engineer rocketed past full-stop signals and into the path of a train coming from the opposite direction—at a cost of 32 lives.

Any accident like that on Long Island, occurring on the Matawan trestle, scores of feet above ground and water, would lead inevitably to a major disaster.

At the time the trestle was built it was stated officially that it was a temporary replacement for the one that burned. Riders have often written to the railroads asking what was meant by the word "temporary" but have never received a definite answer.

JERSEY SUPERVISION

In Washington, officials of the safety bureau of the Interstate Commerce Commission told this writer that while their inspector had jurisdiction over the signals for this structure and the adjoining right-of-way, the Public Utility Commission of New Jersey supervises the bridge itself.

Just such overlapping and conflicting problems of jurisdiction bedevil all railroads and the Government bodies regulating them.

After the recent wreck at Rockville Centre, the Long Island road installed automatic brake trippers at the ends of the gantlet. Before it did, it sought authorization for the step, leading to the comedy of errors described by an official of the New York Public Service Commission in these words:

"Talk about your mix-ups * * * the Long Island didn't know whom to apply to for permission, so it applied to both the ICC and the PSC.

"The law establishing the public service commission instructs it to see that railroads maintain 'service that is safe and adequate' but we know the ICC supersedes us on that matter of safety. There are 13 railroads in the State, with thousands of miles of tracks and heavy train movements. Yet, the Federal law says the ICC shall inspect the signals and then it assigns two or three men at most to do the job."

LIVES IN BALANCE

This opera bouffe handling of jurisdiction would be comical if the lives of thousands of commuters did not hang in the balance. A passenger on a train that collides with another, or which hurtles off the track through an open switch, is disinterested in which government agency is responsible for supervising the railroad.

Another potential danger area exists where the trains from the shore join the main line of the Jersey Central, which also carries the Reading trains and those of the Baltimore and Ohio.

The routes come together at Elizabethport in a maze of cross-over tracks. Here, too, although located in a heavy commuter area, there is a right-angle crossing at grade. Trains from Newark roll across the four tracks of the main line, protected from collision by visual signals, but not by automatic brake trippers. Chance for human failure is always present.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of March 27, 1950]

NEW YORK CENTRAL SAFE TILL SOMEONE ERRS—TRAIN EVERY 40 SECONDS OVER MAZE OF TRACKS UNGUARDED BY TRIPPERS

(By Allan Keller)

Every morning and every evening trains of the New York Central and New Haven Railroads roll in and out of the city on a headway that often runs under 40 seconds.

The four tracks from the junction near the Mott Haven yards in the Bronx to Grand Central are so crowded that often all four are occupied at once.

Yet from the station to the junction, above ground and underground, there are no automatic brake-tripping devices to serve as a safety check on human failure.

In this stretch of heavily used right-of-way is a drawbridge across the Harlem River that swings open to permit tugs and other river craft to pass. Dangerous as it is, it, too, is unguarded by automatic trippers.

SEASIDE TURN NEW

North of the One Hundred and Thirty-eighth Street station in the Bronx, the tracks of the New York Central's Hudson River division, the main line, turn off from the Park Avenue route which carries the New Haven line and the Harlem division of the Central.

In this stretch of tracks, many blocks long, there is a labyrinth of switches over which trains move at a rapid pace. These switches are guarded by interlocking signals if anything is wrong or if two trains are in danger of collision.

These systems are virtually foolproof if the engineer or motorman is alert. Where they fall down is where the system at Rockville Centre gantlet track on the Long Island line broke down—when there is human failure.

USED BY THOUSANDS

Scores of thousands of commuters use these tracks each day and so do other thousands of riders on such crack trains as the Central's Twentieth Century Limited, the

Empire State Express and the Patriot and the New Haven's Merchants' Limited and Yankee Clipper.

New Haven commuters are familiar with the junction at New Rochelle, where trains for Grand Central Station and others for the Hell Gate Bridge route to Pennsylvania Station separate on their way to the city.

Many long freight trains originating on the Hell Gate route have to join the main line to New England at the same junction. Interlocking signals protect the riders but not as adequately as interlocking signals plus automatic train-stopping devices.

All these riders are relying, in the final analysis, on the men at the controls in the locomotive cabs. They are among the finest class of workmen on earth but, being human, they are susceptible to human failures.

The World-Telegram and Sun believes with many commuter organizations that sections of right-of-ways, where the traffic is as dense as that in this city and its suburbs, should have the added protection of brake-tripping devices.

One thing has been made patently clear since the disaster on Long Island: Passengers who rely upon the public service commission to guarantee safety are trusting to false gods. It is shorn of most of the power needed to force railroads to maintain maximum safety.

FEW ICC INSPECTORS

On the other hand, the Interstate Commerce Commission, with full responsibility for supervision of signal and control systems, is functioning with a bare handful of inspectors. Col. J. Monroe Johnson, Chairman of the ICC, himself admitted that in practice the Government regulatory body must rely on the railroads to police their own trackage, with not too frequent checking by the undermanned safety bureau inspectors.

In the past two decades the ICC has been overburdened with the problems of supervising the motor carriers of the Nation. The incredible mushrooming of this type of business has had the effect of making rail transport of secondary interest to the Commission.

Most of the Commissioners would willingly see the work of the safety bureau transferred to a Department of Transportation if one were formed.

SEE LIGHTER REPORTS

"Until transportation—one of the five major businesses of the Nation—is given real stature by a place at the President's Cabinet table, you must expect limited budgets and curtailed services," said Colonel Johnson.

All of this makes tragic reading for the commuter. He knows of the billions being spent on farm crops that wind up as fertilizer. He knows eggs are being sold to Europe at a penny a dozen. He knows of scores of other places and ways in which the taxpayers' money is being spent by an easy-handed administration.

Inevitably he wonders why a few more dollars cannot be invested in the safety of American citizens who ride the trains to work each morning and each evening.

The FBI Files

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I herewith insert three editorials from three newspapers.

The first is the Times-Herald, a radically bitter anti-administration publication.

The second is from the Indianapolis News, a Republican newspaper that puts patriotism above partisanship.

The third is from the Louisville Courier-Journal, which is a moderate Democrat publication as I understand it.

It is remarkable that each arrives at the same general conclusion.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 30, 1950]

IT'S THERE, FIND IT

J. Edgar Hoover has made a case nobody can shake for keeping FBI files confidential. That is clear. But it is equally clear that President Truman is hiding behind the FBI in his attempt to choke off senatorial investigation of State Department corruption at the hands of the Communists.

The situation sums up as follows: The Senate has directed the Tydings subcommittee to subpena executive department files as just one element of the investigation. Mr. Truman has ordered that no executive files be turned over, and is pushing the FBI out front as the clay pigeon for senatorial shooting.

WHAT DOES THE RESOLUTION SAY?

And now, believe it or not, just as the President refuses all executive files to the Senate, the President's own executive loyalty board asks the Tydings committee for its files on Communist matters. The fight therefore exposes itself as an absurdity, except as to the FBI.

Some Senators are saying that if Mr. Truman does not fork over in response to congressional subpena, he must be impeached. We cock an interested ear. But be that as it may, the Senate resolution which dictates the operations of the Tydings committee is one of the most powerful and all-inclusive ever written. It says for that committee to find out not only who is but also who has been corrupting our State Department through Communist influence.

Such an investigation does not stand or fall on the mere issue of whether the Senate can riffle through executive files. There is plenty of evidence elsewhere. Find it, Senators. And act on it.

[From the Indianapolis News of March 28, 1950]

END THE PARTISAN PROBE

J. Edgar Hoover, in whom the country has high confidence, is eminently right in opposing surrender of FBI loyalty files for congressional investigation. To do so would play directly into the hands of Moscow. The information thus revealed would be calculated to do this country far more damage than any possible service that might accrue.

It is to be hoped that the Hoover testimony will bring an early end to the grotesque and politics-ridden publicity field day that has surrounded the charges made by Senator McCARTHY against the State Department.

The national disservice which this so-called investigation has done can only lend weight to the responsible suggestion that the whole business be taken out of the hands of the politicians. Enough public fears have been aroused, however, to warrant a fresh start on an impartial and higher-minded basis.

What is called for is the appointment of a nonpartisan commission with a sufficient sense of responsibility and direction and with enough public confidence to conduct an inquiry on the evidence alone. Such an investigation, conducted with dignity and without headline hunting, should be able to produce the facts on the true situation in the State Department—and that is what the people want.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of March 29, 1950]

A PLOT TO TRUMPET WHISPERED CHARGES

In an atmosphere of which a gestapo-minded man might have taken prime advantage, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has acquitted himself admirably on two occasions in the last few days.

The first instance was Mr. Hoover's rejection of a proposal by Virginia's Representative HOWARD SMITH that the FBI be made to pass on the fitness of all employees of the National Science Foundation. It would have given the FBI unprecedented power as detective, prosecutor, judge, and jury over the inquiring minds of free men. It would have established in this country for the first time a secret police.

Now, Mr. Hoover has displayed equal vigor in protesting the use of FBI secret files in connection with Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY'S blunderbuss charges of communism in the State Department. At immediate issue are the FBI dossiers gathered in the course of loyalty checks on Federal employees.

As Mr. Hoover himself remarked, "One report may allege crime of a most despicable type, and the truth or falsity of these charges may not emerge until several reports are studied, further investigations made, and the wheat separated from the chaff."

The files include everything which neighbors or acquaintances have told special agents about the persons under investigation. Much of it is hearsay. Some of it may be the distortions of personal animosity or ignorance, or the overdramatizations of the suspicious. All of this misinformation is a rightful part of the secret file, because—to borrow Mr. Hoover's metaphor—investigators must gather chaff with the wheat before they can start winnowing. Aside from outright misinformation and unsupported charges that find their way into investigation files, there is a great deal of intimately personal information which has no bearing on the Communist or anti-Communist inclination of the subject. None of this material should be bandied about in public. There could be no worse invasion of the right of privacy.

Mr. Hoover advanced other reasons why he does not want the files put to a use for which they were not intended. They would reveal many of the FBI's informants, ruining their future value if not actually endangering their lives. Indeed, in one sweep, disclosure of the FBI confidential files would smear hundreds of innocent people; it would betray the whole intent of the Bureau since it was organized in the Department of Justice 42 years ago; and it would destroy much of the value painstakingly built into the Bureau.

It is neither the assigned nor intended function of the FBI to ruin or persecute innocent people. The Bureau has jurisdiction over investigations of espionage, sabotage, treason, and other offenses against internal security of the United States. In addition it is charged with investigating violation of some 120 Federal laws, including those dealing with banking, kidnaping, automobile theft, white slavery, and atomic energy.

Americans feel an instinctive revulsion against anything that smacks of a secret police. The outcry which invariably follows reports of wire-tapping is proof of this. The idea of a law-enforcement agency invading the privacy of any individual is distasteful enough even when the invasion is legally warranted, and the results are kept secret. But Senator McCARTHY and Representative SMITH, ostensibly fighting totalitarianism, would cheerfully resort to its very own weapons. Mr. Hoover, Attorney General Howard McGrath, and President Truman are defending American institutions when they take a stand against such folly.

Old-Age Funds Already Spent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission heretofore granted, I am including as part of these remarks a timely article by Sigrid Arne entitled "All of $14,000,000,000 Collected as Old-Age Funds Already Spent," which appeared in the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., in my congressional district, in its issue of March 14, 1950. The article follows:

ALL OF $14,000,000,000 COLLECTED AS OLD-AGE FUNDS ALREADY SPENT

(By Sigrid Arne)

WASHINGTON, March 13.—Every dollar of the nearly $14,000,000,000 paid in under the old-age benefit section of the social-security program by employees and employers has been spent. It paid for office costs. It paid for the comparatively small number of monthly checks now going to workers who are 65 and over. It paid for $11,893,083,053 worth of United States Government bonds held in the United States Treasury for the old-age fund.

The money paid for these bonds went out to cover general Government expenses.

This is generally known to insurance and financial experts, but at Senate hearings on the social-security system Senator EUGENE MILLIKIN, Republican, Colorado, said he suspected the fact escapes public attention.

Money left after benefits and operating costs have been paid has to be turned in for Government bonds. The law says so. The law was written after long study in the thirties by a large group of insurance experts. These experts thought the money would earn interest if it was put into bonds and thereby increase the fund that must eventually pay workers their old-age checks.

Now that idea is under attack in the Senate Finance Committee and by the Brookings Institution, a private nonprofit research organization.

Social-security experts, including Administrator Arthur J. Altmeyer, stoutly defend the system. Here's the background, as they and Treasury Department people outline it:

Employees and employers in covered occupations pay into the social-security fund for every pay check. In 1948 payments amounted to $3,600,000,000.

Payments now more than cover the sums that have to be paid to retired workers.

But sometime there will be so many retired workers that payments will not cover their checks. Then the Social Security Administration will have to go to the Treasury, with its Government bonds in hand, and ask for cash.

When that happens the Treasury will have on hand just the money it has any year—the money that comes in that year. That includes (1) the taxes it collects; (2) any surplus, and (3) the money it gets by selling bonds to private investors.

The Treasury would have to tap one of those three sources.

Consider surplus first. There is little hope now for a surplus for many years to come.

The Government owed $256,477,511,689 as of late February. It paid off part of its debt in 2 years since the war: $750,000,000 in 1947 and $8,400,000,000 in 1948. Now the debt is jumping again.

TAKES BEST SOURCE

Even if the Government could pay off at the 1948 rate from now on, and if no more were added to the debt, it would take until 1982 to tear up the mortgage.

Now take bonds. Treasury experts think that is a likely source of quick cash. Even at the bottom of the depression, in 1933, the Treasury took in $3,000,000,000 in its bond deals with the public.

But the most likely source of revenue for old-age payments would be taxes.

But MILLIKIN said at the Senate hearings that he feels this would result in taxing people twice for their old-age benefits.

Altmeyer argued that the same people would not be taxed. MILLIKIN countered that it would be the same taxpayer, but Altmeyer maintained that the taxpayer would not be taxed twice for the same thing.

The Federal Reserve Bulletin for February says the Government has already used $38,000,000,000 out of the social security, postal savings, veterans insurance, and bank deposit insurance trust funds.

MILLIKIN said that as long as the Government was going to spend these trust-fund moneys, he feels it should use them to pay off the debt, and not just for the general Government expenses.

The Brookings Institution is much more critical than MILLIKIN.

It says: "Since the money is used by the Government in meeting its regular expenditures, no real reserve is created. The obligations of the Government deposited in a trust account do not represent assets; they merely record future obligations which can be fulfilled only through the levy of future taxes upon the economy in general. The trust fund is thus a fiction—serving only to confuse.

Treasury people argue that as long as the Government bonds pay interest they are assets. Brookings says:

"The operation of the old-age insurance fund is not similar in character to that of a private insurance company. Private insurance reserves are usually invested in projects that directly participate in, or promote, the production of goods and services. Thus they earn income."

Brookings adds the Nation may undergo another depression in which the Government will collect small tax totals and yet have to put out more in social-security payments.

It says there are four possible courses for the Nation's social-security program:

1. Helping old persons and others in need by paying the cost out of each year's taxes and making no long-term commitments. Brookings favors this course.

2. Payment of a minimum to all eligible needy without considering what other income they have.

3. Payment of a standard minimum to all eligible but with additional amounts to those who had higher earnings when they worked. This idea recognizes some relation between benefits and the customary living standard of the worker.

4. Payment of such high benefits that it would insure many workers their customary purchasing power.

Demopolis, Ala., Lock and Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I, along with my colleagues from Alabama, was greatly disappointed when I learned that the House Committee on Appropriations had cut the budget recommendation for further construction on the lock and dam just below the confluence of the Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers at Demopolis, Ala., from $4,000,000 down to $358,000. This is a cut of more than 50 percent.

This great lock and dam at Demopolis, Ala., is a very vital step in improving navigation on the Warrior River, which connects the coal fields of Walker County, Ala., and the industrial city of Birmingham with the port of Mobile, Ala.

But this is not all, Mr. Speaker. The lock and dam at Demopolis is the first step in the development of the great Tombigbee inland waterway that would connect the Gulf of Mexico and the Great Lakes of this country by water transportation.

The Tombigbee inland waterway has great industrial possibilities, and of even more immediate importance its construction would be a great defense asset to us in that it would reduce the water distance between the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile and our atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., by some 300 miles.

I recognize that it is imperative that we do all we can here to exercise every reasonable economy in the operation of our Government. But a 90-percent cut at Demopolis is unwise and injust. It seems to me that it would be much fairer to cut allocations for all river-and-harbor projects by a flat 10 percent.

When the appropriation bill comes on for debate next week an effort will be made to restore the $4,000,000 recommended in the President's budget message for the Demopolis lock and dam, less a reasonable across-the-board cut for all projects. I sincerely hope that the members of the House will see the justice of our position, and in the name of national defense and internal development will allow the project at Demopolis to go forward.

As a part of my remarks, I include an editorial from the Thursday, March 23, 1950, issue of the Cullman Tribune published at Cullman, Ala.:

LITTLE RECOGNITION

Alabama, famous for its many rivers, was given a severe jolt this week when the House Appropriations Committee cut a requested $4,000,000 waterways improvement to $358,000. This is less than one-tenth of the amount approved by Army engineers for the further development of the Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers and the lock and dam at Demopolis.

The Tribune is in agreement with those who are demanding less Federal spending. But it is false economy for the fund slashers

to cut appropriations as was done on the Alabama waterways. It would be well for the members of this committee to reconsider their actions concerning these projects. There are other Federal programs that could be trimmed in order to give more funds for the waterways.

Improvements of the rivers will afford protection and benefits. These public-service projects will give employment to many people on constructive work under planned supervision. When completed, there will be better navigation on the rivers and better flood control. Alabama, with its splendid dock facilities at Mobile, definitely needs more improvements on its rivers.

Maybe Alabama would attract more attention in Congress if there were a two-party political system in operation. It certainly received little recognition for its waterways.

Fate of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Journal-American of March 30, 1950, and in other newspapers throughout the country:

FATE OF FREEDOM

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

"He who holds Alaska holds the world." (The late Gen. Billy Mitchell.)

Today marks the eighty-third anniversary of the Alaskan Purchase. The treaty under which the United States acquired the Territory from Czarist Russia by payment of $7,200,000, was signed March 30, 1867. The pact was negotiated under the stewardship of William H. Seward, Secretary of State in President Johnson's Cabinet. Alaska is a fabulous country. It is a land of tomorrow. It is a land of today. It is a source of great wealth in the fish from its waters, the gold from its sands, the silver from its mines, the timber from its forests, and the choicest of furs. It is [illegible] as an empire of scenic wonders.

Soviet Russia has claimed that Alaska belongs to it. At the United Nations Conference in San Francisco, Molotov declared that the purchase of Alaska was a fraud. Russia today has numerous air bases in Siberia. She is building additional airfields there. She is concentrating on air power. She is believed strong enough to strike our Alaska bases, from whence she could launch attacks against the United States proper.

The Hearst newspapers long have publicized the shocking inadequacy of military defenses in the arctic and subarctic areas.

Alaska's Governor Gruening has warned that the Territory's Army, Navy, and air bases are so weakly garrisoned that they can be overpowered by a comparatively small air-borne enemy force.

Let us sound the clarion call for action. Let us shout, "Wake up, America." There is but one thing that the Russians understand and respect. That is strength.

Soviet Russia is planning to exterminate democracy. She is planning to crucify humanity. For the sake of our Nation, for the sake of freemen everywhere, let us admit Alaska and Hawaii into the Union. Statehood for these Territories and adequate defense are inseparably linked.

The President of the United States has recommended statehood for both. The House of Representatives has approved such action. Let the Senate of the United States take a similar patriotic course. Let that action be taken at once. Let us give Alaska and Hawaii statehood now.

Do We Dare?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial in the edition of April 1950 of the Methodist Challenge, published by Robert P. Schuler, pastor of Trinity Methodist Church, Los Angeles, Calif.:

DO WE DARE?

Do we dare acknowledge the facts? Are we courageous enough to face the cold, unpleasant truth? The people called Methodists are in a position where they must search their souls. Our church has been accused of friendliness with an atheistic ideology that is seeking to enslave the world. We are also under grave suspicion of having lent ourselves to organizations and agencies that seek the destruction of the American way of life. These accusations do not extend to the whole membership of either the clergy or the laity. Indeed those accused are very few among us, but very strong and powerful in church organizations and councils. The accusations are undoubtedly true and justified.

The Alabama Christian Advocate is the only Methodist publication that I have seen that actually faces up to the facts. The Christian Advocate (Chicago) does say that the Methodist Federation for Social Action has no right to speak for the Methodist Church, but further editorial comment is weak and spineless. The Michigan Christian Advocate and others go to the defense of the situation as is. I have seen two very cautious statements from two of our bishops, in which they deplore and defend. A strange silence has characterized those bishops and other leaders named in the accusations.

However, the daily press and secular publications generally are speaking, and they are of one accord. Several of the largest churches in Methodism have spoken through their official boards and they have not minced words. While most Methodist pulpits have mouthed weasel words of alibi and excuse, yet more than one pulpit has heard the challenging voice of a real Methodist prophet who has proclaimed against this terrible thing that has been done to us by a minority of our leaders.

Thus far I have not heard or read one actual denial of the facts. The line of defense is as unworthy as the cause. The Michigan Christian Advocate voiced it perfectly. Stanley High and John T. Flynn got part of their information from an "unfrocked" Presbyterian, while Flynn himself is a Roman Catholic, so reported by the Michigan Advocate. What a confession! Have we no stronger defense than that? Is the great Methodist Church, 9,000,000 strong, dependent on name calling and a resort to bigotry for a defense against the charge, proven by documentary evidence, that a group of powerful Methodist leaders have been flirting with atheistic communism? What a confession.

What matters where the information came from, if the information is true? Who cares what church John T. Flynn belongs to, if he wrote and published the truth in his book, "The Road Ahead"? That High and Flynn have published the truth is conceded. Many of the facts published by them have been published before and are not disputed. True, a few frightened apologists seek to mislead by claiming that the facts are fragmentary and that some quotations were not complete. The facts are full enough to be horrible and the quotations complete enough to convict beyond any doubt at all.

Face this: The Methodist Federation for Social Action has its office at 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, gets its mail there, has its telephone there and does business there. That's Methodist headquarters, my dear reader. Then face this fact: A Methodist bishop is president of this indefensible organization and four Methodist bishops and a dean of a Methodist school of divinity are vice presidents. Face this fact: Sixteen bishops of the Methodist Church, two heads of two of our most important boards in Methodism, numerous editors of Methodist publications, and district superintendens galore are active members of this organization, listed by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive. Face this fact: The executive secretary of this now notorious organization is appointed every year to his place of leadership by a Methodist bishop.

Then face this: "The federation rejects the method of struggle for profit as the economic basis for society, and seeks to replace it with social-economic planning to develop a society without class or group discrimination and privilege." (Taken from the masthead of Social Questions Bulletin, official organ of the Methodist Federation for Social Action. That's as near as Americans dare write the creed of communism.)

If some dense mind needs more, face the fact that the executive secretary, spokesman for the federation, recently declared that the purpose of the organization was not the "improvement of the present social order but its revolutionary abolition and replacement anew." That's Marxism.

No amount of twisting and squirming will do now. Whitewash is not enough to wash this stain away. We must either repudiate this subversive movement and soundly rebuke those who have betrayed us or we must suffer the just and merited contempt of all good Americans of whatever name and creed. This is an hour when Methodist people must awaken, arise, advance, and stand upon the walls for the protection of that which is genuine in our church and Nation. We have been betrayed.

Personally, I am grateful to Mr. High and to Mr. Flynn for having brought out the facts and presented the truth which our Methodist sentinels either failed to see or were too cowardly to announce.

I am also encouraged that many of our pastors and people have refused to swallow blindly the alibis and flabby efforts at defense of a few of our leaders, following this unsavory revelation. Unfortunate as is our plight, there is in it the possibility of great blessing if only we awaken, arise, assert ourselves, and refuse to be delivered by a little group of Socialist planners and fellow travelers.

A New Concept on Asia: Asians, Not Americans, Are Chief Losers to Russia and Communism—Filipino Advances New Suggestions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vicente Villamin, Filipino lawyer, writer and economist, has a new analysis of the situation in Asia and the role that America plays on that continent of more than 1,000,000,000 people. I hope and urge those who are interested in the subject, specially the State Department policy makers, to read his analysis, for it may be the key to a new approach to the problem that is becoming more and more involved everyday.

Mr. Villamin's thesis in his own words is as follows:

(a) The Asian peoples should be made clearly to realize that the basic issue in Asia today is not between Russian communism and American democracy, not between Russia and the United States, but rather between Russian communism and Asian nationalism, culture, religion, economic interests, and its own philosophy of life—the Asian old order; (b) that it is of infinitely less consequence for America to lose Asia, as many Americans put it, than for Asia to lose America; and (c) that in losing America, Asia would be getting Russia, with its material poverty, its ideological severity, and its comprehensive restriction of individual freedom and liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to make Mr. Villamin's statement a part of my remarks.

The statement follows:

A NEW REALISTIC ATTITUDE TOWARD ASIA

(By Vicente Villamin)

At present, by force of circumstances, the United States policy actions in Asia may be said to be on a day-to-day basis. That is practical. That is a necessity. As long as the intent is honest and the purpose constructive, inconsistency in action is not a violation of virtue. The United States wants to help Asia, continuing a long tradition and policy. And Asia wishes that help to continue. But the Russians and the Communists have muddled up everything, misrepresented the United States and, unrealized as yet by the Asian peoples, are placing those peoples under the Communist severe regime, lorded over by the powerful and undaunted masters of the Kremlin.

There is an imperative need for a redefinition and reclarification of what the present attitude of America is and what it might be. There is no necessity for a fundamental modification of policy, for it is honest and constructive. What is desirable is a revision in the placement and intensification of emphasis.

The thesis of this paper is this: (a) The Asian peoples should be made clearly to realize that the basic issue in Asia today is not between Russian communism and American democracy, not between Russia and the United States, but, rather, between Russian communism and Asian nationalism, culture, religion, economic interests, and its own philosophy of life—the Asian old order; (b) that it is of infinitely less consequence for America to lose Asia, as many persons put it, than for Asia to lose America; and (c) that in losing America, Asia would be getting Russia, with its material poverty, its ideological severity, and its comprehensive restriction of individual freedom and liberty.

This new approach to the Asian situation requires a repositioning of the observer of the Asia-American scene from the present vantage point of the United States. There are many Americans who think and talk as though their country, instead of Asia, would be the chief loser to communism and to Russia. And that is center and circumference of the present misunderstanding of the issues that are being fought on that continent.

"We (Americans) Are Losing Asia Fast"—that is the title of an article in the Saturday Evening Post by Mr. Stewart Alsop, a writer who recently made a flying visit in Asia. He says that Asia is being lost by America to communism, which means to Russia.

One does not lose anything, tangible or intangible, unless he owns or possesses it. What is America losing in Asia since she does not own or possess it physically or ideologically? Is it Asia's friendship she is losing? Is it Asia's democracy that is being lost by the Asians themselves?

Governments in Asia may be at odds with America on certain questions, but it is safe to state that the Asian peoples are friendly and grateful to America for solid reasons. Of all the "foreign devils," referring to all Western foreigners, the American has been the least selfish and the most helpful. Those peoples have a suppressed fear of the Russians, who say "comrades" in one side of the mouth and shout "obey" in the other.

Asia never has had any democracy, the sort America has, to lose to communism. Every realist knows that basic fact. It has its own philosophy of life, individual, family and national, that is neither communistic nor democratic.

What then is Asia losing to communism? What Asia is losing to communism is its very soul—the old order, which is its very own and its most precious possession. Asia, not America, is the loser. But America, cleverly aided and abetted by Russia, is creating a delusion for herself and confusion among the Asians by seeming to be the loser. That is why many Asians place the responsibility for their ultimate salvation on America instead of on themselves, and also why America is causing so much disappointment to them today. But that is not all the harm that is being done. America is unwittingly preventing the Asians from fully realizing that it is their very soul, their old order, that they are losing to communism.

Therefore, let this be crystal clear: Russia is ousting from Asia the Asian old order rather than America, which is hardly there. Russia wants the world to think that she is driving out imperialist America from Asia for the good of Asia. And apparently America, an unknowing victim of Russian propaganda, believes that Russia is doing just that and she worries about her world mission to save democracy and about her own world security. But the plain, commonsense fact is that Russia is planning communism in Asia for her own good by suppressing its old culture, its religion, its civilization, and its time-honored way of life.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that, largely as the result of the clash of American and Russian actions and propaganda, Asia does not yet comprehend that the issue it is facing is not Americanism against Russianism, but Russian communism against the Asian old order. When Asia comes to realize that this is the issue, it will find itself more consciously, assert its innate nationalism, and consider Russia as another foreign devil to be resisted, shunned, and rejected.

Russia's work of proselyting Asia is effective because she has a definite objective in Asia, which is to establish her authority and her system there, to have it in her political orbit and under the protection of the Russian armed forces. On the contrary, America's counsels on Asia are chaotically diverse, contradictory, and nebulous. No wonder Russia advances, while America falls back. And even American thinkers say we are losing Asia fast.

Because the real issue is befuddled, Asia does not realize clearly another tremendous fact. It is that Asia is losing America, the only foreign country that can and is willing to help it; substantially and unselfishly. Asia does not seem to know of Russia's poverty in material things and in spirit to be of help. Asia should know that Russia's plan is to help herself to the human and economic resources of Asia. When Asia loses America for Russia, it will result in the intensification of its poverty and the restriction or constriction of its liberty.

What is the logical philosophy of action for America in the present situation?

If America's influence in support of the old order is to be felt in Asia, she must make more positive disclosure of her motivations and objectives. As a part of that disclosure, America must make unequivocably clear that those motivations and objectives are radically different from Russia's, citing historical and contemporary precedents, and interpreting their respective purposes in the light of their comparative natural resources and their financial and industrial potentials. Asia will see the elemental wisdom of being with rich and liberal America than with poor, tight-fisted and totalitarian Russia.

Asian governments may become communistic or "peoples'" governments because presently nationalism is defeating itself, but when the people come to know fully and clearly the mission of Russian communism, on the one hand, and the loss of American assistance and collaboration, on the other, they will present such formidable resistance to the new order, even if it be silent at least in the beginning, that the new Communist leaders of Asia will be compelled to relax their relations with the Russians and to reject both their actual and subtle domination of Asian life and affairs. That would be Asia's day of revindication and regeneration.

What the old order in Asia is differs with each country. But at bottom it is identical. It is the quintessence of thousands of years of both recorded and unrecorded history. Between it and Russian communism there is much more conflict than harmony and they are fundamentally beyond conciliation or even synchronization. They are oil and water.

In China, the old order was represented by the Chiang Kai-shek government. That government had done or did not do many things that made it unrepresentative of that order and the people lost faith in it. It is the loss of that faith, which infected even the army, that helped the Communists to win.

In Indochina, the Communists are good tacticians enough to say that they are fighting French colonialism and thus native nationalism; the old order is left dormant and beguiled. The political expedient of putting up a former royal playboy as the head of the country, when everyone knows that his main support is the French Army of 150,000 men, will inevitably be declared a failure.

In Korea, the Communists have separated themselves and created North Korea. In South Korea, the Japanese order has been expunged and under President Rhee there is a reassertion of the old order. America is directly helping that country to help herself.

In India, the old order is Indian, which was influenced at the top by British philosophy and culture. With its present political

independence and its circumspect and cautious leaders, India is a formidable bulwark against communism.

In Indonesia, the old order clings around the broad conceptions of Buddhism and Mohammedanism built on an agricultural and oceanic economy. Four hundred years of Dutch colonialism have served both to develop the country materially and to accentuate the nationalism of the Indonesians to the point that many of the present leaders of the Indonesian Republic fought against the Dutch in the last war on the side of the Japanese, for whom they do not have much love. Indonesian nationalism, the differentiation of the old order, will beat communism hands down.

In the Philippines, American democracy has taken deep root and communism is being fought according to the democratic rules—enlightment instead of suppression. The preservation and strengthening of the Philippine democracy will serve to make it a visible model for all the peoples of Asia to emulate.

In the face of militant communism, fighting down discredited nationalism and old-fashioned colonialism, and encountering disorganization and disintegration, Asia seems fated to succumb and be annexed to Russia's ideological dominion. If that happens it would be but a transient condition, for when the peoples of Asia find out that they have lost America, lost their age-old liberties, and have acquired Russia, its poverty, its severity, and its regimentation, they will rally to the old order and, with their leaders, the wiser for the experience, they will expunge communism from their life and tell Russia to quit Asia for good and all.

America, either voluntarily or upon the urging, either expressed or implied, of Asia, could help powerfully the Asian peoples to preserve their old order in an atmosphere of the present-day concepts of liberty, opportunity, and independence.

The Legion G-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following short editorial that appeared in the Boston Post, March 29, 1950:

THE LEGION G-DAY

The American Legion and its national chaplain, the Reverend Edward J. Carney, OSA, of Lawrence, are to be congratulated for the establishment of G-day—a day to be set aside during the week of April 16 for observance as God's Day. The nearly 17,500 Legion posts and nearly 13,500 women's auxiliary units, located in virtually every village and hamlet in the Nation, should prove a powerful factor in turning the attention of peoples of all faith and creeds back to God.

This nonsectarian observance, which has already won the endorsement and approval of leaders of all faiths, can be a tremendous force in every community, large and small, and should show the American people that the Legion's motto, "For God and Country," really means something to the members of the world's biggest and greatest association of war veterans. The Legion should have full public support in making this splendid observance a great success.

Congress Due To End 25-Year Back-Pay Row

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story from the New York World-Telegram and Sun of Monday, March 27, 1950, which gives the background of a bill, H. R. 7767, now before the Judiciary Committee, to provide for the payment to Federal Customs employees of extra compensation for services performed on Sundays and Federal holidays after September 29, 1931:

CONGRESS DUE TO END 25-YEAR BACK-PAY ROW—BILL WOULD MEET CUSTOMS CLAIMS

(By Roger Stuart)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—A controversy which started a quarter of a century ago over back-pay claims of Federal customs inspectors may be settled soon by congressional action. A measure spelling out rights to overtime pay of inspectional employees has been drafted by the National Customs Service Association and introduced by Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, Michigan.

There are 2,530 customs inspectors at various United States ports. Approximately a fourth of these are stationed in New York. John F. Doyle, of the customs service's liquidation division in New York City, is vice president of the group which drafted the proposed legislation.

LONG, UPHILL FIGHT

Alfred F. Beiter, national president of the association, asserted today that congressional action to provide for back-pay claims is long overdue. Officers and employees of the customs service, he declared, "Have tried for years to have their rights to amounts earned under extra compensation statutes fairly and fully recognized by the administrative departments."

The controversy started early in the 1920's, Mr. Beiter explained. It continued until the middle of the 1930's, when employees took a test case to court. It dragged for several years, but a favorable decision was finally handed down by the Supreme Court in 1944.

DID NOT APPLY TO ALL

Under that decision, according to Mr. Beiter, certain of the employees received payment back to September 1, 1931. But when the employees attempted to persuade the administrative department to apply the Supreme Court decision to other cases where the same type of services was performed, the department refused and still further litigation was necessary.

The customs inspectors won another favorable Court of Claims decision in 1946. Nevertheless, Mr. Beiter said, the administrative departments "have continued since then to refuse to recognize certain aspects of the judicial decisions in settling similar claims, and the matter is still not satisfactorily settled. It is the objective of this bill effectively to dispose of that long-standing problem."

The Dingell bill provides that if any person to whom extra compensation may be payable has died or become legally incapacitated, the money will be paid to his legal representative.

WOULD SET UP SPECIAL UNIT

The measure would lead to creation of a special committee to determine the amounts of money to be paid to any employee. One member would be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, another by the Comptroller General and the third, an employee representative, by the chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

The bill has been referred to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for consideration. Representative DINGELL said he would press for early action.

Strengthening the Army of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Harry H. Schlacht which appeared in the Hearst newspapers of March 28, 1950:

STRENGTHENING THE ARM OF LIBERTY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

"On my honor, I will do my best to do my duty to God and my country."

We salute today the Boy Scouts of America on the happy completion of four decades of distinguished service to American boyhood. The Boy Scouts of America have become part of the very heart of our Nation. The group is an American institution. It is representative of our Nation. It is nonsectarian. It is adapted to the boys' needs. It teaches our lads to practice the fundamentals of good citizenship, of self-reliance, of fair play for others, of the love of God.

The boys are trained in the Scout spirit, living the ideals of Scouting, living the ideals of team work in the homes and church, in the schools and community.

They are taught to cherish loyal and devout adherence to the principles of Americanism. They are taught to respect and support their religious institutions, for a republic cannot live without the spiritual strength of God. They are taught that democracy is America and that America is democracy. The boys live it. The boys practice it.

The Boy Scouts of America have initiated their declaration of purpose in 1950 to strengthen the arm of liberty. They believe that true liberty is rooted in a belief in God and in the brotherhood of man. They believe that love of country is born and fostered through the spirit of service.

The Boy Scouts of America in this fortieth anniversary crusade year are pledged to strengthen the arm of liberty by strengthening themselves through the practice of the Scout Oath "To keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight."

They pledge to strengthen community and Nation through civic good deeds, through faithful performance of religious obligations, through contributions to good citizenship in terms of self-reliance and self-discipline.

This modern crusade for strong Americanism launched by the Boy Scouts of America is America's answer to all the modern isms of dictators.

This epic crusade is a bugle call and a challenge to every American.

And so we say on this happy birthday, a hearty toast from coast to coast to the Boy Scouts of America.

Sustained by faith in America, sustained by faith in God, may you help achieve the objective of mankind, peace—not by force, but with freedom.

Our greatest weapon is our example.

Our greatest strength is our devotion to God and country.

Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the people ir my congressional district are becoming very concerned because of this continuous spending of their money, and they are alarmed over the growing magnitude of the national debt. They want to know for whom and for what their money is being spent and what brakes, if any, the Congress is applying. It is hard for them to keep up with all the programs of the Fair Deal and the New Deal.

For instance, let us examine just one program. There is confusion in the minds of people in my district over the so-called price support program—some believing that the farmers in my district receive benefits under the CCC program—some believing that the program is paying for itself. Nothing could be further from the truth. Yesterday, Ralph S. Trigg, the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Corporation that runs the price program, told a congressional committee that on February 28 this Government had invested more than $4,000,000,000 in farm-price supports. We are to be confronted soon with a request of the Secretary of Agriculture for another $2,000,000,000 for the same program. From January 1 to February 28 the amount invested in this price program increased $400,000,000 and, in simple arithmetic, that means that the Government has been spending on this program about $10,000,000 for every business day. If these programs were a success, perhaps no one could complain but, in potatoes alone, the losses to the taxpayer run into millions and millions of dollars. Just to pick a few of the items in addition to corn, cotton, and wheat which amount to about a billion dollars each, we find listed $14,000,000 in tobacco; $92,000,000 in beans; $23,000,000 in peanuts; $100,000,000 in dried eggs; $1,000,000 in raisins, and so on and so on. The cost of carrying charges—storage, insurance, and so forth—for these items is $25,000 per hour or $400 per minute. Does this look like the program pays for itself? Incidentally, the farmers in my district do not raise tobacco and cotton and the taxes they pay are not just peanuts.

How silly can these governmental agencies be? Well, at the very time when we had stored millions and millions of dollars' worth of surplus food, we find an agency of the United States Government, to wit: the Quartermaster General, advertising in a newspaper in Poughkeepsie, N. Y., for bids on potatoes and eggs for the use of the armed services. Small wonder that the people have become obstinate about this spending program.

As long as we are stuck with the program, we should try to do a few things to alleviate its impact upon the taxpayers' pocketbooks. I have introduced a bill which would compel any agency of the United States Government to first receive a certificate from the Secretary of Agriculture or the CCC that there are no surplus eggs or potatoes available before bids can be received by any of these agencies for the purchase of eggs or potatoes. Why buy something we alreay have paid for and is going to waste? I hope that the Committee on Agriculture and the Members of the House will support this bill. If the CCC authorities who are entrusted with the power of disposing of surplus commodities lack sufficient business acumen to dispose of these commodities in a businesslike way, then the Congress should take the necessary action to force this agency to do so.

The Burleson amendment should be adopted. Under it we could use spoiling surplus commodities for hard dollars. Why give money when we have in abundance the very things these ECA countries could buy elsewhere—with American dollars?

One other disposition of surplus is feasible: the grain surpluses which are hoarded by the CCC should be distributed to our poultrymen who badly need these grains at a fair price, thereby assuring the Government of at least some return. These are only three suggestions to ease the burden. There are many, many others.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when the hard-working people who have to pay for all of these "shots" are in revolt against the ruthless expenditure of their money. In good conscience let us reassess our position and, as representatives of the American people, let us try to do a decent job for them. The bill under consideration now on the floor of the House, and the appropriations bill soon to come, provide us all with a golden opportunity to do just that.

Title III of the ECA Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I append two telegrams showing the support of two of the great churches of our country for technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. These are eloquent and self-explanatory support for this measure:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 30, 1950.*

JACOB K. JAVITS,
House Office Building:

The Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches hopes you will give strong support to point-4 legislation now being considered. We consider leadership of United States of utmost importance in this matter. We urge also that provision be made to give such technical assistance through United Nations so far as possible.

RAY GIBBONS,
Director.
HERMAN F. REISSIG,
International Relations, Secretary, Council for Social Action.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 30, 1950.*

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS:

Urge strong support for legislation which will enable our country to play leading role in expanded program of technical assistance under auspices of United Nations Federal Council of Churches on record believing point-4 program of genuinely international character should be in forefront of American bipartisan foreign policy.

WILLIAM SCARLETT,
Episcopal of Missouri, Chairman, Federal Council, Department International Justice and Good Will.

The Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith a copy of a speech which I recently made over the radio on the Brannan farm plan:

It is now almost a year since the Brannan farm plan was presented to the public. During that time it has been widely discussed. In fact, during a period which has been notable for the happening of many world-shaking events and when some history-making sensation occurs almost every day, the Brannan farm program has continued to be a subject of great interest. This interest is due in part at least to two things: First, the plan's unquestionable political appeal and, second, its questionable economic soundness.

The secret of its political appeal is that it offers something to everybody. From that standpoint it's a stroke of political genius. On the one hand its advocates say to the farmers, "The United States Government is going to guarantee you an income at high wartime levels." And to consumers they say, "We are going to give you low-priced food." That comes mighty close to being utopia. It sounds too good to be true. And unfortunately it is, because when you bring the plan down from the stratosphere and look it over to see what makes it tick you find that a lot of ugly, unutopian things show up.

You find that this isn't legerdemain after all and that if farmers are to get high incomes and consumers are to have cheap food, someone is going to have to pay a bill, and a pretty big bill it's going to be if the plan is carried out on the scale envisioned by its proponents. How big? Secretary Brannan says he doesn't know. Up to date no advocate of the plan has come along with any

figures. They don't like to talk about that part of it.

A good many people have tried to make an estimate. The Department of Agricultural Economics of the University of Illinois has said: "It could easily be as much as the total Federal budget before the war." The same department, taking hogs as an illustration, has estimated that hog supports alone might cost $700,000,000 annually and hogs represent only one-seventh to one-eighth of the output of our farms. The American Farm Bureau Federation, after a study of the cost of the plan as to milk alone, estimated it would amount to $2,450,000,000 annually.

Other estimates as to the cost of the plan as proposed have ranged from $2,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000 per year. Some of the advocates of the plan have compared it to the British food subsidy program, the cost of which has increased every year, amounting in 1948 to the colossal sum of $2,272,000,000. Our population is three times as large as that of Britain so on the basis of population alone the cost of a similar plan here could run to almost $7,000,000,000. But that doesn't take into account that the British are on an austere diet. If they consumed per capita the food we do in this country their cost would undoubtedly be higher and so we are safe in assuming, I think, that the plan here would cost more than three times as much as the British plan is costing.

To make the plan work someone is going to have to dig up billions of dollars because there's no other way to give the farmer high income and the consumer low prices. And where will the money come from? Well, from Uncle Sam—and the only money Uncle Sam has is what you and I give him. That means that every consumer and every farmer is going to have to dig down in his pockets and fork over the money to carry out this gigantic spending operation, and when you count taxes this cheap food may be pretty high-priced food.

But suppose we don't dig up the dollars? Suppose Congress says that with a five-and-a-half-billion-dollar deficit already existing, we just can't appropriate the additional billions which will be necessary to enable Uncle Sam to pay a part of everybody's grocery bill.

What will happen then? Well, initially at least the farmer will be left holding the sack. He will have done his part. He will have produced all that the Secretary of Agriculture asked him to produce. By reason of this heavy production his prices will have declined just as they always do in a time of heavy production when there are no price supports. The consumer will be getting his cheap food but the Secretary will have to tell the farmer. "It's too bad but Congress didn't appropriate the money." Maybe consumers will think that is a good thing, but if they do they will be taking a very short-sighted view because low farm prices and bankrupt farmers in the end mean depression and hard times for everyone. At least that's been the case in the past.

So the Secretary will have to look around for some other means to make good his promise of high incomes for farmers. What can he do? Well, for one thing he can start limiting and controlling the production of farm products on the theory that scarcity will bring high prices. To do that in any effective way will in all probability result in the ultimate nationalization of agriculture. We'll have in this country exactly the same thing they have in England where the Government tells every farmer what he must produce and how much he must produce and if he doesn't carry out the orders in that respect he loses the use of his farm and it is turned over to someone else to operate.

If this sounds far-fetched to anyone I suggest they write their Congressman and get a copy of the bill S. 1971 which puts the Brannan plan into legislative form. This bill was written in the Department of Agriculture and sent to Congress for introduction. It was introduced in the Senate on May 31, 1949. It is 86 pages long. A part of it is a restatement of some of the laws already on the books but much of it is new. Fifteen pages of the 86 relate to penalties upon farmers and there are more pages with penalties for those who deal in agricultural products. I think most farmers would be interested in reading the provisions of section 401 (b) on page 79 of the bill. This section provides that all farmers must keep such books and records and make such reports as may be required by the Secretary; and that if they fail to keep these reports and records they will be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction fined not more than $500. And if they make a false report of record they shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction fined not more than $1,000 and imprisoned for not more than a year. My prediction is that if this bill ever becomes a law we'll either have to have more farm bookkeepers or bigger jails.

We've never had any experience here with an absolute Government-controlled agriculture so we don't know exactly how it will work out but if the history of other countries is any criterion we know that such control will eventually mean less production and more inefficient production. It will mean higher food prices. So in the end the Brannan plan will be just as much of a gold brick for the consumer who has been led to think he will get cheap food as it is for the farmer who wakes up some morning and finds that he has lost control of this farm. Is all this an exaggeration? Not in the least, if the Brannan plan is actually carried out to the extent necessary for its proponents to make good on the promises which they have been making to both producers and consumers.

I think it should be said in justice to the farmers of this country that the Brannan plan did not originate with them. They were not consulted. They had no part in formulating it. Rather it originated with the political leaders of organized labor. It is frankly an effort on their part to form a political coalition between farmers and organized labor. They say in effect to farmers, "Help us elect Members to Congress who will repeal the Taft-Hartley law and we'll help you get the Brannan plan." The labor politicians can't lose on that one. If successful they get repeal of Taft-Hartley toward which they've been moving heaven and earth, and cheap food temporarily. And I know of no way farmers can win on it because the ultimate result must inevitably be lower farm prices, or in the alternative Government control of all agricultural production and ultimate nationalization of the industry. Politically what will happen is what has always happened when a farmer-labor coalition has been attempted. The labor politicians take over the organization and the farmer is left out in the cold.

Now let me make it clear that what I have been discussing is the political Brannan plan of something for everybody. That's the basis on which its proponents are trying to sell it and the basis on which it must be judged. I don't think the farmers of this country will fall for this political Brannan plan. They are too smart to be caught that way. The wonder is that anyone who knows farmers would expect them to be for it. I am afraid that the labor politicians who concocted this plan have gotten their idea of a farmer from the funny papers and are laboring under the delusion that he will buy the Brooklyn bridge if a sufficiently clever line of salestalk is used.

A lot of farmers are wondering why, if the Brannan plan is such a good thing for farmers, it wouldn't be just as good for the manufacturer and the workingman. Why not apply it to the production of automobiles or farm machinery or much-needed housing? Everybody knows the prices of those things should come down. This could be done by reducing wages and cutting other costs. No one would lose. Workers would get a subsidy out of the Treasury to make up the loss of wages. Employers would be given Government payments to make up their losses. And the public would get cheap automobiles and farm machinery and housing and maybe a lot of other things. Something for everybody. Isn't it lovely?

Insurance Against Mass Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND W. KARST

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. KARST. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 17, the Union Labor Advocate of St. Louis, Mo., a newspaper dedicated to the upholding of the principles of the American Federation of Labor, carried a story pointing out the useful purpose which transit radio can serve in these unsettled times.

It is heartening, indeed, Mr. Speaker, to learn in these times of uncertainty that organized labor recognizes the value of civil defense and is appreciative of any and all elements in connection therewith which might save the lives of thousands in the event of an attack upon our cities.

Most of us can recall the chaos that was caused in this country in the late thirties by what was intended to be an entertaining broadcast by an imaginary invasion by men from Mars upon New York City. There was at that time no threat of war facing this Nation. There were no stories being circulated at that time even of flying saucers. Yet the mass hysteria caused by that supposedly entertaining radio broadcast startled this Nation and made us the laughing stock of the world.

Today even the most optimistic authorities admit that we must expect, in the event of war, attacks upon our centers of population. We as a democratic nation must also assume that such attacks will be our first knowledge that we are at war.

It has been said recently by members of the Senate that mass hysteria could do more damage to America's war-making potential than the bombs in an atomic attack on this country.

Our communications, particularly all elements of broadcasting, mobilized to meet such an emergency constitutes our best defense against the chain of fear which might result in mass hysteria, for only through communications can people be warned and fears dispelled.

Again may I say that it is encouraging to note that organized labor has, according to the story which I have mentioned in the Union Labor Advocate, published in my city, recognized the value of transit radio as an element of defense.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the story to which I have referred:

PUBLIC LIKES TRANSIT RADIO, JACOBS FINDS—POLL AMONG RIDERS OF STREETCARS, BUSSES, PROVES IT, UNION CHIEF SAYS

The present newspaper uproar over the merits of transit radio on streetcars and busses is not only rather silly, but not in accord with the opinion and feelings of the riding public say several union officers who were interviewed by an Advocate reporter.

Union memberships in sampling polls said they enjoyed music while they rode, these labor leaders said. The innovation is new to St. Louis and a few complaining letters have appeared in the daily newspapers.

It is evident, however, that the other side, while the vast majority of riders, has been less vocal.

One rider after another, interviewed, said they enjoyed the transit radio programs, music, news, weather reports, etc., as relaxation after a hard grind on the job. Objectors were few.

Among the prominent union officers making such checks of bus and streetcar riders was Business Manager Frank W. Jacobs, of AFL Electrical Workers, Local No. 1.

Other officers and members of local No. 1 took part in the opinion survey, with results already noted.

Besides a desire to ascertain public opinion factually, local No. 1 has an additional interest, since members of that union install and service radio in busses and streetcars and also are employed by radio stations.

Many of the objectors could be classed as cranks and confirmed "crabs," Jacobs told the Advocate, after compiling results of the check-up.

In these unsettled times, Jacobs points out, transit radio can serve a decidedly useful purpose by discounting possible false rumors and advising the public promptly of major happenings, advance knowledge of which could put the people on their guard.

Jacobs characterized the scattered attacks on transit radio as a tempest in a teapot—a cracked pot, at that.

Reorganization Plans of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD memorandums compiled by the staff of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on the 21 reorganization plans submitted to the Congress by the President on March 13, 1950. Each of the 21 plans is covered in detail as to purpose, background, their relation to the Hoover Commission reports, and possible issues that may be involved.

I submitted for the RECORD on Tuesday, March 21, 1950, as appears at pages 3699–3702, a brief summation of these plans in relation to their conformity with and deviation from the Hoover Commission recommendations.

Plans Nos. 1 to 6 are covered in a single memorandum, all of them providing for the centralization of functions in the Departments affected—Treasury, Justice, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. A special memorandum on plan No. 1, on which resolutions of disapproval—Senate Resolutions 246 and 247—have been filed, will be prepared and submitted to the Senate prior to beginning of hearings, on April 11.

The general provisions of plans 7 to 13, on regulatory agencies, are also covered by a single memorandum, relating to the vesting of administrative functions in the chairman, appointment of chairman by the President, and so forth. A separate memorandum covers details of plan No. 12, scheduled for hearings before the committee beginning Tuesday, April 4.

Separate memorandums are submitted on plans 14 to 21, inclusive.

These memorandums have been prepared with a view to assisting Senators in answering inquiries relating to the plans, and to provide them with a concise summation as to the contents and intent of each of the reorganization plans.

There being no objection, the memorandums were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
March 25, 1950.

[Staff Memorandum No. 81-2-40]

REORGANIZATION PLANS 1–6 OF 1950: CENTRALIZATION OF FUNCTIONS IN (1) TREASURY, (2) JUSTICE, (3) INTERIOR, (4) AGRICULTURE, (5) COMMERCE, AND (6) LABOR DEPARTMENTS

On March 13, 1950, the President transmitted various messages to Congress for reorganization of Government agencies, under authority of the Reorganization Act of 1949: (a) A general message discussing 21 proposed individual plans as a whole; (b) another general message on the first 13 of the 21 plans; and (c) 21 messages presenting individual plans. His first general message describes plans 1 to 13 as designed "to establish clear and direct lines of authority and responsibility for the management of the executive branch" which is urged in general terms in Hoover Commission Report No. 1 on general management, and in specific terms in Commission reports on individual departments.

The second general message discusses more fully the centralization in six department heads of the functions now scattered among subordinate officials (the other three Cabinet Departments of State, Defense, and Post Office were acted on last year). It emphasizes a "principal finding of the Hoover Commission (that) the first and essential step in the search for economy and efficiency in the executive branch of the Government is to correct the present diffusion of authority and confusion of responsibility. * * * Without this action all other steps to improve organization are doomed to failure. * * * The heads of departments must hold full responsibility for the conduct of their departments (and) department heads must have adequate staff assistance. * * *"

The second message then states that the above Hoover Commission finding is developed in plans 1–6 through provision of "a clear line of responsibility and authority from the President through the department heads down to the lowest level of operation in each department * * * Each department head (is provided an Administrative Assistant Secretary) to assist him in the managerial side of his responsibilities (because) specific improvements in management can be made only through continuous attention to the effective performance of such aids to management as budgeting, accounting, personnel, and management analysis. Appointment of these new civil service officials by the department heads with the approval of the President will tend to establish a career pattern for these positions extending across departmental lines. (Additional Assistant Secretaries) will provide more adequate staff assistance in supervising and directing the policies and programs."

Resolutions of disapproval of plan No. 1 were introduced in the Senate (S. Res. 246 and 247) for Senators ROBERTSON and CAPEHART, on March 31, 1950, and hearings are scheduled before the committee beginning on Tuesday, April 11.

Other provisions: Plans 1–6 authorize each Secretary to delegate functions, to transfer records, property, personnel, and unexpended balances of appropriation, and to appoint an administrative assistant secretary under the classified civil service, with the approval of the President, at $14,000 per year. In addition, the President is authorized to appoint assistant secretaries, subject to confirmation by the Senate, at the usual salary, as follows: One in Interior, in addition to two now authorized; two in Agriculture, in addition to one now in office (only one addition is urged in the Hoover Report on the Department of Agriculture); and one in Justice, who will replace an assistant solicitor general to be abolished, and who will supplement the six present assistant attorneys general and one solicitor general. (A deputy attorney general is also created in lieu of the present assistant attorney general). No addition is proposed to the present three assistant secretaries in the Labor Department, and to the two each in Commerce and Treasury Departments. (Hoover Task Force E on Departmental Management recommends at least three assistant secretaries in even the smallest department.)

ISSUES INVOLVED

The limited opposition to plans 1 to 6 thus far indicated follows:

Plan 1, Treasury Department: The American Banker, banking newspaper, is opposing centralization of Treasury functions because it would further detract from the prestige and authority of the self-supporting Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. This old office supervises and controls national banks, especially through regular examinations, meets with the FDIC, and reports to Congress. The newspaper states that few bankers will question the present Secretary of the Treasury * * * since he was, at one time, a national bank examiner (but) future Secretaries of the Treasury might, in effect, virtually end the office's time-honored functions, and adds that the merger of Treasury and Comptroller legal divisions under Mr. Morgenthau's regime in effect, ended the assumed independence of the Comptroller.

A total of 300 communications, from 37 States, have been received by the committee to date, all except one being in opposition to the plan.

Plan 2, Justice: There has been some oral objection voiced to the proposed centralization of powers in the Attorney General as weakening the status of the FBI. Actually the plan would increase his present powers in but small degree.

Plan 6, Labor: This plan would centralize in the Secretary all functions throughout the Department of Labor. It was included in the original 1947 proposal to return the United

States Employment Service to the Department of Labor, but was dropped before that return was authorized after two rejections by Congress. The present limited plan again raises the question of the propriety of a head of a Labor Department which, by organic act of 1913, is dedicated to fostering primarily the welfare of the wage earner) taking over regional determinations under the Fair Labor Standards Act relative to wages and hours, now independently administered by the Administrator of the Combined Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions. In practice the same Division personnel, both departmental and field, takes care of wage, hours, safety, and other requirements of the Public Contracts Act, and the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, although the Secretary of Labor has ultimate authority.

The National Lumber Manufacturers Association has submitted a memorandum urging rejection of Plan 6 on the grounds that (a) it was a segment of the larger related rejections by Congress already mentioned; (b) it would improperly subject the above Administrator to a Secretary charged by statute with partisan labor interests; (c) it would be unthinkable to place the present particularly partisan Secretary in direct punitive power over practically all employees, and (d) not even the most fair-minded Secretary should be asked to resolve the basic conflict which exists.

With respect to all six plans, it is to be expected that objections will frequently be voiced over any disturbance of the status quo of subordinate officials. The basic question pertinent to each plan is whether power should be centralized in the responsible department head or be scattered among his subordinates.

HERMAN C. LOEFFLER,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

MARCH 20, 1950.

[Staff Memorandum No. 81-2-35]

REORGANIZATION PLANS NOS. 7-13 OF 1950 RELATING TO REGULATORY COMMISSIONS

INTRODUCTION

The major purpose of Reorganization Plans 7-13 of 1950 is to vest all administrative responsibility for day-to-day operations of the Government's regulatory commissions in each Commission chairman.

This is accomplished by (1) transferring (subject to certain limitations hereafter defined) of all executive functions to the Commission Chairman and (2) authorizing the Chairman to delegate these functions to officials, employees, and staff units of the Commission as he deems appropriate.

Such action is in accord with recommendations of the Hoover Commission, not only in its first report on general management of the executive branch (recommendation 14, "Heads of departments must have full responsibility for conduct of their departments"; recommendation 18, "Each department head should receive from Congress administrative authority to organize his department"; recommendation 20, "The department head should be given authority to determine the organization within his department"); but more specifically in its report on regulatory commissions (recommendation 1, "We recommend that all administrative responsibility be vested in the Chairman of the Commission"; and recommendation 6, "That the statutes be amended to permit commissions to delegate routine * * * work to members of (their) staffs.")

Elsewhere the Commission observed: "Purely executive duties * * * have been imposed upon these commissions with the result that these duties have sometimes been performed badly"; and, "Administration by a plural executive is universally regarded as inefficient. This has proved true * * * with these commissions."

ANALYSIS OF REORGANIZATION PLANS 7-13 OF 1950

Provisions applicable to all regulatory agencies concerned

Plans 7-13 transfer functions relating to (1) appointment and supervision of personnel; (2) distribution of business among personnel or administrative units; and (3) use and expenditure of funds, subject to limitations noted, to the Chairmen of the following regulatory bodies: Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Communications Commission, National Labor Relations Board, Civil Aeronautics Board.

Limitations: The Chairman shall be governed by general policies of the Commission authorized by law; appointment by Chairman of heads of administrative units shall be subject to Commission approval; full time, regularly employed personnel in Commissioners' offices (other than Chairman's) are exempted from plan; budget estimate revision and distribution of appropriated funds are reserved to the Commission.

The plans also authorize the Chairman of the affected regulatory Commissions to authorize the performance by any officer, employee or administrative unit under his jurisdiction of any functions transferred to him under provisions of the plans.

Provisions applicable exclusively to individual agencies

Plan No. 7 (ICC) provides specifically that director of locomotive inspection and two assistant directors shall perform their functions subject to direction of Chairman.

Plans Nos. 7 (ICC), 8 (FTC), 9 (FPC), and 10 (SEC), transfer the functions of choosing a chairman from the Commissions to the President. The Commission made no comment on this proposal, but the task force report made specific recommendations to this effect. (Already provided by statute for FCC, NLRB, and CAB.)

Plan No. 12 (NLRB) provides specifically for transfer of functions of general counsel to Chairman, or to NLRB. Abolishes the general counsel.[1]

CONCLUSION

Firm resistance from many quarters has developed to Reorganization Plan No. 12 which would abolish the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

The House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on March 23, 1950, rejected House Resolution 516 (HOFFMAN of Michigan) to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 12, reporting it unfavorably by a vote of 18 to 7, with four Members reserving the right to support the resolution on the floor. The Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the Executive Departments will hold hearings on a resolution of disapproval introduced by Senator TAFT on April 3, beginning on Tuesday, April 4.

The statutory background of the general counsel, issues involved in the current dispute between the National Labor Relations Board and the general counsel over the latter's independence from the Board, and arguments relating to his retention under existing statutes and his abolishment under legislation pending are contained in Staff Memorandum No. 81-2-33, March 20, 1950.

Some opposition has been previously expressed relating to the vesting of all administrative responsibility in the respective Commission chairmen.

CAB considered such action impractical in its report on the Hoover Commission's recommendations (S. Rept. 1153, p. 261). FPC disagreed with the recommendation (and also the task-force recommendation that its chairman be appointed by the President) for fear "our other members would be subordinated to the chairman," and that the proposal would enable the chairman "to exercise dominant authority in respect to policy matters" (S. Rept. 1158, p. 279).

It is understood, however, that these objections would not necessarily apply to Reorganization Plans Nos. 7 to 13, since the plans are not as extensive in coverage as proposed in the legislation pending before the Congress. The Bureau of the Budget has informed the staff that the plans were cleared with the Commissions before presentation to the Congress.

MILES SCULL, Jr.,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

MARCH 20, 1950.

[Staff Memorandum No. 81-2-33]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 12 OF 1950, TO REORGANIZE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

PROVISIONS

Section 1 transfers to NLRB Chairman executive-administrative functions of the Board and of the general counsel, including: (a) appointment and supervision of personnel, (b) distribution of business among personnel and administrative units, and (c) use of expenditure of funds; subject to following limitations:

(A) The Chairman shall be governed by major policies, regulatory decisions, findings, and determinations of the Board as authorized by law;

(B) The appointment by the Chairman of the heads of the major administrative units under the jurisdiction of the Board shall be subject to approval of the Board;

(C) Full time, regularly employed personnel in the immediate offices of members of the Board other than the Chairman are exempted from provisions of the reorganization plan;

(D) The Board's functions relating to revising budget estimates and determining distribution of appropriated funds according to major programs are reserved to the Board.

Section 2 authorizes the Chairman to delegate to any officer, employee, or administrative unit of NLRB any function transferred to him by section 1.

Section 3 transfers all functions of general counsel not transferred by section 1 to the board. Abolishes office of the general counsel.

STATUTORY BACKGROUND OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947

The office of the general counsel of the NLRB was established by section 3 (d) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 (Taft-Hartley Act) as amended, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, first session (29 U. S. C. 153 (d). Its provisions follows:

"SEC. 3 (d). There shall be a general counsel of the Board who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 4 years. The general counsel of the Board shall exercise general supervision over all attorneys employed by the Board (other than trial examiners and legal assistants to Board members) and over the officers and employees in the regional offices. He shall have final authority, on behalf of the Board, in respect of the investigation of charges and issuance of complaints under section 10, and in respect of the prosecution of such complaints before the Board, and shall have such other duties as the Board may prescribe or as may be provided by law."

Senate and House managers of the conference upon H. R. 3020 which became Public Law 101 of the Eightieth Congress expressed their intent in establishing the general counsel in the following language of the conference report: [2]

Conference report on Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947

"The conference agreement does not make provision for an independent agency to exercise the investigating and prosecuting functions under the act, but does provide that there shall be a general counsel of the Board, who is to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 4 years.

"The general counsel is to have general supervision and direction of all attorneys employed by the Board (excluding the trial examiners and the legal assistants to the individual members of the Board), and of all the officers and employees in the Board's regional offices, and is to have the final authority to act in the name of, but independently of any direction, control, or review by, the Board in respect of the investigation of charges and the issuance of complaints of unfair labor practices, and in respect of the prosecution of such complaints before the Board. He is to have, in addition, such other duties as the Board may prescribe or as may be provided by law. By this provision responsibility for what takes place in the Board's regional offices is centralized in one individual, who is ultimately responsible to the President and Congress.

"The House bill, in the section providing for the Administrator, provided that the regional directors and the chief regional attorneys were to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. It was believed that better administration will result in having responsibility lodged in one person rather than having it diffused through numerous regional directors and regional attorneys, and the conference agreement omits this provision.

"Section 4 of the conference agreement provides that each member of the Board and the general counsel of the Board shall receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 per annum. This section also provides that the Board may not employ any attorneys for the purpose of reviewing transcripts of hearings or preparing drafts of opinions, with the exception that any attorney employed for assignment as a legal assistant to any Board member may, for such member, review transcripts and prepare such drafts. There was a provision in the House bill and also in the Senate amendment having the same effect. This section of the conference agreement also provides that no trial examiner's report can be reviewed either before or after its publication by any person other than a member of the Board or his legal assistant, and in addition trial examiners are prohibited from advising or consulting with the Board with respect to exceptions taken to their findings, rulings, or recommendations. A similar provision was contained in the Senate amendment, but there was no such provision in the House bill. The combination of the provisions dealing with the authority of the general counsel, the provision abolishing the Board's review division, and the provisions relating to the trial examiners and their reports effectively limits the Board to the performance of quasi-judicial functions."

National Labor Relations Act of 1949

S. 249, the National Labor Relations Act of 1949 (81st Cong., 1st sess.) as reported would have repealed the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 (Taft-Hartley Act) and reenacted with minor changes the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 (the Wagner Act), thus abolishing the office of general counsel of the NLRB. A substitute for this act by Senator TAFT et al., which passed the Senate June 30, 1949, reenacted major provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act with numerous important changes, one of which was abolition of the general counsel.

Report of Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on S. 249

In its report on S. 249 (S. Rept. 99, 81st Cong., 1st sess.) the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare declared that "the broad powers of prosecution and administration which the act (the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947) concentrates in the new office of general counsel, plus additional powers delegated to that office by Board (NLRB) members, make the general counsel a virtual dictator in the administration of the law."

Other pertinent comments upon the general counsel by the committee (pp. 39-40, S. Rept. 99) follow:

"The general counsel has unlimited discretion, 'on behalf of the Board,' over the investigation of charges and the issuance of complaints of unfair labor practice. When the general counsel exercises this discretion by refusing to issue a complaint his action cannot be reviewed by the Board. Three consequences flow from this statutory provision: (1) In such cases the general counsel is both prosecutor and judge, exercising in fact quasi-judicial functions similar to those entrusted to the Board, and his decisions cannot even be reviewed by the courts; (2) the general counsel has an absolute control over the cases which he will allow to come before the Board; and (3) conflicting rules can be established in similar cases, because the general counsel can refuse to issue a complaint in a case which under Board decisions would be an unfair labor practice.

"One of the most acute impacts of the evil of dual policy making is felt in the area of injunctions. It is generally recognized that an injunction of even the briefest duration will effectually dispose of the issues which give rise to a strike, since the employees are deprived of the only real bargaining power they have, the use of the strike. The interests of thousands of workers may thus be effectively jeopardized by a single decision of a single individual. Through the medium of securing preliminary injunctions, the general counsel may effectuate, and indeed has effectuated, views which the Board may later wholly repudiate.

"Although in entertaining petitions for injunctions, the courts are restricted to granting or denying temporary relief and only the Board may adjudicate the merits of the complaint, two United States courts of appeals, on appeals from district court preliminary injunctions, have passed upon the statutory construction of sections 8 (b) (4) (A) and 8 (c) in their impact on peaceful picketing in aid of a secondary boycott (*United Brotherhood of Carpenters, etc. v. Sperry* (the Klassen and Hodgson case) (170 F. (2d) 863); *Printing Specialties Union v. LeBaron* (23 L. R. R. M. 2145)). The act thus undermines the purpose of Congress in enacting the National Labor Relations Act of relying upon the Board's expert judgment for the decision of cases. If the Board disagrees with the court of appeals should it accept the court's view of the law, and abdicate its duty under section 10 (c) or should it overrule the court to which, ultimately, the Board's order will go on review? Since original adjudication has been reposed by statute in the Board, it would seem appropriate that the Board's views as to applicable law as well as facts be available to the court when it is called upon to deal with a case. An advantage of original adjudication by an administrative agency in a complex field like labor relations is that the courts, on review, have the benefit of the deliberations of a specialized body. The dual lines of appeal created by the Taft-Hartley Act reverse this process. The general counsel's independent views are tested in the first instance by the courts, with the danger that the Board may ultimately be reduced to the status of a mere finder of facts.

"Another fertile field for internal agency conflict has been the administration of representation cases. In this area the effective use of consent procedures makes it necessary that Board policy be effectuated regionally with a minimum of delay. Under present procedure, all instructions to field staffs are formulated by the general counsel, frequently without clearance by the Board. The Board members are thus isolated from their staffs and are substantially restricted to formal decisions in laying down representation case policy. They exercise no supervision over employees engaged in the performance of duties for which they, as Board members, are responsible.

"The Board members, of course, exercise ultimate decisional authority over representation cases. But even the Board's decisional authority in representation cases is impaired by the separation of functions. Section 9 (c) (3) of the act provides that economic strikers who have been replaced (as distinguished from workers whose strike was caused or prolonged by employer unfair labor parctices) shall not be eligible to vote in Board elections. In the Board's own view it must presume and hold that strikers have lost their eligibility to vote unless the general counsel issues a complaint against the employer and the complaint is sustained (*Matter of Times Square Corp.* (23 L. R. R. M. 1373)). Thus the general counsel is able to determine the outcome of an election conducted during a strike. If for any reason he refuses to proceed on charges filed by the striking union, the strikebreakers will vote in place of the strikers whose jobs they hold.

"Another source of internal friction lies in the general counsel's dual legal role. As prosecutor before the Board he is a litigant; as counsel for the Board he is required to express to the courts the Board's view of applicable law. In the past, the Board's views have differed from those of the general counsel on many important questions, both procedural and substantive. In such cases, the Board has no authority over the actions of the individual responsible for the views.

"The separation of powers constitutes a constant threat to the functioning of the agency. An adamant position too long maintained can lead to chaos. An area in which this danger is acute is that involving the bonds of the agency's jurisdiction. The Board members tend to adhere to the position taken by them under the Wagner Act. Except where secondary boycotts are involved, they reserve the right to decline to exercise jurisdiction where the effect of a dispute on commerce is slight. The general counsel, however, holds that under Taft-Hartley the agency must exercise jurisdiction wherever it can be said technically to exist. Where the minimum legal requirements are present, he denies the power of the Board members to decline to exercise jurisdiction. Neither side has shown signs of yielding. Unless the general counsel alters his position, he will bring to trial and present to the Board for decision cases which he knows the Board will decline to accept—an absurd potential result of the two-headed monster which the act creates. Meanwhile unions and employers in border-line industries must remain uncertain as to their coverage under the law."

---

[1] In its final report on Regulatory Commissions the Hoover Commission made no recommendations exclusively directed to either the National Labor Relations Board or its general counsel. (See Staff Memorandum 81-2-33 on NLRB, March 20, 1950.)

[2] Conference report, Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (H. Rept. No. 510, 80th Cong., 1st sess.), pp. 37-38.

CONFORMANCE OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 12, WITH HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Reorganization Plan No. 12 conforms to the Hoover Commission's recommendations affecting the Government's regulatory commissions in that it vests administrative authority in the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board and gives the Chairman authority to delegate functions to subordinates as recommended by the Hoover Commission in its Report on General Management of the Executive Branch (pt. III), as follows: (Recommendation 14) "Under the President the heads of departments must hold full responsibility for the conduct of their departments. There must be a clear line of authority reaching down through every step of the organization, and no subordinate should have authority independent from that of his superior."

In its Report on Regulatory Commissions, the Hoover Commission made the following specific recommendations supplementing those in its Report on General Management of the Executive Branch: (Recommendation 1) "We recommend that all administrative responsibility be lodged in the chairman of the Commission." (Recommendation 6) "The Commission, therefore, recommends that the statutes be amended so as to permit the commissioners to delegate routine, preliminary, and less important work to members of their staffs under their supervision."

However, nowhere in its final reports did the Hoover Commission recommend that the office of general counsel, or the general counsel, be abolished. The Commission made no recommendation which exclusively affected NLRB.

The Hoover Commission's task force on regulatory commissions, which conducted an organizational survey of the National Labor Relations Board at the Commission's direction, held that the position of the general counsel (1) is an unstable one, (2) has given rise to several internal administrative problems, (3) is anomalous. The task force's comments follow:

Comment of Hoover Commission task force upon NLRB general counsel[1]

"Another problem that has caused us considerable concern is the position of the general counsel. As indicated above, he is a prosecutor, an administrator, a policy maker. The incumbent, Mr. Robert Denham, has noted that his powers are broad and absolute and his authority final to an outstanding degree seldom accorded a single officer in a peacetime agency.[2]

"The existence of such an office, independent both of the Federal departmental structure and of the Board, marks a departure from previous administrative practice. If permitted to set a pattern for future Government organization, it may lead to a diffusion of responsibility.

"Such an official is in a peculiarly exposed position. In view of the wide powers of the office, it is inevitably subject to heavy pressure from all sides, and lacks the protection of either a multiheaded agency or an executive department in resisting such pressures. Experience during the first year indicates a tendency to develop close working relations with the joint congressional committee established by the act. To the extent that this has involved advice and suggestions with respect to interpretation of the act and its application to specific situations, the practice seems unhealthy and likely to blur the desirable separation between the legislature and administration.

"But the administrative position of the general counsel is also anomalous. Thus the field offices under his supervision are engaged partly in representation work which is the direct responsibility of the Board, and partly in investigating, issuing, and prosecuting complaints, on which the general counsel has final authority. Under the act, the Board has the authority to appoint the regional directors and other employees. In part, as has been seen, the work of the general counsel is essentially prosecution of violations of specific offenses under the act. But insofar as his actions establish policy, they are of the kind frequently assigned to an independent commission.

"The unusual position of the general counsel has given rise to several internal administrative problems. One is significant enough to be noted here: In unfair labor practice cases, regional directors issue complaints, though only with the approval of the general counsel in some types of cases. The finality of refusal to issue a complaint has led to demands for an appeal; and it has been further urged that an appeal to the same unit in the counsel's office whose advice was followed in the original refusal is illusory, and that the appeal should be to an independent body. This problem high lights the nature of the authority the general counsel is exercising.

"Our conclusion is that the present position of the general counsel is an unstable one. Various proposals have been made for integrating the position more securely into the Government structure. Some have suggested assigning him to the Department of Labor or of Justice, but each has serious drawbacks as the preceding discussion of his functions should indicate.

"Our staff recommends the creation, by Executive order, of a Council of Labor under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Labor, and including the general counsel and other Federal officials concerned with labor problems. The function of the council would be to coordinate Federal labor policy and to advise the President on appropriate action. This represents a compromise between the present independent status of the general counsel and his subordinates to a department head.

"Others have strongly urged that the office should again be placed under the Board. To this the objection is made that the prosecuting functions should be separate from the hearing of complaints. But as has already been indicated, only in part are his present duties genuinely prosecution; some parts are administrative and parts are a species of rule or policy making. It may be that the administrative and policy-making functions could be subordinated more clearly to the Board's control while still maintaining an adequate separation of the truly prosecuting activities."

DIVERGENCE OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 12 FROM HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

As indicated previously, the Hoover Commission made no specific recommendation for abolishment of the office of general counsel or of the general counsel of the NLRB.

Nor did the Hoover task force recommend the abolishment of the office, but suggested creation of a council of labor which would include the general counsel. (See above.)

POSITIONS OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD AND OF GENERAL COUNSEL

The positions of the National Labor Relations Board and of the NLRB general counsel upon the independence of the general counsel under provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act are expressed in the attached statements of recent date issued by each.

On March 23, 1950, the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments rejected House Resolution 516 (HOFFMAN), which would disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 12, by a vote of 18 to 7, thus in effect approving the plan. The Senate Committee on Expenditures will begin hearings on the plan April 4.

MILES SCULL, Jr.,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

(Attachments: (1) Statement by National Labor Relations Board revising delegation of functions to general counsel. February 25, 1950. (2) Statement by Robert N. Denham, general counsel, NLRB, relating to revision of delegation of functions, March 2, 1950.)

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1950.

NLRB REVISES DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS TO GENERAL COUNSEL

The National Labor Relations Board today announced revision of the delegation of authority under which the general counsel performs certain functions on behalf of the five-member Board.

The general counsel's powers derive both from the provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act and the Board's delegation of authority to him. Today's revisions—the first since the memorandum of delegation of functions was adopted by the Board in August 1947—do not, of course, affect in any manner those powers of the general counsel which flow from the statute.

Today's revisions, the full text of which will appear in the Federal Register, are mostly of a clarifying nature. They were originally discussed by the Board with General Counsel Robert N. Denham in September and October 1949.

The two major revisions in the delegation of functions involve: (1) A clarification of the general counsel's role in the enforcement of Board orders in the courts; and (2) a modification of personnel policy affecting the agency's top field officers and the establishment of regional offices.

(1) Court litigation of Board decisions: As regards the enforcement of decisions and orders of the Board in the Federal courts the statute (sec. 10 (e)) provides: "The Board shall have power to petition any circuit court of appeals of the United States * * * for the enforcement of such order." The Taft-Hartley Act further provides (sec. 10 (d)): "The general counsel of the Board shall exercise general supervision over all attorneys employed by the Board (other than trial examiners and legal assistants to Board members)."

The 1947 memorandum of delegation of functions provided:

"General counsel will, upon direction and in behalf of the Board, petition for enforcement * * * and resist petitions for review of Board orders as provided in section 10 (e) and (f). * * * When directed to do so by the Board, the proceedings described immediately above will be initiated by general counsel without exception. Successive proceedings by way of appeal or on petition for certiorari will be prosecuted by general counsel unless directed to the contrary by the Board."

Today's revisions in the delegation of functions changed the above section to read as follows:

"On behalf of the Board, the general counsel of the Board will, in full accordance with the directions of the Board, petition for enforcement * * * and resist petitions for review of Board orders as provided in section 10 (e) and (f). * * * When he is directed to do so by the Board, the proceedings described above will be initiated and processed by the general counsel without exception. Successive proceedings by way of appeal or on petition for certiorari shall be prosecuted by the general counsel upon, and in full accordance with, the directions of the Board."

(2) Regional offices: As regards the personnel in the agency's regional offices, the statute (sec. 3 (d)) provides: "The general counsel of the Board shall exercise general supervision over * * * the officers and employees in the regional offices." The statute further provides (sec. 4 (a)): "The Board shall appoint * * * examiners and regional directors, and such other employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties."

The 1947 delegation of functions to the general counsel gave him "full and final authority on behalf of the Board over the selection, retention, transfer, promotion, demotion, discipline, discharge, and in all other respects of all personnel engaged in the field * * *."

Today's revisions in the delegations of functions added the following language to the above grant of authority to the general counsel: "*Provided, however*, That no appointment, transfer, demotion, or discharge of any regional director, or of any officer in charge of a subregional office, shall become effective except upon approval by the Board. * * * The establishment, transfer, or elimination of any regional or subregional office shall require the approval of the Board."

Shortly after the Board adopted the delegation of functions in 1947, the Board's Chairman thus described what was originally intended in the memorandum of delegation of functions:

"The Board (had to devote much of its energy during the early weeks to the pioneering tasks of devising new administrative procedures which would both implement the intent of Congress and make for operating efficiency. * * * Several objectives had to be kept in mind:

"In the first place, the unfettered independence of the general counsel in investigating and prosecuting unfair-labor-practice cases was axiomatic under the provisions of the new law.

"Second, it was necessary to preserve the Board's own ultimate responsibility for the administration and interpretation of the statute as a whole, and its continuing responsibility for the conduct of representation and (election) proceedings.

"Third, it was essential to accomplish these things without either imposing on the taxpayers the burden of having two entirely separate staffs in the Board's field offices, or creating a single hybrid field staff. * * *

"A practical solution was called for. The Board therefore made an agreement with the general counsel that was premised upon his statutory authority to supervise the field and most of the legal staff without interference by the Board. * * * It was understood that so much of this authority as is delegated could be revoked by the Board at any time. * * *

"The law requires separation; it does not contemplate divorce."

The Board now consists of four members: Chairman Paul M. Herzog, and members John M. Houston, James J. Reynolds, Jr., and Abe Murdock. Paul L. Styles will be the fifth member when he assumes office next week.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1950.

STATEMENT BY ROBERT N. DENHAM, GENERAL COUNSEL, NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

When I was appointed to the office of general counsel of the Board, President Truman, in the presence of the then members of the Board, instructed me that, notwithstanding his opposition to the Taft-Hartley Act, it was the law of the land and as long as it remained such, he expected me to administer the law the way it is written and in accordance with the intention of the Congress. For 2½ years, I have done this, without criticism from my boss, the President.

The National Labor Relations Board, however, on February 23, 1950, attempted to revise the structure of organization under which the Taft-Hartley Act has been so administered. The Board, in commenting on the attempted revision, stated that it does not, "of course, affect in any manner, those powers of the general counsel which flow from the statute."

It is because the so-called amendments which the Board is attempting to accomplish affect powers of the general counsel which do, in fact, flow from the statute, and would, if effective, deter the general counsel from the performance of the duties and the carrying out of the responsibilities imposed on him by Congress, that he finds it necessary to advise the public of that fact and of his refusal to submit to such action.

One of the primary objectives of Congress in enacting the Taft-Hartley Act was to separate the judicial from the prosecuting functions of the agency. Thus, the conference report of the managers on the part of the House, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 5, p. 6362, commenting on the duties and powers of the general counsel, stated:

"The general counsel is to have general supervision and direction of all attorneys employed by the Board (excluding trial examiners and the legal assistants to the individual members of the Board), and of all the officers and employees in the Board's regional offices, and is to have the final authority to act in the name of, but independently of any direction, control, or review by the Board in respect of the investigation of charges and the issuance of complaints of unfair labor practices, and in respect of prosecution of such complaints before the board. * * * By this provision responsibility for what takes place in the Board's regional offices is centralized in one individual who is ultimately responsible to the President and Congress.

"The House bill, in the section providing for the Administrator, provided that the regional directors and the chief regional attorneys were to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. It was believed that better administration will result in having responsibility lodged in one person rather than having it diffused through numerous regional directors and regional attorneys, and the conference agreement omits this provision."

If the above expressed intent of Congress means anything, it is obvious that the Board, by its action of February 23, is trying to exercise authority it does not possess. Contrary to these clear expressions of the intent of the Congress, it undertakes to assume control over "what takes place in the Board's regional offices" by attempting to control "the selection, retention, transfer, promotion, demotion, discipline (and) discharge" of all regional directors and officers in charge of subregional offices. While this is limited to a single class of field personnel, it clearly carries with it a presumption that the Board also has the power to exert similar control over all other regional office personnel, as well as the attorneys who are under the same "general supervision."

The job of the regional officers is to investigate and prosecute violations of the Taft-Hartley Act. Because the statute makes this prosecuting function the responsibility of the general counsel rather than of the Board, it follows that the regional officers can only be responsible to and controlled by the general counsel. Otherwise the general counsel could not function independently of the Board as was intended by the Congress. The general counsel could not legally delegate this prosecuting function to a Board member or to the Board itself. Obviously, therefore, he could not delegate the function to an agent controlled by the Board members. In the present scheme of things, the regional directors are clothed with broad autonomy, as the general counsel's representatives, to exercise this prosecuting function.

During the past 2½ years the criticism formerly common under the Wagner Act that the Board was judge, jury, and prosecutor has not been heard. The reason is that the general counsel acting through the regional officers, has investigated and prosecuted violations of the statute "independently of any direction, control, or review" by the Board members. He has been able to do so because of the erstwhile recognition by all concerned that the regional officers must be likewise independent of control by the Board members and responsible only to the general counsel, who in turn is responsible only to the President and the Congress. The Board has been, and by Congress was intended to be, judge and jury, but not prosecutor. Should the Board possess the authority it is now attempting to assert, such independence of action in the regional directors would be impossible.

It is important, particularly at this critical time in the Nation's economic history, that everything be done to maintain the confidence of the public and of labor and management in the fact that the labor laws of the country will be administered in the manner prescribed by the peoples' representatives. Because that is so and for other reasons herein stated, the general counsel should not and cannot acquiesce in this attempt by the Board to usurp authority not granted it either by the letter or spirit of the statute. Were the general counsel to take any other position in this matter, he would not be fully and faithfully carrying out the responsibilities which the people, through the Congress and the President, have imposed upon him.

Other material changes attempted to be made by the Board's action of February 23 have to do with the enforcement and defense of its orders before the courts.

Obviously the Board is entitled to look to the general counsel for representation before the courts and to direct the general counsel when and whether to proceed with enforcement petitions and defensive actions. However, there are some limitations on this obligation of the general counsel, measured by the nature of the issue involved, by the effect such action might have on the relation of the general counsel to the court as an officer of the court, or by the canons of ethics that apply to all attorneys. An outstanding example is found in several cases where the Board has issued orders which, in effect, assert that it has the authority to decide whether or not a complaint should have been issued at all, even though the facts show a violation and the Board has clear jurisdiction in the case. Two of these orders are now before the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Judicial Circuit (*A-1 Photo Service*, (83 NLRB No. 26), and *Haleston Drug Stores, Inc.* (86 NLRB No. 125). In

[1] Task Force Report on Regulatory Commissions (appendix N), pp. 139–141.

[2] Remarks of Robert N. Denham before the labor-relations section of the American Bar Association, Cleveland, September 23, 1947.

each case the general counsel has argued to the Board that its order exceeds its own statutory authority and invades that of the general counsel contained in his exclusive and final authority to issue complaints or to refuse to do so. The general counsel cannot now, on behalf of the Board, urge the courts to approve this action. Accordingly, the general counsel has suggested that briefs in such cases be prepared under the supervision of the Board's Solicitor with the aid of whatever help may be required from the general counsel's staff, and that the case then be presented to the court by the Solicitor. This procedure will insure that the courts are fully informed of the Board's position in those cases. The general counsel, however, cannot be expected to urge the courts to approve the Board's incursion into his own area of statutory responsibility or to accept the Board's delegation to him of this type of assignment.

In the other cases where the status of the general counsel as an officer of the court has been affected, he has similarly suggested that briefs be supervised, signed, and argued by the Solicitor to avoid embarrassment and to insure an adequate presentation of the Board's position.

With the exception of such unusual assignments, of which only four or five have arisen, the general counsel is prepared as always to enforce the Board's order to the best of his ability consistent with his obligation to the court and in conformity with the canons of ethics governing the profession.

MARCH 21, 1950.

[Staff memorandum No. 81-2-36]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 14 OF 1950, LABOR STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT

PURPOSE

There are a number of Federal laws which provide for the maintenance of certain standards as related to the employment of laborers and other persons engaged on contracts to which the United States is a direct or indirect party. At the present time the administration of these acts prescribing labor standards and the enforcement thereof are a responsibility of the heads of the respective agencies which may be involved. Thus, it may be seen that such administration and enforcement vary according to interpretations and to method utilized under the processes of any particular agency.

For the purpose of assuring uniformity throughout the Federal Government, both as to administration and enforcement in relation to all such labor standards provisions, authority is centralized by this plan in the Secretary of Labor to prescribe uniform standards, regulations, and procedures for observance by all Federal agencies concerned and to make investigations so as to insure compliance with, and enforcement of, such standards.

COMPLIANCE WITH RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION

In his letter of transmittal, the President states that this reorganization plan is in general accord with recommendations of the Hoover Commission. While the staff finds no specific recommendation of the Commission for the action taken by this plan, the following paragraphs would tend to indicate that this centralizing in the Secretary of Labor of responsibility for rules of administration and enforcement of labor standards is agreeable to the tenor of the Commission's attitude toward the Department of Labor and with the Commission's general position that similar functions should be grouped together.

The Hoover Commission definitely favored rebuilding of the Department of Labor by returning to it many functions previously severed and by placing in that Department functions hitherto lodged elsewhere. For example, in Report No. 13, Department of Labor, Recommendation No. 7 is prefaced by a statement that "'Prevailing wage' inquiries incident to determining wages for blue-collar Federal employees are now conducted by the several agencies, and should be centered in the Bureau of Labor Statistics." Recommendation No. 7 itself states that there should be centralized in the Bureau of Labor Statistics responsibility for collection of data, research, and analysis relating to wholesale prices and living costs, employment and unemployment, working hours, wages, pay rolls, and productivity.

Further, at the beginning of chapter IV the Hoover Commission's report on the Department of Labor is an enumeration of eight separate agencies and functions suggested for transfer to the Department of Labor. This does not constitute one of the numbered major recommendations of the Commission but is in the nature of an inferential recommendation. The fifth item in the enumeration is "enforcement of labor standards in Government contracts (from contracting departments and agencies)." The staff wishes to emphasize to the committee the distinction between the significance of the foregoing quotation and the transfer proposed by Reorganization Plan No. 14. That distinction is that, whereas the quoted excerpt from the Hoover Commission's report relates to the actual enforcement of labor standards in Government contracts, Reorganization Plan No. 14 relates to the prescribing by the Secretary of Labor of "appropriate standards, regulations, and procedures" with respect to the administration and enforcement of labor standards in Government contracts. The importance of the distinction is that the enforcement and administration of labor standards are not transferred by the plan but remain vested in the individual agencies and departments of the Government.

Particularly pertinent to Reorganization Plan No. 14 is the following quotation from chapter V, entitled "Enforcement and Promotion of Employment Standards," of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Public Welfare (appendix P, p. 459):

"1. Regulation of employment standards is an established function of the Federal Government, partly as a means of preserving prevailing wage rates in the construction industry on Federal public-works contracts, and partly to promote economic stability by establishing a national wage floor for economic competition. These functions are centralized in the Labor Department, with the exception of the enforcement responsibilities in connection with contract violations, and the Maritime Commission's function of setting minimum wages in operating-differential subsidy contracts with private American companies engaged in foreign shipping. These are appropriate functions of the Labor Department, to which they should be transferred in connection with clarifying amendments to the coverage and exemptive provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act."

ACTS AFFECTED

This reorganization plan enumerates the laws of the United States in which are found the labor standards provisions with respect to which authority for prescribing standards, regulations, and procedures, and for the making of investigations as to compliance and enforcement is centered in the Secretary of Labor. There follows a list of those laws and a brief identification of each.

Act of March 3, 1931: This is a general law which provides that each contract in excess of $2,000 to which the United States or the District of Columbia is a party and which involves the construction, alteration, or repair of public buildings or public works, shall contain a provision stating the prevailing minimum wages as determined by the Secretary of Labor to be paid various classes of laborers and mechanics to be engaged.

Act of June 13, 1934: This is a provision of law that prohibits anyone from inducing, through threat, intimidation, or similar force, any person employed under a construction contract to which the United States is a direct or indirect party to give up any part of his compensation. The Secretary of Labor is already, in this case, empowered to establish reasonable regulations for contractors and subcontractors.

Act of August 1, 1892: This is an 8-hour law for laborers and mechanics generally, and specifically for any persons employed to perform services similar to those of laborers and mechanics in connection with dredging or rock excavation in any river or harbor of the United States or the District of Columbia, on work for which the United States or the District of Columbia is the direct employer or is a contract party.

Act of June 19, 1912: This law is similar to the act of August 1, 1892, and may be denoted as a general 8-hour law for laborers and mechanics involved in work to which the United States is a contract party.

Act of June 3, 1939: This is a law relating to insurance by the United States of financial institutions to preserve them from loss as a result of loans and advances of credit and similar financial operations in connection with alterations, repairs, and improvements to existing structures and the building of new structures.

Specifically, section 212 (a) of this act provides that the National Housing Administrator shall not insure against loss in connection with construction unless the principal contractor certifies that the laborers and mechanics employed on the project have been paid not less than locally prevailing wages for corresponding classes of employees. This law already provides that determination as to prevailing wages shall be by the Secretary of Labor, and this plan would transfer to him additional authority relating to uniform administration and enforcement of labor standards.

Act of August 13, 1946, Hospital Survey and Construction Act: This is a law relating to construction of hospitals. Specifically, section 625 (a) of the act provides that a State plan for construction thereunder must include assurance to the Surgeon General of the United States that rates of pay for laborers and mechanics engaged in construction on the project will not be less than prevailing wages, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, for similar work.

Act of May 13, 1946, Federal Airport Act: This is a law relating to construction of airports. Specifically, section 15 (b) of the act provides that all contracts in excess of $2,000 for work on projects approved under the act and wherein labor is involved shall contain provisions establishing minimum rates of pay, such rates to be predetermined by the Secretary of Labor. Under this reorganization plan the Secretary of Labor will be empowered to prescribe rules relating to the administration and enforcement of labor standards, in addition to his existing authority relating to determination of prevailing wages.

Act of July 15, 1949, Housing Act of 1949: This law relates to slum clearance, community development, and allied activities. Specifically, section 109 provides that each contract for financial aid under the act shall contain provision for payment of locally prevailing salaries to architects, engineers, draftsmen, and technicians, and for the payment of locally prevailing wages to laborers and mechanics employed on the project, such locally prevailing wages to be determined by the Secretary of Labor. Reorganization Plan No. 14 will empower the Secretary of Labor to prescribe rules for the administration and enforcement of labor standards in addition to such determinations of prevailing wages.

CONCLUSION

So far as the staff has been able to determine there is no important objection to this reorganization plan. It should be reported, however, that the proposal was previously made in Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1947, defeated by both the Senate and the House of Representatives. That plan consisted of three sections, the third designed to accomplish the same results as this present Reorganization Plan No. 14. Section 1 would have transferred the United States Employment Service permanently from the Social Security Board (Federal Security Agency) to the Department of Labor, in which it had been placed originally after creation by the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933; and section 2 would have transferred the functions of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor to the Secretary of Labor.

The House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments recommended disapproval of the plan and, with respect to section 3 thereof, stated that, while there appeared to be some justification for centering in one official the responsibility for coordinating the administration and enforcement of Federal labor standards laws, it was felt that at that time it would be more appropriate to require careful consideration of the matter by appropriate congressional committees. The House had no more to say regarding section 3 and the significance of what it did say is not apparent from the record.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1947 was considered by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which recommended against passage of the concurrent resolution to defeat the plan. In its report, the Senate committee stated with regard to section 3 that coordination by the Secretary of Labor of the administration and enforcement of labor standards provisions should make for more consistency therein. Thus it may be seen that, when the ends sought to be attained by this present Reorganization Plan No. 14 were previously before the Congress, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was in favor thereof while the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments took an adverse viewpoint, although the exact nature of the objection is not apparent. Nevertheless, Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1947 was defeated by both Houses of Congress. Obviously, however, that defeat sprang from objection to sections 1 and 2, and was not due to any important objection to section 3, with the purpose of which we are here concerned.

The staff wishes to report further that this plan has been discussed with legal representatives of the Department of Labor. We are informed that, although under the language of the plan it may well be possible to construe that by it the Secretary of Labor is given authority with respect to "white collar" employees, the Department takes the view that the plan is intended to convey to the Secretary of Labor authority as to "blue collar" workers only.

THOMAS A. SAFFINGTON,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

MARCH 27, 1950.

[Staff memorandum No. 81-2-41]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 15, ALASKA AND VIRGIN ISLANDS PUBLIC WORKS

PURPOSE

This plan proposes to transfer the responsibility for administering the Alaska and Virgin Islands public-works programs from the General Services Administration to the Department of the Interior.

Government sources have indicated that the following basic administrative improvements may be effectuated if the plan is permitted to become effective:

(a) That local public works will be geared to the long-range interests of the inhabitants, and coordinated with the Department of the Interior's policies and programs for promoting the general welfare of the people of Alaska and the Virgin Islands.

(b) The GSA's primary mission is central administrative services, whereas these programs authorize construction which may be considered as an adjunct to community development, and properly belong in the Department of the Interior.

(c) The Department of the Interior has a paramount interest in the affairs of Alaska and the Virgin Islands, and should, therefore, be responsible for these programs.

(d) The centralization of these functions in a single agency will reduce duplication of effort and facilitate administration. This will also make it possible to hold designated officials responsible for execution of the programs.

(e) The plan is comparable to, and in accord with, the theory underlying the transfer of the Alaska Roads Commission to the Department of the Interior (44 Stat. 446).

THE ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

The Alaska public works program was authorized by Public Law No. 264, Eighty-first Congress, approved on August 24, 1949. The purpose of the plan is to foster a settlement program and increase the number of permanent residents of Alaska, to stimulate trade and develop resources, and to provide facilities for community life through a program of useful public works, including schools, hospitals, sewer and water systems, colleges, institutional and public buildings, incinerators, and other community facilities.

Under Public Law 264, any public body may apply for public works construction. The application must be made to the Community Facilities Service of the General Services Administration. The application must be approved by the Governor of Alaska and concurred in by the Secretary of the Interior, after which the Community Facilities Service enters into a contract with the local body stipulating that the Community Facilities Service will build the facilities and, on completion of the project, that it will be turned over to the local body at not less than 25 percent or more than 75 percent of the estimated cost.

The size of the Alaskan public works program is limited by law to a ceiling of $70,000,000, and duration of the program shall continue until the $70,000,000 is obligated, or, in any event, is to terminate on June 30, 1955.

THE VIRGIN ISLANDS PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

The Virgin Islands public works program was authorized by Public Law No. 510, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved on December 20, 1944. The act was designed to assist in the internal development of the islands, and authorized an appropriation of $10,028,420 for construction of about 20 projects specifically set forth in the act.

The act provided further that an appropriation of $2,028,420 should be made in fiscal year 1945, and $2,000,000 each year thereafter during the next 4 years. To date allocations total $5,643,942, or about one-half of the original program has been financed. The General Services Administration has, however, requested $1,300,000 in appropriations and $1,460,000 in contract authorizations in the budget for fiscal year 1951.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAMS

Pursuant to Public Law No. 264, the General Services Administration is responsible for administering the Alaska public works program. The administration of public works in the Virgin Islands was vested in the Federal Works Agency by Public Law No. 510. When that agency was abolished, under Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, its functions were also transferred to the General Services Administration. The Senate Public Works Committee has considered the question of jurisdiction over public works in Alaska and the Virgin Islands on three different occasions during the past 3 years. The long years of experience of capable technicians and the established organization available in the General Services Administration influenced the committee in making its recommendations that this agency should retain jurisdiction over these public works programs.

STATUS OF THE PROGRAM

No public works have been constructed in Alaska under Public Law 264, because the building season has been closed since the approval of the act. Appropriations of $1,000,000 and $4,000,000 in contract authorization, were approved by Congress on October 28, 1949, for fiscal year 1950. The General Services Administration requested an appropriation of $12,000,000 for this program for fiscal year 1951, and contract authorizations in amount of $13,000,000. The Administration recently opened a district engineers office in Juneau, to which has been assigned four employees who are authorized to supervise the local projects and to establish field offices in order that the program may be carried forward as soon as the weather permits.

Public works construction in the Virgin Islands was initiated in 1944, pursuant to Public Law No. 510, which vested the responsibility for administration in the Federal Works Agency. On July 1, 1949, this Agency was abolished and its functions transferred to the General Services Administration by Public Law No. 152. The General Services Administration is responsible for the design and construction of the projects, but, on completion, the projects are turned over to the local authorities for use and administration. Some of the programs have been developed and prosecuted within the limits of available funds. Others have been retarded because the officials in charge failed to consider local needs, had misconceptions in design, and failed to maintain adequate liaison with local officials. As a result some of these programs are behind schedule.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Hoover Commission made no specific recommendation relating to this plan. The Commission did recommend (No. 3, Department of the Interior) that the Department of the Interior be reorganized along more functional and major-purpose lines, and that community services (including public works) be transferred to the Department of the Interior, because of the major-purpose aspect. (Recommendations No. 4 and 8—Department of the Interior.)

The Commission supported these recommendations in the following language (Report on Department of the Interior, p. 17):

(a) Regrouping of development of natural resources and construction, according to major purposes, to secure coordinated policies in these fields.

(b) Provision of a center for coordination of State and Federal action in these fields.

(c) Provision for the Congress of an overall view of the major construction activities of the Government.

(d) Provision of a center for planning and action of Federal construction to be coordinated with the ebb and flow of employment.

The Commission did recommend that Federal construction should be centralized in

the Department of the Interior, and grants-in-aid or loans for construction should be vested in the major-purpose agency.

HOOVER COMMISSION MEMBERS

Commissioners Acheson, Pollock, and Rowe dissented in a separate report (p. 54) in which they admitted that the Department of the Interior should be reorganized, but contended that: "Finally, the addition of all Federal construction programs, as some members (of the Commission) suggest, even further dilutes the major purpose of a resources department. To combine in one agency works and resources emphasizes too largely the construction aspect. The purpose of the construction, which varies greatly from one agency to another, is lost, as it were, in this effort to build a department of many unrelated purposes."

These members of the Commission submitted the following alternate recommendations:

(a) Placing public building construction in the General Services Administration.

(b) Community services with health, education, and other related major-purpose activities.

(c) Hospital construction work in the agency concerned with Federal hospitals (the United Medical Administration).

MINOR PROBLEMS

In contacts with the various agencies affected by this plan, the staff has been advised that there are certain provisions of this plan which should be carefully considered by the committee, some of which are as follows:

(a) The Department of the Interior does not have the technical facilities to administer these programs.

(b) Centralizing all such responsibility in one agency, would not permit of intergovernmental checks by one group as against another.

(c) Local pressure on residential Government officials might result in one community's getting "the lion's share" of the projects, while another goes begging.

(d) Conflicts between the Alaska Field Committee and the Division of Territories and Island Possessions of the Department of the Interior might bring about confusion, delay, and dissatisfaction.

(e) No savings in funds or personnel is indicated or claimed by the administration should this plan become effective.

CONCLUSION

This plan does not accord with specific Hoover Commission recommendations, nor with the views of Commissioners Acheson, Pollock, and Rowe, in the following respects: (a) The President has not established a central public-works agency either in the Department of the Interior or as a separate agency; and (b) the plan, therefore, proposes to transfer a few small construction functions to the Department of the Interior without reorganizing the parent department as recommended by the Commission.

GLENN K. SHRIVER,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

MARCH 28, 1950.

[Staff memorandum No. 81-2-43]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 15, ASSISTANCE TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND WATER-POLLUTION CONTROL

PURPOSE

This plan proposes to transfer the functions relating to assistance to local school districts, and grants and loans for water-pollution-control projects, from the General Services Administrator to the Federal Security Agency.

The President's message accompanying the plan states that by placing these functions in the agency of the Government best informed in matters of public-school administration, and the agency presently responsible for the preparation and adoption of plans for water-pollution control, will simplify Federal-State relations and improve administration of these programs.

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Federal aid to overburdened school districts was originally authorized under title II of the Lanham Act, approved June 28, 1941 (55 Stat. 361). The provisions of this act have been extended each year during the past 4 years. The last extension was by Public Law No. 306, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 10, 1949. Under this act the General Services Administrator is authorized to make contributions to local school agencies located on Federal reservations or other federally owned property, to overburdened schools adjacent to defense areas, and in those areas where acquisition of land by the Federal Government has reduced school revenues.

WATER-POLLUTION CONTROL

The Federal water-pollution-control activities are based chiefly on Public Law No. 845, Eightieth Congress, approved June 30, 1948. This act authorized governmental action of several types, and distributes the responsibility of the program between the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and the Federal Works Agency. (The functions of FWA were recently absorbed by the General Services Administration.) Under this act the Public Health Service (FSA) is charged with the preparation and adoption of comprehensive pollution-control plans for interstate streams. These plans are developed in cooperation with other Federal agencies with State and interstate water-pollution agencies and with the municipalities and industries affected.

A further function of the Public Health Service is that of initiating legal action to compel the abatement of water-pollution conditions declared to fall under the act's definition of public nuisance. On the other hand the Administrator of General Services Administration is authorized to make loans to States, municipalities or interstate agencies for construction of sewage treatment works. The loans cannot exceed $250,000 or 33⅓ percent of the estimated cost, whichever is lower. The plans must be approved by the Surgeon General (PHS), the Administrator of General Services, and the State water pollution agency.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM

At the present time a number of agencies are engaged in helping local school districts overcome the financial burdens imposed by the withdrawal of taxable land for governmental purposes, or by sudden increases in the child population caused by the establishment or reactivation of Federal installations. The programs of the agencies involve different standards and varying financial arrangements, with the result that the situation generally is unsatisfactory both from a Federal and local standpoint.

Last year an appropriation of $7,250,000 was made available for aid to schools in defense areas and on Federal reservations to be allocated by the Administrator of General Services. Practically all other Federal aid to education programs are administered by the Office of Education. Plan No. 16 is designed, through the transfer of these functions to the agency best informed on these matters to bring about improvement and better coordination of these programs.

Approximately $1,750,000 has been appropriated each year since enactment of Public Law No. 845, Eightieth Congress, for the purpose of eliminating water pollution. Under this act the prevention and abatement of water pollution and treatment of industrial waste and other filth discharged into interstate streams has been under the joint administration of the Public Health Service, the General Services Administration, and the State pollution agencies.

The Public Health Service is responsible for the preparation or adoption of pollution-control plans for interstate streams. The plans are developed in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State and interstate water-pollution agencies and with the local municipalities. In effectuating these responsibilities the surgeon general is authorized to conduct joint investigations with the cooperating agencies. He is also directed or authorized to encourage cooperative activities by the States, promote the enactment of uniform laws relating to water-pollution control, encourage compacts for the prevention and abatement of water pollution, disseminate information relating to water pollution, and make investigations into specific problems upon the request of any State or interstate agency.

SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE CONSIDERED JURISDICTION OF WATER POLLUTION

The jurisdiction and control of water pollution was carefully examined by the Senate Committee on Public Works during the first session of the Eightieth Congress and the committee stated that the responsibility for diagnosis of the causes of stream pollution is properly entrusted to the Public Health Service. The execution of the remedies, involving the design and construction of sewage-treatment works by non-Federal public bodies and industries were to be financed, in part, by loans from the Federal Government. The committee further indicated that the agency presently organized on a Nation-wide basis and best qualified to supervise this type of non-Federal construction program is the Federal Works Agency—now GSA. (Senate Rept. No. 462).

The committee further stated that—

"The Public Health Service and the Federal Works Agency, each contributing its special skills and working together cooperatively, can accomplish more than either of them working alone."

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

This plan is not specifically covered by any of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, but is in accord with its determination that Federal-State relations be concentrated where feasible, within the Federal Security Agency, and that major-purpose functions be grouped together in a single agency.

The Commission did recommend that Federal construction should be centralized in the Department of the Interior and grants in aid or loans for construction should be vested in the major-purpose agency. The major functions involved under this plan are public health, and their transfer to the Federal Security Agency is, therefore, in accord with this recommendation.

ISSUES INVOLVED

The issues involved in this plan may not be considered serious, with possibly one exception, and it is understood that both the GSA and FSA have agreed that the responsibility for administering Federal aid to overburdened school districts should be transferred to FSA.

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor has held extensive hearings on H. R. 4115, after which a clean bill, H. R. 7940, was introduced (March 30, 1950) to provide financial assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities. This bill also provides for transferring the administrative responsibility for Federal aid to education in those areas from the Departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the Bureau of Reclamation to the FSA. If this bill is approved, the FSA will be responsible for administering all of the Federal-aid programs except those which are under the Atomic Energy Commission and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Under the law and procedures now in effect the Public Health Service of the FSA is responsible for administering the major portion of those functions created by Public Law No. 845 relating to water-pollution control. Should this plan be approved there is some question as to whether the GSA will be able to liquidate its functions by the time the plan goes into effect. Part of this objection will be overcome by transferring the funds, records, and personnel to FSA as contemplated by Reorganization Plan No. 16.

CONCLUSION

There is considerable merit and general agreement that the responsibility for administering Federal aid to education should be vested in the Office of Education. This plan merely transfers one of these functions, however, and it is believed that similar functions now administered by other agencies, such as Deparment of Defense, Bureau of Reclamation, etc., should likewise be transferred to the Office of Education.

On the other hand the functions involved in water-pollution control are administered jointly by the GSA and the Public Health Service. This program may be classified as a construction function relating to areas in which the Federal Government has a primary responsibility, whereas the local communities have added interests which relate to health, education, and community facilities. Notwithstanding the construction phase of this part of the plan it is reasonable to assume that water pollution is a function that is directed chiefly toward the improvement of health of inhabitants of urban or rural communities.

The committee has received no indications as to any opposition to the plan, and only one letter, from the National Council of Chief State School Officers, favoring its adoption.

GLENN K. SHRIVER,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

APRIL 1, 1950.

[Staff Memorandum No. 81-2-46]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 17, PUBLIC WORKS ADVANCE PLANNING AND OTHER FUNCTIONS

PURPOSE

This plan proposes to transfer the functions relating to advance planning of non-Federal public works, and the management and disposal of certain war public works from the General Services Administration to the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The administration believes that by centralizing these responsibilities in a single agency better administration will be attained, and simplified relationship will be possible between the Federal and local agencies concerned with non-Federal public works as well as improvement in the management of certain war public works activities.

ADVANCE PLANNING FOR NON-FEDERAL PUBLIC WORKS

Public Law No. 352, Eighty-first Congress, authorized the Administrator of General Services to advance Federal funds to State and local governments for the purpose of preparing plans for non-Federal public works. The purpose of the act is to encourage States and other non-Federal public agencies to maintain an adequate reserve of fully planned public works readily available in order that construction may be started promptly when economic conditions make such action desirable. A similar program was carried out under title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act, during the period 1944 to 1947 which is now being liquidated. The current activities are for the most part concerned with recovery of advances previously made under the act of 1944.

Advance planning as contemplated under the new act is an extensive operation, but its duration is temporary in that all applications for approval must be submitted on or before October 13, 1951. Each application for an advance must be reviewed and approved by GSA from the standpoint of local planning, engineering, legal, and financial responsibility of the governing body to support the projects. After an application is approved funds are allocated to the local body for use in preparing blueprints, engineering surveys, and plans for construction. As soon as construction is commenced the local agency repays the Government for the total amount advanced, without interest. The act specifically provides that the making of advances to States or other political subdivisions for preparation of public works plans does not commit the Congress to appropriate any funds for construction.

The types of public facilities which have been planned with the aid of advances under Public Law No. 352, and its predecessor, consisted of sewer and water systems, schools, hospitals, and recreational facilities. These facilities contribute to the health, comfort, and welfare, as well as the physical development, of the communities in which they are located. Many of the loans under this legislation have been made to rural districts and comparatively small communities.

WAR PUBLIC WORKS

Under title II of the Lanham Act, as amended (55 Stat. 361), the Federal Works Administrator was authorized to provide public works necessary to the health, safety, or welfare of persons engaged in national defense activities. The facilities provided consisted of water, sewage, and sanitary facilities, hospitals, schools, and necessary public buildings. These facilities were provided under two categories: (1) Those in which the local community financed construction with the aid of loans or grants from the Federal Government, and (2) those facilities financed and constructed by the Federal Government. The latter public works were owned and operated by the United States and as a result maintenance and disposition of such property became a Federal responsibility. It is this phase of the title II program, together with the liquidating functions on locally sponsored facilities, which continues today as a function of the General Services Administration. These responsibilities will be transferred under this plan to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, where the Administration believes that they can be carried on more effectively than is possible under the present arrangement.

Since 1944 the Federal Government constructed 1,572 war public works projects at an aggregate cost of over $179,000,000. As of February 28, 1950, 985 of the 1,186 projects which were to be disposed of by sale had been sold or leased with an option to purchase. The 201 projects which remained to be sold represented an initial cost of over $36,000,000.

It is contended that the Government will have a substantial number of the title II projects on hand for a long time because some of them serve emergency housing projects. Experience in disposing of these projects to date indicates that many communities are reluctant to make a reasonable offer for these facilities due to the possibility that bills may be introduced in the Congress authorizing donation of such property to the municipality or local subdivisions.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM

As indicated above, the Administrator of General Services is responsible for reviewing applications for advance planning of non-Federal works. This entails screening such applications from the standpoint of engineering feasibility, conformance with legal requirements, and the financial position of the applicant. It is understood that the functions and activities involved in administration of the program have been performed efficiently. The proponents of the plan contend that from an organizational standpoint, this work should be performed by a line agency which is primarily responsible for community development instead of an agency whose primary object is procurement, property management and central administrative services. It is understood that only 17 employees are engaged in property management and disposal of the title II facilities now on hand in the General Services Administration. This represents a very small proportion of the total number of employees and magnitude of a similar program which is presently being administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Because of the relationship of sewer, water, and other related facilities to housing development and the disposition of war developed housing projects it is almost impossible to dispose of the utilities without disposing of the housing projects. It is contended, under the present arrangement of dual responsibility that neither war or defense housing, nor community facilities, are being liquidated effectively because of inter-agency negotiations together with the correlation of the activities of each with the local communities. Other informants have denied that any such difficulty exists, stating that very few, if any, of the remaining facilities serve housing projects still held by the Government.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADVANCE PLANNING

The Senate Committee on Public Works considered the question as to whether or not the General Services Administration was the proper agency to handle advance planning programs and unanimously decided that, inasmuch as its predecessor (the FWA) had been doing this type of work since 1945, the GSA was best qualified, and, therefore, delegated such functions to that agency under Public Law 352.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Hoover Commission did not make any recommendations which specifically cover this plan. The advance planning program was not established until after the Commission had completed its survey of the executive branch.

The Commission did recommend that Federal construction should be centralized in the Department of the Interior, and grants-in-aid or loans for construction should be vested in the major purpose agency.

ISSUES INVOLVED

(a) Advance planning of non-Federal public works is independent of public housing financed by the Federal Government: It is conceivable that if plan 17 is approved the development of advance planning in small communities and rural areas would be neglected or subordinated to plan preparation for urban districts.

The reason given in the President's message for vesting the responsibility for advance planning in the Housing and Home Finance Agency is that the transfer "will result in more economical administration of those activities of the Federal Government which are concerned with the over-all planning and development of communities." It

may be noted, however, that the community planning functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency are performed in connection with its public housing and slum clearance and urban redevelopment programs. Thus, they are primarily big-city projects. The advance planning program, on the other hand, is designed to provide a shelf of public works for communities of all sizes and even for rural areas.

(b) Dispersal of Community Facilities Services of GSA: It is contended that plan No. 17 (and to a certain extent plans 15 and 16) are intended to transfer functions from GSA which are unrelated to its primary mission of providing central administrative services for the executive branch of the Government.

A careful examination of this claim and other information on the subject indicates that these plans are intended to disperse the functions of the Community Facilities Service: transfer those functions to HHFA which that agency wants, but leave stranded in GSA certain other functions which are equally unrelated to its so-called primary mission.

In the latter classification are certain functions now in GSA which are not transferred by any of the plans now before the Congress and which so far as is known are not to be transferred. These consist of the liquidation of the following programs:

1. Public Works Administration.
2. Works Progress Administration.
3. War Public Works in the District of Columbia.
4. Veterans' education and facilities program.

These are liquidation functions, but so is the disposition of war public works which is transferred to HHFA under plan No. 17.

(c) Transfer of programs of limited duration: As indicated above, the disposition of war public works is in process of liquidation. Likewise, the act (Public Law 352) authorizing advance of Federal funds for public works planning is a temporary measure which expires on October 12, 1951. Some question may arise as to whether it is worthwhile to effect transfers of this sort of temporary program in view of the delay and disorganization that may result from such moves from one agency to another.

(d) Diverse types of projects: The advance planning program is very broad in its scope. Under the statute advances may be made for detailed preparation of plans for public works of all types, exclusive of housing. Over-all community planning is to some extent a function of HHFA, but that agency is primarily concerned with housing, which is specifically excluded from the advance planning program. Hence it may be argued that by reason of its diversity there is no agency to which the advance planning program should go under the "major purpose" concept, and that it should properly remain with the "general service" agency of the Government where it can be administered more impartially as between competing types of projects than in any "functional" agency.

GLENN E. SHRIVER,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

MARCH 24, 1950.

[Staff Memorandum No. 81-3-39]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 18, BUILDING AND SPACE MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this plan is to transfer to the Administrator of General Services the functions now vested in other agencies with respect to leasing and assigning general purpose space in buildings, and the operation, maintenance, and custody of office buildings. This proposal is aimed primarily at centralizing the responsibility for leasing, maintenance, and control of office buildings outside of the District of Columbia.

Functions transferred

(a) Responsibility for leasing (except post offices), and assignment of general purpose space from other agencies to the General Services Administration.

(b) Excess of space not needed by post offices to the General Services Administration.

(c) Operation, maintenance, and custody of leased and Government-owned buildings to the General Services Administration, (excludes post offices predominantly occupied by the postal service).

Special purpose buildings excluded

(a) Military posts, arsenals, navy yards, hospitals, etc., and other special-purpose space, unless authorized by the Secretary of Defense.

(b) Post Office Department's leasing authority.

(c) Buildings located in foreign countries.

(d) Post Office building space used by it or leased for its purpose.

(e) Other Government space which GSA finds is wholly or predominantly used for special purposes, such as housing, manufacturing plants, penal institutions, etc.

(f) Treasury Building, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, buildings occupied by Bureau of Standards, and the Smithsonian Institution.

Priority

(a) The Post Office has priority in assignment of space in its buildings.

BACKGROUND

Under exising law the General Services Administration is largely responsible for leasing and allocating space, custody, maintenance and repair of Government office buildings in the District of Columbia. The responsibility for performing these functions outside of the Washington metropolitan area is now largely vested in other departments and agencies of the Government. The President, in his message accompanying the plan, states that he believes centralizing these functions in a single agency, will improve administration through the elimination of confusion, waste, and inefficiency, and effect considerable savings in space, maintenance, personnel, and funds. The plan classifies the functions outside of the District of Columbia into those that relate to general purpose building space, that is space which is suitable for use by a number of Federal agencies, and special purpose space. Under the special purpose classification is included buildings on military posts, arsenals, navy yards, hospitals, laboratories, factories, and other similar installations.

The assignment of space in Government-owned buildings outside of Washington is divided among many agencies. While the Public Building Service constructs a large part of the Government buildings, it operates and controls the assignment of space in only a small portion of them. The Post Office Department operates and allocates the space in post-office buildings, several hundred of which contain substantial amounts of office space available for other agencies. During and immediately after the war several other Federal agencies acquired office buildings in the field. As their activities diminished, surplus space in many of these structures became available for other use. Since there was no central clearing house available in the field to equitably allocate the space, excessive space was occupied by some agencies or it remained unoccupied, while others were going into the open market to procure high-cost space to meet their requirements.

This plan excluded the leasing functions now vested in the Post Office Department and such space which is used by that Department for postal service. This exclusion is intended to safeguard the interest of the Post Office Department by giving it priority on all space under its jurisdiction, while at the same time make it possible to release such space as is in excess of its needs. In other words, if a postal building is predominantly used by that Department its custody and operation would remain under the Department; but, if only a portion of the building is used for the postal service, the remainder of the building would be allocated to the General Services Administration for assignment, maintenance, and upkeep. Under this arrangement it is anticipated that insofar as the cost of operating the postal system is concerned a reduction will be made because these nonpostal expenses are now charged against postal revenues.

A recent survey conducted by the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration shows that as of September 30, 1949, 11,088,000 square feet of Government-owned office space, outside of the District of Columbia, was under the control of various agencies, representing approximately 58 percent of the total space in field offices. In addition, the Government leased over 11,000,000 square feet of space now under the control of various agencies. This represents over 54 percent of the total space leased by the Government. A tabulation of space in the postal buildings located in major cities throughout the country shows that, of the total space available, from 51 percent to 93 percent is now used for nonpostal purposes. Under this plan, the space which is excess to the needs of the postal service would be assigned to other agencies by the General Services Administration.

SUMMARY

(a) Approval of this plan will make possible better utilization of Government space, reduction in personnel, appropriations, and space requirements.

(b) Centralized control should reduce confusion and facilitate coordination of the Government's space requirements with proper centralized administration responsibility.

(c) The plan is in accord with the spirit and intent of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

This plan is in conformance with the Hoover Commission's recommendation No. 6 on Office of General Services (pp. 10–11, Report No. 3).

ISSUES INVOLVED

The National Association of Post Office Maintenance Employees has issued a "special news letter" urging its members to communicate with Members of Congress urging disapproval of this plan. These employees contend that, if the plan is approved and they are transferred to GSA, a reduction in salary from $20 to $740 per annum, involving reductions in every classification will be effected. At present, maintenance and custodial employees are paid under the rates established by Public Law 134 of the Seventy-ninth Congress (Postal Classification Act of 1945), whereas employees performing comparable work for other governmental departments are paid at lower rates established pursuant to the Classification Act of 1949 (Public Law 429, 81st Cong.). In each classification or pay group postal employees are paid more than their counterpart in other agencies of the Federal Government.

The staff has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that a regulation or administrative order is being issued to protect the pay grades, and to make appropriate adjustments in regard to accumulated annual and sick leave of the postal employees who may be transferred by virtue of the taking effect of this plan.

GLENN E. SHRIVER,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

MARCH 21, 1950.

[Staff Memorandum No. 81-2-37]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 19 OF 1950, EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION FUNCTIONS

PURPOSE

This reorganization plan transfers the Bureau of Employees' Compensation and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor. The plan also transfers from the Federal Security Administrator to the Secretary of Labor functions with respect to employees' compensation, including workmen's compensation, and functions with respect to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board. The distinction here made as between the functions of the agencies and the functions of the heads thereof is necessary because there are involved certain organizational responsibilities peculiar to the position of agency head rather than to the agency itself.

Also transferred from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor, as a necessary adjunct to the transfers enumerated above, are related personnel, property, records, and funds.

CONFORMANCE WITH RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION

As stated by the President in his message of transmittal, this plan is in exact conformity with recommendation No. 2 of Hoover Commission Report No. 13 on the Department of Labor, which is as follows:

"We recommend that the Bureau of Employees' Compensation and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board be transferred to the Department of Labor."

In this relation, however, it may be pertinent to record that, in the Hoover Commission's Report No. 15, Social Security, Education, and Indian Affairs, a minority statement by Vice Chairman Acheson and Commissioners Aiken and Rowe contains a recommendation that the Bureau of Employees' Compensation be retained in a Department of Welfare, which would have been created from the Federal Security Agency. This dissent sets forth the opinion that the compensation functions administered by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation bear no resemblance to any other program of the Department of Labor. On the contrary, the dissent maintains workmen's compensation is a form of social insurance and therefore naturally belongs in the Federal Security Agency.

As also relevant to the foregoing, the staff feels that due note should be made of the fact that the dissent referred to was transmitted to the Congress in report No. 15 on March 18, 1949. On June 20, 1949, the President submitted to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1949 which transferred, among other things, the Bureau of Employment Security, including the function of unemployment compensation, from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor and, although resolutions of disapproval were presented to both Houses of Congress through the appropriate committees, the resolutions were disapproved and the plan became law on August 20, 1949. Thus the statement in the dissent that workmen's compensation functions bear no resemblance to any existing operating program of the Department of Labor cannot be said to be true at the present time.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The functions of the present Bureau of Employees' Compensation and of the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board originally were lodged in the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, an independent organization. Under authority of Public Law 263, Seventy-ninth, the Reorganization Act of 1945, approved December 20, 1945, the President on May 16, 1946, submitted to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946. Section 3 of that plan abolished the United States Employees' Compensation Commission and transferred its functions to the Federal Security Agency to be administered under a single head, as distinguished from its previous administration by a quasi-judicial commission of three. Section 3 of that plan also directed that there be established in the Federal Security Agency a Board of three persons which would discharge the appeals functions formerly discharged by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission. Thus, in lieu of the single agency, the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, there came into existence, as a result of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946, two entities, the Bureau of Employees' Compensation and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board, both located in the Federal Security Agency.

On June 24, 1946, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives reported favorably House Concurrent Resolution 151, disapproving the reorganization plan. In accompanying House Report No. 2327, the committee stated that its recommendation for disapproval of the reorganization plan was based on its belief that the abolition of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission violated section (5) (a) (6) of the Reorganization Act of 1945, which provides, in part, that no reorganization plan thereunder should impose on any quasi-judicial function then possessed by an independent agency any greater limitation upon the exercise of that function than existed prior to the reorganization. The committee stated further its belief that Federal employees who have claims under the United States Employment Compensation Act are entitled to appeal to a bipartisan commission that is not subject to the administrative control of another executive agency or department head.

On July 9, 1946, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary reported unfavorably Senate Concurrent Resolution 65, which would have disapproved Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946. As to section 3 of that plan, the Senate committee stated that the language therein to the effect that the functions of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission should be performed "in such manner" as the Federal Security Administrator "shall prescribe," referred only to the technical performance of functions, that is the matter of forms, procedures, etc. The committee took the position that there was no intent or attempt to place the appeals determinations of the Commission under the jurisdiction of the Federal Security Administrator. Thus, it would appear that the Senate committee found itself completely out of sympathy with the stand of the House committee. In any event, the plan was disapproved in the House, but disapproval failed in the Senate and thus the plan became law, the United States Employees' Compensation Commission was abolished and its functions have since been discharged in the Federal Security Agency by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, under a Director, and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board, consisting of three members, one of whom is Chairman.

LAWS INVOLVED

The several acts of Congress which are administered by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation are as follows:

Act of September 7, 1916, as amended: This is the basic compensation law for Federal employees and provides compensation for civilian employees of the United States who suffer personal injuries while in the performance of duty. The act benefits, in addition to all civil employees of the Federal Government, certain employees of the District of Columbia; members of the Naval Reserve Force, of the Officers' Reserve Corps, and of the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, of the Coast Guard Reserve, and of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, under certain conditions; evacuees in war relocation camps, persons employed on certain Federal relief projects, commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, and certain other groups.

Act of March 4, 1927: This law provides workmen's compensation benefits for employees in private enterprise while engaged in maritime employment on navigable waters of the United States.

Act of May 17, 1928: This law extends the provisions of the act of March 4, 1927 (see preceding paragraph), to private employments in the District of Columbia.

Act of August 16, 1941, as amended by the act of December 2, 1942: These two acts extend the provisions of the act of March 4, 1927 (see identification above), to employees on United States military, air, and naval bases in foreign countries, on certain military and naval installations outside the continental limits of the United States, and on certain other projects of the United States outside the country.

Act of July 3, 1948: This is the War Claims Act of 1948, certain parts of which are involved in this transfer of functions, relating specifically to claims of employees of certain contractors with the United States for wages due on account of detention by the enemy during World War II.

Other legal functions: In addition to the foregoing, there are also involved certain miscellaneous activities involving civilian war benefits and claims of certain American civilians and certain contractors arising from World War II.

CONCLUSION

So far as the staff has been able to determine, there is at present no important objection to this plan.

Attention is directed, however, to the Hoover Commission minority dissent reported above under "Conformance with recommendations of the Hoover Commission." Also in this relation, in a letter of July 14, 1949, addressed to the chairman of this committee, Mr. Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, commented as follows with respect to the Bureau of Employees' Compensation and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board:

"As these two functions relate primarily to compensation for injuries of civilian employees of the Federal Government, I am considering them together. Frankly, I can find no tangible reasons why these functions should be transferred from this agency. I feel strongly that the relation of these functions to other Federal social insurances is of much greater importance, and call your committee's attention to the separate statement of Vice Chairman Acheson and Commissioners Aiken and Rowe, which appears on pages 46, 47."

After quoting from the dissent of Vice Chairman Acheson and Commissioners Aiken and Rowe, Mr. Ewing concluded as follows: "I am opposed to the proposal to transfer these functions."

The staff has again consulted the Federal Security Agency regarding this transfer as contemplated by Reorganization Plan No. 19. We are advised that, although the letter of July 14, 1949, referred to above, expressed the views of the Federal Security Agency at that time, now, in view of the President's announced program, the agency voices no present opposition to the transfer.

THOMAS A. SAPPINGTON,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

MARCH 27, 1950.

[Staff memorandum No. 81-2-42]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 20 OF 1950, TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO THE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

PURPOSE

The purpose of this reorganization plan is to transfer to the Administrator of General Services certain preservation, publication, and certification functions now lodged in the Secretary of State and in the Department of State with respect to acts of Congress, amendments to the Constitution of the United States, certificates of appointment, and votes of electors of the President and Vice President of the United States, and official papers of the Territories from which the States of the United States were formed. The Administrator of General Services would be empowered to delegate this authority within the General Services Administration as he may consider appropriate.

The plan would also abolish certain obsolete functions now required to be performed by the Secretary of State, namely (a) the procuring of copies of all statutes of the States of the United States, which function is now performed by the Library of Congress; and (b) the publishing of Presidential proclamations and treaties in a newspaper of the District of Columbia, now published in the Federal Register. Further, treaties are now made available in slip form.

In conjunction with the functions transferred, there are also proposed to be transferred incidental records, property, personnel, and funds.

COMPLIANCE WITH RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION

There is no specific recommendation of the Hoover Commission relating to the transfer of the functions covered by this reorganization plan. However, the plan is in direct conformance with the position of the Hoover Commission as expressed in Report No. 1, General Management of the Executive Branch, to the effect that improvement of the organization and administration of the Government must include "a more orderly grouping of the functions of Government into major departments and agencies under the President." The Commission further stated in Report No. 1 that by placing related functions together in an agency duplication could be eliminated and coordinated policies could be developed.

A part of the General Services Administration is the National Archives and Records Service, and, as will be seen from the ensuing section of this memorandum, the statutory enactments involved place the functions proposed to be transferred squarely within the operational field of that Service.

LAWS INVOLVED

Enactments of Congress affecting functions proposed to be transferred:

Section 204, as amended, Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 159): This is a requirement of law deriving from an act of September 15, 1789. It requires the Secretary of State to preserve the originals of all acts of the Congress.

Title 1, section 112, United States Code: This provision of law requires that the Secretary of State shall cause the compiling, editing, indexing, and publishing of the United States Statutes at Large, prescribes the contents thereof, establishes the status of the Statutes at Large as to legal evidence, and provides for the timeliness of their publication.

Section 210, as amended, Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 165): This provision of law requires that the Secretary of State shall furnish to the Public Printer a correct copy of every act of Congress and of every treaty and international agreement.

Sections 3805 and 3806, as amended, Revised Statutes (44 U. S. C. 192, 193): These statutes, respectively, relate to correction by the Secretary of State of newly printed acts of Congress and treaties and to printing by the Public Printer of postal conventions, which are considered as international agreements.

Act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 609, 615, as amended; 44 U. S. C. 191, 196): This law, as incorporated into the two sections of the United States Code, provides, in the first instance, for certain mechanics of printing of laws and international agreements, and, in the second instance, constitutes a repetition of the contents of the law referred to above at title 1, section 112, United States Code.

Act of April 12, 1904 (33 Stat. 587; 44 U. S. C. 197): This provision of law relates to certain mechanics in the preparation of the United States Statutes at Large.

Section 205, Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 160): This is a provision of law which requires the Secretary of State to have published, and to certify with respect to, amendments of the Constitution which have been adopted.

Title 3, sections 6, 11-13, United States Code: These sections of the law relate to custody by the Secretary of State of actions by electors of the President and Vice President of the United States.

Act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1104, as amended; 5 U. S. C. 167, 168): This law relates to collection by the Secretary of State of the official papers of the Territory from which each State of the United States was formed, and to publications thereof.

Act of July 31, 1945 (59 Stat. 510; 5 U. S. C. 168d): This provision of law relates to the functions enumerated under the law defined in the paragraph immediately preceding.

Enactments of Congress affecting functions proposed to be abolished:

Section 206, Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 161): This is a provision of law which requires the Secretary of State to maintain a complete collection of the statutes of all of the States of the United States. (Now also performed by the Library of Congress.)

Act of July 31, 1876 (19 Stat. 105, as amended; 44 U. S. C. 321): This is the provision of law which requires publication in a newspaper of the District of Columbia, as designated by the Secretary of State, of Presidential proclamations and treaties. (Now also published in the Federal Register.)

CONCLUSION

In the preceding section of this memorandum, there are defined briefly the various legislative enactments involved under Reorganization Plan No. 20. An important feature of the plan is the reservation of the Secretary of State of all printing and publication functions, including compiling, editing, and indexing, with respect to treaties, other international agreements, Presidential proclamations related thereto, and postal conventions. So far as the staff has been able to determine, there is no important objection to any feature of the plan. Discussions have been had with various representatives of the Department of State and the General Services Administration. It is generally agreed that the plan is thoroughly sound and marks a distinct step forward in the development of better governmental administration. It may be said that the plan places all functions involved, which are of a domestic nature, in the hands of the Administrator of General Services, while retaining those of an international character in the hands of the Secretary of State.

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATION

In the course of its investigation of this plan, the staff disclosed and directed to the attention of both agencies concerned a contingency corollary to this reorganization plan, and which inevitably must ensue almost immediately after the plan becomes effective. The staff wishes to direct this matter to the attention of the committee because in the interest of better administration some action of a legislative nature should be taken. At the present time the United States Statutes at Large are issued as required by law on the basis of a session of the Congress and, through custom, publication is made in two segments, the first containing, generally, public laws and reorganization plans, if any, and the second containing, generally, private laws, treaties, other international agreements and related proclamations. Thus, it is readily apparent that retention by the Secretary of State of his functions with respect to the Statutes at Large as related to treaties and other international agreements and proclamations, creates a difficulty for the reason that the function of incorporating private laws and any other inclusions into the second segment of the Statutes at Large are transferred by this reorganization plan to the Administrator of General Services. Obviously, either an unwieldy working arrangement must be attained between the Department of State and the General Services Administration so as to correlate their respective work as to publication of the second segment of the Statutes at Large, or, as an alternative, the Statutes at Large must henceforth be published somewhat differently, as to segments, so as to permit the Department of State to perform its functions regarding treaties and other international agreements and proclamations independently of the General Services Administration.

This latter alternative is exactly what the Department of State and the General Services Administration feel should be done. Further, both agencies agree that, as there is no particular relationship between a session of the Congress and the publication of treaties and other international agreements and proclamations, it should be permissible to have the publication thereof done on the basis of a calendar year. The reasons for this change are very persuasive and the staff is wholly in sympathy therewith.

It should be reported further that, by identical letters of June 10, 1949, to the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Secretary of State submitted for consideration of the Congress a proposed draft of legislation which would amend applicable law to permit removal of treaties, related proclamations, and other international agreements from the Statutes at Large and authorize their publication in a separate volume on the basis of a calendar year. This draft bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, where, after some preliminary investigation, it has remained dormant. The matter has been discussed at length with representatives of the Department of State and the effect sought to be attained by the legislation is still desired by the Department. Of course, the draft bill should be thoroughly revised so as to reflect developments proposed to be brought about by Reorganization Plan No. 20.

The staff recommends in this relation that, immediately upon Reorganization Plan No. 20 becoming effective, an appropriately revised bill be drafted and submitted to the appropriate committee for consideration. The benefits from such legislation can reasonably be expected to be manifold, including better administration with respect to publication of the international documents and a very probable considerable monetary saving arising from elimination of the so-called Malloy volumes in which, from time to time, such international papers have been printed as Senate documents.

THOMAS A. SAPPINGTON,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

[Staff Memorandum No. 81-2-44]

MARCH 28, 1950.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 21: TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

PURPOSE

This reorganization plan provides for the establishment of a Federal Maritime Board and a Maritime Administration in the Department of Commerce to which would be transferred all the functions of the United States Maritime Commission, in the following manner:

To Federal Maritime Board:

(a) To the Chairman: Executive and administrative functions of present chairman (including functions transferred by Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1949).

(b) To the Board: Regulatory functions over rates, services, practices, tariff rules, etc.

(c) Subsidy awards, hearings, sales, assignment or transfer of subsidies.

To Maritime Administration:

(a) The administration of subsidy agreements made by the Board.

(b) Administration of the operating programs, such as ship construction, charter, operation, and sale.

The functions transferred to the Maritime Administration would be vested in the Secretary of Commerce with authority to redelegate such responsibility to the new Administrator or any other subordinate. The Maritime Commission would be abolished.

BACKGROUND

Within the past 3 years three different groups have studied the administration of the Maritime Commission. All have concurred that the operating deficiencies of the agency arise from inadequate, inappropriate, and unsound organization, and that a fundamental reorganization is essential. The first study was made in 1947 by the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine. This committee stated:

"It appears to the committee that the organization structure of the Maritime Commission as set up in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is wholly inadequate for the efficient conduct of the multitude of diverse activities for which the Maritime Commission is now responsible. The deficiencies of the statutory organization for action are regarded by the committee to be the most serious obstacle standing in the way of the development of the merchant marine of this country."

In 1948, the staff of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments made a management survey of the Maritime Commission and reported on December 31, 1948, in part, as follows:

"The Maritime Commission is generally considered to be an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government, but its position is anomalous. It is almost wholly independent of the President and he has virtually no power to require that it conform with the general policies of the Government. The Commissioners who direct the agency are appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the Chairman of the Commission is named by the President. However, after they have been appointed, confirmed, and installed, they can act independently without fear of removal from office, except for neglect of duty or malfeasance, until the expiration of their 6-year terms.

"Although matters over which the Maritime Commission has control affect many other departments and agencies in the executive branch, it is possible for the Maritime Commission to be operated without regard to national policy. In times of emergency, this lack of correlation with other components of the Government could have serious results.

"It might be said that the Maritime Commission is responsible only to the Congress. However, this responsibility is nebulous and is only effective through the control of the purse strings and through specific substantive legislation.

"In the discharge of certain of its duties, its independence is an asset. In performing its quasi-judicial, quasi-legislative, and regulatory duties there is an advantage of shielding it from political influence and reprisals. However, as a promotional agency, as an operating arm of the Government, and as a potential military auxiliary, it should be controlled, directly or indirectly, by the President and be operated in conformance with current national policy" (p. 3).

The report then concluded:

"The fundamental weakness of the Maritime Commission as it is now constituted lies in its prescribed organization."

The Hoover Commission in its report on the Department of Commerce, in discussing the Maritime Commission, stated:

"The United States Maritime Commission, made up of full-time members, has a dual function. It exercises regulatory functions affecting the whole merchant marine and at the same time buys, sells, and subsidizes shipping and makes loans on ships on a huge scale.

"It is an anomaly that a regulatory commission should also conduct the executive function of managing a huge business; that executive functions should be carried on by an agency that is not subject to Presidential direction; that executive functions should be carried on by a full-time board of which all members have equal responsibility and authority, instead of by a single administrator" (p. 17).

Basically the administrative difficulties of the Maritime Commission as it is now constituted arise from the fact that the agency is responsible for administering two types of programs which are incompatible and diametrically opposed to each other. These programs are (a) regulatory and (b) operating and promotional. Management consultants and organization specialists who have participated in the surveys discussed above agree that the regulatory functions of the Maritime Commission should be performed by a separate organizational component from that which is responsible for the operating and promotional activities.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Reorganization Plan No. 21 provides for the establishment of a Federal Maritime Board to be composed of three members who would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

The Board members would be appointed for terms of 4 years and the President would designate the Chairman who would be ex officio administrator of Maritime Administration. Not more than two members of the Board would be of the same political party.

The Board would be an agency within the Department of Commerce, but independent in carrying out its responsibility in respect to holding hearings, recruiting and supervision of its personnel, issuing rules and regulations, establishing rates, tariffs, subsidies, and related functions, but coordinated with the general policies of the Secretary of Commerce.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

As indicated above, the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board would be ex officio Administrator of the Maritime Administration. The plan also provides for a Deputy Maritime Administrator to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, after consultation with the Administrator. The Deputy Administrator would be under the classified civil service and perform such duties as prescribed by the Administrator, but would not sit as a member or acting member of the Federal Maritime Board.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Under Secretary of Commerce: The plan provides for the establishment of an office of "Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation."

Joint utilization of personnel: The Chairman and Administrator may make joint use of the employees under their control.

Conflict of interest: The provision contained in section 201(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which prohibits any commissioner, officer, or employee of the Maritime Commission who has a pecuniary interest in water carriers, contractors, shipbuilders, and so forth, from employment by the Commission, is extended by this plan to all officers and employees of both the Board and the Maritime Administration.

Interim appointment: Until other commissioners, officers, or employees are appointed, the present personnel shall continue in office until new appointments are made, but such personnel shall not continue in office in excess of 90 days unless reappointed.

Transfer of records, property, and funds: The records, property, personnel, and funds of the Maritime Commission will be transferred to the Department of Commerce to be used and expended in connection with the purpose of this transfer; however, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is authorized to make such determinations or dispositions as he feels consonant with the plan.

Abolition of Maritime Commission: The United State Maritime Commission would be abolished, and the Secretary of Commerce would terminate any outstanding affairs not otherwise provided under this plan.

The functions transferred under this plan are not subject to the provisions of plan No. 5 of 1950 (which transferred to the Secretary of Commerce all of the functions heretofore vested in subordinates of that Department).

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Hoover Commission recommended (No. 2 in its report on Department of Commerce and No. 9 on Regulatory Commissions) that the functions of ship construction and the operation, charter, and sale of ships be transferred from the Maritime Commission to the Department of Commerce, and that the functions relating to rates, conditions of service, and the granting of subsidies remain with the Commission.

The above recommendations were based upon the conclusion of the Hoover Commission's task-force report on independent regulatory commissions (staff rept. on U. S. Maritime Commission, pt. 4, p. 32), which are summarized as follows:

"1. Creation of Maritime Administration:

"A. A Maritime Administration, headed by an Administrator should be established in the executive branch.

"B. The Administrator should take over from the Maritime Commission all its operating, administrative, promotional, and other functions except as stated in 2 below.

"C. The Administration should be part of an appropriate department; in peacetime, the Department of Transportation, if one is established or if not, the Department of Commerce; * * * and in time of war, the Department of Defense.

"2. Changes in Maritime Commission:

"A. If recommendation 1 is adopted, the Maritime Commission should continue as a five-man independent agency—

"(1) It should exercise regulatory control over rates, fares, charges, agreements, and practices in the maritime industry, upon complaint by the Administrator.

"(2) The Commission should also have authority, upon the petition of carriers, to investigate the administration of the subsidy program by the Administrator and to report publicly its conclusions.

"B. If the Maritime Administration is not established (as recommended in 1 above),

the Chairman of the Maritime Commission should be made responsible to the President for the administration of the agency and for policy making as to its operating functions."

Other general observations of the Hoover Commission relating to reorganization of the Maritime Commission follow:

(a) Appointment of Commissioners is frequently below standard because of inadequate salaries or appreciation of the importance of the position.

(b) Purely executive duties have been imposed on the Commissioners with no one really vested with over-all authority.

(c) The amount of work in the regulatory field has been so heavy that promotional functions have been neglected.

(d) Delegation of authority to the staff is practically nonexistent.

(e) The Chairman is too frequently the presiding officer with no over-all planning responsibility.

(f) Lack of coordination between the Commission and executive departments (pp. 3 and 4 of Report No. 12 on regulatory commissions).

MINORITY VIEW OF THE COMMISSION

Commissioners Brown and Pollock dissented from the majority, in that they believed that all of the regulatory functions in the transportation field should be consolidated in a single transportation regulatory commission, and that the Maritime Commission should be abolished in favor of a new agency created to take over its regulatory functions.

SHIPS

It is possible that the shipping interests may oppose this plan, but there are indications that the industry is apprehensive lest the whole question of subsidies be brought into the debate if they appear before the committee in opposition to the plan. Large shipping interests may ask to appear against the plan, but in that event the small shipping lines may ask to testify in favor of the plan (in order that their interests may be more sympathetically considered by the Federal Government).

One specific question has arisen as to the application of that part of section 106 (page 3) providing for the administration of functions, under which the chairman "shall be guided by the general policies of the Secretary of Commerce with respect to such functions." It is contended that this provision is in conflict with the language of the same section, which states that the chairman "shall be independent of the Secretary of Commerce," and that "general policies" might encroach on the functions of the chairman.

COMMENTS BY THE CHAIRMAN AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE MARITIME COMMISSION

In 1949 when the Hoover Commission report was received by Congress, the Maritime Commission was requested by the chairman of this committee to comment on the recommendations contained therein. The chairman of the Commission opposed the recommendations affecting it (pp. 261-263, S. Rept. No. 1156) concluding that:

"The so-called business or executive operations of the Commission are in fact so closely interwoven with the regulatory and subsidy activities of the Commission that to separate them would only compound the alleged difficulties in the present administration of the law. * * *

"The Commission is convinced that the belief (which is hardly more than a hope) that the administration of non-regulatory, or executive, or business operations of the Commission can be separated from the regulatory and subsidy functions without serious complications is without foundation. * * * The Commission cannot emphasize too strongly the undesirability and danger of attempting to establish separate administrative agencies for governmental activities in respect to the oceangoing merchant marine. Historically and basically the continuance of promotional or operational or business functions concerned with the merchant marine in the same agency charged with the regulatory activities is a fundamental necessity for the successful administration of the merchant marine policy for the United States. Any other method would simply be a case of letting one hand function without the required amount of coordination with the other hand. * * *

"The Commission is unanimously and vigorously opposed to any proposed splitting of the functions now vested in the Maritime Commission with respect to the merchant marine."

Recently the chairman and two members of the Commission stated to the press that they would support the President in his efforts to improve the merchant fleet and promote efficiency in the administration of maritime affairs, and that they would not oppose the plan. The fourth Commissioner (Mr. Mellen) stated that "he was highly in favor of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 21."

GLENN K. SHRIVER,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

FBI National Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the program in connection with the graduation exercises of the members of the forty-third session of the FBI National Academy, and a very able and constructive address delivered by our colleague, the Honorable JOHN J. ROONEY, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary:

PROGRAM

Call to order.....Mr. Hugh H. Clegg, Assistant Director, FBI
Invocation.....Rev. Robert S. Lloyd, S. J., Manresa-on-Severn, Annapolis, Md.
Address.....Mr. Lester H. Eisenhut, Fort Wayne, Ind., president of the graduating class
Address.....Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, Representative from New York
Address.....Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, Marble Collegiate Church, New York City
Presentation of the guests of honor.....Director John Edgar Hoover, Federal Bureau of Investigation
Recommendation for the awarding of the diplomas.....Mr. Clegg
The awarding of the diplomas.....Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman and the Director
Benediction.....Rev. Robert S. Lloyd, S. J.
Musical program.....The United States Marine Band and Orchestra

The inspiring address of Congressman ROONEY is as follows:

I am indeed honored and very happy to have the privilege of being here with you this morning. The FBI National Academy, since its founding in 1935 under the guidance of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, has symbolized law enforcement at its best—aggressive, alert, and loyal to the democratic tradition of America. The peace officer, in the truest sense of the word, has become the guardian of the rights, lives, and property of the citizenry of our Nation.

The National Academy, to my mind, symbolizes a fundamental principle—the voluntary cooperation of law enforcement, local, State, and National, through democratic methods to achieve a common aim. This principle could be applied, I think, with great benefit to many other phases of our national, yes, even our international, life. This idea of which you, as the forty-third graduating class are a part, presents a solution, at least to some extent, to many of the evils of our time.

As chairman of the House subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, I have closely followed the work of the FBI. Just a short while ago Mr. Hoover appeared before our committee and gave his usual frank, extremely lucid, and interesting analysis of the many phases of the FBI's activities. I was greatly impressed by the FBI's deep interest, and the amount of time and energy expended in strengthening local law enforcement. The Identification Division, the FBI laboratory, the uniform crime reporting program, the FBI National Academy—all of these FBI facilities are available, free of charge, to local police departments, sheriffs' offices, State police organizations. My own State, New York, for example, has 115 graduates from the National Academy. And I am proud to say that the graduating class today contains two more men from the great Empire State of New York.

Almost 15 years have passed since the establishment of the National Academy. At that time we had divided allegiance in law enforcement. Many law-enforcement officers were intensely jealous of their own prerogatives and privileges. They were reluctant to cooperate, not only with other law-enforcement agencies, but even with brother officers. If they possessed an informant, a special investigative technique—well, that was their property, and no persuasion or threat could prevail upon them to share it. These men were "self-contained men"—at least they liked to think of themselves as self-contained. They thought, through their own abilities and talents, they could handle the problems of law enforcement on their beat, in their city or county. Not only were they unwilling to share, but they were unwilling to learn. When law enforcement was dominated by men—and departments—possessing this mentality, it became a merry-go-round, going round and round in the same groove, while the criminals robbed, murdered, and raped to their heart's content.

I need not recall to you the conditions of crime and law enforcement in 1935. Vicious gangs were roaming large areas of our Nation: kidnaping, bank robbery, and murder were common occurrences. Criminals were sneering at law enforcement, almost daring officers of the law to come after them. For example, Alvin Karpis, one of America's most notorious criminals, was still at large. In November 1935, Karpis and four associates, armed with machine guns, shotguns, and automatic pistols held up an Erie Railroad train at Garrettsville, Ohio. They made a score of $34,000 in currency and several thousand dollars in securities. Imagine the audacity of hardened criminals like Karpis and Harry Campbell holding up an American railroad train in broad daylight—amid the circus effects of a wild-west show. Certainly, something had to be done—criminals like Karpis, Campbell, and their ilk, had to be swept from the American scene. The challenge was there—open for all to see. The criminals were utilizing the latest scientific techniques—the automobile, the radio, the airplane. They crossed State lines with virtual impunity, and learned to cooperate with fellow hoodlums—all for the purpose of preying upon the law-abiding citizens of the Nation.

Americans everywhere, I think, are today proud of the record achieved by law enforcement, by you men and your brother officers at home, in counteracting the criminal challenge. Law enforcement, working harmoniously together, blunted the criminal attack. The criminal gangs were broken up, some members were killed while resisting arrest, others brought before the bar of justice. Not that crime was extinguished. Not at all. Unfortunately today, after a terrible war, crimes rates are high, much too high. But the spirit of cooperation, of a united law enforcement, local, State, and National, linked together, in voluntary and fraternal association, is the thrilling point. Better training, more modern equipment, higher professional status—these are the components of good law enforcement. But good as these are, or may be in the future, the key point is the spirit of the men themselves. Unless the will to succeed, the urge to conquer the evildoer, is present, the very best in training and equipment fails to the ground—mere dead letters.

The impetus of the National Academy, which, for 15 long years kept sending out graduates, men like you, helped turn the tide. Mr. Hoover, in founding the Academy, realized the weaknesses of law enforcement, and set about doing what he and the FBI could to remedy them. He knew that local officers, wherever they may be, must possess the latest equipment, be well-trained, and, above all, be animated by the spirit of moral integrity and a devotion to duty. I can testify, as a former prosecuting attorney [in Brooklyn] to the good work which well-trained, fully equipped law enforcement can accomplish. The law-enforcement officer is a man of many skills, each skill dedicated to the service of his fellow man. He must be ready, day and night, in season and out of season, to render the maximum protection to his community. To do anything else would mean betraying the past and forfeiting the future.

Most important, however, in recalling the history of law enforcement during the past 15 years, is this fact: American law enforcement, unlike in so many other Nations of the world, developed in the democratic tradition.

Our law-enforcement agencies are not secret police. They are not sending men and women to concentration camps, to die in a dungeon or on a bleak, snowy hillside. No, indeed not. American law enforcement is the servant of the citizenry, controlled, directly or indirectly, by the elected representatives of the people. It is dedicated to preserving, not assassinating, the liberties of the individual.

The National Academy, by training selected police officers from throughout the Nation, is strengthening the democratic tradition. Some people have the effrontery to say the FBI is a Gestapo. This is pure nonsense and hokum. If these critics were here today they could see, with their very eyes, the stupidity of their charges. The National Academy itself is a bulwark against a police state, a fascinating and effective instrument to improve and to strengthen local law enforcement. Mr. Hoover time after time has reiterated that America has no need for a national police state. He has just hung up a record of 26 years of service during which time he has gained a shining place in public esteem for the FBI.

The system of voluntary law enforcement, local, State, and National, has in the past and will continue in the future to handle the problems of the day. The inadequacies in law enforcement—and there are many—are due, not to the system itself, but the way it operates. And that is what the National Academy—with your help as honored graduates—desires to do; to improve, in a voluntary and democratic manner, the American system of law enforcement.

As a Member of Congress, I am intimately familiar with the principle of the separation of powers, between the executive, the legislative, and judicial branches of our Government and the vital need, in order to advance the best interests of our Nation, for sincere and wholehearted cooperation. This does not mean the stifling of discussion, the predominance of one unit over another, or the adoption of a single way of doing things. Absolutely not. Sincere cooperation encourages free discussion, the free interplay of ideas, the expression of dissent. All sides of the question—and many issues have more than two sides—are discussed, analyzed, weighed. Each person has his share to contribute and to learn. That is the way progress is achieved in a democracy.

America today, perhaps more than in any previous period in its history, needs the cooperation of its citizens to work toward a common, mutually beneficial goal—the fundamental principle symbolized in law enforcement by the National Academy. Sinister forces, the demons of communism, are abroad in the world today. They have conquered large areas and are attempting, with ruthless determination, to subject the free world. Who is not with them, they reason, is against them. Democracy, the way of life which has nurtured the magnificent blessings of freedom and liberty in this Nation, must be destroyed. Every speck of free thought must be identified, tracked down, and exterminated. The dunce cap of intellectual sterility and moral perversion, the essential elements of Communist philosophy, must be slipped over the head of the world. Then, and only then—when the entire world has been conquered—will clear vision, straight thinking, and individual judgment be liquidated. And, then, the age of darkness will have descended—and the age of communism begun.

We Americans must work together to conquer this menace. There will be voices of doom, wailing that America must compromise, must give way, at least partially, to the Communist ideology. I defy this point of view—America can, and must, defeat the totalitarian threat. To compromise, in the least iota, is to undermine the very foundations of democratic society. The principles of free government are sacred and inviolate. If this Nation is to remain free, and to serve as a symbol of justice and right for the peoples of the world, we must work unceasingly to unmask the Communist and to expose, for all to see, his true wares: hate, hypocrisy, sham, and intolerance.

The task will be long and hard—make no mistake about it. The best energies and talents of each individual citizen will be required. Communism must be fought, straight from the shoulder, with truth, knowledge, and the unimpeachable facts.

The entire Nation—and world—could benefit from the principle epitomized by the National Academy—the voluntary cooperation through democratic methods to achieve a common aim. This principle is wider than law enforcement—it encompasses the entire range of human life. If this philosophy could be applied honestly and sincerely today, many of our troubles would disappear. As you return to your various communities this afternoon, you gentlemen can well feel proud of being a part of this great endeavor to make law enforcement ever more effective. By doing your part, wherever you may go, you are doing a share for your Nation.

Letter of Students of Cleburne (Kans.) Rural High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD a splendid letter written by the high-school students of the Cleburne (Kans.) Rural High School.

This display of intelligent and vigorous citizenship is to be commended. I hope my colleagues will read the letter with care.

The letter follows:

CLEBURNE RURAL HIGH SCHOOL,
Cleburne, Kans., March 28, 1950.

Hon. ALBERT M. COLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Believing that, in ourselves our future lies, and that the present is yours, the future ours, we, the undersigned students of the Cleburne Rural High School, feel impelled to raise a red flag warning you of some dangers ahead.

Among other things, we study history, citizenship, and current events. We have decided to pool a few of our ideas and send signed copies to our United States President, Vice President, Congressmen, and some committee members. If we are concerned enough about the future of our country to spend 3 weeks formulating this letter, you should give 15 minutes of your time to read it personally. Some of us are Democrats and some Republicans, but we believe parties are only means to an end, namely, the welfare of the people.

First. We are unable to understand how so frequent big strikes function to promote social unity and economic stability in a healthy democracy. When labor is allowed to dictate to a property owner, and by clubs and guns, tell him how to run his business, our laws are weak somewhere. We are taught that America stands for a free-enterprise system. Any laborer should have a right to take a job as it is or leave it alone, but he has no right to shoot another man who is willing to work under the employers' terms.

We believe John L. Lewis is a dictator, working for the interests of communism, and is apparently powerful enough to bluff Congress and the President of our United States.

If a hungry man steals a loaf of bread he is fined; if I overspeed my car I am judged a menace to society and fined. Lewis can shake the economic and social foundations of our country and keep his freedom, and gets every demand he asks for. When the sum of the parts get to be greater than the whole, then both geometry and democracy are only fairy tales.

Secondly. We are much alarmed over the economic stability of our country. We are taught thrift, economy, saving for emergency, and the dangers of spending beyond our income. It is a pretty weak admonition for a parent who steals, to try to teach his children honesty. Likewise, we look to our Government which is supposed to have the best experts in economic training, as our best and most authoritative teacher. If you Government experts (?) think you can spend the country out of debt or save an economic crash by piling up debts, we cannot go along with you. One may keep climbing a ladder,

[illegible] and extremes and climb higher, but finally it will get top heavy and fall with a crash. Are economic laws any less inevitable than physical laws? Just how long do you figure you can spend $5,000,000,000 to $7,000,000,000 a year more than your income, and still avoid a crash? If you can't make ends meet in prosperous times when wages jump up every time John L. Lewis says "frog," and production is high, how will you pay your debt when hard times come, as they surely will?

This joy ride we are taking on the road to prosperity with borrowed money is a delusion. It cannot work. Let's think of the long walk back home, and stop this runaway vehicle before we wreck the machine. Red-ink financing and increasing of taxes will rob us of everything we have including our personal freedoms. History and logic both prove that statement.

Suppose we merely balance the budget (which we are not doing) we still could never get out of debt. Suppose we pare down present unnecessary and extravagant Government expenditures $15,000,000,000 a year. We could easily do this and still not weaken our economic or social structure in the least, nor would it lower our standard of living. Five billion dollars paid annually on our debt, plus $5,000,000,000 a year interest, would take us 55 years to square up. That is a long time but it won't get any less by adding $5,000,000,000 debt to it every year. Furthermore, a depression could strike in the meantime, and as our parents know, then even interest alone is hard to raise under such circumstances.

We say it is an alarming situation and high time to decide whether we are willing to sacrifice our freedoms for the nostrums panaceas of planned economy which have ruined other nations, or take the simple lesson seventh-grade arithmetic teaches.

You can lay politics aside, use some common sense, and cut out thousands of your unessential employees, merge departments, stop overlapping similar activities, and quit paying money to man one group to a certain thing (example, reclaim waste land to produce more food), and another group to do the opposite (take care of surplus and curtail production).

We believe that there are too many subsidies and too much price support, and wages are going too high. It's like the hitchhiker, the more free rides he gets the more dependent he becomes on free rides. He finally forgets how to run his own vehicle. Too many people are thinking of security instead of opportunity. We feel that there is too much centralized power and that all this bureaucratic concentration of power adds up to socialism. We don't want that. It is only one step from socialism to communism. Let he who craves socialism move to England, and if he craves still more centralized power let him take the first boat to Russia. We want democracy in Washington.

We know the gigantic public debt must be paid or we perish. Why must you hand down to innocent generations the burden of your folly? You are selling our birthright for a mess of pottage.

Third. We believe Congress should submit to the States an amendment to the Constitution providing for a maximum of two terms for any one person to act in the capacity as President of the United States. A longer term provides too great temptation to accumulate power. After three or four terms in office a political machine can be built up with a wall impervious to the will of the voters. It is too much "you vote for me or else." That smacks of totalitarian tactics. Furthermore, 8 years of the physical and mental strain entailed in the great responsibility as President of the United States is enough for any one man.

Fourth. We are giving too much aid to foreign countries. When we give too much of our own blood, who will furnish a transfusion for us? More wisdom, less waste, and less politics, will accomplish greater good at less expense.

Fifth. We do not believe in the present draft system. It is undemocratic. In peace or war you should adjust salaries and other conditions, making them so attractive that enough volunteers will always meet our needs. That is fair to all, and no one could have any logical objection.

Sixth. We do not favor the building of the Tuttle Creek Dam project, suggested by the Army engineers, across the Big Blue Valley. This is proposed under the guise of flood control. People do not treat a thorn in the flesh by putting on salve and wrapping the wound. The wise method of treatment is to pull the thorn out, and it will heal itself. So, why not control floods at the source? This dam calls for $80,000,000. One-half of that amount spent on resodding hillsides, planting forest trees and shrubs, together with a few small dams properly placed in the upper tributaries of the Big Blue Valley will accomplish in a much more sensible way the control of floods. Slow run-off is the answer.

Seventh. We stand for the equal and civil rights of all men regardless of religion, race, or color. Give every man the same rights under similar circumstances.

Eighth. We present these seven outstanding points as constructive criticism. In a democracy the Government promotes the welfare of all the people. There is a cooperative spirit and sense of joint ownership. We are taught that the qualities of each official has much to do with the success of our democracy.

We are soon to assume the responsibilities you now have. We do not want to inherit a public debt beyond our ability to pay, nor a "yes-yes" government controlled by lobbyists, strike leaders, and antidemocratic politicians.

We are emotionally conscious of the tenacious struggle and sacrifices of our forefathers against famine, flood, disease, and tyranny. Overcoming obstacles is the only road to success. The all but overwhelming struggles of the past have given birth to our heritage, the democratic freedoms. So well does it meet the needs and demands of a progressive people that it has stood the ravages of many isms both from within and without.

We believe a properly guided democracy will live forever, just as we believe that all truth, good, and beauty will ultimately triumph over evil. The Almighty will not fail in His purpose. But His creation is not finished. We have very fundamental responsibilities in helping Him finish the task. Just as He has furnished the raw materials and man refines and molds them into finished fountain pens, watches, and radios, so He has given us a mind capable of reason, and certain talents and responsibilities. We must take these and refine and mold them into a great democracy built of happy homes, useful schools, and influential churches, the fundamental foundation stones of a democracy.

If you do not hand down to us a more stable democracy than you took over, then you have failed in your trust. We expect you to put the highest good of the people above all else. We cannot afford to be bribed by the false concept that we can get something for nothing. To lose our freedom is to lose our individuality, our most valuable of all possessions. It is too this end we are preparing to take over. We have faith in America.

We ask you today to underwrite our faith by sacrificing your personal ambitions and proving that the public good is your supreme purpose.

Kent Leavitt, Every American Is Indebted to You for a Job Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a great deal in recent weeks about some of the problems of agriculture. We have tried to deal with troublesome situations in the production of potatoes, cotton, peanuts, and so forth. It was not long ago that some of us were concerned with another outbreak of destructive floodwaters in the Middle West. In New York City and other parts of the country, problems of water supply are becoming more and more acute.

It is probably natural that we spend more time on the problems of agriculture and natural resources than we do on the successes. Apparently, some of the troubles now besetting us can be solved only by action of Congress. Even so, I think it is a hopeful sign, and a heartening one, when people of the country join forces to get an important job done without relying 100 percent on the Government. I think we ought to take notice of such things and encourage them. I think the leaders of such movements should be praised and encouraged.

The National Association of Soil Conservation Districts is dedicated to the development of individual initiative, the exercise of local responsibility, and the accomplishment of constructive work in the conservation of soil and water resources. Its record of achievement has been almost phenomenal. Within a few years, this association has banded together the leaders of soil-conservation districts in all parts of the country to put strength, unity, and a voice of influence behind its principles and goals. This is not a Government organization, nor is it subsidized by the Government. It is made up almost entirely of plain dirt farmers and ranchers. They have joined together because they have a common interest—the conservation of soil and water through cooperative action under local control.

Their purpose, I take it, is shared by all of us. A large number of my distinguished colleagues here in the House have helped, I am happy to say, in the formation and strengthening of this organization. I know, too, that the interest in soil-conservation districts is growing steadily on all sides. Each year the accomplishments of these districts, in terms of land and water actually conserved, and in terms of improved understanding on the part of the people, has been increasing.

These things do not happen without reason. From the beginning, the districts have had the assistance of experienced technicians from the Soil Conservation Service. They have also had help in some places from the Bureau of

Reclamation, the Forest Service, and the State extension services. A great many local organizations have helped, too, including farm-equipment dealers, newspapers and radio stations, magazines, banks, chambers of commerce, and boards of trade.

In addition, soil-conservation districts have been blessed with vigorous, public-spirited leaders, recruited from within their own ranks. One of these men, an outstanding leader and champion of conservation, retired last month as president of the national association after more than 2 years of service, without pay in the public interest. His name, as many of you know, is Kent Leavitt. He is a dairy farmer living near Millbrook, N. Y. For his untiring efforts to build soil-conservation districts, I believe the Nation owes him a debt of real gratitude. He has helped, in his own way, to build a stronger America—one that is stronger by virtue of more protection for natural resources, and stronger also by virtue of greater numbers of Americans taking an active, responsible part in their own community affairs.

For the past several years I have followed the progress of soil-conservation work with a keen interest. I watched the work of Mr. Leavitt with admiration, and sometimes amazement. For weeks on end he traveled from one end of the country to the other, working with State associations of soil-conservation districts and with individual districts. On some occasions he was away from home for as much as 6 weeks at a time attending first hand to district business.

As far as I have been able to find out, Mr. Leavitt has traveled to every State in the country, and to some States many times, in the interest of building stronger and better districts, and in the process he has helped and encouraged other men—other farmers and ranchers—to take a larger part in conservation and district affairs. Probably more than any other one man, he is responsible for the rapid growth and wedding together of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts. When he took over the post of president in September 1947, the association was a new and loosely constructed organization, still searching for the ways and means to make itself most useful. Today it is certainly a growing force in American agriculture and one to be reckoned with.

In his final letter to district supervisors, Mr. Leavitt summarized well.

Together, in these years—

He wrote—

we have built an association of landowners and operators covering the bulk of our agricultural land. We have built it as carefully as possible, under the circumstances, in the image of democracy. Although it has its faults and weaknesses, none of them is of such nature but that it can be corrected by a little hard work and sound thinking. In building our association, we have kept it free of partisan politics. We have made it independent of any one agency—public or private—although we have never refused any assistance which any cared to proffer. We have dedicated our efforts to the development and protection of independent soil-conservation districts and we have proven our ability and shown our willingness to fight for these objectives whenever necessary.

For his efforts of the past 2½ years, Mr. Leavitt can count among his rewards a wide personal friendship with thousands of farm and conservation leaders in every State and in Washington. He can take justifiable pride in the solid growth of the association, and he has had a unique opportunity to study and gain first-hand understanding of the Nation's conservation problems.

One can only hope that in relinquishing the presidency of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Kent Leavitt will not retire completely from public service.

Every American is indebted to Kent Leavitt for a job well done.

Employees in Internal Revenue Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following list of the number of employees in the Internal Revenue Bureau from 1940 through 1951:

Treasury Department, Bureau of Internal Revenue

	Number of employees on rolls [1]	Budget estimate	Amount appropriated
Fiscal year 1940:			
Dec. 31, 1939	22,462	$60,700,000	$59,877,200
June 30, 1940	23,083		
Fiscal year 1941:			
Dec. 31, 1940	25,107	66,667,760	66,006,[illegible]
June 30, 1941	28,061		
Fiscal year 1942:			
Dec. 31, 1941	27,771	80,527,975	77,725,421
June 30, 1942	30,927		
Fiscal year 1943:			
Dec. 31, 1942	30,[illegible]	103,309,400	102,109,680
June 30, 1943	40,345		
Fiscal year 1944:			
Dec. 31, 1943	41,713	135,094,065	133,821,735
June 30, 1944	47,843		
Fiscal year 1945:			
Dec. 31, 1944	48,200	1[illegible],210,000	146,900,000
June 30, 1945	49,814		
Fiscal year 1946:			
Dec. 31, 1945	52,623	179,740,000	176,[illegible],000
June 30, 1946	50,[illegible]		
Fiscal year 1947:			
Dec. 31, 1946	57,731	208,417,400	204,417,400
June 30, 1947	52,[illegible]		
Fiscal year 1948:			
Dec. 31, 1947	49,119	208,000,000	188,000,000
June 30, 1948	52,143		
Fiscal year 1949:			
Dec. 31, 1948	51,301	2[illegible],125,000	210,500,000
June 30, 1949	52,356		
Fiscal year 1950:			
Dec. 31, 1949	54,229	[2]237,708,000	236,[illegible],000
June 30, 1950	[3] 56,495		
Fiscal year 1951:			
Dec. 31, 1950	[3] 59,358	253,000,000	
June 30, 1951	[3] 59,283		

[1] Includes temporary employees.

[2] Includes $5,000,000 estimated cost of authorized pay increases.

[3] Estimated.

America's Responsibility of Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] before the Veterans of Foreign Wars at Easton, Pa., on March 31, 1950:

Like so many other words which can be used to convey different meanings to different people, the term democracy—and I mean with a small "d"—is frequently abused.

Personally, I prefer to use the word democracy as describing the principle and the process by which the people of this Nation govern their affairs.

That process, or method, is to arrive at our decisions by free discussion and majority consent. In all of my years in Congress from the black days of depression and bank closing, through the period of recovery and reform, the era of World War II and now the postwar chapter with its threat of a new war, I know of no decision on national policy which has been reached in any other manner.

Today we are in the midst of another great public discussion on grave issues confronting the United States, not only internally but affecting our relations with the rest of the world.

The situation today is without precedent. After the first World War we blithely resumed our peacetime preoccupations, rejected the League of Nations, and let the rest of the world go by. With the result that we had to fight another world war.

But this time we find no relaxation from the physical and emotional trials of the war years. The relief and the let-down all of us hoped for and expected cannot be ours. Instead, the strain and tension has continued.

We are just beginning to realize that it may continue for some years, and that we will have to learn to live with it. Because, the postwar period has brought us not peace, but uncertainty. Scarcely had we beaten down one threat to the security and stability of the world than we are faced with the threat of new aggression by a ruthless totalitarian force.

By the pressure of armies of occupation, by subversion and propaganda to create internal disunion, communism spread its police-state power across the face of Europe. One after another, small countries fell prey to subjugation.

The war-weakened nations of western Europe, just taking the first halting steps toward economic recovery under the Marshall plan, were hesitant and fearful to oppose the juggernaut. Not only was our peace endangered; not only was our own security threatened, but the future of all western civilization hung in the balance.

Could America take the easy path? Could we appease communism?

One would think that the bitter lessons of two world wars had taught us, first, that when maddogs are astray in the world you must be well-armed and keep your powder dry. Secondly, that this Nation's freedom cannot exist, that its economy cannot thrive, under conditions imposed by an encroaching dictatorship seeking world domination.

In the forum of the United Nations, in occupied Germany, in Korea, and in all the

normal channels of diplomacy, Soviet Russia flouted its international obligations and agreements. Its whole record repudiates the practices of comity among nations.

Unfortunately, communism seems to understand no other language and recognizes no other warning sign than that of a superior armed force.

Thus, the inevitable course of destiny has thrust upon us the role of guardian of individual human liberty and of the way of life we cherish so dearly.

The responsibility of leadership of the free nations of the world is ours. We could not dodge it, we could not share it. We could not ignore it—and we could not escape it.

The United States took the necessary steps to restore the morale of those who wavered in the struggle to save continental Europe from a new slavery. We pumped new strength into their economic life. We are supplying the material to restore their military strength, and we have taken steps to open up the normal channels of trade.

Under the program enacted at the first session of the present Congress, we are the strongest Nation on earth. We must remain so, because our very strength discourages any dictator or group of international gangsters from further aggressive action.

Now, all the steps we have taken to prevent a new war—the Marshall plan for European economic recovery, the North Atlantic Pact to unify the defenses of non-Communist nations, the military assistance program to supply them with arms—were consummated only after the fullest and freest discussions.

Not only in the Halls of Congress but in the newspapers, over the radio, and in public forums of every description, the issues were debated all over the land. The final decision was made by you, the people of this country. And the actions of your elected Representatives in Congress were an expression of that public will.

Since the policy has been fixed and it is now being carried out in accordance with specific laws laid down by the Congress, then what are all the current public discussions about? Do we want to change our policy in these matters? Are people weakening and faltering in the course they have laid down for themselves?

No. I do not think so. But our problems have not ended. Most public concern and questioning, I believe, centers around the cost of these commitments.

Some people are worried about taxes. They complain that the country is being ground between the millstones of mounting costs of Government at home and fulfilling our responsibilities abroad.

It is true that the costs are tremendous. But the job we have undertaken in the world is a momentous one. The price of freedom has always come high.

"But," the doubters ask, "where will it all end? Aren't we reaching the limit of our capacity to pay?"

Administrator Paul Hoffman, of ECA, pointed out the other day that if communism ever overruns Europe the cost will be even greater. We must reconcile ourselves to face that very realistic fact. There is no other alternative than to carry on.

And this brings me to the first answer to the questions of cost that have been raised. It lies within our own spirit and the will for the task—and, above all, in our faith in ourselves and our destiny.

Tom Paine had such a faith. In December 1776—when the cause of the American Colonies seemed almost lost—he wrote:

"'Tis the business of little souls to shrink; but he whose heart is firm and whose conscience approves his conduct, will pursue his principles unto death. * * * By persevering and fortitude we have the prospect of a glorious issue; by cowardice and submission, a sad choice of a variety of evils—a ravaged country, a depopulated city, habitations without safety, and slavery without hope.

"Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered. What we obtain too cheap we esteem too lightly; it is dearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated."

Yes, the price is high, and even greater today. But America, too, is greater today and better equipped to guard the freedom of the world.

And there is a second answer to those of defeatist attitude who spread dire predictions. It is in our untapped natural wealth, the reservoir of human resources in our growing population—which has now passed one hundred and fifty millions—and in the ingenuity and the initiative of American know-how.

Dr. Harold G. Moulton, economist and president of the Brookings Institution, has just completed a study which those of little faith should take to heart.

It shows that the United States has the capacity and the technical knowledge to support a standard of living eight times as high as that enjoyed today for a population double the present size.

Does this sound as though this country has reached the end of its rope? Does this sound as if there are no new frontiers? Does this sound as though we are headed for national bankruptcy?

The fact that we enjoy the highest standard of living ever attained by any nation in the world does not necessarily mean that progress is at an end.

That standard is the highest because it is in comparison with that of other countries. But by the standards we have come to accept, and to expect, America's goals are still to be reached.

Do you know that the House and Senate Joint Committee on the Economic Report just last month issued the results of a study showing that nearly 10,000,000 families in the United States have incomes of less than $2,000 a year, that nearly 18,000,000 families have incomes of less than $3,000 a year?

Do you know that 27,000,000 Americans have no kitchen sink?

Do you realize that 40,000,000 Americans have neither bathtub nor shower in their homes?

In fact, one million need new homes this year.

Eighteen million Americans lack washing machines.

Twenty-five million Americans do not have vacuum cleaners.

Who can say, under these conditions, that opportunity in America is dead? That either our capacity to consume or to produce has reached its limit?

There is one businessman, of whom I read recently, who knows the score.

"Let's not talk about what we've got," he said, listing all those needs. "Let's be more concerned with what we haven't got. We must be concerned for two reasons: First, because these are human needs that should be met; and second, because these needs provide dramatic illustration of the fact that we have not finished anything—we're only beginning.

"There is enough urgent work on hand—" he said, "for every business now in existence—and for industries yet unborn—to keep busy for generations to come. In common sense, we have no excuse for a recession, let alone a depression."

All of this is not to deny that problems confront the Nation, but since when have Americans been licked by problems?

If the people of this country had always surrendered abjectly to difficulties, if we had customarily defaulted to obstacles, if we had always retreated in the face of fears, the United States would not exist today. Our glorious history is testimony of that fact.

I believe we need a revival of that unshakable fighting faith in ourselves that the late President Roosevelt displayed at the height of the banking crisis when he said: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

And we need, too, to recapture the calm assurance of his message to Congress 10 years later when he said:

"The state of this Nation is good; the heart of this Nation is sound; the spirit of this Nation is strong; the faith of this Nation is eternal."

It seems to me the time has come to call a halt on our self-belittling, to take stock of our real situation, and to revise our outlook.

When that call for courage in the face of adversity was sounded in March 1933, only 36,000,000 of the labor force of the Nation was employed. Today more than 60,000,000 are at work.

Liquid savings of individuals amounted to only $43,700,000,000 at that time. Today these savings total $200,000,000,000. Personal income in 1933 amounted to only forty-six and six-tenths billions. Today it is two hundred and fifteen billions. And today's dollar buys twice as much as a 1933 dollar.

So what are we griping about?

True, our economy is not perfect. True, we have not reached the millenium in our social relations. But this only means, as Dr. Moulton has pointed out, that our potentialities have not been exhausted. It means we have room for improvement and expansion. It means that there is opportunity for enterprise, for invention, for research, for productive expansion.

The survival of a free world depends upon America's economic strength and continuous growth. To this every element—business, agriculture, labor, and the Government—must continuously contribute.

We are all equal partners and share in the obligation to discharge the duties imposed upon us by our heritage; and from which we must not shrink.

Only in this way can we hope to achieve, through humanity's long upward struggle, our ultimate goal of a peaceful and prosperous world, a true brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Non-Communist China Still Alive and Resisting Despite Repeated Premature Obituaries by American Officials and Leftist Writers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 20, 1950:

THE SUNGMEN RAID

The Nationalist Government of China cannot be written off as a dead loss. It has ground troops who will fight, with planes and ships to support them. It is able to execute the most difficult of maneuvers, a landing from the open sea on a hostile shore. This much must be conceded if we accept the assertion that Nationalist troops landed Saturday at Sungmen, 200 miles below Shanghai, and killed or drove off the Communist forces along that stretch of coast.

The communiqué given out at Nationalist headquarters on Formosa described this episode as a raid. Commentators in this part of the world were reminded of the Dieppe landing of August 1942, which preceded by nearly 2 years the successful invasion of Normandy. These comparisons are not worth much except as they suggest that a long continental coastline cannot be completely defended against attacks from concentrated enemies based on islands. To reconquer China 2 years—or any number of years—from now, the Nationalists would need vastly more men and material than they now possess. Or they would have to receive instant and effective support on landing from a population ready to rise against the Communist regime. These conditions will not be easy to meet.

Yet, Chiang Kai-shek, less than 3 weeks after resuming his office as president, has made himself felt. The Sungmen raid will have it echoes at Lake Success. It will encourage a wait-and-see policy on the part of some governments which might have been ready to recognize the Chinese Communists. It will influence popular sentiment, in ways hard to measure, throughout Asia.

What Nationalist China needed, beyond the essential tools and materials of war, was discipline, a willingness to fight and a faith in the future. The men who landed at Sungmen must have possessed these qualities; otherwise they would have fled or surrendered, as so many of their predecessors did, at the first Red volley. If there are a few thousand such men there may in time be many thousands. Famine stalks the mainland of Communist China. Disillusion must have overtaken multitudes who have waited in vain for long months the coming of the Communist heaven.

The tide may have turned. We do not know. But as long as there exist Chinese soldiers who will fight as well as the Sungmen raiders seem to have done the cause of Chinese freedom is not dead—not even with all the power of imperial Russia against it.

The Reckless Efforts of Republicans To Find Campaign Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, our friends on the other side of the aisle are somewhat amusing at times in their strained efforts to drum up political issues on which to base their campaigns this year and in 1952.

Having nothing in the way of an affirmative Republican Party record to offer the voters of the country, they rush frantically from one question to another. From day to day they are attacking, denouncing, and hurling reckless charges without regard to facts. The consequences of their reckless utterances fall upon this Government and the Nation itself, rather than upon our Democratic Party.

Understand, what they give forth are not suggestions offered in a constructive spirit, but political sniping designed to gain widespread publicity for Republican propaganda, aimed at a Democratic administration.

Political speech making has its place in our American system. Their own party principles and party causes should be supported by the partisans of each party. That is the way we operate. And I am for it.

But when truth is distorted, when facts are twisted, we on this side of the aisle are going to nail those distortions. We are going to expose those misstatements of fact. We are going to let the people know the real motives and the truth behind these barrages of artificially created scandals.

One of those more recently cooked up by the GOP is the alleged invasion of individual rights of privacy by questions in the census relating to income.

Now, what are the facts on this situation?

Article I of the Constitution provides the foundation in law for United States censuses.

Acts of Congress from 1790 onward provided for each decennial census, and up through the 1920 census listed questions to be asked by the census takers.

President Herbert Hoover signed the act of June 18, 1929, passed by a Republican Congress. It provided for the 1930 census and subsequent decennial censuses. This act is the authority for the 1950 census. Section 4 of this act lists the subjects of population, agriculture, and unemployment among those concerning which inquiries are to be made and delegates to the Director of the Census the responsibility for determining the number, form, and subdivision of these inquiries, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce.

In determining the inquiries, to be made in the 1940 census, the Director of the Census consulted with leaders in business, industry, labor, education, and government. On their advice and with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, questions on income were included in that census. The Census Director employed this same procedure in choosing the questions for the 1950 census and in conformity with the continuing demand for up-to-date information on incomes, to measure the geographical distribution of purchasing power, the income questions were retained for this census.

A census, if it is to be one worthy of the name and if its product is to be of any value, cannot be static. It must keep in step with the times. It must collect information of the most value to the most users within the limits of practicability.

The census collects information on the population and its social characteristics. Items such as age, sex, race, marital status, occupations, employment and unemployment, education, and citizenship are traditional parts of the census. Such information has been collected in some form during the last 100 years at every census.

Now is it proper for us to know these things about ourselves? Long since we have accepted these inquiries as a proper part of a national census. How much more valuable all this information becomes when we are able to relate it to information about our purchasing power, to information about our economic condition.

The census collects information about the Nation's manufacturing output.

The census collects information about the Nation's farm production.

The census collects information about the Nation's retail and wholesale distribution.

The census collects information about the Nation's consumers (population) of these goods and services.

Why should we not have information, too, on the distribution of the Nation's purchasing power? How is that purchasing power to be determined without collecting information on income?

This information is of the greatest value when all the various items are in focus as to time, to establish the relationship to each other in a complete picture of our Nation populationwise and economically.

The income inquiries in the 1950 census were not conceived as a new proposition for this time. The act of Congress providing for the 1937 census of unemployment directed that information on income also be obtained. The 1940 census of population also included questions on income and that information has been of great value during the last 10 years. Certainly there never was any complaint that this information was abused.

How could a true statistical measurement be made of the effect of unemployment without taking into account income loss?

How can a true picture of employment be painted without including in the colors the cardinal pigment that income represents? To omit that would be as foolish as a painter's attempt to complete a portrait with a dry brush.

Centenary of the Sisters of St. Ann and Silver Jubilee of St. Jean de Baptiste School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I know that all my friends in Congress will want to join with me in extending greetings and best wishes on the centenary of the Sisters of St. Ann and the silver jubilee of St. Jean de Baptiste School.

There is a celebration at the parish of St. Jean de Baptiste in Ludlow that will continue through Easter. I know that Rev. J. Armand Silvain and all who are associated with the church, the order, and the school will be pleased to know that Members of Congress throughout the Nation are joining with them in spirit during this celebration.

I know you will all be pleased to join with me in extending our greetings and best wishes to them.

Business wants this information. Business has been pleading with the Census Bureau for years to provide income information and purchasing power data. Thousands of letters pour into the Census Bureau each year from all sorts of users asking for this information. Let me quote the observation of one businessman who certainly knows of what he speaks. Dr. Vergil D. Reed, associate director of research of the J. Walter Thompson Co., the largest advertising agency in the world, has this to say in an address on April 1, 1950, before the 1950 annual convention of the American Association of Advertising Agencies, and I quote:

> This income data should prove extremely valuable, in fact the most valuable economic index yet available by all geographic areas.

And may I remind my colleagues, that Dr. Reed is a man who has worked on both sides of the street. During the 1940 census he served as acting director of the Census Bureau. Before and after, he was in business. Incidentally, he is a member of the Republican Party.

It should be noted that the 1930 census conducted during President Hoover's administration for the first time included a question on the value of home owned for owner-occupied units and the monthly rental paid for tenant-occupied units. The answers to these inquiries were collected under the same 1929 Census Act carrying the same penalty provisions covering the 1950 census. The legality of these questions was not challenged nor were they presumably contrary to the intent of the law as interpreted by the then Director of the Census and then Secretary of Commerce under President Hoover. Their legal justification was the same as is the legal justification for the 1950 income questions. In a report to the Congress of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government signed by ex-President Hoover in February 1949, there appears the following statement:

> Government policy depends upon much detailed knowledge about the Nation's employment, production, and purchasing power.

Income is certainly an important measurement of purchasing power.

All this being true, what other reason than political can there be for the Republican complaints at this late date? There was ample opportunity before the census began to revise the legislation. The list of questions to be used in the 1950 census of population were submitted to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on February 28, 1949, and are printed in the hearings on the Department of Commerce appropriation bill for 1950 on page 149 and following. Following the hearings the Congress appropriated the necessary funds for the conduct of the population and other censuses for fiscal year 1950.

There is a considerable demand on the part of business, labor, and Government agencies for family income statistics as distinguished from individual income statistics. The family, rather than the individual person, is the consumer unit for many consumer goods. For example, it is the family that is the consumer unit for consumer durable goods such as housing, automobiles, refrigerators, and the like. American business interested in the measurement of potential markets needs statistics showing the number of families in each of the various income classes. Moreover, the effect of unemployment, whether it be for a few days, weeks, or a prolonged period on family income provides a measure of the severity of unemployment as well as a measure of losses in purchasing power. Family income data for these and other purposes are not available from any other source.

Incidentally, I want to stress that those who have incomes over $10,000 do not have to furnish any other figure. They merely say their income is over $10,000.

Income statistics are needed by small geographic areas. The Census Bureau plans to publish the 1950 census income statistics for each city haveing 2,500 or more inhabitants, for each county, for the urban and rural-non-farm parts of counties, and for small statistical areas within our larger cities called census tracts averaging about 6,000 persons per tract. These data, too, are available from no other source.

Many persons with low incomes or with types of income not taxable are not required to file tax returns, or not required to report the nontaxable parts of their income. The Bureau of Internal Revenue statistics do not cover all the income of all the people. For 1948, for example, the Bureau of Internal Revenue received 52,500,000 returns. For the same year, information was collected by the Bureau of the Census in its sample current population survey which indicated that there were 70,100,000 income recipients.

The income information furnished to the Bureau of the Census is confidential and census enumerators are sworn not to reveal it to anyone. However, individuals who prefer not to give the income information to the census enumarator have an alternative course they may pursue. The census enumerator will provide the respondent with a special form which may be filled in by the individual and mailed direct to the Census Director in Washington.

The Census Bureau publishes the information only in statistical tables so designed that personal information relating to an individual is not revealed. Every possible safeguard for the individual's anonymity is observed.

In conclusion, I would like to quote from the seventeenth decennial proclamation issued on March 23, 1950, by President Truman:

> No person can be harmed in any way by furnishing the information required. Individual information collected under the seventeenth decennial census will not be used for the purposes of taxation, investigation, or regulation, or in connection with military or jury service, the compulsion of school attendance, the regulation of immigration, or with the enforcement of any National, State, or local law, or ordinance. There need be no fear that disclosure will be made regarding any individual person or his affairs. For the due protection of the rights and interests of the persons furnishing information, every employee of the Census Bureau is prohibited, under heavy penalty, from disclosing any information which may come to his knowledge by reason of his employment.

Life and liberty in a free democracy entail a variety of cooperative actions for the common good. The prompt, complete, and accurate answering of all official inquiries made by census officials should be regarded as one of the requirements of good citizenship and exercise in fundamental democracy.

I include a fine article on the subject written by Lowell Mellett and appearing in a recent issue of the Washington Star:

THERE'S NO REASON TO BE ANNOYED BY QUESTIONS OF THE CENSUS TAKERS

(By Lowell Mellett)

Politics being politics, it is not surprising that an effort has been made to turn the census taking this year into something sinister. So certain Members of Congress who miss no opportunity to embarrass the administration, have been expressing concern over what they term an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of citizens.

One question to be asked by the 140,000 enumerators, when they start out Saturday, has to do with income. One individual in every five, aged 14 or over, will be asked to tell his annual income. In the census of 10 years ago the question was asked of every individual of that age group, but this time it is felt that an extensive sampling process is sufficient for the purposes of the Government and the people who have use for Government statistics.

MEASURING NEEDED

The users of the statistics are business houses, needing to measure their actual and potential markets, manufacturers wishing to determine the need for consumer goods; Federal, State and local agencies having policy decisions to make, and Congress with legislation to consider. The Census Bureau publishes the information only in statistical tables so designed that no information relating to an individual can be revealed. Any census employee violating this right of privacy is subject to a $1,000 fine and 2 years in prison.

These are the essential facts concerning this phase of the census, yet some politicians who profess to be the champions of business and industry and who decry what they call the hostility of the Government to business, have sought to make an issue of it. They blandly ignore the part that representative business organizations have had in setting up the questionnaires to be used by enumerators.

Among the things the census is expected to show is an unprecedented increase in the total number of married couples, a substantial increase in the number of households, and an upward turn in the average size of young families. Exact information with respect to such matters is important to manufacturers and distributors of household goods of all kinds. That goes for the makers of furniture, refrigerators, washing machines, and radios. It goes very much for the builders of baby buggies.

LINCOLN REMARK RECALLED

As Abraham Lincoln said, in justifying the general census, "If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better tell what to do and how to do it."

So, if the census taker wants to put down the kind of house you are living in, its condition, the number of rooms, the number of occupants, the water supply, the toilet facilities and provision for bathing, the year the house was built, the heating and cooking equipment, the refrigeration, electric lighting, radio and television installations; and, if you rent, the amount of your rent and any additional payments for electricity, gas, and water; or, if you are a farmer, the number of your horses, cattle, sheep, hogs, goats, chickens, turkeys; how much you receive from the sale of milk, eggs, and poultry; how many bees you keep, how much honey they produce, and how much you collect for same—you mustn't be annoyed.

He is not being nosey and is not prying into your personal affairs for the benefit of neighborhood gossip. The facts you give him will be just a few of the 15,000,000,000 facts that are gathered concerning the 151,000,000 of us and they will be lost, so far as personal identification is concerned, in a vast compilation of impersonal statistics.

Flood Control on Lower Mississippi River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting and informative articles on the status of flood-control works on the lower Mississippi River recently appeared in the New Orleans Times-Picayune.

The article is particularly timely in that it reviews these structures in the light of the tremendous quantity of water recently handled by the lower Mississippi and the Atchafalaya.

The author, Mr. George W. Healy, Jr., is the managing editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune. By virtue of background and training he is the best-informed writer in the United States on these problems. He served with distinction during the war as the director of the OWI.

The article follows in full:

GROUP TOURS FLOODWAY; SEES NEED FOR EARLY FINISH—CHECK OF MORGANZA POINTS UP URGENCY

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

A group of New Orleanians returned during the past week from an inspection of the Atchafalaya, Old, and lower Mississippi Rivers with definite impressions about the 1950 winter flood and its implications.

Among these impressions are:

1. That the Morganza floodway should be completed at the earliest possible moment.

2. That the 1950 flood, being passed safely to the Gulf of Mexico as this is written, was potentially the third most serious flood since 1544.

3. That this 1950 flood increased the proportion of water being carried to the Gulf of Mexico by the Atchafalaya River—in relation to the flow of the Mississippi River.

Members of the inspection group were guests of Brig. Gen. P. A. Feringa, president of the Mississippi River commission; Brig. Gen. A. L. Culbertson and Dewitt Pyburn, members of the commission, and Col. Charles G. Holle, district engineer.

General Feringa assured the group that his commission is anxious to complete the Morganza floodway before another flood may require its use.

Guide levees of the floodway have been finished from Morganza, on the Mississippi River between Baton Rouge and Old River, to Morgan City. Flowage rights within the floodway have been purchased by the Federal Government. Utility crossings at Krotz Springs have been completed, and the Texas & Pacific Railroad crossing at Melville should be ready within 60 days.

ONLY NEED—MONEY

A highway and the Louisiana & Arkansas Railroad will be carried across the floodway at Morganza, on top of the weir structure which will control release of water into the floodway. Only the approaches for this structure have been built. Test piles have been driven, but the work of building the dam remains to be done.

"All we need to complete this work," says General Feringa, "is the money."

The general is hoping that current appropriations by the Congress will permit him to proceed with the final phases of the spillway work.

The first phase of this final work will be building of a foundation for the dam structure. Because extreme water pressure will be exerted against the dam during high-water periods, piling for the foundation will be driven at an angle to insure the greatest resistance to this pressure.

The second phase will be construction of the concrete dam itself; and the third phase will be the building of the highway and railroad crossings on top of the dam.

DIVERT A FLOOD

"We do not expect to perform these three tasks at three different times," General Feringa explained. "After advertising for the foundation work, probably before the end of the current fiscal year, we will advertise for bids for the other jobs. As the foundation work proceeds, building of the dam will be started. Then before the dam is complete, construction of the rail and highway crossings will be undertaken. If we waited until each job were done before starting the succeeding job, we couldn't finsh the floodway before January 1, 1953, when we hope it will be ready for efficient operation."

When it is ready for operation, the Morganza floodway will be capable of diverting 600,000 cubic feet of water each second from the Mississippi River.

Bonnet Carre spillway, operated in 1937, 1945, and this year, has a rated discharge of 250,000 cubic feet of water per second.

The Morganza Dam will be higher than but not as wide as the Bonnet Carre needle dam. More water will flow through the Morganza Dam than through the Bonnet Carre Dam because its height—or head—will be greater.

Whereas the engineers open and close the Bonnet Carre Dam by removing or replacing wooden needles in the dam structure, they will open and close the Morganza floodway by opening or closing steel gates.

Actually, Morganza would have been opened last month if its dam structure had been ready.

CARRYING MORE

At the peak of this winter's flood the Mississippi River carried 1,498,000 cubic feet of water per second past Morganza. The engineers feel that it should never carry more than 1,500,000 cubic feet of water per second, including 250,000 cubic feet which may be diverted into Lake Pontchartrain by way of the Bonnet Carre spillway.

Incidentally, the proportion of water carried by the Atchafalaya River to the Gulf continues to increase in relation to the volume being carried down the main stream.

In 1927 75 percent of the water originating above Old River moved to the Gulf down the main stream, and 25 percent moved down the Atchafalaya River.

In 1949 72 percent was going down the Mississippi River and 28 percent down the Atchafalaya.

This year, at the crest, 70.3 percent moved down the Mississippi and 29.7 percent down the Atchafalaya.

SHORTER ROUTE

The latter percentage is based on preliminary calculations by the United States engineers of discharge at the crest of this winter's flood. These calculations show that at the crest 1,498,000 cubic feet of water per second moved down the Mississippi and 633,000 cubic feet per second moved down the Atchafalaya.

The Atchafalaya and Mississippi Rivers have been connected for several centuries by Old River. Except on rare occasions, the direction of flow through Old River is into the Atchafalaya from the Mississippi. On these rare occasions Old River, fed by Red River, may flow into the Mississippi River when the latter is very low.

Because the Atchafalaya River route to the Gulf of Mexico is 163 miles shorter than the route via the main stream, water has a tendency to follow the Atchafalaya route. The only reason all water originating above Old River does not go down the Atchafalaya is that the channel of the Atchafalaya is not large enough to accommodate it.

Since sills at the head of the Atchafalaya River were washed out in 1927, the Atchafalaya has been enlarging. These sills, or sunken dams, were placed in the river late in the nineteenth century to halt its enlargement.

Recent enlargement of the Atchafalaya channel has not alarmed members of the Mississippi River Commission, although they acknowledge that ultimately the Atchafalaya could capture all the flow to the Gulf.

MAY NEED CONTROL

This capture, they believe, will be deferred by the completion of the Morganza floodway. Use of this floodway, about 30 miles south of Old River, would reduce the head of water flowing through Old River to the Atchafalaya at times of flood, consequently retarding enlargement of the Atchafalaya Channel.

Some day, the engineers concede, it may be necessary to control the flow of water from the Mississippi into the Atchafalaya to regulate its volume. That day, they believe, is not imminent.

Guests of General Feringa, who made the recent inspection trip, are convinced that the day for action on the Morganza floodway is today.

The Morganza floodway has been in the statutes and on the planning boards for 22 years, and work on the floodway has been under way 12 years.

SEEK FUNDS

World War II interrupted building of the floodway but other delays should be blamed on lack of money to prosecute the work.

C. C. Walther, president of the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce, and other civic leaders are undertaking a campaign to insure that adequate appropriations will be made available to complete the floodway without further delay.

Walther was a member of the group which recently inspected the Atchafalaya, Old, and lower Mississippi Rivers with General Feringa. Others in the group were Robert L. Simpson, president of the dock board; Lester F. Alexander, president of the Tidewater Canal Association; Lloyd J. Cobb, president of International House; J. Lester White, director of the Louisiana Department of Public Works; H. A. Sawyer, member of the dock board and the city railroad terminal board; Ralph Nolan, member of the terminal board; Harold E. Meade, vice president of New Orleans Public Service, Inc., and this writer.

Election of the President and the Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include some comments of my own and certain letters that have been exchanged between myself and the editors of the

Washington Post, and two editorials which appeared in that publication.

I think even a casual reader will get a clearer insight into the mental barrel rolls, loop the loops, and tail spins of the editors of the Washington Post after reading the editorial, my letter concerning it, and the reply to it from Mr. Herbert Elliston who is identified as editor.

An examination of the second paragraph of Mr. Elliston's letter will disclose that he meets himself coming down the road. Any reader of the Post editorial would conclude from perusal of it that the Post favored the election of majority Presidents, as opposed to minority, since that is the usual interpretation of the word "minority" in connection with presidential elections.

Mr. Elliston cunningly attempts to find himself an escape clause by contending that the Post was talking about a different kind of minority President—one who gets less popular votes than his opponent. He admonishes me for writing an intemperate letter and accuses me of "itching for a petty controversy in semantics."

Thus, if Mr. Elliston represents the Post's viewpoint—and from the confused thought of his letter I can quite readily understand that he may well represent it—the Post is actually coming out in favor of the election of plurality Presidents, which is what the so-called democracies of Europe had before they fell one by one.

If the Post and Mr. Elliston eventually reach some conclusion about what they actually stand for, I will be glad to incorporate it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but in the meantime I will have to content myself with pointing out that if the proposed Lodge-Gossett amendment to the Constitution had been in effect in 1896 Bryan would have been elected over McKinley 221.3 electoral votes to 215.3 despite the fact that McKinley's popular vote was 7,035,638 to Bryan's 6,467,946.

The matter above referred to follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 8, 1950]

MINORITY PRESIDENT

Senator TAFT finds himself in strange company in fighting the Lodge-Gossett resolution, for the most vehement opposition to date has come from the special pressure groups. These groups fear that if the electoral votes were distributed among the candidates for President and Vice President in proportion to the popular vote cast in each State, their opportunity for bringing pressure upon the major parties in the key States would be minimized. Senator TAFT fears that this proposed change in the Constitution would be fatal to the hope of electing a Republican President if the election is in any way close. Both complaints obviously reflect selfish interests that ought to be put aside in passing upon the merits of a proposal to correct a serious defect in our electoral system.

Mr. TAFT fears that, under the proposed system, the GOP would not gain enough electoral votes in the South to make up for its sharing of electoral votes in the big States of the North. This seems to us an unwarranted fear, for the reason that the Democratic Party, in order to win, must carry a number of large States in the East, Middle West, and West. And the unit system of counting electoral votes brings a big State to the Democrats on a small margin as easily as it does to the Republicans. In the close election of 1948, for example, the Democratic Party carried California, with 25 electoral votes; Illinois with 28; Massachusetts with 16, and Ohio with 25; but the Republicans carried Indiana, with 13 electoral votes; Michigan with 19; New Jersey with 16; New York with 47; and Pennsylvania with 35. The point is this: The net effect of the voting under the present system was to give Mr. Truman 303 electoral votes to 189 for Mr. Dewey; under the Lodge-Gossett resolution, the division would have been—Truman, 258; Dewey, 221.4.

What Senator TAFT seems to be complaining about is that, in unusual circumstances, the resolution might deprive the Republicans of the opportunity of putting a minority President into the White House. In presenting his proposal to the Senate, Mr. LODGE pointed out that a shift of about 30,000 popular votes in three States would have given the election to Governor Dewey, in spite of a plurality of nearly 2,000,000 popular votes for Mr. Truman. It is precisely this evil that the resolution is designed to prevent. Does Senator TAFT openly and candidly favor the election of minority Presidents? That certainly seems to be the implication of his opposition. We can think of few worse political disasters that may befall the country under the present system than to have a minority President. For that matter, the election of a man to this position without a popular majority behind him would be a calamity for the President himself and for the party which sponsored him.

It is true, of course, that the Lodge-Gossett resolution would not entirely eliminate the danger of electing a minority President. The fact that each State has two electoral votes (corresponding to its two Senators) which do not represent population would make it possible for a candidate to win with fewer popular votes than his rival even under the proposed amendment. But the greatest danger arising from the unit rule of counting electoral votes would be eliminated. We do not see how any man can oppose the amendment on this ground unless he is willing to admit that he favors the election of a minority President, if only his party can win. To us, this seems to be one of the strongest arguments for the change.

MARCH 8, 1950.

Mr. PHILIP L. GRAHAM,
President and Publisher,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR EDITOR GRAHAM: In your editorial today, Wednesday, March 8, 1950, titled "Minority President," you assert:

"We can think of few worse political disasters that may befall the country under the present (electoral college) system than to have a minority President. For that matter, the election of a man to this position without a popular majority behind him would be a calamity for the President himself and for the party which sponsored him."

There is scarcely a day goes by that the editorial writers of the Washington Post fail to bathe publicly in their own ignorance. I have felt called upon on several occasions to draw the attention of Washington Post readers to the fallacious reasoning, specious argument and misstatement of fact which persistently characterizes Washington Post editorials.

Why doesn't the Washington Post wake up? Political disaster has already befallen us. Calamity has already been visited upon the White House. We have a minority President in the White House at this very moment.

If the Washington Post editorial writers will take out their pencils and make a simple calculation, they will discover that Harry S. Truman received only 49.5 percent of the 1948 vote which elected him to office. Yet despite the elements of disaster and calamity which every thinking American knows exist in the President's neo-Socialist policies, the Washington Post supports 95 percent of them, minority President or not.

Sincerely yours,

W. KINGSLAND MACY.

THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1950.

Hon. W. KINGSLAND MACY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Your intemperate letter of March 8, addressed to Mr. Philip L. Graham, publisher of the Washington Post, has been referred to me. If you will read the editorial, Minority President, to which you refer so abusively, you will note that it makes no reference to Mr. Truman being a majority President or a minority President. It simply does not go into that subject, because it had no bearing on the point that the editorial was making.

In saying that we now have a minority President in the White House, however, you seem to rely upon a strained meaning of the word. Webster defines minority as the smaller number; the smaller in number of two aggregates. If Truman is to be regarded as a minority President, where is the majority? You couldn't possibly find any other majority than his in the 1948 election unless you should add the Wallacites and the Dixiecrats to the Republican Party. Is that your reasoning?

It is obvious from the text of the editorial that our reference to a minority President was to one who gets fewer popular votes than does his nearest rival. I do not see how you could misunderstand that acceptable meaning of the word unless you were itching for a petty controversy in semantics.

We have never professed to be infallible, and no newspaper that I know of is more anxious than the Washington Post is to correct misstatements of fact when they are brought to its notice.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT ELLISTON.

MARCH 15, 1950.

Mr. HERBERT ELLISTON,
Editor, Washington Post,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLISTON: Your letter of March 10 came up here to Albany where I am attending the monthly meeting of this board.

I regret that the facts I stated should have caused you so much mental indigestion.

It would seem to me that this controversy in all fairness might appropriately be tested with your readers.

Faithfully yours,

W. KINGSLAND MACY.

[From the Washington Post of March 16, 1950]

WHAT IS A MINORITY?

Representative W. KINGSLAND MACY takes exception to our editorial of March 8 about the Lodge-Gossett resolution in which we said:

"We can think of few worse political disasters that may befall the country under the present system than to have a minority President. For that matter, the election of a man to this position without a popular majority behind him would be a calamity for the President himself and for the party which sponsored him."

Mr. MACY's contention is:

"Political disaster has already befallen us. Calamity has already been visited upon the White House. We have a minority President in the White House at this very moment.

"If the Washington Post editorial writers will take out their pencils and make a simple calculation, they will discover that Harry S. Truman received only 49.5 percent of the 1948 vote which elected him to office. Despite the elements of disaster and calamity which every thinking American knows exist in the President's neo-Socialist policies, the Washington Post supports 95 percent of them, minority President or not."

There are, of course, several definitions of minority President. Webster defines minority as the smaller number. In a limited sense, Mr. Truman is a minority President because he did not receive a majority of the total vote cast, although the customary usage of the term is to designate a President who has fewer popular votes than his nearest rival but wins the office because the strategic location of his popular support gives him a majority of electoral votes. In this sense, of course, Mr. Truman is not a minority President. It seems plain from the context of the editorial that we were using the term in this sense. If Mr. Truman were to be regarded as a minority President, moreover, where would one find the man with the majority? While we never profess to be infallible, we cannot help thinking that Mr. MACY would make more progress toward converting his party into a majority if he gave more attention to building a constructive program and less to quibbling over a word.

Federal Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the Record Stockman, the voice of the western livestock industry, is published at Denver, Colo. It covers the mountain and plains section of the United States very completely. Recently they have been conducting a nonpolitical poll asking the stockgrowers to express their sentiments on farm programs. The following results are interesting:

BULK OF STOCKMEN OPPOSE FEDERAL FARM PROGRAMS

Fifty-seven percent of the hundreds of stockmen voting in the Record Stockman farm-plan poll indicated that they do not want any Government farm program, tabulations of returns from 21 States indicated late Wednesday. Eleven percent of the ballots favored the Brannan farm plan; 16 percent favored the present farm program, and 16 percent supported some other type of farm plan.

Those who voted against all farm programs showed their sentiments in a write-in vote on the Record Stockman ballot published 2 weeks ago. No space was provided for a negative answer. Nevertheless, 57 percent of the stockgrower voters wrote their opposition to all farm programs into the blank space provided on the ballot for an outline of other type of farm plan.

Dozens of ballots were returned with attached sheets outlining proposed farm programs, expressing opposition to the Brannan plan or to any form of farm subsidy. Many of these statements declared that ranchers and farmers with livestock oppose controls, or want to return to the American way, or let us alone, or we can take of ourselves and our problems.

Ballots were returned from these 21 States: Colorado, Wyoming, Nebraska, New Mexico, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, Iowa, Montana, Minnesota, New York, Washington, Utah, Oklahoma, Kansas, California, Nevada, Illinois, Texas, Missouri, Maryland.

Returns by several States in percentage of votes:

	Percent
Colorado:	
Favor the Brannan farm plan	12
Favor present farm plan	15
Favor some other farm plan	17
Oppose any Government farm plan	56
Wyoming:	
Favor the Brannan farm plan	11
Favor present farm plan	5
Favor some other farm plan	21
Oppose any Government farm plan	63
Nebraska:	
Favor present farm plan	10
Favor other farm plan	20
Oppose any Government farm plan	70
New Mexico:	
Favor the Brannan farm plan	17
Favor present farm plan	8
Favor some other farm plan	25
Oppose any Government farm plan	75
Montana:	
Favor the Brannan farm plan	7
Favor present farm plan	27
Favor some other farm plan	7
Oppose any Government farm plan	64
Kansas:	
Favor the Brannan farm plan	14
Favor present farm plan	15
Favor some other farm plan	14
Oppose any Government farm plan	57

The Committee on Un-American Activities and Its Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, several days ago when the House had before it for consideration House Resolution 482 providing additional funds for the continuation of the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I had hoped to make a brief statement in connection with the accomplishments of the committee under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD]. Unfortunately, the House met at 11 a. m. on that day and I was engaged in an executive session of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia, this committee has become one of the most important and useful bodies in the House of Representatives. Chairman WOOD has worked diligently, without fanfare, and without notoriety. In doing so, however, in his quiet, statesmanlike manner, he has greatly expanded the constructive work of this committee and tremendously enhanced its reputation. He has also staffed the committee with competent personnel who are exposing all subversive activities in this country, whether coming from the left or the right. Recently the House of Representatives passed legislation strengthening the security laws of this country by extending the statute of limitations in espionage cases and by providing much greater safeguards for the protection of confidential Government documents and military and atomic installations. This legislation was largely the result of the constructive work of the gentleman from Georgia.

I shall not go into detail about the many investigations which have been conducted during the past 2 years. But they have been extensive and productive. The staff of the committee is at present engaged in the investigation of communism in Hawaii, the Ku Klux Klan, communism in labor unions, and other organizations, including Government departments. The committee is also investigating Fascist organizations in the United States.

The gentleman from Georgia fully understands that communism is an attack upon our free institutions and our way of life. He also understands that it attempts to infiltrate into honest reform movements and all branches of our society, particularly those devoted to humanitarian and similar purposes. Under his direction the committee has adopted a splendid program of education. Factual information on the Communist procedures and methods has been widely circulated. Unsuspecting loyal Americans have thus been acquainted with these devious methods and have consequently been able to meet the Communists on their grounds. We have thus seen the educational institutions, the unions, and many other groups moving on their own initiative to expel all Communists and their sympathizers from their respective organizations.

I believe that the Members of the Congress owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Georgia and his colleagues on the committee. I think the overwhelming vote of last Thursday, when only 12 members of the House of Representatives voted against providing adequate funds for the committee, is the finest testimonial that can be given to the chairman of this committee and his colleagues. I have served in the House of Representatives, with the exception of several years during the war period while in military service, since 1940 and I am quite certain that this is the largest vote of confidence that the committee has ever received. It indicates that the Members of the House of Representatives appreciate the time and effort and intelligence of our distinguished friend from Georgia.

Unfair Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by E. L. Shaner, editor in chief of Steel, titled "Unfair Attack." Being a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I feel that this is a fair appraisal of the hearings that were held, and quite

agree that Mr. Shaner's criticism of the methods used by the majority members of the committee is justifiable:

Careful examination of the majority report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on steel prices shows it to be unbelievably loaded with prejudice, vindictiveness, and deliberate misrepresentation.

Therefore, it is not surprising that all dissenting members of the committee, in a minority report, felt called upon to cite chapter and verse in a score or more of instances wherein the majority of eight displayed bias, usually by distorting or ignoring pertinent evidence. Nor is it surprising that Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, in an individual comment on the majority report, said: "I am sorry that the joint committee is putting out reports of this caliber and I find myself astonished that some of my respected associates on the committee have read it so carelessly that they are willing to sign it."

To these charges of unfairness we could well add our resentment that the author of the majority report lifted 13 words out of an article appearing in the December 26, 1949, issue of this publication and in so doing deliberately gave a false impression of the real meaning of our text.

After reading the majority report it is apparent what happened. When United States Steel raised prices, Senator O'MAHONEY burst out in immediate, hotheaded criticism. He was unimpressed by evidence presented at the hearings. Staff members who drafted the report very likely took their cue from the chairman and thus slanted it against the steel companies in shameful fashion. It is quite possible that some members of the committee who signed it were not aware of its bias.

The important point is that this type of malicious mud slinging is harmful to the Nation. As recently as last Friday in White Sulphur Springs, Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer paid high tribute to private business. "To contemplate the collapse or even the weakening of this great institution," he declared, "is frightening." But, he warned, "If we magnify our differences and if each group guards jealously its prerogatives and withholds from others its good will and its assistance—America may go down in ruins."

Majority members of the joint committee may well reconsider the implications of their unfair attack lest they unwittingly become the architects of destruction.

Resolution of American Protestant Hospital Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

AMERICAN PROTESTANT
HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
Evansville, Ind., March 31, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN TAURIELLO: May I bring to your attention the enclosed resolution adopted at the recent annual meeting of the AMERICAN PROTESTANT HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION? You will note it is the expression of an organization in which the several Protestant Church denominations of our country have combined their common interest in the field of service to the sick and injured men, women, and children of the United States.

As the studied expression of such a representative body, the resolution will, I hope, be of interest to you.

Respectfully yours,

ALBERT G. HAHN,
Executive Director.

Whereas the American Protestant Hospital Association has just completed its twenty-ninth annual convention; and

Whereas for the first time in the history of protestantism in America the several Protestant Church denominations of our country have combined their common interests in the field of Christian eleemosynary service to the aged, the orphaned, and the sick in full realization of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the convention convey its thanks to the representatives of the Protestant denominations that have assisted in making this initial effort an enjoyable and profitable conference; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Protestant Hospital Association by rising vote expresses its appreciation to Dr. L. B. Benson for the fine leadership that he has given us during his term of office; to Dr. and Mrs. Albert Hahn for their faithful and untiring efforts in the planning and promotion of the convention program; and to our officers and committees and those participating in the program for their part in contributing to the enrichment of our experience and the enlargement of our knowledge. To Dr. M. T. MacEachern, president-elect, we desire to pledge our affection and loyalty and to assure him of our sincere desire to cooperate with him in his plans for the next association year; and

Whereas the American Protestant Hospital Association has over the past years maintained friendly, cooperative, and cordial relationship with those other organizations so closely allied in interest to our own, to wit: The American Hospital Association, the Catholic Hospital Association, the American College of Surgeons, the American Medical Association, and the American College of Hospital Administrators, and other allied organizations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Protestant Hospital Association convey to each of these organizations its appreciation of these friendly relationships and expresses the hope that we may continue working together for the common good.

Whereas the American Protestant Hospital Association is deeply interested in providing adequate health services for all the men, women, and children of our Nation; and

Whereas most of our great hospitals and other charitable institutions have been brought into being through the voluntary support of philanthropically minded men and women; and

Whereas the large majority of American families have the resources to pay for adequate medical and hospital care; and

Whereas local government and local hospitals and the medical profession have always recognized their responsibility to those unable to care for themselves; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated by experience that government plans for individual health care in other countries have produced uncontrollable demands upon hospitals, doctors, and other health resources without the possibility of reasonable check and with resulting excessive cost to their people through taxation; and

Whereas medical-hospital related individual-health services in this country are now the best in the world, a system which has developed according to the best tradition of the American character: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Protestant Hospital Association reemphasize its approval of the action of its officers and representatives in their efforts to develop and extend the voluntary prepayment plans such as the Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan for providing health care and authorize them to continue in their cooperation with other organizations and governmental departments providing care for indigents;

Resolved further, That the American Protestant Hospital Association restate its opposition to any system of compulsory health insurance which deprives the individual of free choice or free exercise of his own personal initiative in providing for his health care; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Senate of the United States, and to each Member of the House of Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That a commission be appointed by the president of the American Protestant Hospital Association and concurred by the trustees, to draft an expanded statement of the position of the American Protestant Hospital Association for publication and distribution.

Blow to Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Blow to Reorganization," which appeared in the Washington Star of Saturday last, which states that about 22,000 postmasters are appointed in Washington.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOW TO REORGANIZATION

The quiet death sentence which the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service apparently has ordered for the bill designed to take postmasterships out of politics should not be allowed to stand. There is every indication, however, that the bill will remain dead unless there is enough public demand to force its resurrection. Here is a challenge made to order for the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report and for all other advocates of governmental efficiency.

The bill in question would carry out the Hoover Commission's proposal that all postmasterships be placed on a career civil-service basis. It was inevitable that this sensible plan would run into strong political opposition, for it would end the patronage system which in the past has proved a means of rewarding the faithful in congressional districts. When it is considered that there are about 22,000 politically appointed postal employees, the interest shown by politicians in defeating any curtailment of these patronage opportunities is understandable.

But the Hoover Commission found that politics produces inefficiency and militates against the incentives of promotion. It blamed part of the postal deficit on the fact that the Post Office Department is laboring under the patronage handicap. The proposed legislation would eliminate the requirement for Senate confirmation of postmaster appointments and would place these jobs on a regular merit basis, like other civil-service positions. The plan has the indorsement of President Truman, Postmaster General Donaldson, and numerous postal organizations. No serious opposition to the bill has been openly expressed. Yet, without explanation, the Senate committee has decided to defer action on the bill indefinitely. This is a high-handed procedure which will deny the Senate the right it has of passing on this important reorganization measure during the current session. The Senate will be dealing the postal-reform movement a crushing blow if it allows the postmastership bill to expire in a committee pigeonhole.

A Bill To Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted to me to extend my remarks, I want to insert an editorial from the Boston Globe of March 31, which offers excellent advice to the President. It clearly demonstrates that this influential newspaper recognizes the inevitable consequences of enacting this bill into law. We in New England, as well as in the Northeast, will be receiving natural gas in the not too distant future. I would like to emphasize one sentence which cannot be disputed:

The economic future of this region, already afflicted because of recessive trends in industrial activity, is directly involved.

A BILL TO VETO

A severe blow at New England's hopes for cheaper fuel and power supplies has been dealt by passage in the Senate of the Kerr bill, exempting so-called independent producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission. Only one New England Senator, STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, joined the supporters of this highly dubious piece of legislation.

This bill, and a similar one already passed in the House, now go to conference, and thence to the President for his approval or veto. It is to be hoped that Mr. Truman will disapprove of the legislation. Unless he does, nothing will stand between the interests of the consumers, not only in New England, but in other large areas in the Nation, and soaring costs for natural gas. Under the provisions of this bill, the so-called independents will be free to charge all the traffic will bear. Thirty-five of these companies, it was brought out in the Senate debate, are already paying between 20 and 47 percent of their stock. The estimated bill to the consuming public, according to Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, will soar by between $300,000,000 and $500,000,000 a year. The only curb on price rises would be the sense of self-restraint felt by the producers—a safeguard hitherto found wanting wherever tried.

New England should see to it that the President is thoroughly informed as to the seriousness with which such a prospect is viewed hereabouts. The economic future of this region, already afflicted because of recessive trends in industrial activity, is directly involved. With it are involved the pocketbooks of millions of homemakers.

The Views of the First Iowa District, February 13 to March 31, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, with the approach of the 1950 campaign, I believe it is most important to all men in public life to know the views of the people regarding leading issues now before Congress. In order to secure first-hand and accurate information I planned a comprehensive survey of my district soon after this session of Congress started.

When President Truman presented his state of the Union address, his economic report, and his tax message to Congress, I drew up a list of 27 questions to submit to the people of my district and this questionnaire was mailed by me on February 11. I wrote no letter to accompany the questionnaire except the statement printed on the questionnaire itself. The following describes the list of names to whom the questionnaire was mailed.

Throughout my entire service in Congress I have periodically mailed out farmers' bulletin lists to all box holders on rural routes and star routes and in those post offices not having city delivery. We have kept a file of all requests for farm bulletins, and we used this list of the past 3 years together with all requests for agricultural yearbooks for the past 3 years. In other words, every such box holder had the same opportunity to request bulletins, and in doing so his name automatically was placed on our list. To this list was added an equal number of city and town residents because the population of the First Congressional District is almost equally divided between city and rural. We used the city directories of all cities that had recently published directories, and we used the telephone directories in those cities that did not have recently published directories. We took the name of every fifth householder or telephone subscriber.

Throughout my service in Congress we have followed the practice of sending baby books to the parents of all babies whose births are announced in the newspapers of the First District. We added the names of these parents to whom infant-care books had been sent over the past 3 years.

Altogether these lists totaled approximately 25,000 names. No other names were added and none of these names were deleted. After delivery of the questionnaires in the district, we received special requests for approximately 200 questionnaires and we mailed out these additional questionnaires when requested.

The post offices returned approximately 1,000 questionnaires that could not be delivered to the addressees. In response to the 24,000 questionnaires delivered, we received a total of 4,221 replies, or a return of approximately 17½ percent. This return was exceptionally gratifying, in view of Dr. George Gallup's estimate of half that number of replies. We received more than 1,000 letters with the questionnaires that were filled out and returned to us, and the discussions in these letters were very interesting and informative.

The replies were rather evenly spread throughout the last 2 weeks of February and the month of March and in my opinion they reflect rather accurately the thinking of the people of the First Congressional District for the period February 15 to March 31.

My office force made subtotals of the returns periodically over the period that the replies were coming in. The first subtotal was made after the count of the first 175 replies. The next one came at about 900 replies and thereafter subtotals were taken at about 1,500, 1,800, 2,300, 3,000, 3,600, 3,900, 4,100, and the final tabulation at 4,221. The amazing thing to me is that the percentage of "yes" and "no" replies on each of the 27 questions never varied much from the very first tabulation to the last and the percentages on the final tally sheet are very close to the percentages on each of the tally sheets from the very beginning. From this I believe the opinions throughout my district on these questions during the period covered by the poll are very consistent and dependable.

I am enclosing a tabulation of the replies which I believe will be of interest:

Questionnaire

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act?	1,561	2,959
2. Do you favor socialized medicine?	575	3,400
3. Do you favor Federal aid to education?	2,488	1,444
4. Do you favor extending social security to people not now covered?	2,436	1,384
5. Do you favor increasing the social-security benefits?	1,963	1,858
6. Do you favor higher social-security taxes if they are necessary to make social-security insurance a sound insurance program?	2,518	1,210
7. Do you favor continuation of rent control?	1,621	2,249
8. Do you favor extending the system of drafting men for military service in peacetime?	1,743	2,210
9. Do you favor enacting a draft law to be held available only for use in emergency?	2,647	1,050
10. Should Marshall plan aid be continued?	2,135	1,401
11. Should Marshall plan aid be reduced?	[illegible]	[illegible]
12. Should arms aid to foreign countries be continued?	1,432	2,199
13. Should excise taxes be reduced?	[illegible]	943
14. Do you favor increasing corporate-income taxes?	1,727	1,979
15. Do you favor increasing personal-income taxes?	[illegible]	[illegible]
16. Are you in favor of the Brannan plan for agriculture?	[illegible]	2,755
17. Should the civil rights program be adopted?	[illegible]	1,166
18. Do you favor cutting down Federal spending?	4,015	[illegible]
If so, on which of the following items:		
(a) Veterans' benefits?	1,575	564
(b) National defense?	[illegible]	[illegible]
(c) Foreign aid to civilians?	[illegible]	304
(d) Foreign arms aid?	2,457	257
(e) Farm subsidies?	[illegible]	182
(f) Social welfare, health and social security?	1,337	[illegible]
(g) Federal housing?	[illegible]	[illegible]
(h) Dams, airports, roads, Federal buildings and other public works?	1,617	[illegible]
(i) General expense of government?	[illegible]	[illegible]

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "I Have Found Freedom," published in the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram of November 26, 1949, an article entitled "German Refugees Are Glad They Are Far From Munich," published in the Fall River (Mass.) Herald-News, of June 10, 1949, and an editorial entitled "Displaced Persons," published in the North Adams (Mass.) Transcript, of May 25, 1949.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Holyoke, (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram of November 26, 1949]

"I HAVE FOUND FREEDOM," A DISPLACED PERSON HERE SAYS

Edward Swiecicki, a native of Poland, came to America 2 months ago. He came from 4 years in a Displaced Persons camp and from 6 years of slave labor in Nazi Germany.

Today, after almost a decade of hardship and misery he is a free man working for his living in a Holyoke grocery market, and residing in Easthampton. "I like America. It is a beautiful country," he says, gesturing with his arms, "The Polish people like their freedom and you know how conditions are in Poland today. There is no freedom. I have found freedom here. I am satisfied."

Eddie, as he is called by his friends, has a job with Stanley Wielgosz who operates a grocery and meat market on Lyman St. He calls himself an "all-around helper" at the store, stocking shelves, selling a little and doing various jobs. Mr. Wielgosz says he is a good worker.

Swiecicki was in the Polish army in Warsaw when the German blitzkrieg hit his country in September, 1939. He fought in the siege of Warsaw from September 6 to September 28. He remembers the dates exactly.

The Nazis threw him into a slave-labor camp near Hamburg, Germany. There he worked rebuilding railroads destroyed by Allied bombings. He shoveled coal, loaded freight, laid track and hauled cement and stone. Swiecicki got up from his chair and demonstrated how the prisoners drove the spikes into the rails, raising the heavy sledge hammer way above the head and bringing it down on the spike.

Swiecicki is 40 years old, blue-eyed, tall and muscular. He has a workman's hands, broad-palmed and calloused. He says of the slave labor: "It was so hard that I don't like to remember. I consider it hell. It would take a long time to tell what we suffered."

After the railroad labor he did such tasks as mason work, and setting up telegraph poles in wartime Germany. The camp at Hamburg was bombed by the British and the prisoners had to completely rebuild it.

Food at the German prison camps consisted of two meals a day. Tea and two slices of bread for breakfast would be followed by a supper meal of potato or turnip soup.

Swiecicki's prison camp was liberated by British troops. Four years he lived in DP camps in Germany. For 8 months he worked for UNRRA. He was with Polish and French DP's at this period. Later, in a DP camp in Bavaria he worked in a hotel for American occupation troops. He was a kind of treasurer, keeping accounts for the hotel laundry, barber and tailor shops.

He has a cousin living in Easthampton—Anna Saczygiel, of 109 Parsons Street.

He had never seen his cousin but had exchanged letters with her. Polish Catholic Action paid for his passage over to this country. DP's cannot come to the United States unless somebody here can give assurance that the DP will have a home and a job waiting for him.

"It was beautiful to meet for the first time the person who had given me assurance," declared Eddie.

He arrived in New York and called his cousin. She was unable to come down to the city to get him, so he took a train to Springfield, where he met her.

A displaced person coming to the United States is asked to rest for at least 8 days before starting work. Swiecicki waited 2 days, and then went to work on a tobacco farm in Amherst. He says he didn't want to be dependent on his cousin.

Swiecicki was born in the town of Cieszyn in Poland and went to Vienna at the age of 4. His father was a major in the Polish Army and was killed in the Battle of Warsaw in 1939. He wanted his son to be educated in Vienna, and Eddie went to school there until the age of 20, when he returned and went to a commercial school in Warsaw.

Because of his schooling in Vienna, and subsequent years in German prisons, Swiecicki has a strong German accent. He is taking a night-school course 2 nights a week at Holyoke's Lawrence School and enjoys it very much. Once a week he takes private lessons in English from a Smith College student in Northampton. He reads all the books and newspapers he can in order to better himself. He understands the written English fairly well, but still finds difficulty in speaking and understanding spoken English.

His mother still lives in Poland, and he sends her CARE packages regularly.

Ed has his first citizenship papers and hopes to become a citizen in 2 years. He likes life here in the United States and considers himself lucky to be here. He wishes more of his countrymen in the DP camps of Europe might have the same chance that was his.

[From the Fall River (Mass.) Herald News of June 10, 1949]

GERMAN REFUGEES ARE GLAD THEY ARE FAR FROM MUNICH

It's a long way from Munich, Germany, and there are two Germans in this city who are glad of it.

One is a Jewish master goldsmith who could have come to America sooner, but chose to wait until his non-Jewish wife could come too.

It is easier to come to America when you are a victim of fascism, he explained.

He waited because she loved him very much. Erich Ruben knew this, even before his wife, Charlotte, chose the terror of a Nazi concentration camp rather than divorce him, as she was ordered to.

But when the time came to make her choice, she, an Aryan, elected to stay married to a Jew in Nazi Germany and pledged anew her love.

Erich Ruben is a first cousin of Rolph, a local optometrist. They hadn't seen each other for many years, since they were kinder, children of 7 or 8 years of age, until yesterday at Commonwealth Pier, Boston.

But Rolph arranged to have the couple brought to America. How they managed to stay alive during the Nazi inquisition even they do not fully understand.

"We had gentile neighbors, good neighbors," Rolph Ruben translated. "When the Gestapo raided Jewish homes, they warned us. We jumped out of a window. We hid in their homes. The Nazis did not find us."

That is, at first they did not find them. But in January 1943 early in the morning all Jews were placed under arrest, and that included Erich and Charlotte Ruben.

"I am a veteran of the German Army in the First World War," Erich Ruben said in German. There was no pride in his voice.

"The Gestapo showed me favor because of this. But if the war lasted 15 days more I would have died, like my sister and her husband, my brother and his wife, another brother and their families died in the gas chamber."

Mrs. Ruben was ordered to work for a German construction company, breaking rocks on a road gang. Ruben too, was in a work gang but under Gestapo supervision.

The Rubens have a son. He is in England where he was sent at 13 years of age in 1938 by his parents when the political complexion of the New Germany began to show in earnest.

During the war, he worked with the United States Army in England. It was only a few months ago, just on the eve of a big Jewish holiday, when he walked into his parents' new home in Munich. It was the first time this adult son had seen his parents since they sent him away.

Ruben gives assurance he can do a day's work.

"I am a master goldsmith," he said, exhibiting samples of his work executed since his liberation. "I have my special tools. I can still work."

His cousin said the couple will do nothing their first few days in this city while their cousin plays host. Ruben's services have already been spoken for by a Providence manufacturing concern that can use his special skill.

As a kind of memento, the couple brought to America a cigaret lighter that belonged to a big-shot Nazi, and was used as a place of concealment for an ampule of suicide poison.

Another event which will be notable today in their adventure-filled lives is a birthday party.

It will be a party commemorating the birthday anniversaries of Erich, the refugee, and little Eric, the citizen, son of Rolph.

[From the North Adams (Mass.) Transcript of May 25, 1949]

DISPLACED PERSONS

Even though it appears possible that Congress will act at this session to liberalize the Displaced Persons Act, the success or failure of the DP program will still remain largely in the hands of individual Americans.

This is because, even under the liberalized legislation that has been proposed this year, it is still required that every DP be guaranteed both housing and a job before admission to the United States. Upon the number of Americans able and willing to provide such guaranties depends the number of war victims who can be brought to these shores to start life anew and contribute their abilities and productiveness to this country.

We are indebted to the weekly bulletin of the First Congregational Church of Williamstown for the following information on displaced persons, which should certainly be of interest to many people who might be in a position to sponsor DP's but who, through lack of knowledge of the resettlement program, are still hesitant. The material was prepared by Rev. George E. Bellby, Jr., pastor of the Williamstown church.

"DP's are democratic. They are freedom-loving people. The suffering they have endured under totalitarian rule has reinforced their devotion to democratic ideals. They are most thoroughly screened by Government authorities (30 operations) as to their abilities, loyalties, and physical condition before they are granted visas to come to our shores.

"DP's are people with strong family ties. Having lost almost all other ties in the course of the greatest adversity, displaced persons have clung to their most cherished possession, their family life.

"DP's are religious. In their camps they have constructed places of worship and have maintained their own religious leaders and services.

"DP's are physically and mentally healthy.

"DP's are industrious. They come from places where they were accustomed to work hard on the land, in the factories, and in commercial and professional enterprises.

"DP's have become self-sufficient. The 45,000 who have already been resettled in our country have rapidly become independent. A survey by the New York Times found that less than 100 of these persons who are able to work are in need of assistance.

"Today, displaced persons are like normal people anywhere in all ways save one—they have no home.

"There are trained workers in every trade and profession waiting for sponsors. A DP can help you, as well as your help to him."

Complete information on DP's and their sponsorship may be obtained from Church World Service, Displaced Persons Bureau, 214 East Twenty-first Street, New York 10, N. Y.

National and individual self-interest require that Americans in a position to do so help make the promise inherent in the country's DP program an actuality.

Pennsylvania Still Oil State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pennsylvania Still Oil State," published in the Oil City Derrick of March 31. I call the attention of Senators from the 28 States interested in the production of oil to the fact that over 1,000,000,000 barrels of oil have been produced in Pennsylvania, and that more than that amount still remains in the ground.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA STILL OIL STATE

William S. Lytle, a State geologist, says that 50 percent of the Pennsylvania petroleum is still in the ground. Pennsylvania oil is still rated as the best lubricating oil in the world.

Lytle says that oil operators, most of them in western Pennsylvania, are still depending on secondary recovery for the big part of their current output. This involves flooding the underground oil sands with water and using a simple law of physics. About 80 percent of the Pennsylvania oil production is currently being recovered by artificial water flooding.

The geologist says that more than 1,122,584,000 barrels of oil have been produced in Pennsylvania since the birth of the industry a century ago. Lytle says that the future of the Pennsylvania oil industry depends on the wider application of water, air, or gas injection, interdrilling, selective plugging, and the successful field application of laboratory research. The pioneer work being carried on in the secondary recovery of Pennsylvania crude oil is vital to the continuation of the industry in Pennsylvania and to the future oil economy of our Nation.

The Case of Owen Lattimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News:

THE CASE OF OWEN LATTIMORE

If the Senate committee investigating Senator McCARTHY's charges against the State Department wants to find out how the United States was induced to abandon China to the Communists it will have an excellent opportunity to go into that subject when Owen Lattimore is on the stand tomorrow.

Professor Lattimore was one of the far eastern experts upon whom leftists in the State Department relied for advice and propaganda support when they were working to withdraw American support from Chiang Kai-shek.

He first came into the policy picture when President Roosevelt appointed him American adviser to Chiang in 1941. Then during the war he served as Deputy Director of the Office of War Information, in charge of Pacific operations, when the OWI followed a line well to the left of the State Department on China policy.

Mr. Lattimore accompanied Henry Wallace on his mission to China in 1944, when Mr. Wallace returned with the report that we were "backing the wrong horse" in China—meaning that we ought to get behind the Chinese Communists. The State Department's Office of Far Eastern Affairs has followed the Wallace- Lattimore line since that time on all matters relating to China.

Although he has enjoyed back-door privileges at the State Department the past 10 years, Mr. Lattimore, fortunately, hasn't been so successful in selling his ideas with respect to policy elsewhere in Asia or in Europe.

His books reveal that he regards the Truman doctrine in Greece and Turkey damaging to world peace.

The Marshall plan, he held, should have been channeled through the United Nations so that Russia and her satellites might have participated in the program.

In 1945, he urged the establishment of a government in Japan which would be "left of center and at least liberal enough to be friendly with Russia." In 1949 he foresaw "an inevitable demand" that Japan break away from America in order to come to terms with Communist China.

He apparently viewed this as a wholesome development. "By withholding raw iron ore and supplying Japan only with pig iron and other semiprocessed materials, China would have absolute power to cut off the revival of Japanese war industry," he remarked. He did not seem to be alarmed at the prospect that this might leave Japanese industry at the mercy of a satellite of the Soviet Union. Quite the contrary.

In China, he said "wherever the Communists have taken over they have increased food production, controlled distribution, and stabilized prices, successfully breaking the old cycle of recurring shortages and famines." That conclusion, published last year, is subject to modification now that 50,000,000 persons in Red China are confronted by one of the worst famines in the country's history.

Every Senator should read Mr. Lattimore's book the Situation in Asia, published in 1949. In it he found Asia turning to communism because the progress made by the Soviet republics of Asia has inspired awe and wonder. The same people, he inferred, were turning against the United States because they didn't want to be used as cannon fodder.

Uncle Joe couldn't have handled the subject better himself.

Confidential Files—J. Edgar Hoover's Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal-Transcript of March 31, 1950, entitled "The Confidential Files," and an editorial from the Peoria Star of March 31, 1950, entitled "J. Edgar Hoover's Statement":

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal-Transcript of March 31, 1950]

THE CONFIDENTIAL FILES

The Senate and President Truman are locked in a tight struggle over the confidential files of the Loyalty Board, with the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee demanding a look at the secret documents and the President instructing the Loyalty Board to refuse their release.

Issuance of subpenas by the Senate may eventually bring the matter to a decision, although final disposition of the case may take years and come long after the need for a look at the files has ended.

The sanctity of files classified as confidential by the executive department is a matter that has never been settled although it has been a subject for dispute as far back as 1796. In that year President Washington flatly rejected, as an unconstitutional encroachment on presidential prerogatives, a House request for papers on treaty negotiations. Andrew Jackson also resisted requests for a look at confidential papers.

In 1944, Jonathan Daniels, one of the executive assistants of President Roosevelt, refused to testify before a congressional committee on the grounds that he stood in a close confidential relationship to the President. When contempt proceedings were threatened, however, Daniels was ordered by Roosevelt to testify, thereby avoiding the test of congressional power which may come out of the present controversy.

Another test appeared possible in March 1948 when President Truman ordered Federal officials to reject "any subpena or demand" by Congress for the loyalty files. The House passed a resolution subjecting to fine or imprisonment any official who refused to furnish information demanded of him by majority vote of a congressional committee. Court test of the legislation was prevented when the Senate failed to take action on the House resolution.

If President Truman stands firm in the present case and if the Senate follows through on its demand for the files and cites officials refusing to produce them for contempt, the strange spectacle of the Department of Justice, part of the executive branch, prosecuting executive department official may be seen.

Regardless of the outcome of the struggle over the files, Mr. Truman's refusal to let the Senate committee see them puts him once again in the position of defending individuals accused of disloyalty and treason. He has previously been in that same situation, much to his embarrassment, when he

defended Alger Hiss who later was proved guilty, and in his betrayals of the House Un-American Affairs Committee.

If the involved officials of his Government are innocent, it would be to his, as well as to their, advantage that he permit the files to be examined.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Star of March 31, 1950]

J. EDGAR HOOVER'S STATEMENT

We have read with great interest J. Edgar Hoover's statement explaining why FBI files could not be made available to a Senate subcommittee.

His reasons are divided into two main classes. The first may be entitled "security." The second is not so easy to classify.

Mr. Hoover's security reasons appear to be sound. To allow persons outside the FBI to examine FBI files would be to take the chance that such persons might reveal information on FBI methods, undercover personnel, and so on. Mr. Hoover assumes, as we understand it, that while the Department of Justice may be trusted to keep these secrets, members of a Senate subcommittee may not be so trusted.

Perhaps he is justified in this doubt. If so, the next question is, "Why can't the FBI process its material on the individuals in question, omitting data which refers to methods and undercover personnel, and giving nothing but a factual statement of the FBI's findings?"

The answer to that takes us into the second class of reasons why Mr. Hoover says the Senate subcommittee cannot obtain information from the FBI.

"I, for one," said Mr. Hoover, "would want no part of an investigative organization which had the power of discretion to decide what information would be reported and what would be omitted. An item of information which appears unimportant today may provide the solution of a case when considered with information received at a later date, or it may later establish the innocence of the accused."

To us this seems like muddled thinking unworthy of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It seems to say that the time never arrives when the evidence may be weighed. It seems to say that Mr. Hoover considers himself incapable of fairly interpreting the reports turned in by his agents. It seems to say that if a Government official is believed to be spying for another government, evidence of that spying may not be used if it reveals how the FBI got it.

In short, Mr. Hoover seems to say that no information in possession of the FBI may be used to expose a disloyal Government employee unless a Cabinet member, department head, or the President wishes to proceed against the suspect.

This simply means that Communists may remain in the State Department, if they are there, because the reluctance of President Truman and Secretary Acheson to believe that employees of this Department are disloyal is well known. Information about Alger Hiss was kicked around by top Washington officials for years and no move was made to remove him. Yet he was convicted of lying when he denied under oath certain acts which linked him with a confessed Communist spy. It took a committee of Congress to start proceedings against Hiss. And a committee of Congress is the only body qualified to proceed against alleged Communists now in the State Department. President Truman and Secretary Acheson disqualified themselves in the Hiss case. But no committee of Congress, says Mr. Hoover, may have any information from the FBI on suspected Government employees.

This topsy-turvy situation might have been lifted from the pages of Through the Looking Glass. It doesn't make sense. Neither does Mr. Hoover's explanation of it.

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that President Truman wants to keep essential information from the Senate committee. If this were not true, certainly some commonsense way could be found to remove the barrier between information in possession of the FBI and the Senate committee, which is entitled to know the truth.

Mortgages for Cooperative Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "FHA Says It Will Insure Mortgages for Cooperative Housing," published in the Wall Street Journal on March 30, 1950. It has reference to FHA's now insuring mortgages under the provisions of the laws as they now stand.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FHA SAYS IT WILL INSURE MORTGAGES FOR COOPERATIVE HOUSING—WILL GIVE GUARANTIES DESPITE CONGRESS DEFEAT OF BILL TO SET UP AGENCY FOR THAT PURPOSE

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Housing Administration made it clear that it intends to insure mortgages on cooperative housing ventures, despite Congress' refusal to provide special funds for such projects.

President Truman, in his middle-income housing bill, asked that the Treasury be allowed to put up $2,000,000,000 in funds for a Federal association that would back the sale of debentures for cooperative housing projects. This proposal was defeated in both the House and Senate.

FHA Commissioner Richards yesterday said he does not believe that Congress intended to disapprove cooperative ventures as such. He announced that his agency has agreed to insure a mortgage loan of $367,900, held by the National Life Insurance Co., on a project sponsored by the Mile High Housing Association which is composed primarily of faculty members of the Denver University.

This association plans to start building 32 homes involving a total outlay of more than $425,000. This would indicate that the cost per home will be something over $13,280.

FHA also notified the Ardmore Veterans Housing Corp., Ardmore, Okla., that it can get mortgage insurance on a project involving 126 homes built on a cooperative basis. The agency will insure up to $833,600, or about $6,611 per unit.

In still another move, the FHA revealed that it has agreed to insure a mortgage of $2,679,300 on 300 family units in the Bell Park Gardens, New York. This is a veterans' co-op, FHA said, which has completed 800 units, mortgaged by the Bowery Savings Bank of New York to the tune of $7,220,000. Besides insuring the initial construction, FHA has a commitment to cover $5,000,000 for 550 units in this project and the new commitment to insure $2,679,300 on 300 units. Thus the agency might eventually be guaranteeing mortgages totaling $14,901,800 for this one co-op alone.

Washington Post Continues To Oppose Legislation in Realm of Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD the text of an editorial from the Washington Post of Monday, April 3, 1950, in disapproval of the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill, which competently sums up the basis for the opposition to this misconceived legislation:

CLEAN MUNDT BILL

The new version of the Mundt Communist registration bill reported out by the Senate Judiciary Committee has been cleaned up in several particulars. Even after the lavish applications of soap it has had, however, it still entails sweeping and arbitrary invasions of American liberties unwarranted by the acknowledged threat of subversion. Furthermore, it is dangerous on another count. Although its announced purpose is to force the Communists to operate in the open, its probable effect would be quite the opposite.

Like its predecessor, the new Mundt bill would set up a three-man Subversive Activities Control Board with tremendous powers to decide, without any definite criteria, whether groups were Communist political organizations or Communist-front organizations. All such organizations would be required to register with the Attorney General and maintain accurate lists of their membership; in the case of Communist political organizations the names of members would be made public.

The bill would, of course, prohibit members of Communist organizations from holding any Government job. In addition, it would deny use of the mails or radio broadcasting facilities to any registered group unless the material were plainly marked as coming from a Communist source. It would make it illegal for any member of a Communist political organization to apply for or use a passport. Finally, it would make it a crime for anyone knowingly to conspire "or agree with any other person to perform any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship." Curiously enough, under a new provision of the bill, membership in a Communist organization is not to be construed as a violation of this provision.

Many of the objections to this procedure are obvious. A Government board would have well-nigh absolute powers to tell private American citizens what groups they could join without incurable stigma. The criminal provisions are so vague as to open the door to great abuse. What, precisely, is any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment of dictatorship? Could it be, to use a farfetched example, the one-party system in the South? Moreover, as the Department of Justice has pointed out in a letter to Chairman Woon of the House Un-American Activities Committee:

"A world of difference exists, from the standpoint of sound policy and constitutional validity, between making, as the bill would, membership in an organization designated by the Attorney General a felony, and recognizing such membership, as does the employee loyalty program under Executive Order 9835, as merely one piece of evidence pointing to possible disloyalty. The bill would brand the member of a listed organization a felon, no matter how innocent his membership; the loyalty program enables the member to respond to charges against him and to show, in a manner consistent with American concepts of justice and fairness, that his membership is innocent and does not reflect upon his loyalty."

Although the bill goes to great lengths to avoid the formal outlawing of the Communist Party, for practical purposes it would accomplish just that. It would make membership in Communist organizations without registration a crime. This is not the traditional American approach, which requires the commission of an overt act of subversion before a person can be adjudged guilty of subversion. It is reminiscent of the thought control which used to arouse such mirth among Americans when it was introduced in prewar Japan.

In another category the Mundt bill is of dubious constitutionality. If the conviction of the 11 Communists under the Smith Act, which makes it a crime to advocate the overthrow of the Goverment by force or violence, is upheld in the forthcoming court test, then membership in the Communist Party will per se be evidence of such advocacy. In that case registration under the Mundt bill would amount to compulsory self-incrimination.

If the Mundt bill actually would accomplish the purpose of forcing the Communists into the open and protecting the integrity of the Government, that would be one thing; but should anyone in this day and age be deluded that the really dangerous Communists are those who go by that name and hold party cards? Surely the Kremlin's master minds are persons who shun party meetings and even are known as anti-Communists. The restrictive features of the Mundt bill would only serve to push beneath the surface the visible portion of the Communist Party, which, like an iceberg, is six-sevenths submerged anyhow. In this it would make inordinately more difficult the work of the FBI.

Change in Method of Electing President and Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Blanchard Randall giving some observations and comments on the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to change the method of electing the President and Vice President. I have submitted the article to the Government Printing Office for an estimate of the cost of printing it in the RECORD, and have received an estimate that the manuscript will make four pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $328.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES TO CHANGE THE METHOD OF ELECTING A PRESIDENT AND A VICE PRESIDENT

(By Blanchard Randall)

On February 1, 1950, the United States Senate passed a joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States in respect of the election of a President and a Vice President. The resolution goes now to the House of Representatives, and if approved there, will be sent to the several States for ratification or disapproval. If approved by the legislatures of 36 States, three-quarters of the total, in the 7 years after House approval, the proposal will become an amendment to our Constitution.

The present system of choosing a President and a Vice President, as determined by the Constitution and by the twelfth amendment, which was ratified in 1804, and amplified by the twentieth amendment, ratified in 1933, differs from the proposed, new method chiefly in the following respects: (a) Presidential electors, as persons, and the electoral college, are done away with; although the electoral votes of each State are retained. That is each State will have one electoral vote for each Congressman and each Senator to which the State is entitled as in the past, but electors will never be named, and of course, will never meet. (b) Under the present system, the winning presidential candidate by popular vote in each State receives the entire electoral vote of that State no matter how large or how small may be his plurality over other opponents; under the proposed amendment, the electoral vote of each State would be prorated, or divided among all presidential candidates in proportion to the popular votes each received in that State. (c) Under the present law, a candidate to be elected must get a clear majority of all the electoral votes (at present, a winning candidate must get at least 266 of the 531 electoral votes). Under the proposed amendment, the candidate with the largest number of electoral votes would be the winner, so long as his total is at least 40 percent of the whole electoral vote. (d) Under the present law, if no candidate receives a majority of the electoral vote, the election is thrown into the House of Representatives, and from the persons, not exceeding three, having the highest numbers on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose a President; in their voting the Congressmen from each State act as a unit with one vote; if a State's delegation is split, the majority determines for whom the one vote shall be cast. Under the proposed amendment, the election is thrown into the Congress if no candidate receives as many as 40 percent of the electoral votes, and from the two highest candidates the Congressmen and Senators voting as individuals choose a President. It is noteworthy, here in passing, that the proposed amendment is not precise or clear as to what would happen if two candidates should be tied in their electoral votes and both have more than 40 percent.

The declared purpose of this proposed amendment is to clarify and simplify the process of electing Chief Executives. The present system is not—it is said by proponents of the change—easily understood; and in particular it can result in the election of a man who is not the winner of the greatest number of actual votes, although he should receive a majority of electoral votes. There is danger of an election being thrown into the House of Representatives under the present system, and the proponents of change claim there is no essential virtue in having the election decided by Representatives voting as State units with one vote per State. The claim is made that when the entire electoral vote of a State is credited to the winner by popular vote in that State, no matter how large or small in his plurality, an injustice is done to voters which might result in thwarting the wish of the majority of voters taking the country as a whole; and it is also claimed that the present system is unfair to candidates.

There is much to agree with in many of the points raised by the proponents of this change. But there is also much to be said for the present, time-honored system. There is room for doubt that the proposed changes cure the evils against which they are directed, and there is room to question whether the proposed changes do not accentuate certain weaknesses of the present method and in fact create new and greater weaknesses than are contained in the present procedure.

To estimate properly how this new law would work in the future let us test it against the facts of previous elections and against some of the probabilities we may encounter in future elections. Let us also look back into our history to see whether the present method, with all its alleged draw-backs, has been unfair to candidates or damaging to the country.

At this point the writer wishes to state that the basic data used in analyzing each election was taken from the various issues of the World Almanac between 1896 and 1950, and that he has tried to exercise care and diligence in working up the results he submits. He has little doubt, however, that another mathematician or another historian might find other conclusions than some of his: in fact the proposed amendment itself says in one place that when a candidate would receive less than one one-thousandths part of one electoral vote in any State, this shall be disregarded. Unfortunately the proposed amendment does not say explicitly how one should treat the popular vote of the candidate whose infinitesimal electoral vote is to be so disregarded; nor does the law say to how many decimal points the division of electoral votes shall be carried; nor decree how the calculation is to be made or by whom audited. Perhaps the way is left open for the International Business Machines Corp., or some other company which deals in mechanical wizardy, to overcome man's shortcomings in being able to determine what it is man has tried to do. In any event, the present writer spent hours in calculating and checking the data he now gives you, imperfect though it may be.

Had the proposed amendment been in effect fifty-odd years ago, the place occupied by Mr. William Jennings Bryan in American history would have been very different. Mr. Bryan would have been elected President in 1896 by about 4¼ electoral votes over President McKinley and several minor candidates, although Bryan was given but 46.7 percent of the popular votes and McKinley received more than 51 percent of all votes cast. The minor candidates who in total got about 315,000 popular votes, and no electoral votes, historically, would have been credited under the amendment with over 10½ electoral votes. The 7,100,000 voters who favored McKinley would have been merely a disappointed majority.

Again, in 1900, history tells us President McKinley was reelected over William Jennings Bryan. McKinley received nearly seven and one-quarter million popular votes and 292 electoral votes against Bryan's six and one-third million popular and 155 electoral votes. However, had the proposed amendment been at work, the thrice-defeated Mr. Bryan would actually have been elected again, this time by about one-third of 1 electoral vote, despite the fact that Bryan carried only 17 of the then 45 States and despite the fact that about 8 voters out of every 15 said they wanted McKinley.

In 1908 William Howard Taft was elected President. His opponents were the ubiquitous Messrs. Bryan, Democrat; Debs, Socialist; and quite a few minor candidates. President Taft got over seven and five-eighths million votes, more than 51½ percent of all votes cast, while Bryan was given slightly over 43 percent, Debs slightly under 3 percent, and all other candidates scattered about 2½ percent of the popular votes. History credits President Taft with 321 electoral votes, Bryan with 162. But under the proposed amendment Bryan would have come close, a third time, to accomplishing in theory what he never found possible in fact: He would have lost in 1908, but by only a nose in a photo finish. This writer's figures—under the proposed amendment—give Taft 229.476 electoral votes; Bryan 228.288; Debs 12.464; all other candidates 12.772.

In 1920 the country went Republican by a landslide; President Harding was elected with over 16,000,000 popular and 404 electoral votes to Governor Cox's slightly over 9,000,000 popular and 127 electoral votes. There were also several other candidates, including Mr. Debs, who are credited with a total of about one and three-eighths million popular votes and no electoral votes. But had the new amendment been in effect, President Harding would have had 103½ of his electoral votes taken from him, leaving him a surplus of but 29⅔ votes in excess of the 266 necessary to win: Cox would have been donated 80¾ of Harding's electoral votes and a galaxy of minor candidates would have been given over 27½ of the Republican's electoral votes. Stated another way: Harding, who was the choice of about 61 voters out of every 100 throughout the country, would have been in doubt for some time, while calculators worked feverishly, as to whether he would have enough electoral votes; and would have had to be content with a little over 55 percent of the whole electoral vote although he got about 61 percent of the popular vote. In fact, from causes to be touched on in a moment, it is quite evident that under the new amendment, unless a great many States unexpectedly change their populations and voting habits, Republican candidates must expect to suffer great reduction in their electoral votes as compared to popular votes, and can look forward to winning only when at least minor political landslides favor them in the length and breadth of the land.

In 1924 President Calvin Coolidge was reelected. He received over 55 percent of all popular votes cast. Mr. Davis, Democrat, was given about 29 percent of the popular votes and Senator Robert La Follette, Sr., was given about 16 percent. President Coolidge had 382 electoral votes, Davis 136, and La Follette 13. So much for history. Under the proposed amendment however—and without any change in the popular vote or popular wish so definitely stated by the whole country's voters—President Coolidge would have had to be content with election by a mere 49¼ percent of the electoral votes, because more than 57 of his historical votes would have been given to Mr. Davis, whose 29 percent of popular vote becomes 36 percent of the electoral vote; and because likewise more than 63 of the Coolidge votes would have been given La Follette to swell his total up to over 76 electoral votes.

The only reason why this election in 1924, that of 1908, and that of 1896, would not have ended in the Congress under the new proposed amendment, since in each case an contender would have received 50 percent of the whole electoral vote, is that the authors of the proposed constitutional amendment at the last minute accepted an amendment to their joint resolution which reduced from less than 50 percent to less than 40 percent the point at which an election has to be referred to the Senate and House for solution.

One more case history. In 1929 President Hoover was elected by an overwhelming popular vote; he was given nearly twenty-one and one-half million while Governor Smith polled slightly over 15,000,000. Minor candidates were given a total of less than 1 percent of all votes, that is, only slightly more than one-third of 1,000,000. President Hoover carried 40 States for a total of 444 electoral votes; he lost only Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Rhode Island and South Carolina to Governor Smith with a total of 37 electoral votes. Had the proposed amendment been in effect—eliminating this time the various minor candidates from our calculations—148.52 of Hoover's votes would have been diverted to Governor Smith, swelling the Governor's total to 235.52 and Hoover, like Harding in a similar landslide would have pulled through with less than 30 votes above the 50-percent mark. Hoover's 58¼ percent of popular vote would be represented by less than 55½ percent of electoral votes: Smith's 40¾ percent of popular vote would be represented by over 44½ percent of the electoral votes.

The question may readily be asked: Why are only Republican victories cited as case histories, with unpleasant or dire results to the Republican candidates if the proposed amendment had been in effect? Why are not cases of Democratic victory similarly cited? The answer is comparatively simple: The solid South; where with few exceptions there has really been single-party rule for the past three generations. In these States the Democratic Party wins, not only with regularity, but with overwhelming votes; the proportion of Democratic votes to all other votes generally being no lower than 3 to 2, and frequently being better than 10 to 1; that is 10 Democratic votes to 1 for all other candidates. Accordingly when the electoral vote is divided in proportion to the popular vote in each State, there are several States where the Democratic Party will receive from 60 percent to 95 percent of the electoral vote. In the remaining States of the Union, in average years, however, the opposing or Republican Party is the favorite in but few States by so large a percentage as 60 percent of the entire vote. As a result—if there is a general swing toward the Democratic Party these one-party Solid South States merely add to the pluralities of the Democrat and make them larger. When there is a Republican swing these one-party Solid South States detract from the Republican's victory in electoral vote even under the present system to a comparatively small extent; but under the new amendment, as indicated in previous paragraphs, this detraction can become a major factor in confusing the outcome or even for reversing a large majority of actual voters.

Two factors must be kept in mind for any mathematical analysis of the proposed amendment. One is that there is a great discrepancy between the number of people voting in the different States compared to the electoral votes of the States. For instance, South Carolina, Maryland, and Kansas have approximately similar-sized populations: each State has eight electoral votes; in an average election, however, South Carolina casts a total of around 96,000 votes or say 12,000 for each electoral vote; Maryland a total of around 600,000 or 75,000 for each electoral vote; and Kansas casts some 760,000 votes or 95,000 for each electoral vote.

The other factor relates to the smaller populated States which have but one or two Congressmen, but because of their two Senators, are entitled to 3 or 4 electoral votes respectively. Nevada, for instance, has a population of around 150,000 and 3 electoral votes, or 1 electoral vote for each 50,000 of population. Montana has a population of about 500,000 and 4 electoral votes, or 1 electoral vote for each 125,000 people. On the other hand a State like New York with 45 Congressmen and 2 Senators has 47 electoral votes for a population of around 14,500,000 or one electoral vote for each 310,000 population. Altogether the 48 States contain many wide differences in these fundamental factors of population, representatives, and voting strength.

Then there is the great difference between States in what might be called voting habits. For instance, in 1948, taking the country as a whole, the average popular vote for each electoral vote was about 91,500; but at one end of the list of States there were: South Carolina, Alabama, Nevada, Mississippi, Arkansas, Wyoming, Georgia, Virginia, Vermont, Louisiana, Tennessee, Delaware, New Mexico, Arizona, and Texas with less than 50,000 popular votes for 1 electoral vote. These 15 States had together 125 electoral votes and 4,623,000 total popular votes for an average of 37,000 popular votes for 1 electoral vote. Incidentally the votes of these States were much larger in 1948 than was usual because of the interest in the States' Rights Democratic ticket which obtained about 995,000 or 90 percent of its total vote in these States. But even with the States' Rights Democrat defection of nearly 1,000,000 voters the Democratic ticket polled more than 50 percent of the total votes cast in these States: That is, Democratic 50.4 percent, States' Rights Democrat 23 percent, Republican 26 percent, and all other candidates about one-half of 1 percent.

The next lowest group of States in votes per electoral vote in 1948 were Idaho, Maine, Montana, North Dakota, North Carolina, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Utah, Oklahoma, Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, Rhode Island, Nebraska, Oregon, and Colorado. In each of these 16 States, while there was a much heavier vote for the average elector than in the first group, there was no vote as high as the 91,500 average of the country. In these States 102 electoral votes were cast for a popular vote in 1948 of 7,017,500 votes, or 68,200 average; Democrat 52 percent, Republican 44 percent, States' Rights Democrat 2.4 percent, Wallace 1.2 percent.

The upper middle group of States includes: West Virginia, Kansas, Iowa, Wisconsin, Michigan, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Washington, Connecticut, and Minnesota. These 10 States have a total of 126 electoral votes and they voted from 93,000 to 109,000 per electoral vote in each State. The total votes were Democrat 7,158,200, Republican 6,672,200, States' Rights Democrats about 100 votes, and Wallace 215,000 votes; about 50.9 percent Democrat, 47.5 percent Republican, and 1½ percent Wallace.

The highest group of States when considering popular votes for each electoral vote in 1948 were: Ohio, New Jersey, Indiana, New York, Massachusetts, Illinois, and California with a total of 170 electoral votes. Nearly half of all the popular votes of the entire country cast in 1948 were cast by these 7 States, the total for them being 22,660,000 votes. In the average more than 133,000 votes were cast by States in this group for 1 electoral vote. Here the Democrats received 10,997,300, 48½ percent; Republicans 41 percent; Wallace 3½ percent; and States' Rights Democrats nothing.

One mathematical fallacy in the proposed amendment becomes apparent when these differences between States are considered.

This proposed procedure is rather like the old gag that if you take one-half of one rabbit and one-half of one horse, mix and cook, you can claim that the product is one-half horse and one-half rabbit stew.

If electoral votes are to be distributed in each State in proportion to the popular vote given each candidate, then the candidate's electoral vote becomes merely an arbitrary factor (the State's total electoral vote) multiplied by a percentage; and the addition of these percentage factors in all the 48 States cannot be a reliable guide to the true percentage of each candidate's vote in the whole country.

The addition of these percentage factors would give a true percentage of the whole only when the number of popular votes cast for each electoral vote is identical in each State. That is, if in every State some 91,500 popular votes were recorded for each electoral vote, then and then only would the division of electoral votes among the candidates in each State according to the popular vote each received, give percentage factors which could be added to the similarly obtained percentage factors of the other 47 States and result in sums which would mathematically represent each candidate's total vote.

It was stated earlier that unless the population of States were to alter radically or the voting habits of the different States alter radically, Republican candidates could carry the country only with the aid of minor landslides. Under normal condition, Republican candidates for President would need over 55 percent of the popular vote under the proposed amendment in order to obtain 50 percent of the electoral votes; otherwise a Democratic President would be inaugurated despite the fact that, in this example, from three to five million more voters would have voted for the Republican than voted for the acclaimed winner. Can anything be better calculated to disturb the average citizen's belief in the sanctity of his ballot than to have the popular choice fail of election not because the other got more votes—not because of fraud in any election precinct—or other chicanery, which we are eternally trying to cure and prevent—but by a mathematically imperfect law, presumably well considered and put forward with the backing of Congress?

But this is perhaps not its only fault and shortcoming. A close election today frequently calls for recounts of the vote in some States. Suppose to this difficulty were added the question of correct division of votes among candidates into minute fractional parts of electoral votes. Think of the pressures which would naturally be exerted here and there, to gain one one-hundredth part of an electoral vote or even one one-thousandth part. Think, especially, of the lack of public faith and the amount of recrimination and argument which will necessarily flow in any close election and the delay in finally determining the winner to the highest post in the Nation. Think even a little further. The more candidates there would be in any election the more chance to disperse among them the electoral votes of each State. The law works for this end, provided each candidate gets at least one one-thousandth part of one electoral vote, and in South Carolina, that means getting only 13 votes in the entire State, in an average election; in California you qualify for one one-thousandth part of an electoral vote if you get 162 popular votes in an average election in the entire State. Will not the really smart campaign manager for candidate A try his utmost to get as many candidates as possible filed in each State who would be friendly to his candidate, under cover, in the hope each of these splinters would detract something from his main opponent, candidate B? Is this not an invitation on the other hand to every little candidate with perhaps some local repute to file for President of the United States, whether he has any kind of capacity, or political backing, or none, merely to gain as much personal publicity as possible and with the real assurance he will get at least a minor fraction of one electoral vote, some Nation-wide publicity for notoriety) and a great tale to tell his grandchildren.

Is not this the best way to break down our chief bulwark as a Republic? Heretofore we have determined that so far as we are able, we would use a method as fair as possible to all States and localities, but especially to give us a Government by a clear-cut majority. Because of the division of electoral votes among all candidates, whereas now electoral votes go only to those candidates who can carry one or more States, is not this proposal one which will inevitably lead to so many parties being represented, that no one party has a majority, and as a result we must have coalition or compromise Government? The lesson of a great Republic—France over the past 80 years should be example enough of the dangers which are inherent in this splitting up and splintering of political parties.

Look back into our history for a brief moment. For 160 years the present system has been in effect. It is true that the original concept of having electors chosen in each State and then meeting, as an electoral college to personally choose a President, has been followed by all electors only in the original choice of George Washington. It is true that since the second election, and increasingly through the years, electors were chosen, pledged to a given candidate, and that latterly their instructions have become so clear that the voting by electors has become perfunctory. It is true that electors have never—but once—been completely free to follow their own dictates, but have voted for a certain man in accord with the instruction given them by the popular votes of their States. But have we not all become quite used to this procedure, and have we not actually legalized this procedure by the amendments heretofore added to the Constitution and fortified this procedure through our various State election laws?

Has this time honored procedure we have followed for more than a century and a half worked harm on our country or has it worked unfair handicap on any presidential candidate? Look back through the records: On one occasion one candidate, Mr. Tilden appears to have received about one-quarter million votes more than did his opponent—President Hayes. But while looking at that incident recall the condition of a large part of the country, where reconstruction had just ended, and where rights of franchise and election laws were quite chaotic; where feeling naturally ran high. Recall, also, that this election did not have to be thrown into the House of Representatives, but was settled by the verdict of a special commission. Recall also that the public accepted the outcome unquestioningly. In every other election but one, 1888, since we have had two dominant political parties, the time-honored system put the stamp of authority on the man who received the largest popular vote. Only in 1888 and when there was unusual third party strength—Greenback in 1892 and Bull Moose in 1912 did the winner, by our present system, fail to obtain a majority of all votes cast.

One other great advantage we have enjoyed is allied to the present time-honored system of giving to the winning candidate in each State the total electoral vote of the State. It is the almost unbroken rule that a newly elected president is of the same party as the one in control of Congress. The reason this occurs is due largely to the fact that the prestige and the campaign of a winning presidential candidate carries along with him the candidates for Congress and the Senate who belong to his party and aid their election in those States which favor the head of the ticket. If the President carries enough States with enough electoral votes to elect himself, under the present system, history has shown that his party also elects in those States enough Congressmen and Senators so that his party controls Congress. His new administration is thus enabled to get the legislation from Congress to put his policies into effect. Nothing is more futile than a President who does not have his party in control of Congress. The proposed amendment will tend to increase the number of cases when this dilemma will occur.

As already stated, the new amendment greatly increases the danger of a minority of voters electing the President; here is an added danger—the administration and Congress belonging to different political parties and pursuing divergent policies. The inevitable result must be coalition and compromise; too often, futility.

We have discussed several past elections. What could be expected in a future election. Here is table A showing 17 States which have a strong natural tendency to go Democratic. The first 6 have always in modern history clung to that party, 4 have failed but once to vote Democrat; 2 but twice, and the last 5 have voted at least two-thirds of the past 12 presidential elections in the Democrat column. In 1944 these States voted as shown in table A and all 163 electoral votes were of course, won for the Democratic candidate. Under the proposed amendment the votes would have been split, and eliminating all but the two major parties from calculations, the result would have given the Democratic candidate about 117.4 votes, the Republican candidate 45.6 votes.

This looks like a clear gain for the GOP. But what would the Republican Party have had to give up in the balance of the country in return for these 45.6 votes, if the new rule were applied?

Let us assume, since this is an estimate of what might happen in a future election, that all the other 31 States went Republican; let us assume also that the division of votes between the two major parties favored the Republican side by the best showing that party has made in each State in the past 30 years; that there were no minor candidates, and that the total votes in each State was equal to 1944. Look now at table B showing these 31 States, their electoral votes, the approximate total vote cast in 1944, and the division of electoral votes in proportion to the best showing made by the Republican Party in each State since 1920. This would give the Republicans 223.80 electoral votes; the Democrats would get 144.20 electoral votes. Add these to the figures of divided electoral votes in table A, and the total for the country is Republican 269.4, Democrat 261.6 electoral votes. The Republicans win by 3.9 votes over 50 percent.

But now look at the last two columns of table B, which shows how the 1944 popular vote would have to be divided between these two major parties in order to bring about this eyelash victory for the GOP. Look at the figures: Compared to Republican showings in recent presidential elections, they seem fantastic. They represent the best results the GOP obtained in each of these 31 States in this generation. In total nearly 25,000,000 people had to vote Republican in these States, against slightly more than 16,000,000 voting Democrat, in order to equalize the Democratic lead obtained by less than 6,750,000 total votes shown for the 17 States in table A. This is the cost of the 45-plus electoral votes the GOP gained by the new amendment in those generally Democratic States.

These two tables, looked at together, give the reason why the Republicans will need a landslide, or at least a near landslide, to bring about the election of their candidates under the proposed amendment.

This narrow margin in practice would be altered by whatever votes went to the minor

candidates. It would be easy to foresee times when the Democratic candidate might squeeze through and win by electoral votes, although his Republican opponent might actually receive a plurality measured by several million votes.

Think of one more set of simple figures. South Carolina generally rolls about 90,000 for the Democrat, and around 5,000 for the Republican. The Democrats carry the State by about 85,000 and under the new amendment would get about 7½ electoral votes while the GOP would get about one-half of 1 electoral vote. Now look at New York with nearly 6,500,000 votes, and suppose the Republicans carry New York by 85,000 votes, just as the Democrats carry South Carolina by 85,000 votes. The new amendment would give the Republicans about 23¾ electoral votes in New York to 23¼ electoral votes for the Democrats. In other words, in New York the GOP wins a net of one-half an electoral vote for 85,000 plurality while in South Carolina the Democrats win a net of seven electoral votes for the same plurality of popular votes. If the new amendment is in effect, that is the same as saying that I vote in South Carolina is worth 14 votes in New York. This may be very gratifying to the man in South Carolina or in any similarly situated State where his vote is small in comparison to the electoral vote, but how well does such a theory of discounting votes appeal to the man in New York or Pennsylvania or Ohio or California or Iowa or Kansas or Illinois, or any State where there is a large population and a large turn-out of voters on election day and where the vote is heavy for each electoral vote?

There is now pending another constitutional amendment to limit the length of time a man may serve as President. It is the twenty-second amendment and was started on its journey by Congress in 1947. Up to July 1949 it had been ratified by 21 of the needed 36 States. If for no other reason, the proposed amendment, which is the subject of this article, should be delayed until final action has been taken on the twenty-second amendment, so that the people of the country need not be confused by having two proposals before them at once, effecting both the tenure and the method of electing a President.

But there are other good reasons also for urging the House of Representatives to vote down the proposed amendment relating to the method of electing a President.

The proposal is not a simplification of the present process. In fact it appears to complicate rather than simplify.

The proposal will not eliminate the chance of electing as President some candidate who gets fewer votes than a competitor; it makes the danger greater.

The proposal is based on bad mathematics and will be difficult to administer and will not appear convincing to the public.

The proposal will complicate elections and offers easy cover for election maneuvering, for possible chicanery, and double dealings.

The proposal invites splinter parties and many candidates, thus confusing issues and tending to hamstring national policy.

The proposal will tend to break down our greatest strength of two-party government.

The proposal will tend to bring the ballot into disrepute, because of the great chance of nullifying the electorate's expressed wishes in popular ballots and naming as President and Vice President those who have but a minority of votes.

The proposal should be defeated in Congress, now; and the whole question of clarifying elections carefully studied in detail from all points of view, with lengthy public hearings and discussions, before we attempt to draft new rules on this important question to take the place of those rules which have served us well throughout the years.

TABLE A.—*Pro forma votes*

[April 1944, actual in usually Democratic States]

State	Electoral vote	Approximate vote cast in 1944 for 2 leading parties		Division of electoral vote, proportionately between 2 leading candidates; (figured to nearest 1/10 of a vote) under proposed amendment	
		Democrat	Republican	Democrat	Republican
Alabama	11	198,900	44,500	9	2
Arkansas	9	149,000	63,600	6.3	2.7
Georgia	12	268,200	56,500	9.9	2.1
Louisiana	10	281,600	67,800	8.05	1.95
Mississippi	9	158,500	3,700	8.8	.2
South Carolina	8	90,600	4,500	7.6	.4
Florida	8	339,400	143,200	5.65	2.35
North Carolina	14	527,400	263,100	9.35	4.65
Texas	23	821,600	191,400	18.65	4.35
Virginia	11	242,300	145,200	6.9	4.1
Kentucky	11	472,600	392,400	6	5
Tennessee	12	398,700	200,300	7.3	4.7
Arizona	4	80,900	56,200	2.35	1.65
Montana	4	112,600	93,200	2.2	1.8
Nevada	3	29,600	24,600	1.65	1.35
New Mexico	4	81,400	70,700	2.15	1.85
Oklahoma	10	401,500	319,400	5.55	4.45
Total	163	4,564,800	2,140,400	117.4	45.6

NOTE.—A straight over-all percentage would be: Democrat, 110.97; Republican, 52.03.

ADDITION OF TABLE A AND TABLE B

	State	Electoral vote	Popular votes		Proportionate division of electoral votes	
			Democrat	Republican	Democrat	Republican
A	17	163	4,564,800	2,140,400	117.4	45.6
B	31	368	16,185,150	24,831,850	144.2	223.8
Total	48	531	20,749,950	26,972,250	261.6	269.4

NOTE.—A straight over all percentage would be: Democrat, 230.98 Republican, 300.12.

If Republican Party should lose 3½ percent of its vote, evenly over these 31 States, to minor parties, it would reduce the popular majority of the GOP by some 750,000 votes, but would reduce the proportional electoral vote of the GOP by about 7% votes and, in the country as a whole, make the Democratic candidate the winner by a fraction of 1 electoral vote although the GOP would have received nearly 55 percent of all popular votes cast.

TABLE B.—*Pro forma vote of States*

[1944 approximate vote; percentage of best showing for Republican Party in 25 years]

State	Electoral vote	Approximate total vote cast in 1944	Proportional division of electoral votes between Republicans and Democrats only (figured to nearest 1/10 of 1 vote) using as basis the most favorable election return in each State to Republican candidate in any election of past 25 years		Approximate division of popular 1944 vote which would be required in each State to warrant the electoral votes shown in previous columns	
			Democrat	Republican	Democrat	Republican
California	25	3,500,000	9	16	1,240,000	2,260,000
Colorado	6	510,000	2.1	3.9	1,785,000	3,315,000
Connecticut	8	824,000	3.7	4.3	381,000	443,000
Delaware	3	125,000	1.05	1.95	43,750	81,250
Idaho	4	210,000	1.4	2.6	73,500	136,500
Illinois	28	4,060,000	12	16	1,740,000	2,320,000
Indiana	13	1,664,000	5.2	7.8	[illegible]	[illegible]
Iowa	10	1,050,000	3.8	6.2	[illegible]	651,000
Kansas	8	736,000	2.2	5.8	202,400	[illegible]
Maine	5	300,000	1.55	3.45	[illegible]	207,000
Maryland	8	[illegible]	3.4	4.6	258,400	349,600
Massachusetts	16	1,906,000	6	10	735,000	1,225,000
Michigan	19	2,300,000	[illegible]	13.45	643,000	1,557,000
Minnesota	11	1,122,000	4.55	6.45	[illegible]	[illegible]
Missouri	15	1,575,000	6.6	8.4	[illegible]	882,000
Nebraska	6	564,000	2.15	3.85	202,000	[illegible]
New Hampshire	4	230,000	1.65	2.35	94,900	135,000
New Jersey	16	1,952,000	6.4	9.6	780,800	1,171,200
New York	47	6,298,000	22.9	24.1	3,058,000	3,230,000
North Dakota	4	220,000	1.75	2.25	[illegible]	123,750
Ohio	25	3,130,000	8.7	16.3	1,096,000	2,054,000
Oregon	6	480,000	2.1	3.9	168,000	312,000
Pennsylvania	37	3,780,000	12	25	1,296,000	2,484,000
Rhode Island	4	[illegible]	1.65	2.35	123,750	176,250
South Dakota	4	272,000	1.6	2.4	[illegible]	[illegible]
Utah	4	248,000	1.62	2.38	114,700	[illegible]
Vermont	3	126,000	1	2	42,000	84,000
Washington	8	848,000	2.52	5.45	270,400	577,700
West Virginia	8	716,000	3.3	4.7	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wisconsin	12	1,328,000	5.4	6.6	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wyoming	3	102,000	1.1	1.9	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total	[illegible]	41,016,000	144.20	[illegible]	16,185,150	24,831,850

Congress Has Shirked an Important Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of deep regret to me that the Congress has seen fit to strip the Federal Power Commission, by specific legislative fiat, of its power to serve the consumers of the Nation and protect them against a rapacious monopoly of natural resources.

The passage of H. R. 1758, and the adoption of the Senate amendments, have gone a long way toward vitiating the Natural Gas Act of 1938, as an instrument of protection for the consuming public.

WASTE AND INFLATED PRICES

I have been opposed to this bill per se, and I have also been very much opposed to some of its implications and the pressure used to move it through Congress.

I have also expressed my vigorous opinion against the use of legislative fiat to overthrow judicial decisions when the purpose of the legislation is not to better express the will of the people but only to serve a special interest. This is a device as old as parliamentary government, and just as shabby as its hoariness would suggest.

My fundamental objection to the bill remains however, its objective of narrowing the regulatory range of jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission.

PROPERTY OF THE WHOLE NATION

Natural gas is one of our great natural resources, the property of the whole Nation, and its private exploitation should be carried out as a national trust. Instead, we have had a humiliating spectacle over the last 70 years of wild wastefulness by private exploiters, the levying of charges just as high as the traffic would bear, and a constant pressure of lobbying for special concessions of all kinds, with the amendment of the natural-gas bill topping all the requests in its baldness and brusque disregard of public interest.

Despite the heavy investments required for transmission lines, the production and sale of natural gas is not an expensive process in terms of costs per thousand feet at the consumer's door, and the spotty reduction of consumer prices eulogized by some Members has little relevance to the issue.

Natural gas can be handled just like petroleum: It can be transmitted through pipe lines, or by tank car or tanker or even truck, or in cylinders under compression.

This enactment paves the way for new gouging of the user, whether commercial or household; it further reduces the direct potency of the Commission in preventing or discouraging wasteful practices; and it further encourages high-powered private pressure groups to seek special privilege through congressional tolerance.

THE BILL IS WITHOUT MERIT

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is without merit in any phase.

It is against public interest; it is grossly against consumer interest; it is not even properly in the interest of the private exploiters because, relieved of their fears of the restraining hand of the Federal Power Commission, these huge companies—and I find the claim that this bill is for the benefit of small independent firms tragically funny—are quite likely to destroy the gas industry in their frantic efforts to wring huge profits out of this basic fuel resource while they can.

The Congress has abdicated its proper duty in this action; and I fear that their votes on this measure will come back to haunt many Members when they face their constituents.

ECA Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission heretofore granted, I am including as part of these remarks an editorial entitled "ECA Competition" which appeared in the weekly of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, in its issue of March 17, 1950. I am also including in these remarks as being pertinent to this important subject an article entitled "Britain to Cut Dollar Imports" from the Washington Post for March 29, 1950, and a letter from the manager of Dant & Russell, Inc., a reputable lumber firm in my congressional district. These items follows:

[From Portland (Oreg.) Commerce, of March 17, 1950]

ECA COMPETITION

Canadian lumber piling into United States markets by train and shiploads may well be a sample of what will eventually happen in many other lines of production if the ECA program is successful. In other words, if European producers being loaned money and being instructed in American know-how can ultimately approach United States efficiency in certain lines, it is logical to expect that their products will in the end be in sharp competition with goods made in the United States.

Methods and techniques perfected in the United States have given producers in this country protection against foreign production in many fields. If these elements of protection vanish through European picking up our methods and techniques, then situations similar to that of Canadian lumber on United States markets are most assuredly to arise. When that time arrives, there will be others than Pacific Northwest lumber producers crying for relief. Perhaps, the day may not be so distant as some might think when even Walter Reuther's automobile unionists might be calling on Congress for protection of their jobs, wages, and standard of living.

Canadians start with an advantage of around 10 percent in dollar exchange. Then their lower wage rate, lower taxation, and freight rates pile the advantage up to where if nothing is done, the day is coming when many of our mills will be out of business.

There are those trying to seek a way out. It is probable that the question of a higher lumber tariff agreement will be put on the agenda for discussion with Canada next October. Your Washington representative has talked to one major administration Senator interested in lumber who thinks this may be possible.

In the meantime, lumber is coming down from British Columbia even into Florida. And the southern pine people are shooting their protests in to Washington likewise. There is some hope for relief, but probably not for several months.

Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, is digging into the case, and intends to explore any possible administrative steps that might be urged to effect some relief.

One step that could help not only the lumber producer but many others would be cutting of corporate income tax. It is estimated that buyers of General Motors cars last year paid an average of around $400 a car in taxes of this nature. A lot of people are quite unconscious of the amount of taxes they themselves are paying rather than the big wealthy corporation. The lumber industry with the competition it faces cannot pass on its taxes in higher prices.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of March 29, 1950]

BRITAIN TO CUT DOLLAR IMPORTS

LONDON, March 28.—Britain's Labor Government reaffirmed today its hope that the sterling area, by reducing dollar imports about one-fourth, will be able to cut its annual gold-dollar deficit in half by mid-1951.

Purchases from the United States and other dollar countries are to be slashed 25 percent in the period from July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951.

Originally proposed to the Organization for European Economic Cooperation last January, the cuts were outlined in a Treasury white paper, Economic Survey for 1950, issued today.

The Government has said items on which dollar spending must be cut include bread grains, sugar, tobacco, petroleum products, steel, timber, and pulp and paper.

The white paper, bristling with "ifs," said the reduction from a dollar deficit of $1,531,000,000 for 1949 to one of $785,000,000 for 12 months ending June 30, 1951, can be accomplished under the following conditions:

1. Business continues good in the United States.

2. The lid is kept on wages, prices, and dividends in Britain.

3. British productivity goes on improving with no sharp increase in costs.

4. Exports to dollar markets increase sufficiently to offset the cut in the value of the pound last September from $4.03 to $2.80.

5. Gold earning exports to South Africa can be stepped up.

6. The dollar nations demonstrate readiness to accept imports.

DANT & RUSSELL, INC.,
Portland, Oreg., March 29, 1950.

Representative HOMER D. ANGELL,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: You will be interested in knowing that in February 1950 British Columbia shipped into the United States by water alone 58,713,584 board feet of lumber; this in a month when a great part of the Canadian production was closed down by bad weather, shortage of logs, etc.

This emphasizes the need for some means of protecting the American lumber industry and American labor against countries having low wages and depreciated currencies.

Yours very truly,

H. J. DAHLEN.

The Dairy Industry in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last Thursday evening, I had the pleasure and privilege of addressing the Northeastern Dairy Conference, a gathering of representative dairy producers and others interested in dairy production, meeting in their fifteenth annual session. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks I made on that occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Talking to dairymen about dairy problems is an interesting but not a novel experience for me. I have been talking to dairymen about dairy problems for the past 20 years. I think I have made some contributions to the welfare of that industry in New York State as a result of those discussions.

I must point out to begin with, that my acquaintance with dairy problems comes neither from having been a dairy farmer nor from having spent a summer in the country with a cow. I learned about the dairy industry and its problems the hard way, from tackling the tough and snarled problems of that industry in the period between 1928 and 1942 when I was Lieutenant Governor and Governor of New York.

When I was sworn in for the first time as Governor of New York in 1933, the dairy industry was held in the terrible grip of chaos and depression. The price of milk on the farm was 96 cents per hundredweight. Farmers were dumping their milk into the pig troughs. There were farm strikes in those days—in New York, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota.

I do not think it is necessary, before this audience, to go into detail about the events of those days. We all remember the foreclosures, the glut of milk and other dairy products in the markets, and the terrible combination of apparent overproduction and low prices. And despite the low prices, the consumers, the city people, were still unable to buy the available supplies, even at the low prices then in effect. Low farm prices and high unemployment—a familiar pair. Sometimes we forget that they almost always go together. The price of milk was as low as 96 cents a hundredweight in New York and there were 15,000,000 unemployed in the Nation. The price of feed was low, too. Corn sold for a few cents a bushel. But that wasn't much comfort to the farmers nor to the city folks either. The price of feed was too low for the producers of feed and too high for the producers of dairy products. And milk that sold at retail for 11 cents a quart was still too high for people who did not have 11 cents.

I have not cited these figures nor taken this backward look merely for sentimental or nostalgic reasons. I certainly am not nostalgic about that part of our past. I am sure that none of you is either. No; I have cited these figures and recalled the dark circumstances of two decades ago because today, at this very moment, we are faced with a situation which could possibly lead to at least a trend in the direction of where we stood 20 years ago. The problems of today have that same familiar look, like an old trouble that turns up after a long respite.

I hasten to say that the measures which the Federal and the State Governments have taken since those chaotic days of 1930 have provided a number of essential safeguards against any sudden plunge back into the chaos of 20 years ago. Some of the steps we took in those days were designed to meet the immediate emergency problems. But we also moved to provide for the long-range welfare of the farmers of our State and of the Nation.

It was not enough then—and it is not enough now—to make vague and pious declarations about how the situation could be solved by the initiative and enterprise of the American farmer. The American farmer has, indeed, more than his share of initiative and enterprise. But at that time—20 years ago—we all knew that we were in the path of an avalanche. In the face of the forces which had assaulted us individual enterprise and initiative were meaningless. It took the combined efforts of the entire Nation—citizens and Government, farmers and workers—to deflect the onrushing disaster and to repair the damage which had been done. And today much the same kind of situation exists as far as our dairy farmers are concerned. The problem of the dairy industry cannot be solved by the individual efforts of any one of us. It is far too intricate for that.

The dairy industry is an essential part of the whole complex structure of American agriculture. What is done to help or to hinder the producer of grain helps or hinders the producer of dairy products. Within the framework of the dairy industry, itself, we know that what helps or hinders the producer of butter, helps or hinders the producer of fluid milk and of cheese.

And finally, in the largest framework of all—the framework of the entire American economy—we must recognize and accept as an axiom—as an incontrovertible fact—that the prosperity of the dairy farmer depends upon the prosperity of the worker in the city, of the small-business man, and of all the elements which make up the national economy. The national economy is one and indivisible. No one section of it can prosper at the expense of the other, or independently of the other. What is good for the Nation is good for the dairy farmer. What is good for the dairy farmer is good for the Nation.

Let me turn back for a moment to the steps which we took in 1933 and in the years following for the benefit of the dairy farmers of New York State, in order to illustrate what I mean.

In New York State we insisted that the farmer must have hard surfaced road outlets for his products—farm to market roads we called them—and we built those roads—3,000 miles of them.

We said that it was vital for the farmer to have the commercial advantage of electric power and we saw power lines go up along hundreds of rural roads which had never seen power lines before. We saw that the farmers needed better educational facilities, more adequate health facilities, and regional markets for more efficient food distribution. All these were needed to make of the farmer what he has a right to be—a citizen with the individual dignity and security which is our American birthright. We proceeded to construct rural schools, and to establish rural health programs and regional markets.

These were the general measures we took to benefit all farmers in New York State. For the immediate and particular benefit of the dairy industry we took additional steps to cure the economic ailments which had settled into the very bones of that industry.

In our undertaking to help the dairy industry we did not, however, try to do things for the dairy farmer. Instead we did things together with the dairy farmer. The major role in the milk program worked out in New York State was played by the milk producer himself. We worked out a milk marketing system in which the farmers and their own organizations were the chief movers. This program was and is the farmer's program. The New York milk marketing agreements showed the way, I am told, for the Federal agreements which followed.

Under the terms of the Federal Agriculture Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, 33 marketing agreements blanketing all the main milk producing areas of the Nation were arrived at. The chief effect of these agreements was to establish a minimum price which the distributor had to pay to the farmer for his milk.

But while we were working on specific measures to aid the dairy industry and farmers generally—both in an immediate and in a long range sense—we also worked to raise the purchasing power of the general public. The entire structure of economic legislation designed to stimulate industrial production and to permit the industrial workers to raise their income and their standard of living was as essential for the welfare of the dairy farmer as for the welfare of the worker and businessman.

But we recognized—and still sadly recognize—that American agriculture presented a much more difficult problem than American industry. While it was essential for American agriculture that we abolish unemployment and raise the general standard of living in the cities, special additional measures had to be taken to protect the farmer against the special hazards of harvest, market, and price.

It was because of these factors that the various parity, conservation, and support-price programs were put into effect. While the reasons for these programs are quite clear to you gentlemen—however much some of you might disagree with some of the details of these programs—the basic reasons for these programs are much less clear to the general public. Least clear of all to the general public are the reasons for the support-price program which, as far as the dairy industry is concerned, is confined to manufactured and processed products.

Late in 1948 and early in 1949, when dairy prices began their decline, the Secretary of Agriculture began to invoke these price supports—for butterfat in February of 1949, for dried skim milk in April, and for cheese in July. Today the Federal Government owns some millions of pounds of these commodities.

I must say that the price-support program, even in association with the milk marketing agreements has certainly not been effective in holding up the price of dairy products. This is so true that some of our dairy farmers have been writing to me, petitioning for an abandonment or curtailment of the price-support program for feed grains, on the ground that dairy prices—and poultry and egg prices, too—have dropped out of sight of the price of feed grains.

I shall not tonight undertake a defense of the price-support program. Its defects are obvious to all. But neither these defects, nor any other defects in the farm program can be cured with a meat ax. Something better must be improvised to take its place.

The price-support program is so subject to abuses on the one hand and to public misunderstanding on the other that I, myself, feel strongly that some other formula must be developed. I cannot tonight propose or enunciate a better plan. I have studied and shall continue to study every proposal which has been or will be made to this end.

I know that whatever solution is worked out must be worked out in relation to the entire field of American agriculture. No solution which benefits one field of agriculture at the expense of another is acceptable. No solution which solves the problems of one sector of agriculture without regard to its effect upon the others is acceptable. And, finally, no solution which fails to take into full consideration the welfare and interests of the consumers, of the taxpayer, and of the whole national economy is feasible.

This does not mean, however, that we can dismiss the special problems of the dairy industry and postpone thinking about them or doing something about them until we have solved the whole problem of American agriculture. We here are especially concerned with the problems of the dairy industry. That industry has its special problems which can and must be attack insofar as they are special problems. I propose to discuss a few of them.

The special problems of this industry do not reside entirely in the decline in the price of milk and other dairy products. That decline is as much a symptom as it is a disease. One of the real ailments which besets the dairy industry is the decline in the consumption of fresh milk. Per capita consumption of milk has been dropping. In 1948—the last year for which I have figures—one-third of the families in the cities of America were consuming less than 1 pint of milk, in all its forms, per person per day. This is a threat not only to the dairy industry but to the health of the Nation. This circumstance again is as much a symptom as it is a disease. For many of the families to which I refer, the price of milk is higher than their capacity to pay. We must reverse this downward trend in consumption. The question is how to do it. One way in which that can be accomplished is through full industrial employment at good wages.

The price of milk has dropped 22 percent within the past 2 years. The price of the products which the farmer must buy has dropped only 4 percent. We must continue to exert every effort to halt and reverse that trend.

It has always seemed to me, that in any business, dairying or industrial, the way to increase gross and net income is to increase the volume of production while reducing the unit cost of production. In specific reference to the dairy industry I believe that a sound and practical approach is to encourage demand on the one hand and to work for an increase in the purchasing power of the consuming public on the other. We must work at the same time to decrease the cost of production through more efficient methods of production and distribution. Nor should the retail price reflect an excessive fraction of profit for the middle man.

I know that all this must sound like A B C to this audience. You have heard this general prescription time and again. Yet, for the long run, it is the only prescription for an industry confronted not only with declining prices but shrinking markets. The only question is how to adapt this formula to the special conditions of the dairy industry.

A few weeks ago, I received a very interesting letter from a professor at the New York State College of Agriculture. He wrote that "Farmers are becoming more and more critical of handlers and processors whose costs also continue high, but who receive an increasing proportion of the consumer's dollar, as the price level declines." I cite this observation as a sign post on the road which must be traveled.

I do not mean by all this that there is nothing which the Congress or your State legislatures can do to help you. There is much they can do. And there is much that they could undo.

Recently the Congress enacted legislation which, in my view, was a heavy blow at the dairy industry. I refer to the repeal of the taxes on colored oleomargarine. Paradoxically, I favored the repeal of those taxes because I disapprove, in principle, of excise taxes. I also felt that these excise taxes were not a proper method of accomplishing the objective that was sought. That objective was to protect the dairy industry against the inroads of competition based on pure imitation. I think that the dairy industry should be protected against unfair competition in this form. Therefore, I voted for the Gillette-Wiley amendment, prohibiting the shipment in interstate commerce of oleomargarine colored in exact imitation of butter. As I told my colleagues in the Senate, the ultimate consumer does not say "Please pass the oleo." He says, "Please pass the butter," whether it is butter or oleo. I think that oleo should make its own market and not move into the market on the basis of an exact market and not move into the market on the basis of an exact imitation of butter.

But my objection to the oleo legislation was based on still broader grounds than even this. I objected to this body blow at the butter industry without first measuring and meeting the harmful effect which would be and will be visited upon the dairy industry and upon the whole of American agriculture by the oleo legislation. I believe and still believe that these harmful effects will be much more extensive and much more serious than a simple reduction in the sales of butter. I believed and still believe that the consumer will not benefit in any major way from this action. I make this latter statement on the basis of the fact that the oleo industry is, to a large extent, a monopoly of a few manufacturing companies which can and will control the price for their own benefit to the detriment of the consumer.

As a Senator from New York, the largest consuming State in the Union, and deeply concerned with the interests of all our people, I feared that the effect of this legislation would be to exploit and not to benefit the consumers of my State.

At the same time, I felt that unless immediate steps were taken to adjust the dairy industry to the losses which the industry would inevitably suffer, great harm would be inflicted upon all of American agriculture and hence upon the entire national economy.

I therefore introduced into the Congress only last week two resolutions aimed at meeting these two situations. One resolution called for an investigation of the monopolistic nature of the oleo industry. That resolution calls upon the Justice Department to investigate the oleo industry and to take such steps under the antitrust and fair-trade practices laws as are merited. I can see no possible objection to the speedy approval of this resolution. I urge all of you here tonight to consider the advisability of indicating your support of that resolution.

My second resolution was a much broader one, aimed at measuring the effect upon the dairy industry and upon all of American agriculture of the anticipated decline in butter sales. The Department of Agriculture is asked, under the terms of this resolution, to make recommendations to the Congress of necessary measures to assist in the orderly adjustment of the dairy industry to the new conditions which it will face.

I consider this latter resolution to be addressed to the heart of the situation in which the dairy situation finds itself today. I believe that situation to be serious and deep-laid. The passage of the oleo legislation was merely the explosion of a long-smoldering fire. A study of the statistics discloses that the per capita consumption of butter has been dropping steadily during all the years since the end of the war. This decline in butter consumption since the prewar years is now estimated at about 8 pounds per person per year, a market drop of 1,000,000,000 pounds of butter, representing about 22,000,000,000 pounds of milk. The per capita consumption of oleo has meanwhile been increasing, despite the 10-cent excise tax which has been applicable. The consumption of butter has been going down, and the consumption of oleo has been going up. The recent oleo legislation will merely accentuate, to a major degree, a prevalent trend.

Let us not blind ourselves to the facts. Let us not pretend that these facts do not exist. Oleomargarine is here to stay and will be taking a greater and greater share of what used to be the butter market—unless we do something about it. I am not prepared to say just what can or should be done. I merely say that something must be done. Otherwise our national economy will suffer.

Perhaps the cost of production of butter can be reduced—without reducing the income to the farmer. Perhaps some new process can be developed for the utilization of surplus milk. I hope that the Department of Agriculture will give all these possibilities its full attention. I know that all of you will give this matter your most thoughtful study.

I have not come here tonight with a ready-made solution of your problems. I appear before you tonight as a friend and as a counselor, and as one who is deeply concerned with the conditions in your industry and with your welfare.

I can offer you some general advice. In the solution of your difficulties I would suggest that your efforts be directed toward the integration of your problems with those of the other sectors of the American economy. I would suggest that you keep in the forefront of your consciousness the interest and welfare of the consumer. He must be your friend as well as your customer.

I suggest that you closely identify your interests with those of the working people in the cities and towns and villages. Once we establish the fact that the interests of those who produce food and those who consume it—those who work on the farms and those who work in the cities—are one and the same, we will have cleared away much of the underbrush which prevents us from seeing a clear way to the common road leading to prosperity for all.

An economy based on scarcity is an economy poised on the brink of disaster. Production based on charging all that the market will bear is production based on insecure and insubstantial ground. While the immediate problems of the dairy industry call for immediate action, you must enlist in your long-range support the wholehearted aid and cooperation of the working and consuming public. They have as much a stake in the future of the dairy industry as you. Work with them to make them realize it. Their interest is your interest. Working together we will not fail.

A Program for the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand the text of a splendid address delivered by the distinguished chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. Guy George Gabrielson, at a conference of midwestern and Rocky Mountain Republican State chairmen, in Salt Lake City, Utah, last Friday night, March 31. I believe that every Republican in the Nation will be interested in Chairman Gabrielson's comments, and that independent voters, too, will take heart in his rousing message of patriotic appeal.

We are all familiar with the fact that under Chairman Gabrielson and his executive director of the committee, Mr. Albert B. Hermann, there has been a revitalization of party spirit. It is essential that this occur, because we must have a dynamic two-party system in our

land. In my own State of Wisconsin, we have an outstanding Republican leader, in the form of Mr. Wayne Hood, of La Crosse, at the helm, and he is following in the splendid traditions of his able predecessors, and is doing a great job, not only for the Republican cause, but in the interest of good government in Wisconsin.

A strong Republican Party is indispensable to a strong America. A dynamic two-party system is indispensable to a vital America.

I was particularly interested in the statement by Chairman Gabrielson that to be successful, the machinery of a political party must make for a party of inclusion, not exclusion. He suggested that the Republican Party broaden its base, and I believe that if it does broaden its base, not only will we have a stronger America, but we will have a revitalized two-party system.

Throughout Wisconsin, this policy of broadening the base is fully underway. In every one of the 71 counties, after county organizations are contacting voters, spreading the good word of the importance of public participation in the coming election struggle.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Chairman Gabrielson's comments be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a very great pleasure to be here in Salt Lake City and to have this opportunity of addressing you chairmen of our western and midwestern State organizations. I believe that meeting here in Salt Lake City has an especial significance for the party, which I will mention a little later; and it gives me an especially good opportunity to discuss what I believe must be the basic theme of our party organization.

To be in the forefront of a battle with that objective is scarcely a novelty to a westerner. Those of you who are native to this region and this State know that from long and personal experience. The rest of us know it from our study of American history.

In those pages of history that were written here in this region of the West, the story of the struggle of the Mormon people and their achievement is one of the most inspiring that occurs in any history anywhere. The hardships visited on Joseph Smith, Sidney Rigdon, and Brigham Young and their followers in their movement from New York to Ohio to Missouri and Illinois and Iowa and, finally, to the valley of the Great Salt Lake here in Utah rival those that any group has had to suffer. The courage, the fortitude, and the faith they displayed during this period of tribulation has few peers in American annals—or those of any other nation.

They reached the new land of which Joseph Smith had spoken. It was arid land, a desert. They suffered hunger and deprivation. Frosts and crickets threatened the first scant crops. Even a bare existence required almost endless toil. But the Mormons persevered. They made the desert bloom. They established settlements which grew and prospered. They built Utah to Territorial status and eventually—after a great deal of trouble with a succession of Washington bureaucrats who apparently don't change much—achieved statehood.

To anyone acquainted with this story it is tremendously impressive for its indomitable courage, the determination, and the fixed purposes of the people who lived it. To me it exemplifies the qualities that went into the making of this Nation and the spirit that has made it great.

I believe it is appropriate—particularly so because of the approach of the annual conference—to pay sincere tribute to the Mormon people and the Church of the Latter Day Saints for their great achievements—material and spiritual. They represent a breed of which the United States, today, stands in sore need. We could use a lot more of the fortitude and the conviction that moved the great Mormon leader, Brigham Young, to tell Captain Van Vliet of the United States Army, in 1857, that he did not want to fight the United States "But if they drive us to it, we shall do the best we can; and I will tell you, as the Lord lives, we shall come off conquerors * * *."

That statement bespoke a moral determination and clarity of purpose that must find a resurgence if we Americans are to survive as a free people.

It is no secret to anyone in this country that the times in which we are living are of the most critical character. Not only do we have problems of dealing with Russia in a cold war, and those of an unsettled world generally; we have the additional difficulty of being forced to face these difficult problems in the chronic atmosphere of insecurity, antagonism, and disorder, which has been created by 17 years of Democratic administrations. With all the bombastic and misleading promises which the administration leaders have made about security, the fact is that what the administration has brought to us as a people is insecurity. We are living today in an era of greater individual insecurity, instability, and unrest than ever before in the peacetime history of our country.

For one thing, it is an open secret that business, whether big or small, has no real confidence in the administration, even though the pent-up demand of wartime is not yet filled and business activity is at a high level. And business has good reason to be hesitant and fearful. For years the principal stock in trade of the administration has consisted of attacks on business. Yet it is our system of business, based on free enterprise, which has produced the real wealth of this country, and given us the highest standard of living in the world.

In addition, the national debt is at unprecedented heights. The problems of managing it, and of paying the more than $5,000,000,000 a year interest on it, are alone tremendous problems. Yet, the arrogant attitude of administration leaders toward the national debt, and deficit financing, makes it perfectly plain that they have no real concern with the crushing load which the national debt is imposing on the American people. Indeed, it is common knowledge that the administration will, if not stopped by Republican leadership, indulge in deficit financing and so-called pump priming, indefinitely, in these times of high-business activity, as well as in bad times, until the inevitable day of reckoning for financial extravagance plunges all of the American people headlong into disaster.

It is also no secret that the tax load today is so high that everyone who works for a living has to devote a very substantial amount of his work to pay taxes. At the present time, the average workingman has to work 47 working days in the year—approximately one-sixth of his entire year's effort—simply to pay taxes.

And along with the crushing load of national debt and punitive taxation which the administration has brought us, we also find the administration catering to every pressure group in such manner as to raise the cost of living steadily. While the statements of the leaders of the administration attract attention to the increases in national income, they are significantly silent with respect to the increases in the cost of living for which they are directly responsible. Indeed, it is no secret at all that, in terms of practical purchasing power, the dollar today is worth only about one-half of what it was worth in 1939. But the administration apparently thinks the American people will not, sooner or later, realize that increases in the cost of living offset increases in income, and cut down our standard of living.

In addition, with the Government's unrelenting attacks on business, with the crushing tax load, increases in the cost of living, and the general atmosphere of instability, unrest, and insecurity, we also find that unemployment is rising. For an administration which talks about deficit financing and so-called pump priming in times of what they also describe as unparalleled prosperity, I shudder at what they would propose under less favorable conditions, or in any sort of business depression.

Moreover, in the field of foreign affairs, we now know that the administration deliberately sabotaged the bipartisan foreign policy, inaugurated by the Republicans, and which is essential to the continuity and effectiveness of the diplomacy of any country. As a direct result, we now clearly see the whole foreign policy of the United States plunged into a catastrophe of unparalleled magnitude. It is no secret that the policy of the Far Eastern Division of the State Department was formulated largely by impractical theorists, who were fundamentally sympathetic with the Communists in China. And it is no secret that, spearheaded by its Far Eastern Division, the State Department carried on a personal vendetta and campaign of sabotage against the Nationalist Government of China and its leaders, deliberately undermining our loyal and faithful ally of the war. Today finds the back door of Asia wide open to the Red menace and the enslavement of the Chinese nation of 450,000,000 people. Perhaps the most realistic way to sum this up is simply to say that the Communists now have China as a result of our policy. And our first line of defense has receded from the Orient to the water fronts of Seattle and San Francisco.

Also, with the sinister spearheads of communism now pushing out in all directions in the Orient, the entire East is seething with unrest and disorder. Nobody knows how far the evil red tide, now that its floodgates have been opened by our own State Department, will surge through the Orient. Even now, it is almost impossible to comprehend the full significance of this colossal disaster in foreign policy, the like of which our country has never experienced, and for which the Democrats are directly and solely responsible.

Now, these desperate conditions under which the administration is forcing us to live—and I call them desperate advisedly—have placed new burdens and new responsibilities on the leadership of our party—the Republican Party. I do not believe that we can ever reach sensible solutions to the problems which are facing this country, and which have in large part been created by the administration, except under Republican leadership. Our policies are designed to remedy these desperate conditions that I have described, and we can do that if our party can win.

Thus, we see the tremendous responsibility which the administration's policies have forced upon the leaders of the Republican Party. Now, as never before, there is a public need for leadership and victory by us. And this public need for a Republican victory brings me directly to the main point of my appearance here today, which has to do with the party organization.

Party organization is something which, to my way of thinking, is of prime importance to the future of our country. Every political party has its leaders and its principles, but

the fact that those leaders and principles exist does not mean that the public realizes that they are there, or senses their value. That is where party organization comes in; for it is the job of the party organization to sell its leaders and its principles to the public, to make the public aware of their importance, and of what, in the last analysis, the party has to contribute to this country. Without effective organization, the leaders of any political party always find themselves crying nearly alone in the wilderness.

Now, in order for a political party to sell what it has to the public, the machinery itself must be representative of the public and in close touch with it. To be successful, the organization of a political party must be a party of inclusion, not exclusion. It must use all the talent which is, as a practical matter, available to it, and it must build constantly. It must bring in and utilize all races, groups, creeds, and colors, and in particular it must make full use of all auxiliary groups such as Young Republicans and women's organizations, and give them adequate recognition. There must be room for everybody in the party. It must harmonize and organize all the segments of our support, gathering up all the basic driving forces which are available to us, into a single powerful organization which is articulate and which can make a genuine impact upon the public.

Moreover, we must realize that in this country we have people of very different temperaments and backgrounds, who live in very different geographical sections, and who have very different views and prejudices, at least on minor points. The purpose of the party organization is not to place these differences into conflict; but, through a spirit of fairness, friendly negotiation, and exchange of views, to compromise and consolidate these differences, to close ranks, and present a united front, and to do it with the enthusiasm which genuine cooperation and efficiency always promotes.

Coming now specifically to our party, I feel that at this very time we have an unusual chance to broaden our base. There are millions of Republicans all over the country who never participated in practical politics, but who believe enthusiastically in our basic Republican principles. A clear majority of the leaders in business and the professions are Republican in sentiment. Many of them can be harnessed and put to work. Above all, we must bring Republicans of outstanding ability into our party organization, whether they have ever previously participated in politics or not; and we must make them available as candidates wherever we can. That is a job which you State chairmen are particularly fitted to do. I hope that you will join with me in trying to put on a continual search for high-grade candidates, for every political office from dog catcher up, regardless of whether those candidates have ever before had any political experience. In this way we can build the party from the bottom up.

Also, I think we must remember that, in the last 50 years, the whole political horizon has changed. Fifty years ago the big city machine and paid political workers were prime factors in political parties in America. Today, all that has changed. With the constant betterment in education which we have had in this country over the last 50 years, the intelligence of the electorate and its knowledge of current events have steadily improved and increased. The foreign-born elements of our population have all become increasingly better assimilated and better educated in the principles and traditions of our country, and its system of government. With these changes voters have come to think for themselves; the big city machines have been steadily declining in effectiveness; and paid political workers have been decreasing in number.

Now, while every party needs paid political workers, it also needs volunteers. We have been finding, in recent years, that the public is taking a far greater interest in politics than ever before, and that as a result there are now vast potential numbers of volunteer Republican workers, available from the general ranks of the public. In broadening the base of our party, we must seek out and utilize them, harness them and organize them into that single, integrated Republican organization which I have tried to describe. A distinct vacuum has been created by the combined factors which I have mentioned, and that vacuum fortunately can be easily filled by this new factor, the increasing number of volunteer workers which are available.

Finally, I think we must remember that all elections are won at the local or precinct level. Only concrete activity at the precinct level, and the caliber of the candidates there presented, provide a clear measure of the strength of the party and its value to our country.

It is significant that this meeting is being held in Salt Lake City. For it was in Salt Lake City that the 1946 campaign had its kick-off, and you will recall, we won the congressional elections of 1946. Indeed, the results were startling. In 1944 we Republicans had only 20 of the 49 Representatives in Congress from the 11 Western States. In 1946 we elected 32. And while, in that area, we had only 5 Republican Senators in 1944, in 1946 we elected 10. We won in 1946 because the public was with us; because, one way or another, the base of the party had broadened enough to take in a majority of the American people.

So, I like to think, as we meet here today, in Salt Lake City, that this meeting forecasts the broadening of the base of our party, and is the harbinger of the Republican victories in 1950 and 1952, which I believe to be essential to the welfare of our country.

Democrats Sabotaged Bipartisan Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including an article by Mr. David Lawrence in which he fixes the responsibility for the crack-up in foreign policy. There never has been an honest attempt by the Democrats to establish a real bipartisan approach to a foreign policy as we saw in both the China and Formosa situations. It has always been bipartisan when it was favorable to Democratic Party policy.

DEMOCRATS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR ENDING BIPARTISAN POLICY

WASHINGTON.—A lot of holier-than-thou speeches are being made about how the Republicans are upsetting the bipartisan foreign policy, when the truth of the matter is that the Democrats are primarily responsible for destroying the fine spirit of cooperation which once prevailed.

It's all very well for former Secretary Stimson and others with short memories to denounce the Republicans for their attacks on foreign policy, but the principal damage was done last autumn when John Foster Dulles—who, with the exception of Senator VANDENBERG, was the strongest influence in the Senate for bipartisan cooperation—was pilloried by the Democratic Party's wrecking crew in the New York State campaign.

With Senator VANDENBERG in ill health, it was logical that Mr. Dulles would carry the ball for a bipartisan foreign policy at this session. But the heavy guns of the Democratic administration were trained on him just the same. This antagonized the Republicans in Congress, many of whom harbor to this day a bitter resentment against the tactics of the administration. John Foster Dulles himself has magnanimously chosen to ignore the episode and strive again for cooperation. Some of the Republicans in the Senate, however, say that it is all very well for a Republican to cooperate and help the Democrats muddle through a difficult situation, but his reward usually is a series of partisan reprisals the moment he runs for office.

DULLES REFUSES CONFLICT

With all due respect to former Governor LEHMAN, it was far more important for the country to have Mr. Dulles returned to the Senate. The term was only a year, and it would have been a great example of nonpartisanship if the Truman administration had come out in support of the Republican candidate. That would have made sense because it would have been an example of real patriotism on the part of the administration.

The usual cry by the exponents of hush-hush and suppression is that the potential enemy abroad will derive aid and comfort from criticism in the foreign-policy matters. This is an exaggeration. People in the foreign offices abroad know that the only time an administration can be removed from office in the United States is when a change in the Presidency occurs. A minority opposition viewpoint is thoroughly understood and has its constructive values.

Any national or international policy that cannot stand the light of constant criticism probably isn't worth defending in the first instance. Messrs. Attlee and Churchill didn't observe any bipartisan etiquette on foreign policy in their recent campaign.

Naturally if the Republicans overplay their hand by their criticism, they will hurt themselves, and the majority party and administration will be correspondingly strengthened instead of weakened. If the Republicans happen to be right in their criticism, the Democrats will be influenced to change their policies, which is all to the good.

The fight against Secretary Acheson arose not because of any personal antagonism against him in the first instance, but because he is a symbol of the administration, especially since the President appears to have delegated virtually complete responsibility for the making of foreign policy to his Secretary of State.

BIPARTISAN COOPERATION IS OVER

In these dispatches last autumn attention was called to the way the administration was fighting John Foster Dulles, and the prediction was made then that far more than a Republican candidate was being destroyed. This has now come true. Except for a meaningless gesture now and then like the designation of former Senator Cooper, of Kentucky, to accompany the American delegation to London for the forthcoming meeting of the foreign ministers, the days of bipartisan cooperation on foreign policy as carried on heretofore are over. Republican Senators are no longer to feel muzzled to speak their thoughts in the Senate, and there are signs that the Democrats themselves are considerably relieved, too, to be able to accept the political challenge of their opponents whenever it is flung toward them.

The Navy and American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by Admiral S. E. McCarty, Supply Corps, United States Navy, at the thirty-third annual convention of the American Brush Manufacturers Association, at Atlantic City, N. J. Admiral McCarty gives an informative picture of how the Navy's business arm operates, as well as the importance of American business, big and small, to the defenses of our country. With it all is mixed a good deal of sound horse sense and good Americanism:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and members of the American Brush Manufacturers Association, it is a real pleasure for me to be with you today. Yes, I know all speakers and guests say that on every occasion—but today I have the opportunity of discussing a business that is vital to the Navy, and talking it over with the people who are the real leaders in that business.

As a representative of the Navy Department and the Navy's business arm—the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts—I want to make this session of as much benefit to me as to you. And that is my approach this morning.

Several weeks ago, when your president graciously invited me to be with you during this thirty-third annual convention, I seriously began to evaluate just how important your business is to the armed forces, and particularly to the Navy. Here, many times a day I must have one of your products for my personal use—a toothbrush, shoe brush, clothes brush, hair brush, hand brush, etc., and it comes so natural that true appreciation as to the necessity in daily personal use is lost.

But it is more toward the industrial angle that I want to discuss, where you can help us and to the end that we understand each other. Just to place myself in this picture, it is my privilege to be in command of the biggest single purchasing activity in the armed forces, and I believe it is not an exaggeration to say it is either the biggest or near biggest single purchasing organization in the United States. While the primary mission of my organization, the Aviation Supply Office of the Navy, is aviation supply, yet as a part of our activity is the job of buying all items of common use for the Navy, such as metals, paper, tools, soap, light globes, and, of course, brushes—all told, a list of more than 5,000,000 items.

In the early days of the Navy, there was procured little material in a systematic purchasing system. Weapons were largely the sword, spear, and boarding pike. Salt horse, hardtack, and water could be procured at almost any port.

But the modern vessel, airplane, and weapons of naval warfare are intricate high-speed machines which soon become useless unless regularly provided with replacement parts. Just how fast we are expanding our needs in the Navy is best shown by the fact that in 1940 our needs could be filled by a quarter of a million individual items; now it requires more than 5,000,000 individual items, of which 80 percent are technical parts. And with this highly complex, closely integrated, and scientifically intricate status we find ourselves wholly dependent on the industrial output of the Nation. There is not a type of industry that does not play a part in our existence.

Any specialist, individual, or organization has an understandable tendency to regard his field as all important. You feel that way about brushes, and if you didn't, your value would soon be lost. We, in the Navy, believe we are justified in regarding our specialty, which is the protection of the national security by maintenance of strong and well-balanced military forces, as all important.

But we fully realize that the fulfillment of our mission is entirely dependent upon the existence of a well-molded and well-prepared industrial organization. Unless we can be assured of a constant flow of ready-for-use products from industry, we will fail. You members of the American Brush Manufacturers' Association represent a cross-section of the American industrial mechanism which has proved so valuable to the Navy in the past and which must continue to future operations. You, industry, are indispensable.

Through the ingenuity, cooperation, and resourcefulness of American industry, of people like you here assembled, the Navy maintained the greatest fleet the world has ever seen. The impact on industry, when the Navy really made its wants known, was beyond the wildest thought of prewar planning. You in industry withstood that impact, and you gave us what we had to have to bring victory. During the actual war period, the Navy purchased $67,000,000,000 worth of supplies. I mean by that, support supplies for our combatant forces. You gave us what we asked for and you gave us the vast store of support when we wanted it, where we wanted it, and in amounts we needed. And even in peace we are still in the big-business bracket. Right now, our procurement of brushes alone runs to several million dollars a year. You in the brush business have a special appreciation of world-wide operation. Industry supports our Navy on a global operation, for our ships are prone to travel to every part of the world. You brush manufacturers, on the other hand, must procure your products from world-wide fields. Your bristles come mainly from China, India, and Russia; horsehair from every continent except Africa; vegetable fibers from west Africa, Brazil, and Mexico; wood, metal, rubber, synthetics, and the other hundreds of items used come from outside the United States.

You brush manufacturers were successful in winning for your trade the respect of the armed forces, and I speak especially for the Navy. Your splendid record of production rates second to none in industry. And you accomplished this despite the many obstacles, including the difficulty of obtaining stores in war-ridden countries. Gen. Joe Stilwell, when flying the Hump out of China, made his famous inquiry to Washington: "Will someone please tell me what the hell we're doing flying pig bristles out of China, when there is a war on?" But without those pig bristles flown over the Hump we would have been in a bad way.

During the last war the Navy fought in many climates. For the first time in history, a large portion of our fighting was in the warm, humid areas of the Tropics. There we found a new enemy of gigantic proportion—rust. More than ever before we needed preservation. In the Tropics, metallic surfaces deteriorate rapidly if not fully protected. So we screamed loud for wire brushes to clean off rust, and paint brushes to put on paint. We needed paint for preservation and needed paint for camouflage. When you realize it takes as much as 400,000 pounds of paint for a single battleship, you can see our task. During the war, in the Pacific Ocean alone, the Navy used 80,000 carloads of paint. And believe me, you people had to produce a lot of brushes for that job alone. We used 3,000,000 brushes of tapered synthetic bristles to fight rust and apply deceptive camouflage alone.

As the aviation supply officer of the Navy, I am seriously interested in the support of our plans on a world-wide operation. We gave you one problem of import during the war, and you gave us the right answer. Great difficulty was experienced in the preparation of a positive metal-to-metal contact for the thousands of rivets that go into plane construction. It was absolutely essential to avoid sparking during flight, and our way was to clean the skin surface with steel wool—all a hand operation. You gave us a small, portable, power-driven end brush, constructed so that the operator could center it quickly in the rivet hole. By that one operation, you brush manufacturers increased airplane assembly 1,000 percent.

Your outstanding contribution to plane building was in the field of engines. At the start we manhandled the hundreds of parts that must be machined to provide flowing contours, highly polished surfaces, and microscopic tolerances. This was a long tedious job and not so accurate. You gave us power-brushing techniques that not only speeded up the production, but established mechanical standards never before obtainable.

The contribution of the brush industry to aircraft manufacturers cannot be measured in precise statistical terms, but the dependence of the aircraft industry upon brushes is well appreciated. You are an example of industrial cooperation which so significantly shows the interrelationship of American industries. You can well be proud of your war record and your peacetime support. We in the Navy know you will always be one of our mainstays.

The Navy desires to foster and improve the understanding, cooperation and good feeling which exist between American industry and the Navy Department. We are always anxious to discuss mutual problems. To this end, I would like to discuss Public Law 413, known as the Armed Services Procurement Act, and how it is now affecting our dealings with industry.

When this act was first passed by the Eightieth Congress, I do not believe industry fully appreciated its import. At that time a large number of commodities were still in the scarce class. But during the past year conditions have changed, and we now have a buyer's market, and this has progressed to such an extent that there have been created critical business areas, or "distressed areas."

The passage of the Armed Services Procurement Act, Public Law 413, appreciably changed the procurement policies and practices of the armed services. The basic concept of buying was changed. Where the wartime buying under the First War Powers Act allowed negotiated procurements in quantity, the Armed Services Procurement Act provided for procuring by public advertising all commodities in which competitive bidding could play a role. This was implemented immediately by the armed forces, and has, I am sure, resulted in procurements effected by real competitive bidding; by contracts being placed throughout the various industries; and by the armed forces obtaining products at a lower price.

For the armed services to procure at a lower price does not mean you in industry are being robbed. By quantity contracting you are able to plan your production, for in our buying we ask for staggered delivery. Then you eliminate a great mass of paper work, such as repeatedly submitting bids, your uncertainty of purchasing raw material, repeated billing, etc. It gives you an orderly program.

To vividly illustrate my thought on competition, I might point out that the bidders' list of the Aviation Supply Office contains the names of some 16,000 firms. Yours being a most competitive industry, I don't think I need say more on that score.

Since the end of the war, with unification becoming a major issue, there has been developed single-service procurements. By this I mean the Navy purchases certain products for the Army and the Air Force; and the Air Force and the Army, in turn, purchase various products for the combined services. Single-service purchase is based upon a commodity versus a plant breakdown. I can best illustrate my point by examples of the two. By commodity breakdown I mean that the Navy purchases a commodity for three services. On the first day of January of this year the Navy began buying paint for all of the services. I choose this as a representative example because it is related to your industry. Conversely, the Air Force procures photographic material for the three services. This systemized buying is certainly advantageous to both the services and industry. For the services it will mean in the end more economic procurement. To you in industry it wil mean that you will be dealing with one contracting officer and one governmental agency for a specific commodity. Industry comments have been very favorable on this type of procurement. Now we turn to the other segment of so-called single-service procurement—and that is, literally, plant allocation to one service. Again, to illustrate my point, the Navy has been allocated the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division of the United Aircraft Corp. This means that all Pratt & Whitney engines and engine parts will be purchased by the Navy for the Air Force, as well as for the Navy's requirements. Likewise the Air Force procures engines and engine parts of the Wright manufacture for the Navy, as well as for Air Force requirements. This again will, we think, produce economy in buying, and the contractor deals with one contracting officer. And this phase of industrial mobilization control is extending to all industry.

Just a word about this unification program. We have already gone a long way, particularly in the procurement field. I do not believe there ever was the intention of Congress for a merger as was so glibly brunted about at one time. I believe Congress intends that there must be an Army, a Navy, and an Air Force, all with definite missions to perform and each branch of the Department of Defense to have control of its logistic support. But those men up on Capitol Hill are well versed in the military set-up and they have decreed a plan of unification, such as procurement, medical administration, etc. And that plan is working to the benefit of the taxpayer. The present unification procedure is good because it is efficient and economical and because it is a benefit to industry and the armed forces.

The armed forces have developed specifications for a great majority of the items that we buy and that go into our supply system. In countless instances, these specifications have been developed with the aid of the affected industry. Industry has always appeared most cooperative in aiding the services in the development of specifications; I am sure that this will hold true in your own industry. We, at all times, invite industry's comments and criticisms on existing specifications, for these serve as the basis of our procurements.

At times we are greatly concerned as to whether the bidder is fully aware of all of the requirements of our specifications. This has been particularly true in our procurement of brushes for the past year. We have recently received comparatively low bids on various types of brushes—bids, which when compared to previous prices paid, are extremely low. It is our responsibility to assure ourselves and the bidder that these prices are correct, and that no error has been made in the computation of the bid. Yet, repeatedly, the reply from the low bidder has been that he will furnish the brushes according to the specifications and at the price bid. After much industry comment on this problem, the Navy decided to establish additional facilities to test the brushes under contract to insure that the brushes did meet specifications. This is a protection to the Navy, the users of the brushes, and to industry, the supplier.

The Navy has wholeheartedly supported the administration's attitude toward small-business men. For a while we mailed invitations to bid to every known source, and in addition sent bids to local chambers of commerce, etc. This led to considerable confusion, but also did a lot of good. Since the 1st of March, a more systematic way has been resolved. We now mail invitations to bid to all known and reputable firms in specialized manufacture and mail bids to regional offices of the Department of Commerce. There are 15 such districts in the United States.

The Navy welcomes new prospective suppliers. We have a list of more than 16,000 firms, but will be glad to add others if they can satisfy the Navy that they are legitimate dealers or manufacturers and able to produce according to our specifications.

The Navy has prepared two booklets that should be of interest to every firm represented at this convention. The first is Selling to the Navy and tells just what our procedures are in dealing with industry. The other booklet, How the Navy Buys, is a graphic description of the channels to be followed. These booklets can be procured for the asking. I am leaving a few here today, if any of you are interested.

Now I know I have talked quite a while, but with your indulgence, I would like to discuss another responsibility of your organization.

You people in industry have a very serious responsibility, added since the last war, to assure this country victory if we are forced into another armed conflict. You must recognize and combat the very strongly organized communistic movement aimed to weaken our inner structure. I am not appearing as a warmonger today, but am sure you partially realize that our situation is not good. Our only potential enemy has now a far greater military organization than the United States. This potential enemy has far more airplanes—and very good ones—than we have; it has far more submarines—and good ones; it has 10 times more men actually under arms than we have.

Where a year ago we had a security in the sole possession of the atomic bomb, now that security is lost because we know that Russia has actually proved their construction. While the hydrogen bomb is still not ready for actual use, yet we know that Russia has the knowledge of how to build one. Matching military strength as unit for unit and man for man, we are far in the minority.

But the real danger right now is the weakening of our national structure from within. In the fall of China to the Communists, the evaluation of factors gave the military but 30 percent of the credit and 70 percent to the political strength. Right today we are being subjected to exactly the same process. If an enemy can weaken us from within our structure, then it needs less destructive military power, and, of course, saves its own men and resources.

You brush manufacturers have beeen directly hit very recently. No longer do you get your bristle supply through China sources. You are being forced to deal with Russia, as since the Russian domination of China the bristle industry has been absorbed. You are already paying more and your costs will continue to increase. A prime thought for your consideration is that Russia can stop the bristle supply any time it wishes.

From a movement of mere propaganda a few years ago, the well-organized plan has developed into material conditions, such as your particular business has already felt. We have not taken this situation in a serious vein. We have been and now are too complacent. We have not made it a personal responsibility. I could talk for hours on this one subject because we in the military have considered what is happening.

You people of the brush industry can rightfully be proud of your past record. In our recent conflict there was no carrier-launched airplane, no torpedo fired from a submarine, no bluejacket fired a gun but what a large factor was the result of your product, the support from the American brush industry.

We will need that same support at all times. But the thought I want to leave with you this morning is that you people of industry, yes, collectively—but much more important, as an individual—must realize your responsibility to first keep our country strong from within. Destroy or weaken our political and economic strength and we are defeated before a need for a military support which by that time would be nonexistent.

We are doing our best to keep out of a shooting war. Yes, it is costing millions of dollars to support the Marshall plan, but if we did not have some such a system we would already be in a hot war and spending many billions of dollars and losing hundreds of thousands of precious American lives.

The United Nations is still the best thing offered to further world-wide peace. It is but a babe as yet and must grow to strength by help. But it has already had a big influence on world thinking.

I urge you as individuals to lend your unqualified help to the United Nations, to the Atlantic Pact, and to our foreign aid program. It is right now keeping us out of a shooting war.

You individuals must do your part now. You must individually fight just as hard to stop this communistic onrush in the United States as you did to stem the tide of the military in battle areas. You can stop it, for you do have the power to stop it if you act. Yes, you have that power, and my thought to you is to realize that you have that power and use it now.

Address of Hon. Eamonn L. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Eamonn L. Kennedy, first secretary, Irish Legation, Washington, at the annual banquet of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, Pittston, Pa., March 17, 1950:

Mr. Chairman, very reverend fathers, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, though I speak to you with some trepidation will you please let me say at the beginning how overcome you have made me feel with the warmth of your welcome, how delighted I have been with this exquisite banquet, and how happy I also am that my first speech in this community should be spoken in reply to the hallowed toast of Ireland. We in the Legation of Ireland in Washington are very deeply conscious of the nature of this annual gathering, we are conscious of the great respect and place of honor in which the Irish community of Pennsylvania and of this city have

always been held, and we are never likely to forget all that the people of Irish descent in Pennsylvania have done for the Irish cause in dark days gone by. I feel therefore, a very great responsibility in representing the Irish Government and the Irish people at your banquet table this evening. It is a responsibility that is all the greater because I realize that I speak tonight to your society, perhaps for the first time in its history, for that new, independent, self-reliant, and sovereign Ireland which has grown to manhood in the past 28 years. That is the Ireland I have always known. I was born into a free nation and I grew up a freeman. I speak to you, therefore, for a new generation of Irishmen. It is a generation which can no longer think of Ireland as she has been thought of so often in the literature of our long and agonizing past, as a gray-haired old lady mourning in the shadows for the loss of all her sons, and waiting in vain for help to come across the waves. We turn instead tonight to a land which has become a nation once again and which has proudly taken her place among the nations of the earth. And from that land I bring to your society and to your table our warmest and our most respectful greeting.

And as I salute you on behalf of the new Ireland on this St. Patrick's night I bring you, too, a message of hope. Because there is a message of hope in this dark night which is rolling in from the East on the civilization and culture of Europe. Even as the fires of freedom and the lamps of learning and religion are quenched one after one and as the institutions which have guided mankind for more than a thousand years are pitilessly crushed into the dust before our very eyes, yet I repeat there is hope in the midst of all this gloom. For which one of us in this banquet hall cannot think of another St. Patrick's night in the dim and distant past when it seemed once again that the gates of hell might, indeed, prevail? Our minds hurry down the arches of the years to the twilit world after the fall of the Roman Empire. It was an age like our own when the barbarian hordes were rolling in from the East, burning, destroying, despoiling, and deporting the populations which had lived under the protection of the armed Eagles of Rome. The glory of the West had fallen from the skies and in the dark night of paganism which lay heavily on the world it seemed indeed as if the first light of dawning would never again be seen.

And then suddenly in the midst of this ominous darkness a fire is kindled, it quickly flares and it leaps up in flashing tongues which are reflected in the halls of the heathen king on the Hill of Tara. It is the fire kindled by St. Patrick on that first St. Patrick's night on the Hill of Slane. In defiance of the decrees of the pagan King of Tara. Patrick lit the Paschal Fire to proclaim the passing of paganism in Ireland and to claim our land for the empire of Our Saviour. Who has not heard with pride the story of the kindling of that fire on the Hill of Slane in the County Meath on the first St. Patrick's night and how it was the daring beginning of our national apostle's glorious work?

But make no mistake about it: That flame is no mere blaze on an Irish hillside. It marks the passing of a gleam of spiritual thraldom not merely for Ireland but for the world. It is not merely a fire on a hill in County Meath. It is a light of hope and of liberty to the peoples of Europe already overrun, enslaved, and despoiled by the barbarian hordes who were pouring down unceasingly on the last remnants of European civilization. In the midst of the moral collapse of the fifth century in Europe, the flame enkindled by St. Patrick on the Hill of Slane is a symbol of rebirth, a promise for the future, a fire which would leap across oceans and scale mountain peaks—a fire which would ultimately travel to the ends of the earth—bearing a message of the dignity of the human individual, a message of freedom, a message of no compromise—this was a fire which would never be extinguished.

From Ireland the flame fanned out to the ends of Europe, held aloft by the successors of St. Patrick. They laid the foundations of Christian civilization in England and Scotland. They penetrated into the forests of Germany. They built monasteries in the shadows of the Alps, in Switzerland and in Austria. They recarried their noble message into classical Italy down to the tip of Calabria. Their footprints are still revered in France, in Bohemia, and in Belgium. And to this day the Lithuanian word for peddlar is scotus or Irishman, because the Irish monks visited the shores of the Baltic, peddling Christ to the pagan tribes. And so it was that St. Patrick, the man from Gaul, who had been taken to Ireland as a prisoner in his youth, the first displaced person in our history, returned to the land which had enslaved him, and handed on a flame which has fanned out to the ends of the earth.

Could he himself have known, even for an instant, how successful his beloved Irish would be in carrying his sacred fire across the face of the earth? For the torch of faith and freedom was held aloft, not only by the missionaries who penetrated into the dark recess of Europe. It was held firmly too in the hands of those, who, rather than betray any part of their inheritance of faith and liberty, chose rather to be piled into the prison ships of later and darker days, and sent across the ocean to the West Indies and Australia. And when famine and oppression came with their pitiless scourge, and sent the heaving coffin ships with their human cargo across the seven seas, the Irish emigrant carried his faith and his hatred of oppression close to his breast.

Here, surely, ladies and gentlemen, was a victim nation, carrying the cross to a world-wide Calvary. In sorrow and in confusion, unwittingly and enforcedly, they carried the message of their faith and freedom beyond the frozen forests and across the burning sands to a universal Golgotha. Displaced persons, as St. Patrick was, driven from their homeland as prisoners, deportees, and emigrants, they spread over the face of the earth on a weeping, sobbing, world-wide way of the Cross, which passed through this country linking us every St. Patrick's Day in a world-wide ceremony of commemoration.

Surely there is a message of hope here for each one of us on this St. Patrick's night? Who knows that God may not be repeating the same process which began on the hill of Slane? As Europe once again lies in ruins, as its displaced persons, starving and freezing, once again wander across the face of the earth, and as hundreds of thousands are torn up from their ancestral homes and deported into the unknown regions behind the iron curtain, into a servitude which we thought was forever abolished—may not the Via Dolorosa of the Irish be now repeated with the same results? While we lament the inhumanity of the hour, while God-fearing men and women are uprooted and deported into the center of the Asiatic hinterland, may they not become, like the Irish, the leaven in the mass. They may be nucleus of a great Christianity and a new love of freedom in a new section of the world which will yearn and dream and pray as the displaced Irish prayed on far-flung foreign shores, raising in secrecy new altars under the stars, preaching and teaching a new way of life under God and in freedom, while their oppressors confidently trust to the power of brute force which has never yet stifled the spirits of men soaring to God and yearning for liberty.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a message of hope, not of sadness, which I bring you tonight. And it is fitting, indeed, that a representative of the new Ireland should bring you a message of hope. Because slowly and surely, in the past 28 years, we have been realizing the aspirations and the hopes of those whose efforts and sacrifices won us our independence. How far we have progressed in the stormy 28 years of our history can only be fully appreciated by those who knew the old Ireland, a land of flocks and herds which had been bled white by misgovernment, which lost 5,000,000 of her people in less than 80 years, and a land in which the Irishman would become more rare (as the London Times once said) than the Red Indian on the shores of Manhattan. Our Nation was born after one great war, it grew up in the teeth of a world-wide depression, and attained manhood status in the midst of a second world upheavel. And yet in those uneasy 28 years the hopes on which our young nation was founded have already in great part been realized. Already the ranches and large estates have been divided into small economic holdings privately owned on which as many working families as possible have been settled. Already the nation's supply of essential foodstuffs has been made certain. Where 1 blade of wheat grew before we have grown, not 2 but 10—that is the astounding truth about our wheat acreage which was 39,000 in 1921 and is now over 400,000 acres. Already we mill our own flour, grow and refine our own sugar beet, make our own clothing, textiles, boots and shoes, furniture, and cement out of the natural resources which God has placed in the soil and in the minds and limbs of the people of Ireland. Hospitalization, social services, and slum clearance have changed the face of our land. Our winter nights are brightened and our new factories are driven by the electrical power from the flowing waters of the Shannon, Liffey, and Erne. And in the air the new air services of international civil aviation in which we take an active part have made Ireland a link of union between Europe and Great Britain on the one hand and the North American Continent on the other.

It is no wonder, ladies and gentlemen, that tonight I bring you hopeful greetings from a new Christian democracy, living under a free constitution of its own making, and dedicated to a code of conduct with which we, as a race, in every vicissitude of our fortune, have been identified at home and throughout the world for more than a thousand years.

Today we are moving on toward the realization of our destiny and to the fulfillment of the hopes of the men who laid down their lives with a smile so that my generation might live as free men and women. I wish I could conclude my reply to the hallowed toast of Ireland this evening by saying that all those hopes have been realized. Yet I cannot, for there still remains one more milestone on the long pilgrimage of our people. Ireland, which is one of the oldest motherlands in the whole of Europe, still prays for territory unity. This Christmas I was home in Ireland and I can speak as one who has seen and heard. There is no aspiration of our people on which there is greater agreement among all classes and creeds than the reunification of our country. We recognize partition for what it is—a grievous wrong imposed from outside on an ancient motherland whose boundaries were made by heaven and the sea until 1920. It is a grievous wrong and a crying injustice of this twentieth century because in three and one-half of the six partitioned counties, taken as a block, there is still a majority in favor of union with the rest of Ireland. Such a position is an outrage against which our people will never cease to cry out, wherever they be, across the width of the world. Indeed, ladies and gentlemen, it comes as a shock to us to realize that the places toward which our thoughts naturally turn tonight, the place where St. Patrick was enslaved in Ireland as a boy, the place where he landed when he returned to preach the Christian faith, the city where he established his primatial see—even the very spot where his body has been laid to rest—that all these places are partitioned away from free Ireland by a border which has its roots in no tradition, and is related to no considerations of economies, race, or religion.

I feel that I am not merely expressing my own hopes and prayers, ladies and gentlemen, or the hopes and prayers of the young nation I have the honor to represent here tonight, but the hopes and prayers of all of us here when I hope and pray that St. Patrick will bless the efforts of the Irish people to win back for their own those places which by the very name are sacred to the memory of the Irish people—at home and abroad. Let us tell those who are maintaining the barrier of partition that they are maintaining a barrier against themselves across the width of the world. And let us remember with pride that the tricolor of Ireland is a flag of green, white, and orange. The green is for the original inhabitants of the island. The orange is for the men across the border. The white represents the unity we wish to bring about and which would make our motherland an example to the world. That desire for unity will live as long as there are Irishmen who look forward to an undivided island with its boundaries set in the foaming sea.

We feel, ladies and gentlemen, that a great principle is at stake in Ireland: the principle of whether or not a small portion of a state can break up that nation and impose its desire for disunity on the rest of people. Your great Nation fought a terrible civil war to deny that destructive principle and even today we can hear the echo of the words of the gaunt rail-splitter from Springfield when he asked in Indianapolis in February 1861: "On what rightful principle may a State, being not more than one-fiftieth part of the Nation in soil and population, break up a Nation and then coerce a proportionately larger subdivision of itself, in the most arbitrary way? What mysterious right to play tyrant is conferred on a district of a country, with its people, by merely calling it a State?"

We might indeed repeat Abraham Lincoln's rugged question today at a time when every dispatch and bulletin we read from Europe makes it imperative that the breaking down of artificial barriers be hastened in this hour of danger. The unification of Europe is in the air: it is the fashionable doctrine of the councils of Paris and Strasbourg: let us pray that the reunification of the oldest motherland of that continent will not be forgotten when the time comes to smash down the tyranny of artificial barriers. There is no worthier cause today because those who help to bring an end to the wrong of partition in Ireland are assisting in the great work of world peace. They are helping to remove the only existing barrier to a true and lasting friendship between Ireland and Great Britain.

I know that we can look to the people of the United States and especially to the people of Pennsylvania of every class and creed for support as we advance toward the national unity you have already so happily achieved. For there are not now and there never have been in the whole world any bonds of friendship between nations as close as those which bind Ireland and America today. At the end of this month our missions in each other's countries will be raised to the status of embassies and our representatives in Dublin and Washington will become ambassadors. That is a token of the esteem and friendship which have always existed between our two Republics—an esteem also symbolized in the treaty of friendship signed by your President and by ours just a month ago. But, ladies and gentlemen, our relations go deeper and warmer than the niceties of diplomatic intercourse and the signing of polite protocols. Our relations are those of blood and the Irish nation can have nothing but love and affection for this great land to which she sent so many of her sons in the past and which opened wide her mighty arms to receive them. The footsteps of Irishmen can be traced through every one of the original Thirteen Colonies. They blazed a trail of civilization along your great valleys, bringing in their hearts and minds their twin gifts of faith and freedom in the days when only men and women of willing hands and stout hearts could survive. The local histories of this country tell us how the Irish built the roads, bridged the rivers, hewed down the virgin forest and founded settlements in the clearings to which they gave the sweet-sounding names of their homeland.

But, ladies and gentlemen, surely the page of history shines no brighter with Irish names in those far-off days than it does in Pennsylvania? I can find no history of any town, city, or county of Pennsylvania that does not contain a large proportion of Irish names amongst those enumerated as pioneer settlers. In and around Philadelphia they came, into the counties of Bucks, Chester, Westmoreland, and Lancaster, up and down the beautiful Kittochinny and Cumberland Valleys they flocked in there by thousands. They were a hardy and resolute people with an undaunted spirit of adventure and as early as the first half of the seventeenth century they pressed on to the farthest outposts of western Pennsylvania and the Ohio, up and down the Allegheny and the Shenandoah, tilling clearings in every valley and forest from the Delaware River to the very frontiers of civilization. It was this stock that bore 9 signatories of the Declaration of Independence, 22 Members to the First American Congress of 1774, 7 commanders of brigades and regiments in the struggle for independence and an Irishman also stands in the unique position of Father of the American Navy.

Ladies and gentlemen, it would be impossible for me, even by merely listing all the great achievements of those of Irish descent in Pennsylvania, not to offend you by leaving something unsaid. And yet I cannot but mention with pride tonight the shining name of the Pennsylvania Line which covered itself with glory in the War of Independence. No wonder Gen. Henry Lee, afterward Governor of Virginia, said that they should properly be called the Line of Ireland, no wonder too that when Washington wished to cover his retreat from the disastrous defeat at Long Island in 1776 he chose four of the regiments of the Pennsylvania Line for that purpose—all of them commanded by native-born Irishmen. Yes, indeed, ladies and gentlemen, our people fought and bled in the beautiful valleys of your great State because they carried with them in their hearts a heritage of freedom, because they, in its grandest form, caught the vision splendid, the breath of unity, the soul of nationhood, the gleam of hope's new day.

Forgive me, Mr. President, if I speak with too much pride. The United States of America has meant so much to us in the long agony of our struggle that we like to think, even for a moment, of what we have been able to give in return. Forgive every Irishman if he is proud tonight of the full harvest our fathers sowed in this great land.

For you have always been our inspiration. As our people struck and struck again for their freedom in the nineteenth century they could hear afar off the shouts of the Liberty Boys at Bunker Hill; and on cold gray mornings as shots rang out they could faintly hear the thundering hoofs as Paul Revere rode fast with the stirring news of liberty. I am here to say tonight to everyone in Pennsylvania of every class and creed: Thank you heartily and eternally for all you were to us in tragic days gone by. Thank you eternally for all the times when you lifted up our people, held them to your heart, and wiped away all tears from their eyes. We are proud to think of you as our friends, as tonight the Irish Nation moves forward toward the unification of its territory and the realization of its destiny. We draw inspiration and hope from you as Thomas D'Arcy McGee did in days gone past when he looked around him in this great North American Continent and breathed forth the lines:

"And oh, it were a gallant deed
To show before mankind
How every race and every creed
Might be by love combined
Might be combined yet not forget
The fountains whence they rose
As fed by many a rivulet
The stately Shannon flows."

Orchids to Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain Emeritus of the House of Representatives

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the following remarks to a great Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

I am very sorry that I have delayed so long in paying to you, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain Emeritus of the House of Representatives, as my colleagues already have done so timely, this my belated tribute of appreciation for your great efforts before your retirement from active duties, but the truth of the matter is that like so many of the other better things which I have endeavored to do in life, it too seemed to be fated to be delayed needlessly and almost forgotten entirely. In this instance the delay was occasioned because I misplaced the things which I had written over a period of months concerning you, and have found them just recently.

You do not know me very well I am sure, but I have been privileged to know you, not as the publican of old from afar, but from a very short distance indeed. Since January 3, 1949, I have heard you in person, deliver many beautiful, heart-satisfying prayers and I want to tell you that I truly miss, very much, your splendid spiritual efforts.

Whether you realize it or not you did much, I am sure, for all of the Members of Congress and their aides and the Gallery guests of the House of Representatives who chanced to hear you.

As stated by another more rhetorically worthy than I am concerning the religious efforts of one of your brothers in the service of the Lord:

You showed them paths of wondrous spiritual dream.
You laid across Life's dark a silver gleam.

I want to observe also that it is my belief that the following revamped lines

of another fit splendidly into your fine life's pattern:

He serveth best who knoweth best,
God's things both great and small,
For the dear Lord who loveth us,
Who made and loveth all.

I hope that you will pardon my egotism in dedicating the following poor verses of mine to you during your lifetime, written bit by bit by me, in an attempt to partially reward you for your rich spiritual efforts in behalf of Him who is everywhere and with everyone.

OUR

I

He's surging with the oceans blue,
He's creeping with the restless tide,
He's coursing with the planets far,
And flashing where the meteors ride.

II

He's fleeing with the dark storm clouds,
He's shining with the blazing sun,
He's brooding with the calm twilight,
When the heartless, weary day is done.

III

He's sweeping with the rivers wide,
He's falling with the gentle rains,
He's waving with the woodlands drear,
He's growing with the ripening grain.

IV

He's marching with the zephyrs sweet,
He's rippling in the gentle rills,
He's blooming on the great prairies,
He's toiling in the busy mills.

V

He's with us in the bread and wine,
He shared with His apostles all,
And every faithless Judas can
If will he would heed His sweet call.

VI

It's part of His most noble plan
To know all things both great and small,
And note the most colossal things,
And also mark the sparrow's fall.

VII

He's with us ever, watching, guiding,
Through the waters, land, and boundless space,
Charting the endless course of time,
And ministering to the human race.

VIII

And if our God is everywhere,
As we so surely think he is,
He's in all things placed in our care,
As you best know dear child of his.

IX

When one world men scream out in hate,
And with just blood crimson the sod,
We grieve in deep perplexity,
For those who can't "There is no God."

X

Out of the bad the good he'll take,
Out of the good some bad will show,
If we but knew his perfect plan,
If we could only see and know!

XI

How long, how hard the way leads on,
Through life to what we call our end,
The scourge, the crown of thorns, the cross,
Into eternal life shall blend.

XII

Some day the mists will rise for us,
Some day we'll know the eternal plan,
Some day the most debased of us,
Will have a view of God's true man.

XIII

And when that day shall come my friend,
I hope we'll see you glorified,
And praise to that great scene shall lend,
Because you served the crucified.

Republican Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to make available for reading by the membership a Republican farm plan.

Before you read it I would like you to note that on March 31, 1950, the Wall Street Journal, a publication that is not noted for supporting Democrats, had this to say editorially:

The outline seems to us to shape up into a proposition that the Republicans think perhaps the Brannan plan would be all right if it were not for Brannan.

I am not endorsing the Brannan plan, Mr. Speaker, but I think it is well to point out that much of the talk by our GOP friends is supercharged with politics; that they condemn a thing under one name and advocate it under another name.

And by the way it is a good example to us Democrats as to what we should not do.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of March 11, 1950]

GOP GROUP OFFERS NEW FARM PLAN

ELK POINT, S. DAK., March 10.—Axel J. Beck, chairman of the Republican National Committee's subcommittee on agriculture, today recommended a long-range farm plan which he said should be self-financing, provide for full parity prices and be farmer-administered.

In a report to his subcommittee, Beck said the objectives outlined in his recommendations should be submitted to Republican Congressmen as "suggestions for the basic farm policy of the Republican Party."

He said "negative philosophies of curtailed production" should be rejected.

Beck said the Republican Party must have a long-range farm plan if it expects to win the confidence of the farm-belt voters.

He listed these 10 proposals:

1. Administration by farmer-elected local committees and State directors, and a national board appointed by the President, a majority of which shall be State directors or persons who have held such positions.

2. Full parity on all cash nonperishable crops, restricted only by marketing quotas on each farm when on August 15 of any year the total estimated national supply of a commodity exceeds 150 percent of the predicted requirements for the next year.

3. Full parity on all feed nonperishable crops, limited only by acreage restrictions when the supply on December 1 of any year exceeds 150 percent of its assigned production.

4. Unrestricted livestock production, supported at full parity at market by Government purchases. Any losses from sales or accrued surplus would be financed by a $1 fee per 100 pounds imposed on the killing sale of all livestock. The fee could be increased up to $2 per hundredweight in event of a marketing emergency, or suspended when it is not required.

5. Support of egg and dairy products at full parity price levels by a fee on the products marketed under the same general plan as provided for livestock.

6. Maintenance of prices on semiperishable crops at full parity levels under a Government quota system.

7. Provision for on-farm storage facilities for nonperishable feed crops.

8. Provision for soil conservation.

9. Encouragement of research on new uses of agricultural products.

10. Establishment of a flexible tariff at parity level for all agricultural products.

Attention Chairman Buchanan, of the Select Committee Investigating Lobbying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. O HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the propaganda campaign which is now being conducted by the real-estate lobby against members of the Banking and Currency Committee who fought for a bill which would have ended the housing shortage and placed homes within the financial reach of the many families in the middle-income group.

This bill, which the Banking and Currency Committee reported out after extensive public hearings and which was opposed only by the real-estate lobby and the mortgage bankers, would have reduced the monthly shelter cost on a home now requiring a $90 payment to $64. It would not have cost the Government one cent. Certainly it lowered the interest rate, but if the bankers can afford to make CCC price-support loans to the farmers on a 3-percent interest, only one-half of which they receive, there is no reason under the sun why they cannot afford to make 3-percent loans to families buying homes, especially when all of the 3 percent would be kept by them.

Because the real-estate lobby is interested only in the continuance of the housing shortage, and has been able to block all legislation which promised an early end of the shortage, it is necessary to extend rent control unless we are willing to face the repercussions certain to follow the throwing of thousands of families onto the streets. As far as Chicago is concerned, I can assure the House that the end of rent control on June 30 of this year would do just that. The blame is on the real-estate lobby and the price is being paid by small landlords as well as by tenants.

I have received hundreds of letters from both small landlords and tenants taking to task the real-estate lobby for what it has been doing in preventing a return to normalcy in the housing situation. These letters have been signed by the good men and women who wrote them.

I also have been receiving a number of letters which were either anonymous or were signed with typewritten names with no address. Although they are mailed from widely separated States, the phraseology is so similiar as to suggest a common source of origin. I respectfully suggest to the distinguished and very able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] the chairman of

the select commitee investigating lobbying, that when the spokesmen for the real-estate lobby are summoned before his committee that the inquiry cover the subject of anonymous threats, all in substantially the same phraseology, which from widely separated States are now being sent through the mails to members of the Banking and Currency Committee who have been fighting for the families of America against the real-estate lobby.

Every Member of this body, Republican as well as Democratic, is glad to hear from his constituents, whether they are in agreement with him or contrariwise. When constituents take the time and trouble to write their Representatives in the Congress, it means that dimocracy is functioning at both ends. I am sure none of my colleagues could approve of any inspired resort to anonymous correspondence to muddy the proper, helpful, and legitimate exchange of viewpoints between the Representatives in the Congress and the people back home in the respective districts.

The language in the following letter, which is typewritten even to the name attached, which has no address and which the post office stamp indicates was not mailed from a postal zone in my district, is stubstantially the same as that in anonymous letters I have received from at least a dozen States far removed from Illinois:

Mr. BARRATT O'HARA,
Illinois.

DEAR SIR: When are you fellows going to stop pandering to the gimmie boys and return to the tenets of justice? Let's stop buying votes with the rights of those who have the guts to struggle and succeed.

Since when has it been the function of the Government to force part of the citizenry to support the more indigent members?

As you well know, rent control is the sale of justice for political expediency. Federal housing, as you also know, provides part of the citizenry with housing, schools, parks, etc., at the expense of the remaining stalwarts of private ownership.

We are going to fight this approach to socialism with every means at our disposal. You may join us in our march back to Americanism, or become the target of our initial attack. Make your choice. No fence riding.

I remain respectfully yours,
A VOTER
(Mrs. Helen Rogers).

Now, Mr. Speaker, permit me to turn to the correspondence from the people of Chicago who, when they write me, sign their names in their own handwriting and give me their addresses so that I may know them. They are as forthright with me as I am with them when on every roll call in the House I make public my position. There are hundreds of such letters on my desk. They all tell the same story of the critical housing shortage in Chicago and the certain tragedy which would follow the termination of rent control in Chicago on June 30. I pick the following letter at random:

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 28, 1950.*

Representative O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a mother of three children I plead with you for some form of rent control for Chicago. The agent of the building in which I have rented an apartment for the past 8 years threatens us with eviction as soon as rent controls are lifted in Chicago or else they will raise the rents to such levels that we won't be able to pay.

This is not an idle threat I know, as there have been several vacancies in the building and all have been rented to people without children.

There is rental housing in the de luxe level (apartments at $125 per month and up) and I understand that even these will accept no children.

I am not the only person in this predicament as I know several families who had to store their furniture, separate their families among friends and relatives and occupy a bedroom in a rooming house sharing toilet facilities with five or more families with monthly rentals for these facilities as high as $80 and $85 per month.

Housing in Chicago for middle and lower income groups has never been plentiful, except perhaps for a short period in the thirties' depression when everything—office, factories, stores, and apartments were vacant as people were unable to secure work. Even 8 years ago, when I rented my present apartment I looked a long time for rental space as children were not accepted even then, when some apartments were available. So you see Mr. O'HARA how much we need your help.

God bless you and please help us.

Sincerely,
ESTHER DOMBROSKI
(Mrs. H. Dombroski).

A Chairman at Last

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to set forth an article taken from the Washington Post of April 1, 1950, entitled "A Chairman at Last." It is as follows:

A CHAIRMAN AT LAST

After more than 15 months President Truman has found a man to fill the vacant chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board. The new appointee, Air Secretary W. Stuart Symington, will be looked upon to rescue the NSRB from its long period of aimless drift—drift at a time when this coordinating agency should rave been pushing manpower mobilization and civil defense plans. Mr. Symington has been one of the most vigorous executives of the Truman administration, and if we have frequently disagreed with him, we have never doubted his determination or capacity for decision. Whatever else may be said of the Air Force, it knows where it's going.

A similar sense of mission is the prime need of the Security Resources Board. This top-level agency has the job of arbiter between potential military and civilian demands on human and physical resources. Its responsibilities include the formulation of an up-to-date mobilization plan readily translatable into component details, and the coordination of mobilization activities in the various Federal departments. It also, since last year, has been in charge of civil defense planning. But with only a part-time director in the person of Presidential Assistant John R. Steelman, the NSRB staff has been marking time and seemingly has been more concerned with internal administration than with positive accomplishments.

The need now is to get down to practical details—to provide guidance to the Munitions Board and other agencies on mobilization responsibilities, and to see that States and cities receive concrete help in training civilian defense cadres. The job is not one for scaremongering, but for steady, unflamboyant staff work. Mr. Symington has had plenty of experience, both as an industrialist and businessman as well as in Government. If he will use his abundant energies to restore direction to the NSRB, he will help meet an important national deficiency.

Midpoint Anniversary of ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by Secretary of State Dean Acheson and an address by Gen. G. C. Marshall. Both addresses were given today at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., at a program observing the midpoint anniversary of ECA. I was present at this historic occasion and invite attention to these two reports on ECA.

ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON

Two years ago the American people, acting through their Congress and the President, began a heroic adventure with the people of Europe. The phrase is not mine—it belongs to that valiant worker for peace, Senator VANDENBERG. I know his heart is with General Marshall, Mr. Hoffman, his colleagues of the Senate and House, and the men and women of the Economic Cooperation Administration in this celebration of the second anniversary of the program to which they have all made vital contributions.

Looking back, why did we begin this venture? The war had left the people of Europe nearly prostrate. It would have been difficult, perhaps impossible, for them to rise by their own efforts, and we in America knew that a peaceful and hopeful future could not be won for us or for them until Europe once more stood proudly on its own feet.

We did not limit the scope of our offer of cooperation.

The sufferings and the destruction left by the war were not confined to any one area. All over the continent people were longing to rebuild a useful and orderly existence after the long misery and violence of the war. They wanted to restore their homes and farms and workshops. They wanted to plan for the futures of themselves and their families; they wanted to move toward a more promising day, toward a world in which peace might endure.

We in America wanted this, too. And so General Marshall proposed that all European countries should participate in a joint recovery program, to which each would contribute in the measure of its ability. In this way and with our aid, we hoped that the weak and war-wracked organism of Europe could regain strength and health.

We were rebuffed by a small group of men who stood to profit from Europe's misery and who have never viewed the United States with anything but envy and hostility. More important, the principle of international cooperation was scorned. As a result

of an arbitrary and selfish attitude on the part of some, the program was limited to that half of Europe where men were at liberty to choose the path of cooperation.

Within that half of Europe, the recovery plan has now operated for 2 years under the direction of the European countries, working with Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Harriman and the splendid team they have organized and led. This combination has been unbeatable. This has been the kind of a constructive job that arouses the enthusiasm and spirit and devotion of freemen.

Great progress has been made in western Europe. Over-all industrial production in 1949 was 15 percent above the 1938 level. Coal production was 434,000,000 metric tons in 1949, in 1948 it was [illegible] tons. Steel output in 1949 was 46 [illegible] metric tons, one-sixth more than in [illegible]. The production of bread grains has risen by more than half in the period from 1947 to 1949.

And these gains will continue, for the farmers and workers have more and better tools and machines. In 1949 the average factory worker produced 25 percent more than he did in 1947.

It would be incomplete if I spoke of European recovery as though it mattered only to that one continent. Western Europe is one of the world's great workshops and one of the world's great markets. The recovery which has been made there has extended its influence to many other continents—to the countries of South America, to Africa, and to southern Asia. It is greatly to the interest of all of us to have western Europe strong and healthy.

This illustrates what has been accomplished through the Marshall plan. This is the exciting record of recovery. These statistics are alive with hope.

The progress that has been made is a triumph of man's ingenuity, of man's will, of man's confidence in the power of free institutions. It is not a triumph for any one nation, or for any one class, but a triumph of cooperation.

We are proud of our contribution. We have supplied a great deal of assistance to this cooperative effort. But our contribution has been only the "something extra" that was needed. It has added the vital margin to the efforts and resources of the people of Europe themselves.

When the European recovery program began, the Communists filled the air with dire predictions that the European countries could not cooperate in this way without its ending in their domination by the United States. The experience of the European recovery program has shown how [illegible] and incredibly [illegible] that propaganda was. No country has lost anything but poverty; no country has gained domination, but all have gained in self-respect and have won a new confidence and a strengthened independence. Meanwhile, the peoples of eastern Europe and China have learned that there is indeed a part of the world where the harvest of collaboration is a bitter fruit.

Now, as we look forward, what facts do we want to call to mind?

First of all, we must remind ourselves that the real test of stamina is how we do in the long middle stretch of the race. Here is where staying power has to come in to take over the initial enthusiasm. Eighteen countries are cooperating in the most exciting thing that is happening in the world.

Second, the recovery of production—which was the first great object of the program—was difficult and arduous, but it was easier in many ways than the recovery of trade—the second great object of the program. To restore satisfactory levels of trade, the European countries have to overcome maladjustments arising from the economic effects of two great wars and distortions stemming from political and economic conditions deeply rooted in their history.

The revival of production was mainly a national problem, which required a great national effort and some outside assistance. The recovery of trade, however, is largely an international problem, requiring a high degree of cooperative give and take and difficult, even painful, adjustments. We are aware that it is difficult for the governments of the participating countries, faced with large needs and inadequate reserves, to risk in practice what their own self-interest commends.

We also recognize that trade is a two-way street, for us as well as for them, and that we bear a large responsibility for achieving a satisfactory balancing of our trade with Europe and the world. We are vigorously addressing ourselves to this problem, which is of vital interest to our farmers and workers and businessmen. Together with the participating countries, we have to lay solid foundations during the coming period for the future. We are going to have to continue to cooperate in many ways, to draw more closely together, to coordinate our economic policies, if we are to build a system that works.

Finally, we must remind ourselves that the answer to the forces opposing recovery is the same which we—the United States and the participating countries—gave in 1947, namely, to proceed confidently, seriously, deliberately to the constructive work at hand. Peace is what men make it and the only way to win it is to plug away at it.

The European recovery program lights a path to a future to which man can look with confidence for peace and order in a system based on freedom and justice. We in America continue to regret that the bright hope of progress along this path must be confined to half of Europe. We regret that it has not yet proved possible for all the peoples of Europe, to shake off the shackles of bitterness and violence and to join hands in the creation of a better world. We regret, but we do not despair, for the fear of a few will yet succumb to the hope and the strength and the determination of the many.

ADDRESS OF GEN. G. C. MARSHALL

I am very glad to participate in this gathering today because it celebrates a momentous occasion, the half-way point of the ECA. I never consider the European recovery program without recapturing in my mind the tragic state of western Europe in the late spring of 1947. The situation appeared almost hopeless and every plan we made seemed to be thwarted in advance by a vicious circle of conditions which were the product of war.

Frankly, in those days I thought of the rehabilitation of Europe more in terms of material reconstruction—harbors, buildings, communications, and similar matters. But slowly I learned that the most serious phase of rehabilitation was related to other considerations—political, moral, spiritual.

These were less tangible, but far more difficult to deal with. Not only had the trade and business relations of hundreds of years been completely obliterated, but with them had gone the faith and confidence in many of the key institutions of modern civilization. It was the rehabilitation of these that was by far the most difficult task, and one in which we are still engaged. It is in the meeting of these problems that I feel the European recovery program is making its greatest contribution to the world.

The debates on the question of continuing the program, it seems to me, are confused by a variety of motives. An appraisement of the requirements of the day is befogged by a failure to realize that we are now engaged in a great struggle. You here may not be in the same sort of physical danger as troops on the battlefield, but you are engaged in a contest with a foe who has designs no less deadly than those we have ever faced. Make no mistake about it, the chips are down. Winning this struggle is as vital to the peace and prosperity of the world as any military campaign in history. Indeed, unless we achieve victory our great military and financial sacrifices may have been largely in vain, I fear.

The nature of this struggle should be clearly understood. It seemed to me during the time I served as Secretary of State that at each meeting of the Foreign Ministers, assaults against the enactment or progress of the recovery program were timed to confuse the understanding of the negotiations in the minds of the public. They were directed at weakening the program by forcing expenditure of funds beyond our calculations and appropriations.

The opposition has not been confined to strikes and purely political manifestations. It has followed through in every conceivable manner, even to the point where I found myself within an hour of the event publicly accused over the radio of being the major planner in the assassination of an important and popular public figure in Bogota.

But despite these determined efforts to prevent the rehabilitation of western Europe on a basis which would permit a healthy revival of democratic processes, the plan has succeeded, thanks to the financial endorsement of our Congress, the leadership of the President and the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and the splendid work of you people of ECA here and abroad, under the able direction of Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Foster, and Ambassador Harriman.

But your job is only half done. I must emphasize the tremendous importance of carrying through on the scale planned. We must avoid proposals to emasculate and reduce ECA to a mere relief affair. At the same time, it seems clear to me that we cannot continue this sort of extraordinary aid indefinitely; therefore, the termination date of June 30, 1952, should be adhered to. I feel that if this date is settled and clear it will spur the work of the European leaders and people to accomplish the extremely difficult task ahead of lifting themselves above the need for our financial assistance. There will always be in this generation of men a need for our moral and spiritual backing.

To those who assert that our targets cannot be reached within the short span of two more years, I would say that perfection of accomplishment cannot always be expected. But we have seen a close approach to that perfection in these past 2 years.

It is true that for western Europe to get its economic house in such order that it can survive and prosper in this competitive modern world requires a tremendous final effort over the next 2 years. The erasing of old trade barriers and the construction of new channels, such as a clearing union for Europe's varied moneys, may require a miracle of cooperation.

But, looking again at the conditions prevalent in the spring of 1947, and again considering the situation at this moment, I can only feel that one near miracle has been accomplished. We must work for, and expect, another miracle.

Let me sum it up: We are engaged in a perilous struggle with an implacable foe; we must carry this battle to the finish; we must avoid the temptation to imperil the whole investment—and it is just that, an investment in saving all those previous articles of faith and ways of life we call democracy. It is an investment in preserving the freedoms of men in a clean and decent world.

Closing Valley Forge General Hospital a Blow at Our Disabled Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of acute distress to me to note that the administration, in defense of the closing of several military hospitals throughout the country, of which Valley Forge General Hospital, in my district, is one, gives forth with the pious statement, that, and I quote, "If we really want to make the income of the Government meet its expenditures, the only way it can be done is to cut off some expenditures." Those of us who are urging Federal economy could subscribe to that rather obvious rule were it not for the fact that almost simultaneously with that profound declaration we find the same administration laying down to the Congress a must on the adoption of a point 4 program which, during the next fiscal year will scatter abroad far more millions than will be saved by this curtailment of services to those who have fought their Nation's battles.

In a recent statement made in my presence the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs branded Valley Forge General Hospital as a firetrap, whereas that ill-considered observation was being made at the very time our Government had placed a number of its patients in ill-managed private sanitariums such as Belle Vista, outside of Philadelphia, where a disastrous fire last week caused the death of 10 patients, 2 of whom were veterans. Certainly a policy which condemns a fine hospital like Valley Forge and at the same time utilizes the questionable facilities of a firetrap like Belle Vista needs a drastic overhauling.

Appended hereto is the copy of a letter I have just dispatched to the VA Administrator urging him to reconsider his opposition in the light of this tragic loss of life:

Gen. CARL R. GRAY,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs,
Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL GRAY: The newspaper account of the recent tragic fire at the Belle Vista Sanitarium on the outskirts of Philadelphia raises the question as to why some 30 veterans should have been housed in such a firetrap when it is reported that Valley Forge General Hospital has a 300-bed neuropsychiatric section, the occupancy of which could have been arranged for these mentally disturbed wards of the Government under the contractual arrangements the Veterans' Administration already has with the Department of Defense.

In the light of a policy under which you entrust the care of our disabled to an uncertain fate in a private institution such as Belle Vista, I feel that your claim that Valley Forge is a firetrap falls completely flat. A casual inspection of this institution will reveal that the buildings are of concrete-block construction with brick facing, that a highly effective sprinkler system is in place, and that the detached arrangement of the various wards of itself is protection against fire.

May I respectfully suggest that your responsibility to our disabled dictates that you should recede from your present opposition to the taking over of Valley Forge so that veteran patients who are now housed in ill-managed firetraps can be moved without delay to comparative safety of this splendid Government hospital. I would also point out that lack of funds is hardly a valid excuse for inaction in this matter unless a deficiency request has been refused by Congress.

Sincerely,

PAUL B. DAGUE,
Member of Congress.

Tough Job Assigned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include the article taken from the Evening Star of Friday, March 31, 1950, entitled "Tough Job Assigned." This reads, as follows:

TOUGH JOB ASSIGNED—TRUMAN GIVES SYMINGTON HEAVY TASK OF SELLING INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION

(By Doris Fleeson)

President Truman has assigned his most difficult selling job to the best salesman in Washington.

The phenomenally successful Secretary of Air, W. Stuart Symington, takes over the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board almost coincidentally with a declaration by General Eisenhower that the board's main task—industrial mobilization—is one of the most neglected and most important parts of national defense. The problem, he declared, requires earnest attention and won't cost a nickel.

Nevertheless, it will be a real test of Mr. Symington's mettle. The politician at the head of the Government and the 531 politicians on Capitol Hill are equally timid about real mobilization plans which must necessarily clamp an iron hand upon America in the event of war. Men like B. M. Baruch and General Eisenhower who have made the round trip to two wars may plead and propose, but the politicians will dispose.

CONGRESS MUST BE SOLD

NSRB is a Presidential agency. It must first sell the President, then in conjunction with him, the Congress. This is an election year; in two more years the Presidential campaign will be upon us.

Mr. Symington has shown courage and flair in the battle of Washington. The President first handed him the ticklish and perilous Surplus Property Administration from which he escaped intact. The intrepid maneuvering by which he has outflanked the older services—in one instance, the Secretary of Defense also—and firmly established the infant Air Force, is more recent history.

In his new job, he will still have the advantages of the President's confidence and his own talents. But his product will no longer be popular. Congress dotes on air power; it is the trend of the times and it spares them having to enact universal military training and a heavy draft of manpower. But congressional allergy even to stand-by powers to freeze wages, rents, prices, profits, jobs, and so forth, is natural and formidable.

DELAY INVITES ATTACK

The President has been under heavy attack for the year's delay in filling the NSRB chairmanship. The Symington appointment will be warmly greeted—and much expected from it.

It is understood that Mr. Symington had another preference. He wanted to succeed David E. Lilienthal as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. AEC does not have the fun and kudos of the Air Force job; it more than makes that up with its aura of secrecy and power.

But AEC rates as a man-killer among Government posts which perhaps helps to account for the high turn-over among the Commissioners. Mr. Symington has wholly recovered from the delicate operation performed to cure high blood pressure, but his friends, including the President, are solicitous about his health.

The President also had the problem of finding a man acceptable to Congress among his intimate circle. The resources job is potentially so important Congress will not swallow the ordinary White House crony, as witness the Mon Wallgren turndown. But the NSRB chairman must work intimately with the President, who dislikes strangers.

Whether the President intends that NSRB shall fulfill its allotted functions from here on in only he knows. He now has a chairman who can carry on, if permitted.

Know Your Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an article published in the Washington Post of April 3, 1950, by the Marine News, of New York, as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—WHAT MR. HOOVER BELIEVES

In 1925, when Secretary of Commerce, former President Herbert Hoover said, in part, in an address that "the topography of our country, the present and future necessities of our population, the development we have already accomplished, and, above all, the goodness of providence in our natural water channels, clearly define for us two major inland waterway systems, the Mississippi system and the Great Lakes system. I visualize the Mississippi system as 9,000 miles of connected waterways—a transportation system of which some 3,100 miles are trunk lines and 6,000 miles of laterals. That is, a main north-south trunk line 1,500 miles in length, reaching from New Orleans to Chicago, and there connecting with the Great Lakes system, and, crossing this, a great east-west trunk line 1,600 miles in length, from above Pittsburgh through Cairo to Kansas City. Over a large part of these main stems we can maintain 9 feet of depth. In addition, we must diligently improve feeders through the Tennessee, Cumberland, Arkansas, upper Missouri, upper Mississippi, Monongahela, Allegheny, and other streams to workable depth for modern craft. It will serve the vast heart of American agriculture and will place great commercial and industrial cities with upward of 7,000,000 people

in the cheapest of communications with each other and cheapest transportation of agricultural and bulk commodities over a great hinterland of States. Diesel engines, improved steam appliances, and better loading and discharging devices have all advanced us a long distance from the old canal boats and the packet boat. But the fundamental for use of these appliances is that we shall have sufficient and reliable depths of water to make them possible for use. Modern forms of development have made water carriage the cheapest of all transportation for many types of goods. With greater depths and with the improvements in craft, it is possible to restore our waterways. Nor will this jeopardize the prosperity of our railways, as some predict." What Mr. Hoover believes to be good for the general welfare is a far cry from the clamor of those interests opposed to waterway competition.

Editor News,
New York, N. Y.
GEORGE H. TWINIG,
President and Publisher.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the current uproar over alleged Communist infiltration of the State Department is causing great concern among the American people. Whatever the truth or falsity of current charges it is obvious that the Republican Party is seeking to make a campaign issue of communism.

Such partisan attempts, however, are not justified in view of the Republican record in the case of Alger Hiss. Alger Hiss, the former State Department official, was convicted—mind you, not by the Republicans—but by the Truman administration. And let us not forget that. Let all of us remember that it was the capable, brilliant Bronx Democrat, Assistant United States Attorney Thomas F. Murphy, who prosecuted Alger Hiss and who succeeded in convincing a jury of 12 New Yorkers that Hiss had betrayed his high trust.

There was no coddling of communism in this case by the Democratic administration. But what is the Republican record in the case of Alger Hiss?

For my information I am drawing heavily from the pages of a brilliant new book, just published, on the Hiss-Chambers affair. The book is called Seeds of Treason, and its authors are Victor Lasky, a star reporter of the New York World-Telegram and Sun, and Ralph de Toledano, an assistant editor of Newsweek magazine.

And may I just add parenthetically that aside from the importance of Seeds of Treason as a first-hand study of Communist espionage in operation, Seeds of Treason reads like a detective story. I sat up with it until 3 in the morning. I just could not put it down.

But what interested me, as a Democrat and loyal American, were the references in Seeds of Treason to the Republican role in backing Alger Hiss.

The book discloses that James Byrnes, a Democrat, had, as Secretary of State, "been growing increasingly suspicious of Alger Hiss." But the book adds that John Foster Dulles, who would have become the Republican Secretary of State, had Gov. Thomas E. Dewey been elected, ignored warnings concerning Alger Hiss' connections with communism.

Mr. Lasky and Mr. Toledano claim that despite these warnings Mr. Dulles placed Alger Hiss in the $20,000 a year post of president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

But before Hiss assumed his new office—

And I am quoting from Seeds of Treason—

Dulles received what should have been a disturbing letter from Larry S. Davidow, a Detroit lawyer who had served with the Republican policy maker at ecclesiastical conferences.

Mr. Davidow wrote Mr. Dulles, according to Seeds of Treason:

The information we have would indicate that Mr. Hiss has a provable Communist record. If you are interested in becoming more familiar with this situation reliable individuals in Washington will disclose it to you in full confidence.

And what did Mr. Dulles say in response? According to Seeds of Treason, Mr. Dulles replied on December 26, 1946:

I have heard of the reports which you refer to, but I am confident that there is no reason to doubt Mr. Hiss' complete loyalty to our American institutions. * * * I feel a little skeptical about information which seems inconsistent with all that I personally know.

And as the authors of Seeds of Treason point out Mr. Dulles "dismissed the evidence against Hiss even before he had learned what it was."

And, to repeat, Mr. Dulles would have been the Republican Secretary of State had Gov. Thomas E. Dewey won the Presidency in 1948.

Now what did Governor Dewey do when he heard of the charges against Alger Hiss during the 1944 campaign. The information was provided Governor Dewey by Isaac Don Levine, the anti-Communist journalist. According to Seeds of Treason, Governor Dewey "promised to raise the question in a speech—and then he attacked Adolf A. Berle as a fellow traveler."

Gentlemen, I need not go into the anti-Communist record of Mr. Berle, head of the New York State Liberal Party, and I think you will all agree that calling Mr. Berle a fellow traveler is somewhat ludicrous.

After all, according to Seeds of Treason, when Whittaker Chambers broke with the Communists he took his story to Mr. Berle, who immediately tightened up security in the State Department.

Another Republican leader, who was informed of the grave charges against Alger Hiss, was Senator Warren Austin. And I quote from Seeds of Treason:

Early in 1940, Don Levine went to a friend, Senator Warren Austin—later chief United States representative at the United Nations—with a "fairly comprehensive account" of the Soviet underworld in Washington. For some reason Austin did not feel it was up to him to carry the explosive information to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat my statement that partisan attempts by the Republicans to make capital out of alleged Communist infiltration of the State Department are unjustified in the light of the Republican record in the serious case of Alger Hiss—a case in which the Democratic administration acted firmly and courageously.

Representation of China in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most shocking actions since the founding of the United Nations is that taken by its Secretary General, Mr. Trygve Lie, in trying to maneuver the unseating of one of its founders, the Government of China, and putting in its place the puppet Communist regime set up in Peking and openly proclaiming its subservience to the Soviet Union. As was predicted by those who were willing to study thoroughly the Chinese Communists and their doctrines instead of reading the propaganda of the Fairbanks, Lattimores, Edgar Snows, and the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, the Communists are in the process of making China a colony of the Kremlin. If the UN were to follow Lie's suggestions it would do more to wreck what ought to be the world's best hope for peace than any abstentions or other blackmail by the Kremlin could possibly do. How does it come that the chief official sworn to uphold the United Nations Charter should be engaged in efforts that would destroy confidence in it as an instrument of justice by making it a tool of the Soviet Union?

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following letter sent to Mr. Lie by Mr. Matthew Woll, president of the Free Trade Union Committee of the American Federation of Labor, and a veteran fighter against Communist subversion. It is encouraging to observe that hard-headed labor leaders who have had first-hand experience with Communist tactics are not taken in by slogans or fatuous arguments and cut incisively to the heart of the matter as in this letter. Every American ought to read it.

FREE TRADE UNION COMMITTEE,
LABOR LEAGUE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS,
New York, N. Y., March 24, 1950.

His Excellency TRYGVE LIE,
Secretary General,
The United Nations,
Lake Success, N. Y.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY GENERAL: The free trade union committee of the American Federation of Labor has given careful consideration to your memorandum of March 8, 1950, entitled "Legal Aspects of Problems of Representation in the United Nations."

You seek to reexamine the status of the legitimate government of China in the UN. It is our firm conviction that fundamental principles rather than formal procedure are

involved in the issue you have raised. We fully recognize the urgent desirability of overcoming or ending the continued boycott of UN sessions by Russia and its satellites. We can only applaud your desire to have the UN function most effectively as an instrument of and a force for just and harmonious international relations. It is precisely for these reasons that we reject any proposal which would admit, through the front entrance or through some back door, into the UN the Communist clique of usurpers who, with the aid of foreign funds and forces, have seized power in China.

We grant that the present boycott by the Russian bloc, like the Soviet's preceding unwarranted walk-outs and unscrupulous exercise of the veto power, hurts the efficacy of the UN. But we must warn against rushing into the adoption of some sort of "solution" of this difficulty which might inflict even graver damage on the UN and hurt it irreparably as an agency of international equity and peace. We solemnly warn against a cure which would be far more poisonous and infinitely more harmful to the body-politic of the UN than its present ailment. It is all good and well to seek the return of the Russian bloc, but let no one seek to purchase it at a price which would appease and foster aggression, facilitate and reward fifth column activities by one member nation against another, and thus seriously jeopardize world peace.

In your memorandum you stress that diplomatic recognition is not a prerequisite to admitting new members into the United Nations. Therefore, you would have the United States, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, and other countries stop considering their nonrecognition of the Mao Tse-tung dictatorship as an obstacle to admitting it into the UN. Thereby, all obstacles would be removed and the path would be finally cleared for slipping into the UN the Communist regime imposed on the Chinese people after years of Russian intrigue and intervention in flagrant violation of all international law and the UN Charter itself.

We cannot go along with your reasoning. We must strongly warn against the perilous consequences of any policy based on such reasoning. The analogy of Burma and Yemen whose admission as new members into the UN was voted for by countries which had not accorded them recognition does not at all hold for the present Chinese issue raised by Russia. In the case of China, we are not faced with the problem of seating a new member. Here blackmail and all sorts of pressure are being brought to bear by a distinct and obdurate minority to force the majority to unseat an old, a charter, member of the UN. The Chinese Nationalist Government, with which Russia itself had solemnly entered into a treaty of friendship, has from the very inception of the UN also served as a permanent member of the Security Council. Obviously, this is not a Burma-Yemen case.

Moreover, there is now pending before the Interim Assembly a complaint of the Chinese National Government, which was until recently recognized by all member nations of the UN as the sole legitimate authority in China. This complaint charges the Soviet Government with 455 specific acts of aggression. To eliminate the complainant on one excuse or another would be a brutally unjust and strictly totalitarian method of dealing with complaints. Such arbitrary procedure would be nothing else but rank prejudgment of the complaint.

If upon the bludgeoning demand of a stronger power, a complaining weaker state which put its trust in the UN for assuring it justice should be rewarded with expulsion, then the UN would cease to function and its Charter would be torn to shreds and placed on the scrap heap of history. We emphasize: The UN was conceived and dedicated not to the pampering and appeasing of the strong aggressors but to the protection of the weaker states against aggression.

On the very basis of your proposal to accept as a criterion for admission into the UN the provisions of article 4 of the Covenant, the Mao Tse-tung puppet regime is thoroughly disqualified for and unworthy of membership in the UN. It is still too early to conclude that Communist control of the mainland is solid and final. Over a million Chinese Nationalist guerrillas and well over 600,000 fighting Nationalist troops in Formosa, Hainan, and the coastal islands are yet to be reckoned with by the Peiping puppets. Besides, there is scarcely any economic or political stabilization and consolidation of the usurper regime. Economic collapse and famine are the order of the day in many parts of overrun China. Furthermore, Mao Tse-tung and company certainly have not demonstrated any desire or capacity, any willingness or ability, to carry out the obligations of membership in the United Nations.

In the brief but precarious and pernicious period of its existence, the Peiping regime has already outraged every elementary concept of human decency. It has displayed callous contempt for international obligations and human rights. We need but cite its brazen and brutal refusal to permit the departure of American citizens from Chinese territories which it has overrun. It has murdered in cold blood many of the ablest leaders of free trade unionism in China. Among these martyred heroes of free labor was Liu Sung-shan who was three times the Chinese workers' delegate to the ILO, a most vital agency of the UN.

We are amazed and distressed that anyone with authority and responsibility in the UN should strive for some formula or so-called compromise which would expel from the UN the legitimate Chinese State which has faithfully and consistently fulfilled all its obligations and replace it with a terroristic band of usurpers. We are utterly at a loss to understand why anyone should propose a policy which would penalize the legally constituted State authority of China and reward the usurpers of Chinese legal authority. We cannot believe that usurpation of authority is proof of responsibility and qualification for membership in the UN and its Security Council.

For the UN, directly or covertly, to recognize and reward usurpers as they arise would be fatal to the cause of peace and human progress. Such a course would make the UN itself unstable and uncertain and would make its decisions subject entirely to the fluctuations and machinations of sinister power politics and foreign intervention in the life of weaker nations. Such a policy would prevent the UN from playing the role of harmonizer and stabilizer. It would in effect turn the UN into a source of virulent instability and uncertainty. Such a course could only encourage domestic chaos and widespread fifth column operations. Such a course would remove every assurance of protection which the smaller nations have today in the UN. It would seriously hinder world recovery and gravely endanger the prospects for peace.

We deeply deplore the stubborn and studied boycott of the UN by the Russian bloc. We share with you the desire to end the deadlock. That is why we urge you to direct your appeal for ending this studied abstention to those who are responsible for the damaging deadlock. That is why we sincerely hope that in the interest of the unquestioned and unquestionable impartiality which your high office must have, you withdraw your memorandum of March 8, 1950. Such a withdrawal by you would be fully in line with article 100 of the Charter which provides that: "They [Secretary General and the staff] shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their positions as international officers responsible only to the Organization."

We are sure you share with us our firm faith in the UN and reject unreservedly any notion that this great body cannot function and is futile without active participation by Russia and its satellites. In fact, the UN has been able to do highly valuable work in many fields—without Russian participation. Though boycotted by Moscow, the UN specialized agencies have had a most creditable record. In recent months, the councils and commission of the UN have achieved real results despite Soviet abstentions. In handling the Kashmir case, the Security Council has certainly not been hampered by Russian absence. The Trusteeship Council in its preparation of the Somaliland agreement has not been stymied or strangled by Soviet abstention. Similarly, in its treatment of the problems of rendering financial and technical aid to underdeveloped regions, the ECOSOC has shown that it can get along without the Kremlin's contribution.

In sum, there is no cause for panic. There is not the slightest excuse for haste. While deplorable, the Russian abstention is not fatal. What would be fatal for the UN is for it to yield to bullying and threats by any big power. Indeed, the parallel and precedent of the present difficulty in the UN are not at all with the admission of Burma and Yemen. The present situation in the UN does, however, present a striking and appalling parallel with the crisis faced by the League of Nations in 1935-36 over the Italo-Ethiopian dispute. Then, in order to appease and please Mussolini, whose marauders overran Ethiopia, the League of Nations deprived the government of the momentarily, militarily defeated Emperor Haile Selassie of its credentials and its rights to have a delegation to the 1936 Assembly. That decision marked the death-knell of the League of Nations.

Let not the UN today—in order to appease and satisfy another totalitarian dictator, Stalin, who engineered his Communists' overrunning the Chinese mainland—unseat and expel from the UN the momentarily, militarily, defeated Chinese National Government and replace it with the criminal and foreign-financed Communist usurpers. For the UN to follow the disastrous precedent of the League of Nations would be tantamount to signing its own death warrant. And this time a death blow to the principal international agency and hope of world peace will be more disastrous than was the degrading demise of the League of Nations.

The hour is too grave for appeasement of aggression and injustice. The time is most propitious for a firm stand by the forces of freedom and peace—in the interest of freedom, peace and decency in international relations.

Sincerely yours,
MATTHEW WOLL,
President, Free Trade Union Committee of AFL.

False Pretenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the columns of the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican of March 26, 1950:

FALSE PRETENSES

When Mr. Truman does his stumping this election year, the taxpayer will foot the bill.

The fact that it is an old story doesn't make disguise of political as public business any more palatable. It is a cynical procedure, this charging up of electioneering to the taxpayer. If the American people's sense of their own self-interest were really acute, to say nothing of their sense of what's right and proper on the part of their elected representatives, they would stop it.

Some weeks back, Mr. Truman mentioned to reporters that public business would probably call him on long trips before election day. He grinned when he said it, and the reporters knew what he meant. Public business would be just the pretext for political swings around the circle. Now at Key West he has enlarged upon his plans. In early May he will go out to the Pacific coast to dedicate the Grand Coulee Dam. Other Government projects may be visited. But there is no question about all the political speaking he will do along the route, from addressing a giant Democratic rally at Chicago on May 18, to haranguing any group gathered along the railroad right-of-way.

There ought to be a method of nixing up Presidential excursions like this. Determining whether public or political business was the chief activity and letting the Democratic National Committee pick up just a few of the tabs for these cross-continental jaunts. It is a cinch that on the trip Mr. Truman is planning for May and the one he has in mind for next fall, his identity as President will be altogether swallowed up by his role as party leader out trying to make a lot of Democratic votes.

Atlantic Alliance Is an Illusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I are including an editorial that appeared in the Christian Century for March 22, 1950:

FRANCE AN UNRELIABLE MILITARY ALLY

Ever since the Atlantic military alliance was launched General de Gaulle has been insisting that, from the standpoint of French security, it is worthless. Now the French National Assembly has done its best to prove correct this estimate of the pact's value, though from the American rather than the French point of view. The first shipments of American arms to France were to leave the United States early this month. Fifty planes were in fact taken should a French aircraft carrier at Norfolk. French Communists threatened to tie up ports in which these American arms might be unloaded in France, and other ports from which munitions might be shipped to the Indochina front. Premier Bidault countered by introducing a bill in the National Assembly which would impose life sentences on any persons convicted of such sabotage of military measures. The result was an uproar in Parliament which reduced proceedings to anarchy for almost a week, forced the police to charge in again and again to eject obstreperous Communist deputies, and finally brought from the Assembly's veteran President, Edouard Herriot, the plaintive admission, "I don't know whether this isn't the end of parliament in France." After 5 days of this Premier Bidault finally got his bill through the lower house, but its passage was immediately followed by an outbreak of strikes in utilities which covered most of the nation. The Government broke these only by reverting to the desperation measure of drafting the strikers into the army. In the light of this record, we again register our astonishment that the generals in the Pentagon or any other Americans, should see any value in the Atlantic Pact. Any nation inwardly at war as France has thus shown herself to be is worthless as a military ally. Considering the case purely from a military standpoint, these events in France show that the Atlantic alliance is an illusion. America's arming of a France thus inwardly riven has as little value in making western Europe secure as had our arming of Chiang Kai-shek in keeping China out of Communist hands.

Communism Versus Christianity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I chanced to receive a small calendar card from a well-known religious society, upon which there appeared the following prayer to St. Francis:

Lord, make me an instrument of Your peace—
Where there's hatred, let me sow love;
Where there is injury, pardon;
Where there is doubt, faith;
Where there is despair, hope;
Where ignorance, light, or sadness, joy.

O Divine Master, grant that I may strive
Rather to console than to be consoled;
To understand than to be understood—
To love than to be loved, for:
It is in giving that we receive—
It is in pardoning that we are pardoned, and
It is in dying that we are born to eternal life.

On the reverse side of the card there appeared this very proper reading matter under the title "Communism Versus Christianity":

Communism teaches hate, revenge, atheism, and materialism.

Socialism teaches cooperation and materialism.

Capitalism teaches selfishness, greed, and materialism.

Democracy teaches cooperation, equality, and responsibility.

Internationalism teaches cooperation, responsibility, friendship, and the four freedoms: Freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, and freedom from want.

Christianity teaches love—the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Divine rights are higher than human.

Human rights are above property rights.

Christianity has not failed—it has not been tried.

Communism is a result of failure—the failure of human beings, singly and together, to live the ideals of Christianity.

Communist danger is from within. It is a result of decay—economic, political, social, and religious decay.

Russians are not enemies—Communists are.

Communism is not Russian. It is worldwide. It has enslaved many countries, the largest, so far, being Russia.

When true Christianity is in the market place, the factory, the halls of legislation, the court, the home, the schools, the churches, and in the everyday living of men—then there will be no war, want, fear, or communism.

In time we must all, regardless of race, color, or creed, face up to the fact that, not something, but everything must be done in our Nation, particularly, and generally throughout the world, to combat this terrible menace of spawning and mushrooming communism.

I always wondered why the great Swedish-American humorist, Edgar Bergen, called his dummy by the surname of McCarthy, and I am told that his McCarthy originated in virgin tree form from the forests of Wisconsin, but of course California will immediately deny that I suppose. It is too bad indeed, that the good old name of McCarthy should become famous throughout this land and over the world as a dummy whose life is destined to be spent upon the knee of another to carry out the linguistic purposes of the fellow upon whose knee he is perched.

At this point I am urged to say to myself, let thy right hand with which thou art scribbling these lines, forget its cunning and proceed to introduce the excellent statement given by the Honorable James Green, chairman of the Americanism Commission of the American Legion, before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, on March 23, 1950, in support of H. R. 7595 and H. R. 3903, which bills strike a patriotic blow against Communists and communism:

I am here as the designated representative of the National Commander of the American Legion. Commander Craig is grateful for your invitation to appear and present the attitude of the American Legion. He regrets that the pressure of his official duties prevents him from appearing in person. I appreciate this opportunity to appear in his stead as a representative of the American Legion.

For the record, I am, and since October 1946 have been, Chairman of the National Americanism Commission of the American Legion. I live in Omaha, Nebr., and am an attorney in general practice in that city.

At this late date an extended discussion of the constant position of the American Legion in opposition to communism and other traitorous activities and in support of legislation to curb and control them is not required. Thirty-one years of American Legion history is the most eloquent testimony of that fact. I ask this committee to take notice of that history, which is well known to you. For all of these 31 years this largest of all veterans' organizations has warned against the insidious danger of the amoral Communist conspiracy and has pressed energetically for effective legislative controls to curb and to outlaw it and to rip from it the harlequin mask of pretended political activity.

With its millions of members in every city, town, and county in the several States, representing as they do every walk of life, every creed, and every strata of society, the American Legion truly is one of the most representative organizations in the United States. No national organization reflects the thinking of the unspoken multitude of our population more accurately than does the American Legion.

Time and again at State and National conventions of the American Legion resolutions have been adopted demanding adequate legislation to prevent abuse of citizenship by those who have voluntarily given their

promise of loyalty to an alien power and thereby have become a menace to our national security. Of late years resolutions have been adopted specifically supporting measures of the type you are considering in principle.

Representatives of the American Legion have appeared before this committee and before the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate to state the position of our organization. Specifically, I call your attention to the appearance before this committee of James F. O'Neil, later national commander, of John Thomas Taylor, and myself on the first day of this extended series of hearings in February of 1947. Later, as national commander of the American Legion, in 1948 James F. O'Neil testified again. In May of that same year Paul Griffith, past national commander of the American Legion and presently Assistant to the Secretary of National Defense, testified before the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate in support of H. R. 5852, a forerunner of the present H. R. 7595. On yet another occasion Robert J. Webb, former chairman of the national Americanism commission of the American Legion, testified in support of similar legislation. Again, on May 4, 1949, I appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate in support of S. 1194 and S. 1196, the so-called Mundt and Ferguson bills.

All of that testimony, covering a period of three years, supports in principle the present legislation. If considered necessary or desirable, I request permission to have all of that testimony inserted in the record at this point. If in your judgment it is merely cumulative of other supporting testimony already contained in the record, then, of course, it need not be included.

In that testimony the other witnesses and myself carefully pointed out and argued that the Communist Party was and is the slavishly obedient, willing instrument of a foreign power; that its members and supporters were coldly scheming betrayers, bent upon a mission of liberty destruction, lured by a dream of personal power. We stated further that the Communist Party and its members are part and parcel of a foreign intelligence corps operating in the United States, always willing to obey and carry out the orders of their foreign master. We also called attention to the fact, as did others, that lying, treachery, stealing, any methods were all right according to the philosophy of communism, if they served to advance the Communist cause, and that Communists in government or in any position of trust in our national life were a dangerously weak link in our security. It seemed to us then, and it seems to us now, that it is foolhardy to pour billions of dollars of our national wealth into an effort to contain communism abroad, while blithely blinding ourselves to the danger at home. Why argue for legislation to build up a courageous corps of secret sentinels abroad, only to have Judith Coplon or others like her steal the records of their hidden identity and purpose and turn them over to Soviet Russia and her satellites. Not knowing of any such case, I cannot say that it is so, but wouldn't it weigh heavily on our national conscience to learn that a man serving abroad for his country was convicted abroad, not by evidence obtained abroad, but by evidence forwarded from the United States by American traitors?

Representatives of the American Legion have testified often and at length on this subject during the last 3 years. During all of that time our own research staff has been diligently watchful and quietly and efficiently assembling data. The danger is no less than it was 3 years ago. As our world has become smaller and the Communist-dominated world larger, it is more intense.

This committee and its opposite number in the Senate are deserving of compliment for the careful manner in which they have proceeded. Volumes of evidence have been accumulated. The weight and sufficiency of this evidence have been increased by specific, eminently fair prosecutions in courts of law against persons guilty of hateful acts of betrayal—which the American Legion and others warned might be expected because the only conscience of those who serve communism is in communism, and communism recognizes no conscience, for it recognizes no God.

Legislative findings based upon sufficient study and investigation will not be lightly overturned by courts. You have been careful. You have the facts. Now is the time for action. Americans have been seriously troubled by the full implications of a Soviet fifth column operating in our midst. They have been alarmed by the stark realization of betrayal at the hands of some native-born Americans. They want action and they want it now. To my mind, it is unfortunate that politics have entered this field of inquiry and action. The danger is to national security and, eventually, to national sovereignty. All who have taken an oath to "uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States" should join hands in rooting Red traitors from their hidden holes in our national life.

Act now. Please don't wait for court decisions which may not be handed down for many months. Time is precious. While we debate, our enemies act. At first blush, the request that Congress wait upon a decision yet to be handed down by one of our circuit courts of appeals, and not yet even on its course up to the Supreme Court of the United States, seems reasonable. But that request and that line of reasoning do not take into account the fact that few bills have been drafted with such scrupulous care for their constitutionality as have these, and that is particularly true of H. R. 7595, the Nixon bill. Outstanding attorneys in the field of constitutional law and the standing committee on the Bill of Rights of American Bar Association, in ably reasoned opinions, have expressed belief in the constitutionality of Senate bill 2311, a counterpart of H. R. 7595, and based as it is upon the earlier H. R. 5852. These abundantly qualified attorneys have supported their opinions with an exhaustive study of pertinent decisions.

We are never able to act with certainty. All this committee, or the Congress, or any of us as individuals can do is act with care, governed by our consciences and immutable principles of fundamental justice. Certainly no one can complain with even an infinitesimal degree of right that you have acted in haste or in passion. Haste, when 3 years have been consumed in the study and preparation, is the haste with which a mountain is worn away by the flutter of the tip of a bird's wing. It is haste of the type a small boy experiences in November while waiting for Santa Claus to appear on the 25th of December. Passion which would cause you to act in a fit of anger after three long years have elapsed would certainly be an abiding one. We have had too many of these specious and dilatory arguments. Now the people of America pray that you will act. So does the American Legion.

Legislative measures of this type are intended to expose. They are based upon a sound principle and solidly founded in substantial law. The Federal Government and the Congress have a duty, laid down by our Constitution, to protect the republican form of government to the States and to the ultimate sovereign, the people. This duty cannot be fulfilled if we are not protected against the intrigues of a foreign power carried into operation by its extended arm, the Communist Party.

The character of every act must be judged upon the circumstances under which it is done. Certainly, under existing world conditions and pressures, the acts of Communists and their party are legally criminal and morally wrong. They should be prevented from conspiring together to overthrow our Government. They should be prohibited from employment in our Government; they certainly have no right to it. They should be prevented from stealing and betraying our classified information, and punished if they succeed. They should be denied passports. It would not be wise to give free transport to them so they can exchange information. They should not be permitted to make a mockery of our mails and instrumentalities by using them as transmission belts for their propaganda. They should not be permitted to deduct from taxes funds donated to assist the process of breaking down and destroying liberty. The task to be done by this legislation too long has gone undone. That can be remedied by your thoughtful and patriotic action.

Break in Bipartisan Foreign Policy Held Fault of Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the March 30 issue of the Washington Evening Star relative to the break in the bipartisan foreign policy.

The article follows:

BREAK IN BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY HELD FAULT OF DEMOCRATS—FIGHT AGAINST DULLES IN SENATE RACE CITED AS TYPICAL REWARD

(By David Lawrence)

A lot of holier-than-thou speeches are being made about how the Republicans are upsetting the bipartisan foreign policy, when the truth of the matter is that the Democrats are primarily responsible for destroying the fine spirit of cooperation which once prevailed.

It's all very well for former Secretary Stimson and others with short memories to denounce the Republicans for their attacks on foreign policy, but the principal damage was done last autumn when John Foster Dulles—who, with the exception of Senator VANDENBERG, was the strongest influence in the Senate for bipartisan cooperation—was pilloried by the Democratic Party's wrecking crew in the New York State campaign.

With Senator VANDENBERG in ill health, it was logical that Mr. Dulles would carry the ball for a bipartisan foreign policy at this session. But the heavy guns of the Democratic administration were trained on him just the same. This antagonized the Republicans in Congress, many of whom harbor to this day a bitter resentment against the tactics of the administration.

Mr. Dulles has magnanimously chosen to ignore the episode and strive again for cooperation. Some of the Republicans in the Senate, however, say that it is all very well for a Republican to cooperate and help the Democrats muddle through a difficult situation, but his reward usually is a series of partisan reprisals the moment he runs for office.

CREDIT MINIMIZED

With all due respect to former Governor LEHMAN, it was far more important for the country to have Mr. Dulles returned to the

Senate. The term was only a year, and it would have been a great example of nonpartisanship if the Truman administration had come out in support of the Republican candidate. That would have made sense, because it would have been an example of real patriotism on the part of the administration.

Today the Republicans are aware that whatever credit is due them for their cooperation will be minimized, no matter how much they help, and also that they will have no opportunity to formulate policy, anyhow. For the Republicans were not consulted in the making of far-eastern policy.

The usual cry by the exponents of hushhush and suppression is that the potential enemy abroad will derive aid and comfort from criticism in foreign-policy matters. This is an exaggeration. People in the foreign offices abroad know that the only time an administration can be removed from office in the United States is when a change in the presidency occurs. A minority opposition viewpoint is thoroughly understood and has its constructive values.

Any national or international policy that cannot stand the light of necessary criticism probably isn't worth defending in the first instance. Prime Minister Attlee and Winston Churchill didn't observe any bipartisan etiquette on foreign policy in their recent campaign.

DO CAN OVERPLAY

Naturally, if the Republicans overplay their hand by their criticism, they will hurt themselves, and the majority party and administration will be correspondingly strengthened instead of weakened. If the Republicans happen to be right in their criticism, the Democrats will be influenced to change their policies—which is all to the good.

The fight against Secretary of State Acheson arose not because of any personal antagonism against him in the first instance, but because he is a symbol of the administration, especially since the President appears to have delegated virtually complete responsibility for the making of foreign policy to his Secretary of State.

In these dispatches last autumn, attention was called to the way the administration was fighting Mr. Dulles, and the prediction was made then that far more than a Republican candidate was being destroyed. This has now come true. Except for a meaningless gesture now and then like the designation of former Senator Cooper of Kentucky, to accompany the American delegation to London for the forthcoming meeting of the foreign ministers, the days of bipartisan "cooperation" on foreign policy as carried on heretofore are over.

Republican Senators are no longer to feel muzzled to speak their thoughts in the Senate, and there are signs that the Democrats themselves are considerably relieved, too, to be able to accept the political challenge of their opponents whenever it is flung toward them.

Public Supports McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Senator JOE MCCARTHY has the popular side of his controversy with the State Department. Already his action has flushed out homosexuals in that Department, and now the Commerce Department confesses to the same infliction. As part of my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Frank R. Kent which appeared in the Sunday Star of yesterday:

MCCARTHY'S CHARGES EXPRESS PUBLIC VIEW—WRITER BELIEVES PEOPLE AGREE WITH SENATOR

(By Frank R. Kent)

It is contended that while Senator MCCARTHY has offered no real proof of either his blanket or specific charges of Communist saturation in the State Department, nevertheless, he is strongly supported by the public generally throughout the country.

This is the more significant as the great bulk of press and radio commentators and columnists have been vehemently critical, not to say denunciatory, of Senator MCCARTHY from the start. He has been denounced—and with considerable truth—as reckless and irresponsible; as having, without justification, assailed the character of eminent Americans, such as Dr. Owen Lattimore, Dr. Philip Jessup, Mrs. Dorothy Kenyon, and others; as having damaged the prestige of his country abroad in a time of acute crisis; as having inspired an attack upon Secretary of State Acheson well calculated to weaken our foreign policy, deeply disturbing our allies as well as heartening our potential foes.

A storm of almost unprecedented violence has descended upon Mr. MCCARTHY'S head. Not since 1917, when the late Senator Robert M. La Follette opposed our entry into World War I, has any Member of Congress been as severely excoriated. A good deal of this has been deserved. How, then, in the absence of any genuine confirming evidence, is the public support for Senator MCCARTHY to be accounted for? Unemotionally analyzing the situation, detached men, most of whom feel that the forced resignation of Mr. Acheson would be a calamity, give what seems the only adequate answer: Briefly, it is this—a majority of the people believe (and believed before Mr. MCCARTHY raised his voice) that there is something rotten in the State Department.

The contention is that this belief is justified. Three years ago, it is pointed out, when Whittaker Chambers first told his fantastic story before the Un-American Activities Committee naming Alger Hiss and others, the committee was violently assailed. President Truman called the whole thing a "red herring." The State Department rushed valiantly to Mr. Hiss' defense and many conspicuous friends warmly espoused his cause. The "liberal" commentators who now denounce Mr. MCCARTHY were even more denunciatory then of Mr. Hiss' accusers. In the end, one of the men named by Mr. Chambers committed suicide by jumping out a window. Another—Julian Wadleigh—confessed under oath, claiming immunity because his traitorous acts were more than 10 years old. And, Mr. Hiss, after two concededly fair trials, was convicted. Considering these facts, it is not surprising that Mr. Acheson's two unfortunate Hiss statements should have been misconstrued by the public generally as another defense of Mr. Hiss—and should be resented.

While this feeling was still intense, Senator MCCARTHY burst forth with his charges. It is hardly strange that part of the public was not too much impressed with the denunciation and denials—nor stopped to consider that Mr. MCCARTHY had extremely little with which to back up his sensational allegations. The denunciations and denials could not fail to have a familiar ring. In the midst of all this, their confusion was increased and their resentment enhanced by the statement of Deputy Under Secretary of State Puerifoy that the Department had dismissed nearly 100 homosexual State Department employees as "bad security risks."

Revelation of this situation, which had not been charged by Senator MCCARTHY, came as a shock. Not much has been made of it in the press, but politicians generally agree that their constituents have been more revolted at this voluntary disclosure than by anything else. How, they ask, did there come to be so many of these unfortunate individuals in the employ of the Government and why is the concentration so heavy in the State Department? And how many more of them are there besides those enumerated by Mr. Peurifoy? There seems no adequate answers to these questions, but considering everything, it is not surprising that, regardless of his recklessness and irresponsibility, Senator MCCARTHY should have a large and sympathetic following in his fight.

Rev. Dr. Osmond H. Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, recently an important event occurred in my home town of Buffalo, N. Y., which merits being brought to the attention of the Congress.

Dr. Osmond H. Brown, the rector of St. Philip's Church in Buffalo, is the first Negro priest to be appointed as an honorary canon in the 161-year history of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Dr Brown has been a tireless worker for his church and community and his designation as honorary canon is indeed well deserved and has been well received.

In one of his first statements after receiving this appointment, Father Brown made a plea for the end of racial segregation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am herewith inserting an article in this connection from the Buffalo Courier-Express of March 18, 1950:

FATHER BROWN ASKS END OF RACIAL SEGREGATION

(By Earl Williams)

A conviction that his new position as the first Negro priest to be appointed as honorary canon in the 161-year history of the Protestant Episcopal Church has world-wide significance was expressed yesterday by Dr. Osmond H. Brown, rector of St. Philip's Church, 166 Goodell Street.

Father Brown, who has been flooded with letters and telegrams of congratulations from all sections of the country since the high Anglican honor was bestowed upon him 3 weeks ago, interpreted the action of the Right Reverend Lauriston L. Scaife in naming him an honorary canon of the diocese of western New York as "a test case for the end of segregation in the Christian church."

"I believe," he said, "that the time is now ripe for the end of segregation, which is a curse to Christianity and an incongruity that makes our present democracy a lie.

"The whole world is now seething for respect of human freedom. In many parts of the world people have taken the wrong road to find this freedom."

MADE BY MAN

"The caste system in western civilization was made by man, not God. Unless our civilization is evaluated by Christian culture and not by economic standards, I am convinced that western civilization is doomed for destruction."

Charging that the church has lagged behind the fields of labor, art, and medicine in practicing human solidarity, the rector said he hopes his appointment will lead church people "to put forth before the world the dogma of civil rights and spiritual benefits for every creature of God regardless of creed, race, or previous conditions."

The stumbling block to the end of segregation of Protestant churches, he declared, has been the unwillingness of Christians "to pay the price of respect for human freedom." The true practice of the "law of love," he added, is an expense of our conscience and offers no social profit.

"No people," he continued, "can develop by themselves. There must be an interchange of racial groups and constant human contact to bring about an understanding one to another. Christianity is a fellowship, not a club. There is an urgent need of a better appreciation of respect of the human personality as given by the Supreme Ruler of the universe."

MEET REALITY

The opening of the doors for assimilation of Negroes into American life," Dr. Brown said, "involves a tremendous racial responsibility to adjust ourselves in the spirit of humility and common sense that God may be able to use us as servants for all."

Besides his battle for the end of segregation, Father Brown is concerned that the lack of adequate religious training in education of the majority of Americans today is tending to develop a materialistic and godless nation.

News of the precedent-setting appointment of the Negro priest as an honorary canon, first published in the Courier-Express and carried by wire services throughout the country, has brought a total of 20 letters, 8 telegrams, and many cards of congratulations. Excerpts from one of the letters, sent by Dr. J. DaCosta Harewood, vicar of St. Philip's Episcopal Church, Philadelphia, follows:

"Bishop Scaife has conferred an honor, not only on you but he has honored all of us—the colored clergy of the United States. God bless him.

"May God continue to bless you and enable you to serve Him by serving humanity for many more years to come."

Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with Father Brown. It is ironical that we here in America—where we consider all men to be equal—should have such a running sore as racial segregation. As an American who steadfastly believes in justice and the protection of human rights, I would be derelict in my sworn duty to the people I represent if I did not support the ideals and fundamentals on which our Nation is founded. Those ideals guarantee freedom, liberty, and equality to people of all races and creeds.

In an enlightened nation such as ours no longer can we continue to boast about our democratic principles and forsake these ideals in practice. Discrimination is a cancer in our society. All over the world, the Communists can point to it as proof of the fact that we do not practice what we preach.

I join with Father Brown and other clergymen throughout the country who have dedicated themselves to brotherhood under God and urge that efforts be continued to eliminate the disgraceful and abusive practices of discrimination and segregation.

Father Brown's appointment is another step in the right direction and I want to wish him good luck and continued success.

Reclamation at It Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting the following article which appeared on the editorial page of the San Francisco Chronicle of Thursday, March 23, 1950:

RECLAMATION AT IT AGAIN

In pursuance of its policy to aggrandize itself and to drive private enterprise out of water-power development, the Bureau of Reclamation is seeking to have the Federal Power Commission revoke the licenses it gave last November to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the Fresno irrigation district for developments on Kings River.

Together, though as separate enterprises, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the Fresno irrigation district, with 19 other irrigation districts joining it, propose to develop immediately 418,000 kilowatts with new power company dams greatly increasing irrigation storage on the Kings River.

But the Bureau of Reclamation says it wants to develop Kings River power itself, though its plan would produce only a quarter of the kilowattage proposed by the two present licensees. Incidentally, too, the Bureau proposes to spend $71,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for 101,500 kilowatts, though the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. figures it will get 274,000 kilowatts for $73,000,000.

When would the Bureau have this power ready for a waiting public? It proposes to take 12 years for construction. The P. G. & E. alone proposes to provide more than twice as much power in less than half that time.

The Bureau does not really know when it could turn on the power, if ever. The striking feature of this move by the Bureau is that it has no authorization from Congress for development on Kings River. It may never get one. It is merely trying to block private enterprise. And the grab-everything side of its attempt appears in the fact that one of the licenses it is trying to upset is for the 20 irrigation districts which are public enterprises.

A charge made at the hearing before the Federal Power Commission Tuesday is worth thinking about. It is that the Bureau seeks to grab all economic power sites for Government development and leave only the uneconomic ones for private enterprise. If the Bureau could do this and limit private enterprise to only the marginal undertakings, the private concerns might have to charge higher rates to the consumers. Thus consumers, while being taxed to build overcostly and sometimes unnecessary public plants, would also have to pay more for their electricity.

An example of unnecessary expenditure proposed by the Bureau was turned down by the House Appropriations Committee Tuesday. The committee struck out of the Central Valley project appropriation funds asked by the Bureau for a Delta steam plant and various transmission lines and switchyards. None of these are needed. The existing P. G. & E. facilities are ample, are now meeting all demands and can continue to do so, and, under a contract dictated by the Bureau, at costs which would not be lessened by the duplicate facilities the Bureau wants to spend millions for. Congress after Congress has refused these items, but the Bureau still persists.

The Federal Power Commission was right in November when it pronounced the Bureau of Reclamation's plans for Kings River inadequate and issued the licenses to the P. G. & E. and the Fresno irrigation district. It should not permit itself to be buffaloed by the Interior Department into a reversal.

The Census and the Questions To Be Answered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. Walter Johnson, of Heathsville, Va.:

COUNTRY LAWYER

(By Walter Johnson, Heathsville, Va.)

The Constitution of the United States as so carefully written by the wise founding fathers and as ratified by the people, the Congress is authorized and directed to enumerate the people each 10 years. The purpose is to determine fair representation of the people in Congress on the basis of numbers.

That power to enumerate the people has shamefully been stretched by our Congress into power to impose on the people an enumeration or inventory of all the possessions of the people and of the earnings of the people.

At hand is a large sheet of paper with fine printing on both sides. In this printing are 334 questions, many of which have a number of subdivisions. It is called the agriculture questionnaire. The citizen is directed to answer the question and have it ready for the census taker.

Preparation of these questions was done in the dark dungeons of Washington bureaucracy. Congress did not prepare this monstrosity. But the Census Bureau would never dare impose such a thing on the people without authority of Congress.

That the Government of the United States can force the citizenry to give to it an inventory of possessions both on the farm and in the home is something never expected under the Stars and Stripes.

Government forces the citizen to tell if he has an electric water heater or electric washing machine but somehow it forgot to ask about electric clocks and blankets. Perhaps this information will be picked up by the census taker personally.

Only one Member of Congress has had the courage to raise his voice against this tyranny insofar as this writer has observed. He is CLARENCE BROWN, of Ohio.

In years gone by enumerators have been hired from among ordinary intelligent people in the community to enumerate their neighbors. Not so this year. Now, to make it more expensive and complicated, they are conducting examinations for enumerators.

Among this writer's acquaintances three ladies were examined and rejected as unable to pass. These ladies were all leaders in church and civic affairs and generally recognized as well-informed. They wanted to earn a little pin money and as they thought have a few weeks of interesting employment.

Perhaps it is just as well they were rejected. I am sure they are not the kind who would enjoy propounding unpleasant questions to their neighbors.

This business of forcing the citizen to furnish the Government of the United States with an inventory of his possessions can only be properly described with the one word "tyranny." There is not one bit of authority for it in the Constitution of the United States nor can justification be found any place.

There is only one place to put the blame. That is on our Representatives in Congress. They have failed the people.

Each and every Member of the House of Representatives and one-third of the Members of the Senate will be up for reelection in November. All will want your vote for another term. All will tell you about the fine work they are doing. Let them explain about this inventory they are forcing on the people.

Men like Patrick Henry, George Mason, and Thomas Jefferson are needed today in these United States even more than in 1776. If the men who so carefully wrote the Constitution of the United States could see how the power to enumerate has been wrongfully stretched into the power to inventory possessions of the people these fine patriots would rise out of their graves in angry protest.

Farmers Want a Plan But Not Brannan's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Farm Journal has just rendered a real service to the people of the United States. A recent poll conducted by that leading farm magazine, indicates what farmers think should be a sound program for agriculture. On a six-point program the Brannan plan was sixth, or last, getting one vote out of every 12. This shows the common sense possessed by people who comprise the great farm business in this country. Complete information is in the April issue.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a letter to Congressmen and an article entitled "What Farm Journal Readers Voted On":

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: "Let livestock eat up most of our farm surpluses and replace a good bit of the rest."

That's the line that most readers of Farm Journal prefer, judging by their vote on the 12 plans we asked them to choose from in our February issue.

Votes are still coming in, but an analysis of the first 2,000 showed the livestock solution easily first, with 23 percent of the total.

This plan, which Farm Journal has been vigorously promoting, makes sense to farmers. They point out that livestock cannot only eliminate most surpluses, but can at the same time improve the national diet, help conserve soil, provide more employment within agriculture, and return more of the consumer's food dollar to the farmer.

That's because a livestock feeder is not only a producer of raw products, but a processor.

Sure, they say, livestock farmers would have to have income support at some level, and in some fashion, but that the support might better be under livestock than under many things we support now.

Not that this would be the whole answer. It wouldn't solve everything for everybody, and it couldn't do it all at once, but these farmers say, it's the big goal.

Second place in the voting went to the flexible, sliding-scale price support urged mainly by the Farm Bureau.

Third place went to a plan to swap surpluses for scarce foreign materials.

"More research" came in fourth—research for new crops, and new uses for old crops.

Some kind of two-price system—a higher price for what we use at home, a lower price for exports—came fifth.

And in sixth place was the Brannan plan, getting one vote out of every 12.

These six plans accounted for four-fifths of all the ballots cast. One of every 11 voters had an idea of his own that he thought was better than any of the 12 ideas we described.

The mail brought us everything, from just the coupon at the end of the February article to a 19-page typewritten letter—single spaced. The opinions ranged from some too violent to print to such whimsical ideas as that Secretary Brannan use surplus potatoes as stoppers on more kerosene cans.

There you are, Mr. Congressman. This was no scientifically prepared poll. The sample consisted of anybody who felt moved to write us. But it could be a mighty significant straw in the wind.

One thing was too obvious to miss, as we read through these first 2,000 letters: farmers want farm income kept high in one way or another, but they want even more to stay out of the hands of bureaucrats in Washington, or, for that matter, bureaucrats nearer home.

They believe that if we look around a little, and don't get too hysterical, we can find ways to do both of these things. They expect to be in the farming business for a long time, and they're looking beyond the next few months.

WHAT FARM JOURNAL READERS VOTED ON—HERE ARE THE 12 FARM PLANS OUTLINED IN THE FEBRUARY ISSUE OF FARM JOURNAL, FOR WHICH FARM JOURNAL READERS CAST THEIR VOTES

1. Let livestock eat us out of trouble, as proposed by Farm Journal. Farm animals could easily do it—in fact could leave us short of nearly everything. This would mean more, and therefore cheaper, livestock. Hence farmers would have to cut costs in order to keep making money. But those costs can be cut, as Farm Journal's current series of cost-cutting articles shows.

While Government price supports would be necessary until livestock could get the job done, here is a long-time answer that would get farmers out of the hands of the politicians.

(Some people are suggesting subsidies on livestock to speed this up.)

2. The Brannan plan. Its main feature is to let prices follow the market, thus giving consumers cheap food while the Government makes up the farmers' incomes. What the cost in taxes would be, no one knows, except that it would be terrific. And farmers would have to keep coming back to Congress for huge new appropriations to pay the bill.

The Farmers' Union supports the Brannan plan in principle, but urges even higher levels of support.

3. A two-price system, run by a bipartisan farm board. Supplies for home consumption would be held to a level that would bring good prices; surpluses would be sold abroad at world prices. This board would also have the power to apply any other remedies needed, including marketing agreements, support prices, and, as a last resort, marketing quotas and acreage allotments. The National Grange supports this plan.

The National Milk Producers Federation also supports a two-price program, but would have it operate through farmer-controlled marketing pools.

4. Flexible, sliding-scale support prices, which would prevent prices from falling to bankruptcy levels, but which would not encourage farmers to overproduce. The American Farm Bureau Federation backs this scheme.

5. Food stamps and free school lunches: The Government would figure how much a proper diet would cost a person, and what share of its income any family should spend for food. Then any family that could not buy a proper diet for, say, 40 percent of its income would get stamps—as a gift from the Government—to make up the difference.

6. An international commodity clearinghouse which would handle sales between hard- and soft-money countries. The United States might sell for full price in soft money, or for a discount in hard money. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations proposed this, but the United States officially has turned thumbs down on it.

7. Straight sales to foreign countries, to be paid for in soft money, without any clearinghouse arrangement, and with the taxpayers taking any loss on the foreign currency.

8. Higher subsidies on exports, to lower the price to foreigners, with the United States donating the balance. Payments to us would be made in dollars.

9. Permission to the CCC to sell more of its holdings at a loss. (Not much different from No. 8.)

10. Making an outright gift of more of our food to hungry people overseas, forgetting about any payment.

11. Swapping farm products for scarce materials from abroad.

12. Finding new crops to take the place of surplus crops, and finding new uses for old crops through greatly expanded chemurgic research. (Admittedly this won't solve today's pressing problems, but it's got big possibilities for the long run, if we put up enough money for a real research job.)

Montana Wants Early CVA Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit a copy of a resolution adopted February 26, 1950, by delegates to the Western Montana Conference for CVA, meeting at Polson, Mont. The meeting and the appended resolution are a strong manifestation of the impatience with the long delay in consideration of the CVA proposal:

That President Truman be commended for his perseverance in pressing for the enactment of the Columbia Valley Administration bill. We particularly commend his most recent action in advising the Bureau of the Budget that while development of the Columbia Basin must be continued for the time being under the joint Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation Plan, this is no substitute for the full-scale development under a CVA.

We urge the creation of a CVA because: The Army engineers-Reclamation Bureau plan is based on unproved engineering, a pious hope for cooperation between competing agencies, and a total neglect of the natural unity between land and water. A CVA, on the other hand, offers complete, unified, multipurpose development of the Columbia

Basin's varied resources through the efficient mechanism of a public corporation with headquarters in the region.

We recommend establishing an organization of all interested individuals and groups to promote CVA and its program. This must be done immediately to combat the deluge of misleading propaganda put out by well financed organizations fronting for the vested interests, and by well meaning, but misinformed, local groups.

We respectfully request that the congressional Committees on Public Works of the House and Senate hold public hearings throughout the region at the earliest practicable date.

Unanimously adopted by the committee on resolutions.

RAY KELLY,
Chairman, Lake County.
EUGENE FIKE,
Missoula County.
PETE RUDERMAN,
Missoula County.
MRS. RAY LOGAN,
Lake County.
L. J. CARTER,
Sanders County.
ROBERT WELLES,
Flathead County.
JEROME LOCKE,
Lewis and Clark County.

Not Too Little, Too Late

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a minority member of the subcommittee on appropriations for the armed services, on my own responsibility preliminary to what later I intend to say at some length if I am recognized to say anything under the program of procedure I understand is contemplated, I do wish to say now on the basis of 17 years' experience in this House as a member of the Military Affairs Committee and of the Appropriations Committee that this seems an appropriate time—before it is too late—to sound a warning to the Department of Defense and the Members of Congress against adopting the attitude of fetish with regard to the projected military budget of 13 billions.

This figure was agreed upon as one which would suffice for the needs of the hour. The hour, at the time it was enunciated, was January of this year. The planning and the basic agreement on 13 billions predated January by a substantial period.

That same basic agreement of 13 billions was not without some dissent and mental reservation. I have no doubt that there were far-seeing men among the professionals in the Department of Defense, who, while agreeing upon the 13-billion figure at the time, did so with crossed fingers and a murmured prayer.

Since that time the United States of America has been treated to a spectacle of further Russian expansion and the consolidation of aggressive gains by Russian satellites. Communist China is rattling the saber in the direction of the Western Powers, particularly the United States. Communist forces within still-free nations of southeast Asia are agitating against us.

Only a few days ago Communist-trained forces in Indochina touched off a street riot as a demonstration against a friendly visit by United States vessels at Saigon. In addition, shells were fired from mortars in the direction of our ships. American merchant ships have been barred from evacuating American Nationals including our diplomats from Shanghai.

In Europe, satellites of the Soviets have tried to limit our diplomatic privileges within satellite borders. Our freedom of movement within these countries has been hampered in a fashion which seeks to humiliate the prestige of the United States.

And, an American naval officer, traveling from his post in Rumania, was mysteriously killed. Chinese Communists still hold our Navy fliers prisoner, despite all protests.

Many of these things, these far-flung manifestations of unfriendliness and thinly masked aggression, have occurred since it was agreed among the military planners that 13 billions was the limit beyond which we should not go in financing our national defense for the next fiscal year.

From the planners themselves, there have come expressions of doubt as to the capability of our defense plan for 1951. The Navy has supported House moves towards the building of new ships. The Air Force has said it would like to have more planes, if the money could be had.

There are undoubtedly desirable improvements in our ground forces which could be made—if the money could be forthcoming.

I think it is time that we of the House—and the Congress—told our defense people that they need not feel irrevocably bound to the 13-billion budget projection. I think it is time we put them on notice to tell us promptly if this sum fails to provide for the adequate defense of this Nation. I think it is time we adopted an attitude which would be conducive to having them come to us, if need should indicate. For our own part, we should be ready to revise upwards our appropriations rather than be lacking in essential defense.

A large number of the Members of this House have been distressed to learn that within the projected budget for 1951, it will be impossible to maintain many shore installations.

Under the commendable policy of converting the available funds into maximum forces in being, such retrenchment is inevitable. I believe all of us here agree that we ought to have the strongest fighting muscles possible for the amount of money we spend. Therefore, to maintain this muscle, we must cut what amounts to fat.

But what is fat under the operating schedules projected for the ensuing fiscal year, might well be considered a part of the muscle, if larger operating forces were projected. It is an inexorable rule that shore installations of the Navy, for instance, are predicated on the support of forces afloat, and in the air. Therefore, when we cut the amounts available for forces in being, we also provide indirectly the necessity for cutting the shore and base establishment.

The same applies to other branches of the armed forces.

I do not mean to advocate here that we provide funds for greater forces in being without adequate investigation and testimony to back up the need. But, I do not believe, either, that we ought to freeze to a $13,000,000,000 defense budget simply because, when it was drawn, it was believed to be adequate.

The war plans of the United States shift with changes in conditions. The disposition of strategic strength moves accordingly. In concrete demonstration of this fact, we have witnessed the strengthening of our forces in the Pacific during recent months, and we have heard of plans to strengthen them further in months to come. All of this is being accomplished in the face of the requirement for over-all cuts.

In addition, our Navy has wisely given top priority to antisubmarine warfare preparations. To do this, money is going to have to be diverted from other objectives.

Cutting down on forces, and trying to fit one's needs within a figure, which might well turn out in the final analysis to be an arbitrary and inadequate one, is occupying a great deal of time in the Pentagon. Plans for the procurement of many things have had to be postponed. I have been asking myself whether we ought to take this risk.

The projected forces for 1951 have been described as a calculated risk. Under our system of government, we must take some risk. We cannot economically afford total defense. We cannot make a guns-or-butter choice for our citizens which the German people had made for them by Hitler. Stalin has made this same choice for the Russian people.

On the basis of my own investigation and knowledge I am convinced that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force have tried to make all the economies they could, in good conscience. I know their military staffs have worked hard to bring them about, and to try and fit economies into the picture of necessary ready defense.

I believe it is for us, the Members of this House, to create a receptive atmosphere for their opinions, should they find that the proposed economy budget places too great an element of risk into their planning.

As I said before, I do not believe 13 billions ought to be allowed to become a fetish, or an idol, or an immovable figure which cannot be revised upward if need be. I am deeply appreciative of the efforts which have been made to budget our essential defense within this figure, and for my part, I would welcome the opinions of those who have to work with that budget, if they think it is too small.

Consumers Benefit From Prosperous Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of criticism of the Government farm price support program. A good deal of this criticism has probably been entirely justified.

Over the week end my distinguished colleague from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE] took occasion to explain why it is vitally important to everyone, everywhere to maintain a prosperous farm economy. Speaking at a meeting of Midwest Republican chairmen at Salt Lake City, Utah, Mr. LOVRE pointed out the critical necessity of keeping farm income high. He declared that every dollar of gross farm production means $7 of national economy. He further asserted that when farm prices are low everyone suffers.

Mr. LOVRE also gave the Republicans some excellent political advice concerning the farm vote. He bluntly told the chairmen and party officials that they must do something more than criticize the Brannan scheme presented by the Democrats.

In the interests of the great congressional district which I represent—a district somewhat different from Mr. LOVRE's in that I represent more consumers than farmers—I am presenting his talk. It contains a message vital to wage earners, consumers, and businessmen. I recommend its reading to every Member of this body whether he be interested in agriculture or in the consumer's position in regard to food prices. This frank account deserves the attention of every American who wants to see this Nation remain prosperous and strong:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE HAROLD O. LOVRE, REPUBLICAN, SOUTH DAKOTA, BEFORE A MEETING OF MIDWEST REPUBLICAN STATE CHAIRMAN, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, MARCH 31, 1950

I am especially glad to be here for this meeting because I feel at home with you people. I was Republican State chairman of South Dakota for 2 years and in that capacity I was a member of your group. I understand the problems which you are facing. As a Republican and as a Congressman, I am vitally interested in your problems. They are the basic problems of the Republican Party.

When I, as State chairman, called county chairmen or party workers together, I always asked that everyone speak frankly.

I ask the same today.

The goal of a political organization, as we all know, is to give the people the kind of government that is believed to be right and proper. This can be accomplished only by election of its members to office. It is the responsibility of all of us—party officials, office holders, and all other members—to work for victory, so the principles of Republicanism will be most strongly felt in local, State and National Government.

You people are experts in politics and government. If this were not true, you would not be here today. It is not necessary for me to remind you that to win elections we must get the votes.

The 1948 fiasco supplied a good lesson. The outcome was a shock to me. But, after the shock had subsided, I sat down—as I suppose 140,000,000 other Americans did—and tried to figure out just why we lost. I suppose there was my answer and 140,000,000 others to the question.

My analysis resolved itself to just one simple fact. We lost the 1948 election because we, as a party, failed to live up to the expectations of our old stand-by—the honest-to-goodness dirt farmer. We can rationalize all we want and point to the tactics of the opposition, which maligned the Aiken-Hope law. The fact still remains: Had we carried the farm States we Republicans would have won.

Some say the Democrats tricked the Republican Eightieth Congress into passing the sliding scale law which the New Dealers knew would cost us votes. In reality, the Aiken-Hope law was nothing new. It was simply a carry-over of the New Deal philosophy of solving the farm problem by pouring out Federal funds to support the commodity market. Farmers didn't like it.

Quick to capitalize on the situation, the Democrats came out with a brazen political scheme, aimed at keeping the farm vote and wooing every other group into the fold. I'm speaking of the scheme of Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan. Mr. Brannan's scheme—and I call it a scheme because that's all it is—promises high prices to the farmer. Out of the other side of his mouth, Mr. Brannan promises consumers low food costs. The only one left out in the cold is the taxpayer, the forgotten man—whether he be farmer or consumer—but who eventually must foot the bill. Mr. Brannan has been strangely and significantly silent on this score.

I'm not going to spend a lot of time condemning the Brannan scheme. I'm merely going to list a few of the many objections which I see.

First, the idea is fundamentally unsound. It is foolish to believe we can solve all problems by running to the Federal Treasury for a monetary hypodermic. In this case, it is through subsidies to keep farm prices high. The farmer is being sold on the Brannan scheme because of high price supports. Neither Mr. Brannan nor his hordes of Federal Agriculture Department employees tell the farmer that in return for a cash subsidy—which is nothing more than a dole—he will have to be subjected to rigid Federal controls and regulations.

They don't say that the farmer must obey the edicts of the Washington bureaucrats or lose his subsidy. They don't mention the fact that the farmer who doesn't obey these orders will end up with a stiff fine or jail sentence, or both.

Mr. Brannan, in his appearance before the House Agriculture Committee, spoke of protecting the family sized farmer. Actually, no bill embodying the Brannan philosophy yet reported to Congress makes specific provision for the small operator. The unit limitation which Mr. Brannan originally advocated was stricken from the scheme before it was presented to the House last session. With its provision for subsidy payments to farmers, think of the big operators—about 2 percent of the farm population—who produce 25 percent of the farm crops annually. They could, and would, reap riches at the taxpayers' expense.

The essence of the Brannan scheme is to provide a certain farm income. Let's say $26,000,000,000 annually. With sufficient controls and regulations, that farmers do not want, this could be possible. But suppose farm income on the market fell 20 percent. This would mean that the taxpayers would have to make up 20 percent deficit in farm income to assure the growers their $26,000,000,000 annual income. On the market, this produce would bring $20,800,000,000, leaving $5,200,000,000 to be made up from the Federal Treasury. This might satisfy the farmer, but what about the taxpayers? From what I've seen, I doubt if the farmers could convince the Congress, year after year, to provide this $5,200,000,000 appropriation. That is a grave risk to impose upon the farmer.

Now, let's look at the consumer. You'd expect him to get his food 20 percent cheaper under the Brannan scheme. This is impossible because the farmer gets only about half of what the consumer spends for food. The other half goes into marketing and transporting costs. Hence, the average reduction possible under the Brannan scheme is 10 percent.

For white bread the reduction is even less than that, not quite 3½ percent. Last week my wife paid 29 cents for two loaves of white bread—14½ cents each. Now the value of the wheat that goes into a pound loaf of bread was, according to the 1949 average, 2½ cents. A 20-percent drop in farm prices would reduce this wheat in a loaf of bread by half a cent (20 percent of 2.5 cents=0.5 cent). The retail value of the bread before the Brannan scheme: 14.5 cents. With the Brannan scheme: 14 cents (14.5 cents—0.5 cent=14 cents). The reduction to the consumer in this case is 3.4 percent.

At the same time, however, the consumer would be footing the tax bill to the tune of more than $5,000,000,000 per year, not counting the cost of the salaries of the thousands of employees necessary to administer and police the program.

Furthermore, the Brannan scheme would mean the rebirth of another OPA—on a scale much larger than ever before. Mr. Brannan's scheme would not only regulate the farmer but would of necessity regulate every person dealing with the transporting and marketing of farm produce. Every country grocery and pushcart operator would come under Government regimentation.

Assume for the sake of argument that the Brannan plan would mean 20 percent reduction in food costs. What will that do to the wholesalers, processors, transporters, and retailers of food? They would have to operate their businesses on 20 percent less money. Truck drivers, warehousemen, grocery clerks, country elevator operators, millers, bookkeepers, janitors—everyone connected with converting farm crops into food—would get paid on the basis of 80 cents where they now get a dollar. Uncle Sam would be able to tax them on the basis of only an 80-percent income.

Their income certainly would fall 20 percent. It is obvious what that would mean to the national economy. It would throw it completely out of kilter.

These few illustrations show the fallacy of the Brannan plan.

Despite this unhappy picture, however, there are two good arguments for Mr. Brannan's idea, as wild as it is. They are: (1) the mess into which the present law has put us (some people argue that anything would be better than what we have) and (2) the lack of a plan to substitute for the Brannan scheme.

As JOHN MCCORMACK, the House majority leader, said only last week on the floor of the House: "I call upon those who oppose the Brannan plan to offer a plan of their own." Even Mr. MCCORMACK said he did not know whether the Brannan plan was the correct one, but said one thing in defense of it. That was that Secretary Brannan had the courage to offer a plan.

That statement seems to me to be a direct challenge to our party.

I know that the Republican Party is truly and sincerely interested in the farmer and his welfare, and I shall explain how we can show this devotion to principle.

Agriculture is the most sensitive and powerful part of a combination of factors influencing our Nation's economy. The farmer produces 65 percent of our raw materials, and the produce of the farm is the kind that moves rapidly on the market and quickly is transformed into buying power. Farm income is thus widely and swiftly distributed over the entire Nation. Hence, far more than the 20 percent of the population of the Nation engaged in farming is affected by any rise or fall in farm prices. As a matter of fact any rise or fall in farm prices affects our entire economy. Our national balance sheet is regulated by the volume of farm production and the price it brings on the market.

The record of the United States for 25 years proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that each $1 of gross farm production on the average generates $1 of factory pay rolls, $4 of retail sales volume and $7 of national income.

That is why stabilizing farm products at a proper price level automatically becomes a floor under our national income, our wage level, business profits, and the goods we consume.

History proves that farm income governs national income. The consumer suffers whenever farm income drops. When farm income drops, wages fall, and when wages fall the consumer must turn a greater percentage of his income to food. A national prosperity graph and a graph of farm income run parallel to each other. The years 1928 and 1932 tell a grim story. Farm production in each of those years was about the same. Yet the farm income in 1932 was just half of what it was in 1928. The national income dropped to less than half; automobile production fell from more than 4,000,000 units to 1,186,000, construction values fell even more sharply.

Another instance is what happened in the 2 years 1937–38. Farm income rose nearly $1,000,000,000 in 1937. National income went up approximately $7,000,000,000. But with a larger farm production in 1938, prices weakened and farm income dropped almost $1,000,000,000. National income fell almost $7,000,000,000, with the loss spread all along the line. Manufacturing, employment, wages and salaries, construction and transportation all suffered their proportionate cuts. All started to rise again with the upturn of farm income in 1939.

These facts demonstrate clearly that if industry wants profits, if labor wants high wages and many jobs, and if Government wants sufficient taxes to balance the budget and reduce the public debt, all of these groups should be among the first to insist on fair and proper prices for what the farmers produce.

The administration claimed the 1938 recession came because governmental spending had been reduced too soon. But governmental spending merely represented money borrowed from the store of capital already in existence. The actual reason was the failure to maintain the flow of new income. It had slackened at its source—on the farms—and consumer purchasing power fell accordingly.

Consumers do not gain from low farm prices. They always lose. At the bottom of the depression, although farm prices were disastrously low, the share of the consumers' total income required for food was the highest in a decade. This was because their total income was proportionately lower. In 1938, when farm prices dropped, consumers did not benefit from lower food prices. The shares of their income spent for food remained the same or was higher because their total income had declined in ratio with farm incomes. On the other hand, in 1943–44, although farm prices were at or above parity, the share of consumers' total income required for food was the lowest in history.

Despite Government supports, right now farm income is down compared with 2 years ago.

Farmers aren't happy about that either.

Consumers are angry when they see warehouses bulging with surpluses, which do not do anyone any good, bought with the taxpayer's dollar. There is even a movement on foot to stop price supports for farmers. Witness the unfavorable publicity which the farm program has received and the formation of the Association for the Abolition of Farm Price Supports in New York City earlier this year.

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Democrats are capitalizing on this dissatisfaction by saying it gives reason for repealing the present support law and forcing the Brannan scheme on the American people. I do not believe the present law is what it should be. But I don't believe the answer lies in Mr. Brannan's scheme.

These factors point to the opportunity which is knocking at the door of the Republican Party. The farm philosophy of the Democrats is as outmoded as the Model A Ford that was popular back in 1933 when the New Deal adopted the idea of solving the farm price problem with money out of the Federal Treasury. The approach to the farm problem which the Democrats have taken and are recommending under the Brannan scheme is the approach of the past—that is, subsidies again, but to make it palatable they promise lower food costs, with the loss to be made up out of the Federal Treasury, which means out of the pockets of the farmers and the consumers alike.

The Democrats are dealing with a 1950 problem by a 1933 approach. They want a 1950 automobile on a 1933 chassis.

It remains for the Republicans to come up with a modern 1950 solution to this 1950 problem.

Arriving at the answer we should remember that there is a great need for clear understanding of economic relationships between groups. Unless all groups are making sound and comparable progress there will be weakness in our national economy. It is vital to the welfare and security of the United States of America that the answer be found because a high level of farm income means a high national income and prosperity for all.

It is my opinion that any legislation which serves to stabilize farm prices is not legislation for agriculture alone. Instead, it is legislation which protects the economic welfare of every segment of our country. I say this because farm income governs our national income on a 1 to 7 ratio.

We cannot be blind to this basic fact. We as a political party must take a positive approach to the problem.

We must do more than poke holes in the Brannan scheme.

To attack without offering a constructive alternative is to say in effect that we as Republicans either do not believe in a farm program or that we recommend a return to the outmoded Government support philosophy on a 60 to 90 percent sliding scale which the voters repudiated in the 1948 elections.

The Republican Party is committed to a price program for agriculture. Our 1948 platform contained such a plank. We can't ignore that.

It is my firm conviction that the future success of the Republican Party lies in what we as a party do about the farm problem.

Axel Beck, national committeeman from South Dakota, and chairman of the Republican National Committee's Agriculture Subcommittee, has recommended a farm plan which I believe provides the answer to the Republican Party and to the farmers of America.

I also have been working on a plan which I submit for your consideration. There is no basic difference of opinion between Mr. Beck and me.

My plan establishes a pattern for a Republican victory in 1950 and again in 1952. It supplies the answer farmers and consumers are demanding.

It is a modern solution to a modern problem.

This proposal is self-financing, thus relieving the taxpayer of a heavy burden that he should not have to bear. It assures the farmer of full 100 percent of parity, thus protecting his income. This means a high national income for other elements of our society.

It uses the same procedure which any successful businessman follows—a two-price system, one price for the bulk of his produce and another price for his surplus.

The basic reason for a farm program is to protect the farmer, who now is the one person in our modern economic pattern who has little or nothing to say about the prices he receives. He has to take what he can get. To overcome this stumbling block of our complex modern economic structure there must be a farm program. I believe I have a plan that will effectively serve the farmer and his family and at the same time serve the best interests of the entire Nation.

In approaching any farm program we should strive for a solution that gives the highest degree of free enterprise and the fewest controls. It must be one that will react to the best interests of both producers and consumers. Furthermore, any farm program must be divorced from dependence upon the Federal Treasury for financing. Farmers don't like to be placed in this position and the howl that has gone up among consumers proves that they don't like it either. This resentment is proof of the dire necessity of a program free from the year-to-year whims of Congress and maneuvering by self-centered pressure groups.

As Joseph Davis, director of the food research institute of Stanford University, some time ago said, "America wants an agriculture that earns its way, instead of being continually and increasingly dependent on Government props, vulnerable to political shifts, and forced to accept the accompanying regimentation. It wants an agriculture that, proud of its strength, competes in domestic and foreign markets on the basis of efficiency and fair play."

I believe I have such a plan. It has as its objectives: (1) Full self-financing, thus ending the use of tax money for subsidies; (2) full parity prices at all times for normal domestic consumption; (3) administration by the farmers themselves through elected county, State, and National committees; (4) specific and real protection for the family-sized farmer; (5) a two-price level the same as any other business uses; (6) provision for distribution of food to needy people under a food-stamp plan; (7) encouragement of nonfood commercial uses for surplus crops; (8) exports on the world market coordinated with United States commitments; and (9) a coordinated soil-conservation program.

I visualize my plan to work in this manner:

Farmers would choose their own organizations, with elected county, State, and National committees directing the program from the farm level. Committees would work with the Secretary of Agriculture who would decide each year the normal domestic consumption of each farm product. This total would be divided among farmers. They would receive 100 percent of parity for produce marketed under these marketing quotas. If the farmer produced more than his quota and wanted to sell it, he could buy additional marketing quotas, paying enough for them to finance food stamps, exports, and new uses of the product. If moving the surplus did not cost the entire sum, the balance would be returned to the farmer through the local farm committee.

Thus, the farmer could control his own production and those who create surpluses would stand the losses. Marketing quota laws, as now provided, would go into effect only after a referendum in which the farmers gave their approval.

The plan would operate under the same sound principle as that under which a merchant or manufacturer determines a fair price for the bulk of his goods and then sells the remainder at a discount. For example: Suppose that the parity price of wheat is $2. Farmer Jones has a quota under which he may sell 5,000 bushels at full parity. But because of good growing conditions, he produces 6,000 bushels. He could market the additional 1,000 bushels only by buying an additional quota from his county committee for perhaps $1 per bushel. He would either sell the additional 1,000 bushels at full parity or obtain a full parity loan on them. Chances are, however, that under such circumstances he would store his surplus on his own farm in anticipation of his next year's quota, or as protection against a future disaster.

The $1 per bushel would go to the national committee (such as the Commodity Credit Corporation). That committee might issue food stamps, good for perhaps 75 cents on a bushel of wheat. Or it might export for $1.50 per bushel. Or it might subsidize plants at $1 per bushel for finding new uses for wheat. If, at the end of the year, it finds it has averaged $1.25 per bushel on sales of surplus wheat, Farmer Jones, who has sold surplus, would collect the additional 25 cents per bushel. Thus he would net $2 per bushel (full parity) on the 5,000 bushels in his regular quota, and $1.25 per bushel on the surplus. He would not be subjected to acreage controls. He would regulate his own production.

Obviously, if he continued producing surplus wheat, the amount that he would net for the surplus would decrease to the point where he would voluntarily reduce the acreage sown because he would get so little from it.

Calling loans or selling surplus when parity is exceeded would protect the consumer who certainly should expect to pay parity prices for food the same as for everything else he buys. The food-stamp provision of this plan would provide for the consumer who couldn't afford to feed himself properly. Consumer-taxpayers would not be stuck with financing the plan either.

Protection for the small operator would be assured by law and soil-conservation practices would be vigorously encouraged.

Chances are that this plan does not furnish all the answers. But, in my opinion, it is fundamentally sound and infinitely more practical than the Brannan scheme. Republicans cannot afford to ignore the fact that a sound and healthy farm economy means a sound and healthy and prosperous economy for the entire Nation.

I believe that this program of agriculture should be based around 100 percent of parity for the farmer.

Here is why:

Our economy can be compared to a large department store. If the store manager prices his products so low as, say, 75 percent of the needed price to operate properly (parity) he will land in the bankruptcy courts. In the same way, if the United States permits its price level to drop to 75 percent of parity, then we lose 25 percent of our ability to consume; we have 25-percent unemployment and national deficits which will eventually force us into bankruptcy. Such a course certainly is not consistent with Republican policy and not in line with your thinking of mine.

With about 24,000,000 persons on the Nation's farms today, and millions more whose living comes directly or indirectly from farm production, it is apparent that prices must be stabilized toward a continual flow of new income from farm production. Price stabilization on these crops will also stabilize our credit dollar and the purchasing power of the wage earner.

Whether or not we like large expenditures for foreign aid, defense, and domestic programs, we have to face the hard, cold fact that we must have a high national income to finance such expenditures. I have pointed out that farm income and national income are closely related by a seven-times turn. Therefore if we as a nation are to meet our obligations we must have a high farm income.

In these days of the cold war between the United States and Russia it is desperately important to maintain American prosperity.

Joe Stalin is patiently waiting for an economic bust in this country as the opening crack in our cold-war defense. In the interest of peace we must keep farm income and national income high.

To maintain farm prosperity the farmer must have 100 percent of parity. In other words, he must make enough money so that he can buy what he needs and wants. Give him less than 100 percent of parity (or buying power) and you give him that much less buying power.

It is my belief that no political party can operate the economy of the United States on a basis of full employment, a balanced national budget, and pay off the national debt unless an average of at least 100 percent of parity is maintained at the market place for agricultural production for domestic use.

A political party that has the courage to foster such legislation can show by this very action that it means business when its members say their party is a party of prosperity and plenty. A political party that can provide such a program for the Nation will naturally attract not only the farm vote but the vote of sound, thinking Americans everywhere.

To espouse any other philosophy than 100 percent of parity for the farmer is to threaten the very economic foundation of our whole economy.

It is also political suicide.

Any compromise or influence that reduces farm prices below 100 percent of parity in the market place will reflect the same percentage in the loss of busines volume and departure from full employment. The effect on the national income is just seven times what it is on farm income.

Full parity under my plan or under Mr. Beck's recommendations can be accomplished without Government subsidies or grants, and that is in line with the Republican philosophy of governmental economy. There certainly is no economy under a program that costs each American $30 per year to buy the surpluses which result from it. Today taxpayers have $4,000,000,000 tied up in surpluses alone. It costs $25,000 an hour just to store them.

The Nation's farmers told the Republican Party what was needed in the way of farm legislation at the Sioux City conference last fall. They stated that they recognized that the farm problem is a price problem, and that they insist on full parity which they believe they are justly entitled to in the market place. They also went on record clearly demanding the preservation of basic American freedoms.

Mr. Beck, showing an acute awareness of the necessity for legislation to protect the Nation and the farmer from economic collapse, not long ago advised a farm plan. It is not basically different from the one I am outlining to you today. His objectives are full parity, self-financing, freedom from Government controls, a soil-conservation program, encouraged livestock production, and an on-the-farm storage program.

Meetings—32 of them—to which I invited 85,000 South Dakota farmers last fall convinced me that the farmers want to turn the farm program back to the farmer. They also insist on getting full parity for their products without a Government subsidy.

Consumers approve of the plan because it lifts a heavy taxation burden from their backs.

I want to make it emphatically clear that I do not want to scrap the present farm program until we find something better. To do that would not only be foolhardy, but it would be dangerous to the entire Nation. We should strive to improve upon existing programs.

I believe the plan I have outlined establishes the means by which the Republican Party can regain the farm vote. It is definitely in line with Republican thinking and Republican principles.

The self-financing feature is consistent with the Republican pay-as-you-go idea of government.

The complete freedom from Government controls which the farmer would enjoy is a preservation of the Republican free-enterprize philosophy.

The guarantee of full parity to agriculture is simple forthright reassurance of the Republican pledge to the farmer.

The two-price system is a businesslike approach to a marketing problem which coincides with the Republican demands for greater efficiency in government.

The orderly disposal of surpluses so that produce from God's ground is used to feed God's people shows a willingness to meet a moral obligation.

By maintaining farm income, thus assuring a high national income, the Republican Party can demonstrate that it is a party of prosperity and plenty.

I frankly feel that active and vigorous promotion of this plan will bring a Republican victory in 1950 and again in 1952. In the interests of American agriculture and in the interests of the Republican Party I hope the GOP will get behind this or a similar proposal.

As a political party we are not discharging our obligations to the American people by blinding criticizing the Brannan scheme without offering something constructive in its place.

Furthermore we, who are interested in Republican gains at the polls, cannot expect to win the vote of the American farmer unless we offer him a plan that will solve his price problem and at the same time preserve his basic American freedoms.

I have spoken frankly but from the heart, and have appreciated your attention. I earnestly feel that unless we awake to the fact that there is a farm problem and present some constructive answer—I don't claim that my plan is the only one—that we will fail to fulfill the trust that the American people have placed in us as a political party.

Failure to deal with the problem in a forthright and constructive manner can mean the difference between prosperity and depression for the United States and victory and defeat for the Republican Party.

Colorado River Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a very informative article on the Colorado River controversy, written by one of the outstanding citizens of Los Angeles, Mr. Marshall Stimson. Mr. Stimson is not only one of the pioneers of Los Angeles, but he has been active in support of the municipal-owned department of water and power which is so vitally interested in this controversy. He is always out in front in good government.

The article follows:

COLORADO RIVER CONTROVERSY

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

That the facts regarding the claims of the States of Arizona and California to the water of the Colorado River are not generally known, especially in the East, prompts me to make this statement.

In 1921 or 1922, when the question of a low or high dam was being considered, I was sent by the Los Angeles Water and Power Board to Washington to interview the then Secretary of Commerce, Herbert Hoover. It had been pretty well agreed that a low dam to control the flood waters of the river was a necessity. Regarding a high dam, there was opposition from two sources. The Southern California Edison Co. did not want the competition of public power, and the immense expense of a high dam caused strong opposition in Congress.

I was instructed to ask for Mr. Hoover's approval of a high-dam project and to assure him that in the event it was built, an aqueduct would be built to carry the water, and that power lines would be built to carry the power produced, except that which might be desired by Nevada or Arizona. Had it not been for that promise the dam would not have been built, because Congress would never have authorized it unless there was a chance of obtaining revenue that would pay the cost of the dam.

On March 24, 1922, the Colorado River compact was signed, whereby the upper States—Wyoming, Colorado, portions of New Mexico, Utah, and Arizona, known as the Upper Basin States—were to be allowed 7,500,000 acre-feet, and the Lower Basin States, composed of part of Utah, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, were to have rights to 7,500,000 acre-feet. Arizona, alone, did not sign. However, California did, with the understanding that 4,400,000 acre-feet and one-half of the surplus would go to southern California.

Southern California immediately began work on its two projects, the aqueduct and the power-transmission lines, and it has completely fulfilled all obligations made to induce the building of the Hoover Dam.

Later, a treaty was made between the United States and Mexico, whereby 1,500,000 acre-feet of the river water were allocated to Mexico, and by the same treaty Mexico granted to the United States certain rights to Rio Grande water in Texas.

Largely, the same group in Congress that thus took away some of the water to which southern California was entitled, and gave it to Mexico, recently voted in the Senate to support the central Arizona project.

This undertaking involves an expenditure of over $700,000,000. It contemplates diversion of 1,200,000 acre-feet of the Colorado River into southern Arizona. This, of course, will come largely out of southern California's share.

Those who have studied the Arizona project say that the cost of the irrigation system can never be financed by the revenues derived from the lands upon which it is supposed to spread the water. It is estimated it would cost $1,750 per acre to bring this water to land in the Salt River Valley, and that the production therefrom will be largely in lines in which we now have an overproduction.

I read a rather pathetic story entitled, "Voices From the Purple Sage," by Harlan Trott, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor. A Pima Indian was complaining of the loss of water which had been used by his people for many generations, by a diversion of irrigation water on lands outside the Indian reservation. It is to be noted, however, that it was the Arizona people who took this water from the Pima Indians, and not southern California.

Some parts of California, especially around San Diego, have faced a severe water shortage. That can be met only by use of Colorado River water.

On the basis of an estimate, an agreement was signed with the various California agencies, for the use of 5,362,000 acre feet by portions of southern California.

In a decision by the Supreme Court by Justice Stone, it was decided that the use of water by California was restricted to 5,484,580 acre feet annually.

The Metropolitan Water District in 1931 voted a bond issue of $220,000,000 to finance the aqueduct and, of course, bonded itself heavily to construct the power equipment.

It is understood that the negotiations have failed, arbitration is not feasible, and California contends that the matter should be settled by litigation before the United States Supreme Court.

This seems far more equitable than a political determination by Congress, when it is clearly apparent by the vote of the Senate that neither the justice of California's claim nor the consideration of the question of general public benefit, may be the basis for a decision in the House.

It is submitted that the results which might be obtained from the central Arizona project do not justify the expenditure of so great a sum as $700,000,000, and the possible severe loss to a community which made possible the building of the Hoover Dam.

The story which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of February 24, 1950, admits that the only way any substantial return can be made for the Government's investment in the central Arizona project is from revenue derived from the power purchased by Southern California.

It is of the utmost importance that the entire Nation understand these facts: That it was on account of Southern California's pledge that the Hoover Dam was built, and that practically all of the money advanced came from Southern California, and that they could further recognize that Southern California is expected to pay the greater portion of the expense of the central Arizona project.

Taking these facts into consideration, a detached observer, it would seem, would be justified in giving a conscientious opinion that Southern California was right in its position that the Supreme Court should first pass upon the respective water rights of both California and Arizona, then the feasibility of the central Arizona project could be considered on its merits and in the light of the water to which Arizona would be entitled.

MARSHALL STIMSON.

LOS ANGELES.

AMVETS To Urge Federal Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in all sections of our country, people in every walk of life are becoming more and more conscious of the need for economy in Government and reduction in taxes.

I was glad to note that at a recent meeting in Washington, D. C., of the AMVETS organization, a resolution was adopted calling upon Congress to reduce expenditures and to cut Government costs.

The resolution was introduced by Mr. Joseph S. Crespi, of Atlanta, Ga., vice president of the national service foundation of AMVETS.

I wish to express my appreciation to Mr. Crespi for drawing and introducing the resolution and to congratulate the AMVETS upon their action in adopting it and going on record in favor of economy in Government and reduction in taxes.

Under leave previously granted, I insert herewith a newspaper item regarding this action, this being a clipping from the Atlanta Constitution of March 23, 1950:

AMVETS TO URGE FEDERAL ECONOMY

The AMVETS will call upon Congress to be more reasonable in further taxation as well as expenditures.

A resolution to this effect was introduced by Joe Crespi, of Atlanta, national executive committeeman of AMVETS, at a meeting of the committee in Washington and passed unanimously by the group.

Back in Atlanta, Crespi said yesterday the committee would call the Appropriations Committee's attention to the fact that in 152 years, from 1789 to 1940, the Government spent $167,000,000,000, as compared with the $177,000,000,000 they spent between 1946 and 1949, excluding the cost of World War II, which runs into many more billions.

Crespi was elected vice president of the national service foundation of AMVETS at the meeting.

The Answer to Commodity Credit Corporation Defeatism—Use Farm Surplus To Spur Development of Nonfood Farm Product Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 30, 1950, Ralph S. Trigg, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, informed Congress that the American taxpayer has more than $4,000,000,000 invested in farm price supports. My people out in Nebraska find it difficult to grasp the enormity of this amount of money. I can sympathize with them. It is beyond the power of most of the Members of Congress to understand why such a sum is placed within the power of a single subdivision of one agency to administer. The only way I know of to explain what $4,000,000,000 represents is to compare it to some known quantity. $4,000,000,000 means approximately the sum of the total holdings of Ford, General Motors, and Standard Oil. $4,000,000,000 means an amount approximately two times as great

as all the deposits, loans, and investments of every bank in the State of Nebraska.

Over 2 weeks ago, on March 15, I included my observations on what the Commodity Credit Corporation could do with the vast surplus of farm products, some of which may now be rotting in their warehouses and elevators. My suggestion was this: Make available to the new industries which are engaged, or which will be engaged, in the manufacture of nonfood goods from farm crops those farm surpluses now stored by the CCC at a price which would stimulate the growth of such industries. The products of the farm to be used as food can be utilized by the American consuming public. Fair farm prices can be consistently maintained.

It is now necessary to emphasize a matter of timing.

I repeat that my remarks on the disposal of CCC surpluses through using them in the development of industries dependent for their raw materials on the farmer were included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 15.

The facts on which my remarks were based were requested through usual channels from Dr. G. E. Hilbert, Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, Department of Agriculture, around the middle of February.

Now, I want to call your attention to an article from the Washington (D. C.) Post of March 30, 1950. Note the date—2 weeks after my remarks appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This article is an account of the Fifteenth Annual Chemurgic Conference:

(By N. S. Haseltine)

Development of surgical sponges which can safely be left in the patient's body was disclosed here yesterday by a Government scientist.

The surgical accessory is made from specially processed cornstarch which body tissues can readily absorb, said Dr. G. E. Hilbert, chief of the Agriculture Department's bureau of agricultural and industrial chemistry.

He displayed the new product at opening session of the fifteenth annual Chemurgic Conference, at Hotel Statler. Chemurgy is defined as the science of making new uses of agricultural products.

The 3-day conference convened formally at an opening luncheon session with a welcoming challenge by President Truman to put science to work to maintain good income levels for farmers and higher living standards for all.

[illegible]

The challenge was met by Wheeler McMillen, president of the National Farm Chemurgic Council, of New York City, with a request for research financing similar to the $2,000,000,000 spent for the Manhattan project in developing the atom bomb.

Dr. Hilbert, in discussing the new uses of cornstarch, said the material is formed by boiling cornstarch to a paste, then freezing it, and finally thawing it and pressing out the water. "The sponge product," he said, "dries up hard and brittle."

"In clinical usage, in New York, the cornstarch sponges are proving as efficient as the rubber varieties now in use," Dr. Hilbert said. "They have been used with exceptionally good results in obstetrical cases involving profuse bleeding," he added.

The surgical sponge was only one of a number of recently-developed new products from agricultural crops. Others, modeled by Congressmen's daughters in an amateur fashion show, included raincoats of water-resistant cotton, linen-like cotton dresses, and a variety of clothing now being made from corn.

TRUMAN ENDORSES PROGRAM

President Truman in his message sent to the conference, urged the chemurgists to find new ways to use our increasing abundance so as to yield a good income for farmers and at the same time result in a higher standard of living for all our people.

McMillen, without direct reference to Truman's message, said that in the past 20 years the Government has spent $20,000,000,000 in agriculture subsidy (price support).

McMillen then advocated billions for research, and eventually not 1 cent for subsidies.

"What more splendid economy could be proposed than a 'Manhattan project' for the kind of creative research that experience has soundly proved could prevent agricultural surpluses (by new products and new uses for surplus crops), abolish the need for agricultural subsidies, and add the blessings of new wealth, new comforts, new abundance, and new hopes for all mankind?" he declared.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post article brings out—2 weeks after my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—that President Truman is apparently in favor of putting science to work devising new means for producing nonfood goods out of raw materials from the farm. He favors such action but neglects to present any method by which the desired end might be attained. In the same article, Mr. Wheeler McMillen, president of the National Farm Chemurgic Council of New York City does suggest that research financing in this field be backed with $2,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to be spent in a way similar to that used in the Manhattan project for developing the atom bomb. two billion dollars is almost the exact amount that all the banks in Nebraska have as assets in the form of loans, investments, and deposits.

I think the Nebraska way is much fairer, much more practical and much more American than either a spending suggestion or no suggestion at all. My way—the Nebraska way—is to support farm prices for food crops at a just level; to dispose of American food crops, as food, both at home and abroad; and to make the vast CCC-held farm-product surpluses available to the manufacturers who have started or who will start nonfood agriculture product industries at such a price as give drive and encouragement to these industries which may well prove the key to a prosperous future for our beloved Republic.

New York State Municipal Utilities Oppose the Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the steadily growing opposition throughout the Nation to H. R. 934 and S. 75, the central Arizona project bill, is indicated in a telegram I shall submit here. The telegram opposing the Arizona project, which would cost the taxpayers of the country at least $1,500,000,000, was sent to a number of Congressmen on the committee.

The telegram follows:

Your strong opposition to central Arizona project as provided by terms of bill No. S. 75 and House No. 934 is sought on grounds that costs involved are exorbitant and allocations planned are most unjust. Provisions of bill would heavily and unjustifiably burden power costs with irrigation costs. Interested as we are and have been in public power development we cannot approve this type legislation. Even Federal Power Commission states that costs for irrigation would be so high that power could not possibly be low-cost power. In view of fact that this legislation would most certainly injure entire public-power program severely and expose same to attack by privately owned utilities we respectfully request and urge you to vote against the same.

NEW YORK STATE MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC UTILITIES ASSOCIATION,
HAROLD W. LAUDER, *President*.
B. N. SPARKS, *Executive Secretary*.

The Reserves—a Vital Element in Our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, the strength of the United States rests on the solid foundation of devotion to duty as expressed in many fields and by many groups. Two important elements of this strength were joined in an inspiring demonstration of patriotism on Saturday evening, April 1, at Akron, Ohio. There the Ohio Squadron of the Navy Club of the United States of America gathered in convention, and the principal speaker was a man with outstanding qualifications to discuss a subject of interest to the Navy clubs of the Nation as well as every other city in the land. The speaker was Rear Adm. Irving M. McQuiston, United States Naval Reserve, of Washington, D. C., who serves as adviser to the Deputy Chief for Naval Operations (Air) on Naval Air Reserve matters. Admiral McQuiston took for his subject the importance of the Reserve program in maintaining an adequate national defense, a subject in which he is completely informed due to a lifetime spent in the service and his present status as the only Reserve officer of flag rank in his field of duty.

Because there is Nation-wide interest in the role of reserve military forces, I am including in the RECORD, under permission granted, the text of Admiral McQuiston's address. It deserves the consideration of all Members of Congress as an important aid in charting the future course of our national defense policy:

It is a great pleasure or me to be able to speak to you tonight. At the outset I might say that naval aviation is the one element of the National Defense Establishment in which I'm most interested.

I recognize among you, people whom I've known in all branches of the Navy, and I know that all of you are interested in what the Navy is doing today. I imagine that some of you are concerned and worried about recent reports of cut-back, censorship, and internal strife within the Defense Establishment. It is natural that any organization such as the Department of Defense must expect certain growing pains during its shake-down.

Just as a beginning I would like to point out that what has happened in the Department of Defense has not been a merger but instead unification. I think the difference is important. Merger implies that the various organizations lose their identity within the Department of Defense. Nothing could be further from the truth. Due to the fact that we are living in a shakily peaceful world, all branches of the defense forces of the United States have been required to conform to a budget which will give the country a maximum safety at a minimum cost to our economy. This is nothing unusual. During each demobilization period, we have gone through problems similar to those which the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are being confronted with today. During the war, when our enemies who could not match our military and productive power were being forced to their knees, we had a dangerous blank check. While we were certain of the outcome of the war, we expended all our efforts toward speeding up and cheapening that struggle in terms of human lives. That, of course, was most important because in terms of real value, it would have been far better to have saved one of those lives instead of saving a million dollars of our war budget.

I think it is worth while to look back through the past generation to see what has just happened to the art of war, particularly as it applies to the Navy. During World War I, the Battle of Jutland was almost the end of the era of the battleship, although very few of us could see it at that time. Except for comparatively minor incidents, Jutland represented the end of a development which had its origin in the Spanish-American War. Without realizing the implications of the development of the aircraft, we went ahead on the theory that the battleship was the center and most powerful weapon available to naval forces.

The United States, dedicated to the principles of the League of Nations and the Geneva Charter, hoped for a world of peaceful endeavor. Our hopes led us to a point where we of the military were forced to expend our limited funds, not in the maintenance of large forces, but instead, in the development of new weapons and techniques.

During this period I was concerned with the Naval Air Reserve as most of you know. We started the program on a shoestring, and a very frayed one at that. We begged, borrowed, and stole from various agencies of the First Naval District to get the minimum amount of equipment with which to establish the base I was concerned with, that at Squantum, Mass. I remember that Admiral Byrd, at that time a lieutenant, came to Boston under orders to find out whether it would be worth while to put in a training unit in that area. We took money from our own pockets to buy gasoline. We shoveled cinders provided by the commandant of the First Naval District to make a runway we could use. With the help of the one carpenter we had we repaired a war-weary hangar on the old submarine base at Squantum. Somehow we managed to keep two training-type seaplanes in good enough shape so that the aviators attached to the unit were able to fly.

That was the beginning of the program that I've seen grow into a very powerful yet very inexpensive part of our national defense structure. Within a very few years after the Air Reserve's beginning, Admiral Moffett, the first Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, was able to prove the need for a well-trained Air Reserve within the Navy. This was in spite of the lack of interest that the country had as a whole in matters concerning a future war. Hopefully, all of us believed that we would not have to fight again.

The Air Reserve expanded to an organization which broke the back of the Japanese aggressors in 1942. As I said before, I've been personally concerned with the Naval Air Reserve program since the First World War, and I have been active in it since 1930. We are proud of the fact that 90 percent of the naval aviators at the two crucial battles of the Navy in the Pacific war, namely, Midway and the Coral Sea, were Naval Air Reserves trained in the naval aviation cadet training program prior to the war. Without these young men and without the hundreds of thousands of reserves in other parts of the Naval Establishment, the United States might well have lost its greatest fight for its own freedom and the freedom of other peoples in the world.

We won that war 5 years ago. During the time since VJ-day, a unification act has been passed. This act has had its enemies and its friends. During World War II it frequently became evident that a more closely knit organization than we had then could have made many of our difficulties easier to settle. The question, of course, was how to achieve a unification among the services which would not destroy their individual abilities and responsibilities. During the period when this act was being considered, there was a lot of fear both within and outside of the Military Establishment as to whether the services would be merged and consequently would lose their individual identities and, more important, their own capabilities. As a matter of fact, the Navy fully supports unification and has been practicing it within its own family for 150 years.

Section 2 of the final act states that the services will retain their autonomy and guarantees the integrity of naval aviation and the Marine Corps. Just to keep the record straight, I quote from section 2 of the act:

"In enacting this legislation it is the intention of Congress to provide a comprehensive program for the future security of the United States; to provide three military departments separately administered for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy (including naval aviation and the Marine Corps), and the Air Force; to provide for their authoritative coordination and unified direction under civilian control of the Secretary of Defense, but not to merge them; to provide for unified control and for their integration into an effective team of land, naval, and air forces but not to establish a single chief of staff over the armed forces nor an armed forces general staff."

We've been living under this unification act now for several years. Under it, the Navy has been charged with responsibilities as important as any of the jobs it has done in the past. Frankly, I believe that many of them will be absolutely vital to the continuing safety of the United States. During these days of indefinite peace, cold war, and if necessary, hot water, the guaranty of the freedom of the seas and the Navy's traditional ability to give assistance to the other services will insure the safety and continued prosperity of all of us. In spite of the fact that some people think that the need for naval forces has ceased to exist, one of the great scientists of our time, Dr. Vannevar Bush, commented in his recent and extremely important book, Modern Arms and Freemen:

"The mission of the Navy in the future will be as important and as difficult as it ever has been in history. It will need to employ modern techniques to the utmost and in ample quantity. We are a power in the world and we intend to exert that power, if need be, far from our shores to support our friends and strike an enemy where he is more vulnerable. We shall still need to sweep enemy forces from the seas, whether they are under its surface or above it."

One of the greatest menaces our position as a sea power will be called upon to defeat is that of the submarine. The thin-skinned, slow-moving weapon of World War I grew into a vicious, powerful threat in World War II. In both wars it almost defeated us. In 1942 German submarines were sinking or severely damaging an average of over a half million tons of Allied shipping. At that rate we could not supply Great Britain to protect herself, to say nothing of mounting an offensive against "fortress Europe." We beat World War II's submarine, but by a slim margin. At the end of that war Germany had developed several new modifications which make it a far more vicious and dangerous threat to our security than there has ever been before. The snorkel, for example, makes the submarine almost immune to aircraft search. New engines and streamlining have made the submarine's increase in underwater speed difficult for any of our normal surface craft to follow. If we cannot guarantee freedom of our sea lanes for our merchant shipping we are going to be in great difficulty. So much of our vital raw material stocks comes from overseas that to lose our traditional freedom of the seas would cripple us severely.

Ever since the end of World War II this threat of submarine warfare has received full attention from the Navy. Just last week Admiral Momsen commented that we were approaching the position where the submarine would no longer have the advantage it has had since the development of the snorkel and other improvements. This is a great step forward for the Navy, because without the ability to control the seas on the surface, beneath the surface, and over it the Navy cannot do its job. Without the ability to bring our vital necessities to our ports and without the ability to take men and supplies to foreign shores we can do nothing to guarantee our freedom nor the freedom of other peoples in the world. Without the power of the Navy we would become an island of democracy in an ocean of dictatorship very shortly.

Today the Navy is a great power for the safety of the United States and the peace and freedom of the world. We in the United States have returned our Military Establishment to a peacetime budget based on certain requirements and with a calculated risk involved. Within this budget, we in the Navy have developed our forces along the following lines. We believe that for the present circumstances we must have a small, well-trained, up-to-date force in being, these are the operating forces. To go with these we have a research and development program which is charged with the responsibility for the development of new weapons and techniques for the art of sea warfare. Some of the greatest scientists in the world are involved in this program, and we know that their efforts continually contribute to the efficiency and potency of the Navy. The ships and men of our fleets are continually training and practicing with their weapons, both old and new, to guarantee maximum safety to all of us. During these days of trouble these same forces are appearing in threatened parts of the world as visible proof of our refusal to permit any free men to be subjugated against their will. It is an argument to give pause to any world power which tries to enslave any group of men.

Behind these operating forces and the research and development program comes our Reserve program, of which I am very proud.

Thinking back to the dark days of 1942, I'm amazed at the speed with which we were able to expand our entire Military Establishment. Our Reserve forces must give any potential aggressor a lot of worry. In connection with the Naval Air Reserve I like to think that the infant organization of my early days grew into a giant that helped to beat half the world in the last war. When we started out we had nothing; by 1940 we had 17 Air Reserve stations. We were training a considerable number of cadets every year. These were the young men who were the well-trained forces available when we needed them. After the disarmament of the 1920's and 1930's, and with the small number of men available to the military up until the expansion program of the late thirties, the Navy and naval aviation almost pulled themselves up by their boot straps to enter World War II with the power they did. Combined with the Reserve forces was the productive potential of American industry. No one nation in the world nor any conceivable group of nations can match that industry in its ability to flood the defense establishment with more than it can use. Our supplies of material produced by this great industrial Nation has done a tremendous amount to give our military forces the power they have and will have in any future conflict.

To get back to the Reserve forces, I think that any future aggressors should look carefully at the trained men and women who are available to the military forces in the United States in an emergency. In place of the two airplanes and the small group of men with which the Naval Air Reserve got started after World War I, we now have 12,000 officers and 47,000 well-trained men who can fit into a wartime organization immediately. These are modern minutemen. They are linked into our mobilization plans to be available practically overnight. They represent a potential force which can help to put back on the seas a fleet of carrier task forces which no combination of air, surface, or undersea fleets can stop. The potential aggressors of the world will find that they face a new up-to-date Navy which can move, in the same way that it did in World War II, where it wants to move and defeat almost any combination of military strength.

The Naval Air Reserve today is very important to naval aviation. We're flying off 27 air stations right now, and our efficiency and training is excellent. It isn't a paper organization either. Last year we sent most of our carrier aircraft squadrons back to sea. Note this was 4 years after the end of the war. There were new men in these squadrons, along with the combat-training veterans of World War II. We put them aboard carriers for the first time since the end of the war to conduct maneuvers and to practice the proven techniques of that war. Their performance exceeded all expectations. They had no accidents to speak of and their efficiency was so high that they drew praise from fleet commanders and from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.

In addition to what I have just said, I would like to invite your attention to the fact that the Navy Department is exerting every effort to translate available appropriations into maximum fighting strength and mobilization potential. Savings made are generally available for increasing the state of readiness of authorized forces. Economies already effected have permitted increasing previously planned fleet strength by one large carrier and one cruiser, to provide additional equipment for antisubmarine warfare, and to augment general readiness. Planned economies are an important contributing factor in retaining two additional marine battalions. The Naval Reserve is included in this effort to provide for a ready and able force, and an example of that is that at present the Navy is studying the feasibility of establishing a fighter-type air organized reserve squadron in the Akron area. This record speaks for itself.

Naval aviation and the Navy itself are made up of three parts: The operating forces, the research program, and the Reserve. Together, they are a powerful force for peace and a competent weapon in war. No one of them can exist alone; likewise, no one of the three military services can win a war. Under our present system and with an efficient military organization and a free research and development program, we in the Military Establishment make up a team which will do much to guarantee the peace of the world or defeat any enemies to freemen everywhere.

New Deal Propaganda in Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

NEW DEAL PROPAGANDA IN THE COLLEGES

To judge from the news report of the recent meeting of the American Association of University Professors in Cleveland, no delegate raised the question which ought to be agitating this group as it has never been stirred before. We refer, of course, to the efforts of the Federal Government to alter the curriculum and the methods of teaching of the social sciences in the colleges.

The charge is readily documented. Within the Federal Security Agency headed by Oscar Ewing there is an office of education and within it a division of higher education. Mr. Ewing recently issued a circular advertising for a man to head up his department of sociology in the division. He is offering a starting salary of $7,600, rising to $8,600, which is higher pay than all but a few sociologists receive. Mr. Ewing expects that this bait will land a man of consequence in the academic world, a man who commands the respect of university professors, because only such a man is likely to prove useful to Mr. Ewing in accomplishing the ends he has in view.

The advertisement starts out with a long paragraph listing the attributes of the man to be selected. He should know the place of sociology in the college curriculum, the nature of the courses taught, the textbooks, the need for education in the various branches of this subject, and "the characteristics of faculty personnel engaged in the teaching of sociology." We don't know what the quoted words were intended to mean, but they could mean that he should know who are the collectivists who will follow Mr. Ewing gladly, and who are the believers in liberty who can be expected to buck him.

Then follows another paragraph telling what the man is expected to accomplish. The language is mostly gobbledygook, but it comes down to this: Dr. $7,600 is to do all he can to persuade the faculties of sociology in the colleges and universities to amend their curricula and modify their teaching methods to accord with the notions of Mr. Ewing.

"More specifically," says the advertisement, "the specialist for sociology will be responsible for such activities as the following: * * * (f) promoting and stimulating cooperative experimental studies and demonstrations of improved practices in the teaching of sociology in colleges and universities; and (g) upon request, participating in surveys or evaluations of the programs of colleges and universities pertinent to the teaching of sociology."

The operative word in (f) is "promoting" and no great attention need be paid to "upon request" in (g) because Mr. Ewing has already said he is going to hire the kind of fellow who won't have trouble getting invitations to meddle.

If the National Association of Manufacturers were to advertise in any such terms, the Association of University Professors would throw a fit, and rightly. But Mr. Ewing gets away with it in spite of the fact that he speaks for the biggest of all businesses and in spite of the fact that no man in this country has as much advantage to gain as Mr. Ewing has from twisting the teaching of sociology to his and the New Deal's purposes.

Mr. Ewing wants compulsory medical insurance. He favors huge Federal grants for education and for expanded social services. He wishes the young people of this country to believe in the wisdom and goodness of his program and he will be helped in all of this if the professors of sociology propagandize for his causes. He is out to make New Deal votes and to indoctrinate in collectivism a crop of college-trained bureaucrats to serve in his offices and divisions. All these are plausible reasons for his trying to influence the teaching of sociology in the colleges, a matter in which the Federal Government has no legitimate excuse for meddling.

Apparently this is all to the good so far as the American Association of University Professors is concerned. Maybe they can't get sore at anybody who offers $7,600 salaries. But just what do they mean when they talk about resisting threats to academic freedom?

Partial Answer to Wheat Surplus in More-Flour Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent article by John Cipperly, Washington correspondent of the Northwestern Miller, and published in the March 28 issue of that publication, is of interest to everyone who is desirous of expanding outlets for farm products:

LEGISLATORS SAMPLE MORE-FLOUR BREAD—BREAD MADE WITH 16 PERCENT MORE FLOUR SHIPPED TO CAPITAL—WHEAT-STATE SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES SPONSOR DISTRIBUTION—PARTIAL ANSWER TO WHEAT SURPLUS SEEN POSSIBLE IN NEW IDEA

(By John Cipperly)

WASHINGTON.—The House and Senate restaurants March 22 featured samples of the newly developed bread containing 16 percent more flour. Wheat-State Senators and Representatives sponsored the luncheon distribution of 500 loaves of the bread after it had been flown to the Nation's Capital from Hutchinson, Kans. Mounting wheat surpluses and the reported per capita decline in flour consumption in the United States whetted the interest of the wheat-State legislators, who hoped that part of the answer to these problems might be found in the new bread formula.

The idea was introduced recently in western Kansas by Morris Coover, Kinsley, Kans., business man, who accompanied the shipment to Washington. He has turned the promotion of the project over to the Western Kansas Development Association, of which Robert Bird is executive secretary with headquarters at Garden City, Kans. The bread distributed here was baked by the bakery division of J. S. Dillon & Sons Co., Hutchinson, Kans., chain store. The principal change in the more-flour formula is the inclusion of 110 pounds of white flour and 6 pounds of whole-wheat flour, compared with 100 pounds of white flour in the formula for the standard loaf.

On the surface Mr. Coover appeared to have provided a very simple answer to the wheat surplus problem: Put more flour in bread.

BREAD PALATABLE

The Dillon loaf, baked along the lines suggested by Mr. Coover, was palatable bread. It could be buttered generously without crumbling and then folded, sandwich style, for eating.

One Washington baker pointed out that the Coover idea could have been accomplished by the Dillon Bakery without the addition of 16 pounds more flour to the original bread formula. Rather than adding flour, this operator said all he needed to do was to reduce the water content.

It was also noted that the Coover formula, with the greater flour content in the dough mass, tends to reduce the shortening and milk and sugar content of the finished loaves, since no increase in these ingredients is provided to compensate for the increased amount of flour.

Should the Coover idea take hold it would unquestionably expand the use of flour considerably, a point which bakers and millers understand. The significant thing about the Coover idea is that it is another sign of private initiative's ability to explore new avenues of approach to existing problems. It indicates an awakening interest in the problem of disposing of our wheat surpluses. Each slight gain will lead others to attempt further experiments.

A SIMPLE IDEA

Mr. Coover's idea is a simple one. Sparked by a taste memory, possibly the most impelling factor in the sales of food products, Mr. Coover has tried to recapture the type of bread he remembers eating as a youth. He has bypassed the chemists' laboratories and the technician's control towers and asked only that more flour be put into a loaf of bread.

The advent of the more-flour bread comes at an auspicious time when Congress has been viewing the baking industry with a critical eye. This criticism has been directed at the alleged substitution of synthetic products for those of the farm by the baking industry. A Senate Agriculture Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Senator GUY GILLETTE (Democrat, Iowa) has already closely questioned baking industry leaders on their manufacturing practices and their profits. Other congressional leaders, particularly those from the wheat-producing States, sensing a ground swell of criticism of the farm price support programs from urban areas, are looking for a weapon to strike back and may be ready for an all-out attack on the processing industries which use agricultural commodities.

One baking industry leader after examining the Coover formula noted the percentage reduction of shortening, dried milk, and sugar in the individual loaves made from the Coover mix and expressed concern that a broad use of the Coover formula might provoke criticism from the shortening and dried milk industries, since the Coover plan indicated a reduction in the use of these farm products.

CONTROVERSY PROVOKED

Even if the Coover plan never expands beyond the borders of the State of Kansas it has the great virtue of provoking controversy which will lead others to try and try again to make a better loaf of bread. It also seems possible that the solution of the national farm program does not lie in congressional tinkering but the law of supply and demand and in the ingenuity and initiative of private enterprise in searching for broader markets and profits.

Businessmen in the food-processing and agricultural-distribution field see peril in the cure-alls of the farm price supporters to a point where they let their fears cloud their better judgments. There is reason to hope for a better day when consideration is given to such experiments as Mr. Coover's and the frozen-citrus-concentrate promotion, which saved the Florida citrus industry from the paralyzing effects of a Federal price-support program for that crop. Mr. Coover is pointing the way and inviting others to test their wits on one of the many national problems, the cures of which are too exclusively seen as legislative.

To the great credit of Mr. Coover he appears to have focussed the interest of a broad segment of the public and the baking industry on the use of wheat flour. He is a wheat farmer interested essentially in finding broader markets for that commodity. If his simple suggestion of using more flour in bread succeeds it is possible that the name "Coover" may become more widely and favorably known to wheat markets than those of Jim Patten and Leiter, of wheat-corner fame.

Alaska Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a letter writen by Mr. M. J. Molans, of Pittsburgh, Pa., addressed to the editor of the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, published in the March 29, 1950, issue, endorsing statehood for Alaska:

Your feature articles and mighty editorials on Alaskan statehood are the most gratifying news so forcibly brought to the attention of your vast army of readers. These editorials together with the powerful cartoon by Burris Jenkins, Jr., not only stamps you as a great liberal and champion of true democracy but also as a modern Paul Revere. My sincere hope is, that every one of the 13 Senators you named will have read—and digested the arguments advanced for statehood, and having done so, open the door to our northern territory and welcome it into the family of our 48 States.

I am very familiar with Alaska's needs and problems. My son served with the engineers combat division which built the Alcan Highway and later transferred to the Aleutians, where he served on Attu, Kiska, Shemya, Adak, and Kodiak and during his reenlistment (1945–48) served on Ladd Field. I was in constant contact with conditions throughout Alaska as well as being informed through the pages of Alaska's leading paper (Jessen's Weekly) and through correspondence with Alaskan oldtimers who used to sum up their woes with "Give us statehood."

Back in October 1947, I sounded the alarm that Alaska may be our next Pearl Harbor. I cited the fortifications on Chukotskiy Peninsula, Siberia, a stone's throw from our territory across the Bering Strait, how American fishermen spotted the huge gun emplacements on the Russian side and reported their discovery to our officials at Ladd Field. That was in 1948. Imagine the progress Russia has made to date and how easily they can attack Pearl Harbor, Fairbanks, and all Alaska, if we don't strengthen our defenses there.

Alaskan statehood will unquestionably strengthen all of United States. Billy Mitchell warned "A strong Alaska means a strong America" so—what are we waiting for? If Patrick Henry were alive today, imagine what he would say right now.

Come, Senators, stop treating Alaska as a stepchild. Vote it State and make it a Gibraltar against any aggression from Russia, our potential enemy.

M. J. MOLANS.

What ECA Is Accomplishing in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Roscoe Drummond:

WHAT ECA IS ACCOMPLISHING IN EUROPE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

PARIS.—The Congress of the United States shortly will be deciding one of the most important questions which will come before it this session—whether to approve the Economic Cooperation Administration request for a new appropriation of $2,900,000,000.

In making this decision, Congress undoubtedly will be responsive to American public opinion. As one who, for a period, is officially connected with ECA, it would not be proper for me to argue the case for the Marshall plan—and I will not do so. But I can offer a report on what is being accomplished in Europe and present the underlying facts as faithfully as I have been able to observe them at first hand during the past 8 months.

The prime task which Congress assigned to the ECA was to help the nations of western Europe achieve an economic recovery which would permit them to function without extraordinary outside aid. The purposes which motivated the Marshall plan were:

To rescue Europe from the brink of economic collapse to which the most destructive war in history had brought it.

To help rebuild a prospering and self-supporting Europe, without which a prospering and secure America would be jeopardized.

To bring about such improved social and political conditions as will enable free institutions to regain their strength and thereby resist the march of communism.

Measured in terms of the Marshall plan's basic objective and its central motives, what are the facts to report? Some of the principal facts are these:

It is accurate to say that the progress of the European recovery program—in production and trade, in expanding productive capacity, in restoring internal financial stability, and in slowly raising living standards—has exceeded the largest expectations of 2 years ago.

ABSOLUTES

When the Marshall plan started, millions of persons were going hungry. Today that menace has been removed. Today agricultural productivity as a whole has been brought nearly to the level of prewar, and, given favorable weather conditions, will reach the prewar level or exceed it during

the present crop year. This means an improving diet, but still a bare diet, since western Europe has 20,000,000 more persons to feed than before the war and is putting, by necessity, a very high percentage of its income into durable capital investment rather than consumer goods.

INDUSTRY

For the Marshall plan area as a whole, industrial production has been raised one-third higher than it was in 1937. It took western Europe 7 years to regain its prewar level of production after World War I. Today, after 2 years of the Marshall plan and less than 5 years after the end of the far more destructive World War II, industrial production has been brought to 20 percent higher than 1938.

FINANCIAL STABILITY

Until the inflation which gripped the entirety of western Europe in 1946–47 was checked and brought under control, the nations could not even begin to rebuild their industrial plants. Today the governments have put their financial houses in better order. Prices generally are being held, and the outlook is encouraging.

Under the stimulus of sounder financial conditions and mounting production intra-European trade has improved. Total exports have risen 50 percent since 1947.

These are the facts which bear upon the question of whether a solid foundation of European recovery is being made.

Obviously, there are tough problems still to be met. To enable western Europe to close the dollar gap—or to bring it into manageable proportions—and to carry forward the essential economic unification needed to strengthen and secure the recovery already made are the two biggest jobs which face ECA during the next 2 years.

One question which frequently is asked officials of the ECA is whether the Marshall plan appropriations for the third year should not be substantially reduced, particularly in view of the need for governmental economy in the United States.

Facts rather than arguments are more useful in answering this question.

Marshall plan aid for western Europe for 1948–49 was about $5,800,000,000, including the special appropriation for Germany.

The appropriation for 1949–50 was about $4,280,000,000.

The ECA appropriation request which is now before Congress for 1950–51 is $2,900,000,000.

The Marshall plan is premised upon the principle of reducing the aid substantially every year, and the foregoing facts show wherein the ECA itself always has initiated these reductions rather than waiting for Congress to propose them.

What Is Americanism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most important task of the hour is a development of appreciation for the ideals of freedom and liberty we know as Americanism. Nowhere is the task more important or the results more encouraging than among the boys and girls in our schools. Elks' lodges across the Nation have been contributing to this valuable program by offering worth while cash prizes for the best essays on the subject written by students. Their essays have been uniformly able discussions of problems reflecting credit on themselves and the schools they are attending.

One of the most interesting essays, and winner of first place at Mount Carmel, Ill., High School, was written by Miss Barbara Van Ault, a senior, the editor of her high-school paper, and a member of the Future Teachers of America. Her essay makes good reading for every American, and offers a ray of encouraging hope for the manner in which today's young people are prepared to face their responsibilities in preserving representative government as we have known it in America. For these reasons, I am including the text of her essay under permission granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Each contestant included a short autobiographical sketch. Miss Van Ault's sketch and her prize-winning essay follow:

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

I was born in Princeton, Ind., July 14, 1932.

My first 8 years of schooling were spent at the Count R. Lovellette grade school in Keensburg, after which I entered Mount Carmel high school, and will graduate from there this spring. In high school, I have been active in music, playing in the band, girls' orchestra, flute trio, singing in the glee club and a capella choir. I have been a contestant at both district and State music contests the last 3 years, and district debate contests this year. I am a member of the Future Teachers of America and editor of the high school newspaper.

BARBARA VAN AULT.

WHAT IS AMERICANISM?

Ask any true American for a definition of Americanism, and he will say that it is his faith in his country and Government, his respect and tribute to her traditions and ideals, his willingness to cooperate with others to fulfill her desires and commands.

It is the spirit of democracy that prevails throughout America, the essence of liberty held so dear in the heart of every American. The torch lifted high by the Statue of Liberty to spread its glow of freedom above our Nation's shores, the book of justice held firmly beneath her arm—these things are Americanism.

Stemming from our forefathers, who escaped from tyranny by sheer perseverance and belief in their dreams of freedom, Americanism, is our way of life, our democratic attributes. By virtue of their faith and constancy, their valiant struggles to gain a free life, we of this generation have been handed a firm foundation upon which to build and to keep as long as progress goes onward.

Americanism is the will of the people to build on that foundation, and to erect a structure that will last throughout the ages, a monument to the faith and deeds of the people who have strived through eras of prosperity, through times of despair and depression, to emerge from the mists of gloom to the sunshine of a Nation's wholeheartedness. It is the freedom of the people to carry out that will, to speak and write as they wish, without fear of depression by the Government.

It is this Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, that makes Americanism what it is today—a realization of the hopes, fears and dreams of generations of American people, their abilities to live a life of happiness and freedom of spirit, as well as freedom of American principles.

Americanism is an indestructible quality of our Nation, a lasting quality that generations far into the future will still hold dear. It is through Americanism that any boy or girl can dream, and can make these dreams come true by working toward a higher goal of success.

The spirit that prompts our soldiers to offer their lives without thought of personal gain to defend our Nation's creed is Americanism, helping to spread our ideals in far-flung nations of the world.

It is the generosity of the American people, their willingness to devote countless time and effort to serve mankind diligently, their generous gifts to help their fellowman. The American Red Cross polio, tuberculosis, cancer, and heart-disease drives, the individual to struggle to help the unfortunate and crippled children are symbolic of the great devotion to Americanism in our country today.

The freedom to express our true faith in any religion that we choose is Americanism. Americans are free to worship in any church, at any time. They are not denied the privilege because of an overruling Government. Religion has been outlawed in some countries; in America, it is looked up to and praised for all to hear.

It is the right of the parent to chastise the child, to correct him when he has done wrong, without fear of an armed policeman saying, "You may not punish your own child—that is up to the government." It is this freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom from despair, freedom to say what we please when we please, freedom to put our thoughts in writing for the whole Nation to read, freedom to carry out our own individual plans, freedom to worship in the church of our choice, freedom to help ourselves on the road to success, that makes Americanism a truly great loyalty to a truly great Nation.

Yes, ask any American for his definition of Americanism. His ability and willingness to answer your question is Americanism.

BARBARA VAN AULT.

KEENSBURG, ILL.

Time for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, today a letter came to me from Commander Jack F. Jacobson, of the Department of Nebraska Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

With timely remarks in his letter Commander Jacobson included a very important editorial which appeared recently in the official publication of his organization. Because of its great importance, I include it with my remarks so that all Members may read it and that it be made part of the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Everywhere nowadays seriously minded, mature people engage in conversation which concerns our Government and our national debt. From Maine to California, from our northern border to the Gulf, the average citizen manifests a deep and growing concern, and looks toward Washington for an answer.

Two important questions are upon the mind of the public, and an answer is sought. This matter of cold war and our national debt are now of long standing and of sufficient duration to become irksome and disquieting.

In this matter of cold war, conditions are drifting steadily toward a state of siege. Regulation, regimentation, and martial law are casting their shadow upon this free land of ours, unless the present drift is halted and some positive action is set in motion.

In 1917 America went to war. Many died in the mortal combat to rid this earth of militarism.

Only a few years ago, militarism, the scourge of civilization, was permitted to sprout and grow until its weight and might had to justify its existence and purpose. Aggressor nations were literally wiped out and thousands of Americans died in the cause to rid this world of aggression.

Militarism again is permitted to flourish, for no other purpose than to back with force the aggression now in progress. The method now used by this military power is—infiltrate—then conquer. This scheme and method has recurred with alarming regularity, and at this moment no frontiers are respected, at least not safe from infiltration.

Millions of Chinese will augment hostages and political prisoners in the slave camps scattered throughout the Siberias. All this power's efforts and energies are directed toward one accomplishment. The present number of military divisions under arms, the number of aircraft, and the astounding quantities of submarines in service, clearly show that this power intends to wage a global war.

Possessing all the natural resources required, and an abundance of manpower, the weapons of aggression only need more time to fashion and forge. When that time has elapsed, this country will be the major objective, because penetrating and overrunning the frontiers of many of our present United Nations will require only hours, and actual invasion of our own soil would soon begin.

Time is the most precious commodity—it is irreplaceable. So while there is still time, let the people of the United States mould the opinion, and shape a directive to this power that aggression must cease and that we the people will back this demand with force.

There cannot be any appeasement or any procrastination in this.

Such a policy calls for a prompt and realistic appraisal of our national debt. The national annual budget must be given corrective consideration. Along with all of our resources which must be guardedly preserved, our national wealth should and must receive a prime consideration. It must also be given high priority in the scheme of our national security and national defense.

Our present national debt is looked upon favorably by this aggressor. Our deficit spending may well be allied; be it in fact or only in theory to the supposition that the United States could not bridge a crisis, nor wage another war, and survive, with the national debt as it stands today. Solvency should stand high upon the agenda of our national defense.

The Case Against the Mills Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, while the new excise-tax reduction bill has not yet been unveiled, most of the Members of this body have heard rumors that it will contain provisions to speed up the collection of corporate taxes. This proposal was first offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the March 25 issue of Business Week, which, in my opinion, states valid reasons why this proposal should be thoroughly studied before enactment. The editorial follows:

[From Business Week of March 25, 1950]

THE CASE AGAINST THE MILLS BILL

There is something ominous about the way congressional discussion of tax reform keeps looping back to the idea of speeding up the collection of corporate taxes in 1951. It's ominous because it shows that Congress still won't face up to the hard facts of our fiscal situation.

Congress is understandably unhappy about the spot it is in. Even without badly needed tax reforms, President Truman's budget for fiscal 1951 will show a deficit of about $5,000,000,000. Any attempt to reform our painful and dangerously burdensome tax system will automatically increase that deficit—unless Congress can somehow bring itself to cut expenditures. And cutting expenditures in an election year is something that every Congressman tries to duck.

The speed-up idea—usually called the Mills bill because it was originally sponsored by Representative WILBUR MILLS—seems to offer an alluringly simply way out. On its face, it would boost revenues without increasing the tax burden. That's a neat trick if you can pull it off.

Under present law, corporations pay their taxes in four installments spread out through the year following the year to which the tax applies. This year, for instance, they will be paying up their 1949 liabilities. Next year they will start paying the taxes due on 1950 income.

The Mills plan would accelerate collections by requiring corporations to pay all their 1950 taxes in two installments in the first 6 months of 1951 instead of spreading payments over the whole year.

Over the long run this would make no difference in the total amount of taxes due. But in the year when the switch was made it would produce a big jump in government revenue. The Treasury would cram a year and a half of tax collections into a single 12-month period. In fiscal 1951, this would boost its take by something like $5,000,000,000.

It looks too good to be true—particularly to a Congressman who desperately wants a way of raising revenues without slapping on new taxes.

TRICKY BOOKKEEPING

It is too good to be true. Fundamentally, it's nothing but tricky bookkeeping. It wouldn't solve any of the Government's fiscal problems. It would merely permit Congress to duck them for another year.

When fiscal 1952 rolled around, revenue would drop back again. Congress would find itself right back where it is now—with another year of deficit financing and outsize expenditure programs behind it.

Financial window-dressing may be useful for a hole-in-the-wall operator who is trying to impress his creditors. But it's no way to handle government finances. If we have to run a deficit in fiscal 1951, we will be a great deal better off if we admit it frankly instead of trying to doctor the books to cover it up.

There's another good reason for turning thumbs down on the Mills bill or any variation on the same theme: It would exaggerate the unstabilizing effect that the Federal budget already has on business.

Even with its present methods of collection, the Government takes in most of its revenues during the first half of the calendar year. During this time it often runs tremendous surpluses. In the last 6 months of the year, it usually spends more than it collects.

All this puts a lot of artificial and unnecessary strain on the flow of income and credit through the economy. In the first half of the year, the Government is sopping up purchasing power from individuals and corporations. In the second half, it is pouring money back into the system, automatically boosting purchasing power.

The Mills bill would concentrate revenues even more heavily in the first half of the year—not only in 1951 but in all years after that. And it would increase the size of the deficit in the second half year.

In this respect, it would be a step in the wrong direction. We have enough unavoidable seasonal strains on the economy without introducing any artificial ones. One big object in fiscal planning should be to level Government receipts and expenditures as much as possible over the year. The Mills bill would work just the other way.

WHY PAY AS YOU GO?

There's one other point to be considered. Would there be any advantage in putting corporate taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis similar to individual income taxes? If so, the Mills bill could be a step in that direction.

Theoretically, pay-as-you-go is a good idea. It gears tax collections closely to the flow of income. It helps to keep the Government's fiscal policy from getting out of step with the rest of the economy.

But pay-as-you-go for corporations runs into some big practical objections. Corporate incomes fluctuate widely—much more than individual incomes. It's impossible to make any good advance estimate of what they will be. Hence, a true pay-as-you-go system for corporations would probably bog down almost as soon as it started.

Add all this up, and you come out with a strong case against the Mills bill. Its advantages are illusory; its drawbacks are real.

But rejecting the Mills bill doesn't solve the Government's financial problems. To make a start on that, Congress must also reject the whole idea behind the Mills bill—the idea that everything will be all right if somehow we can make the books show a year-to-year balance of receipts and expenditures.

Receipts and expenditures in any one year aren't the important thing. The real answer to the fiscal problem is to set up a well-planned, efficient tax system and then gear our expenditure programs to it. Until we do that, no amount of fancy bookkeeping can help us.

Positive Action Is Called for To Counter the Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE], meeting with Republican leaders in Salt Lake City, Utah, over the week end, gave the Midwest chairmen a frank and honest appraisal of what he feels is the most serious problem now facing the Republican Party. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE], representing a great agricultural area, has been vitally interested in the problems of the American

farmer. My distinguished colleague is himself the author of a farm plan which he discussed with the Republican leadership out west. As a result of this forthright, straight-from-the-shoulder recommendation, the Deseret News of Salt Lake City, Utah, on Sunday, April 2, carried the following editorial. Because of its significance to all Republicans and to the Nation, I submit it for the RECORD:

POSITIVE ACTION IS CALLED FOR TO COUNTER THE BRANNAN PLAN

HAROLD O. LOVRE, Republican Congressman from South Dakota, who was once his party's chairman in that State, came out from Washington Friday to talk agricultural turkey to the 19 Midwest and Rocky Mountain GOP State chairmen convened here under the chairmanship of Utah's Republican chief, Vernon Romney, to mull this year's campaign plans.

The party's national chairman, Guy Gabrielson, used the occasion as platform for a Nation-wide radio broadcast Saturday afternoon and was the Friday evening banquet's principal speaker; so he created most of the closely reported news.

But what Congressman LOVRE had to say made more than general sense. It deserves attention.

The main burden of his argument was designed to enlist support for a farm plan for which the Republican campaigners can go out and battle.

He suggested one which he has authored; or a similar anti-Brannan plan which has been submitted to the party by Axel Beck, South Dakota's GOP national committeeman and chairman of the national committee's agricultural subcommittee; or a combination of the Beck plan and his; or any Republican farm plan so contrived as to include these points:

(1) Full self-financing, so as to end the use of tax money for farm subsidies; (2) full parity farm prices at all times for normal domestic consumption; (3) administration of the plan by the farmers themselves through elected county, State, and National committees; (4) specific and real protection for the operator of the family size farm; (5) a two-price level which will make it possible to "remainder" surpluses in a way similar to general business practice; (6) provision for distribution of surplus foodstuffs to the needy under a food-stamp plan; (7) encouragement of chemurgical uses for farm surpluses; (8) exports on the world market geared to our international commitments; and (9) a coordinated soil-conservation program.

He offered that as something substantial, something specific, something positive to talk about, whether the party is willing to agree to all his points or not.

His point and argument was that the GOP needs some kind of positive farm plan, anyway.

The trouble with anti-Brannanism is that it is in action mostly emotional. It is no-no-ism, it is heaven-help-us-ism, it is for-great-gosh-goodness-sakes-ism—but it suggests nothing in the Brannan plan's stead.

That is, as Mr. LOVRE declared, the Brannan plan's strength.

Everyone knows that the ruling farm plan, the Aiken-Hope law, in operation, is a mess. At least politically and socially, the farmers it was written to help suffer most. The Nation's taxpayers who presently have $4,000,000,000 tied up in surpluses alone, with a running added cost of $25,000 an hour just to store them, are sick of it. And they should be.

The Brannan plan is as full of implicit economic and social vices as a Florida cracker's hound dog is full of ticks, and Mr. LOVRE counted them off. That is where most Brannan-plan critics stop.

When they are faced by the challenge that House Majority Leader MCCORMACK hurled a few days ago—"I call upon those who oppose the Brannan plan to offer a plan of their own"—they stop because they are stumped. Nobody has offered one. Nobody does.

The Brannan plan has one real virtue and it is great. That is, as Congressman LOVRE pointed out, that the Brannan plan is, it exists. Secretary Brannan had the energy to think a plan up, if not through all its implications; and the courage to present it, and the willingness to struggle for its adoption.

And the scheme's credentialed opponents have thus far no plan whatever of their own. That was Mr. LOVRE's argument, and it is as true as a well-tuned E-string. It should ring in the Republican Party's ears.

For the credentialed opponents of the Brannan plan are, by political definition as anti-Brannanism stands now, the Republicans. It is their bounden duty to draft a farm plan and fight for it.

If they don't come out with a plan in opposition to Mr. Brannan's, one they are willing to fight for and one that the farmers are willing to support positively, which means with votes—if they fail to do that, the Republicans will lose the farm States this year that they lost in '48—Mr. LOVRE is convinced and we are persuaded—and the loss of the farm States will mean the loss of another election.

The GOP elephant, if it expects to survive as an effective element in American affairs, cannot afford to lose much more skin off its hide.

Is There Room in the Poorhouse for 149,000,000 People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Reader's Digest of January 1950:

IS THERE ROOM IN THE POORHOUSE FOR 149,000,000 PEOPLE?

In 1932 Franklin D. Roosevelt, then a presidential candidate, had this to say about Government spending:

"Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse."

Those words, important 17 years ago, have even greater significance today. Why? Because in every year since 1932 (with the exception of the two fiscal years immediately following the war) our Federal Government has spent more than it has collected.

In 1932 our Federal Government spent $4,500,000,000. For the fiscal year of 1950, it is estimated that our Federal Government will spend 10 times that amount—$45,000,000,000.

To give you an idea of just how much money this is, consider these facts:

1. If everyone in the United States cashed in all his life-insurance policies, the total would amount to $44,000,000,000. This would not be enough money to run the Government for 1 year.

2. If every urban home owner in this country sold his home, the total would amount to $30,000,000,000. That's just enough to run the Government for 8 months.

3. If every farmer in this country sold his farm, farm equipment, and livestock, the total would amount to $25,000,000,000. The Government could not run for 7 months on that amount of money.

These facts put a new light on the staggering size of our Federal Government's planned $45,000,000,000 expenditure for the fiscal year of 1950. And remember, this excessive spending is in the face of a national debt of more than $250,000,000,000.

Isn't it as true today as it was in 1932 that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse?

Just what are you doing to end excessive spending by our Federal Government? Have you written your Congressman? Have you discussed the problem with your business associates, your friends, your employees?

Let's make sure our representatives in Government know how we at home feel about the continuance of a habit that means the poorhouse.

The time for action is now.

Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the farmers and livestock producers of Kansas are opposed to the so-called Brannan plan. At the recent annual meeting of the Kansas Livestock Association held in Topeka on March 18, 1950, a strong resolution in opposition to the Brannan plan was adopted. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the same herewith:

BRANNAN PLAN

Whereas the farm program proposed by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan to the Eighty-first Congress would promote low market prices for all agricultural products, would subsidize consumers, rich and poor alike, and would eventually necessitate Federal control of all agriculture; and

Whereas the livestock industry cannot be successfully operated by governmental bureaus: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we are opposed to the proposed program. We consider it unsound economically and entirely imprectical, and we urge Congress to reject it.

Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from editorials concerning statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII AND ALASKA IS NATIONAL INTEREST

More than 300 editorials collected this year point out overwhelming national support for statehood. Cross section of editorial support shown in following excerpts received since House voted for Alaska and Hawaii statehood the first week in March:

Los Angeles (Calif.) Mirror of March 8, 1950:

"The two Territories are increasingly important to our national economy and our national defense. They deserve the privileges as well as the responsibilities of statehood."

Chicago (Ill.) Herald American of March 14, 1950:

"Immediate statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is urgently needed for the safety and welfare of the country, and approval of the pending measures is thus the most urgent duty of the Senate."

Indianapolis (Ind.) News of March 7, 1950:

"Hawaiians are busy framing a State constitution in advance of a congressional affirmative. They are politically, economically, and patriotically ready. Painstaking investigations have scotched charges of subversion for the falsehoods that they are. The most recent public-opinion poll reveals that the American people favor Hawaii statehood, 4 to 1."

Davenport (Iowa) Democrat of March 14, 1950:

"The findings of congressional committees which have studied the question carefully and at first hand fully support the view that these territories are entitled to stars in the Republic's flag."

Wichita (Kans.) Morning Eagle of March 11, 1950:

"If the Senate fears there will be a dictatorship in Hawaii, either of the right or the left, it shows little faith in principle of freely chosen governments. Probably the people of Hawaii can take care of either the business barons or Harry Bridges with their ballots. Anyhow, they are entitled to the right to try it."

Frankfort (Ky.) State Journal of March 10, 1950:

"Chief among arguments for statehood are that the territories are important and growing, that they have populations capable and desirous of sovereign government, and that the best interests of both the territories and the Nation would be served by giving Alaska and Hawaii statehood's economic and political advantages and closer ties with the Union."

Baton Rouge (La.) State Times of March 8, 1950:

"The time for dawdling is past. Alaska, important for its great natural wealth and its strategic location, might as well be accepted into the family. And so might Hawaii."

Great Falls (Mont.) Leader of March 11, 1950:

"Majority sentiment in Montana undoubtedly favors full citizenship for the people of both Hawaii and Alaska."

New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of March 9, 1950:

"In view of the capacity for self-government the Hawaiians have shown and their loyalty to the United States, statehood is due them, and the Senate should go along with the House in admitting both Hawaii and Alaska as the forty-ninth and fiftieth States of the Union."

Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of March 10, 1950:

"Both Hawaii and Alaska probably are better qualified for statehood than were many of the States on the continent when they were admitted. Although they are not located on the mainland, modern transportation has brought them close to Washington."

St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of March 8, 1950:

"The better government it has, the less chance the Communists will have—and the United States has good reasons for wanting to keep control of Hawaii instead of letting it go to the Communists by default."

Grand Island (Nebr.) Daily Independent of March 10, 1950:

"It is an established principle in the United States that a Territory is to be admitted to statehood as soon as practical. If Hawaii was incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof, there is implicit in that treaty a promise of eventual statehood. Hawaii has formally applied 16 times in 53 years for the status of a State. It is entitled to that status."

Newark (N. J.) News of March 9, 1950:

"On all grounds of principle, fairness, and self-interest, Alaska and Hawaii should be relieved of their Territorial status and admitted to the Union as the equal partners of the other 48 States. Their admission would prove to the world that our devotion to the democratic idea has practical, present meaning."

Keene (N. H.) Sentinel of March 8, 1950:

"Hawaiians are Americans. They are just as loyal to the United States as we are. They can offer a great deal to the ideal of the United States. They have waited patiently for many years. Hawaii deserves statehood."

New York (N. Y.) Times of March 7, 1950:

"The people of these islands (Hawaii), like the people of Alaska, ask to be represented in the Government which taxes them and makes their laws. We on the mainland cannot reject this appeal without repudiating a basic principle of our own democracy."

Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer of March 5, 1950: "Our leaders continue to preach democracy to the rest of the world. It might make their preachments more convincing if Congress, at this session, were to practice democracy, in the case of Hawaii, and allow its half million people to enjoy the most elementary right of democracy: the right to be represented in the Government which taxes them."

Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., of March 8, 1950: "Both Alaska and Hawaii are key bastions of America's defense system. They are closely linked with the mainland by trade and tradition.

"They pay millions of dollars in Federal taxes without representation in the Congress.

"They deserve something better than colonial status."

Stillwater (Okla.) News-Press of March 13, 1950: "Both Hawaii and Alaska are closer to statehood than they have been in some time. Their natural resources and determined citizens would certainly be a big help to this Nation."

Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of March 8, 1950: "Of course, the basic claim that Alaska and Hawaii have to statehood is the same which the original colonies pressed against Great Britain. As taxpaying members of a political community they want some voice in making the laws that govern them. Hawaii, which has no voting representation in Congress, pays more Federal income tax than any of 12 present States."

Providence (R. I.) Journal of March 11, 1950: "When Hawaii (in 1900) and Alaska (in 1912) were incorporated as United States Territories, the implication was that they would be admitted as States. It is up to this country to make good our implied pledge."

Madison (S. D.) Daily Leader of March 8, 1950: "Both Alaska and Hawaii are genuine parts of our Union. Both have been United States territory for many decades. They should be admitted as States, and given all the rights (and obligations) of statehood."

Jackson (Tenn.) Sun of March 12, 1950: "The people of the islands are being taxed and they have no representation in Congress, the body which imposes taxes. Taxation without representation was the battle cry of the colonists of this country who threw off the yoke of England."

San Antonio (Tex.) Express of March 8, 1950: "Off and on during the first half of this century, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, most emphatically Hawaii, have been pressing Congress for admission to the Union of States. Both are fully qualified, by the standards of some earlier statehood grants, and their admission would strengthen this Nation's economy, security, and political structures."

Norfolk (Va.) Virginian-Pilot of March 8, 1950: "Both parties are committed to statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. The House majority has done well in advancing the realization a step nearer."

Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of March 9, 1950: "The residents of these areas are taxed but have no voting representation at present. Likewise, they are not able to play a direct part in legislation directly relating to their welfare. Politically their vote is no more incongruous than that of Delaware or Rhode Island."

Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of March 13, 1950: "All in all, the advocates of statehood have made out strong cases for their respective Territories. The Senate would do well to follow the leadership of the House on this long-standing issue."

Reply by Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, to President Truman's Attack on Senate Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the reply by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to President Truman's attack on the Senate investigation, issued under date of March 31, 1950.

There being no objection, the reply was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Truman's bitter and prejudiced attack on Republicans in the Senate does not make sense. His assumption of Lattimore's innocence parallels his support of Alger Hiss, when the Un-American Activities Committee of the Republican House first brought out the facts, which finally proved that vital State Department documents were being supplied to Communist agents by high State Department officials.

The President tries to insult Senator MCCARTHY by calling him a "Kremlin asset." He is a fighting Marine who risked his life to preserve the liberties of the United States. The greatest Kremlin asset in our history has been the pro-Communist group in the State Department who surrendered to every demand of Russia at Yalta and Potsdam, and promoted at every opportunity the Communist cause in China until today communism threatens to take over all of Asia. How can the Kremlin profit by criticism of those

who were responsible for these policies and by their removal from the State Department?

While Mr. Truman slanders Senator McCARTHY he absolutely refuses to let any representative of Congress look at the files in the State Department, the Civil Service Commission, and the FBI which may give the full records of those whose loyalty is in question. What is he afraid of? It was not the Republican Policy Committee but the Democratic Senate itself which passed a resolution directing the committee to make a full investigation and to obtain these files. Our policy committee has only urged that that investigation be fairly made and that the committee be given the means to make a real investigation, and not merely confined to a whitewash result. This committee should not conduct a mock trial of Senator McCARTHY.

As for sabotaging the bipartisan foreign policy Mr. Truman himself killed that policy from the date of his election in November of 1948. To be bipartisan there must be real consultation on policies before they are adopted with the responsible Representatives of the Republicans in Congress. It is not accomplished by the appointment of an individual Republican to executive office as a roving ambassador. There has been no such consultation since 1948. There never was any consultation regarding the policy in China or the Far East. In 1949 Mr. Truman permitted a bitter and false attack to be made on Senator Dulles who had done so much to make bipartisan policy work. "Bipartisan foreign policy" is being used by Mr. Truman as a slogan to smear any Republican who disagrees with Mr. Truman's unilateral foreign policy secretly initiated and put into effect without any real consultation with Congress.

The Republican Party has acquiesced in many features of Mr. Truman's foreign policy. They have agreed with some and in some cases they have not desired to present a divided front to the world. They will continue to pursue this program, but Republicans would violate their constitutional oath if they did not oppose policies which they believe to threaten the future welfare or security of the Nation. Certainly the facts already proved about Hiss and Wadleigh in the State Department justify our support of an investigation unhampered by executive obstinacy and name calling.

Tribute to Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois, by Mac Lowry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Senator LUCAS Plain Speaking Man and a Natural Leader," written by Mac Lowry, and published in the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR LUCAS PLAIN-SPEAKING MAN AND A NATURAL LEADER

(By Mac Lowry)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—Democrat SCOTT W. LUCAS, leader of the United States Senate, has returned to the Capital after making several campaign speeches in the interest of his reelection from Illinois.

The 58-year-old LUCAS is a plain-speaking man who loves politics, loves the wrangle as well as the horseplay, the dramatic flight as well as the picayune thrust.

But despite his habit of plain speaking, the senior Senator from Illinois does not have what could be called a simple temperament. Pundits have often attempted to sum him up in a phrase. They have used in this effort the things that stand out on the surface—good looks, a quick temper, double-breasted suits, party regularity, a worried face, among others.

The phrases are apt, but too easy. And even if one takes them all together they do not explain the fact on which the Capital now finds itself in general, and, to some, surprising agreement:

SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, is the natural choice of the Senate Democrats for both the position and the responsibilities of leadership, and the party would look in vain for an alternative. It is probably not necessary to add that no such search is being carried out.

Almost a year ago, when LUCAS had been majority leader only a few months, reporters trying to manufacture a story would ask the President whether he expected a change in the Senate leadership. The administration's civil-rights and labor proposals had effectively bogged down under the opposition of Republicans and southern Democrats.

First the President and then events themselves took care of the story. It was LUCAS who manipulated the events. He went on from the civil-rights and labor defeats to drive the Senate into its hardest peacetime session. Coming out of the hospital with a nervous stomach pretty well under control, he took a grip on his temper and stayed with the legislative program through heat and exhaustion.

It was as hard on the other Senators as it was on LUCAS. But when the session was finally adjourned in October LUCAS was its leader, even though walking toward his goals through splits and recombinations in both parties.

When the present session opened in January the heat was already on one big 1950 issue—deficit spending. Relations between LUCAS and Minority Leader WHERRY (Republican, Nebraska) were noticeably strained. LUCAS still shows his impatience at the length of time the Senate can drag out its business, but he is visibly more relaxed.

Through the long and often angry first session of the Eighty-first Congress, LUCAS forged the Senate Democratic policy committee into a new instrument, and he relies upon it heavily. Best indication of his success is the understanding tendered toward his position by the committee's two southern Democrats, RUSSELL, of Georgia, and HILL, of Alabama. FEPC will bring a knock-down and drag-out battle over cloture, and nobody has yet caught RUSSELL napping on anything that had to do with the calendar or the parliamentary situation. But RUSSELL obviously feels he knows and respects where LUCAS stands as each issue goes through the policy huddle.

It may be true that LUCAS' concern over his health last year taught him to relax, and he has gone on record to that effect himself. But the performance of his heavy duties day by day shows how inaedquate was the superficial impression of a quick-tempered man with nothing but a reputation as a regular. Such a man could not make the use of a policy committee LUCAS has demonstrated.

Riding herd on a divided party as it struggles with the huge Truman program almost in one lump, LUCAS often finds the knives pointing in his direction, as would any other man in the job. He can return the jabs, usually with real effect. But he bears no wounds and no malice. He has been long enough in the Senate to appreciate the pitfalls in the majority leader's position, and he saw every step in the widening Democratic separation of 1948.

What escapes some observers is that LUCAS takes almost everything intensely. It is easy for his face to look tragic, easy for him to work himself up to short speech, even off the floor. He detests making a long speech, frets over the facility with which the Senate drags out a debate and would love to have a rule of relevance which would bind Senators to the subject at hand.

Though the signs point to his victory in his reelection campaign this fall, LUCAS is taking nothing for granted in the race against former Representative Everett Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois, the Chicago Tribune's candidate.

His position as majority leader affects the race in two ways. In the first place it ties him in Washington for the most part, and his quick round of the hustings this week cannot be frequently repeated. In the second place, LUCAS himself believes that the loss of the Senate majority leader would be a heavy one to his party, that the Illinois election will be a kind of refrendum on the Truman program.

One thing he won't have to worry about is his party's strong support. His freshman colleague, DOUGLAS, and the new Democratic Governor, Adlai Stevenson, are anxious to use their own efforts to offset the time LUCAS must spend in the Capital. Martin Kenelley, the Independent Democratic mayor of Chicago, after an initial coolness, has jumped on the bandwagon.

And the 3-day Democratic national conference scheduled for Chicago in May, with President Truman and the entire Cabinet on deck, was planned with one eye on the Lucas-Dirksen race.

LUCAS himself believes the Republican attack on him will center on the Truman foreign policy, deficit spending, alleged softness toward communism and Fair Deal socialism. He is anxious to battle Dirksen on the foreign-policy issue, given the latter's wavering course and his subjection to Colonel McCormick, and LUCAS' own record in that field has been consistent and strong. He supported lend-lease and the draft in 1941 in a State where "America first" had its stronghold.

LUCAS has his own answers to the "spending" and "socialism" cries, though his colleagues consider him more conservative than the orthodox Fair Dealers. He is ready to make hay with his civil-rights record in Chicago, and downstate he is at least as popular with the Farm Bureau—all powerful in Illinois—as is his opponent. There are reports that Brannan-plan sentiment in the State is growing, but Dirksen can get no help on this score.

The hardest fight LUCAS made as leader in the Eighty-first's first session was to eliminate the antistrike injunction from the Taft bill. Friends say he was bitterly disappointed when the amendment failed by the narrowest margin. Democrats here expect him to have labor's strong support. He voted for the original Taft bill in 1947, but to sustain the Truman veto of Taft-Hartley.

All in all, the Senate's majority leader should be more than a match for Dirksen, unless observers here completely underestimate dissatisfaction with the Truman-Acheson foreign policy in Illinois. As a referendum on this subject, Illinois is the key spot in 1950.

The son of a tenant farmer, LUCAS qualified for his support of the Roosevelt New Deal by an upward battle toward a successful law practice and his present position. He taught country school, played professional baseball for Bloomington in the Three-I league. He has the manners and the appearance of a man born to comfort, however, and without being social in the Washington sense, he is an accomplished golfer and clubman and looks it.

Some of his friends are said to be telling him he should cultivate the Illinois grass roots in the limited time he can spend in the State. They are thinking of the effectiveness Harry Truman showed there in 1948, and counting upon the affable, direct impression LUCAS can make upon a small group of people.

His friends have no fears about LUCAS' losing touch with his State even while Dirksen is running about making five and six speeches a week. Last month the senior Senator from Illinois got his millionth letter since he came to the upper House in 1938.

Before he was majority leader, LUCAS used to get 10,000 letters a month. Now the average is 37,000. They are coming in from everywhere since LUCAS moved from being a Representative from only one State to the man who has most to say about the Senate Calendar.

It is with these letters that LUCAS, along about 5 or 6 o'clock, sits down to take the pulse of things. He has already, in a typical day, been to two committee meetings, taken part in innumerable strategy huddles, launched the Senate session at noon, entertained visiting constituents, and kept on or near the Senate floor lest other Senators desert it.

It is a man-killing schedule for a Senator about to run for reelection in a popular State with every economic interest represented within its borders. LUCAS appears on top of it today, and the signs are multiplying that he will reap a rich harvest of credit on the morrow. To the Senator from Illinois, it must seem about time.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Washington Times-Herald today carries an editorial entitled "Truman's Pride, It Goeth Before Whose Fall?"

This editorial takes the position that most of the ills which confront the United States stem from the secret agreements made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

In contrast with the President's statement that the American people can look with pride upon the foreign policy in effect for the last 5 years, the editorial cites the expansion of Soviet Russia's influence in that period and the steady loss of United States prestige.

I ask unanimous consent for insertion of the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN'S PRIDE, IT GOETH BEFORE WHOSE FALL?

President Truman says "The American people can look back with pride" on the foreign policy in effect for the past 5 years.

A FAIR TEST FOR TRUMAN'S POLICY

There is only one fair way to gage the value of any policy, and that is by the results. Does the policy leave the country stronger and safer and happier than it was before? Are the people paying less money in taxes and getting better government? Five years ago at this time would be April 4, 1945. Franklin D. Roosevelt was President of the United States and Harry S. Truman was playing the piano, a Vice President of no great interest to anybody.

The country knew that the war against Germany, Italy, and Japan was roaring toward a finish and that settlement day between the United States of America, Britain, and Russia, as the three principal survivors, was drawing near.

Civilization's welfare depended upon the United States using its prestige and power as the financier, munitions maker, and major fighting force of the survivors, to determine a sound peace.

What the country did not know was that during the fatal meeting of February 4–11, 1945, at Yalta, the dying Roosevelt, with Alger Hiss at his elbow, had given civilization a terrible blow and Stalin a new start toward expansion of a Communist empire.

Such was the base for this foreign policy of which Truman is so proud. Let us see how it grew.

April 12, 1945: Roosevelt dead. Truman takes over.

April 25, 1945: United Nations begins organizing at San Francisco with Alger Hiss director of procedure.

July 26, 1945: Britain, surviving the war solely on United States funds and in hope of more of the same, elects a Socialist government sworn to destroy the kind of civilization that has made us what we are.

Truman undertakes elaborate campaign to give this Socialist outfit more United States billions, and succeeds.

August 2, 1945: At Potsdam palace in Berlin, Truman agrees that Stalin shall formally begin his conquest of Europe and Asia as the price of assisting the United States against Japan which is already collapsing and trying to get through to us a proposal of surrender.

Peace overtures sent by Japanese to Moscow for transmission to Washington are never passed on, for Stalin knows a sucker when he sees one.

August 6, 1945: The first full-sized atom bomb is dropped on Hiroshima. Thanks to Dr. Allan Nunn May and Dr. Klaus Fuchs, British spies for Russia and others in the United States of America, as yet not brought to justice, Stalin is already at work on short cuts to atom power.

August 8, 1945: Russia declares war on Japan, thus providing an excuse to begin formal conquest of China.

September 2, 1945: While Truman accepts the applause of his gang and the world celebrates at official surrender ceremonies aboard U. S. S. *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay, Stalin announces Russia's recovery of strategic Kurile and Sakhalin Island chain leading up from Japan to Alaska, thus shadowing events to come.

The foregoing are just a few of the significant dates in the first year of this five of which Truman says now we must all be so proud. What is the proved harvest of those episodes above cited?

Today Russia has China and threatens the rest of Asia. Also she has Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and the major food-producing areas of Germany. Menaces all Europe.

Today Socialist Britain is boldly suggesting neutrality in the event of a United States-Russian war.

Today the whole world holds its breath in wonder as to whether Russia has enough atom bombs, made from United States plans stolen by United States and British spies for Russia, to risk an open fight with us. The principal doubt of such a war rests in the logical question of why Stalin should fight as long as he wins such encounters as those of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

The consequences above cited from the first year of Truman's proud five are all of record before the world. Nobody can deny them. God only knows what will be revealed in time to come, as the Nation pries open the secrets of 1946–49.

And now come the Truman gang talking about a bipartisan foreign policy, so the Democrats can make the mistakes and the Republicans can share the blame. In that, Truman's pride goeth before whose fall?

Sporadic Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an article written by two of the leading tax attorneys of Los Angeles, Mr. George T. Altman and Mr. Richard L. Rykoff, on the subject Sporadic Income. This is a matter about which not only the members of the Ways and Means Committee but all the Members of the House should be concerned, as it definitely describes a case of injustice.

The article follows:

SPORADIC INCOME: A SOLUTION

(By George T. Altman and Richard L. Rykoff, attorneys, Los Angeles)

Within recent years the creative artist has become more and more a lone orphan among taxpayers. The relative brevity and sporadic character of his productive life, and the long years of waiting and hoping, of rags, hamburgers, and rejection slips, of midnight oil but no heat, which are suffered and endured before even that questionable productivity begins—these are his trade-mark and often his boast, but they have found no sympathy in the tax collector.

Other situations of similar character have been accorded some relief under the revenue laws. A taxpayer who holds property for investment or speculation and derives gains from the sale of such property has throughout the years been allowed a low, flat rate on such gains, known as capital gains, largely on the theory that they accrued over the entire period of holding. But the creative artist, despite similar long periods of waiting, albeit not often with the specific product sold, has not been very successful in bringing his creations within that category. If he sells an interest in his product, such as the United States rights in a story, he is receiving royalties, not gain on a sale. If he sells the entire product—lock, stock, and barrel—he is, in the usual case, selling property held for sale to customers in the ordinary course of his trade or business. In that event, also, he has ordinary income, not capital gain. Attempts have been made to accomplish capital-gain classification through the use of a corporate intermediary. But it is not often possible for the creative artist to carry out such a process to the satisfaction of the Treasury Department.

Again, a taxpayer who discovers oil or minerals and sells the property, or any interest in it, has always had the surtax on the gain limited in any event to 30 percent of the selling price. The purpose of the limitation was given by the Senate Finance Committee as follows:

"The prospector for * * * oil and gas frequently spends many years and much money in fruitless search. When he does locate a productive property and comes to settle, it seems unwise and unfair that his

profit be taxed at the maximum rate as if it were ordinary income attributable to the normal activities of a single year."

The creative artist is in the same position. He is in many senses a prospector for ideas and forms. In any event he too, must ordinarily accept a long period of fruitless effort and struggle. Then, after he has finally found a market for his works, or his works have risen to a marketable level, the fruits are sporadic, at least as far as the larger [illegible] are concerned. In consequence, the income results of many years of effort and labor are piled up into the brackets of a single year. Yet for him there is no corresponding relief under the tax laws.

Not that fluctuation of income is unknown to other classes of taxpayers. Generally, however, that fluctuation is hinged to the rise and fall of the national income level. Relatively, that fluctuation is modest; it is wholly out of class with the delayed and sporadic character of the income of the artist. A painter may sell a picture or two this year, none the next, and every once in a while he may hit the jackpot with a particularly fortunate sale or series of sales in one year. Or, in the steadily shifting scenes of the motion-picture industry, a writer may have a contract for 20 weeks in one year, nothing the next, and then he may sell an "original" for a substantial price. The following income figures from the files of the Screen Writers Guild illustrate the point, and similar figures are undoubtedly obtainable from all fields among artists:

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	1947
A	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
B	[illegible]	0	[illegible]
C	3,250	1,500	45,000
D	0	0	[illegible]
E	0	12,500	0
F	[illegible]	0	[illegible]
G	2,400	[illegible]	2,500

Of course, under the present code, the full, ordinary income rate is applicable in the year of payment. Thus, the artist with one good year in three must surrender the lion's share in taxes, while the following or preceding few or many years are spent in struggle for that one good year.

LIMITATIONS IN CODE SECTIONS 107 (A), (B)

Sections 107 (a) and (b) of the code are no answer to this problem except in a very few instances. Under these sections relief is available only where the particular work was done over a period of 36 months or more. Where the income is compensation for personal services, such services must have been rendered over a period of 36 months or more. Where the income is compensation for personal services, such services must have been rendered over a period of 36 months or more. Where the income is that derived from an artistic composition or product of the taxpayer, then the taxpayer's work in composing or producing it must have covered a period of 36 months or more. In the one case, the period must relate to the particular services for which the compensation is paid; in the other, it must relate to the particular artistic product from which the income involved is derived.

It is the rare case, however, in which such a period is involved. A writer, for example, may go from one idea to another, developing and shaping each into a story, working months or years on one and only weeks or days on another. Eventually he winds up with a story that makes the big time, and lo, and behold, that particular story took him only a week to write. The ideas may in part come out of other stories he has written, but he cannot trace them with sufficient clarity to satisfy the Treasury Department. Be it story, painting, song, or other artistic work, the particular work which turned out to be an income gusher may have taken only a few weeks to produce. The months and years of toil which preceded it may be brushed aside as experience.

The only solution is to generalize the income. Simplicity and justice also require that the relief be extended to income from personal services of any class. Such a provision could read somewhat as follows:

"If the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for the taxable year (referred to in this subsection as the current year) is at least 80 percent of the aggregate adjusted gross income for any three consecutive taxable years including the current year, and at least 80 percent of such adjusted gross income for the current year is attributable to personal services, or to income or gains derived from property which is a product wholly of the personal efforts or labor of the taxpayer, then in that event the tax for the current year shall be limited to an amount computed as follows:

"(a) Divide the aggregate adjusted gross income for such three consecutive taxable years by three;

"(b) Determine the tax for each of such years by using the amount so computed as the adjusted gross income with all other factors unchanged;

"(c) Add together the increases resulting from such computation in the taxes for the two taxable years other than the current year; and

"(d) Add such amount to the tax so computed for the current year.

"The amount so resulting shall be the tax for the current year, not to exceed the amount computed without the benefit of this subsection. In the event a computation under this subsection results in a refund for the current year, no interest shall be paid on the amount of such refund."

ANNUALIZATION? RARELY!

Adjustment can be made by means of annualization if a year other than the current one is a year of less than 12 months. That, however, would indeed be a rare occurrence.

With a provision such as illustrated above there could be no complaint that here was not relief but a gift to a special group. The provision would be applicable to delayed or sporadic income attributable to any class of personal labor or efforts. The cost to the revenue would be slight. While instances of such income are many, the aggregate in dollars is not great. No other inequity has been so gross without ever having been resolved.

Communists in Our Foreign Policy Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, in the Republican Eightieth Congress, Representatives MUNDT and NIXON, and other members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, carried out the investigation which disclosed the workings of a Communist cell in our foreign policy making. That led to the conviction of one high administration official for perjury about his associations with Communist espionage. The committee had to work with great care to get the proper legal evidence, while protecting our right to true freedom of speech and of association. This they did brilliantly, but nothing was done to rid us of the influence of other members of the ring. Now Senator MCCARTHY is asking bluntly why the administration does not act to rid us of all the Communist agents and Communist dupes influencing our Government policy.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article, from the Brooklyn Tablet, of April 1, 1950, which asks in vigorous fashion, "How long, O Lord, how long?":

KEEP THE ISSUE IN SIGHT

Arthur Krock, well-known journalist, and other Washington newspapermen, as well as Government officials, are surprised at the quantity and type of mail being received at the Capitol since Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY has made his charges against the State Department.

Mr. Krock, his colleagues and officials, think the Senator's charges are exaggerated, if not untrue, and maintain he has not as yet proven his pro-Red charges against even one State Department employee, or former employee; yet most of the mail from the American people seems to favor the Senator. They undoubtedly wonder why this is so.

The reason the American people either accept or are sympathetic with charges against the State Department is twofold. First, the people, by and large, believe the United States was betrayed or sold out in the recent war, and thereafter, to Russia. The people were led to believe they were brought into the conflict in behalf of liberty and democracy, to vindicate the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms and to maintain the freedom of small nations against aggressors, and they observe today that despite their tremendous sacrifice of life, blood, armaments, matériel, and wealth there is more slavery, more dictatorial rule, more tyranny, and a greater threat of war than before. They see in communism a greater threat than nazism, and observe that Russia has endeavored to fulfill to the letter her ideological promise of world revolution, destuction of liberty and all human rights, and international dictatorship.

Moreover, the American people know that at Quebec, Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam millions of people, whole nations, and tremendous power, were given to Russia with the acquiescence of our representatives.

Americans then ask: Who betrayed our country, our principles, the cause for which we fought? The people reason either our State Department must have been hand-in-glove with Russia, either Communist spies or friends of the Soviet dictatorship sold us out, or else our representatives were too stupid to know what Russia was up to. In whichever case, they are waiting for the answer to this frightening situation of more tyranny and more war which now threatens civilization. Did spies sell us out or were our representatives just unbelievably stupid?

Secondly, the American people read about the Hiss case. They know how this seemingly sinister character, placed in the Government, then promoted to key positions and finally sitting alongside of the late President Roosevelt at Yalta and as former Secretary of State Stettinius' adviser at the formation of the United Nations at San Francisco, was convicted of perjury based upon his espionage activities. Finally the people know that the present Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, not only refused to move against Hiss when he was carrying on his espionage activities but even after his conviction the Secretary refused to repudiate him.

Why wouldn't the people have sympathy for Senator MCCARTHY's charges? Why wouldn't they condemn the crowd that asserts "these charges injure the prestige of the State Department," and "the United States is injured abroad by such loose charges"? What gall. Moreover, is it strange that the people refuse to accept the frantic denials of criticised employees that they are not Communists—Hiss, Robeson, Chaplin, and the rest also deny the same charges—when they know that many of Soviet Russia's best friends here have no membership card in the Communist Party?

In the midst of the Senator's attack someone added an even worse charge than life, namely, that the State Department had acted as a home for a colony of degenerates. And the top security official of the State Department immediately stated that he had dismissed 91 of these perverts from the State Department. Whether or not he got rid of all of them we are unable to say, but police officials in Washington on Tuesday stated that the capital had 5,000 of these offenders and 4,000 of them hold Government jobs. What a shocking scandal; what a curse to put on the American people. What an insult to the morality and decency of our Government. What a threat to our security.

There is no reason to wonder at Senator MCCARTHY'S charges—exaggerated, poorly presented, premature or not—being supported, for the people have never had explained to them why and how the Soviet was permitted to capture and enslave one-quarter of the world and seemingly with our acquiescence. The Tablet made a fair suggestion to President Truman when he assumed office in 1945. It urged that he repudiate the secret Yalta agreements—many of which neither he, nor anybody else, save Alger Hiss, knew about at the time—and take full responsibility for whatever went on thereafter. It then suggested that the President re-create the State Department and investigate everyone who had acted as a cat's-paw, if not an agent, of those who betrayed our Nation. This was not done, although later Henry Wallace was forced out. Neither was the proper action taken when Hiss was convicted, for then the President should have ordered an investigation and, if needs be, a trial for those who put Hiss in his posts, who built him up, who covered him up, and those with whom he associated, just as at present there should be an investigation of those responsible for giving government posts to degenerates.

The people have no confidence in the Tydings committee, or officials who consider Senator MCCARTHY—a former marine—the principal menace to our Nation while they are trying to protect and hide those who were pro-Soviet in their deeds, words, and activities. What the American public wants to know is this:

Why was the United States sold out at Yalta and by whom?

Who put the likes of Hiss, Wadleigh, in our State Department, Judy Coplon in the Department of Justice and Harry Dexter White in the Department of the Treasury?

Who put the 91 degenerates into the State Department and who kept them there?

Who was responsible for the abandonment of China, the insane set-up in Germany and the loss of liberty to Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia?

Who decided Formosa has no strategic importance?

The exaggerations or misrepresentations—if they be such—of a Senator MCCARTHY, or the ridiculing of his charges by officials, newspapers, and the radio, merely concern an effect. The administration and the administration alone can answer to the people for the vicious results of policies which imperil the world. Senator MCCARTHY is but a side issue, an individual who is endeavoring to blow the lid off a malodorous situation. The threat to the United States is not so much the Soviet abroad as the pro-Soviet forces, and their defenders, in the United States.

Smearing World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Malcolm Forbes from Forbes magazine:

SMEARING WORLD GOVERNMENT

(By Malcolm Forbes)

American businessmen, having demonstrated their ability, knowledge, and experience to build our present free-enterprise system to its present high level, should perhaps more than any other group in the country be aware of the dire need for a strengthened world organization capable of enforcing world peace. A number, including W. T. Holliday, chairman of Standard Oil of Ohio, and James K. Moffitt, chairman of Crocker First National Bank in San Francisco, have been active on behalf of the United World Federalists and other such organizations. To date 21 State legislatures have adopted resolutions in favor of world government; 110 Congressmen of both parties, including a majority of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, are sponsoring a world-government resolution in Washington.

But now that real progress is being made, various isolationists and some misguided patriots are attempting to smear all efforts toward a world government capable of enforcing world peace as "communistic." A silly charge, considering that from the beginning the bitterest opponent to world government has been Moscow. Reds know well that in any free assembly of the nations of the world the Communist nations would be outvoted on efforts to obstruct world peace as they are today in the UN. They prefer the present UN because their veto power can block any attempt to enforce UN majority decisions. In a strengthened world organization, Russian power to paralyze would be gone.

I doubt if responsible, thinking businessmen would be misled by isolationists and their strange bedfellows in this fight on world government, the Communists, who for opposite reasons fear the only course that offers hope of effectively outlawing war—a strengthened United Nations, with power to enforce peace.

Organization of American Overseas Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. WILSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, one of the most challenging fields for study in connection with the matter of reorganization of the executive branch is that of organization of American overseas activities. Leadership of the democratic nations of the world has brought with it heavy overseas and world responsibilities. To meet these responsibilities and to administer the occupation of enemy territory as well as the programs of assistance necessitated by economic conditions growing out of the late war, we have added first one agency and then another. There has been no over-all direction or planning to this growth of agencies and responsibilities. Four major departments and several independent agencies are now concerned with foreign policy and overseas administration.

The report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, more generally known as the Hoover Commission, effectively high lights the deficiencies and the inadequacies of our present overseas administration. The Commission report calls attention to divided responsibility, the assignment of duties to departments and agencies which are totally unrelated to its normal functions and the qualifications of the personnel normally employed by such departments and agencies. There is no suitable integration of the entire overseas administration field and many of the agencies are responsible but to the President.

Look for a moment if you will at the administration of occupied enemy territories. The formulation of policy is in the hands of the Department of State yet the administration and execution of that policy was assigned to the Department of the Army. If there is delay in the announcement of policy the Army must proceed to formulate its own policy. By its own admission the Army is ill-equipped to deal with problems of nonmilitary nature such as civil liberties, representative forms of government, democratic procedures, and the like.

Another instance of divided responsibility is involved in the administration of Marshall plan funds. The act creating the Economic Cooperation Administration provides merely that the Administrator and the Secretary of State shall keep each other fully and currently informed on matters, including prospective action, arising within the scope of their respective duties which are pertinent to the duties of the other. Should there be areas of disagreement between the Administrator and the Secretary of State it can readily be seen that these would be of serious consequence to our foreign policy and could only be resolved by referral to the President.

Among the departments having overseas duties assigned to them which are unrelated to, and incompatible with, their normal functions are the Navy Department and the Department of the Interior. The Navy Department has the administration of our trust territories of Guam and Samoa while the Department of the Interior administers our organized Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and the like. Where there is a lack of definition and enumeration of the powers and duties of the administrative agency, as in

the case of the Division of Island Territories and Possessions in the Department of the Interior, it can readily be seen that conflict will arise.

Mr. Speaker, I need but to enumerate our major overseas functions, the administering department, commission, or agency, and the expenditures for the function involved, to show the complexity of the problem of reorganization and the need for a thorough study to the end that functions may be regrouped and administration may be integrated. I wish to read into the RECORD at this point a concise statement of the functions involved, the responsible agency, and the expenditure made therefor. The figures on the expenditures involved were furnished me by the staff of the Library of Congress and are for the year 1949.

Tabulation of overseas functions, responsible agencies, and expenditures therefor

1. Occupation of enemy territory (Departments of State and Army)	$1,348,385,558.51
2. Marshall plan aid (Economic Cooperation Administration)	4,637,266,717.90
3. Trust territories (Navy Department)	1,125,000.00
4. Non-self-governing territories, e. g., Guam (Navy)	1,861,019.92
5. Self-governing Territories, e. g., Alaska (Interior Department)	49,371,385.31
6. Office of Foreign Liquidation (State Department). (Figures not available.)	
7. American Battlefield Monuments Commission (an independent commission)	453,197.62
8. Philippine War Damage Commission (an independent commission)	170,305,667.67
9. Philippine Alien Property Administration (independent)	423,808.00
10. Panama Canal (Department of the Army)	24,877,687.51
11. Special missions (State Department—ECA). (None in 1949.)	
12. United States participation in international organizations	94,561,275.88
13. State Department expenditures over and above those heretofore enumerated	208,864,619.73
Total	6,539,595,887.56

If war and its aftermath have created problems beyond our power of anticipation at the time, that is no reason why we should longer delay a thorough investigation of our overseas activities and obligations with a view to regrouping of functions, a realinement of responsibility, and the reduction of administrative costs to a minimum. The Hoover Commission recognized the complexity of the problem faced and its sole recommendation with respect to overseas reorganizations was "that the Congress direct a comprehensive study to be made of the entire problem of overseas operation and administration."

I have recently introduced a bill, H. R. 7554, to create a commission to make a study of the administration of the overseas activities of the Government and make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto. This bill, similar to one already passed by the Senate, would create a study commission composed of 12 members. Four members of the commission would be Members of the House of Representatives, four would be Members of the Senate, and four would be appointed from the executive branch of the Government. Such commission would be required to report to Congress not later than March 1, 1951, and would cease to exist on April 1, 1951. Members would serve without additional compensation.

With our present preeminent world position and with the prospects of continued conflict between the East and West, it seems unlikely that our world and overseas responsibilities will be greatly reduced. Expenditures in the categories I have listed above have decreased since 1949, but even now we are considering the institution of a program of technical assistance to backward nations. With the increasing use of economic aid as an instrument of policy, Congress, which controls the purse strings, should play an increasingly more important role in the administration of foreign affairs. It is altogether appropriate, therefore, that the study commission proposed by my bill should have able members from both Houses of Congress.

We should not longer delay enactment of legislation to expedite reorganization in the field of overseas administration. I am confident that the proposal contained in my bill will result in concrete and constructive recommendations for the organization and grouping of our overseas functions and their administration. I am confident that it will bring about, in time, reorganizations which will provide a maximum of efficiency in the handling of our overseas obligations with a minimum of cost. It may well lead to a reevaluation of our expenditures in this field and of their importance or lack of it. In view of the tremendous expenditures involved, this may well prove one of the most fruitful fields for savings by way of reorganization.

I thank you.

The Greater Lawrence Industrial Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., of Monday, April 3, 1950.

All of us are most hopeful that this committee of representative citizens and members of the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Lawrence will be able to assist in obtaining new industries for that community:

MOVE TOWARD SELF-HELP

The Greater Lawrence Industrial Corp. is the answer to the spirit of defeatism which cripples any attempt to deal with a tough problem. As a nonprofit organization set up to foster general prosperity in this area, it is an affirmation of the principle of free enterprize, which, in the long run, has the horsepower to pull any economic load. All the theory in the world will accomplish no good unless it is tied in with hard-headed, intelligent aggressiveness capable of translating the blueprint into wood and stone, and finally, into whirling wheels and efficient production. Theoretically Greater Lawrence, with a vast reservoir of individual skills at its disposal, with the facilities for the accommodation of a broadened program of industrial development, will find its salvation in selling businessmen the idea of settling here. It is one thing to say it, or think it; it's another thing again to go to the trouble of doing something about it. The Greater Lawrence Industrial Corp. is no theorist's dream, but a practical piece of machinery designed to apply the right kind of leverage in the right places. And as Archimedes pointed out long ago, a big enough lever can pry anything out of the mire.

The kind of confidence we have in the future of Greater Lawrence, and New England generally, is all the more genuine because it stands pruned of any blind optimism. The facts and figures of recession are there to be scanned by any eye, and you can either recoil from them in terror as being harbingers of ultimate doom, or you can react with positive courage, face the facts, and then cast logically about for some means of pulling their fangs. In America this formula has been repeated over and over again. It is the Rx which settled and raised a plenteous yield right in the teeth of the most cantankerous agents of adversity—in the North, in the West, right here in Massachusetts when the Pilgrims stepped from Plymouth rock into the bleak embrace of an untamed land. The pioneer spirit has not atrophied; the qualities of courage, resourcefulness, pertinacity need only to be furbished up a bit to provide us with the sort of mainspring we need to power a new dynamism here, and all over New England. We are most certainly not going to abandon ship because there is a report of a thunderhead 500 miles off our starboard beam.

The Greater Lawrence Industrial Corp. partakes of the nature of a pioneer enterprise because it is one of the first of its kind in New England. Because it aims to meet our collective problems squarely at the local level, without the solicitously paternal intervention of cluck-clucking Federal agencies, it can be greeted as an experiment in self-dependence in an age when there is too much of tendency to look outward, rather than inward, for help and sustenance. Lawrence has been in existence as a going concern for a good many years. She'll be around for a long time to come.

How Many of the People Does the State Department Think It Is Fooling?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received from one of the justices of the Supreme Court of Minnesota. The real indictment of those responsible for conducting our foreign policy in the latter half of the war and in the 4½ years since its end is the incredible record they made of miscalculations regarding the nature, objectives, methods, strength, and determination of the Communist movement all around the world, especially in China and Asia. It is impossible to say how many and which of those responsible, or of their advisers, were actually members of the Communist Party. That is relatively unimportant. The indisputable facts are that what they did has consistently worked out to the interests of the Communist movement and the Soviet Union and against the interests of the United States and world order and peace. The letter follows with the signature of the justice omitted for obvious reasons.

THE SUPREME COURT OF MINNESOTA,
St. Paul, Minn.

Hon. WALTER JUDD,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JUDD: I am very grateful to you for sending me the copy of your January speech in regard to China. The developments since that time have proved your predictions, as well as your conclusions, to have been wholly correct.

Our whole foreign policy in regard to Asia has been very stupid. Had the whole State Department been card-carrying members of the Communist Party they could not have done more for Russia than they have done. I do not see why we should concern ourselves about weeding out the few who are still there. In fact, the foreign policy of the United States, since war was first threatened in Europe, has been stupid in the extreme, it seems to me.

Now we find ourselves at the end of two world wars with no advantage resulting from the victory in either and at the same time saddled with the prospect of a third war and with the necessity of keeping up a tremendous military establishment because military might is the only argument that is persuasive with the Russians. Not only is that true, but we must be careful in our negotiations with them, if any, that they do not trade promises which they do not expect to keep for advantages which they do keep.

More power to you and best regards.

Yours sincerely.

Mr. Stimson, whose distinguished record in public office, both as Secretary of State and as Secretary of War, places him beyond the impeachment of small suspicions and above the tides of political factionalism, points an unerring finger at the danger about which the present Secretary of State and half a dozen other important spokesmen, in both major political parties, have already warned us.

Such goings on, Mr. Stimson remarks, dangerously impede the conduct of the foreign affairs of our Government. The procedure "creates abroad a feeling that we are frightened and suspicious of each other; it diverts our attention at home from the genuine and pressing problems of our foreign affairs; it requires of many high officials that they desert their proper duties in order to prepare and deliver * * * extensive replies. Not one of these effects would have resulted from a disinterested study of the loyalty of any suspected State Department employees."

This aspect of the present situation—its disabling consequences for our policy around the world—is pointed up by the press reaction already evident beyond the seas. "It is ridiculous as it is tragic," comments the influential Manchester Guardian in England, that the fate of Europe should wait upon American uncertainties. Whether the United States can, under such conditions, shape and carry on any rational foreign policy at all, is similarly questioned.

The same uneasy doubts pervade discussions in responsible organs of opinion from Norway to Turkey. And the alacrity with which the Russian press and radio have seized upon this new opportunity to sow distrust and impair confidence in American policy, throughout middle and southeast Asia, provides interesting testimony as to the acumen of the Kremlin's propagandists.

De Tocqueville, writing early in the nineteenth century, thought that it was a piece of great good fortune for the United States that it did not then need a foreign policy, thanks to aloofness from the rest of the world. Had circumstances forced our Nation into the struggle of world politics then, he opined, the consequences would have been disastrous to our survival because of the instability of our democracy. Time and history have borne witness to a greater inner strength and resourcefulness than the famous French critic conceded. Yet is is well to remember that the testing time he foresaw is now upon us.

If this country's position has altered irrevocably under pressure of the tides of history, if isolation has been demolished by science, by growth, by war, and by the shifting of economic and political centers of power, our responsibility for mature procedures in the formulation and administration of foreign policy has become inescapable. To disable that process, to scatter doubt and confusion, to balk and cripple it, is to play lightly with dangerous risks.

The weight of the innumerable charges upon the Department of State in the wide span of our Nation's interests and safety is, in itself, evidence sufficient to convince sane citizens on that point. In Indochina and the neighboring region the issue involves the security of the free peoples of the whole of southeast Asia as well as, eventually, ourselves. In India and Pakistan the riddle of the future freedom and independence of more than 360,000,000 persons is involved, as well as, ultimately, our own. In Persia, Afghanistan, and Tibet where our policy effort is to fortify confidence and strength against tremendous pressures from the north, the destiny of the Middle East and Africa is at issue.

From the easternmost reaches of Turkey to the Italian peninsula, policy problems also swarm for America; and from Austria to the Baltic. Even this scant summary omits the vast riddle of Pacific Asia. To all, those who labor on our policy must address sober, informed, consistent attention. In each region they must endeavor to fuse practical program with constructive purpose, depending for support and useful criticism upon foreign understanding and an attentive, adult public opinion here at home.

Those who would toss monkey wrenches into this difficult undertaking display a sinister disregard for their country and our lives.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Penny-Wise and Pound-Foolish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., Thursday, March 30, 1950:

EBBET CHEESE PARING

In Washington the House, in a rare mood of economy, has voted to cut the European recovery plan appropriation for next fiscal year by $250,000,000 from the $2,950,000,000 requested by President Truman and his advisers. That the House members were not very sure of their ground in this matter is shown by the small margin, 165 to 163, by which they voted the reduction.

When we look back over the past several years and see what has been accomplished by the Marshall plan European aid program, this $250,000,000 cheese paring as against a possible $250,000,000,000 expenditure for a third world war is false economy. When we see how the Marshall plan money has brought Italy and France back from the verge of communism 3 years ago to the point where they are now safely in the family of democratic nations, we think our investment has been small and the return upon it has been enormous.

Yesterday came the announcement from the Netherlands that the chiefs of staff of 11 Atlantic Pact nations have agreed unanimously on an integrated defense plan. The plan is based on the agreed strategic concept of the North Atlantic Pact countries of "all for one and one for all" against any threat of attack. Each nation solemnly pledges to participate with the maximum resources it can provide in assuring the continued security of the territories covered by the North Atlantic organization.

So today we have a unified western Europe ready to cooperate with us in repelling the common enemy of civilization, whereas 3 years ago we were in danger of being left alone in the world. It is more than possible that this western European alliance will soon include western Germany which we have also saved from communism by the Marshall plan aid. Former Prime Minister Winston Churchill in the House of Commons this week, while saying that he did not believe war was either imminent or inevitable, repeated his plea that the new German Republic should be taken in as an equal in this federation of western Europe. He said he could see no reason why the Germans should not aid in the defense of their own country; and, further, that there could be no hope of a united Europe without Germany, nor hope for Germany except in such a free and united Europe.

With such a federation of Europe, recovering economically as it is, we should in a year or two be able to substantially cut down the multi-billion-dollar defense bill we are now paying to fight the cold war. We should not endanger this objective by trying to save a couple of hundred millions now.

Why Coast Guard Needs Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News of April 1, 1950:

WHY COAST GUARD NEEDS RESERVES

New Jersey has a special concern in the refusal of the House Appropriations Committee to provide funds for wartime training of the United States Coast Guard Reserve. In view of the many key industrial plants located on bays and rivers along our extended coastline, their protection in an emergency becomes vital.

The security of seaports is the responsibility of the Coast Guard in wartime, when it becomes a part of the Navy. Adequate patrolling of harbors and piers, inspection of vessels, and protection against ships carrying A- or H-bombs would require tremendous expansion of the personnel of [illegible] it now possesses.

Those extra men can come only from a well-trained reserve. The special skills required for this service cannot be learned overnight. But the House committee has rejected the Budget Bureau's request for $4,100,000 for reserve training in the 1951 money bill. In this atomic and guided-missile age, when an innocent-looking freighter or lighter might blow up a harbor area, that may be short-sighted economy. Secretary Johnson and Admiral Sherman have testified to the need for these funds.

Representative CANFIELD, of Paterson, has offered an amendment for restoration of part of this money on the floor of the House. Support for what he proposes can be expressed in letters to members of the Jersey delegation on Capitol Hill, in care of the House Office Building for Representatives, and the Senate Office Building for our two Senators.

A Realistic Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, as a minority Member of the House I have been patiently waiting for the administration in power to initiate some new action in consideration of a more workable labor bill to rectify the inequities and objectionable features of the Taft-Hartley Act. Nothing further has been done since both the administration's labor bills in the House and Senate were defeated last year. Responsibility for this inaction lies with the administration spokesmen who apparently are more interested in obtaining political advantage than in writing a law which is in the interests of all parties concerned and particularly in the interest of organized labor.

When I realized some time ago that the administration had given up on labor legislation for this Congress and was planning to dust off the issue of Taft-Hartley repeal for the coming elections, I set about writing my own bill to revise the Taft-Hartley law.

My labor bill constitutes an honest attempt to meet the legitimate objections which have been made to the Taft-Hartley law. In fact H. R. 7696 repeals the Taft-Hartley law and then incorporates the best features of our labor law as we have developed it over the past 15 years.

It retains all of the substantive guarantees of the Wagner Act. In the exact language of that law it protects labor's right to organize, to bargain collectively, to be free from discrimination.

It is regrettable to me that any law regulating labor-management relations should be so complicated as the several acts now on the books. We must realize, however, that as the intricacies of organization of both labor unions and employers increase, regulatory legislation must also increase and must become more intricate and involved. My colleagues, this bill, H. R. 7696 was written with the view in mind of eliminating inequities and unfairness of the present law of the land. It may be possible to simplify it considerably and if such is the case, I am heartily in favor of it.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7696 embodies no less than 30 material changes in the present law governing labor-management relations. I ask that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the complete list of changes to the Taft-Hartley law incorporated in my labor bill. They are are follows:

1. The definition of "supervisor" is revised so that no one may be exempted as a foreman unless he is actually a foreman. The words "assign" and "responsibility to direct" are eliminated (sec. 2 (11)).

2. The term "agency" is redefined to make it perfectly clear that a labor organization is only responsible for the acts of its authorized agents to the extent of other business concerns and is not responsible for the acts of any member of the union solely on the ground of membership (sec. 2 (13)).

3. The National Labor Relations Board's membership is increased from five to seven and made bipartisan (sec. 3 (a)).

4. The vote to authorize the union shop is eliminated although a vote to deauthorize a union shop is retained (sec. 8 (a) 3).

5. The closed shop is allowed in those States where the State law specifically legalizes the closed shop (sec. 8 (a) 3).

6. Unions may require the discharge of men expelled from the union for five additional reasons; engaging in Communist activities, wildcat strikes or any activity which subjects the union to civil fines or criminal penalties, disclosing confidential information of the union and conviction of a felony (sec. 8 (a) 3).

7. An employer may notify a labor organization of any vacancy and give it a reasonable opportunity to refer qualified applicants for such employment (sec. 8 (a) 3).

8. Consistent with the change in section 8 (a) 3, unions are permitted to demand that employers discharge men expelled from the union because they are Communists, fellow-travelers, and wildcat strikers (sec. 8 (b) 2).

9. "Struck-work" clauses in collective-bargaining contracts are specifically legalized allowing employees to refuse to work on orders being performed for the account of an employer whose own employees are engaged in a lawful strike (sec. 8 (b) 4).

10. Statements by employers shall be admissible in evidence before the NLRB in all cases where such statements would be admissible as evidence in a court of law (sec. 8 (c)).

11. The clause providing for 60 days' notice and a waiting period is retained, but corrected so that a strike is not illegal in case the contract is reopened in accordance with its terms. Also the penalty against employees engaging in a strike before the 60-day period is repealed (sec. 8 (d)).

12. Whenever a petition has been filed in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the NLRB the Board shall investigate such petition "immediately" and "forthwith" provide for a hearing upon "not more than 10 days" notice (sec. 9 (c) 1 (b)).

13. Employees on strike will be eligible to vote, even if they are not entitled to reinstatement (sec. 9 (c) 3).

14. To protect employees against the possibility of being held in bondage in union shops they wish to terminate, there is provision for "deauthorization" elections when requested by 30 percent of the employees (sec. 9 (e) 1).

15. While unions are still required to file reports, the form of the report is greatly simplified (sec. 9 (f)).

16. Unions are allowed 120 days of grace after the end of their fiscal years within which to file financial reports (sec. 9 (f)).

17. The non-Communist oath is continued, but applied also to employers and their officers (sec. 9 (h)).

18. The statute of limitations on the filing of charges is increased from 6 months to 1 year (sec. 10 (b)).

19. The provision prohibiting the Board from reinstating an individual if he was suspended or discharged for cause is eliminated (sec. 10 (c)).

20. Language has been changed to carefully limit the cases in which injunctive relief can be sought against unions, and provides that, even in these limited cases, only an official of our Government can seek the injunction (sec. 10 (j)).

21. Section 10 (k), which placed great obstacles in the way of settling disputes over work assignments or conflicting jurisdictional claims of unions is eliminated.

22. Section 10 (l), which required the general counsel to seek an injunction in cases arising under sections 8 (b) 4A, B, and C is also eliminated.

23. As a saving provision, the NLRB is not permitted to continue processing violations of the Taft-Hartley Act that would not be violations of the new law (sec. 102).

24. In national emergency strikes the President is authorized to appoint a board of inquiry after an injunction issues, rather than before (sec. 207 (b)).

25. The period within which a board of inquiry is to report to the President after an injunction issues is extended from 60 to 80 days (sec. 207 (c)).

26. The vote of employees on the employer's last offer before an injunction against a strike expires is eliminated (sec. 207 (c)).

27. Rearrangement of Taft-Hartley clauses concerning the composition of boards of inquiry, their pay, and their powers (sec. 207 (c)).

28. While the provision regulating welfare funds is retained, it is no longer required that there be joint control if the employer does not desire it. Criminal liability is removed if the Secretary of Labor approves the terms of the welfare fund. Other changes meet objections in the operation of the law (sec. 302 (a)).

29. Check-off limitations are modified to permit authorization to continue from year to year unless rejected (sec. 302 (c)).

30. Addition to the law relieving unions of liability for damages in court cases to the same extent that the "struck work" clause of section 8 (b) 4A would relieve them from proceedings under section 10.

Why ECA Authorizations Should Not Be Cut Further

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of Sunday, April 2, 1950:

THE ANTICS ARE OVER

Having gotten the clowning out of its system, the House settled down to business Friday and passed a European aid bill which is subject to but one valid criticism.

The absurd Irish partition amendment, adopted last week by a vote of 99 to 66, was knocked out of the bill when House Members who take their responsibility seriously got back on the job. The final vote on this provision was 226 to 60. Also deleted from the bill in its final form was the provision which would have earmarked $1,000,000,000 for use only in the purchase of farm products in the United States. This proposal, rather appealing on its face, might have had a seriously crippling effect on the ECA operation, and the House is to be commended for finally rejecting it.

What remains as a matter of serious concern is the $250,000,000 cut in the authorization for ECA. This cut was made partly in a spirit of misguided economy and partly in response to the preposterous appeal that since the Members had cut the pork-barrel rivers-and-harbors bill they could not go back home and face their constituents without also cutting the European-assistance program.

There are at least two reasons why there is no true economy in cutting ECA. One was set forth by Representative JUDD in arguing against a proposal for a $500,000,000 reduction. He said: "If I thought that this would save the taxpayers of America half a billion dollars I would vote for it, but I am convinced that it would not save them anything, and might, indeed, cost them a great deal. In fact, I am convinced that the Marshall plan has not actually cost the American taxpayers 1 dime. If we had not adopted it we would be deeper in debt and going further in the red in this year's budget than we are, because unquestionably we would have had to increase our defense expenditures by an amount larger than the cost of this program." The other reason lies in the demonstrated fact that Paul Hoffman, ECA Administrator, is not the kind of official who spends money simply because he has it in hand. Funds not needed in the current year's appropriation were not squandered; they were carried over. The estimate for next year represents a cut of 25 percent over the present year. In other words, Mr. Hoffman is adhering faithfully to the assurances that he has given.

In the Star's judgment, Mr. Hoffman should get the full authorization requested. He has carefully pruned his own estimates, and if they should be too high he has shown that he can be trusted to hold on to the unneeded money. On the other hand, an arbitrary cut of nearly 10 percent might well serve to break down the recovery program just when it is beginning to succeed. To invite that risk is not economy; it is foolishness. The Senate will have an opportunity to restore the cut, and it ought to do so.

Withholding Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Malden (Mass.) Evening News of March 23, 1950:

WITHHOLDING TAXES

Now that the income tax accounts are squared for another year, in a manner of speaking, it is interesting to note that the withholding tax is coming under heavier fire. Vivien Kellems, a New England industrialist, has been a rebel for some time. Now James F. Byrnes, the converted New Dealer, is training his guns on the system, contending it was adopted as a wartime emergency measure and should be dropped. "The system," says Byrnes, "was established on the theory that in wartime workers were constantly moving from place to place and it would be difficult to check their returns." But the practice continues, with the result that millions do not seem to realize they are paying taxes because the taxes are withheld from their pay envelopes. If the worker paid quarterly installments out of his take-home pay, there would be such a ruckus that the demand for reduction of Government expenditures would be irresistible. Byrnes suggests that employers not now doing so should insert in workers' pay envelopes a statement showing the total amount of pay and how much has been deducted for income taxes and social security. When a worker's wife gets the slip, she will think of the many things she could have bought with the money deducted and may be moved to write to her Congressman about Government expenditures. The idea has merit. Taxes and Government extravagance will not be reduced until a majority of the people demand reductions.

The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an essay by Gladys Huntington of 31 Washington Street, Lawrence, Mass., on the subject The American Way. This article was submitted in the contest sponsored by the National Wood Association. The writer of this article is one of the employees in the mending room of the Pacific Mills located in Lawrence, Mass., which recently celebrated its one hundredth anniversary of its organization.

This is the subject in which every man, woman, and child in this country should be vitally interested, and I personally feel that this essay is not only educational but most interesting.

We in the United States should and must be thankful for all of the privileges that we enjoy in our American way of life. This employee has in a very excellent way stated the facts concisely and truthfully:

THE AMERICAN WAY

(By Gladys K. Huntington)

Perhaps the paragraph most often quoted from our Declaration of Independence is the following:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Reviewing the early history of America, the thrilling story of struggle for existence and possession in a land rich with resources and opportunities seems almost fantastic when viewed in the light of present-day privileges and opportunities.

From those early years of struggle and hardship have come untold blessings to everyone fortunate enough to call America his home.

We have become so accustomed to the advantages and rights which are ours that we take them for granted.

It is only when we read and hear of what is taking place in other lands that we are truly cognisant of our great blessings.

In the last hundred years we have made steady progress toward a higher standard of working and living conditions. Revolutionary changes have taken place in our mode of life.

Where, but in America, do we find workers going to their jobs in automobiles?

Even those spoken of as in moderate circumstances come home to families where bathrooms, telephones, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, furnaces, and even television are commonplace fixtures.

There is also an abundance of staple food and good clothing.

Still many people in America are discontented. Our struggle is no longer one of physical hardship, but rather the obstacles to be overcome are mental and moral.

In a land rich with opportunity and privileges there is no place for oppression and inequality. When America became a free and independent Nation the thought was that all men should live together and work together, in peace and brotherhood.

This is still the American way.

Never for a moment should we forget that with "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" come duties and responsibilities, as well as privileges.

Perhaps first and foremost is our political duty.

To be well informed on civic and national affairs; to vote intelligently on every question presented; to study issues and candidates with open minds.

We have heard it said that "the most powerful enemies of a country are those from within." This is true of a man, as well as a nation, for it is out of the heart of man that first comes the thought that later developed into the act which will build or destroy all that we now hold dear and cherish as the American way.

United States Coast Guard Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in the United States Coast Guard Reserve, as is everyone who is at all familiar with the duties and responsibilities of that very important branch of the armed forces.

The item for the training of the Coast Guard Reserve has been deleted from the omnibus bill assertedly as an economy measure, and for no other reason.

The fact that no money has been appropriated for this organization in the past is no basis for argument that this legislation is not vital. The Coast Guard has been unable to secure this money due largely to a lack of appreciation by the Congress of the absolute necessity of maintaining a trained organization, to perform at a moment's notice, the many duties performed by the Coast Guard Reserve at the instant a national emergency is declared.

The Navy, Army, and Air Force are confronted largely with problems of expansion at the outset of hostilities while the Coast Guard must not only expand to seven times its peacetime size, but at the same instant, offer full scale police protection to all harbor areas in the United States and its possessions. The full-scale investigation of all who seek access to ships and water-front facilities, must begin immediately and cannot wait 6 months or 2 or 3 years while the reservists are again recruited and trained to perform this herculean task. In the city of Seattle, Wash., alone more than 50,000 persons were investigated and either given clearance or denied access to the very vulnerable, very vital harbor areas.

The loading of explosives must begin at once if the Army, Navy, and Air Force are to be expected to carry on a full-scale assault as even our largest battleships carry only enough ammunition for 24 hours of constant barrage.

The small-boat patrol of each harbor must begin and be maintained constantly day and night, requiring the use of thousands of men and motorboats.

The beach patrol must begin to function, furnishing enough trained men to patrol the entire coastal distance of the Atlantic seaboard, the Gulf coast, and the Pacific coast. An assignment which taxes the imagination when one considers that all these men are in a reserve status, and have no nucleus to cling to but must develop and grow instantly from no personnel to many thousands of members.

The remark has been made that it is ridiculous to expect that the Coast Guard Reserve can train men to the proficiency required on one drill night a week—and that statement is very true so far as it goes—however, it must be understood that the Coast Guard Reserve does not intend nor expect to teach men these very complex skills in 2 hours per week. The fire-prevention personnel are drawn from the underwriters and the best talent the local fire departments have to offer—the Coast Guard Reserve intelligence men are from the very cream of the local police department.

Explosive loading personnel are developed around physicists, and chemists, and ballisticians, who need only military training. These experts who are now members of the Coast Guard Reserve, are all veterans of World War II, some of both World Wars I and II, are now and have been since October 1948, busily engaged in developing explosive loading personnel, beach patrol and intelligence personnel and the many other groups so necessary at the first sign of war.

This work has been purely voluntary and no money whatever has been given them to either furnish them with training equipment, or for pay purposes as is done with all other components of the Armed Forces.

Under Public Law 810, the Coast Guard Reserve is entitled to training on the same basis as the Army, Navy, Air Force, and all other military components and it is the only military organization in existence in this country today which fought and died together with all other services, and yet received no recognition insofar as training appropriations are concerned.

The majority of the House has insisted on economy, reduction in appropriations, and I believe we all feel that we have about reached the saturation point in taxation, but it cannot be shown that to completely ignore and turn our backs upon the most vulnerable, most vital link in our chain of defense, is either economy or sound judgment.

On Italy's Water Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial which appeared in the April 2d issue of Il Progresso.

Nothing which I may say will add to the article which is both revealing and enlightening. Those of us who one day hope to see Italy a member of the family of nations will be more fortified in that hope.

The editorial follows:

ON ITALY'S WATER FRONT

The riots and sabotage which have gripped the ports of France are spreading to Italy. These are lavishly financed, carefully prepared actions directed on a military basis by foreign military agents for a foreign power dedicated to the destruction of the Italian way of life and Italy's subjection to a totalitarian Communist dictatorship. These are not bona fide wage movements to better the conditions of Italy's dockers and seamen. These are solely actions instigated and organized by Russia in its drive to weaken Italy and the other democracies so as to conquer them the more easily in a war now being feverishly prepared by the Kremlin.

We repeat there are no Italian Communists. There are only Russian-dominated Communists in Italy who serve not their people but the enemies of the Italian Nation. This is treason and should be treated only as treason by the Government and people of Italy.

We are confident that the great mass of the Italian maritime workers are loyal to their country and devoted to democracy. Russian-paid-for saboteurs will more and more be finding it difficult to go through with their traitorous plans. Communist schemes for the sabotage of American arms shipments have already suffered some telling rebuffs. In Italy's second largest port, Naples, over 1,000 of 1,800 dockers voted to unload all cargoes, including American war material. Eight other southern Italian ports have followed the example of Naples. Among these are Bari, Brindisi, and Palermo in Sicily.

RUSSIAN HOOLIGANISM

All rowdyism, riots, and sabotage in the wake of these votes are only bought and paid for ruble performances. The Italian authorities will treat their instigators, we hope, just as ordinary spies and foreign saboteurs are treated. To allow criminal stool pigeons and ruble robots to hide behind the democratic legal system for the purpose of overthrowing it is as suicidal as it is unpardonably stupid. There is no rhyme or reason for permitting the Communist-controlled so-called labor federation to serve as an open Russian espionage agency. Such organizations and movements have nothing to do with the ideals and aspirations of trade-unionism. Such outfits are the worst enemies of free trade-unionism. Were such Communist bands are in power free trade-unionism does not exist. Government-controlled company unions have replaced the genuine trade-unions throughout Russia and its satellite areas. The first thing the Communists did when they seized Shanghai was to shoot the outstanding leaders of free labor in the Chinese metropolis.

The spring offensive of the Russian despots against Italian democracy is as much the concern of the American and all other liberty-loving peoples as was the historic electoral contests in Italy in April 1943. When the Communists were defeated then world democracy was greatly aided. Similarly, if the totalitarian tools of the Kremlin will be smashed in Italy's docks now, the forces of freedom will be vastly strengthened everywhere. And just as the democratic groups outside of Italy aided their Italian colleagues in April 1948, so they must aid their hard-pressed Italian colleagues in April 1950.

WE MUST ALL HELP

Americans of Italian origin were in the forefront of the assistance to the people of Italy 2 years ago. Il Progresso rendered distinguished and decisive service to the cause of democracy in Italy in April 1948. There is every reason to feel confident that all these forces will once again respond with enthusiasm and energy to help the fighters for freedom in Italy. Such help is indispensable. The Communists have at their disposal huge sums of Russian money for expenditures on fostering treason and sabotage in Italian ports. The democrats in Italy are themselves too poor to match this part of the giant Soviet military budget. They must, therefore, be helped from outside of Italy. This is living democratic solidarity. Without it, democracy cannot live, especially when it is under fire of Russia's heavy artillery and poison gas warriors.

Specifically and at the outset, the members of the unions on our American waterfronts in the cities where Italian ships dock should fraternize with and explain to the Italian seamen what is behind the Communist insurrectionary assault against the transfer of arms. There are many longshoremen and other transport workers in our midst who are of Italian extraction and who speak Italian. In general, the Italian seamen visiting our ports should be contacted, drawn into our social life and told the truth about the Communist fifth column operating in ports, like Genoa and Leghorn. Here such enlightenment can be engaged in freely. In the Italian ports, gangsters, paid by Moscow and operating behind the mask of Tovarish Di Vittorio's outfit, have succeeded in creating an atmosphere of terror and thereby preventing the workers from learning the truth.

In this connection, the International Transport Workers Federation should get into the picture and have an Italian representative here to establish an Italian seamen's center in the port of New York. This would provide immediate facilities for bringing together the membership and representatives of Italian and American transport workers' unions. The best way for promoting understanding and solidarity among the longshoremen and seamen of both countries would thus be provided. We are confident that the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and its American affiliates, the A. F. of L. and the CIO, would do their share in the cementing of such Italian-American friendship and labor solidarity in the interest of world peace and freedom.

Ohio Oil, Coal, and Railroad Industries Injured by Heavy Imports of Petroleum and Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to increase the import excise tax on petroleum, fuel oil, and other oil products. I shall, under leave to extend my remarks, append the bill to this statement.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing when imports of oil have increased to such proportions that our own oil output and our own employment is severely affected. It is two things when our production of coal is severely curtailed by the unrestricted importation of competing fuel, and it is three things when our railroads are required to lay off hundreds of workers who depend on the transportation of coal for their bread and butter.

When unrestricted imports of oil are brought across our borders and the supply exceeds the demand, what do we do? We reduce our domestic output. Some States curtail output by law and even require some wells to close.

What do we do about imports when the supply exceeds the demand? Do we apply the same formula to the foreign wells as we apply to our own? We do not. On the contrary administration leaders continue to go here and there about the country crying for still greater imports, pointedly ignoring the thousands upon thousands of oil and coal and transportation workers who are forced into idleness.

In the great State of Ohio the coal industry is very important, and transportation of coal is a major source of work and income for the railroads of that State. Now we find that the coal mines are closing down and the railroads have idle equipment and hundreds of unemployed workers. Many of them are rapidly discovering that free trade is not the best policy as applied to fuel products.

The administration's trade agreement program has degenerated into a giveaway program. Our diplomats pointedly ignore the cartels, the monopolies, the subsidies, the State trading and bilateral deals of other nations and continue to open wide our doors to products made by the cheap labor of foreign countries.

If the State of Ohio attempted to ship goods produced in mines or factories that paid starvation wages, exercised monopoly control, or engaged in other cutthroat and unfair labor practices, the Departments of Justice, Commerce, Labor and a number of Government commissions and committees would be investigating us within the hour. Many of the practices engaged in by our foreign competitors would not be permitted for 1 minute in this country and the products of those industries could not be sold on the domestic markets.

How is it then that we not only countenance those practices in foreign countries but we openly encourage them by freeing imports from all regulations. We have even been playing host to numbers of foreign salesmen invited here to learn more about how to capture our home markets.

The so-called escape clause in the trade agreements is a joke and is recognized as such by almost every industry. If there had existed such a thing as a true escape clause it would not have been necessary for me to introduce this bill. The Vice Chairman of the Tariff Commission which administers this escape clause has specifically stated that increased imports and decreased domestic production were foreseen when the trade agreements were negotiated with the foreign countries. Not one of the applicants for aid under this ridiculous section were able to get any redress, even though injury was recognized by the Tariff Commission in some cases.

The independent oil producers asked for an investigation by the Tariff Commission and proved that rapidly increasing imports were followed by rapidly decreasing domestic production. They proved that upward of 25,000 oil workers were out of work. They proved that oil exploration was being abandoned and many domestic wells were being closed. Not one iota of encouragement or help was given, and none has been given to this day.

The coal miners, the railroad workers, and the producers of chinaware, pottery, glassware, and numerous other important items manufactured extensively in Ohio are joining the petroleum industry in the discovery that they have been sold down the river and that there is no such thing as "escape clauses." Congressional action is the only possible solution left, and that must run contrary to the commitments of our overzealous, free-trade State Department.

This great hullabaloo about closing the trade gap is a greatly exaggerated cry of "wolf, wolf." The tables are about to be reversed, and we will soon find that our shipment of dollars abroad is greatly exceeding the amount being returned. In the month of January we exported goods that were valued at about $112,000,000 more than our imports. That is the so-called trade gap. However, the Department of Commerce states that we send abroad more than $107,000,000 per month in the form of tourist expenditures, and sums sent abroad by private individuals and institutions. Actually that leaves only a little more than $5,000,000 as the true gap. This amounts to about $70,000,000 a year, and is a far cry from the three billion which the Government orators point to as the dollar gap.

For a long while more than half of the items imported by this country have been permitted to enter free of any duty. It must be remembered that if we are to increase imports by tariff reductions, then the blow must fall on a comparatively few industries. It has fallen on some, and more will soon feel it as have the oil, coal, and transportation industries already. Our shipment of dollars abroad is now almost balanced with the shipments of dollars into this country. Soon we will be in the embarrassing position of having most of our export markets closed to us and our home market wide open to all the goods of every other nation, including Russia and all her Communist-dominated satellites.

In introducing this bill I have paid close attention to the desires and attitudes of the people of my State and the district I represent. If a cancellation or moderate renegotiation of one or two trade agreements is necessary to prevent the unemployment of thousands more of our workers in the oil, coal, and railroad industries, then it is our duty to see that it is done.

Ohio wants all the international trade that is profitable, but it must, out of all fairness to our own workers, be based on equality. Wage rates, living conditions, fair-trade practices, and other factors that bear upon costs of production must be taken into consideration so that true equality at the borders of our country is the measuring stick for our import regulations.

The bill referred to follows:

A bill to increase the import excise tax on petroleum, fuel oil, and other petroleum derivatives

Be it enacted, etc., That, because of the large quantities of petroleum, fuel oil, and other petroleum derivatives entering the United States from foreign sources and the resulting drastic curtailment of domestic employment, and because of the serious effect of such large imports of fuel and other oil on the very important coal industry of this Nation, and because, as a result of the substantial curtailment in the production, transportation, and use of domestic coal, the railroads normally transporting that product are being severely injured, and because many thousands of workers producing and transporting oil and coal are being driven out

of work by excessive imports of oil, and because it is the sense of this Congress that a weakening of our domestic economy is dangerous to our security and should be mitigated wherever possible, it is therefore declared to be the policy of this Congress that some fair and economically sound methods be devised to increase the production, transportation, and use of domestic oil and coal.

SEC. 2. To implement the policy of this act section 3422 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"Crude petroleum, 2 cents per gallon; fuel oil derived from petroleum, gas oil derived from petroleum, and all liquid derivatives of crude petroleum, except lubricating oil and gasoline or other motor fuel, 2½ cents per gallon; gasoline or other motor fuel, 3 cents per gallon; lubricating oil, 4 cents per gallon; paraffin and other petroleum-wax products, 1 cent per pound. The tax on the articles described in this section shall apply only with respect to the importation of such articles."

SEC. 3. The President is hereby directed to immediately modify any foreign-trade agreements entered into under the authority granted him by Congress in section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 which are affected by the passage of this act, and to proceed as soon thereafter as practicable to renegotiate such agreements. However, the taxes established by this act shall not hereafter be subject to changes under the authority of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended.

New Taxes Aren't Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Medford (Mass.) Mercury:

NEW TAXES AREN'T NEEDED

Mr. Truman's most recent recommendations on taxation have met an extremely mixed reaction, both in Congress and throughout the country. His views on the wartime excise taxes provide a particularly good illustration of that.

The President advocates that these taxes, which are levied on a similar list of commodities and services—including such luxuries as baby oil; commercial transportation for both passengers and freight, and long-distance telephone and telegraph charges—should be substantially reduced. However, he added this all-important proviso—that the loss in revenue must be offset by new taxes, and that he will not approve any bill which does not accomplish this plan.

The President is entitled to his views. However, the fact remains that the excise taxes—which manufacturers, retailers and others concerned say are a definite barrier to trade and employment—were strictly wartime measures which are still on the books many years after the war ended. It is also true that the goods and services they apply to are necessities in many cases, not luxuries. And it is further true that the only sound way to make up any loss of revenue their reduction or repeal would cause is to cut the cost of Government—not to pile more taxes on our overburdened individuals and businesses.

The present temper of Congress seems to be in favor of repeal of the excise taxes—even as it is against tax increases of any kind. That is the right attitude. The enormously impressive Hoover Commission reports have shown where the administrative cost of Government alone can be reduced by three or four billion a year. Congress could make no greater contribution to our economic stability and prosperity than by putting into effect a rigorous policy of economy for every Government activity and every bureau.

President Truman Fails To Handle Food Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, mismanagement and unsound policies are the cause of agricultural surpluses—not makeshift legislation as charged by the President. Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act the President by simple administrative action can set quotas and fees that in effect will stop the importation of agricultural products that are in surplus supply in this country. Why doesn't he act? Why should he continue the do-nothing policy that permits the stealing of our farmers' domestic market by foreign competition?

The Secretary of Agriculture can by present law request studies, and findings by the Tariff Commission of the effect of the importation on our domestic economy. So far he has not seen fit to act. The recent potato scandal is an example of the failure of the administration to carry out its duties and responsibilities to the American people when they permitted potatoes to be brought in from Canada while American potatoes were dumped or converted into cattle feed.

In the formulating of a price-support program for dairy products this year the Secretary of Agriculture saw fit to ignore the recommendations of the industry and dairy farmers and long-established trade marketing practices. The result has been that the Government owned on February 28, 1950, 92,796,753 pounds of butter. I am informed that most of this butter would have remained in trade hands had the recommendations of the dairy industry been followed. The taxpayers however are saddled with a storage bill of approximately $5,000 a day on butter alone because of mismanagement and the efforts of the Secretary of Agriculture to discredit existing legislation in favor of his unsound promising Brannan plan.

The American people are entitled to know the real reasons for our agricultural surpluses. The American taxpayer should be relieved of the burden of unnecessary storage charges on agricultural stocks that have been hoarded by the administration. During a 6-month period, July to December 1949, the handling charges on stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation cost the taxpayers approximately $35,000 an hour and are unquestionably much higher now. The American people want and are demanding fundamental improvements—sound policies and sound management.

One Man's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in man's darkest hour he turns to prayer. Strong as we might be with the atom bomb in our possession, and with the knowledge of the hydrogen bomb, the world is still in a troubled state. One wonders about tomorrow. Will there be peace in our time—and in the time of our children? No one knows. But no one can deny that there is yet hope—so one prays.

Herve L'Heureux and his story of Prayers for Peace should give many of us pause. It is the story of a man and his belief in the efficacy of prayer. That this movement of prayers for peace which belongs to no one sect, no particular denomination has taken such hold of peoples everywhere is indeed inspiring and encouraging. In its simple fashion, it merely urges that one be conscious of our desire for peace, of our striving for peace; and that each of us devote a minute of prayer for peace in these troubled times.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following article which appeared in March 19 issue of the Sunday Mirror:

MILLIONS EVERY DAY JOIN ONE MAN'S PRAYER

(By Francis Anthony)

In the hearts and in the minds of men of faith, the issues are clearly drawn: The power of the Almighty and of prayer versus the atom bomb and war, the hydrogen bomb and chaotic destruction.

In Washington each day at noon, a great, burly man bows his head in a minute of prayer for peace. He is joined, in spirit, by millions of his fellow men. Eighteen months ago he prayed alone. By his faith in a cause, his belief in an idea, he has built, single-handed, a movement that is gathering followers like an avalanche—prayers for peace.

Herve L'Heureux is no platitude-prating pacifist. A wounded veteran of World War I, he was one of the founders of the American Legion. As a career diplomat (now chief of the visa section of the State Department) with 20 years' foreign service, L'Heureux knows only too well the forces that threaten civilization today.

A famous atomic scientist who personally has endorsed prayers for peace states it this way: "It is scientifically sound to believe that the power which creates atomic energy is even greater than the product. I believe that power is faith, and that we should use it to curb and control the destructive forces that have been revealed to men."

In October 1948, at an American Legion meeting in his home town of Manchester, N. H., Mr. L'Heureux spoke of his private custom of taking a minute each day to pray for divine guidance toward the goal of world peace. He invited fellow members to join in his prayer, wherever they might be. The result was a resolution, passed a few days later, pledging members of the organization to daily supplication—in whatever way their hearts and their religions indicated.

In the intervening months more than 500 veterans' groups have adopted similar resolutions. Nearly a hundred business firms, scores of fraternal societies, high school and college student bodies, unions and church organizations have joined the sweeping movement. The total of organizations is now more than 750, the number growing each day.

No contributions, no dues are solicited by Prayers for Peace. There is no fund-raising or publicity organization behind it. Neither is it incorporated. Prayers for Peace is Herve L'Heureux. All money expended in its propagation has come out of his pocket. In a year and a half L'Heureux has replied to more than 12,000 letters. He has typed each answer himself and paid for all postage. In fact, at Christmas, he requested and received postage stamps as gifts from his family.

Rejecting an offer of $15,000 to help promote the movement, L'Heureux told a generous friend: "You cannot buy the spirits of men. Prayers for peace must come from the heart, from the desire of Americans to show the world that we are God-loving people—rather than money-loving and materialistic."

A skeptic who finally became convinced summed it up in this one sentence: "Men have always prayed when they were in greatest trouble—and never has the race of men been in more trouble than now."

Benefits From Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Washington Post of April 4, 1950, by the Marine News of New York, entitled "Benefits From Waterways—the Great Lakes System":

BENEFITS FROM WATERWAYS—THE GREAT LAKES SYSTEM

One of the marvels of America is its amazing rate of growth. What are the greatest contributions to this growth? One of them is the unparalleled Great Lakes transportation system, making for the economical movement of iron ore, grain, coal, and lumber. Eighty-five percent of all steel made in America is from ore transported down the Lakes and through connecting channels made navigable by the Federal Government. Since 1855, approximately 2,500,000,000 tons have been delivered from upper Lake Superior points to steel mills along Lake Michigan and Lake Erie or to ports there for short transshipment by rail to inland mills. The average 1,000-mile haul costs about 1 mill per ton-mile—lowest cost transportation in all the world. It saves money for every taxpayer in America, and more than pays for the entire Great Lakes waterway system during every single year of normal operation. The improved St. Clair and Detroit Rivers carry more tonnage than any other channels on earth. Deeper channels for deeper draft vessels for still more economical operation will add to the already incalculable value of the Great Lakes system.

(Marine News, 26 Water Street, New York, N. Y., George H. Pamer, president and publisher.)

Is It "Loose Talk"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie (Ind.) Star of April 1, 1950:

IS IT "LOOSE TALK"?

In 1948 President Truman called the congressional inquiry into the Hiss case a red herring. This year he says the GOP charge that misfits and Communists still hold jobs in his administration is loose talk and that it is an attempt to sabotage the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States.

But the President and his Secretary of State have already sabotaged the bipartisan foreign policy by refusing to allow any Republican leaders to help make policy as well as to vote for it. All of the new foreign programs have been drawn up by the administration and presented to Congress and the GOP as the final answer to everything. If that is bipartisanship it is a new way of describing it.

Toward the President's repeated assurances that he has cleaned out the rats' nests of Communists and perverts in the Government, the people have adopted that old Missouri attitude and are saying, "Show us." Since the Hiss case, the Coplon case, and the Fuchs case we can be less sure than ever that the President knows what he is talking about when he says he has chased all the Communists out.

The people know that hundreds of Communists and sexual perverts have been kicked out of Federal jobs. They also know that these people were hired while President Truman and President Roosevelt were in office. When they hear charges that the Government is still infested with Reds, when they hear the Commerce Department announce that 27 poor security risks are still in the Department although not allowed to see Government secrets and when they are given no proof that the charges are not true, why shouldn't they suspect Mr. Truman's assurances?

The President says that criticism of his State Department and charges of Communist infiltration are doing irreparable harm to his Government. They may be doing irreparable harm to the administration's future political hopes, but if the charges are true much more harm is being done to the best interests of the American people than the publicity Senator MCCARTHY has been receiving.

Let the President prove he is right, that the loose talk is really loose, and the people will breathe easier. Until he does, they will keep on wondering.

Address by T. R. Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Mr. T. R. Green, secretary-manager of the West Memphis (Ark.) Chamber of Commerce:

It's a real pleasure for me to be up here at the Tyronza Rotary Club today, and to have so many of our friends and visitors here from throughout this part of Arkansas: we have Mountain Home, we have Marked Tree, we have Trumann and two of our own good citizens from West Memphis. So when I talk about this last frontier, eastern Arkansas finds itself in a very unique position: the position of leadership, position of untold and untouched resources which tomorrow will develop one of the greatest outstanding sections of Arkansas. Surely we all will admit that Arkansas is really the opportunity land of America. You know, as we are sitting here, I can't help but realize what a wonderful thing it is for meetings of this kind, when we can get together and talk a little bit about a few things, and I want to tell you that there's only three things of which I am absolutely certain. One of them is that America is the greatest country in all the world, has been and will continue to be; that Arkansas is by far the greatest State in America; and the third thing of which I am certain is that at 1:10, when we adjourn, I will have finished any remarks I might have to make.

So we can relax a little bit and talk for just a few moments about Arkansas. You know, in the old days, we have overlooked one of the most important phases of our whole education, and that is, teaching ourselves a little bit more about this great State in which we live. Most of us have chosen to live here, not for any definite reason, but, because we thought that the opportunity for providing the security that we needed and sought would be greater than any other place. And yet as we go along we hear so much about our friends down south of us in Texas, yet anytime a man from Texas says any more than Texas is the largest State in the Union, he immediately brands himself as a liar. And then let us go to our good people down in Florida who have citrus groves, everglades, swamps and hurricanes. It's the only State where a man puts a little flag up, and what happens—everybody nails boards over their windows, stores, and the business houses so you can't possibly tell what's going on. What about our good friends in California, we've heard a lot about them, we find out that California is a State that has grown great through its sham, through its publicity and through its photography. You know, out there in California they don't have any rain at all, while we here in Arkansas are proud of the 51-and-some-odd inches that we have each year, equally divided throughout the year, with April and September being the two greatest months for water. While in California, the last time I was out there, the first 3 months they had 31 inches of dew, and believe me folks it's rather heavy. And so I say, that Arkansas can be proud, because the encyclopedias say that it's the only State, of all the 48, around which a fence might be built and

the same standard of living maintained throughout the years, without any encroachment from our neighbors or without any dependability upon them for any of the needs for a normal living. But, we don't want that kind of a living. You know I was thinking about two friends of mine the other day, they were discussing the list of what an early season it was to have the flies coming in here, one of them had killed five flies, three males and two females. The other friend said to him, how do you know which were the males and which were the females? He told him that three of them were on a beer bottle and two of them were on a mirror. And so I tell you that as my friends alertness and vision were indications to him of the flies' sex, there are material indications today, if you will just stop long enough to analyze them, which are very definitely along a trend, that if we don't work out the problem that's confronting us we're going to have some difficulties in carrying out our program of continued development and growth along the American way of life.

And I say this as a member of commerce man, the chamber of commerce organization has been in existence for some 8 years prior to the writing of the Declaration of Independence, and that organization that was founded back there in 1768 is still in existence and has never stopped functioning for one moment. And so, as a chamber of commerce man, I'd like to tell you a little bit about America. To offset some of the "isms" we've heard about we'll talk for just a few moments about Arkansas. How many of us have stopped to realize, that over at Magnet-cove, 12 miles from Hot Springs, we have 100 different minerals that are known at this time? How many of you have stopped to realize that down in Pike County, we have the only diamond mine on this hemisphere? And about those diamonds, they contributed much to the winning of the war, for the simple reason that those diamonds are commercial, they are not gem stones, but they are commercial stones. In winning the war you had to have tools and diamond dies and diamond points in the drill bits to reach a perfection where there was a very definite limitation in the tolerance that you could have in providing radar, the proximity fuse and some of the other outstanding developments of this past world war. Not to forget for one moment Bauxite and Benton, Ark., two little communities over here where, in the old days, we mined, and realized that we mined, 93 percent of all the aluminum that was mined on the Western Hemisphere. This aluminum was shipped to East St. Louis where it was pulverized and powdered into what is known as aluminum oxide, from there it traveled to Pittsburgh, Pa., to be placed into aluminum ingots. From Pittsburgh it was shipped back to Alcoa, Tenn., where it was made into sheet aluminum, and from there to the various factories that processed pots and pans. So we originated aluminum through bauxite ore and then we bought the finished products, pots and pans; and out of every dollar that we spent, 60 cents of it was for transportation. Then we got a little bit different approach to this situation and decided it was best to process bauxite in Arkansas and what happened, in World War II when Hurricane Creek and Jones Mill were formed—and they're still functioning under lease to the Reynolds Metal Co.—aluminum was processed directly, and the income per family in Arkansas in that one particular area, from that one industry, was greatly enhanced and trebled in value, due to the fact that the money made by manufacturing is in the processing and not in providing the raw material. And so everything in Arkansas is just that way, it's new and the boundaries are vast and unlimited, but we've got to remember one thing, and that's why I want to pause at this time and tell you about the friend that we've lost. And that's our good friend, George. If we're going to accomplish any purposes and any missions, developing our own area, developing our own State, keeping America American, we have to do so with our own efforts.

We've got to pull together and pull hard in order to provide the continued prosperity which we are entitled to as being the dominating factor in the world today, just merely carrying the prestige of the last great democracy isn't enough, in which to sit back and forget about the hardships that our forefathers went through in order to provide us with the standard of living that we have in our day. But coming along into the present days' centuries I want to pause for a moment and call your attention to two things: First, in the years 1900 to 1930, out of the average dollar that was earned by the workingman, 65 cents of it was spent upon food, clothing, and shelter; 15 cents of each dollar he earned was made available for pleasures, such as picture shows, automobiles, radios, etc.; 15 cents out of each dollar he had left over to provide him with the necessities, such as insurance, such as investments, such as improving his plant and working over his facilities, purchasing stocks and bonds, for an income and investment purpose; and 5 cents out of each dollar was to take care of the county, State, and National taxes. From 1930 to 1939, a 9-year span, 65 cents out of the workingman's dollar earned was still spent for food, clothing, and shelter, but instead of the 15 cents for pleasures and the nice things, automobiles, radios, etc., he's lost that; instead of the 15 cents for investments, insurance, maintenance, improvements of factories and building and business, he's lost most of that; the cost of government has gone from 5 cents, in the first 30 years of 1900, to 30 cents out of each dollar, almost half of what food, clothing, and shelter cost him. That leaves only a nickel for the normal investments and improvements, building up an estate and providing a means of security for his loved ones. And so the picture had radically changed, but that's not the worst picture of all, the worst picture can be brought along a little bit further when we take and compare the total expenditures of this great Nation from its inception back in 1776 where, 169 years, until 1945, we find that our Government spent some one-hundred-and-sixty-odd-billion dollars, this figure includes both World War I and Word War II, and from 1945 through 1949, this same Government of ours has spent $190,000,000,000; more in the last 4 years than in the first 169 years of our existence. And, so I say that, we as Americans have a right to know just what is happening to our money, why it's costing so much, and what we can do as individuals to prevent this continued trend toward increased expenditures in providing more government than is necessary to operate our great Nation. We can't help but realize that if we don't take this matter into our own hands and consider it as each an individual task, that it's going to be too late. I mentioned George a minute ago and I think that this is probably the most fitting time that we can deliver George's obituary and place him in the past, in the hall of fame with the heroes that have lived and have reigned supreme, remembering that he has contributed much to the American way of life.

But, you know, to offset George, we've got a fellow now by the name of Joe, we've got to keep our eye on Joe. Joe does nothing for you and I. If a job arises Joe takes advantage of George and he's been a friend of his. When George was getting along in years and getting a little old and couldn't do much, Joe would pat him on the back and say that's fine I'll help you, but Joe was helping himself, not helping you and I. He was helping himself to the things that we had fought and maintained by our fathers and by our forefathers and that same fight is going on and it's stronger than ever because now there is no George, he's dead. We only have Tom, Dick, and Harry and when we stay with those three men, and that's you and I and our friends, we have a task definitely assigned that we can't shirk. We must continue to plan our program of activity, to let our people know, we've got to take an interest in what's going on in Washington, we've got to take an interest in our own State legislature, we've got to take an interest in the quorum court of Poinsett County, if we don't take an interest how can they tell what we would like to have them do. As actual people and taxpayers, we are stockholders in each of these governments, our own county government, our State government, and our Federal Government. And as a taxpayer and a stockholder in big business, and, gentlemen, it is big business, all three of them, if we do not take an interest how can they tell what we would like for them to do in the way of establishing a program of activity. We've got to sit back and stop and let them know exactly what we are interested in, we've got to provide for them the means with which they might express the views of their constituency, we've got to also back them up when they take a stand that is just exactly the way we would like to have it. Now, in talking about George once again let me cite you the case of the individuals who sat back and didn't busy themselves about what was going on. A few years back, the Government thought it was necessary to move in and take over Muscle Shoals, by forming the Tennessee Valley Authority. And they went in there because they wanted to help the people in that area in a way that they couldn't be helped otherwise. And they had no intention of doing anything but going in there on a temporary basis, but after a very few short years it became a known fact that the Government had taken over all the utilities in the whole area, they had taken over all the appliance firms and operated other stores in direct competition to free enterprise and private business. In so doing they found that they had to expand, and constantly, their plea has been to the various legislatures, please give us more money in order to provide the service which these people are entitled to. They first bankrupt the competitor, which is private enterprise, and then turn right around and ask for private enterprise and the taxpayer to provide them with more money with which to compete with more private enterprise. Now they've asked for 54 million with which to construct the Johnsonville steam plant. That plant is to provide additional kilowatt-hours for the Tennessee Valley Authority; and it's to be built by, not private enterprise, but it's to be built by the taxpayers' money, the people living out in Oregon, Idaho, Washington and California, and in the State of Maine are just as much a part of that enterprise as if it were built in their own back yard. And yet the benefits are very limited in scope, its benefits are for a chosen few which isn't the pure American way of business.

And then let's talk a little bit about this socialized medicine that we've heard so much about. If you'll read your new issue of Reader's Digest you'll find the story about Granny Didn't Live. And that's the story about the old lady that went to the doctor because she was very sick. Critically ill, she went to the doctor and the doctor looked at her name and said, "I'm sorry, I don't have you on my list." Her kinfolks, who had taken her there, explained to the doctor

that she was critically ill and didn't know where she was to go. He said he couldn't help her in any way; he had his orders and he could hardly take care of his own people. And so, Granny went from doctor to doctor and found the same thing and finally she died, merely because her medicine was paid for out of taxpayers' money, but not provided, as it would have been provided, in a free-enterprise system. You can't regiment the people into a healthy situation any more than you can regiment their thinking by providing automatons and robots to go along the streets and the highways of this great Nation. Socialized medicine is not good for England, they know it today, socialized medicine is not good for America, and never will be; it's just another means of getting a toehold into the business which has been built through the hardships and the sweat and toil of the individual in providing 18 and 20 hours of service every day to the people in their communities and getting in return a great reward of thanks and appreciation from the people because of a more complete life. Whereas in socialized medicine, as a regimented national problem, national legislative deal, it is impossible for the individual to be provided with the type of medication and the type of service they're entitled to, and for which they are willing to pay to the private man who has spent his time in providing the education, background, and experience to justify his taking care of their needs. And so, again, there is another ism that we've got, crept into our system of government, that inalienable right of an American cannot be challenged by the isms, there's no place in our whole democracy for anything other than the way our grandfathers planned and prepared the basic background of this great Nation. Now you know, back in Washington's time, he threw a dollar across the river and the world is still talking about that little job, and yet today, Washington throws millions of dollars across the ocean and no one pays attention to it. Hasn't time changed, but it hasn't changed all that much, that we can completely disregard what is taking place in Washington.

If we are to eliminate the causes and the threats to our type of Government which jeopardize this last free democracy, then we must prepare to actively expose such things as the TVA, socialized medicine, and these other encroachments on private enterprise that cannot be and will not be tolerated when the final whistle blows. I've talked to you for quite a while here to tell you a little bit about some of these things, about Arkansas, about our own county and our own State, and I don't know of anything that can be more helpful than the fact that in carrying out these things, we have often talked about England, and we referred to her socialized medicine, a good friend of mine, Clayton Rand, called attention to the fact that England was known as the mother country, and was so known because she was always expecting. In her type of government she hasn't been able to get her budget balanced, and yet we continue to pour millions and billions into their hands and coffers so that they might go ahead with their form of government, entirely foreign and entirely opposed to that which we are trying to operate. And yet we sit here while all the other people criticize our type of Government with one hand and ask that the other be filled with coin and money in order to take care of their own needs because their type of government doesn't work. And so I say it's time for us to stop, look at that mirror in the morning when we get up and say, "Now listen, fella, let's look this day right square in the face," and walk down the street and do a little about what we need to do to take care of the demands upon our business and upon our way of life. You know our public relations throughout this Nation have just about gone to pot and it's all because we, as employers, will not stop long enough to talk to the employees and get acquainted with them, let them know a little bit about our business, tell them a little bit about the problems that we have and by so working together we have an opportunity of better understanding so that our problems could be worked out. If that employer knew the employee better, the employee knew the problems of employer, you'd have none of this strike business, you'd have no labor difference, you'd have a better understanding between management and labor and we'd be able to go ahead with terrific strides in carrying out the development of this great Nation. Now as it is, you walk through your plant, you look at a man over on one corner working over a machine and you say, "Giving me 15 minutes work for every hour I pay him." Isn't that a fine situation? You smile as you go by very nicely, and as he goes by your office to punch the time clock as he goes home, he grits his teeth and says, under his breath, "That's the guy that's trying to kill me, wear me out, without any understanding of what troubles I'm having." Now that isn't right, that isn't a healthy situation, and so, with this American opportunity program, now is the time to get better acquainted, now is the time when we can stop for a moment, pause, and take inventory and say, "Well, it's not too late and I wouldn't trade places with any other three people in this whole world." But it's time for us to also stop and take cognizance of the fact, we can't just go along, it just doesn't happen, we've got to give a little bit of our time and effort, we've got to divide a little bit of our thinking for the benefit of those who have thought before us.

Logic Instead of Emotions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Somerville (Mass.) Journal:

LOGIC INSTEAD OF EMOTIONS

When the Hoover Report was submitted to Congress, Herbert Hoover warned the American people that unless the people themselves demanded action on Federal reorganization, the report would just gather dust on some forgotten shelf.

He also warned of the danger of the report being killed by the grasshopper bites of those who say reorganization is fine for everyone else but don't disturb my agency.

Almost every proposal made by the Commission steps on the toes of some special interest group.

If the Commission's proposals were to be adjusted to take care of all special cases, nothing would be left of the Hoover reorganization program.

Perhaps no group or individual can find himself completely in agreement with every recommendation made by the Hoover Commission. Within the Commission itself there was disagreement in many areas.

Most individuals, however, find themselves substantially in agreement with all save a very few proposals.

Lately, however, serious misconceptions about some of the Hoover Commission's recommendations have arisen in the field of veterans' affairs.

To leave these uncorrected would be unfair to the Hoover Commission. Incidentally, it would be unfair to the taxpayers, including millions of ex-service men and women. It would be equally unfair to veterans organizations which have often called for better and more economical management of Government.

Before we go so far as to say that the Hoover report would dismember or do away with the Veterans' Administration, let's read the actual recommendations.

At no place in the Commission's report can be found any recommendations for either the increase or curtailment of medical benefits or other services to veterans. The Commission stated that such policy decisions were outside its terms of reference and should be the subject of congressional determination.

The Commission's recommendations covered only the better management of existing programs.

It would seem logical and sensible to wait until specific legislation affecting veterans is introduced before allowing emotional thinking to wrap our view of the Hoover blueprint for a more economical management of our Government's business affairs.

It is terribly important that we achieve as much as possible of the program for which most Americans have waited so long.

Pageant of Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, though I am not a member of the Nutley lodge of Elks, nonetheless as a brother Elk from Newark lodge, it is with a sense of fitting but modest pride that under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the March 31 issue of the Nutley Sun lauding the fine, charitable, and praiseworthy work of the Nutley lodge of Elks. This is indeed democracy at work:

A GENEROUS GESTURE

Nutley lodge of Elks, in a ceremony open to the public tonight, will inaugurate its Pageant of Charity which will be marked on its calendar each March hereafter. In a ceremonious fashion, the Elks will distribute $1,000 to all the churches in town, regardless of creed or color, to be used as each church sees fit in its own charity work.

The Elks gesture befits an organization with a splendid record of generosity and service to the town. Nutley lodge has but 348 members but with funds which it raises directly or through its minstrel show and other entertainments, it has financed its own work among crippled children, paraplegics, needy veterans as well as supporting the Red Cross, united drive, cancer and heart campaigns, March of Dimes, and seal sales.

Generosity is a virtue, but in times like these when one drive or campaign follows another, it behooves service clubs like householders and businessmen to budget their gifts to charity. The Elks, in setting up their Pageant of Charity under Mayor William J. Jernick as chairman, have shown a way.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an address by the Honorable James A. Farley at the Common Cause, Inc., dinner which honored Federal Judge Harold R. Medina in absentia at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, March 14, 1950:

As some of you may know, it happens that I go to a great many dinners, nearly all of them honoring one preeminent guest of honor.

This, I think, is the most unusual dinner I have ever attended. Senator Dulles, Mrs. Paine, and the rest of us in making up the committee for this affair, had just one thought in mind—that this dinner would enable us—and you—to do honor to a brave and patient American judge. He was to have been our guest of honor. We had no sooner announced our plans and sent out the invitations than we received an avalanche of responses. They saw in this dinner a long-awaited chance to salute a man who represented all that we admired in a fine American, who had carried through a difficult job without fear or favor.

We did not presume to pass judgment on the legal points at issue in any case over which this judge has presided. But we did want to pay tribute to the character, courage, and patience he showed in doing his duty as he saw it. We did want to defend him from the vilification and smears heaped upon him by a powerful and well-organized pressure group which owes no allegiance to the American ideals of justice. We did want to show our support for the methods and safeguards of the American judicial process, in contrast to the terrible examples of totalitarian justice which are coming to us from across the sea. We felt that if American civil liberties rightly permit people to criticize our judges, certainly it is permissible for American citizens to defend them. As I said, the response to our invitation was terrific. One enthusiastic citizen wrote me that "if a dinner will give the judge some idea of how the citizens feel about his service to the country, we ought to give him one every month."

Well, here we are. And now we find that we have come together to pay honor, not so much to the man himself, but rather to the principles of American justice and decency and fair play for which he stands.

This is the way Judge Medina preferred us to do this. His withdrawal as our guest of honor was unquestionably one of the most difficult decisions he has ever had to make, and yet I am sure he was motivated by just one thought—he wanted to do what he felt was right.

The case so recently before him is still in the appellate courts, where it may remain for a long time. Until, therefore, that case comes to a final and binding decision our honored guest does not feel that he can appear publicly at an affair of this sort.

That decision does him nothing but honor and naturally we abide by it. In making it he has earned our still greater respect and admiration.

And so I say that this is an occasion unique in the history of dinners. Called to honor one man, the affair goes on in his voluntary absence and is dedicated instead to a principle which that man has exemplified. This, it seems to me, is something new and yet it is a distinctly American thing.

And so I think that it is especially important that we have met here tonight. Let us look briefly at the situation in which we meet.

It seems to me that for every eventuality there is either an old Spanish proverb, or that Confucius had something to say. This time the Chinese have a word—or rather an ideograph—for it. A Chinese friend of mine pointed out to me recently that the Chinese ideograph meaning crisis is actually a combination of two symbols—one meaning danger and another meaning opportunity.

I think that our Chinese friends have something here that merits our consideration.

That there is danger I am sure everyone of us here will agree, for we have only to look at any map to see the cost of apathy elsewhere. That this danger has lead to crisis is equally obvious. But what is most important for all Americans, and especially for those of us here, is the fact that inherent in this situation there is real and tangible opportunity.

What then are we going to do about it, the crisis and the danger and the opportunity?

We Americans have been in situations before where there was danger and crisis—and opportunity. It was so when we had to decide whether we would stand as free men or continue as tyrannized colonists. It was true when the issue was whether we could permit a power-drunk Kaiser to work his will with us on the high seas—and we have just emerged from the danger and the crisis which was Hitler, into the opportunity from which there may still be created a free world.

Now we find ourselves once more in danger, this time from an enemy more subtle, more ruthless, more fanatic than any we have ever faced. If our present situation has reached the point of crisis, it is because the time has come for Americans to challenge—wherever and whenever we find it, here or abroad—the aggressive, godless, and treasonable practices of totalitarian communism. If, once more, we have reached the point of danger and crisis, it is through no fault nor wish of the American people. It is because the masters of the politburo have exhausted both our patience and our hope that any moral and ethical relations between our nations can be possible under present conditions.

But let us remember that there is opportunity for us in this situation. One of the first, certainly one of the most vigorous and courageous groups to point out to us that opportunity is the organization which has sponsored this affair tonight—Common Cause, Inc. Ready and alert to take up the gage which aggressive communism has thrown down, Common Cause calls all Americans to battle stations. This does not mean that we want war. God forbid that it should come again. But it does mean that we dare no longer engage in wishful thinking or indifference to a very real and present danger. It does mean that we do not sleep through a crisis.

This freedom we Americans cherish—as individuals and as a Nation—was bought for us at Lexington and Gettysburg; at Chateau Thierry and Omaha Beach. We have tried vigilantly to maintain it, and the right to it of every man and woman. Nowhere was that more vividly shown than in the recent trials where every possible right was granted to the people accused of plotting the overthrow of the Government, whose privileges they flaunted.

I need not recall the contrast of the tragic cases and forced confessions and mock trials on the other side of the world, where victims are held incommunicado for months, where they cannot even select their own lawyers and where there are neither free judges nor jury of any sort. Indeed some of the judges in recent totalitarian trials have been the same men who meted out Nazi justice on behalf of the Fascist governments which served Hitler. Today, thanks to such mounting evidence of the deadly danger of Soviet communism, the period of illusion and self-deception is over in America. We no longer hear Chinese Communists fatuously referred to as agrarians; we are becoming less patient with the kind of liberalism which is only a facade behind which moves the hand of the Kremlin. Thanks to the work of Common Cause, and of other fine organizations, Americans today can discern the red hue regardless of the other colors behind which it may be masked.

In spite of this awakening, it is true that this is a dark moment when things are going badly in the cold war. Liberation for the enslaved peoples looks further away than ever. Defeatism is rife, and there is a tendency now to exaggerate Soviet strength just as we used to underrate the danger. We have gone from one extreme to the other. But let us remember, as we read Churchill's book, that things looked just as black in 1940 after the battle of France, and again in 1941 after Pearl Harbor, and again a year later, until the victories of Stalingrad and El Alamein. The democracies came up off the floor to win. Even in this cold war we have won some great and unexpected victories. Think back to 1946. Stalin already had physical control of eastern Europe, of Manchuria, and much of Iran—Greece, Turkey, Italy, France, Norway, and above all, Berlin, were terribly threatened. Most of the experts had already written off western Europe. Remember what they said about the failure of the Truman doctrine in Greece even a year ago? But one of our speakers tonight will tell you how Greece looks now. Who believed in the success of the Berlin airlift in the early days, except perhaps General Clay? Each of these was a real and largely unexpected victory, and we have had another real victory of a negative sort in Yugoslavia.

In every one of these countries our position today is stronger than anyone who understood the Soviet danger dared to hope 4 years ago. Altogether these successes balance our defeat in China. In the minds of many Americans, we did not put up a real fight for China. We let the battle go by default. We really lost China when we signed away Manchuria, her only rich, industrialized province, at Yalta. Some American organizations, including Common Cause, warned against that course. We must see to it that we are not fooled again and we must increase our power to defend every foot of free territory we still hold.

Here, however, is opportunity once more. Here you good Americans have been willing to come and be counted, have wanted to signify by your presence your deep gratitude to one who has so splendidly manifested the highest American traditions. By coming here you have set your individual seal upon those American principles, of liberty, of loyalty, of decency, in which we all believe.

I believe that Common Cause places a continuing opportunity before you, and that with your help it will be enabled to go on, a constant and courageous challenge to those who would divide and undermine and betray us here. If I were to point out to you tonight the greatest opportunity which this evening offers you, it would be to ask you to lend a hand with Common Cause, and by aiding this fine organization, to do your part in flinging back into the teeth of traitors the ringing notice that we are awake, alert, and ready.

Lord Vansittart and Mr. Stimson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald:

LORD VANSITTART AND MR. STIMSON

On motion of Lord Vansittart, former permanent undersecretary of the British Foreign Office, the House of Lords has adopted a resolution calling for continuous and resolute precautions to protect Britain from Communist infiltration of the Government. Vansittart charged that Communists are entrenched in the public service, the schools, and the British Broadcasting Corporation, a government monopoly.

He mentioned 16 known Communists in the Department of Inland Revenue and said that others were in the Admiralty and War Office, and in the Ministries of Food, Education, and Health. The destrability of cleaning the Communists out of the British Government was as clear to his fellow peers as it was to Vansittart.

Now, let us make a comparison. There is a similar problem in the United States Government. The House Committee on Un-American Affairs has turned up Alger Hiss and numerous other traitors in Government service. Currently Senator MCCARTHY has charged that some 115 persons who are or have been in the State Department are Communists or have Communist sympathies or associations. What has been the reception of such charges in certain influential quarters?

CAREER PARALLELED LORD VANSITTART'S

Henry L. Stimson has occupied a place in recent American politics corresponding in some degree to that of Lord Vansittart. We do not have any position in the State Department which can be directly related to that of the British permanent Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs. Mr. Stimson, however, was Secretary of State. He was Mr. Roosevelt's Pearl Harbor Secretary of War. In influence and length of experience in Government, his station has been not unlike that of Lord Vansittart.

Mr. Stimson has come forward from retirement with a letter to the New York Times in which he attributes various mean motives to Senator MCCARTHY and prophesies various damaging effects because the Senator has made the same allegations against the American Government that Lord Vansittart has made against the British Government. Like Vansittart, Senator MCCARTHY says that there are Reds in the Government and that they should be driven out. His reward is a snide crack from Mr. Stimson: "The man who seeks to gain political advantage from personal attack on a Secretary of State is a man who seeks political advantage from damage to his country."

Would Mr. Stimson say that similar motives govern Lord Vansittart? The British lord has had most of the honors and posts of responsibility within the grant of his country. He has a lifetime seat in the House of Lords. What more would he hope to gain by saying that there are Communists in the Government? Is it possible that Mr. Stimson would concede that Vansittart makes that charge only because he believes that Communists are injurious to the operations of government, and that he seeks to get rid of them? If Mr. Stimson will concede that to Lord Vansittart, why should he attempt to impute a different motive to a United States Senator?

DIDN'T ANSWER 176 QUESTIONS

On other occasions, Mr. Stimson was not quite so eager to volunteer his opinion or so voluble in expressing it. The congressional committee investigating Pearl Harbor sought him as a witness, for he had a very close association with the events at issue. Mr. Stimson pleaded illness and never came before the committee. He was sent 176 questions in writing by a member of the committee minority. He answered none of them. The same Senator addressed 61 additional questions to him. His answers, according to the minority, did not make up for the deficiencies in his earlier failure to respond.

Now, in upbraiding Senator MCCARTHY for what he implies is an improper way to conduct an investigation, Mr. Stimson says that the Senator should have relied on "the fully developed and tested procedure of the executive branch of the Government." That is, he should have let the executive branch render judgment on its own appointees through the Loyalty Review Board, appointed by Mr. Truman and presided over by Seth W. Richardson, general counsel of the Pearl Harbor investigation, which led to an administration whitewash.

Mr. Stimson may remember that the "fully developed and tested procedure" of the New Deal majority in the Pearl Harbor inquiry saved him embarrassment. The majority voted to deny itself access to his diary and made no effort to insist upon his answering the 176 questions which were highly pertinent to the inquiry.

Perhaps Senator MCCARTHY has not the same faith in the "tested procedures" that Mr. Stimson has.

Soil Conservation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie (Ind.) Press of April 1, 1950:

SOIL CONSERVATION NEEDED

New dust storms sweeping priceless topsoil off unprotected farms in the western Great Plains lend a fresh urgency to calls for conservation.

A couple of years ago the Nation saw quite a flurry of books deploring in alarming tones the wasting of United States natural resources, particularly our best soils. They caused a big stir for a while, and then an almost inevitable reaction.

Critics, some of whom didn't like the gloomy mood of these books, sought to minimize the dangers. The fears were exaggerated, they said. American scientific ingenuity would keep us all in foodstuffs no matter what happened to our topsoil.

Some cited experiments indicating rich crops might be grown in the subsoil, the coarse layer lying beneath the fine topsoil so often washed or blown away. They suggested, too, that the expanding chemical age will turn up many new soil-enriching ingredients to add to present-day fertilizers. It was even hinted that subsoils thus built up would be better than the best topsoils.

It would be foolish to say these things will not happen. The chemical age is indeed producing many miracles, and tomorrow's discoveries might revolutionize agriculture speedily.

Yet the one thing all these rosy forecasts ignored was how much these possibly potent soil builders might cost. Farmers today are finding it expensive to doctor their lands with existing fertilizers on an increasing scale to offset mineral depletion caused by heavy cultivation through the war and postwar period. There's good reason to believe any new enriching elements might also prove costly.

The critics can't get away from the fact that good topsoil spread over the land to a depth of several inches is a tremendously valuable natural resource. If it is carried away by wind or water, its food-producing chemicals must be replaced or the stripped land becomes sterile and nonproductive.

None of the critics was able to refute the documented facts of soil depletion. On that point the conservationists quoted Government authorities with chapter and verse. Millions of tons of life-supporting soil lie useless today at the bottom of the oceans and bays where they were borne by silt-laden rivers. Other millions of tons have been caught up in swirling winds and deposited hundreds of miles away as worthless dust.

The dust storms of 1950 thus far are but a faint reminder of the tragic winds of the 1930's when thousands of farms were ruined. But maybe they'll help us to buckle down to the job of preserving the rich soil we still have. It's both cheaper and safer than counting on scientific wizardry to rescue us from folly.

Conservation of America's Soil Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every Member of this House is impressed with the importance of conservation of America's soil resources. I believe also that every Member who is familiar with the work of the Soil Conservation Service appreciates the significant task which this agency is performing in educating farmers and rendering technical assistance in preserving our Nation's irreplaceable topsoil.

A valued friend of mine and a sincere soil conservationist has furnished me with a copy of Chester W. Gee's Creed of the Soil Conservationist. I am pleased to insert a copy of that statement in the RECORD:

CREED OF THE SOIL CONSERVATIONIST

(By C. W. Gee)

As a soil conservationist, I believe God created the earth by His divine processes for the benefit of man, not one man, nor one generation, but mankind for all time.

I believe the Almighty gave man an inheritance of the earth, not to be hoarded as a miser guards his treasure, but to be used with wisdom and in the fullest for the perpetual benefit of all men.

I believe all of mankind, regardless of race or creed are entitled to a fair and equitable share of the earth's bounty commensurate with their own efforts. But in so believing, I hold the irrevocable conviction that man himself owes earth a debt of respect and fealty.

I believe that whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap; that he who manages

his fields, pastures, woodlands, and streams with respect and wisdom shall reap the bountiful harvest and so shall his descendants, while he who uses them selfishly, thinking only of his own immediate gain, shall bring to grief his land, himself, and his children's children.

Holding these beliefs to be true, I dedicate myself to the task of helping my fellow men realize their own personal responsibility in conserving the earth for the generations which follow them. To this end I shall devote my best knowledge in guiding the efforts of those who till the soil so that the land which nurtures us shall be fruitful without end.

For truly, the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, but the responsibility for its stewardship is vested in man.

Partition of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered before the Federation of American Associations for Irish Independence on Sunday evening, April 2, 1950, in Philadelphia:

Thanks for inviting me to join you. We are here tonight because Irish blood flows in our veins. Our principal concern is to voice our objection to partition of Ireland. Our ancestors and present-day Irishmen and their friends have suffered and worked to achieve a fractional victory. We express our deep gratitude while we pledge our every effort to increase that fraction from twenty-six-thirty-seconds to thirty-two-thirty-seconds to make Ireland one. I say Irish blood flows in our veins. We could have other backgrounds and our hearts and our minds would be the same in this fight. If we believe in the right of small nations to self-determination—if we adhere to the principle that powers of government should be derived from the consent of the governed—then we might be Swedish or Czechoslovakian or Danish and we could take no stand other than the one we are advocating tonight.

We come as Americans who love our form of democracy. We bring a notable page from our history to show how our own Nation fought partition. It took 4 years of bloody civil war to fulfill Daniel Webster's words, "The Union will and must be preserved." The great Civil War President, Abraham Lincoln: "On what rightful principle may a State, being not more than one-fiftieth part of the Nation in soil and population, break up the Nation and then coerce a proportionally larger subdivision of itself, in the most arbitrary way? What mysterious right to play tyrant is conferred on a district of a country, with its people, by merely calling it a State?"

There are some issues that can be compromised to the benefit of all. This is not one of them. At this time an American Congressman has every right to voice publicly, and for possible publication, his denunciation of partition. An Atlantic Pact has been formed, of which we are a member. It commits our blood and our treasure to the common defense against communism. One of its purposes is to make democracy look attractive to that portion of the world where majority rule is denied or where it is wavering. With us Great Britain is a member of that pact. She has before her our example of granting complete independence to the Philippines. So when Americans urge the same treatment for Ireland we are consistent. When a fellow pact member is less than that, our mutual cause is damaged before the world. We have every right to tell our partner that he is causing embarrassment to his fellow members.

To put it mildly, this whole history of partition reveals a lack of sincerity on the part of the British. It was first proposed by Prime Minister Herbert Asquith in 1912. His Liberal Party had introduced a home-rule bill for all Ireland which was withdrawn because of tory pressure. This took the form of threats of force and actual mutiny by British Army brass hats. A substitute was prepared which provided for cutting off four Ulster counties. Before this went into operation World War I occurred, and the legislation was tabled while Britain went to war to secure the freedom of small nations. In fact, Premier Asquith named that as the motive when he said in the House of Commons: "We are fighting to vindicate the principle that small nations are not to be crushed * * * by the arbitrary will of a stronger and overmastering power." Home rule was promised at the end of that war, one in which 300,000 Irishmen served and 50,000 gave their lives.

Partition came up again in 1916. The uprising was brutally crushed, and its leaders were executed. It was outside pressure, mainly from this country, which finally compelled Britain to seek some solution to the Irish question. Prime Minister Lloyd George persuaded the leaders of the Irish parliamentary party to accept a home-rule bill which excluded some Ulster counties. This, he assured them, would be temporary. But at that very time he wrote a letter to Sir Edward Carson, Belfast Tory leader, "We must make it clear that Ulster does not, whether she wills it or not, merge in the rest of Ireland."

So great was the popular reaction against partition that the proposal was abandoned and the Irish parliamentary party, which had accepted it, was defeated at the polls in the next general election of 1918. In their place the people elected representatives pledged to an independent and united Ireland. These democratically elected representatives of the Irish people met in Dublin in January 1919 and established (Dial Erin) Dail Eireann, the Parliament of Ireland. In the name of the Irish Nation they declared the independence of Ireland, just as a band of patriots once did for America but seven city blocks from where you are now sitting.

It took 2 years for the British to put partition into operation, 2 years after the Irish people had willed their complete independence at the polls. When the 1920 Government of Ireland Act, partitioning the country, passed Parliament, it did not receive the vote of any Irish Member of Commons, not even those who represented what is now called Northern Ireland.

That is the manner in which partition was accomplished. It has been continued by the British, in spite of the overwhelming majority verdict at the polls that has been expressed against it. It is not a very enticing sample to show the customers who are scrutinizing the Atlantic Pact member nations. It is more in the iron-curtain pattern than western democracy.

Most of us want to forget the mistakes of yesteryears. Everyone here tonight would like to see Ireland and Britain side by side and friendly. Each needs the other, but only when both are completely free. We would like to dismiss from our minds the old British foreign-affairs strategy of divide and conquer. As a boy I read of her sweet Christian intercession in India. The Hindus and the Mohammedans would fly at each other's necks the moment Britain withdrew her troops. Well, the regiments have been called home, and Pakistan and Hindustan are engrossed in building up home industries at a merry rate. Both are doing a pretty fair job at keeping the peace without any outside assistance.

I mention this because it illustrates how the British Foreign Office, on occasion, has put their nation in the light of peacemaker or averter of internal strife. So some peoples elsewhere have this impression: Ireland is a nation composed of Catholics, all of whom are in the South, and Protestants, all of whom are in the North. Kindly Britain keeps them from committing mass murders of one another. Were it not for their sweet neighbor, Ireland would be entirely depopulated after one March 17 and one July 12. No Irishman would survive to see what use was ever made of the H-bomb. Heaven would have an immediate and tremendous housing problem imposed upon it. But Britain, full of sweetness and light, prevents all this from coming to pass.

Of course we know there is no religious problem in Ireland, while the country is preponderantly Catholic, there is religious liberty in the 26 counties when men run for office there is otttimes less attention given to their church affiliation than is sometimes accorded to candidates here in America. Through the centuries there have been many Protestant national leaders, and more than a few of the present-day topnotchers in political life are Protestants. Moreover, they want a united Ireland. If this sentiment for unity were not so prevalent, why does Britain have to resort to the most flagrant gerrymandering witnessed anywhere on the globe? This makes a complete farce of the election system, as practiced in a democracy, on a serious question like that of nationhood.

Of this Mr. De Valera said: "If they left it to be settled in the ordinary democratic way by a majority vote of the Irish people resident in our island home, it could be settled overnight. But British statesmen apparently do not like the settlement that would ensue. Our island has therefore to be gerrymandered and remain gerrymandered into two areas. The one designed to give in perpetuity the result that British statesmen desire, though it is in violation of every principle of justice and fair play.

"The crippling of our nation by the division of its people and its resources, and the frustration of its national will, are to be of no account. The integrity of the selected gerrymandered area is now to be formally guaranteed. The supporters of British policy concentrated in the neighborhood of Belfast, are to be assured a continuing domination over the majorities in Derry City, in the counties of Tyrone and Fermanagh, and in South Armagh, South Down, and East Down.

"Having contrived and left us with an intolerable situation, British statesmen are now trying to shuffle off their responsibility. But the Irish people will not cease to hold Britain responsible. Britain has created this position. Britain has maintained this position. She has sought to consolidate it. That design must be opposed by the Irish race, by every means that is effective and just."

Something of consequence to the discussion of partition happened a few days ago in Congress and something important is about to occur in the way of a new arrival. Whatever the effect of the Fogarty amendment on foreign aid in the House, it will serve to attract greater American interest on the subject of complete Irish independence. Then, too, we hear we are to have a visitor.

We can hail him as an individual while we detest everything he stands for in his official capacity. Who can criticize my old friend, the Mayor of New York, for not greeting him at the city hall? Press photographers would record the handshake and under the picture could appear copy which might infer Irish-American acceptance, or at least indifference. When he comes to Washington, you can depend upon it I will not even say "Hello" within camera shot. But, like you, I want him to visit America, and above all, I want him to talk. Let him discuss the Irish question that is uppermost in the American mind. Here is his grand opportunity to debate partition on the radio and television. Some of us will use what influence we have with the broadcasting chains to get him time, and plenty of it.

We have the men, in and out of public life, who can present our side of the controversy. If partition can stand the white glare of American public opinion, then our visitor should be eager to use every radio and television minute that is offered to him for fair debate. There can be no way quite so important of devoting his time in America. If his cause is just, the American listener will discern that.

For in the final analysis it is our public opinion which will determine how our good-will (and I mean really good-will) toward Britain is headed. The two nations have a common destiny from here on out. We are playing for the high stakes of freedom and democracy. And the world we seek to win and to hold says that freedom and democracy, like charity, must begin at home.

Somehow, I have a feeling tonight that we are going into the late innings of the game. Too bad we cannot have with us all those who contributed so much to Irish freedom. But I cannot help believing that victory is within sight. This is a time that calls for vigilance and making our influence felt. It will mean genuine peace within our own western nations when Ireland can take her place amongst us with dignity. It will mean a common front against today's tremendous menace—communism.

Make no bones about it, when the chips are down, Britain fights beside us. We want good relations with her, but they can never be good while there is a partitioned Ireland. We say to her, "Clean your house so that the Atlantic pact can go before the world unsullied. Take one of your blackest pages and make it white as snow. The Irish are a forgiving and patient people. But there is a point at which patience ceases to be a virtue. Part with the past and face the future united and as friends. Everything in the Irish heritage demands it. Everything in the American heritage eagerly desires it."

No other country had her boundaries set for her by a provident creator. There she is, entirely surrounded by salt water, a natural entity if there ever was one. No man-made line should ever divide her. Please God, one day soon, none shall.

Acheson's Appointments of New Deal Republicans Won't Fool Those Who Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the President and his Secretary of State are making frantic efforts once more to play politics with the national interest and to attempt by subtle methods to squelch discussion of our national problems. They are trying to revive the so-called, miscalled bipartisan foreign policy, which proved to be a snare and a delusion to the people of this country in 1944 and in 1948 and will prove to be so again if the Republicans fall for this line of baloney.

The mere fact that Dean Acheson, friend of Alger Hiss, should name a former New Deal-voting Republican to a high Department of State assignment does not obligate me, or any other Republican in office, to follow Mr. Acheson down his trail to ruin for America.

Dean Acheson can appoint 1, 10, or 100 nominal Republicans—of the stripe he and the Fair Dealers find useful—to high-sounding but meaningless posts in the Department of State. That is his prerogative. But if he thinks that in so doing he is going to revive the so-called bipartisan foreign policy, which strangled the Republicans and left them gagged and helpless in 1948, he has another think coming.

Foreign policy and domestic policy are so closely interrelated today that it is impossible for a logical person to swallow the administration's foreign policy without swallowing the economic absurdities it preaches at home. The foreign policy moves—spending billions in Europe, literally pouring it down rat holes—causes higher taxes in America, makes prices go up, causes people to be strapped for money, and encourages them to think of moves of how to get their hands into the Federal Treasury. A dupe may argue that he supports all these overseas projects and yet is against socialism at home, but no informed and aware person can argue that way.

A foreign policy leads to something internationally. It also leads to something domestically. The British foreign policy, which never has been bipartisan regardless of how often you hear this lie repeated, has led to one thing for Great Britain—first, the development of great social differences—chasms of economic difference—and then, straight to socialism. The British people cannot vote against socialism any more. They already have socialism, whether Churchill wins, Attlee wins, or whoever wins over there. That is because Great Britain's foreign policy has denuded the taxpayers of Great Britain. It has sapped the nation's vitality. It has given rise to pressures that made socialism inevitable there, just as our foreign policy today is giving rise to pressures that, unless stopped, will make socialism inevitable in America.

I have consistently opposed the so-called bipartisan foreign policy since the late President Roosevelt cleverly unfolded it in anticipation of the political campaign of 1944. It served in that year as a gag on Thomas E. Dewey. But Dewey did not feel the strangling hands of this bipartisan ghost fully enough. He allowed himself to become gagged with the same fallacies in 1948. A great many Members of the Republican Party, many of them no longer with us, felt the same terrific results.

Every poll taken has shown the people are overwhelmingly opposed to these huge appropriations of American money to European nations. Every poll shows the people are opposed to Communists, would-be Communists, fellow travelers, or Russian-lovers in the Department of State. Yet, we have had a succession of these small men in the very highest posts. The stream of them never seems to end. One leaves and another takes his place. Again and again and again, America has been sold short.

Yet, we hear apparently intelligent men standing around telling one another that we must have a bipartisan foreign policy. That is sheer tommyrot, utter drivel, and pure political cant. It is so fallacious, so unreasoning, so deadening, so intellectually dishonest, I cannot understand how intelligent men can fall for it.

The Republican leadership has been foolish now for 20 years. In the past 6 months, there has been a reawakening among rank-and-file Republicans and citizens who believe in America, regardless of party. That reawakening has come in spite of commentators, do-gooders, and a veritable avalanche of propaganda. At long last, Messrs. Truman, Acheson, and company see their policies slipping out of public favor.

What is the first old strategem that occurs to them to get out of the closet, dust off, and use again? The so-called, miscalled bipartisan foreign policy. If the Republican leaders fall again for this drivel, the Republican elephant might as well lie down and die quietly.

Labor Dedicates Its Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMAN C. CROOK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an excerpt from the CIO Union News of Indianapolis, Ind.

Organized labor has had a very unique evolution in its dedicated efforts to sustain working conditions conducive to providing respect for the integrity of the human soul, healthful working conditions, collective bargaining, reasonable working hours, education, wholesome family life, security for the twilight years of life, and a fair remuneration for its part in creating the wealth of our Nation.

We, today, are a better and stronger Nation by virtue of organized labor. Its courageous and militant fight in behalf of the workingman has been no different from that of numerous other organized agencies given inception to preserve the rights of certain segments of our people. Organized labor was born of necessity to cope with many other agencies that too frequently were guilty of exploitation and slave labor.

By virtue of the fact that organized labor fully realizes what it has done in the way of promoting and protecting the rights of the working man and woman living in this, the greatest democracy in the world, it now proposes not to turn

back the wheels of time and partake further of the treatment netted in of the yesterdays. This fact is fully predicated by an excerpt from the CIO Union News of Indianapolis, Ind., entitled "A Word to the Wise," of which Neal W. Edwards, president of the Indiana CIO, is the author, and it reads as follows:

In labor's quest for a sound and logical solution to its social and economic problems, imposed on it by big business under the capitalistic system (free enterprise at its worst, if you please), we attempt to carefully consider and analyze the many and varied phases of the labor-versus management conflicts. On what battle front did these conflicts originate? What sparks led up to the creation of these conflicts? What was the ultimate end, or was there an end?

Will there ever be an ending to this age-old war between the two forces * * * one the producer and the other coupon clipper? I hardly think so, unless there is a complete turnabout in the present system practiced by the greedy monopolistic-minded lords of finance. Therefore, it behooves labor to strengthen its bailiwick to enforce their demands for their rightful portion of the goods they produce.

The first American workers realized, as have those who followed in their wake, that if they were to realize even a bare subsistence from their labors, they must join hands and unite all the forces of labor under one banner. It becomes as increasingly and alarmingly apparent today (as it did to our forebears, that to get even a living wage or fair treatment from the employer can only be accomplished by the united efforts of many. It cannot be accomplished by a few or on an individual basis. Therefore, the first American workers had no alternative and the workers of today have no alternative but to band together into strong trade-unions.

LABOR REVERTS TO THE KNUTS

Labor will never go back to industrial serfdom for labor realizes and justifiably so that it is the pulse of industrial might. Without labor, there would be no capital, there would be no coal mined or Chryslers built. (Some few are beginning to realize that fact.) Labor planted the wheat and milled and made it into bread. There is nothing made by man of which labor had no part. While the du Ponts and their like have their fingers in every pie to pull the juicy plums, it must be remembered that labor made the pie and has a right to a fair portion of the pie. Without labor, there would be absolutely nothing.

Much was accomplished by the first trade-unions in solving part of their problems and many advancements that labor enjoys today were gained through the courageous and skilled efforts of these ancestors of the present-day American laborer, who out of sheer necessity and a strong urge to see their children enjoy more benefits and opportunities than they had realized, took the steps necessary to establish a beachhead. It took real courage in those days to buck the employer and his hirelings, coal and iron police, State militia, Pinkertons, and hired strikebreakers. Some of our large corporations spent a great deal of their profits to maintain highly organized and very efficient espionage systems. During the early thirties, the La Follette investigating committee proved beyond a doubt that many corporations were spending hundreds of thousands of dollars for spies, finks, guns and ammunition, tear gas, etc. Despite all this, labor has advanced.

WHAT MORE WILL DO FOR MONEY

Much more could have been accomplished and far greater gains achieved had it not been for the traitors within labor's ranks who for personal gain, were willing to sell their fellow unionists out to the industrialists, for a few pieces of silver—blood money for the informers.

In their desire for personal gain and prestige, they were blinded and did not see the sweat dropping from the undernourished and half-naked bodies of men working long, strenuous hours under unbelievably rotten, revolting conditions. The tinkle of the silver in their hands and the promise of lucrative positions offering them further prestige, drowned out the anguished cries of the oppressed workers whose spilled blood denoted the supreme sacrifice they offered to the cause of labor. They failed to see the tears of the widows and orphans brought about by their being individuals devoid of principles. These traitorous stoolpigeons sold their souls, wrecked the unions and the lives of their neighbors and families.

A REAL UNION MAN

A real union man, whose sole interest is the betterment of mankind, wonders why anyone with the least semblance of morals or principles would stoop to this level. He knows by personal experience and his knowledge of the past history of the labor movement that his salvation and that of his children rests in his being a member of a strong union. He is aware that his everyday wants and needs will be forthcoming only when he participates jointly with his fellow workers in a valiant show of economic strength.

Loyalty to his union and the principles for which it stands are the uppermost thoughts in his mind. Little does he realize how easy it is to inflate the ego of certain individuals and how easy it is to appeal to the grasping natures of these same individuals.

The industrialist knows and uses this knowledge at every opportunity to weaken the union which he hopes to eventually break, usually by pitting one worker against another under the speed-up system, by showing favoritism with promises of job advancement, and the use of spies and finks to infiltrate labor's ranks.

THE SELL-OUT BOYS

And so it goes. When management feels labor is getting too strong economically or politically, they resort to practically the same methods, using the same type of individuals for their tools—the sell-out boys. For a few pieces of silver and the promise of political advancement, these individuals become willing tools in the hands of the financial lords. They forget their union and close their hearts and minds to the pleading from their friends and once fellow unionists, completely ignoring those who made it possible for them to be in their present position through zealous effort and smarting sacrifice, both morally and financially.

Such individuals, devoid of conscience yes, destitute of honor, little realize that should labor lose its political foothold and the advancements gained therewith, they, too, will lose their dubious position. They will be left alone with a newly awakened conscience to torment them. They will have lost the respect of their former labor associates. And the heartless industrialists who used them as tools against their own people will cast them aside as tools no longer needed.

Then these smart boys, self-esteemed shrewd politicians will learn the agonizing torment of a guilty conscience as did Benedict Arnold, the infamous traitor.

AS I SEE IT

I deem it neither advisable or necessary at this time to point the finger of guilt at any particular individual, but should it become necessary at some future date to successfully eliminate the possibilities of a complete breakdown or even the lessening of the tempo of our well-oiled machine, I certainly will not hesitate to expose them regardless of the consequence, or where the chips may fall.

We would like and do believe that the overwhelming majority of our members are honest, sincere, and militant. But in many instances each barrel, "due to pressure," has at least one bad apple. Let us not dispose of the entire barrel in order to get the one bad apple.

This is not a threat. It is a promise.

In the 1950 elections, we shall maintain our previous stand of being independent voters, owing our allegiance to neither political party. We will call on our CIO members to cast their vote accordingly, urging them and our friends to support candidates on their past record, or new political aspirants on their pledge to support liberal legislation regardless of party ties.

We have not, as some would have you believe, endorsed and supported candidates running on the Democratic ticket merely because they were Democrats. It was because ordinarily more liberals are running on the Democratic ticket than on the Republican. One needs only to check the voting records of State legislators or that of the United States Congress to find the source of the majority of our liberal votes. Despite the fact that we have a few liberal Republicans and quite a few reactionary Democrats, we will continue to toss bouquets to our friends and bricks at our enemies, either within or without our union.

Selection of Hon. Stuart Symington as Chairman of National Security Resources Board Brings Man of Proven Ability to One of Nation's Most Important Posts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement by President Truman that he was calling upon his able and trusted aide, Hon. W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force, to take over the Chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board has generally been greeted with approbation. Mr. Symington is an administrator of proven ability and through his dynamic personality and far-sighted vision has been of inestimable value in the welding of a great and unified defense force for our Nation. His elevation to the new post will give new impetus to one of the most important tasks in our national life and will further bring to our citizens the sense of security to be gained from the knowledge that the direction of our defense and security resources lies in good hands. The people of Tennessee and of the Fifth District of Tennessee hold Mr. Symington in high regard and I am pleased in this connection to ask consent that there be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent editorial from the Nashville Tennessean concerning Mr. Symington's appointment.

The editorial is as follows:

MAJOR TASK IN GOOD HANDS

President Truman's appointment of Secretary of Air W. Stuart Symington as chairman of the National Security Resources Board can be taken as a sign that atomic-age civilian defense will now get the attention it deserves.

The country, we think, has been laggard in organizing to meet the different kind of war that will be experienced in the future. There has been a recognition of need for action, but a strange reluctance to face up to the job. In Washington there has been a prevailing fear that the peoples' nerves would be shaken by a candid approach to the need of preparing for atomic attacks.

Instead of being alarmed at evidence that this Nation-wide task will be undertaken without further delay, the national attitude actually should be one of approval.

As Secretary for Air since 1947, Mr. Symington has shown himself to be an efficient administrator. He has brought the Air Force up to a high standard of efficiency by the same qualities that will be helpful to the Security Resources Board.

With the ability to fuse new life into the Board, Mr. Symington can be expected to make rapid progress on an assignment that calls for understanding and administrative skill. Although his new role brings less monetary reward, it is unexcelled in importance to the security of civil and industrial life.

In all Washington circles, the new chairman enjoys the confidence that will encourage helpful cooperation. His standing with the civilian population also is of the highest, thereby paving the way to rapid progress in a field where any more delay could be extremely dangerous.

Attacks on the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Thomas L. Stokes, from the Buffalo Evening News:

[From the Buffalo Evening News of March 30, 1950]

THOMAS L. STOKES SAYS "CHARGES BY McCARTHY SET NEIGHBOR AGAINST NEIGHBOR"

WASHINGTON, March 30.—Senator JOE McCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, has done enough damage to our Government and to its prestige and that of our Nation abroad in a very critical era by his wild and slanderous charges about persons in the State Department from behind the cloak of his congressional immunity.

But he has started something even more insidious and poisonous here at home. It affects the lives of people of probity and decency, their right to privacy and freedom from annoyance and persecution. And if it spreads, it could set neighbor against neighbor in a ghastly un-American fashion.

Because of the terrible significance of this modern witch hunt and because you may have overlooked what has happened here to people like yourselves—decent, law-abiding citizens, and their families—the experiences in two cases is recited, as they were told to the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee investigating the McCarthy charges.

Speaking in the first instance, is Mrs. Esther Caulkin Brunauer, who has served faithfully in the State Department:

"In my household there are two small children and an elderly grandmother, besides myself and my huband. We are all upset and bewildered. Since March 13 (when McCARTHY made his charges about her) we have received anonymous telephone calls at all hours of the day and night, accompanied by threats and profanity, with such advice as 'get out of this neighborhood, you Communists, or you will be carried out in a box.'

"All of you who have families will realize the effects this has on the atmosphere of a home. You know how much you would feel it if it was happening in your home. Senator McCARTHY may have his own reasons for what he has done and the way he has done it, but I will never be able to understand them."

Speaking, in the second instance, is Haldore Hanson, Associated Press reporter during the China-Japanese war, who has been in the State Department for 4 years. He told how in the farm community in which he lives in nearby Virginia one neighbor had called him a "Russian spy" and "that Communist."

"My latest information of this kind," he said, "concerns a meeting of a county agricultural committee at Leesburg at which a Virginia State official from Richmond denounced the growing number of Communists in Government and named me as one of them."

Mr. Hanson challenged Senator McCARTHY to say outside what he had said about him under his congressional immunity and he would sue the Senator. But the Senator does not accept the challenge, though he said in his speech in the Senate February 20, when he began making his charges about State Department personnel that "I will not say anything on the Senate floor which I will not say off the floor. On the day when I take advantage of the security we have on the Senate floor, on that day I will resign from the Senate. Anything I say on the floor of the Senate at any time will be repeated off the floor."

[From the Buffalo Evening News of March 28, 1950]

THOMAS L. STOKES SAYS "GOP LIBERALS TAKE ISSUE WITH DRIVE ON ACHESON"

WASHINGTON, March 28.—The Senator JOE McCARTHY Communists in the State Department flimflam has shoved the Republican Party into an obviously uncomfortable spot.

This was dramatized when one of the party's elder statesmen, Henry L. Stimson, took pen in hand to disclose the danger, both to the party and to the Nation, of the whole shabby episode in a staunch defense of Secretary of State Dean Acheson whom he commended for his "extraordinary record of able and distinguished public service." He warned his party against the little men who are seeking to make a political issue out of the attacks by the Wisconsin Republican Senator which Mr. Stimson frankly recognized as a political attack aimed at the present Secretary of State.

It was significant that his letter to the New York Times giving his views was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator IVES, Republican of New York, a close associate of Governor Dewey who heads the more progressive and international-minded wing of the party.

This issue seems to divide the party along familiar lines.

For it is the Midwest nationalist wing of the party that set up the hue and cry against Secretary Acheson, and is whipping up the McCarthy witch hunt. Noisiest is Senator WHERRY of Nebraska, Republican floor leader, while Senator TAFT of Ohio, chairman of the party's Senate Policy Committee, has given his support to the Wisconsin Senator's still fruitless search for Communists in the State Department by revealing he had urged his colleague to push the matter "and if one case doesn't work to bring up others." This, and his statement that the reaction to the McCarthy charges seems to be good on the whole, disturbed some of the Ohio Senator's friends because of the frank political connotation.

The progressive wing of the party apparently has taken sharp issue with such an attitude. It obviously shares the opinion of Mr. Stimson who concluded his letter by saying that "this is no time to let the noisy antics of a few upset the steady purpose of our country or distract our leaders from their proper tasks.

"This is rather a time for stern rebuke of such antics and outspoken support of the distinguished public servants against whom they are directed."

The nervousness of Republicans over the position in which Senator McCARTHY has put them was best revealed in a Senate speech by Senator SMITH, Republican of New Jersey, who placed himself timidly on all sides of the issue. He did not want it in partisan politics. He said, on the one hand, that he is supporting Senator McCARTHY; but, on the other, he regretted to see innocent people injured. Then he urged that the rest of the proceedings be in closed session.

Who, it might well be asked, put the matter in politics?

Mr. Stimson—though he never used JOE McCARTHY'S name—seemed to understand easily enough, and he said that "the man who seeks to gain political advantage from personal attack on a Secretary of State is a man who seeks political advantage from damage to his country." That would apply, of course, to others who are doing that. He also said:

"It is already obvious that in any test of public confidence the men of honor, in both parties, will choose to stand with the Secretary."

The President's Water Resources Policy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the American Public Power Association on March 30, 1950, passed the appended resolution commending the establishment of the President's Water Resources Commission. The association also joined in the principle of deferment of major changes in water resources legislation pending the report of the Commission in December 1950.

Resolution 2

President's Water Resources Policy Commission

Whereas on January 3, 1950, the President appointed a Water Resources Policy Commission of seven members, with major instructions as follows:

"The President's Water Resources Policy Commission shall study, and make recommendations to the President with respect to, Federal responsibility for and participation in the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources, including related land uses and other public purposes to the extent that they are directly concerned with water resources. The Commission shall give consideration in particular to (a) the extent and character of Federal Government participation in major water-resources programs, (b) an appraisal of the priority of water-resources programs from the standpoint of economic and social need, (c) criteria and standards for evaluating the feasibility of water-resources projects, and (d) desirable legislation or changes in existing

legislation relating to the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources"; and

Whereas the President directed the Commission to submit its report not later than December 1, 1950; and

Whereas in a covering letter January 9, 1950, to Chairman Morris L. Cooke, of the Commission, the President said:

"In many cases, piecemeal or partial approaches to a problem as broad as water resources development tend to confuse, rather than clarify, many of the basic, underlying issues. It is essential, in my judgment, that a comprehensive study and review be made of all existing water-resources legislation and policies and that recommendations be made in the full knowledge of national needs and objectives"; and

Whereas the President, in his budget message of January 1950, said, with respect to the Water Resources Policy Commission:

"Some changes in present Federal legislation can and should be made at this session of the Congress, but major changes should be deferred until the Commission's recommendations are available": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association commends the establishment of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, and recommends that consideration of legislation making major changes in Federal water-resources legislation be deferred until the Commission shall have made its report and recommendations.

The president and executive committee of the American Public Power Association are directed to cooperate with the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, and to designate committees or personnel for consultation with and assistance to the Commission.

Backing Up Our Statesmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a letter appearing on the editorial page of the New York Times, published March 30, 1950. The letter is as follows:

BACKING UP OUR STATESMEN—LINCOLN'S REMARKS RECALLED REGARDING CRITICISM OF GOVERNMENT

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Most of us have our own petty problems and are engrossed with them. There are very few Americans who have the time, the energy, the experience, the poise, the perseverance, the intellect, the character, and the power to understand, grapple with, and solve the delicate international problems of tremendous moment which confront us today. The men responsible for formulating our foreign policy and deciding upon national action need all of their capacities for the great work remaining before them.

Our world leadership, our national security, perhaps our existence as a powerful, prosperous, independent Nation, all require that the President and the Secretary of State devote their efforts to the utmost to achieve and cherish just, lasting, and honorable peace with all nations. This is not a part-time task. If world government is the only alternative to world cataclysm we should decide and act before it is too late. The formulation of this national policy requires calm, intense, deliberate thinking. Leadership, statesmanship, and vision of the highest order are indispensable lest we, leaderless like the swine described in the Bible, rush over the cliffs to destruction on the rocks and in the sea far below.

Democrats and Republicans alike have learned to relish Abraham Lincoln's quaint sayings and revere his homely but persuasive philosophy. When a congressional committee, a Senator, a Representative, an editor, indeed any man or woman, is moved hereafter to nag, badger, or attack our President and our Secretary of State solely for personal or political advantage or for any other selfish or unpatriotic motive let him pause and reflect. Let all of us heed what President Lincoln said to a committee which came to him with a complaint from the West:

"Gentlemen, suppose all the property you were worth was in gold and you had to put it in the hands of Blondin, to carry across the Niagara River on a rope. Would you shake the cable or keep shouting at him, 'Blondin, stand up a little straighter; Blondin, stoop a little more; go a little faster; lean a little more to the north; lean a little more to the south'? No, you would hold your breath as well as your tongue, and keep your hands off until he was safe over. The Government is carrying an enormous weight. Untold treasures are in their hands; they are doing the very best they can. Don't badger them. Keep silence, and we will get you safe across."

HAROLD J. BAILY.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *March 26, 1950*.

The Economic Cooperation Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in order that the membership of the House, as well as the people I have the honor to represent in Congress, may understand my position in reference to the $250,000,000 cut in ECA funds, I should like to give my reasons for voting for this reduction.

In the first place, Mr. Paul Hoffman, Administrator of the ECA program, reported to the House Committee on Appropriations that there was a balance of $150,000,000 from the amount appropriated for this work last year. In addition to that, we all know that many of the countries which are participants under the Marshall plan had abundant crops last year, and they have gone a long way toward rehabilitation of their war-torn countries and the need is not nearly so great as immediately after cessation of hostilities.

The Appropriations Committee has seen fit to cut appropriations all along the line, and I have been in favor of most of those curtailments. In many instances the reductions made by the committee were as much as 50 percent as was done in the appropriation for a survey and dredging of the Baltimore Harbor in my own State, the largest port of entry in the United States from a standpoint of tonnage handled. We have appropriated money under the technical cooperation program for every conceivable kind of assistance such as economic, engineering, medical, educational, agricultural, fishery, mineral and fiscal surveys, demonstration, training, and similar projects, in other words, assistance from the cradle to the grave.

I was fully in accord with the purposes of the Marshall plan in helping these stricken nations to get back on their feet economically, but I am not in favor of the American people footing the bill for the economic development for all the backward nations in the world. There must be an end to this kind of spending sometime.

I have talked with a great many people this year who were in various European countries last year. Without a single exception, they reported the people they saw were well dressed, apparently well fed, and that they encountered no shortage of food, clothing, or other necessities.

Mr. Speaker, if I am the only Member of the House who insists upon the tremendous appropriations for all kinds of hand-outs and subsidies being reduced to a point where we can balance our budget and get this country back on a sound economic basis, I intend to do it, but the vote on the $250,000,000 cut in ECA funds indicates there are many who agree with the position I have taken.

God Is Our Judge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Catholic Monitor, by Joseph Marchiselli:

"He who say I love God and hates his brother is a liar." 1 John 4: 20.

I am happy I am not a Negro. Not that I would be ashamed if I were, for no one should be ashamed of how God made him. I am happy I am not a Negro because I certainly would not like to be treated like they are.

An example of how the Negro is regarded in this country was recently typified by the manner in which the FEPC bill was handled in the United States Congress. That spectacle is an indictment on the American people that will never be lived down until the end of time. Like Caesar, that bill was assassinated not only by its sworn enemies, as represented by the coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans, but also by those representatives who shouted their approval of it, but like Brutus, assisted in its death by conveniently hiding behind the labyrinthical technicalities of parliamentary procedure.

The Fair Employment Practice Act is, or was, a measure to create a commission with power to see that discrimination in employment is not used against men or women because of their color or creed. It was not to be a law to grant special privileges, but to restore to the discriminated minorities, especially the Negroes, a right given them by God and taken away from them by men—the right to live.

There are 17,000,000 Negroes in this country and the biggest percentage of these human beings are Americans by many more generations than many of the other races that make up our heterogeneous population. The preamble to the Declaration of Independence included the Negroes, I'm sure, when it said: "That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Let us examine our hearts and conscience and see what these high-sounding phrases have meant to these people. The last to be hired and the first to be fired, their employment consists of mostly porters, charwomen, elevatormen, track walkers, red caps, coal stokers, waiters, and all such menial jobs. They are denied entrance in many colleges and universities, so that they could not even aspire to their educational and cultural ambitions.

By denying them of the right to live we have forced them into poverty, squalor; forced them to live with two and three families in one vermin-infested apartment, where they never breathe clean air.

What has come of this economic slavery of the Negroes? What could be expected but debauchery, crime, disease, prostitution, and sex perversion. Surely, if you treat a man like a beast he will react like a beast.

If we believe in God, we must accept His teaching that He created all living creatures; that He created the black as well as the white man; that He created the world for all men to have dominion over the fowls of the air, the fishes of the sea, the beasts of the forest, and the resources of the earth.

We went to Germany to destroy Hitler and his nazism, with its philosophy of the master race, only to find its personification right in America in the manner in which our minorities, particularly our fellow Negro Americans are treated. No man is qualified to judge as to which is the superior race. Man was created not to judge, but serve God.

All believers in God, regardless of what denomination, who hate and discriminate, come in the same category as the scribes of old, who occupied the high seats in the synagogue to be seen praying, and prayed out loud to be heard, and Christ said: "Hypocrites that you are. You occupy the high seats to be seen and pray out loud to be heard, but during the week you rob the widow's pension."

To all of you who discriminate, let these words of St. Paul sink into your hearts: "If I speak with the tongues of men, and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.

"And if I should have prophecy and should know all mysteries, and all knowledge, and if I should have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing." 1 Paul 13: 1–2, Corinthians.

Mourn the Loss of Nate Robertson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I note with real regret the death of my dear friend, Nathan W. Robertson, Washington correspondent for over 25 years. This is sad news indeed, for Nate was an exemplary newspaperman, devoted always to the public interest, diligent and painstaking in his efforts to become what he was, a good and conscientious reporter.

Recognition of his ability came to him in the form of a Nieman fellowship to Harvard University in 1944, as well as the American Newspaper Guild's Heywood Broun Memorial Prize. He was a charter member of the Washington Newspaper Guild and a former vice president of the American Newspaper Guild.

Nate was a well-known figure in the House Press Gallery as well as in other Federal agencies. I have known and respected him for many years, and grew to have an affectionate regard for him when he wrote the Washington column for Labor Press Associates.

His loss will be a shock to all newspaperdom.

Our condolences go to his parents, brothers, and to his wife and children.

Charges of Communistic Influence in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, recently the papers have been filled to overflowing with accounts of the wild statements and shotgun tactics being used by a Member of the upper body in connection with his charges of communistic influence in the State Department.

The matter in hand is supposed to do with the actual persons employed in our diplomatic service of the State Department. However, last week this Republican Senator brought up the Amerasia case of 1945.

Five years ago this case was tried in the courts under our democratic procedure and a grand jury held that insufficient evidence existed to warrant prosecution of John S. Service, who was charged with dealing in secret documents. The matter was supposed to have ended. Mr. Service was reinstated and is now consul general in Calcutta. In other words, Mr. Service was exonerated by a jury of his peers under our democratic judicial system.

Some Republicans took occasion to accuse a personal friend of mine of mishandling the Government's side in the Amerasia case. I refer to Robert M. Hitchcock, a Buffalo lawyer, who was formerly an assistant United States attorney and a special attorney for the Department of Justice during the war.

There were charges hurled at Mr. Hitchcock, insinuating that his present association with the firm of Kenefick, Cooke, Mitchell, Bass & Letchworth, of Buffalo, was the result of Hitchcock's failing to prosecute Miss Kate Mitchell, one of the six defendants in the Amerasia case. Miss Mitchell's uncle, the late James M. Mitchell, was formerly a member of that law firm.

When questioned about this charge in Buffalo 2 or 3 days ago, Mr. Hitchcock replied that he had never met Mr. Mitchell until after he went with the firm in 1947 and that he was employed to help in the defense of the many portal-to-portal cases which were flooding the courts at that time.

Moreover, these same charges now being hurled with such abandon under the cloak of congressional immunity were brought up approximately 3 years ago. They were fully investigated at that time by a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee and Mr. Hitchcock's handling of the matter was fully vindicated by that subcommittee. The Congress under which that action was taken was the Eightieth Congress which was preponderantly Republican.

I have known Bob Hitchcock, personally, for many years and know him to be an able and conscientious lawyer. While with the Department of Justice, he rendered invaluable service to the Government including the prosecution of a number of cases dealing with espionage and notably the case of the Nazi spies who landed on the coast of Maine.

He is a man of integrity and fine character and, I know, is the last person to be influenced by outside pressure of any kind.

The firm with which he is now associated is an old Buffalo firm, highly respected and well thought of, not only in my home community but in legal circles throughout the country.

Certainly the attack on Mr. Hitchcock is but another degrading chapter in the Red hunt in which the Republican Party has engaged, because it has no constructive program to offer the people in this election year. Its objective is to defeat all social-reform measures by throwing suspicion on a "guilt by association" basis on all progressive groups and forward-looking citizens.

It is a shame that congressional immunity, so grossly abused by some members of the Republican Party, prevents redress to the people, such as Bob Hitchcock and others who have been smeared by such vicious name calling.

Such charges can do us a great deal of harm as it falls upon the ears of those gullible persons here at home and as it is relayed to nations abroad who look to the United States for leadership, but who have no way of learning that some members of the Republican Party are talking through their hats.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith an editorial from the Buffalo Courier-Express of April 1, 1950, entitled "When Slander Strikes Home":

WHEN SLANDER STRIKES HOME

Perhaps it is just as well that the outrageous and absurd nature of Senator McCARTHY'S Red hunt has been brought home to Buffalo. Senator McCARTHY and Representative DONDERO, of Michigan (who seems to operate on a political level as low as McCARTHY'S own) have extended their smear-campaign to a Buffalo law firm which has numbered among its partners a President of the United States and many of the country's outstanding lawyers.

One of the junior partners in this firm is a former special attorney in the Department of Justice. Five years ago he prosecuted a case in which six persons were arrested on

charges of unlawful removal of State Department documents, allegedly in the interest of a magazine of left-wing tendencies. Among the magazine employees accused was the niece of a nationally eminent Buffalo lawyer, now dead, who was one of the principal partners in the firm mentioned. She voluntarily went before a Federal grand jury and told her story. The grand jury was convinced that she had no part in removal of State Department documents and refused to indict her.

All this happened in 1945. Two years later, after having returned to private practice, the former Federal attorney was associated with the Buffalo firm in defending portal-to-portal lawsuits not connected in the most remote degree with the magazine case. Before the portal-to-portal litigation, the former Federal attorney had not even met the uncle of the young woman whom the grand jury cleared in the State Department documents inquiry.

Distorting such material into evidence of something or other supposedly sinister, Senator McCARTHY continues on his silly, vicious, and slanderous course. President Truman spoke sharply, but not too sharply, when he described the Wisconsin Senator as the Kremlin's greatest asset in this country.

Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, at the Maine Republican State Convention

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] at the Republican State convention in Portland, Maine, on March 31, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is stimulating for a Republican to come to the rock-bound coast of Republican Maine from the stifling vapors of the Capitol City, the home of deals of all kinds which obscure a good deal of clear American vision. The State of Maine has exceptional representation in the United States Senate. Owen Brewster and I went to law school together, and I have long had the highest regard for his ability and character. In MARGARET CHASE SMITH the State of Maine has a unique privilege. She has proved to the country that a woman Senator can be as effective and as able as any man.

This year, Maine, as usual, takes the lead. Here in this convention, you open the campaign in 1950 to elect the Eighty-second Congress. Few elections have been fraught with so much significance in the future of America. In 1948 President Truman was elected on a personal platform which, if carried out, would have established a labor-socialist government in this country similar to that of Great Britain. Fortunately, the people at the same time elected a Congress most of whom had never endorsed or approved the Truman program. The Eighty-first Congress, while much more radical than the Eightieth Congress, still refused to accept the dictates of President Truman, although by a narrow majority and after a violent battle. The election was indecisive because, I believe, the people did not clearly understand the issues.

But in 1952 the people must decide whether they will elect a Congress whose policies will be guided by the principles of liberty which guided this country for 150 years, or one which will accept the Socialist proposals of President Truman. The recent Republican statement of principles and objectives says that the basic domestic issue today is liberty against socialism. It goes on to define these terms. Liberty, it says, means a free people in constant control of their government. Socialism means an all-powerful Federal Government with unlimited power to tax and spend, to direct and operate our agriculture, industry, labor, and local communities, and the daily lives of our citizens.

In the past 4 months I have traveled through the 88 counties of Ohio and visited hundreds of cities and villages, schoolhouses, industrial plants, and farms. I am confident that the people of Ohio—and they are typical of the people of America—believe in liberty, and I think I know what the essential quality of that liberty is. It is the freedom of people in every walk of life and every form of activity to think their own thoughts and carry out their own ideas; the freedom of man to have his ideas taught to others if he can convince his teachers; freedom of the press; freedom of religion. It is the freedom of each community to determine how its own children shall be educated and its health, welfare, and other local activities conducted. In a country this size it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of local self-government if we are to maintain freedom at all, for the bureaus of a central government are never responsive to the will of any considerable number of the people of different sections of this great country.

It is the liberty of men and women to choose their own occupation, and to establish and operate their own business, if they so desire, as they feel it should be operated without interference from the Government, or from labor-union bosses so long as they themselves do not interfere with the rights of others. It is the liberty which encourages every boy and girl to feel that the world is open to their abilities and their efforts, in occupation, in local politics, and in public and private life throughout the Nation.

The results of that freedom have made this country the greatest and the happiest country in the world. An essential feature of liberty is freedom from the direction of government, and particularly a central government. We have a great system of education, probably the best in the world, and it is partly socialized in our public elementary and secondary schools, but it is free because there is no central power directing it. Power is diffused among thousands of school districts and between 48 States and between thousands of private schools and colleges. Many of these schools may have entirely erroneous ideas. Some may do harm rather than good, but the net result is a great system of education with more freedom than is given by any other country. It has resulted in millions of people developing their own ideas and a general opportunity to try them out to see whether they are worth while.

This kind of freedom made the American soldiers the greatest army in the world. Certainly it was not because they were better trained, because they were not, or better disciplined. Their discipline was poor according to military standards. But they outfought the leading military nations of the world because every man was able to think for himself to meet the situation as it occurred.

So, in the field of economic progress. In every industrial plant I have visited the managers think their plant has a peculiar excellence, a new product, better morale, better machines or better methods and production lines. We are ahead of other countries because of the tremendous advance in tools and machinery and the productivity of every workman resulting therefrom. The American farmer is just as far ahead in his methods and productivity.

We are ahead because of freedom, because there are millions of people stimulated to develop ideas and free to put those ideas into effect without some bureaucratic interference. We would be far behind today if Government had owned every little industrial plant in this country as Mr. Attlee desires to have the Government own them in England. Our system has led to a production so great that it gave the basis of victory in two World Wars. It has led to a standard of living in this country two and a half to three times that of Great Britain, or in Europe.

We happen to have today a very vivid comparison with the industrial system of England. The freedom of industry in England was abused, and the importance of freedom was never realized. Monopolies were encouraged rather than competition. Government control and assistance was sought and encouraged until today it is a matter of course. Neither workmen nor management had the interest in new machinery which complete liberty of ideas gave in this country. As a result today, the British workman is getting $20 a week and the American workman $55 a week. The very measures advertised as benefiting the workman have reduced him to a life of austerity. Government control and government taxation have removed any incentive to individuals to invest their money in new plants or new machinery or new methods. And England is unable to make goods cheaply enough, even with cheap labor, to compete with American goods and earn the dollars they need.

What is the greatest enemy of liberty and its accomplishments? Obviously in America today it is the concentration of power in Washington. It is the course of these mistaken individuals who cannot abide the scattered planlessness of liberty however excellent its results, and must establish a regulated order organized to carry out the particular ends they have in mind. Already we have created in our Federal Government the greatest monopoly in the world, an institution spending $46,000,000,000 in 12 months, one-sixth of all the activity in this great country. While the people have resisted many increases of power sought since 1939, spending has gone on until by its mere size and the weight of taxation the freedom of men is limited. If the Government takes from me 20 to 50 percent of my earnings, it is depriving me of liberty to spend that money for myself. It is saying to me that the Government will select the services that I shall receive, whether I want them or not. It removes the income by which men may experiment and carry out their own ideas, and also the incentive to spend their time and their money and their ability and their genius in further improvement.

Socialism is the taking over of human activity by government. Of course socialism is a relative term. Some activities have always been socialized like public schools and the post office in this country. A few Socialists will carry their program to the complete control of all individual activity. But it is not necessary to go so far to bring an effective end to liberty. There is a point at which the growth of government so weakens the effective operation of liberty that government is forced into still greater expansion. In England they have effectively ended economic liberty. They think they can do that and still maintain individual liberty, but I doubt if a real socialistic regime can be continued in force in the economic field for many years except under a dictatorship.

It is said that Harry Truman is no Socialist. That makes little difference if all his policies lead to socialism. We are in

danger of complete Government control not only because of his policies, but because the totalitarian philosophy has affected the thinking of a lot of other people in this country who ought to know better. There was a time when men expected to solve their own problems, when they were solved by cooperative effort and local effort. Today the first thought is to turn to Washington for money and action. The organization of pressure groups has been a dangerous factor in that movement. Every pressure group, whether from business or labor or professions, concentrate their interest on Washington activity. Their paid lobbyists find it much easier to seek a Federal statute than to go out and educate the people or even their own members, to achieve by their own efforts a solution of their problems.

We have been faced in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses with a detailed Truman program which would leave little freedom in the people and concentrate power in the Federal Government, greater even than that it exercised during the war. Every policy which Mr. Truman advocates means more power in Washington. Perhaps he does little realize the total effect of his own program, forced on him item by item by the political necessity of appeasing the CIO Political Action Committee.

In the first place he has been demanding the power of price-fixing, wage-fixing—in a very moderate way, of course—and allocation which means rationing. There was a time in the summer of 1947 when he referred to these powers as "police state controls." Since December 1947, he has continuously demanded these powers now spelled out in the Spence bill.

He demands the power for the Government to go into business. He supports the great expansion of government in the power business and incidental activities through Valley Authorities in every region of the United States.

He insists on the Brannan plan with subsidies to farmers and consumers and the power of government to direct in detail the operation of every farm, the number of acres to be planted to wheat, to corn, to cotton and other crops; the number of animals to be raised—hogs, beef cattle, dairy cattle, chickens.

These measures have been developed by those men who believe in economic planning, and Government control to order those plans to be carried out. They would mean a complete power in government to direct the detailed operation of industry, commerce, and agriculture. They would involve the control of labor and the allotment of jobs. If Harry Truman is not a socialist, then he simply does not understand the effect of the measures which he supports.

Then he advocates the socialization as well as the nationalization of medicine. Under his plan the Government would levy six or seven billion dollars of new taxes and put it all in the hands of a Federal bureau to set up a vast organization to employ all the doctors and hospitals in the United States to give free medical care to 150,000,000 people. All doctors would become employees of the Government and it would destroy the freedom of the medical profession which has contributed more than any other to the remedies against human illness.

Many other proposals before us extend the activities of so-called social insurance to other contingencies of life. Of course, it is not really insurance at all, but merely a plan of additional taxation to provide the cash for free handouts of all kinds of welfare service. This year's report of the Federal Security Agency says "The administration believes that comprehensive welfare services should in time be available to persons requesting them—whether needy or not—in all communities of the Nation."

Naturally enough, Mr. Truman has also advocated universal military training and is not at all fearful concerning a system which would take boys out of their education and occupations in time of peace and subject them for 12 months to the indoctrination of some bureau in the War Department.

As part of all this program, we have the necessary extension of spending and taxation. Already we are spending about 28 percent of our national income on Government. Every man works more than 1 day in 4 for Government and less than 3 days for himself. Taxes increase the price of every product the housewife buys by about 20 percent on the average so that this burden falls on millions who do not realize that they are paying taxes. It destroys the incentive of men to expand their business and their business activities and may soon leave voids which the Government will be urged to fill up with Government investment requiring more taxes. In Great Britain a tax burden of 40 percent of the national income has practically brought a stagnation of progress in industry. Even here there is doubt whether we can get the money necessary to keep up the growth of industry required to give a million new jobs every year to the young people entering the labor market and those displaced by technological improvement. Certainly, some rearrangement of taxes is required.

It is quite true that Mr. Truman does not present his program in its true light. In England the Socialists are proud of their program. They admit freely its cost in taxes and the limitation of freedom, but insist that it is worth the price. Mr. Truman's advisers despair of convincing the American people along that line. They try to play down the radical nature of the proposals they make. Powers are only to be stand-by powers to be occasionally used. The medical program is to retain the liberty of choosing your own doctor. Also, the people are not asked to pay the price. We have a deficit of $5,000,000,000 a year, and no new taxes are asked for. The people are urged to accept all the programs because they are not going to have to pay for them. They are to get something for nothing.

Each step in the past has been taken without warning of those to come. Now, at last, we have the whole program before us. We know that if Mr. Truman can elect a Congress subordinate to his will and that of the labor unions, it is not just a question of socialized medicine or economic control, it is the whole program of the hand-out state and the police state which a radical Eighty-second Congress can put into effect before the end of Mr. Truman's term.

It is important that the people be not fooled by Mr. Truman's occasional hesitations and his olive branches extended to the businessmen. There has been no repudiation of any of these policies. The only way to avoid a creeping socialism is to elect a Republican Congress in 1950 and a Republican President in 1952. The only way to get rid of the Communists in the State Department is to change the head of the Government. It can't be done with men in control who think they are only red herrings. The only way to get a judicial treatment of labor problems is to elect an impartial President. As long as Mr. Truman is there, he will sabotage whatever policy Congress may adopt as he has sabotaged the Taft-Hartley law.

The issue is clear. It is inconceivable to me that the American people would throw away a system at the very time that it has proved its ability to improve the condition of the great mass of the people to a standard of living far beyond anything the world has ever seen, and adopt a system which in Great Britain has failed to benefit the very workmen to which it promised utopia. The issue is, in fact, the issue between continued progress under liberty and a socialized state.

And liberty is the only key to real progress. The Republican Party believes that if we follow the same principles, we can secure the same improvement as in the past. There is no limit or frontier to the productive ability or the standards of living of our people. There is no reason why they should not constantly improve, providing we follow the same principles of freedom which have succeeded in the past. We are opposed to a planned economy through Federal regulation and control, but we support the policies which the Federal Government has pursued for 100 years. We insist on a sound fiscal policy to maintain the value of the American dollar and the savings and insurance policies of the people, a stability which is the base of full employment and prosperity. We favor Federal concern with every important problem—research, advice, and assistance to individuals and business and States and communities, and financial aid in those cases where the need is clearly shown and where the objective is clearly beyond the power of the State or community to achieve.

In the whole field of education, welfare, health, and housing the Federal Government must take that interest. These matters are primarily in the jurisdiction of the States and local communities, but that does not exclude an active interest on the part of the Federal Government. The Federal Government is specially concerned that there be equality of opportunity throughout this great country, particularly for every child who is born into an American family, no matter how poor the family or the community into which he may be born. I believe the American people are convinced that we are sufficiently wealthy so that we can provide a minimum decent standard of living for every family in the United States. This is the obligation recognized by most States and local communities, but all of them are not able to carry out that program, and financial help from the Federal Government can assist them in doing it.

Conclusive figures on illiteracy show that the poorer States in this Nation are not able to provide a minimum decent education for all their children after raising taxes for education in excess of the average throughout the Nation. Consequently, I favor a bill for Federal aid to education in the nature of an equalization fund to see that every child shall have a primary and secondary school education.

We have as good health as any nation in the world, and we have always undertaken to see that free medical care is furnished to those who cannot afford to pay for it, but Federal aid can make that service more complete in providing a sufficient number of hospitals and of doctors, and see that real insurance is available to those who desire to take advantage of it to spread the risk of every illness in 1 year.

I have regarded decent shelter as essential for providing minimum standards of living and supported the bill which will subsidize housing for those in the lowest income brackets.

In this whole field, it is most essential that we do not impose Federal control as a condition of Federal assistance. Administration must remain in the States and local communities. In general, the Federal Government should not be called in unless the need is clearly shown. I do not think the Federal Government should undertake any program to provide free services for those who are able to pay for them and that means the great bulk of the population. Above all, we cannot impose on Federal Government any more than on local government an excessive burden of taxation. The only way we can give free service or support to those who are not working is out of the earnings of those

Americans who are working. The burden on them must not be so great as to threaten their liberty or reduce the incentive and reward for hard work, ability, and daring.

Nor do we adopt any laissez faire principle. Federal action is often essential to maintain liberty itself in industry by preventing monopoly and unfair competition. Federal action can prevent economic oppression by setting a standard for a minimum wage. It can prevent economic inequality by some reasonable price-support program to prevent the destruction of agricultural purchasing power through forces far beyond the control of the individual or the united farmers.

Every proposal for Federal action, however, must be judged by its effect on the liberty of the individual, the family, the community, industry, and labor. Such liberty cannot be sacrificed to any theoretical improvement from Government control or Government spending.

I am convinced that the people of this country are strong believers in liberty and I have a complete faith in their decision in 1950 and 1952. That decision involves not only the future of America. Only if the American people convince themselves and convince the world that they believe in liberty can we hope to meet the aggressive ideology of communism. Communism has spread through the world because there has been no ideal to oppose it. Our leaders have been apologizing for America for 20 years. The time has come when we must spread the banners of liberty throughout the world as did our forefathers after 1776.

Address by Thomas M. Hennessey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I know all Members will be interested in some of the remarks of Thomas M. Hennessey before the Tuesday Club in Springfield on March 21. The address follows:

Last Friday was St. Patrick's Day—a day commemorated by Irishmen everywhere as the great day of their race.

Going back to the dark dawn of our human history we find far out in the Atlantic a little island which is set apart from the populous Continent of Europe. It was then, as it is now, free from Europe's bickering politics and was inhabited by a race called the Celts. They were a mixture of bloods that came long before, it seems, from Germany, from Scandinavia, and from Spain. They were pagans and their gods were the trees, the stars, and the moon. Yet they had achieved a culture and a civilization that is the wonder of historians.

Even before the coming of St. Patrick the old Irish were living under community laws and regulations that were far ahead of the known world. Their completeness and thoroughness surprise us even today when a new law gets drawn at almost the drop of a hat. They regulated the basic elements of human conduct and consequently, there were laws of property, of contract, of agency, of bankruptcy, and of crime.

Then, also, the lawyers were expected to know the law and to abide by it themselves. When they didn't, their fines were many times more severe than those imposed on ordinary men. It seems that even in those days the lawyers had buried their laws in obscure phrases and meaningless words—"whereas, the party of the second part, when, as and if, and so on." And so only the lawyers were able to understand it. Finally, King Conor, in great disgust, reprimanded the offending lawyers and ordered that henceforth the practice of law and pleading in court should be open to everybody.

And now let us look for awhile at St. Patrick. He is a misty figure—his clear outline lost in the distance of remote centuries. His birthdy even, nobody knows; nor the country of his birth; but he was born in either Scotland or France about the year 375. His name Patrick is an abbreviated form of the Roman Patricius, which indicates that his father was of high rank in the Roman Army and in the Republic of Rome. The first certain fact we have about him is that he was kidnaped when a youth, 16 perhaps, from the shores of France and sold as a slave in Ireland. The next few years he spent as a shepherd for his Irish master, tending his flocks on the green hills and resolving to come some day to convert these lovable Irish people to Christianity—to his own God of gentleness and love.

So equipped, he returned to Ireland to undertake the work of his dreams. He failed to convert his former master, but he did succeed in enrolling his two sons. Then on he went to Tara, the palace of King Laoghaire, the most important of all the Irish kings.

I think St. Patrick must be the happiest man in heaven because the pious legends of Ireland have obviously stretched the truth to make him the greatest man that ever lived.

At last the preaching career of St. Patrick came to an end and he retired to the great cathedral he had built at Armagh. After writing his biographies which, typical of his humility, he called "confessions," and after helping the people of Ireland to combine their laws and their government, he died sometime in the fifth century, probably at the age of 87. And over his body there was held a great wake—12 days and nights during which, it is reported, the sun did not set. Some reports go so far as to say that the sun did not set for a whole year. These stories at least reflect his popularity. The people of Ireland had followed him and had come to love him almost to the point of worship. Few men in the history of the whole world have won such devotion and faith from their followers.

"Lives of great men all remind us," said Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, "we can make our lives sublime, and departing, leave behind us, footprints on the sands of time." Look for a little while at the marks St. Patrick left across the centuries. His chief work was religion. And that is why we look particularly upon the contributions he has made to the religious life of his time and the people who followed him.

The history of the religion we call Christian began with the ancient Jews. Yet if we follow its history down the ages, we find a period in early times when Christianity might have been lost except for Ireland. In the Middle Ages, teachers and priests went out from Ireland to every corner of Europe to bring back again the religion which St. Patrick had taught them generations before and which slumbering Europe seemed likely to forget all about. They faithfully kept alive the fire that Patrick had kindled. And so it is, that we find Irish teachers and Irish saints in so many countries—in Italy, in France, in Germany, in Scotland, and even in far off Iceland. They were bringing back again the faith and religion that Patrick had brought them before.

And with religion went learning. Explain it as we will—but throughout the history of the world, religion has been foster mother to education and learning. And for its great accomplishments in this field, Ireland has been sometimes termed the "land of saints and scholars." It was a proud and well-reserved title during the Middle Ages, for out from its quiet, busy monasteries went preachers to awaken the hearts of mankind, and teachers to keep their minds alive. St. Patrick made of Ireland a storehouse for learning and for Christianity. From it, during the Middle Ages, came the resources that stirred and developed the minds and hearts of men.

When we mention the hearts of men, we cannot help but think of the social and domestic virtues of the Irish. And here it is that the Irishman outstrips all his competitors. His hospitality is not only a habit—it is a principle. For the stranger, for the friendless, for the hungry, and for the thirsty—he quickly finds a channel to his heart and his billfold. And it is not merely this virtue but the manner of showing it which records the charm that runs through his conduct. There is a natural politeness and sincerity in his manner which no man can mistake.

But a great part of the work of St. Patrick was in building a nation. Ireland makes St. Patrick her hero. This year she celebrated perhaps her one thousand five hundredth St. Patrick's Day—we will celebrate our one hundred and seventy-fourth Fourth of July. By comparison our Nation is but a youngster.

The history of Ireland is largely one of warfare against oppression. Beginning with the heartbreaking misunderstandings between England and Ireland, with the religious revivals of the sixteenth century, and with the cruelties of Henry VIII and Cromwell and Queen Elizabeth, the people of Ireland were frequently in trouble. Yet they worked constantly for freedom and self-government. Their list of patriots is a long one—and every generation, it seemed, furnished a leader. There was Robert Emmet, who went cheerfully to be executed. There was Daniel O'Connell, who gained a seat in England's Parliament and who bargained as a skillful statesman to secure advantages for his people. There was the great Fenian movement that spread through the world among Irishmen in every country. (As we look back on the Fenian idea, however, it was the sheerest folly, to attempt to attack an empire with a plan so childish. But it was brave.) Then there was Terrence McSweeney, who undertook a hunger strike and gave up his life as a martyr to freedom. There was the rebellion of 1916, the leadership of Eamon DeValera, and finally the establishment of the Irish Republic now recognized, even though partitioned, as an independent nation completely outside the British Commonwealth.

Today Ireland is a good country to live in. It still has its wonderful climate which makes for perpetual delight. It has begun a program of industrial and power development which is making life easier for people who will always get their living from the farms. While there is little great wealth, there is also little of the mass of terrific poverty that is besetting so many of the nations of the world today. The people as well as the country are free. There is little government interference in private living, either through excessive taxation or over-regulation. In short, the Irish in Ireland today are "doing all right, thank you."

And that's probably why, for the first time in centuries, there are more Irish coming to Ireland than leaving it. Emigration has always been one of Ireland's tragedies. Throughout the years she has seen her youngest, her pluckiest, and her healthiest leave the country to seek opportunities in different parts of the world. And they did find opportunities, especially here in America. America has been good to them as she has been good to all immigrant races who were honest and industrious. Irishmen and Irishmen's sons have gone far here. In industry, in the professions, in finance, and in government they have reached the top. And they have done it by the intelligent and industrious application of the talents, skills, and virtues which originated in the teachings of St. Patrick. Now it is the responsibility of all of them to merit the confidence that others have placed in them, and by good example merit the priceless heritage that it has been their good fortune to receive.

So let us think of the great monuments we have in America—the right to think, the right to work, the right to worship. Let us expose those who believe the only monuments in this world are those to be found in the Red Square of Moscow. And finally, let us demonstrate our great sense of national loyalty and carry out to the fullest our self-imposed obligations to become still better men—to become still better Americans.

Keep Our Country Free and Independent—Go to the Polls and Vote—You May Lose a Few Minutes by Voting but You Could Lose a Lifetime of Happiness by Failing to Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an address of Hon. Charles F. Sweeney, secretary of state of Ohio.

Charles F. Sweeney, Ohio's secretary of state, served four terms as a member of the General Assembly of Ohio. He attained a reputation as one of Ohio's aggressive, constructive, and progressive lawmakers. As a young man he served under Gen. John J. Pershing in Mexico, and in World War I was in the Army Secret Service checking espionage and sabotage.

As Ohio's secretary of state he has won the respect and confidence of our people by his efficient, industrious, and economical administration of that important office.

The address follows:

We are assembled here today in the spirit of good fellowship and brotherly love to celebrate a dream come true in dedicating a new home, to commend those who planned and labored long and hard to make this dream come true. It has been a long time since an idea was born by a small group of men gathered in a lumberyard, out of which grew one of the largest benevolent organizations in the world, the Fraternal Order of Eagles. Their benefits and charitable acts to those not so fortunate are many and varied. This is made possible only in a country where men are privileged to free speech and free assembly.

The task before us is clear. For our principles of action we must go back to our Constitution, to our Declaration of Independence, to our history, and to the example set by our national fathers.

As the chief election officer of the State of Ohio, I am responsible for the proper operation of the election machinery of the State and to see to it that elections are properly conducted in the various counties.

The office of secretary of state has channels of information that does not ordinarily get to the general public, and this in part is what I want to talk to you about.

I did not come here to frighten anybody; I merely want to pass along to you a few facts. People have become so complacent and have taken such a matter-of-fact attitude toward our democracy, that the danger signal is out as to just how long we can live as freemen.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the country's greatest authority on the Communist conspiracy, had this to say during an appearance before the House Un-American Activities Committee:

"The size of the Communist Party is relatively unimportant because of the enthusiasm and iron-clad discipline under which they operate. In this connection it might be of interest to know that in 1917, when the Communists overthrew the Russian government, there was one Communist for every 2,277 persons in Russia. In the United States today there is one Communist for every 1,814 persons in the country."

We have seen the White House picketed and our President debased when the policies of our form of government clashed with those of the Communist Party line, and this very thing happened to our Governor at the State house recently.

The forces of communism are running loose in the entire world today. These facts are proof of the necessity that every citizen of the United States must be depended upon to protect the interests of their families and children and to do everything possible to preserve our form of government and our great educational and religious institutions.

What can we do to combat these forces? I'll tell you what you can do. You can exercise your franchise, as the Constitution of the United States guarantees, the privilege of casting a free and secret ballot at election time.

It may be of interest to you to know that only a mere majority of the eligible voters take advantage of this privilege.

Why don't people vote? Some are too lax and indifferent. To those I say don't complain about how the Government is being run. You lost your right to criticize when you failed to exercise your right to vote. Others don't vote because they are afraid they might sometime be called for jury duty. All right, maybe you'd like it better in the Soviet Union, where they don't have any juries. If enough of you stay away from the polls we may have that system in the United States before long.

Another excuse for not voting is that there is no difference between the political parties, so what is the use. Maybe there would be a bigger difference between the parties and issues if you, who give that excuse, would vote, not only at the general elections but at the primaries, where the candidates are nominated.

Some people also have the idea that their vote won't count because there will be so many on the other side. If everybody felt that way there would be no reason for holding elections, and some dictator might as well appoint all the public officials. A lot of people consider themselves to be good citizens if they go to church, pay their taxes, live within their means, attend to their jobs, observe the laws, and don't get into fights with their neighbors. I don't believe that anyone who fails to vote can be regarded as having fulfilled all his duties of good citizenship.

A recent survey of some of the different classes shows among automobile dealers, whom you would expect to have a vital interest in political affairs, 37½ percent of them are either too busy or not interested enough to vote, and 21 percent of them were not even registered.

And here are the facts—members of the chambers of commerce, whom you would expect to be interested in maintaining our kind of government, that 24.57 percent were not sufficiently interested to exercise their franchise, and 19.35 percent of the members were not even registered voters.

The clergymen, who influence the majority of our population, 32 percent of them did not vote in the 1948 Presidential election, and 27½ percent weren't registered.

Independent grocers, who are the very grass roots of democracy, 37 percent of their members couldn't be bothered about voting, and 32 percent of all groups checked were not registered.

And the doctors, who are so perturbed about "socialized medicine," 20 percent stayed away from the polls, and 15.82 percent are not registered.

The Rotary and Kiwanis service clubs throughout the Nation have been outstanding in their work for civic betterment, yet 14 percent are not voting and 9.96 percent are not even registered.

Independent druggists, 26.67 percent are not voting and 23.53 percent are not registered.

And here's something startling—school teachers—here is a group which has the serious responsibility of leadership and of molding public opinion through the medium of education and enlightenment, yet 11.51 percent are not voting and 6.10 percent are not even registered.

It may be of interest to you to know that in the last general election a very small minority of those eligible to vote amended the constitution of the State of Ohio. When a thing like this can happen, in changing the constitution, it is time we wake up to the fact that something is wrong in our democracy.

The right to vote freely is the fundamental basis of a true democracy. Our best guaranty of keeping and preserving our country free and independent, is to guard every hour, the thing which made our country great, namely, the two-party system of government.

I am a firm believer in party politics—so much so, that in my opinion it would be a tragedy for the United States if either the Democratic Party or the Republican Party were to pass from the scene. There is a belief in some quarters that, with the radio and other kinds of high-pressure propaganda methods now available, the old type of political organization is bound for disuse or decay. Not to my way of thinking, and if it is true, the fact should be deplored by every thoughtful American citizen.

The great contribution of the political parties to our way of life is that it has allowed the United States to avoid the destructive blight of government by minority.

The two great political parties help to keep the United States a free Nation because they promote national unity. Without them, it is easy to see how a lot of geographical or sectional political movements might spring up.

If the party government, and especially the two-party system should crumble in this country, then the United States will be at the mercy of every organized minority, every ambitious demagogue, every radio spellbinder, and every political crackpot who comes along. They will spring up overnight and take over control of the Government, and when that happens, it will be a sorry day for the majority of wholesome and fair-dealing American citizens.

Under the two-party system of government we have done well for over 150 years. We are the freest, the best governed, the most prosperous country in the world and the two-party system made it so, and the two-party system will keep it so. It behooves all of us, who are eligible to vote, to exercise our franchise by voting at every election. This way—and this way only, can we be assured of maintaining our kind of government.

Any person able to say "I am an American" should be the proudest person in the world.

The privilege of being a citizen of the United States has been won for us by almost

175 years of suffering and blood. It has taken five great wars to establish the Government of the United States and to maintain it throughout the years.

Deep down in my heart there is this realization that we have a wonderful land, and I am trying to get my fellow Americans to study it a little bit and to understand it a little more and see if we haven't some responsibility as citizens of the greatest country in the world.

I would like to conclude by saying: What kind of an America would you like to live in tomorrow?

My friends, to keep our country free and independent, all you have to do is exercise your franchise, and go to the polls and vote. You may lose a few minutes time by voting, but you could lose a lifetime of happiness if you don't!

Labor Leader's Eulogy of Hon. Mary T. Norton, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, in The Wash Line, official publication of Laundry Workers, Cleaners, and Dyers International Union, Local No. 284, of Essex and Hudson Counties, N. J., a splendid tribute to Hon. MARY T. NORTON, Representative from the Thirteenth District of New Jersey, is paid by Mr. Winfield S. Chasmar, president of the local. Under permission to extend my remarks, I am happy indeed, to append this expression of appreciation to Mrs. NORTON for the aid she has extended to labor throughout her long career in the House:

LOCAL 284 SALUTES MRS. MARY T. NORTON—RETIRING MEMBER OF CONGRESS HAILED AS "LABOR'S FRIEND"

(By Winfield S. Chasmar, president, local No. 284)

It was with a feeling of deep personal regret that I read the decision by MARY T. NORTON to climax her career as a Member of Congress. This means that Mrs. NORTON will not seek reelection in the Thirteenth District which she has served for 25 years.

In view of her long record of championing labor's cause in Congress, I feel that we should pay tribute to this grand lady through the medium of our union publication, the WASH LINE.

I have known Mrs. NORTON for many years, and her long record of valuable service to the cause of organized labor, plus her admirable qualities of leadership, have made a lasting impression upon me. On many occasions I have received the cooperation and assistance of Mrs. NORTON in legislative matters affecting our own membership.

In endeavoring to heap praise upon Mrs. NORTON, I can think of no better tribute than to review her long record in Congress.

Through the years since labor first realized its potentialities and organized on a national basis, there has been in the opinion of many no better friend of labor and stancher supporter of its cause in the halls of Congress than Representative MARY T. NORTON. Elected to the House of Representatives in 1924, Mrs. NORTON served on the Labor Committee as one of its outstanding members until 1937, when she was made its chairman, upon the death of Representative Connery.

As the new chairman of this important committee—which was one of the outstanding cogs in the legislative machinery of the Roosevelt administration—Representative NORTON found her first real opportunity to serve in a constructive way the cause of labor in which she believed so sincerely.

Both during his campaigns and following his election in 1932, President Roosevelt had advocated higher wages and shorter hours for the working men and women of our Nation. Representative NORTON was selected by the Democratic administration as the medium through which the campaign promises could be effectively realized. What an excellent job she did is one of the notable chapters in the history of labor's progress during 18 years.

BATTLE FOR STANDARDS ACT

Admitting that it is the outstanding act of her legislative career and the one in which she gained the greatest pleasure, Mrs. NORTON in 1937 sponsored the Fair Labor Standards Act, more familiarly known as the wage-and-hour law. Recommitted to the House on December 17 of that year, after a full week of discussion on the floor, from which Mrs. NORTON was never absent for a minute, the bill was, under her leadership, again considered by the Labor Committee and reported favorably to the House April 21, 1938. Blocked by the Rules Committee from bringing the bill to the floor of the House for consideration, Mrs. NORTON placed a petition on the Speaker's desk to discharge the measure from that committee.

Evidence of the support she gathered for the petition and her bill is shown by the fact that in only 2 hours and 22 minutes (record-breaking speed), the 218 signatures for the petition, which would permit the bill to again be considered in the House, were obtained.

The bill came up and the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed in the House, May 24, 1938, by a vote of 314 to 97 approved, and the conference report (joint House and Senate) about 3 weeks later by a majority of 202.

This bill established a graduated minimum-wage scale of 25 to 40 cents per hour and a similarly graduated workweek of 44 to 40 hours.

Although Mrs. NORTON had encountered numerous discouragements during the consideration of the legislation, she kept uppermost labor's interests, believing that the time had arrived when the laborer in this country must be recognized and given an opportunity for a decent standard of living.

The morning after the bill was first recommitted, President Roosevelt called Mrs. NORTON and, believing she would be completely discouraged by the turn of events, inquired what she intended to do, to which the congresswoman replied, "Mr. President, I am going to give you a bill." She never wavered from that course and by her sponsorship of the Fair Labor Standards Act gained the gratitude of labor. President Roosevelt joined in calling her "Labor's Friend."

Known as labor's "Bible," the Fair Labor Standards Act placed a ceiling on hours and a floor on wages and all constructive labor legislation since that time has incorporated the basic principles of the act.

Labor assumes Mrs. NORTON's name will ever be associated with labor's first gains on a national basis.

PROTECTED ACT

Through all the years Mrs. NORTON has worked to protect the act, and, as chairman of the House Labor Committee from 1937 to 1947, she guarded zealously the gains made by labor. During that period numerous bills were introduced which would have weakened the law, but none was reported from the Labor Committee, and, finally, when any such measures were introduced in the House, they were so drafted by their authors so as to bypass the Labor Committee and referred to other committees of the House, where labor did not have so stanch a friend. Representative NORTON protested this action herself, declaring in the House that the Labor Committee had "honorably fought for legislation we considered to be for the best interests of the country" and asking that the House "deal with the Labor Committee as you would with any other committee of the House." Labor's enemies knew in the chairman of the House Labor Committee they had a foe whom they could not away or conquer.

This woman's great work was not yet over.

Mrs. NORTON has been ever cognisant of the needs of the workers of the country, and believing that the 40 cents per hour minimum wage adopted in 1938 was far too small and completely out of line with rising living costs, Representative NORTON in subsequent Congresses introduced legislation to increase the minimum hourly wage to at least 75 cents, and in the Eighty-first Congress offered legislation that established the 75-cent rate.

As a member of the Labor Committee, she helped to sponsor the so-called "Magna Carta of Labor," the National Labor Relations Act, and later when amendments were offered in the House, to practically destroy the statute, Mrs. NORTON was almost alone responsible in blocking their passage. That the act remained intact through all her years as chairman of the Labor Committee is evidence of her keen leadership in behalf of labor.

HER OPINION OF HARTLEY

When, in 1946, the Republicans gained a majority of the Congress and Representative Fred Hartley assumed chairmanship of the Labor Committee, Mrs. NORTON resigned from the committee, stating that she "could not serve with a chairman for whom I have no respect." She further said that her reason for resigning was that "while I was chairman of the committee the gentleman who is now chairman and who talks about labor as if he knew something about it, attended exactly six meetings in 10 years."

When the Taft-Hartley bill was first considered in the House, Mrs. NORTON spoke out against it, deploring what she termed the attempt of Congress to strangle labor and accusing "labor baiters" and "labor haters" in the House of forgetting "the great war record of labor, without which it would have been impossible to win the war."

Mrs. NORTON was one of the first to remind other Members of the House of the great part which labor had played in victory. Feeling that all too few people realized that victory in 1945 would not have been possible without labor's devotion, Representative NORTON helped to lead the fight against the Taft-Hartley bill, voting against it herself and working among her colleagues, urging them to oppose it also. Terming it "a retreat—not just a step backward—but a wholesale retreat to the day when labor had no rights," she predicted on the floor of the House the defeat of the Congress which adopted the Taft-Hartley Act. How accurate was her prediction is a matter of record in political annals. A Democratic Congress was elected in 1946.

In the campaign of 1949 in her own congressional district and nationally, Representative NORTON advocated the Taft-Hartley Act repeal and promised to support legislation to abolish the act. During the first session of the Eighty-first Congress the "watered-down" Wood bill was introduced in the House which would have changed some provisions of Taft-Hartley, but would not have repealed it outright. Mrs. NORTON voted against the measure, feeling that the only solution to the "strait-jacket" in which labor found itself was entire repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. When the Wood bill failed of passage, she voted to recommit the legislation to the Labor Committee.

The Taft-Hartley Act is still law. Its fate depends on the congressional election next November.

Untiring foe of compulsion and advocate of voluntary methods to settle labor disputes, Representative NORTON has taken a deep personal interest in legislation which would insure voluntary and free action in labor problems. For example, she sponsored in the Seventy-seventh Congress a bill which provided specifically for voluntary mediation of disputes in defense industries. She believes that labor is capable of solving its own problems intelligently without the compulsory features of the Taft-Hartley law.

Recognized as an authority on labor and its problems, Representative NORTON was appointed in 1945 by President Truman as an alternate delegate and adviser from the United States to the International Labor Organization in Paris. The outstanding part Mrs. NORTON played in these deliberations is well known and admired by those associated with her in this great movement.

The Congresswoman has always been an opponent of discrimination and has led the fight for the establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission. Author of H. R. 2232 in the Seventy-ninth Congress, which prohibited discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, and national origin, she has exerted every means within her power to have FEPC reestablished by legislative statute after the termination of the first Fair Employment Practices Commission created by Executive order. Stymied by the Rules Committee from bringing H. R. 2232 to the floor, she again introduced similar legislation in subsequent Congresses. She is untiring in her efforts to create a new FEPC, and has often hit the headlines with the scathing tongue-lashing she has given congressional opponents from the South.

Known as an advocate of tolerance in all fields, Representative NORTON has sought to eliminate discrimination because of race, creed, color, and national origin, not only in employment but in many phases of our national life. One of her outstanding acts of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress was her introduction of H. R. 3199, a bill which provides that the payment of a poll tax shall not be prerequisite for voting in a primary or other election for national officers. Her bill was adopted in the House July 26, 1949, by a vote of 273 to 116. If finally enacted into law, MARY NORTON will be regarded as responsible for an epic advance in the democratic processes of the Nation.

Chasing Chameleons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a very important article by the noted writer, Freda Utley, which appears in the current issue of Human Events:

CHASING CHAMELEONS

(By Freda Utley)

The chameleon is a species of lizard which protects itself by its power to change the color of its skin so as to become indistinguishable from its environment. According to the dictionary, it also has a projectile tongue and moves slowly. Except for their demonstrated ability to move fast many of those whom Senator MCCARTHY is endeavoring to track down and prove to be Communists could very well meet the definition of chameleons. The Senator from Wisconsin, whose boldness is equaled only by his ignorance of the magnitude of the task he has set himself, must feel that he is in a nightmare in which his quarry continually eludes him, or changes its appearance as soon as he catches it.

Those who only yesterday were joining Communist fronts, advising the administration to place its trust in Stalin, telling the public in speeches, books, and articles that the Russian leader was an ever-loving friend of peace and democracy, and in general deluding the American people as to the nature of the Soviet regime, are today quite otherwise engaged. Either they are fighting a battle of words with the Soviet representatives in the United Nations, or giving advice as to how to contain communism, or shaking their fists at the Kremlin from behind their desks in the State Department. And if rude men like MCCARTHY press them concerning their records they can reply in Dorothy Kenyon's words:

"I do not deny that my name may have been used, even at times with my consent, in connection with organizations that later proved to be subversive but which, at the time, seemed to be engaged in activities or dedicated to objectives which I could and did approve."

And how can one deny the validity of this argument unless one is prepared to denounce, not only Roosevelt, Churchill, General Marshall, but all those who followed in their train? One should recall that the American people—whether Democrats or Republicans—almost all welcomed Stalin as an ally, and rushed to give aid and comfort to the Soviet Union in order to destroy Germany and Japan.

Until about 4 years ago friendship for Soviet Russia was all the rage. The most respectable people appeared on the mastheads or platforms of the multitude of organizations with democratic names founded to ensnare the gullible, the ignorant, and the vain. And many a rich and foolish man gave huge donations to Communist causes to pay for the privilege of being called a liberal.

It was also advantageous to be kind to Communists. During and immediately after the war the anti-Communist was often regarded as a potential, if not actual, Fascist; or at least as not quite nice to know, and dangerous to associate with if one hoped to get on in the world. Anyone in the State Department who took a dim view of the Soviet Union, or who questioned the popular assumption that the Chinese Communists were harmless agrarian reformers, had little hope of promotion, and his advice was disregarded by successive Presidents and Secretaries of State. Alger Hiss, whom Roosevelt chose to take with him to Yalta, in preference to the loyal experts on Russia in the State Department, would never have been singled out for rapid advancement had he not been pro-Soviet.

As regards most of the magazines, newspapers, radio programs, universities, and research associations (such as the Institute of Pacific Relations and the Foreign Policy Association), it was about as hard for an anti-Communist, or critic of the Soviet Government, to obtain a hearing as for the proverbial camel to pass through the eye of a needle. All in all it was profitable to be red, or at least pink; and unprincipled careerists are as responsible as Communist sympathisers for the dangerous situation in which America is now placed.

II

Today the political climate has changed. It is no longer possible to be a Russia-firster while also posing as a loyal American. Today it is as necessary for the time servers to denounce Stalin as it was formerly to praise him. So the political chameleons have suddenly discovered that Russia is ruled by a totalitarian tyranny as bad and as dangerous as Hitler's. One is reminded of the old English song about the Vicar of Bray who got preferment by changing his religion in each reign from the Stuarts to the Hanoverians. Its refrain runs:

"And this is law that I'll maintain
Until my dying day, sir,
That whatsoever King shall reign,
I'll be the Vicar of Bray, sir."

Many of those responsible for the disastrous course taken by American policy from Tehran to Potsdam and for a year or two afterward now cling together in preserving each others' reputations and denying their responsibility. They neither confess to, nor repent of, their past errors and sins. Moreover many of them still display a sneaking regard for communism, even while condemning Russia's aggressive policies. This is evidenced by the friendly attitude displayed toward Tito.

The real Communists are, of course, as adept in changing their outward color for protective purposes as the careerists. Indeed it can be surmised that if there is a "top Soviet espionage agent" in the State Department, as charged by MCCARTHY, he will have taken such care never to display his true colors that his name is not included in the list of suspects. Those Government employees who embraced communism out of conviction and openly displayed their sympathies, can no doubt count upon the discreet silence of the careerists who no longer follow the party line. And might not the threat of exposure be used by the Communists to blackmail those who formerly influenced, or implemented, American policy in accordance with Moscow's interests, but are now pretending that they have always been loyal Americans? Could be.

III

On the other hand those Government employees who have never been sympathetic to communism, or who have never gone along with the Communists in hope of preferment, and are in a position to know or suspect which of their colleagues are disloyal or security risks, cannot testify for fear of losing their jobs. This seems to me the most shocking aspect of the present senatorial investigation, yet it causes little or no comment. The newspapers are full of criticisms of the concept of guilt by association, and of the infringement of civil liberties entailed by loyalty investigations. But no one seems to view with alarm reports that loyal Government employees hesitate to testify against those whom they have reason to believe are Communists, for fear of being victimized by the administration. And the manner in which Senator TYDINGS has conducted the investigation, coupled with the Executive's reluctance to allow the Senate committee to see the files of those accused of subversive activities, suggests that the administration is more concerned to save face than to root out Communists in the Government service.

We must have gone further than we realize along the road which leads to totalitarian tyranny when it is assumed that the administration has the right to demand of Government employees that their first loyalty be to the party in power, not to their country or their conscience; and when Americans are willing to forego their inalienable rights under the Constitution rather than lose their jobs.

Our military government in Germany was instructed at the war's end to hold all Germans guilty of the crimes of the Nazis, and specifically to punish anyone who had been associated with, collaborated with, or been

related to the Nazis. Our law of liberation from national socialism, as the denazification decree was called, penalized not only all party members and their wives and children, but also all members of associations affiliated with the Nazi Party. In other words the principle of guilt by association was made the law of the conquered territory. I have yet to find a liberal commentator, or columnist, now insisting that no man should be suspected on account of his associates, whoever raised his voice to condemn the denazification decree.

II

It is the decline of ethical standards and of belief in universal principles of justice, together with the lack of moral courage, so evident today, which has allowed the Communist disease to spread, and which makes it so hard to cure. McCarthy would achieve more positive results if he concentrated on proving that those who direct United States policy are poor security risks on account of their lack of integrity, their bad judgment, their ignorance, and their gullibility, as shown by the record. Those who directed American policy along the line most advantageous to Moscow, whatever their motives may have been, are far more dangerous than espionage agents. The harm done to the Republic by Alger Hiss at Yalta and San Francisco was incomparably greater than the activities which helped persuade the jury to convict him.

The difficulty is that a real inquiry into the causes for the disastrous policy toward Russia pursued by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman would require a quality of greatness in certain eminent Americans which they have so far not displayed. If General Marshall, for instance, were to tell the truth before the Senate Committee would he admit his mistakes in China? Would he take responsibility for having prepared the way for Moscow to conquer China—by his policy of placing an embargo on arms to Chiang Kai-shek, and by pressing the Generalissimo to take the Communists into the National Government? Would he, at least, fix the responsibility on treacherous State Department advisers? Without such frank speaking, it is difficult to foresee real progress from loyalty investigations.

Basically the problem is up to the American people. They have the power to make an irresistible demand that the administration which they elected follow the courageous and honest path. Unless the people exert this power, their undoubted desire to defeat totalitarianism will be thwarted by the Vicars of Bray.

Tree Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a factual statement on tree farms and forestry, by W. D. Hagenstein, a prominent forest engineer in the Pacific Northwest region. I am sure the information presented by Mr. Hagenstein will be found extremely valuable by all Members of the House who are interested in forestry and the perpetuation of our forest resources.

The statement follows:

[From the Oregon Business Review, Eugene, Oreg., for February 1950]

TREE FARMS: A PACIFIC NORTHWEST BUSINESS ASSET

(By W. D. Hagenstein, forest engineer, Forest Conservation Committee of Pacific Northwest Forest Industries)

The first "tree farm" in the United States was dedicated in 1941 in Grays Harbor County, Wash. After an intensive forestry study, the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. set aside a 120,000-acre property for the permanent production of timber crops. The property was named the Clemons Tree Farm in memory of Charles Clemons, pioneer Grays Harbor County logger. The term "tree farm" implies business forest management.

Prior to the establishment of the Clemons Tree Farm, forest landowning companies in the Pacific Northwest had made a number of starts in forestry as far back as 1901. They soon learned that many serious obstacles beset them. Chief among these was the big gamble with forest enemy No. 1—fire. Because of the huge accumulations of highly inflammable debris in century-old forests and the frequent protracted droughts during July and August, the forest-fire problem in western Oregon and Washington was unparalleled elsewhere in the world.

To solve the fire problem, private-land owners in western Oregon and Washington organized a number of fire-protection associations over 40 years ago. Their early attempts emphasized safeguarding merchantable timber, logging facilities, and other property. The idea of protecting baby trees and saplings didn't enter the thinking of that period. Because of inadequate technical forestry knowledge and know-how of fire protection, results of the early protection efforts were hit and miss for nearly 20 years.

As the forestry profession developed in the region, its research was focused primarily on problems of fire prevention and control. An important discovery was that relative humidity, the amount of moisture in the air as compared with what it could hold at the saturation point, was the best indicator of impending fire danger. Following this discovery, private timber landowners, logging operators, and forest-protection organizations began to watch weather very closely. By 1933 the State forest-protection laws in Oregon and Washington had been modified in the light of operators' experience to provide a good basic code. But more was needed; fire records indicated that, despite good compliance with the forest-protection laws, the region was burning far too many young trees each dry summer.

Realization of this pointed the forestry efforts of a handful of private foresters toward the development of a system of forest management, which offered possibilities for overcoming the fire limitations to economically successful forest management. They termed the system "tree farming."

After studying the fire history on the property which was destined to become the Clemons Tree Farm, foresters determined that, if the company were to manage successfully its forest properties for continuing crops of wood, the fire problem would have to be approached on an entirely different basis than formerly. Their thesis was that a forest property must have protection commensurate with its worth. They established the worth of the company's Clemons property by determining the growing capacity of the land, the fire losses of second-growth trees on lands which had been harvested, and the replacement cost of such trees by artificial means. In this way they demonstrated how much could be spent for fire protection designed to keep within a predetermined maximum the loss on areas burned over annually. They found that the average annual expenditures for forest-fire protection had been about 8 cents per acre and that the acreage of young trees lost each year under this intensity of protection was costing the company a great deal more. To replace the trees lost would require many times the outlay for adequate fire protection. An immediate capital investment of about $1 per acre to provide satisfactory fire-protection roads, fire-detection facilities, a communication system, and modern mechanized fire equipment similar to that used for protection of urban property was recommended. An average annual expense of 25 to 30 cents per acre was estimated as necessary to complete the job.

The company, convinced of the business logic of these recommendations, undertook the type of fire protection suggested. The capital outlay and annual carrying charges for forest-fire protection appeared to be a reasonable insurance premium to assure the long-term investor, the tree farmer, that there would be a crop of ripe trees available when harvest time rolled around.

Basically, that is the genesis of the tree-farm program in America's Northwest corner, the Douglas-fir region. With a modest beginning on 120,000 acres as recent as 1941, the program has since spread throughout the Nation, and there are now over 20,000,000 acres of taxpaying forest lands certified as tree farms in 27 States.

Private foresters have been the leaders in spreading the tree-farm idea to privately owned forest lands, through their efforts to convince forest owners that money can be made in growing trees as well as converting them into forest products. Men conserve things of value; and, when they are shown that cut-over forest land is valuable for growing another crop of timber from which they can expect a reasonable return, nothing can stop them from practicing such forestry as will assure that return. The profit motive is the strongest impelling incentive to forest management, just as it is for good management of other renewable natural resources.

Nearly one-third or 3,270,692 acres of the taxpaying forest lands in western Oregon and Washington are now certified as tree farms. This is indicative of the magnitude of 9 years' progress since the Clemons Tree Farm of 120,000 acres was dedicated in 1941. Along with the increase in the acreage of certified tree farms in this region has come the continued increase in employment of professional foresters by private landowners. In the Douglas-fir region today there are 250 professionally trained foresters whose principal job is to provide efficient fire protection, grow timber, plan timber harvesting, and otherwise manage taxpaying lands for continuing forest crops. Foresters have become just as much a necessary and integral part of the forest-products business as sawmill managers, logging superintendents, salesmen, engineers, accountants, and lawyers. In addition to the tree farms in the western halves of these two States, there are also 1,344,779 acres of certified tree farms in eastern Oregon and Washington.

Tree farms are important business assets of the Pacific Northwest for many economic reasons. To demonstrate the economic impact of wood as a supplier of the wherewithal for the sustenance of the 4,000,000 people in Oregon and Washington, a few general statistics are pertinent.

Oregon and Washington furnish the people of the United States with more than one-fourth of their total annual forest-products needs in the form of lumber, wood pulp and paper, plywood and veneer, shingles, sash and doors, poles and piling, railroad ties, and a wide variety of refined products such as wood furniture, caskets, wood pipe and tanks, cooperage, ladders, crossarms, masts

and spars, and woodenware. Over 2,500 of Oregon and Washington's nearly 7,000 industrial establishments use wood as their basic raw material. The direct wage earners employed in 1948 by the wood-using industry was 170,000, more than the total employed in the use of any other single raw material. The direct wages earned by this large group of industrial workers was about $500,000,000. The value of forest products at Oregon and Washington wood-using plants in 1948 was just a few dollars shy of $1,500,000,000. This is $375 worth of forest products manufactured for every man, woman, and child resident in the two States. This is one-half again as much as agriculture contributes to the Northwest's economy; the 1948 value of the region's agricultural products, including price supports, was about $1,000,000,000.

In addition to the direct employment provided by the wood-using industry, the services and products of other Northwest employers should be considered in an appraisal of the effect of wood upon the region's economy. Fifty-eight percent of the 1948 revenue freight tonnage of class I steam railways originating in Oregon and Washington consisted of forest products. The number of railway employees affected directly by forest products is more than 20,000. Eighty percent of the entire revenue tonnage of water carriers originating in Oregon and Washington is forest products.

Another substantial pay roll directly attributable to the forest industry is the pay roll of the diversified manufacturing and distribution concerns which cater to its material, supply, and equipment needs. There are no reliable data available as to the number of people so employed, but the number has been estimated to be between 30,000 and 35,000.

As a source of taxes the forest industry undoubtedly is the principal regional contributor, though it is impossible to estimate the exact proportion of its contribution to the tax revenues of the two States.

The wage earners directly affected by the growing, harvesting, manufacturing, and marketing of forest products in the two Northwest States probably total about 250,000. It is obvious that the primary wage earners in the forest-products industry, whose average hourly earnings are as high as any group of heavy industrial workers in the world, contribute importantly to the economy of the Northwest's 4,000,000 people. The continuation of this contribution to the two States' well-being depends entirely upon how forest lands are managed to provide the region's principal industry with a continuing supply of raw material.

While a tree farmer's intent is to grow timber for harvest and use, local benefits to soil and water conservation, provision of a natural habitat for wildlife, and, to a limited extent, recreation opportunities will also accrue from the movement. But the recreation-seeking public must cooperate in the protection of private forest lands, especially during those portions of the year when the fire risk is high; one forest fire started during bad fire weather can completely obliterate 10 to 100 years of forest growth.

Tree farms are not just a public-relations stunt designed to convince the public that something is being done about forest management on taxpaying forest land. Tree farms are serious private timber-growing ventures ranging from just a few woodland acres of an enlightened farmer to managed industrial forest properties of 100,000 or more acres. Each in its own way is contributing to the regional and national wood pile through good forest management. The way this job is being done is by no means perfect as yet. But the transition from mere fire protection, and that not always effective, to forestry—in which the attainment of an annual balance between timber growth and timber harvest is the aim—is not something that can be accomplished in a few days, weeks, or years. It took Europe several centuries to attain its present intensity of managed forests. Forestry is only 50 years old in the Unietd States and younger than that in Oregon and Washington; but a substantial start has been made and the passing of each year shows discernible progress. In the Douglas-fir region today many of the best-managed forests are on private land.

Privately owned forests in western Oregon and Washington are certified as tree farms in the following manner:

1. An owner signifies his intentions to qualify as a certified tree farmer in a formal application to the forest conservation committee of the Pacific Northwest Forest Industries; he agrees (a) to maintain a specified area of forest land for growing forest crops; (b). to provide adequate protection from fire, insects, disease, and destructive grazing; (c) to conduct planned timber harvesting to assure reforestation; and (d) to supply information concerning his progress to the forest conservation committee.

2. The applicant is required to submit a plan of development for his property, covering fire protection, timber-harvesting practices, and plans for artificial reforestation, if necessary, for the first 5 years following date of his application.

3. After receipt of a formal application for certification of a private forest as a tree farm, a staff forester of the forest conservation committee examines the property on the ground to determine its suitability as a tree farm. The forester discusses with the owner the policy for his property. If satisfied that the owner sincerely desires to enter into timber growing as a long-term business venture and will agree to carry out the pledges covered in the application, the forester recommends to the forest conservation committee that the property be certified as a tree farm. At a regular meeting of the forest conservation committee the landowner appears to support his applications and is questioned concerning his plans and policy. Should the application and the recommendation of the staff forester not be acceptable to the forest conservation committee, the property is not certified as a tree farm.

Once a property has been certified, annual inspections are made to determine whether the landowner is living up to his pledges for constructive forest management. If it is found that the owner is not living up to the rules of the game, his certificate may be revoked. Four certificates for lands in western Oregon and Washington have been revoked; where violations of landowners' pledges are observed, certificates will continue to be revoked. The only kind of timber-growing program which means anything to the owner of the property so pledged is one which produces results. The Forest Conservation Committee does not condone the certification of taxpaying forests where the owner won't or can't do the job. The tree-farm program is not a philanthropic movement designed to do a fine job of forest management exclusively for public benefit; but, if it succeeds in doing a good job of forest management, the ultimate benefits will accrue to the public at large in the form of adequate timber supplies.

The Pacific Northwest's people have not been sufficiently acquainted with the tree-farm program to realize fully that a tree farm is not a forest property which has been badly treated in the past and is being reforested exclusively by artificial means. Actually, a tree farm may have old-growth timber which is ready for harvest now or in the next few years, natural second-growth trees which are too young for use, trees younger still which have developed naturally on lands from which the original forests have been harvested, lands which did not reforest naturally because of bad cutting or fire and which therefore need rehabilitation, and lands which have been harvested so recently that it is not certain yet whether they will reforest naturally or will require help from man. Present Douglas-fir tree farms have nearly one-half of their acreage occupied by mature timber ripe for harvest, and one-fourth is in natural second-growth trees too young and small for use; the balance consists of land recently harvested, hand-high seedlings, and areas needing rehabilitation.

Because of systematic reservation of seed-bearing timber on each harvest area and because of the subsequent fire protection provided, 90 percent of the lands currently being harvested in the Douglas-fir region are reforesting by natural means. The balance must be reforested artifically by planting of nursery-grown seedlings or by seeding by airplane or by hand.

When tree farms were begun in the Douglas-fir region, there was no source of nursery-grown seedlings for artificial reforestation of taxpaying lands; in 1942 the forest industry developed a cooperative forest-tree nursery for furnishing trees at cost for commercial reforestation by landowners in western Oregon and Washington. This nursery has supplied sufficient seedlings since it began operation 9 years ago to put nearly 60,000 idle acres back to work growing raw material. The nursery is a continuing project to provide artificial means of assuring seedling trees for reforestation wherever natural means fail or where hard luck is encountered in fire protection.

Forestry must not be confounded with tree planting, because tree planting makes up a very small part, although important, in its practice. Common-sense timber harvesting practices, where seed trees are reserved and good protection provided, will do the job of replacing 9 out of 10 trees cut. It is only for the tenth tree where nature fails that man must lend a hand. Tree farms do not mean planting trees. They do mean the management of taxpaying forest properties by wise cutting of mature timber; skillful reservation of seed-bearing trees to reforest the lands harvested; planting or seeding where nature fails; utilizing the raw material to the fullest extent possible; providing society with a continuing supply of needed forest products; assuring plentiful well-paying jobs in forest communities; maintaining a local tax base; and contributing to the happiness and welfare of the Nation.

In Oregon and Washington, where the public owns over 50 percent of the commercial forest land and where the balance is held by taxpayers, it is necessary that forest management become a part of our economic system. The public forests are managed under forestry principles which assure continuous production. The private forests, which to date have contributed more than 90 percent of the annual raw-material requirements of the region's principal industry, have not always been handled in the best possible manner, because of economic impediments and the uncertainty of the success of forest-fire protection efforts. Tree farms, which the wood-using industry is proud it sired, have already put nearly one-third of western Oregon and Washington's highly productive private forest land under permanent forest management by showing the way that timber growing can be made pay—through adequate fire protection, sound harvesting practices, artificial reforestation where needed, and full wood utilization. Promotion of tree farms on lands not so dedicated as yet is continuing each year; eventually the owners of most privately held forests will be practicing tree-farm management.

The tree farms which are already established in the region constitute an important business asset which helps assure a continued high standard of living for the citizens of the Pacific Northwest. The continued success and further development of tree farms will depend upon public support, particularly in the matter of fire prevention, and sympathetic understanding of the fact that timber growing is a long-term program, which must be made to pay its way as long as the American way is opportunity for private ownership and initiative.

Praise for the Late Honorable Schuyler Otis Bland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, as part of my extension of remarks I append herewith article from the Grade Log for March and April 1950, commenting upon the career of the late lamented chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Hon. Schuyler Otis Bland. The tributes to Mr. Bland quoted in the article are more than deserved. He was one of the great Americans of his time and certainly the outstanding advocate in America of an adequate merchant marine. The tribute follows:

REPRESENTATIVE SCHUYLER O. BLAND

Representative Schuyler O. Bland, a senior Member of the lower House of Congress, chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, died in mid-February.

At the age of 77, the sturdy advocate of a strong United States merchant marine, was in his thirty-second year as a Representative from Virginia. Mr. Bland's years of service in Congress were exceeded by only four other Members of the House of Representatives. Despite his years and recently uncertain health, he was active in the promotion of the welfare of the merchant marine.

A resident of Newport News, Mr. Bland continuously had represented the First District of Virginia since 1918. His personal integrity and dignity helped to make him one of the most respected Members of the great legislative body, and were responsible, in part, for the success of much of the legislation which he sponsored.

As chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee for many years, he deserved much of the credit for strengthening United States shipping prior to World War II. Deeply concerned in the postwar years by the deteriorating position of coastwise shipping, the shipbuilding industry, and the merchant marine in general, at the time of his death, he was sponsoring a new long-range program for United States shipping.

Frequently called the "father" and "progenitor" of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, he steered that legislation to passage. Representative Bland maintained constant vigilance to see that its provisions were being followed.

In November of last year, all United States flag ships in New York harbor "dressed ship" as a tribute to Mr. Bland, who was the guest of honor that evening at a testimonial dinner attended by representatives of government, the shipping and shipbuilding industries.

Commenting on the death of Representative Bland, Mr. Frank J. Taylor, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, declared, "The entire United States shipping industry, both management and labor, will sorely miss Schuyler Otis Bland, who is truly the father of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which made possible our present fleet of fine new ships. It is the most important piece of shipping legislation passed in the history of United States shipping. His long tenure as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was filled with other important contributions that aided not only shipping but the Nation as a whole. Every ship afloat in our new merchant marine is a monument to his memory."

Mr. Stanley Ferguson, in the New York Journal of Commerce, commented on Representative Bland's death. He said, "his death * * * removes from the national scene one of the best, most influential friends the United States merchant marine ever had in Congress, or, for that matter, anywhere else.

"* * * he will be remembered with equal admiration for the courage and perseverance with which he continued to fight for the cause of United States shipping in the face of failing health, as well as of political adversity, in the years following the war.

"Mr. Bland's dignity, simplicity, and personal integrity carried such weight in the House that at critical moments it was probably the deciding factor in the enactment of legislation of vital importance to the maritime industry."

Electric Power Restored in Tornado Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, you have heard the rural electrification program criticized many times. Its enemies have invariably attempted to show that it is inefficient.

I want to call your attention to one of the greatest demonstrations of efficiency that I have ever known.

Several days ago a cyclone swept down on the town of Paden, in Tishomingo County, Miss. It destroyed a large number of homes, as well as public buildings, and left the entire area in darkness.

That county is served by the Tishomingo Electric Power Association, of which Mr. William J. Brinkley is the manager. As soon as the notice of the storm was given, Mr. Brinkley got busy and had electric service restored with a speed that certainly challenges everyone's admiration.

At this point I am inserting an article from the Iuka Vidette, which in plain terms tells the story of the efficiency of the Tishomingo Electric Power Association under the direction of Mr. Brinkley, in this trying situation.

The matter referred to follows:

NO LOSS OF TIME DUE TO RADIO SERVICE

Bill Brinkley said the local power company suffered losses up to $500 in the recent tornado at Midway and Paden. We were able to get power restored in the Midway area in about 2 hours, Bill said, and in about 6 hours at Paden.

The extent of the damage at Midway consisted of service wires broken by falling trees and houses being blown off foundations. At Paden, he said the 12,000-volt primary lines were torn down by trees and debris from demolished houses.

Due to facilities such as the two-way radio installed on the trucks and at the main office all the trouble was isolated and repairs were made in a total of about 8 hours. Without this service the same job would have taken fully 2 days. Due to the radio communication facilities we were able to investigate the damage throughout the entire county in a matter of a few minutes, Bill said, otherwise had we depended on telephone it would have taken hours as telephone lines were torn down by the storm.

Political Trends in Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago, I made a speech about "reckless minorities in Latin America" which is recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 21, 1949. At that time there were some who thought me harsh in my description of the communistic tendencies of the present Guatemalan Government, both in its attitude toward American investors and toward attempts of the United States to bring concord and economic cooperation between the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

I have, therefore, been interested in recent revelations of how correct I was in my interpretations of events and my prophecies of trends in Guatemala.

Far from being harsh, I apparently understand the communistic influence in the Guatemalan Government and how much the United States should be concerned about its effect on our interests, including the recent threats on the life of Hon. Richard C. Patterson, Jr., our Ambassador to Guatemala. Recently a five-nation committee of inquiry including representatives of Uruguay, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Colombia, as well as our own State Department, officially found Guatemala among three nations that have deliberately disturbed the peace the United States has been trying to encourage in the Western Hemisphere. As reported in the Washington Post:

A five-nation committee of inquiry yesterday branded Cuba, Guatemala, and the Dominican Republic as responsible for recent plots to stage revolutions, assassinations, and armed invasions in the Caribbean.

That corroborates exactly what I said in my speech a year ago, to wit:

Guatemala has made particular difficulty for the United States in all the attempts of the United States to bring concord and economic cooperation between the nations of the Western Hemisphere. Members of the Guatemalan mission made difficulties at the Rio Conference. They also made difficulties in the Bogota Conference. They have undone a great deal of the efforts of better-intentioned Latin-American governments to bring a feeling of the feasibility of economic

cooperation between the United States and its sister Republics to the south.

In connection with my other charges of the Communist influence in the reckless minority ruling Guatemala, there was published in the Washington Post a short time ago, a long study of the nature of the present Guatemalan Government and its purposes by Mr. Fitzhugh Turner, a reporter of high reputation who made a long trip to Guatemala to learn the facts. In order that we may understand these dangerous symptoms in a country whose airfields dominate the Panama Canal, I am including the entire text of Mr. Fitzhugh Turner's study on Guatemala inserted in the RECORD.

This is an election year in Guatemala for a 6-year presidential term. The influences that have, as Mr. Turner says, brought Guatemala to its present state, are seeking to put themselves in power for at least 6 years and perhaps an indefinite period.

As part of that drive for power, we may expect over the next 6 months a maximum of Communist-inspired attacks on American business and upon American foreign policy such as the attack on American relations with Puerto Rico which occurred last month and the threats to Ambassador Patterson.

For that reason I hope that the people of this country will inform themselves from these articles of Mr. Turner's so that we may fully understand these anticipated attacks in their true significance as part of bigger plans of the Communists for the cold war everywhere.

Mr. Turner's article follows:

The United States, too, has a soft underbelly—Central America and the Caribbean—and trouble has developed there. While North America tries to combat communism in Europe and Asia, Latin communism bores in where it hurts.

Personal and ideological hatreds boil up among the presidents and dictators, small fights rock the area and a big explosion, some say, is on the way.

Others say that talk of an explosion is nonsense, that the State Department and the Organization of American States can deal with the danger. But diplomatic pressure has achieved nothing impressive to date.

Cuba and the Dominican Republic are engaged in a running quarrel, Haiti and the Dominican Republic are at each other's throats, Costa Rica and Nicaragua have tangled in wrath. And the self-styled rebellious child among the erstwhile good neighbors, the 110-year-old Republic of Guatemala, threatens to become more of a problem than ever.

LOOKS FURTHER LEFT

Guatemala is the volcano-studded little country which, with Cuba, harbors a private army, the Caribbean Legion, dedicated to the overthrow of nearby governments. In the geographic sense, it is the nearest to the United States of the six Central American Republics; in the political sense, it is halfway to Poland.

This reporter has just returned from an investigation into conditions there, a sort of sampling of what goes on. The conclusion: Communism exists in Guatemala (although it is not necessarily Russian communism nor the most virulent in the world) and the leftist government is about to leap farther left.

The situation is as senseless as it is dangerous. Guatemala has much, and could have everything.

There is a fertile, scenic plateau where the weather is spring the year around. Poinsettias grow tree high. Easter lilies reach quart size without urging. Mayan and Spanish ruins dot the landscape, along with mountains and big fresh-water lakes.

The area is a little less than that of North Carolina, the population (3,643,000) about the same as in that uncrowded State. About 60 percent of the people are Indians, colorful and primitive. Perhaps 200,000 persons of Spanish or other European descent form the property-holding, and normally, the ruling class.

The volcanic soil is incredibly rich. Coffee and bananas are sold to the United States for dollars, and the Guatemalan quetzal is as valuable as the dollar, with which it is freely interchangeable. Abundant production, good prices, and close ties with the North American economy have eliminated public debt.

DEVELOPERS REBUFFED

With all this, the country is virtually undeveloped. There is oil in the Peten, where Guatemala juts into the Yucatan Peninsula. American interests in the country would like to expand. New American interests would like to come in. President Truman's point 4 program could work as well there as anywhere in the world. But there is little atmosphere for development rather, suspicion, opposition, and rebuff.

Some important investors have pulled out of the country, others have abandoned millions of dollars' worth of improvement plans and still others have refused to come in.

At least part of the reason for this hostility lies in history. The country for 300 years was the seat of repressive Spanish rule in Central America, and for another 100 years of some of the most brutal dictatorships that have sprung up in a dictator-ridden corner of the world. American interests played ball with the dictators, and American diplomacy was hinged to the dollar until the good-neighbor policy came along.

It has been only 5 years since Guatemala became a democracy—near democracy would be a better term. It is understandable, perhaps, that a new government should turn violently against the past. An extreme turn to the left is less understandable. Except emotionally, no Guatemalan really would like to remove his country from the United States orbit, nor believes that it could be done.

President Juan Jose Arevalo's course has been one of cross purposes. He has improved the lot of Guatemala's ordinary people. He has introduced a labor law, has raised wages, has begun social security and has made a start against illiteracy. But he has attacked the sources of his country's wealth.

Economic development has lagged. Roads have deteriorated so much that the four-wheel drive jeep has become a necessary form of transportation. The government pecks at repairs and pleads lack of funds, yet it is spending $4,000,000 on a site of Central American Olympic games.

Marxist propaganda, meanwhile, is encouraged. "Wall Street imperialism" is denounced at every turn. American little business meets red tape, and big business is kicked around with gusto. The Government press gives free space and the government radio free time to leftist attacks on the gringo, and the Communist line, a faithful echo of Moscow, is heard loud in the land.

Spies are everywhere. The Government reads the telegrams and even the mail of those Americans (and Guatemalans) it distrusts. No outsider knows which waiters at hotels and restaurants are police cars.

President Arevalo employs his own agents out of his secret funds of $473,000 a year, and at least one cabinet minister employs agents to watch for signs of revolt. It may be a good idea; more than 20 revolutions have been plotted in the past few years.

There are other agencies at work against the Government. Nicaragua's Anastasio Somoza and the Dominican Republic's Leonidas Trujillo keep constant watch on Dr. Arevalo, who hates them, and on the Caribbean Legion, which is aimed primarily against their two dictatorships. Neighboring Honduras and El Salvador watch for agitators who try to spread Guatemalan ferment to their territories.

There is evidence that both the United States and the British keep an undercover eye on the situation. When a hot foreign issue becomes desirable, Dr. Arevalo whips up Guatemala's claim to adjoining British Honduras, and His Majesty's government maintains Irish troops at Belize to guard against an air-borne Caribbean Legion attack.

ONLY ONE FRIEND

Of all the nations of the Western Hemisphere, Guatemala is on intimate terms with only one, Cuba, where there is also a left-wing regime. Relations with Panama, Costa Rica, Haiti, Honduras, El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua range from suspicion to open break.

Relations with the United States have improved a little since Arevalo supplanted an open leftist with a more friendly Foreign Minister. But the new Minister, Ismael Gonzales Arevalo, has been heard to complain that he has been surrounded by Communists who attempt to thwart his work.

For many years Arevalo lived in self-imposed exile near Buenos Aires. There he obtained Argentine citizenship and acquired friends who turn up quite often now in Guatemala. Some of them have taken to communism in their dislike of the United States, or to dislike of the United States in their pursuit of communism, and sometimes Arevalo has given them Government jobs.

Anti-North American Communist sympathizers, as well, have been installed in important Government press and radio posts, and others have risen to power in the political parties and labor unions which give Arevalo his strength. Still others work with the President in his office, and still others have infiltrated the diplomatic service.

Some of these Communists, pro-Communists, Communist sympathizers, or whatever may be Soviet agents, this reporter does not pretend to know. Those to whom I talked denied it, or said they cannot be Communists at all, since the constitution outlaws the party in Guatemala.

There is no Soviet espionage network in the country, so far as experts can tell. (There is nothing much for a Russian to spy on.) Nor is there, despite recent furor, a Russian submarine base on the coast. Nor does the Moscow radio concentrate on Guatemala.

A PECULIAR MIXTURE

Guatemalan leftism, it is a fair conclusion, is not Russian, but is largely of the peculiar Latin variety, earnest and befuddled rather than cynical, entangling Marxist ideology and Communist propaganda with antigringoism, with local nationalism and with the personal politicking traditional in the Latin world.

This does not mean there is no link to Moscow. The nearest Soviet Embassy to Guatemala is the one in Mexico City, which also is headquarters for Vicente Lombardo Toledano, the pro-Communist Latin labor leader. Guatemala's labor is allied with Toledano's pro-Communist federation, the CTAL, and through it with the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions.

When Soviet propaganda appears in Guatemala, it arrives in company with copies of the CTAL newspaper, and Toledano's agents move freely back and forth between Guatemala and Mexico. Some seem on intimate

terms with President Arevalo. One, for example, was appointed by Arevalo in 1948 to advise the Guatemalan delegation to the Bogota Conference.

A current visitor is Cesar Godoy Godoy, an exiled Chilean Communist and one of Arevalo's old friends. Godoy passed 2 or 3 months in Guatemala last summer trying to organize a United Front for Democratic Liberation, to unseat Caribbean dictators.

Once when two visiting Americans of the CIO made speeches of friendship to the Guatemala railroad union, Godoy followed them to the stand and denounced them as imperialist agents.

"These people have autos and refrigerators and comfortable houses," Godoy declared. "How can they be on your side here?"

Godoy left Guatemala after that to organize the pro-Communist World Peace Congress held at Mexico City in September.

A GLOWER "WITCH"

Another old friend of the President, also a Chilean, is a plumpish, middle-aged blonde named Virginia Bravo Atelier. She formerly was a Chilean cultural attaché in Washington; some Americans who have encountered her at work in Guatemala call her "the witch of the coffee country."

President Arevalo gave this rather shrill lady a job in the Ministry of Education about a year and a half ago. She travels around the country lecturing to rural teachers, denounces American-sponsored teacher training as Yankee imperialism, and spreads the party line wherever she goes.

Most active Communist front outside the labor unions is the Democratic Youth Alliance, known by its Spanish language initials as AJDG. Composed largely of students and dupes, AJDG spreads the Communist line interspersed with cultural programs; has the backing of the government and is headed by Jose H. Zamora, a Salvadorean who holds a government job as the President's publicity chief.

HEEDLY LEFT WING

President Arevalo denies that he himself is a Communist, and the general opinion gives him the benefit of the doubt. Objective people, including some of his enemies, say he is a left-wing idealist with a flair for practical politics and with a sincere desire to achieve social progress in Guatemala.

He has inclined Communists among his supporters, they say, because he is anti-American, because his only real support comes from labor and the left and because he believes he can control them.

It is true that the President has curbed some excesses. With his term about over, however, and with more extreme leftists coming to the fore, it is not clear now whether he is clearly in control of his supporters.

FIVE THOUSAND ARMS BOOGIES

One of the requirements of President Truman's point 4 program is a favorable climate for American investment. In Guatemala the Government not only has failed to create such a climate but has complicated existing interests that the aim is to drive them out of the country.

Some $150,000,000 is involved, most of it in three large companies.

United Fruit, with $100,000,000 invested, has abandoned a $10,000,000 development program because of the Government's attitude; this, by 1951, will return 5,000 acres of Atlantic coast land to jungle and will cost some 4,000 Guatemalans their jobs. Empresa Electrica, a $12,000,000 subsidy of Electric Bond & Share, is in danger of expropriation, and the International Railways of Central America, an $80,000,000 property, is engaged in a wage dispute which threatens to make it a losing financial proposition.

The companies, admittedly, have a history of exploitation. They throve in the time of dictators, and played more than a small part in Central American politics. They still operate under concessions dating to those times, and their contracts extend far into the future, granting low taxes in some cases and tax exemptions in others.

But they long since have changed their old ways. An additional requirement of point 4, the State Department says, is that American investors must exhibit statesmanship abroad.

The Guatemalan companies, then, would like to renegotiate their contracts to make them more acceptable.

United Fruit, for example, already has renegotiated in Honolulu and El Salvador, and has made overtures in Guatemala, only to be rebuffed. Guatemalan leaders have made it clear that renegotiation means huge cash payments, $11,000,000 in the case of the railroad. So the companies have determined to stick to their present contracts until discrimination against them ends.

PAY DISCRIMINATION

Meanwhile, the government and labor unions kick them around. Arevalo's labor law provided that agricultural concerns with more than 500 employees must pay time and a half for overtime, against time and a quarter for others, and must grant 10-day vacations, against 5 days for others. Agricultural concerns with more than 500 employees, in Guatemala, means principally the fruit company.

In most of the anti-American Communist-line propaganda in Guatemala, the three big companies are singled out for the harshest adjectives. Some clue to the reason may line in what Defense Minister Jacobo Arbens told an American in a drinking moment. "You people are doing things for your workers that we won't be able to do for 50 years," he said. "That's why I hate you."

The fact is that the American companies pay by far the highest wages in the country, and take the best care of their employees. The railroad pays manual labor $1.67 per day; the Government pays 64 cents for equivalent work. United Fruit pays agricultural labor a minimum of $1.36 a day, as opposed to 40 cents paid on government coffee plantations. The fruit company maintains two central hospitals, two dozen infirmaries, 54 schools, recreation halls, commissaries, and the like, and even its critics concede its employee housing is the best in the country.

To develop Guatemala, Ismael Gonzales Arevalo, the pro-American Foreign Minister, talks of a World Bank loan for roads and electric power. If a loan is granted, it will be over the objection of United States Ambassador Richard C. Patterson, Jr. He has told the Government he can recommend no loan until corrective action is taken against injustices to American interests.

A PRIVATE ARMY

Besides its Communists, Guatemala has the Caribbean legion mentioned earlier, a private army of exiles and adventurers with designs against neighboring governments. The legion had the use of Guatemalan planes, rifles, and ammunition in an attempted invasion of the Dominican Republic last year, and it is now assembling small boats at Puerto Barrios, on the Atlantic coast, for another expedition, presumably aimed either at the Dominican Republic or Nicaragua.

The legion, which has its headquarters in Cuba, is behind much of the uproar in the Caribbean, according to the Organization of American States. Considering its size, this is something of an achievement. For the legion, between invasions, consisted of no more than 25 to 100 persons, most of them broke.

A few are Communists, others are non-Communist leftists or moderates or rightists, and personal as well as ideological jealousies divide them. Most are Nicaraguans and Dominicans, or exiles from Honduras or El Salvador, although Guatemala, Cuba, Venezuela and even the United States and Britain are represented from time to time. What most have in common is this: that they are out.

Juan Rodrigues, a wealthy Dominican exile, put up most of the money for the attempt against Trujillo, and another Dominican exile, a tough, bearded soldier named Miguel Angel Ramirez, was commander at last account.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY ONE-THOUSANDTHS BATTING AVERAGE

Legion strategy once was full-dress invasion, but this is no longer possible. The force is not strong enough nor can hemisphere opinion be expected to countenance anything as blatant as that. The tactic, rather, is to plot rebellion within the country under attack and to move in simultaneously with the outbreak of revolt.

Results have been fairly dismal; the batting average only 0.250. Members first came together in 1947, in a large-scale attempt to invade the Dominican Republic from Cuba. The expedition included 31 bombers, 2 infantry landing boats, and about 1,100 men. Publicity, undercover United States intervention, and the cooperation of certain Cuban Government officers broke it up before it left Cuban soil.

Internal dissension helped. At least 10 separate participants, it developed, expected to be made Dominican President when Trujillo was dead.

In Guatemala City some months later, a group of the rebels hired a United States pilot, James Hurst, to kill General Somoza of Nicaragua from the air. Gen. Emiliano Chamorro, an exiled rightest revolutionary, was to become President. Hurst was ready to load the explosives when Chamorro objected to the choice of a leftist, Edelberto Torres, to be Vice President, and the plot fell through.

BEHIND BEFORE

It was not until March 1948 that the exiles came into their own. Some of them joined with Jose Figueres, a Costa Rican planter, in an uprising against his Government. The revolt succeeded. The Caribbean Legion was officially organized, with a coat of arms, headquarters at San Jose, and a scheme to unseat General Somoza next door.

The canny Nicaraguan dictator acted first, however. He started a border fight which brought the Rio Pact into action, exposed the legion to publicity, and forced it again to disperse.

Last June's expedition was remarkable even in Central America for mismanagement and bad luck, although members of the Guatemalan Government helped and allowed Guatemala to be used as the main base of operations.

At least six planes loaded with men and arms took off from Guatemala. Some of the arms were from Guatemala stocks and two of the planes were Guatemalan Air Force DC-3's with their official markings, T-1 and T-2, only thinly disguised.

One plane crash-landed en route, three were detained when they landed in Mexico to refuel, one missed the rendezvous, and only a flying boat reached the goal at Luperon, on the Dominican north coast, on time. The three North Americans and eight Latins aboard found no revolutionaries to meet them, and a Trujillo force hunted them down in the hills and killed all except one, a Dominican.

The Guatemalan Government later denied that it participated in the Luperon affair. When this reporter asked a cabinet member why the Government harbors the legion, he replied that this is untrue. But people in and out of the Government have friends, he added, and if individuals wish to help individuals with food, transportation, or other things, that is their own affair.

ELECTION WORRIES

A presidential election is supposed to be held in Guatemala toward the end of this year, but the odds, probably, are no better than 50-50 that it will come off in peace. Most of the country believes that unless he is chosen as the Government candidate and is elected, Defense Minister Arbens will attempt to seize power by force.

This could lead to much bloodshed. For besides Colonel Arbens, the two strongest men in the country are pro-Communist labor leaders who have staked their futures on an election and many of whose followers are armed. The Government itself gave them rifles, some 2,000 or 3,000, during an attempted revolution last summer.

The labor leaders are Manuel Pinto Usaga and Victor Manuel Gutierres. In recent weeks they have consolidated Guatemalan unions into a single federation, and have organized labor into a more or less solid national political action committee. They themselves disavow personal political ambitions but hope, they say, to install the candidate they favor in the Presidency. Their aim is to see that the new President continues the revolution and puts through agrarian reform.

If the labor candidate should win, the new regime would be even further left than the present government. Guatemala's neighbors fear that a government will emerge which will take orders from Moscow, and will seek to install communism in Honduras, El Salvador, and other countries. Further subversion of the labor movement in Latin America might follow, and, conceivably, destruction of the inter-American system.

These worries are traceable, in part, to fears of Pinto Usaga and Gutierres. For both men are known Communist sympathizers and opponents of any except the tamest United States financial interests.

POWER IS ALL

A well-informed Guatemalan, himself a presidential possibility, believes, however, that Pinto Usaga and Gutierres will disappear in short order if a strong man takes over. And since the election will be rigged by the Government, that strong man is likely to be Arbenz.

The Defense Minister, he says, professes leftist views only because he happens to be a member of a leftist Government, and he represents himself as a friend of labor for the same reason. What he really wants is power.

The colonel last summer began to be threatened by the rise to prominence of an old-time partner, Col. Francisco J. Arana, chief of the armed forces, a political moderate and friend of the United States. He was acquiring a large following in the army and among the people, and was talked of as a presidential candidate.

One July day Colonel Arana learned that Lieutenant Colonel Arbenz had been helping the Caribbean Legion, and that a quantity of Guatemalan Government arms had been cached by the legion at Lake Amatitlan. He drove off to investigate and was ambushed and killed with submachine guns.

The assassins neglected to kill Arana's driver, and the man escaped to name two of the gunmen. One, he said, was Mrs. Arbenz's chauffeur, and the other was Alfonso Martinez, business manager for Colonel Arbenz.

ARTILLERY BATTLE

The killing set off a revolution by some of Arana's army friends, and fighting raged for 2 days with weapons as heavy as 105-millimeter artillery. The Government won, the revolutionaries fled, and nobody bothered to bring the Arana assassins to justice. Rumor a few weeks ago was that Martinez, who is a prominent figure in Guatemala City, was about to be appointed chief of police.

In the army since then, Colonel Arbenz has entrenched himself by placing his supporters in key positions and by paying bonuses to officers. Guatemalan officers make from $50 to $250 a month, and favorites receive from $50 to $125 extra from the Defense Minister.

A new man, Maj. Carlos Paz-Tejada, has taken Colonel Arana's post; he refers to himself as "the unknown soldier," and so far at least has done nothing to threaten the Arbenz ambition.

Espionage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, 1949, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, by unanimous vote, reported H. R. 4703, relating to the internal security of the United States. After many delays, a rule was finally granted and the proponents of this important bill were able to bring it to the floor for consideration and vote on March 15, 1950. I was more than glad to support this legislation, and I regret exceedingly that this bill was not passed long ago.

This bill was drafted by experts of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence of the Department of the Army, the Office of Naval Intelligence, and the Central Intelligence, so that all of the intelligence units in the Government joined in a request to the Judiciary Committee and the House that this measure be passed.

The bill does not in any respect change the existing wire-tapping statutes. We all know, of course, that wire-tapping is not illegal and may be exercised under decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. However, information obtained by wire-tapping cannot be used as evidence in any court.

There are many gaps in our security laws and this bill goes a long way toward filling those gaps. Our military laws are adequate to deal with military personnel, but most of the violations of our military security laws are committed by civilians who are not covered by military law.

We have recently had the distressing case of a man in a high Government position accused and convicted of passing confidential Government information to agents of a foreign government. The espionage laws could not apply to that crime because the statute of limitations had run. The culprit was tried on a lesser charge of perjury and sentenced under the laws dealing with perjury. Is a few years in prison enough punishment for a highly intelligent man who betrays his country? Because so many Members of Congress thought not, this bill was reported to the House for a vote.

In general, this bill's section 1 compels persons having in their possession certain enumerated classes of items to surrender the same under penalty for refusal to do so. Presently, the law affords no adequate punishment. For example, there is no violation unless the specific person entitled by law to receive the documents makes the demand for their return. This bill extends the offense to persons who know the material entrusted to them has been illegally removed, lost, stolen, or destroyed and who fail to report the loss or theft promptly to their superior officer. The present penalties are increased in this bill for conspiracy to commit the forbidden acts from $10,000 or 5 years or both to 10 years or $10,000 or both. This increased penalty conforms to the general statute. It makes, in a word, the conspiracy to commit an offense as grave as the crime itself.

Section 2 in general increases the statute of limitation for espionage from 3 to 10 years.

Section 3 amends the Foreign Agents Registration Act so as to make failure to register a continuing offense.

Section 4 delegates to the Secretary of Defense the power to promulgate orders and regulations, the violations of which are made punishable by fine and imprisonment for the security of new military installations.

There may be some question as to whether this Congress has the right to delegate broad authority like that to the Secretary of National Defense and permit him to make regulations and rules concerning military installations and to prescribe penalties. The Supreme Court has frequently sustained that delegation of power to the executive branch.

The only criticism that the Supreme Court has offered is that there must be clearness and clarity in the writing of the statute so as to clearly and succinctly describe the limits of the grant of power.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to preserve the democracy that we all love so well, I believe it is necessary that we deal harshly with those who would betray our beloved country. This bill should act as a deterrent to those who would sell their birthright for a mess of pottage—or worse, for communism.

The High Cost of Food Prices—Why That Is So

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including an editorial that appeared in the Kenosha Evening News on the subject of some farm surplus costs. The information contained in that editorial is very pertinent to the whole question of farm surpluses:

SEEK FARM SURPLUS COSTS

High cost of keeping food prices up under the administration's price support plan is itemized in a recent table printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On January 31 the

Government had the following quantities of agricultural products in storage—the total valued at nearly $4,000,000,000, storage costs alone amount to $300,000,000 a year, or about $23,000 per hour.

		Quantity
Cotton, long staple	bales	9,008
Cotton	do	8,459,499
Cottonseed	tons	118,923
Flax	pounds	178,145
Butter	do	250,726,962
Cheese	do	85,357,489
Milk	do	274,723,095
Linseed oil	do	411,943,823
Peanuts	do	346,974,932
Peanuts, shelled	do	24,069,287
Fruits, dried	do	87,651,596
Potato starch	do	19,173,827
Potatoes	do	1,148,054,700
Barley	bushels	52,968,082
Beans	pounds	1,182,591,900
Corn	bushels	627,480,122
Flaxseed	do	22,237,676
Grain sorghums	pounds	847,621,909
Oats	bushels	41,698,980
Peas	pounds	55,842,100
Rice	do	509,120,800
Rye	bushels	1,543,618
Seeds (pasture)	pounds	725,422
Soybeans	bushels	13,102,098
Wheat	do	473,094,421
Wool	pounds	84,979,140
Eggs, dried	do	73,912,088
Turkeys	do	1,017,105
Rosin	do	551,184,467
Turpentine	gallons	5,107,213
Tobacco	pounds	273,888,094

Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement made by the Honorable J. Bracken Lee, Governor of the State of Utah, when he designated the week of March 19 to 25, 1950, as National Wildlife Restoration Week.

I realize this observance week has passed but I feel it is of sufficient importance to be inserted at this late date.

Governor Lee's statement follows:

One of the attractions that has made the West a center of scenic America has been its wildlife—from fish of mountain streams to the elk and moose of the remote hills. A century ago, the wildlife was a prime source of food for the pioneers and Indians who lived here. Today, the wildlife is largely a memory, to be preserved by this generation for the generations of tomorrow.

The strength of a nation is reflected in its natural resources. We have watched the rapid depletion of our forests, and have awakened to the need to provide for the future through reforestation. Similarly, we have watched the near disappearance of our wildlife and have seen the need to restore and perpetuate them.

In recognition of this effort to preserve our resources and our wildlife, I am designating the period March 19 to 25, 1950, as National Wildlife Restoration Week in Utah, and I urge all citizens, sportsmen's organizations, civil and service clubs, schools and other organizations, to observe this week through appropriate ceremonies devoted to the restoration and preservation of our wildlife and other valuable natural resources.

J. BRACKEN LEE,
GOVERNOR.

MARCH 9, 1950.

Convincingly Logical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the distinguished Catholic writer, Rev. James M. Gillis, C. S. P., which appeared in a recent edition of the Catholic Virginian:

THE LADY'S LOGIC

(Sursum Corda by Rev. James M. Gillis, C. S. P.)

Logic is considered—by a certain type of mind—something reprehensible.

In the mental world as in the moral world there are persons who think we should chuck all rules of thinking, make a blind choice of opinions, jump at conclusions and look upon as "reactionary" or "medieval," anyone who insists that thinking is an art which must be learned and practiced. That's all there is to logic. The logician holds that thought must proceed step by step in a straight line and not, like Stephen Leacock's young man, "ride off madly in all directions."

Perhaps the most reckless disdain for the rules of reason amongst our contemporaries is that of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. I look at her column only semioccasionally (or semidemi-occasionally), but every time I become careless in the custody of my eyes and let them fall upon one of her daily effusions, I seem to happen upon a logical howler. One recent instance is not from her column but from a speech she gave at Iowa State College at about the time the verdict in the Hiss case had been reached.

Mrs. Roosevelt is reported as saying: "A man who has professed innocence is involved by a man who by his own admission is a perjurer and a former Communist. It seems rather horrible to condemn someone on the word of someone else who admits to guilt."

Note the antithesis: one man has professed innocence; the other is, by his own admission, a perjurer. So it is horrible (at least rather horrible, whatever that may be) to condemn the professed innocent on the word of the confessed perjurer. The point, of course, is that the man who protested his innocence was just as much a liar and a perjurer as the man who admitted that he was a liar and a perjurer. Professing innocence didn't make Hiss innocent. The quick and careless reader, deceived by Mrs. Roosevelt's legerdemain, might jump to the conclusion—as she does—that an innocent man was condemned on the word of a guilty man. It's a trick.

In my first year in logic when, by way of diversion, we used to play with some false syllogisms, we had one that went thus: "Epimenides (quoted by St. Paul) said that all the Cretans were liars. But Epimenides himself was a Cretan. Therefore if he was telling the truth, he was a liar." Any fairly bright child in a grade school could pick the flaw in that syllogism. I can see the hands raised in class and hear a chorus of piping voices say, "Teacher, a liar may sometimes tell the truth." Mrs. Roosevelt doesn't seem to realize that Chambers who was sometimes a liar could and did on occasion tell the truth.

GUILTY ON EVIDENCE

Take the second part of her statement, "it seems rather horrible to condemn someone on the word of someone else who admits to guilt." The fact, of course, is that Hiss was not condemned on the word of Chambers. Three juries sat on the case; the grand jury which handed down the indictment, and the Federal juries, one of which voted 8 to 4 and the other 12 to zero that Hiss was guilty. They declared him guilty not on the word of Chambers but on the evidence produced in court.

Let's have another example of careless thinking reported in that same speech—or it may have been in an interview before or after the speech—at Iona State College. The lady want on to say: "If you had been disloyal and your conscience troubled you, the only way you could go scot free would be to accuse someone else of the things you were accused of."

But, dear lady, there is more than one way of "going scot free." You may go scot free in your own conscience, or you may go scot free before the law. You go scot free in conscience by repenting, confessing, and making amends. Such is the way ordained by God. The other way of going scot free is to confess to the civil authorities and turn state's evidence. Chambers did the latter. Perhaps he did the former also. We don't know. Only God knows. At any rate Chambers finally told the truth and stuck to it. Hiss kept on lying to the end. As between the two which was the more pardonable, the man who lied, repented, and atoned or the man who lied and lied and lied?

Mrs. Roosevelt's pity goes out to the unrepentant. In that she disagrees both with the State and God. And all because she has no concern for straight thinking, that is for logic.

National Holstein Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution designating the period beginning June 5 and ending June 10, 1950, as National Holstein Week, in recognition of the fine work done by the Holstein-Friesian Association of America in bringing about Nation-wide improvement in the dairy industry. The membership of the association, of more than 40,000, includes Holstein-Friesian cattle breeders in every one of the 48 States as well as the Territorial possessions and other countries of North America. The sixty-fifth annual convention of this association will be held in Syracuse, N. Y., during the week of June 5–10. We are all aware of the outstanding achievements of this organization, and I sincerely hope the Congress will adopt this resolution making it possible to designate the period of the convention as National Holstein Week.

Port Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we are so concerned about the adequacy of our provision for national defense, it is alarming to discover that we have left a serious gap in our national defense. We have thus far completely neglected the security of our seaports in the event of an emergency. These ports are the bottlenecks through which our men and supplies must be moved in time of war. If they are damaged or destroyed by sabotage, accidental explosion, or fire, much of our other preparations for national defense for which we are spending billions of dollars, could become useless because of our inability to move our men and materials to the fighting fronts.

The protection of our ports, specifically port security, thus becomes a vital aspect of national defense. The problem of port security is one that is not generally realized. It was handled quietly and effectively by the Coast Guard during the recent war, and has received little publicity. Neither the important part which it played during World War II nor its even greater role in any future conflict are generally recognized. But the significance of port security can readily be seen when we stop to reflect on the known Communist infiltration into waterfront areas and organizations. The Russians recognize the vital importance of the ports, and vulnerability in those areas. It is imperative that we, too, recognize their importance now and make provision immediately for filling the gap in our national defense by providing for a trained Coast Guard Reserve which will assure the maximum security for the ports.

The part of our armed forces which is responsible for port security is the Coast Guard, but the Coast Guard must rely primarily on its Reserves for carrying out this responsibility. This is due both to the magnitude of the job as compared with its peacetime personnel and to the specialized training required for port security. The Coast Guard's peacetime strength of around 23,000 officers and men must be expanded about 7 times during war to fulfill its responsibilities. Then, too, while many of its wartime duties are expansions of its normal functions for which regular personnel are trained, the port security duties generally require highly specialized training in fields not normally within the scope of regular personnel training and experience.

In respect to the importance of port security, which is now being brought to the attention of many of us for the first time, let us look a little further into the subject and try to consider and answer some of the quetsions which I know have arisen.

The term "port security" refers to the protection of the ports from damage or destruction by sabotage, explosion of munitions or fire. The measures through which port security is achieved include the continuous use of antisabotage patrols and inspections, supervision of the handling and loading of explosives from freight car to pier and vessel, and the prevention and fighting of fire. All of these are highly specialized and technical duties requiring extensive training and constant instruction in modern developments in weapons, munitions, techniques, and other factors affecting them. This training must be provided in advance of an emergency in order that the personnel responsible for port security will be prepared to assume their duties within the shortest possible number of minutes or hours in the event of an emergency. If the port security specialists are not prepared to be on the job within a matter of minutes and hours, and if such an organization is not constantly alert, a crippling blow could be struck by the damaging or destruction of our ports in the earliest stages of any conflict.

During World War II we were fortunate in that there was no extensive and well organized enemy infiltration into our ports for sabotage. This, and the delay in getting our production and overseas movements of materials and men actively under way, provided time for the expansion and adequate training of the Coast Guard Reserve which had been created in 1941. We are not likely to be fortunate enough again to have so much time for organization and training at the last minute. Furthermore, those who were closest to the rush of last-minute preparations during World War II will tell you that it is anything but an effective, satisfactory or safe way to do the job. Our port security specialists must be highly trained in advance if they are to do us any good in any possible emergency. It is a matter of record that during World War II the Coast Guard, in addition to its participation in every major invasion, established port security organizations in over 75 ports in the United States, including every major port, and, as the war progressed, assumed those functions in our advance base ports overseas. It required a minimum of approximately 16,000 officers and men for these duties in the port of New York, 8,000 in Boston, 4,000 in Philadelphia, 4,000 in Norfolk, 1,200 in Chicago, 8,000 in San Francisco, 4,000 in Seattle, and 2,900 in Baltimore, to cite but a few examples. These port security specialists supervised the loading of about 29,000,000,000 pounds of explosives without a single explosion. This involved the enforcement of specified safety measures in handling explosives, supervision and approval of stowage areas and methods, determination and enforcement of limitations as to type of explosives and other dangerous cargoes which could be stowed together, or which must be separated by specified distances, stowed in specified locations aboard ship, and so forth.

In addition, the port security specialists were successful in detecting and preventing various acts of sabotage, they also discovered and brought under control literally hundreds of fires in ports which might otherwise have been disastrous, and in at least one instance played an important part in preventing the demolition of port facilities by the spread of a raging pier fire to an ammunition-loading area. These few examples of their activities in the last war will give some idea of a few of the vital functions of the port security specialists.

The present situation is one which is most alarming. Although charged with the responsibility for port security, and necessarily relying on its Reserve to fulfill that responsibility, the Coast Guard has been provided no funds with which to maintain the essential training of the Reserve or even to maintain the Reserve in the necessary organized form.

Following the war, the Coast Guard's Reserve officers were placed on inactive duty, retaining their commissions, while its enlisted reservists were discharged. Since then, a few enlisted reservists have returned, but the Coast Guard has had no funds for either the recruiting and organization or the training of a Reserve. The Reserve, therefore, is now simply a skeleton consisting of about 4,000 officers and a handful of enlisted men for whom the Coast Guard can provide none of the essential training. Some of these have been meeting voluntarily once a week for the past year and a half and trying to conduct refresher lectures themselves. This, of course, is not a satisfactory or effective approach and certainly does not fill the needs of national defense.

The question arises as to why the issue of Coast Guard Reserve training funds has not come before the Congress prior to this when you consider what the Reserve components of other services received from this body. Following the war, the Coast Guard, which operates under the Navy in time of war, continued to operate under the Navy until January 1946. This means that the needs of its Reserve, which was being rapidly demobilized, were included in the budget under Navy operations through the fiscal year 1947. Furthermore, the emphasis in all of the services at that time was on demobilization rather than training.

As world conditions became more precarious, however, the Coast Guard turned its attention again to the organization and training of its Reserve to meet responsibilities in the event of an emergency. Funds were requested through the Bureau of the Budget, but the approval of the Bureau was not received until a survey of the relationship of the Coast Guard Reserve to the Reserves of the other services was completed. Unfortunately, this survey was not completed until after the 1950 budget had already gone to the House, and consequently, the matter was not before the Treasury-Post Office appropriations subcommittee when its hearings were held. This subcommittee, however, indicated in its report that although it could take no action in view of the absence of a request, it would give such a request sympathetic attention and a hearing when it was received.

Following approval by the Bureau of the Budget of a request for $3,500,000,

this amount was requested in hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee, which disapproved it in view of the absence of prior House hearings. Strong statements favorable to such an appropriation were made by Members of the Senate when the appropriation bill reached the floor of that Chamber.

The President then, in the third deficiency bill, again requested the appropriation of $3,500,000 for Coast Guard Reserve training. Of the four Treasury Department items in that bill request for Coast Guard Reserve training funds was the only item not referred to a subcommittee for hearings, and consequently no action could be taken on the request which was never brought before the House for consideration.

When the third deficiency bill was considered by the Senate Appropriations Committee an amendment to provide $3,000,000 was approved to provide for Coast Guard Reserve training. This amendment was removed in conference and once again the item did not reach the House for consideration. After the removal of the amendment in conference, strong statements concerning the vital necessity of providing funds for the Coast Guard Reserve training in port security were made by Members of this body.

The proposed budget for 1951, for the Coast Guard, included a request for $4,100,000 for the training of the Reserve. This amount would provide for the training of 1,900 officers and 8,000 enlisted men. The increased amount represents only the effects of the pay increase bills which were passed last session. The request for Coast Guard Reserve training funds was not approved by the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee.

The importance of this request is borne out by Admiral Merlin O'Neill, Commandant of the Coast Guard, Secretary of Defense, and Admiral Forrest Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations.

Admiral O'Neill, testifying at the hearings, said:

> One of the most critical missions that we will have in time of national emergency is in regard to port security. And it is necessary in order to carry out that mission, that we have a force trained and ready for immediate mobilization and use to carry out that function.

The Secretary of Defense, in a letter of January 11, 1950, to the Secretary of the Treasury, said:

> The proposed reactivation of the Coast Guard Reserve is a matter of strong concern to the Department of Defense. Accordingly I desire to go on record as fully concurring with the request for the necessary funds for this purpose. * * * I am particularly perturbed about the security of our ports in the event of an emergency. It is vital to national defense that a modest but fully trained force be in being to detect sabotage, supervise explosives loading, prevent waterfront fires and explosions, control the identity of water front personnel, etc.

The Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Sherman, in writing, stated:

> I feel that the interests of national defense will be well served by the establishment of a Coast Guard Reserve. That, of course, will require funds for the training of such a reserve at the present time. An annual appropriation of $4,100,000 is not excessive.

In the event of mobilization it is contemplated that the Coast Guard will perform the following services: (1) Port security; (2) harbor-master duties at advance bases; (3) beach patrol duty; (4) reactivation and manning of high-frequency direction finding stations; and (5) harbor defense—inshore and offshore patrols in small craft.

A reserve component of the Coast Guard should be trained to proficiency in the foregoing matters. Such training would not duplicate the training now being given the Naval Reserve.

It has been pointed out on several occasions that it is impossible to establish a balanced security system for the Nation as long as the Coast Guard Reserve remains inactive and without a training program. It is in no sense of the word economy to deny the Coast Guard Reserve the money necessary to train its reservists in their important duties, and if it is absolutely necessary to cut down the military expenditures it should be cut from somewhere else in the appropriations for the armed services, leaving the Coast Guard request for Reserve training funds intact.

The seriousness of failing to provide for the security of our ports by having trained personnel ready to step in immediately in the event of an emergency is attaining greater and greater recognition.

In view of the general lack of information in the past concerning the aspect of port security relative to our national defense, I have presented these facts. We have never had this matter before this House and, therefore, have not had the opportunity to learn of its importance or to express our opinions. Now that the facts are before us, I urge that we take immediate steps to appropriate funds for the training of the Coast Guard Reserve. Thus the gap in our national defense will be closed and our vital ports will have the protection against damage or destruction from sabotage, explosion or fire. The ports must be secured if we are to derive any benefit in time of emergency from the billions we are spending for other aspects of national defense for supplies and materials which must be funnelled through the ports.

Wisconsin Swiss Cheese Challenges Ohio Swiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in a friendly spirit of rivalry the Ohio Swiss cheese industry has challenged that its product is superior to that of the Swiss cheese made in Wisconsin and in my congressional district. A very interesting article which appeared in the Monroe Evening Times of March 23 sets out the controversy better than I can do it. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article in question:

MONROE ISSUES CHALLENGE—WISCONSIN CHEESE SNUB STIRS RUCKUS

The battle over the so-called merits of Ohio's Swiss cheese as compared with the better known Green County variety subsided this week, with deep silence from the Minneapolis end of the exchange.

It all started last month with receipt from Louis Orlove, Milwaukee, motion-picture firm representative, of a clipping from a column written by Will Jones in the Minneapolis Tribune.

Jones had made passing and slighting reference to Wisconsin cheese and before the ruckus quieted down this week, Minneapolis, Green County, Monroe, and Dover, Ohio, were all mixed up in claims and counter claims.

Jones, who had been vacationing in Dover at the time, published this reference in his column:

"Today I am thumbing my nose at Wisconsin and all its claims to cheesemaking fame.

"The best Swiss cheese available is made in Ohio."

There was more of the same, but that sample was sufficient to boost the blood pressures among the Cheese Day, Inc., board of directors and at the Evening Times which constantly spreads the word about Green County Swiss cheese to the world.

Jones—who is a native of Dover, it developed—commented on the short course in cheesemaking he had enjoyed and passed along tips on where Minneapolis cheese fans could find good Swiss—in Ohio, of course.

With 1950 Green County Cheese Day coming up September 9, the Times and the Cheese Day board decided to chide Jones a bit. After all, they felt that someone in the Twin Cities area might get the wrong impression about Swiss cheese and where to get it.

So a letter was written to Minneapolis. The reply bounced back immediately, from W. P. Steven, assistant executive editor, son of a New Glarus native and cousin of Arthur C. Benkert.

Columnist Jones also wrote a note, sticking to his guns and displaying none of the penitence for his sins which might be expected.

Anyhow, here's a portion of the Evening Times' letter, published on the editorial page of the Minneapolis Tribune (on St. Patrick's Day).

"We don't pretend to know what Jones' gripe is about Wisconsin but when he says 'the best Swiss * * * is made in Ohio' his gums were snapping like a rat trap.

"He certainly never stopped off in Green County where the only Swiss cheese in the world is made. He never was in Monroe nor did he ever sample Swiss cheese of the flavor and quality of Green County's Gold, which goes out of here by the trainload as compared with the few * * * wheels made in Tuscarawas County, Ohio.

"Jones tips his hand by drooling that he blistered the roof of his mouth eating that good Dover cheese. That must have been fine Swiss. That's the kind * * * we can for fish bait. We certainly don't feed it to our distinguished guests, or send it to the world's markets.

"If Jones, or anyone else in Minneapolis who thinks Wisconsin has lost the art of Swiss cheesemaking wants a little proof, they can come down here any time. Better still, they can show up September 9 at Monroe when the 1950 Cheese Day is held.

"We would appreciate hearing whether Will Jones' opinion of Wisconsin Swiss is shared by others in Minneapolis. If so, we invite them one and to come down for Cheese Day."

Jones' reply included this comment:

"I wasn't invited to your September 9 affair, but I may come down there anyway, under an assumed name. No sabotage intended. I'm a glutton when it comes to cheese, but Ohio is a long way to go for it. So I'll maybe drop into Monroe to try some of your second-rate stuff."

Publication of the Monroe reply to Jones brought several letters from Minneapolis residents, applauding the verbal spanking and agreeing that Jones' opinions were strictly his own.

His boss also sent another missive this way, hinting that Jones' taste buds probably had been permanently damaged by an enforced diet during which he has lost 20 pounds.

Meanwhile, however, Jones has hinted that the Monroe letter was being rerouted to his hosts in Dover and that "I'm sure you'll hear plenty from that section of the country."

So far his prediction has not come true. The silence from Dover has been a little disappointing.

Smear Artists Are Busy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the pinkish New Deal smear artists, who, especially here in Washington, are always busy smearing everyone who opposes measures advanced by the administration but which weaken America, are again on the job in an effort to cover up the dirt in the State Department, and the unsoundness in our foreign policy, which has lost all the advantages gained by those who fought, suffered, and many of whom died in World War II.

The answer to all their propaganda is found in today's piece by George Sokolsky, which reads as follows:

THREE DOTS

(By George Sokolsky)

Propaganda has been started and is gaining some momentum that the charges against Dean Acheson, Philip Jessup, Owen Lattimore, and the Communists and homosexuals in the State Department should be hushed because they undermine confidence in our public officials and make representation abroad difficult.

The propaganda is based upon a truth. Public confidence in the State Department has been shattered for many years. Long before Senator MCCARTHY made his charges, all but the most ardent supporters of the State Department, and particularly those who support British policy in the United States, wondered what has been going on in that department.

The Alger Hiss case, which President Truman called a "red herring," heightened the astonishment of a nation; the disclosure of the homosexual clique climaxed an unfortunate situation. The refusal to provide the Senate with such information as it is entitled to have, if it is to legislate adequately, surely challenges credulity.

To continue to be silent in the face not of charges, but of disclosures, already establishing scandal, is to serve America badly. In these times, there is always an emergency and a crisis and an international conference.

In these times, it was because of these and the war and the plea for unity that we now find ourselves in such a disgraceful situation, involving shameful accusations and no defense.

There must come a time of housecleaning, and that time might as well be now as ever. The trick of finding an obscure Republican ex-Senator, a one-termer, who often voted against his own party, to serve with the State Department in international conferences, does not reestablish a bipartisan foreign policy.

Even were a Republican more prominent than John Sherman Cooper appointed, it would not reestablish the bipartisan foreign policy.

That political apparatus was wrecked on the island of Formosa and it cannot be restored as long as the present top personnel remains in the State Department.

Actually, among the rank and file of the Republicans, any party leader who associates with Dean Acheson's entourage attracts suspicion to himself. It is unfortunate that it should be so, but the State Department created its own atmosphere.

In any other administration, men involved in such scandals would resign. This, too, is a new phenomenon, namely, that these officials feel that they have a vested interest in their job, and the White House supports the view that once a person is appointed to public office he is sacrosanct.

Naturally, any such conception is false and even impossible. It is a reflex to inferiority, coming down from the top. Only those who feel themselves inferior demand such recognition.

When Mr. Hoover was President of the United States, it was found that a young man in the State Department made free with its documents. He was dismissed, and devoted the ensuing years to smearing Mr. Hoover.

The Yardley law was passed because State Department data found their way out of the Department. Certainly Mr. Hoover could not be accused of harboring document thieves; but when he found them, he threw them out.

That is the point—bad appointments might be made, or good men might fall for temptation. What needs to be done is to throw them out whenever they are discovered.

When such men are protected, the protector, to whom they must be abhorrent, must have some ulterior motive. Certainly Harry Truman cannot like either Communists or homosexuals. Why does he protect them? Why does he fight for them?

The answer is in the record. During the New Deal and the war years, when the personnel of government was rapidly expanded, men and women were taken in on their specialized abilities. The FBI and the Civil Service made checks, but often they were made after the person was actually at work.

Those who found the atmosphere uncomfortable in one organ of government found a better berth elsewhere. The check never caught up with the worst of them.

Further, disloyalty involves a legally proved overt act, which makes any safeguards in advance almost impossible. Meanwhile, the subversive or doubtful wins a berth, does his work, and establishes a vested interest, which the President defends.

That is where the trouble lies—in the President's protection of the vested interest of anybody on the public pay roll.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that Mr. Truman, ever since he came to the Presidency, has all too often followed the methods of the corrupt Pendergast political machine of his native State.

Neither he nor the smear artists can convince the people that the State Department does not need a house cleaning.

All that American youth fought for has been given away by the Achesons, the Hisses, and their associates. Apparently, in an effort to save the present administration from political defeat, another war is in the making.

Let no one be deceived. The President is in control of the executive department of the Government. His party has an overwhelming majority in the Senate and in the House. They cannot shirk responsibility for the present situation—for the advancement of the Communists throughout the world, especially in China and the Far East.

Diversity and Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Review of Literature of April 1, 1950:

DIVERSITY AND UNION

The United States is in the midst of a struggle for peace. We are opposed by the efforts of a diabolically clever and well-organized Communist organization which is seeking to destroy our democracy. If we are to succeed in our struggle we must forego all partisanship and all political adventures.

If we are to succeed we must show to our friends in the free world that we are not divided in our counsels but that we are united in our determination to promote the cause of peace and to pursue the wisest policy which our united genius can devise.

There can be no gainsaying the force of the statements with which United States Ambassador-at-Large Philip Jessup repudiated the charge of Communist sympathy leveled against him by Senator MCCARTHY, nor any doubt that incalculable harm is done to America and the world by such irresponsible attacks. All the more reprehensible is the Senator's reckless conduct because at best the democratic process contains dangers inherent to itself in the front it exposes to other nations. In any land where speech is free and debate is open policy crystallizes through a series of often hotly contested exchanges of opinion, the stresses and strains of which can be misconstrued by those inclined to twist them to serve their own ill purposes. Day by day the Russian press and the press of the satellite nations so misrepresent American attitude and action, searching among the flotsam and jetsam of public discussion, seizing here upon a casual statement which falls in with its credo, there upon another which belies American professions, and drawing from minority or tentative or exploratory remarks a totally false picture of the mind of the Nation as a whole.

It is, to be sure, a danger, but it is also the essence of American democracy that it presents a diversity of outlook. The United States was born of diversity, of different peoples seeking new homes for different reasons, of diversity of climate and diversity of geographical nature and economic potentialities. Its culture was compounded of diversity, of the mingling of varied racial strains and variant traditions, of the superimposition of a civilization sprung of the frontier upon the accumulated habits and attitudes of mind of older countries. Its rugged individualism was diversity, its cracker-box philosophers airing his homespun philosophy before his fellows, who like as not howled him down when his generalizations were out of tune with their own independent views, its cowboys and railroad builders, and captains of industry. And

though the enormous modernization of American civilization has seemed at times to threaten diversity, and the evolution of the radio and the motion picture to presage standardization, nonconformity is perhaps stronger in American today than at any time in its history.

Opinion has never been more fluid, party lines never less binding, social standards never less constricting than in the present. Two world wars and a major depression have shaken the American people into new standards of value. Though the United States has gone through no such social revolution and shift of fortunes as England, it, too, has changed its habits of living and its material outlook. High taxes have decreased great fortunes but high wages have expanded the standards of the working classes and widened the diversity of their interests. The greater latitude of opportunity for women has given them a voice not only in business, but in politics. The war experience of millions of young men has lent stimulation to their expression of opinion on their world.

There is, indeed, an underlying sensitivity to conditions and problems of the time, frequently raucous when it is articulate, often floundering. It is this inchoate compound of feeling and opinion which seems so often at cross-purposes, which speaks with contradictory voices, whose meaning can so easily be misinterpreted and distorted by the hostile. In it is all the diversity of America, and all of America. "Sweet are the uses of diversity," paraphrased Frederick Lewis Allen in a recent address. Yes, when properly channeled and directed. It is this direction which Mr. Jessup calls for when he says that if we are to succeed in our struggle for peace "we must show to the free world that we are not divided in our counsels, but that we are united in our determination * * * to pursue the wisest policy which our united genius can devise." To realize that direction, we need unpartisan leaders, not Senator McCarthys. We need men of imagination and vision, men of selflessness and courage. If we get them we may win the peace, for still the old slogans hold, "E Pluribus Unum," "In Union There Is Strength."

A. L.

Resolution of the Department of New York, Jewish War Veterans of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution has just been adopted by the Department of New York, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America:

Whereas Hans Schlange-Schoeninger has been appointed as the West German consul-general to New York City; and

Whereas under the occupation statute, the conduct of German foreign affairs is specifically reserved by and to the occupying powers; and

Whereas Hans Schlange-Schoeninger has a long record of hatred and vilification of the United States and helped pave the way for Nazi power during his leadership of the German National Party during the Weimar Republic; and

Whereas in his book, The Morning After, published in 1946, he expressed no regrets for Hitler's slave-labor massacres and the slaughter of 6,000,000 Jews, but demanded a "forgive and forget" peace program with Europe dominated by German reaction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of New York, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America does herewith make strenuous protest to such appointment of this unrepentant pro-Nazi to such near-ambassadorial status and demands its immediate rescission; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Congressional and Senatorial representatives of the State of New York, to the Governor of the State and the mayor of New York City; and be it further

Resolved, That the national executive committee of Jewish War Veterans be requested to register this protest with the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the High Commissioner for Germany.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that our State Department will take action as recommended in this resolution.

The Insurance of Bank Deposits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "The Insurance of Bank Deposits," which appeared in the American Metal Market, the market authority of the steel and metal industries, on Wednesday, March 22, 1950:

THE INSURANCE OF BANK DEPOSITS

Last week the Senate passed and sent to the House of Representatives a bill which, among other things, would increase insurance on individual bank deposits from $5,000 to $10,000 and reduce the amount of insurance premiums, paid by the insured banks, by an estimated 60 percent. The bill serves as a happy reminder of the valuable service which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has rendered the Nation since it was created in the dark days of 1933 and of the still greater contribution to national stability which it is capable of rendering in the future.

The very efficiency with which the FDIC has functioned has served to obscure its operations from the public eye. The sensational makes the headlines. Quiet efficiency becomes taken for granted. But for the average man, the security of his bank deposits has been a very great stabilizing influence. He may go to bed filled with perplexity over the sad state of the post-war world, and even apprehensive over the chances of surviving some imaginary atomic attack but, unlike his compartiots of two decades and more ago, anxiety over the safety and liquidity of the money he has in the bank is not, fortunately for him, a current worry.

Of course, this has been so ever since his deposits became insured after the creation of FDIC back in 1933. But confidence did not come at once. The skepticism with which the insurance of bank deposits was viewed by many, including no small percentage of the banking fraternity, and the gloomy forebodings (now forgotten) as to the workability of the law, which preceded its enactment, caused many to accept the innovation with reserve. The legislation has proved to be one of the truly great advances made during the last 20 years and, from the manner in which the affairs of the Corporation have been administered, it has achieved what is probably the greatest measure of success that is attainable—it is now taken for granted.

The bill pending in Congress is the first piece of major legislation undertaken since the FDIC was established. A unique feature of this Government corporation is that it does not constitute a drain on the National Treasury. It is an insurance company, in the legitimate sense of the phrase, which has been sustained and achieved its financial success through premiums remitted by the institutions whose deposits it protects. In the beginning, it is true, the initial capital of approximately $289,000,000 was contributed partly by the Treasury and partly by the Federal Reserve banks. This, however, was cleared up with a final payment to the Treasury at the end of last August and as of the end of 1949 the Corporation had accumulated a surplus of over $1,200,000,000. The legislation now pending stipulates that, in addition to the repayment of the original capital, already completed, the Treasury and the Reserve banks shall be paid simple interest at 2 percent, for the funds they advanced. There was no provision for interest in the original legislation, and this feature of the bill will mean a payment of $42,272,862 to the Treasury and $37,691,966 to the banks. However, when such payments are made, it should no longer be possible, even for the most meticulous, to quibble over the point of whether the Corporation has, or has not, fully repaid the advances it received, and now stands on its own feet.

It is symptomatic of the change in conditions since 1933 that it should now be considered expedient to consider increasing the maximum coverage from $5,000 to $10,000. That funds are more abundant is evident in the figures for deposits and for money in circulation, but the added risk and burden which the increase will place upon the reserves of the Corporation seems likely to prove more apparent than real. Aside from the fact that the number of persons likely to maintain cash deposits in excess of $5,000 is comparatively few, there has been nothing in the past to hinder one from obtaining almost unlimited coverage through the duplication of accounts, especially wherever there is duplication of banking facilities. It seems probable that in practice the principal effect of this new provision will be to enable small and remote institutions to retain some funds which might otherwise have taken refuge in more distant centers, once local facilities up to $5,000 were fully utilized.

For several years, as the surplus of the FDIC has risen steadily to such great heights, there has been increasing demand for an abatement in the amount of premium assessed against the insured banks. Large and strong institutions, with exceptional holdings of cash and Government obligations and comparatively little need for protection have been, understandably, among the most insistent that something should be done. The pending bill provides relief in a rather ingenious way. The old premium of one-twelfth of 1 perment of deposits is retained, but the bill provides that each year 60 percent of the assessment income remaining after operating costs and losses would be refunded. This method will obviate the need of changing the rate of assessment with changes in conditions and, under prevailing conditions, it is said to result in a reduction of about 55 percent in the amount member banks will pay in assessments.

The ability of the FDIC to grant this relief without impairing its ability to make good on its guaranties is illustrated by its year-end figures. During 1949, the Corporation collected from assessments and other sources a total of $145,514,301. Its losses were $641,183, and its expenses $5,781,331. There was therefore, a balance for surplus of $139,091,786 and, after completing the repayment of the original capital of $289,000,000, the surplus still stood, as stated above, at $1,208,952,687. In addition, the law already allows the Corporation to borrow from the Treasury up to $3,000,000,000 at one time. This borrowing power has never been utilized.

Through curious contradictory conditions, which one might expect to encounter only in officialdom, this insuring agency is denied access to the records of the institutions it insures except, in the majority of cases, with the consent of other agencies. Member banks, so-called, are subject to examination by the Federal Reserve, and National banks are subject to the Controller of the Currency. This leaves only nonmember insured State banks subject to direct examination by FDIC without possible intervention by an intermediate Federal authority. The Controller of the Currency is, it is true, an ex officio member of the Board of FDIC making, after a fashion, an interlocking of direction so far as National banks are concerned. But, as regards those institutions which are subject to the direct supervision of the Federal Reserve, there exists a measure of conflict of interest not dissimiliar to that which has existed in other matters between the Federal Reserve and the Treasury. Thanks to cooperation in the past, this overlapping of authority has caused no differences of importance, but there are many who consider it rather anomalous that an insuring agency should not enjoy, free from even possible technical impediment, the fullest access to the subject it is called upon to insure.

After the smooth sailing the pending measure has had in the Senate, it is expected to encounter no serious opposition in the House. The banks, we believe, are entitled to the relief that is now in prospect for them. And, whatever his other concerns, Mr. John Q. Public can see from the facts revealed by the hearings on the bill, that his ready money is well protected.

Do We Have to Vote for This? I Did Not!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the statements made in the following press report is characteristic of the extravagance and waste of public funds appropriated for European relief organizations. Instead of appropriating money to that wonderful relief organization, the Red Cross, and broadening its power to succor the distressed people of Europe. We were induced to set up a new organization, the UNNRA and appropriated billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to pay exorbitant salaries and employ incompetent and wasteful personnel. Now we are appropriating more of our taxpayers' money under similar conditions.

There is inserted herewith an illuminating article appearing in the April 2 edition of the New York Post:

ECA "FEUDAL BARONS" FEATHER THEIR NESTS IN VIENNA

(By Seymour Freidin)

VIENNA, April 1.—The cold war apparently has made no impression on Marshall plan officials here.

They have just spent $40,000 in counterpart funds refurnishing swank homes so they can rough it in an opulent rococco style to which they have never been accustomed.

The three highest ECA executives in Austria contended today they had not exceeded the legal maximum Washington entitles them for allowances.

But the point they have overlooked in trying to act like feudal barons is that they are deep behind the iron curtain here, where the Marshall plan is subject to the closest scrutiny by the Russians.

Their insistence on gorgeous tapestries, oriental rugs, ornate swimming pools, and antique chairs certainly does not provide an effective reply locally to Communist charges that the Marshall plan is meant only to enhance American profits and comforts at the Europeans' expense.

John B. Wilson, trying to cover up for his superiors, declined to produce figures under administrative expenses which are drawn from counterpart funds. Wilson tried to slide out with "the figures are just like the loyalty files in Washington, they're secret."

The counterpart funds are derived from the local currencies which governments pay into a pool for Marshall plan goods. They are supposed to be used for reconstruction purposes, except for a small percentage allocated for Marshall plan administrative costs.

Under this, Deputy Administrator William Giblin spent the equivalent of $25,000 to redecorate a four-garage house. Top Administrator Clyde King used $9,000 for little end tables, and Mark Sanborn, another Deputy, took $6,000 for making his place a better cocktail rendezvous.

Giblin, whose previous service consisted of handing out Red Cross sandwiches to soldiers in Britain, said he intended to pay for the bedroom murals in his house. That's a nice gesture, but why he requires a swimming pool flanked by huge figures of water-spouting frogs to help his work should be examined by Congress.

For all this unnecessary expenditure the Marshall plan can only suffer. The funds could have been used for road building or for houses for crowded Austrian families.

Something should be done about such crass disregard of responsibility which is beginning to assume large proportions among many top Marshall plan echelons in Europe.

Role of Cooperatives in America—Address by Jerry Voorhis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an address delivered by a former Member of this House, Jerry Voorhis, now executive secretary of the Cooperative League of the U. S. A., before the seventh annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

With characteristic ability, Mr. Voorhis has told of the role that cooperatives and cooperation play in our modern democracy. I agree wholeheartedly with my good friend that cooperatives are the most democratic way imaginable of conducting our business enterprises—for consumer is also owner, and he takes a direct interest in seeing that his business is run in his interest and in the interest of his community.

I commend this fine address to my colleagues:

SPEECH OF JERRY VOORHIS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U. S. A., TO THE SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, MARCH 8, 1950

All through history the peoples of the earth have applied one basic method of meeting the problems and dangers that beset them. That method has been a joining together of many people to give mutual aid and assistance to one another. Upon that method were built the tribes, the clans, the city states of ancient times. Without it, no modern nation could exist, nor could civil peace be preserved. Mutual aid has always been the answer of the common people to oppression and exploitation by the few, to the danger of violence from those who would violate the law or break the peace, to the concentration of political, social, or economic power in mighty hands. Mutual aid runs through history like a golden thread. For it has been the greatest civilizing influence of all times.

By means of mutual aid the people have attempted to protect themselves against the worst ravages of war. By applying mutual aid broadly enough, courageously enough, and deeply enough, peace on earth could be made possible.

Another name for mutual aid is cooperation. Cooperatives as we know them, whether REA cooperatives or farm-supply cooperatives, or credit unions, or health or housing cooperatives, or cooperative stores—whatever particular kind they may be, cooperatives are simply the application in our times of the basic Christian principle of mutual aid to the everyday economic problems of the people.

The arm of the Lord was not shortened on the day that man dared to take the energy of the universe and fashion it into a weapon capable of wiping out human lives by the millions. Indeed we may be sure the moral law is as inexorable as it ever was. It is well that we remember these things.

For there are facts about our present situation that are more fraught with meaning for the future of man on this earth than we may like to realize.

The question before our generation is whether mankind will act in this crisis as lower forms of life have acted in ages past or whether man will prove that he is indeed God's greatest and highest work. Other forms of life have flourished mightily upon the earth only to disappear, leaving behind only fossil remains. Well, we have populated the earth; some say we are on the point of overpopulating it. And unless we can apply mutual aid to the organization of our life the world probably is overpopulated. Man has piled smartness on smartness, scientific discovery on scientific discovery, until at last we stand on the threshold of the ultimate achievement of scientific smartness—the ability to destroy ourselves and the world as a place of habitation. Only a little way further down this road and man will have followed the dinosaurs, all-powerful rulers of the world in their day, down the way to oblivion.

But man need not do this, not if he uses the resources with which he has been blessed. For man was not born for self-destruction. He was given the insight and the knowledge of spiritual and moral powers which are sufficient to save himself and to harness his own powers and turn them to good. But this we shall not be able to do unless we use all of the best and deepest resources with which God has endowed us.

And by every bit of testimony of every great teacher humanity has ever known the basic resource man possesses to overcome his problems is the ability to work together, to apply mutual aid and cooperation to the dangers that beset us. Somehow, some way

we must organize the will to peace, the will to live, of all the simple people around the world into institutions that will be powerful enough to control the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb and direct them not to war but to the keeping of the peace—indeed to the enforcement of peace over the will to war of any nation.

What has all this to do with the business of this meeting? A very great deal.

Let us ask why these terrible weapons have been created. They have not been created because the people have wanted war. They have been created because the people in certain nations have lacked the strength within themselves to be masters of their own fate. The people, lacking strength in themselves, have permitted all-powerful dictators to rule over them. That is why the very life of man is threatened today.

And so we must seek the only answer there can be to man's danger. That answer lies in building the strength of the people. But it cannot be built from the top down. It has to be built beginning in the communities of the world, especially the rural communities; and then on the basis of strong communities we can build a structure of peace and plenty for all mankind. This is why this meeting and every other cooperative meeting is a matter of such tremendous importance right now.

Now the way the strength of the people is torn down is when they lack responsibility for their own fate—either their personal fate or their political fate or their economic fate. It makes little difference whether it is an all-powerful dictator government that takes away the peoples' responsibility or whether it is a giant economic or financial monopoly that does it.

On the other hand the way the strength of the people is built up is when they have the will and the means and the method and the tools to take command of their own welfare, beginning with their basic economic welfare.

What we are fighting for is the right of the people to own, to operate, to be responsible for their own businesses, and their own institutions of every sort to bring about their own welfare and salvation.

We have just got through defending that right before the Ways and Means Committee. We are trying to defend it in a thousand communities all over this country today. That's what you have met for here in this great annual meeting. It is what the Cooperative League exists to do.

But it is not enough just to defend. We have got to have a position program of building broader and broader the strength of the people. That's the basic answer to communism and to fascism all around the world.

Well, a lot of wonderful progress has been made. No less than 10,000,000 American families are members of one kind of cooperative or another in this country today. They have found the middle way for the United States of America between dependence on private monopoly on the one hand and dependence on all-powerful Government on the other.

Cooperative organization of the people's own businesses restores ownership to the people who have lost it. It spreads ownership—and with ownership responsibility—to millions of citizens who can have that experience in no other way. Cooperation is the restoration of vital, vigorous, democracy in the communities where the people live.

Cooperatives are formed by the people for one purpose and only one—to supply some need for goods or services. Therefore they automatically solve the problem that has plagued every so-called free economy in the world, the problem of keeping supply and demand in balance. Cooperatives produce and distribute to meet needs. They produce for a market that already is assured and measured. The more fully they satisfy that market the greater their success. They can never be afraid of full production and full employment—because their only purpose is to meet the needs of people.

Where cooperatives are strong in an industry that whole industry must produce abundantly—to meet coop competition. This is the reason they can save freedom for everyone, including their competitors. An economy in which cooperatives are strong—where they do 15 percent or so of the business can be proof against depression.

Cooperatives have brought the practice of thrift and an abundance of credit to 5,000,000 American families—credit union members—who did not have it before.

Cooperatives have brought an abundance of electricity to over 3,000,000 farmers—who didn't have it before. They have brought that electricity at costs the farmers can afford. They have made American farming a modern industry and they have done it by preserving and strengthening the family-sized owner-operated farm.

Cooperatives have brought petroleum products and ownership of their own petroleum supplies to 1,500,000 families who otherwise would have suffered shortages and exorbitant costs.

Cooperatives have fed our soil with fertilizer which farmers could not have afforded had not their own cooperative businesses been doing 15 to 20 percent of the business in this field.

Cooperatives have brought hospitals and health care to hundreds of thousands of people who could have them no other way.

Cooperatives have enabled the people to insure themselves through their own insurance companies, to build their own financial institutions, and thus to control their own savings and begin to build their own financial security.

These things cooperatives—the middle way—have already accomplished.

They can and must do more.

Cooperatives can build houses just because people need homes, and they can build and maintain those homes at costs the people can afford. But to do this on a substantial scale, we need equal access to low-interest financing such as legislation now before the Congress would provide.

Cooperatives can build health centers where people need health centers.

Cooperatives can stop both inflation and deflation and restore to the people economic power over the flow of the supplies of the goods and services they need.

By returning to the people as patrons all margins between costs and selling prices, cooperatives can keep buying power always in balance with production. This can render depressions impossible. Applied to trade between nations, the patronage refund can keep international trade balances always even—can lift the burden of unpayable debt from poorer nations and can stop the flow of useless gold to creditor nations.

Here is the "Middle Way for the U. S. A." Even for the world of 1950 it offers a way of abundance and peace by restoring control of their own destinies and responsibility for their own destinies to the people once again.

Here is hope.

But only the people themselves can make that hope real. No small cooperative movement can meet the present desperate situation. Our job is to build our cooperatives to 6 or 8 times their present size, for then we the people will be able by the impact of our people's businesses, to make freedom, security, and abundance—all 3—possible for all America.

I have not picked this figure of a 7-fold growth out of the air. It is based on the fact that co-ops today are doing about 1½ percent to 2 percent of the Nation's business. But we know that in the lines like fertilizer, for example, where co-ops do 15 percent of the business in certain states you get a fine satisfying influence on the whole industry. Well 7 times 2 percent would be 14 percent.

This is no time, then, for us to be wondering whether or not we can succeed in our cooperative endeavors and enterprises. We can succeed simply because we must do so. The very chance for life of our children and our children's children depend upon it. And if we have a spark of religious faith—and I am sure most of us have much more than that—we must know that God does not leave mankind helpless, but that we are given powers of mind and spirit equal to our tasks, however difficult they may be.

Now as long as the peoples' business in their co-ops is a small affair no one complains about it very much. But just as soon as the people begin to develop real economic strength, then there starts an attack upon them. This has always been so, all through history.

To be more specific, as long as REA co-ops are dependent for their supply of power on the big power companies there isn't much complaint. The complaint and the attacks start up with vigor and sometimes with viciousness just as soon as the REA co-ops begin to generate their own power and thus make sure they can supply their members needs all the time and fully. So this is the real fight right now, as I see it, and you may be sure the Cooperative League will back you to the very limit all the way and work with you in every manner you suggest. Not that I'm suggesting that REA co-ops should generate all or even a major part of the power they use. But they must have the right to generate, and they must actually own enough generating capacity here and there to provide security for their members and to give to all America a yardstick of what that power ought to cost.

In other words, the REA co-ops must always have enough generating capacity to prove, and to prove over and over again, that the people can supply themselves wherever necessary. There is enough experience already to show that as long as REA co-ops are completely dependent on outside sources for power supply they will from time to time be told that there isn't enough juice and that they'd better sell out the whole farmers' REA system to the power company. That's going to happen more and more as the co-ops pay off their debt to the Government and own their system free and clear. The first co-op or two that sells out may get a fancy price. But if the farmers fall for these propositions, the price is going to go down and down. It will go down because the strength of the people has gone down.

The same can be said about the materials you need—like aluminum—where you have shown the courage and the foresight to make a contract to break the monopoly to bring down the price and to increase the supply—not only for your own benefit but for the benefit of the whole United States.

This is cooperation and mutual aid at its best.

Today the Congress has given a green light for the development of a real telephone system for rural America. It will be, in some respects, a harder job than rural electrification. It will require a substantial equity payment of the members, because telephone systems are service systems pure and simple and do not generate cash savings like electric systems can do. But all this and much more effort will be worth it if we can develop telephone systems and central facilities belonging to the people who need and use them and providing a real area coverage for our farm people. State cooperative councils, cooperative regional wholesales and the Cooperative League are more than ready to help in any way we can. Rural electrification is one great forward step. Good rural communication should be, and can be the next one.

Every co-op and every American today has to be concerned with a conspiracy—it can only be called that—to smash any business conducted for the direct benefit of the people, rather than for its own profit.

For many years your organization has stood side by side with all other cooperatives in a successful fight to expose and turn back a sinister racket known as NTEA. This outfit, financed largely by really big business, including utilities, has preyed on legitimate small-business men in an effort to smash the best friend that small-town merchants have—the farmers' cooperatives. Its propaganda has been plastered by the millions of dollars worth across the Nation, trying to blacken the business reputations of farm people.

Its co-op "buck" has been exposed as phony and suppressed by Treasury agents; a spotlight of publicity has been turned on the efforts of one of its officers to offer a $10,000 campaign fund to a United States Senator if he would do NTEA's bidding. He refused. Recently the House Small Business Committee presented conclusive evidence that this so-called small-business organization is no more nor less than a front for some of the biggest businesses in the Nation.

Still, thousands of small-business men all across our land continue to be duped by this sinister and unremitting propaganda—simply because they do not know where their friends are. We have not told them often enough nor loud enough nor in a united way.

Money is no object to the NTEA backers and those allied with them. Nearly every day we get new evidence of the vast extent of the conspiracy against the plain people of America who have the audacity to go into business for themselves.

Last month the NTEA started a campaign of using bankers to try to raise funds all over the Midwest to attack not only the co-ops but all nonprofit businesses competing with the banks. These letters named credit unions and FCA's and farm loan associations and mutual savings banks and building and loan associations, if you please. These shake-down letters are addressed to the very same small-town bankers who depend for their very livelihood on the savings and investments of the farmers and townsfolk who belong to these nonprofit associations.

Last week in this very hall spokesmen for the real-estate lobby had the nerve to get up and cry "socialism" at the efforts of the middle-income families of this Nation to get decent housing at a fair price the co-op way. These were the very same real-estate interests that themselves have gratefully, for many years, accepted Government guaranties through the FHA for their mortgage-lending and home-building operations.

But when the unions and the veterans and the religious bodies of this country dare to try to speak for their members in an effort to organize co-ops to take advantage of this very same type of credit guaranties—no, that is socialism.

It appears to make an awful lot of difference for whose benefit the peoples credit is used. And always remember the credit of the United States belongs to all the people.

You folks in the electric co-ops have had to take a lot of this abuse, too. First it was socialism when farmers went into the business of stringing power lines out into the country, using their own good credit made available to them through their Government and getting a lot less of it at that than big business got through the RFC. Then the power companies found it wasn't socialism, but pretty good business, to build lines out to the farmers. So they did. They built many lines and electrified many farms for the first time in their history. But they still fought the REA.

But pretty soon the power companies ran short of power. So you farmers started to build your own generating plants and transmission lines. What happens? The power companies start their propaganda mill all over again. They hire a firm of hot-shot public-relations people to spread the scare headlines across the Nation and to try to say that if farmers own and run their own businesses that is somehow socialistic. Actually, of course, it is just the opposite. But the propaganda mill says liberty is threatened.

Do they mean the liberty of people to crowd into two-room apartments, or milk by hand, or talk over a spluttering old hand-crank telephone, or market their grain at the price set by the big millers, or buy their feed at the big feed merchants' prices?

That's not the kind of American liberty we're talking about here in this meeting or in other co-op meetings. We are working to establish the full liberty of the American people to have a share in ownership of American enterprise, to take responsibility for it, to work out their own problems.

We in the co-ops have never attacked profit business. In fact we would be very foolish if we did not want profit business to make a fair profit in the housing field, or in the field of rural power, rural telephones, or feed, or fertilizer or credit or insurance. This is a big country. There are plenty of needs to be served. There is room for business of all kinds to serve those needs. All we want is to have a fair percentage of the business in the ownership of the people themselves, freely and voluntarily joined together.

And we do say that just as we want businessmen, small and large, to make a fair profit, so do we demand the right of people—on the farm and in the city—to run whatever businesses they choose without profit if they so desire.

And just as we grant the right of any business to seek loans from our Government if it so desires, so do we demand the right of the people to have the same right to their own credit for their non-profit businesses.

Our eyes are open now. We see that the attack is aimed squarely at the people and that every business that depends on the peoples' prosperity and earning power for its success—and that's most business—is also under attack.

That's the attack that we cooperators—all of us—face in the America of the 1950's. It is an insidious attack—now secret, now open—always well-financed, always well-coordinated, planned and directed. And it will only stop when cooperatives in America are so well-established that no one can hope any longer to destroy them.

What can we do to combat it? Our ranks are not closed as are the ranks of our enemies. In the rural communities we have a major story to tell. We have not told it. We need to tell the places where we live—yes, and our own members—what we have done to cut costs of power and credit and insurance; what we have done to bring better quality farm products to the people. We need to tell what we are doing to improve and extend telephone service for farmers; how we are trying to lick the housing shortage for millions of veterans and other middle-income people and their wives and children. Through State and local cooperative councils, through joint action of all the co-ops in each community we can get together our stories of how co-ops have built and will go on building the strength of the people and the strength of their local communities.

We need to stand together, we co-ops, right in our home town, where we do business and where we save money for our members so they can buy at home. We need to tell this story up and down every Main Street in America, with a voice so clear and so united that no one can miss it.

We are attacked together. We must stand together to fight back and to do more than fight back—to tell our story of the co-ops as the middle way for a better America and a better world.

Another Hitchhiker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the Allegan Gazette, published at Allegan, Mich., on March 27, last, was a thought-provoking editorial which reads as follows:

ANOTHER HITCHHIKER

Settlement of the coal strike represents a victory for arson, dynamiting, kidnaping, assault and battery, political conspiracy, chicanery, and extortion.

While a timid and fearful Truman twiddled his thumbs in Washington, John L. Lewis and his coal miners stormed and captured the coal industry causing untold misery and damage to the public.

During the campaign against their own coal operators, the goon squads—with the aid of dynamite and the Molotov cocktail, threats and actual warfare—closed down the nonunion mine.

When Truman finally invoked the Taft-Hartley law Lewis blandly ordered the miners back to work. For the first time in history the union miners refused to follow Lewis, they refused to return to work and as a consequence the union was tried for contempt.

A New Deal judge listened to the evidence and it was held that the union was not in contempt and it is our conclusion that either a sympathetic Attorney General tried the case with his left hand and his tongue in his cheek or a sympathetic, politically minded judge decided the refusal of about 500,000 miners to return to work at the same time was 500,000 coincidences.

Then when the coal supply was reduced to about zero Lewis negotiated and delivered his ultimatum, either meet our terms or nationalize the coal industry.

The coal operators rather than surrender their mines to Truman, to be used by him and his bureaus as a vast social experiment, gave in.

Lewis and his union are destroying a free competitive coal industry. The are destroying employment in the coal industry. They are creating a situation where coal will be a drug on the market. Then our social planners will say that competitive, capitalistic system has failed and the Government will have to subsidize the coal industry and the miners.

It is a fight between those who work to earn their way through life and those who want to live without working.

Soon this country will have another parasite industry not pulling its share of the load, riding on the wagon instead of pulling in harness.

If the trend continues, everybody will be riding, but, gentlemen, we won't be going anywhere.

Mr. Speaker, if, in addition to regular wages, to a right to unemployment compensation, the employees of more and more industries are to enjoy pensions, those pensions must be paid for by adding the cost thereof to the price of each unit produced and sold by such industry.

The flaw in the plan is that the cost must always be added to the price of the article sold, and, ultimately, that price may get so high, as it has in coal, that fewer people buy, and ultimately

the sales drop off, the market is destroyed, unemployment follows.

The point is that no individual, no group of individuals, can for always enjoy special privileges, special benefits, at the cost of the public, without eventually destroying the economic balance.

Economic Cooperation Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, we are coming near the close of the debate on this ECA bill, which carries approximately $3,000,000,000 in aid, mostly to European countries, for the coming year. We expended during the first fiscal year almost $6,000,000,000, during the second year a little over $4,000,000,000, and this year it will be about $3,000,000,000.

From the beginning I have generally favored a program of giving the Marshall-plan countries a sufficient amount of help in this distress, but have advocated only giving them enough help to encourage them to extend their own efforts to the limit in rebuilding their countries. I have felt that if we were too liberal and give them too much they would depend upon us to too great an extent and would not put forth the individual effort required on their part.

In 1948 I offered an amendment to the bill to reduce it by $1,500,000,000. I felt at that time that we were appropriating too much. My amendment was voted down and the bill was finally passed. However, when we came to the end of the year and took up the 1949 bill we found that try as they would, we had appropriated so much money they could not spend the nearly $6,000,000,000 and they had left over almost $1,500,000,000. It appears that I was nearer right at that time than those who voted down the amendment thought.

In the 1949 bill many of us urged a greater reduction than was made. Again our amendments to reduce the bill were defeated.

Now again when we come to consider the 1950 bill we find that there is left over unspent from the 1949 appropriations, $150,000,000. That is a lot of money. I supported the motion to cover this $150,000,000 back into the Treasury but again we failed.

We have, however, made some progress in passing the Case amendment that has reduced the amount asked for by $250,000,000 and we have cut out of title III enough to reduce it to about $25,000,000.

Frankly, it is my opinion that the Vorys amendment offered by one of the ablest members of this committee to reduce the amount by $500,000,000 which was again defeated by the majority of the House should have been approved.

Mr. Speaker, my greatest opposition to this bill is title III, that bold new program suggested by the President in his inaugural speech on January 20, 1949. Title III in this bill should be stricken out. It has no place in this legislation. It seeks to get the foot in the door with a small appropriation that could, and likely will, develop into a never-ending world-wide WPA at the expense of the American Government and the American taxpayers.

It sets up a world-wide program of relief before we have finished the 4-year Marshall-plan program, which is the main purpose of this legislation. It appears that it is the initiation of another spending spree which can be developed in full force when the Marshall plan is discontinued. It is a dangerous undertaking. Why should we start another world-wide plan of relief to so-called backward nations until we have completed the Marshall-plan-relief 4-year program?

To give you some idea as to what is contemplated in this bold new plan to aid backward countries which is provided in title III, to which I object, let me read what the committee which drafted this bill states in its report to the House:

> A review of the Department of State's plans for the first-year program show the meaning of section 317 (2) more precisely. The plans include surveys, studies, scientific research, and joint management operations in the following fields: General economic development, agriculture and forestry, hydroelectric power and flood control, highways, transportation, health, social security, housing, communications, etc.

Mr. Speaker, we have spent over a billion dollars in building highways, roads, bridges, power plants, on irrigation and other projects in the European countries during the past 2 years. Now this new program would expand as you will note to any and all other backward nations of the world.

Our debt is so great now, and our budget is so out of balance that appropriations have been reduced for all flood control including power dams, et cetera, by 25 percent. The loss in my district alone from floods which, in high water, overflows hundreds of thousands of acres of land and causes damage to our farms, towns and cities along the Wabash River runs into millions of dollars. I have been urging that the Government spend about $6,000,000 in order to stop this annual waste and give the protection they need and desire to our own citizens. This is only one illustration of many throughout the Nation. I am opposed to adopting title III of this bill and to spending our taxpayers' money in foreign countries for the development of roads, hydroelectric power, flood control or other developments until our debt and taxes have been reduced to the point where we can take care of our own roads and flood-control projects in the interest of our own people.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to strike out this title with the hope that the amendment will carry. If title III remains in the bill I shall reluctantly vote against the legislation on final passage.

My vote against this bill if title III remains in it will be to express my opposition to starting this new world-wide program before we have finished the first Marshall plan, and is not to express my opposition to the other provisions of the bill. When this bill comes back to the appropriations committee of the House and that committee has reconsidered the amount and recommends it to the Congress for a vote, I shall then support the measure to provide the funds necessary for the ECA program.

We have been able to reduce this third-year cost to a considerable extent. Marshall plan aid has become the fixed policy of our Government. Now in its third year we are in the position of having made our pledge to, and a contract with these countries to run 4 years. The word of the Government is pledged before the world and must be carried out.

Needed by 1955: 12,000,000 Jobs—Growing Labor Force Offsets Business Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the debate on the general appropriations bill, I pointed out the danger of our growing unemployment. In my opinion, its greatest threat lies in the fact that it does not hit us in the face all at once. It grows for a while, then contracts slightly, then creeps on again.

I am inserting in the RECORD an article that recently appeared in United States News and World Report, which points up the threat very clearly. Since this article appeared, we have learned that unemployment dropped over a half million from February to March. But this should not lull us into inaction—for we should not for a moment lose sight of the fact that at this very moment there are in our high schools 1,200,000 persons, and in our colleges and universities over 400,000 persons who will graduate in May and June and become job seekers. Economists are predicting that unemployment will hit the 5,000,000 mark in June.

As this excellent article points out, an expanding economy is the only answer to growing unemployment. In my opinion, it is the cardinal problem of our domestic policy today:

NEEDED BY 1955: 12,000,000 JOBS—GROWING LABOR FORCE OFFSETS BUSINESS RISE

Despite good times, nearly five million are out of work and the number is growing. Unemployment is beginning to look permanent.

Trouble is growth of the labor force. Jobs cannot open up fast enough to keep abreast, at present business levels.

How to meet the future is the problem. Public works, earlier and bigger pensions, shorter work week, all are suggested remedies.

Five years from now, unless business activity rises steadily from the present high level, there may be 12,000,000 unemployed in this country. If business should fail to hold as high as it is now, the number of unemployed will go above the 12,000,000 mark.

The returning problem of unemployment may be here to stay. It is coming back because of two main factors: (1) the steady flow of new workers into the ranks of job seekers; and (2) the year-by-year gain in man-hour output as industry's huge postwar investment in new and more efficient plant and equipment pays off.

The resulting problem, essentially, is this: Out of jobs and seeking jobs today are about 4,700,000 individuals. That is about 1,500,000 more than the number of unemployed a year ago. Number of unemployed will shrink seasonally in the period just ahead, but will be greater a year from now unless the general level of business activity rises.

New workers will add 2,900,000 people to the labor force in the years 1950 through 1954. That is the net increase to be expected after allowing for older workers who will drop out of the labor force. The rise in the labor force in this year alone will approach 700,000.

Jobs to be affected by more efficient use of labor total about 4,400,000 from 1950 through 1954. That assumes an annual increase of 2 to 2.5 percent in man-hour output—a gain that is in line with normal experience. Rising hourly wage rates add to pressure on management to find ways to reduce the use of labor.

Added up, as the chart on page 39 shows, the prospect is: 4,700,000 unemployed now, plus 2,900,000 to be added to the labor force, plus 4,400,000 to be displaced by improved efficiency—a total of 12,000,000. This number will be unable to find jobs in 1954 if business activity fails to rise above the present level and if efficiency in use of labor increases at the normal rate.

The 5-year solution to the problem of growing unemployment, if there is to be one, is this:

Total employment will have to climb from the present 57,000,000 civilian jobs to 67,000,000 jobs, if unemployment is to be held below 3,000,000.

Business activity—total spending, called gross product—will have to expand from the present level of $260,000,000,000 a year to $300,000,000,000 in 1954 to provide the needed additional jobs.

This is the total amount that will have to be spent for goods and services to keep the population fully employed. The $300,000,000,000 figure assumes that prices will stay where they are today. In that figure are the total outlays of consumers, home builders, business investors in plant and equipment, and Government spending at all levels, Federal, State and local.

This need for expansion is beginning to worry officials even now. Recent increases in unemployment are not due to a slackening of business activity but to a growth in the labor force. The number of people wanting jobs is increasing faster than the economy is expanding to provide those jobs. At the same time, output per hour is starting to rise again.

The experience of the last year shows what is happening. Total output today is almost as large as it was a year ago. Total civilian employment also is almost as large. The labor force, however, is larger by almost 1,500,000. Result is that unemployment increased by the amount that the labor force increased. At 4,700,000 unemployment is at a postwar high.

If this trend continues, unemployment will exceed 5,000,000 within a year. And unemployment at above 5,000,000 is recognized as a political problem.

Actually, there are only two developments that can prevent a rise in unemployment. Either private industry must expand, providing more jobs in factories, in construction, in trade and services, or the Government must move in.

Business expansion at the rate necessary to provide full employment appears to be a difficult task. High employment in all past periods has been sparked by a high level of investment in plant and equipment and in construction. At present, investment in new plant is falling off, although orders for new equipment recently have increased. The construction industry has been in a boom for 2 years and is headed for a third year of boom in 1950. It seems unlikely that this industry will expand much more.

Most other industries appear to be able to produce as much as people want. The automobile industry expects to meet most of the demand for new cars by the end of this year. There appears to be no urgent demand to expand output of such things as refrigerators, household appliances, or other hard goods. The soft-goods industries already have been producing surpluses. The steel industry apparently is able to satisfy all customers and the coal industry is plagued with too much capacity.

Moderate expansion can be expected through population growth and family growth. The population is likely to increase by 7,000,000 by 1954 and the number of families probably will grow by about 4,000,000. That will add to the demand for the products of industry, but, even with the probable growth ahead, the increase in job seekers may readily out pace that expansion. Any recession in business activity would result in rapid expansion in the number of unemployed.

To provide employment for ten to twelve million more workers by 1955—to reach a $300,000,000,000 output by that time—means that private business investment must continue at a higher rate than in 1949. That expansion also must be steady. In past periods, business expansion never has been steadily upward; its rise has been marked by periodic spurts and set-backs.

However, if private business expansion fails to check the rise in unemployment, political pressure will grow for a Government program to accomplish the same result. In fact, agitation for Government action can be expected if unemployment exceeds five million by this time next year.

The outline of a Government program already is beginning to take shape in official planning.

Public works expansion is under study now. The Federal Government is aiding States and cities with public works planning. On the shelf are Federal projects for river-valley developments, public-power expansion and land reclamation. President Truman's proposal for a New England power program is an example. New England is one of the areas hardest hit by current unemployment.

The experience of the New Deal suggests, however, that public works cannot provide the complete answer to the employment problem. It is unlikely that Mr. Truman's Fair Deal will be content with public works alone.

Higher old-age pensions are being offered as one way to draw older workers out of the labor force to make way for newcomers. Experience suggests, however, that, as jobs become harder to find, persons with jobs are reluctant to give them up. Union contracts, moreover, usually stress seniority that gives older workers a first claim on the jobs that are available.

A shorter workweek is another suggestion that is stirring in Government and union circles as a solution for unemployment. Agitation for a 30-hour week was intense in the early days of the New Deal, and a 40-hour week finally was established through the wage-and-hour law. A shorter workweek could be established by an amendment to the present law. That law already has been amended to push the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour.

Reduction of the standard workweek from 40 to 35 hours would mean a cutback of one-eighth in total hours of labor for one worker. Applied to a working force of 40,000,000, a 35-hour week would mean an additional 5,000,000 jobs to produce the same volume of output. The appeal of such a device could become important in a period of rising unemployment.

At present, proposals for treating unemployment are still in the discussion stage. The official hope is that the rising trend will be reversed in the months ahead and the problem may solve itself. But, if unemployment is higher a year from now, proposals for a shorter workweek promise to become a political issue.

The Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Otto W. Glade, the alert editor of the East Orange (N. J.) Record, has made a thorough survey of the housing situation in that city. In the second of this most timely series of articles on the subject, appearing in the March 30 issue, Mr. Glade states there is no lack of apartments in the $75 to $180 a month bracket for two to five rooms, but that the shortage is still most acute for the great majority of tenants in need of four- or five-room apartments renting for between $55 to $65 a month. The pattern in East Orange is, of course, duplicated in other cities throughout the country, and I believe the editorial on the subject in the March 30 Record is deserving of the attention of all Members:

THE HOUSING SHORTAGE

How bad is the housing shortage in East Orange? Articles in the Record this week and last seem to point out that it isn't bad at all if you've got the money to pay more than $75 a month for an apartment. But if you haven't, you may have to live in a cellar somewhere.

George Seiler of East Orange, president of the New Jersey Association of Real Estate Boards, aptly describes the situation when he says "There's no shortage of roofs." He's right. If you have the money, there's no housing shortage. If you don't you're just another name on the long list at City Hall trying to get into one of the city-owned barracks. What's the answer?

One school of economics says it is up to the Federal, State, or city government to take care of the low-income families and provide housing for them. Another school says leave it up to private capital. They'll build enough homes and apartments. Most of them will be for upper-income families but as the upper-income group moves to new apartments their old housing will become available for those looking for homes at lower prices. In this way, they say, residents now living in East Orange's older apartments will move into newer structures, the people living in lower-priced apartments will move into the apartments just vacated, and the veterans now living in temporary barracks will move into that housing.

It sounds good on paper. But does it work that way? The answer is evidently

"80" here in East Orange. New apartments have been building at a rapid rate since the war, most of them in the high-rent brackets and they've been rented almost as fast as they've been built. But the housing shortage still exists. Most of the families moving into the new developments are from places other than East Orange, or if they are from the city, they formerly lived with in-laws or are just married and had no previous home. They aren't vacating premises that can be used by someone else. Those living in older apartments aren't moving into new developments because of the huge difference in rent between the Government-controlled figure they're paying and the noncontrolled figure 25 percent or more higher.

Those apartments which do become available in the lower brackets (and in East Orange that means $50 to $70) come as the result of families moving from apartments to homes that they have bought, usually farther out in the suburbs. Thus, all the new building means little relief for the person looking for lower-rent housing.

Rents seem likely to go up before they come down and if the day comes when rents do drop, incomes will probably drop along with them.

Private builders say they can't put up apartments in East Orange that will rent for less than about $25 a room. And they say in the same breath that the Government should stay out of the housing business and should not subsidize home building.

But the truth is that unless the city, or State, or the Federal Government provides homes for persons in the low- or lower-middle income groups, they won't be able to live in East Orange and the city will become a restricted community of upper-income families.

There's no question that the housing shortage still exists. It may not be as bad now as it was in the years just after the war but it is still with us. Families are still living in cellars and in crowded quarters with relatives, right here in East Orange. That shortage will end only when enough homes are provided for persons who need them and at a price they can afford to pay.

Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. A pen and ink letter which a statesman might use for a dozen speeches comes from two of my constituents who hold no college degrees.

Let the wise planners, who know all about everything except hard work and thrift, read and profit.

The letter reads as follows:

FAR FAR, MICH., *March 9, 1950.*

Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We would like to have Hoover Commission recommendations adopted.

We as taxpayers are wanting end of waste as we know you are by your letters to us. And we know you are doing all you can to help us, but feel you need to know how much we appreciate your work.

We do not want socialized medicine. There are claims made that people earning less than $3,000 cannot pay for proper medical care. We never had income that high, but have always paid our doctor, dentist, and hospital bills. We own our farm and have no debts. We do not want any type subsidies or plan to help farmers. When farmers are left to run their own business they do not produce to be destroyed then paid for by taxpayers.

If any individual run their business as bad as Government runs things, everyone would soon starve. Government seems to enjoy wasting everything and has, since 1932.

We never thought social security plan to help anyone but just a device to allow Government to snoop into everyone's business.

Most people getting old-age pension do not really need it and lie and cheat to get it.

We do not want DP's to come to the United States of America as we have many unemployed and needing homes.

Our worst trusts are labor unions, not A. & P. Grocery or Drug Co., and unions should pay tax on income same as any corporation. Also, co-ops should pay tax.

Hope no more money is sent to foreign countries either as gifts or loans.

Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN OTTEN.

Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid speech made by Joseph C. Duggan, of New Bedford, Mass., formerly special assistant to the Attorney General, and former first assistant United States attorney in Massachusetts, the evening of March 16, 1950, before the Robert Emmet Club, of New Bedford, Mass.:

It has been the custom, on occasions like the present to dwell at length on the glories and the miseries of Ireland in times past. Tales of saints and scholars have been embroidered with oratorical artistry—heroes have been orated into legends—and the beautiful isle of the west has been delineated beyond the point of exaggeration as an earthly paradise.

Fitting, indeed, have been these encomiums of Ireland and all things Irish. But as the Irish stock has been assimilated into the warp and woof of America, the tendency has been to look with nostalgia to the past, and to overlook entirely the emergence of the strong and vibrant democracy that is modern Ireland as a full-fledged member of the commonwealth of nations.

It is modern Ireland and her last problem that I would talk of with you tonight.

Recent events concerning Ireland and our own great Nation have emphasized Ireland's coming of age internationally. The raising of our mutual legations in Dublin and Washington to ambassadorial rank signifies the recognition of Ireland as an equal with other great powers in the eyes of our statesmen and diplomats. The successful negotiation of a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States and the Republic of Ireland clearly indicates that Ireland has cut the last tie with the British crown, and that hereafter she shall conduct her own foreign relations as a fully independent sovereignty.

The fact which made these events possible was the effective promulgation of the Republic of Ireland Act on Easter Monday of 1949. To those whose memory goes back to 1916, I need not dwell upon the reason why that date was chosen for launching the Republic into international waters. The date last year does not signify the declaration of the Republic or its independence, for these had been most effectively taken care of on previous historic occasions.

An Irish Republic was first proclaimed as far back as 1798 by the united Irishmen. This first republican uprising, symbolically enough, originated in Belfast and was led mainly by Irish Presbyterians. That effort was not only the first republican movement, but it marked the clarion call for Catholic emancipation and freedom of conscience, thus laying the foundation for the absolute toleration which characterizes the present Irish Constitution.

On Easter Monday in 1916, the republic was again proclaimed and subsequently ratified by the will of the Irish people. It remained, however, for the recurrence of that date in 1949 for the Republic of Ireland to be internationally recognized as such.

Between these two dates, the voice of Ireland was not unheard in the council of world affairs. And it is safe to assert that if that voice had been heeded the world might have been spared the blood bath of the Second World War. For it was the Premier of Ireland, presiding over the old League of Nations, who cried out in vain for effective sanctions against Italian aggression in Ethiopia and Japanese barbarism in Manchuria.

De Valera then spoke from a bitter knowledge of the trials of a small nation. His words fell on deaf ears. America sat on the sidelines—and the Italian and Japanese delegates walked out. The testing grounds for a second world conflict had been chosen.

Ironically, Ireland is in a position today where her voice may not even be raised.

The veto of Godless Soviet Russia in the United Nations Organization bars Christian Ireland from the world parliament. And while that Assembly, without even the common sense to seek divine guidance, fumbles along in the icy heat of a cold war, the honor of Ireland prevents her inclusion into the Atlantic Pact because of the stupid perpetuation of a policy of partition by Great Britain in Northern Ireland.

It is this partition which is the last problem in Ireland. It cannot be viewed through other than Irish eyes.

The modern Irish Constitution, adopted in 1938, contains two significant phrases. It declares, first, that Ireland is a sovereign, independent, democratic state, and secondly, that the national territory consists of the whole island of Ireland, its islands, and the territorial seas.

Yet, within a month after the Republic of Ireland severed its last ties with British External Relations Office, in May of 1949, the British Parliament perpetrated its latest act of intrusion into the internal affairs of Ireland by passing the so-called "Ireland bill." It presumed to declare that "Northern Ireland remains part of His Majesty's dominion and of the United Kingdom and affirms that in no event will Northern Ireland cease to be a part of His Majesty's dominion and of the United Kingdom without the consent of the Parliament of Northern Ireland."

Thus, by solemn legislative act, Great Britain upholds the hand of its own creature which it foisted upon Ireland by the iniquitous Partition Act of 1920. A glance at any map of Ireland before that date 30 years ago will not disclose the division which exists today.

An artificial border was created, effected, and is now maintained by Great Britain. British customs operate that border. British troops occupy the area that has been cut away. And British finances maintain the Belfast government. These are the realities of the situation—and no specious argument can rationalize them away.

After 12 generations of successive programs of confiscation, degradation, exile, and death the freedom and national integrity of the Irish people today extends to only 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland.

This partition has severed from the Irish Nation some of the most hallowed and cherished shrines erected during her age-long history:

The archbishopric of Armagh—the see of St. Patrick;

Downpatrick, where the great bishop and confessor is buried and where rests the remains of Brian, who drove the invader from Ireland at Clontarf;

Bangor, the site of one of Ireland's most famous and ancient schools;

The Derry of St. Columkille;

The Tyrone of the O'Neills;

Belfast itself, the birthplace of the united Irishmen;

MacArt's Fort, where Wolfe Tone took his oath never to cease his efforts for Irish independence.

These and a thousand other storied spots today do not and cannot fly the flag of the Republic of Ireland.

And to realize the loss, I ask you to try to imagine a United States of America without Philadelphia, Lexington, or Concord—and American catholicism without the primatial see of Baltimore.

There are those who argue that this division is both desired by the people and justifiable.

The facts indisputably prove the contrary to be true.

Long before the First World War the problem of national integrity for Ireland was well on the way to solution under the enlightened "home rule" policy of the Gladstone and Asquith governments. The "Unionist" faction of the Tory Party frustrated that policy, and then the war intervened.

The Irish attempt to solve the problem by the uprising of 1916 was abortive, but the national plebiscite of 1918 left no doubt as to the mind of the people. Before the elected representatives of those people could consolidate the program of unification, however, Lloyd George succeeded in passing the Partition Act through Parliament with the promise that it was a temporary expedient. The true attitude of his party, however, was clearly revealed in a letter to Sir Edward Carson, the Tory leader in Belfast, wherein he stated that: "We must make it clear that Ulster does not, whether she wills it or not, merge in the rest of Ireland."

Incidentally, it will be noted that the severed portion of Ireland is referred to as Ulster, and the impression is intended to be left that it corresponds to the ancient Irish province of that name.

The fact is, however, that the British Parliament and its puppet government in Belfast could not maintain its rigged majority if it included all of Ulster in the severance.

Only six of the counties in historic Ulster were cut off.

Three of Ulster's nine counties—Donegal, Cavan, and Monaghan—had to be excluded from the operation of the act of partition so as not to endanger the dominant electoral position of the Unionist majority around Belfast.

Ironically, then, not only Ireland but Ulster itself was partitioned to constitute northeastern Ireland as a foreign outpost of England across the Irish Sea.

In addition, the six severed counties are so gerrymandered that Unionist majorities are guaranteed. I shall cite only three instances:

In County Tyrone, 60,000 Unionist voters can elect 16 members to the Parliament of Northern Ireland, while 74,000 Nationalist voters can elect only 11 members.

In County Fermanagh, 26,000 Unionist voters elect 13 members, while 33,000 Nationalist voters can return only 7 representatives.

In Derry City, the second largest municipality in the 6 counties, 27,000 Nationalist voters can elect only 8 members to the city council, while 18,000 Unionist voters can chose 12 members.

Over 22 instances of such electoral imbalance can be cited; yet, in spite of the rigged constituencies, Belfast itself elected 2 antipartitionist members and Queens University in that city elected 1.

If the Nationalist minority were allowed a true plebiscite in which the weight of its numbers was honestly counted, its total vote in 4 of the 6 partitioned counties would actually constitute a majority for reunion with the 26 counties of the Republic.

If the reason, therefore, for cutting off the 6 counties from the total of 32 is that a Unionist majority can be assured, then by the same logic, the four counties in which a Nationalist majority is possible should be cut off from the six.

Such reasoning and logic, of course, requires acceptance of the proposition that an actual minority in a whole nation has the right of secession when it happens to be a majority in a small area of that nation. In our own country, a tragic fratricidal war disproved that proposition as a political principle. It is the prayerful hope of the friends of Ireland and Great Britain alike that its fallacy will be realized by the Parliaments of Northern Ireland and Great Britain without resort to such a calamitous extremity.

If the democratic right to self-determination is to apply to any country, there is no country which fulfills the requisite conditions more clearly than Ireland. There are three well established tests:

1. The natural boundaries of the country. No country in the world can claim more absolutely defined natural boundaries than those marked by the seas surrounding Ireland.

2. A distinct national history. Few indeed are the nations which can claim a more clearly defined and age-long national history, dating back long before the days of St. Patrick.

3. A homogeneous people. The inhabitants of the whole island are of the same race, the same color, and speak the same language. True, there is disparity of religion, but if this is ground for partition, then Christian amity would be impossible, and every nation would be split into an infinite number of fragments.

Ireland complies with the three tests more completely than any nation on earth. She has the right, therefore, to be one solidified and integrated nation. Partition, then, is unnatural, unhistoric, and, particularly when imposed from without, completely unjustified.

No realist will dispute the fact that, from time immemorial, the primary concern of Britain with Ireland has been principally a matter of defense.

England has tenaciously clung to Irish territory as a western bastion of her own perimeter of defense.

By insisting upon the continuation of partition, Great Britain undoubtedly serves her own interest in this vital matter, but unfortunately, she also deprives all of the other Atlantic nations of the inestimable boon of a united and integrated Republic of Ireland as a full-fledged signatory to the Atlantic Pact.

The national honor of Ireland prohibits her inclusion while a part of her soil is garrisoned by foreign troops.

A truncated Ireland cannot consistently join in an agreement in which one of the principal pledges is the preservation of the national and territorial integrity of the agreeing parties.

The United States rejoices in her alliance with Great Britain in the noble attempt to achieve the reality of the defense of western civilization by means of the Atlantic Pact.

Our people, however, regret that the shortsighted Irish partition policy of that same ally also prevents the inclusion in the pact of the one country which both England and the United States concede to be of utmost strategic importance to the whole scheme of Atlantic defenses.

And most regrettable, is the fact that such policy blinds the British Government to the obvious conclusion that it would be far better to have the whole of Ireland as a cordial, cooperative partner rather than to hold a small segment of that nation in the face of the righteous resentment of the vast majority of her people.

Great Britain, who owes so much to both Ireland and the United States, now has the opportunity to display the greatest statesmanship of which the genius of her polity is capable.

The Ireland Act of 1949 should be repealed.

All of the people of Northern Ireland—without any electoral tampering—should be given an opportunity, under a neutral arbitration commission if necessary, to express their free choice on the question of national integrity by area-wide plebiscite instead of by gerrymandered districts.

The homogeneity of the Republic of Ireland should be permitted to become a political and territorial fact.

The principle of self-determination should be advocated for Ireland with the same vigor as it is claimed for the countries behind the iron curtain.

Britain's preachment of democracy should find its first practice in Ireland.

Partition in the Emerald Isle should be abolished forthwith so that the republic of a united Ireland may be voluntarily forged as a link of steel in the chain of free nations dedicated to the preservation of western culture and Christian civilization.

The concluding words of Robert Emmet's last public utterance were these:

"When my country takes her place among the nations of the earth, then, and not till then, let my epitaph be written. I have done."

The country of which Emmet spoke was the historic Irish Nation and not merely a portion of it. The Ireland of his day knew no partition.

When the unnatural and artificial border erected by that partition is obliterated, his epitaph may be inscribed in few, simple, but glowing words:

"He died for a free and united Ireland."

The Cost of the Central Arizona Irrigation Project to the Taxpayers of Each State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the construction cost of the central Arizona project, as authorized by the

Senate—S. 75, Eighty-first Congress—is $1,250,700,000. This is made up of the initial project, $700,700,000, plus tunnels, authorized by section 1 of the act to be built at the discretion of the appropriation committees, to cost, with connecting aqueduct, $550,000,000 more.

Even if sales of power provide revenues to repay all this invested capital, the project provides no revenues which the Treasury may use to pay interest upon the national debt that the project creates; all interest money, paid by the power users, is dedicated to pay for irrigation works, as a subsidy to the irrigators. The result is that all interest upon the national debt represented by the construction cost of the project must be met by the Federal taxpayer for about a century, including the period of construction and development, as a concealed subsidy. The total amount of the subsidy to be paid by Federal taxpayers, including the nonreimbursable capital items in addition to this interest burden, is $1,173,000,000.

This national total is broken down by States, according to a standard formula used by tax experts, based on a pro rata of income and other Federal taxes, as follows:

Cost to Nation's taxpayers of central Arizona irrigation project by States

	Percent of total	Cost to taxpayers in interest and nonreimbursable subsidies [1]
Alabama	1.17	[illegible]
Arizona	.37	4,340,000
Arkansas	.73	8,486,000
California	8.32	97,564,000
Colorado	.81	9,504,000
Connecticut	0.87	10,203,000
Delaware	.40	4,692,000
Florida	1.28	15,132,000
Georgia	1.40	16,424,000
Idaho	.32	3,754,000
Illinois	7.38	86,531,000
Indiana	2.29	26,862,000
Iowa	1.08	12,662,000
Kansas	1.15	13,490,000
Kentucky	1.20	14,076,000
Louisiana	1.27	14,911,000
Maine	.44	5,161,000
Maryland	1.56	18,304,000
Massachusetts	3.40	39,882,000
Michigan	4.71	55,242,000
Minnesota	1.46	17,124,000
Mississippi	.71	8,328,000
Missouri	3.13	36,677,000
Montana	.35	4,106,000
Nebraska	.86	10,088,000
Nevada	.13	1,525,000
New Hampshire	.26	3,022,000
New Jersey	3.56	36,592,000
New Mexico	.25	3,284,000
New York	14.42	169,078,000
North Carolina	1.59	18,648,000
North Dakota	.34	2,988,000
Ohio	5.78	67,749,000
Oklahoma	1.17	13,724,000
Oregon	1.04	12,196,000
Pennsylvania	7.62	89,292,000
Rhode Island	.70	8,202,000
South Carolina	.76	8,915,000
South Dakota	.36	4,221,000
Tennessee	1.37	16,070,000
Texas	4.38	51,377,000
Utah	.24	2,814,000
Vermont	.19	2,111,000
Virginia	1.39	17,478,000
Washington	1.72	19,354,000
West Virginia	.93	10,902,000
Wisconsin	1.93	23,622,000
Wyoming	.18	2,111,000
District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Alaska	1.46	17,100,000
United States total	100.00	1,173,000,000

[1] Even if construction cost of $1,250,700,000 were repaid to Federal Treasury from power revenues.

Silent Meditation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the following remarks, which I delivered over the facilities of Station WARL, on Sunday, April 2, 1950, in behalf of the Good Friday Observance Committee of the Greater Washington Area:

"We preach Christ and Him crucified" (First Corinthians 1:23).

Passion is a word of different meanings. The first meaning given in the dictionary is "to suffer." And everyone of us has experienced this type of passion in some form or other. To some it designates pain of body; and, for them, passion is a reminder of physical torture. Experience has taught them to cringe from bodily harm. If they still bear this suffering, then they must cultivate patience, which is the endurance of their torture. Still others are disturbed mentally. Their passion affects the mind; and oftentimes there is danger of mental derangement, because of the acuteness of the agony. They have difficulty in focusing their thought processes because their minds do not function properly.

In either of these cases of bodily or mental passion, there is real suffering. Hence the true meaning of the word is born out: "to suffer." The dictionary next tells us that passion is an intense or overpowering feeling, such as of love or of hate. This passion affects the mind, insofar as the emotion is so strong as to sway the one disturbed. The person undergoing this passion, swerving unsteadily from the path of right reason, often loses common sense. Self-control departs from the individual and passion reigns supreme.

Just a step away from the last kind of passion comes the third meaning of the word. Here passion means a strong impulse to give way to physical indulgence. This type of passion resides primarily in our lower or animal nature; it makes itself felt chiefly in the uprisings of the flesh. Like an untamed, wild and unruly beast, once this passion is unleashed it wreaks havoc upon the person who falls prey to its attack. And when this passion takes over to form an evil habit, then the unfortunate sufferer must endure the terrible physical toll taken by its demands. St. Paul rightly terms this passion as a terrifying "tribulation of the flesh."

Passion, meaning to suffer, is a common human lot. We all endure its pain. Every one of us must undergo its fearful demands. Hence, it behooves us to seek out a balm for our trials. The greatest consolation for our affliction is the passion that Jesus Christ endured for us. The saints, in their trials, took refuge in the wounds of Christ. When temptations of unruly passion assailed them, they had immediate recourse to the crucifix or to the sign of the cross. We make our mistake in not imitating them. We seek outlet from suffering and passion in every soothing sedative of distraction or even recreation. Yet we know that this course only postpones but does not solve our problem. If we would bear up under our passion, ultimately we must recur to the cross.

Good Friday, anniversary day of our Lord's suffering, is fast approaching. The 3 hours' agony will be commemorated in every church. Everyone of us must spend part of our time in prayer during those hours. Preferably, this should be in church. There the priest or minister will bring home to our minds the facts of Christ's passion. There we will find the solution to the mystery of our own passion. If the flesh beckons you on, the wounds of Christ will strengthen you against temptation. If sickness weighs you down, the blood-stained and pain-racked body of Christ will give you new courage. If mental trials beset you, the thorn-crowned head of Christ will lessen your own pain by comparison. This Friday will indeed be good for you if you spend it as you should, on your knees in church. If you are unable, then take your crucifix and study the lesson of patience in passion. He is the Master; you are the servant. The Master suffered; you must suffer. For: "The servant is not above the Master." On His Good Friday, pray Him to help you with the cross of your passion. He will then come to your assistance and take the greater part of your suffering. Go to church this Good Friday; take part in the Passion of Jesus Christ.

May the Lord bless thee, keep thee, and give thee peace.

Year After Tragic Hospital Fire, Effingham Ready To Erect New and Larger St. Anthony's Memorial Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, just a year ago today, the Nation was shocked by a disaster at Effingham, Ill., in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. On that fateful day, the lives of 74 persons were taken as flames swept through St. Anthony's hospital with such devastating rapidity that the rescue of any was the result of the most extreme personal heroism.

Just 1 year later, the city of Effingham has accomplished the gigantic task of raising funds, drafting plans, and completing preparation to build a new and larger hospital, to be known as St. Anthony's Memorial in everlasting honor to those who lost their lives on that tragic morning just a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, there is courage in communities, as there is in individuals. The people of Effingham have shown courage, as well as great devotion to their community in laboring to overcome the countless obstacles in the path of an undertaking as large as the erection of a modern hospital. But they have overcome every obstacle and now the results are about to materialize in steel and stone. It is a source of satisfaction to know that the Federal Government itself is sharing in the program through the contribution of Federal funds, and the State of Illinois is doing likewise.

One of the newspapermen who went to the scene a year ago revisited it a few days before the first anniversary. He is

Bob Wright, of the editorial department of the Danville Commercial-News. His impression of the scene, 1 year later, is worthy of reading by all who recall the shock of the tragedy. Under permission granted, I am including his article as follows:

PEOPLE STOOD SILENT BESIDE SMOKING RUINS 1 YEAR AGO

(By Bob Wright)

It is doubtful if any resident of Effingham, Ill., noticed that capricious Nature was in one of her moods. Behind the smile of green grass and budding trees, ready to burst into leaf, was the cold, damp breath of winter.

But most of Effingham's 7,000 population stood silent and unmindful of the weather that spring day a year ago. For there was a deeper chill in their hearts that had nothing to do with the time of the year.

The day was April 5, 1949, more tragic in its personal implications for the little southern Illinois town than December 7, 1941.

Before midnight, a spark had flared within the darkened interior of St. Anthony's hospital. With terrifying speed, the spark became a flame, a roaring blaze that swept down corridors of the old, three-story building. And the night, which had begun quietly, became a hideous welter of sights and sounds—an inferno of fire whose yellow light sharply silhouetted the figures of those trapped within as they poised on window sills before leaping for their lives * * * or to their deaths.

By dawn, the strident clamor of the holocaust was stilled. Tired firemen from six departments in as many neighboring cities still played streams of water on stubborn pockets of flame. The blackened walls stood windowless and roofless and a grimmer work—that of removing the dead—was about to begin.

It was on this scene that I arrived later in the morning. National Guardsmen from Mattoon—part of Deanville's own One Hundred and Thirtieth Regiment—patrolled the grounds. The Red Cross with customary speed and efficiency, had flown in emergency medical supplies and was ministering to those who had escaped the fire. Every major press association and news photographic service was represented and a newsreel company crew set up a camera in the middle of the street fronting the hospital.

One of the favorite subjects of the cameramen was a niche in the second story wall, a niche containing a statue of St. Anthony. All around, the brick masonry was scarred and blackened by the flames. The figure of the saint was untouched.

Another much-photographed scene was the very center of the building. There, amidst a jumble of brick and wreckage from the fallen-in roof, was a large metal cylinder, an escape tower, still standing. Ironically, the doors to each floor were closed. In the panic of that awful night, was this comparatively recent safety device forgotton? Or did the flames move too fast, forming a fiery barrier?

At the rear of the hospital is a low, modern brick building, known as St. Joseph's Villa. In happier times, it was used as a recreation center. On that day, it had become a morgue. Before leaving, I counted 22 blanket-shrouded stretchers being carried within.

Later, when rescuers ceased poking amid the ruins, the list of dead was placed officially at 74. Between 30 and 40 had been saved.

I shall never forget the desolation of that scene nor the unnatural stillness of the people affected the most. I shall never forget, too that this tragedy, America's second most costly hospital fire touched off a Nationwide campaign to strengthen fire precautions in institutions devoted to caring for the sick.

Seeds of Treason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the editorial included in my remarks should be read by all Members. It appeared in the Washington News on yesterday.

SEEDS OF TREASON

More than 3,000,000 words of testimony were taken in the Alger Hiss case.

They were rushed into print on a day-to-day basis during the two trials and the congressional committee hearings at such a tempo and with such a conflict of interpretation and emphasis as to leave the public gasping.

Out of this welter of words—and smears—has come a book titled "Seeds of Treason," by two industrious reporters, Ralph de Toledano of Newsweek and Victor Lasky of the New York World-Telegram and the Sun, a Scripps-Howard newspaper.

The frightening thing about this book, beside which the paradox of Alger Hiss fades into insignificance, is the picture it presents of a government which so consistently rejected or tried to suppress evidence of the great Communist conspiracy against our way of life.

"Who is more guilty," the authors ask, "the man who passes documents to a Soviet spy ring, or the man who, for whatever reason, sponsors the culprit?"

Uncritical acceptance of Russia and the consequent immunity of Communists in our Government has been a cancerous growth in White House administrations since 1933. Just to cite one case, there is the Russian-born Nathan Gregory Silvermaster.

A Civil Service Commission report about him was quoted as saying that an "overwhelming amount of testimony indicates beyond reasonable doubt [he had] for years been a member and a leader of the Communist Party and very probably a secret agent for the OGPU."

Yet, from August 1935 until March 1946, he moved steadily up in Government service. Why? For one thing, he had a staunch friend in Lauchlin Currie, adviser to President Roosevelt. Silvermaster was never transferred from one job to another, which would have given the Civil Service Commission a chance to refuse him clearance, but was loaned instead.

The primary aim of Communists in those early days was infiltration and the influencing of public policy. Yet the Roosevelt and Truman administration persistently closed their eyes and showed no real determination to root the Communist elements out of the Government. Then when the Reds altered their objective to espionage for Russia they were entrenched.

The Amerasia stolen-documents affair was another case in point. The Justice Department seemed to drag its feet and there was never any public trial of the six persons arrested. And pro-Communist influence in the State Department's Far Eastern Division was never uprooted. Our subsequent China policy succeeded in turning over half of Asia to the Communists.

Such things, we agree, are the real meaning and message of the Hiss case.

And, as the authors summarize:

"Hiss is one man caught in a tragedy of arrogance and self-deception. But there are those who aided and abetted him in their blindness; and their name is legion. Instead of crushing the seeds of treason, they scattered them in the good American earth.

"The Hiss-Chambers drama can be a curtain-raiser of a new steadfastness. Or it can be the last whimper of a tired and demoralized world."

Jefferson Soil Conservation District Annual Report, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the annual report of the Jefferson County (Ohio) Soil Conservation District for 1949. The soil-conservation district of Jefferson County, one of the counties in my congressional district, is doing an excellent job of conserving the greatest natural resource in the United States, the topsoil.

The report follows:

JEFFERSON SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT ANNUAL REPORT, 1949

The board of supervisors held 10 meetings during the year. The average attendance of supervisors was 4.1 out of 5. This figure does not include the attendance of the county agent and Soil Conservation Service personnel, which exceeded the preceding figure a few points. Assistance from the Soil Conservation Service and Extension Service personnel was and always has been helpful in every way possible.

Work accomplished this year was as follows:

Farm plans, 30; acreage included 5,734.

Farm plans to date, 199; acreage 29,451.

Farm plan applications, 32 during the year.

A large amount of this acreage is now in use under regular strip cropping, rotations, with full required use of lime, fertilizer, and trees. A separate report of this acreage according to farm practice is attached to this general report.

With the resignation of our regular conservation aide, we sought and found Gabriel Rozsa from local applicants to assist our regular conservationist in the work.

In January, Robert Gray and W. R. Scott were our representatives at the Ohio Federation of District Supervisors' meeting at Columbus, Ohio. Also arrangements were made for the Jefferson soil-conservation district annual meeting in March.

In February, the board completed arrangements for the annual meeting in March. Mr. T. C. Kennard, of the Soil Conservation Service, was the speaker at that meeting. Plans were made for the election of supervisors. At this meeting full support for group planning was agreed upon by the board of supervisors.

The annual meeting in March was one of great interest and success as an audience of 150 listened to Mr. T. C. Kennard's address and to the reports of the Jefferson soil-conservation district officers. At this meeting votes for two supervisors were counted and Robert Gray and Taylor Floyd were declared elected.

The meeting in June continued the planning of the supervisors for an investigation of the group plan. One group already in operation was declared very successful. Also, the air tour was reported very successful. We assisted the county agent in this. Eighty people were carried over the land that had been laid out under farm plans in part of this district.

Two entries were made in the B. & O. contest; one in each class. They were Fleminken and Charles Kirk & Son.

Delegates were sent to Mississippi Valley Association training session at Defiance, and to the State Federation of Soil Conservation Districts. Our chairman, Robert Gray, Jr., is chairman of the strip-mine committee of the State federation.

Our farm planner, Kenneth Thomas, became ill and was not able to carry on the work, and another man, Robert Jones, was provided by the Soil Conservation Service to replace him. With this change we started with all new personnel for the balance of the year.

In October we assisted the county agent with farm tours. Two trips of 1 day each were made. Attendance was excellent, and many farms were visited where farm plans were being carried out.

The Soil Conservation Service furnished a full-time farm planner and aide for the year. Also, 21,000 forest trees were furnished, together with part-time service of an engineer and forester.

Group farm planning was made, which was one of the chief aims of the District. The Soil Conservation Service furnished a man to assist in locating groups. Interest meetings were held with several groups, and one group was carried through a series of farm-planning meetings. Others are to follow at a later date.

The purchase of a large cut-out disk was considered, but was put off to a later date until similar tools were investigated.

In connection with the Extension Service and the agricultural committee of the chamber of commerce, plans were discussed for an educational program. A detailed review of this is to be made at the meeting in February 1950.

Much of the success of the district is due to the splendid aid and cooperation of the Soil Conservation Service and the extension service of the State, and the thanks due them are hereby expressed.

We have experienced difficulties during this year, but as has been said, "Difficulties are but opportunities to test our abilities."

So we close the year with full belief in the soil-conservation district program and its lasting benefit to the farmer and consumer. We are looking forward to new and better things for the coming year.

The Soil Conservation Service granted to the district a 6-foot terracer and rotary scraper. These will be very useful in the work in our territory.

ROBERT M. GRAY, Jr.,
Jefferson Soil Conservation District.
STEUBENVILLE, OHIO.

Other members of the board: Harold McCullough, Taylor W. Floyd, Charles Kirk, Reed Scott.

Jefferson Soil Conservation District annual report of conservation practices

	This year	To date
Agreements signed:		
Number	30	199
Acres	5,734	29,451
Amendments: Number	0	0
Agreements canceled:		
Number		18
Acres		2,379

Practice	Unit	Newly planned		Established	
		This year	To date	This year	To date
Cover cropping	Acres	635	1,503	19	54
Strip cropping	do	986	8,256	1,250	5,314
Pasture improvement	do	676	5,346	420	1,138
Seeding pasture	do	143	1,645	77	313
Woods management	do	0	494	0	73
Tree planting	do	18	183	21	76
Field windbreaks	Miles	0.3	7	0.17	1
Fence-row management	Linear feet	500	18,600	4,200	10,700
Prevention of fire and grazing	Acres	192	1,518	113	1,097
Time cropland	do	739	8,283	1,134	5,627
Farming cropland	do	1,127	8,528	1,159	4,017
Constructed waterways	Linear feet	1,500	4,540	0	1,800

Jefferson Soil Conservation District annual report of receipts and expenditures, period Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1949

RECEIPTS (BY SOURCE)

Balance brought forward	$96.28
Cooperators' fees and equipment rental	55.00
Total	151.28

EXPENDITURES (CLASSIFIED)

Annual meeting expens	46.38
Delegate to Mississippi Valley school	17.00
State association dues	5.00
National association dues	5.00
Affiliate membership dues	25.00
Total	96.38
Balance on hand	54.90

Questions and Answers on Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, farmers in Wisconsin are very interested in the Brannan plan. They want to know more about how it would work, and what it would mean to our important dairy industry in Wisconsin. Their questions often indicate that they like what they have heard about the Brannan plan, but that there is a great deal they do not understand about it.

I have sorted out the questions most frequently asked in Wisconsin about the Brannan plan, and sent them to Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan for first-hand answers. It is my thought that Secretary Brannan himself can best inform the farmers of Wisconsin and other dairy States about the Brannan plan and what it means to farmers.

My questions and his answers follow:

Question. What is the Brannan plan?

Answer. It is the name which has been given to the administration's farm-price-support proposals. These proposals do not really constitute a "plan" at all, but in reality are a series of suggested improvements in existing price-support legislation. Acting as spokesman of the administration, I presented these recommendations to the appropriate congressional committees on April 7, 1949. It would be more accurate to refer to these recommended changes as "the administration's farm-price-support proposals."

Question. What are the aims of the proposals?

Answer. If all the proposals were enacted, they would do two things for farmers: (1) Stop disastrous plunges in farm prices which have so often in the past caused so much suffering and hardship and (2) offer farmers a chance to earn a farm income with adequate purchasing power.

By doing these things the plan would offer the Nation protection against depression in a vital soft spot. Our depressions have often been farm-led and farm-fed; when farm prices hit the skids, unemployment soon shows up in cities and towns, and soon the whole economy is in trouble.

Question. Why do farmers need a price-support program?

Answer. Because farmers, unlike industry, cannot voluntarily adjust their production to the demand for their products. When more is produced than consumers can buy at fair prices, crop surpluses start piling up and farm prices are driven down. The prices of things farmers have to buy, however, stay about the same.

Question. What does the administration recommend that we do about farm income?

Answer. We start with this idea: There is a level below which it is not in the national interest to allow farm income to fall.

The administration recommends the average farm income of 1939–48—in real dollars—as the basic income standard for figuring support prices. This base, the first 10 of the last 12 years, would move forward each year, with an old year dropping out and a new year being added. This would keep the program modern and up to date, instead of chaining farm prices to the obsolete conditions of 40 years ago.

This income standard should provide farmers with the purchasing power they need to operate their farms, to care for their families, and to keep their land in shape. This income standard would be used as the basis for calculating price-support standards for different commodities.

Question. How does the administration's income standard compare with farm income in recent years?

Answer. If the income-support standard were in use this year, the income standard for 1950 would work out at about the farm income of 1942. Net farm income, now in its third year of decline, is expected to run about 10 percent less than in 1942. In other words, the income target would be about 10 percent higher than farm income is expected to be in 1950.

Question. What advantages do the administration's proposals offer Wisconsin farmers?

Answer. Any program supporting farm income is meaningless unless it supports the farm commodities which earn most or all of the Nation's farm income. The administration proposal meets this problem—first, by tying price supports to the income standard, and, second, by requiring the use of price supports for those commodities which earn most of the farm income.

The Agricultural Act of 1949 authorizes mandatory supports for products bringing in about 40 percent of the total farm income. This is an improvement over the provisions of the 1948 act that would have gone into effect if the act of 1949 had not been enacted.

The list of commodities getting mandatory support under the plan recommended by the administration includes products returning about 75 percent of the farm income. Among these commodities are meat, milk, poultry, and eggs, which are leading income producers in Wisconsin. The plan likewise could be extended, with the approval of Congress, to the leading fruits and vegetables.

The table below compares the commodities which are required to be supported by the Agricultural Act of 1949 with those which would be required to be supported under the new proposals.

Commodity	Percentage of total amount, United States farm income, 1948	Agricultural Act of 1949	Administration recommendation
Cotton lint	7.0	Yes	Yes.
Corn	3.7	Yes	Yes.
Wheat	7.8	Yes	Yes.
Tobacco	3.2	Yes	Yes.
Butterfat } Milk }	14.5	Yes	Yes.
		Yes	Yes.
Hogs	12.2	No	Yes.
Eggs	6.1	No	Yes.
Chickens, excluding broilers	1.8	No	Yes.
Cattle and calves	17.1	No	Yes.
Lambs (and sheep)	1.3	No	Yes.
Rice	.6	Yes	No.
Peanuts	.7	Yes	No.
Potatoes	1.9	Yes	No.
Wool [2]	(1)	Yes	No.
Tung nuts	(1)	Yes	No.
Mohair	(1)	Yes	No.
Honey	(1)	Yes	No.

[1] Less than 1/10 of 1 percent.
[2] Including pulled wool.

Question. How do the support prices proposed by the administration compare with what we have?

Answer. The best answer is to be found in the facts.

The following table compares in dollars and cents mandatory minimum support levels recommended by the administration, with those provided by the Agricultural Act of 1949, for important Wisconsin products:

Commodity	Unit	Agricultural Act of 1949 [1]	Recommended by Administration [2]
		Dollars	*Dollars*
Butterfat	Pounds	0.818	0.858
Milk	Hundredweight	3.23	3.40
Hogs	do	(3)	15.70
Eggs	Dozen	(3)	.390
Chickens	Pounds	(3)	.240
Corn	Bushels	1.46	1.42
Potatoes	do	1.00	(3)
Beef cattle	Hundredweight	(3)	14.20
Lambs	do	(3)	15.30

[1] Including consideration of transitional parity calculation.
[2] Support prices shown are bottom of discretionary range provided to allow adjustment to maintain desirable feed ratios.
[3] Support not mandatory.

Question. What will farmers have to do to qualify for price support under the administration's proposal?

Answer. The successful operation of any kind of price-support program, the present legislation and the administration's proposals included, requires the acceptance by farmers of responsibility for cooperating with each other to make whatever production adjustments that may be required. There is nothing new about the administration's proposals in this respect. The price-support program for farmers that has been developed over the past 17 years includes provision for democratically adopted (by a two-thirds favorable vote) production adjustment measures—acreage allotments and marketing quotas—as a means of keeping supplies in balance with genuine demand. The administration has recommended that authority for farmers to use acreage allotments and marketing quotas, as well as marketing agreements and marketing orders, be extended to all commodities, when needed. Used in conjunction with production payments, these production-adjustment measures would actually be needed less frequently. The production-payment system would operate to keep a larger volume of perishables moving through the market stream and into the hands of consumers, thus requiring less dependence upon production-adjustment measures.

The administration has also recommended that our soil-conservation efforts and expenditures should be more closely integrated with our price-support operations. The carrying out of a minimum of sound soil-conserving practices would be required as a condition of eligibility for price support.

Question. How will the administration proposals support perishable products?

Answer. The plan proposes to use production payments to support perishable commodities which can be stored only at heavy expense. These include milk, butterfat, poltry and eggs, meat animals, fruits and vegetables.

The term production payment, means exactly what it says—a payment to the farmer to go on producing to meet genuine consumer needs, rather than restricting output short of that need. Under this system, the farmer would be paid the difference between the support standard price for commodities which he sold and the average market price of such commodities. The payments would be made, of course, only when the market averaged below the support price for a given period.

Question. What are the advantages of the production payments recommended by the administration?

Answer. The payments would go directly to the farmer. It would be an efficient support operation, with every cent used to support farm prices, directly benefiting farmers. In a Government purchase operation, a considerable part of the cost is eaten up by processing and storage.

The production-payment method would eliminate these costs as well as any waste and spoilage which might occur in piling up unmarketable stocks of food. The entire volume of marketings would flow through regular channels of trade to the ultimate consumers to be used in improving their diets.

Farmers likewise could benefit to the extent that their own selling prices were higher than the market average. This means that farmers would have an incentive in dollars and cents to produce and market quality products and do a good job of bargaining.

Question. How much support will the administration proposals offer each farmer?

Answer. The program proposals recommend support protection for the quantity marketed, but no more than 1,800 units of price supported farm products. The maximum eligibility for any one farm would be 18,000 bushels of corn or its equivalent in other commodities. This amount is ample to cover the total marketings of all of the Nation's family farms, including those of our largest, most efficient family farms. Our national policy has long been designed to encourage, improve, and safeguard family farms. This principle has its rightful place in our support programs. If the proposed high point is not correctly placed for our largest and most efficient family farms, it should be reviewed. However, the topmost limit, in itself, is not designed to prohibit higher production.

Question. How much will the administration's price-support proposals cost?

Answer. The Government cost will be no more, and probably less, than present methods.

With high level employment and measures to maintain stable farm income, this cost can be kept at a minimum. If farm income is not maintained through some kind of support program, the full cost of economic maladjustment falls on farmers.

The purchase type programs authorized by the present price-support legislation involve two costs: Government expenditures and artificially high retail prices to consumers. The Government cost is dependent upon how far below support prices the accumulated inventories must be sold by the Government, and, for perishables, desirable outlets are increasingly difficult to find. These purchase programs also require the Government to pay buying, selling, grading, storage, processing, and transportation costs. An additional cost is paid by consumers who are required to pay retail prices reflecting the level of support prices.

Under the production payment method of support recommended by the administration, retail prices to consumers would be the same supply and demand price that would prevail if no support program were in operation. And the Government cost of making the production payments would be no more, and probably less, than the costs of direct Government purchases and the processing and handling charges involved.

The purchase type programs authorized by present legislation require nonfarmers to pay twice—once in taxes and again in higher retail prices. If production payments are used, the cost is assessed only once.

Valladolid Council, No. 70, Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include my remarks which I delivered at the annual communion and breakfast of Valladolid Council, No. 70, Knights of Columbus, of Lynn, Mass., which was held in the Lynn English High School on Sunday, April 2, 1950:

I want to begin by stating an obvious fact. You and I are human beings.

From this fundamental, it is but natural that we should be concerned primarily with our individual selves. Jobs, income, homes, children, progress—these are most important to us.

In living our lives in the company of others, however, we must think of them as well as ourselves. Even a recluse cannot live in an

Electric vacuum. He is still accountable to God.

But we are not hermits, or we WOULDN'T be here at this communion breakfast.

By virtue of a sacrament, we have just passed through a mystical experience that purifies and inspires. Once more, we are clean of heart, and are prepared to face the confusions of life with renewed strength, and devotion to the will of God who is the source of our being.

In this Catholic fraternity, we are properly concerned with what is going on outside our ranks in the different groupings that make up this world.

Action and reaction, this is the law of life. What we do is one thing. What others do has a bearing on us also, and we can ignore the latter only at our peril.

What is the state of our Nation then, and how does it fare in its relations with other national communities?

These are vast and complicated questions, which I can only touch on briefly.

With certain exceptions, conditions in the United States are generally good. There are more people employed and at higher purchasing-power wages than ever before.

Savings accounts and insurance policies in force are at an all-time high. Construction is booming. The Federal public housing program is eliminating our slums. One discouraging note is the road block which the coalition in Congress placed in the way of stimulating the building of housing accommodations for middle-income families. This may well become an issue with the American people, for the industrious and thrifty middle class has heretofore been the very core of our strength. Doctors, lawyers, dentists, and school teachers, farmers, grocers, and every person who is trying to make a living from a small business, these are the people who have been neglected in our preoccupation with the rival claims of industry and organized labor.

It is significant that the Communists first try to destroy the middle class, knowing that it is the balance wheel of a free society. We must not permit this to happen in the United States. Legislation designed to extend and insure loans for small business enterprises is necessary to save us from the concentrated power of monopoly in any form. Competition and freedom go together. We must guard against the possibility that some day, a few men in Government or elsewhere, shall decide what commodities we shall produce and how much, and at what price. Tens of millions of Americans are now making the individual decisions which guide production and consumption of goods. We want to keep it that way.

One dark spot in the present picture is the number of unemployed, particularly in New England. To meet this challenge, the President is recommending that unemployment insurance compensation be extended and increased. We, in the Congress, are working for a program whereby Government contracts shall be channeled to distressed areas in order to pick up the slack in production and employment.

Inasmuch as the Federal Government spends billions of dollars each year for goods and services, it has the power and the responsibility to place these orders in labor-surplus areas.

At best, however, this provides temporary relief. In line with our traditions of independence and self-sufficiency, it is necessary that we do everything possible to help ourselves, rather than depend upon the Federal Government to bail us out of every difficulty. The line must be drawn somewhere, by ourselves, and as mature men who do not easily forfeit all sense of personal responsibility. The road to tyranny is opened up by ever-increasing reliance upon others. It is so easy to shift the burden, not realizing that with it we also surrender the right to control.

I am reminded of this by a statement from the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, pointing out the growth trends in the New England economy. Its message is that New England has been and continues to be an area which shows substantial and encouraging economic progress. Population, labor force, income, retail sales, and bank deposits are increasing. The three leading industries, in terms of growth, are electrical machinery, apparel and related products, printing and publishing.

But I also noticed that the three declining industries are textile-mill products, leather and leather products, lumber and timber products.

Some of our cities and towns are one-industry communities, and if that industry happens to be textiles or leather, the locality is faced with a serious problem.

This happened to Manchester and Nashua, N. H. At this critical pass public-spirited citizens of each community were forced to band together, form a municipal corporation, buy the vacated factories, and work with might and main to attract small industries that would provide diversification. Manchester and Nashua succeeded in making this adjustment after heroic efforts by local action. Other cities in the same category may have to do likewise in the future. Forewarned is forearmed, they say. But in how many of our one-industry communities do we find full-employment committees, working not only in conjunction with the United States Department of Commerce, but on their own, planning and working for the economic future of their home towns? Voluntary group action ahead of time is not only the way to save but to stimulate the well-being of our municipalities. This is where government of the people began. This is where it must continue to show imagination and leadership in order to cope with present problems, instead of depending in ever-greater measure upon the State and the National Governments.

Indeed, the resourcefulness which characterized other generations of Americans and which helped to build this great country is not dead. It is simply not being used to the fullest extent.

We know that there are certain functions which only the Federal Government can perform, but this cannot and must not be cited as an excuse to rely upon the Government at Washington for everything.

It is just like our approach to the menace of communism. While we must keep a strong Military Establishment to defend us, in view of the precarious world situation, this alone is not enough. Even military and economic aid to other free nations is not sufficient.

It is what we do within our Nation that will rally others to our side and convince Russia that democracy not only provides the material comforts of life in larger measure than other systems, but has the spirit to find a workable Christian solution to any problem.

I think that most Americans are unaware of the way in which the peoples of other nations keenly scrutinize everything that we do. We put everything into headlines which we take in stride. But just try to put yourselves into the shoes of a foreigner who reads of the sensational happenings in the United States. Very probably he gets the impression that we are hopelessly divided, and constantly fighting among ourselves on a score of social, political, and economic issues. And he is apt to lose faith in this Nation as a world leader because it cannot solve its own problems first.

If we face up to the fact that we are being watched and judged, we will become more responsible in what we say and do.

Out of our bounty we are spending much money to stem the tide of communism and bring peace to the world. But money alone will not do the trick, even if we could go on spending it lavishly, which we can't.

This is a contest for the minds of men.

To win the victory for freedom we must evidence moral leadership and prove that voluntary associations of our people cooperating with similar groups can build a better society without the heavy hand of government.

This puts the issue squarely up to us, as grown-up men, and not as those who would retreat into childhood and lean completely upon the paternalism of government.

This is the supreme challenge of the age in which we were born.

As Catholics we have faith in God and are obedient to His will.

As Americans, have we the steadfast purpose, in company with our fellow Americans, to further God's kingdom on earth?

I believe that we have; and that, animated by His spiritual grace, we shall go forth to work for a society composed, not of robots, but of men.

For a way of life in which He will be well pleased with the progress we make in His name.

Exportation of French Calfskins to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

APRIL 3, 1950.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: With further reference to our letter of March 24, in regard to the export of French calfskins to the United States, word has been received from Paris that the quota for the United States has been increased from 900 tons to 1,000 tons; 500 tons to be allocated during the first semester, and 500 tons during the second semester, in order to permit early buying without shock to the market.

For your information, we are enclosing a table prepared by the Department of Commerce showing the prewar exports of French calfskins for the years 1929 to 1939, inclusive. You will note that the calfskins shipped to the United States in the 11 prewar years average less than 12 percent of the total French exports. Under the quota of 1,000 tons, the United States would receive more than 30 percent of the contemplated exports.

Both the Departments of Commerce and State, as well as our ECA mission in Paris, are continuing their efforts to increase the United States quota still further on a basis of enabling France to earn more dollars.

In regard to allocations, it is our understanding that a meeting was held in Paris on March 29 by French Government officials with hide and skin exporters of that country. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the quantitative distribution to the United States by recipient firms and by licensing arrangements. Opportunity was to be given to the French exporters, most of whom act as representatives of American firms, to make suggestions and recommendations regarding the licensing procedures. At the moment we do not know the outcome of these discussions.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM FOSTER,
Deputy Administrator.

France: Exports of raw calfskins to foreign countries, 1929–39 (in metric tons)

[U. S. Department of Commerce, Office of International Trade]

Year	Total		United States		United Kingdom		Belgium-Luxemburg		Netherlands		Germany		Canada		All other countries	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1929	17,670	100	1,636	9	(1)	--------	4,652	26	1,928	11	8,640	49	(1)	--------	806	5
1930	14,206	100	996	7	209	1	2,726	18	2,095	14	8,462	57	(1)	--------	967	6
1931	14,716	100	2,157	15	166	1	2,570	17	2,218	15	6,712	46	(1)	--------	883	6
1932	16,400	100	2,142	13	236	1	2,906	22	1,573	11	5,984	36	244	1	2,356	15
1933	20,404	100	2,858	14	(1)	--------	4,674	23	2,374	12	7,683	37	(1)	--------	2,877	14
1934	24,905	100	1,851	8	361	1	5,184	21	2,829	11	11,096	45	(1)	--------	3,293	14
1935	22,646	100	1,979	9	1,133	5	2,875	13	2,963	13	10,968	48	(1)	--------	2,510	11
1936	19,725	100	2,541	13	2,087	11	3,152	16	3,831	19	5,867	28	(1)	--------	2,847	13
1937	24,176	100	2,367	12	3,161	18	2,882	14	3,211	16	6,042	30	(1)	--------	3,511	13
1938	26,993	100	3,970	14	4,354	21	5,864	18	3,290	16	4,797	23	(1)	--------	1,976	8
1939	14,560	100	2,096	14	5,206	36	2,229	16	1,872	12	1,239	12	(1)	--------	1,154	8
Yearly average, 1929–38	19,255	100	2,150	11	(1)	--------	3,648	19	,664	14	7,485	19	[1]	--------	--------	--------
Yearly average, 1930–39	18,944	100	2,192	12	(1)	--------	3,415	18	2,650	14	6,817	36	[1]	--------	--------	--------

[1] Not available.

Source: Official French Trade Statistics.

Increasing Antitrust Fines to $50,000—H. R. 7827 Carries Out Recommendations of House Small Business Committee—Increase to $50,000 Is Worth-While Complement to Recent Amendment Enlarging Civil Penalties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Judiciary Committee has ordered reported H. R. 7827, increasing antitrust fines to $50,000. This bill is virtually the same as H. R. 5139, introduced by me last year and unanimously approved by the Select Committee on Small Business, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

I hope and trust that the Members of this House will act favorably on this bill.

It is not claimed that increasing antitrust fines will solve the greatest difficulties in antitrust enforcement, but it would help, and it will be a worth-while complement to the recent amendment making the maximum civil penalty of $5,000 applicable for each day of violation.

For the further information of the Members it is appropriate to include here pages 73 and 74 of the Progress Report—First Session, of the Select Committee on Small Business. These pages bear on the problem confronting our Federal judges when faced with the assessing adequate penalties upon persons and corporations convicted of violating the antitrust laws.

[Excerpts from Progress Report—First Session, Select Committee on Small Business]

The present fine of $5,000 is completely inconsequential in amount. The amount need only be compared with the vast profits which are made by violating the antitrust laws. This fine is prescribed for in the 60-year-old provision of the Sherman Act. The provision also permits imprisonment for not more than 1 year, in addition to the fine. However, to date, no businessman has been imprisoned for violating the antitrust laws. Therefore, the only punishment is a $5,000 fine—perhaps a few weeks' salary of a corporation official or 1 hour's profit of a corporation.

Firms engaged in violation of the antitrust laws are in a position to rob the public of millions and even billions of dollars. In 1948, to cite one year, 247 firms were charged with price fixing, and the products involved ranged from abrasives to milk, so that the pocketbooks of the entire public were affected. Yet, while the public forfeits huge sums to these price conspirators, what happens if they are convicted? They are fined $5,000 per count—little more than a slap on the wrist even to a medium-sized corporation, let alone one of our giant corporations.

The total inadequacy of the fine permissible under present law has been pointed out by judges of various courts and by Department of Justice representatives. What could be more frustrating to a prosecutor who has proved facts showing flagrant violations perpetrated by a corporation possessing incalculable resources than to have the corporation punished by a $5,000 fine? Federal Judge Simon Rifkind, of New York, stated on March 1, 1949, in imposing fines on six defendants, in *U. S.* v. *National Lead Company:*

"I cannot even go through the formula of looking the defendant in the eye and saying, 'Is there anything you wish to say before I pronounce sentence?' But I must confess that, these amounts being substantially the maximum allowed by the statute, there is very little I can do or very little reflection that I can give this matter except perhaps to make the inevitable comment that a violation of the antitrust laws which persisted from some time in the early twenties to the 1940's, with respect to which the criminal liability is discharged by the payment of $5,000 a count, hardly seems to me to be the nature of penalty which is likely to discourage violations of the antitrust laws as far as the criminal laws are concerned, but that is a problem for the Congress."

This committee agrees with the jurist. The meager fines which can now be imposed present a problem for the Congress. H. R. 5139 proposes that Congress authorize fines which will more adequately fit the magnitude of the offense.

The Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, in testifying before the House Committee on Appropriations in January 1949, had this to say about the attitude of many concerns in regard to present fines:

"I think some of them just consider them license fees for doing business in an illegal way."

The inadequacy of the fines permitted by the present law is demonstrated by fines imposed upon some of the largest companies in the United States for violation of the antitrust laws during the last few years. A sample list is as follows:

Name of defendant	Amount of fine	Total fines of all defendants
Aluminum Co. of America	$15,000	$104,000
American Can Co.	5,000	45,000
American Tobacco Co.	15,000	217,000
E. I. du Pont de Nemours (3 different cases, 1943–45)	5,000	20,000
	7,500	22,500
	5,000	23,000
General Electric Co.	20,000	50,000
General Motors Corp.	5,000	40,000
Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (3 different cases, 1941–46)	5,000	22,500
	5,000	14,000
	(1)	175,000
Kroger Grocery & Baking Co.	5,000	20,000
Safeway Stores, Inc. (Md.)	10,000	40,000
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	5,000	30,000

[1] Fines of $5,000 or $10,000 were imposed on various A. & P. affiliates and on officers or principals.

The Congress has the problem of preserving small business in an era that not only has big business but needs the services of big business. To accomplish this purpose, Congress must set up laws which will deter management of big business from engaging in monopolistic enterprises which destroy competition. Punishment for violations of the antitrust laws must be stringent enough to serve as a real deterrent.

Enemy Under the Bed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material, I insert a speech made to various service clubs in Washington State by Frank H. Lamb, author, of Hoquiam, Wash.:

THE ENEMY UNDER THE BED

(By Frank H. Lamb)

We are so conditioned by a fear campaign that every night before retiring we look under

the bed to see if a commie is hiding there. We breathlessly listen to the radio and scan the press to learn the latest developments in the cold war. We are informed that the Russians now have the atom bomb, which since Hiroshima we hoped guaranteed a quick victory in the next war. The war experts now say that the Communists have guided missiles, supersonic jet planes, super U-boats, and other war machines superior to ours. We certainly cannot match the fighting men that the 800,000,000 people of the communistic nations now have under arms or could place in the field. It is significant that many of these disclosures of what is being done behind the iron curtain are timed to influence congressional action on appropriations and other legislation. When we recall that in the last war it was mainly American tanks, trucks, planes, munitions, and other matériel supplied to Russia that equipped her armies, we marvel that in four short years they have made such phenomenal technical and industrial progress.

War alarms and sales selling is deliberately fostered by the astute masters of the Kremlin for two purposes. First, to keep their own people satisfied to resign their liberties, forego the benefits of their labors, and endure poverty and privation, while devoting their entire resources to arming for world conquest. Second, Stalin knows that more of the resources of his opponents are dissipated in preparation, the more financial and political chaos that can be created in enemy countries, lest can be marshalled against the Red army in any armed conflict.

More immediate and more dangerous than the atom bomb or Red army is the political revolution foisted on us insidiously under such disguises as cooperation, security, socialism, centralization, statism, sovietism, fascism, collectivism, all only stepping stones to the goal of Marxian communism, the destruction of liberty and American institutions. This ideological invasion of foreign isms is no cold war. It is hot and is being waged on a thousand economic, political, and social fronts.

To promise prosperity, security, and everything wanted by everyone, many alluring baits are dangled before the voter. One of the most entrancing is unlimited Government spending. Despite a Federal debt of over $250,000,000,000 we blithely face a deficit of from five to ten billion dollars in the current year. From George Washington through 8 years of Franklin D. Roosevelt the Nation spent $179,620,113,648. In less than these last 8 years it has spent $151,861,394,191, over $11,000,000,000 more. The $48,500,000,000 of Federal expenditure, added to the $22,200,000,000 for the States and other local governments in the current year adds up to about a third of the national income. Benjamin Franklin in Poor Richard's Almanac said "It would be thought a hard government that should tax its people one-tenth part of their time, to be employed in its service." What would Poor Richard think of our tax today of one out of every three?

When taxation through graduated rates is used for a redistribution of wealth and earnings for the benefit of certain classes, freedom is endangered. The same tax power that can take over 90 percent of one's earnings can claim the whole, and higher taxes can socialize the taxpayer's two remaining free days out of three. All intangible wealth can be confiscated by debt, taxation, and debasement of the currency.

When a class numerous enough to swing elections through subsidies can benefit at the expense of the general welfare then democracy will be larger fiction. California old agers voted out the State constitution, appointed an administrator independent of legislature or governor and made the $200,000,000 annual cost for pensions a first lien on all State funds. We in Washington are struggling with initiative 172.

The blight of excessive taxation is more severe on the little man, the local merchant, the beginner in business or industry, than on the big corporation with the large capital and an organization that can pass the costs to the consumer. Monopolies are the half-breed offspring of high taxes and excessive regulation.

The nearly 26,000,000 persons now receiving annually $27,500,000,000 in Government benefits, subsidies, and salaries, with their dependent families, comprise nearly a third of the Nation's population. Among them are 3,000,000 farmers now obtaining price support and millions of more farmers' votes can be bought with promises of a subsidy for their products. Another nearly 10,000,000 of old age and welfare recipients will naturally support the party or candidate that promises larger and more liberal pensions. The 3,700,000 Government employees drawing salaries totaling $10,200,000,000 will vote for the salary increaser. Nearly 5,000,000 veterans will oppose any legislator that even hints there is a financial limit to the gratitude of the Nation. How can a sane fiscal policy be expected under such a wholesale purchase of votes? The check receivers will support the candidate or party that promises to increase the Government handout regardless of the general welfare.

The division of authority among 48 States and other local government units has been a serious handicap to the promoters of centralization. The gradual usurpation of State autonomy by the Federal Government through legislation and Supreme Court decisions is too slow for the plotters. More direct measures are proposed. The whole country would be divided into nine authorities similar to the Tennessee Valley experiment, each governed by three appointed directors with unlimited power over most of the economic and political rights of the people. Nine principalities with 27 czars would bypass the States and put the entire United States economy under socialistic government corporations, independent of Congress, amenable only to the President. The next step would be a single authority, then a dictator. In the Pacific Northwest three political appointees would have absolute control over power, irrigation, water, lands, forests, wildlife; practically the entire economy of the region.

Nineteen forested States have enacted progressive laws for the perpetuation of their forests. Washington forest land can be cut only under State permit and in accordance with State regulations to insure reproduction. We are doing a wonderful job in protecting our forests from fire and securing reforestation. Control of the privately owned forests has long been coveted by the Forest Service. A pending bill would give the Federal bureaucrats power to take over such regulation in any State where they decided State control was not satisfactory. To bait the State to sell its forest freedom the Government would pay half the cost of the forest administration. To browbeat the State hesitant to come under the Federal heel, many Federal appropriations could be withheld from that State.

Farmers are awakening to the fact that along with their crop support and subsidy checks will come the mailed fist of crop control. Without such controls the Commodity Credit Corporation borrowing capacity of $4,750,000,000 will be insufficient to buy up the excess 1950 production of United States basic crops. Storage facilities are inadequate; expensive conversion schemes, foreign gifts, and actual destruction fail to reduce the mountains of grains, potatoes, cotton, tobacco, from price-supported farms. Eighty-five million dollars worth of dried eggs that even hungry Greeks will not eat, are stored in a Kansas cavern. The taxpayers pay twice. Once for the subsidy, and again in higher cost of living.

Business cannot survive part free enterprise and part socialistic. The Government ventures are a growing cancer that will consume the free economy. The Britisher can obtain all the store teeth he wants but has difficulty finding something to use them on. France has long controlled rents and socialized the housing industry with the result that there has been no home building for decades. In both these socialistic countries private enterprise is dying a slow death. Out of despair the people are made ripe for communism.

From colonial days we have jealously retained local control of our schools. Academic freedom and home rule of education have been bulwarks of democracy. The collectivists are planning to get a foot inside the schoolhouse door by the bait of a few hundred millions of Federal aid, which would penalize the States with a high standard to build up those that are below the desired rating. With increasing subsidy will inevitably come greater control until local school boards will be little more than rubber stamps.

The railroads have been controlled so long and thoroughly that they are generally 20 years obsolete and unable to meet the competition of highway vehicles and air transportation. A proposed communication body would take over control of all transport by air, truck, stage, rail, and water, eliminate competition, and lay its blighting hand over further transportation progress.

There are now 50,000 Federal employees in the State of Washington. If these and other centralization plans now before Congress are enacted, Federal police and snoopers in the State will be increased several fold.

Three czars of 10,000,000 union members practically control all American industry through legislation which gives them the power to say who shall work, when and on what conditions. John L. Lewis, by merely frowning, can cut off the country's coal supply. A candidate can buy the labor vote at the cost of his independence and his oath to support the public welfare. Out of the taking over of an industry to stop a strike when other measures fail will come the socialization of the industry with the workers becoming Government employees prohibited from striking, and eventually as in all Communist countries losing the rights of free men.

Control credit, the foundation of business, and you control all. The manipulation of Federal finance now determines availability and quantity of private investment funds, credit, and the interest rate. Twenty-nine Federal agencies are directly engaged in loaning money and 12 in Government finance and credit. No one knows the enormous total of your money loaned to Tom, Dick, or Harry for this or that purpose. Why should the Government loan to a favorite $196,000,000, nearly a third of the RFC funds loaned to all business, mainly to engage in the highly competitive steel and auto industries? Another promoter with $1,000 personal investment controls a corporation that has been loaned $37,500,000, with $12,500,000 more required to attempt to build porcelain enamel steel houses.

More serious, however, is the progressive break-down of traditional American ideals. A church was one of the first provisions of every frontier settlement, and church attendance was enforced by custom and local opinion. Today the church is resigned to the kindergarten and women. The average man is indifferent, a nonbeliever, or a derider of religion. You men who shirk your church duties and attendance are contributing directly to the destruction of a bulwark of freedom which from the time of Nero to today in Czechoslovakia has been purchased at an enormous cost of lives and suffering.

Communism recognized the youth as the most fertile field for propaganda. We want our students to learn the facts regarding

communism and other social and political movements, but we have the right to insist that the instruction shall be objective and not the propaganda of supporters of any theory. No Communist or fellow traveler should be tolerated in the training of youth.

Communists have bored within several great industry-wide unions so successfully that they are now in absolute control. One great branch of unionism is now expelling its Red and leftist groups. Unionism and communism are antithical. Behind the iron curtain unions are only empty-shell satellites of the Communist Politburo. Russian labor has never known freedom or a living wage. The American unionist is enticed to give up his bargaining power, his rights to home and comforts, his freedom for a mess of British socialism that will end in the Russian brand of despotism.

The heaviest guns of all subversive elements are directed against business and profits. America cannot be socialized until its economy is wrecked. Under competitive free enterprise American business in a century and a half has transformed 4,000,000 into a Nation of a 150,000,000 with a higher standard of living, greater freedom and more security than is enjoyed by any other people. Business through taxation has supplied youth with more educational facilities, the people generally with more security against disease and want than the world has ever known. Out of its profits it has built great institutions of learning, churches, libraries, museums and parks for the enjoyment of a higher life. In two World Wars it has marshalled the marvelous production of food, ships, planes, munitions, that enabled our troops to conquer. In the last 10 years it has supplied $72,000,000,000 as gifts and aid overseas to help support many of the very people who are most loudly condemning business and impugning profits. We are paying the bill to enable socialized governments to abolish private business and profit.

Communism is a religion of immorality, Marx declared: "We must be ready to employ trickery, deceit, lawbreaking, withholding and concealing truth, we must and can unite in a language that sows among the masses hate, revolution, scorn and the like." The blighting immoral effects of subversive movements are felt in every club, church, school, lodge, party, union, and society.

The pollution has reached Rotary. You are lulled into forgetting that you are businessmen, selected representatives of your vocation, with obligations to advance its interest, influence and conduct. You are told that the object of business is some sort of fuzzy wuzzy service, that profits are immoral, and the stigma can only be removed by welfare work. A book by Rotary International costing $1 entitled "Service Is My Business," outlines a hazy conception of service to society as an antidote for the pollution of profits. Little in it inspires the businessman to sing with the poet:

"This is my work, my blessing, not my doom,
Of all who live, I am the one by whom
This work can best be done in the right way."

Not a word about the businessman's first duty whether:

"In field or forest, at the desk or loom,
In warring market place, or tranquil room."
—*Henry Van Dyke.*

to more efficiently supply society with its material and cultural needs.

Rotary has had the slogan, "He profits most who serves best," since 1911. It has walked the plank. The international directors with an ear to Rotarians in the socialist-governed countries seeking to abolish profits, have recently decided that the word "profit" might be misconstrued and the slogan was hard to translate. New members no longer receive a pretty copy of the code of ethics for framing on their office walls. Yes, the Rotary organization is apologetic of business and ashamed of profits.

It is not the avowed Communists that are dangerous. They are a noisy nuisance. It is the confused fuzzy-minded shallow thinkers and opportunists who fail to detect the subversive features in the schemes of the social revolutionists and the self-interest of those who are receiving the Government doles that have started as well on a toboggan slide to a fancied utopia. Bought by Government hand-outs, lured by the opiate of inflation, implemented by the destructive power of unlimited taxation, impelled by a gospel of defeatism, we are sacrificing one by one our liberties. A little farther down the road we will come to a fork leading to two despotisms, the right to fascism, the left to communism. Both are equally odious and destructive of all that has been gained in the upward progress of man.

This onrushing subversive invasion cannot be stemmed by a frontal attack, stopped by a Maginot line or bought off with dollars. The defense must come from the grass-root action of loyal Americans. The issues transcend all partisan considerations; they concern the very web and woof of the historic American way of life. No compromise with these enemies under our beds should guide our voting, prompt us to fulfill our duty to religion, clean the pinks and Reds out of our schools, purge our unions, control the conduct of our clubs, lodges, unions, and societies, and support all still uncorrupted servants and measures, if human freedom, integrity and moral standards are to survive in this country.

Resolution of Town of Watertown, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

WATERTOWN, MASS., *April 3, 1950.*

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The town of Watertown, Mass., is fully cognizant of the impending danger represented in a bill pending in Congress entitled "Bill to revise administrative procedures of the Bureau of Customs."

The Hood Rubber Co., the largest industrial organization located in this community and one of the largest rubber-footwear manufacturers, is vitally concerned.

Any action that will tend to destroy and deteriorate this industry will materially affect the future of Watertown. Watertown cannot afford to have any damage done to its largest taxpayer.

In traditional New England style, the town of Watertown, in town meeting assembled on March 27, 1950, recognized the impending danger and adopted a resolution, which I herewith enclose at the direction of said meeting.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE B. WELLMAN,
Town Clerk.

Whereas a bill is pending in Congress entitled "Bill to revise administrative procedures of the Bureau of Customs," which would eliminate what is known as the American selling price principle, specifically as it applies to canvas and waterproof rubber footwear; and

Whereas the State Department has under consideration negotiations which would result in reciprocal trade agreements lowering present tariffs on canvas and waterproof rubber footwear imported from foreign countries; and

Whereas any further reduction in the tariff rates applying to imports of canvas and waterproof rubber footwear would constitute a serious threat to the major industry of our community and to other local business firms and would result in the loss of jobs, widespread distress, increase of relief rolls and increase of the tax burden of our citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the town of Watertown at its annual town meeting held on March 27, 1950, does hereby memorialize and petition the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; United States Senator Leverett Saltonstall, United States Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., and United States Congresswoman, Mrs. Edith Nourse Rogers to take necessary action to prevent any reduction in the tariff on imports of canvas and waterproof rubber footwear whether it be by legislative enactment abrogating the American Selling Price Principle, by negotiation under the general agreement on tariffs and trade, or otherwise; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; United States Senator Leverett Saltonstall, United States Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., and all the New England Congressmen and that these resolutions be spread on the records of the town of Watertown, Mass.

H. HERBERT APPLIN,
WILFRED J. PAQUET,
ROY C. PAPALIA,
Board of Selectmen.

I, George B. Wellman, town clerk of Watertown, Mass., hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of resolution adopted by Town Meeting, duly called and held on March 27, 1950.

Attest:

GEORGE B. WELLMAN, *Town Clerk.*

Nuts From Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on several recent occasions I have called the attention of the House to the fact that 59,000 cases of Russian canned crab, valued at $3,000,000, recently were imported into the United States from Russia.

Now, I find that canned crab is not the only Russian product being landed in the United States and sold to American consumers.

San Francisco newspapers recently carried a news item that 110,000 pounds of shelled Manchurian walnuts recently were landed in San Francisco. Manchuria is controlled by Russia.

The Manchurian nuts, although a 7½-cent-a-pound duty was paid on them, were offered for sale at 42 cents a pound, which was 20 cents a pound under the prevailing price for American nuts. The

news article stated that future shipments were being offered at 49 cents a pound, or 22 cents under the prevailing price for American walnuts.

At the same time these walnuts were being imported from Russian-controlled Manchuria the domestic supply of these nuts was so huge that, according to the San Francisco press dispatch, the United States Department of Agriculture was paying Pacific Coast nut producers 10 cents a pound to divert 5,000,000 pounds of their surplus supplies of nuts from consumer markets to crushing plants.

Continued importation of walnuts from Soviet-controlled Manchuria will depress and create a chaotic price condition in the market for all nuts, almonds, filberts, pecans, and others that are sold in competition with walnuts.

Ruination of the nut-raising business of the United States by competition from products of Russia or Soviet-controlled countries would be a tragedy. It requires years to raise a nut orchard to a bearing stage.

Anything that injures the nut industry will injure the entire Pacific Coast, since all three States of Oregon, Washington, and California are heavy producers of nuts.

It does not make sense that we should be importing nuts from a Russian-controlled country while our own surplus is so huge that we are paying orchardists a subsidy to divert their nuts from the open market to crushing plants.

Emergency Cotton Allotments in Areas Infested by Green Bugs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, there are 2,600,000 acres of wheat planted in Sixth and Seventh Districts of Oklahoma. There are 1,900,000 acres of wheat in Seventh District of Oklahoma alone. Forty percent of this acreage has been destroyed by green bugs and the drought and green-bug infestation is becoming increasingly worse.

I have today introduced the following bill:

A bill to provide emergency cotton allotments in areas which have been infested by green bugs

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall use not more than 500,000 acres (which shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment) for the purpose of making emergency cotton-acreage allotments to producers of farm commodities whose 1950 crops have been substantially destroyed by the insects known as green bugs. Such acreage shall be allocated under regulations promulgated by the Secretary, shall provide for a cotton allocation and marketing quota for the 1950 crop only, and shall not be considered as giving to any farm, county, or State any credit or history for the purposes of cotton allocations in any subsequent year:

Provided, That in no event shall any farm be allotted more than 1 acre of cotton under the provisions of this section for each 1 acre of other crops which have been destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, I have requested aid for the area from the Disaster Loan Corporation and other agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I have contacted the House Committee on Agriculture and its members, also the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and its members urging an immediate hearing and adoption of my bill.

I have also urged the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately report favorably on this measure.

I wish to read letters from representative counties in my district:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Cordell, Okla., March 23, 1950.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your letter of March 18, 1950, in which you requested information in regard to the greenbug infestation in Washita County.

We had a meeting of community committeemen yesterday in which all sections of the county were represented, and it was estimated, as of that date, that a minimum of 60 percent of the wheat in Washita County was damaged and would result in a loss of approximately 50,000 acres. If rain is not received in the next 10 days, the committeemen anticipated that from 60 percent to 80 percent of the entire crop would be lost.

If further information is needed, please call for same.

Very truly yours,
DON HARRISTON,
County Administrative Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Altus, Okla., March 21, 1950.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR VICTOR: In complying with your letter of March 18, 1950, in reference to the greenbug infestation here in Jackson County as well as surrounding counties.

I was able to contact a farmer friend of yours by the name of Ben F. Murphy and I ask Ben to help me answer your letter pertaining to the increase in cotton acreage for the areas that have been substantially destroyed by the green bug.

I am quoting Mr. Murphy at this time: "The green-bug damage already done has been, I would say, 40 percent, but the total damage to be done is beyond anybody's guess. In my opinion, unless heavy rains occur, the damage in the next 2 or 3 weeks will be 90 percent. At the rate of the destruction to fields that were observed 3 or 4 days ago is now almost totally destroyed; yet it is hard to tell just what the destruction will be in the next 2 or 3 weeks.

"A lot of farmers at this time are harrowing their wheat as well as spraying, but with very little results with either. It is estimated that approximately 2,000 acres already or will be in the near future plowed and the ground prepared for other crops or summer fallowed."

Victor, I thought by contacting Mr. Murphy and getting his viewpoints, which is about the same as the other farmers, would be worth more to you than for me to write what I know about the green bugs.

Thank you very much for the conference report House Joint Resolution 398.

We wish you the best of luck in obtaining our full quota of these additional acres.

Yours very truly,
R. E. HAGAR,
Administrative Officer, PMA, Jackson County.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Sayre, Okla., March 22, 1950.

Subject: 1950 cotton allotments and insects.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Congressman, Seventh District of Oklahoma, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of March 18, 1950, concerning additional cotton acreage and green-bug damage, I wish to advise you as follows:

At present time in southwestern Oklahoma there is an extreme drought on, especially in Beckham County. The wheat crop is in a very poor condition. Green bugs have been and are still increasing in great numbers among the wheat fields. I am of the opinion that if present conditions among the wheat does not change in the next 3 weeks that there will be very little wheat left for harvest. At the present time if we could obtain a good rain and warmer weather I think we would loose very little wheat. All indications point to fair and dry weather.

In regard to damage and the present condition of wheat, I would say that Beckham County wheat is probably damaged slightly more than in other southwestern counties due to the fact that we have received less moisture the past 5 months than surrounding counties.

I hope this gives you some idea of the situation here. I am sure that if wheat is totally destroyed that the producers would certainly appreciate any favors granted them in regard to cotton allotments since all land here is adapted to cotton.

We appreciate your interest and efforts devoted to agriculture.

Any time I can be of assistance to you, please advise me of such.

Very truly yours,
J. R. WILD,
County Administrative Officer, Beckham County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Frederick, Okla., March 23, 1950.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: It appears, at the present time, that Tillman County's prospect for a wheat crop has been reduced 60 percent due to green-bug damage.

We estimate that 2,000 acres of wheat has been plowed under and if we do not receive rain and warm weather within the next 10 days 20,000 more acres of wheat will be abandoned. Approximately one-third of this acreage would be put to cotton if permitted.

Wheat farmers of this county would appreciate any amount of cotton acreage to replace their destroyed wheat.

Yours very truly,
VERNON T. DUNCAN,
Administrative Officer, Tillman County.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Hobart, Okla., March 21, 1950.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR VICTOR: This is in reply to your letter of March 18, 1950, which I read regarding the green-bug infestation in this county.

I, along with two members of our county committee made a tour of this county, covering some 60 or 70 miles in the eastern part, also Mr. LeBerge has been over most of the south part of the county, and Mr. Harris the northwest part. I have also talked to a number of grain men, including personnel of the Farmers Co-op of Hobart, Mountain View, and Roosevelt.

This is a summary of what we believe to be the condition of the wheat at this time.

There is approximately 230,000 acres of wheat seeded in Kiowa County. Of this acreage 20 percent is a total loss today. It appears at this time that it would be impossible to make more than 60 or 65 percent of a normal crop. Almost 100 percent of the wheat in the county is infested with green bugs at this time, and conditions can become more serious if the green bugs do not stop or if we do not receive much needed moisture.

I am sure anything that you can do to assist the farmers in any way will be greatly appreciated by them.

We will be glad to assist you in any way possible.

Very truly yours,
W. I. GEORGE,
County Administrative Officer,
Kiowa County.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Arapaho, Okla., March 23, 1950.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE WICKERSHAM: Your letter of March 18 enclosing the conference report on House Joint Resolution 398, has been received. First, on behalf of the farmers of Custer County, we wish to thank you for your efforts in obtaining approval of this amendment and also for the additional cotton acreage to be allocated to wheat farms where the grain is destroyed by green bugs.

With reference to green-bug infestation in Custer County, I will say that at the present time only a few acres has been completely destroyed, but we have green bugs in all of our wheat and in large numbers, and unless something happens to check them such as warmer weather, hard rain, etc., there will be in the next 10 days or 2 weeks, hundreds of acres completely destroyed by this insect. The drought is helping the situation along since it retards the growth of the wheat which gives the green bugs time to complete the job. The weather at the present time is cool and ideal for green bugs and at the best, if it should start warming up now, we would have several hundred acres completely destroyed before the ladybugs and parasites could check them.

If the picture does not change soon, I am sure that we could use a sizable amount of this acreage.

Very truly yours,
RUSSELL E. DILL,
County Administrative Officer.

Abduction of Greek Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a memorandum which has been prepared for me by Mr. A. Sarkissian of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress on the important subject of the abduction of Greek children by the Communists. This memorandum contains information that might be of deep interest to many persons:

ABDUCTED GREEK CHILDREN IN IRON-CURTAIN COUNTRIES

In October of 1944 Greece was liberated, but there was no legal government to govern the country. The government-in-exile had just returned, but its authority was over a very limited area—only over a part of metropolitan Athens. The actual control of the country, the towns, the villages and the provinces, was in the hands of a resistance group known as EAM/ELAS. This group was led and remained under rigid Communist control. No sooner had the government-in-exile returned, than its authority and legality were challenged by the EAM/ELAS leaders. Thus a very embarrassing situation was created, but it was hoped that a satisfactory solution could be had by the union of the Government and the EAM/ELAS leaders. Negotiations lasting more than a month, however, convinced the Government (and also the British representatives) that a union with the resistance leaders was, short of complete submission to their wishes, impossible. British efforts at mediation also proved to be ineffective. Early in December civil war broke out. Fighting in and around Athens lasted more than a month. Then on January 11 of 1945 a truce was effected. EAM/ELAS forces were cleared out of Athens and its environs, and the first serious attempts of the Communists to seize power in Greece were frustrated.

Before and after the truce, while the EAM/ELAS forces were withdrawing from the Athens area, they carried some noncombatant inhabitants with them. How many innocent Greeks were thus driven away from their homes and taken to the mountain fastnesses of northern Greece, it would be impossible to say; and an estimate would probably be a poor guess. At the end of almost 5 years (December 1944–October 16, 1949) of civil war, it was reported that there were more than 700,000 homeless refugees in Greece,[1] and it is probable that many, if not most of these refugees, were held as hostages at one time or another by the Communist guerrillas. It is known that some hostages were treacherously murdered. Even during the first few weeks of fighting gangs of the EAM/ELAS group carried out mass executions, thereby shocking many of their sympathizers.[2] More shocking, however, was the abduction of children from their homes and their removal to iron-curtain countries.

This abominable and barbarous practice was not widespread at first, but by 1947 it had become a major objective of Communist guerrillas. It is reported that at a meeting held on February 10 of that year, in their mountain headquarters, the guerrilla leaders decided to make a registration of all children between the ages of 3 and 14 years in the area then under their control, in order to collect these children and send them into the neighboring Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia.[3] These countries promised to bring up these children and indoctrinate them in Communist ideology. For many months children were abducted and carried off, but in 1948 abductions took place on a large scale and in a systematic manner.

From then on guerrillas would take away children from their parents in many northern provinces. At the same time broadcasts from Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia declared that parents were happily yielding their children to the care of democratic governments. According to the findings of the United Nations special committee on the Balkans there was no truth in these declarations. Actually the children were being abducted without the consent of their parents. To achieve their ends the Communists were obliged to imprison, to torture and to threaten the parents that they would continue this treatment until the children were handed over to them. Other means were also used to force the parents hands, such as burning the stock of food for the village, giving out false news such as that the National Army was preparing to bomb from the air with atomic bombs. In some cases the Communists obtained by such means written depositions from parents handing over the children to their care. Sometimes all the inhabitants of the village were removed with the children, but later the children were forcibly separated from the parents after they got to Albania, and never saw them again.[4]

The fate of these children was first brought to the attention of the United Nations Assembly by the Greek Government on February 27, 1948. Then the Greek Government charged that the guerrillas had earmarked about 60,000 children for abduction from Greece to be distributed in the following countries: Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia were to receive 10,000 each, while the remaining 30,000 children were to go to Rumania, Hungary and Poland.[5] The Assembly asked the special committee to investigate these charges. In the course of its investigation the committee found that Greek children had been taken into Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland in March and April of 1948. A broadcast by the Free Greece radio on March 14, 1948 reported that 4,400 Greek children had been transferred from 80 villages in Greece to the northern countries. On April 9, 1948 Belgrade radio said that 7,000 Greek children had arrived in that city, and on April 12, 1948, it broadcast that 12,000 Greek children were expected to be divided among Albania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Hungary.[6] The committee also learned that this program of abduction was being carried out with the connivance and approval, and even with the assistance of the governments of these countries. The committee recommended that the Greek Government communicate concerning this matter with the governments of these countries. It also recommended that the Secretary-General dispatch copies of its report to the same governments, and urge them to discourage any further removal of children from Greek territory and to arrange for the prompt return to Greece of these children.[7] By this process of abduction northern Greece was being thinned out of its children, for the abduction of 60,000 or even 25,000 children constituted a large proportion of children in that thinly-populated area.

Early in June the Greek Government telegraphed communications to the Governments of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia. The Polish Government categorically denied the presence of any Greek children in Poland. The Hungarian Government in a dispatch to the Secretary-General "acknowledged receiving Greek children on humanitarian grounds, stating that they had lost their parents as a result of military operations in Greece, and had not been torn from their families."[8] On July 19 the Albanian Government replied

---

[1] New York Herald Tribune, December 1, 1949.

[2] Woodhouse, C. M. Apple of Discord, p. 218.

[3] Report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans, p. 18.

[4] From a report prepared by A. S. Devan.

[5] Report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans, p. 18.

[6] Report, p. 19.

[7] Ibid., p. 20.

[8] Report, p. 20.

that there were no Greek children in Albania "who have been removed by force," adding that assistance given to Greek children was a "humanitarian act entirely in keeping with the principles of all civilized and peace-loving nations."[9] No other replies were received.

Then the UN Assembly tried to deal with this matter through the International Red Cross organizations. On November 27, 1948, the Assembly voted unanimously "for the return to their homeland of all such children who themselves ask to be returned or whose parents or close relatives request their return (to Greece)."[10] This resolution also called for the cooperation of the National Red Cross organizations and the Red Crescent (of Turkey) "to assist in such repatriation measures." In January 1949 the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in a letter to Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Greece, called their attention to this resolution.

On April 20 the International Red Cross announced that Yugoslavia was ready to permit a joint international committee of the Red Cross and League of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies Mission to visit Yugoslavia "with respect to the repatriation of Greek children."[11] Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia had also indicated their willingness to cooperate with the International Red Cross organizations.

The International Red Cross organizations did better as far as investigation was concerned. They were permitted to visit three countries—Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia in carrying on their investigations. In Bulgaria they found 1,972 Greek children distributed in seven reception centers. These were cared for by the Bulgarian Red Cross. In Prague the work of the investigators was limited to a few meetings with the Czech authorities. The Czechs would not even admit the presence of Greek children in their country. However, in reply to a note addressed to the International Red Cross the Czech Red Cross admitted that there were 138 Greek children in the country. The investigators had better response in Yugoslavia. They found that there were 1,545 Greek children who were in homes of the Yugoslav Red Cross, "and 3,347 children who were living with their parents, or with refugee Greek families."[12] Greek Red Cross also carried on its own work of investigating and reported that by July of 1949, the total number of abducted Greek children was 24,701, distributed as follows:[13]

Albania	2,000
Bulgaria	1,660
Hungary	3,000
Rumania	3,801
Czechoslovakia	3,240
Yugoslavia	11,000

When the report of the International Red Cross Organization was submitted to the Assembly (in October of 1949), the Assembly again instructed the Secretary-General to pursue the matter further. In a resolution of November 3 the Assembly observed that the Greek children have not yet returned to their homes. The Assembly declared that the resolution—

"1. Instructs the Secretary-General to request the International Committee of the Red Cross and the League of Red Cross Societies to continue their efforts in this humanitarian cause.

"2. Urges all the members of the United Nations and other states harboring the Greek children to make all necessary arrangements, in consultation and cooperation with the International Red Cross organizations, for the early return to their homes.

"3. Invites the International Red Cross organizations to report to the Secretary-General for the information of the members of the United Nations, on the progress being made in the implementation of the present resolution."[14]

But the early return (of abducted Greek children) to their homes is being delayed despite the almost united efforts of the entire civilized world. In a radio address on December 28 last, Queen Frederica of Greece made an appeal for the return of the 28,000 abducted Greek children. In her impassioned appeal she declared that she was pleading on behalf of the mothers of the abducted children, many of whom journeyed to Athens during this Christmas season of good-will to solicit her aid. * * * She asked that something be done to rouse the conscience of the world.[15] On the same day the Archbishop of Canterbury echoed the feelings of Queen Frederica and denounced the perpetrators of these abductions. He declared that by the hateful and deliberate practice of the Communist forces, many thousands of Greek children have been abducted from their homes, their villages, and their country, to an unknown fate.[16]

In January the Archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Church in this country appealed to President Truman. In reply to this appeal the President telegraphed as follows: "We pray that the governments of those countries harboring these children will be moved in a spirit of broad humanitarianism to cooperate in fulfilling the unanimous desire of the United Nations General Assembly that these children be promptly restored to their homes."[17] A report received on March 13 at Lake Success from the United Nations special committee on the Balkans stated that a survey group made a 600-mile tour of Greece's northern frontier and heard numerous pleas for the return of Greek children who had been removed to neighboring Communist countries.[18] A dispatch from the chairman of the committee, Mr. Samuel Atyeo, filed from Athens on March 14, stated that there is one thing that can be singled out as an obstacle to normal relations between Greece and her neighbors—it is the vexatious and terrible question of abducted children."

In brief this is the story of Greek children abducted and forcibly kept by the new democratic governments in iron-curtain countries. Incidentally, this barbarous practice of abducting children is not new in the Balkans and in all parts of the former Ottoman Empire. The cream of the Ottoman armies, the fearless janissaries, were recruited in this manner; these were composed of abducted children from Christian families, brought up in Ottoman manners and in the Mohammedan religion. Many of these must have been Greek children; and in this sense the story of the abducted Greek children goes back to at least early sixteenth century. But in the days gone by these children were abducted by the enemies and conquerors of Greece, while in the present instance the abduction of 24,000, or 28,000, or 60,000 children was carried out by Greeks preaching another gospel—communism—and taking orders from the Kremlin in Moscow. (A. Sarkissian, Foreign Affairs Section.)

[9] Quoted in Greece and the United Nations, 1946–49, p. 30.

[10] United Nations Bulletin, December 15, 1948, p. 1017.

[11] Greece and the United Nations, 1946–49, p. 31.

[12] Essential Data Concerning Repatriation of Abducted Greek Children, pp. 6–7.

[13] Ibid., p. 11.

[14] Essential Data Concerning Repatriation of Abducted Greek Children, p. 5.

[15] New York Times, December 29.

[16] London Times, December 30.

[17] Quoted in New York Times, January 17.

[18] New York Times, March 14.

[19] New York Times, March 15.

Relations Between Puerto Rico and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and the Honorable Senator from Nebraska, Mr. BUTLER, have introduced into the Senate on March 31 a bill, S. 3336, a companion bill to H. R. 7674 which I introduced in the House March 13.

There are slight differences between the two bills but they are fundamentally aimed at the same objectives. Their provisions are almost identical.

I am grateful to both Senators for having so cordially received and sponsored legislation on what constitutes the present wishes of the people of Puerto Rico.

In connection with the Senate and House bills, I would like at this time to take up some pertinent considerations.

In 1900, soon after acquiring sovereignty over Puerto Rico through the Treaty of Paris, the United States Congress enacted the first Organic Act of Puerto Rico. It provided that "on and after the passage of this act, the same tariffs, customs, and duties shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles imported into Puerto Rico from ports other than those of the United States which are required by law to be collected upon articles imported into the United States from foreign countries." It further provided that "in no event shall any duty be collected after the 1st day of March 1902 on merchandise and articles going into Puerto Rico from the United States or coming into the United States from Puerto Rico."

In other words, Congress established what might be described as a customs union between the United States and Puerto Rico. Other provisions concerning the retirement of Puerto Rico coins then in circulation and substituting the coins of the United States, and concerning the application of Federal laws in Puerto Rico, created not only a customs, but an economic and political, union.

The Puerto Rican community had been founded four centuries earlier. It had developed with the Spanish political and economic empire. The new pattern of political and economic relationships made it inescapable for Puerto Rico to reorient its economy. During the past 50 years we have created a new economy. The present economic relationships between Puerto Rico and the mainland are now the core of the economic life of Puerto Rico. Consequently, it is only natural and logical that while seeking democratic political advancement within the Union, we in Puerto Rico may be mindful of our basic economic and political relationships. We do not want to dissolve them, we do not want to disturb them, albeit we strive to perfect them.

In 1917, the people of Puerto Rico were declared to be citizens of the United States. In a republican system of government, we may not find the person of the king to symbolize a common loyalty. But we do find and cherish a great ideological and political symbol, common citizenship to which all owe loyalty. The extension of United States citizenship to the people of Puerto Rico unquestionably added great dignity to our union with the United States. Common citizenship symbolizes the common loyalty of free peoples engaged in a common way of life devoted to upholding their republican democratic institutions. Allow me then to say, as emphatically as I can that, unless the people of Puerto Rico should unmistakably express their desires and reasons for dissolving their union with the United States, which they have never done, it is unrepresentative and unfair, whatever the motives may be, to present before this body and in their behalf any proposition to the end that the people of Puerto Rico be thrown out of this Union. Neither the House bill nor the Senate bill would entertain any such proposition.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and the duty to represent the people of Puerto Rico in this august body. In the 1948 Puerto Rican elections, candidates were nominated for Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico by the Popular Democratic Party, the Statehood and Socialist Parties (in coalition), and the Independentist Party. As the candidate of the Popular Democratic Party, I polled 392,000 votes. I am speaking in rounded numbers. The candidate for the combined Statehood and Socialist Parties polled 180,000 votes. The candidate for the Independentist Party got 66,000 votes. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the combined opposition polled 246,000 votes as compared to the 392,000 votes I received. I had an absolute majority of 146,000 votes over all opposition.

In that same election the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marin ran for Governor on the same party ticket I did and he was elected by about the same majority I was. I believe a clearer mandate from the people for him or me could not anywhere be found. H. R. 7674 is an expression of that mandate.

The Statehood and Socialist coalition candidates campaigned on a platform of statehood for Puerto Rico; the Independentist Party campaigned on a platform of independence for Puerto Rico; the Popular Democratic Party stood on a platform calling for the preservation of present relations between Puerto Rico and the United States and, within such framework, for the adoption by the people of Puerto Rico of a constitution for the organization of our local government. This is not statehood, Mr. Speaker; nor is it independence. But it is American democracy on American soil.

You see, Mr. Speaker, it is in absolute accord with the expressed wishes of the people of Puerto Rico that I have introduced H. R. 7674. It is in accordance with the wish of the people of Puerto Rico that the Senate bill has been introduced. Under these bills, the people of Puerto Rico will adopt their own constitution for their own local government within the existing pattern of political and economic relationships with the Federal Government.

The people of Puerto Rico today have a local government served by officials of their own selection. Under the present organic act, the officials of our government, including the governor, are chosen in free elections by popular vote. The people of Puerto Rico have a good government. May I point out that in his first message to the Legislature of Puerto Rico, Gov. Muñoz Marín, the first elected governor, specifically requested from the legislature authority to proceed with reorganization and streamlining of the government much in line with the procedure followed by the Federal Government. This reorganization which is now taking place is parallel to that now being undertaken by the Federal Government in accordance with the Hoover Commission recommendations. May I also point out that in his second annual message to the legislature the governor recently expressed views on government and economy and organization which have been widely praised by many distinguished students of government, including the Honorable FRED L. CRAWFORD, of Michigan, who recently addressed this House on the subject.

From an article by Mr. Beardsley Ruml, I should like to quote briefly. It was an address which he made before the board of trustees of the Committee for Economic Development last May. He said:

> Muñoz is, without doubt, a remarkable man and a distinguished political leader. Some keen observers are of the opinion that he may emerge as one of the very great world political leaders of our times. A recent issue of Time (May 2, 1949) carried an informative biographical sketch of Muñoz, and his state papers give a clear impression of the depth and penetration of his statesmanship.

He further stated:

> Rule in Puerto Rico is rule by consent, rule after the votes are freely cast. It is the hard way to achieve order in the processes of government, but the result gives confidence in resiliency and toughness. The Government of Puerto Rico under Muñoz will not be characterized by brittleness and caprice.

Mr. Ruml had this to say about honesty in Puerto Rico's Government:

> One further observation about the Government of Puerto Rico. I have taken particular pains to talk to American businessmen and newspapermen to determine whether corruption and graft played any significant part in getting things done in Puerto Rico. The testimony was unanimous that they had found neither "squeeze" nor "bite." I am not so unimaginative as to believe that some deals are not made with some people at some times under some circumstances that are expressions of special privilege for special consideration. But I do believe that there is no system of paying off or of buying rulings and immunities. The higher officials of the Puerto Rican Government are well aware that the program of the Government would be destroyed by corruption or by even the suspicion of corruption.

Puerto Rico is struggling to raise itself out of its present economic difficulties by its own efforts. In our endeavors to industrialize and create new jobs we are having the most helpful cooperation by the Federal Government.

I have said that as a counterpart to what we call our Operation Bootstrap we have an Operation Boost on the part of the Congress. I have included in such proposed Operation Boost the extension to Puerto Rico of public housing, social security, aid to education, coffee rehabilitation, increase of the sugar quota, and so forth. Public housing is already in Puerto Rico under a law passed by this Congress in its first session. Social security for Puerto Rico has already passed this body and is before the Senate. Aid to education has passed the Senate and is pending before the corresponding committee of this House, and I hope some form of agreement can be reached. A coordinated program of action has already been agreed upon by the United States Department of Agriculture and the Puerto Rico Department of Agriculture. Operation Bootstrap is developing well in Puerto Rico. Operation Boost is developing well in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I say we are not going to be deflected from this constructive course. We are not going to aim for objectives which would result in our undoing. We are not going to run after will-o'-the-wisp ideas however charitable the intentions of those who may dangle them before us. We will not jeopardize the whole basis of our economic life and freedom.

In the political sense, H. R. 7674 and S. 3336 are expressions of the same program of advancement which in an economic sense is embodied in our local industrialization program, Operation Bootstrap, and in the congressional counterpart, Operation Boost. H. R. 7674 and S. 3336 would perfect our democratic status within the framework of our union within the United States, in accordance with Puerto Rico's circumstances. I thank the Eightieth Congress for having recognized Puerto Rico's political maturity and having permitted us to elect our governor. I praise the people of Puerto Rico for the wise judgment they showed in electing their present governor. I praise the people of Puerto Rico for supporting our Governor in his present endeavors to streamline our government and industrialize the island. I thank this Congress for the generous consideration it has been giving to our problems and for the helping hand it is extending.

We are an old people with an old culture. San Juan, our capital, and San German, on the southern part of the island, are the two oldest cities under the American flag. San Juan was founded in 1508 and San German in 1511. Under the dome of the old San Juan Cathedral, to the left of the central nave, repose the remains of the first Christian bishop to set foot on New World soil. To the other side of the central nave repose the remains of Juan Ponce de Leon, the founder of San Juan and later the discoverer of Florida.

Ponce de Leon came to the New World from old Castile. He brought with him the pattern of organization of a Spanish medieval city of those days. Thus were San Juan and San German organized. He did not bring with him later-day absolutist Hapsburg or Bourbon ideas of government, as unfortunately befell Spain and consequently befell us in Puerto Rico with the subsequent installation in the Spanish throne of the Hapsburg and Bourbon dynasties. Ponce de Leon represented the old Castillian

ideas of individual freedom. He belonged to that type of sixteenth-century Spaniards whose motto was "To the King my life and tribute, but my honor is of the soul, and my soul belongs to God."

Alonso Manso, the first bishop in the New World, the first bishop of Puerto Rico, represented the Christian faith of the settlers, a faith we have maintained and will always maintain.

There in that cathedral is a symbol which allows us to understand two fundamental characteristics of the Puerto Rican people—the love of individual freedom and the practice of good Christian faith. This explains the fraternal attitude which the Puerto Ricans had for the United States Armies when they arrived in Puerto Rico in 1898. In the flag which they saw the soldiers carry they could see the symbol of that individual freedom with which they had started and which they lost through the three centuries of Hapsburg and Bourbon absolutism, a freedom they yearned to have again. And they knew that in that freedom their faith could flourish. The United States troops marched along a path of flowers through the streets of Ponce, flowers that were thrown by the people.

Because we are Christian we are hospitable; because we love freedom we are Americans. This explains our hospitality to our visitors. For those reasons we will never allow our love for freedom nor our Christian faith to diminish. Our belief in the dignity of man and our Christian faith will always become evident in the way we practice hospitality. We will always break our bread with those that come to visit us as envoys of good will.

On Thursday, March 30, a joint resolution endorsing H. R. 7674 was passed by the Legislature of Puerto Rico. It had the endorsement of 16 votes out of 19 in the senate, with the 1 member not voting. In the house, where there are 39 members, 1 member abstained from voting. The other 38 members endorsed H. R. 7674.

Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a more eloquent expression of the wishes of the people, I am not aware of it.

I hope that H. R. 7674 may promptly be considered by this Congress and speedily, but with thorough consideration, be sent through the legislative machinery to early enactment into law.

Times on the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial, "Times on the TVA," which appeared in the Decatur Daily on Monday, April 3, 1950:

TIMES ON THE TVA

Recently when the sixteenth annual report of the Tennessee Valley Authority was made, it occasioned much comment up and down the country.

The report drew this comment from the New York Times, a great newspaper:

"By every measurable test the Tennessee Valley Authority continues to be a success. Its sixteenth annual report shows an annual production of nearly 16,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or about 10 times as much electricity as was available in its area in 1933. In 1933, 3 percent of the farms in the area were electrified; now the proportion is 66 percent and growing. The improved Tennessee last year carried 427,000,000 tons of freight, or 13 times the load it did in 1933. The TVA has taken the lead in conservation measures to protect soil, forests, and wild life; it has had a large share in the nearly complete elimination of malaria. Private business has flourished. The per capita income in TVA territory has gone up from $148 to $797 this year—still below the national average but increasing much more rapidly than the national average.

"TVA's great building period is nearly over. It has constructed 17 dams and operates a system of 27 major dams and reservoirs. To the installations on the Tennessee and its tributaries will be added dams being built by the Army on the Cumberland power from which will be distributed by TVA. By 1952 TVA expects to be turning out 22,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, for which a ready market will be found. All this has been done with much less mandatory legal power than most people outside of the Tennessee Valley suppose.

"The argument as to whether TVA is in unfair competition with the privately owned electrical industry may long continue. On the face of this report and other official documents it seems likely that TVA is paying sums in lieu of taxes and sums to the Federal Government out of its net profits that come close to being equivalent to the taxes it would have to pay if it were a private enterprise. In addition to these payments, municipalities which operate their own distribution plants are earning net incomes which, in effect, are a species of tax on the ultimate consumer. The real argument for the TVA principle remains substantially what it has always been; that the multiple-purpose development of a great river is too huge an enterprise to be entrusted to a private monopoly. What we can hope to get out of such enterprises, publicly owned and managed, is decentralized and democratic management and the least possible amount of interference with local communities and private businesses. We think that in these objectives TVA has set an admirable example."

Dupes of Soviet Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of April 1, 1950:

BULLITT SAYS DUPES IN STATE DEPARTMENT DO SOVIET AGENT JOB

A former ambassador to Russia charged last night that dupes of Soviet propaganda are doing the work of Russian agents in the State Department.

The critic was William C. Bullitt, who told a Georgetown University audience in Gaston Hall that the United States cannot expect to win its struggle for survival against Russia until the State Department rids itself of Communist sympathisers.

These naive Government officials entered the Department through improper screening during the war, Mr. Bullitt asserted. They remain there now, he said, because Secretary Acheson and his closest associates and friends have a vested interest in their own mistakes.

The former diplomat declared that the Secretary had been persuaded by his counselors, befuddled by Soviet psychological warfare, to cease economic and military aid to China. In any European parliamentary democracy, a minister of foreign affairs who had tossed a great ally like China into the hands of Stalin, would have been dismissed from his post, he added.

He said he regards Indochina as the most critical area in southeast Asia and urged the immediate dispatch of arms aid to that country. He also proposed increased American support of a western European federation and of resistance forces in satellite countries.

Turning his fire on President Truman, Mr. Bullitt said:

"Our President has not understood that an over-all plan for defense, not only of our own country, but also of those countries which still remain outside Stalin's domain, is essential. The President has not yet found within himself the intelligence and spirit to take the offensive effectively against Soviet expansionism."

Rent Controls

REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, approximately a week ago I pointed out when the deficiency appropriation bill was before the House that the $4,000,000 appropriation looked ultimately to the discontinuance of rent control for the future. I pointed out, also, at that time that the new appropriations bill contained no appropriation for the Office of Housing Expediter for the next year, which is as it should be, because there is no authorization. I requested at that time that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency hold hearings soon looking to the continuation of rent control.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Monthly Labor Review has just issued an article entitled "Rent Increases After Decontrol Actions," which is the result of a seven city survey of cities which have been decontrolled, and which shows that between one-third and three-fifths of all rental dwellings in those cities have been affected by rent increases in those dwelling units, and that the rents have been raised, ranging from 16 percent in Salt Lake City to 40 percent in Houston.

The article reads as follows:

RENT INCREASES AFTER DECONTROL ACTIONS[1]

In an effort to find out what happened to rents in decontrolled areas, seven large cities—Knoxville, Dallas, Spokane, Salt Lake City, Jacksonville, Topeka, and Houston—where rents had been decontrolled from 1 to

[1] By Regina Beckhardt of the Bureau's Division of Prices and Cost of Living; and Torleif Melee of the Office of Publications.

8 months, were recently surveyed. The survey was conducted by the United States Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics, at the request of the Office of the Housing Expediter. Between a third and three-fifths of all rental dwelling units in these cities had been affected by rent increases. For those dwelling units for which rents had been raised, the increases ranged from 16 percent in Salt Lake City to 40 percent in Houston. For all rental dwellings (i. e., including those which had no change in rent) rents on the average had increased from 6.6 to 16.7 percent.

In four of the cities for which family income data were also obtained, the greatest percentage rent increases were reported by families earning under $2,000 a year. Their rent increases ranged from about 8 percent in Salt Lake City and Topeka to 31 percent in Dallas. For families in the $4,000–$5,000 and over income group, the increases ranged from 4 to 9 percent.

The 34-city rent component of the Consumer's Price Index, which includes information for two cities recently decontrolled, increased only 1.3 percent from May to November, the approximate period of the survey.

FINDINGS IN SEVEN CITIES

Rents in the seven cities were all decontrolled between June 14, 1949, and October 19, 1949, under the decontrol provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949. Although the cities covered by the survey were chosen by the Expediter from among the largest cities where rents were decontrolled, they are not necessarily representative of all decontrolled areas throughout the country. In 1940, these cities had populations ranging from 68,000 to 255,000, although current estimates indicate considerable expansion.

Survey periods extended from about 3 months prior to the decontrol date to November 15, 1949. Rental data were obtained for each city from a sample of residential units, carefully selected to represent all sections and all types of structures in each of the 7 areas. Particular attention was given to adequate representation of both white and nonwhite neighborhoods and both heavily and sparsely populated blocks. Commercial rooming houses, hotels, trailers, and tourist courts were excluded.

In Dallas, Spokane, and Topeka, the surveys were conducted by personal visits to each of the sample units; in Houston, Jacksonville, Knoxville, and Salt Lake City, where the Bureau's regular samples were available, mail questionnaires were sent out in accordance with usual Bureau of Labor Statistics procedures.[2]

Rent increases for all units (including those reporting no change) ranged from 6.6 percent in Salt Lake City to 16.7 percent in Dallas. However, rents in dwelling units free to rise, which excludes units under lease and those decontrolled before general city decontrol, increased by 7.1 percent in Salt Lake City and by as much as 20.5 percent in Dallas, as shown in the following tabulation.

[2] For discussion, see Monthly Labor Review, January 1940 (p. 60).

City and percent increase for units free to rise

Knoxville	13.9
Dallas	20.5
Spokane	8.2
Salt Lake City	7.1
Jacksonville	12.3
Topeka	10.5
Houston	15.7

If only those units reporting a change are considered, the percentage increase in their rents was much higher, ranging from 16 percent in Salt Lake City to 40 percent in Houston (see table 1).

Dwelling units renting for under $30 a month before decontrol, received the largest percent increase in each of the 7 cities. With the exception of Spokane, the largest proportion of units reporting increases was also concentrated in this group. Family income data obtained in four of the cities covered—Spokane, Dallas, Topeka, and Salt Lake City—showed that a greater proportion of the low-income families reported rent increases than higher income groups. Among the families with incomes under $2,000, from 48 to 71 percent reported rent increases. The rent increases for this income group ranged from 8 percent in Salt Lake City to 31.3 percent in Dallas. At the upper end of the income scale ($4,000 and over bracket), the number of dwelling units receiving increases ranged from 22 percent in Topeka to 37 percent in Dallas with the increase remaining below 9 percent.

TABLE 1.—*Changes in residential rents, by rent and income group, all units, by city, 1949*[1]

[Rental dwellings with kitchen facilities]

Rent group	Percent increase for all rental units	Units reporting rent increases: Percent of all units in rent groups	Units reporting rent increases: Average dollar amount	Units reporting rent increases: Average percent increase	Income group	Percent increase for all rental units	Units reporting rent increases: Percent of all units in income groups	Units reporting rent increases: Average dollar amount	Units reporting rent increases: Average percent increase
Knoxville[2]	13.9	57	$6.52	26.7	Knoxville: Not available				
Under $30 a month	31.5	62	5.31	36.4					
$30–$49.99 a month	13.6	46	6.53	23.7					
$50 a month and over	4.3	41	8.98	10.2					
Dallas area[3]	16.7	39	13.99	36.1	Dallas area:				
Under $30 a month	61.4	78	10.99	51.6	Under $2,000 a year	31.3	71	$9.18	47.9
$30–$49.99 a month	21.9	58	14.27	36.7	$2,000–$2,999 a year	20.6	64	12.94	42.7
$50 a month and over	8.8	42	12.67	27.5	$3,000–$3,999 a year	14.3	56	14.02	32.9
					$4,000–$4,999 a year	9.8	45	15.77	25.8
					$5,000 a year and over	6.4	37	19.24	20.1
Spokane[4]	8.2	45	8.71	19.0	Spokane:				
Under $30 a month	11.9	43	4.39	28.7	Under $2,000 a year	12.1	48	5.49	30.8
$30–$49.99 a month	8.7	53	6.62	17.9	$2,000–$2,999 a year	7.1	50	5.49	16.5
$50 a month and over	5.3	37	8.28	10.3	$3,000–$3,999 a year	7.5	52	6.69	16.7
					$4,000 a year and over	5.9	35	7.88	14.7
Salt Lake City[5]	6.6	34	6.46	16.6	Salt Lake City:				
Under $30 a month	12.9	48	6.07	26.9	Under $2,000 a year	8.0	46	4.39	17.3
$30–$49.99 a month	7.8	47	6.66	16.7	$2,000–$2,999 a year	6.6	41	6.03	15.6
$50 a month and over	5.4	34	6.41	15.2	$3,000–$3,999 a year	6.9	42	7.14	16.4
					$4,000–$4,999 a year	5.2	38	7.97	13.9
					$5,000 a year and over	4.2	38	7.26	11.1
Jacksonville area[6]	10.3	32	6.29	35.8	Jacksonville area: Not available				
Under $30 a month	31.5	66	6.24	54.2					
$30–$49.99 a month	8.2	43	7.68	18.7					
$50 a month and over	1.0	5	12.75	24.4					
Topeka[7]	8.0	36	8.08	20.2	Topeka:				
Under $30 a month	18.1	48	7.09	37.7	Under $2,000 a year	8.1	48	8.12	31.6
$30–$49.99 a month	11.8	39	11.27	28.3	$2,000–$2,999 a year	8.9	31	9.84	31.6
$50 a month and over	−.4	11	8.12	13.8	$3,000–$3,999 a year	6.6	27	10.14	20.4
					$4,000 a year and over	5.6	22	8.06	11.4
Houston area[8]	10.3	33	12.08	40.9	Houston area: Not available				
Under $30 a month	34.3	46	8.87	63.1					
$30–$49.99 a month	13.0	32	14.31	36.3					
$50 a month and over	1.4	9	15.94	15.6					

[1] Rent increases on additional units were reported as follows, effective sometime after Nov. 15, 1949.

	Percent of units	Rent increase: Amount	Rent increase: Percent
Knoxville	1	$5.46	14.1
Dallas	3	8.46	18.1
Spokane	8	6.16	17.6
Salt Lake City	6	7.88	21.7
Jacksonville	1	10.03	44.9
Topeka	4	8.98	26.7
Houston	6	11.88	39.8

[2] Decontrolled June 14, 1949, by the city council; surveyed May 15–Nov. 15, 1949.
[3] Decontrolled June 28, 1949, by the city council; surveyed Apr. 15–Nov. 15, 1949.
[4] Decontrolled July 28, 1949, by the Housing Expediter; surveyed May 15–Nov. 15, 1949.
[5] Decontrolled Aug. 5, 1949, by the city council; surveyed June 15–Nov. 15, 1949.
[6] Decontrolled Aug. 5, 1949, by the city council; surveyed June 15–Nov. 15, 1949.
[7] Decontrolled Sept. 14, 1949, by the city council; surveyed July 15–Nov. 15, 1949.
[8] Decontrolled Oct. 19, 1949, by State-wide action; surveyed Aug. 15–Nov. 15, 1949.

RENTING HARD IN MANY CITIES

In all seven cities surveyed, the demand for available housing has been intensified by an extensive growth in population since 1940. Recent public and private estimates indicate that the population has increased by about 60 percent in Houston and has risen by about a fourth in Salt Lake City and Dallas. The average growth for the other cities is estimated at 30 to 50 percent.

Vacancy rates in these areas have remained low, according to available information. In Knoxville, a recent local survey indicates that vacancies had dropped below the 0.9-percent rate found in the November 1945 survey made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Dallas' vacancy rate for dwellings available for rent or sales dropped from about 6 percent in 1940 to 1.3 percent in 1949, according to a Bureau survey. In January 1949, only 0.8 percent of the dwellings were vacant and available for rent.[2] The rental vacancy rate in Spokane dropped from 12.2 percent in April 1940 to 1 percent in August 1946, according to the Bureau of the Census, but estimates at the end of 1949 indicate that this rate may have risen slightly.[3] In the Salt Lake City metropolitan district, the rental vacancy rate remained somewhat higher than in most cities. In 1940, the census showed that it was 6.4 percent for rental dwellings and, in 1947, it was still 2.8 percent. However, a recent local survey indicates a decline since 1947. Recent surveys show only a slight rise in the vacancy rate in Houston, since April 1947. At that time, according to Bureau of Census estimates, it was 1.8 percent; currently it is about 2 percent.

Over-all vacancy data are not available for Topeka and Houston. However, vacancies in FHA rental housing in Topeka which were created by the closing of the air base were filled within a few weeks, with no rent reductions.

Evidence of a continuing demand for low rental housing is available for four of the areas. The local public housing authority in each of these areas in its application for program reservation,[4] which it filed with the Public Housing Administration in Washington, listed the number of applications on file for low rental housing currently available as follows: Knoxville, 1,284; Dallas, 5,200; Jacksonville, 922; and Houston, 1,218.

RENT ACT OF 1949[5]

The Housing and Rent Act of 1949, effective on April 1, 1949, placed primary responsibility for the decontrol of Federal rental areas upon the States and local municipal councils. Under its terms, an entire State or any portion thereof may be decontrolled either by legislative action or State control may be substituted for Federal control if the Governor certifies to the Housing Expediter that the State legislature has passed adequate rent-control measures to replace the Federal law. Furthermore, the governing bodies of any incorporated city, town, or village may, with the Governor's approval, terminate rent control within their jurisdiction. The Housing Expediter must then decontrol adjacent unincorporated areas if the incorporated place is a major portion of the rental area.

The general authority of the Housing Expediter to decontrol areas in which the demand for rental housing has been reasonably met is continued. Local rent advisory boards may, as under the 1947 and 1948 acts, recommend decontrol of the area under its authority. Unless adequately substantiated, the Housing Expediter can disapprove such recommendations. In appeals by the local board or interested parties, the final arbiter is the Emergency Court of Appeals.

Areas removed from rent control by the Housing Expediter after April 1, 1949, may be recontrolled by him under the provisions of the existing act. The recontrol of areas decontrolled prior to that date and areas never under control must first be recommended by the local board. These recontrol provisions cannot be invoked in areas decontrolled by local or State option.

No general rent adjustment is written into the existing act, but the Housing Expediter is authorized to increase rents individually to provide landlords with a fair net operating income. Under this formula, it was the intent of Congress that landlords should receive an income that is above their expenses by a fair amount. Under the 1947 and 1948 acts, rent ceilings were increased only if the landlord showed that he incurred a financial loss or hardship in the operation of his rental units. Under these earlier acts, increases up to 15 percent were permitted under certain conditions.

The control of evictions was taken away from the local courts and given to the Housing Expediter by the 1949 legislation. He has also been authorized to apply for injunctions to force compliance with the law and to institute a treble damage suit against any person demanding or receiving rent in excess of that established by his office. As under the two earlier laws, the 1949 act continued the exemption of new construction from rent control.

EXTENT OF NATIONAL DECONTROL

About 3,000,000 registered dwelling units were removed from Federal rent control from July 1, 1947, through January 15, 1950, under the various decontrol provisions of the postwar housing and rent acts (see table 2). Some 11,700,000 units remained under control in 365 rental areas. More than 97 percent of the 3,000,000 units were decontrolled after April 1, 1949, under the liberalized decontrol provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949.

Total decontrol actions under the 1947 and 1948 acts affected only an estimated 80,111 dwelling units. These actions were, of course, all taken by the Housing Expediter, either upon his own initiative or upon recommendation of the local advisory boards, since the State- and local-option clauses were not included in any act previous to 1949.

TABLE 2.—*Area decontrol and decontrol actions by type of authority July 1, 1947–Jan. 15, 1950*

Item	Total number	Apr. 1, 1949, to Jan. 15, 1950	Apr. 1, 1948, to Mar. 31, 1949	July 1, 1947, to Mar. 31, 1948
Number of rental areas completely decontrolled [1]	[illegible]	354	7	9
Total 1940 population in decontrolled areas	24,289,967	23,381,962	555,009	352,956
Total decontrol actions [2]	749	[3] 681	44	24
Estimated registered dwelling units in decontrolled areas	2,836,873	[3] 2,806,762	42,234	37,877
Housing Expediter—actions	514	[illegible]	39	6
Estimated units decontrolled	1,194,704	1,156,474	29,275	8,955
Local board recommendations—actions	28	5	3	18
Estimated units decontrolled	115,840	73,959	12,959	28,422
Local option—actions	201	201		
Estimated units decontrolled	738,815	738,815		
State option—actions [4]	6	6		
Estimated units decontrolled	837,514	837,514		

[1] The number of areas still under control is 365.
[2] Some decontrol actions affect only portions of areas.
[3] In 3 cases (Americus, Ga., Altoona-Johnstown, Pa., and Harrodsburg, Ky.) recontrol actions were taken involving 7,120 units.
[4] 4 States completely decontrolled and 1 placed under State rent control.

The importance of these local-option provisions in the 1949 law was great. For more than 56 percent of the total dwelling units decontrolled after April 1, 1949, the action was taken under State or local option. Two States (Texas and Nebraska) removed rent controls entirely by State option, while in Utah and Arizona they were removed completely by a combination of Expediter and local board actions. Wisconsin substituted a State law, which, in effect, allowed rents to be increased 15 percent for those tenants who had previously agreed to a 15-percent voluntary rise under the 1947 and 1948 Federal acts and 30 percent for those who had not signed such agreements. The Alabama Legislature voted to end controls on May 10, 1950.

Although 69 percent of the total decontrol actions from July 1, 1947, were taken by the Housing Expediter upon his own initiative, they were primarily in rural or sparsely populated places and involved only about 41 percent of the dwelling units decontrolled. Many of the actions after April 1, 1949, resulted from the decontrol of surrounding areas after a central city had been decontrolled by local option.

The number of rental units decontrolled by the Housing Expediter upon recommendation of the local advisory boards represents less than 4 percent of the total for the period ending January 15.

Insofar as rents have been decontrolled in cities included in the rent component of the Consumers' Price Index (1935–39=100), the effect is shown in the following tabulation.

Period and percent of increase (34 large cities) [1]

December 1942–June 1947	1.1
June 1947–April 1948	0.5
April 1948–April 1949	3.4
April 1949–December 1949	1.6

[1] Houston and Jacksonville are among the cities regularly included in the index.

Marked increases followed the enactment of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 on July 1, 1947. The 15-percent increases, permitted under lease agreements between landlords and tenants, accounted for a large part of the 10-percent rise in the index between June 1947 and April 1949. In contrast, the rise after the 1949 legislation took effect was relatively small due to the removal of the 15-percent increase provisions.

[2] The median monthly rental asked was $60 and most of the units were built in the last 6 months of 1948.

[3] Some of the projects constructed in Spokane under sec. 608 of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act have found it necessary to reduce rents in order to maintain marketability.

[4] The first step in the procedure whereby a city, through its local housing authority, participates in the low-rent public-housing program.

[5] The Housing and Rent Act of 1949 (Public Law 31, 81st Cong., 1st sess.), approved March 30, 1949.

We'll Never Make Them Do It Our Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein several telegrams from my great friend, H. R. (Roy) Cullen of Houston, Tex. Also to include therein, an article by Ernest O. Hauser in the March 4, 1950, Saturday Evening Post, entitled "We Will Never Make Them Do It Our Way."

Mr. Speaker, I wish every Member of this House, and we have 435 of them, they represent every human being from every district in the United States, 150,000,000 great Americans, knew Roy Cullen of Houston, Tex., and his great work as I do. There is no way to properly describe him, but to me he is one of the finest and one of the most unusual men I have ever known. I have never known such an unselfish human being in my life. When I think about all of the many things he has done to help humanity, to help our churches, our schools, white and colored—when I think about his great brain, his wonderful ability, his unlimited energy and his great understanding heart, I just want to get down on my knees and thank The Great, Good One for giving this Nation a man with the ability and foresight of Texas' own H. R. (Roy) Cullen. He not only does good in Texas, but he does good in every State in this Union, wherever he goes, he and his wonderful wife, who are such pals and who have raised such a wonderful family and who has done so much good in helping to develop one of the greatest cities on this earth, Houston, Tex., and who has visited us down in our great State of Alabama, where he visited all over my district, especially the beautiful Bellingrath Gardens at Mobile, Ala., where he went over our beautiful Mobile Bay, our Dauphin Island and where he is coming back this summer to have another visit with us, where he visited that great Grand Hotel at Point Clear—one of the unforgettable spots of this earth, an unforgettable spot that will never be forgotten by an unforgettable man. To know Roy Cullen and Mrs. Cullen is to love them—they have both just dedicated their lives to help Houston, to help Texas, and to help this Nation, and to do good everywhere they go, and to help keep our way of life.

The matter referred to above follows:

HOUSTON, TEX., *March 23, 1950.*

Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
Representative from Alabama,
House Office Building.

I sent the following telegram to Robert Fuoss, managing editor of the Saturday Evening Post:

"Mr. ROBERT FUOSS,
Managing Editor, the Saturday Evening Post, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa.:

"The most enlightening article in the Post March 4 issue entitled 'We'll Never Make Them Do It Our Way,' by Ernest O. Hauser, should be sent to all of our Representatives in Congress so they will be able to cast an intelligent vote on foreign matters. The article also is a denial to the arguments used by Will Clayton's world union. I will be glad to pay all expenses that may be incurred.

"H. R. CULLEN,
"1710 City National Bank Building."

I received the following telegram in reply from the Saturday Evening Post:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *March 10.*

H. R. CULLEN:

Thanks for wire on Hauser article. We don't plan to circularize it but are glad to give you permission to reprint it intact with credit by special permission Saturday Evening Post copyright 1950 Curtis Publishing Co., for purpose you describe.

W. J. STEVENS, Jr.,
Assistant Managing Editor.

This is permission for you to reproduce article by Ernest O. Hauser in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This article absolutely explodes the theory of Will Clayton's world union.

H. R. CULLEN.

HOUSTON, TEX., *March 24, 1950.*

Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
Representative from Alabama,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please consider this telegram carefully in conjunction with Kerr-Thomas bill that is now pending. Figures quoted are those used in making our income-tax returns and relate to gas field in Calhoun County, Tex., where first-drilling operations were commenced in 1947.

My associates and I drilled two wildcat dry holes on an anticlinical nose at a total cost of $316,650.40. The third well which was drilled is capable of producing gas. A total of seven wells has been drilled, four being producers and three being dry holes. Total cost of all the wells is $932,275.75, resulting in average cost for each well of $133,182.25, or a cost of $233,068.94 for each productive well.

No gas has yet been sold, but negotiations have been consummated on a 10-year contract under which we are to receive an average of 8 cents per thousand cubic feet of gas.

Texas gas is now being sold in cities throughout the country to housewives at prices ranging from $1 to $1.50 per thousand cubic feet; so 92 cents to $1.42 per thousand cubic feet charged to the housewives is taken up by transportation and distribution charges. The gas producers are receiving at the well only 5 to 7 percent of the amount paid by the housewives.

Before deliveries are commenced under the contract previously referred to it will be necessary to expend additional sums for equipment. A gasoline extraction plant may be required at a possible cost in excess of $2,000,000. Under present conditions such plants are being operated at a loss. We are interested in such plant in Refugio County, Tex., which at present loses approximately $6,000 per month.

I have given you a true economic picture of a gas field and I am in position to know that other gas fields in this area have required similar expenditures for discovery and development.

It takes courage to risk such sums on so hazardous an investment under present conditions, but no one but a crazy man would take such risks unless the Kerr-Thomas bill is enacted.

A copy of this telegram is being air-mailed to each Member of the Senate.

H. R. CULLEN.

HOUSTON, TEX., *March 27, 1950.*

Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
Representative from Alabama,
House Office Building:

Supplementing my telegram of March 24, wish to explain why the gas wells mentioned cost so much. Gas fields in this area that are now being found are usually very deep; from 9,000 to 12,000 feet with very high gas pressures and much faulting in the fields, so each well drilled within the field must be drilled as wildcat where much coring and testing is done and high-pressure casing and equipment must be used which alone on one well costs between forty and fifty thousand dollars. The Russian Government would give many billions of rubles to stop the exploration of oil in this country. To defeat the Kerr-Thomas bill which is now before your Senate would make Joe Stalin very happy.

H. R. CULLEN.

HOUSTON, TEX., *March 27, 1950.*

Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
Representative from Alabama,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Supplementing my telegrams March 24 and 27. I hope I am not boring you with my telegrams, but I realize that much pressure is brought to bear on the Senate by pressure groups furnishing data of doubtful nature, and that you might like to have evidence that is supported by income-tax returns.

I have already given you a brief report on a gas field that my associates and I discovered in Calhoun County.

Now, I would like to give you the facts about a gas field that my associates and I discovered in Atascosa County in 1946. We drilled six wells at a total cost of $799,467.82, or an average cost of $133,247.97 per well. Three wells were producers and three wells were dry; thus, cost per productive well was $266,495.94. The producing wells have a pressure of 3,300 pounds on the Christmas tree, but sulfur and carbon-dioxide content is so high gas cannot be sold to the pipe line without being washed. Cost of building and operating a plant to wash the limited quantity of gas discovered is so great that it is not economically feasible at the present price of gas. We now have a large capital investment with slight chance of recovery.

This is another example of the great risk involved in exploring for gas. We can stay in business only if the returns from the good fields can offset the losses of poor ones. Government regulation coupled with the risks of discovery would make exploration impracticable. Passage of the Kerr-Thomas bill would assure availability of gas reserves in the event of a national emergency.

A copy of this telegram is being air mailed to each Member of the Senate.

H. R. CULLEN.

HOUSTON, TEX., *April 3, 1950.*

Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
Representative from Alabama:

The commentator, Drew Pearson, whom both Roosevelt and Truman have termed a "liar," is again at his dirty work of asking the housewives to write President Truman not to sign the gas bill.

All those who are acquainted with the gas situation in the gas fields know that not to pass the gas bill would mean the stopping of drilling of gas wells wherever they may be and would result in terribly high gas prices all over the country. If our Congress and President do not protect the gas producer at the well from Government interference and taxation, then it is time for all of our Senators and Congressmen from the State of Texas to offer bills to tax every commodity at its source from a peanut in the field to a caterpillar in the factory. If you would offer bills to tax every commodity at its source in those States where their Congressmen and Senators are voting against the gas bill, we would get relief from persecution by those States.

This telegram is being sent to Senators CONNALLY, JOHNSON, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Representatives ALBERT THOMAS and FRANK BOYKIN, with copy to President TRUMAN.

H. R. CULLEN.

We'll Never Make Them Do It Our Way

(By Ernest O. Hauser)

PARIS.—American planners in Europe are up a tree. If the immediate aim of ERP was to give this war-struck Continent first aid, we're not doing badly. Throughout western Europe trains are running, currencies are stabilized, and the political situation is solid to the point where communism is no day-to-day menace. With this accomplished, the givers of aid suddenly find themselves confronted with the chronic ills of Europe.

Is it our job to cure these ills? Our planners, seeing that their time by Europe's bedside is nearly up, have begun to talk with greater urgency. Their objective, on the face of it, sound simple enough: Freer trade among European nations, abolition of import quotas and customs barriers, convertibility of Europe's many currencies—in short, the economic integration of Marshall-plan Europe. The word, it was noted, appeared 16 times in the hurry-up speech made by ECA Administrator Paul G. Hoffman in Paris on October 31, 1949.

Translated into action, this means trouble. Already Marshall planning has slipped into a second critical stage, not limited to giving aid. No longer sticking to our original purpose of curing Europe of the war, we're trying to cure her of * * * Europe. Watching this amazing effort from the vantage point of one who has seen this Continent come back, I feel that we've maneuvered ourselves astride a tiger.

For in analyzing some of the implications of Mr. Hoffman's objective, one finds that western Europe would have to undergo a full-blown revolution—technological, psychological, and social—in order to comply. She would have to take the butcher knife to a lot of ingrown habits and hallowed traditions. She would have to turn herself inside out.

And what if she won't? Making satellites is not an American custom—we have no Malenkovs, no commissars to install in European capitals. Behind the tall windows of the Rothschild palace in Paris, ECA headquarters for Europe, Ambassador W. Averell Harriman is still trying to make Europeans do our bidding with a smile. "Soviet policy," he told me, "is to dominate others. American policy is to help others." Ask his associates what methods they're using, and they'll rattle off the known variations on the theme persuade: needle, wheedle, coax, suggest, urge, prevail upon, cajole, inveigle. The one verb not in their vocabulary is "compel."

More persuasion, from here on, just won't make it stick. Take a seemingly innocuous little nostrum—efficiency. To close her dollar gap at a reasonably high level of trade by 1952—the goal of ERP—Europe must export. To export, she must step up production; to step up production, she must produce more efficiently. Yet in advising Europe's industrialists on what they should do, few Americans are aware of the fact that the word "efficiency" cannot be rendered accurately into European languages. And the trouble in getting it translated is as nothing compared to the trouble in getting it across.

A simple case: an ECA official in Rome used to tell Italian cotton manufacturers that once they stopped making several types of cloth in each plant and concentrated, instead, on one line—like we do at home—the result would be higher efficiency and higher profits.

"Just think," one Italian textile man said to me, "what would have happened if I'd taken his advice. We've always turned out 20 or 30 lines because we never had one large, solid market. If a customer said he liked this pattern, but he'd prefer it in blue, we made it in blue for him. Came the sterling devaluation, knocking out the best market we had for cotton goods. Why did I survive? Only because I was flexible enough to offer this type of cloth to the French, that to the Indians, and yet another to the Swedes—by now, I've opened up new markets and absorbed the shock."

An ECA man in Paris who had been looking at one of the largest French automobile plants came back scratching his head. "A workman finishes his castings—door hinges, say—puts them into a tote box and drags the box to the next machine. If it's a large piece, he drags the piece itself across the floor. Back home we use conveyors for that sort of thing. 'You could make more cars,' I say to the manufacturer, 'if you installed a chain hoist or something.' Says he, 'Why make more cars?' He isn't thinking about an ever-expanding market—first a car for the rich, then a car for the workers. All he's thinking of is how to retire at 60. 'Besides,' he tells me, 'if I gave my men a machine that does things faster, they wouldn't use it. Work themselves out of their jobs?' "

To make European managers and workers fall in love with American production methods, ECA is taking groups of them to the United States for a look-see. I talked with a French electrical engineer who had been a member of a group visiting, among other things, the Baldwin Locomotive Works near Philadelphia and the General Electric plant in Schenectady. The experience wasn't lost on him. "Yes, there are a number of things we'd do well to duplicate. For instance, standardization of design—you push the customer toward the standard product by charging him extra for special fixtures or a slight variation in style. Nothing wrong with that. And, another thing, you always worry about increasing your output. In the plants we saw, both managers and workers are encouraged to make suggestions, and they do—all the time. Everyone is constantly moving forward in the States." A trivial thing that had struck him: machine-mounted files were used in making the cutting edges of certain machine tools in Schenectady. "We have them here, too, but our workers won't touch them. They still prefer the slow, old-fashioned hand file, and, for that last polish, a stone." Smoother results? "No," he grinned, "but tell that to one of our old-timers."

Change, so desirable to the average American who firmly believes in progress, is something to be afraid of over here. Europeans are security-minded. The industrialist rocking along nicely with the machinery he installed 30 years ago will think twice before investing in new equipment. What if another war breaks out? What if the Russians are coming, after all? Won't cash be safer? And, if he mail-orders new equipment and doubles production, won't he work himself, quickly, first through his stock pile of raw materials, then through his stock pile of dollars?

Likewise, a French workman, producing only one-fourth as much per man-hour as his American cousin and paid half the American wage, is easily convinced that higher living standards are waiting at the end of Efficiency Street. Yet he hesitates to go that way. Heir to tradition of craftsmanship, the European worker tends to think of himself as starting with a clump of clay and ending up with a graceful vase. Even when working in a steel mill, he still prides himself on being a craftsman. He has an investment in years of painful apprenticeship which he must protect. He's a little afraid of becoming a Stakhanovite at the assembly line. And he's much afraid of finishing any given job in half the time now used—meaning that either he or the fellow next to him will be fired come Friday. These are some deep-rooted attitudes our planners would have to change to make Europe more efficient. What seems a mere face-lifting job turns out to be a complete revamping of the old personality.

So much for efficiency. Now for the slightly larger order, economic integration. Said Mr. Hoffman in his hurry up speech: "The fact that we have in the United States a single market of 150,000 000 consumers has been indispensable to the strength and efficiency of our economy. The creation of a permanent, freely trading area comprising 270,000,000 consumers in western Europe would * * * set in motion a rapid growth in productivity. This would make it possible for Europe to improve its competitive position in the world and thus more nearly satisfy the * * * needs of its people. This is a vital objective."

"Get together, boys," snickered a Frenchman, "or you'll go to bed without supper." While many thinking people west of the iron curtain agree that Europeans must hang together if they don't want to hang separately, century-old traditions still make the concept of integration revolutionary. Whatever European country you visit today, the principal landmarks and sight-seeing objects bring to mind a militant nationalism, Europe's scourge for the last 150 years. Nelson atop a column in Trafalgar Square; Napolean atop a column in the Place Vendôme; Victory atop a column in Berlin; half the street names in every capital, and soldiers' graves lining the highways—echoes, everywhere, of neighbor A's victory over neighbor B in the not forgotten past.

How could it be otherwise? Crammed together, speaking different languages, and following traditions of their own, the people of Europe have always found quarreling the most natural pastime there was. Gradually, the economic structure was made to fit the map. Used to the idea of fighting one another every few years, everyone simply kept watering his plot, trying to raise his own crop of steel castings, biscuits, and uniform buttons. Hoping to change this system by persuasion is obviously unrealistic. Yet we're prodding Europeans to get together overnight.

"What I want to see over here," said one high-minded American, "is the kind of assembly-line economy we have in the United States—everybody makes what he's best at."

In Milan, the other day, I talked with the head of one of Italy's largest industrial concerns, employing 12,000 workers and turning out railroad cars, locomotives, and heavy machinery. What, I asked, would happen if customs barriers throughout western Europe were pulled up? The industrialist's parchment face began to glow. He had always been a rooter for the United States of Europe, and the sooner the better. What about his engineering works? The glow vanished. "Industries like ours were established merely because we didn't wish to depend on others. We have almost no iron ore or coal in this country. Without protective tariffs we'd be out of business overnight."

The entire industrial structure of Italy's Po Valley, one of Europe's great nerve centers, would collapse the minute Europe became one freely trading area. French, British, and German steel, Swedish and German paper, Dutch radios, Belgian glassware, all cheaper than Italians can make them, would pour across the Alps, wrecking industries now giving employment to several million workers. "We still could manufacture things * * * such as precision instruments or something."

The whole idea of this system is to protect the inefficient, high-cost producer against the efficient, low-cost producer across the border. In Italy today a standard typewriter costs $200 and a four-door sedan sets you back $2,350. Both are Italian-made and poor compared to the American equivalent, which would cost you $150 and $1,567, respectively, and which the law keeps you from bringing in. Everywhere trusts and monopoly concerns sit pat on articles whose

production they've been able to corner, refusing to improve the product, refusing to lower the price. "Go ahead with integration," they say, "and you'll get a Europe studded with ghost towns." Some 40,000 Norwegian textile workers, for example, would be out of job and home the minute cheap Swedish textiles came in across the border. Even the French wine growers have come crying to Mr. Harriman's office because the proposed French-Italian customs union would "throw them out of business."

"You mean to say," an incredulous American asked them, "your great French wines couldn't hold their own against Italian ones?"

"Certainly," smiled the French through their tears, "but it would force our prices down."

The resistance of protected groups whose survival in comfort is threatened by integration doesn't worry ECA men half as much as the recalcitrance of one essential partner—Great Britain. In urging Europeans from the start to get together and help themselves, we were quietly assuming that Britain would take the lead. There was reason for hope. It was Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin who first grabbed the ball tossed over the fence by Secretary of State George Marshall in his Harvard speech of June 5, 1947. Since then, however, those early hopes have wilted. You cannot talk with our planners here for more than 10 minutes without hearing them voice their bafflement at British aloofness.

American as well as continental critics, no longer concealing their disappointment, now openly accuse the British of dragging their feet. Already the impression that Britain is willfully holding back the economic unification of Europe has sent British prestige to an all-time low. "It makes you think that just as the veto in the United Nations comes from Russia," a middle-of-the-road Italian newspaper wrote the other day, "so it is Britain's exclusive role to exercise the veto in Europe, at least as things favorable to the Continent are concerned." Said a Frenchman, "They're going down themselves, and they want to pull the house down with them." Said an American, "Whenever the British attend a European recovery meeting, they come with sour faces. They simply do not want to see recovery on the Continent as long as they themselves are faced with economic catastrophe."

Here again it's tradition our impatient planners are up against—a tradition which it would take a sledge hammer to crush. As the inventors of an old game called the balance of power, the British have always been afraid of a united Continent facing them across the Channel, and they've fought a couple of wars to prevent such unity. It isn't easy for them to turn around and forget what amounts to a national attitude. Even today, in surrendering part of their individuality to European union, Britons are afraid they'd be losers—their own tradition of political continuity still seems preferable to the rapid succession of weak governments with which the Continent is cursed.

As Europe's leading nation for so long, is it hard to understand that Britain now finds it difficult to take her place in the queue? The very idea is intolerable. To fathom the British trauma you merely have to travel between London and Paris today. While the Continent faces forward, the British public remains imprisoned by memories of World War II, and the phrase, "when we stood alone," still echoes from every wall. The Continent bustles with a new life—Britain is held down by a cumbersome system of restrictions whose sum total spells poverty.

The resentment of the British tourist who crosses the Channel to find full shelves for those who can buy, ample meals for those who can pay, and an air of pulsating activity all the way from Dover to Naples, is the resentment of the uninvited looking in through the window and seeing the party in full swing. Out of tune with the rest of Europe, he goes back home to his misery, where, once again, he stands alone.

"We don't belong to Europe, we belong to the world," British ECA delegates insist, countering talk about European integration with talk about the British Commonwealth—the world's largest low-tariff area—with which the United Kingdom is doing more business than with the whole of western Europe. Unfortunately, from the ECA point of view, there's little difference between a Conservative and a Laborite when it comes to integration; while Tories are apt to chase the phantom rickshas of their evanescent Empire, Socialists worry about what would happen to their planned economy once Britain traded freely with her neighbors. A Frenchman told me of discussing integration with two British delegates to the 1949 Council of Europe meeting at Strasbourg.

"If I had to choose between the Commonwealth and Europe, I'd take the former," said the Conservative.

"If freer trade with the Continent would throw a single British worker out of his job, I'm against it," said the Laborite.

Not satisfied with the Labor Government's recent gesture in exempting one-half of Britain's private imports from the quota system without liberalizing foreign trade carried on by the Government itself, Marshall planners have frankly given up hoping for British leadership. "We can't hold up the whole convoy just because one of the ships refuses to get up speed," one ECA man said.

Many responsible Europeans feel the same way. "We've got to make a start, regardless," I was told by the French Premier, Georges Bidault.

Here, however, the question pops up at once: Without England, what have you got? Few people on this shrunken Continent are willing to go ahead and integrate without the British, for fear that such a solution would leave western Europe once again dominated by Germany, in more than just the economic sense. Consequently, the various regional integration schemes now half-heartedly sponsored by ECA for want of something better all leave a door open for the British to come on in. Some progress has been made in recent customs-union talks among the Fritalux nations—France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg. Taking it from there, the British themselves—"to please Mr. Hoffman"—have initiated talks for a British-Scandinavian economic union. At this moment, Fritalux as well as Uniscan is a long way from actual operation. It takes more than good will, more than persuasion, to level the walls built by narrow-minded generations.

No longer squeamish about Mr. Marshall's original warning, "The initiative, I think, must come from Europe," we have assumed a leadership no European nation was willing to assume. But though we now have the initiative, what can we do with it?

From the start, our aid was conditioned on performance. Having offered to help Europe if Europe was willing to help herself, we can remind the 17 recipients of our aid that performance is what we want to see, and we constantly do. Beyond that, there's little we can do to enforce our demands. The only instrument of coercion is provided in our bilateral agreements with the recipient governments, and it is a gentle instrument, at that. In selling ERP supplies, from coal to tractors, to the public, each government has agreed to place the proceeds from these sales in a special fund, known as the counterpart fund. Before spending any of the shillings, lire and francs in this fund, it must wait for Uncle Sam's nod. In as much as the counterpart fund makes up a large part of each government's budget, it is naturally anxious to get that nod in order to invest the money in such things as a new bridge or a new power plant. Just by not nodding, we can get a lot of cooperation.

It isn't blackmail exactly, but, combined with a casual reference to the patience of the American taxpayer, it does put a little starch into our suggestions. Nor does even this bashful effort to enforce our will always go down very smoothly.

"Some of the stuff I find on my desk in the morning," the head of one European government told me recently, "is so touchy, if the Communists ever got a peek at it, they'd splash it over the front page of every Red paper in Europe." He was referring to official communications—all in the "persuasion" class—addressed to him by the ECA administration in his capital. "Even so," he added, "the Americans are only trying to be helpful, and I oblige, I oblige."

A small example of what ECA can achieve with this technique is the French tax-reform measure which, with United States blessing, went into effect on January 1, 1949. Europe's archaic tax laws, Americans argue, are among the worst stumbling blocks to recovery. Roughly, Marshall-plan Europe can be divided into two parts—countries such as Britain, Holland, and Germany, where the tax collector gets his due; and countries such as France and Italy, where, for many years past, only fools have paid up. Rare indeed is the French or Italian businessmen who doesn't keep two sets of books.

Finding only poor men at home wherever it dropped in to collect, the French Government has long been trying to get its money by making manufacturers pay heavy taxes on the value of their production, and shopkeepers on their sales. It wasn't democratic—burdening the poor consumer with an enormous hidden tax bill included in the high price of things—but it left fewer loopholes. Even today, after the American-induced reform, a mere 15 percent of France's total tax income represents direct, or income, taxes—as against 75 percent in the United States. Nevertheless, a beginning has been made, and ECA men hope that little by little the burden will shift to the rich, and the easygoing Latins will move toward an American-type income tax. At this moment, tax collectors both here and in Italy are showing a new eagerness in making people render unto Caesar. "They don't put us into jail yet," an Italian businessmen told me, "but several people I know have been fined for doctoring their books."

Just how long this new eagerness will last is hard to say—"As long as the Americans stand over us," according to the cynics, who may be right. For, to make their decrees effective, those well-meaning governments would have to change the moral code of the rich man who finds nothing wrong with cheating society if he can get away with it. They'd have to give a new dignity to their civil servants—ragged, underfed, overworked men and women, drudging away in shabby, poorly lit, evil-smelling offices, living in crowded tenements without comforts, and not always above yielding to the temptation of a bribe.

"Double their pay," Americans urge.

"We know we ought to," say the French, "but it would wreck our budget."

It is a tall order, this second Marshall plan. Far from merely administering aid to Europe, far from helping her to help herself, our planners are now frankly sponsoring a complete transformation of her social and economic structure. In going beyond the original purpose of ERP, they're off on flights of fancy. What we want the 270,000,000 people of western Europe to do is

only this: Scrap a large part of their industries and find some new use for the equipment and labor employed in them; develop managerial attitudes and working habits now prevalent in the United States, though foreign to the established way of European thinking; open their hearts to a new social consciousness and adapt their tax laws to that new mentality. Above all, give their old differences, even to the point of giving up a portion of their sovereignty, and become one great, homogeneous body where factories produce for one vast market, where people, goods, and money move freely back and forth.

Few individuals of the Old World, confronted with this grandiose concept, will deny that it has the earmarks of progress. Still, few are ready for it. Like the steel worker who believes that his hand file and stone are superior to the machine-mounted file that keeps going at a crazy pace, Europeans are attached to a way of life their fathers taught them. "You want us to eat, sleep, work, and die like Americans," one angry Frenchman said. He, and many with him, will resist to the last a process of Americanization which would have western Europe more efficient, more industrious, more advanced, more comfortable, and no longer herself.

What, then, is the answer? Shoot a few French winegrowers? Place commissars in factories? Purge the saboteurs of European unity? Haul Sir Stafford Cripps before a people's court for anti-integrationism? Brute force might work, for a while. Napoleon tried it; Hitler tried it; and Stalin is trying it, not wholly unsuccessfully, in eastern Europe. But it isn't the kind of world we want, and our overenthusiastic planners would be the first to throw up their hands in horror at such a prospect.

Why not stick to our original plan—the first and only Marshall plan? Its clearly stated purpose was a 4-year program of blood transfusions to enable the patient to be up and about by 1952. Looking at the results of this thoroughly realistic, and definitely limited project at the halfway mark, one finds no cause for despair. Western Europe has come a long way already, and there is good reason to believe that at the end of ERP 2 years from now, she'll have progressed to the point where a moderate influx of private United States capital can prevent a relapse. If we leave behind smoking chimneys, busy piers and markets, and governments freely chosen by their people, we'll have done what we set out to do. And we will, in the process, have created the climate for the kind of long-range planning Europe needs.

But this kind of planning can be done only by the Europeans themselves. If the people of this ancient continent have to change their way of life, they'll do the changing on their own hook. With a general rise in standards, and the higher development of the human personality that goes with it, they'll get around to working out their own salvation. No prompting will be required. It won't be tomorrow, and it won't be by 1952, but it's a pretty safe bet that, eventually, their own instinct will guide them toward some sort of unity—Mr. Hoffman's target for tonight. The result of their efforts won't be an Americanized Europe, nor indeed a Soviet Europe, but a Europe in which 270,000,000 proud and surprisingly hardy human beings will somehow make out. Given being anybody's apes or satellites, they'll be our cheerful partners, building with us a safe and prosperous Western World under the aegis of the Atlantic Pact. Rather than persuade them to pull up their socks would it not be wiser to limit ourselves to the first-aid job and let the Europeans take care of the rest—in their own time?

Father Hubbard's Opposition to Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on page A1835 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there appears an insertion of an editorial from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer and also an article quoted from the Los Angeles Examiner. These insertions were made by the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and were undoubtedly based on what appeared to him to be reliable information. However, when the Reverend Bernard Hubbard, S. J., famed "glacier priest," heard of this insertion, he made another statement, which shows him to be definitely against statehood for Alaska at this time, and I have been requested to have his statement, appearing in the March 30 issue of the Seattle Times, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. His statement is therefore submitted herewith.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FATHER HUBBARD STILL OPPOSES ALASKA STATE

The Reverend Bernard Hubbard, S.J., famed glacier priest of Alaska, sent word from Los Angeles to the Times today that he was misquoted in an article read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 10, and which represented him as favoring Alaska statehood.

The article appeared first in a Los Angeles newspaper after a representative of the newspaper interviewed Father Hubbard. The article then was inserted in the RECORD.

"A spurious set of quotations," Father Hubbard said today, "gave the reader the impression that I am for Alaskan statehood now, whereas I am absolutely opposed to it now for reasons that I have stated very clearly. This puts me in the position of reversing my opinions, which is entirely misleading to the American public and unfair to me."

LONG TIME AHEAD

"When Alaska is in a position to support itself, and when there are enough people and business interests in the vast stretches of Alaska to support it as a State, then we can intelligently consider statehood, but obviously that is a long time in the future.

"There has been much loose talk by the uninformed and by politicians with axes to grind about private industry's exploitation of Alaska, but the facts are that private enterprise and risk-capital investment have done wonders for the development of the Territory and its resources. It would be economically unwise and unsound to toss private enterprise into the maws of politicians under present conditions, which would work disaster for private enterprise, even if they would prove a bonanza to self-seeking politicians."

The priest said a lot of gullible people have been misled and cannot see the broad picture of economic and national-security dangers which lie behind the glamor of statehood.

ARGUMENTS FALLACIOUS

Father Hubbard added: "Arguments that Alaska statehood would be a move in the interests of national defense are spurious, superficial, and fallacious, as any agent of the Russian Government in his right mind knows in his heart.

"* * * Any change in Alaska's governmental set-up at any time in the foreseeable near future should be in the direction of a military government, rather than the impractical and suicidal direction of statehood."

Tribute to Hon. Frank P. Graham, of North Carolina, by Alfred Mynders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD part of the column of Alfred Mynders, editor of the Chattanooga Times, which appeared in the Times on April 1, paying well-deserved tribute to our colleague, the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM]. I certainly share the high estimate expressed in the column of this eminent and loyal American, and I wish to add that the record of the Senator from North Carolina in the Senate has been outstanding.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEXT TO THE NEWS

(By Alfred Mynders)

"Give me liberty to know, to think, to believe, and to utter freely, according to conscience, above all other liberties."—John Milton.

What is most detestable in the Russian type of Communist state is complete suppression of freedom of opinion. Just how far this country has drifted under the present wave of fear and hysteria toward that type of state may be determined in North Carolina's senatorial primary of May 27.

Senator FRANK P. GRAHAM, former president of the University of North Carolina, is being opposed by Willis Smith, Raleigh corporation lawyer and a former president of the American Bar Association, and former Senator Robert R. Reynolds.

Mr. Smith defines the main issue as "communism and socialism."

Mr. Reynolds slides with Smith on those alleged issues (though neither is a legitimate issue in North Carolina) and "Buncombe Bob" adds a $100-a-month pension for all persons over 65 as a bait for voters.

The real issue is Senator GRAHAM'S career of public service in which he has tried to work for all the people.

By inuendo or by direct charge, Mr. GRAHAM'S opponents are trying to defeat him by linking him with Communists. This campaign has gone so far that Senator GRAHAM last week issued the following clear and unequivocal statement:

"I am opposed to communism: I am opposed to socialism. I am devoted to the American system of free enterprise for all the people.

"I have always fought, and will continue to fight, fascism, communism, nazism, and every other form of totalitarianism.

"I am, and always have been, a loyal Democrat. In fact, I might add that I have never scratched a Democratic ticket in my life.

"The basic assumption behind Nazi and Communist propaganda tricks is that if a falsehood is big enough and is repeated often enough, some people will start to believe it. Tonight I want to answer a falsehood that has been repeated over and over again about me.

"I have never been, am not now, and never will be a Communist or a Socialist, or a member or supporter of any organization known or suspected by me of being controlled by Communists or Socialists.

"I was never a member of any committee after it was placed on the Attorney General's list as a front organization. I recall having resigned from a committee several years before it was placed on the Attorney General's list."

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, addressing young Democrats in Senator GRAHAM'S home State, at Asheville, recently, said:

"The meanest man who walks the earth is the man who goes out and spreads unjustified fears and fills the people full of unhappiness and discontent and distrust."

But that type of Communist-Fascist technique has gone very far in every State in this country.

North Carolina will have a chance to halt that trend toward a totalitarian state in the May 27 primary. Mr. W. L. Lawrence, of the New York Times, has been making a survey of the political campaign in North Carolina and he says that there seems general agreement among observers at this point that Senator GRAHAM is out in front, with Mr. Smith running second and former Senator Reynolds trailing.

"Money Makes the Mare Go"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SANBORN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly evident that the pseudo economists who diagnosed our economic ills 16 years ago and tempted us to abandon sound redeemable currency for fiat money under the so-called system of managed currency were in the same class as the quack doctor who, having made a wrong diagnosis of his patient's illness, dopes him with every nostrum on the drugstore shelves.

During these 16 years of socialistic experimentation, the dollar and all fixed-dollar-value securities, including savings, pensions, and life insurance, have lost 63 percent of their value; we are burdened with a $255,000,000,000 debt; faced with a $5,000,000,000 deficit, and threatened with another world war.

Three years ago a 250-page committee report entitled "Money Makes the Mare Go" was printed by the Government Printing Office for the use of the House Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, which, in my opinion, correctly diagnosed our economic ills and offered a practical remedy that can be applied in a matter of a few months without cost to the American taxpayers and without economic disturbances of any kind.

It also offers a practical solution of the perplexing farm problem in a way that will stabilize and maintain farm prices and at the same time relieve the taxpayers of paying billions of dollars in farm subsidies. This book received national and international acclaim, and as a consequence the limited supply was soon exhausted, and thousands of requests for copies have been denied.

There are now pending before the House of Representatives five concurrent resolutions for the printing of additional copies to supply this demand, which can be distributed by the Congress or sold by the Government Printing Office at a price approximating the cost of printing—about 20 cents per copy.

I sincerely trust that, in this time of national emergency, the Congress will authorize the printing of this report which tells simply and effectively, in language anyone can understand, how to prevent wars and depressions and eliminate most of the social and economic ills that afflict our country and the world today. Appended are a few of the comments received by the author:

TELEGRAM FROM THE HONORABLE JESSIE SUMNER, OF ILLINOIS, BRILLIANT FORMER MEMBER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MILFORD, ILL., *November 14, 1947.*

JOHN MCBRIDE,
Clerk of Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures,
House of Representatives:

Your report is terrific. Congratulations.

JESSIE SUMNER.

LETTER FROM J. T. CULHANE, PRESIDENT, MINNEAPOLIS GRAIN EXCHANGE

MINNEAPOLIS GRAIN EXCHANGE,
Minneapolis, Minn., November 14, 1947.

Mr. JOHN MCBRIDE,
Clerk, Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCBRIDE: Thanks exceedingly for your fine letter of November 6 and for your kindness in sending me a copy of the report entitled "Money Makes the Mare Go." This was both interesting and heartening, and I am reading it in its entirety. It is my intention, also, to pass the booklet along to other officers and directors of this exchange.

Needless to say, I personally agree with the very practical solution of our present difficulties, as outlined in your letter and in the report.

Sincerely yours,

J. T. CULHANE, *President.*

LETTER FROM FRANCIS H. BROWNELL, CHAIRMAN OF FINANCE COMMITTEE, AMERICAN SMELTING & REFINING CO., 120 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

AMERICAN SMELTING & REFINING CO.,
New York, N. Y., November 14, 1947.

JOHN MCBRIDE, Esquire,
Clerk, Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCBRIDE: Thank you very much for sending me Money Makes the Mare Go, which I have read with much interest.

The pamphlet is scholarly, logical, and lucid. Even if the reader cannot agree with all the conclusions, he will at least have his thought greatly stimulated by such an excellent presentation.

I quite agree that Europe (and I might add Asia and Latin America) needs stabilization of currencies more than it needs our dollars. Perhaps most Americans will agree that requisite food to carry the western nations of Europe over the winter is preeminently necessary. Beyond that, it seems to me stabilization of currencies should be agreed upon before any large expenditure is made on any other theory. Without stabilization, resumption of multilateral trade under a free-enterprise system seems to be impossible. Unfortunately, the subject of currencies and of money is one that is little understood by the people at large and so has not the popular appeal embraced in the thought of "reconstruction." Nonetheless, it is the time when this subject should be given increasing thought and final action taken. Whether the United States should at once proceed alone, I seriously question. But I do believe that any reconstruction approach will ultimately break down unless the currency situation is at least contemporaneously settled.

Thank you for your expression of appreciation of articles written by me. I do not know whether you have seen copy of my Brief on Silver as Money, which I presented before the Board of Governors of the International Monetary Fund early this year, and of which I enclose a copy.

Sincerely yours,

F. H. BROWNELL.

LETTER BY THE REVEREND HENRY F. WOLFE, OF CHARLESTON, S. C., WHICH WAS CARRIED AS AN EDITORIAL IN THE CHARLESTON NEWS AND COURIER

SOUND MONEY; A CURE ON WAR

If it were possible to make a book on money a best seller so that everybody would be reading it and discussing it, wars and depressions would be eliminated. All wars are economic. All depressions are the result of unsound economic and monetary policies.

Until the administration repeals the Bretton Woods Monetary Agreement, the Reciprocal Trade Act, and Public Law 84, all talk of stopping inflation will be so much eyewash. Public Law 84, enacted in 1945, depreciated the dollar 37½ percent, caused commodity prices to advance 60 percent, and is responsible for the vicious inflation and the resultant demand for higher wages.

It is a well-planned fifth column in our country that has blamed the free-enterprise system for our depression when it is the Government that is to blame.

High prices at home, economic chaos abroad, and threats of world war III can be attributed largely to the fact that we have permitted knaves and fools to so debauch our currency that in the short period of 13 years our dollar and all fixed-dollar-value securities have lost 63 percent of their value.

The world needs stabilization of currencies more than it needs our dollars. Sound money is the first requisite for peace and economic recovery. The United States alone has the power to give that stability by adopting a sound monetary system. This can be put into operation in 90 days and will cost us nothing.

Karl Marx said, and Lenin demonstrated, that the surest way to overturn the social order is to debauch the currency. It can be done in such a way that not one out of a million will see it.

It requires $2.71 to buy what could be bought for $1 prior to 1934. Your $10,000 life-insurance policy has a value equivalent to $3,687.50 prior to 1934. Your $50-per-month pension has a purchasing power equivalent to $18.43¾ prior to 1934. A $10 daily wage of today has a purchasing power equivalent to $3.68¾ prior to 1934.

Where have I gathered this information? From a book that could become a best seller, if our congressional leaders in Washington would appropriate moneys to put this book into the hands of every honest-to-God American. Inflation, depression, and world war III would disappear overnight. Russia, the

greatest hoax in all history, would be at an end. Russia knows her only "out" is to keep the United States busy with Europe so she can overrun Asia and seize the rich rubber, tin, and oil resources of Asia and the Middle East.

The name of this book is Money Makes the Mare Go, by John McBride, clerk of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, printed for the use of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, House of Representatives, United States Government Printing Office, just off the press.

When you write for this book you may be told only 1,000 copies were printed.

But you cut this letter out and send it to your congressional leader and ask him if he will not do all he can to get a printing as you can have a copy. After you read it you will be a red-hot American and you will do your best to get your congressional leaders to get this book published and placed in the hands of all Americans.

REV. HENRY F. WOLFE,
Sacred Heart Parish.

CHARLESTON, S. C.

Fifteen Years of Farm Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on February 17, 1950, Chester D. Davis, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis delivered an address, entitled "What We Have Learned in Fifteen Years of Farm Programs," before the Twelfth Annual National Farm Institute in Des Moines, Iowa. In view of the fact that the importance of the address was overshadowed by speeches in connection with the controversy between Secretary Brannan and Mr. Allen Kline, Mr. Davis' address did not receive the attention it so thoroughly deserves. For this reason, and because the over-all significance of Mr. Davis' address commends itself to the attention of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED IN 15 YEARS OF FARM PROGRAMS

The over-all theme of this institute—"What Price Plenty?"—is an inspiring one, but before getting on with my part in it, let me record serious misgivings as to my particular subject. For I'm not sure that we've learned anything from 15 years of farm programs. It seems to me there is much evidence to the contrary, but I hasten to acknowledge that lack of close familiarity with some of the programs of recent years, and perhaps the growth of elderly caution, may raise question as to the validity of my opinions.

The first task is to define terms. The program committee obviously wanted to open the institute with a review of the attempts that have been made since 1933 to relieve farm distress, support farm prices and income, and assist agriculture to make adjustments required by changing conditions at home and abroad. But that is only part of the story. In other areas than this, agriculture has learned a great deal in the last 15 years. Then, too, it is impossible to consider farm programs by themselves, the way you might fence off and cultivate a field. All of our interests are interwoven, in a tight, complicated, fast-moving economy. In the long run, conditions under which farmers raise and market their crops may be more seriously affected by developments entirely outside of agriculture than by what happens in their own field.

In the 1940 Yearbook of Agriculture I attempted to trace the development of agricultural policy since World War I, and took 30 pages for it. There is neither time nor reason for attempting it here. That chapter closed with the observation that if experience in this field teaches us anything of value, it is that a continuous thread runs through the evolution of an agricultural policy notwithstanding the manifest inconsistencies and contradictions that appear in it. Perhaps that is true, though I am less sure of it today. Some of the current farm programs and commitments, and particularly some of the proposals for tomorrow, leave me in the fix of the young Scandinavian who, becoming rich, commissioned a famous painter to do a portrait of his deceased father, with nothing to go on but the young man's description. At the unveiling, the son looked at the portrait from this side and that, and finally said, "Yes; that's him. That's the old geezer, all right. But, my goodness, how he's changed."

From the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 to now emphasis has steadily shifted from adjustment to price-fixing by law. I think that is leading us down the wrong track.

The major programs of the early AAA were set up to be self-financing. Throughout the twenties and early thirties, farm organizations, particularly of the North and West, insisted on that. Since 1936 the shift, of course, has been toward more and larger appropriations from the Treasury, a part of growing fiscal irresponsibility I am going to talk about later.

We have lost ground in cohesion among farm forces in planning and administering the farm programs compared with the situation we had throughout most of the thirties. Perhaps a certain amount of splitting up in opposing schools of thought was inevitable, but I am sure that most of us who have worked in agriculture in the past hate to see it.

There is no truth-divining rod or universally accepted standard that can be laid across programs of today or proposals for the future to determine with finality which features square with the lessons of experience, which do not. It is rather a matter of opinion and judgment and I can express only my own, not that of any group or organization.

This is not a suitable forum for splitting hairs or fussing over details, nor for a play-by-play recital of developments that are now history. What I aim to do before giving way to the heavy artillery—or should I say the gladiators—who are on this institute program, is to make some general observations, first about specific features of our farm programs, and finally about the pattern of public policy that appears to be emerging in this country, of which projected farm programs seem to be a part.

In the first category are the overemphasis and the increasing reliance on government price supports in postwar farm legislation. We should have learned by now that the bare enactment of a law doesn't make price supports effective at the prescribed level. The prices have to be worked out by shirt-sleeve operations on the farm, in the warehouse, or in the market place. For storable commodities there is a honeymoon period while government stocks are being built up by purchases or nonrecourse loans, until the load approaches its limits. After that, prices have to adjust in one way or another to the level at which the commodity will be consumed, unless war or some other catastrophe comes along to bail us out.

We cannot expect to adjust from one let alone two wars of world-wide scope and incalculable destructiveness without paying some penalties. Government price supports and high-level Government loans can help cushion the shock, but they cannot and should not be expected to avert the adjustments that need to be made. We are living in a fool's paradise if we think otherwise. A system of rigid, legislated price supports extended indefinitely into the future, and at levels higher than the over-all supply-demand situation will support, will have extremely undesirable consequences, including a great deal of harm to farmers themselves. There is a place, particularly through the transition period from which we have by no means emerged, for reasonable price supports, free from legislated requirements that prevent intelligent administration. But we cannot expect to ride them painlessly over the rough roads that still have to be traveled. Supports at wartime levels will lead in the all-too-soon future to tight acreage control, impossible-to-manage farm surpluses, and eventual price collapse. It does no good to lull us to sleep in 1950 if in so doing you insure we will have something worse than a headache when we wake up in 1953 or 1953 or 1954.

Next, I have the feeling that current programs of high price and income supports tend to freeze production patterns, to de-emphasize adjustment as a goal of agricultural policy. One of the most important long-range factors at work on the farmer's side is the spectacular increase in our population at a rate that has made expert population forecasts of a few years back look as foolish as the election forecasts of October 1948 look now. By midsummer this year we will have doubled the Nation's population in 50 years—from 76,000,000 in 1900 to 152,000,000. We may be coming in sight of the time when rising living standards combined with population growth will put pressure on our ability to expand and maintain the needed production of milk and meat. I believe present farm programs fall short in encouragement to shifts that need to be made in land use to fit the demand pattern of tomorrow.

Now a word about our export commodities. As I look out at the world picture and the longer-range farm situation, I see many signs which remind me of the twenties and the thirties. I catch myself saying, "I've seen that; here's where we came in." In the twenties we faced real troubles with our major commodities when the United States stopped lending abroad to finance our exports and when our foreign customers ran out of dollars. The first war changed us from a debtor to a creditor nation, and before we had adjusted our thinking and our ways we entered the Second World War, which immeasurably accentuated the change. Adjustments are still ahead of us and they will be particularly severe in the wheat and cotton areas. They will face us as soon as we quit sending out the dollars with which to pay for our exports. Our postwar farm programs do not recognize that fact, right down to and including the Agricultural Act of 1949.

We have unquestionably gained ground in techniques of production, in increased use of capital per worker in the form of more efficient machines, better plant and animal strains, fertilization, etc. We have also made distinct progress in dissemination of know-how in use of land and water to conserve the soil and increase and safeguard its future productivity. Even here a lot of effectiveness is lost through interagency duplication, friction, and even downright conflict. The farmers have a right to better cooperation

than that among the agencies created to serve them. And notwithstanding the growth of technical understanding in this field, the pressure of wartime prices has led wide areas to disregard the warnings of the past, and so set the stage for the dust bowls of the future.

One of the bright sides of the farm picture is the prudent way farmers throughout the forties managed their wartime and postwar income. On the whole, they chose to reduce debt, rather than increase it as happened in the First World War. Public and private farm-credit agencies helped. But the lessons of the last 15 years teach us the need of some new techniques in farm credit, particularly to help finance long-term programs of farm improvements for better land use and conservation. Traditional short-term production loans won't do the job that needs to be done on a big scale throughout the United States.

A glance at your program for tomorrow will tell you why I do not discuss in greater detail the changes in our agricultural legislation advocated by the Secretary of Agriculture. It will be the subject of thorough debate then, but perhaps one or two observations are in order here to give you the direction of my thinking.

I do not agree with the idea that the Government can or should guarantee price supports fixed at a level that will yield farmers in the aggregate a cash income from marketings equal in purchasing power to the average cash income from marketings in the decade 1938-48, and year by year thereafter maintain a level equal to the average of the first 10 of the preceding 12 years. It just can't be done, and that promise along with the implied promise of low-priced food for consumers is the fundamental weakness in the Brannan plan.

I didn't like the idea of general food subsidies during the war, and I like them less now. There's no good reason why nonagricultural workers can't and shouldn't produce enough goods and services to pay for agriculture's production without help from the Treasury. Action to improve the diet of low-income families is quite another thing. That may be good national policy, but it isn't a farm program and shouldn't be called one. School lunches are social programs, not farm programs, and so in fact was the food-stamp plan.

But on the other hand, the device of carrying out Government price guaranties under certain conditions by the use of supplemental payments makes sense to me, if they are geared to moderate, attainable goals, and used with great restraint. If we are going to continue price supports on perishable commodities like potatoes and eggs, there isn't any other socially acceptable way to make them effective. As a matter of fact, supplemental payments were used with cotton in 1955 when the only alternative was a price-fixing loan at or above the market. I think it worked rather well; exports picked up, and the crop moved into consumption. The loudest complaints came from interests that were "long" in the cotton market.

I feel compelled to qualify that approval with a sober warning—don't let anyone tell you there is magic in this device by which to insure high wartime income to farmers on the one hand and cheap food to consumers on the other. The idea may have political sex appeal, but it won't work that well.

Now I want to comment on something I have observed through the years which, if understood, would surprise a lot of people in the cities. The most far-reaching and in an economic sense the most dangerously ambitious legislative proposals for agriculture are not those advanced by responsible farmers or farm organizations but by men who are honestly—and understandably—interested in farm votes. A well-meaning committee chairman may put the farm leaders on the spot by pushing a bill that promises the unattainable, but a farm leader frequently risks his official life if he opposes it. We must look with sympathy on the fix of the Congressmen who are up for election every other year. If given a choice, they tend to vote for the bill which on the face of it promises the highest support price in their part of the country. The Senators are a little better off. Their election comes every 6 years. The easy way out may seem to be merely to extend the wartime guaranties year by year, but sooner or later it will lead us out over our heads.

Before I drop the subject of price supports, I'll stick my head up over the breastworks to be shot at. I am convinced that if we had followed the lessons of the last 15 years—let's make it 25 years—we would have stuck to the long-range provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1948. It impressed me as an attempt to apply experience to present-day problems. No doubt changes were needed, but in the main those long-range provisions would have relieved the Government of the impossible task of maintaining wartime prices in the face of mounting surpluses. They would have introduced administrative flexibility where rigidities still prevail.

Now that I have probably succeeded in ruffling some feelings on the subject of price support and agricultural adjustment, I should like to turn for the rest of my talk to the pattern of public policy we seem to be following in this country, which is more important to agriculture, in the long run, than the shorter-range questions I have touched on.

I mean the growing dependence on Government for direction and aid, and its twin, fiscal irresponsibility inside and outside of Government. Fiscal year 1949 was one of high income and employment and it closed with $1,800,000,000 deficit. The Government estimates $5,500,000,000 deficit this year and $5,100,000,000 for fiscal 1951 with continuation of high-level economic activity assumed. We are nearing the time when billions in savings bonds will mature, with no assurance that holders will reinvest their savings in Government bonds. I doubt if they will if they once get the idea that creeping inflation, continued whittling away of the dollar's buying power, are ahead of us. If the public doesn't take the bonds, the alternative will be more deficit financing at banks, more money not matched by production.

Thinking perhaps I might have a distorted view of the postwar drift, I wrote a friend and told him I was considering starting my talk here today on the question, "What we have learned," with the answer: "Nothing," and then proceed with qualifications and explanations much as I have done. You all know the man—he has held positions of high responsibility in Nation and State, for years in the Department of Agriculture. He replied the other day, and this is what he said in part:

"The only amendment I would make to your answer to the question 'What we have learned in 15 years of farm programs' is that I would say 'less than nothing.' In the current year agricultural prices are still averaging about parity, yet the appropriations proposed for agriculture are $3,500,000,000, plus additional borrowing authority. This is fantastic. We are, I fear, on the verge of losing all the values we have been working for, and the greatest single threat is a loose or reckless fiscal policy."

That is the background for a solemn warning. It will be nothing less than national disaster if the farmers join other groups who are saying in effect: "We can have prosperity, regardless of anything else, if the Government will back us and put up the money." It will also be a disaster if the full weight of farm opinion is not clearly and continuously used to promote policies by labor and industry that will yield the highest sustainable level of nonagricultural production.

Farmers in the main have done a better job than others in keeping on producing at capacity through bad times as well as good. The problem is how to get the others to march along with agriculture in full production. It is the only way the economy can be made to function at a high level. We need adjustments in agriculture, yes, but it will be a bad day for the farmers and for the Nation when we accept the philosophy that nonagricultural industry and labor can't or shouldn't be expected to produce enough to pay for the production of the farms without Treasury help.

Let me elaborate on that a little. Since 1920 the goal of developing agricultural policy has been expressed as the principle of parity of prices or of income for farmers as they exchange their products for the goods and services of nonagricultural industry and labor. Parity does not mean a fixed-price level; it relates rather to the purchasing power or exchange value of the products of one group when traded for the products or the labor of another group. The price level is very important to a farmer who is in debt, but in every other sense the most important consideration is not the dollar price of a product, but what it will bring when exchanged for other goods and services.

If then we think of all the farmers as one trading group, and all the rest of the economy as another trading group, there are two ways to hold the exchange value of the farm output high, or to increase it. One way would be to cut down the volume of farm production. The other way would be to increase the quantity of goods and services produced by the nonagricultural group. I favor the second way as being the better for the Nation, better for the farmers, and better for the world.

My answer to the question, "What price plenty?" would be this: Let the nonagricultural industries and labor find the way to keep working at full efficiency and capacity, turning out goods and services that can be absorbed by this country in a high standard of living—in better homes, equipment, electrification, refrigeration, sanitation, clothing, ad infinitum. With steady work and efficient production, prices could go down without cutting profits or wages. Real wages would rise, for the laborer is like the farmer—it isn't the number of dollars but what he can buy with his products or his labor that counts.

Under such conditions, the farmer could produce abundantly and still trade on good terms for what the other man makes; he could prosper at lower price levels. I think that really is the way out. The relation of agriculture to the rest of the economy is changing radically and further radical adjustments are ahead of us. When Lewis and Clark skirted the western border of Iowa, about 90 percent of the population of the then United States lived on farms, and those farms produced only enough surplus to feed the 10 percent who lived in town. At the peak of war production in 1943 and 1944, 15 percent of the Nation's labor force produced the all-time record crops which fed and clothed this Nation and its own and allied vast war machines. Not much more than one-fifth of our total population actually lives and works on the farms, although the percentage directly dependent on farming is much greater than that.

So you see that with so few producing so much to feed so many, the ability of the cities and towns to pay for and consume our farm products is an all-important consideration to the farmers. That ability in turn rests on the rate at which towns and cities, the mines and factories, keep busy and produce.

In view of the importance to the farmer of employment and production off the farms, what is the situation and what is the outlook today? I think the elements are present to support a high level of business activity for some time to come, if we can only overcome two great big "ifs" that confront us in industry-labor behavior.

We can keep going:

1. If labor leaders will make their followers realize that in the long run, higher wages depend on increased production. Without it, the wage increases are not real, and

2. If management will deliver lower prices as volume grows, and will share fairly with labor and consumer the benefits of increased productivity.

These are stubborn "ifs," but they are very important. Perhaps you say there isn't much agriculture can do about these things. Perhaps you think this kind of talk doesn't fit a farm institute. But I tell you these issues are fundamental to farm welfare. Many farm and business and labor leaders have seen clearly the policy we must follow if our economy is to function. Teamwork in attaining and holding a high level of production is necessary if we are to develop the full economic life required of this Nation.

The annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation in New Orleans in 1950 was devoted to this theme. It needs to be sounded "again and again and again." The forces of those who seem to believe we can make ourselves richer by producing less, with Government direction substituted for individual initiative, are numerous enough and loud enough without recruiting from the farms.

Now in conclusion: Along with many of you I have watched the full cycle of agricultural policy unfold since the First World War. Many mistakes have been made, but, on the other hand, many great miracles have been performed. We have demonstrated as a people that we can accomplish the impossible under the grim discipline of war, and I have full faith that, unless international anarchy prevents us, we will demonstrate the same capacity less spectacularly but no less surely in peace. There is no magic formula by which farmers can be insured prosperity as a class apart from others, but there are ways to achieve plenty with which to provide better living standards for all.

Full achievement in line with our capacities is impossible without farsighted, tolerant, and good-natured cooperation, founded on mutual understanding among leaders of agriculture, labor, industry, and government. This great national forum can contribute to that understanding, and I am proud to have a part in it.

Tribute to Judge Burnita Shelton Matthews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me in tribute to Judge Burnita Shelton Matthews, who has just been appointed a judge on the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the first woman to be so honored.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE BURNITA SHELTON MATTHEWS BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER

The naming of Burnita Shelton Matthews as the first woman in the United States to sit on a Federal district court was a fitting tribute to a woman who has dedicated herself to the advancement of women.

During the years of Burnita Matthews' professional life, women have gone ahead more rapidly than in any other similar period in history. They have won the right to vote over what seemed to be unsurmountable obstacles; they have had passed laws, too numerous to mention, by the Congress of the United States and the legislative bodies in the several States. Some of these laws have corrected wage differences, some have given women jury duty, some have removed discrimination between the sexes in such matters as property rights and guardianship matters.

Much of this unprecedented progress in the advancement of women is directly attributable to the brilliant leadership of Mrs. Matthews, who has given untiringly of her time, energy, and talents.

Many women have been appointed to high offices in the recent past, all of whom have been outstanding in their fields, but none of them is better qualified by temperament, ability, or integrity than Burnita Shelton Matthews.

Her past record stands and speaks for itself. Her future record will surpass it, for she is and will continue to be an outstanding credit to the women, the legal profession, and the judiciary of the United States.

The $300,000,000,000 "Hickonomy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point an article by Robert R. Young which appeared in the March 1950 issue of Railway PROGRESS:

THE $300,000,000,000 "HICKONOMY"—TO ACHIEVE IT WE ARE BEGGARING OUR WHITE-COLLAR CLASS

(By Robert R. Young)

The increase in the standard of living under the New Deal is well illustrated by the decrease in the size of the houses. There is hardly anything one buys, today, that isn't a little shoddier. On top of it we have been made a nation of bookkeepers. By the year 2000, if the trend continues, there promises to be no other occupation left. It will all be as productive and as exhaustive as a game of canasta.

What good is a constantly rising level of wages if the hardware keeps getting tinnier, the beef dearer, and the net after taxes smaller? We are not such hicks as to sell even so cheap a thing as our vote for stage money.

Indeed, nothing could be more destructive of production than spiraling prices, for they destroy the incentive to save which is the source of all production—of Mr. Truman's much longed-for "business investment." And remember, the creditors, whom rising prices de-welfare, are not Mr. Morgan and Mr. Mellon, but the dependent and aged, the owners of savings accounts, insurance policies, and pension funds.

THE DELUSION

Rising wages and prices for a time may delude the worker or farmer into misplacing his vote and his trust, may temporarily make easier the servicing of the national debt, but like dope they are the resource of exploiters of human misery or the escape of weaklings and fools. To expect the system of private capital to meet frequent and radical wage and price changes and maintain previously existing employment is to expect the impossible. Stability of employment can only come through stability in prices. Nowhere is that better illustrated than by the railway passenger equipment industry. It withstood the subsidized competition of the bus and the airplane for several decades, but under the gaff of successive and drastic rounds of wage increases it folded up. Only two of our 132 class I railroads ordered any new passenger cars whatever in all of last year, although virtually the Nation's entire 28,000-car fleet is worn out or obsolete. These 28,000 cars were called upon to deliver as many passenger miles in 1949 as our much newer 45,000-car fleet delivered in 1926. In that year 1,500 cars were ordered, in 1949 only 85. In 10 of the past 12 months no new orders were placed by any railroad.

OTHER BUSINESSES

There are countless other businesses which will find it impossible to raise their revenues fast enough to meet these cost increases, hence, once wartime savings are gone, must fall by the wayside to add to the growing burden of unemployment relief. The white-collar class, representing a large part of our population, bears the brunt of this system of election bribery or pressure-group blackmail, however you wish to label it. It is ironical that the poor grandmother of the fairy tale, the school teachers and public employees, almost solidly liberal, are the very ones the wolf is eating up first. Their income since 1939 has increased even less than the 50-percent increase of the white-collar class, whereas we all must pay 100 percent more for food and 90 percent more for clothing, to say nothing of taxes. It is only with the help of such items as transportation, utilities, and shelter, where time lag, the confiscation of rate and rent control, and the waste of subsidy have temporarily concealed the true cost, that even the skilled laborer has held his own in terms of overall purchasing power, in spite of management's and labor's vast contribution to increased productivity.

In all the history of the world has there ever before been an "idle-ology" such as ours, in which the lazy man is encouraged by pay not to work? Indeed, it is being discovered that in many cases the more enterprising have been paid simultaneously for working and for not working. Is there any wonder that the burden of relief continues to increase even in cities that suffer from shortages of workers, that this decade promises to show nothing like the increase in the standard of living enjoyed by the decade of those liberal laughingstocks Harding and Coolidge, when taxes were reduced, prices gently eased off and Washington was just a pleasant place to go sightseeing? Employment and the standard of living are reduced, not increased, when Congress interposes its cancerous bureaus to give something for nothing, whether it is medicine, housing, the transportation of mail, highway usage, or a day's pay. With welfare, like water, the way to conserve it is to stop giving it away.

RADICAL MEASURES

All of us long for a genuine $300,000,000,000 economy, the hick removed. All of us want that honest-to-goodness $12,000 income and a lot sooner than the year 2000. To attain the "hickonomy," however, there are

certain other radical things being done which a Socialist or a Communist would find too radical to do. He would not, for example, pay bonuses and build storage for produce which the markets will not take when scarcity has driven prices of other produce so high as to cause privation. Yet it is this monstrous albatross which the Brannan plan schemes to fasten permanently about our necks. If this is where laissez faire in electioneering has brought us then, like Wall Street in 1929, Pennsylvania Avenue needs some new rules, our statute books some new crimes.

WASTED LAND

How long can we donate machinery and raw materials to low-wage, long-hour countries and admit their products to our markets duty-free? This, along with easy unemployment relief and the Brannan plan, can quickly make not only a $100,000,000,000 economy out of us but a wasted land.

There are so many radical things a liberal would not do that these strange servants of ours are doing, that grave doubt may be attached by posterity as to their sanity. Yet, there is one thing that runs true to pattern through all these damn foolaries: It is the expediency or the advantage of the moment, not for the electorate but for the elected. In other words, dear child, these grandsires of yours were not such damn fools as they looked. It was only we who were the fools, the weaklings, for taking it lying down—unworthy of our own grandsires.

One thing at least has become clear to me, day by day since 1933: That the New-Deal Democrat is more catholic in his love for mankind. He stands ready at any time to scatter his benefactions world-wide, whereas the Republicans and the conservative Democrat seek to limit them at home.

Judge Rifkind's Resignation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of April 4, 1950, and which, in my opinion, very objectively and fully covers an important phase of our governmental activity. A financially independent judiciary insures a competent and impartial protection of the fundamental personal and property rights of our people.

JUDGE RIFKIND'S RESIGNATION

Judge Simon H. Rifkind has resigned from the Federal district bench because he says that the $15,000 a year which that position pays is insufficient for him to live in a manner fitting the position and at the same time to provide adequately for his family.

When he accepted the appointment, Judge Rifkind thought he was taking a life job. He had budgeted his savings to make this possible but rising living costs and higher taxes knocked that budget into a cocked hat.

Now he says he must return to private law practice and the Federal bench is losing one of its younger and most promising judges.

This is a high price to pay for information regarding a condition which should have been apparent to the budget makers in Washington. They are asking those on the district court bench to sacrifice an impossible amount of monetary reward for the honor and distinction such a post carries.

The salary of a Federal district judge becomes ridiculously low when contrasted with what the State and city pay New York's judiciary. A justice of the State's supreme court or of the county courts in New York City receives $20,000. A judge of the city court gets $20,000.

If the Federal bench is to continue as a goal for aspiring young lawyers, and if it is not to lose more of its able jurists, more adequate pay must be provided. This is especially true when the district to which they may be assigned means living in a high-cost urban area.

A Red Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including an article by Alfred Kohlberg that appeared in China Monthly several years ago. Members who are interested in the China affair should read it.

A RED DREAM

(By Alfred Kohlberg)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In January 1945, one month before Yalta, Alfred Kohlberg wrote down the following dream. On March 28, 1945, having Earl Browder as his guest at luncheon, he mentioned the dream, and that afternoon sent him a copy. On April 5, 1945, he mailed a copy to each Member of the House and Senate. While the course of events for the past 2 years has not in detail followed the pattern of the dream, the similarities to date are so striking that we believe it well worth publishing as food for thought.)

January 15, 1945, I dreamt that I was in Moscow and saw Joseph Stalin in a newspaper kiosk in the middle of the sidewalk selling pamphlets. I stood in line and bought one. It read as follows:

"MY DREAM OF WORLD HISTORY: 1945–1975

"(By Earl Browder)

"The year 1945 opened with the final stages of World War II plainly visible. The vile Nazi-Fascist conspiracy to enslave the world was being demolished on the battlefields of eastern Europe. The indomitable Peoples Army of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics having freed the holy soil of the Socialist fatherland of the Hitlerite invaders had already brought the democratic blessings of communism to the victims and satellites of the Fascists in the Balkans and eastern Europe. Throughout all eastern Europe the Socialist revolution was proceeding with the liquidation of all 'traitors to the people' and establishment of democratic dictatorships of the proletariat under the leadership of the brave Communist leaders who had come to the fore after the dastardly attack by the Hitlerite criminals on the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941. As stated by the noted non-Communist historian of the day, Edgar Snow, these 'traitors to the people' in all the liberated countries of Europe, as well as the defeated enemy nations, comprised all the large landowners, all large property owners, all officials of former governments, and all who would not cooperate in the new internal reforms of the patriotic Communist administrations.

"The liquidation of these Fascist, reactionary elements in Finland, Poland, the Baltic Soviet Republics, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria cleared the ground for the democratic development of people's governments in all these countries, headed by tried and true Communist leaders of the liberal forces. Many of the reactionaries who were adjudged 'traitors to the people' were leniently treated, being granted, with their families, free transport to the Siberian Soviet Socialist Republic where they were enabled to rehabilitate themselves as useful workers in the forests, mines, and industries.

"Popular elections were held, in which an average of 98.4 percent of the qualified electors voted. Delegates elected in these secret, popular elections then met in each of the capitals of these countries and without exception, in accordance with the Atlantic Charter, self-determined themselves into the Soviet Union. This was in accordance with the principle stated by Foreign Commissar Molotov, October 31, 1939, as follows:

"'We stand for the scrupulous and punctilious observance of pacts on the basis of complete reciprocity and we declare that all nonsense about sovietizing the Baltic countries is only to the interest of our common enemies and of all anti-Soviet provocateurs.'

"As the war against Hitlerite Germany proceeded to its close the Free Germany Committee, originally having headquarters in Moscow, moved to Koenigsberg and was recognized (with altered personnel) by the Soviet Union as the provisional government of the new Germany. In the last stages of the war against Hitlerite Germany, the newly recognized provisional government assisted the great mass of the German people to regain their democratic rights by purging all elements of 'traitors to the people' and installing democratic governments in all areas. Popular elections were held without delay and the newly elected delegates petitioned the Soviet Union to annex the Soviet German Republic as a free, self-governing unit in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"In this period, also, the Czechoslovak Republic repudiated the exile government of the capitalist reactionary Benes and petitioned for admission to the great Soviet Union. Meantime the bankrupt capitalist plutocratic empires of the United States and Britain failed to understand the wishes of the masses of the people in Greece, Italy, France, and Belgium, preferring to recognize the discredited exile reactionary regimes in these countries, where popular uprisings, taking their inspiration from the people's victories in eastern Europe, though not successful, succeeded in securing important positions in coalition regimes.

"By the end of 1945 all organized resistance in Germany and eastern Europe was ended, and there remained only the task of liquidating remaining pro-Fascist, reactionary guerrilla forces in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia. The imperialist, plutocratic, capitalist empires of the United States of America and Britain meantime had not been able to bring their war against Japan to a successful conclusion and appealed to the Soviet Union for aid. In accordance with agreements previously made at Tehran in 1943, when Churchill and Roosevelt appealed to Stalin, the Soviet Union honored its promises and recognized the Chinese Soviet republic, headed by that great patriot, Mao Tse-tung, as the government of free China, disavowing the reactionary, pro-Fascist, pro-Japanese government headed by Chiang Kai-shek.

"The indomitable forces of the Red Army attacked the Japanese Fascist criminals in Manchuria and Korea, releasing this holy Russian soil from the invaders who had foully seized it in 1905. At the same time, Russian

forces advanced 900 miles from the borders of the Mongolian Soviet Republic to the capital of the Chinese Soviet Republic at Yenan, bringing supplies and reinforcements. After the freeing of Manchuria and Korea, people's elections were held and the new Soviet Republics resulting therefrom joined the great Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The invasion of Japan followed with the overthrow of the Mikado and the recognition by the Soviet Union of the Japanese People's Liberation Alliance, headed by the well-known Communist, Sanzuna Okano, as the provisional government of Japan.

"As the Soviet liberators advanced with the Chinese Communist brothers-in-arms south into the Yangtse Valley, reactionary publications in the United States of America, such as the New York Times and other capitalist papers, called on the government to oppose the advance of the Communist liberators beyond the so-called Chinese Durham line of the Yellow River and charged a double cross of China. But the liberal, noncapitalist press, such as the Field newspapers, and the scholarly non-Communist research organizations, such as the Institute of Pacific Relations and the Foreign Policy Association, together with the Communist press, exposed the true character of the National Government of China as reactionary, pro-Fascist, and pro-Japanese. They exposed the false Chinese claim that they had been fighting the Japanese for 8 years. In disabusing the American public of the idea that China was its friend and proving that the true meaning of cooperation was according to Communist demands, many famous non-Communist Chinese experts and scholars were outstanding, particularly Agnes Smedley, Edgar Snow, Theodore White, Mark Gayn, Maxwell Stewart, L. K. Rosinger, T. A. Bisson, and Frederick V. Field. Thus, the American Government insisted that the Chungking Government negotiate directly with Moscow, and the United States of America refused to interfere in the internal affairs of China.

"During the years 1946–49 the Chinese Soviet Republic gradually extended its territories to include all of China and restored order throughout its realms by liquidating all traitors to the people. This liquidation was greatly aided by a popular questionnaire filled out by every Chinese reading:

"'1. Why have you not retreated with the Soviet Army in 1933?

"'2. What employment have you pursued under the Kuomintang?

"'3. What anti-Kuomintang sabotage have you done?

"'4. Name the accomplices.

"'5. Name three collaborators of the Kuomintang.'

"Thus did the Soviet Union bring the blessings of peace and true Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist democracy to the great farmer-worker masses of Europe and Asia, encompassing a population of 1,100,000,000 people.

"At this point one should mention the short-lived new League of Nations, often named Dumbarton Oaks after the now-forgotten hotel where it was first conceived. The charter for this organization was finally signed in 1945, but in the existing years it was often used as a sounding board for unfounded and idiotic complaints by reactionary exiles from member states of the great Soviet Union, falsely calling themselves governments, who sought to cast doubts on the great democratic victories of the Soviet Union. The great democratic movements organized in the United States under Sidney Hillman and other liberals, in England under Harry Pollitt, and in France under Maurice Thorez, did not hesitate, however, to expose these Fascist reactionary complaints.

"During the years after 1945 the great Soviet Union rebuilt the proletarian economy of the vast Eurasian lands, happily united under the people's dictatorship, with special emphasis on weapons of defense against the imperialist British, American, and French empires which looked with envious eyes at the great Socialist gains of the Soviet Union. The death in 1949 of Franklin D. Roosevelt, whose ability to cooperate with Marshal Stalin had brought about so many social and territorial gains for the world proletariat, ended a period of cooperation. Three years later the great democratic Soviet Union heeded the call of the submerged masses of India, crushed under the capitalist, reactionary dominion government headed by the pro-Fascist Nehru, and supplied arms and reinforcements for the Indian People's Liberation Alliance. The Dumbarton Oaks league wrote its own death sentence, when it stupidly passed resolutions of censure against the democratic actions of the Soviet Union in India.

"In the succeeding years other Dominions of the British Empire in southeast Asia followed the lead of India in setting up people's governments and joining the great democratic Soviet Union. In the Near East the former Turkish Republic followed reactionary leadership and sought military alliances with the capitalist empires, much against the wishes of the Turkish proletariat, who appealed to the Soviet Union for aid which was liberally given to establish a workers' Soviet Republic.

"Similar movements in British and French colonies in north Africa were ruthlessly suppressed by the reactionary governments. The patriotic leaders of these movements appealed to their brothers the great democratic classes of the Soviet Union, who could not turn a deaf ear to the call of their brothers in distress. Aid in the form of great air fleets was sent. The reactionary British and French Empires, idiotically chose to regard this as war and called on the Dumbarton Oaks League for sanctions against the great People's Republic of the Soviet Union. Fortunately for the cause of the people's liberation the United States voted against action. In this decision the great liberal movement in the United States took a leading part in explaining to the American masses that no pledges of the Dumbarton Oaks Charter could be perverted to require American boys to fight on foreign soil to maintain the undemocratic empires of Britain and France. As it later turned out the reactionary forces of Great Britain and France were overwhelmed in their homelands before the United States of America could have rearmed and come to their assistance in any case.

"Thus in 1957 the British and French Empires came to an inglorious end, but in their stead, France and Britain became truly democratic free Soviet Republics, no longer misled by such traitors to the people as large landowners, large property owners, former officials, bourgeoisie, and other reactionary intellectuals, all of whom were wiped away.

"After the close of this war which led to the freeing of the great French and British masses from the enslavement of their capitalist masters, freedom movements gained great strength in other countries, particularly in North and South America.

"The American Government, under the control of reactionary isolationists sought to cut itself off from the great movements for liberation all over the world. The freedom movement and the liberal element in the U. S. A. proclaimed that if the U. S. A. would only keep its armament to a minimum, thereby avoiding any threatening action, and liberalize its lands and industries by Government ownership and control, peace, a people's prosperity and great social gains would ensue. Unfortunately the reactionary isolationist government did not follow this far-seeing program. It did reduce armament, thus removing incitement to war, but in 1962, it foolishly attempted by law to prohibit the free assembly of the Communist Political Association and all organizations affiliated with it; and other organizations engaged in building up American-Russian friendship and cultural relations. This reactionary law also canceled free-press privileges of the same organizations and organizations allied thereto. (For several years prior thereto difficulties had arisen between citizens of the Japanese Soviet Republic, enjoying their right of access to the fisheries of Alaska and reactionary American officials seeking to deny this people's right.)

"The Foreign Office of the Soviet Union filed formal diplomatic protests against this law, pointing out that it could not but be regarded as an unfriendly action. The State Department, in its answer, alleged that the Soviet Union did not permit criticism in its press or free assembly by friends of the U. S. A. This specious argument was demolished by the Soviet Foreign Office, which replied that freedom of assembly and freedom of the press were permitted in the Soviet Union and if it so happened that no one in the press or in assembly had anything good to say about the U. S. A. or its Government, that was because the citizens of the Soviet Union had such a superior proletarian Socialist society that they could not be so stupid as not to recognize its merits.

"To this frank and sincere statement the United States returned an obdurate reply. While the Soviet Foreign Office was giving careful consideration, public opinion in the Soviet Union was so wrought up by the plight of their proletarian brothers, enslaved in the capitalist U. S. A., that it was determined by the army that an expedition should be sent to restore their freedom.

"By early summer of 1963 the expedition was ready. It was decided to send the expedition by air. Marshal Nokisblockoff, supreme commander of the Soviet forces, decided not to use any of the later models of Soviet airplanes developed in the plants of the German Soviet Republic, but to keep them as reserves for unforeseen eventualities. While full information of the puny forces of the U. S. A. was available to the high command, nevertheless, with far-seeing vision, Nokisblockoff preferred to be ready for all possible surprises.

"Thus a fleet of 50,000 oil-burning transport and fighter planes took off after dark on the night of June 22, 1963, from France, England, Norway, Russia, Germany, Siberia, and Japan. None of the newer types of planes using rocket or atomic propulsion were used. All were of the older types brought to perfection in the early 1950's. The transports carried an average of 250 fully armed men, or equivalent weight in heavy artillery and rocket equipment, each.

"Flying a great circle route, some directly over the North Pole, this air force approached Boston, New York, Washington, Detroit, Chicago, Ottawa, Montreal, Toronto, St. Louis, Atlanta, Birmingham, New Orleans, Omaha, Denver, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles and other points from the north at dawn, June 23, 1963. Less than half a million paratroopers dropped before dawn on the lighted airports, seized control, and the planes landed their 6,000,000 of the Soviet Union's best trained troops a few minutes later. Control of every vital point from the Atlantic to the Pacific was seized. The war was over almost before it started, but foolish forces of misguided guerrillas, operating in the hinterland, had to be hunted down piecemeal. The pacification was greatly aided by measures adopted by the high command, such as extermination of all towns and villages where guerrillas were suspected of having been harbored. Liquidation of all traitors to the people was successfully and thoroughly carried out and the free democratic American Soviet Republic was proclaimed. Popular elections were held in

which 93.2 percent of the qualified voters voted and the new Congress, so elected, petitioned unanimously to be taken into the Soviet Union.

"In the following few years, reactionary governments in other parts of North and South America attempted to destroy the rights of the people, but when the latter appealed to the great Soviet Union they were sympathetically listened to and Soviet arms aided the democratic masses in each country to seize power and form free democratic Soviet Republics.

"Thus was the fringe of the world brought into the great Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, democratically governed by the Supreme Soviet at Moscow, under the wise and unquestioned leadership of the great premier, Joseph Stalin, Jr. Thus has the horror of war between countries been abolished from the world, and the triumph of Marxism, Leninism, Stalinism been granted to a free and united world where all men are vouchsafed the great democratic right to think alike and vote alike."

As I awoke with a start, it took me some moments to realize that this was still 1945 and all the horrors of my nightmare hadn't happened. Whether too much mince pie, or too much reading of the Communist press, can be blamed for this dream, I leave to the reader, who should be aware that every extension of the Communist system, so realistically visualized in my dream, has been predicted in the Communist press.

Open Letter to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following open letter to Congress which appeared in the March 1950 issue of Overture:

OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS

MUSICIANS MUTUAL PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION, LOCAL 47, A. F. OF M.,

Hollywood, Calif., March 1, 1950.

Honorable Senators and Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Capitol, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: On behalf of 14,000 musician members of Local 47, A. F. of M., we are addressing this open letter to the Congress of the United States.

We have suffered since war's end from a discriminatory Federal-imposed tax, namely, the 20-percent cabaret tax. This tax was originally imposed for the twin purposes of raising revenue and discouraging industry nonessential to the winning of the war.

We are not informed as to the efficiency of this measure in discouraging amusement during the war. However, we are very well informed, indeed, as to its efficiency since the war in throwing hundreds of our members out of employment in hotels, night clubs, ballrooms, and similar places of amusement.

Such loss of employment comes either through the closing of such establishments or through their inability to continue a policy of live entertainment. This tax, gentlemen, affects only those establishments using live talent and, in effect, encourages the use of our mortal enemy, canned music.

As to the revenue-producing aspect of this situation, it would seem obvious that in every establishment which ceases to use live talent the tax revenue is cut in two ways. The change in policy means, of course, that no 20-percent tax is collected and as a corollary that the musicians, entertainers, and other employees cease to pay income taxes. The loss of revenue must be enormous from this source alone. This does not take into account the potential revenue from hundreds of establishments which would employ live talent if it were not for the tax. No tax revenue ever comes from the unemployed.

We pray, therefore, gentlemen, that you will give careful consideration to the proposals now before Congress for the repeal of this discriminatory, nonproductive, and unjust tax.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, LOCAL 47,
MAURY PAUL, *Recording Secretary.*

There is a third way in which Federal Government finances are adversely affected which is omitted from the letter, and that is that the unemployed not only pay no income taxes but receive unemployment insurance. Let us repeal these unfair, discriminatory taxes.

Importance of Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on previous occasions on the Senate floor, I have commented on the vital question of the tremendously valuable role which farm cooperatives have played in United States agriculture. Co-ops have become so indispensable a part of Wisconsin and all American farming that it is unthinkable to me that the Congress should take any step which would harm them or hamstring their operations.

The Badger State is, of course, one of the leading cooperative centers of all America and we are proud of the invaluable accomplishments of Wisconsin co-ops in helping to increase and/or stabilize farm income. Recently, there have been very severe declines in this farm income, and without the aid of co-ops, those declines would have still been more severe.

One of the hardest hit groups in Wisconsin have been our fur farmers. Not only have they been affected adversely by the general postwar decline in income and sales, but the ruinous 20-percent excise tax on furs sold at retail has dealt a body blow to the fur industry all along the line.

It is now 14 months since I introduced my fur-tax and other excise-tax repeal bill, but still tax relief is unfortunately stalled over in the House of Representatives. Still another factor accounting for the disastrous conditions in Wisconsin fur farming has been the obstinate refusal of the President and his administration to recognize the terrible harm done to domestic fur farmers by the flood of cheap foreign imports. Time and again, I have appealed to the United States Tariff Commission, to the President, to the State Department, and to Congress, to take necessary actions to prevent complete chaos because of this foreign import flood; but we have always encountered a stone wall of opposition particularly to our efforts—which we are going to carry on nonetheless—to place import quotas on shipments of foreign-produced furs to the United States.

As I say, in spite of administration opposition, we will continue the battle along the line of fur-tax repeal and protection of domestic fur farmers.

I have in my hands now, Mr. President, an editorial from the March 1950 issue of the American National Fur and Market Journal published at Wausau, Wis. The fine magazine is issued by the American National Fur Breeders Association, a mutual nonprofit cooperative organization of American fur farmers. It is edited by Dr. L. J. O'Reilley, president of the ANFBA—a man whose broad background and experience in the industry well qualifies him as a spokesman for it.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this editorial which discusses the importance of co-ops in the fur and other industries.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM COOPERATIVES

Agricultural cooperation in the United States has been molded by leaders emerging from a constantly increasing number of alert and progressive farmers. Expansion has continued since the experimental days of 1810.

In 1908, President Theodore Roosevelt appointed the Country Life Commission and started a train of events that greatly stimulated the movement. In transmitting to Congress the report of the Commission he said: "The cooperative plan is the best plan of organization wherever men have the right spirit to carry it out."

Early in 1920 farmers were given a new slogan: Orderly commodity marketing.

There are many definitions of a cooperative. Here is one found in the Report of the Inquiry on Cooperative Enterprise in Europe, published in 1937:

"A cooperative enterprise is one which belongs to the people who use its services, the control of which rests equally with all the members, and the gains of which are distributed to the members in proportion to the use they make of its services."

A cooperative society is voluntary and democratic. Generally speaking, cooperation means working together for a common purpose. An agricultural cooperative association is a business organization which operates for the mutual benefit of its members. It is a multiple partnership formed by farmers to provide services for themselves.

The American National Fur Breeders Association is a mutual, nonprofit cooperative organization of American fur farmers with over a quarter of a century of service to ranchers.

Through the years, that service has been rendered impartially to fur breeders, whether they had a few animals or thousands of animals. Every attempt has been made to help the fur farmers in solving the problems of disease, nutrition, genetics, ranch management, legislation, and marketing.

In times of depression as well as in times of prosperity—service has come first.

The production of the fur farm must be made available to the consumer. This involves marketing, and marketing has become a highly complex job.

The American National Cooperative Fur Auction, with its six sales a year in Milwaukee, is especially qualified to handle that complex job and to bring a stability to a market that sorely needs such stability.

Farmer cooperatives are part and parcel of the American economic system. They are set up to render service and increase farmers' profits.

Today, about two out of every three farmers belong to one or more agricultural cooperatives whose total memberships almost equal the number of farms in the United States.

Farmer cooperatives simply serve as agents of farmer members. In this way they give the farmer opportunities equal to those enjoyed by other businessmen engaged in the production of goods.

The American National is the fur farmers' cooperative.

Platform of Home Owners and Taxpayers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following platform of the Home Owners and Taxpayers Association adopted at Eureka, Calif., on January 30, 1950:

PLATFORM OF HOME OWNERS AND TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION

Whereas taxation is approaching the state of confiscation of property and business, and hampering personal independence, and is fast coming to a point where democracy is in jeopardy of its survival, as has been and now is being demonstrated in Europe and Asia; and

Whereas business, labor, and the American citizens are being throttled by excess taxation, inordinate expenditure of tax moneys without regard to the source of income or the burden placed on the citizens and taxpayers, and for the perpetuation of political officers, commissions, bureaus, Government agencies, and county and city officers, by spending tax money without due regard to the benefits received by the people or stopping the leaks of tax moneys by collusion between officers and contractors and the actual giving away of tax moneys; and

Whereas the spirit of America of 1776 should be revived for the preservation of the liberty, freedom, independence, and opportunity to progress that our ancestors fought for, and should be recovered and preserved for ourselves and our posterity, we taxpayers have adopted a platform as follows:

1. We shall cooperate to preserve justice, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as given to us by our Creator and fought for by our ancestors of 1776, and to recover the opportunity to progress.

2. We shall watch and guard well to prevent the waste and useless expenditure of tax moneys.

3. We shall watch well all public contracts where tax moneys are expended and criticize useless waste of tax money.

4. We shall foster all legislation for expenditure of tax money well spent toward public benefit, without graft or waste of tax money.

5. We shall recommend legislation to eliminate needless bureaus, commissions, agencies, and other bodies being supported from public funds and serving no beneficial purpose to the people, but which purpose is for political strength at the expense of the taxpayers.

6. We shall endeavor to impress upon all citizens the obligation of registering and voting. Our ancestors fought to give us the best Government and greatest individual opportunity to promote individual progress, to the end that we may enjoy the results of private industry and enterprise, and, as a result, are now the leaders of the world. We shall endeavor to keep Government out of private business and to contest all legislation restricting freedom, both personal and business.

7. We shall publicize excessive expenditure of public funds for useless purpose and all other legislation tending to increase taxes without full benefits to the people, or which will curb the right of liberty, justice, and equal rights to all. Do all things to encourage initiative and protect the same for future generations.

8. We shall endeavor to perpetuate the principles established by our ancestors that this is a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

9. We shall endeavor to regain the Bill of Rights.

10. We shall endeavor to present nonpartisan views on all political and economic issues that may arise and which are of importance to the people in general.

The above platform was duly adopted by the members of the Home Owners and Taxpayers Association, this 30th day of January, 1950, at Eureka, Calif.

HUGH TURNER, *President.*

Attest:

TERRY H. ANDERSON, *Secretary.*

The President's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chattanooga Times:

NOT THE BRANNAN PLAN

When President Truman speaks in generalities, he talks the language of most Americans who are sincerely interested in setting government to work for the welfare of the greatest number. This applies to the economic field as much as any other.

In a special message transmitted to Congress yesterday, Mr. Truman voiced legitimate objections to the Nation's farm program, which has been patched here and tinkered with there, year after year. The result has been a program which approaches unworkability, which contains the worst features of successive plans, and which tends to cater more and more to the interests of special segments of the population.

The price to the taxpayer is represented by a steadily increasing outlay for farm-price supports and a mountainous stock of surplus commodities.

Under the circumstances, the Nation will applaud the President's admonition to Congress to avoid further makeshift legislation in the field and get on with fundamental improvements.

He says the farm program should be changed "to make it more efficient, less costly, and more conducive to abundant production of farm crops, yielding a fair return to farmers, and selling at prices consumers can afford."

These generalities sound fine. But then Mr. Truman says the Brannan plan fills the bill exactly. When he gets down to particulars, he doesn't sound so good.

The Brannan plan would set up a production-payment system under which farm commodities would be allowed to seek their own price level on the open market. If these prices fell below the support level, the Government would pay the farmer the difference.

In the farm bill he has just signed, Mr. Truman found fault with the provision dealing with peanuts because it sets up a two-price system which, in his words, is "subject to serious objections."

Yet the Brannan plan would set up a two-price system for all farm crops.

Mr. Truman can set goals we would all like to reach, but he sometimes loses his way in trying to attain them. Congress will not be likely to follow him into the Brannan plan.

Home Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the home-rule bill for the District of Columbia is, to my mind, a bill which deserves to be considered by the House, and I have signed the discharge petition to bring the subject before us on the floor. The Boston Herald editorial of March 16, 1950, which appears below, states a very strong case for home rule:

SQUARE DEAL FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Last June for the first time in 71 years a bill to restore home rule to the carpetbag city of Washington actually fought its way through one House of Congress. S. 1527, under the joint sponsorship of Senators KEFAUVER and TAFT, passed the Senate by voice vote and went over to the House for final action.

Unfortunately, it is still waiting for action in the House and, unless members of both parties make a real fight for it, it is likely to die in committee when this Congress ends.

The chief roadblock has been thrown up by die-hard Dixiecrats on the House District Committee. Despite the fact than an almost identical measure was favorably reported in the Eightieth Congress (to be lost in the rush for adjournment), the present committee members will not permit a House vote. The trouble of course is the large potential Negro vote in Washington. A handful of southern bourbons just can't swallow democracy even in the Nation's Capital.

But Republicans also share responsibility to some extent. Massachusetts' Representative JOHN F. KENNEDY, a Democrat, has filed a discharge petition for which he has now obtained 170 signatures. But 218 are needed. If the Republicans, who are the original authors of the home-rule movement for Washington, would throw their whole weight behind Mr. KENNEDY's petition, it would go over with a rush.

Republicans are committed to the home-rule principle by their 1948 platform. The reform is in keeping with the whole Republican tradition. Let's not drop the ball on this one. Our District of Columbia fellow citizens deserve a break. And so does the reputation of the Republican Party.

Women in the United States Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I think most of the gentlemen in both Houses of Congress—and certainly the gentlewomen—will be interested in reading an article on women in Congress and the influence they exert in our national legislative chambers.

The article, After 30 Years of Emancipation, was written by Murray Frank and was published in the March 1950 issue of the Pioneer Woman, a publication of Pioneer Women of America, which is a Labor Zionist organization of Jewish women in this country doing important relief work here and for Israel. The article is as follows:

AFTER 30 YEARS OF EMANCIPATION

(By Murray Frank)

This year marks the thirtieth anniversary since American women were granted the right of political suffrage. Ever since 1920 women have taken an active part in the political life of the country. They occupy responsible positions in the Government, sit in Congress, in the State legislatures and hold important judicial positions. But what is the sum total of the role women play in American political life? What influence do they exert toward the general welfare?

Frankly, the results to date have been disappointing. Three decades ago, it was hoped they would exploit their newly acquired power toward improvement of humanity—reforms, education, the maintenance of peace and better relations among the nations of the world. It was argued that since women stand to lose so much in war, they would constitute the strongest force for peace.

We are no nearer this goal today than a generation ago. This is partly due to the fact that women have not taken as great an interest in world problems as anticipated although since the end of the last war this had undergone gradual transformation. A case in point is the feminine representation in the United States Congress.

Members of Congress like to refer to it as the "greatest and most democratic legislative body in the world." Certainly it exerts a tremendous impact on American life and practically on the whole world. How many women sit in this all-important legislature? In the Senate, which consists of 96 members, there is only 1 woman; among the 435 Members of the House of Representatives there are 9 women. Thus, the entire feminine representation in the United States Congress does not exceed 10 out of a total of 531 members, or less than 2 percent.

Yet, some progress may be recorded. Three years ago there were only 7 women in the House of Representatives and none in the Senate. From all indications, next November may see the election of another woman Senator and possibly several more women in the House. Furthermore, some of the present Congresswomen are gradually reaching influential status as chairmen and ranking members of important committees. In view of these prospects, the role and influence of women in our Congress should be no less perhaps greater than in the parliaments of several other countries where women gained political suffrage later than in the United States.

BY WAY OF COMPARISON

Women have obtained a substantial representation in a number of post-war parliaments. In recent years, they had as many as 30 deputies in the French Chamber of Deputies, 25 in the British House of Commons, 38 in the Japanese Diet; women sit in considerable numbers in the parliaments of Italy, India, and other countries. Among the 120 members of the Israel Knesset, there are 11 women; this is equivalent to 9 percent of the Knesset's membership. Proportionately, therefore, the representation of women in Israel's Parliament is four and a half times greater than in the Congress of the world's greatest democracy.

The fact, however, should not be overlooked that women in Congress do not sit there solely as the representatives of their sex, but as the representatives of the citizenry of their respective districts. For the same reason, women do not cast their ballots as members of a particular sex, but as citizens of the land. Yet it leaves unanswered the question why women, who make up more than half of the adult citizen population in the country, do not have a larger representation in Congress.

One explanation is that politics is still a man's world in the United States, and the occasion is indeed rare where political leaders will go out of their way to nominate women for high office. Another is the indifference of women themselves. The average American woman keeps aloof from political problems, seldom participates directly in political struggles, and at best is satisfied merely to go to the polls. It may be due to the fact that women in this country enjoy greater freedom, independence and luxuries, while in other countries they must fight side by side with the men for the most elementary needs.

The group influence of women in the United States Congress is limited by their small number. As individuals, however, they constitute an interesting segment of our national legislature, where they serve as a leaven for greater practicality and guidance, each in her own way, through her own accomplishments and field of activity. Politically, they are divided exactly half and half—five Democrats and five Republicans. By way of introduction, we bring some brief facts about each of the women Members of Congress:

WHO IS WHO?

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH is the only woman in the Senate. A Republican from Maine, she formerly served as a Member of the House of Representatives for 9 years until she entered the Senate in January 1949. She was successively a teacher, business executive, and newspaper woman. When her husband was elected to Congress in 1936, she served as his secretary. After his death in 1940, she was elected to fill his term and has been a Member of Congress ever since.

During the war, Mrs. SMITH served on the House Naval Affairs Committee, and drew the official commendation of President Roosevelt for her work on its subcommittee on congested areas. In 1944, she was adviser to the United States delegation at the International Labor Conference in Philadelphia, and made an inspection trip of American bases in the Pacific. In 1947, she was assigned by the Armed Services Committee to investigate certain conditions in European countries. In the Senate, she is a member of the committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the District of Columbia. She also serves on the Republican Policy Committee.

The dean of the women members is Mrs. MARY T. NORTON, who was elected as a Democratic Representative from New Jersey in 1924 and was the first woman ever to become chairman of a congressional committee. She was chairman of the District of Columbia committee from 1930 to 1937, headed the House Labor Committee until the end of 1946, and was last year named chairman of the House Administration Committee. Before entering politics, Mrs. NORTON was active in welfare work for many years.

Mrs. NORTON's greatest accomplishment in Congress was her sponsorship of the wage-and-hour law in 1938, which benefited millions of American workers. She has consistently supported and sponsored liberal and reform measures, including housing, minimum wage, civil rights, child welfare, labor, etc. Because of her broad knowledge of labor problems, she was appointed by President Truman as alternate delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris in 1948.

Mrs. EDITH N. ROGERS, Republican of Massachusetts, was elected to Congress in June 1925 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of her husband, Representative John J. Rogers. She is now serving her 25th year in Congress. She was born in Maine, but was raised in Massachusetts. As a result of her overseas service in World War I, Mrs. ROGERS is primarily interested in the care of disabled veterans and the dependents of those who died in service. When the Republicans gained control during the 80th Congress, she became chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs; in the present Congress, she is ranking minority member of the committee.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican from Ohio, was born and raised in Cleveland, where she was active for many years in public-health nursing, education, and social work. In 1940 she was elected to fill the unexpired term of her husband, Mr. Chester C. Bolton, and has been a Member of Congress ever since. She serves on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and has traveled abroad on special assignments for the committee. Several years ago she visited King ibn-Saud of Saudi Arabia and upon her return to the United States she espoused the Arab cause and made several damaging statements against the Jewish cause. She later regretted her stand and has recently taken a somewhat friendlier attitude toward Israel.

HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, wife of movie actor Melvyn Douglas and a famous actress in her own right, is without a doubt the most liberal of all women Members in Congress. She has continually fought for various reforms and civil-rights measures, including abolition of the poll tax, an antilynching law, a fair-employment law to abolish discrimination in employment, housing and slum clearance, rent control, minimum wages, etc. She was one of the staunchest supporters in Congress for a Jewish state in Palestine.

Born in New Jersey and educated in New York, she entered California politics in 1940 as a Democrat and was elected to Congress in 1944 and has been reelected twice since. She is a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and served as United States Alternate Delegate to the United Nations Assembly. Recently, she announced her candidacy for the United States Senate and stands a good chance of election next November if she can win the nomination.

Mrs. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, Republican, of New York, is now completing her second term in Congress as Representative of the Twenty-ninth New York District, for many years the stronghold of reactionary isolationist Hamilton Fish. A wealthy business woman of Tuxedo Park, N. Y., she has been very active in the American Red Cross and in various educational and youth groups. In Congress, Mrs. ST. GEORGE is a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, where she authored and supported legislation for pay raises for postal and Federal employees. She is also the author and sponsor of an amendment to the United States

Constitution to provide equal rights for women.

Canadian-born Mrs. CHARE G. WOODHOUSE (Connecticut Democrat) has combined a home career with a professional and political career. Besides having raised two children, she was professor of economics at several colleges, an expert on home economics with the Department of Agriculture, and a Democratic Party leader. She served one term in Congress in 1945 and 1946, was defeated for reelection, but succeeded in regaining her place in November 1948. She has written extensively on education and women's activities. Besides her political and administrative posts in this country, she served as expert on General Clay's staff in Germany. In Congress she is a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. She has favored repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, liberalization of the displaced-persons law, low-cost housing, etc.

NEWCOMERS

The three newest Members of Congress or first termers are: REVA B. BOSONE, Democrat, of Utah; CECIL M. HARDEN, Republican, of Indiana; and EDNA F. KELLY, Democrat, of New York.

Mrs. BOSONE is popularly referred to as Judge BOSONE, having been municipal court judge at Salt Lake City for 12 years. She is the first woman elected to Congress from Utah and is a member of its Committee on Public Lands, which deals with irrigation, reclamation, territories and insular possessions, and Indian affairs. She was the first woman to preside over a court in Utah, where she made a great reputation for herself as an expert in traffic problems, introducing remedial measures regarding alcoholics and rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents.

The Member from Indiana, Mrs. HARDEN, was a public school teacher who took an active interest in local and civic affairs. She began her political career in 1932 and was elected to Congress in November 1948. She is a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mrs. KELLY is the newest Member of Congress, having been chosen at a special election last November. She is also the youngest woman Member at 42, the others all being over 50, with the exception of Mrs. DOUGLAS, who is 49. Mrs. KELLY, who represents the Tenth Congressional District in Brooklyn, N. Y., is the widow of the late City Court Justice, Edward L. Kelly. For the past 7 years she was research director for the Democratic Party in the New York State capital, Albany, where she gained valuable experience in legislation.

UNEXPLOITED STRENGTH

On the whole, the women Members of the United States Congress are an intelligent, industrious, courageous, and hard-working group. They take their work seriously, try to represent their constituents with loyalty and devotion, and make a valuable contribution to the Congress which is far in excess of their number. The women of America have reason to be proud of the woman Members of Congress.

Ideologically, they are largely middle-of-the-roaders, the Democrats among them tapering off to the left of center and the Republicans to the right. With the sole exception of Mrs. BOLTON, the remainder have supported the Jewish cause for Israel during the political struggles of recent years.

Women could make great contributions to American political life if they would take a greater interest in national affairs. In critical times such as these, the American Congress is denied the balancing contribution of their viewpoints on many perplexing problems. It is illogical and inconsistent that in a country where women constitute the majority of eligible voters and where they are such an important factor in the home and in the cultural and social life of the community, they should have such a weak voice in making the laws of the land.

HOLC Liquidation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 14, 1950:

HOLC LIQUIDATION

As the Home Owners Loan Corporation approaches complete liquidation there is good reason to offer congratulations. The HOLC is the rescue agency which undertook in the dark days of 1933 to save thousands of American families from loss of their homes through foreclosure. Foreclosures were then running at the rate of more than 1,000 a day. The distress and discouragement resulting from so many domestic misfortunes of this type were a major factor in the gloom that then beset our economic life. To arrest this trend the HOLC made more than a million loans in an aggregate amount of nearly $3,500,000,000. Everyone seemed to assume that its losses would be heavy. Now, with the HOLC 95 percent liquidated, it is clearly evident that all its stock will be retired at par. Indeed, it has a present surplus of about $10,000,000.

Of course, this happy outcome is, in considerable measure, due to the rise in real-estate prices and to the sustained high level of incomes resulting from the war. Nevertheless, it is a notable record, as President Truman pointed out last week when the HOLC repaid $26,000,000 to the Treasury. In a striking manner it vindicates the judgment of HOLC officials, Members of Congress, and others who resisted premature liquidation of that agency when its situation was much less favorable than it is today. Those efforts to wind up the affairs of the HOLC and turn over its mortgages to private home finance agencies were begun in 1937 and continued for a good many years. This newspaper is proud to have had a hand in fighting these moves and in supporting the HOLC's plea that it be allowed gradually to wind up its own affairs.

In 1944 an especially formidable demand for prompt liquidation of the HOLC came to a head in Congress. The United States Savings and Loan League spearheaded the drive with substantial backing in both the House and Senate. One of the schemes advanced would have turned over to private mortgage companies the sound loans made by HOLC, leaving that agency holding the bag with only questionable loans. The Washington Post said at the time: "There is every reason to believe, moreover, that, given time to liquidate its holdings in the patient, orderly fashion originally prescribed by Congress, HOLC will be able to wind up its affairs without a single penny's cost to the American taxpayer."

Had the premature liquidation scheme been accepted, the Government would have suffered substantial losses instead of the profit that is now in prospect. The good judgment in leaving HOLC free to complete its work without undue haste matches the courage and foresight that went into its original creation.

Midsession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Tuesday, April 4, issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, this editorial sets off pretty well what has been accomplished during this second session of the Eighty-first Congress. After we complete consideration of the appropriations bill, which should be followed shortly by the tax bill, I feel confident that the majority of my constituents would recommend no further action by the Congress on the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, compulsory health insurance, or the Brannan farm program. I am in great hopes that the tax bill will reduce the emergency excise taxes, which taxes the Republicans have been seeking to reduce for a long time. It is my understanding that these excise taxes are hurting New York State merchants to a greater degree than they are the merchants in any other State in the Union. It is high time the New York State representatives, both Republicans and Democrats, realize this fact and make a concentrated effort to bring relief to our own business interests.

The editorial follows:

MIDSESSION

With the second session of the Eighty-first Congress now 3 months old, the legislative record is singularly barren. If campaign-conscious Congressmen have their way, not more than another 3 months remain. Much will have to be accomplished in that time unless the favorite programs of the administration are to be frankly accepted as window dressing.

Mr. Truman's domestic leadership has been subject to notable rebuffs. Civil-rights legislation was narrowed down to a Fair Employment Practices Act and passed in the House in a form which scarcely conforms to Democratic promises. Even this version waits, and may wait indefinitely, in the Senate. The housing legislation on which Mr. Truman had particularly set his heart—the provision of Government-guaranteed loans for cooperative undertakings—was defeated in both Houses, despite the President's personal, last-minute intervention. The prospect of continued rent control is undermined by refusals in both Houses to provide sums necessary for enforcement; aid to education remains bogged down in the House; and even the long-awaited approval of the National Science Foundation was marred by security provisions which the administration considers highly objectionable. Meanwhile virtually nothing has been done on those famous administration standbys: Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, compulsory health insurance, and the Brannan farm program. Mr. Truman's latest appeal for over-all farm legislation sounds, indeed, more like a man whistling in the dark than like a confident leader marshaling his lieutenants.

To a Republican newspaper the failure of certain administration hopes is by no means unwelcome; yet the President must bear the blame for a defective and faltering leadership which has brought good schemes to nought as well as bad schemes, and has presented necessary reforms in such extravagant and ambitious guise as to doom them from the start. Even more gravely, the President must stand open to the charge of insincerity. He has repeatedly beat the drum for measures which he has little expectation—and little desire—of seeing passed, but which he assumes will provide effective talking points on his whistle-stop tours. That Mr. Truman entertains no very serious hopes for his more grandiose legislative conceptions may do credit to his sanity; it does not do credit to his good faith as a leader or his integrity as a statesman.

Amending the National Transportation Act as Far as Natural or Artificial Gas Is Concerned

REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today in the House of Representatives a bill seeking to amend paragraph 1 (b) of title 49 of the United States Code, which is a part of the National Transportation Act, by striking out of subsection (b) the words "except natural or artificial gas."

Heretofore because of the fact that artificial and natural gas pipe lines were pioneers in pipe-line transportation—were infant interstate common carriers in an experimental field, they were specifically exempted from the general law governing other common carriers in interstate commerce, such as railroads, trucking and bus companies, telephone and telegraph companies, and oil and gasoline pipe-line companies. Under existing law none of these last-named interstate companies could be owned by any person, firm, or corporation and devoted exclusively to the sole transportation of products owned by any such person, firm, or corporation. As illustrative of this fact you will recall perhaps the case decided by the Supreme Court of the United States which held that the Ford Motor Co., although it owned the railroad and all of its equipment outright, could not use that railroad for the exclusive transportation of its own iron ore from the Iron Mountain Range to its steel smelting and fabricating plants, but was obliged as an interstate common carrier to haul the freight of other persons, firms, and corporations also. One of the reasons behind this and other like decisions was because that very railroad was privileged to exercise the right of eminent domain, which is one of the attributes of sovereignty, and since it could exercise that right, it was a public and not a private railroad.

In the case of these natural and artificial gas pipe lines they are no longer an infant industry pioneering their way in a new venture. They have thrown off their swaddling clothes and have emerged forth as giants. They are dangerously powerful big business, big bankers, big financial dabblers at New York, Boston, Pittsburgh, and Chicago. They are the blood brothers of private power companies. They have outstripped the private power companies selfishness and greed and stand today serene and autocratic snapping their fingers at the Congress of the United States, and cracking their circus ringmasters' whips at recalcitrant Congressmen. Many people already hold them in awe and fearsomely cast sly glances in the general direction of the New York, Boston, Pittsburgh, and Chicago money marts.

They exercise the right of eminent domain.

Because of the present language of paragraph 1 (b) of title 49 of the United States Code, these natural gas pipe line companies transport in interstate commerce only their own natural gas and also occupy the unique position of an interstate common carrier and a wholesaler and a retailer of their own natural gas. It is indeed high time that this be changed. No one can sell their natural gas to them and I know because I have tried to do so. They transport and sell their own natural gas, and perhaps cut "financial melons" with their friends by buying natural gas from them at a higher price than is necessary. They can isolate and ruin any independent owner of a developed natural gas field. Other common carriers in all of their previous wickedness were but "babes in the woods" compared to them.

They have looked far into the future and are acquiring soft coal mines to manufacture gas and that is why the words "or artificial gas" are in the law.

Let us, before it is too late, strip them down now to the sole position of interstate common carriers of natural gas for hire. Common carriers for hire of everyone's natural or artificial gas. Let others be the shippers and owners. Let others be the wholesalers and retailers. Let us serve notice on them that the days of the gas Goliath hath past.

And before I conclude, I would also like to say that Nebraska and every other State in order to enjoy the full measure of natural gas competition needs to organize cooperative natural and artificial gas pipe lines to serve municipalities which should in the real public interest occupy the position of wholesaler and retailer.

I wish that my colleagues would study these suggestions and if I am correct about this amendment and the suggestions I have made, please lend me a helping hand unless your hands happen to be gas-locked.

Address by Hon. Frank Fellows, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the gentleman from Maine, Hon. FRANK FELLOWS, at the Republican State Convention:

Fellow Americans, my pride in being permitted to speak to you this afternoon comes from an appreciation of the honor you do me, and, through me, those citizens of the third district it has been my privilege to serve for the past 9 years. Your kindness encourages me to take a moment to confide to you that, for another and very personal reason, this opportunity means a great deal to me. To those of you who knew my father, Oscar Fellows, who served in our State legislature—both on the floor and as speaker of the house—I need not confess the enduring strength of the silken bonds of love that always bound us. This gavel which I shall use here is the one father wielded in behalf of a Republican house in Augusta almost half a century ago. I cannot hope to do him justice, but his presence seems a living thing here today. And so my gratitude for this opportunity.

At this Lenten season each year, every budding flower and blade of grass testifies that the awful waste of yesteryear makes fertile the fields of tomorrow * * * that Easter's promise is endorsed by spring. If evidence were needed that remorse is vain and foolish, the fragrance of new grass and the song of returning robins would furnish proof beyond all reasonable doubt that now is the time rather for repentance and reformation.

We meet today to assess our situation, marshal our forces, raise a standard and give new impetus to the unending battle for the preservation of our heritage—America, the home of free men.

We are not assembled as farmers or industrialists—as members of organized labor groups—or as veterans. We do not convene as Catholics, although many of that faith are here, nor as Protestants or Jews, numerous though we may be.

We are gathered here today as God-fearing and God-loving Americans, intent upon proving that a strong two-party system of constitutional representative democracy is not a great experiment but the established method of furnishing the greatest individual freedom to the greatest number. The Constitution guarantees a republican form of government, not a utopian democracy.

Socialism, in its simplest form, is the complete discarding of private property by converting it into public property and dividing the income equally among the people, says Britannica. Contemporary Russia is known not as a Communist state but as the U. S. S. R.—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Today to accuse a man of being the owner of property is to damn him. Call him a capitalist and he is shunned. Yet every owner of an insurance policy, automobile, home, or Government bond is a capitalist on a small scale. Every freckle-faced urchin chewing bubble gum and reading the funnies, whose dad picks potatoes, or works in the wood room of one of our pulp mills, is a potential capitalist. Our bank officials are the sons of yesterday's truckmen, farmers, mill hands, and insurance salesmen. This is still the land of opportunity.

It is easy to see why people who have nothing under their own system of government should be willing and anxious to try another. A system where the government owns everything may seem desirable to those people who have never known such a land of opportunity as ours, or to that man who suffers because he lacks faith in his ability to match effort and intelligence with the next man. But it is inconceivable that normal Americans should favor a Socialist system. When everyone owns everything, no one owns anything, and it is the most natural thing in the world to take pride in one's own possessions.

Little tots toddling about with red carts struggle, pull, and haul, shrilly crying, "It's mine." When an adult says, "My dad," it is a loving tribute to all the sacrifice and care that is symbolized in his person. Such sacrifice and care are the expression of one who acknowledges his duty to his own. Mothers are God's most perfect gift to a wicked and weary world, but unless each of us can each claim memory of one mother completely his or her own, we are like small children at a church Christmas tree whose names have been forgotten when the presents were handed out.

Defend capitalism? Our country glories in it. Communism and socialism do nothing for the individual. Capitalism recognizes his God-given dignity, gives him opportunity, and has fed and equipped the world, and has won the wars.

As citizens of the first State in the Union to see the rising sun, let us concern ourselves not at all now with the old slogan, "As goes Maine so goes the Nation." As loyal Americans, let us busy ourselves with proving of ourselves, and to the Grand Old Party of the other 47 States, that, as Maine Republicans, we are worthy of Maine's motto, "Dirigo"—"I guide; I lead"—for, unless we are ready and willing to admit that the future of America is more important than the future of any particular political party, we are not worthy of the citizenship we enjoy. Unless we are prepared to advocate, or oppose, every major proposal absolutely on the basis of whether it is good for the country, rather than whether it will gain votes for the Republican Party, we do not deserve to win an election.

Remorse is vain and futile. Now is the time for repentance and reformation.

Firm in the conviction that "conquer we must, for our cause it is just," let us satisfy ourselves that, as we go, the rest of the Nation should go.

During a discussion in the Constitutional Convention in 1787, some delegates advocated half measures as more likely to meet with the approval of the people. George Washington said, "It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God."

Whether or not it was desirable, it was inevitable that as this country grew from 13 to 48 States, ocean to ocean, inevitable also that it should grow in government. The adult human body is the result of the division and multiplication of a cell until full growth is accomplished. But the medical profession agree that, beyond a certain point, this process presents a serious problem. Abnormal growth, if not checked, is dangerous, whether in the physical body or the body politic. Just as our vital organs and cancer cannot long exist together, so with democracy and too much government. We have numerous laws today which would have been unthinkable 50 years ago. Whether we approve of some or all of them is not the question, for to try to get rid of them now would be as difficult as putting toothpaste back in a tube once it was squeezed.

But "enough is enough" (as our mothers would say)—if, indeed, it isn't altogether too much! If we are to retain any vestige of self-government, we must practice it. We must practice it in our towns and in our States.

Someone has said that heaven is so high, and the Czar so far away! Well, taxes too are high, and the city of Washington is so far away. The Federal Capital never did anything quicker, better, or cheaper than it could be done locally. And those giants in Washington so anxious to assume all the care and troubles of governing? Distance and propaganda have a way of magnifying both the persons and the deeds of little men.

History and experience are of little value if we read but fail to heed their lessons. Those Pilgrim Fathers who convenanted to erect here in America a substitute for monarchy and despotism were not like those who with ears hear not and who, though having eyes, see not. Liberty, to the Pilgrims, was worth sacrifice and hardship. Now, as then, retention of hard-earned freedom is dependent upon our willingness as individuals to keep awake to the necessity for watching its flame, and furnishing fuel to keep it burning bright. To ignore history and the awful ordeals of other countries is to deliberately court disaster with a view to marriage with calamity and ruin.

The American eagle symbolizes our great country. He was chosen because he has strength, speed, grace of motion and a sense of direction. This administration places emphasis on his left wing. We call them left-wingers. If too much pressure is applied on this eagle's left wing, one of two things occurs—he either turns bottom side up or he revolves in circles. If this eagle has that 'freedom from fear" and "freedom from want" promised by the New Deal, and if his initiative and responsibility for the future are thus removed, he becomes a parrot, either caged or chained to a perch. A parrot only simulates a man—laughs not because he is happy, but because he thinks a laugh is timely. He weeps not because he feels grief, but rather because it is good politics. He whistles because he knows from habit and experience that then somebody will bring him a cracker.

Those people whose ultimate and only concern are security and welfare are the frightened and the selfish. The boys and girls who fought, our two World Wars, like the men whose blood ruddied the snows at Valley Forge, gave little thought to personal comfort or financial reward. Neither selfishness nor fear contributed to this country's growth. Justice is more vital than welfare, for without justice even the deserving suffer.

Those veterans handicapped by injury and disease acquired in the defense of our civilization deserve every consideration. And to accord with the American concept of reward, this consideration must find expression not in the form of charitable handouts, but, instead, as justice decrees and in the form of available opportunity.

Our forefathers sailed from Britain and Russia, from Sweden and France, from Germany and Italy, from Greece and all the Near East, with brave hearts and empty hands. Out of the comparative security of the known they came to face the unknown, asking only civil and religious liberty, and equal justice under law.

Do we deserve more?

It was our own Israel Washburn of Maine, who in 1854, said that "The new party should take the name 'Republican' and have for its purpose the welfare of the whole Union and the stainless honor of the American name."

Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair.

The thought has been expressed that the Republican Party should be "humanized." There may be virtue in the suggestion, but, to humanize it we must be careful not to Trumanize it as well. To compromise principle, in an effort to appeal to the less admirable qualities of human nature, to obtain votes, is unworthy of the great founder of our Republican Party, and no compliment to the intelligence and integrity of the average voter.

No political party has cornered the market on virtue and ability. If our two-party system is to continue functioning, it would seem altogether desirable that each party make its aims so clear that no misunderstanding can exist in the minds of voters, and an honest choice be offered.

Which shall Maine Republicans offer the country?

Shall we offer an undignified scuffle for Trumanized welfare and regimentation—a pauperized paternalism?

Or shall we offer a crusade for self-government, individual initiative, intellectual honesty in government and respect for human dignity?

Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair.

We hear much today of minority groups. The spokesmen for these groups are ever asking, "What are you going to do for us?" No one present but what could, given the disposition, identify himself or herself as one of a minority. If we judge by the numbers voting in recent years, a Republican too belongs to a minority group. When we consider that the most vocal groups labeling themselves minorities add up to more than 50 percent of our total population, armed with ballots, the whole furor becomes slightly ridiculous.

It ill befits the Republican Party to step out of character in a fruitless endeavor to attract the votes of such self-seekers. Should not men and women, whether white or colored, Republican or Democrat, think of themselves first as Americans, and make their query, What can we do for America? not What will the Government do for us?

When we say us let us mean all Americans, not any particular group.

"What care I for case or creed? It is the
deed; it is the deed.
What for class or what for clan? It is the
man; it is the man.
Heirs of love and joy and woe, Who is high,
and who is low?
Mountain, valley, sky and sea, all are for
humanity."

Why did six United States marines, under bitter enemy fire, scramble up the steep side of a volcano on Iwo Jima to stand on rocks and sandbags at the edge of a crater and raise there our country's flag? I will tell you why. They knew that flag represented to their comrades something worth fighting for—yes, worth dying for. It was and is a standard worthy of defense.

LET US RAISE SUCH A STANDARD

This country has long been considered Republican. During the past 18 years it has been in the hands of the opposition party, either because the Republicans themselves voted that way, or because they failed to vote at all. Certainly there is every reason to believe it has become the custom to contribute to the war chest of one party to hold one's Government contracts and contacts—and at the same time to give a lesser amount to the Republican Party, to hold one's membership. The 50 percent who failed to go to the polls in 1948 were largely in small communities, the Republican strongholds.

The New Deal had promised a continuance of practices under a new label, the Fair Deal.

The Republican Party promised to do all the New Deal promised, but indicated its conviction it could do those things better. Those who favored regulation and strangulation from Washington apparently felt that—having the disposition and the stomach for, as well as actual experience in such things—the New Deal should have the job.

Where was our two-party system then?

To the thousands of Americans genuinely disturbed and disgusted by the threat of annihilation of our free institutions by a constantly growing bureaucracy in Washington, no party and neither platform appealed in 1948. They did not bother to vote. Yet, notwithstanding all these things, with 22,000,000 votes our defeat could still have been victory had 30,000 of those votes been distributed differently.

We were fortunate to garner as many as we did.

Caution is not an offensive weapon. But, fighting an entrenched enemy, the Republican Party had to exercise caution not to step on the toes of some of their own party candidates, who ranged from those who would out-Truman Truman in Fair Dealism, to those who found Senator TAFT less conservative than they would have liked.

Party platforms are not platforms if they are made up of loose planks balanced precariously on a sawhorse of expediency where candidates can teeter until they and the voters are dizzy.

LET US RAISE A STANDARD TO WHICH THE WISE AND HONEST CAN REPAIR

Not a soul within the sound of my voice but in his secret heart knows that continuance of our present fiscal and foreign policy means national moral and economic bankruptcy and suicide.

In the legal profession, there is what is known as the rule of the last clear chance. There comes a time when a political party faces such a choice. Let us offer the voters a last chance to declare for what we all know to be right. If we do not, our descendants may well raise a monument to what was once the great party of Abraham Lincoln, and upon it engrave the words, "Wrecked on the rocks of expediency."

In the 11th chapter of Genesis, we read that the whole earth was of one language, and the descendants of Noah conceived the notion of building a tower reaching to heaven, and said, "Let us make us a name." The Lord disapproved the intrusion, descended to earth to confound their speech, and dispersed the crowd. God will not be mocked.

Political pygmies of both major parties, gluttonous for power, clothe themselves in the sackcloth of a concern for the common man and his welfare, but erect a bureaucracy of as monstrous proportions as that Tower of Babel.

LABOR

The record of organized labor in the State of Maine is one which might be studied with profit by industry and labor throughout the country. Cool heads and warm hearts, rather than hot heads and cold hearts, make this record possible. We like to believe that Maine men and women would not tolerate the kind of leadership which seeks for itself power and more power at the expense of union members and the general public. We like to believe the native intelligence of Maine men and women, whether employers or workers, is of too high a caliber to overlook the fact that the fortune of each is dependent upon the other. Whatever injures industry, whether reciprocal trade or high taxes, or both, injures labor, for when industry cannot operate at a profit employment ceases. And that which injures labor, whether high living costs, high taxes, sickness, or unwarranted strikes, injures industry. The recent strikes in the coal industry produced nothing but misery for producers, workers, and the public generally.

Any group that accepts the benefits of a law should be obliged to respect it, operate under its provisions, or forfeit the benefits.

The Taft-Hartley law was not designed to prevent strikes but to delay them and give time for consultation and compromise. The best law ever written is useless when the Chief Executive ridicules it, encourages defiance of it, refuses to enforce it, and finally invokes it belatedly with a threat to seize basic industry. Such action was no accident.

Power is a wonderful but dangerous thing. Nation-wide and industry-wide strikes abuse power, for with lack of wisdom in their use they present a constant threat to the general public. Like medicine, power should be used wisely or not at all. Neither Mr. Lewis nor Mr. Truman used his power wisely.

Unless industry and labor can learn to live together by the practice of self-discipline, the future of either is not bright. Hitler abolished labor unions. The British Labor Government does not permit a farm worker to change his employment. Labor decreases its opportunities for advantage when it operates on an industry-wide or Nation-wide scale by increasing the possibility of creation of national crises and punitive legislation.

Socialism, communism, or a totalitarian government of any kind has nothing to offer American labor. Labor's stake in our free enterprise system is fully as great, if not greater than industry's.

Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair.

FARMERS

In Britain today the very school children on the farms are conscious that their parents are worried. Under their present government, the how, what, when, and where of planting is at the dictation of a central authority—the government. A farmer who plants more or less than he is ordered has his land assigned to someone who will do as he is told. Let us not forget it is happening here.

Mr. Attlee's Mr. Bevin gives warning: "American is following the footsteps of Britain."

"We will become economic galley slaves," declared former Secretary of State and Supreme Court Justice Honorable James Byrnes.

A Maine writer has said that cows are like folks. They like to be led, if at all, by happy companions, not by dudes with umbrellas or demagogs with pitchforks. They like, also, the path to be sunny, tuneful, fragrant: the weather—as it happens; the way—homeward.

Unlike cows, we have the ability to observe and choose. Coaxed with tempting stabilizing plans, we may mistake for happy companions the demagogs leading us down a road from which the ruts of uncertainty seem to have been smoothed, and then we find ourselves, brakes gone, on a steep downgrade which is neither sunny, tuneful, nor fragrant, and which leads—not homeward—but to a strict regimentation and control we have never known before. A dead man, remember, is safe, certain, and secure. But do Maine folks want that kind of security?

Under a Fair Deal administration, the State Department imports from Canada the farm surplus which wrecks the economy and leaves our farmer holding the bag. The potato gets the unfavorable publicity—cotton and peanuts get the cash. And the Democratic Party offers as its pledge of security and welfare to patriotic American farmers the Brannan plan—a scheme whereby the producer receives top price, the consumer pays bottom price, and each makes up the difference to the other in taxes. The farm plan which saw us safely through the war years, with less unfriendly and unwise administration would have operated economically until such time as it became clear that a repetition of the earlier demand to feed the world would not soon again be made as we fight and lose the cold war.

Only salvation is free and in freedom this country has found its salvation.

As the British Labor Government acknowledges, under a similar system in Britain, farmers prefer to be tenants. If a British farmer does not satisfy the Government in the matter of production, his land is taken from him, and farm workers may leave their jobs, but are not permitted to take new ones outside agriculture. That is, indeed, security, for the farmer is not secured—he is chained.

WELFARE

There is not a man or woman in America who is not concerned with the public welfare, whether he be a so-called ultraliberal or ultraconservative. The ultraliberal's philosophy would return us to what our forefathers faced which necessitated their sitting down to write the first rules of human liberty.

The conservative believes in home rule and, although he does not attend the dinner for Mr. Jefferson, he does not discard the philosophy which holds that that country is governed best which is governed least—that you can carry on your farms, stores, employment, and professions better in the interest of public welfare at home than it can be done for you by a defunct college professor who sits in a chair in Washington.

The record of this administration has been one of stupidity and cynicism.

From amid a welter of mink, orchids, champagne, gold plate, and tickets at $100 per, we hear pious mouthings about the common man. It cynically assumes that everything and everyone has a price, and that salvation can be assured if sufficient money is expended. It has led us down the road to national socialism to a state called welfare. Britain followed the same course to financial, mental, and moral bankruptcy.

DISLOYALTY

If it was not deliberate trickery, it was colossal failure to recognize and evaluate the true situation at home, to direct all our attention abroad, when disloyalty was being permitted to invade and spread through the vital centers of the executive department of our own Government.

Communism is a way of life, but not our way. It is built on disillusion, skepticism, cynicism, and treachery. It is godless and ungodly. It is at once corrupt and corrupting. Like the graduates of the Pendergast machine, its converts and fellow travelers eventually will answer before the judgment seat, but on route they enjoy, while they abuse, the privileges of citizenship—go to jail—or get policy-making positions in Washington under the Fair Deal.

Our State Department admits it has but recently purged itself of some 90 moral perverts, and allowed some persons charged with disloyalty to slink away, unregretted—but also, alas—unhanged. And even such belated action came only after Congress had made public evidence resulting from an investigation which the Fair Deal labeled a "witch hunt" and a "red herring."

The Hiss and Fuchs cases are examples of the folly of expending all our energy and treasure fighting communism abroad. That same Hiss served as Department of State's adviser to President Roosevelt at Yalta, when Stalin was handed China, Poland, and eastern Europe. When Hiss' loyalty was questioned, he was placed where he could give aid to Russia in her China policy—then made secretary of the San Francisco United Nations Conference. And when he was indicted for perjury, a sense of propriety was so lacking in such Pair Dealers as the widow of President Roosevelt, Secretary of State Acheson, and two Justices of the Supreme Court, that they volunteered testimonials as to the good character of the culprit.

During the Battle of the Bulge, when America was fighting Germany and Japan for its very existence, and our boys in the Army were subject to 40 years at hard labor for overstaying their leaves, FBI recovered hundreds of documents which had been filched from the files of our State, War, and Navy Departments. Three State Department employees were arrested. Two were indicted and fined only $500 each, under a law which provided a penalty of 5 years in prison and a fine of $5,000 for theft of any one of those documents. The third man

were unscathed, and today holds a high position in the Department of State. A special prosecutor for the Attorney General of the United States stated in open court that the actions of these defendants did not involve any element of disloyalty. How does that fit in with your ideas of loyalty?

Our fighting forces won the war. Our diplomacy has nullified their victory. A department which spends 50 percent of its time conditioning our own citizens for the defeat its policies make certain is at least a 50-percent detriment. The vital question is not the number of Communists in the State Department. It is whether stupidity and disloyalty are to be tolerated and condoned.

Webster defines "diplomacy" as "dexterity or artfulness in securing advantages without arousing hostility." Wherein has our State Department evidenced any of these abilities in behalf of our country?

Vindictive and vicious executives have undertaken purges of elected representatives of the people, and the products of corrupt political machines have not hesitated to enlist, or at least accept, the good offices of professional lawbreakers to steal and destroy ballot-box evidence of their misdeeds.

THESE ARE DEFINITE STATEMENTS

The Fair Deal has Trumanized Government expenditures, the national debt, and the budget. And these things are sanforized as well as Trumanized, because they have been treated to political processes which insure against shrinkage.

When we stop to consider that, if every life-insurance policy in force were cashed in—every city home and country farm with its equipment sold, and every industry converted into cash—the total receipts would run this Federal Government at its present rate of spending only 3 years, we get some idea why the same financial wizardry applied to a small haberdashery in the Middle West led its proprietor in accordance with the Bankruptcy Act of 1898, as amended, to seek other and more fertile fields for the exercise of financial genius.

An administration which has ceaselessly worked at increasing Government's power and enlarging the national debt has taken charge as well of the citizens' pay-envelopes. The value of the dollar has not been sanforized. It shrinks daily and hourly as Government spending and political manipulation of currency continues.

Thirty-two cents of every dollar of income goes for taxes. Based on Nation-wide averages, a man who receives $50 a month from the Government pays $16 of it over the counter in hidden taxes. We spend more on Government than on groceries; 13 times as much as on education; and 40 times what we contribute to our churches.

Seventy cents of every tax dollar goes to the Federal Government, which picks our pockets, and, to give it ever-increasing power over our persons and property, uses that loot to bribe the States into surrender of their power over activities which local government can administer better and more efficiently.

"Such an excess of stupidity is not in nature."

Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair.

Writing to our own Henry Knox, 165 years ago this month, George Washington said, "It is among the evils, and perhaps is not the smallest, of democratical governments, that the people must feel, before they will see. When this happens, they are roused to action; hence it is that this form of government is so slow."

The people are beginning to feel.

The bite being inflicted upon the American taxpayer by the Federal Government is being felt by individuals and local and State governments. It is a hopeful indication that soon they will see as well—see the folly of allowing centralized government tap all the sources of taxation, leaving local and State officials and governments to beg for grants-in-aid to conduct local government activities.

The inanity of the administration's fiscal policy, so-called, is only equaled by the ineptitude of its alleged foreign policy.

It spends billions in Europe to contain communism there, while it harbors in its State and other Departments communistically inclined men and women whose loyalty has been questioned or found wanting, and protects and excused them while they write a policy for Asia which puts millions of souls behind the iron curtain, that shuts God out.

A chill of delayed comprehension and ominous apprehension follows the truth made public at the Hiss and Coplon trials here, and the Fuchs trial in London.

Our Fair Deal poses as the protector of the workingman by advocating a labor policy barring importation of cheap foreign labor on the one hand, and on the other, admits the products of that same labor to compete for our markets.

When a President of these United States took the novel position that a country that had promised to pay in gold could pay in any legal tender it chose, it was an indication of things to come—an era when the mode was to say one thing and mean another.

Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair, for certainly now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of the country.

Cynicism has consorted with perversion of truth.

Intellectual honesty is one of the worst shortages from which we suffer. Playing on the emotions, coloring the news, embroidering the truth—all lead to only one end—confusion.

As our own David Barker once wrote:

"Go for error or for truth;
Go for darkness or for light;
Paint your flag and hang it out,
Be it black or be it white,
Ever.

"Never ape the tadpole, man;
Never swim around incog;
Off with tail or off with claws;
Be it polliwog or frog,
Ever."

We need a new appreciation of democracy.

We need a new dedication to higher standards of the conduct of public affairs.

We need, as has been held by authorities, stock piles of manganese, tin, and lead, to meet emergencies. But, even more, we need to renew our stock piles of spiritual values.

The Republican Party was called into being to save the Union. It saved the Union!

The Republican Party would deem it a high privilege, as well as its bounden duty to save the country now.

The Grand Old Party of Abraham Lincoln cannot deny responsibility merely by indicting the Fair Deal.

We must never underrate the intelligence and integrity of the average citizen.

We can give concrete evidence of our belief that indeed honesty is the best policy by frankly and fearlessly proclaiming our convictions, and by ceasing to dignify with the title of leaders mere political weathervanes that subject themselves to each passing breeze.

Lincoln believed that human liberty is like unto a coral isle—built from the deeps, built by the dying of the builders, until at last it greets the surface and the sun and he held steadfastly to his main purpose with the charm of a poet and fell, as only monuments can fall.

We would say—he preferred to go down to defeat with banners flying, rather than just go down to defeat—period. The question to be answered by this convention is, "Have we had our banners flying?"

If not, are we prepared now to raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair?

The Republican Party never had been too proud to fight! It must never fight for an unworthy cause!

Give us leaders—and let us fight for principles!

Men facetiously remark that women always have the last word. Without question that will be true in the coming election. They have the power to decide what the future shall hold for their children. Awake to the fact that the present foreign policy, deficit spending, increasing national debt, and a trend toward regimentation bid fair to enslave for generations those they love, the women of this Nation can be depended upon to turn the tide. We feel confident of that, for of each man here it may be said that, because of the memory of his own mother, "faith in womankind beats with his blood, and trust in all things high comes easy to him; and tho' he trip and fall, he shall not blind his soul with clay."

Here in Maine, a Republican executive and legislature, assisted in some instances by loyal and able members of the opposition party, have conducted our State affairs to the entire satisfaction of a large majority of our citizens. Safety, sanity, and solvency have been their goal, and the State's record remains, as always, one of which our Governor and legislature may be proud.

Your delegation in Washington, with such weapons as it could muster, has fought a rear-guard action to delay, when it could not halt, what has at times seemed the inevitable ruin of all that the architects and builders of our system have evolved.

This convention should present an outline of doctrine understandable and easily applied to any situation:

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

Our children—the Young Republicans—must fight for a return to local self-government, with power to tax and spend their own money. Such was our inheritance, but the exigencies of two World Wars and a world trend dissipated that legacy. We and they must recover and restore it for their children.

SOUND MONEY

Sound money, brought about by economy and thrift on local levels and a saving of the collection and disbursing fees of that greatest of all 10-percenters—the Federal Government. Cost of government must be cut. Deficit spending must stop.

RESPONSIBILITY

Recognition that projects, however worthy, should not be undertaken if we are either unable or unwilling to be taxed to pay for them.

INTELLECTUAL HONESTY

Intellectual honesty in Government and officials. For no man is better than his word, and "by their fruits ye shall know them."

LEADERS

Insistence upon men and women who, in ability and moral courage, loom above and beyond the trusting and timid, and by precept and example prove they stand for something more than their own election.

Our Father, at this vesper hour, we look backward in gratitude and forward in confidence, for we know that Thy laws are now and ever have been the supreme law—unchanged and unchanging—that truth, and truth alone, withstands the test of time.

As we onward walk the paths of duty, do Thou endow us with stout hearts, and open minds. Stimulate us with the faith that

greets the dawn rather than the setting sun; faith in Thee, in our fellow men, in our Republic, and in the ultimate triumph of all things right. Dismissing past regrets and future fears, send us forth on errands of mercy and good will; then we shall have the restful satisfaction that comes to those who have borne wisely and well their part. Fill us with large sympathies for others, and bless us with complete trust in Thy goodness, and Thine shall be the glory forever.

Need for Intelligent Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the well-known historian, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., appearing in the magazine section of the New York Times, Sunday, April 2, 1950. The article, entitled "The Need for an Intelligent Opposition," presents some sound advice pointing to the development of a truly conservative yet constructive Republican Party.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED FOR AN INTELLIGENT OPPOSITION

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

The Republican Party, after due meditation in the wilderness, awhile ago came forth with a statement of principles. That statement, while forthright in its endorsement of diligence, economy, courage, initiative, and patriotism, was less clear when it moved on to details. Thus it came out strongly for civil liberties, while at the same time it condemned the administration for its "soft" loyalty policy. It firmly favored the promotion of world trade, while with equal firmness it insisted on the principle of tariff protection. It demanded welfare programs, a strong national defense, and a balanced budget, while it denounced taxation and spending.

A leading Fair Dealer was soon after heard to remark, "What this country needs is an intelligent opposition." Now this wish should not be dismissed as a pious but insincere genuflection to the two-party system. The hard fact is that, while the Democrats may gain short-run benefits from the present absence of competition, thoughtful members of the party understand the long-run dangers from absence of competition. An essential function of a party in our system is to secure the concurrence in our political processes of that part of the community which it represents; and, if a party becomes so feeble and confused that it turns into an object of public pity or contempt, it can no longer assist in securing that concurrence. As a result our whole political fabric suffers; the party itself disappears; and there is no guaranty that any new party which rises in its place will have a basic respect for constitutional processes and public order.

A responsible liberal, in short, would rather have a healthy and intelligent conservative party, which might even win an election now and then, than a dull and hopeless conservative party, threatening at any moment to break into pieces and leave its members prey for Fascist-minded demagogues. Or, to put it in another way, a liberal must prefer a genuinely conservative party to a reactionary party because reaction, though it may be static and stupid for a time, can always, and easily, emerge as a dynamic and dangerous force.

There is a vital difference between a conservative and a reactionary. A true conservative believes that the processes of change are gradual and organic; that you cannot impose abstract ideas on the massive, glacial flow of society; that the comprehensive blueprint and the exclusive panacea are alike irrelevant to the stream of history. But he knows well that there is a stream of history, that change does come about, and that the recognition of the necessity of change is the best way of preventing it from disrupting society.

The reactionary, on the other hand, hates and fears all change—except that which promises to entrench him all the more firmly in his power and privilege. He is dedicated to the interests of his class—unlike the conservative, who has a sense of social and national responsibility which absorbs and sometimes overrides his loyalty to his class. The conservative believes in freedom under law for all and recognizes his obligation to make all citizens members of the community. He is a constitutionalist and therefore a libertarian, and a pluralist; and because he understands that constitutions live only as expressions of organic vitality, he is a believer in reciprocal obligations and social welfare. His gods are law, freedom, and social cohesion. His prophets are Burke and Disraeli, Alexander Hamilton, and John Quincy Adams.

The model of such responsible conservatism was the Tory democracy of Victorian Britain. Here, Disraeli, perceiving the necessity of social change, and recognizing, moreover, the obligation to make the new industrial masses feel themselves a part of the community, led the way in converting the two nations, which threatened destruction of the British community, into one. His success dulled the sharp edges of revolutionary discontent. It also transformed Toryism into a doctrine of at least partial social responsibility and thereby transformed Marxism into the amiable and peaceful creed of Fabianism. The result was that vital British sense of national community—of being, for better or worse, members of one great family—which saw Britain through the war and is overseeing today the experiment in socialism.

In our own country, conservatism began under affirmative and public-spirited auspices. At a time when the followers of Jefferson, fearing the establishment of national authority, supported a futile localism in politics and a static agrarianism in economics, it was the Federalists who demanded a strong Central Government and who projected a splendid vision of an industrial economy. Alexander Hamilton was indeed advancing class interests in his financial program, as Charles Beard has pointed out. But the Hamiltonian interpretation of the interests of the business community promoted the general welfare as well.

It can also be noted that Jefferson's views on politics and economics—I do not speak here of his views on education and on civil freedom—were just as much an expression of class interest—and of a class interest which, if dominant, would have gravely retarded our national development.

The Federalist Party had at the start a high sense of national obligation. But its flavor and its rhetoric were aristocratic in an increasingly democratic land, and it soon passed from the scene. Its nationalist heritage was taken over, however, by statesmen like Henry Clay, with his American system, and John Quincy Adams, with his call for national economic planning. Almost in the accents of a believer in the welfare state, the younger Adams as President could define the great object of government as the progressive improvement of the condition of the governed.

Yet, after Adams the decline of American conservatism set in. The administration of Andrew Jackson, with its vigorous exercise of the national power in the popular interest, set in motion the long process of weaning the Jeffersonians from antistatism. At the same time, the Whig Party rejected the truly conservative possibilities inherent in its own intellectual position. That party—as August Heckscher has argued in A Pattern of Politics—was founded on a recognition of the diverse interests in society. Its avowed end was the harmonizing of those interests in the service of a national unity; its cherished means was the positive action of government within a framework of constitutionalism. Yet it came to sacrifice the interests of society to the interests of the business community. It became, in Emerson's phrase, too much the shop-and-till party.

Later the Presidency of Abraham Lincoln momentarily recharged American conservatism with a passionate sense of the national interest. But class interests took over again in the next generation; the short-run interests of business became glibly identified with the long-run interests of the Nation.

Theodore Roosevelt made the final—and a vigorous—attempt to restore to American conservatism something of the spirit of the Tory democracy of Britain. "We Republicans [must] hold the just balance," he cried, "and set ourselves against improper corporate influence on the one hand as against demagogy and mob rule on the other." But those who controlled the Republican Party would not tolerate so detached an attitude toward the great corporations and, in 1912, they drove Roosevelt out of the party. With him went the last powerful impulse of true conservatism in the Republican Party.

True, there have been some authentic conservatives since Theodore Roosevelt—Henry L. Stimson, Charles Evans Hughes, Elihu Root, Dwight Morrow, Wendell Willkie, for example. But it is chastening to note how few were ever used by a Republican administration, except in the field of foreign policy, or were politically acceptable to the Republican bosses. Indeed, such followers of Theodore Roosevelt in 1912 as John G. Winant, Harold Ickes and Frank Knox eventually found a more congenial atmosphere in the liberal administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Generally, however, the conservative party in the United States has become, in a degree unimagined by Emerson, the "shop and till party."

"Conservatism belongs to society as a whole," Peter Viereck has written in Conservatism Revisited, "for its purpose is to conserve the values needed by society as a whole. Conservatism is betrayed when it becomes the exclusive property of a single social or economic minority." It is precisely this betrayal which has reduced American conservatism to its current fatuity. For the Republican Party as an organization has become in recent years so committed to the short-run interests of the business community that it has often tended to ignore what are clearly the long-run interests of the Nation.

A few examples will suffice to illustrate this conflict. High tariffs, for instance, protect the immediate advantages of certain industries. Yet every economist knows, and every politician should know, that we can maintain our tariff barriers and close our markets to foreign goods only at the expense of world economic stability. In the

long run, a protective tariff system will destroy the position of American business. But the magnetism of the short run is too great, and the Republican Party resists nearly every attempt at tariff reduction.

Similarly, in the field of social welfare it is obviously essential, if capitalism is to survive, to hold the loyalty of the masses to the existing economic system. And it is obviously impossible to hold that loyalty if the existing economic system fails to feed, house, and clothe all the people, to provide them decent medical care or adequate education. So the dictates of true conservatism would be to bribe the masses into loyalty, if you like, by assuring them the basic necessities of living.

As the British Tory Quintin Hogg has put it, "If you do not give the people social reform, they will give you social revolution." Yet the Republican Party, in proclaiming its crusade against the welfare state, is abandoning the working masses to the radicals—and all in the name of a lower tax rate. Again the short run triumphs over the long.

Similarly, in the field of foreign policy, the business community has no future except in a free and peaceful world. Yet again, under the banner of tax reduction, it demands cuts in our spending which threaten to dismantle vital parts of our Defense Establishment and of our foreign economic policy. The price of retirement in a world on the verge of war may well be national disaster.

Is American conservatism dead beyond recall? Has it become simply the political reflex of the fears and timidities of the leadership of business? One certainly sees no Disraeli leading the Republicans to an affirmative social policy at home; no Churchill calling for an adequate program to resist tyranny abroad.

Yet there are, I think, signs today that the true conservatives are attempting to rescue their party from the reactionaries with a vigor they have not shown since the days of Theodore Roosevelt. Young men like August Reckscher, Peter Viereck, and McGeorge Bundy have set forth for the first time in a generation a usable political philosophy for conservatism, and the activity of Senators like Wayne Morse and Henry Cabot Lodge and Congressmen like Jacob Javits; of governors like Youngdahl, of Minnesota; Peterson, of Nebraska; and Driscoll, of New Jersey; as well as of younger politicians like Cleveland Rodgers, Jr., and Philip Willkie, has suggested the main lines of an intelligent conservative policy.

It is not too hard to describe the positions a true conservatism should take. It must, in the first place, follow the example of Theodore Roosevelt and dedicate itself to the public interest as against the special interests of any single group. This position would have particular potency at a time when many citizens are becoming apprehensive over the power of organized labor. But it is not a position which Republicans can convincingly assume until they demonstrate that they have liberated themselves from a posture of entire subserviency before the business community.

In the second place, the conservative party must, like John Quincy Adams, commit itself to a program of social welfare. It can make its distinctive contribution to such a program by opposing the socialization of welfare services in the Federal Government. It can argue for the encouragement of private and voluntary initiatives; it can argue for the local and state administration of welfare policies. But again the Republicans cannot plausibly assume this position until they demonstrate that they are genuinely devoted to welfare objectives.

In the third place, the conservative party must, like Abraham Lincoln, assume a principled position on the question of civil rights. It must demand the speedy recognition of the equal rights of the Negro. And it must revive the ancient conservative respect for due process of law, especially as it affects the freedom of expression. It must follow Holmes and Hughes, not Mundt and Nixon; its best traditions, not its worst, on questions of political and intellectual liberty.

In the fourth place, the conservative party must, like Henry L. Stimson and Wendell Willkie, give unstinted support to foreign policies designed to assure national security. This means recognizing the dangers in the world and preparing to meet them. Nor do verbal blasts at communism or reckless demands for military adventures in Formosa constitute any substitute for the hard, exacting, costly job of constructing a foreign policy and appropriating the resources necessary to execute it.

Would such a four-point program be "metoolism"? In the sense that this program admits to meeting the problems of the age of Truman, and not those of the age of Rutherford B. Hayes, it is no doubt guilty of that weird heresy. But in the sense that it represents an identity of program with the Fair Deal, surely not. The differences between the parties would remain great and significant.

By standing convincingly for the public interest, the Republicans could throw on the Democrats the onus of representing special and "selfish" groups. By standing convincingly for a program of decentralized welfare, the Republicans could throw on the Democrats the burden of explaining why everything must be run from Washington. Within the objectives of the twentieth century, an alternative program to the Fair Deal is entirely conceivable.

But to stand "convincingly" for these objectives, the Republicans must remember that conservatism is not the private property of the National Association of Manufacturers. It is not a device for increasing the short-run security of business. It is rather a profound sense of national continuity, stretching deep into the past and forward into the future, and providing a protective membrane for all the people of society.

"It is the people with a sense of injustice," Senator Lodge recently observed, "who become a target for Communist activity. The way to defeat the Communists is not by trying to shoot them, but by being just to our own people." This would be the essential doctrine of a responsible American conservatism and the only likely condition for its revival.

Low Brand of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. H. HEDRICK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Charleston Gazette, Charleston, W. Va., dated March 28, 1950, and entitled "Low Brand of Politics":

LOW BRAND OF POLITICS

It is unfortunate that an otherwise smart man like Secretary of State Dean Acheson should have been so neglectful of his public relations. Many a less able man has succeeded in public life because of a pleasing personality.

We believe that there is something more than loyalty to friends that has made President Truman announce that he is not going to fire Acheson in spite of the fact that it was hitherto generally reported that the President had enough of him and was letting him go. Apparently Acheson is to stay on the job indefinitely.

The foreign policies adopted by the Secretary of State are not his alone. They were worked out after many conferences with the President and his other advisers. The policies are the coordinated conclusions of the national administration.

Acheson is not the sort of man to "make friends and influence people." No doubt this phase of his character is due to some youthful inhibitions that expressed themselves in a retiring nature, even an antagonistic attitude toward others. He retreated within himself and fought back only when molested. Being an introvert he devoted himself to study, and having a fine mind he accumulated a wide and well-coordinated lot of general knowledge.

Be sure Acheson was fully discussed before the President appointed him. A man was wanted who would put up an uncompromising front toward Stalin and at the same time would follow the rules of common sense. Thus far that is what Acheson has done and the policy is having marked effect on Soviet Russia.

Acheson started out with making himself unpopular with the press. Probably he was not warned against that which is the only mistake of consequence he has made thus far. No newspaper reporter has given him the worst of it, but at the same time few if any have taken the trouble to report the more favorable aspects. Some columnist once observed that you may be able to whip a reporter one day but that he can whip a man in public life every day by leaving him out of the paper. That is not vicious retaliation but mere disinterest.

The Secretary of State having built up his own poor press he was considered a vulnerable member of the national administration by the Republican leaders. They decided to concentrate their attack on him, even to try to run him out of office. They hoped for criticism of the public that might be brought to bear on the administration as a whole. That explains the vicious attack by Republican Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY. Acheson was to be made the goat and MCCARTHY was to heap criticism upon him.

Now the better balanced Republican leaders regret that the plan was ever adopted. It has kicked back seriously. MCCARTHY has been making accusations that later proved to be groundless. He has been so hell-bent on getting something on the Democrats that he has been blasting with a blunderbuss, hoping that he might hit someone or something in his blind attack.

Time was when the Department of State was an inept, antiquated and ineffectual department, run by career men whose chief ability lay in retaining social connections. A lot has been done toward ridding the Department of this element and toward making it a modern, up-and-going department. Acheson, without any publicity, has accomplished much along these lines.

Acheson's chief value, however, has been in his handling of international relations and in this he seems to have employed a high type of intelligence.

On the other hand, MCCARTHY by his blind, vicious and violent attacks on the Department has put serious obstacles in the path of the Secretary and has served only to hurt our international standing and influence.

It is a pity that a man like MCCARTHY can be allowed to do such a disservice to his country by employment of low political party devices in an effort to discredit a high member of the national administration.

For honor, patriotism, and intelligence there is no comparison between the two men.

Foreign Policy an Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the April 4 issue of the Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram relative to our foreign policy:

FOREIGN POLICY AN ISSUE

In the congressional elections to be held in the fall, United States voters are going to be much more concerned with candidates' records than with their personalities.

Major issues are beginning to shape up, and reports from over the Nation indicate that men and women are deeply interested in foreign policy. Already the Republican National Committee chief, Guy Gabrielson, has denounced the administration's policy in violent terms, asserting also that the Communists have China today, solely as the result of our policy.

President Truman left no doubt that foreign policy will be a major issue with him and his Fair Deal associates when he thundered against Senators WHERRY, BRICKER, and MCCARTHY, calling them saboteurs of foreign policy and branding them as the greatest assets of the Kremlin.

Senator TAFT then, speaking to Maine Republicans, said the only thing that will keep us from being victims of creeping socialism is to elect a GOP Congress this year and a GOP President in 1952. This is the only way, he said, to get rid of Communists in the State Department. And the State Department is engaged directly in shaping and carrying out foreign policy. Its leading exponent is Secretary Acheson, champion of the policy which, his critics say, is sympathetic to the aims of Soviet Russia.

Not since the issue of the League of Nations issue following World War I have we had such interest in foreign affairs. The world situation today is much more inflammatory than it was then.

When the President brushed off the Communist problem with the now famous red-herring expression he made campaign material for his foes. He said the inquiry initiated by the Republicans was designed only to detract public attention from the extra session of Congress he had summoned to curb inflation. On the same day Alger Hiss denied he ever had any connections with Communists. We know now all about him, and Julian Wadleigh, Judith Coplon, and we know that 91 depraved persons were ousted from the State Department because they were easy prey for the Soviet's ring of agents here. Also, an undisclosed number of persons were tossed out of the Department because they were found to be poor security risks.

There is more to come, lots more apparently. By the fall the American people will have been treated to such an abundance of name calling, political pyrotechnics, testimony, and possible convictions of spying, their votes will be cast largely on where a man stands on this paramount question of foreign policy.

Address on Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address on Abraham Lincoln, delivered on Sunday afternoon, February 12, 1950, at the Ford Theater, Washington, D. C. This is the very theater room and location where Abraham Lincoln was assassinated. The speech was delivered by a distinguished lawyer of the State of California Bar Association, to wit, Ralph G. Lindstrom. Mr. Lindstrom is recognized as one of the prominent men of our Nation; he has given much of his time and ability to a deep and consecrated study of the events surrounding the life of Abraham Lincoln, and had come to Washington again for the expressed purpose of doing some more research work in our great Congressional Library. He had not come to make this address on the occasion of the observance of Abraham Lincoln's birthday. I was privileged to introduce him, as I know him personally, as a distinguished, able member, of the California bar, at Los Angeles, Calif., and as I am president of the Abraham Lincoln group of Long Beach, Calif., and also a member of the board of directors of the Lincoln group of Washington, D. C., I considered it a privilege to preside at this meeting February 12, 1950.

In my introduction of the distinguished speaker, I remarked that Los Angeles was a suburb of my home city of Long Beach, and that I had been relieved of giving the main address on this occasion on the life of Abraham Lincoln, by reason of the fact that Attorney Lindstrom had come to Washington that very Saturday evening before. This explains Mr. Lindstrom's remarks contained in the first two paragraphs.

The address follows:

ADDRESS ON ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Congressman DOYLE, ladies and gentlemen, I, too, am in one of the main points of Los Angeles County as to residence. I live in Beverly Hills and Los Angeles is the suburb in which I have my office. We permit Long Beach to be another minor community attached to Beverly Hills.

Congressman DOYLE was at a disadvantage. You see, he had 24 hours in which to worry. I have only had 15 minutes, so I'll start worrying after I make this speech on the way back to the hotel after the meeting is over.

Because of the shortness of time after the invitation today to address you, when I walked over to Ford Theater from my hotel, I stopped across the street at the Petersen House and stood there a little while in the room where Abraham Lincoln expired after having been shot by Booth in this building. This thought came to me: What would Lincoln be saying to us now? Are we embalming him in beautiful, lifeless monuments, or are we letting all these lovely memorials speak to us the message that Abraham Lincoln lived and died to leave behind for us? Is Abraham Lincoln dead in America or does he live in our hearts and in our civic lives? Are we thinking in terms of that great Federal Union for which he gave his life?

He had one life purpose, just one. He never forgot that one purpose. He was vilified because he wouldn't forget it. Abraham Lincoln stood long under great vilification because he was waiting for the support of the people of the United States in carrying out that purpose and for the time in which to carry it out.

This one life purpose I should like to have you consider was a Federal plan of government, a government under which people could live in a large area with unity in diversity. He was for that Federal Union because he knew the only alternatives were either the anarchy of no law in interstate or national affairs, or an over-all unitary national tyranny which absorbed all of the States and local governments, instead of preserving them.

In this morning's New York Times there is a beautiful editorial and I'd like to use two short paragraphs as my text for this afternoon. The editorial was speaking of the Gettysburg Address and of what Mr. Lincoln went there to proclaim, and then says:

"Mr. Lincoln's mind went back to the beginning of the Republic. He knew that principles laid down in 1776 were not secure in 1863 unless men were still willing to give their lives for them as they had done at Gettysburg and unless the living were still willing to work for them. One birth of freedom was not sufficient. From generation to generation freedom had to be reborn.

"Mr. Lincoln had a deep reverence for George Washington. It could not have been in his mind that he himself would some day be as greatly revered as Washington and even more deeply loved. He turned back to Washington and Jefferson over what seemed to him a considerable length of time, looking to them for inspiration and justification. Now, in the same way over the same span of time we turn back to Lincoln. The great task is still unfinished. If freedom in his day was having its new birth on one continent, now it is struggling to survive on all continents. From the words and memories of Abraham Lincoln we here again take increased devotion after this new lapse of fourscore and 7 years to the ancient and undying cause."

There are two possible paths before mankind. It was the peril which Mr. Lincoln saw for a nation which is now a world peril from which, in the light of Mr. Lincoln's life and purpose, we must save the world.

It is the old question of how to avoid the anarchy of no law to govern the relations of men, and still also avoid the unitary tyranny which absorbs all into a general government. Stephen Douglas on July 9, 1858, at Chicago said, in effect:

This fellow Lincoln would destroy all the parts, all the States, all the local conditions and sovereignties. He'd have Congress regulating cranberry laws of Indiana and telling Louisiana to raise corn and Nebraska to raise cotton. Why, God has fixed all that.

The next July 10, 1858, Mr. Lincoln made his response. Think it over in the light of today's conditions in the world:

"I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruit of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other man's rights."

Don't you see he reached way back to the first chapter of Genesis for that one? God gave man dominion over all the earth and man has been busy prostituting that dominion into an effort to have domination over other men. Lincoln continued:

"Each community as a State, has a right to do exactly as it pleases with all the concerns within that State that interfere with the right of no other State; and that the General Government, upon principle, has no right to interfere with anything other than

that general class of things that does concern the whole."

There is a perfect definition of sovereignty as always internal to an area of law and government.

Douglas, you see, charged Lincoln with a purpose to establish throughout the nation dead uniformity. Mr. Lincoln went right back to the constitutional fathers for his answer. He said:

"The great variety of the local institutions in the States, springing from differences in the soil, differences in the face of the country, and in the climate, are bonds of union. They do not make 'a house divided against itself,' but they make a house united. If they produce in one section of the country what is called for by the wants of another section, and this other section can supply the wants of the first, they are not matters of discord, but bonds of union, true bonds of union."

In his House Divided Against Itself speech in 1858 when he announced his candidacy for the United States Senate, you remember he started out by saying:

"If we could but know where we are and whither we are tending, we could tell better what to do and how to do it."

Well, where are we today and whither are we tending?

America has been given an opportunity to take leadership in the world, moral and civic leadership, in establishing law in place of anarchy for world affairs. This cannot be done without strong support and understanding by the people of the United States. I know there is a developing ground-swell for the establishment of law for world affairs by making the United Nations an effective instrumentality for world order and peace. But democratic governments cannot get too far out ahead of the people. It is of no use for us to plough against either political party or the administration, unless we give that ground-swell of public opinion to sustain a course of action which makes it safe in a democracy for an administration to proceed. Listen to how Mr. Lincoln saw that, when he was faced with the crisis of a dividing union and two sections of the country ready to destroy each other. When he was en route to Washington at Indianapolis on February 11, 1861, he said this, and he is saying it to us today:

"When the people rise in mass in behalf of the Union and the liberties of this country, truly it may be said 'The gates of Hell cannot prevail against them.' * * * It is your business to rise up and preserve the Union and liberty for yourselves, and not for me. I appeal to you again to constantly bear in mind that not with politicians, not with Presidents, not with office-seekers, but with you, is the question: Shall the Union and shall the liberties of this country be preserved to the latest generations?"

Oh, he labored, he thought, and, my friends, he prayed to save our Federal Union, our Federal plan. Now, was this for the United States alone and for its people alone? Let's turn to what Mr. Lincoln himself said so it will be no one's opinion about what he thought. When he responded to Douglas in Peoria in that great speech of October 1854, he said this:

"Let us readopt the Declaration of Independence and with it the practices and policies which harmonize with it. If we do this we shall not only have saved the Union, but we shall have so saved it as to make it and keep it forever worthy of saving. We shall have so saved it that the succeeding millions of free, happy people the world over shall rise up and call us blessed to the latest generation."

Again when he reached New Jersey on the same trip he referred to the struggles of America in the Revolutionary War, and then said:

"I am exceedingly anxious that that thing which they struggled for; that something even more than national independence; that something that held out a great promise to all the people of the world to all time to come: I am exceeding anxious that this Union, the Constitution, and the liberties of the people shall be perpetuated in accordance with the original idea for which that struggle was made."

Then, at the very darkest hour of the Civil War, when his Cabinet wasn't sure that he should retain the war powers as Executive and when the Congress, in its Committee for the Conduct of War, was questioning everything he did, then Mr. Lincoln dipped his pen into his very heart and told Congress in his message of December 1, 1862:

"We know how to save the Union. The world knows we do know how to save it. We, even we here, hold the power and bear the responsibility. * * * We shall nobly save or meanly lose, the last best hope of earth."

Notice, he didn't say "last best hope of the United States" but "last best hope of earth." Then he went on referring to the Union, the Federal Union:

"Other means may succeed; this could not fail. The way is plain, peaceful, generous, just—a way which, if followed, the world will forever applaud, and God must forever bless."

Well, whither are we tending? Now no one can seriously question today, that physically or conceptually, we are one world in time and space and in communications. We can fly to California from Washington in 9 hours. You can go to Europe overnight. It is one world physically. On that fact we cannot disagree; but in this one world physically we have two worlds, at least, politically.

One of these worlds or power groups is headed up, not by the Russian people, but by a dictatorship over the Russian people which seeks to be the head of a unitary world government with this Kremlin Politburo as a tyrannical totalitarian topkick. Oh, they don't say this. They deny it. But all their actions prove it.

On the other hand, the United States—and I fear unwittingly because of not taking the leadership in lawful world affairs—is rapidly establishing a unitary national government. This is not because of anyone's ideology, not because of anyone's politics, but primarily because in war or threat of war, the war power must be supreme. In the threat of war and in the conduct of war and in the backwash of war, power is siphoned from the States and local levels to the national level. It has done so, not only in this country, but is doing so in every nation threatened with or participating in world-wide war. In this country we are very largely substituting for our Federal plan, a unitary national government. Power flows to Washington. Its jurisdiction increases necessarily under the impulse to build a garrison police state to assure peace in a world area of no law or anarchy. We may find ourselves without peace, without a Federal Union, without liberty under a unitary, national, all-absorbing military government.

Again, whither are we tending? The people of the world stand mesmerized today before the hellishness of bacteriological weapons, an atom bomb, and a hydrogen bomb. They say to themselves, "Oh, we ought not use these but we must and so we will." Oh, I am not criticizing those in power who are developing these weapons. We cannot disarm unilaterally. We must be nationally strong until the United Nations has effective power to police the peace.

But the atomic monopoly is gone. The hydrogen bomb is no pure science secret. It apparently is only a question of technological development. Bacteriological horrors are beyond description as war weapons.

Well, then, what is the best hope of earth presently? Today our best hope is the United Nations. We must not sneer at it. We must not allow it to be frustrated out of existence by asking it to do what we do not give it the power to do. It is veto ridden. But we cannot and should not abolish the veto without safeguarding changes in the United Nations Charter.

It may be seriously questioned if Russia ever spiritually joined the United Nations. Today she is not participating at all. And when she does participate she stymies important action by the abuse of the veto.

The whole world is confronted with business dislocation and trade unbalance which makes, day by day, ever more serious problems in all parts of the world. In the United States we have an uneasy prosperity with a $260,000,000,000 national debt. Last year we had a $5,000,000,000 deficit, and this year we'll have another $5,000,000,000 deficit. We'll have a great deal of excitable debate about balancing the budget and reducing taxes, but as long as the present threat of war and an arms race with hydrogen bombs and other horrendous weapons continues, with 79 cents of every Federal tax dollar going to war, past, present, and future, there isn't much opportunity for reduction in that area of expenditure. We cannot much reduce that 79 cents per dollar until the nations of the world cease spending all their substance and give up all liberty in the stupid business of developing themselves into mutual extermination camps and competitive garrison police states.

I repeat, we cannot disarm unilaterally. We must develop a way under which it safely can be done.

The threat of inflation out of control is also the way we are tending. Speaking of inflation, I wonder if you have heard the anecdote which I recently learned. When in the Civil War the gold and silver stocks were shrinking rapidly and paper currency increasing, one member of the Cabinet said: "Mr. Lincoln, if we are going to have to print more of this paper money, let's at least take off this motto 'In God we trust.'" Mr. Lincoln thought a little while and then said: "Well, if you do take off that motto, we could print: 'Silver and gold have I none but such as I have give I thee.'"

We must also realize, I repeat, that Russia is deliberately the most isolationist nation in the world today. The Kremlin Politburo is striving for a unitary, single control, world government. Her concept of a world government would be a totalitarian tyranny, with the Kremlin Politburo at the top. Such a world government would absorb all sovereignties, all nations, all states, all cities, all school districts, all colleges and universities, all cultures and customs, all religions and rights. It would make our world the place of the living dead.

On the other hand, the United States unwittingly, I repeat, has gone farther down that same road than we realize. We do not in the United States seek a totalitarian world tyranny, but we are unwittingly changing our National Government into more of a unitary type than a Federal plan of government. Under the supremacy of the war power, it is idle to say that someone is deliberately doing this. It cannot be prevented, and if the cold war continues long enough and if we continue developing these mutual extermination camps and regiment this Nation of people to the extent necessary to police against hydrogen bombs, then, ladies and gentlemen, you are going to have a unitary National Government, no matter who is in power, because there is no alternative. And remember that power which continually flows to a unitary government seldom returns, not only because of the habit of power at the unitary level but also because the habit of the surrender of the exercise of local sovereignty and responsibility by the people and smaller units of government corrupts

independent self-reliance into supine dependence.

Oh, if we carelessly and through inertia change the Federal Government, to preserve which Abraham Lincoln gave his life, into a unitary National Government, even if we then won world war III, whether we fight it as a preventive war or as a defensive war, we will no longer be a nation of free men. We would have forgotten, I fear, America is adjured by her hymn: "* * * confirm my soul in self-control, thy liberty in law."

The United States, if it became the head of a unitary world government, would cease to be the instrumentality of freedom, of demonstrating liberty under federal law.

The American-tested federal plan of law for over-all affairs, but limited in jurisdiction to over-all affairs, is our only possible salvation from (1) world-wide destruction, (2) continued anarchy in world affairs until we return to barbarism, or (3) unitary and tyrannical world government. This federal plan is what American civic genius tested for the world. It is this federal plan for which Abraham Lincoln gave his life in this very building. This federal plan is the only possible alternative to unitary tyranny on the one hand or to anarchy between nations on the other hand. It is the only effective way to save the United States its internal sovereignty and way of life. It is the only safe and still effective way to save the UN. It is the only safe and still effective way to have a government for world affairs which will not be a threat to our Nation, our way of life.

In creating such a federal world government, as was true when we created our national federal government, by transforming, if we will, the UN into a government solely for world affairs, we will exercise our sovereignty. We will not surrender sovereignty. We surrender sovereignty by failing to use it. We will put law where anarchy now exists between nations. That is the only way of ever reducing the backbreaking expenditures which are making this and every other nation in the world insolvent today. Do not forget that in the most inflated economy of any nation in history which still retained any currency responsibility, we have not been able to reduce but rather have increased our national war debt. In 2 years we are adding $10,000,000,000. If the time came when we had a truly effective federal government for world affairs, and we were to spend $5,000,000,000 to support it, there would be, as against the nearly $15,000,000,000 we now spend on the current Military Establishment, an annual difference of $10,000,000,000. This saving could pay interest—$5,000,000,000—on our debt and amortize the debt at the annual rate of $5,000,000,000. What we now spend on debt interest could be used for a really helpful and much-needed tax reduction.

Also such a federal plan of government for world affairs would reverse the trend, the very dangerous trend, within the United States, toward a unitary, centralized government. It would permit us to carefully give Washington—and other nations can then give their national capitals—all the power, but only the power, essential in internal affairs in connection with their developing commerce and the closer association of people in daily life. At the same time it will enable us to retain our national sovereignty and existence, while at the same time we preserve local governments under local control. Thus we may also preserve the individual self-reliance which we so highly prize.

Sovereignty, as Mr. Lincoln conceived it, is an internal thing. It is internal to an area of law. It is internal to a government. It is internal self-control. Whenever you have a thing called external sovereignty, whether it be men with guns on their hips or nations with hydrogen bombs in their arsenals, to be used in an area without law, it is anarchy. External sovereignty is only a delusion. It is sheer anarchy. It is the anarchy which could spell the end of man.

When we save the UN by making it a federal world government for world affairs only, we will do it by creating an era of world liberty under world law where the anarchy of nonlaw now exists. This effective UN will be federal not unitary. Such an effective UN federation would not absorb national sovereignty but will preserve it. It will preserve nations and states and cities and cultures and religions and rights and freedoms and local laws. Yes, it will preserve, as our form of government has preserved, unity in diversity. That is humanhood's only way of governing a large area without the loss of liberty which is inevitable in a unitary over-all government.

Finally, the greatest blessing of such a federal concept of law for world affairs would be to challenge man to think in terms of people, in terms of men, and not in terms of nationals of despised enemy states. If man can commence to think in terms of man, there may again be peace on the earth and there may be brought out what Mr. Lincoln called in his first inaugural "the better angels of our nature."

I should like to close with what may be to some a presumptuous but slight paraphrase of a part of the Gettysburg Address. I am thinking of Mr. Lincoln whose conscious human life ended in this building. When he spoke at Gettysburg, referring to the dead there who gave their lives that our Federal Union might continue as our way of life, I think he was speaking to all men everywhere and for all time to come. Let Lincoln speak to us, here, now in our self-pledge to that great Unionist: "It is for us, the living, to be here dedicated, today and always, to the unfinished work which he who was assassinated in this building so nobly advanced. It is for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from our honored, assassinated President we take increased devotion to that cause for which he gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that our noble Lincoln shall not have died in vain; that the federal plan of government, under God, shall give birth to universal freedom from war; that federal government for world affairs—government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall be established upon earth so that men shall not perish from the earth."

Unjust Partition of the Republic of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter and resolution:

ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS,
Somerville, Mass., April 3, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed resolution passed unanimously by the Massachusetts State Board, Ancient Order of Hibernians, at our last meeting is transmitted to you by direction of the State board.

I am sure it is not necessary for me to call to your attention the deep interest that true sons of Erin the world over have in eliminating the unjust partition of Ireland.

Your efforts in behalf of the Fogarty resolution (H. Res. 270) are earnestly requested.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. PHILLIPS,
State Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS STATE BOARD OF THE ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS IN AMERICA

Whereas our membership, as American citizens of Irish birth or descent, are justly proud of the contributions, sacrifices, and efforts the Irish have always so unselfishly made for the preservation of the great American principles: freedom, liberty, and the unity for the people of the United States of America; and these same Irish contributions were made in every war to preserve these same principles for the peoples and nations of the world oppressed by totalitarian groups or governments through communistic or other un-American practices; and

Whereas the Republic of Ireland is the one country in the world free from communism and its liberty-destroying theories and practices which today threatens the United States of America and the whole world; and

Whereas the Government of Great Britain has been the recipient of financial gifts and grants from the American taxpayers, including some 30,000,000 taxpayers of Irish blood, and from this aid, Great Britain has supported a puppet government in the six northeast counties of the Republic of Ireland against the will and votes of the majority of the people of Ireland; and

Whereas Great Britain has recently given its governmental recognition to communism in another nation of the world; and

Whereas in the event of war between our United States of America and the forces of communism, the Republic of Ireland, united with its 32 counties free from the Great Britain-made partition, would be the United States of America's strongest bulwark in Europe against communism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts State Board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, in regular meeting assembled at Boston, Mass., urgently requests the President of the United States of America, the Secretary of State Department of the United States of America, the Members of the United States Senate and United States House of Representatives to take proper action to have the Government of Great Britain to remove this unjust partition of the Republic of Ireland immediately by the passage of the Fogarty bill now before the Legislature of the United States of America; and that copies of this petition be sent to the presiding officers of Government in Washington, D. C.

The Massachusetts State Board of the AOH: Rev. Michael J. Houlihan, Chaplain, Watertown; Paul E. Tierney, President, Somerville; William P. Sullivan, Vice President, Holyoke; Thomas C. Phillips, Secretary, Worcester; James P. McCarthy, Treasurer, Malden; Hugh P. Caffrey, Organizer, Brockton; Thomas H. Murray, Mission Chairman, Brighton; P. Frank Kean, Director, Brighton; Thomas F. Hall, Sr., Pittsfield; William J. Ronan, New Bedford; Joseph P. McKenna, Methuen; Daniel J. Clifford, Watertown; Daniel F. Slattery, Norwood; Richard Fitzmaurice, Brockton; Hugh A. Moriarty, Worcester.

House Resolution 270

Whereas the House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress (1919) third session, by House Joint Resolution 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the

form of government under which they desired to live; and

Whereas in the intervening 30 years, the people of Ireland have so determined but the effect of their determination has been thwarted, and they have in fact been deprived of the right to the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has, as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

The Effect of Present Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have made statements on the floor of this House and elsewhere concerning our burdensome Federal taxes and their effect upon individuals and small business. In doing so I have attempted to express my own views as well as those of Delawareans who have written or spoken to me on this subject.

Recently, however, I received a letter from a Delawarean which expresses with infinite clarity and thoughtfulness the views and impressions of a private citizen as to the serious and detrimental effects of existing Federal taxation. I was so thoroughly impressed by the content of this letter and the importance of the views set forth in it that I requested and obtained permission of its author to have it included as a part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, in including this letter as a part of my remarks I urge all the Members to read it with care and to give fullest consideration to the statements contained in it. I especially direct attention to the fact that the day-to-day work of its author is the counseling of taxpayers and the preparation of business and personal income-tax returns. Through this experience she has, therefore, become particularly qualified to discuss the subject of the effect of Federal taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add that in my opinion this is one of the finest statements on this subject which it has been my pleasure to read. The letter follows:

WILMINGTON, DEL., *March 28, 1950.*

Hon. CALEB BOGGS,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read with interest your efforts in behalf of a more nearly balanced budget for Government expenditures, but, like most of the business and private individuals in our country today, I am much concerned about the attacking of business and private enterprise due to the already high taxes and am more concerned about any possibility of having them increased.

It happens that my line of work and my private business is advice and preparation of business and personal income-tax returns. This has given me a very sharp picture of the effect of our present system, not only of taxation but the methods of collecting same.

I am sure you have been besieged with letters on the subject of taxes and their crippling effect, first on business expansion, business existence, the security of people who have retired on what should be, at least, a comfortable living income, as well as the great army of young people who are starting out today. My remarks in connection with these are brief:

1. People in retirement (who are trying to live on what was considered to be an adequate pension, augmented, perhaps, by some additional income from stocks and bonds, or real-estate investments), due to taxation crippling their dividends, due to rent control crippling their income from real-estate investments, and to the extremely high cost of everything they buy (perhaps because of taxes or Government subsidies) are faced with the fact that they do not have a living income.

2. The young people today, due also to the high cost of everything, have been forced to obtain property for themselves, and their families, with a crippling debt. The amount they have each year to amortize their homes is so small that, after all taxes have been met, the debt remains at a figure they may never be able to clear. When a young couple having an income of say $4,000 must pay a direct income tax of approximately $600 or over, plus a State tax, plus another $200 or $300 hidden tax on everything they buy, they have practically nothing to save.

3. In considering small business concerns the past 2 years alone, when preparing income-tax returns, I have seen three out of every five small businesses go to the wall and give up because their capital, instead of building up against a few months of slackened business (or perhaps a year) has had to be milked to the last cent for income tax even though their net profits were comparatively small.

4. It is a self-evident fact that each large corporation is the goose that lays the golden egg. It is they who already pay millions to the Government for taxes; it is they who furnish employment to thousands and thousands of workers who, in turn, pay millions in taxes; it is they who pay dividends to individuals who, in turn, pay tax on the dividends. It is they who, because of their economy of organization made possible because of their size, can operate with lower overhead and furnish every product they make to the public at a lower cost, and they, too, who support the smaller business firms from whom they purchase supplies.

The above protests are all in favor of the individual citizen or organization that suffers from high taxes, but our legislators, I am sure, must analyze the tax problem also from the standpoint of annual income to the Government. From this standpoint it seems to me the same arguments are effective as for the above groups who are taxed, i. e., add, if you will, additional tax to corporations. They will pay lower dividends. The individual will pay less tax on those dividends. The corporation will pay lower salaries. The employees will pay less tax to the Government on a lowered salary. They will have to increase the cost of their product. Assume, for a moment, it is an automobile. Higher prices of cars, with lowered income for the individual, means less sales of cars, less sales means no excise tax on the unsold cars.

Every small company that goes out of business ceases to pay tax to the Government, while it is the high price of taxes in the beginning, to a great extent, that has squeezed them out; they, in turn, pay no employees. Those employees go on relief. The Government must use an equal amount of money to support them.

In the final analysis does increasing taxes increase Government income? Where, then, is the advantage to the Government of keeping crippling wartime taxes with a country not at war?

In considering the hardships of excessive taxation, there is one point which has been brought out to me in contacts with many taxpayers through my own business. They are a solid front on the standpoint that the Government should allow, at least, a fair living sum as exemption before start of taxation. This applies especially to young, single people, widows, and people well along in years yet below the 65-year limit. One thousand and two hundred dollars exemption as a living income, before taxation, is the very least that seems fair for the citizen, regardless of the Government's need for money.

May I call to your attention the fact that the auditors of the Internal Revenue Bureau in auditing an account that seems out of line and in which they cannot identify money used for the taxpayer's living expenses, always add as a minimum to their indebtedness for assessment from $1,200 to $3,000. If that is considered the minimum to be added for living expense of the taxpayer's money in a year for taxation, that should be the minimum used for the individual's exemption against taxation. In other words, when our Representatives in Congress come to the point of feeling that income taxes should be reduced, the fairest place to start is to allow more exemption for everybody. The reduced taxation in 1948, due to the recognition of community property rights with a split income for married people, relieved that class of people a great deal. It did nothing for thousands of individuals who have lost their mates, or who have never had one, or for the young people who are just starting out in life and must look forward to the necessity of saving if they are ever to establish themselves on a firm basis in the United States of America, the finest country in the world.

Apologizing for taking so much of your time, and congratulating you on every good move you have made in the interest of the citizens of the first State of the United States, whose deciding vote decided liberty, and with admiration for your representation of me in Congress, I am,

Most respectfully yours,

(Miss) LOUISE H. TATNALL.

Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, among the innumerable letters from constituents occasionally we receive one which contains an unusual amount of sound judgment relating to manifold problems of government. Such a one I have recently received from a constituent and take pleasure in including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

OSWEGO, N. Y.

Hon. W. STERLING COLE,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLE: While I realize that you are very busy I would like to tell you the kind of Government that I would like.

I would like a Government that is for all the people and not for this labor group or this farm group.

I am not a member of any labor union but I firmly believe in the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively.

I believe they should accept the responsibility that goes with power and remember that a few labor unions in key industries should not rule the country.

Between 1900 and 1908 we curbed the power of the great trusts and it is as it should be.

I believe that labor unions should be subject to the same laws as any other body with great wealth and power. We cannot have one law for Joe Doakes and another for Tom Jones.

As for the Federal aid to schools, I do not want it or need it. In the first place I want church and state completely separate.

I am not in favor of $1 of public money going to any private school, religious or otherwise. If the Baptist, Methodist, Catholic, or any other group want a private school they should pay for it. I want the privilege of helping if I feel that it is good. I do not want it in my tax bill.

I am not in favor of Federal aid to anything that should be done on the local level.

I do not have a college degree in economics but from any angle that I can figure I can't see where it pays to send $3 to Washington to get from $1 to $2 back in Federal aid. In many cases the money raised on the local level would do the job without the aid.

Our county's last report said that the relief load was 56 percent of our budget, 80 percent being reimbursed by the State. The 20 percent that we raise locally would do the job if the State and Government would keep out and only those were on relief that should be.

Will you please tell me where I and millions of small fry like me can go for some relief from this kind of government, surely not the Democratic and Republican Parties as they now are.

If you have taken the trouble to read this I thank you. This letter is from one of your small-fry constituents who has never bothered you before. I am a World War I vet, having served in France with the Eighty-seventh Division and strange as it may seem I am not looking for a pension or any other hand-out, except the privilege of working and taking care of myself.

Respectfully yours,

GUY E. PETTIS.

Government Propaganda Writers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of March 28, 1950:

HOW TO WRITE PROPAGANDA

For young students of the art of writing political propaganda we recommend very highly a study of the Steel Report just issued by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

The drafter of this report, whoever he may be, is an excellent craftsman. Eschewing the bludgeon, he shows what a master artisan can do using words with the sublety and finesse of a fencer.

The techniques used in the report are many, but perhaps one example will suffice to show the skill of the writer. One of the recommendations of the committee was made to read like this:

"With the express purpose of revealing the effect on free, competitive enterprise of present trends in the steel industry, a study should be authorized to examine the extent to which the steel industry has developed technological and economic similarity to public utilities and has acquired such strategic importance in war, peace, and the maintenance of high-level employment as to become uniquely affected with a public interest in order that Congress may determine what, if any, legislation should be adopted for the preservation of competition."

Now a cursory reading of this paragraph might persuade any man to endorse it. Seemingly it only calls for another of those studies that Congress habitually undertakes wholesale. Who could possibly object to a study of the steel industry?

But let us look more closely at what a skillful writer has done with the wording of this simple proposal.

The study's purpose, it will be noted, is not to determine whether present trends in the industry have effected free, competitive enterprise; its purpose is to reveal what the industry has done to free, competitive enterprise. And a revelation subtly predisposes the mind to presuppose there is something bad to reveal.

Again, the question is not whether the steel industry has become similar to a public utility or whether it is uniquely affected with public interest. The study is to determine the extent to which it has devolped these qualities. Again, you see, it is assumed in advance that the steel industry has acquired at least something of this peculiar status about which something ought to be done.

But what about that phrase "if any"? The Congress is to determine what, if any, legislation is to be adopted. Doesn't that leave the question unbiased and open to debate? Isn't the writer being eminently fair in not prejudging matters?

Well, Congress having revealed that the present trends in the steel industry are affecting free competition and having decided that the industry is uniquely affecting the public interest in everything from war to full employment, is to decide what, if any, legislation "should be adopted for the preservation of competition."

Consider this marvelous smoothness. Congress is not to decide whether legislation may be necessary or advisable; it is to determine what legislation should be adopted. And this legislation is for the preservation of competition—competition that is assumed to be endangered.

True, the wording does leave one avenue open. Congress could decide it isn't interested in preserving competition; it could decide it doesn't give a hoot-nanny about war preparedness, the maintenance of high level employment, or the public interest in general. In that case it might decide to have "not any" legislation.

The skill of this is that the word duellist has closed off every avenue of escape from his way except the one road he knows his antagonist will not take. For all practical purposes, the findings of fact, the conclusions and the recommendations are decided before the study even begins.

It is a beautiful piece of work, and this excellence of quality is, amazingly, sustained throughout the whole report. If there were a Pulitzer Prize now—as there may be some day—for outstanding work in dialectical propaganda, we should unhesitatingly recommend that it go to the nameless and unhonored creator of this work of art.

Natural-Gas Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes from the Buffalo News of March 31, 1950:

THOMAS L. STOKES SAYS DEMOCRAT-PASSED GAS BILL TO HAUNT TRUMAN ON TOUR

WASHINGTON, March 31.—President Truman may find himself embarrassed in attacking the special interests in his projected cross-country whistle-stop tour to begin early in May unless, meanwhile, he vetoes the Harris-Kerr-Thomas bill that frees independent natural gas producers from regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

The measure, which would cost 40,000,000 natural gas consumers millions of dollars annually, soon will be placed on his desk for decision. It was sponsored by Democrats and put over in the Senate this week, as in the House last session, by Democratic votes in a Democratic Congress. A bill of similar purpose, though broader in scope, could not even get through that Eightieth Republican Congress, which the President denounced in 1948 as the worst in history.

This was, indeed, a special-interest coup. The result in the Senate is disturbing evidence of the weight now exerted by "big oil" in the Democratic Party. "Big oil" was behind the bill, which will benefit handsomely a handful of the Nation's major oil companies. They own the bulk of natural-gas reserves in the Southwest and will enjoy virtually a monopoly status if it becomes law.

On his way across the country the President will travel through States where consumers are vitally affected by this measure. A number of Republican Senators from that area, reflecting this consumer concern, fought bitterly against it and voted against it.

Republicans supplied the majority of votes against the bill in the Senate, with 16 Democrats voting with them. Twenty-eight Democrats voted for it, along with 16 Republicans.

At the western terminus of his tour, the President is to dedicate a great public power project, Grand Coulee Dam in Washington State. Incidentally, it was while on a visit to Grand Coulee on his transcontinental tour in June 1948 that the President made his crack about the Eightieth Republican Congress being the worst in history.

The Democratic Party's leadership in Congress plainly defaulted on this issue, though a minority of individual Democrats in the ranks fought it. President Truman, who openly opposed it in the last session of Congress, was represented about the lobbies of the Senate during its consideration as not accepting it, though this was denied by aides in Key West.

Senator SCOTT LUCAS, Democrat, of Illinois, the administration's Senate leader, walked out completely on the fight. Leadership was assumed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois. So effective was his direction of the battle, with the able help of a number of Republicans and a few other Democrats, that the reported overwhelming majority claimed for it at the outset was whittled down to a very thin majority ultimately.

Originally, it was thought the debate would consume only 3 or 4 days. As public interest and pressure mounted, the debate continued for 2 weeks. During its course the bill was transformed from the routine matter that its

sponsors tried to make it into a full fledged national issue on which countrymen far and wide were alerted.

The Democratic Party hasn't heard the last of this.

United States Can Save World From Communism Only by Unity at Home and Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REVA BECK BOSONE

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune of January 29, 1950:

UNITED STATES CAN SAVE WORLD FROM COMMUNISM ONLY BY UNITY AT HOME AND ABROAD

Are we going to give Russia the world by default?

If the rejection of aid to Korea by the House Representatives is made to stick and represents a continuing attitude of the anti-administration bloc, Asia might as well be written off our slate. Europe, too, is threatened by a widening partisan split which may affect the Marshall plan.

Strategically, there may be little reason to try to hold Korea. Much of past expenditures there may have gone down the drain. The main thing about the congressional rebellion—stemming from a quarrel between the past and the present—is that it clouds our over-all foreign policy. "The issue in the Korean aid bill is whether the United States will honor a commitment made to the people of southern Korea and in the presence of the United Nations," says Walter Lippmann. "The question of honor is paramount." If the people of Asia, not yet gobbled up by communism, become convinced our policy is unstable, they will be quicker to turn to Russia. The Soviet, of course, is working through its fifth column and propaganda machine to drive us out of Asia. The "hate Americans" campaign is bolstered by the fact that Chiang Kai-shek remains on the task.

Two courses of action could alleviate our foreign policy crisis. Formation of a really bipartisan program (actually none has existed concerning Asia) and closer cooperation and consultation with other non-Communist countries are essential to salvage anything. This being an election year, it is perhaps naive to hope that any working arrangement can be made between the administration and the congressional rebels. Both sides are to blame for the current schism.

Having written off Nationalist China, the State Department is awaiting the report of Special Ambassador Jessup, currently touring the Far East, before launching a new policy. But time does not stand still. The India-Pakistan feud grows hotter while the Communists await an economic break-down to pave the way for them to take over. French Indochina is in peril from a domestic Communist revolution and possibly from an invasion by Chinese Reds. Civil war undermines Indonesia. Communist forces are on Tibet's frontier, and Burma's Government totters. The question of Japan and the need for a peace treaty is so highly complicated that discussion must wait for another day. Meanwhile, General MacArthur is occupation chief for the former allies, including Russia and Britain, which have recognized Red China, as well as the United States, which has not. Japan's economic future is closely tied to China.

Signing of agreements with eight Atlantic Pact partners under the military phase of the North Atlantic Defense Pact turns attention for the moment from Asia's misery to Europe. Our row with Bulgaria has brought suggestions that Congress act to revoke and repudiate the treaties with the Russian satellites which have been made meaningless. Secretary Acheson, reversing his policy toward the last survivor of the Fascist Axis, Spain's Franco, now proposes to restore full recognition, when and if the United Nations approves. (This indication of expediency and self-interest is similar to our plans for supporting Bao Dai in Indochina.)

The "little blockade" in Berlin is variously interpreted as a minor harassing tactic and a possible show-down which could bring war. Tension in the Saar, disagreement with Britain, and countless other mounting problems call for a definite and agreed over-all policy by the United States.

It is becoming increasingly clear that we cannot continue indefinitely to try to mold the kind of world we want with mere dollars. If the debacle in China did not prove that, our national deficit does. Even administration supporters admit we must limit our objectives to what we can afford, and to programs which can be carefully worked out. Thoughtful observers believe that much can be salvaged in southeast Asia, but only after consultation and cooperation with other governments having interests in the region, including India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain, France, and the Netherlands. Point 4 help should go to countries which indicate they want it and show they can use it effectively.

Meanwhile, the door should not be shut tight against dealing some way with the Chinese. The Mao regime, like that of Tito in Yugoslavia, may find its interests clash with Moscow's.

The cold war will continue for some time. Failures may heap fuel upon isolationist fires and increase cynicism. Regardless of what we try to do the world is bound to remain in a mess for years. Our main hope is to build stability where possible. It can be done only if we achieve a measure of unity in our Government and with the friends we have left in the world.

Meanwhile, we should lend all support to efforts to strengthen the United Nations, leading eventually to some form of world government.

Profits of Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

1949 CORPORATION PROFITS ALMOST RECORD BREAKER

NEW YORK, March 11.—Profits of 565 representative American corporations last year almost equaled the all-time high record set in 1948. The total is only 2.6 percent under 1948 earnings of these same companies, making 1949 the second most profitable year in the history of the Nation's industry.

These companies earned 20 percent more than in 1947, and 70 percent more than in the postwar conversion year of 1946.

The figures are shown in a compilation by the Associated Press of earnings reports of typical corporations, large and small, in 26 major fields which to date have published balance sheets for last year.

The showing for 1949 is impressive because of the snap-back in business from the recession starting early in the year. At that time the profits barometer pointed downward, giving rise to a feeling that the big postwar boom was over.

But recovery progressed steadily thereafter with a pick-up in the profits picture becoming more evident in the final quarter of the year.

The 565 corporations reported dollar profits of $5,049,852,639, a decline of 2.6 percent from the 1948 total of $5,186,705,908. The total was a gain of 20 percent over the 1947 total of $4,216,702,007, and was 70 percent higher than the $2,971,939,076 reported by these corporations in 1946.

The earnings of the big automobile companies had a marked influence on the overall totals. Total earnings of nine makers of autos and trucks were 44 percent higher than 1946 although five of the nine fell behind their 1948 totals. These companies not only made the biggest percentage advance but also contributed the largest number of dollars to total earnings.

Earnings of air lines and aircraft companies gained 41 percent over the previous year, but total dollar earnings were small compared with automobiles.

Agricultural-implement companies advanced 24 percent, cement makers were up 17 percent, and the manufacturers of drugs, cosmetics, and soap showed a 12-percent rise.

While automobiles were moving ahead in the profits column, the producers of motor-vehicle parts and accessories just managed to hold their own by making only five-tenths of 1 percent less than in 1948.

On the other side of the ledger are the companies whose 1949 profits were less than in 1948.

The oil group, with 24 companies, stands out. Last year the group headed the list of dollar earners (excluding utilities) even ahead of automobiles, but this year it slipped down to fifth place with total earnings 26 percent less than in 1948.

The biggest slide from 1948 was made by the textile group, off 54 percent.

Coal-mining companies, as might be expected because of strikes, backed down 43 percent from the previous year. Metal-mining companies were close behind with a total 42 percent under 1948. Paper and pulp makers were down 36 percent, and the machinery and tool manufacturers were 31 percent lower.

Altogether, 63 percent of the individual companies reporting had profits lower in 1949 than in 1948, while 37 percent advanced.

The railroad group of 27 lines, not included in the grand total of 565 companies, reported earnings of $334,032,560, a decline of 37 percent from 1948 and 11 percent from 1947. The total, however, was 70 percent higher than in 1946.

Val. J. Peter Named a Knight of St. Gregory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following letter and newspaper article:

GERMANIC PUBLISHING CO.,
Buffalo, N. Y.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I thought you would be interested in the news that Pope Pius XII has named Val. J. Peter, publisher of our newspaper, a knight of St. Gregory. Press clippings enclosed.

Mr. Peter comes to Buffalo often although he lives in Omaha, Nebr. The announcement of his appointment was made by Archbishop Gerald T. Bergan, of Omaha, upon advice of the papal delegate in Washington.

We, who have had the good fortune to be with him for many years, know the tremendous work he has done and is continuing to do toward the goal of Christian approach to the solution of world problems through his various newspapers from coast to coast.

We know that you and his many other friends join with us in extending our best wishes to him on the occasion of this honor.

With every good wish, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
BUFFALO VOLKSBEOBACHTER,
By HARRY B. SCHUMECHEY,
General Manager.

[From the Omaha Morning World-Herald of March 31, 1950]

OMAHANS NEW PAPAL KNIGHTS—BERT MURPHY, VAL PETER TO BE INVESTED

Two prominent Omahans have been made Knights of St. Gregory the Great.

Archbishop Gerald T. Bergan said Thursday the high Catholic Church layman honors were conferred by Pope Pius XII on Andrew Albert (Bert) Murphy, 75, car dealer; and Valentine Peter, 74, German-language newspaper publisher.

Word of the Pope's action came from the apostolic delegation in Washington, said Archbishop Bergan. The pontifical honor was conferred on the recommendation of the archbishop.

Public investiture of the two new knights will be after Easter, when official briefs are received from Rome.

The knighthood was established about 100 years ago by Pope Gregory XVI to honor Catholic laymen for exemplary lives and services for the church.

SIX OTHER KNIGHTS

Other Omaha knights are Navy Secretary Francis P. Matthews, J. Francis McDermott, Dr. Adolph Sachs, J. E. Fitzpatrick, Edward F. Leary, and Charles W. Hamilton, Jr.

Archbishop Bergan said that Mr. Murphy "is held in the highest esteem by all citizens of Omaha and the Midwest irrespective of religious belief."

Mr. Murphy's business, Andrew Murphy & Son, last November marked its eightieth year in business in Omaha.

"Without any doubt," said Archbishop Bergan, "he would be considered Omaha's most beloved citizen. He has ever enjoyed the regard and respect of all the clergy and bishops of Omaha, including myself."

PETER'S DESCENT GERMAN

The archbishop lauded Mr. Peter as one of America's outstanding Catholics of German descent.

Born in Lower Franconia, Bavaria, Mr. Peter was brought to the United States when he was 14. His father died 2 years later. Mr. Peter taught school for two sessions, then got a job on a semiweekly language paper at Rock Island, Ill. Later he bought the paper at a sheriff's sale.

He now publishes papers from Baltimore to San Francisco and is believed to be the country's largest publisher of German-language newspapers. He has the Omaha Daily German Tribune in Omaha.

The Peters have 12 children.

Smear Campaign Threatens To Slow Down Movement To Build a Peaceful World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REVA BECK BOSONE

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune of March 27, 1950:

SMEAR CAMPAIGN THREATENS TO SLOW DOWN MOVEMENT TO BUILD A PEACEFUL WORLD

The American people are genuinely concerned about the growing world tension and Congressmen's mail is being flooded with proposals for peace. Pressures for action have mounted since the administration decided to proceed with building of a hydrogen bomb, according to a Congressional Quarterly report.

In addition to organizations seeking world federation, disarmament, peace talks with Russia, or a revamping of the United Nations, church groups are emerging as strong backers of a moral crusade for peace.

Unfortunately, organizations disagree on ways to insure peace. Shaping up is a bitter-end show-down on the question of world federation versus national sovereignty. The controversy conceivably could become so bitter that it would balk any real movement toward a stronger global organization. However, more hopeful observers see an opportunity for working out a compromise between the various plans as the debate reaches a climactic stage.

Chief stimulant for the flood of letters to Congressmen, says the Congressional Quarterly, continues to be plans pending in Congress for a kind of Government which could legislate on the basic causes of present international frictions. Eleven major proposals are formally before Congress at present; 3 of them are jointly sponsored by 10 or more Senators. One is backed by more than 100 Representatives. All are aimed at peace, though varying in ways the sponsors feel it may best be secured. Most prominent among the proposals are plans to alter the United Nations and to achieve a federation of democracies by way of the UN. Leading proponents of various plans are United World Federalists, Federal Union, Inc.; American Association for the UN, Citizens' Committee for UN Reform, Chamber of Commerce, League of Women Voters, American Legion, Society for the Prevention of World War III, and the Committee to Frame a World Constitution.

While plans for insuring peace have been multiplying and gaining converts, a counter-campaign has gained strength to balk any proposal which would abridge American sovereignty. This campaign has taken on such proportions in some sections that efforts are being made to smear the United World Federalists. In Georgia a world government resolution has been repealed. Maine's House of Representatives voted for repeal, but the senate stood by its world government resolution. Repeal motions are pending in New Jersey and Virginia.

Mary Hornaday reports in the Christian Science Monitor that the campaign against world government has been taken up by such right-wing organizations as the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, the National Society of New England Women, the Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, the American Coalition, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

A speaker before a group of women patriots told a congressional committee, "There is little difference between those who advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States and those who advocate the surrender of the Government of the United States." Some critics have gone so far as to brand the UWF subversive. Some of the "dangerous left-wingers" interested in the movement include such patriotic and able persons as Dr. Albert Einstein, commentator Raymond Gram Swing, playwright Robert Sherwood, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, attorney Grenville Clark, historian Carl van Doren, and Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature. How ridiculous can smear campaigns get?

UWF policy adopted in October 1949, said federalists differ on how much power a world federal government should have at the start, but fully agreed that we should move as rapidly as possible to a world federal government with authority and power to legislate on basic causes of international friction. The group backs UN, but says it cannot prevent war as long as it remains a league of sovereign states.

The Atlantic union plan of Federal Union, Inc., calls for a union of the free democracies. It calls for immediate development of the North Atlantic treaty powers into a regional federation within the UN. It differs from world federation mainly in procedure. Other plans would revise the UN Charter and abolish the veto in the Security Council.

There is little hope for achieving real security as long as people are locked in a bitter fight over sovereignty as against world government. America will be unable to sell the idea of federation to the strongly nationalistic Europeans until its people demonstrate that they are willing to lend their support to an international authority to stop wars. The United States can hardly point the finger of scorn at "noncooperative" Russia if they cannot join in support of a plan calling for more than an international debating society.

Conservation and Development of Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, there was held in my home town of Gadsden, Ala., an important meeting for the purpose of discussing ways and means for the conservation and development of the natural resources of our great State. Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of the Corps of Engineers, was the featured speaker at this meeting. I commend his address to the attention of the Members of Congress:

What I would like to talk about is the building of a greater America.

If you were going to start out today to lay out a blueprint for the building of a greater America, where would you start? If you were going to lay out a plan for the building of this great dam on the Coosa River that we

hope to start next year, what would you do? Well, I don't know what you'd do, but I'll tell you what if you didn't do, you'd be in a very bad way in a very short while. And that is, if you did not find the right kind of foundation before you started building on it.

Now, if you're going to build a greater America, what kind of foundation would you start with? As you build a great country you can't stop in the middle of the building and turn around and start all over again. Because it requires too much effort, too much money, and would disrupt too many things to try to rearrange the building of a great country every few years. So, to build a greater country than we are now and one which you and I both know is the greatest country in the world, you'd have to start on those things which would give you the firmest foundation. Those of which you have the most. Those which would last few longer than any other potential which you have. If you didn't, you'd be like the man memorialized in the Bible who built his house upon an unsecure foundation.

Now, in order to build a greater America, and we must build a greater America. We must build a greater United States. We must build on our greatest potentials. I've seen the Garden of Eden. I've seen where the Euphrates and Tigris come together. And I'll guarantee you that there's nothing left there but a little thin fringe of date palms on both sides of those two streams. And they're maintained because they take the water out of the Tigris River and run it around the rows of date palms in order to feed the roots with the proper amount of moisture to keep them going. For thousands of miles on each side there is nothing but sand, no trees, no grass—perhaps a little thistle. And that was the section of the country which at one time produced cities like Babylon. It was the center of the agricultural development of the known world at that time because that was memorialized as the area in which the Garden of Eden was located. We in the United States know that we are a young country. We know that there is plenty of land right in the States of Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi and the other Southern States that have been worn out farming. A man told me not long ago that he had worn out three farms. Think about it—a man wearing out three farms during his own lifetime. It means that he actually did wear it out. He cultivated the land so that all the topsoil washed away. But, down in this part of the United States when you do wear out a farm, we can throw it out and let it lie idle for a number of years and it'll grow a crop of pine trees or hardwood. We can reclaim that land, but you can't reclaim such land in the West. Once it wears out and gets ground up into shale, it won't even grow grass. It's gone forever. It's bad land.

Therefore, if you were to lay out a blueprint for the United States you'd have to start with your land if you wanted to continue strong as an agricultural nation, and we must do that. God forgive us that day when we have to go abroad for our meat and bread. Meat and bread for whom? The present population? Or the population we're going to have in the next 50 years? You and I know that the population of the United States has doubled since 1900. You and I know that our population is increasing at the rate of 2,000,000 per year. You and I know that at the end of this present century—50 years hence—we're going to have a much larger population than we have now. And, certainly, in a hundred years from now, conceivably, we will have 300,000,000 people. Now, what does that mean?

It means that we cannot exist as a leading nation of the world by continuing to be just an agricultural nation. However, we must continue to be a strong agricultural nation. We must always try to raise enough meat and bread to take care of our own people.

We've already developed into one of the greatest industrial nations in the world. Can we rest on our laurels? If we come up in the year 2000 with 200,000,000 people we've got to have jobs for them. We've got to provide employment for them. We've got to keep those people busy, if we want to maintain our way of life. Therefore, we must continue to build industrially. We cannot afford to stop now because, as soon as we stop building in this great country of ours we'll start down. Think about the countries that have passed by the wayside during the time of written history. You can see that the civilization has drifted from the Middle East on to the west. We have just inherited the leadership in the world, although that leadership is being challenged. We must not allow the challenge to disturb our going forward. We must not allow anything to disturb us from going forward. But we've got to do it wisely.

I've told you about one of the great potentials. The other is water. It means that we've got to have sufficient water to meet the needs of the people of the United States in carrying out the rebuilding of a greater America. The building of a greater United States. We've got to have the water. In my estimation there is no limit to that building of a great America. There isn't but one thing that will limit that building of a great United States or greater United States. That one thing is not land, but it's water—water. Our Nation, less than 200 years old under our presently constituted government and, yet on Saturday night, I was sitting in a hotel restaurant in New York and the man came around and said, "Will you have a glass of water?" I said, "Yes." He said, "You know if you want water in New York you have to ask for it." They are not serving water on the restaurant and dining room tables in New York now.

Think about it. Think about it. They discovered gold in California in 1849. In that 100 years the boundary of the United States has been shifted from the Mississippi River to the California coast. All of that happened in such a short time. Most of it happened since the Civil War. We've got States in the United States that are only 34 years old. We are a young and prosperous Nation. We must continue to be a young and prosperous Nation because the young men will build this country. The young men will build it. The young men must take up the burden as they come around to take over the jobs from us older people. They are the men with vision to go ahead with the building of this great country. Industrially we've been able to build up rapidly because we had such a vast storehouse of natural potentials in the form of mineral resources in this country. You and I know that those mineral resources have been used up at a rapid rate. You and I know that the backbone of all of this great development in the United States has centered around that load of iron ore on the Iron Range in Minnesota and Wisconsin. You and I both know today that's running out. And you and I know that it wouldn't be wise to take all of that out of the ground before you found a new source.

You have to provide cheap transportation if you want to continue as a great industrial nation. That is absolutely true. We must provide the cheapest transportation that is possible, because what have we got to do? We've got to continue as a great industrial Nation. That means we can always produce more than necessary to meet our home consumption. We've got to send some abroad to the far corners of the world. Now we can go into the far corners of the world, and get the natural mineral ores and raw products that we need if we bring them here by employing cheap transportation. And get it to the areas in which they can be worked up, processed, and then sell the finished product to our own people and export the rest of it to the far corners of the world. But we cannot do that and at the same time go out and have to bring in our meat and bread. We have seen countries fall by the wayside because they tried just that system of doing things. England today is in a terrible fix because she's trying to carry on an industrial development and, at the same time, bring in the raw materials and also bring in the food. It can't be done.

We've got the highest standard of living in the world. We've got to guard that, jealously so. Therefore, we've got to do everything as cheaply as possible. And, remember, that we've got the two potentials to work on—our land and water. We can take care of the land. The people of the United States, our Government, our Congress, are all conscious of that fact and working toward that development. It necessarily must come slow because it is such a vast undertaking. But tremendous progress is being made on it. But, if we've got an industrialist development in the United States now that balances off to take care of 152,000,000 people, we've got to have a greater industrial development later on to take care of those people that are coming along to increase our population. The one thing that stops industrial development in any area is the lack of water. New York is short of water now. They can get some more water, but there is a limit to that which they can get. They will increase their supply up there. They are already working to increase it. But that will take care of them for 15—not more than 20—years because they've had to rebuild their system on an average of every 10 to 15 years. Philadelphia, Jersey City, Baltimore—they all know exactly how much water they have available to them now, and that must last them from now on.

See where you get your water supply. See where it comes from. See how much you've got to work, not only for the next 25 years but 50, 75, 100, and 500 years from now. That's all the water you've got. You're blessed here in the Tennessee Basin because there has been a great and wonderful development out here to conserve the water in this area. You could pipe water from the Tennessee River up here and some day you may have to do it. But there are a lot of areas in the United States that can't do that. I know places in the United States—great industrial areas—that you couldn't put one more industrial establishment because they don't have the water. I know areas in the United States where they are running salt water through some of their industrial processing plants because they have no fresh water and it's costing them very dearly to be using salt water because the corrosion is terrific. We can't continue on that basis so we've got to conserve the water in all of our stream basins in the United States because we need it.

Industry will be distributed all over the United States. You've heard a lot said that that is necessary from a national-defense standpoint. That no doubt is entirely true, if we understand what's going on in the world today. But I will tell you that there are going to be industries distributed all over the United States whether we have potential peace or not. That's bound to come because of a lack of water. The Corps of Engineers, under its charge from the Congress, is vitally concerned with and responsible for the conservation of water and the destruction of floods and the providing of navigation channels all over the United States. This organization has been doing this work for the Congress for 125 years. They have been engaged in engineering work for 175 years. Today we are working on over 200 stream basins in the United States. We've done a lot to help in large areas in the

United States to develop the water resources in those States. The Missouri Basin, for instance, 530,000 square miles of territory, is being actively worked on today, to stop the destruction and put the water to work for the people.

I've looked at this area down in the South and, if you want to see a magic area, you look at the area from the Savannah River watershed on around through Alabama over into Mississippi and down to the Pearl River. There is a territory that has been settled a long time that used the waterways to the maximum. They came in here. And then they left the waterways alone. That was the thing to do because the transportation facilities required were much faster than those that could be afforded on the waterways. The waterways in their natural state would not serve the people. We needed a network of railroads, we needed a network of highways and now we've got the air lines we certainly need. We've seen this area develop, we've seen the possibilities of developing the resources to provide the wherewithal to carry on a greater industrial development. And, in this area, there are vast resources of minerals that will stand us in good stead for many years to come. And I understand there may be oil here in Alabama and Mississippi, perhaps in Florida and Georgia. That will be grand, but all of those will go by the wayside. I've seen great areas in Kansas where the oil derricks were just as thick as these tables around here when you stand off and look at them at a distance. And yet I've seen them where they have pulled the pumpers out and I've seen the farmers planting their wheat, last year, right up to the old site of the pump. They pumped all the oil out and have gone. But they're still growing wheat out there and that is where we produce all of our surplus wheat in the United States. The minerals are gone.

The minerals will go from this area down here, in time. But there is a vast store of them here yet to encourage the development of a great industrial area down here. I call it the magic area. About 2,000,000 kilowatts of power is possible in the area I am telling you about. You've got the transportation facilities here—land, rail, and highway and air. You have the possibilities of bringing those rivers right into the heart of the area where that power is possible. You impound the water and you have plenty of fresh water in that area. It's remained dormant, almost, for years so far as the water is concerned. But it's needed now and, if the people want that water developed down here, if the people want to see a great industrial development in this section, they are going to have it. The Congress is developing those sections of the country like the Central Basin of California, the Missouri Basin, vast territories in Texas and Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Arizona and the Columbia Basin. Up the Mississippi Basin, they are developing those great areas because the people want them developed. I'm positive that the Congress wants to see this area developed down here because they've authorized a survey and it'll prove the project and they've started appropriating the funds.

The United States steel people now expect to bring in within 3 years of the port of Mobile to start out with 3,000,000 tons of rich iron ore, even richer than that on the iron range in the central part of the United States. Even richer—67 percent iron. They are going to start by bringing 3,000,000 tons into the Birmingham area. Why? Not because they need it all now but they don't want to take it all out of the ground. Obviously they haven't told me that but I know that's true. We can go all over the world and get the raw products and bring them in here. We can expand our industries. We can develop jobs for the thousands and hundreds of thousands and millions of people that are to come on later.

But we've got to have the water. When the water is impounded, it should be used over and over and over as many times as we possibly can to get all of the benefits out of it before we turn it into the sea. We must prevent the destruction caused by floods. We must provide depth to the water in the rivers so that towboats can come up there and bring these raw products in from ports like Savannah, Jacksonville, Mobile, New Orleans; so they can bring it into the areas where it can be processed. And we ought to have an exit from this area to the central part of the United States. We ought to have a connection from the Tombigbee and the Warrior system down there with the Tennessee River so that those finished products could be distributed in our own country. I've seen people in India die by the thousands because they couldn't distribute the needed bread from one state to another because they have no means of transportation. You've got to have transportation from the great industrial areas down in Alabama and Georgia and Mississippi and Florida to get it to the central part of the United States. There is a little gap here between the Tennessee River and the Tombigbee River. If that were cut through (it is entirely feasible and not too costly) you would be able to ship the products from the Birmingham area, from this industrial area, and from the Coosa River where you just built that great paper mill. You can send paper from the paper mill right here on the Coosa River to one of the owners of that mill by barge through the waterways that exist today except for that little narrow gap between the Tennessee River and the Warrior River down there. You can ship in slack water to the Tennessee and up the Ohio to the Pittsburgh area. You can ship it to St. Louis, you can ship it to Chicago, you can ship it to Minneapolis and St. Paul. You can ship it on up the Missouri River as far as it goes. It is approved now 800 miles up the Missouri River. You can ship it to Corpus Christi, Tex., or Brownsville, Tex., or you can ship it up the Atlantic seaboard all the way up to New Jersey.

Transportation—cheap transportation—it can't be too cheap. You say that takes revenue away from the other forms of transportation that we have got to keep up. No. In this area right here, if you doubled the industrial development in this that I call the magic area, you'll have to rebuild the railroads to haul what they will be called upon to haul out of here. The power companies—I don't care who distributes the power, I don't care who gets the money for it. All I want to do is see us not destroy any of the power possibilities here. I know that if you develop a large amount of power in Alabama, Mississippi, and Georgia, it will be for the benefit of the people. And the Congress and the Federal Power Commission have never had any trouble in working out satisfactory rates so that the people would get those benefits. So let's not worry about who is going to get what. Who does what and who is going to get the $2. Let us develop the country. We can work out these things on an equity basis. If we do not start out right you can change it. But if you destroy any of the potentials on any of these waterways or if you destroy the possibilities of using the water in these streams to the maximum, then you are doing something that cannot be easily undone. Let us get all out of our water we can.

Gentlemen, you have got to have water for people to drink. You have got to have water to carry on industrial development. It takes 300 gallons of water to make a pound of synthetic rubber. It takes 32 gallons of water to make a pound of steel. It takes a tremendous amount of water for one of our newest industries—air conditioning. It takes water for every industrial processing that we know of and the more you have the more water it is going to take. But, listen, don't ever let anybody get you to invest a lot of money in a scheme where they are going to get cooling water from the ground. Because, gentlemen, that is only a very, very temporary source. You can't make it in this country by trying to get the water out of the ground. I know States now that have found that out. Let that water stay in the ground and figure on using the annual run-off by conserving all of our streams in this country, and we will perpetuate the United States as a great Nation for thousands of years to come.

How to Achieve Total Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following recent article by George Sokolsky. It recites once more some of the record of Mr. Dean Acheson which makes it difficult, if not impossible, for either Americans or foreign nations to have the confidence in our Department of State which it must command if we are to have at home and abroad the strength and unity necessary to meet the perils of this hour. Mr. Acheson rightly says we need total diplomacy. Some of us have urged that for 3 years. But the fact is that Mr. Acheson's own record makes it impossible for him to command the confidence necessary to achieve total diplomacy.

(By George Sokolsky)

Dean Acheson is now a convert to reality. After a career of error, beginning in 1941 and ending a week ago, he has finally come to a realization of the errors, but not to a recognition of his responsibility for them. His last gamble with destiny was a bad throw; he had fantastically assumed that reality was at fault and he played to lose on Mao Tse-tung.

In any country other than ours, any man who had been so consistently and obstinately wrong would have been driven from public life. He would long since have been forced to resign.

All he seems to do here is to announce a change of policy, not even confessing his errors, and we are expected to accept his conversion without scrutiny or even wonder.

Acheson asks us all to unite in a total diplomacy against Soviet Russia, but how can we unite with him? From 1941 until last week, he and his teammate Alger Hiss, were responsible for the appeasement of Russian policy. The record is clear.

Dean Acheson, graduate of the Harvard law school, like so many others of the confused employees of our Government, entered upon his career in the Treasury, where he did not agree with Mr. Roosevelt's fantastic fiscal conceptions and was dropped.

In 1941, he entered the State Department as Assistant Secretary of State; then he became Under Secretary of State, a position he held until 1947 when he resigned. He returned as Secretary of State in 1949.

The Acheson influence in the State Department has been enormous. He was the

smart man. His principal adjutant was Alger Hiss.

Alger's brother, Donald, became a partner in Acheson's law firm, which specialized in representing foreign countries in Washington, particularly such as had special relations with the State and Treasury Departments: Colombia, Greece, Iran, Denmark, Pakistan, and Soviet Poland.

We must now go back a step to the Harold Ware Communist cell organized in 1934. That cell was organized to penetrate high levels of administration and it is clear from the evidence at both Hiss trials that Alger Hiss was of this cell.

At any rate, in 1939, Dr. J. B. Matthews of the Dies committee gave to the Department of Justice the names of the members of the Ware cell. Among those names was that of Alger Hiss. Matthews showed me the list at the time.

Also in that year, Whittaker Chambers and Isaac Don Levine discussed most of the evidence that was brought out at both Hiss trials with Adolf A. Berle, then of the State Department.

Berle has testified under oath that as early as 1941, he had warned Acheson that the loyalty of both Alger and Donald Hiss was doubtful. In 1944, Berle, then security officer of the State Department, warned Acheson and others in the State Department that their pro-Russian policy was wrong.

The Acheson group, with Alger Hiss as Acheson's principal assistant, fought Berle, had Hiss transferred to Brazil and as Berle said: "That ended my diplomatic career."

Subsequent to Berle's reports on Alger Hiss, Acheson had his friend transferred from the Far Eastern Affairs Division, where he had no business to be as he knew nothing about the subject, to the Office of Special Political Affairs which Acheson ran and which had to do with all the peace efforts of the Government.

This was no place for a man whose loyalty was in doubt and who could have an affiliation with a foreign government that might imperil the negotiating power of the United States.

Acheson cannot plead that he did not know about Hiss; he can only say that he did not believe what he was told. But in his position, could he risk a doubtful personality as executive secretary of Dumbarton Oaks or as President Roosevelt's adviser at Yalta, or as secretary-general of the San Francisco Conference setting up the United Nations?

Dean Acheson succeeded Joseph C. Grew as Under Secretary of State after Grew insisted upon prosecuting the spies in the Amerasia case. What power in our Government drove Grew out and put Acheson in his place?

Are We Heading for Financial Disaster?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Are We Heading for Financial Disaster?" delivered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the American Retail Federation, on April 4, 1950, together with a statement prepared by me to precede the address.

There being no objection, the statement and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. GURNEY

Mr. President, last evening I attended the annual dinner of the delegates to the American Retail Federation convention. This is the parent organization representing many national and State retail trade organizations—representing therefore a very fine and large group; a real cross-section of America.

The address was delivered by an honored Member of the Senate of the United States, the senior Senator from the State of Ohio, Mr. TAFT. His address, entitled "Are We Heading for Financial Disaster," is a subject about which many of us in the Senate are deeply concerned and about which the people of our country are rightly worried.

This very serious financial situation our country is now in was described in such a concise and logical manner that I should like to bring it to the attention of my colleagues who did not hear the address. I commend it to all Senators and urge all Senators to read it.

ARE WE HEADING FOR FINANCIAL DISASTER?

It is a great privilege to be invited to address the American Retail Federation in their annual convention. The Retailers of America number more than half of the people who are engaged in operating their own business. They, therefore, contribute to the independent thinking and the free system of the American economy. They carry out to the limit the theory of competition and, as a general rule, the larger the company the narrower the spread on which it does business. We have no problem here as I see it in preventing the growth of monopoly. Rather, the danger is an occasional excessive use of unfair methods of competition.

The retailers, I believe, are a real bulwark against the steady trend toward socialism which has been so apparent in our recent history. They believe in liberty, as the cause of our success, and as the basis for hoping that the American people may constantly improve in their knowledge, their ideals, their production and their standard of living. They can be the leaders of American thought in the right direction.

I spoke last week of the necessarily socialistic effect of the program presented to the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses by the Administration in power in the demand for economic planning to be carried out by complete bureaucratic control of commerce, industry and agriculture; in the demand for free Federal services in every field of education and welfare; in the attempt to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and purge those who dared to limit the special privileges of labor union officials. In that policy we find a program almost exactly like that of the labor-socialist government of Great Britain, urged upon us in homeopathic doses. It adds up to a complete concentration of power in Washington.

DEFICIT SPENDING

Tonight I want to deal with another policy of the Government which can lead just as certainly to the same end—the policy of Government spending unlimited by any necessity of raising taxes to pay for the spending—deficit spending in time of peace. Every citizen of this country should be tremendously disturbed and alarmed at the present fiscal program.

The first year of the Eightieth Congress we had a surplus of more than $6,000,000,000, the second year a deficit of one billion eight. To end of the first year of the Eighty-first Congress will see a deficit of $6,000,000,000, and the budget message submitted by the President contemplates another deficit for the year ending July 1, 1951, of more than $5,000,000,000. In 3 years the expenses of the Government have increased from $34,000,000,000 to $43,000,000,000, of which only about $2,500,000,000 is in foreign spending, perhaps justified by the cold war against Russia. The President's budget and tax messages gave a slight lip service to the principle of a balanced budget. It is suggested that taxes at the present rate will ultimately yield more because there will be an increase in prosperity. It is suggested that the veterans' education program and the aid to foreign countries will taper off. Nothing is said, however, about the additional expenses recommended in the Brannan plan, direct Government loans for housing, universal military training, socialized medicine, and increases in other welfare services, all recommended by the President and amounting to far more than any possible saving in the items which he mentions. The President blames the deficit on the Republicans because they enacted a decrease in the war income-tax rates, but he nullifies his own argument by recommending against a restoration of those taxes. In fact, the essence of his fiscal policy appears to be that Government deficit spending is desirable in order to prime the pump of increased prosperity which will then produce more taxes to balance the budget. This is the old fallacy that we can spend ourselves into prosperity. I do not think there is any respectable economic authority, right or left, who favors an unbalanced budget at the present time. There are some economists who feel that we should not attempt to balance the budget in depression years—but they would balance the deficit in such years with surpluses in more prosperous times. Today we are not below normal, and even their theory that the budget need only be balanced over a reasonable number of years would not justify a deficit.

We have a huge debt of $256,000,000,000. It is hard to carry today and dangerous indeed if we have to face the financing required by another war. If we increase it at the rate of five billion a year, it is difficult to see how we can do any war financing without destructive inflation.

Even without war, such a deficit means a resumption of the inflationary spiral. It creates purchasing power with no production to balance it. It means, therefore, a further rise in prices, stimulating further increases in wages and a steady depreciation in the value of a dollar. It is, in effect, a form of bankruptcy. The Government is repudiating a portion of its own debt, including savings bonds now being sold, by pursuing a policy which will enable it to pay that debt off in cheap dollars far below the real value of the dollars which it borrows.

The deficit spending policy is demoralizing to Congress. If any Congress ever accepts the philosophy that money can be spent in peacetime without any necessity of levying taxes to provide the money, there is no limit to what Congress can spend. We have projects before us for many billions of dollars, many of them worthy projects if we could afford them. Take away the necessity of enacting unpopular taxes and our deficit will be closer to fifteen billion than five. The policy is demoralizing to the people and an easy road to socialism. In effect, it says to the people that they can get something for nothing. Of course the fact is they will pay double for the spending projects through the inflation of prices. The principle of deficit spending makes socialism easier to achieve. The British are at least frank with their people. "Here is socialism," they say, "and here is the bill for it. True, it is expensive, but it is worth it." The British Government balances its budget. But our deficit spending policy is an attempt to tell the people that they can have all these free services without 1 cent of cost.

GREATER TAXATION IS BAYONETS

If we wish to escape the national calamity contained in such a policy, we have only two alternative—either we must increase taxes, or we must reduce expenses. The increase of taxes seems to me also a very dangerous policy, because I believe that taxes are already so high as to threaten the success of a free economy. In the next fiscal year, we intend to raise $38,000,000,000 in direct Federal taxes, another $6,000,000,000 in pay-roll taxes and perhaps $16,000,000,000 in State and local taxes. This is a total of $60,000,000,000 or 28 percent of our national income—about 24 percent of our gross product. Unquestionably, there is some limit beyond which taxes cannot go and still expect the free system to operate or even produce the taxes we are trying to collect.

In the first place, such a tax burden directly reduces the standard of living of the people, including those who think they do not pay a cent of tax. Most taxes are passed on to the consumer. Certainly, the real estate tax appears in rent, the pay-roll and withholding and excise taxes in the price of the products bought. I think it is conservative to estimate that probably 20 percent of the price paid for food and clothing and other necessities of life represents taxes passed on by those who pay them directly. Taxes, therefore, have already become a serious limitation on the liberty of the people. We have been asked by the administration where we have lost any liberty up to this time. Here is the place. The Government tells us all that we cannot keep the proceeds of our own labor and spend it as we desire to spend it. It will take from 20 to 50 percent of our income and will spend it as the Government sees fit, instead of leaving us free to do our own spending. It proposes to spend our income on services which we may or may not get, and which we may or may not want. Obviously, if this percentage is increased, we have less and less freedom. If we reach 30 or 40 percent, we have a complete socialist state in which the Government conducts all our activities and our spending for us.

Furthermore, excessive taxation can kill the goose that lays the golden egg and prevent the operation of a free economy. I fully agree with President Truman when he said in his message "taxes can and do have an important effect upon business conditions and economic activity. It should be our constant objective to improve our tax system so that the required revenues can be obtained without impairing the private initiative and enterprise essential to continued economic growth." Remember, we cannot stand still. We must provide about a million new jobs a year to provide for the young people coming into the labor market and those displaced by technological improvements. Perhaps the present system can be improved, but even our present weight of taxes today has cut down the money available for risk enterprise. There is little investment money for common stocks in large or small companies. There is little money for new businesses, except very small ones which can be financed by one man and his family. The reason is very clear. Any man who invests in any business finds a tax of 38 percent on corporation profits, and a high personal income-tax rate on any money which is distributed to him. If he loses, he loses his own money—and two-thirds of new businesses are said to fail—if he hits a profit-making enterprise, the Government takes most of his profits away from him. "Heads you win, tails I lose."

As I say, we can perhaps improve this condition at our present level of taxation by devising some means of reducing the double taxation on risk enterprise and directing the large savings from lower-income groups into industry rather than into institutions which can only lend money. One thing is certain to my mind, however; we cannot safely increase the present tax burden. In Great Britain they have raised taxes to a point where they are taking 40 percent of the national income. Most men have a hard time keeping enough money to pay their living expenses, and few have any money to invest in industrial expansion and improvement. The result has been stagnation in such development, and austerity for the British workmen.

In our States and localities, we have constitutional and statutory tax limitations. Since we have none in the Federal Government, the people have come to believe that the Federal Treasury is an inexhaustible grab bag. As a matter of fact, we have a practical limitation on Federal taxation beyond which we cannot go without destroying the very proceeds we are trying to reach and in the process destroying our free industrial system. We have reached that practical limit.

THE ONLY REMEDY IS TO REDUCE EXPENSES

It seems clear to me, therefore, that Government spending has reached a point beyond that which we can maintain and still hope to retain the liberty of a free people and the success of a free economy. Those expenses must be reduced if we do not intend to go steadily down the road toward socialistic controls and the all-powerful state. The increase of expenses from fiscal 1948 to fiscal 1950 is $9,500,000,000. Of this increase, about six billion is in domestic expenditures, more than two and one-half billion in foreign. I believe the statement made by Senators BYRD and GEORGE asserting that six billion can be cut from the budget is a practical program, perhaps not for the coming fiscal year, but certainly for the following year. A good many of the programs cannot be cut off over night, and so I would be willing to accept some smaller deficit for the year 1951 if we can see a balance in 1952.

At the present moment, I do not feel that we can afford to cut the national defense forces. I believe that Mr. Johnson has done a good job in eliminating unnecessary duplications and perhaps something more can be done in that line, but if so the money can well be used for strengthening the weak spots pointed out by General Eisenhower.

The President has expressed the view that our aid to foreign countries will decrease. I have supported the ECA because I felt that as an emergency matter to meet the crisis growing out of the war we could block communism in Europe by aiding western nations to come back to normal much more rapidly than they could do without our aid. Their production today is back to normal, and the problems they have to solve are long-range problems which basically they must solve for themselves. I believe the ECA should be rapidly tapered off, as originally contemplated, and that aid to foreign countries within 2 years should be reduced by $3,500,000,000. If we had not had a large surplus I doubt if such aid should ever have been undertaken. No other nation in the world has ever contemplated such a program. No doubt, there will always be some expenditures where the value is so great as to justify the taxing of our people for the benefit of other nations, but the aid should be confined to matters clearly beneficial both to us and to the nation assisted, and I should hope that even that burden might be taken over gradually by private capital seeking investment.

In the domestic field, however, we have been led into many programs which have assumed an expense far beyond the figures which were at first suggested. It seems to me that the time has come to make a completely impartial, nonpartisan study of this whole problem of Government spending. A nonpartisan Commission of leading citizens should be appointed by the President and Congress, containing representatives of the executive and legislative branches, to study and report on the long-range spending programs of the Federal Government with reference to their relative importance, and also on the burden of taxation which a free economy can stand and still exist. We have not understood, as a rule, the tremendous expense involved when the Government attempts to benefit directly millions of its citizens instead of confining itself to operations in research, education, advice, and assistance. Thus, the veterans' expense of more than $6,000,000,000 has to reach 20,000,000 veterans. That makes it necessary that the program be scrutinized with critical care.

During the current year we are paying out more than $12,000,000,000 under various programs direct to individuals whose contributions, if any, have been made in past years. At the moment they are getting something for nothing. In addition to the veterans' program, we are paying $2,000,000,000 in dividends on life-insurance policies, more than $1,100,000,000 for public assistance, more than $1,105,000,000 for retirement pensions of different kinds, more than $2,000,000,000 for unemployment compensation. We have been led into many of these on the theory that they cost nothing to the taxpayer and do not directly affect the budget. Nevertheless, they all add to the burden of taxation and cut the taxes which can be safely levied to meet other expenses. Pay-roll taxes for unemployment compensation, Federal old-age and survivors insurance, railroad retirement funds, are just as much taxes though levied for a special purpose.

A complete restudy should be made at once of the agricultural program from the point of view of the long-range expense to which we have found ourselves suddenly committed. Farm programs like the McNary-Haugen bill and the export debenture plan never contemplated any subsidy out of the Treasury. The farmer himself took the loss involved in disposing of the surplus. The price-support program as originally conceived did not involve the Government in loss, but only the carrying of surpluses from good years to bad and in general the maintenance of a fair price which would also be fair to the consumer, and enable any products purchased to be disposed of in most cases without loss.

Nor did the GI housing program originally propose to draw any cash out of the Treasury, but only to guarantee loans. Yet today it is taking more than a billion dollars a year to buy the GI mortgages.

The function of such a commission as I have suggested is much broader than the Hoover Commission. Substantial savings can be made if the Hoover report is accepted, but that report after all deals only with the reorganization rather than with changes in policy, and the matter so far submitted by the President, except in the case of the armed forces, hardly promises any financial saving.

It is strange indeed that in an administration devoted to the principle of economic planning no real over-all plan has been made. I believe the reason is that the economic planners for the most part like the idea of a Socialist state. That is what their planning thoughts are directed toward, and not toward the successful operation of a free economy. Consequently, they are more than pleased with a policy of drift and fail no restraint about unlimited spending, excessive taxation, and huge deficits. It may be that only the people at the polls rather than a scientific commission can introduce sound planning into Government.

At the present time great pressure is being brought to bear for the armed forces and foreign spending. It is possible that the danger of a crisis is being exaggerated somewhat at the time when appropriations are

being sought. On the other hand, I may be wrong and Congress may determine that huge foreign expenditures will have to continue because of the cold war waged against us by Russia. If the administration and Congress determine that present-level foreign spending shall be continued, it can only be justified by the real existence of a tremendous national emergency very similar to war. Under those circumstances, we should balance the budget by postponing many expenditures at home just as we did during the Second World War.

Public works are highly desirable, but they can be postponed for a few years. Improvement in public welfare is one of the purposes of our Republic, but the liberty and the security of the Republic is of still greater importance. The very cold war crisis which would justify continued foreign spending demands a sound fiscal foundation against the possibility of a shooting war. I am personally in favor of many welfare measures and most of the public works program. But if final decision is that foreign spending is necessary for national security, then I would be willing to postpone even those programs in which I have the greatest interest.

There is some tendency to say that the cold war justifies a deficit. I do not agree. If we could have financed the Second World War out of taxes, we should have done so. Failure to do so raised the cost of living by 70 percent and cut the value of a dollar almost in half. But the sums which had to be spent there were so huge no one could devise a tax system to meet them without the greatest injustice to millions of our people and hardship to many. This cold war, no matter how serious, can be financed by taxes if we are willing to postpone a few of the things which we would like to enjoy.

The purpose of our foreign policy is primarily to maintain the liberty of the American people. For that purpose, I am willing to spend money which is proved to be necessary, but it makes no sense to spend vast sums abroad to maintain that liberty, and then at home pursue a policy of deficit spending or excessive taxation which would bring to an end here the very liberty which we are trying to maintain.

The Pony Express

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE MAGEE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following speech by Congressman PHIL J. WELCH, of Missouri, at the ninetieth anniversary of the start of the Pony Express, which was printed in the St. Joseph News-Press of April 3, 1950:

Honorable Mayor Allison, Mr. Redmond, distinguished guests, friends: we tread historic ground here today.

At this very spot just 90 years ago a brave and colorful undertaking—the historic Pony Express—started.

The Pony Express, as daring an adventure as features the pages of our history, did more than merely deliver letters between the East and West.

The Pony Express aided an imperiled government, helped to pacify and retain in the Union the giant commonwealth of California. It showed the practicability of establishing a transcontinental railroad, and keeping it open for traffic regardless of winter blizzards and snows.

It bound together the East and the West at a time when overland travel was slow and cumbersome, when a great national crisis—the even then impending Civil War—made the rapid communication of news between the East and the West an imperative necessity.

Had it not been for the Pony Express this Nation might today be two countries—one western, one eastern. The Pony Express played the titanic role of lessening the distance of plain and desert that 90 years ago separated this Nation into two segments only sparsely connected.

True, the Pony Express failed financially, but it served the Nation faithfully and well, not only during the comparative brief months of its existence but on through the years.

Thus it is most fitting that we are gathered here at the site of the Pony Express Stables to join in a celebration of the ninetieth anniversary of the start of the Pony Express with our sister city on the west coast, the capital of California, Sacramento, the western terminus of the Pony Express.

Just as we stand here today so 90 years ago did our forefathers stand on this very ground to witness the start of what then, as now, was a courageous example of American enterprise.

Many of us in this crowd today are direct descendants of the stalwart people who stood here that April 3, 1860, evening as the first Pony Express rider dashed away into the gloom with his precious load of mail.

We are gathered this afternoon to dedicate the Pony Express Stables which the Goetz Pony Express Foundation will this year restore as a perpetual historic shrine and museum. Today these stables are in disrepair. But already the work of reconstruction has begun.

When completed it will stand as a monument to the glorious history of our State and the Old West. It will draw visitors from all corners of the United States to St. Joseph and the Midland Empire. Yes, the restoration of the Pony Express Stables will be a great civic asset a great Midland Empire asset, and a fitting tribute in reverence and honor to the men of vision who dreamed up the idea of a Pony Express and the intrepid young riders who carried that dream to glorious fulfillment.

As you know, I was not supposed to be the speaker here today. But as a St. Joseph man I naturally was interested in the Pony Express and the celebration planned for today. This is why I availed myself of the greatest source of information in the world, the Library of Congress in Washington, to increase my knowledge of the Pony Express.

James Buchanan was President of the United States when the Pony Express started. Twenty-one years before this county had been named in his honor. That was, of course, long before he became President. The county was named in his honor because of his great and outstanding service as United States Ambassador to Russia.

The population of St. Joseph when the Pony Express started was 8,891. Here let me digress a few seconds. Two of those 8,891 were my grandfather and my grandmother.

Our city today is approximately 10 times as large. The population of our Nation is approximately five times as large as the 31,443,321 inhabitants totaled in the 1860 census.

The total expenditures of the United States Government for the fiscal year that included the latter half of 1860 and the first 6 months of 1861 was $58,570,780. That included interest on the public debt.

Today our national budget is past the $40,000,000,000 figure.

Missouri, which now has 13 Congressmen, had 8 in 1860. The district of which St. Joseph was a part, the fourth in those days, was represented by the Honorable James Craig, many of whose descendants, including the Garth family, still reside in St. Joseph and are active in the affairs of the community.

It is most reassuring to have the Pony Express stables restored. We here in the Middle West are often too careless with our historic buildings and landmarks. Many a building that would in the East be regarded as outstanding because of its historical significance has been allowed to go before the wreckers' hammer thoughtlessly in this part of the country. We in the Middle West have a great and colorful heritage. We should do everything we can to see that that heritage and our history is preserved. Steps such as this preservation work undertaken by the Goetz Foundation are of immense value to a community and we cannot commend too highly those behind this and similar movements.

The operation of the Pony Express was a supreme achievement of physical endurance on the part of man and his ever faithful companion, the horse. It has been said that the history of the Pony Express should be a lasting monument to the physical sacrifice of man and beast in an effort to accomplish something worthwhile. It should be added that its history also should be an enduring tribute to American courage and American organizing genius.

Probably more than anything else, the Pony Express accurately portrays the kind of men who made possible the winning of the West. Its riders were youngsters who daily took their lives in their hands, youths who delighted in daring and who disregarded the suffering so often occasioned by their duties. Their idea was to get the mail through, regardless of cold, Indians, treacherous mountain paths, or desert. And they did just that. They were not to be halted. Those five words tell in full how our people won the West.

The men who operated the Pony Express were blunt. They made no attempt to hide the risks the riders would face. Proof of that is the advertisements they ran to secure riders.

Those advertisements boldly proclaimed that orphans were preferred as riders. The intent was clear. There would be no families to mourn their passing if ever-lurking ill fate befell them while on duty.

Your Pony Express Rodeo Band, the western attire which so many of you are wearing today, even the 10-gallon hat which you folks have so graciously presented to me, indicate the glamour the Pony Express holds for all of us. And no wonder. The Pony Express recounts the most thrilling chapter in the story of the Old West.

I can vividly recall my childhood days when Buffalo Bill would come to St. Joseph with his circus. I can still see him riding down Felix Street in a stagecoach in the parade of his circus, his long white hair touching his shoulders. I can recall the buckskin clothing he wore, the very way he waved his hat to his cheering admirers.

And why did Buffalo Bill thrill us?

Buffalo Bill had been a Pony Express rider. He had gone through with his mail despite Indian arrows and bullets. To us he was all that was great and glamorous. He was a Pony Express rider.

We went home thrilled and exhausted. For days there was no playing of cops and robbers. The game was Indians and Pony Express riders and the fellow who could prove he was toughest got the much desired role of Buffalo Bill in our game.

Our live-wire St. Joseph Junior Chamber of Commerce has offered $100 for the person who can present documentary evidence to prove the identity of the chap who swung his leg across a pony here in St. Joseph and took the Pony Express mail on the first run west.

I do not have much documentary evidence, but I feel certain that the first rider was Johnny Fry. I say that because when I was a boy I never heard anyone but Johnny Fry mentioned as being the first rider. I know that the late Josiah B. Moss, a talking history book of St. Joseph, always said that Johnny Fry was the first rider. And Mr. Moss was among those who stood at this very spot that day as the Pony Express started.

Yes—that was a long time back. It was the spring that Abraham Lincoln was making his campaign for the nomination for the Presidency. But the memory of Mr. Moss, who died only a few years ago, was remarkable, and I want to go along with him and my youthful playmates in the belief that Johnny Fry was the first rider.

Let us in mind's eye reconstruct what happened 90 years ago.

A crowd, as gay as that with us today, was gathered to witness the start. Mail from the East destined for the first run had been placed on the old Hannibal and St. Joseph Railroad at Hannibal. That was the first railroad west of the Mississippi and today it is part of the Burlington lines.

That day the wood-burning locomotive had a bad time. It was late arriving in St. Joseph, but the crowd at this spot waited. The mail was taken from the train to the post office, sorted, transferred to a mail pouch, and delivered to the first rider. Then there was the dash of the rider to the ferry, the bump as the ferryboat touched Kansas soil, and then the rider disappearing into the darkness as his mount started thundering along the first stretches of the long path across then bloody Kansas.

What happened that day was repeated over and over during the 79 weeks the Pony Express continued in operation. The management, although losing money, tried its best to improve the service and to shorten the time. It did and it cut the cost of sending mail.

Although the Pony Express was such a great factor in the California crisis and in assisting the Government in retaining the Pacific coast, it was the irony of fate that Congress should never give any direct relief or financial assistance to that mail service.

It was a private enterprise that did not rely on the Government. It paid its own way and more. One of its major expenses was the $75,000 it spent for protecting its interests in the war waged by the Utes and allied tribes. Undoubtedly that protection should have been furnished by the Government or the State or Territorial militia. It wasn't though. The Pony Express bore the brunt of that Indian outbreak and paid for it out of its own coffers.

When Edward Creighton, on October 24, 1861, completed the Pacific telegraph and began sending messages by wire from coast to coast, the doom of the Pony Express was sounded. The people of the far West were ardent supporters of the Pony Express by that time, and, records in the Library of Congress show, strongly protested against the eliminating of the Pony Express service.

For a glorious year and a half the Pony Express operated. The advance of civilization ended its operation, but did not mar its luster as one of the great, daring projects of the Nation. The names of the towns and the stations along the Pony Express Overland Route read like a litany of Old West lore—Elwood, Troy, Kennekuk, Seneca, Marysville, Big Sandy, Fort Kearney, North Platte, Fort Laramie, Casper, Salt Lake City, Carson City, Placerville, Sacramento, and the most famous of them all—St. Joseph, Mo., where the great adventure started.

Today I want to congratulate the people of St. Joseph, its excellent junior chamber of commerce, Mr. G. I. Ewick, president of the State Historical Society of Missouri; Bartlett Roder, president of the St. Joseph Historical Society; Floyd Shoemaker, executive secretary of the State Historical Society; St. Joseph's newspapers and radio stations, and all the other civic groups and organizations which have cooperated in this all-day celebration on the nineteenth anniversary of the Pony Express. To Sacramento and San Francisco may I also extend the greetings of this city.

And to the Goetz Pony Express Foundation I want to extend an especial congratulation. Because of this foundation, work on the reconstruction of the stables has already begun. And so, after 90 years, St. Joseph and the Midland Empire can say to the dauntless pony riders of yesteryear—to Johnny Fry, Pony Bob Haslem, Buffalo Bill Cody, Billy Richardson, and all the rest:

"Ride your ghost ponies back to St. Joseph. The doors of the Pony Express stables are open once more."

Gadsden, Ala., Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the surplus airport program initiated by the Congress, whereby airport properties were transferred to municipalities for use and development, has in my home town of Gadsden, Ala., been an outstanding success. Much of the credit for the successful development of this airport is attributable to the outstanding mayor of Gadsden, the Honorable J. Herbert Meighan.

Recently, Mr. W. Russell Graham, Jr., a representative of the CAA in Washington, inspected the airport property at Gadsden, and issued a very fine report on the development and operation of the Gadsden Airport. I attach herewith excerpts from his report, as follows:

Purpose of assignment: To analyze the administrative and financial operations of the Gadsden Airport; to survey the use of the airport properties which had been transferred to the city under the provisions of Public Law 289; and to evaluate the relative success of these operations, together with the city's use and management of the revenues received from such properties.

GENERAL

At the beginning of this report, it should be stated that the city of Gadsden has given us an outstanding demonstration of what can be accomplished with surplus properties when they are taken over and managed by public officials who have the will, initiative, and imagination to make such properties produce revenues to support, finance, and advance the local development of civil aviation.

Approximately 2 years ago, this city assumed the ownership and management of three very substantial bases which had been declared surplus to the needs of the military. At the time of their transfer from the War Assets Administration, many of the buildings were in a deplorable condition of repair. The city has spent some considerable sums of money in rehabilitating these buildings and other facilities. It has rented many of the buildings on long-term leases to tenants who are engaged in a variety of commercial enterprises. It has encouraged and persuaded these tenants to make substantial installations of equipment, and to spend sums on extensive repairs, rehabilitation, and maintenance.

As a result of these efforts, the city will earn revenues during the current year which are sufficient to repay all of its expenditures to date, and, in addition, will create a sizable reserve which will be used for major improvements of its airport. Within the near future, the city contemplates the following major improvements to its airport all of which, it is anticipated, will be financed from the revenues derived from these facilities.

1. Installation of new runway lighting system. The contract for this work has already been awarded at an estimated cost of $16,400.
2. Clean and reseal all expansion joints in the concrete runways and apron.
3. Stabilize the drainage area adjacent to the landing strips.
4. Construct a new access road.
5. Construct a new terminal building and control tower.
6. Construct new civil-aviation building.

CONCLUSION

In view of the very splendid job which is being accomplished in the management of these properties by Mayor J. H. Meighan, Mr. W. B. Mills, Jr., Mr. Cary Graham, and other city officials, this writer felt that he had no advice or suggestions to offer.

Know Your Waterways—Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit copy of an article published in the Washington Post, of even date, signed by the Marine News, of New York, as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—FLOOD CONTROL

Should our rivers flow down to the seas carrying away fertile topsoil from countless upland acres and wreckage from flood desolation, rather than a large part of the Nation's commerce? It is estimated that the Mississippi deposits more than 400,000,000 tons of fertile soil (silt) into the Gulf of Mexico every year, and the Columbia more than 100,000,000 tons into the Pacific. This tremendous loss of one of the Nation's most valuable assets, its land, is ominous. Should upcountry floodwater be dumped on unprotected regions below? Overflows from as widely separated areas as Montana and New York State finally reach the Gulf through the Mississippi and its tributaries. No State can take care of its floodwaters within its own borders. Should the tremendous power in our rivers run wild, disrupting industry and transportation, destroying wealth rather than creating it? When unimproved and uncontrolled, rivers are killers and destroyers; when controlled and improved, they are servants and producers.

MARINE NEWS,
GEORGE H. PALMER,
President and Publisher.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Emory R. Johnson and the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the special subcommittee on Panama Canal tolls, under House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress, of which I am chairman, and Representatives TOM B. FOGATT and EDWARD T. MILLER are members, started upon its investigation of the financial operation of the Panama Canal in the first session of the present Congress.

In conducting our studies we consulted the celebrated works on Panama Canal Tolls by Prof. Emory R. Johnson, a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission for Exploration—1899-1900—and author of the toll system of the Panama Canal. His studies and conclusions on this subject, in the main, are still applicable today and were important reference sources reflected in our first interim report, House Report No. 1064, Eighty-first Congress. The subcommittee also corresponded with Dr. Johnson during the course of its studies.

It was with deep regret, therefore, that I read about the death of this eminent authority, which occurred on March 6, 1950, closing a career of rare distinction.

As the greatest work of his life centered around the Panama Canal, it is most fitting that the account of his career as published in the Panama Star and Herald of March 13, 1950—the fine newspaper which has served the Isthmus since its founding in 1849—should be made available to the Congress and the Nation.

Under appropriate leave, I am extending my remarks to include its full text:

DR. JOHNSON, TOLLS EXPERT, DIED MARCH 6—
TRANSPORTATION SPECIALIST SERVED WITH RETIRAL ZONE COMMITTEES

Dr. Emory R. Johnson died March 6, according to information received on the Isthmus recently. He was 86 years old.

As a widely known expert in the field of transportation research and economics, he exerted considerable influence on the development of the Panama Canal from the earliest days of the American canal effort.

From 1899 to 1904, he was a member of a special commission on the Isthmian Canal. In 1911, he was appointed special commissioner on traffic and tolls for the Isthmian Canal Commission. In 1936 and 1937, he served as chairman of a special Presidential committee on Panama Canal tolls and vessels measurement rules which resulted in the establishment of the single system of measurement on the Panama Canal.

Dr. Johnson visited the Isthmus twice, the first time in connection with his service as a special commissioner for the Isthmian Canal Commission and again at the time he was chairman of the special committee on tolls.

Among his many books on economics and transportation were three concerning the Canal: The Report to the Isthmian Canal Commission on Industrial and Commercial Value, Isthmian Canal, 1901; Panama Canal Traffic and Tolls, 1912; Measurement of Vessels for the Panama Canal, 1913; and The Panama Canal and Commerce, 1916.

Dr. Johnson was born in Wautun, Wis. He served for several years as economics instructor at Haverford College before assuming the same position at the University of Pennsylvania in 1893. He remained at the university for many years and from 1919 to 1933 served as dean of the Wharton School of Business and Finance.

Throughout his long career as educator and economist his services were utilized by many government and private agencies inside and outside the United States, but were directed primarily to rail and water transportation.

Private Business Has Many Reasons for Supporting the International Trade Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Winthrop G. Brown, Director, Office of International Trade Policy, Department of State, on January 11, 1950, before the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of the United States, New York, N. Y.:

WHY PRIVATE BUSINESS SHOULD SUPPORT THE ITO

You have asked me to come here today to tell you why you as American businessmen and as leaders in the chemical industry should support the International Trade Organization. I can give you the answer very simply. You should support it because you are believers in the private-enterprise system and in the United States. You have a great stake in the private-enterprise system and in the prosperity of the United States. Therefore, you should support any agreement or organization which will serve to promote those two great interests. It is my conviction that the International Trade Organization will materially advance the interests of the private-enterprise system and the interests of the United States, and I propose to try to tell you why.

Let us look first at the problem and at the facts which we face. We can then judge better as to whether the means adopted to deal with them are appropriate.

Most of the countries of the world emerged from World War II with their economies seriously disturbed. Their normal trade channels had been cut off, their business connections disrupted, their productive facilities destroyed, many of the means of earning their way lost. At the same time, with the experience of the economic warfare of the interwar period and the necessities of war itself, governments had developed a whole variety of new and improved techniques for the control of the domestic and foreign trade of their citizens. In wartime it was absolutely essential to have those controls, so that the full strength of the Nation could be focused on the matter of winning the war. But after the cessation of hostilities, countries still faced tremendous difficulties and these instruments of control were available to help deal with them. This was true in our own country as well as in others.

In our international trade we deal with a very large number of countries. They are in all stages of economic development and they have widely different political and economic attitudes. Some believe in capitalism, others believe in socialism, others use a mixture. In some countries government imposes only mild controls over certain parts of trade; in other countries the government actually does the trading in whole or in part itself. This is true of the United States as well as of other countries.

We don't believe in socialism; we don't want to have it in this country. Other people do believe in socialism and do want to have it in their countries. These are facts. We can't change them. The waves did not stand still simply because King Canute told them to.

Almost all countries are vitally interested in international trade. In a country like New Zealand, for example, 85 percent of its national income comes from international trade. In the United States, international trade accounts for perhaps 10 or 12 percent of our national income. But that 10 or 12 percent in 1949 amounted to something over $20,000,000,000, so it is not hay.

Because of the importance of trade and because of the shortages and dislocations which arose out of the war, countries have been deeply concerned to use their own resources to the best advantage and to get the things they needed from other countries. Because the things that were needed were for the most part in short supply, their distribution had to be controlled so that it could be most effectively used and grave inequities and injustices avoided. You will recall vividly last winter, for example, the outcry which went up in the United States against the export of oil to other countries because we were short in this country. There was great demand for the Government to step in and keep oil in this country. The people who made that outcry apparently did not think that the private-enterprise system adequately met their needs in this particular case.

Most countries in the world are short of dollars. Therefore, they cannot permit their citizens to use the few dollars which they do have at will. They have to limit their purchases from the dollar area to be sure that they get the things that they can't do without, just as a man with a limited income has to limit his family's purchases so as to be sure they get their food and pay their rent.

Now these techniques of control and Government interference with the flow of trade can be used for necessary and legitimate purposes such as the budgeting of foreign exchange to which I have just referred, or they can be used for straight protection, or they can be used for economic warfare, or they can be used for political advantage, or they can be used to promote bilateralism.

Faced with such a world and such conditions, what then is the wise and sensible course to pursue? Should we just let things drift? Should we leave each country free to use all of these techniques for any purpose it desires without restraint, without the possibility of complaint or redress? Shall we follow the policy of every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost? The statement of the question almost states the answer.

This brings me to the reason why I think that everyone who believes in the private-enterprise system and in the American way should support the ITO charter. For the ITO charter is essentially a limitation upon the power of governments to use these restrictive and controlling devices. The charter gives no powers of control or intervention to governments which they do not now possess and which they are now not free to exercise at will, except in the few cases where they are limited by specific agreements. The charter limits the operations of governments when they are in business them-

selves and it limits their rights to interfere with the operation of private business. It also limits the right of private businessmen to interfere with the trade of other private businessmen by cartel combinations.

This is important, and I want to repeat it. The charter gives no new powers to governments to interfere with business. It limits the powers which governments now have and which they are using to interfere with business.

I stress this point because critics of the charter have so often implied that the charter gives governments permission to use new devices, that it sanctions new interference and new discrimination. I think what these critics are thinking about and have misunderstood is the fact that the charter limitations upon the powers of governments are not all-embracing; they do not require the abandonment of every use of all of these control devices. Obviously, they cannot. If it were possible today to secure the abolition of all government controls over international trade, there would be no need for a charter or for any international agreements in the field of trade. But just because you can't get agreement to eliminate all government restrictions and interferences with trade is no reason not to get agreement to eliminate or reduce as many as you can. And that is what the charter does.

Let me illustrate. The core of the charter, so far as the United States is concerned, is the chapter on commercial policy. The first article commits member countries to give general most-favored-nation treatment. This is good United States policy. We follow it for everybody except Cuba and the Philippines, where we have long-established preferential systems. It did not seem to us sensible to abandon a world commitment not to discriminate in tariff treatment simply because we and the British could not overnight eliminate long-established trading relationships with certain countries, even though we were willing to undertake the commitment to negotiate for their elimination.

Another article in this chapter limits the powers of governments to use internal taxes and regulations as a discrimination against imports. It did not seem to us sensible to throw away this world-wide commitment to limit a governmental interference with trade used against us much more than by us simply because we could not and would not give up our mixing regulations designed to protect our synthetic rubber industry.

Article 20 provides for general elimination of quotas, the worst of all restrictive devices. It did not seem to us sensible to give up a world-wide commitment against the use of this restrictive device simply because exchange shortages required even a large number of countries to use the device until their exchange reserves were restored or because we would not abandon our agricultural price-support programs.

The recognition in the charter of this fact that it is permissible to use quotas and to discriminate because of the shortages of foreign exchange has been the central basis for one of the main objections to the charter—namely, that it allows discrimination against the United States. It is said that since the United States and possibly Switzerland are almost the only countries in the world which aren't in balance-of-payments difficulties, this is in some way unfair to the United States and Switzerland. Gentlemen, the other countries of the world are spending every dollar that they have in the United States, and every dollar that they can get. They are doing everything they possibly can to get more dollars and to cease this discrimination against the United States. If it be in any colloquial sense a discrimination. But I don't think it's any more a discrimination against the United States than it is a discrimination against Cartier's when I don't buy my wife a diamond bracelet there. I can't afford it. When I make enough money so that I can afford it, then I will buy the bracelet and cease the discrimination.

It is also said that because the charter permits this type of discrimination it prevents the United States from retaliating, and that this is unfair. What would our retaliation be? It would be to impose some barrier or quota to imports from the countries that are not buying from us. And, gentlemen, all that would do would be to decrease the amount of dollars they have and to increase their need to discriminate against us.

Another set of articles in this chapter limits the activities of state trading enterprises by requiring that they be guided by commercial considerations, that they give private and public enterprises of other countries opportunity under normal business terms to bid for their business, and requires them to negotiate for the reduction of protective margins in their operations. It did not seem to us sensible to give up a commitment to restrict the operations of state trading enterprises simply because we could not get agreement to eliminate state trading. The United States, of course, could not agree to abandon state trading.

The chapter also deals with subsidies, limiting their use. The whole set of articles dealing with the invisible tariff of customs regulations is designed to prevent and limit arbitrary interferences with trade through the use of these regulations.

The chapter on cartels establishes the first international mechanism for limiting the operations of international private cartels. The chapter on commodity agreements, which has been described as sanctioning government cartels, is a limitation upon the occasions on which such agreements can be entered into and the nature of the agreement when it is entered into. At present governments are free to make commodity agreements. I am willing to make the flat prediction that they will make commodity agreements when the needs of their people impel them to do so. Now they can make them when they will, without consultation, if they will, and in any form that they want, without regard to their consequences to others and to us. Under the charter they can only make them under certain circumstances which are specified. If they do make them we have to be consulted. As the largest consumer of almost everything, we would have to be represented. The consuming countries would have to have an equal voice with the producing countries. And we intend to submit any agreement which we may negotiate under this chapter to the Congress for its approval.

At the present time other countries are free, except in a few cases where we have treaties with them on the subject, to impose any requirements or limitation that they choose, arbitrary or otherwise, upon the admission of our capital to their borders or upon the treatment of our capital now invested there. Under the charter they cannot do this. Under the charter, members are required to provide adequate security for existing and future investments, and any requirements that they do impose must be just and reasonable. If the United States should consider that any regulations or requirements are arbitrary, oppressive, unreasonable, or unjust, we would under the charter have a basis for protest, first to the Organization, and, if necessary or if we wished it, to the International Court of Justice. We have none of this now. Moreover, the charter expressly recognizes that this is a minimum requirement and obligates members on request to negotiate for more detailed arrangements, such as the type of commercial treaty which we have recently signed with Italy and with Uruguay. Both of these countries, incidentally, were at Habana and their representatives concurred in the text of the charter.

One further point on this matter of investment: and that is that an effort was made to introduce into the charter the principle that compensation in the case of expropriation would be in local currencies. This effort was unequivocally and flatly rejected. I agree that it would have been fine if we could have got agreement on, say, the terms of the Uruguay Treaty as part of this charter, but it seems to me foolish to throw away what we did get simply because we couldn't get all that we may have wanted.

There is one other subject dealt with in the charter which I think would be of interest to this audience. That is the subject of the tariff. Certain members of this group have expressed the opinion that the charter condemns the use of tariffs and that it takes the tariff-making power out of the hands of the United States and gives it to the Organization. I might add that I have gathered that there are certain members of this association who think that the present administration in Washington condemns the use of the tariff and thinks that any tariff is ipso facto bad. Since I have, during the course of my connection with the State Department, been in charge of the Department's work on tariffs and chairman of the interdepartmental organization which administers the Trade Agreements Act, I believe I am qualified to speak on both these points.

Let me make two things explicitly clear. The charter does not condemn the use of the tariff. The charter does not not affect the complete control of the United States Government over its tariff policy.

What the charter does is to commit the other countries of the world to the policy which the United States has been following since 1934 of standing ready to negotiate with other countries for the selective reduction of tariffs on a mutually advantageous basis.

There is a very important distinction in the charter between tariffs and certain other forms of trade restrictions. For example, the quota is to be abolished. Negotiations about preferences are to be directed toward their elimination. With respect to tariffs, any negotiations that take place are for their reduction. Negotiations about tariffs must be on a mutually advantageous basis. No country is required to reduce the tariff on any particular product. No country is required to make any concessions unless it receives satisfactory concessions in return. That is the commitment which this country would accept under the charter, to continue to do what it has done for 15 years.

Not a word as to the administration's attitude toward the tariff. We do not think that tariffs per se are bad. We agree with Dr. Killheffer that they are far less objectionable obstacles to trade than the quota, because if you pay the tariff and the demand is there, you can get your product into the country, whereas the quota is an absolute bar. But we think that the Smoot-Hawley tariff established many rates which were unnecessarily high. We believe that in many cases a tariff can be an embargo just as effectively as a quota, and we don't believe in embargoes. Like you, gentlemen, we believe in competition.

We believe that we should not deal with any tariff rate without consultation with people in labor or agriculture or industry whose interests may be affected. We do consult them. And we pay attention to the case which they present. We, of course, do not always agree with it. If we did, the rates would all have stayed just where they were in 1930, because the normal attitude of those who come down to tariff hearings is that

any reduction of any kind in the tariff rate at present existing on their product will be reciprocal.

But we do pay the most careful attention and give the greatest weight to the facts and figures presented in the briefs and testimony, and I submit that any dispassionate study of the tariff schedules of the agreements which have been negotiated under the Trade Agreements Act will show the influence which the facts presented by various industries have had upon the final outcome of the negotiations.

Under the charter each country is the judge of what tariff concessions it will make. Each country is the judge of how it will handle the negotiations and what procedures it will follow. And the Organization has no power whatsoever to order or direct any country to alter those judgments.

One more point before I summarize. I understand that many of you are concerned about the fact that the United States will have only one vote in this Organization. You are concerned lest we be perpetually in a minority and be outvoted on important questions affecting our interests. I am not worried about this. Let me tell you why.

This fear of our being ganged up on and outvoted is based upon several false assumptions. It assumes, first, that the influence of a country in international councils is measured only by its numerical vote. That is, of course, not true. Everywhere I go in international meetings and in international negotiations, the main question on every important problem is, "What is the attitude of the United States? What is the United States going to do?" Our predominant position in the world obviously gives us an influence far greater than that of smaller countries, if for no other reason than that our support and cooperation are essential for the accomplishment of most important international measures.

Secondly, this fear assumes that the interests of the other fifty or so countries will be the same and predominantly adverse to that of the United States. This, again, is a false assumption. On any particular issue that comes up there will be a diversity of attitudes among the other countries. In any case of trade restriction, for example, there will almost always be a substantial number of other countries who are in the same position as the United States either as producers or consumers of the product involved, or as producers or consumers of other products which they might not like to see restricted in the future.

More important, perhaps, this fear assumes bad faith on the part of the other countries in accepting the commitments of the charter, or stupidity and incompetence on the part of the representatives of the United States in presentation the United States' case. It even goes so far as to assume bias on the part of the International Court of Justice, to which under the charter we have recourse in any case where we feel that its provisions have been improperly interpreted by the Organization. I don't accept the assumption of bad faith on the part of other governments. If I did, I would not recommend entering into the charter or any other international organization. I do not accept the assumption of incompetence on the part of our representatives. My personal experience in Wall Street, in Washington, and in international negotiations has been that our representatives compare favorably in both competence and negotiating ability with men in other walks of life in this country and with the representatives of foreign countries. Moreover, actual experience in the United Nations and in the sessions of the contracting parties to the general agreement on tariffs and trade, in both of which we have only one vote, has demonstrated that we are not ganged up on and outvoted, but are normally in the overwhelming majority. So I am not afraid to go into a meeting representing the United States even though I have only one vote.

Well, gentlemen, what does this add up to? It adds up to the fact that we are confronted with the amazing and unprecedented achievement of having secured agreement between the representatives of some 54 nations, representing every stage of economic development and a wide variety of political philosophies, on a code of rules to guide their international trade which embodies fundamentally the United States philosophy of the maximum amount of competition and the minimum of government control.

Under this agreement even governments themselves when in business will be required to be guided by commercial considerations. This agreement does not attempt to have every country adopt the same form of government or the same political or economic system. It provides a means whereby countries with different political and economic systems can trade together in an orderly way. It commits them to the obligation to consult with each other before they take action which will adversely affect each other's interests. It is essentially a limitation on the power of governments to interfere with trade. It does not abolish all interferences. Of course not. But it does abolish some, it reduces others, and it limits still others to precisely defined areas.

What is the alternative? Governments are in the international trade picture more than ever before. At their disposal are new, highly effective and ingenious devices for the control of trade. The circumstances in which many countries find themselves create powerful demands for the use of these techniques for narrow, short-run, selfish interests. If the rules of the ITO are not accepted, countries will be free to use these techniques, not only in the cases not prohibited by the charter but in all other cases not specifically covered by treaty or agreement.

Where does the private trader stand in such a world? And where does his government stand when he comes to it and asks it to protect on his behalf against the arbitrary action of some other government which injures his business? We can say to the other government that we don't like what it is doing and that its action hurts our citizens. This often produces results. If this fails, in extreme cases we might impose counterrestrictions on their trade. But this is self-defeating. Restriction breeds restriction, and before long the government is controlling the destinies of private business. With the ITO we will be able to say to that other government that we are protesting what it has done not only because it hurts our citizens, but also because it violates an obligation which it has assumed not only to us but to other governments as well. Moreover, if necessary, we will be in a position to call that government to account before the other ITO members, before the International Court of Justice, and before the public opinion of the world. I submit to you that the choice is clear.

International Confederation of Free Trade Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of an article which appeared in the January 1950 issue of the Master, Mate, and Pilot, the official publication of the National Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America.

An international conference to establish a new democratic world labor federation opened in London on November 28, 1949. Delegations from Britain, western Europe, Scandinavia, the Middle East, the Far East, and Latin America, as well as United States and Canadian delegates from the A. F. of L., the CIO, and the United Mine Workers were in attendance. It was estimated that a membership of over 48,000,000 workers in 53 countries were represented. The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions was organized as a result of the conference, and Mr. Jacobus Hendrik Oldenbroek, of the International Transport Workers Federation, was elected by acclamation as the first secretary general.

The article to which I refer, describing the career and accomplishments of Mr. Oldenbroek, follows:

REVIEWING THE CAREER OF JACOBUS H. OLDENBROEK

(By John Herling)

A stubborn Dutch boy, you remember, once stuck his finger in a dike and thereby kept back the threatening sea until help came. He saved his country from the floods.

Today, a twentieth century edition of that storybook hero is a very determined, not-to-be kidded Dutchman. He is Jacobus Hendrik Oldenbroek. Recently he was elected, by acclamation, as secretary general of the newly organized International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, with thirty-five to forty million members in about 50 countries.

This merely makes official what a lot of people already knew—that ruddy-faced 52-year-old Oldenbroek is one of the outstanding labor leaders of our time.

MULTILINGUAL

He has had no career outside the labor movement and has merely equipped himself to do a bang-up job as a labor official. He speaks a dozen languages.

As a young man, he became the assistant to the late Edo Fimmen, the Dutch longshore leader, who was secretary general of the International Transport Workers Federation. Mr. Fimmen was a man in the craggy mold of Andrew Furuseth, the leader of American sailors. Under him, Mr. Oldenbroek was taught that there was more to labor organization than direct job considerations. He also learned how not to get lost in the labyrinth of labor movement machinery.

During the war he took general charge of underground activities and the restoration of trade-unions on the Continent. His main job was to keep together the organizational pieces and personnel of the European trade-union movement.

Both Nazis and Communists knew him as a vigorous opponent. When the Nazis began overrunning Europe, it was Mr. Oldenbroek, as acting secretary general of the International Transport Workers Federation, who began at once to organize a detailed plan of sabotage.

WORK AGAINST NAZIS

As a Dutchman, he was especially keen on seeing to it that the Nazis would have a very difficult time. He kept his labor contacts warm through an intricate system of communications—from Norway to Italy. He was able to engineer strategic strikes wherever and whenever it would make the Nazis scream the loudest. They didn't like him.

But neither did the Communists, Soviets or otherwise.

For years before 1939 the Communists were very anxious indeed to work their way into the Transport Workers, which is the international union of all the railroad workers, sailors, longshoremen. Logistically speaking, anybody who controls or even influences such an organization has a terrific leverage on the world's economy. But in fair weather and foul, the Commies were kept out.

Then came the Nazi-Soviet Pact, and Mr. Oldenbroek's work began in grim earnest.

The Transport Workers Federation, the great mobile unit of what was left of the international labor movement, had its work cut out for it. Both the Nazis and the Communists were the combined enemy, right out in the open.

The totalitarian influence ranged all over the world. In the port of New York, Communists were trying to get Norwegian and Dutch sailors to jump ship, and so interfere with the flow of munitions and goods to Britain, which was the jumping-off place for all of beleaguered Europe.

It was a tough time, requiring enormous skill, and a full knowledge of ships, road systems, and manpower. Oldenbroek was one of the chief organizers of the labor base for the antitotalitarian cause. He was a coordinator, if there ever was one.

NOT HOODWINKED

But when the Soviets were pushed into the war by the Nazi attack, and the whole world lost its mind and memory, Oldenbroek kept his twinkling, but disenchanted blue eyes wide open. He knew that many of the most gallant trade-union leaders on the Continent, especially in France, had been exterminated by the Nazis, with the Commies often acting as the finger-men.

That was why the Communist leadership suddenly zoomed in importance in the resistance movements. They had survived at the expense of honest men. Now they were ready to shed crocodile tears of remorse and take over the labor movements they had tried to undermine.

After the war they hoped to get control of world labor through the World Federation of Trade Unions, which was set up in 1945.

There was one organization the Commies were particularly anxious to get into the world federation, the International Transport Workers Federation, of course. The pressure on Mr. Oldenbroek became tremendous. If the transport workers yielded to become a subordinate part of the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions, others would have to follow suit.

But Mr. Oldenbroek said no. Privately he made it clear he thought that the WFTU could not be long for this world, since the Communists are what they are. He found important help in the 19 United States railroad brotherhoods. They joined the International Transport Workers Federation. And at the same time, without saying so, they made it clear they had no intention of joining the Communist-dominated WFTU through any back door.

There no longer was any doubt of the Communist postwar intentions. In the face of the Soviet and Communist attack on the Marshall plan, he and the transport workers put their full strength behind the economic rehabilitation of Europe.

Mr. Oldenbroek was able to take his finger out of the dike and lead the counteroffensive against the Communist aggression. He built up the ITF's strength through branch offices in New York, Rome, Bombay, and, most recently, Habana.

By last year the WFTU began to disintegrate under the impact of possible alternatives. Through careful handling Mr. Oldenbroek was able to save face for the British and CIO, who had to retire in good order from the WFTU they had help set up.

So a new International Confederation of Free Trade Unions has been launched. Mr. Oldenbroek will be able to talk directly to all the leaders without the services of an interpreter.

Fort Harrison Veterans' Hospital

REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] in calling to the attention of the House the deplorable situation which exists at the Fort Harrison, Mont., veterans' facility at the present time. Fort Harrison is not taking in the veterans as they come because it has neither the necessary funds nor personnel. This is not due to any fault of the manager at Fort Harrison who has done an extremely good job, but because cuts have been made recently which have made it impossible to operate this hospital as it should be operated. I am hopeful that the Veterans' Administration under General Gray will take cognizance of the pleas of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] and myself and do something about the Fort Harrison hospital to the end that Montana veterans can be taken over, our nurses not be overworked, and our doctors at the fort given the aid and assistance which they must have. The fine work done by the staff at Fort Harrison should be encouraged and not hindered.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following communications I have received and the answers thereto on this subject:

CHRISTIAN RURAL OVERSEAS PROGRAM
Helena, Mont., March 29, 1950.

DEAR MIKE: The plight of the veterans' hospital at Fort Harrison was called to my attention yesterday. I am acquainted with some of the staff and have attempted to assist in obtaining some highly trained technicians for it.

The recent cut in the hospital's staff, as a result of budget cuts, would not have been serious if the staff had been up where it should have been, for an institution its size. Coming as it did the situation is really serious.

As of yesterday the waiting list was 40, 3 cancer in its early stages. Four nurses resigned recently because of overwork, caused by a small number trying to take care of the patients. Surgeons did 50 major operations in 15 days last month.

I hope you will contact the Veterans' Administration, get the facts concerning this institution, and see if some relief can be obtained.

With kindest regards, I remain

Yours very truly,

ALBERT H. KRUSE.

MARCH 27, 1950.

Gen. CARL GRAY,
Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL GRAY: I am enclosing herewith letter I have received from Albert H. Kruse relative to the situation at Fort Harrison.

I would appreciate your looking into this matter to see what might be done to alleviate the situation. May I hear from you, and please return the enclosure with your reply.

Thanking you and with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

MARCH 27, 1950.

Mr. ALBERT H. KRUSE,
Helena, Mont.

DEAR ALBERT: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 29 which I have read with much interest.

I am immediately looking into the situation at Fort Harrison and you may be assured that I will do all I can to be of assistance on this.

Must close now but assuring you of my deep interest in this and with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

MARCH 31, 1950.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Your letter to the Administrator, dated March 27, 1950, with attached letter from Mr. Albert Kruse, 1051 Breckenridge, Helena, Mont., has been referred to this office for reply. I appreciate your concern over the reduction in medical and allied staffs with its possible impairment of service.

It became necessary to effect a reduction of employees in hospitals and regional office medical divisions in order to stay within the funds available to us in the fiscal year 1950 appropriation and proposed fiscal year 1951 appropriation. The reductions were not based on a State-to-State comparison, but were apportioned to each hospital and regional office medical division based on the following factors: (a) number of beds, patients, or out-patient work load; (b) research and training programs; (c) special activities; and (d) type of construction in the case of hospitals.

Complete reports from hospitals and regional offices on the effects of the reductions are being reviewed at this time with the objective of making adjustments where appropriate. It is planned to continue with our staffing of new hospitals as they are completed. Every effort will be made to transfer to new hospitals doctors, dentists, nurses, and medical technical personnel who may be declared surplus at various hospitals and regional offices.

Very truly yours,

PAUL B. MAGNUSON,
Chief Medical Director.

HELENA, MONT., *April 5, 1950.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Your immediate help is urgently needed. Fort Harrison officials faced with early decision concerning reduction in bed capacity in the loss of hospital medical personnel. Veterans' Administration contemplated order for reduction we believe discriminates against Fort Harrison. In discussing matter with Meredith, manager VA center, he advised that since the number of professional medical-service personnel authorized at Fort Harrison was so far below the allocation of similar personnel at other VA hospitals of comparable size he expects allocation of additional medical personnel which has not as yet materialized. Senator MURRAY familiar with recent criticism lodged by several patients, not against the physicians, and in our opinion criticism if justified is traceable to lack of supporting medical personnel. We

want to retain the present bed capacity of 204 if possible, which is only 1 bed for every 236 veterans. This is entirely inadequate. This cannot be done unless an increased allocation in personnel is made.

E. J. CALLAGHAN,
Veterans' Welfare Commission of Montana.
HERBERT KIELER,
Department Adjutant,
American Legion of Montana.

APRIL 6, 1950.

Mr. E. J. CALLAGHAN,
Veterans' Welfare Commission.
HERBERT KIELER,
Department Adjutant,
American Legion, Helena, Mont.

DEAR GENE AND HERB: This will acknowledge receipt of your telegram of April 5 which I have just received and read with much interest.

Just recently I contacted the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration relative to the reduction in medical and allied staffs at Fort Harrison. On March 31, I received a letter from Paul B. Magnuson, chief medical director of the Veterans' Administration, which read:

"It became necessary to effect a reduction of employees in hospitals and regional office medical divisions in order to stay within the funds available to us in the fiscal year 1950 appropriation and proposed fiscal year 1951 appropriation. The reductions were not based on a State-to-State comparison, but were apportioned to each hospital and regional office medical division based on the following factors: (a) Number of beds, patients, or out-patient work load; (b) research and training programs; (c) special activities; and (d) type of construction in the case of hospitals.

"Complete reports from hospitals and regional offices on the effects of the reductions are being reviewed at this time with the objective of making adjustments where appropriate. It is planned to continue with our staffing of new hospitals as they are completed. Every effort will be made to transfer to new hospitals, doctors, dentists, nurses, and medical technical personnel who may be declared surplus at various hospitals and regional offices."

You may be certain that this matter is receiving my best attention and that I will do all I can to be of assistance.

Must close now, but thanking you for your telegram and with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,
MAX MANSFIELD.

Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include copies of two editorials which have recently appeared in San Francisco newspapers regarding the central Arizona project, which has been approved in the Senate in S. 75 and which the House will presently consider.

The first editorial appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle of February 27, 1950, and is entitled "Dreamy Central Arizona Project." The second is from the San Francisco Examiner under the title "The Need and the Right." The editorials follow:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of February 27, 1950]

DREAMY CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

Arizona's Senators have scored a preliminary victory in their long battle to start a huge project tapping Colorado River water for the irrigation of 725,000 acres of central Arizona and New Mexico farm land. The Senate last week authorized $708,000,000 to dam the Colorado at Bridge Canyon, above Hoover Dam, and to build reservoirs, tunnels, canals, and pumping plants to carry the water 315 miles to the cotton, grain, and hay farms, for which it is almost exclusively intended.

This project is premature in a number of senses. In the first place, it is subject to doubt whether Arizona even has the right to take 1,200,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water each year, as proposed. That is a question very much in dispute.

In a bill passed by the Senate along with the central Arizona project authorization, California is given permission to file suit in the Supreme Court for the determination of the Colorado water rights controversy. So until the Court rules, any expenditures on the project would be unwarranted, and indeed the Court may entitle Arizona to so small a part of the 1,200,000 acre-feet sought that the project would be washed up right there.

It is well that the Senate has put the issue on the way to settlement, and we call on the House to ratify this permission to bring suit. But, in obligation to the whole American people, the House ought not to ratify the central Arizona project.

Persuasive testimony shows it to be uneconomic and therefore indefensible at this time—premature again. Its high cost would not justify the purpose of irrigating low-cost crops. It is charged by Senator DOWNEY, of California, that the project will cost ultimately at least $1,250,000,000 or, in other words, $1,750 for every benefited acre. Yet, as he says, the land when irrigated will be worth only $300 an acre. The Department of Agriculture has an illuminating comment on this point:

"The first and most important question that must be asked about any proposed public work is: Will the total benefits produced equal or exceed the total costs? Frankly, we were unable to determine."

The Department of Agriculture charges that the Bureau of Reclamation's methods of estimating benefits are not valid. It speaks of procedural error and asks for the correction of these errors before giving its opinion on the worth of the venture.

In short, the Bureau of Reclamation has been exposed in a palpable effort to make the project look good. This is no surprise, for the Bureau is always glad to accommodate with estimates of a rosy character.

If, as we suspect, the Senate authorized this huge works as a barrel of pork for the Southwest, we can only say it is outrageously expensive pork. The last time President Truman was heard on the subject, a year ago, he advised that it was not in accord with his program at this time. To protect his already large budget from further inroads he should exert his leadership to get the central Arizona project quashed in the House.

[From the San Francisco Examiner]

THE NEED AND THE RIGHT

The Colorado River forms part of the southeast boundary of California, and by natural riparian rights, this State is entitled to its full share of the waters of that river. That is the right.

The need for that water by southern California cities and farming communities is imperative.

But both the right and the need are in jeopardy in Congress, where there is pending a bill to grant Arizona a Federal gift of a billion-dollar water project.

There is no question of Arizona's right to its share of Colorado River water. There must be no question of California's right to its share.

The United States Senate on February 21 passed a bill to make the billion-dollar grant to the Arizona project. The measure is now pending in the House of Representatives, and there the fate of much of California is at stake.

It might be noted that if the Arizona project billion-dollar bill passes, California, with its high income-tax payments, will have to meet more than $100,000,000 of the cost. That is, California would have to pay $100,000,000 so that its area could be deprived of essential water.

All of California's 23 Representatives in Congress are united in defending the State's rights, irrespective of party lines and of sectional lines. All these California Congressmen have introduced identical bills calling for settlement by the United States Supreme Court of the interstate dispute over the water.

That is, the California Congressmen want the question settled on a fair, legal basis. They do not ask for a grab by their State. They are confident in California's legal rights to its share of the water, and they want the matter adjusted fairly, legally, not as a matter of political expediency.

Now the people of California can do their part by assuring all California Congressmen that they have universal State support in their fight.

In particular, northern and central California citizens should write or wire their Congressmen they are back of them in this desperate fight for a fair allotment of water.

As a matter of justice alone no Californian wants to see southern California dispossessed of water needed for present and future needs.

Let each one of the 23 California Congressmen know that their people are behind them in their tough fight against the Arizona project grab.

Resurvey of the Warrior-Tombigbee River System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein a statement made by my friend and constituent, Mr. W. I. McElroy, of Mobile, Ala., regarding the resurvey of the Warrior-Tombigbee River system from Mobile to Birmingham, Ala. I consider this, Mr. Speaker, one of the most intelligent statements I have ever read, and I know thousands of people from one end of the State of Alabama to the other will be interested in reading the facts as presented by Mr. W. I. McElroy.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON THE RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE RESURVEY OF THE WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE RIVER SYSTEM BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS, PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE, ON APRIL 3, 1950

My name is W. I. McElroy. I am superintendent of operations of the Warrior & Gulf Navigation Co., Chickasaw, Ala. The purpose of my appearance here is to emphasize the necessity of securing approval of a resolution to authorize the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army to conduct a resurvey of the Warrior-Tombigbee River system from Port Birmingham to Mobile, Ala., to consider the justification of a modernization program. The Warrior & Gulf Navigation Co. is a contract carrier operating a fleet of modern Diesel towboats and barges between Port Birmingham and Mobile on the Warrior-Tombigbee system and from Mobile east to Tampa, Fla., and west to Corpus Christi, Tex., on the Intracoastal Waterway.

The Warrior-Tombigbee River system is one of the oldest commercially navigable streams in the country, the first project for its improvement having been authorized by the Congress March 3, 1875. Realizing the potential value of this waterway to the southeastern region, Congress continued to authorize improvements until 1915, when the last of some 17 navigation locks were completed, providing a navigable channel from Mobile to Port Birmingham on the Locust Fork and to Cordova, Ala., on the Mulberry Fork, 419 and 439 miles, respectively, above Mobile.

The subsequent historic development of this region is a matter of record. The city of Birmingham has become a most important industrial and manufacturing center in the South and the port of Mobile is now ranked the sixth most important port in the Nation by the United States Department of Commerce. The Birmingham district bears a striking resemblance to the Pittsburgh district, not only in the matter of steel production, but likewise in the fact that Birmingham has a river connection with the seaport of Mobile which might be compared with the Monongahela, Ohio and Mississippi River system serving the Pittsburgh district. Our big advantage lies in the shorter distance from Birmingham to Mobile as compared with the distance from Pittsburgh to New Orleans.

Approximately 22 years after the river was canalized, the Congress apparently recognizing the importance of this waterway as a transportation artery authorized a complete survey to determine the possible need of improvement and modernization. Acting on the direction of Congress, an exhaustive study was made by the district engineer, who recommended a complete modernization program to be effected in three phases, House Document 56, Seventy-third Congress, first session. The district engineer, on the occasion of this survey based his findings on the potential increase of commerce which would justify the improvements and he further advised that a number of the locks and dams were in such a deteriorated condition that they would have to be replaced in relatively short time in order to avoid heavy continuing maintenance. The study of the waterway embraced, in addition to navigation, the subject of water power, flood control, and irrigation. He found that the development of hydroelectric power and flood control was not justified. Some of the improvements originally recommended have been completed, such as improvement to dam No. 17, the Sunflower Bend cut-off, and a new lock and dam built at Tuscaloosa, Ala., to replace three obsolete locks and dams which were over 40 years old. After the building of the Tuscaloosa lock, no further improvements were made, principally because of the outbreak of World War II. In the meantime, the existing old structures on the river have been held together as best as could be accomplished by more or less temporary repairs. In one instance, a blow-out occurred in one of these antiquated wooden dams which necessitated unwatering a section of the dam by use of sheet steel piling in order to make repairs. This occurred at lock No. 8 and attached photographs (exhibit A) clearly show the deplorable condition of the dam. This condition is typical of the eight remaining wooden dams and we consider ourselves fortunate in that the blow-out was discovered in time to make repairs before a complete failure of the entire structure. Such an occurrence is quite possible at any of these dams and we are thus faced with an impending disaster which would close the waterway down for an extended period.

In another instance, a blow-out occurred in the wooden floor of the chamber of lock No. 6 which brought about a serious delay to traffic. Photographs of this blow-out are attached and the seriousness of the situation is clearly pictured. The river was closed to navigation for a period of 10 days during the repairs to this lock.

All of the existing locks, with the exception of the Tuscaloosa lock, are equipped with antiquated hand-operated gates and valves which make the lockage of vessels and barges a very slow and laborious process. Further, these locks are provided with lock chambers 52 feet wide by 286 feet long as compared with the standard Ohio River lock of 110 feet by 600 feet. Under the circumstances, it is necessary to break our standard tows up into three segments and thus make three separate lockages while tows of a similar size and even larger may lock in one operation through an Ohio River lock. Time lost on the Warrior-Tombigbee, including the breaking up of the tow, the lockage operations and the reassembling of the tow will approximate 3 hours at each lock as compared to approximately 20 to 30 minutes on the Ohio River. Photographs of one of our tows approaching and locking through lock No. 1 are attached (exhibit D). The restricted size of the lock chamber and the antiquated method of operating the gates are clearly shown. Large tows making a round trip from Mobile to Port Birmingham and return lose approximately 3½ days due wholly to the antiquated and outmoded system of locks. With a lesser number of modern Ohio River type locks which could be spaced further apart by reason of higher dams, it is conservatively estimated that time lost due to lockage operations could be reduced to 1 day, a saving of 2½ days per trip. The total saving in time which would be afforded by such a system of locks would be the equivalent of five round trips per year. On the basis of an existing schedule of 24 trips per year per vessel, an increase in cargo handling capacity of 21 percent would be effected. The only additional cost involved in the handling of the extra 21 percent of freight would be the actual fuel, lubricating oil and miscellaneous deck supplies consumed during the extra five voyages, plus a small amount of additional maintenance expense. Vessel expense such as wages of crew, depreciation, taxes, insurance, etc., is an annual expense continuing throughout the year and naturally if additional trips can be made, this cost will be spread over a greater tonnage, thereby resulting in further savings.

Construction of the existing locks during the early 1900's took place as the need arose to extend the navigable channel to accommodate the commerce offered. They were designed to meet the needs of the shallow draft paddle wheel vessels then in use and consequently were comparatively low in height which permitted the use of wooden timbers in their construction. The result was the building of a large number of low lift locks, the average being about 10 feet. These low lift locks created a series of shallow pools which are characterized by an extremely narrow and winding channel. In many reaches of the river, especially between Demopolis and Tuscaloosa, Ala., the channel is barely 150 feet in width and 7 to 8 feet in depth. Serious delays to traffic have occurred because of the grounding of tows in the shallow reaches of the river. In May of 1948, three of our vessels towing a total of 35 loaded barges were delayed for 6 days between mile 183 and 206 in the Tombigbee River. Several other vessels and tows of other operators were likewise delayed at this point. Modern high lift locks and dams which provide wide deep pools would allow operators to increase appreciably the size of tows handled.

This company has recently placed into service on the river, two new powerful towboats capable of towing 11 barges with an aggregate tonnage of 6,000 or an increase of 3 barges over the standard tow of 8 barges. Since there have been only comparatively minor increases in water freight rates, the only recourse open to operators today to meet mounting operating costs, is to increase the size of the pay load on each tow. With this thought in mind, we attempted to increase our tows to 11 barges, but our experience in the restricted channels of the river soon led us to return to the 8-barge tow, due to so much loss of time resulting from groundings in the narrow bends and shoals.

In spite of the operating handicaps, the river today is handling more commerce than ever before and we come before you with the earnest request that you authorize a resurvey of the river as we are convinced that such a survey will disclose the urgent need of a modernization program to keep this important waterway in step with the vast amount of development that has taken place in the section of the country which it serves. Since the last survey made during 1927, improvements have been made in the art of waterpower development and it is now entirely possible that a program for the production of power will be found to be practical. With the relationship which exists between power development and flood control, the latter will be automatically taken care of with the installation of power development facilities.

According to standard and accepted accounting practice with regard to depreciation and amortization of capital equipment, all of the locks on this waterway, except the Tuscaloosa lock should have been completely amortized and written off some years ago. Four of the locks are 45 or more years old; six locks 40 or more; and four locks 35 or more years old. (See exhibit E attached.) These structures have long since become obsolete and presently do not provide the efficient capacity needed to accommodate the traffic. These original facilities, however, have forcefully indicated the wisdom of early Congresses in allocating funds for their construction and the rapidly growing commerce which has been experienced during the past several years and the prospect of continued expansion, accentuates the need for modernization to bring this artery of transportation to a peak of efficiency.

We believe that the proposed survey will develop potential tonnage for the waterway that was entirely unheard of in the era when the last survey was made. It is also our belief that this system of rivers has served a very valuable purpose and that unless a program of modernization is shortly reinstated we will continue to be faced with an impending disaster by failure of one or more of the antiquated and obsolete structures. We are sure that the Army engineers have been carrying a very heavy burden to forego such a possibility. In view of the physical

condition and age of some of the dams and locks it seems to be questionable as to how much longer the use of hay bale wire and strings may serve to keep these structures functioning. Without a thorough resurvey, the important facts can hardly be developed.

In spite of the fact that this river, under present conditions offers many handicaps to economical operation, nevertheless, as indicated by the steady increase in tonnage there is definite proof that it has an important attraction to commerce. With much needed improvement and modernization to the stream we anticipate rapid growth in tonnage volume and we hold the conviction that benefits to the territory served, will be widespread and abundant.

The tonnage handled on the Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers has grown from 407,245 short tons in 1915, the year the entire system was opened to navigation, to a total of 2,056,504 in 1948. Fluctuations in tonnage handled were comparatively light. Exhibit E containing tonnage record from 1915 to date is attached hereto and submitted as part of this statement. This record was compiled from figures shown in the annual reports of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army. A steady increase was recorded from 1915 to 1942 with the exception of the depression years, 1930, 1931, and 1932. Even during this period, the waterway enjoyed a substantial flow of commerce as may be noted from the exhibit. The river, in 1933, began to regain its depression era losses and this trend continued through 1942. During the period from 1943 to 1946 commerce was adversely affected as a result of the adjustments made during and subsequent to World War II. It is apparent that the traffic on this river system is not subject to violent fluctuations, but provides a sustained large volume of tonnage. The principal commodities transported which constitute more than 90 percent of the total traffic are: iron ore, manganese ore, petroleum products, coal, logs, pulpwood, sand and gravel, sulfur, iron and steel. Tonnage figures for 1949 are not yet available, however, indications are that the 1949 traffic will show an appreciable increase over that for 1948. The increase in tons handled by the Warrior & Gulf Navigation Co. from 329,779 in 1948 to 422,371 in 1949, or slightly more than 27 percent will substantiate this statement.

The upward trend of traffic on the Warrior-Tombigbee system is reflected in tonnage figures of the Warrior & Gulf Navigation Co. Attached hereto, as a part of this statement is exhibit G showing the tons handled by years from 1929 to date. The consistent increase, year by year, since 1944 clearly indicates the growing importance of the Warrior-Tombigbee system to the continued development of the southeastern and southwestern regions. Tonnage handled in 1947 more than doubled that moved in 1944 and the 1944 figure was almost tripled in 1948. A similar increase was recorded in 1949 when 422,371 tons were handled. Movements and existing commitments thus far in 1950 indicate that we will transport more than 500,000 tons this year. Both the 1948 and 1949 volumes were the largest handled in the history of the company. A substantial part of this tonnage was imported high-grade iron ore which is vitally needed to supplement comparatively low-grade native ores. Its importance is particularly apparent in view of the most urgent need for increased steel production and of the fact that steel is one of the most essential materials, both in time of peace and war.

The Warrior-Tombigbee River system is an important artery for the distribution of bulk petroleum products, the volume of which runs between 200,000 and 300,000 tons per year. This commodity is of great significance to the economy of the areas served by the river system, and based on the increasing public demand, there is every possibility that its transportation by barge will experience a substantial increase. It is essential that such a widely used commodity must have the advantage of modern inland waterway routes.

Quite recently oil has been discovered in south Alabama within a short distance of the river. A new field is now in production and shipments of crude petroleum by barge to a refinery in Tuscaloosa have been in progress for some time. Geological reports indicate that this section of the country is destined to become a leading petroleum producing center. This commodity was not of course in the picture on the occasion of the last survey and the transportation of the greater volume of production of this field by barge both upstream to Tuscaloosa and downstream to the seaport of Mobile is a foregone conclusion.

It should be pointed out that a majority of the commerce transported on this river are bulk commodities which are particularly suited to water transportation. There is in prospect today, the movement of a substantial quantity of coal from the Warrior coal field to Mobile, thence by intracoastal waterway to Houston, Tex., for consumption in Houston's new steel industry. Here is a clear-cut example of recent industrial developments that have taken place in the Gulf coast area which will directly influence expansion of river commerce beyond the estimates given in the last survey made around 1927.

It is interesting to note that in his survey, the district engineer, estimated in 1930 that commerce would increase to 4,545,000 tons by 1950 provided the plan of improvements recommended were carried out by this time. The general plan of improvements recommended included construction of six new locks and the enlargement of the lock chambers and raising of the dams at six existing locks. Of this plan, the only item completed thus far is the construction of one new lock at Tuscaloosa. A study of traffic statistics reveal that as early as 1941 tonnage had risen from 1,581,974 in 1930 to 2,296,562, an increase of 45 percent. This increase was made in spite of the fact that less than 15 percent of the recommended plan of improvement has been completed. Under the circumstances, it is not unreasonable to conclude that had the entire program of modernization been carried out as scheduled, the present traffic on the waterway would far exceed the original estimate of the district engineer.

It is now public knowledge that the production of high-grade iron ores in the Mesabi Range in Minnesota will almost disappear within the next 20 to 25 years. Realizing the seriousness of this situation, the United States Steel Corp., after spending millions of dollars in the exploration of world ore reserves, located vast deposits of high-grade iron ore in Venezuela. Plans are already under way to commence shipment of some 2,000,000 tons annually from this field to the Birmingham district, all of which is scheduled to move through the port of Mobile. The rich Venezuelan ore (over 60-percent iron) will be mixed with native low-grade ores, and on the basis of experiments made by the Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co. in their blast furnaces in Birmingham, will result in an increased steel production of 15 percent with the existing facilities. Obviously the movement of such a large volume of bulk ore must be done as cheaply as possible in order to make its use economical in Birmingham. This cannot be accomplished with locks built more than 40 years ago whose narrow and obsolete size require multiple lockages of tows, restricts the passage of larger tows that are in use today, and will further restrict the desirable larger units and tows that could be employed with increased movements of huge quantities of bulk commodities. A reduction in the number of dams and the enlargement of lock chambers so as to permit the passing of tows intact will result in lowered transportation cost and assure the movement of this commodity over the river.

The value of the new iron-ore discoveries in Venezuela and its movement by water to the steel mills in Birmingham cannot be overemphasized from the standpoint of national defense as well as peacetime production. Should this country be faced with another war of similar proportions to the last, our ability to produce a war machine capable of defending the country is open to question in view of our present depleted iron-ore reserves. The movement to the mills of a large volume of foreign high-grade iron ore by the use of a modern waterway will supplement our diminishing ore reserves and provide a margin of safety in time of war. We have information that the United States Steel Corp. by 1955 will be shipping upward of 2,000,000 tons of imported iron ore annually to its Birmingham mills. It is urgent that the modernization of the Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers be resumed at the earliest possible date in order that this ore may be transported economically.

Our company has operated on this system of rivers for approximately 22 years. We are fully cognizant of the handicaps and of the impending risk to continuing our operations due to the bad physical condition of the major part of the navigational structures. We have been compelled to assume that this critical situation continues to prevail because of a lack of understanding by the Congress, who alone has the authority to correct the deficiencies. It is principally this thought which suggests to us the matter of resurvey of the facilities. It should be obvious that in no other way can the facts be made known to the proper authorities. With this in mind, the foregoing information is respectfully submitted.

EXHIBIT E.—*Data pertaining to locks and dams on the Warrior-Tombigbee River system*

Lock and dam No.	Miles above Mobile	Type of construction	Inside dimensions of lock chambers	Date of completion	Actual cost of lock and dam
1	111	Concrete	281.9 by 52 feet	1939	$360,286.02
2	182	Timber	286 by 52 feet	1915	560,114.09
3	200	do	286 by 52 feet	1915	699,622.80
4	231	do	285.6 by 52 feet	1918	479,000.00
5	246	do	285.6 by 52 feet	1918	391,000.00
6	267	do	285.6 by 52 feet	1909	443,000.00
7	283	do	284.7 by 52 feet	1913	225,000.00
8	298	do	284.7 by 51.65 feet	1918	212,400.00
9	315	do	284.7 by 52 feet	1912	202,440.00
10 [1]	342	do	286.6 by 52 feet	1896	344,500.00
11 [1]	362	do	286 by 52 feet	1895	170,000.00
12 [1]	363	do	286.2 by 52 feet	1892	160,000.00
13	370	do	285.5 by 52 feet	1909	323,700.00
14	372	Concrete	282.1 by 52 feet	1916	414,714.89
15	383	do	282.1 by 52 feet	1916	430,333.57
16	387	do	285.5 by 52 feet	1918	820,853.88
17	396	do	285.5 by 52 feet	1918	[2] 3,174,070.00

[1] Original locks 10, 11, and 12 were replaced by a new lock 10 which was constructed in 1936. Size of the new lock 10 is 95 by 600 feet, with a lift of 30 feet. Cost of the new lock 10 was $4,450,873.10.
[2] Estimated.

EXHIBIT F.—*Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers, Ala.—Comparative statement of traffic*

Year:	Total tons
1915	407,245
1916	466,812
1917	560,778
1918	671,405
1919	601,068
1920	699,522
1921	784,967
1922	973,419
1923	954,181
1924	1,105,260
1925	1,383,713
1926	1,292,096
1927	1,487,515
1928	1,758,358
1929	1,938,773
1930	1,581,947
1931	1,692,647
1932	958,337
1933	1,122,823
1934	1,067,442
1935	1,131,366
1936	1,432,293
1937	1,835,568
1938	1,851,972
1939	1,928,231
1940	1,890,399
1941	2,296,562
1942	2,187,277
1943	1,653,157
1944	1,440,432
1945	1,492,496
1946	1,371,841
1947	1,848,417
1948	2,056,504

EXHIBIT G.—*Tonnage record*

Year:	
1929	311,337
1930	282,947
1931	252,150
1932	101,865
1933	150,433
1934	119,360
1935	146,360
1936	237,824
1937	305,438
1938	262,417
1939	294,332
1940	278,186
1941	213,088
1942	168,570
1943	163,255
1944	124,812
1945	158,192
1946	156,386
1947	257,914
1948	329,779
1949	422,371
1950 (estimated)	500,000

Recommendations of the President on Unemployment Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, although the State of California is one of the largest and most critical areas of unemployment in the country, the specter of unemployment is of national concern. Nearly a year ago, shortly after the President submitted his midyear economic report, on July 12, 1949, I introduced a bill to strengthen the Federal unemployment insurance system by establishing minimum benefit standards for all parts of the country and by broadening coverage.

My bill would have established a Federal reinsurance fund for greater protection of those States threatened with a prolonged period of substantial unemployment.

I am fully convinced that the great natural resources of the West will enable us fully and productively to employ the talents of the large increase in population since the beginning of the war. During the period of adjustment while new enterprises are being established and getting into large-scale production, however, a more adequate system of unemployment insurance is essential. I am gratified that the President has gone beyond the proposals contained in my bill, and I shall do everything that I can to obtain early consideration of his recommendations by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to include a letter recently published in the New York Times, which letter was signed by persons prominent in the field of education and public service, on the subject of Federal aid to schools.

Since the views expressed by these prominent figures coincide with my own and because these views so clearly present what to me is the major premise upon which I think Congress ought to consider this issue, I am making this article available to those who hold views on this same basic principle. To me, I feel any action by Congress that includes any other factors will be a mistake that will do permanent and lasting harm to the cause of education as well as democracy.

Those signing this letter are taking an active part in the affairs of the committee for Federal aid to public schools.

The letter follows:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Foremost among the unfinished business of the Eighty-first Congress is the enactment of a bill providing Federal aid to public education. Few can doubt the need for Federal assistance to the States to meet the present educational crisis. In the wealthiest Nation in the world vast numbers of children receive no elementary education at all or at best a seriously substandard education. In the Second World War 12 percent of the men found unfit for service were rejected solely for educational deficiencies. The United States Census Bureau estimates that for the year 1947 about 4,000,000 children between 5 and 17 attended no school at all. More than 10 percent of teachers in public schools are serving under emergency or substandard certificates.

We believe that a bill for Federal aid to education which can unite the forward-looking forces and thus insure its enactment must possess the following minimum essentials:

REPRESENTATIVE COMPARATIVE

1. Basically it must be an equalization measure. The educational situation is far more critical in some sections of the country than in others, since the country's wealth is unequally distributed among the States. Income per capita in the United States ranges from $659 in Mississippi to $1,781 in New York (1947 averages), and this geographic maldistribution of wealth and income manifests itself in a tragic maldistribution of educational opportunity. During the school year of 1944–45, New Jersey expended $199.33 for each child in its public schools, while Mississippi spent no more than $44.80. The amount spent for each child in New York was $194.47, while in Arkansas it was only $60.25. The average teacher's salary in New York was $2,783, while in Arkansas it was only $918. That this discrepancy is not caused by a greater concern for education in New York than in Arkansas is proved by the fact that Arkansas spent a greater percentage of its income for its schools than did New York. Inequality of educational opportunity is the result of economic inequality, not of inequality of will.

Hence, while a nominal allocation may be made to every State, the bulk of the appropriation must be distributed among the States in accordance with need.

2. The bill must contain adequate safeguards against discriminatory treatment of Negro and other minority groups. According to the United States Office of Education, States having segregated school systems expend an average of almost twice as much for the education of a white child as for a Negro child. The existence of racially segregated schools is itself a blot upon the American public school system which must in time be eliminated. Any measure which forward-looking forces can support must provide effective means to prevent discriminatory application of Federal funds. Such discrimination is inequitable and unconstitutional.

3. It should be an educational measure dealing only with educational services. Federal aid for health and other necessary welfare services must be met in legislation apart from a law to equalize educational opportunities.

RECIPIENTS OF BENEFITS

4. The educational benefits of a Federal aid bill must be limited to tax-supported and publicly controlled educational institutions, whether or not State constitutions or laws permit use of State funds for sectarian educational institutions.

5. The bill must contain adequate safeguards to prevent violation of these principles. Provision must be made for judicial review of its administration so as to insure against unlawful diversion of Federal funds for sectarian purposes.

A bill containing the essential elements outlined in this letter could, we are convinced, unite the forward-looking forces of our country in a determined and successful campaign to equalize educational opportunities while maintaining the integrity of our nonsectarian public-school system.

John L. Childs, John Dewey, Frederick May Eliot, Harry Emerson Fosdick, John Haynes Holmes, Bryn J. Hovde, Alvin Johnson, Horace M. Kallen, Frank E. Karelsen, Jr., William H. Kilpatrick, Irving Miller, Jerome Nathanson, John K. Norton, G. Bromley Oxnam, Leo Pfeffer, Harold Taylor, V. T. Thayer.

NEW YORK, *January 4, 1950.*

Witch Hunting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial in the Long Beach Independent about Senator McCARTHY and communism. The Long Beach Independent is a daily newspaper printed in my home city of Long Beach, Calif. I have the pleasure of calling to your attention an editorial therein, under date of Friday, March 31, 1950, as it specifically mentions the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, the Communist Party, the President, and the State Department. Too, I feel it especially appropriate that you have the benefit of reading it. It described the charges of the Senator as "his wild charges of Communists in the State Department." The editor says:

We have no use for the McCarthy tactics. The Republican Party leaders who fail to speak out against them are doing themselves a great injustice.

We Members of Congress should take note of the editor's observations when he says:

There is danger of allowing irresponsible Senators to go through a man's entire life records.

Mr. Speaker, the editor's comment just quoted by me, causes me to remark that on February 13, 1950, in this House of Representatives, I again vigorously spoke out to the end that we must be irresponsible as Members of Congress in what we say on the floor of the House.

I firmly agree with the editor when he says, "We need vigilance" and "we must not have 'witch hunts' destroying reputations over rumors for hungry politicians" and that "we want common sense and a sense of decency that is lacking at present."

At the time I said:

This, under the circumstances of the present world situation, does clearly add to confusion; to fear; to suspicion; to ill will; to national and even international misunderstanding as to what the facts really are. For, I say to my colleagues, that the distinguished gentleman uttered his intemperate words without basis in law or fact to substantiate his untimely and unwarranted remarks. And so it goes.

Granting that we have congressional immunity in what we say; granting that we are free to say what we wish on the floor of this Congress as Members of Congress without fear of libel or slander, this does not justify us in being any less diligent in sticking to the facts and the law and the truth than we would have our own constituents be in our own respective congressional districts; does it? Why should we take liberties on the floor of this House in speaking of any matter when it is only scandal and rumor and gossip and "political dishwater"? Yes, even though most of us are candidates for reelection, even though the two-party system thrives and lives, partially, at least, on account of the desire of those in the majority to stay in the majority, and those in the minority party to become the majority party, this does not justify members of either party in relating as facts or truth anything which is known to them to not yet be established as facts or as the truth.

Gentlemen of this House, let us by our daily words and conduct add to the sum total of our privilege and obligation which we especially have to strengthen the sinews of our American way of life. As democracy depends on an intelligent and well-informed participating electorate at the grass roots, so the American electorate depends upon us, as Members of Congress, both the House and the Senate, to be consciously temperate, truthful, accurate, and of careful and considerate speech in everything we say.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this editorial in one of my home city newspapers, is very timely. I commend your reading it:

WITCH HUNTING

Senator McCARTHY with his wild charges of Communists in the State Department is not helping the chances of Congressman NIXON who is running for the Senate from California. NIXON did a wonderful job when Alger Hiss was brought to justice. It was NIXON and the un-American Activities Committee who forced the trial of Hiss over the apathy or opposition of the President and the State Department. It was the President who referred to the case as a "red herring."

It was hoped that the spectacular "Pumpkin Papers" and Judith Coplon conviction would carry NIXON along on a popular wave of Americanism versus Communism. Now the burlesque ballyhoo of Senator McCARTHY with his unproven smears of many people has made the people cautious. The cry of Communist against a hundred or more mythical public employees has dulled the people's appetite.

We have no use for the McCarthy tactics. The Republican Party leaders who fail to speak out against them are doing themselves a great injustice. The people are now not in sympathy with the demand for the loyalty files. They feel confidential information concerning individuals could not be entrusted to men like McCARTHY. The great disservice McCARTHY has done his cause is that the people now turn to the other extreme. They may allow the President to suppress much information the people should be given.

There is danger of allowing irresponsible Senators to go through a man's entire life records. There are few of us who do not have a skeleton hidden somewhere in our closet. At some time in the life of most of us we have done something we would suffer greatly from if it were later disclosed. We may have corrected our fault, and no one was ever hurt, but to publicize it at this late day would cause great suffering to ourselves and others who are innocent. In other words, such information would be valuable to a blackmailer or an irresponsible Senator, with his immunity from libel damages.

In this city are men who 25 years ago were prominent members of the local Ku Klux Klan. These men would pay dearly today to keep that from being published. They joined with a lot of other fellows in what seemed to them a good cause. They soon became thoroughly disgusted and quit. They and their families would be sick at heart if their friends of today knew of what they now consider their gullibility.

The same situation is undoubtedly true of many people who have been members of the Communist Party. We have many known examples of men who have resigned and turned against all its teaching. One of the heroes, in our estimation, is Whittaker Chambers. He has lost his job and placed his life in jeopardy to repay the debt he owes for his membership.

We need vigilance and an uncompromising policy against Communists in public employment. There are still disloyal people working in vital spots. But we must not have witch hunts destroying reputations over rumors and for publicity-hungry politicians. The Republican Party has a lot to live down because of its McCARTHY's, just as the Democrats do their Huey Long's, Bilbo's, and Talmadge's. We want no tolerance toward Communists. But we want common sense and a sense of decency that is lacking at present. Candidate NIXON might well speak out against the irresponsibility of McCARTHY if he hopes to hold the interest of his listeners when he talks of un-American activities.—L. A. C.

Members of Congress and Their Families Will Visit New York City April 28, 29, and 30

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the annual congressional visit to New York City will take place Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, April 28, 29, and 30.

For the information of those interested I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of my letter to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 30, 1950.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: It is my pleasure to inform you that the Honorable William O'Dwyer, mayor of the city of New York, has again invited Members of Congress and their families to visit New York City, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, April 28, 29, and 30, 1950.

The mayor has arranged a most interesting schedule of events which will include a sightseeing tour of New York, boat trip around Long Island Sound, Hell Gate Rapids, and New York Harbor, Statue of Liberty, Ellis Island, Maritime Academy at Kings Point, Coney Island, Jones Beach, United Nations at Lake Success, Radio City and Rockefeller Center, International Airport, the line-up at metropolitan police headquarters, tickets for radio and television stage shows, a personal welcome to the city by Mayor O'Dwyer at New York City Hall.

The trip from Washington to New York and return will be made by special train via the Pennsylvania Railroad, leaving Washington at 12:55 p. m. Friday, April 28, returning leave New York 5:25 p. m., eastern daylight-saving time (note daylight time Sunday), arriving in Washington 9:25 p. m., eastern daylight-saving time. Our headquarters in New York will be the Hotel New Yorker.

The total cost of this trip will be $30 per person. It will include your round-trip railroad ticket, two nights at the New Yorker Hotel, all meals, baggage transfers, tips, and entertainment.

The mayor of the city of New York has designated Hon. EMANUEL CELLER as chairman of the reception committee while the group is in New York City, and myself as chairman of the committee on arrangements for the congressional group.

In view of the great expense to be incurred by the Department of Commerce of New York City and the time required for arrangements it shall be appreciated if you will promptly indicate your interest by returning the enclosed card or calling my office, extension 355.

Those of you who made the trip with us last year will never forget the royal welcome extended to our party.

With best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
Chairman, Committee on Arrangements.

What Is Americanism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most promising signs for the future well-being of our Republic is the heightened appreciation among the young people of the land for the true significance of Americanism. Nowhere is this better demonstrated than in the essay contests being conducted currently among high-school students under the sponsorship of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks.

I have read with great interest the first prize essay in the contest conducted in Lawrence County, one of the 11 counties in the Twenty-third Illinois District which I have the honor to represent in this Congress. The winning essay was chosen as the best among 123 entered in the competition, and as an indication of growing interest it should be pointed out that a year ago, in similar contest, only 21 students competed.

The winning essay was written by Miss Noretta Koertge, a junior in Bridgeport Township High School. Active in student affairs, she is the feature editor of the Portonian, Bridgeport High School's newspaper, as well as a member of the school band and a consistent honor student. Her grasp of the deep meaning of Americanism reflects great credit not only on herself but on the high caliber of the school in which she is a student. Under permission granted to extend my remarks, I am including the text of her prize-winning essay:

WHAT IS AMERICANISM?

(By Noretta Koertge)

If we ask ourselves, "What is Americanism?" our simple reply is, "Americanism is the belief in American ideals and the American way of life." But that is not very complete. What are these ideals? Are they absolute and unchanging? Laws passed now to promote the general welfare would have been considered destructive of individual liberty in the early days of our country. The old policy of America for Americans and hands off Europe is quite different from the Marshall plan. The influence that our huge Government wields over the world and the individual is rapidly increasing, making this an opportune time to learn more of our great American ideals that do not change although the method of expressing and attaining them does change as our civilization becomes more complex. Every new and untried plan for human betterment should receive serious thought. We should ask ourselves, "Will this plan actually work? Will it destroy our American heritage of freedom?"

We believe in the dignity of man. We believe that everyone should have an opportunity for training or education, have the right to choose his own profession, and to work where he desires. The situation in Britain at the present time where workers are forbidden to change jobs seems repulsive to us. We believe in individual initiative. Ever since the time of Horace Greely, who said, "Go west, young man," American youth have gone wherever a new frontier of opportunity is found. Our national economy is built on the success of individuals. The American efficiency that is world known is a result of competition between energetic individuals. Our standard of living is the highest in the world. This shows that democracy is not an impractical ideal but is much more successful in the actual working than any form of statism, such as communism or socialism.

We believe in political liberty for the individual. Ever since the days of Magna Carta English speaking people have fought for equality before the law, freedom of speech, the privilege of invoking habeas corpus, self-taxation, protection against unlawful seizure of person or property, and many other rights. Our history rings with statements like, "No taxation without representation," and "A man's house is his castle." Today, when freedom of speech is extinct in many countries, we should be especially thankful for our free press and radio. We should be grateful for our right of assembly also. Some freedoms are curtailed in wartime but with the consent of the people, and not a permanent condition as in a police state.

We believe in religious liberty. Everyone may worship as he pleases, or not worship if he so desires. However, the fact that all sessions of Congress are opened with prayer for guidance shows that we are a godly Nation. Our recognition of the importance of the individual is akin to Christ's interest in every single soul. An example of this is the story of an aircraft carrier in the last war. Although the ship was in dangerous waters, it turned on its lights making it a perfect target, so that a few airplanes might land. This would never have happened in an atheistic state.

What is Americanism? As a midtwentieth century "teenager" basing my reply on a study of history, current events, and actual experience, it seems that it is belief in every individual being developed by education and training to live a happy, useful life so that he can work where he feels opportunity is greatest, under a democratic form of government that protects his life, civic liberty, and religious freedom.

Today's youth can face the challenge that the history of America offers. Let America still be the land of opportunity—that is security enough. Any promise of security that is not based on the energy and efforts of individuals seems to be an illusionary pot of gold at the foot of the rainbow. I believe in Americanism, the American way of life.

The Kerr Bill Is of Democratic Paternity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 4, 1950, the three Republican Members from Connecticut addressed to the President a statement requesting that he veto the so-called Kerr natural-gas bill. Cognizant of our responsibilities to the general public, Representatives SADLAK and LODGE and I are tremendously concerned over the effect this legislation will have if signed into law. President Truman has consistently assailed special interests without identifying those groups. It can be specifically charged that failure to veto this measure will be recognized as complete capitulation by the President and the Democratic Party to special interests.

The people of New England will not endorse the action of this Congress in passing the Kerr bill. They will realize that it was motivated by a greedy group of producers seeking carte blanche to gouge the consumer. The bill was pushed through Congress by Democratic leaders to pay off past political debts, and to assure that financial support will be forthcoming in the future. This baby is on the Democratic doorstep, and that party cannot deny paternity.

The Waterbury (Conn.) Republican and American, in editorials on April 4, point out the fact that the public is the scapegoat in this matter. The letter requesting Presidential veto is also inserted.

The matters follow:

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican of April 4, 1950]

VETO THE KERR BILL

To Connecticut and to other New England States it is particularly important that President Truman veto the legislation which exempts the so-called independent producers of natural gas from Federal regulation.

If New England is to remain a good location for industries, one of the advantages the section must be able to offer is a reliable supply of low-cost fuel.

What with rising transport costs, mine strikes, and the other numerous factors which make our usual fuels more expensive and their supply less certain, natural gas has looked like a better and better possibility.

But just as New England utilities concerns were beginning seriously to consider arrangements and contracts for the distribution of natural gas piped here from oil fields in Texas and Oklahoma, the big oil companies which own the sources of natural gas turned tremendous pressure on Congress and on the administration to make natural gas one natural resource that isn't regarded as a public utility by the Government.

In the Eightieth Congress an attempt to exempt nearly all of the natural gas industry from any Federal regulation over prices and practices was defeated by a narrow margin. The Fair Deal used its successful fight against this legislation as campaign material in the 1948 Presidential battle.

The natural-gas interests were back again in the Eighty-first Congress, however, and succeeded in lining up a number of Dixiecrats and such Republicans as Senators WHERRY, CAPPERART, HICKENLOOPER, and McCARTHY to put through another version in the Kerr bill. This, although it doesn't exempt quite all of the industry from the kind of regulation which would enable the Government to keep prices from becoming extortionate, is almost as bad a measure as the one that was defeated in the Eightieth Congress.

Senator DOUGLAS, one of the leaders of the opposition to the Kerr bill when it was in the Senate this year, has estimated that unless the President vetoes it the consumers of natural gas will pay up to half a billion dollars more a year in fuel charges.

Connecticut's Senators and Representatives were unanimous in their opposition to the Kerr legislation, and rightly so. They

were thus allied with most other legislators from New England and the progressive-minded legislators from all parts of the country. It was a misfortune that by the slenderest of majorities this sell-out to greedy interests and their lobbyists was passed in both Houses.

President Truman, with the utmost of justification, can veto the Kerr bill. He should do so without hesitation.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) American of April 4, 1950

ENERGY FOR TRUMAN

Staunch loyalty to his friends has been one of President Truman's outstanding traits. He has shown it, sometimes even toward friends who evidently didn't deserve it. There was Edwin S. Pauley, for instance. There was Gen. Harry H. Vaughan.

Maybe, now, Senator ROBERT S. KERR is going to fit into the same category. He has been a good friend to the President. He supported Mr. Truman 2 years ago, in his candidacy for nomination to succeed himself in the White House, when many prominent Democrats were opposing it. He is supposed to have contributed liberally to the Democratic Party's national campaign fund.

In the present session of Congress, Senator KERR has sponsored a measure to exempt so-called independent producers of natural gas from control by the Federal Power Commission. Both Chambers have approved it. Mr. Truman accordingly has to decide whether to let it go or to veto it. It he turns it down, his good friend Senator KERR surely is going to be chagrined.

Perhaps it may bother Mr. Truman particularly to have in mind that if he signs this bill he will be putting himself on the same side with Senator ROBERT A. TAFT. Senator TAFT spoke for it and voted for it. In general, he has been the President's severest critic.

There is still another point about the bill that may worry Mr. Truman. He may foresee that by signing it he would be handing his Republican opponents a means of annoying him in the congressional election campaign this year. In 1948 he condemned Republican leaders of the Eightieth Congress for sponsoring the Moore-Rizley bill. It would have exempted almost all of the natural-gas industry from Federal control. It failed by a small margin. The Kerr bill would exempt about 85 percent of the industry, including 24 of the biggest producers.

With the aid of advice from expert legal technicians, Mr. Truman might be able to figure out a way to reconcile opposition to the Moore-Rizley bill, Republican, with assent to the Kerr bill, Democratic. But it would be a difficult stunt. Many people certainly would be unable to see through it. They would be haunted by a deep suspicion that the President was fibbing.

APRIL 4, 1950.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This request is addressed to you on behalf of the American public generally, and the citizens of Connecticut specifically. The House of Representatives, on Friday, March 31, endorsed prior Senate action with reference to the Natural Gas Act by passage of H. R. 1758. The fate of this legislation and the responsibility for its effects rests with you.

It is the sincere desire of this group that you exercise your Presidential prerogative by vetoing this measure, which we believe not to be in the public interest.

The bill as enacted leaves natural gas without the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission until such time as it enters interstate commerce. A very plausible case has been presented by proponents to the effect that such regulation would be an infringement upon the rights of producers engaged in free enterprise. Nothing could be further from the truth, as natural gas sold to consumers will be in the nature of a virtual monopoly, and should be treated as such.

We unanimously concur in the opinion that natural gas be made available in Connecticut and throughout New England. Should H. R. 1758 be enacted into law, the consuming public would be completely unprotected as to the ultimate cost. It is obvious that a commodity without regulation at the source cannot be successfully regulated in transit or at its end use. No honest analogy can be drawn with other fuels—as coal and oil sell in competitive markets subject to public demand and public choice. Should H. R. 1758 become law, the general public will be at the mercy of the producers, as a single entity will control the distribution of natural gas from the point of the original arms-length sale.

New England is presently facing economic hardship through loss of industries to areas where fuel is available at lower cost. Should natural gas be made available to New England users in the immediate future, and this step is contemplated, prices of this fuel, if unregulated, would be so high as to severely limit its potential value. The danger of this course to our Nation is of serious consequence.

For the reasons stated, we respectfully request that you, as the President of the United States, seriously consider the harmful effects of this legislation, and exercise the power of veto to protect the public from the unregulated sale of natural gas.

Very respectfully yours,
JAMES T. PATTERSON,
ANTONI N. SADLAK,
JOHN DAVIS LODGE,
Members of Congress.

Industrial Expansion in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the State of California and the entire Pacific coast are now experiencing a tremendous expansion of population and of industrial activity. The war and postwar years have brought an influx of new permanent residents, the exact extent of which can only be estimated at present, but which the census now being taken will definitely determine. These people have been attracted to California and the coast by the outstanding natural advantages of climate and scenic beauty, and by the unrivaled opportunities for economic and social development which that region enjoys. However, in order to support the presently swollen population and the future growth which seems inevitable, it is absolutely necessary that the Pacific coast be freed of economic fetters which now restrict the natural industrial expansion which should and must accompany an increased population. I wish to call the attention of this House to a news article recently published in a San Francisco newspaper which high lights one of the most noxious conditions now hampering the development of west-coast industries. I refer to the viciously inequitable system of freight rates now existing, which stifles the flow of goods from West to East and prevents freely competitive trade by Califorina and west-coast industries with eastern markets. This system of inequities is a relic of our economic past which perpetuates freight differentials now completely anachronistic in the light of present transportation facilities and economic conditions, and must be revised in order that natural industrial growth may be uninhibited.

The news article brings out a further situation which bears investigation by the Federal Trade Commission. I speak now of practices indulged in by eastern manufacturers endeavoring to capitalize on the justly deserved reputation of the California clothing industry for quality and style of product. Labeling of New York products as "Styled in California" and inclusion of the designation "California" or "Hollywood" in the names of New York manufacturing concerns is surely the type of misrepresentation and misbranding which that body was set up to prevent and which it has strongly condemned in the past.

I ask that the news article to which I have referred be printed in full in the RECORD and that immediate consideration be given to methods of correcting these abusive situations. For that purpose I now submit the article:

"MADE IN CALIFORNIA" LABEL STOLEN BY NEW YORK MANUFACTURERS

SACRAMENTO.—New York garment makers have appropriated the "Made in California" label, Governor Warren was informed yesterday.

He was also told that high freight rates threaten further expansion of the clothing industry in California.

The Governor met for 3 hours with representatives of California garment makers and then promised:

"You have an ally in me as far as freight rates are concerned. I want to help you and I will help you."

Adolph Schuman, San Francisco, told the Governor that he can ship woolen fabric from New York to London to San Francisco and save one-third over the New York to California rate.

"Our transportation rates are a relic of the Golden West days," held Charles Fleischman, San Francisco. Asked Dan Gerteman, Los Angeles: "Why can't we ship goods east at least on an equitable basis?"

The accusation against the New Yorkers came from Dorothy Handelman, Los Angeles. She said New York garment factory racks are full of items labeled "Styled in California." She urged protection of the "Made in California" label to assure buyers they are getting California design, California style, California color, and California comfort.

Mathew K. de la Vallade, Los Angeles, said he once looked into a New York telephone directory and found 3½ columns of clothing firms with names beginning with "California" or "Hollywood."

This recommendation on shipping was given the Governor by Fleischman:

"California is now the second State and unless California, politically, throws its weight around on the freight rates nothing is going to happen."

Henry Hyman, Los Angeles, told of his shipping problem. He said he has been mailing brassieres east by parcel post. Stamps, he found, cost less than freight rates. But now, complained Hyman, there is a bill before Congress limiting the size of packages which can be mailed.

Unions Are Not Monopolies—Play Important Role in Maintaining Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the misinformation currently being spread about labor unions, their power and their practices, I want to bring to your attention a recent lecture delivered at Wayne University at Detroit, February 2, 1950, by Edwin E. Witte, the distinguished chairman of the department of economics at the University of Wisconsin.

Titled "The Role of Unions in Contemporary Society," it is an effective and detailed refutation of those who claim unions have monopolistic power in our society. It would be well if more Members of the House understood what Professor Witte says in his closing statement:

Free trade-unions can exist only where there is a democratic government and, vice versa, I believe, the survival of democratic government, under present-day conditions, is dependent upon the continuance of a strong trade-union movement.

The matter follows:

ROLE OF UNIONS IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY—THEY ARE NOT MONOPOLIES

That unions have attained a very important position in the United States of today is known to everyone. On occasions people who do not like unions still talk about the small percentage of all workers who are members of unions. Some 62,000,000 Americans are in the labor force and only 15,000,000 are in labor unions. But much more frequently, nowadays, these people who do not like unions talk, alarmingly, about the monopolistic power of the unions. Only this week, General Counsel Denham of the National Labor Relations Board painted the teamsters' union as having such vast power that it could bring our entire economy to a standstill within a few days through a Nation-wide strike.

Quite a few academic writers on industrial relations have expressed similar views. A recent book, Unions and Capitalism, by Charles E. Lindbloom, a Yale University economist of theoretical bent, has attracted wide attention, not only in academic but also in nonacademic circles. In this book, Lindbloom is greatly worried about the growing monopolistic power of the unions. "Unionism," as he sees it, "is destroying the competitive price system" and leads to the "systematic disorganization of markets and persistent undercutting of managerial authority." Unions are undermining capitalism and are rapidly converting our entire economy into a syndicalist society. In less alarmist tones, one of the foremost of American economists, Sumner H. Slichter of Harvard, has long been talking about a laboristic society, which, he thinks, the United States has now become.

Quite naturally, these interpretations of the role of unions in our contemporary society by economists of unquestioned repute and objectivity have eagerly been seized upon by people who would like to see the unions cut down to size, if not destroyed. In all the vast propaganda now being carried on against the unions, their alleged monopolistic position and enormous power is stressed. At the same time, however, there often creeps into this propaganda the completely inconsistent claim that the unions, after all, have the support only of a small minority of the workers.

NO MONOPOLY CONTROL

As I see the position of the unions in the contemporary United States, neither of these contradictory claims is supported by the facts. The American unions have, indeed, made great progress and have attained a degree of strength which no one thought possible less than two decades ago. They do not have, however, monopolistic control of wages or other conditions of employment, to say nothing about production, prices, or profits. They do not control Government and, acting alone, have little prospect of gaining such control in the forseeable future. Unionism is not a single centrally controlled movement, but is split into two major federations, plus numerous unaffiliated unions. The federations are constituted of several hundred international unions, which are themselves composed of more than 50,000 local unions. In dealing with employers and in substantially everything else, the unions of this country never act as a unit. Nearly everywhere, the organized workers, including their families, are only a minority in the population, and even their leaders are socially unacceptable in the so-called best circles. Our society is "laboristic" only in the sense that unionism has made great gains and is beginning to challenge the dominance of our great corporations. But they have neither monopoly control over industry nor the main say in public affairs in the contemporary United States.

Unionism in this country is almost as old as is the Nation. There were strikes and short-lived unions in the last years of the eighteenth century. The first city centrals were organized in the 1830's, and at that time also the first independent labor party was launched. The first national federation of unions was organized in the 1850's; the first of the still existing international unions, the typographical union, early in the 1850's. We now have some local unions which have had a continuous history of more than 100 years. By the time of the Civil War we had a truly national labor movement, with some unions in all or nearly all Northern States. By the 1880's we had a much greater labor movement centering in the Knights of Labor. In the second half of that decade the Knights were challenged by the newly organized American Federation of Labor, which soon replaced them as the central organization in the labor movement. Thereafter unionism had ups and downs, periods of increasing and decreasing membership. But at least since the 1880's unionism has always been of real importance in our American society.

The great growth of unionism in this country, however, has occurred during the last 15 years. At the beginning of the New Deal period unionism was at a low point, after a continuous decline in membership during the prosperous twenties. The total union membership was only 3,000,000, contrasted with over 5,000,000 in 1920. Even at this low point, the building trades and the printing and garment industries, and some skilled occupations, were reasonably well organized. But in the great mass-production industries the unions were almost nonexistent. Much of American industry was militantly antiunion and was practically unrestrained in the methods it could use to keep out the unions.

NEW DEAL HELPED

The depression made the American workers more receptive to unionism and the New Deal brought a political climate favorable to its growth. Law restricted the employers in the methods they might employ to keep out and destroy unionism and made it their legal duty to bargain collectively with unions representing a majority of their employees. While Government never directly aided the organization of workers, as it has long aided the formation of cooperatives among farmers, it looked with favor upon unionism and encouraged collective bargaining.

Under these favorable conditions, but primarily because there was a real need for unionism, as well as aggressive leadership, the unions grew in membership and power. This growth started in 1933 but made real headway in the mass production industries only after the organization of the CIO in 1935 and the decisions of the United States in 1937 upholding and giving broad application to the Wagner Act. From under 3,000,000 members in 1933, union membership increased to 7,400,000 in 1937 and 8,500,000 in 1940. In the last years of the thirties, the unions won recognition and their first contracts from many of our greatest corporations. Gains in union membership continued at a rapid pace during the war years, reaching a peak of 13,750,000 in 1944, despite the fact that 3,000,000 union members were in our armed forces. In the period of great labor troubles immediately following the war, the unions made some further, although smaller, advances. The Taft-Hartley Act passed by Congress in 1947, further slowed union growth in a period of increasing employment, but the unions at least held their own. It is probable that there has been some decline in total union membership during the last year of decreasing total employment. Probably the 15,000,000 figure usually given for the present total union membership in this country is an overstatement, if only dues-paying members in good standing are counted, but an underestimate of the total number of Americans who regard themselves as union members. The number of workers employed in establishments in which conditions of employment are, in part, governed by collective bargaining agreements is slightly larger. There are quite a few union members in industries and plants where agreements are not sought or in which the unions have not gained recognition. These are somewhat more than offset by nonunion workers included within the bargaining units in which there are union agreements. The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that at the end of 1946 there were 14,800,000 workers in this country working under collective bargaining agreements, compared with 13,800,000 union members. Since then there have been no official estimates of either union membership or the number of workers under collective bargaining agreements, but both totals probably, are now somewhat greater, although not very much.

The growth of unionism in the last two decades has been very great in absolute numbers and still greater percentagewise. There has been a fivefold growth in union membership since 1933 and more than a 75-percent increase in the last decade. The increase in the number of workers covered by collective-bargaining agreements has been even greater.

[illegible]

The total present labor force of this country is above 62,000,000. As there are only 15,000,000 union members, the statement is often made that the organized labor movement represents less than one-fourth of the country's workers. But the total for the labor force includes the noncorporate employers, the farmers, the urban self-employed, and even the men and women in the armed forces, as well as all employees. The employees include the managers and other executives and supervisors in our corporate enterprises, all clerical and white-collar workers, as well as the production employees. While there are above 62,000,000 persons in the labor force of the United States, only around 40,000,000 are workers in employments in which there is any appreciable organization. But even so the organized workers constitute less than 40 percent of all

the workers in such employments and less than one-third of all employees, exclusive of executives and supervisors.

These totals obscure much higher percentages of organization in many major industries. In all manufacturing industries combined an estimated 70 percent of the production workers are employed under collective-bargaining agreements. This percentage is even higher in mining, construction, and transportation, but is less than 60 percent in public utilities, less than 40 percent in service industries, and less than 20 percent in trade, finance, Government, and agriculture. In particular industries and occupations within these broad classifications there are higher percentages of union organization, but there are few industries or classes of workers in which there is approximately 100 percent of union organization. This may be true of such small employments as photoengravers, pattern makers, window-glass cutters, and a few others, but even in coal mining there is today a considerable volume of nonunion production and a not negligible rival union which is working while the United Mine Workers are on strike.

The alarmist outcries about the monopolistic position which unions have attained seem least warranted when comparison is made between the strength of our unions and that of our great corporations. In many respects the labor union is the counterpart of the corporation. Both are associations, with an entity and existence distinct from that of their members.

There are something like 500,000 active corporations in this country—10 times the number of our labor unions. Collectively, they do two-thirds of the business of all kinds in the United States of today. In manufacturing they have well in excess of 95 percent of the total production and even higher percentages in the finance, public utility, and transportation fields.

The great majority of the corporations differ from individual and partnership enterprises only in having a corporate existence distinct from their members and limited liability for their owners. They are individually or family owned and do not represent large aggregations of economic power and resources.

CORPORATION WEALTH, POWER

While corporations of this sort greatly outnumber the large corporations, the latter have vastly greater wealth and power than all the small corporations combined. The TNEC investigation on the eve of World War II disclosed that the 780 corporations—each of which owned assets of $50,000,000 or more—represented but two-tenths of all corporations but owned 52 percent of the total assets of all corporations. Thirty corporations had assets of more than $1,000,000,000 each. The two largest of these immense corporations each had assets greater than the combined wealth of all the people in 38 of the 48 States of the Union. Since this report was made, 10 years ago, moreover, the great corporations have grown immensely and almost certainly control a greater percentage of the production and wealth of the Nation.

In contrast with the great wealth of the large corporations, the resources of the labor unions of today are but puny. A recent study of the financial resources of 50 international unions, whose combined membership was nearly 12,000,000—four-fifths of the active union membership of the country—reported their total net worth to be $339,000,000, including all their insurance funds. Only one union, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, had assets of as much as $50,000,000, while, already 10 years ago, as has been noted, 780 corporations had assets of above this amount. Only 28 of the international unions had a net worth of as much as $1,000,000. The resources of each of the two great labor federations, the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations only slightly exceed this figure of $1,000,000. No similar study has been made of local union funds and only estimates are available regarding the total resources of all our unions. A very recent estimate by Dr. Alexander S. Lipsett, of Floyd L. Carlisle, Inc., public relations consultants for business organizations, is that all our unions at all levels today have total assets of between three and four billion dollars—a figure exceeded by each of more than a half dozen of our large corporations.

In other respects also, the great corporations are much more powerful than our largest unions or all unions combined. In many large corporations the stockholders outnumber the employees, which is significant because these corporations get almost unanimous support from their stockholders when they get into labor difficulties. The great corporations also have far more extensive propaganda facilities and generally get much more favorable publicity through regular news channels. Corporation managers and executives are the best paid of all people in our present-day society. They are socially acceptable everywhere and command much attention whenever they express their views on any subject. In contrast, our labor leaders are outcasts in social circles, and are suspect by a large part of the general public.

LABOR IN POLITICS

Much alarm has been expressed about the growing political consciousness of labor. But labor people seldom are elected to top offices anywhere in the United States. Probably, no other large element in our country is proportionately more under-represented among our office holders than are the production workers in industry. In this connection it is important to bear in mind that in nearly all States, the production workers and their families constitute only a minority of the population and the organized workers are only a minority of all production workers. Moreover, seldom, if ever, have all union men voted together. If labor is to succeed politically, it must get strong support from other groups. Certain it is that it is still far from dominating the political scene or our Government on any level.

What all this comes to is that the United States is today far more of a managerial than a laboristic society. Industry is our main source of income and managers run industry, or at least large industry. A majority of our great corporations are management controlled, in that, normally the management selects the directors. Managers are very much the leaders in our society and, as such, have great influence upon all our institutions.

To some degree, unionism represents a challenge to absolutism on the part of management. When the union enters, the management ceases to have a completely free hand in many matters affecting conditions of employment. What these are varies from union to union and from time to time. Speaking generally, there has been a tendency for unions to concern themselves about more and more matters. This has led to the outcry about the invasion of management rights by the unions and to claim that what labor is after is to usurp the powers of management or, at least, to demand an equal voice with the representatives of the stockholders in management.

GREAT VARIETY OF UNIONS

Among the 50,000 labor unions of the country, examples can be found of almost everything. There are as great variations among unions as among corporations, with respect to organization and structure, size and power, objectives and methods. The smallest international union has only 100 members, the largest above a million. There are a few unions which are profit-making business organizations; some others that are cooperatives; and a few which are really medieval guilds, constituted of both masters and journeymen. A few unions have brought disrepute upon the labor movement by employing racketeering methods and others by resort to terrorism and violence. There are unions which seem to have as their primary objective service to foreign ideologies and nations. On the other hand, there are company unions, whose real purpose is to undermine genuine unionism and to fool the workers, in the interests of employers.

The labor movement is too large and too varied to be fully and accurately described in a few brief sentences. The sort of unions mentioned, however, are not typical. There have been crooks in the labor movement, but not more than in other strata of society. Unions and union men have sometimes employed lawless methods, but what group has not done so? With the passing of the years, violence in labor disputes has become much less common than it was earlier. Unionism has suffered from the infiltration of Communists and their attempts to use the union movement to advance party interests. But no one has done so much to keep the Communists from making real headway in this country as have the unions. A vigorous union movement is the best safeguard we have against the possibility that our workers may fall for the false promises of those who would undermine our economy and Government.

When it comes to generalizing about unionism in this country, one of the few characteristics which applies to all unions is that they are organizations of workers formed for their benefit. They are more than social clubs, although they do afford workers an opportunity for meetings with their fellows outside of the shop and on terms of social equality and often sponsor very worth while social gatherings for the families as well as the members. They are not educational organizations, although unions are devoting increasing attention to union education and the training of their officials and representatives. They are not propaganda organizations, although they have come to recognize the great importance of getting their message to the public in a favorable light. They are not occupational organizations whose purpose is to improve the skills of their members and their efficiency as producers, although wise leaders recognize that continuous large advances in real wages are possible only if there is increased production. Neither are unions primarily service organizations, although they render a multitude of services for their members, many of them not directly related to their work.

Services of this kind have grown apace in recent years and are an essential function of present-day unions, but they are only incidental to the main purpose for which unions were organized. Unions, also, are not business organizations, which seek to maximize the earnings of their members, as individual entrepreneurs and corporations seek to maximize their profits. While wages are a matter of much concern to all unions, they are by no means all that matters to them. The continued existence of the union often is of greater importance than what the members may get out of it at the moment. Finally, unions are not political organizations in the sense of party organizations or political clubs. It has become fashionable, even among friends of labor, to say that they are essentially political organizations. But this is true only in the sense that the union leaders must satisfy their members and pay heed to their wishes or suffer the penalty of defeat in elections.

UNION BENEFITS

Unions in this country have traditionally functioned primarily in the economic sphere.

This is still the major field of activity of substantially all unions. Their best-known objective is to increase the return to their members from their productive efforts. Many new union members look upon their unions as something akin to a slot machine, in which they put in a few dollars and expect to make a killing. This has led unions to overemphasize wage rates, especially in their early years, but increasingly union members and the unions they control have come to recognize that the largest possible return to the workers involves more than increases in rates per hour. So they have become concerned with wage-rate inequalities and wage-rate structures, incentives and production standards, down time and call-in time, overtime and holiday pay, vacations, sick leave, and, this year, to a greatly augmented degree, retirement pensions, group insurance, and health and welfare funds. Just around the corner, perhaps, is a real drive for guaranties of employment or wages and severance pay.

Less well known to outsiders but not less important to the members are the efforts made by unions to protect their members from arbitrary action by management and to insure that they will be treated in the shop with fairness and in accord with human dignity. This is involved in many grievances, to which all unions devote a great deal of attention. It is also the basis of seniority rules and a review of discharges and other disciplinary action.

But more important to the dyed-in-the-wool unionists and the far-seeing union leaders than any of these is the preservation of the union and the strengthening of its position when its existence seems to be threatened. This is the reason why real union people are not much impressed by the propaganda, which makes its appearance in every serious strike, to the effect that the strikers are losing far more in wages than they can possibly recoup in many years through wage increases they may win. One of the most important aspects of unionism in contemporary America is the intense loyalty the unions arouse among their active members.

To attain these objectives unions in their dealings with management have placed main reliance upon collective bargaining, contracts with employers and machinery for grievance adjustment. Not until the 1880's were these procedures utilized and not until the present century can they be said to have become the standard practices of unions. Despite splits in the labor movement and controversies on many issues among rival unions, all unions now operate in this manner.

UNIONS ALWAYS IN POLITICS

On the part of the general public there is a widespread belief that unions in recent years have changed their tactics to gain their objectives through politics. Unions are more active in politics now than they ever before have been. But it is erroneous that they previously were indifferent to politics. From its very beginning American unions often took part in politics and on many occasions formed independent political parties. The American Federation of Labor from its inception gave much attention to lobbying and at each of its conventions adopted resolutions dealing with general public issues. For nearly 50 years it has pursued the policy of "reward your friends and punish your enemies" in elections. What is new in the present situation is an issue which has united all labor—repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. In the past also organized labor has been most aroused politically when it felt that the unions and their economic activities were being threatened by the Government. There is on the part of some influential labor leaders an appreciation that the unions have attained a position in our society which requires that they must concern themselves with major public questions of general import. Further the change in the attitude of the United States Supreme Court on protective labor legislation has made it possible to attain some of the objectives of organized labor through legislation. But I see the present activities of unions in politics, not as a fundamental change in concepts and policies but as an intensification of tactics they have always employed, brought about primarily by the fact that their economic freedom of action has been restricted by the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The leading living interpreter of the labor movement among academicians, my colleague at Wisconsin, Prof. Selig Perlman, has termed the economic objectives of American unionism and the methods it employs to attain these objectives, "job control." The strength our unionism has attained, he attributes to this earthy objective, distinguishing it from the revolutionary aim of establishing some form of a socialistic society, which has been the objective of most European labor movements and which not a few intellectuals in this country have wanted our labor movement to adopt.

As Professor Perlman has also pointed out, job control as practiced by unions in this country does not deprive management of any of its function. Rather it is a program for giving labor a voice in determining conditions of employment. It limits absolutism on the part of management, but does not sovietize industry or change our system of free enterprise into one of syndicalism.

RECOGNIZE MANAGEMENT RIGHTS

Labor's attitude on management rights was fully disclosed in the National Labor-Management Conference of 1945. In that conference, the management members, among whom were many of the leading industrialists of the country, wanted labor to agree that a long list of subjects, including even safety in the workshop, were matters of management rights with which labor would not concern itself. The labor representatives both AFL and CIO refused to go along. Their position was not that there are no management rights or even no matters about which the unions would not concern themselves, but that no enumeration of such rights could be applicable under all conditions, and at all times. They recognized that management is necessary for the successful conduct of industry and stated positively that labor does not wish to take over management or even to share it. What labor seeks is a voice for the workers in determining their conditions of employment.

There is nothing revolutionary in this aim. Both the CIO and the AFL have repeatedly declared that they favor the continuance of our system of free enterprise. Labor can properly claim that it more sincerely favors free enterprise than do many of those who try to pin the charge of monopoly on it. What labor insists upon is that human beings are more than commodities and that the welfare of the workers should not be determined solely by market considerations. It challenges absolutism on the part of management in dealing with workers, not free enterprise. Rather it is the strongest bulwark we have against the replacement of free enterprise by some form of socialism or communism.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF AMERICAN UNIONISM

Having now dealt with the position unionism has attained in the contemporary American scene and its objectives and methods, I want to conclude by a brief recital of what it has accomplished to date.

American unions have not been successful in everything they have undertaken and everything they have done has not been in the public interest. But viewed as a whole, the record of the American labor movement has been one of substantial accomplishments for its members and of benefit for our entire society. Its record has been at least as good as that of any other labor movement in the world and its contributions to the general welfare of our country as valuable as those of any other group in our society.

On the value of unions to their members the first question which arises is whether the unions increase rates of pay and earnings. Most union members have no doubt that they do; in fact, that is why most workers first join unions. But spokesmen for anti-union employers often say that the unions get no wage increases which they would not have gotten anyhow, or, if they do that the higher wages are at the expense of reduced employment. At other times, and sometimes almost in the same breath, they say that the unions have been responsible for price increases which were rendered necessary by wage increases forced upon industry by the unions. These claims of people who do not like unions have considerable support from theoretical economists and a little support in bona fide statistics. The most impressive statistical data supporting the view that unions have not done very much to increase wages or, at least, real earnings is that relating to the total percentage of the national income going to labor. This shows that the percentage of the total income going to labor has not gone up very much since unionism became powerful. But what this proves is not certain. Labor in all such statistics includes management and all types of workers, organized and unorganized. Data on the share of the total income of given industries going into the production workers alone is scant; moreover, there is no way of knowing what would have been their share had they remained totally unorganized. With the aggregate capital invested in industry ever increasing, there might well have occurred a decided reduction in the share of income going to the workers but for the spread of union organization.

Besides such data relating to the share of labor (including management) in the total income, there have been some analyses of the increase in the earnings of organized workers with those of unorganized workers. How those come out seems to depend upon the particular groups compared and the years used in the comparisons. Quite clearly, the organized tend to shoot ahead of the unorganized most rapidly in their first contracts. Further gains are slower and smaller and may even be reversed. But conclusions drawn from such statistics are also doubtful. The spread of unionism has benefited the unorganized, as well as the organized. No one can prove statistically what wage rates and earnings would have been had there been no unionism.

HIGHER PAY

In the absence of conclusive statistical proof, we must fall back upon every day observations. Very generally, organized workers get higher pay than unorganized workers. Workers know this and so do employers. Both act accordingly and there is little doubt about the facts, theoretical reasoning and statistical manipulation to the contrary notwithstanding.

But all intelligent unionists know that there is a limit to possible wage increases at a given time. That limit is set by the fact that industry must meet all costs and normally must yield a profit. Some wage increases are possible without price increases, but large continuous increases can be gotten only if there is increased production and productivity.

Increased wage rates and higher earnings are by no means all the gains unions have brought their members. There have been innumerable other improvements in conditions of employment. Among these are such material, although intangible, matters as vacations, paid holidays, benefit funds, and many others. Such advances cannot be

measured in exact monetary terms, but collectively have added a great deal to the economic gains unionism has brought to its members. Prof. Joseph Shister of the University of Buffalo, an economist who inclines to the view that the long-run influence of unionism on wage rates is likely not to be very great, in a paper at the recent New York meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association, has pointed out that such nonmarket gains to workers and society are not automatic but need the stimulus of unionism. It is his conclusion that the rapid progress in these respects is attributable, mainly if not entirely, to unionism and the threat of its spread.

HUMAN DIGNITY

Beyond all economic gains are noneconomic values, perhaps even more important to the workers. These relate to treatment of working men and women in accordance with human dignity and the freeing of the workers from a terrible fear of insecurity. By no means all managements and supervisors before unionism or even a majority of them treated the ordinary workers as inferiors or as mere cogs in production. But there can be no doubt that with the coming of the unions conditions in these respects improved greatly in many shops. Similarly, the unions restricted arbitrary discharges and other disciplinary action and afforded considerable protection to the jobs of their members. Through such policies the unions have greatly improved the position and psychological satisfactions of the workers—their status in their own eyes and that of their fellows as men and women.

Unionism has afforded opportunities to many workers for growth as been which they probably would not have had otherwise. Citing another address made at the recent meeting of American Economic Association, this one by Professor Spengler of Duke University, it was Professor Spengler's observation that, increasingly, management is recruited from the colleges, not from the rank and file of the workers. Whether this is or is not true, certain it is that many workers have found in their unions opportunities to grow and rise to positions of esteem among their fellows. While union leaders are often looked down upon by management and the public, these positions are eagerly sought by many workers; in fact, if public opinion polls are to be trusted, more than advancement to the ranks of management.

The benefits of unionism have not been confined to the union members, but have accrued to all workers. When unions become the statutory collective bargaining representatives of all workers, they are obligated by law to fairly represent the nonmembers in the plant or company, in the same way as the members. Generally the nonmembers get the benefit of the same wage increases and all other improvements in working conditions provided for in union contracts. Unorganized workers in plants where there is no unionism at all also have benefited greatly from unionism. Wage increases are often made to keep out the union and when unionized plants get increases, the nonunion plants also make increases—usually later and often in somewhat lesser amounts, but something at least. With the spread of unionism, grievance machinery and fair treatment of workers has also developed in many unorganized plants. Further, the unorganized workers have been the principal beneficiaries of protective labor legislation, whose most powerful supporter has been organized labor. Protective labor standards—the increase to the 75 cents per hour minimum recently effective under the amended Fair Labor Standards Act, for which organized labor fought so hard, for instance—directly benefit many, if any, union members but means higher pay and few unorganized workers.

THEORIES HELPS MANAGEMENT

Unionism also has had many values for management. This is a thesis often developed by Sumner Slichter. He starts with the fact that unionism tends to increase wages and labor costs. This makes management more alert to technological improvements and steps up to the tempo of progress. Slichter credits unionism with operating to put management on its toes, to the benefit of the entire public. Joseph Shister, in the address previously referred to, notes that the nonmarket values of unionism tend to improve employee morale, which is of direct benefit to management and the stockholders.

Certain it is that in the last decade in which unionism has been powerful, corporation profits have reached all-time highs. A Federal Trade Commission survey of the profits of 926 manufacturing corporations in 25 major industries disclosed that in all these industries the total profits were greater in 1948 than in 1940. In all but two of the 25 industries, also, the rate of return on investment was greater. An average return of 10 percent on investment in 1940 became 20 percent in 1948. I doubt whether there is much of a casual connection between the growth of unionism and the great prosperity of industry. But strong unionism, very certainly, has not resulted in financial ruin for industry. Strong unionism has coincided with increased production, higher salaries to management, larger dividends, heavy reinvestment of profits in plant modernization and expansion, and general prosperity.

Unionism has also benefited the general public. The economic gains won by the unions for the workers have not been at the expense of other major elements in our society. Higher wages to workers have meant a great purchasing power, which has benefited all groups. Treatment of workers in accordance with human dignity costs nothing but raises our entire social level. The advances made by the workers in industry have aroused many jealousies, but, at least to date, other groups have prospered along with the workers and have benefited from their economic advances.

For the public, also, there are values in unionism going beyond monetary gains. Sumner H. Slichter has very truly remarked: "Industry produces men as well as goods and the kind of men which a democratic community needs may not be produced in shops which are small oriental despotisms." The survival of our democracy depends to a very great degree upon the quality of our citizens. The close relations between industrial and political democracy is indicated by the fact that every totalitarian government on earth, whether of the right or the left, has always suppressed free trade-unionism and has remade the unions into mere organs of the party or the government. Free trade-unions can exist only where there is a democratic government, and vice versa, I believe, the survival of democratic government, under present-day conditions, is dependent upon the continuance of a strong trade-union movement.

Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, according to the Washington Post today the mayors of 18 big cities yesterday joined in a telegraphic request to President Truman strongly urging him to veto the Kerr natural-gas bill "on behalf of the millions of consumers in our cities." Those signing the telegram were the mayors of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Los Angeles, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, St. Louis, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Kansas City, Cincinnati, Denver, Toledo, Birmingham, Akron, and St. Paul.

I cannot help but believe that when the full import of this legislation, which was passed last week by the House only after several Members changed their votes, is realized by other mayors, especially those in the New York-New Jersey area, they, too, will urge a Presidential veto in behalf of the consuming public they represent.

Why Not a Subsidy on Rockers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a letter from a clever constituent of mine from southern Indiana. Coming from one of the most down-to-earth sections of the country, this tongue-in-cheek communication tickled me, though the situation it points up is anything but funny:

SEYMOUR, IND., *March 25, 1950.*

DEAR MR. WILSON: I am in the furniture business and am writing this letter to request that you obtain for me a subsidy on our platform rockers. We are now making about a thousand a year and are eager to step this production up to 50,000 as soon as possible. With so many people in the country getting rockin'-chair money, we feel that the market is unlimited for our product. Since you are voting money for potatoes, cotton, tobacco, railroads, aviation, and many other industries, I see no reason why we in the furniture business should be slighted.

Now, we would like a guaranteed price of $50 each for these rockers. In the event we are unable to sell all of them, we will arrange to burn them right here at the factory rather than go to the expense of shipping them somewhere else to be destroyed. I notice that you paid $2.90 a bag for potatoes in Maine and then shipped them to Chicago, which raised the cost to $4 a bag, and then sold them to farmers for 1 cent a bag. That sort of thing is pretty expensive, so we will gladly arrange to destroy any surplus of our rockers right at the factory.

It should be an easy matter for you to get the above-mentioned program through Congress, since I see that last year you boys voted to spend $29,000,000,000 without even a roll call. Perhaps you can get one of Harry's boys to enter our rocker program in the budget. I realize that it will be small potatoes to the billion-dollar programs that you are accustomed to, but perhaps you can start a new bureau or something to raise the ante and get it in the billion-dollar bracket. I certainly cannot see that I am asking anything unreasonable, as I have paid taxes all my life and have never received a check from my Government. You paid some of the boys in Maine as much as $450,000 for raising potatoes which the Nation could not possibly consume, so why not a few bucks for the underfed furniture business?

We are in a position to provide some pretty expensive lobbyist with a pocket full of money to spend on the program if you think that is necessary. There must be some secret to getting those big spending programs which benefit a particular group through Congress, and we are eager to obtain the secret. Any information regarding the same will be gratefully appreciated.

Please let me hear from you as soon as possible regarding the above-mentioned rocker program, as we are eager to get the Government checks started rolling in.

Yours most respectfully,

HARRY BOLLING.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, to insert in the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Hon. Arthur Bliss Lane on the "Justice for Poland" radio program sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish American Congress and the introductory remarks made by Attorney Paul P. Fiak, of Springfield, Mass.

It is refreshing to note that the cause of Poland has not been and never will be abandoned.

Despite weak-kneed appeasers, soft-thinking internationalists and tyrannical Communist persecution, there are many of us in this Nation who will never cease our activity until the betrayals of Yalta and Tehran have been renounced, until Poland shall be liberated from the bondage of godless enemies of democracy and freedom.

I congratulate my valued friends upon their efforts, urge their continued activity and pledge them my unyielding loyal support for this great cause.

The address follows:

INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS OF ATTORNEY PAUL P. FIAK

The Poles have been the warmest friends that the United States had in Europe. To retain this valuable friendship, so essential in the present unsettled condition of the world, justice must be accorded to Poland because she was brutally betrayed by her western allies. For this reason in a series of addresses the speakers who have appeared on these programs have delved on stimulating interest in the tragic fate of Poland and have shown the necessity of the repudiation of the Yalta agreements that opened the gates for the imperialistic expansion of the Soviets. It was at Yalta that we violated the noble pronouncements of the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms. As a result of Yalta, Soviets became a threat to our American security and forced us to spend billions on the Marshall plan and other preventative measures. We are beginning to see some ray of light appearing, for recently Congressman ROBERT HALE, of Maine, introduced a resolution stating that the agreements at Yalta are not binding, for they were violated by the Russians. The Secretary of State in his California speech has brought out among the seven points needed to achieve peace and end the cold war "to withdraw Russian military and police forces from present satellite nations and let them choose their own form of government." This is the first time since Yalta that the countries behind the iron curtain, now enslaved by the Soviets, received encouragement and some evidence of sympathy against oppressors. Another topic that our speakers have brought to the attention of our fellow Americans was a grave warning against the spread of communism in the United States. I shall read you an editorial from the Times Leader, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., presenting the remarks of the head of our organization and also the editorial comment:

"Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish-American Congress and of the Polish National Alliance, speaking at a benefit dinner for displaced persons in Chicago last week, said among other things: Let us clean up the Communist scum in America. Communist propaganda should be banned. No red professors should be permitted to teach in our universities. Communists should be treated the way every criminal is treated. Let us show them no mercy. They are traitors and should be treated as such. Every foreign-born Communist should be thrown out of America. Every native-born Communist should be placed behind prison bars. This great country of ours should belong only to loyal Americans. In plain words, let us destroy communism in this country. If we don't, it will destroy us. It is a case of their neck or ours."

That is language that can be understood by Americans everywhere. It makes sense in Wilkes-Barre, Mr. Rozmarek's home town, as well as in Chicago, the city of his adoption. It might even be understood in Washington, but Mr. Rozmarek would not be too sure of that in the light of his experience with the Roosevelt administration and the double-cross of Poland and the cause of freedom at Yalta. The sentiments Mr. Rozmarek expresses in his Palmer House address were those of a loyal American. It was not the first time he raised his voice in warning on the threat of communism. He has the foresight to detect the designs of Soviet Russia on the land of his forefathers, but the wartime administration in Washington played Stalin's game with disastrous results. The fate that befell Poland now menaces America.

Mr. Rozmarek is justifiably alarmed and he makes himself unmistakably clear in sounding a call to arm for his fellow countrymen. True, the measures he proposes are drastic in a land like ours, but it is well to bear in mind that we are facing a ruthless foe who plays according to his own rules and with whom anything goes if his purpose can be accomplished. We dare not to be too squeamish without inviting the fate that inevitably will overtake us unless we secure ourselves on the home front. Mr. Rozmarek's proposal that all foreign-born Communists be deported is sound. If they don't like the American way of life, they don't belong here. Why are they here, anyway, if it is not to stir up strife and undermine our liberties? They are enemies of the United States as much as the Nazis and Japs ever were. In a sense, they are worse, for they take advantage of our hospitality and bore from within. Why not round up all these alien reds and replace them with homeless soldiers and exiles of Poland and other lands who fought for our cause and who sacrificed everything except their lives, which they offered to preserve the ideals of America? It is easy to agree with Mr. Rozmarek that the time for pussy-footing on communism is passed. He is right when he indicates it is a case of survival. The suggestion that communism and democracy can live side by side in this world is the bunk. The record of recent years speaks for itself.

Our speaker today is Hon. Arthur Bliss Lane who resigned as Ambassador to Poland and terminated what President Truman called "a long and distinguished career in the American foreign service." He began his diplomatic service in 1916, the year he was graduated from Yale, as a private secretary to the United States Ambassador to Italy. Some of his other assignments have included secretary to the United States delegation to the Supreme Council at Paris, Chief of the Division of Mexican Affairs, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Yugoslavia, minister to Costa Rica, and Ambassador to Colombia.

The difficult Polish assignment began in 1944 when Mr. Lane was appointed Ambassador to the Polish Government in exile in London and later as Ambassador to Poland's regime. Mr. Lane was at Warsaw to enforce the Yalta and Potsdam mandates stipulating that the Polish election be free and unfettered. Once the election was held, in his letter of resignation to the President, he charged the Polish Government with cynical disregard for the international obligations. He caused an international stir by his decision to gain the freedom of a private citizen by resigning his diplomatic post so he could speak openly to the American people on the subject of the betrayal of Poland. It is a pleasure that I now present the Honorable Arthur Bliss Lane.

ADDRESS OF HON. ARTHUR BLISS LANE

As one who has twice served in Poland as a member of the American Foreign Service and who has accordingly acquired the highest admiration and the deepest affection for the Polish race, I feel greatly privileged to speak on the Justice for Poland radio program of the Polish-American Congress.

No people has suffered greater injustices, physical, and mental hardships. In addition, the Nation has twice lost its liberty—once to the Nazis and then to the Communists.

And the terrible admission which we Americans must make is that Poland's present plight today—being subjected to a regime of persecution where none of the "four freedoms" exists—is due in part to the attitude of the United States at the conferences of Tehran and Yalta. Whether this betrayal of a faithful ally was deliberate or unwitting, the fact is that in acquiescing to the cession of Polish territory to the Soviet Union we ourselves violated the principles of the Atlantic Charter for which we had supposedly been fighting the war. We thereby cleared the way for the setting up of the Communist Government in Poland. Contrary to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, we did not consult the Polish Government in exile in London, which we then recognized as the legal Polish Government, regarding the cession of 60,000 square miles of Polish territory, nor did we consult the Polish people. Anyone who knows the Polish people knows that they have no sympathy for communism. They are one of the most religious peoples in Europe and certainly would not wish to be ruled by a government which is openly atheistic.

Many explanations have been made as to why it was necessary for the United States at Tehran and Yalta to agree to the imposition on Poland of Communist domination. Some claim that if we had not agreed, Stalin would have made a separate peace with Hitler. Others claim that Stalin's participation in the Japanese war was essential for the United States and would save countless American lives by shortening the war. In any case, it is clear at this point in our history that we renounced the principles to which we had solemnly subscribed and which we persuaded other members of the United Nations to subscribe, including Poland and the Soviet Union.

By renouncing solemn principles insulting our international integrity, not only was our prestige greatly lowered by our unwittingly encouraging the Soviet Union to proceed in Poland and in all the other countries of eastern Europe as well, to disregard the promises which it and its satellite countries had made regarding the holding of free elections.

Our Government has on many occasions denounced the violation of the Yalta agreement by the Soviet Government and by its satellites. Our protests have had no effect whatever, for the Soviet Government well understood that short of war there was no action which we could take to remedy the situation. But we as a Nation should do far more than protest the violations of Yalta. We should denounce Yalta. Not only is Yalta unconstitutional, never having been ratified by the United States Senate, but as a violation of the Atlantic Charter it should be denounced and repudiated as being contrary to the principles of our expressed foreign policy. Only a few weeks ago Dean Rusk of the Department of State, in referring to the possibility of a meeting between President Truman and Stalin, said: "We are not prepared * * * to sit down in a corner with another great power and dispose of the basic interest of other governments or peoples behind their backs." And yet that is exactly what we did at Tehran and Yalta.

Some may accuse me of being destructive in my criticism. But if we are to build a new world we must tear down the false foundations on which certain conceptions of our foreign policy are based. And the American people can use their democratic processes so that the United States will take constructive action. The step which I propose that the American people should take is indeed simple and will cost no appropriation by Congress. It is merely that the Congress of the United States should be urged by the people to declare that Yalta is no longer binding on the United States, for the reasons which I have given. This step is more than an academic one. It would have far-reaching effects. First, it would show the Soviet Union that the people's representatives in the United States are warning the Soviet Union that it can go no further in its policy of aggression. Second, it would tell the peoples behind the iron curtain, through the Voice of America, that we are thinking of them and that their day of liberation is still a possibility despite present-day oppression. Thirdly, we would be putting ourselves on record as having reverted to the principles of international morality which we so righteously proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter. If we are to regain the international respect which has traditionally been ours for years, we must base our foreign policy on principles and not on expediency.

All of you can and must help to accomplish this end.

National Security Resources Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, since September 1949, I have been calling attention to the fact that the all-important National Security Resources Board has been without a permanent Chairman and its acting head, Dr. John R. Steelman, assistant to the President, was too busy with other duties to provide proper leadership.

This week in describing to the House the chapter in the omnibus appropriation bill dealing with the National Defense Establishment, our able colleague, Representative MAHON, of Texas, agreed with me that it had been most unfortunate that the National Security Resources Board had been leaderless for so many months during the so-called cold war. Both of us hail last week's selection of W. Stuart Symington, Air Force Secretary, as the Board's permanent Chairman and we are mindful of the tough job he has ahead.

Mr. Drew Pearson in today's Washington Merry-go-Round has some pungent words to say in the situation. They follow:

HEADLESS BUREAU

When hard-driving, imaginative Secretary of the Air Force Stuart Symington changes desks to run the National Security Resources Board, he will find an outfit about as full of snap as a worn-out spring. On the books, the NSRB has the vital job of blueprinting civil defense, relocating industries, finding the most effective use of resources, and planning for regulating production, manpower, and Government facilities in time of emergency.

But this all-important Board has been both leaderless and kicked around by agencies that should be obeying its orders.

The Amerasia Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Sokolsky:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

No writer likes to keep everlastingly on one subject, trying the patience of his readers—and his own—but I know that the suppressed Amerasia case is the key to all this miserable quarrel over the State Department.

Two raids were made on that magazine—one by the OSS; the other by the FBI. In this piece I shall discuss the suppressed OSS investigation.

An unimportant report on Thailand appeared as an article in the magazine Amerasia. While the article itself did not matter, obviously, the OSS, which was a very secret arm of the Government under the direction of Gen. William Donovan, was deeply concerned, for it led to a leak in its own organization. It meant that the OSS, which dealt with espionage, was itself the subject of espionage.

Thereupon an investigation ensued under the direction of Frank Brooks Bielaski, ordered by A. Van Beuren, security officer of OSS. It was found that about 30 persons in various departments of the Government had access to this document and each name was known.

It was decided to visit the offices of the magazine. It took the investigating crew about a week, from March 3 to 10, 1945, to get into the premises because someone was always working there late at night.

Five persons entered the premises at midnight of March 11, one a mechanic. The reason for the late hour was that the office was in use all day Sunday until 5 p. m.

This magazine then had a circulation of 1,700—a fact which is important because, while the publication itself could not have amounted to anything, its premises seemed very busy. In it was located a large photocopy room with an unusual amount of equipment. Such equipment could not have been needed to produce this small magazine.

In the rear of the office suite were three principal rooms—the office of Kate Mitchell, the office of Philip Jaffe, and a large library which contained hundreds of volumes relating to the Far East.

On the library table was an envelope containing secret documents, across the top of each of which was written the name of one of America's most important novelists, whose name I am not giving now. In that envelope were found six documents, hastily copied on a typewriter from original Navy documents, all marked "top secret." I have in my possession a general description of these documents.

In Philip Jaffe's office were found a bellows-type suitcase and two brief cases suitable for carrying documents. The suitcase was marked "P. J. J." Scores of secret documents were found in these three receptacles.

They were from the State Department, Naval Intelligence, Army Intelligence, and the OSS. Some were original documents; some typewritten copies, with three or four carbon copies. There were also photostats of State Department documents.

The raiders actually took some of these documents as samples. All the OSS documents were stamped with a declaration to the effect that possession of such articles by an unauthorized person constituted a violation of the Espionage Act. One of the photostats, from the State Department, showed the complete distribution of all groups in the Chinese Army, the places where located, under whose command, naming units division by division, and showing their strength.

Four agents saw all the documents and are therefore witnesses to the transaction. They have never been called in any investigation, although 5 years have passed and the statute of limitations has been permitted to run.

All this was duly reported and the documents delivered to the OSS security officer, A. Van Beuren. Undoubtedly this was given to Gen. William Donovan, who has never been called to testify concerning a case of major espionage, involving hundreds of documents.

The original officers of the Amerasia magazine were:

Editorial board, Frederick W. Field, chairman; Philip J. Jaffe, managing editor; Lilian Peffer, assistant editor; Harriet Levine, secretary; T. A. Bisson, Ch'ao Ting-chih, Kenneth W. Colegrove, Owen Lattimore, William W. Lockwood, Cyrus H. Peake, David H. Popper, William T. Stone. (From issue of August 1938, vol. 11, No. 6.)

To this subject I shall refer again.

Home Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sandusky (Ohio) Register-Star-News:

HOME RULE FOR CAPITAL DENIED VOTERS BECAUSE OF RACE ISSUE

Of all the burdens saddled upon Congress, acting as a city council for Washington seems the silliest. Long hours are devoted to details of municipal government that are admittedly tiresome to most of the lawmakers involved.

Actually, no one likes the arrangement. Washington's residents want to govern themselves just as do citizens everywhere else. Officials of the District of Columbia, who run the city under the thumb of Congress, plead for more authority.

Both major parties went on record in their 1948 platforms as favoring home rule for the Capital.

Despite all this action on home rule legislation is stymied. Last year the Senate passed a bill by Senator KEFAUVER, Tennessee Democrat, to give Washingtonians the right to vote for a city council and to provide for a reorganized District government. But the House District Committee sat on the measure.

That's the situation today, except that a petition is being circulated among House Members to discharge the committee from further study of the bill. The discharge petition, the only way a measure can be brought to the floor over the adverse vote of a committee, now lacks but 49 of the 218 signatures to become effective.

Why has the home-rule proposal been blocked when so many appear to favor it?

The answer is simple. Between a fourth and a third of the Capital's population is Negro. There is fear in certain quarters that to enfranchise Washington voters will mean to give this minority more than its proportionate strength at the polls.

Obviously there can be no defense of such a viewpoint in this country. Forward-looking elements in the South have been slowly but surely winning the Negro his rightful status at the polls after decades of disfranchisement. And there the problem has, of course, been most acute.

Certainly Washington is the last place democratic America should wish to see barriers raised against use of the voting privilege. It may be pointed out that the Capital is in a ticklish spot, on the borderline between North and South. But the possibilities for conflict are probably no more explosive than in, let's say, Detroit or Chicago, where the growth of Negro minorities is pressing hard on a limited housing supply.

The fact is Washington is a Capital first and a border city second. As the Nation's Capital, it must reflect in daily practice the country's loftiest ideals. How can a city symbolize democracy if it doesn't live it?

This Odious So-Called Kerr Natural-Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received many reports from the Second Nebraska Congressional District, which I represent in the Congress of the United States, asking me to not only oppose this thoroughly bad measure but to endeavor to induce President Truman to veto same.

As illustrative of these missives, I wish to now set forth a letter which I received from Greenville P. North, Esq., a prominent Omaha attorney, who has devoted much of his time in the interests of the people, which letter expresses so well the thoughts of the persons who, as under-contract consumers, are now relegated to the natural gas rate-raising clutches of the natural-gas companies, if the so-called Kerr natural-gas bill is not vetoed by the President:

OMAHA, NEBR., *April 4, 1950.*

Hon. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

GENE: As I expected, you are on what appeared to me to be the right side of the Kerr bill.

I cannot but believe that the President would veto this bill if he knew the very great fear of thousands of the people (and by that I mean only of this district as I am not familiar with others) that the taking away of the jurisdiction to regulate the prices at the point of delivery to the pipe lines would not only result in an enormous increase in price to the users of gas but would also result in an enormous increase in the price of coal and fuel oil and all related commodities. To the great majority of wage earners in this district this would so reduce their incomes as to seriously affect the entire economy of the district, and I assume that the same conditions are true in many other localities.

Of course, I realize that I have not the same perspective as either you or the President concerning this matter and there may be some other material matter that would necessitate the approval of this bill, but I have been unable to learn of such necessity from any source.

You know that I have always been a great admirer and friend and defender of the President, even to the extent that I always considered his friendship for the late Mr. Pendergast a great virtue and not, as many Republicans and some Democrats in this district claimed to have considered, as a vice. Of course, you know that no matter what his final decision will be, I have the utmost confidence that it will be based upon what he believes to be right.

I have not discussed this letter with anyone nor has anyone requested me to write or telegraph you, but it is being sent only in the thought that it might help you to present the feelings of a great many people in this district. I am sure that if the President does not veto the bill it will cost him literally thousands of Democratic votes in this district. Of course, if he has information that he feels would justify him in approving the bill he would have to do it no matter whether it cost the votes or not, but I think you have a right to know what I think the attitude of the people is and as your friend and as a friend of the President, I am writing this and sending it air mail, special delivery.

So that Mr. North and my other constituents may be advised correctly about what I am doing in the premises, I now set forth a copy of a telegram which I sent today to President Truman:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 6, 1950.*

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Key West, Fla.:

Please pardon me for doing a JOHN W. HESELTON and telegraphing you about vetoing the Kerr natural-gas bill. Have received many letters and telegrams from my district from little and big consumers and Democrats generally who feel that this measure is a special-interest one and I hope you will pardon me for urging you to veto the bill.

EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Second Nebraska District.

The Fuchs Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from a recent issue of the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., by Lester Allen:

FUCHS CASE DID LOT FOR REDS—MADE UNITED STATES AND BRITISH SECURITY SERVICES APPEAR SILLY AND CAUSED ATOMIC RIFT

(By Lester Allen)

Beside the name of one Klaus Emil Julius Fuchs, Ph. D., in the notebook of a Soviet agent seized in Canada, was the Russian word for "ours" and never was an ownership more complete, for the Soviet Union owned him body and soul, used him to extract the most carefully guarded atomic secrets, used him to drive an almost irreparable wedge between the United States and Great Britain and destroyed one of the world's great theoretical physicists in the process.

What befell Dr. Klaus Fuchs is contained in his confession, a document which may never become part of a public record because of the appalling amount of information it contains, not only about atomic secrets he betrayed to the Russians, but also the fantastic carelessness with which Fuchs was blithely admitted to the innermost councils of the top physicists working on atomic development.

Those few who have seen the confession declare that it is one of the most tragic documents they have ever read, to be compared with Oscar Wilde's De Profundis in describing the deterioration of a man's soul under the handling of Soviet agents. They took Klaus Fuchs, the ideological zealot, and turned him into a thief stealing secrets for miserable pay. The treachery he undertook out of a burning belief in the Communist cause was deliberately turned into petty larceny by Soviet agents who schemed and plotted to make Fuchs accept a miserable pittance in payment for his treason.

PLAN MISFIRED

No better illustration of the sinister and inhuman attitude of the Soviet plan for world domination could be found than the Fuchs case. There is good reason now to suspect that the exposure of the Soviet spy ring in Canada, which entrapped only the smallest of small fry, was staged for the purpose of driving a wedge of suspicion between the United States and Great Britain.

It is unreasonable to suppose that a Soviet agent would be in circulation in Canada carrying an incriminating list of men working for the Soviet Union which included names of men as highly placed as Klaus Fuchs in atomic research. The notebook containing Fuchs' name now looks very much like a plant. He was being thrown to the wolves for the purpose of setting up distrust between the United States and Great Britain. It appears to have been the aim to compel the United States, out of self-interest and for security, to deny the sharing of any further atomic information with Great Britain.

The plan misfired, however, because nothing was done about Fuchs' name found in the Soviet agent's notebook. It is astounding but true that not only was it ignored by MI5 section of the British Home Office intelligence, but by the MI6 section of the British Foreign Office—the latter a secret intelligence operation of vaunted skill in espionage and evaluation. The Department of Justice in the United States ignored the Fuchs notation as well for several years, for so long, indeed, that Fuchs was chosen chief of the theoretical physics branch of Britain's secret Harwell atomic research center.

DID IT FOR MONEY

It was 2 years before anything was done about Fuchs and then it was done only because the Soviet Union dropped another hint that Fuchs was their creature and in their pay.

Never was a jurist more mistaken than Lord Goddard when, in sentencing Fuchs at Old Bailey to 14 years' penal servitude, he said that Fuchs had done irreparable and incalculable harm to Britain and the United States merely to further a political creed. The man in the dock knew differently, knew how base had been his motives after he was launched on his career of treachery. He had done it for paltry sums of money, even though he had been willing to do it for nothing.

Fuchs clarified something that had always puzzled the intelligence agents of the democracies. Soviet spying operations had been carried out in a large measure by rabid Communist zealots who believed they were aiding a great cause in spying for the Soviet Union. Yet in almost every instance where the spy became important or achieved access to important information the Russians insisted upon making payment for service rendered.

COMPLETELY REFRESHED HIM

Perhaps the most puzzling element in the Hiss case was the presentation to Hiss of an oriental rug which could easily be traced back to the donor. It was so simple that its very simplicity made Hiss appear to be an innocent dupe. Fuchs made it clear that the purpose of such payments was the destruction of a man's inner integrity and faith in his own soul—to make a miserable thief out of him and deprive him of the consolation of assuaging pangs of conscience with the belief that what had been done was done of high faith and real for a cause.

Not a small part of the rage and frustration of the American Communists who were exposed by Department of Justice agents who had infiltrated their ranks was their chagrin at not having compromised the infiltrating operatives so that their testimony would have been invalidated.

Fuchs was given the full treatment. A mousy, myopic, and absorbed scientist whose chief interest was his work, they turned him into a loathsome thief who could have no respect for himself. But they went further. They involved him in shady and clandestine affairs with women and completed the job of destroying him.

FEAR HUMILIATION

The Fuchs case accomplished a great deal for the Russians. It made the vaunted skill of the British secret service look silly, and did the same for American security safeguards. It caused a rift between the two countries on atomic matters which only the most courageous and farsighted statesmanship of high-policy-level individuals can overcome. It created an atmosphere of "What next?" among the scientists of first rank working on American and British atomic developments and made the imperative task of securing the top men in theoretical physics for the atomic program much more difficult. It added fuel to the heat of suspicion, unfounded and otherwise, that further guaranteed more and more witch hunts for possible traitors.

There's only one positive safeguard against leakage of atomic secrets and that is utter secrecy. Scientists hold that such complete secrecy makes rapid research into atomic problems impossible because of the fact that they are operating in a realm of science where even the merest clue unearthed by some independent researcher may provide the link they need to complete a chain of scientific evidence.

Frankly there are all too few top scientists who will take the risk of going to work for the Atomic Energy Commission today because they would never know when they might have to run the gauntlet of a loyalty review, a congressional hearing, or a guilt-by-association proceeding.

Most of the top scientists know or have exchanged information of a scientific nature with professed Communist sympathizers in their own fields. Many of them are unwilling to bury their careers without acclaim and without recognition in a secret program that will bring them nothing but a very modest salary and the possibility of humiliation.

WHAT REDS WANTED

This was precisely what was in the minds of the Soviet spy masters when they threw Fuchs to the wolves. That's the way they planned it. They wanted distrust, fear, unfounded suspicion, faltering confidence. And it looks as if they got what they were after.

The one means that the Atomic Energy Commission had of setting up a research program that might have bypassed the reluctance of established scientists to continue their efforts was denied them. It had been planned to select brilliant young graduates of American universities whose background had been cleared by all the security tests necessary to insure complete loyalty and give them research fellowships. The money was not appropriated, however, and the funds available had to go into projects which had high priority.

Had the Fuchs case happened in Russia it would not have been nearly as damaging to the Russians. The Soviet Union is a total police state. Klaus Fuchs would merely have disappeared and no mention would have been made of his fate. But Anglo-Saxon justice does not work that way. Fuchs had to take his medicine in public.

AGENTS NEVER RETURN

Just how total the police state is in Russia may be determined by the fact that no intelligence service in the world, except the Soviet service, knows for certain where any of the Soviet atomic energy plants are located, much less what they are doing. There is a grim joke among the operatives in the intelligence services of the western nations. They say: "We have effected a saving on our operations in the Soviet Union. We now buy only one-way ticket to Russia." The inference is, of course, that agents who get behind the iron curtain never return.

The one real service Klaus Fuchs performed for the United States and Great Britain, particularly the latter, is his exposure of the incredible stupidity and ineptitude of the counterintelligence services. It was established that the British secret service wasn't even aware that Klaus Fuchs was a Communist, yet, as his defense counsel, Derek Curtis-Bennett, declared, he had never pretended to be anything else. That seems to be carrying the theory that a man's political beliefs are his own personal concern a little bit too far.

Klaus Fuchs' confession, only parts of which were read to the court at Old Bailey, may never become public. What is more likely is that the impounded document will disappear after a generation or so. But if it does become public within the next few months it will be plain indication to the Russians that we have some new secrets—and they will have to find another Fuchs.

Columbiana Soil Conservation District Annual Report, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the 1949 annual report of the Columbiana County, Ohio, soil-conservation district. It was my priviiege to address the members of this district at their annual meeting at Lisbon on March 10, and I found that they are enthusiastically working to preserve one of the greatest assets this country has, its topsoil.

The report follows:

COLUMBIANA SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT
ANNUAL REPORT, 1949

The matter of first importance in the annual report of a year's work of a soil conservation district should be the amount of work done. The Columbiana Soil Conservation District of Ohio can take some pride in its accomplishments in 1949. Details of this, as to figures, will be found tabulated later in the report. It can be stated briefly that the work accomplished, in such important fields as watercourses constructed, contour strip cropping, and cropland limed, amounted to more in the past year by 10 to 25 percent, than was completed for the previous year.

The work done fell somewhat short of the amount that the Soil Conservation Service personnel thought could be done, and there is always the great amount that should be done in the county, but the district supervisors feel that 1949 was a good year.

Confining most of the concrete accomplishments to tables, the narrative part of the report will concern some of the actions and opinions of the district supervisors.

It was a fairly active year for both supervisors and Soil Conservation Service personnel, with somebody representing the county at practically every meeting or event important to soil-conservation work. It should be reported that in our county there is excellent cooperation with other agencies in the farm field. The president of our board is a member of the county PMA committee. Our meetings usually have in attendance both the county agricultural extension agent and the area forestry extension agent, both of whom take an active interest. Public acceptance of the program seems fairly general.

A tour was sponsored for farmers of the county to the Soil Conservation Service Hydrological Laboratory at Coshocton, Ohio, and it was considered a successful event. Clyde Freeman attended the annual meeting of the Ohio Federation of Soil Conservation Districts.

Two persons, district conservationist Pendry, and supervisor Rupert, accompanied the tour of area farmers to the Regional Pasture Laboratory at State College, Pa.

A tour of a good farm was conducted by the Soil Conservation Service Farm Planner for the benefit of rural ministers, just prior to the national rural life Sunday.

It should be pointed out that the Extension Service was active in arranging the details of some of these tours, as well as helping in the organizing of neighborhood study groups.

During the year our personnel gave more attention to group work, as a means of reaching more people with educational material,

and with the idea of cutting down work of the farm planner to some extent, by equipping cooperators to do more of their own planning. While it is perhaps too early to judge the results of the 1949 schools, Farm Planner Reuter has been commended for his work along this line.

Three county farms received honorable mention in awards of the Cleveland Farmers Club for good farming practices. We had no entrants in the B. & O. contest, although several folks were asked by mail if they would care to enter. The minutes for the board meeting, September 29, 1949, include the following statement: "The idea was expressed that the prizes in this contest are not very large for the amount of labor that is usually expended in preparing the applications, and technical personnel was instructed to do no more work for the contest unless some of the persons approached asked for help to enter."

During the year a letter was sent out asking for association fund membership money, and several farmers responded to this. Enough was sent in to secure an affiliate membership to the national federation.

Supervisors started a plan of each man visiting a cooperator's farm to study the application of the farm plan on the land. Reports from these trips served to help supervisors understand problems involved, and perhaps be of some help to the planners through the discussions that were held. Many shortcomings were found in actual working of the plan, but the supervisors heard very little criticism of the program on the original plans.

The annual meeting of the district was well attended (240 present), and James Chapman, farm-program director of radio station WTAM, Cleveland, was the speaker.

The district supervisors and Soil Conservation Service personnel helped at the Apple Creek Field Day.

A tour to the Bromfield farm was held and was well attended (150 present).

As indicated in the 1948 report, the board did not attempt any general field day during the year, but planting of forage crops were made, which might serve as exhibits for such a field day in 1950. Plans for this were discussed at various times during the year.

The State representative was asked to use his influence to get a larger number of trees from the State nursery for actual farm planting. It was pointed out at the board meeting that many strip-mine spoilbank plantings in the county show clearly that a large percentage of the trees allotted for spoilbank reclaiming are wasted because of failure to grow.

Personnel were instructed to start arrangements for an air tour in 1950, so that farm people could see erosion and control work from overhead.

The board was perhaps a little more critical in accepting work during 1949. Not many requests were refused, but a few very large farms were at least postponed because the board felt there was no assurance, in view of past history and people involved, that the work planned would be completed. Likewise, a few small places were refused, in cases where farming was not the primary interest and where it was felt that the applicant was not interested in a complete plan for his land.

The supervisors wish to thank all cooperating agencies—the Soil Conservation Service for furnishing full time of a farm planner and aide, also an extra aide to work on follow-up with our 400 cooperators; the Extension Service for help in our educational program; and all others.

Statistics concerning the condition of the district follow.

OLIVER FREEMAN,
Chairman, Columbiana Soil Conservation District, Lisbon, Ohio.

Other members of the board: James Huston, Elden Groves, Don Rupert, Edwin Copeland.

Annual report of receipts and expenditures, period Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1949

Receipts (by source):	
Balance brought forward	$185.48
Cooperators fees	30.00
Affiliate membership contributions	62.00
Rental of equipment	23.60
Annual meeting (donations and sale of food)	51.38
Check No. 16 (was outstanding)	2.50
Total	354.96
Expenditures (classified):	
Repair of plow	4.50
Postage, stamps, post cards, etc.	10.53
Annual meeting (speaker, food, etc.)	59.13
Service charge	.25
Lyle printing	2.85
Advertise, election	4.38
Tags, field day	.75
National association dues	10.00
State association dues	19.00
Affiliate membership dues	50.00
Mileage, Mr. Walton	36.40
Mileage, Mr. Hays	25.50
Total	224.69
Total receipts	354.96
Total expenditures	224.69
Balance on hand	130.27

Annual report of conservation practices

	This year	To date
Farms planned:		
Number	45	431
Acres	5,637	46,540

Practice	Newly planned		Established	
	This year	To date	This year	To date
Contour farming ... acres	56	99	35	68
Cover cropping ... do	440	522	255	307
Strip cropping ... do	1,430	16,634	1,289	13,181
Pasture improvement ... acres	1,247	6,869	454	2,900
Seeding pasture ... do	1,131	4,703	227	1,578
Woods management ... do	402	975	0	53
Tree planting ... do	132	597	39	198
Terraces ... miles	19	67	3	29
Farm ponds ... each	12	56	6	16
Field diversions ... miles	7	47	2	30
Farm drainage ... acres	79	264	18	102
Farm drainage, linear feet	13,600	205,145	6,300	130,496
Lime cropland ... acres	3,235	23,326	2,882	16,792
Fertilize cropland ... do	2,812	23,678	2,557	19,540
Constructed waterways ... linear feet	22,625	105,637	8,725	54,660
Prevention of fire and grazing ... acres	653	2,670	611	2,239
Fence row management ... linear feet	67,400	74,800	13,000	25,050

Operation Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to spread upon the RECORD the resolution adopted by the Waterbury Junior Chamber of Commerce with reference to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

It will be recalled that the members of this fine organization recently came to Washington in furtherance of its support for the Hoover Commission program.

I believe that this group is performing a fine public service by bringing to the attention of the general public the many savings which can be made by adoption of these proposals:

WATERBURY JUNIOR CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE, INC.,
Waterbury, Conn., March 21, 1950.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PATTERSON: We are enclosing herewith the text of a resolution adopted by the Waterbury Junior Chamber of Commerce, Inc., at a meeting March 20 in the Elton. We respectfully urge you that serious consideration and wholehearted support be given to this resolution:

"Whereas the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce has called attention to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission report through its program of education and petitioning known as Operation Economy; and

"Whereas the Connecticut Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Waterbury Junior Chamber of Commerce have assisted in this No. 1 civic project since last fall: Therefore be it:

"*Resolved*, That it be known that the Waterbury Junior Chamber of Commerce is on record for urging the Congress for the adoption of all the recommendations as set forth in the Hoover Commission report and as presented to the Congress by President Truman."

Respectfully yours,

EDWARD A. JONES,
President.

JOHN DELDONNO,
Chairman, Committee for Support of the Hoover Report.

Maintenance of an American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that no one will question that the maintenance of an American merchant marine is an absolute essential to an integrated American economy in time of peace. In time of war the necessity of a developed and efficiently operating domestic shipping industry is multiplied a thousandfold. That fact has been demonstrated through the harsh lessons of the last two wars, to our great cost in terms of money and human lives. We are now faced with a situation which, God forbid, may result in a third repetition of that same harsh lesson. It is with the view of forestalling to some extent the cruel consequences of an unintelligent lack of ability to profit by the lessons of the past that I address the House today.

H. R. 7786, the omnibus appropriation bill which we are now considering, contains in chapter VIII, pages 301 to 309, an appropriation for the United States

Maritime Commission. That appropriation includes a total amount of 346,749,000 in new appropriations and funds from various existing accounts for operating-differential subsidies to American-flag ships as authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended. I have no quarrel at this time with the amount of that appropriation. However, on page 304, lines 5 to 10, of the bill there appears a proviso which can only serve to cripple an already seriously menaced American shipping industry. That proviso reads as follows:

Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for obligation, nor any obligation made, for the payment of an operating-differential subsidy for any number of ships in excess of the number of ships receiving such subsidy as of January 1, 1950.

I have before me an information release from the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, dated March 27, 1950, which explains in detail the very serious consequences which will almost inevitably result should we permit that proviso to remain in the bill as finally passed. Freezing of operating-differential subsidies to the number of vessels receiving such subsidies as of January 1, 1950, can serve no useful purpose. The total amount of funds appropriated is an effective limitation on the cost of the subsidy program. The restrictive proviso cannot, therefore, be defended as an economy measure. Its sole purpose is to handicap presently unsubsidized operators, now voluntarily assuming operating-differential costs, in favor of the owners now receiving and enjoying the benefits of Government subsidies. Its sure result will be a reduction in the total number of American-flag vessels in the face of reduced freight rates, cargo shrinkages, increased operating costs, and increased foreign competition.

May I ask that every Member of the House read and seriously consider the information release which will accompany these remarks in the RECORD so that when chapter VIII comes up for consideration this iniquitous proviso may be stricken out? The matter referred to follows:

The House Appropriations Committee has included in the general appropriation bill, 1951, a provision which is intended to freeze the number of subsidized vessels to the aggregate number of vessels actually receiving subsidy on January 1, 1950. The action was taken without a full presentation of all the facts, which are as follows:

1. According to the reports of the American Bureau of Shipping, there were a total of 858 American-flag, dry-cargo, and combination-cargo and passenger vessels operating in the foreign trade during the calendar year 1949 (March 1950 bulletin). According to the Maritime Commission testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, there were only 235 subsidized vessels operating during the calendar year 1949. The effect of the House action is to prohibit the extension of Government aid to any of the 621 vessels which operated in 1949 without Government subsidy.

2. The operators of the 621 unsubsidized vessels who have been trying to run without Government aid are penalized by the House action, whereas the owners of the vessels which actually received subsidy in 1949 are protected. Therefore the legislation is outrageously unfair (obviously unintentionally so) to that group of operators who are deserving of maximum Government support and encouragement because of their willingness to operate in the past without seeking Government aid, as contrasted with other companies which have operated only with the protection of millions of dollars of Government subsidy.

3. The companies which have been operating without subsidy in the past are not in a position to continue indefinitely to operate without subsidy in the future. There have been substantial reductions in freight rates during the past year. There has also been a shrinkage in cargo and increased foreign-flag competition, as a result of which the space utilization per vessel has been reduced. To an increasing extent, foreign-flag competitors, in view of their lower costs, are in a position to cut rates below the break-even point for American-flag vessels, thus driving American-flag vessels out of business unless their cost differential is equalized by the Government. Based on subsidy payments by the Maritime Commission, it would appear that the cost advantage of the foreign-flag operator is $50,000 to $75,000 per voyage. That is the amount of handicap which the unsubsidized operators have been voluntarily assuming in the past, but which they will probably be unable to assume in the future.

4. It appears that the House Appropriations Committee is proceeding on the erroneous assumption that additional subsidy payments are synonymous with an expanding American-flag merchant marine, notwithstanding a contracting world-wide trade. There is no question but that the total American-flag merchant marine engaged in foreign trade will contract, perhaps substantially, thereby reducing the total number of vessels engaged in the foreign trade from 856 (1949 average) to a substantially lower figure. This is regrettable, but apparently inevitable. However, even the reduced number of vessels will be unable to operate unless a larger number of vessels are subsidized. There is nothing inconsistent between increasing the number of subsidized vessels on the one hand and reducing the total number of vessels in the foreign trade on the other hand. We may end up with a subsidized merchant marine of 500 vessels, which would result in approximately doubling the amount of operating subsidy. However, on the assumption that vessels cannot operate in the foreign trade without subsidy, this will mean a reduction in the total foreign-trade fleet from 856 to 500 vessels, or approximately 30 percent. If the confusion between the total number of vessels engaged in the foreign trade as against the total number receiving subsidy is cleared up, we are confident that the Appropriations Committee will realize that it is erroneous to assume that an expanding number of subsidized vessels is inconsistent with a reduced number of vessels in the foreign trade under the American flag.

5. The total participation in the foreign trade by American-flag vessels in the aggregate during 1949 was less than 50 percent. This includes participation of both subsidized and unsubsidized vessels. A substantial reduction in the number of vessels operating in the foreign trade will result in a further reduction in the American-flag participation in the foreign trade.

6. The action of the Appropriations Committee creates a very disturbing precedent. It in effect repeals the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, except as to persons who have already been fortunate enough to secure its benefits, and does so without advice or consultation with the legislative committees which are primarily concerned with the merchant-marine policy of the United States. It also requires dismissal of proceedings now pending before the Maritime Commission based on applications for subsidy which have been carried on for the past several months with the expenditure of considerable amounts of time and money in an attempt to make a case for subsidy under the provisions of the act. The precedent will likewise destroy any hope of further building commitments from applicants, since companies making commitments for purchase or construction of vessels will be required to gamble on the action of the Appropriations Committee in connection with annual budget requests emanating from the Maritime Commission.

In view of these considerations, we hope that the House Appropriations Committee will reconsider its action and refer the matter to the legislative committees for further consideration. In that connection, the President's plan for the reorganization of the Maritime Commission may be taken into account, since it apparently delegates to the Secretary of Commerce authority to make over-all policy determinations regarding our subsidy program, which would presumably include determinations as to the size and scope of our subsidized merchant marine.

Federal Assistance to School Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I will deliver over radio station WJR on Friday, April 7, 1950, at Detroit, Mich.:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, my broadcast to you a month ago pointed out what happens to a community when a large Federal installation, such as an airfield or a large plant manufacturing airplanes for war purposes is established, and thousands of additional workers are brought to the area to man the installation. I pointed out that Federal activities of this type had affected hundreds of communities during the war and that such activities as reclamation and flood control projects, Atomic Energy Commission projects, and other peacetime activities of the Federal Government, had accentuated this problem since the war. Our own area here in Detroit, many times referred to as the "arsenal of democracy" was particularly affected during the war period as hundreds of thousands of new workers and their families moved in to man the factories producing materials for the war.

In that talk I further pointed out that the Congress had set up during the war a program of assistance to communities, particularly school districts affected by Federal activities, and had continued that program since the cessation of hostilities on a restricted basis, because the affected school districts still had a critical problem. In fact, the problem has become so acute that a dozen different Federal agencies have been given the authority by the Congress to provide Federal assistance to school districts affected by their activities. This legislative authority is not uniform from one agency to another. There is some duplication and there are some gaps not covered by any authority to provide assistance. This entire matter was considered by the House Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am chairman, in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, and it was determined to appoint a subcommittee to study this problem and bring back recommendations for a solution early in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. As a matter of fact, two different subcommittees were appointed to study this problem and also to investigate some labor problems. Congressman CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, of West Virginia, was chairman of one subcommittee, and the members were Congressmen IRVING from Missouri, STEED from Oklahoma, MORTON from Kentucky, and NIXON from California. The other subcommittee, under the chairman of THOMAS H. BURKE of Ohio, included Congressmen PERKINS of Kentucky, WIER of Minnesota, MCCONNELL of Pennsylvania, and WERDEL of California. These two subcommittees held extensive hearings throughout the Nation receiving testimony from over 600 witnesses in 23 locations in 17 States. The material presented before these subcommittees in those hearings have been printed in two volumes, constituting approximately 2,700 pages, filled with factual information showing how the Federal Government has seriously affected the ability of school districts in which its projects are located to finance school services.

These two subcommittees supplemented their field investigations by statistical data reported by affected school districts which show the total number of children involved, the number of school districts affected, and the degree to which these Federal activities have affected school services in the communities. This mass of information conclusively shows that Uncle Sam, when he becomes a citizen in a community by owning land, by building and renting houses, and by operating industrial or commercial activities without paying taxes, creates a financial burden on the community which it cannot solve without Federal assistance. These Federal activities affect school districts principally in two ways. The Federal Government acquires property, removing it from the tax rolls, and thus the school districts lose the revenue that otherwise would have been received, because federally owned property is not taxable. It brings in a large influx of population to man the installations built on this property creating an additional financial burden on the remaining taxpayers in the community. In some cases people live on the Federal property and attend the adjacent school districts. In other districts they live in the community but work at the tax-free installation. The evidence collected by the committee shows that there are 600 or 700 school districts that have been so seriously affected by these Federal activities that they cannot finance normal school services without Federal help. There are 1,500,000 children living in these school districts who will be deprived of normal school services unless Federal assistance is provided. They need additional funds to pay current operating expenses, and they need Federal assistance to provide additional school buildings.

The two subcommittees have been meeting each day for the past 3 weeks to develop legislation that will meet this problem created by the Federal Government on a fair and equitable basis. They have completed action on the bill which will provide assistance for current operating expenses. The bill for current operating expenses was introduced March 30, of the present year, and the number is H. R. 7940.

Briefly, the bill provides that the Federal assistance shall be extended in such a manner that it will meet only the Federal responsibility and will not relieve the school districts or the State of their normal responsibility of providing school services. It assumes that the Federal Government should be responsible for making a payment equivalent to the reduction in school revenues by removal of land from the tax rolls so that all school districts which have suffered a Federal impact because of a reduction of school revenues from Federal acquisition of property will receive a payment on this basis. The bill then provides that in addition the Federal Government will make a payment for those additional children brought to the school district as the result of Federal activities. The amount of the payment will be based on the extent of the Federal burden placed on the school district. For children living on Federal property for which no tax is received by the school district, the Federal Government will pay an amount equivalent to the local share of the cost of current operating expenses per child. For children whose parents work at nontaxable property located in the school district, the Federal Government will pay a smaller amount per child, and the final category is that group where there has been a very sudden and substantial impact of additional children without a commensurate increase in tax valuations. For this group the Federal Government will pay an amount determined by the Commissioner of Education to be necessary to provide normal educational services for the additional children. Assistance in this last category is to be continued only for a 3-year period, because it is expected that the communities will have been able to make the financial adjustments necessary to handle this impact of additional children at the end of that period.

Provision also is made in the bill to assist for a limited period of time those school districts that have experienced a severe impact during the war period because of Federal activities and still have a heavy financial burden caused by this Federal impact. The amount of this assistance will be based on the extent of this past impact and the burden it still places on the district. There are safeguards in the bill to restrict Federal assistance only to the amount necessary to meet Federal-caused needs and to prevent any Federal interference or control over local educational matters. The provisions of the bill also assure that Federal funds will not be used to pay those costs that should be borne by State and local governments. It is truly a bill to meet the Federal responsibility created when Uncle Sam becomes a citizen of a community.

It is the intention of the subcommittee to report out in the very near future a bill that will provide Federal assistance for construction of additional school-plant facilities made necessary by the increased number of children in the district caused by Federal activities.

I am unable at this time to give you any details of the bill that will be proposed to provide assistance for construction of additional school facilities because the subcommittees have just started work on that phase. I am informed by the subcommittee members, however, that they intend to develop a bill that will meet the responsibility of the Federal Government for additional school facilities which its activities have created.

Now let us look for a moment at what the bill already introduced will do for the State of Michigan. Statistical data reported to the subcommittees by the school districts do not show the extent to which school districts would be eligible for assistance because of reduction of revenues resulting from Federal ownership of land. They do show, however, the extent to which districts would be eligible because of an impact of additional children. There are 16 seriously impacted school districts that reported information which was sufficiently complete to include in the subcommittees' tabulation. This is not the entire number in the State that may benefit from this proposed legislation, but includes only those on which the subcommittee now has necessary information.

It appears from the data these 16 districts reported that each of these would be eligible for assistance under the terms of H. R. 7940 as proposed by the subcommittee. Six of them would be eligible to receive payments because they have children living on nontaxable Federally owned property. An additional 4 school districts appear to be eligible for assistance because they have children whose parents are employed at Federally owned nontaxable property located in the school district; and 11 of the 16 districts appear to be eligible because of a sudden and substantial impact of additional children resulting from activities of the Federal Government not accompanied by Federal ownership of property. Those districts on which the data are now complete are: Erin Township No. 6, Erin and Warren No. 2, Fraser Public Erin No. 1, Livonia Township District, Madison No. 10, Mount Clemens No. 1, Muskegon Township No. 1, Romulus Township, Roseville No. 5, Royal Oak Township No. 1, Warren Consolidated No. 1, Wayne District, Ypsilanti Township District No. 1, Dearborn Township, Grosse Ile Township, Warren Township. These figures must be regarded as tentative and may change next year, but based upon the data reported by the school districts, the categories as outlined above will apply.

It is not possible to tell you from the data now available the amount these districts would receive, because that will be determined by taking the actual figures for the school year in which the payment is to be made. However, it does appear that this bill, if passed by the Congress, will give substantial assistance to those critically overburdened areas in our State, many of them in and around Detroit, which have for the past 8 or 10 years been carrying added financial responsibilities placed on them by the Federal Government.

My sincere thanks to WJR, the good-will station, for the opportunity to speak this evening over their facilities.

Thank you and good night.

Two Great Omahans Honored by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Omaha World-Herald there appeared the following article which announced to the reading public that two great Omahans had been signally honored by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, by having been made Knights of St. Gregory the Great.

I wish to congratulate these two outstanding citizens of Omaha, Nebr., for having received this great honor, and in passing may I also observe that I am sure that every Nebraskan will join with me in stating that these two fine gentlemen richly deserved the signal recognition which they have received.

The newspaper article is as follows:

OMAHANS NEW PAPAL KNIGHTS—BERT MURPHY, VAL PETER TO BE INVESTED

Two prominent Omahans have been made Knights of St. Gregory the Great.

Archbishop Gerald T. Bergan said Thursday the high Catholic Church layman honors were conferred by Pope Pius XII on Andrew Albert (Bert) Murphy, 75, car dealer, and Valentine Peter, 74, German language newspaper publisher.

Word of the Pope's action came from the apostolic delegation in Washington, said Archbishop Bergan. The pontifical honor was conferred on the recommendation of the archbishop.

Public investitures of the two new knights will be after Easter, when official briefs are received from Rome.

The knighthood was established about 100 years ago by Pope Gregory XVI to honor Catholic laymen for exemplary lives and services for the church.

HIS OTHER KNIGHTS

Other Omaha knights are Navy Secretary Francis P. Matthews, J. Francis McDermott, Dr. Adolph Sachs, J. E. Fitzpatrick, Edward F. Leary, and Charles W. Hamilton, Jr.

Archbishop Bergan said that Mr. Murphy "is held in the highest esteem by all citizens of Omaha and the Midwest irrespective of religious belief."

Mr. Murphy's business, Andrew Murphy & Son, last November marked its eightieth year in business in Omaha.

"Without any doubt," said Archbishop Bergan, "he would be considered Omaha's most beloved citizen. He has ever enjoyed the regard and respect of all the clergy and bishops of Omaha including myself."

PETER'S RECENT HONOR

The archbishop lauded Mr. Peter as "one of America's outstanding Catholics of German descent."

Born in Lower Franconia, Bavaria, Mr. Peter was brought to the United States when he was 14. His father died 2 years later. Mr. Peter taught school for two sessions, then got a job on a semiweekly language paper at Rock Island, Ill. Later he bought the paper at a sheriff's sale.

He now publishes papers from Baltimore to San Francisco and is believed to be the country's largest publisher of German language newspapers. He has the Omaha Daily German Tribune in Omaha.

The Peters have 12 children.

Appropriations Spent Quarterly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, over and above the annual appropriations made by the Congress, there are in addition deficiency and urgent appropriations amounting to more than $15,000,000,000 for the fiscal years covering 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949, all going to the bureaus and oftentimes spent by the bureaucrats without regard to waste, authorization, and the intent of Congress.

Now the Congress is asked to authorize the spending of "what we don't have"—to spend nearly $6,000,000,000 more money than the Treasury will collect as income, even in face of the Government now being in debt for nearly $250,000,000,000.

Will the Congress again authorize the spending of billions more than income at the request of the executive branch of the Government?

Is it any wonder that the bureaucrats waste and spend other than authorized, spend and give away for purposes not intended by the Congress?—for the whole annual appropriation is made available to the bureaucrats in a lump sum, all at one time, and with nothing to worry them for another year.

Each bureau spends as it desires, often regardless of the intent of Congress, and then makes its excuse the following year. For the report of irregularities and abuses come from the Comptroller General only after the money is gone from the Treasury. It is the same pattern and practice each year with little done—not even the proverbial "locking the barn door after the horse is stolen"—the door is open each year for the same abuses, waste and misspending. And after the money is gone little investigation or none at all.

While hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money have been lost to the Government by the spending of these bureaucrats, yet many pass over such conduct by facetiously saying it is simply "Yankee shrewdness doing business with saps in the bureaus."

Let us stop this year-after-year waste and spending of funds by not waiting until the moneys are actually gone, by not permitting the same people in the Government to waste the taxpayers' money, and release no further appropriations to such people in the bureaus. I do not believe that appropriations should be paid and given to the bureaus for spending in an annual lump sum. Private business would be bankrupt if it gave millions of dollars for a year's operation and paid no further attention to the moneys expended until the following year. It seems that much of the abuse, misspending, and waste of taxpayers' money, might be stopped by only paying and releasing it to the bureaucrats in quarterly installments. And if the bureau does not justify its spending in the previous quarter, the next quarterly installment should be reduced and the personnel responsible separated from the Government. By such procedure waste and misspending of the taxpayers' money might be stopped, for under the present system the bureau can spend all that is appropriated and sometimes overspend.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the quarterly release and payment of appropriations would save hundreds of millions of dollars and would be a greater saving to the taxpayers rather than investigation after the money is gone. I have introduced the following bill to make appropriations available in quarterly installments:

A bill relating to the checking, spending, and quarterly payment of appropriations for the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That all appropriations for the executive branch of the Government shall be available for payment and spending only in four quarterly installments, and in such amounts as the Senate and the House of Representatives through their Appropriations Committees shall approve within 30 days previous to the 1st day of July, October, January, and April, beginning on the 1st day of July 1950, and thereafter.

Sec. 2. And such quarterly release and payment of moneys for spending shall be only after appearance, justification, and report to the House Committee on Appropriations detailing the payment and spending of the previous quarter by each department of the executive branch of the Government and the Treasurer of the United States shall release only such sums as shall be so determined jointly by the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations.

Appropriate Appropriations for VA Medical Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter and resolution:

AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY, INC.,
DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Boston, Mass., April 5, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: At the meeting of the Department Executive Committee held April 1 at the Parker House, Boston, it was unanimously voted to adopt the enclosed resolutions and to forward a copy to each of our Senators and Representatives.

I know your interest in the veterans who have served our Nation in time of peril and I trust that you will consider favorably the legislation which is now under discussion.

I shall appreciate hearing from you at your convenience on either or both of the resolutions enclosed.

Cordially yours,
ADELAIDE L. FITZGERALD,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Resolution 1

Whereas the Hoover Commission created under Public Law 162 expended $2,000,000 of the taxpayer's money in preparing their report for reorganization of various Federal departments; and

Whereas this report recommended that five Federal agencies of the Government take over the work of the Veterans' Administration which now handles all veterans' affairs and which was recommended by President Hoover in 1929 for both efficiency and economy: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the department executive committee of the American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Massachusetts, Inc., endorse the action of the American Legion in opposing those recommendations of the Hoover Report insofar as they affect veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That we advise the Massachusetts Senators and Congressmen of our interest in economy in Government, but that we believe economy and efficiency can be best achieved through the handling of all veterans' affairs under the one branch known as the Veterans' Administration.

Resolution 2

Whereas the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration has ordered a cut of over 7,500 personnel in the Veterans' Administration, many of whom are in the Medical Division who are caring for the men and women who served during both World Wars; and

Whereas this cut in personnel was required because of the failure to provide the necessary funds as recommended by the Veterans' Administrator in his supplementary appropriation request last October: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the department executive committee of the American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Massachusetts, Inc., notify the Senators and Congressmen of Massachusetts that we believe immediate action should be taken to provide the necessary appropriation to cover present needs.

Peanuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with that inimitable columnist, George Dixon, that peanuts are no longer "peanuts." Peanuts are now dollar conscious.

Mr. Dixon and I approach the goober problem from different directions.

Peanuts, to me, are an important food—a source of protein as every mother has learned. Their food value is high. A good case could be made for peanut butter—a convenient and ready item of diet for children.

Alas, peanut butter—as all mothers in the medium to lower income brackets know—has been priced out of the market.

Peanut butter has been priced out of the market because an artificial demand has been created for other peanut products in the nonedible field made possible because we have supported peanuts at too high a level.

Peanut growers, peanut speculators and peanut brokers have made many a quick dollar. They have made it because Uncle Sam has kept his good right arm around them in the form of high subsidy prices thus assisting in the creation of an artificial shortage.

I think the peanut group are as "nuts" as their product. They had the chance to build a steady, ever expanding market for peanut butter—a market that would have consumed more and more of the crop each year, a dependable market that would have returned them good profits. They tossed all that away for a "quickie" profit in peanut oil.

They ignored a firm market in which they had no other comparable competing item to enter a field already overcrowded with sesame, tung, palm, flax, fish, coconut and other sources of fatty oil.

Oh, well, when support prices are curtailed—and they will be—the peanut growers may return to the days when peanuts again mean small change.

Here is George Dixon's little chitchat:

WASHINGTON SCENE

PEANUTS ARE NOT "PEANUTS" NOW

(By George Dixon)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—I don't know whether you have given this the thought it merits, but Baldy Brannan, the eroded noggin of agriculture, is knocking the very foundations from under our American language.

The Secretary of Agriculture has made a grim mockery of many of our most cherished expressions. To sing "Potatoes are cheaper—tomatoes are cheaper—now's the time to fall in love," would elicit only hollow laughter these days, and you would probably be strung from the nearest tree if you said, "And that ain't hay," to a stock raiser.

But the expression Brannan has made the biggest bum out of is: "That's peanuts."

"That's peanuts," we used to say, with a blithe snap of the fingers. We meant it didn't amount to a hill of beans. What am I saying? A hill of beans runs into money.

"That's peanuts." If it's an expression you're in the habit of using, I think I can cure you of it.

Peanuts are costing you a fortune, and I'm not handing you any spinach.

I couldn't afford to hand you any spinach anyway. It's too expensive.

"That's peanuts." The Government today is purchasing more than a quarter of all the peanuts grown in this country, under the support program. Uncle Sam, using your hard-earned dough, my little pets, bought $62,864,000 worth of peanuts last year.

The total peanut crop brought $225,000,000 to the growers. But even that represents only a fraction of the peanut money, according to men who know their onions.

Under the support program, beloved of the rutabaga economist, the Department of Agriculture bought 367,000,000 pounds of shelled peanuts last year, and 74,000,000 pounds of unshelled. It looks to buy even more this year.

"That's peanuts." Peanuts represent a fabulous amount of money. That $225,000,000 we mentioned a moment ago represents only payments to growers. But think how this pyramids through middlemen, jobbers, and so forth, down to the white-coated fellow at the ball park who sells you a bag with eighteen or so peanuts for 10 cents.

"That's peanuts?" Nuts.

"That's peanuts" is a billion-dollar business.

Imports of Foreign Fish Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter addressed to me by the Deep Sea Fishermen's Union of the Pacific calling my attention to the injurious effects of imports of foreign fish products upon domestic fisheries industry. Lowered tariffs upon imports of foreign products produced with low-paid labor can ultimately destroy many American industries unless some quota is placed upon those imports.

The letter follows:

DEEP SEA FISHERMEN'S UNION
OF THE PACIFIC,
March 31, 1950.

Hon. THOR TOLLEFSON,
House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the Deep Sea Fishermen's Union of Seattle, we are writing you in connection with proposed hearings in your committee relating to regulations of quotas on the import of fish liver oils into the United States.

As you are no doubt aware, our State Department has issued a directive removing all quotas on oils containing vitamin A. This has resulted in a large import of Japanese oils into the United States, resulting in a tremendous drop in the price of soupfin shark livers, and dogfish livers, the source of such oils. This has resulted in a great hardship on the fishing industry in the Northwest.

Our union has some 2,000 men who are employed on fishing vessels out of Seattle and Northwest points. The principal product of these vessels during the winter months are shark, dogfish, and other bottom fish from which the livers are obtained and processed for the vitamin A oil content. As all crew members share in the catch, the price received has a direct relation to the earnings of the men on these vessels. Up to the time that these quotas were removed, $8 to $12 per pound was paid for soupfin shark livers of high vitamin A potency. Today, as a result primarily of foreign imports, the price is around $2.50 to $3 per pound. Fishing in the small boats in the open sea is an extremely arduous and hazardous occupation. The price of $8 to $12 per pound for the soupfin shark livers is only a fair compensation for this work, by the present day standards. In addition, there is a great risk of loss and damage to equipment in fishing for shark, and such risks will not be undertaken by the owners of the vessels unless the price received for the product is commensurate with the risk involved.

Not only is there a direct risk on the vessel in fishing in North Pacific waters during the winter months, but there is a particularly great risk on the equipment and nets used in shark fishing. Shark nets have an initial cost of $6,000 to $10,000 for their construction, their combined sections are frequently as much as 18,000 feet in length. Sudden storms and normal ocean hazards will frequently cause their loss or destruction. With such a high mortality on equipment, insurance rates thereon are prohibitive.

In 1946 there were about 100 vessels employed in shark fishing during the winter months. Each vessel employed an average of seven men. Today with the price approximately $2.50 to $3 per pound by reason of the imports of Japanese oils, there are only about 20 or 25 vessels engaged in such operation. The price of dogfish liver has been so depressed by these imports that today not one single boat in the Puget Sound area is engaged in fishing for dogfish, against a normal operation of 75 or 80 boats working in the winter months for this product. This has resulted in a substantial unemployment among our members.

The figures as to the increase of liver oil imports are published by the United States Bureau of Customs. According to the customs records, there has been a substantial increase in the imports of various liver oils, principally from Japan and South Africa. In 1947 over 1,159,000 pounds of such oils were imported for a declared value of $4,591,000. In 1948, 3,743,000 pounds of shark liver oil was imported with a declared value of $8,429,000, and the first 11 months of 1949, 3,296,000 pounds of shark liver oils were imported with a declared value of $2,996,000. No shark liver oils were imported in 1947. In addition to the shark liver oil many millions of pounds of other oils were imported, their sources being cod livers, dogfish, etc. The price has now dropped to about $2.50 per pound for high potency shark livers caught by United States vessels and crews.

On the other hand since 1946 there has been a very sharp increase in the cost of equipment and gear both for the vessels and the men employed on the vessels. As the price received for the catch has dropped, fishing expectations are no longer profitable for ships and crews, and the vessels remain tied up in the ports.

We can readily understand the desire of the State Department to assist other countries to get on their feet by encouraging export of their products and sale in the United States. However, such imports of foreign products should not be permitted if their results would be to reduce the standard of living of American workmen and result in

widespread unemployment. It is, of course, impossible for American workmen to compete with foreign standards of living. When prices are further depressed by devalued currency their impact on American workmen who produce the same products result in great hardships to these workmen.

We feel that the problem of foreign aid can be met without placing the greatest burden on the particular group of American workmen affected by the import of cheap foreign products supported and subsidized by American dollars. This problem can be met by establishing reasonable duties on the imports of fish liver oils. We feel that a customs duty should be placed upon this product which is realistic and bears some relation to the problems of protecting American products from such competition.

We urge that this committee give full consideration to this problem not only with relation to the specific items involved, to wit, fish liver oils, but with relation to all fish products. Not only are the members of our union affected but there are many thousands of men in allied unions who have a direct interest in this problem. We feel sure you will give your sincere consideration in view of the direct relationship to the welfare of our own members and the commercial fishermen. We shall, of course, follow your progress in this problem with deep interest.

Respectfully submitted.

H. GROTLE, *Secretary.*

The Political Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by George Rothwell Brown appearing in the New York Evening Journal April 5, 1950:

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, April 5.—Secretary Acheson's statement that he didn't think he had ever met Owen Lattimore, immediate target of the McCarthy charges, is in itself a remarkable revelation of the slipshod methods by which our State Department is being conducted.

The Secretary of State obviously is either mistaken about his acquaintance with Lattimore or he is guilty of the gravest negligence in not getting acquainted with a man who is already engaged, for the United Nations, in secret work under President Truman's point 4 program—before that program has even been approved by Congress.

There is an obscurity about the presence of Mr. Lattimore in Afghanistan, as an agent of the United Nations, on a mission to pick out some key economic projects for that country, which might provide the basis of long-term assistance under the point 4 plan, which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should probe with complete thoroughness.

Senator McCARTHY has quite a hole in the curtain of secrecy enveloping the machinations of the State Department. In its secret scheme to extend the New Deal "squander-bond" to the international scene, when his allegations suddenly had the effect of revealing the presence of Mr. Lattimore in the heart of Asia.

Lattimore was there, the State Department insisted, not as a representative of the State Department.

Acheson followed with his disavowal of even knowing Lattimore.

Yet at this very time Acheson was appearing before Congress urging speedy approval of a measure that would commit the United States to an initial expenditure of $45,000,000 as a starter for the point 4 program.

Mr. Acheson made this appearance before Congress not as the representative of the United Nations but as the spokesman for the State Department.

Yet we know, as a result of Senator McCARTHY's revelations, that already the United Nations had taken over point 4.

The same day Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, was disclosing in some pretty blunt language that he had already determined in his own mind that the United Nations would have to be eliminated from participation in the point 4 program.

This outburst by the Texan occurred at a committee hearing, in the presence of Acheson, on the morning of March 30.

McCARTHY's disclosure, on the authority of the Library of Congress, that Lattimore was in Afghanistan, cooking up a point 4 operation for the United Nations, was made to the Senate in the late afternoon of the same day.

Obviously CONNALLY's suspicions had been previously aroused. He described the United Nations as a "chiseling spending agency"—which it has been from the day it was launched at San Francisco in 1945.

"It seems to me," said CONNALLY, an administration Democrat, "that about all we would do would be to furnish the money and have them mess it up. It also looks like a plan to create a lot of new jobs and have us pay for them."

Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State, testified that UN already had done much work on point 4, and had several projects ready.

So here we have Mr. Acheson asking for a huge appropriation for the State Department which was to be spent by the United Nations.

And here we have, already as busy as a bee in Afghanistan, getting ready to blow in a wad of American tax money, Mr. Owen Lattimore, a gentleman with whom Mr. Acheson was unacquainted.

If that's the way the State Department is being run, the quicker it is reorganized from top to bottom the better.

Union in Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, since the announcement of the so-called Truman doctrine in Greece in 1947 a considerable number of the Members of the Congress have actively sponsored the movement for European union.

It will be recalled that Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and I joined in introducing a United States of Europe resolution.

Since then the need for unification has been universally recognized.

A forceful editorial on the subject was recently written by Mr. M. F. Everett, of Catholic Action of the South.

I am pleased to include the editorial in the RECORD.

SEEING THINGS—UNION IN WESTERN EUROPE

(By M. F. Everett)

There was a weak spot in the fence, and I knew it. But I put off repairing it. So one day a hog found it and pushed through. The whole herd immediately got out. I had to round them up and repair the fence. Then, because they had learned they could get out once and tried it over and over again, I had to do a lot more work on the fence than if I had fixed it in the first place.

Most of us act as I did when a farm boy. We know that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," but we still don't get busy until we are forced to do so or until long experience has convinced us that the ounce of prevention is the wiser course.

I was thinking of this as I conned news reports of various moves toward union in western Europe. There is serious need for economic and political, or at least ideological, unity among these countries. The Old World set-up has been shattered, and they are being forced to act together or be blotted out, one by one, behind the iron curtain. A number of moves have been made toward union, but whether the peoples as a whole realize the need sufficiently to forget old animosities and work together remains to be seen.

Dr. Austin J. App, a professor at LaSalle college, Philadelphia, and, if I remember correctly, an active worker in the Catholic Association for International Peace, asserted in a recent address that America will soon either permit a strong Christian Germany or see a strong communistic Europe. He said that the present United States-British-French policy of trying to make Germany democratic but to keep her weak in military force, industry, and commerce is calculated to soften up what is left of Germany for a strong Bolshevism. He fears that, as in Hungary and other Red satellite nations, Germany and other free European nations will be betrayed to communism, with the liquidation of Christian leaders, Bishops, priests, scholars, and all the most decent people.

Konrad Adenauer, German Chancellor, boldly offered to France this month a complete union of the two countries as a means of settling all differences over the Saar and other problems and to lay a cornerstone for a United States of Europe. But France fears Germany with a terror born of frequent conquest, and this fear is not allayed by the fact that western Germany is becoming more Catholic and Christian as expellees from territory taken over by Poland settle there.

Winston Churchill offered France a similar union in the recent war. But England has been ruled for several years by a labor party that is interested in setting up a socialistic state. France does not know how far England will go now in cooperating to achieve political and economic unity in western Europe. Its doubt is strong enough that President Auriol of France made a plea for British cooperation the basis for a recent talk before the British Parliament, a most unusual move.

He told the Parliament that the former Anglo-French military alliance was not enough to counter present dangers. The two countries should cooperate in all spheres and both should cooperate on the same basis with all of western Europe. "Why wait for disaster?" he asked. "It is we, the English and the French, whom a new war would once again place in the forefront of peril."

These incidents dramatize the need for unity. They also show that leaders are aware of the desperate necessity for joint action. Other signs are favorable. The discussions over military supplies in the Atlantic pact, the consultative assembly at Strasbourg, the economic unions of several nations in Benelux and Frittilux, the Franco-Italian parleys for economic union—these show that western Europe has gone further on the road to unity in the past 2 years than in the previous past 2 centuries. We hope the various moves coalesce into a successful union while there is still time.

The Coast Guard Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial appearing in the Seattle Times on April 3, 1950, dealing with a subject which should have the attention of Members of Congress. The Coast Guard Reserve program should have our best consideration. The editorial follows:

ENTITLED TO THE SAME AS OTHER RESERVISTS

In Seattle there is disappointment that Congress again has made no provision for the training program of the United States Coast Guard Volunteer Reserve. The House Appropriations Committee has slashed some $20,000,000 from the Coast Guard's 1951 budget, including more than $13,000,000 for construction and improvements, $2,000,000 for operation expenses, and $4,000,000 for the Reserve program.

The committee, perhaps wisely, declined to increase the size of the Coast Guard's air arm, though we in this region are familiar with the work that branch of the Coast Guard performs in rescuing survivors of ship and plane disasters. The committee said it is in sympathy with the arguments favoring a training program for the Coast Guard Reserve, but feels that the Treasury is in such condition that it cannot sanction the initiation of new programs.

The Coast Guard has asked for $4,100,000 to provide training for 1,900 officers and 6,000 enlisted men of the Coast Guard Volunteer Reserve. That organization exists only with volunteer status. The Reserve units of the Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps all are entitled at least to a minimum of yearly training, to keep prepared for a call to duty, but the volunteer reservists of the Coast Guard enjoy no such advantages. The lack would leave the harbors and waterways of the United States and its possessions without any "force in being" trained to be called into immediate action in an emergency.

During World War II, the Coast Guard supervised the safe handling of no less than 12,000,000,000 pounds of explosives at ports of this State alone. It is from the Reserves that the Coast Guard must draw the personnel to perform such expert services in an emergency.

This is the third year that Congress has denied funds for the Coast Guard Reserve training program. It is a shortsighted policy. Seattle Coast Guard volunteer reservists are justified in their determination to fight to have the relatively small appropriation for their organization restored.

British Ask: "When Does the Roman Circus Close in the United States?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by William H. Stringer, chief, London News Bureau, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of April 5, 1950:

BRITISH ASK: "WHEN DOES THE ROMAN CIRCUS CLOSE IN THE UNITED STATES?"

(By William H. Stringer)

LONDON.—Several times in the past week friends in the British Government or the press have asked me anxiously whether a reaction of sanity had set in yet in Washington.

Frankly, the British and a good many other Europeans are worried and dumbfounded at the Roman circus of Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY in Washington and at the incredible collaboration of some Republican Senators and some of the American press.

Dumbfounded, yes, and disheartened. Because to them it has looked as though the United States Government, on which the west places vast reliance for leadership and strength in the struggle to counter Russian expansionism, was coming apart at the seams. American prestige abroad has been dangerously debased at a serious moment in postwar history.

ACHESON SUPPORTED IN BRITAIN

Maybe the United States is big enough not to care what other nations or peoples think about it. And maybe not. Maybe you don't care whether foreigners think well of your Secretary of State. But you may as well know that Dean Acheson, now under a barrage of denunciation from Senators McCARTHY, WHERRY, and BRIDGES, is regarded in Britain as an individual of the highest talents and statesmanship. People over here think you should be thanking your lucky stars that you have found a man of such integrity, intellect, and unswerving purpose to succeed Gen. George C. Marshall.

The Times of London, for instance, declares: "When Mr. Acheson was chosen to succeed Mr. Marshall, the choice was felt to be singularly happy and likely not only to shed luster on the administration but also to provide international leadership of a high order."

EMPHASIS PUT ON RESOLUTE ACTION

One might say cynically: Yes, of course, Mr. Acheson favors Marshall aid, so why shouldn't Europe support him? But for you to come to that conclusion is, to use Winston Churchill's recent phrase, falling below the level of events. It is failing to see that the world is in a truly tough spot right now. And that the situation has to be met, not by ousting a couple of fellow travelers from some Washington bureau—if such can be found—but by resolute action along the whole perimeter of the West's physical and political ramparts.

"Quarrels between Republicans and Democrats are, of course, for Americans alone to determine," says the responsible London Economist. "But so long as the rest of the free world depends for its existence upon American wisdom and strength, it has a right to express its horror at the lengths to which partisan levity is being carried in Washington. It is not by such leadership that freedom will be saved."

Of course, the British Government itself has not been vigorously enunciating foreign policy lately. And when Mr. Churchill has raised problems of deep urgency in the House of Commons he has been more than once criticized by Government spokesmen as being irresponsible or mischievous. But British hesitancy to take bold steps stems partially from American indecision—the kind of indecision that is prolonged when responsible officials must spend half of their time preparing replies and defenses against vicious attacks.

NO ROMAN FORUMS FOR BRITAIN

Over here when there is suspicion of misconduct in office, the immediate impulse is to set up a commission of able men of great integrity to investigate, but not a Roman forum with klieg-light publicity. Maybe there is another difference, too, in that the British—and I mean those who really are awake to the Communist menace—never seem to get so all-fired excited over communism as some Americans do.

After all, Russian communism is not some dreadful contagion which cannot be halted. It is a shrewd despotism which can be beaten to a standstill by resolute action—the very kind of action which Mr. Acheson has been proposing in his recent California speeches.

There is wide awareness, even from this distance, that the main purpose of the attack on the State Department is political. And, personally, I would be willing to bet the same crowd is peddling the attack which sought, unsuccessfully, to find a diabolical plot in the Pearl Harbor disaster—the same slick radio commentators expounding the daily grist of charges and the same behind-the-scenes operators.

Britons are not being self-righteous when they comment that such unsubstantiated charges as have been made in the United States Senate would not get very far in Britain. Few members of Parliament would dare use their parliamentary immunity to make such guilt-by-association accusations.

And why? Because the British public, with its strong sense of fair play, would almost certainly ostracize such behavior from public life. Maybe it's high time for the American public, with its equally well-publicized sense of fair play, to come to the rescue of Mr. Acheson.

Galveston Engineer District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, for many years, my home town of Galveston, has been the Texas district headquarters of the United States Army engineers. More recently, a good deal of flood-control work has developed in the interior of the State. A few months ago, in the course of a continuing Nation-wide study of the engineers' activities, it was reported to the Chief of Engineers that economy of money and effort could be attained by moving the administrative offices concerned with flood control to a point located closer to the geographic center of those activities.

For a time, it was considered that the entire district headquarters including

not only flood-control work in the interior, but rivers and harbors development and maintenance adjacent to the coast, should be moved inland and away from Galveston.

Further studies indicated that it would not be economically justifiable to remove the rivers and harbors headquarters away from its theater of operation on the coast. Therefore it was concluded that a new district should be established in the interior, and that personnel pertinent to inland flood control should be removed from Galveston to that office.

A move of this kind is something that no Member of Congress could like. However, the Corps of Engineers, with the utmost consideration for me and respect for the fight I had made in behalf of Galveston, kept me fully informed as to the course of their surveys and when the decision was finally made to remove a part of my people, I was left without any factual data on which to base an argument.

Subsequently public and civic officials of Galveston appeared before General Pick in person. Last Monday there was a further conference between the division engineer and the Galveston people held in that city. The outcome is set forth in an article from the Galveston News of April 4, which follows.

I wish to invite especial attention to the final reaction of the Galveston civic leaders. Their acceptance of the move was no easier for them than it was for me, but they did accept it as being best for the greatest number and as an economy move which, as they expressed it, might well "become contagious in other Federal operations":

GALVESTON ENGINEER DISTRICT WILL REMAIN ONE OF LARGEST

Galveston district of the United States Corps of Engineers will remain one of the largest in the country, both in money appropriated to its projects and in actual area, C.J. Louis W. Prentiss, division engineer at Dallas, informed officers of the chamber of commerce Monday.

He told the officers at a conference here over the split of the Galveston district, that this district will grow in activity in the future as big drainage projects are begun.

Under the split of the local office, a district office will be opened in Fort Worth to supervise flood-control work. The Galveston district will remain in charge of river and harbor work, Colonel Prentiss explained.

Among the future projects for the local office as explained by the division engineer are downstream locks and dams on rivers flowing into the Gulf.

After the conference David C. Leavell, president of the chamber of commerce, said, "On the basis of the figures and other data submitted by Colonel Prentiss, the action is justified from an economy angle as well as from that of securing increased efficiency in his flood-control program."

Colonel Prentiss told the local officials that with eight large dams and reservoir projects under construction in north Texas, it is impossible for the district engineer and his assistants to cover all the territory and still do an effective job with river and harbor work.

With the division of the district, the personnel in Galveston can concentrate on the Texas Gulf coast which is the biggest river and harbor engineer district in the United States.

"Nine important harbors are located in the local district," Colonel Prentiss added.

A survey was begun in September of last year as to the advisability of splitting the district, Prentiss explained. A long and careful study of all angles of the proposed division was made before any definite decision was reached, he said.

In explaining the personnel situation, Prentiss said 328 employees in the Galveston office will remain here.

Besides these, 14 persons from the Houston real-estate office of engineers will be transferred to Galveston. This will make a total of 342 persons remaining in the local office, Prentiss added.

In addition to the transfer of 300 employees to the new Fort Worth office, 66 local employees will be relieved from duty, the division engineer said.

HOUSTON OFFICE CLOSED

The Houston real-estate office will be closed under this division plan with the transfer of 90 employees from that office to Fort Worth, Prentiss added.

Personnel transfers will begin the week of April 17 and will move in relays over a 3-month period, he explained.

Removal of fixtures and equipment from the local office will begin April 14, Colonel Prentiss said.

Present plans call for the completion of all moving, both of personnel and equipment by July, he said.

PLEASED BY ECONOMY

Leavell in continuing his comment after the conference, said:

"While we are unhappy over losing any members of the Galveston district office, still we are pleased to see that an honest effort is being made by a Federal service to achieve efficiency at a lower cost.

"It is to be hoped that such a program of thinking becomes contagious in other Federal operations, and that it reaches clear up to Washington, including the President."

"Our position in the Galveston-Port Worth matter has always been of keeping the present district intact unless real money could be saved in the action, and we now have a feeling that such a saving can be made."

NO DESTRUCTIONISTS

The chamber of commerce president continued his comments by saying, "We positively would not want to obstruct a program of saving the taxpayers' money."

Those attending the conference, in addition to Prentiss and Leavell, were Dr. D. B. Calvin, chamber of commerce first vice president; Alvin Kelso, second vice president; A. J. Peterson, treasurer; E. S. Holliday, general manager; and Lt. Col. Ellsworth I. Davis, Galveston district engineer.

These officers of the chamber of commerce will report their findings of the conference to their board of directors Friday morning.

Praise for Representative Phil J. Welch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE MAGEE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I caused to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by Hon. PHIL J. WELCH which was made in St. Joseph, Mo., at the celebration which commemorated the ninetieth anniversary of the beginning of the Pony Express. The speech showed much preparation and thought. It was filled with historical data, as well as being timely and interesting. The St. Joseph News-Press is one of our finest daily publications in Missouri. The day following Mr. WELCH's address this publication wrote an editorial commending the Representative of Missouri's Third Congressional District.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the same is herewith inserted:

A SPEECH TO PRESERVE

Congressman PHIL J. WELCH added a laurel to his crown today. To accommodate citizens who were to be disappointed because of the sudden illness of Lt. Gov. James T. Blair, scheduled Pony Express speaker, the Congressman filled in today at the celebration of the ninetieth anniversary of the start of the Pony Express.

It was 3 p. m. yesterday when Congressman WELCH was told the lieutenant governor could not be here. Could he speak? He could.

The Pony Express speech of Congressman WELCH is reproduced in its entirety. It is given because we believe it is an important contribution to the archives in what is probably St. Joseph's most illustrious—certainly its most romantic—historic episode.

A native of St. Joseph, PHIL J. WELCH as a boy loved the Pony Express heritage that is ours. As mayor he often stood on the stone parapet of the civic center. There he gazed at that re-creation in bronze of the first rider.

What more natural than in Washington, with the Library of Congress available, he spent many nights poring over tomes on this St. Joseph to Sacramento early day means of transportation.

We regret the inability of the lieutenant governor to be present, but his illness was a blessing in disguise, for the St. Joseph Historical Society now has for its records a speech that well deserves to be preserved for posterity.

Congratulations to the Junior Chamber of Commerce for its initiative and ingenuity in thinking of PHIL WELCH. Some pinch hitter.

Shall the People's Congress Be Ignored?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a statement by me entitled, "Shall the People's Congress Be Ignored?"

The statement is as follows:

By an unholy alliance between the New Deal Party and certain labor leaders, the Wagner Act became law.

What happened? We had an immediate outburst of industrial strife. Strikes and violence became rampant. Law and order were set aside, except where the new monopoly itself established its own brand of police power. It ignored the local police power and the regularly constituted law-enforcement agencies. Instead, in labor cases, it became the police power, the prosecutor, and the court, able to carry out its own will.

Under the Wagner Act, the National Labor Relations Board itself investigated complaints of abuses by management. It left labor entirely free from investigation or prosecution. The same Board also tried the

case and rendered judgment against management. It was, therefore, investigator, prosecutor, and court. Its decisions followed the Russian pattern of the one-party system, using the court to enforce purposes and policies of the party in power. Its decisions were one-sided. Its fundamental purpose was to weaken and destroy the opposition. It worked just as the Supreme Court of the United States would work if it investigated and prosecuted and then rendered its decision according to party prejudice or purpose, on the evidence it chose to present to itself.

As a result the people's Congress rose up in its might, and passed the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947. Under it, the National Labor Relations Board was to be truly a court of impartial men, to be selected by the President and confirmed by the Senate, to decide fairly disputes between employers and employees. The court was no longer permitted to investigate and prosecute. Those functions and powers were specifically lodged in an independent general counsel. His relation to the Board was somewhat like that of the United States Attorney General's to the United States courts.

Under this procedure law and order have been more nearly restored. Strikes and violence have been greatly reduced, in spite of the President's deliberate and continuous attempts to sabotage the law. He first tried to prevent passage of the bill. Then he vetoed it. Then he promised to repeal it. Defeated in all this by the votes of both parties in Congress, he still threatens to "rip the Taft-Hartley Act out of the statute books."

CONDONING BREACHES OF THE PEACE

Prior to the Taft-Hartley Act, the Board was as arbitrary and unreasonable in the encouragement of violence in strikes, in picketing, and boycotting, as the worst advocates of class war. There were cases, in fact, of active participation of Board employees in the attempted use of force and intimidation. It became a scandalous fact that the Board and its staff were recruited from intellectuals who had written for or represented labor unions, of the parties in the disputes. This same Board was continued under the Taft-Hartley Act, with the addition of two new Board members.

Even today, with the separation of functions which the new law provides, the slant of the Board is already indicated by such decisions as the Horne Manufacturing Co. case (83-NLRB-1177), in the testimony before the Senate. A striker threw a hammer through the car window of a nonstriker going to work. The company refused to reemploy the striker. The Board ordered the employer to take him back, saying "We find that the striker's conduct, although objectionable, was not so extreme as to render him unfit for further service, and to justify his exclusion from the reinstatement order."

In the Kelco Company case (79-NLRB-759) the United States Circuit Court for the Fourth Circuit refused to enforce a Board order to reinstate five strikers who, the Board admitted, had engaged in "brutal violence and intimidation of a serious character, ganging up on a nonstriking employee and chasing him home in one case, knocking down an employee and beating him publicly in another."

Here is a case where the local court had issued an injunction in order to restore order and peace, through the machinery of local government, which is the responsible center of enforcement of law and order, yet the National Labor Relations Board, sitting in Washington, set aside the enforcement of the peace by the local authorities, and superseded them by invoking a Federal law which condones branches of the peace by certain classes in society.

In the third case, the Kansas Milling Co., a striker was found guilty of deliberately ramming and damaging the car of a nonstriker, and fined $50 by a local court. The Board granted him reinstatement and back pay.

No matter what provocation labor union members might have met with in the past, from extra-legal activities of employers of the old type, it is no advantage to labor for either the Board or the courts to tolerate violence. The workers of this country cannot gain by setting up defiance of the peace in their turn, or seeking to be made the kind of privileged group or estate that the dictators set up to fool the workers of Europe. It is more important to workers to be sure the laws are enforced, and that they have all the protection of the police power, than it is to the employers themselves.

These acts of the Board show that it is still of the same mind as under the Wagner Act, that it is committed, at the present time, with the New Deal's approval, to violate the specific language of the Taft-Hartley Act, which says that it is an unfair labor practice for a union or any of its agents to restrain or coerce employees in the right, guaranteed by the act, to join or not join a union.

In the light of our experience with the National Labor Relations Board from its inception in 1935 down to the present hour, we dare not expose our country to a Board which not only refuses to investigate and prosecute violators on both sides, but is incapable of being a judicial body, so long as it is also investigator and prosecutor.

Executive dictatorial orders lead to the kind of police power that is exempt from judicial control for a special class or group which polices itself and enforces its own arbitrary law. Congress has relied on the police power that is subject to orderly, impartial, judicial review. That alone can lead to equal justice for all.

CHALLENGE TO THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE LEGISLATIVE POWER

The people of the United States face squarely the question whether they want the law to be made by their elected Representatives or by Presidential usurpation of legislative power. Congress has three times affirmed the Taft-Hartley law—first in its original passage, then in its passage over the veto of the President, and then in their refusal in 1949 to adopt a substitute.

The Board is at present operating in a political climate of opinion which blithely assumes that the Taft-Hartley Act is going to be rescinded and the Wagner Act reinstated after the next election when the President will have a Congress subservient to his will. Such a travesty of "law enforcement" is a total violation of the Constitution which gives to the Congress the legislative power and does not permit nor imply in any way that the Executive can remake or reshape the law to suit its own purposes.

The President's false representation to the people that his plan No. 12 for the elimination of the general counsel under the National Labor Relations Act, is in keeping with the recommendations in the Hoover report, has been roundly exposed by a telegram read in the hearings of the Senate yesterday, from the former President himself. He said that the Commission never even considered the matter and certainly never made any such recommendations. The Hoover report did what President Truman should do, strictly avoid all pretense of solving by Executive order problems which belong to the legislative responsibilities of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention to the fact that originally the Congress granted the reorganization power to the President of the United States as an administrative power to clarify and strengthen the innumerable functions of the administrative agencies, and never with the thought that the President would use that power to legislate in violation of the express will of the Congress. At that time the Congress granted to him the right to support reorganization measures as a step to simple efficiency. This plan will go into effect within 60 days, unless a constitutional majority, which in the House means 218 Members present and voting, has acted adversely on his recommendation. Gentlemen, this is a test not of your views with respect to labor legislation, but of whether or not any Member of Congress is going to betray the constitutional power of this Congress of the United States. This is a nonpartisan, constitutional issue which requires a prompt and overwhelming rejection of the President's position, not by 218 Members, but by every Member of the House of Representatives who is true to his oath of office.

If the President wins in his contention, he will set up an arbitrary, personal police court that will literally become the most powerful court in our whole Government. He will have a life-or-death authority over all business. He will have a personal arm of government that can be bent entirely to his will. From his decisions there will be no appeal. This is in truth a step to the police state in all of its evil manifestations—even in America with all its traditions and its history of constitutional law.

If Congress wins in this contest it will assert that there shall be no police power except the power that is subject to impartial judicial review. The law shall be no personal law, no administrative order, no dictator's decree.

A Young American Speaks Out on Foreign Policy, Peace, and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in presenting herewith for your attention a communication received by me from one of the younger generation of Americans. He is a very successful young man in his own right and it is with his express permission, in response to my inquiry, that I have the privilege of sharing its important text with you. I am also forwarding the same to our State Department.

Certainly it is true that only by an exchange of considered opinions can there be enduring progress in a democracy.

I would welcome receiving any comments from you, my colleagues, about Tom Shields' communication to me.

The communication follows:

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *February 18, 1950.*

Congressman CLYDE DOYLE,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLYDE: I want to pass along a few ideas about world peace for your consideration and comment. You may be ahead of me on these items as I realize that "a safe and sound America in a world of peace"

has been a very real objective of yours for years.

Our program for peace, as I understand it, might be considered under two points—

1. To make the United States and western democracies strong;

2. To promote international understanding and good will.

Point 1 avoids the mistakes of prewar pacifism and disarmament, which programs proved so ineffectual. And we have certainly learned that any form of appeasement and any evidence of weakness would be fatal. It is to be hoped that the present Congress will not make any unwarranted cuts in defense or foreign aid appropriations. In some respects present expenditures for these programs may be inadequate.

But point 1 above, necessary as it is, cannot succeed alone. It is essentially negative. The more positive aspect of our foreign policy, point 2 above, is equally important. It seems to me that it could be strengthened further by various positive steps toward better understanding with peoples behind the iron curtain.

One of our foremost problems is to sell our friendship and peaceful intentions to the peoples of Communist-dominated countries. Events of recent years have shown that, absolute as a dictatorship may be, it cannot afford to disregard entirely the opinions of its citizens. Hence the stupendous propaganda and espionage efforts. Hence also the fanatical desire to isolate the people from all factual knowledge of the Western World. It is doubtful that the members of the Politburo can be changed by anything short of rebellion and of popular demand for international friendship on the part of their peoples which would be too overwhelming to be purged.

Admittedly this is a big order. But also admittedly other courses of action are not completely successful. Time may be running short. It would seem that this approach has enough merit to justify its use in conjunction with our other policies. I am convinced that it could be conducted in such a way as to be thoroughly consistent with our point 1 of adequate strength.

Now as to ways and means. If this approach is worth trying at all, it is worth our best efforts. President Truman might appoint a commission including businessmen, labor leaders, advertising executives, clergymen, educators, newsmen, and representatives of Congress and the State Department—top caliber men all of them. The commission members might be put through a few seminars in Washington to brief them on the problem and significant background information. They might then be asked to work on the problem and bring in recommendations as soon as possible. The same results could be secured in a more quiet, informal manner if that seemed preferable.

This aspect of our foreign policy has been discussed recently by a few Government officials and private citizens. It seems to have many facets worthy of consideration, a few of which are—

1. Expand the Voice of America, and seek to open all other possible avenues of information and influence.

2. Make an offer to iron-curtain countries of certain consumer goods, including food, on condition that the recipients are told of the source of the commodities. If the offer is not accepted, publicize the facts to the people of those countries.

3. Attempt to have the Christian churches within Communist-dominated countries convey our friendly intentions to the people.

4. Investigate all feasible methods of sending leaflets, soap, and American trinkets of various kinds to these peoples.

5. Encourage Americans with friends and relatives in these countries to correspond with them regularly and pass along information which they might otherwise miss.

6. Utilize services and contacts of political refugees and exiles from iron-curtain countries where feasible.

7. Have representatives of American labor unions work with cooperative European labor union members to undermine Communist influence within European trade-unionism.

8. Propose exchange arrangements for students, professors, and clergymen.

9. Have our Central Intelligence Agency on the alert for any underground movements which we could help, and for anti-American trends which we might counteract.

The cost of such a program would be comparatively small and the potential return on the investment would be high, so I hope we would be willing to give it every dollar that could be effectively used.

A particularly significant feature of such a program is that it would give us an opportunity to prove just how Christian we are as a nation, and whether we believe in the brotherhood of man as we profess to do. Fine as the Marshall plan is, it involves giving to our friends—this program would mean giving to those who are at least potentially our enemies. While we would be doing it because it would contribute to our own survival, it would nonetheless contribute to the eventual well-being of millions of people now in the rankest type of servitude.

It may be that because we as Christians have failed to practice the Sermon on the Mount for the advantage of those less fortunate than we, we are now to be forced to do so for our own survival.

The Kremlin is peddling a diabolical product—communism—with an all-out campaign of intensive and extensive propaganda, subversion, falsification, and hate. I believe that American ingenuity can sell an infinitely superior product—democracy—with an equally vigorous program of information, counter-subversion, truth, and good will.

I would like to see a program similar to the one discussed above developed and carried forward as though our very lives depended upon it. They may.

Sincerely,

THOMAS K. SHIELDS.

Aesop's Fable and McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following editorial, Aesop's Fable and McCARTHY, from the Milwaukee Journal, dated April 4, 1950:

AESOP'S FABLE AND MCCARTHY

A great many Americans have been saying that Senator McCARTHY is playing directly into the hands of the Communists by the way he has carried on his current Red hunt.

The Nation's leading newspapers, Republican and Democrat, have been pointing this out for several weeks. So have columnists and radio commentators. President Truman touched this note last week when he said that McCARTHY is "the Kremlin's greatest asset" in this country.

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts, Republican member of the committee investigating the McCarthy charges, joined the chorus this week. Pointing out that not one of McCARTHY's charges had been proved, he explained that a charge made in this shotgun manner, and investigated openly by Congress, "often besmirches the character of innocent persons, weakens the position of the United States before the world, and fails to find the really dangerous individuals."

Congressman RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, the member of the House Un-American Activities Committee who is given credit for digging out the Alger Hiss case, criticized the McCarthy system on a television program Sunday night. He said, in effect, that smearing the innocent for political purposes is no way to expose the guilty. Walter Reuther, the labor leader, in another such program, declared that McCARTHY's charges should have been given to the FBI or other authorities and not spread publicly. He said McCARTHY did exactly what Stalin "would want him to do."

Probably the best explanation of the damage that Senator McCARTHY is doing was given in Milwaukee last week by Father John F. Cronin, S. S. Father Cronin is assistant director of the social action committee of the National Catholic Welfare Committee. He has studied communism in this country for 10 years and is considered one of the Nation's authorities on Communist infestation and infiltration.

Father Cronin said that Senator McCARTHY had made charges that he couldn't prove, that he had not evaluated his information properly, that he had been badly briefed, and that it was unfortunate he had gone to such extremes.

Referring to the most sensational of McCARTHY's charges—the one that there are 57 card-carrying Communists in the State Department—Father Cronin declared that his investigation had shown that there is not one known Communist Party member in that Department.

The McCarthy technique is remindful of that of the shepherd's boy in Aesop's fables. This lad cried out "Wolf, wolf" erroneously several times, and fooled the villagers. When the wolf finally did appear, and the boy cried out, the villagers thought he was merely deceiving them again and nobody came to help him.

People are beginning to put McCARTHY's shoutings in the "Wolf, wolf" class. This is a situation made to order for Stalin's stooges. For years they have used the red-herring cry as a shield when attention was directed their way. Now they may have a new shield. Anyone who points out a real Communist, and may have proof to back his charges, may be accused of applying the McCarthy smirch—another name for a witch hunt or a phony smear campaign.

It is this that worries men like Father Cronin, the President, Senator Lodge, Representative Nixon, and others who know the Communists and all their tricks. If McCARTHY falls on his face in this campaign, as now seems so likely, it is going to be harder and harder to dig out the Communists wherever they are embedded.

World Health Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is World Health Day. It marks

the second anniversary of the functioning of the World Health Organization, that remarkably successful specialized agency of the United Nations. It is also a day of dedication to the improvement of the health of people everywhere.

With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements by Federal Security Administrator Oscar W. Ewing and Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service:

STATEMENT BY FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR OSCAR R. EWING

In this year's observance of World Health Day people everywhere can look to international teamwork for real progress in improving human health and welfare.

When I was in Europe recently, nothing impressed me more than the increasing emphasis on cooperation among many nations in attacking these common problems. In country after country I found a growing confidence that by working together we can control and wipe out preventable diseases.

This confidence is based on experience. At the headquarters of the World Health Organization, in Geneva, Switzerland, I heard heartening reports of what has been accomplished for health on a broad international front. To take only one example, I learned in Italy that malaria, responsible for more than half a million deaths in 1945, has now been practically eradicated. In Sardinia a similar program has met with sensational success. Such concerted attacks upon diseases are paying real dividends, not only in human life but in opening new possibilities for economic development.

The United States faces a great obligation and a great opportunity for leadership in health and welfare. The experience of the Federal Security Agency in dealing here at home with problems of health, education, and social security is being drawn upon more and more frequently in the international relations of the United States. During the past year the Agency's Office of International Relations has worked closely with the State Department, with many of the United Nations agencies, and with other organizations. From every part of the Federal Security Agency—the Public Health Service, the Office of Education, the Social Security Administration, including the Children's Bureau, and others—we are contributing technical assistance to this international effort.

One of the most important of these activities is the planning of the "bold new program" set forth by the President. This includes projects for public health and sanitation, looking especially toward the control of such diseases as malaria, which interfere with economic development in many parts of the world.

As the constitution of the World Health Organization affirms, the health of all peoples is fundamental to the attainment of peace and security. The Federal Security Agency is proud to help in this world-wide partnership dedicated to health and welfare. It welcomes this opportunity to join in observing World Health Day and in pledging its continuing concern for health as one of the foundations of democracy.

STATEMENT BY DR. LEONARD A. SCHEELE, SURGEON GENERAL, UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

As we pass the halfway mark in the twentieth century we in America can be proud of our progress in public health. In the past 50 years we have made important gains in building a healthier Nation. We have learned that scientific research can produce new knowledge and better methods of improving health. We have increased our efforts to advance medical science and to apply it wisely. We have expanded our health services and hospitals. As individuals seeking health we have learned to use our services more frequently and more efficiently than our forefathers.

We have also learned that if our desire for peace is to triumph, we must help all peace-loving peoples to conquer misery and disease. The world's health is everybody's business. In the underdeveloped parts of the world there are vast areas where the average man does not live beyond his twenties, where at least one person in every family will be ill at all times, and where poverty holds the benefits of medical science from those who need it most.

As we begin the second half of the century, therefore, we look forward to new world health action. The World Health Organization may well be proud of the vigorous international program for better health which it already has under way. We hope that this program can be further expanded under the President's proposal for cooperative technical assistance programs to aid the peoples of the world's underdeveloped areas.

With all the peace-loving nations of the world working together we can at last begin to bridge the gap between the people of these poverty-stricken but naturally rich areas and their more fortunate fellowmen. Certainly the project is potentially one of the most beneficial that the world has ever seen.

It is with these objectives in mind that the United States joins with the other nations of the world in the observance of World Health Day at the beginning of the second half of the century.

If a Law Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Independence (Iowa) Bulletin-Journal urging favorable action on my bill to prohibit Supreme Court Justices from acting as character witnesses in criminal trials in the Federal courts:

IF A LAW IS NEEDED

From a number of angles, there is much to be said for the bill introduced by Representative KEATING, of New York, to bar any member of the United States Supreme Court from appearing as character witness in a lower court.

The measure, of course, was prompted by the testimony given by Justices Frankfurter and Reed in the case of Alger Hiss.

The case quite likely will end in an appeal to the Supreme Court. These two members by their activity in the trial will be automatically barred from passing on the case. That means a depleted bench.

For another thing, it isn't very becoming of a member of the highest tribunal to go traipsing around the country using the prestige of his position to help a friend.

Personal taste should dictate this decision. But in cases where it doesn't, there should be protection by law.

China's "People's Democracy" Makes a Mockery of Democratic Freedom and Slaves of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article on conditions in Shanghai under the Communists who, according to leftist propaganda, were liberating China from its allegedly feudal war lords in order to bring in utopia. This report is from the CAT Bulletin, the little paper put out monthly by the officials and employees, American and Chinese, of Civil Air Transport, the air line established and operated in Asia by Gen. Claire Chennault and a group of Americans and Chinese.

The article follows:

CHINA'S "PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY" MAKES A MOCKERY OF DEMOCRATIC FREEDOM AND SLAVES OF THE PEOPLE

The October 17 issue of Life carries an exclusive report on Communist Shanghai. In it Correspondent Robert Doyle gives a graphic picture of the creeping economic paralysis spreading over the once great port city of China. He left on the steamship *General Gordon* in late September.

Since the *Gordon*, several ships have arrived in Hongkong with passengers from Shanghai. Most of these evacuees agree that within the few weeks since the Life story was written, conditions have become much worse, particularly for foreigners who wish to do business in the city. Instead of trying to ease the economic coma into which the city has fallen by encouraging foreign trade, present policies of the powerful Military Control Commission are moving in the opposite direction.

It is explained that the main weapon of the Military Control Commission in its fight to destroy foreign interests is the labor union. However, these unions are not organizations in the accepted sense of the word but are completely under the control of the MCC. They are told when to strike, whom to strike, and how much to strike for. Workers have no voice in union policy but serve as pawns in the hands of mysterious minions of the Communist Party under the MCC.

The case of a certain American business firm in Shanghai is cited as an instance of this abuse of power and authority. A man appeared one morning in the office of the manager of the American firm and asked to be taken on as an employee. The manager replied that, under present conditions, he was laying off men, not hiring them. The stranger insisted that he be employed but was again refused. He then left. The next morning he turned up in the factory of the American firm armed with a pistol and proceeded to beat up the Chinese factory foreman. The American manager was then accused of having refused employment to the stranger and, at the insistence of the labor union, was haled before a "people's court." No news has been received on the outcome of this trial.

Employees of foreign firms who were dismissed years ago for one reason or another are returning to the office or factory of firms which once employed them, demanding back

pay and reinstatement. Employers realize this is not the doing of the workers, but that they are merely carrying out orders from above. The case is cited by one recent arrival of a man who a year ago had been working for a certain firm and had been caught and convicted on a petty thieving charge. After the Reds took over, this individual was released from jail. In October, with the backing of the labor union, he approached his old firm demanding back pay, bonus, and reinstatement.

Under terroristic policies such as these it is said that numerous small firms are approaching bankruptcy and going out of business. No matter how hard they strive, businessmen are constantly in hot water with the labor unions. Larger firms are under the same political pressures but, backed by their home offices and bigger capital investments, will be able to hold out longer providing outright confiscation of property is not resorted to.

A representative of one of the larger foreign firms in Shanghai has openly announced to the Communist authorities that if they enforce present tax policies and continue to obstruct production through the labor union, he cannot stay in business longer than a few more months. He has candidly asked them what their pleasure is.

Recent passengers from Shanghai hold out little hope for any improvement but expect that the situation will deteriorate further. One of the inexplicable features which the businessman faces is the fact that even when he decides he can no longer continue in business, he is not permitted to leave. This refusal on the part of the Communists to allow businessmen and factory owners to sell out or leave Shanghai has aroused a deep sense of uncertainty and many are now fearful for their lives.

In this connection it is reliably reported that there are 223 foreigners in Shanghai who probably will not be allowed to leave the city but will be held as hostages against any possible economic measures which might not be favorable to the labor unions.

More startling than this is the report which insists that before the year is out, Russian commissars will take over the top police jobs and political sections of the city government. If this should materialize it is feared that present policies will become more terroristic than ever. Even now under Mayor Chen Yi's administration people no longer can trust their own servants. Private letters are being opened, files examined and pilfered by domestics who obviously are acting on orders from above.

The daily movements of prominent businessmen are being watched and reported on by secret operatives of the police. Individual dossiers are being compiled and no one is certain when he will be called up for questioning, accused of being an agent for a foreign power or sabotaging the "people's livelihood."

The pattern of terrorism now becoming vogue in Shanghai has strong resemblances to other countries under the Soviet Russian yoke. What they will become, if and when Russian functionaries actually take over the police department in Shanghai, is anyone's guess. The point has already been reached when few people wish to discuss politics and even a word or two exchanged is done with a look over the shoulder.

It is reported that living costs have risen 5 times since the Communists moved into Shanghai. A car license often costs as much as US$50 per month. Public utilities are beginning to break down, and electric power shortages have developed without explanation. People in the larger apartment buildings often find they have no elevator service and must walk up.

The feeling of never knowing what to expect next has discouraged new business and enterprise. Instead, most everyone seems to be waiting—waiting for the next turn of the screw. Who will be the next victim to be haled into court on trumped-up charges, or barricaded in his office by MCC-dominated labor unions? Who will be the next man to be beaten for some minor dispute with a stevedore or rickshaw coolie? Every possible excuse is being used to intimidate and terrorize the upper and middle classes among the Chinese and foreigners in general. It is said that even among the poorer people of Shanghai, Gen. Chiang Kai-shek has never been so popular as he is now. They see in Chiang the only possible savior from their present torment.

A popular dream or vision which is being repeated and claimed by many Chinese revolves around the number 3. Some people who report this dream say they see three people, or three candles, or three Buddhas in a room. In one corner the candle (or Buddha) represents Mao Tze-tung, in another corner Chiang Kai-shek, but in the third corner a mysterious stranger sits whom no one can quite identify. Word of mouth report has this third stranger representing a new figure in Chinese politics who will oust the Communists and bring back an orderly and decent regime to China. Those who describe this dream explain that it reflects a deep-seated desire for a miracle to happen which would destroy communism.

Much is heard about the mammoth parades which are being staged in liberated cities. In Shanghai it is said that these parades, far from being spontaneous or voluntary, are organized from the top by the Communists with great attention to detail and propaganda effects. Every shop has to furnish one man and every school must turn out its pupils for the demonstration or suffer a penalty. Prominent Chinese businessmen, obviously feeling like idiots have been observed in these parades, wearing false mustaches and poor clothing to look like lao pohsing and coolies.

One foreign businessman who recently arrived from Shanghai definitely believes it will be impossible for any foreigner, other than Communist, to do business with Red China where his business has anything to do with Chinese labor. There is no assurance, he states, that conditions will remain favorable one week to the next regardless of permissions granted by the authorities.

Communist planners have been placed in charge of economic policies over which they have no knowledge or experience. Without realizing, or perhaps without wishing to realize, they are killing the goose that lays the golden eggs in Shanghai and have made an economic shambles of this once great center of trade and commerce.

Well-Merited Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Allentown (Pa.) Evening Chronicle endorsing legislation to prevent Federal officials, including Members of Congress, from profiting through their own wrongdoing, by receiving pension benefits after they have demonstrated faithlessness to their trust:

WELL-MERITED LEGISLATION

The scheduled introduction today of a bill by Congressman KEATING, of New York, to cut off pension annuities for any Federal employee convicted of a felony, committed in connection with his Government service, brings to three the number of House proposals which would withhold retirement benefits from Congressmen jailed for serious crimes.

Actuated by the May and Thomas convictions, the bills have obvious merit, and it is to be hoped that one will be made into law during the present session.

Former Representative May, Kentucky Democrat, is drawing retirement benefits while serving an 8-month to 2-year term on a bribery conviction in connection with wartime Government contracts. Former Representative Thomas, New Jersey Republican, now serving a jail sentence for accepting salary kick-backs from an employee on his congressional pay roll, will be eligible for retirement benefits when he reaches the age of 62.

These men violated their oath of office as well as the criminal code and should reasonably be subject to deprivation of the right to receive bounty from a Government whose laws they have flouted, besides having disgraced their high office.

Such a law as that proposed would unquestionably serve as a sizable deterrent to any others on the public pay roll of similarly stunted moral stature.

Constitutional, Economic, and Political Relations Between the United States and Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, the Honorable ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, delivered an interesting and educational address before the International Club of Fordham University. Being myself a graduate of Fordham University, class of 1915, and having recently returned from a visit to Puerto Rico, this address by Dr. FERNÓS caught my pointed attention.

Since this body is responsible for passing on many legislative matters which affect Puerto Rico, and more especially because there are pending before the Congress two bills, H. R. 7674 and S. 3336, which provide for the organization of a constitutional government for Puerto Rico, I believe every Member should read this address.

This being Pan-American Day, it is worthy of the notice of all countries and communities of Spanish heritage that Puerto Rico, itself a community of American citizens of Spanish-American origin, is marching rapidly along the road of democracy toward more and more self-government.

The United States has consistently and willingly recognized the aspirations of Puerto Rico's people for greater and greater equality, thus according Puerto Rico a respected and dignified station within the United States system.

The address follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL, ECONOMIC, AND POLITICAL RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND PUERTO RICO

Constitutional, economic, and political relations between the United States and Puerto Rico began with the Treaty of Paris, which was signed the tenth day of December 1898. Puerto Rico, up to that time, had been a province in the Spanish Kingdom, with a provincial government and full representation in the Spanish Parliament. Since 1897 it had attained the status of a dominion, while still retaining parliamentary representation in Madrid. The Treaty of Paris re-established peace between the United States and the Kingdom of Spain, which had engaged during that year in what is known as the Spanish-American War. Under the terms of the treaty, Spain relinquished sovereignty over Cuba, which had been the cause of the war, and ceded to the United States the island of Puerto Rico and other islands then under Spanish sovereignty—the island of Guam and the Philippines.

Under article VIII of the treaty, Spain ceded in Puerto Rico, together with sovereignty, all immovable property which, under law, belonged to the public domain, and, as such, to the Crown of Spain. It was stated, however, in the second paragraph of the same article, that this stipulation did not impair property or rights which by law belonged to the peaceful possession of property of all kinds, of the province, or of municipalities, public or private establishments, ecclesiastical or civic bodies, or any other associations having legal capacity to acquire and possess property in the renounced or ceded territories, or of private individuals, of whatsoever nationality such individuals might be.

In accordance with article IX, the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories ceded to the United States were to be determined by Congress.

Under Article X, the inhabitants of the territories over which Spain relinquished her sovereignty were declared to be secured in the free exercise of their religion.

The status of Puerto Rico within the United States political system stems from this treaty, and is determined by Congress, subject to the terms of the treaty and obviously to applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States. It is plain that Puerto Rico, in itself, was not ceded as property. The Crown and its government ceded what it had in Puerto Rico: paramount political authority, sovereignty, and, in addition, Crown property. Moreover, it was plain that the United States was not making war against the people of Puerto Rico. General Miles, upon landing at Ponce, issued the following proclamation:

"To the Inhabitants of Puerto Rico:

"In the prosecution of the war against the Kingdom of Spain by the people of the United States in the cause of liberty, justice, and humanity, its military forces have come to occupy the island of Puerto Rico. They come bearing the banner of freedom, inspired by a noble purpose to seek the enemies of our country and yours, and to destroy or capture all who are in armed resistance. They bring you the fostering arm of a nation of free people, whose greatest power is in justice and humanity to all those living within its fold. Hence, the first effect of this occupation will be the immediate release of your former political relations, and it is hoped a cheerful acceptance of the Government of the United States. The chief object of the American military forces will be to overthrow the armed authority of Spain and to give to the people of your beautiful island the largest measure of liberty consistent with this military occupation. We have not come to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries has been oppressed, but, on the contrary, to bring you protection, not only to yourselves but to your property, to promote your prosperity, and to bestow upon you the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our Government. It is not our purpose to interfere with any existing laws and customs that are wholesome and beneficial to your people so long as they conform to the rules of military administration, of order and justice. This is not a war of devastation, but one to give to all within the control of its military and naval forces the advantages and blessings of enlightened civilization.

"NELSON A. MILES,
"*Major General,*
"Commanding, United States Army."

After ratification of the treaty, on the 11th day of April 1899, Puerto Rico was placed under military government. On August 15, 1899, General Davis, the military governor, issued a circular or general order in which it was explained to the people of Puerto Rico, the general features of the policy he was pursuing (and intended to pursue) touching the affairs of government in the island. From this circular letter, I quote:

"Under the American Constitution, the whole theory of Government is based on the principle that the people, themselves, are to make and enforce their own laws. As Congress has as yet taken no measures or action respecting Puerto Rico, the supreme government is, under the Constitution, vested in the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He (the President) has designated a general officer to represent him and to perform the functions of civil government. Several important orders have been issued of great import. Among those relating to superior administration and the judiciary are:

"1. The announcement by General Brooks on October 18, 1898, that the laws of the land, not in conflict with the Constitution of the United States, would be enforced.

"2. * * *

"3. Continuation of the council of secretaries as constituted October 18, 1898—order by General Brooks. (This referred to the council of secretaries or cabinet as established under the self-government constitution granted by Spain in 1897.)

"5. Dissolution of the council of secretaries by General Henry. (Thus, it was through a general order issued by former Military Governor Henry that the self-government constitution of Puerto Rico, granted by Spain, was suspended.)

"6. Appointment of heads of departments in the civil government by General Henry.

"The effect of the orders issued and changes resulting from these orders tend directly toward harmonizing the existing system and that to come with territorial autonomy, if such might be enacted by Congress. * * * The Governor would have a legislature, senate, and house of representatives, to regulate his actions, to make laws for the people, and to control expenditures. * * *

"It results from the foregoing that the necessity ceases for retaining the separate departments which have been presided over by able officers collectively called the cabinet; and it follows that the department organization should cease to exist, and announcement to the effect is now made."

Following this general order, General Davis established a secretary for civil affairs and entrusted all former departments to Army officers.

With the enactment of the first organic act and the inauguration of civil government, Puerto Rico ceased to be under the War Department. Nine years later Puerto Rico was again placed under the War Department, although civil government was continued. From 1909 to 1934, Puerto Rican affairs, at the Washington end, were in the charge of the Bureau of Insular Affairs in the War Department. From 1934 to the present time, they have been under the Department of the Interior.

Under the first Organic Act of Puerto Rico, the inhabitants of Puerto Rico, formerly defined as Spaniards, were to be deemed to be "citizens of Puerto Rico" and as such "entitled to the protection of the United States." They, together with citizens of the United States residing in Puerto Rico, were collectively organized into a body politic to be known as the people of Puerto Rico with powers of government as stated in the organic act and with power to sue and be sued. Later it was interpreted by the Supreme Court that Puerto Rico was appurtenant to, but did not form a part of, the United States. It has been held also by the Supreme Court in the case of *Balzac* v. *The People of Puerto Rico* (1922) that the conferring of United States citizenship upon the people of Puerto Rico did not incorporate Puerto Rico into the United States. To this day, Puerto Rico remains an unincorporated territory, subject to the sovereignty and protection of the United States. Such sovereignty takes the place of that of the Spanish King and his government, as formerly exercised under the Spanish Constitution and so ceded to the United States.

Under the 1900 act, it was provided that the same tariffs, customs, and duties should be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles imported into Puerto Rico from ports other than those of the United States which were required by law to be collected upon articles imported into the United States from foreign countries. And it was also provided that in no event should any duties be collected after the 1st day of March 1902 on merchandise and articles going into Puerto Rico from the United States or coming into the United States from Puerto Rico. Under these two provisions of the first organic act which are still in effect there was established what amounts to a customs union between the United States and Puerto Rico. Other provisions made it an economic and political union as well. For instance:

Section 2 provided for the retirement of the Puerto Rican coins then in circulation and the substituting of the coins of the United States.

Section 14 stated: "The statutory laws of the United States not locally inapplicable, except as hereinbefore or hereinafter otherwise provided, shall have the same force and effect in Puerto Rico as in the United States." These provisions were continued or reenacted by the 1917 Organic Act.

Within this framework of economic and political affiliation, a local government was to be established. The structure of government was spelled out in the 1900 act. It was a disappointment to Puerto Rico.

It was liberalized under the 1917 act. It has been gradually democraticized through subsequent amendments to the organic act. But to begin with, the government created in 1900 was composed of a governor, six heads of departments, and a supreme court, all to be appointed by the President of the United States. There was also a legislature composed of two houses, the upper to be appointed by the President of the United States, the house of delegates to be elected by the people. The six heads of departments were to be ex officio members of the executive council which was the upper

house. The five additional members without portfolio were Puerto Ricans. The governor appointed all officials in the district courts with the advice and consent of the executive council.

The 1917 act substituted the executive council with an elective senate and provided that four of the six department heads were to be appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the senate. However, the attorney general and the commissioner of education were still appointed by the President of the United States.

In 1947, a great step forward, in the direction of full local self-government, took place. The organic act was so amended so that the governor appoints all heads of departments. The governor, himself, is elected by the people. The supreme court judges and the auditor of the island, however, are still appointed by the President.

The fundamental provisions regarding the application of Federal laws and regarding economic relationships were not changed.

It should be noted that in accordance with section 12 of the first organic act and section 6 of the 1917 act, all expenses incurred on account of the government of Puerto Rico for salaries of officials and the conduct of their offices and departments, and all expenses and obligations contracted for the internal improvement, or development of the island, are paid by the treasurer of Puerto Rico out of the revenue in his custody. The United States Government pays only for Federal establishments and services.

Federal tax laws do not apply to Puerto Rico. All taxes paid in Puerto Rico are covered into the insular treasury. Therefore, Puerto Rico, participating in Federal Government matters only through its Resident Commissioner, is not burdened with taxation without representation.

The President may exempt Puerto Rico from Federal laws which, because of local conditions, he finds inapplicable, provided they have not been made specifically applicable by the Congress.

Since 1900, Puerto Rico has elected a Resident Commissioner to the United States. Upon presentation to the Department of State of a certificate of election from the Governor of Puerto Rico, he is entitled to official recognition as such Commissioner by all departments of the Government of the United States. In 1904, the House of Representatives voted to extend all privileges of congressional membership to the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico. As a result, the Commissioner has ever since had a dual capacity—that of a Commissioner before all executive departments of the Government (especially before the Department of the Interior in charge of insular matters) and that of a Delegate in Congress. A Delegate is a Congressman without a vote.

Under section 11 of the organic act, the President is authorized to place all matters pertaining to the Government of Puerto Rico within the jurisdiction of an executive department of the Federal Government to be designated by him. The Department of the Interior has been so designated.

Under the Elective Governor Act of 1947, the rights, privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States are to be respected in Puerto Rico to the same extent as though Puerto Rico were a State of the Union and subject to the provisions of paragraph 1 of section 2 of article IV of the Constitution of the United States.

As aforesaid, tariff duties in Puerto Rico must be the same as in the United States. But, since it is the policy of Congress not to tax Puerto Rico, collections from customs are covered into the Treasury of Puerto Rico for use by the Government of Puerto Rico. As a matter of fact, the officials in charge of the customs are paid out of the revenues collected by them. They are not on the pay roll of the United States.

Puerto Rico makes its own internal revenue laws. However, it is provided by the organic act that merchandise shipped from the mainland to Puerto Rico shall not be discriminated against and shall be subject to equal internal revenue laws as domestic merchandise consumed in Puerto Rico. Merchandise shipped from Puerto Rico to the mainland is not subject to United States internal revenue laws, but it is subject to a tax equal to that imposed upon the like domestic articles in the United States. Collections under this tax are also covered into the Treasury of Puerto Rico.

This provision has led to a great deal of confusion. It is generally stated that moneys collected under United States internal revenue laws on Puerto Rican merchandise shipped to the mainland are paid back to Puerto Rico. As a matter of fact, such collections never find their way into the United States Treasury. They are collected in Puerto Rico. They are covered into the Treasury of Puerto Rico. They are collected under the law of 1900, not under United States internal revenue laws. By establishing the provision, Congress reconciled: (1) The principle of no taxation without representation, with (2) free trade, and (3) the necessary imposition of an equal tax burden on merchandise selling at either market, regardless of origin.

What is the present political status of Puerto Rico? To say that it is unincorporated territory is to put the question in the negative. It is not incorporated territory. But to say what it isn't is not to say what it is. Perhaps the best way to express it, is to say that the island of Puerto Rico is a dependency of the United States. It has a treaty status, akin to a protectorate, as a result of congressional determination. The United States exercises paramount political authority over Puerto Rico. The people of Puerto Rico constitute a body politic. They form a community of citizens with such rights and privileges as have been recognized by the Congress. They are United States citizens. They have the fundamental rights and privileges of United States citizens. But they are United States citizens living outside the United States, in a Territory under the sovereignty of the United States. Because of the democratic structure of the government that Congress has given them, because of the rights and privileges the Puerto Rican people exercise and practice, they live in a manner comparable to that of the inhabitants of any State. However, the relationships between the island and the Federal Government are not the same as those between the Federal Government and a State. In the United States political system, the status of a State is determined by the Constitution of the United States; the status of Puerto Rico, on the other hand, follows congressional determinations, implementing a treaty. Paramount political authority over Puerto Rico rests with the United States, subject to the terms of the treaty and applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

On March 13, 1950, I introduced H. R. 7674. It is a bill calling for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico, within such terms as provided by said act. It begins with the statement that the Congress of the United States, by a series of enactments, has progressively recognized the right of self-government of the people of Puerto Rico. It points out that under the terms of these congressional enactments, an increasingly large measure of self-government has been achieved and that, fully recognizing the principle of government by consent, this act is now adopted in the nature of a compact, so that the people of Puerto Rico under its terms, may organize a government pursuant to the constitution of their own adoption.

The people of Puerto Rico, under the bill, are free to express their acceptance of the act if they see fit. Having accepted its terms, they may proceed, within them, to adopt a constitution in accordance with procedures to be prescribed by the laws of Puerto Rico. The constitution, once adopted, would be transmitted to the President of the United States. If the President finds that the Puerto Rican Constitution conforms with the applicable provisions of the act and with applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States he is authorized to transmit the constitution to the Congress. The Congress might approve or disapprove the constitution the Puerto Rican people may have agreed upon. If Congress should adjourn without having acted during the session when it was transmitted, the constitution would be considered to have the approval of Congress.

The Puerto Rican Constitution would create a government republican in form and would include a bill of rights. Upon its becoming effective, such sections of the present Organic Act as create the local government in Puerto Rico would be superseded by the Constitution of Puerto Rico, and, therefore, repealed. On the other hand, such sections of the organic act as are not thus repealed would be continued. They would thereafter be known as the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, which would continue present economic relations and the application of Federal laws as heretofore. The section establishing the fact that the Government of Puerto Rico would be maintained by local taxes would also be continued. Puerto Ricans, of course, would continue to be citizens of the United States. The paramount political authority of the United States under the treaty, and in accordance with the United States Constitution, would continue undisturbed.

This act, calling for a local constitution for Puerto Rico, would have the effect of elevating such provisions of law as create the present political and economic relationships between Puerto Rico and the United States to the nature of a compact between a community of United States citizens and their Federal Government, very much in the way the old Northwest Ordinance created the first territorial government and relationships between the Federal Government and the inhabitants of the Territories. The people of Puerto Rico would have accepted such relationships of their own free will and would proceed to organize their local Government within the terms of such relationships as so accepted. The rights and privileges which the people of Puerto Rico would exercise in the organization of their Government would stem not from a law of Congress, but from a constitution which they, themselves, would have shaped, framed, and agreed upon. This is basic in the American philosophy of government.

Again, they would have consented to the terms of relationship with the United States, as established by Congress, and therefore to the application of the Federal Relations Act, much as a new State accepts the terms of an enabling act for its admission into the Union. A new form of federation would have been created. The inhabitants of Puerto Rico, unincorporated territory, would organize themselves politically in accordance with what would be comparable with a State constitution within a federative structure similar to, but not the same as, that created by the United States Constitution, for member States of the Union.

The Federal Relations Act would take the place of such provisions of the Constitution of the United States as establish the relationship between a State and the Federal Government, which do not apply in the case of Puerto Rico. Fundamental provisions of the Constitution of the United States would apply equally in both cases. From the status

of a dependency and protectorate, or, as it is worse called at present, a possession, Puerto Rico would ascend to the position of a federated commonwealth, albeit not federated on the same basis as a State.

The two fundamental differences between the status of Puerto Rico and that of a State, both stemming out of the fact that Puerto Rico is not incorporated, would be (1) that Puerto Rico would not be equally represented in Congress nor would it participate in national elections; (2) that Puerto Rico, although included within the customs and economic union, would not be subject to Federal taxation.

Although we would thus escape taxation without representation, it could be held that there would continue the situation of legislation without representation. To a certain extent, this is true. With a few exceptions, Federal laws would apply to Puerto Rico, in most instances equally as in the States, despite the fact that the people of Puerto Rico are not equally represented in Congress as are the people of the States. But it could not be claimed that Puerto Rico is not represented at all in Congress. The Resident Commissioner is a Member of the House of Representatives. He serves in committees. He introduces bills, and he may engage in debate.

On the other hand, the President is authorized to declare inapplicable to Puerto Rico, at the request of the Government of Puerto Rico, any Federal law not specifically made applicable to Puerto Rico by Congress, which he may deem inapplicable by reason of local conditions. Some laws, such as internal revenue laws, are declared inapplicable by the organic act itself. Thus, the area of legislation without representation is not as broad or significant as it might at first appear. To this area of application of Federal laws, Puerto Rico would have consented on accepting the act.

Puerto Rico has developed an economy based on such relationships with the United States as have existed for 50 years. To separate itself from the United States, to organize itself as an independent republic, would mean pulling the rug out from under our feet. It would mean the collapse of the economy of Puerto Rico. To attain statehood and to bear the burden of Federal taxation would deprive Puerto Rico of all means of maintaining its State government. It would mean the quick collapse of that State government and a severe reduction in available resources for much-needed development.

The two solutions for the problem of Puerto Rico is status which for 50 years has been the theme for academic discussion in Puerto Rico, are both unsuited to present circumstances of Puerto Rico. To insist on either, exclusively and for anything but the possibility of either in the indeterminate future, in view of the unsurmountable obstacles which either one would meet now, would simply mean the indefinite postponement of Puerto Rico's democratic development.

With H. R. 7674, we have found a new approach—an approach which allows for the democratic development of Puerto Rico within its present relationships, simultaneously with Puerto Rico's advancement to a higher level within the Union and assured economic stability and progress.

Moreover, such a proposition would be consistent with the declaration entered into by the United States upon its ratification of the Charter of the United Nations. I quote from the Charter:

"Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose people have not yet attained a full measure of self-government, recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and, to this end: (a) * * * (b) to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of its peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory, and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement."

H. R. 7674 is the answer to such a challenge in the case of Puerto Rico, under present circumstances. In their development from a colonial status to full political maturity within a monarchial system, such as the British Empire, or as it was with Spain, self-government without separation may be attained by former colonies when they ascend to dominion status on the basis of a common loyalty to the person of the king. Within a republican system, such as that of the United States, self-governing peoples may not maintain union among themselves through the symbol of a common loyalty to the person of a king. There are no kings in our Republic. But there is citizenship, our common United States citizenship. And there are other things: our common loyalty to our citizenship; our common devotion to our republican institutions and principles, under the Federal Constitution; our common devotion to the security of this great federation, of which we are all a part; our obedience to laws enacted by our freely chosen representatives or freely accepted by the people at the time they accept their terms of relationship.

Thus, under H. R. 7674, our present political and economic relations are continued and reaffirmed while government by consent, both at home and at the Federal level, is attained. In that way, we may occupy a dignified station within the Union, in a manner suitable to our circumstances. Thus, we shall continue to be united in common loyalty to our institutions, to our citizenship, and to our Christian way of life, under our local constitution and our Federal Constitution.

Investigation of the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the magazine America:

INVESTIGATE COAL

Recent reports from Washington indicate that Congress is losing its enthusiasm for an investigation of the coal industry. Having worked themselves up to a high pitch of excitement during the coal strike, the legislators appear to be suffering the inevitable reaction. With the miners back on the job and operations again normal, they welcome the repose that nature decrees after conflict and crisis. The solons are the more disposed to postpone serious endeavor because both the United Mine Workers and the coal operators have made known their opposition to any investigation of their sick industry. In fact, the operators deny with great vehemence that the industry is sick at all. (A decade ago, before the war brought artificial prosperity to the coal fields, they whistled a different tune.)

We trust that the Congress will not be turned aside from its plain duty either by its own indolence or by the opposition of self-interested men who deserve small consideration. Though there is peace of sorts in the industry, the law of supply and demand continues to operate to its undoing. On a 5-day schedule, the miners can produce weekly 3,500,000 more tons of coal than the country can consume. At that rate, stock piles depleted during the strike will be rebuilt within 6 months. Then what?

Are we destined to undergo again the old cycle of cutthroat competition, bankruptcies, and mounting unemployment? The Federal Power Commission reports that 13,000,000 homes and factories are now using natural and mixed gas and that the number is constantly growing. The conversion of the railroads—traditionally one of the largest users of coal—from steam to Diesel engines is in full swing and will not be reversed. The economic plight of the coal industry is certain to become much worse before there is any sign of improvement. If Congress remembers that our reserves of oil and natural gas are limited, that coal remains our most abundant source of power, it will not delay an investigation which has great significance for our future security.

What the So-Called Kerr Natural-Gas Bill Does to the Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the use of my colleagues and the reading public the following enlightening and timely article sent to me by the Honorable Charles Rhyne, executive secretary and general counsel of the National Institute of Municipal Law Offices, 730 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

It presents succintly the views of the municipalities of the Nation in regard to the so-called Kerr natural-gas bill and the baneful results which may be expected to follow the permitting of same to be enacted as a part of the law of the land.

The article follows:

A VETO OF THE KERR BILL PLEASE, MR. PRESIDENT

I want to talk about the Kerr bill which passed this House 176 to 174 last Friday night.

In opening my discussion of this important matter I would first like to get clearly before the House an identification of the parties to the issue which you just decided. On one side we have the natural gas producers of an estimated 85 percent of the natural gas in the United States. All of these natural-gas producers (since they do not own pipe lines) are exempted by this bill from the power conferred upon the Federal Power Commission by the Natural Gas Act of 1938 to set aside unreasonable rates charged consumers of natural gas. The great oil companies of the Nation, like Standard Oil, Phillips Petroleum et al., are the chief beneficiaries of this bill because it is estimated that around 35 of the large

companies control nearly 70 percent of the natural gas which will be exempted from all control by this bill.

On the other side of the issue have involved the only clearly identified party in the consumer or user of natural gas. It is estimated that some 50,000,000 consumers will soon have the benefits of this very wonderful product—and there can be no doubt but what natural gas is the cleanest, best fuel available for the purposes for which it is adapted. The opposition of the consumers to the Kerr bill, outside Congress, was voiced chiefly by city officials. These city officials have no possible personal benefit to gain by opposing the Kerr bill—except that their voters may possibly give them a stronger support in their next election because of their opposition to the unjust enrichment of natural-gas producers at the expense of these consumer-user-voters.

HOW CITIES GET INTO THE FIGHT

From very ancient times cities have been looked upon as the proper party to protect their residents against matters which affect the whole number of these residents. This has been especially true in the case of utilities and businesses affected with a public interest. Early examples are found in the instances of city regulation of the rates charged by ferries. Private persons would construct ferries across rivers, all roads would lead to them and then when the people were entirely dependent upon the ferry the owner thereof would start raising his price. They would often charge unreasonable rates and charge different rates to different persons. Cities stepped in to regulate these ferry rates and prevent such practices by fixing reasonable rates, yet rates which assured the ferry operator of a fair return on his investment. The courts sustained cities in their regulation of the reasonableness of rates of ferries and their regulation prohibiting discrimination.

From the very beginning of local government in the United States the cities have fulfilled this traditional role as protectors of the people against unreasonable charges of businesses affected with a public interest. The Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly recognized that cities are the "proper persons" to perform this function. In the case of *In Re Englehard*, 231 U. S. 646, the Supreme Court of the United States in 1914 stated that the city of Louisville "was the proper party" in a telephone rate case "as representative of all interested," and in fact held that the city should be the exclusive representative of all consumers in a case involving a contest over telephone rates, so that an individual could not intervene for the purpose of representing other interests.

In the case of *O'Connell v. Pacific Gas & Light Company* (19 Fed. (2d) 493) the Court again holding that the city was the exclusive representative of consumers in rate litigation, said, in part, "The appellant (consumer) is represented in the litigation by the city and county of San Francisco, as are all other consumers of gas whose rights are involved. * * *"

In the case of *Wright v. Central Kentucky Natural Gas Company* (297 U. S. 537) the Supreme Court of the United States held that all consumers were represented by the city of Louisville in settling certain rate litigation, the Court holding:

"In making the rate settlement as well as in making the original franchise contract, the consumers are represented by the city."

The cases are legion to the same effect both in the Supreme Court of the United States and other jurisdictions. The law and the practice is certainly well established that cities are the legal and normal representatives of their residents in utility matters.

CITIES WERE AMONG THE CHIEF SPONSORS OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT OF 1938

The Natural Gas Act of 1938 was a direct result of the lack of jurisdiction in State utility commissions to control unreasonable rates charged for natural gas shipped in interstate commerce. Chief advocates of the bill were former Mayors Miller of Louisville, Ky., Smith of Detroit, Mich., Scully of Pittsburgh, Hoan of Milwaukee, and Burton (present Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States) of Cleveland. Ohio cities, including Cleveland, Dayton, Akron, and Columbus, were then among the first cities to file petitions before the Federal Power Commission to reduce unreasonable rates for gas shipped to them in interstate commerce. Missouri, Michigan, and other cities filed similar petitions at about the same time. More than 100 cities have appeared in rate litigation of various kinds before the Federal Power Commission since 1938 and the rate reductions to consumers in those cities exceed $50,000,000 per year. The Kerr bill would of course scuttle the power of the Federal Power Commission to make such reductions and would assure gas producers of a return of much of this $50,000,000, even though the pipe-line companies are also involved and those pipe-line companies are not affected by this bill.

City officials are the best informed public officials in the country on natural gas and the facts of the Kerr bill because they have worked in this field over a long period of time and their experts are fully informed upon all the technical ramifications of this extremely technical subject. Is it any wonder that these cities would like to retain in the Federal Power Commission the jurisdiction conferred to prevent unreasonable prices for natural gas rather than leave the fixing of prices to the gas producers themselves?

HOW CITIES HAVE OPPOSED THE KERR BILL

City attorneys are the city officials who have appeared for cities in utility rate regulation cases. Most of the experts of cities on utility maters are either the city attorney or one of his assistants. In the larger cities of the Nation, their law departments usually contain several attorneys who have devoted their lives to utility litigation as representatives of users and consumers within the municipalities. These people are experts and are in a position to evaluate the effect of all proposals of utilities and they have spent years in representing cities on such proposals. Utility regulation is so technical that most city officials are not informed as to this subject and they naturally rely upon these experts who are informed by experience and training in this field. It was these attorneys who represented cities in securing the rate reductions under the Natural Gas Act and it is these attorneys who have represented and who are representing cities in connection with the tremendous expansion through new pipe lines of the use of natural gas all over the United States.

It cannot justly be said that these attorneys are prejudiced except in the public interest, and they are certainly most sincere when they advise city officials that the Kerr bill is not in the public interest because it would increase natural-gas rates tremendously. I therefore believe that the motives of these city officials are above reproach and that you, Mr. President, should listen most carefully to the advice they give.

At the hearings on the Moore-Risley bill and on the Kerr bill cities were represented chiefly by Miss Anne X. Alpern, city solicitor of Pittsburgh, Pa., David A. Proctor, city counselor of Kansas City, Mo., and Jerome M. Joffee, special utilities and legislative counsel of the city of Kansas City, Mo. These people are among the best informed in the United States on natural gas and its problems, and you will find their testimony set forth in full in the hearings most interesting and helpful in your consideration of this bill.

WILL THE KERR BILL INCREASE THE PRICE OF NATURAL GAS?

My attention has been called to a letter signed by Emby Kaye of Tulsa, Okla., which appears on page 10 of the March 16, 1950, edition of the Washington Post. In that letter Mr. Kaye quite correctly points out that the Federal Power Commission has never exercised its right to control the price at which gas in the field is sold. He also points out that while the price of natural gas has formerly been 3 to 4 cents per thousand cubic feet, it has recently risen to 10 cents and I might add I am informed that in some instances it has gone up to 13 cents and above and will go even higher under escalator clauses contained in nearly every contract for the sale of natural gas. (Under the usual escalator clause the producer will automatically get the highest new price paid any producer in this area. The effect of this is obvious.)

These price increases described by Mr. Kaye have come since World War II, and after pipelines have been run into California, New York, and throughout the South, West, and Midwest, with cities changing over from manfactured gas to natural gas at an expense of millions of dollars to consumers. All of this tremendous expansion came about because of the price of natural gas has been low in the past.

The producers of natural gas who are under Federal Power Commission jurisdiction, according to reliable public records at the Federal Power Commission, are practically guaranteed at least 6 percent and many of them have made much more than 20 percent on their investment under the present law which the Kerr bill emasculates. That natural-gas producers are making a lot of money and anxious to sell their gas is evidenced by the tremendous increase in applications to serve new cities just referred to. There is no lack of gas available to serve these cities, but now that these cities have either secured or will soon secure natural gas, it is quite obvious that the producers, through the Kerr bill, want to raise the price by getting out from under control of the price they will charge. This action is inequitable, to say the least, and just as in the case of the ferry operator referred to above, these natural-gas producers have city natural-gas users at their mercy. The only hope for the consumer is some over-all national control of natural-gas prices as local and State control cannot be effective under our Federal Constitution.

The users can only buy gas from the pipelines, who have in turn purchased it from the natural gas producers. They cannot go down to the corner filling station or any other place and buy natural gas. It must come through the pipelines, and must come from the only people who have it—the people who would be exempted from control by the Kerr bill.

It has not been necessary in the past for the Federal Power Commission to exercise the jurisdiction it has had under the Natural Gas Act to cut down on the prices charged by those now classified for propaganda purposes as "independent" gas producers under the Kerr bill, because, as Mr. Kaye pointed out in his letter, the price up until recent months has been most reasonable, and it is only now that the demand has been tremendously increased that the price has doubled and tripled.

The Federal Power Commission has moved in to investigate the doubling of the price of natural gas by Phillips Petroleum Co. to the city of Detroit, and to certain Wisconsin cities, including Milwaukee and Madison. This Phillips case will be the first test of the Commission's jurisdiction to roll back

to a reasonable level the charges made by the so-called "independent" Phillips Co.—one of the largest producers of natural gas in the United States. Since this case is still pending and will not be heard until May 1, 1950, it seems that at least, Mr. President, you should veto the Kerr bill so as to delay action until we find out just what the Commission will and can do in the Phillips case. Perhaps we will need to strengthen the Commission's jurisdiction when that case is over. If you sign the Kerr bill, of course, the Phillips case is ended. Was that one of the big reasons for the tremendous hurry on this bill?

NATURAL GAS IS A COMMODITY AFFECTED WITH A PUBLIC INTEREST AND SUBJECT TO PUBLIC CONTROL

I do not think it can be successfully argued that regulation of the price of natural gas is the regulation of a business which is not "affected with a public interest." The Kansas Public Utility Commission has stepped in to fix minimum prices of natural gas at 8 cents recently on the theory that the price is affected with a public interest and subject to public control. I do not think anyone will question the legal conclusion that since natural gas producers enjoy a monopoly under public protection in that they have an assured market and a guaranteed reasonable rate of return it is a business affected with a public interest. No one can, without a certificate from the Federal Power Commission step into a particular city and sell natural gas. If it were not for the privilege flowing from this monopoly certificate granted by the Federal Government these producers would not be in the unique position they enjoy. There are not several natural-gas mains laid in one city with each pleading with the householder "Please buy from me." There is only one line serving each user and that company has a monopoly for that service. The user must buy from him or do without natural gas.

A natural-gas company will thus know that all of the natural gas it can produce will come to Washington or New York or whatever market the pipe-line company to which it sells serves. There can be no competition in Washington or New York between natural-gas producers, because only one pipe-line company and only one local utility company is available to a particular user. Certainly, as already stated, on the local distribution level, the consumer cannot pick and choose between utilities to serve him natural gas. So the natural-gas producers have a monopoly and an assured market.

To try to camouflage the issue before you, Mr. President, by referring to natural gas as "local production" and terming the jurisdiction to roll back unreasonable prices as an "interference with local business" is to torture words out of their natural meaning and circumstances where they have no application. The natural-gas producers, therefore, unlike the usual private businessman has an obligation to the consumer who must use his product growing out of this monopoly and assured market, and perhaps you on the other hand have an obligation to prevent the consumer from getting natural gas too cheaply at the expense of the producer, while at the same time carrying out your obligation to prevent the producer from charging too high a price to the consumer. The only way this balancing of interests of the producer and consumer can be brought about is through the exercise of our lawmaking jurisdiction under the Federal Constitution as we have done under the Natural Gas Act of 1938 which I have already referred to. There must be some impartial public body to resolve in a fair manner the conflicting interest between users and producers and that must be a Federal agency because of the Nationwide operations in this field. If you withdraw the protecting cloak of Federal regulation to prevent unreasonable natural-gas prices, consumers are defenseless. Surely such a result cannot be allowed in good conscience. And there is no ducking this issue, Mr. President. Regardless of how many Democrats and how many Republicans voted for or against this bill, that is past now and the entire responsibility is yours. It is to you that the consumers of the Nation now look for protection. You either protect them or you let them down. There is no middle course, as everyone knows the bill cannot be passed over your veto.

THE TAX LOOPHOLE AND THE KERR BILL

Recently you recommended that the loophole in the income-tax law whereby oil millionaires are exempted from income taxes be plugged. In your message you demonstrated, for example, how these oil millionaires escape nearly all taxes on the millions they are now making. In fact, it is obvious that the only way one can become a millionaire in the United States today is through the ownership of oil and gas wells through this tax loophole.

My attention has been called to a report filed by one of the smaller gas-producing companies which gives its gross earnings, income taxes, and net income, as follows:

	Gross income	Income taxes	Net income
1949	$14,930,150	$6,949	$1,218,827
1948	12,558,038	26,052	1,366,464
1947	8,098,635	13,000	344,903
1946	6,206,101	300	106,208
1945	7,029,622	406,900	1,113,053

It seems to me that the people of the United States are already giving such a tremendous subsidy to oil and gas producers through the income-tax loophole that they should not be asked to contribute a further subsidy in the form of the estimated $200,000,000 to $500,000,000 per year which the Kerr bill would cost.

There can be argument about the amount of the increase, as it is based upon a guess by experts about how much the increase will be in the wholesale rate. As Mr. Kaye pointed out above, the wholesale rate has increased from 3 and 4 cents to more than 10 cents since the war, and it seems reasonable that the increase from the Kerr bill, brought about by the removal of all possible control of the wholesale rate paid to 86 percent of the producers will be at least 5 cents per thousand cubic feet. It is certainly arguable that the increase will be double 5 cents or even higher. At 5 cents the increase would amount to the $200,000,000 per year, and the higher increases would amount to increases accordingly.

I have already pointed out that oil and gas companies are making what many businesses would consider an excessive rate of return on their investment now. They have a guaranteed market and cannot possibly lose any money because when they drill a dry hole the expense of that is taken off of their all-too-low income tax as a business loss. It would seem to me to be a good idea that this Kerr bill be discussed at the time we consider the elimination of the tax loophole now enjoyed by these gas and oil companies. A veto would enable that joint consideration.

There simply must be a limit to the subsidy which a particular industry receives—especially an industry which is based upon nature's bounty which was put here for the benefit of all the people rather than the enrichment of a few.

I therefore most earnestly suggest that the Kerr bill should be vetoed as it is unjustified, unjust, and unreasonable in the extreme. I do not think that these oil and gas producers who have led cities on by the hope of receiving this wonderful commodity for a reasonable price should be allowed now to change their story, escape all possible regulation now that they have city users at their mercy and charge whatever prices the traffic will bear. I urge you to make a careful survey of the reaction of the users, or soon to be users, of natural gas to this bill. You will certainly hear from those users in the future if you sign this bill. Oil and gas producers are receiving more than fair treatment under the Natural Gas Act of 1938 and consumers are entitled to the same consideration—we have millions of consumers and only a very, very few gas companies. I do not mean to suggest that the millions should profit at the expense of the few. Each should be assured of fair treatment by the only device known to our constitutional system of government under the law, that is, the right to reasonable rates determined after notice and hearing by an impartial public agency such as we now have under the Natural Gas Act of 1938.

Please, Mr. President, I know that you have always thought of the little defenseless consumer, rather than the special interests back of the Kerr bill. You were elected by these little people. You are their man—not the man the oil millionaires would have elected. Your veto of the Kerr bill, I think, will tell these little people that you are still their man.

Employment for Older People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to offer some additional economic and statistical data to support the resolution I introduced on February 15, 1950, House Resolution 473, in which I asked that a select committee be created by this body to study the problems of the aging.

Employment for older people is one of the fundamental problems of aging. Continuance on a job gives the older person status or recognition among his fellows, provides financial security for him—or her—and his wife, enables him to maintain his home and preserve his health for a longer period of time, gives him something to do and opportunity to be with other people. From society's point of view, the employed older person is an economic asset, is a producer of goods or services needed by society, and is a more contented individual.

The question of employment for older people is complex. It is receiving a good deal of attention at the present time. Recognition of the problem is bringing about a reversal of the opinion that older workers should retire at an arbitrary age such as 60 or 65. There are, however, many problems to be solved before the trend in employment of older persons begins to rise.

One of these problems is the attitude, opinion, or superstition that older workers are less satisfactory than younger ones. The New York State Joint Legislative Committee has made thoroughgoing studies and lists five reasons why

employers refuse to hire older workers. These are:

1. A widespread belief among employers, but denied by many authorities, that workmen's compensation rates go up when the elderly are employed.

2. A widespread belief, denied by authoritative studies, that older workers are subject to higher accident rates and endanger other workers.

3. A widespread belief, unsupported as yet by facts, that the public prefers younger workers for jobs requiring public contacts, such as waitresses, clerks, office workers, salesmen, etc.

4. A widespread belief, repudiated by surveys made by our committee, that the elderly cannot produce as profitably as younger workers. Our committee found that when employers studied the matter three out of four agreed that elderly workers produce as much as younger workers, that they are absent less than younger workers.

5. A widespread belief that it is unprofitable to invest in the training of an older worker. Since the man of 65 has over a decade more of life today, it behooves industry to reexamine this belief.

All in all, our committee insists that many of these notions that militate against the hiring of older workers have no basis in fact, others are based on grossly exaggerated situations, and all could be combated successfully by progressive personnel measures.

Compulsory retirement based on chronological age rather than functional age—ability to do the job—is one of the most vicious factors in the life of older workers. Since there is coming to be a tendency to stigmatize organizations that have compulsory retirement programs, it is difficult to get reliable information about policies. Quasi-scientific surveys, conducted by managerial groups, have shown low proportions of firms with such requirements. A more rigorous survey by the New York State Committee showed, however, that 60 percent of all firms with a pension plan and 30 percent of all other firms had a mandatory "get-out" rule based on chronological age. About 80 percent of the firms with retirement policies set the age at 65. The National Industrial Conference Board studied 200 firms and found 65-year retirement policies in effect in 62 percent of them.

Perhaps even more vicious is the reluctance to hire older persons who become unemployed or who wish to change jobs. Discrimination often begins at 35 years of age. This low upper-age limit is said to be particularly widespread in California at the present time.

One way of measuring the effects of age discrimination is to study the distribution of unemployed who, at any one time, have exhausted their 26 weeks of unemployment compensation benefits. During a typical month in one employment office area, only 9 percent of those who had exhausted their benefits were under 45 years of age. Ninety-one percent were 45 or more and 54 percent were 65. The older worker has a very hard time getting back.

Unemployment insurance data show in general that—

(a) Older persons stay unemployed longer than younger persons.

(b) The "exhaustion rate" of unemployment insurance benefits increases as the age group rises.

(c) There is a sharp rise in the exhaustion rate for men 55 or over as compared with younger men.

(d) There is a marked increase in the unemployment period of women 35 and over as compared with younger women.

Yet the New York State committee was forced to conclude as follows:

Our committee is convinced that the rampant prejudice which bars many of our elderly workers from employment is sending many of our oldtimers to their graves before their time. We are permitting the rust of valuable skills and the loss of valuable judgment and advice. And we are removing from our productive forces some of our most brilliant and capable men and women.

The committee found—

In the survey conducted by our staff, 39 percent of the firms responding admitted they had formal age barriers, and that these obstacles to employment of the elderly ran from as low as 35 years of age to a high of 75 years of age. Public utilities, banks, and metal concerns ranked prominent among those having formal age barriers. The bulk of the companies with age barriers were large business firms. It is interesting, in this connection, to note that it was the public utilities that first adopted pension systems in this country and today virtually all public utilities have retirement programs.

Anthony Monaco, 49, was arrested on June 25, 1948, for holding up the Guttenberg Bank & Trust Co., in New Jersey. When captured, he said, "I was disgusted with everything. I could not get a job because employers do not want men who are over 40." Fortunately, most of our citizens are law abiding and will not resort to crime, but the menace that age barriers can be lies not only in the loss of production, not only in the human tragedies produced, but also in the threat to the stability of our society.

The widespread reluctance to employ older people exists despite evidence that it is an unreasonable reluctance or based on a foolish superstition. The late Edsel Ford said, during World War II:

As long as a man has judgment and ability to drive an automobile, he has the judgment and ability to operate an industrial machine. It may be true that older men are not so fast nor so strong as those in the 20-30 group, but this is more than offset by their experience, their cooler, more mature thinking, and their accuracy.

Industry must make up its mind now that it is going to emphasize the employment of those persons in the 40-and-upward group, or else the younger people will have to support their elders and themselves. That merely will aggravate the situation, for it will mean that persons will be marrying later in life and be in their middle years before the period of accumulation occurs.

Economically, it is more sound to keep able-bodied men and women earning incomes and buying goods than to place arbitrary age barriers and permit them to lapse, beyond these barriers, into senility and inaction, which is not only unfortunate but economically costly. As a matter of fact, men grow old not so much by the passage of time as by the shadow of hopelessness, the conviction of uselessness. Those who look forward to tomorrow's constructive activity have no time to grow feeble. Courage is not a matter of age or physical condition.

The Institute of Industrial Medicine at New York University-Bellevue Medical Center interviewed a number of business executives and came up with the conclusion that—

Almost invariably it was found that the worker 45 or older had a definite advantage over the younger worker in conscientiousness, actual ability, and attendance.

The eminent student of the problems of the aging, Dr. Edward J. Stieglitz, has said:

The changes which come (with age) are not all decline. I think there's a general opinion that it's all downhill. Speed of reaction does diminish, but endurance increases in certain capacities. It is not without significance that the records for all the sprints are held by youngsters, but the marathon records are held by men 38 to 45 and have been for many years. Endurance of a certain type, for the long, slow grind, the continuous type of labor situation increases. As speed declines skill is increased with practice, and as strength declines judgment increases. The mental changes are not all decline either. There is some depreciation in the ability to learn but it is extraordinarily less than the average individual assumes.

An outstanding industrial executive, Dr. Theodore G. Klumpp, points out that—

Our society has been quite illogical and inconsistent in its attitude toward the older worker. On the one hand it is apparent that we have no objection to electing and appointing older individuals to positions of the greatest responsibility in government, business, and the professions. And yet on the other hand, as far as the rank and file of workers is concerned, we have no objection to the imposition of blind, and unselective compulsory retirement rules which automatically eliminate those in the ranks who have reached the same age regardless of their fitness, ability, and contribution to the group for which they labor.

Senator Desmond—New York State—says that—

Even if some of the objections raised by industry to the employment of older workers are valid, the oldsters offer compensatory advantages over the younger employees. They have more experience which eliminates waste motions; they are less inclined toward outside distractions; they have greater conscientiousness arising from longer service and more mature attitudes.

The following are excerpts from the findings and recommendations of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Problems of the Aging—Legislative Document No. 32, 1949:

NEVER TOO OLD TO WORK

THE PLIGHT OF OUR ELDERLY

Many of our elderly are barred from employment by age barriers which bear no relation to ability. Others, beneficiaries of industry's billion-dollar-a-year pension systems, find themselves emotionally unfit or unprepared for retirement and as a result decay mentally and physically at a rapid rate.

Our hospitals lack adequate facilities for the chronically ill. Our nursing homes, which range from ill-kept boarding houses to admirably staffed and maintained domiciles, are unsupervised. Private homes for the elderly have huge waiting lists, but often the oldster cannot wait; he needs a home now. Many of our public housing projects bar older couples and single oldsters.

Old-age-assistance spending rises steadily but is far from adequate in providing a decent level of living to our unfortunate oldsters. Our old-age-insurance program still reaches only a small proportion of our senior citizens. And our country has not yet made up its mind whether it wishes to continue our dual insurance-assistance program of financial aid to the elderly or substitute a single pension system.

Our mental hospitals are jammed with senile oldsters who in many instances do not need the high-cost care of prison-like institutions but only the occasional supervision of a nurse or housekeeper. Our communities provide practically no facilities where the emotionally distressed senior citizen can obtain psychiatric help which might prevent his being institutionalized (p. 5).

* * * * *

The significance of such population trends was indicated in our first report. Social scientists foresaw an increase in the political influence of the elderly, the development of new types of consumer goods aimed at the old-age market, the redesigning of homes, and other changes.

The strength of pro-pension movements was high lighted by the fact that whereas in 1940, persons 50 and over comprised 32 percent of our voting population, in 1980 this age group will constitute 42 percent of the voters (p. 8).

* * * * *

Successful retirement is one of the most difficult achievements of a lifetime. Retirement, improperly handled, can shorten your life, turn you into a nervous wreck or unexpectedly thrust you on relief rolls. Yet few of our 26,000,000 Americans who are 45 to 64 years old are prepared for the hazards of retirement. The myth that retirement from useful activity is desirable must be exploded.

State Health Commissioner Herman E. Hilleboe has emphasized that the provision of pensions is all very well, but nothing is done to lessen the psychological shock and fear that comes when one is, so to say, thrown on the economic scrap heap. Geriatricians are virtually unanimous that premature retirement while still vigorous can be a major disease. Our own committee believes that no healthy man should retire until he is fit not only economically but also emotionally to retire.

America must learn a new concept of retirement. If this retirement period is not to become one of pain and disease, it must be one of useful activity, if not of useful hobbies then of continuation of work, perhaps on a more moderate level, perhaps involving part-time employment.

Industry would be wise to review its retirement policies now, so that they can be considered in an atmosphere of quiet cooperation rather than wait until later when sharp disputes may arise around this issue.

In "birthdays don't count," we cited the views of various authorities on this problem. The consensus was that retirement, poorly executed, can become a major disease and cause death, just as certainly as can cancer, and that—

1. There is no chronological age that should predetermine retirement.

2. You should retire only when you can afford to, have to, or want to, due to inability to continue, and then be certain you don't merely vegetate, but retire to some worthwhile activity (p. 15).

* * * * *

Our committee urges that the Federal Social Security Administration utilize its vast facilities not only for the payment of insurance checks to our aging population, but to educate the recipients in their health needs, and the need for keeping active and useful in retirement. In other words, our committee believes the Social Security Administration has a tremendous opportunity to serve not merely as a retirement-check mailing medium, but also as a channel for distribution of needed health literature (p. 22).

Frontiers in World Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you and the gentlemen of this House are all aware of the significance of World Health Day which is being celebrated this week on April 7. There is no other one thing more important to the economic development and to the encouragement of democracy in all the peace-loving nations of the world than freedom from disease and disability. Sick men cannot work, and therefore cannot contribute to their country's economic betterment. Sick men are unhappy men, and therefore are the most susceptible to the hyprocritical promises of better conditions under totalitarian regimes. It is not only humanitarian to do everything in our power to help better the health of the peoples of the world, it is an intrinsic weapon we can use in our battle to protect and extend democracy to all corners of the globe.

Much has already been done to combat disease throughout the world. The United States has played a leading part in this successful fight. But there is still much more to do, much more that can be done, by working with and strengthening existing organizations, by helping individual countries directly, and by carrying out President Truman's magnificent proposal—his point 4 program—to share our own knowledge and techniques with the less privileged areas of the world.

Dr. Leonard Scheele, the surgeon general of the United States Public Health Service, recently made an address ably presenting the public-health problems that confront us, the encouraging counterattacks that have already been made against disease, and the tasks that lie ahead in advancing the frontiers in world health.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include this address in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FRONTIERS IN WORLD HEALTH

(Address by Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General, Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, February 23, 1950, at the Round Table Club, New Orleans, La.)

Tonight I want to talk to you about the aggressive world counterattack against disease, which I believe is one of the most encouraging recent developments on the international scene.

This counterattack is urgently needed. Today at least two-thirds of the people of the world live in areas in which they are the daily prey of preventable disease. Last year, for example, at least one and one-half billion people of the world's total population of two and two-thirds billion were afflicted with illness. These ill people—notably concentrated in Asia, Africa, and Latin America—are in desperate need of more adequate health services.

Millions of them die needlessly each year. Hundreds of millions have their energies sapped by debilitating diseases which make it impossible for them to better their way of life.

Disease, moreover, is on the march. In Africa, for example, where close to 4,500,000 square miles are already rendered relatively uninhabitable by sleeping sickness, additional areas are now threatened.

FREE INFECTIOUS DISEASE INTERVENES

The health problems of the people of the economically underdeveloped areas are the common concern of the United States and the other nations of the world. Our interest is not only humanitarian. The United States, for example, has an immediate direct concern in the attack on infectious diseases at their source. Since the beginning of this century it has been increasingly recognized that the only long-range defense against the spread of disease across national boundaries is the eradication of epidemic diseases on a global basis.

We are also urgently interested in aiding the people of the underdeveloped areas to meet their health problems because improvement in their health will spur their economic development.

The people in these regions have been stirred recently by a powerful desire for a better life. If we leave them unable to fulfill their reasonable aspirations, their poverty and ill-health make them fertile for any ideology—however false—which holds out to them the promise of a fuller life.

ECONOMIC INEQUALITIES ARE DANGEROUS

Democratic ideals cannot survive in a world in which the present dangerous economic inequalities are continued and further accentuated. In terms of nations, we have learned that there is considerable truth in the old saying that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. Back in 1939—before we had embarked on the tremendous war-induced program of industrial expansion—our per capita income was $554. In that period the average citizen of one of the less-developed countries earned about $40 a year. By 1947, however, the per capita income of the United States had more than doubled, reaching the figure of $1,400, while the lot of the people of the underdeveloped areas had not improved, and in many cases had actually declined.

Thus, the glaring inequalities in the world division of the essentials of life have become progressively more apparent in the past decade. There is little doubt that one of the fundamental objectives of communism is to seize upon the misery of people of the underdeveloped areas to create suspicion and distrust of the more-favored nations.

Technical assistance to the people of the underdeveloped areas in health and other fields offers a unique opportunity to counteract what Prime Minister Nehru, of India, has called the "apathy of despair." By offering these people a tangible hope for the future we shall be giving the world an on-the-spot demonstration of democracy in action and the creative power of a free-enterprise economy.

Today it is axiomatic that economic development and public health go hand in hand. The economic development of the large areas whose population is constantly afflicted with endemic diseases is impossible without broad-scale action in the medical field. The existence of disease and disease-carrying pests has, in fact, made it impossible to open up valuable resources in many regions. It has been demonstrated that an effective public-health program will benefit all phases of a nation's life. The elimination of an endemic disease has in some cases, for example, enabled farmers to double their food production.

GREAT ADVANCES IN PUBLIC HEALTH

Fortunately, modern science has made available the means to control and conquer some of the most stubborn diseases that plague mankind. In well-developed areas, such as the United States, this half century's great progress in preventing communicable

diseases is well known. However, the application of much of this new medical knowledge is still limited to the better developed areas. The lack of modern water and sewerage systems, for instance, is largely responsible for the existing high rates of typhoid fever, dysenteries, cholera, hookworm, and other diseases in wide areas. The use of even rudimentary sanitary methods in water supply and waste disposal can substantially control these diseases as crucial health problems.

Other diseases, such as malaria, the venereal diseases, and tuberculosis, are also highly vulnerable to planned attack. World health experts have concluded, for example, that if an effective campaign were waged against malaria in all of the malarious areas concurrently, human malaria would totally disappear in a few years.

Each year malaria is being dramatically conquered in one area after another through the use of the new insecticides, such as DDT. Nevertheless, the disease still causes hundreds of millions of preventable cases and millions of needless deaths. In India, close to two million deaths have been recorded as caused by malaria in 1 year, and the problem is equally grave in many other countries.

MALARIA CONTROL URGENT PROBLEM

The World Health Organization has given malaria control a high priority because the serious loss in working efficiency among malaria-ridden populations contributes greatly to the desperate shortage of food in many areas. Today, with the population of the world increasing at a rate estimated at 25 millions a year—greater than ever before—and the world food shortage becoming more critical, the urgency of malaria control as an economic measure alone is evident.

Striking examples of the economic advancement which is made possible by successful campaigns against malaria, cholera, typhus, and other diseases are afforded by recent attacks on these health problems.

Until recently, for example, Greece had been one of the most heavily infested malaria areas in the world. In 1946 UNRRA introduced the modern method of malaria control and began a campaign which has since been carried on by the United States Public Health Service personnel in the ECA mission to Greece in cooperation with the Greek Government. Principal reliance has been placed in residual spraying of homes and stables, although DDT spraying from planes has also been conducted in a few malaria areas.

IMPORTANT ECONOMIC EFFECTS

Today we are able to see the results. Whereas in 1942 there were at least 2,000,000 cases of malaria in Greece, in 1949 the incidence of the disease had been reduced below 50,000, and the greater part of the country is now free of malaria and no longer needs spraying. It is reliably estimated that from thirty to sixty million man-workdays a year have been saved by the operation. This would be equivalent to adding several hundred thousand workers to the nation's productive force—without the addition of more mouths to feed.

Similar results have been achieved by the campaigns against malaria in Brazil, Egypt, the Philippines, Haiti, and other areas.

In 1930 the deadly Anopheles gambiae mosquito, the world's most efficient malaria vector, was introduced into Brazil from its home in the African tropical belt. The disease spread from Natal and brought death and crippling illness to a 12,000-mile area in an epidemic which reached its peak in 1939 when 114,000 persons were treated for the disease. A 2-year campaign by the Brazilian Government, conducted with the assistance of the Rockefeller Foundation, brought the disease under control and made possible the resumption of the economic development of the region.

EGYPT CONQUERS MALARIA

In 1942, this same mosquito started another invasion, this time northward through the Nile Valley, pushing its attack to within 200 miles of Cairo and causing the worst epidemic in Egypt's history. In some areas as many as 90 percent of the people were ill at one time. Health authorities estimated that about 135,000 people died from malaria in that region in 1942 and 1943.

Commencing in 1944, the Egyptian Government with the advice of only four American malaria experts, had by February 1945, completely eradicated the gambiae mosquito in the infested areas and it has not since reappeared.

Some indication of the economic loss caused by the disease is given by the fact that one Egyptian plantation alone suffered a monetary loss in 2 years of about $600,000—representing among other things the loss of one-half the wheat crop and one-third the sugar crop.

CHOLERA AND TYPHUS FOUGHT

Equally effective campaigns have been conducted against such diseases as cholera and typhus. In 1947, for example, the economic life of lower Egypt was disorganized as the result of the rapid spread of cholera which suddenly appeared in that area. The World Health Organization was called on for help. Vaccines were flown in immediately from New York, then from many other areas and cholera experts were dispatched from various countries. Despite the violence of the outbreak, the disease was brought under control in less than 2 months.

Hookworm is a disease which also seriously interferes with the economic life of many areas. The Institute of Inter-American Affairs has assisted in a cooperative campaign against this disease in one area of Peru which has resulted in the reduction in the number of school children infected with the parasite from 59 to 38 percent.

The great work done in the Southern States of the United States in the sharp reduction of hookworm must also be recognized as contributing greatly to the economic potential of the people.

I have cited these instances of successful control programs against various diseases to illustrate the fact that we have the scientific knowledge and techniques at hand to embark on a broad program of technical assistance in the health field for the people of the underdeveloped areas.

POINT 4 PROGRAM IMPORTANT

President Truman vividly summarized the possibilities inherent in our American know-how in the fields of health, agriculture, and industry when he proposed his now world-famous point 4 program of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. "For the first time in history," the President said, "humanity possesses the knowledge and skill to relieve the sufferings of these people."

The various inter-American health programs in which the United States has played a leading role have developed tested procedures and practical methods for meeting health problems on a cooperative basis.

The United States Public Health Service has cooperated closely for a number of years with the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, now also serving as the regional office for WHO in the Western Hemisphere. Under the programs sponsored by the Bureau, United States experts have been detailed on scores of assignments to other American republics and hundreds of Latin Americans have been given training in this country. These activities over the past 40 years have aided materially in strengthening and expanding national health services in Latin America.

Through these multilateral programs we have developed the practical procedures which will undoubtedly constitute a basic guide for the proposed health projects under point 4. In that sense, therefore, point 4 is not a new concept in the health field. However, point 4 is both bold and new in the sense that for the first time all world agencies will be directed toward a common end in a coordinated effort to raise the health and living standards of the underdeveloped areas of the world.

WORLD HEALTH PROGRAM IMPORTANT

We are now entering the second half of the twentieth century. The first half of this century has been one of the most eventful periods of man's history. On the debit side of the ledger it has been a period of disastrous wars that have threatened the very fabric of our existence. But it has also been a period of the most amazing scientific progress. We have probably added more to our scientific knowledge in the past 50 years than in any previous 200-year period. And the pace of our conquest of the fundamental secrets of nature and life at an ever-accelerating pace.

We have it within our power to use this knowledge for the creation of a stable and healthy world. We also have the potential power to destroy not only our civilization but all mankind. The world today is in the process of making the choice.

In this critical period we need to start a chain reaction which will create rather than destroy. I believe that in the proposal of expanded technical assistance to help all the world's people better their lives, we have the ingredients necessary to inspire such a creative chain reaction.

As a matter of fact, I venture to predict that when future historians assess the events of our time they shall recognize the beginning of the world program of health betterment which we are now witnessing as one of the most dynamic and far-reaching actions of our era.

Our Help in Ages Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Olean (N. Y.) Times-Herald:

OUR HELP IN AGES PAST

Following President Truman's announcement that this country will manufacture the superpowerful hydrogen bomb, correspondents in the National Capital queried various legislators as to their reactions.

And all of them—with one exception—expressed views on the matter that came from military or political standpoints, or both.

The one exception was Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of Rochester, N. Y., who expressed the conviction that, with such a weapon in the hands of mortals, the only hope for the salvation of the world would be through prayer.

"The President's decision emphasizes the imperative need for men and women of good will the world over to unite in a vast peace crusade before it is too late," declared the Congressman.

"Only on our knees, each praying to the one God according to the dictates of his own faith, can we hope to save the world from a fate too horrible to contemplate."

He is right, of course.

But he doesn't mean that we should discard the means—every possible means—of national protection.

Representative KEATING knows as well as anyone else that if it were possible for men and women of good will all over the world to unite in a vast peace crusade the tension under which the human race now is laboring would be lifted almost overnight.

The trouble is, of course, that the people who exist under ruthless dictatorships are not able to unite with those of other nations in such a crusade.

Their rulers, who will adopt every method—including wholesale murder—to maintain their power, will cut off all means of outside communication, and will delude them that the very people who are desirous of peace and who are the champions of a democratic regime of freedom for the individual are conniving to make war upon them and enslave them.

The Russian people, the rank and file of the people, want peace just as ardently as do those of any other country.

But the "menace" of "imperialist America" continually is being drilled into their consciousness. They have come to look upon this country as a natural and relentless enemy; and the little group of conscienceless men in Moscow, to further their own ambitions and strengthen their grip of power, will see to it that such an attitude is maintained.

Before there can be world peace, the Russian people must see the light.

How that will come about must remain to be seen, but miracles have happened before, and miracles will happen again.

In the meantime, we who believe in the dignity of man and sanctity of individual freedom, may well remember the observation of Representative KEATING, that "only on our knees, each praying to the one God according to the dictates of his own faith, can we hope to save the world from a fate too horrible to contemplate."

Congressional Greetings to Young America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the district of Illinois which I have the honor to represent is located the Harvard School for Boys. It is a private school of high standing in a community noted for its educational institutions. This week a delegation of young men from this school are visting Washington and as they sit in the galleries above us, watching perhaps for the first time the functioning of our democracy in this greatest legislative body in the world, I know that my colleagues would wish to join with me in an expression of welcome. We are happy that they are with us and especially at this time when a great and a historic debate is being staged in this Chamber which has been the theater of action of so many of the immortals of American history. The debate to which they are listening, I might say to these young men from the Harvard School for Boys in the Second District of Illinois, is historic in that the bill under discussion is the omnibus appropriation bill and this is the first time in the history of the Congress that all the appropriations of the Federal money for the many necessary purposes of our Government, upon which the stability of the entire world rests, are covered in one bill instead of a number of bills as was the custom during the years. Combining all the appropriations in one bill, and providing for all the expenditures of the richest and most powerful country in all recorded history, it is, of course, the largest appropriation bill ever considered in any legislative body. We are glad to have the young men from the Harvard School for Boys with us at this time and to pause for the moment in the very serious business before us to give them a word of welcome.

The young men are William Aronson, Robert Daskal, James Droege, Leon Fein, Joel Goldberg, Peter Handler, Andrew Karzas, Allan Kulp, Edward Lang, James Leven, James Lindsay, Robert Propp, Lester Senechalle, Michael Vick, and Stebbins Younger.

Their chaperone is Miss Yvonne Marie Arnold.

Unpartisan—Not Bipartisan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial by David Lawrence which appeared in the United States News and World Report of April 7, 1950. It is well known that our so-called bipartisan foreign policy has never been truly bipartisan. Although it has been generally supported by the Republicans, it has long been my feeling that both major parties should also have a share in initiating major policy decisions. The article by Mr. Lawrence offers constructive thinking with respect to bipartisan policy, and I commend it to the attention of the Members of Congress. It is as follows:

UNPARTISAN—NOT BIPARTISAN

(By David Lawrence)

The term "bipartisan" has been loosely used in recent months to describe procedures that actually have never been followed.

The general impression is that Republicans and Democrats sit down together in the Department of State regularly, discuss all the available facts and then decide jointly on a major policy. This has never been true.

Day-by-day decisions on policies of a far-reaching nature are made only by the Secretary of State and his assistants. Members of either party in Congress rarely learn about the inside of these matters.

Sometimes Republicans are invited by the administration to participate as members of international conferences abroad. This is done to win minority votes in Congress on a few measures on which commitments have already been made and which require ratification or the appropriation of funds.

The making of foreign policy in a large sense, however, is an executive function. Strictly speaking, under our Constitution, there is and can be no such thing as a bipartisan foreign policy. The people must be able to hold a President or his party in Congress accountable at the polls for failure to adopt constructive policies that can lead to peace in the world or for bungling policies that can lead to a world war. There must be no place for the bipartisan alibi which seeks to anesthetize political opposition or shift the blame for mistakes made.

It is one of the weaknesses of our system and one of the strong points of the parliamentary system that the power to make foreign policy is concentrated solely in the Executive in this country, as contrasted with England and the various British commonwealths where foreign policy is made by the legislative leadership which wields the executive power but can be checked instantly by the people in elections that can be ordered at any time.

In America, no matter how many outside consultants or Republican Members of Congress are taken along on trips to international conferences or are occasionally invited to the office of the Secretary of State for discussion, policy making remains the responsibility of the majority party. This was made clear by Senator TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, in an interview appearing in our March 31 issue, when he said:

"I don't think the minority can initiate or control foreign policy. But you can, of course, criticise this or that policy. We can't reverse a foreign policy, for it's in the hands of the President of the United States. We can't shape foreign policy at all. All we can do is to act as an effective brake on some of these bad tendencies. And, of course, individuals may express individual views of what they would do."

The minority party, therefore, must remain free to criticize the international as well as national policies of an administration. To hold otherwise is to advocate a conformity and oneness of view which is contrary to the basic philosophy of our republican form of government.

The specious argument is often made nevertheless that, since a nation must present a united front as against other powers, it gives an impression of division if criticism is voiced in Congress or elsewhere. This confuses discussion with action. Freedom of debate should be encouraged so that when a substantial majority—composed of both Republicans and Democrats—finally votes for a given policy, it is revealed as a free choice and not an imposed will.

What is needed, of course, is a foreign policy developed as a result of an unpartisan approach. This means that not only Republicans must refrain from asserting views merely for the sake of partisanship but that Democrats, too—including the President in this instance—must refrain from seeking political credit at the polls for measures made possible by Republican votes in Congress.

It is important also that Democrats should not, as a smokescreen to cloud free discussion, cry out that critics of the administration's policies are giving aid and comfort to Russia. It is, of course, illogical for the Republicans to characterize as Communists those officials in the Department of State who blundered in forsaking the Nationalists as the Communists rose to power in China. But it is equally illogical for President Truman or anyone else in the administration to declare that efforts by the Republicans to crusade against Communist influence inside our Government are of aid to the Kremlin. There is far more aid and comfort for Stalin when he sees in America the beginnings of a vindication of his doctrine of one-party totalitarianism—as witnessed in the attempts being made currently to denounce criticism as unpatriotic—than when he reads that the minority in Congress is concerning itself with measures to rid our Government of Communist sympathisers.

Let us recognize that, while both parties cannot participate in the formulation of international policy, the two parties can, by freedom of debate and an impartial examination of the issues, create the public opinion needed to reject an unwise, or to support a wise, policy in international affairs.

The Yalta Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following book review of Roosevelt and the Russians, the report by Edward R. Stettinius of his observations as Secretary of State. The review is from the New Leader and was written by Felix Wittmer, an anti-Nazi German persecuted by Hitler and now teaching at Montclair (N. J.) Teachers College. Since most of our troubles today stem from the incredible mistakes of judgment and violations of principle made at the Yalta Conference, it is important to our future that we better understand our past:

THE YALTA CONFERENCE

(Roosevelt and the Russians, by Edward R. Stettinius, edited by Walter Johnson. Reviewed by Felix Wittmer)

This book offers ample evidence that Stalin and Molotov, at the Yalta Conference, were determined to obtain 10 main objectives:

1. Weaken Germany through dismemberment so thoroughly that she could never be turned into a bulwark against communism.

2. Have the west agree to the most crushing amount of German reparations possible.

3. Push Poland much farther west than seemed reasonable to Churchill and Roosevelt.

4. Replace basically the Polish Government in exile by the Soviet-sponsored so-called Lublin government.

5. Obtain spheres of influence in the Balkans.

6. Prevent setting up of delible machinery for free elections in the east European countries.

7. Postpone participation in the war with Japan to the last moment, but make certain to get into the fracas.

8. Act as if the Soviet Union needed to be coaxed into far-eastern military operations and, through such deception, strike a bargain.

9. Make efficiency of future United Nations Organization, as an instrument to prevent war, illusory.

10. Put every bit of western concessions down in clear terms, but leave any point of disagreement vague and wide open.

Even though Mr. Stettinius attempts to whitewash our tragic failure at Yalta, his book proves that Stalin and Molotov have scored on every one of the 10 principal issues. Yet, Mr. Stettinius—to the delight and everlasting gratitude of the Pegler-Burn and the Pravda boys—assures us (p. ix) that "the Soviet Union made more concessions to the United States and Great Britain than were made to the Soviet Union by either the United States or Great Britain." Let us look at the facts and data, as recorded by the former Secretary of State himself.

Point 1: We readily agreed with the Russians on German zones for we did not dare adopt the long Soviet view of the final conflict between proletarian Communist world revolution and the parliamentarian-imperialist-capitalist-bourgeois-etc. nations. We banned from our mind even the shadow of the thought that the total weakening of Germany might turn out to be a political triumph of Stalinoid world revolution.

Point 2: No matter how hard we tried to convince the Russian negotiators that reparations perpetuate chaotic conditions, we agreed to have the sum of $20,000,000,000 for German reparations mentioned in the—supposedly secret—protocol, as a basis for discussion.

Point 3: Without the consent of the Polish Government in London, we agreed to the cession of eastern Poland to Russia. Our hope that we might at least save the city of Lwow for Poland was frustrated. Since the Russians wanted Poland's western frontiers far nearer to Berlin than seemed good to us, it was decided that the final delimitation of the western frontier of Poland should thereafter await the peace conference.

Point 4: When Russia would not even listen to any discussion about recognizing the widely representative Polish Government-in-Exile as the basis of Poland's future government, we captitulated. All talk about changing the term "enlargement" of the Lublin Government into "reorganization" is so much piffle. Ingenuously, Mr. Stettinius explains, "As a result of this military situation, it was not a question of what Great Britain and the United States would permit Russia to do in Poland, but what the two countries could persuade the Soviet Union to accept" (p. 301). In other words, in the friendly cooperative atmosphere of Yalta, which the author vaunts, we yielded to force.

Point 5: The actual though not nominal division of the Balkans into spheres of influence, which led to Soviet absorption of Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria, was arranged by Mr. Churchill with Roosevelt's approval of "a 3-months' trial." That after a few months' operation of the Communist secret police our game would be lost, is not mentioned in the ex-Secretary's book. The author does admit that President Roosevelt acted "without consulting the State Department" (p. 12).

Throughout the book it becomes manifest that in intricate matters, often misnamed "purely military," President Roosevelt, either alone, or through Harry Hopkins, negotiated directly with Stalin, without informing the State Department, i. e., Secretary Stettinius. The author urbanely calls that the "faulty liaison between the White House and the Department of State."

Point 6: While earlier drafts of the paragraphs on Poland emphasize the "responsibility" of our western ministers in regard to free elections, the final draft of the Protocol is sufficiently watered down merely to refer to "ambassadors by whose reports the respective governments will be kept informed about the situation in Poland." Whatever was worked out concerning Yugoslavia was clothed in the form of a recommendation only.

Points 7 and 8: It has apparently never entered the mind of Mr. Stettinius that in the light of 2,200 years of Chinese history, the basic realities of Leninism-Stalinism, and the most elementary information on ideological warfare, we should have done everything in our power to prevent the Soviet Union from participating in the war against Japan. From every bit of evidence, the author is still today unacquainted with these primary matters. Thus, he tells us that "President Roosevelt and the War Department had assigned Harriman the task of discovering (sic!) what was necessary to bring Russia into the far eastern war."

Although in more than 2,000 years of history China again and again was conquered by those who possessed themselves of the northern provinces of the nation, we gave the Soviet Union a hold on Port Arthur and the Manchurian railroads, and threw in the strategically important Kurile Islands for good measure. Although any far-eastern expert who is not politically color blind could know as early as 1927 that the Chinese Communist leaders were trained, financed, and controlled by Moscow, we opened the door to world revolution.

It is of course true, as we know from Henry L. Stimson and McGeorge Bundy (On Active Service in Peace and War) that our military authorities, even as late as July, 1945, urged Russian military cooperation against Japan. However, to subordinate long-term political requirements to military operations indicates absence of statesmanship. There is no evidence that anyone in the State Department warned our President against the coming far-eastern disaster. Mr. Roosevelt listened to the generals, Harry Hopkins, and his inner voice; Mr. Stettinius practiced rigorous silence.

Point 9: To have the United Nations veto excluded from procedural discussions was no fundamental gain on our part. Essentially, the veto power, in concerns of economic and military sanctions, is the blatant expression of the cleavage between the Communist world and ours. No attempt was made on either side to bring about enforcement guaranties of peace. The United Nations Organization was outlined as a facade, just as Mr. Stettinius served as a facade for the President.

Point 10: Whenever the Russian negotiators could not have their way, Molotov, according to the author, "could not go any further." Thus, Poland's western frontier was not determined. Everyone of our wishes regarding Iran was shelved. Vital matters concerning Yugoslavia, Italy, Bulgaria, and Austria were left to "future consideration."

What did we gain in what Mr. Stettinius euphemistically named a "compromise"? Was it really such a great concession on the part of the Soviet Union to permit France a seat on the Allied Control Commission of Germany? Was it any political victory of ours to have only 3 instead of 16 Soviet Russian republics represented in the General Assembly? Had not primary security already been lost through the establishment of the veto power?

Yet, Mr. Stettinius goes on record agreeing with his superior that "the Soviet Union had decided to take its place in the United Nations family as a good citizen." (Reporting to Getulio Vargas, p. 307.) Like the equally well-meaning and personally pleasant non-expert James F. Byrnes he put his trust in unity through compromise. He might have done well to recall (or learn about) Plekhanov who once said that "Lenin desires unity as a man desires unity with a piece of bread: he swallows it." Stalin does not admit a single instance where he would deviate from the gospel truth of Lenin strategy and tactics.

In the humble opinion of this reviewer, only the appendix of Roosevelt and the Russians is of any positive value: it contains the otherwise unavailable official documents of the Yalta Conference. The book itself—some 330 pages—offers 300 pages of dreary, semi-official description of surface matters, and 30 pages of faulty, shallow, naive, and incredible apologia.

Carefully, the author has avoided any probing of the preponderant and basal issues. He has regaled us with a pageant of externals, such as the custom-built elevator of the Sacred Cow, Stalin's large black Packard limousine, Churchill's freshly-lit 8-inch cigar, and a Russian dinner consisting of 8 courses and 45 toasts.

Mexican Oil Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been apparent to me for a long time that the State Department is not in favor of a loan to Mexico to improve or expand its facilities for developing its oil reserves. This is difficult to understand in view of the mutual benefits that would result to both Mexico and the United States. It is particularly difficult to understand our State Department policy in this matter in view of the generally recognized interest of President Truman which, on more than one occasion, has seemed to indicate his favorable attitude.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House at the present time is conducting a series of hearings on the question of a petroleum policy for the United States. Yesterday it had the privilege of hearing testimony given by Willard Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State. During his testimony it was developed that our State Department had submitted to the Government of Mexico an aide-memoire on the subject of a possible loan to Mexico by our Government and that it contained two or more conditions or suggestions to be met or at least considered preliminary to any favorable action by our Government. It further appeared that these suggestions had been very displeasing to the Mexican Government and as a result all negotiations had been discontinued. The questions and answers during the examination of Mr. Thorp were very illuminating and at times approached what may be termed as "double talk."

Without going into all of these matters at this time I am including in my remarks the following portion of the record of the hearing which gives in a summary way an analysis of the situation:

Mr. WOLVERTON. We have made loans right along to Britain that we never expect to get paid back, or we have made advances to them.

What I want to know, and the time is getting short—what I am getting at is this, this committee started its investigation of the fuel problem in 1947 when there was a very distinct shortage in this country. We had before us the leading representatives of large companies. The question was, Where can we get oil? There was not a single witness out of the number who appeared who made any reference whatsoever to Mexico as a possible source of supply. Of course, the Near East was mentioned, and Venezuela was mentioned, but never Mexico. Without any previous thought on the subject it seemed to me significant, and I merely asked the question, What about Mexico as a source of supply? Well, there was a degree of consternation when I wanted to consider Mexico.

That led me to make some study of the subject, and I have read very considerable upon it, and I came to the conclusion that there was a very definite policy on the part of some companies, and which I regret seemed to have been carried out by the State Department, so that obstacles were thrown in the way of developing the oil resources of Mexico.

This undoubtedly grew out of the expropriation in 1938, but whatever may have been the cause, they insisted that there was a lack of desire to consider Mexico as a possible source of supply.

From that time to this there has been an ever-accumulating amount of evidence, so far as I have been able to observe, of effort on the part of the State Department to stop any real consideration of Mexico as a source of supply.

Now, I will tell you why I thought that the State Department should have been more interested in it than it was. There are two reasons. First, at that time, the economic stability of Mexico was not as stable as some would have liked to have seen it. The peso was dropping in value, and oil was an asset that they could have utilized to advantage. The other was the military consideration, having in mind that in the case of emergency, as you have stated in your statement today, we would not have sufficient oil in the United States, and would have to get it from the outside, and there was no place where we could get it with greater assurance than from Mexico, because with the use of pipe lines the tanker situation could be eliminated. Furthermore, if tankers were used, they could operate across the Atlantic from one side of Mexico, and they could operate across the Pacific on the other side, so that it had a very strategic military value.

It seems to me from an economic and from a military standpoint that favorable consideration should be given to a country which makes application for a loan, not a gift, but a loan where any businessman would be willing to recognize its value.

Mexico has paid its other loans that it got either from private or public sources, and there is no doubt in anybody's mind, as far as I have heard, and no one has raised the question that this would not be paid back.

Now, it comes down to the point where application was made to our committee, after our visit to Mexico, by the Cromwell firm, through an appointment made by Mr. Allen Dulles, not John Dulles, who is his brother—in fact they are both in the same firm.

Mr. HARRIS. You are speaking of John Foster Dulles?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Yes, that is his full name. Instead of Mr. Allen Dulles appearing he sent Mr. Miller, who is now Secretary or Assistant Secretary in charge of Latin-American Affairs in the State Department. He wanted us to put in our report the very same suggestion that now appears in the aide-memoire. We refused to do it, thinking we were not a collection agency.

It then appears that after our committee refused to do it application was made to the State Department. That would be in the spring of 1949.

Now, from that time to this there has been nothing done except that after Mr. Miller had presented the claim, or Cromwell & Sullivan had presented the claim, to the State Department, he was appointed Assistant Secretary on the 28th of May, and on the 28th of June he was confirmed, and within 10 days after his confirmation this aide-memoire went to Mexico, with that claim in it that attention should be given to a large claim.

Subsequently to that, as you must be aware, or, if not, I hope that you will refresh your mind upon it, you will find that the Mexican Government objected to the conditions or suggestions, whichever you wish to term them, that had been laid down in the aide memoire, and that closed negotiations.

It then became the subject matter of a conference that the President held with newspapermen, and the question was asked time and again, have negotiations ceased? The President at all times indicated his interest in the matter, and I have all of those news reports before me right here if your mind needs refreshing. He indicated his interest in the loan to Mexico, and said negotiations would be carried on.

Now, here we are in April of 1950. Eight months have elapsed since the President said that the negotiations would be inaugurated or reestablished, and nothing more has been done than was done at this time a year ago before Mr. Miller went into the Department. Now, are negotiations going on or are they not? If they are going on, is the President aware of the fact that in the aide memoire some conditions particularly were laid down that were offensive to the Mexican Government; one, a suggestion about basic policy, which I think you will find in their answer, meant a change of their laws, and another, a reference to this blackjack method of settlement of claims in a matter that had no relationship to it whatever.

What I would like to know is this. You say that conferences were held, three of them, by the Secretary of State and the President. You think two of them were before the aide memoire and one must have been subsequent. Under those circumstances, it might be inferred that the Sabalo matter was spoken of to the President. I wish you would refresh your mind on that, as to whether the President ever saw the aide-memoire.

I think I can discern from the statements that have been made by the President on his visit to Mexico, which improved our relationship considerably—as well as the visit of the President of Mexico to this country—and from the interest that the President has displayed in this matter, something that has led me to the conclusion—and if I am wrong, I am glad to be corrected and to know what the situation really is—but I am of the opinion that, notwithstanding the President's interest in this matter, the State Department has been sabotaging his effort all the way along. We are just spending time running around on this matter. The chairman of this committee, Mr. CROSSER, made innumerable visits to the State Department and to the White House, and yet nothing has been done, notwithstanding what seemed to be favorable opinions that were expressed. I am just unable to understand anything other than that the State Department is using double talk.

I am interested in this from the standpoint of having a friendly neighbor to the south, as we have one to the north. We are spending billions of dollars abroad; and I have supported those programs. We are spending that money to head off communism and collapse of governments on the other side. If we can do it abroad, I cannot see why it is not far more important to do it on this side of the water, in connection with a country that is a neighbor of ours, so that we may have friendly neighbors on the north and on the south of us. I do not believe the matter has had the serious consideration that its importance entitles it to have.

Now, I have a hundred more questions I would like to ask. May I inquire whether Mr. Thorp, after he has refreshed his mind on some of these matters, will be back or not? What I am trying to get is this: What is the policy of the State Department with reference to oil? Is it to advance one? Is it to thrust down another? Is it to help here and to refuse to help elsewhere? Are we playing favorites in this game? I see now that Argentina is coming into the picture, and there is this situation that you have referred to about the British, and so on.

It seems that we are considering everybody except our nearest neighbor. I think it is time that we began to think of the Western Hemispere as well as any other hemisphere in this world of ours, from the standpoint of any emergency that might happen.

May I say, before I finish, that I would recommend as reading to the State Department the speeches and the statements that

were made by President Roosevelt dealing with petroleum in Mexico. I would suggest particularly that you read the book published under the title "Shirt Sleeve Diplomat, Josephus Daniels, Ambassador to Mexico, 1933–42." It is one of the finest expositions of what, in my opinion, should be the good-neighbor policy, that I have read. I wish the State Department would make itself familiar with the viewpoint of that great Ambassador from this country.

There is another book, a very small one, called Mexican Oil: A Symbol of Recent Trends in International Relations, written by Harlow S. Pearson, Ph. D., which refers to the background, and so forth, of the settlement that was made on the expropriation claims for damages; and see what our Secretary of State had to say in that connection about the rights of Mexico, and so forth.

It seems to me that it would be good reading, and it would be helpful reading, in formulating a good-neighbor policy which, it seems to me, we are in a good way to wreck if we continue on the course we are now pursuing. And if you run out of reading, I can give you the names of a few more books.

Mr. HESELTON. I might suggest that we read the gentleman's [Mr. WOLVERTON] speech.

Mr. HARRIS. Gentlemen, I promised Mr. Thorp that we would adjourn this meeting shortly after 12 o'clock, because he had a funeral that he had to attend. Of course, our good friend and distinguished colleague, for whom we have the greatest admiration, has taken about 20 minutes with his remarks without having given the witness an opportunity to answer. I realize that the gentleman has questions that he wants the witness to answer, but it is obvious that we will have to conclude the hearings for today. I know there are other members of the committee who have some questions in their mind that they want to ask in connection with your statement here today.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for having taken so much time. I certainly appreciate the opportunity that you gave me in making a lengthy statement without asking questions; it was with the idea of giving the witness some inkling of what was in my mind, and of giving him the opportunity to be prepared when he returns as a witness.

The thing I am interested in is this: Is the President of the United States familiar with the aide-memoire? You have said he was. I would like to hear somebody in a position to say that. I have my doubts.

Mr. HARRIS. In all fairness to the witness before us, he had advised that, so far as he knows, the President has been kept advised of these matters in connection with the Mexican Government. Perhaps the question, in all fairness to the witness, should be directed to another source. Nevertheless, these matters are of great importance in maintaining a consistent policy of our Government on international business, wherever it takes place, in connection with our own national security and making available ample supplies of petroleum to help improve the economic condition of our country. These questions are of tremendous importance to the members of the committee, and we realize that they involve fundamental policies on which there might be divergencies of opinion.

I assume that Mr. Thorp will be glad to return at some convenient time.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I would not want the chairman to think that my only interest is Mexico. I have made a study of this from the standpoint of Venezuela and some of these other countries as well, including far-eastern countries. Mexico is not the only country in which I am interested.

Mr. HARRIS. Everyone knows of the interest that the gentleman from New Jersey has in the subject of petroleum, and in the economic stability of our friendly neighbors and other nations of the world, as well as our own economic stability. We know of the great amount of work the gentleman has done on this problem as it affects our own relationships with Mexico and other nations of the world. I think the committee and the Congress and the country are very fortunate in having a man with the ability and experience of our distinguished colleague here on this committee. At the same time, and with all due deference, there is the question of the State Department carrying on this matter in the usual way, taking into consideration the relationship of this country with other countries, having in mind our own free-enterprise system and the opportunity of our own capital to expand, wherever it might be helpful to us. This is a broad, serious policy question, and one that deserves every possible consideration.

Mr. THORP. Mr. Chairman, may I say just two sentences to complete the record on one point?

Mr. HARRIS. Very well.

Mr. THORP. Namely, that when Mr. Miller was appointed Assistant Secretary in the State Department, he immediately disqualified himself from all matters relating to the Mexican petroleum situation; and he has not participated in any way in those matters since he came into the State Department.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Did he participate in the State Department discussions before he went into the Department?

Mr. THORP. No, sir.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Who did on behalf of Cromwell & Sullivan?

Mr. THORP. As far as I am concerned, I only recall seeing Mr. Dulles.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Allen Dulles?

Mr. THORP. Allen Dulles.

Mr. HARRIS. It may be that after the memorandum on this particular claim is presented, which you have stated you would present, the matter will be cleared up. Thank you very much, Mr. Thorp. The committee now stands adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)

Centennial of Clinton, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include two excerpts from the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item containing the remarks, in part, of the Honorable Paul A. Dever, Governor, and the Honorable Charles F. (Jeff) Sullivan, Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at the centennial banquet of my home town of Clinton on March 14.

The excerpts follow:

"The city of Cambridge is famous for many things. In education particularly has this great city achieved noteworthy and world-wide repute," said Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, toastmaster, in introducing Gov. Paul A. Dever.

"But Cambridge is also famous as the city of governors. The most recent of these leading citizens of University City honors us with his presence tonight. He has many warm friends here. He comes as the esteemed chief executive of our beloved Commonwealth.

"His career eloquently symbolizes the opportunity the Nation affords to those possessed of the will and capacity to forge ahead despite the handicaps which humble beginnings so frequently impose.

"Endowed with great ability, vigorous and energetic, outstanding before the bar, seasoned legislator in the general court, former distinguished Attorney-General of the Commonwealth, uncompromising advocate of the cause of labor, able and humane, his record is one of brilliant achievement and service.

"I am happy, honored, and proud to present to respond to the toast, 'Clinton and our Commonwealth,' our great Governor—the Hon. Paul A. Dever."

Gov. Paul A. Dever, responding to the toast, "Massachusetts," said:

"There is one thing of which I am reasonably certain, tonight. I am about to extend a greeting to the town of Clinton to which I feel sure she will never be able to reciprocate in kind. A one hundredth birthday is truly an occasion to observe. I congratulate Clinton, and I extend to her the sincere greetings of the Commonwealth.

"Tonight, I feel that I am among friends, and it is a pleasant feeling. Clinton has been very kind to me. Even during those times when fate did not lend its smile to my political aspirations, the people of Clinton stood by me—and what is better evidence of a real friend?

"So it is needless for me to say I enjoy being with you, tonight. I will always enjoy being with you.

"Last year, with the help of people like you, I was honored with the highest privilege obtainable by a citizen of this Commonwealth. I became your Governor; and as such I became charged with the solemn responsibility of managing your affairs in our State government."

PROMOTING THE COMMON GOOD

"I have worked hard since that time to warrant the confidence you were so kind to impose in me. Goaded by the desire to reward that confidence with good works, I have taken into consideration the probable effects of my program on the people as a whole. It has been my sincere desire to make fairness my guiding principle, and the public welfare my goal. Within the powers which Providence has allowed me, I have exerted my every energy to put into action those principles of government which are inherent in my philosophy, a philosophy which dictates that government must not be stagnant, but must rather through affirmative action promote the common good.

"In these days of conflicting thought, when the very fiber of our democratic existence is being put to a most crucial test, it is imperative that we adjust our mode of government to the conditions which surround us. The strength of democracy lies in its flexibility. We are no longer a country with a wide frontier to take up the slack of limited opportunity. The frontier vanished in 1890. Our new frontier must of necessity be found in the legislative chambers of our Federal, State, and local governments. It is their responsibility to mold into its proper form the pattern of society which will offer to all our citizens the equality of opportunity which is so commendable an objective of American democracy.

"To strive toward that objective has been my constant aim. * * *"

* * * * *

"Our acomplishments during the past year have been many. They are doubly significant when we consider the forces which have worked against them. There are those in our society to whom Congress is odious.

"The status quo is to them an idol to be worshiped, for under it they are able to continue their grabbing ways and realize their selfish ambitions. To them personal gain

transcends governmental obligations. To them a twisted mind, or a hungry belly, or a substandard home is something to be tolerated but not to be remedied.

"In their narrowness they lose sight of their own welfare and feed those forces which would harass and subdue us. Blinded by ignorance and poisoned by an unconscious urge to degrade, they sow the seeds of discontent. They are the disciples of discord, who would stifle our initiative, not knowing that by their actions they are furthering the cause of our enemies abroad."

WE MUST NOT REST

"These inimical forces, whose greatest fault is their own gullibility, do not rest. If we are to combat them successfully, we must not rest either.

"We must remain constantly alert so that through lack of sedulity we shall not play into those hands which are eager to destroy the way of life so dear to all of us.

"As Governor of this great Commonwealth I give you my pledge that my tenure of office will witness no let-up in this battle against reaction. We cannot afford to relinquish that fight. I am determined that we will not.

"Once again, my heartiest congratulations to the town of Clinton on its one hundredth anniversary. May you continue to prosper for centuries to come."

* * * * *

"The history of Clinton is like a miniature history of the United States. Although if we are to measure a town's age by her corporate existence, she is only a century old, actually the story of Clinton's ingenuity and love of freedom is centuries older. History records that nearly three centuries ago white men were tilling her soil and engaging her valuable waterpower. The sagacious and enterprising John Prescott, realizing that she offered no broad meadows to invite the husbandmen, was among the first to see in Clinton's physiognomy her potentialities as a manufacturing town and established the Prescott Mills.

"His was not the first in a long list of manufacturing enterprises which led to the eventual separation of Clinton in 1850 from the agricultural community of Lancaster, of which, as Clintonville, she had been a part. As a manufacturing center she grew until she listed among her manufactures the variety of commodities so indicative of her versatility and so characteristic of her history.

"Her loyalty to principle stands unchallenged over the centuries. When the rallying cry, 'Taxation without representation is tyranny,' rang through the land, the forebears of Clinton were among the first to organize to answer the call to arms.

"According to the Honorable Henry S. Nourse, whose comments on Clinton are considered to bear the weight of authenticity, 'When the political champions of slavery treasonably sought to break up the Federal Union, nowhere did the spirit of patriotism, so fervent everywhere in Massachusetts, flame forth sooner, or with more genuine fire, than in Clinton.'

"In the two great world struggles, the later of which we have only recently concluded, the town of Clinton contributed its share to the armies of young men who have risked their lives in the successful prosecution of those blood-spending conflicts.

"To those phases of her history Clinton can surely point with justifiable pride. She has been a model of both patriotism and progress. I feel honored to have been able to include among my most admired personal friends one of her most renowned citizens, one who gave to the governorship of our Commonwealth and the Senate of the United States the wealth of energy and accomplishment which stand as a lasting tribute to the town from which he sprang. I refer, of course, to one of your greatest sons, the late Senator David I. Walsh."

* * * * *

"The heart of the Commonwealth, the great city of Worcester has given us many splendid public men. None of these has excelled the next speaker in his steady advance from the ranks to an exalted position in the government of our beloved Commonwealth," said Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, toastmaster, in introducing Lt. Gov. Charles F. (Jeff) Sullivan, of Worcester.

"Former mayor of his native city, experienced legislator, zealous champion of any cause he espouses, able and distinguished in the affairs of state, I am pleased indeed to present to respond to the toast, Tribute to Our Neighbors, the genial, friendly and capable lieutenant governor of the Commonwealth, his honor the Honorable Charles F. (Jeff) Sullivan, of Worcester."

Lt. Gov. Charles F. (Jeff) Sullivan, of Worcester, responding to the toast, "Tribute to Our Neighbors," said:

"Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Dever, reverend clergy, and honored citizens, friends, and neighbors, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I respond to the gracious toast of our able and eloquent toastmaster, Congressman PHIL PHILBIN. It is with pride that I see my home city of Worcester called 'neighbor and friend' to such a splendid community as is Clinton. It is with pleasure that I think of myself not only as a son of Worcester, but almost as a man of dual allegiance to Clinton as well as Worcester. Indeed this is so because so many of my friends and relatives who call Clinton their home have entertained me that Clinton is a second home. Any man would be glad to call Clinton his home.

"Consider for a brief moment its proud history. The early settlers of Clinton came from many different races: Irish, German, Italian, Polish, Scotch, and English. They worked long and hard. They were honest, industrious, and religious. Their children truly typify the melting pot of America. They inherited their parents' sturdy characteristics as was easily seen when the depression of the thirties closed the major mills in the town. The people of Clinton showed their inherited fighting qualities. They organized and with determination brought new industries into the town, so that today Clinton is one of the outstanding, prosperous towns of our Commonwealth.

"These same early ancestors of present-day Clintonites would indeed be proud of the outstanding men that Clinton has sent into the world. Merely reciting their names is enough to bring to the mind of every person here the extraordinary leadership of the late Congressman Kenney, of New Jersey; ex-Congressman Joseph E. Casey; Presidential Secretary Matt Connelly; our capable and conscientious toastmaster, Congressman Phil Philbin; and the late Senator David I. Walsh and many others who have served with distinction in both houses of the Massachusetts Legislature.

"Clinton's outstanding citizens have not been solely in public service. The large number of clergymen it has sent into the world to spread the word of God is an eternal tribute to the deeply religious nature of Clinton's citizens. The outstanding members of the judiciary who call Clinton their home bear eloquent testimony of the high regard and deep esteem that all residents of Clinton have for the American concept of law and order—Judge O'Toole, Judge Kittredge, and Judge Jaquith, of district court; Judge O'Malley, of Springfield District Court; and Judge Buttrick, of Massachusetts Superior Court.

"I could go on indefinitely reciting the leading figures in all walks of life who come from Clinton, but the names of all are as well known to you as they are to me.

"It is no mere chance that a community of the size of Clinton has made such a large contribution to the progress of Massachusetts. It is rather the result of a careful, conscientious citizenry who have, down through many generations, established, improved, and enlarged their public institutions, particularly the school systems, both public and parochial. It is to the credit of the high standards of the schools that Clinton has developed so many leaders in all fields, and the schools in turn are the product of the ambitious, hard-working, and religious fathers and mothers of this splendid community.

"Truly Clinton typifies all that we strive for in our American way of life. It is because she is such a splendid example of our American community that I close as I opened my brief response to our toastmaster, Congressman PHIL PHILBIN, by reaffirming how proud I am, and what pleasure I take in saying to him, that Clinton and Clinton's citizens say a most gracious and sincere thank you for such a moving and eloquent toast to them."

Harvard Law Professor Raises Strong Objection to Mundt-Nixon Bill—Old Laws Viewed Sufficient to Hold Communists Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Langdell professor at Harvard University Law School, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of April 5, 1950:

HARVARD LAW PROFESSOR RAISES STRONG OBJECTION TO MUNDT-NIXON BILL—OLD LAWS VIEWED SUFFICIENT TO HOLD COMMUNISTS DOWN

(By Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Langdell professor at Harvard University Law School)

I am one of the large number of old-fashioned Americans, trying to do their own job as well as they can, who care a good deal about our Bill of Rights and about maintaining American traditions of freedom and tolerance. We like the kind of country in which we grew up, and we want it to stay that kind of country for our children and our grandchildren.

Because we detest totalitarianism, we are greatly disturbed by proposals, such as the Mundt-Nixon bill, to copy any of the methods which totalitarian nations use for keeping a tight control over the thoughts and expressions of individuals, over their political activities when they do not meet the approval of officials, and over the exchange of views among individuals in publications and meetings.

My main objection to this bill is that I see very little evidence to support the recital that the world Communist movement presents "a clear and present danger * * * to the existence of free American institutions." Let me begin by reviewing the acts of Congress which now protect our Government and institutions from attacks through violence or other unlawful action.

First, a statute enacted in 1861 (U. S. C., new title 18, sec. 2384) punishes conspiracy "to overthrow, put down, or to destroy by force the Government of the United States, * * * or to oppose by force the

authority thereof, or by force to prevent, hinder, or delay the execution of any law of the United States."

EFFECTIVE STATUTES

This was considered adequate to protect the Government when the Confederate Army was within 100 miles of Washington. In 1867 it was supplemented by another statute punishing conspiracy to commit any offense against the Government with any overt act, no force being required (U. S. C., new title 18, sec. 371).

These two statutes kept us safe from any serious consequences of internal disaffection in time of peace for three-quarters of a century. Without any sedition act, we came through the panic of 1873, the panic of 1893, the panic of 1907, and the great depression of 1929–33. The absence of any prosecutions against revolutionists under either of these laws demonstrates that the sky has been clear of forcible revolution for a good many years.

Still, in 1940 Congress wanted more than the old conspiracy statutes. So it created two new types of criminal offenses in the Alien Registration Act.

To begin with, it made the Espionage Act of 1917 applicable in time of peace, so as to punish anybody who advocated insubordination, disloyalty, and so forth, in the armed forces. (U. S. C., new title 18, sec. 2387.) This measure was urged as essential to protect the Army and Navy from Communist organizations.

Yet the only reported case under it was the abortive prosecution of about 30 Fascists and anti-Semites in Washington in 1944. The fact that there is no reported case under this statute against a Communist proves one of two things.

QUIET FORCES

Either Communist activities to demoralize the armed forces never have amounted to much, in which event there seems to be no need for more legislation for the same purpose; or else the 1940 statute has been very successful in putting a stop to such Communist activities, and if so why do we have to have a new law to safeguard soldiers and sailors?

The other part of the 1940 statute, commonly distinguished as the Smith Act (new title 18, sec. 2385), makes it a serious crime to advocate the overthrow of any government in the United States by force, or to be an organizer or a member of any group of persons which advocates such overthrow.

This is the first Federal peacetime sedition law since the ill-fated Sedition Act of 1798. It goes very far toward reaching anybody who belongs to what the new bills define as a "Communist political organization."

If there were really a clear and present danger in this country from world-wide communism, anybody would naturally expect that this Smith Act would have been invoked again and again during recent years. On the contrary we find just three prosecutions. The first was several years ago, *Dunne v. United States* (138 Fed. 2d. 137 (1943)).

OUTLAW LABOR UNION

Although there was a good deal of wild talk by the men who were convicted in this case, their organization amounted to little more than a small outlaw labor union and being Trotskyites, they were about as far removed as possible from the Communist dictatorship of the Soviet Union, which is described in the pending bill as the fountainhead of danger to our own country.

The second was the abortive Washington prosecution of Fascists, already mentioned. Surely Stalin's influences over American citizens could not have created an overwhelming peril to our Nation when the Smith Act lay dormant for 8 years before any of Stalin's admirers were thought worth prosecuting.

At last, 11 leaders of the Communist Party of America were indicted. They were convicted last autumn in New York City. The Government's case at this trial enables us to get a pretty good idea whether these 11 men and their organization have put our country in deadly danger.

NO ALARM SEEN

Nobody was the least bit scared. Nor did I see alarm expressed by a single editorial or a single letter to the editor of a newspaper. It was about the least exciting news of the day.

Consequently, I see no need for supplementing the drastic penalties of the Smith Act by another and much more sweeping sedition law.

Some have argued that Communist spies make this bill necessary. Yet the Criminal Code already contains comprehensive legislation against espionage (new title 17, secs. 701–797).

If the present statutes against spying are thought to be defective, the proper remedy lies in amending those statutes so as to aim directly at spies, and not in roaming all over the lot against thousands of people, most of whom would never dream of being spies.

Finally, in connection with the registration provisions in this bill, it is important that we now have two statutes requiring registration in particularly serious situations.

Anybody who acts as the agent of a foreign government must register (except diplomats, consuls, etc.) and any organization subject to foreign control must register if it is engaged in political activity or if it aims to control, seize, or overthrow the Government of the United States by force. (22 U. S. Code, secs. 233–233g; new title 18, sec. 2386.)

Anybody within these two statutes who fails to register before acting incurs severe criminal penalties. Now, if the Communist Party of America or any other group in this country really satisfied definition of a "Communist political organization" (sec. 2 (3) in H. R. 7595), then there is no need of a new law to make it register.

It can be compelled to do so any day under the existing statutes just mentioned. The fact that these two statutes have not been enforced against the Communist Party or its leaders indicates that all the talk in section 2 of the bill about American Communists creating a clear and present danger of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States is like the reports of Mark Twain's death—grossly exaggerated.

SURVEY SUMMED UP

To sum up in two sentences this survey of the present United States Code:

If American Communists and fellow-travelers are as dangerous as the supporters of this bill make out, then there is enough legislation already with teeth in it to take care of these people; so no new law is needed.

If, on the contrary, existing statutes are not violated by what these people are saying or doing, then they can't be very dangerous; so no new law is needed.

I fully recognize that the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia was a danger to the freedom of Czechoslovakia, and the same is probably true of Italy and some other countries.

It does not follow that the inclusion of less than one-twentieth of 1 percent of our population in a Communist Party here is a real danger to our institutions and our freedom under the very different conditions in this country.

We have a very strong Government equipped with existing legislation and efficient Federal police. Our Government does not need any such novel bill as this in order to deal effectively with any actual conspiracy against its existence or any actual effort toward violent revolution.

Where inside this country are the facts which justify the establishment of unheard-of regulatory machinery, the expenditure of large sums of money in its operation, and the severe punishment of American citizens because somebody or other has not filled out a piece of paper?

It is now nearly 30 years since my work as a student of freedom of speech led me to pay considerable attention to the activities of Communists in this country.

Although they are as detestable as ever, it is my considered opinion that they are far less dangerous today than they were in 1919–20, soon after the Russian revolution.

The spiritual health of the Nation is far better than in 1919. We have a much greater immunity to revolutionary radicalism.

Sometimes I wonder whether the supporters of measures like this bill have been worrying so much about Communists that they have forgotten what freedom-loving Americans are like.

The only possibility of communistic control of this country, leaving out the chance of foreign conquest, would come, I believe, from the destruction of this confidence which the great mass of our citizens now have in their own future and that of their children's future.

FURTHER OBJECTION

Imagine a prolonged period of enormous unemployment; the dollar buying what a dime buys now, and perhaps worth a nickel next week, who knows; ever-mounting taxes; the national revenue heavily mortgaged for decades by unwise commitments to groups of the aged at the expense of active men and women and their children; voters hating and despising the men they themselves have put in office because they had nobody better to choose from.

The safeguard against communism and any other sort of disloyalty is to keep on working hard to make this a better country to live in.

A further objection to the pending bill is that, while it purports to be necessary to preserve "free American institutions," it gravely impairs some of the most precious of those institutions—freedom of speech and press and assembly, which our ancestors put at the very head of our Bill of Rights.

Without bothering you with an extensive discussion of the meaning of those freedoms, I merely point out that the American tradition of freedom of speech and press and assembly is that words as such shall not be punished or restricted, however objectionable the ideas they express.

Peaceable language should be left alone by law, for the proper remedy for it is peaceable language on the other side. An especially strong claim to immunity is possessed by speeches and publications concerning political issues and candidates for office, because they are an essential part of the process of self-government.

The only words which may properly be made unlawful are either (1) immediately injurious, like libel and obscenity; or (2) closely connected with commonly recognised wrongful acts, e. g., an incitement to murder or to desert from the armed forces.

The present bill is not limited to the two exceptional situations just mentioned. Let me run through it rapidly to bring out this point.

Section 4 punishes any person who agrees with another to perform any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship.

There is no requirement of the use of force or other unlawful methods at any time. The act may be wholly peaceable. It may be one of the commonest political activities, like nominating a candidate for office who is pledged to the specified policy.

Section 6 keeps a man within this country because of his association with men of specified political views, with no consideration

of his own unfitness to travel abroad and with no reference to any unlawful act. The denial of a passport may amount to a severe penalty on a person with bona fide reasons for going abroad.

All the registration provisions relating to a Communist political organization restrict normal political processes without regard to any unlawful act.

NEXT OBJECTION

The registration provisions for Communist-front organizations have no relation to any unlawful act, but are imposed because of the expression and exchange of opinions.

My next objection is drawn from the past experience of the Nation. This is not the first time when fears of the infiltration of revolutionary radicalism from Europe has led earnest men to demand drastic laws against speeches and publications.

A hundred and fifty years ago patriots, terrified of the French Revolution, got your predecessors to enact the Sedition Act of 1798. It is commonly regarded as one of the greatest follies in our history. Happily it expired in 2 years by its own terms.

Again, after the First World War, Congress was repeatedly urged to pass a new peacetime sedition law.

Revolutionary groups were much more vocal than now. Violent acts occurred, like a bomb exploded near the house of the Attorney General. Still Congress refused to do anything, and nobody now regrets that refusal.

The years that followed proved that the law which eminent men said was indispensable to save the country was not needed at all. The names of the men who supported the bills of 1798 and 1919–20 have long ago slipped into oblivion, but we remember Jefferson, Holmes, Hughes, and Al Smith for their courageous insistence that we must trust open discussion to bring us safely through.

That courage, we are now told by proponents of a bill like this, is out of date. The United States never had to face Stalin before. But in 1798–1801 it had to face the French Revolution and Napoleon. And in 1919–20 it had to face Lenin. His army was not so big as Stalin's, but he was a far abler master of revolutionary tactics.

The lawyers who drafted the Sedition Act of 1798 and the judges who enforced that law were firmly convinced that they were stamping out a foreign menace fully as dangerous as the foreign menace which confronts us today.

Indeed, they used much the same arguments as those urged for these bills now, with France the villain instead of Russia and Switzerland replacing Czechoslovakia as the victim, to forecast the fate of our own Republic if we do not save ourselves by passing a sedition law.

We are going through such a settling-down process today. It is particularly difficult for all sorts of causes—the magnitude of the devastation, the delay in the peace treaties, the diverse character of the victorious nations, the unprecedented formation of a world-wide permanent union, and so on.

We have plenty of real worries, and it is quite natural that they should be reflected in some false worries as well. All the more reason for keeping our heads.

I have read a good many regrets that particular sedition laws were passed. Never, given the lapse of 2 or 3 years, have I known anybody to regret that a sedition law was rejected.

The principles which Jefferson used to allay apprehensions in his time are equally valid in our time. Meet unlawful action with action; proceed against real spies and real plotters as he prosecuted Aaron Burr and approved the dismissal of Genet. Meet objectionable ideas from abroad by living up to our own ideas—give increased drawing power to our great traditions of democracy and freedom.

FINAL POINT

My final point is very important. Its enactment would disastrously impair our influence over other freedom-loving peoples.

If we leave aside military considerations, the best way to combat the spread of communism in western Europe and elsewhere is to give increased drawing power to the great traditions of democracy and freedom.

These war-torn countries want more than weapons, more than food and machinery. They are eager for ideals to strengthen the spirit and make life worth living. Communism, we are told, operates like a religion; it is presented as the vision of a better world.

Yet, Jefferson and Lincoln had a great vision. During the nineteenth century it possessed the appeal of a religion to bring millions to our shores.

In order to hearten the discouraged peoples of the twentieth century, we must keep that vision bright—not, this time, to attract them to America but to enable them to build their lives in their own homes, so that the freedom which Jefferson and Lincoln did so much to give us will be a reality in many parts of the world.

MORE THAN WORDS

More than words is needed. Unless our acts show that we believe in our democratic ideals, we lessen the chance of winning wavering men to democracy.

In my experience with foreigners in the United Nations, I have been constantly impressed by the way our prevailing adherence to the ideals of our Bill of Rights helps to close up the ranks of freedom-loving countries in opposition to undesirable measures.

On the other hand, I have seen how much harm is done whenever we conspicuously depart from our professed basic principles. It lays us open to damaging charges of hypocrisy and pretense which are hard to meet.

There is no doubt that such attacks based on concrete facts do impress men from many countries whose support we need, and sometimes they are thus pried apart from the United States delegation on critical votes.

Now, freedom of information is one of the big issues in the United Nations at the present time. A treaty of great value to facilitate the work of foreign correspondents, which was originally projected by our State Department, has been put in final form by the General Assembly.

Over and above this, freedom of speech and press is an American ideal which means a very great deal to the citizens of countries where censorship and every sort of gross suppression have prevailed in recent years.

So the way we maintain freedom of speech and press or the way we depart from it is bound to have tremendous effect, for good or bad, upon delegates from countries like Holland, Norway, India, and Australia.

GREAT HARM FORESEEN

Consequently, if we enact a new sedition law like this bill, it will do us great harm among our natural friends in the United Nations. They know well how much suppression is made possible by the vague definitions in this bill.

We just can't defend such a sedition law against the bitter attacks of our opponents, and still less against the distrust of our friends. Our professions of love for open discussion will ring hollow in their ears.

And matters will be much worse when enforcement starts, with numerous inquisitions by the Subversive Activities Control Board, mail opened, nonregistrants prosecuted, lists gone through with a fine-toothed comb, and all the rest of it.

Frenchmen, Belgians, Dutchmen, Norwegians, Danes have had years of experience with that sort of thing under totalitarian occupations and it leaves a stench in their nostrils.

The way for us to spread abroad freedom of speech is to live up to it ourselves. The rejection of this bill will be a telling demonstration that we are governed by the principles of Thomas Jefferson.

Economy (?) at Expense of South Jersey Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, a situation has arisen in south Jersey that adversely affects the veterans of that area. On the basis of lack of funds, the Veterans' Administration has closed the Camden office that heretofore has given medical and dental service to veterans.

As usual, when departments of Government squander or, through inefficient administration, are faced with a deficiency of funds, they close down facilities on the basis that Congress has not provided sufficient funds. Thus, in this case the Veterans' Administration, in a release issued March 10, 1950, announced "that State-wide cuts in personnel would be made within the next month in order to meet current budgetary restrictions." The release continues "that in order to maintain top medical services in other clinics throughout the State it would be necessary to discontinue the limited medical facilities at the Camden VA office. To do otherwise would result in the reduction of the other clinics to a limited basis of operations."

The truth of the matter is that Congress allowed and approved the full amount asked by the Veterans' Administration for medical treatment. The Appropriations Committee of the House, in its report, stated:

> The reductions in this item arise principally from reduced needs in all programs other than medical and hospital care which are provided for in full as proposed in the estimates. The total cost of the medical program is $566,666,400. The committee has not reduced this sum by one penny and directs the Administrator not to reduce it.

General Gray has been before both the House and the Senate committees twice since this bill was considered, once in the last session and once early in this session. No mention was made of the fact that they were short of money or that they would be obliged to discharge employees connected with and needed in hospitals and medical services.

There should be economy in the Veterans' Administration and in all other Federal departments, but it should be true economy brought about by eliminating needless employees who serve little or no purpose.

It is not economy and not the desire of Congress to curtail or disrupt the medical services provided for veterans.

I am of the opinion that the order to close the Camden office was issued without any careful study or survey. The fact that all of the counties of south Jersey are left without any of the facilities previously afforded by the Camden office is evidence of an absolute disregard of the best interests of the veterans resident in this large area. It means that all the veterans of this area must now travel to the Trenton office if they wish the same services previously provided by the Camden office, or carry on correspondence, with all the red tape and delay incident thereto, in order to get authorization for local medical service through private doctors. It is unjustified and unfair to require some veterans in this area to travel as much as 125 miles to visit the Trenton office.

At a recent meeting of representative veterans from the south Jersey counties strong resentment was expressed for the action taken by the Veterans' Administration in closing the Camden office. A resolution was passed demanding that the order be repealed. Widespread opposition has developed throughout south Jersey upon the part of others than veteran organizations, as is evidenced by the strong editorial appearing in the Courier-Post newspapers, Camden, N. J., in the issue of April 5, 1950, and which I herewith include as a part of my remarks:

VA ECONOMY AT EXPENSE OF SOUTH JERSEY VETS

South Jersey has long been accustomed to being treated as a stepchild in State affairs, even if it has never been happy about it and is growing more insistent on equal recognition of its rights.

But it certainly will not look with complacency on the Federal Government also treating it as an orphan.

And that is exactly what veterans and their organizations think Washington has done by eliminating Veterans' Administration medical and dental clinics in Camden, while retaining all others upstate, of which the nearest are in Trenton.

Hence last week's mass protest rally here, a few hours after shut-down of the VA offices on orders from the National Capital.

Joseph O'Hearn, VA manager at Newark, and Dr. Salvatore Rainino, chief medical officer at Newark, asserted that the Camden closing was necessitated by economy orders.

But Congressman WOLVERTON addressing the protest rally, discounted the economy motive and pointed out that National Administrator Carl Gray had made no reply to his suggestion that if VA is in dire straits for funds, it should present a deficiency appropriation request to Congress, and that a favorable congressional reaction would be almost certain.

"I admit there is a drive for economy," WOLVERTON said, "but Congress has never been moved to economize at the expense of the veterans. The excuse of a budgetary necessity cannot be laid at the door of Congress, since Administrator Gray never has come before us and intimated the necessity of more funds to keep these clinics open."

Over and above the question of economy, however, is the question why, if the VA was forced to retrench in this State, it had to do so solely at the expense of south Jersey, closing down the only clinics in this end of the State and forcing our veterans to travel to Trenton for the service to which they are entitled.

It is true that the Camden office is not the only one in which retrenchment is taking place. Fourteen employees are being laid off here, 4 at Trenton, 13 at Union City, and 23 at Newark.

But the Camden clinics are the only ones being closed completely.

And while Camden is closed and the clinics at Trenton now must handle a vastly increased load as a result, north Jersey will continue to be served by two offices as close together as Newark and Union City. The lack of geographical balance and the injustice to south Jersey vets ought to be obvious.

At the close of last week's protest meeting, a committee of south Jersey veterans' organization officials was named by Albert J. Gifford, VFW county commander, who presided at this meeting. This committee will go to Washington and, with WOLVERTON cooperating, will protest against the Camden closing.

The VA has bungled in closing the Camden clinics without examining the situation more thoroughly. It will be bungling even more badly if it does not give the protest committee a sympathetic hearing and reverse a move that may mean a trifling economy—but an economy effected at the expense of south Jersey veterans.

I call upon General Gray, as Veterans' Administrator, to make a personal study of the situation, repeal the order that has been made, and, if necessary apply to the Appropriations Committee for a deficiency appropriation that will enable the Camden office to be reopened. The thousands of veterans residing in south Jersey are entitled to this consideration.

Flexible Depreciation Would Aid Small Business and the National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a statement made by Ralph A. Fletcher, vice president of the Smaller Business Association of New England, at a meeting, here in Washington, on March 27, between representatives of the association and the members of the New England congressional delegation.

Mr. Fletcher is a consulting engineer and manufacturer of long experience and proven ability. He gave a lucid and impressive explanation, to the group, of the manner in which the small-business man is handicapped by the present operation of our depreciation tax regulations. He pointed out it is manifestly unjust to expect the small-business man to contest Treasury Department decisions by appeal to the courts since they have neither the money nor the legal assistance possessed by the large corporations.

Mr. Fletcher's plea for the adoption of his flexible depreciation recommendations is worthy of serious consideration and the complete text follows:

Mr. Chairman, honorable congressional delegation, ladies and gentlemen, as vice president and chairman of the membership committee of the Smaller Business Association of New England it is an honor and a privilege for me to present on behalf of our association a brief discussion of the need of small business for flexible depreciation.

I must preface my remarks with a statement that I am an engineer by training, a quarryman and manufacturer by experience. I am not an attorney, accountant, nor a tax expert. I can only present this problem as it appears to the fellow who is earnestly and sincerely trying to produce more and more goods under constantly improved working conditions with lowering costs and prices, and endeavoring to increase wages and stabilize employment.

I believe this to be a fair statement of some of the objectives of the smaller producer, and it goes without saying that to the extent he is able to achieve these ends he expects some reward beyond that of a task well done.

FIRST, WHAT IS DEPRECIATION TAXWISE?

Under Internal Revenue Code, section 23, deductions from gross income, we find the following:

"In computing net income there shall be allowed as deductions:

"(1) Depreciation: A reasonable allowance for the exhaustion, wear and tear (including a reasonable allowance for obsolescence) (1) of property used in the trade or business, or (2) of property held for the production of income."

This seems to be a simple, clear, and straightforward statement. However, bulletin F (revised January 1942) of the United States Treasury Department, Bureau of Internal Revenue, contains over 90 pages of printed matter on the subject, but cautions taxpayers against relying solely on information contained therein.

This creates a situation which may be all right for big business equipped as it is with staffs of highly paid attorneys and expert accountants, many of whom have been trained in the Government services. They can and do negotiate with the Treasury regarding depreciation allowances on more or less even terms. On the contrary, the small-business man is not, and in the nature of things, never can be equipped to do more than accept whatever depreciation allowances the Bureau of Internal Revenue may grant him, whether or not he feels them to be reasonable and just.

His only recourse now, in the final analysis, is an appeal to the courts and he has neither the time, nor the money for this. The Treasury understands this just as well as the small-business man and so a most difficult situation is created for him. Flexible depreciation would cure this inequity.

SECOND, WHAT IS FLEXIBLE DEPRECIATION

If the word "reasonable" is deleted from the law as stated above and if the words "as determined by the taxpayer" are inserted, so that the law would then read as follows:

"In computing net income there shall be allowed as deductions:

"(1) Depreciation: An allowance, as determined by the taxpayer, for the exhaustion, wear, and tear (including an allowance for obsolescence) (1) of property used in the trade or business, or (2) of property held for the production of income."

And flexible depreciation rates would result.

WHY DOES SMALL BUSINESS NEED FLEXIBLE DEPRECIATION RATES?

Let us assume a hypothetical case to illustrate a common condition.

Imagine, if you will, a small manufacturing concern: It probably had a hard time through the great depression, but weathered it; a rough time again during the war, but with the help of the Smaller War Plants Corporation managed to convert to war production and make a nice contribution to the national defense. In the postwar period it realizes that its equipment and methods have become obsolete, but it is caught in a working capital shortage due to higher general price levels.

At this stage, its employees who also know the equipment is worn out and obsolete and not worth repairing become dissatisfied with the situation. They think the old man has lost his grip, gone by, etc. Finally they send a delegation in to see him with a proposition. They have it all figured out. If he'll get them some decent tools to work with, and better the working conditions, which they figure can be done for about $10,000, they, in time, will guarantee to produce enough more than currently to pay for it all in 1 year and they think that the new stuff should be good for about 10 years. Let us say that their recommendations involve some special heat-treating equipment, precision controls, and air-conditioning embodying techniques developed during the late war years, which are matters of general knowledge now, but which do require special engineering for adaptation to each industrial application and have little, if any, resale or market value.

To the employees this looks like a pretty good proposition and they sort of think that after the stuff is paid for that there should be something in the way of a division of the spoils—perhaps a raise or a bonus for them. A better product and a somewhat lower price for the customers, an increased market demand, more sales, steadier work, and perhaps a job for a son or brother who is coming along in school and whom they would like to get placed.

We believe this is the way things should be and that under flexible depreciation the proposition could be put over, but let's see just how it is now, and what a tough and disagreeable job our small-business man has ahead of him to try to explain to a group of practical, sensible workingmen why he can't get the money to go ahead with it even though he agrees wholeheartedly with their idea.

First, let us consider the number of times which the new equipment must earn its cost in order to provide enough dollars to repay the money borrowed or invested for its purchase.

Under the present tax system this could be from twice to three or more times the initial cost, depending on the type of ownership and the amount of other income.

If our recommendation for flexible depreciation is adopted it would only be necessary to earn the amount of the cost one time, in order to repay the investment regardless of the type of ownership or amount of other income.

Now, let us see what possible sources there are for the needed capital and what chance there is of getting it under the present tax system, and the conditions which would exist if flexible depreciation were adopted.

SOURCES AND AVAILABILITY OF CAPITAL

	Under present tax system	*Under flexible depreciation*
1.	Own capital (past savings): Not available now.	Would tend to become available out of future earnings.
2.	Current or anticipated earnings: Insufficient now after taxes.	Definitely available if estimated gain is correct.
3.	Venture or risk capital. Not available now.	Would tend to become more available.
4.	Borrowed capital:	
	(a) Long term: Not available.	(a) Not needed.
	(b) Short term: Not safe to use for such purposes.	(b) Would probably be available and safe to use.
	(c) Installment purchase: Availability subject to marketability and quite restricted now.	(c) Use would probably be considerably broadened.
	Conclusion: Not available.	Available.

What this all amounts to is that the taxpayer and his employees would only have to earn the cost of the equipment once, in order to have the use of this income-producing improvement. However, he still must pay local property taxes on it during its life, and income taxes on the revenue that it produces so long as it is used. Also, if sold at any future time the entire proceeds would be subject to capital gains, taxes, and, in the case of an individual taxpayer's death, to estate taxes.

The taxpayer gets 100 percent depreciation under the present system providing he lives long enough. What we propose is that he should get 100 percent depreciation at the time he considers most advantageous to his business. The result is the same, he only gets it once, but the timing is different and he get it when he can use it.

There can be no question but that the tools of production should be as readily obtainable as possible for the greatest good since it is only from production that we get goods and services.

That we have in recent years instituted a system of taxation which operates to prevent the acquisition of these tools has been a matter of increasing concern to many thinking people.

Short of actual conquest, it is hard to see how an enemy could devise a better method for hamstringing productivity, discouraging enterprise and removing incentives for growth and improvement, than the tax straitjacket we have imposed upon the small producer here in the United States of America. It does not operate overnight, but is like a lingering deadly disease, a cancerous consumption causing a wasting away of health in the economic structure of our country.

In closing, I wish to thank you on behalf of our association for this opportunity to present to you our need for flexible depreciation as one of the ways by which you can help small business to increase production and employment to grow and prosper and become a strong and healthy segment of our national economy.

Reversing Red Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, for a long time it has been the contention of the liberals in Congress that the way to overcome Communist propaganda is not by torpedoing the Bill of Rights—nor by the passage of sedition laws, which was tried once in the early history of our country during a period of great hysteria and subsequently repealed when the Nation regained its sanity. We have opposed the Mundt, Nixon, Ferguson, Hobbs, and Smith bills, because they all aim directly or indirectly to shackle or manacle the Bill of Rights and those great privileges that are enjoyed only by the American people. In winning the fight for these rights, Thomas Jefferson and James Madison warned the citizens to be eternally vigilant against those people who would in devious ways try to destroy these rights.

The proper way to beat communism and communistic propaganda is to show to the people of the world that our system is better. The constructive arguments on our side are overwhelming. We must look hysterically foolish to the people of the world when we brandish the atomic and hydrogen bombs and make wild accusations of communism against teachers, professors, scientists, writers, and public officials.

By taking the side of the common people, the downtrodden, the landless, the jobless, and the hungry, as we have just recently done in Greece; by showing and proving the advantages of a free democratic economy, as against that of totalitarian; is the proper way to fight Communist propaganda.

The following article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor and written by Neal Stanford, gives an illustration of the proper way to fight Communist propaganda:

REVERSING RED PROPAGANDA

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—There are signs that the American Government is slowly learning the difficult—and dangerous—art of counterpropaganda.

For a long time Uncle Sam seemed satisfied to stand on his record, ignoring the verbal tomatoes and rotten eggs thrown at him by the Kremlin's propaganda machine.

But as the Communist attacks on American policy have increased and their distortions of the American way of life become more vicious, the State Department sometimes has gingerly faced the need of answering these misrepresentations.

It has learned to its surprise—and dismay—that not inconsiderable bits of Moscow's anti-American propaganda, which floods not only Russia but Europe, Asia, and other parts of the world, in time tend to be accepted by peoples with no first-hand knowledge of America, where they get no contrary explanation of the United States.

One of the latest efforts to meet Soviet propaganda relates to the Kremlin's sudden intensive campaign to make its own people as well as others (particularly in Europe and Asia) believe that living conditions and costs in the U. S. S. R. are utopian compared to the situation in the United States—where inflation, unemployment, strikes, military costs are pictured as reducing America to near-chaos.

Last February, the Kremlin announced with great fanfare that it was revaluing the ruble—whereas the capitalist world was devaluing its currencies; that it was cutting the prices of consumer goods, whereas in capitalist states—the United States, for example—living costs were rising steadily and sharply.

For a month, the Kremlin has played this theme fortissimo on its government-run information organs, working 24 hours a day to sell it to the Russians, the Poles, the Hungarians, the Czechs, the Bulgarians, the Rumanians, the Arabs, Indians, Frenchmen, Italians.

The American rejoinder has now come in the form of a note to the Soviet Government—a note ostensibly directed at getting the Kremlin to let the American Embassy in Moscow continue to buy rubles at the special "diplomatic" rate of 12½ cents instead of the new rate of 25 cents a ruble.

But the request was embroidered with plenty of counterpropaganda material the

Department is now sending over its Voice of America to those parts of the world which have been blanketed with Moscow's version of Soviet bliss versus American chaos.

This Soviet anti-American propaganda has taken two directions: that with announced price cuts the Soviet worker or Moscowite is much better off than his American or Washington counterpart; that living costs are constantly rising in the United States to the detriment of the United States worker.

As for the first charge, Washington notified the Soviet foreign office and is now broadcasting all over the world that:

Even at the new "official" rate for the ruble of four to the dollar (which is a purely fictitious rate since the ruble is not an internationally traded currency) food is considerably cheaper in Washington than in Moscow. White bread costs 11.8 cents a pound here but 63.6 cents in Moscow; butter, 69 cents a pound here to between $2.30 and $5.61 a pound in the Soviet capital; granulated sugar, 10 cents a pound here to $1.20 a pound there; potatoes, 3.6 cents a pound here to 14 cents a pound there; vegetable oil, 64.5 cents a quart here to $5.76 a quart there; dressed chicken, 43 cents a pound here to $2.24 a pound in Moscow, etc.

It is further explained that there can be no comparison between Moscow and Washington costs for black bread—a Russian's basic food—because nothing like it is eaten here; but that a Russian pays about a quarter for a pound of this black bread—a price which, incidentally, is just twice what it was 3 years ago. The mere recitation of these comparative figures of Russian and American prices pulls the rug out completely from Moscow's propagandists.

The second point the Soviet propagandists have been trying to make is that the buying power of the United States dollar is steadily declining. To this the American mass answers with this counterpropaganda now being directed all over the world:

An index of the cost of living in the United States prepared by the United Nations—not the United States—shows that the cost of living here is the same now as 3 years ago.

The American counterpropaganda does not ask its listeners to believe what the UN is saying as contrasted to what Moscow claims—it only points out the discrepancy. The thought is that nothing will so undermine what respect or attention is given Soviet broadcasts as just comparing them with studies of UN agencies and other recognized authorities.

Compliance With Robinson-Patman Act Urged—Food Brokers' President Cautions Against Misuse of the Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Watson Rogers, president of the National Food Brokers Association, recently addressed a meeting of association members in Los Angeles. Mr. Rogers pointed out the protection which the Robinson-Patman Act extends to the buyer and urged sales tactics which would not in any way weaken the act by creating ill-will for it. In effect, Mr. Rogers stated that buyers sometimes get the wrong impression from suppliers who indicate to the buyers that they would like to do something for you, but the act forbids it.

This—

Mr. Rogers said—

is the wrong approach. Instead, the buyer should be shown how dangerous it would be to him if any preferential prices were granted. He should be advised of the fact that there would not be any limit to the spread of such discrimination, very quickly placing him under great disadvantage. Actually, the act is of the greatest importance to the great majority of buyers, protecting them from unfair price discrimination.

The report of Mr. Rogers' remarks as they appeared in the Journal of Commerce, March 27, follows in full:

PATMAN ACT HELD AN AID TO BUYER—ROGERS CAUTIONS TRADE ON WEAKENING STATUTE—CITES SALES PROBLEM

LOS ANGELES, March 25.—Some of the strongest supporters of the Robinson-Patman Act are unconsciously creating ill will for the act by giving some buyers the wrong impression, Watson Rogers, president of the National Food Brokers Association, told a meeting of food brokers here at the week end. Speaking before a luncheon gathering of the Los Angeles Food Brokers Club, he said that the guilty parties included food brokers' and manufacturers' own sales staffs.

"What such sales people do is to take the easy way out. They use the Robinson-Patman Act as an excuse for not trying to secure special price discriminations from the manufacturers. 'I would like to do it for you,' they say, 'but the act forbids it.' They give the wholesale buyer the impression that if not for the act he would get such discriminations, when actually that is not the case. Instead, the buyer should be shown how dangerous it would be to him if any preferential prices were granted. He should be advised of the fact that there would not be any limit to the spread of such discrimination, very quickly placing him at a great disadvantage," the speaker declared. "Actually, the act is of the greatest importance to the great majority of buyers, protecting them from unfair price discrimination."

CITES MARKETING CHANGE

Turning to a discussion of the constantly changing pattern of wholesale food distribution, Mr. Rogers told the Los Angeles food brokers that their market was typical of most areas experiencing this evolutionary adjustment. "Back in the old days the manufacturer could expect the wholesalers' salesmen to get almost 100 percent distribution for him. With the great change that has taken place in food distribution, that is not possible any more in many markets.

"Further, most wholesalers are operating a streamlined business and have eliminated a number of activities. This means that the manufacturer must himself see to the handling of some of the functions previously done for him by the wholesaler. This is true whether he sells through the food broker or his own sales force."

NEW FUNCTIONS ADDED

"As a result, the manufacturer who sells through food brokers frequently puts pressure on the brokers to perform a lot of these functions. Where the latter is the case it puts an added expense burden on the food broker. Many manufacturers have realized this and are making adjustments accordingly."

The fact that sales expenses are greatly on the increase is one of the reasons why many manufacturers who did not formerly use food brokers are turning to them now, Mr. Rogers said. "Today the manufacturer needs aggressive on-the-spot selling in the market at all times to maintain a program of balanced distribution. Although vanity makes us want to feel that the food broker's ability is the only reason for this change to food brokers, we must admit that an equally strong reason is their realization that their own sales organization is a terrific overhead expense. They can best beat this overhead by using food brokers."

Leadership for Peace—An Intimate Message From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article by Josephine Ripley that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor:

LEADERSHIP FOR PEACE—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—Americans are always writing to their Congressmen, but when more than 6,500 recently set off a landslide of mail applauding the McMahon peace plan, it was news.

It was news because it indicated the troubled thoughts of thousands of American citizens over present world conditions, and the eagerness with which they are ready to grasp at any ray of hope for a new approach to peace.

The Soviet press chose to interpret this as an indication that the American people want their leaders to come to terms with the Russians. But it was not a plea for appeasement. It was not a suggestion of peace without honor, or peace at any price.

What Americans want, from their letters, is a strong, aggressive leadership. They want to know that the United States is doing something more to insure peace than building bigger bombs than the other fellow.

What they need is to know what is going on—on all fronts—in the cold war; what the status of American foreign policy is, and all about it.

They can get it piecemeal, here and there in the newspapers, from public statements of various officials. But they need to have it put together in a concise, frank statement from the one they naturally look to in such a crisis—the President.

They haven't had such an explanation. Instead, they have been reading day after day, of the grim potentialities of the hydrogen bomb. First, the warning of Professor Einstein that explosion of an H-bomb might mean "general annihilation." Then the cheerful little contribution of the atomic scientist, Dr. Urey, that "there will be no place to hide." Not to be outdone, four atomic scientists combined in a dark prediction to end all dark predictions—that an H-bomb could pack enough radioactive dynamite to wipe out the world's entire population.

On top of this came word that top secret atomic information had been leaking to Russia by way of German-born Klaus Fuchs, who had been working with the British atomic scientists.

It is not surprising that thousands of Americans burst into spontaneous applause over the proposal of Senator McMAHON, chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee,

for another approach to agreement with Russia. It was the first plan for peace by other means than bigger bomb-making to be put forward after the President's terse announcement that the United States would go ahead with H-bomb development.

Senator McMAHON's plan does not call for any backtracking with Russia. What it proposes is a 5-year $50,000,000,000 "global Marshall plan" to include Russia and its satellites.

But to qualify for this largess, Russia would have to accept an effective program for international control of atomic energy and an agreement * * * enforced through inspection, that two-thirds of * * * present spending upon armaments be devoted toward constructive ends.

Now Senator McMAHON has followed up this bold step with another, calling for an Atlantic council parley to plan atomic peace, and challenging Russia to be host to a Town Meeting of the World to discuss this plan.

He has offered these proposals as examples of the bold steps which the Soviet atomic explosion, the shadow of the hydrogen bomb, and the pyramiding arms race should persuade us to consider.

This is the kind of action—even if it proves futile—that Americans were waiting for. It is the kind of gesture which they can understand, even if they don't comprehend all the fine points of foreign policy. It is the kind of leadership they want.

They have said as much:

"We need the leadership of people like you."

"We believe this country must take the lead, and at once, in developing a constructive, aggressive program for peace."

"We are cheered by your proposal that the United States should assume leadership for peace through economic means."

These writers were not crying peace, peace where there is no peace. Rather, they echoed a plea for leadership, for strong, spiritual, statesmanlike leadership in this grim crisis in world affairs, the kind of leadership which the President himself is usually expected to provide.

Power, Not Vacillation, Will Earn Freedom and Respect for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

POWER, NOT VACILLATION, WILL EARN FREEDOM AND RESPECT FOR AMERICA

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Now that its plebiscite has demonstrated the total enslavement of the Soviet peoples, the Kremlin is peddling the hint that it would be willing to talk peace with the United States.

This is not surprising. The Soviet Union has conquered China. During the time needed for digestion, it would like to quiet its opponents. This is exactly the tactics followed successfully by Adolf Hitler during the 1930's when after each successive grab he announced that it was definitely the last.

That is why Stalin is hinting at a new meeting with Americans at which he could expect some new concession—perhaps Indochina or control of Germany or recognition of the Chinese Communists by Washington—as the price of peace.

Surprising is the number of faint-hearted or soft-headed Americans who seem eager to fall into so visible a trap. The mere repetition by Soviet speakers that "communism and capitalism can coexist" starts them cooing about a "return to the spirit of Yalta."

Too bad that they did not look further into these Soviet pronouncements. Communist leaders have always maintained that the two regimes could continue to coexist peacefully provided that the Communist area grows and the free area shrinks. In his electoral speech of March 10, Vyacheslav Molotov repeated this hoary come-on.

SOVIET LACKS CONFIDENCE

But the Deputy Chairman of the U. S. S. R. Council of Ministers also explained why the Soviet Union wants peace at the present moment. Mr. Molotov told his hearers that capitalism is declining. In the capitalist countries, according to him, the number of unemployed and semiemployed has reached almost 45,000,000 people. He then proceeded to let the cat out of the bag.

"Under such circumstances," he said textually, "it becomes understandable that the Soviet Union and the people's democracies [the satellite governments] are in favor of a peaceful competition between the socialist and the capitalist systems at a time when in the camp of imperialism [meaning us] a spirit of gloomy imperialism and warlike adventures is reigning. Each of these efforts under conditions of peace serves the consolidation of the position of such states as the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, which cannot be said of the capitalist states."

In other words, the Soviet Union is frightened. The Russians want time for economic consolidation of their conquests. Therefore they are talking of some new compromise where Stalin can obtain a new extension of Soviet power or communism as the price of peace.

The Russian plan is—as I said—just part of the Soviet game. What the American people have to decide is whether we are going to fall for this sort of soft soaping or whether we are going to understand that no matter what they say, all Communists aim at the total destruction of the United States.

FAINT HEART NE'ER WON

Once we accept this, we shall cease listening either to the siren voices from Moscow or to those faint-hearted and soft-headed Americans who would do almost anything to end the cold war.

Our real job is not to strengthen Soviet Communist economies by providing otherwise unobtainable supplies but to weaken it by withholding those supplies. It is not to recognize the Chinese Communists as the Government of China. It is to make clear to Moscow and to Secretary General Trygve Lie of the UN that so long as one nationalist Chinese anywhere is fighting communism, we shall continue to recognize that fighting Chinese as the Chinese Government. It is to inform the Russians and their trained satellite seals that if they walk out of any more UN bodies, we shall urge those bodies to continue the current business without them. It is to inform the impertinent little men of Sofia and Budapest who are arresting and imprisoning United States citizens on invented charges of espionage that one day the United States of America will make them pay for such outrages. It is to follow Senator BRIEN McMAHON, of Connecticut and step up the Voice of America 10 times so that it can reach the Russian people despite the 200 radio stations that the frightened Bolsheviks are now using to jam our messages. It is to encourage every form of anticommunism in Russia itself—to urge the Ukrainians to secede (which they have a right to do according to the Soviet Constitution). It is to urge the captive Azerbaijani of Russia to join the freer Azerbaijani of Iran. It is to bolster Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia and bring about the overthrow of the tottering tyranny of Enver Hoxja in Albania. It is not merely to help Bao Dai in Indochina but to make sure that Communist Ho Chi-minh cannot win.

PEACE BY THE SWORD

In short, it is to understand that the free peoples of the world do not respect the United States because of our kind hearts but because of our power. They will come to our side when they see that we can and will protect them—and not before, and when they believe that further armed expansion by the Soviet Union means war.

Does all this preclude any sincere move for peace by the United States?

Certainly not. This is the only basis upon which we can hope to obtain peace. Speaking in Tashkent on March 11, Soviet Minister Lazar Kaganovitch said to his voting sheep:

"The U. S. S. R. is mighty and we will not permit anyone to shove his imperialist snout into our Soviet kitchen garden."

Once we have created a free kitchen garden of our own in which no Soviet agent can successfully shove his snout, the Kremlin may be ready to talk international understanding on a reciprocal basis. Not before.

The Unknown General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the United States Air Force was struck a severe and damaging blow by the recent passing of Gen. Muir S. Fairchild. This great man was a most respected figure in national-defense circles and his loss will be keenly felt.

The people of the State of Washington particularly mourn the passing of General Fairchild. We recognize the outstanding service he so unstintingly gave to the Nation, but more poignantly we feel in our hearts the loss of a native son. The general was born in Bellingham, Wash., September 2, 1894, and began his distinguished career as an enlisted man in our State guard. The Nation has lost a great servant, Washington an eminent citizen of its State.

Although the Members of this House are familiar with General Fairchild's contribution since coming to Washington, and although some few Members have enjoyed his brilliant and thorough presentations before committee hearings, many are perhaps unfamiliar with his earlier activities. Therefore, I include in the RECORD the article by that noted columnist, Peter Edson, from the Washington News of March 21, 1950:

THE UNKNOWN GENERAL

(By Peter Edson)

He was an Air Force general whom few people knew. When wires carried the news that Gen. Muir S. Fairchild had died of a heart seizure, even many officers and men in the Air Force may have had to knit their

brows and ask, "Who?" For here was an arrogant, be-medaled, publicity-seeking martinet.

He was a four-star general—the No. 2 man in the Air Force. He was buried today in a simple grave at Arlington National Cemetery, with full military honors. All the big brass came out to do him honor, for he was a general's general. But such was his passion for anonymity that he was practically unknown, outside of his own small circle.

Arnold, Spaatz, Doolittle, Kenney, Vandenberg and the others won the battles and the headlines. General Fairchild had been assigned to stay home—a Pentagon general who stayed home and worked on plans.

If, suddenly, tomorrow, the United States should be attacked by an air raid that dropped an A-bomb, there would be an instant retaliation. It would be aimed at immobilizing the enemy until the United States and its allies could mobilize for counterattack. The plans are all made and this general nature of their content is common knowledge.

If these plans worked, one of the men to whom top credit should go would be General Fairchild. For the past 2 years that has been his job. He has been general administrator of the Air Force. It has been his responsibility to see that plans came to life.

Because he was such an excellent planner, General Fairchild had been picked for this job 2 years ago. He had been jumped from a two-star to a four-star general, over the heads of many another who had been his senior. But that was only one of the many surprises in the career of this unknown general.

He was an old man, the way Air Force generals go. He was 55. What's more, he was not a West Pointer. He came up the hard way. He enlisted as a private in 1917, and he came up through the Washington State National Guard.

In World War I he was a bomber pilot attached to the French Air Force and he flew on a number of missions over the Rhine. He stayed in the Army after the war and got the usual run of assignments. He was a test pilot for a time, and he flew one of the old bombers on the Pan American good-will flight of 1926. He went to a lot of service schools, including the War College, but when World War II broke, he was only a lieutenant colonel.

They grabbed him quick, though, promoted him to brigadier general and put him in the War Plans Division at Air Force headquarters. He was one of three officers on the Joint Strategic Survey Committee. He sweated out most of the war there, with an Army general and a Navy admiral, constantly renewing, constantly planning.

They hung a Legion of Merit and a Distinguished Service Medal on General Fairchild when the war was over, but he still wasn't famous. Then in 1946 he came up with an idea that will make him long remembered in the Air Force. It was a plan for the Air University.

General Fairchild had never graduated from college himself. The First World War had broken off his own formal education, and he never went back to finish. It was not the least surprising of this unknown general's achievements, therefore, that he should become best known as an educator. He was more celebrated in the educational world than in the military.

They told him to go ahead with his air-university idea and put him in command of it. His headquarters were at Maxwell Field, Ala., but his campus was scattered all over the South. He pulled together the Air War College, the Air Command and Staff School, the Air Tactical School, and the School of Aviation Medicine. He worked out a plan whereby every Air Force officer now gets an educational rejuvenation every 7 years or oftener.

Again—One-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, a phase of the foreign-assistance program which has always given me especial concern is that we provide aid in general measure, and many other benefits, without getting much consideration for it.

The article appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer on March 28, 1950, and written by the well-known columnist, Ivan H. Peterman, illuminates this problem, and should be called to the attention of the House. The article follows:

UNITED STATES EXPENDS AID WITHOUT GUARANTEES

(By Ivan H. Peterman)

Senator VANDENBERG's call for unpartisan handling of the cold war's problems could become a cornerstone in some sort of breakwater against the economic erosion of America, through continuing foreign-aid grants. Sooner or later a substitute must be evolved for giving away the Nation's substance in return for rented security.

For "rented" seems to be the word, judging from recurring Red disturbances. Under the present loose system of distribution, Marshall-plan billions are buying no guaranteed loyalties anywhere; any or all of the participating countries can suddenly vote in a Communist parliament, or permit infiltration, to create another Czech-style coup.

It is almost 2 years since an exasperated member of the United States Foreign Service expressed serious misgivings on our give-away policies in Europe and the Middle East. We were driving to a Big Three ministers' meeting in Paris, sharing a diplomatic car to a press briefing.

"I've never believed in handing over money, goods, or anything substantial without it being a two-way bargain," the party said. "I've been too long in this Service not to know that most people prefer it that way. They don't respect outright donations. They like to think it's a deal, whether it really is or not. Call it mass psychology, pride, or face, but it's there. It exists today as it did centuries ago, too. Ours is a sucker's game, and in the end we may be despised for it."

This week Congress is debating the new ECA appropriations, hoping to whittle the sum under the Senate committee's recommended $1,950,500,000 and still remain adequate to the tasks in Europe. Since April of 1948 the United States has spread close to ten billions around Europe, reestablishing it economically. France in that time has received almost as much as the present plan calls for.

Yet France just lately has gone through a series of unpleasant Communist disorders, involving port riots, transport and utility strikes, and disgraceful rowbottoms in the Chamber of Deputies itself. For a time the Government seemed to verge on collapse. All in spite of 2 years unstinted aid, with a concentrated program of education and orientation to democratic principles, with special emphasis upon French workers and peasants through the efforts of American labor leaders.

Italy also is having some of the nastiest civil disorder. Six weeks ago in Milan, I was astonished at the prevalence of Communist propaganda plastered over that huge city. There were 10 Red posters to 1 for our side. In southern Italy armed Reds were able to take a whole town, San Severo.

What is lacking in the Marshall plan that such conditions still prevail? It is no wonder some authorities think the plan has failed. With this any visitor to Europe must disagree, but he will also admit our united western front should be tighter.

One of the answers, as any unpartisan board will soon discover, is the lack of important conditions attached to ECA grants. We have assumed too much, and have underestimated the come-back qualities of communism. This could be a first study of any nonpolitical group wishing to appraise Marshall-plan results.

Had the United States insisted that Italy's land reform program be pushed, Commies would not have ready-made fields to exploit. Increasing the Italian police force doesn't offset the effect of 2,000,000 unemployed in a nation's 18,000,000 working populace. Nor is it encouraging to know that many Italians work two jobs to piece out a living, because wages are so miserable.

The Reds would still be there, of course, were all things beyond reproach. This also seems due for readjustment. So long as armed thugs masquerade as politicians, Europe—and Asia and Africa too—remain bad security risks. When you lay out billions expressly for peace promotion, it seems peculiar to have permitted your enemy within to continue his tricks and his threats.

Granting we want none of the police state tyrannies, but there might be a happy medium. A guaranty that at least prevents Red rioters from ranging loose with weapons as if they, not American taxpayers, had been badly done by.

But we have asked for no such guaranties. One wonders if, as with lend-lease to Russia, we even bothered to get receipts.

Year of Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, this is a year in which the traditional American concept of freedom is facing challenge from many directions. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following radio address by Col. Rudolph Habermann, of Battle Creek which deals with the subject "Economy and taxes":

Good evening. You and I, as American citizens, have some inalienable rights which are expressed in our Constitution.

One of these, contained in the thirteenth amendment, states that we shall not be reduced to slavery or involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime.

I am sure you cherish that right, as I do; that you would rise up against any tyrant who threatened to enslave you.

Perhaps you feel quite secure in that freedom. If you do, it may startle you to learn that you have 14 months of servitude to your Federal Government hanging over you, in the form of the national debt.

By spending more than it has collected—and it is still doing it—the Government has run up a debt of $258,000,000,000. Now, that may not sound alarming. You may regard the Federal debt as an impersonal, complicated set of figures which has very little meaning to your way of life. So look at it this way: Our total national income in America amounts to $221,000,000,000 a year.

In other words, all the money that you and every other person and every company earns in 14 months would be required to pay the Federal debt. Your part of that debt is 14 months of your productive effort—14 months of work.

You may think you will escape the 14 months of servitude already charged up against you. Probably you will escape most of it. But your children and their children will inherit that part of your debt which you do not pay. They will have to work to help square accounts.

In this fiscal year the Government expects to go another $5,000,000,000 in the red. That means an additional $5,000,000,000 piled on the debt. In terms of labor on the part of taxpayers, figured at the $221,000,000,000 annual income rate, it means that 8 more days are being added to the 14 months of servitude to which our Federal Government has committed us. So at the end of this fiscal year you will owe 14 months and 8 days of your labor.

That is what the Federal debt means to you. It has a direct bearing on your freedom, and your children's freedom.

Apply that same line of thought to taxes and you will find that you are actually working 1 day out of every 5 to pay your Federal taxes. That is what it amounts to—20 percent of your earnings go to support the Federal Government. If you work a 5-day week, 50 weeks of the year, you are working for the Government 50 days a year. That is servitude you cannot escape.

A billion dollars is easy to say but hard to comprehend. Measured in human effort it means this: If 1,000 men had been employed at $10 a day in the year 1676—100 years before the signing of the Declaration of Independence—and had labored every day from then on, Sundays included, it would take them up to this year—1950—to earn a billion dollars. A thousand men laboring for 274 years at $10 a day.

Well, what's to be done about it? What can be done?

Several things.

The basic issue is the question of higher taxes or deeper debt against reductions in spending.

Congress has tried to tackle the problem but gets blocked out of the play by the weight and confusion of the whole host of Government bureaus and agencies, each scrambling for more authority and funds with never a thought of whether there's enough money to go around.

So the pressure on Uncle Sam's pocketbook—your pocketbook—builds up and up, and you wonder why it doesn't collapse completely.

Now I'll grant you that there are some very essential services of government that cannot be cut.

The most notable thing about a Federal department is the urge to spend money. Somebody else's money! The first symptom is a request for more funds than are needed. Then the strategy is to swarm all over Congress in support of these padded requests. Congressmen try to cut them down, but they can never accurately know just how much is real and how much is padding. And since there's no logical pattern to the Federal budget, it becomes a matter of first authorizing the spending and then waking up to face the hang-over of where to get the money. And that's where you come in again with your taxes.

The only logical answer to this dilemma is for Congress to revamp its appropriations machinery.

First, all requests for money should be in a single package, so that Congress can know the relation of the grand total to the amount of money actually on hand.

Congress has already taken the first step to correct this. There's no reason why all spending bills shouldn't be consolidated into one and examined in the light of probable income. Let your Representatives and Senators know you're behind this very sensible move toward economy.

But that's not the only method of saving some of your money. Let's see some of the others.

Do you think it's necessary to have more than 2,000,000 people working for the Government? Two million civilians, I mean. I'm not speaking of our armed forces at all here. I'm talking of the increase in civilian Government workers from 900,000 in 1939 to a little more than 2,000,000 today.

The Hoover Commission doesn't think they're all needed. That's the Commission, you know, headed by former President Hoover, which made a 2-year investigation of the entire Federal Government structure. It found incredible examples of waste, inefficiency, duplication of effort, and a complete lack of understanding of even the most elementary rules of sound business.

For instance, the general practice is for all supervisors to get more and more people working under them. If you are in the Government, that's the way to get yourself a raise. It doesn't matter what you are doing or what these people who work for you do. All that's necessary to get a raise is to get some friend in the personnel office to assign more people under your direction. That does it, and you can see where that leads to. If it works today, it will work again next year. So you just keep at it. No wonder there isn't office space in Washington to house all the people on Uncle Sam's pay roll.

Most of us have some contact with the Veterans' Administration, keeping up GI insurance, and the like. Well, did you know that the average work load for a Veterans' Administration employee is 450 insurance policies as compared with more than 1,700 for an employee of a private company? It takes about 90 days for the Veterans' Administration to handle a claim as compared with about 15 days for a private insurance company. That's four times as much work in one-sixth the time. How do you like that for efficiency?

That is just an inkling of what goes on. The Hoover Commission found literally hundreds of situations just as alarming in all the other bureaus.

I cannot urge you too strongly to acquaint yourself with these Hoover reports. There are several important bills now under consideration, and if they are enacted it can mean a saving of untold dollars—your tax dollars. It's a multi-million-dollar opportunity you just can't afford to pass up.

Now let's look at the other side of the picture and see what the Congress itself can do.

They work for you, too, you know. And you have every right—in fact a duty—to inquire into the ways they serve you.

Every Congressman has his own district to worry about. He wants to see it prosper, and he wants to do all he can for the people he is elected to represent.

That's fine, and we believe in that basic principle of representative government. It is the best system yet devised by man for handling his affairs of government.

Yet, with his responsibility to his own particular constituents, each Member of Congress has a broader duty to the whole Nation, and that is what I want to talk about now.

Let's assume that in your district there is a chance to put up a big Federal dam or power project that will automatically bring money and employment into the area and keep it there as long as the project continues. It sounds wonderful. It seems good for the community. It seems good for local business. It looks like the type of thing to give your civic pride a real boost.

And since it looks good to you, it appeals to your Congressman. So he sets out to get the project approved for the home folks. Now that's a very laudable thing, but we only ask that he do one thing more, and that you people and the people in each of the 435 local election districts in the country do that one thing more with him. Ask yourself honestly and carefully—is it good for the whole country? Does the whole country not have a stake in what we do here, just as we have a stake in what the rest of the people do? Will we help ourselves at the expense of others? Is there no other way to get this particular thing done? Must it be done by Government? What's its effect going to be on the over-all picture?

That is a tough assignment, I know. But you can see what it means if every Member of Congress, under prodding from the folks at home in trying to get some kind of a federally financed project, thought only of his own district. You would soon have every community competing with every other community to find out who gets the most Federal money and who can spend it fastest.

You couldn't coin money fast enough to keep pouring it around that way. And it's the same money as all the other Government money. Your tax money.

So there you have what may be the toughest assignment of all. You, I, all of us—our Congressmen included—must face up to this issue squarely. We must decide whether we are going to close our eyes to the Nation's welfare and bury ourselves in the selfishness of our own immediate local gain.

You can see it takes a lot of fortitude to do what you know to be right in a case like this one. The temptation is strong. Yet we ask our Congressman to exercise that same degree of fortitude in facing up to problems of great national and international significance. The least we can do is support him and tell him we're behind him in this one great effort to cooperate personally, actively, locally, in the wise use of Federal money—again, your own tax money.

Next, there's a point very closely tied in with the responsibility of every Congressman to subordinate purely local interests to national considerations. I'm thinking of the great tendency of organized groups, farmers, teachers, workers, businessmen, and their associations to pressure Congress for more and greater bounties, subsidies, and hand-outs of all kinds.

Each individual, and every group, and each segment of our population must do a little soul-searching when faced with the temptation to reach in and grab. Tough as it sounds and difficult as it is to do, we must face the issue squarely. If it isn't good for the country, it isn't good for us.

And now I'll add one more point that goes to the very heart of the whole problem. It's a point of trouble which, if properly attended to, could do more than any other single factor toward reversing the present trend and help correct the current tendency to spend ourselves into national bankruptcy.

Now that Federal expenditures are higher than ever, the persistent planners contend that taxes must be kept as high as possible. They argue that new and greater spending is in and of itself a good thing. They are trying desperately to get Congress to accept that view.

They never seriously ask themselves the significance of that type of thinking. They say simply spend, spend, spend. They ignore the relation of spending to the simple proposition that there must first be money—your tax money.

How much simpler and how much more sensible would it be to take a good, long look around to see how much we have available, and then decide how it can be spent to the best advantage of all of us.

It all boils down to that. There's no sense in tossing around a lot of very high-sounding technical words and trying to confuse the issue so no one can understand it. That's

the tactic of those who can't face the simple facts of life on this question. They're afraid to reduce it to its bare essentials. They're afraid to tell the truth.

Yet, you know only too well that you can't run your own home without examining what you need in the light of what you have to spend on it. You do the same with your business. A good, efficient government must follow the same course.

So why not your Government?

It is your Government, but it won't remain your Government forever unless you take an active part in its affairs.

We cannot afford to let it get away from us, but that's exactly what we're doing when we ignore the question of money—the very heart of Government operations. Radio station WBCK or the Battle Creek Chamber of Commerce will gladly give you a brochure at no cost on economy and taxes so that you may be well posted.

With an election coming up, those who oppose this reckless spending and the complete disregard for our own ability to support it, will be damned as "reactionaries" and accused of having some kind of "special interest."

Well, it is high time to react. It is high time to show your special interest. It is time to react to your own interests, the special interest of 150,000,000 Americans, and the only hope of the world—the soundness, the stability, and the continuation of these United States as a solvent going concern.

New England Smaller Business Association's Program of Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 27, a very timely and mutually valuable conference took place, here in the Capitol, between the Members of the New England congressional delegation and representatives of the Smaller Business Association of New England.

At this meeting, Mr. Russell Maintain, chairman of the association's public relations committee gave an excellent summarized presentation of the group's general objectives and operations. The program of action was outlined as follows:

PROGRAM OF ACTION

I. GENERAL OBJECTIVES

To speak for small business in New England.

To inform small business of its importance in the preservation of our free-enterprise system.

To preserve free private competitive incentives enterprise.

II. SPEAKERS' BUREAU

Speakers' clinics have been enlarged to include many individual businessmen who are not active as officers or directors of the association.

Meets periodically to discuss association viewpoints, policies and procedures, objectives (e. g., association is not an "anti" group), and to enable speakers to discuss and develop their talks and receive constructive critiques.

To provide speakers for service clubs, veterans' groups, radio programs, civic affairs, fraternity meetings, business panels, schools, churches, colleges, and other associations.

May send several speakers a year to the same organizations to talk on various subjects.

Over 100 addresses during the year.

III. NEWSPAPER AND MAGAZINE PUBLICITY

Handled through Newsome & Co.

Produces approximately 1,000 column inches of small business and association news per week.

Releases go out at least weekly to 106 daily newspapers and 314 weekly newspapers; also wire services Associated Press, United Press, and International News Service.

IV. RADIO PROGRAM

One-half hour Sundays over Columbia outlet in New England, WEEI in Boston.

Estimated audience over half a million.

Round-table discussions by not only small-business men themselves but also by authorities on labor, education, politics, world affairs, and other subjects of importance to small business.

Includes also each week a 5-minute news summary on important events of the week pertaining to small business.

V. MONTHLY BULLETIN OF SMALL BUSINESS

Summarizes association activities and plans and other matters of importance.

Goes to all members as well as to men of importance in government, education, associations, business, and clergy.

Emphasizes and expresses free enterprise economic facts of life.

VI. REGIONAL MEETINGS

Held periodically in principal community centers throughout New England.

Aim is to hold one meeting yearly in each congressional district.

Meetings in April will be held in Keene, N. H., and Portland, Maine, under direction of William J. Jamieson, executive secretary.

RUSS MAINTAIN,
Chairman.

Our Freedom of Religion Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report to my constituents.

IS RELIGIOUS FREEDOM POSSIBLE IF ECONOMIC FREEDOM IS LOST?

Many Christians believe we can advocate compulsion in our economic life, and still keep our freedom in the religious realm. But how long will religious freedom last if we go Socialist?

Perhaps you doubt that leaders of Christian religious groups advocate the use of force. If so, you should study closely the literature on social and economic action published by some of our church bodies. They openly reject economic freedom as anti-Christian. Adam Smith, who led the Western World to the full enjoyment of economic freedom, is placed in the same category with Karl Marx, who sired the brutal force called socialism, that is, communism.

Whatever the members of our denominational groups may think, their spokesmen often publish statements that are masterpieces of Socialist dialectics. They say, "There can be no Christian sanction for one-sided support of either economic individualism or economic collectivism." This is the pose of neutrality, but it is neutrality as between the robber and his victim. They would destroy every economic gain that has made the people of this country freer and more kindly than the people of any other country. They argue for a middle way, a clever trap which must bring forth the answer, "socialism."

Many of our clergymen, like many of our teachers, have been drawn into support of socialism because they believed, without careful analysis, that it would benefit the wage-workers and the poor. For generations, the advocates of socialism have been living in a dream world, surrounded by subjective feelings that they were warmer, kinder, more generous, than other men. That dream lasted while the world was prosperous and peaceful, and governments could not interfere with those who were trying to better themselves. The dream now has to face a cold reality—where the Socialist dreamers were able to get possession or control, and remake the world by force; their new world soon became one great concentration camp. The poor were poorer, the downtrodden were more cruelly trodden upon; the classes were more fiercely at war with each other. The ruling group could keep its privileges only by setting up a police state. The people worked at what and wherever they were told, at whatever wages and in whatever value of money was fixed by the state.

Suppose our Socialist ministers are successful in their efforts to use our churches as transmission belts for state control of income and wages. What will happen to our churches? If political leaders in government own or control all the income of the people, how long will our churches remain free? What will happen to men in the pulpit who dare to challenge the decisions of the political managers of our wordly goods? People will still be able to think as they like, of course, but what religious actions will they be allowed to take? What financial support will they be able to give to church education, or press, or church building? How long can church and state remain really separate?

We know that men lost their religious freedom in Germany and in Russia when the government took or controlled their economic resources. But we think America is different. Is it?

He who controls our economic well-being controls every aspect of our life. Men dependent on government for their subsistence are no longer free in anything. They are slaves, and like slaves, they must obey. In a planned economy, the church must be planned too.

As the state takes a larger and larger share of our production, it plays a larger and larger part in our lives, until it manages all of our lives. When it can tell people what kind of potatoes they may eat and how much they must pay, it will soon tell the preacher what he may say, and how much he can be paid.

Freedom is indivisible. Without freedom to keep and use the products we create, we cannot insist on freedom of speech or of action. Without freedom of speech and of action, there is no freedom. We cannot serve two masters—force and freedom. Force does not compromise. Those who believe in religious freedom have no choice but to demand economic freedom.

Freedom is Christian. It is the rule of conscience, not of force. A free economy is a Christian economy, the only possible Christian economy.

Remember Father Cronin?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to study Washington and to see how long it takes for many people of the country to become aware of what is happening within their Government.

More than 3 years ago, a nationally known Catholic priest, Father John F. Cronin, a member of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, issued a blast against the Communists and fellow travelers in the Department of State. The charge was promptly and most vehemently denied by the high officials of the Department. Newspapers from one end of the country to the other carried editorials ridiculing the Catholic father.

Since that date the Republicans came into power in Congress for a brief 2 years. In that short time the Congress uncovered enough evidence to prove that Father Cronin knew of what he had charged. Alger Hiss has been convicted as a traitor, Judith Coplon has been caught and convicted, and many other employees of the State Department have been permitted to resign while under investigation as security risks.

Recently, Senator MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, has made similar charges. Again, certain newspapers whose editors apparently do not know what is happening in the Nation's Capital, take the accuser to task. But, it would be a good bet that within a year or so they will learn that additional security risks have been allowed to resign.

Critics of Senator MCCARTHY ask, where are the spies and weak security risks that he talks about?

The reply might well be, why did all of those fellow travelers and security risks resign while under investigation before? If they were filled with sweetness and light and loyalty, why did they run for the cover of private life as soon as they were threatened with investigation?

It would be well for critics of Senator MCCARTHY to bear in mind, when his charges are being debated, that the Department of State was just as vehement in its denials of Father Cronin's charges, 3 years ago, as it has been in its denials of the Senator's charges.

Resolution of the New York State Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by the New York State Legislature with respect to the unemployment-insurance taxes levied on pay rolls for a specific purpose and used, to a large extent, for purposes entirely different. The memorializing resolution points out that the Federal Government has collected $150,000,000 more than it has returned to New York State for administration of the unemployment-insurance program, thus seriously endangering the State program. This unjustified diversion of funds from all the States amounts now to a billion dollars.

This practice of using funds collected for one specific purpose for other programs of the Government should stop. It finds a parallel in the Government's use of social-security funds. Such practices in private business would land the perpetrators in serious trouble. No amount of juggling of the figures can disguise the fact that this money was collected in the State of New York, belongs to the State, and should be made available for immediate use.

The resolution follows:

Concurrent Resolution 209

Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly proposing that the Congress of the United States be memorialized respecting the earmarking of funds collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to each State to be used in the administration of the unemployment insurance law

Whereas under existing law, the several States of the Union bear the responsibility for the administration of the unemployment insurance and employment service programs; and

Whereas the Federal Government levies a pay-roll tax of three-tenths of 1 percent on employers of eight or more persons to pay the administrative cost of such programs by the States; and

Whereas each State has no control over the amount it receives for the administration of such program and must accept whatever amount is allowed to it by the Federal Government; and

Whereas since the inception of unemployment insurance and employment service program, the Federal Government has collected from the employers of this State for the administration of this program $150,000,000 more than has been returned to the State for this purpose, and the amounts so returned to the State of New York have been consistently and grossly inadequate; and

Whereas it was never intended that the Federal Government should divert the proceeds of this tax for its own general purposes, which it has done to the extent of $1,000,000,000; and

Whereas the continued inadequacy of operating moneys and personnel makes the detection of improper and fraudulent benefits claims exceedingly difficult and impedes efforts to cope with tax evasions; and

Whereas the failure to make adequate moneys available for efficient administration, to the extent that it weakens control over disbursements from the unemployment insurance fund, jeopardizes the effectiveness and stability of the entire program and brings it into disrepute: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is respectfully memorialized to enact legislation which will—

1. Earmark the taxes collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to assure adequate funds for administration by each State of the unemployment insurance and employment service program.

2. Transfer any excess over the amounts allocated by the Federal administrative agencies to the States for use in the unemployment insurance and employment service program with full responsibility resting on each State for the proper use thereof free from Federal control;

3. Make reasonable provisions assuring all States equitable participation in such allotment; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate of the United States, and each Member of the Congress duly elected from the State of New York.

By order of the assembly:

ASHLEY B. DOSKEWICH,
Clerk.

In senate, March 20, 1950. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the senate:

WILLIAM S. KING,
Secretary.

Cardinal Mooney on School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following article from the Detroit News of April 2, 1950, by Edward Cardinal Mooney, archbishop of Detroit:

MOONEY TELLS CATHOLIC STAND ON SCHOOL AID

It seems to me that, to keep the record straight, some observations are pertinent in the aftermath of the protracted discussions on proposed bills for Federal aid to education.

The general intent of these bills is entirely commendable in view of the low standards of education that prevail in many parts of the country and in view of the legitimate interest of the Federal Government in the attainment of fairly equal educational opportunities for all United States citizens. The questions they raise will never be solved by incrimination and recrimination but only by clear thinking and calm, frank discussion.

In the religious controversy which the question of Federal aid to education has unfortunately aroused, assertions or implications have been repeatedly made which

hinder rather than help calm and clear discussion.

WHO DOT ARISE

As one who is deeply interested in the welfare of 125,000 pupils in Catholic schools in southeastern Michigan, I cannot agree with the assertion that the point at issue in the present apparent stalemate on Federal-aid bills under consideration—the provision of welfare services for all American children in schools they legally attend—has anything to do with the American doctrine of separation of church and state.

I do not say that all Americans are agreed on what is the American doctrine of separation of church and state. That doctrine can be defined only on the basis of the first amendment to the Constitution: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

There has been, especially in more recent years, sharp controversy about the exact meaning of the first amendment. It was only in 1947 that the Supreme Court gave a comprehensive definition of the establishment of religion clause in that amendment, interpreting it to prohibit aid to religion or religious institutions—even when no discrimination is involved.

WIDELY CHALLENGED

That definition has been widely challenged on the grounds of logic, history, and accepted norms of legal interpretation. That challenge was voiced by the Journal of the American Bar Association and by eminent authorities in constitutional law.

It was taken up by a group of prominent non-Catholic religious leaders, and made their own by the Catholic bishops of the United States in their annual statement of November 21, 1949—in which they attributed this novel definition to the influence of secularist theories of public education and law. That definition stands now as a practical norm of procedure though it is by no means irreversible, as the history of the Supreme Court shows.

But this controversy on the first amendment, which is real and of far-reaching import, has nothing to do with the point at issue in the pending bills on Federal aid to education.

For the very first ruling handed down by the Supreme Court under its ominously extensive and utterly secularist definition of the American doctrine of separation of church and state explicitly upheld the legality of giving tax-supported welfare services—and in so many words, bus transportation—to the children of parochial as well as of public schools.

That patent fact ought to remove the issue of separation of church and state from the present discussion on Federal aid to education which centers precisely on the point of making the Federal-aid bill help to provide welfare services to all American school children.

THE PUBLIC QUESTIONED

Those who are interested in the health and safety of parochial school children cannot agree with the assertion that "State or Federal funds derived from taxes on the public for the benefit of school children should in principle be expended only through public schools."

We would agree if they said that these funds should be expended only through schools that serve a public purpose. For parochial and private schools which are recognized by law as fulfilling the requirements of compulsory school attendance do serve a public purpose and the people who exercise their constitutional right of educating their children in recognized church-related schools are part of the public who pay the taxes.

We do not agree with the assertion—or the implication—that legislators, or anybody else, may legitimately resent the interest of church groups in the way these legislators vote on questions that affect members of church groups as citizens. These same legislators do not seem to resent the interest of business groups in the way they vote, or of labor groups, or race groups, or secularist-minded groups like the National Educational Association.

CALLS ON LEGISLATORS

Why, by implication, should members of church groups be disqualified as citizens in the defense of their natural and legal rights, when the exercise or suppression of those rights is to be decided by vote? Certainly we do not want to see church lines and political lines run parallel in the United States. The one sure way to prevent that is for legislators to see that those lines are not drawn parallel in the legislation they propose.

It is sound Americanism to hold that what is good for religion—with no discrimination in favor of or against any church group in comparison with others—is good for responsible citizenship; and no American who cherishes his religion as a personal and a civic asset can, in good conscience, fail to make the only means he has at his disposal—his vote and his voice—count in the determination of American policy.

That is the stand which our Catholic principles support, as applied to church and society in the conditions that obtain in our country, and I hope that the Catholics of this diocese will maintain that stand in never-failing good will and fairness to their fellow citizens.

Tax Adjustments Are Vitally Needed by Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting between representatives of the Smaller Business Association of New England and the Members of Congress from the New England area, on March 27, 1950, Mr. Charles W. Proctor, an outstanding attorney from my home city of Worcester, Mass., outlined an excellent analysis of the vital need for equitable tax adjustments in order for small business and private enterprise to survive in this country.

Mr. Proctor's very able presentation merits serious study and attention. I earnestly hope that every Member of this House will take the time to read his recommendations on this important subject:

NEED OF SMALL BUSINESS FOR TAX ADJUSTMENTS

Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate and Congress of the United States from New England, I am here as a representative of the Smaller Business Association of New England. My name is Charles W. Proctor. I am a Worcester lawyer, a former law-school teacher, and am chairman of the association's committee on taxation. This association comprises about 1,000 members, all of whom are employers; no one is eligible to join the association who employs over 50 people, although a few memberships have been renewed where the number of employees has slightly exceeded that amount. Roughly speaking, its membership employs 35,000 to 40,000 persons.

I want at the outset, if I can, to tell you what that means in regard to the status of most of the members.

When a man has first incorporated his business, his own personality and his own success are projected into corporate form, but it still is essentially a one-man enterprise, and rarely, if at all, do more than two or three men share in the establishment or the early stages of the running and conducting a business such as these.

That means that whether the business is mirrored in corporate form or otherwise, from its very nature it must grow to a size where it can support executive assistants and technical experts and others at the executive level, if it is to prosper, or even if it is to continue after the personal incapacity, death, or failure of its originators.

If we go back to early economic history this was the picture of all American business, and it was not until assistance was awarded, by tariffs on imports, by special grants to railroads, and other methods, that growth was stimulated, and we arrived at the point where we saw business multiply in our manufacturing and commerce in the hands of a self-perpetuating group, into which admittance was easy for a new man showing proper qualifications, and thence resulted in the dollar sustaining the social welfare of the entire world.

Most of us are old enough now to remember the man who started his own business and made it thrive. I have in my mind recollection of the origin of the Norton Co., of Worcester, a concern now selling its products all over the world and employing 8,000 to 12,000 persons. In its origin, it was started in a back yard by two instructors at Worcester Polytechnic Institute who had to continue teaching to support it, until they brought it along to its present, or nearly its present, high state of efficiency. Both of them died millionaires many times over.

Not so today. My clients do not expect any return to Government assistance or Government nursing, but are only asking to be relieved from Government amputation of their profits, that might properly be used to build up and make grow something for the future benefit of all mankind.

Speaking more specifically about House bill 4431, this is a bill to exempt corporations from paying taxes on the first $25,000 of their income while still in the hands of the corporate entity. If, as would be expected, it was paid out in dividends, the dividends would still be taxed. If it was distributed in unreasonably high salaries, the salaries would still be taxed, and if, as is our desire to make possible, it was returned to the corporation for the purpose of enlarging, developing, buying new machinery and other processes in business growth, the taxation might be delayed a little, but the net profits in the forms of taxation would, we think, be beneficial because the larger your tax base the more money can be collected, even on a smaller rate of taxation.

At the present time the businessman who has progressed no further than my clients, is sadly handicapped to finance capital expenditures as it is beyond his power to have the income to purchase them. The banks do not want him, except on terms of very short loans, and if he goes to the private lender for a long-term loan, the charges of interest that he must pay make it almost impossible for him to do business at all advantageously. He wants the privilege of answering his own capital needs by his own economy. Today he does not have it.

Most of you know what the first $25,000 on corporate income is taxed; that is 15 percent on the first $5,000; 17 percent on the next $15,000; 19 percent on the next $5,000; and on the next $25,000 he is taxed 31 percent, a higher tax than he pays in any other bracket

and apparently with the thought in mind of reaching back to the original $25,000, and leveling it off to a point where the total income tax of the smaller fellow will approximate the 24 percent demanded from the great incomes of corporate wealth.

No corporation is going to last indefinitely. The places of those of Nation-wide importance must be taken by the growing up of business and industry that is now in its infancy, and unless they are allowed to use their own money for development, that growth becomes stunted, and in many instances impossible, and in many more results in its actually dying out.

Forty-eight percent of the people employed in the United States are now employed by smaller businesses. The throwing of 5, 10, or 15 men out of employment by the failure of a small-business man is hardly noticeable. However, 98 percent of the businessmen in the country qualify as small-business men, and the failure of this 98 percent would provoke a major panic. The failure of any appreciable number thereof would destroy our economic security. I am not a raven croaking about hard times, but we need only to look across the water to see that our economy at the moment is bolstered up by the needs of Europe and Asia. When the time comes that they have returned to normal, unless the inhibitions now placed on the small-business men are removed to some extent at least, his growth will inevitably become stunted and in all probability will cease, and the free competition that has made our country great will be stifled, and we will become a country of cartels, where the business is firmly held in the hands of a few families, a condition toward which we are moving more rapidly than we realize. It is later than you think.

The question is often asked, "Assuming we remove this income from taxation, what have we to take its place?"

We believe that we have plenty to take its place, in the passage of H. R. 5064, or similar legislation. When Congress enacted the Internal Revenue Code, it, out of its wisdom, and we think properly, exempted charitable, educational, and religious institutions and cooperatives from liability to the income tax.

We do not quarrel at all from exempting from taxation of income derived by charitable, religious, and educational institutions from the conduct of their proper activities, and the plowing back of that income into the continuance and the extension of such work. We do object most vigorously to paying so large a tax to support the share that these corporations should pay when they invade the field of private business and are acting in competition with the ordinary business activities of the community. For example, Yale University recently purchased two of our largest buildings in the city of Worcester. The first building and the land on which it rests has an assessment of $70,000; and the second building and the land on which it rests has an assessment of $540,500. If we regarded the assessment value as the fair market value, which it is not, and the income therefrom as 5 percent, which is about fair, we would have a withdrawal from taxation of $30,525 a year on these two buildings alone. The chances are that these buildings are worth much nearer $1,000,000 taken together than the assessed value, and if that is true, it is safe to say that $50,000 a year net income is received from them, and is not taxed at all.

This illustration might be multiplied many times, and you have heard so much about it that I will not enlarge on it, except to say that every man who is familiar with real estate in his own community can point out at least a few illustrations of it nearly everywhere in the country, and it is not confined to real estate, but charitable corporations so-called are engaged in manufacturing, merchandising, and every business under the sun, which they never intended to enter at the time of their inception, but have encroached upon from the time the Internal Revenue Code made it attractive to them to engage in this form of enterprise.

In Massachusetts, property has been dealt with, we think wisely by providing an exemption for personal property as follows:

"Personal property of literary, benevolent, charitable, and scientific institutions and of temperance societies incorporated in the Commonwealth, the real estate owned and occupied by them or their officers for the purposes for which they are incorporated, and the real estate purchased by them with the purpose of removal thereto, shall be exempt from taxation."

Again, "Houses of religious worship owned by, or held in trust for the use of, any religious organization, and the pews and furniture, and, to an amount not exceeding $5,000 for each parsonage, parsonage so owned or held; but such exemption shall not, except as herein provided, extend to any portion of any such house of religious worship appropriated for purposes other than religious worship or instruction."

If a similar provision is made in the Internal Revenue Code and if cooperatives, which are really business corporations, are taxed as other corporations, we believe the loss of income derived from the tax on the first $25,000 of corporate profits will be more than compensated.

We also believe that the taxation of freight charges has imposed a tremendous burden on small industry without any corresponding benefit to the Government.

The Supreme Court of the United States and the Federal Trade Commission have held in no uncertain terms, that it is the duty of the manufacturer to use all its customers alike, and that under the Federal Trade Commission Act, this means that he must charge his customers the same amount of money for his product, and that the test is not what each pays, but the net amount the seller receives from each, and if the product is transported from the manufacturer to the buyer, the cost of transportation must either be paid by the buyer, or must be billed to the buyer after the manufacturer has paid it. (See *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Cement Institute* (333 U. S. p. 683)).

This means that there must be no leveling of prices in different parts of the country. Also we have seen horizontal freight increases allowed by the Interstate Commerce Commission from about 1914 to the present time. In heavy industry particularly, and in all industries to some extent the freight charges of the raw material to the manufacturer and freight charges of the finished product to the customer are becoming more and more an important part of charges to the customer, and with these increases the market of the manufacturer is becoming more and more circumscribed, and he can no longer meet competition from a manufacturer who is located more closely to either the place where the raw material is produced or to the place where the product is sold. In New England this fact is becoming more and more acute, and as the New England manufacturer can ship only to the west and southwest, freight rates alone are resulting in the curtailment of production as the local market is already well supplied, and additional cost for the purpose of taxation on the transportation means an additional cost of bookkeeping in small items to the shipper or customer as well as an additional cost in the freight bill itself.

We believe that if competition is to be kept alive our industries must be given a chance to compete and that this unnecessary and pernicious restriction on their orbit of obtaining raw materials and their outlets for sale should in justice and equity be removed.

Thank you.

You'd Discharge an Administration as Foolish as Your Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, now that the staggering one-package appropriation bill is before the House for debate, it would be helpful if every Member of Congress would read an editorial published recently in the Danville, Ill., Commercial-News, the largest newspaper in the Twenty-third Congressional District. The Commercial-News is one of the Gannett group of newspapers, all of them outstanding in their devotion to community service and the public welfare. In recent weeks they have performed a great public service in organizing what has come to be called the legion of obstinate men and women, dedicated to the task of halting the steadily mounting burden of Government expenditures.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the text of the Commercial-News editorial, as follows:

YOU'D DISCHARGE AN ADMINISTRATION AS FOOLISH AS YOUR GOVERNMENT

If you had so much money you had to have somebody handle it for you, and he ran through your pile, keeping you in debt and taking on more new long-range obligations, what would you do?

Well, you'd fire him if you found it out before it was too late.

Don't be surprised, you are such a person.

Whatever you do for a living and however much you earn, the Government handles one-fourth of your money. It takes a certain amount in withholding and income tax. The rest is collected from you by your grocer, butcher, and anyone else with whom you do business.

The Federal Government is running through it like an administrator who ought to be fired. It is keeping you in debt. The wage-earner of every average-size family owes $8,000 of it. It is increasing at a national rate of $5,500,000,000 a year.

And it is trying with all the wiles of artful propaganda to commit you to new long-range obligations of, Senator McCLELLAN says, another $25,000,000,000 a year.

Isn't it time to be as obstinate with government as you would be with an administrator who handled it all?

Some people profess to think that what they spend is their money and what the Government spends is some other kind of money—the Government's.

But the Government has no money. All it can have is what it takes from you. It spends exactly the same kind of money that you do. And what it spends, you don's.

Whatever the combined efforts of everybody produce—industry, agriculture, business and labor—is all there is. That's the only place wealth can come from. And that's where Government has to go to get what it wants.

A year ago President Truman in his budget message told Congress:

"In a period of high prosperity it is not sound public policy for Government to operate at a deficit. A Government surplus at this time is vitally important."

But this year somebody—and another mammoth deficit—got to him. The spender's argument that he repeated goes something like this:

If American industry keeps on growing at the rate it has grown and no more by the year 2000 we'll have a billion dollar national income and what would these debts in mere billions be then? So what are we afraid of?

Because this is the most ill-studied fantasy ever dreamed up.

American industry has grown because it was free to plow back its earnings, and Americans were free to accumulate enough capital to start new businesses. Government spending has cut these freedoms to the bone.

That's only one if. The others are if we can achieve peace and sustain it, if we have no depression, if we don't have to support large areas of the world indefinitely, if, if, if.

Or conversely, if the national debt continues to grow at its present rate it will be $535,000,000,000 by the year 2000—more than $16,000 for every wage earner of an average-size family.

And what would the dollar be worth then? Well, it came down to 59 cents in running up the first $256,000,000,000 of the debt.

At that rate it would be lucky to be worth a dime by the year 2000.

The fact is that what Mr. Truman argued a year ago is the eternal truth today. With the highest rate of national income, the highest level of taxes, the burden of the largest debt, the most serious threat to our democracy, it is high time to balance the budget and return to sound financial footings.

Famine in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 28, 1950:

FAMINE IN CHINA

There seems little doubt now that famine in China this year will be catastrophic. There is reason to believe, on the basis of fragmentary reports, that the situation will be more critical than at any other time in a half century. What the people of the United States should do and how they should go about doing it, will be questions of the gravest import that will have to be answered shortly. It is necessary, therefore, that our thinking be clear and our courses of action sound and straightforward.

The people of the United States have no quarrel with the people of China. They have been, and are, our good friends to the extent that their rulers will allow. Every humane instinct urges that we do what we can to alleviate their misery. That misery is very little of their own choosing. The Communist conquest of China is a relatively small factor in the causes of famine, although it has undoubtedly contributed. Recruiting of farmers and continuing shipments of foodstuffs to the Soviet Union certainly do not help the situation.

But the individual Chinese who will suffer hunger and the ills of starvation have had very little to do with the Communist conquest. We cannot make ourselves deaf to their appeal merely because we are at odds with the Government that has put itself into power over them. We should like to help, if we can.

The actions of the Communist Government, however, have cut us off from the normal channels of access to the people. Those actions have likewise made us mistrustful of the motives and methods of the Government itself. We cannot, therefore, simply give famine relief aid to the Chinese Communist Government with any confidence that it will reach the persons whom we desire to help. We certainly do not want to start feeding the Chinese Communist Army. And, by the same token, we do not want to put into the hands of that army and its political overlords a weapon that will be used for military and political purposes.

Unhappily, our previous experiences with aid to peoples in the Soviet-dominated sphere have taught us what to expect. We have no assurance that our help will extend to the points where it is needed, and we have reason to believe that any materials we supply will be relabeled and used for propaganda purposes and their origin concealed or falsified. We wish, in a spirit of entire friendliness, to help feed the Chinese, but we certainly have a right to expect that this friendliness be made known to them and not distorted to our own permanent disadvantage.

This situation suggests its own solution. We can give famine relief in China, provided the Chinese Communist Government agrees that it be administered and distributed by Americans on the ground. They could be nonmilitary Americans—teachers, doctors, missionaries, and businessmen who could be called into that service. They could be persons whose basic attachment to the Chinese people was well established. Their function would be to see that food got to persons who really needed it and that they knew from whose hands the food came. If the Chinese Communist Government is really devoted to the welfare of the people it will readily accept such a proposal.

Clyde Doyle, Representative in Congress from the Eighteenth District of California, Reports to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, at all times the people who elect us in our respective congressional districts, should be kept as fully informed as possible, as to what we as their representatives in Congress are doing on the job. But the Eighteenth District of California, in Los Angeles County, which I have now represented for nearly 4 years, as I am serving my second term, is about 3,000 miles from Washington, D. C. Relatively few of these people ever travel here. And the cost of travel to me personally, by plane, to my congressional district, is at least $325, round trip, from Washington, D. C.

Another primary election comes in my native State of California on June 6, 1950. Cross filing is in vogue there. I receive many requests for information about my work here. Constituents write and ask about the work and duties and services of a Representative in Congress. They want to know. That is good for America. Only an informed democracy will endure. Also, those who are not in office, but want to be elected, naturally, are not in any position to know what the actual facts are, or what has been done by a Member of Congress during his term. Neither can the news channels, 3,000 miles away, be expected to publish the full text of a report of a Member of Congress. So, the only practical way to let the people really know is to make adequate report and see that as many as possible thus have opportunity to know the facts and truth.

Mr. Speaker, I have abiding faith and confidence in the sound judgment and patriotism of the people of the Eighteenth District and of all America, if and when they are in possession of the material facts.

The record shows that Members of this great Congress, in both political parties, for many years have regularly printed, at their own expense, and have forwarded to their constituents a report of their work. I am now doing so at my personal expense. I also made such report during my first term of 2 years as a Member of this great House of Representatives. In that report, amongst other things, I then said, and I now repeat:

> Only an informed democracy can act intelligently, and only an intelligently acting democracy will endure.

I trust the following facts will help the people of the Eighteenth District, all of whom I have had the honor to represent for nearly 4 years in this Congress, to be much better informed about the work, labor, and services of their Congressman. Also, to be better informed about the functioning of Congress itself. Manifestly, time and space both limit me in these remarks and report:

To the voters of the Eighteenth Congressional District, California, I respectfully state:

1. Your Representative's offices at Washington, D. C., have been open daily, excepting Sunday and legal holidays, from 8:30 a. m. until at least 5:30 p. m., excepting a very few Saturday afternoons. Frequently it is open as late at 7:30 p. m., and sometimes later. I have four capable secretaries, two of whom are residents of Long Beach.

My district office in the post-office building in my home city of Long Beach has also been open regular hours daily, and I have also had a field secretary in the Eighteenth District in order to more promptly and adequately meet the service needs of the district. My wife has also worked right along with me at Washington, but is not on the Government pay roll.

2. Heavy daily mail received. It averages 75 to 150 first-class letters daily, all of which I have and do read. I have had this habit ever since I was first elected. I also try to personally answer every first-class letter.

I receive from 25 to 50 second- and third-class pieces of mail daily; from 10 to 25 newspapers and periodicals daily; from 8 to 30 printed reports, resolutions, petitions, circular letters, foreign periodicals, departmental announcements, etc.

3. I am a member of important Armed Services Committee. Upon the Eighty-first Congress opening, I was promptly elected a member of the House Armed Services Committee. Hon. Carl Vinson, Democrat, of Georgia, is the distinguished chairman of the committee. During my first term in Congress I was a member of the important Rivers and Harbors Committee. So I have had a great privilege in my committee

work. In my first term I was a subcommittee member on Invalid Pensions, Patents, Claims, Erosion, etc. In this Eighty-first Congress my subcommittees are: Military Reserve Components, Radar Fence, Wind Tunnels, Armories, Central Intelligence, Military Establishment, Reports to Congress, etc.

4. I am a member of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. I am one of seven Members only, of all the House of Representatives, to be appointed to the Select Lobbying Committee. Congress first gave us $40,000 for our committee staff, investigators, and hearings. We have already had several public hearings and will have more. One of our duties will be to recommend ways and means, by which the Federal Lobbying Act should be amended and altered. In my first term in Congress I helped enact this Lobbying Act. I am now further studying its operations, as a member of this committee, which has such important Nationwide attention and interest. It is here regarded as an honor and responsibility to be chosen 1 of 7 members out of 435, to serve upon this committee. Witnesses of national reputation have already testified before us. It is a fact-finding policy committee.

5. I am a member of the special subcommittee on Military Hospitals. I was named as one of six members of the entire Armed Services Committee membership, both Democrats and Republicans, to make a bi-partisan field survey and report. This subcommittee made inspections and held public hearings in 10 of the congressional districts, where military hospitals are located. Some were represented in Congress by Republicans and some were represented by Democrats. Congress does not play "party politics" with the health or suffering of veterans or military dependents. This subcommittee, was authorized by the unanimous approval of the Armed Services Committee; both Democrats and Republicans. We were directed to travel by plane to Michigan, California, Texas, Florida, Georgia, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts and have public hearings and make on-the-spot studies and gather pertinent facts for Congress to consider in the realm of military hospitals. I was honored by being asked to preside as chairman at the hearings at Long Beach and Oceanside, Calif.

6. I keep daily diary on floor of Congress. As in my first term, I have again kept a brief but interesting and important diary of unusual and significant events on the floor of the House. I make record of valuable data you do not find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Majority Leader MCCORMACK and Speaker SAM RAYBURN and others on both sides of the political aisle have commended me for it. They say it is the only one of its sort in existence. It takes work, of course. But it is valuable work.

7. I have appeared before several congressional committees. Each congressional committee acts essentially as a jury in a civil court. It hears testimony; receives documentary evidence; interrogates witnesses; makes findings and recommendations; files both majority and minority reports if there are both. Some of the appearances I have made before committees are as follows:

Ways and Means: To argue for removal of certain war-time excise taxes; as on transportation, telegrams, and so forth.

Appropriations: To argue for the Whittier Narrows Dam. Four million dollars were secured and is now actually available for this important flood protection to the Eighteenth District, which I represent.

Post Office and Civil Service: To argue for certain increases in pay to post-office clerks and for benefits to post-office clerks who were in the military services, H. R. 87; and also for the post-office supervisory positions bill, H. R. 4678, etc.

Judiciary: Tidelands oil bill. It was stipulated before the committee, that the testimony previously given in the other session of Congress should be considered as having been given again. So none of the California Congressmen were asked to, or did orally testify before the House committee of this Eighty-first Congress. But the Doyle bill, H. R. 1212, supporting the claims of the city of Long Beach and the State of California, was filed by me on January 10, 1949, only 7 days after this Eighty-first Congress convened.

Also, I personally interviewed the members of the subcommittee and the full Judiciary Committee, and furnished them photographs and charts promptly furnished me by the Long Beach Harbor Department and the city attorney's office. The judiciary subcommittee unanimously approved the theory of the bill approved by Long Beach city attorney and the attorney general of California. I have done all, and more than I have been asked to do by the city or the State. I also filed the first bill for the city and State in my first term in Congress and the California bill only had 11 votes against it in the House. The facts reveal that I, during my first term in Congress, discovered and forthwith reported to the city and State the jeopardy to its tidelands. I have continued to work diligently for both the city and State in this my second term in Congress. I have received a written commendation from the attorney general of California for my work for this bill.

I also personally appeared and argued before a judiciary subcommittee for the issuance of a national charter by Congress to the American Blue Star Mothers, Inc.; and also for a national charter for the Army and Navy Union.

Labor and Education Subcommittee: To invite the subcommittee studying the effect of Federal installations in school districts of the Nation, on the local public-school attendance and maintenance costs, etc., to come to Long Beach and hold one of its few public hearings. It did so. It also honored Long Beach by making the Wilton Hotel its headquarters at my request and invitation. At my invitation an appropriate and very fine public dinner was held in honor of this subcommittee of Congress at the Lafayette Hotel, Long Beach, Calif., through the splendid cooperation of school and other groups of interested citizens.

8. I have debated and spoken in Congress. I have either spoken or participated in debate, or extended my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD more than 90 times. They can be easily found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at your public library, high school, chamber of commerce, college library, where I have had the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD forwarded, so the most people could have access to it.

9. I have filed bills to help. A Congressman cannot always file a bill, for all the many objects he is asked to by well-meaning constituents. The legislative counsel is necessarily consulted first. Not all needs of constituents can be met by merely filing a bill. But it has been my pleasure to file and start through the complicated processes of department, subcommittee, committee, House, Senate subcommittee, Senate committee, Senate, President, more than 40 bills. They cover a wide variety of subjects. Some of the public bills I have filed are as follows:

H. R. 1212: To protect California tidelands for State ownership and control.

H. R. 1828: To incorporate Army and Navy Union.

House Joint Resolution 107: Adjudication of claims of waters of the Colorado River in the Supreme Court.

H. R. 2171: Slum clearance.

H. R. 2172: To amend the act to reclassify the salaries of postal employees, and to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation, etc.

H. R. 2173: Incorporate Blue Star Mothers.

H. R. 2292: Retired pay for Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve of World Wars I and II.

House Joint Resolution 155: For relief of farmers in storm-stricken areas.

H. R. 2542: Extension of veterans' benefits to disabled retired enlisted personnel of Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, without impairment of benefit rights earned for service prior to World War II.

H. R. 2543: Repeal tax on transportation of persons and property.

H. R. 2544: Amend veterans' regulations to provide increased rates of compensation for certain veterans with specific service-incurred disabilities.

H. R. 2545: Reclassify assistant postmasters and other supervisory positions in postal field service.

H. R. 2644: Promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of Post Office Department.

H. R. 2676: Authorize demonstration plants to produce potable water from sea water, etc., to increase national water resources.

H. R. 2939: Federal aid to education.

H. R. 3276: Exempt persons who served in wartime merchant marine from induction into armed services under Selective Service Act of 1948.

H. R. 4296: Give effect to the convention between the United States and Mexico for the scientific investigation of tuna.

House Concurrent Resolution 92: To strengthen and support the United Nations.

H. R. 5228: Give effect to the convention between the United States and Costa Rica for the establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

House Joint Resolution 277: Establish a National Children's Day.

H. R. 5758: Return to California copies of original documents and maps (Spanish-Mexican land-grant papers) deposited in National Archives.

H. R. 5786: Provide automobiles for veteran amputees.

H. R. 6058: Improve procedure relating to determination and priority of combat connection of disabilities, injuries or diseases.

H. R. 7097: Extension of pensions to widows and children of deceased World War II veterans to equal pensions extended to widows and children of World War I deceased veterans.

H. R. 7495: Terminate war excise tax on theater tickets, amusements, and recreation.

I have filed more than 10 bills for the benefit and relief of individuals who make claim against the Government as a result of injuries to person or to property or other losses or damage or detriment suffered by said individuals without their being at fault.

I want to report that, even though the law has to be necessarily strict—sometimes it seems supertechnical—even Uncle Sam has a heart. Remember the incident in March 1944, when two lovely girls were shot to death by a crazy soldier in uniform at Riverside Army base? Admittedly, he was not on duty when he killed them. Admittedly their behavior had been as perfect ladies. But, both had fond parents who had a right to expect that of their lovely daughters. So, one of my bills for the relief of the parents of these girls has been approved by the Budget for about $6,700 in one case and about $6,400 in the other.

But the ways of a private bill in Congress are long. Many times it takes attention in more than one session of Congress to obtain the relief asked for. Many times no relief can be had.

The Doyle resolution, House Joint Resolution 277, to establish a National Children's Day, is an illustration of opportunity for a Congressman to file a bill in a worthy cause. This arose from the activities of the people of Lynwood and South Gate, through their Kiwanis Club at Lynwood and the leadership of Rev. James Roberts, of Lynwood. The International Kiwanis Convention last

year approved Doyle, House Joint Resolution 277. Other Nation-wide and State-wide groups have approved it. Also, at least 20 other Members of the House have already filed exactly the same bill at my request. The Children's Bureau of the Federal Security Agency is interested in the subject matter, too. A subcommittee now has it before it.

10. I have had personal conferences with the President and Cabinet members. My duties as your Representative have made it necessary for me to have several conferences with the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, Department of State, Secretary of Navy, Secretary of Army, Secretary of Air Force, Surgeons General, Director of the Budget, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, Postmaster General, Secretary of Agriculture, Attorney General of the United States, Maritime Commission, FHA, RFC, Federal Security Agency, Children's Bureau, Secretary of Labor, etc., etc.

These high officials and department administrators do not have their offices on the Hill where Congress meets. They are all either uptown or at the Pentagon Building; from 10 to 30 minutes by auto from my office. As Congress meets daily at 12 noon, we have to try to see these executive and administrative officers in between 9 a. m. and 12 noon, in addition to attending various committee meetings which move almost daily, beginning at 9:30 or 10 a. m. and lasting until 12 noon.

11. The records show that I did all that could be done to keep the Long Beach shipyard in active status. A very, very brief account, and only a partial list of the important steps I took as your Congressman in this connection are as follows:

A. Within a few weeks after I took my seat as your Representative, I discovered that "the subsidence" or sinking condition at the navy yard had for several years previously worried the Navy very definitely—especially since the Harris engineers' report on subsidence to the Navy and the city dated 1945.

B. Had conferences with Bureau of Ships, Naval Operations, Secretary of Navy, regarding subsidence as relating to employment and operations level as a result of subsidence.

C. April 4, 1949, telegraphed official, Long Beach Chamber of Commerce, etc., as follows:

"Have just studied report of Bureau of Yards and Docks on subsidence, LB Naval Shipyard, February 1949. Please advise the earliest possible date whether or not board of harbor commissioners satisfied with present status of subsidence, studies, and survey, especially with reference to possible implications re LB Naval Shipyard availability, use and permanency. Also advise if local interests continuing employment of Stanford Survey.

"CLYDE DOYLE, *Member of Congress.*"

D. On April 21, 1949, received letter from Chief of Bureau of Ships, Washington, answering mine of prior date, which letter also said:

"In addition to this situation a problem exists which concerns the Long Beach shipyard alone. The land upon which this shipyard is built has been sinking at the rate of about a foot a year. Unless remedial action, for which funds are not now available, is taken within the near future certain areas and facilities of the yard will be untenable. Even after funds are made available and the planned bulkheads around the docks and piers are constructed there will result a decreased efficiency of operation. The planned reduced level of operations at the Long Beach Naval Shipyard takes these conditions into consideration."

And on May 12, 1949, I received further statement from the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, which letter also said:

"Last, but by no means least, the sinking phenomenon now occurring at Long Beach was given consideration. The Navy is extremely concerned with the sinkage at that yard. The fact that sinkage exists is real and cannot be ignored when the problem of work distribution is being considered. Without doubt this factor has adversely affected the employment at Long Beach, and will continue to affect the employment at that yard until the situation concerning sinkage is cleared up. Sinkage considerations do not affect the other yards."

E. I personally paid for and immediately mailed 5,000 copies of these letters to me dated April 21 and May 12; which letters included the language set forth in the above quotations.

F. Also telegraphed, telephoned, etc., Long Beach officials, community leaders, etc., warning of danger of subsidence.

G. Promptly obtained allocation of $4,500,000 to begin constructing dikes, walls, etc., to protect shipyard installations from damage or destruction by salt water resulting from subsidence condition.

H. Flew to Long Beach after Washington made arrangements for me to meet chairman of the on-the-site survey, Navy, re subsidence; I met with him in executive session; conferred with Admiral Klein and Navy engineers re subsidence.

I. Immediately met Long Beach Harbor Board, mayor, and city councilmen, and the city attorney on subsidence, etc.

J. Arranged another visit to Long Beach re subsidence at naval yard with Under Secretary of Navy Kimball; we met with harbor board and city councilmen.

K. Again traveled to Long Beach and met with harbor board and city officials re subsidence and Navy Yard Harris Report, Stanford Report, etc.

L. Obtained waiver dated September 30, 1949, by Attorney General of the United States to Navy, permitting volunteer reduction of oil production up to 30 percent by Wilmington-Long Beach area oil producers for the purpose of testing whether oil production principal cause of subsidence and immediately furnished oil producers and official Long Beach copies thereof.

M. Sent every oil producer in Wilmington oil field personally signed letter as Congressman, asking immediate cooperation in test by curtailing production because of subsidence. Harris Report on Navy had long previously advised major cause of subsidence was rate of extraction of oil.

N. Arranged personal inspection Long Beach Navy Yard by Secretary of Navy Matthews and again flew to Long Beach to be personally present.

O. Vigorously and vigilantly undertook to obtain maximum cooperation by official Long Beach and other oil producers to make test by voluntary reduction of oil production, up to 30 percent, to establish whether oil extraction was major cause of subsidence as claimed by Navy and the Harris Report dated 1945.

P. In every way cooperated with all persons or groups seeking retention of Long Beach Navy Shipyard as active yard and to obtain cooperation of city and other oil producers in testing cause of subsidence.

Q. Vigorously, continuously pressed claims of Long Beach Navy Shipyard for remaining "active status" to attention executive and administrative departments of Government, Washington, from very early date I first discovered that "subsidence" had been established and well-known as a hazard to the shipyard.

R. Helped arrange conference between Long Beach representatives and office of President of the United States at Washington, for presentation of Long Beach shipyard claims against making it reserve yard.

S. February 7, 1950, received final decision, Secretary of Navy, which, in part, said:

"Subsidence has affected vital areas of the yard. The rate of subsidence has not changed significantly within recent months and, in some important areas, the rate has accelerated somewhat.

"Due to the subsidence, dikes must be constructed around the piers, drydocks, and quay walls to protect the Government's investment for mobilization purposes. The initial construction of these dikes is to begin early in February 1950. Continued subsidence will require the extension of these dikes in later years. Despite the construction of dikes, however, subsidence may possibly continue to the point where no use could be made of the facilities in the event of mobilization, and the shipyard would have to be abandoned. * * *

"Please accept my assurance that only the necessity of irremediable circumstances has forced our reluctant decision."

T. Col. H. E. Hedger, chief engineer, Los Angeles County Flood Control District, on February 24, 1950, testified here in Washington before a congressional committee:

"The extensive subsidence which has occurred in the Long Beach Harbor area has resulted in a lowering in elevation of levees and bridges in the lower Los Angeles River channel near its outlet by as much as 4 feet and has reduced its flood carrying capacity by an estimated 25 percent. Consequently, the protection provided by the flood-control work constructed in the past by the United States Government and the Los Angeles County Flood Control District on this reach of the channel has been substantially diminished. * * * It justifies work in the amount of $1,000,000."

Thus you will see that the Honorable Secretary of the Navy, in his final decision to your Congressman, dated February 7, 1950, gave the same cause for inactivating the Long Beach Naval Shipyard as the distinguished Los Angeles flood-control engineer gave for asking $1,000,000 to correct a condition which has developed immediately adjacent to Terminal Island, on which the shipyard is located, and which condition was described as "the extensive subsidence."

U. I, personally, spent hundreds of dollars in transportation, communication and other expenses in my effort to keep the yard in active status.

I have not been advised by any person, as to any manner in which a Congressman can keep Terminal Island from sinking. Nor have I been informed of any highly reputed or nationally known engineer who has yet signed his name to a report on subsidence declaring that the Harris Report of 1945 was wrong; or, that the Secretary of the Navy's final opinion, dated February 7, 1950, to me as your Congressman, was ill-founded.

12. I have served the Eighteenth Congressional District well. Every request for information, for service to local committees or local city officials, chambers of commerce, Red Cross, labor organizations, schools, colleges, trade organizations, veterans organizations, patriotic societies and groups, civic groups of all types, professional and business interest groups, fraternal lodges and groups, manufacturing concerns, etc., has been promptly attended to and serviced as far as I know. No person or group, has been denied my service on account of political affiliation, or, on account of race, creed or color. My privilege and honor is to represent the interests of all the people of the Eighteenth District of California, for this, my second term.

13. I have given weekly, nonpartisan, public-service radio broadcasts. At my own expense, each week for several months, through the courtesy of stations KFOX and KNOB, Long Beach, I have conducted a public service radio broadcast by "platter" from the radio room here at your Nation's Capital. The stations have not charged me one cent; but, I have personally paid the cost of the radio "platter" and air express which is about $5 for each "platter" each week.

The fact that both Long Beach radio stations informed me that they had received no complaint about anything I had said on their public service broadcasts, for the first period of 3 months and then both invited me to take another 3 months free time, gave evidence that I had not imposed upon their invitation to talk nonpartisanly.

And, because I am to continue my nonpartisan public service talks over KNOB for a few weeks yet, I list those dates here, KNOB, dial 103.1, FM station channel 276: Friday nights, May 5 and 19, 7:15 p. m.; June 2, 16 and 30, 7:15 p. m.

14. I have competitive examinations for candidates for both Academies. As in my first term as your Represenative, I have again required a civil-service competitive examination be taken by all applicants for either Annapolis or West Point. These examinations are strictly competitive and open to all qualified lads, regardless of race, creed, or color, and also regardless of the political registration of their parents, relatives, or sponsors. I also require a written statement of about 2,000 words by each applicant as to why he chooses a military career. I notify all applicants and their parents that I will not authorize any lad to take the competitive examination unless he has previously declared his intention to make the military his career. This, I believe fair to the taxpayers. I believe it not fair for a lad to get his 4 years of free schooling and then promptly resign, without giving value received to the taxpeyers and to his country.

15. My attendance in Congress and committees is prompt. My attendance and work record on both my committees and in Congress will speak up that I have been on the job for you. During official absences from the floor of Congress on account of my subcommittee work, I have directed and authorized pairs as far as possible. This is the only procedure provided in Congress. There is no vote by proxy in Congress; although there is in committee. Absences on quorum calls do not affect or relate to voting, if a Member is present to vote. Many times, Members continue their executive or public hearing attendance in committee, even though the bells ring for a quorum. Sometimes a quorum call is made by some Member who, at the moment, is tempermental. Also, quorum calls are often made to filibuster for time. No bill is being voted upon as a result of a quorum call. A quorum is not a call to vote. It is not a roll call vote.

Sometimes, the quorum call is a matter of political party stalling for time; or, it may be that they do not want any vote on the particular bill or amendment thereto until the next day or so. Thus, on Tuesday, April 4, when the Special Subcommittee on Military Hospitals, of which I am a member, was at Murphy General Hospital in Massachusetts, holding public hearings and making a survey and study upon the unanimous instruction and direction of the entire Armed Services Committee of the House, the same as we had done previously at Long Beach Navy Hospital and others in Mare Island, Calif., Oceanside, Calif., Corpus Christi, Tex., Jacksonville, Fla., Augusta, Ga., etc., the New York Times' Washington special correspondent for Wednesday, April 5, in writing about the general debate on the omnibus appropriation bill said:

"It was 2:15 p. m. before debate got under way today as business of the House was slowed down by three quorum calls; all sought by Republicans and each of which took 25 minutes."

These three quorum calls happened while we were busy on official congressional assignment in Massachusetts. We did not miss actual votes. We only missed quorum calls—which had no connection with votes; there were no roll-call votes. The hospitals subcommittee had planned to hurry to Pennsylvania and Massachusetts the week before; but we remained in Washington so as not to miss any vote in connection with ECA.

This illustrates, how impossible it is for important subcommittees of Congress to promptly function without missing some quorum calls; and also, it is likewise impossible without missing a few actual votes if Congress calls them. But there is no other way provided.

When the same hospitals subcommittee left Congress for Michigan, California, Texas, Florida, Georgia, the members resultingly missed some votes; but under such circumstances, Congressmen on official subcommittee assignments, cannot be two places at once.

But, it is not here considered a neglect of congressional duties for Members of Congress to fulfill necessary official committee assignments on subcommittees; even if it results in the members of that subcommittee being personally absent when some votes are called for. Members are not absent unnecessarily.

16. I write Your Congressman Reports, a Washington newsletter. As during my first 2 years as your Representative, I have again personally written the text of my Washington newsletter, Your Congressman Reports. In it I have again endeavored to give you friends at home, glimpses and information about Washington and the Nation not likely to be had otherwise. Many folks write in and ask me to put their names on the free mailing list to receive it whenever I write it. There is no charge for it to anybody. I personally pay for its printing and send it out every 2 or 3 months. It is not a political or partisan letter.

17. I fought for California against Arizona, for Colorado River water for California. I early filed House Joint Resolution 107, the Doyle bill. It asks for adjudication in the United States Supreme Court of the legal differences between California and Arizona on the important subject of diversion of waters from the Colorado River between California and Arizona. I have worked diligently with my colleagues from California, regardless of political party, for the protection of California's share of this vital water. I have also worked with the official representatives of the State of California and of the metropolitan water district, Colorado River Association and all agencies and committees with this common objective. I have received much commendation for my activities in this regard.

18. I was bipartisanly selected by my colleagues from California on the West Coast Committee representing California, Oregon, and Washington in the matter of maritime matters and west coast shipbuilding. Also, I was named as one of the Congressmen from California, bipartisanly, to represent the interests of California and other Western States at the time of the freeze in southern California, Nevada, and other Western States, for the purpose of devising ways and means of aid, if necessary, in relief to the farmers and agriculturalists in these Western States.

19. The record clearly shows I did everything possible to keep the Long Beach naval hospital open (as a military, or as a veterans', or as a joint-use hospital), but the Congress, in which I am your Representative, is only the legislative branch of government. It does not have jurisdiction or control of the executive branch, under which the Department of the Secretary of Defense is classified. It was this Department of administrative government, which issued the order closing the Long Beach Naval Hospital and several other military hospitals in whole or in part, scattered over the States of Michigan, California, Texas, Florida, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New Hampshire. Our great American Constitution, expressly provides for the separation of the executive, legislative, and judicial departments of Government. Furthermore, Members of Congress could not possibly either qualify or find time, with their legislative duties, to try to also administer the many laws which they find it necessary to enact.

Long Beach Naval Hospital was only one of several similarly included in the closing or inactivation order by the Secretary of Defense. I immediately protested on the meritorious grounds that there was not yet any showing that the order was either economical or in the best interests of national defense. Promptly, the Secretary of Defense communicated to me his claimed justification. Promptly, I refused to accept it as sufficient justification. Promptly, several of my colleagues, both Republican and Democratic Members of the House Armed Services Committee, joined me in asking for appointment of a subcommittee to investigate the effects of the closing order. The hospitals involved were in congressional districts represented about equally by Republicans and Democrats.

The House Armed Services Committee unanimously authorized appointment of the subcommittee of which I have been serving as a member and with which I came to Long Beach, where there was held public hearings at the hospital and at the Long Beach City Hall. The subcommittee had first gone to Michigan, represented by a Republican Member of Congress and then to Mare Island, Calif., another district represented by another Republican Member of Congress. It is a bipartisan committee, with equal numbers of Republicans and Democrats on it.

During our survey and public hearings, we have been excused from attendance of committees of Congress. There is no other way provided whereby congressional committees can function, excepting that they be excused from their Washington duties temporarily and gather the facts and make report back as early as practical. Within 24 hours, after the closing order was announced I conferred with the Defense Department, the Secretary of Navy, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration; the Bureau of the Budget, the Surgeons General of the Army and the Navy.

Through the courtesy of Representative RIVERS, South Carolina, subcommittee chairman, I was named to act as presiding subcommittee chairman at the public hearings at Long Beach and at Oceanside, Calif. This subcommittee, was charged with ascertaining the facts and making findings, conclusions, and recommendations with regard to what the congressional policy should be in matters of military hospitalization. At this writing, the future use of Long Beach Navy Hospital is not fully determined by the administrative departments of the Federal Government concerned with its possible use.

I have vigorously and vigilantly opposed the closing on the following grounds, amongst others:

A. It would compel military personnel dependents who needed general hospitalization to travel too far at their own expense to make it practical for them to obtain prompt, adequate, reasonable hospitalization.

B. It would force too many military personnel dependents into private hospitals—whereas, all private hospitals in the Long Beach area are already overcrowded and the additional expense would also be prohibitive.

C. It would reduce the number of available beds for veterans in the immediate Los Angeles-Long Beach area, and there is already a shortage of such beds.

D. It would remove the general hospitalization too far away from the retired military personnel in the Long Beach area, and many hundreds of retired military personnel have admittedly purchased homes, or, are now buying homes in the Long Beach area, in order to take advantage of the Navy hospital.

E. It breaks faith with "inducements" frequently made by the enlisting officers of the

military, in representing that their dependents would have necessary hospitalization.

F. It removes many patients from the fireproof, modern portion of the Long Beach Navy hospital at Oceanside, Calif., and other hospital facilities which are not fireproof.

These are just a few of my reasons for vigorous opposition to this administrative order.

20. I have kept faith with the electors of the Eighteenth Congressional District. I am a registered Democrat. I was such at the time of my first election, and again for my second term. This fact was adequately publicized. I was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention from the State of California. I voted for the national platform of the Democratic Party at the national convention. I supported President Truman and Vice President Barkley for election and campaigned for them. The publicity for me specified that I was a registered Democrat. I then frequently stated, and I again state that I think the cross-filing system in the State of California dissipates and materially weakens the obligation of political party responsibility. My record as your representative clearly shows that I have voted to support the principles enunciated in the National Democratic Party platform. I had frequently declared that I considered the platform of a political party something to fight for after election as well as something to speak for during a political campaign.

21. I have promptly supplied every request for printed material or information about Government wherever possible. I had Congressional Record, Government pamphlets, directories, and reports placed in public libraries, public colleges, high school libraries, etc., for people's use because I realize that many more people wanted access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Congressional Directory, and other Government pamphlets and booklets than just a few who could be supplied by mail. I had forwarded to the public libraries and public colleges and high school libraries, in some cases regularly and in other cases as often as possible, copies of this valuable reference, documents, and books. This applies to the libraries in the communities of the Eighteenth Congressional District which I represent. Also, I have had mailed direct to as many people in the Eighteenth Congressional District as I had supply for the valuable publications of the Department of Agriculture, Department of the Interior, and the Children's Bureau, the Department of State, etc., so that the maximum number of citizens could be better informed about the operations and functioning of the Federal Government.

The Congress annually appropriates money for the printing of such documents and pamphlets and booklets for experience has proven by the demand of the people of the country that they find this printed material of value and practical use to them. For instance, every Congress for more than 20 years has appropriated money for the printing of valuable booklets, commonly described as the "baby books." This applies to both the Republican and Democratic majorities of Congress.

No free seeds have been furnished to Members of Congress for distribution from the Department of Agriculture, or otherwise, since the year 1923.

Literally thousands of requests for specific governmental pamphlets, bills, reports, resolutions, and publications have been received from residents of the Eighteenth Congressional District. These have been promptly attended to and promptly complied with wherever the printed material was available. My Washington office is so organized that request for such information is promptly dispatched. I have also forwarded to high schools and colleges in the District governmental pamphlets on such subjects as the history of the flag, history of our Government, the United States Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, etc.

22. My comprehensive voting record speaks clearly of my work and votes as your Representative. The following is a list of my votes on many of the major issues of the Eighty-first Congress to the date of this report, to wit: April 5, 1950:

On the following bills relating to international affairs, I voted "aye":

S. 1309: Authorizes continuance of Marshall plan (Public Law 47).

H. R. 4830: Finances European recovery program; aid to Greece and Turkey, and relief of occupied areas (Public Law 327).

H. R. 1211: Restores and extends reciprocal trade agreements (Public Law 307).

H. R. 4567: Amends Displaced Persons Act to remove discriminatory provisions.

Senate Joint Resolution 36: Special contribution of $16,000,000 to the UN to aid DP's in Palestine War (Public Law 25).

H. R. 5895 (S. 2388): Military aid to western Europe (Public Law 329).

H. R. 5594, H. R. 5615, S. 2197: Point 4 program; technical and industrial aid to underdeveloped countries.

S. 1250. Extends Institute of Inter-American Affairs to continue cooperative health, education, agriculture, and other projects to improve living standards (Public Law 283).

S. 2093, H. R. 4706: Revises UN Participation Act to authorize appointment of Deputy United States Representative; fixes salaries of representatives and gives them ambassador status (Public Law 341).

H. R. 4406: International Claims Settlement Act. Establishes machinery within Department of State to carry out terms of settlements with former enemies. Yugoslavia, $17,000,000 (Public Law 455).

H. R. 2785: Extends for 1-year period for use of United States contribution to International Children's Emergency Fund. Makes available until June 30, 1950, $17,300,000 balance of $57,700,000 total United States contribution (Public Law 170).

H. R. 4332: Permits National and State banks in Federal Reserve System to deal in securities of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (Public Law 142).

Senate Joint Resolution 3: Provides for use of World War I debt payments by Finland for educational and technical instruction and training in United States for citizens of Finland (Public Law 265).

H. R. 7797: Foreign Economic Assistance (the roll-call vote in the House was—yeas 287 to nays 86).

On the following bills relating to national defense and internal security, I voted "aye":

H. R. 5632 and S. 1843: Unification of Armed Services. Defines powers of Secretary of Defense (Public Law 216).

H. R. 2216: Creates post of Under Secretary of Defense to relieve Secretary of administrative burdens (Public Law 36).

H. R. 2663: Defines authority and powers of Central Intelligence Agency and improves its administration and operation (Public Law 110).

H. R. 1437: Fixes the composition and strength of Army and Air Force.

H. R. 5007: Military pay increases. $303,000,000 (Public Law 351).

H. R. 2546: Authorizes construction of radar air-warning and control installations (Public Law 30).

H. R. 1741: Authorizes establishment of guided missile proving ground for testing rockets, etc. $75,000,000 (Public Law 60).

H. R. 3434 and S. 1367: Authorizes construction of supersonic wind tunnel (Public Law 415).

H. R. 4007 and S. 1505: Experimental submarine program (Public Law 213).

H. R. 4080 and S. 857: Establishes uniform code of military justice for all branches of the Armed Services and Coast Guard.

On the following bills relating to governmental reorganization, I voted "aye":

H. R. 2361 and S. 526: Authorizes President to reorganize Executive Departments in line with Hoover Commission Report re Welfare Department, Labor Department, Post Office Department, National Security Council, Civil Service Commission, Maritime Commission, Commerce Department, unification of Armed Services (Public Law 109).

S. 1704: Authorizes reorganization of State Department (Public Law 73).

H. R. 4754: Establishes the General Services Administration including Federal Works Agency; Bureau of Federal Supply and the Office of Contract Settlement from Treasury; War Assets Administration and Archives (Public Law 152).

H. R. 1689 and S. 498: Salary increases for Government executives (Public Law 359).

On the following bills relating to national economy, I voted "aye":

H. R. 1731: Extends rent control for 15 months from March 31, 1949 (Public Law 31).

H. R. 1660 and S. 547: Extends to September 30, 1949, the President's authority to make voluntary agreements affecting transportation, inventory control, speculative trading in commodities affecting cost of living, and for allocation of key materials in short supply (Public Law 6).

H. R. 1661: Extends to June 30, 1951, the President's authority to control exports (Public Law 11).

H. R. 3652: Authorizes $40,000,000 appropriation for sites and planning for new Federal public buildings, and $30,000,000 for modernization of existing structures (Public Law 105).

S. 2116 and H. R. 5739: Authorizes Federal aid to States and local governments for advance planning of public works (Public Law 352).

H. R. 1161: Permits national banks to become State banks.

H. R. 2734: Tightens antitrust laws to prohibit acquisitions or mergers which lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

On the following bill relating to national economy, I voted "no":

H. R. 2222 and S. 1008: Legalizes basing point price system when not in conflict with antitrust laws.

On the following bills relating to social security, health, and welfare, I voted "aye":

S. 1070: Housing Act; $1,000,000,000 in loans and $500,000,000 in grants to State and local authorities for slum clearance; $300,000,000 in Federal aid to farmers for construction and repair of farm dwellings; research program to stimulate home construction and cut building costs; 810,000 public housing units to be built in 6 years (Public Law 171).

House Joint Resolution 228: Authorizes expenditure of $75,000 to President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week (Public Law 162).

House Joint Resolution 212: Appropriates $1,500,000 emergency funds for crippled children, in addition to regular annual grants to States (Public Law 42).

H. R. 5208, S. 1407: Authorizes 10-year program for rehabilitation of Navajo-Hopi Indian Tribes. Ninety million dollars. (Vetoed October 17, 1949.)

S. 1184: Permits private industry to construct rental housing on or near military installations and authorizes insurance of $500,000,000 additional mortgages (Public Law 211).

H. R. 4846, S. 247: Establishes National Science Foundation.

H. R 3829: Continues for 1 year Federal aid for schools with war-swelled populations and for education of children on Federal reservations (Public Law 306).

Senate Joint Resolution 109: Extends for 60 days authority to insure loans for repairs, renovation and low-cost housing, and authority to insure mortgages on multiple dwelling projects; increases by $500,000,000 insurance authority under title II of National Housing Act (Public Law 278).

On the following bills relating to agriculture, I voted "aye":

H. R. 5345, S. 1971: Revises price-support system (Public Law 439).

H. R. 3699: Improves and makes more effective the Federal Land Bank system to aid farmers (Public Law 433).

H. R. 2682, S. 900: Revises charter of Commodity Credit Corporation to provide adequate crop storage facilities and for exchange of surplus commodities for strategic and critical materials (Public Law 85).

H. R. 2101, S. 913: Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make production disaster loans to farmers from $44,000,000 revolving fund balance of the Regional Agriculture Credit Corporation, which was abolished (Public Law 38).

House Joint Resolution 112, House Joint Resolution 136: Emergency appropriations for relief loans to farmers whose crops were destroyed in western blizzard (Public Laws 3 and 5).

H. R. 2960: Authorizes the REA to make loans for construction of rural telephone lines (Public Law 460).

H. R. 5738, S. 1962: Provides for national marketing quota and acreage allotment for cotton production (Public Law 272).

H. R. 2514: Authorizes loans by Farmers Home Administration to homestead entrymen (Public Law 361).

House Joint Resolution 327: Appropriates $1,750,000 for control of pests and plant disease (Public Law 215).

H. R. 5856, S. 653: Increase minimum wage to 75 cents an hour (Fair Labor Standards Act of 1949) (Public Law 393).

H. R. 3191, S. 1287: Liberalizes compensation benefits to Government employees injured or killed in line of duty (Public Law 357).

H. R. 3005, S. 352: Increases travel allowance for civilian Government employees (Public Law 92).

H. R. 858: Clarifies overtime-pay provisions of Fair Labor Standards Act, and outlaws retroactive claims (Public Law 177).

H. R. 2032 (on Wood substitute, May 2, 1949, voted "nay"): Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act, on a motion to recommit the Wood substitute (H. R. 3236) voted "aye."

On the following bills relating to veterans, I voted "aye":

H. R. 4617: Liberalizes pensions to veterans, widows, and children; $67,000,000.

S. 2115: Provides automobiles for crippled veterans; $16,000,000 (Pocket vetoed, Oct. 31, 1949).

S. 266: Permits payment to veterans of retroactive benefits withheld during hospitalization (Public Law 194).

S. 811: Extends time for filing in certain cases, for pensions and compensation (Public Law 195).

H. R. 5598: Raises from 75 percent to 100 percent the rates of payment for presumed service-connected disabilities (Public Law 339).

H. R. 4692: Extends term of certain patents of persons who served in World War II.

On the following bills relating to civil rights, I voted "aye":

H. R. 4453: Establishes a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission.

H. R. 3199, S. 97, S. 1727: Bars poll tax as qualification for voting.

H. R. 4963: Strengthens administration of justice by creating new Federal judgeships (Public Law 205).

H. Res. 298: Creates a select committee to investigate and regulate lobbying activities.

On the following bills relating to natural resources, I voted "aye":

H. R. 5472: Authorizes improvements to rivers and harbors and the construction of flood-control projects.

H. R. 165: Expands Folsom Dam project as step in development of American River Basin, Calif. (Public Law 356).

S. 790: Gives Federal approval to compact between States along Colorado River (Public Law 37).

H. R. 163: Authorizes construction of irrigation canals to serve 250,000 acres in Sacramento Valley as part of Central Valley project, Calif.

H. R. 4151: Gives Federal approval to compact between States along Arkansas River (Public Law 82).

H. R. 3615, S. 351: Encourages construction of public and private housing in Alaska by making available $15,000,000 through FHA (Public Law 52).

S. 355: Authorizes 5-year program of public works for development of Alaska. $70,000,000 (Public Law 264).

H. R. 2296: Increases Federal aid to States in cooperative programs for forest fire prevention (Public Law 392).

H. R. 1694: Limits Federal outlay for irrigation maintenance to self-liquidating projects (Public Law 335).

On the following bill relating to natural resources, I voted "no":

H. R. 1758: Clarifies the Natural Gas Act to exempt independent producers and gatherers from regulation by Federal Power Commission.

On S. 2246: Housing for moderate income families, I was paired "aye". I was absent from the floor on account of official subcommittee inspection of military hospitals.

At this date, April 6, 1950, the omnibus appropriation bill is being debated on the floor of Congress. We have already taken about 4 days for such debate and indications are that there will be further debate upon our return to Congress after the House Easter recess. This is the first time in the history of Congress that there has been an omnibus appropriation bill. The sincere effort has been to coordinate all departmental budget estimates and place them before Congress in one bill.

As I write this report to you, I have in my hands House Document No. 405, Eighty-first Congress, second session, entitled "The Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951." This volume consists of 1,196 printed pages of statistical tables of finances relating to this omnibus budget, with explanations thereof.

Answering the many inquiries which have come to me about the budget dollar for the year 1951. I report to you that this budget dollar comes from the following sources of income: Direct taxes on individuals, 41 cents; direct taxes on corporations, 23 cents; new taxes and borrowing, 12 cents; excise taxes, 18 cents; customs and other taxes, 6 cents. And this same budget dollar for 1951 will go, as follows: National defense, 32 cents; veterans, 15 cents; international, 11 cents; interest on debt, 13 cents; social welfare, health, security, 6 cents; other, 23 cents.

Of the $13,500,000,000 total for national defense, $4,100,000,000 will be spent for Army; $4,100,000,000 for the Navy; and $4,400,000,000 for the Air Force; $900,000,000 for various activities supporting defense, including primarily the strategic stock pile costing $650,000,000.

The expenditures for international programs in 1951 will be at least $1,800,000,000 less than the expenditures of 1950.

The 6 cents to be spent for social welfare, health, and security amounts to $2,700,000,000 and is divided as follows: Assistance to the aged, the blind, dependent children (to 2,700,000 old-age survivors insurance trust fund participants, etc.; the average public-assistance benefits for the aged are $45 a month, whereas, old-age insurance benefits are about $26 per month), $1,401,000. Railroad retirement payments to trust account (this now amounts to nearly $2,500,000,000 from which about 365,000 people will draw $350,000,000 in retirement benefits during 1951), $594,000,000. Promotion of public health (causes and cure of cancer, tuberculosis, arthritis, communicable disease, hospital construction, financial help to State and local governments) $432,000,000. Crime control and correction (FBI, narcotics control, United States district attorney offices, Federal prisons, etc.), $99,000,000. School lunch program (to about 7,000,000 American school children), $83,000,000. All others, including health, education, and welfare services to Indians and grants to States for rehabilitation of physically handicapped, etc., $105,000,000.

The 32 cents of each tax dollar spent for national defense totals 71 percent of each tax dollar and includes $8,100,000,000 for veterans; $5,600,000,000 interest on the public debt, which largely arises out of past or future war problems; and $4,700,000,000 for international relations, including $91,000,000 assistance to the Philippines, $239,000,000 for conducting foreign affairs, $81,000,000 foreign economic development, $645,000,000 for foreign military assistance.

So that only 29 percent of every tax dollar remains available for all other governmental expenses and obligations, including natural resources, agriculture, education, housing, transportation and communication, commerce and industry, labor and finance, general government, social welfare.

The 23 cents of each tax dollar to be expended includes all costs of general government, such as legislative and judicial functions, $81,000,000; weather bureau, immigration control, etc., $170,000,000; interest on refunds of receipts $100,000,000, etc.

23. The reorganization of Government plans are progressing. The commonly named Hoover Commission recommendations on organization of the executive branch of government, established by Public Law 162 as a bipartisan report, looking to more efficiency and less expense, is making real progress. The final report of the Commission was filed on June 12, 1949. More than 150 bills relating to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission were introduced during the first session of this Eighty-first Congress; it included only bills of fairly general application.

Fifteen of these bills were enacted into law. Seven passed either the House or the Senate. Nine more were reported out from committee. The new laws relating to and arising out of reports of the Hoover Commission are as follows: two as to general management; five as to personnel management; two as to the Office of General Services; two, National Security Organization; one each to Foreign Affairs, Post Office Department, Labor Department, Interior Department.

A most significant new law is the Reorganization Act of 1949, which granted the President of the United States power to resubmit reorganization plans to the Congress, which plans, however, were subject to disapproval by either House within 60 days. Six out of the seven presidential recommended reorganization plans submitted to the first session of this Eighty-first Congress were put into law and effect. It is now estimated that at least 25 percent of the actions required under these six reorganization plans put into law have been accomplished. The Citizens Committee for Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government estimated in early October 1949 that at that time about 20 percent of the Hoover Commission's recommendations had then been accomplished. I have voted for these reorganization plans to date, as recommended by the President of the United States, who continues to submit reorganization plans to Congress in fairly prompt and regular fashion.

24. I have rendered important personal service to hundreds of individuals upon their request. Requests for aid or assistance of many sorts come to my office daily from present and former members of the armed services; civilian employees of the Government

in connection with Government retirement, employees compensation, applications for new employment or for transfers of employment; persons requesting assistance in locating missing relatives and persons; immigration and passport problems; requests for assistance in presenting hearings on appeal in Government matters; assistance to business and industry in making contacts with appropriate governmental departments for information or opportunities to submit bids and offers for supply of materials in competitive bidding, etc., etc.

I have handled more than 500 cases of personal service to individuals who have applied for and need help in relation to their problems with Government departments. I have facilitated and obtained more than $150,000 for more than 80 applicants for Government retirement refunds, employees compensation, and other claims of the Government.

25. I have been pleased to receive calls and visits at my office of many California residents. Even though my congressional office is more than 3,000 miles away from the Eighteenth Congressional District, hardly a week has gone by but that one or more residents of the Eighteenth Congressional District have honored me by their personal call upon me and visit to their Congressman's office. On many occasions it has been the pleasure of Mrs. Doyle to show them around the Capitol and the Washington area because I find it impossible to do so when Congress is in session on account of my heavy committee and floor work. But every visitor has been most gracious and is most welcome. I cordially invite anyone from the Eighteenth District to favor me by calling upon me whenever you come to the Washington area. Mrs. Doyle and my secretaries and I will all be happy to see you. More than 750 visitors have thus honored my office during this Eighty-first Congress.

I shall visit the people of my congressional district when possible. I have not been able to return and visit my relatives at Long Beach excepting during the short congressional recess. The distance of 3,000 miles and the expense of traveling frequently makes it prohibitive. Furthermore, even in a campaign year, your Congressman feels it is his first duty to be on the job at Washington. Of course, old, experienced Members of Congress say that if you are not reelected, you can't serve your people and the district. Besides I believe it important that the voters have opportunity to see and hear candidates discuss the campaign issues of the day and pronounce their political beliefs and platforms. This is the American way. It is the best way known to man. It is the reaffirming of the democratic processes. It injects strength and virility into our American way of life. It energizes considered opinion. It activates thinking and analysis of individual, group, and national destiny.

In addition to the factual information I have given you in this report, I have endeavored to so write it that you would thereby obtain at least some glimpse or look at some of the steps taken and problems met by your own Congressman. I pay for the printing of this report to you. It is, of course, true that Congress votes your destiny; but you, as individual Americans, vote for your respective Representative in Congress. Therefore, the voters of America shape their own destiny when they vote for Members of Congress.

I respectfully reaffirm and restate my belief and position as your Representative in Congress, to-wit: That all patriotic Americans must vigorously cooperate in vigilant endeavor for a safe and sound America in a world at peace.

I have the honor to be

Your Representative in Congress,
CLIFF DOYLE.

The Short and Long of It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD IRVING
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I desire to include a speech in reply to the earlier oration of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], that I would have delivered on the floor of the House today, April 6, had it been possible for me, at that late hour, to secure time to do so:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words to the Members of this august body. I do not pretend to have any halos shining over my head nor any wings sprouting from my shoulders, nor can I boast of any fraternity keys or pins, nor any degrees from well-known American colleges or universities, neither do I possess any from the many famous schools of Europe. Neither do I assume the pious role of a moralist that many pretend to cast themselves in and do not live up to. Therefore it was with some temerity that I sought permission to speak out of order this afternoon as did the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. I might say, the first time since having been a Member that I have made such a request. Although it is a continuous practice that some Members seem to indulge in. And, might I say, Mr. Speaker, that is about the only way they speak, that is, out of order, hardly do they ever have anything to say or any contribution to make relative to the business before the House at the time of their escapades into the realm of poetry, history, or other various unrelated subjects. The important matters before the House which the taxpayers are paying good money to its representatives and lawmakers to handle as expeditiously and efficiently as possible, are far from their minds. Sometimes methinks their minds are so open that each gust of wind blows clear through them. Somehow I think the spirits must move these people to make such oratorical exhibitions. Many of them have very agile minds and nimble tongues. Makes me think that if their feet and legs were as agile and nimble as their minds and tongues, they would compete nicely with the mountain goat.

Now, of course, I naturally want to refer to the vulgar and dastardly attack the gentleman from Galena, Mo., has seen fit to make upon the city of Kansas City and our great President, Harry Truman. I do not do so because I think that I have to defend Mr. Truman because it has been my observation that he does a pretty good job of defending himself. In fact, as you well know, he usually cracks out with an offensive that has his enemies on the defensive most of the time, much to their displeasure and embarrassment.

However, I think it is pretty cowardly and unprincipled to attempt, by innuendo and insinuation and deceit, to connect the President with the matter the gentleman has so cunningly referred to. Does he not remember Big Bill Thompson of Chicago, its racketeers, gangsters, and killings of a few years back? Has he forgotten the latest exposé of the activities of a nefarious Republican machine operating in Philadelphia, the birthplace of our Constitution, the corruption thereby uncovered, and headlining the newspapers? Can the gentleman remember the stench that arose from the scandals of the Republican Harding regime? Yes, I could go on for hours digging up the ghosts and bones of the past. Let us think of any major city or even a smaller one that does not have a skeleton in its city hall closet. That quite often is one of the stages of our American political life, and so the remarks that I am about to make about the city of Joplin should not be taken as critical of its present citizens or administration, because I know very little about the current situation, nor do I subscribe to the idea that any one period of a particular city's history is very different from that of any other city that has found itself at some period or other in the sooty web of circumstances. Ever in such cases has decency in our public-spirited citizens created a movement of reform so strong and backed by an aroused public opinion, as to banish these evils from their midst. Does he not remember the notorious reputation of the only large city in his district? Can he recall during the days of prohibition that it was a mecca for sinners, an oasis in the desert for those of the tri-State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas, where even some of the youth of the city were so contaminated that they would borrow the hearse (the sacred vehicle of the dead) to steal and haul beer and whisky for their orgies? I have a little verse which the gentleman might like to memorize as he does so often:

"With oil of tender mercy
The tide of your censure stem;
Has Joplin no scarlet sinnings
Need for itself in winning
The sweetest words the Nazarene ever spoke,
Neither do I condemn."

Does the gentleman fail to perceive the beam in his own eye and that of his city of Joplin while seeing it so plainly in others?

Now, I don't condone lawlessness, not even the feuds of the Ozarks where men take the law into their own hands and shoot each other, much as was done in the case the gentleman describes.

Some of the people the gentleman mentioned I knew not, others I was barely acquainted with, but what concerns me more is the vicious attack he has made upon the President of this great Nation, and for the purpose of correcting this low attack I would like permission to include in my remarks part of a lengthy article that appeared 1 year ago in the Kansas City Star, which gives a brief summation of Mr. Truman's virtues. That was written by one who is considered by many experts as one of the ablest and best newsmen in this country, Mr. Roy Roberts. He spent many years in Washington during the early part of his career, and therefore knows the political situation well, and was, no doubt, intimately acquainted with many Presidents and other high political figures. Mr. Roberts is of the Republican faith, I believe, and could not too well be accused of being biased or prejudiced in Mr. Truman's favor. Thereupon I base my observation that in this article his approach is impartial and honest, as good reporting should be:

"SURE OF COURSE—TRUMAN HAS CONFIDENCE IN HIMSELF AND FEELS THAT PEOPLE ARE SUPPORTING HIM—HOLDS TO HOME TRAITS—RUMORS THAT PRESIDENT HAD TAKEN ON NEW AIRS AFTER ELECTION ARE DISPELLED—LOOK TO NEXT ELECTION—BOTH MAJOR PARTIES ARE PLANNING STRATEGY FOR THE 1950 CONGRESSIONAL RACES

"(By Roy A. Roberts)

"No; there isn't a new Truman sitting in the White House now. Fundamentally he is the same old Harry of back-home days. But there is a new confidence and self-reliance now that he is President in his own right after a miraculous one-man election victory.

That assuredness stands out and it is only natural that it should.

"When the writer was back East—in New York and Washington—for the first time since the election, he sought to get a line on how the President was functioning and how Congress and folks generally were reacting to him. Whispers that he had become cocky and had a bit of swelling in the head are bosh.

"TAKE IN STRIDE

"It isn't that at all. Rather, it is a feeling that he is on top of the job, can handle it, and that the people are behind him. There is more assurance in his approach to things. Yet down underneath it is my guess he reacts fundamentally in his decisions and conduct exactly as he did when he was a long-shot possibility for election, at the best.

"You sense a bit of increased dignity, possibly, and a feeling that he is going to take a place in history of some rank yet to be determined. Whatever it is, he wants it to be his own making. In a few words, this is now a Truman administration.

"Physically, the President looks great. His physician says he couldn't be in better shape. Truman went through the most grueling campaign any candidate ever made for the Presidency. He appeared tired and burned out. The two short rests at Key West under the sun brought him right back. He is trim and has a healthy color.

"STILL SHOW STRAIN

"Many of those around him, even though they have had the same rest the President had, are still worn; they haven't bounced back. But not so the President. He has the ability to sleep and relax completely, and that he does. He is still first up in the morning, and wants his walk before most have even begun to think of starting the day.

"While the Blair House is much smaller and not so formal as the White House, the Trumans are said to like it very much and are as comfortable as can be in it, while the White House awaits complete rebuilding."

In conclusion, may I say that, as a new Member who has never before and not long now lived at the expense of the taxpayers, I wish to show due deference and respect to my distinguished colleague, who has been here so long a time, and it is with hesitancy that I suggest that he remember the old saying about "He that casts the first stones," "Glass houses," "The pot calling the kettle black," etc.—a suggestion that it might be wiser and more in the public interests to shine up all the pots and kettles and keep them clean. I feel the gentleman does not want to appear as a cantankerous individual nor as a crusading moral and social reformer, as he might appear, by his castigation of the people of the State of which he claims to be so proud.

Cooperation of Volunteer Firemen Highly Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, as you and the other Members of this House know, I have frequently expressed my very deep interest in the volunteer firemen of this country and my personal appreciation of their devotion to duty and unselfish sacrifices on behalf of others.

In the Eightieth Congress and in the present one I have introduced legislation on behalf of volunteer fire companies, and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge again at this point that early and favorable consideration be given to H. R. 1822, which has been referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means and which provides that contributions to volunteer fire companies shall be deductible by the donors for income-tax purposes.

I have before me at this time, Mr. Speaker, an article from the April 5, 1950, issue of the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News. This article was written by my good friend, Mr. William P. Frank, the very able columnist of the Morning News, who is better known throughout Delaware as Bill Frank.

In this column Mr. Frank has written eloquently concerning the importance of volunteer fire companies and stressing their splendid cooperation with the professional paid fire companies. The cooperation which exists between professional and volunteer fire companies and the high regard and real respect which each group has for the other has too frequently been overlooked. Bill Frank has effectively directed attention to this spirit of mutual cooperation and respect which is of such vital importance to the lives and property of those who live in adjoining urban and rural areas.

Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to include as a part of my remarks the splendid article by Mr. Frank, which follows:

FRANKLY SPEAKING

(By Bill Frank)

Operations: Volunteer fire fighting cooperation.

My thoughts this morning are about the volunteer firemen of New Castle County districts who responded to the general alarm in Wilmington on Sunday.

As a resident of a rural area north of Wilmington, I experience a great pride in the contribution the men of the rural districts made to Wilmington.

I also pass along the lavish praise from Fire Chief Morgan, of Wilmington, to the scores of volunteers who dashed away from their homes on that very springlike afternoon—some of them returning home well past midnight, some not until 4 or 5 o'clock Monday morning—and not a few of them drenched to the skin, tired, begrimed with smoke and soot.

And all in the interest of their neighbors in Wilmington.

Actually, at this moment, I feel like getting up and making a speech about rural firemen and their contributions to better living.

And I certainly hope that someone keeps this story in mind when the general assembly meets again and a bill is presented for ample support for volunteer fire companies.

But getting back to Sunday's story—

There seems to be a prearranged agreement between Wilmington and the rural fire companies about what is to be done when and if a general alarm is struck.

As the third alarm is sounded, the telephone operator in the police and fire department begins calling all rural fire companies.

They immediately respond with at least one piece of rolling apparatus and as many men as can be summoned.

Also, according to a prearranged plan, each rural fire company is to go to a certain fire station in Wilmington, there to stand ready in the event another fire of any magnitude develops in any other part of the city.

The plan gets more and more detailed based on any contingency—such as a fire breaking out in a rural area, or another major fire within the city.

Chief Morgan keeps in close touch with the entire situation throughout this very critical period.

Nothing is left to chance and nothing is taken for granted.

So on Sunday afternoon, when the third alarm was sounded, rural fire companies in the immediate vicinity were called.

I hope I haven't omitted any, but as far as I can check there were Claymont, Talleyville, Five Points, Wilmington Manor, Hockessin, Elsmere, Holloway Terrace, Brandywine Hundred, Minquadale, and Newport.

And then there was the Second Alarmers Association of Willow Grove, Pa., that rushed down here with coffee and doughnuts for the firemen. They had heard about the fire on their radio.

Chief Morgan gives a conservative estimate that from 150 to 200 volunteers came into Wilmington—most of them assigned to the fire scene while the others took their posts in the various stations of the city.

For example, one rural fire company sent three pieces of apparatus to Wilmington with a total of 36 men.

On their way to their assigned station, the men passed as close to the fire as possible. Immediately sizing up the crisis, two of the apparatus swung into the fire area while the third kept on going to its prearranged station in another part of Wilmington.

As soon as these volunteers appear at a major fire in Wilmington, they report to the fire department official in charge. On Sunday he was Chief Morgan.

The fire official immediately assigns them to a post and the volunteers do the best they can in getting helmets (if they have left them behind) and other equipment.

They work alongside the Wilmington firemen and willingly subject themselves to the same discipline the Wilmington men are under.

Each man has a sincere admiration and respect for the other. They are both on the scene to do a job—and in the case of last Sunday, they worked together as if they had been drilled as teams for months.

But this city-rural volunteer fire company cooperation is not a one-way proposition.

There is a similar understanding in case a major fire develops in a rural town or district. The Wilmington firemen respond—and they at once put themselves at the service of the chief in charge of fighting a rural blaze.

A friend of mine whose memory goes back a long time says that Sunday's response on the part of the rural firemen was the greatest he has ever known.

And now that the excitement has died down, we may ask ourselves, "Why? What sends a man from his home—from his personal comfort—into an area that's choked with smoke, alive with embers—into a veritable furnace?"

Cynics may say that many rural firemen are just kids at heart—anxious to see a fire.

But I for one refuse to accept that viewpoint. Fun is fun—up to a certain point. When civilians will risk their lives in a volunteer job so that someone else might have a home or so that someone's business might be saved, then it seems to me there is certainly a more lofty drive.

That's why I, as a rural resident, living in a comparatively sparsely settled village in Brandywine Hundred, feel safe because I know there are men all around the countryside ready to help me—if my home is on fire.

Program of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress—Letter From the President of the United States and Address by Hon. John L. McClellan, of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the President of the United States, dated March 7, 1950, to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 7, 1950.

To the National Rivers and Harbors Congress:

It gives me great pleasure to send greetings and congratulations to the fortieth convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The work which you are doing has increased in importance ever since it began at the turn of this century. As our country has grown in material possessions as well as in world leadership, your organization's program has kept pace with our national needs.

The sound development of our land and water resources is a critically important factor in insuring the over-all health and strength of our country. By your work in this vital field you are making an important contribution to the strength of America and the peace of the world.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that immediately following the letter of the President, there be printed an address I made to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress on Friday, March 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

(Address of Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, to the fortieth convention, Friday, March 24, 1950)

Delegates to the convention, ladies and gentlemen, it now becomes my pleasure and my pleasant duty as your president to make a report, and I shall try to make it comparatively brief, concerning the activities of the Congress during the year since we last met in this room on April 8 and 9, 1949, for our thirty-ninth annual convention. During that time we have witnessed some progress toward our objectives, but, in all fairness, I cannot say that we are speeding toward the attainment of our goals. We have been laboring, and we shall have to continue our efforts, under the handicaps of constantly increasing operating costs of Government, and possibly with declining revenues, and at present at least under a deficit-spending program on the part of our Government.

Now so long as this condition exists we may expect our river resources development program to be retarded. Under these conditions it is highly improbable, if not impossible, that we can soon accelerate the speed of appropriations for construction commensurate with the needs for improvements already developed and those that are now in process and are yet to be authorized by the Congress.

At our last convention we had a number of subjects on our agenda for consideration. Those same subjects are problems for us yet to consider and I shall now enumerate some of those that I consider most important so that we may keep them in mind during our deliberations in this meeting.

(1) Report of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

If I may digress from this report, I may say, having served as a member of the Hoover Commission, I think it did a considerable amount of very valuable and constructive work. I did not agree with all of its recommendations. With some, I rather violently disagreed; but that report, insofar as it relates to this rivers and harbors development, flood-control program, according to my judgment, and I believe according to yours, is not constructive but, instead, it is devastating.

That report and the recommendations of the majority of the Commission as related to reorganizations affecting river resources development is of vital importance because in the judgment of your president, who was a member of the Commission and who filed a dissenting report to the majority's findings and recommendations, its proposals would reorganize into disorganization—in fact, would emasculate the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers and do irreparable harm to both our flood control, navigation, and rivers and harbors program and to the Nation.

(2) Federal, regional, or Valley Authority bills introduced in the Eighty-first Congress—which are still pending and which have administration support for their enactment into law.

(3) Ownership of submerged or tidelands;

(4) The necessity, if any, for adoption of a Federal power policy properly recognizing and protecting the interests, rights, and responsibilities of State governments in the field of water resources and power development;

(5) Other water and land development problems such as (a) soil conservation; (b) legislative programs, including the necessary appropriations therefor.

There were others on the agenda at the last session and others at this session of the Congress but I consider those that I have referred to as of the greater importance.

The scorecard on the two legislative proposals in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress affecting rivers and harbors and flood control is about as follows:

1. The civil functions appropriation bill (H. R. 3734) for flood control and rivers and harbors finally approved in the conference report of the two Houses and as approved by the President on October 13, 1949, contained for—

Rivers and harbors	$197,489,690
Flood control	426,930,400
Total	634,420,090

2. Omnibus rivers and harbors and flood-control bill (H. R. 5472), and this is the authorization bill, passed the House August 22, authorizing for—

Rivers and harbors	$119,539,975
Flood Control	995,000,000

This is the bill as passed by the House of Representatives.

On October 7 the Senate Public Works Committee after extended hearings on the bill reported the bill to the Senate, recommending the addition of 28 rivers and harbors projects, totaling $108,699,650, and 21 additional flood-control projects in the amount of $338,529,000. On October 17 the Senate approved all of these amendments that had been proposed by the Senate Public Works Committee, but deferred action on final passage of the bill until Congress should reconvene in January of this year.

That bill is still on the calendar of the Senate. I believe we have assurances, at least it is expected that, immediately after the passage of the pending bill, the pending business in the Senate at the present, a bill (I do not have the number of it) known as the Kerr gas bill, as soon as that is disposed of, I understand, our flood control and rivers and harbors authorization bill will be the next matter of business in the Senate, and I am very hopeful that nothing else will intervene. Action on the bill has been delayed for various reasons and we are all very hopeful that nothing will intervene to further delay the final enactment of this measure.

The bill as amended and on the Senate Calendar contains authorizations as follows:

For rivers and harbors	$628,169,625
For flood control	1,236,645,200
Grand total	1,864,814,825

The people of this Nation are apparently becoming more conscious of the need of increasing the tempo of Federal activity in this field of public improvements.

I can testify to that because I am a member of both the Public Works Committee of the Senate, that has jurisdiction over authorization bills of this character, and also a member of the Appropriations Committee where we hear testimony and vote with reference to the immediate need and, in many instances, an emergency need for various projects throughout the Nation. Last year—and the same thing is being repeated this year—there appeared before these committees, before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, many citizens from all over the country, from practically every State in the Union, urging the Appropriations Committee of the Senate to include many projects that are not recommended by the budget but for which they are able to make a convincing case, not only of the immediate need but of their soundness with respect to economy and with respect to the necessity of them, to protect both property and human lives.

To all those who have worked unceasingly for greater development and control of our water resources, we have reason for much encouragement in our efforts. However, while the President's budget recommendations for the 1951 fiscal year are in some respects quite satisfactory, in others they are very disappointing.

The President recommended appropriations for 1951 as follows: For flood control, $556,752,000; rivers and harbors, $240,714,000; or a total of $797,466,000. These are substantial sums and we are very appreciative and grateful to the President for having the wisdom, in the meeting of his responsibilities to this Nation in the position he occupies, having recognized this need, he has been willing, notwithstanding the fiscal conditions of our Government, to recommend an increase this year over that of last; but it must be borne in mind by all of us that this program has been tremendously retarded for, during the war years it was impossible to carry it on and practically all work of this character was suspended and, therefore, we failed in that period of time, utterly failed, by the very inability to do so, to keep pace with the increasing needs for improvement of this character.

Thus, the President, too, recognizes the growing need and urgency for completion of projects that are now in the course of construction but, in view of fiscal difficulties that have arisen which reflect an operating deficit of $5,500,000,000 for the present fiscal year 1950, and a correspondingly anticipated deficit for 1951 of five billion or more, the

President felt constrained to withhold from his budget any recommendations for appropriations to start construction of new projects that have long been authorized and the need for many of which, are actually in an emergency category.

I know we would like to have those projects constructed. I have a number in my area that are ready and badly needed, but I want to emphasize this morning that we are confronted with a condition with reference to the fiscal affairs of this Government that cannot be disregarded and, with respect to this recommendation, I commend the President for his effort in that instance, at least, to try to hold expenditures down so that we might not run such a heavy deficit. I only wish that he had gone as far in some other directions to reduce expenditures, because I believe it would have contributed to a very much closer balanced budget.

It is perfectly apparent that if this condition continues, this deficit spending, this living beyond our national income, if this continues for another 2 or 3 years, our water resources development programs will suffer greatly and could possibly be indefinitely postponed.

I say that in all seriousness, because there is a feeling in the hearts and the minds of the people of this Nation now that it is dangerous for this Government, in this critical period, to adopt what may become and can easily become a fixed policy of deficit spending.

No one is more aware of the urgent need for economy in Federal expenditures than are the officers of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and I am sure that applies to every delegate here. Your president, as a Member of the United States Senate, is among that group of Congressman and Senators who are often publicly maligned and ridiculed and termed reactionary, because we favor sound fiscal policies on the part of the Federal Government and insist that it should operate under a balanced budget. And as I see the picture, a balanced budget is essential to the carrying on of our public-improvements program because our entire program is subjected to attack when the Federal Government operates by deficit spending. It is, therefore, imperative and in the interest of progress toward our goal that the Congress eliminate every nonessential expenditure possible from the operating cost of the Government and only make expenditures for the most needed essentials. If this is not done, river and harbor and flood-control programs will become the victims of such a policy and will be materially impeded to the extent that desirable and essential progress in this field will be harmfully if not disastrously retarded. It is still our firm conviction that it is true economy and a wise, sound business investment for the Federal Government to spend an adequate amount of public funds in developing the Nation's natural resources and in providing the means to effectively combat the floods that are constantly destroying life and property each year in the various parts of the country, and to construct river projects that enhance the economic opportunities of our people and build a stronger nation in conserved and utilized resources and in productive capacity.

It should be remembered and the people should be made conscious that all such Federal projects authorized by the Congress provide public benefits exceeding their cost. It is well known that the Corps of Army Engineers, in their capacity as consulting engineers for the Congress, definitely lean to the side of conservatism in estimating those benefits and costs and do not include many auxiliary benefits that necessarily flow from such developments which could and should properly be taken into account in arriving at cost-ratio benefits.

REGIONAL OR VALLEY AUTHORITIES

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has repeatedly expressed its opposition to legislation creating Federal regional or valley authorities and has supported the program of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army; Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; and Department of Agriculture for the development of our water and land resources.

We have registered and reaffirmed our opposition to the creation of Federal regional or valley authorities either by legislative act or by Executive order.

We have urged the extension of comprehensive basin-wide research and planning similar to the Pick-Sloan plan now operating in the Missouri Basin to other major basins which present similar problems and opportunities, respecting at all times the rights and desires of each State located in such basin as they may appear.

IRRIGATION-RECLAMATION

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has commended the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior for the progress it has made in reclaiming the arid and semiarid land in the 17 Western States and emphasized the necessity for continued effort. There is increasing need there for additional Federal projects for irrigation to bring all cultivatable lands for which water is available into production for the increasing population of the Western States and to meet our extensive commitments abroad. Adequate funds to provide the many facilities for the varied irrigation needs must be available in consistent annual amounts to enable rapid progress to be made and we have urged that the Congress provide them.

SOIL CONSERVATION

We believe that the prevention of soil erosion as a responsibility of the Department of Agriculture and the closely related major drainage and channel improvement program now conducted by the Corps of Engineers should be accelerated as a beneficial and most important feature in the development and preservation of our natural resources. These programs must outpace the devastation and soil erosion now visiting our fertile slopes and the resulting detrimental effect on the efficiency of our commerce-laden streams. Only then can we be assured of maximum returns from the soil which helped to create this Nation.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER

In promoting the orderly development of our land and water resources the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has been steadfast in its position that hydroelectric power development at Federal dams should be economically justified and consistent with the necessity for such power. Our position is and has been that such development should be confined, however, to projects located in shortage areas and then only when feasible and as a supplement to existing private supply. Supplemental power from steam plants is questioned as being inconsistent with the "private enterprise" policy which has made our Nation the envy of the world. Unrestricted and unwarranted competition with private power facilities will continue to be opposed.

TIDELANDS

We believe the title to the submerged lands of our Nation should be vested in the States through adequate legislation designed to reserve such submerged lands and the resources therein to the respective States and their people. However, any legislation for this purpose should preserve to the United States the paramount right to continue with improvements for national defense, navigation, flood control, and allied purposes as now authorized and as may be authorized in the future.

REORGANIZATION

Since it was organized at Johns Hopkins University in October 1901, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has never deviated from the position that development and improvement of our rivers, harbors, and water resources can best be planned and executed by the nonpolitical, experienced, conservative Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. The Congress has consistently opposed the many efforts which have been made through the years to turn these functions over to a civilian organization, whether it be called a department of public works, a public works administration, or a so-called regional or valley authority.

The latest assault upon the Corps of Army Engineers as the agency of the Congress entrusted with the responsibility and duty of making surveys, estimates, and legislative recommendations, stems from the recommendations of a majority of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government. A majority of that Commission recommended that all of the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers be transferred to the Department of the Interior. That means that the Bureau of Reclamation would become the prime surveying, investigating, recommending, constructing, and operating agency of the Congress and the Government for all river and harbor, navigation, and flood-control projects throughout this Nation. This recommendation violates the tradition and established practices of the Congress and the Federal Government which have continued for more than 125 years. It disregards and discards all wisdom gained by experience of the most competent, efficient, and constructive agency of the Federal Government. It is purely a grab for power—an attempt to concentrate in one single agency an unprecedented power, both economic and political. This is a vicious proposal. It is the dream of theorists. It is the plotting of planners. It has neither supporting data, statistics, experience, judgment, improved efficiency, economy, nor anything else of merit to recommend it.

This attempt to emasculate the Corps of Engineers and to disorganize the construction and operations of this tremendously vital public-improvement program should be defeated, and I hope you will let your representatives in Congress know that you feel that this proposal, if enacted into law, will result in tremendous harm, not only to your communities where you have a vital stake, but to this great Nation of ours, not only in the destiny of our own lives but in the destiny of civilization.

Much false propaganda is being disseminated by those who have designs upon this important service and function of the Federal Government. I believe there is definitely an organized campaign of false propaganda being disseminated among the people of this Nation in the name of so-called economy and efficiency, to transfer all of the construction functions of the Government into one single agency. We talk about concentration of power. You give to one agency the power over a tremendous part of the purse strings of this Nation and you take both economical and political risks that are not safe in any democracy.

Those of us who are dedicated to the development and conservation of our great natural water resources so that their utilization may be available for the benefit of all of our citizens must get into this fight and refute, repudiate, and counteract the false and deceptive propaganda that is now being disseminated with the premeditated and calculated intent to deceive and mislead the American people for the purpose of consolidating into one agency of Government unprecedented economic, social, and political power.

If the American people can be sufficiently informed of the dangers inherent in this proposal they will demand that such a plan and scheme be rejected.

A bill has already been introduced in the Senate (S. 2833) to carry out the recommendations of the Commission to transfer these functions to the Department of the Interior. That bill has been referred to the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I am chairman. I wish to give assurances to you and to the people of this Nation that I shall do all in my power to defeat that measure. I give the same assurances with reference to any reorganization plan that the President may submit to the Congress which may have the same objective.

This is not my fight alone, nor that of the Congress alone. It is not just another battle looming in the Congress. It is the fight of the people of this Nation to protect their natural resources against those who would sacrifice efficient service in the interest of the national welfare solely for the purpose of gaining control within themselves of the most vital public-improvement program within the activities of the Federal Government solely in order that there may be concentrated in them and at their disposal unprecedented and dangerous economic and political power.

Congressman FORST, in his remarks a while ago, referred to the total expenditures that this Government has made for all time for river and harbor works and their maintenance and for flood control. He gave you the figures with reference to these, but I give you the figures that we have spent for construction only. He included maintenance. For rivers and harbors throughout all time this Government has spent $12,245,000,000. A conservative estimate of the benefits that have flowed from those improvements to the people, economic benefits, throughout the 29 years from 1929 through 1948 is $5,478,000,000, or in that 20-year period the people of this Nation received in economic benefits $2.20 for every dollar the Federal Government has spent in construction of these projects. The same is true in flood control. For all time the Federal Government has spent $2,710,000,000 for the construction of flood-control projects. Estimated benefits, a conservative estimate of benefits, up to 1948 through the same 20-year period amount to $5,600,000,000, or for every dollar the Federal Government has expended for the construction of flood-control projects the people in return have benefited $2.07.

Bear in mind that all these projects are of comparatively new life. They will continue to exist. They will continue to provide these benefits throughout the years. That is my answer to those who charge that this program has failed, that it is inefficient, that it isn't justified. That is my answer to the enemies of this organization and every other group in this Nation who say that this work has not contributed to the building of a stronger Nation.

This does not take into account thousands upon thousands of human lives that have been saved. May I say this to you, that the enemies of this program, those who are demanding today the crucifixion of the Corps of Engineers and the turning over of all of this authority and power to another agency, are not responsible for this progress. That progress was made by people like you, who are willing to give your time, to come to meetings like this, originate programs, try to see that they are sound and get the Congress to authorize them and appropriate money for their construction.

Yes, that is the answer. Do we want to discontinue it? Are you ready to continue to fight for it? I invite you, in your deliberations here, and when you return to your respective communities, bear in mind that there are two dangers today to this internal development program. One is a policy of deficit spending on the part of the Federal Government; as evidence of that see what the House committee did to the President's budget recommended for this purpose. It made an over-all cut the other day of 4 percent on the President's budget, but singled out this program and cut it 25 percent. There is one danger to this program, one of the greatest, for this Government to continue to operate by deficit spending.

And the other is the disorganization of the efficient system that we have built up, and the transferring of these functions to less competent, less experienced hands.

Let us fight to retain this program. I have been charged with being a lobbyist for this group. Well, I am. I am going to lobby on the floor of the Senate; I am going to lobby to the people of this Nation, if by lobbying you mean standing for my convictions and fighting for a program that I believe to be constructive and that will build this Nation strong and powerful to meet the contingencies that arise in the future. Thank you. [Applause.]

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Jackson County Medical Society Weekly Bulletin, Kansas City, Mo., March 11, 1950, entitled "Keep on Calling It What It Is, Doc—It's Socialized Medicine."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP ON CALLING IT WHAT IT IS, DOC—IT'S SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Recently at lunch with a lawyer friend (who gets around and rates in the upper Democrat echelons), the writer was amazed to hear him make this statement.

He explained that in his opinion the American people would never buy socialized medicine, if you doctors will only keep on calling it by its right name. In this respect, our friend agrees with the philosophy expressed by Henry Wallace a good many years ago.

Wallace is reported to have said that neither socialism nor communism will ever come to America unless it arrives under a different label. Many have retorted that Wallace ought to know, as an expert. For he has advocated many measures, somewhat pinko, under other names.

But, for the purposes of this writing, let us not get confused with any side issues. Probably nothing has stung the administration spokesmen to the core more poignantly than the just and accurate accusation that they are sponsoring the socialization of medical care in the United States.

Almost invariably, from the top-drawer mouthpiece on down to the ward heeler, they have vehemently denied this allegation. And, by the same token, it is the truth which hurts them.

Without any attempt to enter the puerile practice of bantering such as: "My dad can lick yours. No; he can't. Yes; he can. No; he can't," we insist on the right and privilege of calling an issue exactly as it is.

When the administration demands a comprehensive health-insurance plan for all our people, that identifies the proposition as a collectivist, regimentation technique. And, if all our banks, all our railroads, all our coal mines, or all our anything, is lumped into a gigantic scheme, it is then socialization, pure and simple.

We have talked with many people, as individuals and in groups, and there is something inherently frightening about the phrase "socialized medicine" which causes the average American a feeling of revulsion. They don't want any part of it. Now (reasons our opponents) if we but pretty up this basic concept, if we but sugar-coat it, and call it "national health insurance," it doesn't sound so bad.

It is on this play of words that the proponents of socialized medicine are staking their claim for effectiveness. They know quite well that the American public is not ready to buy socialized medicine. And, as our lawyer friend advised us, it is necessary as physicians to label it correctly in the eyes and the minds of the American public. It is our duty to keep on calling it what it is: socialized medicine.

Reorganization Plan No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times regarding President Truman's Rorganization Plan No. 1, and a statement prepared in opposition to the plan.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 4, 1950]

OPPOSE ABOLITION OF COMPTROLLER—BANKS OF NATION ARE RALLYING AGAINST REORGANIZATION PLAN THAT SPELLS VIRTUAL DOOM—INDEPENDENCE SEEN STAKE—STATE SUPERVISORS JOIN ABA, OTHER ASSOCIATIONS IN FIGHT—HEARINGS DUE THIS WEEK

(By George A. Mooney)

Banks throughout the country are rallying in opposition to President Truman's Reorganization Plan No. 1 which would virtually abolish the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, it was learned yesterday. Although the proposal primarily affects national banks, the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, it is understood, has joined with the American Bankers Association, State banking associations and other interested groups in an effort to arouse resistance.

The drive will reach its peak intensity on Tuesday and Wednesday this week when hearings are scheduled to be held before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department. Last week the Senate Banking Committee voted to oppose the shift. Also it was reported that Senators H. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, and HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana, have both introduced resolutions requesting that the proposal be defeated and the resolutions will be presented at the hearings.

Although this action might have been expected to allay concern, bankers are not relaxing the fight, at least not in this area. Despite the resolutions by the Senators, Arthur T. Roth, president of the Franklin National Bank, of Franklin Square, Long Island, mailed out a 7-page statement to all national banks in an attempt to arouse grass-roots opposition to the plan. Urging the banks to make their views known to Congress promptly, Mr. Roth pointed out that unless a legal majority of 49 Senators approves the resolution, the plan will automatically become effective May 11.

During the week also, the New York State Bankers Association issued a broadside to its member banks throughout the State, asking immediate action.

"The American Bankers Association in Washington is exerting every influence at its command to save the independence of the Comptroller's office," the State association wrote. "The ABA adds that it is of grave concern to all banking—this move in Washington is a direct challenge to an independent banking system."

URGED BY HOOVER GROUP

Reorganization Plan No. 1, ostensibly an adaptation of a recommendation of the Hoover Commission, was one of 21 Government reorganization plans which President Truman sent to Congress on March 13. Submitted under the Reorganization Act of 1949, the plan would (a) vest in the Secretary of the Treasury all functions of all other department officers, employees, and offices; (b) authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to delegate functions to any officer, employee, or office of the Department; (c) establish an administrative Assistant Secretary in the Department.

As presently established, the Comptroller's office has a semi-independent status. Although under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller now reports directly to Congress and the office makes its own recommendations to that body. The Comptroller also enjoys a position of prestige on the same level as the heads of other supervisory authorities, such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

There are approximately 5,000 national banks in this country, representing more than 56 percent of all the commercial banking resources of the Nation, and the Comptroller serves as the sponsor of these banks in Washington. Thus, the banks are most anxious that the Comptroller's office be maintained intact. They are not concerned that Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder might absorb the office if given the power, but they are afraid that some future holder of the office might do so.

VIEWS OF SECRETARY

The Secretary, incidentally, when questioned on his views last week was quoted as saying that he did not need any legislation to help him run the Treasury. He added that he "had no further comment at this time."

Perhaps the major concern of the bankers, however, is the fear that the reorganization plan would be a further step toward breaking down the dual banking system, and another move nearer to nationalization. The plan, it is held, might be only the forerunner of an additional reorganization plan which would transfer either to the Board of Governors, or the FDIC, the examining, statistical, and other functions of the Comptroller.

But while presumably intended to permit economies of operation in Government, the plan would not eliminate any of the demands on the public purse, the bankers point out. Actually, the Comptroller's office is entirely self-sustaining and dependent in no way upon appropriations made by Congress or funds supplied by the Treasury Department. Expenses of the office are defrayed exclusively by the assessment on national banks for examinations made by it. The plan, moreover, would permit the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer the funds of the office as well as its records, property and personnel, to carry out other functions of the Treasury Department.

The foregoing are only a sampling of the variety of reasons in opposition to the plan advanced by the bankers. They hasten to explain that they are in full accord with all plans which would reduce Federal expenditures and promote economy, provided they are consistent with efficient operation of the Government. The bankers add, however, that there are many activities, especially those developed in recent years, in which economies can be readily effected. But the Comptroller's office, they assert, has performed an effective function in its semi-independent status for 86 years.

MEMORANDUM: REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 AS APPLIED TO OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

The principal powers and functions which would be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury under the plan would be:

Chartering of national banks.

Approval of branch offices.

Approval of consolidations between National banks or State and National banks.

Approval of conversions of State banks into National banks.

Approval of recapitalizations and reorganizations.

Examination and supervision of national banks.

Power to examine nonbanking affiliates of national banks.

Promulgation of rules and regulations relating to investment securities of national banks. (State member banks are also subject to these regulations.)

Interpretation, application, and administration of laws relating to lending and investment powers of national banks.

Power to initiate proceedings to remove officers and directors of national banks for violation of law or continuance of unsafe and unsound banking practices.

Power to initiate court proceedings to forfeit charter of national bank for violation of law.

Power to publish bank's reports of examination in newspaper if bank refuses to conduct sound banking.

Power to levy assessments against shareholders of national banks to restore impairment of capital.

Power to assess fees against national banks for the purpose of covering costs of examinations and to determine the amount thereof.

Control over funds of the Comptroller's office obtained through assessments against national banks for expenses of examination; this would be transferred to the Secretary to be used as he deems appropriate.

Power to determine insolvency of national banks and to appoint a receiver therefor.

Power to appoint a conservator of a national bank.

Duty of Comptroller to serve as a director of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Many of these powers and functions can, in their exercise, be far reaching in their effect on our economy and must be exercised with sound judgment and caution, free from political pressures.

When Congress, 87 years ago, created the national banking system and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, it recognized that such office, clothed with quasi-judicial functions, must be independent. Fresh in the mind of all was the country's experience with the United States Bank, politically dominated, bestowing its favors on some and ruin on others.

Congress, therefore, in order to make the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency a nonpolitical office and to remove it as far as practicable from the influences incident to the quadrennial changes in party or political administration of the Federal Government, fixed the term of the Comptroller at 5 years, and he was required to report annually direct to Congress, instead of to the Secretary of the Treasury, as other department-bureau officers are required to do.

The purpose of this latter requirement was to enable the Comptroller to present to Congress for consideration his independent views and recommendations in regard to the conditions and necessities of the banking interests and currency needs of the country, free from censorship by his official superior, the Secretary of the Treasury.

Thus, Congress made the Comptroller of the Currency somewhat akin to an arm of Congress, just as it did in latter years with the Office of the Comptroller General of the United States.

It is, of course, true that the Comptroller is under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury, but a glance at the Comptroller's powers or functions will clearly demonstrate the responsibility placed in him and him alone. Moreover, his office is financed exclusively by fees and charges paid by national banks and not by appropriated funds and if he should be dismissed by the President, the reasons must be reported to the Senate.

Further evidence of the policy of Congress to make the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency independent of the Secretary of the Treasury, even in recent years, can be found in the fact that while originally the Comptroller was appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, Congress in 1935 eliminated the provision for the Secretary's recommendation.

The independence of this office is well illustrated by the opinion rendered to President Taft in 1912 by Attorney General Wickersham when he said: "While the Comptroller is performing quasi-judicial functions, his discretion cannot be controlled by you * * * even though with respect to other duties he acts under the general direction of the Secretary of the Treasury."

These safeguards of independence which Congress has for 87 years thrown around the Office of the Comptroller to insure the impartial exercise of the great powers and functions lodged in that office would disappear if Reorganization Plan No. 1 becomes law.

The power of life and death over about 5,000 banks holding more than 50 percent of the banking resources of this country would pass into other less independent hands. Likewise would pass the general supervision and examination of the banks with power to control and shape credit policies which could lead to political domination and control of the money and credit of this country, the business lifeblood of all our communities and citizens.

The potentialities presented should be the concern of all, whether Democrat or Republican, even though one cannot be apprehensive of the actions of the present Secretary of the Treasury if vested with such powers and

functions. But the use of such powers by a future Secretary in such a way as not to be conducive to sound banking or for the general public welfare cannot be assumed. Political considerations are often demanding and the urge to exercise power hard to resist.

A Secretary of the Treasury confronted with the necessity of floating the public debt and clothed with the enumerated powers now vested in the Comptroller of the Currency could enforce a demand for contraction of credit in loans and the heavy investment in Government securities or as was done during the day of the United States Bank, the withdrawal of credit in a section of the country, to its ruin, where its votes were not deemed to be properly cast.

The reorganization plan is not the so-called Hoover plan. It was designed by the Budget Bureau. As applied to the Comptroller of the Currency's office, it can only be assumed that they know not what they do. Certainly none of the five objections for which Congress directed the Commission to submit plans, is involved. There is no limiting of Federal expenditures, since appropriated funds are not expended in carrying on the functions of such office. Likewise, no nonessential or duplicated services are involved or are any executive functions limited. On the contrary, the plan, if put into execution, could lead to confusion, nonefficient and cumbersome administration.

Congress has by grants of final authority and concentration of responsibility placed in one office the supervision of the national banking system.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950 inevitably would destroy this invaluable service rendered by the Office of the Comptroller. A Secretary of the Treasury who was so inclined could delegate any of the functions now performed by the Comptroller of the Currency to any other agency or employee of the Department, however ill-equipped or unsuited to perform the particular functions. National bankers who had problems confronting them could rarely discuss them with the Secretary of the Treasury, who would have final authority in making the decisions, because as a Cabinet officer he has so many duties to which he must devote time and attention. The Secretary's complex duties at the present time are such as to prohibit him from giving his personal attention to problems of individual banks. He must confine his activities to making decisions on broad national policies, and there can be no doubt that successful bank supervision demands the closest personal attention of those who are charged with its administration.

A Secretary of the Treasury might distribute the functions of the Comptroller's Office to a number of persons with diverse and even conflicting policies. For example, he could vest the chartering power in one employee, the power to grant branches in another, and different segments of supervision in others, thereby losing the consistency and harmony of policies which have long been dominant factors in molding the national banking system and improving its strength and efficiency.

The national banking system could not long exist on its present high level in the absence of a bureau with this degree of autonomy, authority, and responsibility, the singleness of purpose and the general objectives now embodied in the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. That Bureau is the very heart and core of the national banking system, having created all of its units and supervised their growth.

The national bankers of this country look to this compact, single-purposed organization for guidance and leadership, and such a change in its status as would be made by Reorganization Plan No. 1 would cause irreparable damage not only to the national banking system but to all American banking generally. Without that independent bureau around which national banking is built, the unit banks would lose the organization which now binds them into the kind of a system intended by Congress to serve the people and stand as a model for the various State systems.

Furthermore, Reorganization Plan No. 1 would vest in the Secretary of the Treasury the power to take over the funds of the Comptroller's office derived from assessments against national banks and to use them for other purposes. It is assumed that the other purposes would have to be related purposes, but even so, it is highly questionable that funds derived from examination fees paid by national banks should be used for any purposes other than the administration and supervision of the national banking system by an independent agency having the sole responsibility.

At the present time competition between the national banking system and the various State banking systems is on a high plane chiefly because of the relationship between the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the respective State bank supervisory authorities, as well as the relationship between the Comptroller and the other two Federal bank supervisory agencies. All of these relationships would be destroyed because every other agency would assume that the Comptroller could not speak authoritatively with respect to either the national banking system or the functions and policies of his office, since the Secretary of the Treasury would always be in a position (if he had not already delegated the functions to some other employee of the Department) to overrule his positions. Furthermore, these relationships would be seriously impaired by destroying the prestige and authority of the Comptroller and they could not be rebuilt by the Secretary of the Treasury because of the difference between his position as a Cabinet officer and the position of the respective State and Federal bank supervisor authorities.

Since one of the functions of the Comptroller is to serve as a director of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Secretary would—under this reorganization plan—be a director and vice chairman of that Corporation. By virtue of the prestige of his Cabinet position, he would effectively control the Corporation. Hence, control of two of the three Federal bank supervisory agencies would be concentrated in the hands of the Secretary. Under these circumstances, it is questionable whether the third supervisory agency—the Federal Reserve System—could long remain undominated, if a Secretary of the Treasury were inclined toward complete consolidation, a possibility which is alarming to all of our bankers.

As previously pointed out, the intent of Congress, as indicated by legislation from Lincoln's administration to Franklin D. Roosevelt's, has been to keep the Comptroller's office free from political influence, and up to this time that intent of Congress has been faithfully carried out. It should not now be changed.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum compiled by the staff of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950, providing for reorganization of the Department of the Treasury.

As will be noted from the memorandum, resolutions of disapproval have been introduced by Senators ROBERTSON (S. Res. 246) and CAPEHART (S. Res. 247), and hearings are scheduled before the committee beginning tomorrow, April 11.

This memorandum has been prepared with a view to providing Senators who may be interested in this proposal with advance information relative to its provisions and the points at issue. It also indicates the material which was omitted in the reprint of an earlier staff memorandum on plans 1 through 6, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A4243.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
April 7, 1950.

(Staff Memorandum No. 81-2-49)

Subject: Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950, providing for reorganization within the Department of the Treasury.

This memorandum supplements Staff Memorandum 81-2-40 which discussed plans 1 through 6 as a whole. These six plans centralize scattered functions by transferring to individual department heads "all functions of all other officers of (the department) and all functions of all agencies and employees of such department," except those of hearing examiners, and a few specified Government corporations and boards. The plans tackle "the first and essential step in the search for efficiency and economy by eliminating the present diffusion of authority and confusion of responsibility" in line with the four following numbered recommendations in Hoover Commission Report No. 1 on General Management:

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

"14. Under the President, the heads of departments must hold full responsibility for the conduct of their departments. There must be a clear line of authority reaching down through every step of the organization and no subordinate should have authority independent from that of his superior.

"16. Department heads must have adequate staff assistance if they are to achieve efficiency and economy in departmental operations.

"18. Each department head should receive from the Congress administrative authority to organize his department. * * *

"20. We recommend that the department head should be given authority to determine the organization within his department."[1]

PROVISIONS AND EFFECT OF PLAN NO. 1

This memorandum develops further those considerations particularly related to plan No. 1, as to which two resolutions of disapproval were introduced on March 31, 1950, by Senators ROBERTSON (S. Res. 246) and CAPEHART (S. Res. 247).

Hearings will be held on these two resolutions on April 11 and 12, 1950. Witnesses will include Senators ROBERTSON and CAPEHART, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the American Bankers Association, and representatives of other banking groups.

[1] The information up to this point was included in Staff Memorandum 81-2-40 discussing plans 1-6, but was inadvertently omitted by the printer in the reprint of that memorandum in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (p. A2443).

Section 1 of plan No. 1 transfers to the Secretary all functions scattered throughout the Department of the Treasury, except the functions of hearing examiners and except the operations of the Coast Guard which becomes a part of the Navy in time of war or when the President so directs. The three other sections of plan No. 1 authorize the Secretary to delegate functions; to appoint an Administrative Assistant Secretary, with the approval of the President, under the classified civil service at an annual salary of $14,000; and to make those transfers of records, property, personnel, and funds which are required to carry out this plan.

The statutes controlling the Treasury Department lodge most of the departmental functions in its major operating units, and, hence, plan No. 1 would shift to the Secretary the powers now scattered among the (1) Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, (2) Bureau of Internal Revenue, (3) Bureau of Customs, (4) Bureau of Narcotics, (5) Bureau of the Mint, (6) Bureau of Engraving and Printing, (7) Fiscal Service, (8) United States Secret Service, and (9) United States Coast Guard.

Since the opposition to plan No. 1 has centered on the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the following legal citations are limited to the statutory provisions governing his activities, as amended to date (title 12, U. S. Code):

"SECTION 1. There shall be in the Department of the Treasury a bureau charged with the execution of all laws passed by Congress relating to the issue and regulation of a national currency secured by United States bonds and, under the general supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, of all Federal Reserve notes, the chief officer of which bureau shall be called the Comptroller of the Currency, and shall perform his duties under the general directions of the Secretary of the Treasury.

"SEC. 2. The Comptroller of the Currency shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall hold office for a term of 5 years unless sooner removed by the President, upon reasons to be communicated by him to the Senate; and he shall receive a salary at the rate of $15,000 a year." (The provisions of the 1864 statute dealing with Comptroller appointments, also required the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury; this provision was eliminated in 1935.)

VIEWS ON PLAN NO. 1

A total of 547 communications from 39 States dealing with plan No. 1, has been received to date, all except one being in opposition to the plan.

A letter has been received setting forth the views of the Secretary of the Treasury, and will be submitted for the record at the hearing.

The American Banker, banking newspaper, is opposing centralization of Treasury functions because it would detract from the prestige and authority of the self-supporting Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. This old office supervises and controls national banks, especially through regular examinations, meets with the FDIC, and reports to Congress. The newspaper states that few bankers will question the present Secretary of the Treasury * * * since he was, at one time, a national bank examiner [but] future Secretaries of the Treasury might, in effect, virtually end the Office's time-honored functions, and adds that the merger of Treasury and Comptroller legal divisions under Mr. Morgenthau's regime in effect, ended the assumed independence of the Comptroller.

With respect to the latter merger of the legal divisions, of the Treasury Department and of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, it is stated that the establishment of the new Office of General Counsel in the Treasury in 1934 did not change the legal work performed by the Legal Division of the Comptroller's Office. A possible exception to this statement would be that, whereas the legality of all considerations pertinent to the operations of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency were handled by the legal division of that agency prior to 1934, the statute passed in the latter year would require joint legal work on legal questions of a department-wide scope.

CONCLUSIONS

The basic question before the committee is whether ultimate authority over all Treasury Department functions should be centralized in the Secretary, as is proposed in general in plans 1 to 6. In connection with plan No. 1, however, consideration must also be given to two somewhat conflicting statutory provisions. On the one hand, the statutes specifically authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue general directions to the Comptroller of the Currency. On the other hand, since 1935, they have given the Comptroller the more independent status usually associated with a Presidential appointee; in that year a legislative amendment eliminated the long-time requirement that the Secretary of the Treasury must make recommendations in connection with appointments of Comptrollers.

HERMAN C. LOEFFLER,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved: WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

Cost of the Chrysler Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an Associated Press article from the Washington Post, April 8, 1950, relative to the losses due to the strike at the Chrysler plants. The figures show that today it costs all told better than a billion dollars.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLION IS COST OF CHRYSLER STRIKE TO DATE

DETROIT, April 7.—Direct losses due to the Chrysler strike will pass the $1,000,000,000 mark Monday, April 10, Automotive News asserted today.

The various Chrysler plants have been idle since January 25. The trade paper said that regardless of the outcome of current negotiations it would be impossible for them to reopen next Monday.

Automotive News estimates that through Saturday direct losses growing out of the shut-down will total $994,509,680. Another $20,000,000 it adds, will be lost Monday.

Itemizing the losses, the paper says:

"The $994,509,680 includes the following components: $700,000,000 representing average value of the 350,000 lost cars and trucks; $212,000,000 in lost purchases to Chrysler's 6,500 suppliers; $61,509,680 in lost wages to the 89,000 Chrysler workers, and $21,000,000 in lost wages to the 50,000 idled supplier employees (after unemployment-compensation benefits).

"The $1,000,000,000 Chrysler loss is not an automotive strike record. That distinction is held by the General Motors strike of 1945-46, which lasted for 16 weeks and 1 day and cost directly affected parties $1,457,400,000."

The crucial point is still the method of financing $100-a-month pensions, including Federal social security, for Chrysler workers at age 65 after 26 years of service.

The Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Natural Gas Bill," published in the New York Times on Sunday, April 9. I believe that it is one of the most penetrating discussions I have read of the natural gas bill. It concludes with:

We therefore believe that President Truman should veto the Kerr bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATURAL GAS BILL

Within a very few days President Truman must decide whether to veto the Kerr bill amending the Natural Gas Act of 1938. This amendment would exempt prices charged by so-called independent producers of natural gas from control of the Federal Power Commission. The practical effect of the bill would be clearly to forestall Federal regulation of companies which by 1952 will produce some 80 percent of the natural gas sold in the United States and which dominate an even higher percentage of America's natural gas reserves.

Congress through the Natural Gas Act of 1938 granted the Federal Power Commission the right, which no one now seriously disputes, to regulate rates charged by pipe-line companies engaged in interstate transportation of natural gas and also in its production. Whether this law permitted the FPC to go one step further back and to regulate independent producers—those who did not engage in transportation of gas—is open to argument. The Supreme Court has said it has that right, but the FPC has disavowed any intention of interpreting the act in so broad a manner. However, this was an administrative decision which can always be revoked. It seems, in fact, likely to be revoked; and it is precisely to forestall such a move that the Kerr bill has been brought forward.

Proponents of the Kerr measure insist that it would do nothing more than reaffirm the original intention of Congress as expressed in the Natural Gas Act. But what Congress may have intended in 1938 is less important than what the facts demand today.

The principal producers of gas are now not the pipe-line companies but the very independents whom the Kerr bill would take out from under any possible Federal control. Who are these independents? There are a few thousand of them, but a mere dozen—including some of the biggest names in the oil business—will soon be producing about half the total amount of natural gas transported from the southwestern fields, where the bulk of the Nation's supply is concentrated.

The crucial point is whether these independents, large or small, are so important and so closely linked with that part of the natural-gas industry which already is indisputably subject to regulation that Federal rate control will become meaningless unless they, too, are regulated. To state the problem in this way is almost to answer it. For under conditions as they actually exist in the industry, once a pipe line (the only practicable cheap method of transporting natural gas) is laid to a field, competition at the source virtually ceases. Pipe lines are too expensive to be laid down and picked up at will, so that a field and the line which it feeds are rather permanently joined. Since it has been found necessary for the Government to regulate rates of the pipe-line companies, it seems inescapable that the Government also be at least in a position to control the rates on gas production with which the pipe lines are indissolubly linked. Dominating the Nation's output as they do, obviously the independents must be subject to Federal regulation if there is to be any effective Federal regulation at all. We therefore believe that President Truman should veto the Kerr bill.

No Excuses for the Kerr Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Excuses for the Kerr Bill," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, St. Louis, Mo., on April 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO EXCUSES FOR THE KERR BILL

Supporters of the Kerr natural gas bill think President Truman will sign the gas grab into law. Edward A. Harris reports from Washington that these Congressmen expect the President to offer five explanations for this jolt to the consuming public:

1. Mr. Truman could say the Kerr bill differs from the Moore-Rizley bill which he bitterly opposed. The Moore bill would have allowed rate increases for the entire gas-producing industry, while the Kerr bill would permit increases for producers who control 85 percent of the gas reserves. The distinction is between letting the gas industry cut a whole pie or most of it.

2. The President could note that the Kerr bill was amended to let the Federal Power Commission study gas-production prices. Rate regulation by studies is obvious nonsense.

3. Mr. Truman could stress that gas prices have not risen as have prices of other fuels. Natural gas is a relatively new industry and its efforts at major price increases date only to 1947. But Senator DOUGLAS reported that these prices have doubled or tripled in many recent instances. Shall they continue upward?

4. Mr. Truman could promise new regulatory legislation if gas prices do go up as a result of the Kerr bill. The common phrase for this is locking the barn after the horse is stolen.

5. The President would sign the Kerr bill reluctantly. It would make more sense if he were so reluctant to sign that he would veto the bill instead. The Kerr bill is just the kind of special-interest legislation which the Fair Deal is pledged to oppose. There is no way to excuse it.

Pricing Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which was published in the New York Times of April 10, 1950, under the heading of "Pricing natural gas—Kerr bill said to aid consumer by fostering competition."

The letter was addressed to the editor of the New York Times by Roland F. Beers, head of the department of fuel resources of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute of Troy, N. Y.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICING NATURAL GAS—KERR BILL SAID TO AID CONSUMER BY FOSTERING COMPETITION

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is evident that much confusion abounds as to the real meaning of the Kerr amendment to the Natural Gas Act now before the President for signing. It has been reported in the New York Times that the bill passed the Senate and then the House with a majority of but two votes. Since the action by Congress it has been predicted by various sources that the people are to be robbed of their money to pay for the increased prices of gas, that the rich are gouging the poor, and that a few interests have succeeded in putting over a nefarious plot to fill their coffers at the expense of the general public. It may be helpful to point out the factual situation and to quiet the fears of those who may be alarmed.

It is assumed that the purpose of desirable legislation is to encourage the production of abundant quantities of natural gas for long periods of time at prices favorable to those offered by other fuels—e. g., coal and oil. It is the writer's belief that the Kerr bill will accomplish this result.

In order to maintain low consumer prices for natural gas there must be adequate and continuing supplies. The history of the oil and gas industry shows, as a matter of record, that when prices for these commodities are favorable in relation to costs, exploration effort arises which maintains supplies at levels consistent with a satisfactory price structure. So long as there is an adequate reward for the risks of exploration, drilling, production, and recovery, there will be found the venture funds to carry on these hazardous undertakings.

SUBJECT TO REGULATIONS

If the Federal Power Commission assumes control over the price of natural gas at the wellhead, the commodity will, in effect, be subject to two, possibly three, separate sets of regulations: FPC commodity price-control, FPC pipe line rates and State public utility rate controls. It is probable that FPC price control would be based on the net return after taxes, not more than approximately 6 percent, on the computed cost of acquisition. This is the general plan upon which pipe line rates are determined today. The range of acquisition costs is very great.

At the present time the price of natural gas at the wellhead is at an index of 88.3, compared with coal at 108 and oil at 192. It is well to note that the low price for natural gas prevails in the complete absence of price control at this time, and with a market demand many times that of the available supply. If there were adequate supplies of gas at the consuming markets of the Northeast, it is safe to say that gas would quadruple its present volume of consumption in competition with other fuels.

The gas industry is well aware of the possibilities of this great market, and the planning of pipe lines costing hundreds of millions of dollars, operated under the strict regulation of the Federal Power Commission, is contemplated in the face of strong competition of oil and coal. Therefore, the gas industry recognizes full well that these large outlays of capital funds can earn adequate return only on the basis of maintaining a healthy competitive price structure.

Considering these factors together, there is but one logical conclusion as to future practices of gas producers in respect to price. The lack of Federal regulation will not cause them to raise their wellhead prices indiscriminately. If they yield to such temptation, they will sooner or later lose their markets. The natural competition of 5,500 independent gas producers among themselves is the best guarantee in this Nation that consumers will not be gouged of money to fill the pockets of the rich. We cannot say as much for Federal price regulation of other commodities.

DWINDLING RESERVES

Although we now have 180,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas reserves, enough for 30 years at the present rate of consumption, this huge amount will dwindle to 9 years' supply in 1955, when our markets will take 20,000,000,000,000 cubic feet per year. Meanwhile, under the incentive of a fair return on exploration and production costs, programs of exploration will be organized to maintain the Nation's gas reserves at safe levels. It is important to note that the oil industry has kept approximately 13 years' supplies in sight for more than 20 years, due to operation of economic laws involving balance of supply and demand in a competitive field.

There seems slight justification for regulation of the price of mineral fuels at this time unless we wish to go all-out for the specialized state. It is surprising to note the loud clamor of people who imagine the threat of domination by the interests to be at their very doors. If we desire abundant quantities of natural gas at competitive prices, the Kerr bill should become law. It is as simple as that.

ROLAND F. BEERS,
Head, Department of Fuel Resources, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.
TROY, N. Y., *April 5, 1950.*

Way to Cheap Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Way to Cheap Gas," published in the Chicago Daily News of April 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAY TO CHEAP GAS

The Natural Gas Rate Exemption Act passed by Congress and now awaiting action by President Truman offered a prime invitation to demagogy, and its opponents have made the most of it. They have skillfully created the impression that this is a brash grab by greedy interests at the consumers' pocket.

The fact is that the act merely continues the present condition in which the Federal Power Commission does not regulate the price of natural gas sold by independent producers to the pipe-line companies. The FPC had tentatively reached for such authority, and the new law was enacted to clarify the present Natural Gas Act.

Under the present unregulated market, the Bureau of Mines has reported, the price of a million units of heat bought in the form of gas has dropped appreciably in the last 10 years. Bought as coal or oil, the cost of those units has increased sharply. There is good reason to believe that Federal regulation would not, as its advocates assert, cut the price of gas, but, on the contrary, would boost it.

The reason for this is that the independent producers of gas do not have to sell it to the pipeline companies. They have a vast market in concerns which convert natural gas to high octane gasoline and other hydrocarbon products.

Furthermore, the standard regulatory practice of allowing a rate that will return 6 percent on investment is not sufficient to promote the extensive exploration that is required if supplies are to be increased. It is abundant supply that cuts prices.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS was the most voluble and effective spokesman against the bill, which was sponsored by Senator KERR (who happens to be a millionaire gas producer). Senator DOUGLAS likes Government regulation on principle, be it of rents, farm prices, or gas wells.

He made the point that the independent gas producers hold the relation toward the pipe-line companies that the railroads occupy in relation to shippers. That is to say, "Once the railroads are built, local shippers are at their mercy."

The analogy is good, but it doesn't come out as Senator DOUGLAS intended. He is right about the theory of rail regulation. But it overlooks the competition they have by air, highway and water. The plight of the railroads from the character of this regulation is apparent.

Gas, too, must meet competition. Consumers are not going to install gas furnaces unless it makes a clear saving over oil or coal. Senator DOUGLAS made a tearful plea for "12,000,000 housewives who pay for cooking gas with scanty pocketbooks" cowing before the onrush of the octopus.

These housewives might be glad to know that 4 cents would be a generous estimate of the field price of the gas they use in a month's cooking. They might also be glad of the reassurance of Speaker RAYBURN, who is at least as well informed on the subject as Senator DOUGLAS, that the Kerr bill would not increase the price of gas by one red cent.

The Daily News is for low gas prices. We are convinced that the way to have them is to encourage producers to find more gas and to sell it to the pipe lines. Transmission costs drop as volume increases, and the more high-priced manufactured gas that is displaced by natural gas, the greater the saving.

The clamor for regulation has put President Truman in a delicate spot. If he signs the bill he will appear to be siding against bogus, self-annointed "champions of the consumer" within his own party. It is a hard choice for a man who is professionally on the side of more regulation of everything.

He realizes, however, that his Defense Department has approved the Kerr bill, knowing that incentives are required for the exploration that will add to the existing reserves. He realizes, also, that rent control is not producing housing, any more than price control of men's shirts and toilet paper produced those articles, but merely turned manufacture into other items that would yield a profit.

Gas interests are probably no more and no less greedy than any other segment of business. There might be a drive also to exempt from rate regulation those gas supplies which are owned by the pipe-line companies. If it comes it should be defeated. There must be regulation of self-dealing by a public utility.

Finally, the Kerr bill permits the FPC to carry on a continuing investigation of gas prices. If some combination of collusive practices should result in excessive prices, the legislative remedy is at hand.

Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Could Stronger States Solve Problem?" from the issue of March 16, 1950, of the Northampton Times, published at Cape Charles, Va.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COULD STRONGER STATES SOLVE PROBLEM?

Without attempting to solve the present political problems facing the people of this country as they contemplate the increasing cost of Government or to decide where Government spending should stop, we call attention to the dangerous practice of deficit spending in times of relatively great prosperity.

If the United States Government cannot reduce its national debt, in the midst of a prosperous era, one wonders whether the debt will ever be reduced. It may be, of course, that the growing wealth of the Nation will enable it, in future years to carry the burden without too much strain. Nevertheless, if the cost of Government continues to go up and governmental expenditures are financed by deficit spending, no one can predict the end.

It is quite apparent, however, that if such a course is pursued by the United States—the kind of government we will have hitherto known—the Government will take over more and more of the responsibility that has formerly attached to individuals. Those with wealth of any kind will be taxed more and more to provide equality of everything for those who have not, for various reasons, earned such equality.

While we are not wise enough to say when such a thing would occur, it is obvious that, at some point, the Government would dominate a completely regimented society.

Discussing this general problem recently, Mr. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General, urged a decrease of Federal grants to the States, asserting that if this trend is not discontinued, the States will gradually give up all of their responsibilities and the Federal Government will absorb them. This process has been going on for many years and, in the end, the result will be the one Mr. Farley predicts unless some intelligent effort is made to strengthen the financial position of the States and other local governing units.

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, there appeared in the Baltimore Sun of this morning the first of a series of four articles by Miss Helen Delich on the condition of the American merchant marine. I am convinced that the story unfolded in this and succeeding articles will be of such vital interest not only to the Members of the Congress, but to the people at large that they should be given the widest possible attention.

Hearings conducted by our Subcommittee on Maritime and Merchant Marine have disclosed a pitiful condition in this once great segment of our national economy. To all intents and purposes the American merchant marine, as the testimony and available data reveal, is rapidly passing from the world scene. Only immediate remedial action along different lines proposed, including S. 2786, which I introduced to interest private capital in the construction and operation of merchant and passenger ships, will save the situation, and assure the ships and the ship workers which our country would need badly in case of a future emergency.

I ask unanimous consent that this morning's article be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of April 10, 1950]

ONE THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHT SHIPS OF MERCHANT MARINE; FIVE THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SEVEN IN 1946

(The following article is the first of a series of four by Miss Delich on the condition of the American merchant marine.)

(By Helen Delich)

The American merchant marine—one of the most controversial subjects in Washington and United States seaports for the last 5 years—today consists of 1,208 active ships with a total deadweight tonnage of 14,000,000.

On June 30, 1946, there were 5,387 ships with a deadweight tonnage of 55,100,000 flying the American flag.

In the prewar period, on September 1, 1939, the Stars and Stripes waved from 1,379 ships totaling 11,700,000 tons. More than 1,200 of these were active. At that time the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 provided for the construction of 50 new ships a year, both to replace obsolete ones and to add to the fleet for a 10-year period.

NOTHING DONE TO HALT DECREASE

Today, while the American merchant marine steadily declines—4, 6, 10 ships a month—nothing is being done to halt the decrease.

A Senate subcommittee on maritime matters, headed by Senator O'CONOR and Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat, Washington, has been conducting hearings on the status of the merchant marine in conjunction with a long-range bill they have proposed to alleviate the plight of the industry.

They are also attempting to get $35,000,000 in a separate appropriation for the immediate repair of 134 merchant ships, considered to be of the necessary military auxiliary type, in the laid-up fleet.

NO MARITIME BILL

Neither of these bills is expected to meet with congressional approval unless action to awaken the lawmakers is taken at once, both Senators have said.

One of the principal reasons why the American merchant marine issue has been tossed from pillar to post in the Capitol is that the maritime States do not have—and, apparently, are not interested in—any solid front, such as the silver bloc and the farm bloc, to present and push their case.

The nearest to solid support for the maritime cause comes from the Washington State representatives, all of whom are diligent to get some action. From Maryland, Senator O'CONOR appears to be doing more than the other seven Congressmen combined. Yet the maritime industry is as important to this State as to the northwestern one.

DESIRABILITY WIDELY AGREED

It is agreed that any world power must have an adequate merchant marine. Besides its war usefulness, a merchant fleet is important to the peacetime commerce and economic stability of its nation, as well as playing an important role in international finance, foreign relations, and foreign economics.

Despite this, the number of laid-up ships—in deteriorated condition—in the American National defense reserve fleet has increased to 2,180. Seventy-five others are laid up at piers and temporary anchorages by the lack of cargoes.

Special requests by the Maritime Commission and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to have some of these ships in the reserve fleet in absolute readiness to meet an emergency have gone unheeded.

When the laid-up fleets were designated by Congress at the end of the war, the legislators also ordered that these "dead" ships should be maintained. Not only have they failed to comply with their own mandate but they are refusing to allot the requested $35,000,000 to save $268,000,000 worth of ships—the cost of building only 134.

Not included in the 2,180 figure are 86 ships which this country lent to Russia under the lend-lease program and which have never been returned or accounted for since. With the exception of France, which still has one such craft, Russia is the only nation still charged with lend-lease steamers.

American passenger ships, essential for troop transports, now number 39 privately owned craft with a total gross tonnage of 343,000.

In 1939 there were 117 of 677,300 gross tons.

SUPERLINER WITH DIESEL

Under construction are the United States Lines superliner, two American Export Lines liners for the Mediterranean service, and three for the American President Line to serve round the world.

In prospect are a Diesel-propelled passenger liner for the Mississippi Shipping Co. and two combination passenger-trader ships for the Los Angeles-San Francisco run.

Arnold Bernstein has requested Maritime Commission permission to buy two P-2 transports and convert them to passenger ships for the New York-Amsterdam-Rotterdam run, not now covered by an American-flag ship. The Commission has authorized issuance of bids to determine the cost of these.

A method of replacing the Moore-McCormack Lines Good Neighbor ships to South America must be worked out by October when their charter on the Government-owned vessels expires.

COASTAL AND INTERCOASTAL

Another phase of the industry sharply affected is the once-important coastwise and intercoastal dry cargo fleets—those which saw the United States through the early days of both world wars. Today they employ 75 to 100 ships. Before the last war there were 409 dry-cargo ships there.

Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, chairman of the Maritime Commission, describes the intercoastal situation as a matter of grave concern.

"We need a domestic fleet to handle a large peacetime volume of coastwise and intercoastal trade," the chairman believes. "In two World Wars, our home fleet has also provided the solid core of vessels operating in our own waters that we required for national security. Let us not forget that it was domestic fleets, transferred to military use, which plugged the gap in 1917 and held the line after Pearl Harbor until we could build a bridge of ships."

WAGES AND CANAL TOLLS

The intercoastal business is affected by seamen's high wages, the high Panama Canal tolls (which the President has proposed to raise even higher) and expensive stevedoring costs.

The average freighter plying between Baltimore and Los Angeles pays $7,000 each time it goes through the Canal. Studies are under way to attempt to lessen the burden of loading and discharging ships.

The status of the American merchant marine is reflected sharply in the shipbuilding and ship-repair yards, whose existence virtually depends on American shipping.

Nine ship-construction and repair yards dating back to the prewar period have had to close down completely because there is no prospect of new building. Repairing has hit rock bottom with the foreign ships having all of their major work done at home.

FOUR YARDS SWITCH JOBS

Four other prominent yards have switched to manufacturing oil-refinery machinery, offset printing presses, paper-making machinery, spinning machines, hydraulic turbines, crushing (ice) and beverage (the coin type) machines.

The beverage-machine manufacturer is the Bath (Maine) Iron Works, a shipyard whose construction history dates back to 1889.

J. M. Willis, head of Baltimore's Bethlehem Steel division, who has been in the business 52 years, calls the situation a "crisis" and describes it as "the most extreme the American shipping world has ever faced."

The Shipbuilders Council of America said the United States must have an absolute minimum of 35,000 to 40,000 men in the private shipbuilding industry to face any emergency.

Today, there are less than 20,000 actually taking checks home each week. Sparrows Point, still the leader in the number of new ships in process and on order, last week ordered an average of 2,600 skilled production workers daily.

A committee appointed by President Truman in 1947 to study the situation declared, "It will be a matter of national concern if the number of men actually engaged in the construction of vessels in private and naval shipyards should drop below 60,000. Every practicable effort should be made so to schedule shipbuilding that the work load in the shipyards may be maintained at a reasonably uniform level."

NUMBER EXPECTED TO DROP

The number of skilled men engaged in private and naval shipyard construction—actual production workers—today is approximately 35,000.

This number is expected to begin dropping more sharply within 2 months and continue until all of the 32 ships now under construction are finished. The last one slated for delivery is the 48,000-ton superliner in April 1952. All the others will be in the hands of their owners by April 1951.

In the ship-repair field, it is recommended that an equal number of skilled repair men be available as new builders.

Commercial ship-repair yards are working about 10,000 production workers a day right now.

COMPARISON WITH 1933 EBB

In Baltimore, considered one of the most important ship-repairing points in the Nation, less than 1,800 men actually worked in the production end the week of March 12.

In 1933, described by the President's committee as the "low ebb of shipbuilding activity," the over-all employment for shipbuilding and repair was about 56,000, of which 34,000 were employed in private yards, both repair and building.

Some 75,000 shipyard workers, who had become skilled and planned to make their livelihood in the yards, have turned to whatever else promises steady work or are drawing unemployment compensation.

DRAFTSMEN TURN ELSEWHERE

Their fear of taking a chance in order to wait for a revival in the shipyard business is illustrated by the 100 draftsmen who were released, but on call, at the Sparrows Point plant about 6 weeks ago.

A week later when Bethlehem needed a number back to help with its own Venezuelan ore-trade building project, only three skilled draftsmen returned. The others had found jobs in more certain industries and were not willing to face a dim future. Sparrows Point shipbuilding is scheduled for a complete shutdown by next March.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936—which enacted the 10-year-50-ships-a-year program and its subsidies—boosted employment in private shipyards to 67,700 in 1939; 97,500 in 1940, and 307,700 in October 1941.

WAR FORCE BUILT ABOUT NUCLEUS

When the shipyards were expanded before and during World War II, they were built around a small skilled nucleus of immigrant workers brought here in the 1920's under relaxed immigration laws from Scotland and England. Most of these men today are retired or dead. One is president of the CIO shipyard workers union.

No nucleus will be available in another year or two at the present rate of decline. Ten years are needed to train a shipyard worker properly.

Besides the unemployed shipyard workers, longshoremen are affected. Also there are some 40,000 seamen on the beaches around the United States waiting for their turn to ship out. Many feel lucky if they receive one trip a year now.

A large number are drawing unemployment compensation.

WORLD TONNAGE 102,007,200

The present world tonnage of vessels over 1,000 gross tons consists of 12,765 ships of 102,007,200 deadweight tons. With 10,000,000 tons on order and allowing for losses and scrapping, the world picture will remain at above 100,000,000 tons. Before the war, it was about 80,000,000.

The United States owns one-third of that tonnage. But the United States has two-thirds of its tonnage laid up in nine "graveyards" along the coasts.

Therefore, the United States—the country which supplied 5,500,000 tons of merchant ships to the Allies during the war in return for 715,000 from them—operates only 9 percent of the world's ships.

No other country has a comparable inactive fleet.

UNITED STATES RATIO TO TOTAL

In 1890, the United States had 8.2 percent of the world's total; 1914, 6.8 percent; 1919–20, 22.2 percent; 1939, 13.9 percent; 1940, 14.1 percent, and 1946, 49.8 percent.

Only 3.1 percent of the present United States fleet consists of ships of 10,000 gross tons or more. The British have 21.8 percent in this category.

Besides facing competition from such traditional maritime nations as Sweden, Norway, Italy, and Great Britain, the United States is being challenged by countries previously possessing little or no shipping.

For instance, Argentina has 225 percent more ships over 1,000 gross tons than in 1939; Brazil, 68; Mexico, 381; Poland, 121; Uruguay, 643. Eire, Iceland, and Switzerland, which had no seagoing fleets in 1939, have a combined fleet of 150,000 deadweight tons.

ALLOWED GERMAN RECOVERY

Germany has been permitted to regain 40 percent of her prewar ship construction capacity. This means she will return practically to her full commercial construction, because before the war 50 percent of her shipbuilding was for navy and defense purposes. Her new ships are limited in speed and to a 7,000-ton capacity.

Right now three German shipping officials are in this country trying to charter larger ships so they might carry their own ECA goods to that country.

Under its program to aid Japan, the United States is spending more than $22,000,000 to build 20 to 30 ships of transocean carriage which will fly the Rising Sun flag.

American builders and operators do not believe that the large vessels will be held just to operations between the Japanese islands. They fear competition on the Pacific sea lanes.

TANKERS UNDER FOREIGN FLAGS

Of 33 tankers completed in American shipyards last year, 30 are sailing under foreign flags. These are the most modern tankers in the world.

The number of ships in the National Defense Reserve Fleet may seem large to an outsider, but many are considered obsolete and too expensive to operate. They were built to fill an emergency.

Of the 46 new passenger ships recommended by President Truman's committee in 1947 as essential to put the American merchant marine up to date and keep the shipbuilding industry alive, 34 are not yet even under consideration. Six are under construction. Six others are in the talking stage.

Socialism as a Threat to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the following article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD entitled "Socialism Held Threat to United States by Whittemore," appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on Tuesday, March 28, 1950. Mr. Whittemore is an outstanding Democrat and businessman and what he has to say has particular significance.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIALISM HELD THREAT TO UNITED STATES BY WHITTEMORE—HEAD OF BROWN CO. SEES WEALTH OUTPUT ASSAILED

Americans have come to understand in greater numbers that their liberties do not maintain themselves, but must be defended through day-to-day actions, Lawrence F. Whittemore, president of Brown Co., told the forty-seventh annual convention of the National Paper Trade Association at the Waldorf-Astoria yesterday.

Nevertheless, Mr. Whittemore said, a trend toward socialism is continuing in this country which, if intensified, could result in a dictatorship. "You will say there is no danger of this sort of thing in the United States, and I will agree with you as long as business is good, but the minute the economic picture changes, the danger is very great," he declared.

Mr. Whittemore said an attack on wealth production was one of the disturbing phases of the socialistic trend, otherwise illustrated by the growth of government and various measures through which individuals have traded their rights for immediate gain or promises of security. He called the anti-trust suit against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. an instance of the war on wealth production, saying that our system was based on competition with freedom of individuals and companies to grow as large and prosperous as was reasonable as long as the public is not penalized.

The approximately 1,000 paper merchants and millmen registered for the paper-trade convention will deal principally at their work sessions with problems of increasing costs which have made it increasingly difficult to handle small orders, William G. Leathers, the association's executive secretary, declared in an interview.

Mr. Leathers said small orders that once could be handled at a profit were now showing a loss and that, unfortunately, these represented a substantial percentage of the merchants' and millmen's total orders. To combat this, the paper trades are giving closer attention to more efficient selling methods, reduction of office work where possible, and the elimination of operations that fail to sell goods or help to control sales.

Volume of business for the trades represented was off in 1949 about 10 percent in dollars from sales achieved in the previous year. This year's business for the paper merchants will probably not be as great as either 1947 or 1948, but generally the prospects are good, according to Mr. Leathers. The industry is sharing with others in serving the needs of a population that has increased markedly in recent years, he pointed out. Paper consumption has risen particularly as a result of new developments in packaging, he said.

Social Security for Hired Farm Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, much interest is being shown among farm organizations and throughout the agricultural States in the question of social-security coverage for hired farm workers. It is interesting that in the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee, which have just been concluded, all the major farm organizations appeared to advocate coverage for agricultural labor, as well as spokesmen for many of the agricultural States. The American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, the the Farmers Union, and the National Farm Labor Union of the A. F. of L., have all endorsed such coverage.

In view of the interest in this subject, which will soon be before the Senate in connection with consideration of H. R. 6000, I request unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a series of questions and answers entitled "Social Security for Hired Farm Workers," prepared by the American Public Welfare Association.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR HIRED FARM WORKERS

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. What is the present social-security situation with respect to hired farm workers?

At present agricultural workers, like self-employed farmers, are excluded from the contributory Federal old-age and survivors insurance program. This is the part of social security under which most industrial and commercial workers are now assured cash retirement benefits after 65 or survivors benefits to their dependents if they die. These payments are made to insured persons as a matter of equity right from an insurance fund built up by contributions from covered workers and their employers in contrast to assistance which is paid on an individual means tests basis from general tax funds. Since farm workers have no insurance rights a disproportionate number find themselves in need when they are no longer able to work and must turn to assistance. This is usually satisfactory neither to the worker, who is apt to resent the invasion of his privacy implicit in a means test, nor to the agricultural community which must carry a heavier assistance burden than its urban counterpart.

2. Is there any general recognition that farm workers need the protection of the insurance program?

Coverage of farm workers has been recommended by most authorities who have studied the problem. In particular, the Advisory Council on Social Security appointed by the Senate Committee on Finance, in its report to that committee in 1948, recommended that they be covered. In the words of the advisory council, "the social desirability of extending coverage to these workers has long been a matter of common agreement, and it is now evident that administrative considerations no longer constitute an important barrier to their receiving the protection of the system." Coverage of farm workers has also been recommended by all the major national farm organizations including the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, the Farmer's Union, and the National Farm Labor Union of the American Federation of Labor.

3. What would be the effect of H. R. 6000, the social-security bill now under consideration in the Congress, on farm workers?

H. R. 6000, the bill to liberalize and extend social security passed by the House last year, greatly increases the social insurance benefit payments, adds permanent and total disability benefits to the program and extends coverage to 11,000,000 workers, but these do not

include farm workers (except for certain border-line workers employed in processing farm products off the farm). The Senate Finance Committee, however, which is now studying H. R. 6000 has heard much testimony urging that they add farm workers to those covered by the bill. The higher benefit level and protection against permanent disability for those covered has tended to sharpen the sense of discriminatory treatment on the part of those excluded, and has therefore increased the demands for broader coverage.

4. Why should farm workers be covered under this insurance program?

Farm workers need social insurance protection as much as any other group; they are just as likely to grow old, to become disabled, or to die and leave their families with no earning power. Because their earnings are generally lower than those of other groups, they are even less able to provide individually for their own security. Department of Agriculture estimates indicate that over 85 percent of all farm workers earned cash wages of less than $1,000 during 1947; and that almost 95 percent earned less than $1,400 in cash. Almost 85 percent of all male employees who worked only on farms earned cash wages of less than $1,400. Moreover, farm workers do not have effective means of providing security for themselves as a group. The employer and union pension plans which are now developing for the industrial worker cannot, of course, be applied to people engaged in farm work. The typical farm worker nowadays has no recourse in time of need but to go on the assistance rolls, which for this very reason must carry an especially heavy burden in rural communities.

5. Is it true that farm workers could be covered without imposing troublesome requirements on the workers and their employers?

The Social Security Administration has indicated that farm workers could be covered without any difficulty. One of the ways this could be done is through the use of the stamp plan. Under this plan the worker would be provided with a stamp book, in which his employer would place special social-security stamps indicating the amount of wages paid. The employer would buy the stamps from the post office or rural mail carrier, and would deduct half the cost of the stamps from the worker's earnings as his share of the contribution. The money value of noncash wages, such as meals and lodging, would be included in the wages reported. The stamp book would be sent to the Social Security Administration, which would credit the worker with the amount of the wages reported.

6. In view of the low wages which farm workers receive, could they afford to pay for old-age and survivors insurance protection?

They cannot afford not to. Contributions are related to earnings, so that ability to pay is taken into account. While benefits are also related to earnings, they are so computed that the lower-paid workers receive greater benefits in proportion to their contributions than do higher-paid workers. In addition, benefits are payable to the dependents of workers, and farm families are customarily larger than city families. It must be remembered, too, that there is no other effective way for farm workers to provide security for themselves. A further point is that from one-third to one-half of all farm workers spend a part of their lives in employment that is now covered under the program. In 1947 about one-quarter of all employees who did farm work also had some nonfarm work. If farm employment is not covered, many of these workers will never become insured despite the contributions they have paid; others will be insured, but the benefits payable to them or to their families will be inadequate because their wages for farm work will not be included in computing the benefit amounts.

7. How much would farm employees pay for this insurance protection?

If farm workers were covered under H. R. 6000, they would pay 2 percent of their annual net earnings during the years 1951 through 1959; farm employers would pay a like amount. Thus a worker earning, say, $1,200 a year would pay $24—or $2 a month—for the next 10 years, for a total of $240 over the 10-year period. After that the rates would increase gradually to a maximum of 3¼ percent in 1970; at that rate the farm worker earning $1,200 would pay $39 a year, or $3.25 a month.

8. What protection would the farm worker get for these contributions?

If he lived to age 65, he would receive a retirement benefit each month; his wife would also receive a monthly benefit at that age; and if there were children under 18 they, too, would get benefits. If the worker died prematurely, a lump sum would be paid to his widow or to the person who paid the funeral expenses, and the widow and young children, or aged dependent parents, would get monthly benefits. H. R. 6000 would also provide for the payment of monthly insurance benefits to permanently and totally disabled workers, so that the farm worker would receive benefits before age 65 if permanently unable to work. Benefits would not be paid for any month in which the beneficiary earned as much as $50 for covered work.

9. How large would these insurance benefits be?

Under H. R. 6000, if the worker has been covered for 10 years at $1,200 a year he would be eligible at age 65 for benefits of $52 a month. When his wife became 65 the family would get $79 a month. If the worker died after 10 years of coverage at $1,200 and left a widow and one child under 18, the family would receive $79 a month. If there were a child but no widow, the monthly benefit amount would be $39; if there were two children, $65. Benefits would stop when the youngest child attained age 18, but the widow would again be entitled to benefits at $39 a month when she reached 65. In addition, a lump sum amounting to $156 would be paid.

10. How long would the farm worker have to contribute to the insurance program in order to get benefits?

He would be insured for survivor benefits after he had been covered for a year and a half. Under H. R. 6000, he would have to be covered for at least 5 years in most instances before he could get retirement or disability benefits; however, under the "new start" proposal of the Advisory Council he would be insured for retirement benefits after only a year and a half. Where a farm worker has already spent some time in covered employment, this employment will shorten the time he needs to work in the future to become eligible for benefits.

11. Would it be possible to cover migratory workers, tenant farmers, or share croppers under social insurance?

Migratory workers could readily be covered under the stamp-plan method described above. Tenant farmers or share croppers could either be covered as farm workers or self-employed farmers depending on the nature of their arrangement with the farm owner.

12. Does the exclusion of farm workers discriminate against agricultural States?

Yes; because at least a part of the cost of social security for industrial workers is a charge against the cost of production of the things the farm worker buys. Moreover, in agricultural States the major governmental provision for the aged must be made under old-age assistance which is a charge against State and local, as well as Federal tax funds. Thus the farm worker pays for the social security of urban people in the price of things he buys and for rural people in his taxes; the more heavily agricultural the State the greater the pressure on its old-age-assistance program and the greater its economic handicap. There is a parity factor in social security exactly as there is in the question of current income for the farmer or farm worker in his producing years.

Flow of American Secrets to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the following editorial from the New Hampshire Morning Union of March 30, 1950, inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JORDAN'S TESTIMONY IS VINDICATED

The accumulating evidence substantiating the testimony of Maj. George Racey Jordan concerning the flow of American secrets to Soviet Russia through the base at Great Falls, Mont., makes positively ridiculous the slurs of those wiseacres who tried to discredit this testimony when it was first given.

The latest and most convincing evidence comes from Victor A. Kravchenko, author of I Chose Freedom. Kravchenko was a member of the wartime Soviet Purchasing Commission in the United States, and in that position, he says he packed some of the secret information sent to Russia, such as maps, charts, photostats, and blueprints, into diplomatic pouches for shipment by sea and air. He told the House Un-American Activities Committee that the purchasing commission had orders from Soviet Foreign Trade Minister Mikoyan to find all secret information about the industry of the United States and especially the military industry, including such matters as bombs and other weapons.

Every Soviet diplomat, Kravchenko said, whether Malik in the United Nations or Panyushkin in Washington, has received extensive training along these lines and has had wide experience in such matters. He added further (and this is most important of all) that it was no wonder that they got what they wanted when the administration attitude in Washington was: "Who cares what the Russians get?"

Leon Blum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story

special to the New York Times under date line of Paris, March 30, concerning the death of Leon Blum, former Premier of France. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed an editorial from the New York Times dated March 31, an editorial from the Washington Star dated April 2, and an editorial from the Washington Post dated April 1.

Many times during the past year the Republican leadership has accused the European social democrats of being neo-Communists. I believe that the story of the life of Leon Blum is adequate refutation to the political irresponsibility of the Republican leadership. Europe has known no greater defender of the democratic way of life than Leon Blum. The world has had few men in the history of the twentieth century who more valiantly and vigorously battled against Communists and communism than the Socialist leader, Leon Blum. His record of devotion to democratic ideals and principles, his untiring efforts in behalf of human freedom should put at rest for once and for all the false dogma and political misrepresentation of Mr. Guy Gabrielson and his political lieutenants. Every lover of human freedom should pay silent tribute to the noble work and efforts of this beloved man of France who had the courage to fight against totalitarianism where the battle was hot and militant and the issue was sharply drawn.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

LEON BLUM IS DEAD OF A HEART ATTACK—FORMER PREMIER OF FRANCE, VETERAN SOCIALIST LEADER, STRICKEN IN HIS HOME—AT NATION'S HELM THREE TIMES—FIRST IN OFFICE IN 1936, WHEN POPULAR FRONT WON ELECTION—FOSTERED LABOR GAINS

PARIS, March 30.—Leon Blum, former Premier of France and veteran Socialist leader, died today of a heart attack. He would have been 78 on April 9.

He was stricken in his old country cottage near a hamlet called Jouy-en-Josas, 15 miles from Paris. The cottage stands on a small unfrequented road. From the long oak table he used as a desk, M. Blum had looked over a sloping field, fruit trees and bushes lately bursting into blossom.

In failing strength, he had spent in this quiet retreat, under the constant care of his wife, most of the time since his return from German captivity in 1944.

Though in delicate health, notably since an operation a year ago, M. Blum remained a political leader to the last. He was among the Socialists who met in Paris yesterday to celebrate the progress of the Socialist newspaper, Le Populaire, of which he had remained directeur politique. He telephoned to the newspaper office this morning to ask the latest political news.

In recent months, M. Blum's major task was to hold the Socialist Party together despite an internal split, and in this role he may well prove irreplaceable.

NOTABLES PAY THEIR RESPECT

Soon after M. Blum's death, President Vincent Auriol drove to Jouy-en-Josas to pay his respects, as did Edouard Hérriot, President of the National Assembly; Gaston Monnerville, President of the Advisory Council of the Republic, and other officials and Socialist leaders.

Upon receipt of the news, Robert Schuman, Foreign Minister, informed the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the European nations meeting in Strasbourg, which sent a message to Mme. Blum.

Just before the French National Assembly adjourned as a mark of respect, M. Herriot made a speech in which he said that the quality of M. Blum's mind and the extent of his erudition recalled Jean Léon Jaurès, Socialist leader of the latter part of the last century, who was shot in 1914. Leaders of the other parties also paid tribute to M. Blum—except the Communists, whose official manifestoes had called him a traitor.

In March 1946 M. Blum went to Washington and negotiated credits aggregating $1,400,000,000, the largest France has received at one time since the war, not excluding those under the Marshall plan.

M. Blum's political fame rests chiefly on the improvement of the wage earners' lot through collective bargaining, paid holidays, and the 40-hour week during his premiership in 1936. The last article he wrote for Le Populaire contended that wages were too low in France because industry was badly organized.

Those who knew M. Blum will think of him as an exponent of a revolutionary philosophy who remained moderate and tenaciously democratic in its application. In him were combined a brilliant intellect and a passion for social justice. Both were expressed in his newspaper articles, written in the most lucid of styles. His gentle temperament and his quiet appeal to reason differentiated him more and more sharply from some Socialists, and especially from the Communists, who were his political allies in 1936.

COUNCIL OF MINISTERS PAYS TRIBUTE

STRASBOURG, France, March 30.—The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe suspended its meeting here for half an hour today on receipt of news of the death of M. Blum. The Ministers paid homage to the memory of M. Blum and dispatched a message of sympathy to his family before resuming their work.

SOCIAL JUSTICE HIS PASSION

Leon Blum was a great idealist in French politics. His passion for social justice took him from the Paris literary salons in the 1890's to become Socialist Premier of France and prime mover of one of the most controversial social experiments of all time.

In 1936 M. Blum headed the first popular front government of Radicals, Socialists, and Communists. Supporters of the ideals of this movement said that it carried forward the will of the French people for long-overdue social reforms. Its antagonists said that it paralyzed French industry, fostered communism, and ruined France's arms production and morale at a moment when Hitler was mustering a united and toiling Germany to launch the blow that laid France low in 1940.

M. Blum's honest idealism never was questioned. His good judgment was challenged frequently, even after his courageous conduct during the Second World War had reinstated him in the hearts of all but a handful of his political enemies.

Leon Blum was born in Paris on April 9, 1872, in a quarter that still echoed with the bloody Communard uprising of a year earlier. He was the son of a well-to-do Jewish lace and ribbon merchant, and grew up much under the influence of a grandmother whose revolutionary fervor was such as to acquire for her the nickname of "La Communarde."

He associated with such brilliant literary figures as Marcel Proust, Pierre Louys, and Anatole France and contributed to the little advance-guard magazines. He was an inveterate first nighter and a bit of a dandy, and his dramatic criticisms were regarded as among the best of the time.

M. Blum was a Socialist when he was 17. His liberalism was tempered in the fire of the Dreyfus affair. Jean Jures, the Socialist leader who was assassinated at the outbreak of the First World War, was the greatest influence in his life after his militant grandmother.

During part of the First World War, M. Blum was executive secretary to Marcel Sembat, Socialist leader and Minister of Public Works. In 1919 M. Blum was elected chairman of the executive board of the Socialist Party and successfully stood for the Chamber of Deputies from a Paris division.

In 1921 he was leader of the dissident group of the Socialist Party—the group opposing affiliation with the Third International. The militant "right" was the most powerful force in French politics. Organizations of uniformed men such as the Croix de Feu sought to dominate the streets and the various elements of the "left" began to draw together for their protection.

On February 12, 1924, M. Blum and his one-time enemy, Marcel Cachin, Communist leader, spoke from the same platforms, and the "popular front" was born. The hatred of the "right" extremists for M. Blum mounted, and on February 13, 1936, the scholarly intellectual was attacked and badly beaten by "rightist" hoodlums.

VICTORY FOR "POPULAR FRONT"

The "left" won an overwhelming victory on April 26 and May 3, 1936, in the general elections. The Communists held 62 seats in the new Chamber of Deputies as against 10 in the previous Chamber, and the Radicals, who had lost some strength, could contribute 159 seats. The regular Socialist group of M. Blum, together with various Socialist splinter groups, gave the "popular front" 334 seats out of 618, with scattered support among other groups of the moderate "left." The parties making up the "popular front" never had anything approaching a clear majority of the popular vote, however.

Leon Blum became Premier on June 4, and by the end of the month 12,142 sit-down strikes, involving 1,830,936 strikers, were on record. A new flag, the French tricolors with a red field and the hammer and sickle, appeared over some struck factories.

M. Blum laid before the Chamber of Deputies bills prescribing the 40-hour week, vacations with pay, the nationalization of the armament industries, the reform of the Bank of France, and the establishment of a board to control bread prices, and many other sweeping reforms.

The proposals were almost all approved, and the basis of an entirely new social structure was enacted into law in a few days. M. Blum insisted that he sought to reform the capitalist system without destroying it. This alienated his Communist supporters, who wanted the capitalist system liquidated at once.

The first Popular Front Government foundered on the rocks of finance, just like many French Governments before and since. M. Blum had consented to a devaluation of the franc on October 1, 1936, somewhat against his will, and on June 21, 1937, he was forced to go before the senate to seek authority to set up a financial dictatorship, which was refused. In the early morning hours of June 21, M. Blum resigned, and the first Popular Front Government came to an end.

The ensuing Government of Camille Chautemps was called a Popular Front Government, and M. Blum took part in it and was again called to form a government on March 13, 1938. This time his government lasted less than a month, and he was succeeded by the government of Edouard Deladier, Radical.

During his terms as Premier, M. Blum tried to steer a neutral course in the Spanish Civil

War, which began in July 1936. He withheld open French aid to the Spanish Government, and when this Government was defeated, M. Blum was severely criticized by many who had supported him in the Popular Front.

ON TRIAL BY VICHYITES

M. Blum was placed on trial by the Vichy Government at Riom on February 19, 1942, on charges of "betrayal of the duties of his charges." On trial with him were M. Daladier, Gen. Maurice Gustave Gamelin, Guy La Chambre, Minister for Air in M. Daladier's cabinet, and Pierre Jacomet, General Secretary of the War Ministry under M. Daladier.

M. Blum was a prisoner in Germany when the war was drawing toward a close, and was freed by the Eighty-third Division of the United States Army.

Factionalism had greatly weakened the French Socialist Party. Many of its left-wing members had gone over to the Communists, while a considerable number of its more conservative adherents had joined the ranks of the Popular Republican Party or another of the moderate groups.

On December 12, 1946, M. Blum became Premier for the third time. It was understood that his government was to be an interim affair, and on January 27, 1947, he retired in favor of Paul Ramadier, another old-line Socialist. In November 1947 he narrowly missed being Premier once more. He lost by a handful of votes when the Communists refused to support him.

[From the New York Times of March 31, 1950]

LEON BLUM

Leon Blum was a figure whose great career dealt so closely with modern events that one cannot think of a period since the First World War in which he did not play a prominent part. It was inevitable that his role should have been controversial and that it should have had its ups and downs, its strengths and weaknesses. Historians will have a rich field for study and comment. The inter-war period was not M. Blum's best because it saw him forced to compromise his beliefs and ideals in order to play a positive role in coalition government. It was Leon Blum's popular front government that joined the British in the nonintervention policy which spelled the doom of the Spanish Loyalists in the Civil War. However, it was also Leon Blum, who stood up so bravely against the victorious Germans at the Riom trial, and in subsequent internment during the Second World War.

His record since the war ended was a wholly admirable one of wise statesmanship and moderation. That France had been able to keep the middle road in these desperate years was due as much to M. Blum as to any French statesman. The best measure of his greatness is that he now leaves a void that cannot be filled. France has suffered a real loss in his passing.

[From the Washington Star of April 2, 1950]

LEON BLUM

Leon Blum became a politician by accident. At the start of the Dreyfus affair in the autumn of 1894 he was a young boulevard literary man without an ideal of any sort in his head unless it was that of writing French attractively. But his Jewish ancestry was a force in his nature, and it drove him into active defense of a fellow-Jew attacked by anti-Semites. The struggle ending in Dreyfus' vindication taught the future premier much. It brought him into close association with Jean Jaures, and that contact made him a Socialist.

But the variety of socialism which he adopted was a philosopher's brand. M. Blum tried to be a rational revolutionary. The Marxist doctrine was too rigid for him to accept without reservation. He attempted a middle-of-the-road course. This endeavor inevitably involved him in difficulties with both the extreme left and the extreme right. By 1924 he was head of his own party, editor of its paper, and the spokesman in these positions of millions of French workers. To gain control of the government he joined with Marcel Cachin, the Communist, in developing the first popular front. The union was unrealistic and lasted little more than a year. But momentarily it did turn France upside down. The good and the evil it accomplished probably will be debated for decades. If it actually democratized French industry, it also weakened the national security of France. The number of sit-down strikes in 1936 reached a total exceeding 12,000.

Twice subsequently M. Blum was called to head a national administration. He was Premier for a few weeks in 1938 and again in 1946. Meanwhile, he had been tried by the Vichy regime at Riom, where his eloquent defense of himself embarrassed both Petain and Hitler and in consequence he was neither convicted nor acquitted but merely held a prisoner. On the eve of his death at 77 he was once more a literary man, writing beautiful French. Washington remembers him as it saw him 4 years ago—a scholar striving to be dynamic, a patriot trying to be rationalistic, a European desperately hoping to survive as such in an age seemingly moving toward universal mediocrity and frustration. He had contributed to the debacle, but so had practically every other leader of his generation.

[From the Washington Post of April 1, 1950]

LEON BLUM

The great figures of the Third Republic combined the profession of letters with that of politics, and Leon Blum, dead at 77, was one of the most glittering stars of the constellation. A boulevardier in his youth, with an ample private income at his disposal, he wrote poetry, dramatic criticism, essays, and books, and seems at the same time to have held down a job as a civil servant. Withal, he flitted from salon to salon clad wholly in black from his broad-brimmed hat and loose-string tie, and contributed to the bohemian circles of Paris a conversation that is said to have sparkled with wit and to have been couched in a language as pure as any in France.

It seems to have been the Dreyfus case at the end of the nineteenth century that thrust Blum into public affairs. He felt the case as a humanitarian even more than as a Jew, and his polemics rate high in the literature of that celebrated episode. Having taken the plunge, he found his place in public life by the side of Jean Jaures, the father of the Socialist Party, and he led that party through the split with communism, then into collaboration in two prewar popular-front cabinets. He put through social reforms, but at the expense of total neglect of France's defense; yet Blum redeemed his reputation while he was a prisoner in Germany and by his brilliant conduct of his defense at the Riom trials.

Blum was a man of thought more than a man of action, and his spiritual home, as Lania says in his Nine Lives of Europe, would have been in a two and one-half international, or one between the second and third internationals. This effort to reconcile the irreconcilable reappeared in his postwar advocacy of a third force. By that time the world issue had become not one between capitalism and communism, but between freedom and slavery, and there is no middle ground between these two. Yet the cause to which Blum of recent times gave his powerful talents was clear-cut and authentic; he was one of the stalwarts of the European movement. In this respect he had little kinship with the nationalism of more doctrinaire socialists in Britain, but then, there was nothing provincial or narrow-minded in Leon Blum. He had a cosmopolitan culture, a fealty to the European system, and a fierce loyalty to moral values which made him a great humanist.

Acceptance of New Mundt Bill Shows Public Understands Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Acceptance of New Mundt Bill Shows Public Understands Reds," published in the Omaha World-Herald of recent date. The editorial gives the reasons why the so-called Mundt-Ferguson-Johnson bill to control subversive activities, should be reported for favorable action by the United States Senate at an early date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCEPTANCE OF NEW MUNDT BILL SHOWS PUBLIC UNDERSTANDS REDS

Two years ago the Mundt-Nixon bill was a burning issue.

New Dealers and the pinkish fringe were opposed to this anti-Communist legislation almost to a man. So were a number of other people who wanted communism curbed but thought the Mundt-Nixon bill was unworkable or unwise. Governor Dewey and Harold Stassen debated it publicly, Mr. Dewey making a formidable defense of the then fairly popular view that special legislation to expose Communists was unnecessary.

The bill had passed the House, 319 to 58, when the controversy reached fever pitch. It died in the Senate, never came to a vote.

TODAY IT'S DIFFERENT

Today the attitude is different.

The Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston bill to register Communists is much like the Mundt-Nixon bill. Senator MUNDT has held tenaciously to his purpose, argued steadily for his bill, revised it, tempered it, and finally won over the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously except for Senator LANGER, the North Dakota maverick. The new Mundt bill, backed almost solidly by Senate Republicans and by a cross section of Democrats that includes New Dealers KEFAUVER, GRAHAM, and KILGORE, is conceded an excellent chance of becoming law.

Some of the credit is due to the persistence and the persuasive powers of Mr. MUNDT. However, circumstances have helped a great deal. The Communist conspiracy trials, the Hiss and Coplon cases have convinced most Americans that communism can be fought successfully in the courts. And they are now aware that good, reasonable, enforceable laws are needed to counter the Communist conspiracy. The improved Mundt bill has the makings of such a law.

The purpose of the Mundt bill is exposure. It would recognize frankly that the Communist Party is not a political party like the Republicans or the Democrats or even the Socialists, but an agency of Soviet Russia. Communists would have to register with the Attorney General. Communists would be barred from appointive Federal jobs and denied passports for foreign travel.

COMMUNISTS APART

If it is argued that the Mundt bill sets the Communists apart, it can be argued equally that the Communist has set himself apart by joining a world-wide conspiracy that threatens free American institutions. The Mundt bill would not outlaw the Communist Party and it would prohibit none of the lawful political activity which the Communists claim is their only purpose. But it would make it more difficult for Communists to carry on their conspiracy. It would provide the courts with a useful tool.

The fact that the new Mundt bill has made so much progress with so little fanfare shows how American thinking has changed since 1948. It is evidence that the people and their representatives in Congress do not propose to sit idly by while the Communist conspiracy, masquerading as a harmless political party, tries to undermine and destroy.

New York County Lawyers' Association Opposes H. R. 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, my own opposition, the strong minority report filed by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the equally adverse attitude of the American Jewish Congress and of the leading immigration lawyers to H. R. 10, a bill which would permit the Attorney General to imprison aliens for no crime and without court proceeding and would take the Immigration and Naturalization Service out from under the Administrative Procedure Act, are all well known.

You can imagine my gratification, therefore, when I received in the mail a communication from Mr. W. Houston Kenyon, Jr., chairman of the committee on Federal legislation of the New York County Lawyers' Association, informing me that the committee on American citizenship had adversely reported H. R. 10 after due consideration.

This is tantamount to adverse recommendation by the association and in all probability reflects the opinion of all the principal lawyers' associations in metropolitan New York.

Under leave, and in the hope that the adverse resolution will come to the attention of all Members, I am inserting the letter from Mr. Kenyon and the resolution in the RECORD.

NEW YORK COUNTY LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., April 6, 1950.

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed please find copy of report adopted by the committee on American citizenship of the New York County Lawyers' Association.

Very truly yours,
W. HOUSTON KENYON, Jr.,
Chairman of Committee on Federal Legislation.

HOUSE BILL 10

NEW YORK COUNTY LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION,
February 17, 1950.

The committee on American citizenship having considered H. R. 10 respectfully reports as follows:

The bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. SAM HOBBS of Alabama on January 3, 1949, and was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The salient features of the bill are: (1) to permit the deportation of an alien to any nation which is willing to accept such alien into its territory; (2) pending final determination of the deportability of any alien taken into custody under warrant of the Attorney General, such alien may be continued in custody; (3) pending actual deportation, any alien may be transported to a place of detention designated by the Attorney General and there detained, though not at hard labor; (4) should any alien who has previously departed from the United States pursuant to this law, return unlawfully to the United States, the original warrant of deportation is to be considered reinstated and he is to be proceeded against without the commencement of new deportation proceedings; (5) the validity of detention may be inquired into by writ of habeas corpus; and (6) making inapplicable certain provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1004 et seq.) and the Declaratory Judgment Act of 1934, as amended (28 U. S. C. 400) to the provisions of this act or to any law relating to the immigration, exclusion, expulsion or registration of aliens, or to the nationality or naturalization laws of the United States; nor should the provisions of section 503 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (8 U. S. C. 903) be applicable in any case which involves a determination of the right of a person to be admitted or to remain in the United States under the provisions of any of the immediately foregoing described laws.

On August 4, 1949, a majority of the Committee on the Judiciary reported favorably on this legislation and recommended that the bill do pass (Rept. No. 1192). Minority views, however, were recorded by Congressman CELLER and GOSSETT. The majority of the Committee on the Judiciary struck out the bill as advocated by Mr. HOBBS and rewrote same with amendments. There appears to be no material change in the rewritten bill, with the exception that a provision has been inserted depriving any court of jurisdiction to release on bond or otherwise any alien detained under any provision of law relating to the exclusion or expulsion of aliens at any time prior to a decision of a court in his favor which is not subject to further judicial reviews.

Your committee has adopted the views expressed in the minority report. However, the said minority report makes no mention of subdivision (g) of section 4 which was inserted by the committee. As stated above, this subdivision ousts any court of jurisdiction to release on bond or otherwise any alien detained under any provision of law relating to the exclusion or expulsion of aliens at any time prior to a decision of a court in his favor which is not subject to further judicial reviews. This means that it may be only the Supreme Court of the United States, on appeal, that would have final authority to release an alien from detention, under the proposed legislation, in a habeas corpus proceeding. This is the only proceeding available to an alien, because other remedies that he may now have under any of the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, Declaratory Judgment Act, or under the Nationality Act would not be available to him. Your committee deplores that fact that it is sought to take out the Immigration and Naturalization Service from the classes of agencies within the scope of the Administrative Procedure Act. The author of this act, Senator MCCARRAN, referred to it as "a comprehensive charter of private liberty and solemn undertaking of official fairness." It was entitled "An act to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure." It was widely acclaimed as an advance in democratic government. Its main features were separation of powers in adjudicatory matters, procedural requirements in regard to hearings and decisions, and for judicial review. All of these are done away with under the proposed legislation. If this proposed legislation is enacted into law, there will be lodged with the officers in the Immigration and Naturalization Service autocratic power over aliens without the judicial branch of the Government to act as a check on its activities, save the meager relief of an inquiry by habeas corpus, which reviews the legality of detention and not the merits of the case.

Any law which denies to an alien any right to the type of hearing and judicial review contemplated by the Administrative Procedure Act and any law which may deny an alien his liberty until the Supreme Court has spoken, is repugnant to our concept of due process, particularly when we consider that the average alien has not the financial means to take his cause to the highest Court. Moreover, there is no reason to deprive an alien, whose liberty is at stake, from the benefits of the Administrative Procedure Act and other remedial legislation, when such benefits are available where property rights are involved.

For the foregoing reasons, your committee respectfully reports that it opposes the enactment of H. R. 10 as it now stands.

Respectfully submitted.

COMMITTEE ON AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP.

Dr. Charles R. Drew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on April 1 Dr. Charles Drew, an outstanding Negro physician and a member of our District of Columbia community, was killed in an automobile accident. Dr. Drew was a pioneer in the field of blood plasma and as a result of his brilliant research in that field saved thousands of British and American lives during the war. In 1943 he won the Spingarn medal for "the highest and noblest achievement by an American Negro." In 1940 he was awarded a doctorate in medical science by Columbia University and was most recently professor of surgery at Howard University and chief surgeon at Freedmen's Hospital.

Dr. Drew's tragic accident is a profound loss to the whole American community. It is fitting that we in the Senate of the United States give his achievements due recognition and express to

his family, to his friends and to the members of the Negro race our sorrow at the loss of this great American.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial paying tribute to Dr. Drew which appeared in the Washington Post for April 6, 1950, as well as the obituary notice of his death, which appeared in the April 2 issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 6, 1950]

CHARLES R. DREW

Dr. Charles R. Drew, whose life was snuffed out in its early maturity by an automobile accident on Saturday, was among the most gifted of American surgeons. He chose to devote his gifts to the advancement of medicine rather than to the advancement of a personal career or to winning the monetary rewards that were easily within his reach. In particular, he devoted his gifts to the training of young Negro surgeons desperately needed for the medical care of their race. It is said that more than half of the Negro surgeons who have been certified by the American Board of Surgery were trained by Dr. Drew, himself the first Negro to serve as an examiner on the board.

A native of Washington and a graduate of Amherst College and of the McGill University Medical School at Montreal, he came to Howard University as an instructor in pathology and an assistant in surgery in 1935. Subsequently, he was awarded a Rockefeller fellowship in surgery at Columbia University. Since 1941, he has been professor of surgery at Howard and for several years past has served also as chief surgeon at Freedmen's Hospital. The Spingarn Medal was awarded to him in 1943 for the highest and noblest achievement by an American Negro during the preceding year or years. He worked ardently to enlarge the meager opportunities for Negro doctors to receive training in American medical schools and hospitals. He will be missed, however, not alone by his own race but by his whole profession and by men everywhere who value scientific devotion and integrity.

[From the New York Times of April 2, 1950]

Born in Washington, D. C., Dr. Drew was graduated from Amherst in 1926, the year in which he won the National Junior Amateur Athletic Union championship in the high hurdles. At McGill University, Montreal, where he received the degrees of M. D. and Master of Surgery in 1933, he not only won first prize in physiological anatomy and obtained the Hosmer Fellowship in medicine but was the all-time high scorer in Canadian intercollegiate track competition.

After an interval on the faculty of Howard University he studied at the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, at the same time serving as a resident in surgery at the Presbyterian Hospital and in 1940 was awarded a Doctorate in Medical Science.

Early in the Second World War, when it was decided by the Blood Transfusion Association to investigate the possibility of aiding the Allies by shipping plasma to Europe, a planning committee was formed, consisting of Dr. E. H. L. Corwin, Dr. John Scudder, and Dr. Drew, who had already done brilliant research in blood plasma with Dr. Scudder at the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center.

On October 1, 1940, in answer to the urgent call from the British, Dr. Drew was appointed full-time medical director of the plasma project for Great Britain. This project, which functioned at the Presbyterian Hospital, ended in 1941. The American Red Cross then decided to set up blood-donor stations to collect plasma for the American armed forces. Dr. Drew was appointed the first director of the new project and set up the first collection unit. Three months later, when the work was in successful operation, he resigned to take the chair of surgery at Howard University.

Unbiased Investigation Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Exeter News-Letter, Exeter, N. H., entitled "Unbiased Investigation Necessary," written by Mr. James P. Lynch.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNBIASED INVESTIGATION NECESSARY

(By James P. Lynch)

What a price we have to pay for plain stupidity. This great Nation of ours, due to our political clowns, has been turned into the laughing stock of the world practically overnight. We boast of leadership yet by our very actions we lack it. We have seen leadership transformed from greatness to confusion and misgiving.

If ever in the history of the United States there was a dire need for leaders in Washington, then it is today. By our performances we have proven to the world that the mad scramble for political control is jeopardizing the future security of the Nation.

This is no time for business leaders to sit back and watch the men of Washington act like circus performers. This is the time for the executives of industry to be willing to sacrifice personal gains in private business and take a foothold in running the affairs of the Nation. They must come out of the shell of private enterprise and plan the destiny of a greater America.

Many of the politicians at the Nation's Capitol have proven that they are not capable of the position entrusted in them by the people of the Nation. It is time the people voted them out of office so the country will not be subjected to a continuance of such foolish tactics.

We pay our servants in Washington good salaries. Yet today, in actual dollars and cents, the results of our expenditures for such representation is a disgrace to the people of the Nation. Our dollar is worth a trifle of what it was worth years ago. By the same token we are not receiving full value from our politicians. In fact, our return from these public servants is so low that it resembles a bankrupt dollar.

How much longer will the people tolerate these stupid actions? This fall, some office holders will be retired for the good of the Nation. They will retire on a pension fund that they voted for themselves. But the fall is still many months away. The continuance of such unforgivable representation will only tend to lower the degree of respect other nations have for us.

How does one expect the people of foreign nations to understand our political maneuverings in Washington when the people of the United States have a difficult time figuring them out.

We feel that such a committee would serve the people better because the Democrats have proven by their actions on Monday in the Senate that they prefer to prevent any outright probe. For example, our senior Senator attempted to gain the floor to deliver a speech shortly after the Senate convened at noon. It was nearly 7 o'clock before he was able to accomplish this. Even when BRIDGES tried to address this body after being attacked by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, he was denied the opportunity.

BRIDGES denounced such tactics by stating: "It is rather unheard of that a Senator cannot obtain the floor to speak on a situation of that kind. I have been in the Senate nearly 14 years, and I expect to be here many more years, and I do not intend to be walked on, trod on, jumped on, or imposed upon. In the weeks, months, and years to come we are going to have fair play, or many in this body are going to know the reason why."

He continued: "I believe it is time that someone stands up in this Chamber and asks some questions. They are questions which are formed by the lips of the vast majority of the people of the United States."

BRIDGES denounced the actions of Acheson. He described the latter as playing on the fervent yearning of our people for peace.

Our Senator showed that there is a dire need for an investigation of the State Department.

"Our Department of State," BRIDGES remarked, "has fallen into a condition unparalleled in the Nation's history. That all of us in the Chamber know. But we are not alone in that knowledge. Stalin knows it. And, thank God, the American people know it."

He explained that is the reason why the various Senators are receiving letters demanding that the State Department be liberated from the Communists, and the commie sympathizers, the fellow travelers, the Socialists, the homosexuals, and the just plain incompetents who have brought it so low in the Nation's esteem.

BRIDGES emphasized: "The public is alarmed, and rightly alarmed. After all, confessed and proved spies and traitors have been found in the high policy-making echelons on the State Department."

He pointed out how by the Department's own count, some 91 homosexuals, every one a logical target for exploitation and blackmail by spies, have been caught. "Even by the half-hearted and self-serving investigations the Department has been conducting of itself in the very recent past, these perverts were exposed," stated the Senator.

BRIDGES condemned the tactics being used. Referring to the Senate resolution in regard to loyalty in the State Department, he uttered: "The resolution does not say slap together a quick hearing, discredit the testimony of one witness, call on him to prove single-handed, that which it is the duty of the Department of State and the Department of Justice and the Central Intelligence Agency to act upon, without even being told to do so.

"It does not say," he continued, "to set up a sounding board from which Senators can run for reelection. It does not say to find excuses for covering up that which the country knows good and well to be true."

BRIDGES was quite critical throughout his address of the State Department. If his questions are answered sincerely it will be beneficial to the country.

If one doubts the threat of communism it might be well to look over the figures recently given out by Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen in

a radio broadcast. The noted priest stated: Communism which in January 1945 enslaved only 190,000,000 people, today enslaves 800,000,000.

One cannot overlook these threats. An enlightened America will help bring victory in the cold war.

Doctor Raps AMA—Shows Health Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, since a great deal of false and misleading propaganda on the subject of Government health activities is circulated by the American Medical Association, I was delighted to find an excellent statement by a doctor on the need for more Government aid to medicine. I think everyone who is sincerely interested in understanding the medical picture in this country will find the following articles, by Dr. Ira D. McCoy of Bad Axe, Mich., most helpful.

Dr. McCoy's articles are a spontaneous effort, having their origin in his many years of medical service to two Michigan communities, Bad Axe and Port Austin. Dr. McCoy graduated from the University of Michigan Medical School. He has since completed studies at Harvard University and the Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn. He served as a captain in the Army Medical Corps in World War II.

DOCTOR RAPS AMA—SHOWS HEALTH NEED

(By Ira Dean McCoy, M. D.)

(First of two articles)

WASHINGTON.—The American Medical Association, at enormous cost, has bombarded the American public with a flag-waving, red, white, and blue propaganda leaflet explaining the proposed Federal-health-insurance legislation.

Every member of the AMA was assessed $25 in order that one of the Nation's top publicity agencies might be employed to frighten the American public by untruthfully calling the proposed legislation socialism, statism, and paternalism.

Often in the heat of argument or in criticizing another's belief, the words paternalism and statism are too indiscriminately used and the users forget or lose sight of exactly the form of Government we have in these United States.

APATHY DANGEROUS

The Government is composed of men like ourselves whom the majority of us elect to govern us and it is always within our power to change the political complexion of our National Government every 2 years if we so choose. Far, far more dangerous to the welfare of our country than statism or paternalism is our apathy toward our duties as citizens. It is everyone's duty to be actively inquisitive and interested in Government; and it is the sacred privilege as well as our duty and obligation to cast our ballot at every opportunity. The more active and interested we, as a people, become in Government, the better will be our Government and the safer will be our liberties.

I firmly believe in the system of free enterprise and our capitalistic way of life; but in a complex nation the size of ours, government simply must take over the education and health of our people to a greater extent in the future.

If the handling of atomic energy is too complex and too big for private industry, certainly the health and education of our people is too great and pressing a problem to be allowed to drift much longer. There can be no solution but more and more Government aid and control. After all, isn't good government, "One for all and all for one?" But let's get back to Federal health insurance.

THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DIE UNNECESSARILY

Over 300,000 of our people, men, women, and children, will die this year because they cannot afford medical care. That isn't all the sad truth: This year, too, America will lose 4,300,000 man-years of work because of bad health. And this year, too, $27,000,000,000 in national wealth will be lost—lost because of sickness and disability.

On the basis of selective-service experience at least 40 percent of our men of military age—between 8,000,000 and 9,000,000 men—are unfit for military duty. On any one day, at least 7,000,000 people in the United States suffer some illness. As many as 23,000,000 persons have a chronic or disabling disease. Sickness and accidents cost the Nation at least $8,000,000,000 a year.

Our health services and facilities are wholly inadequate. Forty percent of our counties do not have even a full-time local public health officer. Hospitals are needed—areas of our country with an aggregate population of 15,000,000 people do not have a single recognized general hospital. Pure shortages of doctors, nurses, dentists, psychiatrists, and other trained health personnel are so great that many persons are forced to forego medical care. In 1944, 558 counties had less than 1 active physician per 3,000 population, the danger line. And numerous counties had no active doctor at all.

STAGGERING STATISTICS

If we had adequate services available for mothers and children, we could prevent at least half of the deaths of mothers who die in childbirth, and one-third of the deaths of the young babies. Our State health agencies have, on their waiting lists, thousands of crippled children who require and cannot get proper attention because of the lack of facilities and personnel, and over half a million children with rheumatic fever fail to receive good medical care.

Staggering statistics, aren't they? But more shocking is the simple fact that we have the knowledge to prevent these needless deaths and this tragic waste. We have the highly trained personnel capable of applying that knowledge. The one essential ingredient lacking is the assurance that people needing that knowledge can have it when they need it.

But before we project the solution, let's look more searchingly at the problem. Can the average American family pay for modern medical care? Can you?

At least 2 out of every 3 Americans—that means 97,000,000 people—cannot, and this figure comes straight from the American Medical Association's Bureau of Medical Economics. If your family has an annual income of $5,000 or less per year, you are in this group. You cannot afford adequate medical care.

PUT OFF CARE

Most Americans avoid seeking prompt medical attention at the first sign of complaint. They tend to put off going to the doctor in the hope that the pain or illness will right itself. They delay mainly because of fear of medical costs.

Such delay is often serious, and sometimes fatal, as in tuberculosis and cancer. We doctors know that 30 percent of cancer is curable if caught in its very early stages. We know that the disabling effects of many other chronic diseases can be halted or even prevented entirely, if caught in time.

There is an endless amount of data to prove that the relation between money and life—between wealth and health—is direct and deadly.

The problem, from which we can no longer run, is simply this: How can we remove this major economic barrier which blocks better health for the Nation and assure everyone who needs it adequate medical care regardless of economic status?

DEMOCRATIC SOLUTION

The democratic solution is: National health insurance. By broadening the scope of our compulsory social security program to include a system of national health insurance, by utilizing the proven, successful method of pay-roll deductions to which employers and employees would contribute equal shares—the costs of physicians and hospital care could be prepaid, guaranteeing both availability of care to all who need it and adequate payment to doctors, hospitals, and others who supply the services.

For a long time, the AMA fought even voluntary health insurance plans. It still fights them today, unless it can control them. It supports voluntary health insurance today in a frenzied rear-guard action to head off national health insurance. The AMA has long been several steps behind the march of events and the needs of the American people.

Voluntary health insurance plans, while often excellent in the limited spheres in which most of them operate, cannot and will not be able to do the necessary job because:

1. Benefits are inadequate. The plans which provide anything approximating comprehensive insurance protection reach relatively few persons—actually less than 3 percent of the population—because they have been held back by the opposition of medical societies. The plans sponsored by medical societies provide only very limited services.

2. Voluntary plans have no sliding scales of payments to match incomes. They charge a flat rate, usually high, for limited benefits that cover only a fraction of the population. It is hardly likely that they could broaden their benefits without pricing themselves out of reach of many present subscribers.

3. Many of them offer only cash payments instead of actual medical services, and these payments cover only part of the costs of care.

4. They have the smallest coverage where the need is greatest—in rural areas and among lower income groups.

DOCTOR DISPELS FOG ON INSURANCE PLAN

(By Ira Dean McCoy, M. D.)

(Second of two articles)

WASHINGTON.—A continuous smoke screen has been laid down by special interests to befog the public's mind on what national health insurance is and what it would mean to the doctor and the patient.

Proponents of national health insurance cherish the freedom and intimacy of the doctor-patient relationship as much as our die-hard opponents. Patients, as now, would select their own doctors; doctors, as now, would accept or reject patients. National health insurance is just a method of paying for medical care.

The only change proposed by advocates of national health insurance is that, instead of the patient paying when and if he has money available, the doctor or the hospital of his choice would be paid by the insurance system at a rate and by a method to which the doctor had agreed.

Those who support national health insurance are keenly aware that our Nation has fewer physicians and hospital beds than we

need, and these so poorly distributed that in some rural counties there are no resident physicians at all and little or no hospitalization accessible.

UNREALISTIC TO DELAY

Nevertheless, it is unrealistic to argue that national health insurance should be delayed for the years required to train many more doctors and build many more hospitals. The supply of medical personnel and facilities will expand only when, through insurance, the money to pay for them is guaranteed. This demand depends on families' purchasing power for medical care. This is the simple principle of supply and demand which operates throughout our economy.

Opponents claim that national health insurance will cost too much, that national expenditure for medical and health services would be greater under this plan, and that administrative costs would be excessive.

The first answer to this objection is that the Nation needs to spend more for health. Too many of us have been doing without for too long. Moreover, a large part of the expenditures under national health insurance would not be new or added expenditures. Money now expended in direct payments for medical care by sick persons would be distributed under the plan in small regular payments from all people. Consequently, the costs of sickness—ordinarily concentrated upon a small part of the population in any given year—would be spread over the whole year and over all the people.

As for administrative costs, it is worth noting that expenses of voluntary, nonprofit plans run to 7.1 percent or more in comparison with the premiums collected. An important part of these administrative expenses is the cost of soliciting and retaining members, a task that would be eliminated by national health insurance.

OTHER COSTS ELIMINATED

Many other costs would also be eliminated by national health insurance. It might at this time be interesting to note that the Blue Cross of Michigan has approximately 1,500,000 policyholders, or subscribers, as they choose to call the people who are buying Blue Cross insurance.

From January 1 until June 30, 1949, the Blue Cross of Michigan had a total earned income of $12,599,566.57. But during that same period of time their operating expense was $1,135,477.46. Of that $1,135,477.46 are some interesting items of expense: $711,990.07 was paid out in salaries; $47,517.09 was paid out in travel and other expenses; and $79,783.54 was paid out in "sundry" expenses (of which no explanation is made).

By these few figures I have given, it is very plain to be seen that the administrative costs of the Michigan Blue Cross are tremendous in comparison to the amount of money collected from their policyholders. It is, however, a nonprofit corporation. A great many patrons who are using the Blue Cross learn to their sorrow its services are limited. This could be due to the huge expenses I have already cited.

As a result of the very cunning, insidious, and extremely expensive propaganda campaign carried on by the medical lobby, the American Medical Association and its National Physicians' Committee, most people think that all doctors, or nearly all, unqualifiedly follow the AMA "party line" in opposition to national health insurance.

The dictatorial, undemocratic rule of the AMA's house of delegates imposes its policies practically by fiat on a hapless and helpless membership. Serious disagreement by an individual doctor with the policies laid down by the house of delegates or by his local medical society may result in unpleasant economic and professional consequences for that doctor. Few doctors dare risk these consequences.

REACTION AGAINST AMA

But opposition to AMA reaction has been growing and has expressed itself in several organizations of doctors who are in favor of national health insurance and who say so openly. These organizations—the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care, the Physician's Forum, and the Committee for the Nation's Health, composed of both laymen and doctors—are becoming growing spearheads of opposition to the entrenched leaders of the AMA.

The American Medical Association has been spoon-feeding the American people a terrific amount of propaganda against national health insurance; but I can cite the bill itself and tell you as well as anyone just what it is and what it will do for you.

STEP-BY-STEP ANALYSIS

1. It would make available to you and all other employed and self-employed persons (with few exceptions) all the care you need from physicians, both family doctors and specialists, hospital, laboratory, and X-ray services, unusually expensive medicines, eyeglasses, and appliances; and dental care and home nursing to a limited degree.

2. It would also cover the dependent members of your family.

3. You would be free to choose your own doctor, hospital, etc., and to change your selection. Actually, countless individuals would have greater freedom of choice than they have now, because the prepaid plan of health insurance would help assure a better supply of physicians in many areas where there are not now enough doctors, and because the prepayment plan would enable millions who cannot now pay, to have the services of a doctor of their choice for the first time.

4. Your doctor's professional freedom would be fully protected. He would not become a Government employee. He would remain a practitioner, free to accept or reject patients, to locate wherever he wishes, to participate in, or stay outside, the insurance plan. He would be paid by the insurance funds in amounts and methods which he or his own representatives would negotiate.

5. It would cost you 1½ percent of your earnings (up to $4,800 of income). Your employer would pay an equal amount. You would pay 3 percent (up to $4,800) if you are self-employed.

6. If you are a member of a voluntary health insurance plan that meets minimum standards, this plan could continue to provide you with services and your premiums would be paid from the national insurance fund.

7. Health insurance would not be run from Washington. It would be managed by local areas under a plan adopted by each State.

In view of the above-mentioned facts it is almost impossible to understand the American Medical Association's bitter opposition especially when the AMA House of Delegates in 1916 petitioned the Congress to spread a universal health insurance over all the American people. This petition was recalled or withdrawn in 1920.

Many of us fear the threat of communism but do we all realize the best way to combat the scourge of communism is to increase the opportunities of the ordinary individual? America is great enough and rich enough that we should have no slums, we should have equal opportunity insofar as public-school education is concerned in this country for all our children whatever their color or creed. All children have a right in this great country of ours to healthy and sound bodies insofar as our medical science can give it to them.

These are not visionary ideals. We can and must find a way for their fulfillment. "He stands straight who stoops to help a child."

House Concurrent Resolution 64

REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, in view of an obvious misunderstanding in certain areas of the purpose of House Concurrent Resolution 64 I wish to present on behalf of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and myself a clarifying statement on the meaning of the resolution.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman from Arkansas. What we are recognizing is that the United Nations in its present form is not operating in the way that the people of the world had hoped. When an instrument does not operate properly, the thing to do is not to discard it but to try to improve it. The purpose of the resolution is to discover what is wrong and to do whatever is necessary to strengthen that Organization which is still one of the world's best hopes for peace.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. And to define the long-range objectives of our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and I stand strongly behind the world federation resolution. It does not commit us to any particular formula for a world legal order. It does not commit us to changes in the present United Nations that are not specifically ratified by the United States Congress and by the people after they are drafted and submitted for ratification. It does not commit us to the creation of any organization outside of or parallel to the United Nations. It does not commit us to any plan for a broad-powered world government with control of trade, currency, immigration, taxes, and individual civil rights. It does not place us in the position of abandoning all hope for peace by fairly negotiated agreements. Above all, it does not commit us to appeasement or unilateral disarmament while other nations remain armed.

The resolution means just what it says. It expresses full support for the United Nations. It defines more clearly than existing legislation certain objectives of our foreign policy. It is based on the conviction that another world war is not inevitable. It declares that we are for true law and order in international affairs instead of anarchy. It declares that we favor vesting in a strengthened United Nations adequate power and force to enable it to prevent aggression by any country against any other. It declares that the United States has no plans for aggressive war and that it is willing, if other nations do likewise, to confer upon the United Nations authority to outlaw those weapons which

would cause total destruction. We favor only those measures which are adopted in strict conformity to constitutional requirements.

The resolution should be promptly considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee and action taken to fortify the faith of the American people in a system of world law. It will be an historical milestone for the United States and the world.

The Veterans Present Their Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, like many other Members of Congress, I have been receiving expressions of opinion from many veterans of the armed forces who are gravely concerned over possible changes affecting adversely those who are in greatest need of hospital treatment and medical care. Under permission granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including communications from two groups of veterans in the Twenty-third Congressional District of Illinois.

The Crawford County Council of the American Legion "strongly objects" to the portion of the Hoover Commission report which would disturb benefits to veterans under existing law. The American Legion post at St. Peter, Ill., desires to go on record in opposition to socialized medicine proposals as contrary to the best interests of veterans. The communications follow:

ERNEST M. COULTER POST, NO. 69,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Robinson, Ill.

Hon. EDWARD H. JENISON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENISON: Attached to this letter is a report of the action taken by the Crawford County Council, American Legion, Crawford County, Ill., concerning the recommendations contained in the Hoover Commission proposals for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Federal Government, especially affecting veterans' benefits and administration of veterans' hospitals and facilities.

We cannot help but believe that you, as a veteran, will agree with your friends here at home, that economy at the expense of our sick and disabled comrades, the widows and orphans of our deceased servicemen, is not the desire of the great majority of our people.

We appeal to you in their behalf.

Sincerely, in comradeship,
LEROY G. HAMILTON,
Commander, Crawford County Council, American Legion.

Hon. EDWARD H. JENISON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENISON: Determined opposition to the recommendations contained in the Hoover Commission report pertaining to veterans' laws and the Veterans' Administration, was strongly voiced at the all-county meeting of the American Legion and American Legion Auxiliary, in a joint session, at Flat Rock, Ill.

By a unanimous vote, the county commander was directed to appoint a committee, representing all American Legion posts and auxiliary units of Crawford County, Ill., with an approximate membership strength of 3,000, to prepare and forward to you this statement: "Strongly objecting to the legislative proposals specified in the Hoover Commission report, which would disturb any benefits of existing veterans' laws."

We earnestly request that you give this matter due consideration in voicing our objections to this Hoover Commission proposal.

Sincerely,

H. L. Thompson, Past Commander, Post 69, Robinson; Past Commander, Crawford County; Past Commander, Twenty-third District, Ill.; Mrs. Beatrice Rogers, President, American Legion Auxiliary 219, Oblong; Mrs. Gwendolyn Meeker, Past President, Auxiliary, Robinson, Ill.; Leroy Littlejohn, Past Commander, American Legion, Oblong, Post 219; Fifth Division Chairman Medal Awards, Illinois; W. Weger Allison, Past Commander, American Legion, Flat Rock, Ill.; H. L. Thompson; Beatrice Rogers; Gwendolyn Meeker; Leroy Littlejohn; W. Weger Allison, Committee.

WODTKA-ROTHE-REISS POST, NO. 380,
St. Peter, Ill.

Hon. EDWARD H. JENISON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JENISON: Whereas the American veteran in two World Wars has defended the American free-enterprise system, which had made possible the development in this country of the highest standards of medical care and the finest medical institutions attained by any major country in the world; and

Whereas, having experienced the shortcomings of impersonal, assembly-line medical care inherent in the form of Government-controlled medicine necessary in time of war, the veteran understands the dangers of imposing such a system permanently on the entire population; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would impose an unjust tax on the veteran's pay check for medical care to which it is now entitled free of charge as a reward for his service to his country; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would force a tax of 3 percent on the income of employed veterans, rising to a tax of at least 6 percent within a few years, creating new financial burdens which would increase the costs of necessities of life and lower the standard of living for veterans and other citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wodtka-Rothe-Reiss Post, No. 380, of the American Legion does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and our District Representative from the State of Illinois, and that said Senators and Representative be and are respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

ADOLPH C. MEYER,
Commander.
ARTHUR A. BOYE,
Adjutant.

Small-Business Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio discussion between the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, regarding small-business loans.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO DISCUSSION ON S. 2947 (SMALL-BUSINESS LOANS) BETWEEN HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS, OF ILLINOIS, AND GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS

Mr. BURGER. I have studied carefully the splendid statement you made on the floor of the Senate on January 30 when you introduced your bill, S. 2947, to encourage loans to independent small-business enterprises through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In the first instance, I like the simplicity of your proposed bill. It is not loaded with a lot of long-sounding words, but keeps to its direct objective. I am also pleased, and I know the Nation's independent small-business men are pleased, that in your remarks in the Senate you emphasized again the statement made by the President in the state of the Union message when he said that our antimonopoly laws must be strengthened in the interest of small business and for encouraging the growth of new enterprises.

Senator, in my opinion this must be done by Congress at the earliest possible moment. Strong antimonopoly laws are necessary if small independent business enterprises in America are to survive. I liked that part of your message where you stated that the Corporation in making funds available under your bill is authorized to give management skills, past-earning records, and prospective earnings consideration over collateral security. We who own and operate establishments realize the importance of this recommendation.

If the Congress sets out such a policy and the RFC puts it into effect, I am sure the independent business enterprises of America will be grateful, and in return will set an admirable record in repaying these loans.

Before coming to the questions that I would like to ask you, Senator, I want to say that I was pleased that you placed on the record in clear and understandable words the following statement. I quote your words: "I want to make it clear at the outset that this bill is not being introduced to offer aid to unsound, inefficient or fly-by-night business enterprises, but is being offered to give capital assistance to efficient businessmen at times when such assistance may be urgently needed."

You are to be complimented on making this fact clear to your colleagues in the Senate.

Now, I would like to have you explain in more detail your statement on the floor of the Senate that the guaranty provisions of your bill utilize the present procedures of the RFC but increases the amount of the guaranty up to 90 percent.

Senator LUCAS. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation today is authorized to make business loans in cooperation with private banks. I do not wish to change that practice, but rather I want to encourage more of these loans. Under the present law the private bank makes a loan to a business enterprise and the RFC at the same time agrees to take a certain portion of the loan off the hands of the private bank upon request.

The amount of the loan that the RFC may take off the hands of a private bank is now limited to 70 percent. My bill would increase this to 90 percent. The fact that under my bill private banks would be able to call upon the RFC to reimburse them up to 90 percent of the amounts of these private loans should be a real encouragement to private banks in making loans to independent small-business enterprises.

Mr. BURGER. Isn't it also true, Senator, that many independent small-business enterprises which today are unable to obtain loans from any source will be able to get assistance under your bill?

Senator LUCAS. That is very true. Today private lending institutions and the RFC, as a general rule, will not lend money to anyone unless the borrower has property that can be mortgaged. In other words, a loan will not be made to a small enterprise today unless that enterprise can put up enough collateral security to assure its repayment.

My bill permits the private bank and the RFC to place larger emphasis upon management skills and prospective earnings and less emphasis upon the security that a borrower can offer. This should mean that a person about to start a new business or the operator of an existing business enterprise will be able to get a loan without putting on the line every last dollar's worth of his property.

Mr. BURGER. You stated earlier that you hope to encourage loans through private banks. Isn't it possible that cases may arise where private banks will refuse to make loans even with this 90-percent guaranty? If such cases should arise, does your bill make any provision to meet this situation?

Senator LUCAS. It is my firm belief that private banks will cooperate, and that borrowers will be able to obtain loans directly from their local banker. I have looked into this matter quite closely, and the Federal Reserve, the RFC, and FDIC tell me they have been unable to discover any banking regulations which would prevent private banks from making loans such as I propose even though they are not fully backed with collateral security.

Private banks would be taking very little risk. In the first place, the bank can always get back 90 cents on the dollar from the RFC. Also, collateral security will not be dispensed with entirely, and in addition to that, the loans will be made only to those enterprises which will be well managed and which have a promising future. I should expect that the private lending institutions will be very happy to cooperate in this program. On the other hand, in those unusual cases where the private bank will not make the loan, the borrower can apply directly to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. BURGER. As I understand your bill, Senator, it is designed to make long-term capital available to established businesses which certainly are in need of such aid.

Senator LUCAS. That is correct.

By long-term capital we mean loans which can be paid back over a long period of time. Banks and other private lending institutions which are willing to make loans to independent small-business enterprises usually require that these loans be paid back over a short period.

My bill directs the RFC to encourage private banks to make loans for periods longer than 10 years. This should be a real benefit to many small-business men.

Mr. BURGER. Your bill, Senator, will also make capital available for new enterprises, will it not?

Senator LUCAS. Yes, it will.

This bill is intended to serve a threefold purpose. It will make long-term capital available to established business enterprises. It will provide a source of loans for the establishment of new enterprises, and it will assist those newly established business ventures which have such a difficult struggle to survive during their early stages.

Mr. BURGER. I agree with you that new business enterprises during their infancy need considerable help. Twenty-six percent of all new businesses undertaken each year are discontinued before the year is over.

Senator LUCAS. On that same point, surveys by the Department of Commerce have shown that just about as many business enterprises fail each year as are started. In other words, the total number of business enterprises in America is standing still.

If we could succeed in cutting the number of these failures in half, we would double the total number of business enterprises in the United States within a period of 20 years. It seems to me that this would be a worthwhile goal; our population has doubled in the last 50 years, our business activity must keep pace. In my opinion this is the way to attain full employment, and this is the way to attain a sound Government fiscal policy and at the same time lower taxes.

Mr. BURGER. Senator, a matter which is of serious concern to independent businessmen in the United States is the tendency for large business firms to grow larger while small independent business enterprises are rapidly disappearing. If this tendency keeps up, we may someday find that there is no place left for the small independent businessman.

Senator LUCAS. I would say, Mr. Burger, that the disappearance of independent small businesses in America would be the last thing that any of us would want to see happen.

We never want to arrive at the point where an ambitious young man or woman cannot start his own business with a fair chance of succeeding. One of the main reasons why small business enterprises are having a difficult struggle while larger businesses are growing even larger is the fact that the little independent businessman is unable to get adequate financial help in times of need.

Under my bill the small-business man who would otherwise sell out his business to a larger firm will be able to get financial aid. Also under this bill the number of healthy independent small-business enterprises in America would steadily mount as financial aid would be given in time to prevent the failure of many new enterprises during their early stages of development.

Mr. BURGER. In conclusion, Senator, I think we could say then that your bill will strengthen existing business enterprises and will encourage the creation of new ones. Rather than burdening the taxpayers, it will stimulate employment and business activity which in the end will substantially benefit everybody.

Soviet Expansionism in Europe and Asia Since 1939

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a lecture delivered by William C. Bullitt at Georgetown University on March 31, 1950, entitled "Soviet Expansionism in Europe and Asia Since 1939."

Mr. Bullitt has had a long and honorable association with the Department of State. During his many years as a representative of this Government in the State Department he has held the following positions: Assistant in Department of State from 1917 to 1918; Attaché to American Commission to Negotiate Peace from 1918 to 1919; chief of special mission to Russia in 1919; special assistant to Secretary of State in 1933; member of American delegation to World Monetary and Economic Conference in 1933; Ambassador to Russia from 1933 to 1936; Ambassador to France from 1936 to 1941; Ambassador at large from November 1941 to April 1942.

Ambassador Bullitt has spent considerable time in China and is considered one of America's best authorities on Chinese conditions and political trends. Bullitt is a good Democrat and was a close associate of President Roosevelt during most of his first three terms. Unfortunately, however, it seems Mr. Bullitt's counsel is neither sought nor welcomed by the Truman-Acheson high command.

Mr. President, I have received from the Public Printer an estimate saying the address will cover two and three-quarter pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $225.50.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET EXPANSIONISM IN EUROPE AND ASIA SINCE 1939

Soviet expansionism springs from the Communist creed: The Marx-Lenin-Stalin creed which denies God and claims to be based on science. It attributes all evil to private ownership of the means of production. It teaches that the establishment of Communist dictatorship throughout the earth and the abolition of private ownership of the means of production will end all war and so improve the nature of all men in all nations that the state will wither away, and all men will live without a state in perfect freedom and happiness. This is the utterly unscientific faith which, in the name of science, Communist-controlled governments teach as absolute truth to the children they control. They prepare the children to live and, if need be, to die for it. A large percentage of the children, having no other faith taught them, become believers in the Communist creed, and, as Communist believers, offer their lives for their faith as gallantly as did the early Christians. They believe that they are fighting for the emancipation of all humanity from all evil. They think they serve eternal truth. The Communist Party, to them, is a union of the faithful. Their old testament contains the books of Marx and Engels; their new testament, the works of Lenin and Stalin. Since the highest moral goal, according to their creed, is to achieve the destruction of the state following the establishment of Communist dictatorship throughout the earth, the highest moral duty of man is to promote such dictatorship. This supreme moral end, they believe, justifies all means for its achievement, including the pledged work given and broken, character assassination, torture, murder, and war. In the words of Lenin: "It is necessary * * * to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of truth. * * * It is inconceivable

that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialistic states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

The dynamo of Soviet expansionism is the Communist creed. Many older Communists become skeptical and disillusioned. But they do not dare to express disbelief. The penalties are too terrible. So the old, however skeptical, render lip service. But the young believe. And while the old die off, the young come on forever. In consequence, so long as mighty races and resources are controlled by Communists, there will be no peace in this world. The aim of the Soviet Government and the other Communist-controlled governments will continue to be the conquest of the world for communism. The Communists will not stop. They can only be stopped.

Stalin sits in the Kremlin with members of the Politburo, who compose his planning staff for the conquest of the world. He prepares his attacks on a world scale as carefully as the commander in chief of an army prepares plans for his advances. He decides when and where to strike, and what forces will be needed to seize his objective. He is a careful and crafty leader who never takes great chances. He always remembers that the physical strength of the Soviet Union is the most important factor in the spread of communism, and he does not risk destruction of that primary source of strength.

In 1939, Stalin controlled about 170,000,000 persons. Today he directs about 800,000,000. The chief methods which he has employed in making this extraordinary advance toward control of the entire human race have been the following:

First. Easy war. For example, 17 days after Hitler had attacked Poland in 1939, when the Polish armies had been disrupted, Stalin attacked Poland, and seized all eastern Poland. Similarly, in the Far East, after we had pulverized the military resistance of Japan, Stalin, only 4 days before Japan surrendered, declared war on Japan and seized Manchuria.

Second. Occupation by the Red army and gradual imposition of absolute Soviet rule. This was the method employed from 1945 onward in Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and, with slight variations, in Czechoslovakia. Its effectiveness is demonstrated by the simple fact that Stalin has now been able to install as commander in chief of the Polish Army a marshal of the Soviet Union.

Third. The method of the camel's nose. You all remember the old story of the camel who was cold one night in the desert and put his nose under his master's tent and persuaded his master to let him keep it there. Soon afterward, the camel was inside the tent and his owner was out in the cold. That method in 1940 was used by Stalin in taking over Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. First, under threats of war and promises of peace, he persuaded the governments of those three little Baltic countries to accept the presence of Soviet garrisons at certain strategic points. The Soviet soldiers behaved themselves well, and many Balts believed their prospects for survival were good. However, when Stalin considered that the moment had come to close his hand on those countries, he closed it. He murdered or deported to death at slave labor his political opponents of all classes. He finally reduced his victims to a terrorized mass of despairing individuals whom he then compelled to go to booths and vote for Soviet-chosen candidates under penalty of losing their bread cards which were nothing more or less than permits to live.

Fourth. Use of local Communist movements in areas where Communists have been strong enough to organize armed resistance to existing governments. The foremost example of the success of this method is, of course, China. By turning over to the Chinese Communists all the arms captured from the Japanese Army in Manchuria; by sending a few generals who were masters of strategy and tactics to plan the attacks of the Chinese Communists, Stalin succeeded in bringing the whole of continental China under Communist control. When he attempted to use the same method in Iran and Greece he met such determined opposition from the United States that he allowed his local agents to be defeated—temporarily at least.

Fifth. Communist control or infiltration of nationalist independence movements in colonial countries. At the present moment, Stalin is advancing by this method in Indochina and at other points in southeast Asia.

Sixth. Psychological warfare.

Under this heading must be included two different methods of deceiving victims.

A. The pledged word of the Soviet Union given and broken. Stalin lulls his prospective victims to sleep by entering into all sorts of pacts and agreements with them—and breaks the agreements as soon as it becomes convenient for him to do so. Stalin's violations of the most solemn international agreements have exceeded in number similar violations by Hitler.

B. The deception of naive government officials in all countries. We do not have to go further than our own country to observe Stalin's notable achievements in this domain. Quite aside from Soviet agents in our Government departments and atomic-energy organization, we have had in Washington and throughout the world a number of Government officials who were not Soviet agents but served the Soviet Government as effectively as if they had been Soviet agents. You will all recall that from 1942 until 1947 our Department of State was bamboozled into treating the Soviet Union as a peace-loving democracy. Officials of our Government so described the Soviet Union in a long series of documents.

The Yalta agreements—including the secret one by which we promised Stalin control of the great Manchurian ports of Dairen and Port Arthur and the Chinese Eastern Railroad—were signed during that period. They were one of the greatest triumphs of Soviet psychological warfare. Had we acted in accord with the national interests of the United States and of our faithful ally China, we would have done everything in our power to prevent the Soviet Union from entering the war against Japan. But our leaders had been bamboozled into believing that the Soviet Union would work with us cordially to produce a world of liberty and peace, and in addition had been fooled into believing that we would need Soviet help to defeat Japan. So we secretly sponsored Soviet domination of Manchuria and enabled Stalin to arm the Chinese Communists with the vast armaments of the Japanese armies.

You will recall that officials of our Department of State had also been persuaded by Soviet propaganda to believe that the Chinese Communists were "mere agrarian reformers who had no connection with Moscow." Our Government, acting on their advice, attempted to compel the Chinese Government to take Communists into the Government, and when Chiang Kai-shek refused to do this, cut off all military supplies to him for a period of nearly 2 years. You will remember that we refused his repeated pleas for a top-rank American general to organize the defense of China in the same manner that top Soviet generals were organizing the attack on Chinese independence. Thus we allowed China to slide into Stalin's hands.

Similarly the Yalta agreement with regard to Poland resulted in the present absolute control of Poland by the Soviet Government.

Much ink has been used by apologists for the Yalta agreements in an attempt to prove that what was wrong was not the agreements themselves but the fact that the Soviet Union did not carry out the agreements. This is as if a banker who had been appointed trustee of the fortune of a child should place the funds entrusted to his care in a Ponzi get-rich-quick scheme, and then when the money was lost plead that the trouble was not with the trustees—who accepted Mr. Ponzi's promise to pay 200 percent per year—but with Ponzi's failure to carry out the agreement. The people of the United States hire officials to work in the Department of State because they need experts to handle complex world questions. The officials of that Department are trustees of the vital interests of the American people, and the most contemptible excuse that can be offered by or for them is that they meant well, but were "played for suckers."

There is a great moral difference between traitors and Soviet dupes. It is the same difference that is recognized in law between a man guilty of murder and a man guilty of manslaughter. In the case of manslaughter there is no intention to commit the crime. But in both cases the victim ends up dead. Soviet dupes may do as great harm to the United States as Soviet agents.

Seventh. Infiltration of respected organizations: One of Stalin's most effective weapons to reduce resistance to his attack is, of course, infiltration of educational institutions, scientific societies, welfare organizations, and trade-unions by Soviet agents. He managed to use this weapon so effectively in both France and Italy that leadership of the great trade-unions of both of these countries was seized by the Communists and for a time it seemed that both countries might be hopelessly paralyzed by Communist-led strikes. At the present moment the non-Communist members of the trade-unions in France and Italy have set up their own organizations, but the Communist-led unions are still able to organize strikes of huge dimensions for purely political purposes. Fortunately for our own country, although for a time some of our labor leaders were as deceived as was our Government with regard to the Communists, our great trade-unions have either purged their ranks of Communists or are in the process of purging them. Stalin is having little success in our trade-unions, and I think we should congratulate ourselves on the patriotic qualities of our top labor leaders. I wish I could say as much about our professors, some of whom appear to be too educated for their brains.

Eighth. The final weapon employed by Stalin to disintegrate opposition to Communist advance is fear. Now that Stalin has atomic bombs and plenty of bombers to deliver them to any spot in Europe, Asia, or North America; now that he has China as an ally and is increasing his military power much faster than we are increasing ours; his propaganda has taken a new line—the line of warning his opponents of all classes in Europe and in Asia that power is on his side and that time is on his side, and that unless they desire to meet the fate which he accords to defeated opponents, they had better leave the camp of the United States and join the Soviet side.

The fear which he is thus able to engender has been vastly increased by revelation of the methods which are now used by the Communists to break down and destroy human personality. You have all read recently in the newspapers Shipkov's statement of the relatively simple methods used to break him down and force him to make a false confession to the Bulgarian Communist authorities. Far more sinister and horrible pressures are used when the individual presents more resistance. The final method is that of narcohypnosis. The victim in that case receives quantities of drugs until he can be hypnotized so deeply that he can be deprived of all memory of the actual facts of his past life and made to believe in a new set of facts invented by his hypnotizer. Human

personality can thus be totally changed. No man can say longer say that he is master of his fate or of his own actions and thoughts. If he falls into the hands of the Communists, he can be reduced to a puppet with a new personality invented by his hypnotizer. This is a final horror—an unexampled triumph of satanism. To die in battle is nothing compared to the living death of personality under narcohypnosis. Recently a French lady said to me: "We are all of us enjoying ourselves as much as possible in Paris since we know that within a few years we shall either be destroyed by Soviet atomic bombs, or raped, or hypnotized into new personalities." That is the state of mind which is growing in western Europe.

We have now glanced at the Communist creed which underlies Soviet expansionism, and at some of the methods employed by Stalin to achieve world conquest. Let us now look briefly at the attacks which armed Communists are making at the present moment.

As we have already noted, they are advancing by open warfare in Indochina, or—to be exact—in the eastern portion of Indochina which is known as Vietnam. The war in Vietnam is one of the saddest that has ever been fought, for three-fourths of the troops of Ho Chi Minh, the Moscow-trained leader of the Annamites, who are fighting the French and the forces of the Emperor Bao Dai, are not Communists but simple patriots who believe that they can achieve complete independence only by throwing the French and Bao Dai into the sea. Yet, in truth, the only result of such a victory would be that the Annamites would exchange the yoke of France, which has now become relatively light, for the terrible yoke of Stalin.

The French, 3 years late, have given Vietnam "independence within the French Empire," retaining for themselves control over foreign relations and military affairs. To us, this seems a limited, almost nonexistent form of independence. Yet, if the French were to withdraw now from Vietnam, the country would collapse at once into the hands of the Communists. This is so because of the failure of the French to train Annamites for high administrative and military posts. The French reserved those posts for themselves. They never built up in Vietnam a native civil service comparable to the civil service which the British built up in India. In consequence, Bao Dai, if left to his own resources, could not find the man to staff efficiently the military and administrative services of his country.

For a period, the Annamites, who are highly intelligent as well as patriotic people, will be obliged to rely on the advice and assistance of foreigners of some sort. They would like to have Americans instead of French running their army and their administration, but no American speaks their language. The secondary language of Vietnam is French, and so few Americans of first-rate quality speak French adequately that it is hopeless to expect that thousands of efficient, French-speaking Americans can be found to go to Vietnam. The Annamites would also like to have American troops replace the 130,000 French troops now holding the forces of Ho Chi Minh. Quite aside from other considerations, we have no such number of troops to spare. And we should be thankful that the French Army is fighting Ho Chi Minh in Vietnam. They will probably have to meet stronger attacks in the near future. For the Chinese Communists have now reached the borders of Vietnam and are passing arms and munitions to Ho Chi Minh.

In consequence, unless Indochina is to fall into the hands of Stalin, we shall have to work with and through both Bao Dai and the French. If we fail to do so because some State Department dupe of Soviet psychological warfare takes the position that we must not give help to Vietnam until all the French shall have left, we shall merely be handing the country by default to the Communists.

If we let Indochina fall, Burma, Siam, and British Malaya—with its vast production of rubber and tin—will also fall. Then it will be India's turn.

At another point, the Communists are making small attacks preparatory to a great attack. The Chinese Communists for some time have been attempting to seize small islands on the way to the great strategic island of Formosa. Formosa is still being held by the Chinese Nationalist Army which, just 2 weeks ago, gave proof of its good morale by seizing a port on the mainland. If the Chinese Communists should capture Formosa, Stalin's forces would be within 250 miles of the northern Philippines. It was from Formosa that Japan attacked and captured the Philippines. Our Joint Chiefs of Staff, headed by General Bradley, pleaded with President Truman to send munitions and equipment, as well as economic aid to Formosa, and a few American officers to advise regarding defense. Secretary of State Acheson opposed our military leaders, and persuaded President Truman to decide that we would continue to give no support to the Nationalists, do nothing toward preventing the fall of Formosa. That is our present policy. For the Philippines, the Department of State is preparing another Bataan.

Recently Secretary Acheson announced that we must wage total diplomacy. And in San Francisco he intimated that if the Chinese Communists should commit aggressions against the countries of southeast Asia, they would find themselves in trouble with us. But his total diplomacy does not include Formosa. He and his closest associates and friends have a vested interest in their own mistakes with regard to China. In any European parliamentary democracy, a minister for foreign affairs who had tossed a great ally like China into the hands of Stalin would have been dismissed from his post. Mr. Acheson retains his office and turns his back on Formosa.

In the Near East, Iran, with its huge oil production which plays such a large part in British economic life, is again threatened by Soviet-directed revolutionaries of the Tudeh Party. They have a fertile field in which to work. The poverty among the peasants of Iran is so grinding that they are close to revolt. Unless the Government of the United States moves rapidly to alleviate the suffering in Iran, Stalin may soon add that ancient country to his long list of satellites.

These, for the moment, are the areas in Asia where Stalin is pressing his advance strongly. But we cannot congratulate ourselves that even the situation in western Europe is satisfactory.

In Italy, more than 20 percent of the workmen are unemployed, and the Communists, who gathered one-third of the votes at the last elections, are gaining in strength.

In France, the Government is far weaker than any French Government before the Second World War, and its entire apparatus is riddled with Communists. Even the head of French atomic research is a Communist.

Great Britain is staggering toward another financial and economic crisis. In 1945 the British voted themselves a higher standard of living than, under existing world conditions, they could possibly earn. Today they can neither feed themselves nor defend themselves.

Western Germany, under the pressure of unemployment, is beginning to listen to the Soviet propaganda which says: Side with the United States and you will have unemployment, underfeeding, shortage of raw materials, a divided country, and, finally, Soviet atomic bombs on your cities; side with the Soviet Union and you will have all the wheat and raw materials you want, no unemployment, and a united Germany including the part that is momentarily Polish. Pastor Niemoeller, much admired by Americans, has now declared himself in favor of a united Germany even at the price of Communist rule.

Moreover, the whole of western Europe is without defense, and everyone in western Europe knows it. Its cities cannot be protected against Soviet atomic bombs except by our Air Force, which today is not strong enough for the task. To oppose the 125 Soviet divisions, the French have 6, the British say they can furnish 1, the Belgians 1. To have a chance to stop the Red army for a few months, the European democracies would need from 50 to 60 divisions. Modern equipment for such a number of divisions would cost from $10,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000. And most military authorities agree that no western European defense system can be effective unless both the western Germans and the Spaniards are included in it.

When we began to give Marshall-plan aid, and when we signed the Atlantic Pact, our object was to make western Europe a strong ally. We have succeeded only in keeping alive 17 picturesque, competing countries which cannot feed or defend themselves. If they would unite their economies by entering a European federation, they would be on the path to strength. But their governments refuse to take any serious steps toward federation and our Government is making no effective effort to move them toward federation. They feel confident that, even after 1952, we will not stop our doles to them. And, indeed, we do not dare to stop for fear that they will all collapse into the hands of Stalin and be organized as Soviet satellites for his final attack on us.

When will such an attack come? To that question I can, of course, give no definite answer. But I can give you my own opinion and the reasons for it.

Today Stalin has atomic bombs and at least 35 long-range bombers capable of carrying them to any spot in the United States. We have no radar warning net to detect the approach of his planes. We have only a fraction of the number of pursuit planes needed to make effective use of a warning net. The authoritative Finletter Commission in 1948 recommended as a minimum for national security 70 air groups. We have 44. Stalin's total air force outnumbers ours by about 3 to 1. His annual production of war planes is about three to our one. He has 125 army divisions to our 10—among them, 30 armored divisions to our 1. In addition, he has approximately 270 submarines—about 30 of the latest type against which we have not yet produced effective counterweapons. Furthermore, thanks to his agent Fuchs who transmitted to him all our secrets for production of both A-bombs and hydrogen bombs, he may be ahead of us in production of H-bombs.

Some officials in Washington who have access to most secret information believe that Stalin will attack us this year. They argue that by August 1950 he will probably have 50 A-bombs, enough to destroy our great cities and our atomic production plant, and thus prevent effective American counterattack. But my opinion is that Stalin will not launch a shooting war until he is certain that he can defeat us easily. As I have said before, he is a cautious and crafty leader, who strikes only when he feels sure of quick victory. This year his first surprise attack might not be successful. We might be able to strike back effectively. Therefore it seems likely that he will not start bombing in the near future, but will go on increasing his military strength faster than we are adding to ours, and seize more peoples, resources, and strategic areas, until he feels that his power is irresistible. We are allowing time to run on his side, and he knows it.

What then is the real state of our defenses against Soviet expansionism? Our own military strength is falling behind the growing military strength of Stalin. Asia is slipping into Stalin's hands; the Near East is threatened; Europe is defenseless. The Soviet atomic bomb threat to our homes, our families, and our country is increasing each day. The Communists are advancing; we are retreating. They are on the offensive; we are on the defensive. And no war, hot or cold, was ever won by forces which remained on the defensive.

Why are we doing so badly? Because our Government has never faced the fact that Stalin will not stop, but can only be stopped. Our President has not understood that an over-all plan for defense not only of our own country but also of those countries which still remain outside Stalin's domain is essential. Not so long ago he said, "I like old Joe." In consequence the systematic advances of the Communists, executed by carefully planned attacks, have been met for the most part either by American retreats or spasmodic and inadequate defensive efforts.

Time is running against us; but at the present moment our Government is behaving exactly as the French Government behaved from 1936 to 1939. In that period, when the Nazis were preparing for war and working 60 hours a week, the French cut their working hours to 40 a week. When the Germans were producing 700 to 800 planes a month, the French cut their plane production to 50 a month. They did this for much the same reason that we are now reducing our expenditures for our military forces and for support of our friends throughout the world. The people of France, like all other peoples, wanted a higher standard of living and leisure. They did not realize that a higher standard of living would soon give them a higher rate of dying. In 1940, Hitler destroyed the independence of France.

Today we should be living hard, as our forefathers lived hard in the days of Valley Forge. We are living soft. Our President has staked his political future on a program of hand-outs for crop support, housing, education, and other projects which appeal to groups of voters. To get more tax money for the hand-out program which produces votes, he has cut down the defense program which might produce survival. Our tax money is being used to buy surplus potatoes instead of jet planes.

In consequence, the balance of power in the world is swinging rapidly in favor of the Soviet Union. And our President, who is an entirely patriotic American, has not yet found within himself the intelligence and the spirit to take the offensive effectively against Soviet expansionism. Unless he will take the offensive, unless we—the American people—will let him know that we do not want to hear from him what we can get from our country, but do want to hear from him what we can give to our country, we shall suffer the fate that France suffered in 1940.

We restored the independence of France. There is no nation standing behind us to restore our independence.

Is it too much to hope that we will find within ourselves the courage and the will to save our country and our Christian civilization? It is not too much. It is late—very late. It is not too late. We can begin today to take the offensive. We can increase vastly our expenditures for national defense and cut our expenditures for hand-outs. We can take action to prevent Communist conquest of Formosa. We can help the Annamites and the French throw the Communists completely out of Indochina—as we helped the Greeks throw them out of Greece. We can achieve the federation of western Europe and make that federation a strong ally. We can give effective economic aid to Iran. We can help the Albanian exiles to rescue Albania from the Communists and thus give new spirit to all the enslaved peoples behind the iron curtain. We can give far greater aid than we have been giving to the resistance forces in all the Soviet satellite countries. We can stand up with force to the threat of the Communists in eastern Germany who have had the effrontery to announce that on May 28 they intend to arrange an invasion of west Berlin by Communist-led bands from east Berlin.

Those Americans who are still befuddled by Soviet psychological warfare will argue that such a course of action would produce an unbridgeable chasm between the free world and the Communist world. That chasm already exists. It was dug by the Communists. There is no bridge, and there will be no bridge. We face today, not a struggle for security, but a struggle for survival. However much we all wish and pray for peace, this is the hard fact which we cannot get rid of by wishful thinking. We can stop Stalin only by keeping him constantly confronted by superior force and by daring to use that force whenever and wherever he commits direct or indirect aggression. Today we are the last strong power on the side of liberty and Christian civilization. We have to find within ourselves the same courage and will that our forefathers found at Lexington and Concord. We have to be ready once more to give all that we have and all that we are to save the greatest adventure in human freedom that this earth has known—our America.

Our Older Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorial from the Boston Daily Globe of April 1, 1950, be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR OLDER WORKERS

Just as a matter of fair play, men and women who remain in the labor market after they have attained 65 years of age should be relieved of paying the 1½-percent tax for old-age and survivors Federal insurance. Bills to bring this about have been introduced by Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, and Congressman ANCHER L. GOODWIN, of Melrose.

The subject grows increasingly important as the percentage of aged persons able and willing to work grows in this country. It would be an incentive to them to continue to give their services and also to employers, who would also be relieved of the tax, to hire them.

At present a worker over 65 who earns more than $14.99 a month has his benefits suspended. Later when he does give up work his social-security payments are increased by what he has earned after 65. Congress, in considering the legislation, should make certain the untaxed earnings are credited. The change would then be 100-percent meritorious.

AMA Lobbyist Prefers Charity to Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Jonathan Stout which appeared in the March 11 issue of the New Leader:

AMA LOBBYIST PREFERS CHARITY TO SECURITY

(By Jonathan Stout)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—There appears to be an overproduction of representatives in Washington. Representatives of the people are not confined solely to Congressmen. There are other representatives, but most people do not realize that.

For instance, last week three gentlemen came to Washington. They said they were representatives of the 144,000 physicians who belong to the American Medical Association; and they told a visibly impressed group of important Senators what kind of legislation the people of America ought to have.

The occasion was a hearing before the Senate Finance Committee on the proposed bill to improve the social-security law.

One wondered why the American Medical Association and its three medical spokesmen should interest themselves in the nonmedical question of social security. But the answer was soon forthcoming. The bill before the Senate includes a new social-security provision to establish what amounts to pension payments for people who, through fate or accident, become totally disabled and can never work again or earn a living. Essentially, this is an extension of the idea that old age is an unavoidable disease all of us eventually catch—if we live that long; that it prevents many people from earning an independent livelihood; and that it makes many old people burdens on their families if not, indeed, wards of charity.

The point of the logic is that old age is not only the only disease that disables wage earners and leaves them helpless. Some diseases—unlike age—do not wait until we are old before they incapacitate people permanently. There is, for instance, the person who contracts an incurable cancer. If such a person is past 65 he can get an old-age pension to help him meet his problems with self-respect.

But what if such a person is only 35? Should he be shrugged off because he is unable to meet the only acceptable criterion of unemployability—old age?

President Truman wants to improve the social-security laws to provide pensions for persons who become permanently disabled at any age, by treating them the same way as if they already had reached the retirement age of 65. The three doctors from the American Medical Association came to Washington last week to tell the senatorial committee that they don't think such a provision would be good for the American people.

One of the three was Dr. H. L. Sensenich, of South Bend, Ind., who is the immediate past president of the American Medical Association. Whether the general public would approve what he said is a moot point; but more pertinent is the question whether the 144,000 physicians in the AMA will think Dr. Sensenich expressed their views.

Dr. Sensenich said the board of trustees of the AMA was against permanent-disability

insurance. "Total and permanent disability," he maintained, "is often a condition over which the individual who is disabled and his physician may exercise control. This subjective control which may be exercised by the individual multiplies the opportunity for malingering."

Now this sounds very much as if Dr. Sensenich were implying that doctors and their patients might go into cahoots on a widespread scale to do a lot of cheating—which is a startling implication for an AMA leader to make. The implication is also left that the board of trustees of the AMA—or, at least, their official spokesman—have a low opinion of people generally, including the 144,000 physicians they claim to represent.

Still another thought is expressed in Dr. Sensenich's statement. According to him, it seems to be the AMA view that, rather than let one malingerer get away with anything, it is prepared to let honest men suffering from some permanent disability to go unaided through the physical and spiritual miseries of their helplessness.

It made some of us wonder not only what kind of doctors these are, but what kind of people they are. It seemed incredible that this could really be the opinions of the 144,000 physicians for whom Dr. Sensenich claimed to speak.

Dr. Sensenich later undertook to answer the questions he had raised. The result was hardly fortunate. Dr. Sensenich warned about what he called the high additional percentage of national income to be committed to social programs by the enactment of the extensions in the social-security bill. Dr. Sensenich, in short, was expressing concern over his pocketbook.

One might have accepted medical objections from Dr. Sensenich. But he wasn't really expressing medical objections at all. What he said might have come from a typical representative of a group of manufacturers, brokers, bankers, or any well-to-do group.

Once that became apparent, a lot more became clear. For instance, at another point Dr. Sensenich said:

"The American Medical Association recognizes the need for assistance to the disabled needy, and feels that this aid should always be administered on a local level. Financial assistance to the locality should only be advanced from State or Federal sources when a need can be clearly shown."

The Senators listening to him asked Dr. Sensenich what he meant by that. Dr. Sensenich explained:

"With reference to the complaint that in those areas where medical care is provided by a governmental agency the need must be demonstrated, that seems to be a very painful matter to a certain group who constantly say that it should be set up in such a way that it is a matter of right, and that the matter of determination of need is a very painful and undesirable thing. • • • I am not so much concerned about this need definition. I don't think it should be embarrassing to the individual and in any way harmful."

In plain words, it is not going to embarrass Dr. Sensenich if a worker becomes a charity patient.

Dr. Sensenich and his colleagues came to Washington last week, speaking officially for the American Medical Association, to tell us that he and his fellow fat cats disagree with the idea that social security is a right, not a form of charity. They don't seem to think it important to preserve the self-respect of people. So they see nothing wrong with requiring people to declare themselves paupers and proving their need before they can get help.

The Plea of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by Hon. Luis A. Ferre, vice president, Ponce Cement Corp., and Porto Rico Iron Works, Inc., which was read at a public hearing of a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives held at Ponce, P. R., on the 23d of November 1949.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PLEA OF PUERTO RICO

(By Luis A. Ferre, vice president, Ponce Cement Corp. and Porto Rico Iron Works, Inc.)

Gentlemen, as a member of the Puerto Rico Statehood Party, who polled 180,000 votes during the last election as candidate for the post of Resident Commissioner in Washington, I have followed with great interest your experiences in Puerto Rico during the last few days and have noted your statements of surprise as to the dire need in which more than 2,000,000 American citizens find themselves in Puerto Rico, and your repeated assurances that you intend to do everything you can to help us out of this situation. As a representative of my party I wish to express to you our sincere appreciation for your generous interest in our problems.

However, it is necessary that we point out to you that our problem is one that requires more than a kind interest on your part and that of Congress to extend to us this or that measure of help, in a generous spirit of fair deal, which is typical of America. The root of our problem goes deeper and requires an equal deal for the American citizens of Puerto Rico which will give us the equality of opportunity to which every American citizen is entitled, to be able to solve his own problems by his own effort and through his own enterprise under American principles of government.

The Governor of Puerto Rico, Mr. Luis Muñoz-Marin, has indicated that Puerto Rico has recently changed its attitude from Operation Lament to Operation Bootstrap. I believe—and your statements seem to show that you have arrived at a similar conclusion—that we, American citizens of Puerto Rico, have been doing an honest effort to improve our lot with the limited resources at our command. But you will agree with me that we cannot hope to go very far in solving our problems if we are to be restricted to pulling ourselves up by our own bootstrap. You all are practical men and are familiar with the physical impossibility of such a feat. What we must be given is the opportunity to start Operation Equal Deal, which will give us the same opportunities as are enjoyed by the American citizens of the 48 States of the Union to solve our own problems.

The true reason for the great misery you have seen around in Puerto Rico is twofold.

In the first place, Puerto Rico was a poor island when in 1898 is was transferred from Spain to the United States. At that time total island exports and imports amounted to $8,500,000 and $9,000,000 respectively, and the exchange of currency from Spanish pesos to American dollars amounted to $3,077,485 in 1900. In the year 1948–49, exports to continental United States were $195,000,000 and imports from continental United States were $326,000,000—a total trade of over $520,000,000, while bank deposits amounted to $270,000,000 in June 1949.

Of the above imports amounting to $326,000,000, $15,000,000 were automobiles, which came from the State of Michigan, here represented by the chairman of the committee, Congressman JOHN LESINSKI; $10,600,000 were pork products and $8,500,000 lard, coming from the State of Illinois, here represented by Congressman H. VELDE; $13,700,000 were dairy products from the States of Illinois and Iowa; $20,500,000 were building materials coming substantially from the State of Pennsylvania, here represented by Congressmen A. B. KELLEY and CARROLL D. KEARNS, and $8,600,000 corresponded to gasoline imports from corporations operating mostly in the State of New Jersey, here represented by Congressman CHARLES E. HOWELL.

In relative terms American citizens of Puerto Rico have made a great progress in 50 years under the American flag and for this opportunity they are happy and grateful to the people of continental United States. But how do we still compare in the development of our economy with the 48 States of the Union? In this respect we are still way behind the poorest State of the Union, Mississippi, since our per capita income is approximately $250, while Mississippi's was $555 in 1948 and the average for the Nation is over $1,200. Of course, you have had first-hand information of this condition by your direct observation of our slums.

The explanation to this discrepancy in income gives the clue to the second reason for our undeveloped condition. The fact that our economy has been completely integrated with the economy of the United States to the extent that 95 percent of our commerce is with continental United States, while its development has been subjected to the arbitrary though benevolent regulation of Congress, without the rightful means to protect our interest, when in conflict with other regional interest, gives the explanation for our inability to expand our economy to raise the standards of living of our 2,200,000 American citizens to the general average of the Nation. Members of Congress have been at times very kind and have always—as in your present case—been very receptive when they have had first-hand information of our problems. But in the give and take of congressional everyday business we have had no opportunity to protect our economy in the global manner it needs protection. And our economy and our progress have been stifled accordingly.

In this respect, a number of misconceptions have been paramount. Congress has felt satisfied because it has not extended the Federal income-tax law to the American citizens of Puerto Rico, and because Federal excise taxes from rum and other items shipped from Puerto Rico to continental United States, including customs receipts in Puerto Rico, are returned to the insular treasury. Congress has felt that these concessions are an economic aid to the island and they are justly so. However, how much do we lose in exchange for this advantage?

We do not receive full benefits of social security, nor do we participate in the proportion we would participate if we were a State of the Union, of Federal legislation such as rural electrification, rural roads, main roads, rivers and harbors, farm-support legislation, etc. Nor is the area of Puerto Rico included in the Federal blueprint for administering Federal aid in proportion to the unemployment situation under Mr. John L. Steelman's new program. Under this program it is proposed to funnel military and other Federal expenditures into areas where unemployment is in excess of the 6 percent national average, such as New Bedford, and Worcester, Mass., Philadelphia, and Scranton, Pa., San José, etc. Instead the Navy has just announced that two air bases in Puerto Rico will be shut down without considering that unemployment in the island is over 15 percent.

I am giving you below a tabulation of economic advantages and disadvantages of our present status and you will see that we are the direct losers.

TABLE A

Economic advantages under present status	$36,000,000
1. Federal income tax on $100,000,000 net taxable income	20,000,000
2. Custom receipts in Puerto Rico	3,000,000
3. Excise tax on rum shipments to continental United States	5,000,000
4. Excise tax on local rum and cigarette consumption	8,000,000
Disadvantages	40,000,000
1. Social security and benefits	28,000,000
2. Rural electrification	3,000,000
3. Secondary roads (1949 Federal budget $128,000,000)	3,000,000
4. First-class road (net direct loss $4,000,000)	4,000,000
5. Others	2,000,000

(If the Barden bill for Federal aid to education had become law we would then have lost an additional $14,000,000.)

During fiscal years 1946–47 and 1947–48 Federal aid to various States was as follows:

Florida, 2,300,000 inhabitants	$30,200,000
Oklahoma, 2,200,000 inhabitants	65,600,000
Louisiana, 2,500,000 inhabitants	30,124,000
Washington, 2,254,000 inhabitants	34,048,000
Illinois, 8,000,000 inhabitants	55,500,000
Pennsylvania, 10,000,000 inhabitants	86,500,000
Michigan, 5,200,000 inhabitants	25,592,000
Massachusetts, 4,600,000 inhabitants	47,190,000
Indirect loss of gross income:	
Price differential on 1,000,000 tons raw sugar from $6 to $9	60,000,000
500,000 tons quota limitation at $180	90,000,000
Limitation on sugar refinding	30,000,000
Insufficient tariff protection on needlework, etc	90,000,000
Insufficient tariff protection on pineapples, tobacco, coconuts, citron, etc	30,000,000
Total	300,000,000

Furthermore, though the American citizens of Puerto Rico do not contribute directly in the form of Federal income and excise taxes to the general fund of the United States Treasury from which social-security benefits and other appropriations are made, they do contribute indirectly, since by purchasing manufactured and farm products from producers in continental United States we pay in higher prices to maintain a fair return on their investments after paying Federal income tax and contributions to social security through pay-roll increases, while we have to sell our products in continental United States at prices that do not allow us to pay similar high wages.

You will point out that you are considering to correct this situation in part by extending social security to the American citizens of Puerto Rico and that you will do your best to see that we get a fair percentage of other future Federal appropriations, and we appreciate and thank you for your expressions of good will. But what guaranty do we have that a few years hence, when other men take your places in Congress, they will not, through lack of familiarity with the problems which you yourselves have observed, let things slide back so that the American citizens of Puerto Rico will not receive their due proportion of Federal aid?

Such a dependence on a paternalistic attitude from kind-hearted men is not the American way of doing things. Americans believe in a government of law, not a government of men, that is, in obtaining what is due them under a system of legal government that guarantees equal opportunities to all.

Furthermore, will the help that we can receive through this legislation be enough to solve our problems? We may receive from social security $28,000,000 a year. This amount is far from the minimum requirements of Puerto Rico to meet its many problems. According to the Columbia University report just published, $65,000,000 a year are required to give the minimum educational facilities to our 600,000 children of school age, of which number 300,000 are out of school, while $50,000,000 is the minimum required to supply the necessary building facilities. Our appropriation for education is $21,000,000 out of a general budget of $73,000,000. Furthermore, our housing problem requires about 50,000 homes with a total outlay of $200,000,000. And our industrial development needs investments of at least $500,000,000 to really make a difference.

Indeed, what is being considered now is simply a drop in the bucket and certainly justifies the expression "operation boot strap" which the Governor has used.

What must be done instead? I contend that the problem of the American citizens of Puerto Rico must be met with a massive attack, with courage, determination, and honesty. If we are American citizens, then we must be given the tools that our fellow American citizens in continental United States have to solve their problems; and these tools are equal rights under statehood. Why?

Our economy is principally dependent on sugar. Sugar means to us 60 percent of our income, and yet sugar is the only staple under the American flag whose production is limited, and whose price has been arbitrarily maintained below the average rise of the cost-of-living index.

Consider what would happen to the State of Michigan if its automobile production were reduced to 60 percent of its present output; or to Illinois if a similar reduction were ordered in its meat industry. And yet, none of those two activities loom as important in the economy of these two States as sugar does in the economy of Puerto Rico.

You will contend that sugar quotas also limit the production of sugar in the States. To this we answer that, in the first place, sugar is only 1.5 percent of the wealth production of Louisiana, 1 percent of Utah, 1 percent of Florida, 3 percent of the wealth production of Colorado, and that furthermore the quotas allocated to the sugar-producing States are such that they do not in fact limit their production because they have never been able to fill them. In the case of Puerto Rico, our shipping quota is 910,000 tons, while Cuba, a foreign country, has a quota of 2,229,000 tons, though our potential production capacity for export is 1,500,000 tons. A ton of sugar sells for $120. An additional sugar production of 500,000 tons would mean $60,000,000 additional yearly income to the island. Instead, we are forced to carry over this year 96,000 tons of sugar from the 1949 crop into 1950 with the resulting economic loss entailed.

By contrast the potato farmers of Maine obtained a subsidy of $61,000,000 for their excess potato crop last year, later sold at a nominal price to the alcohol distilleries. And Maine is a State with a total population of 847,000 as against 2,200,000 for Puerto Rico.

In addition, the price of sugar before price controls were released, was $4.20. When sugar was removed from price controls, Congress passed the Sugar Act ordering the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain the sugar consumption quota at a figure that would maintain the proper relation of the $4.20 price of sugar with the index of consumption increase after OPA was released. The index has gone up to 2¼ while sugar price today is $6. In accordance with the spirit of the law it should be $9. The proper increase in the price of 1,500,000 tons of sugar from $6 to $9 per qq. would mean an added income to the island of $90,000,000 per year.

Furthermore, we are restricted in the refining of our sugar to 110,000 tons. If we were allowed to refine all our sugar our income would increase by $30,000,000 a year.

This change in the sugar economy of the island would mean an additional yearly income of $180,000,000. With such an increase in production, the sugar industry could mechanize and could certainly meet the minimum wage of 75 cents which has just become law besides taking care of Federal income tax and of social-security contributions.

The above-described situation exists also in the needlework industry. We cannot pay the 75 cents minimum in this industry because reciprocal trade agreements have been negotiated with China, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, the Philippines and other countries, reducing the tariff protection on such things as handkerchiefs, gloves, etc., in such a manner that to meet such competition we can only pay 20 or 25 cents per hour to our needleworkers. Are you surprised that we have slums now instead of the decent homes our workers could have if they worked in an industry that was able to offer them decent wages? The needlework industry which amounts today to about $30,000,000 a year could certainly increase to $120,000,000 if it were duly protected.

You may go through the rest of our farm and industrial products and you would find a similar condition with pineapples, tobacco, citron, etc.

What then is necessary to increase the income of the island by at least $600,000,000 a year in order to increase the average per capita income to $550?

We believe that an equal deal for the American citizens of Puerto Rico, so that they can protect their economic interests in that very place—Congress—where economic policies are established, is not only necessary but indispensable to the solution of its problems.

Only by having two Senators and six Congressmen who can be on the alert all the time and who have the power to protect our interests, can the American citizens of Puerto Rico give their economy the necessary impetus to solve their problems.

This was the right which the States of Delaware and New Jersey fought for during the Constitutional Convention in 1787, and it is the right which the States from which you gentlemen come fought for later, for all you

realized that only by having equal opportunities could you protect the interests of your people.

As to the fear which has been voiced in the continental United States of the possible migration of industries to Puerto Rico to the detriment of the interests and welfare of other States, the simple realization of the fact that the total labor force of Puerto Rico is only 600,000 workers while the number of gainfully employed persons in continental United States is approximately 60,000,000 proves the fallacy of such a statement. What risk of any substantial industrial migration is there to give employment to maybe 100,000 unemployed persons in Puerto Rico? Contrariwise, the gainful employment of the unemployed American citizens of Puerto Rico and the general increase in their wage rates, would mean greater purchasing power to buy automobiles from Detroit, pork products from Chicago, and manufactured products from New Jersey and Pennsylvania. The constructive and fair solution of the problems of Puerto Rico, will, as it has always happened when the wealth of other States has increased, reflect itself in more opportunities for work throughout the Nation.

On behalf of 2,200,000 American citizens of Puerto Rico, I request that you help Puerto Rico to receive not only the benefits of social security and other similar Federal legislation, but in addition the "equal deal" of statehood, with all its rights and all its responsibilities.

Medical Care for Needy Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we hear so much about controversy and disagreement in matters affecting health legislation that it is particularly impressive when all major health organizations join in urging on Congress that provision be made under the Social Security Act to provide medical care for needy persons.

Last summer the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Dental Association, American Nurses' Association, the American Public Health Association, and the American Public Welfare Association joined together to form the Inter-Association Committee on Health for consideration of mutual problems. Dr. George F. Lull, secretary and general manager of the American Medical Association, in behalf of the Inter-Association Committee, released a statement regarding the committee action on this subject, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Inter-Association Committee on Health which met in New York on Saturday March 25, made public today a statement in regard to medical care for the needy. The Inter-Association Committee on Health is made up of representatives from the American Dental Society, the American Hospital Association, the American Medical Association, the American Nursing Association, the American Public Health Association, and the American Public Welfare Association. The statement which follows has been approved by the parent associations of all members of the committee:

"It is recognized that public-welfare departments are now handicapped in carrying out their existing responsibility to assure medical care, when needed and not otherwise available, to recipients of federally aided public assistance by the inadequate financial provision of the Social Security Act and its requirement that all aid be extended in the form of cash payments to the recipient. It is therefore recommended that the latter restriction be eliminated and that the agency administering assistance be authorized to finance the purchase of medical care in behalf of assistance recipients. In order to assure the quality of medical care thus purchased for assistance recipients and relate it to their individual needs, it is also recommended that its financing be accomplished through funds earmarked for that purpose rather than charged against the funds available for cash payments to individuals. The further view is expressed that any provision to finance medical care for assistance recipients should permit the administration of the medical aspects of such care by public-health departments and that such arrangements should have the support of these six organizations.

"Wherever the term 'medical care' is used in this statement, it is understood to include dental, nursing, hospital, and other health care as well as physicians' services."

Agricultural Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Food Allotment Program," delivered by the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] at the Northeast Dairy Conference held in Washington, D. C., on March 31, 1950. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Dairy Products and the Agricultural Surplus," delivered by Dr. John D. Black at the conference on March 30, 1950. I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript of Dr. Black's address will make 2⅔ pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $218.67.

The addresses of Senator AIKEN and Dr. Black are an interesting and fruitful contribution to the general subject of our agricultural policy.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOOD ALLOTMENT PROGRAM

(By Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont)

For the last two decades, with the exception of a few years, the United States has been severely plagued by the twin problems of surplus food and malnutrition.

I don't use the words starvation or hunger because those are scare words and, as a matter of fact, the number of people suffering from actual hunger is only a small percentage of the whole.

On the other hand, the percentage of people suffering from malnutrition or underconsumption of foods necessary to an adequate diet is far larger than one would think.

While there is no way of actually determining the number of people in the United States who suffer from lack of a proper diet, yet we do have some figures that give an idea as to how many there may be.

During the month of December 1949 assistance was given to 2,700,000 persons through old-age assistance and survivors insurance.

Two million one hundred thousand were living in families where aid to dependent children was given.

One hundred thousand received aid to the blind and 1,300,000 were participating in general assistance programs, including State relief.

Therefore, this group receiving direct assistance of some kind totaled 6,200,000 persons.

We are also informed by the Census Bureau that in 1948 13,000,000 persons were living in broken families, with 54 percent of these families having an income of less than $2,500 a year.

Assuming some duplication by the groups receiving direct assistance and the broken family group, we can still safely assume that 10,000,000 people in the two groups do not have enough purchasing power to buy the foods necessary to maintain good health.

These two groups mentioned, however, are far from representing the total number of Americans whose income would indicate that they could not afford an adequate diet.

We can add to this number at least part of over a million disabled veterans or their families drawing pensions or disability compensation. There are possibly 200,000 retired and disabled firemen, policemen, State, and municipal employees and an unknown number of other persons living on fixed incomes which have depreciated in purchasing value during recent years. Besides those groups there are doubtless several million other low-income persons who are unable to buy the food they need.

It is indeed paradoxical that the number of persons who lack the means to buy nutritious food seems to increase proportionately as surplus foods pile up on the farms or are taken from the market by Government in order to maintain a living price for the farmer.

Of course, if the purchasing power of the farmer falls, the number of unemployed people in the cities becomes greater and the number of people who are unable to buy health-giving foods increases.

We have been trying and are trying now to maintain a healthy national economy through a farm price-support program. We are already finding out that support prices if held too high reduce farm income through necessitating sharp cuts in production.

We also know that when farm prices are held high and there is much less than full employment among consumers, there is more than a corresponding drop in consumption which, in turn, necessitates a still greater reduction in production on the farm.

We have also learned from experience that unemployment and lack of purchasing power in our industrial areas diverts the purchase of food from the high quality animal protein commodities, such as milk, butter, cheese, poultry and meats, to the lower cost commodities, particularly cereal products, thus creating still further unemployment among processing, transportation and distribution groups, as well as diminishing the market for grain.

At the present time, there is little indication that the problems of surplus foods and unemployment are getting any less acute. In fact, the only reason that they have not reached the critical stage before this has been the foreign assistance programs of our Government.

Most of us have favored aid to other nations, particularly the western European nations. Now, we have reached the point where western Europe does not need our surplus food so much by reason of becoming more self-sufficient each year. We may look forward to a reduced export outlet for farm surpluses from now on.

We may look forward to a greater degree of unemployment and diminishing purchasing power in our industrial areas unless steps are taken soon to prevent it.

I have frequently stated that full employment for industry is a legitimate farm objective and conversely high purchasing power on the farm is an industrial necessity.

I have also held, and I do so now, that the farm problems of today cannot be solved on the farm.

What the cost of our efforts to maintain farm income through a price-support program may be is difficult to determine.

I would say that when all the cards are placed face up on the table it will be found that it is costing a billion dollars a year right now.

We are told that the number of unemployed in the United States has now reached a total of about five million.

It has been suggested that a solution lies in letting all our farm output go on the market at a low price level and then reimburse the farmer for the difference between the average price received and a high support level.

While this proposal might work in the case of certain commodities, at certain times, it would not be workable as a general policy for the simple reason that the cost of the program would fall heavily upon the taxpayers, and the most important and by far the largest source of tax revenue is the working people of America. Neither could we be sure that the commodities produced in heavy surplus would be the kinds most needed by consumers.

With mounting surpluses and increasing unemployment, there is no time to be lost in meeting the challenge head on.

We have learned several ways how not to meet the problem. We can no longer depend upon dumping surpluses overseas. We can no longer rely upon the destruction of food supplies to do the job, particularly in view of the rising tempo of consumer wrath. Finally, we have found that a severe restriction of production on the farm will only aggravate rather than alleviate our troubles.

There is, however, right at our front door, the solution we seek if we can only find a way to reach it.

That large element of our population that I mentioned in the beginning, the low income people of America, would prove to be an outlet for most of our surplus production if we can find a means of getting badly needed food into their homes.

Probably the dairy producers of America are more keenly aware of the possibilities of this outlet than almost any other group.

The milk producer remembers all too well those cruel days of the thirties when food spoiled on the farm and prices collapsed in the market place while untold millions of American citizens walked the streets in search of jobs and went hungry.

The dairyman remembers full well the start of the penny milk program which was the result of a desperate effort to find an outlet for milk which at one time reached the wholesale price of less than 2 cents a quart.

From that humble beginning, the penny milk program has been developed into the highly successful school-lunch program which today furnishes nourishing lunches to nearly 8,000,000 school children and in fiscal 1949 utilized among other commodities 245,000,000 quarts of milk served for drinking and 170,000,000 pounds of milk equivalent served in the form of cheese, butter, and evaporated milk having a value of $50,000,000.

The school-lunch program is now well on the way toward meeting its need in all parts of the country. Not all school children are included as yet and in some sections not even milk is available for school lunches.

But the achievements of this great health-giving program from the early days of the penny milk sales have been little short of miraculous in improving the health of our children as well as providing an additional outlet for the products of our dairies.

It was the results obtained from the school-lunch program, more than anything else, which drew the attention of some of us a few years ago to the possibility of expanding the consumption of food not only among children, but among the low-income adult population of the country.

The question which arose in our minds was the manner in which this could best be done.

There was no question as to the benefits to be derived in the form of better health and improved markets.

Back in the late thirties, when the Government was still groping for more satisfactory methods of assisting needy people, it initiated on an experimental basis what was called the stamp plan of that day.

Through this plan, certain areas were selected where stamps to be used for food purchases were provided to low-income people to enable them to enjoy a better and more healthful life. This stamp-plan program was probably the most successful and satisfactory of all the assistance programs attempted during the decade of the thirties.

It was not entirely satisfactory, however, and many mistakes were made in its application.

Therefore, in 1943, when Senator LaFollette and I, realizing that there were still a great many people in America who didn't have enough to eat and foreseeing the day when surplus foods would again be with us, introduced the first food allotment bill.

We drew heavily upon the experience and knowledge of those who had been concerned with the operations of the stamp plan of the late thirties.

The bill we offered at that time was, in my opinion, a vast improvement on the stamp plan.

Since 1943, I have seen to it that a food allotment bill has been introduced in each session of Congress, making changes in the text and provisions of the bill as such improvements have been deemed advisable.

The proposed food allotment program has received a good deal of support of a sporadic nature. Some farm groups, some consumer groups, and some commercial people have evidenced a great deal of interest in it.

I have not felt that the time was propitious for asking Congress to act upon this proposed legislation until pressure for its enactment became more widespread and better organized.

Although from the start we had cooperation of Department of Agriculture people in the preparation of the bill, it was not until 1948 that Secretary of Agriculture CLINTON ANDERSON formally endorsed it.

The food allotment bill is based on the conviction that adequate diets for all families and better markets for farmers are in the national interest and that it is a national responsibility to achieve those ends as far as possible.

Primarily, the objective sought is a better dietary level, but when this is attained, we will have an automatic broadening of the market for the products of the farm.

The basic principles of the food allotment program are simple.

The first step is to determine scientifically the level of nutrition needed to keep an average person strong and healthy, and to translate that nutrition level into actual amounts of lower-cost foods.

The second step is to determine the value of the low-cost adequate diet periodically at current retail food prices. This cost on a yearly basis would be known as the food allotment.

The third step is to supplement the buying power of families that are not able to afford low-cost adequate diets.

In carrying out the third step, needless red tape that would limit the effectiveness of the program must be avoided.

At the same time, Federal funds must be used in the most effective way to raise levels of nutrition and improve farm markets.

To meet these difficulties the food allotment program utilizes the fact that on the average, lower-income families in the past have spent about 40 percent of their income on food.

Under the proposed program, participating families would continue their normal spending for food. The amount contributed by the Government would be used to buy additional food or better food.

Here is an example of the way the program would work:

Suppose the retail cost of the food allotment per person was $15 a month and for a family of four was $60. If the family had an income of $100 a month, it could get the $60 worth of coupons by paying 40 percent of its income, or $40.

If the family income was $125, it could buy the same number of coupons for $50.

But if its income were $150 the family would have to pay $60 for $60 worth of coupons, and, therefore, would find no advantage in participating.

A family of five with an income of $150, however, would gain benefit by buying $75 worth of coupons for $60.

Thus, the Government's contribution would largely represent a net increase in family food consumption.

Operation of the program could be relatively simple.

It would not in any sense be a relief program; no means test or long investigations by welfare agencies would be necessary. A simple declaration of income, similar to that required in connection with the Federal income tax, would be sufficient.

Any family would be eligible to buy coupons by paying the required percentage of its income. This would be in marked contrast to the food stamp plan, which in almost every area was limited to families receiving public assistance. Participation would not be limited to people in cities and towns. Many farm families are poorly nourished, too. Some them, of course, could best help themselves by raising more family food.

The food-allotment bill has special provisions for taking home-grown food into account.

This allotment has attracted a great deal of favorable attention among grocers, market men, and others engaged in the normal channels of trade.

These people remember all too well that period in the thirties when there was a great deal of political distribution of food which added to the troubles of already greatly harassed tradesmen.

The program I propose provides for the expenditure of food coupons at the store where the recipient usually does his trading.

The market man puts them in the bank along with his regular deposit.

It is highly essential that in attempting to alleviate distress among one group of people that we do not increase the trials and tribulations of another.

The cost of the food-allotment program would be determined by the extent to which it were used. However, if used to the maximum practicable extent, I doubt if the cost would be much, if any, more than what we are now spending in keeping food off the market.

Whereas the money we spend for food to be destroyed or kept off the market actually reduces employment, the same amount of money spent in enabling low-income persons to purchase food would have a salutary effect in enhancing the national economy through furnishing greater employment as well as improving the health of the Nation.

What the direct effect upon the dairy industry would be is also problematical, although it goes without saying that it would be very beneficial.

Recent surveys by the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics indicate that families with incomes from $3,000 to $5,000 consume more products than families with less than $2,000 income in the following percentages:

	Percent
Dairy products other than butter	35
Butter	57
Meat	26
Eggs	15

If only 10 percent of the people of the Nation participated in a food allotment program, this would mean an increased total consumption of—

	Percent
Butter	5.7
Other dairy products	3.5
Meat	2.6
Pork	5.0
Eggs	1.5

Inasmuch as Government purchases of butter, nonfat milk solids, cheese, and evaporated milk in 1949 amounted to between 3 and 4 percent of our total milk production, it can be seen that had the food allotment program been in effect last year, no Government purchases of dairy products would have been necessary and we would not now have on hand 200,000,000 pounds of powdered milk and 100,000,000 pounds of butter that we can't dispose of.

In discussing the advantages of a food allotment program, I am not unaware of the probability that the bill which I am sponsoring is far from perfect.

I am also fully aware of the probability that a program such as I am sponsoring might encounter obstacles in its application.

For that reason, I have hoped that Congress might authorize it on an experimental basis before we get to the point where it may be urgently needed.

By trying it out in selected areas, both urban and rural, in different sections of the country, we could learn how it would work and take the kinks out of it before it becomes necessary to apply it on a broad scale.

The cost of trial programs would be very small in proportion to the value of the knowledge acquired.

Inasmuch as the dairy producers themselves would probably benefit from such a program more than any other agricultural group, I hope that this organization will give the matter serious study and use its influence to create and promote a wider interest in one possible solution to our economic ills.

Dairy Products and the Agricultural Surplus

(By John D. Black)

As I get into this paper, you will discover how fortunate I am in having had Senator Aiken come before me and outline his thinking on how not to have any surpluses of dairy products and his program for bringing this to pass. The question as he has analyzed it is not one of how to dispose of excess stocks of dairy products that accumulate under the kind of mismanagement that we have under our present agricultural programs, but one of preventing such stocks from ever accumulating by keeping them moving freely into consumption. My thinking and Senator Aiken's run exactly parallel. If it is exceptional to find an economist and a Member of Congress thinking closely alike on a subject, you will have to blame the exception in this case on Senator Aiken—it is because he is thinking like an economist and not because I am thinking like a Senator.

It is true that the Commodity Credit Corporation now has some nonfat milk solids, butter and cheese and other dairy products on hand, but the amounts are small and of little consequence. The reason that the CCC is doing little to dispose of them is because the amounts are so small. If the Government stocks were 10 times what they are, disposal action would be more urgent, and probably would be taken. For, after all, getting more dairy products consumed is relatively simple. None of them, like potatoes, is costly to transport and store, or like potatoes is pressing hard on all potential uses. I say this even though around 100,000,000 pounds of butter have been allowed to accumulate.

The important aspect of the subject in hand is of another nature. It is simply this: If dairy products were substituted, as they easily could be in the food consumption of the United States, for potatoes and wheat and other cereals, this would help greatly in preventing food surpluses in general. Also if considerable rolling land now in cotton in the South were shifted to dairy production and the resulting dairy products consumed in the South where they are much needed in the diets, this would help greatly with our cotton surpluses. Combine with these possible shifts in land use and consumption the possible parallel shifts to more meat and poultry production and consumption and we have almost the whole solution of the agricultural surplus problem.

Let us see some of the evidence in support of this:

Assuming potato yields of 180 bushels per acre, the substitution of dairy production for production of 100,000,000 bushels of potatoes, and substitution in our diets at the same time of the resulting dairy-product calories for potato calories would provide a use for 4,000,000 surplus acres of land. That is, it would take 4,000,000 acres to produce the calories in the form of dairy products now provided by the 100,000,000 bushels of potatoes being produced on 560,000 acres.

A parallel shifting to dairy production of 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, and substituting the resulting dairy-product calories for white-flour calories, if we assume a yield of 15 bushels per acre, would provide a use for 18,000,000 present wheat acres. In other words, it would take 18,000,000 more acres than the 7,000,000 now being used to produce this 100,000,000 bushels of wheat to produce as many calories in dairy products as are provided by this 100,000,000 bushels of wheat in the form of white flour.

A parallel shifting to dairy production of 2,000,000 bales of cotton grown on rolling land of the South would provide a use in dairy farming, assuming a cotton yield of 200 pounds per acre, for 5,000,000 present cotton acres. This would mean additional dairy products to consume in the South at the rate of 40,000 calories per person per year, equivalent to 60 quarts of milk. All of this needs to be consumed in the South, where fluid-milk consumption is little more than half what it is in the North.

The increased dairy output from these 4 plus 18 plus 5 equals 27,000,000 more acres of land devoted to dairy production would equal the equivalent of only two-fifths of a quart of milk per person per day in the United States. Distributed among consumption uses in the usual proportions in this country, this would mean, per capita annually, 90 quarts of whole milk, plus 5 pounds of butter, plus 4 pounds of cheese, plus 10 pounds of evaporated milk, plus 2 pounds of nonfat milk solids.

If diversion of 27,000,000 surplus acres of land to dairy production in this way did not prove enough to prevent agricultural surpluses, many more million acres or so of potatoes, wheat, and cotton land could be handled in the same way. Or, if our people preferred it instead, as they probably would, they could divert another 27,000,000 acres or so to the production of beef, pork, eggs, or poultry meat, or preferably some balanced combination of these. Pork production uses four times as much land per million calories as potatoes, and 2.2 times as much as wheat. Poultry production uses 15 times as much land as potatoes, and 8 times as much land as wheat. The corresponding figures for beef production are 40 and 25. Poultry and meat production thus use up land much faster even than dairy production.

We are, of course, concerned with the amount of farm labor used as well as with the amount of land. Dairy production uses less labor per acre than potato and cotton production, but more than wheat production. The general effect of diverting to dairy production the 27,000,000 acres now in potatoes, wheat, and cotton, in the proportions indicated above, would be to increase the employment of farm labor by 80,000 workers. This results from the fact that so large a part of the diversion is out of wheat. If the level of our national diet were raised presently by adding more dairy and other livestock products than produced on these 27,000,000 acres, plus whatever more is needed to prevent agricultural surpluses, we should then be employing still more labor. Dairy production uses 5 times as much labor per 1,000,000 calories as potato production, and 20 times as much as wheat production. Future population growth will contribute to the same effect.

Now let us consider the dietary significance of such a program. If the additional dairy production was consumed in this way, it would add 700,000,000 pounds annually of animal protein to the diets of our people, of which much more than half would be replacement of poorer plant proteins. It would increase the per capita intake of calcium by 20 percent, and of vitamins by 5 percent.

If the additional dairy output were used all as whole milk, it would mean only 2.8 quarts more per person per week. This would add 1,700,000,000 pounds of animal protein per year, or 14 grams per person per day. The increase in calcium intake would be from 1 to 1.4 grams per day.

Few of us need to be told how much better the land of this country would be conserved if 30,000,000 to 50,000,000 acres of it now in potatoes, cotton, and other row crops, or in wheat or sorghum in the Great Plains, were diverted to hay crops and pasture to be used as dairy and cattle feed.

The obvious conclusion to be drawn from the foregoing is that all this country needs in the way of a surplus program is a program for getting consumed the dairy and other livestock products that would be produced on 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 acres of land now in potatoes, wheat, cotton, tobacco, and a few other crops. The farmers will need some credit and other help in shifting their production over to livestock, but this will be easy to provide and will cost very little.

Once such a program is in full operation, there will be no more need for acreage allotments or marketing quotas. They may be needed in some situations while the program is getting under way, but not after it is in full swing.

The place to begin is with legislation to set up programs that will bring about the increased consumption of dairy and related livestock products. It is at this end that all programs should begin. Shifts in production to dairy and other livestock products should follow the shifts in consumption, and come only as fast as the expansion of consumption provides a demand for the additional dairy, poultry, and meat production.

Such legislation should, however, presently guarantee to every producer of dairy products a market for all that he produces at a return per unit of product which multiplied by the national dairy output per capita of the national population of that year will give to the dairy producers of this country the same level of income measured in purchasing power as received by them in some near-at-hand reasonable base period. This proposal, you will note, is for a parity-income standard. The essence of any true parity-income standard is that it will take account of increases in output, resulting from higher yields, improved technology, or other related causes, as well as of changes in prices. It needs also to allow, moreover, for the expansion of any line of production as demand increases with growth of the national population. The base period chosen as a standard should be recent so that the base will be in terms of current technology. It must, however, be one in which agricultural prices and incomes are in general in that relation to other prices and incomes as can be expected with reasonably full employment and normal exports and imports of farm products.

The returns thus guarantied should be very largely obtained in the market place. Some use of production payments to supplement market receipts may be made to advantage at the start of such a program. They should not be needed after it is in full swing. The objective of the whole program should be to raise consumption to a point that no supplements to market prices will be needed and no acreage or market quotas.

What form should a consumption expansion program take? First, a doubling or trebling of the present school-feeding program. As Senator Aiken stated, we are just well started with this program. If for just one generation all the school children in the United States had really adequate diets, with all the dairy and other livestock products, vegetables, and fruits in them required for proper growth and bodily functioning, and formed the habits of eating such foods, malnutrition in this country would become history only. The cost of a full-scale school-feeding program is a small amount to pay for such an accomplishment. The present school-feeding program is deficient in some other respects, but these can be corrected in the legislation. There must be more assurance that the children are getting the right foods.

Second, the Aiken national food allotment program exactly as Senator Aiken has presented it today. This plan is carefully designed to spend the public money on exactly those groups in the population who will expand their food consumption most with a given amount of aid in the form of what amounts to lower prices. Under it the great bulk of low-income families will, in effect, be able to buy their dairy and poultry foods and meats at half price or close to it, and another large group of them at around two-thirds prices. It might be wisest to start this program with families on relief of the types listed by Senator Aiken, and bring in other low-income families later. I was glad to hear him include the families receiving social-security payments and the unemployed. Social-security payments are far below what families need, and to make food available to them at low prices is the most effective way to supplement the small payments. At the start, I would favor going further in limiting the foods to foods of livestock origin than Senator Aiken proposes.

Why these programs rather than the Brannan program for letting prices of farm prices fall to whatever level they will have to to move supplies and making up the differences in production payments? A chart on page 51 in the 1950 Outlook Chartbook on Rural Family Living of the United States Department of Agriculture shows that for families with an income below $4,000 per year, the consumption of dairy products expressed in quarts of milk increases at the rate of 2.9 quarts per week for each additional thousand dollars of annual income after taxes. Above $4,000, the comparable increase is only at the rate of six-tenths of a quart for each $1,000 of additional income, or one-fifth as much. This indicates that, other things being the same, a sum of money spent on expanding the dairy products consumption of families with incomes below $4,000 would go much further than if spent on higher-income families—possibly as much as five times further. It probably would not do this at once—it takes time for families to adapt their consumption practices to make full use of particular foods as they become cheaper. But there is little reason to doubt that large responses would occur within a year or two, and that they would be much greater with low-income families than with high-income families.

The reader may be interested in figures for some other food products comparable to the five for milk included in the same chart:

Meats: Low-income groups two times that for higher-income groups.

Eggs: Low-income groups two and seven-tenths times that for higher-income groups.

Citrus and tomatoes: Low-income groups one and four-tenths times that for higher-priced groups.

Other vegetables: Low-income groups three times that for higher-income groups.

Thus for all these foods, any expenditures designed to support farm prices and incomes by expanding consumption will be much more effective if designed to expand the consumption of the lower-income groups; and money spent making foods cheaper for the higher-income groups causes very little increase in their consumption. It is much to be doubted that the Congress will ever be liberal enough in its appropriations to expand the consumption of food to warrant spending much of it on the higher-income groups.

As further support of the foregoing, Senator Aiken told you that the low-income families of the United States spend 40 percent of their incomes for food. The comparable figure for the average family in the United States reported in the last Agricultural Outlook Charts was only 24 percent.

A program such as just outlined seems clear and obvious enough. Then what are we waiting for? The answer is equally obvious. The organized dairy and other livestock producer groups have not given Senator Aiken and his kind enough support for such a program to make him believe that it was worth his effort to press for it hard in Congress. He has, in fact, just told us this in his own words. As a result, the producer groups and their Congressmen who want high support prices at almost any cost have been allowed to carry the ball most of the time in the last two Congresses.

Why have the dairy and related producer groups not pushed hard for such a program? One principal answer is probably that they have not understood the situation and realized the value to them of such a program. I hope I have done something in this paper to remedy this situation.

Perhaps a stronger reason has been fear that any program of this sort might expand production faster than consumption. This fear must be met in the two ways I have outlined, by providing for the expansion of consumption first, and a firm assurance of income supports in the event of such a mishap.

As the situation now stands, the dairy groups are in the key position. There is no real escape from the stinking mess that our agricultural programs have become but to begin at the consumption end and expand the use of the products that will use our land most freely and thus reduce our large surplus of acres in wheat, cotton, and potatoes. I have shown that expansion of dairy production consumption for families with less than $4,000 of income is the most effective way of increasing food consumption. Why, then, do not the dairy groups step into this situation and save the day for the agriculture of the Nation as well as for themselves? The poultry and other livestock groups would surely want to join in if the dairy groups would lead the way.

Most of the foregoing has been written from the point of view mainly of solving the Nation's agricultural surplus problem. Fortunately, the diets of our people could be improved greatly at the same time. The dairy industry has another opportunity to improve the national diet. This one will reduce no surpluses except that of the nonfat dry solids. This is by getting the important food values in skim milk and whey into human food. The simplest way of getting skim milk and whey thus used is to get it included in bread and other foods in the form of powder. The commercial bread sold in this country averages only around 3 percent of milk in all forms. Twice or three times this amount could be used to good advantage both from the standpoint of quality of the loaf and nutritive value. Millers and bakers generally, however, do not seem willing to incur this extra cost. It has been calculated that a subsidy of about half the price of skim-milk powder, or around 6 cents per pound, is needed to offset this extra cost to the bakers. This would add little if any to the receipts of dairy farmers. Present prices of such powder do little more than cover the cost of assembling the skim milk and processing it. But the people of the United States would be getting in their staff-of-life a food containing the particular proteins that are most essential to health. Nonfat milk powder contains about all the proteins that are vital to health in about the proportions needed.

The production of skim-milk powder reached a level of 900,000,000 pounds in 1949. Of this, 475,000,000 pounds was used in domestic foods. The rest was handled by the Government or exported. Production should be doubled in the next 5 years, with all the increase going into bread and other foodstuffs, the expansion of production in this case, too, following that of the expansion of consumption. Some very simple legislation giving specific instruction to the Commodity Credit Corporation would meet the immediate needs of this situation. Apparently this will be required if it is going to be done. The present law permits this, but the present administration of the Department of Agriculture apparently prefers to give its stocks of skim-milk powder to Europe to feed its livestock.

In place of a bold stroke such as instructing the Commodity Credit Corporation to make available to millers and makers at, say, 5 cents per pound, all the nonfat milk powder that they will use in flour, bread, and other bakery goods, the dairy groups in this country are fussing around over what to do with the 125,000,000 pounds surplus of it now left to be distributed. No doubt, it was what to do with this, and comparable amounts of butter and cheese, that you folks expected me to discuss today. I am altogether too busy a person to spend my time over such piddling questions. As I said at the outset, the only reason that we are not doing something really significant with dairy surpluses is that we do not have enough of them to make it worth while.

At the end of one protracted discussion of long-range agricultural policy in which I participated not long after the end of the war, I came out of it with the conclusion that no Congress of the United States would enact any legislation in the next few years that would really meet the situation, and

that probably no farm organization would accept such a proposal; that the situation was one in which what needs to be done will not be done so long as the country and its agriculture are getting along after a fashion—in other words, things must get a lot worse than they were before any action of the necessary sort would be taken. Today, I have to report to you that things are still not bad enough, that they must still get worse than they are now. However, we are clearly headed toward such a state of affairs. For full action of the sort needed, we may even have to wait for a general business depression. You may say that then it will be too late. It is true that earlier action would be twice as effective. But constituted the way we are, we cannot get such action now. Hence we have to do it the only way available. Senator AIKEN has told us that we have no time to lose. I am pretty certain, Senator AIKEN, that we are going to keep on losing it for awhile—at least until after the next congressional election.

In particular, it may be needful to clarify the present confusion on two points before any real progress can be made. One of these relates to the level of support of agricultural income. Secretary Brannan in his original statement presented a parity income standard that meant prices averaging within a few percent of full 100 percent parity on the 1910–14 base. The administration also waged its last presidential campaign in language that implied close to a full parity standard, and there is much to indicate that it has similar intentions for this summer and fall. I have just read a report in the Wall Street Journal to the effect that a strong group in the Republican leadership is favoring a campaign promising a level of prices higher than the Democrats ever have thus far dared to promise. Thus we may have a campaign in which the two parties may strive to outdo themselves with impossible promises.

In actual fact, Secretary Brannan is now administering an act of 1948 which sets something like 90 percent of revised parity standard as a base, with adjustment for the size of crop (except in the case of tobacco) beginning next year, for the six basic crops, and 75 to 90 percent of such parity for dairy products, and gives him still wider discretion for everything else except wool and sugar. Exercising such discretion, he has set a level of around 79 percent for dairy products, 75 percent for eggs, and 60 percent for potatoes. He is demonstrating under this act plenty of ability to recognize that setting a price too high means accumulating large surplus stocks, and there are reports that his economic advisers are figuring in terms of production payments, if his program were accepted, far below what he set up in his original announcement. His recent presentation in favor of production payments for potatoes seems to have taken $1 per bushel, or 60 percent of parity, as the level for determining production payments.

Now, if Secretary Brannan has in mind price and income levels, such as he is now prescribing under the present act, as the levels to be used under a production payment plan, or only as much higher than those as he thinks he can get Congress to appropriate the money for, as would seem to be indicated by his statement on potatoes, by all means the helpful thing for him to do is to announce this publicly. Then there need not be any competitive out-promising the others in the coming campaign.

This raises the whole question as to the level that this country really can be expected to support. Much wild talk is being made on this subject. A chart on page 17 of the same Outlook Chart Book on Rural Family Living, that I cited before, shows that rural farm-family incomes rose 39 percent from 1945 to 1947, and urban-family incomes only 11 percent. Now all of us have to admit that farmers were doing pretty well in 1943–45, but still we are having a lot of loud talking about how far farm prices have fallen since 1947 while urban wages are still rising. The sharp break upward in prices of farm products in 1945–47 was highly abnormal and cannot properly be used as a basis for judging reasonable farm-price levels.

Another of the Department of Agriculture series shows that the farm population is now less than 19 percent of the Nation's population as compared with about 26 percent in 1925–29, and that its share of the national income was virtually the same in 1949 as in 1925–29. This represents a gain for agriculture of 26 percent. Another USDA series shows that in terms of income per capita of the farm and nonfarm population, the parity ratio in 1949 was 129 in favor of agriculture on the 1910–14 base, and 128 on the 1925–29 base.

Agricultural output has increased 67 percent in this country since 1910–14. This larger output is being produced with 10 percent fewer workers in the farm labor force. Hence the increase in output per worker in agriculture has been much larger—in fact, 86 percent.

Here are two figures that are very much worth while comparing—129 on the 1910–14 base as the figure for gain to 1949 in per capita farm income, and 186 as the figure for gain to 1949 in physical output per worker in agriculture. The 29 out of the 86 is the measure of about the extent to which agriculture was itself benefiting in 1949 from its improvements in technology. The remaining 57 had been passed on to consumers. At 1947 levels of prices for farm products farm folks would have been getting 64 out of the 86.

Figures of this kind do not of course take account, on the one hand of the improvements in transportation (the automobile and roads, for example), in communication (the telephone, rural mail service, and the radio, for example), in housing, in the reduction of the physical strain of hard labor, and a score of other things, that have probably added more to farm living than to urban living since 1910; nor, on the other hand, of the larger reduction in working hours of urban than of farm workers. After all, it is the living that a people gets out of its work that counts and cash income, or so-called purchasing power, or what is sometimes called real income, may be a poor measure indeed of the actual living obtained.

It would seem probable from the foregoing, nevertheless that if agricultural incomes go much below present levels, agricultural folks will not be sharing as they should in the gains in technology that they are making. We therefore need to bestir ourselves to find ways of keeping them from doing so. But it is important that the ways chosen will really achieve the ends desired. Trying to hold prices up on stilts by simple direct price-support measures, supported by storage and marketing quotas, we should have learned by this time, is largely a waste of effort except for a few products taken at a time for a few years at a time. The only really effective methods are those that get to the heart of the problem and adjust consumption and production, as outlined in this paper.

There is of course another kind of tactics that farm folk could try; that is, yelling loudly for much more than they have any right to expect. This is what labor does when it gets ready to enter into a new contract with employers. But agriculture is trying to work out its problem in collaboration with Government, and Government is not the employer of agriculture. It is instead the representatives of the public. As such it must seek with agriculture to find out what is agriculture's contribution to the national dividend and due reward.

The other subject on which there is much confusion is that of the cost of the different programs. Senator AIKEN has told you that the present program is costing the country $1,000,000,000 a year if everything is counted in. This is a very good estimate. The cost will run fully as high next year and afterward in spite of the flexible pricing arrangements for the basic crops. After all, they represent only a minor fraction of the total. Furthermore, they will be kept at this level only by extending marketing quotas to more and more of the nonbasic crops and managing somehow to enforce them. Senator AIKEN says that the same amount of money employed as he proposes would finance his program. I agree with him. It would, in addition, in due time make acreage and market quotas largely if not wholly unnecessary.

What the Brannan proposal would cost depends entirely upon the level of production payments. To achieve the same level of income, prices plus production payments, with no acreage or market quotas, as would be obtained under Senator AIKEN's proposal and mine would probably cost at least two billions a year, and probably more. This is because so much would be spent under his plan in lowering the prices for the higher-income groups which buy little more as prices are lowered.

Those favoring the Brannan plan over the Aiken plan sometimes draw comparisons between the Aiken plan and the old prewar stamp plan. No comparisons of this sort have any meaning. The prewar stamp plan was conducted on the basis of disposing of the particular goods that were in surplus. Often these were bulky foods that could not find an outlet in the same territory and were often stored for months and shipped long distances, often under refrigeration. The Aiken plan would lead to the production largely of foods of livestock origin that are not bulky and costly to store and transport, and the major portion would move into nearby consumption. They would be far less in bulk than the foods they would replace, and cost less to move through the channels of trade. Moreover, they would move through the regular channels of trade.

Cultural Interchange Promotes Inter-American Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Miss Ellen Collins, a graduate of St. Joseph's College, Emmitsburg, Md., and a master of arts of Columbia University, on the occasion of the annual celebration of Pan American Day at St. John's University. It was in connection with this event that Miss Collins was awarded the university's gold medal voted each year to the citizen who has done the most for the cause of inter-American understanding.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CULTURAL INTERCHANGE PROMOTES INTER-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP

(By Ellen Collins, associate editor of World Affairs)

Not long ago, a Latin-American girl, visiting in Texas, remarked that, prior to her experience in the United States, she had been led to believe that all Americans chewed gum, were always in a hurry, and had too much money. After a few months in this country, however, the young lady from South America discovered that there were many of our people who eschew the product of the chicle, who know the uses of leisure enough to putter around a garden, and who, in most instances, do not have enough American dollars. First-hand, eyewitness, day-to-day knowledge of the United States made the difference.

Almost every student from the other American Republics can report similar revelations. Although, for some of the Latin boys, it is a shock to find that every North American girl is not a Betty Grable, the young men from Hispanic America soon adjust themselves to an environment where chaperones, or duennas, are not even considered a necessary evil, whether asleep or awake. They are quick to realize that living in a country is a sure bridge of friendship.

When university study deepens the relationship, the boy or girl goes back to his or her own people an apostle of international understanding. Politicians may come and politicians may go; but the student, girl or boy, is an eternal phenomenon. Not only the college or university remains for the scholar a cherished mother; the country, too, continues an alma mater.

One of my most vivid recollections of study at the University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru, revolves around a conversation with a young man of that nation who described the mere thought of a scholarship in the United States of America as his "sueño dorado." It was easy to see that the simple possibility of some academic sojourn in the land of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln gave inspiration and meaning to the work he was doing in his own country. The fact that intellectual achievement had brought cultural fortune to other boys and girls kept him at his books and in his laboratories when others, less thoughtful, were devoting their afternoons and evenings to idle pleasures. This happened before the invention of the card game Canasta. It is pleasant to record that the young man from San Marcos won his chance to specialize in engineering at a United States institution of learning and that, today, he is superintending the operation of airports in the Republic of Peru. Among his fellow citizens there is no more enthusiastic promoter of inter-American good will.

Another case is equally illuminating. While engaged in the Cultural Relations Department of the United States Embassy in Quito, Ecuador, I was approached by two religious of the Order of St. Dominic. One was the mother superior of the convent in Cuenca, a city notable for culture throughout the Republic of Ecuador. The other was the mother superior's assistant. Both had as their most cherished ambition the desire to study hospital administration and educational methods in North America. Thanks to Rev. Mother M. Gerald, O. P., prioress general of the Dominican Sisters of Siena Heights College, Adrian, Mich., it was possible to translate the dream of the Ecuadoran nuns into golden reality. When the expert on hospital administration and the specialist on educational methods returned to Cuenca, they carried back with them an abiding affection for the people of the United States. Their influence in Ecuador today extends over an entire region as well as throughout an important religious community.

Not long after this adventure in inter-American cooperation, Mother Gerald, who had become fired with the desire to expand the Dominican tradition of cultural interchange, founded a college for girls in Ciudad Trujillo, the Dominican Republic. The establishment has been a brilliant success. As a token of appreciation and, still more, of understanding the four-centuries-old University of Santo Domingo, last year, conferred upon the prioress general of the Dominican Sisters of Adrian, Mich., the degree of doctor of philosophy, honoris causa. It was the first time in the history of the institution that an honorary degree had been awarded to a woman. Naturally the whole Dominican family in the United States looks upon this gesture as another precious tie in the inter-American system. Educational links are more important than, and, often enough, rise superior to political agreements, or disagreements.

It is interesting to note that a South American as prominent as President Galo Plaza of Ecuador has long been active in this sphere of cultural interchange. When Señor Plaza was serving his country as Ambassador in Washington, he constantly found time to consult with, and, if necessary, to extend help to, Ecuadoran students who had come to North America in search of education. One case I recall with special interest was that of Alejandro Villavicencio, the son of a famous Quito physician. This young South American, whose father had died before the son could visit the United States, discovered in Ambassador Plaza, himself a product of American education, a second father. Although Alejandro came to this country determined to study medicine, he was advised in the Embassy that the real need of his own countrymen was for farmers and engineers. Consequently, Alejandro, with the good counsel and encouragement of Ecuador's representative in Washington, took up these subjects at the University of Notre Dame. Prior to the conclusion of his studies, he waxed so enthusiastic about the United States that he persuaded his mother, sisters, cousins, and other relatives to make extended visits to North America.

Now the family is reunited in Quito, where the Villavicencios are ardent admirers of American democracy. Furthermore, Ambassador Plaza, as Candidate Plaza, gave Ecuador its first taste of a political campaign without partisan politics. Running as the head of a new group, the National Civic Movement, free from any dependence upon the old-line conservatives and liberals. As a result, the Republic of Ecuador, despite stratagems and plots, is enjoying a period of genuine representative government, under a President who studied in two United States institutions—the University of California and the University of Maryland. Perhaps the day will come when a President of the United States of America may boast that he went to school in Quito, or Lima, or Rio de Janeiro, or Port-au-Prince. Such an event would mark the dawn of a new era in inter-American understanding.

Another Ecuadorian who can be cited as a worker in the cause of truth in inter-American affairs is Dr. Miguel Albornoz. The latter, after a 2-year course in journalism in the Pulitzer School, Columbia University, effected an immense improvement in the make-up and content of the leading Quito newspaper, El Comercio. This organ, prior to the United States educational experience of Dr. Albornoz, had been almost violently anti-United States of America. Fortunately, the change I mentioned took place during the war when we needed exponents of the true facts in every capital of South and Central America. Dr. Albornoz, patriotic Ecuadorian to the core, insisted upon objective presentation of the news at a critical moment in history. It was no accident that Dr. Benjamin Cohen, Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations in charge of Public Information, invited Dr. Albornoz to join his staff at Lake Success, where he continues to put his inter-American principles into daily operation.

In view of the imminent visit of His Excellency President Gabriel Gonzáles Videla, of the Republic of Chile, it is useful to recall that a United States citizen, Dr. Gustave Weigel, acted for many years as dean of the faculty of theology in the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution in Santiago de Chile. In this post, Dr. Weigel distinguished himself by his mastery of the Spanish language and by his familiarity with every phase of Chile's culture. Unlike many another North American resident in a South American capital, he understood that his vocation required that he know and like the Chileans, not simply the socially conscious members of the English-speaking colony in his community.

Dr. Weigel became an adopted son of the Republic. Moreover, when World War II broke out, he was able to serve the broad cause of hemisphere defense by a lecture tour which took him to many important Latin American centers. Both by his personality and by the breadth of his ideas he contributed to victory in South America. Although now on the faculty of Woodstock College, Md., he is known as an honorary Chilean and an active figure in the inter-American movement. It was about 1 year ago that Dr. Weigel was awarded the Order of Merit of the Republic of Chile. No North American ever did more to deserve the honor. And President Gonzáles Videla, whose friend he is, would be the first to acknowledge this fact.

It may be added that Father Weigel was big enough to recognize the United States intellectual who was the first recipient of the gold medal awarded by the Pi Alpha Sigma Fraternity. As dean of the faculty of theology, Dr. Weigel recommended Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, founder of the Inter-American Seminars in the University of Habana, the University of San Marcos, and the Nation University of Mexico for the first honorary doctor of divinity degree ever granted to a North American by the Pontifical University of Chile. Since your own distinguished chairman of the department of romance languages in St. John's University, Dr. Nick Sallese, is a friend and coworker of Dr. Thorning, he no doubt could relate much more about the wartime service of this apostle of the good-neighbor policy. I myself, as a product of the Inter-American Seminars and subsequently director of the Seminar in the University of Mexico, can testify to the respect in which Dr. Thorning is held in all cultural and religious centers in the other American Republics.

It is with a sense of joyful privilege, therefore, that I accept the Our Lady of Guadalupe Medal for 1950. Relatively insignificant as my contributions have been, they have brought me to the attention of Pi Alpha Sigma. Consequently, your decision and your award may serve as an encouragement to young people throughout the Western Hemisphere who look to our universities and colleges for Christian principles and ideals of public service. As a graduate of Mother Elizabeth Seton's College, St. Joseph's, Emmitsburg, Md., and one who has been a beneficiary of the spirituality and culture of the Fathers of the Mission as well as of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, a saint well beloved throughout Latin America, I am happy to be with you today in your pan-American festivities, and to accept from the hands of your officers the accolade of Our Heavenly Mother, Our Lady of Guadalupe, whose Son is the Christ of the Andes.

The Ferguson-Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Why the Ferguson-Mundt-Nixon Proposal Should Be Defeated by the Congress," which I delivered last night, and which was broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE FERGUSON-MUNDT-NIXON PROPOSAL SHOULD BE DEFEATED BY THE CONGRESS:

Not long ago President Truman took occasion to compare the national hysteria prevalent in our country with that which prevailed at another time in our history which we all recall with shame. He indicated that the hysteria reminded him of the time in 1798 when the infamous alien and sedition laws were enacted (press conference, June 16, 1949). For a time those laws blotted out freedom in our land. What caused the enactment of these unconstitutional laws?

Why, France had gone through a revolution. The Federalist Party, then in power in the United States said the French Government was spreading revolutionary propaganda in America through paid agents, just as they say Russia is doing today. To meet these alleged dangers they passed these laws.

The Alien Act gave the President power to expel from the country any alien he believed to be plotting against the Government. The Sedition Act forbade the publication of any false, scandalous or malicious writing with intent to incite sedition, defame the Government, or aid any hostile design of any nation.

Whom do you suppose the Federalists prosecuted and sent to jail?

All of the prosecutions under these repressive laws were against Republicans. The accused included a Republican Member of Congress and the proprietors, editors, and chief writers of the Republican press.

It was Thomas Jefferson and James Madison who led the battle to wipe out these laws. Both declared the Sedition Act to be unconstitutional, and therefore null and void. In the election of 1800 this act was the major issue. Jefferson was overwhelmingly elected President. The Federalist Party was destroyed, never to reappear again. Those imprisoned were released. Their fines were remitted. The alien and sedition laws were ignored as null and void.

In his inaugural address March 4, 1801, Thomas Jefferson said, "If there be any among us who wish to dissolve this Union, or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

The principle thus stated so eloquently lives to this day in our law. The Supreme Court has said, "The very purpose of the first amendment is to preclude public authority from assuming a guardianship of the public's mind through regulating press, speech, and religion. In this field every person must be his own watchman for truth, because the forefathers did not want any government to separate the truth from the false for us." (*Thomas v. Collins* (323 U. S. 511, 545).) And Mr. Justice Jackson in an opinion, made it clear that freedom of thought is a substantial right. He said, "Freedom to differ is not limited to things that do not matter much. That would be a mere shadow of freedom. The test of its substance is the right to differ as to things that touch the heart of the existing order." (*Board of Education v. Barnette* (319 U. S. 624, 642).)

This principle of freedom of speech and press from governmental interference is the very foundation of democratic government. This is true because the people can only govern themselves, if they can get all the facts. You cannot make up your mind what you want of your Government unless you can first hear every point of view. You cannot get your Government and Representatives in Congress to know what your will is unless you are free to speak your mind; and associate together with others of like mind to further your common will.

I regret to say that these great American principles are more threatened today than at any time in our history. A bill has been reported favorably to the Senate by the Senate Judiciary Committee (with myself alone dissenting) which, if enacted, would undermine dangerously or entirely destroy the substance of freedom of speech, press, and association in the United States.

I, WILLIAM LANGER, alone, wrote a minority dissenting opinion. It is a good one. If you wish a copy write me here at Washington.

Like the alien and sedition laws these bills are the product of hysteria, of frantic, unthinking fear of ideas. Like those bills they merit the vigorous opposition of all of you who cherish liberty.

Under the guise of protecting our democratic institutions against an alleged threat of subversion from foreign agents who seek to overthrow our Government by coercive means, it is proposed by this bill to regiment the thinking of the American people and to impair or prevent the free exercise of constitutionally guaranteed rights.

It is proposed to confer on a politically appointed board vague and, therefore, unrestricted power to outlaw associations of citizens whose views and policies are considered by it to be dangerous.

If this political board of three members considered that a group of citizens or an organization supported some policies which were similar to policies supported by Communists; or they included some Communists in their group, or they failed to disclose information about themselves, they would have to register with the Attorney General as Communist organizations. The bill defines such organizations as conspiratorial agents of Moscow seeking to overthrow our Government by coercive means, and to set up in its place a totalitarian dictatorship controlled by Moscow. Obviously no group could continue to exist with that label pinned on it. Its members would be hounded and cast out as outlaws. Who would employ members of groups hounded by the Government in that way? The victims would have little chance of earning a living after their names were registered.

Yet, it is not necessary under the bill to prove that the organization or any of its members, ever did a single thing to overthrow our Government, or establish any kind of a dictatorship here, or ever had any such idea in their minds. Moreover, these people, good American citizens, likely often veterans of World Wars I and II, could suffer these awful penalties, without ever having a trial before a court or jury. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt according to our American judicial standards would also be dispensed with.

Just think of that. Talk about a bill conferring arbitrary power. Here we have it. In North Dakota, if they do not like the Nonpartisan League, they could bar it. Many people do not like the Nonpartisan League because we were successful in promoting measures whereby the State owns its own bank, writes its own insurance, and owns its own State mill and elevator, and has operated all of them successfully for 30 years. It can be readily understood why certain people do not like a political organization of that kind. Here it is proposed to give the political board power to outlaw the Nonpartisan League.

Under these vague powers trade-unions and other organizations which may seek to alter the status quo or oppose this or that governmental policy, by lawful means, with no evil intent, could be branded as traitorous agents of foreign governments or movements. Their members could be relegated to the position of second-class citizens—made subject to economic and social outlawry.

In the effort to avoid obliteration, voluntary associations of citizens would be compelled to conduct witch hunts to determine the views and associations of their members—to fear to express their views on any controversial questions, to encourage their members to spy and inform on each other.

It is proposed to punish as a crime mere membership in an organization which has failed to destroy itself by registering when ordered to do so.

It is proposed to make criminal the agreement to do any act, however innocent and lawful, which a court might find would substantially contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship.

Who can say with any certainty what agreement or act might be held to substantially contribute to a totalitarian dictatorship?

Would an unbalanced budget, compulsory health insurance, Federal low-rent housing, or the Brannan farm-subsidy bill substantially contribute to the establishment of such a dictatorship?

If some group opposes the peacetime draft or the North Atlantic Pact or huge military appropriations, can a court which considers these measures necessary for the defense of our country against alleged Russian designs, hold that such opposition substantially contributes to the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States?

What about peaceful advocacy of socialism? Would an American still have the right to be a Socialist if he wanted to be one?

How would a court answer these questions? No one can tell. The answer would actually rest to a large extent on political opinion. Our courts would soon lose the respect they now enjoy if judges decided cases on such a basis. And, under our Constitution, all accused persons are entitled to due process of law. When men must guess at the meaning of a law—if they cannot know with reasonable certainty the conduct it would punish, they are clearly denied that due process.

It is for such reasons as these that I have concluded that the American tradition of freedom could only suffocate and die in the atmosphere these bills would create.

Attempts to overthrow the Government, sabotage, espionage, treason, armed civilian groups must be stopped, and proven foreign agents should be required to register. Any forcible resistance to law should be punished. Attempts to undermine the loyalty, discipline, or morale of the armed forces should be a crime. But all of these are now punishable as crimes, or required under existing law.

No emergency can be pointed to as a justification for this departure from our great heritage of freedom. By honoring that heritage we have met all threats to our national security. While preserving liberty, we have become the strongest nation on earth. We can never hope to maintain our democracy by resorting to measures which strike at its very foundations.

In these troubled times only a people vigilant and active in the cause of liberty can hope to maintain their freedom. The alien and sedition laws were canceled because the people met the challenge. They showed how they cherished liberty by joining the good fight. May history repeat itself, and now, in time to stop the enactment of these bills.

I fervently hope that reason will prevail over hysteria in the Congress of the United States when the time comes to vote on these measures. In that case, I am confident that these repressive measures will meet the resounding repudiation they deserve.

ECA's New Strategy for a New Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, Economic Cooperation Administrator, which appeared in This Week magazine on April 2, 1950, having special reference to the second anniversary of ECA. I commented on the floor of the Senate 2 weeks ago that ECA had "perhaps the most brilliant leadership of any operating department of our Government." I was, of course, referring to Mr. Hoffman and the many outstanding men, both here and abroad, which he and his deputy, Mr. William Foster, have brought into the administration of the ECA.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECA'S NEW STRATEGY FOR A UNITED EUROPE

(The Marshall plan is 2 years old tomorrow. With two more years to go, its Administrator sets forth a new policy. Up to now ECA has helped nations to their feet; now it will get them all to join hands.)

(By Paul G. Hoffman, Economic Cooperation Administrator)

WASHINGTON.—After 2½ years in the struggle for European recovery against a cold war of mounting fury, we are, this week, halfway through the Marshall plan. Can we foresee final victory on June 30, 1952? Or, as ominous headlines sometimes seem to indicate, are we being drawn into an unending battle against communism of which no man can predict the outcome?

I am not a prophet, but I know that we can see the shape of our problem far more clearly than was possible 2 years ago when we opened our first ECA "office" in my room at the Statler Hotel here in Washington.

The vortex of today's struggle is in western Europe, where the Kremlin is attempting to wreck European recovery and to set back the European self-generated movement toward unity. Moscow knows that if it can halt recovery and gain control of western Europe piecemeal, its schemes for world domination will be given terrible impetus. Moscow also knows that failure to halt European recovery and win western Europe will block its ambition to dominate the world.

"A NEAR MIRACLE"

At the halfway mark we can look back on the strategy by which we have made progress so far and outline the somewhat different strategy necessary from now until 1952.

The first half of the Marshall plan was necessarily devoted to overcoming economic collapse within each nation, raising production and restoring the financial stability of each government. We had to start with existing economic modes and machinery.

And what has been accomplished, largely on a country-by-country basis within 2½ years, has been spectacular.

The recovery of European industry, literally built up from the rubble of World War II, has been a near miracle. Less than 5 years after the end of the war, industrial production has been lifted 20 percent above its prewar level. In contrast, after World War I in which the destruction was not nearly so bad, Europe needed 7 years just to regain her prewar level.

Hard-coal production is up 17 percent above prewar, steel, 52 percent; electric power, 21 percent; cement, 68 percent; and cotton yarn, 31 percent. Farm production has lagged somewhat behind but is now almost back to prewar levels.

Now that production is restored about as far as it can be within the existing economic framework of western Europe, we are ready to go beyond this opening stage of the struggle.

Congress has stated it to be the policy of the people of the United States "to encourage the unification of Europe." As the program has gone forward during its first 2 years, we have come to appreciate more and more the wisdom of our Congress in emphasizing the importance of this goal.

A united Europe means an economically stronger Europe. Against a strong, united Europe, Stalin and his Russian cohorts will not march.

BACKGROUND TO CHAOS

What are the basic causes of European disunity? To see the roots of chaos in western Europe we must look back even beyond the First World War.

In 1900, the American worker and the western European worker produced and lived about on the same scale. But since 1900, the United States has been growing because of our one big market and free competition across State lines. We have seen the dawn of the highway age.

Western Europe meanwhile slipped into narrow compartments. Fifty years of wars and preparation for wars, cartels, tariffs, import quotas, exchange controls and other devices of economic nationalism have choked free competition at its source—and made mass production for a big market impossible.

Last year, the United States, with 150,000,000 people, turned out a gross national product of about $260,000,000,000. Western Europe, with its 270,000,000 people, had a gross national product of $160,000,000,000.

If European per capita output had been on a par with ours, their gross national product would have been $470,000,000,000 instead of $160,000,000,000. Of course Europe hasn't the raw materials, horsepower, or other resources for production at this level. But she doesn't need to equal American per capita production, in order to get an expanding standard of living which will lift her people above the threat and wiles of aggressive communism.

The obvious need is for Europe to develop her own program for taking fuller advantage of the great potentialities for prosperity and security that lie in closer cooperation. Unless she does move in this direction, and move fast, the recovery so far achieved within the individual nations cannot stick.

STEPPING OFF ON THE RIGHT FOOT

Marshall plan countries were the first to recognize that Europe has got to attain a broad, freely trading market so it can take advantage of large-scale, low-cost production. Also, they know such economic integration will provide the means to bring the new German Republic fully into the western European family of nations—an essential condition for a peaceful and prosperous western Europe.

Integration has already started. Since last fall, the participating countries have removed quota restrictions from 50 percent of their trade which had previously been restricted. They are working to reduce these restrictions still further and have made some progress toward ending dual pricing—the system of charging one price for goods on the domestic market and up to 40 percent more to a neighbor. They took a vital step in naming Dr. Dirk Stikker, the able Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, to a new high-level post within the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) to help speed the necessary political decisions that must accompany economic policy.

Thus, the OEEC, originally formed as a means to determine how to divide American economic aid, gives promise of evolving into a permanent force for European integration. And from now until June 30, 1952, the Marshall plan will be helping Europe unify herself more rapidly. Accordingly, there will be some changes in the ECA operation.

Early in the Marshall plan, an intra-European payments plan was worked out which operated on the principle of "forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors."

Norway, for example, had a terrible housing shortage because the retreating Germans had blown up thousands of homes. She had the lumber for new construction but lacked the nails. Belgium had the nails—but Norway was out of francs.

Marshall plan credits were therefore extended to Belgium on condition that she extend an equivalent credit in francs to Norway. The Norwegians bought the nails and built the houses by last Christmas.

A BOOST OVER THE FENCE

But this plan, even with some modifications to increase the flow of intra-European trade, still left the existing currency barriers about where they were. It gave a boost over the fence but did not tear it down.

Marshall-plan countries are now negotiating a new European Payments Union which, with the help of the Economic Cooperation Administration, will help tear down this fence.

The new payments union will act as a clearinghouse for the nations of western Europe in settling their debts with each other and also, to some extent, as a bank to finance a deficit country—so long as that country is making every effort to put its financial house in order and increase exports to its neighbors.

Henceforth, each country will receive a pro rata allotment of Marshall-plan funds based on the previous divisions of aid.

We plan to withhold at the start not less than $600,000,000 from the total 1950–51 ECA appropriation, which can be available to the payments union to encourage the program of liberalized trade. Only as an effective payments union is put into operation will the full amount of the 1950–51 appropriation be made available to all the participating countries.

The United States is asking a great deal of western Europe. The steps we are asking amount to forcing in 25 months a process which might normally take 25 years. But I am not discouraged because I believe that the job can be done and is beginning to be done.

Meanwhile, there are some adjustments we shall have to make ourselves.

MORE DOLLARS NOW

In financial terms, it was the dollar gap which was Europe's trouble in 1947, when Gen. George C. Marshall first proposed the plan which bears his name. Europe simply

didn't have the dollars to buy the essential things she needed for survival, and she had no way to earn those dollars.

The dollar gap between Europe and America has been narrowed from about $7,500,000,000 in 1947 to some $[illegible],000,000,000 in 1949-50.

The dollar gap actually has a long history, and unless we take steps on our side of the water, it may persist after June 30, 1952, with results very damaging to the cause of freedom. In every single year from 1914 to the present, part of western Europe's trade with the United States has been on the cuff.

AMERICANS PAY

We have sold more abroad than we bought in return, and the American taxpayers have paid for most of the difference through a long series of peacetime loans and grants amounting to some $52,000,000,000.

I don't think the dollar gap can be completely closed by June 30, 1952, but I believe that with strenuous efforts in Europe, and if Americans are willing to take more imports, we can reduce it to manageable proportions.

Most of the gap can be closed with noncompetitive goods and services—American tourist travel to Europe, materials for national defense, noncompetitive luxuries which enrich our own lives. Yet there will have to be some competitive imports if we are going to close the gap.

Perhaps by 1953 Europe will be in a position to sell us close to a billion and a quarter dollars' worth of goods competitive with our own.

DROP IN THE BUCKET

Accepting these imports—which will be only a drop in the bucket compared with our own production in this country—will be essential to our strategy for total victory. By enabling a strong, united Europe to earn dollars to pay for what she buys we can help Europeans raise their own living standards. Thereby we can defeat communism on its home and neighboring grounds.

In buying more from free Europe we strengthen ourselves, and eventually reduce and eliminate the need for our staggering load of armaments.

If we are willing to lead the world along the better way of expanding living standards and free institutions, we can end the threat of communism.

Slavery behind the iron curtain must eventually break down as democracy in free Europe proves its greater benefits to the average man. If we are determined and unafraid, we can answer our questions about the hazardous future after June 30, 1952.

A Free Press as First Line of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Our First Line of Defense: A Free Press," delivered by Martha Rountree, director of the Meet the Press radio program, at the twentieth annual joint luncheon of the Alliance of Business and Professional Women of Chicago, and Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, held in Chicago on March 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE: A FREE PRESS

I feel very honored to be here today—I really mean it. I think you have paid me a great compliment and I hope I live up to your expectations. My invitation came from a most charming and persuasive lady. When she asked what my subject would be, the very first thing that came to mind was a free press, which I consider America's main line of defense. That, to me, is the most important issue in the United States today.

Spending as much time in Washington as I do as producer of a news program and working as an editor of a national magazine—I have become very conscious of our free press, of the importance of a free press and the dangers to it. Without a free press, the magazine I work for could not exist, because the American Mercury magazine is a magazine of opinion which never hesitates to speak out against those in power; without a free press the radio program to which I devote a great deal of my time and energy could not exist. On Meet the Press top figures in the news accept the challenge of four trained and top newspaper reporters each week in an unrehearsed, probing, on the record press conference.

The press conference is an American institution. Meet the Press brings it to the whole Nation. It is in the press conference that men in public life have the opportunity to advance their ideas informally and to champion their activities. Here also newsmen have an opportunity to exercise their right to information. They question searchingly. From these free exchanges the public gets a better insight into leaders in public life and the course they pursue.

From the center of the news front, in Washington, Meet the Press brings these exchanges to millions of listeners throughout America. Nothing is off the record. The newsmen in their questioning do not always indicate their opinions. They take different ways of digging for information. They explore the criticism others have voiced. The people being interviewed speak extemporaneously, replying to unrestricted questions. They are courageous men, ready to meet the challenge of a free press and free radio.

Through sharp questioning and unprepared answers we try to get the story behind the story—to uncover hidden facts and information for the American public. Usually we succeed in getting a story or some aspect of a story which has not yet been told. Most frequently we come up with a story that clarifies the news—which is our main objective—and on many occasions we come up with a story that makes sensational news. For example, when we interviewed Senator Bilbo some years ago, the whole country was shocked when he boldly admitted under the persistent questioning of the newsmen participating on Meet the Press that night, that he was a member of the Ku Klux Klan. His admission was largely responsible for the senatorial investigation to unseat him.

It was on Meet the Press that Whittaker Chambers accepted Alger Hiss' challenge to call him a Communist without congressional immunity. As a result of this broadcast Alger Hiss sued Whittaker Chambers for libel. The rest of the story you know—the pumpkin papers, the indictment for perjury, and finally Hiss' conviction.

I could go on citing many other instances where Meet the Press has served to bring before the public the true facts. One of the most interesting aspects of the program is the kind of mail we receive. We get thousands of letters from people in all walks of life and from all parts of the country. Among these there are hundreds which could be summarized this way, "Meet the Press is democracy in action." That, to me, shows how vividly alive the American public is to the importance of ungarnished news. Where else in the world will a man subject himself to questioning by leading newsmen, experts in their own fields? Where else can we sit down and listen to this give and take and be permitted to arrive at our own conclusions? But Meet the Press is only one small facet of our great press in the United States. And it is not my purpose to talk about my own work exclusively. But because of my work it has been brought home to me that a free press is not just a natural occurrence—not something that can be taken for granted. It is something for which we have to fight now as our forefathers fought throughout the years. At the very roots of our union lie the struggles and victories of the men who formulated our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Today we are apt to look upon the habeas corpus law, trial by jury, the Magna Carta, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, as things that grew on trees and our natural right and forget that they have had to be fought for every inch of the way and that this fight is by no means over. There are many forces at work which will whittle away and destroy these hard-won rights if we don't exercise constant vigilance.

No tradition is more sacred in this country than that of the free press. The very first of the original 10 amendments to the Constitution deals with the free press. Even before the Constitution was adopted, virtually all Americans agreed with Jefferson when he said, "Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost." Virtually all Americans agree today with what Jefferson said. Yet few things have been taken more for granted. All through history attempts have been made by powerful forces to curtail that freedom.

In the earliest years of this country, the greatest danger to a free press came from the newspaper profession itself. The American press of a hundred years ago was, with very few exceptions, unspeakably shrill and vulgar. It was chauvinistic and libelous. By its excesses, it came close to digging its own grave. But fortunately, as the country matured, the press matured with it, and developed a sense of responsibility.

The American press not only cured itself, it surmounted the threat of domination by special interests. Anyone who doubts that has only to look at a newsstand or turn on the radio. He will speedily find that no opinions are excluded. Everyone, including the avowed enemies of our form of government, has the opportunity to state his case. Liberals and conservatives, Fascists, and Communists, are all permitted to speak out and to be heard. There can be no question about it: the American press is the freest as well as the ablest in the world. It does a magnificent job in gathering and sifting the news and in presenting it to you in a way that makes the most sense. But let's not get smug about that. The press is in real danger today—in greater danger, it seems to me, than ever before. And that danger comes from the very people whose job it is to protect it: our Government officials—our powerful bureaucracy that believes it knows best what should and should not be told to the people.

Just the other day I read that there are approximately 48,000 propagandists on our Federal pay roll—a great many of these are known in Washington as PR's, in other words, public-relations experts. No matter what you call them, propagandists or public-relation experts, I do not believe the American people need 48,000 interpreters to manipulate the news and tell them what to think. The press is dependent upon that bureaucracy for a great deal of information. No one can compete with the Federal Government when it comes to accumulating information. Every American embassy throughout the world, the FBI, the agents of every department are constantly sending on-the-spot reports of importance. Too often, however, these reports are kept secret, are doctored, or released at the wrong time. That information belongs to the American people. It should be available ungarnished, unadorned by public relations experts. To delay it, to twist it, to make it more or less palatable depending upon the purpose to be served, is to exercise a subtle and dangerous censorship. And that, unfortunately, has been happening in Washington for a great many years.

On May 6, 1949, the United Press reported that the President had instructed Government officials to notify the Democratic National Committee whenever they planned to make a speech. Just what was the purpose of that? When the question was asked, the answer was that no censorship was involved, just exploitation. But why should a speech on foreign policy by the Secretary of State be put on the same level with an address to a political rally? Why should a report by the Secretary of Defense to the Nation on our defense policy be made to serve the purposes of the Democratic National Committee? All things must have a beginning—political manipulation of information is a beginning, but a party line may be the end. And a party line is a threat to free democratic institutions in America whether it be a Communist Party line, a Fascist Party line a Democratic Party line, or a Republican Party line. There is no excuse for that kind of exploitation by any political party, of information that rightfully belongs to the American people. It has been demonstrated too often that it is a short step between exploiting a speech for political purposes and censoring or twisting it for the same reason.

There was some excuse for controlling information at the source during the war. There is no excuse for it today.

Let us examine in detail the major issues of national defense. Do we know what our strength is today? Are we told exactly wherein we are weak? One day Secretary of Defense Johnson says we are prepared "to lick the hell out of Joe Stalin"—the country is in grand shape militarily. The clear implication is that we have nothing to worry about, that it is unnecessary to increase our military budget. But almost the very next day, Secretary of the Air Symington says Russia "has the world's largest army, the world's largest air force, and the largest submarine force"—and we have no sure defense if that enemy should launch a surprise atomic attack against any part of the United States.

Both men can't be right. One of two things must be true: Either someone knows the truth and is hiding it from the American people, or those in charge of our defenses are incompetent and should be replaced. The press, of course, can only report the opinion of those who have access to the facts—and it cannot say whether the facts thus reported are accurate and complete. In this instance, someone, for reasons best known to himself is obviously withholding some facts. It is no excuse to say that we cannot tell the American people the truth because we want to keep it from the enemy. If the enemy has been successful in stealing our atomic secrets, surely he has been smart enough to spy out the state of our defense. How simple the problem would be if those who knew told us the whole truth—told us how strong the enemy is—how weak or strong we are. Once the American people knew that, they would do what was necessary to place the Nation in an impregnable position. But they cannot make a sensible decision on the basis of conflicting opinions—especially when they suspect that some of these opinions are influenced by political considerations.

Know the truth, and the truth shall make you free—know the truth and the truth shall keep you free.

The problem of getting information from those who know it is by no means a new problem. It has long been with us—when we fail to solve it the results are always serious and sometimes disastrous.

In December 1941 we suffered a catastrophe at Pearl Harbor. That, and our state of unpreparedness, can be traced directly to those who were running our Government. By 1936, as we know now, our embassies and private informants told our leaders that Germany was preparing for war. They knew that Hitler was building the most powerful war machine in history. They knew that this war machine was to be directed first against Europe, and later against the rest of the world. They knew from every fact that was available to them that this country was in great danger. But they kept the information to themselves. They never gave us the facts—they gave us only opinions about the facts—often contradictory opinions, as they are doing now. While their sources from all over the world sent in a steady stream of warnings, they continued to talk out of both sides of their mouth. When President Roosevelt delivered his famous "Quarantine the aggressors" speech in 1937, it was pretty late to set the record straight. The American people had been led to believe that Europe was not our problem, that we could stay out of the mess. And when, as was to be expected, we did not react as he hoped to his speech—the administration returned to the cheerful optimism of the early thirties. The facts continued to be the exclusive property of a small group in the administration.

It is interesting, in retrospect, to look at the 1940 Presidential campaign in this country. In the course of that campaign, Wendell Willkie said: "Freedom of the press is the staff of life for any vital democracy." President Roosevelt matched this when he said that all of our freedoms "would be nullified should freedom of the press ever be successfully challenged." But both of these leaders were guilty of deceiving the people—both of them ran on a platform to keep the peace. Both of them pretended that this country could be kept out of the war. Both of them knew that it could not.

We never would have been so unprepared if the experts at the top had taken the public into their confidence, had given them facts rather than opinions, had confirmed what so many journalists had been shouting for years. We know what happened when the American people finally did learn the truth at Pearl Harbor. Their doubts and confusions were dispelled overnight, and they reacted, as they always have, with intelligence, determination, and courage.

When Germany and Japan had been defeated, however, the bureaucrats reverted to type. They once again withheld from the American people the most important information about our national security.

In this case, they withheld information about Soviet Russia. We were again allowed to develop a false sense of security. During the war and for more than a year after the end of the war, our Government fed us on a diet of pious optimism concerning Russia. Here again, the men at the top knew the facts. They knew that Stalin was not demobilizing his army; they knew that he was creating a war machine even mightier than Hitler's. More to the point, they knew that he was dealing with us as a potential enemy, not as a friend and ally. And yet, those who ran our Government fed us propaganda about the Russians, made us believe in spite of what many of our newspapers said, that we were on the road to one democratic world.

And what was the result of this deception? One result was the cry to "bring our boys home" immediately. The cry was certainly a natural one under the circumstances. We are not an aggressive Nation; we would be perfectly happy if we never had to keep a single tank in operation. And so we broke up the mightiest army and the mightiest air force the world had ever seen. We weakened our defenses to the point of near disaster. Once again, a bureaucracy had placed the Nation in danger by withholding important information and feeding us misinformation.

It seems to me that our free press, and our democracy, have reached something of a crisis. In each decade, our Government grows bigger and bigger. It has acquired facilities which no private concern can hope to match. It is the biggest employer in the country, the biggest producer, and the biggest spender. And it is also the biggest news gatherer in the country. No publisher has such a tremendous staff of experts to lean on. No publisher has such highly organized sources of inside information all over the world.

That information belongs to the American people. It should be made available to the American press, uncut and unedited by public relations experts. Withholding and editing such information is a subtle and dangerous censorship. And those officials who condone such practices have no understanding of democracy—or the dangerous game they play.

One more example of the bureaucratic censorship of important news, with its disastrous results: Consider the history of our policy in China. For years Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalists were our friends. We praised their courage and their high resolve. We helped them in their uphill fight against the Japanese. When we entered the war, they were our allies. President Roosevelt made an address in which he said: "China likewise expresses the magnificent will of plain people to resist the dismemberment of their nation. China, and General Chiang Kai-shek asks our help. America has said that China shall have our help." When he returned from the Cairo conference, President Roosevelt said in a speech, "Today we and the Republic of China are closer together than ever before in deep friendship and in unity of purpose." We recognized China under the generalissimo's leadership as one of the five great powers, gave China a permanent seat in the Security Council. Was that the whole truth about our relationship with China? Not by any means. We discovered too late to do anything about it that a secret agreement had been made at Yalta by which China was sold down the river to Stalin. From that point on, conditions grew worse and worse for the nationalist government and better for the Chinese Communists. The full force of our official propaganda turned on Chiang Kai-shek after our attempt to get him to work with the Chinese Communists. Clearly the American people were officially told a series of lies about China and the Chinese Communists, while the situation deteriorated to a point where it could not be saved. China was lost to our camp—and our State Department issued a white paper—or rather a whitewash paper. Had the people been told the truth about China, had they known what was actually happening there, they would have insisted on the kind of action that kept Greece from falling into the hands of the Communists—of that I am sure. If the Government had spoken up, if it had released the documented truth about the Chinese Communists, the whole ghastly mess might have been avoided. The American people would have recognized the Chinese Communists for what they were, and would have insisted that steps be taken to prevent their enormous conquests. Our Government kept us in the dark, and Stalin has won another great victory in the cold war.

This bureaucratic policy of censoring news at the source makes freedom of the press pretty much of a mockery. How can the

American people make intelligent decisions on any policy when the Government withholds the necessary information? The answer is that they cannot. Slowly but surely we seem to be moving into an era of government by administrators. James Burnham called this phenomenon "the managerial revolution," a phrase which refers to the making of high Government policy by an elite group of administrative experts. Whatever you call it, it presents a grave danger to American democracy.

What I have been saying adds up to this: Our security and our future happiness are threatened by censorship that is hard to recognize and difficult to deal with. This censorship withholds vital information from the American people when they need it most. Until we master this problem of censorship at the source, our press cannot be truly free—our people cannot be accurately informed—our democracy cannot function effectively.

Displaced Persons Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, editorial expressions from various newspapers throughout the country seem to give general approval to the final action taken by the Senate on the displaced persons legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD excerpts from the editorial of the Baltimore Evening Sun of April 6, together with an editorial on the same subject from the New York Times of April 7.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of April 6, 1950]

TO ADMIT MORE DP'S

THANKS to SENATOR O'CONOR, Senator KILGORE and SENATOR FERGUSON, who led yesterday's fight in the Senate for a liberalized DP bill, one of the most shamefully petty policies in recent years will soon be corrected. That is the narrow and discriminatory displaced persons law we have had since 1948. * * *

In more than 19 hours of steady work, these 3 Senators led a bipartisan majority successfully through voting on a series of amendments designed to kill any fair and honorable program and finally secured the adoption of a bill that corrects most of the inequities in the old one. Gone are the provisions that worked to exclude large numbers of Catholics and Jews. Also dropped are certain exclusive claims given to Balts and agricultural workers that had the effect of defeating the purposes of the DP program.

The time limit is properly extended from June of this year to June of next year. * * * Some 200,000 more people will be eligible under the new bill, including a selected group of expellees—ethnic Germans forced out of their homes in eastern Europe—and 20,000 war orphans.

These are all reasonable and desirable corrections, and it seems incredible that they could not have been accepted long before this. * * * At issue were such fundamental questions as these: Was this country to lay itself open to a charge of inconsistency cooperating with other nations of the world in major policies and refusing to go along in some minor ones? Was this country to lay itself open to a charge of aloof charity, giving billions in material foreign aid and declining to help actively in the desirable relocation of DP's? Were we to abandon even a gesture to an honored policy of providing haven for those who needed it? And were we to permit a small group of prejudiced and narrow men to impose their pettiness upon the majority?

Fortunately, the answer has now been given. Those who helped to clear the record deserve a vote of thanks, from Americans as well as from the DPs who will now be able to enter.

[From the New York Times of April 7, 1950]

THE DP BILL

For the first time since the question of displaced persons arose to plague the world at the close of the war, the United States is to have adequate legislation to deal with this terrible problem. It has been a hard struggle, waged against prejudice, parochialism, and ignorance, as well as against honest confusion. But with the Senate's action Wedensday night in approving the Kilgore bill, the battle has to all intents and purposes been won. The differences between Senator KILGORE'S measure as it passed the Senate and H. R. 4567, which the House adopted over 10 months ago, are not of great importance, and no difficulty is anticipated in reaching a conference agreement.

The most important features of the legislation are these: (1) It increases by 139,000 the number of DP's who may enter this country, and makes a year's extension of the time within which they can be admitted; (2) it eliminates the requirements that 40 percent of the DP's be Balts and that 30 percent have agricultural experience; (3) it shifts from December 22, 1945, to January 1, 1949, the date by which DP's must have arrived in the western occupied zones. Many more thousands of victims of religious and political persecution will now at least be eligible.

Equally important, perhaps, is what the Senate did not do. It rejected the attempt to wreck the entire program by indiscriminately opening it to the German ethnics. It also apparently refused to take too seriously the wild and irresponsible charges flung in the direction of the Displaced Persons Commission, which actually has been doing a capable and conscientious job in the face of serious difficulties. And of course it must be remembered that the employment, housing and security guaranties of existing law are all retained, even in some respects strengthened.

Certain features of both the House and Senate versions are open to criticism. But the bills are on the whole very satisfactory; and we congratulate the devoted legislators who have finally succeeded in redeeming on this question the honor and good faith of the United States.

Informational Media Guaranties Program of the Economic Cooperation Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as a result of some observations I offered yesterday about Time magazine a number of my colleagues have indicated that they are desirous of securing additional information to cover the status of information media guaranties which have been issued by the Economic Cooperation Administration. I ask unanimous consent that an ECA statement on the subject, together with an annex which provides the names of applicants and the sum of guaranties issued up to December 31, 1949, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It will be noted that applications which were pending for magazine projects as of January 31, 1950, amounted to $1,380,555. Time magazine has applications pending for $248,500 out of this sum.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—STATUS OF THE INFORMATIONAL MEDIA GUARANTIES PROGRAM AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1949

1. Guaranties issued: Up to December 31, 1949, 90 guaranty contracts (including renewals) had been made for informational media projects. The aggregate face amount of these guaranties was $2,823,291, divided among types of projects as follows:

Magazine projects	$753,765
Book projects	692,047
Motion-picture projects	1,163,539
Newspaper and news agency projects	213,940
Total	2,823,291

Contracts made in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, accounted for $1,867,004 of this total; those made in the 6 months ended December 31, 1949, accounted for the balance, $956,287.

A detailed summary of the guaranties made up to December 31, 1949, is given in Annex A. Approximately 90 percent of the total was for projects in western Germany, where there is both a large demand for American informational media and also an acute need for assistance in effecting dollar transfers.

The dollar conversions actually made by the ECA up to December 31, 1949, under all informational media guaranties, amounted to $525,421. There is naturally a substantial time lag between the making of each guaranty and the completion of all sales, collection of receipts in foreign currency, and actual conversion.

2. Applications denied: Six applications in the aggregate amount of $485,120 had been denied up to December 31, 1949.

3. Applications pending (as of January 31, 1950): Applications pending as of January 31, 1950 aggregated $10,308,152, calculated on the basis of estimated requirements for a 12-month period of operations in each case. The total of pending applications was divided among types of projects as follows:

Magazine projects	$1,380,555
Book projects	1,220,471
Motion-picture projects	7,661,626
Newspaper and news agency projects	45,500
Total	10,308,152

While it is difficult to estimate the exact amount of the guaranties which may be made on the basis of these pending applications, it is believed that the total will probably not exceed $5,500,000, allowing for a 12-month period of operation for each project. The total would include about $3,500,000 for motion-picture projects in western Germany and about $1,500,000 for book and magazine projects in western Germany, the Netherlands, and certain other countries. It is possible that a major portion of the total may be issued before June 30, 1950.

Informational media guaranties issued up to Dec. 31, 1949

Applicant	Media to be distributed	Face amount of guaranties issued					
		Western Germany	Netherlands	Australia	Norway	Italy	Total
A. MAGAZINE PROJECTS							
McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.	22 technical, industrial, and trade periodicals	$30,000					$30,000
The Crowell-Collier Publishing Co.	Collier's, American Magazine, and Woman's Home Companion.	36,600	$4,400	$2,400			43,300
The Curtis Publishing Co.	Saturday Evening Post, Ladies' Home Journal, and Holiday.	38,000	20,000			$7,000	58,300
The Reader's Digest Association, Inc.	English or German edition or both	202,000	5,620	32,500	23,000	5,620	268,740
The Yorke Publishing Co., Inc.	American Journal of Surgery, American Journal of Medicine.	3,000					3,000
Time, Inc.	International edition of Life or Time or both	243,000	36,300	27,000	44,000		343,400
Weekly Publications, Inc.	International edition of Newsweek	41,325					41,325
Subtotal		595,925	63,320	59,900	67,000	12,620	753,765
B. BOOK PROJECTS							
Academic Press, Inc.	Any books published (scientific and technical)		5,400				5,400
Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.	Any books published	9,000					9,000
Atlas Publishing Co., Inc.	World Markets Directory, World's Waste Trade Directory, World Chemical Directory (also subscriptions to World Markets, a weekly trade newspaper).	5,000					5,000
Bantam Books, Inc.	List of books specially selected by applicant (256 reprints).	21,300	5,000			5,000	31,300
Duell, Sloan & Pearce, Inc.	Any books published	4,000					4,000
D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc.	Any books published (mainly technical)	28,000					28,000
Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc.	Any books published	9,000					9,000
Harper & Bros.	do	28,000					28,000
Harvard University Press	do	11,000					11,000
Institute for Research in Biography, Inc.	World Biography, a 2-volume reference work	930		542		1,875	3,347
Interscience Publishers, Inc.	Any books published (scientific and technical)		6,200				6,200
John Wiley & Sons, Inc.	do		8,400				8,400
Nassau Distributing Co., Inc.	List of books specially selected by applicant (mainly scientific and technical).	200,000					200,000
Paul B. Hoeber, Inc.	Any books published (medical)	6,000					6,000
Pocket Books, Inc.	List of books specially selected by applicant (25-cent reprints).	100,000	12,500			12,500	125,000
Princeton University Press	Any books published	8,000					8,000
Reinhold Publishing Corp.	Any books published (scientific and technical)		3,400				3,400
Silver Burdett Co.	Any books published (textbooks)	1,200					1,200
Stechert-Hafner, Inc.	Any books published by the Macmillan Co.	40,000					40,000
The New American Library of World Literature, Inc.	List of books specially selected by applicant (25- and 35-cent reprints).	100,000	22,500			16,000	138,500
The Viking Press	Any books published	16,500					16,500
W. B. Saunders Co.	Any books published (medical)		1,300				1,300
Subtotal		598,130	69,000	542		35,375	692,047
C. MOTION-PICTURE PROJECTS							
Bookfilm International Corp.	Prints of Snow White, Fantasia, and 12 Walt Disney short subjects.	70,000					70,000
Motion Picture Export Association (Germany), Inc.	Prints of about 87 feature films and about 36 short subjects, as approved by military government.	1,093,539					1,093,539
Subtotal		1,163,539					1,163,539
D. NEWSPAPER AND NEWS AGENCY PROJECTS							
New York Herald Tribune, Inc.	European edition	160,000		7,000			167,000
Overseas News Agency, Inc.	News service in German language	31,000					31,000
The Journal of Commerce Corp.	The Journal of Commerce, Weekly Report on U. S. Business, and Import Bulletin.	5,000					5,000
The Progressive Publishing Association, Inc.	Neue Volkszeitung, a weekly newspaper published in New York.	10,940					10,940
Subtotal		206,940		7,000			213,940
Total		2,564,074	131,180	58,442	67,000	46,545	2,823,291

Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the first two of a series of three articles entitled "When Congress Fumbles for Facts," written by Lindsay Rogers, Burgess professor of public law, Columbia University, and published in the New York Herald Tribune on Wednesday, March 29 and Thursday, March 30, 1950. I think they are worthy of consideration by Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN CONGRESS FUMBLES FOR FACTS

SENATOR M'CARTHY'S CHARGES SUGGEST NEED FOR EXPERT COURSE OF INVESTIGATION

(By Lindsay Rogers, Burgess professor of public law, Columbia University)

I

Once more public opinion is shocked by grotesque proceedings before a congressional investigating committee. Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, makes loud but vague charges of Communist infiltration in the State Department. A subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee listens to his allegations, and, when it endeavors to find out what supporting evidence he has, Senator MCCARTHY cries out that the Senators on the Democratic side who interrogate him are tools of the State Department and are endeavoring to cover up.

The Senator demands that the President permit the inspection of the Department's loyalty files and thus risk the smearing of persons whose probity has been fully established. If the President refuses, Senator MCCARTHY can claim that his charges are not disproved. If the President agrees and the charges blow up, Senator MCCARTHY can boast that he, single-handed, has won a victory in a battle that Congress has consistently lost since its defeat by the first President, George Washington: right of access to executive papers when the President thinks that their disclosure would be incompatible with the public interest.

A spectacle such as this, unfortunate under any circumstances, becomes appalling at a moment when the State Department, facing tasks as delicate and important as ever before in its history, needs the full support of American public opinion, the complete confidence of friendly states and the healthy respect of the Communist bloc. Moreover, when the subcommittee concludes its investigation, any report that it makes is not likely to be unanimous. Representatives and Senators, though they pose as judges, are still politicians who are mindful of advantages for themselves and their

political parties. If, after a committee has affrighted underlings and angered persons in high places, it reports that all the smoke came from a very small fire, some will suspect political whitewash. If a committee ferrets out and proclaims wrongdoing, some will refuse to believe that there was no more and some will cry "foul."

The plain fact is that congressional investigations do not command public confidence. They are indispensable in the absence of something better, but something better should take their place. This is not only because investigations are partisan but because they are incompetent. By insisting on their right to compel disclosures by executive departments and by citizens, Anglo-Saxon legislatures have been less craven and have proved more vigorous protectors of the public weal than their European counterparts, like, say, the Chamber of Deputies under the Third Republic or the Weimar Reichstag. It is the legislature which, in Woodrow Wilson's phrase, must demand the examination of "corners suspected to be dirty" even though to draw the public eye it must "magnify and intensify the scandal." Congress must not shirk its duty. When the reasons seem to it to be good and sufficient, it must demand and secure complete disclosures.

But the business of inquiring into dark corners is not a simple one, and part-time amateurs cannot handle it successfully. Investigations must be speedy so that witnesses have less time to plan dissimulations. Inquisitors must deal with masses of factual detail so complicated that their mastery requires not only nonsensous thought in the hearing room but subconscious thought in moments of leisure. Cross-examination must be carefully prepared and ruthlessly conducted. "The many possible deficiencies, suppressions, sources of error, and untrustworthiness which lie underneath the bare untested assertion of a witness may be best brought to light and exposed by cross-examination," wrote John H. Wigmore, the authority on the law of evidence. "Cross-examination is beyond doubt the greatest legal engine ever invented for the discovery of truth."

How can Senators or Representatives be efficient inquisitors when, save exceptionally, they are able to devote only parts of mornings to the job and then must turn to legislative tasks and constituents' entreaties? They never have the time to master the detail of any but the simplest kind of case, and hence with rare exceptions cross-examination is ludicrously feeble. In the five-percenter inquiry, for example, the committee allowed counsel to do most of the questioning of the less prominent witnesses. He had not had sufficient time to prepare himself fully, but so long as Senators did not interrupt, his cross-examination was workmanlike. When Maj. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan, the President's military aide, was the witness, larger headlines were naturally in prospect. Counsel was told to take a rest, and six Senators questioned General Vaughan extemporaneously and repetitiously. At one point Senator McCARTHY said that it was unfair to the other members of the committee for him to take up so much time. He had planned on asking the junior and senior lady in the House to take over before (Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine). "I think we will continue to rotate," said Senator HOEY, the chairman, "and see if anybody on this side [that is, the Democratic side] wants to ask questions."

What a way to conduct an inquiry. And what a lack of dignity to disclose to witnesses and to the public the chief interest—that is, publicity—of at least some of those which the Congress permits to conduct in its name investigations into matters of urgent public importance. The day following his examination of General Vaughan, Senator McCARTHY had to apologize for addressing him as Mr. Maragon. The Senator also said he had mixed up two different distillers corporations. "It was not done purposely," he explained to the committee. "I just have an inexcusable habit while I am cross-examining the witness of concentrating all my thoughts and my thoughts apparently sometimes get ahead of my tongue, which is bad."

It was the House Committee on Un-American Activities, first chaired by Martin Dies, and later by J. Parnell Thomas (both happily no longer in Congress), that raised serious questions as to whether congressional inquisitors were not too disdainful of private rights. Responsible Senators and Representatives have been uneasy. The press has been critical. Bar associations have discussed improved procedures. Bills seeking to protect those whom committee members may accuse have been introduced in Congress. Reforms of procedure are certainly desirable, but my point is that even if congressional inquisitors never allowed their consciences to be subservient to their cravings for headlines and to release them from the obligations of procedures prescribed by law, Congress should still wonder whether, when it acts as a high court through the agency of a committee, it is playing this role with the sureness and competence that are essential.

For many years Senators and Representatives insisted that they were competent to draft the laws Congress passed. "I am unwilling to make the admission," cried a Representative only 25 years ago, "that if I have a piece of legislation that I think ought to become the law that I am incapacitated, that the people who are elected in other districts are incapacitated, to do their own thinking and prepare their own bills. I am unwilling to make the admission that the House of Representatives must have an expert legislative bill drafter to whom to go to draft bills."

But even the lawyers in Congress began to realize that drafting required a particular kind of competence. At first Congress was willing to authorize only a skeleton staff, whose senior members had to be trained in the Columbia University legislative drafting bureau by my colleague, Prof. Joseph P. Chamberlain. Now the National Legislature is well served by draftsmen and no Senator or Representative would dream of trusting his own skill in preparing any important bill that he hoped to have enacted into law.

Congress should now decide that it wishes investigations handled more competently. In determining the kind of agency it deems best suited for the purpose, it should look at practices in Albany and London, which never witness the abuses that are complained of in Washington. Moreover, New York's Moreland Commissioner and the British Tribunal of Inquiry are able to convince the public that they are reporting accurately on what they have found in the dark corners that they investigate.

The Moreland commissionerships have worked sucessfully since 1907. The British substituted tribunals of inquiry for select committees of the House of Commons after there was general criticism of the investigation of the Marconi scandal. In 1912 there were allegations that members of the Liberal Cabinet had speculated in shares of the Marconi Co., which was expected to profit from a contract that the Government was negotiating with it. The House of Commons appointed a select committee to investigate, but its procedure and reports were subject to criticism. Members of the committee were partisan—they protected and attacked when they questioned witnesses. There were majority and minority reports. The public was not satisfied.

Neither the Moreland commissionership nor the British Tribunal of Inquiry is a plant which would thrive in Washington's political climate. But by taking heed of the procedures used in Albany and in London, Congress should be able to determine on an agency in which it would have confidence and which would fit smoothly into the Federal framework of government.

WHEN CONGRESS FUMBLES FOR FACTS

HOW THE PROBLEM OF EXPERT INVESTIGATION IS MANAGED IN NEW YORK AND GREAT BRITAIN

(By Lindsay Rogers, Burgess professor of public law, Columbia University)

II

Only rarely do the citizens of New York State have the spectacle of a legislature investigating committee fighting to peer into dark corners of an executive department, crying that there is wrongdoing, calling for resignations and demanding information that the Governor refuses to give them. This is not because there are no situations which make the legislature wish for disclosures, or because the matters in question are unimportant. The chief reason is section 8 of the executive law commonly known as the Moreland Act.

This empowers the governor, whenever he so desires, to appoint a commissioner or commissioners "to examine and investigate the management and affairs of any department, board, bureau, or commission of the State." The commissioner can subpena persons and records and swear witnesses. He can employ counsel and investigators. The legislature assures the governor a free hand by making continuing appropriations for the payment of the commissioners and the expenses they incur. Reports go to the governor for submission to the legislature.

Since 1907, when the act was passed, there have been more than 70 commissions issued to more than 60 different persons (some served as commissioner more than once). Rarely, if ever, has the legislature been able to charge that the governor selected as commissioner a partisan or a nonentity to criticize the methods of investigation or to maintain that a report did not carry conviction. Practically all of the commissioners have been men who had reputations that they wished to preserve. They have been judges like Frederick E. Crane and John V. McEvoy; journalists and educators like John H. Finley, Henry L. Stoddard and Edward Lee Thorndike; lawyers like George W. Alger and George Gordon Battle, and public servants like Robert Moses and John H. Delaney. Such men were careful to provide themselves with efficient investigators and counsel and did not seek headlines.

Hostility on the part of the legislature has been rare. Indeed, there have been cases when legislative committees which had already started to probe matters yielded the field to a Moreland commissioner. The "absurdities and difficulties which inhere in a race to subpena witnesses and documents," said the assembly speaker on one occasion, "require us to restrict our activity." This forebearance no one appreciated more than myself, for I was then (1928) a Moreland commissioner investigating widely publicized charges of fraud in the Bureau of Workmen's Compensation. If there were a Federal Moreland Act, Senators and Representatives might in time be willing to restrain themselves in the same fashion and to wait for a report. But Congress is not likely to want a Federal Moreland Act. Nor is it likely to copy the British Tribunal of Inquiry, which I describe by recounting the circumstances under which it was last used.

During the summer of 1948 rumors began to circulate in Great Britain that ministers of the crown and other government servants had received or had been offered bribes in respect of withdrawals of prosecutions and the granting of various licenses. As soon as Parliament met in October, the Prime Minister moved that the matter be referred to a tribunal of inquiry which, under an act passed in 1921, can be called into existence by a resolution of both houses of Parliament and then has "all such powers, rights

and privileges as are vested in the high court." The House of Commons acted promptly and in a manner that will seem incredible to Senators and Representatives—without partisan debate. The leader of the Conservative opposition, Winston Churchill, counseled that until the tribunal had finished its investigation and made its report members of the House should abstain from gossip.

The home secretary appointed a judge of the high court as chairman of the tribunal and associated with him two well known barristers. Precedent was followed when the treasury solicitor put his services at the disposal of the tribunal to take such steps as they may direct him to take for the purpose of bringing before the tribunal all the evidence which the tribunal think is relevant to the inquiry. The attorney general (with two learned friends) acted as counsel, called the witnesses and cross-examined them. Statements were taken from all prospective witnesses before determining whether they should be called. The attorney general led the witnesses through their statements (which were available to the tribunal) and then conducted his cross-examination. Nineteen different counsel representing witnesses were permitted to cross-examine on evidence directly affecting their clients.

After its first (organization) meeting the tribunal adjourned for a fortnight. It did not wish to hear any witnesses until all of them had made statements and counsel had his case prepared and knew what he hoped to bring out. Following the fortnight of preparation the tribunal sat for 26 days between November 5 and December 21. Four days were allowed counsel for their arguments. One month later the tribunal made its report.

In introducing his resolution in the House of Commons, Mr. Attlee said that the Government's attention had been drawn to four specific matters but that he desired the tribunal to have wide terms of reference. Hence the resolution instructed it to inquire whether there is any justification for allegations that payments, rewards or other considerations have been sought, offered, promised, made or received by or to ministers of the Crown or other public servants in connection with licenses or permissions required under any enactment, regulation or order, or in connection with the withdrawal of any prosecution, and if so, in what circumstances the transactions took place and what persons were involved therein.

The tribunal's report—it is hardly necessary to say it was unanimous—was a document of 80 pages that made a detailed analysis of the evidence and in measured words inculpated some officials and exculpated others. The case the tribunal had heard was tawdry but fascinating. Some Labor politicians had been moving in moneyed circles that were unfamiliar to them. State controls were pervasive and irked or even threatened disaster to merchants and builders. Hospitality and presents might accelerate and influence departmental decisions when there were reasonable grounds for the use of discretion. But the story is pertinent here only to the extent that it discloses how a British Tribunal of Inquiry can carry conviction when it announces what in its view merits the attention of the public prosecutor; what for holders of public office or civil servants has been culpable conduct; and what actions have been innocently indiscreet or entirely blameless.

In the tribunal's view, two individuals who had given presents to the parliamentary secretary to the board of trade had done so without corrupt motive. A liquor merchant had made presents of wine and spirits "for the purpose of securing favorable and expeditious treatment by the board of trade for his applications for a license to import sherry casks"; and the parliamentary secretary had received these gifts "knowing the purpose for which they were made and in return for these gifts intervened to secure the grant of the licenses." From the most prominent figure in the case—an undischarged bankrupt who had gone under several names and who was subject to a deportation order—the parliamentary secretary had accepted a gold cigarette case, a suit of clothes, and much hospitality, knowing that the benefactions had been made "for the purpose of securing expeditious and favorable consideration" of applications made by any person whom the donor might introduce.

A prominent trade-union official who had become a director of the Bank of England had been offered the chairmanship of a proposed new company as a consideration to induce him "as a public servant to assist in obtaining from the Treasury, upon the recommendation of the capital issues committee, permission for a public issue of the shares of the new company." "We are satisfied," said the tribunal, "that the person in question did this in the hope of material advantages to himself, although in fact all that he received, apart from some trivial gifts, was a present of a suit of clothes." In respect of other ministers and certain civil servants who testified, the tribunal, after reviewing the evidence affecting them, expressed itself as "satisfied that there is no foundation" for allegations or suggestions of wrongdoing.

The parliamentary secretary resigned without waiting for the report of the tribunal and vacated his seat in the House of Commons. The director of the Bank of England resigned. Moreover (there may be no connection), two men whom the tribunal cleared and who were reelected to the House of Commons were dropped from the Labor government when Mr. Attlee reorganized it after the February election. The men who were blamed by the tribunal did not like its report, but there was no criticism of its proceedings or its findings from any other quarter. An efficient body had inquired into a dark corner of British politics and had closed the door on it.

What should Congress do to make its investigations more efficient and conclusive?

Support for the Economic Cooperation Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter by Mr. Bernard Weitzer, national legislative representative, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, which appeared in the New York Times last week.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL SUPPORT OF ECA URGED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

What a magnificent tonic to all Americans Senator VANDENBERG has provided in his timely and masterly letter of March 25 to Paul G. Hoffman, Administrator of ECA. The Senator said exactly what needed to be said at this time when irrationality, irresponsibility, and ignorance are guiding much of the comment on all of our foreign policy.

Whatever fair criticism there may be of the handling of our foreign affairs, there can be no question of the desirability of "going down the line" for the ECA program. As Mr. VANDENBERG emphasizes, that program (of which he was the major architect) was conceived, formulated, and has been carried out as an unpartisan enterprise. The ills at which it was directed are, in large measure, on the way to being cured as a result of the soundness of the remedy and the skillful administration of ECA. Surely it is a wise course to follow through with his suggestion that the same careful studies which preceded ECA be initiated now to map the policies which will be needed when ECA comes to an end in 1952.

But right now it is urgent to keep on with appropriations for ECA which will not hamstring its efforts. Those who are advocating cuts in the proposal submitted by Mr. Hoffman should pause, for they will effect no real savings by such cuts. Any diminution in the effectiveness of the ECA program, which has been our most successful weapon in the cold war, will cost us more than the illusory savings of the proposed cut in the appropriation. Nothing could be more welcome to the Soviet Politburo than a weakened ECA.

BERNARD WEITZER,
National Legislative Representative, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

WASHINGTON, *March 27, 1950.*

John Crown's Legacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to a veteran, John Crown, by Howard A. Rusk, M. D.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN CROWN'S LEGACY—VETERAN LEAVES AN EXAMPLE OF COURAGE AND A PLEA THAT LOVE SUPPLANT GREED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

(In 1946 a letter was published in this column from a young veteran in Halloran Hospital, a letter created by suffering, anguish and bewilderment. Last week, after 4 years of struggle, the writer, John Crown, died. His legacy to the world was an example of courage and a philosophy of life which, in these troubled and uncertain days, plead even more eloquently for the necessity of understanding than the day on which his letter was written.

(In this era of precocious technology, hydrogen bombs, guided missiles and all the additions to the horrors of war that have caused an epidemic of anxiety and tension throughout the world, this pain-wracked boy's prescription for peace among men merits thoughtful rereading.)

My name is John Crown. I am a paraplegic at Halloran General Hospital. My physical wounds are very small in comparison with my spiritual wounds. I have come back from death to a world that I no longer care for. I, who have been engaged in the great struggle to save the world from tyranny and having seen my comrades die for this cause, can now find no peace in the world or in my country.

Having lived close to death for 2 years, the reasons why there is no peace seem infinitesimally flimsy. Russia wants the Dardanelles. Yugoslavia wants Trieste, the Moslems want India, Labor wants more wages, capital wants more profit, Smith wants to pass the car in front of him, junior wants more spending money. To these, I say, is it necessary to kill and cripple human beings for these petty gains?

Anyone who thinks a human body is so cheap that it can be traded for a tract of land, a piece of silver, or a few minutes of time should be forced to listen to the moans of the dying night and day for the rest of his life.

All the troubles of the world originate in the common man. The selfish and greedy ways of nations are just the ways of each individual man multiplied a hundredfold. When the morals of the common man drop, so do the morals of the Nation and of the world.

As long as our individual morals remain at a low ebb, so will be the world. Until each of us stops hogging the road with his car, stops fighting over the seat on the bus, stops arguing over who is going to cut the grass, there will be no peace in the world. If man wishes peace again, he must return to the great commandment, "Love thy neighbor as thyself for the love of God."

Jim Farley's Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Jim Farley's Philosophy," which was carried in the Davenport (Iowa) Democrat of March 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JIM FARLEY'S PHILOSOPHY

It was a pleasure indeed, to read extracts of the address James A. Farley delivered before the Atlanta, Ga., Rotary Club. He is chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.

We have always considered Jim Farley to be one of the best informed, most reliable, and conservative of Americans, whether in the role of statesman or business man, in both of which he fits to perfection.

We can hardly forget the recipe he gave some years back for taming Stalin and the Russians. "Give them not vodka, but Coca-Cola to drink," he declared. In view of past events we fear "Uncle Joe" and his fellow Commies failed to take this sage advice.

In his Atlanta talk Mr. Farley observed that the economic prospect for 1950 was very good, and he sees no reason for any change in his optimism. He held that free trade was the key to peace, declaring that goods made in the United States are found in all parts of the world.

And, he emphasized, "American goods abroad everywhere carry with them a feeling of integrity and good faith." Giving a strong endorsement to the Marshall plan, Mr. Farley declared, "It is doubtful whether without America's aid, this world reconstruction could take place at all. When the announcement was made more than 2 years ago that this Nation was considering the Marshall plan, it was 'like turning on a light all over Europe.'"

Turning to Russian communism, Mr. Farley said the threat of the spread of this ideology may be fought with words, the atom bomb, or with trade.

The first is insufficient, the second is repulsive to us, but the third is the middle way and the one that should ultimately be successful, he declared. "Trade leads," he contended, "to an intermingling, interdependence, and understanding between peoples."

Looking toward this end, Mr. Farley concluded, this Nation should promote world trade continuously and as fully as possible, "for where American products go, understanding of what they stand for will not be very far behind."

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the first of a series of four articles on the American merchant marine appearing in the Baltimore Morning Sun under the authorship of Miss Helen Delich.

So vital is it, I believe, that our people be made aware of the situation confronting the merchant marine today, that I now ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the second article of the series, which appeared in today's Baltimore Morning Sun paper.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of April 11, 1950]

SHIP-SUBSIDY BACKERS CITE FARM AID, TARIFF—AMERICAN WAGES AND TAXES NOTED AS BASIS OF NEED, RECAPTURE RULE AS UNIQUE SAFEGUARD

(The following article is the second of a series of four by Miss Delich on the condition of the American merchant marine.)

(By Helen Delich)

American shipowners and operators are seeking additional Federal subsidies to keep them on a par with foreign competitors and to salvage the American merchant marine.

Otherwise, they say, "We will soon have a merchant marine without ships to sail." This description first was offered at the Senate subcommittee's maritime hearings by John Green, president of the CIO shipyard workers.

The increasing disparity between American and foreign costs has widened the difference between American and foreign merchant marines.

American ships cost more to operate because of higher wages, higher safety standards demanded by the Government, and taxes collected by the Federal Government.

SEAMEN'S WAGES COMPARED

American seamen's wages are the highest in the world. An American able-bodied seaman receives $226.01 basic pay a month; Canadian, $170 (before devaluation); British, $76.80 now; Norwegian, $74.50; Danish, $46.67; and French, $39.78. The overtime and penalty pay, and even a war bonus of $2.50 a day in some areas, paid to Americans are not received by the foreign seamen.

On a round trip from the United States to France via the northern route on a ship of the same size, an American operator would pay $24,201 in total wages; a Frenchman, $7,626; Greek, $7,352; Swede, $6,680; Dane, $6,190; British, $5,868; Norwegian, $5,263; and Italian, $5,647.

In shipyards the average English worker receives $14 a week.

The average American shipyard workers draw $59 a week, if he works 5 days.

American shipyard owners, however, have stated that they approve of their employees living according to the same standard as other wage earners in this country today.

ONLY ONES WITH RECAPTURE

Because ship owners must compete with foreign companies continuously, subsidies to American shipping serve the same purpose as protective tariffs do to many of our domestic industries.

However, under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, if a shipping line earns more than 10 percent profit, one-half of such excess must be returned to the Government up to the whole amount of the subsidy.

Thus ship owners are the only recipients of Federal subsidies subject to recapture.

The Maritime Commission reports that two-thirds of the operating differential subsidies have been repaid to the Government. Five of the 13 subsidized lines have paid back in full. The others are still in the process.

Last year the Maritime Commission turned over to the Treasury of the United States $330,920,330.21 obtained from subsidized lines, ship-chartering proceeds, and the sale of war-built and Government ships.

Altogether, the Maritime Commission on its war surplus has showed an average return of 65 cents for every $1 spent on a ship. The War Assets Administration returned only 12 to 13 cents per dollar.

RATIO OF ALL SUBSIDIES

The National Federation of American Shipping says that the total net operating differential subsidy payments to American ship owners have been less than seventeen-one hundredths of 1 percent of all Federal subsidies paid to business and farmers from 1934 to 1948.

From 1936 to 1946, the total subsidy payments to shipping, including construction and operating payments, was $297,018,000.

There are about 250 modern ships in the American merchant marine to show for this subsidy. All can be requisitioned by the Government at any time.

The Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation from 1934 to 1946 paid out subsidies of $9,713,012,114 to farmers.

FARM-MORTGAGE SUBSIDIES

The Treasury provided subsidies of $334,151,000 from 1934 to 1946 to banks and lending institutions which lost money on farm mortgages.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation allowed subsidies of $3,266,729,000 to businesses from 1941 to 1946.

In 1947 Norway spent $150 in operating aid to its merchant ships for every $1,000,000 of its national income; in 1949 Spain spent $26 of every $1,000,000 on operating aid; the United Kingdom spent $1.90; the United States spent 6.6 cents out of every $1,000,000 of national income on operating aid for its merchant ships.

Sweden, in computing taxes, does not limit the amount of depreciation on a ship. It can be as high as 100 percent the first year a ship begins operating.

ITALIAN AID TO SHIPPING

Italy, using a counterpart of $12,600,000 of ECA funds allotted to aid Italian merchant-ship construction, has a new law making direct contributions and direct subsidies for materials and amortization not in excess of 33 percent of the cost of the vessel.

In addition, the Italian Government guarantees 40 percent of the cost of the ship. This 73-percent total means the shipowner is required to provide only 27 percent of the cost of a ship directly. Italy also exempts from taxation all earnings from ships for the first 8 years.

The Italian luxury liner, Conte Biancamano, which arrived in New York recently, was reconstructed with $3,500,000 of ECA money. The 650-foot 25-year-old liner will operate on a run in competition with American lines receiving some subsidy assistance.

BRITISH TAX ALLOWANCES

Great Britain recently increased the depreciation allowance on ships from 20 to 40 percent in the first year of operation. On taxes, British shipowners also may carry losses forward for 6 years, so they can average good times with bad.

Denmark allows a 50 percent depreciation on a ship the first year and 25 percent thereafter.

The United States permits amortization of 4 to 5 percent per year and taxes are paid by shipowners on the same basis as any other corporation.

To give an insight into what the merchant marine means to the United States Government in tax revenue, the National Federation recently hired a special tax-accounting firm.

ESTIMATE OF TAX RETURNS

They used as a basis the nonsubsidized owners who operate 4,700,000 tons of shipping today. To keep this shipping at peak efficiency, it would be necessary to replace 235,000 tons annually for 20 years at a cost of $70,500,000.

The shipbuilding costs each year would be $54,091,000.

The following taxes would be derived only from the shipbuilding activities: On shipbuilders' profits, $2,435,000; income taxes from shipyard labor, $923,000; social-security taxes, $923,000; taxes on material, men and subcontractors' profits on materials, $1,151,000; income taxes by recipients of wages and salaries at subcontractors and suppliers, $436,000; social security on these, $436,000, and taxes on small business supported by wage earners, $1,495,000.

These tax recoupments would be $7,799,000 annually for 20 years under present conditions from the shipbuilding end.

ITEMS NOT INCLUDED

They do not include the taxes the shipowners pay from profits in operating their ships.

The accountants also point out that they do not include various other transactions which would be generated by the construction program and which would provide "substantial" Federal income taxes. For example, neither taxes on the wages of employees of suppliers of items purchased by wage earners nor taxes on profits of manufacturers and middlemen supplying the retail stores are included.

"We also made no provision for State taxes, Federal amusement, transportation taxes, Federal incomes on dividends paid by corporations benefiting from the above, or savings in unemployment benefits which result from work."

The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Maritime Commission in 1947 requested $50,000,000 to repair 258 of the best ships in the inactive fleet to be held ready to meet an emergency.

REDUCED REQUEST FOLLS

After that request was denied, they pared their costs to cover a bare minimum of 134 vessels they considered essential. Last year they failed to get the $25,000,000 asked from Congress. The issue is up again.

The predicament of the merchant marine today is a repetition of past history.

Back in the Civil War days, many ships shifted to foreign registry to lessen the war hazards and to avoid the exorbitant insurance rates. They were not permitted to return to United States registry later.

When the steel-hull steam-propelled ships were developed, the United States took a back seat in comparison with England because Great Britain was able to produce the vessels cheaper. Industrialization was advanced in England at that time and products were cheaper there.

The higher operating costs in this country did not attract private capital to shipping and the American merchant marine declined in 1913–14 to a level at which only 9 percent of our foreign commerce moved in American bottoms.

As soon as World War I broke out in Europe and the foreign nations pulled their ships home, American ports found themselves jammed with export cargo and no ships to move it.

The Shipping Act of 1916, providing aid for private construction, finally was passed, but the United States was in the war before the program was started. The ships were too late to be effective for that conflict, but the American merchant marine did grow from 8 percent of the world's total to 22.2 percent in 1920.

Various methods were used to sell the war-built ships, primarily to private American operators.

ACT OF 1936 AND WAR

However, the foreign competition was almost too much and American ships became less and less evident on the high seas. In 1930, 3 years after the passage of the act of 1936 to save the industry, this country had only 13.9 percent of the world's ships on the seas.

The 1936 legislation provided for the construction of 50 ships a year over a period of 10 years to rehabilitate the dry-cargo tonnage of the merchant marine through various subsidies.

From 1939 to 1946, American shipyards built 5,600 ships, 60 percent of the world's total. These were built at excessive costs and still were not enough to handle the war needs.

PRESIDENT'S ATTITUDE

On August 20, 1949, President Truman wrote the Maritime Commission:

"An adequate appreciation of the importance of the merchant marine to the Nation is lacking and is much needed today. Not enough of our people seem to realize the United States is a maritime Nation. I hope the Commission will take the lead in a program to correct this situation."

Despite this statement, it was pointed out at the recent Senate hearings, Mr. Truman appeared to disapprove of the requested operating-subsidy allowance of $90,000,000 to cover a 3-year period (subject to recapture through profits above 10 percent) because it was so much higher than the prewar level.

At the same time, he is recommending that the Maritime Commission—the only independent agency the merchant marine has to fight for it—be absorbed into the Department of Commerce.

Brand Names Day, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand the text of an outstanding address delivered by one of our foremost American citizens, Mr. Louis B. Mayer, vice president of Loews, Inc., on the occasion of the celebration of Brand Names Day at a luncheon in the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria, New York. I am happy to call this address to the attention of my colleagues and of the American people, because not only are Mr. Mayer's comments on the subject of motion pictures of tremendous interest, particularly in these days of the cold propaganda war throughout the world, but because the organization which he addressed—the Brand Names Foundation—is one of the most vital elements in the American system of private enterprise.

This twentieth century is an age of brands, not only in the field of motion pictures, but in practically every field of production and consumption. The stability of entire industries, the continuance of millions of jobs, of hundreds of thousands of small retail and wholesale businesses, depend on the protection of brand names.

I ask unanimous consent that a few observations which I have prepared regarding both this eminent American and the noble organization to whom he spoke be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement by Senator WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY ON BRAND NAMES DAY PROGRAM

Mr. President, the Brand Names Foundation is a nonprofit educational organization whose membership constitutes a roster of great American industries, newspapers, radio stations, magazines, and other enterprises. Looking down the membership list I was happy to see a long series of fine Wisconsin companies whose names denote quality not only in the Badger State but throughout the Nation.

Brand names day is an annual affair, and this year the occasion affords a splendid opportunity for more than 1,000 business leaders, who have, like the rest of us, a stake in the brand system, to exchange ideas and discuss mutual problems. Since 1949 the foundation has dramatized the brand story to consumers and distributors at national and community levels through a broad public-relations program.

COMBATING COLLECTIVIST FORCES

The foundation combats the collectivists in our country who would like to destroy trade-marks, who would like to destroy the brand-name system. Why?

WHY THESE COLLECTIVIST PLANS?

In order to regiment American industry into producing uniform items with uniform packaging and qualities based on the whims and the phony slide-rule notions of some bureaucratic alleged "master minds."

IMPORTANCE OF TRADE-MARKS

I am delighted that the foundation has carried on this public-relations program, because I know from my experience as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trade-marks, and Copyright Laws, how crucial the trade-mark protective statutes are to this Nation. Without these statutes a tiny minority of business pirates could steal the fruits of hard-won brand loyalties which honest, industrious Americans have put a lifetime of work and effort to build up.

ROSTER OF BRAND NAMES FOUNDATION

To indicate the broad basis on which the Brand Names Foundation is built, I should just like to include at this point the names

of the 1949-50 officers and their companies which read as follows:

Officers

Chairman of the board, Donald B. Douglas, vice president, the Quaker Oats Co.; president, Henry E. Abt; treasurer, Gavin K. MacBain, treasurer, Bristol-Myers Co.; vice chairmen of the board, Maj. Gen. Julius Ochs Adler, vice president, the New York Times; W. T. Holliday, president, the Standard Oil Co. (Ohio); chairman of the executive committee, John W. Hubbell, vice president, Simmons Co.

I should like to follow that list with the distinguished board of directors of the foundation—names which are readily identified as being among the civic leaders of this entire nation:

Board of directors

Maj. Gen. Julius Ochs Adler, vice president the New York Times, New York, N. Y.; Frank Bratcher, president Periodical Publishers Association of America, New York, N. Y.; A. O. Buckingham, vice president Cluett, Peabody & Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.; John R. Christie, Dan B. Miner Co., Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.; Donald B. Douglas, vice president the Quaker Oats Co., Chicago, Ill.; Frank M. Folsom, president Radio Corp. of America, New York, N. Y.; George E. Frazer, president National Transitads, Inc., Chicago, Ill.; Robert M. Ganger, vice president Geyer, Newell & Ganger, Inc., New York, N. Y.; W. T. Holliday, president the Standard Oil Co. (Ohio), Cleveland, Ohio; John W. Hubbell, vice president Simmons Co., New York, N. Y.; Charles T. Lawson, vice president Nash-Kelvinator Corp., Detroit, Mich.; Richard H. Lippincott, vice president Holeproof Hosiery Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; George S. McMillan, vice president Bristol-Myers Co., New York, N. Y.; Theophil H. Mueller, president Julius Kayser & Co., New York, N. Y.; Roy W. Peet, manager Association of American Soap & Glycerine Producers, Inc., New York, N. Y.; Edward S. Rogers, chairman of the board Sterling Drug Inc., New York, N. Y.; Donovan B. Stetler, vice president Standard Brands, Inc., New York, N. Y.; W. W. Wachtel, president Calvert Distillers Corp., New York, N. Y.; William G. Werner, manager division of public relations the Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; Paul West, president Association of National Advertisers, Inc., New York, N. Y.; Paul S. Willis, president Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., New York, N. Y.; Mark Woods, president American Broadcasting Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.

NEW YORK PROCLAMATION

I am glad to say that the mayor of the Nation's largest city, New York, more than fully appreciated the significance of April 5 as brand names day, and he issued a special proclamation of invitation and greetings which I should like to have reproduced in the RECORD at this point:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
New York, N. Y.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the American standard of living is recognized as the highest in the world, and is due, in great part, to the abundance and high quality of the products of our free competitive enterprise system and their forthright and responsible identification by trade-marks submitted to the choice of the consuming public; and

Whereas the city of New York, because of its pool of highly skilled workers and technicians and unsurpassed manufacturing and distribution facilities, provides a great share of our Nation's products; and

Whereas New York welcomes the representatives of the firms associated with the educational organization known as Brand Names Foundation, Inc., whose members are dedicating their conference to the furtherance of our traditional free enterprise and brand competition system;

Now, therefore, I, William O'Dwyer, mayor of the city of New York, do hereby proclaim Wednesday, April 5, 1950, as brand names day, and urge all residents of this city to support the aspirations of this vital division of our industrial life, the success of which will guarantee greater employment here and throughout the Nation.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of New York to be affixed this 28th day of March 1950.

[SEAL] WILLIAM O'DWYER,
Mayor.

WILLIAM J. DONOGHUE,
Secretary to the Mayor.

VARIED APRIL 5 PROGRAM

I wish that it might have been my opportunity and the opportunity of Members of this great body to be on hand at the April 5 luncheon. The committee for brand names day was headed by the regional manager of Hearst Advertising Service, Mr. H. James Gediman. He received able assistance from the following business leaders: Harry B. Carpenter, vice president, Young & Rubicam, Inc.; George Fotis, director of sales promotion, Remington Rand, Inc.; Ivor Kenway, vice president, American Broadcasting Co., Inc.; Albert L. Morse, vice president, Goodall-Sanford, Inc.; H. Ford Perine, director of merchandising, Time, Inc.

Of course, there were so many memorable features of the program that to mention any one might be to slight unintentionally the others. Suffice it to say, however, that one of our great American scientists, Dr. Robert A. Millikan, of the California Institute of Technology, addressed the assembly and there were many other fine and enjoyable parts of the program.

ADDRESS BY L. B. MAYER

Without, however, detracting in the slightest from those other phases, I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues to what observers consider to have been probably the outstanding occasion of an outstanding day, the address by the vice president of Loew's, Inc., Mr. Louis B. Mayer.

This great citizen certainly needs no commendation in detail on my part because his contributions to the American free-enterprise system and because his very life itself are parts of an epic even greater than any of the cinema epics which his world-famous company has produced. Here is an American whose biography is the Horatio Alger sort that would inspire any American youngster. Here is a man who has literally pioneered in the creation and development of one of our greatest industries—motion pictures. His service to that industry alone merits warm praise and appreciation of the movie-going American people, because he initiated a whole host of motion-picture techniques and programs which have since become the accepted standards and, indeed, the ideals of the industry. But, over and above his contributions to that industry, a look at the record will show that he has always more than fulfilled his patriotic obligations as an American, as has the industry itself.

These are no mere empty words of passing tribute; I assure you they are my sincere convictions which I offer publicly in justified endorsement of this splendid American.

Since the memorable day in 1907 when Louis B. Mayer opened his first nickelodeon in Haverhill, Mass., he has been the acknowledged pacemaker in a pacemaking industry. For 25 of those 43 subsequent years he has been the production head of the consistently successful Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Corp., the film producing subsidiary of Loew's, Inc.

Naturally the major elements in Mr. Mayer's comments were devoted to the crucial role of motion pictures in the twentieth century world. But I think that any American will also profit from reading Mr. Mayer's sage comments on the trade-mark system in general, because certainly, the head of the company which offers Leo the Lion—an international symbol of cinema quality—has more than an ordinary right to speak on the importance of brand names.

I also invite attention to Mr. Mayer's other comments on such subjects as the sterling American patriot, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Sr., and on such themes as the present crushing burden of Federal taxes and related matters.

Motion pictures to quote Mr. Mayer are "The most powerful ambassador of Americanism we could have." And, it is men like Mr. Mayer who are in themselves great ambassadors of the American system.

TRIBUTE TO MR. MAYER

I have in my hand the text of a very fine letter that was addressed by the chairman of the committee for brand names day, Mr. H. James Gediman, to Brig. Gen. Julius Klein. Mr. Gediman stated that thanks to General Klein's untiring efforts the annual affair acquired even more than the customary significance because of Mr. Mayer's presence. I should like to quote at this point Mr. Gediman's letter because I think that it eloquently bespeaks the admiration which his audience rightly had for Mr. Mayer.

HEARST ADVERTISING SERVICE,
New York, N. Y., April 6, 1950.

Brig. Gen. JULIUS KLEIN,
Public Relations, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I can now understand the depth of your regard for Mr. Mayer. He is a wonderful person.

It was a real privilege to meet him because he exemplifies a favorite notion of mine that "the bigger they are—the nicer they are."

His address is the talk of the town. He had one of the most sophisticated and distinguished audiences I have seen in a long time and he held them absolutely spellbound.

While the Brand Names Foundation was outstandingly the chief beneficiary of Mr. Mayer's visit, may I say that in my opinion the whole occasion reflected very constructively on Mr. Mayer personally and on Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

We are all deeply indebted to you.

Sincerely yours,

H. JAMES GEDIMAN.

Mr. WILEY. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mayer's address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOU AND MOTION PICTURES

Mr. Chairman, members of the Brand Names Foundation, it is not only a genuine privilege to be invited to join with you today, but I am honored, indeed, to be on the same dias with this great American, Dr. Millikan.

The presence here of the learned Dr. Millikan brings promptly to mind the great debt we owe to our American scientists. Surely, there is scarcely a moment in our everyday lives that is not made more comfortable, efficient, and happier, by their achievements.

But let us not forget, that without the enterprise of the manufacturer, and the creation of markets for new products by advertising, much of the advancement offered by science would remain hidden within the confines of the laboratory.

Yes, Mr. Abt; I am very aware of the value of brand names. I recall that shortly after Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer had become established as a successful studio, I made a trip

to Europe. I met all kinds of people, on the trains, waiters in the hotels, businessmen.

But they didn't seem very impressed by the name of Mayer when I was introduced. Then somebody would mention something about my connection with American films.

"Herr Mayer of the cinema?" they would repeat. "Oh yes, the Lion pictures!"

That, gentlemen, is how we became famous. We started out with a trade-mark people the world over remembered.

Yes; we of the motion-picture industry are in a brand-name business too. We have our brand names, in our trade-marks, and also in the names of our stars. These are the products we have to sell. Let us suppose, for example, that we were to advertise a picture starring Spangler Arlington Brugh, Judy Gumm, and Jeanette Morrison. I doubt if we would sell any tickets. But give these stars their brand-name identifications, Robert Taylor, Judy Garland, and Janet Leigh, and the box office would do very well, indeed.

There was a time, some of you may recall, when motion picture actors had no identity. Their names never appeared on the films Those were the days when feature pictures were only a few hundred feet long. You saw five or six subjects in an hour. Today's single feature runs an hour and a half or more. As motion pictures developed, so did the curiosity of the public. They wanted to know who the players were. And so our box office names were born. Today it is not infrequent that the title of the picture itself is of secondary importance. How often have you been asked a question like, "Have you seen the new Lana Turner picture?"

In 1924 when Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer came into being through the merger of three separate producing companies, we determined to make our trade-mark really stand for something, to be the first in motion-picture entertainment to produce the best pictures humanly possible, and to live up to our advertising. We have tried, very conscientiously, to fulfill that promise.

We know, as you do, that popular demand must be created for any product. Public appetite must be stimulated. There are, of course, popular favorites in commercial products as well as in motion-picture stars. I could not tell you why one person will walk up to a counter and ask for one brand of tooth paste while a second customer demands a different kind. And I cannot tell you why a theatergoer will walk past one box office and pay his money at another down the street. We are a people of free choice, and thank God that it should be so. And I know of no greater illustration of our system of free enterprise than that there exists such competition for the choice of the individual, be it for a brand of mattress, a motion picture, or a candidate for the Presidency.

There is a certain psychology about the brand names. I want to confess that I am a victim of this phenomenon. If you advertise a product successfully, I find myself buying it, and liking it. Some other product might be just as good, might be exactly the same, but the special brand psychology has convinced me that product is the best. Nothing else could taste as good to me.

In the motion-picture industry we believe in advertising. We spend many millions every year to advertise our pictures. We know as you do that a fine product is not enough. It must be merchandised and advertised so attractively and cleverly that it develops its own brand-name appeal.

Our problem of advertising and merchandising is made difficult as no two pictures are alike. Every picture is a fresh creation.

In most businesses when you gentlemen originate and establish a brand-name product, that merchandise is set. Your package, your ingredients, will be the same tomorrow as they are today.

To create and then introduce to the public hundreds of new and different products each year is a formidable task indeed.

But necessity is the mother of invention and our sales and advertising departments have met the challenge.

It has been said that everybody has two businesses, his own and motion pictures. Motion pictures are our business but they are really yours, too. For I am certain that no medium has been so instrumental in popularizing commercial products as has the screen. Wherever our films are shown, there are also demonstrated the products of American industry. I suspect this may be why you invited me here today.

I recall that shortly after the merger that created Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, I went to Italy to look after the production of Ben Hur which we had inherited. Upon my return to this country I stopped in Washington to see my very dear friend, then the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Herbert Hoover. He had requested my report on a question he asked before I went to Italy, could so gigantic a production be successfully made, far from its home base of supply, under the social and economic conditions existing under the Fascist regime. I had to report that it could not, that we were bringing the company back to Culver City to finish the picture.

Mr. Hoover took me to see the President. I felt very sentimental about visiting President Coolidge, especially since he was from Massachusetts, where I began my career. I was flattered, too, that anything I might have to say should interest the President of the United States. I was surprised how important he considered motion pictures. Mr. Hoover told him, "Mr. President, our commerce used to follow the ships carrying the American flag into foreign ports. Today, it follows our motion pictures."

He told the President how the fad of bobbed hair, popularized in our films, had spread throughout Europe, how the styles in clothing, the many comforts and conveniences of American life, household appliances and kitchen utilities were being demanded in foreign markets following their introduction through our motion pictures.

Some 20 years ago our gifted art director, Cedric Gibbons, tried a startling idea in home design for the settings used in Our Dancing Daughters. He called it moderne, simple, clean of line, functional, beautiful, and comfortable. Certainly a far cry from the stuffy, dust-catching type of much home decoration. Well, you know how popular moderne has become. You see its influence on every hand today. A little later, Gibbons introduced another vogue, the charming early American farmhouse sets for When Ladies Meet. I could not begin to tell you how many people wrote in for plans or how many times this particular set was copied in real life. You can scarcely go through any American community without finding a counterpart in design.

Such influence on the living and purchasing habits of people throughout the world is beyond estimate. If a motion-picture scene shows a refrigerator, washing machine, a new type of furniture, a spring style, a trinket, novelty, something new in electric razors, or whatever the product may be, the resultant demand, the appetite and desire to possess is overwhelming. You advertise. We dramatize.

We were made very aware of this screen potency when Clark Gable and Claudette Colbert made It Happened One Night. There was a scene, you may recall, where Clark Gable removed his shirt. You probably do not recall, however, that when he took his shirt off his torso remained bare. No undershirt. Well, it wasn't long before we heard the screams of the underwear manufacturers. It seems that male America was following the no-undershirt style inspired by Mr. Gable. Let me assure you gentlemen, particularly those who may be associated with the manufacture of undershirts, Mr. Gable has kept his on ever since.

Then there was our young Dr. Kildare, who discovered that goat's milk had caused undulant fever in one of his patients. We heard from the Goat Milk Producers Association. Believe me, gentlemen, I had no idea of how many thousands of people there are in this country who raise goats.

This far-reaching influence of the screen is not entirely appreciated in certain countries. There has been, in recent years, an intensified resistance in some foreign nations. Barriers have been set up against us. Must stop the showing of American pictures, they say, or their people will become too Americanized. That would be a tragedy, now wouldn't it?

Russia is not the only place where our films are barred. There are other countries, too, that do not want their people to see the happiness and prosperity of America. They want to keep their people in ignorance, so that the lies and misconceptions our enemies tell about us can be believed. The United States spends billions of dollars to help the economy of the nations of people who are still free. But what is more important than to bring them enlightenment, information, the truth about the freedom of our democracy, so that they, too, shall not yield to pressure and become enslaved.

Our newspapers, magazines, and radio do not enter these countries to a sufficient degree. But, even so, the language is foreign to them. But for our foreign markets, we see that our motion pictures speak the language of every country they are shown in. Think what it can mean to show these people how our American workers live, the automobiles they drive, their sons and daughters attending our institutions of higher education, all the benefits and opportunities that exist in our paradise of democracy. Yet our Government allows barriers to be erected against us.

Yes; it would be good business for the motion-picture industry if these foreign markets were all open to us—yes; and it would be good business for all American industry as well—but, most important of all, it is the best way to show to the people of the world what America stands for and has to offer. Our motion pictures, gentlemen, are the most powerful ambassadors of Americanism we could have. I believe it is the responsibility of our Government to send them into every nation on earth if, for no other reason, than that there are countries who want to keep them out.

I don't have to tell you of the great part our motion pictures played in the war. Ask General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, Admiral Nimitz. Ask any of our soldiers, sailors, marines, airmen, what motion pictures meant to them behind the battlefronts, on the ships, in the jungles, wherever they served. We are very proud of this record, grateful for the privilege to have served our country. Let me ask you this, what do you suppose any other nation would give to have a motion-picture industry like ours?

Gentlemen, the industries you represent here today are the backbone of our Nation's economic life. We have built together, prospered together. We have much to be grateful for, much to be proud of, and much to protect, and I cannot help but think we should take time out right now, that we put aside for the moment thoughts of business gain, and devote ourselves to fortifying the foundations of our democracy with new cement and new steel. Let us profit by the lessons of yesterday. Let us not wait too long. Let us not leave it to others. Most of all, let us think.

You remember how prohibition came about. We all laughed at it. It couldn't happen here. But while we were busy with our jobs, it did happen.

We didn't take Hitler too seriously at first either. And I am mindful of the indifference

that greeted the first warnings against communism sounded by my dear friend, a truly great American, William Randolph Hearst. He had the foresight, the courage, the patriotism. Most people thought him an alarmist, didn't pay very much attention to what he had to say about this menace to our freedom. There are many today who wish they had given more heed.

It is difficult, of course, to understand that there could be those who call themselves Americans and yet would destroy everything for which it stands. We know of children who have a beautiful new toy, how they worship it for a moment, and then tear it apart to find out how it works and to see if they can't make it better, only to find they've destroyed their prized possession. But those are children. We never had any idea there could be grown men who would do that to their country. Thank God for the vigilance of the American press and radio, that they awakened us, I hope, before it was too late.

Yes, my friends, this is a time for thought and deliberation. We must make certain our ship of state is headed on the right course, sailing in safe waters. We have seen how helpless is the mightiest of battleships once she veers from the straight channel and mires on a shoal.

Another great danger we must all face realistically is taxation. There are Government taxes, State taxes, county taxes, city taxes and taxes on practically everything that is purchased—yes—even death and inheritance taxes. The tax situation is a problem, and a very great problem, to all of us. We need the help of the press and radio to give the people the truth about who is really paying these taxes, that it is not only big business and those in the high income brackets, but everyone.

How many housewives do you think know how much of the price of a loaf of bread goes for taxes. We must show them just where, and how, and for what, this tax money is spent.

The cry today is to balance the budget by raising taxes. Keep raising taxes. I haven't heard very much about balancing the budget by not spending so much. By not wasting so much. What if a wife told her husband she couldn't do anything about balancing her household budget, unless he went out and made a lot more money? What would that husband be likely to say—or do?

We are a very fortunate people. There are few countries left in this world where exist such opportunities to be enjoyed. Only under a system of free enterprise, such as ours, could there be the constructive spirit of competition, that has provided the incentive which is responsible for our incomparable productivity. Let us guard this well, let us protect it with all our strength. Let us not be too occupied with our own individual interests that we have no time to look out for the perilous shoals ahead. It may be later than we think.

I thank you.

Radio Program for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11, 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast over the American Forum of the Air on March 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum of the Air, founded by Theodore Granik and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, which today starts its 22d consecutive year and comes to you from the NBC Theater in Washington, D. C.

Before we present our moderator, Theodore Granik, here is Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado, chairman of the United States Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Senator JOHNSON.

Senator JOHNSON. I have had the pleasure of appearing many times on the American Forum of the Air as a participant. Today I am here to speak not on the Forum, but about the Forum and its moderator, Ted Granik.

This program and its founder today observe their 22d year of service to the American people, and what a service.

In 22 years the Forum has presented speakers on every conceivable issue of national and international importance to American homes through the medium of radio and now through the scientific wonder of this age, television. I wish it were in the power of the Congress of the United States to award an Oscar, an award for democracy, an award to my friend, Ted Granik, and to this program which has brought speakers of all political persuasions squarely before the citizens of our Nation for public inspection of their views.

The April 1 issue of Collier's magazine salutes and pays tribute to the American Forum of the Air in an article entitled "It's a Radio Program for Democracy," written by the distinguished journalist and dean of radio reporters, Ben Gross, of the New York Daily News. My congressional colleagues and I join with this noted editor in calling the American Forum of the Air our unofficial Congress. It typifies to me the very best example of democracy in action. It is truly a tragedy that there are nations of this world where such a program could not exist today.

President Truman some time ago said: "Mr. Granik's program, the oldest forum on the air, has been outstanding in its field. In the finest American tradition of freedom of speech, week in and week out, it has presented to the American people discussions of vital concern."

Thus spoke the President.

To Ted Granik and to the National Broadcasting Co., which makes this program possible, I would like to convey the congratulations and thanks of my colleagues, and I feel most certainly of the American people, for a program which continues to serve the highest interests of the public after 22 exciting and eventful years.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you ever so much, Senator JOHNSON, for your very kind and generous remarks. On behalf of my wonderful staff and my grand NBC colleagues, all of whom cooperate so heartily in planning, arranging, and producing these programs, and who worry with me each week, we are all very deeply grateful to you and to the other distinguished speakers who have participated in these forums.

[From Collier's magazine for April 1, 1950]

IT'S A RADIO PROGRAM FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Ben Gross)

Several weeks before VJ-day Theodore Granik, founder and moderator of the American Forum of the Air, scheduled a debate on the subject What Should We Do With Japan After We Win the War? Setting August 14 as the date for the broadcast, Granik called the State Department to see if it would furnish one of the debaters.

Less than an hour later Under Secretary of State Joseph Clark Grew telephoned Granik and asked him to come to his office at once. "If that program goes on," Grew confided, "you might embarrass certain negotiations now in progress. It would be particularly bad if one of your speakers offended the Japanese Emperor."

Granik, of course, promptly canceled the debate. At the same time, he became privy to one of the greatest bits of inside information of the time: That negotiations were under way for Japan's surrender, and that with the surrender Hirohito would remain on his throne.

This is not the only occasion on which Granik, a genial, balding 6-footer with a perennially naive expression, has been a party to Washington's top secrets. His forum, oldest show of its kind on the air, now heard and seen weekly on the NBC radio and television networks, has regularly floated trial balloons for critical changes in administration policy and has provided both "ins" and "outs" with a sounding board on which to test public sentiment on major issues.

Thus, it was that Marvin McIntyre, secretary to President Roosevelt, phoned Granik to suggest "an interesting show"—a discussion of the possibility of swapping some old United States destroyers for British bases. Granik complied with this suggestion, which was made before Roosevelt formally presented his destroyers-for-bases proposal to Congress, and the thousands of letters which poured in from listeners added to F. D. R.'s assurance that most Americans would favor the swap.

Because more than 90 percent of the membership of Congress has appeared on the forum, it is known on Capitol Hill as "the unofficial Congress of the United States." It is the only broadcast reprinted each week in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Cabinet members have also appeared on the program, as have leaders of industry and labor, President Roosevelt when he was New York Governor, and President Truman while he was Senator.

In the forum's 22 years, the transcripts of its debates have piled up into a lively political history of the times. From the Hoover-Smith campaign to the Truman administration, hardly an issue of public controversy has gone unaired on the program. In 1928 forum debaters were threshing out "Should We Have Joined the League of Nations?" In the early thirties, "Is the NRA a Menace?"; several years later, "Is Appeasement the Right Policy?"; in 1944, "What To Do With Germany;" and, by last year, "The Welfare State."

The American Forum of the Air came into being accidentally. In 1925, Granik, Brooklyn-born son of a dry-goods store owner, was attending City College and at the same time working as secretary to Lee Adam Gimbel, vice president of Gimbel's Department Store. On the store's eighth floor the Gimbels had set up a small radio station, WGBS, mainly as a curiosity to lure customers to the piano department hard by. Ted was soon spending more of his time at the studio than at his secretarial duties, writing minstrel shows and filling in with Bible reading when a performer failed to show up.

While still at WGBS, he began to study law at night at St. John's University. His mind torn between Blackstone and Marconi, he finally persuaded members of the St. John's faculty to launch a weekly program called Law for the Layman, a discussion of legal topics in popular language, over the Gimbel station. The program was set up with the young law student as moderator, and such was its success that when WGBS was sold, Granik was invited to bring his show over to WOR.

At that time the repeal of prohibition was one of the most bitterly contested issues of the day. Granik invited Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, to discuss the legal

aspects of the problem. Mrs. Ella Boole, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, read an announcement of this in the papers and immediately demanded air time to answer. "Why don't you put her on with us?" Ted suggested to WOR executives. "It might make a hot show."

It was then almost unheard of to permit a speaker on a controversial issue to go before a microphone without a carefully censored script. But Granik's was an ad-lib program.

After considerable argument, and despite Mrs. Boole's reputation for rhetorical vitriol, the station's bosses agreed.

The youthful moderator strove mightily to preserve some semblance of order, but a rough-and-tumble soon ensued. Mrs. Boole grew so excited that when she reached for a glass of water her hands trembled and she drenched herself. Madder than a wet hen, she let go with an astounding charge. She informed her listeners that some of the highest Government officials in Washington were such scofflaws they had built subterranean passages between their offices and nearby speakeasies.

Mrs. Boole's accusation hit the front pages and inspired hundreds of editorials. With the blessing of WOR, Granik's program became a regular forum for the presentation of both sides of public issues.

DEFICITS MET FROM LAW PRACTICE

Granik estimates that during the past 22 years he has dug into his own pocket for more than $250,000 to carry on his show, pointing out that the weekly stipend paid him for the program has not sufficed to meet expenses. He has been in a position to foot the difference because of the handsome yearly income he nets from his law practice, with which he kept up during the years that the forum was advancing to national fame.

From 1934 to 1937, Granik served as assistant district attorney to New York County and from 1937 to 1941 as counsel of the United States Housing Authority. In 1941 he was civilian aide to Maj. Gen. Lewis Hershey, head of the draft, served as special adviser to Donald Nelson on the War Production Board, and after the war contributed his services to the Belgian Government. Through his contacts with Washington officialdom, he was able to cut red tape and rush relief to that distressed nation, for which he recently received one of its highest awards.

Today Granik has law offices in both Washington and New York, acting as legal adviser on Government matters to banks, steel companies, steamship lines, and other large industrial and financial outfits. But the forum remains the major interest of his life. He and a staff of secretaries, researchers and clerks devote as many as 50 hours a week to planning the program.

Granik's preparations for his show also include the buttonholing of Senators and Congressmen in the Capitol dining rooms regarding topics to be discussed. He entertains them on his yacht on the Potomac and relentlessly pursues them via long-distance telephone to all parts of the country and sometimes even to Europe.

Granik, whose long-distance bills average around $2,000 a month, is regarded as such a good customer of the telephone company that once last year, when he was abed with pneumonia, a Washington phone supervisor called in great concern, saying: "We're worried about you. Two days have passed and you haven't made a single long-distance call."

Despite the financial licking Granik has taken in his broadcasting activities, he has been amply compensated in other ways. His show is a past winner of the George Foster Peabody award, regarded as the Pulitzer prize of radio. And Harry S. Truman himself, while Vice President, in 1945 paid tribute to the forum for its adherence to the finest traditions of American free speech.

It was in 1937, when Granik moved the broadcast from New York to Washington, that it began to attract national attention. Many Congressmen and Senators were at first reluctant to appear, fearing the program's ad-lib format and off-the-cuff debate, which permitted no prepared script save for each speaker's 1-minute opening statement.

But when word got around of the surprisingly large mail response received by Congressmen who had ventured onto the show, Capitol Hill hesitancy vanished. First a mere trickle of legislative eloquence flowed into the National Press Club auditorium and later to the Shoreham Hotel, where the broadcasts were staged. Then it became a flood. By 1941 all doubts had disappeared. In that year, a debate on lend-lease, in which Senator C. Wayland Brooks, of Illinois, argued for the negative, brought him 18,000 letters.

Today, the forum broadcast and telecast stems from the Wardman Park Hotel, and draws an audience comprised in good part of Government officials. The procedure of the program is simple: Each debater delivers a brief prepared statement. From then on it's give and take. Next come questions by the audience, and finally 1-minute summaries by the participants.

On the whole, Granik has successfully maintained decorum during the frequently torrid discussions. Sometimes, however, the partisan or personal emotions of the participants prevail.

During the Roosevelt era, for instance, Senator Sherman Minton of Indiana, now on the Supreme Court, debated the rights of labor with Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN of Michigan. In the heat of debate, HOFFMAN resorted to name calling. Minton became so enraged that he lifted his opponent from the floor and was about to hurl him into the audience. With frantic cries of "Shay, Shay" (the Justice's nickname) Granik managed to stop him.

The late Gen. Hugh Johnson, NRA boss and a man of easily aroused temper, lost patience with his forum opponent, Senator CLAUDE PEPPER of Florida. The fiery soldier, no longer willing to rely merely on his corrosive vocabulary seized the mike and tempted to hit PEPPER on the head. Granik again played referee and the discussion proceeded to an orderly end.

Such sensational outbursts are, of course, the exception. Usually the forum debate runs a lively but dignified course.

Government leaders, aware of this, often use the forum to tee off headline news on major changes in policy. January 1949 provided such an instance. The night before President Truman delivered his state of the Union message to Congress, one of its most important points was revealed to forum listeners by J Howard McGrath, then chairman of the Democratic National Committee, during the debate with Senator ROBERT A. TAFT. McGrath made it plain that the President would ask authority for stand-by price controls and allocation of scarce materials.

Occasionally, top officials go out of their way to seek debate with more caustic opponents of the administration. Not so long ago Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer had Granik book him against Henry A. Wallace to argue on How Can We Keep America Prosperous?

Wallace refused to speak in any place which barred Negroes, and so the broadcast took place in the Department of Commerce auditorium. The debate was a tense one. The climax came, when, according to the transcript, Wallace said "* * * the reason I am on this program is to try to needle this depression—needle this administration—into taking action which will prevent that depression."

Sawyer snapped, "You were right the first time."

Wallace angrily demanded the withdrawal of that remark. Sawyer deliberately removed his glasses and pugnaciously announced he wasn't taking anything back. "The guilty flee where no man pursueth," he added.

Once during the Presidential campaign year of 1948 an unexpected news development forced Granik to change a topic already booked for airing. As on other occasions, he was thereby tipped off to a big "secret." But, this time, like most Washingtonians, he did not take much stock in the accuracy of the tipster's information.

AN UNWISE CHOICE OF TOPIC

At the suggestion of Congressman HUGH SCOTT, then chairman of the Republican National Committee, Granik had lined up for the week after election a discussion on "What Will Be Dewey's Policies?" He telephoned Democratic Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY in his home State of Wyoming, asking him to participate in the program. O'MAHONEY refused. "I'll be glad to go on your show, Ted," he said, "but not with that topic. There are some strange winds blowing out here, and I tell you right now that the election is going to surprise a lot of people."

O'MAHONEY did appear on the scheduled date—to discuss the meaning of the surprising political upset.

The GOP chairman, on the other hand, had a melancholy look as he reported for the broadcast. Calling O'MAHONEY aside, he said, "Just before coming here, I stopped at my headquarters for a few minutes. The boys and girls up there are so gloomy that even the china elephant on my desk is dropping his tail between his legs."

O'MAHONEY offered the proper condolences and SCOTT continued: "Do me a favor, will you? Don't become offended if tonight I become overaggressive. I want to use this broadcast as a pep talk to my fellow Republicans."

As Granik recalls it, "We had a humdinger of a show."

One of the virtues on which Granik prides himself is his absolute impartiality as a moderator. "Naturally, I have my own opinions," he says, "but I challenge anyone to know what these are from my conduct on the air. I bend backward to assure both of my speakers an equal hearing.

"The importance of this was impressed on me during my early years in Washington. One evening, Marion Martin, then assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee, came to our studio with a stop watch, a pencil, and a pad. She used these all during the early portion of our broadcast. Later, she told me that she had suspected me of partiality for the Democrats. But she soon quit her checking up when she found that during the first portion of the program she, as Republican spokesman, had actually consumed more time than her Democratic opponent. Of course, this was evened up during the latter part of the show."

One of the most important ways to preserve impartiality, according to Granik, is to match speakers of equal debating ability. Often a certain Congressman or Senator will suggest that he would like to debate another. But Granik never pits them against each other, unless he's certain they're in the same class as speakers.

Sometimes a public orator has a poorer opinion of his abilities than Granik has. Some years ago, Martin Dies, of Texas, then chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, was scheduled for a debate with Morris Ernst, the New York lawyer representing the American Civil Liberties Union. Although Ernst has a reputation as a formidable antagonist, Granik felt that Dies could make a good showing.

On the evening of the broadcast, Congressman Dies sent a substitute speaker. His excuse was that he had a communicable illness. The sub proved no match for Ernst.

The next evening, as Granik tells it, he ran into Dies at a party. "Thought you were in quarantine," said Ted.

"I fooled you!" Dies winked, and confessed that he had decided it was the better part of valor to forgo a session with Ernst.

"It's the only time a congressional speaker has ever run out on me," Ted says.

MRS. LUCE WAXES EMOTIONAL

One of the most troublesome problems of a moderator is the speaker who insists on interrupting the opposition. Former Congresswoman Clare Boothe Luce, during an argument with the Communist leader, William Z. Foster, on "Communism Versus Democracy," was so eager to refute his statements that she broke into almost every sentence he uttered. She waxed so emotional that Granik had to grasp her gesticulating arm in order to bring her under control.

"But Clare is a wonderful speaker to have on a forum," Ted adds. "She has such zest—and what an ad-libber." He recalls a debate in which she was paired with William B. Ziff, the publisher, against Admiral Jerry Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, and J. Carter Forte, general counsel of the American Association of Railroads. The Connecticut Congresswoman brought down the house with her crack to Bill: "You take the Land, Bill, and I'll hold the Forte."

Granik frowns on his debaters smoking during the broadcast. Not that he has any prejudice against tobacco. It's just that he remembers what happened to Congressman Sam Hobbs.

"A crackajack speaker," says Ted, "but he lost out in one debate because of his deliberate manner while smoking. His opponent would fire a question at him and before Sam could remove his pipe from his mouth, his antagonist had already started answering the questions he himself had asked."

Some of the most dramatic developments in the program's long history have been the several occasions when forum speakers have actually converted their opponents while the program is on the air. Clarence Streit, head of the Union Now movement, had the satisfaction of converting an isolationist Congressman during a broadcast. On another occasion, Mrs. Irving Berlin shamed a woman opponent into resigning from the America First Committee.

His 22 years of experience with nationally famous political figures have given Granik some emphatic ideas about public speakers and their complex art. Basing his judgments on the showings they have made on the forum, he names among the best debaters of these times Norman Thomas, the Socialist leader; Senators ROBERT A. TAFT, CLAUDE PEPPER, and OWEN BREWSTER; Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan, and former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes. "Senator Taft is not only an outstanding debater," Ted says, "but, contrary to general impression, also a talented ad-libber."

The famous names which have appeared on the Granik show have provided him with a unique file of historical footnotes on oratorial mannerisms.

TRUMAN THE PERSISTENT ONE

Of President Truman, Granik reveals, "The one quality I recall about him as a forum speaker is a certain bulldog-like plodding ahead despite opposition. As a Senator 11 years ago he debated on America's railroad problem speaking on behalf of a bill he had sponsored with Senator Burton K. Wheeler to reorganize railroads in financial difficulties. And he simply refused to budge in his arguments.

"Incidentally, when Mr. Truman was Vice President, I phoned him one Sunday afternoon. He was his usual homey self. He said, 'Ted, what are you doing? The Mrs. and Margaret have gone out. I'm sitting here in my dressing robe; so why don't you come over and we'll "schmoose" awhile?'

"President Roosevelt, who spoke on our program while he was Governor of New York, impressed us with his ease of manner and the way he marshaled his facts into line. His written script for his formal opening statement on the forum taught me many things. For example, I noticed that he placed just one thought on each page and that his words were underlined for emphasis and for pauses.

"Mayor LaGuardia of New York City was one of the most vivid speakers our show has ever presented. He had quick, lightning-like movements and grimaced without inhibition."

Granik has formulated his own commandments for public speakers. He advises making speeches short, using down-to-earth language, translating abstract arguments into terms of common experience, avoiding statistics as much as possible, and, above all, keeping your temper regardless of how much your opponent needles you.

Granik confesses that although he has been on the air for 22 years, he himself has yet to master all these precepts.

But for a boy from Brooklyn, he has done all right nonetheless. In the swank Westchester Apartments, near the Washington Cathedral, where he lives with his wife and two children, William, 12, and Marion, 8, virtually every householder is a Senator, Congressman, Cabinet Member, or other high Government official. Granik hobnobs with them and has become a Washington celebrity in his own right.

Recently he invested $50,000 in an FM radio station, WHMB, representing the initials of his wife and youngsters. But it is safe to say that the forum will remain the great love of his life. Granik devoutly feels that the show furthers the democratic way of life because it brings to the public the livest topics of the day discussed by leading legislators and enables the people in the studio audiences to question them face to face.

"It give me," he happily confides, "the consciousness of participating in the making of history."

Shadow of the Censor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Shadow of the Censor," which was published in the Washington Post of today. The editorial relates to radio broadcasting.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHADOW OF THE CENSOR

A hearing of great importance to the radio industry and the public has recessed in California. It involves charges of bias and news-slanting against George A. Richards, the owner of KMPC in Los Angeles and two other powerful radio stations. Three former employees of Mr. Richards charge that he ordered them to distort and color the news so as to discredit some individuals and groups and to reflect credit upon others. Since the Federal Communications Commission has no powers of censorship, the issue boils down to whether or not the licensee is a fit person to operate radio facilities subject to regulation in the public interest.

Of course, no broadcaster is free to operate his station, using public facilities, solely as he may see fit. In the broad sense of the word he must serve the public interest or give way to someone else who can. But the public interest thus to be served necessarily has a very broad meaning. The FCC is not at liberty to put a broadcaster off the air because it may disagree with his viewpoint or because he may fall short of perfection in the management of his broadcasts. The history of broadcasting in this country shows relatively few abuses of the freedom that Congress has granted to the licensees in shaping their own programs. That record is not such as to warrant the disciplining of broadcasters by the back-door method of finding them unfit persons to operate a radio station, unless their activities fall hopelessly below the minimum standards of public service.

If the Silver Shirts, the Communist Party, the Ku Klux Klan, or a gang of outlaws were operating a broadcasting station to further their own interests, there would be no question about the necessity of withdrawing their license. But these are extreme cases. It would be a very different matter for the FCC to undertake to discipline a broadcaster because of the manner in which he "played" the news. If Mr. Richards should be put off the air for trying to slant the news against the persons and groups that are anathema to him, where would such a policy end? To be consistent the Commission would then have to withdraw the licenses of stations slanting the news against other political figures and organizations. We do not believe that the Commission has any standards that would be a safe guide in such a venture, and if it did, the enforcement of such a policy would go seriously against the grain of our traditions.

Every decision as to what shall go on the air and how it shall be "played" is likely to be influenced by the broadcaster's or the newscaster's prejudices. The best radio stations and the best newspapers hold these prejudices in check, struggling for fair and unbiased presentation of the facts. But it is common knowledge that slanted newspapers flourish, presumably because the people wish to read them. Would it be feasible for the Commission to put off the air a broadcaster catering to prejudices that were common with big metropolitan dailies in the same city? To be sure, the number of broadcasting channels is limited, but so are the opportunities for publication of a daily newspaper. We doubt that the FCC can apply stricter policies in the regulation of broadcasting than the press generally applies without taking upon itself an unmanageable problem of censorship. The public interest demands a wide range of freedom on the air as well as in the press. The danger of the FCC embarking upon a policy of censorship seems to us much greater than the occasional abuse of freedom by licensees whose prejudices color their judgment.

The National Hymn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a letter signed by several young people from Indianapolis regarding a proposed change in the name of the national hymn.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *March 30, 1950.*

DEAR SENATOR JENNER: Our fifth grade class, room 24, school 70, Indianapolis, Ind., would like to have our national hymn, not our national anthem, but our national hymn, changed from America to America the Beautiful.

America is originally an English tune, God Save the King.

America the Beautiful describes our Nation very well. If you could see Warner Bros. picture America the Beautiful I think you would agree.

Many other Americans feel just the same as we do.

You, as our Senator, could give this idea a great boost.

Sincerely,

Tom Reilly, Harry Jennings, Alice Broadbent, Tom Osborne, Barbara Shook, Nancy Fowler, John Brennan, Douglas Branch, Charles Allen, Jim P., Douglas Burns, Gary Williams, Jimmy Fiege.

Here Is an Accomplished Fact—Not Hope, but History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, statistics are not always dull and uninteresting. Some tabulations which I want to furnish herein contain a thrilling story of man's conquest of nature in converting deserts into gardens. Since my great interest and duty in national legislation is to promote the cause of reclamation, it might be assumed that I have in mind at this moment some future reclamation project. Not so. Just now I want to tell you very briefly in recorded statistics the last 10-year story of one of the oldest reclamation projects in the West. In other words, this is what happened in Yuma County, Ariz., instead of what we might hope will happen.

More than a third of a century ago enterprising farmers in Yuma County, Ariz., began to develop farm lands along the Arizona portion of the Yuma Valley below the town of Yuma, extending southward to the Mexican border. The United States Bureau of Reclamation developed their project. The Laguna diversion dam was built on the Colorado River a few miles above Yuma, and water for the project was diverted from the Laguna Dam and carried in a canal on the California side of the river, because the physical obstructions were less on the west side at that point than on the Arizona side. The canal came down opposite the city of Yuma and was brought under the Colorado River through an inverted siphon. In this way, water was brought to about 45,000 acres of desert land in the extreme southwestern corner of the State of Arizona in Yuma County. The project is known as the Yuma Valley project and is one of two Federal reclamation projects in Arizona which have been very successfully functioning more than a third of a century.

According to official reports, the average gross crop value per acre on this project has been greater than any other project in the entire Pacific Southwest. To illustrate, in the year 1948 the average gross crop production per acre on that project was a little over $300. While I do not have the record on this project for 1949, it is known to be correspondingly high. What is the reason for this phenomenal yield? Undoubtedly it was because of a fortunate combination of rich soil, plenty of water, and, above all, a climate furnishing the very best possible growing season throughout 12 months of the year. It happens that specialty crops, not of a competitive nature, are grown in this area. Such crops as may be said to be moderately competitive, as, for instance, head lettuce, are carefully timed for the produce to be ready for the market on a time schedule that will not bring such produce into competition either with the Imperial Valley in California or the Salt River Valley in Arizona. Thus, these three great garden spots in the Pacific Southwest grow their produce almost by the stop watch so that the produce is not harvested simultaneously from the three, but harvested tandemlike, in order that the market demand will be greatest.

Another reason why the gross crop production is so remarkably high is that this area is a veritable hothouse or sun parlor, not glassed in. During the six cooler months which are called winter, valuable seed is grown and harvested early in time to produce quantities of seed for seed markets to be used in other areas during the following 6 months. Perhaps no equal area in the country produces such great quantities of seed as does the Yuma Valley. Naturally, such seed brings higher prices than could otherwise be obtained. Below is a tabulation showing cultivated acreage, gross crop value, gross crop value per acre, and the gross crop value annually per acre-foot of water used:

Data on Yuma Valley, Ariz.

Year	Cultivated acreage	Gross crop value	Gross crop value per acre	Gross crop value per acre-foot of water
1939	44,493.00	$2,014,952.00	$45.29	[illegible]
1940	44,445.00	1,971,604.00	44.36	10.46
1941	45,027.00	3,363,280.00	74.19	19.17
1942	45,567.00	5,646,638.00	124.41	29.48
1943	45,682.00	8,487,630.00	185.88	42.84
1944	45,077.00	6,682,266.00	148.24	38.31
1945	44,765.00	6,811,119.00	152.16	38.14
1946	45,700.00	10,379,312.00	227.12	44.82
1947	45,435.00	12,600,027.00	277.32	56.94
1948	46,265.00	13,971,371.00	301.90	59.56
Total	453,034.00	71,950,208.00	1,580.96	[illegible]
Average	45,303.40	7,195,020.80	158.10	32.10

I cannot study this tabulation and view the amount of wealth created by a given quantity of Colorado River water without extreme regret that about 40 times that amount of water during the same 10-year period flowed past Yuma, Ariz., without being used and was wasted in the Gulf of California. Was that tragic fact because there was no other land on which the water could have been used? No; that was not the cause. There were 10 times that many acres of just the same kind of land in the State of Arizona that might have produced the same aggregate wealth if 10 times that amount of water had been put upon such land—but why speculate? It is useless to cry over spilled milk. However, it is not necessary to spill some more milk because some has already been spilled. The thing I want to emphasize is the sobering fact that 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 acre-feet of water have been flowing, are now flowing, and may continue to flow for a good many years to come, past this very spot without being used, only to be wasted in the Gulf of California unless Congress wisely acts.

The Road to Nowhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the March 18, 1950, issue of America, a national Catholic weekly review, entitled "The Road to Nowhere." This article presents an analysis of the book entitled "The Road Ahead" by John T. Flynn.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROAD TO NOWHERE

A physician has sent us a paper-covered edition of John T. Flynn's book, the Road Ahead. He probably got a mailing from the Committee for Constitutional Government, according to official report the second most expensive lobby in Washington.

The mailing of February 9, for example, To All Dentists—A Call for Action Now, urged the immediate distribution of five enclosed postcards entitled "If You Want To Stop Socialism in U. S. A." If you want to stop socialism (most good people do) you will buy, preferably in bulk orders, John T. Flynn's book at the special February-March introductory price of 50 cents per copy on orders of two or more from the Committee for Constitutional Government. Hundreds of doctors have purchased as many as 25, 50, and 100 copies, some 5,000 in all. One Indiana surgeon bought 1,100 copies. * * * The Oregon State Medical Association purchased 8,000 copies for distribution to individuals across the State.

The Road Ahead, a book whose significance has been compared to the written Word of God, has a chapter on the "Kingdom of God" (quotes are Mr. Flynn's, presumably as evidence of his sense of irony). Protesting, too much, that "this is not an attack on religion or on any organized church," he sets himself to expose the organization of a clique of Christian ministers and laymen to poison the minds of the Christian churches in America with the principles of radical socialism.

Mr. Flynn fearlessly supplies immediate identification of this portentous democratic. It is the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, described five pages further on in the same book as "the greatest religious lay body in America," an organization of 25 Protestant denominations, representing 142,354 local congregations with a membership of 27,000,000.

Mr. Flynn disapproves to use a euphemism—of the pronouncements of the Council on social and economic questions. He really disapproves of the efficiency of any religious group in impugning the sanctity of the uncontrolled capitalism he advocates. His explicit indictment is tamer and slacker than that, of course. The Federal Council is beguiling simple pious Protestants into socialism. Mr. Flynn documents his case—in part by a quotation from the Council's Social Creed of the Churches that is simply not in the document. The author of The Road Ahead courteously acknowledges in a footnote that he took the misinformed quotation from a book by Carl McIntire, the unfrocked Presbyterian minister, a promoter of the superfundamentalist American Council of Christian Churches, who went to Amsterdam to steal the headlines from the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches and to Bangkok to disrupt the International Missionary Council Conference.

Such fervid advocacy is pure Manchuerism. There is the same pretense of impressive documentation, the same subtle selectivity of sources, the same ill-concealed resentment of any expression of the social role of religion. Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, general secretary of the Council, is prepared to supply on request (address: 297 Fourth Avenue, New York City, 10) a detailed answer to the "misunderstandings, misrepresentations, and falsities" in Mr. Flynn's chapter. Dr. Cavert's conviction that Mr. Flynn's background unfits him to write "about a field with which he is wholly unfamiliar" should serve as a caution to Protestants gulled by Paul Blanshard's seeming knowledge of Catholicism.

Mr. Flynn's genial lumping together of England and Russia as equally socialist, his insistence that we must stop spending money on "What we are told is a 'cold war,'" manifests a mentality confidently awaiting word of McKinley's election. Mr. Flynn is hardly to be thanked that he strangely omitted quotations from Catholic sources on economic and social problems of the day. Perhaps he anticipated the judgment, say, of the Rev. George G. Higgins, assistant director of NCWC's social action department, who tagged The Road Ahead as "the most emotional, illogical, inaccurate, and probably even libelous book which we have ever been foolish enough to purchase."

Policies of the Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from a businessman in Indiana which appears to me to be a masterpiece of satire on the foolish policies pursued by the Department of Agriculture in its destruction of perishable foodstuffs.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEYMOUR, IND., *March 25, 1950.*

The Honorable WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENNER: I am in the furniture business and am writing this letter to request that you obtain for me a subsidy on our platform rockers. We are now making about a thousand a year and are eager to step this production up to 50,000 as soon as possible. With so many people in the country getting rockin'-chair money we feel that the market is unlimited for our product. Since you are voting money for potatoes, cotton, tobacco, railroads, aviation, and many other industries I see no reason why we in the furniture business should be slighted. Now we would like a guaranteed price of $50 each for these rockers. In the event we are unable to sell all of them we will arrange to burn them right here at the factory rather than go to the expense of shipping them somewhere else to be destroyed. I notice that you paid $2.90 a bag for potatoes in Maine and then shipped them to Chicago which raised the cost to $4 a bag, then sold them to farmers for 1 cent a bag. That sort of thing is pretty expensive so we will gladly arrange to destroy any surplus of our rockers right at the factory.

It should be an easy matter for you to get the above-mentioned program through Congress since I see that last year you boys voted to spend twenty-nine billion without even a roll call. Perhaps you can get one of Harry's boys to enter our rocker program in the budget. I realize that it will be small potatoes to the billion-dollar programs you are accustomed to, but perhaps you can start a new bureau or something to raise the ante and get it in the billion-dollar bracket. I certainly cannot see that I am asking anything unreasonable as I have paid taxes all my life and have never received a check from my Government. You paid some of the boys in Maine as much as $450,000 for raising potatoes which the Nation could not possibly consume, so why not a few bucks for the underfed furniture business.

We are in a position to provide some pretty expensive lobbyists with a pocket full of money to spend on the program if you think that is necessary. There must be some secret to getting those big spending programs, which benefit a particular group, through Congress, and we are eager to obtain the secret. Any information regarding the same will be gratefully appreciated.

Please let me hear from you as soon as possible regarding the above-mentioned rocker program as we are eager to get the Government checks started rolling in.

Yours most respectfully,

HARRY BOLING.

National Cancer Drive—Addresses by Hon. Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington, and Award to Walter Winchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made on April 2, 1950, in New York, when the national cancer drive was inaugurated. On that occasion I had the honor to present, as I have on other occasions, the Clement Cleveland medal, which is a medal presented by the American Cancer Society for outstanding work in cancer research during the previous year. The medal was awarded to Mr. Walter Winchell, the noted columnist, for his work in connection with the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund. At the banquet Mr. Winchell donated to the American Cancer Society a quarter of a million dollars to start the drive. I made some remarks in presenting the medal to Mr. Winchell, which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. President, at the same meeting to which I have referred I delivered an address on the problem of cancer. I should like to have that inserted in the RECORD also.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR MAGNUSON IN CONNECTION WITH CLEMENT CLEVELAND AWARD TO WALTER WINCHELL, APRIL 2, 1950

No history books that I can recall ever referred to the 1880's in America as "the dark ages," but regarding the problem of cancer, that term may well apply.

For it was only 67 years ago, here in New York, that Mrs. John Jacob Astor offered to add a wing to the Women's Hospital in New York, stipulating only that it be called the Cancer Pavilion. The hospital's answer, astonishingly enough was a resounding "No"—one of the few cases on record where a hospital, no matter how wealthy, ever turned down a gift of money.

The hospital's reasoning was this: "We couldn't get a patient to enter a section of the hospital with such a dismal name."

Fortunately, Mrs. Astor consulted a physician who was doing tremendous work as a cancer specialist—Dr. Clement Cleveland. He persuaded her to build a whole new hospital and call it frankly the New York Cancer Hospital. But, Dr. Cleveland was a little ahead of his time—the hush-hush attitude toward cancer was not to be broken down that easily. The New York Cancer Hospital was forced to change its name to stay in business.

Such experiences made a lasting impression on Dr. Cleveland's daughter, Elsie. Over and over again she heard her father and other doctors say: "If the patient would have just come to us a little earlier—last year, last month, last week—we could have saved his life." She realized that doctors alone could not win this battle. The people themselves must learn to face cancer facts squarely and openly. It was Dr. Cleveland and his daughter—then Mrs. Robert G. Mead—who brought together top professional and lay leaders in 1913 in a historical meeting which saw the birth of the American Society for the Control of Cancer—now the American Cancer Society.

In 1913, the society operated on a budget of $10,000. Last year the public contributed $14,000,000 to the cancer crusade. Through every medium of public communication we see and hear the word "cancer," and learn the facts which can save lives. Cancer control is a reality—a tribute to such pioneers as Dr. Clement Cleveland.

Dr. Cleveland died in 1934. Three years later the New York City Cancer Committee established in his memory the annual Clement Cleveland Medal for outstanding work in the campaign to control cancer.

Year after year this award has gone to outstanding men and women—research scientists, administrators, physicians, laymen—who have dedicated themselves to the all-out fight to lick cancer.

The New York City Cancer Committee has chosen as the recipient of the Clement Cleveland Medal for 1949 a man who has probably done more than any other single human to drive home to the people of the world the meaning of the word "cancer," and the necessity of sparing no effort in seeking out its cause and cure. In the memory of a friend, whose life cancer took, he launched the Damon Runyon Memorial Fund for cancer research, and we all have seen what this great voluntary effort has achieved. Now in its fourth year, the fund has spurred some $3,000,000 in contributions from the public, and in turn has put this money to work through grants to 77 institutions in 35 States. It has worked hand in hand with the American Cancer Society and its local affiliate, the New York City Cancer Committee, in giving to science the equipment and the manpower this fight against cancer demands.

As a great molder of public opinion, he has aroused a whole Nation to action. He has helped influence Government, as well as private spending, in a great coordinated fight against cancer.

It is my pleasure to award to Walter Winchell the New York City Cancer Committee's Clement Cleveland Medal for 1949.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

If any of you like old stories, you will relish this one. It made the rounds over and over again during the war, but I still like it. Perhaps some of you saw the signs that were posted in the offices of the military establishment's top-secret experimental laboratories. "The difficult we do immediately," said the signs, "the impossible takes a little longer." Similar signs could be posted today in laboratories throughout the country where top-flight researchers are fighting another war—the one against cancer.

Not too long ago an open discussion of cancer would have appalled you because so little was known about it and because people had an aversion to the very word cancer. Today we have been able to erase from our minds much of the false stigma attached to this disease and we know a great deal about cancer—that early detection and early treatment can cure many cases.

This has come about principally because of the American Cancer Society, an organization of laymen and doctors who are devoted to stamping out cancer as a major killer among the diseases of mankind.

Research

The search for new knowledge in the medical sciences is being expended daily. American investments in research have produced a body of knowledge which if fully applied, would advance human health immeasurably. The health care of the American people cannot and must not become a monopoly—either of governments, private enterprise or charitable institutions. Each of these have made great contributions to American health. Each must grow and endure in wisdom, strength and efficiency; and all must work together.

The crisis in America's professional schools is most serious. Many medical and other professional schools have fallen into serious financial straits. Present high standards must be maintained and raised as rapidly as possible. Expansion of educational facilities is essential if the demand for trained personnel is to be met.

During the last 5 years, the American Cancer Society, having recognized the importance of intensified investigative efforts through its 61 chartered divisions and more than 2,600 county branches, has allocated over $13,000,000 for research from the money contributed by the American people. The society spends 25 percent of its income in the support of studies in the field of growth and in the training of young scientists to carry it forward.

Control of cancer eventually will come through an understanding of cancer's causes, the means of prevention, and effective treatment methods. This knowledge waits on research. The path of research is long and hard. Cancer is as mysterious as life itself. Scientists may have to uncover the secret of growth in the individual cell before they can learn why and how it starts, how it grows, and what will stop it.

As time is measured in research, we are progressing rapidly. Each year more progress is made in organizing cancer research than during any previous year, but none can tell how long a time must pass before cancer is beaten. But the search goes on. Thousands of substances are under test to find one powerful enough to destroy cancer without harming normal cells.

Progress has been made in the standard methods of treating cancer. Surgery and radiation. New antibiotics, like penicillin. Improved anesthesia and surgical techniques enable us to excise cancer from parts of the body that were formerly inaccessible.

X-rays are being directed with increasing success at hidden cancers, and radium focused upon many tumors. And the possibilities of radio-active isotopes—byproducts of atomic energy are being explored. Noteworthy among the research advances made in 1949 were several facts:

1. New evidence relating to changes in blood serum in cancer patients, opening up the possible development of a practical blood test for cancer.

2. Evaluation of antifolic acid compounds as a treatment of definite but limited benefit in treating acute leukemia.

3. Discovery of the vast potentialities of the hormones, ACTH and cortisone, in treatment of rheumatism and other diseases, and preliminary testing of these drugs in cancer, particularly leukemia.

4. Discovery that a new chemical compound—guanazolo—will inhibit the growth of certain types of cancer in mice without apparent toxic effects to the animal.

5. Further evidence that chemical agents which produce environmental cancer also cause changes in the hereditary pattern of the body's cells.

Research gets 25 cents of each dollar to hire laboratory technicians, buy centrifuges, electronic microscopes, experimental animals, and other equipment needed to track down and destroy the disease. Modern research, bit by bit, is exposing cancer's secrets. It is learning slowly but surely the relationship between cancer and the hormones our glands secrete, the food we eat, the rays of the sun, the biochemical reactions in our body and the chemicals in our environment. The research program of the American Cancer Society with its interest and money may make it possible to beat cancer in our time. The once narrow horizon of the scientists who worked on cancer has been broadened beyond belief.

During the current fiscal year the American Cancer Society has financed research projects by more than 240 scientists and teams of scientists. It has financed additional work by other hundreds of scientists with grants to 26 large research institutions in 20 States throughout the Nation. The total expended on cancer research by the Society for the year is more than $3,500,000. It can be said truly that never in history has an investment brought a greater return. The threat of cancer is worth the mobilized effort of our scientists, for after all, cancer costs more American lives than combat exacted during the most destructive years of World War II. It's up to us, the citizenry, to get behind our scientists to give them the time, manpower, equipment and the experimental materials they need to find the cause and cure of cancer. In 1913, the American Cancer Society operated on a budget of $10,000. Last year, the public contributed $13,600,000. Today cancer control is big business. It has to be in order to curb the disease that is one of our most serious and most baffling national medical problems.

With painstaking care, scientists are tracing the basic biological processes of life—to determine where they vary in people with and without cancer. And in this maze of biochemical and physiological reactions they are finding threads of evidence which eventually may indicate the origins of cancer. Certain patterns of hormone production are proving peculiar to some kinds of cancer. Enzymes, those substances whose presence are essential to normal cell chemistry—the building and break-down of living tissue and the generation of energy—have been found to have bearing upon the development of cancer. Even the B-complex vitamins in the food we eat are now known to have some influence on the disease.

The physicists have discovered that ultraviolet rays can cause cancer—even habitual overexposure to the rays of the sun. Geneticists are trying to determine how much of a part inheritance plays in susceptibility and resistance to cancer.

In a hundred strategic sectors, the counterattack against cancer is being perfected. These points, of course, are laboratories in universities and hospitals where our greatest research scientists work. The weapons they forge against this disease are made available to all of us—everywhere. The hormones found in Boston to help breast cancer patients are being used in Butte and San Diego. Substances used in Berkeley are being tried in Kansas City and New York. New methods of detecting cancer in body fluids are developed in Portland, Oreg., and used in Portland, Maine. Surgical techniques perfected in New Orleans are saving lives in Washington and Wisconsin. A day after a Chicago scientist announced a possible blood test for early cancer, hospitals from Bangor to Seattle and Miami to Los Angeles were clamoring for the information. The scientists who learns in a laboratory at the University of Washington that certain drugs may cause cancer and the scientist who works in a massive, marble building in New York on chemicals that kill cancer are working for us—each one of us right here. They are trying to find out how to prevent our getting cancer or—in case it should happen—how to cure us.

Whether we like it or not—whether we choose to be or not—we are in this cancer fight—every last one of us. Our lives and the lives of our loved ones are at stake. We cannot dodge the cancer draft. We cannot go AWOL from the cancer fight.

Now that we are in this cancer war, let's fight it with all we have, and let's win it. This year the scientists who equip us with weapons against cancer are working with the $3,500,000 we gave them through the American Cancer Society. They could use at least twice that amount. They need at least twice that amount. They need it for research beds which cost as much as $12,000 a year, so they can study the effect on humans of promising experimental chemicals. They need as much as $25,000 for electron microscopes which enlarge the cells 200,000 times and enable them to study viruses which may cause some cancers. They need countless rats and mice and guinea pigs for experiments with new compounds—to find one which may save our lives. They need massive and delicate instruments, like the mass spectrometer costing $15,000, which can tear apart and identify the fragments of infinitely small bits of matter.

Many of us here tonight are familiar with the work of Dr. Vannevar Bush and the organization he directed during the war.

The Office of Scientific Research and Development gave us the atom bomb, the proximity fuse, rockets, and guided missiles. I had the good fortune to meet with Dr. Bush and one of his aides, Mr. Teeter, at the close of the last war. Out of that meeting, I sponsored a National Science Foundation

bill, which has now passed both Houses of Congress.

National Science Foundation

The primary purpose of the establishment of a National Science Foundation is to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences and correlate its scientific research programs with those undertaken by public and private research groups. The institutes of health are concerned with health and medicine in the field of applied science. The National Science Foundation is concerned only with basic medicine. The National Science Foundation will only implement programs already going and in no way restrict the activities of institutes of health. All agencies will and can cooperate together.

The Division of Medicine of the National Science Foundation will be the medical scientists' right arm in wrestling with the basic problems of medicine. It will seek solutions through basic research in the hope that by pushing back this frontier the answer to specific diseases will be revealed. From the National Science Foundation it is hoped will come ideas to nurture and provide life blood to institutes of health and the American Cancer Society.

Cancer will be more difficult to solve than the atomic bomb was to build. We know the basic science of the bomb. We do not know the secret of growth in man. However mechanical we men may seem to the ladies, we are not so easy to understand as a machine. Machines are built by men and we inherit human beings by accident of birth. The complicated mechanism of man is not entirely understood. The female of the species is never understood.

American Cancer Society and the Damon Runyon Memorial Fund

Incorporated in the spring of 1947, the Runyon Fund, largely through the efforts of Mr. Winchell, its treasurer, and his associates, Dan Parker and Leonard Lyons, has raised over $3,000,000 for cancer research. All of these funds are allocated for cancer research, including fellowships. Some $1,300,000 has been allocated to 70 institutions in 35 States, a substantial portion of which is for research in New York City where you fortunately have outstanding facilities.

The relationship between the Damon Runyon Fund and the American Cancer Society is a superb example of two partners working together for a common goal. The American Cancer Society carefully screen research projects, the money for which is provided from funds which you volunteers raise which go not only for research, but for the education of the physicians and the individual, and service to cancer sufferers. The Damon Runyon Fund provides additional funds so that the Nation's cancer research program may go on without interruption and without lagging.

I could not close without paying tribute to you who are here, who are dedicated to the proposition that no problem, not even cancer, is too difficult to tackle.

Food for Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Food for Thought, delivered by me on April 6, 1950, at New Orleans, La., before members of the Council of the Chamber of Commerce of New Orleans.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

Today, April 6, marks the thirty-third anniversary of our entry into World War I. When President Wilson in April 1917 asked Congress for a declaration of war, so that we might join our friends in that great struggle, he said:

"The world must be made safe for democracy."

And so, it came to pass, that we did dedicate our lives, our fortunes and all that was near and dear to us, so that our way of life could be preserved—or may I say, so that democracy might live. America had chosen to spend her blood and exert her might for the principles that gave her birth and for the preservation of the unbounded freedom she has always enjoyed.

Less than a quarter of a century later we were forced into another cruel conflict, World War II. Here again we dedicated our lives, our fortunes and all that was near and dear to us, so as to save a great and precious form of Government for ourselves and for the world. A few days after Congress declared war, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said:

"We covenant with each other before all the world, that having taken up arms in the defense of liberty, we will not lay them down before liberty is once again secure in the world we live in. For that security we pray; for that security we act—now and ever more."

We risked our lives, we dissipated our God-given natural resources in those two devastating wars, so that our country could continue to protect and preserve our cherished liberty. As a free people we have developed a matchless private enterprise system that provides us with a standard of living unequaled, in fact, far superior to that of any other country on earth. That I know, for I have learned it from actual observation and experience.

Under that system we were able to create almost overnight the greatest war machine that was ever assembled to give battle; to direct it across two oceans and through almost 4 years of grueling war, and to drive it to ultimate and unconditional victory. Last, but not least, we have been able to produce ample food and manufacture sufficient industrial equipment to materially assist a war-torn world to get back on its feet.

We were willing to sacrifice our all so that we could continue to enjoy the blessings of freedom. And yet, today, we have certain elements in our scheme of society that are advocating plans—and some are actively sponsoring legislation—that bid fair to destroy our way of life. Others are openly defying the law and are getting by with it. Need I emphasize that law and order must be maintained at all cost—political expediency notwithstanding—lest we may be subjected to mob rule.

Our system of private enterprise has become most complex during the past generation. There has developed an unhealthy amount of antagonism between labor and capital. I am not entirely satisfied with the existing method of handling labor-management disputes. The cause should be explored. There is room for improvement. The Senate adopted several amendments to the existing law but the House of Representatives has failed to follow through as a result of pressure from labor czars. If only the labor leaders would cooperate with the Congress, our task would be greatly simplified. Instead, they are advocating a return to the lopsided Wagner Act. Thus far they have met with little success. In passing, may I point out that not very long ago it was management that was in control and labor suffered considerably. It was management that defied Congress at that time and as a result the one-sided Wagner Act was passed. If management had then cooperated with the Congress the Wagner Act would never have become law in its present form. Today both sides have had their fling and it is to be hoped that more cooperation will be forthcoming between the two groups constituting our private enterprise system. I firmly believe that labor and management should be kept in balance and that neither should be given an advantage over the other.

The rights of our sovereign States, those rights that played such an important part in the formation of our Union, are being increasingly circumscribed by a bureaucracy that believes in a powerful centralized government. The Tidelands question, with which all of you are familiar, is a good example of that trend. The big arm of the Federal Government is reaching out to control the vast oil and gas resources lying beneath our coastal waters, all in contradiction to established customs and well-settled jurisprudence. Next will come Federal control of our fisheries and other resources of the sea.

Only last week it was necessary for Congress to act in order to prevent power-crazed bureaucrats from usurping the States' jurisdiction over the production and gathering of natural gas. Not content with the power to regulate the sale of gas when it is transported in interstate commerce, these bureaucrats sought the authority to regulate the exploration and the drilling for gas in a sovereign State. Not only that, but they also sought to regulate the extraction of butane, gasoline, and other byproducts of natural gas, notwithstanding the fact that those operations are performed entirely within the confines of a sovereign State.

I could dwell on other phases of the plan, such as socialized medicine, the classification of jobs in industry, and the fixing of wages beginning with the minimum established by law, all of which I have opposed. Time will not permit me to discuss all of them.

I should like to now discuss briefly some of the iniquitous civil-rights bills advocated by the President. This attack upon constitutional government has been fostered by both of the great political parties and for purely political reasons. The head of the Democratic Party is bending every effort to beat the Republicans to the draw, and the South has been forced to wage a strenuous fight to uphold the Constitution and to maintain its traditions and customs. The civil-rights legislation is a disguised attempt to create a central bureaucracy, in which the traditional and constitutional rights, both of the States and of the people, could be disregarded at the whim of an all-powerful Chief Executive.

We in Louisiana dislike the poll tax. As a former member of the Louisiana Legislature I helped to pass a law to abolish it as a prerequisite for voting. Other States have done likewise until today the poll tax exists in only seven States. Repeal movements are now under way in those States, and within 4 or 5 years the poll tax will be a thing of the past. In spite of this, however, the civil-rights advocates would have the Congress usurp a State's constitutional authority to establish the qualifications of its voters.

We of the South condemn lynching for what it is—murder. We are dealing with lynching through State police systems, through education, and through other methods. We are coping with it most effectively. There is no offense in the history of criminology that is more on the way out than is lynching. It is almost extinct. Let the civil-rights advocates desire legislation enacted to make lynching a Federal crime, so that the Federal authorities could go into any sovereign State where a lynching is suspected, supplant the local officers, prosecute those officers, and even bring civil suits for damages against the local government itself. Such a law would invade the domain of powers reserved to the States by the United States Constitution. Antilynching legislation could not possibly be enforced and I fear that it would do serious harm to the very people it is designed to help—the southern Negroes. Its enactment would set off a chain of violent reaction toward them.

I now come to the most far-reaching and dangerous of the civil-rights proposals, commonly referred to as the FEPC bill. It is my understanding that every effort will be made to push that nefarious piece of legislation through the Congress. I propose to speak against its enactment as long as God gives me breath.

The FEPC proposal would establish a vast Federal bureaucracy, with regional, State, and local officers to supervise the daily operations of every sizable business in the United States, dictating to every employer whom he can hire, fire, transfer, or promote. Should the day ever come when the Federal Government can interfere with an employer's free judgment in the selection and maintenance of an efficient force of employees, we might as well hang black crepe on the doors of private enterprise.

The bill is a serious and indefensible denial of the liberty to contract. It substitutes governmental judgment for personal judgment as to the qualifications and desirability of persons for employment and for advancement. It imposes arbitrary restraints on freedom of association.

The bill attempts to create a civil right which is beyond the scope of Congress. Such a right has not been delegated to the United States, but has been specifically retained in the States.

Aside from its unconstitutionality, the legislation ignores social patterns. Legislation cannot create tolerance and good feeling. Nor can it erase differences in attitude, outlook, or human behavior. The bill ignores established social patterns based on law and customs. Its operation would inevitably tend to undermine those local patterns, thereby setting the stage for untold strife, dissension, and fierce resistance to enforcement of the law.

Whether segregation is right or wrong has no place in the argument. Segregation exists. Mark Ethridge, publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal, is well known for his liberal views. While a member of the wartime Fair Employment Practices Commission, he said this:

"There is no power in the world—not even in all the mechanized armies of the earth, Allied and Axis—which could now force the southern white people to the abandonment of the principle of segregation."

Such a law would be a tremendous step in the direction of governmental control not only of private management but also of every phase of human endeavor and human relationship. It would eventually destroy the cherished liberty which we fought two Global Wars to preserve.

I should like your indulgence for a few more minutes to discuss a problem that is undermining our financial structure and eating into the strength and vitality of our National Government. Unless checked, it will destroy our democracy, by leading us straight into national impoverishment. I refer to deficit spending. Whenever a nation, like a person or a corporation, goes on, year after year, living beyond its means, it can only end in bankruptcy. I ask: If the United States Government cannot balance its budget even in these times of relative prosperity, what is going to happen if and when hard times come along? During this period of prosperity we should be not only paying our way, but also cutting down on our national debt. Instead, we are adding to it at the rate of $5,000,000,000 per year. Deficit spending must come to an end, and soon. We must balance the budget, and steer away from the perilous tendency now prevalent among our Government planners, that of spending more money than the Federal Treasury takes in. Each and every departmental head should be instructed by the Chief Executive to effect substantial economies in the interest of national solvency.

As the spokesmen of our international policies, members of the State Department in particular might well heed my words in this respect. As chairman of a special Senate Appropriations Fact-Finding Subcommittee, I made a round-the-world trip last fall; I visited most of the nations that are now receiving American aid, or are looking to us for help. I was amazed to find that the leaders of those countries believe that we live in a land of unlimited milk and honey, and that our resources are inexhaustible. They believe, too, that we should open our treasury to them to prevent the Communists from taking over their countries. I can assure you, that however backward they might be in other respects, they are not backward in asking for financial assistance from their generous Uncle Sam.

The State Department should brief our representatives abroad as to our financial condition, and in turn have them enlighten these people on the cold facts. If that were done, I am certain that the demands upon us might be tempered with reason. The State Department should tell our friends across the seas that every dollar we give them or lend them is borrowed money; that in order to assist them we are placing ourselves deeper in debt. In other words, if our representatives would present a realistic version of our economy—talk po'mouf as we say in the South—instead of presenting the lush picture that is usually painted of America, we might find these dependent nations less aggressive in their demands.

When I was abroad recently, I told the rulers of several governments in the Middle East and Far East about our debt situation. I informed them that the interest of our national debt amounted to more than was required to run our Government in 1934 and 1935. They could not believe that we had permitted our country to drift into such a situation. All of them were laboring under the impression that our Goverment can spare with ease all the goods and moneys we are handing out. In most cases, after I made known our financial condition, the response was unanimous that America must conserve its resources and remain strong financially in order to prevent the further spread of communism throughout the world.

Need I further emphasize to you that unless the trend that now prevails in Washington is arrested, we are apt to lose our way of life—a way that has enabled America to achieve undisputed world leadership. It would be a sad paradox if, in order to avert communism among our friends, we should exhaust and impoverish ourselves and in so doing invite communism to our own shores.

It is necessary that our people interest themselves in government and keep abreast of what is going on and make every effort to stem the tide lest it engulf us. So long as Americans keep awake, so long as they are vigilant, so long as they remain on guard for the preservation of their individual liberties, I have no fear of the consequences. A story I heard recently might better illustrate what I am trying to emphasize.

There was once a minister of the gospel who had engaged sea passage from England to Norway, and having never traveled by sea before, he was somewhat apprehensive of the perils of ocean travel. He asked the ticket agent if there were any danger in his crossing, and the agent told him that so long as the sailors were a-fussin' and a-cussin' they were not frightened; it was only when they were too afraid to fuss and cuss that the ship would be in serious trouble.

While they were in midpassage a terrible storm hit the ship, and it began to pitch and roll. The minister peeped out of his cabin, and the sailors on deck were fussing and cussing, so he went back relieved. The storm grew worse, and again the minister peeped out. Sure enough, the sailors were fussin' and cussin' above the roar of the winds. A little while later the minister again listened, fearful that the severity of the storm had finally frightened the seamen, but they were still fussin' and cussin'. The clergyman retired to his room, but he had lost confidence somewhat in the ticket agent's admonitions, and he felt that he had best resort to prayer. He knelt on the rolling deck of his staterooom and prayed, "O Lord, if in your infinite wisdom you must keep this tempest howling outside and this ship pitching and tossing, just please, O Lord, also keep those sailors fussin' and cussin'."

So long as we as Americans can keep a-cussin' and a-fussin' we shall be able to exercise our freedom to speak, our freedom to complain, and our freedom to choose. It is when the gloom of discouragement settles over us that we will no longer assert ourselves. Then either we will no longer care to preserve our personal liberties, or we will realize too late that they have been lost forever.

Let us make every effort to maintain ourselves free—free of foreign "isms," and as well, free of the creeping tentacles of an omnipotent Federal bureaucracy. I shall continue to fight against both. Perhaps I am old fashioned, but I believe that it is old-fashioned Americanism that our country has been built upon and stands for today. Only by fighting for our system of free incentive and free enterprise can we hope to preserve it against the onslaughts of those who would tear it down and subject our people to the oppression of complete state control. In closing I ask only that each of you go forth determined to promote the resurgence of the Americanism that has made our country the finest, the strongest, the most prosperous land in the world.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, on the Occasion of the Presentation to Him of the Annual Award of Metropolitan Conference of Temple Brotherhoods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to the Metropolitan Conference of Temple Brotherhoods in New York on April 9, 1950. I was deeply moved by the scroll which was presented to our eminent and world-famous colleague. I am sure the Senate as a whole will respond similarly to it. It pays high and deserved tribute in the following eloquent words:

To HERBERT H. LEHMAN, first man of our people, Governor of our State, and Senator, you have wielded the power of high office for the betterment of mankind. Because of your striving toward the brotherhood of man,

its goal approaches near to reality. You have honored and glorified the name of Israel.

On this Passover, day of memorial for the deliverance of our people, we remember that you, too, are blessed, like Abraham of old, who withheld not his son from the altar of freedom but gave him, your own heart's blood, in supreme sacrifice for human liberty. When the evil was overthrown, you, one of the driven and oppressed, were chosen, as by an act of God, to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, shelter the homeless, and comfort the distressed among all peoples. May the days of your years exceed the fourscore and ten, with the grace of God and the love of all men.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I feel honored and proud to be invited here this evening to accept this scroll—the annual award of the Metropolitan Conference of Temple Brotherhoods. At the same time I feel a deep humility, because I know that whatever small contribution I might have made to my fellow men is insignificant in the face of the terrible problems that confront us today.

There has been much talk in recent years about a return to God—a return to belief in basic values and basic concepts. I hope and pray that this is more than talk. The need for a true moral revival has never been greater than it is today. In a world where an atomic bomb or a hydrogen bomb can destroy a life or a civilization, we must reinvigorate our spiritual values if we are to avert total catastrophe. This is the only sound course for all mankind.

We here in the United States, of all faiths and all religions, must show the way. Here in the fresh climate of freedom and democracy, man can turn to his God without fear.

So while our faith in God must be revitalized, our faith in our own democratic institutions, too, must be renewed and strengthened. If our democratic institutions are permitted to fail by our own indifference, we cannot hope to retain the freedom which these institutions are designed to serve. And where there is no freedom there is no God.

In the final analysis the outcome in the struggle for peace lies in the hands of every one of us as individuals. We must strive increasingly to maintain the climate in which democracy can survive and grow.

And democracy must stand up to the critical task of providing greater security for all people while defending without compromise the rights of the individual.

There is one major obstacle to our winning this struggle which is not presented by either the Communists on the left or the reactionaries of the right. It is not that obstacle that is in our own hearts and minds. It is fear. We must overcome our sense of personal fear which is today impeding our efforts to keep democracy a living and dynamic force here at home and throughout the world.

Our fear takes many forms. The most prevalent is our fear and suspicion of each other. This fear leads us to question the sincerity and the morality of all our fellow citizens.

It is a good thing for men to be temperate in their judgments. There is also the danger, however, that we will be restrained in our actions not through judgment but through fear. There is a growing tendency to be restrained by the fear that what we are going to say is going to make the wrong impression on somebody else. Our reticence can easily become a mark of cowardice as well as of wisdom.

It takes courage to live fully in these times and to speak out against those who are assailing the character and patriotism of our neighbors. It takes courage to overcome our complacency in the face of economic and social injustices and demand equality and freedom for all our fellow men, not for just some of them.

In spite of the obvious disappointments and discouragement which today beset us, I believe with all my heart that world security and a lasting peace can be provided if we show enough patience, good will, and understanding. In a democracy it is the responsibility of the individual to work toward this end. While collectively we have a great blessing in our wealth and freedom, individually we have a great responsibility for the outcome of the ideological conflict which today divides the world.

In many other nations this idea of individualism has never taken root. But we in America should never forget that the rights which we call inalienable can only be preserved by the most unceasing vigilance on the part of each and all of us. We must hold to our faith in freedom even in the valley of fear through which we now walk. We must confront and defeat the forces of fear and evil which press hard for our surrender.

To overcome our fear we must bulwark our faith: our faith in God, in our own capacities, and in our fellow man.

But even democracy is mere form without content, unless it bears at its center an inner faith in the goodness of God, in the sanctity of the human soul, and in the brotherhood of man under God. First we must be loyal to these concepts, or our devotion to democracy is tinsel and dross. If our spiritual faith is weakened, we will not prevail in the struggles ahead.

If we let down our defenses in our democratic practices, if we permit the rights of some of our people to be denied or withheld, for any reason, if we deny equal justice to any in our midst—even to those who would deny it to us—if we do any of these things, we invite defeat and disaster. The fortress of democracy is only as strong as its weakest point. Our Nation is weakest where its democracy is weakest—in the partial denial of rights and privileges to racial minorities, and in the withholding of full social justice from vast numbers of the underprivileged.

Democracy, like religion, is an expression of faith, a call to duty from which no man may draw back. Democracy must be supported by a militant faith, and by a willingness to crusade for that faith, and to abide by it in all ways and in all relationships. Democracy is not a habit to be worn only on fair days. Sometimes democracy is awkward, and uncomfortable. Sometimes it involves danger. But if it is good at all, it is good all the time.

So, in accepting this award today, I accept it as an honor, but also as a challenge. It is a challenge to me personally, and to all of us who are gathered here tonight. Let us demonstrate that faith which has made our religion a symbol of survival through the centuries of persecution and disaster. Let us strive for the concrete manifestations of brotherhood to which this great temple is dedicated. Let us hold fast to our faith and cherish each other, not in fear but in love.

Let us emerge from the shadows of doubt into the light of confidence and courage. We are strong in our ideals, and our strength is multiplied tenfold by tolerance and understanding.

In this green and pleasant land of ours, let us show the world that love and devotion are our watchwords. Under these brave banners, we will prevail.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD program No. 22 in my broadcasts to the people of Pennsylvania on Happenings in Washington. This broadcast was on April 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 22)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

I want to talk to you about social security. This is one of the most important of all subjects to millions of our workers, to millions of their dependents, and to those past the age of 65 who have retired to live on the benefits.

The Federal social security law came into being in 1935. Naturally, as with any new law, the test of time and operation pointed out its weaknesses and strong points. Some glaring weaknesses were shown up. Some drastic changes were indicated. Today we are working on the first major revision since 1939.

Last year the House of Representatives, by an overwhelming vote of 333 to 14, passed a bill to amend the old Social Security Act.

The new bill would extend social-security coverages to about 11,000,000 people not now covered. It offers coverage to millions of self-employed men and women in certain classifications who were not provided for in the original act. It provides an average increase of 70 percent to present beneficiaries and a new category to cover total and permanently disabled persons regardless of age.

Other new provisions would give a wage credit to veterans of World War II for time spent in service. It would include State and local government employees on a voluntary basis. Also it would increase the total annual earnings on which contributions are made by employees and employers from $3,000 to $3,600.

At the very end of the 1949 session the bill was sent to the Senate. Early this year the Senate Finance Committee—of which I am a member—went to work on the bill.

We held almost daily hearings for 9 weeks. Two hundred and seventy-five witnesses appeared before us. They presented a great variety of views and opinions. Many were experts on various subjects. They included representatives of State governments and officials of State and national organizations. Many citizens testified as individuals, offering their own ideas on social security. Our committee heard them all.

In addition, we received for study and consideration about 250 briefs and statements, and thousands of letters from all parts of the country. So, you see, this matter is receiving deep and detailed consideration from the Senate Finance Committee.

We have finished our hearings. Now we are meeting regularly in executive session to study the vast mass of information, and to consider such changes as the committee members believe would make the bill stronger and better.

As I have stated before, I believe in social-security legislation for our older citizens and to protect the surviving widows and dependent children of workers.

So naturally I am for the principle of the law and will vote for the measure as finally drafted.

But, in the meantime, it is my intention to fight—and fight hard—to make this the strongest and soundest possible system.

That, my fellow Pennsylvanians, will be a tough battle. And I am afraid it will be a losing battle. For I believe that Congress will refuse to take the all-out step necessary to make our social-security system basically sound.

Let me tell you now what I think is wrong with the system and what should be done to rebuild it on a firmer foundation.

First, I want to point out the difference between the Federal system and the kind operated by the great insurance companies in which many of you have policies.

When you take out an insurance policy, the company puts your money to work in productive enterprise—let me repeat—productive enterprise. It also sets up a reserve fund to meet emergencies and to guarantee enough cash to pay out benefits to you in the form of an annuity, an endowment, or to your survivors if you die. In general the payments made by the policyholders each year are sufficient to cover the needs of that year and to build protection for the future.

But this does not happen under the Federal social-security system. The money taken from your weekly pay envelope and the money paid by your employer, is not handled that way by Washington.

Instead, this is what happens. Your money, out of your pay roll, goes to the Social Security Board. Then Uncle Sam dips his hand into the till, takes the money out, and spends it for the high-priced business of running the Government.

He leaves an I O U in the till. It is a bond, paying 2½ percent annually. At present, about $10,000,000,000 of your money has been removed and the 2½ percent I O U's left behind.

Well, you might say, that sounds like a good, sound investment—2½ percent on our money from the Government. But first, consider this:

Where will Uncle Sam get the 2½ percent interest? The same place he gets all of his money—by taxing you and the other citizens of this country, including those who are not covered under the social-security law.

Keep in mind that when you pay your money into an insurance company it is invested so as to produce earnings. But Uncle Sam has no earning capacity. He can use only what he takes from the people in taxes or borrows from your savings.

Now a lot of people start reaching age 65. They have paid into the fund for years. They want their social-security benefits. How do they get them?

Well, remember that the bureaucrats in Washington have spent the pay-roll contributions. Nothing is left in the till but IOU's. So your Government has to get the money to pay your social-security benefits by levying taxes against all the people.

The man who is over 65 and is no longer employed is taxed to pay part of the cost of the social-security benefits he thought he was paying for during his younger working years.

The man under 65, making his own social-security payments, is also taxed to pay part of the older man's benefits. Both categories, are in fact, paying twice for their social security. They were promised by their Government that they would only pay once. But tney are paying twice.

I believe that system is wrong, unfair, and unsound. We can and we should put our social-security system on a sound, solid basis.

And I say this emphatically—most emphatically—if our Federal social security system is to survive, sooner or later we must put it on a sounder basis than it is today.

Let me explain that. Today about 35,000,000 active workers pay contributions into the fund in an average week. About 2,700,000 are receiving benefits.

That means much more money is going into the fund than is coming out each year. So there is plenty left over for Uncle Sam to take from the till—leaving behind those IOU's.

But this picture is changing.

More and more of our people are reaching the age 65—the age at which social-security benefits begin—and are living on for many years afterward. In 1935 when the social-security law was passed, there were only 7,800,000 persons over 65 in the United States and none of them was entitled to a nickel of benefits.

Today there are 11,500,000. By 1975, according to the Government statisticians, there will be 19,000,000 persons over 65 living in the United States and most of them will be on social security.

That means that more and more must be paid out until the amount going out will exceed the amount coming in. The Social Security Administration statisticians have estimated that 50 years from now—in the year 2000—the annual benefit payments will run from over $13,000,000,000 to twenty billion and a half. Nongovernmental experts, also estimating the cost for the year 2000, say these figures are ultraconservative. The nongovernment experts say they will go over thirty billions a year.

Well, the system will be in trouble long before that. Billions a year must be paid out and there'll be nothing in the cash drawer but those I O U's. So billions of dollars in new taxes will have to be levied on the American people each year to meet the cost of the payments. After a time these taxes will become oppressively heavy.

Then and there the system will break down.

So, I repeat, we must have the best possible social-security system. We must have a sound system, one that will survive. Such a system must have real reserves and real money at real work.

I believe that a system—actuarily sound and on a pay-as-you-go basis—should be created for managing the money paid into the Federal security system.

Otherwise there is grave danger that this social-security system will not be able to keep its promise to pay to you and your children in your old age.

Yes, I am for social security, and I want our system to be made as sound and solid as can be done.

At the beginning of my talk I mentioned to you that the Senate Finance Committee heard the testimony of 275 witnesses. Some of them represented the splendid retirement funds maintained by school teachers, policemen, firemen, and other groups of State and municipal employees.

You will be interested in what they testified.

The bill which passed the House of Representatives provides that all State and local employees may voluntarily come under the Federal social-security system.

Let me assure you that these groups want no part of the system—and for the reason I have mentioned above. You see, most of these firemen, policemen, and school-teacher funds are set up on an actuarial basis. Their retirement systems are built up upon soundly invested funds.

They fear that political pressure in their home States might force them to get into the Federal system. So they came to us. They urged and begged our committee to eliminate from the bill the language which might result in forcing them into what they say is an unsound pension system.

For many years I have been fighting for national solvency as the best and strongest defense of the American system of government.

A government that is not sound financially can give no assurance that its citizens will enjoy any kind of security.

Freedom of the individual cannot be maintained in a nation which spends beyond its income year after year.

The Government's promise of security is of no value whatsoever if those in charge of its affairs take a wasteful, spendthrift course which must end in national bankruptcy.

If we are to have a strong, sound, social-security system we must first return to strong, sound fiscal policies. That means we must put an end to deficit financing. We must balance the budget. We must put an end to wasteful and extravagant spending that means higher taxes and bigger debt.

Above all, we must stand firm in opposition to every socialistic scheme that promises something for nothing.

I ask you to join in the fight for those objectives because they mean so much to your security, your children, and to the future of the American Republic.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the third of a series of three articles entitled "When Congress Fumbles for Facts," written by Lindsay Rogers, Burgess professor of public law, Columbia University, and published in the New York Herald Tribune on Friday, March 31, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN CONGRESS FUMBLES FOR FACTS

THE SUGGESTED REMEDY IS AN INVESTIGATING COMMISSION APPOINTED BY THE CHIEF JUSTICE

(By Lindsay Rogers, Burgess professor of public law, Columbia University)

III

Neither the New York State nor the British method of conducting investigations would be satisfactory to the Congress of the United States. In New York State the initial responsibility is largely the Governor's, but I can recall no instance of his refusing to act when the legislature wished him to. In Great Britain, while it is Parliament that calls a tribunal into being, the executive appoints its members and the law officers of the Crown place themselves at its service. Congress is too distrustful of the President to consent to either arrangement. I think that Congress is probably too suspicious. A President would surely realize the risk of losing public esteem by appointments which Congress (and the country) could not applaud, and that if he did make such appointments, Congress would be able to humiliate him. Congress, however, takes a different view of the matter. What, then, is possible?

I suggest a statute modeled in part on the British Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act of 1921 insofar as conferring the powers to be given an investigating body. The statute could provide that whenever Congress by a concurrent resolution (which does not require Presidential approval) declared that it wished an inquiry into a matter that the resolution defined, a congressional investigating commission should come into being having all the powers, rights, and privileges that are vested in a district court of the United States. I say concurrent resolution because the commission should be the representative of Congress and not of a single branch. Senate and House committees sometimes investigate the same scandals concurrently and even compete with each other to subpena witnesses first. But if the investigating process were handed over to a servant of Congress, it is not likely that either House would refuse to consent to the appointment of a commission that the other House thought necessary.

A congressional investigating commission should have the power to enforce the attendance of witnesses, examine them on oath and compel the production of documents. If witnesses refused to attend or produce documents, or answer any question to which the commission could legally require an answer, or if they did any other thing which would, were the commission a court of law having power to commit for contempt, be contempt of court, the commission would initiate contempt proceedings. Witnesses would have the same privileges as witnesses in the district court—that is, they could not be sued for defamation.

The commission should meet in public unless it thought that because of the subject matter to be inquired into, or the nature of certain evidence to be given, it should meet in private. It would authorize representation by counsel of any person appearing to them to be entitled to counsel, or it could refuse such representation. There should be no controversy over the necessary powers of a congressional investigating commission. They should be as complete as possible.

But how should the members of a commission be appointed? Congress is too suspicious of the President to give him the responsibility the British Executive has. Appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate? That was the arrangement when Congress had no confidence that the Department of Justice (Harry M. Daugherty was then Attorney General) would prosecute feelingly persons involved in the Teapot Dome scandals. Congress passed a statute under which the President appointed Owen J. Roberts and Atlee Pomerene as special prosecutors, and the Senate confirmed them. But the necessity of Senatorial confirmation would probably make service on a congressional investigating commission unpalatable to some men who had no real desire to serve but who were willing to undertake a public duty if it seemed to them that they should.

Why could not the members of a congressional investigating commission be appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States? It could be left to the commission to determine what counsel and other assistance it needed. The fees to be paid persons who served on commissions or to counsel could be stipulated in the law on a per diem basis or could be subject to approval by the Chief Justice or by the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate. Commissioners would be under an obligation to leave their private undertakings for the duration of investigations and to report to Congress. What possible objection can there be to such a proposal? Its advantages are many.

Senators and Representatives would be freed from tasks that reduce the amount of time available for their legislative work, which is always in arrears. During the present session of Congress the Senate has authorized 15 committee or subcommittee investigations and the House has authorized 20. Funds currently available to the investigators amount to more than $1,500,000. To be sure, some of these investigations are directly connected with the preparation of legislation that is under consideration. In large part, however, they are inquiries into administrative practices and performances and into large problems—for example, crime (interstate and in the District of Columbia), lobbying, the Immigration Service—which congressional committees are not always competent to explore. It should be remembered that the Moreland Act has been used to inquire into controversial questions of public policy. For example, Commissioner Robert M. Benjamin's report on administrative adjudication in the State of New York (1942) is a more informing document than all the committee reports on the many bills introduced in Congress to regulate procedure before Federal administrative tribunals, and the New York Legislature accepted the Benjamin report as authoritative. Many Senators and Representatives would sigh with relief if they did not have to spend wearisome hours in hearing rooms listening to discursive discussions of matters in which they had no real interest.

Few more than the publicity seekers in Congress relish the sensational aspects of inquisitions into alleged wrongdoing, and for this kind of inquiry, as I have already said, thoughtful Congressmen have been endeavoring to devise better procedural safeguards. Thus Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and majority leader in the Senate, wants a person under attack before a congressional committee given the right (a) to appear personally before the committee; (b) to compel the committee to subpena up to four persons to testify in his defense; (c) to cross-examine witnesses personally or through counsel; and (d) to secure stenographic transcripts of testimony at cost. All these safeguards would automatically spring into being if Congress handed over its investigating power to congressional investigating commissions and there would be a complete elimination of an evil which will exist so long as congressional committees function and which no legislation can eradicate: the committee accusers later become committee judges.

There was one British tribunal of inquiry which found itself embarrassed by the necessity of seeming hostile to the witnesses who appeared before it. In 1936 budget secrets leaked (the "Jimmy" Thomas case) and it was alleged that some friends of the Minister had insured themselves against losses as a result of tax increases which the Cabinet contemplated but which had not been announced. A tribunal was appointed and felt it necessary to proceed very quickly. In its report it lamented the fact that because there had been no counsel to prepare the case, "the testing of the witnesses' stories by way of cross-examination or otherwise has necessarily been undertaken by the members of the tribunal themselves, with the resultant possibility of creating the impression that they were from the start hostile to some of the witnesses who appeared before them."

Moreover, because the outlines of the case were not known in advance, "it happened that persons whose conduct was the subject of the closest scrutiny were not represented before the tribunal until some days had elapsed," and counsel "who appeared to represent such persons were hampered by their inability to object to the reception of evidence in the nature of hearsay and prevented from presenting the case of their clients in the manner in which they would ordinarily have presented it before a court of law in this country." No legislation that Senator LUCAS can devise will prevent a congressional investigating committee from being the accuser before it becomes the judge and from receiving evidence which it would not wish to receive were its character known in advance.

Most discussions of the way in which Congress uses its inquisitorial powers stress unfairness to innocent persons and obscene hungering for newspaper headlines. These discussions have point, but my principal point is that Congress, when it acts through investigating committees, acts incompetently and frequently fails in its important task of compelling disclosures. It fails completely in convincing the public that the disclosures are complete. Hence Congress should employ competent agencies to investigate and should not delay doing this as long as it delayed employing competent people to do its legislative drafting.

Baylor University Browning Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, at Baylor University, in Waco, Tex., there has been established what is known as a Browning Library, a unique undertaking, which has been growing over the years. Dr. A. Joseph Armstrong, who is chairman of the department of English at the university, has been a prime mover in this project, which is now approaching completion.

I hold in my hand a letter from Mr. Douglas Hammond, of Ensley, Ala., addressed to me, with respect to Dr. Armstrong and his achievements. I know Dr. Armstrong personally, and have known him for a great many years. He is a very distinguished English scholar, and has attracted international attention. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Hammond, in the form of a tribute to Dr. Armstrong, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: At Christmas time 1948, in his annual Christmas message, Dr. A. Joseph Armstrong said: "After long years in the land of dreams, the Baylor Browning Library is gradually becoming a beautiful reality. The war has delayed our project, but now the war has ended and the campaign has been given new impetus. The end is in sight. Our present plans are tremendously more ambitious than our first ideas. Today we are building for eternity. The actual foundation is being laid; the concrete is pouring into the wide, deep hole that is soon to rise as the long cherished Browning Library. Just a little more of that long pull, strong pull, and pull all together and the financing will be completed. Are you listening, friend"?

Baylor University, Waco, Tex., with its modest income and even more modest endowment could never have built the Baylor Browning Library. The love that Dr. Armstrong, chairman of the department of English, has for Baylor University, Texas, and the world, has raised this magnificent monument. The Baylor Browning Library, which is to be completed this year, bears a message of such import and majesty that it should of a certainty be the epicenter of this Nation's eyes as those eyes with hesitency turn toward the enigmatic future. Here, in this majestic, magnificent temple of beauty, a cloistered retreat, students will be invited to a place of quiet meditation; to stimulate creative thinking on intellectual and spiritual objectives * * * a retreat of such compelling beauty that reverence and prayer shall ever, consciously or subconsciously, abide in the souls of those who enter here.

The Browning Library is the fulfillment of the dream of one man: A. Joseph Armstrong. As early as 1935 Lilian Whiting credited this visionary man with creating the most magnificant outward memorial of a poet that the world has known. Through his indefatigable efforts and undaunted purpose these treasures of priceless Browningiana are housed in an exquisite library whose beauty and service pay lasting tribute to the poet Robert Browning.

As a young professor in 1912, Dr. A. Joseph Armstrong returned to head Baylor University's English department, where he had formerly served 1 year as an interim professor. Behind him was an enviable record of scholarship and literary contacts: bachelor of arts degree from Wabash College in 1902, followed by a master of arts in 1904; doctor of philosophy from the University of Pennsylvania in 1908, where he won the friendship of the great Shakespearean scholar Felix E. Schelling; a student at the British Museum, 1909–10.

For 30 years Dr. Armstrong has allowed his imagination to build up a glorious shrine in the form of a library and museum dedicated to Robert Browning. All through these years he has added valuable material to the collection until it stands now the greatest and largest collection of Browningiana in the world. His travels have carried him around the world more than a dozen times, and always his foremost thought was "will I be able to find something for the Browning Library? And, if I find it, will I have enough money to purchase it?" Often the material was found, but his own personal savings had been depleted time and time again in purchasing Browningiana, and pleas had to be issued to former students, friends, students in his current classes, and ever so often funds from his own meager store. All he had was a pocket full of dreams, a pocket which had been bulging for years, and a firm belief that all honest labor will be rewarded. And it was rewarded. Each year saw continuous contributions from friends the world over, and each year saw the addition of more priceless works of art, literature, etc., to the Browning collection.

In order to get money for the Browning Library, Dr. Armstrong brought, at his own expense, many brilliant artists, lecturers, authors, poets, musicians, actors, world travelers, and explorers, to Baylor University, and the visits of such notables as Carl Sandburg, John Erskine, Katharine Cornell, Edwin Markham, Edna St. Vincent Millay, Robert Frost, Helen Hayes, Alfred Noyes, Amy Lowell, William Lyon Phelps, Prince William of Sweden, Tagore, John Masefield, Vachel Lindsay, and so many, many others, laid the foundation of the Browning collection.

At the ceremony held to lay the cornerstone on February 25, 1950, many noted Texans took part, and were present to pay tribute to this outstanding achievement. Dr. Pat M. Neff, former Governor of Texas and a past president of the university, Dr. William R. White, president of Baylor University, and many other prominent Texans were present. Miss Frances Winwar (Mrs. Francis Lazenby) of New York and Chicago, noted biographer of literary folk, presented the original manuscript of her latest biography, The Immortal Lovers, depicting the lives of the Brownings, which is to be released by Harper & Bros., New York, on April 26 next.

The Browning collection now includes first editions of all of the poet's works and copies of nearly every article and book that has ever been written on Browning or his poems. His writings alone fill 500 volumes. Books which Browning or his family owned will be included. Other treasures in the collection are the bronze model of the clasped hands of Browning and his wife; 160 portraits of Browning, including the seven originals done when he was alive; original letters written by the author to famous contemporaries; the clock which chimed through three generations of the Browning family; a gold brooch, his gift to his wife on their first anniversary; flowers picked by Browning, some of which were enclosed in his love letters, over 600 pieces of music inspired by Browning or his wife; his snuff box; silver and china used by the poets; two of his passports; a New Testament given the writer by his Aunt Arabella; a shawl worn by his wife; and a lock of Browning's hair taken after his death. These, and many other valuable collector's items are to be included in the Browningiana to be placed in the library.

Today, Dr. Armstrong holds court as he likes to call it, in his office on the third floor of Pat Neff Hall, and looks across the campus and sees the naked girders of his dream being covered with white Indiana limestone. The long, hard years of effort are as nothing to him, and he has said, "If we can create * * * a place where young people can meditate on great thoughts, and by that means give the world * * * another Dante, another Shakespeare, another Browning—we will count the cost a bargain."

World renowned scholar and a friend of the famous—authors and nobility the world over—he most certainly would say with Wordsworth: "If I am remembered, it must be as a teacher."

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS HAMMOND.

Endorsement of Secretary of State Acheson by the New York Young Democratic Club, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the face of the many irresponsible attacks that have been made upon the Secretary of State, it is most important that expressions of confidence in him by representative groups of American citizens be noted and entered upon the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that a resolution of the New York Young Democratic Club, Inc., expressing confidence in, and support of Mr. Acheson, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, has with great distinction and ability been furthering the democratic way of life throughout the world and has been steadfastly upholding the interests of the western democracies in general and of the United States in particular in the so-called cold war with Soviet Russia; and

Whereas Secretary Acheson and his administration of the Department of State have been unjustly maligned by certain members of the minority party in Congress and by the opposition press with unfounded and irresponsible charges of disloyalty in the Department, which charges are advanced for reasons of political opportunism and which tend to create an hysteria which hinders the work of the Department in its conduct of our foreign relations and threatens our democratic processes and civil rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York Young Democratic Club, Inc., hereby condemns the utterly irresponsible attacks presently being made for reasons solely political upon the Honorable Dean Acheson, our Secretary of State, and hereby expresses its continuing confidence in and support of Mr. Acheson in his administration of the Department of State and his conduct of the foreign relations of this country.

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the third of the series of articles by Miss Helen Delich, of the staff of the Baltimore Morning Sun, published this morning, deals with the effect upon the United States merchant marine of the transfer of vessels to Panamanian registry, or to registries of other nations. It is a matter of great concern to many people, and I ask unanimous consent that the article in question be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of April 12, 1950]

FOREIGN REGISTRY CUTS UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE—AMERICANS OWN 52.8 PERCENT OF SHIPS SAILING UNDER PANAMANIAN FLAG

(The following article is the third of a series of four by Miss Delich on the condition of the American merchant marine.)

(By Helen Delich)

The Panamanian merchant fleet cannot be overlooked in any discussion of the American merchant marine, since 52.8 percent of that foreign fleet is owned by Americans.

Such unorthodox foreign registry is not limited to Panama, for lately the Liberia flag has been hoisted over new tankers built in Baltimore and Norfolk. In addition, the largest portion of the 75 ships registered in Honduras is owned by Americans.

RAISED TO SEVENTH PLACE

The American-owned craft have boosted Panama up to seventh place in the world's merchant marines on the basis of ships of

1,000 gross tons or more. The nations ahead of it are the United States, United Kingdom, Norway, Sweden, Netherlands, and France. Panama has more large merchant ships than Russia, Spain, Italy, or Denmark.

Labor unions the world over have threatened to boycott these Panamanian, Honduran, and Liberian ships, contending such registration is designed to avoid taxes, high wages, and safety standards, and has put many seamen out of work.

In connection with this threatened boycott the International Labor Organization conducted an investigation into the Panamanian fleet.

In a recent report the ILO committee made the following disclosures:

1. No authority from Panama ever inspects the ships as to conditions aboard, because most of these vessels never touch their country of registry.

2. Panamanian ships have no regulations to give effect to the safety of life at sea convention and the loadline convention.

3. There are no regulations concerning crew accommodations, manning requirements, hours of work and overtime in sea transport, food and catering on board ship, certification of ships' cooks, and inspection of seafarers' conditions of work. There are no remedies for enabling seafarers to recover arrears of wages and no provision for the maintenance of seafarers when repatriated.

LEGISLATION NOT BEING ENFORCED

4. What legislation exists is not being enforced due to the lack of consuls and because the owners and masters frequently are not aware of the provisions of Panamanian law and of their application to the seafarer under the law.

5. Wages and other conditions of employment on Panamanian ships are very diverse and in several cases well below international or good national standards.

Two years ago an official of the National Federation of American Shipping credited the doubling of the Panamanian-Honduran fleets since prewar days to the sale and transfers of American ships.

"The growth of these fleets has been a result of world forces," he said. "In international enterprises, such as shipping, it is often difficult to identify all the national interests involved. The nationality of a corporation, the nationality of its officers, and the nationality course of the capital involved may differ widely in any particular enterprise.

"Within the limits of these difficulties, it is clear that Greek money has been far and away the largest elements in financing private transfers of American vessels, and that several other European maritime nations have also participated."

REELS AT SPARROWS POINT

Most of the tankers built recently at Sparrows Point are owned by foreign companies in New York. They sail under Panamanian, Liberian, or Honduran flags.

The most recent to leave Baltimore was the *Olympic Flame*, owned by a Greek who is an Argentine citizen with offices in New York, registered in Honduras, and manned with a German crew.

The Standard Oil Co. is one of the largest American concerns to operate tankers under the Panamanian flag in the name of its subsidiary company.

The transfer to Panamanian, Honduran, and Liberian flags is serious, but not as serious as the continuing drop in the American-flag fleet, the NFAS executive said when the United States tonnage was 28,000,000 deadweight tons. Today it is 14,000,000.

BLOW TO NATIONAL INTEREST SEEN

Predicting a drop in the American merchant marine to a size only slightly more than the prewar fleet, he declared:

"This drop in the size of our fleet carries serious consequences for the shipping industry, for labor, and for the national interest as a whole. Already the job opportunities in our industry have dropped from the peak of 250,000 to the present level of 140,000 and we appear to be heading for the prewar level of only 60,000 job opportunities."

L. R. Sanford, in behalf of the Shipbuilders Council of America, claims that continued and reasonably steady ship construction is necessary if the United States is to continue as a first-class maritime power with vessels at least equal to, if not better than, those of other maritime nations.

"VITAL ELEMENT OF SEA POWER

"History demonstrates that no world power can continue as such without sea power and an adequate merchant marine is one vital element of that sea power.

"Navies, armies, and even air forces are helpless and circumscribed without a supporting merchant marine. World trade cannot be achieved and maintained without an adequate merchant marine. It would be foolhardy to rely upon foreign merchant marines to operate in the interest of our foreign trade and commerce without the restraining influence of a vigorous competition by United States-flag ships.

"I should like to add another warning which naturally follows as a sequel to the last statement made. There is a school of thought, at present somewhat articulate, on the part of some of those in high places in this Government, which maintains that a merchant marine under the United States flag is not necessary in the interest of national security."

INSULTS FOREIGN INTENT

"The State Department appears to take the position that there is no justifiable reason for the maintenance by this country of a merchant marine when foreign-flag ships, operating at lower cost, are available and could carry our exports and imports more cheaply.

"Possibly they could, but would they? Could we rely upon them to safeguard our interests? Any affirmative answer to that question would be naive indeed.

"The State Department's apparent policy is to bargain for alleged concessions from foreign countries by eliminating shipping subsidies, United States participation in ECA cargoes, and other like items which irk foreign nations. The State Department appears to think that the trading off of our merchant marine will promote the negotiation of treaties and their other ideas abroad. Experience has shown that we usually come out second best in such trades."

LUCKENBACH CITES EXPERIENCE

J. Lewis Luckenbach, chairman of the board of the American Bureau of Shipping, points out that past experience should be enough for this Nation to realize the necessity of keeping alive the industry with the employment of the men in yards to build more ships when needed and the employment of crews to operate the ships.

Both groups require more time for training than is needed for the building of a ship.

"Let us not blind ourselves with the thought that we may look to others for help in a national emergency," Luckenbach said, "as in the past that type of thinking has cost us many dollars and much human sacrifice, which cannot be expressed in dollars. Remember the old adage—'God helps them that help themselves.' "

There Are Two Worlds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "There Are Two Worlds," which was published in the April issue of the magazine Eagle.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE ARE TWO WORLDS

Wendell Willkie wrote a book, and called it, "One World." It was a good book, but it had a very misleading title.

The tragic truth is that there are, and have been always, two worlds. Not only in the sense of the present gulf that divides the free world from the Kremlin-dominated areas of the world's surface. For there are also two worlds within every country, in every community, and inside every single human soul.

Mahatma Gandhi, the strange little man from India with his Christlike faith in love and nonviolence, said it best when he wrote,

"The human body is the battlefield where the eternal duel between right and wrong goes on * * *. Who is there who has not experienced within himself the daily conflict between the forces of evil and the forces of good?"

This Hindu who lived in the spirit of the Galilean saw the roots of violence in every human being and began his crusade for truth within himself. Whatever aspect of his life you study, you find it lived as a never-ending struggle to strengthen the good and subdue the bad within himself. The great mass movement that brought freedom to a half-starved, demoralized people began as a personal influence. He taught others, only by precept and example, to honor truth, to love their fellow man, and never to resort to evil means even for an intended good.

With his learning to weave and his homespun garments, he showed others that, even without great factories, they need not go naked. His going to the sea to distill a handful of salt from the ocean was stronger than a sermon to teach that God intended to provide for all. By receiving the "untouchables" into his home, and performing menial tasks for them, he demonstrated his belief that no man was so humble that he should be harmed. His fasts and imprisonments gave pride and character to the poor and demoralized for whom he was willing to suffer. Without a regiment or an atomic bomb, by the power of personal example and the force of shared faith, he helped his people free themselves and help themselves.

No wonder the Vatican newspaper said, when an assassin's bullet laid him low, "He imitated Christ in his own way. He said, 'Blessed are the peaceful,' and he was blessed in being so." For he was the one great man of our times to tell us that the struggle for a better world begins within ourselves. The world may need a new roof but its foundation will always be the quality of the people that live in it. To change the world, begin with yourself. The old Chinese Christian said it well, when he prayed, "O Lord, make my church better, and begin with me."

The Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in a few days we are to be called upon to consider the foreign-aid program. One of the titles of this program is that dynamic undertaking commonly called point 4. A very excellent and penetrating analysis of the point 4 program, and some of the reasons why the point 4 program is important, was recently distributed by the North American Newspaper Alliance. The article was written by Mr. Paul Manning, of New York. I commend this article to the attention of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POPULATION GROWS, FOOD SOURCES DWINDLE, KEEP UP WAR PRESSURES, CONSERVATIONIST STRESSES: THUS TRUMAN'S POINT 4 BECOMES KEY PROGRAM, PROJECTING WORLD PEACE

(By Paul Manning)

NEW YORK, April 6.—The $45,000,000 asked of Congress by President Truman to supply technical aid to undeveloped areas of the world today was called a meritorious bit of legislation by Fairfield Osborn, president of the conservation foundation, assuming a considerable amount of these funds will be directed to the improvement of agricultural methods.

Mr. Osborn, one of America's authorities on the subject of world food, water, soil and timber conservation, remarked that the United States certainly cannot feed the world. But any money granted, such as the $45,000,000, to teach backward areas and countries how to produce more food for themselves is money well spent.

"The world today is faced with a basic problem of land depletion in the face of increasing population pressure," Mr. Osborn pointed out. "This must be corrected if a balance between natural resources and growing population is to be achieved."

The growth of the world's population in the last 300 years, from 400,000,000 people to about 2,250,000,000, is a fact which causes deep concern to conservation-minded leaders like Mr. Osborn.

In the crowded communities of the world such as Italy, many of the South American countries, and certainly India and China, the inability to produce food for booming populations without destroying the productive land areas, which are being cultivated under forced draft and by methods that destroy fertility, leads to tensions which can explode into war.

The old cry of "lebensraum"—living space—was one of the reasons advanced by Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo for embarking on military adventures which ultimately plunged most of the world into armed conflict. But, however specious the excuse, it was and continues to be a fact that dense populations which are crowded into fallow regions absorb the tensions of mass congestion and sooner or later follow any leader who promises more food and a better life.

For example, it is this problem which confronts Italy today. Neither war nor the uneasy peace of today has solved her basic difficulty; that of 47,000,000 people and an annual net population increase of 400,000 packed onto land which cannot support them all in reasonable decency.

This is the problem which has plagued economic recovery program experts in Italy from the very beginning of the Marshall plan. Their efforts even to institute land reforms have thus far failed, and as long as success eludes them in this matter alone Italy will always be ripe for communism.

The need for food also confronts Germany, a fact which the Soviet Union further aggravates by flooding the American, British, and French zones with countless refugees. United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy estimates that the saturation point has just about been reached in his zone, yet more than 1,000 refugees a day continue to stream into the western zones looking for food and a better life.

In northern China as well it has been Soviet policy to intensify local problems by draining off food surpluses to the U. S. S. R. This is the Russian strategy of mass attrition as practiced in all world areas they control. For Soviet leaders are convinced that any population which continues to live at a semistarvation level will come to regard war without disfavor. People of satellite areas who have known better days are now beginning to echo this philosophy as they declare: "War couldn't be much worse than the way we live now; and in war it is always possible to seize vast productive areas and perhaps live well again."

It is this reasoning which, if it spreads too thoroughly through the tension spots of eastern Europe, could cause a third world war. Conrad Adenauer, Chancelor of the new German Republic at Bonn, states that the way to avoid war is to convince the Kremlin that their reasoning in this respect is faulty; that the lands of western Europe would not contribute to a better life for the peoples of the East.

A new type of diplomacy might eventually change Soviet thinking. But as of today, and as long as a military vacuum exists in western Europe, the lands which stretch from the Baltic to the Mediterranean constitute a glittering prize. And now, with vast populations being convinced that only war would lead to more food and better land, the Soviets control a weapon of human desire as explosive as any hydrogen bomb.

There's no easy answer to this grave problem. The development of backward areas with United States money and technical specialists may eventually remove some trouble spots from the tensions that can lead to war.

But, as Fairfield Osborn observes, "the world will continue to be confronted with the problem of balancing supply with an increasing demand. Unless the world tackles this dilemma with more effort and greater scientific detachment or, in turn, with better conservation methods and with recognition of the effects of population pressures, the conditions that lead to wars will still exist."

The Texas Wheat Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in the past several years bountiful wheat harvests have been produced in the rich grain-growing lands of the Texas Panhandle and South Plains areas.

This great region in the northwestern part of Texas has lived long on borrowed time, insofar as its supply of adequate rainfall is concerned. Citizens of the area have been acutely aware of this and have shown commendable interest in developing water-conservation programs to fit the immediate and future needs of the region.

As yet, these programs have not advanced much beyond the planning stage. There is much more work to be done and people of the Panhandle are energetically laboring on the task they have undertaken.

Indicative of the constant threat that overshadows the economic life of the Panhandle is a comprehensive survey printed in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram Sunday, reporting the dire need for rain to save the wheat crop this year. I ask unanimous consent that this survey by the Fort Worth Star-Telegram be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS WHEAT OUTLOOK BAD, BUT SOAKING RAIN STILL CAN SAVE CROP

The Texas wheat outlook is dark but not hopeless.

Farmers say that rain within the next 2 weeks may change the picture as it exists today.

And by rain nothing short of from 3 to 4 inches is meant since the hot, blowing winds this spring have not only taken away what surface moisture there was but have reached into the subsoil.

A survey by the Star-Telegram through county agents in the principal wheat-growing counties brought almost unanimous agreement that:

GREEN BUGS ARE BAD

Green bugs are doing as much damage as the dry weather.

Summer fallowed land is withstanding the dry weather better than that which wasn't fallowed.

Irrigation brings good growth to wheat but also brings on the bugs.

If rains do not come within 2 weeks hundreds of thousands of acres sowed to wheat will be either grazed over or plowed. And if the latter practice is followed one of the largest grain sorghum crops in the history of the State may be the result.

None of the county agents would so much as hazard a guess on the probable yield of wheat, because the condition of the crop is such that there is no way of estimating.

The large infestation by green bugs, brown mites, and red spiders is due to the mild winter. The cold weather has lasted for only a day or two at a time. No snow has fallen in the Panhandle or South Plains areas during the winter, contrasted to the 1948–49 season, when most of the upper tier of counties was blanketed for 4 weeks.

Many countries report no appreciable rain since last October. Others report the last good rain—of an inch or more—in February.

The situation is not yet one of despair but is marked by a lot of finger-crossing hope for rain.

WHAT AGENTS REPORT

Reports by counties from county agents:

Armstrong: Charles O. Reed, 120,000 acres seeded, no appreciable rain in 6 months, green bugs rampant, fields too dry to plow, none abandoned so far. Rain by April 15

will save some of the grain. About 5,000 acres irrigated, but green bugs are hurting here, too.

Baylor: Roy McClung, 75,000 acres planted, fair to poor condition. Late planting in fair shape. All taken off grazing. Northwest part of county in good shape. East side of county hurt worst. Good subsoil moisture and good rain in 10 days would assure fair crop.

Briscoe: Leo White, 70,000 acres seeded, green bugs hurting, with 60 percent damaged. Could make fair yield with rain in 2 weeks, 7,000 irrigated acres in fair shape. Last substantial moisture in October.

Carson: H. M. Nichols, 150,000 acres seeded. Recent showers brought in bugs but many farmers still optimistic and believe rain by April 10 will help. Some fields plowed.

POWER DRY SUBSOIL

Childress: Vernon Hefner, 60,000 acres planted. Had 2-inch rain February 17 but high dry winds recently taking out subsoil moisture. Ten percent damage from green bugs, about 1,000 acres abandoned and will be more if rain doesn't come soon.

Collin: Jack McCullough, 30,000 acres seeded. Topsoil dry but good subsoil. Not suffering yet. Good rain would get rid of green bugs which have caused some damage.

Cooke: B. T. Hawes, 50,000 acres planted. Have some second infestation of green bugs. If get rain soon will make fair grain crop.

Cottle: G. J. Lane, 33,000 acres seeded. Dry weather worse than green bugs. Some fields being grazed out. Three- or four-inch rain would change picture.

Crosby: W. R. Kimbrough, 11,500 acres planted with about 10,000 abandoned to grazing and plowing. The 5,000 irrigated acres of wheat in good shape. Very few green bugs in county. Need 2- or 3-inch rain in 10 days or 2 weeks.

Castro: Raymond King, 105,000 acres planted, of which 25,000 irrigated. Green bugs and dry weather about equal in causing extreme damage. Green bugs damaging irrigated wheat. Good rain would help some.

Denton: Ed McKay, 40,000 acres seeded. Green bugs getting most of wheat. Fields very dry.

Deaf Smith: H. L. Clearman, 110,000 acres seeded. If lucky will harvest 25 percent. Green bugs leaving dry land and infesting irrigated. Most of irrigated will be planted to sorghums and dry land will be summer fallowed.

Donley: H. M. Breedlove, 50,000 acres. Some green bugs damage but dry weather hurting more. Last good rain in October. Year before snow on ground 4 weeks. No snow this year. If no rain fields will be grazed and plowed.

Floyd: Robert H. Gibson, 13,000 acres. No rain since last October of half inch or more. Two-thirds destroyed, with green bugs causing greatest damage. Farmers plan to plow and put in row crops if rain doesn't come soon. Doubtful whether rain would help much now.

DRY WEATHER DAMAGE

Foard: Joe Burkett, 77,500 acres seeded. Forty percent damage due to dry weather and green bugs. In west part of county some wheat heading prematurely. Rain would help in other sections.

Gray: Ralph Thomas, 120,000 acres planted. Some subsoil moisture. Green bugs all over county, about one-third of acreage browning over.

Grayson: Ben Cook, 53,000 acres planted. Bugs done more damage than lack of moisture. Few fields have been plowed. Moisture of substantial nature would help.

Hale: Ollie Liner, 165,000 acres planted. Dry and riddled by green bugs. Estimated 65,000 acres abandoned mostly by grazing out. The 30,000 to 40,000 irrigated acres of wheat not stooling out as it should. Didn't get rainfall when needed.

Hartley: E. L. Dysart, 112,000 acres. No green bugs, wheat not up enough but fields have greened up last 2 weeks. No appreciable moisture since last summer. Only two-one-hundredths of an inch moisture from snow this winter. Even rain now would not help much.

Hansford: Jack Jaggers, 265,000 acres seeded. Green bugs, brown mites, and red spiders. None abandoned, but picture will be different unless get rain in 10 days.

Haskell: Frank Martin, 80,000 acres planted. Fair to poor condition. Number of farmers turned stock back in for grazing. Rain would help late planted wheat, estimated at about two-thirds of total.

Hemphill: Walter Grist, 50,000 acres. "Nothing wrong that a good rain wouldn't straighten out." Ladybugs killing green bugs. Ten thousand acres abandoned, to be put in legumes, clover, and barley. Very few green bugs.

CROPS ARE SPOTTED

Jones: William H. Lehmeg, 80,000 acres planted, slightly over allotment. Northeast and northwest sections of county still in good shape. Central part of the crop gone. Some premature heading and few green bugs, spiders and aphids. Very small part of acreage abandoned.

Lamb: David Eaton, 30,000 acres seeded, including 10,000 irrigated. Green bugs damaging irrigated wheat, dry land holding its own. Not much blowing. Rain would still help.

Lipscomb: Martin Gossett, 150,000 acres. Situation "looks rough." Only four-tenths of an inch rain in February, first since last October. Fifty percent of acreage hurt by green bugs and dry weather. About 10,000 in summer fallow would be helped by rain in 10 days.

McCulloch: A. R. Grote, 30,000 acres. Some green bugs. Might make average crop if get rain in 10 days. However, farmers already plowing up some wheat.

Ochiltree: Hood Wills, 260,000 acres. Good subsoil moisture although no rain since October and no snow during winter. Bugs doing more damage than dry weather. None abandoned so far.

Oldham: Roy Ivy, 80,000 acres. Dry land wheat about gone. Fifty percent of acreage would make wheat if rains come in 10 days.

Parmer: Joe Jones, 190,000 acres planted. Green bugs hurting irrigated wheat. Some has been grazed out. Last rain in August. Fallow-land wheat looks good.

Roberts: Victory Joyner, 50,000 acres. Green bugs have hit pretty hard. Rain wouldn't help much.

Sherman: E. Goule, 230,000 acres seeded. No green bugs except nuisance. One-third of acreage planted didn't come up. Only 150,000 acres have any prospects of making anything. If don't get rain by April 10 will be plowed and put to row crops. Summer fallow land in good shape. Driest wheat season in 53 years.

HALF ABANDONED

Swisher: C. D. Holcomb, 223,000 acres. Estimated over half been abandoned, of which 50 percent be summer fallowed and rest put to grain sorghums. Very little irrigated because of green bugs.

Taylor: Horace Stanley, 53,000 acres. Very little abandoned, only about 5,000 grazed. Had only 1.43 inches rain this year. Good rain by Easter would make from 8 to 10 bushels. Very few bugs.

Throckmorton: George Blackburn, 38,000 acres. Some wheat looks good but moisture needed. Late planted grain hasn't suffered too much. Some early wheat heading. Some been overgrazed. Rain soon would help.

Tom Green: Paul Newton, assistant, 5,000 acres. Burning from dry weather. If no rain in 2 weeks most will be plowed and put to row crops.

Young: R. O. Dunkle, 60,000 acres. Dry weather and bugs hurting. Could make 35 percent of normal on late planted wheat if rain within week. Rest of wheat almost beyond help.

Wichita: Max Carpenter, 79,000 acres. Wheat good along Red River Valley. Rest suffering. East part green bug damage heavy. Estimated one-eighth being grazed or plowed. Northwest section of county got 3-inch rain February 12.

Wilbarger: Frank Wendt, 85,000 acres. Green bugs stunted growth. Rain still would insure average crop of 12½ bushels.

Wise: Tom Roof, 18,000 acres. None abandoned. Very few green bugs. Farmers plan to wait 2 or 3 weeks for moisture, then will graze rather than plow. Some will be seeded to hay.

Natural Gas Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial regarding the bill recently passed relating to the production of natural gas. The editorial is entitled "CROSSER and YOUNG Lack Faith in Free Enterprise," and is from the Cleveland News of April 4, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CROSSER AND YOUNG LACK FAITH IN FREE ENTERPRISE

Sometimes our Democratic friends in Congress get their signals mixed and come up with mighty strange formations.

For instance, it was a bit difficult for Ohio's Congressman STEPHEN M. YOUNG to maintain his argument that the Kerr natural gas bill is a "billion dollar steal" when a principal advocate of the measure was his Democratic leader, Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

Congressman YOUNG professed to believe that, if the bill passed by both Houses becomes law, consumers will pay through the nose to the extent of $100,000,000 a year.

Speaker RAYBURN followed Mr. YOUNG to the floor to remind Congressmen of his long record on behalf of Fair-New Deal legislation. Then he appealed successfully for passage of the bill, asserting flatly that "this will not raise the price of natural gas to any consumer in the United States one red penny."

You can take your choice of RAYBURN or YOUNG. We don't think a Speaker of the House would be caught out on a limb without complete assurance that it wouldn't crack under him.

The "billion dollar steal" cry had no more basis than the imagination of Congressman YOUNG and his associates. They had nothing to base it on except their own mistrust of the traditional free-enterprise system. They just prefer Government regulation to free competitive operation.

Speaker RAYBURN put his finger on their real objective when he said in reference to the position of another Clevelander:

"If I felt, as my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] has indicated he feels, that the Federal Government should own and control all the natural resources of this country, then my position on this and much other legislation certainly would be changed."

But Speaker RAYBURN hasn't let his affection for the New Deal send him scurrying to embrace every move toward nationalization that turns up. That is what inspired opposition to the Kerr bill, we believe. That's what Congressman YOUNG was suggesting in arguing that "the Almighty has given this (gas supply) to us for the benefit and general welfare of all our citizens."

An awful lot of bunk was written and said about the Kerr bill steal. You didn't hear as much about its recommendation by the Department of Defense, that the effect of the bill should be to encourage the development of oil and gas resources and thus to benefit the national security.

No; most of what you heard were the shrill cries that the wicked gas producers would rob the consumers without a shred of evidence to support the charge.

Actually the Kerr bill provides for continuing study to see that such a thing doesn't happen. If the producers were short-sighted enough to take such a course, they have had ample warning that Congress will consider the situation again.

Job for Everyone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which I am inserting as a part of my remarks appeared in the Wall Street Journal of Monday, April 10, 1950, entitled "Job for Everyone." It ought to challenge the thinking of the businessmen of this country.

If the representative form of Republican government is to survive each citizen who is a sovereign in his own right will have to make use of the ballot which is the instrument which places in the citizen the power to govern. Too long the public has been under the seductive influence and the resulting stupor which, like the lotus eaters, dulled the effect of the drug of excessive spending. Great segments of society have been bribed with their own money until now the bureaucrats are spending as they see fit the hard-earned money of the taxpayers. The businessmen, along with others, have been getting their hand-outs, including the magazines and the press. Now we see the representatives of the people who have been responsible for excessive spending rushing into the headlines as the champions of economy.

It is time for everybody to get down to earth and realize that this Government cannot spend itself into solvency. I have had my share of criticism because I have opposed the boondoggling spending both here and abroad. I was chairman of the National Debt Policy Committee, made up of some of the most conservative men in the House, which made a report in 1939 predicting accurately what the result of this spending program would be on our economy. In the wild and reckless era of spending under the Roosevelt and Truman regimes such a report as this committee made was not considered, and therefore, its praises were unheralded and unsung.

I am glad to see men like Mr. Elmer L. Lindseth, president of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., and also president of the Edison Electric Institute, make the forthright statement which is mentioned in the editorial which I am inserting as part of my remarks, under unanimous leave to extend, heretofore granted:

JOB FOR EVERYONE

All those people alarmed by the idea of a Socialist state agree on one thing: They'd like to halt this country's trend in that direction. For most of them, however, the problem is how to do it.

In Cleveland the other day one businessman, who obviously has been doing some thinking about that problem, offered some specific proposals. He is Elmer L. Lindseth, president of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co. and also president of the Edison Electric Institute.

Said Mr. Lindseth: "The American people are being sold the socialistic furore by one of the most skillful sales campaigns ever conducted. While we on the other side are doing a great job selling the products of our factories and in raising the standards of living of our people, we are shamefully neglecting the obvious job of selling the system that makes it all possible."

Many advocates of the hand-out state are living comfortably in Washington on taxpayer money. Some of them are in positions where they can devote their full energy to plotting an economic revolution.

"By contrast," as Mr. Lindseth emphasizes, "most of us (businessmen) devote a pitifully small share of time to combatting the forces we despise or selling the public on our ideals."

A part of this can be explained by the fact that businessmen are busy men. But part of it is due to the strangeness of the job of selling free enterprise, or freedom. So Mr. Lindseth proposes a six-point plan of action.

1. Get informed on the free American economic and political system so you can explain it clearly.

2. Recognize that many reform proposals stem from real human problems. The desire for a fuller life and more security is very strong, so we must sell to it.

3. Be for progress and change. Stress the better standard of living, security, independence, and freedom that our system has brought—but stress, too, that it can and will be improved.

4. Spread the story of the superiority of the American system, in terms everyone can understand.

5. Take a more alert personal interest in government.

6. Deserve the confidence of the people in business.

Those are Mr. Lindseth's six points. We'd like to add one of our own: Assume that the vast majority of the American people are on the free-enterprise side but need weapons to battle the social propagandists.

As the Cleveland utility man says, there are people everywhere to listen to the story. Customers, employees, and just plain friends are among them. Almost any business firm has many mediums of communication; employee publications, worker meetings, foremen's sessions are some.

The important thing: Don't sit idly by and "let Joe do it." This is a job for everyone. Otherwise, as Mr. Lindseth says: "We shall awaken one morning and find socialism is an accomplished fact."

Let Us Study This Opposition From Southern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, very few bills have met with such bitter opposition as has S. 75, the central Arizona project. It has been a determined opposition, obviously well financed and very cleverly conducted. Somebody has a powerful interest in attempting to defeat this measure. Who is it and why? What are some ostensible objections broadcast against it so freely by the opposition? Could there be other reasons, hidden but nonetheless real, prompting the opposition? Well, let us look at some of the reasons expressed.

California men have voiced opposition to Senate bill 75 on several grounds, one of which is their claim that it would take 1,200,000 acre-feet of water into Arizona which is needed in Los Angeles and other southern California cities containing a total population of 5,000,000 souls. This, whether true or not, is one of their most telling and effective points of argument in opposition, because it has human appeal. While I emphatically declare that it is Arizona's water asked for in the bill, I will lay aside for a moment the question of who has the legal right to use that 1,200,000 acre-feet annually and ask that we consider the question whether that water would be taken away from Los Angeles if diverted into Arizona. I deny that Los Angeles would be deprived of one bucketful if the diversion into Arizona were made under Senate bill 75.

The reason for my statement is the fact that Los Angeles has not been using even a fifth of her quota of water out of the Colorado River during the past 9 years which she might have used. The metropolitan water district has built an aqueduct large enough to carry this same quantity of water to Los Angeles and neighboring cities from the Colorado River, that is, about 1,000,000,000 gallons daily, but that aqueduct has been very slightly used—only to the extent of 7 percent—during the 9 years of its existence. The water has been in Lake Havasu on the Colorado and might have been drawn on had there been imperative need of it in the west coast cities. Therefore, it is plainly a mathematical fact that there is little present need of Colorado River water in Los Angeles and any propaganda to that effect does not square with the facts. It is quite clear that S. 75 does not seek to take any presently used water needed today by Los Angeles or the metropolitan water district. Any claim to the contrary is highly deceptive and misleading. Most protests against this legislation, the central Arizona project, on the ground that it would take water away from Los Angeles come from individuals who have been misinformed on this matter.

Could it be, as they say, a future need of water that it threatens? That idea I emphatically deny. The best engineers have shown conclusively that Los Angeles and the surrounding area have sufficient total water resources including, first, local supply; second, Owens River Aqueduct supply; and third, Colorado River aqueduct supply, adequate to maintain a population for a larger city than any to be found in the world today and for a larger population than Los Angeles can possibly be expected to have in the foreseeable future. This presupposes, what is a fact, that the present Colorado River aqueduct can furnish about 1,000,000,000 gallons daily from Lake Havasu on the Colorado River. The water for such a supply is unquestionably in the Colorado River physically and legally, and will be there even after S. 75 is enacted and 1,200,000 acre-feet, the quantity called for from Lake Havasu, is diverted into Arizona. Therefore the present facilities and water supply of Los Angeles are not jeopardized by this legislation.

How about any possible future need of Los Angeles for the Colorado River waters beyond the billion gallons daily? I do not believe that the time will ever come in this or any following century when Los Angeles will need more water out of the Colorado River than the present metropolitan aqueduct will carry. I have never heard any responsible official in California speak of building another aqueduct as large or larger than the existing metropolitan aqueduct. Since it has been built now a decade and has been used to only 7 percent of its capacity, obviously it is going to be many years in the future before the one now built will be needed to its full capacity. To build another one like it today would cost a half a billion dollars and call for such great quantities of operating power that the need would have to be very great indeed any time in the indefinite future to justify the thought of another such aqueduct. Why is the need for operating power so great? Because every drop of water going to Los Angeles from the Colorado River in the present aqueduct has to be lifted more than 1,600 feet in that aqueduct. This tremendous pump lift, nearly four times the height of the Washington Monument, makes it very improbable that Los Angeles even though it were four times as large as New York City would get its water supply from the Colorado River.

If, however, it eventually used its present big aqueduct to the full capacity and drew a billion gallons daily from the Colorado River and then years hence felt the need of building a second such aqueduct, to carry an additional billion gallons daily from the Colorado River, even then the metropolitan water district would be consuming only half of the water in the Colorado River allotted by law to California without any legal question raised by Arizona. No, it is preposterous to assume that the Los Angeles city water supply at the present time or in any foreseeable future would be cut short by diverting water into Arizona under the terms of S. 75. To tell the truth, I just do not believe that Los Angeles is putting up this fight because of any danger to her present or future water supply. There must be another reason.

What other reason could there be? Senator MCFARLAND with penetrating insight summed it up when he said:

> Mr. President, what is this argument all about? It has become abundantly clear during the course of this debate. It is simply a question of whether southern California power users shall receive cheaper power or whether the people of Arizona will be able to survive. If proof was needed, it was revealed this afternoon by the introduction of a power company telegram. They admit they are willing to construct the power end of the project. They say, "Just take the irrigation off, and we are willing to let it go. Let our power users in California have cheaper power."

Undoubtedly, the real opposition put up by the propaganda machines in Los Angeles to Senate bill 75, is because if this measure is enacted and the project is carried out, there will be less hydroelectric power for southern California and any available will not be so cheap as some of the power which Los Angeles is getting from other dams on the Colorado River. Why will that be the case? Because the central Arizona project calls for a third of any power to be produced at the power plant at the Bridge Canyon Dam to be used for Arizona's purpose in pumping water for this diversion and therefore there would be only two-thirds of the total production of power available to anyone for commercial purposes. Incidentally, the Arizona Power Authority has made application for all of the commercial power to be produced there and is willing to contract for the other two-thirds of the power so that there need not be a kilowatt from the Bridge Canyon Dam go out of Arizona. They do not like that in Los Angeles, for they would like to get all such power and want it at the cheapest possible rates.

Why would any commercial power that might be available to Los Angeles at the Bridge Canyon Dam under S. 75 not be as cheap as some of the power the, are presently getting from the Colorado River? This is why. Under the terms of S. 75, power is called on to subsidize irrigation to a reasonable extent which is also true today of every other big project in the West. In this bill, the subsidy for irrigation has been computed by the Bureau at seventy-two one-hundredths of a mill, which is much less of a subsidy than is being computed in many other irrigation projects. Now, obviously, if there were no irrigation for Arizona tied to this project the commercial power might be available at a somewhat cheaper rate.

Los Angeles needs more hydroelectric power and they want very cheap power so as to attract industry. That is the crux of their opposition to S. 75. If we do not subsidize irrigation and specialized food production in Arizona with power produced at the Bridge Canyon Dam, we would surely be subsidizing the building up of industry at or near Los Angeles. Is that what Congress wants to do in the complete development of the Colorado River?

Holifield Attacks Waste and Red Tape in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Government reorganization for greater economy and greater efficiency has become a watchword of the American people. They want Uncle Sam to put his house in order.

The Federal Government is big business—the biggest of its kind on the face of the earth. The American people as taxpayers, as stockholders in that business, want it to be well run. They demand that modern businesslike techniques of management be applied. They insist that the structure of Government be simplified and that lines of authority be clearly drawn, so that we can hold our public servants fully accountable for their actions.

In other words, they want an all-out attack on inefficiency, waste, and red tape in their Government. Beset with heavy taxes and a national budget deficit, the American people are right in making these demands. There is no excuse for a government structure that is too sprawling and cumbersome to be well managed. There is no excuse for wasteful duplication of agencies and activities.

I am glad to report, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress is alert to the problem. Without fanfare, without headlines, we are moving steadily forward in reorganizing the executive branch of the Government under the guiding hand of the Hoover Commission recommendations. Uncle Sam is taking firm steps to put his house in order. Mr. Hoover himself recently testified before a Senate committee that "astonishing progress" has been made. Experts say that we have accomplished more in the past year than in any like period in our history.

As the ranking member of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which handles all the President's reorganization plans and a major part of the legislation growing out of the Hoover Commission reports, I am privileged to take part in this vital task. Particularly as chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, I have made careful and extensive studies of the various reorganization plans and bills. With pardonable pride I can say, Mr. Speaker, that a primary part of my legislative work is directed to making our Federal Government less costly and better managed.

The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, which I sponsored and which was unanimously approved by the Congress, has been called one of the greatest consolidations of government agencies in history. This law provides the framework for sweeping improvements in the so-called housekeeping activities of Government—the purchase, storage, use and disposal of property, the keeping of records, the management of Government buildings, and the like. The Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report estimates that $250,000,000 yearly will be saved, when this act is fully in operation.

With the administrative tools provided by the new Federal property law, the Government will be able to search out waste and inefficiency in every corner of the Federal establishment. It will cut down the huge inventory—estimated at $27,000,000,000—of goods now stocked in Government warehouses throughout the land. It will reduce costly paper work and the multitude of forms now used in buying small items. It will catalog the millions of items now bought by the Government, so that one agency knows what the other is buying, and can take advantage of the best price. It will assure that Government buildings and property are put to full use. It will, in short, make its operations more efficient and businesslike, more understandable to the average citizen, and more economical for the taxpayer.

Speaking as a legislator who has served his district continuously for 8 years, as a businessman with 25 years of successful experience, and as an individual citizen who wants his Government to be sound and strong and prepared to meet the problems of the atomic age, I sincerely believe that thoroughgoing Government reorganization along the lines proposed by the Hoover Commission, ranks as one of the crucial problems. We must solve it; we will solve it, as our progress today demonstrates. In so doing, we must rise above narrow partisan or private interest; good government comes first.

Those of us who are concerned about our country's welfare realize how important is the need for overhauling the machinery of Government. We cannot travel the modern highway to peace and prosperity with a vehicle handed down from the horse-and-buggy days.

Democracy faces the challenge of a totalitarian ideology. To resist it successfully, our Government must be streamlined and organized to render efficient service. Every ounce of fat must be trimmed off. Its muscles and sinews must be strong.

Our Department of Defense is now vigorously engaged in the process of trimming the fat. The military unification law passed by the present Congress has given Secretary Johnson the administrative weapons to mop up pockets of inefficiency, to clean out superfluous activities and idle personnel. With our military services spending almost one-third of the total Federal budget, large economies can be expected in this field. Secretary Johnson estimates that $1,500,000,000 can be saved through military reorganization during the current fiscal year.

Of course, in putting our great departments of Government on a diet of expenditures, we must take care not to injure their body health. We want the most security and the most service we can get for each tax dollar; but we do not want our security to be weakened, nor the essential services of Government to be curtailed.

When our work of Government reorganization—now at the halfway mark—comes close to fulfillment—possibly three or four billion dollars in yearly savings will result. This will do away with a substantial part of the budget deficit. It will bring within reach the goal of a balanced budget. More than that, it will mean a better Government and a healthier democracy.

Mr. Speaker, 21 Presidential reorganization plans and many important legislative proposals are now before our committee. Every member of the Committee on Executive Expenditures is pledged to the task of eliminating the waste and inefficiency in our Federal Government.

I predict that over 90 percent of the Hoover Commission recommendations will be found worthy of acceptance, and the economies resulting therefrom will be reflected in lower taxes.

World Federation Resolution Would Strengthen United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it was my privilege to give consideration last fall to the world federation resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 64. Because of the pressure of immediate legislative items such as ECA extension, the committee has not yet reported the world federation resolution. I hope that it can be reported favorably within the very near future.

The gravest problem which confronts us all today is the problem of how to avoid war and promote freedom and security. I believe that we can avoid war, but to do so will take the combined wisdom and efforts of all of us. It will take, too, a combination of many different actions and programs. There is no single solution or panacea for the complex and dangerously explosive situation in which we find ourselves.

It is crucial, however, in our search for the right programs and policies for our Nation to follow, that we have an over-all objective in which we believe, in which we have faith, and in which the other peoples of the world can have faith. It is not enough to say, "We want peace with freedom." The Soviets say this, too. It is not enough to say, "We believe in the United Nations." The Soviet says this, too, although I think it is perfectly clear that Soviet actions belie Soviet professions and protestations. We must be sure that United States actions are actually in keeping with our professions; we must be sure that we have a well-defined goal which offers some promise of peace, a goal toward which our every interim action can be directed, a goal which can win the support of other peace- and freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

I believe that the time has come when it is necessary for the United States to reaffirm its determination to make the UN the core of our program for peace, and to state our determination to work for its development into the kind of peace-keeping organization which the nations of all the world can confidently entrust with the responsibility for assuring their security from aggression.

For this reason I support House Concurrent Resolution 64 as a step toward the crystallization of United States support for a stronger and more effective UN.

Soviet Control of United States Fur Markets Blow to Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article by Fred Niendorff appearing in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer calling attention to the fact that imports of raw furs from Russia are destroying Pacific Northwest fur business. Most certainly this calls for some action by the Department of Commerce.

SOVIET CONTROL OF UNITED STATES FUR MARKETS BLOW TO NORTHWEST

Of more than 200 fox fur farms doing a thriving business in the State of Washington a few years ago only three are left.

Four hundred mink farmers still are struggling on, but they cannot be sure for how long.

In Alaska, wild fur trapping has shrunk to a mere shadow of its former robust self.

In brief, the once lusty Pacific Northwest fur industry, wild and domestic, is sick.

Hope that the wartime excise tax on retail furs might be cut or removed has had its influence recently on retail sales.

But the real villain in the piece is Soviet Russia.

She has gone on a wild fur export spree and today dominates the raw fur markets of the United States.

The authority for that statement is the National Board of Fur Farm Organizations. It includes the Puget Sound Fur Farmers Association, the Northwest Fur Farmers Association and the Inland Empire Fur Breeders Association.

The national board has devoted months to investigating what has happened to American fur growers since the war. And according to Michael Dederer, president of the Seattle Fur Exchange, it is now prepared to insist upon defensive tariff action.

Its investigation disclosed that United States imports of furs have expanded from an annual average of $51,000,000 before the war to $167,000,000 since the war.

Russian imports increased 800 percent, those from all other countries, 300 percent. By contributing 30 percent to the import total, the Soviets in fact, the board contends, control the United States raw fur market.

(The board makes this finding, which it is submitting in its plea for a tariff wall:

"Domination and control of the American raw fur market by the Soviet Union is crushing the American fur producer and is also causing hardships to other friendly countries which have, for years, depended on our market for sale of their furs."

Sixteen countries getting American Marshall plan aid have not been able to increase their fur exports to the United States, the board found.

In fact, the board asserts, the Marshall plan countries, in order to compete with Russian prices, "have had to place into operation export subsidies, compensation rebates, dollar discounts, barter programs, and every other device known to international trade."

Now, the board challenges, is the open door to Soviet furs contributing to the economic stability of Marshall plan countries in the fur trade? It asserts the very opposite is true and that their only recourse is "to sell their furs to the United States at a loss and ask for more Marshall plan aid."

"Russia knows that by reason of her slave labor and state-trading program she can undersell every country in our free market," the relief petition asserts.

It goes further:

"While we (the United States) have been drifting on 'no look, hands off' policy, Russia has successfully demoralized our own industry and taken control of the raw fur market."

Dederer, who knows more about furs than the animals they grow on, contends that unless tariff relief is forthcoming the Pacific Northwest fur growing and fur trapping industry faces extinction under the heel of the red bear—total extinction, that is.

Condition of the American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the serious plight of the United States merchant marine warrants and demands the immediate attention of the Congress. In the Baltimore Sun of this morning the fourth and concluding article of a series on this present-day problem is published and is well worth the reading and attention of the Congress and the American public. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of April 13, 1950]

FORT OF BALTIMORE FEELING SLUMP IN MERCHANT MARINE

(The following is the final article of a series of four by Miss Delich on the condition of the American merchant marine.)

[By Helen Delich]

The steady decline of the American merchant marine is reflected clearly in the vessel-arrival figures in the port of Baltimore, the Nation's second foreign-tonnage seaport.

Last year 1,374 American ships in foreign trade visited this port, as against 1,968 foreign-flag craft.

In 1949 there were 1,272 foreign, 1,644 American. In 1948 the figures were 685 foreign and 1,644 American; 1947 showed 1,416 foreign and 1,738 American, and in 1946 there were 1,476 foreign and 1,500 American.

EFFECTS ON CITY

The sharp contrast between 1948 and 1949 in foreign and American shipping arrivals has affected the port—and, therefore, the city—as follows:

1. About 5,000 seamen are "on the beach."

2. About 3,000 longshoremen and shipyard workers are drawing unemployment compensation. Another 3,000 are working only 1 and 2 days a week.

3. The steamship agency which had the largest operating force in Baltimore had to cut its staff in half and return nine chartered vessels to the Government because cargoes were not available. This also means that 333 seamen, most of them Baltimoreans, were put out of work.

4. A typical ship-maintenance company that deals exclusively with American ships dropped 123 employees last year and decreased its pay roll $255,000. Many of the present 256 employees work only 1 or 2 days a week.

REPAIR YARDS LAY OFF MEN

5. Ship-repair yards have reduced until they work only about 1,800 men a day and still are cutting their pay-roll forces. Some of the men laid off have had from 10 to 25 years' experience.

6. The Sparrows Point shipbuilding yard faces a complete shutdown early next year.

7. A paint concern, one of the many industries not thought of normally in connection with the maritime world, cut its staff 25 percent because orders had dropped that much.

8. A stevedoring concern that deals exclusively with American deep-sea ships reported its pay roll for the first 9 weeks of 1950 was $30,000 less than in the comparable period in 1948.

9. Baltimore no longer has a single ocean shipping line with headquarters here, the Baltimore Mail Line and the Merchants and Miners being among the firms never recovering from the war.

(The ships owned by these companies were among those diverted to the British for use in supplying their troops in the battle against General Rommel in Africa.)

SHOWS IN COASTWISE LINE

10. The intercoastal and coastwise decline is indicated by the Quaker Line, which has cut its staff in half and runs only two ships a month from here instead of its prewar weekly service.

11. Although the number of foreign-trade ships in port in 1949 exceeded the number for 1948, the money spent was considerably less because foreign vessels cannot receive extensive repairs in this country, nor do they buy many of their supplies here.

The 5,000 seamen "on the beach" in Baltimore are a segment of the 40,000 lying idle around the Nation waiting for their turn to ship out. Some are drawing unemployment compensation; others are working at odd jobs a day or two a week when such jobs are available.

AFFECTED BY NATIONAL FIGURE

The national figure for men on the beaches affects Marylanders more than the 5,000 in Baltimore, as the unions estimate about 18 percent of all seamen come from this area. Seamen ship from the port they believe will give them the best opportunity to get a trip.

The ship-repair and building industry is one of the saddest in the entire merchant-marine picture, as the skilled men are turning to jobs with more security.

The CIO Shipyard Workers Union said that now is one of the times when the seniority privilege has backfired somewhat, as the first men to lose their jobs—the younger ones—were able to get located within a short period of time.

However, today, the older men—ranging in age from 35 to 45 and holding experience ratings of 10 to 25 years—are having difficulty finding other work because jobs are scarcer and older men are not wanted by new companies, the union said.

FEARS LACK OF SKILLED MEN

J. M. Willis, general manager of the Bethlehem Steel Baltimore shipbuilding division, fears for the industry's future because of the lack of skilled workmen.

"When we built the night boats New York and Boston back in the 1920's, we imported English and Scotch skilled workers under the more lax immigration laws," Mr. Willis said. "We didn't have many American workers left over from the first war, as the merchant marine then also was permitted to decline. These immigrants, many of whom are now dead or retired, served as the nucleus in the last war.

"There's nothing today to entice a young man to enter the industry. I've spent 52 years in this business, but I'm not going to permit my grandson to enter the business. There's no future here.

"It's no longer an industry which is passed on down from generation to generation in America. They're still doing it abroad, though, because they know the importance of a merchant marine."

CALLS CRISIS EXTREME

"We've had our ups and downs before, but there has always been hope ahead. This is the most pessimistic I've ever been, as the crisis is more extreme than any the American shipping world has ever faced."

At Sparrows Point each time one of the tankers—for foreign interests—is finished another crew of workmen is laid off. This tanker program will be completed next year, when the yard is slated to be shut down because American shipbuilding does not even appear promising.

The world monetary situation struck Sparrows Point directly when contracts for the construction of two 25,000-ton ore ships were canceled and transferred to England. After deflation abroad, Republic Steel figured it could build the ore ships in that country, pay the 40 percent duty charged by the United States and still save $2,000,000 per vessel.

NOTED IN PORT SURVEY

The importance of the shipbuilding and ship-repair business to the port of Baltimore, listed as the city's chief asset, was cited in the recent port survey as follows:

"Baltimore's extensive shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities have made this port one of the leading marine construction and repair centers of the world, and, because of the excellence of the repair services offered, have been influential in establishing Baltimore as an important port of call for the vessels of many of the world's leading shipping lines."

Besides the paint industry, the decline in marine repair and building work affects leather, wood, glass, glue, canvas, gear manufacturers, boiler producers, to mention a few.

The stevedoring company said that if this port did not have the bulk cargoes provided by the chemical plants in Curtis Bay, its pay roll would have dropped considerably more than the $30,000 for the 9-week period.

MONEY IN GENERAL CARGOES

"There isn't any money in bulk cargoes," the president said, "but it gives us something to do. The money is in the general cargo, which is going more and more to foreign vessels."

One American steamship company, which operates both coastwise and foreign-trade ships, reported that it didn't take it long after the war to learn it couldn't compete with the foreign-flag ships and had to retrench its activities on those lines.

However, that firm is carrying considerable cargo coastwise—of the 292,000 tons it handled last year, 178,000 was for the domestic service. What it lost in the foreign trade it gained in coastwise cargoes. It is the only company operating between United States ports to claim a gain.

The Bull Line never replaced its coastwise service. Others which are operating, but to a lesser extent than before the war, include Pope & Talbot and Calmar.

AFFECTED BY DOLLAR SHORTAGE

The dollar shortage in South America has had its mark on shipments from Baltimore to South America. In outbound general cargo, the Moore-McCormack Lines dropped 39 percent from 1939 to 1949.

But there are more foreign lines operating out of Baltimore to South America today than in 1939.

On the European end, the Moore-McCormack Lines showed a 199 percent increase in the 10-year comparison because of the Marshall-plan consignment. These lines, imports from Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, and Poland declined 40 percent.

Ore importation to Baltimore from Brazil, Norway, and Sweden had held up the inward tonnage, for it jumped 100 percent from 1939 to 1949.

MORE DOLLARS FOR CITY

An American ship in port means more to the city in dollars than a foreign ship, because the latter is not permitted to obtain extensive repairs here nor to purchase other than necessary supplies. Foreign ships also do not pay their crews off here.

Where a 10,000-ton American ship loading grain for Germany recently spent $43,000 in port, a foreign-flag ship under similar circumstances spent less than $20,000.

The American expenditures included: Pilotage, tugboats, watchmen, crew payoff, food for 60 days, deck and engine stores, fuel bunkers, fresh water, incidental supplies, stevedoring, voyage repair bill, custom-house fee, line handling, consul's fee, doctor for crew, supplies, labor, underwriter's fee, and agent's fee.

Not included in the $43,000 is the money spent for the grain, nor the amount earned by the railroads for the grain's transportation.

Indirectly almost every type of business in the city received a certain portion of that $43,000, as well as of the $20,000.

East Texas Chamber of Commerce Silver Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to the silver jubilee of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. President, today and tomorrow, April 13 and 14, members of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce are meeting in Tyler, Tex., to celebrate the silver jubilee of their organization.

The East Texas Chamber of Commerce has for 25 years effectively represented the determined spirit of Texans who have developed one great new industry and re-created older industries. Within the span of the chamber of commerce's life this region has become the oil capital of the Western Hemisphere. Its very name is synonymous with oil. More than 5,000,000,000 barrels of petroleum has come out of the ground of east Texas since the discovery of the Spindletop gusher half a century ago.

The combined efforts of many outstanding Texans, directed and inspired by one of the South's outstanding citizens, Ernest Kurth, of Lufkin, has helped convert the bountiful pine forests of east Texas into a major source of wealth. Each year a $135,000,000 cash crop of lumber is harvested in the more than 10,000,000 acres of east Texas timber lands. In addition, 47,000 Texans are employed in the woods and mills and factories which process the timber and produce famous east Texas newsprint.

Since the end of World War II, industry has focused its attention more and more on this rich and growing region. More than 1,000 new industrial plants have been started within the last 5 years in east Texas. More plants are still to come.

All this is quite a different picture from the east Texas of the early 1930's. In those days the region was poor, hampered by a one-crop economy, threatened by worn-out soil, slowed down by incredibly bad roads, and suffering from the lack of hope. Wise leadership of native east Texans has brought the region out of the mud, literally as well as figuratively. There are now more than 10,000 miles of good hard surface roads and highways through the piney woods of east Texas, more than 3,061 miles of this total in farm-to-market roads, so badly needed for so long by east Texas farmers. There is still much to do, of course, but east Texans can be justifiably proud of what they have done for themselves and for their State.

The East Texas Chamber of Commerce members and leaders deserve a great deal of the credit for the advancement that this region has made. This organization, perhaps more than any other, has kept initiative alive when spirits sag. It has directed capable talents into productive channels. It has wisely endeavored to develop the whole region.

I congratulate the East Texas Chamber of Commerce and its president, Mr. Henry Bell, of Tyler, on this twenty-fifth anniversary. I sincerely hope that the organization will continue its tireless labors for the progress of east Texas.

Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release from the office of the junior Senator from Nevada, relative to excise taxes.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 13, 1950.—"'Soak the poor,' in the principle of our wartime nuisance taxes," United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, Nevada, declared today in a statement demanding that Congress immediately eliminate nuisance taxes.

"The low-income groups are the ones hardest hit by the excise or nuisance taxes," the Nevada Senator said, "because these taxes represent a proportionately bigger part of their cost of living." To illustrate this, Senator MALONE said, "To a rich family the nuisance tax on a can of baby powder does Senator MALONE said, "To a rich family the extra pennies must be counted. Uncle Sam exacts his 20 percent, and this, on top of all the hidden taxes, makes a 29-cent can of baby powder cost 47 cents."

Continuing, Senator MALONE said: "If a member of a family lies dying and a telegram or a phone message must be sent to a relative, Uncle Sam taxes that message 25 percent, calling it a luxury. If a trip must be made and pennies counted in order to get together train fare, Uncle Sam demands a tax of 15 percent.

"If a man must buy an automobile in order to keep his job or for the well-being of his family for a price of, say, $1,500, $108 must be scraped up for Uncle Sam before he takes possession. In every family budget, particularly those of low income, movies is an item. A luxury, you say? Who is to say what is a luxury and what is a necessity? When the poor family sets aside money for the movies, they must add 20 percent for Uncle Sam's excise tax.

"The imposition of nuisance taxes and the increase of former excise taxes, falling hardest on the poor, was a wartime measure, to be withdrawn when the war ceased. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is full of pledges to remove the nuisance at the end of the war.

"The chief purpose of the excise taxes was not for revenue, so we were told, they were to cut down consumption. Are we still trying to cut down consumption?

"To correct the unfair burden imposed by nuisance taxes, I introduced a bill, S. 2751, in October 1949. The bill was referred to the Committee on Finance. While it lies in committee, the American people are clamoring for us to act now—not at some distant date in the future.

"I doubt the sincerity of those who say that this legislation to eliminate wartime excises should be made part of an over-all tax reform. When we imposed these hastily put together wartime nuisance taxes, with apologies to the people, did we say we would withdraw them only when we could substitute other taxes? Did we say they would be withdrawn some indefinite time after the war when we could all get together on the general reorganization of our tax structure? We did not. We said the nuisance would be withdrawn at the end of the war.

"Let us pass the Malone bill, S. 2751, and keep our promise to the people. The alternative is to do nothing and continue to 'soak the poor.'"

Justice Roberts Urges Union To Prevent War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Justice Roberts Urges Union

To Prevent War," by Daniel A. Poling, published in the Philadelphia Bulletin.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE ROBERTS URGES UNION TO PREVENT WAR

(By Daniel A. Poling)

The American people wait now for constructive, practical, and dynamic plans for peace. They are ready and eager to listen to their leaders. The proposal of United States Senator BRIEN MCMAHON even though it involves a possible $50,000,000,000, receives their serious attention. Perhaps nothing that Secretary of State Acheson has said since he assumed the responsibilities of his office has been so favorably received as his realistic comments on accords with Russia.

[illegible]

Equally impressive and to some of us, even more convincing, were words spoken by former Supreme Court Justice Owen Roberts when he appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee. "The only united world today," he said, "is the Communist world." And he added, "Among the democracies each nation behaves as though it were a world unto itself." Mr. Roberts is President of the Atlantic Union Committee. Right now he is pouring his great talents with energies to match them into the forward-looking program of this committee. He believes in a federal union of Atlantic democracies with a common foreign policy, a common currency, a common defense force, and with free movements of peoples and goods. Speaking to the Senators he declared that this union "is the surest, cheapest, strongest way to stop war, stop communism, and create prosperity."

A GOOD INVESTMENT

It is difficult to meet the argument of this man that democratic unity now can prevent world war III. Also he believes that it could have prevented World Wars I and II had it been effective before 1914. There is an Atlantic union resolution before both the Senate and the House. This resolution would allow President Truman to call the democracies together that initiated the Atlantic Pact.

Justice Roberts believes that these democracies are ready to explore the possibilities of forming the federal union. Also he believes that all they need is the leadership of the United States of America. Actually the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact are the beginnings of just such a federal union which would strengthen, not weaken, the United Nations. These and other programs need the continuing, supporting strength of such a union.

Again and again mankind has been overwhelmed because of an insidious "too little and too late." Justice Roberts and his associates have something better for the world.

One Hundred and Fifty Thousand German Troops Organized by Russians in Eastern Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "One Hundred Fifty Thousand German Troops Organized by Russians in Eastern Zone," published in the Washington Evening Star of April 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD—ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND GERMAN TROOPS ORGANIZED BY RUSSIANS IN EASTERN ZONE

(By Constantine Brown)

The new German Army organized by the Russians in the eastern occupation zone is estimated conservatively at 150,000 well-trained men equipped with the latest types of small arms, some artillery and tanks, but no aviation.

A portion of this force is expected to parade in full war paraphernalia in Berlin during Whitsun week next month. The size of the parading contingent depends on how strong a force the western powers concentrate in the former German capital.

If our present forces are strengthened considerably it is probable that the eastern people's army will be held to a mere parade group, designed to bolster national feeling and the self-confidence of the Germans under Soviet rule. If we fail to reinforce the meager allied detachments in Berlin, it is likely that the demonstration troops from the east will be of considerable number—probably 45,000 men.

FORMER SS MEMBERS

The new German Army, strictly controlled by the Russians, is commanded by Gen. Wilhelm Zeiser, a former German Regular Army officer who went to China after World War I and later headed the Stahlhelm, a patriotic German officers' association.

It is believed that during his stay in China he came into contact with and was converted to militant communism. Anyway his name is found again in the files of Western Intelligence Services as a commander of a Spanish Loyalist contingent under the assumed name of General Gomez.

Zeiser's deputies are reported to be a General Markgraff and a General Steiner. Both saw active service in Hitler's Wehrmacht. Markgraff at one time was head of police in the eastern sector of Berlin. He disappeared about a year ago and it was rumored then that he had been purged. Instead he appears now as one of the principal lieutenants of Zeiser. Steiner is the son-in-law of Wilhelm Pieck, puppet President of the Eastern German Republic.

The various divisions and brigades are commanded by majors and colonels in Hitler's army, including former members of the SS. All of them have been carefully screened by the Soviet MVD not for their adherence to the Communist doctrines but for their nationalism and devotion to the cause of Germany's revival as a strong military power on Russia's side.

COMPETENT OFFICERS

There is no dearth of competent officer material. Many who lived a hand-to-mouth existence in the western zones are said to be eager now to offer their services to the new "people's army."

This is understandable. While the "people's republic," that is to say, the U. S. S. R., pays as much as 2,000 marks ($500) a month to officers of the new force, former members of the Wehrmacht are starving in the western zones, particularly if they have not been denazified. The Western German Government does not pay pensions to former officers, and with relatively few exceptions, all the employment former Wehrmacht officers can find is as day laborers, domestics, or other menial workers.

These former members of the German armed forces naturally are attracted by substantial offers of good pay, special food, and other privileges which they receive from the east, provided they are in good health and have a good record in the Kaiser's or Hitler's armies.

According to reports from Eastern Germany, several units of the new forces have been sent to Hungary, where they form the nucleus of a force which may be used at a given time against Yugoslavia. These detachments have not been incorporated into the Russian divisions now stationed there, but form the shock troops which the Russians may throw against Marshal Tito when they decide the time has come to punish him.

Comparison of Benefits and Pay-Roll Taxes Under Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on several previous occasions I have introduced in the RECORD comparisons of the respective benefits and pay roll tax rates under the present Social Security Act, H. R. 6000, which is the proposed Social Security Act, and the present Railroad Retirement Act. I now have exhibit F for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD which makes a further comparison of certain benefits under these acts.

I want to explain that I am presenting these comparisons purely for the information of the Senate and at the request of a group of railroad men interested in the pension question. I do not claim to know the answers to all the problems involved, but I am in hope that these comparisons may shed some light on the questions with which we are confronted.

There being no objection, the comparison was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT F.—*Social security versus railroad retirement: Wage credits after age 65 if worker continues in employment, or returns to employment after receipt of old-age retirement annuity*[1]

Social security, 1950	H. R. 6000, social security, proposed	Railroad retirement, [illegible]
Wages count toward benefits regardless of the worker's age. Benefits may be computed or recomputed at periodic intervals to assure the highest possible retirement or survivor benefits.		No wage credits count toward retirement benefits after age 65. Upon return to railroad employment, or to last employer, after annuity has begun to accrue, it shall not be subject to recomputation.

[1] In either event, worker continues to pay tax.

Source: Rail Pension News, published by the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

The above exhibit F has been submitted to Senator HUGH BUTLER, a member of the Senate Finance Committee, with the request that same be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a matter of information in connection with previous exhibits A, B, C, D, and E. It was prepared by Mr. Thomas G. Stack, president of the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc. (a voluntary organization of union and nonunion rail workers), April 1950.

Program for Action on China Policy Adopted by United Front Action Conference on China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter dated March 1, 1949, on the letterhead of the Communist Party of New York State, the first paragraph reading:

Enclosed please find Program for Action on China Policy, as voted upon by a united-front action conference on China, held in New York on January 29, 1949.

I ask that the entire letter, plus the Program for Action on China Policy be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I call attention of the Senate especially to the No. 1 objective of the program, being to attack the so-called China lobby.

There being no objection, the letter and program were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNIST PARTY
OF NEW YORK STATE,
New York, N. Y., March 1, 1949.

To All Sections and Counties.

DEAR COMRADES: Enclosed please find Program for Action on China Policy, as voted upon by a united front action conference on China, held in New York on January 29, 1949.

We are sure that you will find this material not only informative, but helpful in planning actions on China in your communities.

A special outline has also been issued by the National Education Committee on Communist Policy in China. This can be secured through orders from our district education department. The outline can be used as the basis for discussion in your sections and branches.

Any inquiries in relation to further activity can be received by writing to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, at 111 West Forty-second Street, New York City.

Comradely yours,

MAY MILLER,
Assistant Organization Secretary.

PROGRAM FOR ACTION ON CHINA POLICY AS SUGGESTED BY THE ACTION CONFERENCE ON CHINA POLICY, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 29, 1949

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. Demand a congressional investigation—

A. Of the Chinese lobby in Washington. One of the largest spending foreign influences in our capital; not registered as foreign agents.

B. Of the billions of dollars of private accumulation deposited in American banks and investments by Chinese officials and individuals.

2. Demand a new China policy—

A. An end to all forms of American intervention in China and of plans to aid any elements and remnants of the Kuomintang.

B. Preparation by our Government to recognize the government which the people of China are now establishing.

C. Planning now by our authorities for genuine and self-respecting cooperation with the people's government in China, including normal and friendly trade relations free of any political conditions.

3. Get the facts and implications of the Government's China policy to the American people.

IMMEDIATE STEPS FOR CARRYING OUT THE ACTION PROGRAM

1. Get your organization immediately to pass a resolution on China policy. (Use the enclosed January conference resolution for suggestions.)

Send copies of your organization's resolution to your Senators and your Congressmen; give it publicity in your organization's publication and elsewhere; send a copy to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

2. Make use of the "political ammunition" of facts: The American people, if they know, will act.

A. Make a drive to get readers and subscribers to Far East Spotlight, the committee's monthly magazine. This is the indispensable tool for every fighter for a new and friendly policy toward China. Previous sources of reliable information about China and the Far East now have an NAM slant; only Far East Spotlight gives you the positive and encouraging facts about the Chinese people's great and successful fight against American reaction, and keeps you up-to-date about Washington's evil plans to go on backing reaction in China and the Far East. Subscription: $2 a year. Introductory offer: $1 for 8 months. Members of the CDFEP get this free.

B. Push the sale and reading of Anna Louise Strong's Tomorrow's China. Paper bound, 65 cents; cloth bound, $2. Organizational orders for 5 or more: 25 percent discount.

C. Have meetings on the China policy issue—

(a) The committee can furnish speakers: In the New York City area: Telephone the speaker's bureau of the committee any afternoon, BRyant 9-6343. In California, the San Francisco area: Contact Mr. William Kerner, 1841 Ellis Street, San Francisco. Los Angeles area: Contact Mrs. Jeannette Orel, 362 South Columbia Avenue, Los Angeles.

(b) Send your organization's own speakers to the briefing session on China. First session: Friday night February 18, 7:30 sharp. Telephone the committee for registration blanks; BRyant 9-6342. No fee.

You can't fight without facts. Far East Spotlight is your basic source of information. Meetings on China will bring facts to hundreds of others.

3. See to it that the President and the Members of Congress hear from hundreds of individuals on China policy right now. Order prepared postcards from the Committee—1 cent each. Write your own messages. Make calls—in person and by telephone—on your Senators and Congressmen.

4. Have your organization make an immediate contribution to the work of the committee or plan to give a regular (monthly, quarterly, or yearly) contribution.

5. Support the committee for a democratic Far Eastern policy.

A. By becoming members and by getting your friends to join. Membership includes subscription to Far East Spotlight.

B. By securing individual contributions for the committee. Your own; your friends; throw a party for the committee.

C. By doing volunteer work at the committee's office; 111 West Forty-second Street, fifth floor—any time, any day. Every Tuesday night the staff is at home to friends who come to help.

The Chinese people are defeating the American reactionaries. So can we.

China policy reveals the over-all character of Washington's foreign policy—it harms the American people.

China policy is directly related to our domestic struggle for homes, for more consumption goods, for lower prices for increased social security, for healthy international trade, for freedom from depression and militarism.

China shows up the weak spot in our reactionaries' program.

Let's fight on China policy and take advantage of the blow the Chinese people have dealt the American reactionaries.

COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC
FAR EASTERN POLICY,
111 West Forty-second Street, New York City.

ACTION CONFERENCE ON CHINA POLICY, NEW YORK, JANUARY 29, 1949—RESOLUTION ON CHINA POLICY

This Action Conference on China Policy, meeting in New York City on January 29, 1949, and attended by 182 registered delegates and observers from 80 organizations and including 48 individual participants, voted to send to every member of the Eighty-first Congress, through the Committee for a Democratic Far-Eastern Policy under whose auspices the conference was held, the following resolution:

In view of the following facts:

1. That our Government since VJ-day has violated both the democratic objective of World War II and the Charter of the United Nations in giving support to the antidemocratic and dictatorial Kuomintang regime of Chiang Kai-shek;

2. That our Government since VJ-day has made available to the Kuomintang regime of Chiang Kai-shek over $6,000,000,000 worth of the resources of the American people for use in civil war against the people of China, who are our historic friends and allies in the task of building a peaceful, prosperous, and democratic world;

3. That American guns, bullets, airplanes, bombs, poison gas, gasoline jelly, and flame throwers have brought suffering, death, and destruction to millions of people in China, thus threatening the alienation of 1,500,000,000 people of Asia, who are our natural allies in a democratic world;

4. That we Americans whose resources have been wasted and misused in China are still waiting for adequate and decent housing, for lower prices on consumption goods and food, for increased social security, for mutually beneficial trade relations between our two countries as a factor in preventing a depression, and for freedom from militarism and for the security which only peaceful and cooperative relations among nations can give;

5. That our Government's policy toward China is causing frictions and misunderstandings that can easily lead to conflicts and even to war;

6. That the people of China have decisively demonstrated their purpose and power to rid themselves of the callous, cruel, antidemocratic and outworn feudal regime which for the past years has existed only with outside (American) support and have shown their power to negate all the military advice, training, and equipment given by the United States to the Kuomintang regime of Chiang Kai-shek, and are now establishing a functioning government of their own creating.

7. That there are nationally prominent American political, military, and publishing figures openly and secretly advocating and working for continued and intensified intervention in the internal affairs of China against the Chinese people;

8. That a strong Chinese lobby is at work in Washington (one of the biggest money-spending foreign influences in our Capital but not registered as a foreign agent) trying to influence our Government authorities to continue support of the antidemocratic and unpopular Kuomintang elements;

9. That the very Chinese officials and individuals who are urging more pouring out of the American people's money in China are known to have accumulated billions of dollars (wrung from the suffering people of China and stolen from the pockets of the American taxpayers) and now stowed away

in American banks and investments: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we go on record as demanding—

1. That there be a congressional investigation—

A. Into the activities of the Chinese lobby in this country; and

B. Into the private wealth which Chinese officials and individuals have stowed away in American banks and investments.

2. That there be an immediate end to all forms of American intervention in China including an end to any dealings with any elements or remnants of the Kuomintang regime, recognizing the right of the Chinese people to make decisions about their country free of all pressure or interference on the part of our Government.

3. That our Government prepare to recognize the government which the Chinese people are now establishing for themselves and that our authorities begin planning for genuine and self-respecting cooperation with that government, including normal and friendly trade relations free of any political conditions.

Retirement of Admiral Lewis L. Strauss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, at the end of this week Admiral Lewis L. Strauss will retire from membership on the Atomic Energy Commission. Admiral Strauss, a close friend of mine, is a distinguished citizen of New York, of whose public service his State is proud. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on Mr. Strauss entitled "A Job Well Done," from this morning's New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A JOB WELL DONE

The retirement at the end of this week of Lewis L. Strauss from membership on the Atomic Energy Commission will bring at least to a temporary halt a distinguished career of public service. Mr. Strauss was one of the original quintet appointed by President Truman to the AEC when that agency was organized in 1947. Before that, and following a successful career in private business, he had spent the war years in the service of the Navy, where he rose to the rank of rear admiral and received the Legion of Merit for his substantial aid in helping to build American seapower up to its wartime strength. Thus, for nearly a decade he has been almost continuously in the service of his country.

The Atomic Energy Commission operates for the most part behind a veil of secrecy, for reasons which are obvious and necessary, and the contribution made individually to its debates and to its work by the various commissioners is only infrequently a matter of public record. There is good cause, however, to believe that Mr. Strauss has been one of the most useful members of the original group of five; that the influence which he has exerted has been a steadying and constructive force, and that this vast experimental project, pushing its frontiers into new, hazardous, and vitally important territory, has gained greatly from his broad experience, his alertness, his perseverance, and his level-headed judgment. As he prepares to take leave of public office we salute him on a job well done.

What ECA Is Accomplishing in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What ECA Is Accomplishing in Europe," by Roscoe Drummond.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF EUROPE—WHAT ECA IS ACCOMPLISHING IN EUROPE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

PARIS.—The Congress of the United States shortly will be deciding one of the most important questions which will come before it this session—whether to approve the Economic Cooperation Administration request for a new appropriation of $2,900,000,000.

In making this decision, Congress undoubtedly will be responsive to American public opinion. As one who, for a period, is officially connected with ECA, it would not be proper for me to argue the case for the Marshall plan—and I will not do so. But I can offer a report on what is being accomplished in Europe and present the underlying facts as faithfully as I have been able to observe them at first hand during the past 8 months.

The prime task which Congress assigned to the ECA was to help the nations of western Europe achieve an economic recovery which would permit them to function without extraordinary outside aid. The purposes which motivated the Marshall plan were:

To rescue Europe from the brink of economic collapse to which the most destructive war in history had brought it.

To help rebuild a prospering and self-supporting Europe, without which a prospering and secure America would be jeopardized.

To bring about such improved social and political conditions as will enable free institutions to regain their strength and thereby resist the march of communism.

Measured in terms of the Marshall plan's basic objective and its central motives, what are the facts to report? Some of the principal facts are these:

It is accurate to say that the progress of the European recovery program—in production and trade, in expanding productive capacity, in restoring internal financial stability, and in slowly raising living standards—has exceeded the largest expectations of 2 years ago.

AGRICULTURE

When the Marshall plan started, millions of persons were going hungry. Today that menace has been removed. Today agricultural productivity as a whole has been brought nearly to the level of prewar, and, given favorable weather conditions, will reach the prewar level or exceed it during the present crop year. This means an improving diet, but still a bare diet, since western Europe has 20,000,000 more persons to feed than before the war and is putting, by necessity, a very high percentage of its income into durable capital investment rather than consumer goods.

INDUSTRY

For the Marshall plan countries as a whole, industrial production has been raised one-third higher than it was in 1937. It took western Europe 7 years to regain its prewar level of production after World War I. Today, after 2 years of the Marshall plan and less than 5 years after the end of the far more destructive World War II, industrial production has been brought to 20 percent higher than 1938.

FINANCIAL STABILITY

Until the inflation which gripped the entirety of western Europe in 1946–47 was checked and brought under control, the nations could not even begin to rebuild their industrial plants. Today the governments have put their financial houses in better order. Prices generally are being held, and the outlook is encouraging.

Under the stimulus of sounder financial conditions and mounting production, intra-European trade has improved. Total exports have risen 50 percent since 1947.

These are the facts which bear upon the question of whether a solid foundation of European recovery is being made.

Obviously, there are tough problems still to be met. To enable western Europe to close the dollar gap—or to bring it into manageable proportions—and to carry forward the essential economic unification needed to strengthen and secure the recovery already made are the two biggest jobs which face ECA during the next 2 years.

One question which frequently is asked officials of the ECA is whether the Marshall plan appropriations for the third year should not be substantially reduced, particularly in view of the need for governmental economy in the United States.

Facts rather than arguments are more useful in answering this question.

Marshall-plan aid for western Europe for 1948–49 was about $5,800,000,000, including the special appropriation for Germany.

The appropriation for 1949–50 was about $4,200,000,000.

The ECA appropriation request which is now before Congress for 1950–51 is $2,900,000,000.

The Marshall plan is premised upon the principle of reducing the aid substantially every year, and the foregoing facts show wherein the ECA itself always has initiated these reductions rather than waiting for Congress to propose them.

A Marshall Plan of Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

BY

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I received yesterday from Mr. Philip Murray, president of the CIO, an organization not without influence in my State of Connecticut. I read this letter this morning to the National Commission for UNESCO, which is opening its annual 3-day meeting here in Washington. The letter, in my judgment, is not only a tribute to Mr. Murray but to the intelligent and constructive interest which the great labor organizations are taking in the field of foreign policy. I had considerable background when I served as

Assistant Secretary of State with labor's development of this interest, and there are no more effective spokesmen abroad for the United States and our democratic ideals than our outstanding labor-union leaders such as Mr. Murray and many of his associates.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1950.

The Honorable WILLIAM BENTON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BENTON: I have read with a great deal of interest the speech which you delivered in the Senate on March 22 proposing a Marshall plan of ideas.

You are to be heartily congratulated for taking the leadership in introducing your resolution setting forth a six-point program.

We cannot weaken our military power or our diplomatic influence but both could be significantly implemented by the suggestions which you make. In a world such as ours, we cannot underestimate the necessity for strength. But, unfortunately, we have been strengthening only our military power when we should also be strengthening the desire and the demand for peace in the minds and loyalties of men.

You can be assured of my personal support, as well as the support of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, for your proposals to extend freedom of information and to strengthen the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and to encourage further exchanges of scholars, students, and workers.

Sincerely,

PHILIP MURRAY, *President.*

Communists Act To Drive Public Mind Into Reaction and Intellectual Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Communists Act To Drive Public Mind Into Reaction and Intellectual Fear," written by Dorothy Thompson, and published in the Washington Evening Star of April 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE RECORD—COMMUNISTS ACT TO DRIVE PUBLIC MIND INTO REACTION AND INTELLECTUAL FEAR

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Everywhere, the activities of the Communists have the same deplorable effect. They tend to drive their opponents, and the public mind, into extreme reaction and intellectual timidity, thus paralyzing all vigorous and constructive social and political thinking on either domestic or foreign policy. The extreme left and the extreme right are everywhere natural allies—consciously so on the part of the Communists, unconsciously on the part of the rightists.

It is extremely important to understand this. For the struggle against communism is futile as a struggle against isolated personalities. It is a political struggle that must be waged by political means.

MAIN TARGET OF REDS

The main target of the Communists in every country is the so-called social Fascists, those who, recognizing the dynamics of history, wish to bring about social and political reforms. If Communists cannot infiltrate to control these movements they cooperate with anybody to destroy them.

Nowhere was that clearer than in pre-Hitler Germany. In 1932, the year before Hitler came to power, a tacit alliance existed between the Nazis and the Communists. Both had the same objective: the disintegration of the republic, and the elimination of the middle.

Up until the day Hitler became chancelor, the Communist press was denouncing, in the first line, not nazism but the social democracy. They joined the transport strike staged by the Nazis in 1932 and refused to join a general strike, which the Social-Democrats wanted to call in protest against Hitler's chancelorship. And both tried to penetrate and disrupt the trade union movement.

SAME THING SEEN AGAIN

Today, in Germany, we see the same thing. Who in Germany favors a military alliance with Russia and an antiwestern orientation? Communists, of course, plus many ex-Nazis including former police spies, some former diplomats, generals bitten by the bug of the old Bismarck policy, while extreme rightists do everything possible to paralyze the Bonn government.

And we see exactly the same thing here. The anti-Communists drive is conducted by unreconstructed isolationists, enemies of all social reform, anti-trade unionists, opponents of Marshall aid, and economic imperialists who want to use Marshall aid for subsidized dumping of American products to embarrass and paralyze the administration, despite the fact that willy-nilly it must govern for another two extremely critical years.

The tragedy of our times has been a whole series of false alliances and false divisions, all of which play into the hands of those who wish, above all, paralysis of democratic government.

Rotating Internship for Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, all of us who are members of the legal profession are interested in means whereby the high character of the profession may be preserved and promoted. Mr. Edward L. Bryant, whom I have known personally for many years as a member of the Detroit and Michigan bar, has devoted himself over a long period of years to improvement of the profession by the training of young lawyers in the field. He has evolved a program known as a rotating internship for lawyers, and I ask unanimous consent that an article by him on that subject which appeared in the Journal of the American Judicature Society for February 1950 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROTATING INTERNSHIP FOR LAWYERS

(By Edward L. Bryant)

Even after several years of law school training and after passing of State bar examinations and admission to the bar, the young lawyer is not prepared to render services to either employers or clients.

It must be conceded that law schools cannot train students in this important phase of preparation. Law schools are doing excellent work in most cases, but after the admission to the bar, the profession must take charge of the young lawyer who wishes to engage in active practice of the law, and a rotating internship seems to be the best manner for preparing these persons.

A student of the law cannot get more than a smattering of practical experience before graduation. It is absolutely necessary to tie up the law school and the law office. There is much need for supervised activities after the admission to the bar.

The intern is more likely to become a successful practitioner if there is supervision for his first year and if the integrated bar provides a systematic and progressive program for experiences in practice work and if the progress is followed carefully until the license to practice law is granted.

What can be accomplished? Many of these things and more can be accomplished by having a rotating internship for lawyers for 1 year after admission to the bar. Some of the suggestions are:

1. Elimination of unemployment during the first year of admission.

2. Practical training in courts, departments, bureaus, offices, commissions, and penal institutions.

3. Reducing of exploitation by older lawyers and organizations because the intern and his supervisors have had a year to appraise and evaluate.

4. Eliminating those lawyers who are not likely to succeed as practicing attorneys through the aid of counseling and assistance; the intern could not be eliminated, of course, without his written consent.

5. Practical experiences in briefing, pleading, law-office management, trial work, office accounting, purchases, and abstracting.

6. Training and practical education so that sucker lists and sucker schemes would be avoided and unnecessary law books would not be purchased or contracted for and the intern would not join clubs indiscriminately. He might even be taught how to deal with insurance lawyers instead of insurance adjusters.

7. Substantial reduction of the trial-and-error system.

8. Reducing the overcrowding of lawyers in many counties and circuits.

9. Training in the manner of charging and thereby reducing failures from undercharging as well as overcharging. Also training regarding attorney-and-client relations.

10. Reducing of grievance-committee work.

11. Providing systematic opportunities to contribute articles to publications and reviews.

12. Providing of an outline in manual form with full instructions and rules and schedules similar to that used by medical interns in an accredited hospital.

13. Increase the opportunities for older lawyers and younger lawyers to become better acquainted so that successful practice would be better established after the internship.

14. Practical training in corporation and financial affairs, labor management, and special types of practice such as admiralty, tax, patent law, and workmen's compensation.

15. Elimination of all evidence of supervisory control and governing influences except by rules of the State bar and the courts, promptly upon completion of the internship.

THE PLAN FOR ROTATING INTERNSHIP FOR LAWYERS

1. When and where to begin, for how long: membership: At the time the student is informed that he has passed the State bar examination, he would file his application with the Supreme Court if he desired to become actively engaged in the practice of the law. He would then promptly become an intern for a period of 1 year. Upon completing this period of training, he would be certified as a practicing attorney.

This plan will not in any way interfere with the inactive class of membership in the State bar, such as is provided for in volume 273 of Michigan Reports for the State Bar of Michigan.

2. Headquarters: The main intern headquarters will be the headquarters of the State bar and living quarters may be established for the interns at designated places.

Administrative branches may be established in every county and circuit in the State.

3. Supervision: The State bar organization shall have complete supervision with the Supreme Court over all certified interns, and rules will be established and books of instructions prepared; the committees of the State bar shall have full authority to perform duties in connection with the supervision of the interns.

4. Compensation: Each intern would be compensated in an amount comparable to that of the first-year intern in accredited hospitals.

5. Living headquarters for the intern: These will be established and dignified and supervised by the State bar in such places as it may designate. All interns will live in these quarters for at least the first 4 months' period of the internship. The remaining period of 8 months would follow that plan used by accredited hospitals.

6. How the intern would be trained:

(a) He would first receive his manual of instructions and rules. He would be presented with a standard file, list of general conveyancing forms, and schedule of assignments. He would immediately begin active training for the practice of law by being instructed in the operation of a model law office established at the headquarters.

(b) He would actively appear in all courts in the county where the State capital is located, and he would alternate with the attorneys for the plaintiff, then the defendant or petitioner and respondent or complainant.

(c) He would work in or get active experience in the many State departments such as the attorney general's office, the corporation and securities commission, the public utilities commission, the insurance department, and all such other State offices and departments as would be designated by the State bar.

(d) He would attend legislative sessions, if possible, and learn the practical operations of both houses as to rules and procedures and the manner of drafting bills and public acts.

(e) He would actively appear in the Federal courts, including the court of the master in chancery, the bankruptcy court, the United States commissioner's court; his assignments would be alternated so that he would act for the plaintiff at one time and for the defendant in the next case.

(f) He would be assigned to agencies and offices such as penal institutions, immigration offices, the legal aid bureau, the friend of the court, and the probation departments. He would attend lectures and receive instructions on the operations of these offices.

(g) He would actively participate before the workmen's compensation court and the circuit court commissioner in differing cases.

(h) He would be practically instructed regarding the operation of bodies politic, municipal corporations, and the many departments such as the corporation counsel and the prosecuting attorney, and we would actually assist in the briefing and preparation, including the investigation, of many types of cases as well as trials.

(i) He would receive constant, intelligent instruction and hear lectures by practicing attorneys, judges, and officials.

7. How busy would the intern be? He would be busier than he was in law school and about as busy as the medical interns who are on duty from 12 to 24 hours per day.

8. What would the intern do after the opening periods of training including the period of training at the capital city, and at the largest city in the State other than the capital city of the State if he wished to train somewhere else in the State? (NOTE.—Some young men would like to go with their fathers or other relatives or in a particular office.)

(a) The intern will first select his location after getting full information from the supervisors as to the number of lawyers and the population of the county which he selects. He may go into any one of the counties of the State he wishes but only after he has had the opening periods of training, including the period of training at the capital city and 2 months in the largest city in the State other than the capital city of the State.[1]

(b) Of course, if he wishes to locate permanently in either of the cities where the training is given, he will continue his practice training in these places.

(c) If he selects a county other than the county in which he is being trained, supervision will be identical and he will still be under the Supreme Court and the State bar. The rules will be the same in all counties and his manual or guide book of instructions will be unchanged and his training and duties will be similar.

(d) In the new location his working headquarters will be those approved or established by the State bar. He will operate from the county building and he will be supervised also by the presiding judge in this circuit.

(e) He may even be allowed to work with a responsible and paying mentor, sponsor, or preceptor, or to enter where there appears to be permanent employment for him if approval is given by the State bar and the standards meet full approval.

(f) He will still continue to accept and perform all assignments, and all remuneration which is paid from any source for his work will go to the common fund of the State bar for interns.

(g) He will continue to make general monthly reports of his accomplishments and activities to the State bar as the other interns will have to do on forms provided by the integrated bar.

(h) His income will be the same as he received in the cities where he first began his training and he will receive his certificate to practice at the same time the rest of his class is so honored.

9. Money. How the internship plan would be financed: All funds would be controlled by the State bar. Funds would have to come regularly from every county and every circuit and the State bar. Some of the sources from which money could come are as follows:

(a) Increased dues of the full bar membership. [NOTE.—This will be cheap for all of the bar members in the end because of the great benefit to be derived.]

(b) Increased suit fees in all courts of record in all counties.

(c) Increased fees for defaults, decrees, and judgment orders.

(d) Salaries paid for work done by the interns.

(e) Appraiser and referee fees, administrator and executor fees, trustee and receivership fees.

(f) For briefing and other assignments of his work.

(g) From donations and wills and trophy awards (similar to the Ross trophy now competed for).

(h) From foundations.

(i) From sources similar to those which benefit hospital interns, including work at official agencies and bureaus.

(j) From intern fees paid by opposing litigants in trial work in the amount of a dollar a day each.

(k) Grand jury investigation work.

(l) Abstracting.

(m) For services rendered as public defender or amicus curiae.

There are many other sources which can be listed, of course, and which can be contemplated. To illustrate the effectiveness of increased membership dues, in Michigan there are over 6,000 lawyers who would contribute through dues.

As an example of the possibilities where the interns can earn compensation, Wayne County, Mich., has started and completed an average of 20,000 cases every year since 1940 in the circuit court alone. There have been thousands of circuit court commissioner cases, common pleas cases, criminal cases, Federal cases, and bankruptcy cases in Wayne County alone, and the total number of cases in other counties would more than double these totals. For performing many of the duties connected with cases such as these, the interns would be paid and this money would go to the common fund. Many assignments would be earmarked for the interns by the courts and department heads. The court reporters and clerks are paid large salaries. Since no one asks where the entry fee, decree fees, or the judgment or sheriff fees go, why would there be any trouble in getting these funds for the interns, which would be adequate to pay them the compensation comparable to that paid to medical interns in accredited hospitals?

10. Purpose: The purpose of this rotating internship is to have the first-year interns rotate work in as many courts and departments as possible so that they would be well equipped to enter private, ethical practice in any kind of a law office. The further purpose is to help establish a rotating internship for every practicing lawyer in the United States.

11. Will the plan succeed, and has the plan been tried? This plan will succeed. Experience has actually been had with more than 25 young lawyers who had practiced less than 3 years.

Under the supervision of the supreme court and the State bar and the judges, the interns would be very well trained and supervised. They would have their manuals and their standard files, their practice training and their lectures and abstracting work. They would have a chance to evaluate. They would be better acquainted. They would be very busy. They would not learn by trial and error alone. They would learn to try lawsuits and they would learn of the benefits of the conciliation and pretrial dockets. They certainly would be better lawyers. They would have permanent friendships. They would perhaps learn about cooperative offices and neighborhood offices and they would make the profession almost a fraternity. They would be serious about their profession instead of just trying to get a job, and they would not be just trying to get something to do. They would all have a connection or an office at the end of the year, and they certainly would be happier.

They could now give their clients a square deal.

12. What benefit would all of this be to the State bar? The bar would be definitely improved. The law school and the office would be tied up for the first time in our history. The junior bar associations would be more powerful. The State bars would be more active and more respected. The youth would now be experienced. The judges and the lawyers as well as the teachers would all have assisted in the training of the intern so his training would be complete.

13. Conclusions:

(a) Will the rotating internship be a success? Yes, definitely, for it has been successfully tried, on a small but definite scale.

(b) Is it necessary? Yes, because there is a great need for it and most lawyers agree that an internship is necessary or, at least, that there must be some practice training after graduation.

(c) Is the period too long? No. Most lawyers flounder and waste their first year.

(d) Is this plan complete? No. Remember, the first automobile gasoline motor operated on a table before it was put on wheels, and now it travels at over 100 miles an hour. It will take a long while to establish this internship plan properly.

(e) Will it help the young lawyer's social contacts and better living? It cannot help but do so because he will fraternize with the older lawyers in a practical manner.

(f) Is it paternalistic? No, because it is an impartial, supervised training of beginners in a highly respected profession and it terminates at the end of 1 year.

(g) Will it adversely affect early establishment in special fields? No, it will broaden the specialists.

(h) Can it be comparable to the fine training young medics get? Yes, because the law profession has more courts, departments, and commissions at its disposal than the medical profession has hospitals and clinics at its disposal, and the training would be supervised by the State bar associations, the supreme courts, and judges of courts in all counties.

(i) Can we finance it? Why not? The medics do, and the young doctors survive on their compensation.

(j) Will young interns be prevented from going in offices of their choice? No, but they won't be hurried. They can now have time to appraise and to be appraised and so there will be fewer disappointments and failures and their work will be supervised constantly. They can specialize in admiralty if they wish but they must be prepared and have diversification first.

k. Are things unsatisfactory for the young lawyer now? It is apparent that they are.

l. Would this apply to all new lawyers? It certainly would, regardless of school grades, connections, or age.

14. Finally: The legal profession must be improved. The way to do it is to train the young. The experiences must not be along one line; they must be rotated. We must not leave this training to sponsors, mentors, preceptors, or professors. The State bar must tie in the law school and the law office.

The great work done at Duke University, Western Reserve, and in the great States of New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Vermont, the plan of the Legal Aid Society of New York, the operation of the Pennsylvania plan, the reports made by the Russell Sage Foundations, the establishment of the European precedent to clerkship, the mentor system of Cleveland, and the valuable guide published by Prof. John Tracy, of the University of Michigan Law School, all make valuable contributions but these are not enough, as the bar surveys have shown. The man who elects to practice law should be trained by practical men and the work must be supervised. The student is trained in law school by excellent pedagogues. When his school work is over, the State bar should take over in earnest for a period of 1 year. The training must be standardized the same as it is in law school, only it must be from a practical standpoint, of course.

Let us protect our young lawyers. Let us improve this wonderful old profession so that the general public will no longer sneeringly say "Lawyer? Did you say 'liar'?", or "A lawyer and an honest man; there must be two men in that grave."

15. Authority to establish the plan: These ideas and the plan are not copyrighted or patented. You can, in all probability, suggest something better or perhaps you can improve on these generalities. This is just a start. Fortunately, there is power to go ahead at once with a plan for rotating internship without legislation. Most State bar organizations have the power under rules or statutes to aid in the promotion of improvements in the administration of justice and the advancement of the science of jurisprudence, in the improvement of the relations between the profession and the public, and in promotion of the interests of the legal profession.

[1] This plan is drafted with a State like Michigan, Illinois, or Louisiana in mind, when there is one big metropolitan city and a State capital located elsewhere. Adaptations would be necessary in a State like Indiana, where the two are combined, or in other States with differing circumstances.

Kerr Gas Bill Only Affirms Present Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Kerr Gas Bill Only Affirms Present Law," published in the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, of April 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KERR GAS BILL ONLY AFFIRMS PRESENT LAW

Never within his memory, said Representative TYLER, of Texas, during House debate on the Kerr natural gas bill, has a measure been so falsely, maliciously, and deliberately misrepresented. This widespread campaign of distortion and misstatement continues while the bill is before President Truman for his approval or veto, matched only by the vicious personal attacks directed at sponsors of the legislation, and especially its author, Senator KERR, of Oklahoma.

Chief among the misleading statements made about the bill are that its effect would be to triple the price of gas to the consumer (mainly those in northern States), unjustifiably enrich the independent producers of natural gas, and create a monopoly in that field. This it would do, according to the intemperate opponents of the bill, by killing the Federal Power Commission's rate-fixing authority over independent producers who sell gas to interstate pipe line companies.

The measure would do none of these things, as anyone ought to know who has given the bill even a cursory reading and who has even the most elementary knowledge of the natural-gas business.

As a matter of fact, the bill, if it is signed into law by the President, will not take away an iota of the authority the FPC has claimed or exercised since the original Natural Gas Act was passed in 1938. The FPC does not and never has controlled or regulated the rates at which gas is sold at the well. The Commission controls, and would continue to control, the interstate pipeline transportation of gas and its sale for wholesale purposes. State regulatory bodies control, and would continue to control, the price at which gas is sold to the consumers.

In 1947 the FPC specifically disclaimed any right to regulate the sale of gas at the well and approved passage of a bill almost identical with the present one. That proposed legislation also was approved by the Department of Defense, which said its enactment would "remove uncertainties now existing as to the extent of the application of the Natural Gas Act" and that the effect should be increased development of oil and gas resources of benefit to national security.

The uncertainties spoken of by the Defense Department were created by a decision of the United States Supreme Court which seemed to some to indicate—although it did not say so plainly—that the original Natural Gas Act gave the FPC jurisdiction over the price of gas at the well. Since then there have been signs of intent by the Commission to assert that shadowy authority. The newly passed measure would merely reassert and clarify the original intent of Congress by specifically stating that the FPC has no such authority.

That Congress never intended for the powers of the FPC to extend that far is evidenced by the legislative history of the act and the flat statement of the chairman of the House Interstate Commerce Committee, then Representative Lea of California, at the time of its passage. In response to a direct question on the floor of the House, he stated: "The bill does not apply to the production and gathering of gas."

Any fear that the price paid by the consumer for gas would triple, or even go up at all as a result of passage of the Kerr bill, is contrary to all reason and all experience. Especially preposterous are the extravagant and unsupported statements that consumers would find their gas bills increased anywhere from $100,000,000 to $500,000,000 a year. The bill does nothing more than to provide that the same conditions which have been in effect for the last 12 years shall remain in effect. And during that time, while there has been some advance in the price paid to gas producers in the Southwest, the price paid by consumers of this fuel has declined by an average of 12 percent.

The reason for the advance in the price of gas at the well is the widened market that has been created for it by construction of pipe lines from the Southwest to Northern and Eastern States. The reason the price to the consumer has declined, in spite of the increased cost in the field, is that wider markets and greater demand for gas has made it possible to deliver a higher volume at a lower price.

That process can be expected to continue if the Kerr bill becomes law, since the volume of gas transported by pipe line has more to do with its price at the point of delivery than does the cost at the well. On the other hand, failure of the bill to become law would subject producers to such rigid regulation as to discourage the expensive search for new gas sources. This is by reason of the fact that, under FPC regulation, each independent producer would be in the class of a public utility, restricted to a fixed rate of return applying only to those wells which produce gas and making no allowance for the cost of drilling dry holes and for other exploratory expense.

Thus, instead of being penalized, the consumer stands to receive a more plentiful, dependable supply of gas at lower cost if the bill becomes law. The assertion that gas producers and holders of gas reserves would be enriched by hundreds of millions of dollars a year is exploded by figures showing that total sales of the product by the Nation's independent producers for movement in interstate commerce amount to only $75,000,000 a year.

The selling of gas has developed into a competitive business. Producers of natural gas number more than 5,000. The nearly 100 pipe lines authorized in the last 8 years have contracts with thousands of producers and gatherers of gas at different prices in different fields and even within the same field. Most of these producers are bound by long-term contracts to deliver gas at a fixed price. That is just the opposite of monopolistic ability to sell gas at whatever price they choose.

The threat of Federal control from which the Kerr bill would deliver the independent producer of gas is a matter affecting not only the gas producer but all producers. No raw product is now under Federal price control in the hands of the producer. But if the price of gas at the well were brought under Federal regulation, it would be only a short and inevitable step to Federal regulation of oil, since in many cases the production of oil and gas are inseparable.

That is the foot-in-the-door method of starting with Government control of one small segment of industry and gradually extending it to include others. The ultimate result could be complete destruction of the American system of free enterprise.

The Kerr bill is fair, honest, constructive, and consistent, and will be the means of insuring an unlimited supply of cheap gas in the future. The President, in signing it, will be rendering a service to the consumers of gas and preserving the principle of free enterprise. If by any chance it should work out to anybody's detriment, a safeguard has been written into the bill in the form of an amendment which gives the President the final say.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Defend the Marshall Plan," from the Christian Science Monitor for March 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFEND THE MARSHALL PLAN

The cheapest wars to win are those that don't begin. The United States has been fighting such a war for 2 years now, and winning it.

Yes; we are talking about the Marshall plan. But we are not talking about it at this moment because of its tremendous achievements. These are generally recognized. We are talking about it because, despite its accomplishments for European well-being and American security, the European recovery program is in immediate danger.

It is endangered not by any swing of majority opinion against it in the United States. The threats come from several different minority interests.

They come from Members of both Houses of Congress who know the American people are weary of many of the Government's spending policies, but who are not too courageous about tackling spending where their constituents can feel it. These legislators look on European aid as providing a field in which savings can be made without the voters feeling it, at any rate without feeling it this side of new troubles with communism involving stepped-up military preparations or maybe war.

The marshall plan is also endangered by interests who are determined to make aid to Europe aid to themselves first. They are producers of crops and other goods in which surpluses are expected to be more burdensome in the near future.

They want more and more strings attached to the Marshall plan, strings that will force Europeans to buy certain products in American markets. These interests would, whether intentionally or not, insist on new provisions in Marshall plan legislation which would tend to perpetuate the dollar gap between Europe and the United States instead of closing it.

There is also a move afoot to alter the form of the aid from grants to repayable loans. This would intensify the European dollar problem, since the recipients of aid would have to find dollars to pay back on principal and interest, and there is no way for them to get dollars except by selling goods to the United States.

Which brings us to another less direct danger to the Marshall plan.

Now that the sellers' market is disappearing in the United States, the demand for protection against European competition could frustrate some of the important aims of the Marshall plan.

We do not believe the American people are willing to risk a failure in so important a field of their foreign policy to satisfy sectional demands for drastic cuts in money aid to Europe or for special benefits from that aid to certain American producers.

These attacks on the Marshall plan would cut severely into America's peace program just as the Soviet Union is embarking on what promises to be an unprecedented peace offensive. In the battle for men's minds one of the most important influences on world opinion will be the ability of the United States to stick to its aims. To seem to back away from the Marshall program just as it reaches half-way house can be neither good statesmanship nor sound economy. But it may take the voices of an enlightened citizenry to convince the politicians of this fact.

Oil and Gas: Curse or Blessing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Oil and Gas: A Curse or Blessing?" published in Time magazine of the issue of April 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL AND GAS: CURSE OR BLESSING?

In a hullabaloo of argument, President Truman tried to make up his mind last week whether he should sign or veto the Kerr gas bill. The bill's opponents loudly damned it as the biggest raid by "special interests" since Teapot Dome. Just as warmly, the bill's backers called it indispensable for the further growth of the natural-gas industry.

The big oil and gas companies, who had championed oil-rich Senator ROBERT KERR's bill for all they were worth, marshaled some potent arguments on their side. Despite all the political uproar, they pointed out that the bill, which exempts "independent" gas producers from the price-fixing control of the Federal Power Commission, merely repeats and clarifies a previous congressional action. The 1938 Natural Gas Act, in their opinion, had specifically exempted the independents (i. e., those gas producers and gatherers not affiliated with interstate pipe-line companies) from FPC's jurisdiction. The United States Supreme Court had disagreed in 1947, when it ordered Louisiana's Interstate Natural Gas Co. to rebate nearly $800,000 on consumers' gas bills. It thereby virtually wrote a blank check for FPC to regulate the price of gas in the field whenever the gas crossed a State line for resale.

Instead of welcoming this power, FPC Commissioners urged Congress to pass a bill once more exempting the independents. Even the then Commissioner Leland Olds, a zealot for regulation, approved FPC's stand that it would not "assert such jurisdiction." Less than a year later, Olds and the Commission changed their minds. In October 1948 they started proceedings against the natural-gas affiliate of Phillips Petroleum Co., which has the biggest gas reserves of any independent gas producer, to test their power to fix the price of gas in the field.

CAPPED WELLS

Phillips and the other oil companies feared the threat to fix their gas prices, but what they feared more was that FPC would use the authority it won over gas as a lever to try to declare the whole oil industry a public utility—and thus control oil prices and profits also. (Since gas is a byproduct of oil development, the big oil companies are also big gas producers.) The result was that many of the big producers refused to sell gas to the interstate pipe lines. They pumped the gas back into the ground, sold it only within the State, or let it go to waste.

Although State authorities have tried to stop the waste, Oklahoma oilmen were still blowing off great quantities of gas last week rather than run what one oilman called the "tremendous risk" of FPC regulation. For the same reason, hundreds of gas wells have been capped, and new pipe-line operators have found it hard to line up contracts for sufficient gas. The majority of those who did had to agree that the contracts would be canceled if FPC got control over gas prices. One result: out of the 5,700,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas produced in the Southwest in 1948, only 1,200,000,000,000 feet went through the interstate pipe lines.

CAPPED PRICES?

Opponents of the bill, notably Illinois Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, argued that the lack of regulation would send gas prices soaring and boost consumers' bills $100,000,000 a year. In answer, oilmen pointed to the record. In the last 10 years the price of gas in the field has risen, in some cases quintupled (the price had been so low 10 years ago that gas had virtually been given away). Yet, the average price of natural gas to residential users had dropped from 70.9 cents per 1,000 cubic feet in 1939 to 63.5 cents in 1948. Even if the Kerr bill becomes law, the rates charged by transmission companies and utilities will still be regulated by FPC or State utility commissions.

Charles I. Francis, vice president of Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., pooh-poohed the talk of immediate price rises. Said he: "The public will benefit by lower gas prices."

As long as the current gas surplus exists, oilmen contended that gas prices, even in the field, would not rise much. Eventually, they probably would. Said Gordon W. Reed, chairman of small-sized Texas Gulf Producing Co.: "Where the price of gas will end, no one can predict right now, but it is definitely going to reach its economic level. Prices to producers in the Southwest could go up another 5 cents or 6 cents a thousand cubic feet (roughly 55 percent) without affecting consumers' prices in the North."

Address by Hon. William Benton to the United States National Commission for UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered this morning by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] to keynote the 3-day meeting of the United States National Commission for UNESCO. The Senate may recall that it was the Senator from Connecticut who, as Assistant Secretary of State, sponsored the legislation which authorized our joining UNESCO, and he tells me that the pen with which the President signed the act decorates his office at the headquarters of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. The Senator handled the London Conference of 1945 for the State Department, at which the UNESCO charter was written; and he was chairman of the United States delegation at the first two general conferences of UNESCO—in Paris in 1946, and in Mexico City in 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Stoddard and fellow members of the National Commission, this will be a political talk. In my first six words, I want once more to register the fact that UNESCO is a political instrument.

The United States National Commission is a political body and the future of the United States, and the whole free world is now balanced on crucial, political decisions which will determine the fate of mankind.

There are those deeply interested in UNESCO who sincerely believe that it is better for UNESCO to remain aloof from what they regard as the sordid fingers of world politics. Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, who represented the United States at the UNESCO meeting on German education in Paris last August, writes me that he thinks UNESCO's hesitancy on the subject of Germany is due to what he calls rather fantastic notions about the importance of the Czech and Polish adhesion to UNESCO. This is of course, politics, and let us at least recognize it for what it is.

Too many among UNESCO's constituents still cling to the idea of UNESCO as a society of intellectuals, not to be degraded by the vulgar forces of raw power. Many would have us remain, so to speak, above the battles and the bombs.

With this view I emphatically take issue, as I have so often in the past.

For what is UNESCO all about if it is not a part—and a vital part—of the world-wide struggle for survival? Show me the line today which divides culture from politics, education from foreign policy or science from war and the threat of war. At least there is no such line in the mind of Congress when it appropriates money for UNESCO. Was it not Hitler's anthropologists who showed us how to corrupt science and scientists for the political ends of a pseudo-master race. Stalin's artists are disciplined to sway elections in two hemispheres with their posters. The great Russian male choruses are trained to give an impression of immense power and vitality to the audiences in Prague and Budapest.

What is the answer of our free society to the slave cultures of the totalitarian masters? Is it not in part the dissemination of the truth by all available means?

Is not the search for truth the most democratic of all pursuits? Is not the expression of truth the ultimate goal of all art and all science? And is it not truth to which we must cling as the key to real understanding among free men and free nations?

The dissemination of truth is the counter weapon, the only counter weapon capable of fending off and neutralizing the lies and distortions of totalitarian propaganda. The dissemination of truth is the supreme weapon in the battle for the hearts and minds of men—the political battle which is engulfing the world.

How far can UNESCO reach in this struggle? Is it willing to reach? And how far? Where is the infantry of the arts and sciences marching? Is it indeed marching at all?

I have been asked to lead off on our subject: How far can UNESCO reach? I fear I shall give some of the skeptics plenty to shoot at. My answer to our subject is a double negative. First, and negatively, UNESCO can reach no further than its willingness boldly to face up to the great political issues of our times. Who was it who once said that bold generals are sometimes lucky—but that no general is ever lucky unless he is bold? Unless UNESCO boldly faces up to the political issues of war and peace, I fear that it is doomed to the ineffectuality of the Arab scribes of the middle ages.

Secondly, and still negatively, UNESCO can reach no further than we in the United States will encourage it; and support it; and help it. In this sense UNESCO's future is up to us. This is the assumption we must make. If the United States National Commission does not help provide the leadership, and does not counsel the State Department to provide the leadership—from whence will the leadership come?

This is a very heavy responsibility for you who are here today. With each passing hour, as the world moves from crisis to crisis, the responsibility grows heavier.

Both of my negative answers were implicit in the very first report issued by this Commission. This was the report of the Commission's initial meeting, held in September 1946. I want to read one of the closing paragraphs of our report to Secretary of State Byrnes:

"The responsibility of UNESCO in this present crisis is so great and so pressing that the organization should not hesitate to employ any proper means, however novel or however costly, which gives promise of success. The organization itself is a new agency, daring in purpose and novel in structure. The means it employs should be appropriate to its nature. It must serve as the cutting edge for international action. If annual military expenditures of $13,000,000,000 for the defense of the people of the United States against attack are justified, 10 percent of that amount, and far more than 10 percent, might well and wisely be expended to remove or greatly to reduce the danger of attack. It would be cheap insurance * * * The National Commission believes that a budget in the amount of a billion or a billion and a half dollars, or even more, might well be justified."

That declaration called upon the United States to measure its support of UNESCO in bold terms and in military terms. Military terms are power terms; they are political terms. Note that this declaration did not necessarily call upon the other member states of UNESCO to match 10 percent of the United States military expenditures with three to four billion dollars, on a 38 percent for 62-percent basis, or a 33-67 basis. This declaration quite properly recognized UNESCO as a potentially important instrument through which the United States can develop its foreign policy. So also is the United Nations. As I have said again and again, the United States opportunity through UNESCO is to help provide effective leadership and bold plans by which the forces of education, and science, and culture can be marshalled on a world-wide basis in the cause of peace. They are means to an end only. They are not ends in themselves. The ends of our foreign policy are peace and security.

Now I am not going to try to spell out the specific troubles UNESCO has experienced in the past 4½ years. Many of them were foreseen from the start. Many are being overcome. As George Stoddard says, "UNESCO is looking up." UNESCO has a splendid leader in Dr. Torres Bodet. We no longer have to say as one university president once put it, "We cannot allow ourselves to be discouraged about UNESCO."

In Cleveland last year I asked Sir John Maud which he would abolish, UNESCO or Oxford, if he had to make the choice—judged wholly by the present and potential contribution of either to understanding among peoples and to the cause of peace. This proved to be a tough enough question to make an Oxford man wince and duck.

Manifestly UNESCO can never equal Oxford in the things that great universities do best. It should not try to. But if UNESCO were carried forward on a scale equal to its conception, it should carry a direct impact on the issue of peace or war a hundredfold and five hundredfold greater than any single university could. The universities help tell UNESCO what to say and do. It is UNESCO's task to say it and do it, not by slow seepage from an intellectual elite down to the masses of the people, but directly and by any proper means, however novel or costly.

Perhaps we can agree that the National Commission's declaration of 1946 was at the time primarily a declaration of faith in an idea, a deliberately provocative declaration rather than the expression of a realistic hope. Yet the timing was interesting, in view of a subsequent and parallel development. It was made 9 months before Secretary Marshall's famous speech at Harvard. Within a year after our National Commission's declaration the Nation was seriously debating whether to spend $15,000,000,000 for a European recovery program—a figure which would have seemed, in September of 1946, visionary and fantastic for any international economic program. Since then we have not only created and successfully carried on a European recovery program; we

have expended more billions for a program of military assistance to other nations. Now we are debating President TRUMAN's Point 4 program for economic aid to underdeveloped lands.

The people of the United States have proven themselves ready to invest heavily in such foreign programs. They have become convinced that it is our national self-interest to do so.

The American people have not yet been asked to consider whether an investment in peace by communication and by education is remotely in a class with military and economic investments. The voices in the field have been few and weak. I have much evidence which satisfies me that the Congress and the people will respond to the idea that the national defense of the United States is closely tied up with better communication and better education on a world-wide scale. Those who believe this should now step forward and provide the leadership the country and the Congress need. Is there a nation in the world that has greater faith in the power of education on a mass basis for all its people? That faith in education, if it is fortified further with the demonstration of its close relation to national defense, is valid abroad as it is at home.

I have several times urged upon this group the consideration of a world-wide broadcasting network, with time provided for UNESCO if it can learn how to do the programming job so urgently needed by the peoples of the world. Don't be alarmed: I shall not go into that again now. But I have pointed out that, if there is to be a broadcasting network for UNESCO there now seems no way of financing its construction unless the United States is willing to do it. This principle has many possible ramifications. If it is in the national interest of the United States that UNESCO become a powerful force in the world—as I believe it is—then we should not hesitate to finance it if it has the leadership and the projects with sufficient promise. It is we of the United States who have the faith in UNESCO. And it is only we who have the resources.

Now I am aware that UNESCO is sensitive to any sign of what loosely is called American cultural imperialism, and I believe this is quite right and as it should be. And I would not propose that the United States increase its proportionate contributions to the basic operating or administrative budget of UNESCO. My suggestion is that the United States offers to finance, in whole or in large part, certain extraordinary UNESCO projects which UNESCO would wish to carry forward if it had the resources and which the United States would like to see carried out. If the leadership and the projects hold promise, and great promise—let us not assume in advance that Congress will not appropriate the money.

As Secretary Barrett has pointed out, there is no conflict between UNESCO policy and basic foreign policy of the United States. More than that, UNESCO's goal of advancing, through better human communications, human freedom, human dignity and human rights, is identical with the foreign policy of the United States. For UNESCO, this is an end. For the United States, it is both a means and an end. We have been altogether too sensitive to the possible allegation that the United States might be accused of being self-seeking in strengthening UNESCO. Two weeks ago I met with the International Relations Committee of the Connecticut Council of Churches. They piled me with questions about world government, about world federation, about union now. I replied that these were all worthy objectives and that the process of discussing them was a valuable process of civic education. But I asked that they devote themselves also to problems we can do something about—ourselves—now. What I am suggesting here is something we can at least try to get done—ourselves—and now.

There is plenty of precedent for a cooperative international enterprise in which one nation bears more than a proportionate share of the cost. UNRRA was such a case. The Emergency Children's Fund of the United Nations is another. ECA is another. So also is the military-assistance program. Now comes the technical-assistance program under point 4. This is to be administered partly by the United States, bilaterally, and partly through UN. UNESCO seems delighted that it will have 14 percent of the UN funds for point 4.

I understand that Dr. Torres Bodet has asked that the Florence Conference debate the question whether UNESCO can officially ignore and remain silent on the issues in the present international crisis. My hat is off to him.

Mr. Barrett has asked me to serve on the delegation, which unhappily I cannot do as nothing in the world interests me more than the future of those activities to which UNESCO is dedicated. But I shall fly over with him for a few days if I can. I'd like to participate in that debate. I don't want to receive a cablegram from Florence reading: "Flash: UNESCO voted today (with 12 nations abstaining) that there is a world and we are in it."

I agree that there can be no conflict between UNESCO policy and the policy of the enslaved nations if there are no UNESCO policies. But who is better equipped to enunciate the hope and the policy of free men and of the free world than those who understand freedom best, and the necessity of freedom to all forms of progress—the forces of science, education, and culture?

Let me give you a single example of the kind of role UNESCO might assume which would raise it to the stature it deserves and bring it to vivid life in the eyes of the world.

The State Department has asked for $18,500,000 for fiscal 1951 for reorientation work in the American zone of Germany. This is nearly two-thirds of the total budget High Commissioner McCloy is requesting for his organization in Germany. Testifying before the House Appropriations Subcommittee last month, Mr. McCloy described this reorientation work, among his three major activities, as "in many ways the one which may offer the greatest hope for long-range success. * * * This is the program of education designed to assist, advise, and persuade the German Government and people to take the democratic road. * * * Everything depends, the whole concept of western Europe, depends on that. * * * This effort is of overriding political and psychological importance." Mr. McCloy further said, "We probably could spend $100,000,000 in this effort and still not match the resources of the Soviets, but our methods are different and our objectives are different." (Let me say parenthetically that we should perhaps be matching the Soviet $100,000,000, and that Mr. McCloy, when he was Assistant Secretary of War, would not have agreed to any such ratio if it were a matter of comparative air forces. Let me also parenthetically read the following paragraph from a letter I received from a friend of mine in the British Foreign Office in London, with whom I became well acquainted at the Geneva Conference on Freedom of Information in 1948: "Certainly everything that has happened since then has brought more into focus the priorities of the ideological struggle we talked of at that time. I thought the leakage of what Vishinsky said to the German Communist hierarchy in Berlin recently was most significant: 'We shall conquer the world, not with atom bombs but with something the Americans cannot produce—with our ideas, our brains, our doctrines'."

Now I ask whether UNESCO, rather than assuming a minor and facilitative role in Germany, cannot take maximum responsibility? Dr. Nieubuhr asks me to explore the whole possibility of turning the whole German education program over to UNESCO. If UNESCO cannot do a better job than the United States, or England, or France can alone—it, of course, can operate in all three zones, not just in one—why can't it? If it can, then in this one project alone it would gain the stature it needs.

I have mentioned President Truman's point 4. Is it not now time—and way past time—for us to recognize the need for a companion point 5? I urge point 5 upon you today and upon the State Department. Point 5 of our foreign policy would recognize that the central issue of our time is intellectual and spiritual, and that the heart of the present conflict is a struggle for the minds and loyalties of mankind. It would create a program on a scale commensurate with the problem. And it would not have a terminal date in 1952. The problem is perpetual and only the means vary. We sensed the need in our 1946 declaration, although, as so often happens among intellectuals, we were more interested in being right than in fixing responsibility for action and in seeing to it that action followed decision. Are we now ready to act?—and to bring point 5 alive?

Three weeks ago I spoke for an hour on the floor of the Senate on this general subject, and introduced a resolution through which I hoped I might focus the attention of the Congress on a grossly neglected area of supreme national importance. I believe George Stoddard has sent each of you the text of my remarks, and a copy of the resolution. The New York Times said in its editorial, "It was to be expected that Senator BENTON in his first speech in the Senate, should return to a theme he has developed before many other audiences." I quote this because you are one of the long-suffering audiences the Times refers to; and here I am again.

My resolution was sponsored by 13 Senators. I do not know how many more Senators might have joined me as sponsors if I had described it to more of them. I talked mostly with my old friends and did not seek a large number of sponsors. I did not make a point of asking the members of the Foreign Relations or Appropriations Committees because they, I hope, will consider the resolution. I have received only a single unfavorable reaction in the Senate, and I have received many expressions of enthusiasm—from very unexpected sources. My moral is that a bold program—a program that promises to make an important contribution to an important problem—a bold program has a chance of winning enthusiastic support and of succeeding; a timid program has none. I fear that some of us in UNESCO and in the secretariat of the National Commission tend to become amateur experts on what the public will accept, and on what is politically feasible, rather than concentrating on our true vocation, the discovery and projection of what is right and necessary. In so doing we underrate both the public and the politicians.

Those of you who read my resolution may recall that one of its six points calls for acceleration of the work of UNESCO to the point where, with effective leadership, it has a chance to make a significant, perhaps decisive contribution to peace. What I'd like to emphasize here is that each of the other five points could also be carried out by UNESCO, and often carried out better by UNESCO than by the United States.

Point one in the resolution calls for an intensified effort in behalf of worldwide freedom of information. This is obviously a UNESCO objective, and I hope UNESCO will do far more in this field. Point two deals with UNESCO. Point three calls for a comprehensive world-wide program of documentary and educational motion pictures, for the creation of a world broadcasting network capable ultimately of reaching every receiver in the world, for an immediate expansion of our program of bringing foreign students to the United States, and for efforts to penetrate the iron curtain. Point four calls for promotion of democratic education abroad, notably in Germany and Japan. Point five proposes a conference looking toward a joint effort in the information field by the free nations; and point six invokes the cooperation of nongovernmental groups and agencies. Although I had the interests of the United States primarily in mind, there is not one of these six points that does not coincide with UNESCO's aims and program.

My final point about Senate Resolution No. 243—I trust you'll become familiar with that number—is that it is a beginning only. Many, many months may pass before it can be adopted; years may be required to put it into effect. You and the organizations you represent can do far more in its behalf than I can. But a resolution, even if it is adopted, is not a congressional authorization. And an authorization is not a plan and a program; these must be developed by the State Department and this Commission and by UNESCO itself. A plan and a program are not an appropriation. And an appropriation is not an organization or an operation.

This helps show that the road is long. It is unending. My own best role for the present—indeed the only productive role I can have at present—is with my colleagues on the Hill. Fortunately many are friends of long standing. For those of you who subscribe to Senate Resolution 243—and it is in substantial part a distillate of what I learned from you, and what I learned with you. I want to close by repeating something I said in welcoming the first group of members to the first meeting of the national commission in September of 1946:

"If we who profess a belief in education really believe the words which we so often use, namely that understanding among peoples is necessary to the maintenance of peace, then we who are responsible for this national commission face a challenge that is terrifying. But we must not admit that the challenge is beyond our group. * * * Many demands will be made upon our time and energy. I dedicate you here to hard work."

Seemingly I am here today at a rededication—to more work, harder work, the work of an age and a planet. But what task is there today which can compare with this one, the survival of freedom and the development of the spirit and the soul of mankind?

Disability Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Disability Insurance," from the Washington Post of January 27, 1950, and with it an article on the same subject which recently was published by the American Public Welfare Association.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of January 27, 1950]

DISABILITY INSURANCE

Senate approval of the bill passed by the House expanding the coverage and increasing the benefits payable under the old-age insurance system is confidently anticipated, although the Senate may make some changes in detail. However, there is likely to be a battle royal over the proposal to pension insured workers who become permanently and totally disabled before reaching retirement age. For some Members of Congress claim that it would open the way for introduction of national compulsory health insurance.

In our opinion, that assumption is quite untenable. As a matter of fact that proposal would not involve any fundamental change in the old-age insurance system. It merely recognizes the need for a more flexible retirement system providing pensions for workers forced by circumstances beyond their control to withdraw prematurely from active life. Then, too, as the Ways and Means Committee report on the social-insurance bill points out: "The worker who has paid social-insurance contributions for a number of years—perhaps over much of his working lifetime—has a real stake in the system which deserves to be recognized. He should not be required to show need to become entitled to benefits."

Yet, under the present law disabled workers who may have made regular and substantial contributions to the Federal old-age insurance system are not entitled to receive benefits until they are 65 years of age. Unless they have independent means, they are forced to rely for subsistence on public aid or private charity. Moreover, the amount of benefits to which they can lay claim eventually, if death does not overtake them before they reach retirement age, steadily declines during the intervening years of enforced idleness. This shrinkage is due to the methods employed in the computation of their average monthly wages which in turn are used to compute the amount of their annuities.

While employees disabled on the job may benefit from State workmen's compensation laws, only 5 percent or thereabouts of all permanent and total disability cases are work-connected. Consequently, the vast majority of workers have no protection against loss of earning power caused by disability. In justice to helpless men and women who have earned the right to pension protection by contributing to the old-age insurance fund and who have the added misfortune of being disabled, this gap in the insurance system should be closed.

Objections to pensions for the totally disabled based on considerations of cost ignore the fact that such pensions would reduce the pressure for public aid. Nor is there any reason to fear that malingering would be encouraged by pensioning the disabled, in view of the severely limited benefits provided under the House bill, plus the requirement of a 6-month waiting period before payments would begin. Moreover, if a pensioner is tempted to sham illness, the examining physician can usually be trusted to discover the fraud.

It is conceivable that disability pensions, once introduced, might be progressively liberalized until eventually full-fledged compulsory health insurance might be brought in by the back door. But in view of the fact that the administration is already openly working for a national health-insurance program it seems absurd to assume that the outcome of the struggle over disability pensions will influence action on the health program.

AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., January 1950.

DISABILITY INSURANCE

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. What is meant by disability insurance?

Disability insurance means cash payments to insured persons which partially compensate them for loss of earnings due to illness or disability. Public disability insurance programs (other than workmen's compensation programs which compensate solely for work-connected injuries) are of two kinds: Insurance against temporary disability, now provided by five States and[1] which is limited to illness of less than 6 months duration and so-called permanent and total disability insurance which compensates individuals suffering extended disability lasting beyond 6 months. In neither case is the problem of medical care, health insurance, or so-called socialized medicine involved.

2. What would be done under proposals for permanent and total disability insurance now pending in Congress?

H. R. 6000, the social-security bill passed last year by the House of Representatives and now pending in the Senate Finance Committee, would add insurance against permanent and total disability to the present Federal old-age and survivors insurance program. That program, administered by the Federal Government, provides cash benefits related to previous earnings for retired persons over 65 years of age and their families, and for the widows and orphans of deceased workers, out of an insurance fund built up by contributions from covered workers and their employers. Under H. R. 6000 a worker forced by extended disability to retire before 65 would draw the same primary OASI benefit payment to which he would have been entitled were he 65.

3. Who would be covered by permanent and total disability insurance?

All those workers included in the program of old-age and survivors insurance would likewise be protected against premature retirement due to extended total disability. Under the provisions of H. R. 6000 this would include virtually all working people except farm operators, farm workers, part-time domestic workers, and certain self-employed professional groups such as doctors, dentists, and lawyers. However, the advisory council on social security, appointed to advise the Senate Finance Committee in 1947–48, has recommended that all these groups be included in the social-insurance program and hence covered against loss of income due to protracted disability. This wider coverage will undoubtedly receive careful consideration in the Senate Finance Committee.

4. What kind of disability would entitle a covered worker to disability benefits?

An insured worker, to qualify for permanent and total disability benefits must be stricken with a medically demonstrable illness, injury, or other physical or mental impairment which makes it impossible for him to continue any substantial gainful activity or must be blind. The disability must have existed for 6 months before any benefit can be paid and must be presumed to be permanent by medical diagnosis. The Advisory Council recommended a somewhat more liberal concept of permanence in disability.

5. What benefit would a disabled worker receive?

Under H. R. 6000, the beneficiary of disability insurance would receive the primary benefit to which his past earning record would have entitled him on retirement, but no dependents' benefits. Thus a worker with an average earning of $2,400 a year would receive a basic benefit of $60 a month plus an additional one-half of 1 percent for each year

[1] New York, New Jersey, Rhode Island, California, and Washington.

he had worked in covered employment. The minimum primary benefit would be $25 a month; the average around $50. If the disablement were one of the relatively few covered by workmen's compensation he would receive his social security disability benefit reduced by an amount equal to one-half of whichever of the two benefits was smaller.

6. Is there a real need for protection against permanent and total disability?

Prolonged total disability is one of the chief causes of poverty in the United States. When a father is so seriously disabled that he can no longer work his children and his wife are almost always threatened with destitution. He may require considerable care, and doctor bills inevitably pile up. The mother must try to find work; perhaps older children must quit school and look for jobs. Savings and hope for the future rapidly disappear.

Moreover, it is not the individual alone who bears the burden of disablement. Over three-fourths of a million persons on the Federally aided public assistance rolls are there because of disability. An additional one-third of a million persons receive State and locally financed general assistance because the person who would normally support them is disabled. About 80,000 needy blind persons receive public aid, and private charities and relatives care for uncounted thousands more who are in need because disabilities keep them from working. It is estimated that well over 2,000,000 potential workers have been totally disabled for more than 6 months, and that only a few have sufficient resources to be self-supporting.

7. Can't workers provide protection for themselves against loss of income on account of disability?

The large majority of working people have no means of protecting themselves against income loss when they become permanently and totally disabled. Private insurance policies providing cash benefits for long-term disability are not available to most people, either because of cost or because the individuals are not first-class risks. Some union contracts include limited provisions for disability protection, and a few private employers have plans providing disability benefits, but most of the latter require many years of service before the employee is eligible. Under certain circumstances, veterans, railroad employees, and some employees in State or Federal Government work can draw cash benefits if they become totally disabled. Most workers who are injured on the job or suffer work-connected illnesses can draw benefits under State workmen's compensation laws, but work-connected illnesses and injuries make up only about 5 percent of all total disabilities. For most workers, serious disablement means loss of earnings and other assets, and, if the disability is prolonged, an eventual resort to public aid.

8. Would disability insurance be a desirable way of meeting this problem, or is it better to take care of disabled persons through public assistance?

Contributory social insurance is the best primary means of meeting the major causes of income loss both from the point of view of the individual and of economic and social factors. This view has been expressed by most people who have studied the problem. The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, in its report on H. R. 6000, summarized its agreement with this view in the following words:

"The time has come to reaffirm the basic principle that a contributory system of social insurance in which workers share directly in meeting the cost of the protection afforded is the most satisfactory way of preventing dependency. A contributory system, in which both contributions and benefits are directly related to the individual's own productive efforts, prevents insecurity while preserving self-reliance and initiative. * * * The contributory system of old-age and survivors insurance * * * should continue to be the basic method for preventing dependency. Insurance against wage loss due to permanent and total disability will round out the protection of the insurance system."

Similarly, the Advisory Council on Social Security, in its report to the Senate Finance Committee in 1948, indicated that it was "strongly impressed with the seriousness of the problems created by permanent and total disability and with the social disadvantages of compelling the victims of this misfortune to depend upon public assistance. * * * The Council believes that the permanently and totally disabled worker—as well as the aged worker or the dependent survivors of a deceased worker—should not be required to reduce himself to virtual destitution before he can become eligible for benefits. Certainly there is as great a need to protect the resources, the self-reliance, dignity, and self-respect of disabled workers as of any other group. The protection of the material and spiritual resources of the disabled worker is an important part of preserving his will to work and plays a positive role in his rehabilitation." There is, of course, need for assistance to meet, on an individual basis, basic requirements not covered by an insurance approach, and provision is made in H. R. 6000 for Federal aid to State programs of assistance to needy persons suffering permanent and total disability. These two programs are complementary and neither can be considered a satisfactory substitute for the other.

9. If the individual paid for his benefits, wouldn't he regard them as a right, and wouldn't this encourage malingering?

A disability-insurance program administered by the Government would have adequate safeguards against malingering, including safeguards not available to private insurance. Under H. R. 6000, benefits would be paid only to persons who are dependent on regular earnings; in order to qualify, the individual would have to work for at least 5 years and to have substantial employment just prior to his disablement. Since the benefits would be considerably lower than the individual's regular earnings, there would be a financial inducement for him to return to work, and his earnings would be checked automatically through employer tax returns and income-tax reports.

Beneficiaries would be carefully examined by competent doctors and would be reexamined at frequent intervals. An individual's condition would be followed by local field offices through personal contacts and reports from local agencies. Where it appeared that the beneficiary might be retrained for work, he would be encouraged to undertake such rehabilitation; and if he refused without good cause, he would be removed from the benefit rolls.

10. Is it true that the payment of disability benefits would encourage rehabilitation?

Disability insurance and rehabilitation work hand in hand. The insurance benefits would help to lessen the worries and discouragement which usually accompany serious disability. With a small steady income a worker would be in a better frame of mind to try to fit himself for a new job. The benefits would provide basic security, but they would be low enough so that there would always be an incentive for a disabled person to try to improve his condition.

It would be possible to provide that the costs of rehabilitation would be paid out of the social-insurance trust fund, and thus the insurance would not only provide current income, but would also be used to pay for services which would fit the individual to return to work. Successful rehabilitation of disabled persons would, of course, reduce the burden on the trust fund and add to the productive capacity of the Nation. A provision of this sort was recommended by the Senate Advisory Council and was included in H. R. 2893, the social-security bill recommended by the President. However, H. R. 6000 omits the provision and leaves rehabilitation to existing State-Federal programs.

11. Would disability insurance be difficult or costly to administer?

Disability benefits have been successfully administered for years by governmental agencies, including the Veterans' Administration, the Railroad Retirement Board, Federal and State retirement systems, workmen's compensation agencies and the social insurance programs of 40 nations of the world. The machinery for administering the present old-age and survivors insurance program—including the network of almost 500 field offices for taking claims can be used to take on the job of paying benefits to disabled persons. Medical examinations would be made by local doctors, who would be paid their usual fee for such work; the arrangements between doctors and the Government would be similar to those between doctors and private insurance companies. There is no reason to believe that the program could not be administered successfully.

For More Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "For More Democracy," which deals with the Mundt-Nixon-Ferguson bill, published in the Washington Daily News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, of April 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR MORE DEMOCRACY

The American Civil Liberties Union came up yesterday with worth-while comment on the Mundt-Nixon antisubversive bill.

Arthur Garfield Hays, the union's counsel, criticized sections of the bill calling for registration of Communists and Communist-front organizations.

He said that the inevitable effect of this provision would be to smear and probably endanger the effectiveness of good reform movements. The danger lies in the Commies' tactics, which are to worm into any and all possible worthy crusades in order to mislead the public and pervert the crusade to their own ends.

The facade of reform hides their real intentions.

They can, of course, take credit for the reform if it succeeds in spite of them, or have an instrument for propaganda and converts if it doesn't, which they prefer.

They invariably try to destroy the effectiveness of a reform movement, because they'd rather preserve social ills than have reforms within a social structure other than Communist dictatorship.

If they are found out in an organization and are thrown out, their classic gambit then is to try to wreck the organization.

Over and over again Commies have demonstrated that they are really for nothing that will help make our society work.

And time and time again they have proved themselves skillful camouflagers of their real intent.

All this is old hat, of course, but it's worth repeating constantly.

Therefore there is much in what Mr. Hays says; that there is danger of destroying the usefulness of innocent organizations and members by labeling them as subversive because of the Commies machinations.

One way of not having needed reforms at all is to make it impossible for reformers to reform. And that's one sure way of playing into the Commies' hands.

Says Mr. Hays:

"If it be true that our American institutions are threatened by advocacy of totalitarianism alien to our tradition, we must meet the threat not by direct or indirect repression, but by the free political discussion which is the very cornerstone of democracy. * * * It must be remembered that it was Czarist Russia in which repressive measures were first taken against Communists—and that it was Czarist Russia in which communism scored its first victory. Police state tactics will not destroy communism. Only counterpropaganda and more democracy will."

Senator Myers' Report to the People of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my biweekly newsletter, dated April 6, on the general subject of foreign policy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

APRIL 6, 1950.

Peace-making programs will cost us an estimated $4,700,000,000 in the coming year—an average of about $30 per American. This is our investment in the survival and growth of personal liberty and free institutions in the world. Two world wars have taught us that our security is directly linked to that of the free world.

Economic assistance, military aid, and participation in world organizations are the tools being used to fashion the peace, and apply in two great areas—Europe and the Far East.

In Europe, the Marshall plan has stopped Communist expansion. "A near miracle" is Paul G. Hoffman's description of ECA progress in the past 2 years. Starvation has been converted into a diet adequate to grow and work on. Unemployment, in most countries, has been changed into nearly full employment. Industrial production is 20 percent above prewar. Agricultural output (after disastrous decline in war years) has been brought almost to prewar levels and is due to rise steadily. And most important—despair has been replaced by hope, and the Communists have been repudiated at election after election in the ECA countries during the past 2 years.

The 1949 Atlantic Pact signifies that the nations of the North Atlantic community will stand together against any aggressor that threatens their independence and freedom.

The military-assistance program, enacted by Congress last year to aid the North Atlantic democracies in bolstering their defenses, will give new meaning to the Atlantic Pact. This program is an extension of the 1947 Truman doctrine which furnished military assistance to Greece, enabling her to stamp out the Communist-inspired guerrilla warfare, and which, at the same time, helped Turkey fortify herself against Russian threats.

But Europe's headaches aren't over yet—and $3,000,000,000 of our expenditures are earmarked for Marshall-plan aid in the coming year. This is a big reduction over the cost of ECA last year and reflects the progress already made. However, if Europe's economy is to be put on a self-supporting basis, there can be no reduction in present efforts, because serious unemployment still exists in Italy, Belgium, and western Germany; trade barriers still hamper the flow of goods between the European countries and much more needs to be done to unite the European democracies economically; productive efficiency is very low by American standards, and much can be done through passing along technical assistance and our productive know-how; the dollar-gap, though closing, still exists, and further steps are needed to balance European exports with the things she buys from America.

In the Far East the point 4 program and military aid to countries outside the Communist orbit are the first steps to stability in Asia. Point 4—which will bring technical know-how and private investment to economically underdeveloped nations—can do much to stamp out starvation and raise living standards. This is the way to prove that democracy, not communism, is the only system which can meet and solve problems of social and economic distress.

These programs point the way to peace. ECA, the Atlantic Pact, and the military-assistance programs have halted the Russian practice of knocking off the European countries one at a time. By strengthening the economic foundations, improving the defenses, raising the living standards, and expanding trade, the democracies are daily growing stronger against Communist threats from within and without. These tested and proven methods will be extended to the economically backward countries of Asia under legislation now pending in Congress.

Peace is more than the absence of war. The ultimate success of democracy will result from proving what we in America already know—that freemen, working together, can solve the world's problems far better than any dictator. The costs of peace are great—but less than $5,000,000,000 yearly is far cheaper than a third world war when we stop to recall that the direct costs of World War II to America were more than $300,000,000,000.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Columbia Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Regional Authority Idea Was Born in Republican, Not Socialist, Brain," by Lowell Mellett, from the Washington Evening Star of yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE OTHER HAND—REGIONAL AUTHORITY IDEA WAS BORN IN REPUBLICAN, NOT SOCIALIST, BRAIN

(By Lowell Mellett)

One of the President's pet projects bogged down for the time being is the Columbia Valley Authority, for which he asked in his state of the Union message and in a later special message to Congress. Any hope for progress on this great enterprise depends on the President's ability to activate the Public Works Committees of the Senate and the House. Both have held some hearings on bills introduced last year, but the consideration given them has been desultory at best. Now it has been agreed to hold up further consideration until a joint subcommittee can hold hearings "in the field" and this junket is not to be undertaken until the rivers and harbors bill has been disposed of by the Senate.

The rivers and harbors bill, commonly called the pork barrel bill, was passed by the House last year, carrying a cost of nearly $1,200,000,000. As reported out by the Senate committee it contains projects with a total cost of $1,564,000,000. It is now at the top of the Senate calendar and may soon be disposed of.

POWER PROPAGANDA DRIVE

The foot-dragging on the CVA proposal coincides with an extensive propaganda drive by the country's private power companies against all such undertakings. By institutional advertising and other means the companies are spreading the Republican "liberty versus socialism" bugaboo far and wide, tying it directly to the public power issue. Just announced is a breakfast for Washington correspondents to be given by the National Association of Electric Companies next Wednesday morning. Purcell Smith, $60,000-a-year president of the association and popularly known as the town's best-paid lobbyist, has suggested to the correspondents that they bring along their editors or other friends who may be here for the annual meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Opposition to all regional authorities is voiced in the platform adopted at Republican Chairman Gabrielson's February meeting. This has caused Judson King, director of the National Popular Government League and probably Washington's worst-paid lobbyist, to dig up some almost ancient history. He finds that the real father of the regional authority idea was Senator Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio, one of the great Republican stalwarts of his day, a conservative.

BURTON STOPPED RIVERS FORCES

It was Senator Burton, Mr. King recalls, who, as chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, killed a State's rights joker in a bill granting a private company the right to develop water power at Muscle Shoals. Burton's action protected the precedent of Federal authority over the rivers and made possible the later development of Muscle Shoals into the Tennessee Valley Authority. That was in 1896.

Ten years later, Senator Burton as chairman of the Inland Waterways Commission in a report to President Theodore Roosevelt, recommended the development of the Mississippi from mouth to source, with provision for flood control, land reclamation, reforestation and water power, all coordinated. The projects, he said, should be planned, built, and managed by an independent commission, exclusive of established agencies. There was the valley authority idea in its infancy.

Not at all the child of European socialism as alleged in the GOP February platform.

Mr. King also recalls that one of the stoutest supporters of Senator George W. Norris in his long battle to save Muscle Shoals for the American people was Senator Charles L. McNary, of Oregon, the Republican candidate for Vice President in 1940.

Address by Hon. Frank P. Graham, of North Carolina, on Anniversary of Birth of Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by my colleague the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], before the Sons of the American Revolution, commemorating the two hundred and sixth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, Sons of the American Revolution, ladies and gentlemen, April 13, 1743. Thomas Jefferson was born; April 12, 1945, Franklin D. Roosevelt died. With the birth of Jefferson began the life of one of the greatest Democrats and humanitarians and with the death of Roosevelt ended the life of one of the greatest Democrats and humanitarians of modern history. It was a source of deep satisfaction to Roosevelt first, as President, he sponsored the building of this beautiful memorial of the life and service of Thomas Jefferson.

I speak here this afternoon as the representative of a State, which at historic Halifax, N. C., April 12, 1776, was the first of all the colonies to authorize its delegates to join in the Declaration of Independence at Philadelphia, which in Jefferson's immortal words has since made July 4 one of the great birthdays of human liberty.

COMPARISONS

Along with Washington, Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt, Thomas Jefferson, in competent opinions, is one of the five greatest Presidents of the United States. The Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, and the Jefferson Memorial have commemorated these three, whom history has chosen as belonging to the great of all ages. With Benjamin Franklin and Theodore Roosevelt, Jefferson is one of the three most versatile, intellectually curious, and versatile public leaders in American history. With Lincoln and Wilson, he is one of the three greatest masters of English prose. With Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt, he was the consummate politician whose politics became high statesmanship. With Washington and Lincoln, he was the most reviled of Presidents. With Andrew Jackson, who carried forward to the people and embodied for the people his democracy, Jefferson has given his name to an era and a quality of democracy. Both of the great political parties have claimed him as their actual or spiritual founder. Sympathetically with James Madison and oppositely with Alexander Hamilton and John Marshall, Thomas Jefferson was the author of principles of government which have been synthesized in the American system of freedom and union, local, State, and national democracy.

UNIVERSALITY

Thomas Jefferson, son of the frontiersman, Peter Jefferson, and of the gentlewoman, Jane Randolph, was a Democrat, a humanitarian, an educational philosopher, an agriculturist, a scientist, an architect, an individualist, a champion of States' right, a nationalist, an internationalist, and a humanist, who became a universalist in the catholicity of his mind, the sweep of his humane spirit, the depth of his spiritual faith, and the immortality of his influence.

DEMOCRAT AND EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHER

He was a Democrat who had enduring faith in the capacity of the people for self-government. While deeply sensible of the dangers to free government lurking in the ignorance of large bodies of people, he feared their ignorance less than he feared the tyranny of the privileged power of the few. He wrote the immortal words, "All men are created equal and endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" and that "governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed." A scientific farmer, his greatest faith was in those who worked in the earth. He fought for and achieved the abolition of the laws of primogeniture and entail which had become the artificial basis for an American aristocracy of birth and privilege.

His very faith in the people, when informed, charged him with a passion for a system of public education open to all, with screening for higher talent in successive stages from the primary grades through the university. Self government of the people carried with it for him the obligation for public self-education of the people. His ordinance prepared in 1784 was the forerunner of the great Northwest Ordinance of 1787 which set aside land for the public schools. He designed, laid out the grounds and buildings, framed the curriculum, selected the faculty, championed its freedom and founded the University of Virginia. His spirit still haunts the serpentine walls and classic halls of the gracious lawn of the University of Virginia, an American temple of human freedom. He still lives as "Mr. Jefferson" to all the loyal sons of his university whose fatherhood he placed in highest honor along with the authorship of the Declaration of Independence and the Statute of Religious Freedom for Virginia. The freedom of the mind, human dignity, the education of the people, and government of the people, based on the consent of the governed, are the principles of the Western World's first preeminent democrat and still unsurpassed champion of the rule of the people.

His democratic Americanism was by his enemies called Jacobinism. He was, himself, often falsely called a Jacobin. The Americanism of his democracy, while watered from distant springs in the best English tradition of John Milton, John Locke, and the Bill of Rights of 1689, was yet self grown on the American frontier and from grass roots in the American soil.

The American Declaration of Independence has long been the bugle call of democracy to the peoples of the earth whether to the people of France in 1789, the Latin-American and European peoples in the first half of the nineteenth century, the people of Asia in the twentieth century, and the peoples of Indonesia today. Perhaps Jefferson's principles of human freedom and dignity and the consent of the governed will, with new meaning and democratic power, yet reach through the iron curtain which now hides the prison walls of the police state.

HUMANITARIAN

As part of his democracy, Thomas Jefferson, was a humanitarian, who was concerned with the welfare of Hessian prisoners of war; who fought to end the slave trade; who freed his own slaves; and who often, at the very thought of human slavery, trembled for the future of the Nation which he helped to organize with humane hopes of its meaning for the freedom of all mankind. With his strong strain of humanitarianism, went an insistence on balancing the budget and the liquidation of the national debt, as the basis of freedom and security.

INDIVIDUALIST

Thomas Jefferson was not only a humanitarian democrat with an abiding faith in the masses of the people, he was also a great individualist. He stood for the free individual with a bill of rights against the tyranny of a majority, or religious intolerance, or vested privilege, or centralized Federal power. He valiantly fought for the right of the individual to think, speak, publish, worship, and be a free person as the supreme fact and concern of democracy. He wrote the Statute of Religious Freedom for Virginia. He worked for and helped to achieve the incorporation of the Bill of Rights as the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States. He swore upon the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

STATES' RIGHTS MAN

In the interest of the freedom of the individual, Thomas Jefferson was a States' rights man. He believed in the functional value of the freedom and responsibility of the locality, the States and the Nation, whose composite federalism was a guaranty against the development of the centralized power of a totalitarian state. His theory of States' rights, however, was not an end in itself, but an instrument of freedom to keep the Government close and responsible to the people.

In Jefferson's day over three-fourths of the things by which men worked and lived were produced in their own household economy and local community. The capacity and authority of local self-government and the State were sufficient for the needs of the household industry and local agrarian economy. The freedom of the individual, the freedom of speech, publication and assembly were threatened by the tyranny of the Federal Government and its alien and sedition laws. The Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, inspired by Thomas Jefferson, were assertions of the rights of the States in behalf of the freedom of the individual to speak his mind and publish his views to the people. He would not use States rights in behalf of the intrenchment of the financial power of the few or the political power of slave holders or the economic power of privilege or corporate monopoly. Nor do we believe he would advise the use of the compulsory power of the Federal Government to abolish prejudice in human relations far ahead of what is in the minds and hearts of the people in the States. A States rights man and an educational philosopher, he would wait upon the more enduring ways of education and the humane spirit of the people in the States, rather than resort to Federal coercion which would cause set-backs in the clear progress in the relation of races based on deeper religion, broader education, and wider opportunities.

NATIONALIST

A States-rights man, he was yet also a nationalist in his outlook and influence. His

stream of letters to leaders in all the States helped to unite the 13 States into a combined struggle for national independence. His vast correspondence, his genius for practical organization, his democratic idealism, and his commitment to leadership of the people against the privilege and power of the few, made him the founder of the first enduring National Party. This party was the last bond which held the Union together in bitter decades. When this party split the Union was broken and war began. This reunited party has been a strong force for nationalism to this hour.

Jefferson's purchase of Louisiana, making its wide lands a responsibility of the whole Nation, was the act of a nationalist and a force for nationalism. Reaching across the frontier of America, the vast Territory of Louisiana was a bond which bound the Nation together with common lands from the Gulf to the Great Lakes.

INTERNATIONALIST

Jefferson was a nationalist who was also an internationalist. Excepting Benjamin Franklin, no American public leader has been more cosmopolitan than Thomas Jefferson. Steeped in the classical heritage of the Greeks and Romans, the political philosophy of the British, the enlightenment of the French encyclopedists, his correspondence included some of the choicest spirits of the old world and the new. Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations and Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence both came in 1776 as the birth cries of economic individualism and political freedom in Europe and America.

His Summary View of the Rights of British America prophetically envisaged the present British Commonwealth as an international union of free peoples. When he sensed that the dictatorship of Napoleon might threaten the freedom and integrity of America by his possible possession of the Louisiana Territory he declared, in that event, we would marry ourselves to the British Fleet and thus join two great federations of peoples against the threats of imperial power. One hundred and fifty years ago when the north African pirates preyed upon the commerce of nations, Thomas Jefferson proposed the cooperation of nations to enforce safety and peace upon the seas. Ahead of his times, Jefferson resorted to economic boycott instead of war against the great powers, prophetic of the sanctions for peace yet to come among the nations of the world.

THE MEANING OF AMERICA

We are grateful to the Sons of the American Revolution for reminding us today of the life and work of Thomas Jefferson, born on this day 207 years ago. The Sons of the great American Revolution will not let us in our day become the fathers of a great American reaction. We must not allow the shibboleths of human liberty, which came flaming from the soul of Thomas Jefferson in behalf of the freedom of forgotten people in the eighteenth century, to be turned in reverse against the freedom of forgotten millions in the twentieth century.

As we see these men of the United States Navy and the veterans of the world war here this afternoon, we need to remember that within the decade past the freedom for which Jefferson stood was renounced or crushed in almost half the world. The Axis powers reached in conquering might from the top of Norway to the Bay of Biscay, across Europe to the Volga and across North Africa to the gates of Alexandria; from the islands off Alaska to the islands off Australia and across Asia almost to the gates of India.

In such a world, darkening with Fascist tyranny, the allied forces bravely held on in grim desperation. The youth of America went into these embattled lines and turned the tides at last upon the seas and lands on all the farthest fronts to save freedom on this imperiled earth. As we remember Thomas Jefferson, we also remember our comrades who died that we might be free. "Lord God of host, be with us yet, lest we forget, lest we forget."

In the remembrance of our heroic dead may we have a deeper sense of the meaning of America. This strategic land of vast resources, stored up and saved for thousands of years for the development by the fresh people of the west, of an abundance undreamed of even by modern man, cannot, without losing its own soul, withhold the hopes of food and freedom from the broken and bewildered peoples of the earth. This blessed America, heir of all region and races, colors, and creeds, the haven of heretics and refugees in the years of its weakness, must not become the stronghold of bigots in the days of its power. We must not scorn or hate less fortunate people, but even while strongly guarding against totalitarian tyranny and aggression, we must have compassion for people in wide lands where dictatorships became not a transition to freedom and peace, but an inevitably cruel fixation for increasing tyranny and power.

America must be made safe for both democracy and differences, we must have compassion for people in wide lands where dictatorships became not a transition to freedom and peace, but an inevitably cruel fixation for increasing tyranny and power.

America must be made safe for both democracy and differences, where the answer to error is not terror; where democracy is achieved without vulgarity and excellence without arrogance; where the majority is without tyranny, the minority without fear, and all people have hope.

On this day and in this place may we take this commemoration of Thomas Jefferson a rededication of ourselves to carry forward the spirit of the American Revolution for that human freedom and equal opportunity to which he gave his dedicated life. As we look across the river into the historic commonwealth which gave him to the Nation and to the world, we see in our mind's eyes a tall reddish-sandy haired, sunny faced young man come down from the Virginia hills to take up his lifelong struggle for human liberty, the self government of the people, and international cooperation for justice and peace in the world.

In the face of monstrous Fascist and Communist totalitarian tyrannies, which in our day have threatened, and still threaten, to destroy the freedom and degrade the dignity of individual human beings, let us, as loyal Sons of the American Revolution, swear with him on the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the body, the mind, and the spirit of man. While we guard our freedom against the conspiracies, infiltrations, and aggressions of fanatical international communism, we must not, ourselves, go totalitarian and lose our own historic liberties. Freedom must resume again its upward human pilgrimage of the centuries of struggle and faith.

Jefferson still lives. America carries on. Totalitarian tyranny must sometime begin to give way to human freedom now enslaved behind the iron curtain, but never dead within the human spirit. The light of liberty will yet shine through the iron curtain of men's minds. The warmth of human brotherhood will yet melt away the iron curtain of men's hearts. The peoples' hopes of freedom and peace still fly their flags high in the western world and across the eastern seas, where people this last Sunday looked up in prayer to the Easter morning of their aspirations for one free and federated world neighborhood of human brotherhood, we all pray God in our time.

Auto Liability Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Auto Liability Insurance," which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press on April 6.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTO LIABILITY INSURANCE

(By Eleanor Morehead)

Most American motorists are driving more carefully than ever before, according to accident records.

But the 15-to-24 age group has racked up so bad a driving record since the end of World War II that most auto liability insurance firms have sharply boosted the premium rates for drivers under 25.

Youthful recklessness at the wheel of a stripped-down "hot rod" or decrepit jalopy has raised this age group's postwar auto accident death rate to 31.2 persons per 100,000—an 86 percent increase over the 1923–27 rate.

On the other hand, the Nation's traffic death rate as a whole has been cut 41 percent in the last 2 years, according to the President's Highway Safety Conference.

It dropped last year to 7.1 deaths for each 100,000,000 miles of highway travel, the lowest in automotive history. Nevertheless, 31,500 persons died in traffic accidents last year.

RESPONSIBILITY LAWS

Because grave social problems often are involved in these accidents if a driver is unable to compensate financially for the damage he has caused, 45 of the States have adopted laws on financial responsibility for auto accidents. Pennsylvania's law went into effect on February 1.

Massachusetts is the only State with a compulsory-insurance law. Connecticut, in addition to a financial-responsibility law, requires insurance of vehicles operated by drivers between the ages of 16 and 18. Texas requires financial responsibility only of operators of commercial vehicles.

Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina are the only States without financial-responsibility laws.

In general, such laws call for the deposit of security and/or proof of future responsibility in the event of an accident, or upon conviction and judgment arising from an accident, or both. If these provisions are not met, the driving privilege is suspended.

INSURANCE COMPANIES OPPOSED

However, compulsory insurance is opposed by the occasional driver and by the careful driver. These complain that they are penalized for the sins of the careless driver.

It is opposed also by the insurance companies. They argue that it leads to an enormous increase in litigation; that juries are much more apt to be generous when an insurance company foots the bill; and that compulsory insurance promotes fraud and racketeering in claims.

The companies charge also that it is unfair to require them to insure drivers with bad accident records.

Because wartime gasoline rationing limited motoring, insurance rates were reduced during the war. They were quickly revised upward for all age groups after the war.

The Kerr-Thomas Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Kerr-Thomas Gas Bill," which was published in the Montgomery Advertiser for April 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KERR-THOMAS GAS BILL

It seems to us that, purely as a matter of tentative policy that could be changed, President Truman should sign the Kerr-Thomas bill which exempts natural gas producers from Federal price control.

It is a complex question because of the difficulty in determining whether there is enough true competition among producers to regulate prices. That cannot now be answered yes or no.

The situation is this. The country is going to natural gas. The gas is transported from the Southwest by pipe lines. But those that own the pipe lines are not the producers of the gas. They buy their gas and transport it across the country for sale to consumers.

The question is whether to exempt the producers' gas prices to the pipe liners. For if the producers run the price of the gas up, the pipe liners will of course pass the increases on to the public.

In the United States system, we accept the principle of controlling prices where a monopoly exists, as in the case of railroads and power companies. These controls are imposed in place of the controls that operate on prices through competition.

There is a fine point as to whether pipe lines are monopolies like a railroad. Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, chief opponent of the Kerr-Thomas bill, contends that pipe lines are monopolistic. He points out that they are extremely costly and an owner can go around taking them up from connection with one producer and laying them down to another with a lower price on gas.

DOUGLAS holds that it is a question of whether "the great gifts of nature, placed here we believe by divine power, are to be appropriated by the few or be administered as a trusteeship for the people of the Nation when these resources are essential to consumers but do not lend themselves to competitive methods of sales and distribution."

The proponents of the bill counter that there will be competition to restrain profiteering because there are 2,300 producers. DOUGLAS responds that this is deceptive because 3 percent of these sold 70 percent of the gas in 1947.

There is evidence to support DOUGLAS' contention that producers will get around to charging all the traffic will bear. One increase now pending would cost the consumers of four States $5,000,000 yearly.

Nevertheless, the case is not proved and wherever it is possible to avoid adding a Government control and adding a regiment of enforcement officials, it should be done. There is a provision in the Kerr bill that directs the Federal Power Commission to make a continuing study of producer prices and report to the President and Congress. If this surveillance reveals unreasonable price rises, gas production can, and should, then be placed under control.

Communists in the Government Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Hamilton Fish, a former Member of the House of Representatives, regarding the inquiry being made by the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, together with an editorial entitled "Cut Out Politics: Get Facts on Reds!" from the Philadelphia Inquirer of this morning.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 11, 1950.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I was shocked but not surprised by the callous and unfounded statement of Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War, that our foreign relations "could not be in hands more capable or more trustworthy" than those of Secretary of State Acheson.

I was responsible for the appointment of Mr. Patterson from my congressional district, as a Federal judge, in the closing days of the Hoover administration. At that time he was a stanch Republican. He later joined the Roosevelt administration as Under Secretary of War, and became one of its foremost supporters on foreign and domestic issues. He supported Roosevelt openly, and ceased to enroll as a Republican in Putnam County, N. Y. In the 1948 election he told numerous friends that he intended to vote for Harry Truman for President. Not long ago, Robert Patterson wrote a similar letter of endorsement of Alger Hiss.

I in no way question his right to express his views on Dean Acheson's "keen insight and clear understanding of the aims and purposes of the Russian Government." However, I do question his right to speak as a Republican. Furthermore, Dean Acheson has been so tragically wrong on China, Germany, and Spain that he should be removed without delay. In any other country he would have been ousted long before, because of his record of blunders that will plague us for years to come. Dean Acheson has outlived his usefulness.

I doubt if there will be, or can be any unity behind his so-called bipartisan foreign policies, no matter how many Republicans are appointed to bolster his dismal failures, and also friendship for Alger Hiss, convicted of perjury, and virtually of disloyalty. There is something very rotten in the State Department. In the last 4 years 134 Communists and subversives and 91 homosexuals have been dismissed from the State Department.

Who is responsible for their appointment, and for the appointment of Alger Hiss, and Julian Wadleigh, self-admitted spy, to key positions in the State Department? The American people have a right to know. They look to you, Senator, to continue your fight to present these facts to the public, and to compel the reopening of the Amerasia case that smells to high heaven, and, if fully exposed would dwarf the Hiss conviction.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 14, 1950]

CUT OUT POLITICS: GET FACTS ON REDS

By adopting an obvious politics-first approach to the serious charges against the State Department made by Senator Joseph McCarthy, President Truman, and Senator Millard E. Tydings have diminished the likelihood that the public will soon learn the whole truth about this vitally important matter.

Instead of pressing vigorously for a thorough, impartial sifting of the charges, both the President and TYDINGS have chosen to treat the whole affair as a partisan game.

And instead of getting a satisfactory, thorough, let-the-chips-fall-where-they-may report on the presence or absence of Communists in the State Department, the public is liable to witness another display of election-year politics and not much more.

This newspaper has criticized Senator McCARTHY's failure to back up his sensational charges with evidence and his irresponsible use of smear tactics which can have a grave effect on both the revival of bipartisan foreign policy and on our prestige abroad.

But the very seriousness of the charges, and the fact, backed up by evidence in the Alger Hiss trial, that there have been Communist agents in the State Department, makes it inexcusable for the administration to fail to get to the bottom of them and let the public know what is found.

Public confidence in the State Department won't be restored by a President who, after quite properly refusing to disclose confidential files, proceeds to join in a political row with wisecracks aimed at McCARTHY.

Nor will it be enhanced by a chairman of the committee investigating the charges who shows more interest in the possible political gain that might accrue to an investigator, than to the man's fitness to do a fair, deep digging, honest, job of getting the facts.

That appears to be the position of TYDINGS, head of the Senate subcommittee probing McCARTHY's charges. He at first blocked and now has withdrawn his objection to the appointment of Frederick Ayer, Jr., of Massachusetts, as a member of the investigative staff. His objection was based on the fact that Ayer is a candidate for the Republican nomination for attorney general of his home State.

Who isn't candidate, among all those connected with the probe? Senators McMAHON and HICKENLOOPER of the committee are, and so, for that matter, is TYDINGS himself.

This was more than a slap at Senator LODGE, who nominated Ayer. LODGE's refusal to engage in extreme partisanship, and his insistence on facts, instead of unsupported charges, have been commendable and, moreover, merit better treatment from the committee chairman. As far as the record shows, Ayer shares LODGE's repugnance to harming innocent persons through unsubstantiated charges.

But TYDINGS should realize that the President's refusal to turn over his secret files makes it all the more important that the committee's own investigation be exhaustive, effective, and free from any suspicion of partisanship. A staff of able investigators,

drawn from both parties, is essential to such a probe.

It is encouraging that widespread criticism, coupled with LODGE's own angry blast, has led TYDINGS to change his mind about Ayer. We hope Ayer, or someone else fully qualified, takes the job and starts digging for any facts behind McCARTHY's accusations.

It would be more encouraging if President Truman recognized the intense public interest—and public stake—in the situation in the State Department, and aided the investigation in every way possible, instead of regarding it as simply the springboard into a political free-for-all. That recalls his now discredited "red herring" approach.

Obviously there is politics on both sides in this investigation. But the public has every right to demand that politics not be permitted to go so far as to prevent a fair and factual determination of the loyalties of the men responsible for our foreign policy.

Both sides should cut down on politics in this inquiry. Get the facts on any Communists in the State Department.

Resolution of Potato Growers of Wisconsin, Inc., on Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there has been a tremendous amount of discussion on the subject of the surplus potato problem. In the course of that discussion there has, unfortunately, been a considerable amount of unjustified criticism of the potato growers—the little fellows working on small family size farms trying to cover their costs and to meet the consumer's needs for good spuds at fair prices.

Recently a survey was made among the potato growers in Wisconsin as to whether or not they want continued supports for Irish potatoes. The results showed that two-thirds of the growers oppose potato supports.

I believe that this grass-roots survey will indeed be of interest to my colleagues and to the American public. Among the many things that are clear from this survey is the fact that the Wisconsin potato farmer believes steadfastly in the free-enterprise system and that he, like other people in our population, is deeply skeptical about Government controls.

All of us are naturally interested in a sound, healthy, prosperous agriculture, but we are similarly interested in a free agriculture and a free America.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the text of a press release which I received from Mr. Cliff Hutchinson, executive secretary of Potato Growers of Wisconsin, Inc., together with the resolution adopted by that organization.

There being no objection, the release and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN POTATO PRICE-SUPPORT STORY

Basing their action on the results of a survey recently completed among potato growers in the State, the board of directors of the Potato Growers of Wisconsin, a Statewide association of potato producers, passed unanimously a resolution demanding that the Secretary of Agriculture abandon potato price supports in any form in the State of Wisconsin for Irish potatoes.

In the survey, ballots were sent to 1,500 growers in the State asking them if they were for or against the Government program of supporting prices on potatoes and nearly two-thirds of the growers voted in opposition to the measure.

Edward Okray, of Stevens Point, president of the association, stated that Wisconsin growers were satisfied that price supports, as an incentive for production of food during the war were necessary and that they accomplished their purpose in providing an adequate supply of potatoes for the war effort. "The war is over now," Okray said, "and it's time that we farmers got back on our own feet and paid some attention to sound principles of farming such as supply and demand. We're making a great mistake in depending upon artificial programs such as price support set up by the Government at a tremendous cost to the taxpayers."

At present Wisconsin is set up in a four-State marketing agreement with North Dakota, Minnesota, and Michigan. Efforts to withdraw from this group have been made by Wisconsin farmers as far back as 1948, but to date the Department of Agriculture seems reluctant to let them go it alone. State growers want to withdraw and operate their marketing under a local board of control whereby the potatoes can be disposed of to the consumer on a free and competitive basis without any cost to the Government and at a reasonable profit to the producer. The association has hundreds of signatures of growers on petitions asking the Secretary to allow Wisconsin to withdraw. The signatures represent thousands of acres of potatoes, but the Agriculture officials say that unless the other three States vote to allow Wisconsin to get out that it can't be done.

With the big markets so close to Wisconsin potato fields, growers here find it a great disadvantage when competing with the other States. However, when a Federal regulation is issued it automatically applies to all four States and thus Wisconsin growers are often placed in a bad position.

Most State growers are now satisfied that there is no substitute for free enterprise and that if they are to continue to operate efficiently under a system of supply and demand that the Government should now step out of the potato business and let the farmer operate his own farm.

The parade of States grows longer each day in which growers are demanding that the Government allow the farmer to carry on by himself. Resolutions asking that price support be abandoned have been passed by groups in Pennsylvania, Idaho, Florida, California, Indiana, Colorado, Nebraska, and now Wisconsin has joined the list. There are rumblings in North Dakota, Minnesota, and Michigan but the latter three States have taken no definite action as yet.

The resolution passed by the Wisconsin association board will be forwarded to Secretary of Agriculture Brannan. The text follows:

"RESOLUTION PASSED MARCH 31 BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE POTATO GROWERS OF WISCONSIN, INC., AT STEVENS POINT

"The Potato Growers of Wisconsin, Inc., an association of potato growers in the State of Wisconsin, on this date, through its officers and board of directors, unanimously passed the following resolution: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Potato Growers of Wisconsin, Inc., go on record as being opposed to the continuance of the price-support program in any form for Irish potatoes in the State of Wisconsin; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we also oppose the continuance of regulation and regimentation of potato producers by marketing agreements, marketing quotas, and other governmental controls; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of Agriculture, all Wisconsin Senators and Congressmen, and to the daily newspapers in Wisconsin and the Middle West.

"This action was decided upon after establishment of the following facts:

"1. That nearly two-thirds of Wisconsin growers voted against price supports.

"2. That the past and present potato programs set up by the Government in Wisconsin tend to place the grower under complete subservience to the Government.

"3. The present Government program gives an advantage to the inefficient grower and penalizes the efficient producer.

"4. The program has increased consumer resistance to potato purchases.

"5. The program has reduced Wisconsin's potato acreage to the alarmingly low figure of 33,900 acres.

"6. In nonwar periods, an artificial economy as typified by price support is a tremendous and unnecessary waste of the tax money.

"7. In spite of several years' trial of Government programs the crop surplus has increased each year to a point where the industry is in actual danger of destruction.

"8. The Government programs have encouraged abuses and violations that do not exist under a system of free enterprise.

"CLIFF HUTCHINSON,
"Executive Secretary, Potato Growers of Wisconsin, Inc."

Equality for Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, of Boston, entitled "Separate but Equal," under date of April 12, 1950.

There is such a contrast between the tone and sentiments expressed in this editorial and the attitude of the Department of Justice in going out of its way to appear before the Supreme Court in an effort to upset a decision of another branch of the Government, the Interstate Commerce Commission, because of its violent difference of opinion with the tenor of that decision. The duty of the Attorney General was to support the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission and to seek to make effective its judgment and decree.

Any fair-minded and unprejudiced person will see the force of the reasoning contained in this editorial and in the wisdom of the position taken by the Christian Science Monitor, which is in striking contrast to the political expediency course of the Department of Justice in response to the demand of pressure groups. After a while it may yet dawn upon the extreme advocates of antisegregation by compulsory statutes

that it is not even good politics, much less good patriotism.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SEPARATE BUT EQUAL"

How can the American Negro be helped from what he terms "second class" citizenship to a status where equality of opportunity has genuine meaning? Opportunity is not equal when his available schooling is not. It is not equal when his advancement in job or profession depends less on merit than on racial attitudes. It is not equal where labyrinths of the law prevent him from casting his ballot in behalf of his own rights and interests.

That equality of opportunity is the goal, and that these are the chief obstacles, the majority of Americans, including, we believe, a majority in the South, will agree. The "how" represents the problem. And a most difficult and delicate problem it is.

How to approach the goal gradually enough so that the compulsions of legislation do not too far outrun emotional attachments to deep-rooted custom lest moderates be driven into the arms of the reactionaries, the flouting or evasion of law acquire social acceptance, and extremists of either side fan hatreds which only serve to turn back the clock.

How to press toward that goal fast enough so that those who have a vested interest in white supremacy in all its ancient and ugliest manifestations cannot further intrench an old order against a changing world; fast enough, also, so that no militant fringe can exploit the Negro's understandable feelings of frustration to the point of irrational words and acts. That could bring the very explosive divisions among Americans that their enemies hope for.

The Supreme Court, in its disposal of three cases now before it, can either strengthen this delicate equilibrium or upset it. All three suits involve the now-famous doctrine of "separate but equal" facilities for whites and Negroes. Two involve education in State universities (Oklahoma and Texas); the third, the seating of a Negro Government official in a dining car while traveling through a Jim Crow State.

The pertinent precedents go back to 1896, when the High Court ruled that if the facilities provided were equal, the fact that they were separate did not violate the Constitution. This view was reaffirmed in a District of Columbia school case just 2 months ago. But it is contested in the three pending cases that segregation in practice makes equality impossible and that segregation per se does violate the Constitution.

No one could establish, to be sure, that segregated facilities since the 1896 decision have been equal—far from it. But of late years lower courts have been insisting that facilities must be reasonably equal if they are to remain separate.

The effect of this has been encouraging. And the movement for regional universities and professional schools for Negroes gives hope that equality in education at the level where it is most difficult to achieve is a practical possibility.

We subscribe to no ideological or theological rationalization of segregation (terms have been advanced in connection with cases now before the Supreme Court). We are concerned only that Americans may find the soundest and most workable means toward an end which needs no justification—equality of opportunity.

And it seems wise to us to leave the legal picture as it is: Permit States to maintain separate facilities if they are equal. But require that this equality be made real.

To throw out segregation bodily within States that still desire it would run all the dangers we have listed where law presses custom too fast and hard. To demand equality as the price for separateness, on the other hand, promises steady and peaceful progress.

This is, frankly, the course of gradualism. Some are always irked by the slowness of its workings. But in a social issue so intertwined with subconscious attitudes and convictions of right and wrong it is the only course which can build without destroying.

Socialism in Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to socialism in Great Britain, written by George Weller, and published in the Washington Evening Star of last night.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITONS TELL US TO STOP GIBES AT SOCIALISM AND LOOK AT UNITED STATES ECONOMY

(By George Weller)

LONDON, April 13.—Britons wish Americans would stop scolding them about socialism and take a look at their own economy. If they did so, the British think, Americans would discover that the economic systems of the two nations are getting more alike daily.

Americans, without admitting it, are getting more socialist and the British are getting more capitalist.

Americans criticize the British for socialist measures like food subsidy. The British report: "Certainly we subsidize food prices, because we must to buy food abroad. But food subsidy in Britain is aimed to lower food costs, not increase them. Now you Americans subsidize dried milk, potatoes, peanuts, eggs, and fats. But you subsidize to keep prices high, and take an extra cut out of the consumer-taxpayer.

"Who has the more tyrannical form of state interference: You who subsidize to keep the cost of living up, or we who subsidize to keep it down?"

TO KEEP BALLOON THEN DOWN

Britain, like the United States, has a boom-or-bust economy that is producing far more than before the war. The Government's struggle is to keep the balloon, inflated to bursting size with easy dollars from the Marshall plan, from breaking away.

Yet, the British attitude toward the boom is the more conservative. The Americans keep on accumulating deficits and spending more. But Britain, which Americans assail for socialist free spending, has a budget surplus of nearly $3,000,000,000—one-third a gift of the Marshall plan—and is soberly paying off its debts.

Even the theme of the open door and the land of opportunity are reversed. The British have no unemployed and London's windows are full of "help wanted" signs. The British cannot get enough hands to run the big new productive plant.

The United States, however, has nearly 4,000,000 unemployed. Yet in London today, full of French, Irish, and Scandinavian new hands, you hear more foreign accents than in New York.

LOADED WITH CAPITAL

British banks are loaded with loose investment capital. The Government won't let the owners of the money put it into new business because American aid and British gumption have already built the productive plant to swollen size.

"But before you pity us for the restraints of socialism," say the British, "have a bash at the red tape hampering new investment in your own country. We are no tighter over here than your own Federal boards on securities. And at least we don't preach about an expanding economy, while tying it down with unnecessary red tape."

The British get an ironic kick out of Marshall aid being used to pay off the British debt. "If paying off our debt pushes us toward conservativism and away from socialism," they say, "you are leading us to the right. But what about yourselves?"

DEFLATIONARY IN BRITAIN

The Marshall plan, inflationary in the United States where it adds to the national debt, is deflationary in Britain where it reduces it.

A Prophecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have had many requests for the report of the National Debt Policy Committee, of which I was chairman. This report, which was unanimously approved by the Republican conference of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, May 16, 1939, accurately prophesied where this excessive spending program of the New Deal administration—Fair Deal and Raw Deal—would land this country.

Under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I am inserting the report of the National Debt Policy Committee:

During the 6 years of the New Deal, the public debt of the United States has more than doubled. The revenue of the Federal Government increased from $3,115,554,000 in 1934 to an estimated $5,669,000,000 in 1939. During the same period, expenditures of the Federal Government increased from $7,105,050,000 in 1934 to an estimated $8,995,000,000 in 1939. The annual deficits have resulted in a total deficit of $20,889,000,000 during the 6 years and a corresponding increase in the public debt. It is, therefore, not surprising that the per capita public debt of the United States has more than doubled during the course of 8 years, increasing from $131 in 1931 to $305 in 1939.

Despite this tremendous increase in the public debt, each year a larger and larger proportion of the total national income is being devoted to paying the cost of Government. In 1913 only 6.4 percent of the total national income went for Federal, State, and local taxes. In 1930, 14.2 percent went for the payment of such taxes, and in 1938, 23.6 percent of the total income of the American people was turned over to tax collectors. The share of the national income taken by the Federal Government has been increasing more rapidly than the share taken by the States and their political subdivisions. In 1913 only 1.9 percent of the total national income went for Federal taxes. In 1930, 4.8 percent was devoted to the payment of Federal taxes, and by 1938 it had increased to 10.9 percent. State and local taxes in 1913

took 4.5 percent of the total national income, 9.5 percent in 1930, and 12.7 percent in 1938.

The increase of the Federal public debt from $20,937,000,000 on March 4, 1933, to approximately $41,000,000,000 as of June 30, 1939, does not reveal the total increase of the Federal debt. A number of Government-owned corporations have the capacity to issue bonds that are fully guaranteed by the Federal Government both as to principal and interest. In addition to this increase in the direct public debt of the United States, the contingent liabilities of the Federal Government have increased by more than $5,416,000,000. When the New Deal commenced, there were no contingent liabilities of the Federal Government in the hands of the public. As of February 15, 1939, the total contingent liabilities of the Federal Government guaranteed by it both as to principal and interest and in the hands of the public were as follows:

	Outstanding Feb. 15, 1939
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	$819,100,000
Commodity Credit Corporation	206,200,000
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	1,387,800,000
Federal Housing Administration	1,700,000
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	2,887,600,000
U. S. Housing Authority	114,150,000
Total	5,416,600,000

Thus, by June 30, 1939, the total debt of the United States, including these contingent liabilities, will be in excess of $46,000,000,000.

The present debt limit of the United States (not including contingent liabilities) was set by Congress in 1935 at $45,000,000,000. Of this amount, not more than $30,000,000,000 can be in bonds, and the remainder must be in short-term notes and certificates. The bill now before the House of Representatives would permit the entire $45,000,000,000 of the direct public debt of the United States to be in the form of long-term bonds. Before this statutory limitation is reached another $4,000,000,000 of direct indebtedness can be incurred after June 30, 1939.

It should also be remembered that a number of Government-owned corporations can, under existing authorization from Congress, issue additional bonds that will be fully guaranteed both as to principal and interest by the Federal Government, and that these bonds are not included in the above debt limitation. Inasmuch as a number of these Government corporations are not subject to audit by the General Accounting Office in the case of their nonadministrative expenditures, it is always possible that some of the money raised through the issuance of bonds by them could be used for purposes not contemplated by Congress. These corporations have the power, as yet unexercised, to issue more than $9,483,000,000 of such guaranteed obligations. Such authorizations and the unused balances are as follows:

	Total authorized	Authorized but unissued
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	$3,750,000,000	$2,[illegible],400,000
Commodities Credit Corporation	[illegible]	[illegible],800,000
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	[illegible]	612,[illegible],000
Federal Housing Administration	3,000,000,000	2,[illegible],[illegible],000
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	4,750,000,000	1,[illegible],400,000
U. S. Housing Authority	[illegible]	[illegible]
Tennessee Valley Authority	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total	14,900,000,000	9,483,000,000

Furthermore, in 1934 Congress set up an exchange-stabilization fund of $2,000,000,000, and the money in this fund can be expended by the President as he sees fit without audit by the General Accounting Office. The President could utilize the money in this fund to meet the current expenses of the Federal Government if Congress should not authorize an increase in the debt limit.

In addition, and with even more dangerous potentialities, the President has been vested by Congress with authority to resort to various inflationary devices whereby he can issue fiat money that can be used to meet the day-to-day expenditures of the Government if Congress should not authorize any additional increase in the debt. Under the Thomas amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of May 12, 1933, the President can issue at any time $3,000,000,000 of United States notes secured only by the promise of the Federal Government to pay. It also authorized the Federal Reserve banks, at the request of the President, to purchase up to $3,000,000,000 of Treasury bills. Thus, in reality, the President can issue $6,000,000,000 of printing-press money that could be used by the Government to meet its day-to-day obligations if Congress should not increase the debt limit. If the Government should resort to the issuance of such paper money, widespread and devastating inflation would be the consequence.

Congress has vested in the President certain monetary powers relative to gold and silver which can be exercised in such a way as to result in a profit to the Government out of which the day-to-day deficits of the Government could be met. For example, if the President should exercise his power to devalue the dollar to 50 percent of its previous value or by the full amount authorized by statute, the profit on the increased gold stocks would be $2,762,000,000 in addition to the profit already realized in 1934.

Relative to silver the President is given the power to monetize our present silver stocks at $1.29 an ounce. If this should be done on our present holdings of over two and one-half billion ounces, the profits over the purchase price would be $1,612,000,000. Of course the President can also devalue the silver dollar to the same extent that he devalues the gold dollar. If he should devalue silver to 50 percent and then monetize it, a profit of $2,394,000,000 would result. The Silver Purchase Act of June 19, 1934, directs the President to purchase silver, both domestic and foreign, until the silver stocks shall equal one-fourth of the total monetary value of both the silver and gold stock of the country. If we should ever completely comply with this law, our total silver stock would amount to three and three-fourth billion ounces. Then, if the silver dollar were devalued to 50 percent of its present value and the entire silver stock thus acquired were monetized at $2.58 an ounce, this would result in an issuance of $9,600,000,000 of silver certificates which would be a clear profit to the Treasury at the ultimate expense of the people. Thus it appears that out of silver the Government can make a profit varying from $1,612,000,000 to $9,600,000,000, depending upon the circumstances and the extent of devaluation, and there is no question that the inflationary effects of this would be ruinous.

In summary, through direct inflationary means, the President has the following potential sources of funds which could be used to meet current expenditures of the Government: (1) $3,000,000,000 of greenbacks; (2) $3,000,000,000 of Treasury bills secured only by Government bonds; (3) a profit of $2,762,000,000 that could result from the further devaluation of the gold dollar; and (4) a profit of not less than $1,612,000,000 that could result from the monetization of the present silver stocks of the Government without devaluation.

II

The public-debt problem outlined above has resulted from varied New Deal attempts to promote a quick recovery by spending billions of borrowed money. In fact, spending, whether it is known as priming the pump, compensatory spending, or investment for the future, has been the center of New Deal thought and action ever since June 16, 1933. On that date the President approved the National Industrial Recovery Act, title II of which provided for the appropriation of $3,300,000,000 for a pump-priming program.

While this was the beginning of the world's greatest spending spree, the date has additional significance. It was also the date on which President Roosevelt repudiated his party's campaign pledge to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government and the date on which he washed his hands of his own solemn pledge and promise to stop the deficits and to force a stern and unremitting administration policy of living within our income.

Why he changed his views no one knows, but this much is certain: When President Roosevelt believed in a balanced budget he had faith in the future of American enterprise, but when he became a spender, he accepted the collectivist attitude that our economic system could no longer expand along former lines, and that unemployment and relief were permanent problems. To this he added the belief that future progress would come only through governmental action.

We have now had 6 years' experience with the New Deal pump-priming or spending theory. We believe that this is sufficient time to test any theory, especially a theory the validity of which has always been questioned, and which, if invalid, can result in economic disaster. As a result of a careful and thorough study of all factors, we reach the conclusion that a spending program, as such, has no place in a well-grounded and general recovery plan. Our condemnation is complete and emphatic.

The best proof that spending has failed to promote recovery is the fact that eleven to twelve million unemployed American workers are looking for jobs. In the face of this alone it is folly to contend that spending has worked, for in the words of the President, "to put people back to work" was the one purpose of the first spending bill as well as every bill that has since been passed.

It is equally evident that the stimulation of consumption-goods spending has not led to a revival of capital-goods spending. While there is no doubt that some stimulation of capital expenditures may be accomplished in this way, whatever amount has occurred has not been sufficient to promote a sustained recovery. Statistics contained in a study published recently by the National Bureau of Economic Research indicate that while total expenditures for durable goods and for private construction dropped from about $14,500,000,000 in 1929 to $3,300,000,000 in 1933, that they increased to only $6,000,000,000 by 1935, after 2 years of heavy spending. The figures in this study only go through 1935, but if one allows for a further increase of capital-goods spending from 1936 to 1938, it is clear that the total still remains far short of the amount spent before the depression.

In this connection it must be remembered that consumer spending has not always provided the original impetus for great periods of industrial expansion. For example, the railroads, automobiles, the telegraph and telephone, motion pictures, and radio, among countless other new products and facilities, were not the result of current spending. They happened because, as one economist has stated, "bold and enterprising men have had faith that future spending could be stimulated and that profits could be derived from such expansion."

The New Deal administration claims that the depression beginning in 1937 resulted from a curtailment in public spending, and that the soundness of the spending theory was thus proven.

The contrary is the fact. There is no better proof than the depression which began in 1937 that the spending theory is unsound because after 3½ years of spending the only result was a lopsided recovery. It was dependent on consumption-goods buying and lacked the support of capital-goods buying, without which a full and sustained recovery cannot be achieved.

Our examination reveals weaknesses in the theory itself as well as practical reasons explaining the failure of spending to produce the desired results. An analysis of the 6 years' experience reveals one bold, stark fact—that it is impossible to put men to work on Public Works jobs with sufficient speed to maximize the effectiveness of a given amount of expenditure. Another administrative difficulty involves the determination of when to spend. Since the spending theory assumes that public spending will be increased when private spending falls off, it is necessary to know accurately whether any given decline in private spending is temporary or whether the decline is to be prolonged and pronounced. It is questionable whether the art of economic forecasting has reached this highly developed stage. Furthermore, just as the spending theory involves the determination of when to spend, equally important is the determination of when to stop. Public spending, according to the theory, should be reduced when private spending is resumed. Work on large construction projects, however, cannot be stopped at will.

In addition to the above there are economic reasons why the theory failed. To a great extent these are psychological, but real, nonetheless. When the Federal Government set out to spend it fostered the rise of pressure groups, which in time have become imbued with the single objective of obtaining more and more aid. The claims of one group, if satisfied, are incitements for the claims of other groups.

As a result Federal expenditures have increased year after year; and since tax revenues failed to make up for the ever-increasing expenditures, the Budget has remained continually out of balance. Continuing deficits have made businessmen and others, especially those with funds to invest, distrustful of the future. As private spenders became fearful of the future they refused to invest, and the effectiveness of additional public spending was thereby reduced.

There were other so-called "depressants" to a resumption in public or business spending. As spending and the deficits increased, the attempt was made to lessen the size of the deficits by increasing revenues from taxation. As businessmen and others felt the increased burden of these taxes, their attention was fixed not only upon the present burden but also upon the ultimate burden of taxation as well. No one can view this situation with anything short of alarm, for business stagnates in an atmosphere of uncertainty and governmental competition and oppression.

Equally important but more difficult to overlook is the fact that other New Deal activities reduced any positive results that might have flower from spending as such. While the plan assumed that capital expansion would follow, other New Deal policies and acts have prevented this from occuring. For example, the New Deal enacted many tax measures which took money out of the worker's pocket and thus decreased his power to buy, even though the objective in the first instance was to increase consumer purchasing power. For these and other reasons we find it difficult to appraise the spending program apart from New Deal policy as a whole. We stress this fact in our report to you.

III

So far we have discussed the program only from the standpoint of how it worked and why, and have left until last our discussion of the long-term effects that will inevitably follow if we continue to spend more than we collect in taxes. We approach this particular phase with a deep sense of its seriousness, for we believe that the future of the Nation depends upon a clear understanding of these vital facts by every man and woman in this country.

We refer here to the threat of inflation. The administration earnestly professes to promote the welfare of all, but at the same time adopts a program which has always, without fail, led to enslavement and to moral and financial bankruptcy. Our study convinces us that there is no essential difference in our current financial situation and that which finally led to run-away inflation in postwar Europe. Inflation in every instance that we have examined has been the result of a government spending more than it collected in taxes, and this is true whether the inflation was generated by a currency or credit expansion.

Inherent in the very nature of inflation is its irresistible tendency to burst the bounds of all control through public panic.

We are further convinced that there are no greater hardships to be suffered by a people than those induced by such inflation. If we continue following the line of least resistance, we shall reach the limit of our credit. When this happens, all will fall before us. Savings, big and little, will lose most of their value. Insurance companies and banks will go to the wall. The endowments of our charitable, fraternal, social, religious, and educational institutions, endowments which have taken years to create, will be reduced to a mere pittance. The increase in the cost of living will put even the essentials of life—adequate food, clothing, and shelter—beyond the reach of a majority of the population. Even those yet unborn will pay the price for our folly.

No person or group of persons will escape. Wage earners will see the purchasing power of their pay envelopes shrink as inflation brings a ruinous rise in prices. As a result, the worker's standard of living will be reduced to the barest subsistence level. Salary workers will be hit even more quickly, for salaries are relatively fixed and adjustments are not made as rapidly. Those who live on pensions, annuities, or interest from lifetime savings will meet a like fate. Farmers will suffer even more than other groups, for though they might seem to gain temporarily while prices are moving up, this in the end will be an illusive gain. Recall that the source of present farm problems lies in war inflation. Should we embark upon a similar inflation, the farmer can look forward to only more of the same troubles he has been fighting for 20 years.

Furthermore it is doubtful if our system of free government and free private enterprise could withstand this shock. In this respect we call your attention to the fact that dictators now rule the peoples in Europe where government spending and inflation first ran their course. As President Roosevelt recognized in his economy message to Congress in March 1933, "Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policy." The profound truth is that a government cannot endure if through unsound financial policies and legislation it brings the nation to economic ruin. Such a condition produces all too often a man or group of men to whom the people in their despair may be persuaded to turn on the promise that economic security will be provided in exchange for their liberties.

Our present financial situation is serious. No one knows what the limit of Government credit is or when this limit will be reached. There is no exact figure for the limit depends upon circumstances and varies with conditions. Ultimately Government credit rests solely on the confidence of lenders in the taxing power and policies of the Government. There is no way to measure public confidence.

While the New Deal has been able to finance its spending at low-interest rates and without apparent difficulties to date such excessively low-interest rates are not a sign of financial stability but the sign of economic ill health.

Furthermore, the New Deal deficits have been covered principally by borrowing in the financial markets, by the process of selling bonds and short-term Treasury obligations to the banks. The process of financing deficits by the creation of new deposit credits is potentially inflationary. The fact that this process has not resulted in actual inflation is no guaranty that it will not, or that it can be controlled once it comes. Regardless of this, the New Deal has created approximately $9,000,000,000 of credit for the purchase of Government obligations and the financing of its deficits. The very fact that the banks have absorbed so large a proportion of the increased public debt has put them on a treadmill, for they must continue buying to support the market, and the more they buy the more vulnerable they become.

Also of vital importance is the question of financial preparedness, in event of emergency. The spending plan assumes that public indebtedness will be reduced during the period of prosperity that follows spending, but what happens if prosperity does not follow? In that event, or if a sufficient period of prosperity does not ensue during which the debt can be appreciably reduced, we will enter the next emergency, perhaps war, with the odds heavily against us. Wars are costly, and should we enter a great war with an impaired credit, there would be the threat of inflation to contend with from the very start. Thus a sound fiscal policy is necessary for an adequate national defense.

Unless spending is reduced our only hope is that national income will increase so that taxes will provide sufficient income with which to balance the budget. But this in itself is an utterly futile hope because under the New Deal we are relying upon spending to produce an increase in national income and spending has not worked that way, nor will it; it served only to make matters worse. It is for this reason that the monetary powers discussed earlier assume great importance, for as, if, and when it becomes impossible to force more Government securities into the banking system, currency inflation will follow. Thus, it becomes evident that sound policy involves not only a balanced budget but revocation of the monetary powers of the President.

IV

If we are to prevent the disastrous conditions that may develop as a consequence of spending more than we collect in taxes, it is imperative that Congress adopt a well-rounded program of Government action along the lines set forth below. A piecemeal program will not solve the problem. To have a maximum effect on the national welfare, all the elements herein suggested must be adopted. Above all the budget must be balanced.

(1) To accomplish this, Congress and the Government must adopt every possible means to increase the real national income. If the real income of the Nation increases, Government revenue will also increase and at the same time the alleged need for Government spending will disappear. The hindrances to production resulting from Government regulation, burdensome taxation and fear for the future have all contributed to hindering the increase in the real income of the American people.

A recent publication of the Brookings Institution has observed:

"The vital problem is to secure a great increase in national production and income. The central issue, with respect to public finance, is whether such an expansion of production can best be stimulated by extravagant Federal expenditures, increasing deficits, and heavier taxes, or by some modifications of taxes and a reduction of Federal expenditures—within the limits set by essential requirements. * * *

"Unless we can promptly secure a substantial increase in the national income it will be necessary to conclude that the United States has already reached the danger point in the growth of public indebtedness." (Taxation and Capital Investment, pp. 19 and 21.)

Real recovery in the United States will solve the problem of the public debt, but real recovery in practically every way depends upon sound Government policies.

(2) In addition, it is highly desirable that a thoroughgoing and intensive study of how the national budget can be balanced should be undertaken immediately. The budget cannot be balanced by a mere pruning of expenditures here and there. To accomplish real reductions in Government expenditures it is necessary to evaluate the functions now being performed by the Federal Government and to determine how those functions which are desirable can be most advantageously performed at the most reasonable cost. Some present functions could probably be eliminated, and other functions could be performed in a much less expensive manner.

(3) As previously pointed out, the President has been vested by Congress with the power through various inflationary devices to secure added funds to meet with the ordinary expenditures of the Government without incurring additional debt. The results of the use of such inflationary devices would be disastrous to the national well-being.

Lump-sum debt limit increases are as vicious in principle as lump-sum appropriations and blank checks.

Lump-sum debt increases offer the temptation to a gigantic political bureaucracy to spend up to the limit and ask for more.

Submitted unanimously by the Republican Conference Committee on National Debt Policy.

Daniel A. Reed, New York, chairman; Dewey Short, Missouri, Edward H. Rees, Kansas, Albert E. Carter, California, Albert J. Engel, Michigan, Albert G. Rutherford, Pennsylvania, Albert E. Austin, Connecticut, Albert L. Vreeland, New Jersey, L. L. Marshall, Ohio, Frank O. Horton, Wyoming, Charles Haws, Jr., Wisconsin.

The So-Called Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the so-called equal-rights amendment is now pending before the Congress. I think all organized labor, the League of Women Voters, and numerous other organizations are bitterly opposed. The National Woman's Party and a number of other organizations favor this constitutional amendment.

It is conceded if the amendment were adopted, many State laws would necessarily be changed. I am in receipt of a statement from the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor concerning the laws of my State of Michigan, which is informative and pertinent to this issue. Pursuant to the permission granted by the House, I am including that statement, which is as follows:

STATE LAWS OF SPECIAL VALUE TO WOMEN

MICHIGAN

I. For wives and mothers

The primary duty of the husband to support his family (common law).

Admission of the wife's testimony without consent of the husband in desertion and nonsupport cases (sec. 17115–166).

Wife's freedom in disposing of her property by will without regard to provision for her husband (constitution, article XVI, sec. 8, Comp. Laws, secs. 13057, 13473).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (secs. 12690, 12704, 12717).

Protects wife's dower (or its substitute) when the husband conveys his lands by his sole deed or mortgage, without providing a similar protection to the husband as to his wife's property (sec. 13072).

II. For widows

One year's residence, rent free, in husband's home; also 1 year's support from the estate, and an allowance up to $200 value in house furnishings and personal property (secs. 13090, 15726; 1939 Laws, act 288).

Right to select, according to the resulting best advantage to her, (1) the provision for her by the husband's will, (2) her legal share of his estate, or (3) her dower (if she is entitled to dower) (1935 Supp., sec. 13085).

Inheritance advantage in cases provided for by statute (sec. 15726).

III. For workingwomen

Hours of work: 9 a day, 54 a week (sec. 8324; department of labor and industry, regulations affecting employment of females and minors).

Meal and rest period. (The granting of definite rest periods of 15 minutes' duration, morning and afternoon or on swing shifts, etc., is a recommendation of the State labor department.)

Lifting or carrying. (The department of labor and industry, regulations on employment of women.)

Equal pay (Public Acts, 1931, act 328, sec. 556, reenacting act 239 of Public Acts of 1919).

Industrial home work (sec. 8337).

(Source: 1929 Compiled Laws and Supplements.)

A Bill To Reduce the Debt Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when drastic action will have to be taken by the Congress if this country is to avert the worst calamity it has ever faced during its entire history up to this time. The wild, reckless, and insane spending of the people's money, resulting in crushing taxation, must be stopped.

To this end I am inserting, under leave heretofore granted, a release as follows:

Following is a joint statement by seven Republican members of the House Ways and Means Committee—Representative DANIEL A. REED, New York; Representative ROY O. WOODRUFF, Michigan; Representative THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio; Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Pennsylvania; Representative ROBERT W. KEAN, New Jersey; Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, Iowa; Representative CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska:

We have come to the conclusion that the surest way to force the Truman administration to come to its senses financially is to lower the limit on the national debt. When the House meets next week, we will introduce bills to reduce the debt limit from the present $275,000,000,000 to 257,000,000,000. On March 31, 1950, the debt was $255,622,574,315.

The Truman administration has embarked on a nonstop spending spree that can end only in disaster unless it is checked. Between March 31, 1949, and March 31, 1950, the Federal debt rose by $4,048,041,274. For the year July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951, President Truman submitted a budget that would push up the debt by an additional $5,133,000,000.

Already the debt is equal to $6,768 for every family of four persons in the country. The interest alone comes to $153 a year for every family, and this interest is paid only out of the taxpayers' sweat.

President Truman has not demonstrated that he has even the slightest intention of ever putting the Government's house in order. He prefers the easy alternative of spend-and-borrow, hoping that he will be safely out of the White House before bankruptcy strikes. His lieutenants in Congress have shown the same unwillingness to face the cold facts of life and they have gone along with his spend-and-borrow policy.

Where there should be strong leadership on the part of the administration, there is a vacuum. Therefore, Republican Members of Congress have a responsibility to step in and force some sanity on the administration. A reduction in the debt limit would be a step in that direction.

If the measure is adopted, the Treasury will still have a margin of almost $1,500,000,000 in borrowing power to take care of unforeseen emergencies. At the same time the Government will finally be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Rights of Government Employees Transferred Under Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House have received numerous inquiries about Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950, and have heard objections by employees in the custodial services of the Post Office Department that loss in pay or accrued leave rights would result from a possible transfer of such employees to the General Services Administration.

The House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, upon the call of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], held a conference in executive session on March 27, 1950, with representatives of the Government agencies primarily affected by Reorganization Plan No. 18. In a public release of the

same date our chairman listed those persons participating in the conference and summarized its achievement as follows:

It was developed during the executive session that arrangements within the executive branch are being made to safeguard the interests of the employees affected by this transfer of personnel. Assurances were made in the testimony by representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, Post Office Department, and the General Services Administration that, under proposed arrangements, transferred employees would not be reduced in salary, would receive lump-sum payments for accumulated annual leave. It was further developed that, in the case of postal employees so affected, by virtue of this transfer to the General Services Administration, they would be eligible for the more liberal annual and sick leave allowances now provided under the Classification Act of 1949 for civil service employees.

Notwithstanding this explanation, resolutions—House Resolution 539 and House Resolution 541—proposing a rejection of Reorganization Plan No. 18 were introduced on April 5. Of course, the committee will give due consideration to these resolutions and make a report to the House. In the meantime I believe it will be helpful to the Members to have a detailed summary of this problem and of the action taken following the conference held by our committee.

SALARY STATUS UPON TRANSFER

The present salaries received by all employees transferred under Reorganization Plan No. 18 will be protected.

Under the Classification Act of 1949 the Civil Service Commission is authorized to determine what pay adjustments shall be made for employees coming within the classified system for the first time by transfer. Accordingly, on Saturday, April 1, 1950, the Civil Service Commission published in the Federal Register a regulation—reproduced at the conclusion of these remarks—which insures that present salaries will be protected for all employees transferred under Reorganization Plan No. 18.

A perusal of this regulation indicates that in two kinds of cases, transferred employees might actually receive higher pay: (a) if their basic compensation was less than the minimum scheduled rate of the grade in which they are placed; (b) if their basic compensation fell within the salary range of the grade in which they are placed, but not at one of the rates prescribed therein. Upon transfer, those under the minimum would receive the minimum rate; those within the salary range of a given grade but not getting a prescribed rate would receive the next higher rate.

There will be also some employees whose maximum rate for a given grade under the postal-pay system is somewhat higher than that payable under the Classification Act of 1949. Although they will retain their rates upon transfer, for such employees the long-term salary ceiling will be limited to a lower rate in the General Services Administration.

ANNUAL SALARY INCREASES

Under the postal-pay acts all employees are entitled to an annual raise of $100 provided their service has been satisfactory during the preceding year. Under the Classification Act, however, the amount of the annual salary increases varies from $60 to $125 on an annual basis, depending on the grade. Under the Classification Act, in the higher grades, the employees receive a $200 or more salary increase every 18 months. There is no comparable provision in the postal pay system. This will mean that in some cases employees transferred will receive smaller annual increases. In other cases they will receive larger annual increases than are possible under the postal-pay schedule.

ANNUAL LEAVE

All employees of the postal field service receive 15 days annual leave a year. Upon transfer to General Services Administration they will receive annual leave at the rate of 26 days a year, which may be accumulated up to 60 days. All annual leave that postal employees have to their credit on the date of any transfers made to the General Services Administration will be paid for in cash by the Post Office Department. This will be done in accordance with section 3 of Public Law 525 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, which section reads as follows:

SEC. 3. That all accumulated and current accrued leave be liquidated by a lump-sum payment to any civilian officer or employee of the Federal Government or the Government of the District of Columbia in cases involving transfer to agencies under different leave systems. Such lump-sum payment shall equal the compensation that such employee would have received had he not been transferred until the expiration of the period of such leave: *Provided*, That the lump-sum payment herein authorized shall not be regarded, except for purposes of taxation, as salary or compensation and shall not be subject to retirement reductions.

SICK LEAVE

Employees of the postal field service receive 10 days sick leave a year with no limit on accumulation. They will receive sick leave, upon transfer to General Services Administration, at the rate of 15 days a year, which may be accumulated up to 90 days. Not to exceed 90 days of accumulated sick leave will be transferred from the Post Office Department to the General Services Administration under the authority of a regulation of the Civil Service Commission published in the Federal Register on Wednesday, April 5, 1950. This regulation is reproduced at the conclusion of these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to set forth the available facts which bear upon the status of employees to be transferred under Reorganization Plan No. 18. A representative from the General Services Administration has told the committee that the GSA is anxious to have the rights of transferred employees fully protected, because of that agency's interest in maintaining an efficient and satisfied work force. I believe that the arrangements which have been worked out for the protection of these rights of transferred employees are reasonable and equitable, considering all the factors involved.

PURPOSE OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 18

Reorganization Plan No. 18 conforms to a recommendation of the Hoover Commission in its report, Office of General Services: Supply Activities—pages 10–11—that the operation and maintenance of public buildings, including allotment of space, be centralized in the one administrative agency concerned with general services and supply activities. By Public Law 152 of the past session, this agency was created and titled the General Services Administration. At the present time its responsibility with respect to public buildings management is largely confined to the District of Columbia. Reorganization Plan No. 18 would broaden this responsibility, in keeping with the principles laid down in this law, by including the administration of Government office buildings in the field. The President stated in his accompanying message—House Document No. 523, Eighty-first Congress, second session:

The transfers made by this plan will promote more economical leasing, better utilization of building space, and more efficient operation of Government-controlled office buildings.

In bringing together under one responsible head the functions relating to the acquisition and control of building space, now divided in the field among a number of agencies, Reorganization Plan No. 18 specifically excludes buildings at military and defense installations and space in hospitals, laboratories, factories, and other special-purpose buildings. Also, the present leasing authority of the Post Office Department is left untouched, as well as its space assignment authority in portions of post-office buildings occupied by the Department. These exceptions accord generally with the provisos in the report of the Hoover Commission.

Because the Members are interested in the relationship between Reorganization Plan No. 18 and the Post Office Department, it is well to set forth the pertinent part of the President's accompanying message:

Also, the plan excludes the Post Office Department from the transfer of leasing authority since the Department has a highly developed organization for this purpose, and it limits the transfer of space assignment authority in post-office buildings to the space not occupied by the Department. Further, it gives the needs of the Post Office Department priority in the assignment of space in post-office buildings. Thus, the plan amply safeguards the interests of the Post Office Department while making it possible to include the general office space in post-office buildings in any given city with other similar space under Federal control in planning and executing an efficient program for housing Government agencies in that area.

The Post Office Department operates 3,300 buildings, most of which are devoted exclusively to postal purposes. Buildings so used would not be affected by the reorganization plan. In the larger cities about 250 buildings are so-called multiple-use buildings, with a relatively small percentage of space used for postal purposes. These buildings, according to Mr. Burke, employ a custodial force of approximately 10,000 persons, about half the total custodial work force employed by the Post Office Department. Although no definite allocations of buildings and personnel to be transferred have been made as yet, these 250 multiple-use buildings with their 10,000 custodial employees represent, in Mr. Burke's opinion, the maximum possible transfer under the reorganization plan.

It will be necessary to make careful studies, building by building, to determine exactly which ones are to be finally transferred. The Budget Bureau representative, Mr. Joseph E. Winslow, who acts as personnel adviser to the Bureau, estimated that possibly between 2,000 and 4,000 employees would be transferred under Reorganization Plan No. 18.

The Deputy Postmaster General, in emphasizing his approval of the reorganization plan, pointed out that it would relieve the Post Office Department from operating and maintenance outlays for buildings not primarily utilized for post-office work, thus affording a more accurate picture of Post Office Department operating expenses.

The plan would also provide a central clearinghouse for space in large cities, putting an end to the divided function and divided responsibility between the Post Office Department and the General Services Administration.

At this point I will include the texts of the Civil Service Commission regulations, printed in the Federal Register, to which reference is made in these remarks:

PART 25. FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY REGULATIONS

SUBPART B—GENERAL COMPENSATION RULES

1. Effective 30 days after publication in the Federal Register, section 25.103 of this subpart is amended by the addition of paragraph (d) as set out below.

"Section 25.103. General provisions:

* * * * *

"(d) Where an employee occupies a position not subject to the Classification Act, and the employee together with his position is initially brought under the Classification Act of 1949 pursuant to the Reorganization Act of 1949 or other legislation, an Executive order of the President, or decision of the Civil Service Commission under section 203 of the Classification Act of 1949, the provisions of section 25.104 (b) (1) to (5), inclusive, shall apply in determining the employee's initial rate of basic compensation. This provision shall apply only so long as the employee continues to occupy the same position.

"(1) The rate of basic compensation of a subsequent appointee to such position shall be fixed in accordance with the other applicable provisions in this subpart."

2. Section 25.104 of this subpart is amended by deleting "802" from the first sentence of paragraph (b). This change is retroactively effective as of the first day of the first pay period following enactment of the Classification Act of 1949. As amended, paragraph (b) reads as follows:

"Section 25.104. Special provisions:

* * * * *

"(b) Under the authority of sections 1101 and 1105 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, establishment of initial salary rates of basic compensation for employees who on an effective date specified by the Commission under section 1105 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949 occupy positions under that act which immediately prior to October 28, 1949, were exempt from the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (including positions in grade 9 of the professional and scientific service or in grade 16 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service referred to in section 13 of such act), shall be as follows:

"(1) If the employee is receiving a rate of basic compensation less than the minimum scheduled rate of the grade in which his position is placed, his compensation shall be increased to the minimum rate.

"(2) If the employee is receiving a rate of basic compensation within the range of salary prescribed for the grade in which his position is placed, at one of the rates fixed therein, no change shall be made in his existing rate.

"(3) If the employee is receiving a rate of basic compensation within the range of salary prescribed for the grade in which his position is placed, but not at one of the rates fixed therein, his compensation shall be increased to the next higher rate.

"(4) If the employee is receiving a rate of basic compensation in excess of the maximum scheduled rate for the grade in which his position is initially placed, no change shall be made in his existing rate.

"(5) After salary rates have been initially established, an employee may subsequently receive an increase in compensation by reason of the operation of titles V and VII, section 802 (b) of title VIII or title X. An employee whose salary was initially established under the foregoing provisions in a position which is later changed to a lower grade without material change of duties and responsibilities, shall be paid at the rate he received immediately prior to the date his position became subject to the act, or at a higher rate authorized by the provisions of section 25.103.

"(6) The rate of basic compensation of a subsequent appointee to such position shall be fixed in accordance with the other applicable provisions in this subpart." (Sec. 1101, Public Law 429, 81st Cong.)

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,

[SEAL] HARRY B. MITCHELL, *Chairman.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-2700; filed, March 31, 1950; 8:56 a. m.]

PART 30. ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE REGULATIONS

TRANSFER FROM POSITION NOT WITHIN PURVIEW OF LEAVE ACTS TO POSITION WITHIN PURVIEW OF LEAVE ACTS

Effective 30 days after publication in the Federal Register, section 30.410 is amended by the addition of paragraph (d) as follows:

"Section 30.410. Transfer from position not within purview of leave acts to position within purview of leave acts:

* * * * *

"(d) Whenever any employee in the postal service or in any other agency or position whose sick leave is not governed by the regulations in this part is transferred to any agency or position which is subject to the regulations in this part and the transfer of such employee is an incident to a transfer of function made by or under authority of law, there shall be transferred with the employee the accumulated and current accrued sick leave standing to the credit of such employee at the time of transfer. The amount of any sick leave so transferred shall not exceed 90 days." (Sec. 7, 49 Stat. 1162; 5 U. S. C. 30e. E. O. 9414, Jan. 13, 1944, 9 F. R. 623, 3 CFR, 1944 Supp.)

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,

[SEAL] HARRY B. MITCHELL, *Chairman.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-2820; filed, Apr. 4, 1950; 8:52 a. m.]

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] before a student convocation at Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., on April 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and my fellow Americans, it is always a pleasure to visit one of Pennsylvania's great centers of higher education.

This is particularly true of Lafayette College because here, for a century and a quarter, patriotic Americans have upheld the sacred ideals of freedom.

A great procession of young men has gone forth from its halls, imbued with the spirit of a free school, a free church, and of a Nation which recognizes freedom of the individual as a blessing bestowed by God.

It is also a pleasure to come to Lafayette because your president is a devoted Christian, an outstanding scholar, and a courageous patriot. Pennsylvania is proud of Dr. Ralph Cooper Hutchison. He has served his church, his State, and the Nation faithfully and well, as every real American should.

Here at Lafayette you are preparing to share in the unlimited opportunities that our land of freedom offers to all its sons under the American plan of government.

Equally important, or even more important, is your preparation to meet the great responsibilities of citizenship in a Republic where the people rule.

The future of the United States depends upon the spirit with which the young men and women now in our schools and colleges accept those responsibilities.

The welfare and progress of our people depends upon the moral strength and the leadership that is developed here at Lafayette and upon every other college campus in the United States.

It will be your duty to preserve and strengthen those qualities which are the foundation of American greatness.

You must take your places in the battle lines to defend and safeguard America from those, at home and abroad, who would undermine and destroy our most precious possession, freedom of the individual.

With those thoughts in mind, let us consider some American principles and some of the dangers which confront us as a nation.

First, let us take note of our individual and collective responsibilities to our country and to each other.

It can be summed up briefly as follows:

To preserve for all time the divine endowment of freedom of the individual and to hand down untarnished to future generations our rich heritage of liberty and independence.

Those words are not mere rhetoric to be spoken on occasions like this. They comprise a living precept by which every right-thinking God-fearing American should be guided in his everyday life.

They are the essence of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights. Those sacred documents were conceived and drafted by men who prized liberty above life itself. They were men of deep religious conviction. They sought the truth in the teachings of the Holy Bible.

One of the great teachings of religion is "Know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

Therefore, for a moment, let us look at the real truth.

Our fathers established this powerful Nation of freedom by sweat, tears, and blood. The Republic they created has advanced, in less than 200 years, from a dense wilderness to the most powerful country in all history.

Other lands have had richer natural resources. Other nations had greater population. But through its plan of equal opportunity and the God-given freedom of the individual, the United States has produced

the highest living standard, the most advanced cultural position, and the greatest spiritual attainments of all time.

What made this unparalleled progress possible?

The answer is found in that God-given freedom of opportunity, placed in the basic law of our country, and proclaimed in our Declaration of Independence in these words:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

That made our advancement possible.

Please note that the founding fathers, in enumerating the sacred rights of mankind, placed emphasis on the pursuit of happiness.

They did not attempt to guarantee happiness. They recognized the truth that no government since the world began has ever succeeded in giving happiness.

The founders of our Republic upheld the right of every citizen to enjoy the rewards of his initiative, hard work, sacrifice, and persistence. Our Constitution is not only a great charter of human rights but it also protects property rights. The right to possess property is one of the greatest of human rights. It creates incentive by giving the individual the benefit of his labors.

That incentive caused the pioneers of American expansion to move westward. It inspired them to found homes, schools, and churches, and to build communities where they might improve living and raise the cultural and spiritual standards.

That incentive caused men to cross mountains, rivers, and prairies to discover natural resources, which, through God-guided talent, were converted into useful things for the improvement of mankind.

This forward movement took courage, initiative and sacrifice but it finally established a country from one ocean to the other. It carved out a new civilization.

These men did not ask the Government for security. They only asked for an opportunity. They had the self-reliant spirit that comes from faith in God, faith in each other and faith in the future of the United States.

Unfortunately in recent years there has been a great change in the thinking of so many of our people. They have been misled into believing that the Government can provide security from the cradle to the grave.

They have accepted the false promise of demagogues who seek to strengthen and perpetuate their power by pretending to be the friends and benefactors of the people.

Attracted by the hope of security, the people forget the cost. They forget that it is a part of the socialistic philosophy which teaches that all powerful central government can manage the people's lives better than they can for themselves.

They forget that wherever the people looked to the Government for security individual freedom was lost.

Wherever the people abandoned initiative and self-reliance for the glamorous promise of security from the government the result has been enslavement to the government.

Without freedom there can be no security.

As early as 1755 Benjamin Franklin said, and I quote:

"They that give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

There is a stern lesson in Dr. Franklin's warning.

Security will not be achieved by taxing more and more of the workers' earnings.

It will not be gained by going deeper and deeper into debt or by spending ourselves into national bankruptcy.

It will not be attained through fiscal policies which deprive industry of investment capital and destroy incentive for the expansion of our productive capacity.

Real security can be created only in an atmosphere of freedom, giving encouragement to a high rate of national production.

Increased production is the result of better machinery, better living standards, better management, improved health and educational facilities, more skill among craftsmen and higher spiritual standards.

None of these things are developed where the socialistic system wipes out desire to succeed. Every socialized state has reduced the standard of living and finally made all the people poor.

The difference between individual freedom and socialism is shown by a comparison of what a week's wages will buy.

Let us compare the buying power of a Russian workingman with that of an American worker.

An American worker with his week's wages can buy 394 loaves of bread against the Russian's 22. He can buy 276 quarts of milk and the Russian can buy only 15. The American can buy 83 pounds of beef and the Russian only 8.

The time has come when Americans should wake up to the situation into which we are drifting.

We are living in a time of aggressive and confusing propaganda. Much of it emanates from men in political activity who want to be known as progressives, liberals, forward looking friends of the common man, and other names which seem to have popular appeal.

But in many cases these fine sounding titles are merely political disguises. They serve as vote-getting cloaks to cover reckless and extravagant spending schemes, and to support tricky political promises of so-called social-welfare reforms.

The free spender of other people's money is always popular, but his wasteful, spendthrift course means higher taxes, more deficit financing, and bigger debt. In the end it means national bankruptcy, the loss of individual freedom, and the slavery of the Socialist state.

Let us consider the national debt which has reached the unbelievable sum of of $256,000,000,000 and is being increased at the rate of $5,000,000,000 a year.

That huge debt is not just a bookkeeping item. It represents money that has been borrowed and spent. It must be repaid, together with interest at the rate of $5,500,000,000 a year.

The Federal debt today is $1,700 for every man, woman, and child in the United States or $5,800 for the average family of four. It means that when you go out to earn a living you will start with a mortgage of at least $1,700 against you. That is a most dangerous situation. It strikes at the foundation of our freedom.

Let us look at some other startling facts.

In 20 years the cost of Government has multiplied eight times. We pay almost one-fourth of our total income just to govern ourselves. We pay 13 times as much for Government as we spend for education and 40 times as much as we contribute to the church. We pay more for Government than we pay for food.

In 20 years the number of job holders on the Government pay roll has multiplied four times. In 1929 Uncle Sam had less than 600,000 civilian employees. Today there are nearly 2,000,000. In the same period the number of bureaus, commissions, and agencies of the Government were increased from 400 to more than 1,800.

The three levels of Government are sending out checks at regular intervals to more than 20,000,000 Americans. How long can that be continued before there will be no one on the paying side of the ledger?

Where does all this money come from? The answer is obvious. It is taken in direct and hidden taxes from the earnings of every man and every woman who works for a living.

Less than half of the Federal revenues are produced by the income tax. Over 50 percent of the income tax is paid by people earning less than $6,000 a year.

The greater part of Federal revenue is derived from taxes concealed in the selling prices of goods and services.

Those are the hidden taxes. No matter whether you pay an income tax in the higher brackets or no tax at all, you are affected by the hidden taxes that are included in the purchase price of everything you buy. They are a staggering burden on the poor, even though they pay no direct tax.

All of these facts and figures mean that government has grown too big, too complex, and too expensive.

It has been truly said: "That nation is best governed which is least governed."

Right now we need to think of America as it was really intended by the founders. It was not intended to be socialistic. It was not intended to be paternalistic. It was not intended to direct and control our lives. It was intended to give freedom and to protect opportunity.

Most of the problems that trouble us today are not the result of a break-down in the system upon which our Government was established. They have come upon us because of the weakening of the moral fiber of the people.

The destructive blight now corrupting American morality is the false hope of something for nothing.

We want security. We want our investments guaranteed. We want to borrow money from the Government. We want to sell our products at Government-supported prices. We demand new projects and new services from the Government whether we can afford them or not.

There has never been a time in the history of the United States when there was a greater need for a return to the principles of real Americanism.

The creeping paralysis of socialism is spreading through our Government. The danger of national bankruptcy hangs over our heads. Oppressive taxation and a growing mountain of debt threatens our progress and our standard of living.

To save America we must return to the fundamentals of the American way of life.

We must reestablish honesty, industry, self-reliance, thrift, tolerance, and the love of God as sacred principles to guide our daily conduct.

We must think more of the spiritual welfare of our country and less about the material things of life.

As I said earlier in my remarks, you young men must take your places in the battle lines to defend and safeguard America.

I would like to suggest some issues that are worth fighting for. They are:

1. Americanism against socialism.
2. Freedom against regimentation.
3. Free enterprise against a planned economy.
4. Solvency against deficit financing.
5. A national economy based on justice for agriculture, labor, and industry with the rights of the public paramount over all.

We must fight for these things in the political arena. The kind of government we have is decided at the ballot box.

It is a tragic fact that too many of our people take too little interest in government. They avoid participation in political affairs. Nearly one-third of our people do not even take the trouble to vote.

Remember always it is your Government. In a republic the people are the government. The share you take in government is the measure of your citizenship.

There is a great truth inscribed on the wall of the Library of Congress, from which I quote:

"Enlighten the people generally and tyranny and oppression * * * will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day."

Let us tell the people that living standards can only be improved by increasing earning power. This means greater skills, better management, and less Government interference.

Let us all demand that government at all levels, local, State, and Federal, avoid deficit financing, high taxes, and unbalanced budgets.

Let us tell the people that taxes are not paid by politicians who are always shedding briny tears for the ordinary man but are paid by the sweat of those who work.

Our freedom is a sacred heritage. Our forefathers fought for this freedom on the frozen battlegrounds of the Revolution. Other generations have fought to extend that freedom by bloody battles on land, on sea, and in the air.

Americans of every generation have firmly stood in legislative halls, in the courthouses, and in the pulpits to maintain our precious freedoms.

The air is now filled with new battle cries. There are men who would tear down the walls of freedom. They would raise a new flag in place of the Stars and Stripes. They would substitute a police state for our individual freedom. They would exchange the pure air of America for the unholy ideology which pretends it can plan better than God.

We must now fight to retain our God-given freedoms. We must fight against those who would centralize our government, regulate our lives, and regiment us by telling us where to work, how to work, and when to work.

We must rearm ourselves with high moral and spiritual courage, and join the men and women who are waging war for individual freedom against the socialistic police state.

Again I say the battleground is in the arena of politics.

The orders are being issued. The lines are being drawn.

Our mission is to preserve the God-given freedom of the individual.

Let us join in the fight now.

American Policy in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial of the subject of who is wrong in Chinese policy, by Daniel A. Poling, editor of the Christian Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORIALLY SPEAKING

WHO'S WRONG?

On the day the press described Japanese women weeping before the gates of the Communist embassy in Tokyo, crying for their husbands, sons, or brothers held in prison work camps, the day when Douglas MacArthur denounced Russia's slave pits where more than 300,000 Japanese prisoners of war are held illegally—if they are still alive—the Michigan Christian Advocate honored me with an editorial, You're Wrong, Dr. Poling, Fifty-nine Missionaries Say So.

I am "wrong" because I advocate all-out aid to our ally, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-chek, who is a devout Christian, a Methodist. Wrong because as the Advocate sees it, I advocate outmoded methods for the new era into which the world has moved. This slashing editorial which affirms that 59 missionaries say I'm wrong does admit rather casually toward its close that not all missionaries are in complete accord.

I stand and will stand with the rest of those all.

There are two and only two dominant methods in the world today. One is anti-individual freedom, antidemocracy, anti-God. This method is communism. The other is proindividual freedom, prodemocracy, pro-God. If Michigan Christian Advocate thinks these latter are outmoded—I do not.

I stand with those who realistically strive on to defend, enrich, and perfect these. I stand with the overwhelming majority of all Christian missionaries in China and at home who disagree with the 59. I stand with Generalissimo Chiang and Madame Chiang and many other Methodists in China, as well as with the considerable number of the bishops of Chiang's church. I stand with those of my own blood who have given a total of more than 200 years to Christian missions in China.

I stand with Methodist Bishop Arthur J. Moore, who writing in the Wesleyan Advocate from Formosa, in December, has this to say: "Why America would fail to support him (Chiang) as he struggles against atheistic communism and thus allow the Soviets to overrun all of China is a question to which I have no answer. To fight communism in Europe and give it no opposition in Asia looks to me like stupidity. Democracy and Christianity will have to fight for their very existence in Russia if allowed to consolidate her gains in China. I came back to our boat wishing desperately that even yet England and America might be more realistic about affairs in China."

At two points I agree with the Michigan Christian Advocate editorial. I agree that "communism cannot be beaten by military might" and that "the only way to defeat it is to remove the conditions that foster its growth." I give a 100-percent yes to all that.

Then how?

By withdrawing before the military might of communism? By standing in silence before the slave camps of communism? By failing to denounce the liquidation of Christian populations in the Baltic countries by communism? By issuing a white paper which betrayed a faithful ally to communism?

And how may we remove conditions which foster communism? If by weakness, then Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the rest should be now the most democratic and Christian countries in the world.

"But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?"

Imagine New York, Chicago, or San Francisco without a police force or less than an adequate force. The world today without the comprehensive strength of America, including military might, would be a Communist world, a totalitarian world, a slave world, an atheist world.

At the moment we have lost both the moral and political battle in China. Now, immediately, and against whatever odds, we must make the defenses of freedom in the Far East impregnable. How? The answer is still a MacArthur plan for the Far East.

I am for peace—I know war. I am for peace, the peace of Christ which is the peace of freedom, democracy, brotherhood, and sacrifical love. By all these tests communism has within itself the seed of death. That seed germinates. It needs only time. The realistic formula for this peace of Christ is strength with patience.

Here alone lies man's justified hope for world security. Here and here only is the promise that war shall not come again.

Here then I stand, so help me God.

DANIEL A. POLING,
Editor of Christian Herald.

Method of Election of President and Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I offer for the RECORD an item published in today's Washington Post which treats with the Lodge-Gossett joint resolution for the reform of the electoral college system. This item is a two-column communication to the Washington Post from Prof. Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., of Princeton University. It proves convincingly to my mind that the electoral reform proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and which is still pending before the House, has as its underlying principle the principle of proportional representation. At the time of the debate in this body I stated this view affirmatively, and offered clear logic to support it. The Senator from Massachusetts did not agree with me. I am pleased, therefore, to offer for the RECORD today further confirmation of the point I made. This proof should substantially contribute to the House consideration of this electoral reform measure.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION IN THE LODGE-GOSSETT AMENDMENT

(By Lucius Wilmerding, Jr.)

Senator LODGE has recently taken me to task for asserting that the Lodge-Gossett amendment, changing the mode of electing the President and Vice President, is based on the principle of proportional representation. He says: "The proposed constitutional amendment has no relation whatever to 'proportional representation.' It could not have * * *. Proportional representation cannot be applied to the election of a single official. It is impossible to take one man and divide him up proportionately—or otherwise—and expect him to live."

My answer to this statement is brief. I have never accused Senator LODGE of proposing to divide up the President, proportionately or otherwise. When I say that he proposes to apply the principle of proportional representation to the electoral voting system, I mean that he proposes to divide up the 531 electoral votes according to that system. In this I am saying no more than was said by Messrs. Hoag and Hallett of the Proportional Representation League in their book Proportional Representation. Under the caption, "How proportional representation should be applied to the presidency," they write: "Obviously we cannot have proportional representation in the Presidency because it is a single office, but we can have it in the electoral college or in the distribution of the electoral vote."

Now I submit that Senator Lodge's proposal is to have proportional representation in the distribution of the electoral vote. His amendment provides that in electing the President and Vice President the electoral vote of each State shall be counted in proportion to the popular vote. Take a State with 16 electoral votes and assume that there are four candidates for President, A, B, C, and D. A gets 40 percent of the popular vote; B gets 30 percent, C gets 20 percent and D, 10 percent. Under the Lodge amendment A, B, C, and D would be credited with 6.4, 4.8, 3.2, and 1.6 electoral votes, respectively.

What principle is this if it is not the principle of proportional representation? Let us suppose that the congressional delegation of this same State were to be elected by the list system of proportional representation and that the popular vote followed the same pattern for Congressmen as for President. The number of seats to be distributed would be 14 instead of 16, since each State has two less Representatives than it has electoral votes. Do the arithmetic and you will find that the four parties would be entitled to 5.6, 4.2, 2.8, and 1.4 seats, respectively. Since fractional seats and fractional votes are unknown in the House of Representatives you might give the two seats represented by the sum of the decimals to parties A and C, since they have the two highest fractions. The final result would be that parties A, B, C, and D would be allotted 6, 4, 3, and 1 seat respectively.

Anyone who thinks about this will see that the Lodge formula is the same, both mathematically and in design, as the formula of proportional representation in each State the popular vote for candidate A is to the total popular vote as the electoral vote for candidate A is to the total electoral vote; in each State the popular vote for party A is to the total popular vote as the representation in Congress for party A is to the total representation in Congress. The mere fact that in one case you find the answer integers while in the other you figure three places of decimals can hardly be thought to affect the principle.

I might add that the principle advocated by Senator Lodge for counting the electoral votes has for many years been identified with the principle of proportional representation. If you trace the proportional features of the Lodge amendment backward through history you come eventually to the Malish amendment of 1877. This amendment was described by one of its sponsors (Senator Buckalew) in the North American Review for July 1877, under three heads of remarks: "First, it provides for a direct vote by the people for President and Vice President; second, it retains electoral votes as at present, while dispensing with electors and electoral colleges; and third, it assigns to candidates electoral votes from each State in proportion to popular votes received by them therein."

The only difference between the Malish proposal and the Lodge proposal is that Malish would have awarded the votes represented by the sum of the decimal to the candidate having the largest fraction—that is to say, he would have made an integral distribution of the electoral vote. In the same year an exact counterpart of the Lodge proposal, even to the three places of decimals, was contained in an amendment introduced by Representative Cravens. In 1878 a similar proposal was reported by a committee of the House of Representatives.

The Malish amendment was described by J. Hampden Dougherty in his book on the Electoral System (a work to which Representative Celler is much indebted) as embodying some of the principles of the Hare plan for minority representation. H. V. Ames, in his Proposed Amendments to the Constitution, praises this same amendment as an application of the system of proportional representation to the election of President and Vice President.

But let us come down to more recent times. The immediate predecessor of the Lodge-Gossett amendment is the Lea-Walsh amendment of 1928 and subsequent years. According to Representative Gossett, "Mr. Lea is really the father of the particular proposal under consideration." The Lea amendment was indorsed time and again by the Proportional Representation League as an application of proportional representation to Presidential elections. Nor was Senator Walsh, of Massachusetts, cosponsor of the amendment, in any doubt as to its true nature. Pending a change in the Constitution he called upon the Senate to adopt proportional representation in the electoral colleges of their own volition. On May 29, 1928, he introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 which read in part as follows: "Whereas, proportional representation * * * has proved to be easily workable, satisfactory to the voters, and just to all parties. * * * *Resolved*, * * * that the legislatures of the several States should establish by appropriate legislation proportional representation in the choosing of Presidential electors."

Finally I would call Senator Lodge's attention to the June 1948 issue of the National Municipal Review. In its department called proportional representation the progress of the Lodge and Gossett resolutions in Congress is reported under the caption "Proportional representation for Presidential electoral votes advances."

It seems to me therefore that it is by no means a play on words to use the term "proportional representation" in connection with Senator Lodge's proposal. When two principles are exactly the same, why not call them by a single name? The real difference between Senator Lodge and myself is not one of terminology but of opinion. I think that the application of his principle (by whatever name he calls it) to the distribution of the States' electoral votes would increase the likelihood of the same principle being applied to the representation of the States in Congress. Senator Lodge thinks otherwise.

PRINCETON, N. J.

A Timely Revised Gettysburg Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a 1950 version of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, whose author is unknown but which was forwarded to me by Mr. Barry Yutzi and Mr. Eugene Wollaston, students at the University of Delaware.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TIMELY REVISED GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

One score and sixteen years ago our fathers brought forth upon this Nation a new tax, conceived in desperation and dedicated to the proposition that all men are fair game.

Now we are engaged in a great mass of calculations testing whether that taxpayer or any taxpayer so confused and so impoverished can long endure. We are met on form 1040. We have come to dedicate a large portion of our income to a final resting place with those men who spend their lives that they may spend our money (politicians).

It is altogether anguish and torture that we should do this. But in the legal sense we cannot evade—we cannot cheat—we cannot underestimate this tax. The collectors, clever and sly, who computed here, have gone far beyond our power to add and subtract.

Our creditors will little note nor long remember what we pay here, but the Bureau of Internal Revenue can never forget what we report here. It is for us the taxpayers rather to be devoted here to the tax return which the Government has thus far so nobly spent. It is rather for us to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these vanished dollars we take increased devotion to the few remaining; that we here highly resolve that next year will not find us in a higher income tax bracket; that this taxpayer, underpaid, shall figure out more deductions, and that taxation of the people, by the Congress, for the Government, shall not cause our solvency to perish.

Texas Tech Studies Dust Storms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the April 10, 1950, edition of the Lubbock Avalanche.

This interesting article by Avalanche reporter, Kenneth May, tells of the work now being carried on at Texas Technological College in Lubbock studying the dust storms which are again blowing over the western half of Texas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TECH STUDY SHOWS TONS OF DUST CARRIED IN MORE INTENSE BLOWS

(By Kenneth May)

A half million tons of sand is a lot of dirt, but that much can pass over Lubbock within an hour's time during an intensive dust storm, experiments at Texas Tech have indicated.

G. Frederick Warn, associate professor of geology, and William C. Irvin, instructor, directing the research, said that an estimated 500,000 tons of dirt will blow over the area of Lubbock within 60 minutes when the wind velocity is 45 miles per hour or faster.

Such, at least, are the indications of the Tech project. So far as Warn knows this is the first time such an estimation has been attempted in the Lubbock area.

STUDENTS COOPERATE

Four students of geology, physics, and biology are cooperating in the experiments, which include different phases of research ranging from a study of conditions generating dust storms to a determination of the harmful bacterial content of the dust particles.

Wind turbulence, or vertical movement, and the air moisture, as well as the horizontal wind velocity, have a bearing upon dust storms and their intensity, Warn said. Low relative humidity prevailing in the South Plains area recently reached an all-time low of 6 percent on March 25, he said, the same day the barometric pressure here reached a record low of 26.05.

Until now most of the experimentation and writing done concerning dusters has been directed toward the phase of soil erosion. Although the current Tech research is studying that side of the question, laboratory tests delving into possible disease-spreading aspects of the high winds are being undertaken also.

NO RESULTS YET

Warn said the tests along that line have not progressed sufficiently to report any results. Germs picked up by the wind from human or animal wastes would be the most likely to be found in dust particles, he said.

Recent storms in west Texas have sent dust spiraling to a maximum height of 17,500 feet (about 3 miles above sea level) and over an area of 85,520 square miles during the early stages. Winds up to 70 miles per hour have whipped the dust, which ultimately reached as far northeastward as the Great Lakes, Warn asserted.

Generally, most of the dust which whips along close to the ground has been picked up locally, the geology professor said, while a larger percentage of that high in the air comes from greater distances. A high percentage of South Plains storms, especially the more intense, have their beginning in New Mexico, he said, where unploughed and uncovered wastelands lie as easy prey to rollicking winds.

TRAPS DUST PARTICLES

In carrying out the Tech experiments a boxlike contraption with baffle plates to trap dust particles has been erected 60 feet above the surface. Additional tests are to be made with the trap only 5 feet above the ground, Warn said. The trapped dust not only gives an indication of the amount of dirt in the air, but provides particles for laboratory analysis.

Particles twenty-five one hundredths of a millimeter in size have been caught 60 feet above ground, and about 1 percent of the particles included were organic matter such as leaves, straw, or grass, according to undetailed analysis. Warn said a more minute study will probably reveal a much higher organic matter content not immediately visible.

Is there ever any good generated by a dust storm? "Not that I can see," says Warn. He conceded that a particular farm might have dust carrying beneficial organic matter or fertilizing properties, come to rest on it and thus be enriched, but he hastened to point out that alkali dust might also settle on the farm, as well as the seed of infectious weeds.

A determination of the size and amounts of particles which will probably be carried by the wind at a given velocity is another aspect of the Tech experiments. No conclusive results have been reached along that line as yet, according to the geology prof, but so far tests show correlations between particle size and wind velocity and direction have run true to form.

There is little possibility that minerals carried along by the dust will lose any of their chemical characteristics, Warn said, but it is quite likely that physical wear and destruction will occur. Through the tests underway at Tech, students hope to determine pretty closely what the mineral composition of the sand will be when blowing from a given direction.

GIVE PREVENTIONS

About the only preventions Warn could give for the dusters were deep listing of ground, sowing of cover crops, and artificial rain making. The latter feat must be accomplished when temperature and moisture content of the air are in rain making condition, he said, however, and such a condition has existed very few times over the South Plains during the last 6 months of drouth.

Students carrying on the experiments are enrolled in a meteorology and sedimentation course at the college. Included are William B. Cox of Monahans, a graduate student in geology studying eolian sedimentation and weather conditions associated with sand storms; Dewain Cox, of Monahans, a physics student studying weather conditions on the South Plains and the use of recording instruments; Jack Pales, a physics student from Lawton, Okla., studying special types of fronts and storms; and John C. Porter of Lubbock, graduate student in biology, running culture studies on air-borne particles.

Study of dust storms was first undertaken at Tech in 1935 and 1936 under direction of Dr. Raymond Sidwell, now head of the geology department. Warn and Irvin said that need for such studies is evidenced by the fact that an estimated 850,000,000 tons of southwestern dirt passes over the Mississippi River during an average year. Many of the small lakes formed on farms in the South Plains region owe their existence largely to wind erosion, they added.

The Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD lines by one of my constituents, the eminent historian, Mr. James T. Shotwell, published in a recent issue of the Saturday Review of Literature. I commend this poem to the reading of all those who delight in fine and meaningful poetry.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAY

(By James T. Shotwell)

I

Harp of the wild old ages, of the music of the spheres,
Strummed for the dance the worlds began when they circled their first careers.
O harp of the world! What visions appear as we stoop to play
Seeking the mystic rhythms, the spirit of song for aye.
The echoes of mighty masters on the strings are vibrant still,
Homer and Dante and Milton, and those whose touch can thrill,
With the drama of human passion and the lyric's birdlike flight.
Let not the vulgar touch profane, where these have greatly wrought
The lasting harmonies of life, or, by creative thought,
Have opened the ways of the universe to follow questing light,
Or plumbed the depths of the atom beyond the range of sight.
Thine is the cosmic note that lies in all enduring song,
Whether in choral harmony, solemn and vast and strong,
Or the still, small voice, when the spirit wakes from life's enthralling dream,
To find that it and the world are one, with one enduring theme,
And that the hands of mortals can touch eternal strings
When the mind, triumphant, beats its way through all opposing things,
Measuring space and mastering time, forcing matter to yield
The mysteries of the starry way and the force in the atom congealed.
Yet, as at last with godlike power we move through matter and mind,
Darkly we grope on the ways of death for ourselves and all mankind.
Here is the greater challenge, the greatest and the last,
To bring the variant breeds of men out of their variant past,
Holding secure the heritage of the things they richly prize,
But seeing the future through the light of justice's unbound eyes.
With war and violence banished; it can and it must be done.
For the world itself will not endure unless mankind is one.

II

The past is more than prologue to the drama of human fate,
The ice-age minds are with us still, with their iron claws of hate,
But the sword of the Lord and Gideon their forces can withstand
Until we build Jerusalem in every pleasant land.
For, rising through sorrow and suffering, the central theme grows clear,
Welding peace and justice, freedom from want and fear.
Not by wishful thinking can the task be carried through,
Nations have still to learn their part that never freedom knew;
Not by a code of rigid law, enforced by a world police,
With nations surrendering freedom in the search for lasting peace.
The key to the plot was given on a sunlit mount by a sea
The only guidance the world has yet to make men safe and free.
Not to Caesar alone we turn to meet the threat of war,
His militant scepter cannot reach where the springs of action are;
But the mind that has ranged the universe must now itself control.
For the force in the mighty atom is less than the human soul;
And simpler than any equation are the words forever true:
Do ye unto others as ye would they do by you.
This is the missing fulcrum for Archimedes' lever
To lift the weight of ancient hate, so the peoples that pass by
May reach together the shining goal which none can reach alone,
Helping each other along the way that each can make its own,
By joint consent surrendering the ancient right of war,
Alert to thwart betrayal, aware where dangers are
That lie in differing loyalties, where bickering conflicts run,
But offering charity to all, with malice toward none.
Then undismayed by the powers we wield, steady we stand and strong,
As the harp of the world keeps measure to life's triumphant song.

Local Control of Valley Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Utah Senator Proposes a Plan for Local Control of Valley Projects," from the Salt Lake Telegram of April 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTAH SENATOR PROPOSES A PLAN FOR LOCAL CONTROL OF VALLEY PROJECTS

Utah's Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS has offered a bill, and elaborated upon it in a lengthy speech on the Senate floor, which would authorize large-scale regional water and power projects with grass-roots management rather than tight Federal control.

Senator WATKINS' bill is in answer to the admitted problem of constructing great river development projects in the face of the artificial limitations imposed by State lines. The answer proposed by the administration to this problem is the creation of regional valley authorities like the Tennessee Valley Authority, with broad powers affecting not only irrigation, flood control, navigation, and electric power production but also including such things as manufacture and distribution of fertilizer, building parks and playgrounds, fish culture, etc.

Most of the activities undertaken by these valley authorities are legitimate governmental tasks, but the imposition of a new super-governmental system under tight Federal control on top of the State system is a matter which has aroused grave concern in America among Americans of both parties.

Many thoughtful students of the question see the proposed development of the entire Nation into a series of valley authorities crossing State lines as the beginning of the end for local government and the kind of local responsibility which is the essence of our democracy. They see this encroaching Federal control over so many aspects of our economic life as a long stride in the direction of nationalized industry and state socialism.

Whether or not this fear is entirely justified, the fact that there is such fear warrants careful study of any alternative plan which promises to accomplish the admitted good of great regional water and power developments without risking a socialistic Federal domination over our lives.

Senator WATKINS thinks he has the answer. He says he recognizes that from here on western reclamation development is largely a program of giant projects on interstate streams, such as, for example, the Colorado development in which Utah is so much interested. He wants to build these projects but without creating a giant Federal utility bureaucracy. He believes the answer is a scheme for a combination of Federal aid and local autonomy. He would have the United States Bureau of Reclamation plan and build the projects, but an interstate agency retaining local control would operate and maintain the projects once they were constructed and sell the power and water.

The bill proposed by Senator WATKINS goes into much more detail, but the fundamental point is the substitution of a locally controlled regional agency to operate these huge projects for the federally controlled agency set up under the valley authority idea.

We do not know whether Senator WATKINS' scheme will work. We do agree with him, however, that some means for regional development on a broad basis is necessary if there is to be further progress in the fullest utilization of the basic land and water resources of this Nation. We also believe that the more government can be kept close to the people the better. City government run by the people of a city is better than city government run from a State capitol. Utah government is better run by Utahans than by bureaucrats in Washington. Likewise regional governmental activities will be better if they can be kept under control of the people of the region.

If it will work, it's a good scheme. We hope the Congress gives Senator WATKINS' proposal the most careful consideration.

French Ask Fusion of Atlantic Aims in a High Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the most constructive and worthwhile suggestions I have seen from any of the officials of this country or of the nations with which we are associated, for uniting our efforts among the North Atlantic nations comes from French Foreign Minister George Bidault in a speech which he recently delivered at Lyon. The speech is carried in an article published in the New York Times of today, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRENCH ASK FUSION OF ATLANTIC AIMS IN A HIGH COUNCIL—BIDAULT URGES STUDY OF PLAN TO KNIT TREATY POWERS IN ECONOMICS AND POLITICS—HOPES FOR A REPORT SOON—PREMIER TO SEEK LONDON ACTION IN MAY—PROPOSAL IS HELD RESULT OF BRADLEY TALK

(By Harold Callender)

PARIS, April 16.—Creation by the North Atlantic Treaty nations of an Atlantic High Council to coordinate their strategic, economic, and political policies was urged today by George Bidault, Premier of France.

M. Bidault, speaking in Lyon, asked the nations concerned to study this French proposal for knitting together the Atlantic community in more than a merely military sense. He said he hoped that when they met in London May 8, the Foreign Ministers of the Western powers would name a committee to report by a fixed date on the composition, powers and functioning of such a council.

The Premier suggested that the proposed council should deal first with two fields of activity, defense, and economic relations, which he described as corresponding to two dangers—aggression and depression, as he said Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, had defined them. But he added the hope that before long the council could deal also with the political problems of the Atlantic coalition.

SEES NO MONOPOLY ON PEACE

M. Bidault suggested that the council be entitled "Atlantic High Council for Peace," so as to forestall perverse interpretations. He said there was no reason to let the term "peace" be monopolized by "those who have annexed it, among other things, and who call us the camp of aggression."

Referring to Secretary of State Dean Acheson's decision a few days ago to create a stratgic committee to coordinate United States foreign policy in the diplomatic and economic spheres, M. Bidault explained that the French proposal was to create a similar executive organism on the scale of the Atlantic alliance.

Discussion not only of some new central mechanism for the Atlantic Treaty but of giving it greater and broader content as the nucleus of a more closely linked western world has taken place privately here ever since Foreign Minister Robert Schuman dropped a cryptic hint of the new French proposal. M. Schuman did this in a speech on March 27 to the national committee of the Popular Republican Party, to which he and M. Bidault belong. All he said was that the Atlantic community might deprive the Atlantic Pact of its exclusively military character.

COST CONCERNS FRENCH LEADERS

Those who sought elaboration of this phrase discovered that high French officials were greatly concerned by the enormous cost of the defense of western Europe, as contemplated by the defense committee under the Atlantic Treaty, since neither France nor any other continental country could begin to finance its share.

The French and other continental leaders were likewise disturbed by the effect that this rearmament might have upon economic recovery since it would entail additional budget expenditure and a diversion of productive resources to uneconomic ends.

It was therefore thought necessary for the Atlantic Treaty nations as a whole to consider not only the division of responsibility for defense but the division of the economic burden involved in defense. This burden was calculated by some experts as likely to reach proportions comparable to those of the dollar aid under the Marshall plan. The conclusion reached was that only by further United States economic aid could western Europe provide anything like the defenses called for in the blueprints of the military leaders.

There was much speculation in western Europe whether the United States would extend substantial aid to Europe after the end of the Marshall plan in 1952. Encouragement was found in President Truman's appointment of Gordon Gray, former Secretary of the Army, to study what the United States could do after that portentous date and in the apparently growing conviction that, as General Bradley expressed it in Chicago on Friday, the "American people have decided to hold and save western Europe for the free world."

PLAN CALLED LOGICAL EXTENSION

The assumption that General Bradley's statement is correct is the basis for the carefully considered French proposal put forth by M. Bidault today.

M. Bidault said that this proposal was "the logical extension and linking" of what had gone before—the Brussels Treaty, the organization of Europe, and the foundation of the Atlantic community. M. Bidault added that "Europe is still in the process of gestation" but that this process could be favorably affected only by "the broadening of the prospect to Atlantic dimensions."

The Premier therefore explained that the French Government's new proposal was not meant to dissolve the united Europe that awaited birth but to enable it to fit into the wider unity "while retaining its originality and its integrity."

For the benefit of those who fear that Europe's originality and integrity might be endangered by being merged in a wider community, M. Bidault added that the Atlantic consolidation should leave no room for any fear of dependence or of ingratitude—the first fear being in Europe, the second in the United States.

The economic cooperation on an Atlantic scale should, he said, exclude the idea of displacement and the fear of exploitation. By the first of these two phrases, M. Bidault apparently meant the displacement of national economic interests by other interests.

The Premier said that if each nation tried to build its own defenses in isolation, the machinery of security would break down and liberty and peace would find defeat in the ruined countries.

In view of the probable assumption in some quarters that the motive for the French proposal is simply to get more United States economic aid, it is no more than objective to point out that the French Government has had a hard time selling the Atlantic Treaty to the French people, many of whom still wonder just what good it will do them in terms of defense against an invasion of their soil. This question has been asked more frequently since the United States apparently ceased to have a monopoly of the atomic bomb. These doubts have been engendered not by the Communists, who have adroitly exploited them, but by the strategic circumstances.

Black Land Experiment Station in Central Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an Associated Press article, date line April 8, reporting on the valuable work being carried by the Black Land Experiment Station in central Texas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEMPLE, April 8.—What good is a gully-washing rain? Plenty, you soon may be saying, all because of tests made at the Black Land Experiment Station near here.

The tests, if black-land soil farmers are guided by them, may mean that topsoil stops washing, crops roots will have plenty of moisture through the dry summers, water wells will fill again and long-dormant springs bubble.

There's no reason why 7 or 8 inches of rain within an hour can't be kept in black-land soils, the experiment indicate. It's moisture that has been running off but which should be stored in the ground and used by crops during hot summer months when growth is most important.

If black-land farmers use the new information, you'll quit calling them downpour gully washers. The rain will soak into the soil, with no surface run-off.

The Temple Telegram, reporting on the Black Land Station experiments, indicates how these heavy rains can be harnessed.

The newspaper reports that in Austin clay soil, which had been in continuous cultivation for the past 70 years, only .0004 inch of rain can be absorbed in an hour. The rest runs off, generally taking topsoil with it. And that figure applies only to the first 4 inches of soil. The soil between 8 and 10 inches absorbs no water at all. Houston clay soil up to 4 inches absorbs .73 inches of rain an hour, and, like the Austin clay, absorbs none on the 8- to 10-inch level.

Land continuous in cotton does a little better. Austin clay will absorb .32 inches of rain in an hour, at both the 4-inch and the 8-10-inch level.

It hasn't always been that way. Experiment-station workers found that native meadow which never has gone under the plow absorbs 5.5 inches of rain an hour for the first 4 inches. But absorption slows down sharply when the 8-10-inch level is reached. Only 0.29 inch an hour is taken up at that level.

Dr. J. R. Johnson of the experiment station, believe recent tests point the way to making the dream of an abundant moisture supply come true.

Suppose a gully washer of 6 or 7 inches of rain an hour—an extremely heavy rainfall almost anywhere—struck these soils. Most of it would run off, carrying topsoil with it.

But the experiment station started rotating cotton and Madrid clover. And the scientists found that Austin clay soil rotated with these crops will absorb rainfall at the rate of 7.54 inches an hour. Houston clay soaks up 4.9 inches of rain an hour.

That is, the first 4 inches absorb that much.

What about that vital layer at the 8-10-inch level? Grass and Madrid clover roots rarely go below 4 inches. And it's the growth of the roots that loosens the land and makes it porous.

To answer the 8-10-inch level question, Doctor Johnston points to a big picture on his desk, showing the root system of an evergreen clover plant. The roots of this plant reach deep into the soil, going beyond 36 inches.

This may solve the problem of getting rain to soak all the way into the soil with no run-off? Rotation of grass and Madrid clover would loosen the top 4 inches. Fitting evergreen clover into the rotation might crack that crucial 8-10-inch layer.

This, the experimenters believe, will take care of all the water from just about as heavy a rain as ever falls in central Texas. It would leave the rainwater down in the ground where crop roots could use it during the dry summer months.

The Temple Telegram brings up the possibility that there will be other benefits. "How about these wells which are going dry all over central Texas?" asks the newspaper. "Isn't it possible that putting all of our rainfall into the soil would bring them back? Isn't it possible that we might build up our supply of ground water to the point where springs which once bubbled out hundreds of gallons a minute would flow again?"

The Murders in Kansas City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very recent editorial entitled "Petters on the FBI," from the St. Louis Star-Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETTERS ON THE FBI

Presidential Press Secretary Charles Ross says that the Star-Times' copyrighted story Saturday about how, shortly before he was murdered, gangster Charles Binaggio tried to make a political deal with President Harry Truman is a "lot of hooey."

Several previous discrepancies between Mr. Ross' statements and the facts could be cited. A recent example occurred last week. As Drew Pearson points out in his column on this page, Ross denied that John Foster Dulles was appointed to the State Department even though the appointment was already a fact and was announced the next day. Incidentally, in the Binaggio case, Ross was denying a scoop by the Star-Times over his old employer, the Post-Dispatch.

In 1934 Harry Truman was hand-picked for Senator by Boss Tom Pendergast in much the same way that Harry Truman is now trying to hand-pick Emery W. Allison.

When Maurice M. Milligan, United States district attorney at Kansas City, probed the vote frauds and sent Boss Tom to jail, he made an implacable enemy of Harry Truman. When Mr. Truman was Senator in 1938, first he tried to smear Milligan's reputation. Then he opposed, unsuccessfully, his reappointment for another term.

Early in 1945 when "Boss Tom" died, Vice President Truman flew to his funeral in Kansas City. A few months later Harry Truman successfully used all the influence of his high office to block the reappointment of Milligan.

One year later President Harry Truman tried to handpick Enos Axtell for the House. Axtell won in the primary but lost in the general election. Proof of widespread frauds in the primary voting was uncovered. In sharp contrast to the energy with which Maurice Milligan had pushed the probe against Tom Pendergast, in this instance the FBI moved very slowly. Finally, one night in May 1947, the safe in which the evidence was being held was blown and the evidence was stolen. The frauds had taken place in the districts controlled by Charley Binaggio. One of Binaggio's lieutenants, Henry McKissick, was indicted, but, thanks to the theft of evidence, not convicted.

On the night of May 27-28, 1947, President Truman was sleeping several blocks from the courthouse where the theft occurred. The area must have teemed with Secret Service agents. The leads were many. No fewer than 17 men had keys to the vault room. Yet the usually swift and brilliant FBI has let the sands of time run nearly out without exposing the guilty parties. One of the key witnesses, Joseph Falco, died in July 1947. Charley Binaggio was another key witness. Unless the FBI solves the case within the next 45 days, the statute of limitations will intervene.

Now the same pattern seems being repeated in the Binaggio and Gargotta murders. The Binaggio machine opposed the Pendergast machine as revived by James Pendergast. Harry Truman is trying to get Emery W. Allison nominated as United States Senator. Charley Binaggio opposed the nomination of Allison.

In several ways Charley Binaggio was put on the spot. He had persuaded various gangsters and gamblers to support the candidacy of Forrest Smith for Governor with the promise that Missouri would be opened up to them. He failed to produce. Then last September a Federal grand jury began to investigate organized crime and gambling in Kansas City. Immediately it involved Binaggio and his crew. The Government began looking into Binaggio's income taxes.

When Binaggio and Gargotta were murdered Gov. Forrest Smith, who had been supported by Binaggio, immediately wired the FBI for "all-out assistance."

Yet, yesterday, 5 days after the request, the Attorney General's office told the Star Times it had not found any legal authority as yet for Federal participation in solving the murders.

Binaggio and Gargotta had both been witnesses before the Federal grand jury, and one

theory of their killing is that they were "rubbed out" to keep them from giving information. Binaggio's Federal income-tax returns were being checked. On February 15, 1950, both President Truman and Attorney General McGrath had promised to throw the weight of the Federal Government behind community drives against organized crime, particularly gambling. Yet, while the trail in Kansas City gets cold, Attorney General McGrath can find no legal authority for ordering the FBI to pick it up.

The highly trained agents of the FBI, their scientific methods, their vast nation-wide resources are being held in leash. Why?

Fair Play in Committee Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting, with one minor excision out of deference to comity between the Houses of Congress, an editorial from the Washington Post of April 11, 1950, on the subject of procedures in congressional committees in regard to investigations and hearings where adverse testimony may be produced against a third party.

Obviously, the whole question of committee procedures can be examined critically with advantage to the public interest; perhaps the present lack of delimitation can be successfully defended in the forum of public debate, and perhaps it can be found that the respective Houses should lay down some definite lines of demarcation.

When it comes to privileged defamation of individuals there can be no question of the glaring faults which accompany the anarchical device of giving each chairman just as much latitude as he cares to take. I should like to remind the House that I have pending H. R. 3443, which has as its purpose the amendment of the Legislative Reorganization Act to provide a fair procedure in investigation. I am also including the text of that bill in my remarks.

RULE OF FAIR PLAY

Creeping progress is being made toward the establishment of a fair code of procedure for congressional investigators. The Labor-Management Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which Senator MURRAY is chairman, has adopted a set of rules to govern all its future hearings. It is the third congressional group to take such action since our Turning on the Light series of editorials 2 years ago. The first was in the Bender subcommittee of the House during the Eightieth Congress and the second the Senate Investigations Committee, then under Senator FERGUSON's chairmanship.

The new rules of the Murray subcommittee, like those previously adopted by other groups, are admittedly a compromise. Sworn testimony may not be taken by staff members unless at least one member of the subcommittee is present. All hearings will be public except that the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may authorize the subcommittee to hear public officials in executive session when the public interest warrants such a deviation from the normal course. At least two committeemen and a staff member must be present for any examination of witnesses behind closed doors. Recorded testimony must be made public when any part of such testimony has been released by the subcommittee or when it has been made the basis of a report by members of the subcommittee. Witnesses may obtain a transcript of their testimony at nominal fees.

Every witness will have the right to file a sworn statement for the record and to read a summary of it before the subcommittee. Other persons believing that their reputations have been adversely affected by testimony before the subcommittee may also file sworn statements for the record, the subcommittee reserving the right to decide whether such statements are relevant and to require conciseness. All witnesses may be accompanied by counsel. The subcommittee may not publish any report until it has been approved by a majority of a quorum present at a duly called meeting.

We do not suppose that these rules are an absolute guaranty against abuses even in the subcommittee to which they apply. But they are a long step in the right direction. The difficulty with this piecemeal adoption of rules is that the committees needing them most are left free to continue operating without rules or any sense of self-restraint. Another powerful argument for the adoption of a general code of fair procedure is to be found in the decision of the Supreme Court yesterday not to review the conviction of John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo for contempt of Congress. That ruling confirms the power of Congress to compel a witness to testify whether or not he is a member of the Communist Party. We think the ruling is right. But it throws upon Congress a tremendous responsibility to prevent the abuse of its sweeping investigative powers by setting up rules of fair conduct by which all its committees would have to abide.

H. R. 3443

A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 by adopting principles of procedure in investigations by committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 134 of title I of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601 of the 79th Cong.) is amended by adding a new section reading as follows:

"(d) (1) The subject of any investigation in connection with which witnesses are summoned shall be clearly stated before the commencement of any hearings, and the evidence sought to be elicited shall be relevant and germane to the subject as so stated. In cases of special investigations authorized by congressional resolution, the subject of the investigation shall be so stated in the resolution and, in the case of investigations initiated by the committee, the subject shall be so stated by the committee and announced before the commencement of the hearings.

"(2) Any witness summoned at a private hearing and, unless the committee by a majority vote determines otherwise, any witness before a private hearing, shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel, who shall be permitted to advise the witness while on the witness stand of his rights.

"(3) Every witness shall have an opportunity, at the conclusion of the examination by the committee, to supplement the testimony which he has given, by making a written or oral statement, which shall be made a part of the record; but such testimony shall be confined to matters with regard to which he has previously been examined.

"(4) An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of each witness, whether in public or in executive session. In either case, the record of his testimony shall be made available for inspection by the witness or his counsel; and if given in public session he shall be furnished with a copy thereof if he so requests, and if given in executive session he shall be furnished with a copy thereof in case his testimony is subsequently used or referred to in a public session.

"(5) No photographs, moving pictures, television, or radio broadcasting of the proceedings shall be permitted while any witness is testifying.

"(6) Any person whose name is mentioned or who is specifically identified and who believes that testimony or other evidence given in a public hearing before any committee or comment made by any member of the committee or its counsel tends to defame him or otherwise adversely affects his reputation, shall be afforded the following privileges:

"(i) To file with the committee a sworn statement concerning such testimony, evidence, or comment, which shall be made a part of the record of such hearing.

"(ii) To appear personally before the committee and testify in his own behalf.

"(iii) To have the committee secure the appearance of witnesses whose testimony adversely affected him, and to cross-examine such witnesses, either personally or by counsel; but such cross-examination shall be limited to 1 hour as to any one witness unless the committee votes to lengthen the period.

"(iv) In the discretion of the committee, by a majority vote, to have the committee call a reasonable number of witnesses in his behalf. The extent to which this privilege may be availed of shall be left to the discretion of the committee.

"(7) These principles shall apply to investigations by all committees of either House of Congress, including standing committees, select and special committees, or joint committees of the two Houses, and a duly authorized subcommittee of any of the foregoing."

Secret of the Continuous Vitality of Hon. Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, all the Members of the Senate have received a letter from Vrest Orton, secretary of the Vermont Guild of Oldtime Crafts and Industries, Inc., of Weston, Vt., which explains the magic of the continuous vitality and eagerness of our distinguished colleague the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. We have received, also, samples of the product which the Senator's good health so highly recommends. We trust that it may be as beneficial to us as it has been to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VERMONT GUILD OF OLDTIME
CRAFTS & INDUSTRIES, INC.,
Weston, Vt.

DEAR SENATOR: Some years ago your distinguished colleague and my good friend RALPH E. FLANDERS, established the Vermont Guild of Crafts and Industries in this Vermont hill village, the chief exhibit being a 150-year old stone grist mill turned by waterpower.

Knowing you must have admired the constant and ever increasing vitality of our good friend the junior Senator from Vermont and assuming you will be glad to have the secret of his power, I am now revealing that the Senator eats Vermont Guild wholegrains.

Since for some years during the late war I observed for the War Department the hearings of your eminent body on the hill and was therefore in a position to know what extraordinary strength a Senator has to have, I have now concluded that it is my bounden duty to make some slight contribution to the well-being and vitality of the Senate.

It is therefore with extreme pleasure and honor that I am sending you today, with the compliments of Senator FLANDERS, a gift of a wholegrain sampler which I trust you and your good wife will relish and enjoy.

With every good wish, I am,
Cordially,

VREST ORTON.

Dealing With Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, although most business reports point to another good year, nevertheless, it is a fact that unemployment has made itself felt in many homes. Those people past 45 years of age, and those young folks recently graduated from colleges are the ones having difficulty finding employment. From everywhere come reports that good-paying jobs are scarce. Labor leaders and Congressmen representing industrial districts are anxiously looking for means to prevent any large or serious unemployment situation.

In normal times, before the war, we would export about 10 percent of our production. Today if friendly arrangements for trade and commerce and the exchange of credit could be worked out, the United States would enjoy an export-import trade of boom proportions. This, in turn, would mean millions of well-paying new jobs and new sources of profit for industry, and additional revenue for the United States Treasury.

According to recent reports, foreign markets are being supplied more and more by German, Japanese, and English goods. There are many United States items which could not be labelled as war material, and yet cannot be sold for export, because of licensing restrictions. At the same time we learn that the same goods and material is being manufactured and sold by Germany, Japan, England, and other nations to our former allies and former customers. Our export business has degenerated into a free hand-out, Santa Claus affair. The only export business we have today is on those goods which are going out under the Marshall plan. If we were to stop taking money from the United States Treasury to buy these Marshall-plan goods which we give away for free, we would have practically no export business whatsoever.

A healthy and genuine export-import program is vital to the welfare of the Nation. It is one of the programs that must be developed if we wish to provide full employment for our people.

At this point I wish to include an article written by Maurice J. Tobin which appeared in the American Federationist dealing with unemployment:

DEALING WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor)

The problem of unemployment is one of the Nation's foremost problems.

The Nation's employment in 1949 continued to be very high, averaging close to the 59,000,000 average of 1948. But this past February, at a seasonal peak of unemployment, there were almost 4,700,000 unemployed.

The Nation's labor force has been expanding more rapidly than our economy. The problem we are confronted with is: How are we going to get more jobs—more jobs for those who are unemployed and for the new entrants into the labor market?

As a result of accumulated information concerning the seriousness of local problems of unemployment, both from the standpoint of the effect of joblessness on communities and the national economy, I recently asked all governors of States to take the lead in establishing State-wide and local maximum employment committees.

I urged that organized labor, management, civic groups, and local government sit down in the local communities and plan action which would alleviate unemployment. My reasoning was and is that here in America we have a long heritage of working out our problems in a spirit of fruitful cooperation.

It seems obvious to me that action to solve unemployment—especially in those areas which now have high unemployment ratios—should start in the local communities themselves.

A majority of the governors responded favorably. There are now State-wide committees in 14 States and 1 Territory. Local committees have been established in many communities, according to reports to the Bureau of Employment Security, and are attacking community unemployment problems with varying degrees of success.

State and local full employment committees offer trade unionists an exceptional opportunity for participation and leadership in State and community employment planning. These State and local committees need not be only temporary or emergency bodies. They might well be continuing bodies to explore and plan new ways to expand economic activity and employment. I can well imagine that the very existence of such committees and the wide knowledge of such plans would challenge entire communities to make greater contributions in the building of a better America.

One way we can demonstrate our devotion to the democratic ideal is to throw the vast resources of our States and our communities into the common effort to find productive and rewarding jobs for all workers.

It is poor business to wait until the local economy becomes so disorganized that workers lose their skills and subsistence relief is necessary for workers' families before positive community action is taken.

I feel sure that governors and mayors will welcome the participation of State federations of labor and central trades and labor councils in the work of full employment committees already established or which may be organized.

I am also sure that State and local offices of the State employment services will be glad to furnish economic facts concerning communities in which unemployment is currently high or is a threat. The local offices of the employment service usually maintain data concerning economic trends and the size and availability of the local labor force, as well as the occupational characteristics of unemployed men and women.

Just what can community full-employment committees do? The activities of community committees already at work include studies of means to expand existing industry, attraction of new industry, financial assistance to industry, public works, vocational training and retraining, placement of workers, and other projects. Committees should be sure to have basic information about the community, its workers, its trade and industry, its employment trends, its resources, and its economic potential.

One community found that a public-works program would not correct unemployment, because the unemployed were factory workers and not construction workers. On the other hand, a construction program might be the need in another locality.

It would be unwise to encourage the bringing into a community of a new firm which would employ chiefly women when the unemployed for the most part are men.

But experience shows that training, experience, and availability of workers are not the only factors to be considered in a community full-employment program. It is also necessary to consider what can be done through business or industrial expansion which will iron out seasonal fluctuations of employment and otherwise stabilize employment—at high levels.

As I have indicated, the primary responsibility for solving local unemployment problems rests in the beginning, at least, with the community. Of course, there may be limitations to what a community may do, since its principal markets may lie outside its boundaries or its unemployment may be due in part to national business conditions.

Even so, the community can make a start by finding out what its own resources are and what help it may need. Where community efforts cannot alone solve local unemployment, it may become necessary for more comprehensive measures to be taken.

At the present time the Federal Government is doing what it can to help areas of substantial unemployment. For example, it is encouraging business firms in such areas to bid on Government contracts. This help is often of limited nature, however, since the Federal Government is required by law to award contracts to the lowest bidder.

I am confident that we can and will ward off the threat of Nation-wide unemployment—that full employment and a high standard of living can and will be maintained. But the solution of unemployment is everyone's business. It is the responsibility of everyone, including responsible organized labor such as the American Federation of Labor.

Some people believe that all American frontiers have been crossed and that our future progress will be limited. Probably not very many of our citizens believe that. I am sure that such a man as Samuel Gompers, if he were alive today, would not believe it. He would undoubtedly believe that the pioneering American spirit in which he played such an important part still has the vitality and the courage upon which to expand community and Nation-wide business and industrial activity for many generations to come.

Today there are forces loose in the world, as A. F. of L. members well know, which would destroy our democracy and our free labor movement. We must constantly be on guard against those forces. We must be on guard at the grass roots—in the local community.

It is there that the cure for unemployment must be sought first.

Need for Legislative Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from an article by Mr. Albert L. Warner, which appeared in the March 1950 issue of Harper's magazine.

Members of the Senate will recall that on January 11 I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter signed by Mr. Robert Heller on behalf of the National Committee for the Strengthening of Congress suggesting a program for further legislative reorganization. At that time I announced that I was planning to introduce legislation toward that end. I hope very soon, Mr. President, to have a resolution prepared and introduced to establish a Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed, as follows:

THE CRISIS OF CONGRESS

(By Albert L. Warner)

Three and a half years ago a congressional reorganization law "modernized and streamlined" Congress. Now it is all too easy to see that nothing was done to improve either chassis or engine. Some chromium and a couple of bug-eyed headlights may have been superimposed, but it is still the same old model-T rattletrap.

One might almost say that the only tangible result of the congressional reorganization act was to raise the pay of Congressmen and to provide retirement pensions for them. In all fairness, certain improvements and reforms were made; but they are less conspicuous than the creaking and swaying of the lumbering congressional vehicle.

Take, for instance, the utter lack of financial responsibility in Congress. The last session demonstrated it appallingly. So complete was the financial chaos that the average Congressman in the week before adjournment had no idea how much of a Government-spending program he was voting, or whether the deficit would be two or twelve billion dollars.

The reorganization law of 1946 had attempted to set up a legislative budget. It directed that the appropriating and tax-raising committees in Congress were to estimate on February 15 of each year the total projected expenditures for the next fiscal year and the total expected revenue. In 1947 and 1948 a Republican Congress gave this provision of the law a half-hearted and fitful recognition. The Democrats of the Eighty-first Congress threw it in the ashcan. They considered it unworkable, and perhaps it was, in part; but at any rate even its spirit of the law was flouted.

Appropriation bills came along by fits and starts. A chamber would economize one day and go on a spending spree the next. It would cut out $3,000,000 for a fair in the District of Columbia to celebrate the sesquicentennial of the Capital City, and then authorize $40,000,000 for the construction of new post offices or Federal buildings in every Congressman's district, whether needed or not. And the scales were so loaded against economy that the friends of the District fair could come back three times to the House of Representatives—and make the grade the third time. The House reversed itself and gave the money.

The old back-clapping process, you-help-me-and-I'll-help-you, operated without hindrance on the time-honored pork-barrel bill for rivers and harbors and flood control. The House approved a generous appropriation of $593,000,000; then the Members of the House rushed over to the other side of the Capitol to join their Senators at committee hearings and urge still bigger appropriations, till when the bill passed the Senate it had reached $751,000,000.

The old congressional system of first authorizing a program entailing the spending of money, and then in separate action making the appropriation, lent itself to confusion as usual and played into the hands of the spendthrift. Representative CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, sought to stop an appropriation for drawing up plans for a small dam at Gavins Point on the Missouri River. The dam, he said, should not be built for 13 years and might never be needed—depending on the effectiveness of other dams under construction. But the House is always sensitive to local projects, and the theory that it was already committed to this one carried the day; the blueprinting of the dam was upheld.

It would have been reasonable to expect all the appropriation bills for the new fiscal year to pass before it began, on July 1. But so dilatory was Congress that it had to adopt five stop-gap resolutions to allow Government pay rolls to be met while it continued to fumble over bills for weeks after the deadline. On October 1, when a quarter of the fiscal year had elapsed, five appropriation bills were still stuck in the works; and not until October 17 was the vital defense appropriation bill passed—more than 3½ months late!

Not only did the average legislator during the session have no idea of what the appropriations were totaling—according to Representative MIKE MONRONEY, the able Oklahoma Democrat who fathered the reorganization law—but when the session was over even the financial leaders of Congress differed as to what they had done. Representative CANNON, House Appropriations chairman, and Representative JOHN TABER, ranking Republican Member of the committee, were about $2,000,000,000 apart on the total of the appropriations they said had been voted.

It is evident that in fiscal matters Congress at the outset of a session doesn't know where it is headed, during the session doesn't know where it is, and at the end doesn't know where it has been.

II

It was the optimistic thought of the sponsors of the reorganization law that they were improving the committee system of Congress. It is true that they reduced the number of standing committees, equipped them with professional staffs, and put a brake on the creation of special committees. But consider the duplication and confusion that still remain.

The duplication of testimony before congressional committees is an indecent waste of time and of officials' energy. The House Foreign Affairs Committee holds hearings on the bill to extend the Marshall plan for another year. Then the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hears the same men and raises the same questions. Next the House Appropriations Committee, and after it the Senate Appropriations Committee, go over the same well-beaten ground. The joint Congressional Watchdog Committee delves into the same operations. Paul Hoffman, the administrator of the Marshall plan, spent 9 days before the Senate Appropriations Committee alone, being heckled about every export detail from brooms to wigs; and during the past session Louis Johnson, the Secretary of Defense, had to testify before 10 different committees or subcommittees of Congress. In 1 month he made no less than 15 appearances.

Compounding confusion, the Appropriations Committees are beginning to take over the making of policy also. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate was willing to go along with the State Department on policies affecting Franco Spain; but Senator PAT MCCARRAN, as chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee, said to the Secretary of State, "I am not in favor of your policy with reference to Spain and until that policy is changed I am going to examine your appropriations with a fine-tooth comb." And the influence of Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, exercised through the Senate Appropriations Committee, held up the pay of Reclamation Commissioner Michael Straus for 5 months because the Senator did not like Mr. Straus' policies.

For all the virtues of the reorganization bill, it left untouched the biggest evil of the present committee system: the hoary system of seniority that sits upon the committees like an old man of the sea. The chairmen of committees are those who have grown old coming from safe districts. Ability, effectiveness, knowledge, even political shrewdness—which is sometimes needed to get things done—have nothing to do with the selection of a committee chairman. The oldest man in point of service gets the job.

A committee chairman appoints the personnel of subcommittees. He sets the dates for meetings. He directs what bills are to be considered and when. Because of the traditional deference to him he can practically smother legislation which fails to meet with his personal approval.

The result is that several of the most important committees of Congress have been kept in a state of disorganization. Chairman JOHN LESINSKI, of the House Committee on Education, and Labor began the past session by trying to install a committee counsel whom not even his Democratic colleagues on the committee would swallow. Later the administration's effort to repeal or drastically modify the Taft-Hartley Act saved face only by sending the measures back to committee. The bill for Federal aid to education, handled so smoothly by the Senate that it passed with scarcely a ripple, was allowed to fall into a needlessly bitter row in this House committee, and was stranded there, its friends unable to muster a committee majority to consider it. Finally, the chairman used his arbitrary power to abolish several subcommittees. Representative ANDREW JACOBS, Indiana, Democrat, bitterly protesting, spent the last 3 weeks of the session trying to have the full committee called together. The chairman by seniority said "No." In the nondemocratic committee system of Congress, a chairman's "No" is effective.

Then there is Chairman JOHN E. RANKIN, of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee—chairman, of course, by virtue of seniority. After giving his committee members only a few minutes to look over a new version of a bill to cost $125,000,000,000 for veterans' pensions, he railroaded it to the floor of the House over the shrieks of protesting Democrats. It took not only good sense but considerable political fortitude for the House to send the bill back to committee, because it is considered political suicide to vote against anything for veterans.

At the other end of the Capitol, Senator MCCARRAN, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, secure in his seniority, defied his own party leadership and a majority of both parties of the Senate for one entire session over the bill to revise the displaced-persons law. He did so by just prolonging indefinitely public hearings on the bill. The Senate, always deferential to committee chairmen, had authorized $135,000 for immigration inquiries, which gave scope to protracted study.

III

Much of the unedifying spectacle of congressional dawdling, fumbling, and obstructionism is caused by slow motion in the Senate, and this results from the rule of unlimited debate and the rule of unanimous consent. One dissenter holds up action; and, because there is no requirement that speeches be germane to the issue before the Senate, the discussion of a housing program may be stalled for 4 hours by a speech on milk for Hottentots. There is value in deliberation and full debate, but the result of such latitude is boredom and a snail's pace. In the past session it was only when summer had crept into fall and the House had taken a conspicuous vacation that the Senate finished what could easily have been completed 3 months earlier.

During last winter and spring it became standard practice for the Senate to spend 2 or 3 weeks on every major bill. Any reasonable men, untrammeled by the habits of the Senate, could have resolved each of those issues in 4 days with full discussion.

Real filibusters are not frequent, but there are always long, long speeches carried well beyond the point of weariness. While one or two men harry a point for days, the rest of the Senators are working in their offices or off home for a visit. Sometimes the speeches are a form of political blackmail. Just to get rid of the talks, the Senate accepts what they demand.

In the midst of the debate over a change in the Senate rules last year, up rose Senator HARRY CAIN, the Washington Republican, and delivered himself for 6½ hours of his low opinion of Mon Wallgren, whom the President was trying to appoint as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. The Senator brought along an extra pair of shoes for the talkathon, changing from one to the other to relieve weary feet. The bored listeners got no such attention.

Incidentally, in the House a roll call takes 40 minutes; in the Senate, 15. Electrical voting equipment would eliminate this droning ritual. But Congress will have none of it.

IV

Some of the causes of congressional inefficiency appear to be insoluble. For instance, the greatest source of distraction to Congressmen in the efficient conduct of their legislative work is their individual constituents. The nonlegislative workload of errands and chores takes 80 percent of the time of some Members of Congress. The gamut of these worries runs from jobs, pension troubles, railroad retirement and social security cases, veterans' affairs, and RFC loans, to defense installations and river and harbor projects for their home districts.

Mr. MONRONEY recalls that someone ironically suggested that half of Congress should be legislators and half should be representatives of the districts. The only trouble is that the representatives of the districts would be the ones reelected.

As if it were not enough that Congressmen should be laden with errands for their districts, they are also imposing upon themselves a new load of publicity activity. They are writing weekly columns for their local newspapers and weekly radio talks by transcription to their local radio stations. And new Congressman GERALD R. FORD, Michigan, Republican, is setting what may become a ghastly precedent. He has become the actor-star in a Washington travelog to be sent to clubs and schools back home, a movie full of the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, the Potomac, the chambers of Congress, and Congressman FORD. God alone knows what the demands of television will be.

Perhaps there is no way of curbing such outside activity on the part of our legislators. But some of the other scandalous conditions that I have been discussing can be remedied.

1. The chaos in finances. There is at least a faint hope that this situation will be bettered in the present session by the introduction of a single, comprehensive appropriation bill, lumping together all appropriations. This will give Congressmen a chance to look at the total of what they are voting to spend. The appropriations of the previous year will be set in juxtaposition to the omnibus measure, and the same accounting plan will be used for each year. This plan, pushed by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia, Democrat, could at least show Congress what it is doing.

To let Congress cope with the administrative departments on more even terms, the Appropriations Committees need a professional staff of perhaps a hundred members—accountants and budgetary experts delving into operations as the budget is made up.

2. The demoralizing rule of congressional committees by seniority. It would be a relatively simple change to have the committee chairman chosen either by the elected majority leaders of the Senate and the House or by the members of the committees. All that is needed is enough nerve on the part of enough legislators to push through the change; the country would applaud.

3. The rules of the Senate which provide for unlimited debate and unanimous consent. Even a mild limitation of debate, invokable only in extremities, and a standing requirement that speeches must be germane to the subject before the Senate, would bring improvement.

The old model T was a good car but the roads are slicker now and the traffic fast and heavy. The ancient congressional jalopy needs some fundamental rebuilding.

The Basing-Point Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the April issue of the National Independent which vigorously opposes Senate bill 1008, the so-called basing-point bill. This publication represents the independent tire dealers and tire rebuilders, and is another instance of small business opposing Senate bill 1008.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BASING-POINT BILL MUST BE KILLED

The basing-point bill, S. 1008, which threatens to rip the very guts out of the Robinson-Patman Act, is dangerously close to becoming law.

This is a very bad bill. It must not pass.

It must not pass because it will destroy the antiprice discrimination provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act. It will weaken the very antitrust laws which both major political parties swore solemnly, during their 1948 election-year campaigns, to enforce and strengthen.

It must not pass because it will sacrifice small and independent businessmen on the altar of giant, monopoly business. It will injure mortally small and independent businessmen whose interests both major political parties swore solemnly, during their 1948 election-year campaigns, to protect and advance.

It must not pass because it will bless the operations and expansion of monopolies. It will increase monopoly domination of American business, something which both major political parties swore solemnly, during their 1948 election-year campaigns, they would oppose firmly.

It must not pass because it will, in furthering the interests of monopolies, drive our Nation down the road away from freedom toward the slave state. It will speed us on the road to socialism, fascism, or communism (three birds of a feather), which both major political parties swore solemnly, during their 1948 election-year campaigns, they would battle.

It must not pass because it is not honest. The bill will not, as its sponsors claim, benefit small and independent businessmen—rather it will injure them. The bill is not being sponsored by small and independent businessmen on their own initiative—rather it is being sponsored by small and independent businessmen completely misled by giant, monopoly industry interests.

It must not pass because it has not been given the thorough airing all legislation should receive. Senate and House sponsors of the bill have refused to hear in committees charged with considering S. 1008 the objections of small and independent businessmen to the measure. This is a practice more characteristic of the Communist slave state than of free America.

What can we do about this?

We can do three things. First, write now to President Truman, explaining our objections, and demanding that he veto S. 1008. Second, write now to our Senators, explaining our objections, and demanding that they vote against S. 1008 when it comes up for passage and in support of a Presidential veto. Third, write now to our Representative, demanding that he vote to support a Presidential veto.

Farm Rule of Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Alfred D. Stedman entitled "Farm Rule of Reason," which appeared in a recent issue of the St. Paul Pioneer Press.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM RULE OF REASON

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Due allowances are to be made for tendencies in the writing craft, as among other folk, to go a little loony in the spring. And since the fussing and fuming are now about the Federal farm-price program, there's a better-than-usual excuse. For the potato-and-egg mess isn't imaginary. The wheat and corn surpluses do exist. The four billions of tax money tied up in products ain't hay. And the job of press and radio is to drag such things into daylight. So the democratic process of full and free reporting must go on.

Nevertheless there still are such things as facts and the rule of reason. It is with

them that the current spring writing rage plays havoc. An aim to stir a public stampede against the farm program is avowed by two magazines and reflected by others. These two expressly adopt the Mencken view, that while the average American is too dumb to understand much of anything, he can easily be scared. So the word is out to give the farm program the works. Alarm the people into killing it. That's the idea, and, boy, are the word wizards doing it up brown.

Exhibit A on the extreme side is the article that the April Reader's Digest reprints from Fortune, these magazines being the Mencken slant twins. Fortune's original title was "The Farmers versus the People." Maybe because that seemed to label the producers of this Nation's food as inferior creatures, not people, the Digest changed it a bit. The new title is "Farm Politics versus the People." But the general theme remains.

The magazines condemn the farm program for seeking to increase agriculture's share of the national income "regardless of the group's contribution to that income"—exactly the opposite of its aim. They compare it with John L. Lewis, to his advantage. They call it inflationary, though farm prices are our most deflationary factor. They see grand scale Federal buying of pork, though pork meats have not been bought. They talk of a mounting wheat surplus in another wet cycle year, though the Plains really are swept by drought, dust storms and crop loss.

Other examples almost as extreme could fill out the alphabet. A Life magazine writer described the huge food reserves under the program as a curse. But a Louisville paper denounced the program for perpetuating artificial scarcity. A NANA correspondent interpreted that wheat planting will run 45,000,000 bushels above 1949 and corn planting as much as 200,000,000 bushels higher thus maybe sinking the price supports—whatever the heck bushels of plantings might mean. People read about "Cadillac farmers" rolling in wealth, whereas income per farmer averages about half the income of nonfarmers. Repeatedly the epithet socialistic is applied to Government financing of self help for those who are really this country's most individual people. And not content with reasonable criticism of granting $8 per diem pay to farm committeemen attending the St. Paul meeting April 4, a Minneapolis newspaper editorial publishes a comparison of around 4,500 committeemen who have been elected by vote of Minnesota farmers to the long malodorous Pendergast outfit, saying that PMA stands for "Pendergast Machine in Agriculture."

On runs the gamut of denunciation, carrying small hint of Government aid to anybody except the farmer, until his head is bloody and bowed.

Certainly the farm program's costs and surpluses need scaling down, the potato-and-egg mess needs to be cleaned up, and a lot more soil conservation needs to be injected into the program. But do not other facts call for consideration before killing it off entirely?

One such fact is that the program's reserves of wheat and corn, through exceedingly large in other respects, are also a backlog of human food that, in event of war or drought, could be vital. In opposing the program, a Minneapolis editorial belittles even this preparedness value, although on the same theory a hospital or fire-fighting or insurance plan could be derided as relying for success on the occurrence of trouble. The wheat reserve is obviously protective now in view of the Plains drought that already has slashed the official wheat estimate a drastic 120,000,000 bushels. And the corn reserve is protective at a time when corn belt subsoil moisture is very low. These reserves are food—bread, milk and meat in storable form. Hostile words cannot take away their value of protection against possible emergencies.

Another such fact is that while the organized farm groups are denounced for upholding the program, all except one are fighting for more moderate and more flexible price supports. The dairy group is taking the lead in asking Congress for restoration of the self-financing feature that first President Coolidge and then the United States Supreme Court, with business backing, knocked out of the farm program. And while verbally opposed to the program's flexible price support feature, Secretary Brannan has officially and repeatedly used that feature to lower price supports on potatoes, eggs, flax, dairy and other products. So even the politics of the program are being misrepresented to the country.

A final fact is that not within agriculture but outside of it originate the conditions that are forcing farm price protection. Between big business and tightly organized professions on one side and big labor on the other side are the competing millions of mostly small farming units. So in postwar times, farm prices have invariably slumped much faster than other prices. Past experience tells clearly that the result of failure to guard against this is a crash and spreading disaster. Isn't there something to be said for choosing to iron out the bad spots from the farm program instead of going through another such postwar collapse? Facts and the rule of reason seem to say so. And maybe those, when the pen-and-ink brigade's present spell of spring fever passes, will for a change get a play.

The Financial Solvency of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and timely address delivered by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., leader of the minority of the House of Representatives, at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner Club, at the William Penn Hotel, in Pittsburgh, Pa., on April 15, last.

Later I hope to have the opportunity to place in the RECORD an address delivered at the same dinner by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, fellow Americans, I am honored by your kind invitation to address the Amen Corner.

Standing before taxpayers who help pay the bills for the Washington spenders, I speak to you tonight somewhat in the manner of the referee in bankruptcy—I can't repair all the damage—but I can tell you where the money went.

We are at the crossroads in Washington today. The thinking members of both political parties realize this, and I think it is a tribute to the greatness of our Nation that these men place patriotism above partisanship and act in the best interests of our country.

When we speak of the financial solvency of Government we are speaking about a situation that affects us far more than the stability of our currency or the value of our bonds or the condition of our Treasury. When we consider that we now have a mountainous debt and that we are operating on a deficit basis, then it is clear to anyone that our very national security is at stake.

We sometimes forget that the Federal budget has only been in balance once in a generation of endless deficit spending.

We sometimes forget that taxes have only been reduced once in a generation of ever-increasing taxes.

We sometimes forget that our national debt has been reduced only once in a generation of ever mounting national debt.

Only in the years of 1947 and 1948 was the budget in balance. Only in those years was there an application made toward retirement of the debt. Only in those years—and it took 2 years and the survival of three presidential vetoes to do it—was there a reduction in taxes.

Those years—1947 and 1948—were the years of the late and much abused Eightieth Congress. Yes, the Republicans were in control in 1947 and 1948, but the task performed by that Congress would never have been achieved without the aid of patriotic and sincere Democrats who firmly believed then and believe now that the solvency of America is vital not only to the American people but to the world.

Of course, times change—in fact, they changed rather abruptly for my party in November 1948. Things are a bit different since that momentous date.

Spending has been resumed at an enormous rate. Where the Treasury showed a surplus of more than $8,000,000,000 when the books were closed on the fiscal year 1948, the books for the fiscal year 1950 will show a deficit of more than $5,000,000,000.

The budget for 1951 is based on another deficit of $5,500,000,000.

In brief, the Federal spenders will have run up a total deficit for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951—of almost $13,000,000,000.

And this at a time when Federal tax collections are running approximately $40,000,000,000 a year.

I repeat, the battle for solvency—the great battle of this year 1950—may well determine the future, not only of our own country, but of the entire free world.

Because this struggle is of such overshadowing importance, we must have the united support of all our people—Republicans, Democrats, and independents alike.

Let all patriots, regardless of party, join in this great crusade to end the era of red ink and red herring. Let us elect to office only men and women who will keep the American faith.

The world tide of public opinion is marked clearly in the recent elections in New Zealand, Australia, and England. Spendthrift socialism has been tested in the work-a-day world—and it is not the answer to the progressive needs of this twentieth century world. It has not brought to the people either peace, security, progress, or sustained prosperity.

Our crusade today is to save constitutional government. We must preserve the freedom of the American people. We must fight off a new threat of slavery—slavery to government and to crushing, crippling debt.

If I may interpose a personal note, let me remind you, fellow Americans, that it was exactly 85 years ago this day that the immortal Abraham Lincoln departed this earth.

Many times have I walked past that historic old brick house on Tenth Street, in Washington, where Lincoln had lain in agony all night long, after the fateful attack of the assassin in Ford's Theater, across the street. History tells us that a cold, driving rain fell in Washington on that Saturday morning of April 15, 1865. At 20 minutes after 7 in the morning there was a sudden stir and bustle

in the crowd which had kept its prayerful vigil through the night. At that moment, John Hay, Lincoln's secretary, emerged from the dark, brooding house to announce the death of Father Abraham.

Let this day remind us, then, that the battle against human slavery is never finished. The battle for freedom is unending.

Today we face the threat of yet another form of slavery—indenture to debt—and ours is the solemn charge to stand like bold men and proclaim to all the world: "It shall not come to pass."

Let us dare to hold high the sacred torch of freedom, lest the darkness of tyranny fall again upon all mankind.

Sickening to the patriot's heart is the orgy of waste, extravagance, and plain bad management encountered on every hand in Washington today—shocking waste—sinful waste—demoralizing waste of the people's substance.

Only a month ago we had a report from the Federal Supply Service telling of the tremendous inventories of equipment and supplies on hand in some of the executive departments. I want to read some of the figures to you—they tell the whole story of the kind of administration we are paying for today.

One agency had on hand enough fluorescent light tubes to last it for 93 years.

The same agency had on hand, as routine inventory, sufficient ruled paper to last it for 158 years.

It also carried as inventory enough tracing cloth to last for 9 years—and enough loose-leaf binders to last it for 247 years.

That's the kind of government a nation always gets when one party remains too long in power.

The bureaucrats grow fat, lazy, arrogant, indifferent, careless. They spend just for the sake of giving someone an order.

First, they become callous to the cries and pleas of the taxpayers—and then, as time goes on, these callous moods harden into attitudes of utter contempt for the people. That's when government begins to push the people around. And that's exactly where we stand today—one short step removed from the police state of compulsion.

Give this sort of government just one more vote of confidence—just one more term of security for the bureaucrats—and you will find them so deeply entrenched in their spending and give-away programs that there will be no uprooting them, ever.

The longer bureaucrats remain in power, the more money they spend. And the more they spend, the more powerful and far-reaching becomes their propaganda to crush and snuff out every voice of criticism and opposition.

High, wide, and handsome is the spending sway today. Only last month the Appropriations Committee of the House examined some detailed bills for new furniture for one office in the Federal Power Commission. The bill came to $2,189—for one office. Here are some of the items:

"Two walnut wastebaskets, at $13 each; and two ashtrays, at $5 each."

There you have the picture of today's spendthrift bureaucracy freewheeling with the people's money.

That's how they got their favorite campaign slogan, "Tax and tax, spend and spend."

Only a few sentences are needed to summarize this alarming trend in Washington today.

The Federal budget in 1928 was $4,000,000,000. By 1938 it was $8,000,000,000. By 1948 it was $40,000,000,000.

In 1928 we had 400 Federal agencies in the budget. In 1938 we had 1,000. And today we have 1,800 Federal units in Government. In 1928 the per capita debt was $146. In 1938 it was $286. And in 1948 it was $1,759.

In 1928 we had 500,000 Federal employees in all departments. By 1938 we had a million civil employees. And by 1948 we had a few more than 2,000,000, not counting any military personnel, officers, or enlisted men.

The Federal debt today is an unseen mortgage of more than $7,000 on every family in America.

The spenders have mortgaged the lives, not only of your children and your grandchildren but of their grandchildren for generations almost unnumbered.

I call as a witness against this reckless course another noted Missourian, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, Democratic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. Commenting on the Federal budget for 1951, Chairman CANNON told the House on January 9 this year:

"From every technical and statistical point of view, our fiscal situation is the most unfavorable in the peacetime history of the Republic."

I could read to you tonight for hours from the splendid reports submitted last year by the Hoover Commission. Those 19 reports cataloged waste, extravagance, and overlap and duplication in every department and agency of the Government—page after page of such items as I have cited from this year's appropriations hearings.

Yet the powerful administration propaganda machine only sneers and jeers at the people's cry for real economy in Government and lower taxes. They make no real effort to cut down the spending.

But the day is fast approaching when the Government can no longer live on I O U's. The day is approaching when they must tell the people what has become of the social-security trust funds. Today the social-security till is empty. The social-security taxes for 15 years were spent for routine Government operations, as fast as they came in. The trust fund is a pile of Federal I O U's.

When the day of accounting comes—as surely it must—we will find the master spenders grouped on the White House steps responding to the assembled multitudes:

"Let 'em eat powdered eggs."

Or:

"Let 'em eat dried milk—there are whole caves full of these spoiling foods available in Kansas."

Or perhaps they might offer us a few potatoes.

No, fellow Americans, we dare not stand idly by and see such a band of reckless, irresponsible, and desperate men steer this mighty land into the shoals of economic disaster.

Ours is the solemn duty and the sacred responsibility to demand a house cleaning in Washington—now.

One of the great myths in Washington today is this thing called Federal aid.

"Taxes must remain high," the spenders tell us, "because Washington is sending so much money back to the States to help build roads, hospitals, airports, and other public works, and to sustain vital welfare programs."

But what is the truth about Federal aid:

Every dollar sent back to the States from Washington comes from the States in the first place. Every State except one is taxed more for these services than it gets back.

Look at the figures for your own great State of Pennsylvania. In the fiscal year 1948 Pennsylvania paid into the Federal Treasury in all forms of taxation the astonishing total of $3,223,000,000.

And Pennsylvania got back in all forms of Federal aids and grants only $359,000,000.

In other words, every time Pennsylvania pays in a dollar for Federal taxes, she gets back 11 cents.

Yet the thinkers and planners down there tell you it is the State-aid programs which keeps taxes so high.

Pennsylvania pays in a dollar and gets back a dime.

Given her own Federal revenues each year, Pennsylvania could do for herself everything that Washington is doing for her today in the way of Federal aids and grants—and save millions upon millions a year in the bargain. Isn't that worth doing something about?

Federal aid is a myth. The bureaucratic brokerage is terrific. Any State or any city—yes, any citizen—can spend this money at home more wisely than the Washington planners can spend it for us.

The spenders tell us that everything is going to be lovely. They tell us that in 50 years every family will have an income of $12,000 a year.

And that is another cruel and heartless myth.

The President was very careful not to predict what the American dollar would be worth in the year 2000.

He knows that today's dollar buys only 60 cents' worth of goods, as measured in 1939 purchasing power—and less than 30 cents' worth of goods, as measured in the purchasing power of the year 1900.

If the purchasing power of the American dollar falls off as much during the next 50 years as it has in the last 50, the dollar will be worth exactly 18 cents, in that great year of promise, A. D. 2000.

Then the $12,000 family income so glibly promised by today's tax-eaters would represent a yearly purchasing power of $2,160 in terms of 1939 dollars—less than today's average income per family.

So this whole theory and program is only a gigantic hoax on all the people—a political shot-in-the-arm to lull them to complacency for a few more years of irresponsible tax extraction.

And this gigantic hoax is reared upon the contemptuous official opinion in Washington that the American people do not catch the difference between the 100-cent dollar, a 60-cent dollar, and an 18-cent dollar.

Such callous trafficking in human destiny is without parallel in modern history.

I predict that the American people, once aroused, will soundly reject and repudiate the power grasping mob which seriously sponsors such economic nonsense. There is a job for all of us. We must all unite in seeing that the American people are fully informed. They must know the facts. When they do, they will make an intelligent decision.

What this country needs is a good five-point program for American revival, security, and progress.

We must get rid of the wartime excise taxes and other punitive taxation.

We must create tax incentive for small business.

We must balance the budget and reduce the debt.

We must administer the tariff program more carefully, to protect American jobs.

We must remove the threat of socialization which hangs like a pall over the spirit of American thrift and industry.

We must stop this pump-priming for disaster.

And we must drive the Reds, subversives, spies, and saboteurs from the structure of the Federal Government. Our policies must be supervised by men and women whose first loyalty is to the United States.

Let us band together like good Americans to end the era of the red herring, and secret government.

Every time a committee of the House or Senate digs up a new name of a Communist sympathizer on the Federal pay roll, that's more red herring.

The official record demonstrates that our State Department has been harboring in recent years, by their own admission, people who never had any moral right to any position of power or influence in public affairs.

But may the American people look at these records?

Oh, no. They are confidential. They are secret. They must be held under lock and key. No official of any department may release these records to Congress save upon personal order of the President.

That order is denied.

Our highest defense secrets have been stolen.

Our policies have been betrayed.

Our security has been undermined by spies and saboteurs.

But the records are sealed from the American people. Why?

Yet I feel confident that an overwhelming majority of the American people support our proposition that we must root out the Communists and fellow-travelers in every department and every branch of our Government. The people want action—not excuses. They know that the Stalinites have outwitted us, and they want the stables cleaned.

We must rid ourselves of those worthies who now frustrate and obstruct and sabotage operations within the very structure of government itself.

There is no place in our Government for these spies, traitors, and saboteurs.

It is a profound fact of history that the secrets of the pumpkin papers were first disclosed to an Assistant Secretary of State as long ago as 1939. But the American people did not hear of these black deeds until the summer of 1948.

We face difficult times as we grope for progress and prosperity at home and peace abroad. These two problems go hand in hand. Without a strong and solvent America we cannot have good times and be sure of the preservation of our rights and progress. Without a strong America we cannot meet the great challenge to America to preserve the liberties and freedoms of the people and to exert a powerful influence for peace. We must not waste and squander our liberties. We must be strong financially and we must be strong in a military sense. Only through a strong army and navy and an all powerful air force can we make sure of peace. New ventures and new experiments in government must be delayed while we build our air forces as a mighty impetus for peace. My countrymen, only through self-denial and sacrifice and unselfishness can we meet this great challenge. We must go forward united; class, racial, and religious differences must be subordinated to the common good. We are one people, all with a common destiny. We will go forward together or we will sink together; united we can meet successfully, fairly, and justly the economic problems of our time. With tolerance and patience we can build a better America for all. We can build a stronger America that will bring peace, happiness, and progress, not only for our own people but the people of all the world.

We must not fail in this God-given opportunity to serve our day and generation. Our duty to civilization demands we shall not fail.

How To Regain Lost Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How To Regain Lost Water Rights," published in the Los Angeles Times of April 12, 1950. The editorial comments on Senate bill 3376, which I introduced a week ago Monday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO REGAIN LOST WATER RIGHTS

Sudden realization throughout the West of the bold attempt of the Bureau of Reclamation to take over internal water and power rights in the various States, has led to a revolt at last.

This awakening has been late. But it is not too late.

Congress finally has been asked to act on a comprehensive plan to rescue many water and power projects which have been taken over by the Bureau of Reclamation on an apparently permanent basis in its policy of seize and control. The proposed legislation would restore to the people the local rights and legal privileges which have been wrested from them by the Bureau.

WATKINS, OF UTAH

Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, is the spokesman for local rights who has stepped forward with specific legislation. His bill is described as an effort to provide grass-root management of multipurpose reclamation projects—that is, where irrigation and power development both are involved.

The so-called basin projects include those in which the Bureau, by long-planned and devious steps has succeeded in supplanting local control and has substituted its own costly and extravagant management from Washington. The Colorado River and the Columbia River and the Central Valley project in California are examples of the Bureau's continuous and growing encroachment.

Only by some such plan as that put forward by Senator WATKINS can this Federal domination, resulting eventually in full economic and political control by the bureau planners in Washington, be forestalled.

THE BANKER TAKES ALL

Simply framed, Senator WATKINS' bill would provide the legal machinery for enlargement of local operational groups to care for the big water and power developments. This would fit in perfectly with the aims of many aroused groups throughout California which now are seeking to take back control of the vast Central Valley project from the Bureau of Reclamation. The Central Valley story is unfolding day by day as the Bureau through many maneuvers seeks to tighten its hold, and the local groups, fighting hard at last, move to block the loss of their remaining rights and to regain their lost ones.

A point which Senator WATKINS makes is so important that it is difficult to understand how it has been overlooked so often. This is that in every instance the local citizens are paying for the water and power developments, yet full control is sought by Washington merely because it has provided the basic loan or financing. It is as if a bank, making a home loan, should demand the right to dictate what kind of a house a man is going to build and also seek title to the house even after the borrower has paid off the loan.

Entire objective of the Watkins bill is to move back toward the original purposes of the Reclamation Act of 1902. This act has been perverted flagrantly by the Department of the Interior and the Reclamation Bureau in their efforts to foist a strangling Federal domination upon the West.

ALL MUST JOIN FRAY

In the Central Valley project of California, particularly, some aid is needed immediately to restore local rights. The Bureau at the moment is seeking by every means at its command to take over the hydroelectric rights of the Pine Flat Dam on the Kings River in defiance of Congress, the Federal Power Commission, precedent, and the rights of the owners of the water. This effort merely is an extension and a support of previous attempts to force the 1,000,000-acre Kings River Water Users Association into the Central Valley project against its will.

The united and fighting efforts of organizations throughout the State are needed now to crystallize the sentiment of local farmers and other citizens to fight the Bureau at every turn. Support of Senator WATKINS' bill is one segment of this struggle; positive backing should be given the bill in Congress by every Californian interested in preserving his State from outside domination.

Southern California's $550,000,000 stake in the Hoover Dam-Colorado River development is a vital reason for this section to be active in aiding all efforts to block the Bureau from permanent control. Local taxpayers are footing the bill every day; they should know that their investment is to be secure.

Sometimes it takes a good while for a realization of the enormity of the seize-and-rule schemes such as those exemplified by the Bureau of Reclamation. Now that the realization has begun to make itself apparent, there should be no let-up in the fight.

The Bureau is in the wrong. It can be defeated. It must be.

Chinese Representation in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, Professor Owen Lattimore has publicly suggested that the United States representatives to the United Nations so act as to bring about the expulsion of the Chinese Nationalist delegates which would lead inevitably to the seating of the Communists, sent here by the Peiping regime, the collaborators of Russia. I consider it would be a grave mistake for the United States to follow Dr. Lattimore's article. In my opinion the views he here expressed are not shared by the great majority of Americans. It is to be hoped that the State Department will ignore his counsel. Not only would we be repudiating the friendly representatives of China who have cooperated with the freedom-loving nations at Lake Success but we would be giving aid and comfort to communism by any manifestation of attitude which will hasten the seating of representatives of the Peiping regime.

Furthermore, if our Nation follows this advice of Professor Lattimore we will merely assure another certain "veto" in any deliberations of the United Nations where democratic interests are involved. Why invite into our midst a group of Communists, all of whom are looking for the opportunity, and biding their time, to help in the overthrow of our free institutions? Certainly Moscow would rejoice over having scored another major victory if we assist in any way in the seating of the Chinese Communist delegation, which I hope we will never do. It would give Russia two of the Big Five votes to thwart any action looking toward the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

The New York Times has expressed its well-considered views in an editorial entitled "The View of Dr. Lattimore." I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VIEWS OF DR. LATTIMORE

Prof. Owen Lattimore has a right to his opinions and a right to express them. They may be wrong, sometimes, but to challenge them is not to challenge his integrity. Since he has that right, others have the right to disagree with him without being accused of having joined a smear campaign.

Since his views have been brought conspicuously into the limelight by present circumstances, it is prudent to weigh them carefully, not to see if they are subversive but to see if they fit the facts sufficiently well to inspire confidence. He is a specialist on the Far East, and our policies in respect to that area are much in debate. Whether his advice should be followed is germane to that debate.

In Philadelphia on Saturday night Dr. Lattimore advised members of the American Academy of Political and Social Science that the United States should disavow the Nationalist Government of China by "allowing those members of the United Nations who wished to do so to vote to unseat the old Chinese delegation to the United Nations and seat a new one." We submit that this is bad advice because it is based on a false presumption and is therefore thoroughly misleading in respect to the United States and its relations to the United Nations.

The assumption that the United States could and should "allow" other nations to take courses of action is false, since it implies that the United States thus far has not so "allowed." The United States, exactly contrary to this assumption, made it plain 2 months ago that it would abide by a majority decision on China in the Security Council. Dr. Lattimore is urging the United States to do something it has already done.

The disadvantageous and dangerous aspect of this advice lies in its equally false implication that it is the refusal of the United States to "allow" a vote in the United Nations that is causing the present stalemate in the international organization. That record must be kept straight. The United Nations is in difficulty at present, not because the United States does not recognize the Communist regime in Peiping or welcome it into the United Nations but because of the blackmailing boycott of the Soviet Union and its satellites.

The issue is not one of recognition or representation. The issue is merely whether the Soviet Union can force the United Nations to be obedient to its dictation by a policy of walk-outs. When Dr. Lattimore beclouds that issue he is putting his Government in the wrong light and hindering the important business of getting the facts in the case and getting them straight.

The Atlantic Community Looks Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Atlantic Community Looks Ahead," by Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY LOOKS AHEAD

(By Walter Lippmann)

The principal Atlantic allies—Britain, France, and the United States—have been carrying on friendly but difficult discussions which turn finally on the question of what is to happen 2 years hence, when the Marshall plan ends. Mr. Hoffman's campaign for European integration and the European Payments Union, Sir Stafford Cripps' reluctance to commit Great Britain to these schemes, and now M. Bidault's proposal to set up an Atlantic High Council all stem from a realization that the end of the Marshall plan is in sight.

The ERP program, to be sure, has been in operation for only 2 of its 4 years. But Congress is about to vote on the third installment, and after that there will be only one more. When Congress meets next January it will have to go to work on the fourth and terminating installment. Thus, while in operation the ERP has run only half its course, from the point of view of the Governments the great decisions of policy about what is to follow are close at hand.

The attitude of the three governments is inspired and defined now by what each thinks could or should happen after ERP ends.

Mr. Hoffman, adhering loyally to the mandate of Congress, is in effect saying for the United States that if the Marshall countries are to become substantially independent of an American subsidy by 1952, they must now integrate—that is to say, they must agree on measures to develop a greater volume of trade among themselves and their own dependencies. Mr. Hoffman is trying to induce the Marshall countries to unite in order that the Marshall plan may end with its main legal objectives attained.

But the consideration which inspires him to put pressure on Great Britain inspires Sir Stafford Cripps to resist the pressure. The British view, I think it is fair to say, is that Britain has a better chance of achieving financial independence if it has a relatively free hand to make its own bargains and arrangements than if it is integrated—that is, tied very closely to the European continent. Mr. Hoffman has no way of guaranteeing the British that if integration with the continent proves to be a costly burden on the British reserves, the United States will underwrite the losses.

On the assumption that American aid is to end in 1952, Mr. Hoffman has no conclusive bargaining power today which can induce or compel the British to do what they regard as disadvantageous and dangerous. Though the British will probably make compromises to avoid a serious quarrel, we must not think that we can buy a commitment from them which extends beyond 1952 because there are still two installments of the ERP subsidy to be voted.

These installments have in fact been discounted. The British know and we know that in the critical condition of the cold war, the subsidy is not likely to be withheld. They know and we know, moreover, that if it were withheld Britain could, nevertheless, survive. There would be hardship. But the British can and will endure hardship when their national independence is at stake.

M. Bidault's proposal, judging from what is known of it, is designed to be a framework of mutual aid for the period which comes after the end of the Marshall plan. His fundamental assumption is quite evidently that large American contributions to the Atlantic community should not end cannot end in 1952. He is proposing to create an institution and, thereby, an implied commitment not to terminate the American subsidies at the end of the Marshall plan.

It is fair to say that if the British could know and could believe that 1952 would not see the end of American dollar aid to the Atlantic community, that somehow or other we would make it our national policy to finance the dollar gap at a high level of international trade and domestic employment, they would soon be leading the procession, rather than "dragging their feet" toward large schemes of cooperation and multilateralism and convertible currencies.

But it is not possible for Mr. Truman, Mr. Mr. Acheson, and Mr. Hoffman to make convincing American commitments after 1952. They cannot speak now for the Eighty-second Congress which is to be elected in the autumn, must less for the next President and the Eighty-third Congress.

But while they cannot commit the Congress to action in the future, they can still do something substantial and important. They can recognize the fact, which no one will be able to deny, that, though the Marshall plan ends, it will still be an American vital interest to see that the dollar gap is closed—not through deflation and unemployment from a contraction of exports, but by the maintenance of a high level of trade and investment. Though they cannot commit the Government to voting subsidies, and should not try, they can lead the American people to an understanding of their own interests.

They can, then, lay the foundations of American policy after 1952 not on the principle of subsidies to needy but deserving and valuable allies but on the stability and prosperity of the American economy. They can adhere to the idea that 1952 is to mark the end of direct subsidies by the United States to Great Britain certainly, and one may hope to our other principal allies as well. They can take the view that after 1952 we shall deal with Britain not as the recipient of our subsidy but as the manager of a great trading community—the sterling area—with which the dollar area must find profitable relations.

In the larger view, which transcends questions of money and trade and embraces the political future of western civilization, we should look forward hopefully to 1952 and to the end of our ERP relations with Great Britain. The subsidy has been necessary. It has served a useful purpose. But it must be ended because, were it to be anything but a temporary arrangement, it would demoralize the Anglo-American partnership on which the future of the Atlantic community depends.

That partnership cannot be satisfactory if Britain is not truly independent. Britain is not independent when every spring it has to justify itself to all the committees and to both Houses of the United States Congress. At whatever cost and inconvenience, Britain must cease to be our client and be free again to be our equal ally.

The British would not be the great ally they are if they did not hate this relationship and were not determined, however unpopular it makes them in Europe and over here, to get free of it.

Soviet Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Sante Fe New Mexican. I do so at the request of a constituent.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOONER THAN THE H-BOMB

The nonchalant American, who can be aroused only by Bunker Hill, Fort Sumter, the battleship *Maine*, or Pearl Harbor, may soon be aroused more than ever before, without so much as the dropping of an old model-T A-bomb. In the humble opinion of this oldest newspaper in the West, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics may shortly:

1. Denounce the United Nations as a Jim Crow cartel for world dominion by white colonial imperialism;

2. Resign from the United Nations;

3. Declare that the U. S. S. R. is not and never has been a European, white, colonial, or imperial power;

4. Withdraw Soviet troops from all occupied countries;

5. Proclaim that the U. S. S. R. is and always has been an Asiatic power, of, by, and for Asiatics;

6. Point to a democratic federation for the advancement of Asiatic and other downtrodden peoples, concurrently formed in some pliant capital of the Indochinese or Malayan Balkans;

7. Proudly accept membership in this incipiently largest of the parliaments of man;

8. Donate to the new federation twice as much money for twice as big a skyscraper as Uncle Sam built the United Nations;

9. Then sit back and laugh; and

10. While our radio and newspaper commentators grope to explain why the dirty Russians didn't attack us honestly and fairly with an H-bomb, so we could retaliate.

Veterans' Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statement issued by the Veterans' Administration which I am sure will be of interest to every Member of Congress, as well as to the veterans throughout the country.

The matter referred to follows:

The deadline for most veterans for starting a course of education and training under the GI bill is 15 months away—on July 25, 1951.

A Veterans' Administration regulation, issued today, states that the majority of veterans will not be permitted to begin GI bill courses after that date. An exception has been made for those discharged after July 25, 1947, and those who enlisted or reenlisted under the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act.

July 25, 1951, however, is not important to veterans who have started and actually are pursuing GI bill training on that date, as they have the right to continue their education.

The VA regulation explains that a veteran who has started a course and who has continued in it will be considered to be in training, even though he has temporarily interrupted the course for the summer vacation or for other reasons beyond his control.

Once a veteran completes or discontinues his program of GI bill training after the 1951 date, he may not start another course.

The GI bill provides that generally training must be initiated by July 25, 1951, or 4 years after a veteran's discharge, whichever is later, and it must be completed by July 25, 1956.

Most veterans are subject to the 1951 and 1956 cut-off dates. But there are the following exceptions:

1. Veterans discharged after July 25, 1947, have 4 years from date of discharge in which to begin GI bill training. However, they must finish by July 25, 1956.

2. Veterans who enlisted or reenlisted under the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act (between October 6, 1945, and October 5, 1946) are not bound by either dead line. Instead, they have 4 years from the end of that enlistment or reenlistment period in which to start, and 9 years from that time in which to complete their course of training.

A veteran in either of these two categories actually must be in training when his individual entrance dead line comes around, in order to continue afterward.

The VA regulation outlines requirements that veterans in training after the entrance cut-off date will have to meet.

They will be expected to pursue their training continuously until completion, except for conditions which normally would cause interruption by any student.

They may change their educational objectives only while in training and then for reasons satisfactory to the Administrator.

According to the regulations, satisfactory reasons for change are these:

1. When the veteran is not making satisfactory progress in his present course and the failure is not due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application.

2. When the course to which he desires to change is more in keeping with his aptitude, previous education, training, or other such pertinent factors.

3. When the course to which he wants to change is a normal progression from his current course and will help him attain his educational or vocational objective.

No additional changes of course will be approved, the regulation states, except for the most cogent reasons.

The VA regulation defines a course of education or training as a "curriculum, program of study or training, or combination of subjects as are prescribed by the institution as constituting a course."

The following do not constitute a change of course: a change of one or more subjects within an elected curriculum or program; the dropping of a subject without replacing it with another; the adding of a subject; change in the sequence in which subjects are taken, or advancement from a basic or preparatory phase to an advanced phase of a course.

VA explained that it is issuing its regulations on dead-line dates at this time in order to give veterans ample opportunity to make their plans for the future.

McCarthy Gets Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Senator JOE MCCARTHY has achieved a great deal in his charges against poor security risks in the State Department. Mr. George Sokolsky has recently called attention to some of his accomplishments to date. I am including his article as part of my remarks which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

The attack on Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, so far, seems to be focused upon one point: He is being accused not of saying too much but of being ill-mannered, loud, and exaggerative. He is being accused of overstatement, of employing such a term as "top spy" when nobody can know actually who the "top spy" ever is.

Maybe so. JOE MCCARTHY, I am sure, would not advertise himself as a delicate powder-puff. He is both Irish and a marine and that involves a man in a pattern of life.

My old friend, Smedley Butler, was a Quaker; yet he became a marine general. I once heard him deliver an address to his marines which would, had they known about it, have made our State Department lulus not only blush but positively crimson.

Now, let us see what Senator JOE MCCARTHY's noise has so far accomplished:

1. It forced Deputy Undersecretary Peurifoy to admit that the State Department had become a nest of homosexuals and that he had fired 91 of them—all subject, because of their vice, to blackmail. Mr. Peurifoy can probably in truth say that he did it before he heard JOE's bellow, but he kept whatever he did strictly to himself and nobody has yet assured us that these unfortunates have not got jobs elsewhere in the Government;

2. He established, through the Washington, D. C., police force, that this is only a segment of the colony of perverts in Government.

3. He reopened interest in the Amerasia case, which is the key to espionage in the State, Treasury, Army, Navy Departments and the OSS.

4. He established the fact beyond doubt, that the administration protects Communists, pro-Communists, fellow travelers and stooges by objecting to a full, impartial, bipartisan investigation into the perils of espionage at a time when espionage has been proved in the Alger Hiss and the Fuchs cases.

5. He exposed Senator TYDINGS as capable of misquoting J. Edgar Hoover, and of giving a false impression that the FBI clears persons as though it were a court and not a police department.

6. He blew the top off the State Department far eastern policy. In this regard:

A. He forced Owen Lattimore to give publicity to his own recommendations which many Americans, including myself, will regard as harmful to the United States.

B. He frightened Dean Acheson into a publicity campaign to separate himself from Lattimore.

C. He reopened interest in the Institute of Pacific Relations.

D. He reopened interest in the Pacific story, a series of 181 NBC broadcasts to our troops during and after the war.

E. He ended the trickery of the Bangkok Conference by which the State Department sought a way to recognize Soviet China by indirection.

F. He knocked the spots out of the smart trick of bringing Soviet China into the United Nations by majority vote.

Much of this Senator JOE MCCARTHY accomplished by indirection, just as he had nothing to do personally with Dean Acheson's attempt to restore the bipartisan foreign policy by having the obscure John Sherman Cooper and the Deweyite John Foster Dulles taken into the State Department.

To the rank and file of the Republican Party, Cooper is wholly unknown and when they check his voting record during his one term in the Senate, it does not look Republican. As for John Foster Dulles, this act surely ends his political career as a Republican.

For any man is entitled once to such a mistake as recommending Alger Hiss to the Carnegie endowment, but when to that is added an effort to throw a protective wall around the current administration of the State Department, it is indicative of political cloudiness. Besides, the Dewey group seems to be abandoning participation in national Republican leadership.

The point is that the State Department would not have begged Senator VANDENBERG and Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH of New Jersey to help them put up a false facade of bipartisanship had not Senator MCCARTHY's excitement proved that there never has been a Republican-Democratic bipartisan foreign policy on the most vital issues. Policy has been made by little people in key jobs.

It sometimes takes unusual means to bring out the truth—but the truth will come out.

Import of Czechoslovak Women's Shoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following release of the New England Shoe and Leather Association, regarding the import of women's Czechoslovak shoes, which matter is now being investigated by the Treasury Department in order to determine whether or not these imports are in violation of the Antidumping Act of 1921:

[From the New England Shoe and Leather Association Shoe News of April 11, 1950]

FEBRUARY IMPORTS OF CZECHOSLOVAK WOMEN'S SHOES TOTAL 153,436 PAIRS—THREE TIMES JANUARY IMPORTS

Imports of women's shoes from Czechoslovakia during February 1950 totaled 153,436 pairs, valued at $146,644, according to the New England Shoe and Leather Association, based on official data released by the United States Department of Commerce. "This amount is three times the January imports of Czech shoes of 58,018 pairs, valued at $47,064. Furthermore, the combined imports for January-February of 211,454 pairs valued at $193,708 is fully 112.5 percent greater than imports for the full year of 1949, which equaled 99,491 pairs, valued at $101,413," stated Maxwell Field, executive vice president of the association.

"Equally as interesting as the heavy increase in imports is the fact that the average price of these women's casual shoes, based on the declared values stated on the import manifests, is only 95 cents per pair," declared Mr. Field. These facts substantiate our association's previous claims that over a million pairs of Czech shoes will be imported into the United States this year, and that the declared price constituted a suspicion of dumping in violation of the antidumping Act of the 1921. The Customs Bureau of the United States Treasury Department is presently reviewing this situation to determine whether a formal investigation should be undertaken under this law," Mr. Field pointed out.

An Iowa Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, the March 31 issue of the Iowa Development Bulletin contains a brief but highly interesting account of the boyhood of the world-renowned Wright Brothers, the first men to fly heavier-than-air machines. The setting is Cedar Rapids, Iowa, in my district; the time, 1878. The original source of the story is the official biography of the Wright Brothers, written by Fred C. Kelly and authorized by Orville Wright. My State is proud to have sheltered these great men in their youth, and, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include their story, which is a part of Iowa's lore:

THE WRIGHT BROTHERS IN IOWA

In June 1878, when Orville was 7 years old and Wilbur was 11, the Wright family left Dayton, Ohio, because the work of the father, who had been made a bishop of the United Brethren Church, was shifted to Cedar Rapids, Iowa. And it was in a house on Adams Street, in Cedar Rapids, not long after their arrival there, that an event occurred which was to have much influence on the lives of Wilbur and Orville—as well as to have its effect on the whole human race.

Bishop Wright had returned from a short trip on church business, bringing with him a little present for his two younger sons.

"Look here, boys!" he said to Wilbur and Orville, holding out his hands with something hidden between them. Then he tossed the gift toward them. But instead of falling at once to the floor or into their hands, as they expected, it went to the ceiling where it fluttered briefly before it fell. It was a flying machine, a helicopter, the invention of a Frenchman, Alphonse Penaud. Made of cork, bamboo, and thin paper, the device weighed so little that twisted rubber bands provided all the power needed to send it aloft for a few seconds. As the brothers were to learn later, Penaud, an invalid during most of his short life, had not only invented, as early as 1871, various kinds of toy flying-machines, both the helicopter type and others that flew horizontally, but was the originator of the use of rubber bands for motive power. Simple as was this helicopter—they called it the "bat"—Wilbur and Orville felt great admiration for its ingenuity. Though it soon went the way of all fragile toys, the impression it left on their minds never faded.

Not long afterward Wilbur tried to build an improvement on the toy helicopter. If so small a device could fly, why not make a bigger one that could fly longer and higher? Orville was still too young to contribute much to the actual building of larger models, but he was keenly interested as Wilbur made several, each larger than the one preceding. To the brothers' astonishment, they discovered that the bigger the machine, the less it would fly; and if it was much bigger than the original toy, it wouldn't fly at all. They did not yet understand that a machine of only twice the linear dimensions of another would require eight times the power.

While in Cedar Rapids, Orville showed enterprise in another direction. He had enough intellectual curiosity to study lessons that the teacher had not assigned. When a little more than 8 years old he told his father that he was tired of the Second Reader they were still studying at school and wished he had a Third Reader.

One morning, not long after that, at the middle of the school year, the principal came to the room Orville was in and announced that any pupils who showed enough proficiency in reading might be promoted at once, without waiting until the end of the year, and begin the Third Reader. The more promising members of the class, selected by the teacher, then stood toeing a chalk mark, up front, as was commonly done, and took turns at reading. In his alarm lest he might not do himself full justice, Orville, someone told him later, held his book upside down. That did not prevent him from reading accurately, as he knew the book by heart, and he was promoted.

"I'm now in the Third Reader class," he proudly announced when he reached home that noon.

"Well, that's a strange thing," said his father. "Just this morning I bought the Third Reader you asked for. But," he added, "you won't be able to use it today, because you're going to miss school this afternoon. I have arranged for you and Wilbur to go to the photographer's and have your pictures taken."

Orville's picture thus commemorated what had seemed to him an important event in his life.

American Samoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to join with my friend, Peter Tali Coleman, of American Samoa, who is now a student in one of our Washington universities, in calling the attention of the Members of the House to the fiftieth anniversary of the flag raising on American Samoa which anniversary occurred yesterday, April 17, 1950.

It has been my great privilege to visit and to personally meet the present leaders of the American Samoans in Tutuila, as well as the Samoans living under the New Zealand flag on the islands of Savaii and Upolu.

American Samoa, a group of islands same 900 miles south of the equator, were acquired by the United States during the

period 1889–99 through agreement between Britain, the United States, and Germany. At that time the great Samoan race was split by this agreement without their consent and approval. These three great powers simply made a division of the territory which suited their convenience and ideas. During all of these years American Samoa has made great progress. These people are as magnificent in character and intelligence and loyal and as ambitious as any people you could find in colonial life. In all of the colonial possessions of the earth there could be found no finer people. In stature, in general appearance, cleanliness, and sincerity they are par excellence. In American Samoa you find no poor people, rich, or so-called middle-class people of consequence. The economy of the islands is operated under the Matai or chieftain system with high talking chiefs, talking chiefs, and other chiefs. The Matai and the chiefs see that all of their clansmen or tribesmen—the very young, the teenagers, the middle-aged, and the old—are all properly fed, clothed, and housed. They are ambitious from the standpoint of education and of striving toward obtaining a full and complete life as sought by the American people. The American Samoans and other parts of their race which are now under the control primarily of New Zealand—Germany having lost this territory to New Zealand following World War I—look forward to the day when the machinery of the Trustee Council of the United Nations, together with the Congress of the United States will bring the whole Samoan race back together under the protection of the United States. Shortly our Congress will be called upon to consider the approval of an organic act setting up a civilian form of government for American Samoa—they having been under our Navy rule for the past several decades—and this act, when approved, will unquestionably offer American citizenship to the Samoans, giving them a bill of rights and set them up as a possession but not as an organized territory subject to becoming a State at some future date.

Under permission granted, I submit for the RECORD the following statement prepared by Mr. Peter Coleman

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FLAG-RAISING DAY IN AMERICAN SAMOA, APRIL 17, 1950

(By Peter Tali Coleman of American Samoa)

Fifty years ago today, the American flag was raised in Tutuila, the main island of the American Samoa group. It was for the first time the United States of America deviated from its then established foreign policy of nonintervention. It was on this day that the high chiefs of Tutuila, without any solicitation, ceded the islands of Tutuila and Aunu'u to the Government of the United States "for the promotion of the peace and welfare of the people of said islands, for the establishment of a good and sound government, and for the preservation of the rights and property of the inhabitants of said islands, the chiefs, rulers, and people thereof are desirous of granting unto the said Government of the United States full power and authority to enact proper legislation for and to control the said islands, and are further desirous of removing all disabilities that may be existing in connection therewith, and to ratify and to confirm the grant of the rule of said islands heretofore granted on the 2d (sic) day of April 1900." Commander B. F. Tilley, commandant of the naval station, Tutuila, hoisted the American flag. The deed of cessation was signed by Leoso in the presence of and at the request of the chiefs and representatives of the division of Fofo and Aitulagi and by Pele in the presence of and at the request of the chiefs and representatives of the division of Sua and Vaifanua in Tutuila in conformity with Samoan custom.

Now, the day of democracy is dawning in the vast, once turbulent Pacific. Hawaii, the adult, is ready, willing, and able to shoulder the responsibilities demanded of a member of our society of States. Guam, the child, is taking its first step toward the fulfillment of a nurtured hope for self-government. Samoa, the embryo, is awaiting further developments that will bring about its government of the people.

In World War II this American possession joined readily in the war effort. Samoans participated in this global effort together with the rest of the American boys in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps. Some made the supreme sacrifice for that cause which this flag represents. Thus, today, the Samoan stands as an American, believing in the fundamental principle of "In God we trust," as a common denominator of the Christian world.

In the near future, Samoa will be afforded an opportunity to participate in a representative form of government. It should be no challenge to its traditional system, for the representative form of government is only a modification, and both are founded on the same principle that the life of the land is preserved in its righteousness. As Americans, we can all feel proud of this little island. It may be a molehill in our country of States, but it is a towering mountain proclaiming to the eyes of the freedom-seeking people in the Pacific and Asia the recognition of one of God's greatest endowments to man—his natural rights.

Memorial Address by William H. McIntyre, National Vice President, the Society of American Legion Founders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a recent address by Mr. William H. McIntyre, national vice president of the Society of American Legion Founders and a past national officer of three prominent veterans' organizations in this country. He is, also, at the present time, New York department chairman of graves registration of the American Legion:

The address follows:

The debt to the living and dead can be discharged by deeds, by building a secure nation in a world which never again will turn to war.

Some of us were present on that cool gray morning 31 years ago when the bugle sounded "cease firing," others at a later date in 1945 in both the European and Pacific theaters when cessation of hostilities happened.

Once again we meet to honor our dead. Your speaker had the privilege to be present when the first of our heroic dead were exhumed at St. Laurent Cemetery, Normandy, France, in September 1947, and has met every funeral ship arriving in the port of New York and attended services at the pier. Over 107,000 have been returned to date.

Nothing I might say here can minimize the great loss nor alleviate the suffering of their families. These dead stand in an unbroken line of patriots who dared to die that freedom might live and increase its blessings. Freedom lives and through it they live in a way that humbles the undertakings of most men.

The debt to the living and dead can be discharged by deeds, yes, by building a secure nation in a world which never again will turn to war. Perhaps atomic energy will prevent further conflicts; however, we should be prepared, keep our powder dry and in sufficient quantity.

At this time it would be unfaithful not to recognize the evils which exist. However, I do wish to bring to your attention and think it proper and fitting, the fact, that there are too many doctrines being preached and tolerated in this great country of ours.

The only ism that we are interested in is that of Americanism. Only a short time ago many of us saw marching in and around different parts of our State those who would tear apart and rend asunder the structures of happiness and contentment. While it is true that our Constitution guarantees free speech and tolerance, bear in mind that law and order are fundamental and liberty must not be taken for license.

The persons that I have seen parading should be taught a love for America. Love for America should be inculcated in the families of foreigners, especially those who desire to become citizens. Never in the history of our country has there been a greater need for emphasizing the principles of American citizenship.

If, in our schools we had a respect for God and an adherence and practice of some religion, we need never fear any ism that would sow the seeds of discontent, and mob rule would have no place in America. Respect for authority is the greatest responsibility of the citizens of this country.

Children of immature age cannot understand, let alone discuss the doctrines that are being preached. We grant these children may be curious, but why in common sense should we let the little school house of our youth be torn apart by propaganda from people living beyond the iron curtain?

There are definite and decent limitations for individuals' expressions, therefore, we should interest ourselves in what is taking place in our community. Don't stand idle; with the unrest that is rampant in the world today it behooves all to be on their guard to respect and obey the law, to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America and continue to love, honor and enjoy our independence and freedom.

Mr. Facing-Both-Ways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article by William Henry Chamberlin,

which appeared in the Wall Street Journal recently:

MR. FACING-BOTH-WAYS—SPIRIT OF BUNYAN'S FABULOUS CHARACTER HAS BEEN PRESENT IN THE ADMINISTRATION'S CONDUCT OF FOREIGN POLICY

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Recent criticisms of the State Department have elicited a storm of countercriticism. The men who have censured the present Secretary of State and some of his aides have been accused of being factious isolationists, guilty of weakening American foreign policy at a critical moment.

But there are stronger elements in the mood of popular distrust which lies behind current criticism than the thick-and-thin defenders of Mr. Acheson and the Department which he heads recognize. One of the symbolic characters in Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress is Mr. Facing-Both-Ways. There has been too much of the spirit of Mr. Facing-Both-Ways in the records of the Roosevelt and Truman administration. Here is the explanation for the attitude of mistrust which has recently come into the open.

There are, for instance, the implications of Mr. Acheson's aggressive assertion of friendship for Alger Hiss, convicted of perjury in connection with his denial that he turned over a considerable number of State Department confidential documents to a Soviet spy ring. Mr. A. A. Berle, a State Department colleague of Acheson, has testified that in 1941 he communicated to Acheson information suggesting that Hiss' loyalty was under some question. Acheson brushed this aside and Hiss went from one high wartime assignment to another. He was one of the small number of American diplomatic representatives at Yalta and he played a prominent role in the organization of the United Nations.

MR. ACHESON'S IDEAS HAVE CHANGED

One may sympathize with the chivalry of Mr. Acheson's refusal to turn his back on a friend who had apparently gone wrong and yet feel that there is a certain inconsistency between what might fairly be called a substantial error of judgment in the Hiss case and the Secretary's recent trumpet call for total diplomacy.

Mr. Acheson's recent state papers on the state of American-Soviet relations have been excellent. They have been well reasoned and realistic. But here again the shadow of "Mr. Facing-Both-Ways" obtrudes. Mr. Acheson did not always cherish such views.

As late as November 1945 he was the State Department representative at a Council of American-Soviet Friendship meeting in honor of the notorious "red dean" of Canterbury, who rather grotesquely combines his clerical office with insistent preaching of the glories of Stalin's atheistic tyranny. This organization was subsequently placed on the Attorney General's subversive list.

At this meeting Mr. Acheson assured the enthusiastic audience that never in the past, present, or future has there been any place in the globe where the interests of the American and Russian people clashed or were antagonistic. This was at a time when sharp American-Soviet differences of opinion had developed on a number of issues, on Poland, the Balkans, Iran, the peace treaty procedures, among others. At any rate the jump from this assurance of eternal harmony to the present doctrine of eternal discord is substantial and is not calculated to clear up public opinion.

One of the Secretary's recent seven points for peace with Moscow was the freeing of the satellite countries and the withdrawal of Soviet troops and police within Soviet frontiers. But in 1946 Acheson was influential in getting an American credit of $90,000,000 for a Polish Government which was Communist-dominated and which was violating all the conditions for the "free unfettered elections" which had been promised at Yalta. The grant of this credit was against the advice of Arthur Bliss Lane, American Ambassador to Poland, who wanted to see some free elections and a few elementary civil liberties first.

POOR JUDGMENT ON CHINA POLICY

Consistently opposing proposals for large-scale aid to Nationalist China, Acheson assured the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on March 20, 1947: "The Chinese Government * * * is not threatened by defeat by the Communists. The war with the Communists is going on much as it has for the last 20 years."

This was not a very perspicacious judgment, as the rapid collapse in 1949 would soon show. Nor was the sting of the debacle of American policy in China drawn by the following sentence in the letter to the President which served as a preface to the white paper on China:

"The unfortunate but inescapable fact is that the ominous result of the civil war in China was beyond the control of the Government of the United States."

If the "ominous" outlook had been clearly recognized in 1947, it is at least conceivable that something more might have been done, both on the Chinese side and on the American. It would, of course, be unfair to saddle Mr. Acheson with responsibility for the collapse in China.

But he has been unfortunate, to say the least, in his China policy, if indeed there has been a policy, apart from waiting for the dust to settle. The world isolationist is often hurled in reproach at critics of any phase of the Roosevelt and Truman foreign policies.

But the course of events has made us isolationists in China, whether we like it or not. The Communist regime in China has proved impossible to deal with; it has forced us in self-respect to withdraw our diplomatic and consular personnel. At the same time we have done everything to cold shoulder continued Nationalist resistance on Formosa.

When there are fewer inconsistencies, when the spirit of "Mr. Facing-Both-Ways" disappears, there will be a more united and confident public opinion behind American foreign policy.

Something Is Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a very interesting letter. It is from a man who says "I am just an ordinary citizen." His theme is reckless Government spending and he finds support in statements made by important people. His point is well made. I include all of his letter at this point:

APRIL 11, 1950.

DEAR SIR: I am just an ordinary citizen, but it appears to me that something is wrong:

(a) Because Senator PAUL DOUGLAS says, "We must reverse the trend whereby everyone is taking a quick grab at the Public Treasury. Folks have got to be sold in letting up—or we will be in trouble."

(b) Because Dr. Vannevar Bush says, "A people bent on a soft security, surrendering their birthright of individual self-reliance for favors, voting themselves into Eden from a supposedly inexhaustible public purse, supporting everyone by soaking a fast-disappearing rich * * * will not measure up to competition with a tough dictatorship."

(c) Because the Honorable James F. Byrnes says, "Our real trouble is debt and taxes. We cannot cure it by more debt and more taxes."

(d) Because Dr. Edwin C. Nourse says, "I am not happy when I see Government slipping back into deficits as a way of life in a period when production and employment are high, instead of putting its fiscal house in order and husbanding reserves to support the economy if less prosperous times overtake us."

(e) Because Mr. Bernard Baruch says that among the most important developments of the first half of the twentieth century is man's loss of confidence in himself and turning too much to the state instead of himself.

(f) And, finally, because our national deficit of $6,000,000,000 this year means that we are spending $16,000,000 more each day than we are taking in.

Don't you think that we should get on, and stay on, a pay-as-you-go basis? Is there any good reason why my children and grandchildren should pay for my social and welfare benefits?

Why wouldn't one solution be to restrict the benefits of the Government's social and welfare legislation to those who need it?

I am writing you, because it seems to me that you are in a position to do something about it. My name is Charles R. Petticrew, 304 West Forty-sixth Street, Indianapolis, Ind., 34 years old, with wife and four children, veteran (5½ years in service), and modest income. (Driving 1947 Dodge and is busy paying mortgage on house.)

If the above facts are in error, I would appreciate your writing me and pointing out what is incorrect.

Sincerely,

C. R. PETTICREW.

1950 Battle Line—David Against Goliath—Edwin Arthur Hall Versus the Binghamton Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, to my friends back home who want to see American Government prevail, I am issuing the call to resist the Red Fascists in the Thirty-seventh Congressional District as you have never done before.

The anti-Hall propaganda, circulated by these venal wretches for so many years, challenges every decent man and woman in the counties of Broome, Chenango and Madison and at long last must compel all of you to stand fearlessly on the side of truth.

Foremost and practically the only real perpetrator of hate toward the six-times elected Representative of this district stands the Binghamton Press, the greatest mud slinging Gargantua in the Nation today.

In company with the Press and bringing up the unhappy rear, follows an ugly assortment of pasty-faced sycophants, entirely subservient to their master but as bloodthirsty to get at your Congressman as the Press itself.

These are the poison-peddlers, who employ their every working hour with one unholy pastime, besmirching the name of EDWIN ARTHUR HALL from every street corner and cracker barrel and to every unsuspecting citizen in our district.

For 11 years, this mighty dirt dissemination has persisted, and is now reaching its foul crescendo.

Responsibility for such un-American defiance of the people's will to elect their own Representative during all these years rests mainly upon the shoulders of the Binghamton Press.

Suffice it to say, with all its open avowed intentions to overthrow the American electoral system, with all its honesty of sinister purpose to destroy Members of Congress, the Communist Daily Worker is a piker compared to the Binghamton Press.

Because the Press assumes to play the role of something it is not, the apotheosis of American respectability. The pseudo-intellectuals, who cling to its pay rolls as editorial writers actually are nothing more than literary punks devoted to the lousy profession of character assassination.

Their hate-filled minds have one obsession, and this has long since reached a perverted stage, to plunge their quivering quills into the back of your Congressman, while he is facing our Nation's Capitol, fighting the battle of the people.

Under the protection of the oft-abused freedom of the press, these zealots of avarice have ridden long roughshod over the reason and sensibilities of the voters of this district, sniping, spearing, harpooning all the forthright attempts of your Congressman in the interests of orderly legislative action.

I repeat, the Communist Daily Worker is not more dangerous than the Binghamton Press to the preservation of a free American electoral system in the Thirty-seventh Congressional District.

Sadly enough, due to their being tolerated, these monkeys have become so commonplace in our decent society hereabouts, they appear as proper and harmless as Pope's subject in his "Essay on MAN."

> Vice is a monster of so frightful mien
> As to be hated needs but to be seen;
> Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
> We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

Their nefarious work in the Binghamton area has produced a matter plot for smearing public officials. Their supposed function, news gathering, went out the window when they got their first taste of blood some years back.

Of course, the target which they have shot at most consistently of all their sordid below-the-belt schemes is your Congressman.

Just as Stalin knows America stands in his path for world domination, so is the Binghamton Press fully aware that EDWIN ARTHUR HALL is the only obstacle in her way for complete political power in New York's southern tier.

They are sworn to remove this only barrier by any and all means at their command.

In spite of their tremendous circulation in Congressman HALL'S district and their day-by-day defaming of him, they still have a long way to go before they can eliminate him, and they know it.

Their plan is this: Cut the ground from under HALL'S feet, soften up his support by continuing their limitless smears; then get behind an innocent-looking candidate and use him to try to finish HALL off.

My undying objective between now and August 22 will be to throw the withering spotlight of public exposure upon these rats and foil their plot.

I do not know whether the political blueprint now being followed by the Binghamton Press is in use throughout the fast-growing Gannett newspapers, but if it is, I am certain this group is bent upon complete political domination of the Northeast.

I do know this, that I am fighting for my political life against a giddy Goliath, already drunk with power, and if I am to survive, I will have to use all the pebbles in my slingshot, which are no bigger than David's when he faced the giant.

I presume it was jumbled journalism like that practiced by the Binghamton Press which caused no less an American statesman than Thomas Jefferson to say:

> A man who never looks in a newspaper is better informed than he who reads them; inasmuch as he who knows nothing is nearer to the truth than he whose mind is filled with falsehoods and errors. (Source: UE News, November 28, 1949, p. 7.)

So the battle lines are drawn in the Thirty-seventh Congressional District: it is David against Goliath, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL versus the Binghamton Press.

The galaxy of candidates arrayed against me is of no consequence. The Press will knock out all of them before the time for filing arrives except the one made to order for the Press.

It would be foolhardy to deal with the candidates when the only opponent is the Binghamton Press.

The Press would have you think that HALL is the only one who has enemies. The thousands of letters I have received condemning the Binghamton Press for their 11 years' smear campaign against a man of the people proves the Press has a host of them.

The struggle is between the Press and me. The Press is so far out on the limb it cannot now retreat. The lines are drawn. There is no other issue from now on. Either the Press beats me, or it must retire from political dominance once and for all in our southern tier.

Let them call forth all the anti-HALL forces in this district. Let them encourage the large Communist cell which has operated without their interference for a long time in the triple cities.

Let them bring forth their greatest gobs of smear because they will need it.

I believe the decent, respectable, upstanding Americans of our section are still in the majority and that they will back me up in this, my Armageddon.

Essential Unity of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article by John Griffin from the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., April 16, 1950:

CROSS-COUNTRY TRIP REVEALS THAT WE CAN HAVE GREAT FAITH IN OUR LAND—REAL VOICE OF AMERICA IS ITS BUSY MACHINES AND ROLLING REAPERS—PRODUCTION POWER AMAZING

(By John Griffin)

Last week we flew from New York to Los Angeles on a quick trip which gave us a couple of days in California and a couple in Arizona and permitted us to be home before the week was out. It left us with a lot of awe for the majesty of America.

An American Airlines DC-6 coach service coast-to-coast was being inaugurated on Easter Sunday and a group of newspapermen were taken along on a preinaugural flight. We are not plugging for American Airlines, but we wish everyone could take such a trip.

It inspires a pride in America and a feeling for the country which cannot be had sitting at a desk. In the space of a few hours the might of the industrial East passes beneath, and the broad reaches of the Middle West, the great granary of America, are succeeded by the grandeur of the Rockies and then come the incredible areas of southern California.

You do a lot of thinking as you travel along at 300 miles an hour. You wonder at the ignorance and arrogance of the Communists and the pinkos who have the colossal gall to believe they can upset a nation of such magnitude and such potential.

Then you move around in California and the Southwest and talk to people in all walks of life, and you begin to wonder whether Washington has any conception of the way people are thinking.

FREEDOM A VITAL PART

You think of the things that might be wrong about America, the poverty that exists in certain areas, the political connivance that sometimes mars our national existence, and then you begin to realize that all these things are bound to fade away in the face of the great facts and the great possibilities that are in this country.

You sense most of all the freedom that is a vital part of America, where people travel about without ever a thought of State lines or any other boundaries in their realization that it is all one big country, full of power and majesty.

You talk to a movie director in Hollywood and a farmer in Arizona, a storekeeper in Chicago, and a mechanic in Detroit and you find that despite all the efforts of those who would destroy our form of government, they are making less progress than the headlines would indicate.

You wish that some of the people in the other nations of the world could come here, and that instead of groups going over to study Germany and other occupied areas, that Germans and others, particularly the influential people in the countries that border on the iron curtain, could be taken on a tour of the United States.

The Voice of America can never convey the stature of America. The best it can do is counteract some of the propaganda that is directed against the United States. The only way the real feeling of America can be transmitted abroad in an influential way is through people who see and know America.

REAL VOICE OF AMERICA

Rex Smith, vice president of American Airlines, has suggested in Washington that such a program of seeing America be provided for business and governmental and professional leaders of European countries. It would, we are convinced, do more to show our advantages than 100 Voices of America.

Because the Voice of America is not the voice of some script writer in Washington sent out over the air to foreign lands. The voice of America can be heard in the humming machinery of the industrial areas, in the clank of the reapers that cut through the vast wheat fields of the Midwest, in the thump of the pumps that bring water up from the earth to irrigate the farms and ranches of the Southwest.

It can be heard in the traffic noises on the highways of the Nation; in the busy roar of the big airports; in the streets of a thousand small towns. It can be felt by anyone who is attuned to it, and it forms a sound that inspires and quickens the spirit.

But even before people are brought from other lands to hear it, Americans should pay it more attention. Many Americans do not know their own country. Not everyone, of course, has the time and the means to travel, but as time goes on most people are having more opportunity for leisure, and perhaps it won't be long before the average person gets to know his own country.

Then the industrial worker of the East will know something about the man in the Midwest who owns his own land and works it, and the farmer of the West will appreciate the problems of his fellow countrymen whose way of making a living is different from his own.

CONFIDENCE IN FUTURE

Then there will be less fear in this country and more confidence in its future. The fear that too many politicians are fostering nowadays develops from lack of confidence in our own country. If we listened to the cries out of the Capital, the conflicting voices of the scientists and the politicians, and had no other information and no sense of what America really is, we would easily become prey to unreasonable hysteria.

It is impossible to cross the country and talk to people in other areas without obtaining a renewal of faith and a bolstering of confidence. You can't be in California for breakfast and in New York for dinner the same day without realizing the essential unity of America.

The Communists and the pinks can spout from the forums and do their utmost, but, fortunately, they are only a trifle in the Nation that reaches from the Atlantic to the Pacific across areas that, in every respect, hold unlimited possibilities for the future.

We intend to keep on hammering at Communists and deceitful politicians, but we have a new and unshakable faith in the greatness of this country as it stands and its limitless possibilities for the future.

Veterans' Hospital Facilities in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to bring to the attention of this body some recent communications that have come to my office on the deplorable veterans' hospital situation in California.

In addition to many letters from individual veterans, I have received communications from veterans' organizations, from local chambers of commerce, from other interested public and private groups urging reconsideration of the present policy of closing service facilities, in view of the probable drastic effects on veterans in need of medical care, on the personnel of the hospitals, and on the communities involved.

I should like to submit here only the communications from organizations. The first, from the American Veterans Committee, is on the general hospital situation. The other seven are similar resolutions protesting against the closing of the Van Nuys Birmingham Hospital and the removal of patients—including veterans—and staff to the naval hospital at Long Beach. These communications are from, first, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, San Fernando; second, San Fernando Chamber of Commerce; third, Sun Valley Chamber of Commerce; fourth, Woodland Hills Chamber of Commerce; fifth, Woodland Hills Men's Club; sixth, Council of the City of San Fernando; seventh, Kiwanis Club of Sepulveda.

Inasmuch as the resolutions in every case are practically identical, I give it below as it came to me from the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The signatories on the other resolutions are given in the order listed above.

AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE, INC.,
Washington, D. C., March 30, 1950.

The Honorable HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: The wholesale closing of Veterans' Administration hospitals, and those of the Army and Navy, has taken a particularly heavy toll in southern California. Our chapters of the American Veterans' Committee (AVC) in and around Los Angeles are greatly disturbed by the serious shortage of hospital beds for veterans in southern California, by the delay in getting new hospital construction under way, and by the closing of Army and Navy hospitals which had contracted to treat VA patients.

The closing of the Army's McCormack General Hospital and the Navy's Corona hospital has deprived California veterans of 325 hospital beds. The announced closing of the Navy's Long Beach and Mare Island hospitals will slash beds available another 550. This is the falsest sort of economy.

In fact, the number of veterans in California is steadily increasing as more and more people are moving to that State. To meet the needs of this growing veteran population, more hospital beds are needed, and needed now.

There are literally hundreds of veterans waiting to be admitted to southern California hospitals, particularly veterans who are mentally sick or tuberculous.

AVC wholeheartedly supports your effort, and that of your fellow southern California Congressmen, to get authority that will permit the VA to take over Army and Navy hospitals that have been closed, or are about to be closed.

We are united in our insistence that America's disabled, sick, and mentally ill veterans must get an even break. Indiscriminately closing hospitals to achieve a dollar saving of a few millions, while the loss in suffering and human waste mounts steadily, will in the end prove very costly to our country.

Sincerely,

LOUIS C. FAKNER,
Executive Director.

Resolution concerning the contemplated closing of the Van Nuys Birmingham Hospital, and the moving of patients and staff to the naval hospital at Long Beach

Whereas the transfer of the Birmingham Hospital and its facilities would seriously impair treatment now provided veterans in this area, for the reason that most of the doctors, specialists now involved in research work at nearby medical schools, would not move with it; and

Whereas the Birmingham Hospital in its present location represents a greater convenience to the veterans of the populous Los Angeles area who require treatment and regular visitation by relatives than if such a facility were located at some point outside the area of population concentration; and

Whereas the laboratory at the Birmingham Hospital, one of the largest and best equipped in the United States, is three or four times the size of the laboratory facilities available for research and treatment purposes in Long Beach; and

Whereas the cancer research program carried out here as well as the paraplegic rehabilitation program is likewise not equaled by a governmental hospital anywhere in the United States; and

Whereas more than $850,000 has already been provided local paraplegic veteran patients under Public Law 702 for 85 new homes built and occupied in this area with special features, ramps, low cupboards, shelves, fixtures, etc., for the convenience of those confined to wheel chairs, but of little use to normal individuals, a property investment on which the veteran as well as the Government would suffer loss in the event of resale; and

Whereas the climate of the San Fernando Valley, with its comparatively light rainfall, freedom from cold, fogs, and smog, and even climate bordering on that found in desert areas, is more conducive to the well-being of the 455 patients suffering from tuberculosis and other respiratory ailments at the Birmingham Hospital, than the climate to be found at Long Beach, adjacent to the ocean; and

Whereas it would require a 20-percent increase in personnel to staff the Long Beach Hospital because of its inconvenient ward arrangements, resulting in more than $1,000,000 a year added cost for veteran patient care; and

Whereas more than 60 percent of the employees, doctors, laboratory workers, hospital attendants, nurses, and their families are veterans who have bought homes near the hospital, an investment on which they would sustain a loss if the hospital is moved elsewhere; and

Whereas the closing of the Birmingham Hospital with its $5,500,000 a year pay roll would be a serious blow to the economy of the metropolitan and San Fernando Valley areas, a source of prosperity upon which business establishments have long expected they might depend: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Captain Frank L. Muller Post, No. 2829, Veterans of Foreign Wars, United States Veterans' Administration Hospital, San Fernando, Calif., does hereby register its objection to the proposed move, and further recommends that the Birmingham Hospital be established by the Veterans' Administration on a permanent basis, both with respect to buildings and all other facilities.

Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Captain Frank Muller Post, No. 2829, San Fernando, Calif., Norman E. Zeller, Commander, Edmond J. O'Brien, Adjutant; San Fernando Chamber of

Commerce, San Fernando, Calif., J. W. Flynn, President, Harold R. Allen; Sun Valley Chamber of Commerce, Sun Valley, Calif., S. F. Muhlittner, President, George D. Hildebrandt, Secretary; Woodland Hills Chamber of Comerce, Woodland Hills, Calif., C. C. Livingston, President; Woodland Hills Men's Club, Woodland Hills, Calif., Richard William Hutchings, President; Council of the City of San Fernando, San Fernando, Calif., Bryce Schnurr, mayor, Ray A. Woods, City Clerk; Kiwanis Club of Sepulveda, Sepulveda, Calif., Gordon W. McKay, President, C. Benjamin Bemis.

Greater Lawrence Industrial Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very excellent editorial that appeared in the April 13, 1950, edition of the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass.

This article contains a great deal of constructive thought and most worthwhile suggestion. No doubt it is a step in the right direction, and I am sure a most progressive step for the community of Greater Lawrence, Mass.:

WHAT IS YOUR FUTURE?

The formation of the Greater Lawrence Industrial Corp. is, to me, an indication of reborn confidence and faith in Greater Lawrence. I believe the other nine incorporators of the corporation feel as I do.

The object of this new corporation is to stimulate the promotion of the economic and industrial welfare of the people of Greater Lawrence, to maintain and increase opportunities for employment.

Ten incorporators cannot do this alone. The program, to be effective, needs the help and cooperation of everyone.

I am not an alarmist, nor am I wearing rose-colored glasses. I am, however, a businessman, and use, I think, a business approach to most problems. We, here in Greater Lawrence, do have a problem. We have groups which have diagnosed the ills as deadly with no hope of survival; others, as minor irritations that will clear up in time. Both are right—minor now, but deadly, if we neglect them.

I refer to the migration of New England industries to other parts of the country and the curtailment of activity by the inability of our mills to meet competitive bids for orders because of higher production costs and higher taxes than in other sections and which also handicap us in attracting new industries. I have in mind the present unemployment conditions in our local industries caused by the lack of orders. I also have in mind the resultant financial stress of some of our families even now, and the lack of spending money which will eventually be reflected in retail business and, as the cycle completes itself, will be felt by the manufacturers whose production is governed by demand.

These conditions exist not only in Lawrence, they prevail in many cities and towns throughout New England and particularly in Massachusetts. Textile cities like Lawrence, in false confidence in the future, did nothing about revaluating and readjusting their positions after the boom, war days.

Since accepting the presidency of the Greater Lawrence Industrial Corp. on March 30, I have made a personal survey of diversified Nation-wide industries which, I hoped, might be interested in coming to this community. But, at the suggestion of locating here, the answer was emphatically "No," not only as far as Lawrence is concerned, but Massachusetts as well.

The reasons?

First, the penalty of State legislation on corporations. I learned that in 1941, business paid, throughout the 48 States, an average of 14½ percent of all State tax collections with the exception of property, sales, and certain license and privilege taxes. At that time, Massachusetts business paid to this State just about the average, 14.3 percent of all tax collections. In 1948, however, Massachusetts business paid the highest percentage of any State, 33.6 percent, the average for the country being 18.1 percent. In 7 years the picture has changed sharply in this State, from an average experience to one where business is taxed nearly twice as much as in the average State. I also learned that in Massachusetts, $100,000 of plant property pays $20,500 per year in taxes, whereas in Illinois, for example, this same property would pay only $8,450. How can we compete with this?

The other reason was the lack of employee cooperation and lower production per worker in comparison to similar industries in other sections of the country. I, personally, feel that workers, seeking what is their just due, should receive every help from management, but, it is also my conviction that local conditions and the plant's ability to meet demands must receive the serious consideration of employees for the preservation of their jobs.

It is encouraging to learn that some communities are waking up to the threat to their existence and that they and State authorities throughout the region are taking more direct action to solve problems of plant, space, financing, and taxation, in order to improve prospects for industry and jobs in New England. Programs are taking a variety of forms. In Maine, a Development Credit Corporation, pooling a small part of resources of Maine banks and other financial institutions, has opened its doors to make capital available to promising enterprises. Civic programs, along the idea of our Greater Lawrence Industrial Corporation, are being organized throughout New England. The State of Rhode Island moves to relieve one major complaint of its manufacturers by ordering an average cut of 24.5 percent in compulsory workmen's compensation rates. In Massachusetts, a special commission on taxation has inaugurated a study of the tax structure of the Commonwealth, with special emphasis on the burden of taxation in industry, and will present the most urgent problems to the 1950 legislature.

All these are steps in the right direction, but we, here in Greater Lawrence, also need local and more direct action.

I believe we are letting Greater Lawrence down. All of us, by sitting around, wringing our hands and moaning, or waving our arms in alarm, but actually doing nothing. I do not believe that being labeled a distress area and waiting for orders to be channeled through is going to solve our problem. It might afford minor, temporary relief, and our legislators should see to it that activities are channeled to Lawrence to help alleviate conditions until a more permanent and secure solution can be worked out. We want Lawrence to get orders, lots of them, not because Lawrence can't keep up in the race, but because Lawrence can produce more efficiently, more harmoniously, than any other city.

Greater Lawrence is a closely knit community as we have proved in the past by the big and small projects that we have "put over." In this kind of unity there is strength and, if we approach this problem united, there is no reason why we can't surmount it. If we are serious and sincere about improving conditions in our area, we must forget personal gains, and all work together. Your future, as well as that of each and every one of the 124,849 people in Greater Lawrence, is at stake.

The solution depends upon us; but, we do need the wholehearted cooperation of all groups from all segments of the community, city government, management, labor, big and small business owners, public organizations, and even the fellow who works for a weekly pay check.

Why can't we have a meeting of men representative of these groups and find out what, and how much, can be done before it is too late?

Mayor James P. Meehan, will you call such a meeting by inviting representatives from these various groups?

Perhaps we have made mistakes in the past, but let's forget them now and really put our shoulders to the wheel to insure a brighter and better future for all in Greater Lawrence.

We must, we can, and we will succeed.

IRVING E. ROGERS,
Publisher.

What Is the Government Deficit and Who Will Pay It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I have written a letter to some of my constituents and have found the interest therein so great that I have decided to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it may have a wider distribution:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1950.

WHO WILL PAY THE GOVERNMENT DEFICIT?

DEAR CONSTITUENTS: We will all pay for this deficit spending program, and we should not kid ourselves that it will be otherwise. Everyone pays taxes. The cost of Government is being paid by each one of us, either directly in personal income and consumer excise taxes, or property taxes, or indirectly in the inflation of prices which result from the imposition of income and excise taxes upon the corporations which produce the commodities we buy. Therefore, every one of us should be deeply concerned about the fact that we are spending more money than we are taking in.

Most people think that Government finances are so complex and intricate, and the figures involved are so astronomical, that they as laymen cannot understand them. But let me say, as a certified public accountant, that the same principles are involved whether the business be large or small, and the net results are identical. In other words, a successful executive of a large corporation wants the picture of his operation reduced to the smallest component part. Therefore, I am going to try to analyze the administration's budget by reducing it at a ratio to compare to the average man's problems.

Exact figures presented by the Bureau of the Budget in its statement to Congress:

National defense	$13,500,000,000
Veterans	6,100,000,000
Interest on public debt	5,600,000,000
International program	4,700,000,000
Social welfare, health, security	2,700,000,000
Natural resources	2,200,000,000
Agriculture	2,200,000,000
Housing, education	1,800,000,000
Transportation, communication	1,700,000,000
General Government	1,300,000,000
Labor, finance, commerce, and industry	500,000,000
To be spent	42,300,000,000
Estimated budget receipts (take-in)	37,300,000,000
Deficit (loss)	5,000,000,000

Let us translate these figures at the same ratio into a budget we will assume as our own.

PERSONAL BUDGET

What does it mean?

We know we are going to spend $4,230 (Federal budget, $42,300,000,000).

We think we will earn $3,730 (estimated Federal receipts, $37,300,000,000).

We will have a shortage of $500 (estimated Federal deficit, $5,000,000,000).

Where are we going to get that $500? Naturally we are going to have to borrow it. But we must not forget that we are already in debt in the amount of $25,593. (Federal debt as of March 22, 1950, $255,931,000,000.) It is also alarming to note that the interest we will have to pay on our debt is $560 (Federal interest, $5,600,000,000) and next year it will be even more because we are increasing our debt.

Our earnings

We are sure we are going to spend $4,230, but we are not sure that we are going to earn $3,730. In fact, business is not quite so good as it was when we made our budget, and it looks as though our earnings will be less, which means our deficit will be greater. Also, shouldn't we consider the fact that we are going into debt in boom times? What would we do in the event of some emergency?

Analysis of spending

We are going to spend $470 (Federal budget, $4,700,000,000 for international program) to help our neighbors who are just recovering from a big disaster which has also hit us and which is partly responsible for our debt, at least the biggest portion of our debt. Don't you think that our personal financial condition is just as important as theirs? In other words, must we not remain in good financial condition if we are going to continue to help them, as we know they expect us to do? Frankly, our own family does not have all it needs at present (unemployment today, imports in competition with our own products, etc.). To be specific, we know that our neighbors can't help us. Therefore, we had better not get into a financial position which will put us in trouble.

Also, bear in mind that the money which we are giving these neighbors they are using to pay off their internal debts, paying their own relatives what they owe them, while we are building up the same type of debt and have no one to help us pay ours off. Furthermore, they are not using this money as it was intended, to rehabilitate themselves, build homes, etc.

What will you do about it?

I think you will take care of your own family first, and then judiciously assist your neighbors. I firmly believe our family welfare (the United States) should come first, not from a selfish standpoint but from the standpoint of self-preservation and good economics.

RETURN TO FEDERAL BUDGET

Interest on public debt

Let us take a look at the amount of interest the Government is paying on its huge debt of $255,900,000,000. Of course, we cannot eliminate the interest item but we certainly can reduce it. This interest amounts to more than what we are spending on housing, education, social welfare, health, security, labor, finance, commerce, and industry combined.

Do you realize that this interest is costing the taxpayers $15,000,000 a day and, in addition, that the interest on the deficit which we are creating this year will cost us $375,000 a day, at the 2.7 percent average interest rate which the Government pays? Take your pencils and figure it out. Inasmuch as this is a growing item during good times, shouldn't we be concerned about reducing it now?

Agriculture

Then, too, you should know that, under our present Government program, agriculture is going to cost more than shown in the budget, because the losses are not shown which the Commodity Credit Corporation is bound to take on the $4,000,000,000 worth of commodities which they had as of January 31, 1950. We have a billion dollars worth of cotton (1 year's supply) on hand now, and yet Congress has foolishly increased the cotton acreage by 1,200,000 acres for this year. (I voted against it.)

"We owe it to ourselves"

The proponents of this deficit-spending program say: What difference does it make since we owe this money to ourselves? Surely this is a silly philosophy because we know that not everyone owns the Government bonds which comprise this debt. However, we all pay taxes, part of which is used to pay the interest on these bonds. Furthermore, the integrity of the Nation is tied up in the promise to pay off these bonds with interest.

Government's ultimate "out"

If this deficit spending continues, the Government will either have to take over and wipe out all the debts, or else change the value of the currency. The first alternative I know 90 percent of us are opposed to. As to the "funny money" idea, too few people realize that such a move would be as costly as refinancing their automobile.

Budget can be cut

The President's budget can be cut. All it takes is the will to cut it, and the cooperation of the President, the various bureaus, and Congress, and the people throughout the country who must quit demanding increased acreages, increased subsidies, and increased profits. As Henry Hazlitt said in Newsweek of January 2: "The hand-out state will last * * * until the voter sees that he is being bribed with his own money."

Where there is a will there is a way. We proved it in the last war. We proved it in the last Congress. That Eightieth Congress, which President Truman described as the worst in the Nation's history, hired their own experts and found a way not only to balance the budget but to pay off $17,000,000,000 of the public debt, which of course reduced interest proportionately. Yes, the propaganda machines of the bureaucratic departments raised a howl. But, I ask you, which is the more important: satisfying their demands or saving the Nation?

This present Eighty-first Congress is going to add about $10,000,000,000 at the minimum to the public debt. Need I say more?

Illustrations

Just to show you that there is room for economy, here are a few simple illustrations taken from testimony at the current hearings before the Appropriations Committee:

The Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine asked funds for 63 new automobiles. Committee investigators reported that the Bureau's Denver office, with 35 persons, had 217 automobiles. In the first 4 months of 1949, 194 of the Denver cars were unused and the Denver office has 80 cars for which it contemplated no future use.

During the campaign to kill grasshoppers last year, the Bureau rented one airplane at $100 per hour. The $100-an-hour plane cost the owner $6,600, but the Department paid a rental of $27,000 in 2 weeks.

A DC-3 plane was rented at $450 an hour. One of the larger air lines told the committee investigators that they would rent a similar plane with pilot, copilot and stewardess at $150 an hour and make a 25-percent profit.

Investigators located an airplane owned by the Bureau in a Macon, Ga., hangar. They said that in 2 years and 3 months it made flights totaling 30 hours.

Testimony brought out that the Bureau miscalculated on the number of grasshoppers per yard and not enough spray was used, and it had to be done over again.

Investigators learned that the Bureau sent one-half of a truck unit to Florida, the other half to Texas, in order to prevent another agency of the Department from using it.

In November 1949, a division of the Bureau declared 9,064 pencils surplus. They had been on hand since 1942.

More enlightenment from Agriculture Department: A Department announcement solemnly says: "About a fourth of the families living in open-country areas own a piece of tarpaulin and about twice as many farm families own a piece as nonfarm families in the same area, according to the result of a personal interview survey made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in May and June 1949. Of those who own them, about one out of every three has more than one piece." (And think what that investigation cost the taxpayer.)

Just spend it, it's only taxpayer's money: Testimony of Jess Larson, Administrator of General Services, before the Appropriations subcommittee, revealed that one Government agency had a supply of the following articles:

Fluorescent light bulbs to last for 93 years.
Ruled filler paper to last for 168 years.
Loaseleaf binders to last for 247 years.
Tracing cloth to last for 9 years.

Selling the ECA: The Economic Cooperation Administration shortly will request $2,950,000,000 to finance the Marshall plan for another year. In connection with this, ECA has just hired five new press agents at a cost of $39,450 a year and engaged a magazine "consultant" at the rate of $50 a day when consulted. ECA also reveals it is looking for additional magazine and newspaper writers to act as press agents. The appropriation for publicity for ECA in this country is $285,000 for the fiscal year.

Your responsibility

Again I remind you that each of you has a responsibility and you should make your demands known to your elected officials. The best way to do this is at election time.

Sincerely yours,

NORRIS POULSON,
Member of Congress.

Lattimore and Russian Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Owen Lattimore, the target for Jos

McCarthy's pot shots has made his own record on communism. It has been in print for some time and the Senator has rendered a real public service by turning some light on Lattimore's views. I am including an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of April 6 which cites chapter and verse on this State Department's Far East expert. It is fair to imply after reading the editorial that Lattimore loves the U. S. S. R. more than the United States of America. He should be removed immediately from any connection with our foreign policy anywhere in the world.

LATTIMORE'S VISION OF DESTINY

Owen Lattimore, accused by Senator McCarthy as a Soviet agent who is or has been a member of the Communist Party, is to appear today before a Senate investigating committee. Denials will occasion no surprise. But if Mr. Lattimore is not what Senator McCarthy says he is, then what is he?

By his own representations and in the belief of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, Mr. Lattimore is an authority on Asia. Senator McCarthy asserts that the State Department considers him the outstanding authority. Mr. Lattimore is further described as the architect of America's far eastern policy—a policy which everywhere has led to American retreat while Russia has been advancing.

Mr. Lattimore has written widely on these matters. If there are any salient points in his doctrine, they may be reduced to these general propositions:

1. That Soviet Russia is a young and vital nation, producing leaders who are "men of destiny," and that the Russian rise to power is fated. On the other hand, America and the west produce mediocrities as leaders, western thought is no longer dynamic, and western nations, however good in intention, are helpless in action.

2. That Russia stands for democracy, prosperity, progress, security, and freedom in the eyes of Asiatics, but that the West has exhausted its powers of creativeness, has become old and rigid, and, in Asiatic minds, is associated with discredited imperialism.

3. That Russia, through inevitable historic force, exercises an irresistible power of attraction over the people of all adjacent territories; that this cannot be called Red imperialism; that it signifies "hope" to the peoples of Asia; and that Soviet methods of expansion deserve careful and respectful study.

4. Finally, that there is nothing that we can do about Russia's winning of Asia; that we must keep hands off; that nothing succeeds like success; and that "to be progressive in politics means to be on the side of that which is going up and against that which is going down."

Mr. Lattimore's outlook may be buttressed by citations from his own works. For example, on point 1:

"Russia appears to be the only nation of the modern world that is 'young' enough to have 'men of destiny.' It produces its Lenin and its Stalin; they follow each other with the certainty of fate. Russia, more than China and more than any nation of the West, is launched on a career of growth, and grow it will, irrespective of the leader. Russia, of all countries, is the one of which it can be said not only that something new may happen, but that something new is bound to happen." (Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict, p. 294.)

"* * * It cannot be said of American or British politics of the present day that a Harding, a Coolidge, a Hoover, or a Lloyd George, a Baldwin, or a MacDonald, are 'men of destiny.' * * * Our modern tendency to create commissions and delegate committees is a confession of subconscious loss of confidence in the inevitability of our leaders." (Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict, pp. 293–294.)

"The specific internationalism of the West, with its characteristics of good will in intention and helplessness in action, is an index of the fact that the civilizations of the West no longer guide the civilization which they created. Yet the old western passion for individualism, responsibility, and assertive control lives on; our leaders only last so long as they can keep up the illusion of controlling the uncontrollable." (Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict, p. 293.)

Point 2:

"To all of these peoples (Asiatics bordering on Russia) the Russians and the Soviet Union have a great power of attraction. In their eyes—rather doubtfully in the eyes of the older generation, more and more clearly in the eyes of the younger generation—the Soviet Union stands for strategic security, economic prosperity, technological progress, miraculous medicine, free education, equality of opportunity, and democracy; a powerful combination." (Solution in Asia, p. 139.)

"The truth is that the Russian model of civilization is not built up so high above its foundations that to adapt it to local requirements need postulate extensive sacrifice of essential structural elements. Thus it can offer to any population a model which, while Russian in action, is largely local in structure—whereas both the western and the Chinese models have been so specialized in the course of their own evolution that they are old and rigid, and must handle new material more inconsiderately in order to adapt it to their own requirements. Russian action can therefore more easily accomplish its effects by the dynamic use of converted minorities." (Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict, p. 245.)

"There seems to be no conclusion but that the west has exhausted its powers of creativeness." (Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict, p. 293.)

"All of the peoples of Asia, each in its degree—the subject colonial peoples and the people of China whose liberty had been encroached on, though not destroyed, by nineteenth century imperialism—were startled into hope, expectation, or political daydreaming by the Russian revolution." (Solution in Asia, p. 68.)

"The age of imperialism, though not dead, is withering. The decades of drift are over. We must now set a course. Have we any idea what course to set?" (Solution in Asia, p. 55.)

Point 3:

"Granted the inevitable historic force of the Russian attraction toward the Pacific; granted their reluctance to cooperate with Chinese under Chinese rule, but their proved talent for combination with all kinds of alien elements under their own rule; granted their ability to settle on the land itself, and their superior talent for modernization without corollary subordination to the west—it is difficult not to foresee a steady increase of Russian influence in the region roughly bounded on the south by the Chinese Eastern Railway. It is possible even to foresee actual Russian occupation to an indefinite depth south of the Amur." (Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict, pp. 252–253.)

This "cannot fairly be called Red imperialism." (The Situation in Asia.)

"Throughout Asia today there prevails an atmosphere of hope, not of despair. * * * What they see opening up before them is a limitless horizon of hope—the hope of peaceful, constructive activities in free countries, and peaceful cooperation among free peoples." (The Situation in Asia, p. 238.)

Stalin's formula "is so electrifyingly exact that it should be studied with cautious respect." (The Situation in Asia.) "It certainly establishes a standard with which other nations must compete if they wish to practice a policy of attraction in Asia. Russo-Mongol relations in Asia, like Russo-Czechoslovak relations in Europe, deserve careful and respectful study." (Same volume.)

Point 4:

"Clearly the Communist ascendancy had become so decisive that it could not be reversed." (The Situation in Asia, p. 151.)

"We must also abandon the stubbornly lingering delusion that we can somehow maintain footholds by supporting rump territories or rump government somewhere south of the Yangtze, or on the coast, or in Formosa." (The Situation in Asia, p. 179.) This was written when the Chinese Communists were north of the Yangtze and controlled only one-third of China.

"To be progressive in politics means to be on the side of that which is going up and against that which is going down." (The Situation in Asia.)

Senator McCarthy suggested that this last statement explains Mr. Lattimore. By his every account, Soviet Russia and communism are bound to triumph. It is historically inevitable—the Marxian view. So, said the Senator, Mr. Lattimore has chosen his side.

If the investigating committee finds that Mr. Lattimore is not what Senator McCarthy says he is, will it kindly tell the American people just what he is?

The Budget and the Spending Program of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the Record two letters, and include a newspaper article dealing with the budget and the spending program of the Government. One of the letters is from an old friend in Texas; the other from an outstanding constituent, giving the views of a chamber of commerce in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I was home during the 10-day recess. I find people more and more disturbed about the big spending by the Federal Government. It seems that your party has adopted deficit spending as a way of life. People are beginning to realize that their dollar is buying less and less. Indeed the Government may find considerable difficulty in selling their bonds, unless the people can be assured that the dollar they put in such savings will be worth a dollar when it is drawn out. It seems to me that the first obligation of government is that of guaranteeing sound money to its people. The Government, the banks, insurance and trust companies are unofficial custodians of the people's money. We just cannot have sound money when we continue to spend more than we take in.

Mr. Speaker, your party, with a majority of 91 in the House, now controls all legislation, and it seems incumbent upon you and your party to take the lead in cutting the fat out of the Federal

budget and bring it into balance with our income.

APRIL 17, 1950.

Dr. A. L. MILLER,
Congressman, Fourth District, Nebraska.

DEAR DOCTOR: I have been reading a lot in the last few months about the wild spending of Harry Truman, backed by the Democratic wing of our legislators. I feel that you are of my opinion—that we are on the road to destroying our American way of life.

With a national debt of $256,000,000,000 and interest of over $5,000,000,000 a year, our economic resources are overloaded. Today I cut the enclosed clipping from the McAllen Monitor, a valley daily paper. After you have read it I would like to know if what is stated here is the truth: If it is only half true, it is the biggest piece of racketeering one could think of in a country which is not at war. Our Government bonds cannot possibly bring par and the income tax and other internal revenues will not pay the bill.

Much has been written and said in justification of the Marshall plan, but you know, and I know that you cannot buy democracy or prosperity with any kind of money.

Is not there some way to stop this wild spending and balance our budget to include a liberal payment on our debts?

In this article it says that the Government will have to borrow $9,000,000,000 in the next year to pay the millions of Government employees and carry out Truman's planned expenditures. I have some Liberty bonds in my box at the bank, and am seriously thinking of cashing them for what I can get as, in my opinion, they will not be worth 50 cents on the dollar in a short time. What do you think? The clipping is from the April 7, 1950, paper.

I would be glad if you'd take this up with LLOYD M. BENTSEN, Jr., our Representative from the valley, and with others you may wish to contact, as something has to be done, and it is only through our Congress, in my opinion, that any headway can be made.

Would be glad if you'd also interview our Representatives from Texas and see if you can't get their help. I am not in the habit of asking favors of our Congressmen or Senators, but this is too serious a matter to stand quietly by and not express an opinion. You have known me for many years, and know I am inclined to be optimistic. With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely.

[From the McAllen (Tex.) Monitor of April 7, 1950]

GOVERNMENT TO START BORROWING MORE MONEY

WASHINGTON.—The Government, expected to overspend its income by more than $9,000,000,000 in the next 15 months, will start borrowing new money next week to make ends meet.

That will add considerably to the Government's debts, which already total nearly $256,000,000,000.

The first step in the new borrowing program, as announced by Secretary of the Treasury Snyder Thursday night, will take this form:

The Treasury owes about $900,000,000 in 91-day bills falling due April 13. It will sell $1,000,000,000 in new 91-day bills that day to pay off the due debt and leave it $100,000,000 extra cash.

Except in scale, the transaction will be the same as that of a man who has a $900 note falling due at the bank next Thursday and takes care of it by giving a new note for $1,000.

MORE FALLING DUE

The Treasury will have a chance to pick up an extra $100,000,000 in each of the two succeeding weeks by identical transactions, for it has $900,000,000 issues of 91-day bills also falling due April 20 and 27.

Next week will mark the first time in 7 months that the Treasury has sought to borrow extra funds in the public money market, made up mostly of banks.

Since last September it has been paying off securities falling due by selling practically identical amounts of new securities.

It has not, however, been heavily pressed for cash in that time, partly because the Government has run only about $1,370,000,000 in the red since the 1950 fiscal year started last July 1.

Also, it could stall along by using cash on hand, borrowing from Government trust funds (particularly the social security fund), and looking forward to heavy income tax collections in March.

As it turned out, income tax receipts proved disappointingly low, raising a threat that the Government income may fall short of expenses by more than the $5,533,000,000 total President Truman figured for this fiscal year.

Worse still, nearly $4,200,000,000 of that deficit will be piled up between now and the fiscal year's end June 30, and the President has estimated that income will fall $5,100,000,000 short of spending in the following 12 months fiscal 1951.

PAYING INTEREST

The Treasury already is paying out more than $5,700,000,000 a year to cover interest charges on the old and climbing debt.

Right now, the Treasury has around $5,650,000,000 in cash on hand, some of which can be used in taking care of the coming deficit costs.

Much of it, however, must be kept on hand as a sort of reserve against emergencies, in view of the billions in back debt on which payment could be demanded any time and in view of the scale of Government outlays.

The practice is to keep at least $3,000,000,000 in cash on hand at all times, and borrowing to meet cash needs in excess of that minimum balance.

In the borrowing operation, funds will be obtained not only from banks and other lending institutions but also from the trust funds and from the individual sales of savings bonds.

APRIL 10, 1950.

Representative A. L. MILLER,
House of Representatives (Nebraska), Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: In behalf of a chamber of commerce and community in Nebraska and to add my personal feelings, I would like to add a voice to the many letters you must receive on the state of the Union as it now exists.

There is an incessant demand on the streets of this city for more economy in our Government affairs. On April 18 the House will be voting on the $29,000,000,000 single-package bill. The over-all total of Government expenditures must be cut in all events. In order to satisfy the political demands of the Nation, the bill should be sent back to the Appropriations Committee with order to distribute cuts among the various agencies and departments. Our solicitations to you are almost in the nature of a demand that your vote be on the side of economy at every opportunity. Unless cuts are made, the public is about ready to question the financial status of the Government. On the streets I hear questions raised on the Government bonds themselves. If the Nation gets fearful of the credit of the United States and they commence cashing their bonds in wholesale fashion, this Nation will resound with cries of anguish from all quarters. Whenever the public becomes fearful of its Government, we are on the road to complete ruin. I believe that the people in this community are in a state of unrest because of the fiscal policy of the United States Government. The people still want their little dole, but they are slowly wakening to what is going on. It is for you and me to comprehend this situation and to make our complaints in the form of a demand with all the strength and power that we possess.

I find myself personally advising crowds at the sale of real estate to get the money out of the banks and cash their bonds because of the fiscal policy of the Government. This letter is a warning as best I can compose the same that great trouble lies ahead unless you boys put up a stronger fight than has been manifest heretofore. Our people are getting tired of the lip service of their Congressmen and the lack of action on the part of Congress. TAFT has hit a good line when he states that the only way to change this policy of our Government is to have a change of administration. That statement is taking hold of the public mind. The gang war in Kansas City is linked directly to the President's door. The Congress should be urged to look deeply into gang warfare. It is more deeply connected with Government than we are willing to admit. I believe nothing constructive will be done until Congress itself awakens to the peril of this country.

In fairness this community would like to know why there is such little progress in enacting many of the Hoover Commission recommendations. The recommendations are the heart and the over-all demand of this Nation for economy measures. Your office is varied in its duties, but instead of answering this letter, this community asks you to not give up the fight and do more than you have done, even though you think you have done your best. The best you have done is not good enough. It is time to do more.

With kind personal regards.

Carroll Binder Reports From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Carroll Binder, editorial editor of the Minneapolis Tribune, has earned for himself the reputation in the State of Minnesota as one of the most outstanding of our citizens. His writings on international affairs demonstrate an objectivity, coupled with a firm dedication to democratic principles, which make him, in my opinion, one of the most valuable writers in American journalism. He has been observing, reporting, and analyzing major news developments throughout the world ever since he graduated from Harvard in 1916. In 1922 he joined the Chicago Daily News. As foreign correspondent, and later as foreign editor and director of that newspaper's foreign service, Carroll Binder reported the rise of fascism in Italy, nazism in Germany, and communism in Russia. He became editorial editor of the Minneapolis Tribune in 1945, and we have been grateful to welcome him as our neighbor and fellow Minnesotan. During World War II Mr. Binder covered the war in the Pacific and in Europe, and following the war was present in San Francisco for the formation of the United Nations.

Most recently Mr. Binder made a trip to western Europe. With 14 other editors he spent 3 weeks studying the operation of the Economic Recovery Program. He then spent 2 more weeks investigating other problems of western Europe, particularly as they affect American foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of articles entitled "Carroll Binder Reports From Europe."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BINDER SEES HOPE DIM FOR WEST UNITY—RULING ELEMENTS CLING TO NATIONALIST PRIDE, TOURING WRITER FINDS

(By Carroll Binder)

PARIS, FRANCE.—If you expect the nations of western Europe to scrap their separate nationalisms shortly, and form a United States of Europe in return for the billions put up by American taxpayers, you're in for a big disappointment.

I have heard much talk about integration in each of the four countries I have visited during the past 5 weeks.

I found many individuals who share the belief of many Americans that the European democracies cannot survive politically or economically if they persist in trying to remain independent and in trying to become self-sufficient.

NOT READY TO YIELD

But I found no evidence that ruling elements in any country soon will be ready to give up their national sovereignties for the purpose of changing Europe into one big market of 270,000,000 people.

This change is what Paul Hoffman and other American spokesmen are asking for when they advocate integration.

"The only real Europeans are the Americans," hard-bitten west German Socialist leader Kurt Schumacher said in reply to my inquiry about the prospects for European integration.

Schumacher voiced disgust at the intense nationalism rampant in Europe, particularly among his fellow Socialists in other countries.

He justifies his own intense nationalism by the lack of camaraderie he finds in British and French socialism.

THREATENED STATES

The only possibility of political and economic union Schumacher sees is between western Germany and Austria.

Since the Marshall plan emphasizes American interest in uniting Europe, and since integration has become to many Americans a measure of the success or failure of our aid to Europe, this adherence of western Europeans to nationalism is of major significance.

To one unfamiliar with European history, economics, politics, traditions, and temperament this resistance to integration may seem stupid, perverse, and unappreciative of American aid and advice.

To one familiar with the power manipulating on the other side of the iron curtain—750,000,000 people scattered over 15,000,000 square miles and great natural resources at the command of the most ruthless and purposeful dictatorship in history—the persistence of separate western European nationalisms and the failure to integrate may seem suicidal.

THINKING OUT LOUD

This series of articles is more of a report on things as they are and appear likely to be several years hence than a discussion of what should be done.

It may not be amiss to say that a study of talk about integration is likely to leave one less clear as to what Congress and ECA spokesmen mean when they urge integration upon western Europeans.

It also is likely to create serious doubts as to whether political integration of western Europe outside of both the American and Soviet systems is desirable from the standpoint of the United States.

There could not be the sort of economic integration we urge without some political integration.

This is not to imply that western Europe can survive in its present divided condition but to say that our own concepts of integration at present are too confused and unrealistic to warrant our attaching so much importance to such a formula.

Something more sound and more apt to endure seems to be necessary.

The American people probably will have to show more willingness to integrate with Europe before they can prevail upon Europeans to integrate with each other.

Europeans would be more impressed if Americans integrated their talks about integration.

There is a tremendous spread between what Americans urge Europeans to do—sometimes the same Americans.

At times our spokesmen seem to be insisting that tariff walls be abolished, fiscal policies be coordinated and currencies be made interchangeable to the extent that only a United States of Europe could achieve.

At other times our spokesmen seem to have in mind only small regional tariff groupings, abolition of quota restrictions on intra-European trade and aiming at the general reduction of tariff barriers.

Vested interests in each country naturally fight any modification of existing national barriers which seem essential to continuance of their profits, jobs, prestige, or influence.

French wine growers don't want to have to compete with Italian wines and Italian automobile manufacturers don't want to have to compete with British cars in the domestic markets.

Workers in other countries oppose the admission of Italy's surplus workers for any except poorly paid or exceptionally arduous work such as farm labor or mining. European steel production already promises to exceed present annual consumption by about 8,000,000 tons.

Nevertheless each government would like to make itself independent of others in steel and other key production.

But resistance to early and far-reaching lowering of national barriers is not confined to self-centered special interest. A sudden lowering of long-existing barriers in such an unbalanced area as western Europe would create economic and social problems graver than those it is desired to solve.

Every government must think about the welfare of its own people as well as the general welfare. It is normal that prudent governments should be cautious about exposing their people to unemployment and other economic dislocation which might result from giving free rein to less prudent governments of other countries.

A Swedish leader had this in mind when he said his people would not consent to linking their fortunes too closely with "Frenchmen and Italians who are addicted to tax evasion and blackmarketing"—practices frowned upon in his country.

A Dutchman who has seen how much more luxuriously Italians doing the kind of work he does are able to live in Italy's "free" economy balks at pooling his country's frugal economy with Italy's. The Dutch limit their families and share their limited resources to keep their national house in order. The Italians go on reproducing at their traditional rate despite a chronic overpopulation of 2,000,000 for which at present there is neither employment nor a home abroad.

It is difficult to integrate economies such as those of Britain, the Netherlands, and Scandinavia (planned along Socialist lines) with relatively unplanned economies such as those of France and Belgium. Such fundamental differences exist between neighboring Belgium and the Netherlands that Benelux, the pioneer European project for elimination of customs barriers, has yet to be implemented.

The three Scandinavian countries have as good a basis for union as can be found anywhere. But, despite common institutions and other integrating forces, differences in wealth and conflicts between industries thus far have prevented implementation of the long-discussed customs union.

Sudden abolition of barriers would throw about 50,000 Norwegian women textile workers out of employment. Their product couldn't compete with the more efficient Swedish textile industry. But the Norwegian women could not be moved elsewhere because their husbands are engaged in fishing. The families must remain near the sea, and the mills have gone to fishing towns to obtain this available female labor. If Sweden would buy Norway's chemicals, Norway could buy Sweden's textiles, but Sweden developed its own chemical industry as a defense measure.

Even in the case of Belgium and Luxemburg, there are constant rows over joint trade agreements with other countries. Luxemburg is primarily dependent on its steel industry. Belgium has a steel industry, but its textiles are more important. When Belgolux negotiates a trade agreement with Norway, the Belgians insist on disposing of a lot of textiles, while the Luxemburgers insist on Norway taking a large part of its payment in steel.

Such experiences with limited forms of integration and such moods in western Europe lead Prof. Gottfried Haberler, of Harvard, to believe that only a dictator or the imminent danger of being taken over by Soviet aggressors could induce the various countries to abandon their separate national sovereignties and become one sovereignty.

Haberler believes that collapse of the dictatorship or subsidence of the crisis would lead to the quick disintegration of such a forced western European union. He thinks the planned and the unplanned societies would each try to go their own ways rather than remain united. Less comprehensive cooperation is possible, however, in Haberler's opinion, and should be fostered.

EUROPE LAYS RECOVERY LAG TO BRITAIN—BINDER WARNS UNITED STATES MUST NOT TURN BACK ON DEPENDABLE ALLY

(By Carroll Binder)

PARIS, FRANCE.—When a man makes a quiet getaway in France—whether from jail or from a social situation—they say he scrammed in the English fashion. In England they describe such behavior as taking French leave.

These popular expressions reflect states of mind about each other which have developed in centuries of contact between peoples separated by wide cultural, political, and temperamental differences as well as by the English Channel.

It thus comes naturally for Frenchmen and other Europeans to blame the British for failure to make appreciable headway toward European cooperation. And it is not surprising that Americans, in and out of the Economic Cooperation Administration, accuse the British of dragging their feet.

BOTH AMERICANS, TOO

Europeans who do not wish to have their own countries' failure to take real steps toward integration examined too closely join with anti-British groups in attributing lack of progress to the British, who are playing their usual selfish game.

The British are doing some things which certainly are not conducive to integration. They sometimes rub Americans as well as Europeans the wrong way.

But attempts to saddle all the blame on the British can only obscure more important stumbling blocks to the recovery and peace of Europe.

Also, it would be a great injustice to the British, whose stand with us in time of stress is the chief hope of preserving free institutions.

ONLY DEPENDABLE ALLY

When all things are considered Great Britain is the one ally in this part of the world upon whom we can count unreservedly for thick-and-thin cooperation for the common defense.

Such a dependable and capable ally is entitled to hold aloof from any project which it fears may weaken, rather than strengthen, its ability to survive in freedom and relative well-being.

Its stubborn standoffishness may prove less difficult to cope with than the pretended cooperation of nations not so wholeheartedly dedicated to freedom.

The British refuse to put all their eggs into the western European basket because they are not convinced such a political and economic entity can stand up to the Soviet challenge or remain a going concern.

They have two other relationships which they consider more vital than their continental relationships. One is with the British commonwealth. The other is with the United States.

BRITISH DETERMINED

The British are determined to preserve their ability to deal directly with both the United States and the other members of the British commonwealth, regardless of urging by high-placed Americans to identify themselves more unreservedly with Europe.

Although the commonwealth and other parts of the world constituting the sterling bloc no longer offer the economic and political advantages they once did, this integration of 250,000,000 people and a quarter of the world's trade is a bird in hand.

The British deem it worth more than the bird in the European bush.

If Europe continues to be a collection of would-be self-sufficient nations, Britain wants the sterling bloc and commonwealth aces in the hole. Britain believes that the United States will make arrangements with it which it is not yet prepared to make with western Europeans individually or collectively.

The monetary talks last autumn in Washington confirm that British estimate. Britain may be persuaded to conduct its sterling and United States relationships in a more constructive manner as regards European cooperation, but it cannot be bullied out of them any more than the United States can be induced to forfeit values it cherishes for dubious values about which little can be ascertained.

Britain's participation in the European integration movement is also conditioned by ideological and other factors spelled out in the second article in this series.

Britain is not willing to expose its full employment policies to the forces operative in the relatively free economies of France, Italy, and Belgium. It is not willing to again subject its critically low gold and dollar reserve to Belgian and other attempts to gather a still larger dollar and gold strength through convertible currencies.

Conservative leader Anthony Eden is no more willing to discard currency controls than the Laborites.

There are some other potent factors in British policy. Unlike the Italians and the Germans, who take it for granted that the United States should and will continue to help them indefinitely or the French who assume that the United States can always be counted upon to come to their rescue if they face disaster, the British are determined to try to get off the back of the United States at the earliest possible moment.

They resent being dependent on American aid and deliberately go without most of the good things of life in the hope of working their own passage again.

How Britain can stand on its own feet economically is hard to see. Some experts consider it impossible of attainment. But Britain's effort to become independent deserves more respect than the sycophancy of Europeans who expect to be supported in return for their lip service to European unity.

Key personalities in the Labor regime are motivated by other considerations. They want to be able to carry on (in even more austere fashion if necessary but independently) if the United States decides to shut off aid because of disappointment with results of ERP or displeasure with British Socialist policies. Some British measures arise out of that attempt to insure against an unfavorable turn of events.

This preoccupation with British survival and with cherished domestic measures has led to certain British practices such as dual pricing which ECA officials feel to be highly unfair and dangerous.

It is estimated that Britain is making a profit of about $50,000,000 a year by imposing an extra charge of £1 a ton on coal exported to other Marshall plan countries.

Sir Stafford Cripps and conservative businessmen justify this practice on the grounds that coal always has been sold abroad at the price that can be gotten and that the United States and other countries have more than one price for the same commodity when they can get away with it.

ECA accuses the Labor government of taking advantage of scarcity abroad to make the nationalized coal industry show a profit which otherwise would not be possible with high costs of production and subsidized domestic prices.

There can be no economic integration if each country being helped takes its little advantage at the expense of other countries which are being helped.

While the practice may help a given country to make a temporary gain, none will benefit in the end because Sweden, overcharged for British coal, is likely to overcharge some other country for its iron ore and soft wood. France will have an excuse to overcharge for its phosphates, Italy for its hemp, and Norway for its whale oil. Instead of being enlarged, trade thereby would be contracted.

An ECA official, whom I know well enough to feel certain that he is fundamentally friendly to Britain, likened Britain's present behavior toward European integration to the London policeman he observed during one of the worst blitzes busily trying to put out a gaslight which, according to regulations should not have been on.

Across the street the blaze of one of the largest buildings of London afforded enemy raiders an illumination 10,000 times brighter than the offending gaslight.

My friend fears that Britain's preoccupation with its own survival overlooks the burning building across the street which is Soviet designs on free Europe.

He thinks Britain could not survive in freedom if western Europe is taken over by the Soviets and that western Europe cannot save itself without the wholehearted cooperation of Britain.

How Your Tax Bill Grew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Pathfinder for March 8, 1950:

HOW YOUR TAX BILL GREW

Sometime before midnight, Wednesday, March 15, 53,000,000 Americans will pay an average income tax of a dollar a day for the privilege of being governed.

This dollar-a-day levy will provide $19,000,000,000 of the $43,300,000,000 needed to run the Federal Government this year—or about 43 cents of every $1 the Government collects.

Moreover, these same Americans and their families will pay through taxes on their whiskies, cigarettes, Easter presents and Christmas gifts, movie tickets, and corporations another $18,000,000,000.

When it's all in, the Treasury will need $5,500,000,000 more to meet the bills.

To make up the shortage, these same Americans will lend their Government this $5,500,000,000, indirectly, through their banks; directly, by buying Government bonds.

By then the Government will owe about $260,000,000,000, nearly $1,750 for each man, woman, and child.

In the light of these six harsh facts there was little wonder that few taxpayers were happy as they turned over their Forms 1040 to internal-revenue collectors this week.

Equally cheerless are these other facts, probably less well known than the dreary six:

Income-taxpaying citizens will pay 15 times as much this year as they did in 1930.

By the end of this year the national debt will be 10 times larger than it was at the close of World War I.

The total cost of running the Federal Government this year will be nearly 13 times more than it was 2 decades ago.

This year's Federal deficit alone will be $2,100,000,000 more than the cost of all Federal activities in 1930.

The question of greatest interest to individual taxpayers was, of course, omitted from the short forms and long forms.

Why has the cost of Government skyrocketed so in the last 20 years?

Part of the answer, but not all of it, comes from these specifics:

In 1930 the Federal Government was composed of 36 major departments and agencies. Today there are 61.

In 1930 the Federal Government employed 600,000 workers. Today it employs 2,100,000.

In 1930 the United States taxpayer supported the Government of one nation, his own. Today he helps support more than 30 governments, including his own.

In 1930 the population of the United States was about 123,000,000. Today a Government which serves 150,000,000 is necessarily larger.

These partial answers point to the vast expansion of the functions of Government since 1930. Then, a citizen's chief contacts with his Government came during presidential or congressional elections; or when he ordered a pamphlet from the Agriculture Department.

But when, early in the thirties, the Government tried to end the depression by hiring everyone who was out of work, its functions mushroomed. So did its costs.

In 1938 the Government's income, which had been mounting steadily because of

greater national income and more taxpayers, had passed the $5,000,000,000 mark. But the same year Federal spending pushed $8,000,000,000. This deficit, plus earlier debts, put the Government in the red for some $37,000,000,000.

Then came World War II. When it was over the Nation staggered out of its far-flung foxholes with a gaping wound in its budgetary side—a national debt of $269,000,000,000.

COSTLY HEALS

And, since VJ-day, taxpayers' hopes for a return "to the good old days" have been frozen stiff in the cold war. Rather than be caught flat-footed again, as they had been twice within a generation, the taxpayers' representatives face this year:

The spending of $13,500,000,000 for military defenses—nearly as much as the total cost of Government in 1941.

Care of veterans of all wars at a cost of $6,000,000,000—nearly six times what it was 20 years ago.

Help to friendly nations through independent loans, Marshall plan aid and the North Atlantic Pact at a cost of nearly $5,000,000,000.

These, plus the interest of $5,000,000,000 on old debts, add up to three-fourths of the $42,600,000,000 1951 budget President Truman submitted to Congress last January. The President deplored the deficit, but made it clear that he regarded paper solvency of less importance than his Fair Deal program—which cannot help but create more debt.

Stuyvesant Town's Threat to Our Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court is preparing to consider the constitutionality of a decision handed down by the highest court of New York in which it upheld the right of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. to restrict its huge housing development, known as Stuyvesant Town, to "whites only." The effort to reverse that decision has significance which goes beyond the field of housing or even the problem of racial discrimination. Unless the decision is reversed, it may set a precedent which in time may prove ominous to our whole American pattern of democratic government.

A study on this subject appeared in the November 1949 issue of Commentary. It is written by Charles Abrams, a leading authority in the field of housing, who himself played an important role as counsel in the legal fight to abolish racial discrimination in Stuyvesant Town. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

STUYVESANT TOWN'S THREAT TO OUR LIBERTIES—GOVERNMENT WITHIN THE CONSTITUTION FOR PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

(By Charles Abrams)

(New York State's highest court has upheld the right of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. to restrict "to whites only" its huge housing development on New York's East Side, near the United Nations site, built with the public aid of the city of New York; now the Supreme Court of the United States is preparing to consider the constitutionality of this decision. The struggle to reverse the decision, Charles Abrams argues here, has significance beyond the housing area, or even the broader field of racial discrimination, important as both are. It is necessary to void a precedent, Mr. Abrams suggests, that may have the most ominous consequences for our whole American democratic pattern of government. Mr. Abrams, a leading authority in the field of housing, is an attorney, and was until recently housing analyst for the New York Post Home News. He himself played a prominent role, as counsel, in the legal fight to abolish racial discrimination in Stuyvesant Town. He is the author of The Future of Housing and Revolution in Land. His article The Segregation Threat in Housing appeared in the February 1949 Commentary.)

Last July, New York's highest court, by a 4 to 3 decision, upheld the right of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. to bar Negroes from its Stuyvesant Town housing project. (*Dorsey v. Stuyvesant Town Corporation* (299 N. Y. 512).) Though the decision received Nation-wide mention in the press, the general impression was that it concerned only another attempt, perhaps new in its form, to ban Negroes from white neighborhoods. But when the court's majority and dissenting opinions appeared in the law journals, the issue emerged in its full gravity: the case reached down to the very roots of American freedom.

It was not merely that minorities living in slums could now, with the help of city and State governments, be ousted from their homes to make way for restricted private developments. Far more important was the fact that an ominous device for circumventing the constitutional safeguards against arbitrary government had received judicial sanction. Public enterprises in private hands were held free to segregate, discriminate, and be above the law. Private corporations, the court held, may now be lawfully handed the powers and funds of government and use them unhindered by constitutional restraint.

It is not hard to see why dissenting Judge Stanley Fuld characterized the majority opinion as "perplexing." Where power is unlimited, tyranny begins. For centuries the safeguards against abuse of public power have been protected and reinforced. Its release into private hands opens a new chapter in political science. "It is impossible to balance the essence of democracy against fireproof buildings, and well-kept lawns," wrote Judge Fuld. "The Constitutions, Federal and State, forbid our putting the former into the judicial scales, just as they forbade the city officials from putting it upon the bargaining table * * * this undertaking was a governmentally conceived, governmentally aided, and governmentally regulated project * * * Stuyvesant Town in its role as chosen instrument for this public purpose may not escape the obligations that accompany the privileges."

But Stuyvesant Town has escaped those obligations, Judge Fuld's opinion is not the law. The law is that the precious powers of Government may now be used to create "private baronies." Indeed, with the recent passage of a Federal urban redevelopment law, dozens of them are already in the blueprint stage all over the country.

Never before in American history has such a unique liaison between Government and private enterprise been authorized. But the surrender of public powers to nonrepresentative private groups—always in the name of "social reform"—is not a phenomenon entirely strange to the modern world. It was one of the unique characteristics of the "corporate states" which have weighed like massive incubi on the prostrate body politic of Europe. The judicial approval of Stuyvesant Town represents an ominous relaxation of democratic controls when reinforcement is more essential than ever.

The Stuyvesant Town "barony" consists of 18 square city blocks and lies in the heart of New York City's East Side facing the East River between Fourteenth and Twentieth Streets. It cost $93,000,000 to build and houses some 25,000 people. It was conceived and sponsored by Park Commissioner Robert Moses as an alternative to public housing. That it is a sound investment for its owner, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., is due to a huge grant of tax exemption by the city totaling more than $55,000,000, or more than three times the cost of the land. The city also turned over to the company public streets amounting to a fifth of the area; these streets are now closed to the public and no one but the city's comptroller may tread on them without the company's consent. The city also condemned the land, ousting some 10,000 low-income tenants from their homes, as well as a host of storekeepers, churches, schools—and even another publicly regulated housing project. There are no public playgrounds or schools inside the Stuyvesant Town area, for it was feared by Metropolitan's chairman of the board that Negro children might attend. Negro tenants were to be barred, too, he said, because "Negroes and whites don't mix. A hundred years from now, maybe they will." The company openly admits its intention to discriminate against Negroes, claiming it as a constitutional right.

The law which authorized this singular undertaking was specially tailored to suit this $9,000,000,000 company. The ostensible public purpose behind these vast gifts of public moneys and powers is called urban redevelopment, described by the law with the novel term, "superior public use"—which means superior to schools and playgrounds, which are legally only ordinary public uses. The novel legal jargon, however, only inadquately conceals a more familiar process. Urban redevelopment is but the latest of a succession of devices conceived originally to improve housing and neighborhoods, but which have been perverted to keep minorities in their place.

Since minorities are most frequently contained in slum areas and cannot easily break out directly into better neighborhoods, they tend to infiltrate family by family where they can. A first device to prevent this infiltration was municipal zoning ordinances forbidding occupancy by certain races. These were soon held unconstitutional on the theory that an ordinance is State action, and therefore violates the fourteenth amendment, which prohibits States and public agencies from enforcing laws that deny equal protection to citizens. A second device aiming to keep minorities in their places, the racial restrictive covenant, was recently held unenforceable by the courts on the ground that courts are instruments of States and, therefore, court enforcement would violate the fourteenth amendment.[1]

But urban redevelopment is something new and different, the implications of its perversion far more sinister. The racial zoning ordinances and restrictive covenants aim only to bar minorities from coming into certain areas. Urban redevelopment, however, authorizes cities to root them out of areas in which they already live, all in the name of slum clearance. Because slum clearance is a recognized public purpose, the land on which they live and the homes they own may now be taken from them by forced sale.

Further, after acquiring the land for the private developer, the city may then turn it over to him without restrictions, according to the Stuyvesant Town decision. Cities are authorized to sell it for less than cost,

[1] See Charles Abrams, Homes for Aryans Only, Commentary, May 1947, and The Segregation Threat in Housing, Commentary, February 1949.

with taxpayers, Negro and white, Jew and Gentile, footing the bill. Yet while benefiting from these powers and subsidies emanating from all the people, the developer is free to discriminate in the renting of dwelling units. The theoretical justification for this is that once the property is in private hands the discrimination is no longer State action. The program thus grants equality of the laws during the process of eviction, i. e., no favorites are played and all are turned out into the streets with an even hand; but there is no equality in the sharing of the dividends of urban redevelopment. The minority is thus assured equality in the burdens, but never in the fruits. Slum clearance, which was intended to be the preliminary to decent housing, may now become the prelude to mass homelessness.

This is no academic matter, nor is it an isolated bogey inflated by alarmists. Twenty-five States have already passed urban redevelopment laws, and since Congress has now authorized huge Federal subsidies for urban redevelopment, mass shifts of minorities from one slum to another worse one, may soon begin. The proportion of the overcrowding in housing occupied by nonwhites is already four times as great as that of whites, the proportion of substandard housing is six times as high. These houses are the ones now most often scheduled for demolition and redevelopment. The evicted minorities find other areas barred to them while the new private redevelopment projects with few exceptions intend to follow the Stuyvesant Town exclusion policies.

The cost in human suffering may be imagined. But the evil of the program lies not only in its brutal imposition upon various minorities, but also, and perhaps primarily, in the fact that States and cities are now permitted by law to become partners to discrimination and injustice—a partnership now sanctioned by an influential court as constitutional. As racial zoning and the restrictive covenant proved, discriminatory practices are epidemic. We are thus witnessing the establishment of a legal precedent which may yet upset the safeguards of 150 years of freedom and split the structure of constitutional government.

Awakening to the dangers inherent in such urban redevelopment, minority groups have attempted to write antibias clauses into the enabling legislation. But their efforts have, to date, been thwarted. One obstacle in the fight has been the glee with which certain legislators—Senators BRICKER, of Ohio, and CAIN, of Washington, deserve special mention—have used civil-rights amendments as political footballs; the strategy is to tack anti-discrimination amendments on to social legislation in the hope of alienating enough Southern votes to kill the entire Fair Deal program. (CAIN, it might be noted, led the filibuster which defeated the administration's civil-rights program.) Unfortunately, some representatives of minority groups fell into the trap, and supported such amendments regardless of motives. A more apt phrase would have been "regardless of political realities," for the amendment as drawn almost defeated the public housing program which offered the only hope for housing some of the evicted minorities.

At the same time, Federal housing officials, who might have been expected to further the fight against discrimination in urban redevelopment, have remained indifferent. So much so, that when an amendment passed the House giving displaced tenants priority in the new urban redevelopment projects, it was smothered in conference because Housing Administrator Raymond M. Foley failed to give it administration approval.

Progress on the local front is only slightly more hopeful. Of all the State urban redevelopment laws now in effect, only Pennsylvania's bars racial discrimination. In New York City a local ordinance forbids granting tax exemption to housing projects which discriminate (but it does not apply to Stuyvesant Town, which was authorized before the ordinance passed). San Francisco is the only other city outlawing discrimination in urban redevelopment; Chicago and other cities have refused to go along, claiming that private investment would be discouraged. Experience with New York City's law, however, should dissipate Chicago's fears. More than $30,000,000 is now being invested by lending institutions in nondiscriminating urban redevelopment projects, and another $16,000,000 is being advanced for limited dividend projects.

Among the institutions making loans under the city's antibias ordinance are the Bowery Savings Bank, whose board chairman, Henry Bruers, once opposed the ordinance, but has since informed the writer that he is aware of the new social habits and that his approach in making these loans on nondiscriminating undertakings is entirely pragmatic. The Bowery has a total of $13,500,000 invested in such projects at as little as 3½ percent interest. Another New York project, Queensview Houses, a cooperative, headed by Louis Pink and financed by an 80-percent loan of $6,000,000 by the Mutual Life Insurance Co. at 4 percent, has sold almost all of its apartments to middle-income families, although 10 of the cooperators will be Negroes.

Yet, all that has been done in New York City has failed to offset the example of Stuyvesant Town and the implications of its victory in the courts. It is Stuyvesant Town the precedent, rather than Stuyvesant Town the project, that looms so large as a threat to the American way of life.

Throughout America's history rigid restrictions have been imposed upon the Government's use of the eminent domain, tax, and police powers—powers which the New York court has held may now be used for private developers who are free from such restrictions. These three powers constitute the working tools of any government, be it capitalist, Fascist, or Socialist. When abused, these are the powers that threaten life, liberty, and property.

The power to regulate, for example, is also the power to regulate out of existence; the American system has therefore always required that the courts stand guard to see that it is exercised reasonably. The power of eminent domain is the power to take another man's property; it may therefore be exercised only for a public use and upon payment of just compensation. The power to tax carries with it the obligation to use the proceeds for public purposes and not for private or class use.

One of the salient differences between democratic and totalitarian governments is that in the latter these powers are subject to the whim of a single dictator, while in a democracy their arbitrary exercise is effectively checked. The whole system of checks and balances which make up the American Republic was erected to prevent the abuse of these powers, or their subordination to private advantage.

In recent years, however, America has veered to what is euphemistically called the welfare state, and it is here that the Stuyvesant Town decision becomes the judicial authorization for a menacing liaison between private and public enterprises.

We are, to be sure, far from embarking upon any Fascist ideology or upon any conscious imitation of fascism's racist aberrations. But political systems have an inherent dynamic of their own; it is not the personal motives of politicians or businessmen which shape the ultimate pattern in the relationship between the State and the individual.

Freedom is an ethic but it is also the by-product of economic institutions. That it has flourished in America is due not only to the scheme of separation of powers but to the separation of government from business as well. In the American system up to now, enjoyment of both property and personal freedom have been inextricably linked. The linkage survived the great shift from the freehold economy to the modern corporate system, when it continued to be to the interest of the propertied and entrepreneurial classes to oppose government expansion so as to keep taxes low and regulation minimal.

With the release of the welfare and spending powers, however, the competition for government aid has taken a new turn. The insulation of business from government is ended and as the Government has now become the main functionary in the economic milieu, the driving forces of enterprise are being headed toward the Nation's Capital. The trader and tycoon are rising to the occasion to manipulate Government policies for their own ends, to influence legislation, and to harness the public official in the private interest.

In consequence, the welfare state as it is beginning to emerge in America bids fair to be a far cry from the pure and simple dispensing of benefits to America's common man, as was the intent of its initial sponsors. Under the guidance of certain business interests—as shortsighted as they are powerful—there is, at least in part, emerging a business welfare state in which the Government is being called upon to pump the funds authorized under the newly expanded welfare programs into certain private pipe lines. The common men are to become, as it were, the residual legatees, instead of being the direct beneficiaries; their benefits will be enjoyed at a second or third remove.

In the name of such public purposes as defense, housing betterment, encouragement of infant as well as senile industries, economic pump priming during slumps, protection of savings, home-ownership encouragement, and a growing list of other high-sounding goals, we are stumbling blindly in several directions, one of which is a subsidies-to-business economy. In the name of social reforms the Government is called upon also to loan to business at low rates, to socialize business losses when necessary, to remove risk from private enterprise by Federal insurance. In the process, these protected enterprises insist, of course, upon the same immunity from regulation they enjoyed before they drew upon the Government purse and the Government's powers.

The majority opinion of Judge Bruce Bromley in the Stuyvesant Town case justifies this immunity thus: "The increasing and fruitful participation of Government, both State and Federal, in the industrial and economic life of the Nation—by subsidy and control analogous to that found in this case—suggests the grave and delicate problem in defining the scope of the constitutional inhibitions which would be posed if we were to characterize the rental policy of respondents as governmental action."

Discrimination against minorities is no sudden, accidental byproduct of this emerging business-welfare state. On the contrary, discrimination in older phases of the housing program, wherever the business-Government liaison has been in effect, points to an intrinsic relationship and suggests the dangers of its extension into other fields.

It was, for example, in the Federal Housing Administration that the racial restrictive covenant received its greatest impetus. For years, and in fact during the entire period of the New Deal, this Government agency recommended the exclusion of minorities from newly developed areas, refused to insure mortgages on property if minorities were allowed to enter, and in an official manual drew up the very racial covenants that private developers were to use if they were to be eligible for FHA insurance.

The Government manual warned against such "adverse influences" as "unharmonious

racial groups." It said that "If a neighborhood is to retain stability it is necessary that properties shall continue to be occupied by the same social and racial classes." The "model" covenant it recommended provided that "no person of any race other than (race to be inserted) shall use or occupy any building or any lot, except that this covenant shall not prevent occupancy by domestic servants of a different race domiciled with an owner or tenant." In the face of vigorous protest, this manual was finally modified; but there is all too little evidence of any genuine change of heart.

Similar tendencies were noted in the liquidation operations of the Home Owners Loan Corporation. So too with urban redevelopment.

A 1944 Federal memorandum on the subject (for internal use only) states: "It is unfortunately true that, with but few exceptions, a displacement of neighborhood population by a new group results in an immediate lowering of the neighborhood level; that is, when higher groups leave, their places are taken by lower groups, four people drive out five people, rather than the other way around." The lower groups as four people are then listed as Negroes and Jews, and examples of decline in values as a result of the "travel of Jewish groups from an original semighetto" are cited.

The report goes on: "It is, of course, substantially impossible under our present social and economic system to effectively control people's movements. There is no way, nor is it necessarily socially desirable that there be a way to keep people where they are. It is, therefore, extremely difficult to prevent the encroachment upon other neighborhoods of people of unharmonious economic, social, national, and racial groups. The problem must be approached indirectly and, therefore, with poor efficiency and with only partial result."

Three indirect methods to contain neighborhoods and to keep out the undesirables were then proposed, including restrictive covenants which were recommended as "a rallying point around which neighborhood residents could gather to fight encroachment."

To stamp out discrimination in one or a few Government agencies, worth while as this is, does not affect the disease itself but only dabs at the more irritating symptoms. For the evil of discrimination in housing is not localized; nor is it due to the personal prejudice of officials; it flows from the Government-business relationship itself.

Democratic government and democratic business act under almost opposite sets of ethics and principles. Private business may, in certain respects, discriminate if it wishes to; democratic government is bound to the principle of nondiscrimination and the equal protection of the laws. According to the ideal of free enterprise, the entrepreneur may be single minded in his quest for profit, employ whomsoever he chooses, rent his product to whom he selects, do business with whom he wants. Minority and majority alike compete with their time, money, and talents. To be sure, abstractly speaking, the dominance of the profit motive in the economic system is supposed to be an assurance of egalitarianism, of the hiring of the most efficient employee and the catering to the source of profit, regardless of the race or ancestry of the worker or customer. But the real, working economic system under which we live deviates from the ideal model of the laissez-faire enthusiasts in a few important areas; economic motives do not always govern personal prejudice, and this is especially true when it touches upon the subject of housing: a man's home is his castle and an impassable moat still separates the elite from the unwanted in American neighborhoods. Exclusion practices function also in other fields in which employers as well as employees may be the participants.

In the private-enterprise economy, however, Government's role is that of keeper of the democratic morals, and it often sees that free enterprise remains truly free—a cash transaction in the open market—and is not subordinated to monopolistic restraints or racial dogmas. Any aberration in the state's activities in the direction of discrimination is subject to check by the courts, while simultaneously Government is drawn toward imposing its higher standards upon private enterprise when the latter forsakes the cash-nexus for the racial-nexus. Thus, hotels and restaurants are occasionally forbidden to discriminate though they are private businesses; courts refuse to enforce contracts that are against public policy, such as restrictive covenants. Employers may be forbidden to discriminate in carrying out public contracts, even in private employment. So, too, unions may be kept in line with the constitutional ethic, when they are beneficiaries of Government aid or power. The free-enterprise society, regulated by democratic government against abuse, has produced one of the great historical demonstrations of a tolerant society.

But in the establishment of the new government-business liaison, the ethics of the entrepreneur are not elevated to the governmental level. On the contrary, the tendency has been for Government agencies to lower their own standards to those of the illiberal self-seeking entrepreneurs who find catering to prejudice easier or lucrative. This is so—and must be so—because the establishment of the joint venture imposes a responsibility upon the administrators to make the joint venture function efficiently. Thus, for example, when the subsidized builder promises his home-buying prospect a restricted neighborhood, FHA tends to acquiesce or even encourage the policy.

This should be no surprise, for FHA depends for its success upon getting a sufficient volume of housing-insurance business to make its actuarial formulas work. If this public agency made its aid to builders conditional upon nondiscrimination by the latter, it might not get enough mortgage insurance to justify its existence. The same is true in joint ventures such as urban redevelopment. Not the assurance of equality in the market place nor the inauguration of experiments in interracial harmony, but the financial success of the joint enterprise becomes the primary concern of the public administrators. Thus the Government attitudes becomes conditioned by the privileged private needs and interests, and soon private prejudices become part of the public policy.

A second reason for the degradation of democratic values is that the public agencies become dependent upon their private beneficiaries for lobby support in Congress. This is no secret in Washington today. The agencies best accommodated by Congress are those with an active private lobby campaigning for them. It is inevitable, therefore, that the agency officials will tend to yield to the pressures, prejudices, and customs of the beneficiary, and will close their eyes to the traditional ethical code for Government behavior.

Still another reason is that few Federal administrators who enact regulations are anxious to set them according to the relatively higher standard of racial tolerance in the North. They are apt to be practical and make their rules so they can function in the South as well. What may therefore be a localized discriminatory custom tends to become the common denominator in racial policy, and it is usually less than the standard set by the Bill of Rights.

Thus it is that inalienable rights may be diluted, governmental standards undermined, and safeguards of freedom whittled down, until racism is not only acquiesced in but becomes part of the customs and ultimately of the law of the land.

The strong dissenting opinion of Judge Fuld, the sharply divided court, and the crucial nature of the issue, however, all give hope that the Supreme Court of the United States will accept review of the case and perhaps reverse the holding.

This court has not been unaware of the implications of the growth of private governments, and since the days of the New Deal has rendered a series of decisions bringing them within the fold of the Constitution.

The Democratic Party of Texas, declared to be a private voluntary corporation by State laws, was enjoined from refusing a Negro a Democratic ballot. It was held to be "an agency of the State insofar as it determines the participants in a primary election" (*Smith v. Allright* (321 U. S. 629, 1944)).

When a Negro railroad employee sued to enjoin discrimination against him by a labor union which was the exclusive bargaining representative under the Railway Labor Act, the Court described the union as "clothed with power not unlike a legislature which is subject to constitutional limitations on its power to deny, restrict, destroy, or discriminate against the rights of those for whom it legislates and which is also under an affirmative constitutional duty to protect those rights" (*Steele v. Louisville & Nashville R. R. Co.* (323 U. S. 192, 1944)).

A company town that refused to allow a member of Jehovah's Witnesses to use its streets for the distribution of religious literature was enjoined by the court, which said that "the State urges in effect that the corporation's right to control the inhabitants of Chickasaw is coextensive with the right of a home owner to regulate the conduct of his guests. We cannot accept that contention. Ownership does not always mean absolute dominion. * * * Since these facilities are built and operated primarily to benefit the public and since their operation is essentially a public function, it is subject to State regulation." (*Marsh v. Alabama* (326 U. S. 501, 1946).)

A Federal district court in West Virginia found that a renting of a municipally built swimming pool to a private company did not authorize discrimination since "the voice is Jacob's voice even though 'the hands are the hands of Esau.'" (*Lawrence v. Hancock* (76 Fed. Sup. 1004, 1948).)

But while these cases have indicated an alertness on the part of the courts to the menace to civil rights inherent in the new "quasi-public" corporations,[2] the majority opinion in the Stuyvesant Town case has held to the view that the constitutional prohibition against racial discrimination is a prohibition against the State and that Stuyvesant Town as such is not a "state." It holds that the cases cited above are not controlling.

The dissenting judges, on the other hand, insisted: "The concept of 'state action' has been vitalized and expanded; the definition of 'private' conduct in this context has been tightened and restricted. * * * The construction and operation of Stuyvesant Town are not matters of 'merely private concern.' * * * Everywhere in evidence are the voice and authority of the State and city. * * * Stuyvesant is in no sense an ordinary private landlord. * * * The argument overlooks that the constitutional rights of American citizens are involved and that such rights may not be used as pawns in driving bargains. * * * The mandate that there be equal protection of the laws, designed as a basic safeguard for all, binds us and respondents as well to put an end to this discrimination."

In Stuyvesant Town, the issue of private government versus the Constitution is clearly

[2] After the city of New York had continuously taken the position that Stuyvesant Town was private, it issued a report on housing shortly after the Stuyvesant Town decision calling it quasi-public housing.

drawn. The crucial question is whether a 1789 Constitution, devised for a private-enterprise system and a democratic government, can safely serve as a basis for a business-welfare state. Unless the challenge is clearly seen in its full portent, and unless shaken principles and safeguards are retrieved and reaffirmed, the stage may be set in the years to come for a dangerous innovation on the American political scene.

What Should Be Expected of Advertising Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following most timely and intelligent address delivered by Philip Liebmann, president of Liebmann Breweries, Inc., before the meeting of the Association of National Advertisers held at Hot Springs, Va., Wednesday, March 29, 1950. Mr. Liebmann, representing as he does one of the large industries of Brooklyn, has brought to his speech the full experience of one who has studiously and constructively devoted most of his public life in the field of advertising. The Liebmann Rheingold Brewery in Brooklyn is world famous, much of it due to its arresting advertising programs which have been developed under the management and inspirational leadership of Philip Liebmann.

I have been asked to address you today on a subject which I think puts the emphasis in the wrong place. The title which has been chosen for me is "What I Expect of Advertising Today." I think what is more important is what should be expected of advertising today, not by me, but by you, by every advertising man and every company that advertises, and, most important of all, by the public as a whole.

For years the advertising men have asked to be accepted as a very important part of business. For years they fought the good fight to establish advertising on a level with the manufacturing and selling functions. This fight has been more or less won in many enlightened companies.

I say more or less because advertising men still insist that their specialty is not looked upon as an exact science; that, in too many companies, the advertising approach is still a matter of opinion, of whim; that it is not regarded in the same businesslike way as manufacturing and salesmanship.

In those companies where this is the case, the people who direct advertising, quite properly, think that they are very vulnerable. Of course, in this vulnerability they have a certain advantage, and it is this: While everyone can recognize a good advertising man, as well as a good manufacturing-production man, and a good sales manager, it is possible to get away far longer with being a bad advertising man. Because where advertising is a matter of unscientific opinion, rather than factual measurement, the abilities of the man who directs the advertising are also a matter of opinion.

And what, in my opinion, is a bad advertising director? Today, he is a man who has not grown up and matured with his profession. He is a man who has leveled criticism at those in his company who are responsible for product development and sales management for not recognizing advertising as being just as important as these other functions. And yet, because he does not recognize his responsibilities toward these other management problems, his own criticisms can today be properly leveled at him.

The fact is—and we all know—that no matter how good a sales force is, it cannot sell goods and services which are not worth what people are asked to pay for them and which don't stack up competitively. We know that a good sales force also needs very competent advertising backing.

No matter how good a product is, it must be properly sold both in personal contact by salesmen and by a proper advertising program. Even the finest product and the finest selling force needs good advertising to produce the proper results.

All this is elementary, of course. But is it? Certainly it explains why those in management responsible for manufacturing take an active interest in the sales manager and his staff, and in the advertising director and what he produces. Certainly it explains why the sales manager is always going back to the men in charge of production with suggestions, why he has such a great interest in advertising. What it doesn't explain is why some advertising men, having argued and cajoled and pleaded for so long for the recognition of their importance, should be willing to live in a world of their own and not really function as a part of the whole except for occasional giving of criticism and frequent dodging of criticism.

The first, and in many ways the most important, role of an advertising director is to ascertain the advertising needs of his company, to understand the products, the services, and public-relations activities which must be carried out in order to achieve the goals set by top management of the company.

The second function of the advertising director is to present properly to top management the role that advertising plays and must play in the company's problems. He must be able to interpret to top management the needs and responsibilities of the advertising department.

The third function of the advertising director is to sell the role which his department plays to the entire organization of the company. And this means not only convincing the sales force of the importance of advertising as a tool, but from the point of view of good public relations, the entire advertising program should be sold to all employees of the company.

In order to decide and guide advertising policy, the advertising director should make a study of all the problems involved in the manufacture, the selling and the merchandising of the products of his company.

It is necessary to study dealer attitudes, consumer attitudes and the basic merits—and sometimes the demerits—of the products and services of the company. I believe that, in the ultimate approach, not only the specific copy, not only the specific slogans and headlines, but the whole of the advertising approach should be to sell by direction and indirection, by word and picture—the very special advantages which this company may have in the merchandising of its product. Thus, if quality is the primary thing which is to be sold, all the advertising of the company must bear that over-all impression. If economy is the major factor, this must, of course, be stressed all the way through the entire campaign. If convenience, or some unique patent feature is what will probably bring the best results, then this should be the theme of all advertising efforts.

Most important of all, the advertising director must know where to go for the best possible guidance. If the company sells directly, as our company does, then the entire sales organization can serve as a veritable radar screen to bring to the advertising management all kinds of valuable information on consumer and dealer reaction which will aid in determining methods and policies.

And, of course, I think all of us feel that the selection of an advertising agency should be based entirely on merit and suitability for the job to be performed. And here again an advertising director can perform a great service for his company. He can be an effective liaison man between top management of the company and the advertising agency. Many advertising managers make the mistake of leaning too heavily on the agency, of not giving the agency the sort of direction it needs to do a good job. It certainly is an important part of the advertising director's function to make the best use of his agency's talents.

All necessary market research, copy research, and other research facilities should be used so that the net result of the thinking is based not on whim, not on prejudice, but upon sound analysis of the problems to be faced, the course which will help solve them and the results which are hoped for. It is only after this exploratory effort has been made, after basic budget recommendations, media, and copy plans have been made, that the task of accomplishing a well-rounded advertising program can be begun.

To me, advertising is the voice of our business, any business. The plant, the production, and the quality of the product are the body of a company. Sales and production management are the mind. Advertising is the voice.

The history of our company, while not exactly like the history of other companies, has followed the times in which it has been in existence. Our company has grown slowly down through more than 100 years of metamorphosis—from the earliest days of the industrial revolution to the present time. When a business such as ours started, the first problems were simply to produce a good product, and sell to a limited number of outlets which were well known to the management. Then, as the business became larger, the problems were not only those of producing a better product but of producing more. And finally, in the last phase, before advertising became of age, the problem was to organize a competent sales force to convince an ever-expanding number of retailers of the merits and qualities of our product—together with the services which our company could render to the retailer.

Now, in an era when production has grown to so much greater importance, we can no longer stop at this stage. Our salesmen and our organization can only go so far, but no further. We must reach out not only to the dealers but we must also go beyond them to the consumer, to create a desire for our product, and to sell those same consumers the very ideas which the sales organization must sell to the dealers. The complexities of our economy today require this because the dealer handles so many items that he cannot sell their individual merits to his customers and they must be, to a great extent, presold before they enter his establishment.

Since I have talked so frankly about the faults of some advertising men, I think I have a right to criticize some managements. One of the greatest fallacies of management is that it, in many cases, grew up before advertising had come of age and still looks on advertising with a jaundiced eye.

In many respects, advertising has not come of age. In a great many companies, instead of being a full partner, it is considered an expensive and perhaps unnecessary luxury. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Managements which take this point of view are very apt to end up on the losing side.

There is no need to dwell on this point, because the old story of the soap that stepped advertising and other similar stories are too well known to you.

But despite this evidence, it is unfortunately the truth that occasionally advertising is regarded as a sort of auxiliary. This is a dangerous belief for anyone to have. As I said before, I believe the three cornerstones of the structure of any modern business are management from the point of view of production, management from the point of view of sales, and advertising from the point of view of doing full justice to the manufacturing and selling aspects of the business. And I believe, actually, that I have named these three cornerstones in the order of their importance.

In view of this, I simply cannot understand why there are still a number of advertising people who consistently irritate the other members of the management team by taking the point of view that all you need is a wonderful advertising campaign and the salesmen will just become order-takers, and that it doesn't matter what kind of a product you produce. This, in reverse, is just as ridiculous a point of view as the attitude of a management that does not understand advertising. An advertising director, or an advertising department which makes this serious error will certainly not be able to educate top management in the proper use and evaluation of advertising but will instead so irritate the other executives responsible for the success of the business that they will close their eyes and ears and minds to an intelligent point of view about advertising.

When I look through the advertising trade journals, I often ask myself why so many of the men who write for them, who influence the advertising profession to a very great extent, often pay so much more attention to the advertising embroidery, rather than to the pattern of an entire business of which the advertising is only a part. I understand, of course, that people who read advertising trade journals are, naturally, interested in advertising. This does not explain why an advertising trade journal, when it tells the story of the success of a business, will give the major—if not all the credit—to the advertising history of that company, ignoring the part that the product and sales force must play in any success story.

I say this in the kindliest spirit possible. Surely no one has said nicer things about the advertising of my own company than the trade journals. And I am proud of the advertising job our company has been able to do.

But I must insist that, in the last analysis, all advertising can hope to accomplish is to create an attitude on the part of the buying public in respect to the company and its product and to get the public to try the product; that if the product is not satisfactory, the public will not continue to buy it regardless of the advertising; and if the sales organization does not achieve proper distribution, then the public will not be able to obtain the product.

The point I wish to make here is this—that, as a man who resents the fact that some companies look upon advertising as a stepchild, I think I have a right to speak frankly to those members of the advertising profession who look upon advertising as the sole power behind the throne.

I do not care how good the advertising of a company is—if the sales organization doesn't have the good will of the retail trade, its efforts can be killed off even before the advertising starts to work. You can create all the demand you want. If people have never tried the product, they may ask for it, but they will not insist on it, and unless it is available and distribution is complete, you will lose many an advertising dollar. Most important of all is the quality of the product. No matter how effective your advertising is all it can do is to get people to try your product; if they don't like the product once they have tried it, all the advertising in the world will not make them buy it again.

These facts may seem so simple you may wonder why I take your time telling you about them. But, unfortunately, neither top business management nor top advertising management seems to have thought them important enough to look at the forest instead of the trees. That is why, when advertising people outside our organization are so very flattering to our advertising, and insist upon attributing so much of the success of our company to the advertising, it bothers me. And that is because it is not a true picture of our company and its operations and of the reasons for its success.

In our company, after we have determined on the correct course of advertising budget, media, and copy recommendations, after we have sold the top management and the board of directors of our company on the wisdom of our policies, we are not through. We may still have a good product, we may have planned a fine advertising program, and yet we are still missing one of the most important keys in any advertising or business operation.

Unless we are able to sell our ideas and plans and product to our sales organization so that they not only will become more enthusiastic in their selling, more confident not only of the quality of the product, but also of the way in which all their potential customers are being made aware of the quality of the product—unless we do these things, we will not have our sales force taking full advantage of all the work that has been done. They will not be as enthusiastic as they should be and if they are not enthusiastic, our dealers will not be enthusiastic either. And if our dealers are not enthusiastic, even though a good sales organization improperly indoctrinated may still be able to get the product on the shelves, they will lack that spark, that ignition when the gas is pushed into the cylinder, which will make for a bang-up success, rather than mediocre results.

In other words, good management and a good sales force and a good advertising program can create fair success but a really sensational success can only be achieved if these things can be tied together through proper indoctrination.

Now, you may ask, What is proper indoctrination? I do not believe proper indoctrination is to hold a great big convention of your entire sales organization at which a lot of stuffed shirts from the front office get up and cram something down the throats of 200 salesmen. Nobody could possibly be enthusiastic about that kind of a program.

First of all, we should realize that our salesmen (and here, of course, I am speaking more directly of a company like our own, which maintains somewhere over 200 men on its sales force, who contact the retail trade directly)—we should realize that these men can act as radar screens, as I said before. Not only can we give them information, but they can give us information. They are out there 300 and some days a year, contacting the retail trade, getting the reaction not only to our product and our advertising, but to general trade conditions and to the products and advertising of our competitors. I would be the last one to say that we can or even should adopt most of the policies which they will recommend, because, naturally, each one of them, dealing with a particular type of retailer and with a particular section or territory, amplifies, in his own mind, the special local problems with which he comes in contact, and which, while they may be important to him, are not so important from an over-all point of view. We must collect all this material, and evaluate it from this larger point of view. But the sum total of the collective material can be very valuable to us in developing our own plans and projects.

Naturally, salesmen are prejudiced; they are very heavily prejudiced in favor of what the dealer wants and often what the dealer wants is not in the best interests of the operation, from the point of view of the manufacturer in reaching the consumer.

Having received this information from our salesmen, and evaluated it, we not only receive something which is of value to us, but we let our organization know that their desires and their thoughts are important to us and are carefully considered in the formulation of our plans. This information cannot be garnered in large meetings, and it has always been my practice and that of the other men in the advertising department of our company, to continually talk with the salesmen, with the district managers and with the supervisors daily; to meet with them at least every few weeks in small groups, that is to say, different divisions of the company both product-wise and area-wise; to sit down with 6 or 8 or even as many as 15 men, and let them talk and answer their questions constructively. I do not believe a day passes that I do not talk with a number of men in our sales organization, and I think my associates, Mr. Graham and Mr. Grau, talk with at least as many men themselves each day. As a result, our department has daily contact with a large segment of our sales organization.

This has now achieved two purposes. This continuous contact not only sells our men on the product which we manufacture, but also on the ways in which we are trying to help them to do their work, to enable them to make more money. We further contact them through a company house organ, through special bulletins from the advertising department to the sales organization, which we try to issue at least once a month, and through additional written material such as booklets, reprints of all our advertising material, broadsides—not covering a whole year, but every few months on forthcoming advertising projects, et cetera. Once a year, or so, we do have one of these great big get-togethers which I have described before, but this is done simply to try to wrap the whole thing up into a package and present it to the men in a very brief and informal form. It is a bit of showmanship to add a little glamor to the daily routine, but there is no easy road, no huge once-a-year meeting, that will give constant information to the sales force and get constant information from them for the use of the advertising organization. It is just a matter of plugging day in and day out, of working closely together, to achieve the maximum results.

These daily or weekly "bull sessions" in groups and individually will build an organization with the kind of comradeship and spirit of cooperation which will make advertising not only respected but appreciated by both management and the sales organization.

As a last obligation I believe the advertising director should have a very clear view of the social philosophy of advertising. He must be very conscious of the necessity to convince both the stockholders and the directors of his company. As I have mentioned, many people look upon advertising as a luxury. This is sheer nonsense, just as ridiculous as the attitude of the businessman who thinks he should spend a lot of money on advertising because business is wonderful and he is making a lot of money and doesn't know what else to do with it. The same man, as soon as things get a little tough, says, "Well, I guess we will have to cut the budget." I don't know which of these points of view is more ridiculous. Advertising is not something on which you spend money because you don't know what else to do with it, nor is it something you can dispense with

as things get tough. Actually when things get tough is the time when advertising is needed more than ever because the smaller the melon gets the bigger the slice that is needed for each individual company which is trying to get a piece of that melon in order to stay in the black. The stockholders don't make more money when advertising is cut; they risk their whole investment.

But our most important obligation is to the consumer. And what does the consumer say? He says, "Here you are spending a lot of money for advertising. If you didn't couldn't you sell me better products for less?"

The consumer should be told in every way possible how socially beneficial advertising can be to him. Most important of all, it preserves freedom of choice. In many other countries there is very little freedom of choice—in some cases because of unrestricted cartelization and, in others, because of government restrictions both on products and on price. In my opinion, despite all that has been said on this subject, our country has the greatest economic democracy of all. And our advertising preserves the freedom of choice encouraged by our free system. If advertising did not tell American consumers of the qualities and services of the products made available by our companies, then they would have nothing to guide them in choosing. Accordingly, they would purchase what they were allowed to purchase. The dealers would stock only a few items, and so nobody would insist on any particular product; consumers would have to be satisfied with what they could get, because they would find the same situation more or less at all dealers.

Only because we have created a demand for a larger number of different products and different brands, will dealers carry all these products, and the consumer may vote each day at the ballot box for that product which he prefers.

This makes for another special protection of the consumer. For any company that spends the large amount of money over the years that is spent in advertising of well-known brands would not take the chance of throwing away this entire expenditure by tampering with the quality of the product, and risking the refusal of the public to buy. Thus, advertising acts, in a very important way, as a strict quality control.

There is a third benefit to the consumer. The advertising cost per unit of almost any type of product is actually infinitesimal. If the advertising were eliminated, the saving would be fictitious because lower volume and higher distribution costs could immediately increase and not decrease the price the consumer is asked to pay. So, in actuality, advertising not only costs the public nothing but saves the public money.

How about the dealer? Couldn't the dealer say, "Why don't you let me make a little more money? If you cut your advertising budget, couldn't I get a higher profit?" Of course, this is sheer nonsense. Advertising makes it easier for the dealer to handle a multiplicity of items, turn them over fast, do more business, and lower the cost of distribution because he does not have to sell each of his customers on each particular brand of merchandise—the customer has already been presold for him. Thus, he is able to do a larger volume of business at less expense, benefiting both himself and his customers. And also he is able to eliminate the inventory risk of being stuck with merchandise for which there is no consumer demand.

And what about the salesman who works for your company? Couldn't he say, "If you cut your advertising, why couldn't you give me a little more salary?" This is a completely false assumption. Advertising builds up the security of the salesman's job, as well as the security of every employee of the company, because an advertised product is, naturally, a more secure product when it comes to maintaining a constant level of production and employment.

Yes, advertising offers security to stockholders, to the management of the company, to all the employees of the company, to dealers and to consumers. In addition, it makes possible the preservation of a free press, a free radio and television; it pays almost the entire cost of our wonderful organs of information. Advertising plays a real role in the creation of a true economic democracy in the fields of public communication.

I am not falling into my own trap here. I am not saying that advertising brings us all the benefits of our free economy any more than I say that advertising could possibly deserve the sole credit for the success of any business. Advertising is not all-important but it is important. The practitioners of advertising must at all times realize that, in any company, quality of production, economy of production, personnel, and dealer relations are paramount; that these are the foundations on which advertising can function efficiently and well; that the sales organization is another structure which will be built upon the same foundations. Manufacturing, selling, and advertising are a team; each must respect the prerogatives and special interests of the others. Each must be willing to work in harmony, to achieve the same goal. I believe that if advertising men play their part properly; if they not only create good advertising but sell the social and economic benefits of advertising to their fellow workers, to their top management, to their sales organization, if they realize and give credit to the equal importance of the other functions of our economic democracy, then they will receive their proper share of the credit. They will benefit the firms for which they work, and all the people connected with them and they will render greater service to a greater community, whether it be city, State, or country—or even to the world as a whole.

Advertising is not only the voice, it is the free speech of business. It doesn't stand by itself, but it is a vital and integral part of the merchandising evolution of which we are a part.

In the understanding of this I believe we can go forward, into a rising standard of living tomorrow, providing more goods and better goods at lower prices to more people than ever before.

This is what should be expected of advertising today.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, on United Jewish Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the United Jewish Appeal is currently conducting its 1950 campaign to carry out a threefold humanitarian program: First, immigration and settlement of large numbers of Jews in Israel where they will no longer be homeless; second, relief and rehabilitation to the depleted Jewish communities in Europe, and to the Jews in north Africa who are suffering untold misery; third, adjustment and integration of refugees arriving in this country under the displaced-persons law. Because of its activities on such a wide scale, the United Jewish Appeal is often described as an instrument of human reconstruction.

The United Jewish Appeal drive is now going on in some 3,500 communities throughout the United States. In many of these, our non-Jewish friends are lending a helping hand and are making possible the success of these drives.

The campaign in the Nation's Capital began on April 12. I am certain many of you will find extremely interesting the remarks on that occasion by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, who has long been associated with every type of humanitarian work. His address was as follows:

History is moving at such a rapid pace that we rarely find the opportunity to study its significance or assay our own role in events that are changing the entire face of civilization.

In our concern with current problems we often lose perspective. We are either so preoccupied with our work or with the critical necessities of the moment that we do not have the time to look around to see the direction in which we are going.

In the year 1950 we are confronted with many serious problems. All of us are keenly aware of the importance of the United Jewish Appeal. Yet relatively few of us know, except in some vague, intuitive way, why this is a crucial year, why we are again called upon to act in a spirit of sacrifice.

I have been associated with the tasks of aiding Jews in distress for many years. For a third of a century I have been affiliated in an active capacity with the Joint Distribution Committee, one of the three constituent organizations of the United Jewish Appeal. I can fully appreciate the sentiments of those who say that they are tired, of those who year after year keep asking, "How long is this going to continue? How much longer must we expend all this energy and give these vast sums of money?"

But these questions are justified only where we fail to grasp the meaning of the momentous developments of recent years, and where we fail to see that the ultimate goal is almost within our reach.

In point of time, the recent past, the present, and the future can most easily be summed up in three words, achievement, crises, and fulfillment.

Let us take achievement first. I believe that American Jewry has a great deal to be proud of. I believe that in the historic accomplishments which American Jews have made possible in the rescue and rehabilitation of their coreligionists, they have not merely added stature to their spiritual and communal life as Jews. They have enriched their Americanism with a devotion to human ideals that is without parallel in modern civilization.

In a matter of days Israel will celebrate the second anniversary of its independence. The establishment of Israel as an independent nation gave the people of Israel their freedom, the Jews of the rest of the world—the homeless and distressed—the right to find a new home—and to the Jews of the United States a high sense of achievement in the program of building a better future for the Jewish people.

Let us not forget that independence did not come easily for the Jews of Israel, any more than it did for the people of these United States. They paid a heavy price in blood and tears. And they fought and many died not merely for their own survival, but to open the doors of the Jewish homeland to victims of persecution and homelessness. The victory they won was not merely recorded as a triumph on the battlefield. The victory they won is being reaffirmed every

day in the great influx of new immigrants. The fact that 400,000 Jewish refugees have been brought into Israel during the past 2 years eloquently demonstrates that its people did not merely fight a war for independence but that they actually fought and won a war for Jewish survival and Jewish rescue. To the great extent that you and other members of the Jewish community of Washington and the Jewish communities of other parts of the United States contributed to the United Jewish Appeal to keep the doors open to this unprecedented immigration you had a decisive role in the war for Jewish survival.

As long as there are large numbers of Jews who must find a new home in Israel, mass immigration cannot be separated from the existence of Israel as an independent state. In that respect, one may very well say that the crisis which Israel now faces in receiving and absorbing tens of thousands of new immigrants is directly related to the victory that made the open door possible.

The shooting war in Israel is over. But the Jewish State still has a long way to travel to achieve peace. Armistice agreements exist. But the Arab States are doing more than just talking of a second round. There is a great deal of evidence to prove that they are preparing for another war. This is a matter which should be of the gravest concern not merely to American Jews but to the American Government as well. The possibility of another conflict in the Middle East is not merely a threat to the existence of Israel. It is a danger to world peace. I firmly believe that it is the responsibility of our Government, which is keenly interested in preserving world peace, to take a firm stand in speeding a peace settlement in the Middle East. It seems to me one of the first steps in achieving permanent peace in that part of the world is to discourage all preparations for war and to prevent the large-scale rearming of Egypt and other Arab countries.

Israel wants peace. Israel needs peace to cope with the overwhelming tasks of immigration and economic development. In the 2 years of its existence, Israel has emerged as a vital and progressive democracy. In the interests of peace, in the interests of aiding this young democratic Nation, the United States Government should extend continued aid for its economic development.

We have come a long way since the days of mass murder in Europe, since the days when the doors of Israel were open only to a trickle of immigration, and when there were 250,000 survivors of Nazi oppression waiting in the DP camps of Germany.

But we have not yet reached the point where we can regard crisis and emergency as things of the past. Not while oppression and poverty endanger the status of 900,000 Jews in north Africa and other Moslem areas. Not while 35,000 Jews are still waiting in the DP centers for a new home in Israel and the United States. Not while many thousands of others must be gotten out of eastern Europe before the doors of rescue are closed.

It is this urgent situation that makes so vital the continuation of large immigration into Israel. It is this urgent need that makes it imperative for us to support the transfer and absorption of at least 150,000 this year.

As you know, Mrs. Lehman and I visited Israel a year ago. We saw at first hand the miraculous accomplishments of the Jewish pioneers and builders. We also saw the misery and heartbreak of the transit immigrant camps, the indescribable hardships which so many thousands have had to endure in the miserable tents and barracks. And there are 90,000 new immigrants in these camps today, still waiting for the fulfillment of the promise of a new home in the Promised Land.

Under these circumstances, it is no exaggeration to say that the critical problems which Israel is facing today are just as great as when its heroic people had to fight a war of survival against the invading armies of six Arab countries.

You will recall that we have never questioned the fundamental fact that the problem of the displaced and distressed Jews in Europe and elsewhere was the responsibility of the Jews of the United States and the rest of the world. The fact that these displaced Jews have been transferred to Israel does not in any way reduce our responsibility. How can we say that the DP problem is solved, if it is merely transplanted to the soil of Israel?

The burden of receiving and caring for refugees who are entering Israel at the rate of more than 12,000 a month involves many overwhelming problems. There is the need of providing homes and making these people productive citizens of the new democracy. There is the problem of integrating into its economic and social structure men and women coming from 30 countries, from highly varied environments, speaking many different languages. All these superhuman tasks cannot possibly be borne by the people of Israel alone.

And I know that it was never our intention that the Jews of Israel should have to face this situation alone. When we prayed for the days of their deliverance, for the hour when Israel would be able to receive tens of thousand and hundreds of thousands of immigrants, we, you and I, and the rest of American Jewry, firmly pledged our fullest material and moral aid to achieve a resettlement of such enormous proportions. Surely we have not forgotten. Surely we must recognize that we now have the opportunity as well as the obligation to fulfill these solemn pledges.

I have full confidence in your understanding and your sense of generosity. I know that there is no question about your readiness to do what is expected of you in this year's United Jewish Appeal campaign. The record of the past decade has proved that where there is need you respond and that you do so in the measure required to meet that need.

The only thing we have to fear is that we underestimate the need, that we minimize the critical aspects of the present situation.

There are many critical problems still confronting us in many corners of the world. I have referred to deadlines on emigration out of eastern Europe. It is estimated that 20,000 Jews can be brought out of Poland to Israel. But this migration project must be completed before the end of September when Poland will close her doors.

In other parts of eastern Europe, as in Hungary and Rumania, limited opportunities for imigration exist, but there is the constant danger that the policies will be changed, and many will lose the chance to start life anew in Israel.

There is also great urgency in the plight of large numbers of Jews in the Moslem countries. The speed with which we get them out may spell the difference between life and death.

I am not at liberty to go into details concerning the situation, but I can tell you that Jews are coming out in increasing numbers. We cannot, we dare not permit lack of funds to stem that flood of emigration, to halt the escape of men and women fleeing from persecution and fear. One fact I can divulge: Operation Magic Carpet, that twentieth century miracle which has brought more than 45,000 Jews out of medieval Yemen into the sunlight and hope of Israel, is nearing an end. We can take great pride in the fact that through the United Jewish Appeal we have carried out one of the greatest rescue efforts in history.

As many as can be moved must be gotten out of the Moslem lands. But we must also provide for the great numbers who will remain behind and who are in desperate need of assistance. In truth, the problem of poverty, disease, discrimination in these lands is so great that only the most superhuman efforts can adequately meet the problem.

We are making encouraging progress in caring for the children in these countries, the youngsters who have had only a 50–50 chance of living beyond their thirteenth year. A network of medical installations has been established, schools have been set up, clothing is being provided, and food is being given to tens of thousands of children and adults, for whom it represents the only barrier against literal starvation.

In some parts of Europe, the situation is a happier one. As a result of the great constructive work of the Joint Distribution Committee since the end of the war, a very substantial section of European Jewry is well on the road to self-support and independence. This is indeed an accomplishment in which we can rejoice—particularly when we recall the pitiful survivors who remained when the Nazi blight was lifted from the continent.

Yet, even in western Europe, there remain many thousands who will require our continued aid for some time to come.

And there is still another front. All of you, I am sure, are familiar with the DP legislation which has for many months been pending in Congress. The great majority of the Members of Congress are very anxious that our country should continue to play its traditions' part in receiving and aiding those who need haven and refuge. Happily after a long and hard struggle a liberalized DP bill has been enacted by the Congress only a few days ago.

I hope that under this act a substantial number of refugees can enter this country in 1950 if we provide the necessary homes, jobs, and other assistance. The refugees whom we have enabled to come to the United States in the past 10 or 15 years have, by their contribution to our economy and our way of life proved themselves an outstanding asset to our country and its democratic ideals. Those who still wait anxiously for an opportunity to settle here also merit our help and our confidence.

How can we relax our efforts in the face of these global needs? How can we relax when the state of Israel faces a most serious crisis? How can we relax when hundreds of thousands of Jews are still running for their lives—still fleeing from terror and homelessness? How can we relax when there is so much that still must be done to finish the job of rehabilitation for the surviving victims of Hitlerism?

Believe me when I say that the needs of the United Jewish Appeal are greater today than ever before. Everything that we have built up through decades of devotion and sacrifice hangs in the balance of the outcome of this year's campaign.

We have to our credit great and unforgettable achievements in the reconstruction of our coreligionists, in the inspiring rebuilding of Israel and in the revival of Jewish life elsewhere. But these achievements are not yet secure. The crucial needs of 1950 still call for the most strenuous effort and the greatest service that it is in our power to give.

Let us be guided by the knowledge that we are capable of meeting the challenge of history. Our generation was blessed with the privilege and the opportunity to rescue our coreligionists from destruction and to bring new meaning and dignity to Jews throughout the world.

I am confident that you, the leaders of the Jewish community of Washington, will understand your responsibility as you always have over the years. I am confident that through your action tonight on behalf of the United Jewish Appeal, you will set an example of leadership that will inspire Jewish communities throughout the Nation. I am sure that the greatness of this hour will find all of us big enough to live up to the highest expectations of humanity.

United Negro College Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in all the activities which we are pursuing at home and abroad we must remember that the solid foundation is an informed and effective people. The enormous human resources available from the 32 private Negro colleges have a great contribution to make to the pool of skill and ability which we have in our country. It is a campaign which should draw its support from every truly American community. I append hereto an article from the Christian Science Monitor of April 13, 1950, signaling the opening of this drive:

UNITED NEGRO COLLEGE FUND OPENS DRIVE

NEW YORK.—The United Negro College fund has begun its seventh annual Nationwide campaign to gain support for 32 private Negro colleges and universities.

It seeks $1,400,000, the critical 10 percent that assures effective use of the other 90 percent of member institutions' combined budgets, according to fund officials.

These colleges make up the "avant garde of a democracy that we can really achieve," said Dr. Ira deA. Reid, vice chairman of the 1950 campaign, during opening ceremonies April 12 at the Rainbow Room of the RCA building.

URGENTLY NECESSARY

"Until we have completely integrated and implemented our democratic principles and practices in American public and private life, they are going to continue to be necessary to provide meaning for people our culture has disinherited," said Dr. Reid, chairman of the department of sociology, Haverford College, Pa.

More than 25,000 students from 43 States and Washington attend the 32 institutions in 13 States. The average student pays 50 percent of the cost of his education, according to the fund.

Each year, the fund has raised approximately $1,000,000. Alumni and other Negroes have contributed about 12 percent of the total in each campaign, besides giving increasingly to the colleges' endowment and building needs, officials estimate.

BENEFITS CITED

They point out that money raised by the fund enables the institutions to provide for necessary additions to faculty to meet increased enrollment and for more nearly adequate teaching salaries; provide scholarship aid for deserving students; provide for a reasonable expenditure for the operation and maintenance of the collective physical plant; and provide for additional laboratory and teaching equipment and improved library service.

At the campaign opening, Brig Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America, urged support of the drive and said, "We mustn't shift the burden of education to Government."

He called for "more education in politics and less politics in education."

Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, chairman of the Greater New York men's division of the fund, saw the colleges as a means of expanding training for leadership which we have not developed as we should have for 10 percent of our population.

Roland Hayes, noted concert artist and alumnus of Fisk University, a fund college, sang for the 400 persons assembled. Thomas I. Parkinson, president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States and national chairman of the 1950 campaign, presided.

Cost of National Government in Sixth Iowa District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, herewith is a compilation of the burden of Federal expenses on the people of the 15 counties in the Sixth Congressional District of Iowa:

I. Share of national debt owed by people of 6th District of Iowa, Mar. 31, 1950

County	Population (in thousands)	Share of national debt on basis of population	1949 taxable valuation	Share of 1951 Federal budget	Million equivalent
Boone	[illegible]	$57,285,000	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Carroll	23.7	41,430,000	41,047,363	7,196,296	178.73
Calhoun	17.2	29,921,000	[illegible]	5,225,268	129.73
Crawford	[illegible]	[illegible]	39,178,086	6,617,138	164.30
Emmet	13.0	22,595,000	27,127,174	4,319,279	107.23
Greene	14.8	25,820,000	36,[illegible]	5,738,951	142.49
Hamilton	24.1	42,025,000	43,554,870	6,418,828	159.37
Hancock	15.6	27,364,000	[illegible]	4,962,370	123.18
Humboldt	[illegible]	[illegible]	27,722,602	4,326,355	107.42
Kossuth	28.7	48,544,000	57,350,522	8,378,019	208.09
Palo Alto	15.8	27,830,000	[illegible]	5,205,812	129.24
Pocahontas	15.6	27,108,000	[illegible]	5,240,742	130.11
Webster	43.4	75,698,000	66,164,139	13,377,651	332.10
Winnebago	13.5	23,784,000	[illegible]	4,301,638	106.81
Wright	19.1	33,246,000	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total for district	304.5	530,912,000			

Source: Library of Congress. Iowa Taxpayers Association, Des Moines, Iowa.

II. Share of the 6th District of Iowa in current costs of the Federal debt and deficit

County	Percent of United States population	Share in daily interest in Federal debt total [1]	Share in estimated annual deficit on basis of population [2]	Share in daily interest on Federal deficit	Share in annual interest on Federal deficit
Boone	[illegible]	$3,513	$1,239,477	$74.67	[illegible]
Carroll	.0162	2,541	[illegible]	54.01	19,712
Calhoun	.0117	1,835	[illegible]	39.00	14,236
Crawford	.0137	2,149	[illegible]	45.67	16,670
Emmet	.0088	1,380	[illegible]	29.34	10,708
Greene	.0101	1,584	558,871	33.67	12,291
Hamilton	.0137	2,149	758,073	45.67	16,670
Hancock	.0107	1,678	[illegible]	35.67	13,020
Humboldt	.0098	1,536	[illegible]	29.34	10,708
Kossuth	.0182	2,857	1,007,075	60.67	22,146
Palo Alto	.0108	1,695	[illegible]	36.00	13,141
Pocahontas	.0106	1,663	[illegible]	35.34	12,898
Webster	.0296	4,643	1,637,880	98.68	36,017
Winnebago	.0085	1,459	[illegible]	31.00	11,316
Wright	.0120	[illegible]	[illegible]	42.34	15,458
Total for district	.208	[illegible]	11,509,425	[illegible]	[illegible]

[1] The Treasury Department estimates that interest paid on the national debt during fiscal 1950 will amount to $5,725,000,000.

[2] The Treasury Department estimates that the deficit during fiscal 1950 will amount to $5,533,377,244.

Source: Library of Congress.

Strengthening of Free Enterprise Through Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a most informative and inspiring address has been delivered by Mr. Willard F. Rockwell, which ought to be carefully read by the businessmen of America who believe in the effectiveness of advertising as a means of molding public opinion. This is the time of all times when the fundamental principles of free enterprise should be sold to the American people. The address of Mr. Willard F. Rockwell, which I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under unanimous consent, deals with this important subject. It follows:

STRENGTHENING OF FREE ENTERPRISE THROUGH ADVERTISING

Our Nation is the wealthiest and the most powerful in peace or war ever known on the

face of this earth, in spite of the fact that our national debt exceeds the total national debt of all the nations we are trying to support. We are told that we are engaged in a cold war with Russia because of her determination to attain world domination. Even though our working hours are nearly 50 percent lower than the Russian standard, our current productive capacity is more than four times greater, and Russia is dissipating one-fourth of her smaller capacity in an attempt to build a war machine. Russia cannot conduct a successful war against us until she accumulates vast quantities of strategic and critical materials, which are not now available and which cannot be accumulated in any short space of time. Russia would not have the atom bomb today if it had not been for the treachery in high places in our Government, which has finally been brought out into the open. The cold war is not an imminent threat. High military recognition of these facts was rendered when General Eisenhower recently said that national bankruptcy is more to be feared than the atom bomb.

Most great nations in history have met disaster through internal dissension and disorder. In Durant's history of Rome we read:

"All the white man's world looked to Rome as the center of the universe, the omnipotent and eternal city. Never had there been such wealth, such splendor or such power.

"Nevertheless, amid the prosperity that made Rome brilliant in the second century, all the seeds were germinating for the crisis that was to bring her ruin in the third century. Private and local independence, initiative, and pride withered as the power of the state increased. The wealth of the nation was drained away by ever-rising taxation to support a self-multiplying bureaucracy. Government expenditures and doles exhausted the treasury and debased the currency."

But the Romans had learned nothing from the experience of Athens, where Pericles had practiced the purchase of votes by subsidies to citizens until that great state had collapsed. And who knows how many states had risen to power through industry before Athens and Rome, only to disappear in dust when demagogues deluded and deceived the people into believing they could buy happiness by trading in their personal liberty. It has been said that Rome fell when Roman citizens lost their individual pride in their contributions to their government and became dependents on it.

The greatest threat to our high position is not the cold war with Russia, but the cold war in our own country between politicians seeking power and the business interests which have produced its wealth. Our national debt far exceeds the total assessed value of all of our taxable property. Our local, State, and Federal Governments are taking more than 30 percent of our national income, and demanding still higher taxes to meet increasing deficits. One out of every six adult Americans (or 16,000,000 people) are receiving regular pay checks from the Federal Government; and several million more are employed by State and local governments. Not content with this vast burden on business, politicians are planning even greater expenditures. All of these threats to our very existence were foreseen by the framers of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, but we are urged to forget their warnings, to discard their theories of government, and to adopt a new way of life. Our educational system has been a direful failure if we do not perceive that the proposed way has been tried and found wanting time after time in the course of history.

Every effort is being made to convince us that the welfare state is not a socialistic state, but it is impossible for the proponents to conceal the basic scheme, which is a redistribution of wealth and income to assure the maximum number of votes for the planners.

The founding fathers were deeply religious men who accepted the teachings of the Bible and, therefore, could not embrace either communism or socialism. They accepted the eighth commandment, "Thou shalt not steal"; and the tenth commandment, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's possessions." Surely if it is sinful to covet the property or income of your neighbor, it is no less sinful to vote for a government which plainly states that it will take property and income from some for the purpose of redistributing it to others.

No Christian should have any doubts about the approval of the capitalistic system or the rights to a profit after he reads the Parable of the Talents. He will not only discover that profits are commended, but that, on the other hand, punishment is recommended for anyone who willfully fails to produce. The two servants who were given custody of their master's capital while he went into a far country were rewarded when they met him on his return and were able to return the capital with 100-percent profit. To each he said, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou has been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things." But when the unfaithful servant told the master, "I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strewn; and I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth; lo, there thou hast that is thine," the master told him that he was wicked and slothful and that the least he could have done was to put the money out at interest and then return him the money with interest. The talent was taken from the disloyal and disrespectful servant who had buried it, and given to the servant who had made the most profit. And the master said, "For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath." And finally in contrast to National Labor Relations Board edicts, the master said, "Cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness," which should leave no doubt in anyone's mind that Christian principles are not compatible with the Socialist commandment that each shall produce according to his ability and each shall receive according to his need. History has demonstrated that a dictator is needed when one man's production is confiscated to provide for another who merely desires it.

When it was suggested to Washington and Jefferson that any new form of government should provide security for its people, Jefferson said:

"It is an idle dream * * * to redeem man from the original sentence of his Maker: In the sweat of his brow shall he eat his bread." And Jefferson could have added that St. Paul told the Thessalonians, "If any would not work, neither should he eat."

Political apologists for a welfare state claim they have developed a modernized Jeffersonian democracy. That the very word "democracy" was anathema to the constitutional founders is demonstrated by this quotation from James Madison in the Federalist (1787):

"Democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths."

The founding fathers only sought to guarantee us life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and warned us that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. It is astounding when you stop to think of it, that politicians throughout our modern world have made some people believe that Government cannot only support us but can guarantee us security without the effort required to pursue it. All such demagogues ask is surrender of personal freedom in exchange for greater power to them to plan and order our existence.

The statement that "human rights come before property rights" has a pious sound, but simple analysis shows that it is merely a pandering appeal to unthinking people. There has never been a community in which property rights were denied where human rights were upheld. President Washington pointed out our need to depend on religion to assure security for our property rights when he said in his Farewell Address:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness—these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, 'Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice?' "

The Russian kulaks died by the millions rather than surrender their little farms in exchange for the benefits of the great welfare state of communism. Many of the Jews in Germany were given opportunity to escape with their lives from Hitlerism by forfeiting their property, but many chose to risk their lives, and almost inevitably lost both property and life. Washington placed security for property first; security for reputation second; and security for life third, in that farewell message.

Some may be puzzled as to just when we took the initial step away from the religious and moral paths defined in our Constitution. Future historians will point out that we took that final fatal step in 1913, the step which has removed our right to privacy and our rights to property, and may eventually deny us every form of personal liberty and security.

In 1913 the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution was ratified, which granted Congress the power to lay and collect taxes on income from whatever source derived. That gave the politicians the power to tax, which you cannot deny is the power to destroy; and, although you were assured that the Government would never take as much as 5 percent or 10 percent of any man's or any group's earned income, you have seen that Government take 70 percent from many, and more than 100 percent from a few. Their tax bills take one-third of your income—more than enough to guarantee security to the lowest paid if they could keep it—and all we have in return is a pathetically puerile political promise of security based on the insecurity of a government which cannot live within its income when business is producing a new top in taxable income. They promised to save your money, because you were imprudent; but they have spent all they collected to date and have run up a national debt exceeding 100 percent of the assessed value of your total physical assets; and, to provide more doles, they demand increased taxes on inheritances and gifts, or the confiscation of the widow's and orphan's mite. You know it is un-American and anti-American; it is immoral and unmoral; it is irreligious and sacrilegious.

The people have been deceived into believing that only the rich and prosperous pay the taxes; but, in 1949, the Federal Government alone took $55,000,000,000, which is 25 percent of the national income and exceeds the entire national income for the year of 1932, or the year of 1933, or the year of 1934. Federal, State, and local governments have pay rolls exceeding $20,000,000,000, with over 7,500,000 employees—or nearly one in every eight workers in the entire country; and, with a new high of 5,000,000 unemployed, only government pay rolls are still rising. In the last 5 years, this Government has spent more than all previous Federal Governments spent from 1780 to 1940—or 160 years.

Although 46,000 people pay out 75 percent of their income in direct taxes and many millions pay no direct taxes, every family receiving less than $5,000 a year loses a large part of that income through hidden taxes collected in Federal corporation income taxes as a part of the price of every necessity of life which they buy.

It was just a little direct tax on tea which started the flames of the American Revolution; and, sooner or later, most people will discover that they are paying the taxes to support the vast bureaucracy which, even now, plans to multiply itself, and even now demands more and more taxes. Howls of the manufacturers and labor unions protesting the tax burden on luxuries have produced strange results—the ruling politicians promise to remove these taxes, paid mostly by the well-to-do, but propose that a similar amount be recovered by higher corporation taxes, which are paid in larger proportion by the people in the lowest-income classes.

Politicians constantly attack business profits and distort both the amount and the necessity for them. Dr. Robinson's Opinion Research Poll covering industrial employees' opinions on profits shows that industrial workers believe that average corporation profits are about 25 percent, and that 10-percent profit would be fair enough. Now the Government's own reports for 1948 show that industry averaged only 5.9 percent on investment, which equaled only 2.9 percent on sales; and Professor Slichter, of Harvard, says that these profits are overstated by at least 25 percent because of higher cost of replacement inventory and insufficient allowance for depreciation of plant and facilities. The Government's attitude is never logical. A recent congressional committee report states that profits of big steel companies are entirely too high, but complains that small producers cannot show any profit. Producing steel and producing wheat are both businesses, and why there should be great difference in fair-profit standards is impossible to see, unless you follow the political viewpoint that higher profits should be allowed only when they produce more votes. The Secretary of Agriculture says that wheat producers in the Pacific Northwest have a cost of 95 cents a bushel, which includes labor, cash outlay, seed, and machinery costs, and charge for the land. He says the average Government support price in that area is $1.90, which means that the Government taxes both the employees and stockholders of the steel companies in order to insure 100-percent profit to the wheat grower. A 6-percent profit on steel sales is condemned, while 100-percent profit on wheat sales is commended; and the main difference can only be in the number of votes garnered.

Throwing aside all consideration of profits, the safety of this Nation cannot be assured unless we continue to lead the world industrially. With 7 percent of the world's population, industry has provided, and our people are in possession of, more than half the automobiles, bathtubs, telephones, radios, washing machines, and other such labor saving and luxury items existing in the whole world. General von Hindenburg was considered the greatest military expert of the First World War, and he attributed his defeat chiefly to the industrial production of the United States. In the Second World War, Russia, who must share the blame with Hitler for starting it, was finally made the victim of Germany's aggression, and its western territory was so thoroughly devastated that Russia was impotent to attack Germany until furnished with American trucks, tanks, airplanes, and the necessary petroleum products to operate them. Every military expert admits that American industrial power turned the tide of battle to victory in both world wars, in spite of which our politicians lost the First World War's objective, which was to establish world-wide peace, and are rapidly losing all of the benefits which should have been derived from our great victories of the Second World War on land, sea, and in the air. The very people who have failed so completely in dealing with our allies and enemies demand the right to control American industry, and the people of this country just cannot afford to let that happen.

The problem of retaining or returning to Washington's form of government is a personal problem for every citizen. We businessmen can no longer escape our duty to our customers, our employees, our stockholders, and our dependents. If silence means consent, we must protest vociferously. We have faith in the judgment of the American citizen when he has the facts presented to him; and we believe that management must spend part of its income—and, if necessary, all of its income—to protect the rights of these people, who, when you get through enumerating them, are all the people in the country, even the short-sighted, self-seeking, political job holders.

Along about the time of the Flanders committee hearings in January 1949, the management and directors of the Standard Steel Spring Co. decided no more time should be lost and we must employ the weapon of advertising in a militant crusade against this growing menace of political infringement upon our priceless heritage of liberty and personal dignity. We have always had a solid conviction that our citizens are not stupid. They have been exposed to one-way political propaganda, and we felt that ignorance of the facts concerning American business constitutes the greatest single menace to our system and to our way of life.

During 1949, we published 12 full-page advertisements at intervals of approximately 3 weeks, in 61 daily newspapers in 43 cities throughout the country. We selected newspapers because we thought they had the maximum mass penetration and news impact. So far as the market survey is concerned for this particular undertaking, we regard the American public as being divided into four groups: (1) the comparatively small segment of indoctrinated and very active voters on the extreme left; (2) a somewhat larger group of well-informed voters at the extreme right, who are traditionally conservative and, therefore, not too vocal; (3) the great mass of American voters between these two groups, who are misinformed or uninformed, confused, or uninterested, either on the fence or passive in their reactions to political and social trends, and (4) a vast group of 45,000,000 pathetically apathetic citizens of voting age who failed to vote in the last election.

Of course, we were told in the beginning that newspaper advertising would never reach the very class of voters who have been most misled by the political propaganda. Some predicted our plan would present another illustration of business inanely talking to itself. But we proceeded, because we felt that a simplified but aggressive explanation of the historical fundamental functions of our American business system would be welcome to open-minded Americans, and now we know it.

When our first advertisements received almost universal approval, business friends requested a résumé of the results. We, too, wanted to check results as accurately as possible, so we employed the accepted methods of testing readership commonly used in the publishing and advertising business. Nationally recognized Daniel Starch and staff are employed to tell newspapers how effective advertising is, and we found they had surveyed the New York World-Telegram of June 9, which carried our full-page story. You know the Starch organization interviews an equal number of men and women, 18 years of age and over, who have read a particular paper, within 24 hours after issue, over the entire area of distribution, in direct proportion to the circulation break-down of the newspaper. Each interview covers the entire newspaper to determine how many have seen the advertisement, how many have read it and associate it with the product or advertiser, and how many have read it thoroughly. Our position was not so good: two-thirds of the way back in the newspaper. In this particular issue, the average observation of all national ads was 10 percent among men and 16 percent among women (women, of course, looking for advertised bargains). The observation of the Standard Steel Spring Co.'s advertisement was 40 percent among men, and 33 percent among women. The average thorough readership of all national ads of this issue was 4 percent among men, and 6 percent among women. The thorough readership of the Standard Steel Spring advertisement was 23 percent among men, and 12 percent among women. On July 28, over 1 month later, the Starch organization surveyed another advertisement in the New York Sun. The average observation of all ads in the issue was 16 percent for men, 19 percent for women. The Standard Steel ad was 56 percent for men, 42 percent for women, indicating cumulative interest in the series. The average thorough readership was 31 percent for men, 15 percent for women. These readership figures by all known standards of measure appeared so optimistic that we requested the Starch organization to compare readership of our advertising with the highest rated advertisements in all issues they had studied from January to the end of July, of the New York World-Telegram and the New York Sun.

From the standpoint of thorough readership in the New York World-Telegram among men readers, we tied with one other advertiser for first place among all the advertisements in the seven months. Among women readers, we rated highest in the entire seven-month period. And in the New York Sun for the same period, in thorough readership, we received the highest total among all advertisements of both men and women readers. I would like to emphasize again that thorough readership means reading from top to bottom.

Remembering the Literary Digest and Gallup polls, these reports aroused skepticism on such surprising readership figures, so we decided to make our own readership study during the week of July 25 in 9 cities: Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and San Francisco. We instructed our interviewers to stay down among the lower income groups and to get an adequate cross section of labor union workers, housewives, proprietors, clerks, and so forth. This 9-city survey confirmed the Starch figures. We came up with an observation rating of 49 percent among men and 33 percent among women, and thorough readership of 34 percent among men and 17 percent among women. Such thorough readership figures are virtually unheard of in any type of advertising.

In answer to the question, "Who is reading these ads?" a study of circulation figures proves that there are not enough white collar workers or stuffed shirts in any of these cities, or in this whole country, to add up to such totals. It is impossible to cover here the extent and contents of the mail that we received spontaneously from all classes of citizens throughout the world. We read and

analyzed every letter received, and 98 percent of them have been favorable and enthusiastic. Two percent have been unfavorable, and, as you might suspect, most of such were not signed. We received mail from 45 States and Canada, India, Cuba, Mexico, Australia, Hawaii, Sweden, Germany, England, New Zealand, and so forth.

During the summer, British General Critchley, whom some of you met during the war, asked us to send proofs of these ads to members of Parliament and important business executives in England. Of course, we sent them. We had very favorable replies. General Critchley wrote us, and said: "Thank you very much indeed for sending these reprints. * * * These ads make the case against socialism stronger than anything we have yet seen on this side, and your firm is to be highly congratulated in making the layout so very definite and readable."

Comment on these new-type ads followed almost in an avalanche. The usual statements run to this effect: "You're doing a great job; why don't other corporations do the same thing?" and "Please don't stop." I will read you one that we received from a Diesel Workers' Union. It says:

"DEAR SIRS: We have 12 bulletin boards in this plant, and we would like the ads on 12 copies No. 1, 12 copies No. 2"—and so on.

"Also we would like to know the cost of just one of each of the 10. Please send your reply to the Diesel Workers' Union, attention of Dan Ramadell, and I thank you kind hope to hear from you."

Of course we sent them, and he replies as follows:

"Received the advertising you sent and want to thank you very much. It's companies like yours that keep labor on the up and up. Again we say thank you."

We have received so many requests from businesses of all types for numbers of reprints that we decided to query 26 of them to find out how they were being used. Wilson & Co. and J. I. Case distributed them to their branch managers and posted them in the factories. Torrington Manufacturing Co. distributed reprints to every employee in the shop. Eddie Rickenbacker's Eastern Airline Co. asked for 7,500 and distributed one to every employee in his pay envelope, which may indicate the methods which keep this air-transport company in the black. Wolverine Oil said: "We are a small oil company with 80 employees and service-station dealers. Think your ad is wonderful propaganda for our form of government"—probably meaning the form of government we did have.

General Foods: "Posted ads on all company bulletin boards." Peavy Elevators—that's grain elevators—"Distributed reprints to 225 country elevators in Minnesota, North and South Dakota." The response from educational institutions has been one of the most amazing interesting reactions to these ads. To date, 39.4 percent of all Americans of voting age have had no experience politically with anything but New Deal and Fair Deal administrations; and the teenagers of today are the voters of tomorrow. They represent a very fertile field, which has been insidiously cultivated by the proponents of socialistic and communistic thinking. So you may understand with what gratification we have received letters from teachers, professors, and university students, presidents, and hundreds of public-school teachers and students.

It seemed important to us to get back to some of these people and get their reactions, so we interviewed 1,762 small retailers in 27 cities where these ads had been published. We simply showed them the proofs, asked them if they had seen and read the advertising, and what they thought of it. Eighty-two percent of this nearly 2,000 retailers reported that they had seen the ads, 64 percent that they read them. Eighty-seven percent of those who read our ads expressed the opinion that other companies should do a similar job. The typical comment of the small retailer could be summarized in the statement of a small jewelry store operator in Los Angeles who said: "Well done. It's about time the big companies helped the little ones." Or a musical instrument dealer in Cleveland who said: "A big boon to small business who cannot afford the same publicity."

The campaign was barely started before the editorial departments picked it up and put the story into editorials. Such newspapers as the Cincinnati Enquirer, Boston Traveler, Memphis Commercial Appeal, Chicago Daily News, Cleveland Plain Dealer, Seattle Post-Intelligencer, and so on, had editorials on the subject. Many of them quoted in part or in whole, and most gave definite credit to Standard Steel Spring Co. One of the most interesting and serious editorial efforts was that of the Pittsburgh Courier, which some of you may know has the largest circulation and is a leading Negro newspaper in this country. This publisher not only printed editorials, but, at his own expense, reprinted the eight ads that we first put out and mailed them to 2,500 leading colored citizens, teachers, preachers, etc., throughout the country.

Typical of spontaneous letters received is a statement from the publisher of the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald:

"If not at this juncture, just when should private enterprise state its case in positive, dynamic fashion? Surely not after the whole damned horse is stolen. Accordingly, if you will pardon my vehemence, this was the right time for enterprise to speak up. Tomorrow is still the right time. Day after tomorrow may be too late." Possibly he was hoping public sentiment might shorten the bitter coal strike. The publisher of the Canton (Ill.) Daily Ledger says: "Personally, in my almost 30 years in the newspaper and advertising field, I have never seen a better prepared campaign, nor more forceful copy than this. More copy of this nature should have been around in this country several years ago." I think he meant 17 years ago.

The publisher of the San Francisco Examiner made this comment. "This is the first time in my many years in any formal publication I have seen the basic principles and factors of economic and political philosophy so simply, so effectively expressed, and so forcibly presented."

Many small businesses wrote for permission to publish our ads in their own newspapers at their own expense. In Lancaster, Pa., for example, a newspaper published the entire series over their own name. And a number of English manufacturers published them in England, with footnotes to remind the reader that these ads originated in the United States of America and represent an American view of what is going on over there. The advertisement on socialism was displayed or quoted on the front page of a number of English newspapers, and the Glasgow (Scotland) Daily News. When the Scots take notice, you know you have hit pay dirt.

It would be next to impossible to tell you how many house organs throughout the country have picked up these ads and published them. The Bell Telephone, Standard Oil of New Jersey, General Motors, a number of the biggest companies, and many of the smallest.

Now, naturally, there were people who said when we were advertising in such papers as the New York Times we were wasting our time and money. Our advertising people thought we weren't, and I feel the best answer came from some of the people who have picked up our program from the New York Times, resulting in radio comment which has been surprisingly helpful and significant. Arthur Godfrey has an audience estimated at 3,650,000, which, of course, includes the stay-at-homes, the hospitalized, the housewives, and many who cannot read and others who are temporarily unable to read. On June 7, he read one of these ads to this vast morning coast-to-coast assembly. He devoted 6 minutes out of his 30-minute Chesterfield program to this advertisement. But there was one great comment he made which shows you what ads can do to arouse our people by reminding prominent speakers of our current dangers.

Godfrey said: "I would like to quote a statement of significance by Thomas Jefferson:

"'I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest danger to be feared. To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt.

"'We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts we must be taxed in our meats and in our drink, in our necessities and in our conveniences, in our labors and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

"'We are endeavoring to reduce the Government to the practice of rigid economy to avoid burdening the people and arming the magistrate with a patronage of money which might be used to corrupt the principles of our Government.'

"And," said Mr. Godfrey, "wouldn't it have been wonderful if we had followed his advice?" How can anyone claim that Jefferson would endorse any political platform presented to the voters in our 1948 presidential election? They should give complete credit to General Coxey, who said our Government should print money and distribute it to the poor.

Baukhage, the top ABC commentator, also quoted from our current advertising. Kate Smith, of Moon Over the Mountain fame, made reference to our advertising and added force and facts to our story.

This, for the Standard Steel Spring Co., has been a major effort in terms of dollars spent. It has cost nearly a million dollars, but it has produced amazing results. Of course, as a Congressman from Texas pointed out, some of that expenditure reduced tax income for the Government, for which we're awfully sorry, but we believe the money was used for the benefit of every American, while tax money sometimes arms the magistrate with a patronage of money, just as Jefferson prophesied, "to corrupt the principle of our Government."

So far as this experiment in combining public education with institutional advertising has gone, it has registered in a manner beyond our greatest expectations. As I have said, I am deeply concerned about the future of business in this country and the future of this country's way of life, and many of you share in that concern. But now we have proof positive that the American citizen does think straight and will act decisively if he is given the straight facts about any public policy. This advertising experience proves the existence in the people of our country of keen desire to acquire facts affecting the economics of business—facts which do enable them to refute the planned-economy propaganda and to exert themselves to recover the political powers they surrendered in 1913. This experience has proved to us, if it has proved nothing else, that there is in the minds of the American people (including the minds of so-called small business throughout this country), a latent respect and admiration for the great American accomplishments which the "Farewell State" advocates have labeled, libeled, and criticized as big, bad business. There is still time, in our opinion, for business leaders, large and small, to employ their courage and vision to discharge their obligation to their fellow citizens—openly and factually to protect, defend, and advance our competitive free enterprise system.

American business had led the world in advertising and sales promotion of its products. It has altered and improved the living habits of the American people and most other civilized nations. But American business has failed miserably in selling 150,000,000 Americans on the fact that our competitive free enterprise business system is the secret and source of our success; that the return to, or resort to, repudiated and reprehensible political panaceas is a frightful threat, not only to business and employment but to the American way of living—the envy of 2,000,000,000 people on this earth who do not share it.

Closed Door for Price Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, at the St. Louis meeting of the Zinc Institute, Director Boyd, of the United States Bureau of Mines, said:

It has become obvious to all but the most blind that our reserves have not been developed at the desired rate. The door is virtually closed for price support and production subsidies. The need for encouraging exploration must become more fully recognized.

If the point is made clear to the Government and the public, and not clouded by extraneous issues and the problems of individual operators, there is some hope for constructive action.

This appears to me to be a statement of utter futility.

No Government agency did more to close this door than the Interior Department itself. What mining company of ordinary size can afford to participate in exploration programs which, if successful, would most likely find ore which cannot be produced profitably now or in the reasonably foreseeable future? This leaves the exploration field pretty much to large companies and the Government itself, not at all a happy situation.

As to the "problems of the individual operators"—and does that not mean those of the numerical majority of those in the mining industry?—Mr. Boyd no doubt long since has noted they rapidly are solving themselves like the problems of those 10 little Indians who died 1 by 1.

This Is Not Fiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer and reproduced in the Melrose (Mass.) Free Press:

THIS IS NOT FICTION

(From Cleveland Plain Dealer)

Will the reader pretend that he has an obscure neighbor by the name of Harry Truman? And will he pretend that Neighbor Truman has decided he must borrow money, a decision which many of us ordinary folks have reached at times in the tempestuous course of life?

Neighbor Truman, we're going to pretend, steps into the bank to apply for the loan, and we're going to have the privilege of observing the transaction.

"I want to borrow $500," says our neighbor. (Now most will anticipate the next few questions.)

"Do you have any debts at the present time?" the banker inquires.

"Yes," says our neighbor. "I owe the bank at this moment about $25,800."

"What is your annual income, Mr. Truman?"

"I have take-home pay amounting to $3,750 a year."

"Hmmmmmm," the banker hmms. He at once is suspicious of the client's ability to pay the old debt without $500 more added. And aren't his eavesdropping neighbors suspicious?

But the banker gives allowance for unforeseen circumstances. So he asks Mr. Truman, "Do you think you will be able to save a large portion of your income this year and each succeeding year to reduce your indebtedness?"

"Oh, no," Neighbor Truman replies to the surprise of the banker, and the neighbors listening in. "My necessary living expenses this year will be $4,250. I'll be forced to spend more than I earn."

"Pardon me," the startled banker interjects. "Do you mean that, owing already an amount that constitutes seven times what you'll take in during a year, you're going to spend more than you earn?"

"That's right," says Neighbor Truman. "You see I must provide tuition at private schools for my children. I must help a poor relative set up a new business in which he's going to lose money for a long time to come."

"Just what kind of business is that relative going to sink your money in?" the incredulous banker asks.

"Why," says Mr. Truman, "he's got a wonderful humanitarian idea. He's going to sell milk to the Hottentots at a price they can afford to pay."

"But just those things won't eat up your whole income this year, will they?"

"No, but that isn't all," says Mr. Truman. "I am building security for my children by putting price supports under them. My boys sell newspapers to the neighbors at a nickel a piece, but I give the man an extra nickel. My daughters make lamp shades which they sell for $5, but I don't think that's a fair price, so I give an extra $2 for each one they sell. Besides, my wife wants a television set."

The banker now steps aside to get his breath. Here's a fellow who owes more than he can ever repay if he lives frugally below his income, seeking to borrow still more, and at the same time boldly proclaiming his intention of carrying out fantastic money-spending schemes.

What will the banker do?

Will he lend the new money? It's silly even to ask the question.

This scene is not fiction. It constitutes a faithful reproduction of the program set forth in regal solemnity by President of the United States Harry S. Truman. Multiply all figures by 10,000,000 and you have the Truman budget, his plan of government, the Government's income, and the Government's debt.

In this case Congress is the banker. If it makes the loan, Borrower Truman's note will have to be signed by the taxpayers, which is to say by all the people. Who, in his right mind, would voluntarily sign the note of such a profligate spender?

The Kerr Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House Members to the attached editorial from the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune in connection with the so-called Kerr natural gas bill. This issue has held tremendous interest in Congress and the Nation recently and will, I believe, continue to be one of growing interest as time goes on despite the veto death of this bill last week.

My purpose in placing this editorial of record is because this article so completely and clearly points out the real facts at issue. Now that this effort to protect the developers of our natural-gas reserves has failed, the consumers will need have no doubt as to who is really to blame when their gas bills begin to increase in the months and years ahead. All those who have a clear knowledge of the oil and gas producing industry know that gas prices to the consumer are going to go up. Opponents of the Kerr bill put so much emphasis on their love for the gas consumer that I feel the information here will make interesting reading for these consumers when they find themselves faced with higher gas costs.

By placing this editorial on file for future reference, the day is not far off when these consumers will be enabled to discover who really had the consumers' best interests at heart in this fight.

The editorial follows:

Mr. Dowling's cartoon today illustrates the practical problem President Truman is supposed to be up against in determining whether to sign the Kerr natural-gas bill or veto it. But the picture doesn't tell the whole story. Maybe there's no use trying to tell the whole story to people who refuse to look beyond their noses. But we'll try, once more.

There is a natural-gas reserve of 180,000,000,000,000 cubic feet. This would last 30 years at the present rate of consumption. But more miles of pipe line and more consumers are being added every day to the Nation's gas system. By 1955 the present reserve will be equal to only 9 years' supply at the accelerated rate of burning.

Heretofore the gas business has largely been a byproduct of the oil exploration and production business. Hereafter it will be big business and stand on its own legs. Until now, being a byproduct, gas has sold at unsteady prices at the wellhead. Some has been blown in the air because it would cost more to connect it to a pipe line than it would bring in a reasonable length of time at prevailing prices. The price at the wellhead even in the light of today's growing demand is only at an index of 88.3 compared with coal at 108.

However, and this is what Mr. Dowling doesn't recognize, the natural-gas business can only remain big business if there is assurance that the supply will be kept in line with the demand. This will make exploration and drilling, with the usual risks that attend mining enterprises, such as unproductive wells. The so-called independent producer will have to drill these speculative wells. The interstate pipe liners are in the business of transporting and selling gas, not drilling for it, except in a few instances.

Clearly, then, the driller can't be put under the same rule book as the transporter. The Natural Gas Act regulates the latter, holding him to something like 6-percent profit after taxes on his investment. That's eminently proper, for he has a mortal cinch—if the gas supply holds out.

The Kerr amendment merely takes the driller out of the regulatory set-up, where it was never intended he should be in the first instance. Out of a strait-jacket, he is free to drill a second well if his first one is a failure, and charge enough for the gas he gets from it to cover his costs of both wells and his profit. Kept in the traces, he'd never drill the second and subsequent wells that are necessary if the whole new natural-gas structure is not to collapse.

Cartoonist Dowling's big city consumers ought to be able to see that an abnormally low gas price for a year or two isn't going to do them any good if it halts the search for new reserves. The reserves will be exhausted before they can amortize the costs of their new furnaces with their savings over coal, unless the producers are encouraged up to continue the venturesome business of exploring, drilling, and recovering. Naturally as the reserve dwindled the wellhead price would rise until it reached a figure equal to the value of coal plus the worth of the convenience of gas.

Cartoonist Dowling's complaining users are not the real victims of the new deal in natural gas. They would be lucky to get gas at twice the price they have to pay today. The real unfortunates in this revolutionary change that John L. Lewis has brought about by shutting down the coal industry until he has sent its prices sky high are the people of Oklahoma and Texas.

We had a century's supply of natural gas at fair prices for all concerned until the interstate pipe liners came along to blow it out from under our feet. Now we have no more gas than the people at the other end of the longest line—Milwaukee or Pittsburgh.

When the supply is exhausted for one it will be gone for all. Milwaukee then will still have its lake upon which to float in coal cheaply. Pittsburgh will still have its nearby coal mines which operate at low costs, relatively speaking. Oklahoma will have only high-cost and low-grade domestic coal. Texas will have—exactly nothing to burn but what is left of its oil and mesquite.

Farm Message Lures Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in order to obscure and confuse the people regarding the costly result of his action in signing the cotton- and peanut-acreage allotment bill, President Truman dragged into his message another plea for his pet vote snarer, the Brannan plan. The President recognized the bad features of the bill he signed. His message shows that.

This bill and the Kerr-Thomas natural-gas bill illustrate the hybrid legislation which results from the strange alliance which composes the present-day majority party.

The Milwaukee Journal, Wisconsin's largest newspaper, commented on the President's farm message in an editorial which pierces the veil surrounding his statement. I commend it to my colleagues:

FARM MESSAGE LURES VOTERS

The reluctance with which the President says he signed the potato-cotton-peanut farm bill is perfectly understandable. The bill was a makeshift, patchwork measure.

The bad features of the measure and the extra outlays that will be required, which the President discusses in detail in his message, at least come close to offsetting the promise of stricter control of potato surpluses. The legislation falls far short, as the President says, of any sound solution for the potato problem. It isn't even the beginning of a sounder program for coping with farm prices and surpluses.

The President neglects to mention, however, that much of the responsibility for the muddling and waste and colossal expense in the present farm program rests upon him and the Democratic majority in Congress. He takes undue credit if he implies that he or his party have been wiser or more consistent than the Republicans; or any less prone to play farm politics with tax billions.

All that the President says about need for better farm legislation to protect agricultural, consumer, and taxpayer welfare is trite and scarcely open to argument.

There is plenty of room for argument about the Brannan plan, which the President again urges Congress to adopt. The merits and costs of the Brannan plan are speculative. There is no evidence of marked agreement in Congress, in farm circles or the country at large as to whether the plan would work better than present legislation in the case of perishable farm products, or any particular product.

At present, there appears no strong probability that Congress will even give serious consideration to the Brannan plan before the fall congressional elections.

The President's farm bill message, therefore, sounds very much like political thunder for the coming political campaign. He can cite it as evidence that he has demanded something "far better" in the way of farm legislation. He can call for the election of Democrats to Congress to help him achieve that goal.

That may be good for some votes next fall.

Address of John B. Trevor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, John B. Trevor, president of the American Coalition, on April 13, delivered one of the soundest, most sensible, most farseeingly patriotic addresses that has come to my attention in many months.

Mr. Trevor, during the First World War, was in command of military intelligence in the entire New York area. For many years he has devoted his time and efforts to the elimination of all subversive elements within our population and has stood and worked for those principles which would perpetuate the Constitution of the United States and all it stands for.

Under unanimous consent, I include the splendid speech to which I have referred:

Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the honor of the invitation extended to me to address this distinguished body. The name of the society arouses memories of the greatest tradition in our history, that is, the founding of our Republic. You trace your ancestry to the patriots who made this great Nation possible, so it seems to me not out of place to suggest that membership in the Order of Founders and Patriots carries with it a grave responsibility to defend aggressively, and to the last ditch, the magnificent heritage handed down to you by your forefathers.

We are faced as everyone throughout the land knows by a deceitful and ruthless enemy abroad, and within we are confronted by not only the agents of this enemy who have penetrated every organism of our body politic, but also by a multitude of groups led by persons of prominence in the community, which, consciously or unconsciously, are undermining that patriotic fervor which impels men to die for their country on the battlefield.

I do not question for a moment the sincerity of these leaders in the cause of peace—God knows we all want peace—but with all respect to the accomplishments of these men in various fields of endeavor which they thoroughly understand, I challenge their knowledge of the world they seek to reorganize.

The sounds of battle had barely ceased in 1945, when Dr. Mortimer J. Adler, said to be well-known as an author, philosopher, and psychologist, proclaimed from a platform in the auditorium of Notre Dame College, in Cleveland, Ohio—"We must do everything we can to abolish the United States." The reason the speaker gave for this pronouncement is summed up in one short paragraph: "The only answer to the threat of atomic war is world government—complete relinquishment of United States and all other national sovereignties."

A much more distinguished citizen, former Justice Owen J. Roberts, of the Supreme Court of the United States, gave the impression to the audience at a recent hearing before the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, that he was ready to join with Senator THOMAS, chairman of that subcommittee, in pulling down the Stars and Stripes from the Capitol in pursuance of a desire to create a world government. Also, and specifically, Justice Roberts said, and I quote: "What is there in nationalism that so poisons the ability to be broad and to see the other fellow's point of view?"

On an earlier occasion, that is, as far back as 1943, Justice Roberts declared, "An international government, with police power over every individual citizen in the nations belonging to it—instead of over merely the national governments as such—is the only way to keep the peace."

Now let me call your attention to the beliefs, purposes, and policies of the United World Federalists, Inc. I quote from one of their leaflets, dated October 29, 1949: "The world federal government should include the following basic organs: (a) A world legislature to enact all laws necessary to carry out the functions delegated to the world federal government; (b) a world executive agency to administer and enforce the laws; (c) world courts to interpret the constitution and laws, and to try and to sentence lawbreakers." Let me slip down to

No. 4, of their principles, which reads: "World law should be enforceable directly upon individuals"; and, the seventh principle declares: "The world federal government should have authority to raise dependable revenue under a carefully defined and limited but direct taxing power independent of national taxation."

Up to this point the proponents of world government are united. They want to abolish the United States as it now is. They want to abolish the national sovereignty of all States, and they want to focus the loyalty of all the people of all the world upon the world government of a superstate. Furthermore, they want this superstate to have the right to enforce its laws upon the individual citizen of the world state in its own courts, and, finally, they want to confer upon the superstate the right to tax directly the individual citizen of the superstate regardless of whatever national taxation he may be required to pay. But when it comes to actually drafting a constitution, the proponents of world government are one and all floundering in a morass of philosophical speculation on how to devise an acceptable system for the selection of delegates to the legislature of the all-embracing power they seek to create.

Let us analyze this situation objectively. We are up against a real and very serious problem. The United World Federalists, to mention only one society, have spent $291,672 to lobby their plan for the development of the United Nations into a world federation through Congress, and they have plenty to show for their money.

House Resolution No. 64 was sponsored by at least 119 Representatives, and its counterpart, Senate Resolution No. 56, is supported by 17 Senators. There are a whole flock of other resolutions, varying in scope and variously sponsored. In addition, the legislatures of 22 States have approved resolutions for world government. This thing is not a joke, at least not in the United States.

In a discussion of world government by the State Department, in Publication 3712, released in January of this year, appear the following comments:

"The absence of universal identity of purpose and principle among nations is as marked now as it was at San Francisco, and the conflict between national aims and ambitions is in some cases much sharper. To establish any type of world government would mean that individual States would have to be prepared to carry out the decisions of that body even when they ran counter to established national policies. It would also mean that the world government would itself have the means to force a recalcitrant State into line.

"Under present circumstances—when what appears as essential to the welfare of the people of one state is so often diametrically opposed to the apparent interests of another—there is little indication that nations are now generally disposed to surrender their sovereign rights to this extent.

"There is hardly reason to believe that a proposal to establish a world government would receive the support of a substantial number of the nations of the world, or that these nations would be willing to delegate the necessary powers to such a superstate. There is, in fact, some danger that efforts toward this end, if pressed too far, too fast, may impede rather than encourage international cooperation."

Right here in these comments of the State Department upon world government, the thought is expressed in no uncertain terms that there is at the moment no identity of purpose and principle among the nations of the world. Furthermore, the State Department specifically sets forth the fact that the conflict between national aims and ambitions is even now more pronounced than at the time the United Nations emerged in concrete form from the conference at San Francisco.

The State Department also makes clear, what really is self-evident, that a world government must have power to bring a recalcitrant state into line. Well, gentlemen, that, of course, is merely another way of saying that war would be a necessity in order to bring about the perfect union of which the proponents of world government dream. That thought is in conformity with our own experience. It was the very lack of identity of purpose and the wide divergence of economic interests that made our Civil War inevitable. There is, therefore, no guaranty of peace in the attempt to amalgamate in a superstate a mass of nations and people who differ widely in their interests, their culture, their civilization, and their race. In fact, I think the very attempt to bring together these utterly divergent interests might be the best way to precipitate a conflict.

As I have already said, a federal union is no guaranty of peace, and while the United States has been involved in only 12 wars, our Government has engaged in over 170 distinct military campaigns. As I have stated before, I do not question for one moment the idealism of the proponents of world government, but I definitely challenge their ability to appreciate the realities of the situation which confronts the world in this day and age.

Let us now take a brief look at the population of the world which is estimated to be composed of approximately 2,250,000,000 souls. This 2,250,000,000 people represent 29 distinct types, ranging from the Bushmen of South Africa, the Dravidians of India, the Patagonians of South America, and the Eskimos of the Arctic to the northern and western Europeans from whom the founders and patriots of 1789 were descended. These 29 types, described by the great anthropologist Deniker, subdivide into hundreds of linguistic groups or races of which our Bureau of Immigration has recognized 45 as coming to the United States. Thirty-six of these races or peoples are indigenous to Europe. From this heterogeneous mass of humanity there are in our population, according to the United States census of 1940, 106,795,732 native whites; 12,865,518 Negroes; and 11,419,138 foreign-born.

Gentlemen, I suggest that you consider these statistics and figure out for yourselves what our influence would be in a world legislature recruited by popular suffrage, and give a thought to what that legislature would be like. Also, let me ask, How long do you suppose any limitations on taxation would last which might be incorporated in the new constitution of the world. If we objected, our power to resist would be gone, and our right to secede is specifically denied in the program.

In a very interesting article which appeared not long ago in the magazine American Affairs, it was estimated that we had about 6 percent of the world's population, and approximately 36 percent of the world's income. You will readily see that on a share-the-wealth basis the present-day American would have to cut his living standard to one-sixth of what it is now, when the socialist government of the superstate really got going. As a matter of fact, the administration now in power in Washington has an international agreement before the Senate to merge all the trade of the world under the control of an international body in which we would have 1 vote out of 58; in other words, our influence in this international association would be on a par with Luxemburg or Siam. In plain English, our whole economic system is at the moment in imminent peril of destruction at the hands of our socialistic internationalists.

This peril is no fantasy of the imagination. Look at the platform of the present government now in control of England. It differs only in minor details from the economic philosophy of the Politburo of Soviet Russia; and, let me say, the same comment may fairly be made in varying degrees upon virtually every government of continental Europe, except possibly Switzerland, Spain, and Portugal.

So I say to you, gentlemen, even if Soviet Russia is left out of the picture, and it cannot be logically done, we Americans would face utter and complete ruin if we become involved in any form of world government which would be dominated by the Marxian Socialists of western Europe. Let us not forget, that it is governments controlled by these Socialists that the American taxpayer is now supporting by paying the deficits in the economy of their nations. That is the picture. Take a good look at it. In saying this, bear in mind, that I have not even mentioned the fact that if a representative system of government is conceivable for a world government, and I do not believe it is, the people of Asia alone could outvote all the nations of the earth, and her civilization, such as it is, would be supreme. The alternative is some sort of a Fascist regime which no American should tolerate.

Now, for a last word—the leaders of the Russian Revolution declared in their constitution for the Soviet Union in 1923 that they had taken "a new decisive step along the path of the union of the workers of all countries in a World Socialist Soviet Republic." To be sure, this union is now composed of only 182 nationalities, speaking 149 different languages or dialects. It also has ten to fifteen million of its citizens in jails or concentration camps, and its firing squads are never idle.

It will not do, gentlemen, for anyone to assert that the Russian system is beyond a reasonable conception of what may happen here. Mr. Beveridge, the English economist, whose plan had wide publicity in the United States, frankly admitted that his scheme for industrial reform would be unworkable unless force were used to make all persons subject to it comply with the orders of the directing authority. That, of course, is despotism, and there is nothing more despotic in theory now in operation under the Russian regime.

I, personally, have no use for the Soviet system, or any Fascist form of government, but, as I have seen the world and lived abroad among some of its strange peoples, I think the Russians have devised the only form of world government which will work, and so far as it goes, although it is utterly detestable, it does work.

It would, of course, be silly to suppose that the present promoters of world government have any connection with the Communist movement in the United States. I would be the last to suggest the thought, but if patriotism is destroyed by advocacy of loyalty to a superstate and we let our Government drift much further into socialism, I fear that a communistic Frankenstein, as bad as Russia, may be created which will engulf the great heritage handed down to us by the founders of the Republic.

Ex-Justice Hyman Rayfiel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of

April 5, 1950, the subject of which, former Justice Hyman Rayfiel, was for many years a distinguished resident of my district and whose career will long remain an inspiration for the youth of that community and of Brooklyn. He served his borough and city most creditably and possessed all those fine and rare attributes that make for a most successful judicial career. His distinguished son and former colleague, Leo Rayfiel, now United States district judge of the eastern district of New York, has been inspired by his father. We who knew him mourn his passing.

(Ex-Justice Hyman Rayfiel.

Hyman Rayfiel, former special sessions justice who died at the age of 89, had a long and interesting life. The father of Federal Judge Leo Rayfiel came here from Austria at the age of 16, got a job as court interpreter, studied diligently and passed his regent examinations without a day of formal high-school education. He went to law school at night, was named chief clerk of the New Jersey Avenue police court, was appointed a magistrate and later was moved up to special sessions court. After 37 years in the courts, he retired to take up once more the art career he dropped when he decided to become a lawyer. In the course of his long life Justice Rayfiel made countless friends who mourn his passing.

Lyndon Johnson and the Kerr Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a very fine editorial which appeared in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram on April 9, 1950.

This editorial recognized the important role the junior Senator from Texas, LYNDON JOHNSON, had in the recent debate on the Kerr gas bill.

No one worked more tirelessly than Senator JOHNSON to make certain that the bill, passed by both Houses, would not make any change in the existing Federal Power Commission practices. Senator JOHNSON with great patience and with painstaking effort made certain that the bill would not have an adverse effect on the consuming public and that it would provide justice and fair play for producers.

The Senator from Texas served as chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee which rewrote the original Kerr bill.

It was a tribute to his leadership and to his fairness that the subcommittee unanimously voted to report the bill.

He maintained his fairness and objectivity throughout the long debate on this bill.

LYNDON JOHNSON AND THE KERR GAS BILL

Leslie Carpenter of the Star-Telegram's Washington bureau has called attention to the important part played by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, in the passage of the Kerr natural gas bill by the Senate.

"The 44 to 38 victory of the bill in the Senate," Mr. Carpenter reports, "can be laid to a large extent to the long and hard work of Senator JOHNSON of Texas. When some of the best-informed observers around the Senate predicted certain defeat for the bill, Senator JOHNSON labored even harder. When the votes were counted, the bill won."

Mr. Carpenter was simply giving credit where credit is due. As a matter of fact, the legislative history of this measure indicates it might properly have been designated the Johnson-Kerr bill.

The need for amendments to the Natural Gas Act of 1938 to clarify certain court decisions arose in 1947. A measure known as the Moore-Rizley bill was introduced in the Eightieth Congress and was passed by the House but never cleared the Senate.

Early in the Eighty-first Congress measures similar to the Moore-Rizley bill were introduced in the Senate by Senator KERR, of Oklahoma, who had succeeded Senator Moore of that State, and by Representative HARRIS, of Arkansas. A modified version of the Harris bill passed the House last year and went on to the Senate where, like the Moore-Rizley bill, it was not acted upon.

Meanwhile the Kerr bill (S. 1498) had been referred to a subcommittee of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, of which Senator JOHNSON of Texas, was chairman. After extended hearings by the subcommittee in May of last year, Senator JOHNSON revised the Kerr bill to meet administration objections.

The revised bill retained its original number and the name of its original sponsor, however, and it is proper that this was the case. Senator KERR, although serving his first term in the Senate, was floor manager of the measure and handled the debate on it with the skill of a veteran legislator.

There were substantial differences between the measure passed by the Senate and the Harris bill which had been passed by the House last year. Instead of sending the two measures to a conference committee to work out the differences, the House accepted the bill without change as it had passed the Senate. It thus paid Senators JOHNSON and KERR an unusual compliment.

All who voted for the bill deserve commendation because its enactment was a distinct victory for States' rights.

Technically, the purpose of the bill is to clarify the Federal Power Commission's scope of jurisdiction over the production and gathering of natural gas, by confirming the exempt status of independent producers.

Actually, as Speaker of the House RAYBURN put it, "The purpose of the bill is to see that the little producer (of gas) is not hauled up to Washington to be regulated."

Heretofore regulation of oil and gas production has been a State function. Congress now has said in no uncertain terms that this business should continue to be subject to State regulations, and not to Federal control.

By exerting himself on behalf of this measure Senator JOHNSON also demonstrated that he is fully aware of the best interests of his home State. It is estimated that Texas has 55 percent of the natural-gas reserves of the United States. But this great natural resource has little value to Texas or to the Nation unless it can be produced and utilized. Enactment of S. 1498 should stabilize and preserve a system which is making this cheapest, cleanest, and best of all fuels available to American homes and industries, and at the same time providing producers in Texas and other Southwestern States with a market for their gas at a fair price.

Stopping Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, all over America our people are thinking, thinking of the unspeakable horrors of an atomic war, thinking of the crushing cost of another great conflict, thinking of the necessity of an understanding with Russia before that war comes.

Evidence of that thinking is indicated by a communication received by me from an instructor in the State university, at Grand Forks, N. Dak., Arthur W. Munk. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include that letter:

STOPPING COMMUNISM

GRAND FORKS.—We are all interested in stopping communism. Thus far, however, the methods which our Government has used have been crude, clumsy, and ineffective. You cannot stop communism with military force. Foolish blusterings like those of Secretary Johnson, when he said we could knock the hell out of Russia in 90 minutes, will not stop it.

The Truman doctrine, the North Atlantic Pact, and the Marshall plan have also proven ineffective. Why? Because all three are based on the futile faith in force, and are part of the foolish cold war. All three have stimulated Russia to intensify her efforts. In fact, now that Russia has the atom bomb (and she may beat us to the hydrogen bomb), the Truman doctrine, the North Atlantic Pact, and the Marshall plan are hopelessly obsolete. We must evolve a better strategy.

How can we stop communism? By doing four things. First, we must convince the world that we are really for peace. The time has come for us to take the lead in a great world-wide peace offensive. Witness how the British people rallied to Winston Churchill when he insisted that the time had come for another attempt at a peaceful solution of the differences which divide the east and the west. The neutral nations know that we cannot defend them, now that Russia has the atom bomb. Yet they would certainly rally to our side if we took the lead in launching a great peace offensive. Even Russia would eventually have to fall in line or lose face; and Senator MCMAHON, of Connecticut, and Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, have actually suggested such a strategy.

Second, we must convince both the rulers and the people of Russia that our intentions are good; that we mean to be friendly. Nearly everything that we have done so far has served to arouse their suspicions. Third, we must give minority groups within our own land their rights and treat them with respect like human beings. How can we preach democracy abroad when we refuse to practice it at home?

Fourth, a serious effort must be made through the United Nations and otherwise to feed the world. Hunger makes Communists. We could stop communism at the borders of India if we would. Instead of forcing our farmers to reduce production we ought to be encouraging them to produce to capacity, even if we have to subsidize them. Then let us make our surpluses available to the people of India and other hungry people. Even if we have to give them vast quantities of food—this would be far cheaper than an arms race and a war.

ARTHUR W. MUNK.

Mr. Truman Takes the Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune of April 14, 1950:

MR. TRUMAN TAKES THE CREDIT

The President of the United States told his news conference Thursday a rather amazing thing. He said he expects to take credit for the nation's prosperous condition "despite claims by some parts of the press that these conditions would exist even if a moron were in the White House."

Mr. Truman seems to carry a chip on his shoulders these days when he meets newspapermen. It's a far cry from April 1945, when Vice President Truman nervously told some reporters, "If any of you boys ever pray, please pray for me now."

That was when he stepped into the place made vacant by the death of President Roosevelt.

Since his election victory, Mr. Truman has become a very much changed man. He appears to forget that as President, he represents all the American people, not just those who voted for him.

Maybe it was because of his recent challenging attitude toward the public and the press that he took credit for the Nation's present good condition. Perhaps it was because as a politician, he knew that he could be blamed for it if the Nation were in bad condition.

But, as a matter of judgment, his statement appears in poor light.

For one thing, the American system was not set up, nor is it even now, to be so dependent upon one man that he can determine its whole course. Yet, the last two Presidents appear to have operated, and to be operating, upon that premise.

For another thing, if the President takes credit for prosperity, he may be asked to show what he has done to bring this about.

A frank appraisal of our country today must lead one inevitably to the conclusion that our national prosperity such as we have is in spite of the President's programs, none of which offers the least aid to progress or prosperity.

Newspapermen often are severe critics of the Government and the administration because their work requires them to watch the actions of their President and Government more carefully than the average American.

A perusal of the record fails to show specifically what Mr. Truman has done to bring about national prosperity, which has been created despite Government efforts to depress it through tax and regulation. Prosperity is created by the doers, the workers, the planners, the Americans who produce.

The greatest boon the American Government was intended to give was freedom to produce.

That freedom has been dwindling year by year, through the joint efforts of President, radical advisers, and often a Congress itself which has lost sight of American freedom.

The daily record shows that Mr. Truman's every effort appears to be aimed politically.

Senator BYRD threw him a challenge the other night that Mr. Truman can be expected to ignore. The Virginia Senator asked the President to show proof that he does not favor socialism.

It is exceedingly tiresome to have our elected officials constantly making patriotic statements about our American freedom and then in the next breath proposing programs that are the very antithesis of Americanism.

Politicians generally are looking too hopefully toward the socialistic welfare state ideas as a vote getter.

The idea will probably offer temptations both to officeholders and public—until the public becomes informed—and takes the trouble to do so.

Never in the history of government has there been one that could give out to the people more than they pay into it.

To the contrary, every welfare state shows by its record that the people—the poor people, the common people—pay in taxes far more than they derive in benefits. If the money taken from them in taxes were to be applied to private pension or insurance funds, their benefits would be far more than they receive by government.

But what Mr. Truman and other socialistic planners propose is to force the people to accept social welfare programs for which they pay in taxes and for which they also pay the extravagantly high extra cost of government's inefficient administration.

In Britain, for example, the poor people, averaging $1,200 to $1,500 a year, pay an average of $9 to $10 weekly in taxes, but their benefits—that is, those they can claim—never total more than an average $8 a week.

American progress will cease when the time comes that our prosperity must depend upon a President, rather than upon the individual initiative and ability of the American people.

Address by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan at United Jewish Appeal Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Charle F. Brannan was one of the major speakers at the conference of the national Christian committee of the United Jewish Appeal, held in Washington, D. C., last Sunday, April 16. I commend his remarks, which follow, to the attention of my colleagues:

There is an old saying that the best way to keep good acts in memory is to refresh them with new ones. Evidently this is being applied here today.

You people have come here from many parts of the country with enthusiasm and determination to carry on a magnificent program of cooperation and brotherhood in action.

I consider it not only a pleasure, not merely an honor, but a true privilege to have some part with so many other Americans in this work.

It is only about 2 years since the modern State of Israel came into existence as an independent entity. I wonder if there was ever a time when a fledgling nation found the going tougher than today.

Here are some of Israel's problems as they have been presented to me.

In 2 years' time, 400,000 immigrants have poured into that land. Penniless and without resources, from more than 30 countries, and speaking almost as many different languages, they have come to this new nation as to a long-promised home.

This is almost as many immigrants as we admitted to our own land in the entire decade of the 1930's. And the population of Israel, even after all this influx of new residents, is not much more than a million persons.

Our own land has been a melting pot in which multitudes of men and women from abroad have been fused into a democratic, freedom-loving society. We know that this peaceful and healthy assimilation was made possible by the opportunity immigrants found here—jobs in industry and land to settle and cultivate.

Our own experience demonstrates that the peaceful assimilation of so many immigrants into so small a country as Israel is a task to stagger the imagination. Last year alone this small country took within its borders as many immigrants as our own Nation took from the end of the Revolutionary War to 1820.

For me, that one fact does more than anything else to illustrate the kind of problem Israel and its immigrants are facing.

It is a tremendous accomplishment that already three-fourths of these 400,000 newcomers of the past 2 years have found homes and a beginning of economic opportunity.

This is an accomplishment in which many factors played their parts; but one of the biggest, and one of the indispensable factors has been the success of the United Jewish Appeal in raising funds to provide for these needy people.

It takes millions of dollars to pay transportation costs—and these costs are an important part of the UJA budget.

It takes more millions to provide for the maintenance of immigrants until they can earn their own way. I am told that there are still some 90,000 persons in Israel living in tents and barracks in temporary reception camps. Even at an average of 50 cents a day for food—even a minimum cost for other necessities—it still takes a lot of millions to keep 90,000 persons going.

And 150,000 additional immigrants are expected this year.

It takes even more millions to build homes and agricultural settlements for so many newcomers.

I am given to understand that most of this year's budget will go for such purposes as I have just mentioned.

The great endeavor, of course, must be to help the immigrants to become self-supporting as rapidly as possible. One of the most pressing problems is that of expanding agricultural production in Israel to provide enough food. I appreciate the fact that the agriculture of Israel is being developed by competent technicians. The work in research, pest control, irrigation projects, and other phases of agriculture is of a very high order. I hope that the time will soon come when we shall have an effective point 4 program that will enable us to cooperate with Israel along agricultural lines to the mutual benefit of both nations.

Recently a new type of agricultural settlement called the workers village has been developed. I understand that immigrants will be able to live in these new-type agricultural settlements and to find work in shops, factories, and building projects while they are getting themselves settled on farm units.

Now, I suspect that the question has arisen in your minds, as it did in mine, whether the assimilation of the new population would not be much easier if the flow of immigrants could be reduced for a few years. Undoubtedly it would, but the question unfortunately

is not very practical. Some of the countries from which these people are coming have set dead lines for getting out. In Poland, for example, the dead line for some 30,000 Jews who are planning to leave is October 1, 1950. After that, the doors may close and then in sober truth those left behind would be without a country.

Even apart from the persecution, discrimination, and threat of physical violence to which these unfortunate people are subjected, they would have to face the hard fact that adjusting to life in Russian-dominated areas is tremendously difficult. Many of these persons were formerly shopkeepers or were engaged in other forms of small business or the professions. But throughout the Russian-dominated area private enterprise of this kind is being obliterated.

There is, then, no time to lose.

That is why this appeal aims at a high goal. That is why Jewish and non-Jewish people alike are making this year a greater effort to meet the goal than ever before.

A year ago, when I spoke to you, I mentioned that a schedule had been set up "for the ingathering of some 250,000 homeless Jews" during 1949. I hope you will pardon me for saying that I had some doubts that the job could be done.

It was done. The problem of the displaced Jews of Europe is almost solved today—largely because of the work done by the agencies of the United Jewish Appeal. Two years ago there were more than a quarter of a million Jews in the DP camps. Today there are no more than 40,000, and almost all of those who have left have gone to Israel.

Those who remain represent mostly the "hard core" of the DP problem—the sick, the disabled, the aged, those whom no country has welcomed to its shores.

Yet even these unfortunates will now be enabled to go to Israel. Under a special program developed by the agencies of the UJA, in cooperation with the Government of Israel, 4,000 of these most difficult cases, together with more than 5,000 dependents, will go to Israel during the months ahead. There they will have special care and special aid in rehabilitation.

In addition to the projects I have mentioned, the United Jewish Appeal has programs of medical and welfare services for impoverished Jews who will remain in Europe, or north Africa, or in other areas. The UJA will also assist some 25,000 Jewish refugees who are expected to come to our own country this year.

I want to congratulate all of you on your part in these inspiring programs. And I should like to recall to all our friends that whatever good we do benefits you and me as well as those unfortunates who receive our aid. Anything done for another is done also for oneself, for as George Eliot expressed it: "Our deeds determine us, as much as we determine our deeds."

I say sincerely: May the Almighty bless this work and help us make it a great influence for peace and for justice.

District Sesquicentennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have a high regard for Mr. Jesse C. Suter, of the Washington Sunday Star, and those who have followed his writings about the District of Columbia will soon be in agreement with me on that point.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include his newspaper article which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on April 16, 1950, regarding the opening feature of the sesquicentennial celebration:

BEGINNING OF PAGEANT OF AMERICA; PATRIOTS' DAY EVENTS RECALLED

(By Jesse C. Suter)

DISTRICT SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION BEGAN YESTERDAY

The opening feature of the sesquicentennial of the permanent seat of the Government of the United States was held on the Capitol Plaza in the forenoon of yesterday. While the celebration is in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment here in what is now the District of Columbia of the seat of the Government, the first feature commemorates the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the laying on April 15, 1791, of the first cornerstone at the south corner of the original "10 miles square." The exact location of this stone is at Jones Point, on the Potomac River, below Alexandria, and since the retrocession of the Virginia portion of the District to Virginia, it is now located within that State.

It is recalled that on April 15, 1941, the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the event was picturesquely celebrated under the auspices of a joint committee of the Masonic Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia, the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District, the Alexandria-Washington Lodge, of which George Washington was at one time the worshipful master, and officers from the Washington Board of Trade. Among the speakers at this triple-featured celebration were the mayor of Alexandria, William T. Wilkins; District Commissioners John Russell Young and David McCoach, Jr.; the president of the Washington Society of Alexandria, John B. Gordon; Ara M. Daniels, grand master of Masons in the District of Columbia; and others.

The most interesting feature of the occasion was the arrival of a procession led by the master and members of the Washington-Alexandria Lodge, the officers attired in colonial costumes and impersonating members who had participated in the ceremonies of 1791. The officers of the lodge so costumed reenacted the laying of the cornerstone.

It is related in the records of the lodge that when they returned to the place from whence they came, a number of toasts were drunk and the following was delivered by the master of the lodge, Dr. Cullen Dick, and was received with every token of approbation:

"May jealousy, that 'green-eyed monster,' be buried deep under the work which we have this day completed, never to rise again within the Federal district."

The theme of the sesquicentennial celebration is freedom and colorful pageantry throughout the sesquicentennial year will recreate America's 150 years of progress through freedom.

In thus celebrating the anniversary of the establishment here of the permanent seat of Government of the United States of America it is most interesting that here at the very heart of this, the greatest republic which the world has ever known, the most important and fundamental freedom is denied those Americans who permanently reside here, who owe no allegiance to any State, but solely to the United States of America.

That freedom which they are denied is the right and privilege to be represented in both Houses of the Congress of the United States and to vote for the President and the Vice President, and thus to participate in the government of their country by which they are taxed and for which they are required to bear all of the burdens which are common to the Americans of all of the sovereign States.

No feature of this sesquicentennial celebration could be more appropriate than for the Congress to take affirmative action on one of the proposed amendments of the Constitution under which the voteless and unrepresented American citizens of the District of Columbia would be enabled to gain this important freedom of which they are now so unjustly deprived.

PATRIOTS' DAY LESSON—REVERE, LEXINGTON, AND CONCORD

Next Wednesday will mark the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the stirring events of April 19, 1775. Paul Revere at midnight of the 18th began his famous ride to warn the people "of every Middlesex village and town" of the approach by land of the British soldiers. It was on April 19 that the Minutemen on the village green at Lexington were fired upon by the Redcoats for failing to comply with the British officer's order to disperse. The fight at Lexington has been depicted in the historic painting entitled "The First Blow for Freedom."

While Patriot's Day is observed annually in some parts of New England, its only regular observance in Washington is by the opening on that date of the annual sessions of the Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

It is of present interest that supporters of the Kefauver bill pending in Congress to grant so-called home rule to the District of Columbia are planning an observance on April 18, 1950, of the ride of Paul Revere. This is a publicity stunt and fund-raising enterprise. Promoters will have a character representing Paul Revere, attired in colonial costume and astride a horse, ride through downtown streets bearing a slogan, "Taxation without representation is still tyranny."

The real point in Paul Revere's ride and the memorable events of April 19 was not a protest against some form of local government but against an overriding powerful government of foreigners over all of the Colonies. The "taxation without representation" which they considered tyranny was taxation by a foreign power in whose Parliament the American colonists were not represented by those of their own choosing. Such a demonstration would be definitely appropriate in support of a constitutional amendment which would give the people of the District of Columbia voting representation in the Congress which exercises an overriding authority over the people of the District of Columbia without their consent.

In these days of hustle and bustle, heavy taxation, deficit spending, and mounting public debt, there are those who tell us that fundamental Americanism was all right in its day, but now there are trends which cannot be ignored. Now one might ask, is our great America no longer to be the land of opportunity where the poor boy may become king? And must private enterprise and individual freedom give way to a welfare state?

These are important vital questions of the day and may be amplified to an alarming degree. Are there any among the people of this broad land of ours who are more vitally interested in and affected by the solution of these problems enumerated above than are the voteless and unrepresented people of the District of Columbia?

These important questions threaten our life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—and, in fact, the very existence of the Republic. Are we of this great Capital of the greatest Republic on earth to be denied our rightful participation in the Government of our country?

We read frequently in the press of large classes in naturalization getting their final citizenship papers from the courts. To the voteless and unrepresented Washingtonian this presents a disgusting situation, which has been so aptly put by the late Philander Johnson in rhyme:

"Two American voters
Met here by chance.
One came from Russia
And one came from France.
With pride in their franchise
They learned with regret
That a man from right here
Isn't naturalized yet."

RECENT ACTIONS BY THE CITIZEN GROUPS SUMMARIZED

Citizen group meetings during the past 2 weeks indicate a lively interest in both neighborhood and District-wide problems. Press reports of the meetings of 23 affiliates of the Federation of Citizens' Associations were reviewed.

The chief interest was in the petition of the Capital Transit Co. for an increased fare and abandonment of the weekly pass. The associations rather generally registered their opposition to an increase.

Continuance of segregated swimming pools and the position taken by the Recreation Board in declining to take over the pools from the Interior Department under a nonsegregated requirement are supported generally. Construction of a stadium and indoor pool at Coolidge High School has wide support and some groups would provide the stadium with floodlights for night use.

Most associations have favored summer daylight time and one raised serious objection to using the police for a poll of the people on the daylight question.

The demand for the repeal of the individual personal property tax law of the District is receiving some attention. Other actions include demand for 100 more policemen, 5-day week for policemen, establishment of a junior college and reduction in the number of places licensed to sell liquor.

The Columbia Heights Citizens' Association has announced that its May meeting will be Central High School night.

The North Washington Council passed resolutions giving specific reasons for its opposition to the transfer of Central High School and urging the Board of Education to rescind its action.

Guilt by Association—Who Started Persecuting?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal, an outstanding independent newspaper, has published a series of editorial commentaries on the charges of Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY. With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach two of these distinguished editorials, titled "Guilt by Association" and "Who Started Persecuting?" The first was published March 19, the second, April 14:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 19, 1950]

GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

The technique that Senator MCCARTHY has used to date in trying to prove his sensational charges of communism in the State Department is known as indictment by association.

This means that a person is held guilty of a crime, or error, or disloyalty, or whatever someone may charge him with—not on the basis of facts, but because of associations or contacts, close or remote, that he may have or may have had.

Marquis Childs, highly respected and cautious, moderate columnist, has pointed out that this technique is out of place in this country. We have always been devoted to the Anglo-Saxon concept of equal justice and fair trial under law.

The indictment-by-association technique, Childs explains, is that of the revolutionary tribunal. Thus the so-called courts of revolutionary France sent thousands to the guillotine because they were found to have had some contact with aristocrats. The contact might have been extremely limited and of years past. But this made no difference. The purge trials in Nazi Germany and in Soviet Russia operated along this same line.

What are the possibilities of this technique?

Persons who belonged to or had any association with groups containing Communists, before it was known the groups were Communist fronts, could be called disloyal or unsafe Americans.

Anyone who ever wrote a friendly word about Soviet Russia, or communism, or Communists anywhere, could be termed "soft" on communism.

Anyone who ever spoke, accidentally, before a meeting at which Communists were in attendance would fall in a like category.

Anyone who belonged to a group which later fell under Communist control could be considered tainted.

An individual who, even in the united-front days of the war, joined movements to send clothes to Russian children, could be splashed with MCCARTHY's red paint.

Operating under this technique, thousands of Milwaukeeans could be labeled as "soft" on communism, because during and following the war (when we were counting on a bright new world of peace) they worked in friendship groups which later become Communist fronts. These Milwaukeeans have worked, in the past, oftentimes unknowingly, alongside Communists in war activities, politics, civic movements, welfare groups, labor unions, and other movements.

This indictment by association can became a fantastic thing. A doctrine like this is repulsive to a free people. Certainly Americans, when they think it through, will repudiate it.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 14, 1950]

WHO STARTED PERSECUTING?

They are trying MCCARTHY, say Senator TAFT and the chairman of the Wisconsin Republican organization. They are persecuting MCCARTHY, wails the McCormick-Hearst press. They are smearing MCCARTHY with epithets and vituperation, moans a Milwaukee veterans' group.

Whoa, now, wait a minute, wait a minute. Who started this business, anyhow?

Who said, back in February, that the State Department was ridden with Communists—205, 57, 85, or 4 of them? Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

Who said, but recently, that he would rest his entire case against the State Department on one name, and then named an individual who has no direct connection whatever with the State Department? JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

Who has charged a whole string of American citizens with being disloyal and traitorous, blackening their names and imperiling their careers? JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

Who has had 2 months, almost to the day, to prove these grave charges, and has not so far proved a single, solitary one? JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

Who has accused the President of the United States of endangering the Nation's security? Who has accused a fellow Senator of lying? Who has accused another fellow Senator of being a "tool" of the State Department? JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

Who proclaimed on the Senate floor that he would never hide behind congressional immunity but would say off the Senate floor anything he said on it, and face the possibility of libel suits?

And who has bobbed like the dodger in a carnival booth to avoid saying off the Senate floor what he said on it?

Of course, Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

It is MCCARTHY who is trying people—on the most serious charges, probably, that an American citizen can be faced with—and he is apparently doing it, at least so far, without evidence to prove his charges. It is Senator MCCARTHY who is "persecuting" people. It is MCCARTHY who has led the way in the unrestrained use of "epithets and vituperation."

MCCARTHY being tried? MCCARTHY being smeared and persecuted? MCCARTHY the victim of "epithets and vituperation"? That must bring a bitter laugh, indeed, from the many individuals whom Senator MCCARTHY has spattered with his whirling red brush—no matter what, if any, charges he may ever substantiate.

Potato Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Pathfinder News magazine by Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief, recently reproduced in the Wakefield (Mass.) Item:

POTATO MESS

(By Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief, Pathfinder News magazine)

How did our Government manage to get itself into this mess with potatoes? Here boils a pot of absurdities such as one could not believe if the clownish, costly facts did not stand out so plain.

First of all, the Government started out to do some good. The original idea was to protect the country against farm price disasters. The one 20 years ago not only busted farmers but closed factories and hurt everyone. So the idea was, roughly, to pass a law to keep farm prices from falling too low.

Then, politically, it seemed like a good idea to pass laws to make farm prices high. Since—if that were done for cotton or wheat—corn, peanuts, potatoes and spinach would yell that they were victims of outrageous discrimination, the law had to guarantee a percentage of parity for about every crop.

Assured high prices naturally encourage more production, so acreage allotments had to be tried. That inspired farmers to farm their restricted acres better. (If they do not know how, the Government shows them how.)

A good farmer, with the kinds of seed, fertilizer and cultural practices recommended by the Government can push his potato yields pretty high. There are many good potato farmers.

So now the Government, in the course of trying to do some good, finds itself paying to a farmer $1.46 a hundredweight for his potatoes, then selling them back to him for 1 cent.

It finds itself dyeing good potatoes blue so no one will eat them. It finds itself giving potatoes away and talking of burning them up. It finds itself taxing everybody to keep everybody's potatoes expensive. It finds that somebody can and does buy Canadian potatoes, even along the Gulf of Mexico, for less than it permits United States potatoes to be sold.

The critics of the potato situation are many and loud. But are they fair?

After all, the Government has only been trying to do some good. Is that wrong?

History has made it quite plain for a few thousand years that government efforts to do good beyond its basic services have generally robbed the people and wrecked the country. But is that any sign? Are we not smarter than anybody ever has been before?

It's wonderful to do good. Especially with other people's money.

Dr. Lowdermilk To Advise Israel on Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading soil-conservation experts in the United States, Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, has become a special adviser to the Israel Government to aid that country solve its soil-conservation problems. Dr. Lowdermilk has long been known as an ardent champion of a plan to establish a Jordan Valley Authority to develop the water and power resources of that region.

I believe many Members of this House will be interested in the two brief articles dealing with Dr. Lowdermilk and with his JVA plan, which were published in Israel Speaks, March 24, 1950. They are as follows:

DR. LOWDERMILK, WHO DRAFTED TVA FOR ISRAEL, TO BECOME GOVERNMENT ADVISER

TEL AVIV.—Eleven years ago, when Jewish hopes for Palestine had just received the staggering blow of the British white paper, closing most of the country to further Jewish colonization, the achievements and plans of the pioneers suddenly found an unexpected and powerful non-Jewish champion.

In that year, Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, top American soil conservation expert, was making a survey of Palestine by air. As he flew over lands made barren by centuries of neglect, he was struck by the special opportunity presented by the extraordinary difference in altitude between the Jordan valley and the Dead Sea (1,300 feet below sea level) and the Mediterranean, only a few tens of miles away.

What followed was Dr. Lowdermilk's concept of a Jordan Valley Authority, patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority of the United States in scope and function, which would provide both water and power for irrigation and enable Palestine to support a population of at least 5,000,000.

Dr. Lowdermilk's bold ideas—coupled with a warm-hearted description of the reclamation efforts already under way—were later described in his classic book, Palestine—Land of Promise. In turn it became an important weapon in the battle to persuade the world that the Jews should be given a fair opportunity in Palestine.

Toward the end of World War II, Dr. Lowdermilk was associated with a group of leading American authorities in the further development of the Jordan Valley Authority plan. Under the auspices of this group, another American engineer, James B. Hays (formerly project manager of the Tennessee Valley Authority) spent nearly a year carrying out detailed field surveys.

The result was the Hays scheme, blueprinting the full utilization of the country's water resources. This remains the basis of Israel's thinking on the over-all planning of its land and water resources.

After 11 years, Dr. Lowdermilk, accompanied by his wife, has come to this country again—this time as the guest of the government of a Jewish state which it would have seemed crazy to prophesy in 1939.

With a scientist's impatience at the way politics can snarl up progress, Dr. Lowdermilk told newsmen he deplored the lack of cooperation from the neighboring Arab States to make the full Jordan Valley Authority possible, and stressed the great benefits it would bring to them, as well as to Israel.

Certain phases of the Hays scheme can, however, be brought into operation even before peace is reached with our neighbors. Now that Dr. Lowdermilk has accepted the post of special adviser on soil conservation to the Israel Government, it may be expected that he will turn his attention to these when he comes to Israel again in October, to remain for a year.

But, apart from the tremendous value of his technical advice, Dr. Lowdermilk is doubly welcome in Israel—he makes us feel good because he believes in what we are trying to do.

DETAILS OF THE HAYS-LOWDERMILK PLAN

The Jordan Valley Authority, as envisioned by Dr. Lowdermilk and developed by Mr. Hays, would supply Palestine's two chief economic needs, water for irrigated agriculture and power for industrial development. It would divert the sweet waters of the upper Jordan and its tributaries into a network of irrigation canals and, in order to keep the Dead Sea at its present level, would introduce sea water from the Mediterranean by means of a canal originating near Haifa. As this sea water dropped into the Jordan depression, there would be almost 1,300 feet of effective fall for the development of hydroelectric power. The plan is based on a unified Palestine, and its complete execution is at present dependent on the settlement of several outstanding political questions.

A brief summary of the eight stages of the original Hays scheme is given below:

Stage 1 provides for developing underground water sources, resulting in the recovery of 618,000 000 cubic meters per year, of which 518,000,000 would be utilized to irrigate some 176,000 acres (1 cubic meter=264.17 gallons). Its second aspect is construction of a power project, including a dam, on the Hasbani River in Lebanon. The latter aspect would require agreement with Lebanon.

Stage 2 proposes to channel the summer flow of the upper Jordan and its tributaries, together with spring waters in northern Galilee, into a gravity canal. These waters would be available for irrigation in the northeast and be released also in the Emek Jezreel.

Stage 3 would utilize the waters of the Yarmuk to prevent a lowering of the level of Lake Tiberias as a result of the diversion of upper Jordan waters projected in stage 2. A dam would be built to provide a new mouth at Lake Tiberias for the Yarmuk, which now enters the Jordan from the east about 12 miles below the lake. Half the river's annual flow would be allocated to Transjordan and would enable the irrigation of about 37,500 acres of good land on its side of the border.

Stage 4 calls for the dramatic step of replenishing the Dead Sea with salt water from the Mediterranean to make up for the diversion of the Jordan waters. A good deal of the territory the sea water canal would have to cross, including the sites of the two principal power plants, is now held by the Arabs. No other route is possible because of the mountains, which bisect Palestine except in the Emek region.

Stage 5 is a continuation of stage 2 and provides for the construction of a large storage reservoir at Sahl el Battauf, a wide flat valley north of Nazareth. It is proposed to recover and store here the winter flow of all streams, wadis, and springs of the upper Jordan.

Stage 6 calls for the long-proposed reclamation of Lake Huleh and its surrounding marshes.

Stage 7 concerns irrigation in the lower Jordan Valley, as far down as the Plain of Jericho. This territory is now in Arab hands.

Stage 8 contemplates the storage and recovery of winter waters from all the principal wadis draining into the Mediterranean. This supply would then be conveyed to the Negev and released for irrigation by means of the main canal running south through territory almost entirely within Israel's borders. In the neighborhood of Dorot a pumping plant would pick up the winter surplus flow of the canal and pump it into a large regulating reservoir. In summer, during peak demand, the pumping plant would pump water from the reservoir back into the canal.

Cost of the Jordan Valley Authority, as estimated by Dr. Lowdermilk and Mr. Hays, is approximately $250,000,000. It is believed it would take 10 years to build, and would be self-liquidating in a 50-year period—a standard considered quite satisfactory for American reclamation projects.

Essex County Training School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an excellent article by Steve Walsh, who is very familiar with the workings of the Essex County Training School situation at Lawrence, Mass.

Mr. Walsh, due to his position with the attendance departments, Lynn public schools, in the city of Lynn, Mass., has over the years had much experience with the conduct of these institutions and the amount of constructive work accomplished by the superintendents, past and present.

Mr. Walsh knows whereof he speaks, and I offer this interesting article for the Members for their thought and consideration:

Most of you know the city of Lawrence as a woolen and worsted center. And we have often taken a ride up to that locality to also know that tourists have commented on the nearby Bodwell's Falls and the flowing Merrimack. But for a long, long time the writer has linked this bustling community as being the place where the Essex County Training School stands. There are many reasons for my having such a keen interest in its welfare, and whenever I hear of the unusual happening up that way, it is quite natural that I lift what is known as an eyebrow. For anything good that comes to this school brings satisfaction because I know its worth.

EVEN SUCH IS TIME

One of the first things which the presiding judge of southern Essex did after his appointment to the bench was to take a trip to the afore-mentioned school. And the Honorable William J. Landergan had a purpose in his quest. And not having the temerity of thinking that I can speak for him, I do feel that I can openly praise him without restraint. That is because I liked what he did.

The records will show that Judge Landergan was the only man who has worn the black robe of justice in this district who found the time to pay a visit to the school that harbors certain boys and girls, teaches them the need of becoming proper members of society, and sends them back into the world with a far different understanding than what they had when they came to this 60-year-old institution.

It has been my privilege to be affiliated with the last three superintendents of the school and all of them made the position a public trust—the late Grant Fancher; former State Senator Robert J. Tetler, who was buried a month ago; and the present director, George A. Baker, who has been on the job for the last 3 years. And Mr. Baker was the man whom Judge Landergan had his talk with.

A careful analysis of the school will also interest any citizen because of the vast amount of good it performs. Here, then, could have been the scope of thought that passed between the two men; information which I have known for a long time, and feel is of vital importance for others to possess. For this is one answer to juvenile delinquency and a formidable one, if you will.

Such an Essex County program was created by an act of the State legislature and approved by the county commissioners in 1891, under the name of the Essex County Truant School. This name was changed in 1906 to that of the Essex County Training School, a better word being supplemented to avoid any form of stigma that might be in the way of a boy or girl as they advanced through life.

THAT TAKES IN TRUST

Teaching means the imparting of knowledge whereas training implies not merely the imparting of knowledge but also inspires to repeated action which results in the formation of habits, or making use of the knowledge acquired. Essex County Training School is thus in a community by itself, undistricted by city or town life, situated on a slope overlooking the Merrimack River.

The physical make-up of the school consists of some 80 acres of land upon which stand many fine buildings of modern construction; the most important of them being academic hall, containing classrooms, auditorium, gymnasium, and a swimming pool. Nearby is an administration hall, housing the office and the superintendent's quarters. Adjacent to this are the Bates and Wings halls.

In the last two are kitchens, dining rooms, laundry, tailor shop, recreation room, dentist office, library, instructor's quarters, locker and shower rooms, and three large dormitories where the students are segregated chronologically. Three classes of maladjusted children are assigned to the school—the habitual truant, the habitual absentee, and the habitual school offender.

Just why they come there can be traced to various reasons but their delinquencies are not an aggressive reaction but are really the opposite; consisting of flight from unpleasant situations rather than attacks upon them. Schools, to the delinquent, are a place where they come in contact with unsatisfactory, unsuccessful, unhappy and extremely frustrating situations.

School is the first organized society with which the pupil comes in contact and in which he does not have any part in formulating the rules governing the conduct of the group. Prescribed regulations are met which often are in conflict with his developed ways of behaving. If the student is not socialized properly by his teachers, he is on the road to becoming a delinquent.

There are four basic factors for living together—security, love, recognition, and a new activity which allows a proper outlet of the adventurous urge. Training school officials remember these four factors and see that they are placed at the disposal of each and every individual regardless of age. When one or a combination of these four factors are denied, delinquency has its birth.

OUR YOUTH, OUR JOYS

This school of training affords the cities and towns of Essex County a community of learning and cooperative living. Its program is designed to help students develop those appreciations, habits, and skills which are so necessary for satisfying and creative experience. Regular academic training, as prescribed by the State board of education is carried out to the letter.

This school of training emphasizes the adjustment of the course of study to the individual student. Recognizing that each student has his own individual needs, encouragement is made possible for him to go ahead in each subject as fast as he is able. A daily trade-training is another feature that is distinctive, and a valuable element is the experiment of preparing the child.

Each student receives 2 hours of trade training daily. This means that periodically they will be found gaining additional training in the woodworking shop, laundry, kitchen, dairy, poultry houses, piggery, greenhouse on the truck farm. Physical development, vocational significance habit-forming, and proper attitude are the benefits accrued from this program.

Instructors at this school are selected for their capabilities to fit into the atmosphere confronting them. They are expected to guide youngsters by responsive, flexible, adaptable means which entails a quiet, humorous, understandable manner than that of the threatening and domineering demand. Social and personal needs must always be considered and the ECTS staff carry these out to perfection.

Religious influence is constantly encouraged, and alertness is maintained to see that the trainee takes regular advantage of this perquisite. Thus Catholic students attend mass each Sunday and Holy Day of Obligation, go to confession and Holy Communion monthly as well as attending religious classes as prescribed by law. Protestant children attend their church on Sunday as well as the religious classes.

An important contribution to the social treatment of delinquent juveniles is the athletic program. This school conducts a modified interscholastic scheme that emphasizes the value of team play and also that of the individual. Ample facilities are provided for intramural sports—football, soccer, swimming, basketball, hockey, baseball, and track. Such activities provide pleasure in leisurable hours.

OUR ALL WE HAVE

When the youngsters are first brought to this training school they are given a thorough physical examination to determine their physical condition. From this finding can be determined what kind of treatment is needed to bring about a well-developed body, because no child can do good work of any kind unless he feels well. A study is made of his needs and these are provided as quickly as possible.

Physical ailments being corrected, a child with a good healthy body is ready for training and guidance. The future health of the student body is cared for by a staff of competent doctors who advise the means needed to control the undernourished body and physical ailments such as faulty teeth, eyes, ears, nose, tonsils, and adenoids. Then, too, the facilities of the Lawrence General Hospital are always available.

Despite the spiral prices for foodstuffs and commodities in these days, the feeding of the youngsters doesn't create an excessive cost. This is brought about because of the good husbandry that prevails at the ECTC—the raising and producing milk, eggs, butter, vegetables, pork, ham, bacon, and chickens; all of which with other edibles keep the cost of operation at a minimum.

Each city and town of Essex County pays their proportional share of maintaining this training school. This is based on the valuation of each city and town. Lynn with its valuation of $151,194,710 pays 21.05 percent of the costs. In addition to this, each city and town pays to Essex County the sum of $2 weekly toward the support of each youngster enrolled from their district.

This, therefore, is a thumbnail sketch of the Essex County Training School in Lawrence. It has been within my province to pay frequent visits to its environs on many occasions. No place of its kind that I know of has greater efficiency in its plant, or more humane understanding for the wants of the children therein. It is a model to look up to; it is a credit to Essex County in its entirety.

Youngsters who never got a chance in the beginning of life emerge from its portals ready and willing to meet life anew. Impressive records have been compiled of what they have performed since leaving the school on the banks of the Merrimack. Supt. George A. Baker is doing a well-planned and efficient job as its leader. Anyone who knows of what I say will gladly substantiate that statement. That is why I was very pleased to hear that Judge William J. Landergan took time out from his work to see for himself. For he is a valuable ally for the youngster of today and tomorrow, who only asks for a chance.

RINGING THE BELL

The Essex County Training School will conduct its annual graduation exercises in June just as it has for the last 60 years. It is always a memorable occasion because it shows just how effective the training school has been in producing adjusted future citizens. Statistics compiled over the years bear this statement out. Hundreds of youngsters have left Lawrence and have made their mark in the world. Over 70 percent who have returned to the society of which they were a part have made creditable names for themselves. Isolated cases verify this such as the Andover boy who went out to become a respected member of a large law firm in the State of Florida; a Lynn boy, who furthered his education in a large eastern college and now is a member of the faculty of a prominent preparatory school; a Haverhill boy who has been assigned to the United States Air Corps to deal with the secrets of atomic energy; another Lynn boy who braved the perils and the hardships of the South Pacific with the last expedition of Admiral Byrd. Such is the proud boast of the ECTS.

"Another War Means Wholesale Destruction," Says Senator Westberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, during the hearings on House Joint Resolution 64 someone said "No peace without law, no law without government."

Without stating the problem so cogently I believe I am correct in saying that this was the thought which led the State of Washington Legislature to adopt a memorial asking the Congress "to take all possible steps to strengthen the present form of the United Nations so that it shall possess the means and legal authority to preserve world peace."

Certainly it was with this general thought in mind that I appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs to urge action on House Joint Resolution 64 as a first step of many which this Nation should take to maintain its leadership in the striving for peace.

To the committee, I stated in part, as follows:

The world is groping for methods and institutions capable of preventing another war, a war that could easily leave this globe in shambles. Nations seek a moral leadership that offers the promise of a peaceful, plentiful future. The United States stands in a position to accept that challenge with a policy that far outshines the hollow promises of world communism.

In the past we have put our faith in military strength and defensive alliances. This alone can never be a panacea. For a new age we must develop new systems of social and political implementation. This is tragically evident in international affairs today.

It is in this spirit that we must take this big step forward and supply law and order where none have ever existed.

That the desire to do something constructive to aid future peace prospects is widespread is nowhere better illustrated than by the activity on the part of the young men and women of the United World Federalist organization in Seattle.

No one better exemplifies this spirit than the president of the Seattle UWF chapter, the Honorable Alfred J. Westberg. Mr. Westberg, a Republican, represents the thirty-seventh legislative district in the State senate.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include President Westberg's speech made at the First Baptist Church in Seattle March 12, in the RECORD:

UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS

Ladies and gentlemen, as a representative of the Seattle chapter of the United World Federalists, I want to preface my remarks on the subject of world government by a brief statement to you about the United World Federalists.

It is an organization, Nation-wide in scope, of about 40,000 members. In the State of Washington there are about 400 active members divided into chapters in the larger cities and members at large in smaller communities where chapters have not yet been organized. Nationally, the membership of the organization is widely representative of all groups of citizens of all political points of view and various ages, representing a fair cross-section of American citizenship. It is significant that a large proportion of the membership is made up of veterans of World War II. Cord Meyer, Jr., who was the first president of the national organization, and served as president until this year, is a veteran who suffered serious injuries during the war and was veteran adviser to Harold Stassen at the San Francisco conference where the Charter of the United Nations was drafted. Numbered among the national leaders of the organization are the chairman of the board of the Standard Oil Co., of Ohio, leading bankers and educators, as well as numerous citizens who have been leaders in their communities and in national affairs. Leaders in church organizations are active in the United World Federalists, both nationally and locally. One of our most active members in Seattle is Mr. Stephen P. Chadwick, former national commander of the American Legion. The people who are active in the world federalist movement in the United States are patriotic Americans who are convinced that our country has a responsibility to the whole world to lead the way toward ultimate and permanent solution of the problems of international relations and that without the leadership and cooperation of the United States no movement toward that end can be successful.

Based upon the horrible experience of the last war, in which it was clearly demonstrated that armies and navies cannot defend their countries from attack but can only attack the enemy countries and that wars cannot result in anything greater than victory and destruction, we are convinced that there is not much time in which to act if we are to avoid future catastrophes. The rapid development of the atom bomb and the threat of the use of the new H-bomb have convinced us that, if another war comes about, it will result only in wholesale destruction of cities and civilian populations beyond the power of any army, navy, or air force to prevent, and can end only in a victory for that side which becomes paralyzed and exhausted last.

Likewise we are concerned with the state of our country's finances. The cost of paying for past and future wars is becoming an intolerable burden upon the economic structure not only of our country but of the world as a whole. Our country cannot long continue to assume the obligations to defend with military power and to support the agricultural and industrial requirements of the entire world. Every day that goes by our country goes further in debt and the dollars we have in the bank and in our pockets are worth less and less in food and clothing and the other things we want to buy. To continue on such a course leads us only and inevitably into the necessities of a rigidly planned and Government-controlled economy. This will mean that our wages, our prices, and every activity of our lives will be controlled to support the vast military establishment which must grow if we are to contain our enemies. In this way we will lose our freedom while doing our utmost to defend it.

To this grim prospect we see only one alternative, that is, the establishment of a world government with power to pass laws prohibiting the development and possession of the materials for war and with power to enforce its laws against individuals wherever they may be located. Such a world government would naturally possess some military force, otherwise its laws would be as unenforcible as our laws would here without a police force to arrest and without courts to punish individuals who violate them. However, if such a world government were established, its powers must be limited to the field of international relations. It should not have any right to decide the economic structure of our country, the rights and privileges and freedoms of our citizens, or those of any other country. The United States must recognize likewise that it will not have control of such a world government. If we seek a world government over which we have control we are seeking only an American empire. We have no greater right to impose our will upon the entire world than Russia has to impose her will upon the entire world. However, if all nations of the world, or even only those substantial military powers that now exist, agree to surrender their military power and to submit to the rules adopted by a world government, we could not fear any aggressor.

I am satisfied that the people of the world like the people of the United States want peace. However, I am also satisfied that the actions of our Government and the comments made in our Congress and before our congressional committees with reference to the manufacturing of atom bombs, the increases in the size of our Air Force, the bases being built all over the world, must look to any other country as the actions of an aggressive or warlike people. We also interpret the acts of the Russian Government, in constantly seeking to expand its sphere of influence and to bring within its control greater and greater areas, as imperialistic and aggressive. Until we offer to the Russians and to the rest of the world a proposal to abandon the frantic arms race in which we are now engaged and to submit with them to a world government in which we all participate, we cannot expect that they will be more anxious than we are to surrender their sovereignty or abandon their efforts as they see them to defend themselves from the threat of American imperialism. The Russian Government has not looked with favor upon the World Federalist movement within the United States and Pravda has publicly described the leadership of the United World Federalists as the fig leaf of American imperialism. So it seems that the two great contenders for world power, our country and Russia, are at this time caught in a dilemma which can lead only to one of two results. Either we and they will continue on the path toward total mobilization, grinding burdens for the support of military establishment, and loss of all individual freedom of action, or we will join in a movement toward government of the world by law and not by force with a machinery within the framework of the United Nations strong enough to prevent war and insure peace.

Naturally, we recognize that until a world government is set up which will protect us as well as all others from the aggressive acts of other nations or individuals we cannot surrender our program of self-defense. No World Federalist advocates the scrapping of our Army, Navy, or Air Force in advance of the creation of an effective structure of world government. No one nation can offer to enter into a world government except upon the condition that other nations will simultaneously do so. It is obvious that no world government will meet the purposes we have outlined unless it includes both the United States and Russia but we can set up the framework of a world government and announce our readiness to enter into it, reserving our right to defend ourselves from attack until all of our potential enemies, whoever they may be, likewise join the world government.

Proposals for world government have some substantial support in official circles in the United States. Over 100 Members of the House of Representatives and 20 Members of the Senate have endorsed resolutions which, if adopted, would direct that the purpose of American foreign policy will be toward the strengthening of the United Nations so that it may become a world government of limited powers with sufficient authority to prevent war and insure peace.

In six States the people themselves or their legislatures have called upon Congress to call a constitutional convention for the purpose of amending our American Constitution so that this country may enter into a world government when such a world government is set up and when such a government meets with the approval of the Congress. In this State the local chapter of the United World Federalists is sponsoring an initiative for the purpose of having the people vote at next November's election on whether or not they would approve of the State of Washington likewise asking Congress to call such a convention. The approval of such a measure, of course, is only a very first preliminary step and does not commit the United States toward any particular form of world government or surrender one whit of our right to defend ourselves or to examine carefully the structure of any world government that is proposed and determine for ourselves whether we wish to join it. But such a movement, supported by the people of this country, could not help but have a healthy effect on the attitude of people all over the world. Likewise, it should strengthen the United Nations because we have in the recent past gone outside the structure of the United Nations in dealing with other powers.

It is our view that the United Nations deserves the active support of the United States and the use of the facilities that it now provides for the settlement of international problems. Only through use of the facilities that are given us will the possibilities of strengthening them and making them more secure be realized. I hope all of you will become fully familiar with the facts and the arguments with reference to proposals for world government. They offer to mankind the achievement of greater freedoms and unlimited benefits by permitting us to use our economic and industrial development for the benefit of our people rather than for the support of military organizations and to pay for the cost of destruction, loss of life and limb in warfare. Without that burden, there is no limit to the benefits which American enterprise, ingenuity, and resources can achieve, and they will be achieved on that basis for all of the people of our country.

The Real Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am glad to include an editorial which appeared in the Chattanooga Times for Wednesday, April 12, 1950, entitled "The Real Tragedy."

I agree with this editorial that it is truly tragic that men in positions of high responsibility should accept the shrieking tantrums of a John T. Flynn—and may I add of the "copycat" sermon of the minister in Tennessee—as a substitute for thinking our way out of our problems.

The editorial follows:

THE REAL TRAGEDY

We were glad to reprint yesterday the article by Hodding Carter protesting against the widely distributed sermon by a Nashville minister. We shall not go into the points of the dispute again. Mr. Carter, we think, gave the sermon a more decent burial than it deserved.

But the tragedy of the present hysteria in which so much of the country has joined is that men and women from whom we have a right to expect sane and fair thinking have abdicated that role. It is tragic that men in positions of high responsibility should accept the shrieking tantrums of a John T. Flynn as a substitute for thinking our way out of the problems before us, and should believe they find salvation in the gospel according to "St." Flynn.

We have had propagandists of this kind before in this country. Some of the early political pamphleteers were their intellectual forebears. But in these days of mass communication and reprints by the millions, the machinery of propaganda is more ponderous in size, and more frightening. And we have reason to fear for reason itself when we look in the mail in the morning and discover that men who should know better are distributing the shoddy wares broadcast.

How can it be that straight-thinking Americans do not recognize the hysterical writing of such people for what it is? There is plenty to criticize in our Government and in our ways of life, and some solid arguments can be made against men and policies now to the fore. But one discards good American common sense in putting the case for pleading in the hands of men whose logic, whose respect for the truth and the simple rules of evidence qualify them for jobs only on such newspapers as Izvestia and Pravda, the organs of the Communist tribe.

It is tragic, again, that the wild stuff of Stalin and his kind should have led us to think that the way to combat the Communist menace is to produce stuff just as nauseating on the other side. Our democracy, our justified faith in freedom and free enterprise, in the sacredness and dignity of the humblest individual, call for the simple truth simply told.

It is not a bad idea, when someone asks you to defray the expense of sending out a reprint of the Nashville sermon, of a Flynn article, of a Senator McCARTHY outburst, or something of the kind, to reread the Gettysburg Address. It is good mental medicine, one likely to cure mild cases of hysteria. Some cases, we know, are hopeless.

Four Billions Not Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of April 14, 1950:

FOUR BILLIONS NOT SAVED

If the present national administration desired to manage Government affairs economically and efficiently, the tools to do so are at its disposal. A nonpartisan commission, created by Congress in 1947 and headed by Herbert Hoover, studied Government organization, functions, and methods for 2 years and had come up with plans for reorganization which would have saved at least a billion dollars a year, while improving the quality of work that was done.

The Hoover Commission was no muckraking group seeking to make capital for a political party and gain publicity for ambitious politicians. Neither was it an undertaking of academicians without practical experience in the affairs of Government and business.

COMMISSION WELL QUALIFIED

Four members of the Hoover Commission were appointed by the President, two of whom were high-ranking officers in his administration and two from private life. Four members of the Commission were appointed by the Speaker of the House, two being able Congressmen, one from each party, and two from private life.

One of the latter was Mr. Hoover. The four members to round out the 12 were appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, who named two able Senators, one from each party, and two non-Government men.

The Commission was the best qualified group ever created to seek improvement in Government and reduce costs of administration. It went about the job with great intelligence and drive. Three hundred experts were employed and assigned to 24 committees, each dealing with a specific function, area, or group of problems.

The research reports were reviewed by the Commission and made the basis of comprehensive plans for eliminating duplication of work, cutting red tape, and revising administrative methods.

The Commission did not concern itself with the billions spent by the Government on activities which could well be eliminated. It found ways of saving $4,000,000,000 without eliminating any Government functions.

For the citizen who wants to inform himself about the economies the Hoover Commission pointed out, there is a little book entitled "A Hook in Leviathan," by Bradley D. Nash and Cornelius Lynde.

A wise and able President would have utilized the enthusiastic popular reception of the Hoover report to put it into effect in its entirety. But that is not what Mr. Truman did. What he saw in the Hoover plan was backing for petty moves of advantage to himself.

The Commission proposed that the salary of the President be increased from $75,000 to $100,000, and that, in addition, he be paid $50,000 a year of tax-exempt money. Mr. Hoover himself appeared before a congressional committee to approve this.

That had Mr. Truman's complete endorsement and a bill was rushed through Congress so that the President could get the extra money from the beginning of his second administration.

Mr. Truman also was happy to have the authority of the Hoover Commission back of a transfer of the public employment offices and the unemployment compensation machinery from the Social Security Board to the Department of Labor.

Congress had on three occasions vetoed his request for the transfer. This was a move dear to the heart of the President because he owed something to Secretary of Labor Tobin, who took the Secretaryship in 1948 when no one else would.

RECOMMENDATIONS ARE DELAYED

After dawdling a year and a half, while the Government went into the red five or six billion dollars, Mr. Truman on March 13 sent to Congress a batch of 21 plans for administrative changes. One of the plans called for abolishing the Office of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, as proposed by the unions. This was not a part of the Hoover plan at all. It had never even been discussed by the Hoover Commission.

Other plans have been so long belated that opposition has been allowed to develop which may prevent their acceptance by Congress. Mr. Truman has used the Hoover report when possible to serve his personal and political ends and otherwise has reduced its effectiveness. Even at this late date he admits he has done nothing about half of the things suggested.

If anyone ever supposed that the Truman administration was interested in economy, a

look at a recent report of the Armed Services Committee of the House would correct the impression. It mentions:

"A budget request is pending for a new $18,000,000 veterans' hospital in the Los Angeles area, while the Navy is closing the 1,500-bed Long Beach Naval Hospital in the same area.

"A 500-bed veterans' hospital is being built in Philadelphia, while the Army is closing the 2,000-bed Valley Forge Hospital 20 miles away.

"The veterans' agency plans to build 1,000-bed hospitals in Boston and at Brockton, Mass., while the Army is closing Murphy General Hospital at Waltham, Mass.

"The Veterans' Administration wants to build a 500-bed hospital in Atlanta, while the Army is closing Oliver General Hospital at Augusta, Ga.

"A 500-bed veterans' hospital is planned at Ann Arbor, Mich., while the Army is closing the 1,600-bed Jones Hospital at Battle Creek."

There won't be any Government economy until there is a different kind of a man in the White House.

Address by Secretary Chapman at United Jewish Appeal Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, at the conference of the national Christian committee of the United Jewish Appeal, held in Washington, D. C., last Sunday, April 16, Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman delivered an important address which deserves wide attention. The full text of his address is as follows:

I consider it a privilege to come here this morning to lend all the support I can to the United Jewish Appeal, and to the work to be done under its auspices. The needs it must serve are urgent, and during 1950 they will be greater than ever before.

In this critical year of the world's mid-century, it is imperative for Jews and Christians alike that the democratic nations be strengthened in every way we can devise. We can assume that our citizens will give strong support to the appeal because of their admiration for the courageous efforts of the people of Israel and because of their almost traditional warm response to the needs of those who undergo hardship and suffering. There is something else at stake this time. We as American citizens are beginning to recognize that if our own country is to remain strong and secure in the ways of democracy, we must make sure that the light of democracy is not extinguished anywhere on the globe.

The new nation of Israel is a democracy that has sprung up in an area of the world where its fruits are badly needed. It was established by a relatively small group of determined and idealistic people, many of whom had endured untold suffering and misery in the mass persecution under Hitler, but who still possessed the courage to build a land of hope for themselves and their brothers in other parts of the world.

Their remarkable achievement has been an inspiration to all of those who are concerned with the progress of democracy. The establishment of Israel on the foundations of human liberty in the face of overwhelming odds is a welcome reassurance to mankind in its search for better understanding and lasting peace. Like our own forefathers the founders of Israel are striving to secure the fundamental principles of democracy that we and other nations enjoy.

Next Saturday we celebrate the second anniversary of Israel's declaration of independence. Within these 2 years, the accomplishments of this new nation have been much more fruitful than the world had anticipated.

Since the establishment of Israel, its 660,000 Jews have welcomed nearly 400,000 more, increasing the nation's population nearly 60 percent. I am told that, through the United Jewish Appeal and other sources, 250,000 immigrants were brought to Israel in 1949, that 80,000 were helped to emmigrate from Moslem lands, and that only 40,000 Jews remain in displaced-persons camps. I am advised also that over 31,000 housing units were completed in 1949, and that 174 new settlements have been established.

Many of you know more forcefully than I do that these things have meant a refuge for life itself to thousands of men, women, and children. They have meant for thousands more a breathing once again of the air of freedom. For untold numbers of children and youths the opportunities and aspirations possible in a free land are present for the first time in their lives. And for the people of this and other countries throughout the world, Israel is a symbol of a strengthening spirit and determination in man that refuse to bow to the forces of degradation and repression that press inward from so many sides today.

For this new nation's own security, for the very continuance of the lives of its people, for the growing strength of decency on earth, for the peace of the world—Israel must not be weakened in its determination to provide this kind of salvation for men. All of the people of our country must be told the story of Israel's work, and they must come to understand its meaning for America and for the world.

It is imperative that Israel succeed in this great crusade upon which it is embarked in the name of humanity. Its paramount concern for unlimited immigration, resulting in its record influx of refugees, has created situations in living and rehabilitation that must be met, and met soon.

The thousands of people still living in tents and shacks must be housed in decency and security. Sanitation must be provided. New settlements must be established, and newcomers must find work they are fitted to do. Israel has to build schools and hospitals. It has to reclaim much more of its land to produce food in sufficient quantity to nourish the people who keep on coming. I am told that, while Israel's citizens are engaged in this herculean task during 1950, a minimum of 150,000 additional immigrants must be accepted as permanent residents.

Israel will win this heroic struggle to establish a sound economy, just as it won the war for its freedom. Right now, in 1950, its people must have help as they wrestle with problems of rehabilitation and reconstruction on a scale never undertaken by a small nation. The progress Israel makes this year will be in a real sense the measure of Israel's own future. The effort must not be allowed to fail.

In addition to this vital work of human reconstruction in Israel, the United Jewish Appeal has before it other activites in rebuilding and readjusting the lives of victims of homelessness and persecution overseas. Aid must be provided for hundreds of thousands of Jews in European lands and for the adjustment of refugees who find a haven in the United States. The United Jewish Appeal offers to the people of America, Jew and Christian alike, opportunity to associate themselves with this humanitarian effort to bring the blessings of brotherhood and warm affection to those upon whom the tortures of war inflicted their greatest and most dreadful toll.

This is the great year of Israel's need, and it is also the year during which millions of the world's people will choose some way of life which they believe can promise them security for the future. The democratic system of government is undergoing the severest test in its history, and men and women in far-flung areas of the earth's surface are looking for leadership that will guide them from the darkness of fear into the light of peace.

We have long ago determined that the democracies of Europe shall not be undermined. America cannot afford to let the democracy of Israel disappear from the world. Regardless of religious affiliation, we remember vividly, as one people, the death and suffering visited upon Jews under the brutal lashings of the dictators. We remember that we promised ourselves to erase such things from the world forever.

The people of Israel ask help, not for themselves, but for others. This means that contributions to the United Jewish appeal declares to the world that the people of the United States have not forgotten, and that they do not intend to forget.

Our contribution will also mean that the United States stands behind the efforts of people everywhere to establish and strengthen the democratic way of life, and that the aid given to the democracies by our Government is strongly supported by the people themselves.

I am glad to represent the Department of the Interior at a meeting like this, for the work of reclaiming natural resources with which we are charged stirs our close sympathy with the Israelis as they move forward to reclaim their land. We know the importance of watering the desert that it may bloom like the rose, and we have learned how living can achieve serenity and peace when life-giving waters bring arid land into fruitfulness.

As a citizen of the most-favored nation on earth, I know, too, what the air of freedom and the climate of peace and abundance can give to men who share them. Israel's people have a homeland which holds a deep promise for the future. And as they grow in security and abundance, that homeland will become a lasting beacon of democracy that shines throughout the world.

Whatever the citizens of America contribute today to build the strength and hope of Israel will be yielded back to them many times over, for Israel will remain on the side of humanity in its battle for a lasting peace.

Address of Dr. George W. Cox Before United States-Mexico Border Public Health Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a speech delivered by Dr. George W. Cox, State health officer of Texas, before a meeting of the United States-Mexico Border Public Health Association in Chihuahua, Mexico. Dr. Cox is president of this very worth-while association which was organized for the purpose of promoting health and sanitation along both sides of the border from Brownsville, Tex., to San Diego, Calif.

Members of the United States-Mexico Border Public Health Association, my good friends of both Mexico and the United States, ladies and gentlemen, the time has arrived when we find ourselves again assembled in this, the eighth annual convention of the United States-Mexico Border Public Health Association. For me, this is indeed a happy and honorable occasion, and I acknowledge with humility the privilege of serving as your president for the past year. While I would like to personally thank each of you individually for your splendid cooperation, I hope you will accept instead my simple expression of gratitude at this time.

Meeting in this beautiful city of Chihuahua and observing its physical charm, its culture, tradition, and national life, brings back to me treasured memories of years gone by—and my active medical practice along the border when my friends and patrons were equally divided by the Rio Grande. I recall those years with pride and satisfaction—and without a single regret. Those were years of personal service to mankind, and to humanity, on the basis of mutual understanding. In the field of service in which I am now engaged, I regret to say I have discovered that the greatest single obstacle we face is the difficulty in establishing mutual understanding. In order to surmount this obstacle, we must realize first, that man fears those things he does not understand.

A meager knowledge of the people in other lands has frequently been to our disadvantage; however, I am fully conviced that when adequate ways and means are provided for people to assemble and discuss with one another their different problems, they will achieve understanding in the end—and finally realize that our objectives are all the same. That is the purpose of this association; and these meetings should teach us to understand other people better, so that we may view their shortcomings with charity, their virtues with appreciation, and their kindness to us with gratitude. Peace and understanding in our time, and for all time, must be brought through a greater measure of international understanding.

My friends of the business world tell me that every well-managed business compiles an inventory at regular intervals. Over a period of many years, this custom has proved to be helpful in determining the existence of obsolete stock and the need for its replacement. An orderly establishment of these facts allows us to develop plans for the future upon a sound basis, and while I know that in both our professional lives and in business not all our goals are achieved, we at least are able to direct our efforts in an orderly manner toward the objectives we set for ourselves. Public health, while primarily a profession, is nonetheless a business too, and it would perhaps be well for us, as members of this profession, to pause, and, like good businessmen, also take inventory to determine if we are keeping pace with modern trends.

At this time I am conscious, as you are, that we are at the beginning of a new half century—a new year—a year of great promise, but also of grave significance. Great events seldom develop in a single year; they cast their shadows before, and the world lives in the aftermath. Events that will change and direct our future are constantly developing, and are about us today. No doubt the quiet day-by-day living of the early part of this century is gone forever.

The first change we notice is in the map of the world. It is different to the extent that geographical boundary lines have passed on into history, and we cannot help but realize at the same time that great empires which have existed for centuries have substantially relinquished colonial possession and authority. Millions of people have moved from one place to another, all of which is vastly significant.

The next noticeable sphere of change is in the field of science—with its new discoveries and inventions. They have arrived rapidly, and the interval of time between discovery and production, to actual use, is incredibly short. Science, in just the last few years, has produced radar, electronics, atomic energy, new metals, chemicals, wonder drugs—and we are advised that more discoveries will be presented in the immediate future. In medicine, our doctors feel they are very near the answer to disease that has ravaged mankind since history began.

The next change that appears imminent, and may actually be in evidence, is the philosophy that would change and control our ideas and beliefs about people, about governments, about life. In a world that feels the tragic potentials of atomic implications, mankind undoubtedly faces a critical and urgent choice, whether or not we on this planet should learn to live together or cease to exist. There is one way to live together, and that is according to the Golden Rule, which means doing unto others as we would have them do unto us. Unfortunately, there are some nations not willing to abide by this rule in their international obligations. The fundamental question of our time is whether or not our system of living will be forcefully superseded by some order that we do not want. There is only one practical answer to this problem, and that is found in the very preamble or formula of self-preservation. Our formula for self-preservation can best be established by maintaining and improving good health; by being strong in our industry; strong in our finances; strong in our purpose. Now you ask, What is purpose? Whereupon we must define and accept the definition for the word. The word "purpose" is all-inclusive of the policies we adopt and the procedures we follow; our public relations, our international relations, which are essentially and in substance the expression of faith and confidence and the will to do by agreement.

This organization has gone far beyond treaty and agreement. This organization has set an international precedent for professional-scientific cooperation, understanding, friendship, good will, faith, and confidence—all of which can be nothing less than the common denominator in the affairs of public health. I am glad to express my highest regard for my friends in Mexico who are members of this organization for their sincerity of purpose; for their accomplishments; for their high quality of attainment in the medical and scientific world.

This is the kind of goal that can be achieved, only if we place our emphasis on the human element instead of concentrating on the economic and political factors of life. While this organization developed its original plan and objective on a rather local, restricted basis, intending to give attention and concern especially to those public health problems that arose on either side of the Rio Grande, I am confident that a great deal more progress has been made than we are able to enumerate or point out as visible physical accomplishments.

My own efforts in this joint program have not gone as far as I would have liked, I must admit; however, I can assure my friends in this organization that as time and circumstances permit, we will do our part. Latent and active factors have developed as a result of this public health organization that we must not forget, and in the course of time I am sure we will appreciate them more. To know one another, and to know the problems and difficulties of each other on a personal basis, can only accurately determine the human equation that establishes mutual friendship.

In this connection I cannot fail to mention a generous offer of assistance from Dr. Rafael P. Gamboa, secretary of the Mexican Department of Health and Sanitation, when he proposed to me the services of his personnel to help complete a vaccination program during a smallpox epidemic in three southern counties of Texas. I wish to acknowledge in grateful appreciation this fine expression of cooperation on the part of Dr. Gamboa and his epidemiologist, Dr. Calderon. Their efforts as well as those of the health officers of Tamulipas and Reynosa and other cities are largely responsible for the control of this disease on the Mexican side of the border.

Compliments are due officials at Nuevo Laredo for their public health program. I am aware that this good-neighbor city has a first-class water-treatment plant, modern swimming pool, a new market, and modern schools. It is reassuring to know of the continued typhus-control program and the fine mutual interest manifested by joint attendance at the Laredo Insect Control School. The joint monthly waterworks meetings, carried on bilingually, should be a source of pride to both Mexico and the United States. The interchange of morbidity reports continues to prove helpful.

The fine building at Juarez stands as a monument to an expanded health program, and it has given impetus to general public health service in that area. It is gratifying to observe the close cooperation at El Paso between the two health departments, evidenced by the interchange of laboratory service, in-service training, and inspection facilities.

It should be pleasing to note that public opinion in the Matamoros area is beginning to swing strongly toward the desire for mosquito-control activity. Here, as in Laredo, morbidity reports are exchanged on a weekly basis.

The Pan-American Sanitary Bureau, now directed by Dr. Soper, is rendering a vital service, with the limited resources that it has available, in putting public health on a firm basis. The Pan-American Sanitary Bureau has been recognized as an integral part of the World Health Organization, which, as you know, is laying the foundation now for solid philosophy with principles designed by and for all mankind.

I especially wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the work that was initiated by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs—work of a most practical nature. The record reveals the fact that the Institute of Inter-American Affairs has about 600 projects, on a cooperative basis in 10 American Republics under its general jurisdiction, in which general sanitation and other programs are given consideration. Our National Congress unanimously approved the work of the institute and made a moderate appropriation to assist in the continuation of this program for the next 5 years. Doubtless this program is contributing much in public-health improvement.

Likewise it is interesting to review overall progress that has been made these last 7 years along the border. In the field of sanitation we find a number of improvements have been made to the border water supplies. Operators of water plants have been trained and surveys of railroad-coach waters and tourist-court waters have been completed. Several sewage-treatment plants have been constructed, and in other instances waste has been removed from the common boundary stream and used advantageously for crop production. Ratproofing, as well as typhus-control programs have been initiated in several boundary communities, while malaria control has been stimulated in several other communities. Food sanitation has received more attention in a number of localities. Model market houses and slaughtering establishments have been constructed.

Venereal-disease control has received major emphasis in almost every community on both sides of the border. It is my understanding that other speakers at our meeting here will review the progress made in the control of these diseases and make some pertinent observations. Considerable educational material was distributed relative to tuberculosis control. We were successful in making X-ray chest examinations of all the counties along the Texas border; and our State has seen fit to locate a tuberculosis sanatorium in Hidalgo County. The health officers from the other States will, undoubtedly, report on the activities in their States on tuberculosis control.

Incidentally, in my opinion, probably the finest thing that has come out of this organization is the fine fellowship that is created. Public health speaks but one language—public health is the foundation on which to erect the pillars of good government. It appeals to all creeds, and it is free of all "isms." It appeals to all strata of society, and offers great reward by paying dividends in the way of prosperity, well-being, and contentment.

Although we have made a creditable showing by first approaching our major public-health problems along the border, there is still much left undone, especially in the environmental sanitation field. We should here rededicate our efforts to enlarge our activities in the fields mentioned and eventually increase the scope of our horizon. I feel very much encouraged when statesmen of the caliber of Gov. Fernado Noglio Miramontes, and other administrative officials of Mexico, come to a meeting of this nature, give their time, and indicate such sincere interest in this growing humanitarian service.

The attendance at this conference which includes a great number of the outstanding leaders in the fields of government and public health is an inspiration to me, and the quality of the program as well as the multitude of details related to the success of our annual meeting is a tribute to the organizational ability and patience of our secretary, Dr. M. F. Haralson. We all realize that Dr. Haralson has expended great effort in helping to make this our eighth annual meeting such a wonderful success, and I wish at this time to extend my personal thanks and the gratitude of the entire membership for his competent and faithful service.

I wish also to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to the city officials of Chihuahua, to the various committees and individuals, who have contributed so generously of their time and interest toward making this annual conference such an outstanding success.

The Rio Grande—the border—with its rich historical background, its beautiful natural environment, its romantic heritage, will undoubtedly attract many more visitors in the future. We can see that this border lends itself to the development of a health resort, a playground and recreational center; and furthermore, we, through our association, can set the pattern for other nations to live in peace, and enjoy the fullness of life together. We have touched off the spark, which I hope will kindle the imagination of other nations to eventually build a world nation without discord in the harmonious program in which we have thus far been successful.

This, then, is my inventory of conditions as they exist today. There is room for vast improvement in partically every phase of an international public health program, which is too great for any single nation, state, agency, or individual; it demands the concerted effort of everyone.

United in our thinking, united in purpose, and united in our efforts, may we all as members of the United States-Mexico Border Public Health Association face this midpoint of the twentieth century with a spirit of mutual understanding, and rededicate ourselves to a concept of service through public health to a world where all mankind can live, work, and walk with the dignity of a civilized being in full, physical, mental, and moral health.

Thank you.

The Lattimore Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune, reveals the general opinion of everybody who I talked to when I was home during the Easter recess. Republicans also feel that National Republican Chairman Gabrielson and other leaders made a mistake in approving the McCarthy fiasco:

SENATOR MCCARTHY FALLS FLAT ON HIS FACE OVER CHARGES

Senator MCCARTHY's probe of the State Department and particularly his charge that Owen Lattimore is a Communist and a spy fell on its face because MCCARTHY was relying on rumor rather than fact. It is true that Lattimore has been regarded as a radical by some but there is nothing in his record or his writings to prove he is or was a Communist.

The Post-Tribune has published many of Lattimore's writings and not a Communist tinge has appeared in any of them. With some of his viewpoints we have not agreed but that he is an authority on the Orient we have no doubt. MCCARTHY took a chance of making political hay out of the Communist issue. And despite his failure he may have succeeded.

The reason for this curious possibility lies in the mistakes of the State Department and the growing antagonism in America to communism. MCCARTHY voiced some of the rumors that have been rampant and so may be regarded as a fighter against this foreign "ism" despite his failure to make good his charges.

The popularity of his attack is based in the knowledge that at one time the State Department was infested with Communist ideas and with sex perverts and Americans look upon the record with wonder and disgust. How, they ask, could men of the caliber of Acheson and the other higher-ups in the Department countenance such goings-on?

And if he did countenance such a situation has he changed enough so that Americans may have full confidence in his present position? If it is true he led the Russian contingent in the Department how is it possible to have confidence in his judgment now? Had MCCARTHY put his emphasis on the known record he might have made more of an impression on thinking Americans.

However, MCCARTHY preferred to rest his case on the sensational charge that a Russian Communist spy was determining State Department policy. This was absurd. Whatever the State Department has done in the past there can be no doubt about the forthwith policy Acheson recently announced. Precisely what he means by total diplomacy is not clear but that it indicates a change from a defensive to an offensive policy is certain.

Unquestionably Acheson has made serious mistakes in relation to Russia but he has unquestionably turned completely around and is now intent on stopping further aggression. He is an able man and capable of developing and carrying on an effective attack against our enemies. Therefore, despite his somewhat soiled record we prefer to let him alone rather than risk another Truman appointment.

Don't Disturb Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, evidence is accumulating that obstacles are going to be put in the way of adoption of some of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission by reason of an outpouring of letters from constituents who assure us that while they believe in economy they are constrained to oppose certain of the plans. In most of these cases it is not difficult to deduce that those who are doing the objecting have a personal interest either direct or indirect. Pertinent to this subject is the following editorial from a recent issue of the Medford (Mass.) Mercury:

"DON'T DISTURB US"

When the Hoover Report was submitted to Congress Herbert Hoover warned the American people that unless the people themselves demanded action on Federal reorganization the report would just gather dust on some forgotten shelf.

He also warned of the danger of the report being killed by the "grasshopper bites" of those who say "reorganization is fine for everybody else but don't disturb my agency."

Almost every proposal made by the Commission steps on the toes of some special-interest group.

If the Commission's proposals were to be adjusted to take care of all special cases, nothing would be left of the Hoover reorganization program.

Perhaps no group or individual can find himself completely in agreement with every recommendation made by the Hoover Commission. Within the Commission itself, there was disagreement in many areas.

Most individuals, however, find themselves substantially in agreement with all save a very few proposals.

Lately, however, serious misconceptions about some of the Hoover Commission's recommendations have arisen in the field of veterans' affairs.

To leave these uncorrected would be unfair to the Hoover Commission. Incidentally it would be unfair to the taxpayers, including millions of ex-service men and women. It would be equally unfair to veterans' organizations which have often called for better and more economical management of government.

Before we go so far as to say that the Hoover report would dismember or do away with the Veterans' Administration let's read the actual recommendations.

At no place in the Commission's report can be found any recommendations for either the increase or curtailment of medical benefits or other services, to veterans. The Commission stated that such policy decisions were outside its terms of reference and should be the subject of congressional determination.

The Commission's recommendations covered only the better management of existing programs.

It would seem logical and sensible to wait until specific legislation affecting veterans is introduced before allowing emotional thinking to warp our view of the Hoover blueprint for a more economical management of our Government's business affairs.

It is terribly important that we achieve as much as possible of the program for which most Americans have waited so long.

Lobbying Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal lately about the investigation of lobbying. Every legislative body ought to check this matter carefully at regular intervals. One of the greatest and most dangerous lobbying groups exists within the Government agencies—the "Federal lobby." The trend toward too much government and too much centralization of that government has grown alarmingly. The great urge of bureaucracy is to expand, and the agencies have thousands of tax-supported public-relations agents to drum up the false need for more and bigger agencies.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Buchanan committee will not consider its work completed until it has thoroughly investigated the tactics used by Government agencies to propagandize their own programs. The Harness subcommittee of the Eightieth Congress made a notable contribution on that score. Much remains to be done.

Apropos of this need, I submit a forceful editorial which appeared recently in the Wisconsin State Journal, a fine objective newspaper published in Wisconsin's capital city:

THOSE WHO WILL NOT BE TOUCHED

There is one area of lobbying that really would bear some investigation, and subsequent regulation.

But there will be little investigation in this direction, and no strict regulation.

We refer here to the pressure tactics and propagandizing by Government agencies in behalf of their own programs.

According to Congressman JOHN VORYS, of Ohio, our Federal publicity and public relations activities now cost taxpayers more than $100,000,000 a year.

This tax-supported lobby works unceasingly for Federal housing, Federal power, socialized medicine, more valley authorities, and more Federal control of everything.

There are more than 3,500 Federal employees—who cost taxpayers more than a million dollars a month—engaged in selling and lobbying for and stirring up support for the programs wanted—not by the people—but by department heads and Mr. Truman. The Department of Agriculture now has 525 information specialists boosting the Brannan plan, Congressman VORYS points out. Five different agencies are lobbying and publicizing Federal housing, while over the past 10 years the Federal Security Agencies' bureaus have spent more than $20,000,000 in a campaign for socialized medicine.

Congressman VORYS points out one great danger in this tax-supported Federal lobby:

"Whether the immediate purpose of Government propaganda is good or bad, the fact remains that individual liberty and free institutions cannot long survive when the vast power of government may be marshaled against the people to perpetuate a given policy or a particular group of officeholders."

Some of these tax-paid lobbyists work directly—even arrogantly—upon our Congressmen and Senators. Others work indirectly, stirring up the demand for more and more Government services out in the provinces.

Now here, in our opinion, is a lobby that should be investigated—thoroughly and completely.

Here are lobbyists who constitute an immediate threat to the taxpayer—to his freedom, his way of life, and his pocketbook.

And the not-so-funny part of it is that the taxpayer, unwillingly and unknowingly, is financing the very menace from which he now has no protection.

Will Congress do anything about this tax-supported Federal lobby?

We'll bet against it, for a very good reason:

The tax-supported lobbyists now are beating their brains out, working in behalf of and stirring up a demand for Dr. Truman's political patent medicines.

Indian Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that several bills designed to bring equality and justice to America's Indian citizens are soon to come before the Congress, I am placing this editorial from the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune in the RECORD in the hope it will aid House Members in becoming better informed on some of these issues and problems.

The editorial follows:

STATUS OF THE INDIANS

Last week's prediction from Representative TOBY MORRIS, of the Sixth Oklahoma District, that the House of Representatives, at least, will approve claims of members of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians against the Government for more than $10,000,000 sent reporters digging into Indian statistics. One of them Sunday came up with an estimate that the claims our red brothers have on file in Washington total more than half a billion dollars. All are based on treaties, guardianships, and the other trappings of dealings between separate peoples.

This must puzzle many people who remember that in 1924 Congress conferred citizenship on all United States Indians. The act was half in earnest and half out of the emotion that arose from the action of so many tribesmen in volunteering for service in World War I. They were not liable under the draft, but they went to training camp by the battalions and fought with conspicuous bravery in Europe.

The courts attached strings to the congressional enactment almost immediately, holding that citizenship is not incompatible with either tribal existence or continued guardianship. Pulling these strings, the Indian Bureau seems to have been able to tighten its grip on Indian affairs. It is a notable, and most Indians say, a tragic fact that in the last 17 years, or since it was proposed by the Bureau in 1937 that 29 tribes would be released from Federal supervision over a 10-year period, fewer Indians have escaped from the Bureau into full citizenship than had done so during any period of like length in the past 100 years.

How is the Bureau able to survive all these promises and years and get huge biennial appropriations to keep large staffs in the field and an army of white chiefs and helpers in Washington? Probably by never actually settling its disputes with the tribes, or pushing the Indian Claims Commission to do so. The same desire to hold onto jobs with the Commission undoubtedly impels workers there to take their time about winding up any case.

Should the $10,000,000 appropriation for the Five Civilized Tribes clear both Houses of Congress and be approved by the President, a new push to clear the docket of claims might follow. Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, found considerable favor Nation-wide when he said a few years ago:

"The Government of the United States should determine definitely what its debt to the Indians amounts to—individually and collectively—pay such debts and allow them to take their places in the communities of this Nation on an even basis with other citizens—they have been on probation long enough."

Don Eddy, for the American Magazine, made a 9,000-mile tour to ask the Indians what they thought about the situation. He came up with the conclusion that restitution for past wrongs is not so important to present-day Indians as the right to be treated as equal citizens.

Thoughtful Oklahomans will agree with Senator BUTLER. Since it is proposed to cut all special ties between the Indian and the Federal Government finally, and transfer the Indian to the jurisdiction of State and local governments. Oklahoma will want them to come in as well prepared financially to hold up their ends as is possible and just.

More than a third of all American Indians live in this State, by order of Uncle Sam. As with any other large segment of our population some are well-to-do and some are necessarily objects of charity. If any of the latter are due sums from the Government, Oklahomans will want them to colect and be self-supporting at the time of terminating Federal wardships.

Address by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt to Americans for Democratic Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on the occasion of the annual convention of Americans for Democratic Action, held here in Washington on April 1, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt delivered a fine and thoughtful address, stressing the truth

that we must have the courage of our convictions and the freedom to express them, if our democracy is to survive. As always, Mrs. Roosevelt speaks from the depths of her great wisdom and her profound belief in our way of life. I ask unanimous consent to have Mrs. Roosevelt's speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it's a very inspiring thing these days to come to a meeting such as this and find so many people coming together to discuss and make plans for an organization devoted to obtaining in our country as good a government as we can have. This organization is made up of both Democrats and Republicans.

I was amused the other night to have a young boy at a meeting where we were discussing good government say, "Mrs. Roosevelt, you've talked about the liberals, but if you really have conservative convictions, what should you do?" I think the thing that makes one happy about ADA is that it really has convictions. And the people who belong, belong because they want to find a way to put those convictions to work. They recognize—everyone in this room at this meeting knows—that our democracy is not perfect. But they also know that it's working to improve democracy. That is the important thing. Those who are satisfied—those who feel that there is nothing they can do—they are the people who will do harm to the Government and the citizenship in the United States.

We live in a time when every single one of us must realize that what actually is important in a democracy is that sense of individual responsibility. And there are certain things here in our country that I think we must watch very carefully. It is true, as has been said, that there is a sense of insecurity—I might almost say a sense of fear—among many people in this country of ours. With some people it's a fear of the possibility of war; with others it's a fear of what the new weapons of war may mean if we should come to war; with others it's a fear of what may happen to them personally if by chance they offend in any way. That is the fear that bothers me most—the fear of people who are afraid to be themselves, to hold convictions, to stand up for them—because that fear, I think, is the fear which can really hurt our democracy more than any other.

This is a time when it takes courage to live. It takes the kind of courage that it took in the earliest days of our history. I'm quite sure that George Washington and his men must have had moments when they wondered how on earth the United States was ever going to exist. And I'm sure that there have been other times in our history which have looked black indeed to the citizens of the country and its leaders. But at present we need all the courage that our forefathers had and perhaps a little more, because we have a job to do at home and a job to do in the world.

The job at home has to be done, and has to be done first. We have to be unafraid. And we have to realize that here is where we as individuals have to fulfill our belief in democracy. If we cannot prove here that we believe in freedom, in the ability of people to govern themselves, if we cannot have confidence in each other, if we cannot feel that fundamentally we are all trying to retain the best in our democracy and improve it, if we cannot find some basic unity even in peace, then we are never going to be able to lead the world. This is the problem that is before us today. If we do not lead the world, who is going to lead it? We have to accept the fact that it's what we do here that makes us fit to lead the world. So every day in our daily lives as citizens we are building our world leadership.

Our great struggle today is to prove to the world that democracy has more to offer than communism. You can't just say that anyone who understands communism must be against it. You have to face the fact that this is a struggle, and a very great struggle. If we want to win the cold war, if we want to reach a greater security—I think it's going to take us a long time, and I think we have to develop a courage and a stanchness that perhaps we have never had. If we want to achieve it, then we must prove to the world what we can offer. That means we have to take certain definite steps. We have, for instance, to make sure that we have civil rights in this country. There was time when we could look on that question as a purely domestic one—that we could take all the time we wanted to educate ourselves to solve the problem. It isn't any longer a domestic question—it's an international question. It is perhaps the question which may decide whether democracy or communism wins out in the world.

I sit in the United Nations, have sat in the General Assembly since 1946, and I sit in the Human Rights Commission. Over and over again the failures of democracy are pointed out to me in terms of specific instances of things that have happened in our country. I don't try to say they didn't happen, because usually I know that they did. All I can say is that we know about them, and those of us who really care, work to improve our democracy. Therefore, we must actually look at ourselves with more critical eyes than we have in the past.

Where do we fail, and how hard do we try to live up to the things we've given lip service to? It's not a domestic question; it's a question that perhaps is one of the most important factors in the winning of the struggle. Of course, economic questions enter into this struggle, too. We cannot be complacent about unemployment in our country—about injustices. Not long ago I remember hearing in a certain city that the papers actually printed what certain rather well-paid officials would have as pensions in an industry, and yet when it came to the point of pensions to the workers, that was too heavy a burden for the industry. Well now, I'm not a Socialist. I'm a very practical capitalist, I'm sure. But if we want to keep capitalism, we in this country have got to learn that there must be a real sharing, a real understanding, between management and labor. They must plan together because their interests are really identical. But both sides must realize it.

Now, the answer to unemployment, I didn't get an answer when I asked some of our Democratic Senators the other day, "What is the answer to unemployment?" I doubt if many people know. I think it's one of the things that perhaps we need to experiment, and perhaps it may be tied up, too, with some of our decisions in the realm of foreign affairs. Perhaps backing the United Nations with our own four-point program, seeing what can be done through them, to work with other nations in the world, that may have some tie with unemployment. There may be other things that I know nothing about, but I never like to feel that we don't face problems and that we don't set people to work on finding the answers. There's no reason why we shouldn't say we don't know the answer now; there's every reason why we shouldn't say we're not trying to find out. It is essential, I think, to our winning this struggle that we actually find answers, because in this economic area communism has a program. And democracy has to have a better one. If it doesn't, we're being judged before the bar of the world, and we have to win. We have to win because we have a conviction that democracy does offer people something that no other form of government and no other way of life can offer.

There's one thing that always strikes me, and that is that the Communist representatives in the United Nations never talk about liberty; they never mention it. On one occasion when Mr. Vishinsky was forced to do so, he said that was a foolish thing to talk about because no one could have liberty. Well, you and I know quite well that everyone's liberty is conditioned by the rights of other people. But we must think about liberty, because that is really one of the basic reasons why we prefer democracy to communism. And somehow we must keep ourselves free from fear and suspicion of each other. I sit with people who are representatives of Communist countries, and to sit with them is a lesson in what fear can do. Fear can take away from you all the courage to be an individual. You become a mouthpiece for the ideas which you have been told you must give forth. I have no feeling of real antagonism toward these representatives because, poor things, they can do no other. They must do that; their lives depend on it.

Now, it seems to me that the ADA is an organization that has thinking people in it, and we must preserve the right to think and to differ in the United States. We must be able to disagree with people, and to consider new ideas, and not to be afraid. The day that I am afraid to sit down in a room with people that I do not know because perhaps 5 years from now, someone will say, "You sat in the room and five people were Communists, and so you are a Communist," that day will be a bad day for democracy. We must be sure enough of ourselves, of our own convictions, to sit down with anyone and not be afraid of listening to what they have to say, and not be afraid to contamination by association. It's true that the company you keep may say something about what you are. But to be able to meet with people and argue your own point of view, and to meet with people whom you do not have screened beforehand to be sure they are safe to meet with—that must be a part of the freedom of every citizen in the United States.

So I'm grateful that ADA prods us to think, that it has an opportunity to bring before us the ideas that seem important, that it also has the opportunity of backing people in elections who promise to be good public servants. I'm grateful that it is representative of people in both political parties, and I'm grateful for the numbers that have come today. I think it shows that we as a Nation are waking up to the need to preserve our basic ideals in our Republic, that we are taking up to the fact that we have to live those ideals, and that we have to improve our democracy by the way we live. To do that we must come together, and consult together, and get other people to help us where we need help. There must be no one who fights the battle of good government, of freedom of thought, of real democracy, with a sense of doing it alone. That is the value of ADA—you do not have to be alone.

I was speaking to a little group of college students the other day who had started an organization where they tried to live the ideals of democracy, and one of them said to me, "I graduate this year. What do I do when I go home?" And I said, "You find people who feel as you do." He said, "I don't know any, where I live." Now, that shouldn't happen to any young person, because they should be sure that if they were really trying to live their convictions they would find support in their community. That's why I stress that it is in our own communities that we must fight this struggle, not only the struggle against communism but the struggle for peace.

We will have on a world-wide scale, a human rights convention, probably before the General Assembly next autumn at the United Nations, and then before our Senate, a ratification. That's part of our struggle. If we don't ratify, who else will ratify in the world? And yet human rights are basic to establishing peace. A common understanding throughout the world of human rights—of the value of human personality and freedom—that understanding, spread throughout the world, is one of the cornerstones on which we must build for peace.

Curtailment of Postal Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me protesting the order of the Postmaster General curtailing mail deliveries and making other changes in the postal rules.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY URGES POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT TO WITHDRAW OUTRAGEOUS POSTAL-SERVICE CUTS

I urge my colleagues in the Senate and House of Representatives to take immediate action and request a withdrawal of the outrageous order just issued by the Postmaster General curtailing mail deliveries to residential sections and making other changes in postal rules.

I believe that there is a deep suspicion among the American people that this drastic Postmaster General edict has been timed with Congress' review of the 1951 fiscal year budget—as a means of putting pressure on the Congress. Fifty million tired taxpayers have been hit in the mail box by this ruling, and I, for one, think it is disgusting because, from reports which I have received from my people, there is need for more mail service rather than less mail service.

I think it is outrageous to make wholesale changes in postal rules and regulations before the Congress has acted on the Hoover Commission reports dealing with the reorganization of the Post Office Department. While there are some controversial elements in those reports, I believe that we can effect considerable savings through them, and that in particular, the budget and accounting system of the Post Office Department which is so hopelessly obsolete that it must be revised. In addition, there are many items in the Post Office budget (which contribute to the present size of the deficit) which should be removed from that budget, and thus the deficit will shrink. Over 2 years ago, I suggested that Congress take out the air-mail subsidy and the Government and congressional free-mail subsidy from the Post Office Department budget, because those should be allocated to the budgets of the respective agencies and to the Congress rather than to the Post Office Department.

It is absurd that the same administration which has just soaked and socked the American taxpayer with:

1. A $1,250,000,000 rat-hole appropriation for a few land owners in Arizona (a bill which has passed the Senate).

2. A wasteful $300,000,000 subsidy to peanut and cotton growers in the South to increase their already surplus acreage.

3. A $1,500,000,000 pork-barrel rivers and harbors bill.

That this same administration should suddenly become so interested in "economy" that it tries to save some money by firing a few $40-a-week substitute postal workers—most of whom are veterans. This order hits the little fellows in the Post Office Department, but what is far worse, it hits every user of the mail.

The Senate and House Appropriations Committees and the Senate and House Post Office Committees should indicate their extreme displeasure with Postmaster General Donaldson's ruling and they should take action immediately to have this unjustified ruling rescinded.

The International Trade Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The ITO Charter Should Be Ratified," from Business Week for February 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ITO CHARTER SHOULD BE RATIFIED

The International Trade Organization is coming before Congress for the third time. Backers and critics agree that this time it will either be floated or left on the shoals as a monument to a vast amount of frustrated international negotiating.

American business itself is sharply divided. The National Association of Manufacturers, the National Foreign Trade Council, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and others have lined up against it. The Committee for Economic Development, the National Planning Association and the National Council of Importers are among those backing it.

The impressive array of organizations on both sides of the question is ample testimony to the complexity of the problem. After careful study, we line up with those who are supporting the charter.

In spite of its weaknesses, the charter is demonstrably useful in economic terms. And we think that ratification is important to preserve America's leadership in world trade and to strengthen the forces promoting free trade.

DISAPPOINTING

Admittedly the charter has major weaknesses. American business will get little benefit from ITO in the immediate future.

The charter provision outlawing import quotas has been made meaningless by a score of amendments and exceptions. For example, a special provision permits use of quotas to limit imports from countries whose currency is scarce. Since the United States makes less use of import quotas than any other major country, and since dollars are short, this provision has the effect of permitting discrimination against our goods.

The charter will also disappoint Americans looking for guarantees on foreign investments. It offers no more than a general declaration favoring fair treatment of foreign capital. Investors may well feel that the United States will have to obtain strong additional guaranties by diplomatic negotiation.

Even so far as the charter goes, ITO will have only powers of persuasion. The charter contains no enforcement provisions. It is difficult to see how the clause outlawing cartels, for example, can be enforced effectively through persuasion alone.

Beyond these specific points, many critics point out that the charter does little to restore unrestricted free trade. It does not sweep away restrictions; it accepts them and tries to limit their use.

Finally, the charter is riddled with loopholes and is so complicated that it is difficult to say what many points mean.

THERE WE CAN SAY

The question is: Could we get a better agreement by starting fresh, from scratch?

The thing to remember is that the United States is virtually the only country pushing for unrestricted multilateral trade. And even the United States has written into the charter several restrictions designed to protect particular American interests. Considering that most major countries do want restrictions, the charter on the whole goes a long way in the direction of American thinking.

Actually, the charter probably could not be stronger; it is unlikely that the major nations would give an international body any greater control than this over their domestic policies. At this stage, it seems, few international organizations can be more than sounding boards or, at best, arbitrators.

POSITIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In spite of all its weaknesses, we think that the charter can help knock down the trade barriers between nations—and so, in the end, benefit American business. Several provisions have positive, immediate value:

1. The charter outlaws discriminatory two-nation trading deals. Countries with government trading organizations would have to compete in world markets just as the free enterprise countries do. This is very important to American business and agriculture.

2. Dumping goods in foreign markets at prices below domestic levels is prohibited, except for farm commodities (an exception put in by the United States).

3. Tariff negotiations would be conducted selectively on the "most favored nation" principle—a basic point in United States tariff policy since 1934.

4. Existing tariff preferences (such as our agreement with the Philippines) are to be honored—but preferences are not to be increased. The charter permits customs unions and mutual tariff reductions by neighboring countries.

5. The charter outlaws a multitude of practices now widely used to limit imports.

All these are highly desirable objectives.

Now, what about the political questions involved?

First, and most important, is that the United States may lose its leadership in international trade affairs if it rejects the charter. We proposed the idea. We have supplied much of the effort behind it. Our approval of the charter would give confidence to the countries that now fear the United States may return to economic isolationism. Our approval in itself would strengthen the drive for freer world trade. And it would give us a foundation on which we could continue to promote free trade.

If the United States stays out, however, there is little reason to believe that the world can make any great progress toward freer trade. The time is not ripe for a stronger agreement. Past experience makes it doubtful whether much could be done through bilateral treaties.

Recognizing all the weaknesses, we believe ITO must be given its chance.

Tariff Rates on Imports of Canvas and Waterproof Rubber Footwear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MASSACHUSETTS FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Boston, Mass., April 18, 1950.

Representative RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WIGGLESWORTH: RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, MASSACHUSETTS FEDERATION OF LABOR, APRIL 5, 1950

Whereas a bill is pending in Congress entitled "Bill to revise administrative procedures of the Bureau of Customs," which would eliminate what is known as the American selling-price principle, specifically as it applies to canvas and waterproof rubber footwear; and

Whereas the State Department has under consideration negotiations which would result in reciprocal trade agreements lowering present tariffs on canvas and waterproof rubber footwear imported from foreign countries; and

Whereas and further reduction in the tariff rates applying to imports of canvas and waterproof rubber footwear would constitute a serious threat to the major industry of our community and to other local business firms and would result in the loss of jobs, widespread distress, increase of relief rolls, and increase of the tax burden of our citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive council of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor at its monthly meeting, held Wednesday, April 5, 1950, does hereby memorialize and petition the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; and all Senators and Congressmen from the New England States, to take necessary action to prevent any reduction in the tariff on imports of canvas and waterproof footwear whether it be by legislative enactment abrogating the American selling-price principle, by negotiation under the general agreement on tariffs and trade, or otherwise; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; and Senators and Congressmen from the New England States.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY J. BRIEN,
President.

KENNETH J. KELLEY,
Secretary-Treasurer, Legislative Agent.

Address by Henry Morgenthau, Jr., at United Jewish Appeal Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., who is the general chairman of the United Jewish Appeal drive for the fourth consecutive year, delivered an important address at the national conference of the United Jewish Appeal, held in Washington, D. C., on April 15. I am glad to bring his remarks to the attention of my colleagues. The text of his address is as follows:

This conference is a unique symbol of American unity. As the campaigns throughout the country approach the decisive phase, it should be a source of greatest encouragement to all of us that many distinguished American leaders have joined together under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., as chairman and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Senator Robert A. Taft as honorary chairmen in forming the National Christian Committee and in convening this national conference.

The National Christian Committee has already made very substantial progress. The fact that Americans of all faiths have not merely demonstrated their sympathy but are actively participating in this 1950 campaign must serve notice to the entire world that the American people are solidly behind the people of Israel in the building of a new democracy and in rescuing their fellow Jews from homelessness and oppression.

We have two very good reasons for taking stock. In the first place, as I have indicated, we are now entering the crucial stage of the 1950 United Jewish Appeal. What happens in the next 30 days will tell the story of American Jewry's response to the needs in Israel and the needs of Jews in other parts of the world.

Secondly, we are assembled here a week prior to the official celebration of the second anniversary of the state of Israel. Two years have passed since the proclamation of independence was signed in the midst of war and trial—2 years in which many miraculous achievements were recorded—2 years in which we, the Jews of the United States, played a truly decisive role through the United Jewish Appeal—2 years of glorious fulfillment and 2 years of bitter struggle against superhuman difficulties.

There will be many celebrations in various parts of the country. And there is a great deal to celebrate. We can rejoice in the fact that Jews everywhere have achieved a new dignity as a result of the establishment of the state of Israel. The young men and women of Israel performed incredible feats of heroism in time of war. But we must not forget that the people of Israel as a whole have given no less a glorious account of themselves in coming to grips with the problems and the responsibilities that followed that victory.

Let this be our celebration here but let it be the kind of celebration that will not merely herald an historic event with resolutions and hallelujahs. Let us mark this occasion with a solemn pledge of continued devotion and with the kind of concrete action that will demonstrate to Israel that we are as firmly behind them today as we were in the darkest period of their fight for life 2 years ago.

It is easy to give expression to sentiment. But our deepest sentiments will have very little meaning unless they are reflected in concrete action to meet the critical problems facing Israel today.

I am sure that all of you are interested in the status of the campaign thus far. The progress chart, as I see it, looks good. In fact, the reports from key cities in various parts of the country are highly encouraging. I am happy to be able to report that the campaign is doing better than last year. And that is a tribute not to the leadership of the United Jewish Appeal, but to everyone of the leaders and volunteers in the local communities who are working very hard to achieve the best results.

Since January 1, 1950, we have received a considerable amount of cash. This is good. But not good enough to meet the urgent needs that confront us every day.

Believe me, the financial position of the United Jewish Appeal is very serious. We cannot meet the emergency requests that come to us from the United Palestine Appeal and the Jewish Agency. There are still 90,000 immigrants in the camps in Israel. Right now, one of the most difficult problems is to maintain them and try to give them a decent home.

In the past several weeks two things have happened to underscore the emergency character of the 1950 campaign.

The Government of Iraq has voted to permit the Jews who have been living in that country under the shadow of persecution, to leave and emigrate to Israel. There are about 130,000 Jews in Iraq. Most of them want to go to Israel. But this emigration, like the emigration from eastern Europe, has a deadline attached to it. The Jews have only 1 year in which to move out. This means that we must provide for the transfer and absorption of a minimum of 90,000 Iraqi Jews before the end of 1950. Shall we say that we didn't include these Jews in our campaign figures—that we can't provide for more than the immigration of 150,000 Jews in 1950 that we pledged ourselves to help at the beginning of the year?

The second event of major importance in the work of the United Jewish appeal was the beginning of the transfer of the hard-core cases—the old and the sick among the Jewish DP's still left in Germany—and the arrival of the first group in Israel earlier this month. These are the people who suffered most and waited longest to leave the soil that was the scene of the destruction of millions of their fellow Jews. Israel has decided to take them and try to rebuild their lives or give them the chance to spend the years that are left to them in freedom among their own people. But this program cannot be carried on unless the Joint Distribution Committee and the United Palestine Appeal receive the funds they need to fulfill their share of the project that is being carried on together with the Government of Israel.

Make no mistake about it. Israel is still fighting to save the lives of many sections of the Jewish people. And it is still fighting for its own existence.

I am not going to discuss the military and political situation. But we must not underestimate the developments in Cairo and the machinations of the Arab League. There are various ways of making war. The Arab States are intensifying their economic war against Israel. They are counting on us to get tired. They are hoping that the United Jewish Appeal will fail. And they are waiting and hoping that the world and the Jews of the United States will turn to other things and cut down their support to the Jewish State.

When he independence of Israel was proclaimed we pledged ourselves to help realize the dream of the return of the homeless and oppressed Jews of the world. Israel is doing more than her share. Her people are achieving the impossible in developing a new democracy in the face of the most difficult problems.

I have said it before, and I must repeat it now. The crisis Israel is facing in immigration, in doing the job that is as much our responsibility as hers, is as grave as was the crisis of her war for survival.

For this reason we must be prepared to make sacrifices. For this reason we should feel greatly heartened by the conference that is taking place here this weekend—a conference that demonstrates that all Americans are vitally interested in the preservation of Israel as a new hope for democracy and as a major achievement in the redemption of large sections of the Jewish people.

As Israel stands on the threshold of its third year, let us give its people the firm assurance that we understand her needs and that we are ready to meet our obligations through the 1950 United Jewish Appeal.

Truman "Prosperity"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of April 15, 1950:

TRUMAN "PROSPERITY"

We wonder if people are really as happy about Mr. Truman's prosperity as he seems to think they are. Not long ago he was calling a very similar situation Republican inflation. It may be prosperity, but it is inflation too, and we are rather inclined to the view that if there is partisanship in the inflation it is more Democratic than Republican.

Is it really prosperity when the Federal Government is running at a five to six billion dollar annual deficit; when excise taxes are at wartime levels; when more taxes are being taken from the workers than at any time except at the height of the recent war? We trust that when the President goes across the country on his forthcoming trip he will listen as well as talk. And we mean listen to persons other than those who are looking for Federal jobs or already have them.

In Kansas, for example, he might run into some of the 600 Kansas stockmen who recently adopted a resolution which said:

"There impends today a stupendous threat which so menacingly overshadows the future of our country that we Kansas stockmen, of all shades of political belief, feel it our duty to speak out in unmistakable terms. This threat lies in the fact that our country—without opportunity for conscious choice on the part of its people—is rapidly drifting toward the consummation of a false concept, contemptible to free men—the socialized state.

"Tokens of this danger are everywhere and undeniable. The growing power and expansion of a wasteful government; the colossal public debt; the heavy burden of taxation, designed in large part to redistribute the wealth of the people; the ridiculous attempt—by dictating wages, hours of labor, prices, etc., and by innumerable other false expedients—to substitute an artificial economy for the natural economy which alone can function in freedom; the gradual assumption by the State of financial responsibility for every hazard incident to the life, labor, infirmity, and old age of all—hazards which must be personally met and borne by every human being who has the instinctive will to survive and the inherent impulse to be free; the arraignment of economic and social groups, one against the other, in denial of the obvious fact that their interests are identical and can be logically promoted only by application of the Golden Rule; and numerous other kindred concepts, similarly inspired and equally false.

"Government produces nothing and has no means by which to support these false and destructive policies except by exacting from its citizens the fruits of their labor. The present semblance of prosperity is only the byproduct of the most terrible and destructive war that ever afflicted the world and is now maintained only by artifice implemented by folly, fear and dire forebodings.

"The course our government is now taking, unless it is promptly reversed, will inevitably lead to national bankruptcy. In a vain effort to prolong a specious sense of security, more similar expedients will be applied until we all become mere numbers in a completely socialized state."

We think those Kansans were very discerning men. We hope Mr. Truman takes the time to fathom their thinking before he makes more sport of the slogan, "liberty versus socialism." Or brags about prosperity.

Our Citizens Are Becoming More Aware of the Problems of Wildlife Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to address the Spring Mills Game and Fish Association, Spring Mills, Pa., on April 14, 1950.

Some 150 central Pennsylvania sportsmen were on hand for the monthly meeting of this wide-awake organization.

My remarks to this group of outstanding sportsmen were as follows:

The great problem of wildlife management is one of maintaining a balance between the needs of man on one hand and the needs of wild creatures on the other. The balance is constantly being lost as man uses up the forests, pollutes the rivers, or makes inroads on animal populations through excessive hunting. Then again, the balance is upset when animal populations increase out of proportion to the amount of food available.

As our citizens are becoming more aware of the problems of wildlife management, professional conservationists are in turn able to work more effectively to solve those problems. Americans, fortunately, are placing more emphasis on conservation. The recognition of the importance of soil conservation in agriculture, for instance, has enabled wildlife experts to point out that the populations of wild animals on a farm are also directly related to the land's fertility and inherent carrying capacity.

We are slowly making people aware of the fact that "habitat" means "living quarters." Americans are learning that wide open spaces and plenty of green brush do not necessarily make good living quarters for animals. Consequently, more farmers are planting hedgerows and border strips of food-producing plants. A wide sympathy toward the conservation philosophy by our citizens, who investigate for themselves the relationship between the wise use of soil, water, and plant life and the national welfare, is making the task easier.

Other aspects of unfavorable environment are being recognized by our citizens. Such activities as marsh drainage, admission of salt water into fresh-water marshes, diversion of rivers, industrial pollution of streams, and the general advance of industrial and urban settlements into wilderness areas constantly reduce the amount of land suitable for wildlife occupancy. Our efforts to oppose these unfavorable influences must continue without abatement.

In many phases of wildlife management we have gone far beyond the stage of indiscriminate efforts to build up the populations of animals. Some of our big game animals—most notably the white-tailed deer—have increased to such numbers that they threaten their own existence by overbrowsing their ranges. While some of this increase in populations of white-tail is the result of the animals' natural ability to adapt themselves to living in densely populated farm areas, the main factor is the failure to take doe deer as well as bucks during the hunting season. Many of the States are moving toward open season on does.

In the realm of wildlife management, research has also received a great deal of attention. Definite progress in obtaining answers and solutions to serious wildlife problems are being made in the fields of land management, waterfowl management, protection of wildlife in relation to insect control, rodent control, and predator control, and in the ecology of wild fur animals and bird migrations. The continued interest and support of the public in these research activities assure us of eventually obtaining the answers to our wildlife problems.

Not only is wildlife worth billions of dollars to us in cash, it is worth immeasurably more as a source of recreation, good living, and as a morale builder for the continual fight which we must wage in a world of insecurity and competition. In line with this thought is another: By the wise exploitation of the people's natural interest in wildlife we can foster interest in the need for soil conservation, rehabilitation of our watersheds, and the cleansing of our polluted streams. Not only would we then be building habitat for wildlife, we would be serving ourselves and our neighbors in maintaining a high standard of living and security, which must come inevitably from the land.

Many writers and scientists are reporting the sad state of resource exploitation in the world today, but the United States is one country that is pushing efforts at conservation—especially in the categories of fisheries and wildlife.

In maintaining populations of salmon, for instance, there is progress in rehabilitation of the runs of Atlantic salmon in the Northeastern States, a number of streams have been surveyed by the Fish and Wildlife Service and areas capable of supporting new runs have been found.

On the west coast, experiments are continuing in methods of guiding salmon fingerlings around dams and away from water-use diversions. Such experiments are employing chemical, temperature, and sonic stimuli to urge fish to go where they are supposed to go.

The increased construction of dams and irrigation projects make it essential for the continuation of salmon runs, that ways and means be found to preserve the spawning salmon and the fingerling returning to the sea.

Off the Florida west coast a Fish and Wildlife Service vessel, the 60-foot *Pompano* has been engaged in research to determine the causes of the "red tide," which killed millions of valuable food fish in 1947. In its study of oceanography, planktology, and the chemical constituents of the coastal waters, the Fish and Wildlife Service is working in cooperation with the University of Miami's marine laboratory and the Florida Department of Conservation.

The organism responsible for the plague is known, but the causes for its sudden increased abundance—as many as 60,000,000 in a quart of water at the height of the scourge—and possibilities for predicting and controlling future outbreaks are being studied.

Other research vessels engaged in study of the commercial fisheries are the *Black Douglas* off the west coast, and *Albatross III*, which has been making a census of total fish populations off the great North Atlantic fishing banks.

In addition, fishery research projects having to do with blue crabs, clams, and oysters are under way. In the Gulf, research is directed toward control of the most serious

oyster pest, a drilling snail, the possibilities in the culture of oyster beds off Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands is also being surveyed.

The sea lamprey, which threatens both sport and commercial fishing in the Great Lakes, has received a good deal of attention. The eel-like parasite, which sucks the blood of fish, leaving them either dead or so badly scarred as to be unmarketable, has practically destroyed lake trout fishing in Lake Huron and has cut the take of lake trout in Lake Michigan to one-sixth of the normal 6,000,000 pounds.

The increased fishing pressure on other lakes and species due to this decline of lake trout is also very serious. Hearings concerning the control of sea lamprey are underway at Ann Arbor, Mich., but a more comprehensive research program is planned to develop methods of control of the lamprey.

Fisheries research has many phases, extending into better methods of fish culture, the effects of insecticides on fish, and the control of water pollution by industry.

Since my election to Congress in 1938, I have transmitted several thousand fish applications from this congressional district to the Fish and Wildlife Service for the purpose of restocking local streams.

The demands for stocking Pennsylvania waters with legal-sized trout and warm-water fishes have increased greatly during the postwar period. In close cooperation with the Pennsylvania Board of Fish Commissioners, the Fish and Wildlife Service has endeavored to meet the increased demands for fishes for stocking Pennsylvania waters from the production of the nearby Lamar Hatchery.

Unfortunately, construction of the Lamar Hatchery was not completed at the time of establishment and the production of both trout and warm-water fishes has been limited by the lack of adequate rearing facilities, refrigeration, and equipment for the proper handling of fish food, housing, etc.

The distribution area of the Lamar Hatchery comprises most of Pennsylvania and in addition, warm-water species are distributed to southwestern New York and northern New Jersey. The demands for fishes for stocking waters in this large heavily populated area cannot be met with the rearing facilities presently available at the Lamar Hatchery. In the calendar year 1949, 230,-[illegible] warm-water fishes and 383,[illegible]60 trout were produced and distributed by the Lamar Hatchery.

A development program was started in 1949 to complete the Lamar Hatchery and funds in the amount of $40,000 were provided for the construction of a holding house and trout raceways in that year. During the present fiscal year (1950), $30,000 has been provided for the construction of a cold-storage and food preparation building. It will require an additional $170,000 to complete the Lamar Hatchery into a well-balanced unit capable of producing a large number of legal-sized trout and fingerling warm-water fishes.

In the budget for the fiscal year 1951, as presented to Congress by the President, there is an item of $95,000 for continuing the development program for the Lamar Hatchery.

What Is the Bill of Rights Saying to "We, the People"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, on March 16 last I inserted in the RECORD an editorial by E. F. Hutton. In my judgment, a second editorial by Mr. Hutton appearing in the Palm Beach Daily News of Florida entitled "What Is the Bill of Rights Saying to 'We, the People'"? is even a more important commentary on the situation confronting the people of our country today that it also should be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I call attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that Miss Elizabeth Bentley, in her testimony before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House testified that while she was a graduate of one of the best universities of the country, never in all of her school career was she taught a proper course in the history of the United States. Miss Bentley admitted that she had joined the Communist Party and, worse yet, she admitted that she had entered into a conspiracy to filch secret documents out of various departments of our Government for transmittal to Russian emissaries. Her conduct shows conclusively that there is something very definitely lacking in our educational system. It seems to me that our public schools and our State universities should embark on a realistic program that would sell not only the students but all the people the great blessings of liberty which the common people enjoy under our system of Government. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that Mr. Hutton's editorial is most timely.

I therefore, under unanimous consent, insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial by Mr. Hutton which appeared in the Palm Beach Daily News on March 18 last:

WHAT IS THE BILL OF RIGHTS SAYING TO "WE, THE PEOPLE"?

(By E. F. Hutton)

It is a potent symbol of something that should be as dear to all Americans as life, itself. It carries restatement of our heritage to the peoples of the 48 States.

Everything that men and women have hoped, prayed, and fought for since the dawn of history.

Why?

Because it all boils down to you—and is all about you.

Actually, that document is saying: "What is life without liberty?"

And the answer is echoed in your own soul. It is slavery.

Our Bill of Rights was conceived and started with the Magna Carta granted by King John 732 years ago. Then, in 1620, a band of Pilgrims, en route to America, made a compact, on board their frail ship the *Mayflower*.

Then, in 1776, the great-grandchildren of early settlers signed, sealed, and fought to make good a Declaration of Independence.

Then came that miracle called the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights. We are now living in a tough world.

Freedom is on the auction block in many lands. So, why all the "to-do" about Freedom? Because we are in great danger of forgetting what we have and why we have it. That would be the first step toward the loss of freedom.

Our way of life is not perfect. No one is perfect.

Our Government is not perfect.

No labor union is perfect.

Our profit and loss and competitive system is not perfect. Nothing will ever reach perfection in any land in the entire world.

But America has spent 171 years developing the truest Republic on all of God's green earth in all known history.

We have established rules and regulations in which American institutions find perpetuity in constant modification and changes.

We have accorded to all such freedoms as man never before knew.

We have accomplished the highest standards of living, the greatest tolerance, materially and spiritually.

They are the steps in the ladder of the rise of man.

Isn't that what you want?

Freedom of worship; freedom of speech; freedom of action; opportunity to make progress; chance to expand; right to earn and save; right to vote; sanctity of home and family; right to work where and when you please; right to change jobs, without asking permission; right to live without control over your thoughts, your beliefs, your actions? Don't you want the right to exercise human ambitions?

You have them. But only "we, the people" of America have all of them, because of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

That's what we started with. Let us be sure we do not end by trading them, the most precious possessions ever had by any people anywhere.

Let not "we, the people" permit the change of our Declaration of Independence into the Declaration of Dependence.

All of our documents of freedoms are written and printed papers.

You can see these pieces of paper in the Library of Congress in Washington. They dignify your progress, and the progress of the whole world from darkness to light, from slavery to freedom. You can see the Mayflower Compact. You can see the Declaration of Independence—you can see the Constitution, a charter of, and for, the government of a welded 13 States.

You can see and read your Bill of Rights, the breath of life, the very soul of the Constitution.

In 1791, our Constitution, and the Bill Rights was the charter of freedom for 3,000,-000 people living in 13 weak States.

We had no world industry, no world commerce, and no world power.

We were a company of dangerous dreamers, so the foreign lands thought; we believed in the rights of man.

Kings and princes—emperors and despots either ridiculed or hated us.

From 3,000,000 of nobodies, with liberty, freedom and rights of human ambitions and 13 weak States, in no time flat we became top world power in less than 171 years.

Now we have only 7 percent of the world's people, only 6 percent of the world's land area, and yet we have 35 percent of the world's railroads, 70 percent of the world's telephones, 80 percent of the world's automobiles, 66 percent of the world's wealth, and more.

By mass production—the industrial know-how—we have converted luxuries into staples within reach of the vast majority of our people. Such luxuries cannot even be found in foreign lands.

Now, how did we get all this? Are we superior beings? Not at all.

We, the people of America, have no more brains, but liberty gave us the right to exercise our brains—no better souls nor bodies than other people.

Neither race, creed, or color has had anything to do with our getting what we have and being what we are.

We had the rights of human ambitions. That made us what we are.

We have simply lived under a system that gives us the rights, the privileges, the liberty, and the freedom that every man, woman, and child should have.

We have these, because of the thoughts, the deeds, the plans, and the progress of man.

There is no such thing in this country as the common man. He is the most uncommon of all. He is what he is and has

what he has because he is an American citizen.

He has liberty.

When we, the people, lose that, we become not common men but common slaves. This so-called common man may be washing windows, cleaning streets, driving a truck, or working in a coal mine. That does not make him common.

Why?

Because no one has told him he must accept such occupation—not yet. Our uncommon man represents 75 percent of our jury system. Our uncommon man is our peer when judging whether we are guilty or not, before the law.

The jury system has never been smeared or belittled. It has done a good job. Yes; there have been some errors in decisions but then nothing will ever reach perfection.

The uncommon man holds the fate of our Nation in the palm of his hands. As he thinks he votes, strikes, and works.

There are facts he should have before him—facts of our social, economic, political, and public questions. Only industrial leadership can give him such facts. Some are doing it. More should be doing it.

Please, God, forbid the authority of any man to state: "My tongue is the law." When and if that becomes a fact America falls to the laws of the jungle. Let us keep the rights of freedom in America which, step by step, have been taken away in other countries.

There are many people in our country who have reached success. Many of them came here as immigrants because only under our Bill of Rights could they use their brains freely and their talents without fear.

But everyone here owns a share in the Constitution and Bill of Rights—everybody.

If we fail to grasp the significance of what these pieces of paper, which you can see in the Library of Congress, really mean to all of us, then we are scheduled for the dust heap of fallen nations. We have failed miserably to live up to the liberty and the freedom that has been handed to us on a platter by our two-fisted, God-fearing ancestors.

If there is a Godly way of life on earth, you have it.

Your right to escape controls and dictations. My right to make this statement. Your right to read it. Your right to throw it in the wastebasket.

Every single right you exercise from morning to night. Every safety you have all the night through, can be found in the Library of Congress.

The only enemies you have in the whole world are two in number.

One is the enemy who wants you to exchange your Americanism for some foreign ism and to take your liberty away from you by making this a planned-economy, police-governed autocracy.

The other enemy is you—too complacent, too careless, too indifferent, to protect what you have.

Patrick Henry said, "Give me liberty or give me death!"

Or, is it easier to say: "Master, here I am. Put on the ball and chain. Enslave me. I am thy good and chattel. I am nothing. You, the state, is all there is." Liberty isn't merely a heritage but a fresh conquest for every generation. We were once a weak nation having nothing but freedom and liberty. We were "short" on everything but the right to exercise human ambitions, our own initiative and enterprise.

But under our documents of freedom, we have become a beacon to the world. The right to enter America is now considered something like a passport to heaven by all who are not here.

Show us.

Where on the face of this earth has there been a country or a form of government by which communism, collectivism, socialism, has given the people more happiness, bigger pay checks, less hours of work, more comforts, more luxuries, better foods, better entertainment and greater opportunity than given by America under the American system.

Show us.

Not by arguments, dreams, blueprints, or imaginary figures, but the facts.

Show us.

Give us concrete evidence. Prove it by example, prove that any other system is better than ours.

Prove that the system, founded on our Constitution, gives less life, less liberty, less opportunity, and less freedom, than any other system.

Without a single political purpose, without a single hasty charge, without pointing a single finger of scorn, at any other system, let us review what we have; appraise, judge, evaluate, and know what we have before we trade it for any other form of government or bow to any other as being superior to ours.

Benjamin Hill stated: "The Constitution is my only client, its preservation is the only fee I ask." That is my credo. I ask no fee for my effort to preserve freedoms for "we, the people."

Budget Bureau Report on Panama Canal Tolls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission heretofore granted, I include as part of these remarks an editorial from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin under date of March 15, 1950, entitled "Budget Bureau Report on Panama Tolls Errs in Not Recognizing Defense Value of Canal."

The editorial follows:

SERIOUS FAILURE—BUDGET BUREAU REPORT ON PANAMA TOLLS ERRS IN NOT RECOGNIZING DEFENSE VALUE OF CANAL

Pursuant to studies looking toward a revision of Panama Canal toll charges, the United States Budget Bureau issued a report and recommendations concerning Canal tolls.

In most of its aspects, the report has been greeted favorably by shipping interests.

However, the report is seriously defective in one respect, from the standpoint of west coast shipping, and is open to criticism on this point.

As the National Federation of American Shipping has pointed out, in analyzing the report, the Budget Bureau has failed to take into consideration the national-defense value and function of the Canal.

Under its recommendations, the entire capital investment of the Canal would be included in the base for computation of toll charges.

What this means, of course, is that shipping operators in the intercoastal or international trade would still be required to pay, in tolls, for a national-defense project.

This is manifestly unfair to private shipping operators, for it requires them to pay for something which is essentially a Government function and which should be paid for by the Government.

Such an arrangement, naturally, makes for higher tolls—which have an adverse effect on the shipping of San Francisco and other west-coast ports.

Shipping interests and labor, civic and business groups on this coast have been exerting themselves to combat this viewpoint, and in any final action on Canal tolls Congress should give heed to their side of the question.

The cost of national defense—and the cost of the Canal very largely represents a national-defense item—should not be thrown on the shipping operators.

Even the Budget Bureau's report concedes that the Canal was built for purposes of defense as well as commerce, and that it would be difficult to determine now which purpose was primary.

The report has recommended a division between the Government and the commercial functions of the Canal.

The former would be placed in the newly created Canal Zone Government; the latter would be assigned to the Panama Railroad Company, to be known as the Panama Canal Company.

"A logical, businesslike way" to give adequate recognition to the national-defense value of the Canal in toll computations, the Pacific American Steamship Association observed, would be "to reduce the capital cost of the newly proposed Canal company so that interest will be charged to commercial Canal users only on the basis of the Canal's commercial value."

In any final formulation of policy regarding Canal toll charges, Congress should insist that this be done.

Otherwise, shipping operators will have to bear an unfair share of Canal costs, imposed through unjustly high toll charges, and the maritime commerce of our port and others on this coast will suffer in consequence.

Inspections by Representatives of the Department of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received copy of a letter written by the president of Row, Peterson & Co. which gives so vivid a picture of methods that have been permitted to creep into our industrial methods that can never be often enough brought to the fore of the consciousness of the membership of this House and the people of the United States. We are constantly insisting ours is still a free economy. This letter presents certain doubts which I submit should give us pause:

ROW, PETERSON & CO.,
Evanston, Ill., March 20, 1950.

Mr. MAURICE J. TOBIN,
Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Last Thursday I returned from an out-of-town trip to find one of your official representatives in the office inspecting almost everything. From Thursday morning to Monday night he bothered our office manager, annoyed our treasurer and bookkeeper, irritated me a little bit, and contrived to take up the useful time of 15 or 20 other people out of a small office of 70 or so persons.

He was pleasant enough and shall be nameless because after all he was but a minor vassal of the slave state, and I expect his counterpart is in every nook and cranny of the land. I gather, however, that all of the people he interviewed were divided between amusement and irritation and had somewhat

of an urge to throw him out the door"—over teakettle" to use the language of one of my favorite boatswain mate friends.

He uncovered some crimes, too:

1. By diligent questioning he discovered that one of our editors had taken a manuscript home over the weekend and had done some work on it. She wasn't paid overtime either. In fact, until adroitly sweated out of her, no one had previously been aware of this alarming condition.

2. Another editor had been guilty of repeatedly working overtime for some period because she wanted to get two extra weeks' vacation to extend her trip to Europe. This she was alarmed to discover, is contrary to section something or other which says that all overtime must be paid for in the week committed.

3. The third and most serious crime is in process of commission. Your minion left a directive to the effect that some kind of a time clock, or book, or other watch dog must be kept on all of our editorial personnel. This involves some difficulty. I do not intend to personally check them in and out and besides, I am out of town a good bit. I certainly would not want to impose on one of the editors the task of checking on the balance, and to ask each editor to keep track of his or her own time, while it might be a logical procedure, would certainly break down at the end of the first week. As a matter of fact, consider the utter futility of any such registration scheme unless it were accompanied by guards at the front and back doors to search everyone leaving and entering the premises (refer to crime 1). What, also, is to be done about the most valuable part of an editor's work; namely, the idea which comes to one who wakes up between 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning? Is this to be overlooked?

We will freely admit that our combination scheme of a small drawing account with a split-up of the profits at the year's end does not fit the Federal statutes. We will be glad to pay any one of our people in accordance with the Federal statutes quite rigorously (if he or she will keep his own time), and we will be glad to include in the overtime the Sunday morning hour peeling the feet after the Saturday night dance should any one of our people express a desire to be paid in this fashion instead of in accordance with our present scheme. I doubt if this will eventuate because no signs of feeble mindedness have yet been apparent in our staff.

I am impelled to write you this letter and send copies to the Members of Congress because I have heard rumors from almost everyone to whom I talk that the thing most urgently needed in the Federal Government is a radical cut in expenditures. Since anyone can get the kind of government that your department is promoting very simply by going straight to Russia, it seems unnecessary to develop it here, and the implications are that Congressmen could find room for a large initial saving in expenses by sharply chopping the funds of the Department of Labor.

Very truly,

GORDON M. JONES, President.

Depletion or Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Charles D. Fogle, of Marietta, Ohio:

DEPLETION OR DESTRUCTION

(By Charles D. Fogle, of Fogle & Fogle, lawyers, Marietta, Ohio, general counsel for Ohio Oil and Gas Association)

At first impression, it might seem that a discussion of the 27½-percent-depletion allowance in favor of the oil and gas industry and reasons for its continuation would be a highly technical one. A casual hearer might assume that it is a matter of concern to a relatively small group.

Actually, it involves two things of direct concern to every American—oil and gas and income taxes. In our highly industrialized society, we cannot live without these natural resources. In our Nation of highly developed government, we cannot survive without income taxes. Oil and gas producers are completely willing to pay their share of income taxes. But the tax must be fair if they are to continue to be income-producing.

An argument for retention of the depletion allowance is an argument for a fair income tax. It is not an attempt by a special group to avoid or duck fair taxes. It is not a new idea. What is new, or fairly new, is the theory that the industry should suddenly be deprived of a consideration under the income-tax law it has enjoyed for a quarter century.

The industry is not asking that it be permitted to pay less than its fair share of the tax burden. It is only asking that it not be taxed out of business.

The theory of an income tax in the United States dates back to Civil War days.

We are constantly being told that the major part of the Federal Government's income goes to pay for past wars and to prevent new ones. That was as true in the time of the Civil War as it is today in the cold war. The first Federal income-tax law was passed by Congress to pay for the Civil War. That was in 1861.

Although this was the first income-tax law, no taxes were actually collected under it. It was superseded by a law which became effective December 1, 1862. This law was further changed and amended and an income tax was in effect until 1872, when the act of 1870 expired by its own terms.

Then 24 years later came a Federal income-tax law on net income. The rate was a flat 2 percent upon all income above $4,000.

Reviewing the controversy that preceded the enactment of this 2-percent tax law we can smile—and we might well smile. Certain political factions in those days were all out in favor of the new Federal income tax. Others opposed it on the grounds that it was socialistic to levy such a tax in times of peace. Advocates of it were found mainly among the Populists and Democrats of the West. But the East fought it and fought it bitterly, even though the rate was, as stated, 2 percent.

Then in 1895, the United States Supreme Court when asked to review the income-tax question ruled by a split decision that the income-tax law was unconstitutional. Four judges dissented. The Court's reason for ruling it unconstitutional was that it was a direct tax and not apportioned.

The die was cast. It was evident by this time that the Nation favored the income tax. The sixteenth amendment to the Constitution empowered Congress to levy and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, and no consideration was given to apportionment or to any census or enumeration. It was passed by Congress in 1909 and ratified by three-fourths of the States in February 1913.

After ratification of the amendment the Congress enacted a net income tax law in 1913. The rates were graduated from 1 to 7 percent.

In this very first income-tax law a careful distinction is made between taxation of income and taxation of capital. Congress worked on the proper theory that it is unconstitutional to tax capital by way of income tax.

A special provision was written into this first income-tax law which would protect producers of oil and gas from being taxed on their capital. That provision came to be known as the depletion allowance. Actually, it is a type of deduction. The first depletion allowance was a deduction of 5 percent of the value of the production at the mouth of the well.

So we see that the depletion allowance is not only not a new idea, but that it dates back to the time of the original income-tax law.

The depletion allowance for producers is an essential part of the income-tax law. It is as basic and fundamental part of the theory of income tax as is the principle of depreciation in real estate.

The new income tax was only 5 years old when it was found that the depletion allowance as written in the first law was inadequate. It had not accomplished what it was designed to do; namely, prevent producers from being taxed on their capital. What had happened was that taxing a producer on 95 percent of the production from a lease, was, in effect, a tax on his capital.

To correct this the revenue laws were revised in 1918 and the principle of depletion allowance was broadened.

This revision marked the introduction of a new idea—the principle of fair market value. The new enactment said:

"Where the taxpayer on or after March 1, 1913, has discovered an oil and gas property and where the fair market value of the property is materially in excess of cost, the allowance for depletion shall be based upon the fair market value of the property at the date of discovery or within 30 days thereafter."

A further revision came in 1921 when Congress limited the allowance to the net income from the property computed before deducting the depletion. This was to prevent the allowance for discovery depletion from exceeding the income from the property. In 1924 it was limited to 50 percent of the net income of the property and in 1926 the law which is still in effect today was written, namely, 27½ percent of the gross or 50 percent of the net.

What the 1926 revision did was to substitute percentage allowance for discovery allowance. The discovery allowance was good in theory, but it presented so many administrative difficulties as to make it practically unworkable. In practice it also proved to be unfair and discriminatory.

So the 27½-percent depletion allowance was decided upon in 1926 and has remained in effect until the present time. How so arbitrary a figure as 27½ came to be agreed upon deserves a word of explanation.

Both theory of percentage depletion and the size of the percentage were arrived at by Congress after careful study. The Government made a survey of oil-production operations from the years 1918 to 1925. That survey showed that the annual average depletion of capital invested by producers in finding oil and producing it was between 32 and 33 percent. The House of Representatives passed a bill providing for a percentage-depletion allowance on gross income from a producing property of 30 percent in figuring taxes. The Senate passed a similar measure but setting the percentage at 25. The figure 27½ percent represents a compromise between these two.

I have outlined the history of the depletion allowance merely to show that the principle of percent ge depletion has been long recognized in this country as a fair one. The history also shows that the amount

decided upon is not a figure snatched from the thin air, but an amount agreed upon on the basis of long study.

Depletion has been defined many ways, but most simply put, it is an allowance for the year-to-year decrease in value of property by withdrawal of minerals.

As Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, has said:

"The theory of depletion is that a reduction from current income should be allowed in order to compensate for capital invested in a natural resource which is exhausted by production; or putting it another way, an allowance for exhausting capital or something that cannot be replaced, as oil or gas."

The percentage allowance is the only fair and reasonable method for figuring tax on the most unpredictable and capricious industry in the country.

Depletion allowance is not a tax loophole. If it be a tax loophole, the hole should be closed, not simply made smaller as is being recommended by some so-called tax experts.

Contrary to being a tax loophole, the depletion allowance spells the difference to many small operators between survival and failure. To others it means the difference between making a fair profit and getting by by the skin of their teeth.

The threat of removing or reducing the depletion allowance for oil and gas producers is the unfair result of a frenzied search for more tax dollars. Under pressure the administration is frantically reviewing the traditional tax sources to see where it can gouge a little deeper. To disturb the depletion allowance to oil and gas producers would be really a masterpiece of illogical thinking. It would be literally killing the goose that lays the golden egg. It makes no more sense than breaking up an old rosewood table for kindling because the shed is temporarily out of firewood.

It would plug the gap to be sure. Today's crisis would be solved, but what of tomorrow? What of the industry? It would mean taxing the capital of the members of a basic industry. That is always a deadly and dangerous policy for any nation to pursue.

In time it would have the effect of eliminating the independent producer. That in itself would be criminal. Of course, taxing any man out of business could never be considered a democratic practice. But aside from the personal tragedies of these thousands what would it mean to the Nation?

In the first place, it would encourage monopolies. Monopolies would be the inevitable result because only the very large could survive under such a crushing burden.

Second, it would mean a serious curtailment of the Nation's oil and gas production.

Third, it would have the unmistakable effect of discouraging exploration. The search for oil and gas is an immensely risky business. There is no way of eliminating that risk. The opening of a dry well is an all too frequent experience of many operators. The romantic tale of getting rich overnight on oil cuts a fine swath on the movie screen but the real-life facts tell a much grimmer story.

As was once said by Chief Justice Matthew J. Kane, of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma:

"To undertake to tax an oil or gas lease is to undertake to impose a tax upon the illimitable vista of hope."

Depletion is a recognition of the risky nature of the oil and gas industry. Costs of exploration and development are fantastic. The original purpose of percentage depletion was to permit the tax-free return of capital. It is this margin which permits the operator to discover and develop new wells. New discoveries are essential to the industry and they are essential to the Nation. In a time when we hear so much about the development of our natural resources it seems very strange, indeed, to be also contemplating a tax increase which will have the effect of discouraging discovery.

Only one wildcat in five finds production. Of all wells drilled in 1949—wildcats and development wells—more than one in three was dry. And this is not the whole story. Added to this woe is the fact that the costs of drilling increase geometrically as depths increase. In other words, a 10,000-foot hole costs 10 times as much as one of 2,500 feet.

It should be noted in connection with consideration of the high cost of exploration that it has been estimated by the Government that from 75 to 90 percent of the wildcat wells and new discoveries in the Nation have been drilled by independent operators.

Yet this is the group that would suffer the most by any tampering with the depletion allowance.

And new discoveries are not the only manner in which the small fellow would be hurt. Reduction or removal of the depletion allowance would cause many stripper wells to be abandoned and it would discourage secondary recovery operations. Although the output for stripper wells is small that output is needed to help swell the Nation's total oil output.

In days when we are struggling to build a strong defense and live in the constant threat of war it is no time to be talking about producing less oil.

Depletion is not a tax loophole, it is not a special privilege allowed the oil industry alone. Depletion allowances are allowed in the following industries: coal, 5 percent; iron ore, lead, zinc and more than 20 other minerals, 15 percent; sulfur, 23 percent; and other mines including precious stones and salt, discovery limited to 50 percent of net.

Finally, the threat of removal or reduction of the depletion allowance is a financial threat not only to the oil and gas industry but to the Nation as a whole. The industry controls 5 percent of our national wealth, enjoys 2½ percent of our national income—but—the petroleum industry and its products pays 12 percent of all our taxes, national and State and local.

In one year alone—1948—the industry paid out $1,200,000,000 in oil and gas royalties, and lease bonuses and rentals.

Thirty-seven States, 28 of them oil and gas producing, benefited from this expenditure. This means jobs and it means purchasing power. It helped not only men in the industry but the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker in all 37 States.

It is impossible to estimate the disastrous effect upon American business if oil and gas production is seriously curtailed. And curtailed it will be if depletion is not allowed thousands of small producers.

The industry is ready and willing to bear its fair share of the tax burden. It always has. It is not asking special favors. It is merely asking to be permitted to stay in business. To stay in business, incidentally, so it will be on hand 10, 20 and 30 years from now when the income tax man comes around. The same Federal treasury which would be bulging this year if it ravaged the oil and gas industry might well be rattling in years to come.

The 27½ percent of receipts limited to 50 percent of net income from oil and gas properties is a tax exemption and not a depletion income. It is a deserved tax exemption. To take the exemption away would be asset confiscation, to reduce the exemption would be partial asset confiscation. Neither is justified. Removal or reduction will cripple. A tax crippled industry can't produce. It is depletion exemption at 27½ percent or industry destruction.

Woman of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. MARSALIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. MARSALIS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an article entitled "Woman of the Week" by Glad Morath, which appeared in the Colorado Springs Gazette-Telegraph on Saturday, April 1, 1950. It pertains to the life and activities of Mrs. Lillian H. Kerr, a resident of Colorado Springs, Colo., for many years, who has been nationally prominent in connection with the equal rights for women movement. She was one of the three women who composed the present proposed equal-rights amendment in 1923 at Colorado Springs.

Since this amendment has already passed the Senate and a discharge petition for its consideration by the House is now pending, I believe it most pertinent that the article be brought to the attention of the Members of this body. The National Woman's Party has also requested that it be inserted in the RECORD.

Mrs. Kerr has been most outstanding in civic and political affairs, and I feel certain that the Members will enjoy reading this brief résumé of her history and activities.

The article follows:

WOMAN OF THE WEEK

(By Glad Morath)

When the suffrage amendment was added to the Constitution of the United States in 1920, most of us believed that women had been given complete equality with men, and that nothing more was to be desired in the way of women's rights. On the contrary, most State laws still deny to women many rights enjoyed by men. In 1923, right here in the city of sunshine, three women composed the text of a proposed equal-rights amendment, which would supersede State laws and give all women of the country equal rights and privileges with men under the law. One of these women was Mrs. Lillian H. Kerr, whose name for 50 years has been synonymous with any cause she believes to be beneficial to women. For 27 years Mrs. Kerr has worked personally, through the National Women's Party, and by writing letters to Congressmen, Senators, and members of the Judiciary Committee to get this amendment before Congress. In the welter of H-bomb and crime news, few of us noticed that on January 25, the amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 63 to 16.

The text of the amendment reads:

"Equal rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress and the several States shall have the power, within their respective jurisdictions to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"This amendment shall take effect 1 year after the date of ratification."

A few minutes before the vote was taken, a crippling and limiting rider, known as the Hayden rider, was attached, which Mrs. Kerr and members of the Women's Party feel almost nullifies the power of the amendment. It reads:

"The provisions of this article shall not be construed to impair any rights, benefits, or

exemptions now or hereafter conferred on persons of the female sex."

Naturally Mrs. Kerr will go on with her personal protests and will seek support for the passage of the original amendment, sans the rider, through clubs and individuals, and by supporting further action by the National Women's Party, which she helped to organize and of which she is an officer. She is also a member of the World Woman's Party.

"We are the political descendants of Susan B. Anthony," declares Mrs. Kerr. "It took 75 years to get suffrage, and it has taken 27 years to get the equal-rights amendment before Congress.

"There are only two rights for women that are nationally assured. One is the right to vote and the other is the right to choose citizenship when marrying an alien. All other rights are matters of State law. Colorado has the best State laws for women in the whole country."

The fact that Mrs. Kerr has devoted a large part of the 50 years of her residence in Colorado to politics no doubt has much to do with the good fortune of Colorado women.

"Peace is the most important problem of all," observes Mrs. Kerr. "Without peace nothing else matters. My second concern is always for the advancement of women. I glory in the things women are doing and the wonderful careers they are building for themselves. For the second time in 30 years the National Women's Party is conducting research in each State to uncover laws that are discriminatory to women.

"In some States," declares Mrs. Kerr, "a man can take a woman's salary. In others she can have no legal say about her children—her husband has their sole legal custody."

Mrs. Kerr, who lived in Texas before coming to Colorado, was the first feminine notary public in the Panhandle.

"I think I may have been the first in the whole State of Texas," she says. "Some people would not accept my seal because of my sex. I once sold property there, and could not close the deal without my husband's signature."

In 1918 Mrs. Kerr started the movement in Colorado Springs for municipal ownership of utilities, presenting to the city council on November 1, 1918, a petition signed by 500 citizens. Her efforts were not fully rewarded until 1925, when municipal ownership took effect. During the intervening years she and her helpers wrote to other cities, getting all the available information possible as to the differences in consumer costs.

Mrs. Kerr is the widow of the late Robert Kerr, former county judge, who passed away in 1928. She was born in Independence, Iowa, in 1867, and was 83 years old on her last birthday. While her activities are curtailed because of her advancing age her mind and her thoughts are young and sharp from constructive usage. She is still the "power behind the throne" in many activities of women's organizations in Colorado Springs. A brief review of her activities gives a clear picture of her determination to work for the benefit of humanity in general and women in particular.

Mrs. Kerr organized, and was the first president of the Colorado Springs Woman's Club. For many years she conducted classes in parliamentary law and current events, enabling club women to learn smooth and businesslike rules for presiding at meetings and to keep informed on national and international events. Her pupils were outstanding women in all professions and lines of business, as well as those who conducted more or less social groups.

A member of the Zebulon Pike Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, she served as State parliamentarian for the organization for 8 years. She is a member of the north end WCTU, and has always been an active exponent of the temperance cause, and is a member of the First Congregational Church.

She was originally a Republican but supported Theodore Roosevelt when he broke from the party. She served as a delegate to the Bull Moose Convention which nominated him in Chicago. Later, she became a Democrat, and in 1924 ran for Congress.

At one time she served as chairman of the civil service committee of the State Federation of Women's Clubs, because of her strong belief in the merit system. During World War I she served as a Red Cross worker at headquarters, and was a member of the speakers' bureau of El Paso County for the Liberty Loan drives. Later, she went to Washington, D. C., serving in the department of compensations and claims, in the War Risk Bureau. After the war, she took the field for ratification of the suffrage amendment, working in Colorado, Oklahoma, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Washington. These five States were among the first 36 to ratify the amendment.

She was long active in YWCA work, and was organizer of the women's auxiliary of the YMCA. For 10 years she was a member of the faculty of the Labor College of Colorado Springs. She was active in the Business and Professional Women's Club, and was named an honorary member of Alpha Iota, a young business women's sorority, which she helped organize years ago. In the days when disarmament seemed to spell world peace, Mrs. Kerr was appointed from Washington as chairman of the women's committee for world disarmament, an emergency committee to push the Borah resolution for a world conference on disarmament. She is a member of the Peoples' Mandate for Peace, an organization primarily interested in Pan American affairs where women are concerned.

She was a charter member of the Drama League, from which grew the Civic Players, and was president of the organization at the time the Fine Arts Center was opened to the organization. She was occasionally seen in dramatic parts, displaying histrionic ability as well as political finesse.

Mrs. Kerr had an exceptionally happy and successful married life, and is far from being a manhater, or a masculine-type suffragette, but she strongly believes that men have forfeited the right to govern, and that women will have to take over if there is to be any lasting peace in the world.

"Men have ruled the world for thousands of years," she observes. "And what have they accomplished? Wars and more wars. Now we don't dare to have another war, or the human race will be destroyed. So it's high time women took the reins. Things can't go on this way. The women can stop it, and they will. I'm very optimistic on this point."

When the women of the United States go to the polls to vote, they forget that that privilege is a comparatively new one. Few, if any know or remember the struggle women like Mrs. Kerr endured to bring about this privilege. Some of the severest critics of the suffrage movement were women, and it was quite the thing to ridicule and caricature those who pioneered in the campaign. But, as always in a successful crusade, the pioneers seldom receive the credit they deserve, and the fruits of their labors are enjoyed even by her critics.

No doubt, an equal-rights amendment in some form will eventually be passed, again through the efforts of a far-sighted few. And, if and when the history of the progress of women is written, Mrs. Kerr will deserve a place in the local, State, national, and international picture. She has unwaveringly followed what she believes to be the rigid path of duty, and few statesmen or public officials, have done as much for the general good of either sex. Regardless of her age or present limited activity, Mrs. Kerr will continue to be a firebrand for the rights of her sex, and she is respectfully designated "woman of the week."

Tribute to Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, in the Wisconsin Jewish Chronicle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have in my hand a very splendid tribute which has been paid to our senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] in the editorial pages of the Wisconsin Jewish Chronicle in the March 25, 1950, issue of this important publication.

The editor pointed out the Senator's splendid services in many humanitarian causes. I believe that this editorial will be of interest to my colleagues and to Americans of all faiths, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR ENLIGHTENED STATESMANSHIP

The Chronicle has always hewed to a nonpartisan line in politics. We have steered clear of any alliances or entanglements with any party, and we have never endorsed any candidate or politician, however worthy may have been his record. We have believed that party and personality was a choice which our readers were sufficiently intelligent to determine for themselves.

It is, therefore, somewhat of a rarity that these editorial columns should single out Senator ALEXANDER WILEY for particular praise, but we find that the senior Wisconsin Senator has been most conspicuous of recent months in his earnest advocacy of affairs which deal with matters most humanitarian in their content. He has been sympathetic and understanding in legislation dealing with human rights, and he has exhibited a keen interest and assumed a forward position in the espousal of causes relating to international justice for Israel.

We commend Senator WILEY for his attitude and fight in behalf of the liberalized DP legislation before the Senate; for his strength and fortitude in advancing the adoption by the United States of the Genocide Convention, and for his deep concern with the disturbing signs of renewed hostility in the Far East, and his urgings upon the State Department that the latter express to Great Britain its anxiety concerning the tremendous shipments of arms being sent to the Arabs.

We are mindful that Senator WILEY will be a candidate to succeed himself this fall, and we therefore hasten to add that this is not intended to serve as an endorsement of Senator WILEY. We merely believe that credit should be given where it is due, and Senator WILEY has manifested qualities of enlightened statesmanship in several worthwhile directions.

Expenditure of Government Funds for Purpose of Hearing Discussion of Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Richmond News-Leader.

It appears to me that the propaganda machine of the Federal Government has reached a new low when it uses Government funds for the purpose of hearing the Secretary of Agriculture explain the Brannan plan.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EIGHT DOLLARS A DAY TO LISTEN TO MR. BRANNAN

Farmers who have been paid by the Government for fertilizing their land, raising legumes to improve their land, planting trees to keep their land from eroding, turning under green crops to increase the value of their land, and growing anything they like on it later whether there is any market for it or not, are now being paid by the Government to attend political meetings, at which the Government pays the speakers to speak to them.

This latest example of prodigal squandering of public money was disclosed at St. Paul, Minn., on April 4, when Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who is being paid $15,000 a year to attend to legislative duties in the United States Senate, and Secretary Charles W. Brannan, who receives $22,500 a year to administer the Department of Agriculture, traveled at Government expense to St. Paul. They went there to urge support of the Brannan plan to a group of farmers, all of whom had been paid $8 a day and traveling expenses to come from all over Minnesota to hear them. So far as can be learned, the meeting of 5,000 community committeemen, summoned by the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture, had no other purpose than to afford the committeemen an opportunity to see and to hear our Secretary of Agriculture, Charles F. Brannan. "We feel," the official PMA letter announcing the meeting stated, "it is extremely important for you to have this chance to hear your Secretary, who is making a terrific fight to maintain some measure of economic stability for farmers."

To make it worth the committeemen's time to come, they were told their expenses to and from St. Paul would be paid and per diem of $8 would be allowed for 1 or 2 days. In per diem alone, this meeting cost the taxpayers more than $40,000—there is no way of estimating how much more it cost them in traveling expenses—Mr. Brannan's expenses for the trip, including an entourage of seven which he took with him, have been estimated at $15,000; anything between $75,000 and $100,000 is a reasonable estimate of the total cost of this one meeting to the taxpayers. And at the meeting, Mr. Brannan was quoted as saying that it was one of several that are being held throughout the country.

According to all press and other accounts, Mr. Brannan divided his speech between an impassioned appeal for support of the Brannan plan and an attack on the present Agricultural Act, during which he frequently assailed Allen B. Klein, the head of the American Farm Bureau, who supports it. Now Mr. Brannan may not like the Agricultural Act of 1949, but it is the law of the land; Mr. Brannan is charged with administering it and has sworn to do so. Under any circumstances, the propriety of his denouncing it throughout the country and lobbying for passage of his own bill, would be questionable. There is no question at all whether public money should be used to pay audiences to hear him do so. Clearly it should not. If no worse can be said for it, this constitutes a shocking extravagance in the use of public funds, the more outrageous and indefensible in that it occurs at a time when the Nation is running a deficit of $5,000,000,000 a year.

Government Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Deficit Grows—and Still Congress Votes Spending," from the Philadelphia Inquirer of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFICIT GROWS—AND STILL CONGRESS VOTES SPENDING

It is not necessary to accept as final the estimate of the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue that the deficit this fiscal year will reach $6,700,000,000 to recognize that red-ink spending is still a top national problem.

Yet by its vote authorizing the spending of $1,500,000,000 for navigation aids and flood-control projects in various sections of the country, the Senate has afforded alarming signs that it is still following a head-in-the-sand policy when it comes to dealing with the deficit situation.

And unfortunately, the Senate is not alone in this. The House passed a similar waterways bill, allowing for spending $1,117,000,000. The Senate simply raised the amount—and for projects which Senator PAUL DOUGLAS rightly termed "flagrant examples of pork."

This is the kind of legislation that breeds deficits. Worse than that, it reflects the custom of Congressmen, especially in election years, of putting politics before any obligation to face the responsibility for the financial stability of the Federal Government. Sectional interests and vote swapping combine to build up a costly list of a flood-control project here, a dredging project there, until the Government is committeed to spend billions it doesn't have.

Such reckless voting has brought us to a situation where the deficit, according to the joint committee staff, will be $1,200,000,000 more than forecast by President Truman. The staff may be wrong, but its record is at least as good as the President's in these matters.

Mr. Truman cannot escape his own responsibility for this situation. He has presented huge budgets without apparent concern for the fact that they can't be financed out of current revenue. But even his inflated budgets didn't include an appropriation for the waterways projects this year.

Congress should face the financial facts and refuse to vote the waterways appropriations—still necessary before this additional drain on the Treasury can become a reality. If the deficit menace is to be ended Congress will have to do more. It will have to stop committing the Government to present or future spending unless it has made sure that the revenue will be enough to pay the bills.

My Dear Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "My Dear Mr. Truman," published in the Sussex Countian, of Georgetown, Del., on April 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. TRUMAN

With your vast national and international interests, you are not cognizant of the fact, probably, that there is a little county in Delaware by the name of Sussex. There was, however, an important news story coming out of our northernmost border town of Milford last week that you should have read. It had to do with jobless benefits. This story appeared in the Wilmington papers the same day that you asked Congress to hike unemployment compensation to $30 a week, plus additional pay for dependents. Here's the Milford story:

This small town in Delaware decided to offer jobs to 10 men who were receiving unemployment compensation. What happened? Of the 10 notified to report for work, 5 failed to show up and were automatically dropped from relief rolls. The sixth man immediately obtained a job in private industry. He was dropped from relief, as well as another man who worked only 1 day and quit. Seventy-five percent of the loafers were weeded out.

Mr. Truman, don't you know—all the rest of us do—that what is the case in Milford is true in your home town in Missouri as well as in the great cities of this vast country. Seventy-five percent of those receiving Uncle Sam's dole are not deserving of it. You are going on the false assumption that all men are industrious and want to work. You know human nature better than that. If you keep on increasing the amount paid to the unemployed, you are making this Nation a land of loafers. You'll get more votes next election, but you are "selling the United States down the river," and making a lot of hardworking citizens support a lot of lazy people.

Try the Milford "work-relief" plan throughout this country. You will find out, as quickly as Milford did, that you and Uncle Sam are being taken for a ride; that billions of dollars are being wasted that could go for defense. If you keep on, you are going to take the incentive to work away from all of us. If compensations go up to $30 a week, plus additional pay for dependents, why most of the citizens will do better by themselves if they quit work. Why should we lift when we get better pay if we lean. Please, Mr. Truman, check the Milford plan.

A Review and a Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Review and a Warning," published in the bulletin of the metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor, of March 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REVIEW AND A WARNING

The metal trades department is again compelled to call to the attention of all, the shameful imposition being practiced upon the navy yard employee by the United States Department of Defense.

We cannot accept lightly the disregarding of the rights of the civilian navy yard worker. Not only his right to work; not only the forced abandonment of his home; not only the necessity of his seeking employment in sections of the country far distant from the community in which he has established roots, but the crowning assault has been made upon him and upon all American labor, to have forced, captive, and lesser-paid labor perform the work for which the navy yard civilian worker is traditionally called upon to perform. This is work for which his training eminently fits him, work which a statute of the United States says he shall perform.

We refer to the ever-expanding use by the Department of the Navy of enlisted personnel in the naval shipyards and their replacement of the civilian worker.

This charge is frequently denied by the officials of the Department of Defense, but denials do not change the facts. The files and records of the metal-trades department are replete with cases, including the nature of the work performed, the location, the dates, and all other information pertinent.

Members of Congress have protested to no avail. Regrettable as it may seem, incredible as it may sound, Congressmen protesting have been given the same run-around as has the navy-yard worker. Quite true, letters answering Congressmen's protests, bearing the signature of the top official down through to lesser officials, have been sent denying that enlisted personnel are replacing civilians. These replies all attempt at justification of the Navy Department's practices, rather than an acceptance of the issue, or a denial, or admittance that they are in violation of the intent or spirit of the statute of 1912, which statute prescribes limitations on work which the enlisted personnel shall perform.

It is also interesting to note that, although these letters to the Congressmen bear different signatures, the replies are so alike in each instance that, to say the least, they challenge the theory of coincidence.

To emphasize the position of the Department of Defense, it is best to reprint two orders issued by the Secretary which speak for themselves. The first was issued October 14, 1949.

"The Department of Defense is responsible for the security of our country. Civilian employees share fully in that responsibility. Use of civilian employees affords abilities not otherwise available, assures continuity of administration and operation, and provides a nucleus of trained personnel necessary for expansion in any emergency. Because civilian employees free military personnel for primarily military duties, they will be utilized in all positions which do not require military skills or military incumbents for reasons of training, security, or discipline.

"The establishment of a work environment in which civilian employees will be able to contribute most effectively shall be the responsibility of every person who plans or directs the work of others. Supervisors will provide progressive and constructive leadership to individual employees and shall endeavor to create sound management-employee relationships. They will insure that every employee understands what is expected of him, to whom he is responsible, and his work relationships with his fellow workers. Productive efficiency can be built only upon a recognition of the individual as the basis of the organization and through application of sound principles of human relations.

"The following principles will guide the conduct of human relations in the Department of Defense:

"1. There shall be no discrimination because of race, sex, color, religion, national origin, lawful political affiliation, or physical handicap.

"2. Employees shall be placed in jobs for which they are best fitted and shall be given opportunities for advancement.

"3. Training necessary to insure improved performance and individual development shall be provided.

"4. Appraisal of work performance shall be made fairly and objectively on a continuing basis and such appraisal shall be discussed with employees.

"5. Within whatever compensation schedule is applicable, employees shall receive equal pay for work of equal difficulty and responsibility.

"6. Working conditions shall be made safe and healthful as possible.

"7. Recognizing that a well-informed work force is a productive work force, employees shall be informed, insofar as possible, of plans and policies affecting them and their work.

"8. Employees shall be encouraged to express themselves concerning improvement of work method and working conditions.

"9. Employees shall have the right, without interference, coercion, restraint, or reprisal, to join or refrain from joining any lawful employee organization or association.

"10. Any employees having a grievance shall be accorded a fair and prompt discussion with the supervisor immediately concerned and, failing prompt and satisfactory adjustment, he shall have a right to appeal, under established grievance procedure. In presenting a grievance, an employee shall be free from interference, restraint, or reprisal, and he may designate a representative of his own choice to assist him.

"Maintenance of sound management-employee relations is not the responsibility of management alone. The Department of Defense recognizes its obligations to its employees. In return, it makes reasonable demands of employees to discharge conscientiously their assigned duties in the most effective manner possible, to respect administrative authority of those directing their work, and to observe the spirit as well as the letter of the laws and regulations governing their official conduct.

"This policy is applicable throughout the Department of Defense. The Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force will assure that it is made effective within their respective departments.

"LOUIS JOHNSON."

The metal trades department and its constituent organizations can, and do subscribe to this statement.

But, what happened? Either the statement was contrary to the practices being carried on, or someone was responsible for the Secretary making another one on the same subject.

The first release could not have been much more than circulated when the second appeared within a period of 60 days—December 14, 1949. The high-sounding pronunciations of October 14, of human relations were forgotten.

In their place were apologies for, and denials of intent of the October 14 statement, evasion of the issue and the magnifying of training, inconsistency, and finally, the mailed military fist. We quote this statement:

"Memorandum for the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force

"The over-all statement of personnel policy for civilian employees in the Department of Defense, released on October 14, 1949, contained the following sentence:

" 'Because civilian employees free military personnel for primarily military duties, they will be utilized in all positions which do not require military skills or military incumbents for reasons of training, security, or discipline.'

"The question has been raised as to whether this statement of policy would require that civilian employees be hired to perform necessary repair and maintenance work on military equipment or facilities, even though military personnel are available to perform the work because, temporarily, they are not required for primarily military duties.

"The quoted statement of policy recognizes that certain positions will require the use of military personnel for reasons of training. This is particularly true of operations involving the necessary repair and maintenance of military equipment or facilities, in view of the requirement that military personnel be able to carry on these operations under conditions which preclude the use of civilian personnel. However, aside from the question of training, it is not my intention that this policy statement be construed so as to require the employment of civilians when military personnel are temporarily available for these operations, since any such construction would cause unnecessary expenditures of public funds and would prevent the realization of the economies in operations for which we must constantly strive. Therefore this statement must be construed to mean that whenever military personnel are available because, temporarily, they are not required for primarily military duties they shall be utilized, in the interest of economy, to perform necessary repair and maintenance operations on military equipment or facilities.

"This will not, of course, change the original intent of the policy statement and authorize the use on a continuing basis of military personnel on jobs which are primarily civilian in character and where the factors of training, security, or discipline are not present.

"LOUIS JOHNSON."

We cannot accept the thesis of this December 14 declaration and remain or hope to remain very long free American workmen.

It becomes more and more apparent that the last one to profit by experience is the United States Government, and in this instance, the United States Navy Department.

So the record may be complete, let us review briefly the navy-yard worker and his accomplishments.

First, there was a tremendous expansion in shore facilities prior to the emergency preceding World War II. It reached its peak somewhere in 1945. Thousands of skilled men, responding to the call of their Government, moved into naval shipyard areas and went to work, in many instances, at much lower rates of pay than they could have received in most other industries. Many of these skilled mechanics subjected themselves to additional training to fit them for navy-yard work. This training came from association with and benefiting by the experience of the skilled navy-yard men who had made naval shipyard work their career. Many of these navy-yard workers had never worked anywhere else. They had learned their trade there and were accepted as being the highest type of mechanic. They were part of the community in which the shore facilities were located. They purchased homes. Their children attended school in the same area, and in many instances, aspired to succeed their fathers in navy-yard work. At least all of these people were dependent upon navy-yard employment in one form or another. They were an essential part of the economy of the section in which they lived.

Among the many thousands of new employes in the yards were some not so highly skilled as the regular navy-yard worker or the journeyman mechanic. Thousands of navy-yard employees, following the same course of employees in private industry, became either inducted or enlisted in some branch of the armed forces. These navy-yard employees were very carefully screened by those responsible for the production of naval vessels however, with the result that deferment was forced upon those considered more essential. Therefore, even though the employee may have wished to enter one of the military services, he could not.

As a result of this, and with the passage of the Veterans' Preference Act, we have a great many veteran navy-yard workers, some with at least 20 years of seniority, being replaced by navy yard employees of a year. In some instances, sons have replaced fathers. But, even with the inequities of the Veterans' Preference Act, which has caused great hardship among some navy yard workers, it is still something tangible. It is also the law and can be corrected through legislative channels if found necessary or advisable.

However, the latest challenge to the navy-yard worker is something else. It is something which is being fostered and carried out by some who are either not aware of the traditional practices of the Navy Department in its relation with civilian employees, or who do not care. The new practices are alleged to result in economies of operation and to effect economy of Government spending.

We assert that present practices, in substituting enlisted personnel, are neither economical, sound strategically, nor fair to the trained navy-shipyard personnel. Any economies which may result from pay-roll reduction of civilian personnel are more than balanced by the numbers required to perform like work from other sources.

So there may be no misunderstanding about labor's attitude toward the enlisted sailor, let us say we offer no criticism of him whatever. We have the highest admiration for him. He represents the finest type of young American manhood. The vast majority are the sons of workers. Large numbers are the sons of men who are dependent upon work in the naval shipyards for their livelihood. True to their oath to their Nation, if ordered they are compelled to carry out the orders given them, dissatisfied as they may be. We would not have them do otherwise.

Further, make no mistake about it, we all favor economy in the administration of our Government, regardless of its branch, and who it may affect. But we submit that it is not economy, nor is it just, that military personnel, enlisted for military duty, with the attendant benefits and obligations, be used to replace Government employees at lower rates of pay, and yet at higher aggregate costs—that compulsory guaranteed labor be used to replace free labor. This is totalitarianism in its initial stages.

There is still another aspect to this invasion of civilian rights which must be apparent to those charged with the administration of national defense.

Present practices create the possibility that workers in the future, if they are recruited for naval-shipyard work, will request rates of wages comparable to those they could obtain in private, commercial employment. The attraction of working in the navy yard will be dissipated by the knowledge that as soon as enlisted sailors are available and not needed for the purpose for which they enlisted, they will take the mechanics' job. Surely this is not a very inviting prospect for the mechanic or the recruiting of one.

In addition to the previous comments, it is evident that attention should be focused upon another phase of current developments which may well transcend in importance any other question which has been raised.

We refer to the gradual usurping by the military of functions which are essentially civilian. We agree that full and complete defense measures are necessary to protect our Nation, its people and our way of life. In accepting this premise, American people must never forget that our Government is one of laws, one of representatives chosen by the people of the Nation in free elections; a Government responsive to the wish of the majority of the people, or as it has been so aptly expressed, "of, for and by the people."

Under such a form of government it is difficult to foresee any possibility of that government being challenged from within.

However, we assert that today there exists a challenge to the rights of civilians. This is evident in the gradual assumption by the Department of Defense in the replacement of free labor by enlisted, military personnel.

It is not difficult to envisage military dictatorship, without military personnel under military control and conditions carrying out every phase of defense operations, including those civilian in character.

In the formation of our Government it was never proposed that the military branches should be a law or body unto themselves. The Constitution provides for a civilian commander in chief in the person of the President of the United States. This principle has been further carried out by the selection of civilians to be the chiefs of the various departments of defense. This system has proved eminently satisfactory in the past. Perhaps not to those whose horizon is clouded with visions of an entire nation's economy and people being subjected to the efficiency, precision, and obeisance of a marching army, but we must accept the fact that under civilian control, we as a nation, have managed to get the job done for a century and three quarters. Comparison with the history of other nations of the world, who have moved from monarchies to pseudo-democracies, to dictatorships, proves the wisdom of continuing civilian control of all branches and agencies of our Government.

But we must submit that with the complex, scientific, highly technical development of defense mechanisms, a temptation is offered to military administrators to bypass the civilian and to become an agency apart and free from the everyday, not too efficient seeming, administration of a real functioning democracy such as our own.

The Nation expects its civilian administrators to protect it against any movement which might destroy or tend to destroy its essential civilian character. We want to believe that this basic cornerstone of our freedom will be as zealously guarded in the future as it has been in the past.

We believe the principle must be practiced, not on the basis of economy of operation in terms of dollars and cents, as is professed at the present time in the use of enlisted personnel and the discharge of civilians, but on the basis of the preservation of an ideal.

Billions of dollars have been spent in the past to preserve our democracy. Billions are being spent now. Billions will be spent in the future. Great sacrifices have been made in devastating wars. We do not propose to permit this most cherished possession of the people of our Nation to be undermined and menaced under the guise of economy or ambition.

And, we further submit, that we have every right to expect that work traditionally performed by civilians continue to be performed by them, and that any move away from traditional civilian administration in any branch of our Government be halted.

Bonnie Mae Mathews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, radio station WWL, New Orleans, is Louisiana's only clear channel radio station. WWL has been a willing public servant ever since its beginning in 1922. With its clear channel on 870 kilocycles it is able to extend its service from the immediate environs of New Orleans to remote sections of Louisiana and nearby States to give some folks the only radio service they are able to enjoy and to others a choice of programs which would otherwise not be possible.

I think it is interesting to note a recent public service of WWL which is typical of that station's dedication to the good will and well-being of the folks in the deep South. Without further comment I hereby ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD this brief article in response to an American Red Cross appeal for aid to a child suffering from the dreaded disease, nephritis.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

New Orleans WWL 50,000-watt clear-channel station teamed up with the American Red Cross, Pan American World Airways, and Mid-Continent Airlines recently to save the life of 8-year-old Bonnie Mae Mathews, of Coushatta, La.

Watermelons, which are out of season, were desperately needed for use in the treatment of nephritis, which Bonnie Mae had contracted.

The American Red Cross' appeal for the hard-to-get melons was aired over WWL, and within 24 hours melons flown up by PAA from Balboa, C. Z., were being fed to the child victim.

Pan American officials have assured the Red Cross and WWL that they will continue to supply the watermelons as needed for an indefinite period.

The melons were received in New Orleans by George Shannon, WWL's farm-service director and flown to Coushatta by Mid-Continent Airlines.

Meantime Bonnie Mae is beginning to show improvement on her diet of melons, which is a must if she is to overcome the dread nephritis.

Texas City Boomed Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of the most inspiring stories of community initiative in our national history is the heroic story of Texas City.

Three years ago this month this city on the Gulf coast of Texas was virtually destroyed by a gigantic explosion which killed 500 of the city's citizens and injured 2,000 more.

Today the scars of that terrible moment remain only in the hearts of Texas City residents. On the surface the city shows no marks of the violence which tore out its heart in 1947.

All Texans are very proud of the city which bears the name of the State. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD today an article from Business Week magazine of April 15, 1950, reporting on the amazing progress made in rebuilding Texas City.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Three years ago, on a warm April morning, the freighter *Grandcamp* was burning alongside a pier at Texas City. It blew up. In the train of explosions that followed, over 500 people were killed, 2,000 injured. Much of the town was left in wreckage.

This week, on the third anniversary of the holocaust, Texas City claims it's the fastest city in America—and very likely is. Its industries have not only been rebuilt; they are setting new production records. By 1948, chemical and petroleum refineries in the Texas City area were valued at $129,000,000, and some $15,000,000 of new construction have been added since then. All together, these plants turn out some $500,000,000 worth of products a year. Pay rolls of the 500 firms in the area come to $25,000,000.

Signs of Texas City's rebirth can be seen everywhere. Along the city's streets rise rows of new houses and buildings. Texas City has a new high school and elementary school, two new department stores, and a host of smaller ones. Not including industrial plants, over $1,700,000 worth of building permits were issued in Texas City in 1949.

Texas City has more people, too. Population was 18,000 in 1946, is 27,000 now. In recent months, homes for about 1,000 families have been put up. On the outskirts of town new subdivisions have sprouted, complete with streets and utility lines. Even so, 42 percent of the people who work in Texas City must still live in other towns. "If we could just build fast enough," said one enthusiastic citizen, "we'd have a population of 50,000 today."

It took more than an explosion to overcome Texas City's favorable location. It has always been a transportation center. Five railroad trunk lines serve the city; it has water shipping; it's near Texas' oil fields. Before the disaster, Texas City ranked as eleventh largest port in the United States. It hasn't regained this spot yet, for debris is still being removed from the burned docks. But even now, new docks are being planned for handling grain, sugar, potash, and other cargoes.

Seatrains are making two calls a week at the city, handling about 15,000 loaded railroad cars in and out of the port annually. Another 31,000 cars a year are handled by direct-rail connections.

Of the industrial plants flattened by the blast, Monsanto Chemical Co.'s suffered most. Its polystyrene unit, finished just 3 months before, was ripped to shreds. Some 145 Monsanto employees were killed. But less than a week afterward Monsanto's president, William M. Rand, stoutly affirmed his company's intentions of rebuilding. Within a year's time a new styrene plant was already in operation (BW, April 17, 1948, p. 48).

Today the Monsanto plant is back on its feet, bigger and better than ever. From its original 45 acres the plant area has grown to 60. Total cost of the new plant is about $10,000,000.

The other chemical and petroleum companies, which were not as hard hit as Monsanto, have also gone doggedly ahead with reconstruction and expansion plans.

Pan American Refining Co. was far enough from the explosion to escape serious damage. But 12 employees were killed and the company's dock area suffered $750,000 in damages. Today the refinery, which turns out aviation gasoline, motor and industrial fuels, has a capacity of 100,000 barrels of crude a day. The company recently finished a desalting unit and has several more under construction. The company's pay roll in 1949 came to $3,500,000.

Carbon & Carbide's plant, which was 2 miles from the blast, suffered little damage except some broken window panes. The company's recent building program is estimated at upward of $15,000,000. This week several large units for producing vinyl resins and methanol were just about ready to go into operation. The plant, which was originally built in 1938, turns out some 35 organic chemicals.

Republic Oil Refining Co. suffered heavy losses in both personnel and plant from the blast. Its $2,500,000 refinery was destroyed; its docks were a total loss; some 90 storage tanks were ruined. Today the refinery has been almost completely rebuilt. A polymerization unit was added in 1949. The present capacity of the plant is 36,000 barrels of crude oil a day.

Tin Processing Corp.'s Longhorn Tin Smelter has just finished a $2,700,000 hydrochloric acid recovery plant. The smelter employs around 800 and turned out 37,000 tons of tin in 1949.

Electoral Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest newspapermen and one of the best editorial writers in the northeastern section of our country is Mr. James Morgan. In the Boston Sunday Globe of March 26, 1950, Mr. Morgan has written an excellent article on Senate Joint Resolution 2 and House Joint Resolution 2, now currently referred to as the Lodge-Gossett amendment. I commend Mr. Morgan's discussion to the serious attention of the Members of the House. Such article follows:

A HOAX IN THE CONSTITUTION?

(By James Morgan)

Once I had a question that I thought would stump the now late and widely lamented Information Please, but I neglected to send it in. Here is the riddle: What American college has awarded diplomas to many distinguished men, perhaps to more of them than any other college in the land has graduated, and yet it has neither a campus nor a classroom, nor a faculty, nor any habitation whatsoever? Answer: The electoral college.

Franklin P. Adams, John Kieran, and their companion experts now are off the air, more's the pity. Even the electoral college itself may vanish if and whenever the House of Representatives is permitted to consider and decide whether to concur with the Senate in submitting to the States a proposal to remove that vermiform appendix of Uncle Sam.

Thanks to Senator LODGE, who since World War II has been less inclined than formerly to narrow his mind and give up to party what was meant for mankind, this question has not become ensnarled in partisan politics. The Massachusetts Senator associated himself with Congressman GOSSETT, a Texas Democrat, in a joint sponsorship of the amendment. He hitched up also a strong bipartisan team of cosponsors in the Senate, with Republicans and Democrats, southerners, easterners, and westerners all pulling together.

A CONSTITUTIONAL HOAX?

An experience of a century and two-thirds justifies Gladstone's tribute to the American Constitution as the most remarkable work * * * in modern times to have been produced by the human intellect at a single stroke. Nevertheless, the wise fathers of the Republic fumbled badly the problem of electing a chief of state in a then world of hereditary rulers. Two changes already have been made in order to correct their mistakes.

The twelfth amendment was necessary to prevent a repetition of the deadlock in 1801, when the country came perilously near having Aaron Burr in the Presidency instead of Thomas Jefferson. The twentieth or lame-duck amendment shortened the interregnum between the election and installation of a new President after we had come dangerously close to being left without an effective Government in critical periods of the Civil War and the two world wars.

The nicely laid plan for an electoral college never did work except in the two elections when George Washington was acclaimed the unanimous choice of public opinion. Since his retirement, it has remained for 150 years a rubber stamp of the parties, a puppet show.

The idea that the electors, sitting apart in their respective States on the same day without an opportunity for a meeting of minds, could ever give a majority to anyone, is so fantastic that the men who wrote the provision in the Constitution cannot have believed that it would function. Many members of the Philadelphia convention were in favor of having Congress choose the Chief Executives. It is only fair to their common sense to assume that they contrived this plan as a disguise for their real design, which was to throw the election into the House of Representatives in the inevitable failure of the electors to produce a majority. The scheme looks very like a hoax, perpetrated on the Constitution.

THIRD NEW FLAW

Men more wise did those planners surprise. They did not foresee the rise of political parties which now have had a firm grip on the electors for 125 years. No one of them has presumed to exercise his constitutional right to vote his own individual choice, except a lone Tennessean in 1948, who was elected on the Truman ticket but cast his ballot for Thurmond, the Dixiecrat candidate. The pending twenty-second amendment would remove the ever present danger of a sufficient number of electors taking it into their heads to reverse a Presidential election.

The amendment would abolish the electors while retaining the electoral vote. Each State would continue to have the same number of votes that it has Senators and Representatives in Congress. That is the basic compromise of the Constitution between the larger and the smaller States. These latter would not have sacrificed their independence and entered the Union in the first place had they not been guaranteed an equality in the Senate.

PRO AND CON

That equality is reflected in the electoral votes, where Nevada and New York alike each have two to correspond with their two Senators. If the proposed amendment had not retained that compromise, it could not have commanded the necessary support of two-thirds of the Senators. Nor would it have a chance to be ratified by the required three-fourths of the legislatures. Twelve of the lesser States hold an effective vote on any change in the Constitution.

Another provision of the Lodge-Gossett amendment drops the majority rule in the election of a President. Like all other elective officials in the country, he would need only a plurality. Now, if no one has received more electoral votes than all his opponents, the election is thrown into the House, which chooses from the three highest names on the poll. The amendment provides that if there be a tie only the names of the two candidates who have the same number of votes would be submitted to Congress, where not the House alone but a joint session of Senate and House would elect. Nor would the vote be by States, as now, with each State casting one vote. Senators and Representatives would vote individually, and a majority of the whole assembly would choose between the two candidates.

The most controversial feature of the amendment provides that a winning candidate for President in any State should no longer be credited with the entire vote of that State. The winner would not take all, but would have to share electoral votes with the other candidates in the proportion of the popular vote received by each. For example, the total electoral vote of New York would not have been awarded to Dewey in 1948, who carried the State by a plurality of 61,000, and Truman's plurality of only 7,000 in Ohio would not have given him the whole electoral vote of that State.

EVIL OF DOUBTFUL STATES

This provision has raised the cry that it would encourage the growth of splinter parties, which are the plague of France, Italy, and other European countries. Senator LODGE and his cosponsors accepted a qualifying provision that a candidate must have 40 percent of the total popular vote in order to be elected.

The electoral vote undoubtedly has done the country the service of maintaining the two-party system. There have been as many as 70 parties which succeeded in breaking into Congress, but only 11 have won any electoral votes. After that experience most of the losers went out of business.

The potential danger of splinter parties is to be weighed in the scale with the certain advantage of making every vote in every State count in a presidential election. This would cure the evil of one-party States and of safe States, where the ballots of a minority are lost. The Democrats would campaign in Maine and Vermont and the Republicans in Georgia and Alabama. That would widen the participation in voting, and our total vote would not be put to shame in comparison with that of every other free country.

A counterproposal by Congressman COUDERT, of New York, would retain the electors and avoid proportional voting by breaking up the electoral vote of a State into congressional districts. Under the Coudert plan, only the two electors that correspond to the two Senators would be chosen on a State-wide ballot and the rest would be elected by districts. That would not crack the solid South. Neither would it open up some safe States and many safe districts in the North to hopeful contests by the minority.

Moreover, it is notorious that congressional districts are fearfully and wonderfully made for the unfair advantage of the party in control of the redistricting. This is such an old, recognized American custom that we have a word for it. If a President should be chosen by districts there would be an added incentive to gerrymander them even worse than they are, if that be possible.

The Lodge-Gossett amendment would cure the most serious evil of all in presidential elections, the centering of campaigns and campaign funds on pivotal States. These coquettish sisters in the family would be cut down to size, not only in elections but also in the bargaining of nominating conventions and in the distribution of patronage. There would be less truth than there is in the saying that some men are born great, some achieve greatness, and some come from doubtful States.

A Vote for Integrity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Vote for Integrity," published in the Wilmington (Del.) Journal of April 18, 1950. The editorial deals with the President's plan for reorganization of the National Labor Relations Board. It rebukes the President for seeking to "gain by guile what he knew he never could obtain by honest and forthright action."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VOTE FOR INTEGRITY

By a majority of 9 to 4, the seven Democrats and six Republicans comprising the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department have called on the Senate to veto the President's plan for a reorganization of the National Labor Relations Board. This is at once a vote for integrity in government and a stinging rebuke to a President who sought to gain by guile what he knew he never could obtain by honest and forthright action.

The Truman proposal, now stymied, and it is hoped, forever dead, would abolish the office of Robert N. Denham, the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, and thus leave the administration of the Taft-Hartley Act at the complete mercy of its enemies. Its acceptance would have virtually given Mr. Truman what he has been seeking all along, the repeal or at least nullification of the act. The vigorous support which organized labor mustered in behalf of the President's plan is the best proof that this would have been the result.

The part which Mr. Truman played in this shady performance is thoroughly discreditable. He had pretended, and even stated publicly with a great show of virtue designed to deceive the unthinking, that he was merely carrying out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on governmental reorganization. That was not so. The Commission never advocated any course of this sort.

Fortunately the Senate committee has seen through this effort to mislead the Nation. The whole Senate, we trust, will be no less determined to strike a blow for straightforward dealing.

John M. Clayton, Famous Delawarean and Outstanding American Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, as president of the Delaware State Society of the District of Columbia, it has just been my privilege to place a wreath upon the statue here in the Capitol of John M. Clayton.

In the commemorative ceremony which marks the one hundredth anniversary of the signing of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, I said:

Born in Sussex County, Delaware, John M. Clayton achieved outstanding success and international prominence, and rose to one of the highest public offices in this country, that of Secretary of State.

The career of John M. Clayton is an inspirational story of a great American. He was renowned and respected as a lawyer, legislator, jurist, United States Senator, statesman, diplomat, and outstanding citizen of his State and Nation.

It is appropriate that this commemorative ceremony be held at this time for it marks the one hundredth anniversary of John M. Clayton's greatest achievement, the signing of the historical Clayton-Bulwer Treaty between the United States and Great Britain.

As Delawareans we have every reason to express our pride in John M. Clayton, whose ability and achievements brought great honor to Delaware, the first State.

Mr. Speaker, a very fine piece of reporting concerning the facts and the historical significance of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty has been done by my good friend, William P. Frank, of the News-Journal Co., in Wilmington, Del. Therefore, as a part of my remarks it is a pleasure to include Mr. Frank's article on this

subject, which was published in the Wilmington Morning News on April 16, 1950. That article follows:

CENTURY-OLD CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY WILL BE CELEBRATED

(By William P. Frank)

Exactly a hundred years ago next week—April 19—a Delaware-born statesman and a skilled British diplomat signed their names to a treaty that was to become one of the most controversial documents in American history.

Even to this day, historians are debating whether John M. Clayton, of Delaware, outmaneuvered Sir Henry Bulwer-Lytton, or whether the Englishman outwitted the Delawarean—in the drafting of what has come to be known as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty.

While the treaty ended a cold war of nerves between the United States and Great Britain over Central American territory, it also made Clayton the target of personal attacks that branded him everything from a coward to un-American.

Because the treaty involved British-American control of any canal built in Central America, American land speculators, and expansionists sneeringly declared that Clayton deserved British knighthood.

PREVENTED WAR

But the more intelligent verdict of historians is that Clayton in 1850, as Secretary of State under President Zachary Taylor, prevented the possibilities of a war with Great Britain at a time when the United States couldn't afford to go to war.

Also, the general opinion of modern critics of the treaty is that it was executed at a time when the United States was a far weaker maritime power than England, and that it was a triumph for American diplomacy because it ended all risk of British expansion in Central America.

The treaty was signed on April 19, 1850, and ratified by the Senate on July 4 of that year. Five days later, President Taylor died and Secretary of State Clayton returned to private life at his home, Buena Vista, near Wilmington—now the home of a descendant, the former United States Senator Clayton Douglass Buck.

TREATY ATTACKED

Almost immediately, Clayton's political opponents began a campaign of attack upon him and the treaty. Joining the hue and cry were schemers and speculators who didn't like the treaty because it restricted them from land-grabbing in Central America.

The attack became so vicious and so personal that the Delaware General Assembly, split between the Democrats and Whigs, disregarded politics and elected Clayton to the United States Senate so that he could more advantageously refute his critics and enemies in Washington.

The Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which continued under fire for more than 50 years, was finally superseded by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty which paved the way for the American construction of the Panama Canal.

A heroic statue of Clayton is in the Capitol in Washington and plans are being made for a brief ceremony there through the Delaware State Society in Washington on the anniversary of the treaty.

In his day, Clayton was one of the best-known Delawareans, having entered the legal profession and politics at an early age. He was born in Dagsboro and educated in Sussex County, was graduated from Yale, and began his law practice in Georgetown. He was first elected to the United States Senate in 1839, at the age of 33, then the youngest Senator.

OUTSTANDING JURIST

He took part in the revision of the State constitution, became chief justice of Delaware at the age of 41, and when he left the bench was hailed as one of the outstanding jurists of the State.

He became an ardent admirer of Gen. Zachary Taylor and, in fact, he named his home south of Wilmington Buena Vista after the great battle won by General Taylor in the Mexican War.

Politics was the great field in which Clayton played an important role and when Taylor became President, Clayton was selected as his Secretary of State.

Almost as soon as Clayton took over the post, he was confronted not only with the problems of North versus South in the United States, but also the very acute question of what to do about Great Britain in Central America.

Gold had been discovered in California, and it was important to find the shortest route to the west coast. The Isthmus of Panama afforded the possibilities for such a route. Sensing that the United States would soon be interested in a ship canal across the Isthmus, Great Britain began taking over territory in that area on various pretexts, particularly in the vicinity of British Honduras.

JOCKEY FOR POSITION

But as Great Britain moved to protect her interests in Central America, the United States also moved in the same direction—both countries jockeying for advantageous position in reference to a possible canal through the isthmus.

It became a war of nerves. Strained relations developed between the two governments. Each nation assured the other that its interests were not selfish.

There was talk of the possibilities of war, or an armed collision. And at that point, Sir Henry came to Washington to negotiate a treaty with Clayton.

The treaty—which eventually stirred up such a conflict within the Nation and the Senate—provided that the two countries would jointly control and protect any canal built across the isthmus. The treaty also stated that neither country would occupy or fortify any part of Central America.

ANOTHER DISPUTE

But even as the treaty was ratified in the summer of 1850, another dispute developed over the interpretation of the treaty. The United States said the treaty was retroactive, that Great Britain would have to give up Central American territory. England said the opposite. Again war threatened but finally Great Britain withdrew from the disputed Central American areas in 1856.

Many attempts were subsequently made in the Senate to abrogate the treaty because of the way it restricted the United States, but these efforts failed until 1902 when a new treaty was effected—and then came the Panama Canal.

Allan Nevins in his Ordeal of the Union writes, "The accusation that Clayton permitted himself to be outwitted by slippery diplomatists had no truth. He made a fair, and for the period, a profitable agreement."

Another authority states that while the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, by taking Great Britain into American partnership in controlling the proposed canal, violated the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine, it should be noted that the United States forced the British to give up long-existing territorial claims—a unique triumph for the Monroe Doctrine.

Carroll Binder Reports From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the Appendix of yesterday's RECORD there appeared two reports written by Mr. Carroll Binder, editorial writer of the Minneapolis Tribune. The reports relate to conditions in Europe as found by Mr. Binder. I now present two more articles in the series of articles by Mr. Binder, and ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST EUROPE BACKS PHONY INTEGRATION—CYNICAL REFUSE TO ABANDON SOVEREIGNTY FOR ECONOMIC UNITY

(By Carroll Binder)

PARIS, FRANCE.—Since Congress and a section of the American public think integration will cure Europe's ills, certain cynical western Europeans are prepared to go through the motions of pretending to take the cure.

More concerned with keeping up the flow of American aid than with laying a base for enduring security, Europeans of this ilk give lip service to integration without any intention of trying to make it a reality. They show no inclination to give up their national sovereignties for the purpose of changing Europe into one big market of 270,000,000 people.

SINGLE LEADER SOUGHT

This state of mind was behind much of the European support for roving Ambassador Averell Harriman's attempt to make Paul-Henri Spaak, of Belgium, the political leader of the European Marshall plan council.

Harriman wanted to deal with one European leader who, in turn, would deal with the various governments receiving aid.

He thought Spaak, out of office in Belgium and active in movements for European unity, would fill the bill.

A number of governments, which do not care much for Spaak and would prefer to deal directly with the chief ECA representative in Europe, supported Harriman's efforts to have Spaak accepted as his deputy and as a super-European spokesman.

They thought they could create the impression in the United States that western Europeans are integrating without surrendering any real sovereignty or foregoing the right to make direct approaches to American aid distributors.

BRITISH VETO MOVE

The British scotched this move. They would have none of Spaak. They are being severely criticized for torpedoing an attempt at integration.

The British attitude toward integration, which will be discussed later, played a part in their veto of Spaak.

Belgium, a hard-currency country, has made the going especially tough for the soft-currency countries. Hence Britain and other soft-currency countries objected to the former Premier of Belgium being placed in a position where he might create greater difficulties for them.

PEEVED AT SPAAK

The Labor Government of Britain was also peeved at Spaak, a fellow Socialist, for a speech and an article in which he criticized British behavior toward Europe.

Still other Europeans didn't like the idea of trying to fool the American public with such a phony sort of integration.

They knew that, in the present mood of Europe, Spaak really would not have functioned as Americans were given to understand he would function. They rightly believed that European-American relations will not thrive permanently in such an atmosphere of petty deception.

They believed a sounder basis for collaboration is for Americans to become acquainted with European realities and vice versa.

Designation of Foreign Minister Stikker, of the Netherlands, as a political conciliator of the European Marshall plan council is a more honest move.

His duties have yet to be defined and probably will not amount to much. But at least his provisional appointment and the other provisional moves toward integration do not give Americans or Europeans the impression that barriers are being lowered when they remain as high as ever.

Foreign Minister Sforza, of Italy, who launched the idea of an economic union between Italy and France in 1947 and is as ardent a worker for real unity in Europe as I have found, urges Americans not to be discouraged by the slowness of the movement for integration.

"I want free Europe to be united," Sforza said, "but I do not believe in miracles. Where there is power such as America possesses there is responsibility. The United States has a responsibility to work for integration despite the opposition of commercial, emotional, or other elements in individual countries."

Sforza, who has been in diplomacy and politics for a half century, is better acquainted with both the United States and Europe than most Europeans. He takes a dim view of the ability of Italy, France, or Britain separately to resist the rise of another leader in Germany who might again attempt to impose Germany's will on Europe.

He believes only a united free Europe can successfully resist Soviet imperialism. He gave the impression that he does not despair of such eventual cooperation.

Meantime the preoccupation of each Marshall plan country with its own narrow economic interests and preservation of its full freedom of action makes a greater impact on the American than the prospects for lowered barriers.

It is not merely difficult to get individual countries to abandon uneconomic industries being nursed along for reasons of prestige, security, or make-work. Attempts to prevent building up steel, oil, and other key production facilities beyond reasonable needs are being frustrated by hog deals between interested countries. Western Europe already has facilities for making 8,000,000 more tons of steel a year than it is expected to consume. Yet the Dutch are being allowed to build an uneconomical steel mill although neighboring Belgium and Luxemburg cannot find markets for all their present steel output and neighboring Germany has excess steel mills. The Dutch got this sanction because they supported a French project for expanding the steel plants of Lorraine.

The urge to be self-sufficient and give fullest possible employment is always present in intra-European attempts to jointly regulate investment programs.

Since our money is being used and our security and prosperity also are at stake, we have a right to criticize these European shortcomings. We have a right to press for better and more prompt performance as Paul Hoffman and other ECA spokesmen do incessantly.

But it might not be amiss for us to admit to ourselves that we sometimes have been a long time fulfilling our own precepts. There is considerable discrepancy between what we tell Europeans to do and what we ourselves do.

That does not excuse Europeans but it should make us more tolerant and patient.

The American Union did not start with 48 States. It took years for the 13 colonies to agree on a basis of union and it took a great civil war to preserve the union.

If the United States were willing to identify its fortunes as closely with western Europe as it urges western Europeans to identify their fortunes with each other, integration would proceed far more rapidly.

If we were willing to modify our sovereignty in an American-European union as we propose that Europeans modify theirs in a European union, a union of the free might take form more rapidly.

Western Europeans proceed cautiously for substantially the same reasons that we proceed cautiously in such unfamiliar paths. There is danger that we all may do too little too late. This is a report on the way things are rather than on the way they ought to be.

EUROPE AID STALLS RUSS, BINDER FINDS—WAR NOT INEVITABLE, BUT TENSION WILL CONTINUE, HE SAYS

(By Carroll Binder)

PARIS, FRANCE.—What is there to show for the $3,000,000,000 the American people have invested in the Marshall plan and the additional $12,000,000,000 worth of assistance they have given Europe since the end of the war?

What can the American people hope to gain by investing an additional $3,000,000,000 in the European recovery program for the year beginning next June 30 and another $2,000,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1952?

I have sought the answer to these and related questions in a 5-week study of conditions in four of the principal beneficiaries of this American aid—Britain, Germany, Italy, and France.

I have talked with leading personalities in the Governments of those four countries. I have talked with leaders of the opposition. I have talked with farmers, workingmen, labor leaders, and journalists as well as with businessmen and statesmen. I have visited farms, factories, slums, the homes of the rich, eating places of the very poor, and the ritzy restaurants where the best food and service is enjoyed by those well-enough heeled to pay the high prices charged.

I have talked off the record with American diplomats, Marshall-plan executives, and military men closely identified with administration of American aid to Europe and the safeguarding of American interests.

I have checked my impressions and what I have been told with the estimates of old friends who have been covering Europe for the American press for many years and know how to distinguish the real from the phony.

I have known one of these countries—France—for 32 years, having spent 3 years in the French war zone in World War I. My first-hand acquaintance with the other three countries is of more than 23 years standing. I have lived in each of them for prolonged periods.

This is my second visit to western Europe since the end of the war.

My impressions will be set forth in greater detail and with more specific reservations in subsequent articles. In this first article on the state of western Europe, 57 months after the cessation of hostilities and at the halfway point of the Marshall plan, they may be summarized thus:

A shooting war with Russia does not appear to be either imminent or inevitable.

A lasting settlement between the Soviet power and the western democracies does not appear to be achievable in the near future.

Therefore the cold war seems more likely to last for decades than to degenerate into a shooting war or to be ended on a mutually satisfactory basis.

The Marshall plan has frustrated, at least temporarily, Communist chances of taking over France, Italy, and possibly some other western European countries.

American aid to western Europe has given a priceless breathing spell in which to create such social stability here that the Communists cannot come to power through disaffection of large sections of the public.

American aid has permitted western Europeans to acquire goods and services essential to quick economic recovery which could not otherwise have been acquired because of low dollar purchasing power.

Thanks to this dollar aid and their own efforts, western Europeans have made far more rapid strides toward recovery than they made in a comparable period after the First World War. Industrial production in many lines is well ahead of what it was in 1938. Agricultural production is almost up to prewar level.

The recovery program has halted inflationary forces which otherwise might have caused profound social dislocations and paved the way for dictatorships of the extreme right or left, such as happened after World War I.

By providing jobs, food, clothing, and other means of survival at a critical juncture, the recovery program has given hope and vigor to peoples who otherwise might have been lost to our side of the struggle between Russia and the free world.

The skills, industrial establishments, resources, military potential, and strategic positions of western Europe are one of the greatest prizes in that struggle. If they remain securely on our side, we shall have to spend only a fraction of what we should have to spend for national defense if they fall into Soviet hands.

American aid to Europe has provided markets for American agricultural and industrial production. Thus, it has provided profits and wages which otherwise would not have been available because of severely limited European dollar purchasing power.

While particular regions and industries have gotten the direct benefits of this spending, the American economy as a whole has enjoyed a higher level of prosperity than otherwise would have been likely.

These are oversimplifications, for the sake of brevity. This summary would not be complete without mention of things not accomplished by the Marshall plan and important to be borne in mind as Congress debates recovery programs and appropriations:

While the recovery program has provided jobs and certain goods, it has not yet resulted in far-reaching social betterment in such critically situated countries as France and Italy. The working classes in both of these countries still have such poor standards of living and such a disaffected mood that they may yet fall a prey to communism if their lot is not greatly improved. The same is true of the land-hungry peasants in Italy.

I saw relatively little evidence that either the governments or the privileged classes of Italy and France are sufficiently aware of the urgent need for social reform or the hazards of prevailing social inequalities.

Communism, in other words, remains a profound threat and there is no reason to believe it will have disappeared when Marshall aid ends in 1952. In some respects

Marshall plan aid appears to have intensified the feeling between the classes.

The special interests—industrialists, businessmen, and agriculturalists whose products go into the general market—still influence production, distribution, and prices for their own special benefit and without thought of the general welfare. That means continuation of restrictions and other barriers to the free flow of goods and persons—barriers the Marshall plan was designed to reduce or eliminate.

Little appreciable progress toward real economic or political integration of western Europe is likely to be made by 1952.

Extremely self-centered nationalism remains the dominant mood of western Europeans. There are wide differences between the countries believing in planned economies and those with relatively free economies. The recovery program tends to bring to light rather than eliminate these differences.

Despite the impressive increase in production, inter-European trade and increases in exports to the dollar area, western Europe as a whole will have a dollar deficit of at least $3,250,000,000 annually after 1952. The United States will have to deal with this deficit either in continued subsidies, long-term investment, or other devices, if it wishes to keep western Europe in business and dispose of certain surpluses in the European market.

Some sounder approach to the problem than keeping western Europe a permanent pensioner of the United States will have to be found if western civilization is to survive and continue to flower.

Covering Up for the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when President Truman said that the charge that there were Communists in the State Department was just a red herring drawn across the trail by Republicans for political purposes, he did not inaugurate any new policy of the New or Fair Dealers.

The activities of the Dies committee, engaged as it was in ferreting out and exposing Communists in executive departments, were opposed most vigorously by a small group in the House and by the administration then in power.

Part of their activities are disclosed in a news story written by Willard Edwards, of the Chicago Tribune, and published in the Washington Times-Herald on February 19. Edwards is a factual writer and the story for the 10th reads as follows:

REDS HAD WHITE HOUSE EVERY PROD 1946, OFFICIAL PAPERS SHOW—REPRESENTATIVE O'CONNOR PUSHED AFTER WARNING F. D. R. ABOUT CONGRESSMAN'S INFORMATION

(By Willard Edwards)

Representative John J. O'Connor, New York Democrat, chairman of the House Rules Committee, hurried to the White House one day in 1936 to impart information of a startling nature to President Roosevelt.

"Mr. President," he said breathlessly, "do you know that one of your own stenographers is a card-carrying member of the Communist Party?"

"The only response I got," said O'Connor, telling the story years later, "was that well-known raising of the chin and blinking of the eyelids. So far as I know the woman is still there."

WEDGE TO O'CONNOR PURGE

The incident started a coolness between the Democratic leader and his chief which resulted 2 years later in a successful purge of O'Connor from the political scene. Mr. Roosevelt personally engaged in the campaign to defeat O'Connor for reelection.

From 1935 on, official records make it clear, Communists and Red sympathizers held White House jobs. In 1941, according to an official report just 2 months before Pearl Harbor, there were nine employees in the executive office of the President who were members of subversive organizations under Communist control. There were no dismissals.

In 1947, the case of Helene Yuhas was made public. She had been employed as a White House clerk from 1939 to 1944, handling the correspondence of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. In May 1944, she went to work for the Soviet Embassy, writing editorials for the Russian propaganda magazine, the Soviet Information Bulletin.

CLAYTON'S SECRETARY

After 7 months in the Soviet embassy, Miss Yuhas decided to return to Government work. The shift was accomplished with ease. The State Department hired her and she became secretary to Under Secretary of State Clayton. Finally, late in 1947, the State Department requested her resignation and, after some protests, she left.

Lauchlin Currie, a White House administrative assistant, was named in 1948 by Elizabeth Bentley, admitted Soviet spy, as an informant for a spy ring. He vehemently denied the charge. Shortly thereafter, this story was unfolded before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Nathan G. Silvermaster, $10,000 a year Government official, had been under FBI investigation, by his own admission, soon after he entered Government employment in 1935.

Born in Russia, Silvermaster entered the United States at San Francisco in 1915 and became a naturalized citizen in 1927. He had been an associate of Harry Bridges and well-known Communists on the west coast. But he had no difficulty in securing a job in the Resettlement Administration under Rexford Guy Tugwell, later shifting to the Farm Security Administration under Agriculture Secretary Henry A. Wallace.

DENOUNCED BY FBI

In 1943, Silvermaster applied for a transfer to the Board of Economic Warfare. The FBI reported that he was a known Communist, a probable agent of the Russian police, and should not be given a post in a war agency where he would have access to confidential information.

Silvermaster immediately sought out Currie, the White House aide. He complained angrily that the Communist charge against him was "an insult and a smear." He also appealed to another friend, C. B. Baldwin, of the Farm Security Administration, who last year refused to tell a Senate committee whether he was a Communist.

As a result of these appeals, War Secretary Patterson was induced to write a letter to the Civil Service Commission which completely exonerated Silvermaster of all charges against him. He was given a key war post in which he served until he resigned in March 1944.

Silvermaster was named as a leader of the Communist cell in Washington which furnished secret documents to Miss Bentley which were photographed in the basement of his home.

BROWDER MET WITH F. D.

The history of Communist influence in the White House is lengthy and detailed. When Earl Browder was head of the Communist Party in the United States in 1944, he held secret meetings there with Mr. Roosevelt, according to the testimony of a former Communist Party official.

Louis Adamic, Yugoslav-born Communist propagandist who has 30 Communist-front connections listed in official records, was a frequent visitor at the White House during the war years. Adamic is given credit for the major shift in American policy in the Balkans which resulted in the desertion of Gen. Mihailovich's Chetniks in Yugoslavia and indorsement of Marshal Tito's Soviet-dominated partisans.

Joseph Lash, protege of Mrs. Roosevelt, former leader of the Communist-controlled American student union, was another who spent many nights under the White House roof. Lash was drafted in 1942 after he had been turned down as unqualified for a Navy commission despite the intercession of Mrs. Roosevelt. In 1944, he was rejected as a candidate for officer candidate school.

STIMSON AIDED LASH

On the day he was turned down, December 29, 1944, President Roosevelt sent a telegram ordering Lash to the candidate school. The wire specifically stated that "objections arising from his (Lash's) civil activities" should not be considered.

Mr. Roosevelt died before Lash was commissioned in May 1945. War Secretary Stimson wrote Mrs. Roosevelt that to deny officer rank to Lash would be an insult to the memory of her sainted husband.

The White House record of opposition to investigation of communism in the Government is unbroken from 1935 to the present date. Senator FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, in August 1948, reviewed the record, suggesting it called for curbing Presidential arrogance by the impeachment process.

Both Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, he noted, had refused to permit Congress to see files bearing on the loyalty of Government employees.

"There has long been an increasing tendency on the part of the executive branch to conduct their affairs in secret," he told the Senate. "It began with the voting of grants of power and great sums of money to the President simply because somebody had to act and act quickly.

"A political-military hierarchy was built up, an entirely new bureaucracy centering in the White House, the State Department, and the military. The Bureau of the Budget, shifted to the White House, became a master planner.

"An ever-increasing number of confidential agents, of whom Harry Hopkins was the chief, made their headquarters in the White House. All their activities were secret. When Mr. Roosevelt died Mr. Truman became the willing prisoner and mouthpiece of this power clique.

"In sum, the President claims the right to don the cloak of absolute executive immunity whenever he desires to do so. If he carries this claim to unconscionable extremes, the Constitution says that Congress can dispose of him by impeachment proceedings."

WHITEWASH OF 1943

Both Presidents initiated "loyalty probes" which accomplished little or nothing. Mr. Roosevelt's five-man interdepartmental committee to pass on complaints of subversive activities by Federal employees was established in 1943. It reported proudly that

there were practically no Communists in the Government. Four years later a Civil Service Commission official admitted there were more than 4,000 Communists on the pay roll in the war years.

In his 1952 veto of the Communist-registration bill Mr. Roosevelt issued what was termed in Congress a virtual invitation to the Soviet Government to spy. Registration of Communists, he wrote, might be "onerous in respect to the representatives of friendly nations who are constantly coming to and from the United States to cooperate with us."

It was in 1942, subsequent events disclosed, that the Soviet Government ordered its spies into the United States to steal the secrets of the atomic-bomb experiments.

Any thought that McCARTHY might get away unsmeared, unvilified, when he made his more recent charges against the Communists, was an idle one. The President was quick to charge that McCARTHY was Stalin's best asset; to charge that two other Republican Senators—WHERRY and BRIDGES—with McCARTHY, were aiding Stalin's cause.

President Truman has evidently learned that the public recognizes his statement as being silly and ridiculous and hence has just called this week for the aid of Senator BRIDGES.

Brought up as a member of a corrupt political machine, the President often gets on slippery ground. His administration needs not only a thoroughgoing house cleaning, but a complete disinfecting job in a tank of sheep dip.

While cleaning out the Communists he would do well to get rid of the homosexuals. Several hundred of them, it is not denied, are in executive departments.

M. D. Anderson Hospital for Cancer Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the month of April is being observed as Cancer Control Month. In Texas we are proud that one of the outstanding cancer-research centers in the Nation is the University of Texas M. D. Anderson Hospital for Cancer Research at Houston, Texas.

This center has grown rapidly in recent years, with both private and public support. The contributions this hospital is making and will continue to make to the fight against cancer will be a tribute to the capacity and determination of the Texas medical educators who have given so much of their time and talent to the advancement of this important institution.

Recently Dr. R. Lee Clark, Jr., director and surgeon in chief of the M. D. Anderson Hospital for Cancer Research, authored a most interesting article on the status of today's cancer treatment. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a University of Texas news service release on Dr. Clark's article.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today's tools, if properly applied, can bring about a momentous improvement in the diagnosis and treatment of cancer.

That is the opinion of Dr. R. Lee Clark, Jr., director and surgeon in chief of the University of Texas M. D. Anderson Hospital for Cancer Research.

Writing in Postgraduate Medicine, a professional publication, Dr. Clark declares the promise for the future development of adequate tools for early diagnosis and treatment is excellent, but even more important is the constant evaluation of methods in common use which have promise of great improvement.

"As intriguing as it is to speculate upon the possibilities to be offered by research and clinical investigation, we have a responsibility to examine the results of present-day therapy and to use available means to greater immediate advantage," Dr. Clark writes.

Summarizing a review of today's status of cancer treatment, he concludes it is apparent that if available means for the diagnosis and treatment of cancer were adequately used a great saving of lives could be effected.

The successful use of these means are, however, dependent upon several interwoven factors, which Dr. Clark outlines as follows:

First, exact knowledge should be disseminated to the public at the community and individual level.

Second, the individual, once awakened by education, should realize the need for immediate action, and go to a physician if he has a persistent aberration from normal in his body economy.

Third, every physician's office is an actual and potential cancer detection center, where a high degree of suspicion must be maintained, and where all lumps, bleeding orifices, or other persistent abnormalities must be examined, and explained.

Fourth, the primary treatment given must be adequate and radical, if necessary, but never a compromise

Fifth, the availability of the cancer team to the patient must become general. In no field is group opinion any more necessary. This is so well recognized now, that individual physicians should be able to obtain it through general tumor-clinic sessions. The combined opinions of the pathologist, internist, roentgenologist, and surgeon will assure the patient of a far better over-all primary therapy.

Sixth, all tissue removed should be examined by the pathologist.

And seventh, and most important, we should hold the progress that has been made and the progress that is to be made by assuming personal responsibility, together with every physician, for being alert to, and conscious of, what to seek as signs of early cancer among our patients.

Electoral Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, a vast majority of the serious students of government and of the political scientists of this country are strongly in favor of the Lodge-Gossett amendment.

Dr. Hugh A. Bone, professor of political science at the University of Washington, wrote an excellent letter to the New York Herald Tribune on March 14 in which he discusses the relative merits of the so-called Coudert amendment with the so-called Lodge-Gossett amendment. Professor Bone's letter is offered herewith for the consideration of those interested in this subject:

MARCH 14, 1950.

EDITOR, NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Readers are indebted to the Herald Tribune for carrying the articles by Walter Lippmann on the proposed Lodge-Gossett amendment to the Constitution to provide a fairer method of electing a president. Lippmann sees the district plan as proposed by Representative COUDERT as superior to the Lodge proposal. A strong case can be made for the Coudert substitute but there is one problem which needs serious consideration in connection with it—how and by whom will the districts be drawn?

The simplest solution is to use existing congressional districts as drawn by the State legislatures. Partisan and other reasons led the legislatures during the nineteenth century to employ the technique of gerrymandering, that is, the practice of the party in control of the legislature to concentrate opposing party strength into a few districts (sometimes all in one) and to spread their own strength over many districts. The ruling party, therefore, was assured a lion's share of the seats in Congress and also in the State legislature. Legislatures dominated by rural interests found this helpful in keeping the urban areas from getting a fair share of the seats in legislative bodies. Congress became concerned enough with this practice that it passed numerous laws requiring the State legislatures to draw congressional-district boundary lines so that representatives would be elected from contiguous and compact territory. None of these equalization statutes made any provision for enforcement by Congress. A 1929 Federal law, moreover, left the matter open and the practical effect is to leave the legislatures free to district according to custom and usage. Many of the old-time shoestring- and horseshoe-shaped districts have disappeared but gerrymandering in one degree or another has persisted.

Many districts today are compact and contiguous but show adroit gerrymandering by the concentration or dispersion of bloc voters (ethnic and class) or by extreme inequities in size. The First Congressional District of the State of Washington, according to the last census, has a population of 413,000 while the Fourth District has 245,000, a discrepancy of 168,000. This is mild compared to Ohio where the difference between the largest and smallest district is 535,000. Although the differences are not so sharp, New York and New Jersey districts show substantial variation. A study made about a decade ago (Schmeckebier, Congressional Apportionment) found substantially defective districting in 26 States.

Though the total vote for Democratic Representatives slightly exceeded that for the Republican nominees in Washington in 1948, the Republicans captured four out of six seats. In Illinois the total Democratic congressional vote exceeded that of the Republicans by over 175,000 yet the Democrats captured 12 out of 26 seats. This suggests that if congressional districts are to be used as a basis for presidential electoral contests, a perverted electoral result is possible. In smaller States the two electors chosen from the State at

large would help to balance up such inequalities but in the larger States this is more doubtful. Until we can evolve a plan for presenting unfair districting in the States, the Lodge proposal promises to reflect the wishes of the voters of a given State more accurately. Proponents of the Coudert substitute can strengthen their case by offering suggestions for the troublesome problem of districting.

Some of the proposals for correcting the inequities are (1) districting by the State executive with the assistance of an expert nonpartisan commission; (2) denial of seats in Congress to those States failing to conform to a minimum standard laid down by Congress; (3) districting by Congress where a satisfactory State law is not provided. Each of these has defects and would have serious opposition. In the final analysis any plan to minimize gerrymandering will be effective only if it will be backed up by an aggressive and alert public opinion that will force the State legislatures and Congress to take proper action.

Finally, Republicans may wish to consider whether the Coudert system will be of any help in adding to their electoral-vote strength in the South. In 1948 for example, the Lodge plan would have given Governor Dewey four and a fraction votes while under the district system the Governor would have had virtually no chance of even picking up one electoral vote. In this instance at least, it is debatable whether Mr. Lippmann is correct in saying the Coudert plan "would cure all the evils of the present system quite as well as the Lodge-Gossett amendment."

Sincerely,

HUGH A. BONE,
Professor of Political Science,
University of Washington.

(Writer was formerly professor at Queens College, Flushing.)

China as Viewed Through the Eyes of Republican National Committeeman Guy G. Gabrielson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Christian Science Monitor of April 17 last, I read an article written by Mr. Joseph C. Harsch, chief of the Washington news bureau of the Christian Science Monitor dealing with the state of the Nation through political eyes and one part of same dealing with the question as to whether China was lost or not, as so many people now claim, impressed me very much.

The part of the article in question is as follows:

A simple truth to be borne in mind today, and in months to come, is that it is seldom in the interest of any politician to present the state of our affairs in their true shape.

An example of this distortion on one side of the political fence is Mr. Gabrielson's declaration that the Truman administration has, among other things, lost the cold war in China.

The word "lost" is a very final one. Mr. Gabrielson takes the gloomiest possible view of the situation in China when he says that it has been lost. Perhaps China has been lost to the West irretrievably, and for all time. But to say that China has been lost at this stage is to assume the worst and ignore history. Some Americans thought China was lost to Communists back in 1926 when Chiang Kai-shek accepted Russian advisers and entrusted to Communists the planning of his victorious march northward. We were nearly as afraid of the same Chiang Kai-shek then, and for the same reason, as we are of his opponents of today.

But in 1927 Chiang suddenly turned our way, and it was the Russians and the Communists who lost that battle for China. Now they have won the latest round in China. And we will strive to reverse this decision, just as the Russians strove to reverse the decision of 23 years ago. We have no more certainly lost the cold war in China, yet, than we lost the real war in the Pacific with the fall of Corregidor, Singapore, and the Dutch East Indies. We have lost a battle, but we hardly assume yet that we have lost the campaign.

The Smear Artists Confounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Senator MCCARTHY's charges that the administration was harboring Communists were scarcely given publicity before the small group of smear artists, administration bootlickers and self-styled intellectuals brought out their stinkpots and proceeded to attempt to do a job on the Senator.

When Senator MCCARTHY named Judge Dorothy Kenyon as one who has associated with Communist organizations, that group not only belittled but intimated that his statements were downright falsehoods, and that the Senator knew them to be false when he made them.

Judge Dorothy Kenyon rushed to Washington, appeared before a Senate committee and branded the charges as completely without foundation and said that Senator MCCARTHY was a liar.

Not long after, in her conceit, Dorothy appeared before three reporters on a radio broadcast.

George Sokolsky gives a brief account of what happened there. It reads as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

A meeting of the Ancient Order of Red-Baiters gathered in the home of Dr. J. B. Matthews for three purposes: 1. To eat his wonderful curry which he learned to cook in Java, while he was translating hymns into Malaya. 2. To celebrate the publication of Seeds of Treason by De Toledano and Lasky. 3. To listen, on the radio, to Meet the Press.

When it came time to listen to Meet the Press, we foregathered about the radio, with daggers up our sleeves, to await Miss Dorothy Kenyon, who reminds one of Eleanor Roosevelt before her voice was cured of its falsetto.

The first voice, after the interlocutor, to come over was that of an honored member of the Ancient Order of Red-Baiters, Frank Waldrop of the Washington Times-Herald. And his first question was sharply pointed. He asked:

"Judge Kenyon, do you know one Alger Hiss?"

That did it. They all got into the situation and literally tore her apart, for the lady admitted that she only knew what appeared in the New York Times. Her exact words were, "I'm as well informed as any other reader of the New York Times * * *." So Waldrop said, "Can you tell us about Hiss?"

Mae Craig, of the Portland Press-Herald tried to get a word in to ask how many front organizations Miss Kenyon belonged to. Senator MCCARTHY had said 28; Miss Kenyon said 4 or 5. So at the soiree of the Red-Baiters we tried to figure it out. We got to a figure of 31. Maybe that was high, but we had been eating Dr. Matthew's curry.

While all this was going on, Mae Craig started this colloquy:

Craig, "Well, when you found that your name was being used without your permission, or after you had withdrawn, did you take any legal means to stop it? You're a lawyer, so I presume——"

Kenyon, "Oh, yes, yes."

Craig, "What did you do legally to stop it?"

Kenyon, "Well, when I decided that I no longer wanted to be associated with those organizations, no longer wanted to be a sponsor, I told them so. I told them that I was withdrawing."

Craig, "But that didn't quite answer the question. Did you do or take legal means to prevent it?"

One of the newspapermen on this quiz show is Larry Spivak, who can be a bad egg when he wants to. At any rate, on this particular occasion he asked some of the very worst questions which could be asked of a lady lawyer. I thought Larry was very unkind, because he stripped the lady of the last vestige of an excuse. Look at this question by Larry Spivak:

"Miss Kenyon, in your testimony before the Senate you said, and I quote, 'I challenge and defy anyone to prove that I ever joined or sponsored or continued to identify myself with any organization or individuals I knew or had reason to believe were subversive.'

"Now, the out word there was 'I knew.' That's out, but shouldn't you have known? Is it enough for someone like you simply to say 'I didn't know the gun was loaded?' "

The lady could not answer. She swirled and fished and wove, but she could not answer. She got all excited and wanted to slap Frank Waldrop. But Mae Craig brought her up to October 1949; that is, long after the cold war started.

Then Miss Kenyon faced Spivak again, which should not happen to an "artful dodger." Read this:

Spivak: "Well, now, you said that you knew about them, that you didn't join them carelessly, that you knew all about them when you joined."

Kenyon: "That's right. That's right. The ones that I did join, and I'm telling you that there were only four or five of those, and that those were all in the early 1930's."

Spivak: "Well, now, you said that you knew about them, that you didn't join them carelessly, that you knew all about them when you joined."

Kenyon: "Well, I wish, I wish you could tell me. I'd like to know, Mr. Spivak, I'd be very happy to know."

Spivak: "Well, mine didn't get on any list; why did yours?"

It is just possible that Judge Dorothy Kenyon has overlooked the Hiss, the Christoffel, and the Harry Bridges cases.

The latter two were convicted of perjury when they denied association with Communists. Hiss was convicted of perjury because of false testimony given a congressional committee.

It is just possible that Judge Kenyon does not appreciate the significance of her membership in or the use of her name by organizations classed as Communist-dominated; that she does not understand the significance of MCCARTHY's charges.

The columnists and radio commentators who have been branding MCCARTHY as a falsifier have often been careless with the facts and their interpretation of the facts.

Just why, when a Red is caught, or an administration employee is charged with being a Communist or sympathetic toward Communists, this little group of commentators and columnists should feel called upon to rush to their defense, has never been explained.

Certain it is, however, that their influence is rapidly growing less. They are becoming known as professional mudslingers.

A Salute to the Glory That Is Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article entitled "A Salute to the Glory That Is Greece," written by Harry H. Schlacht, and published in the March 24, 1950 issue of the New York Journal American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SALUTE TO THE GLORY THAT IS GREECE

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Hail, O, hail, O glorious Greece, on the one-hundredth and twenty-ninth anniversary of your Independence Day.

We cheer your unconquerable soul. We salute the glory that is Greece.

Your past is unrivaled in intellectual richness. Your past is filled with the meaning of justice and beauty. Your past is studded with every form of human achievement. Your past is kindled with the eternal love of human liberty.

No tyrant has ever been able to crush you. No tyrant ever will.

You have ever held aloft the torch of liberty and freedom to light the pathway of civilization.

Your love of freedom, and your love of music and the arts; your love of the finest impulses of the human heart and mind, flourished and blossomed with such rich fertility during the age of Pericles that they have never been exceeded in history.

Like that of your Olympian god, your polished brow was ranked above the contending forces that surged below. Like Aristotle, Socrates, and Plato of old, you have kept your eyes focused on the stars.

You have demonstrated in the most terrible of wars that you possess the flame which made your ancestors transcendent examples of what the human spirit can achieve.

You have never surrendered your convictions or ideals. You have emerged triumphant through every test of fire and sword. You have manifested in blood and suffering the invincible spirit of your martyred heroes who fought and died for liberty.

You have preferred to die on your feet rather than live on your knees. You were our ally in war, you are our ally in peace.

Spring has come again to the golden land of Hellas. We can feel the warm breezes playing gently over her pastoral Arcadia. We can see the red poppies of Attica bloom beneath the gray green olive trees. We can see the branches, heavy with buds, in the Thessalonian orchards. We can see the Greek dances and hear the Greek music.

Today mother Greece is mourning for her 28,000 children held behind the iron curtain by their Communist abductors.

In the name of Him who is full of compassion for little children, let us lift our voices against this blackest crime against humanity.

Let us denounce this mass outrage at the bar of civilization. Let us demand the return of these helpless children to their grieving parents.

This is a challenge to American leadership. This is a challenge to American fortitude.

This is a spiritual challenge.

America will, America must respond to the cry of mother Greece.

From the lamps of Acropolis, from the tragedies of Euripides, from the songs of Menander, from the poems of Palamis, from the thought of Aristotle, from the science of Archimedes, the light of liberty will never be extinguished.

Hail to the land of Hellas—one nation, one language, one history, one greatness.

Long live liberty. Long live Greece.

Life Insurance Is Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered before the Union Labor Life Insurance group:

LIFE INSURANCE IS INTERSTATE COMMERCE

I am indeed pleased to have this opportunity to give some of my views on the vital subject of insurance to a group like the union-labor life insurance group. A group such as yours understands more clearly than the lay public the dramatic impact that the business of life insurance has upon the economy of the Nation.

For many, many years a legal myth existed that insurance was intrastate business, and hence not subject to Federal regulation. It was not until 1944 in the United States against Southeastern Underwriters case that the Supreme Court held decisively that insurance is interstate commerce. Thus was exploded a myth that had no, and never did have any, basis in fact. In all the business operations of life-insurance companies, there is such a crossing and recrossing of State lines that to think of insurance as merely operating in a localized area of activity is absurd on the face of it.

Life-insurance investment carries it into almost every phase of our economy, and it is this significant investment problem that must be the concern of an aware and informed public. It is a group such as yours that constitute the nub of such a public.

The admitted assets, according to Dunne's International Insurance Reports, as of December 31, 1947, of the Big Five insurance companies, were: Metropolitan, $8,548,422,601; Prudential, $7,321,488,722; Equitable Life Insurance, $4,504,971,753; New York Life, $4,234,184,598; and Mutual Life of New York, $1,942,722,247. Since 1947, the figures have gone considerably higher.

Total assets of all insurance companies are somewhere in the neighborhood of $59,000,000,000, and these assets are increasing daily. When we view the staggering fact that between the end of 1939 and the end of 1949, assets of life-insurance firms jumped from $29,243,000,000 to $59,280,000,000, we have before us a rate of increase that must ultimately bring to the life-insurance companies a control over the economy of the Nation greater than any other segment in private enterprise.

The life-insurance companies have more than twice the volume of the mortgages they held 10 years ago; they hold three times the amount of Government security they did 10 years ago. They have nearly trebled their holdings in bonds and stocks.

As a consequence the insurance companies are involved in numerous types of business. They construct housing projects; they build commercial and industrial structures and rent them for short or long periods. They are in the banking business and make loans to all manner and kinds of business. There is neither floor nor ceiling to their financial activities, save that they may only invest in capital stock to a limited degree.

Now we learn that the insurance companies will purchase freight cars and lease them to the railroads. The Atlantic Coast Line Railroad has rented 1,300 freight cars to cost about $7,500,000 especially built for the Equitable Life Insurance Co. by the Pullman Standard Car Manufacturing Co. We learn also that the New York Central Railroad will similarly rent 1,500 boxcars from the Equitable Life Insurance Co.

Most significantly, the Subcommittee on the Study of Monopoly Power, which is a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of which I am chairman, has made some preliminary investigations on the disposition of the vast assets in the hands of the life insurance companies. We found that the larger of these life insurance companies are practically laws unto themselves. Their combined power is incalculable. It is not too difficult to foresee, for example, another of the insurance companies buying and renting locomotives or Diesel engines, and another passenger cars, and still another parlor cars, and a fifth one proposing to electrify railroads. These railroads need help, and the insurance companies are a source of much needed money's supply. However, where can this sort of practice end—in the complete control of railroads by insurance companies? This is by no means an improbable conclusion. I predict that this kind of practice will spread like wildfire. I see a long queue of railroads at the offices of the big five life insurance companies—insurance companies which are faced with a necessity of investing their billions of dollars of assets which keep increasing. Why not? Officials of railroads would be foolish, indeed, not to take advantage of these offers by insurance companies. They

can deduct the rents of the cars from their income taxes and get much needed good equipment for bed.

Now the point I wish to make is that I am not condemning this practice as such. That it holds implications of danger is apparent. The railroad financial situation is not of the moment, and we must, therefore, question how secure are these investments for the company, the policyholder, and the public, but I do believe there is a more fundamental issue involved and that is the lack of proper supervision over life insurance companies' business operations.

In the last 2 years, according to some evidence submitted to me, private loans placed by life insurance companies have practically doubled. It has been estimated that between the years 1945 to 1947, these private loans have risen from five and one-half billion dollars to ten and one-half billions. I understand that these figures have been challenged, others placing it at six billion and some placing it at ten billion. Whatever the figure, the bold fact is that these loans are being made without supervision by entities like the SEC, the Federal Reserve Board or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, entities which supervise loans made by banks, underwriters and investment outfits. Certainly, there should be some protective guidance to safeguard the interests of the stockholders, the policyholders and the public with reference to life insurance. These loans are usually negotiated between the insurance companies and the borrower without benefit of any intermediary, with no registration with State or Federal entities. These loans are of an investment character requiring far closer supervision and inspection than can possibly be given by any local State superintendent of insurance.

I am personally convinced that Federal regulation is necessary. There is presently no State supervision of life insurance companies (although there is a pretense of one), and even when there is, as for example in New York, the supervisor is made a year later when the insurance companies make their reports. Then that which is already done becomes an almost impossible and involved job to undo. Frankly, in most of the States, the regulated have already become the regulators, with few exceptions, so that there is no public reckoning.

I re-emphasize that Federal regulation is imperative. It is not, of course, my thought to superimpose Federal regulations upon State regulations which would result in 49 regulatory bodies. But it is my belief that the solution lies in Federal regulation which would govern in any conflict between State and Federal law.

In the preliminary discussions before the Monopoly Subcommittee, two very vital facts were presented: (1) that insurance with smaller companies is just as safe as with larger companies, and (2) that the premiums paid for insurance are no higher with a smaller company.

These two facts contain within themselves most interesting implications, particularly with reference to the size of insurance companies—size that carries with it a power almost as great as Government itself. I think that there is a need to explore these facts further and to relate them to both the question of size and Federal regulation of life insurance companies.

I know that you are alive to these problems, and I present them because I believe that a healthy, vigorous, and critical examination by groups such as yours will in the end produce the best answers in the interest of the people and the country.

A Century of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an excerpt from the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item. This excellent article is the work of Mr. Orra L. Stone, editor of the Item, an authority on the history of Clinton:

A CENTURY OF PROGRESS

When Erastus Brigham Bigelow touched off the spark that fixed Clinton in the industrial firmament as the mid-nineteenth-century center of the manufacture of carpets, ginghams, and wire cloth and probably influenced, more than any other American, the development of the textile art, neither he nor his associates envisaged that within a century the plants that rose Phoenixlike to provide thousands with their living would, with one exception, wither or be removed from Factory Village in a little over three-quarters of a century.

But such is history and in place of three local enterprises that grew out of his inventions only one remains today. The original companies have been succeeded by approximately 35 smaller industrial establishments employing more than 3,200 workers to whom are being paid, in wages, approximately $6,000,000 annually, in the year that Clinton observes its centennial year.

One hundred years old today the great and General Court of Massachusetts passed the act that gave birth to the town and during that period its sons and daughters have passed through many trying years, none more seemingly disastrous than the early thirties of the present century when the Lancaster Mills liquidated and the Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co. closed its local plant and removed its machinery to Thompsonville, Conn., and Amsterdam, N. Y.

These events from the economic point of view seemed to herald the end of Clinton as a manufacturing town and to spell bankruptcy to its merchants as the former weekly pay rolls of $130,000 melted into approximately $15,000 every six working days.

Every resident faced a crisis such as has befallen few Bay State towns and cities, but the courage, initiative, and business acumen of a group of 33 leading citizens were drawn upon in forming the Clinton Industries Corp. and a campaign was immediately launched which resulted in the acquisition of the idle plants and, aided by the chamber of commerce, concerns were lured from their former locations, vacant plants were filled with machinery, and the town again resumed its industrial march with diversified products shipped to all world areas.

It was the second time that Clinton's growth and prosperity had been adversely affected as, in 1895, the expansion of homes and manufacturing plants to the south part of the town was halted when the Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Board seized 17 percent of the territory of this municipality, at that time the smallest town in Worcester County, in area, save Hopedale.

But, on the 5.2 square miles that constitute the geographical limits of Clinton, approximately 13,000 souls today confidently look forward to the continued influence of the town in the halls of statesmanship, education, industry, and all walks of life.

From time immemorial the go-getters have been the people who have run the world. Their souls have been awake and after all it is the soul that counts, not the body, not brawn and bone and blood and muscle, avoirdupois, and athletics.

A sleeve may carry a stump and a leg may go with a limp, but the soul that is regnant and determined will arise and overcome all difficulties as has been amply demonstrated by Clintonians since the natal day of its existence.

Nothing can block the way for the dauntless spirit that says: "It shall be done."

Like all towns Clinton has had those who never found themselves, those who have never gotten into action, others who were creatures of circumstance and easily diverted to the line of least resistance.

Some have been spineless and visionless, quickly subsiding without an ounce of steam in the throttle, a pound of coal in the bunker or a spark of fire in the furnace and have wondered why they failed.

But the human personalities that have made Clinton what it is today were dynamos of power, Niagaras running to waste and reservoirs of energy merely waiting to be tapped. Men have failed not because they lacked education, or equipment, or opportunity, but because they lacked pep and failed to demonstrate driving power.

The switch was never thrown, the will never asserted itself. That type failed to become a go-getter but fortunately the army of men and women who devoted themselves to the upbuilding of Clinton has been and today is awake and numerous and cannot be halted.

It is a far cry from the few dusty and ofttimes muddy highways that served Clinton in 1850, to the 35 miles of paved streets that Clintonians traverse daily while the primitive cesspools of that year have given way to 34 miles of sewers.

No longer must residents go to the expense of locating and digging wells as was the case in 1850, for today they are served by 45 miles of water mains on every street in town, providing them, by the simple turn of a tap, with a daily capacity of 925,000 gallons of the purest water enjoyed by any Bay State municipality with the right to pump 500,000,000 gallons a year from Wachusett Reservoir in times of emergency and with the Wekepeke reservoirs holding 235,000,000 gallons of water which flow, by gravity, to Clinton, without the aid of pumps and with the value of the waterworks system set at $1,000,000.

In 1850, residents enjoyed illumination from kerosene lights or candles while today electricity flows through 4,200 meters installed in all dwellings and public and private buildings.

One hundred years ago the busy Clinton housewife prepared the meals for her family on a range fed with wood while today at least 2,200 dwellings are equipped with gas meters supplying fuel, through modern ranges, that require only a thumb to turn the flow off and on and many more homes are equipped with electric ranges.

In 1850, if a Clinton resident wanted to talk with a relative or neighbor it was necessary to journey to where they lived but, today, by simply uncradling a receiver from a mechanical instrument in 4,039 homes or places of business he can almost instantaneously make his voice heard in any town or city between the Atlantic and the Pacific or in the far corners of the globe.

No longer is it necessary to hide one's money in a stocking at home or journey to the mother town to place it on interest as was the case when Clinton was incorporated, but he finds safe depositories in either the Clinton Trust Co., the Clinton Savings

Bank, or the John Prescott Cooperative Bank, the three financial institutions possessing total assets exceeding $16,330,000.

Four years before Clinton was incorporated the first newspaper, the Lancaster Courant, was established, later to become the Clinton Courant and 7 years before the town celebrated its semicentennial the late William J. Coulter launched the Clinton Daily Item.

When Clinton came into being residents were dependent for home reading on such volumes as they purchased or obtained at the limited library established by the Bigelow Mechanics Institute, in Clintonville, just prior to the incorporation of the town, but today they are served by the Bigelow Free Public Library, housed in a building erected largely by the philanthropy of the late Andrew Carnegie and now containing on its shelves more than 53,000 volumes in its circulating department and approximately 44,000 in the children's department.

The religious life of Clintonians is cared for by 15 churches, including three Roman Catholic parishes, and edifices housing the Baptist, Congregational, Episcopal, Methodist, Free Methodist, Greek Orthodox, Jewish, Lutheran, United Presbyterian, Unitarian, and Christian Science denominations.

Through the generosity of the late Frank T. Holder and his wife, Clinton, although the youngest of Lancaster's daughters, boasts a historical building that is second to none in the Commonwealth and serves as a center for many civic activities.

The boys of 1850 showed their athletic prowess on vacant sandlots, but the youth of 1950 is served by three playgrounds; Fuller Field, with a seating capacity of 3,000, and four public parks with the old common providing a beautiful centerpiece for the many public and private buildings surrounding its four sides.

In 1850 the residents of the little town enjoyed only a few stores with meager stocks, but 100 years later more than 125 wholesale and retail establishments, including some of the leading national chains, are visited daily by thousands of customers in their ultramodern interiors where are dispensed every article catering to human needs at prices on a par with the big department marts in the larger cities.

Notable indeed are the recently enlarged enterprises of the F. W. Woolworth Co., and the J. J. Newberry Co.

The retail enterprises cater to a consuming population of more than 25,000 persons within a shopping radius of 8 or 10 miles.

While the horse and buggy served the denizens of Clinton, in 1850, today more than 3,000 locally owned automobiles and trucks traverse Clinton streets daily speeding their owners and passengers to the shopping center and to towns and cities where many Clintonians are employed.

Of the 2,088 dwellings in Clinton, more than 505 are one-apartment houses and are owned and occupied by the owners. During the period of the last depression from 1929 to 1940, the longest in the history of the Nation, few new houses were erected but in 1949, approximately 50 were constructed at an estimated cost of $256,000, to partially relieve the acute housing conditions, and in this centennial year the town's first State-sponsored housing development will be completed and dedicated at a cost of $300,000.

In 1850, all new arrivals were ushered into the world at the homes of their parents but today, 99 percent of all infants born to local and vicinity families see the first light of day at the Clinton Hospital now a little more than a half a century old and the centennial year will witness the dedication of a $1,000,000 fireproof brick structure bearing the name of its founder, the late Dr. Walter P. Bowers, which with its maternity ward, will accommodate 117 beds.

Out of Clinton have gone, especially in the last half century, sons who were products of Clinton High School to take their places in the halls of statecraft. A decade ago Clinton boasted, in a single year, a State representative, a State senator, a United States Congressman, and a United States Senator, and previously a Lieutenant Governor and a Governor as well as candidates for Attorney General and Lieutenant Governor. The town has furnished two United States Congressmen within the past 10 years.

Clinton High School probably has graduated more young men who went on to win national and world fame in many fields than any other institution of its type in a town the size of Clinton in this or any other State.

Included in the long list are such notables as former lieutenant governor, governor, and United States Senator, Hon. David I. Walsh, the late Congressman Edward Kenny, of New Jersey, Congressman Philip J. Philbin, former Congressman Joseph E. Casey, Matthew J. Connelly, Secretary to President Harry S. Truman for the past 8 years, associate justice of the Superior Court John W. Corcoran, who also was honored by Democratic Party nominations, successively, as attorney general and lieutenant governor and only a few years ago it looked to many people as if Clinton might be the home of both Massachusetts United States Senators when the late Senator Walsh was serving, as the senior representative of the Commonwealth in the upper branch of Congress and Congressman Casey was nominated, by his party, for the junior senatorship.

Hon. John A. Roche served as the reform mayor of the great city of Chicago from 1887 to 1889, while the late Rev. Dr. Charles H. Parkhurst, born in the house now owned by Dr. Edward H. Mackay, led the greatest moral, social, and political upheaval that has occurred in the United States in the past century when he attacked Tammany Hall, in the Nation's metropolis and was given the support of the newspapers and of all civic groups of the largest city of the country.

Adwin Lassiter Bynner, author of the novel Agnes Surriage, won laurels in the field of literature and Arthur F. Bowers, brother of the late Dr. Walter P. Bowers exerted great influences in the fourth estate, in New York City where he served as editor of the New York Tribune.

David M. Cheney, of 130 Prescott Street, has authored several historical novels in recent years that have enjoyed large sales and is at work on an epic contribution to American literature at the present time, while pertinent contributions to the life of the era frequently appear in the Saturday Evening Post, from the pen of Richard F. Attridge, of 37 Hammond Street. The writer of this editorial is the author of a 4-volume history of Massachusetts industries which appeared in 1930.

Cause and Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the membership of the Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to a very timely editorial written by the Honorable James E. Lawrence, editor of the Lincoln Star, published at Lincoln, Nebr., which editorial appeared in the issue of Tuesday, April 11, 1950.

All Democrats and Republicans whose political faiths have not been fashioned in the loom of un-Americanism by the interweaving of the warp of extreme left wingism and the woof of the extreme right wingism will, I am sure, appreciate reading this editorial.

Mr. Lawrence has for many years been one of the outstanding, faithful Democrats of Nebraska, and has always pursued his journalistic labors in an effort to be helpful to people of Nebraska and the Nation. He has been a firm believer in, and advocate of, the great Jeffersonian principle reiterated by Abraham Lincoln that the citizens of our Republic are entitled to have "a Government of the people, by the people and for the people" instead of a Government, State and national, of selfish big business, by selfish big business and for selfish big business.

In passing, I might also observe that the Lincoln Daily Star is the leading Democratic newspaper in Nebraska, and but for the efforts of this newspaper and its sister Republican newspaper, the Lincoln Daily Journal, all political faith in Nebraska would have been less potent today than it is now. True, there are a number of other great Democratic and Republican newspapers in Nebraska which have less circulation than these two fine newspapers and they, too, are entitled to their full measure of praise for the great good they have accomplished. Concerning all of these fine publications it might well be stated "Glorious it is to wear the crown of a pure and well-deserved success."

Of course, it should be the desire of everyone to reduce taxes if possible, but when doing so we should remember that we are not living in an era of peacetime economy where we can freely cut expenditures to the bone and pay off the national debt. On the contrary, we are living perhaps in the most disturbed era which our country has ever known.

We are endeavoring to successfully fight the cold war through ECA appropriations and in other ways, and many people think the time is not far distant when we shall be engaged in world war III, and if that be a fact, then our watchword should not be "economy," but on the contrary should be "preparedness." We should not be induced to follow the reactionary pattern which was in vogue before Pearl Harbor and which almost brought about our defeat—but we should profit by the experiences of the past and do everything possible to protect our Nation and save its people and its Government which is not only our hope but the last ray of hope to the peoples of the world who desire freedom and lasting peace.

I now will set forth the editorial which I have mentioned herein with a few slight changes by way of deleting from the text the name of the person mentioned therein:

CAUSE AND CURE

One of the Nebraska Representatives "in Congress is quite certain that he has located

the cause of a Nebraska ailment. Unfortunately in setting forth his views, nothing that he says even slightly resembles a cure for the disease he has discovered."

He "told a staff member of the Washington bureau of the Omaha World-Herald that a small-town banker in southeastern Nebraska had written him that his institution had made out 304 income-tax returns for taxpayers who also filed returns in 1945 and the tax paid for 1949 was approximately 50 percent of what they paid in 1948. Then he added:

"The root of the trouble is an economically unsound tax system that destroys savings and discourages new business. Continuation of the present heavy wartime tax load certainly is one of the basic problems in the national as well as the farm-income drop for excessive taxation is not conducive to expanded enterprise either in the city or on the farm."

There is a germ of truth in what he says. Certainly excessive taxation destroys savings. Whether it robs individuals of incentive is open to argument. There is no evidence to support it in Nebraska. The farmers of this State continue to plow and plant, to cultivate and to harvest. In this towns and the cities, business and industry look forward to new physical plants, to increased production, to greater efficiency, and to more successful operation.

We have yet to talk to a single individual, who actually has decided to seek an easy chair, or to sit with folded hands, lazily gazing at the skies. The tax burden is heavy. The amount of each dollar of earnings that goes to the support of Government at all levels, takes a surprisingly large chunk of every dollar of the individual's earnings. But in spite of it we see no loss of creative thinking by Americans. They work, plan, and actually, they complain surprisingly little. They dream of homes, of comforts and necessities, and they do continue to practice thrift.

We're inclined to think most of them are realists enough to recognize that if there is to be national security, it will prove costly; that if America is to fulfill foreign commitments, that will take huge chunks of money; that if the single item of interest on the national debt is to be met, it alone will call for an annual tax burden equal to an approximate 40 percent of the total Federal budget in the early thirties.

It does not take a smart man to recognize that the present tax load is punishing. It does call for a miracle man to figure out how America can cut its present expenditures substantially—cut them enough to make the economies reflect themselves in the individual's tax burden.

He has been a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, where tax legislation originates in Congress. There's where he should try his cure if he can convince his associates that he has one.

Address by President Truman Before the American Society of Newspaper Editors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by President Truman today before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. It is an honor and privilege to insert an address which refers to my resolution, Senate Resolution 243, now before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and which brings to its objectives such eloquent and powerful support.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, I am happy to be here today with this group of editors. You and I have a great many important problems in common, and one of the most important of these is the responsibility we share in helping to make the foreign policy of the United States of America. That is why I am going to take this opportunity to discuss with you some aspects of that policy.

No group of men in this country is of greater importance to our foreign policy than the group your society represents.

In a democracy, foreign policy is based on the decisions of the people.

One vital function of a free press is to present the facts on which the citizens of a democracy can base their decisions. You are a link between the American people and world affairs. If you inform the people well and completely, their decisions will be good. If you misinform them, their decisions will be bad; our country will suffer and the world will suffer.

You cannot make up people's minds for them. What you can do is to give them the facts they need to make up their own minds. This is a tremendous responsibility.

Most of you are meeting that responsibility well—but I am sorry to say a few are meeting it badly. Foreign policy is not a matter for partisan presentation. The facts about Europe or Asia should not be twisted to conform to one side or the other of a political dispute. Twisting the facts might change the course of an election at home, but it would certainly damage our country's program abroad.

In many other countries today, the papers print about foreign affairs only what their governments tell them to print. They can't add anything, or cut anything. In the democracies, the papers have a free hand. Only in a democracy is there such mutual trust and confidence among citizens that a private group is given such an all-important role in determining what the Nation as a whole shall do. There is too much nonsense about striped trousers in foreign affairs. Far more influence is exerted by the baggy pants of the managing editor.

There has never been a time in our history when there was so great a need for our citizens to be informed and to understand what is happening in the world.

The cause of freedom is being challenged throughout the world today by the forces of imperialistic communism. This is a struggle, above all else, for the minds of men. Propaganda is one of the most powerful weapons the Communists have in this struggle. Deceit, distortion, and lies are systematically used by them as a matter of deliberate policy.

This propaganda can be overcome by truth—plain, simple, unvarnished truth—presented by newspapers, radio, and other sources that the people trust. If the people are not told the truth, or if they do not have confidence in the accuracy and fairness of the press, they have no defense against falsehoods. But if they are given the true facts, these falsehoods become laughable instead of dangerous.

We can have confidence that the free press of the United States and most of the other free nations will keep us from being deceived by Communist propaganda. But in other parts of the world the struggle between falsehood and truth is far more intense and dangerous.

Communist propaganda is so false, so crude, so blatant, that we wonder how men can be swayed by it. We forget that most of the people to whom it is directed do not have free access to accurate information. We forget that they do not hear our broadcasts or read impartial newspapers. We forget that they do not have a chance to learn the truth by traveling abroad or by talking freely to travelers in their own countries.

All too often the people who are subject to Communist propaganda do not know Americans, or citizens of the other free nations, as we really are. They do not know us as farmers or as workers. They do not know us as people having hopes and problems like their own. Our way of life is something strange to them. They do not even know what we mean when we say "democracy."

This presents one of the greatest tasks facing the free nations today. That task is nothing less than to meet false propaganda with truth all around the globe. Everywhere that the propaganda of Communist totalitarianism is spread, we must meet it and overcome it with honest information about freedom and democracy.

In recent years, there has been tremendous progress all over the world in education and the exchange of ideas. This progress has stirred men everywhere to new desires and new ambitions. They want greater knowledge, they want better lives, they want to be masters of their own affairs. We have helped and encouraged these people, but the Communists have seized upon their desires and ambitions and are seeking to exploit them for their own selfish purposes.

In the Far East, for example, millions are restlessly seeking to break away from the conditions of poverty and misery that have surrounded them in the past. The Communists understand this situation very well. They are trying to move in and take advantage of these aspirations. They are making glittering promises about the benefits of communism. They reach directly to the peasant or the villager in these vast areas, and talk to him directly in his own tongue about the things he has learned to desire. They say that they can get these things for him. And too often he hears no voice from our side to dispute them.

We know how false these Communist promises are. But it is not enough for us to know this. Unless we get the real story across to people in other countries, we will lose the battle for men's minds by default.

The Communist propaganda portrays the Soviet Union as the world's foremost advocate of peace and the protector of defenseless peoples. The contradiction between what the Communist leaders have promised and what they have actually done is so startling that we are amazed that anyone can be deceived. In Berlin, in Czechoslovakia, in the Balkans, in the Far East, they have proved, time after time, that their talk about peace is only a cloak for imperialism.

But their intended victims will not learn these facts from Soviet propaganda. We are the ones who must make sure that the truth about communism is known everywhere.

At the same time, we must overcome the constant stream of slander and vilification that the Communists pour out in an effort to discredit the United States and other free nations.

Soviet propaganda constantly reviles the United States as a nation of war mongers and imperialists. You and I know how absurd that is. We know that the United States is wholly dedicated to the cause of peace. We have no purpose of going to war except in defense of freedom. Our actions demonstrate that we mean exactly what we say. But when men throughout the world are making their choice between communism and democracy, the important thing is not what we know about our purposes and our actions—the important thing is what they know.

Communist propaganda also seeks to destroy our influence in the world by saying the American economy is weak and about to collapse. We know this is preposterous. The industrial production of the United States is equal to that of the rest of the world combined. Our agricultural production is more than adequate for our needs. Our people enjoy the highest standard of living in the world's history. Our economic strength is the bulwark of the free world.

From every standpoint, our free way of life is vastly superior to the system of oppression which the Communists seek to impose upon mankind. In many parts of the world, however, where men must choose between freedom and communism, the true story is being untold.

We cannot run the risk that nations may be lost to the cause of freedom because their people do not know the facts.

I am convinced that we should greatly extend and strengthen our efforts for making the truth known to people in all the world.

Most of us have recognized for years, of course, how important it is to spread the truth about freedom and democracy. We are already doing some very good work, through the Voice of America and the United States information offices and libraries in many parts of the world, through the exchange of students, through the United Nations and its affiliated organizations, and in other ways. But events have shown, I believe, that we need to do much more, both ourselves and in collaboration with the other free nations. We must use every means at our command, private as well as governmental, to get the truth to other peoples.

Private groups and organizations have an important part to play. Our labor unions have already done fine work in communicating with labor in Europe, in Latin America, and elsewhere. The story of free American labor, told by American trade unionists, is a better weapon against Communist propaganda among workers in other countries than any number of speeches by Government officials.

The same principle applies to other groups. The best way for farmers in other countries to find out about us is to talk directly with our own farmers. Our businessmen can speak directly to businessmen abroad. We need to promote much more direct contact between our people and those of other countries.

We should encourage many more people from other countries to visit us here, to see for themselves what is true and what is not true about our country. We should find more opportunities for foreign students to study in our schools and universities. They will learn here the skills and techniques needed in their own countries. They will also see at first hand the rights and duties of citizens in our land of democratic institutions.

Our colleges should train more Americans to go abroad as teachers, especially to teach modern methods of farming, industry, and public health—and, by example, to teach our concepts of democracy. The notable record of our many charitable and religious organizations who send teachers abroad is proof of what can be done.

Another major part of our effort must be carried out through our great public information channels—newspapers and magazines, radio, and motion pictures. We must strive constantly to break down or leap over barriers to free communication wherever they exist. We must make full use of every effective means of communicating information, in simple, understandable form, to people whose backgrounds and cultures are different from ours.

This poses an enormous challenge to groups such as yours, a challenge which can be met only by extraordinary inventiveness and enterprise. I am confident that the American press can and will make a tremendously useful contribution toward finding new solutions.

The Government's programs for telling the truth about the United States to the peoples of the world also need constant improvement. Our present overseas information and educational exchange program is getting results. For example, the Voice of America has been carrying to people behind the iron curtain the true story of world events. It has been so successful that the Soviet Government is using a vast amount of costly equipment in an attempt to drown out our broadcasts by jamming. We must devise ways to break through that jamming and get our message across. And we must improve and strengthen our whole range of information and educational services.

This is not a conclusion reached by Government officials alone. We have had the valuable aid of the United States Advisory Commission on Information created by the Congress. Your own society is ably represented on that Commission by Mr. Mark Ethridge and Mr. Erwin D. Canham. The members of the Commission have given intensive study to the overseas information program and have made repeated recommendations that it be substantially expanded. Similar recommendations for the exchange program have been made by the Advisory Commission on Education, headed by Dr. Harvie Branscomb. I have been glad to see that many Members of the Congress have urged an improved and expanded program in these fields, as shown, for example, by the resolution introduced recently by Senator BENTON for himself and a number of his colleagues.

Because of the pressing need to increase our efforts along this line, I have directed the Secretary of State to plan a strengthened and more effective national effort to use the great power of truth in working for peace. This effort will require the imagination and energies of private individuals and groups throughout the country. We shall need to use fully all the private and governmental means that have proved successful so far—and to discover and employ new ones.

Our task is to present the truth to the millions of people who are uninformed or misinformed or unconvinced. Our task is to reach them in their daily lives, as they work and learn. We must be alert, ingenious, and diligent in reaching peoples of other countries, whatever their educational and cultural backgrounds may be. Our task is to show them that freedom is the way to economic and social advancement, the way to political independence, the way to strength, happiness, and peace.

This task is not separate and distinct from other elements of our foreign policy. It is a necessary part of all we are doing to build a peaceful world. It is as important as armed strength or economic aid. The Marshall Plan, military aid, point 4—these and other programs depend for their success on the understanding and support of our own citizens and those of other countries.

We must make ourselves known as we really are, not as Communist propaganda pictures us. We must pool our efforts with those of the other free peoples in a sustained, intensified program to promote the cause of freedom against the propaganda of slavery. We must make ourselves heard round the world in a great campaign of truth.

We have tremendous advantages in the struggle for men's minds and loyalties. We have truth and freedom on our side. The appeal of free institutions and self-government springs from the deepest and noblest aspirations of mankind. It is based on every man's desire for liberty and opportunity. It is based on every man's wish to be self-reliant and to shape his own destiny.

As we go forward with our campaign of truth, we will make lasting progress toward the kind of world we seek—a world in which men and nations live not as enemies but as brothers.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Annual Dinner of the Amen Corner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered last Saturday by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] at Pittsburgh, Pa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is appropriate on occasions such as this, when sincere, loyal Americans meet to consider the welfare of our country, to recall the warning contained in the familiar quotation:

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

It is likewise appropriate to recall the words of Daniel Webster, who said:

"God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it."

When we reflect upon those profound truths it is incumbent upon each of us to search his soul and to ask:

"Have we been eternally vigilant in the protection of our liberties?"

"Have we been always ready to guard and defend the freedom that God has granted us?"

My friends, because we cannot, in good conscience, reply in the affirmative, we live in a world of unrest and confusion, a time when our precious liberties are in grave peril.

There are many dangers in the world today. The air is filled with strange philosophies and fantastic slogans.

On all sides we are bombarded by propaganda that the plan of free government by free men, established by the founders of our Republic, is outmoded and should be thrown on the junk pile.

Loud voices have been raised telling us that it should be replaced by a socialistic

ideology with an all-powerful central government promising comfort, ease, and security from the cradle to the grave.

But they do not tell us that the price of the system they advocate is surrender of all individual freedom.

They do not tell us that its inevitable result would be enslavement of the people to the government under rigid controls, regulation, and regimentation.

They do not tell us that the socialistic plan has brought disaster to every nation where it gained control and that it dragged the people down to poverty and misery.

Under its plan of individual freedom, the United States, throughout its history, has been a bright beacon of peace, good will, and liberty in the world.

In less than 200 years we have made greater progress than any other people on earth. We have produced the highest living standards and most advanced cultural and spiritual attainments of all time.

Yet we are not free from danger. There are those, jealous of our unparalleled success as a nation and a people, who would destroy us.

There are those who would discard our system of free enterprise and would substitute a planned economy to direct our lives and our activities.

We have those who are striving to array one class against another and one section against the other to create dissension and distrust among our people.

These are some of the elements of the national peril which threaten freedom of the individual and freedom of opportunity—the firm foundation of American greatness.

But we are exposed today to a greater and more menacing source of danger.

The greatest threat to American freedom is the atomic bomb of national bankruptcy caused by excessive taxation and reckless, extravagant Government spending.

One of the most shocking developments in American history is the rapid increase in the cost of Government and the heavily increased burden of taxation and debt.

In recent years we have witnessed radical changes in the philosophy of government and dangerous departures from the traditional American course.

We have seen a vast increase in the size and complexity of the Federal Government. We have seen its power encroaching more and more upon the functions and authority of State and local government.

We have seen the cost of Government multiplied eightfold in 20 years. We have seen excessive direct and hidden taxes drain away the earnings of the worker, the farmer, and the resources of industry.

We have witnessed the tragic spectacle of an administration unaware of the danger of national bankruptcy and the threat to American freedom that is inherent in a national debt exceeding a quarter of a trillion dollars.

We have witnessed the wildest spending spree in our Nation's history. This year alone it may add $6,000,000,000 to our present crushing burden of debt.

The cost of government at all three levels, local, State, and Federal, has increased until it has reached $65,000,000,000 a year.

Government costs 13 times as much as education. We pay for government 40 times as much as we contribute to our churches of every denomination. We spend more for government than for food.

Thirty cents out of every dollar earned by every one of us—worker, farmer, preacher, lawyer, doctor, and businessman—goes for government.

Government is taking so much from the earnings of the people that the men and women who have supported the churches, hospitals, charitable institutions, research foundations, and colleges will no longer have the means to continue their support.

These institutions will be forced to make increased demands for governmental aid and finally will become totally dependent upon government for their existence.

They will no longer be free institutions. They will be controlled and directed by political overlords with the power of life or death, according to the whims of political fortune.

With these critical conditions confronting us there are important questions which must be answered.

How much of the national income can be taken in taxes and still leave enough to continue high employment and operate industry at full capacity?

How far can we go without everyone getting hurt in the tax squeeze?

How far can we allow taxes to consume the substance of the people and still maintain our high living standards?

If we reduce taxes more people will have more money to spend for automobiles, homes, household appliances, and the necessities of life. That is the way real income should be increased, not by inflation through government spending of borrowed money.

Under the socialistic government of Great Britain the people pay even a higher tax than we pay here in the United States. As a result living conditions for the worker have been reduced to a poverty level and opportunities to improve health and education have been ignored.

High taxes ruined Germany. They were "goose stepped" into regimentation and all freedoms were lost. The same happened to Italy and Russia and to every other nation which followed this plan.

History teaches us that one of the causes of the fall of the great Roman Empire was the steady trend toward turning citizens into pensioners. When the Roman masses got their minds firmly fixed on free bread and circuses, they soon became indifferent to liberty and freedom.

In modern times we see the same abuses in the constantly increasing pressure and demand upon the government for support of destructive programs that reach into every activity of our daily lives.

When Government control goes far enough into medicine, education, agriculture, labor and business, the freedoms which made us a great Nation will be lost.

Security is the desire of every right-thinking man; but never in the history of the world has it been attained by a governmental formula.

Real security must be bought and paid for by work and sweat, individual thrift and sacrifice. It is the reward of enterprise, initiative and prudence.

Security cannot be achieved by the simple method of having the earnings of the people spent, not by themselves, but by a spendthrift Government bureaucracy.

Is there one individual in all our broad land who will say:

"I no longer want freedom."

Is there one with soul so small or vision so limited that he will say:

"Give me security and I will surrender into other hands God's gift of liberty."

If there is he has ceased to be an American. He has forfeited the rights and privileges of American citizenship.

Real Americans can serve their country by working and fighting for sound fiscal policies and economical, business-like administration of the public funds.

A bankrupt America cannot stop communism at home or abroad.

A system of taxation that destroys initiative and incentive and prevents the production of new wealth can destroy the United States.

Our first line of defense must be a strong, dynamic, solvent America.

I repeat:

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Renewal of Radio Station Licenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me regarding the FCC hearings on renewal of radio-station licenses.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, on March 30 I introduced into the RECORD a statement with reference to the present Federal Communications Commission hearings in connection with the Commission's attempt to not renew the licenses of radio stations KMPC in Los Angeles, WGAR in Cleveland, and WJR in Detroit.

I am this morning in receipt of a copy of a statement relative to this matter, issued by Mr. Hugh Fulton who is the chief trial counsel for these radio stations. His statement is as follows:

"I am amazed that the Federal Communications Commission would attempt to destroy an excellent station like KMPC and its right to its license on the basis of testimony of witnesses such as those relied upon by the Commission.

"With the exception of a very few whose testimony if accepted 100 percent would not justify any attack upon the license of KMPC, they were all disgruntled former employees who had been fired for laziness or incompetence. Very obviously they nursed grudges against KMPC and against Mr. Richards (principal owner of the stations) and have endeavored for years to damage and injure the station.

"Testimony was replete with obvious exaggeration and emphasis on everything which they conceived might be stretched into something unfavorable. Wherever they thought they could do harm they purported to have marvelous recollections but on cross-examination constantly sought refuge in 'I don't remember.'

"On their own testimony it was clear that most of them were committing perjury and some of them also admitted facts establishing theft of files from the station and participation in ventures under investigation by the district attorney for fraud. One openly asserted on the stand that he had deliberately lied in a prior statement.

"The amazing thing is that the Federal Communications Commission should have vouched for the credibility of witnesses such as these and should rely on that kind of evidence in an attempt to destroy great radio stations which have for so many years furnished such excellent service to tens of millions of listeners.

"In all that time the Federal Communications Commission put in evidence only one solitary complaint from a listener and referred to two or three other complaints which its witnesses said they had received in the course of 11 years, but which they had not kept, despite the fact that one of its leading witnesses testified that he had carefully preserved for 7 years all the material which he thought might be injurious to the station.

"The Federal Communications Commission counsel fought desperately to prevent the authentication of the actual scripts that had been used in broadcasts by KMPC, and even went so far as to try to prevent the authentication of the scripts for use on cross-examination. This attempt of the Commission to get away from the criterion of what was actually broadcast, taken together with the absence of complaint and complete satisfaction of the listening public with KMPC and its programs, is most significant.

"The Commission's only claim of right to examine into the matter at all is on the theory that the public needs to be protected. The public itself is the best judge and the verdict of the public with respect to all three stations based on years of listening by tens of millions of persons was rendered in favor of the stations many years ago.

"These proceedings have already cost the taxpayers and the radio stations, and through the radio stations the public, a vast sum of money, and have diverted time and attention that otherwise would have been devoted to still further improving the excellent service rendered to the public by these fine stations.

"Despite the fact that none of the Commission's witnesses could show anything broadcast that was false or that deceived the public, the Commission apparently thinks it proper to engage in this kind of proceeding on the testimony of these disgruntled former employees, most of which was to the effect that Mr. Richards dared to have political views different from those of the administration in Washington, and particularly that he dared to state over the radio true facts which such witnesses characterized as unfavorable to the administration and to various persons connected with it, particularly the Roosevelt family.

"Clearly, this is an attempt to censor what goes over the radio in violation of the Constitution and of the ban by Congress against censorship, and all this is in the face of the admission in Washington by the chief counsel of the Commission that the Commission has no investigation pending against any radio stations owned by Democrats or labor unions that have expressly stated their intention to purge and drive from office Republican Senators and Congressmen who support the Taft-Hartley Act."

Mr. President, I am sure that no Member of this Congress—either Republican or Democrat—can question the integrity of Mr. Fulton. Many Members of the Congress will recall that Mr. Fulton was chief counsel for the War Investigating Committee during the period when President Truman was chairman of that committee. They will recall the fine reputation which Mr. Fulton made for himself at that time and the many tributes paid to him, both by the President and other members of the committee. The fact that Mr. Fulton is a Democrat and is in this case defending the right of Mr. Richards, an avowed Republican who has been a foe of the administration privately, to voice his private opinion lends even greater support to my belief in Mr. Fulton's intellectual honesty. It is because of this very fact that I believe that the members of this Senate should carefully examine the statements by Mr. Fulton which I have placed in the RECORD today.

Hidden Billions—United States Ignores Assets of ERP Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Herman A. Lowe, appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Thursday, March 30, 1950. I recommend this article to the careful consideration of all Senators, since it is based upon careful research by Delaware's most efficient and capable Representative BOGGS, who calls our attention to the unknown billions of dollars' worth of assets in the 16 European nations now receiving aid from this country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIDDEN BILLIONS—UNITED STATES IGNORES ASSETS OF ERP NATIONS

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, March 29.—Delaware's able Congressman, J. CALEB BOGGS, has turned a spotlight on this Nation's most prominent anatomical peculiarity—its heart is bigger than its head.

At a time when Congress is beginning to think about what kind of policy should succeed the European recovery program which expires in 1952, BOGGS has asked leaders of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to:

1. Try to find out the value of the foreign assets of the 16 ERP nations.

2. Determine whether some of these assets should not be liquidated to pay for a portion of the goods being supplied to them by the heavily burdened American taxpayers.

In the course of digging for information, BOGGS has verified that the 16 ERP countries and their citizens own billions of dollars worth of assets in the United States and other countries—but that our Government has only a notion of how many billions.

Yet, without bothering to learn the answers, our Government lays billions of dollars in taxes upon the American public and adds other billions to the national debt, to aid the ERP countries.

So far as BOGGS is concerned, that is a very unrealistic way of operating. He thinks maybe we ought to be governed by some of these facts as well as by our generous emotions.

In his letter to the Republican and Democratic leaders of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, BOGGS said:

"It seems very proper at this time to ask for an over-all statement of such overseas assets as may now be owned by the 16 ERP countries. It is known that large investments by European governments and private citizens have taken place in the United States during the five postwar years.

"It is most surprising and remarkable that we have never been given a comprehensive report of the assets owned by the 16 ERP countries in areas where we have spent money for off-shore procurement on behalf of Europe under the Marshall plan."

That second paragraph holds the crux of BOGGS' idea for having the ECA countries pay for part of the aid. A substantial part of the food and other materials which ECA has bought with American money has been in other countries. BOGGS says it amounts to $2,700,000,000 worth. He thinks that some of the assets of the 16 beneficiaries in those other countries should be liquidated to pay for future commodities there—instead of the burden all falling on the American taxpayer. He does not urge at this time that any of the beneficiary country assets in the United States be liquidated. He does, however, suggest that we find out what these assets amount to.

The latest figure on ECA country assets in the United States was released by the United States Department of Commerce in 1947. It set the total at about $11,000,000,000. BOGGS took this up the other day with the State Department which pointed out that many of the figures in the big total were compiled in 1941 and that no recapitulation had been made since.

State Department threw up its hands vaguely, explaining that: "Any estimates derived from the original census become more and more unreliable as the years go by, and consequently it is not believed that a reliable estimate can be made today." State admitted that, so far as it was concerned, it just did not know how much was around.

On the question of what assets the ECA countries had in other foreign nations, the State Department had even less to offer.

"To our knowledge," it informed BOGGS, "such information is available only in isolated cases and not on any comprehensive basis."

State went on to explain that it was "the understanding" of the Department that the balances had been reduced. However, no real efforts have been made to find out.

And there you have the situation. Billions have been spent for ECA aid by the United States. Yet our Government has never obtained any figures to determine whether the spending was all necessary, or whether our people could have been spared some.

BOGGS thinks we ought to insist upon getting all the facts before we shape up a new program which will doubtless cost us additional billions.

Patriots' Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Lexington, Mass., on April 19, 1950, to commemorate the one hundred and seventy-sixth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord:

Mr. Chairman, the immortal heroes of the battle of Lexington, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, and all my friends, the most outstanding and significant factor in all history is that from Wednesday dawn, April 19, 1775, this Nation, conceived in freedom and born on this immortal spot of earth, still exists and has steadily progressed, enduring many national catastrophes, two world wars, and threatening enslaving philosophies of government, until now, this Wednesday dawn, 175 years later, it is the most modern, God-fearing, the most powerful Nation on earth—depended upon by free nations everywhere this United States of America holds within its power and strength the freedom of mankind throughout the world.

Here on this precious soil little did the heroic men of that momentous dawn know the meaning of their stand against the overwhelming force of British Regulars. Little did they know the destiny of the colonies their valor cemented together into a new Nation dedicated to freedom and equal justice under law. Little did they know this new Nation under a new concept of government would some day extend for 3,000 miles across the Great Plains, the fertile valleys, and majestic mountains to the Pacific Ocean. Little did they know their heroism that Wednesday morning was the beginning of the United States of America

which has twice saved the great British nation and twice saved the free nations of the world from enslavement and the loss of their lands, their people, their culture, and their civilization. Little did they know their fearless gallantry set the example, molded the pattern, and breathed the indomitable spirit of life into the Nation which has become the most powerful on earth and which can, if necessary, assemble twenty-five—yes, thirty—millions fully equipped for the defense of its freedom. Every patriotic American knows that freedom is the most valuable asset of mankind and that once gained and experienced, death is preferable to its loss. Let no nation—no dictator—no group of greedy world-power schemers—ever again make the mistake of attacking the free people of this powerful America, for if they do they will experience the mighty fury and full devastation of this power.

It is not easy for any trained soldier of a great modern army of this time and day to go forth to meet the full storm of the enemy. When he does, however, he is assured by the fact he possesses the finest equipment industrial science has developed. In the breast of every soldier is the courage to meet the test. More than courage, however, flourished in the hearts of the 60 patriots who assembled here on this honored green under the leadership of Capt. John Parker. These men possessed the spirit of self-sacrifice. They were ready and willing to sacrifice their lives to save freedom for those who survived and those who would follow.

No modern equipment had they. Theirs was powder, ball, and musket. In the last great war America possessed many generals completely able to lead our armies to victory just as efficiently as the leadership which did, but here on the green of Lexington there was only one Capt. John Parker. His order to his men that momentous Wednesday morning still stands today as one of the most inspiring and decisive military commands ever given by any field commander. "Don't fire unless you are fired on but if they want war, let them begin it here." This command now is an American principle. America does not desire to make war on any country. America does not desire to engage in war but if any country fires on America they will receive the full weight of our might in return.

On this Wednesday, 175 years after Lexington and Concord, America is in trouble. Since the conclusion of the war there has been a gradual disintegration of national and moral unity largely accomplished by the spread of communism. Russian communism is organized. It's objective is world domination. On a number of occasions the Soviet leaders have expressed their conclusion that our system of free government and free enterprise cannot exist in the same world with communism. In five short years we have seen communism take over eastern Europe and constantly threaten the western European nations. It is spreading over Asia, having gained control of China, and moving south to Siam, Burma, and India. But for the European-aid program, organized and operated by our own Government, Soviet communism at this very hour would be in control of all Europe and moving across the Mediterranean into Africa. The only power which stands across the path of world domination by Russia blocking the spread of communism is the United States of America. This country stands for a free world and a world of free people. Because we believe this to be right we must be adequately prepared to meet successfully the Russian challenge of communism. We must go on keeping the flag of freedom flying amid all the winds that blow.

Under our Government we possess many freedoms we now accept as routine in our day-to-day living. Freedom of speech permits us to express our views regarding political issues, the Government, and activities of our fellowmen. This cannot be done in Russia under communism. Freedom of the press permits all sides of an issue to be presented to the people for their determination of that which is false and that which is right. This is not permitted in Russia under communism. Freedom of religion gives us the right to worship God in our own way. This is not permitted in Russia under communism. The heart of our strength as a Nation is our faith in God. This faith represents one of our cardinal differences with communism, for communism neither believes nor accepts a higher authority. The government is all-powerful in itself and is in no sense subject to the higher authority of God. If you believe in communism then communism must be your God for you cannot look to any other. This is the creed of the Communists and this is the reason it is impossible to bridge the gulf between these two ways of life.

Our national unity is only so strong as the spirit of patriotism is alive and burning in the hearts of the people. For 283 years prior to April 19, 1775, the American Colonies welcomed to their free soil the oppressed peoples of Europe. As these people came to this new land they quickly adapted themselves to their new life and were proud to be Americans. During the 175 years that have followed Lexington and Concord people from every country in the world have streamed into America seeking the freedom and opportunities making for a happier life. After becoming an American citizen it is the duty of every new American to give to his new country his complete loyalty and cooperation. If he is not willing to do this the right to remain should abruptly cease. Just recently I have been informed that in the event of an open conflict with Russian communism many of our workers, on which the Nation would greatly depend, plan to resort to sabotage and do everything they can to assist and promote the communistic cause, hoping for a communistic victory. Not for one moment do I believe this to be true. I have complete confidence in the workers of America. I believe them to be loyal, patriotic Americans. They have proved their loyalty many times. In case of an attack on their country they would be among the very first to see that every man and woman did their duty. Once having experienced freedom, it is most illogical and most difficult to believe that anyone would seek a life of limitation and enslavement by decrees of dictators and the atheism of communism.

Without a doubt, there are many agents of communism and Soviet Russia here in America. Without a doubt, some are citizens—yes, native-born citizens. Without a doubt, some have worked themselves into high and important positions in our Government. Regardless of the political consequences, the American people should arise to this underhanded challenge to our country and demand that they should be expunged from the Government and denied the right of citizenship, just as the patriots of Lexington made their stand against the challenge to their freedom. I cannot find within my heart and conscience any desire to close the door on this great issue until America—your country and mine—is free of the cancerous scourage of communism. It is our duty—our precious duty—to do everything we can to strengthen our national unity and to protect the spirit of America, for if we do not we are no longer worthy of the bravery of Capt. John Parker and his men and no longer worthy of freedom. It is well to remember:

"Freedom's battle once begun
Bequeathed by bleeding sire to son
Though baffled oft is ever won."

The dramatic event which fate determined to happen on this immortal spot is the most significant since Calvary. And like Calvary it will command the heart and spirit throughout the history of mankind. Lexington was the beginning of a new world. Lexington brought to an end serfdom and slavery and replaced it with freedom for millions. Because of Capt. John Parker and his 60 minutemen patriots a new concept of government was born—government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Lexington was the beginning of this great free Nation—the United States of America. I am so proud, so deeply proud to represent it in the Congress of the United States.

In this troubled time of our Nation's life, our solemn duty orders us to hold fast and to protect all they gained for us the living and to measure every act and deed, for we cannot fail to meet successfully the test of our generation. It is your duty to constantly try and my duty to constantly try—and try we will.

In every part of America and throughout the world free men are turning their eyes and attention to Lexington during these hours of celebration. They, like those of us here, again give thanks to Capt. John Parker and thanks to his noble men.

Promoting Democracy Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, a few days ago bipartisan sponsorship was given to the resolution introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], calling for an enlarged program for promoting democracy abroad. The proposal has brought forth much favorable editorial comment, and I should like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Promoting Democracy Abroad," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 24, 1950; an editorial entitled "On Selling Freedom," published in the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of March 24, 1950; an editorial entitled "Global Sales Campaign," published in the Meriden (Conn.) Journal of March 24, 1950; and an editorial entitled "A Constructive Plan," published in the Hamden (Conn.) Chronicle of March 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 24, 1950]

PROMOTING DEMOCRACY ABROAD

At a time when most Congressmen are engrossed with the economic and political intricacies of budget slashing, including the State Department's information budget, Senator BENTON, of Connecticut, has had

the vision and the wisdom to issue a call for a greatly expanded information and cultural program to promote democratic ideals through the diplomacy of public opinion.

He was joined by 10 other Senators, members of both parties, in sponsoring a resolution calling for a six-point program to close the mental gap between ourselves and the peoples of the world.

The extent and urgency of the need, Senator BENTON knows full well from his service as director of the State Department's information program abroad. The Russian Army, he pointed out, is only the reserve in the cold war. The front line at present is manned by propaganda.

Each of his six points is sorely needed and could accomplish much good if prosecuted with sufficient vigor. They include: increased pressure for world-wide freedom of information; acceleration of the work of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; expansion of the State Department's information and education programs; promotion of democratic education abroad, especially in Germany and Japan where our efforts have been no more than halting in this field thus far; coordination of the information programs of all non-Communist nations, and encouragement of the efforts of private citizens who are trying to attain these goals through nongovernmental channels.

The United States has been lagging badly in one of its most urgent and important tasks. It needs to encourage the development of democracy in the world. Here is a way to do it, at relatively small cost.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of March 24, 1950]

ON SELLING FREEDOM

Speaking from a background of public relations, Senator BENTON, of Connecticut, proposes that the United States organize a world-wide "campaign of ideas" against communism. He argues that the free nations so far have been losing the propaganda battle with the Soviet Union. He urges that they now coordinate their efforts and employ every resource of communication to spread the gospel of democracy. There is a good deal to be said for the Senator's proposition. It has the support of a sizable Democratic and Republican group in the Senate.

Communist propaganda for years has been highly centralized. Much of it may appear to emanate from the Communist parties of various nations. But it is all dictated from Moscow and a great part of it obviously is financed by the Soviet Government. The intended victims of this propaganda, on the other hand, have fought it singly. They have moved to concert their military, economic, and even political policies, without doing anything of a common-defense nature in the realm of ideas.

It may be objected at once that actions speak louder than words. They do. If the western democracies are to win the support, say, of the peoples of southern Asia or eastern Europe, they must themselves demonstrate the practical superiority of freedom to any authoritarian order, and they must show that they are not merely paying lip service to the ideals they profess. But in the face of a vigorous propaganda offensive against them, using every technique of distortion and misrepresentation, that is no longer enough.

We cannot wait for the truth to prevail by its own inherent virtue in some distant future—if, indeed, under modern conditions it can ever hope to prevail in competition with the censorship, deliberate lying and terrorism as practiced by a dictatorship. The time would seem ripe for a massive counterattack by the free nations at the informational level. Not only is the need self-evident but the Communists are becoming increasingly vulnerable in the very field of propaganda which they have been exploiting so actively.

Day by day the Soviet Union is emerging, in the words of an old-line German Communist, not as the liberator of oppressed peoples but as the inheritor of the political ambitions of Czarist Russia. The imperialistic ambitions of the Kremlin are becoming obvious even to the eyes of non-Russian Communists. The successful Tito revolt against domination from Moscow has created a rich opportunity for exposing the gigantic hypocrisy of the Soviet Government.

That hypocrisy must be underscored and placed in vivid contrast to a program of dynamic democracy. No one nation is in a position to do this alone. By the leading governments of the non-Communist world can—and should—do it on a cooperative basis.

They now have a chance to make themselves the salesmen of freedom, and, provided they can prove the article they are selling is as advertised and unadulterated, a master plan of democratic propaganda of the type Senator BENTON recommends ought to be invaluable.

[From the Meriden (Conn.) Journal of March 24, 1950]

GLOBAL SALES CAMPAIGN

Freshman Senator BENTON's proposal of a global sales campaign in behalf of democracy should be taken seriously, for it comes from a source which has produced some of the most successful sales ideas ever launched into the world of advertising. After all, the production of sentiment favorable to democratic systems of government does not differ fundamentally from any other advertising job. It's merely bigger. And no job of promotion has ever been too big for BILL BENTON.

Sizing up the competition, it doesn't seem that the obstacles are insuperable. Those men in the Kremlin turn out terrible stuff. Their copy is amateurish. The claims made for their product—communism—are simply absurd, and would never stand up under a sampling test. That such advertising has pulled in droves of customers may be laid to the fact that it is directed to a market controlled by fear.

There's where the Benton plan faces a major difficulty. He can't make people listen, and he wouldn't want to, if he could. He can't even be sure of reaching his sales prospects while Russia is jamming up the air waves. But we'd bet that, given a free hand to perfect his organization, he'd find ways and means.

After all, Senator BENTON has learned a lot since he was teamed up with Chester Bowles in one of the slickest combinations that ever made a nation clamor for the stuff it was boosting. He has had other experience that counts: much of it under his present boss—Uncle Sam. He knows what the State Department is like on the inside. He raised the Voice of America from a feeble squeak into a clear and powerful organ for good.

The genius of the Senator is in his ability to organize: to lay out a plan and put it across. He has demonstrated that genius again and again. In his maiden speech in the Senate, he showed that his mind is still teeming with the stuff which won him his first success. He presented a solid, practical scheme. One of the best things about it is that it doesn't contemplate giving anything away. In many respects, it parallels the proved methods of commercial advertising.

First, there would be the sales conference—to be made up of representatives of non-Communist countries. Next, the business of establishing a world broadcasting network, arranging for time on this network, turning out movies with a selling punch for democracy, planting educational programs in the right spots—wrinkles which Mr. BENTON knows from A to Z.

Of course there's the possibility of a hitch. The Senator must first convince his colleagues, who are also, in a way, his clients. Many a good advertising scheme has come to naught before the board of directors. But BILL BENTON has had considerable success, too, in softening up hard-minded boards. Here's his first opportunity to show that his talents are not wasted in his present job. We shall see what we shall see.

[From the Hamden (Conn.) Chronicle of March 30, 1950]

A CONSTRUCTIVE PLAN

Senator BENTON has rung the bell in a speech before the Senate calling for a Marshall plan of ideas to promote the cause of democracy throughout the world.

The junior Senator from Connecticut has followed up his talk by introducing a resolution cosponsored by Senator MCMAHON in addition to 11 other Senators, calling for the United States to take the initiative and vigorously prosecute a greatly expanded program of information and education among all the peoples of the world with a view toward closing that mental gulf that separates the United States from other peoples and blockades hopes for freedom and peace.

Senator BENTON's proposal is akin to a bell of peace resounding over the roar of war drums. His suggestion for the United States taking the initiative is a welcome relief from our perennial defensive maneuvers of dashing to and fro to plug leaks in the dike against the steadily rising tide of communism.

It is a constructive program which we hope his colleagues in the Senate will give the serious consideration it deserves. Certainly it cannot, or should not be cast aside as another impractical plan born of desperation to end the cold war.

The Senator points out that we have the advantage in such a propaganda campaign in that we don't need to lie. We might add to this priceless asset of having the world's best salesmen who are convinced of the superiority of their product.

Contribution of Imports to Business Activity and Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there is, on the part of all economic groups in this country, a growing interest in import problems. Those charged with carrying out our foreign policy have indicated that it is imperative that this country buy more from other countries in order to make it possible for those countries to get back on their feet, and and thus eventually permit a reduction of our foreign economic assistance. We have heard, however, in the last few

weeks, some growing resentment on the part of some on the ground that imports are hurting us, that they are increasing unemployment in this country, and that we should reexamine our whole tariff policy. I have been impressed by an article on this subject in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of April 13, 1950, by Maurice Heyne, Belgian minister and commercial counselor, titled "Contribution of Imports to Business Activity and Employment." I ask unanimous consent to include a portion of Mr. Heyne's article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTRIBUTION OF IMPORTS TO BUSINESS ACTIVITY AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

(By Maurice Heyne, Belgian Minister and commercial counselor)

* * * * *

Now we might as well face the fact that there is considerable resistance to imports here in your country and abroad. In fact, in almost every country exports are considered its meat, imports its poison. As long as this situation exists world trade will continue to be jeopardized.

* * * * *

By reason of their interdependence one upon the other, imports and exports alike contribute to the well-being within a country. It can hardly be said that one creates business activity and employment and that the other detracts from it. A high level of domestic activity and full employment is always accompanied by a similar level in world trade. The opposite is also true.

* * * * *

In your country a double-barreled effect lends force to the resistance to imports. It must seem to the American people as if it should be enough to pay the bill for ECA in an all-out effort to put Marshall plan countries back on their feet. They are now being asked to turn around and buy what they have helped other countries to produce, in order to keep the ball rolling. Why, they ask, should they be required to accept foreign merchandise which may be in competition with domestic products, or which may be imported in such quantities as to cause dislocation in certain industries?

This is important, because the attitude toward imports is a major factor in selling them. The very publicity necessary to develop a market is likely to increase resistance in proportion to the aggressiveness with which imports are promoted.

Yours is a country which has built an enormous and dynamic productive machine. It accounts for half the world's output. Because of the dominant position of the United States, what happens here, and the policies you adopt, penetrate every nook and cranny of world trade.

The world needs what America produces. It does not have enough dollars to pay for it, however, unless you, in turn, buy enough of what the world has to sell. Despite the eminent success of the Marshall plan and the able administration of ECA, the dollar gap is still of such proportions that items such as shipping, tourism, investments, and loans that help to make up the international balance sheet, cannot possibly be expanded to achieve the necessary trade balance. This can be accomplished only by closing what Mr. Bradfield has called the merchandise gap.

Thus, the attention of almost every country is focused on the United States as a market.

In spite of the rich bounty with which your country is blessed, imports are important to you. You recognize that fact. For in 1948, 60 percent of your imports were free of duty. Only 40 percent were considered in protection of American industry.

The major share of duty-free imports is, of course, in raw materials and commodities. These are either not available in the United States, or supplement domestic supply. Your country uses about half of the raw materials which enter into international trade.

The automotive and allied industries, a source of employment in many centers in the United States, import materials from all over the world. "Thirty countries furnished this room" was the caption of a recent advertisement in your magazines.

Almost half of your imports in 1948 were in crude foods and materials. Another quarter was in semi-manufactures, a total of over 70 percent imported for further fabrication. Without such imports, many of your industries would have to close down entirely, or greatly restrict production.

EXPORTS PROVIDE 5,000,000

Let us turn this over and look at the export picture. It is estimated that the rate of your current exports provides some five million jobs. In 1947, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, nearly half of these were engaged directly or indirectly in nonagricultural industries in the production of goods for export. In the durable goods industries, in mining, and especially in capital goods, export workers accounted for 14 percent of the employment.

This is borne out when we consider the character of your exports. In 1948, only 22 percent of all United States exports were in crude foods and materials; 11 percent in semi-manufactures, and 67 percent in manufactured foodstuffs and finished goods. In other words, two-thirds of your exports were the product of a high content of American labor. If we include semi-manufactures, the proportion rises to over 75 percent.

Normally, 7 to 10 percent of your output is exported. Averages, however, fail to reveal the degree of dependence of the American economy on its export trade.

American cotton represents 45 percent of the international trade in this commodity; American tobacco 42 percent. Although your production of rice is only a small percentage of world production, your exports since the war have accounted for almost 16 percent of all rice moving in international trade.

In 1948, 25 percent of your production of machine tools, 20 percent of agricultural machinery, 15 percent of motor trucks were exported. These percentages are not out of line with the proportion of production exported before the war.

Because your economy is geared to your mass-production industry, any sharp cutbacks in exports of these industries would be felt, not only in the labor market directly affected, but in the entire economy. A considerable drop in production would mean higher unit costs, less profit to industry, price fluctuations at the consumer level, and unemployment in both agriculture and industry.

Moreover, the size and complexity of American industry and production, and its importance in world trade, are such that repercussions from any curtailment are felt all over the world. We are all too familiar with the effect of the comparatively mild recession in 1949 for me to enlarge on this point.

But I do want to call your attention to a report published by the OEEC early in March. The New York Times had this to say: "Decisive measures to narrow the dollar gap are apparently being taken on the dollar side, where drastic cuts in exports from the United States and Canada are expected to account for more than 57 percent of the anticipated reduction of the deficit." As the flow of the Marshall Plan aid diminishes, the report continues, exports from these two countries will be confined to the rigid requirements of basic foods and raw materials.

The significant point here is that decreases in your exports are likely to be in semi-manufactures and finished goods—in effect, in the product of American labor.

* * * * *

According to the economist, Robert L. Gullick, in representative years before the war, strictly consumer goods, other than foodstuffs, comprised around 6 percent of total imports. In 1948, all imported finished goods going into your industrial and consumer markets, including foods, were less than one-third of your total imports. These represent merchandise with a high content of the labor of other countries. In contrast, two-thirds of your exports represented a high content of your labor.

Imports of raw materials and semi-manufactures contribute to the manufacturing processes of industry. They thereby provide employment in many industries which otherwise could not exist at their present levels.

Employment thus created or sustained means purchasing power for other products of domestic manufacture—in the same way that purchasing power is provided by those 5,000,000 jobs in export industries.

Moreover, as raw materials, commodities, semi and finished goods for industrial and consumer use, move through the channels of trade, they create employment in the distributive trades. They increase demands for insurance and services, they add to the activity at ports of entry, they are warehoused, and shipped to their destinations. Even though they may displace in competitive selling American goods of a similar nature, they still have to be handled in transit. Therefore, in distribution channels, they cannot be said to displace labor.

DISLOCATIONS ALWAYS OCCURRING

Certain imports may cause some dislocations in the manufacturing fields. But dislocations are occurring at all times in a world where nothing is certain but change. Substitute materials, or new products growing out of changed conditions, outmode or replace those long established. A factory moves to a new location, or a machine is invented which displaces labor. But such is man's resourcefulness and inventiveness that another factory replaces the old one, or a new invention is the start of an entirely new industry or group of industries.

I am not minimizing the distressing effects of these dislocations. They are very real to the people and industries involved. How to cope with these situations as they arise constitutes a domestic problem of utmost concern in my country as well as in yours. In a time of growing social consciousness, however, we most surely can—and must—arrive at an equable solution.

The dislocation caused by the volume sale of an imported product tends to be offset by two factors. One we have already mentioned—employment in the distribution and service trades.

The other is that the more a product—whether domestic or foreign—is promoted, the wider its sale. This sale is not entirely at the expense of customers of competitive products, but—if I understand rightly the thesis of American selling—the whole base of the market is broadened to take in new customers. Thus the luxuries of yesterday have become the necessities of today.

But, you say, wage scales abroad are lower than in the United States. Imports not only compete for the consumer dollar, but undersell the comparable American product.

Unfortunately, the spotlight turned on imports produced by excessively cheap labor

tars all imports with the same brush. The postwar problem of the majority of foreign exporters to the United States is how to get their prices sufficiently low to compete in your market.

It is also true that other countries with lower wage scales erect tariff and other trade barriers to protect their workers against the low American wage cost per unit.

Now, I want to ask you a question:

Do the people of Michigan say to the people of Mississippi: "We will buy your raw cotton for our automobiles, and you, in turn, buy our automobiles. But we do not want to buy your paper or canned goods, because we process those things too, and our wage scale is higher than yours."

AN INTEGRATED MARKET

The answer is an obvious "No." Why? Because you have here in America an integrated market, as Mr. Hoffman calls it, a market of 160,000,000 people, the same kind of market that he is advocating for Europe.

Full employment in a given industry or locality increases the purchasing power for necessities and luxuries alike, whether they are produced in the same area or elsewhere. By the same token, unemployment decreases that purchasing power.

The Wall Street Journal recently reported that New York's share of all goods entering the country by ship was 20 percent, compared to 33 percent in 1941. Part of this slump was due to competition with other ports, but a major cause was the interruption in the full flow of trade, when ships had to sail only partially loaded, or with empty bottoms. One out of every ten persons employed in the New York metropolitan area is in some way dependent on port activity and foreign trade. Where is the purchasing power of these people who may be thrown out of employment?

If your exports are sharply curtailed—I refer particularly to finished manufactures and consumer goods—the effect on employment will be felt in key industries, in key localities, at ports of entry, and in all distributive trades. It will be far greater than any possible dislocation caused by an increase in imports—particularly so, because such imports are diffused over large areas of population.

Therefore, is it the increased imports of the product of labor of other countries, or the decreased exports of the product of domestic labor which constitutes the real threat to full employment?

In spite of the unprecedented demand for materials and products of United States manufacture following the war, the total volume of your exports today is not abnormally high in relation to national income and production.

In contrast, the ECA commerce mission, headed by Mr. Wayne Chatfield Taylor, who is with us today, pointed out that had the prewar relationship between imports and the gross national product been maintained, ECA countries alone, in 1948, could have sold to you $2,000,000,000 more than they did.

* * * * *

In closing, I should like to quote a few remarks made by Dr. Amos E. Taylor, who is also with us today. As you know, he was for many years director of your Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and is now director of Economic and Social Affairs for the Pan American Union. In a brochure prepared for the Committee on International Economic Policy, Dr. Taylor says:

"Not only does a substantial part of United States imports consist of raw materials and semifinished products essential to American industry, but certain other imported commodities are in increasing demand when the level of national income rises. * * * In order to avoid the mistakes of the past, we need to remove the traditional fears relative to imports. In a world of full employment, specialized production, and a high standard of living, imports should be viewed as benefits, not dangers to the economy. * * * Employment is not solely a national problem. It is an international problem, the solution of which can be found only in an expansion of world trade and economic cooperation. The modern interdependent world must do business with itself if peace and prosperity are to be more than an empty hope."

Investigation of Interstate Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two recent editorials which have to do with the prosecution of former Representative Roger C. Slaughter, in which there is reason to believe the Department of Justice has been used by the administration as an instrument of political controversy.

One of the editorials is from the Washington Evening Star of April 19 and is entitled "A Political Prosecution." The other editorial is from the Washington Times-Herald of April 20 and is entitled "The Lobby Fraud."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 11, 1950]

A POLITICAL PROSECUTION

The Department of Justice has nothing to be proud of in its prosecution of former Congressman Roger C. Slaughter on charges of violating the Lobbying Act. On the contrary, the responsible officials should be ashamed of forcing a man to stand trial on the basis of evidence such as that produced against Mr. Slaughter.

This case had its inception more than 18 months ago, when the Justice Department was headed by Tom Clark, now a member of the Supreme Court. It came on the heels of a political fight between the President and Mr. Slaughter, who was a Member of the House from Kansas City. The President was determined to purge his fellow Missourian. The fraudulent voting in that contest, in which Mr. Slaughter was beaten, was investigated by the Department of Justice, but it can hardly be said that the investigation was conducted with vigor and determination.

Naturally, after that discreditable episode, there was some lifting of eyebrows when Mr. Slaughter was indicted. It looked then like a political prosecution. And that is what it looks like now.

A motion to dismiss the indictment was rejected several weeks ago by Judge Schweinhaut. But it was clear, from the language of his memorandum opinion, that he refused to dismiss because he had been led to believe the Government would produce evidence at the trial to support its contention that Mr. Slaughter had not acted merely as an attorney, but also as a lobbyist in the ordinary sense of that term.

When the case came to trial before Judge Holtzoff, however, the Government made a miserable showing. It produced nothing which could be called evidence to support its charge of lobbying. As evidence of lobbying, the prosecution offered to show that Mr. Slaughter had made telephone calls to Members of Congress which were paid for by some of his clients. But the Government attorneys admitted they did not know what had been said in any of these conversations.

In other words, they were willing to convict a man of a crime on the basis of sheer conjecture. Judge Holtzoff quite properly refused to accept such evidence as that and promptly found Mr. Slaughter not guilty.

On the record of this case, Mr. Slaughter seems amply justified in his contention that the charges against him were politically inspired. And it seems to the Star that Judge Holtzoff's verdict of acquittal amply demonstrates the wisdom of the founding fathers in removing our Federal judges as far as possible from the influence of partisan politics.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 20, 1950]

THE LOBBY FRAUD

The Truman gang's cruel and reckless use of the criminal law to abuse people they do not like politically, was illustrated in clear detail here 2 days ago, in the case of one Roger C. Slaughter of Kansas City.

This case equally well shows up the fraudulent and hypocritical nature of the laws restraining the ancient right of petition, now commonly called lobbying.

Here is a summary of facts about Slaughter and why he was brought to court charged with a crime that could have sent him to prison.

Slaughter is a Democrat who was elected to Congress in 1942 and defeated in 1946 because, as a member of the House Rules Committee, he refused to let the Truman gang dictate the way he should vote.

His independence was particularly offensive to the gang because he was, of all things, the representative from Truman's own home congressional district. For the crime of acting on his own, Slaughter became Truman's target No. 1 for 1946.

"If Slaughter is right," he said, "I am wrong." Truer words were never spoken, though the proving cost Slaughter and his family 4 years of expense and suffering.

Kansas City, being the Truman gang's headquarters, the boss' will on Slaughter in 1946 was naturally their command and so he lost at the polls.

As defeated Members of Congress have been doing for 150 years, Slaughter then looked around for a new job that could make use of his talents and knowledge of Government. He undertook to work here for people in the grain business, natural enough considering the part of the country from which he comes.

But the gang wasn't satisfied just to kick him out of Congress. The boss wanted Slaughter crushed to death. So, on November 23, 1948, he was indicted by a District of Columbia grand jury on two counts, charged with failure to register as a lobbyist.

ON TRIAL 1 HOUR

His case came on for trial here Monday, April 17, 1950, before Judge Alexander Holtzoff, who threw the case out of court within an hour after it started.

This says something not only about the integrity of the judge, the innocence of Slaughter and the black-hearted willfulness of the Truman gang, but also about the way the Government uses grand juries and about the laws on lobbying both as to their nature and their enforcement.

The Constitution of the United States says in article I of the Bill of Rights:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

The grain men who hired Slaughter were following that guarantee of right. They had a grievance and they hired a man to explain it.

But their right of petition was abridged and denied because they hired the wrong MAN.

And if you want to understand that well, follow the proceedings of the House committee right now carrying on one of the perennial lobby investigations.

This investigation is headed by Representative BUCHANAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania. If it wants to do anything about lobbying, why doesn't it point the finger at the way the executive branch of the Government uses its power to force congressional action? Why doesn't it tell the candid truth, that no influence can be exerted on legislation, except with the willing compliance of the legislators?

The place to clean up lobbying is obviously inside, not outside, the Federal establishment.

Protest Against Federal Hand-Outs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hero Rebels at Hand-Outs," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick on April 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERO REBELS AT HAND-OUTS

Recently the Governor of Connecticut addressed a state-wide audience in which he made a plea for greater Federal aid for his state.

As the Governor finished his address, a 24-year-old war veteran, hero of Guadalcanal and winner of the Purple Heart, walked to the platform and asked permission to say a few words. He was permitted to speak and speak he did:

"There is no such thing as Federal aid. It is all money taken from the people. In 1948 the Federal Government took $862,000,000 out of Connecticut in the form of taxes. And the Federal Government can never send back anywhere near the amount they took out because of the tremendous overhead.

"The growing popularity of Federal aid in States and large cities is becoming more and more contemptible due to the political cowardice of governors and mayors who are determined to stay in office come hell or high water.

"And they do this by making their administrations look less and less expensive to promote their own selfish craving madness for money and power regardless of cost. This is played right into the hands of the New Dealers, whose sole objective requires that the power of States be weakened and that State institutions be made dependent upon Washington hand-outs.

"Our dear old uncle is handing out the money with one hand while holding a club behind his back with the other, if you should fail to behave. A few States have been able to resist the rule of the three golden balls that ornament the Washington front porch."

Think it over.

Presidential Visits to Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "No Gettysburg Address?—Mr. Truman Just Too Busy," written by John M. Cummings and published in today's issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO GETTYSBURG ADDRESS?—MR. TRUMAN JUST TOO BUSY

(By John M. Cummings)

One of the great, decisive battles of the world was fought at Gettysburg in Pennsylvania's Adams County. Here the high tide of rebellion was checked. In the national cemetery on this battlefield rest the bones of many men who died in the bloody conflict.

President Lincoln dedicated the cemetery November 19, 1863. It was then he delivered what has since become known as the Gettysburg Address. "We are met on a great battlefield of that (Civil) war. We are met to dedicate a portion of that field as the final resting place of the men who here gave their lives that that Nation (the United States) might live."

In an unbroken line since the days of Theodore Roosevelt our Presidents have been proud to deliver the Memorial Day speech at Gettysburg. In more than 40 years Harry Truman is the only President to reject every invitation to attend the memorial exercises to the honored dead.

Five times since he became President on the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Mr. Truman has found an excuse for sending regrets. The latest, of course, was his rejection of an invitation to deliver the Memorial Day address next May 30.

Theodore Roosevelt, twice, once after he left the presidency, William Howard Taft, Woodrow Wilson, Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, and Franklin Roosevelt, all have been at this national shrine on Memorial Day. Franklin Roosevelt also spoke there when the Eternal Light Peace Memorial was dedicated in 1938.

James F. Lind, the Democratic Congressman from the district in which the national cemetery is located; Francis J. Myers, the Democratic United States Senator; Pittsburgh's Mayor David L. Lawrence, a member of the Democratic National Committee, all importuned the President to attend the exercises next month.

"The President finds he must again decline this year," one of the Truman secretariat wrote Representative LIND. "His calendar for the month of May is already very crowded."

Of course he has a crowded calendar. Mr. Truman leaves early in May on a nonpolitical tour of the West. He will visit many towns and deliver many speeches in which he is expected to make nonpolitical appeals for the election of a Democratic Congress in the fall. And he'll cap the tour by attending the mid-month sessions of the Democratic National Committee in Chicago. Here, more likely than not, he will lay down the law for the conduct of the Democratic campaign.

Long before Memorial Day Mr. Truman will be back in Washington. No doubt he has other stints scheduled. Inquiry at the White House, however, elicited the information he has no fixed engagements for that day.

In the absence of anything definite, you can only speculate on the reason for President Truman's year-by-year rejection of the invitation to speak at Gettysburg. Certainly he must know the Civil War is over, that men who wore the gray of the South have visited the battlefield on which the hopes of the Confederacy were shattered.

Only a few days ago a grandson of Grant and a great-grandson of Lee met at Appomattox, where the last rite of the war was performed. Let's have the lowdown, Harry.

Carroll Binder Reports From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD an additional report written by Mr. Carroll Binder, editorial editor of the Minneapolis Tribune, relating to conditions in Europe. This is the fifth report by Mr. Binder which I have had printed in the RECORD. Two appeared in the RECORD of Tuesday, April 18, and two in the RECORD of Wednesday, April 19.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HALT OF AID TO CUT JOBS IN AMERICA—1952 WILL THREATEN UNITED STATES WITH DEFLATION, EUROPE WITH POVERTY

(By Carroll Binder)

PARIS, FRANCE.—The American people and western Europeans have a rendezvous with destiny in mid-1952.

By that date the United States will have completed spending an estimated $15,000,000,000 to help western Europe get on its feet so securely that it can resist Soviet pressure and get along without further American subsidies.

What will be the shape of things on June 30, 1952, when Marshall aid has ended?

Five weeks' study of conditions in the 4 principal western European countries and talks with people familiar with the 14 other Marshall-plan countries leave me with a very strong impression. It is that the situation in mid-1952 is going to be much less satisfactory and potentially more critical than most Americans will be prepared for.

NONE ARE READY

None of the countries we are helping is in sight of self-sufficiency. The British, Scandinavian, and low countries hope that they will be able to maintain the present level of existence or at least tolerable standards if no further American aid is forthcoming.

But they will only be able to do so by the greatest austerity.

They will absorb far fewer American farm, factory, and mine products than they have been absorbing under the Marshall plan.

Some careful students of the post-1952 prospects doubt that even austerity and rigorous controls will enable all of those countries to keep their heads above water without continued American aid.

One of the greatest economists in England told me he knows of no official who in his heart believes there is the faintest chance of balancing accounts by the time dollar-aid runs out.

Belgium is a case apart but the fate of western Europe will not be determined by that little country's dollar balances. Because of its high agricultural productivity and other factors France probably can manage, if need be, without further dollar aid except when crops fail or the mines are tied up by strikes.

Austria and Greece will have to have continued assistance from the United States to keep going after 1952. So, it is generally assumed, will Italy and western Germany.

Nor will the impact of the end of Marshall-plan expenditures be confined to western European beneficiaries. Many Americans, few of whom realize they are beneficiaries of the European recovery program, seem destined to experience unpleasant jolts in the form of lost markets, lowered prices, and reduced employment.

DEFLATION INEVITABLE

That is, unless Uncle Sam finds quick ways of taking up the slack bound to result when he no longer gives western Europeans dollars with which to buy cotton, tobacco, cereals, metals, chemicals, and machinery.

Deflation seems inevitable unless the United States spends at home at least as much as it has been spending abroad to provide the purchasing power created by our postwar exports.

Western Europe will be no less receptive to such exports after 1952.

Without some of them unemployment will increase and standards of living again will decline. Europe will still need food and raw materials obtainable only through dollar purchasing power. It will not have recovered to such an extent that it can provide full employment and the necessaries of life to its increased population.

The United States cannot maintain exports at the current $12,000,000,000 level unless it imports much more than the present $7,000,000,000 level or gives western Europe dollar purchasing power by some post-Marshall plan of gifts, loans, or long-term investments.

Two-thirds of United States exports to western Europe are being financed by Marshall-plan funds at present. That represents a foreign market for $2,800,000,000 worth of American goods and services which otherwise would not have existed. For certain industries and regions of the United States it has meant the difference between good and poor prices, profit and loss, employment and unemployment.

But the Marshall-plan council has just issued a report estimating that under the most favorable circumstances western Europe will have a dollar deficit of $2,250,000,000 when the plan ends.

This estimate assumes that the level of business activity in the United States will remain at least as high as it was at the end of 1949. "Even small set-backs" in the United States economy would have disproportionately large consequences for western Europe, whose reserves are not great enough to sustain much strain, the council points out.

Whatever individual countries may do to get along without American aid after 1952, the "dollar gap" for western Europe as a whole will remain at least $2,250,000,000 and may go much higher if world economic conditions take a turn for the worse.

The discontinuance of Marshall-plan assistance thus seems certain to have a deflationary influence upon both the western European and the American economies. So did the discontinuance of American aid and investments in 1920–21 and 1931–31.

Was the Marshall plan then a mistake? Is our investment of $8,000,000,000 to date and $7,000,000,000 projected for the next 2 years money thrown down the drain?

Not unless we and the countries we are helping fail to build wisely on the foundations so hopefully laid.

We have bought time with which to try to save western civilization from eclipse. We still have an opportunity to save those political, cultural, and economic institutions to which we owe our present well-being and which are the only hope of the future. We have a chance to save them by less costly means than a shooting war for survival. But the methods have yet to be agreed upon.

We shall be called upon for more fateful decisions than any we thus far have had to make—Americans as well as western Europeans.

We Americans are like investors who have poured enormous sums into a concern threatened with bankruptcy which still is far from getting on its feet. Unless we make further investments all the $20,000,000,000 we have put up so far will be wasted and we shall be weaker than ever.

Our investments should not be primarily in further gifts, though aid to Greece and Austria cannot take any other rational form. We shall have to invest much more than we have been doing thus far in things Europe has to sell us or in the exports of countries which in turn buy from Europe. ECA is doing its best to prepare Europe to make things which can be sold to Americans and to prepare Americans to buy more in order that Europe in turn can buy more from us.

Paul Hoffman's goal of 1 to 1½ billion dollars worth of competitive imports is small when compared with our $250,000,000,000 gross national product. But makers of watches object to the entry of watches and dairy interests object to the entry of competing European products. It will not be easy to get quotas and tariffs down on those items in which any group of voters has a special interest and it is those which Europe usually is best situated to offer.

Nor will it be easy to get European manufacturers and exporters to make the extra effort required to penetrate the dollar market so long as they can sell without effort and at higher prices in soft currency countries. The rigidities of the European price structure, the distaste for the free competitive methods which are the life of a vigorous capitalistic system, the cartels and other restrictive agreements against which we crusade are so deeply ingrained in European practice that they are not going to disappear by 1952.

So long as any investment made in western Europe is subject to total loss if the Communists take over, so long as there is unfair competition from nationalized industries and hamstringing regulations, so long as profits remain subject to exorbitant taxation and not assuredly convertible into dollars there will be no large scale private investment to help bridge the dollar gap.

Paul Hoffman calculates that ever since World War I we have spent about 1 percent of our income for foreign aid in one form or another. That, of course, includes the loans we made in the twenties which were never repaid, as well as our gifts. Hoffman expects that we will continue to devote at least 1 percent of our income to maintaining conditions we deem essential to our security.

But spending is not enough. As I conclude this report on things present and likely to come in Europe I am impressed anew by the limitations of any program which is based on the United States trying to remain in one compartment and sending aid out to friendly nations living in other compartments.

Even if we should succeed in getting those nations into one compartment without ourselves joining them it is doubtful if the two compartments indefinitely could separately resist all the pressures to which they would be subjected by the Soviet power whose compartment grows ever larger.

This logically leads to a thesis long advanced by Clarence Streit and other advocates of a union of the free. It is advanced in a recent issue of Fortune: "Agreements, pacts, and alliances are no substitutes for efforts toward political union; subsidies and balances of payments are no substitutes for economic union." And no such union can succeed without United States participation.

A Legal Analysis of Unconstitutionality of Proposed Licensing of Motion Pictures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on March 15, I commented on the Senate floor, that following a rapid review of legislation introduced the day before by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] to license the motion-picture industry, it was my opinion that his bill was completely unconstitutional. I have a deep affection and admiration for my colleague, and yet, without any further reference to personalities or individuals, I must regretfully differ strongly with him.

I want to point out, Mr. President, that when I entered upon the office of Senator and when other Senators entered office, we swore an oath "to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States." It seems to me that I, for one—particularly as ranking Republican on the Senate Judiciary Committee—cannot protect and defend the Constitution if I, or anyone else, stand silently by while legislation that is unconstitutional is introduced and is dignified by hearings. It seems to me, too, that it has always been incumbent upon the Congress to kill bad bills just as it is incumbent upon Congress to pass good bills.

I will not take up the time of the Senate to analyze in great detail this issue

on the floor. I do, however, want to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief memorandum I have prepared on this subject as well as a legal analysis of the bill's unconstitutionality. While the latter item is rather lengthy, I humbly feel that its over-all legal implications are so significant, insofar as freedom of the press is concerned, that the analysis makes for constructive reading. Following that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from a few editorials which have been carried in the newspapers of my State opposing the licensing bill. I could add to these editorials almost indefinitely by quoting from hundreds of other messages throughout the Nation, but I do not believe that this is necessary and I will not take the space in the RECORD to do so.

Yes, some folks may ask why I take the time to take this obviously unconstitutional bill seriously and to make an extensive legal analysis of it. I want to point out, however, that when the day comes when we in the Congress regard with mere smugness unconstitutional legislation, then that will indeed be a black day for our country.

There being no objection, the memorandum, analysis, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR WILEY OPPOSING LICENSING BILL

Mr. President, with around 12,000 bills pending before the Congress, with literally hundreds of crucial problems presented to the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee as well as to the 40 other odd Committees of the Senate and House, I am indeed sorry that major hearings have been scheduled by the Interstate Commerce Committee on this issue of proposed regimentation of the motion-picture industry of America.

I, for one, have never attempted to interfere in the jurisdiction of any other SENATOR. I am not a member of the Commerce Committee, but I respectfully submit to its distinguished and able chairman and to the membership of that committee that there are many issues to which the committee might better devote its attention than this licensing proposal.

HEARINGS SHOULD BE CANCELED

I earnestly suggest, therefore, that this hearing be canceled, and that the motion-picture industry be given the opportunity to work out on a voluntary basis its own solutions to this problem.

MY COMMENTS SHOULD NOT BE MISUNDERSTOOD

Let me reiterate my objections to building up a gestapo over the American motion-picture industry are based primarily on legal and constitutional grounds and that: (a) I definitely would not want my comments to be misunderstood as condoning in the slightest the disgusting breaking of the moral law—the code of God and man—by a few individuals connected with films or by any other individuals.

(b) That my comments are not in any way meant to condone the appalling commercialization of sin that has occasionally marred Hollywood advertising (or for that matter, other business advertising that has violated good taste).

(c) And lastly, that my comments are not designed to condone in the slightest any other tendency which would serve to weaken the moral fiber of American people.

FLITGUN NOT SHOTGUN SHOULD BE USED

However, I stated on March 15, and I repeat, that Congress should not attempt to use a 100-barrel shotgun when an industry-used flitgun would more than suffice. Congress should not pillory a whole industry because of isolated misconduct of a few individuals.

PAST LICENSING PROPOSALS

I want to point out, Mr. President, too, that the suggestion for licensing made by the Senator from Colorado is not the first such unsound suggestion. A search which I have made shows that all the way back in the Sixty-third Congress, on March 21, 1914, Congressman Hughes, of Georgia, introduced bill H. R. 14895, which would have created a Federal Motion Picture Commission to analyze the problem of "obscene, indecent, immoral, inhuman pictures." The bill was reported upon but no action was taken.

In the Sixty-fourth Congress Congressman Hughes again introduced a bill on which hearings were held in January 1916. Then, on May 8, 1916, Mr. Hughes introduced still another bill along this very same line.

In the Sixty-ninth Congress Mr. Swoope introduced what was called a Motion Picture Regulation Act, H. R. 4094, on which hearings were held in April and May of 1926.

In 1925 Mr. Upshaw introduced bill H. R. 6233, which was referred to the House Education Committee. It, too, would have created a Federal Motion Picture Commission. Among its provisions, one would have banned the movement of film in interstate commerce unless a license had been granted by the whim of the Commission. Hearings were held on that issue, too, in April and May 1926, but nothing was done.

The years passed, and on June 12, 1933, Congressman PATMAN introduced bill H. R. 6097, designed for licensing films. Hearings were held by the Interstate Commerce Committee in March 1934, but nothing came of this legislation.

And so, Mr. President, the story of would-be efforts to regiment the industry goes. Through these many years as the motion-picture industry has grown from its swaddling clothes, we see that there have been repeated efforts, perhaps well-intentioned but nonetheless ill-advised, to establish a czar, a Kremlin-type dictator, over the industry. But always the good common sense of the Congress and of the American people has defeated these attempts, and I am sure that this will occur right now.

AMERICA'S MORALS NEED NO POLICE-STATE MONSTER

Surely, America's morals are not so weak; surely, our churches are not so defenseless that we need a police-state monster to safeguard our people. Let there be a spontaneous moral crusade among our people—led by our great churches, assisted by all the devout people in the cinema themselves, and let this voluntary crusade be the answer to the problem of immorality in Hollywood or anywhere else.

WHY RUN TO UNCLE SAM FOR ANSWER?

I am deeply sorry that there is in our land an affliction which we might call "governmentitis" which makes some few individuals run to the Federal Government every time they see some problem which they think ought to be corrected. Why must individuals always ask Uncle Sam to set up some new bureaucratic agency in order to handle problems which can be better handled by private industry? The Motion Picture Association of America, and organizations of independent producers and exhibitors are more than qualified under their present leadership to meet this problem.

I know that Mr. Eric Johnston of the MPA, a great patriotic American, is equally concerned with Senator JOHNSON in encouraging the finest possible motion pictures on the highest possible level and the finest possible advertising on the highest possible level for the industry.

Why, then, should hearings be held on this gestapo idea?

PICTURES CRUCIAL FOR COLD WAR VICTORY

Let me as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee point out that we are fighting a cold war throughout the world in order to save ourselves from a hot war—a war of blood and death. Motion pictures are a vital element in our winning that cold war.

The motion-picture industry in this connection has made preparations to assist in a gigantic peace-bond drive next month. Why should we attempt to cripple an industry which is one of the spearheads of our international crusade for peace and freedom?

Let no Senator be silent against this regimentation menace. There are no major motion-picture production companies in Wisconsin, or for that matter, in most of the other States. But this is a national issue, not a State issue. We are United States Senators, not State senators. Our concern is with freedom in all 48 States.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, now let the legal analysis of this bill, S. 3237, speak for itself. This analysis demonstrates that the bill violates the first, fifth, and sixth amendments to the Constitution. It violates due process of law. It constitutes both a bill of attainder and an ex post facto law—both specifically banned by our Constitution.

Moreover, this legislation violates, I believe, the provisions of the Constitution relating to freedom of the press. The Supreme Court in 1948 held that "We have no doubt that motion pictures like newspapers and radios are included in the press, whose freedom is guaranteed by the first amendment."

Let us strike a lasting blow for freedom which future generations will not forget. Let us reject before it gets started unsound, unwise licensing legislation.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF S. 3237, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

The first question to be answered with reference to this bill is whether or not the subject matter thereof is one within the legislative power of the Congress.

As the Constitution of the United States does not grant the Congress any general police powers, the same having been expressly reserved to the States by the tenth amendment, *Hamilton v. Kentucky Distilleries and Warehouse Co.* ((1919) 251 U. S. 146); *United States v. Berken* ((WDSC) (1944) 55 F. Supp. 1, aff'd. 147 F. 2d 905, cert. den. 326 U. S. 774), the regulations of the motion picture industry proposed in this bill must be predicated upon the commerce clause (art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3). The power emanating from this clause is complete in itself and as an incident to it, Congress may adopt not only means necessary, but means convenient to its exercise and these means may be of the quality of police regulations. *United States v. Hall* ((1879) 98 U. S. 343); *Ex parte Curtis* ((1883) 106 U. S. 371); *Caminetti v. United States* ((1917) 242 U. S. 470); *United States v. Hill* ((1919) 248 U. S. 420); *United States v. Simpson* ((1920) 252 U. S. 465); *Brooks v. United States* ((1925) 267 U. S. 432); *Doherty v. United States* ((1938) 94 F. 2d 495, cert. den. 308 U. S. 658); *United States v. Parker* ((1939) 103 F. 2d 857, cert. den., 307 U. S. 642); *United States v. Darby* ((1941) 312 U. S. 100); and *United States v. Reginelli* ((1943) 1933 F. (2d) 595, cert. den., 318 U. S. 783).

While the rights of private individuals must give way to the authority of Congress to legislate in matters pertaining to interstate commerce and for the good of all the people, *Hollingsworth et al. v. Federal Min. & Smelting Co.* ((1947) 74 F. Supp. 1009), Congress cannot vest in bureaus and officials charged with the duty of regulating business activities of citizens inquisitorial powers that are not subject to the beneficent provisions of the so-called Federal Bill of Rights contained in the first 10 amendments to the Federal Constitution. *United States v. Goodner* ((1940) 35 F. Supp. 286, 291).

I will develop seriatim now that the constitutional rights and guaranties of the fifth, sixth, and first amendments and the first article are violated by the provisions of S. 3237.

VIOLATION OF FIFTH AMENDMENT

Due process

Section 3 (a) of the bill provides:

"The Secretary of Commerce shall, upon written application, issue to any eligible individual, (1) upon payment of a fee of $1, a license authorizing such individual to appear as an actor or actress in any motion picture, or (2) upon payment of a fee of $100, a license authorizing such individual to produce any motion picture. Such application shall set forth such facts as the Secretary may require for the purpose of determining whether such individual is eligible for such license under the provisions of subsection (b), and shall be signed by the applicant under oath or affirmation."

These provisions clearly impose upon an individual the necessity of obtaining a license to engage in the vocation of acting or to engage in the vocation of producing motion pictures. Assuming, although the section does not specifically so provide, that the provisions are only applicable to persons who are engaged in these activities in connection with the production of motion pictures to become products of interstate commerce, the provisions still would deny due process of law as required by the fifth amendment. *Gibbons v. Ogden* ((1824) 9 Wheat. 1, 196); *Monongahela Navigation Co. v. United States* ((1893) 148 U. S. 312, 336); *Lottery Case* ((1903) 188 U. S. 321, 362); *United States v. Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pac. R. R. Co.* ((1931) 282 U. S. 311, 327); *Railroad Retirement Board v. Alton Railroad Co.* ((1935) 295 U. S. 330, 347).

The right of a citizen to engage in a legitimate occupation is a property right of which he may not be deprived except by due process of law. *Barn Ballroom Co. v. Ainsworth* ((1946) 67 F. Supp. 299). An attorney's calling or profession is property within the true sense and meaning of the Constitution. *Ex parte Wall* ((1883) 107 U. S. 265, 289). The right to earn a living is property within this clause. *Dotson v. International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Emp. and Moving Picture Mach. Operators of U. S. and Canada, Local 162* (Cal. App. (1948) 191 P. 2d 778). Membership in a trade union is a property right within this clause which the courts will protect. *DeMille v. American Federation of Radio Artists* ((1947) 187 P. 2d 769, 31 Cal. 2d 139, cert. den. 333 U. S. 876). The operation of a travel bureau for the purpose of bringing together persons who on their own responsibility may enter into agreements to make an automobile trip together, is legitimate and any attempt to eliminate it by regulation is unconstitutional. *Garland v. Brown* ((1943) 52 F. Supp. 401). The proposed statute, without providing for a hearing and without providing for an investigation of the character of the applicant but solely upon his former conviction or his forced admission of having committed a certain type of act (which act need not necessarily be a crime), takes away from the applicant his right to earn a living in his chosen profession.

Self-incrimination

The words, "or who admits committing acts constituting the essential elements of a crime involving moral turpitude," contained in section 3 (b), when read in conjunction with the provision of section 3 (a) to the effect that the application for a license "shall be signed by the applicant under oath or affirmation," require self-incrimination. The clause prohibiting compulsory self-incrimination must be construed to secure immunity from every kind of self-accusation (*Counselman v. Hitchcock* ((1892) 142 U. S. 563)); *In re Nachman* ((1902) 114 Fed. 995); to comprehend compulsion which subjects a citizen to some important disadvantage in order to extract the desired evidence from him (*United States v. Bell*, C. C. Tenn. ((1897) 81 F. 830)); to protect a person from being forced to produce and authenticate any personal documents that might incriminate him (*United States v. White* ((1944) 322 U. S. 694)); and to afford the constitutional guaranty of a fundamental right long regarded as a safeguard of civil liberty (*In re Graz* ((1940) 26 N. E. 2d 963); *Harris v. United States* ((1945) 151 F. 2d 837, aff'd. 331 U. S. 145, rehearing denied 331 U. S. 867)).

If a bankrupt need not answer incriminating questions (*Arndstein v. McCarthy* ((1920) 254 U. S. 71)); if a person accused of importing an alien unlawfully need not be a witness against himself (*Lees v. United States* ((1893) 150 U. S. 476, 480)); if in a suit for forfeiture of property under the customs laws a person need not be a witness against himself (*Boyd v. United States* ((1886) 116 U. S. 616, 634)); and if an attorney need not swear he has not borne arms against the United States (*In re Shorter* ((1865) 22 Fed. Cas. No. 12,811)). See also *Matter of Baxter* ((1866) 2 Fed. Cas. No. 1,118) a fortiori, a person need not answer under oath that he has committed an act involving the essential elements of moral turpitude.

Under the terms of the proposed provisions a person would be refused a license if he refused to apply and answer under oath as to whether or not he had ever been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude or whether or not he had ever committed an act which involved the essential elements of moral turpitude. The refusal to issue a license on the basis that he did not so swear would in effect be equivalent to drawing an inference from his silence that he had been convicted of such a crime or that he had committed an act involving the essential elements of such a crime. Such an inference, and a refusal to issue a license on the basis of such an inference, would be violative of the prohibition against compelling self-incrimination. See *United States ex rel. Vajtauer v. Commissioner of Immigration* ((1927) 273 U. S. 103, 113).

VIOLATION OF SIXTH AMENDMENT

The provisions of section 3 which require an actor or producer to obtain a license for which he is ineligible unless he swears he has not committed any act containing an essential element of a crime involving moral turpitude, and the provisions of section 9 which impose a penalty of $1,000 for willfully accepting or continuing employment without a license, are violative of amendment 6 of the United States Constitution.

Generally speaking the definitions of this bill are so indefinite and vague that it is impossible to me as an attorney to conceive that it would be held valid under the fifth and sixth amendments of the Constitution. A new statutory offense must be defined in language understood by the common mind, and the prohibited act or acts must be described in reasonably explicit language. Although the language of the proposed bill requiring a license is explicit enough, the language describing the action which an applicant must swear or affirm he has not committed to obtain a license is not specific enough. See *Lanzetta v. New Jersey* ((1939) 306 U. S. 451, 453). For example:

"SEC. 2. (3) The term 'actor or actress' means an individual who appears in a speaking role in any motion picture, and who receives compensation for such appearance."

This definition is not limited to motion pictures intended for interstate commerce, and is not applicable to nonspeaking actors. As pantomime can be salacious, is the classification justified?

"SEC. 2. (5) The term 'distributor' means the person having primary responsibility for the leasing, rental, or sale for exhibition in the United States, its Territories, or possessions, of any motion-picture film."

What is the meaning of "primary responsibility"?

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Commerce shall, upon written application, issue to any eligible individual, (1) upon payment of a fee of $1, a license authorizing such individual to appear as an actor or actress in any motion picture, or (2) upon payment of a fee of $100, a license authorizing such individual to produce any motion picture. Such application shall set forth such facts as the Secretary may require for the purpose of determining whether such individual is eligible for such license under the provisions of subsection (b), and shall be signed by the applicant under oath or affirmation."

This definition refers to eligible individuals, and eligible individuals under subsection (b), but there is no definition of an eligible individual. Subsection (b) does not state who is an eligible individual but states two classes of persons who are not eligible.

"SEC. 4. (b) No motion-picture film made or produced in whole or in part in the United States, its Territories, or possessions shall be eligible for licensing unless the Secretary shall find (1) that all persons appearing as actors or actresses in such film possess, or, if deceased, possessed at time of death, unrevoked licenses issued under section 3 (a) (1); (2) that the individuals producing such film, who are required under this act to obtain licenses, possess, or, if deceased, possessed at time of death, unrevoked licenses issued under section 3 (a) (2); (3) that such film cannot reasonably be expected to contribute to juvenile delinquency; and (4) that such film is not reasonably calculated to encourage a contempt for law, or public or private morality."

What are the standards by which (3) and (4) of this subsection are to be controlled?

"SEC. 4. (c) No motion-picture film wholly made or produced outside the United States, its Territories, or possessions shall be eligible for licensing unless the Secretary shall find (1) that such film cannot reasonably be expected to contribute to juvenile delinquency, (2) that such film is not reasonably calculated to encourage a contempt for law, or public or private morality, and (3) that the producers of, and actors or actresses in, such motion picture are not criminals or persons of ill repute."

What are the standards for establishing that a person is one of ill repute?

"SEC. 4. (d) * * * Public notice of the issuance of any such license shall be given in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe, and a copy thereof furnished to any interested person upon his application."

Who is required to supply the copy that is to be furnished to anyone interested?

Indefinite nature of "moral turpitude" term

The indefinite and loose wording of the act and particularly the reference to moral

turpitude reinforce my belief that this act is unconstitutional. The term "moral turpitude" has been defined any number of times, but all the definitions state more or less that moral turpitude is a vague and indefinite term which imports an act of baseness, vileness, or depravity in the private and social duties which a man owes to his fellow man or to society in general. *Neibling v. Terry* ((177 S. W. 2d 302); *In re Pontarelli* (66 N. E. 2d 83); *U. S. ex rel. Mazzella v. Zimmerman* ((1947) 71 F. Supp. 534, 537); *United States ex rel. Berlandi v. Reimer* ((1939) 30 F. Supp. 767). Crimes involving moral turpitude do not depend upon individual judgment but upon the commonly accepted mores current at the time. *United States v. Francioso* ((1947) 164 F. 2d 163).

A statute which either forbids or requires the doing of an act in terms so vague that men of common intelligence must necessarily guess at its meaning and differ as to its application, is violative of due process. *Winters v. New York* ((1948) 333 U. S. 507, 518). A statute creating an offense must set up ascertainable standards of guilt. *United States v. L. Cohen Grocery Co.* ((1921) 255 U. S. 81, 89); *Smith v. Cahoon* ((1933) 283 U. S. 553, 564); *Champlin Refining Co. v. Corporation Commission* ((1932) 286 U. S. 210, 242).

From the foregoing it can be readily seen that it is almost too much to expect a person to swear to a statement that he has not committed an act which might contain an essential element of moral turpitude when the definition of moral turpitude is so indefinite and subject to change with the change in the moral conscience. It, therefore, may be asserted that the definition of this term is violative of the definiteness needed in criminal statutes in order not to violate amendments five and six of the Constitution. *United States v. Reese* ((1876) 92 U. S. 214, 220); *United States v. Brewer* ((1891) 139 U. S. 278, 288); *Connally v. General Construction Company* ((1926) 269 U. S. 385, 391).

Further, as stated in the case of *Lanzetta v. New Jersey* ((1939) 306 U. S. 451, 453):

"If on its face the challenged provision is repugnant to the due-process clause, specification of details of the offense intended to be charged would not serve to validate it. Cf. *United States v. Reese* (92 U. S. 214, 221); *Czarra v. Board of Medical Examiners* (25 App. D. C. 443, 453). It is the statute, not the accusation under it, that prescribes the rule to govern conduct and warns against transgression. See *Stromberg v. California* (283 U. S. 359, 368); *Lovell v. Griffin* (303 U. S. 444). No one may be required at peril of life, liberty, or property to speculate as to the meaning of penal statutes. All are entitled to be informed as to what the State commands or forbids. The applicable rule is stated in *Connally v. General Construction Co.* (269 U. S. 385, 39): 'That the terms of a penal statute creating a new offense must be sufficiently explicit to inform those who are subject to it what conduct on their part will render them liable to its penalties, is a well-recognized requirement, consonant alike with ordinary notions of fair play and the settled rules of law.'"

VIOLATION OF FIRST AMENDMENT

Freedom of the press

The censorship provisions of the bill are included in section 4 (b), which reads:

"No motion-picture film made or produced in whole or in part in the United States, its Territories, or possessions shall be eligible for licensing unless the Secretary shall find * * * (3) that such film cannot reasonably be expected to contribute to juvenile delinquency; and (4) that such film is not reasonably calculated to encourage a contempt for law, or public or private morality."

These provisions would seem to be violative of the first amendment of the Constitution. Although the Supreme Court in 1915 in the case of *Mutual Film Corporation v. Industrial Commission of Ohio* ((1915) 236 U. S. 230), held that motion pictures could not be brought into a practical and legal similitude to a free press and liberty of opinion, it is of interest to note that the Supreme Court in 1948 in the case of *United States v. Paramount Pictures* ((1948) 334 U. S. 131, 165), stated, "We have no doubt that motion pictures, like newspapers and radios are included in the press whose freedom is guaranteed by the first amendment." It is not contended that this latter statement of the Supreme Court overrules the Mutual Film Corporation case, but as stated in *RDDR Corporation v. Smith*, decided March 6, 1950, by Judge Andrews in U. S. D. C., N. Ga. (18 LW 2435), the question appears to need reexamination in view of the statements made by the Supreme Court in *Gitlow v. New York* ((1925) 268 U. S. 652); *Winters v. New York* ((1948) 333 U. S. 507); and *Terminiello v. Chicago* ((1949) 337 U. S. 1). And, as stated in *Near v. Minnesota* ((1931) 283 U. S. 697, 713), the essence of censorship is whether a statute authorizing such proceedings in restraint of publication is consistent with the conception of the liberty of the press as historically conceived and guaranteed. In determining the extent of the constitutional protection, it has been generally, if not universally, considered that it is the chief purpose of the guaranty to prevent previous restraints upon publication. The struggle in England, directed against the legislative power of the licensor, resulted in renunciation of the censorship of the press.

As stated in *Schenck v. United States* ((1919) 249 U. S. 47, 52):

"The question in every case is whether the words are used in such circumstances and are of such nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent."

The censorship provisions of this section use the expressions "that cannot reasonably be expected to contribute" and "not reasonably calculated to encourage." These are rather broad standards by which to judge whether or not the film should be barred from distribution. In fact, under such wording, it would appear to be absolutely discretionary with the Secretary of Commerce to determine whether or not the picture was ons to be shown. This is censorship of the most vicious type.

VIOLATION OF ARTICLE I

Article I, section 9, clause 3, provides:

"No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed" by Congress.

The bill is in the nature of a bill of attainder and is also an ex post facto law.

Bills of attainder

When our Constitution and Bill of Rights were written, our forefathers had ample reason to know that legislative trials and punishments were too dangerous to liberty to exist in the nation of freemen they envisioned. And so they rightly prescribed bills of attainder. *United States v. Lovett* ((1946) 328 U. S. 303, 317). They knew the danger inherent in special legislative acts which take away the life, liberty, or property of particular-named persons or classes of persons because the legislature thinks them guilty of conduct which deserves punishment. *Duncan v. Kahanamoku* ((1946) 327 U. S. 304). This clause precludes specific acts imposing punishment upon particular persons or classes of persons by legislative authority. See *Cummings v. Missouri* (4 Wall 277); *Ex parte Garland* (4 Wall. 333); *Drehman v. Stifle* (8 Wall. 595); *Pierce v. Carskadon* (16 Wall. 234); *Fletcher v. Peck* (6 Cr. 87); *Ogden v. Saunders* (12 Wheat. 213, 290); *Klinger v. Missouri* (13 Wall. 257). In the very recent case, *United States v. Lovett* ((1946) 328 U. S. 317), the Court stated inter alia:

"Neither of these cases (*Cummings v. Missouri, supra* or *Ex parte Garland, supra*) have ever been overruled. They stand for the proposition that legislative acts, no matter what their form, that apply either to named individuals or to easily ascertainable members of a group in such a way as to inflict punishment on them without a judicial trial are bills of attainder prohibited by the Constitution."

The proposed statute, just as the statute in the former cases mentioned, "operates as a legislative decree of perpetual exclusion" from a chosen vocation and just like those statutes is violative of this article.

Ex post facto

This bill imposes an additional penalty on a person who has been convicted and served his sentence for a crime involving moral turpitude and it also imposes a penalty, where none existed before, on a person who has committed an act which involves the essential elements of a crime of moral turpitude. An ex post facto law is one which imposes a punishment for an act which was not punishable at the time it was committed or imposes a punishment in addition to that prescribed at the time of the commission of the act (*United States v. Hall* ((1810) 6 Cr. 171); *Burgess v. Salmon* (97 U. S. 381, 384)); or alters the situation of the accused to his disadvantage (*Kring v. Missouri* ((1883) 107 U. S. 221, 228); *Medley, Petitioner* ((1890) 134 U. S. 160, 171); *United States v. Great Northern R. R. Co.* ((1907) 157 Fed. 288, error dismissed 214 U. S. 530); *Cases v. United States* ((1942) 131 F. (2d), cert. den. 319 U. S. 770, rehearing den., 324 U. S. 889)). And the ex post facto effect of the law cannot be evaded by giving a civil form to that which is essentially criminal. *Burgess v. Salmon, supra*. In *Cummings v. Missouri* ((1867) 4 Wall. 277, 323), the provision of the Missouri Reconstruction Constitution which required persons to take an oath of loyalty as a prerequisite to practicing a profession was invalidated because it constituted a bill of attainder and because it had an ex post facto operation. On the same day in *Ex parte Garland* ((1867) 4 Wall. 333), the Court invalidated on the same grounds an act of Congress which required attorneys practicing before the Supreme Court to take a similar oath. An accused must be clearly informed of the charge against him, the law which he is charged with violating must have been passed before he committed the act charged, and even after conviction no cruel and unusual punishment can be inflicted upon him. See *Chambers v. Florida* (309 U. S. 227, 235–238).

CONCLUSION

There are many other legally objectionable features of this bill, but it is believed that the above evidence amply supports my thesis of the bill's unconstitutionality.

EXCERPTS FROM WISCONSIN PRESS EDITORIALS

[From the Racine Journal-Times of March 23, 1950]

Senator EDWIN JOHNSON, of Colorado, is so worked up over the antics of movie actors, actresses, and producers that he proposes to set up a Government licensing system to govern the motion-picture industry. Many persons will agree that the recent use of the sordid Bergman-Rossellini affair to promote the dull Stromboli at the box office was an attempt to exploit the immoral escapades of the film stars.

But however repugnant these escapades may be to our sense of morality, the Johnson proposal is not the answer. It would impose a governmental censorship that is just as repugnant to our system of personal freedom and liberty.

No one is forced to go to a movie. If an individual chooses to boycott films of the actors and actresses whose private lives do not meet his standards of morality, or for any other reason, the customer is free to do so. That, after all, would be the most effective deterrent. If Americans refused to attend films, producers would be quick to change their tactics.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal of March 16, 1950]

As for Senator JOHNSON's actor-licensing proposal, the whole thing strikes us as ridiculous. This is carrying Government supervision of individual morals to the extreme.

RKO may have engaged in nauseating commercial opportunism by its shameless exploitation of Stromboli, but Senator JOHNSON doesn't have to go see the picture, nor does anyone else.

How do Miss Bergman's morals compare with the behavior of Alger Hiss, or General Vaughan, or John Maragon? Is Miss Bergman a greater sinner than J. Parnell Thomas or Congressman Andrew May?

There is a Judge that will decide these things. We doubt if He needs any help from a licensing system established by the Congress of the United States.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 19, 1950]

HITLER FUHRER FOR HOLLYWOOD?

For fantastic suggestions to improve the moral tone of Hollywood and its films, Senator JOHNSON of Colorado deserves an Oscar.

His proposal that the Federal Government license actors, producers, and films got the lambasting it deserved from other Senators. Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, did as telling a job as any.

Senator WILEY said that he was as shocked as anyone over the scandalous affair of Roberto Rossellini, a love pirate, and Miss Ingrid Bergman; also by the way Hollywood exploited their illicit conduct to promote patronage for their film Stromboli. But Senator WILEY went on to condemn the Johnson cure as unconstitutional and a police-state measure. It would open the way, he said, to an entire train of dictatorial legislation. Where it would end, no man could foresee.

One Hollywood comment hit that nail right on the head. What about a measure to control the moral conduct of United States Senators?

As Senator WILEY pointed out, those of us who are disgusted when Hollywood exploits scandal have effective remedies now within our grasp. He put it this way:

"When Hollywood learns that the American people will not patronize pictures featuring a particular individual, that individual quickly leaves the Hollywood scene."

The Land-Grant Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by President John A. Hannah of Michigan State College, at the annual convention of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. I should like to point out that Dr. Arthur S. Adams, president of the University of New Hampshire, who is also president of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, has inserted in this address in parentheses figures which are applicable only to the University of New Hampshire.

Mr. President, I am informed by the Public Printer that this address will make approximately three pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $246.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT LOSE THE COMMON TOUCH

We meet today—presidents, deans, and directors of the land-grant colleges and universities—as persons with a wide diversity of special interests, reflected in the programs we are to enjoy during the next few days. But we have a great common interest, too, and it is about that common interest I want to talk with you this morning.

I would have you recall that we all share a tremendous responsibility to the people of this Nation because we are the conservators of one of the best of America's great traditions.

We know it as the land-grant-college tradition, and we describe it generally as the conception that there should be equality of educational opportunity for every American, that higher education should be practical in the sense that it should fit students to live satisfying and useful lives, and that higher education has the responsibility to train young men and women to be effective citizens of this great democracy.

We who serve the land-grant-college system of America believe that we are in a manner of speaking disciples of Milton, who gave us a good definition of education in these words:

"I call, therefore, a complete and generous education that which fits a man to perform justly, skillfully, and magnanimously all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war."

Nearly as eloquent was the Michigan farmer who led the campaign which culminated nearly a century ago in the establishment of the first agricultural college in America. After describing the practical studies of the ideal curriculum for the college to be, Bela Hubbard added:

"Nor should the claims of literature and the fine arts be wholly neglected, as tending to polish the mind and manner, and add greater luster and dignity to life."

Much more recently, the president of a great eastern university, which has antecedents wholly unrelated to those of the institutions we represent, wrote something which might well be taken as a succinct expression of the philosophy which motivates, or at least should motivate, the institutions we represent. In General Education in a Free Society, President James Bryant Conant, of Harvard, wrote:

"The primary concern of American education today is not the development of the appreciation of the good life in young gentlemen born to the purple. Our purpose is to cultivate in the largest number of our future citizens an appreciation both of the responsibilities and the benefits which come to them because they are American and free."

To that sentiment each of us can subscribe, and Senator Morrill and President Lincoln would have applauded had a university president of their day expressed as well the idea which led to the establishment of the land-grant-college system of America.

Of course, we are not alone in our guardianship of the tradition of higher education at public expense in the best interests of the Nation. Many great universities and colleges share the trust. But I think that our friends in the State universities outside our own land-grant association would grant that passage of the Morrill Act was one of the most significant events in the entire history of this Nation in that it brought higher education out of the cloisters of the past and made it available to the people at large in the solution of their everyday problems.

Few thinking men question that the system of higher education growing out of the Morrill Act has been a powerful factor in the development of the American democratic system.

The introductory section of the annual statistical report of the Federal Security Agency put it neatly when it said:

"It is not easy to appraise in brief space the services of these land-grant institutions. They have broadened the base of higher education, bringing it within the interest and attainment of vastly larger numbers of people than would otherwise have been reached. They have spread widely the concept that higher education is something in which all the people have a stake. They have, therefore, a place of deep affection in the hearts of the people. They are growing in strength and influence with each passing decade."

How pleasant it would be to relax in the warmth of that praise from an impartial Government bureau and to take comfort in the contemplation of deeds well done.

But the statistical tables immediately following that very page of praise raise a sign of danger which we will be blind if we do not see, and derelict if we do not heed. It says, indirectly but plainly enough to make the message clear, that higher education in the United States as represented by all publicly supported institutions, and the land-grant colleges and universities in particular, is face to face with a serious financial crisis.

To understand the danger signals, we must keep in mind the special characteristics of the land-grant system. One of the important characteristics is that our land-grant colleges and universities are peculiarly creatures of the several States and Territories. True, they were established for the most part under the benevolence of the Federal Government, but through the decades each has been supported largely by the tax dollars of the State or Territory it represents, and each has served the special interests of its State or Territory.

A second characteristic is that these institutions have been devoted to the education of the agricultural and industrial classes—that is to say, those who labor with their hands and minds in the production of tangible goods and services. For that reason, these are known as practical institutions, although I prefer the phrases of a neighboring Canadian educator who refers to them as being established on the democratic, rather than the aristocratic, pattern.

A third important characteristic is that, of and by reason of their genesis and tradition, they are dedicated to the proposition that there shall be equality of educational opportunity, as nearly as equality can be achieved in a nation with as great a diversity of people and interests as our own.

As we near the midpoint of this difficult twentieth century, let us take a little time to see how we measure up to the standards set for us by those who preceded us as president, deans, and directors. Do our institutions continue to be the favored children of our individual States, cherished and nourished by the deep affection of the people? Are we still devoted to the service of the industrial and agricultural classes, seeking to improve their lots in life? Have we accomplished much by way of equality of educational opportunity for all classes of our citizens?

I would not presume to claim to have the complete answers to those three questions, but this would be a wasted opportunity if some of the evidence were not called to your attention on this occasion.

First, as to the matter of State support. The annual statistical report of the Federal Security Agency to which I referred indicates that we are losing, not gaining, assistance from our individual States, which are supposed to be the strong supporters of the land-grant colleges and universities. This is no place to quote tables of statistics, when they have been published for your reading and examination. But in support of my contention let me point out that while enrollments in all land-grant colleges and universities increased by 68.7 percent (New Hampshire 81 percent) from the 1945–46 school year through the 1947–48 school year, income from State appropriations increased a little less—65.6 percent (New Hampshire 57.9 percent). But most significant is the fact that income from student fees increased by 279 percent (New Hampshire 378 percent) in the same period, while total income was increasing by 74.6 percent (New Hampshire 98.6 percent).

Or put another way, the States contributed 42.5 percent (New Hampshire 30.4 percent) of the total income of all the land-grant colleges and universities in 1945–46, and only 40.3 percent (New Hampshire 24.2) last year. Meanwhile, the percentage of contribution to total income from student fees increased from 12.3 (New Hampshire 12.8) in 1945–46 to 30.4 (New Hampshire 31) last year. That was a relative increase of 147 percent (New Hampshire 142 percent) in the contribution from fees, and a decrease of 5.1 percent (New Hampshire 20.3 percent) in the contribution by the several States.

This merely substantiates, of course, the findings of the President's Commission on Higher Education that the percentage of educational costs being contributed by students has been creeping upwards for years, and has reached the point at which it endangers the whole program of public education in this country.

What many of us may have failed to realize, however, is the gradual disinclination or inability of State governments to support higher education on the accustomed scale to responsible for placing ever-growing burdens on students and their families.

This is true of both the land-grant colleges and universities and the other State-supported institutions as well. A recent study by the University of Michigan, which I am privileged to quote, found that enrollments in State-supported colleges and universities in 20 selected States have increased by 154 percent (New Hampshire 141 percent) in the 20 years since 1929, and that while appropriations in gross have increased at a slightly faster rate—162 percent (New Hampshire 160 percent)—appropriations per student in terms of 1948 dollars have declined by 14 percent (New Hampshire increased 8 per cent).

Of course, the record varies from State to State. For example, appropriations per student in terms of 1948 dollars increased in 5 of the 20 selected States, and decreased in the other 15. It may explain some of my concern that the decrease in Michigan has been 35 percent, compared with the average decrease of 14 percent.

To illustrate the importance of fees in our financial structure, one need but think where our land-grant institutions would have been without the $56,500,000 (New Hampshire, $624,318.41) in fees received from the Veterans' Administration in 1946–47, or the $65,000,000 (New Hampshire, $555,832.54) received last year. Last year, for example, VA fee receipts were almost twice what it cost to operate and maintain our physical plants (New Hampshire, $577,631.64); they were equivalent to more than 53 percent (New Hampshire, 87.7 percent) of the cost of resident instruction (New Hampshire, $1,008,912.64) in all our institutions.

Is any one of us so naive as to think that our State governments would have footed the whole bill if there had been no millions forthcoming in the form of veterans' fees?

And who will foot the bill when this source of funds dries up, as it is beginning to dry up?

Let us leave this disturbing topic for a moment, and consider how we have fared in our mission to provide equality of educational opportunity. Again, there is no need to quote figures and percentages, for the report of the President's Commission has made it abundantly and painfully clear that every year our high schools graduate thousands upon thousands of talented and capable young men and women for whom a college education is out of the question, simply because it is too costly for them. Most of them, beyond doubt, are from the families in the "industrial classes" our institutions were created to serve specifically. The recent studies in the State of New York bear out earlier findings that not only does parental income pretty much determine whether boys and girls go on to college but also the level of parental income tends to determine the curriculum to be followed by the youngster who is lucky enough to get into college. That, of course, means that the well-to-do parent can make a lawyer or a doctor of his son, and the less well-to-do parent will have to restrict his son's ambitions to the less remunerative fields of teaching, commerce, and the industrial trades.

Is here the revival of the social stratification which the founders of the land-grant college system sought to destroy by broadening the base of higher education? Their weapon, you recall, was inexpensive education, education practically free to all who qualified to receive it. Is the weapon to be broken in the hands of those who hold it now?

Prospects that the trend can be reversed are not encouraging, but reversed it must be, or the land-grant colleges which have been the pride, and in many respects the glory, of America, will lose their character and become merely institutions where those with means are welcome, and those without resources and special social qualifications are told to keep away. The people of this country rejected that kind of higher education 87 years ago, and I am convinced that they will not choose to return to it—if they have a free, enlightened choice.

The next questions follow naturally: What can be done to reverse this trend, to put higher education back within the grasp of the great majority of our young men and women? How can we continue to operate the great physical plants our colleges and universities have come to be? How can we pay the great teachers and scientists who make up our faculties when our incomes from fees begin to shrink?

The answer of the short-sighted and those who do not understand the value of a democratic society of a well-educated young citizenry will be to raise student fees to make up the difference. For us, this must be the last resort, if resort it be at all. Our efforts must be expended in reducing the cost of education for the individual student, not in finding ways to drain away more of his family resources.

The next most obvious answer is to increase public appropriations for higher education. This, of course, will be far easier said than done. Throughout the country this year there was evidence of great reluctance on the part of State legislatures to spent tax money in what fair-minded persons would say were adequate amounts for the support of institutions of higher learning. Experience varied from State to State, and by and large we have all been treated fairly well. But I wonder what the story will be next year, and the year after, when the veterans have finished their schooling, and the flow of comparatively easy money from the Veterans' Administration dribbles to a stop. What chance have we to compensate for the loss of income? Our chance is not a very good one, I fear, when we consider the competition for the taxpayers' dollars.

The competition is formidable. The most serious competition is in the field of social welfare, where there are a great many persons with a sizable stake. They far outnumber all our students and alumni, and all others who might be friendly to our cause.

Let me take my own State as an example. Back in 1937, when we were far less prosperous than now, the State of Michigan expended a little more than $7,500,000 (New Hampshire: $896,741.98) on a higher education out of a total budget of a little more than $160,000,000 (New Hampshire: $20,789,237.95), or 4.6 percent (New Hampshire: 4.3 percent). Ten years later—the fiscal year ending in 1948—it spent $22,000,000 (New Hampshire: $1,734,822.37) on higher education, out of a total expenditure of $461,666,667 (New Hampshire: $47,090,838.31), or 4.76 percent (New Hampshire: 3.7 percent).

Now, had enrollments remained the same, or even increased in ratio with the population, higher education would have fared comparatively well. But enrollments in our State-supported universities and colleges and increased by 25,750 (New Hampshire: 2,159), or 72 percent (New Hampshire: 118 percent), and it took $171 in 1948 to buy what $100 had bought in 1937.

Meanwhile, higher educations' competitors for State support had gained ground at an astonishing speed. State expenditures for public welfare, for example, jumped from $1,500,000 (New Hampshire: $1,363,050.13) to $14,333,334 (New Hampshire: $5,046,965.53), payments to local units of government for public welfare programs leaped from $21,750,00 to $69,333,334; payments for primary and secondary education increased from $38,500,000 (New Hampshire: $704,526.86) to $107,500,000 (New Hampshire: $3,292,044.37). Here is competition indeed.

In the face of facts such as these—and the situation is probably comparable in other States—we must begin to consider where the cuts are to be made when the current grumbling against high taxes swells into a roar which our legislators must hear. Will they reduce payments for old-age pensions, or for the care of crippled children, or for primary and secondary schools, or for the economic unfortunate who must subsist on a dole? Higher education is much more vulnerable, considering that those other recipients of governmental support represent far larger blocks of voting strength.

The land-grant system was established, and public support of higher education was strongest, in the pioneering era of America. Certainly, it was the demand for trained farmers and engineers and teachers in an expanding economy which was the great impetus for the land-grant-college movement. Perhaps we have reached the point at which we are turning away from the philosophy that there should be opportunities for every American to accomplish as much as his own ability and ambition enable him to accomplish. Perhaps we are turning toward the philosophy that a minimum standard of safety and security should be guaranteed for everyone, regardless of ability and effort. I should hate to think that the latter philosophy has the upper hand in America, for

under such circumstances the minimum has a way of becoming the maximum, and everyone lives on a humdrum level.

All that aside, we must recognize that advocates of public support for higher education in the future will have to work harder than ever before and develop better arguments, if they are to convince those who spend the tax dollars that they are the champions of one function of Government in which everyone has vital stake.

Amid these gloomy predictions there is at least one ray of light. It is that American parents still want the best possible educations for their children and are still sold on the notion that a college education is something every American boy and girl should have. We have all sensed that fact, I believe, but the recent Fortune survey produced facts and figures to substantiate our belief. That survey is worthy of the close study I am sure it has received from all of us. The thousands of words and figures are neatly and adequately summed up on the cover of the supplement:

"Americans want all (the higher education) they can get for their young people, and where they cannot foot the bill they think the Government should help out."

Despite all the critical things that can be said truthfully about higher education in the United States, the fact remains that the people themselves still believe in its value, and will slave and sacrifice to buy a college education for their children. On that foundation we must build our plans to meet the crisis which now confronts us.

I have no sure-fire plan for solving the financial problems of higher education. To a degree, I imagine that we will have to do more of what each of us has to do in his own university or academic school or extension service or experiment station—contrive, revise, adapt, compromise, combine, and struggle—to try to make $1 do the work of two. There never has been all the money that could be spent usefully and profitably, and the only safe prediction is that there never will be.

Financial aid from the Federal Government may be the solution; I do not profess to know. I recognize the dangers in such an approach. But I am not as alarmed as some educators, for I recall that the land-grant colleges have been working in fairly comfortable partnership with the Federal Government for many decades, and if a single one of them has surrendered its institutional individuality and accepted political dictation from Washington, I have yet to hear of it.

This I do know—if the tax-supported institutions of higher learning do have to turn to the Federal Government for succor, it will be because they have not received their just deserts at the hands of the State governments whose proper wards they are.

I am sure that hit-or-miss individual attacks on this program will not be enough. Some things we must do in concert, because as the current guardians of a great public trust, we must act together to protect the interest of the American people whom we serve.

It seems to me that any program of action must fall into the area of publicity and performance, just as do any good programs to improve public relations. By publicity I do not mean press agentry, but rather a program of information for the enlightenment of the people of this country. Publicly supported education needs spokesmen; it needs advocates, with a deep conviction in their souls and the energy to carry the great story they have to tell to the far corners of every State.

For example, the story of the land-grant movement needs to be written, not in the exact but tedious language of the historian interested only in the bare bones of facts, but by someone who can describe in readable, vivid language the great adventure which has brought our institutions to prominence and influence in this country. We need to have people understand that philosophy that gives a special sort of animation to the land-grant colleges and universities, and to have them appreciate the great things that have been wrought in their behalf in the years since 1862. There is a best-seller in that idea for some great writer.

Incidentally, the story of the land-grant college movement needs to be told over and over again on our own campuses, too. I fear that too many of our own faculty and staff members fail to understand why our institutions, came into being, and why they proved successful. Somehow, we must rekindle the enthusiasm for a practical ideal which marked those who had the land-grant colleges and universities in their charge in former years. Certainly there is no finer and no more inspiring tradition to claim the loyalty of the teachers of young Americans.

We need to make it clear beyond misunderstanding that the support contributed by the State and Federal Governments does not pay all the bills for college students. We should hammer it home in our State capitols that for every dollar in taxpayers' money spent on giving a young man or woman college training, the student spends at least $3 of his own, because the expense of living away from home—board, room, clothing, and incidentals—costs far more than instruction itself.

We need to destroy the false notion that current enrollments will soon drop back to prewar levels, and the pressure eased accordingly.

We need to hammer home the solid fact that for every penny of tax money spent on agricultural research, each State receives many dollars in return.

We need to tell over and over again the story of the agricultural extension service, what it has done to improve farming as a profession and farming as a way of life, and what it can do in the future if given the support it deserves.

I sincerely believe that we as administrators need to go personally to industry and say: We are training your engineers, your chemists, your salesmen, your executives—give us the active support we deserve. We must go to the primary and secondary schools and say: We are training your teachers for you—give us the support we deserve. We need to awaken the great learned professions to the necessity for maintaining universities fully equipped and staffed to train the lawyers and doctors and other professional people of the future.

And at this particular juncture, we just answer those who are attempting to mislead the people into the belief that publicly supported higher education is somehow unclean, and that high-minded education, free from political taint, is to be found only within the walls of the private colleges. My friend David B. Henry, president of Wayne University, answered those critics effectively in School and Society in the issue of September 3; I recommend it to your careful attention for what he has to say is sound and sensible, and worthy of wide quotation.

Probably all the things mentioned would be of some help to us, but it seems to be beyond question that they would not be enough. Certainly we cannot content ourselves with merely stating our case, and then sitting back to await a miracle. The gods help them that help themselves, as truly now as in Aesop's day.

At least some of our institutions are going to be called upon to reduce our costs wherever possible. In some cases, it may be possible to eliminate or reduce services, although experience has taught most of us that while the public will applaud the theory of reducing expenses in that way, the same public will be highly indignant if it is attempted.

It is probable that a more effective way of cutting costs will be found in the examination of teaching methods. It is doubtful that we have yet achieved the ultimate of efficiency in the transfer of knowledge, and if more efficient methods are capable of development, it is the inherent responsibility of the university and the college to develop them.

It is probable, for example, that even more effective visual aids to teaching could be developed with a considerable saving in teaching costs. We are only on the verge of the television era, and we may find before too many years have passed that it is possible for a great scientist or a great humanist to teach thousands of students by television where today he teaches hundreds, or possibly only scores. I am sure that television holds exciting possibilities for the agricultural extension service as well as for classroom teaching, and for the whole field of adult education.

One of the great foundations could render a tremendous service to higher education if it would sponsor and finance a study of the educational possibilities of television. Let me add that I sincerely hope that we do not miss as many opportunities in this exciting new medium as we did in radio.

It seems to me that there would be far more research within our own schools in the direction of developing better teaching methods. There has been some excellent work, but there must be more if we are to face the critics of the cost of higher education and say honestly, "We have done everything we can do."

It seems to me that we should give some serious consideration to the oft-repeated charge that our colleges and universities have grown too large. Much of their expansion to their present sizes has been forced expansion in response to public demands. Are we sure that a large, complex institution can operate more cheaply and teach more effectively than two or three smaller institutions? Certainly the point of diminishing returns must be reached sometime, but where is that point, and will we know when we have reached it? Are there graduate students in some of our institutions who can develop some facts by research into this problem?

Perhaps such a study would help each of us uncover some of the flaws which must have developed as we recruited staffs to meet the postwar demands for teaching services. I know, for example, that we found it possible to eliminate more than 60 teaching positions from the Michigan State College faculty this year, in the face of increasing enrollments, and no one was hurt seriously.

It would be embarrassing if unkindly critics detected any padding of faculty or administrative staffs, and it would be far better to eliminate the excess ourselves, rather than have it done for us, painfully.

But these too are but mechanical devices which can do little more than make a dent in prospective deficits. It seems to me that the greatest and most beneficial exercise in which we could engage would be some candid soul-searching, some quiet contemplation of the far distant and the more recent histories of our institutions.

It seems to me that we should consider seriously whether these great land-grant colleges and universities, which had the most humble of beginnings, have grown fat and proud and worldly with success. I wonder sometimes whether those who brought this great system of higher education into being would be as concerned as we are today with degrees, and accreditation, and the size of

our graduate schools, and research for the sake of research, instead of research for the sake of knowledge of value to the common people.

It is time to ask ourselves whether our institutions have lost a share of the public esteem and affection in which they used to be held, not because the people have grown away from us, but because we have grown away from them. It seems to me that we cannot hope to regain the unwavering support that the people once gave their land-grant colleges unless we concern ourselves far more with the wants and needs of the people themselves—what they say they want, instead of what we think they should have.

To determine those wants and needs accurately, our staff and faculty members must come into more intimate association with the people. There is no room for remote ivory towers on the campus of a land-grant college, and no place on its faculty for those who disdain to accept responsibilities outside their narrow fields of academic interest. Sometimes some of our staff people tend to look down their noses at some of the very vocational classes we are obligated to serve, and to avoid any contact with them. This is an attitude we dare not tolerate if we are to be the people's universities.

We must remember that not every student can absorb or usefully employ a 4-year college education. For many of them, 1 or 2 years would be enough to equip them to live useful, happy, and effective lives. But we do not have much time for these youngsters; we count our accomplishments in terms of degrees granted, not in terms of effective citizens trained, as we should.

And at the other end of the scale, it is not particularity to the credit of the land-grant universities and the State universities that are not land-grant institutions that despite the tremendous growth in the population of the United States and the increased public interest in health and medicine, place was made for only 548 more medical students in 1947–48 than in 1935–37, and that the number of students of dentistry increased only 446 in the same period of time. Can it be said that our universities are fully responsive to the demands of the public when the records tell that story?

I am convinced that if the progress of the land-grant colleges and universities in the next decade is to compare at all favorably with the record since their establishment, they will have to be guided by the same philosophy as they were in those past years. We must remember that what has been done is interesting, but not very important. What will be done in the 13 years between now and the centennial year will loom far larger in the people's minds than what has been done in the past 87 years.

Our charter is so broad that it needs no amendment to make it effective in even an atomic age. We are charged with promoting the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life.

Methods and techniques, tools, and personalities, administrations and social outlooks, all may change, but our objectives remain the same: The training of enlightened citizens capable of performing their day-to-day tasks capably and efficiently so that each may win from life something of the beauty and happiness and satisfaction the Creator certainly meant each man to have.

And if we truly believe that the ultimate wisdom lies in the people, let us learn from them that we may be better teachers; let us follow them that we may be better leaders; let us accept their loyalty humbly that we may serve them better. There can be no other course for institutions created to serve the common people. In no other way can we deserve their deep affection and their trust.

The Government's Farm Price-Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the April 1950 edition of the Reader's Digest:

FARM POLITICS VERSUS THE PEOPLE

(Condensed From Fortune)

The time has come for a sensible, honest, radically new agricultural act. The Government's farm price-support program, after 17 years, is coming full circle to its logical, preposterous conclusion.

It has erected a false work of bogus values under the whole farm economy, which would collapse into ruin if the support were suddenly removed. It is forcing farmers to produce wildly in excess of any reasonable American capacity to consume. It is responsible for most of the $1,800,000,000 deficit in the last fiscal year and at least one-fourth of the larger current deficit. It is one of the most potent of inflationary influences.

Almost everybody has heard how the Government lost $204,000,000, by destroying potatoes or selling them for less than the price of their bags; how it fed millions of dollars' worth of California raisins to hogs. Such incidents may sometimes be exaggerated, but they are not fictitious. They are a fair illustration of what happens when the Government helps a special group maintain or increase its share of the national income regardless of the group's contribution to that income. John L. Lewis is trying to do the same thing for the coal-mining industry. But, at least, Lewis hasn't forced the Government to buy up surplus coal and give it away as railway ballast or burn it up in huge bonfires.

The Government's Commodity Credit Corporation has a current investment of close to $3,000,000,000 in loans, in products acquired when loans were called, in purchases and in agreements to purchase. Last year it actually took over 21 percent of the wheat and 26 percent of the cotton crops. It has managed to dispose of only relatively small amounts, mostly to occupied countries, ECA, charitable outfits, and organizations furnishing free lunches for school children. Thus, besides its loans, it is left with a fantastic $2,000,000,000 inventory:

Nearly 5,000,000 bales of cotton, worth about $750,000,000—about a 7-months' supply for the Nation's cotton mills.

Nearly 400,000,000 bushels of wheat costing around $900,000,000—enough wheat to give everyone in the United States more than one loaf of bread a week throughout a full year.

Nearly 600,000,000 bushels of corn worth around $900,000,000—one-fourth as much corn as was fed to United States livestock and poultry last year.

More than 70,000,000 pounds of dried eggs costing close to $100,000,000—enough to last United States bakers 5 years.

More than 100,000,000 pounds of butter costing more than $60,000,000—probably more than Russia's annual output.

About a quarter of a billion pounds of dried milk worth over $30,000,000—three-quarters of a year's supply for the United States.

This by no means exhausts the list. Huge stocks of tobacco, dried fruit, turpentine and rosin, wool, soybeans, turkeys, and peanuts are also piling up. This immense store could obviously supply food and clothing for millions of poor people, were it not that CCC is forced by statute to price the products so high that the poor cannot possibly buy them.

There is little hope that CCC's colossal inventory will melt away. On the contrary, present farm policies are bound to increase it. The 1949 corn crop turned out so well that nearly 600,000,000 bushels will probably be put under loan. (The Government loans money on the crops as security; both parties know the farmer intends to keep the money and let the Government have the crop.) Prices of hogs are at 3-year lows, and CCC may soon have to buy pork on a grand scale. The western plains are enjoying another year in the "wet cycle," and another billion-bushel wheat crop is in sight. CCC may well exhaust its disbursing limit of five and a half billion dollars by next summer, and will need even more money in the fiscal year 1950–51. (In January, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan asked two billions more for crop purchases.)

What can the Government do under the present law? The Government is worried, not only by the sheer size of cost of the inventory but also by the lack of storage space. Commodities are being stored in oil tanks, hangars, gymnasiums, schoolrooms, and laid-up ships. This fiscal year at least $80,000,000 is being invested, in additional space.

The planners talk of selling the surplus cheap—i. e., of dumping it abroad at a loss, and cutting prices in the open markets (the complaint of competitors and the trade policy of the State Department notwithstanding), or bartering their surplus for foreign strategic products. The only sizable deal in sight, however, is a scheme whereby the United States would advance India a million tons of wheat against future delivery of strategic materials like mica and manganese. But even this Himalaya of wheat amounts to less than 10 percent of CCC's interest.

The Department of Agriculture's other solution is to limit output. The Department has asked farmers to cut acreage of wheat, cotton, potatoes, peanuts, and tobacco, but whether this will cut production is another thing. Better seed and more fertilizer may well maintain output despite somewhat smaller acreage. And acreage taken out of restricted crops will be shifted to other crops, causing new gluts, new purchase, and price pegs.

And even if acreage controls could restrict output considerably they would probably restrict it the wrong way. If there is one thing every so-called expert is agreed on, it is that production should be shifted somewhat from cereals and grain to livestock, that no fewer than 35,000,000 acres now planted in wheat, cotton, and perhaps corn, should be converted to hay and pasture. The domestic market for grain is strictly limited; that for competitively priced livestock and dairy products is immensely expansible. But politics will not let the Department of Agriculture allow commodities to find their own prices. Instead, it is pegging prices high by restricting production.

The time has come, to repeat, for a radically new farm act that will gradually ease the price-control falsework from under the farm economy, expose it to the genuine incentives of the open market, and get rid of the growing multitude of bureaucrats and hangers-on in the Government.

The prospects for this are not so bad as they may seem. The notion that the Government should maintain or increase the farmer's share of the national income regardless of his contribution to that income is

fortunately running into trouble. The reason was once put rather cruelly by H. L. Mencken, who remarked that it is a terrific job to ram even the most elemental idea into the average man but it is always easy to scare him. For the best part of 15 years the injustices and absurdities of price support were expounded and criticized by the experts and the press. The average taxpayer, far from being alarmed, was bored if not mystified by the intricacies of the arguments. He also suffered from the notion that all farmers were as poor as a few once were. Thus the only real pressure on Congress was the pressure on the farmers, who knew what they wanted.

In the past year, however, surpluses have grown so fast, the payments so large, the prospects of disposing of excess products so dim, that even the most indifferent citizen would have to be a dunce indeed not to be alarmed. The time has plainly come for the politicians to pay attention not only to the bureaucrats and to the farm organizations, but to the rest of the people as well.

Defense of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an article by Bill Watson, a senior at St. Ann's High School in West Palm Beach, Fla. The article is a product of a recent American Legion oratorical contest and received first place. I thought this such a fine article that I wanted it placed in the RECORD so that everyone might read it. The article is as follows:

DEFENSE OF THE CONSTITUTION

Voices echoed throughout the typically colonial room of Independence Hall. At quick intervals men rose from their chairs to make proposals which showed strenuous thought and true feeling of heart. For each gesture, thought, and word was governed by recollections of the dreadful price, paid in brutality, hunger, utter destruction, devastation, and death before such words "of freemen" could be spoken. Here the scholarly James Madison, the lawyer Edmund Randolph, the aged but humorous Benjamin Franklin, the youthful Hamilton (and nearly 50 other patriots) argued, compromised, and decided. At the head of them sat their great, beloved countryman, George Washington, giving thanks to be able to share in and be a part of the ultimate climax for which his gallant soldiers left their blood-stained footprints indented upon the snow-clad fields of Valley Forge. Such was the birthplace of a new guardian and protector of our God-given rights, the Constitution of the United States of America.

It was a time for the patriotic colonists to rejoice, for those who had fought hard for freedom; like Hiram Jones who served as a rifleman in the war. His father had been dragged from his own home and imprisoned by order of the King. Now Hiram need no longer fear tyrannical kings. Under the new Constitution bills of attainder were abolished. Now men must be tried only by jury. At last the power to govern was seized from monarchism and placed into the worthy hands of the people. From this precious power, we the people of the United States must never loosen our grasp, no matter what the cost. We should live up to the Constitution and in time of peril go forth to defend our Guardian of Human Rights.

The need for such defense arose on a universal basis in 1917 when the threat of hostility swept from the German Nation, striking against the massive sides of our boulder-like Constitution. Alarm was sounded, and farmers laid down their plows; office workers left their desks; laborers let fall their tools; and young men flipped closed the pages of their books as all joined hands and fought to protect what was theirs—a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Throughout generations many wars have been fought against opposing elements and forces, contrary to the ideas and ideals of freemen. Men whose families or who they themselves had witnessed tyranny, fascism, and other poisonous elements were glad to defend the Constitution. Like Mario Ferrari, whose parents were barred from going to the church of their faith, fought so that he, his wife, and children could continue to worship as they pleased. Mario was in the same convoy of the American troopship which sank to the bottom of the Atlantic, laden with soldiers of all religions in whose midst were a Jewish rabbi, a Protestant minister, and a Catholic priest. Our Constitution grants to all men freedom of religion. With Mario men fought to live for their country; to live free from ex post facto laws which menaced their ancestors by depriving them of the protection entitled to them in times of conviction; to defend, such writs of habeas corpus which protect them from being put into prison without formal charge and left there without hearing or trial.

After taking the same oath as all our great Presidents, "I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and will, to the bert of my ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States," President Abraham Lincoln said, "Half the country cannot remain free and the other half slave." These words were taken to heart by many of the colonial patriots. Not long afterward the defense of human rights and strengthening of the Constitution was begun in what climaxed the Civil War. Guns roared, blood was spilled, starvation prevailed, buildings burned to the ground, but from then onward people of every color, creed, and race were able to enjoy the blessings of the American Constitution.

Lincoln's message should be renewed in our minds today with a slight change of wording—half the world cannot remain free and the other half slave. This means the unfortunate countries upon which are cast the shadow of the hammer and sickle, symbolic of Soviet Russia bursting forth with infiltrations of communism. These are delicate times; even more trying than our ancestors have ever witnessed. We the people of the United States must be on guard more than ever before in defense of our Constitution. This defense is not accomplished only on the battlefield, but to a great degree can be accomplished here in our own home towns and communities. We the people should exercise our right to vote for local and national officers. And in doing so should be extremely cautious by electing only those who live up to their constitutional oaths and are free from any ties whatsoever with opposing forces of communism and the like. For these forces are aimed only at tearing apart and destroying that which was paid for by the courage and lives of young boys and men at Bataan, Normandy, Bastogne, Iwo Jima, and the tears of mothers and wives waiting, praying, and hoping here at home. When asked to serve on a jury, we should call to mind the not to distant years when courts lacked such juries of the people. We should consider it an honor to be chosen to fulfill the duty, in defense of the Constitution in seeing to it that the innocent are acquitted and the guilty convicted. We must take an active interest in Government affairs so that when undesirable bills and proposals arise in the Nation's Capital we can personally call it to the attention of fellow citizens and raise petition against them to our Congressman. In this manner we the people of the United States are defending our Constitution from enactments contradicting the basic principles of free men, upon which our Government was founded.

Alien hostilities, foreign systems, and fanatic powers have attempted to stampede the rights of our forefathers, but always our fellow countrymen's faith in what was theirs, a constitution of the people, held these destructful forces back. In this age of mechanical brains and atomic bombs and the threat of communistic rule, we the citizens of the United States must stand alert, willing, and able to defend what has in past years been defended for us—a free nation under a constitution of the people. We owe it to our posterity to defend the protector and guardian of human rights whose fruits of freedom and liberty have been enjoyed by us so that our Nation's citizens of the future need never fear tyrannical dictators who determine the right to live or die—nor live in constant dread that members of their own families will be dragged from their own homes to suffer punishment because of their race, color, or creed—nor ever weep for their children who have been snatched by the government to be molded into tyrants—nor need they fear death for expressing their own ideas openly. Through our efforts as citizens of the United States, let our Constitution always be triumphant in standing for the rights, ideas, and ideals of freemen. And let its principles be raised on high to serve as an inspiration for all oppressed men throughout the world to enjoy the rights for which our forefathers so gallantly fought.

Investigation by Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the challenge to so many good Americans today is to hold the balance between the exposure and punishment of those who would subvert our institutions from within and the protection of the freedom of the innocent individuals whose names may come up in such investigations, for which we have so long fought. I am convinced that both these objectives are essential to our victory in the cold war and I am also convinced they are entirely consistent and can be attained. One of the great tests is in the activities of congressional investigating committees—a power which must be sustained and implemented—yet which must be safeguarded against abuse by unreasonable jeopardy of the reputations and means of livelihood of innocent individuals. The appended editorial of the New York Times of April 12, 1950 calls attention to this problem and to Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 introduced by Senator

LUCAS dealing with it; my own resolution along substantially the same lines being House Joint Resolution 20, introduced January 3, 1949:

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE

By declining to review the cases, the Supreme Court has now, in effect, upheld the convictions of two Hollywood film writers and the chairman of an allegedly subversive organization for contempt of Congress. The two writers (and eight other writers and directors) had refused to state before the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether they were members of the Communist Party. The official of the suspect organization had declined to produce its records at the demand of the same committee.

Without going into the merits of these particular cases, it is clear that the power to investigate is one of the most fundamental and one of the most necessary powers of Congress. In a recent article in this newspaper, Senator LUCAS has called it, without exaggeration, "an essential part of the legislative process," without which "Congress simply could not discharge its obligation." If this be so, then it follows that the congressional committee, as an investigatory arm of Congress, must also have broad powers that will enable it to obtain all the facts that have any bearing on any particular question. The power of subpena is essential, and so, it seems to us, is the power to cite for contempt. Without such powers, any congressional investigation could be rendered meaningless.

What does not follow from all this is that congressional committees have unrestricted rights of persecution. The courts have held that the Un-American Activities Committee was within its powers in the cases mentioned above; but all too often this same committee—and, unfortunately, it is by no means the only one—has clearly gone very much further than could conceivably be justifiable or necessary in trespassing on the rights of the individual. Long ago Senator LUCAS introduced a resolution looking toward a code of fair practice for committees, and only a few days ago a Senate subcommittee made news by adopting, of its own accord, rules for the protection of witnesses and for orderly procedure. Congress must give serious attention to this problem, if the respect of the public is to be retained for the system of investigation by committee.

Menace of Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article by Ernest H. Gaunt, general manager, Andover-Gaunt Textiles, Inc., Lawrence, Mass., which is a reprint from the Annual Wool Review appearing in a recent issue of the New York Journal of Commerce:

INDEMNITIES FOR LOSSES DUE TO IMPORTS USED FOR WORLDWIDE INFLUENCE

(By Ernest H. Gaunt, general manager, Andover-Gaunt Textiles, Inc.)

Today our United States tariffs are being lowered, and face further lowerings in the name of world welfare by our own authoritarian State Department which is isolated from the people.

Formerly, tariffs were lowered or raised in the name of American general welfare by our own elected Congress which is close to the people.

Whether the general welfare of the world actually will be benefited by sacrificing certain American industries which are of the greatest importance as providers of employment and of vital strategic importance in wartime has been far from proved by our ivory-tower State Department.

MENACE IS REAL

To those industries selected to be sacrificed, the menace of imports is very real and immediate. It is no cry of "wolf." The proverbial last straw may soon break the camel's back in a number of industries vital to this Nation's general welfare. In the watch industry the "camel's back" has already been broken.

Bargains for American consumers in imports from foreign countries with low-wage, sweatshop or even slave labor may become boomerangs before the end of 1950. Within the United States, traffic between States in child labor, sweatshop products, is not allowed on moral grounds. And Europe does not have the high minimum wages enforced here. Is it not strange reasoning to allow such unfair competition in international trade?

LINCOLN'S VIEW

Abraham Lincoln was for tariff protection for our domestic industries on the ground that by trading with ourselves we had both the goods and the money ourselves.

It is doubtful that if he were alive today, he would think it was world humanitarianism for us to let our own house be pulled down to help foreigners to build their houses. Rather would he confine our help as a Nation to aiding foreign nations to rebuild their own houses, i. e., the Marshall plan, but not the tearing-down plan of our State Department low-tariff theorists.

In the present cold war with Russia these intellectualistic State Departmentists lack the common horse sense practically to be able to see the domestic effects of their world-scale planning.

Without sharing fully the current suspicion of possible Communists and present or "reformed" fellow travelers on the State Department staff, it seems clear that leftists as well as rightists in positions of power are everywhere and always authoritarian in their thinking; and their judgment is warped outside their own specialty, as demonstrated recently in the case of the brilliant British scientist, Dr. Fuchs. Such narrow specialists are highly dangerous in administrative positions because of their lack of sound over-all judgment.

IDEALISTS ARE IMPATIENT

Pearl Buck has written that the once idealistic, socialistic, intellectualistic humanitarians of Lenin-Stalin Russia grew impatient with the stupidity of the common herd. Harry Hopkins is reported to have said of our own American people that "they are too damn dumb to understand." These "superior people" in Russia assumed the attitude of papa knows best, and turned to the more and more cruel methods in the belief that these methods must be used for the Russian general welfare.

And the American counterparts in our State Department, also regarding themselves as superior people, are joined, in some degree, by those hard-headed American industrialists who want foreign trade for their own industries.

It is not without significance that Paul Hoffman, a splendid and able man personally, and a business liberal, but whose great business success was entirely with automobiles, is inclined to belittle the claims for indemnification from American industries hurt by tariff lowering.

Automobile manufacturers were once protectionists until the domestic market became saturated and they looked abroad for new fields to conquer.

Mr. Hoffman is reported to have said that such indemnification to injured American industries would be no more logical than if indemnities had been paid to buggy manufacturers who were displaced by automobiles. However, such reasoning is not parallel. The woolen-worsted, watch, glassware, pottery, and other American industries definitely already hurt by importations from foreign countries with lower wages and living standards—are being hurt by their own United States Government. The transition from buggy to automobiles was not caused by Government.

GOVERNMENT CAN BE WRONG

It is not true that the Government can do no wrong. No government, Russian or Nazi or Fascist or Falangist, British or American, is more just or wise than the men who control and operate it. And, if elementary and traditional Anglo-Saxon justice has for centuries required local governments to indemnify citizens who are injured by destruction of their real property for general welfare projects such as public highways—it is no less a requirement of elemental justice that Federal, National Government should also indenify the citizens whose jobs or property it injures or destroys.

The remoteness of a National Government from its citizens, as compared with the closeness of local governments, does not remove the requirements of human justice and moral responsibility. Errors or injustices by any government are errors and injustices done by persons.

It is a most dangerous fiction that by calling political governments or private corporations impersonal, they can be considered outside the area where moral distinctions, moral obligations, or responsibilities are applicable.

If Congress is convinced that our American general welfare at this time is best protected by saving the world, Congress must reassume the responsibility for tariff-making which it delegated to our State Department. Congress must enact laws at once to prevent further damage to domestic industries by any further lowering of tariffs, and provide for prompt and adequate indemnification by Government for damage already done by Government, and for future possible damage by our Government to American displaced workers and factory owners and stockholders.

For stockholders in the automobile or other industries helped by lower tariffs, to label such just indemnities as subsidies—is to evade the moral responsibility of one class of citizens to other classes of citizens, and to encourage the Government of us all to be likewise irresponsible for moral and economic results.

SUBSIDIES NOT NEW

Our American Government throughout its whole history, in honest pursuit of the general welfare, has run almost the whole gamut of subsidies to special economic interests or classes or groups, as banks, railroads, union labor, farmers.

These subsidies have always had a money-content whether by direct cash or grants of public property or by exemption from taxes or exemptions from laws.

In fact our American Government has become a subsidy state. But the theory, and mostly the honest attempt, has been to balance one subsidy against the other, for the general welfare.

The so-called welfare state is a subsidization of the numerically largest economic group of citizens, the consumers. Whether in Russia, Britain or the United States, consumers as such can be subsidized (or bribed) successfully in the long run, only if the general welfare is promoted.

OWNERS INDEMNIFIED

In Britain the Anglo-Saxon concept of justice has been at least partially implemented by indemnities or subsidies paid to those hurt by nationalization of industries. Government stock has been given to owners of private industries which have been nationalized; but Government stock cannot honestly pay dividends unless Government control or operation is in the black.

So far, as shown in a recent issue of Business Week, British Government control, regulation, and operation has not been successful except in one industry, and that one can go into the red if the British Government grants too great subsidies to the consumer in the form of too low prices.

In our new American role of Atlas sustaining the world we shall surely come to an internal break-down if we undermine our own national American economic health and general welfare by a weakening of such vital industries as woolen-worsteds, by unwise or too-rapid lowering of tariffs while seeking world general welfare.

INDEMNITIES NEEDED

Wherever our Government, wisely or unwisely, deems it necessary to sacrifice certain domestic industries to advance world welfare to keep us and the whole world out of war, or build up allies in case of war—it must, if it is to remain American, indemnify the workers, owners, and stockholders in those sacrificed industries.

Steps already taken in that direction must be pushed and strengthened and additional steps taken, at once. The legislative steps already taken include House Resolutions 198, 199, and 200, April 29, 1949.

Indemnification to owners and stockholders should be provided for at once for concerns which have been shutting down or which have permanently gone out of business due to the tariff lowering already established under the Reciprocal Trade Act.

Provision must now be also made by Congress for indemnification for future damages resulting from still further tariff lowering under ITO or in any other manner.

RATES SUGGESTED

In the woolen-worsted industry the following suggestions should be studied and soon acted upon as a means to such indemnification:

Beginning with January 1, 1949, indemnifying all woolen-worsted cloth manufacturers for all lost production from normal, the year 1946 being taken as a standard of normal volume of production, at the following rates of indemnification: 50 cents per yard of lost production for goods which sold in 1946 or 1947 at the mill price of $5 per yard or over; 40 cents per yard of lost production for goods which sold in 1946 or 1947 at the mill price of $4 to $5 per yard; 30 cents per yard of lost production for goods which sold in 1946 or 1947 at the mill price of $3 to $4 per yard; 20 cents per yard of lost production for goods which sold in 1946 or 1947 at the mill price of $2 to $3 per yard; 10 cents per yard of lost production for goods which sold in 1946 or 1947 at the mill price of $1 to $2 per yard.

These indemnification payments to woolen-worsted cloth producing concerns should be continued so long as production of such goods in the United States continues to be lost, due to the imports of cloth of the sorts which have been, are being, and can be, manufactured here in the United States of America.

Indemnification should be paid to wage-workers and white-collar workers and other workers in the woolen-worsted industries for one year's wages retroactive to January 1, 1949—to allow them to retrain and readjust to jobs in other United States of America industries which the low-tariff and free-trade people say will absorb all workers now being sacrificed and about to be sacrificed by the export of their jobs to England and Europe, under the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements.

The payment of these indemnification wages should be retroactive to January 1, 1949, although unemployment in the woolen-worsted industries started before then, directly due to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements would be extended and tariffs lowered still further.

EXPORTERS SHOULD CONTRIBUTE

Indemnification loss payments by the Government to woolen-worsted wage workers, and owners and stockholders of woolen-worsted companies, should be at least partially recovered from those United States exporters who will benefit financially from the suffering and damage to the woolen-worsted industries' wage workers and owners and stockholders.

Those United States exporters who will thus benefit financially from the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement and from further lowering of our tariffs under ITO, are chiefly the manufacturers of automobiles, other machinery, and grain and cotton growers.

The indemnification losses paid by the Government should be apportioned to these United States exporters by means of special excess profits taxes applying only to such exporters: or by export taxes high enough to balance the payments of indemnification losses to those United States citizens who suffer by reason of those exports.

Mail Deliveries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Washington, D. C. April 18, 1950.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ROGERS: We are seriously alarmed over the instructions contained in the Postal Bulletin of Tuesday, April 18. Having spent the greater part of our lives in the postal service and representing 102,000 letter carriers, we feel that the orders contained in the Postal Bulletin of April 18 will result in irreparable damage and the destruction of our fine postal system. It will make the great postal service—the Government function closest to the lives of the American people—a second-rate inferior Government agency.

We have always been mighty proud of the fact that the postal service rendered excellent necessary service. The service ideal is assassinated by the orders issued by the Post Office Department. Delivery of mail Nationwide is restricted to one delivery a day in residential districts and service is greatly reduced in business districts. Parcel-post deliveries are to be cut in half in business areas. Weekly magazines, such as Time, United States News, Newsweek, and all others that have become an important part of American life will no longer receive expeditious handling. The prompt mail delivery that the American people have been receiving will not be available.

Postmasters have been ordered to discontinue directory service on all ordinary mail other than perishable matter and parcels of obvious value. This order contains many other provisions, every one of them seriously restricting the fine delivery now being afforded the American people and imperiling the postal service itself.

These orders will result in tremendous money losses to American business and great inconvenience to the general public. Postal employees—particularly low-paid substitutes—will suffer greatly because of the reduction in the number of trips. All this despite the following statement of Postmaster General Donaldson, which appears in the infamous order:

"Splendid progress has been made and the productive effort of the employees has been increased as indicated by the accomplishments in the fiscal year 1949, compared with the fiscal year 1939. During that period, the revenues increased more than 110.73 percent, the number of pieces handled increased 64.70 percent, the weight of the mails increased more than 104.73 percent while the increase in the number of employees was less than 48.43 percent."

We appeal to you as a Member of Congress to take immediate corrective action against this devastating, ill-advised, and unnecessary order issued by the Post Office Department under date of Tuesday, April 18.

Sincerely,

W. C. DOHERTY,
President.
D. R. SULLIVAN,
Vice President.
JEROME J. KEATING,
Secretary.
R. B. KREMER,
Assistant Secretary.

Let's Learn a Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Polish-American Journal:

LET'S LEARN A LESSON

Last week throughout the world persons of Irish descent observed St. Patrick's Day.

In this country there were huge celebrations, with parades, dinners, and other affairs.

And during these observances while people of Irish extraction were honoring their patron saint, they extolled the virtues and greatness of their heritage. Speakers lauded the sons of Ireland—their great statesmen, their great soldiers, their great poets, writers, and composers. They told of the contributions Ireland has made in the development of America.

Americans of Irish descent are proud of their ancestry, and well they might be. They are a fine people with an honored history.

They have done much to make this Nation what it is today.

Some persons of Polish descent might take a lesson from those of Irish extraction. Some persons of Polish heritage have inferiority complexes because their ancestors or they themselves came from Poland. Some are ashamed of the land from which they came.

Such an attitude on the part of anyone, no matter what his racial origin, is of course, ridiculous. All races have contributed their talents to make America great.

Persons of Polish ancestry can well be proud of their native land and the accomplishments of those of their race. Poland traditionally has always opposed oppression, tyranny, and subjugation. It has always fought gallantly on the side of justice and freedom. It is a country which has given the world great music, great poetry, great science. Copernicus, Madame Curie, Chopin, Paderewski, Sienkiewicz, are but a few names known to everyone.

And Americans of Polish extraction might well be proud of their history here. From the days of Pulaski and Kosciusko to the present, they have added their measure to that of their brothers of other races in the building of this Nation.

Let us not, then, be ashamed of our origin. Rather we should heed the words of Henry Cabot Lodge, who said: "Let every man honor the land of his birth and the race from which he springs. It is a pious and honorable duty."

Economic Jiu-Jitsu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the speech made by Mr. Carroll B. Huntress, vice president, Republic Coal & Coke Co., New York City, and chairman, National St. Lawrence Project Conference at seventeenth annual meeting, Southeastern Electric Exchange, Greenbrier Hotel, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., April 12, 1950:

ECONOMIC JIU-JITSU

As a member of an industry diagnosed as ailing by that master physician of Washington, I welcome the opportunity to meet with the southern leaders of another industry, one which has long enjoyed the envy, as well as the solicitude, of politicians. Here is involved no hazard of guilt by association but rather is combined certainly of invigorating influence. In fact, I have already been invigorated by the words of your president, Mr. McMeekin, and those of Elmer L. Lindseth and Charles E. Wilson.

The aggressive attitude which the private electric-power companies have taken augments hope for the preservation of a free society. Opposition to your industry has been the vehicle on which many demagogs and phonies have ridden into political office. However, the broad program of dissemination of the truth, in which your industry is now engaged, is bound to reverse that trend.

The public-power boys resemble the professional days of old. They are so much like those zealots, with the same disregard for facts, the same furtive cunning, the same technique of smear. And, like those professionals, they have but one test of a candidate for office, scalawag or what not, and that is, does he lisp their refrain. The result is that we have men in Congress, in other places of public life, whose only claim to the office is that they are against the electric-utility industry, for public power. This is the sole subject on which they can articulate; the one tune to which they dance. But make no mistake about it, those evangelists are numerically and politically strong. The carnival medicine men, vendors of swamp-root drugs, longer life guaranteed in every bottle, were angels as compared with these modern racketeers, babbling behind the banner of public and cheaper power.

After all, why not call a spade a spade in speaking of these fraudulent soul-savers of politics, from the late George W. Norris, up or down. I come up with a feeling of loathing, disgust, at tirades against the so-called Power Trust and mention of its alleged machinations against the public weal. The most ruthless, selfish lobby today, barring none, is that of public power, composed of certain labor bosses, ambitious bureaucrats, parlor pinks, meditative Socialists, leftists, plain Reds, "lame duck" politicians, and mush-headed intellectuals; a power-thirsty crew. Their gall is monumental. Imagine a crowd prating about the Government giving the people cheaper power by bookkeeping gymnastics, when that Government is taxing them at an all-time high.

Every branch of American business should not only acclaim but also aid and abet the program of your industry to expose the insidious propaganda calculated to fix you in the public mind as the entrepreneurs of some sort of con game and unworthy of attention in public affairs. The public-power apostles have worked assiduously, and to some extent successfully, in making the private operators synonomous with greed, while those apostles appear as benefactors of mankind, workers in the vineyard of humanity. I was amazed that flags were not flown at half-mast when that selfless public servant, Leland Olds, was turned down by the Senate last year. The selfish interests got him, moaned Mrs. Roosevelt in her column, along with the leftist and pinko writers of the syndicated press—got this man who had saved millions of dollars to the users of electrical energy. The reason this national calamity was soon forgotten may have been due to the fact that citizens, having one-fourth of their earnings taken from them, could not bring themselves to an appreciation of the alleged savings.

However, there are some who fear it may be premature to celebrate the political demise of Mr. Olds, for he has been appointed to the Water Resources Policy Commission. It wouldn't be surprising if he soon bobbed up in New England, with his pencil and pad, intent upon harnessing all the rills and brooks and tying them to Passamaquoddy, the rapids of the St. Lawrence, and the falls of the Niagara to furnish another and an unwanted TVA.

The avowed mistreatment of public servants such as Mr. Olds calls to mind the experience of a public power Lochinvar out in Pennsylvania, back in the thirties. In the political upheaval of those days, he was elected to Congress. His highest annual income had been $3,500. Sensing that the district would go back to normal 2 years later, he became a bold foe of the so-called Power Trust; all the while loudly voicing the conviction that he was signing his political death warrant because that ogrelike trust would get him. So effective was public-power propaganda that he grew to tremendous stature as a sacrificer and won the sympathy of all people against sin everywhere. Well, he was "got" in the next election. To the best of my knowledge, no power company lifted its voice; the people of his district disposed of him. But in the great game of buncombe practiced upon the people, he had a good knowledge of the cards; to wit, the leftists made him a trustee of a utility-holding company which had been thrown into bankruptcy—and he took over at $40,000 a year.

Indeed, Americans should rejoice that you do not cow before your traducers, not one of them able to claim a single constructive accomplishment. You are now speaking up and are being heard. You were among the very first to sound alarm at the socialistic trend of our Government, and many of your fellow members in the chamber of commerce thought you were idly crying "wolf." Why shouldn't we, your fellow chamber members asked, take this bit of Government bounty for a local power project? That's not socialism, it's simply getting in on the Government gravy train, they pleaded. That's what they thought. We have seen this thing grow. Witness the fight of the doctors to head off socialized medicine. Read the Hoover Commission Report that the Federal Government owns or has investments in over 100 kinds of business, totaling approximately $20,000,000,000, with congressional authorization for over $14,000,000,000 more. And the end is not in sight.

The presentation this morning of What Can One Man Do? by Elmer Lindseth, was inspiring. In this audience I see former associates of Wendell Willkie. They remember how one man fought, what one man did, in the late thirties. Conversely, I emphasize the evil that one man can do. Practice of opportunism by a business executive makes mockery of solemn resolutions of the civic organization which he heads. More than that, it breeds widespread cynicism. It explains intellectual pessimism. Again, on the score of the evil one man can do, a certain cross-country supposedly nonpolitical trip in May should be watched closely, and for every blast directed at you, two bigger and better ones should be returned.

Approaching the subject from another angle, we were told by H. S. Rausenbush, back in the twenties, "One good man with his eyes, ears, and wits about him, in a Government department, can do more to perfect the technique of control of industry than a hundred men outside." Shortly Mr. Rausenbush found for himself a vital spot in Interior and proceeded to promote his program of encroaching control, which he predicted would gradually socialize the power industry. At that time, only 3 percent of the industry was under political management, as against the present figure of 20 percent under Government ownership or political management. Whatever the word used by our sophisticated conservatives who profess to see no danger in this trend, Mr. Webster calls it socialism. Because there are so many enemies of the free-enterprise system, working in divers and devious ways, with your industry the principal target, America must be alerted. The revolution by nibbling, as Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, called it a few days ago, is taking a frightful toll. Power seekers, in and out of Government, are hacking away at personal and business freedom, with disastrous results.

Since the days of Rausenbush—and before, for that matter—the collectivists have relied on processes which I choose to label economic jiu jitsu, to assure the destruction, economically, politically, and spiritually, of freedom. I label them economic jiu jitsu because they make our own strength work against us and are effective, whereas a straight-out conflict would be hopeless. The American people, even today, far down

the road as we have gone, if asked to adopt socialism frankly recognized as such would unequivocally reject the proposition. Recourse, therefore, has been had to a variety of devices designed to accomplish by indirection the end desired by the collectivists.

Without a too close pursuit of this analogue, I would say that a principal device for the destruction of liberty in this country, which pioneered political institutions planned to assure personal freedom under the aegis of its Constitution, has been to create an obsessing fear of various isms and preoccupation with plans ostensibly for protection against them, so that our strength should be made to fight against us. This is no new thing. A score of years ago it was bruited about that the country would go communistic if we didn't throw out the then incumbent rascals. Whether rascally or not, they were ousted; and then we were told that this, that, or the other enterprise by the State was necessary in order to prevent the loss of our four freedoms to socialism. We demonetized our currency; we set up a so-called social security, and we plunged the country into the horrors of a managed economy under the short-lived NRA; all in order that we might preserve our way of life.

We have gone a long distance beyond what in the thirties we used to call the middle way. Authoritarian proposals are daily made and set forth in the press, on the platform, in the halls of our legislative bodies. The shock is not so much that they can be made but that they are received as a matter of course; that there is not a flaming outburst of editorial denunciation of the very proposal of these infractions of human liberty. Can it be that the Washington planners are proceeding on the premise that the people are disposed to entertain a proposition to swap their birthright for a mess of pottage? I am not cynical enough to believe that all the advocates of these myriad devices for reducing man to mathematical formulas are consciously trying to wreck our Government. On the other hand, I am not naive enough to believe that every last one of our social planners is innocent of an ulterior purpose to do just that. It is sufficient to say that, whatsoever the motivation, the end result of a managed economy cannot be other than the removal of volition from the people and the substitution of authority vested in little bureaucrats or omnipotent commissars—call them by whatsoever name.

Local communities and individual business concerns, various categories in the population have evinced an eagerness to accept class or special legislation, subsidy or protective preferential treatment by quasi-public bodies in order to gain material benefits; when it must be as clear as day that acceptance of those benefits implies, as always does the taking of the King's shilling, a subordination to a master.

There is only one way to avoid this sort of thing and that is to oppose, with all one's strength, the specious individual proposals, one by one, as they arise; to scrutinize every Government undertaking and determine whether it is a necessary and legitimate function of a Government of a free people. On every count, the St. Lawrence waterway and power project fails to meet this test. It would be another step along the road to socialism; which, according to Harold J. Gallagher, president of the American Bar Association, is the same as the road to communism.

Lately, we have heard a great deal about the necessity for the navigation features and the power capacity of the St. Lawrence project as instruments of national defense. It seems that all one has to do in order to justify increased taxes, swollen national debt and usurpation of enterprise by bureaucracy is to talk of the necessity for national defense. Anyway, it appears to placate the peasantry. I'd like to spend a few minutes on the power aspect, analyzing with you its value as a defense instrument. I am of the opinion that the St. Lawrence development is substantially worthless for that purpose, and that what is said with reference to power can also be said with reference to navigation.

There is no need to stress with you the fact that 570,000 kilowatts of firm power which could be developed on the American side of the river would be scarcely a drop in the bucket; certainly not the indispensable thing for national defense that has been pictured by the more ardent of the advocates. Again, there's no need to point out that, small though the St. Lawrence development would be in the total picture, it would, nonetheless, represent an ideal objective of aerial warfare, particularly when combined with the bottleneck features of transportation to and from the Great Lakes Basin. The St. Lawrence proponents cheerfully pass up the hundreds of millions of dollars of defense installation and the thousands on thousands of defense personnel necessary to guard this concentrated facility against attack from the air, from the Gulf of St. Lawrence—even from the upper St. Lawrence River itself. It may be trite to note that one well-placed bomb would wreck the entire project. Army engineers have stated that one bomb could destroy the Panama Canal. The St. Lawrence is a more accessible target.

What I wish to accentuate is that there is only one way to provide power capacity for national defense beyond what would be created by the natural operation of economic process. That way is to create the capacity and hold it idle against the day when more power may be needed than can be dug up by conversion of industry and by operation on a three-shift basis. As a hard-headed, practical matter, if we must have idle capacity in preparation for war, the best way to have it is as extra reserve capacity in the diversified power plants scattered throughout the country, reasonably close to the munition industries. Even the advocates of the St. Lawrence seem to recognize the fact that the project would not create idle power capacity, since, in their enthusiasm for a really good story, they envisage a managed economy whereunder industry would be brought to the region from less-subsidized parts of the country, and all the capacity, both firm and infirm, utilized right up to the hilt under a preferential process of definitely socialistic character, and this quite regardless of defense needs. We have then an interesting device whereby, in the guise of equipping us to fight a war for freedom, an additional collectivist undertaking is advanced.

Of the three devices which I have described and defined as economic jiu jitsu, two are most practical in their operations—the one which professedly pertains to protection against "isms" and the other which concerns subsidy and preferential treatment. The third is more real and more devastating, though less apparent. It could lead to such a thorough loss of individual freedom that it would become of little point to strive further toward warding off collectivism. If we can be persuaded to lock up any of our resources by foolish expenditure, to that extent we weaken our economic means of defense. Remember the Maginot line. No nation—not even ours—has a fund of resources beyond its needs. What we squander must come out of what we should usefully employ. What we waste on a fictitious defense must be at the expense of our real ability to take care of ourselves or must mean adoption of a lower standard of living. Every capital expenditure put into the hands of Government is, with the personnel related to it, just so much of our strength frozen into the rigidity of superorganization.

There is new, startling evidence of economic jiu jitsu in the Southwestern Power Administration, an offshoot of the United States Department of the Interior, commissioned to operate in 10 of your States. This is setting out to be an empire of power, both electrical and political.

The electric power prospects are described by the newly appointed Administrator as over a million kilowatts of federally generated power by the end of 1955, and double that amount a little later. He boasted that these Government power plants in the 10 States will probably be linked with a web of federally owned transmission lines.

The political power prospects are more important but less obvious to the general public. They result from both the outpouring of Federal funds for construction and the manipulation of the federally subsidized power supply. Such activities have already been found handy by the ruling political clique in buying public support here and there. They are being counted upon in this case as one means of turning people away from that strong element of political leadership in the South which is not sympathetic with the leftists in Washington.

I hear talk within your industry that the thing to do is to come to an understanding with the Federal Government as to where its activities will stop and where the industry can operate in peace. In my opinion, any hope of such an arrangement is utterly unrealistic. Less than a couple of years have elapsed since the famous Alatoona contract between one of your companies and the Department of the Interior. That contract seemed to do just that. But the policies of the Interior Department have already moved far beyond the Alatoona contract. More recently, the stipulated preference for public agencies and rural-electric cooperatives, contained in Federal laws, has been interpreted by the Interior Department as a prohibition against any long-term sales of firm power to utility companies—even by State agencies. I refer to the correspondence between the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of South Dakota.

For helpful suggestions that I might pass on to you, I inquired of an old friend of yours and mine, Tom Martin, of Birmingham. His one suggestion is, "express your convictions." In the light of many years of work having to do with politics, of having to know the mechanics of politics, I am convinced, gentlemen, that no appeasement program can stop this public power gang. They are bent on complete collectivization of electric power supply and they are confident they can get it. Only the votes of the citizens of this country can stop them. Only public appreciation of the superior services your companies render, public respect for enterprises that are competent, self-supporting taxpayers, and public disfavor for agencies that waste public resources in unjustifiable projects can produce those votes. To that end, I know you are dedicating your all-out efforts. The extent to which those and like efforts bear fruit will be a determining factor in the destiny of this land.

Address of Hon. Katharine St. George, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix

of the RECORD, I am inserting an address made by my friend and colleague, the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, at the dinner of the Republican Activities Committee in honor of William Davis, chairman of the Republican Town Committee of Manchester, Conn.

I take particular pleasure in inserting this eloquent speech because I believe that it is a notable example of the conscientious and distinguished service which our colleague Mrs. ST. GEORGE has been rendering in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses.

The address follows:

We are gathered here this evening to honor the town chairman of Manchester, Mr. William S. Davis, a good Republican. I know enough about these chairmanships to know that you have to be an unselfish and high-minded idealist to take the job of Republican chairman, sir, in this day and age.

The reason for this is that our party has little or no patronage to offer and the Republican chairman can only hold his workers and the citizens together through sheer personality, hard work and conviction. The chairman himself never gets any reward. I know this because for a few years I was chairman of my county committee.

When you win elections, it is always the successful candidate who gets the laws and take the applause but when you lose, it is always because the chairman was a knave or a fool, or both.

So, I am happy that the Republicans of this great State have seen fit to honor one of their town chairmen and I am most happy to be here with them on this most pleasant occasion to join in paying my tribute to one whose fine services to our party are being fittingly recognized.

Now, this brings me to the subject I have come here to discuss with you tonight and that subject is how to win elections. That is the one question to which we Republicans must find an answer and, in my humble opinion, we must find it now or we may well find that our days are numbered and we've even than that, that the two-party system has died in America and the world.

First, the Republican Party has got to have convictions worth fighting for. They have got to be positive and they have got to be bold in their approach. Then let them get out and fight. Never look back and never be afraid of being licked.

The first requisite for a politician, the most necessary qualification is: can he or she stand up to defeat? It is a good thing for us all to be defeated in our political battles occasionally, just to show the stuff we are really made of. No one has proved this better in our day than President Hoover. As a result, he has grown immeasurably in the hearts of his countrymen. If ever a man had a just cause to be bitter and angry at the smear campaign leveled at him in 1932, it was Mr. Hoover, but he rose above it and continued to devote his life to the service of his country, culminating in his tremendous work in heading up the Hoover Commission and carrying the work of this Commission through to a successful end. Why did he do this? Because he had strong beliefs and convictions that made it possible for him to rise above pettiness in defeat and to continue his labor for causes he loved and for his country which he put ahead of all personal considerations.

No, if defeat is going to stop us we had better give up at once. At this time in the country's history we need people who do not fear defeat and, above all, people who will not sell their birthright for a mess of pottage.

The Republican Party is the party of reform. It was so conceived and it was born into the world for that purpose. It first saved the Union and abolished slavery. In its best days it was the party of the farmer, the small-business man, in short, the party of the individual American. By its name the Republican Party typifies American ideals and philosophy. Our country was founded as a Republic, not a Democracy, and it is well to remember that Thomas Jefferson, the patron saint of the modern Democratic Party for whom all these $100 tax-free dinners are given, always called himself a Republican. Later in our country's history it was our party, the Republican Party, that reformed big business which had become arrogant and proud and said: "The public be damned!" Yes, it was the Republican Party that fostered the antitrust laws that prevented big business from over-reaching itself and controlling not only our economy but our political life as well.

We are now once again in an era when reforms are needed and are long overdue. We need first of all to reform our Government, to clean and purge it thoroughly and completely. There is only one way to do this: It is by turning the present party in power out and putting the Republican Party, the party of reform, in.

The United States is suffering at home and abroad from lack of confidence in our Government agencies and in many of the heads of these agencies. This is notably true of the State Department.

The American people are shocked beyond measure at the revelation of moral corruption and perversion revealed in the testimony of Mr. John E. Peurifoy, Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, that the State Department had had to get rid of 91 employees as bad security risks and Mr. Peurifoy adds that they were all homosexuals.

Now I for one, have always believed, and still believe, that a person's private life and morals are no concern of any political opponent and are matters that concern his own conscience. As one who lived through the noble experiment of prohibition, I also know that you cannot make people good by legislation, however well intentioned. But, these unfortunate people are a grave security risk. They are preys to the blackmailers and spies, in fact, it is well known that General Cannaris, one of the heads of the German Intelligence under Hitler, had a list of the homo-sexuals in our Government and what information could be obtained from each and everyone of them. It is well also to remember that the Germans and Russians were Allies up to the year 1941 and that they pooled their information up to that year. So these people are a very real menace and have already done grave harm to our country at home and abroad, in fact, they have in very truth been traitors to the Nation they have sworn to serve.

How and why anyone should feel that they are being unjustly treated is inconceivable. They should be held up to scorn and the Department heads should hang their heads in shame at having only cleaned up part of the mess, when they were forced to do so by congressional committees, spurred on by public indignation.

This is not a time for the Republican Party to stand aside and be squeamish. This is not a time to hold one's nose and pass on, on the other side of the street. This is rather the time for the Republican Party to take up the challenge and once again to play its part as the Party of Reform.

And today the matter in hand will be the reform of the United States Government. The people are ahead of the Congress in this and in many other matters, so no Republican need be afraid to carry the story to them. The people of the United States are sick of platitudes and well-chosen words. They are looking for someone to lead them out of the wilderness of corruption, waste and extravagance in which they know this country is floundering.

One of the big reforms that is long overdue is: The complete over-hauling of the financial and tax structure of the Nation. Thomas Jefferson said: "I place economy among the first and most important of Republican virtues and public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared."

One wonders what Thomas Jefferson would say today if he could see this Nation in an era of peace and prosperity with a national debt of two-hundred and fifty-eight and a half billions and a deficit budget of between five and eight billions for the present fiscal year. Some will say: "Oh, but we are far bigger and far richer; our income is more, and therefore our debt and our expenses must be greater."

This would be true if the income and expenses had kept pace with each other, but, unfortunately, that is far from being the case. Here are the figures: Since 1939 the national income of the United States has more than trebled, but the national debt has gone from forty and a half billions in 1939 to two hundred and fifty eight and a half billions in 1950, or a jump of over six times the 1939 amount.

Then we have the food prices and the surpluses and when we look into that we can only paraphrase the words of your own great citizen, Clare Boothe Luce, and say that the Department of Agriculture must be a lunatic asylum run by the inmates.

From July through December, Canada sent 1,587,000 dozen shell eggs to the United States; during the same period Communist China shipped 1,746,000 pounds of dried eggs to the United States; 283,000 pounds of frozen eggs also were received in the United States; the Government stock pile of eggs on December 31 totaled more than 78,500,000 pounds of dried eggs, and the Department was still buying them at the rate of more than 2,000,000 pounds a week.

Again, to quote that great Republican, Thomas Jefferson: "Nothing betrays imbecility so much as being insensible to it."

Art Wardner, a Minnesota farmer, sold 160,000 pounds of potatoes to the Government at $1.46 a hundredweight, and immediately bought them back for 1 cent per 100 pounds. Wardner never lost possession of the potatoes in the deal. He simply received a Federal check and then wrote out one of his own checks to buy back the potatoes.

As this Government bureaucracy grows, business (and especially small business) declines. We know that unemployment is on the increase. Government has grown to the extent that it is the biggest single enterprise in the United States today. People in 21 States get more money from Federal, State, and local governments than they receive from industrial pay rolls. In 15 other States payments are more than half as big as the wages paid by manufacturers. Payments by Government to individuals total about twenty eight billions a year. The manufacturing industry has payments totaling about forty six billions a year.

It is estimated that nearly 6,000,000 civilians depend upon some form of government activity for their livelihood. They form about one-tenth of the total number of all employed. In addition, several million farm owners receive price support and conservation funds from the United States Government. Still many other millions are receiving pensions, relief payments and other forms of Government aid. Only in heavily industrialized States are the factory pay rolls larger than Government payments as a source of

income. In California, Government payments exceed factory pay rolls and in New York State they are 60 percent as large. Government payments approximate 14 percent of the income received by individuals. This is constantly growing and has already exceeded the farm income.

In the face of all this we get this kind of extravagant nonsense paid for with the taxpayers' money. The Department of the Interior has put out quantities of the following pamphlets:

"Determination of Age in Fishes"

"Concerning Mortality of Soft Clams at Essex, Mass."

"Biology of the Atlantic Mackerel; Early Life History"

Of course, we can count on several more volumes on the middle and later life of the mackerel. These things may be interesting and even of a certain value to a few of our people, but they are a criminal extravagance when the country is running a deficit of over 5 billions annually. It was President Roosevelt who said, in his first campaign:

"Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors because they are a burden on production and can be paid only by production. Our workers may never see a tax bill but they pay in reduction from wages and increased cost of what they buy."

And on that I must agree with him, but he certainly got over that idea very quickly after his election.

So now, after 16 long years going from extravagance to greater extravagance and from deficit to ever greater deficits, we must have a change of leadership if this Republic is to survive.

Pray God that the Republican Party may be ready and able for that leadership, because if it is not, some leader will arise—someone with a delightful voice and agreeable personality who will promise the people these reforms if they will but surrender the power of the state to him. That has happended all over the world. It can happen here. Remember Hitler and Mussolini, both gave the people honest and efficient government with all the most advanced social services such as agrarian reforms, social security, old-age insurance and pensions, socialized medicine, but at the same time they took their liberty.

"We shall banish want. We shall banish fear. The essence of national socialism is human welfare. National socialism is the revolution of the common man. National socialism means a new day of abundance at home and a better world abroad."

Those are the words of Adolph Hitler. They have rather sickening familiar ring. That is one of the cures for corrupt government—dictatorship. The other solution, the solution of free men and women, is to turn the corrupt administration out and put the reformers to work.

To do this the Republicans must be aggressive. We must point out corruption in Government wherever it is and let the chips fall where they may. This year every congressional district must elect a representative. You will find that you are going to hear all the old familiar catchwords and all the alerts and emergency calls for help trotted out once again. We are beginning once more to hear that war is nearer than we think and soon you will hear that we must not change horses in mid-stream.

I would like to remind you that here again it should never be forgotten that war solves many problems. It puts an end to all criticism of the administration in power. It permits unlimited spending and extravagance. It puts an end to unemployment, even if that end is the grave.

War also puts an end to the freedom of the individual. Instead, it regiments and leads him regardless of his own will. War and freedom cannot long endure together. We would do well to pause and remember that we have had two world wars under the leadership of the Democrat Party and that on both occasions we were told we were fighting for freedom and to promote a free world.

What has happened? There is less freedom in the world today than since the Dark Ages. There is more nationalism and less free interchange of goods and ideas than at any time in modern history. And finally, there is more isolationism in the world today than ever before. At this very minute 800,000,000 people are dominated by the Soviet Union and isolated behind the iron curtain and that isolated area of the world is pushing forward slowly but surely every day.

That is what has happened in these last 16 years. Don't you think we need a change?

To get this change we must have teamwork. The Republicans in the Congress are making the Republican record and it is this record that the national candidates, both this year and in 1952, must stand on. Therefore, we must be forthright and even though we may disagree on minor isues, we must stand together on the big fundamental ones, and above all, on the main issue: Can a republic of free men endure in the modern world? The answer to that question must be given soon or our two-party system will disappear and when that happens, the Republic will collapse because the two-party system is the cornerstone of the building.

The plans to scrap this Republic are well advanced. There are two bills now pending that are being gently pushed by the administration. When they pass, they will put an end to individual rights and freedom in this country. One is S. 1971, introduced by Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma—the bill embodying the so-called Brannan plan. This measure consists of 86 pages, 15 of which are a list of penalties that the American farmer will be subject to if he disobeys any of the regulations and provisions embodied in the act. He will be liable to fines, imprisonment, or both if he does not fill out all the forms and if he does not sow and reap according to the regulations of an all-seeing Government bureaucracy. Thomas Jefferson surely must have been looking at this country with a prophet's eye when he said: "If we were to be told from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we would soon starve." The Secretary of Agriculture says he has no idea of the cost of this program and its enforcement, but obviously it will be tremendous and the American farmer will be nothing but a Government employee at best, or a slave of the State at worst.

The other bill that will finish the work of regulating the lives of the American people is the Spence bill, H. R. 2756, introduced by Congressman SPENCE, of Kentucky. This measure, which would practically give complete power to the executive branch of the Government, caused so much indignation when it was first revealed to an astonished Congress that it is being carefully held in abeyance for the present and will not be brought up for consideration at the present session of Congress. If the Democrats win many more congressional seats this year, you may be sure that both these measures will be introduced and probably passed by the Eighty-second Congress.

These measures would spell the end of the two-party system in this country because the vast majority of the people would be directly beholden to the executive branch of the Government for their living. The Congress would be a rather second-rate debating society whose highest function would be to act as a go-between for constituents and the all-powerful Government departments.

Such a government would, of course, be upheld by the modern police-state methods and, mark you, that is something that no one has yet found a way to overthrow—the modern police state.

My friends, you may think I am an alarmist, but I submit to you that many great nations have gone this way and we must look ahead. Hindsight never pays.

These reasons are the reasons why we Republicans must go forth this year bravely and without compromise and fight the good fight, with confidence that right will triumph, with conviction and belief in our cause and its justice. We must tell the people the truth. We must be honest with ourselves first and with those to whom we are going to preach the gospel of the Republic. In Maxwell Anderson's play, Valley Forge, George Washington says:

"This liberty will look easy by and by when nobody dies for it."

Yes; we take all this for granted. We forget those who died for liberty. But we have come to the time in our history when liberty will perish from the earth if no one will fight to preserve her.

We Republicans are the only ones today who can make that fight. Let us march on with courage and humility to victory, freedom, and peace.

Four Billions Not Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of April 14, 1950:

FOUR BILLIONS NOT SAVED

If the present national administration desired to manage Government affairs economically and efficiently, the tools to do so are at its disposal. A non-Partisan Commission, created by Congress in 1947 and headed by Herbert Hoover, studied Government organization, functions, and methods for 2 years and had come up with plans for reorganization which would have saved at least a billion dollars a year, while improving the quality of work that was done.

The Hoover Commission was no muckraking group seeking to make capital for a political party and gain publicity for ambitious politicians. Neither was it an undertaking of academicians without practical experience in the affairs of Government and business.

COMMISSION WELL QUALIFIED

Four members of the Hoover Commission were appointed by the President, two of whom were high-ranking officers in his administration and two from private life. Four members of the Commission were appointed by the Speaker of the House, two being able Congressmen, one from each party, and two from private life.

One of the latter was Mr. Hoover. The four members to round out the 12 were appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, who named two able Senators, one from each party, and two non-Government men.

The Commission was the best qualified group ever created to seek improvement in

Government said reduce costs of administration. It went about the job with great intelligence and drive. Three hundred experts were employed and assigned to 24 committees, each dealing with a specific function, area, or group of problems.

The research reports were review by the Commission and made the basis of comprehensive plans for eliminating duplication of work, cutting red tape, and revising administrative methods.

The commission did not concern itself with the billions spent by the Government on activities which could well be eliminated. It found ways of saving $4,000,000,000 without eliminating any Government functions.

For the citizen who wants to inform himself about the economies the Hoover Commission pointed out, there is a little book entitled "A Book in Leviathan," by Bradley H. Nash and Cornelius Lynde.

A wise and able President would have utilized the enthusiastic popular reception of the Hoover report to put it into effect in its entirety. But that is not what Mr. Truman did. What he saw in the Hoover plan was backing for petty moves of advantage to himself.

The Commission proposed that the salary of the President be increased from $75,000 to $100,000 and that, in addition, he be paid $50,000 a year of tax-exempt salary. Mr. Hoover himself appeared before a congressional committee to approve this.

That had Mr. Truman's complete endorsement and a bill was rushed through Congress so that the President could get the extra money from the beginning of his second administration.

Mr. Truman also was happy to have the authority of the Hoover Commission back of a transfer of the public employment offices and the unemployment compensation machinery from the social security board to the Department of Labor.

RECOMMENDATIONS ARE DELAYED

Congress had on three occasions vetoed his request for the transfer. This was a move dear to the heart of the President because he owed something to Secretary of Labor Tobin, who took the secretaryship in 1948 when no one else would.

After dwadling a year and a half, while the Government went into the red 5 or 6 billion dollars, Mr. Truman on March 13 sent to Congress a batch of 21 plans for administrative changes. One of the plans called for abolishing the office of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, as proposed by the unions. This was not a part of the Hoover plan at all. It had never even been discussed by the Hoover Commission.

Other plans have been so long belated that opposition has been allowed to develop which may prevent their acceptance by Congress. Mr. Truman has used the Hoover report when possible to serve his personal and political ends and otherwise has reduced its effectiveness. Even at this late date he admits he has done nothing about half of the things suggested.

If anyone ever supposed that the Truman administration was interested in economy, a look at a recent report of the Armed Services Committee of the House would convert the impression. It mentions:

"A budget request is pending for a new $13,000,000 veterans' hospital in the Los Angeles area, while the Navy is closing the 1,500-bed Long Branch naval hospital in the same area.

"A 800-bed veterans' hospital is being built in Philadelphia, while the Army is closing the 2,000-bed Valley Forge hospital 30 miles away.

"The Veterans' agency plans to build 1,000-bed hospitals in Boston and at Brockton, Mass., while the Army is closing Murphy General Hospital at Waltham, Mass.

"The Veterans' Administration wants to build a 800-bed hospital in Atlanta, while the Army is closing Oliver General Hospital at Augusta, Ga.

"A 500-bed veterans' hospital is planned at Ann Arbor, Mich., while the Army is closing the 1,600-bed Jones Hospital at Battle Creek."

There won't be any Government economy until there is a different kind of a man in the White House.

Safety Rally at the Brooklyn Navy Yard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to be able to accept the invitation of Rear Adm. Paul B. Nibecker, commander of the New York naval shipyard, to attend a safety rally at the yard on April 6, 1950. We who live in Brooklyn, of course, always call it the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

The officers and enlisted men, together with the entire civilian personnel, are to be congratulated for their very fine safety record. I believe it can well be held out to the entire country as an excellent example of what men and women can accomplish when they set their minds to it.

The over-all yard record was 77 days without a single lost-time accident. That is exceptional in the light of the tremendous number of men and women working there under all sorts of conditions.

The record of the three top shops is particularly outstanding. The pattern shop did not have a lost-time accident in 2,923 days; the sail and flag loft did not have one in 1,510 days; and the electronics shop, none in 746 days.

Admiral Nibecker has every reason to be proud of these fine accomplishments.

Truth on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truth on Civil Rights" which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of yesterday, April 19.

It is high time that the American people know the truth about the Democratic Party's position on the civil-rights program. The truth is that the Democratic Party, under the leadership of President Truman, has no real intention whatever of advancing the program. As the editorial so well points out, the administration is engaging in a lot of double talk in an attempt to deceive the people.

Let me remind you that the Democratic Party has been in power around 18 years with substantial and overwhelming majorities in Congress. In all these years not a single major civil-rights measure has been enacted. In this Eighty-first Congress the Democratic Party has a substantial majority in both the House and the Senate, but to date the civil-rights program has received little more than lip-service from the Democrats. While they profess great interest in civil rights, the Democratic leadership in the Congress repeatedly postpones consideration of the program.

Abraham Lincoln once said to a caller at the White House:

> If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem. It is true that you may fool all the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all the time.

The editorial follows:

TRUTH ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The Democratic Senate Policy Committee has announced that consideration of the civil-rights program, and particularly of the Fair Employment Practices Commission, has been indefinitely deferred in favor of more urgent matters.

To members of racial and religious groups who take the professions of Mr. Truman's party at face value, we commend the following remarks of Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, a stalwart Truman Fair Dealer, made in a radio speech April 12 to his constituents:

"I tell you it is the power and influence of your Senators and Congressmen that has made possible defeat of FEPC and other so-called civil-rights bills. They hold this power and influence as members of the Democratic Party.

"The anti-poll-tax bill is bottled up today in a subcommittee of the Senate Rules Committee. Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, Democrat, Mississippi, is chairman of this subcommittee because of his membership in the Democratic Party. If he were a member of the Dixiecrat splinter party, he could not be chairman and could have little influence in the fight against civil-rights bills.

"The general civil rights bill (containing a combination of the controversial programs) is bottled up today in a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Senator JOHN EASTLAND, Democrat, Mississippi, is chairman of this committee. If he were not a Democrat, he could not be chairman of this or any other committee."

ONLY FOR HOME CONSUMPTION

"As a Democrat, I hold a place on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I led the fight in committee against the FEPC bill, and the committee dropped it like a foundling on the Senate's doorstep—without a word in its favor." (The committee reported the bill to the Senate Calendar without recommendation.) "If our group of southern Senators is to continue to defeat these rights bills, we must keep the power and influence we hold as members of the Democratic Party. I also warn that the Republicans are committed to civil rights."

When Senator HILL was asked how these statements were to be matched with the Democratic Party's claim that it is a party of tolerance, abhorring racial and religious prejudices, he made the classic response:

"I was speaking to the people of Alabama."

In other words, the Truman party shows one face and speaks with one voice when it is seeking the white supremacy vote in the South, and it shows the opposite side of the face and speaks with an entirely different voice when it is appealing to the vote of minorities in the North. Senator HILL has exposed the trick.

Has Mr. Truman the guts to pull out his party's supposed passion to institute a civil rights program once again in the fall congressional election as a means of wooing the minorities? If so, he must think the gullibility of the people is beyond exaggeration.

Postage Stamp in Honor of the Late Col. David (Mickey) Marcus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1950, I introduced H. R. 8053, for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Col. David (Mickey) Marcus, who was killed in Israel on June 10, 1948.

The bill authorizes the Postmaster General to issue the special stamp within 1 year after enactment of the measure. The stamp is to bear a likeness of Colonel Marcus and its denomination is to be determined by the Post Office Department. In view of the fact that Marcus was a resident of Brooklyn, I suggested in my bill that the stamp be placed on sale in Brooklyn 1 day before it is made available to the public elsewhere.

Colonel Marcus, a graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1924, had gone to Israel to help lead its forces in the struggle for independence after the Arab states invaded it in 1948. He instilled a spirit of modern warfare among Israel's forces and planned its military strategy. He is one of the great Jewish heroes to emerge from Israel's modern war for independence.

David Marcus was born on New York's East Side. After his graduation from West Point, he served as a lieutenant in the infantry until 1926. He attended Brooklyn Law School, passed the bar examination in 1927 and received a doctor's degree from the same law school in 1928. He then served successively as assistant district attorney, as assistant United States attorney, and commissioner of correction in New York City under Mayor LaGuardia.

Marcus remained in the Army Reserve throughout his civic activities. During World War II, he went back into service as a lieutenant colonel, first as a Judge Advocate and later as a provost marshal in the Twenty-seventh Division. He parachuted into Normandy on D-day and was with American troops during the fighting in Sicily.

Liability Insurance for Private Plane Owners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, recently at a hearing of a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I was disturbed to learn that a serious gap exists in our aviation laws. Upon questioning a responsible official of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, I discovered that not many private planes carry insurance to cover injuries they may do to persons and damage to property.

Since there are more than 90,000 private planes in this country today, and since no law requires their owners to show they are financially responsible for any damage they may cause, it is time that Congress ends this current state of irresponsibility. In recent months several planes have crashed in residential and business areas. In the months ahead we may expect more.

Americans are home owners and many of them invest their life savings in their homes. Unless the home owner carries comprehensive insurance, and not too many do, a freak airplane accident may wipe out his security and well-being.

The chances of a private plane being involved in an air mishap are certainly greater than for a commercial plane, which must meet strict safety standards. Commercial planes carry liability insurance. Many States require car owners to carry liability insurance to protect individual life and property. There is no reason why private aircraft should be treated differently.

For this reason, I have today introduced H. R. 8126, which will require all planes to furnish proof of their financial responsibility in case of accident. Officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, who will prescribe the standards of financial responsibility when this bill is enacted into law, are agreed as to its essentiality. With 90,000 private planes in the air, we are past the age of curiosity and experimentation. We have a responsibility to all property owners in the United States and to all parents to lessen the danger and fear of air mishaps.

Address of Charles H. Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1950, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States held their fifty-fifth anniversary dinner at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City. The guest of honor on this noteworthy occasion was Mr. Louis B. Mayer. Mr. Charles H. Silver, a distinguished citizen, well known in civic, philanthropic, and business affairs in the city of New York, served as chairman. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the address delivered by Mr. Silver to the guests assembled:

> I consider it a distinguished honor to be chairman of the fifty-fifth anniversary dinner of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. It is more than half a century since soldiers of the Jewish faith formed an organization and, while vast changes have been wrought in the life of our Nation during the intervening years, the spirit which animated the founders has never changed—the spirit of Americanism and brotherhood.
>
> The Jewish War Veterans of the United States were cradled in the American way of life. When they came to maturity they grew in stature and influence because they were rooted in genuine American ideals. They are part and parcel of a system of society that has made this Nation great and glorious and that will never be changed by those who would try to tear down this system.
>
> The boys of Jewish blood who stood beside their Christian comrades in the foxholes never asked those with whom they fought to what religion they belonged and they, in turn, were never questioned about their faith. The men in the foxholes had a common religion—Democracy. Yet each worshiped God in his own way.
>
> The Jewish war veterans who have emerged from the slime and dirt and heartbreak of the battlefields have now taken their place in the forums of peace. It is worth mentioning and repeating from time to time that these men who fought so valiantly so that Democracy might survive are now engaged in another monumental struggle—the fight to create a peace that will banish the fear of the atom bomb and make the hearts of men and women glad that there is no longer any prospect of wanton and needless slaughter.
>
> At this time I should like to say a word about this organization which has become a permanent part of the general pattern of American Democracy. Over in Europe, for centuries Jews were not permitted to volunteer to fight for their country. And in this country Asser Levy, the Dutch Jew, was denied permission by Gov. Peter Stuyvesant to participate in the defense of the colony of New Amsterdam.
>
> Of course Peter Stuyvesant was merely reflecting the prejudice that colored the minds of European sovereigns. Levy had to plead with Stuyvesant to be allowed to risk his life in the common defense of the colony before he was accepted for service.
>
> All this changed when America was born. It was one of the few countries that permitted Jews to wear the uniform of their country as honorable volunteers. And it is very interesting to note, my friends, that among the Jews who fought in the Civil War were immigrants who would have been denied the right to volunteer for military service in the countries of their origin. More than 10,000 Jews fought in the contending armies of the Civil War. Seven of these men were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.
>
> My friends, I could go on and on giving you the record of the Jews and it is a story replete with deeds of heroism and sacrifice. I could give you figures that would astound

you but they need no praise from me. But I would like to point out that some 250,000 Jews saw service in World War I and more than 550,000—over half a million—served in World War II.

Among them were those who had recently become citizens. Many of these were the descendants of those who were forced to wear the Yellow Star of David under German and Russian tyrants and who emerged from the war wearing the Purple Heart for wounds received in the service of democracy.

I think that all of us—Catholics, Protestants, and Jews—may well be proud of this splendid record. For what they have done is more than a tribute to these men of the Jewish faith; it is a reflection of the splendid faith which we of all races and creeds have in the strength and nobility of American democracy. It is democracy as we practice it in this country that has been a springboard for the vast strides that we made in so short a time and will continue to remain the motivating factors of our daily lives.

What the Jewish veterans have done in the past is now part of the history of this country. What about the present? What are they doing now? What are the problems they face and how are they trying to solve them? Again, I say I could quote figures and statistics which would amaze you. But I want to briefly tell you about their vast program in the field of human relations. In the present state of the world human relationships have become a very vital part in the planning for a permanent peace.

This organization, my friends, is now engaged in fighting every form of tyranny, bigotry, and intolerance. The Jewish War Veterans of the United States were among the very first to speak out boldly against Hungary's persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty and the oppression visited on the Protestant clergies in central Europe. They have been assailed by the Communists as a tool of big-business interests on the one hand and by Gerald L. K. Smith's anti-Semitic cross and flag on the other hand.

What has been the answer to these attacks? A program of action in the field of human relations. They have worked with the American Legion, the Catholic War Veterans, and other major veterans' organizations. They are reminding 18,000,000 servicemen in America that racial and religious disunity can be just as harmful and menacing to the country's welfare in peace as it would have been in war.

Let those who would cast ships on our way of life remember this very important fact. The Jewish War Veterans' service program, staffed by hundreds of professional and voluntary counselors, serves more than 110,000 veterans and veterans' dependents of all faiths. More than 20 percent of those who have been aided are non-Jewish. There, my friends, you have American democracy in action—action that is unfettered by any consideration of race, color, or creed. That is something that is worth fighting for and keeping so that we and our children and our children's children may enjoy the blessings of our glorious way of life.

If I have been enthusiastic about the past achievements and present status of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, you will understand why; I have attempted to give you a rather quick picture of an organization that has never faltered in its efforts to obtain its noble objectives.

We are engaged today in a struggle for the minds of men. We are trying to show those who do not share our philosophy of life that it is only in a democracy that man attains his full dignity as a human being. It is a tremendous undertaking. It is, I believe, too great for any individual to direct; what is required is a harmonious working of all forces striving in various directions to create a peaceful world.

There are many organizations in this country which are trying to coordinate these efforts for world peace. All of them should be encouraged. That is why it is important that we should give our support and sympathetic cooperation to the Jewish War Veterans of America in the general plan that is slowly being evolved to bring the peoples of the world together. Organizations like the Jewish War Veterans must play a very vital role.

We are indeed honored this evening by the presence of one of the great spiritual leaders of our times, His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman. It has been my good fortune to be associated with him in his untiring labors in behalf of a great hospital in this city. To know him is to grasp a true understanding of what is meant by the word charity. For to him, charity means friendship, compassion, tolerance, and help for those who suffer or are in need. His philosophy is as broad as the philosophy of humanity in its noblest sense. He holds in his heart love for people of all races and creeds. I have been very fortunate in having the pleasure of his comradeship, his advice, and wisdom.

Tonight the Jewish War Veterans of the United States are honoring one who is known throughout the land as a great patriot and who has earned the respect and admiration of his fellow citizens for his achievements as a worker in behalf of many worthy causes—Mr. Louis B. Mayer.

He has done much to bring about a world understanding of American ideals and principles and that, to my mind, is as important a job as any man can do these trying days. It is especially for this that we honor him this evening, an honor that has been well earned. And I want to take this opportunity to add my word of tribute to those of the other speakers whom you will hear this evening.

So I close by saluting the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. May the coming years bring them greater strength to follow through with their plans for peace and brotherhood.

Nice Showing for Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Helena (Ark.) World:

NICE SHOWING FOR ARKANSAS

Arkansas, in 1949, ranked seventh in cash income from livestock among the 15 Southern States. Our farmers got something over $155,000,000 from this source, putting them out in front of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Florida, North and South Carolina, and West Virginia.

That's a mighty nice rating. It would be a happier one, of course, if we stood higher, but our livestock industry is pretty much a recent development. It was largely a "depression baby," taken up by many of our farmers in that harsh time of the 1930's.

In the States which lead Arkansas livestock has been an important part of their farming for a long time. These States are Texas (really three or four States in one), Oklahoma, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, Georgia, and Maryland. And the last two are ahead of Arkansas by only a few million dollars each.

Now, a lot of our farmers have the "know how" with livestock. They have much idle land, a chunk of it taken from restricted cotton and rice crops, to find use for. And good blood for improving livestock herds is available in the many fine breeding herds now established in the State.

So Arkansas might well expand its livestock farming and step up a notch or two in the State's rank. The income from this source could be doubled, possibly tripled, over a period of years if all the resources were fully used.

Our towns and cities would benefit greatly from such an advance. Farmers would have more money to spend in them, and they would get a lot more of the processing plants which prepare livestock and its products for the consumer. The present sprinkling of these plants adds millions of dollars annually to the farm value of the livestock output.

Here is one of our real opportunities.

Development and Maintenance of American Flag Shipping on the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolutions:

CITY OF BUFFALO,
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
April 18, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Pursuant to the direction of the Common Council of this city, I am enclosing herewith copy of Resolution No. 108 relative to introductory bill, H. R. 7520, "to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes," which resolution was passed at the council session of April 4, 1950.

Very truly yours,
Dr. JOSEPH J. TRONOLONE,
City Clerk.

No. 108

ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO, Member of Congress, re introductory bill H. R. 7520, to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes and for other purposes

Mr. Rybka moved that the petition be received and filed and that it is hereby resolved that the Common Council of the City of Buffalo hereby approves introductory bill H. R. 7520 amending the Ship Sales Act to permit lakes operators to purchase vessels for conversion for services as package freight and/or passenger ships for exclusive operation on the Lakes and to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes and that the Members of Congress representing districts including the city of Buffalo as part of its territory be and they hereby are urged to support said bill to the end that it may be enacted into law, and that the city clerk be and hereby is directed to forward copies of this resolution to such Senators and Congressmen.

Passed:

Ayes, 15; noes, none.

Mrs. J. Borden Harriman's Address to the United Jewish Appeal Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to the attention of my colleagues a heart-warming address delivered by Mrs. J. Borden Harriman at the national conference of the Christian Committee of the United Jewish Appeal, held in Washington, D. C., April 16. Mrs. Harriman, who is a former American Minister to Norway, is now chairman of the women's division of the United Jewish Appeal Christian Committee, in which capacity she is particularly interested in aiding homeless Jewish orphans overseas and bringing them to Israel, where they will find a home.

Mrs. Harriman's address is as follows:

Shalom!

I greet you today with the salutation of the people of Israel. I greet you with the one word—"Peace!"—which I think symbolizes the ideal for which Israel is striving, the ideal which motivates you who have come to this conference to plan assistance for your fellowmen.

When I speak of peace, I mean more than the absence of war between nations, although that is the most important meaning of the word. I am thinking rather of that inner peace and security, that feeling of being loved and wanted and living among friends, which is the greatest possession of any free man or woman.

I imagine that the absence of this feeling of security has been among the most tragic experiences of those who suffered through the long years of war and oppressions that have marred our times. In the concentration camps, and later in the DP camps, the individual must have felt completely alone and forsaken.

It has been a slow and difficult task to help these people return to normal living. So deep are the scars they bear, that many of them require the most devoted and prolonged care to restore their faith in human nature.

This to me has been Israel's most important achievement. This work of human redemption has drawn me to active participation in the campaign of the United Jewish Appeal. I think it is this aspect of your activities which means the most to the people of America, for it is in the tradition of our country to place the highest worth on human values.

I have read with interest the statistics of the work performed by the United Jewish Appeal. The figures are impressive—many hundreds of thousands brought to Israel, great numbers in other lands receiving our help. And most important of all, many hundreds and thousands of others still facing danger, still fleeing from persecution.

But it seems to me that the human aspect is too often lost when we become immersed in statistics. To me, they assume real meaning only when I think in terms of the individuals whom we are trying to help.

As a woman, it is heartening to me to know that the thousands of children who were the remnants of Hitler's war are being given a chance in the postwar world. For as we know, childhood experiences determine in a large part what kind of adults will shape the future of mankind. A bitter, frustrated, and cynical youth can only result in a hard, calculating, and hopeless adult.

Certainly, European youth was headed for just such a future. We all read and saw pictures of the wild children of Europe, boys and girls who knew all the wrong answers much too early in life. The Jewish youth of Europe was particularly affected. They spent most of their formative years behind the barbed wires of concentration camps, next to the incinerators which devoured their mothers and fathers. They lived in forests, basements, closets—hiding from the Nazi monsters. They were the disinherited.

Now these children are being given a chance. More than 20,000 orphans have come to Israel since the proclamation of the Jewish State. Their rightful heritage is being restored to them. Some of them don't know quite how to accept this bounty of enough to eat, a place to sleep, and an education. The simplest things are miracles to them, miracles which you, in your generosity and understanding, have made possible.

But much remains to be done. We must still care for thousands of orphaned children who are being kept in child-care centers, hospitals, and rest homes. What would happen to these youngsters if you were not supporting them? They might be roaming the streets, friendless, homeless, drifting along on the tides of fortune, taking what charity and chance offered them. Without you they would constitute a pitiful, lost generation. And there are thousands of others who are being given a new chance through a special foster home program.

It is particularly heartening to think of the miraculous work being done for the children and young people in Israel. But we must not close our eyes to the needs of those great numbers of children who have not yet benefited adequately from our aid. Thousands of immigrant children still live in the reception camps in conditions which are unsuitable for even a vigorous adult. Their situation must be remedied. We cannot permit these youngsters to spend any more time in camps and temporary installations. They are entitled to normal lives in normal home surroundings—and the United Jewish Appeal must receive the money to give them what they need.

I have spoken about the children whom we are helping, because they are so close to my heart. But our work for the adults, for the aged, the sick, and the disabled, must be carried on with equal vigor. All of them—the men, women and children who have been hunted and hated and persecuted—must be given their chance to live again.

These people have suffered greatly through no fault of their own. You or I—any of us here today—might have been in their place but for the grace of God. Helping them is a challenge and a responsibility that all of us, I feel, must gladly assume.

And when I say all of us, I mean Americans of all faiths—Christians as well as Jews. I am proud of the great number of my fellow Christians who are taking part in this great work of the United Jewish Appeal. I am particularly gratified by the response that Christian women in all parts of the country have shown to the formation of our women's division.

It is perhaps tactless of me to say this before an audience consisting mainly of men, but I feel that the women of America can contribute something to the drive of the United Jewish Appeal that is frequently lacking in our charitable efforts. I refer particularly to the quality of heart and an understanding of the needs of human beings. Men are not incapable of showing these qualities, but I think it takes the woman's touch to breathe real humanity into a philanthropic campaign—even one of such scope and importance as this one.

As a Christian, I am deeply moved by the opportunity for service which the UJA drive offers me. To feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to provide hope for the downtrodden and homes for the dispossessed—these are consonant with the highest traditions of Christianity. These principles are part of the Jewish tradition as well, and mark another one of those many areas in which our religions have a common heritage.

Our joint effort for the United Jewish Appeal brings that basic harmony into the realm of practical, everyday life. And nothing can be more practical than the job we have undertaken. For the UJA program of immigration and reconstruction is playing a key role in repairing the damage wrought by the horrors of the past decade.

We have a big job to do in 1950. I need not itemize the tasks to be done—you know them as well as I do. I look forward to great things as a result of this conference. And I think you know that, in all your work, the women of America will give you the fullest support.

A Notable Virginian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch, of Richmond, Va., which pays a well-merited tribute to Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, who recently resigned as a member of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

Admiral Strauss was a boyhood companion of mine and our friendship has grown through the years. I have followed his brilliant career with interest and admiration. During World War I he served as private secretary to the Honorable Herbert Hoover, United States Food Administrator. Following the war he assisted Mr. Hoover in his American Relief Administration and peace-conference activities. When these duties were completed he returned to private life as a partner of the banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of New York. This connection gave him an opportunity to display his unusual talents and he soon became one of the leading young businessmen of America.

During World War II, Admiral Strauss entered the Navy and became the first Reserve officer to attain the high rank of rear admiral. He served as Navy member of the Army-Navy Munitions Board; Inter-departmental Committee on Atomic Energy; and as a special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy.

Admiral Strauss has been awarded the Legion of Merit and Gold Star by the Navy; Oak Leaf Cluster by the Army; Legion of Honor by France, and decorations from other governments.

When the Atomic Energy Commission was created, Admiral Strauss was appointed by President Truman as a member of that highly important agency of

the Government. He is a pioneer in the field of nuclear energy where his achievements will stand as an enduring monument to his outstanding abilities and services. Virginia is proud of the record he has made and extends to him her best wishes in his future undertakings.

The editorial referred to follows:

A NOTABLE VIRGINIAN

Lewis L. Strauss, one of the most distinguished of living Virginians, is entitled to resign his membership on the Atomic Energy Commission, after undergoing more than 3 years of strain and overwork as a member of that body. His service there followed 5 years in the Navy, where he rose to the rank of rear admiral.

President Truman's decision to proceed with the manufacture of the H-bomb apparently was in part due to the urging of AEC member Strauss. This is only the latest example of the remarkable public service performed by this remarkable man, who is still only 54.

He attended the public schools in Richmond, and although he did not go to college, he was elected last year to the presidency of the world-famous Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N. J. He is one of the Nation's leading bankers, having risen to a partnership in the New York firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. at the age of 33. He left Richmond in May 1917, at the age of 21, for Washington, and soon became secretary to Herbert Hoover. He remained Mr. Hoover's secretary during the period when the President-to-be was directing relief activities for multitudes of starving peoples overseas.

His services in the recent war were so conspicuous that he was awarded various decorations and citations by both the Army and the Navy. He was already the recipient of decorations from half a dozen foreign governments.

It was his physics textbook at old John Marshall High School, when he was a student there, which aroused the interest of Lewis Strauss in science. As a result, he was instrumental years later in the construction of a laboratory at California Institute of Technology for research in the field of atomic energy. His appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission by President Truman was the natural outgrowth of his long-time interest in the latest atomic developments.

Mr. STRAUSS has also been prominent as a lay religious leader, having been president of Congregation Emanu-El, in New York. He is likewise a foremost patron of music and the arts, and is a director both of the Metropolitan Opera, in New York, and the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, in Richmond.

Although he is hale and vigorous, and apparently a long way from retirement, Mr. STRAUSS admirers and friends in Virginia are glad to note that he has a country estate near Brandy Station, Culpeper County. If he doesn't retire eventually to his old home town of Richmond, Richmonders will count on him to settle no farther away than Culpeper.

Promoting International Understanding for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to bring to the attention of the members a very timely and informative article by Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, entitled "UNESCO and Agreement of Men's Minds," which appeared in the April 15, 1950 issue of the weekly review, America.

This lucid explanation of what the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization is trying to do to win men's minds toward international understanding is excellently presented and deserves wide reading. The article follows:

UNESCO AND AGREEMENT OF MEN'S MINDS

When UNESCO began its career in 1946 it was the victim of a gentle pun, often quoted. "What is it," people asked, "a tea biscuit?" The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization is 4 years old now. Most of its critics would agree that it is less like a tea biscuit than like the K-rations of war days—too dry to be immediately tempting but potentially too valuable to discard.

As an organization affiliated to the United Nations, UNESCO has for its special concern the areas of education, science, and culture in their relationship to international peace. "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed," says the preamble of UNESCO's charter, a product of the versatile pens of Etienne Gilson and Archibald MacLeish. These intellectual leaders, like the others who joined with them in the creation of UNESCO, were convinced, apparently, that the road to peace was not one trod solely by politicians and statesmen. They found common cause among many groups in the determination to use every avenue to achieve the goal of international understanding, and to build peace upon the dignity of the human person.

Such an idea was not entirely new. Out of the shambles of World War I had come a similar organization that was related to the League of Nations but never earnestly or completely supported by the League. This organization, the Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, did bring together important leaders in the cultural and educational fields who worked hard at the task of bringing about an international understanding of and sympathy for divergent cultures. The distinguished Ambassador of France to the United States, M. Henri Bonnet, was the executive director of the Institute. It is no discredit to him to report that the organization was not very successful.

The program of the Institute, and similar ideas, were all laid aside during the early and middle periods of World War II. But in the late days of the war a movement began in the United States to establish a new kind of International Office of Education that would promote knowledge and understanding among the nations looking toward the final goal of world peace. Similar undertakings were reported from France and England. Finally, our own Government began private talks with leading educators designed to produce a charter for such an international organization. The movement was given impetus by the inclusion of education among the items considered at the Charter Conference of the United Nations in San Francisco, April to June 1945, and came into its own in London in November 1945, when UNESCO was formally launched.

If the Institute of Intellectual Cooperation failed to achieve its desired ends, that failure was ascribed in large part to the inability of the Institute to interest a large cross section of people in member nations. UNESCO, determined not to make the same mistake, provided in its constitution for the creation of national cooperating bodies or national commissions which would enlist the support of as many cultural groups as possible.

In the United States the United States National Commission was relatively successful from the very beginning. Sixty important national organizations named delegates to its meetings, while many more clamored for the right to be associated with the work. Forty individuals were added, as representatives of national, State, and local government, to bring the membership in the national commission to 100. Meetings have been held twice yearly. Plenary sessions have been scheduled in Washington, Philadelphia, Boston, and Cleveland. Despite the large number of individuals and organizations participating and regardless of the attention given to the United States National Commission in the daily press and in many periodicals, the parent organization and the Commission remain largely unknown in the United States, especially along the eastern seaboard. In Kansas and in certain other Western States there are State-wide, county-wide, and city-wide UNESCO units dedicated to bringing the message of peace and understanding to the man in the street in terms he can understand and cooperate with. Despite these special efforts, however, UNESCO and the National Commission remain for the most part a mystery to most people.

This apparent neglect of UNESCO might derive from any number of causes. The average citizen may distrust his own ability to make a contribution to peace, regarding the problem as the affair of statesmen. Or he may distrust the intellectuals and the program they envision under UNESCO, dismissing it as an idea of dreamers who are tinkering with social problems in an ineffectual, harmless way. Yet it should never be imagined that the citizen is not interested in peace or the ways of achieving it. Perhaps there is just enough cynicism about the United Nations to create a distrust of any organization that is affiliated with it. Those who attack UNESCO directly do so because they dislike the program or some of the individuals who are responsible for its execution or administration. Despite external criticism and internal tensions UNESCO has a fair record of accomplishment to mark its 4-year history.

HEADQUARTERS AND STAFF

The international headquarters of UNESCO is Maison UNESCO in Paris, once the Hotel Majestic, where now the clatter of typewriters and the buzz of conferences and debates has succeeded the click of hard-heeled Nazi boots that once echoed through these same corridors during the days of German occupation. It seems fitting that UNESCO has accomplished a sort of metamorphosis from peace to war in its historic headquarters. There are those who regard this change as presaging what UNESCO can do in the realization of peace and understanding.

The staff at UNESCO House who shape the program and guide it throughout the year depend for their directives on UNESCO's Executive Committee and on the annual General Conference. Four conferences have been held, two at Paris, one at Mexico City, one at Beirut; a fifth conference at Florence is now in preparation and is expected to convene about May 18 and conclude June 20, 1950. Fifty-four member nations will assemble at Florence for 16 plenary sessions and about 84 working meetings which will be needed to analyze and develop UNESCO's seven-point program. Resolutions and directives will be worked out for specific programs in the field of educational reconstruction for war-devastated countries, education, national science, social science, philosophy and humanistic study, cultural activities, and communication. The activities in all these fields must be geared to a limited budget and to a stimulation of programs that will in a much larger way become the ultimate responsibility of the independent member states rather than of UNESCO itself.

To demonstrate that the stimulating function of UNESCO is deemed to be its most important role one has only to look at the quite modest budget of $8,000,000 that is earmarked for the execution of the annual program. Directives adopted at the third conference in Beirut required the limitation of program and policy to approved projects, and placed the emphasis of an enlarged program on international governmental and nongovernmental organizations pursuing in specialized fields ends similar to or relative to those of UNESCO.

OPERATION

How does UNESCO operate in the seven above-mentioned fields? In various ways. For example, consider education. In 1950 UNESCO was directed to work more closely with the International Bureau of Education to determine problems involved in making free compulsory primary education more nearly universal and of longer duration throughout the world. Among the educational projects to be undertaken were the direction by UNESCO of two international seminars, one on the teaching of geography and the second on the improvement of textbooks, particularly history textbooks.

In natural science UNESCO is instructed to carry on the activities of a world center of scientific liaison. These include such tasks as promoting the exchange of scientists and the facilitation of their movements across frontiers, the exchange of information about films on scientific research, abstracting, rationalization, and other aspects of scientific documentation. An attempt is being made to establish a world registry of scientific institutions and scientists.

The present program of UNESCO in philosophy and humanistic studies calls for the increase of international cooperation in the field of philosophy and humanistic studies by grants-in-aid on contracts for financial assistance to the International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, and for the organization of round-table discussions dealing with philosophical concepts that have special concern for UNESCO's purposes.

UNESCO has complied with one of its directives in the field of human rights by publishing in 1949, a symposium on this subject, with an introduction by Jacques Maritain, containing 32 essays by distinguished philosophers.

Space prohibits more detail in describing the program but one cannot conclude without at least a passing reference to the UNESCO book-coupon scheme that permits soft-currency countries to profit by an exchange with hard-currency countries, or the UNESCO-CARE book program that has made it possible to distribute books valued at more than $50,000 to 17 countries and territories.

Despite a fair number of contributions to the cause of international understanding UNESCO has not fared well at the hands of its international critics. The first broadside launched against it resulted from the choice of Julian Huxley as Director General. His naturalistic philosophy made him the target of sharp criticism by philosophers and idealists. Later, when he seemed ready to plunge the organization into an administrative morass, it was hinted that matters were saved only by the organizing genius of the deputy director, Walter Laves, of the United States.

When it began its work UNESCO almost sank under its own weight because the program was loaded down with the hobby-horses of private as well as public interests instead of workable projects that could be realized at an early date. A certain amount of internal strife within the organization itself slowed it down. Human nature being what it is, this particular difficulty was a predictable one. The seven interests represented on the program began to vie for major portions of the budget and for a large place in the over-all plan. With the advent of Torres Bodet as Director General in 1949, order began to emerge. Although natural rivalries may be expected to continue, the program should now begin to take on a definite pattern with proper emphasis on the major areas to be studied and reported.

At home, the United States National Commission has fared much better in most areas than has the parent organization. During its first 3 years it enjoyed the magnificent leadership of Milton Eisenhower, whose administrative ability, vision, and general good sense were the delight of all who were privileged to work with him. Although the American press failed to perceive it at the time, the National Commission was also fortunate in having WILLIAM BENTON, and later George Allen, as Assistant Secretaries of State for Public Affairs. Senator BENTON, in his recent speech proposing a Marshall plan of ideas, has justified the promise he showed in his early work with the Commission. Many thoughtful persons would agree that the United States must close the mental gap between its citizens and the rest of the world, while yet avoiding, if it can, the charge of cultural imperialism. The Benton resolution (S. Res. 243), now before the Senate, calls for, among other things, the acceleration of the work of UNESCO to the point where, with effective leadership, it has a chance to make a significant, perhaps decisive, contribution to world peace.

Religious leaders have been and are fearful that UNESCO and the National Commission may flounder on the rocks of secularism, since the program of UNESCO has paid little attention to the fact that peace must be established by transforming man from the interior and not merely by erecting external structures. Lecomte du Noüy has reiterated for us a position that religious leaders have been insisting upon: The source of all wars, the source of all evil, lies within us. Outside protection will not suffice if we allow the enemy in our heart to live. Noüy is paraphrasing the Holy Father when he says that there is only one method by which it is possible to establish peace.

"First, to reestablish the cult of historic truth, by feeding the youth of the entire world with the same substance, thus establishing a basis for mutual understanding. This is a preliminary step and it can be taken immediately. Next, to strive to establish the cult of individual human dignity and to improve man by stifling his archaic instinct. This will be the work of centuries to come."

Negative criticism alone, however, will accomplish little for the UNESCO ideal. Men with profound religious convictions must establish the truth that love and justice among men are not only the purpose but the connective tissue of international society.

The Popes Point the Way to Social Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, two of the great social documents of modern times are the Rerum Novarum of Pope Leo XIII and the Quadragesimo Anno of Pope Pius XI. Despite the 40 years which separate their publication, they are remarkably similar pleas for social reform. And although almost 20 more years have ensued since the publication of the second, both contain remarkable applications to the problems of our time.

Dr. Philip Taft, chairman of the department of economics of Brown University, has written a sound analysis of these two papal encyclicals in the April 22 issue of the magazine America. Titled, "The Popes Point the Way to Social Justice," the article is a reminder that the two documents hold important meanings for Catholics and non-Catholics alike.

With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach a copy of the article:

THE POPES POINT THE WAY TO SOCIAL JUSTICE

(By Philip Taft)

The modern world is continually faced with the need of deciding basic economic policy. Not only must we evolve institutions that will assure equity and justice; we must here and now avoid anything that looks like a major depression. Serious industrial dislocation and wide unemployment would not only cause great distress but would weaken and perhaps even destroy our power to resist infiltration by totalitarian groups.

While the present generation faces the grim task of defending society and its traditions against corrosion from within and attack from without, the problems themselves are not new, and guidance on these questions can still be found by non-Catholics as well as Catholics in the papal encyclicals, Rerum Novarum and Quadragesimo Anno. Despite their age, these documents have a vitality and freshness absent in many contemporary pronouncements on social issues. Not only do they accurately diagnose the economic maladies of our time, but the remedies prescribed have been found effective in the past and are sufficiently potent to be helpful in the present.

RERUM NOVARUM

Rerum Novarum appeared in 1891, soon after the modern Socialist movement had established itself upon an international basis and was for the first time attracting to its standards large masses of industrial workers in continental countries. The spread of Socialist ideas could be primarily traced neither to the attractiveness of its doctrine nor the logical cogency of its arguments, but to the unbearable burdens imposed upon the wage earner by aggressive and expanding capitalism.

While modern industrialism raised living standards, it also encouraged sprawling city slums, overwork, and the brutal exploitation of the young and the weak. These conditions were justified by a theory of laissez faire whose tenets received an unenthusiastic reception among industrial workers. Instead they began to turn toward socialism. Germany witnessed the formation of the first modern Socialist Party in 1863, inspired by Ferdinand Lassalle, who outlined his program in his Open Letter. Within the next 20 years, Socialist parties were functioning in every European country that allowed free political activity.

The causes for the spread of radical doctrine among the industrial population were clearly perceived by the Catholic Bishop of Mainz, William Emanuel von Ketteler, who recognized the evils of modern industrialism and insisted that the church take the lead in eradicating them. His Christianity and the Labor Question not only attacked evils but prescribed remedies. The view that society should leave economic problems to the free play of economic law was challenged, and the theory that nothing could be done to mitigate the hardship of the worker rejected. Bishop Von Ketteler's work was carried further in Germany, and similar movements

were inaugurated in other European countries. All were founded on a belief that unregulated industrialism was not only guilty of inhuman treatment of the worker but, by its excesses, it was driving the worker into the arms of the revolutionary legions clamorously appealing for support.

Out of this awakening among Catholic social pioneers grew Pope Leo XIII's Rerum Novarum. It addressed itself to the social and economic problems raised by a laissez-faire capitalism, and prescribed a broad program for their solution. The encyclical showed that between the demands of the rugged individualist for no interference with the working of economic law and the revolutionary theorist for complete government control over economic resources, a third road was available, one of orderly, gradual adaptation to change.

One notices this feature of Rerum Novarum: it is a reformist and not a revolutionary document. Its approach to social problems is pragmatic, not doctrinaire, simple and direct rather than devious and complicated. Evils exist, a remedy is presented. Although the encyclical is almost 60 years old, it reads today like a current document, for our world has learned at the price of much suffering that complete and one-shot remedies for complex social problems are an illusion, that man is too limited, fallible and stubborn to find an easy, complete answer to the problems that beset him.

The tone of Rerum Novarum should be described as reformist, in the sense that it is more concerned with the eradication of evils than the transforming of institutions. The Pope sees the modern worker exposed to many evils and oppressions. He rejects the remedies offered by the Socialists of his time. He suggests as an alternative a program of reform, of guaranteeing the worker the right to organize, of placing a floor under wages, a ceiling upon the hours of labor, of protecting the young and weak against exploitation. He is intent on applying ethical principles, but to the existing order.

In examining the economic system of his time Leo XIII did not deal with abstractions, as do the Marxists and the economic liberals, but with the impact of the new industrialism on individual men and women. He insists that the poor, who contribute by their labor to the welfare of the community, must not be neglected; that the prizes must not be monopolized by the strong and powerful. Rerum Novarum emphasized, therefore, the necessity of establishing those legal safeguards for the worker which have since been partially or entirely adopted in western Europe and the United States. "Government policy," said the Pope, "must be so arranged as to produce * * * public well-being and private prosperity."

The argument in behalf of such measures is based upon the inequality of bargaining power between employer and employee. The right of workers to form associations for the advancement of their interests is affirmed, and every precaution should be taken not to violate the rights of individuals, and not to make unreasonable regulations under the pretense of public benefits. This warning directed against governments controlled or influenced by the wealthy classes is even more applicable to the contemporary totalitarian regimes, which in the name of public interest either subordinate or destroy every expression of individual or group independence. Rerum Novarum outlined the methods by which the workers' welfare and dignity could be protected. It also chastised those who accepted the then dominant belief that an overwhelming lust for gain was a high social virtue.

The view that economic activity must be the servant and not the master of man was a blow at both the insatiable demand for ever greater profits, and the theorists who insisted that society and the great variety of its institutions only reflected the changing aspects of economic activity.

QUADRAGESIMO ANNO

The 40-year period between the publication of Rerum Novarum and Quadragesimo Anno witnessed the expansion of the labor movement, and the introduction of many reforms envisaged in the earlier encyclical. It also saw a division of world socialism, with the extreme wing setting up a movement of its own under the name of communism. Quadragesimo Anno was issued when the doctrine of laissez-faire in economic affairs had lost most of its appeal, and when the economies of Europe and the United States were in the throes of a severe crisis. The automatic adjustments and the optimum distribution of capital and labor by the market had failed to solve the severe difficulties engulfing most of the world.

Whatever the explanation may be, the greater significance of trade-unions and of government in economic life could not be denied. Limitations on the use and even ownership of property had taken place in virtually all parts of the world. The subordination of property rights to the needs of society had been increasingly accepted. Control upon the use of wealth in behalf of the community was no longer regarded as interference with the legitimate rights of property, a view excellently expressed in Quadragesimo Anno:

"However, when civil authority adjusts ownership to meet the needs of public good it acts not as an enemy, but as a friend of private owners; for thus it effectively prevents the possession of private property * * * from creating intolerable burdens and so rushing to its own destruction."

Reform is justified not only on moral grounds, but as the most effective protector of the institution itself. Certainly the New Deal and Fair Deal programs are based upon similar assumptions. Inferentially the encyclical recognizes that the institution of private property is in danger not only from those who would overthrow it, but from those who insist upon continuing the injustices that arise as a result of unrestricted use.

The pronouncements with respect to labor are more explicit in Quadragesimo Anno than in Rerum Novarum, owing to the changes that had taken place in the interval between their publication. The latter was in a real sense a pioneer statement of a more sure if less spectacular road to social and economic progress than the one offered by extremist doctrinaires.

Quadragesimo Anno advocates a wage policy that will allow the worker to earn a sufficient amount for the proper support of his family. However, the wage policy must be sufficiently flexible to take into account the position of the single enterprise so that wages, considering also the basic needs of the worker, will not be so high as to cause unemployment. The Pope recognized that while such decisions can be made only by examining particular conditions, a policy that leads to unemployment is not merely harmful to the individual but socially dangerous as well. No specific wage policy is laid down, and the great diversity in the condition of individual business is recognized.

The test of a wage policy, in addition to minimum levels, must be its effect on employment—a good modern view. Severe unemployment, said Pius XI, is a dreadful scourge; it causes misery and temptation to the laborer, ruins the prosperity of nations, and endangers public order, peace, and tranquillity the world over. In a few simple lines, the dangers inherent in widespread unemployment are eloquently expressed. In the discussion of wages, the emphasis is on common good rather than on individual or group advantage. While minimum wage standards should be observed, the Pope recognized that the rates paid for different occupations and grades of work must be related. Otherwise there is not only a tendency for some groups to profit, but distortions in the wage structure may cause unemployment.

The Pope shows an awareness of changes in corporate organization, and his view—that "immense power and despotic economic domination is concentrated in the hands of a few, and those few are frequently not the owners, but only the trustees and directors of invested funds, who administer them at their good pleasure"—might have been taken out of the report of the Temporary National Economic Committee. The concentration of economic power is not only a threat to domestic order but to international peace. Few secular documents contain as sharp an assault upon free competition, nor is it often stated in language as direct and simple.

In dealing with socialism the Pope recognized the changes that had taken place since the 1890's, and some of his observations foreshadow the evolution of the third force which has played an important role in stemming the Communist tide after World War II. After World War I the Socialist movement became divided into hostile factions. The seeds of this division had long existed, for in the Socialist camp were found extreme revolutionaries as well as moderate reformers. The victory of bolshevism in Russia in 1917 ended the artificial unity. Extreme Socialists began to call themselves Communists, while the moderate Socialists retained their old name.

From the beginning the Socialists opposed dictatorship, the one-party state and suppression of minorities. Moreover Pope Pius XII recognized that their emphases upon human dignity and moderate reform rather than revolution "often strikingly approach the just demands of Christian social reformers." While still critical of some of the doctrines advocated by Socialists, the Pope saw the reasonableness and the utility of many of their demands. "For it is rightly contended that certain forms of property must be reserved to the state, since they carry with the man opportunity of domination too great to be left to private individuals without injury to the community at large." While specific criteria are not laid down, the Pope states that same types of industry might have to be nationalized. The test in this instance is not that nationalization is in itself desirable, but that private controls over some areas of economic life allow some people too much power over others.

CONCLUSION

Both Rerum Novarum and Quadragesimo Anno show a keen insight into the problems of their time. Both encyclicals stress reform by moderate means. While they denounce the doctrines of laissez-faire, they see great evils in the complete subordination of the individual to an all-powerful state. The method of achieving improvement in economic relations is through groups such as trade-unions, and laws directed against specific evils. There are no all-embracing panaceas, but readers of the encyclicals, irrespective of religion, can find there eloquent appeals in behalf of justice and human dignity. In Quadragesimo Anno the Pope sensed the crucial issue of the century: Whether men are to remain free or be swallowed up in a new slavery. He extended the hand of fellowship to all men desirous of correcting the evils of our industrial society and at the same time holding fast to the traditions of human liberty.

Will Americans Be Enslaved?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a radio address delivered by me over WJR, Detroit, Mich., April 14:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my belief that you, as free men and women under the Constitution, have awakened to what is being done to our liberties and our free institutions by political freebooters; a group of men who have stultified the principles of their political party; a group of men who would enslave us all under the dead hand of socialism, while continuing to protest a tender regard for our social and economic welfare.

Most of you have lived through the period in which Soviet Russia has pursued a policy of Communist expansionism which today threatens to engulf the entire world in a new total war. Many of you will recall that before the end of the First World War the Russian Czar fell before the onslaught of men who called themselves Socialists. You may recall that these men set up a revolutionary government which they called a Socialist government.

You may recall, too, that the necessities of the Socialist state led on, within a few years, to the Communist state, with its excesses of summary arrest, torture, and imprisonment without recourse to courts of law, forced labor in political slave camps, and a general reign of terror.

The history of Russia since the fall of the czars has proved to all the world that socialism is merely the last stage on the road to communism. We have seen how the Labor Socialist Government of Great Britain has led that once great nation to the brink of political, social, and economic disaster.

But here in the United States we have still in power a political party whose aims have been prostituted by the gang in control of it. We have a left-wing administration which is dead set toward imposing upon the American people exactly the same socialism which has come near to destroying the British Nation and which led to communism in Russia. Many things now going on in Washington offer proof positive that this is so.

Most significant of these proofs—to my mind at least—is the fact that known Communists and hordes of Communist fellow travelers have been, and are now, harbored in various executive departments and agencies of the Government. Not only these, but hundreds of men whose unmentionable crime against the social order render them easy prey to blackmailing Communist spies, both in and out of the Government.

None of you, I trust, has forgotten the Alger Hiss case, nor the so-called Amerasia case, in which the FBI seized hundreds of top-secret Government documents connected with national security, which had been stolen and transmitted to the New York offices of the left-wing magazine called Amerasia. The editor and owner of that publication escaped with a small fine; others escaped scot free. But it looks now as if the Amerasia case will be reopened, with frightening revelations to be expected.

Neither, I trust, has any one forgotten the Fuchs case, wherein an American scientist in England gave the hydrogen bomb secret to the Russians and was imprisoned for a term of 15 years in a British prison.

Yet, the President has talked about "political red herrings." He has refused to dismiss Secretary of State Acheson after Acheson lost the confidence of the American people by his post-trial support of Alger Hiss.

The President has refused point-blank to permit the FBI, the State Department, and the Departments of Army and Navy, to open their security files to the Senate committee now investigating open subversion, to say nothing of perversion, in the State Department. It is just as if, in a criminal court trial, the defense were permitted to impound and conceal the evidence, and defy the prosecution to prove its case.

The President and his friends cry out that disclosures by Senator McCARTHY discredit this country abroad. They should have thought of that long ago, when they were permitting Communist infiltration of the Government departments and agencies.

At the beginning of this broadcast I made the assertion that the gang in control of the Democratic Party, and hence of the Government, seeks to impose socialism upon the American people. This raises the question of how they are going about it. The answer, of course, is not difficult. They propose to do it by means of what they call the welfare state. The poorhouse state is a better name.

The welfare state is touted as pure democracy—pie right out of the sky for the labor unionist and his forgotten white-collar brother. As a matter of fact, it is pure socialism, of the Fabian English variety. The welfare state is a state of regimentation for everyone. The welfare state is a state of slavery in the long run, because it is the precursor of communism.

Now the technique whereby it is sought to impose welfare statism upon the American people has two parts. The first part consists of persuading the people that the Federal Government can do better for them the things they always have done for themselves as freemen. This doing consists of subsidies for industry and business, pensions for everybody, free medical care, more and more pay for less and less work by Federal law, Federal grants to municipalities and States in lieu of the money from tax sources the Federal Government has taken away from them.

The second part of this technique consists of more and more taxes—you get the point; more and more pay with which to pay more and more taxes. Less and less work, of course, means fewer and fewer things people can have to enjoy. Taxes now take nearly 37 percent of all individual incomes, and at least an equal amount of corporate incomes. When the tax take exceeds 40 percent, economists point out, people will not have enough income left to pay for a decent standard of living without Federal Government help.

We see these things going on all about us. We all know about the subsidies, the pensions, the grants-in-aid; and we hear about the proposals for free medicine, Federal aid to education, vastly increased social-security coverage. We know that the country today is staggering under a well-nigh insupportable burden of taxation; and we know how the Fair Dealers fight against Republican proposals to reduce excise taxes. We hear the President's demands for higher income taxes with which to pay the prospective costs of his Fair Deal program.

In the light of these things, do you have any doubt that Fair Deal welfare state-ers plan eventually to pauperize the people, to reduce them to helpless dependence upon the state? Have you any doubt that they plan to render the people willing to depend upon the state by telling them that Uncle Sam's purse is inexhaustible and that the bureaucrats are good-hearted fellows who seek only to make life easy for the populace? I hope—I believe—you are not fooled by the talk about the welfare state. It would be a poorhouse state, indeed.

It is my conviction, too, that all of us now understand that when the Federal Government takes in taxes, the money people need for every day living, when the Federal Government takes in taxes the money needed by business and industry for their ordinary operations, then economic chaos results. Then the time comes, as certainly as night after day, that the Government takes over all capital, all means of production, all personal property, all real estate, everything, in order to keep the national economy running.

This means socialism, pure and unadulterated. Americans no longer would be free. No man is free when his earnings are confiscated, and the ordinary necessities of life are obtainable only through the favor of bureaucratic officeholders.

Some of my listeners may disagree with me as to the excessive tax burden. Let me point to the undeniable fact that the average wage earner, with a family of four to support and earning $1,800 a year, now works from January 1 to April 26, just to pay his Federal taxes. Only after that is he free to turn a hand for himself and his family. It takes an average of another month's earnings to pay State and local taxes.

Nearly 5 months' earnings go to the tax collectors. But even then, the earner is not entirely free of taxes. Hidden taxes, excises on goods and services, and the like, take about 18 cents out of every dollar he has left. Small wonder so many people in this high-wage era find it hard to get by, debt free at the end of the year.

Yet in the face of this, President Truman submitted to the Congress a 1951 budget totaling $42,500,000,000, or approximately $5,200,000,000 more than the estimated Government income of $37,300,000,000 for the year. Then in addition—and this is something few people have been told about—his budget included $9,200,000,000 in so-called contract authorizations. These are authorizations for such Federal agencies as the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau to spend in advance of congressional appropriations. The money is spent in the same sense that each of you spends $2,000 or more when he contracts to buy a new automobile. You do not have to pay all of it today, but you surely will have to pay it over a number of tomorrows. You cannot use the money for anything else.

On this basis, next year's deficit might have reached $14,400,000,000, if Congress had not acted to cut down the total. The present year's Government deficit will be in excess of $5,000,000,000, in spite of the budget cutting done last year.

Now it is worth while to consider the impact of the "squandermania" of the Fair Deal; to consider where it is most severe. You, Mrs. Housewife, know where that is. The inflationary spending of the Fair Deal hits hardest at your household expense fund. You know that New Deal and Fair Deal spending, even more than the war itself, have cut the buying power of the dollar in half. A dollar buys today little more than half as much in food, clothing, shelter, medical care, and amusements as it did only a few years ago.

Do you think, perhaps, that things are going to get better? If you do, you are mistaken, so long as the present spending policies are continued. This spending, in largest part, is made possible by the taxes you pay without knowing about them, at the grocery store, the meat shop, the drug store, and everywhere else you go on your shopping tours.

Of course, there is a way to correct these evils. The Republican Eightieth Congress

set up the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Federal Government. The Commission recommended the changes that should be made for economy and efficiency in government, and for the preservation of our freedoms. But has the Fair Deal administration given anything more than lip-service to the Hoover program? It has not. The President's effort to hamstring the Taft-Hartley Act, the true magna carta of American labor, by putting all National Labor Relations Board power in the hands of a single Presidential appointee, is an example. This was because Congress had refused to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. Congress knew that the act, in truth, is not a slave-labor law but is a law which sets labor free to run its own business, without the dictatorship of dishonest labor leaders or dishonest industrial management, in those instances where they exist.

So there you have it. The Fair Deal plays footsie with Communists, and defends and supports Communist stooges in the Government. The Fair Deal would impose socialism upon the American people, first by pauperizing them and then by rendering them wholly dependent on the Federal Government. The Fair Deal refuses honestly to put the Hoover recommendations into effect, because that would prevent realization of the Fair Deal's socialistic aims.

A national election was won in this country, once upon a time, with a slogan which said: "Toss the rascals out." Possibly that should be the campaign slogan of the American people this year and in 1952.

Dr. John C. Ball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to pay my humble tribute to one of the finest Christian leaders I have ever known, Dr. John C. Ball, pastor emeritus of the Metropolitan Baptist Church, here in Washington, who passed away last night, at the age of 87.

I have known Dr. Ball intimately for a long time, and my admiration for him has grown with the passing years.

He was converted by, and for a long time associated with, Dr. Russell H. Conwill, one of the most outstanding evangelists this country has ever known, whose famous lecture "Acres of Diamonds" will ring down the centuries.

I realize that owing to his extreme age, Dr. Ball's passing was not unexpected, but it will be difficult indeed, if not impossible, to ever replace him.

Many years ago, I was rambling through the Georgetown Cemetery, here in Washington, when I came across the tomb of Howard Payne, the author of Home Sweet Home. On it was a little verse which, to my mind, applies to Dr. Ball.

It went something like this:

Lo, when his blessed spirit fled
To realms beyond the azure dome,
With outstretched arms God's angels said
"Welcome to Heaven's Home Sweet Home."

The Great Need: An Informed Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Mr. Lester Markel, Sunday editor of New York Times, entitled "The Great Need—An Informed Opinion," which appeared in the New York Times magazine on Easter Sunday, April 9.

As Mr. Markel points out, the problems and issues with which America, as the leader of free nations, is confronted, are more complex and difficult of solution than ever before in our history. Mr. Markel deals here primarily with international problems, but our domestic affairs are no less complicated.

Here in Washington it is at least possible to get hold of a good many pieces of the puzzle of world affairs, and to put a few of them together. Even then, the picture is far from complete or clear.

The picture is portrayed to the Nation primarily through our daily newspapers, which, often of necessity, chop it up into small pieces, which are displayed irregularly. The bright colors of the spy scares and the crimes are made most prominent, while the more drab details of the picture—which may be more important to an understanding of the whole picture—are often cast aside or shoved off into a corner.

Very properly, Mr. Markel picks out Members of Congress as one group which can and should bring to the citizens of America a picture of the problems they must consider in which at least some of the pieces have been put together so as to be intelligible. I believe that the American people want, need, and deserve leadership. During the summer months, every Member of this Congress will be seeing and talking to great numbers of Americans. I hope that we will all heed the lesson of this article. I hope that we will all take the facts of the world and the national situation back to our constituents.

THE GREAT NEED: AN INFORMED OPINION—WE HAVE ALL THE EQUIPMENT AT HAND FOR GUIDANCE AND LEADERSHIP, BUT WE MUST PUT IT TO USE NOW

(By Lester Markel)

In the year 1 of the hydrogen age, Washington is beset by uncertainties. It is unsure about the world; it is unsure about the Nation; most of all, it is unsure about itself.

This indecision is not unique to Washington; it is characteristic of the age. From the beginning of history, man has been largely preoccupied with the task of controlling nature. Now, long before that task has been completed, he is confronted with another and even more difficult one—the task of controlling man.

Everywhere there is this uncertainty. Even in Russia. At midnight in the Kremlin, the 13 stern, secretive men must have their misgivings and their doubts, too. But Washington's indecision is far more meaningful than the indecisions of other capitals, because it is the capital of the free world, representing power such as history has never before known and making judgments that will reach far into the future.

Washington's mood is a reflection of the mood of the Nation; its indecision means that the Nation, too, is unsure. The Capital tries to discover and to anticipate the wishes of the voters. Now it feels it has no clear directives and it gropes for them.

But the Nation does not have, in the vital area of foreign policy, either the information or the compulsion to give clear directives. There are disturbing reports: that about 3 out of 10 voters are unaware of almost every effort in American foreign affairs; that only 25 out of every 100 voters are reasonably well informed. This means that the Nation is likely to move by emotion rather than by intelligence; by prejudice rather than by conviction; that it may be deceived into wrestling with bogies rather than grappling with facts.

It becomes clear that the great need is the education of American public opinion; it becomes clear, also, that Washington is required to lead, not merely to follow; to search out the minds, not solely the votes, of the Nation.

The atmosphere of the Capital today impresses on the visitor the proportions of the task.

I. THE POLITICAL SHADOWS

Washington is unique among the great capitals of the world. London suggests the black and gray of empire—Paris echoes with the memories of the Sun King—Rome is both an imperial city and a religious city. These capitals dominate government. But in Washington Government dominates the city; there the political rather than the global view is apt to prevail.

At no time has this preoccupation with politics been more apparent than it is today. The elections of 1950 and 1952 are casting their murky shadows before; the politicians are searching feverishly for paramount issues.

The capital is a vast listening post, straining its ears and nerves to catch every whisper throughout the land. It has devised a large assortment of apparatus, scientific and otherwise, to tune in on the men in the streets—polls, overt and covert; personal pipe lines; correspondence with constituents; conversations over fences in process of being mended. In view of the vastness and diversity of the currents that run through the Nation one wonders how effective is all this activity. Nevertheless Congress has distilled its samplings into certain basic beliefs.

On the domestic side, three predominate: beliefs in the pocketbook vote, in the pork barrel and in the balanced budget. Congress is likely to cut any international fund in favor of a domestic bounty, even though it may be more than half convinced of the dangers of such a cut. In the deep recesses of the pork barrel the balanced budget concept is often lost.

In foreign affairs, also, there are certain cardinal credos: an instinctive suspicion of foreign lands and foreign peoples; a belief that the Europeans play us for suckers; a deep concern about China—a reflection of a sentiment that echoes back to our missionary days and to our special role in the Pacific war. Russia evokes both vast distrust and vast anxiety; as a result there are st rling ranges of sentiment, from demands for atomic intervention to proposals for quick appeasement.

Congress has much more assurance about domestic affairs than about foreign; therefore it has always looked with some suspicion on the State Department. Moreover, the Congressman has always been inclined to view State Department personnel as outsiders—foreigners dealing in foreign affairs; "cookie pushers," "long-haired boys," certainly not folks. There has been also a feeling that Congress was being disregarded—"snooted" is the word on Capitol Hill.

Now there is inquiry—searching, unrelenting inquiry—into the ideology and morals of the Department. At a moment when our most momentous international decisions face us, foreign policy has become a focal point in the political struggle. The overtones and the undertones of that struggle are clearly heard at the current hearings.

The observer, attending one of these sessions, has the curious feeling that he is sitting in at the production of a television show, rather than at an inquiry. The newsreel men and the photographers seem to dominate the proceedings, moving freely about the chamber, exploding their bulbs with complete extroversion. The cameras hum at the sensational moments; in periods of calm refutation they are likely to be silent.

You wonder whether the answers ever catch up with the charges; whether any of the accused, no matter how convincing the defense and how complete the vindication, will ever again be fully clear of smirch. You ask why any man should seek public office if he is likely to be subjected to this ordeal by fire, ink, and film. These may be part of the processes and the rumbling of democracy, but you understand why there are demands for curbing such licenses, especially in time of emergency.

Emergency? Many in Congress do not seem to recognize it through the mists of politics. But in the sensitive departments of the Government, the observer comes upon problems and questions that give the word sharp impact.

II. THE VITAL TRIAD

In foreign affairs, this is Washington's vital triad: State, defense, and ECA—diplomacy, arms, and economics. The three are closely related; action cannot be taken in one area without affecting the others.

The men who head up the three departments provide three absorbing studies. If, in painting your Washington portraits, you are not bothered about oversimplification, you might characterize the three this way: Acheson, the intellectual man; Johnson, the political man; Hoffman, the businessman.

In Mr. Acheson the visitor feels a deep conviction about our international role. It is, he holds, a tremendous responsibility; the rest of the free world depends on us, is sustained by us; a weakening on our part is likely to bring down all the others. The Russians see this clearly and try their utmost to create confusions and fears among us. We must see it just as clearly. He quotes Donne; never was it more true that if the bell tolls for one it tolls for all men.

You soon discover in the Secretary his quick intelligence. You suspect this gets him into trouble, because though he may not mean to condescend, he seems often to be condescending. Perhaps statesmen should learn to hide their brightnesses under bushels lest their light dazzle those with whom they deal and so lead to accusations of superiority.

These are trying days for State and for Mr. Acheson personally. This is not the kind of fight he has ever had to make before, this sheer, unashamed onslaught. Yet, he seems to be facing up to it squarely and without flinching. The question is whether he can communicate to the Congress and to the country the feeling that his manner masks.

Secretary Johnson, the political man, would have less difficulty in countering this kind of barrage. He has been brought up in the rough-and-tumble of the political ring and he is accustomed to this kind of ruction.

The diplomatic operation is, to be sure, one much more delicate than the defense operation; the ingrained discipline of the military cannot be expected of State. But, as Mr. Johnson emphasizes, they are both part of the same over-all strategy; the military problem cannot be separated from the diplomatic or economic. It is one team, he says, and it is working as one.

Mr. Johnson expresses complete confidence; he is, he says, a born and insurable optimist and you believe it. He holds that our defenses are good and that unification is being achieved.

Yet the visitor is conscious of the large problems that concern the Pentagon. How much shall we spend on defense? What sort of defense shall it be? Again the observer realizes that there are many more questions than answers in Washington.

Some of the toughest of these questions are put to Paul Hoffman, who has moved so amazingly from big business into big diplomacy. When you call Mr. Hoffman the businessman in government, the phrase should be carefully defined. He has always been a leader in the most enlightened group in industry. He has always believed and continues to believe in enterprise as unfettered as possible, but he holds that this freedom cannot be maintained at the expense of other freedoms and that business must be ready to make sacrifices, for its own and for the public good.

The first of the ECA assignments is to work out an economy for Europe and so save it from communism. The Marshall plan has succeeded beyond all expectations, but as Mr. Hoffman is the first to point out, many dangers remain. The great shadow is the year 1952 when Marshall-plan aid will end, even though the need will continue. So there is now a second assignment of equal importance: to persuade the American people and especially American business that our economic isolation, like our political isolation, is forever ended.

There is no complacency in these key departments. As there is no complacency in any part of a world groping in a new kind of darkness.

III. THE BASIC ISSUES

To these makers of our foreign policies you put this question: If the American people were really informed, if they were reaching sound decisions, what would their conclusions be? These are the answers you get:

Atomic weapons?

The H-bomb cannot win for us. We cannot gain a real or a lasting victory through force. We can gain it only through ideas. We are involved, as Mr. Acheson puts it, in a basic moral conflict, a conflict of the human spirit that must go on until it is settled.

War with Russia?

This kind of struggle does not mean hot war with Russia. The Russians, cut off as they may be from the world, must realize how great is our industrial machine and how quickly it can be mobilized; the lesson that Hitler learned is surely not lost on Stalin. But this does not mean peace. We must prepare our defenses unstintingly and we must exert what Mr. Acheson calls total diplomacy, total effort in the political, the economic and the psychological fields, until the Russians recognize our firmness of purpose and come to terms.

Help for the world?

We must be ready to pay, with money and in energy, for world peace. The cold war is economic rather than political or military; communism prevails only where conditions are such that men turn to it as a last resort. Thus we must be prepared to provide aid to Europe beyond 1952 and to give generous support to point 4, which means help for the rest of the democratic or potentially democratic world, especially the Far East. We must realize that these appropriations are not charity for others but insurance for us. And, as Mr. Hoffman will point out, they are relatively inexpensive programs; for example, the cost of ECA, designed to prevent war, is about $850,000 a day; in 1945 World War II was costing us two hundred and seventy millions a day.

Our economy?

We must be watchful of our economy, for this is our basic defense. Russia counts on the "inevitable decline" of capitalism, rather than on military marches. There is danger (and Mr. Johnson emphasizes this) that the military budgets will become so large that our economy will be thrown out of kilter. The delicate balance must and can be maintained; we must not allow the Russians to stampede us either into overspending or cajole us into underspending.

And tariffs?

We have to learn the economic facts of life; that we cannot exist in economic isolation; that we cannot sell without buying; that tariffs may become hazards instead of protections. Mr. Hoffman urges that we take more of the products of Europe. That does not mean any great expenditure; it is estimated that to close the dollar gap we need to increase our imports by only a billion dollars—which is less than four-tenths of 1 percent of our national production. The real solution lies not in restrictions on trade but in opening up new markets (in brief, by the application of point 4).

Our attitude?

We must learn to be humble, to walk softly even though we carry a big stick and possess 60 percent of the world's gold. Agreed that our democracy is the best form of government yet devised, nevertheless it is not yet perfect. Even though we believe we are right and, more, that we are righteous, a good part of the world is still suspicious of our motives—and we must do our utmost to dissipate that suspicion.

The cold war?

Above all, we must avoid hysteria in our conduct at home and in our dealings abroad. We must not make the Nation fearful and suspicious through witchhunts, either ideological or political. We must have a genuinely unpartisan foreign policy; we must make our international decisions calmly and convincingly. Cold war calls for cool heads.

To the listener, impressed with the conviction with which they are given, these analyses and these injunctions seem right and almost obvious. Why then, he asks, does not the Nation recognize and accept them? Or at least why does not the Nation debate them in these terms, without emotion and without prejudice?

Is it because the people are apathetic as well as poorly informed? Or is it because the issues have not been made clear to them? There are many signs that this last is true, that the people are seeking facts; that, if they had them, they would eagerly respond; and that, in instinct, even now they are ahead of their leaders.

It may well be, therefore, that the essential problem confronting us is the problem of leadership.

IV. THE LEADERS

These are the three great educating forces in public opinion: Government, press, and citizen groups. They are like streams moving in to form a river; individually they are weak; united they are potent.

In the formulation and explanation of foreign policy, the President obviously is the prime figure. Because of the development of mass communication, he has attained great power, for good or for evil. If he can speak eloquently and convincingly to the Nation, he will win full support.

The Secretary of State likewise can exert a wide influence. To his desk each day are channeled reports from all over the world; he, more than anyone else, has the opportunity of acquiring the global view. If his is a strong personality, his advice will be the main mold of the President's international decisions. And he, too, has ready access to the presses and the microphones.

Lately there have been signs in both White House and State that the need for educating opinion is having increased attention. It is being recognized that, without public support, the best of programs can be too easily scuttled.

In the State Department especially the effort is noticeable. That is as it needs to be, for the State Department—our Foreign Office (as Mr. Acheson is likely to call it), the GHQ of our international forces—is responsible for the day-by-day formulation of foreign policy and for the decisions as to how much of it shall be made known to the country and when and in what form it shall be published.

The State Department has always been inclined to regard itself as largely outside the congressional purview and beyond the public gaze. The white-shuttered doors in the old baroque structure opposite the White House were almost symbolic—combinations of iron curtain and Victorian barrier. When State, some 3 years ago, moved to its present building—a khaki home built for the Army—those doors were figuratively moved with it.

Only now, after long years and under steady pressure, the passion for secrecy is slowly yielding. Mr. Acheson believes, too, that the great problem is to make the people aware. He has begun a series of talks to explain foreign policy to the Nation. In this effort, he says, he feels at times like a man standing on a dock with an car, trying to make the dock move. Perhaps he exaggerates the task, but it is surely a formidable one.

Because of the size and complexity of the problem, there is a strong feeling in many quarters in Washington that the opinion operation must be more extensive, that it must be infused with larger elements of system and continuity.

The suggestion is made that the fireside chat formula be revived. It is argued that, with the country as uncertain as it is, these reports to the Nation are as urgent now as in the time of Franklin Roosevelt. It is proposed further that the Government supply to the media of mass communication a full measure of information—which means the facts plus the background needed for understanding. This would be done through press conferences and generally through a news policy as liberal as the requirements of diplomacy permit. Certainly the press should not be regarded as an imposter sanctioned by the Bill of Rights, but as an agent of the people and as a reporter to the people.

The Members of Congress can also make their contributions, through speeches and through explanations to constituents. Some of them do. But too many are engaged only in the vote-hunt. They talk as though they are moving to the lofty realms of leadership, but they never raise their ears from the ground. It is a neat trick if it can be done.

There is much, then, that Government can do to inform and to lead. But even if it speaks frankly to the Nation, even if it briefs the press fully, it cannot do all of the job or nearly all of it. The enlistment of the other agencies of illumination in the effort is vital.

Education, it is contended, should be linked more closely with the outside world so that the present will be made as intelligible as the past and that the future will not be blackness. World affairs should have a definite, not a casual, place in the curricula of our schools and colleges. Adult education should join in the operation; and the citizen groups also—the public forums, the women's clubs, study groups of various kinds.

The newspaper has an especially important role. We have a free press, but we have yet to develop a fully responsible one. Too many newspapers are preoccupied with entertainment and lose sight of the basic reason for their being, as disseminators of the news. The smaller newspapers, daily and weekly, can be a much more effective factor in opinion if they will undertake to interpret programs such as the Marshall plan and Point Four in terms of the Main Streets they cover, instead of depending for such interpretation on the cosmic columnists.

Radio and television, too, have assignments to fulfill. True, they are primarily entertainment media (in contrast with the newspapers), but they also are endowed with public service aspects and so they, too, are required to maintain high standards of objectivity and responsibility.

The task, then, that confronts us is a gigantic task of education, almost a crusade, requiring the mobilization of all the forces of potential enlightenment—Government, mass media, schools, the instruments of adult teaching.

This means, basically, that in all these fields leadership is essential. It is important that we define clearly what leadership means. What, emphatically, it does not mean is the fuehrer principle. In a dictatorship there is the word and then the march; fiats are substituted for public opinion. In a democracy there must be understanding and conviction; there will not be blind support of a policy proclaimed from above.

The real leader explains and persuades. And he inspires. He does not wait to be forced onward from behind; he chooses the course which, in his judgment, is right and he holds to that course, no matter what the politicians and the commentators shout.

V. THE WHITE FAITH

There must be leadership, but there must be response to leadership also. In time of actual hostilities, when dangers and fears are concrete and immediate, the citizen will answer the summons. The cold war may not be as dramatic as the hot war, but it is surely as fateful; it requires of the citizen an effort as unstinting as that of 1917 or 1941.

There is the story of Michael Shipkov, employee of our legation in Sofia; he was captured by the Communists; he was then released to spy in the legation, instead he prepared a statement describing his imprisonment, to be published if he were captured again, he was captured again and now he has vanished into the darkness of a Communist cell.

In that statement Shipkov wrote of those who questioned and tortured him: "They are disciples and fervent followers of the dogma. Not much imagination, nor quick brains nor much intellectual baggage nor sensitivity—but undeviating loyalty to their creed, fanatic belief in their own cause, fanatic hatred and mistrust of anything else."

"Fanatic belief in their own cause"—there is the challenge. We must feel as strongly about democracy, about our cause, as these Communists feel about theirs; we must build a white faith to counter the dark one that confronts us.

There is a basic strength, and a basic unity in the Nation. In the long run our decisions have been right; we have come through in the crises. If there is leadership, and response to leadership, there are no reasons for doubt now.

"One person with a belief," wrote John Stuart Mill, "is a power equal to 99 who have only interests."

Belief is the key word—the belief that derives from conviction and from courage; the faith that alone dispels fear and indecision.

Closing of Army and Navy Medical Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr Speaker, on the 15th of February, the Secretary of Defense announced the imminent closing of a number of Army and Navy hospitals and medical facilities, and the reduction of others. According to the press release, and statements of officials, the purpose of this move was to save money by inactivating installations no longer required for military personnel, veterans, and other authorized patients, and the consolidation, where practicable, of other facilities. Claims of large savings in cost were made on behalf of this move.

Like many other administrative actions, this important step was directed without any prior notice or consultation with the Representatives in Congress, even those on the Armed Services Committee, who are supposed to represent the people in formulating the policies of the Military Establishment. The chairman of our committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, has remarked at length on certain matters concerning the functions and responsibilities of the Congress. In this case, he appointed a special subcommittee, headed by Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Caroline, to inquire into this proposed action. Meanwhile, he requested the Secretary of Defense to defer carrying out this measure until the committee had examined into the matter and made a report. Secretary of Defense Johnson was unwilling to defer action on this proposal, but did agree that none of the equipment and properties at the hospitals to be closed would be transferred, pending the outcome of the investigation.

I am, of course, in full accord with any proposal which will achieve real economy in the operation of our Government and save money for the taxpayers. However, as soon as the committee began its investigation, the amount of savings to be made began to shrink. It has now practically disappeared. What savings are achieved will apparently be made at the expense of medical care afforded our service men and women, their dependents, and the facilities available for the treatment of disabled veterans of World War I and World War II. This is an odd, and I think, an inappropriate place to begin saving, especially after the House has so recently approved expenditures of nearly $3,000,000,000 in foreign aid for the next fiscal year. Apparently, there is ample money to rehabilitate the factories, oil refineries, transportation systems, and tourist hotels in Europe; there are funds to rehabilitate the economy of Japan; there is ample cash to develop the so-called backward areas; and there is no shortage of credit or aid for the Koreans, the Chinese, the Iranians, or any other group—except for the defenders of our country, their dependents, and the veterans of World Wars I and II. This is not a partisan issue, and I do not desire to approach it on that basis; but I am totally unable to comprehend the reason or justification for seeking an illusory and unreal economy in this field.

The hearings of the subcommittee held in Washington developed conclusively that the reduction in medical facilities and care had been directed without any prior consultation with the Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, or with Admiral Boone, whose distinguished record and outstanding capabilities were evident when he testified before our subcommittee. The best that can be said for this closing order is that it was hastily conceived, on the basis of inaccurate data and incorrect or outmoded statistics. While some mistakes and errors of judgment are inevitable during the course of war, or in time of emergency, this present program is a piece of stupidity, with no necessity or justification, 5 years after the end of the shooting war.

The subcommittee which I mentioned has also made two trips, one to the Middle West, the Pacific coast and the South, and a second to Pennsylvania and New England. While I was not able to go on the first trip, I did visit Valley Forge General Hospital, near Phoenixville, Pa., and Murphy General Hospital, near Waltham, Mass. At the latter point, we also heard representatives from the United States Naval Hospital at Portsmouth, N. H.

VALLEY FORGE GENERAL HOSPITAL

On April 3, the subcommittee talked with the commanding officer and staff of this hospital, and had the benefit of hearing several eminent physicians and surgeons who serve as consultants in various fields for this hospital. These men testified that Valley Forge General Hospital has been a major facility for ophthamologic—eye—surgery, and plastic surgery for the Army and the Air Force. I need not remind you that such work requires the highest degree of professional skill and competence and requires hospitalization for an extended period. In addition, Valley Forge General Hospital has been preeminent throughout the Nation in the conduct of the controlled research on infectious hepatitis. This disease, commonly known as yellow jaundice, resulted in over 400,000 cases during World War II. Operations in the Southwest Pacific, especially New Guinea and Guadalcanal, were at one time seriously handicapped by the numbers of men disabled by this disease. I am told that at the peak one division had 7,000 men sick from this condition. In Italy, during the fall and winter of 1943, yellow jaundice was a major problem of our forces, and resulted in more hospitalization than battle casualties. According to the testimony of the eminent physicians who appeared before our committee, the period of hospitalization is from 30 to 60 days. It is obvious, in view of our numerous cases during World War II and the extended time during which victims were unable to perform duty, that the control and conquest of this disease is of major military importance. Some progress in the research necessary to its control has been made; but the Surgeon General of the Army and the consultants at Valley Forge General Hospital both assured the committee that the problem is not yet solved. In view of this, and the emphasis which is being placed on research and development in other fields, it seems incredible that the Department of Defense would close the only institution where advanced work of this type is being carried on for the Army and the Air Force, with the sponsorship of the National Research Council.

So far as the buildings and facilities at Valley Forge General Hospital are concerned, it may be noted that this institution was built during the latter part of 1942 and opened in March 1943. Construction is generally of brick facing, on concrete- or cinder-block base. At a rate of 100 square feet per patient, the capacity is 1,700 beds. On the basis of 72 square feet per patient, it is 2,000 beds, and with the use of some temporary shelter it could care for a wartime patient load of over 2,500. Prior to the order of February 15, Valley Forge General Hospital had an authorized operating capacity of 1,650 beds. When it was built in 1942–43, this hospital cost a little over $10,000,000; to replace it now would probably cost two or three times that amount. Since the end of hostilities of World War II, Valley Forge General Hospital has been thoroughly overhauled and reconditioned. During the period July 1949 through January 1950—just 6 weeks before it was ordered closed—$635,000 had been spent on the plant. New roofs have been placed on several buildings, copper water lines have been installed, a new diet kitchen has been built at a cost of $100,000, and the interiors of the ward buildings have been redecorated at the cost of another $100,000. In addition, application has been submitted, through the Department of the Army, for the approval of a FHA housing project, under Public Law 211 of this Eighty-first Congress—known as the Wherry Act—to provide essential accommodations for military and civilian staff. Projects of this type are limited to those on or in the vicinity of permanent installations; and so far as anyone knew, Valley Forge General Hospital is in that category.

As to the work this hospital is performing, there were 1,460 patients on January 31 of this year. Nine hundred and sixty-two of these are Army and Air Force personnel on active duty, 4 were retired, 163 were veterans, for whom the Department of the Army was reimbursed, and 70 were dependents of military personnel. Of the above number 233 were neuropsychiatric patients, of whom over 175 were in closed wards for the protection of themselves or other people. Most of these psychiatric cases are ultimately transferred to the Veterans' Administration, but that agency has inadequate facilities now in Pennsylvania to take care of such cases and it is compelled to contract out to private mental hospitals and sanatoriums for care of numerous veterans. Two veterans with service-connected mental disorders were recently burned to death at the tragic fire at the Bella Vista Hospital, near Philadelphia, where nine patients lost their lives.

As I stated before, there are no facilities to take care of many of these patients at the present time, either by the Army or by the Veterans' Administration. The committee also inquired as to the possibility of institutions in Philadelphia providing necessary hospital care for servicemen and dependents. We were told by well-informed civilian physicians and surgeons that the Philadelphia hospitals are now overcrowded, and that doctors wait up to 3 weeks before patients can be admitted for ward care and up to 3 months before private or semiprivate rooms are available. Even if such facilities were available, the dependents of enlisted men, many of whom receive salaries of $100–$150 per month, would be unable to pay the cost of such hospitalization.

Finally, in considering the effect of closing Valley Forge General Hospital, it is necessary to consider the impact on the training program of the Medical Corps of the Army and Air Force. If that organization is to furnish first-class care to individual service men and women, it must attract able graduates of medical schools. This can only be done by affording adequate opportunities for professional training and experience. Located, as it is, upon the outskirts of Philadelphia, where there are three outstanding medical colleges, Valley Forge General Hospital was very favorably situated to obtain the services and instruction of highly-qualified physicians and staff doctors for teaching purposes. As of the end of February, there were 27 interns participating in residency training programs, in some six special fields at Valley Forge General Hospital. In addition, there was a rotating internship program, with 11 Army interns and 4 Air Force interns. The effect of terminating such training programs cannot be other than adverse with respect to the recruitment of medical officers for our armed services.

In summary, any savings effected by the closing of Valley Forge General Hospital will be at the cost of medical care furnished our service men and women, research in vitally important fields, reduction in the limited care now available to veterans, and curtailment of the recruiting and training program of medical

officers. I cannot believe that this is the proper area in which to begin Government economy.

MURPHY GENERAL HOSPITAL

The situation at Murphy General Hospital is much the same, while Murphy General Hospital is an institution with the bed capacity of only 471, is similar in that it is situated on the outskirts of Boston, and has available the professional services of eminent doctors on the faculties and staff of the medical schools in that metropolitan center.

Murphy General Hospital is the only institution of its type operated by the Army or Air Force in the entire New England area, where there are 19,000 service personnel on active duty. In addition, there are substantial numbers of dependents and retired personnel, and during the summer large numbers of Reserve and civilian component personnel on active duty. The work of this hospital has been largely in orthopedic surgery, particularly that involving or requiring the use and fitting of special footwear. Boston is, of course, the logical center for such work, and many cases have been transferred there from other hospitals.

During the past 2 years the Surgeon General of the Army in an effort to develop plans for more efficient utilization of our personnel resources in time of war has conducted at Murphy General Hospital a program of utilizing members of the Women's Army Corps and Women's Medical Specialist Corps to the maximum extent practicable in replacing male personnel. When one considers the shortage of military manpower which developed in this country during the last war, and the terrible requirements which we would face if we became engaged in another conflict, the importance and significance of such tests and management studies become apparent. The results to date have been very satisfactory, and had this hospital remained open it is likely that the information and data obtained could have been used as the basis or pattern for operations elsewhere in time of war.

The buildings at Murphy General Hospital are of brick facing, on a concrete, or cinder block base, and are in excellent state of repair. The plant has been thoroughly overhauled and modernized in the last 4 years, and is well equipped to meet the needs of that area for a military hospital. It was constructed in 1942, at a cost of about 2½ million dollars; and to replace it at today's costs would probably take at least 5 million dollars. In place of that modern, well-equipped facility located on the outskirts of Boston, with ready access to eminent consultants, transportation facilities, and so forth, it is proposed to rehabilitate and reoccupy several vacant buildings at the former Lovell General Hospital at Fort Devens, Mass. This latter is a wartime, temporary wooden barracks-type installation, built in 1941 and 1942 to last 5 years. Some facilities are now operated there, for 100 patients from that post. Even with a much smaller number, the cost of heating the wards and the buildings there exceeds that of Murphy General Hospital. It is difficult to see where there is any economy in abandoning a modern, well-equipped permanent-type hospital and attempting to rehabilitate worn-out, temporary facilities suitable only for wartime use. Furthermore, it must be noted that the location of Fort Devens, while suitable for a wartime mobilization center, will increase the cost of transporting patients and greatly hinder if not entirely preclude the procurement of consultants from the distinguished medical colleges and hospitals in the Boston area.

So far as the situation with respect to dependents of military personnel is concerned, the situation here is much the same as in the vicinity of Philadelphia. Civilian hospitals are greatly overcrowded; and even where available, the rate for ward care is from $10 to $12 per day, or a private from from $14 to $30 per day, in addition to the other costs and charges involved.

Here again it appears that whatever economies are achieved—and they are very doubtful, if not illusory—will be at the expense of adequate medical care for servicemen and women, retired personnel of the armed services, and their dependents.

In conclusion, we must remember that we are not yet at peace. The present condition has been called a cold war but it is nonetheless a real and bitter struggle against a determined enemy who will not hesitate to use any means at his disposal if assured of success. The President announced some months ago that Russia had apparently solved the basic problems of an atomic bomb. Subsequent disclosures, such as the trial of Dr. Fuchs in England, have clearly shown that the Russians received valuable information and assistance in this line. While I sincerely hope that we shall not be thrown into the horrors of an atomic war, we must, during this period, make our preparations meet such a contingency. During World War II, the Philadelphia area was a major war production center accounting for approximately 10 percent of our total military output, and far exceeding New York City which is principally a shipping and distribution area. A war production center of this importance will certainly be a target in any future war. Distinguished civilian doctors who testified before our subcommittee stated that practically all the hospitals in Philadelphia were in the downtown metropolitan area, or so close that they would in all likelihood be seriously damaged, if not destroyed, by any atomic bomb exploding in that vicinity. Such a condition would call for greatly augmented medical and hospital facilities, outside the bomb damaged area. Under these circumstances, it would appear the part of ordinary prudence, under the present conditions, to retain in operation the only large modern, well-equipped facility able to meet some portion of the heavy load in the event of an attack upon Philadelphia. Valley Forge General Hospital, located some 10 miles from that city, is favorably situated in this regard; and for this reason alone should, in my opinion, be kept in operating condition until our foreign relations are in far better condition than exists today.

The Balance Sheet in Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Robert P. Patterson before the New York State Society of Certified Public Accountants at the Hotel Roosevelt, New York City on Monday, April 10, 1950:

It is indeed a pleasure to be with you at this meeting of the New York State Society of Certified Public Accountants.

I have called this talk the Balance Sheet in Foreign Affairs. Since the world is lining up into two opposing camps, the balance sheet could just as well be entitled "Freedom Versus Communism," or even more specifically "United States Versus Russia."

The purpose of the foreign policy Americans believe in and stand for can be summed up, I submit, in the words "maintenance of peace without surrender of freedom." Peace can, of course, be achieved at the price of submission to foreign dictatorship, but it would be the peace of the prison or the graveyard. Life under that kind of peace would be a surrender of civilization itself and hardly worth living. Peace, yes, but not at any price.

If we go back a few years, we recall the hopes held almost universally by Americans at the close of World War II. The menace of Germany and Japan was a thing of the past. The San Francisco Charter had just been signed and the United Nations was on its way. Here was the bright promise of organized world peace. The pledges were firm—the pledge of saving future generations from the scourge of war, the pledge of living together as good neighbors, the pledge of taking united measures to remove threats to the peace. Higher pledges were never put down on paper. The ways and means of performing those pledges were also agreed on by common consent, through the Security Council and General Assembly of United Nations and through provision for combined forces to support the decisions of the United Nations. All nations, large and small, signed up. There would be no more aggression by the strong against the weak, no more armament races, no more balance of power. The sky was blue. It remained only for nations or those in control of nations to live up to their engagements.

We recall how quickly our hopes for achieving a system of peace through collective world action faded, how soon the blue in the sky was followed by an overcast sky. It was only a matter of months when the proof began to pile up that the men in charge of Russia's destinies were not minded to work with free nations for removal of threats to the peace. The record of Soviet obstruction is a dreary one and there is no need to dwell long on it—Soviet resistance to control of atomic energy, Soviet opposition to ending the war against Greece, Soviet aggression against the countries of eastern Europe, Soviet ambitions in China and Korea, Soviet maneuvers to push us out of Berlin, Soviet efforts to defeat economic recovery in western Europe, Soviet fifth-column sabotage in the free countries—to say nothing of the monotonous Soviet vetoes and walk-outs in the United Nations—to say nothing of the charges that come monotonously from Moscow of American war-mongering, American imperialism, American encirclement. In that hostile and threatening behavior of the men in the Kremlin we suffered a defeat of our foreign policy, the preservation of peace through United Nations. It was a defeat that no amount of skill and diplomacy on the part of our Government could have avoided, a defeat shared by the other nations that subscribed to collective efforts to prevent war by means of United Nations.

That hostility by the 14 rulers of Soviet Russia is the most tragic fact we face as of today in the second half of the twentieth century. It has brought about the indefinite postponement of attaining peace by united world action. If war is to be avoided, it must be by other means and other measures.

Appeasement, like collaboration, is a word with a bad reputation, and deservedly so. By bitter lessons, the world has been taught that appeasement settles nothing in dealing with restless dictators; it is taken as a sign of weakness and merely serves to sharpen their appetite for more of the same. While the word appeasement is not used, there nevertheless is still a feeling in some quarters that our differences with Soviet Russia are merely due to misunderstandings, each side being actuated by good faith, and that the differences could readily be cleared up if the President would only invite Stalin to sit down with him at a table and candidly talk things over. The good-natured people who hold that opinion close their eyes to the proof that it is not the policy of Stalin, any more than it was the policy of Hitler, to have friendly relations with the United States. There are many Americans, too, who feel that somewhere there must be a fairly easy answer to the Russian problem, many who hope that before long someone in the Government will hit on it.

The answer is simple, but it is not easy.

The plain fact is that the free nations, this one included, are face to face with a set of men who control the resources of a powerful country, who are fired with the ambition to rule the world out of Moscow, who have no scruples on the means of gaining their goal. Covenants, engagements, and commitments are made only for the purpose of deceiving the other side. A twist is given to words as familiar as democracy and freedom, a twist that utterly perverts their meaning. The aim is not merely world communism; from the case of Tito and Yugoslavia we know that in all other countries the communism must be a puppet communism, directed and operated through strings that run straight to the Kremlin. Any phase of our foreign policy that fails to recognize that Moscow respects nothing but the facts of force is foredoomed to failure. At Potsdam, when Stalin, on mention of a statement by the Pope, inquired "How many divisions has the Pope?" he summed up his entire foreign policy in those six words.

There is nothing new in that, except for the scale of it. Plutarch, in his life of Theseus, wrote of a band of outlaws in ancient Greece:

"All respect for others, all justice, they thought, all equity and humanity in no way concerned those who were strong enough to win for themselves."

Little as we like it, we must conform our conduct to the truth that there is no easy answer, that a meeting across the table will not give us a swift ending of the cold war, that the road ahead will not be a smooth one, that the most solid assurance for preservation of peace will consist of the strength of our resources.

For quick assets we have the Military Establishment—Army, Navy, Air. No matter how well conceived our diplomatic measures may be, the record will finally be written in red ink unless those measures are backed up by the presence of armed strength.

If polls are still of any value, public opinion is all but unanimous on the necessity of armed strength. Americans from Maine to California are in accord that our expenditures in maintenance of the national defense should be as large as is consistent with our economic health; beyond that point no one would care to go under present conditions.

As for organization, we have the unified Department of Defense, in place of the old, out-dated structure of separate departments. We have a single team under single leadership, instead of the divided effort inherent in the system of independent services under independent departments. The new plan is logical, and it is working well. There are officers, it is true, who have found it hard to adapt their ideas to the principle of combined command. They are few, however, and becoming fewer day by day.

The differences of opinion that exist have to do with the composition of the Military Establishment. It is a waste of effort, I submit, to try to be strong everywhere, a waste that we cannot afford. The most effective deterrent to an aggressor, it would seem plain, is the ability to strike deep at his vitals. Until the day of push-button warfare, a day in the far distant future, that cannot be done save by long-range air power. Atom bombs, and hydrogen bombs, too, if they come, are utterly useless without the means of delivering them at the targets. We have no means unless we rely on air power. If these premises are sound, we will speak less about maintaining "balanced forces" and about spending one-third of our funds for national defense on each of the three arms, as if each had an equal claim on the country. Instead, we will put the emphasis—heavy emphasis—on our air strength. While it happens that my military career was confined to the infantry, I trust that I am not deserting the cause of the foot soldier by stating it as my conviction that our future security lies in air power. American air power in the twentieth century, if made unmistakably predominant, can have the same sobering effect on disturbers of the peace that British sea power had in the nineteenth century. As matters stand today, we are not devoting to the air branch the proportion of our total effort that the situation calls for.

A second asset for maintenance of peace that is under our own control is the enactment of industrial mobilization measures now, to be put into operation any time later by joint resolution of Congress. Mr. Baruch last week made a powerful appeal for action to cover this need. I subscribe to everything he said on the value of making prompt provision for priority powers, price controls, wage controls, industrial and manpower controls. In World War II we endured the wasteful experience of makeshift devices. We did win our way to mobilization of the industrial plant, through requisitioning powers, the authority to place compulsory orders on industry, and control of profits through contract renegotiation. We never did succeed in getting manpower mobilization, though almost every other nation at war lost no time in adopting a program of that character. Instead, we had the mortifying spectacle of shortages of workers in war industries and in other vital activities when there were plenty of people in unessential pursuits who were allowed to take a free ride for the war. To those who had responsibilities for keeping the men in the fighting forces equipped and supplied, the failure of Congress to pass a work-or-fight law was our greatest shortcoming on the home front.

The third asset is directly in the field of foreign relations. It consists of strengthening the forces of freedom in nations overseas. Plainly, if by assistance to people in western Europe and elsewhere who have the same devotion to the principles of free government that we have, we can help them to preserve their freedom, the risk of a march out of Moscow is reduced. Aid to Greece and Turkey, the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Defense Pact, and the Military Assistance Law were steps taken in pursuit of this policy, and they have been attended with success.

We cannot say as much for the Far East. China has been overrun by the Communists and for the time being at least has become a Russian satellite, managed by Moscow. There is no denying that this stands as an accrued liability in the balance sheet of our foreign affairs. We have not won every time.

In the performance of its task in these difficult times the State Department, I submit, is entitled to have the full confidence of the American people. Without that confidence it cannot manage its activities to the advantage of the Nation. Surely, the unproved charges that have been made so recklessly from the immunity of the floor of the Senate must not be allowed to impair that confidence. Our foreign relations, we may be certain, could not be in hands more capable or more trustworthy than those of Secretary Acheson. He has shown keen insight and clear understanding of the aims and purposes of the Russian Government. His political nonpartisanship in the conduct of foreign affairs, consistent all along, has been further attested by the appointment of two eminent statesmen of the other party to posts of high authority in the Department.

The balance sheet in foreign affairs is one that cannot carry dollar values. On the liability side we have the single item, the risk of war with Soviet Russia, and it is a risk that should not be minimized. The risk of war is always present when an ambitious dictatorship has the resources of a powerful nation under its thumb.

On the asset side we have our military forces in being. We have the priceless asset of a productive economy, with an industrial plant far beyond anything that Soviet Russia can hope for, and the priceless asset of political institutions that put up no barriers against the vigor, energy, and enterprise of men and women. Those assets, provided we manage them with a clear vision of what we are up against in world affairs, should give us a fair margin over the liability side in the days ahead. But we will not manage them wisely if we have any fuzziness in our thinking about the present and future hostility of the Soviet dictatorship. It is a hostility that no amount of argument on our part will dispel. The price we will pay for that kind of fuzziness might well be the loss of our existence as a free people.

The chances for peace will vary directly with the world-mindedness of the people of this country. The day of isolationism, we trust, is past. We cannot afford to lose sight of the position of the United States as a bulwark in the struggle for freedom.

How long will the war of nerves continue? How long must we keep on with the policy of building our military strength? The answer depends on how long the enslavement of the Russian people lasts.

From history we know that all tyrannies have finally collapsed. One day the censorship of information, the suppression of freedom in Russia will break down. One day the Politburo will no longer be able to control the destiny of 200,000,000 Russians by wish or whim. When that time comes, the world will be able to go ahead with disarmament. Not until then will the threat to peace disappear.

Russian Crab Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly called the attention of the House to the fact that during recent months 59,000 cases of Russian canned crab, valued at $3,000,000, have been imported into the United States. Also, I have said that the Russians probably have another 400,000 cases of this canned crab which they will dump into this country unless steps are taken by our executive departments to ban these imports.

The laws of this country say definitely that the Secretary of the Treasury may ban imports from foreign countries where the imported goods are produced by forced labor, and forced labor in that law is defined to mean involuntary labor.

It is common knowledge that much of the labor employed in Russia is slave or forced labor, on the ground because it is involuntary. I have urged Secretary of the Treasury Snyder to enforce this law against Russian canned crab and thereby bar further Russian crab imports and thus save our prosperous crabbing industry from destruction by Russian slave-labor competition.

Under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, I include with this speech a column, Inside Labor, by Victor Riesel. This column has appeared in 154 American newspapers having a total circulation of many millions. Mr. Riesel's column follows:

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

In any one of a hundred restaurants you don't have to rub a magic lamp and wish for a genii in order to be served by some remote slave. Just order crab meat. It will have come from a slave's hands. It will have been packed by a slave's frozen fingers. It will have been speared out of frigid waters by iron hooks held in a slave's cramped fist.

No fairy tale this. Just the story of Soviet slave labor in icy camps, dumping millions of pounds of fish for your dainty cocktail forks each month—and so beginning to kill off a multi-million dollar American fishing industry, canneries, boatbuilding and gear production.

All of which means lots fewer jobs for the average American Joe.

Within the past few months, exactly $3,000,000 worth of this fancily canned crab meat has come into the United States via Seattle and Boston—some of it direct from Russia's forced-labor fishing camps. This slave-packed food for America's tables arrived in 59,000 cases, 15,000 of which entered Seattle right from Siberia.

So that those who deal in this slave-speared crab meat shall know where it comes from—I put in the record the fact that there are 17 such slave fishing camps, stretching from Murmansk to the Sakhalin Islands. And it's easy to get into any one of them. I have before me the official Soviet Corrective Labor Code, which the State Department can have for a nickel phone call. The code (drawn up by the MVD secret police) reports that "The task of the penal policy of the proletariat during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism is the defense of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Socialist construction carried out by it, against encroachments by class-hostile elements and infringements not only on the part of déclassé elements but also of unstable elements among the workers."

To make certain of this, the secret police must put the condemned in conditions which debar them from the possibility of committing acts which inflict harm on Socialist construction.

This harm, according to the official code before me, can mean coming late to work, attempting to change jobs without permission, griping to the plant foremen out loud so that the other workers can hear, and taking too many days off from the job.

For any of these crimes, you can be sent to any one of several hundred camps run by the secret police. In some, you cut lumber. In others, you help mine 80 percent of Russia's gold. And in some, you fish—for crab meat, among other delectable items, for the world's gourmets. And, since the MVD doesn't exactly set up a pay-roll window every Friday, the crab meat can be sold in America at a price far less than it costs to fish up and can in the United States. So, the more crab meat from Russia, the fewer jobs for the United States.

And that's just what's been happening at a moment when we're thinking of setting up a CCC to care for millions of unemployed youngsters and retiring older workers.

For example, of the 59,000 cases of Soviet crab meat, about 15,000 went through Seattle and 44,000 via Boston. This second shipment came from England. When some of our business people and their Congressmen complained to ECA Chief Paul Hoffman, he revealed that the British had told him that England was forced to buy 80,000 cases of canned crab if London wanted to buy salmon, which her people needed desperately. In exchange for the vital salmon, the British send Russia woolens and cloth.

The British then start a price-cutting war with American crab fishers and packers to get something out of the deal. The English sell for $2 a case less than the American firms do, and when the Americans slash their price to meet the British competition, the British simply cut down by another $2.

There you see an American industry, with thousands of jobs, being threatened by Soviet MVD prison-camp labor. And when it was pointed out to Secretary of the Treasury Snyder that a 1930 law on our books gave him power to ban importation of goods made by forced labor ("for which the worker doesn't offer himself voluntarily," the law states specifically), Mr. Snyder apparently was too busy to reply.

All right, you don't eat crab meat. Maybe you eat nuts. Well, the other day 110,000 pounds of walnuts were unloaded in San Francisco, direct from Soviet-controlled Manchuria, and sold for 20 cents a pound less than our growers can put the stuff on the market. If it's not fish, it's nuts, or gold, or furs, or ships, or any one of a hundred items.

It's just beginning. Soon we'll have lots more to crab about than crab meat.